UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 91—PART 11

MARCH 23, 1945, TO JUNE 8, 1945

(PAGES A1399 TO A2766)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Pacific Naval Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following chapter of a report compiled by me on a trip made to the South Pacific for the Naval Affairs Committee:

Recently I had the most thrilling experience for which any man could hope. It was my privilege, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, to tour the Pacific naval bases, and with the blessing of the good Lord, and through the skill and guidance of our great Air Force, to return safely home.

My distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HEFFERNAN, of New York, will no doubt give the Naval Affairs Committee and the House a more detailed report of our experience and impressions.

As members of the Naval Affairs Committee, we were naturally primarily interested in our naval installations, and as we were guests of the Navy we were escorted by naval experts and were given every opportunity to see our Navy in action. But I will speak to you today not about our Navy but about G. I. Joe—Johnny Doughboy—the men of our Army who, with the sailors and marines, have done such a magnificent job wherever our men are called upon to give battle to the enemy. I am extremely grateful to the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee for having included me in this inspection trip, even though it was on short notice.

I have been a newspaperman for many years. Naturally this background helped me to see and to observe things, especially those that would ordinarily escape the attention of the so-called average "visiting fireman." I am not now attempting to pose as an expert on war strategy or even try to comment on matters of a military or naval nature. But, having been in public life these many years, first as a newspaperman, then as a member of the Chicago City Council, and now as a Member of this honorable body, I feel that I know human nature, or, in plain English, understand Johnny Doughboy from Main Street back home, the average American boy from the average American home, and I want to tell you my impressions of him and of his leaders.

We left the United States at the beginning of December. We returned in time for Christmas. In 3 weeks we had spanned 25,000 miles, flying from Washington to San Francisco; San Francisco to Pearl Harbor; Pearl Harbor to Kwajalein; Kwajalein to Saipan (where we saw stop-and-go signs just like in Chicago, constructed by our Army engineers); Saipan to Guam; Guam to Manus; Manus to Sydney; Sydney to Canberra; Canberra to New Caledonia; New Caledonia to Samoa; Samoa to Palmyra; Palmyra to Pearl Harbor; Pearl Harbor to San Francisco; and thence back to Washington. Twenty-five thousand miles in 3 weeks. Thanks to American wings.

It is only natural that we as Members of the House of Representatives were concerned with our own constituents who are working and fighting thousands of miles from home. Now I can much better understand the title of Bob Hope's book, I Never Left Home, because wherever I went I met boys from Chicago, from my great State of Illinois, and from my own district, and my own neighborhood. Every little hamlet, nearly every house in America is represented in each part of this global war. You can imagine how thrilled I was when in Sydney, Australia, I was greeted by a sailor who lives only a few blocks away from my home; or when I met Lt. Harry Posner, survivor of the ill-fated *McCawley*, wearer of the Purple Heart, now serving at a South Pacific base; or when I met two boys from just around the corner on an airplane carrier; or when in Pearl Harbor at the Army Hospital, "Spike" McAdams, a wounded Chicagoan, said "Hello, Bill. It's so good to see you"; or the pride which I experienced to see my old friend of newspaper days in Chicago, Col. Julius Klein, standing by the runway of an airfield cut from hills and jungle while early morning tropical sun promised sweltering heat for the day, as he waved good-bye to me after a visit with him that was both enjoyable and instructive. I was happy to see those boys and I wish I could describe to you the joy I had when in Chicago on Christmas Day I telephoned their loved ones and those of the others of the armed forces whom I met, giving them the greeting from Bill, Mike, Abe, or John from Saipan, Kwajalein, Guam, or New Caledonia.

At Pearl Harbor we had the privilege of being guests of those two great leaders of our armed forces, Admiral Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Ocean areas, and Lieutenant General Richardson, commander of all Army forces in that ocean area of fabulous distances. And from Pearl Harbor we jumped from island to island, meeting our fighting men of the land, sea, and air.

Here is something to think about, gentlemen. Many of these boys asked me these startling questions, which we at home should prepare to answer. "Is it true that back home they think the war is over?" "Do they realize that we have not met the bulk of the Japanese Army?" "Is it true that people back home who have been working in the war industries are now looking for peacetime jobs for security?" The thoughts which inspired these questions from the boys were emphasized by admirals and generals who know that they have just begun to fight, and who urge us to tell the people of the United States that the war in the Pacific is just beginning. I have come back to Washington with some entirely different answers to those questions than I had before. And I think that they are the answers which our Army and Navy leaders, and boys they lead, would make to their questions. Yes, G. I. Joe wants the war over as quickly as possible, but he feels that without 100-percent home support the fight will be long. He is confident that when the full force of the Japanese Army is met that he and his comrades will be superior to it, if given proper backing. He wants security, too, but he knows that he may have to make the supreme sacrifice to secure it for the Nation. His thoughts are not of partisan politics. He is not Republican or Democrat; not union or antiunion; not C. I. O. or A. F. of L. He is an American and he may belong to any or none of the groups mentioned, but he wants his rights protected so that when he comes home he can return to his choice or make his choice anew.

I realize that my long-distance trip (but in short time) does not qualify me to write an "inside Pacific diary," but the boys to whom I spoke from one end of the Pacific to the other can and when the sons of America come home to tell their stories, you will marvel at their accomplishments. I wish I could go into details.

I was particularly impressed with the South Pacific Base Command, or, as it is called in abbreviated military language, "SoPacBaCom," commanded by one of America's most distinguished soldiers, Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath. Not long ago American soldiers at this base on foreign soil were living in a very strange land, many thousands of miles away from home, under primitive conditions with no outlet for proper relaxation as they were accustomed to at home.

I refer now to Army supply bases in the South Pacific, the supply bases from which the vital war materials were being sent to the front, the bases where great combat convoys were formed to stop and push back the Japanese enemy. Much has been written about the morale problem in the South Pacific. Yes, there was a morale problem, and I say, yes, "Johnny Doughboy" of the supply installations was bored and lonesome. If he had been in a fox hole or in the fighting

zone his morale would have been high. But, back in the supply lines, driving trucks day and night, loading ships day and night, assembling equipment and armament day and night, without hearing a shot fired, and then after a hard day's work going to a tent in some semijungle bivouac, day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, yes, year in and year out, would get on anybody's nerves. Some of our boys have experienced this work for nearly 3 years.

I am proud and happy to report to you that in the South Pacific Base Command the commanding general, Major General Gilbreath, is aware of the sacred trust that the American people have put in him and other great generals and has demonstrated it by doing a real job not only as the chief of the supply lines but also by personally caring for the welfare of the enlisted men. Nowhere have I found more enthusiasm for a big brass hat than I found by talking to some of these soldiers when they discussed the improvements and facilities brought to them by the general. As one described him, "He spreads the welfare around. He is tough but square."

I had the pleasure of meeting Admiral Newton and General Gilbreath at their headquarters. I was given every opportunity to see what I wanted to see and to talk freely to anyone, and believe me, I did a lot of listening. And if the phrase, "Tell it to your Congressman" ever was more justified I don't know where or when. The boys pointed with pride to the modern P. X. (post exchange), their soda fountain, their open movie area, the various special-service programs, and the educational and religious facilities. I had expected to get a lot of kicks and complaints, for boys from Chicago never hesitate to speak freely. And since my colleagues will tell you more about our men of the Navy, I am glad to pay this justly deserved tribute to the Army which at this very same moment is carrying the brunt of the battle in the Philippines, which will some day invade Japan proper, and which has been supplied from these important joint Army and Navy bases in the Pacific of which I speak.

While waiting at an Army airport for my plane to take me back home, I read directives describing the job which had been met and completed by the South Pacific Base Command in the months just passed. In those were quoted a few of the remarks by General Gilbreath to the officers and men of his headquarters shortly after he took command several months ago:

"This command is a team and must work as a team. All work should be done well. It is easier to do a good piece of work than it is to do a mediocre one. We live only to do things. In so doing, our work can either improve or deteriorate; it cannot stand still. It will improve.

"Rehabilitating men who are coming into this area from zones of actual combat is a duty of this command. These men must be given every chance to recuperate from their strenuous activities, recover themselves physically and mentally. Opportunity for recreation and relaxation must be offered. This function will increase in importance.

"It is common knowledge that much has been happening in the Pacific, and more will happen in coming months More and more important operations will be launched. While the war moves to the west this command assumes another and different but important job. The duties will increase, though the nature of these duties may be altered. Our leaders know where they are going and have known since the first day they entered the war.

"Combat troops must be supplied the materials they need. Food, ammunition, clothing, gasoline, oil, and a thousand and one other items must be procured far in advance, shipped halfway around the globe, stored in depots, reconsigned, and reshipped when needed. Records, reports, supply levels must be maintained. Thousands of men are required to keep the implements of war available. We are now supplying hundreds of thousands of men and the number will become greater in coming months.

"An extensive training program for the combat troops in this area must be maintained—a job which will become more and more important in the coming months. Training facilities, aids, areas, centers, and firing ranges must be the very best that it is possible to furnish. This area is ideal for certain types of training such as amphibious beached assaults, knocking out jungle pill boxes, malarial training, and many more.

"We are charged with the defense of this area. While it is true that actual operations have moved forward, there remains the job of maintaining a sound defense. There are still enemy troops in the area. Attack is always a possibility, even though it may seem remote. We must be prepared for any emergency."

The American soldier in the South Pacific when Major General Gilbreath took over was immediately educated as to his responsibilities. In a few words, his mission was described as follows:

"We are daily and hourly performing functions which affect the defeat of Japan. To show the meaning of this statement let's take first the overall picture. The problem presented is one of getting together sufficient land and naval forces to strike at Japanese occupied lands, and to defeat the Japanese Fleet and Army. 'We are going to Tokyo * * *,' said the President. Getting these forces together is dependent upon many factors as we all know. Having the men alone is not enough. We must be able to supply these men with every single thing they need; we must be able to provide them with medical service, with training, and we must be able to transport them. Recently we have attacked and landed on many islands, and former Japanese occupied territories in the Pacific; Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Peleliu, Leyte, to name a few. These actions took a lot of planning and a lot of work. They have brought us thousands of miles closer to Tokyo. What about the effect of all of this on Sopacbacom?

"The approximate total area to these new holdings (exclusive of Leyte) is about 700 square miles. Compared to about 16,743 square miles in Sopacbacom (New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Guadalcanal) this indeed is little land on which to stage and train thousands of troops, to build large hospitals, to build up huge stock piles of ammunition, gasoline, and other equipment and supplies. And even if these newly occupied lands could take the work of Sopacbacom at the present time, we probably wouldn't want to put everything up there in one basket. Therefore, for these and other reasons, Sopacbacom is still a tremendously vital area for our offensive against the Japanese."

The Sopacbacom team is performing a mission which is vitally keyed with our strategy against the enemy.

The job described to the soldier as his mission in the South Pacific a few months ago now nears completion, and the commander may be justly proud of the achievements of his command.

I can now understand the telegram sent by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, who has a gigantic job as Army commander of the entire Pacific Ocean area, to General MacArthur, which reads as follows:

"It is with pride that this command joins Americans throughout the world in extending to you and the Army and Navy forces under your command sincere congratulations on your return to the Philippines.

"We are confident that your success will continue until the islands are once again under your command.

"I have been requested particularly by the South Pacific Base Command to convey the admiration of their officers and men in your great military achievements. The highest traditions of the United States Army are exemplified by the Sixth Army, the Tenth Corps, and the Twenty-fourth Corps.

"All of us are especially proud that our Twenty-fourth Corps has been given this opportunity to fight with you."

General MacArthur replied as follows:

"The splendid efficiency of your Twenty-fourth Corps reflects the careful training it has received under your able command. The corps has performed most gallantly."

The long months spent in building up supplies, in training troops, had then proven their worth.

So much for the past of the South Pacific and the job its officers and men have done in starting from the smallest of beginnings, far removed from Tokyo and moving island to island with troops and supplies, until now they are daily over the rooftops of Tokyo. What is the present and the future job of the South Pacific Base Command?

First, it will continue to do the job it has been doing, diminishing in scope as the contest moves westward and more advanced supply bases are opened.

Second, it will advance trained men closer to the scene of operations, where their arrival will be felt shortly thereafter by the Tokyo high command.

Third, it will advance supplies stored for local South Pacific operations to theaters and battlefields now written in the glorious pages of American history and to places now known to but few, but on some not-distant tomorrow destined to rank equal with the scenes of former fields of hallowed military memory.

Fourth, the South Pacific Base Command has begun the tremendous job of reclaiming American dollars which were originally invested in building facilities for your boys. Installations are being discontinued and the buildings and other usable materials which cannot be moved forward are being turned into salvage. Salvage drives, as intense as have ever been carried on at home, are now in progress in jungles and along coral beaches so that these materials may be returned to the States to become new weapons of war or readied for conversion to civilian enterprise. The materials of war bought by your bonds are either moving forward to continue the fight or they are going home, as the soldiers dream of doing some day, to take part in the building of a future America.

Fifth, hospitals are being developed and expertly staffed, so that the back areas are held as possible havens of rest and recuperation for the sick and wounded.

Sixth, the education of the soldier for peace has begun. This is not an education for the development of peace. Our South Pacific soldier now realizes that against the forces which he meets today his education for the achievement of peace was learning to shoot and to march and to fight to the end from jungle island to jungle island. But he is now being taught other things for the day when he will win final peace. He is learning what problems he will face at home after the war, how he can meet them, what aids Congress had provided for his future security, the G. I. bill of rights, and, above all, his responsibilities as an American citizen when he takes off his uniform and sets aside his gun for the last time.

I was particularly interested in how our three services, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the Allied troops work together. And, of course, I was particularly proud to see that our citizen soldiers, our National Guard, and Reserve Corps, have contributed so immensely to the successful prosecution of this greatest of all our wars. I met many Illinois National Guard soldiers. The Thirty-third Infantry Division, Illinois National

Guard, is now in New Guinea, but many of its officers are spread all over the world.

General Gilbreath pointed with pride to one of his assistants, a National Guard officer, one of Chicago's outstanding citizens, well known to you in Washington and also in the Middle West for his writings, Col. Julius Klein, who commands a large Quartermaster Group in the Pacific and was also the port commander there. He was recently promoted to the rank of full colonel by General Richardson upon the recommendation of General Gilbreath. In his complete uniform, Colonel Klein would wear decoration of service and accomplishment of World War No. 1 as well as World War No. 2 but today except for the silver eagle on the collar of his open khaki shirt, he looks and acts like the brother of G. I. Joe. I was glad to see him and I asked him whether he had a message for the people back home. He answered me, "Are you interviewing, now, an old interviewer, or are you asking me as my Congressman?" I asked him why and his answer was, "I am a soldier and as such at this time I cannot write or talk politics even off the record. I wish I could. But you can tell them back home that the boys overseas are doing a great job. They are doing all they can to get this war over with to help the Japanese realize their dream to join their ancestors because our boys want to be home and become ancestors themselves. But they must find a sane and sound America that will carry out the pledge given not only to servicemen and to the people of the world, security and peace. And don't let Congress again think of scrapping our Navy and cutting down our Army to a token force. Time and American industry alone helped us to erase this mistake which we made after World War No. 1."

Colonel Klein described to me the reactions of the fighting soldier. One story he told me I shall never forget. Weeks before Christmas he was with a combat outfit about to move into action. None of those he was with knew where they would be on Christmas Day, or that they would be alive to celebrate it. The night before they moved off, they lit their area by scores of Christmas candles and there in the semijungle they sang the carols which at Christmas time would reecho through the homes they loved. Men like that cannot be defeated by any enemy.

My colleagues, today I want to take my hat off to one of the most important branches in the service, one of the most gigantic undertakings of our time, and that is the supply services, the Army bases in the Pacific. And while the members of the Naval Affairs Committee are justly singing the praises of our Navy, I feel much better in having told you something about what Johnny Doughboy is doing back in the supply bases in the South Pacific, keeping the supplies flowing and getting ready himself to jump on the Jap's throat.

We are all proud of Nimitz and Halsey in the Pacific. We are all thrilled by MacArthur, and we have all reason to be very proud of leaders like General Richardson and General Gilbreath. I know now why Gen. George C. Marshall is the greatest Chief of Staff our Nation has ever produced, because he has picked the right men.

And let me conclude my remarks by telling you briefly what is on the mind of these soldiers in the South Pacific under General Gilbreath. I asked the general what G. I. Joe needs most, and here is his answer: "1. Rotation. 2. Mail from home. 3. Fresh eggs and fresh milk. That's not much to ask for."

Military necessity will naturally rule the rotation policy, but we back home must and will do all we can to make life a little easier for our boys in the service overseas.

I am glad I made this trip. Spanning the Pacific world and three times covering distances like 2,500 miles in one hop made me realize how futile isolationism really is. But it also made me realize what a great age we are living in and the wonders and the miracles of our industry which some day again will be turned back to be the industry of peace and progress because Johnny Doughboy is fighting on foreign soil to keep the war away from America and to keep for America our own way of life. We shall never be able to repay the debt for the sacrifices made by the flower of America's youth.

I hope it will be possible for each and every Member of this House to visit the war zones. It will help us all in time to come, to assure a better future for our great country.

While I was in the South Pacific, Chaplain Lawrence E. Lynch, of Brooklyn, an Army chaplain, said the following about G. I. Joe.

"Within the ranks of our young soldiers of today are our leaders of tomorrow; each boy is an important personage to us, someone very important, he is an American and represents great things. He is a future pillar of America. He is important enough to fight for America and he deserves all the care and help which he can get now. He brought his religion into the Army with him and I am sure that he will leave the Army stronger in the beliefs of his faith."

And so I say, "Yes, Father Lynch is right." Our boys and girls in uniform are assurance for a greater and better America. After this most interesting trip of my life I can tell you, my colleagues, my constituents, and the people of America that we have every reason to be proud of our sons and daughters in the service and that the flower of America's youth is in trusted hands.

Some day in the future, great writers, great composers, great artists will appear whose dramatic skill may bring home eloquently to the American people the drama of the South Pacific. While history is being made we can but watch and hope that the America of the future will cherish the gains which Johnny Doughboy's sacrifices have won.

Development of Rural Electrification Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a speech of Mr. Guy W. Thaxton, Chief, Design and Construction Division, Rural Electrification Administration, delivered at the third annual meeting of National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, San Antonio, Tex., January 16, 1945.

The address follows:

Rural electrification is not new. A program for Government activity in this field was advocated before the Congress about 1910. Rural electrification did not materialize on a large scale, however, until the Rural Electrification Administration was established by Executive order of the President in May 1935.

So-called rural electrification in the earlier days consisted largely of building short extensions to existing urban lines to serve those areas where a moderately high density could be obtained. In 1928, at the time of my first efforts to electrify Rural America, line costs were high and it was found that the consumer density which it was possible to secure by further extension of urban system lines had dropped to that point where it was necessary for the utility companies either to charge very high rates for service in rural areas, to ask for large contributions from prospective users, or to reduce line cost, if futher profitable extensions were to be made.

Operating engineers were actively engaged in studying this problem in order to lower the cost of rural line construction. But in 1932, one of the large holding companies published, for distribution to its subsidiaries, a report on rural line construction practice and cost which indicated that very little genuine progress had been made. It showed that practically all of the operating companies were still using hard-drawn copper conductor and were attaining average spans from 200 to 300 feet. Expensive cross arm construction was still being used on primary lines. No standard system voltage had yet been adopted.

Ordinarily, the private-utility company would build short extensions to serve new rural customers as the demand arose, if each such addition was deemed feasible when considered as an economic problem independent of other customers to be served in the area. This piecemeal construction did not lend itself to low cost and did not offer much possibility of a decrease in cost and because there was little line building being undertaken and specifications varied so widely, manufacturers were unable to achieve mass production.

For many years electric-utility companies and the manufacturers have had standards committees. Each individual power company had evolved a set of standards to fit the conditions encountered in its operating area. Also, each manufacturer had evolved standards which could be met by his equipment and which suited the needs of his customers. Standardization of minimum specification, by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and A. I. E. E., did not result in the interchangeability of parts of the various manufacturers. The actual line designs and arrangement of the various items of line construction were almost as numerous as the companies in the field.

Prior to the beginning of our present rural electrification program electric transmission and distribution lines were built almost exclusively by crews of the electric service companies or by forces supplied by engineering or management companies affiliated with the service companies. Only a small percentage of the work was done by independent private contractors.

The coming of the R. E. A. program changed this situation. Many contractors of all types began competing for the business of building rural lines. This competitive spirit challenged the ingenuity of construction men, and new and faster methods of construction were developed. Construction took on the appearance of the factory assembly line, with crews repeating the same operation time after time. The crews, performing one operation, were followed by other crews performing the next operation.

The possibilities of the mass-production method of construction led to the need for mass-production methods of engineering. To this, it is felt, we of the R. E. A. have contributed a great deal.

Studies and standardization take time. Therefore while standardization studies were being made by R. E. A., lines had to be built. The types of construction on the early R. E. A.-financed projects were almost as varied as that which had gone on before. The legend on the assembly unit drawings for one of our first projects states "For long span construction—not to be used on spans longer than 250 feet."

At the beginning of the R. E. A. standardization program, studies were made of all types of existing distribution systems. We finally standardized on a type which was not

new. It had been used for many years and was then being used extensively. That we have built it with mass-production methods in previously unheard of quantities constitutes our contribution to the art.

We collected most of the economies which had been proved in practice. For example, we used a grounded neutral which eliminated one cut-out and one lightning arrester per transformer, and produced a saving of $25 to $35 per mile. Furthermore, as the National Electrical Safety Code allows a clearance to ground of 3 feet less for the grounded neutral than for the hot wire, we adopted single phase vertical construction, thus saving the cost of the cross arm and braces. We were able to settle upon the design of 5 main types of assemblies for each type of line: single phase, two phase and three phase. Therefore, the majority of our lines are built with but 15 types of pole-top assemblies. The reduction in the types and kinds of hardware required is remarkable. Our standard list today carries only 66 different types of equipment, where hundreds would be used without standardization.

R. E. A. standards are temporary standards—but they represent today's best practice. Continuous studies are being made of proposed changes and improvements. Standards must not become stagnant. They must be continually improved. Tomorrow, probably, we will hit on something just a little better. Everyone connected with the engineering activities of the R. E. A. is constantly on the alert for new ideas. You have contributed many of these. However, before any proposed change is adopted, it is given a very thorough examination. The first question asked is: "Is it better than our present standard? If it is, will it require our borrowers to carry additional items of material in stock? If this is necessary, is it then worth while?"

Although there has been a steady effort toward improvement, all lines designed and constructed in accordance with our approved designs and specifications have repeatedly demonstrated their ability to withstand ice and wind storms that would have wrecked old style lines.

Average line costs have been reduced by standardization of materials, specifications, and methods from $1,500 to $2,000 per mile, which were common before R. E. A. to less than $700 per mile. One system consisting of more than 2,000 miles of lines was built for slightly less than $500 per mile average, including all overheads.

These two factors, mass-production line engineering and mass-production line construction, have resulted in construction records which 10 years ago would have been called impossible. Contracts have been executed requiring the building of as much as 10 miles per day. At the peak of construction, R. E. A. borrowers were building and energizing an average of approximately 600 miles per day.

In 1 year 125,000 miles of distribution line were completed and energized, bringing service to 281,000 more rural homes and establishments. This required an investment of approximately $100,000,000, which included generation and transmission in cases where satisfactory arrangements for the purchase of power could not be made. Now, there are more than 800 systems operated by R. E. A. borrowers, totaling more than 405,000 miles and serving nearly 1,250,000 farms and other rural establishments.

The R. E. A. program has stimulated mass manufacturing of specific items, with resultant reduction in the cost per unit. The reduction in cost has induced others to use the same equipment. Standardization became more readily available to all. We have adopted private utility ideas. Others have adopted our standards. This is as it should be. The more widely the same equipment is used, the lower the cost becomes and the more everyone benefits, including the seller.

The problem of providing sectionalizing and protection for the circuits in R. E. A. systems was encountered early in the program. Therefore, it might be well to point out the development of the single phase pole-mounted automatic circuit recloser. In the early days of the R. E. A. program only one manufacturer was making such a device and it did not lend itself too readily to the solution of our problems. A great many of them were, however, installed on an experimental basis. That manufacturer, at our urging, greatly improved his product and more recently several other manufacturers have entered this field with the result that we are now getting very much better reclosers while having to pay $40 to $50 less. Since those earlier days too we have encouraged manufacturers to produce reclosers with a type of time delay mechanism which can be adjusted in the field. While they have not brought out such equipment, we are still urging its development.

It should be pointed out that in guiding the initial design of our borrowers' system, we have made provision to take care of all the members plus half of the prospects. We were accused of being optimistic. The truth is there are many, many miles of line where there are no prospects, all of them having long since taken service.

Perhaps the variations in the size of existing R. E. A.-financed systems might be interesting. There is right here in Texas one such with 3,000 miles of lines in operation. Several of our borrowers are operating systems with as many as 2,000 miles. The average R. E. A.-financed system is slightly under 500 miles of line. On the other hand, there are today several systems with as little as 100 miles. The eventual completion of these systems on an area coverage basis will in nearly every case bring them up to the average size.

The R. E. A. systems have constituted a vast laboratory for research and observation. As an example, much has been learned concerning the different types of grounding. It has been demonstrated clearly that increased emphasis on better grounding results both in greater reliability in service and lower energy losses. As a result, the multigrounded neutral Y-connected system which we adopted is now being widely used throughout the industry. Furthermore, we have found that because such a large proportion of the current which ordinarily would be thought of as flowing in the neutral wire actually returns to the source through the ground by way of the many ground connections, it has been possible for us to adopt the policy of using for a neutral conductor a wire smaller than the phase wires with very satisfactory results and a consequent saving in first cost.

This so-called laboratory has enabled us to work out with the communications companies the coordination of their systems with R. E. A.-financed systems on a basis which has been mutually satisfactory. The great volume of R. E. A. experience has afforded, and will in the future afford, the means of obtaining accurate data and factors very valuable to design engineers with reference to fundamental assumptions, upon which such designs must be predicated.

Results from this laboratory so far obtained show convincingly that rural electric distribution systems cannot be designed with the aid of only the mathematical formulas used in designing urban circuits, but that the design engineer must use in addition sound engineering judgment and resourcefulness.

In the year ending June 30, 1944, a total of approximately 1,988,000,000 kilowatt-hours were used by more than 800 operating systems. Of this total the privately owned power companies supplied 829,000,000 kilowatt-hours, public-owned companies supplied 940,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and 219,000,000 was supplied by cooperatively owned generating plants which were financed by R. E. A. In some instances it has been found that suitable power sources were not available. In these few cases we have financed the construction of generating plants which consist of steam, Diesel, and hydro plants. The needs for wholesale power have been met in the past without large-scale construction of these plants and systems. However, the future needs for power may surpass the most optimistic estimates and more generating plants may have to be constructed to meet these needs.

What the future holds for rural electrification by us will be determined by a number of factors. Some of the factors are, or will be, within your control or the control of the employees of the Rural Electrification Administration, and others will be determined by the Congress. Possibly one of the greatest influences will be the improvements in equipment offered by the sciences and the possible development of revolutionary means of transmitting power. Not only will developments in the field of electrical engineering affect rural electrification, but also will the developments in the other fields of science.

With reference to the influence which R. E. A. employees will nave on rural electrification, it is recognized that our engineers must at all times keep professionally young and modern in their thinking. By doing so, they will not only make use of all improvements offered in the industry but also will stimulate thought looking toward the development of new devices and methods. As manufacturers bring out new equipment adaptable to the needs and suitable for rural use, the engineers of R. E. A. will stand ready to approve the incorporation of such items into the systems.

The manufacturers of equipment have cooperated splendidly with R. E. A. engineers in their efforts to bring out new or improved devices which would aid in taking reliable electrical service into the thinly settled areas. They have made a valuable contribution no rural America and to the Nation as a whole. There is yet much for them to do, however.

Development of the Nation's generating resources will be an important factor in rural electrification. As more low-cost electricity is generated, the people of the Nation can enjoy its benefits. As it is distributed to serve industrial loads and municipalities, it must be made available to rural communities. One thing is certain; it will be done.

If it is necessary to build transmission lines to get power into a rural area, this will be done. If the building of generating plants in rural areas proves to be the most economical solution, that will be done.

Now all of the foregoing brings me to the most important part of my talk. Everything which has gone before in our work has been either experimental or developmental to prove that our experimental results are right. Today, on the basis of what we have learned, together with the knowledge of the ultimate rural electrification program, we are in a position to engineer systems so that all rural people can get dependable electric service.

Back in the early days of the R. E. A. program I pointed out that our program was loosely named. We are concerned not only with rural electrification but with area electrification, area coverage. I have always had a feeling that whatever agency vent into an area to render service to farmers and rural establishments, had imposed upon it the duty and responsibility to provide service to every user within that area who could benefit economically from such service. Don't you agree that this concept is fundamentally sound and that our engineering ought to be based upon it?

Piecemeal construction without consideration of the direction, extent, and time of extensions to make up the ultimate system, runs up cost. It results in less efficiency

than area coverage. It makes the engineer go back and redesign rebuilt transmission lines and substations.

I hope that the time will come when adjacent cooperatives with the aid of their engineers will get together and draw a line on a map to delineate the area into which each system will expand. The line will not be determined by political boundaries, nor trade areas, nor any other artificial device. It will be determined by the scientific application of the principles of sound engineering economics. Everything on one side of the line will be more efficiently served by one co-op, everything on the other side by the other co-op.

All of our standardization, all of our development work, all of our experience in the past adds up to getting the best engineering and the best construction at the lowest over-all cost consistent with the requirement that good, dependable service be rendered to your members. The selection of areas of coverage, the determination of the distance to be covered from a substation and many other factors have an important bearing on our progress toward that goal. Unless somebody does draw such a line as I have mentioned we are not going to attain area coverage and we are not going to attain the lowest possible cost of satisfactory service.

When your engineers plan to provide electric service for everyone within the area to be served by your cooperative you get better engineering and lower-cost construction and greater assurance of continuity of service. And right here please let me call your attention to the fact that continuity of service must be given the same consideration as voltage regulation. The types of loads which you are serving make continuous service essential. I think that you ought to give your engineer a much greater voice in your plans than has been the custom. If you really want area coverage—and can there be any doubt of it?—then you will turn over a map of your area and say to your engineer, "Design the best system to get dependable electric service to everybody who lives here." In the past you have told him, "We want a line down this road, this road and that one." There's a great difference. You bought a coat, a vest, and a pair of pants; you didn't buy a suit.

On the other hand, as engineers we know how to get the rest of this job done. We have pioneered in a new field; yes—we made our few mistakes before we arrived at the answers. But we've got the answers now, and they are the right answers. We know it. You have told us of your willingness to undertake a most ambitious expansion program. I give you my assurance that so far as the engineering profession is concerned, that program is completely possible. The job can be done.

It is inevitable that the controlling factors in the common effort to modernize the farms and rural communities will synchronize. To watch them mesh, to have a part in applying the results, is a challenge to all engineers and, I am sure, to you and to all others who are genuinely interested in electrifying rural America.

Resignation of Bowles Demanded

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is my humble opinion that the Congress should demand that the President immediately remove Chester Bowles as the head of the Office of Price Administration. His attempts in trying to regulate the prices of some 8,000,000 different products is a dismal failure. The thousands of pages of directives which his office has issued has caused a sharp reduction in the supplies of food and other materials so desperately needed by the world.

He has failed to follow the considered judgment and advice of its advisory councils for industry.

Had it followed the advice, we would not now be witnessing such a grave shortage of food. Mr. Bowles is an advertising man—knows nothing about production. As an advertiser, he has done a fairly good job of selling O. P. A. to Congress and the country. The practical results, however, is the thing that counts. In results, he has been a failure. Yesterday, he was blaming the Army for the shortage of food—saying they had taken a large quantity. The Army claims they do not have enough and do not have a surplus of food on hand.

The O. P. A. has produced the present prices in foods:

First. By issuing hundreds of thousands of directives and orders which have confused producers, processors, and distributors. This has reduced the volume of food and materials going to the consumers.

Second. By proceeding on the recommendations of so-called experts who, in most cases, have not had practical experience, rather than by taking the advice of patriotic American men and women engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of all goods.

Third. By being more concerned lest individual businesses make a large profit in the operation than by placing the emphasis on achieving maximum production as a means of keeping down prices.

Mr. Bowles is not satisfied with the shortages he has produced in food—he even wants to regulate prices in barber and beauty shops. His philosophy has been that of regulating everything and everybody from their hair tonic to their shoestrings.

Mr. Bowles should be removed by the President and a practical man put in his place. The O. P. A. needs more than an advertising man at its head. If it is to be continued, he should be an experienced individual in the production of food.

The Nation's Meat Supply

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, the question of our meat supply, the over-all profit of the meat-packing industry, and the available supply of meat in the hands of the consumer, are now occupying the attention of our country and of these legislative bodies. A new series of regulations governing the production of fresh meats and the killing of fresh meats and the sale of fresh meats is now in contemplation, and the indications are that we are to have again a regulation which will centralize the killing in the hands of the big packers.

Every meat order, from Meat Restriction Order No. 1 down to the present time, has been so worded and so interpreted as to give the big packers the advantage in killing the largest number of pounds of the available meat. These orders have been directed to the proposition of eliminating all independent slaughterhouses which have heretofore operated under local health-inspection regulations.

In the years prior to rationing, the city of Hamilton, Ohio, used to receive an average of 15 carloads of fresh meat per week from the Chicago packers, Swift, Armour, and Wilson. Some of these packers had cold-storage facilities for storing their meat in the city of Hamilton. Since rationing, the city receives only 1 to 2 cars per week, and these cars are partially loaded with cold cuts and processed loaves rather than fresh meats.

At the same time, the local slaughtering house is restricted in the amount of meat that it can kill, to a point considerably below the number of heads of cattle and hogs which it killed during the period before rationing.

The statistics on meat supplies furnished by the Office of Price Administration in March 1945 show that in the years 1935 to 1939 the average number of pounds of total meat supply was 17,100,000,000 pounds, of which 96 percent went to civilian uses and 4 percent to the Government. In the year 1944 the total meat supply was 25,900,000,000 pounds, of which 76 percent went to civilians, and under regulations from the Food Division of the O. P. A. the distribution of this civilian supply was in the hands of the big packers of the larger cities who refused to ship it to those whom they served in prerationing days. At the same time they were urging Mr. Madigan of the Food Division of the O. P. A. to curtail the amount of meat which was available for the local slaughterhouses. Mr. Madigan, who was formerly an employee of Armour Packing Co., has allowed the American Meat Institute to dominate all regulations up to this time. It is essential that the new regulation permit the slaughter of fresh meats by local slaughterhouses which are properly inspected under local health ordinances, so that there will be a fair distribution of the available civilian supplies.

The American Meat Institute is an organization controlled by the large packers through multiple memberships, and its policies do not reflect the opinion or desires of small slaughterhouses.

The O. P. A. Food Division has conspired with the Defense Supplies Corporation to avoid paying the subsidies that are required on meat production,

and with the curtailment of the poundage which small slaughterhouses are allowed to kill, it is the slaughterhouse which is operating at a loss while the large packing house is permitted to expand its earnings to two and a half times what they were from 1936 through 1939 after taxes. The Defense Supplies Corporation, at the request of O. P. A., refused to pay a subsidy to the slaughterhouse located at Hamilton, Ohio, and sent three examiners in to determine that the Defense Supplies Corporation order was correct. After this examination, we asked the Defense Supplies Corporation to advise us the dates, invoice numbers, and names of buyers to whom processed meat was sold. The Defense Supplies Corporation in turn advised us that they had not required their examiners to make that notation, but that if we would employ an accountant and send him to the Cleveland office for special instructions and then have him return to Hamilton to make the examination—all at the expense of the small slaughterhouse—they would then consider his right to this subsidy.

Here was a Government agency, employing three accountants to inspect the records of a citizen of the United States, making a decision based upon such inspection and not being able to support that decision with any tangible evidence, and finally requiring the taxpayer, at his own expense, to make the type of examination which the Government should have made originally with the three men who were sent to Hamilton.

Administrative abuses are not the result of lack of finances in the agencies required to enforce the provision of the law, but they are strictly administrative abuses resulting from inefficiency and in some cases conspiracy to avoid carrying out the provisions of the law and regulation.

Unless the new meat regulations are so drawn up as to prohibit the possibility of these inequities of administration, then this Congress should enact by statute regulations that will eliminate these abuses.

G. I. Joe at Peace Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a short series of very interesting and important articles by my gallant, able, and distinguished friend, Maj. George J. Feldman, of the United States Army Air Forces:

[From the Boston Traveler]

G. I. JOE AT PEACE TABLE

(By Maj. George J. Feldman, U. S. Army Air Forces)

The men who are winning the war must share in winning the peace. G. I. Joe who is spilling his blood to bring us victory in battle must be granted a place at the peace table if that victory is to prove lasting.

Only he, plodding through the jungles of Guadalcanal or the hedgerows of Normandy, driving the Luftwaffe from the sky and the Japanese fleet from the seas, knows what the real cost of the next war will be if we do not now finish it for all time.

Only he can measure his sacrifices and his suffering as the price which he has paid for guarding his children and his children's children against renewed sacrifices and suffering in the years to come.

It is only he who can appraise the terms of the peace against that single overriding imperative and who can be trusted to subordinate all lesser values to the one goal that it must never happen again.

Too often in the past have the victories won by the men who gave their blood been betrayed and distorted by the peacemakers to whom war was just a fascinating game played with pins on a map. I do not mean to suggest that the peacemakers of the past were men of ill will or men unmindful of the true interests of their own nations. For the most part they were sincere and capable in their professions; well trained in the business of diplomacy.

They played their roles well as they had been taught them, with due regard for all the traditional proprieties and protocol. But no matter how high their motives or how great their skill, they had not come from the battlefields, and could not know or had forgotten what the battle means.

They decided the stakes of war without appreciating the price which had been paid for their right to decide those stakes. That full price is known only to those who have been in battle and who are fresh from battle, for man's memory is mercifully short and the reality of war is soon forgotten, most quickly by those whose suffering has been most intense.

A quarter of a century ago we fought and won a war that was to end all wars and that would reach this goal by making the world safe for democracy. It was easy to scoff at those words in the disillusioned years after 1918; to pervert them with gay jests as the world plunged to a new catastrophe.

But that scoffing and those jests came after the armistice and not before it. The truth could not be denied while the battle was still raging; last of all by those who fought.

They realized instinctively that the world no more than this Nation could exist half slave and half free and that a new enslavement would lead inevitably to a new conflict.

This truth was clearest to those who fought in the battle, yet the making of the peace that was to enshrine that truth was entrusted to men who had never seen their comrades die or felt the bite of shrapnel.

The pact of Versailles and the defeat of that treaty in our Senate were the almost inevitable results of failing to give a voice in its making to the men who had made it possible.

The leader of the Allied forces in World War No. 1 saw this clearly before the ink was yet dried on the treaties. On November 19, 1921, Marshal Foch, addressing an audience in New York, had this to say:

"It is to be noted and remembered that the Allies did not have one representative of the field forces at that peace table where the decisions were made for turning the Allied victory to the best advantage. The men who on the land, on the sea, and in the air had fallen by millions to achieve that victory had not one comrade at that table to speak for that honorable company whose greater suffering and sacrifice, in all justice, deserved that recognition.

"The armed forces are the nation in arms, and as such are entitled to representation in any international conference whose business is to adjust the results of their victory by the international agreement of the victors.

"Moreover, among men who have served together upon the battlefield there is always a certain spirit of comradeship and conciliation whether they belong to the forces of the same or of different nations. Surely, such men, who have known and solved the problems of the battlefield successfully, would be useful in the international conversion from war to peace and in the maintenance of that peace which will, beyond doubt, depend upon the character of the post-war international settlement."

Today, even before the guns are stilled, the seeds of a new and greater conflict are being sowed. Already those who have stayed at home are busy scattering the seeds of suspicion and disunity among those who are fighting side by side as one great team.

We are being told that we have been hoodwinked into war by the British and that we must be alert to see that they do not steal the fruits of victory.

We are being warned that we must prepare now for a life-and-death struggle with Russia.

We are being urged to crawl under our shell once more and to fight only those who would dare to lift it from us.

These echoes of Goebbels are growing louder with every passing week, spread ever wider by those who think in terms of personal rancor or political advantage, and who do not and cannot conceive through their own hard experience what the cost of war really is. These are not the words of our fighting men or of the fighting men of our allies.

Even if we can hope that our diplomats will this time shun the blunders of Versailles, the need will remain for recognizing G. I. Joe and his fighting comrades in arms at the peace table.

The process of diplomatic negotiation has always been shrouded in secrecy and mystery, some of it perhaps necessary, but much of it merely reflecting the bonds of tradition. The peoples of each nation can only guess what is occurring behind the scenes, and their suspicions that they have been sold out are readily fanned by the blind or by the unscrupulous.

Give the soldiers who have fought the war a place at the peace table and a share in its give and take, and these suspicions will automatically be allayed. The peace that results will truly be, and be hailed as, a people's peace rather than a diplomat's peace.

So much for the reasons for dealing G. I. Joe a hand. I know that many questions will immediately arise, even from those who quickly argue in principle. Is G. I. Joe qualified to sit in; can he hold his own in a game for which he has not been specially trained? How can the best men be selected; where shall they sit, and to what role shall we assign them? Is the whole project capable of being realized in workable, practical terms?

As regards the qualifications of our fighters, the answer is in the emphatic affirmative.

Acting under general instructions from headquarters, I have had the privilege of conducting discussion groups among the enlisted men and officers of my outfit at a fighter base in England. Naturally, they differed greatly in their capacity, their backgrounds, and their perception of issues.

But there were many among them who showed not only a keen awareness of their stake in the peace that is to be written, but a real grasp of the issues that will be involved in that peace.

There were many who had had excellent training in the specialized fields with which the peace will be concerned, in business, in economics, in law, and in history.

Surely within the 11,000,000 men in our armed forces we are not lacking in those who by education, intelligence, and training are fully capable of coping with the problems that must be settled at the peace table and can contribute importantly to their solution.

As an example of their awareness of the problems, let me quote from just one letter from G. I. Joe—in this case Sgt. Joseph Lash, in Guadalcanal—writing to Yank, who said:

"The United States must accept a responsible part in building a system of international security and promoting measures to insure peaceful arbitration of disputes: (a) An Anglo-Soviet-China-United States alliance and nonaggression pact as a nucleus of world security in which the vanquished nations will ultimately take their places; (b) a United Nations servicemen's entente to facilitate post-war collaboration and understanding; (c) retention of 1 year's military service for all persons 18 years old to keep America strong; (d) internationalization of the world's airways by making reciprocal arrangements for use of the world's airports under international control."

On some kinds of problems, moreover, G. I. Joe is from the outset, far more qualified to speak than any civilian can be.

As an example, there is the problem of the occupation of Germany and Japan. How will that be handled? How will the occupying troops be selected, and how long shall they stay?

By the time the diplomats assemble around the peace table there will already be many troops who have participated in the actual task of occupation, and who will know its meaning as no layman can.

Surely, the viewpoint of those who have had this experience must be given great weight in the decisions of the conference.

I have spoken so far of our own men, but it is equally important to include their comrades at arms. What is true of our Army and Navy is true in equal measure of those of our allies. They too include many who can couple their special training and aptitudes with their intimate and unique knowledge of the meaning of war and the need for its prevention.

I have spoken so far of our own men, but it is equally important to include their comrades at arms. What is true of our Army and Navy is true in equal measure of those of our allies.

They, too, include many who can couple their special training and aptitudes with their intimate and unique knowledge of the meaning of war and the need for its prevention.

Granting that the right men are available, how shall we go about their selection? Admittedly, this problem will be difficult, but it is in no sense insuperable.

The Army itself has developed a very efficient procedure for selecting its best qualified personnel for officer candidates. Obviously, we must guard against the choice of a purely hand-picked contingent.

The soldiers themselves should be given as much of a voice as possible in the selection of their own representatives.

One possible suggestion may be for the men in each battalion (or its counterpart in other services) to select the person they deem best qualified to represent them; these in turn could meet and choose from their own number those whom they wish to entrust with the responsibility of speaking for them.

Alternative plans may suggest themselves, but in any event the problem is one which can be licked with a modicum of the ingenuity which our armed forces have applied so successfully to far more difficult matters.

Above all, however, the representatives ultimately chosen must truly represent the fighting men and not the higher echelons. Preferably, the representatives should be chosen from the enlisted men themselves; in any event, it may be well to lay down in advance the rule that no one be chosen above the rank of captain in the Army or lieutenant in the Navy.

Having chosen our men, what role shall we assign them—with how much responsibility can we entrust them?

Again, the problem is one which will require careful consideration. I have thought a good deal about this matter; and while I have no final solution to offer, the following suggestions may offer at least a starting point:

Peace negotiations are by their very nature exceedingly complex. The final decisions are necessarily, under our Constitution and under the forms of governments of all our allies, the inescapable responsibility of the Chief Executive.

The President cannot—nor would he wish to—yield to the burden of this ultimate duty, nor can the responsibility of the Senate for review and approval of the decisions reached be shifted or diluted.

In practice, however, the terms of peace and the framework of future world organization cannot be decided alone and unaided by the President and the British Prime Minister, by Marshal Stalin and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the chiefs of the other United Nations.

Treaties have never been so made. It is true, as I have already said, that our leaders will have to make the final decisions and that they will have to lay down the broad lines of policy which must guide their respective delegations.

In practice, however, the details will have to be worked out, as always, by a series of many groups or committees, each working on specific phases of the problem; on boundaries and banking and reparations, on trade and terms of occupation and on the details of international cooperation.

Each of these groups is normally composed of civilian experts in their respective fields. It is the work of these groups or committees which gives living flesh and blood to the frameworks laid down by the chief executives and it is in terms of this living flesh and blood that the peace will have real meaning and content.

We must permit G. I. Joe to participate in the work of these committees, to sit with the civilian representatives of his nation and with his comrades at arms and civilian representatives of the other United Nations, and work with them in the development of the world of the future.

The little that he may lack in specialized knowledge or experience can be soon made up and will be far more than compensated from the start by his knowledge of what war means and his burning awareness of the goals for which he has been fighting.

Naturally, he, as well as his civilian colleagues, must accept the broad decisions of his commander in chief, but he will not be accepting them blindly.

Nor is it inconceivable that the mere fact that G. I. Joe will know what these decisions are should affect the thinking of those who make them.

In interpreting them and in giving them the life of detailed expression he will bring to the counsel table a fresh viewpoint unwarped by the shackles of tradition, and permeated by a clear view of his goal.

He may make mistakes in judgment, no less than the civilian diplomat, but the mistakes will err on the side of vision and not of pettiness.

Once such a peace has been written it will gain public acceptance never before accorded to any peace conceived in tradition and midwifed by protocol.

Against such a peace there could be leveled no accusation of undercover diplomacy or of the bartering of national interest. A peace so conceived and brought forth would by its nature be acclaimed and approved by the populace of each nation.

No subtle campaign of misrepresentation could bar its passage by Congress, nor its wholehearted support by all its signatories in the years to come.

Moreover, it would be a peace made by youth, for our soldiers are young. It would be their peace and they would support it and make it real as they assume their inevitable roles of leadership in the political life of the future.

Let me emphasize again that the detailed proposals which I have outlined must be regarded merely as suggestions. They can undoubtedly be improved upon in many respects.

On the basic principle, however, there should be no compromise.

The old ways have failed in the past and must fail again. The new way must succeed because it is inherently right.

Those who spilled their blood to bring victory must be given a chance to make sure this time that their victory will not again be lost.

Protest of the Council of the American Priests of Polish Descent of the Archdiocese of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which I have received today, dated March 19, 1945:

MARCH 19, 1945.

The Honorable GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR MR. SADOWSKI: We, the American clergy of Polish extraction of the Archdiocese of Detroit, and 300,000 souls entrusted to our spiritual care and guidance, view with misgivings and alarm the decisions of the Big Three conference. We feel that the unfair, unjust, and ungrateful treatment of Poland and other small nations as Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by the Crimean Conference, violating not only the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but ethical principles, for the sake of power politics and political expedinecy, was a betrayal of our hopes and expectations so confidently placed in the hands of our leaders.

Time and again glowing tributes we hoped to have been sincere were paid our loyal ally, Poland, by the President, when he said "that Poland was the inspiration of nations"; by Winston Churchill when he said, "That in the fateful days of 1940 when in no uncertain terms Poland contributed immeasurably to save Great Britain." Now by the decisions of the Crimean Conference we learn that the men who were the inspiration of nations and saviors—the heroes of Narvik, of the African campaign, of the Mediterranean invasions, and of western Europe—are to be compensated for their deeds of valor and untold sacrifices by dismemberment, loss of their land and 12,000,000 of their compatriots, and by the interference in the internal affairs of their government. It is inconceivable to punish an ally for his contributions to victory. History never recorded such a case.

We most vehemently protest the further appeasement of our Russian ally, and the condoning of outrages perpetrated by the Big Three. These would only serve the

purposes of a new aggression and the sowing of the seeds of a new war. May we urge you not to be a partner in this crime. May we solicit your aid to uphold and to live up to the American traditions by keeping untarnished the historical records of a nation that was never a party to injustices committed to weaker nations.

May the protests of Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson in similar circumstances re-echo again. We place the fate of Poland in your able hands and your reasoned judgment.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. ADALBERT ZADALA,
President.
Rev. VINCENT V. BORKOWICZ,
Vice President.
Rev. FRANCIS J. ZDRODOWSKI,
Secretary.

Executive board: Most Rev. Stephen Woznicki, D. D., honorary president; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Adalbert B. Zadala, president; Rev. Vincent V. Borkowicz, vice president; Rev. Francis J. Zdrodowski, secretary.

Board of directors: Most Rev. Stephen Woznicki, D. D., Rt. Rev. Msgr. Adalbert B. Zadala, Rev. Vincent V. Borkowicz, Rev. Francis J. Zdrodowski, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Grupa, Rev. Eustace Bartoszewicz, O. M. C., Rev. Maximilian Kamieniecki, Rev. John V. Raczynski, Rev. Ladislaus Szok, Rev. Edward J. Szumal, Rev. Stephen W. Trepczynski, Rev. Peter P. Walkowiak.

St. Albertus: Rev. Bernard F. Ciesielski, Rev. M. J. Witkowski, Rev. Sylvester J. Radziecki, Rev. Peter Borkowicz.

St. Andrew: Rev. Stephen W. Trepczynski, Rev. Ignatius Czapski, Rev. Edmund F. Behrendt, Rev. Alexander J. Siubowski.

Church of the Ascension: Rev. Anthony J. Kolanczyk, Rev. Edward J. Sobczak.

Church of the Assumption: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Adalbert B. Zadala, Rev. Edward J. Miotke, Rev. Francis A. Lukasiewicz.

St. Bartholomew: Rev. John C. Miller.

St. Casimir: Rev. Edward S. Maisel, Rev. Peter P. Wyrzykowski, Rev. Victor J. Dominas.

St. Christopher: Rev. Louis C. Zurek.

Corpus Christi: Rev. S. M. Sacilowski, Rev. Francis J. Sysol.

St. Cunegundis: Rev. Alexander S. Wilczewski, Rev. Francis J. Dolot, Rev. Victor M. Kolasa.

St. Florian: Rev. Peter P. Walkowiak, Rev. Paul C. Zelaff, Rev. Boleslaus B. Postula, Rev. Francis Okonowski, Rev. Edward W. Bujak, Rev. Thaddeus F. Wypijewski.

St. Francis: Rev. Maximilian Gannas, Rev. Edward F. Kalinowski, Rev. Francis P. Kozlowski, Rev. Charles A. Szczesny.

St. Hedwig: Rev. Floria Zaklikowski, O. M. C., Rev. Justinian Pawelek, O. M. C., Rev. John Chrobak, O. M. C., Rev. Louis Glinski, O. M. C., Rev. Isidore Swierkowski, O. M. C. Rev. Thaddeus Krochmal, O. M. C., Rev. Valentine Ras, O. M. C.

St. Hyacinth: Most Rev. Stephen S. Woznicki, D. D., Rev. John A. Krause, Rev. Edward F. Kalinowski, Rev. Edwin Milka.

Immaculate Conception: Rev. John V. Raczynski, Rev. Maximilian Kamieniecki, Rev. Thomas J. Zielinski.

St. John Cantius: Rev. Vincent Anuszkiewicz, Rev. Edmund J. Wolschon.

St. Josaphat: Rev. Alex F. Jarzembowski, Rev. Ladislaus S. Golas.

St. Ladislaus: Rev. Anthony A. Majewski, Rev. Alphonse A. Madeja, Rev. Francis J. Szaniawski, Rev. John J. Rozak.

St. Lawrence: Rev. Vincent J. Balcer, Rev. Leo A. Malkowski.

St. Louis: Rev. Constantine Dziuk, Rev. Edmund S. Domer, Rev. Edward S. Szczepanski.

Our Lady Help of Christians: Rev. Peter S. Rypel, Rev. Thomas Jobs, Rev. Valentine J. Kaznowski.

Our Lady Queen of Angels: Rev. Eustace Bartoszewicz, O. M. C.; Rev. Conrad Wawrzynczyk, O. M. C.; Rev. Pius Kaluzny, O. M. C.; Rev. Francis Widlak, O. M. C; Rev. Bede Ziolkowski, O. M. C.

Our Lady Queen of Apostles: Rev. Ladisalus Szok, Rev. Albert J. Folta, Rev. Edward Rucinski.

Our Lady Queen of Heaven: Rev. Albert A. Mrowka, Rev. Anthony I. Wasielewski.

St. Peter and Paul: Rev. Francis S. Gramza, Rev. Lawrence J. Matysiak.

Church of the Resurrection: Rev. Francis A. Banaszak, Rev. Edward M. Obuchowski, Rev. Michael J. Filip.

St. Stanislaus: Rev. Vincent V. Borkowicz, Rev. Walter Jasionowicz, Rev. Joseph J. Matlenga, Rev. Andrew M. Nieckarz.

St. Stephen: Rev. Boleslaus A. Milinkiewicz, Rev. Francis J. Zdrodowski.

Sweetest Heart of Mary: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Grupa, Rev. Stephen A. Rojewski, Rev. Jerome S. Smalarz, Rev. Jerome A. Herman.

St. Thomas the Apostle: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stanislaus S. Skrzycki, Rev. Leonard A. Makulski, Rev. Benedict J. Rembelski, Rev. Mitchell J. Bednarski.

Our Lady of Refuge, Orchard Lake: Rev. Simon S. Kilar, Rev. Joseph M. Torzewski.

St. Philip, Columbus: Rev. S. J. Dziatkiewicz.

St. Barbara, Dearborn: Rev. Joseph F. Tompor, Rev. Roman F. Narkun.

St. John Baptist: Rev. Theodore F. Kowalewski.

St. Camillus, Eloise: Rev. Jerome E. Juchniewicz.

St. Stephen, New Boston: Rev. Alphonse A. Nowogrodzki.

Church of the Transfiguration: Rev. Egidius L. Bartol.

St. Joseph, Pontiac: Rev. Bernard F. Jarzembowski.

St. Helena, Wyandotte: Rev. John J. Bartkowiak.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel: Rev. Ladislaus A. Krych, Rev. Thaddeus J. Rzeznik, Rev. Joseph S. Strzelewicz.

St. Stanislaus Kostka: Rev. Alexander Szumowski, Rev. Casimir F. Lutomski.

Sacred Heart Seminary: Rev. Stanley S. Borucki, Rev. Joseph J. Szymaszek, Rev. Francis J. Wojcik.

SS. Cyril and Methodius Seminary: Rev. Edward J. Szumal, Rev. Joseph Rybinski, Rev. Constantine Cyran, Rev. John Buszek, Rev. Venceslaus Filipowicz, Rev. Ladislaus Janiga, Rev. Valerius Jasinski, Rev. Michael Koltuniak, Rev. Joseph Kubik, Rev. Anthony Maksimik, Rev. Bruno Neumann, Rev. Francis Orlik, Rev. Andrew Pawelczak, Rev. Edward Popielarz, Rev. Chester Ropella, Rev. Edward Skrocki, Rev. Joseph Ewastek, Rev. Henry Torzala, Rev. Henry Waraksa, Rev. Andrew Wotta.

Broadcasting of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Broadcasting of Tomorrow," delivered by Paul A. Porter, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at a meeting of the National Association of Broadcasters held at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on March 12, 1945.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $208 to print the address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I first want to assure both broadcasters and their guests that I am completely aware of the obvious fact that sudden appointment to important public office does not of itself contribute to the wisdom of the appointee. To the contrary, some of you no doubt believe—and I have had some expression of that point of view—that the acceptance of this particular job at this particular time, far from constituting any evidence of infallability or competent judgment, is proof positive of the exact opposite. Three months' tenure would incline me to support that view, and I am assured, day by day, that the worst is yet to come.

These preliminary observations are made solely for the purpose of seeking to avoid creating the impression that I think I know the answers. I haven't yet caught up with the questions. One thing I wish to emphasize: In spite of some pretty general doubts as to the sanity of anyone assuming these duties, I have attempted to bring to the job a sense of public responsibility, a deep feeling as to the importance and scope of the problems ahead, and some understanding of the life and habits of broadcasters.

I am appreciative of the many expressions of confidence and good will that I have received from broadcasters. I hope to deserve your continuing confidence and, further, I hope relationships between the Commission and the industry always will be based upon the solid ground of mutual understanding that will permit the Commission to discharge its functions competently and honestly and the industry to perform its important public responsibilities in an atmosphere free from suspicion or mistrust, either on the part of the regulatory agency or on the part of those affected by its rules and policies.

I do not want to give the impression that I am predicting an era of tranquillity or the dawn of a new age of sweetness and light. There just aren't enough frequencies to go around for that—or maybe in the not too distant future there will be too many frequences. What I am trying to say is that the Commission and its members should feel free as public officials to express frankly and openly their views and opinions upon problems of mutual concern without being subject to the charge of attempting to preach, reform, or to abolish the American system of broadcasting. There are a number of problems, of which we are all conscious, that can only be met rationally by free and open discussion and for my part I propose to do just that when I conceive it to be my responsibility to express an opinion or to advocate some policy, although it is my aim to do as little talking as possible. Tonight seems an appropriate occasion to talk candidly about a few of the problems we face together.

Again, in all humility, I emphasize that my views, insofar as they may have matured upon the questions I propose to discuss, are worth listening to only because I happen to occupy this position at a time when the communications industry is on the threshold of such vast and significant developments.

I have tried and will continue to strive, insofar as my own responsibilities are concerned, to maintain an open mind, to decide questions or policies, insofar as I can influence them, only after accumulating all the facts I can absorb and to act on specific matters only in concert with my colleagues on the Commission whose public responsibilities are identical to mine.

I have never thought there was any back door to this Commission. But if there ever was I want to assert that as far as I am concerned that door is locked and the key

thrown away. The front door is wide open to all who have business before the agency and your views and advice are solicited and welcomed in assisting us in the discharge of our duties.

I consented tonight to talk about Broadcasting of Tomorrow. The topic is not a limited one even if I felt competent to discuss it. It involves prophecy of the sort that I would not like to undertake. It's dangerous business as well. There is the stern voice of experience to prove just how far wrong can be those who essay to stake out the future. For example, not too many years ago, as time is measured, one oracle spoke thus about the future of broadcasting:

"It is inconceivable that we should allow so great a possibility for service, for news, for entertainment, for education, and for vital commercial purposes to be drowned in advertising chatter."

These were not the words of an irresponsible crackpot or reckless reformer. This was an utterance of Herbert Hoover at the first radio conference in 1922. Two years later at the conference in 1924, the distinguished Secretary of Commerce and future President had another try at predicting the future of this dynamic industry when he said:

"I believe that the quickest way to kill broadcasting would be to use it for direct advertising."

Please don't misunderstand me. The only point I am trying to make is that prophecy is really a dangerous undertaking. But Mr. Hoover, as is well known, is a very persistent individual. Again in 1925 he made a final fling at this pastime of prophecy when he said:

"Advertising in the intrusive sense will dull the interest of the listener and will thus defeat the industry. Furthermore it can bring disaster to the very purpose of advertising if it creates resentment to the advertiser."

And this particular prophecy was made, you understand, before the days of the singing commercial.

Now, I hope I do not subject myself to the charge that I have made an attack on advertising, free enterprise, or private initiative, because I have quoted Herbert Hoover. His early forecasts on the future pattern of broadcasting as he saw it 20 years ago have not come to pass.

Today, however, many influential broadcasters have expressed to me deep concern over what they themselves describe as an alarming trend toward "excessive commercialism." They see, as do many of us who have studied the great progress of this industry, developments which unless checked may lead to real difficulty in the future. I have been told, as I am sure many of you have, that somehow there must be a determination as to whether broadcasting is simply going to operate as an advertising and entertainment media or whether it will continue to perform in increasing measure public service functions in addition. I want broadcasters themselves to provide the answer to that question. The cloud on the horizon is bigger than a man's hand and I know that responsible broadcasters see it and are concerned about it.

Naturally you are asking yourselves the question as to what extent the Commission may propose to inject itself into this particular field. I wish I could tell you the answer to that one but I can't because I don't know. I am familiar with all the arguments about the Government keeping its rude, bureaucratic hands off of anything that smacks of program control and I am in agreement with most of those arguments. I am likewise conscious of the limitations imposed by Congress in the statute with respect to matters involving censorship and am fully aware of the dangers of any Government agency, legislative or administrative, toying with standards of program content.

But under present circumstances one of the issues involved has taken a different form and it has been laid right on the Commission's door step. Briefly the facts are these: An applicant seeks a construction permit for a new station and in his application makes the usual representations as to the type of service he proposes. These representations include specific pledges that time will be made available for civic, educational, agricultural, and other public-service programs. The station is constructed and begins operations. Subsequently the licensee asks for a 3-year renewal and the record clearly shows that he has not fulfilled the promises made to the Commission when he received the original grant. The Commission in the past has, for a variety of reasons, including limitations of staff, automatically renewed these licenses even in cases where there is a vast disparity between promises and performance.

We have under consideration at the present time, however, a procedure whereby promises will be compared with performances. I think the industry is entitled to know of our concern in this matter and should be informed that there is pending before the Commission staff proposals which are designed to strengthen renewal procedures and give the Commission a more definite picture of the station's over-all operation when licenses come up for renewal.

I have no present views as to what further steps should be taken when it appears from the record in a specific case that an applicant has completely disregarded the representations upon which he obtained his original grant. Obviously no one would advocate that the representations made in the original application constitute a rigid blueprint for the future. Experience will dictate new and superior methods of performing public service. But in cases where commercial opportunities cause a complete abandonment of other services which he has agreed to perform a different question is raised. I am not charging that broadcasting generally has tossed public service out the window. We all know that is not true. What I am saying is that there seems to be a growing body of responsible opinion that believes that the public functions of broadcasting are becoming submerged by commercialism.

Under these conditions, I submit to you that in a case such as I have described, the Commission is confronted with a real problem. Are we of the Commission to assume that the statutory standard of public interest becomes a mere negative presumption and that so long as the licensee violates none of the specific prohibition against obscenity, lotteries, and the like, the regulatory authority is not to inquire further into the licensee's general performance? I do not believe Congress so intended—or at least some individual Members of the present Congress are looking to the Commission for some clarification of policy in this respect.

We all recognize the important part played by broadcasting in the war program. None should seek to detract from vast contributions which have been made by the networks and a great majority of the individual stations. Perhaps I have become sensitive to what seems to be an increasingly critical atmosphere because I have only recently become exposed to it. Believing as I do in the great potentials of this industry, it is my personal view that broadcasting can never be content to become merely adequate. It can and must continue to seek new and more engaging methods to win and maintain public approval. And in evaluating public approval, it seems to me, the tastes and interests of minorities must be taken into account. Above all, it seems to me that it does no good to merely resent criticism. The nature of broadcasting is such that most listeners feel a proprietary interest in its operations and, I recognize, too, that it is often true that the sins of a few are charged against the industry as a whole. But the obvious course is to seek to remove the cause of justifiable criticism.

It is my personal position, as I have indicated, that it is far better for broadcasters themselves to take whatever actions may be necessary to eliminate the causes of general public dissatisfaction. I would view with great reluctance attempts to legislate more detailed standards in the field of the public service obligations of broadcasting. I have grave doubts not only as to the propriety but as to the practicability of spelling out by mathematical formula or some other device the general methods which broadcasters should follow in discharging their public service functions.

The question of freedom of broadcasting is involved and those of us who feel deeply about this subject want broadcasting to remain free because it deserves to and not simply because it may under our system be entitled to claim some kind of immunity from enforced standards of conduct.

What I have said lacks specificity. And I have been general on purpose. But I think responsible broadcasters are aware of the nature of the problems to which I have alluded. I have attempted to call attention to considerations which I know are of concern to you, to increasing segments of public opinion, to the Congress and the Commission. I have no suggestions as to any general remedy for the problem. I think the answer rests primarily with the broadcasting industry and it is my hope that there will be honest public discussion on the basic questions of policies and procedures and that action will follow which will make it apparent to all that broadcasting can and will perform those functions which Congress intended it to perform and which its licenses require of it.

I do not believe that there is a broadcaster in the sound of my voice who does not agree with me that if public clamor against certain practices continues, there is a very real danger that the solutions which might be proposed would be more severe than the realities of the situation require. Broadcasting of the past has been a great and growing force in America; broadcasting of today is making notable contributions to public welfare; broadcasting of tomorrow—my formal subject this evening—will be what you as individual broadcasters make it.

There are a few other problems which I would like to mention that lie down the road not too distant. The Commission will soon be required to consider definite licensing policies with respect to television, FM and other new services. Certain contours of these policies have already been developed, with particular emphasis on avoidance of monopoly or centralization of control or whatever term you may wish to apply. With these principles I am in complete accord and I think you are, too.

There is one basic conception I would like to emphasize. Broadcasting has come of age. I think you gentlemen as leaders of the industry know that it can stand on its own feet now and need not rely upon heavy aggregations of outside capital for future development. Those of you now in this field, plus independent newcomers who propose to bring to broadcasting their skills and talents rather than merely their accumulated funds, can I think carry broadcasting to the new heights which the engineers and technicians have mapped out.

To be more specific, sound public policy would, in my judgment, oppose large sums of Wall Street money or any other funds coming into broadcasting as a purely speculative venture. A new empire of the ether—the spectrum space for FM and television—is about to open up. The way applicants are lining up at the barrier waiting to go is somewhat reminiscent of the Oklahoma Territory at noon April 12, 1889. I do not

know when the signal gun will be fired. It will be soon, I hope. But for the proper development of this valuable new empire, I think we want to exclude the speculators, the high-pressure promoters and others who are looking merely for a quick turnover. A sound licensing policy will welcome the true homesteader and should offer grants only to those who want to take up permanent residence in this new empire, cultivate it and improve it and generally operate it in the public interest. And as far as I am concerned, I am looking to broadcasters—the proven pioneers—as the ones who will take the lead in the great developments that lie ahead. And I conceive it to be the duty of the Commission to provide every encouragement to that end.

The reasons of public policy against purely speculative raids on broadcasting from any source are clear. Congress when it wrote the Communications Act of 1934, was concerned with diversification of control over a great new instrument for molding the thoughts and habits of the Nation. Congress didn't want control in the hands of any Federal agency, and it didn't want control concentrated in the hands of any private monopoly. So it wrote antimonopoly provisions throughout the act and those provisions are still in force and effect. You are familiar with the present requirements as to multiple ownership of FM and television stations, and are aware of the past efforts of the Commission to create competitive conditions in a field limited by physical facts of allocation. This protection against monopoly, it seems to me, while primarily for the benefit of the public, also protects the independent broadcast station operators who compose the chief membership of this association and who have contributed so much to the development of standard broadcasting as we know it today. There is a corresponding responsibility, accordingly, on the present broadcasters, to move forward with the advance of the art and to bring to the public the fullest possible service on the new bands which will soon be opened up for FM, television, facsimile, and the other new services.

I don't mean to suggest, of course, that existing broadcasters are to be protected against all newcomers in FM, television, or other new fields, and I don't think broadcasters want any such protection. The proposal of the FM broadcasters that the FM band we widened to 80 or 100 channels and that educational broadcasting be provided for is a clear indication that the basic philosophy of the free competitive field in broadcasting is not only the policy of Congress and of the Commission, but of forward-looking broadcasters as well.

The basic principles of diversification of control and individual-licensee responsibility are now so well understood and widely accepted that we have the opportunity to build FM and television soundly from the beginning if we have the wisdom to profit by experience.

In the early days of standard broadcasting, these principles were not as well understood; and so various concentrations of control arose which, as you know, have been eliminated only with some difficulty. Unscrambling that situation has been, and is, no easy matter, as the industry, the Commission, the Congress, and the Supreme Court know.

Fortunately, both for the Commission and for the industry, we have, today, a Congress which is perhaps better informed with respect to broadcasting than its predecessors were. A long succession of hearings, first on the White resolution and then on the Sanders bill and then on the Wheeler-White bill and then the select committee to investigate the F. C. C., interspersed with annual hearings before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and the perennial Petrillo hearings—these sessions have certainly made the Congress expert in the problems which we face together. It is accordingly not too much to hope that, during the critical period of planning which lies ahead, the industry, the Commission and the Congress can each, in its own sphere, work toward a sound broadcasting structure for the future.

I mentioned how much harder it is to undo the mistakes of the past than to build right from the beginning. An example is the hearings which the Commission has announced on the clear channels for May of this year. The need for this hearing can be clearly stated. According to the best data currently available to the Commission, approximately 38.5 percent of the area of the continental United States lies outside the daytime service area of any standard broadcast station; in this area live more than 10,000,000 people who are thus without daytime radio service. At night nearly 57 percent of the area of the country lies outside the primary service area of any standard broadcast station; and hence the 21,000,000 people residing in these regions must rely on a relatively inferior secondary service. This is an intolerable situation for a country with our great resources and technical capacity. The condition is particularly aggravated when you consider that the millions who have no service or only inferior service are precisely those isolated rural families which of necessity must rely the most on radio for their contact with the outside world. I want to emphasize that the decision to reopen the clear-channel issues, with special attention to the congressional mandate to insure a Nation-wide radio service was a unanimous decision. I know of no one in the Commission who does not recognize the need for a reappraisal of this problem.

If we were starting from the beginning in standard broadcasting, as we are in television, for example, the Commission's engineers and the industry engineers could sit down and draw a master plan of allocation which would theoreticaly meet the service reqirements of the entire country, both rural and urban. But, of course, we all recognize the difference between starting de novo and doing the best we can within the limits set by the existing situation. Just because an engineer's chart might show that wider coverage could be obtained by moving a clear-channel station located on the coast to an inland site does not mean that, all things considered, public interest would require such a shift. But I hope we will have the opportunity to look at many possibilities, and I want to assure you that the Commission is determined to consider all relevant factors—social, economic, day and night coverage, rural and urban coverage, considerations of an equitable distribution of facilities, and the like—before it reaches even tentative conclusions.

What I am asking is full and complete cooperation of all interested elements in building a record from which sound conclusions can be drawn. The allocation hearings just closed were a magnificent example of the way in which industry and Government can pull together in reaching an agreement at least on the facts upon which conclusions must be based. There were, of course, some exceptions in the allocations hearings—a few problems too tough to achieve agreement even on the facts. But in reviewing the spectrum from 10 kilocycles to 30,000,000 kilocycles the amount of agreement reached is astonishing—thanks principally to industry cooperation in building the record. N. B. C. and C. B. S. both applauded the television allocation, for example. So the day of miracles is not past. I am hopeful that similar cooperative efforts will characterize the clear-channel hearings, and from the way we are started I think that will be the case.

I want to say to you further and with all earnestness that the Commission faces the clear channel problem with no advance conclusions or commitments. So far as I know, we are completely open-minded. We want first of all to determine what the Nation-wide service picture really is. The latest survey on that subject is already 7 years old and was challenged as inadequate when it was made. We want a picture of what is technically possible from an engineering point of view. And we want all the other facts in addition to engineering data which bear upon the subject. With such a record, it should be possible for the Commission to reach conclusions which would bring service to the underserved millions without doing violence to the American system of broadcasting or the legitimate interests of any particular broadcaster.

The clear-channel group of broadcasters, the 4 networks and all other interested parties who have something to contribute can be of genuine help by coming in with really constructive proposals for improving the present situation. Such proposals might involve the relocating of some facilities, changes in power upward or downward, duplicate operation on clear channels, changes in antenna design or any other proposals directed toward the objective of obtaining a really Nation-wide service. It is my belief that we'll come out with a much sounder solution if we have constructive proposals from the industry to consider, rather than having a record filled with attempts to explain why so many of the channels which were cleared with such great difficulty in the late 1920's are now rendering their primary service to the residents of fully served urban centers.

I've been asked why there was no FM issue written into our clear-channel order. The answer, in part at least, is that it's still too early to determine the effect of FM on AM broadcasting. In the highly unlikely event that FM supplants AM altogether in the next few years, the problem solves itself. No one, of course, seriously believes that's what will happen—certainly not the people who have been buying standard broadcast stations lately. In the somewhat more likely event that after a period of years enough city broadcasters have established themselves so firmly in FM that they just don't seek renewal of their standard broadcast licenses, it may be possible to solve the clear-channel problem by creating some more clear channels in the holes that are thus left open. But even that solution is conjectural and lies in the indefinite future. It's little comfort to the underserved millions today to tell them that some day FM may solve all the problems of standard broadcasting. That's why we're opening the clear-channel problem now, and leaving the effect of FM on clear channels for the future. I need not remind this group that, under the legislation which Congress enacted in 1927 and reenacted in 1934, a radio channel is public domain, not private property. Congress could hardly have stated that fact more explicitly when it provided—and I quote the congressional language—for "the use of channels, but not the ownership thereof, by persons for limited periods of time, under licenses granted by Federal authority, and no such license shall be construed to create any right beyond the terms, conditions, and periods of the license." The Commission, in setting the terms and conditions, must under the law seek to establish a satisfactory service for the entire country, and that is our basic aim in the clear-channel hearing.

In conclusion, I have a final point. The opportunity presented by presence of Members of Congress is too tempting to refrain from a little lobbying. I want to lobby quite frankly and openly for a bigger and better F. C. C. appropriation. And I am optimistic enough to hope that the broadcasting industry, which is alleged to have had some experience in this activity, might offer some assistance. Because I think I can prove to you that it is to our mutual advantage that

the regulatory and licensing facilities of the Commission be expanded and improved.

I hasten to point out to the gentlemen of Congress that I have read section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code which makes it a penal offense to use appropriations to pay for personal services to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose legislation, and I have a legal opinion that since I am doing this on N. A. B. time and at their expense the statute does not apply.

My purposes in seeking a larger appropriation for regular activities—not just a slightly larger but a much larger appropriation—do not arise from the pride of a bureaucrat who wants a bigger staff or more luxurious assistance, but stems from an honest conviction that the better the job the Commission does the better not only the public but the industries which the Commission regulates will be served. Let's take a few examples.

The Commission urgently needs more personel to process broadcasting applications. On the very day the War Production Board gives the green light for civilian station construction the Commission will be beseiged for prompt action on some 500 applications for new FM stations (more than 350 of which are now on file), almost 100 television applications now on file and many more to come in these and other services. We estimate that when manpower and materials become available our licensing work will be increased at least ten-fold over the rate that prevailed before the war.

Even if procedures are drastically revised and every effort made to simplify and streamline, the administrative burden of discharging our statutory functions in determining the legal, technical, financial, and other qualifications of applicants will be enormously increased.

Many of you broadcasters have applications pending and there are many others in the industry who have been waiting for a termination of the war in order to improve existing facilities or build new stations. Considerable sums have been invested in preliminary engineering and legal work, money has been expended on sites, and other preparatory and development expenses have been incurred. After months of waiting and planning you and other broadcasters will want and expect and deserve prompt service from the Commission.

Frankly, you are not going to get it unless the Commission has the opportunity to expand its facilities and personnel to give this service. All of you are familiar with the amount of work necessary to bring even an uncontested application to final decision. This is not the place to debate whether all the procedures in effect are essential but I think there will be agreement at least upon the necessity of the Commission making an adequate review of the proposals it receives. Then consider the 350 FM and 100 television applications, with many more to come when the green light flashes. Then I will ask you to make a mental estimate of the number of engineers we now have on hand to process them. The Non-Standard Broadcast Section of our Engineering Department is responsible for processing these applications. But, in addition to television and FM, this section also has responsibility for international broadcasting, facsimile, studio-transmitter link, and some miscellaneous categories. And the section which has all these duties is composed at present of precisely 3 engineers.

We are reviewing our work-load, present and anticipated, with a view of asking Congress for a supplemental appropriation in order that those who have post-war plans about communications, including broadcasting, will not be held up by the Commission. Our goal in broadcast matters is to give the industry and the public a 30-day speed of service on all applications which can be granted without a hearing and a 90-day speed of service where a hearing is necessary. If we achieve this goal, the development of post-war broadcasting will be expedited, employment opportunities created for returning veterans and others and when final victory over our enemies is achieved we should be ready to move forward without undue delay.

It is a source of embarrassment to those of us at the Commission to have to explain to Members of Congress and applicants why the matters in which they are interested have been pending for months without action. Frankly, we all have gotten a little weary of having to apologize. We are now going to estimate our work as accurately as we can and submit a plan to the Budget Bureau and Congress which will be designed to achieve the goals we have set for ourselves. And I have every confidence that Congress will view our requirements sympathetically.

Speed of service is only one aspect of the problem in which broadcasters should be interested. There is also the question of quality of service. FM, for example, is being widely advertised to the public as an interference-free service. It is also being urged as the final solution to all the alleged ills of broadcasting, all the way from the need for more free speech to the question of what to do about clear channels. I hope it fulfills all these expectations and I believe it has a real chance to do it. But the achieving of these or any other ends will depend in good measure upon soundness of the Commission's FM rules, its standards of good engineering practice, and the proper application of these technical rules and standards in particular cases. The standard broadcast band today is an eloquent example of how badly such problems were handled 20 years ago. An effort must be made to get the technical rules and standards as near right as possible the first time rather than to try to unscramble the omelet at some future date.

Accordingly, as soon as the allocations are out of the way, the Commission's technical staff will get into the job of developing the soundest possible technical rules and standards to match. Of course, we want to do the best job possible. That means more engineers—and the best engineers to be had. It means also a strengthening of the legal and accounting departments.

When we submit revised estimates for these important purposes we may try to get a little more money for research. I am not talking about the kind of research that is performed in the great laboratories of this industry. But rather a sufficient staff of competent experts to coordinate the results of private research wherever it is important for the industry as a whole and applicable to the functions of the regulatory agency. Those of you who sat through the allocations hearings know how frequently an important issue turned upon the answer to a particular question—and nobody knew the answer. As Major Armstrong put it at one point, the Commission was in a position of having to predict or guess what was going to happen at the height of the next 11-year sunspot cycle. There were many other examples where intelligent research would have been vastly superior to argument in answering difficult questions.

In the Technical Information Division of the Commission, where research of this general character is centered, we find again only three engineers.

There are other important fields of nontechnical research that could be explored. Questions of social and economic policy are too often based upon the predilections of the individual rather than upon facts. (My earlier remarks this evening may be cited by some as an evidence of that conclusion.) But back in 1938, Senator WHEELER introduced a bill to establish a Director of Research within the Commission and so I take no credit for the idea. However, I am of the firm opinion that every dollar spent upon the proper kind of research in communications will be returned many times in terms of better service to the public, a more informed attitude by the regulatory authority and perhaps result in a more stable foundation for the industries involved.

Finally, an increase appropriation is only one phase of getting us ready to do our job properly and promptly finding the right men to fill the jobs is another. Today, of course, all the money in the world wouldn't get the engineering talent we need. Radio engineers are largely in the armed forces or engaged in vital war communications work. But as these men are released the Commission will want and need the services of some of them. I am hopeful, indeed, that the Commission at the proper time can sit down with the Army Signal Corps and the Office of Naval Communications and work out an arrangement whereby our employment needs will be geared into their demobilization policies. In that way a qualified veteran could walk into the Commission the day he was discharged from the armed forces and find a desk ready and his work laid out.

Time does not permit discussion or exploration of other problems which lie ahead. I can only say that we have our work cut out for us. In addition to winding up the frequency allocations above 25,000 kilocycles and bringing out a proposed allocation below 25,000 kilocycles, and devising rules and standards of good engineering practice for the new services involved, we also have the clear channel hearing in prospect. Moreover there is the complex question of international communications and the proposals for a consolidation or merger of these carriers. If that completed the agenda for the immediate figure, it would be enough. But there's the question of what to do about international broadcasting when O. W. I. is no longer in the field and we must consider that. Added to that is the question of what new communications legislation should be recommended to Congress. And, of course meantime, we must help prepare for the Inter-American Radio Conference at Rio de Janeiro in June and perhaps a world telecommunications conference thereafter. And always right ahead of us are the hundreds—and perhaps thousands—of broadcast applications staring us in the eye demanding attention when the freeze is thawed.

It looks like a busy spring ahead.

Forty-five Days 'Til Frisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is any single person in the United States who has worked more wholeheartedly and diligently on behalf of intelligent international cooperation than the Reverend E. A. Conway, S. J., of the social-action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

Those of us who have been privileged to know Father Conway and to have worked with him in a small way have the highest admiration and respect for him as a man and as a forthright worker for the cause of international cooperation.

I am very pleased, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks to include a

radio broadcast made by him in Indianapolis, Ind., on March 11, 1945, under the auspices of the Indiana Committee for Victory:

Only 45 days remain before the world-shaping conference of the 44 United Nations at San Francisco on April 25.

Mr. Henry F. Grady, president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and one-time assistant secretary of state, said recently that the conference "may well prove to be the most significant conclave in the history of the human race."

I know it is customary to take chamber of commerce statements with a liberal sprinkling of salt, but in this case I am inclined to agree with Mr. Grady.

I am reminded, in this connection, of a letter which John Adams wrote to his wife on the 3d day of July 1776. Said John Adams to Mrs. Adams, "Yesterday, the greatest question was decided which ever was debated in America; and a greater perhaps never was, nor will be, decided among men. A resolution was passed without one dissenting colony that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states."

At San Francisco, as a matter of fact, a greater question will be decided among men. The meeting in the Golden Gate city will be far more important than that other meeting which so impressed John Adams. In 1776 men formed 13 free and independent States; and that, and I say it proudly, was a mighty achievement. But in 1945 men have it in their power to form one world. Philadelphia gave birth to a new nation; San Francisco may bring forth a new world order.

Make no mistake about it, my dear friends, the parley that is going to take place in San Francisco will set the pattern of the world for generations to come. Out of these San Francisco sessions will come an organized world or an anarchic world—one world or the end of the world as we know it. Out of them will come lasting peace or eventually another war.

How can we explain the American public's continuing apathy toward the San Francisco Conference? May it not be the result of the ordinary citizen's humble underestimation of his own power and his lack of knowledge of how to make his influence felt—of how he can play his part in that vague but powerful thing known as public opinion?

I was happy to learn on my arrival in Indianapolis that you are taking steps here in Indiana to remedy that situation. I take the liberty of congratulating you citizens of Indiana and especially the Indiana Committee for Victory, because your Governor is the first, as far as I know, to have designated a special foreign-policy week (week of March 25) in which to develop public interest in the problem of organizing the peace.

Public opinion can make itself felt at the San Francisco Conference. I am quite sure it has already played its part in other conferences, I think it is unquestionable that public opinion influenced the compromises of the Yalta Conference. I think it is safe to say that the decision of the Big Three to act conjointly henceforth was undoubtedly influenced by widespread opposition to "unilateralism" both here and in Britain. The right of free elections in the liberated lands and the compromise on the question of the unlimited veto were also, I believe, at least partially the result of insistent public pressure.

But, unfortunately, on other questions public pressure has thus far been too little because the "pressers" have been too few. There has been no ground swell of opinion, no deep rumbling from within the Nation to tell our national authorities that at San Francisco we are determined that they shall develop what the Yalta communiqué said in such a fine phrase: "A new world order under law."

Speaking as a churchman, I venture to say that no group in the Nation has done more than the organized religious groups to develop public understanding of these problems. The official Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish agencies have issued formal statements or commentaries on the tentative Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a world security organization.

First came the now famous Bishops' Statement on International Order, issued by 103 Catholic bishops on November 16, 1944. Two months later, on January 17 of this year, the Synagogue Council of America, representing orthodox, conservative, and reformed Jews, published its official judgment. Next day the Federal Council of Churches adopted a resolution in the name of organized Protestantism proposing nine measures designed to bring the Dumbarton Oaks plan "into closer conformity with Christian ideals."

In view of the fact that these three groups agreed over a year ago on the essentials of the ideal world organization, as expressed in the trifaith "pattern for peace," it is not surprising that their criticisms of the concrete proposals of Dumbarton Oaks are substantially the same.

A comparative study of the recent commentaries on the Dumbarton proposals would seem to indicate that the three religious groups agree that the Dumbarton proposals are a constructive step toward world cooperation. But it is likewise evident that they want the San Francisco Conference to make many improvements in the present preliminary draft.

I suggest on the basis of the official statements the following nine improvements as a program which Catholics, Protestants, and Jews can support together:

1. Preamble: A preamble acknowledging that States are subject, no less than individuals, to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God. (It might go on to reaffirm the principles of the Atlantic Charter, as the Federal council suggested and as the Chinese delegation had already proposed. But it seems to me that the preamble should dig down to the solid rock of the moral law and commit the signatory states to the acknowledgment that they are subject to a law that "takes priority over their individual wills.")

2. Commission on international law: A body of experts should be organized at once to proceed with the development and codification of international law.

3. Commission on human rights: A similar commission should be set up at once, under the social and economic council, to draw up an international bill of human rights, to be subscribed to by all the members of the proposed organization.

4. Commission on non-self-governing peoples: A third commission or council should be added, to act in an advisory and consultative capacity for the advancement of dependent peoples, and to supervise the administration of existing mandated territories and dependent territories taken from enemy states.

5. Commission on minorities: A commission should be set up to safeguard the rights of racial, religious, and cultural minorities, including groups uprooted by war or oppression.

6. Disarmament: The draft should provide more specific guaranties that drastic limitation of national armaments will be inaugurated as soon as collective security measures have proved successful.

7. Rights of small nations: More specific guaranties should be given that the economic and political independence of the smaller members of the organization will be safeguarded, and an adequate share given them in the policy making of the new organization.

8. Revision of treaties: More specific provision should be incorporated in the draft for the future revision of territorial and other settlements made during the "transition period," and for the revision of any treaties which may be adjudged to be unjust.

9. Voting procedure: The Yalta compromise on the veto remains a compromise. It should not be continued indefinitely. We should urge that provision be made in the draft for the review of the question after a definite period of time.

I suggest these nine points for improvement as a program for immediate action by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews together. These points have the merit, I believe, of being specific. Neither the State Department officials nor our San Francisco delegates are aided by vaguely phrased demands that morality be injected into the final charter They are quite justified in asking, it seems to me, "Just what do you want us to change?"

To which I hope all of us, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, will reply, "We want nine improvements. We want this preamble. We want these four commissions. We want more specific commitments on these three points. And we want provision for eventual review of the veto power given the Big Five."

We have 45 days to agree on a common program and to make our demands known to our delegation.

What will come of San Francisco, no one yet knows. The weight of the world will rest on the delegates of these 44 nations. The words which Churchill addressed to the Royal Air Force might well be paraphrased and applied to them and to their governmental chiefs, "Never have so many depended for so much upon so few." But a little depends upon you, too. Upon you depends whether our delegates go to San Francisco assured that you want an international organization but likewise convinced that you want these nine improvements. They will be if enough people write and tell them so.

But remember—only 45 days—only 45 working days until Frisco.

Polish People Fear Lublin Committee—Polish-Russian Unity, Friendship, and Good Will Being Destroyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the London Dziennik Polski, March 21, dealing with conditions in Poland under the Lublin authorities since the Crimea Conference:

We receive reports from Poland and from neutral countries from time to time. Though meager and fragmentary, these reports deal with facts and not of sporadic ones resulting from some individual abuse of power. The Lublin people, after announcing the Crimea decision, predicted, left and right, semiofficially and whisperingly, that now, on the eve of the reconstruction of their government, their politics could be changed. They say they will prove to world opinion that they are able to govern democratically. However, everything ended with whispered propaganda.

After the Crimean decisions not even the smallest changes can be seen on Polish soil. Arrests and mass deportation of Poles toward the east continue. This affects particularly those Polish territories which are east of the

Curzon line. On March 3, 1945, during 1 day only, 1,000 Poles were sent from Lwow to an unknown destination. At the same time thousands were being deported to provinces. Among the deported, 20 percent were women, and the age of the deported varied from 14 to 70. Conditions in which Poles are being imprisoned and deported are simply ghastly and full of cruelty. Hence, many cases of death. In Russia these deportees are presented as Germans or as German collaborators.

The cruel aim lies therein, to cause inimical feeling amongst the Russian population against those unfortunate people. All neutral citizens, who are returning from Poland, repeat the desperate appeals of the Polish mission of the Polish community, for help, for causing arrests and deportations to cease, and if that be impossible, then at least, for softening of police authorities' methods. The appeal, "Do not allow us to be destroyed" sounds from all sides of tortured Poland. East of the Curzon line compulsory calls into the army and forcible moving of the population continues. Cases of ordinary plundering are very frequent. A third food quota has been forced onto the peasants. And all that is happening after the Yalta Conference.

Announcing this news, we have no intention to doubt with the facts the good-will of Stalin, who also at Yalta repeated many times that he wanted to see a strong and free Poland, but we must question, in the light of those facts, the good-will of the Soviet police authorities who are acting in Poland, as well as that of their agents—men from Lublin.

The Polish Nation, organized by its traditional political parties, headed by the secret committee of ministers in Poland and armed by their home army, upheld a positive attitude toward Russia. They contributed to the victories of the Red Army, where and how they could, paying with the highest price—with their blood. Only recently—a few days ago—Moscow stressed with unusual objectivity, the almost unheard-of efficiency and good-will of the Polish railway workers who, not waiting for their pay or for the "Lublin authorities," took into their own hands the initiative of fighting the Germans. With lightning speed they earnestly restored communications on the rear of the Red Army which was biting into German defense positions on the Oder. The Red Army advanced further in their victorious march and behind them police authorities and their Lublin agents began to arrive. Hope dwindled. It is exactly those people from Lublin and their authorizers who destroy confidence in the good-will of the Russian authorities and destroy sympathy toward Russia which could have well increased.

The Dumbarton Oaks Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the Dumbarton Oak plan by Dorothy Thompson, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of March 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Lord Beveridge, of the famous Beveridge plan, is by nature optimistic and by years old and wise. A few weeks ago he expressed lack of optimism about the Dumbarton Oaks plan and stated that he feared this form of world organization and voting system might lead us instead into the next war.

Lord Beveridge is not alone in his hesitations. There is also Comdr. Harold Stassen. But there has been little candid discussion of the proposals raising the critical questions. Our intellectual leaders—historians, publicists, international lawyers—seem afraid to "rock the boat" and are under pressure to accept the plan in its present form lest there "should be no world peace." Enduring peace is civilization's most imperative need, and since the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have become associated in every mind with this hope, to criticize them is seemingly to betray peace.

Yet the scheme, as filled out at Yalta, calls for sober reflection, retrospectively and prospectively.

Once before three powers, after a series of meetings between the heads of states, presented to their peoples, delirious with joy, a plan for "peace for our times." Its thesis was that if the three great European powers of that day could agree "never to go to war against each other"—and they did—peace could be maintained indefinitely.

But this peace also rested on the assumption that whereas great powers should submit to no strictures, smaller states should be subject to compulsions if their policies seemed to threaten the peace of the powers. That concept inevitably involves the readiness of the weak to renounce force in behalf of those who will not themselves renounce it.

Thus the powers delivered up Austria to one of their number "to avoid war." Thus the powers—avoiding "unilateral decisions"—brought united pressure to dismember the Czechoslovak state "in the interests of world peace." The Runciman commission had the task of actually putting Czechoslovakia in the role of aggressor should she refuse to accept the decision of the big three.

The big-three agreement—the peace of Munich—which ended in the extinction of the Czechoslovak Republic, though there is still a Czech Government in Prague, did not preclude other alliances, as Dumbarton Oaks does not. Britain and France made an alliance with Poland against aggressors. Germany also had a long-standing nonagression treaty with the same state.

The Munich peace foundered on the unwillingness of Poland to sacrifice herself for the peace of the powers, and the refusal of two of them, Britain and France, to coerce her.

Germany, having concluded a nonaggression pact with Russia and, assuming that the peace of Munich would continue through a unilateral decision, or be restored after a fait accompli, moved into Poland on a "mere punitive expedition," whereupon the alliances, after some horrified hesitation, went into play.

It will be argued that none of the present great powers has the aggressive intentions of Hitler Germany. But prudent men do not draw contracts even with their best friends on the assumption of no possibility of default. And there is nothing, as far as I can see, in the Dumbarton Oaks plan, as such, to prevent a repetition of this bitter experience.

The great powers are to be above all law and subject to no compulsions. Therefore the force that is to be used to prevent aggression, can only be used to coerce small states that might threaten the peace of the powers. If the great powers should agree on measures to be taken against smaller states these would be helpless, but if any one of the powers should seek to extend its influence over a small state, by force or the threat of force, or by interventions hitherto unpermissible under international law, nothing could stop that power that would not at the same time dissolve the world organization.

What is, in fact, proposed is not a world order of law, but an organizational instrument for continuing great-power agreements. In our own times we have seen where this can lead. It is the prelude to the present war.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, at Testimonial Dinner for Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at a testimonial dinner honoring Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, March 25, 1945, at the Hotel Commodore, New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to be invited to speak at this testimonial dinner to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. I welcome the opportunity to express my highest admiration for the manner in which he has conducted a most difficult cause, and for the unswerving adherence he has displayed for the principles in which he believes. My interest in a Palestine State was brought about by Dr. Silver's clear presentation of the facts and the ideals which make it an attainable goal to be vigorously sought. It is principally due to Dr. Silver's earnest methods that one public man after another, that one party after another, have come to support and advocate publicly the establishment of a Palestine Commonwealth.

I believe my proper function here is to lay before you in a brief statement the actual facts relating to the Palestine Commonwealth since February 1, 1944, when Senator WAGNER and I introduced Senate Resolution 247. After reciting the Balfour Declaration and the 1922 resolution of Congress, our resolution proposed that the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstruct Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth.

I don't here need to review the history which gave rise to that resolution, beginning with the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, in which the British Government committed itself to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. That declaration was carried into the Palestine mandate by which that country was turned over to the British Government, already committed to the Zionist principle. It was carried into the treaty which we made

with the British Government regarding mandated territory. It was reaffirmed by the Congress of the United States by resolution on June 30, 1922. After the World War Jewish immigration into Palestine continued and a great deal of money and effort were expended in building up the economic life of this small homeland.

During this period the British showed no great sympathy with their own Balfour Declaration and worked out a complete separation from Palestine of the territory of Trans-Jordania, which always had been a part of Palestine. Then came the shock of the white paper of 1937 essentially repudiating the Balfour Declaration, placing a limit on Jewish immigration and making future independence impossible. It is significant that the League of Nations, which granted the mandate refused to sanction this repudiation. It is significant that our Government has refused to recognize it It is significant that Mr. Churchill himself stated on May 22, 1939, that it "is a plain breach of a solemn obligation." But the British are still in Palestine. Immigration is still greatly restricted. The British Government officially has never repudiated the white paper of 1937.

Now we have come to one of the great periods of national reorganization in the history of the world. It will not be easy for many years, if ever, to reverse arrangements which are made in connection with the approaching peace settlement. Dr. Silver and his friends realized that the issue cannot any longer be bypassed or postponed. Unless the principle is adopted now by the great powers and incorporated in the peace settlement, there will be no Jewish national home and no Jewish commonwealth. We cannot long support the Arab position and the Jewish position at the same time. This Government must take a public and definite position now, and urge now upon the British Government the performance of its obligations; or our position on the question will become of no importance.

When our resolution was introduced, and at all times since then, it has had the overwhelming personal support of the Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It was immediately met, however, by the opposition of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, undoubtedly with the knowledge and assent of the President and the Secretary of State. The Secretary of War stated that even the holding of public hearings on the resolution "had grave implications which would seriously interfere with the progress of the war." While dubious of the facts, the committee had no choice except to accept the military judgment of our military leaders. But the committee was astonished a few days later to have the President issue a statement that "full justice will be done to those who ask a Jewish national home, for which our Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy." Surely if the holding of public hearings by the Senate would have so stirred up Arab public opinion as to endanger our armies, the issuance of this statement by our President, with his tremendous prestige, would have had even more effect. But there is no evidence that there was the slightest interference with our armies then fighting in Italy.

The matter remained quiet until the Republican National Convention in June 1944 called for the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and land ownership, so that Palestine might be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. The platform said, "We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provisions of the Balfour Declaration and of the mandate while he pretends to support them."

Thereupon the Democratic platform in July endorsed the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

On October 12 Governor Dewey endorsed the Republican plank. On October 15 the President endorsed the Democratic plank and stated that "Efforts will be made to find ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable."

Immediately after the election Senator WAGNER and I therefore pressed for immediate consideration of our resolution. At Dr. Silver's suggestion, I had obtained a letter from the Secretary of War stating that the military considerations which led to his previous action in opposing the passage of the resolution were not as strong a factor as they had been, that in his judgment political considerations now outweighed the military, and that the issue should be determined upon the political rather than the military basis.

We were greatly astonished, therefore, when the Secretary of State appeared before the committee and opposed the passage of the resolution, apparently under the President's direction. This was all in secret. The committee insisted on proceeding to report the resolution unless the Secretary of State was willing to state publicly his opinion. This he finally did on December 11, 1944, after consultation with the President, giving his opinion that passage of the resolution at the present time would be unwise from the standpoint of the general international situation. Even then the resolution was only shelved by a vote of 12 to 8. Yet only last week the President again endorsed the Democratic platform and stated that he would seek to bring about its earliest realization.

Why on earth, then, should the President object to a Senate resolution urging him to use his good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that this policy may be carried out. What is the position of the administration on this question? It says one thing and does another. It is suggested that the President wishes a free hand to persuade the Arabs and the British into this policy without arousing them by a congressional resolution. Why would his hand not be strengthened by such a resolution? I am told that protests from the Arabs have naively suggested that they realize the exigencies of an American election and that they do not take seriously promises made in a campaign, but a resolution passed at this time would alarm them. This is hardly a complimentary attitude toward American statesmanship.

I think we are entitled to doubt that the President has taken any steps to carry out the promise of the campaign. We have not been told what was said in the conversation with Ibn Saud, but the President stated that he learned more in 5 minutes conversation with Ibn Saud about the Moslem problem and the Jewish problem than he could have learned in the exchange of 2 or 3 dozen letters. But did he tell Ibn Saud as he told Dr. Wise last week that he and the United States favored the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine? I doubt it. Whether he did or not, apparently he did not obtain any concession, for he is quoted as saying last week that he would continue to seek to bring about the earliest realization of Zionism.

I cannot overemphasize the vital nature of the present moment and the necessity of the United States Government taking an unequivocal position with the British and the Arabs. What is the reason for our failure to do so? Fundamentally it seems to be the fear of arousing Arab opposition. If that fear is to prevail today, why will it not prevail indefinitely? The Arab position is bound to grow stronger, and their success today will increase their future opposition. If the question is not settled now, it never will be settled. For today our armies are at the height of their power and in a short time Germany will be prostrate.

Can it be that we are afraid to press the issue because of our desire to obtain Arab oil? If the desire for oil is to prevail over the interests of the Jewish people in Palestine, I see no reason why it should not prevail indefinitely, for oil will become a more and more scarce commodity and the importance of the oil fields in Arabia will apparently increase. If the Palestine problem is settled right, why can't we hope for as much oil from Arabia as if it is settled wrong?

Can it be that we are afraid of antagonizing the British Government? It seems to me that we are in a better position to persuade the British Government today than perhaps we will ever be in the future. Furthermore, we are told reliably that Prime Minister Churchill, who has always supported the Jewish position, and a tremendous party in England, perhaps a majority of the people, that does the same, would welcome strong representations from this Government. I do not believe we can longer blame our failure to act on the British.

I am prepared to reintroduce the resolution at any time that your leaders think it is advisable. I can only repeat that unless our Government takes a different position talking to foreign nations before the peace treaty is signed than it has up to this time the chance for the establishment of a Palestine commonwealth will disappear forever. I have heretofore stated the reasons why I believe the establishment of that commonwealth is the best solution of the Jewish question in Europe. I see no interference with the development of Arab nationality throughout the great territory which they control without restriction. I see no other practical solution of the terrible Jewish problem in eastern Europe. I see no other method of keeping our promises to the Jews throughout the world.

Throughout this long contest Dr. Silver has stood firm for prompt action by our Government. He has not been diverted by personal considerations or party considerations. He has courteously but persistently presented the fundamental principles of the Palestine situation to every branch of the Government, to the authorities of the political parties, and to the public. He has not quibbled about words, but he has refused to compromise on principle. It has been a pleasure to be associated with him and to testify to his unswerving loyalty to the interests of the people of the United States. For if this problem is left unsolved, out of our failure to solve it may easily grow the Third World War, which it is our first national interest to prevent.

Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts regarding the wildlife sanctuary in Essex County, which have my strong approval:

Resolutions requesting the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Reserves, of the United States House of Representatives, to restrain any further action by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the Parker River and Monomoy Point refuges until the completion of an investigation thereof by a joint committee of the general court

Whereas the committee on conservation of the General Court of Massachusetts has been directed, under an order adopted by both branches of said general court on January 29, in the current year, to conduct a special investigation of the acquisition of lands in the Commonwealth by the Federal Government for the purpose of national wildlife refuges; and

Whereas said committee has held numerous public hearings in the process of carrying out said order; and

Whereas sworn testimony given in such hearings by many landowners and farm owners in such wildlife-refuge areas indicates that subterfuge, misrepresentation, and threats were made in acquiring portions of said land; and

Whereas a bill repealing the State law which enabled the United States Department of the Interior to acquire lands for wildlife-refuge purposes was filed in the general court in September 1944 because of alleged bad faith on the part of the agents of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

Whereas the said committee has reason to believe, at this time, that the filing of this bill caused the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to accelerate their plans for the Parker River refuge and hasten a meeting on December 13, 1944, with the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for permission to acquire this area so that the declaration of taking could be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts on December 30, 1944, just prior to January 1945, when the General court convened and could consider this bill; and

Whereas according to the testimony of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Director, Ira N. Gabrielson, before said committee on March 5, 1945, approximately 6,800 acres, representing nearly 70 percent of all land acquired by the Federal Government in the Parker River refuge area, was seized by condemnation proceedings in said district court on December 30, 1944, without any advance notice to the land owners involved that their lands were being taken; and

Whereas said committee has reason to doubt that the acquisition of lands for the Parker River and Monomoy Point refuges are duly authorized by law; and

Whereas further testimony now being taken by said committee from reputable and authoritative sources tends to indicate reasonable doubt as to the suitability of the Parker River refuge and of the Monomoy Point area for the purposes for which they have been acquired; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, together with the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources of the United States House of Representatives, are respectfully requested to restrain immediately any further action or proceedings of any nature by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, its agents or representatives, on the Parker River and Monomoy Point refuges until the completion of the investigation by said committee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, together with a copy of the order adopted by the General Court on January 29, 1945, be sent to each member of the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and each member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 13, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted in concurrence March 14, 1945:

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Academic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Academic Freedom," from yesterday's edition of PM.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

We congratulate Dr. Homer P. Rainey, deposed president of the University of Texas, for declining to prove again that academic freedom has been suppressed at that institution.

Rainey has just turned down the offer of the Dallas Times-Herald to give $5,000 to the Red Cross (or any charity he named) to prove this suppression by "specific and indisputable facts." We agree with Rainey that this already has been proved "specifically and indisputably" in three ways by:

Rainey's 16-point protest against the regents' administration of the university which preceded his firing last fall.

The Senate investigation which followed.

The conclusions of the American Association of University Professors—highest academic tribunal in the country.

If the Dallas Times-Herald wanted to get the facts, all it had to do was turn loose some reporters really to report the story that remained just barely beneath the surface for several years and burst forth flamboyantly in the Senate investigation.

That's what the Austin American did. Edited by an alumnus, Gordon Fulcher, and having many loyal ex-students on its staff, this paper found plenty of proof in the finest job of Rainey coverage in the State of Texas.

That's what PM did, in 4 days and a few nights, listening out in Texas, which proved to our satisfaction "specifically and indisputably" that academic freedom had been kicked all over the campus.

A few fearless editors of small independent papers in Texas also were able to prove it.

And repeatedly correspondents for the powerful papers of the big Texas cities—papers too involved in the same interests of philosophy of the anti-Rainey forces—confided to me their deep shame that a Texas paper could not delve into this story.

In making the Times-Herald offer, the publisher, Tom M. Gootch, challenged Rainey:

"If the students have not been curtailed in their freedom in the search for truth, how can it be proved that academic freedom has been squelched?"

If the Times-Herald is so concerned about the students' quest for the truth, why didn't the paper get up and yell for it when the students, almost to a man, marched to the capitol under a banner proclaiming: "Academic Freedom Is Dead?"

The Times-Herald, in its offer, contends it has no connection with Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, the Texas regulars, or the powerful oil, utility, banking, and motion picture interests which Rainey charges were out to get him. What then was holding the Times-Herald back in supporting Rainey when he needed its support so sorely?

It seems to us that the only thing the Dallas publisher can do, if his offer is in as good faith as he insists, is to follow Rainey's suggestion and turn his offer about. Let the regents answer.

"If there is still any doubt in your mind," suggests Rainey, "call upon the regents to show indisputable proof that they have not violated the principles of academic freedom and the principles of good university administration."

Let the regents prove they were primarily concerned in protecting students' search for truth when they fired three economics professors for "impolite behavior" when they tried to correct misstatements of fact at a smear-labor meeting and protested to a Dallas paper because they were denied the floor.

Let them explain why they banned John Dos Passos' trilogy, U. S. A., from a contemporary English reading list.

Let them defend their refusal to grant funds for the long-wanted School of Social Work and eight social sciences projects in a row, blocking Rainey's program for the university's development.

Let them make their prize offer to Regent Orville Bullington, who said before the Senate investigating committee:

"We have heard too much about the university motto: 'Ye shall know the truth shall set you free.' Let us hear more about the motto on the State seal: 'Discipline is the foundation of the State.'"

And to Regent J. Frank Strickland, who licked his lips over the smutty vulgate of U. S. A. and who wanted all professors to submit to a "patriotism test."

Let the regents prove there was no secret meeting in Houston in the spring of 1940, as was testified under oath, to plan the purge of education in Texas.

Let them disprove the charge of "interlocking directorates" that brought this purge about.

Let them prove they did not attempt to gag Rainey, forbidding him to "make so many speeches—particularly to religious groups."

Ask the regents finally if the students' freedom to seek the truth extends to the truth when spoken by a New Deal Democrat.

Let the regents take the rap for a while. They still have their jobs.

EVELYN SEELY,
For the Editors of PM.

The Brotherhood of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk by Rev. H. R. Ricketts of February 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I sought my soul,
But my soul I could not see;
I sought my God,
But my God eluded me;
I sought my brother
And I found all three.
—(*Author unknown.*)

Read I John iv: 7–21, "If any one says 'I love God' and hates his brother, he is a liar."

These words spoken by the writer of the Epistle of John are very interesting. Let us see if they are in harmony with the teachings of Jesus:

In Matthew 25: 45, in giving us the mark of the saved, Jesus says: "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

In Matthew 23 He condemns the Scribes and Pharisees not because they did not go to church, say their prayers, read their Bible, pay their tithe—they did those things—he condemned them because they omitted the weightier matters of the Law: Judgment, Mercy, and Faith.

He was once asked; who is my neighbor? His answer was the parable of the Good Samaritan.

In Matthew 5: 23–24 Jesus says: "When you are presenting your gifts at the altar, if you remember that your brother has any grievance against you, leave the gift there before the altar and go and make up with your brother, then come back and present your gift."

We might go on, but this glance at the teachings of Jesus indicates that our text is in perfect harmony with His Teachings. "If a man say he love God and hate his brother he is a liar."

We are living in a world fraught with danger. That danger is not some foreign army but our own selfish hate. Our whole civilization is being sacrificed on the altar of greed. We hate our neighbor. We have imperialism as our political philosophy and monopoly as our economic goal. Man is but a commodity in our markets and a very cheap one at that. His blood is made to run like water that we may maintain our imperialistic power and hold our monopoly on world trade. We do it with great religious fervor. We degrade man, destroy the world, for selfish purposes.

In the Book of Judges is the story of the crossing of the Jordan. Each person who passed had to pronounce the word "shibboleth." Those who were foreign could not pronounce the word. Today we stand at the ford which crosses into a new day. If we ever get across the ford we have a password to learn. It is a short word, but one very difficult to pronounce, without a foreign accent. The little word is the first person plural of the personal pronoun, "we," "our." We say, "our Father," but we speak it with an accent. We really mean our group, our Nation, our class, our race, our interest, ourselves. Because of our failure to pronounce this word we are forbidden entrance to the promised land of peace.

We have builded our walls of racial and class distinctions. We live in our own room of national interest. We rob people of lesser breeds and then wonder why the world is in such conflict.

Once Mr. Whistler, the artist, sold one of his best productions to the city of Paris. A friend of Mr. Whistler's criticized the picture, telling him that the picture did not fit the room. Whistler responded, "My friend, aren't you beginning at the wrong end? You can't make that picture fit this room. You'll have to make the room fit the picture."

There was another great Master who gave His masterpiece to the world. That masterpiece was the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. He painted that masterpiece with his lifeblood. Today we criticize it. We say it is not practical, that it is impossible because it does not fit into our narrow-walled political-economic room. In order to maintain our room we have marred that picture almost beyond recognition. In our present peace discussions we are more interested in maintaining our low-ceilinged room than in preserving the eternal revelation of God. Why not tear out some of our old partitions, lift our ceilings, and build a room large enough for the brotherhood of man? He that sayeth he loves God and hates his brother is a liar.

Labor Is Entitled to Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that adequate wages for labor in this Nation is a social and economic problem, not a political issue. And consequently labor should not depend upon nor adhere itself to either of the major political parties because by so doing it may create an injustice and raise political animosity toward its membership. It should remain strictly nonpartisan.

The well-being of the social and economic life of this Nation depends on labor receiving adequate wages to properly clothe, feed, shelter, and educate their families. When this fails the economic and social life of the Nation is adversely affected. Most of our lower standards of education and lack of social and cultural development can be traced to low wages.

Labor is entitled to the same independence and security as those who employ labor.

It is the duty of Congress to see that this balance is maintained.

Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, stated labor's position in connection with the rising cost of living in an editorial recently in the American Federationist, official magazine of the American Federation of Labor, as follows:

UNION RESPONSIBILITY

When our Nation went to war, representatives speaking for unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor gave their solemn pledge not to strike while the conflict was on. To keep that pledge labor has done everything humanly possible, even though collective bargaining was suspended and our wages frozen.

The Stabilization Act, which tied wages to the cost of living, has served to make more obvious wage inequities within plants and between similar kinds of work in communities. In the interests of morale, many of these inequities have been corrected. The result has been a leveling up, with pioneering groups given no chance to raise new standards, as has been the procedure under the evolutionary methods of collective bargaining. The consequences have been most serious. Wages no longer even approximate a fair share of the returns from joint work, nor have wage earners kept their former place in sharing social progress.

While workers are eager to return to collective bargaining, they realize they still have a responsibility to help control inflation. Possibilities of inflation will become increasingly serious as reconversion begins, so that all wartime controls cannot be lifted at once.

In this period, as unions resume their responsibility, there will be need for wise leadership as well as discipline within union memberships. In this period labor must again determine its own plans and policies and resume the responsibilities of free unions.

Upon the wisdom of our decision will depend our success and continued freedom. We should not let ourselves become the tools of any political party or adjuncts of the Government.

WM. GREEN.

This is a fair and impartial appraisal of the situation that now exists. It seems to me that it is the responsibility of Congress to give it serious consideration.

A Home for the Peace Capital of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of the peace-loving nations of the world that the efforts now being made to establish a world-wide organization for the maintenance of peace will succeed. If an effective organization for that purpose can be established, it will mark one of the greatest steps in human progress.

The functioning of such an organization will require a central location for its activities. The best possible location should be selected. It has been suggested that there is probably no better place in the world for carrying on such activities with congenial surroundings than in the San Francisco area on the west coast.

When it becomes necessary to make a detailed selection of a suitable site for the exercise of the great responsibilities of this organization, no better location could be secured than in or near the forests of redwood trees conveniently located to the San Francisco Bay area. The main part of the Redwood Forest Belt is in my congressional district on the north coast of California, extending from San Francisco to the Oregon line. These trees are among the most inspiring of all the trees in the world. Their lofty height, their great solemn red columns and great age would form a setting worthy of the peace capital of the world.

At a recent session of the State Legislature of California, a resolution, introduced by Senators Slater, Collier, Shelley, Gordon, Biggar, Quinn, and Keating was unanimously adopted inviting and urging a selection of this area as a per-

manent seat of government that may be established by this world peace organization.

Mr. George G. Hoberg, president of the Redwood Empire Association, which is a civic organization covering practically the whole redwood empire of northern California, extends its gracious invitation of that organization through the President to the peace conference at San Francisco.

In accordance with the consent granted by the House, I include in the RECORD an able editorial on this subject by Herbert J. Waters, which recently appeared in the Press Democrat, Santa Rosa, Calif., my home city:

OUR REDWOODS—PEACE CAPITAL OF WORLD

From behind the grim, dark clouds of war, the bright rays of the world's hopes for permanent peace are beginning to emerge. Each day brings us closer to the fateful day of military victory, and closer, as well, to the grave responsibilities of turning that victory into a just and lasting peace for the future well-being of all people.

Soon, statesmen of all the United Nations will gather in San Francisco to commence molding the structure of that permanent world peace.

Out of that conference will come the framework for an organization of peace-loving nations pledged to work shoulder to shoulder throughout the years to come for the maintenance of world peace.

But the great San Francisco United Nations Conference, no matter how significant and historic its decisions may be, can be only a start toward the vast objective ahead. To reach our goal of a workable and lasting peace, designated representatives of each participating nation must continue planning, thinking, and working together for the good of all concerned.

For that reason there must soon emerge a new world capital—a United Nations center for the permanent location of research and administrative staffs of any world council that may be evolved.

We believe that world peace capital should be in California.

With the strategic location of our State in relation to Europe, Asia, and both North and South America already recognized in the choice of San Francisco for the United Nations peace-designing conference, we believe delegations from all nations should go one step further and choose northern California as the permanent headquarters for the United Nations.

We believe, further, that no more appropriate location could be selected for a permanent world-peace capital than in one of the great redwood groves of our world-famous redwood empire, possibly even stately Armstrong Grove State Park in Sonoma County.

Few things left in this war-torn world symbolize eternal security as vividly as the centuries-old towering redwoods, giant trees that have stood guardian over this part of California since the real Prince of Peace was born in a manger in Bethlehem.

Inspiring by their very permanence a peace to last for all time, we believe the redwoods could become a great symbol of security to all the United Nations.

What, fo. example, could be more appropriate and attract more world-wide respect than a world-peace capital surrounded by a great grove of nature's towering redwood monuments, a grove containing a giant redwood tree dedicated to and named for each of the participating United Nations?

We present our proposal for the sincere and immediate consideration of all northern California, and urge that every effort be extended to put forward the plan at the forthcoming United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

The Sacrifice of LaGuardia's Night Club Operators and Habitues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, practically ever since the beginning of this war some of us have been complaining that the war on the home front has been more or less of a pink-tea party. We have repeatedly stated that the only real sacrifice being made so far as America is concerned in this war is that suffered by the men wearing the uniform and the resultant bereavement of their loved ones.

For months we have been debating an adequate manpower bill, which now appears to be hopelessly tied up in conference by the Senate. But along came the Little Flower, the mighty mayor of the city of New York, and issued an edict defying and challenging the United States Government. It was this mighty man who called our attention to the outstanding sacrifice being made by the night club operators and the playboys and girls of the great city of New York in the fact that no more liquor could be served after the hour of midnight. He extended the hour and defied the Government.

Our attention has just been called to the reaction of the men on the fighting fronts—the "playboys" of the fox holes, the trenches, the air, and the sea—who play for keeps, whose lives are the stakes. The following article from Midpacifican, the armed forces newspaper in the Pacific Ocean areas, reflects their disgust. The article was written prior to the defiance of the Government by the little mayor of New York. What the reaction of America's fighting men to that defiance is now is a matter for your own conjecture. The article follows:

G. I.'s SHED TEAR FOR PLAYBOYS WOUNDED BY STATESIDE CURFEW

The mainland's midnight curfew, initiated to conserve vital fuel and electric power, has seriously cut into night life there and has already given birth to speakeasies throughout the Nation.

Being a few thousand miles from the scene of action, we're forced to rely on eyewitness accounts, but from all sources come tales of how playboys and playgirls are bravely facing war's encroachment on their private lives.

For instance, a New York Daily News dispatch says that post-midnight speaks are flourishing, with prices ranging from a dollar a drink to $20 for a bottle of Scotch, thereby announcing to the world that war or no war, fuel or no fuel, they're courageously carrying on.

SCENE OF STARK MISERY

Going into greater detail, Army News Service has wired a touching tongue-in-the-cheek description of the tragic consequences of the new midnight curfew for night club habitues. To an observer 6,000 miles away it would seem that New York's Scotch-and-soda belt has seldom witnessed a scene of such stark misery.

The story relates the sad plight of guys and gals who had been arising at 6 p. m. to entertain in or frequent night spots which formerly sold liquor until 4 a. m. We'll now let A. N. S. paint the scene, with appropriate background music:

"It was the first night of the curfew. The scene was Reuben's, yawning-hour hang-out of the Broadway mob in recent 'old days' of 4 a. m. closings. The time was 12:30 a. m.

"IMAGINE SLEEPING AT 1 A. M.

"Sherman Billingsley, proprietor of the Stork Club, walked in. After a quarter of a century of going to bed at dawn or later it was too soon to try to get to bed at 1 or 2 a. m. Why, a guy might get the bends jumping into a new routine like that without adequate conditioning.

"Billy Rose arrived with Leon Henderson. 'If I went home, now, the servants would think I was a burglar,' said the bantam owner of the Diamond Horseshoe.

"Damon Runyon, famed chronicler of Broadway characters, sat in the center of a group of fellows who looked dejectedly defeated at the prospect of going to bed at such an unnaturally early hour. Monte Proser, owner of the Copacabana, only major curfew casualty to date, looked even more pessimistic than usual."

AN UNHEARD-OF HOUR

There were dozens of celebrities, twice as many beautiful showgirls, pretty little chorus girls, press agents, head waiters, a few gamblers, song writers, at least one racketeer, and a dozen Broadway reporters, all a bit confused, even a little dazed at the prospect of going home at such an unheard-of-hour.

"At 3: 30 a. m. the crowd was almost gone. Arnold Reuben put on his hat and coat, looked bewilderedly about his abandoned premises, shrugged his shoulders, and headed for home.

"It feels like the middle of the day," he said.

At this point we doubt if there is a dry eye among our readers.

Elsewhere other voices were raised in less subtle protest. William Hopkins, president of the Philadelphia cafe men, said, "No one can tell me when to close—not even the President."

EARL DOESN'T LIKE IT

And out in Hollywood, Earl Carroll, who runs a super de luxe night club restaurant, added, "I don't like any part of the whole thing."

Newspaper columnists, too, had their innings. Like Lee Mortimer, of the New York Daily Mirror, who wrote, "The town will be loaded with speak-easies. After 2 weeks the curfew won't make any difference, for New Yorkers will find places to go."

Meaning, we surmise, that fun's fun and having a good time is their way of forgetting the war. It's a technique that might prove equally effective in fox holes, except that it might lose some lives and the war.

Paul Martin, writing in the World-Telegram, all but gave War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes 24 hours to get out of town, saying: "I'm going to find myself a good, comfortable speak-easy, just like everyone else. The late crowds are not going to go home."

THESE POOR, SUFFERING FOLK

If there was ever a group deserving a serviceman's sympathy, it's these poor, suffering characters whose lives have suddenly been uprooted, who have been forced to make one of the most drastic readjustments of the decade. When contrasted with the carefree, unrestricted life of the average overseas G. I., it sort of tugs at your heartstrings.

The whole picture presents, purely and simply, one of the most effective tear jerkers of our time.

It's the type of light, entertaining material that reads well on Pacific beachheads, where

the boring prospect of having to hit a feather bed at 1 a. m. is never a problem, where there is plenty of night life. Jap flares, mortar fragments, HE shells, infiltrating Nips, midnight bathing parties in water-filled fox holes.

SHOR TAKES HIS STAND

It's simply peachy stuff to send to Manila, China, and Europe's eastern and western fronts. Guys in those spots are bound to experience a feeling of intense pity, knowing what some folks back home are enduring.

Among the small voices raised in rebuttal to the Big Stem's general feeling of they-can't-do-this-to-us was that of Toots Shor, whose restaurant is a rendezvous for stage, screen, sports, and radio stars.

"Anyone who can't get drunk by midnight ain't tryin'," said Toots.

Yours in deep sympathy,

HARRY.

The Curfew Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of South Carolina dated March 22, 1945:

Resolution urging the observance by all citizens and sections of South Carolina of the midnight closing or curfew promulgated by War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes and pledging the backing and support of this State to War Mobilizer Byrnes in his efforts to further the successful prosecution of the war

Whereas War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes has called upon the Nation to observe the midnight closing or curfew of certain businesses and establishments, which closing or curfew is regarded by him as necessary and appropriate for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas all sections of the Nation immediately took steps to cooperate in the war effort by the observance of said midnight closing or curfew; and

Whereas it was sought thereby to conserve the Nation's power and fuel resources, to minimize absenteeism in war work, to reduce the strain on overloaded transportation facilities, and to give to the men and women of our fighting forces concrete evidence that our people are wholeheartedly supporting them and are prepared to make any sacrifice which we may be called upon to make to hasten the day of final victory; and

Whereas we feel that, compared to the sacrifices being made by our men and women hourly on the battlefields of the world, the observance of the midnight closing or curfew is little enough to ask of the American people, and that all citizens and sections of the Nation should readily respond to the Nation's call: be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That we call upon every citizen and section of the State of South Carolina to respond wholeheartedly and without reservation to the request of War Mobilizer, James F. Byrnes, for the midnight closing or curfew and we commend him for his action in calling upon the people to make this contribution to the war effort, and pledge him the loyalty and support of the State of South Carolina in this, and all other matters, in which he asks for the aid of the American people; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house forthwith transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina.

JAMES E. HUNTER, Jr.,
Clerk of the House.

A Secretary for Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the need for establishing a new Cabinet post, to be headed by a Secretary of Aviation, is more pronounced today than ever before. Foreign governments under the leadership of their ministries devoted exclusively to air transport already are laying plans for the promotion of post-war air flight on a vast scale.

Our own country with the largest fleet of planes suitable for commercial flight has been unable to arrive at definite and long-range conclusions in this sphere because we have no individual specifically responsible for determining our policies in the field of aviation.

It is worth while to point out that the man who headed up our delegation to the recent Chicago Aviation Conference, Mr. Adolf Berle, Jr., is now in a post entirely removed from the whole aviation question. It does our country no good to take the lead in formulating plans for the development of aviation or to produce the world's finest planes unless we are to pursue those plans and use those planes in accordance with a clearly stated and intelligible policy.

If the very individuals who one day devote themselves to the formulating of those plans are removed to a diplomatic post the next day, we shall be unable to maintain the leadership in air transport which our present position merits. A Cabinet officer, sitting at the head of a Department of Aviation and charged with the responsibility of developing and executing a post-war aviation program which would use our tremendous new aircraft industry to its fullest advantage, both commercially in time of peace and militarily in the event of war, would furnish the entire Nation with reasonable hope that our vast potential strength in the air would be well and wisely used. We are the only nation among the leading powers which has refused to recognize the importance of air transport by the creation of an agency dedicated to this alone. We have divided air authority among a whole group of other departments. Unless we act promptly to meet this need, we may find ourselves in the position of being outdistanced by other nations with fewer resources but greater resourcefulness.

I have repeatedly urged the creation of such a Cabinet position and the establishing of a Department of Aviation. In my judgment, such a Department should be functioning actively before the end of the war and should be recognized as a vital factor in the post-war plans of our Government.

This proposal should be a must in our immediate legislative program.

Cracking Down on the Wasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, February 27, 1945, endorsing the order issued by War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes closing night clubs and bars at midnight.

CRACKING DOWN ON THE WASTERS

War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes and the War Manpower Commission together have cracked down on the Nation's night spots.

Twelve midnight was the national curfew hour, effective at midnight Monday.

No liquor may be served after that hour. Gambling and juke-box playing are "out."

This is a drastic order. But it is needed. Millions in the United States are wasting time and money while American boys die in deserts, on lonely, battered islands, in jungles, in the valleys of Germany, and on the torn terrain of Iwo Jima.

The Nation's manpower is far from completely mobilized and working. Millions of man-hours are being lost, in war plants and in other industries and occupations, by sheer dissipation. Loafing has become a scandal in many war centers.

This new order is not directed particularly at labor, though labor must obey it.

It is directed also at the fat and affluent proprietors of bars and taverns and roadhouses; the smooth slickers who run night clubs; the hordes of men and women who haunt the places where other men and women spend money foolishly, and who by one means or another, pick up easy livings off the drippings.

It is directed at all the careless, money-tossing wastrels who patronize the night-spots and the "hotspots" and make merry with booze and women and song and jest while elsewhere far better Americans are dying of wounds and disease and thirst and starvation.

In Hawaii there has been a night curfew ever since the war broke out.

It used to be at dusk, then at 8 p. m., and now for some time it has been at 10 p. m., so we do not need the midnight-closing order here.

But the lesson of what's happened suddenly to mainland nightspots should not be lost: As the rigors and sacrifices of war bite down, our Government is getting "tough" on wasters of time and dissipators of energy.

And something like the Byrnes order could happen here.

Congress Is Air-Minded—The Flying Seventy-Ninth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress is air-minded. We have organized a Congressional Flying Club of which our colleague, Congressman RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, is president, Members of the House, their employees, and employees of the House are entitled to membership and the splendid opportunities to fly afforded by the club. This progressive activity has brought favorable comment upon the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1945:

"THE FLYING SEVENTY-NINTH"

The important recognition which was given the oncoming of a post-war air age by the organization in Washington last summer of a Congressional Flying Club, gains in value this week by the news that the club has now 91 members, and that Secretary of Commerce Wallace, who has lately declared his intention of learning to fly, may be made an associate member at an early date. Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, is the club's flying president, and several other members are ex-pilots of the First World War. Mr. RANDOLPH has announced that "Congressmen should know how to fly in order to pass intelligent laws on aviation"—a statement which is, we believe, the truest of talk.

In 1910, according to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, there were but 62,655 automobiles registered in New York State. In 1941 there were almost 3,000,000. From such figures it is easy to foresee the number of privately owned planes which could exist in our already air-plotted 48 States if the development of Everyman's plane should parallel even in a moderate degree the growth of the automobile age. The peacetime returns of thousands of pilots to their home towns will stimulate by influence and example both private and commercial flying. A future Congress is likely to have many more law-making ex-pilots than now are Members of what Mr. RANDOLPH calls "the flying Seventy-ninth." Out of such practical knowledge of skyway modes and problems our wide-spaced country cannot fail to gain in legislation of experience and foresight. Certainly it requires no crystal ball at Washington or elsewhere to predict a people's future in aviation—a future which may well require more than past, desk-grounded wings of Congressional thought to plan for and control.

I was pleased also to note Mr. Speaker, that a page of this House and a member of the Congressional Flying Club recently received his solo pilot's license and wish to include in my remarks the following Associated Press release relating thereto and to the activities of the club:

HOUSE PAGE GETS PILOT'S LICENSE AFTER 11 HOURS

A House page has received his pilot's license after 11 hours of flying, it was revealed yesterday. He is 16-year-old Neal Phillips of Elberton, Ga.

The revelation came in connection with the expanded activity of the Congressional Flying Club, composed of 97 Capitol persons who are either licensed or student pilots.

The idea started with the lawmakers, spread to their staffs, and one outsider was formally taken into membership this week. Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace was approved, got into a plane and took his first 45-minute lesson.

Three World War pilots, now Members of the House, are in the club. They are LEROY JOHNSON of California, MCKENZIE of Louisiana and VORYS of Ohio.

Food Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 23, 1945:

FOOD INQUIRY

A broad inquiry into food production and distribution has been authorized by the Senate and proposed in the House. These inquiries appear to have been prompted by the fears of an impending food shortage. But it is important to keep in mind that civilian per capita consumption in 1944 was at an all-time peak. The Survey of Current Business noted recently:

"Civilian per capita consumption of food in 1944 was 9 percent above the 1935–39 average. Moreover, the wartime increases have been accompanied by a general improvement in the nutritive content of the national average diet and apparently by some reduction in the disparity among the diets of various segments of the population."

It seems clear that the anticipated moderate reduction from this record supply will not cause any serious difficulties. Except for products like meats, sugar, butter, and cheese, it seems probable that per capita consumption in 1945, although somewhat lower than last year, will still be in excess of that in the pre-war period. Thus, for example, the Department of Agriculture estimates that in 1945 civilians will have 420 pounds of fluid milk and cream per capita, as compared with only 340 pounds before the war; 358 eggs, as compared with 298; 24 pounds of poultry, as compared with 21; 142 pounds of fresh fruits, as compared with 138; 45 pounds of corn products, as compared with 39; 16 pounds of coffee, as compared with 14.

With many important foods unrationed—grains, eggs, poultry, milk, fresh fruits, and vegetables—it is unrealistic to talk as though we were faced with a food famine. That shortages will prevail seems evident, but these shortages will reflect the expansion in demand which has accompanied the large wartime increase in incomes. For some products an uneven geographic distribution of available supplies will accentuate these shortages. This situation has been particularly evident for meats in recent months. We will not have all we would like to have, but we certainly will have enough to give us an adequate diet. When conditions are contrasted with those in other countries such as England, the relative plenty prevailing here becomes even more evident.

Much misleading information and many ill-informed rumors have been circulated concerning the food situation. In some quarters, for example, it is maintained that civilians are being deprived of large amounts of food because of lend-lease shipments. A clear statement of the factors affecting the available supplies and how they are distributed will be very helpful. It is doubtful that the committee can do much to increase our food supply; it probably can do a great deal to dispel many of the rumors.

Some of the questions to which answers should be sought include the following: How have wartime regulations affected the supplies of particular products? To what extent, if at all, have the armed forces accumulated excessive stores of food products? Has there been any substantial spoilage of such items? To what extent have supplies been restricted because of inadequate transportation facilities? To what extent is the black market diverting supplies from legitimate uses? Have the available civilian supplies been distributed equitably? If they have not, to what extent has this been attributable to inadequacies in the rationing system?

These are a few of the questions which could be profitably examined by this committee. The proposed investigation would probably be more fruitful if it were conducted by a joint congressional committee rather than by separate and competing committees in each House of Congress.

The Late Honorable James V. Heidinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this membership is truly saddened by the passing of our colleague and friend, Judge Heidinger, who so ably represented the twenty-fourth district, Illinois.

Born in humble circumstances, by industry he carved out enviable success in material things; by close application to his chosen profession, the law, he gained the deserved confidence of his people as a practicing attorney and as a judge of the court.

But these attainments, commendable as they were, are not those which are today uppermost in our minds; rather we remember his handclasp of genuine friendship which evidenced his kindly nature and his deep faith in men. This feeling was innate in him. He believed in every instinct that a kind act was brighter than gold and more enduring than the stars. He truly believed that in the cross and crown of life and death, we are nearer to God as we draw closer to our fellow man.

There is a realm into which we, his colleagues, may not intrude and that is the sacred circle of a family sorrow, but I feel I express the hope of all of us who knew him well and loved him, that those in his family circle may be visited by the God of Consolation with the comfort that garrisons the soul against the devastating effect of sorrow, and that they may come to realize that in his passing he typified the most sacred meaning of the soul in a life of devotion to country, friends, and those he loved.

Pertinent Present-Day Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I present for the consideration of my colleagues a series of short discussions of present-day problems taken from my weekly letters to the newspapers of my district. They were prepared in the first place for the benefit of my people back home:

SHOULD WE CHANGE NOW?

Senator MURRAY's jobs-for-all bill is based upon the false assumption that every person has an inherent right to a useful and remunerative job. This assumption is the product of theorists that claim the Government owes everyone a living. However, neither our Constitution nor our laws guarantee a living to anyone. They simply express political and legal equality and suggest that no one should be excluded from work or discriminated against "on account of race, color, sex, or creed." The leaders of the C. I. O. claim they believe in the doctrine that every person has an inherent right to a job. Yet, with the approval and aid of the Federal Government, the leaders of the C. I. O. repudiate that doctrine when they prevent a man from working unless and until he accepts the compulsion of union membership and hands over union fees and union dues. Harley L. Lutz says, "The Murray bill rests upon the assumption that a small select group in government has the superior wisdom and foresight to make all necessary decisions for the rest of the people." This is the theory that underlies communism in Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, and fascism in Italy. It is exactly the opposite to the democratic theory of government under which we have thrived for 1½ centuries. Do we want to change now?

INTERESTING AND TRUE

The Soviet Constitution contains the following clause: "Citizens of the U. S. S. R. are guaranteed the right of employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality." In this clause we have the origin of Wallace's Full Employment Bill of 1945.

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY CONFERENCE

On February 12 President Roosevelt sent a message to the Congress asking for immediate passage of legislation to implement the agreements arrived at by the representatives of 44 nations at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference held last July. Briefly, these agreements covered the establishment of an International Bank for World Reconstruction and Development, and an International Monetary Fund. These two institutions were to have a combined capital of 18 billion dollars, one-third of which the United States would be expected to furnish. The United States, however, would be expected to provide more than one-half of the gold or gold currency in the fund. In other words, our gold and sound currency would be put in "to match the depreciated currencies of the busted nations." Congressman Reed of New York, in describing the Bretton Woods agreements, said: "Boiled down to the lowest common denominator the Bretton Woods agreements propose the establishment of an international bank, Uncle Sam to furnish most of the money, but the borrowers to control the bank."

The guiding spirit of the Bretton Woods Conference was Lord Keynes, a British economist. The agreements arrived at were for the most part his proposals. This is the same Lord Keynes who persuaded President Roosevelt early in 1933 to discard his economy program and embark upon the spend and spend and spend program of the New Deal. The Bretton Woods agreements, if accepted by Congress and implemented by law, would start us off on a spending spree to rebuild a war torn world in the face of our 300-billion-dollar debt. Why should Uncle Sam follow the lead of a discredited English economist, one whom the English themselves refuse to follow?

ADVICE FROM ANOTHER ENGLISHMAN

Sir Walter Citrine, a titled Englishman, in a speech at the recent London World Trade Union Conference, proposed an international T. V. A., which would include a Rhine Valley authority and a Danube Valley authority to develop electric power for European use. Sir Walter did not say so, but the inference was plain that this international T. V. A. should be set up, established, and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. If the Bretton Woods agreements are implemented by law, they will provide convenient machinery for financing this international T. V. A.

The post-war monetary scheme of Lord Keynes and the international T. V. A. scheme of Sir Walter Citrine are very closely related. The President's message to the Congress urging the passage of legislation to implement the Bretton Woods agreements same immeditely after Sir Walter's speech at the London conference. Can it be possiby that the proposals of these two titled Englishmen add up to the fact that John Bull again wants Uncle Sam to pull England's financial chestnuts out of the fire, and once again get our fingers burned while doing it?

ROCKS AHEAD

The ship of state is entering troubled waters. A few months back James Petrillo, czar of the musicians' union, demanded a royalty on every musical phonograph disc. The manufacturers and radio people held out against his demand for awhile but finally surrendered when they found out that Washington would not back them up in maintaining their constitutional rights. When John L. Lewis found how easy it was to gouge the American consumer, he determined to try the same thing, and now blandly announces that, in addition to a number of other conditions, he is going to demand a flat royalty of 10 cents on each ton of coal mined in the United States. This will amount to a private tax of $55,000,000 annually, all to be paid by the consumer into the mine-union treasury.

Before you jump on Lewis with both feet and denounce him as un-American you should realize that he is only asking that his miners be treated as Petrillo's musicians are now being treated, and he has every right to do that. If Petrillo has the right to rob the American people, then certainly John L. Lewis has the same right. But it won't stop with John L. Lewis and the miners' union. It will not be long before the automobile workers will be demanding a royalty on every automobile, truck, and tractor produced; the clothing and garment workers a royalty on every suit and garment that they turn out; the shoemakers, hatters, weavers, etc., ditto. Thus we will create a new circle of increasing costs that will inevitably lead to an inflation that is bound to destroy our whole economy. Where will it all end?

FULL EMPLOYMENT IN A FREE SOCIETY

The title of this article is the title of Sir William Beveridge's new book. We are going to hear a lot in the days just ahead about "Jobs for all," about Senator MURRAY's full employment bill, about "Sixty million American jobs," etc., all based upon the assertions and the assumptions found in this new book. Sir William's book rests wholly upon the false assumption that a nation can banish want, poverty, unemployment, disease, and ignorance simply by passing a law. Overnight, by legislative fiat, Sir William claims we can create a new world free from all the ills that have afflicted mankind since Adam and Eve. Wouldn't that be a wonderful thing if we could do it? Of course, what Sir William and the rest of our world planners are talking about is a planned society, an authoritarian government—the very thing we are fighting against today, Japan, Germany, and Russia have enjoyed a planned society, have had authoritarian governments for some time now. Do we want to follow in their footsteps? Do we want to exchange our privileges, our freedoms, and our high standards of living for what these nations have today?

A FREE FOOD FEDERAL HAND-OUT

Senator AIKEN of Vermont has introduced a bill, S. 185, that proposes to set up a national food allotment program. It provides for dispensing free food coupons to all families whose expenditures for food are below the standards the national food allotment director deems necessary for the proper nourishment of each person in the family. These undernourished families would take the free food coupons to the store, and receive groceries or meats for them gratis; the Federal Government providing the cash to redeem the coupons. The appropriation called for in the bill for the first year is $500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. However, the bill also says "The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized"; which is in reality a blanket authorization for an unlimited amount in addition to the $500,000,000 specified.

The bill establishes a basic food allotment per person per week, as follows: 5 quarts milk, or its equivalent; 4 pounds potatoes; 8 ounces dried beans, peas, and nuts; 1 pound 8 ounces tomatoes and citrus fruits; 2 pounds 5 ounces of cabbage or leafy vegetables; 4 eggs; 1 pound 8 ounces of meat, poultry, and fish; 4 pounds 7 ounces flour and cereals; 14 ounces fats and oils; 12 ounces sugar, sirups, and preserves. (Quite a menu for one person each week.) The director under the bill must also establish standards for normal food expenditures, taking into consideration the amount of food produced in the gardens of the families of these undernourished people. As a part of this program the bill states: "The director shall in cooperation with existing Federal, State, local, or private agencies, provide an educational program for improving the buying habits, the food ultilization techniques, and the food preservation methods of the participants in the food allotment plan." What do you think of the Senator's bill? Would you vote for it? It will require at least 200,000 more jobs on the Federal pay roll to administer the program. If John Doe spends too much of his income for rent, clothes, drink, or auto, and not enough for food for his family, what can the director do about it? This is a $64 question. Can you answer it? I cannot.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS CONCERNING S. 185

1. Is it consistent to tax these undernourished families, as we are doing, and then hand them free food coupons to buy food with on the ground that their income is not sufficient to buy those goods that are essential to health? Why not stop taxing such people?

2. If the Director has the power to say what families shall be eligible for benefits, how can the administration of the bill be kept on a non-partisan, impartial basis?

3. Would not such a program be an indirect wage increase for the selected beneficiaries of these free food coupons?

4. What limit, if any, should be placed upon the amount of the appropriation that could be spent for "educational facilities to improve buying habits, food utilization technique, and food preservation methods?"

5. Should the power to "hand out" or "to deny" the free food coupons be placed in the hands of one man?

Need for Bretton Woods Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been misunderstanding on the part of some people with reference to the Bretton Woods plan and some opposition to it which would not exist if it were thoroughly understood.

One of my constituents sent me an article which appeared recently in the press from the pen of Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, an able and impartial news columnist of Washington, which is a simple and direct explanation of the vital need for the enactment of this legislation, and, under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

SEES NEED FOR BRETTON WOODS PLAN

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The American people are looking hopefully to the United Nations Conference late next month at San Francisco to create an international organization designed to keep the peace.

This has come to be symbolized in the name "Dumbarton Oaks" because a preliminary plan was drafted at the estate here by that name.

But, meanwhile, there is something going on here in Congress that is tied up directly with Dumbarton Oaks and the international security organization to which the people also ought to pay attention, for there are powerful interests busy trying to scuttle this companion effort.

This is symbolized in the name "Bretton Woods" from the restort in New Hampshire where representatives of 44 nations met some time ago. There they drew up 2 plans—1 for an international bank for reconstruction and development and the other for an international monetary fund. The 2 are to form keystone arches in the world economic organization to put devastated nations on their feet again and to promote trade among nations.

Dumbarton Oaks is for international organization on a political basis; Bretton Woods, on an economic basis. They go hand in hand, or, as Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau expressed it, their objectives are "as interdependent as the blades of a pair of scissors."

He was speaking to the House Banking Committee which has just begun to consider legislation to authorize the Bretton Woods agencies, on behalf of the United States. Passage of that legislation will contribute much toward the success of the Dumbarton Oaks plan at San Francisco. Its failure, or modification, would have a dampening effect.

This is the first real test in Congress of the sincerity of its intention to cooperate with the rest of the world.

Big international bankers in this country who are trying to kill this plan for international financial cooperation, though giving it a species of lip service, are raising up the usual tangles of technical language, seeking to make out that it is something the ordinary person cannot understand and has no business trying to understand, as is the way with lots of bankers.

But it is really very simple in purpose and it is something that is close to the everyday lives of everybody.

The relation between Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods might be very simply illustrated. Dumbarton Oaks is for the world what the local political government—the mayor, the council, the police force—is to the average town or city. Similarly, Bretton Woods has the purpose for the world that the banks and building and loan associations have in the average community—to provide capital for conducting the business of the community in normal times and, in times of emergency, to finance reconstruction of a building or home that has been burned down.

Each is necessary for the community. Each is necessary for the world if people are to be prosperous and wars are to be avoided.

The projected international bank, which will have a subscribed capital of $9,100,000,000, of which the United States will furnish $3,175,000,000, can either guarantee loans by private bankers, as the Federal Housing Authority does in this country, or it can lend directly, as the ordinary bank does.

The monetary fund is a stablization fund to keep currencies stable so the businessmen of the world always can be sure just what they will get for what they sell and what price they have to pay if buying. Its capital will be $8,800,000,000 of which the United States will furnish $2,750,000,000.

These financial agencies have a very close relation to every individual, in this country and all over the world, for the aim is to provide funds for sound investments which mean all sorts of enterprises that will furnish jobs.

The objective is for governments, representing the people, to have a voice hereafter in international finance and economy, rather than to let the big international bankers do it all, though this plan still leaves private bankers in the various countries all the business they can handle.

The international bankers naturally don't like it. They are fighting it just as they fought the Federal Reserve System, the Securities and Exchange Commission, bank-deposit guaranty, and numerous other agencies created in this country in recent years.

National Cemetery in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts regarding the procurement of land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery:

Resolutions memorializing Congress urging the Federal Government to procure land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to procure in a central location within Massachusetts such land as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 12, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted in concurrence March 15, 1945.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Pattern for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech of my colleague, Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, delivered March 21, 1945, before the Cleveland Round Table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio:

The seventh proposition of the Pattern for Peace which we introduced in the House as part of our concurrent resolution declares that the harmony of the world community is intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium of the individual States. This internal equilibrium, it declares, must be achieved by the "collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good."

I am happy to appear with my able and distinguished colleagues, Mr. LAFOLLETTE and Mr. WEISS, under the auspices of an organization which has done so much in the past years to develop that collaboration of all groups and classes of our Nation in the interest of the common good of the whole country.

I believe that our sponsorship of House Concurrent Resolution 21 is another example of that collaborative effort in behalf of the common good. We are members of three different faiths and of both political allegiances: Yet we joined to gether impelled by a profound conviction that these are times which demand that men rise above partisanship whether it be religious, racial, or political to help build a better and a safer world.

In the building of that better future there is no place, I am firmly convinced, for seeking partisan advantage. That is why I deplore the statement made by David Lawrence yesterday in his syndicated column that the Dumbarton Oaks plan is regarded by the administration as a desirable minimum while the Republican leaders will work to influence the San Francisco Conference to go further toward maximum improvement in order more perfectly to safeguard peace.

The cooperation of both parties in the field of our foreign policy has heretofore been excellent. I hope and pray we can continue to go forward together keeping partisan politics out of the peace. By their willingness to forego partisan advantage by combining

on a common program, the religious groups of the country have offered an inspiring example of unselfishness which our political parties would do well to emulate.

When we introduced the pattern for peace as part of our concurrent resolution, we were convinced of the necessity of building the new world order which will follow our victory on the sound and solid foundations provided by that seven point pronouncement of the three religious faiths. We wanted to bring to the attention of our policy makers those basic principles of morality which are held in common by Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Pagans alike.

I am informed that since the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were issued for public discussion and debate, all three of the official agencies which a year and a half ago published the seven point code have issued official commentaries on the proposals. It is indeed heartening to note upon examination of these three documents issued by the Catholic Welfare Conference, the Synagogue Council, and the Federal Council of Churches, the substantial agreement they show in their evaluation of that tentative draft. Speaking as a legislator, I want to pay tribute to the realistic approach of these churchmen to the problem of organizing the peace. There is nothing visionary or utopian in their proposals. They offer, in fact, a series of valuable suggestions which the San Francisco conferees cannot afford to ignore.

The delegates of the 44 nations who will meet at San Francisco on April 25 must draft a covenant as perfect as the wisdom of man, aided by the grace of God, can achieve. It is, therefore, of supreme importance that they do not lightly dismiss the wise counsel of the official leaders of the three faiths in this country.

Among their most notable agreements as to improvements which should be made at the Golden Gate conference I call your attention to these: First, a preamble is needed which shall acknowledge that the signatory nations are bound by the same code of moral conduct as individuals are. You may recall that Colonel House proposed such a preamble in the first draft of the League Covenant which he prepared for President Wilson. Secondly, they ask also for the creation of commissions on international law, human rights, non-self-governing peoples and on minorities. The proposed world organization will be quite incomplete without them.

Furthermore all three faiths seem to agree that the political and economic independence of small nations must be strongly safeguarded. And here let me voice my concern over the apparent inactivity of the three-man commission which was set up at Yalta to preside over the reorganization of the Polish provisional government. The base of that government must be broadened as soon as possible in order that it may prepare to play the part it deserves to play in the coming conference at San Francisco. Much longer delay in completing the new provisional government will seriously handicap Poland's preparation for the conference—if it does not prevent its participation entirely. We all remember the failure of the European Advisory Council. World opinion should demand that the Board hasten the work of reorganizing this government. Already there has been too much drift and delay in this crucial test of Yalta's sincerity.

Speaking as a Democrat I want to subscribe to Senator VANDENBERG'S proposal that the final charter provide for revision of territorial and other arrangements made before and during the peace conference. I see no other way in which the inevitable injustices in the original settlements can be rectified.

However, I should like to note that this doctrine of revision has been preached by all three faiths together since the publication of the Pattern for Peace, and has been strongly reiterated in their recent commentaries on the Dumbarton proposals. Without question the final draft should provide more clearly for the revision of unjust treaties and other arrangements made during the transition period.

The American delegation to San Francisco would be well advised to give serious consideration to the demands for these improvements made by religious leaders whose constituents number in the neighborhood of 60,000,000 citizens. Perhaps here today we could launch a Nation-wide movement to stimulate not only greater interest in the San Francisco conference in general but also begin a Nation-wide demand that these improvements based upon moral principles should be incorporated in the final text.

As part of the campaign to develop public interest in the Dumbarton proposals, petitions have been sent to the Governors of all the States asking them to proclaim a Dumbarton Oaks Week or a Foreign Policy Week. I suggest that this assembly petition the Governor of Ohio to proclaim such a week in the immediate future. I further suggest that this assembly petition him to proclaim Sunday, April 22, as a special day of prayer throughout the State of Ohio. The whole message of these church leaders which we three as your Representatives have been privileged to voice in the Halls of Congress is to the effect that without God and without the moral principles of His law, no world organization to maintain peace can possibly succeed. Without His guidance and assistance at San Francisco, enlightening the minds and strengthening the wills of those conferees, neither can they succeed.

International Economic Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational-Christian Churches of the United States of America, New York, N. Y.:

[The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America]

NEW YORK, *March 21, 1945.*

DEAR FRIEND: The legislative committee of the Council for Social Action, an agency representing more than a million members of the Congregational Christian Churches, believes that a healthy international economic system is absolutely essential to the maintenance of peace. It is also our considered opinion that the proposed International Security Organization (as developed at Dumbarton Oaks) cannot function except in an atmosphere of international economic cooperation. Adequate instruments and organizations are needed to put such cooperation into effect. We believe that the Bretton Woods proposals relating to an International Bank and an International Monetary Fund are part of the instruments needed to bring about a sound basis for the exchange of goods between nations, the development of the world's resources, and the full employment of American workers. In short, the Bretton Woods plans are integrally related to the effective operation of the International Security Organization. Without Bretton Woods and other forms of international economic cooperation, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals become nothing more than a well-meaning but ineffective organization for a peace which would be bound to collapse.

The legislative committee specifically approves the International Monetary Fund. Furthermore, because the fund is to serve a radically different purpose than the bank, it is our judgment that the fund should be kept separate from the bank.

It is our conviction that the separate existence of the fund is necessary for the following considerations:

1. The need for the fund will be greatest during the period immediately following the cessation of hostilities. During this period, unstable and chaotic situations will exist in many parts of the world. Lend-lease and U. N. R. R. A. will either be withdrawn or limited in function. The fund would be used to prevent violent swings in exchange rates and to encourage the full interchange of currencies, thus facilitating trade and investment. Furthermore, it is during exactly such chaotic situations that the bank itself could not function. Nor could the fund work as it should if it is tied to the bank with the motives and considerations which should govern the bank.

2. The bank itself cannot function properly until stability in the exchange rates and the free interchange of currencies has been established. The usefulness of the bank will be greatly impaired by the lack of an independent fund.

3. In the absence of the fund, governments will set up exchange controls, restrict the movement of currencies, and generally create anew, and in more extreme forms, the monetary warfare of the 1930's. In other words, the real alternative to the International Monetary Fund as proposed is not a substitute fund controlled by the bank but rather a series of unilateral currency controls which spell nothing more nor less than economic warfare.

In view of these considerations, the legislative committee urges you to support the Bretton Woods proposals with a separate and independent International Monetary Fund. The American people mean business about international economic cooperation. Your support is necessary so that the desires of the Americans will not be thwarted again.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS B. KEEHN,
Secretary, Legislative Committee.

A Letter From the Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein A Letter From the Boss, Brig. Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr., of the Third Military Railway Service, Persian Gulf Command, which bespeaks the esteem he holds for his men:

LETTER FROM THE BOSS

HEADQUARTERS THIRD MILITARY RAILWAY SERVICE,
PERSIAN GULF COMMAND,
Tehran, Iran.

To the Men of the Third Military Railway Service:

"It's the same the wide world over—
While the poor get all the blyme,
It's the rich what gets the pleasure.
Ain't it all a bloody shyme."

Many of you men, stymied by lack of T/O vacancies, are doing work which calls for a higher grade. In spite of failure to receive deserved promotion, you have never failed to do more than required in delivering goods to Russia.

It is paradoxical that your outstanding successful performance has resulted in rewarding not yourselves but me.

I have no illusions about who has earned the promotion I have received. I realize that my good fortune is a byproduct of your desire to get this job done, to get the war over, and to get back home.

While I appreciate the fact that I owe my promotion to the work of you men in the Railway Service, I am nevertheless mighty happy to be a brigadier general, and I thank you-all sincerely for the honor you have bestowed upon me.

FRANK S. BESSON, Jr.,
Brigadier General, United States Army.

What To Do With the German Nation and the Japanese Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Corp. Peter H. Perich, of Port Vue, Pa., one of the finest young men of my district, fearless and courageous, is a wounded veteran of this war now stationed at Turner Field, Albany, Ga. Corp. Perich has submitted his opinion on what to do with the German Nation and the Japanese Empire which I am happy to include as part of my remarks:

A WOUNDED VETERAN'S OPINION ON WHAT TO DO WITH THE GERMAN NATION AND THE JAPANESE EMPIRE

(By Corp. Peter H. Perich)

I do not profess to be a diplomat, world analyst, nor do I profess to be a barbarian. I am a soldier of the United States—a soldier who in combat has faced the enemy whose wish is to enslave the world. Among the soldiers who are fighting our ruthless enemies, there are varied opinions on what to do with the German Nation and the Japanese Empire after their defeat; but foremost in the minds of all is the hope that we do not "bungle" the job again when victory is ours. I want to be able to face my future sons in a world of peace and endow to them the inheritance of security from aggression.

How to bring this about? First we must face the problem squarely and honestly, and lay all the cards on the table. There aren't any good Germans in Germany and there aren't any good Japanese in Japan. The German people—the majority of the German people (that is what we are dealing with) wanted and welcomed the rule of Hitler as do the Japanese the rule of the Emperor. The German and Japanese people knew of the atrocities that their governments and soldiers were inflicting on the world, and yet they did nothing to prevent it. No; they gloried in that brutality—yes; every last man and woman who has in any way helped build that machine of aggression.

Can we salvage any part of these nations? I contend that the children of Germany and Japan can be rehabilitated and taught that the world can live in peace, but the older generation is incorrigible, so we should turn all our efforts to the children.

1. We must separate the children from the older generation, who, as I have said, are incorrigible, and, above all, show the children—not by mere book study what becomes of the aggressor, but by the living examples of their ancestry spending the rest of their lives if necessary, rebuilding the world they attempted to destroy.

2. I believe that with truth, environment—yes, and love—these children can find their rightful place in a world of peace.

3. We must destroy the military machines of Germany and Japan and their war factories that have made those military machines possible.

4. We must endeavor and demand that our Government forbid private capital from entering Germany and Japan to exploit these countries after their defeat.

5. We must, without reservation, make the German and Japanese people rebuild the world they meant to destroy, and I mean rebuild it by the sweat of their brow and not by mere cash payment.

6. Above all, we must be just but firm, and prove to any nation who should aspire to become an aggressor that it doesn't pay.

When all hostilities have ceased, if we, the living, can write "mission completed" to our endeavors of eternal world peace, then we have truly completed the difficult task set before us; but if we fail, then we have failed not only our children who are to live in this world ahead of us, but we have criminally failed all those who have willingly given up their lives in the belief that eternal world peace is possibe. Let us pray to God we do not fail.

What Goes on Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening article, in the form of an editorial, appeared very recently in the Indianapolis Star, on the subject of "What goes on here"? It is high time that the people of this Nation begin to make a survey of the things that "are going on here"—before it is too late. It is true that we are fighting this war for the preservation of the American way of life, but the question recurs to all of us—and very frequently—are we accomplishing that desired end? On our home front, and in our western hemisphere, many things are being done which cause our people to pause and wonder what the end will be, and what our situation will be when this war ends. While our people want to do all within their power to win this war quickly and completely, yet they do not want to yield their heritage, their possessions, and their birthright in their own nation for the future years. Many things are being done that are unnecessary even in time of war. Waste and extravagance has been the rule, rather than the exception, in this war.

It is time for those in power to get back to earth, inject some sound business judgment into the war effort and on the home front, and thus convince the people that there is at least some effort being made to save our Nation, and the possessions of the people. These are serious days. These are sad days in untold thousands of homes throughout our land—because a gold star represents those brilliant lives that have been spent in this frightful war for the preservation of the American way of life. If those in power give away, or lend-lease or barter, or ruthlessly abandon every vestige of our American heritage under the guise of the war emergency—then we are in a frightful situation. And, may I say, Mr. Speaker, if the present policies are continued—and they have been continued throughout this war to this very hour—we will awaken, after the war ends, and find ourselves in the embrace of bondage, regimentation, and with practically every right as an American citizen frittered away. These are serious thoughts, and these are serious days.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include the editorial, appearing in the Indianapolis Star, of recent date, which follows:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

The time has come for a little plain speaking about the administration of civilian war effort. Glaring inconsistencies, extravagant excesses, absurd pampering in the name of "good will," are dissipating the patriotic fervor of the American people. Discussion of these injustices are shushed, shushed by official Washington on the grounds that nothing must be said that will affect civilian morale. Well, the truth is that the very fact the administration closes its eyes to these things is definitely weakening morale.

Take the case of rationing. No sensible American objects to rationing. It is necessary, it is patriotic, it is wise. But it should be administered with consistent common sense. And our neighbors to the north and south should be requested in plain language to play ball on rationing.

An Indianapolis man who happened to spend a day in Mexico recently saw things which made his blood boil. There is no rationing in Mexico. Not even of American goods. One shop displayed in a single window 18 electric irons, American made. A radio store had 26 late models of Philco radios. Another offered electric refrigerators and washing machines. Meats of all kinds, cigarettes, hosiery are to be had in unlimited quantities. Gasoline is available to all without coupons. Yes; and there was plenty of Scotch liquor.

But American citizens are prohibited from bringing across the border American-made goods that are rationed in the United States. There are plenty of radios, electric irons, electric refrigerators and washing machines—all made in this country—for the Mexicans but not a single one for an American citizen. Practically the same thing is true in Canada. In dear old Canada, which to date has not been able successfully to conscript soldiers for its armies.

And another bit of good will absurdity. There is at Florence, Ariz., a magnificent new and splendidly equipped German prison camp. It is complete in comfort and convenience. The German prisoners who occupy this camp were brought down to the Valley of the Sun from Montana early in the winter. But—and this is the last word in "good will"—they will be taken back to Montana in April or May because it gets pretty hot in Arizona in the summer and our German "guests" must not be allowed to become uncomfortable while enjoying our hospitality. Of course, it doesn't seem to matter much that thousands upon thousands of fine American boys will suffer through the torrid Arizona heat in Army training camps at Tuscon and

Phoenix. Our own boys, you see, are merely soldiers, not "guests."

What goes on here, anyway? We are fighting a war to provide equal opportunity to all the people of the world. As Americans we have proved, with few exceptions, our willingness to pay any price in blood, sweat and tears for unqualified victory. But isn't it time that equal opportunity be interpreted to mean equal responsibility as well?

The Sunshine International Air Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am, under unanimous consent, inserting in the RECORD, copies of a letter I have sent to all the Senators and Congressmen from various States in the Rocky Mountain, Central and southern regions as well as a paper showing the numerous advantages this route—the Sunshine International Air Route—possesses. This sky road, developed by the Army Transport Command over the past 2½ years, is very vital to our future relations with Alaska, Siberia, China and the Orient. We are on the verge of the Pacific era with its many potential advantages and opportunities. Because of the importance of this route I am taking this means to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1945.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you perhaps know, the Western Air Lines has an application before the Civil Aeronautics Board for a route extending from Great Falls, Mont., to Alaska. Representatives from seven States interested in furthering this route, the Sunshine International Air Route, met in Denver March 9 and arranged for a larger meeting where representatives of all chambers of commerce and others interested will meet again on April 3 to perfect a permanent organization of the Sunshine International Air Route.

This route is of tremendous importance to the States of Texas, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and the eastern half of Idaho. In the post-war period this great region will wish to convert their great steel, copper, iron, oil, chemical, airplane, and other war-developed plants to industrial uses. The people of all these States have a vital interest in establishing and maintaining daily air service over a route running through the heart of the United States from Houston, Tex., north through Denver, and Great Falls to Alaska. This route will permit the central and Rocky Mountain area of the United States to assist in supplying Alaska, Russia, and the Far East with products originating in their area.

I feel that the experience of the Army Transport Command flying the Great Falls route since the summer of 1942 has proven its value. As you know, Great Falls is the principal northwest point of air embarkation for the route going to Alaska over which flows a very substantial part of the aid going to Russia. We of Montana know, the Army knows, and I feel sure the Civil Aeronautics Board knows, that this route is entirely feasible and is, in fact, more flyable than any other route to Alaska. The thousands of planes, the tens of thousands of tons of cargo, and the hundreds of passengers carried over this route over the past 2½ years would, I am sure, equal and probably exceed the total flown over any other route to Alaska in a similar period. It is to our mutual advantage that we have a direct air connection to Alaska over such an excellent and well-established route.

Another point that is certainly worth serious consideration is the military advantage of maintaining this route in peacetime. The raids by our carrier-borne planes on Tokyo show what can happen to any transportation or industry along a coast line. It is absolutely essential to our national safety that this route be maintained in peacetime and it can be maintained and improved only if it has flying over it a strong commercial airline.

Another point of importance which is not to be overlooked is the great number of flying days. Great Falls runs usually about 300 flying days per year which is considerably better than Seattle and somewhat better than Minneapolis. It is true that newly developed instruments make blind flying possible but, to quote an experienced ferry command pilot, "when a pilot can take a choice between flying on instruments, and going the same place by a shorter route, over which he can see where he is going, he is certainly going to choose the latter route." That is only common sense. If the Seattle or the Minneapolis routes had been as good as the Great Falls route, the Seventh Ferrying Command would not have located at Great Falls. They have had a delivery percentage of better than 98 percent on this route, which is well nigh perfect.

I am bringing these matters to your attention because I feel that together we can accomplish a great deal in behalf of our section of the country and I urge that you give this matter your most serious and earnest consideration. We stand on the threshhold of the Pacific era and the skyways of tomorrow are going to have a great deal to do with the development of our country and with the safeguarding of our future. If you agree with the prospectus as outlined in this communication I would appreciate it very much if you would do what you can in its behalf.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress.

ADVANTAGES OF GREAT FALLS GATEWAY FOR INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTE, MEXICO VIA UNITED STATES TO ALASKA

SHORTEST AND MOST CONVENIENT ROUTE

The Great Falls gateway is the most convenient gateway to Alaska for that portion of the United States west of Omaha and Kansas City to west line of States of Utah and New Mexico, or more than 41 percent of the area of the United States.

SUNSHINE ROUTE

The air route from Great Falls to Alaska has more days of sunshine and consequently more flying days than any other route.

GOOD-NEIGHBOR ROUTE

Development of the good neighbor idea should include provision for the shortest, safest air route across the United States and Canada for use of travelers from Central and South America to Alaska, Russia, and the Orient.

SAFEST ROUTE

Military selection of the Great Falls gateway to Alaska and Russia for delivery of thousands of planes and the handling of an immense war traffic, requiring the construction at Great Falls of large warehousing facilities and modification shops, proves conclusively that the Great Falls-Alaska route is the safest and best route for regular and quantity air traffic.

VACATION ROUTE

Emphasis is being placed on anticipated Alaska travel for vacation purposes. Use of Great Falls gateway will permit Alaska travelers to also visit the great playground area of the United States, including Glacier, Yellowstone, Grand Teton, Bryce Canyon, Zion, Rocky Mountain, Estes National Parks, Colorado Springs, and other points of interest to persons on vacation trips.

POST-WAR IMPORTANCE

The States of Texas, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, eastern half of Idaho, and Montana in the post-war period will wish to convert the great steel, copper, iron, oil, chemical, airplane, and other war developed plants to industrial uses.

Senators, Congressmen, governors, chambers of commerce, and citizens of the States mentioned in above paragraph have a vital interest in establishing and maintaining daily air service over a route running through the heart of the United States from Houston, Tex., north through Denver, and Great Falls to Alaska, as this will permit the central area of the United States to participate in supplying Alaska, Russia, and the East with products manufactured in Central States.

ORGANIZATION OF SUNSHINE INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTE

Representatives from seven States met in Denver on March 9 and arranged for a larger meeting where representatives of all chambers of commerce and others interested will meet on April 3, 1945, to perfect the permanent organization of the Sunshine International Air Route.

Address of Rev. Father Robert J. White, Chaplains' Corps, U. S. N. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid, powerful, and inspirational ovation made in connection with the historical exercises of the evacuation-day celebration in South Boston, Mass., by Rev. Father Robert J. White, captain, Chaplains' Corps, United States Naval Reserve, on March 11, 1945, conducted under the auspices of the South Boston Citizens Association:

This is my first speech during my service as Navy chaplain, breaking my rule not to speak in wartime, but to devote all my efforts to the men of the armed services. However, I accepted this invitation gladly not only because of my friendship for Boston, but because the invitation was extended from Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK * * *.

The celebration of a great historic anniversary, such as the evacuation of Boston in 1776, acquires an added solemn significance in the days of our trial by war in 1945. In the days of peace, it was easy to parade and place wreaths upon monuments to victories of the past, which endowed our present with the heritage of a great and free democracy. In these, the days of our trial by war—with victory not yet won, however certain, and

long days of hardship ahead—monuments may lose their meaning and traditions may fade into forgetfulness. Yes, that can happen even here, unless our men and women, and even children, rising above the temptations and trials of war, valiantly uphold the arms of our fighting men, by sustaining the strong spiritual supports of American democracy, which our fighting men defend

Now the greatest of these strong supports of democracy, next after religion, is the strength of the God-fearing and God-loving American home. Neither the Constitution, nor laws, nor bureaus, nor surveys, nor subsidies, can build or reestablish the traditional American home. That must be done by the faith and the devotion and the self-sacrifice of the mothers and fathers of America, young and old.

Fortunately, in God's providence we have been spared the material devastation of our land, while many other nations have suffered desolation. But tragically, we may suffer a far greater devastation and a more vital permanent loss if American family life is allowed to weaken and break in the trials of war.

No casuistry, however bold, can excuse the disloyalty to family ties, the immorality, the sham gentility without morals, the drunkenness and the break-down of family discipline, which blights American life today. Scientists can create synthetics, but there is no plastic substitute for the tough moral fiber necessary for the American people to survive the war and to progress in peace.

Indeed, the demands upon the people of the home front in war call for more than giving of their sons and daughters, more than buying War bonds, more than the mutual efforts of all war endeavors. And that vital something more is a sturdy and devoted allegiance to the American home.

It would be silly to deny the fact that there exists some strain between the people at home and their sons on the war front. Let us not indulge in any self-deception. This strain comes from a critical concern by the men at the front over the apparent success of sordid and selfish interests, and over the rise of the futile attempt to escape reality in a cheap and tawdry search for thrills and gaiety.

Such deterioration of character can never be excused as the wholesome relaxation to which a people under the strain of war are entitled. The greatest worry of our men in war comes from their anxiety of how things are going in the American home. I have had to tell men they were going to die. That was a stern and trying duty. However, it was not to be compared with the tragedy of having to tell a man and the father of children that his wife had become infatuated with another and was about to desert him. For him the war was lost. For him, life had lost all its hopes in the bitter consciousness of a final personal defeat in black despair.

Yes, our men are thinking of home. I remember so often, when men were tired almost beyond human endurance, had suffered the horrors of war, and seen the death and injury of their shipmates—how the arrival of mail from home would lift them with new courage and hope for the dangers and tasks of tomorrow. I have been in a room with many men at dinner when someone started to sing a solo White Christmas. Like the hush of a cathedral, all talking ceased; all eating stopped; and men choked back the sobs that moved them—they were thinking of their American home.

I have watched them in religious services, stalwart young sons of America, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew raising their voices to their Maker. They sang as never before. But the overtones were clear. They were praying in song for a return to America and home.

More important than all the charters and the agreements; more important than Dumbarton and Yalta, or even the terms of the final peace treaty—is the needed restoration of the American home in its strength and in its purity, in its self-discipline and generous sacrifices of mutual devotion—the one strong spiritual support of the present and future hopes of America—the God-fearing and God-loving American home.

Who fails the hopes of these young heroes sins in basest ingratitude, and stands adjudged by all decent men as guilty of treason. Through my experience with thousands of these young warriors, I know their heart's desire. They want to return to America—blessed with the God-fearing and God-loving American home of our tradition.

Moreover these heroes demand a united America. They want no blocs—no veterans' bloc, no labor bloc, no farmers' bloc, no manufacturers' bloc. They would willingly hurl a block-buster into all American blocs that we might rebuild our essential American unity, working together in mutual confidence and understanding, planning, and collaborating in the problems of peace.

May God grant us the strength and courage to justify in our lives the sacrifices so generously made by the young manhood of America. Let us not deceive ourselves. The road to victory and peace is still long and hard, and filled with death and wounds and sorrow. Let us, with God's help, bravely face these future days of our hardship and our trial.

Nor let any man deceive himself that V-day will mark the end of the mutual sacrifices necessary to achieve at long last the peace for which men hunger, and the good will between nations, necessary in a world that has grown so small that isolation becomes the wish for a myth.

Indeed, the calm night that brings victory in war will usher in the dawn of a new day filled with the tasks of peace. Now nations like combatants may suffer from war fatigue, and in their exhaustion show profound and strange reactions when released from the compulsions and conformities demanded by war. From the Revolution down to and including World War No. 2 there is a fateful and ominous pattern in the post-war problems of every American war. Some common factors in one or more of these periods have been the depreciation of values, apprehensive uncertainty, widespread unemployment, a cowardly search for a scapegoat in some minority of race or religion, and the swing of the pendulum away from an idealistic and generous cooperation to sullen and suspicious isolation. It is then that the excessive stress upon sovereignty no entangling alliances and national self-sufficiency may raise slogans that serve as the stalking horses for demagogs rising to power upon the emotions of a tired, confused, and worried people.

America cannot turn back history, even if she would. It is far wiser, much less costly in men and arms, and far more honorable for America, now come of age, to take her powerful place in maintaining world peace.

This course is better by far than to retreat again to supposed security and later to be drawn reluctantly into wars that can only be averted by the wisdom and power of world collaboration.

Indeed, there must be sanctions in the post-war world that can prevent the repetition of the stark tragedy of our days—yes, even sanctions that mean military cooperation. History is the witness of such necessity. For the failure to avert World War No. 2 in its real beginning, was not so much due to lack of knowledge of the danger, and of the logical conclusion of wars that would follow. That failure was rather due to the primary lack of wisdom in not implementing peace after World War No. 1. It was also due to lack of courage in nations in not resorting to arms at once rather than submit to the futile policy of appeasement. Truly, then, America must fulfill the responsibilities of leadership in world affairs, not only because such a course fulfills the promise of her ideals, but as well because cooperation is the only certain guarantee of this Nation's survival and progress in peace.

Until that day, when rocket bombs are harmless, when bombers cease to fly, when submarines fail to ply their evil course below the ocean's surface, when radio and radar and gas and chemicals, as weapons of warfare, have become mere shadowy dreams of a fitful slumber—until that day—which will never come—let us courageously face the necessity for American cooperation in world peace.

In the choice of methods to solve the problems of war and peace, our citizens—never compromising in principle, nor yielding on reasonable freedom of speech—should respect with tolerance and understanding the honest opinion of others. Finally after free discussion has served its proper purpose, there is a plain duty upon the citizens of American democracy to pay respectful deference to the decisions of our duly elected representatives, and in particular to the Congress of the United States, under the leadership of the courageous world leader—our President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

If the magnitude of the tasks before us dismay us by their greatness and complexity—let us for a moment draw back the curtain of time and revisit the revolutionary scene we commemorate. Lacking ammunition, weakened by illness and cold, clinging to a strategically untenable position—those heavy odds against them dismayed not Washington and his men.

Washington's plan to attack Boston came through a sudden daring decision to attack forces greatly outnumbering his own. His broadsides from the cannons shook Boston—the most terrific bombardment the British had yet felt. Strategically Washington feinted an attack to draw the British to the wrong place while General Thomas moved his regiments into place. The Yankee farmers rose to the occasion, and left their plows behind them, to appear suddenly in the ranks, eager for action. This sudden mobilization completely amazed the British generals. General Howe said he had never seen such flexibility, like a tornado against which no army could fight successfully. The impregnable breastworks of earth and blocks of ice, of sharp timbers, and hogsheads filled with gravel and old iron, menaced the British with death if they attempted to assault the heights. General Howe reeled, dazed by the American spirit and daring, and recoiling from further death and slaughter evacuated Boston on Sunday morning, March 17.

As General Howe sailed with his men for Halifax, the evacuation of Boston meant more to American freemen than the military possession of a great city. It gave proof to the world that fewer Yankees, fired by their love of liberty, could drive the British Army before them. By this victory the Yankee fighters restored a people's faith in the prowess of this undisciplined militia of free men fighting for freedom.

In honesty we recognize, and in fairness we pay tribute, to the hardy pioneers of New England—men and women of faith and courage, who for two centuries before the coming of our ancestors wrested a wilderness from the savage Indian, and built a new civilization, dedicated to freedom. Honor is due those men and women who though struggling in poverty and hardship, brought in their share of wheat and corn, and even shoes, to establish institutions of learning, which should give glory to God, and light the lamp of learning for generations to come.

If in the years up to our own time they and their descendants have sometimes unloosed the sting of a cold social and political disdain, of racial prejudice, and of religious hostility, let us, the descendants of later immigrations, prove the truth of the faith that we profess and forgive past wrongs in

genuine charity. Nor let us be too indulgent of our own failings and occasional lapses in political responsibility in yielding to persuasiveness and personality rather than demanding the essential virtues of honesty and character.

Of this I am convinced: That out of the past and the present unity of our war efforts comes a certain confidence and strong hope that the best of the old and the best of the new, working together, can, united, solve the problems of peace and of the progress of Boston.

Indeed, the tradition of Boston's devotion to freedom was not to be the exclusive possession of early settlers and their descendants. Nor was it to belong to the people of any particular period. That tradition has been the glory of all our people in all our days of peace and war.

The call to arms in the War between the States brought to the aid of the Nation thousands of sturdy immigrants who had braved the sea in exile to escape from persecution and famine. They knew the meaning of America's promise of freedom and opportunity. They were profoundly grateful.

Boston's own, the gallant fighting Ninth, marched proudly behind three standard unfurled in the breeze—the red, white, and blue, the blue and white of Massachusetts, the flag of emerald green whose embroidered words proclaimed:

"As aliens and strangers thou didst us befriend,
As sons and true patriots we do thee defend."

Was it any wonder, that in the World War No. 1 new generations, heirs of the traditions of the brave Ninth, volunteered willingly and marched proudly in the One Hundred and First Infantry of the glorious Twenty-sixth, that division among the first to land in France, which battled in the front lines without break for 210 days, and carried through every major engagement to final victory.

And now I come to the heritage of this day and hour and the deeds of the American youth in blue and khaki and olive green. They are your sons, your brother, and your friends—the bluejacket, the G. I. Joe and the leatherneck marine—my men. I have seen them in the blazing heat of Africa and the freezing hills of Italy and seen them stung by the frozen winter spray.

I have seen them marching abroad the LCI's and the LCT's, young men old before their time, tired but smiling through to victory.

I bow in reverence to the splendor of their deeds—their stalwart faith in God and His divine providence—their fidelity to their religious duties that led bishops in far-off Africa and Italy and priests in distant Corsica and France to exclaim to me in open admiration of the deep devotion—the bluejackets, G. I. Joes' and leatherneck marines. Their bravery, no man could adequately portray. Fearless in danger, I have never seen a single man of them cringe or complain at the horrors of total war—American youth—brave, hardy, and unafraid—the blue jacket, the G. I. Joe, and the leatherneck marine.

Of their loyaly to each other—epics will be written in the days to come. I have stood on the decks of a destroyer, into whose machinery poor lads have been literally blown by torpedoes, and heard from the lips of the young captain, his praise of his men who in the same night of disaster, unloaded their ammunition on another destroyer that their shipmates might attack the enemy again without delay.

In their generosity there is no youth in all the world that can compare. Their love of children—how deeply touching to remember. The little orphan lad of the docks adopted by the bluejackets; the sweet little girl of 7 the pride of the Army post; the amusing little courtship of the sailor and the miss not more than 6, sitting on the fence in Corsica, just watching the jeeps go by. Finally the great, generous efforts of the bluejackets of our fleet providing Christmas for children who have not known the meaning of the word in desolation with a prodigal generosity, showering over 30,000 poor ragged kids with clothes, and shoes, and candy, and toys, and the things that make Christmas.

Such faith, such bravery, such loyalty to fellow comrades, and such generosity best portray your sons and brothers—my men, the bluejacket, the G. I. Joe, and the leatherneck marine.

Surely standing in the hallowed light of such a historic past, and conscious of such tremendous sacrifices of the present—we Americans may face the future, brave, confident, and unafraid. Strengthened by our heritage, fortified by our faith—with God's help we consecrate our all to achieve victory in war and to establish justice in peace—the promise of America to the world, the light and the hope of all mankind.

Vocational Training for Handicapped Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent which I have received, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD an address by Dr. Loyal D. Odhner on vocational training for handicapped veterans:

Never before in my life have I made a study in which I started out knowing so much and ended up knowing so little as I have in this instance.

When I commenced work on this subject I definitely knew that I was dealing with a topic that had been grossly ignored both by public and private agencies and that I was a pioneer sailing forth on uncharted seas.

By the time I was ready to commence writing this paper, I had discovered that in the New York Public Library alone, one can find 48 articles on what Germany has done for the rehabilitation and vocational training of her wounded veterans; 7 on what Italy has done; 30 on England's work in this field; 2 on New Zealand; 1 on South Africa; and 120 on United States; and just to top that off, I found that the Russell Sage Foundation has issued a bibliography on the rehabilitation of the disabled serviceman, containing the titles of 276 articles, books, bulletins, and other publications on this subject, practically all of which have been written since 1942, and none of which are duplications of those mentioned above.

Valuable studies have been prepared by the War Manpower Commission, the Veterans' Administration, Selective Service, the United States Office of Education, and the Civil Service Commission. The departments of education of most of the States have issued bulletins on the subject, as have the departments of vocational rehabilitation. Many corporations already have made studies in which they have analyzed the physical requirements of every job in their organization and have paralleled them with similar analyses of what handicapped men are able to do according to the type of their handicap. This point is illustrated in the attached job analysis made by the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.

Among corporations which have made such studies are the Carnegie Illinois Steel Co. and the General Motors Corporation. Some corporations are making invaluable experience studies. They are now employing workers with a wide variety of physical handicaps and are carefully studying what they can and cannot do and are giving especial attention to the handicapped workers' psychological reactions.

Following the last war, the Red Cross under the guidance of Douglas C. McMurtrie, operated a school exclusively for handicapped veterans and kept a careful record of their experiences.

An organization known as the National Rehabilitation Committee recently has been established with headquarters at 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. The Disabled American Veterans, a well-known ex-servicemen's organization formed after the last war, just last week, announced in New York City the launching of a $1,000,000 campaign to finance their proposed program for the wounded veterans of World War No. 2.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have their committees on handicapped veterans. Army and Navy hospitals are having thorough psychological tests made of handicapped veterans before they are discharged and careful records are made of their aptitudes and attitudes.

Right here in Philadelphia our vocational schools have in operation a plan worked out in conjunction with the Philadelphia Naval Hospital and the Pennsylvania Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation for training handicapped veterans while they are still under naval hospital jurisdiction and before they have been discharged. As a matter of fact, a whole session on this same subject is now in process in this very hotel at industrial vocational section of this same convention. Also here in Philadelphia a group of firms—large and small—are cooperating with the Veterans' Placement Bureau of the United States Employment Service and the Philadelphia Naval Hospital and the Army hospital in Valley Forge in employing wounded veterans while they are still under hospital care. Nearly 100 injured veterans are now working in Philadelphia plants on this pioneering program.

Firms on the honor roll to date are: Kellett Autogiro Co., R. F. Sedgely Co., J. J. Smith Electric Co., Philadelphia Record, Eastman Kodak Co. (Philadelphia office), Bendix Aviation Co., Sloan Blabon Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Renninger & Graves, Railway Express Co. (Philadelphia office), Philadelphia Navy Yard, Annex Philadelphia Hearing Aid, Cramp Shipbuilding Co., Baldwin Locomotive Works, Whiting Paterson Paper Co., Limeburner Optical Co., Globe Ticket Co., Cuneo Eastern Press, J. J. Pocock, Inc., Thomas Martindale Co., General Motors (Philadelphia).

All of the above is written merely by way of introduction, and to beg your indulgence in my attempt to talk to you on this topic.

After all, who am I to speak to you teachers on such a subject as vocational training for handicapped veterans? I am neither a teacher nor a personnel man for industry, nor a handicapped veteran. And yet, gentlemen, I proceed. I do so because of the tremendous importance of this problem. I do so because our country is now, and will increasingly continue to be faced with a more serious situation with handicapped veterans than ever before in its history.

I ask you to bear in mind continually during this discussion the all-important fact that in this war there will be a greater number of handicapped veterans in proportion to the total number engaged in battle than during any previous war in world history. This con-

dition is a direct result of the miraculous advances made in medical science and transportation during the last several years. The sulfa drugs and penicillin and blood plasma have made it possible to save the lives in this war of countless thousands of wounded soldiers who would have bled to death or have died of infections in any previous war. And the airplane has made it possible to place severely wounded men in the hospitals at Atlantic City or Miami within 48 hours after they have been picked up off the battlefields of Europe. There they receive the very last word in medical science and care. And so, we already have and increasingly will continue to have with us handicapped men who never would have lived in any past war.

It is this fact which makes this subject one of such paramount importance and which makes it so intensely interesting to me as a public relations man, for that—and not teaching nor personnel work—is my profession.

The handicapped veteran will be an influence which simply cannot be ignored following this war and it behooves all of us in the field of public relations to make certain that we give him primary consideration in our thinking, planning, and actions. With this thought in mind, therefore, let us proceed to constructive consideration of our topic.

In the first place, let us get a clear picture of the Federal agencies involved and of their respective responsibilities.

1. Army and Navy hospitals: After a soldier is wounded in battle or otherwise disabled, he is transported as quickly as possible to a naval or Army hospital. There he is given the necessary medical and surgical attention. He is thoroughly "reconditioned." He is then given a psychological test to determine his aptitude and attitude and in some cases is given vocational training even before discharge.

2. Selective service: Immediately upon discharge the veteran, whether disabled or not, must report to his local draft board. (All draft boards are under Selective Service.) There he must interview the employment committeeman who reviews his record, determines whether or not he wishes to go back to his pre-war job and in the case of handicapped veterans, whether he is able to do the work involved. A veteran must make application for return to his pre-war position within 90 days after separation from the military service. (It was 40 days, but I believe that it was lengthened to 90 days only last week.) The employment committeeman then refers the veteran to the—

3. United States Employment Service: The U. S. E. S., as it is commonly called, then takes over and goes through the necessary procedure either to relocate the veteran in his pre-war position or to find new employment for him.

4. The Veterans' Administration: The Veterans' Administration takes care of all other matters affecting veterans, such as provisions for apprentice training, vocational training, loans for homes, farms, and business education, hospital care, medical attention, disability pensions, etc.

There is no question that the veteran of World War No. 2 has been generously provided for under the G. I. bill of rights and that the handicapped veteran will not be thrown out of the service to become an object of charity. But let us remember that even though the handicapped veteran may receive a pension of nearly $100 a month, he does not want to waste away his life doing nothing. He wants to be a self-supporting, self-respecting man, just as much after his injury as before.

What can industry, the community, and vocational education do to help him obtain this goal?

Industry, and by industry I mean all employers, can thoroughly analyze every job in the business to determine the physical requirements and working conditions of each rsepective job. It can then match this rtudy with the physical abilities that each wounded veteran has left and fit him into jobs that will require no more than he is able to perform.

Industry also can revamp its entire thinking about the physically handicapped, so that instead of rejecting the wounded veteran applicant for what he cannot do, it will employ him for what he can do.

Industry must never employ a handicapped man out of charity. It must employ him because it needs him to fill certain jobs.

Finally, industry must start now to determine where it can and where it cannot employ handicapped veterans. The problem of employing or reemploying the wounded veteran is not one that can wait for demobilization following the cessation of hostilities. It is one that is facing us now. War injuries do not wait for peace to be signed. They happen while the war is being fought, and we already have a tragically large number of severely injured men now in the process of reconditioning. Every day adds many more.

I do not know the total number of permanently handicapped veterans today, but it can be safely predicted that before this war ends the number will exceed the combined total of all wars in our country's history, including the Civil War and World War No. 1. Therefore, immediate action on the part of industry is a fundamental necessity.

I want to add a word about the small employer. Some way must be found to aid him in making the same studies and employing the same proportionate numbers as the large employer, who can maintain a personnel department.

Small business employs more workers than big business. It is in this field that I believe that vocational education can perform its greatest service.

I will go into this further under the subject What Can Vocational Education Do? Above all things, industry must give handicapped veterans sympathetic consideration, especially during the early months of their employment.

The community has a very important part to play. It can organize veterans rehabilitation committees, perferably under the most aggressive existing local agency such as the chamber of commerce, junior chamber of commerce, Red Cross, the Public Charities Association, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This committee should—

A. Mobilize local employers now to study the problem of employing handicapped veterans and to follow that up by employing the largest number possible. Some employers fear that they will involve themselves in difficulties with their insurance if they employ handicapped veterans. They should be shown the publication entitled "A Plan to Help You Employ Disabled Veterans and Other Handicapped Persons, Productively and Safely," published by the National Association of Mutual Casualty Cos.

Not only do the casualty companies not oppose the employment of handicapped persons, they encourage it. All firms having had extensive experience in the employment of the handicapped, agree that they excel the average worker in dependability and carefulness. This should be emphasized to all employers.

B. See that material for making this study is on file in the local public library. This is essential because many employers will want to make this study privately before committing themselves publicly.

C. See that this material is on file with the local board of education and that some teacher or teachers are assigned to specialize in its study.

This is essential because many employers will want to consult with someone well versed in this problem before making a commitment.

D. Keep in close touch with the Veterans' Administration to determine the total number of handicapped veterans from the community. Every community will want its handicapped men to return home, yet many severely handicapped men feel that they never want to face the home folks again and would prefer to start life over again in some other community. It is also important that the local committee should know at all times the extent of its handicapped veterans' problem.

E. Make a study locally of what handicapped people have done for themselves. (Nothing will give one a clearer idea of the great possibilities for gainful employment of handicapped veterans than to study what handicapped people already have done for themselves.) Also, nothing can be more encouraging to wounded men than to learn of the successes of others who are similarly handicapped.

F. To study the experiences of local homes for cripples. Almost every large American community now has one or more homes for crippled children. Many of the "graduates" from these homes are now self-supporting. The children have disabilities paralleling practically everything that has resulted from war injuries.

G. To follow up on handicapped veterans who are employed and study their experiences.

H. To forward the result of all studies to a central national agency, perhaps by way of a central State agency for redistribution to all localities so that every community may benefit from the other communities' experiences.

I. To interest local groups, such as the luncheon-service clubs, to specialize in helping certain types of disability. I have in mind the work the Lion's Club has done for the blind.

Please note that in submitting this proposed community committee program I have kept two important points in mind: The first is to avoid, if possible, the creation of a new organization or assocation. The second is to refrain from entering the field of interviewing the handicapped veterans. Remember, he already will be interviewed by the Army or the Navy, by Selective Service, the U. S. E. S., the Veterans' Administration, and his prospective employers. If there is to be any interviewing of these veterans by volunteer groups, I strongly urge that that be left to their own kind, namely, the local chapter of the Disabled American Veterans. Even the follow-up of disabled veterans who are employed should be confined as much as possible to the employer.

The purpose of the voluntary Community Veterans' Rehabilitation Committee is to mobilize employers to hire handicapped men and to study the community's experiences with handicapped people in order that all interested may gain thereby.

There is going to be a veritable rush of well-intentioned organizations to enter the field of helping the handicapped veterans. Most of them will be unnecessary duplications of existing agencies, and many of them will do more harm than good through confusing rather than helping the wounded man. There is a need for mobilizing the employers and for studying local experiences. These two tasks will give the local voluntary committee all that they can do with the time available to them.

In general, I think the local committee should be comprised of:

A. Representatives from the leading lines of employment—manufacturing, distribution, construction, transportation, service trades, professions, agriculture, etc.

B. A social worker from the community chest or united social agencies or Red Cross.

C. Representatives from the public and private school system.

D. A representative from municipal government.

E. Representatives from veterans' associations.

F. Representatives from local press and radio.

G. A leading medical man.

Wherever physically handicapped people can be found in the lines above suggested who are competent to represent the community, I believe it would be wise to have them as members of these community committees.

What can vocational education do for the handicapped veteran?

1. Having learned where handicapped veterans can be employed and where there is likelihood of a need for them, open classes in those lines.

2. Make a thorough study of the most likely lines for self-employment of handicapped veterans and open classes in those lines. Self-employment means going into business for oneself. No field offers greater prospects for this than retail distribution. It, therefore, behooves distributive education to make the training of handicapped veterans a major item in its 1945 program of activities.

3. America is rapidly losing the art of reading. Many of the handicapped will not be able to flit over the countryside with the ease of the average man. Therefore, I urge that any program of vocational education for the wounded veterans shall include a course in the good old art of reading worthwhile literature. If this can be done, it will be a source of permanent joy to the veteran and will be a boon to the country.

4. Distributive vocational education and the distributive industry should frankly face the fact that we are far behind manufacturing in the matter of vocational education and employment of handicapped veterans.

We are not backward when it comes to claiming that distribution is one of the largest employers in our economic system, but we are definitely backward when it comes to training and employing our wounded soldiers. We can't begin to match manufacturing in the percentage of our large companies which have made job analyses for the purpose of determining our possibilities for employing handicapped veterans and of engaging in current experiments in adding them to our pay rolls.

I believe that distributive education can perform a great national service in taking the lead in educating employers in our line to become more aggressive in this activity.

There is a very definite reason for our backwardness. Our classification and treatment as a nonessential industry has compelled us more and more to resort to the employment of women and high-school students and we have found that they have done wonders in helping us meet a manpower emergency far more serious than faced any other line of endeavor and in fulfilling our function far beyond the most wildly optimistic hopes of 1942 (only 2 short years ago).

But suppose for a moment that the pessimistic predictions of a post-war slump should not prove true. Suppose for a moment that those who are planning for a maintained national income of $150,000,000,000 should succeed. Suppose that the necessary $70,000,000,000 retail volume to support such an economy should develop. And again, suppose that with the war pressure removed the husbands, sons, fathers, and brothers of our women workers and our student help should decide that they want them back in the home to reestablish a normal home life.

Then where would we be?

I don't like to introduce this type of appeal, because we should be planning to employ our handicapped veterans regardless of the probabilities of meeting our employment needs with mothers, wives, and high-school students.

Nevertheless, I think it is important for us to keep this possibility in mind. What a tragedy it would be if distribution failed to meet a post-war boom because of manpower shortage after the magnificent job that we have done in meeting the war emergency—and no one can deny that we have done a magnificent job.

Distributive education can add to its war laurels—and they are many—by taking the lead in selling distribution to match manufacturing in the training and employing of handicapped veterans.

5. Education—if not vocational education—can contribute materially to the solution of the problem of training the handicapped veterans through encouraging students to make this the subject of their graduation theses. There seems to be a tendency on the part of many who are studying the problem today to start from 1940 or 1942 and to ignore the mass of material that developed from the last war and the many years of experience of our homes for the physically disabled. Such studies should contribute materially to the general good.

6. Distributive education can render a great service to little business through studying the subject of the placement of handicapped veterans and acting as advisers to the small businessman who cannot employ personnel managers.

7. One of the most important things that distributive education can do for our handicapped veterans is to train its teachers to become sympathetic listeners. All of those engaged in this work whom I have interviewed have emphasized the importance of this apparently unimportant point. It seems to be characteristic of these men that they want to talk—not about their military experiences—but their personal problems, to anybody who will listen. They are nervous, unsettled, yes—unstable. They have had experiences so foreign to their normal lives that they are changed to their very foundations. They want to think—but they want to think out loud. Those who hope to contribute to their education simply must become patient and sympathetic listeners or else they should not continue in this particular field of education.

The Office of Education seems to be the logical Federal agency to make the study of the subject that should be on file with all libraries and boards of education.

In conclusion, I wish to present a plan for employment of handicapped veterans, which was presented to me by Walter Spear, himself a wounded veteran, on behalf of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia. Mr. Spear was a member of the Rangers who landed at Salerno before the infantry went ashore. He is one of the few men left out of his entire unit, and few men know the thinking of our injured soldiers more intimately than he does.

"While the soldier or sailor is in the Army or Naval Hospital, have the doctor or a board of doctors state to what degree he is disabled. Then have him discuss his desires with qualified men who will make suggestions to the soldier in regard to the positions in industry open to him and describing the nature and possibilities in every industry for which he is qualified. Have books and plans of all positions and training needed so that the soldier can read and study this material to acquaint himself with the possibilities in industry for which he is qualified. In doing this at the hospital or camp, the men will not have time to think they are helpless cripples—thus new interest will be started. And, when the veterans are ready to leave the hospital for home, they will know better what they are fitted for and perhaps what job they want to go after.

"In their home city have one recognized board of experienced men whom these veterans can see for a final discussion. An appointment should be made for the veterans before they leave the hospital or camp and they will be expected to report to the designated board or a predetermined day. The names and reports of qualifications for desired job or training of each should be forwarded to the board in his particular city in advance. Such a report would indicate his physical condition so that the returning veteran will not have to keep telling his advisers and employers about his condition. The board will, of course, expect the veteran to have an idea as to his desires and qualifications.

"With such information supplied in advance, the soldier will, to a certain extent, feel that the board knows him personally, thus creating a friendly helpful atmosphere. This board will not be expected to place the soldier in his desired school or job, but just to advise and suggest local possibilities for his benefit.

"Train these men so well that industry will want them, not so that industry will take them just to help. Show the soldiers and employers the record of performance of the handicapped civilian workers while the boys were at war.

"WALTER SPEAR,
"Chairman, Veterans' Rehabilitation Committee, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Philadelphia, Pa."

Finally, as a guide to those who may desire to make a study of this subject, I submit the following:

1. Communicate with:

(a) United States Civil Service Commission.

(b) United States Office of Education.

(c) United States Employment Service (try to secure if possible copies of "Special Aids for Placing Military Personnel in Civilian Jobs" and "Special Aids for Placing Naval Personnel in Civilian Jobs."

(d) Veterans' Administration.

(e) Selective Service.

(f) Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—Federal Security Agency.

(g) United States Department of Labor.

(h) State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.

(i) Visit your nearest army or navy hospital.

2. Procure a copy of Bulletin 162 of the Russell Sage Foundation—130 East 22d Street, New York City (price 20 cents). It is a bibliography of all recent articles on the Rehabilitation of the Disabled Serviceman.

3. Review articles in your local library under the subject Disabled, Physically Handicapped, and Crippled.

4. Contact your local Red Cross, Disabled American Veterans, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Community Chest.

5. If you are Philadelphians, contact your chamber of commerce.

One of the finest of all of the studies which I have reviewed on employment and training of veterans has been made by our own Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and has been summarized in two pamphlets, entitled "Employment of Veterans" and "Soldier, We Wish You Well." Don't fail to obtain copies of them if you wish to study this subject.

By following the above suggestions one can compile for oneself a bibliography of bibliographies and can study the subject as extensively or as sketchily as one may wish.

And I unhesitatingly predict that anyone making a study of this subject will become convinced of the vital importance of the problem of vocational training and employment of our handicapped veterans and will volunteer his services for as long as they may be needed.

Jobs suitable for disabled veterans

	Legs, having—				Arms, having—			Deaf	Mute	Blind
	0	1	1½	Right and ½ left	Right	Left and ½ right	Left			
Stores:										
Clerks		K	A	A	A	A	K			
Shelf stocker			A	A				A	A	
Checkers		A	A	A	A					
Meat cutter		A	A	K						
Warehouse:										
Car gang			K					A	A	
Elevator operator	K	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Mule operator		K	A	A				A	A	
Order runner			K	A				A	A	
Stocker			K	K				A	A	
Loader			K	K				A	A	
Receiving clerk		A	A	A	A			K		
Porter		A	A					A	A	
Salvage			K	A	K			A	A	
Repack		A	A	A	A	A		A	A	
(Banana pack)	K	A	A	A	A	A		A	A	
Office:										
Telephone operator	K	A	A	A	A	A	A			
Mail room		K	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Comptometer operator	K	A	A					A	A	
Dictaphone operator	K	A	A						A	K
Clerical (general)	K	A	A	A	A			A	A	
Garage mechanic		A	A					A	K	
Truck driver									A	

NOTE.—K=Kroger veteran; A=any veteran.

Cartels Threaten Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Howard Pew, president, Sun Oil Co., before the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, Monday evening, March 19, 1945:

We are here tonight as representatives of the trade press. As such it is our responsibility to advocate those measures which are good for the American public, and that which is really good for the American people is good for business. Ours is the responsibility of providing wise leadership, so that all segments of business and industry may clearly understand our economic system.

Under the impact of the world's most terrible war, we have been jarred loose from our social, economic, and political moorings. Emotion has replaced reason. Expediency is adopted in the hope that thereby the war may be brought to a speedier conclusion. Many people would stoop to use the war to impose their panaceas on us for our economic salvation. Virtually every dawn brings a new crop of prophets of a brave new world in the future. Virtually each twilight has seen unfolded new and beguiling schemes whereby men may live without the painful process of work or thought. Yours is the task of analyzing in ar impartial and logical manner these grandiose schemes, and of pointing out the fallacies in their glittering promises. It is in the hope of making some small contribution in assisting you in that task that I have come nere tonight.

In recent years there have been various pressures undermining our competitive enterprise system and pushing us toward a collectivist system under ever-expanding governmental authority. I shall discuss tonight only one of these pressures—that of monopolistic restraints of trade. The widespread movement that recently has come to the front to cartelize world trade under government control through so-called trade accords is, in my opinion, the greatest danger now threatening economic progress in America. My desire is to arouse you to a realization of the gravity of that danger, and, through you, our leaders of business, industry, and the American people.

Discussions of this sort mean very little unless we have before us a clear definition of the terms and words we are using, and a definite exposition of the principles upon which we make our stand. So, as a starting point, all that I say shall be bottomed upon a strong and fervent faith in the superiority of our American competitive enterprise system as a means of raising the standard of living for all, providing employment for those able and willing to work, and creating opportunities for men and women to utilize their talents to the utmost.

Business and industry render their greatest service to the Nation when they constantly produce better products and services at lower prices through an efficiency that reconciles a low-cost policy with the payment of high wages. But that objective can be realized only through constantly increasing the productive efficiency of everyone engaged in business and industry. It cannot be achieved under the restrictions of bureaucratic control; nor can it be achieved in the face of feather-bedding practices, whether imposed by government, labor, or the owners of industry; and it cannot be achieved if we are going to adopt policies that remove both the stimulus and the means to increased efficiency by reducing alike the rewards for seeking it and the penalties for ignoring it.

If you believe in that principle and its implications, then you cannot regard cartels, in any form, as good business practices. If you do not believe in that principle, if you favor collectivism in our economic life, national socialism, national ownership, and all the other philosophies which lead to the all powerful state, then you will find cartels an admirable instrument to achieve your objectives.

When I use the word "cartel" I mean an arrangement whereby two or more independent enterprises undertake to restrict the production, fix the prices, and/or allocate markets or sales quotas covering commodities in which they trade. This is the so-called private cartel.

A government-controlled cartel is such an arrangement under the direction or with the sanction of the government having jurisdiction over such enterprises and it usually contains provisions for the enforcement of the arrangement.

A super-state cartel is an arrangement requiring independent enterprises to restrict production, fix prices, and/or allocate markets, made pursuant to an international agreement or treaty between two or more governments which undertake in some manner to enforce upon their nationals the terms and conditions of such an arrangement.

The private cartel embraces monopolistic practices in restraint of trade that have been outlawed in this country for more than 50 years. The evil and reprehensible nature of such practices is beyond dispute. Their effect has been to destroy initiative, close the door of opportunity for new individual entrepreneur, destroy small business units, encourage inefficiency, raise prices, and thus lower the standard of living. These fruits of the cartel system result in the freezing of industrial progress to the detriment of workers, consumers, and those with savings to invest.

Few voices today are openly raised in defense of the so-called private cartel. But there is a school of thought which believes that an undertaking which is against the general welfare, and thus bad, can be made good if it is conducted under government control. Illustrative of the Government-controlled cartel were the N. R. A. codes of a few years ago. There we have the Government urging and even forcing upon American industries practices, which, if undertaken outside of the N. R. A. codes, would have been unlawful. Their counterpart has flourished in Europe for many years and is a primary reason for the backwardness of European industry compared with our own.

The superstate cartel is a relatively new evolution of the cartel idea, under the deceptive labeling of trade accords. These agreements compound all the evils found in private and government-controlled cartels, adding to them a dangerous expansion of power in our Federal Government through the treaty-making device. Illustrative of the superstate cartel is the abortive Anglo-American petroleum agreement submitted to the United States Senate last summer, but subsequently withdrawn under pressure of the unanimous protest of the American petroleum industry. The objectives of this proposal were never clearly set forth beyond vague statements that the purpose was to bring about an orderly development of the world's oil resources through the stabilization of the operations of the industry.

Such euphemisms as orderly development, stabilization, fair competition, rationalized competition, elimination of waste, and fair prices always are used to describe the objectives of a cartel. They are terms which should immediately arouse your suspicions and command your close scrutiny.

The Anglo-American oil agreement provided the framework for restrictions on the production of petroleum and its products, the fixing of prices, and the allocation of marketing quotas upon the recommendations of an international petroleum commission. Inherent in the implications of the agreement was the assumption of an obligation by our Federal Government, when it concurred in such recommendations, to undertake to carry them out in the domestic field. This would necessitate the exercise by the Federal Government of an authority which it does not now possess under our Constitution, since jurisdiction over national resources is among the powers reserved to the States in the tenth amendment.

The Federal Government would have gotten the authority to fulfill its part of the

bargain made with other nations through the treaty-making power.

Our Constitution makes treaties the supreme law of the land, on a par with the Constitution itself, and overriding other Federal laws and State constitutions and laws which may be in conflict with the treaty. Thus the reserve powers of the States would, through treaties dealing with them, fall into the orbit of Federal authority and jurisdiction.

As a matter of fact, such a procedure is the only lawful way, since the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional, to cartelize effectively the American petroleum industry. Even were private cartels lawful, there are too many enterprises within the industry for any master plan to embrace all of them. Those outside of the cartel arrangement in a reasonably short time would succeed in defeating the conspiracy. To make a petroleum cartel effective here it must necessarily be implemented by the lash of governmental authority. What is more, the petroleum industry, by and large, wants no part of cartel action, since its growth has resulted from spirited competition. Here we had the amazing spectacle of the administrative agencies seeking to force an industry into a superstate cartel against its wishes.

Throughout the controversy over the oil agreement, it was difficult to avoid the conclusion that those who had proposed it were desirous of taking a short cut designed to change our American system overnight to the status of the German system of national socialism. Just remember that the advocates of socialism long have proposed the promotion of cartels in the conviction that a system of extensive monopolies controlled by the State paved the way for a socialist economy. The Fascists and Nazis seized upon existing cartel systems for the foundation of their totalitarian states. For those reasons I believe the superstate cartel is far more reprehensible and detrimental to the public welfare than private cartels entered into by individual companies, bad as they are.

Much of what I have said specifically in regard to the oil treaty, would be applicable to similar undertakings affecting other industries. This use of the treaty-making power to override constitutional limitations and set the stage for transforming our American system into national socialism is a danger that may engulf all of us.

During the controversy over the petroleum agreement it was reported that similar international agreements were contemplated covering approximately 60 commodities and services in international trade. These were said to cover rubber, tin, sugar, coffee, shipping cargo space, and global airways. Undoubtedly others had to do with metals, leather, wool, cotton, chemicals, as well as manufactured articles, that could be fitted into a cartel framework.

The list is sufficiently broad, if those plans are pursued, to encompass a large part of world trade in a superstate cartel system. More alarming, however, this movement would entangle a large part of our domestic economy in the tentacles of the vicious cartel system, with destructive repercussions upon every other line of economic activity. International trade and domestic trade are not two different things. They cannot be isolated in compartments, one from the other. They are parts of the same thing. This country cannot be cartelized in its foreign trade and free in its domestic enterprise any more than a nation can survive half free and half slave. Once we start to regiment through allocations, price fixing and production controls our activities in the foreign field, we of necessity will have forced upon us by the Government restrictive measures upon operations falling wholly within the domestic field.

Turning to the arguments advanced in behalf of the negotiations of these superstate cartels, we find the contention that cartels are a necessary device to safeguard industry and invested capital against unfair and destructive competition and the wastes which result from wide fluctuations in industrial activity—that they serve to permit the orderly development of industries and stabilize prices.

Now all of that argument begs the question of what is best for the general welfare. Like the League of Nations' definition that cartels are associations of independent undertakings in the same or similar branches of industry established with a view to improving conditions of production and sales, it fails to state to whom the benefit or improvement accrues. The answer is obvious, since the primary purpose of cartels is to restrict competition. Competition, bringing better products at lower prices, benefits the consuming public. So whatever restricts competition, in the long run, harms the public welfare. Price stabilization usually means the establishment of a rigidity designed to protect high cost and marginal producers. It destroys incentives for low-cost policies. Thus, cartels operate against the smaller or relatively newer enterprises which, through increased efficiency, are challenging the position of larger and older enterprises when the latter have become waterlogged through plant obsolescence and inefficiency.

Prof. Anton de Haas of the Harvard Business School in a recent defense of cartels, distributed, ironically, by an organization calling itself American Enterprise Association, cites all of these justifications for cartels. He also attributes to the cartel the virtue of providing equality of opportunity. This phrase contradicts itself. Since all men differ in talent, initiative, and industry, creation of equality of opportunity would shut the door of opportunity for the efficient, and drag them down to the level of the inefficient.

Much written in defense of cartels makes little sense to me. We find, for instance, Milo Perkins, former Executive Director of the Economic Warfare Board, concluding a recent magazine article with the assertion that "where we cannot eliminate cartels, we must gradually perfect ways to make them into instruments which serve the public interest." But at the beginning of the article, emphasized by italic type, Mr. Perkins states: "All cartels are in business to keep prices at levels which could not be held if free competition existed." In other words, Mr. Perkins in one breath asserts cartels are devices for rooking the public, and in the next breath that such devices can be made to serve the public interest.

Another group asserts that although in normal times cartels may be undesirable, they are necessary devices for short terms in periods of depression to prevent the too precipitous drop in price levels, which has disastrous consequences. I suppose that here and there a showing of facts could be made to sustain that conclusion. But it also could be demonstrated that the operation of cartels creates depressions and prolongs them. The danger in resorting to cartels during emergencies is that the cartel survives after the real emergency has passed.

Aside from all of that, however, it is significant this argument is put forth at this time by the cartel advocates. This country does not face a post-war depression. This approach to post-war prboblems is illustrative of the defeatist attitude marking the economic thinking in Washington during the last 12 years. Too much Washington planning is being done under the shadows of the past. These planners should approach the problem in a venturesome spirit determined to seize upon the great opportunity presented for a dynamic expanding economy, the only hope for the restoration of full employment in this country.

Some argue that American participation in superstate cartels is necessary to assure lasting peace. I remind them it was cartels, subsidies, unduly high tariffs, bartering, and governments trading with other governments which generated so much of the economic friction preceding this war. The cartel idea had its origin in Germany. When Adolf Hitler seized power he found in the cartel system a completely forged weapon for his program of rearmament and war.

This peace argument is based upon a corollary contention that they are necessary to expand world trade. Actually cartels operate to contract world trade. At best they might serve to transfer markets from one nation to another without increasing the total of world trade. But if the ills of the world are to be healed through international trade, then the volume of international trade must be expanded. New consumer markets must be created and this can be done only through the production of better goods for sale at lower prices.

A healthy foreign trade is essential to our well-being as well as that of the rest of the world. Our Government should be vigilant in opening and preserving trade opportunities abroad for American business and every effort, compatible with our national interest, should be made to expand world trade. Our volume of world trade, proportionately small as it has been, is of great importance to our economic life, particularly to those industries largely dependent upon export business. But this foreign trade is not worth the price, if that price is abandonment of our competitive enterprise system and placing our domestic economy in a totalitarian strait jacket.

Finally we hear it said our participation in super-state cartels is inevitable. The argument goes that most of the world has embraced cartels and there is nothing that we can do about it. Thus, we are urged to climb aboard the cartel bandwagon, even though it means the destruction of a system at home which has given our people the highest standard of living ever achieved anywhere at any time upon this earth.

As Friedrich Hayek wrote in his excellent book, The Road to Serfdom, nothing in social evolution is inevitable unless thinking makes it so. Who can be certain that other nations will remain wedded to the cartel system? Events in Europe have not progressed far enough to indicate definitely the political and economic desires of the people upon the European continent. Nor are the English united in support of cartels. Only last week Prime Minister Winston Churchill called upon the Conservative Party to make private enterprise versus collectivization, and liberty versus controls, the issues of the forthcoming election. The London Economist weekly thunders that cartels and other forms of collectivism are will o' the wisps leading Britain to disaster.

Assume that we must live in a world which outside our borders is wedded to the cartel system. Then we should use our great economic power to give world leadership and direction toward a more universal adoption of the competitive enterprise system. For instance, when the war in Europe ends, there will be billions of dollars of lend-lease material that can be converted to peaceful industrial use—perhaps as much as thirty billions worth. In disposing of that surplus material in the countries in which it is stored, let us attach a condition that none of it may be sold or given to any enterprise that is a party to any cartel arrangement. There have been suggestions in Congress that the surplus war material in this country should not be sold to monopolistic enterprises. There is no reason for any less exclusive requirement for the disposal of surplus material abroad.

Again, why should not Congress enact legislation making it unlawful for America to lend money to foreign enterprises participating in cartel arrangements. Such action

would apply to foreign loans the prudence and common sense exercised at home by bankers against lending to enterprises engaged in practices destructive of their markets.

Pending before the Senate are the Bretton Woods monetary agreements. One of these provides for establishment of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development with a capital of $8,800,000,000, of which this Government would be obligated to provide two and three-quarters billions of dollars. In ratifying that agreement, why should not the United States Senate attach a reservation providing that no part of this sum may be loaned to any enterprise participating in cartel arrangements. We also could shut out of our rich market foreign monopolists set on discriminating against us and thereby driving us into a totalitarian economy. I am not proposing that any of these things be done. I merely suggest courses of action open to us as protective measures against countries, if any there be, attempting to strong arm us into cartel arrangements.

In conclusion, I appeal to you gentlemen to proclaim on every occasion your faith in our competitive enterprise system; to demonstrate by fact and example the superiority of this system over the programs of the collectivists and totalitarians; to scrutinize with realistic eyes schemes that are labeled "free enterprise," but which might well undermine our competitive enterprise system, ending the best hope we have for economic progress, high levels of employment, and a rising standard of living.

Let us not be beguiled by emotional appelas and glittering promises, but let us give sober reflection to the Wall Street Journal's recent observation that "No people ever entered the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted." Through the doors of superstate and Government-controlled cartels lies the road that leads to nationalism, isolationism, totalitarianism, and finally, to another disastrous war.

Veterans' Hospitals

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, next to the war itself, next to the preservation of our Government itself, there is no more vital need facing this Congress today than the prompt and thorough investigation of veterans' and servicemen's matters, an investigation of the entire rehabilitation program from the top to the bottom. Some of the alleged conditions in Government hospitals throughout the country are unspeakable. Of that we have an abundance of evidence. I hope this House will soon and expeditiously authorize a real investigation to deal with these matters and to correct these situations that now exist. This must be a thorough, sweeping, impartial, independent, and fearless investigation, I repeat, one that will look into these conditions from the top to the bottom, of the entire rehabilitation program.

I cannot understand the trepidation on the part of some officials whose departments are concerned with the subject matter of this proposed investigation, and indeed some Members of the House, concerning House Resolution 172 which merely proposes a sweeping and general investigation of veterans and servicemen's matters. If there are no irregularities to uncover, if no abuses exist, if no intolerable conditions are present in these institutions, I cannot understand why anyone, in or out of this House, should fear a thorough, impartial investigation. In fact, I should think that the officials concerned, and certainly Members of this House would welcome such an investigation.

Apparently the able and distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Committee, since he has introduced a resolution for a limited investigation, embracing the Veterans' Administration alone, is now of the opinion that an investigation of some knd is necessary. Let me assure you gentlemen—and I know that you are all vitally interested in the welfare of our beloved veterans—that there can be absolutely no question concerning the need—the very urgent need—for an investigation. I have gone into this matter quite thoroughly and for some months past have been withholding this resolution in the hope that the agencies concerned would be able to pick up the slack so to speak, and correct some of these impossible conditions that affect practically every part of the rehabilitation program. But the situation has steadily progressed until it has become truly intolerable, if we are to believe the evidence at hand which has come to me from all sections of the country complaining of unspeakable conditions in many Government hospitals controlled by the Veterans' Administration and also by the Army and Navy.

Not only does it appear from this evidence that these facilities are overcrowded but it is asserted by many reputable persons, some of unquestionably high standing and repute, that the character and quality of the medical service, attention, and treatment leaves very much to be desired. It is charged that first-rate men—our war heroes—wounded, disabled, shattered in body and mind—are being treated by third-rate doctors, using outmoded methods, and apparently not aware of the progress of their own medical profession. Some of the charges made—and I will refer to them later—are almost unbelievable.

According to figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration, there is admittedly a backlog of about 88,000 cases as of January 31 still pending, unsettled, and unadjudicated in that agency, while thousands of returned veterans, many of them in sore distress and need, are compelled to wait for months before they receive consideration. Serious complaints are made about the rating boards, and it is charged that the allowances made in many instances are woefully inconsistent with the condition of the veteran.

The Congress has provided generous funds to build adequate hospitals for these men and women, yet it is repeatedly charged that overcrowding exists in many of these installations. The Congress has provided generous funds for wholesome, healthful food for these unfortunate victims of war, but in many instances the veterans and servicemen complain that they are poorly fed. The Congress has intended that the supervisors and superintendents presiding over these hospitals shall accord our boys considerate and respectful attention, yet in many instances it is stated that our boys have been treated with insult, unreasonable restrictions, and harsh discipline, more resembling that of a concentration camp than a Government hospital. The Congress has contemplated a speedy adjudication of the claims and cases of our boys, but, as I said before, the record shows on the face of it that this process is bound up with so much red tape that needy boys are kept waiting month after month for a decision, and then, in all too many cases, are awarded a rating which does not enable them to live decently. The Congress contemplated that under the G. I. bill of rights it would be made easy for veterans to buy homes or go into business, yet the official figures show that relatively only a few returning veterans have been accorded this entitlement.

The conditions warranting this investigation, as proposed under House Resolution 172, let me make it clear, are not confined to the Veterans' Administration nor to its institutions. There are many complaints, I am sorry to say, concerning Army and Navy installations and stations that are equally bad, that reflect neglect, mistreatment, and disregard and disrespect for our returning heroes. Members of the House, you can believe me when I tell you that the evidence is so abundant that it would be unduly repetitious, cumulative, and a trespass upon your time to produce it in full; in fact, it would take hours to produce all the evidence that I have in my possession concerning these most regrettable and intolerable conditions.

Now I am not prepared to assert that all of this information that has come to me is necessarily accurate, true, and correct. I fully appreciate, as you all do, that some it may be, for one reason or other, because of bias or prejudice or animosity, unworthy of credibility. I do not contend that all this information is trustworthy. I do not contend that all of it can be believed absolutely. But I do contend that where so many people, including men of unquestionable authority in the field of medicine and retired officials and employees of the Veterans' Administration, and personnel of the Army and Navy, and experts in Government and medical science, and also a very large number of alleged victims—the wives, the children, and the parents of those who claim to have received unconscionable treatment—have taken the pains to present their complaints and offer to submit their evidence under oath before any impartial governmental inquiry, that these facts are a clear indication that where there is smoke there is fire, and it becomes the duty of this Congress and this House, responsive to its investigative function and its responsibility to the veterans of this and other

wars, to make a speedy and effective inquiry into these matters.

In other words, this abundance of evidence, whether all of it is true or not, makes out at least a prima facie case and places upon the agencies involved an obligation to present evidence refuting and contradicting these charges and upon this House the burden of taking up these questions and these serious allegations and investigating them thoroughly, completely, and impartially, so that if these conditions do exist they can be speedily rectified, whether they exist in the Veterans' Administration or Army and Navy installations, so that justice may be done to our brave veterans and their dependents, and families who are the wards of this Government and to whom we, as Representatives of the people, owe a most sacred trust to see to it that they are accorded decent and generous treatment at all times and under all circumstances in connection with the administration of laws which Congress has passed for their benefit, and especially in connection with the helpless and pitiable victims of war, the broken and the maimed, the sick and the weak, the tubercular and those who have lost their reason and who are now hospitalized in Government institutions of one kind or another.

As I pointed out, these complaints cover practically every phase of the rehabilitation and hospital program. I have great respect for the ability and patriotism of the chairman of the Veterans Committee but in all deference to him I do not believe that he is ready to assert that this type of investigation, which I think most of us acknowledge is absolutely necessary, should be conducted by the Veterans' Administration itself. That, of course would be a travesty. Neither do I believe that this investigation, embracing as it does Army and Navy installations, which might come under the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs or Naval Affairs Committee of this House should or could be conducted by the Veterans' Committee of this House alone. However, talented, however experienced and however zealous and patriotic the chairman and members of the Veterans' Committee may be, because many of these matters, affecting perhaps millions of our boys before this war is over and in the post-war period, clearly go beyond the jurisdiction of that able committee. These matters are far too serious and far too important to so very many of our boys to be trifled with or delayed, and I am assuming that every Member of the House wants to see them corrected at the earliest time possible, they are far too sweeping and too broad I must repeat, again with due respect, to be confined within the province and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Committee alone.

Recognizing the experience, great ability, and special knowledge of veterans' problems possessed by the veterans' committee, in House Resolution 172, I provided that 5 of the 11 members of the proposed investigating committee, if the resolution was adopted, be named by the Speaker from the Veterans' Committee. By this proviso, I think I have given most generous recognition, consideration, and respect to the members of the Veterans' Committee and it is only proper and fair in the interests of our veterans and the House that this proposed investigating committee be comprised of a cross section of our entire membership so that in the eyes of the country there will be absolutely no question whatever concerning either its impartiality or its representative character.

We should have one integrated investigation by one all-embracing body authorized to deal with all these matters instead of several investigations conducted by various committees which may be the case in the event House Resolution 172 is not adopted, because certainly, some committee or committees of this House, whether it is an integrated committee, or whether it is the Military Affairs Committee, or the Naval Affairs Committee, the Invalid Pensions Committee, the Pensions Committee, or all five committees, conducting separate inquiries, will have to look into the question of conditions in Army and Navy hospitals and compensation and pensions. Nor should we be concerned with whatever expense is required to conduct this broad-scoped investigation which I propose. I appreciate the view which some Members have that investigations where possible should be conducted by standing committees in order to avoid expense, but I do not believe there is a Member of this House who would be willing to deny funds legitimately required for a comprehensive and complete inquiry of veterans' and servicemen's matters.

Before I close I would like to pick out at random a few comments and quotations from the tremendous volume of complaints directed against practically all phases of veteran and servicemen's rehabilitation problems that have come to me both before and since I introduced House Resolution 172. Because I do not wish to stigmatize anyone unfairly on the basis of ex parte statements, in some cases not under oath, I will not mention the name and location of these hospitals, or the names or addresses of any individuals at this particular time. I would like to have you listen to what this returned veteran writing from a Southwestern State hospital had to say about conditions he observed in several veterans hospitals. I quote:

> Why are they making such an effort to prevent this investigation if there is nothing to be disclosed? I have spent sufficient time in several facilities to observe conditions that are the lack of executive and administrative ability. We need a complete independent investigation into veterans and servicemen's affairs. Why keep patients in a hospital such as the one located—

And he mentions an eastern hospital—

> where dampness and fog make conditions unbearable for all tubercular, arthritis, and asthma patients.

He continues:

> I know personally where the patients at night would put in a call for the officer of the day and he would never show up. The night nurses are under orders not to disturb them, and if they should come their language is insulting. Before I left the eastern hospital they had about 100 cases of ptomaine poisoning due to eating a stew that in my estimation was rotten, but this affair was squashed. The food up there became utterly repulsive to me. We need a thorough investigation to expose inefficiency and neglect of our veterans.

Here is a veteran from an eastern State who was discharged from the Army because of a lung condition for which he subsequently had to have an emergency operation. He complains as follows:

> I was under the impression that the Veterans' Bureau did pay for emergency operations that were service connected. I made visits out to the (X) Veterans' Hospital but was told that they did not have the facilities to treat me. Later I was told by the Veterans' Bureau that they have to receive notice within 24 hours of the time the patient enters the hospital but these doctors never told me that. It has cost me a lot of money for these two operations. Frankly I can't afford to pay it as I am unable to work most of the time. I have been told I may have to have another operation on my left lung. I doubt if the Veterans' Bureau would tell me the right way.
>
> I also have been having trouble in regard to my service insurance and sent quite a few letters. I received a reply from them last November saying that the Veterans' Administration had no official notification of discontinuance of the service-pay allotments from the Army finance, so they could not tell me the status of my account. It seems to me that they should know by now as I have been out of service about a year and a half.

And here is another statement under oath from the Nation's Capital. I quote:

> The attendants at Hospital (X) handled me so rough they caused me to be ruptured. My back, arms, legs, kidneys, and rupture on account of rough treatment are giving me a lot of trouble. I refused to eat the food at Hospital (X) because it wasn't fit for a dog to eat.

Here is one from the great State of Missouri:

> I am a permanent and total disabled veteran and have been to the Veterans' Hospital for treatment and examinations and all I have ever got was a push in the face. I have been under doctor's care all the time. I have seven gun-shot wounds and many other things wrong. I have four decorations and though I have tried every way, at present I have to live on relief. You can investigate me any place in my home town.

The next is from a discharged lieutenant in the Army who served in Alaska, who according to his story was improperly treated in a service hospital, and when he complained about it, was thrown into a small cell and locked up. I quote:

> In the cell next to me was a veteran of World War No. 1 who had become a liquor addict. This poor devil died screaming during the night after several corpsmen and a doctor tried to quiet him with a needle and evidently blundered.
>
> At Hospital (X) I was transferred to a place where there were a hundred of us in one large room. The only time I ever saw a doctor to talk to was after I had been there a week. I was pretty much run down with 5 weeks of hell on the west coast. My discharge was made effective in October and I have been afraid to open my mouth to any one until now about the terrible error on the part of someone on Attu.
>
> Any number of my fellow officers are willing to testify to my character and my actions. They, like myself, don't understand it at all.

From Chicago I quote the following:

My brother came home February 7, 1945, and since then he hasn't received any money that's due him. In fact when he was leaving the hospital (out in the far Middle West) he did not have any money for train fare—not one cent in his pockets.

Speaking of another hospital in the Middle West, a veteran says:

I would personally much rather be on Iwo Jima Island with our marines than be in a veterans' hospital under the same experiences I have had. I could certainly fight back there, but here you cannot.

From Indiana comes another complaint:

In February of this year I had occasion to visit my daughter who was in a (here he mentions a service hospital in the Southwest). There I heard a returned nurse say that she had been in the hospital for 9 days and hadn't seen a doctor up to that time. One little returned nurse waiting her papers for discharge was told she was filthy lazy because she refused to go out on the floor and work. In a dark hall room made into a so-called ward, I saw about 8 or 10 patients lying in a bed and a more neglected sight I never hope to see again.

In another hospital in the Middle West mentioned in this letter, I quote:

Patients confined with measles were ignored and had to get up and try to care for each other. Food and services were terrible. It is time somebody put the fear of God in these people and looked after the ones who need care.

Still another very intelligent letter from the Middle West, from which I quote:

I was a patient for 23 months in hospital (X) and I never thought the place was managed properly and that all possible was done for the patients. I also considered some of the wards unsanitary and some dark and dirty and in need of paint and other things. Food was not warm and was poor. My present employment is in a defense plant where I have a responsible position so I would not be able to spend much time away from my job, but if the Legion or some other organization gives me notice, I will have my notes ready.

From the great State of Connecticut, I quote from a letter, as follows:

I spent 6 weeks at hospital (X), an eastern hospital, and the conditions there were so bad that I went AWOL and spent the rest of my hospitalization in our State Sanitarium. I have to go once a year to determine my eligibility for pension, but the doctors who do the examining aren't TB experts, which they should be.

From Kentucky, a lady writes as follows, speaking of her husband, hospitalized in a midwestern veterans' hospital:

They finally were about to operate for a hernia when out of a clear sky, they told him they couldn't operate, that his heart was in such bad condition he would die on the table. We later consulted a heart specialist and were assured his heart was perfect. Our son, on leave, was taken ill during the night and was taken to a service hospital. The doctor in charge assured us they would have an ear specialist to take care of him. Next afternoon when I went to see him, he had a temperature of 103. He was in bed for two weeks and never once was given a bath except those I gave him myself. He laid in filthy linens and was handed pajamas with no buttons. The food was atrocious. The cockroaches nearly carried us away. The room, windows, floors were filthy. He was given pills which knocked him out, but never saw an ear specialist. Finally toward the end when he was able to be up a little, the doctor stated Bill's ear was ruptured and that he had never seen his ear—though it was the same doctor who examined him upon entrance. They at last sent him to our own ear specialist and by the grace of God the ear was not ruptured. We were very fortunate to get him out of that filthy place. We could have given him such good care at home if they let us. We feel that the officials must surely not know existing conditions at this hospital or they would insist on better treatment for our boys.

She continues:

I went up to see another boy in the hospital who was a pal of my son's. The second day after his arrival—he was injured in an auto accident—he was still lying on a blood-soaked pillow, clotted blood all over his face and hands and pajamas. He was too ill to move or eat. Nothing was done, not even did he receive a bath until he was able to get up and take a shower. These two boys are at present in the Pacific and I pray God that they and all returning veterans can expect and will get something better in our hospitals than they have had.

From Virginia, I quote concerning a veterans' hospital:

I could give you some first-hand information as regards conditions here and at other facilities with names, dates, and witnesses. You understand that severe reprisals would be taken against me by the authorities if they knew of this letter.

From California, let me cite the following case concerning an Army hospital:

Unfortunately, these alleged intolerable conditions did prevail in the psychiatric section of (X) General Hospital during my 4 months stay there. It was my misfortune, as one of others whom I can name, to be the recipient of some of these intolerable conditions at the hands or fists of attendants.

It seems to me that such treatment is to be deplored not only from the standpoint of humanity, but also as definitely poor psychiatric therapy.

The following conditions are said to exist in a veterans hospital in Colorado:

An attendant sat on an 86-pound patient and twisted his leg until it broke.

A Missouri letter states:

The brutal treatment of inmates at the (X) hospital during February of 1944, revealing the kicking of inmates or stomping on them after they were knocked down. Slapping or pushing inmates with open hands or fists. Choking inmates with arm or towel. Whipping inmates with a wet towel. Confinement of inmates without clothes or bedding in strip cells devoid of all furnishings. Unfortunately, the above all resulted in the usual whitewash and passing of the buck, as most investigations usually do. It is time to talk less about concentration camps in other countries when we have many individuals needlessly tortured in mental hospitals.

From my own State of Massachusetts, a distinguished citizen writes me, as follows:

For some time now, I have been active in matters pertaining to the welfare of the returning veterans. From actual experience, I know the statements you made to Congress are borne out day after day in the City of Boston. I have personally escorted many veterans who have only recently been discharged from service through the tangled maze of procedure which they must unravel in order to obtain their compensation and benefits.

The present set-up in Massachusetts is entirely inadequate and inconvenient for the veterans who are, in all conscience, entitled to a well-equipped veterans' bureau where all their needs can be taken care of.

A correspondent from our great State of Washington sends the following:

The writer is prepared to give a committee the harrowing details of his experience in the X hospital here, provided such information would be considered as strictly confidential, inasmuch as I am still under treatment at said hospital, and although my present attending physicians are in no way to blame for the treatment I received while a patient, still from an ethical standpoint, there might be repercussions on their part that I would prefer to avoid. I feel sure that you gentlemen will understand the situation in which I am placed and grant my request for secrecy. As a matter of fact there are many former patients in all Government hospitals who feel the same as I do regarding these matters, and it would be very difficult indeed to arrive at the true state of affairs in these institutions unless this was done.

From California again:

I have just returned from the veterans' hospital at X, Calif., where I have been trying for some time to have dental work and eye work done. The administration office is considerably overstaffed, but even so, a veteran cools his heels there for days, weeks, and sometimes months before he can get action on his case.

Tennessee reports the following:

For 10 years I have spent all of my vacations from my job near the veterans' hospital, which kept my brother. Whenever possible, he returns home with me and improves greatly under the influence and conditions enjoyed away from the institution. The more I know about discipline and restrictive regulations at these institutions, the greater I yearn to see changes in them.

This is what one writer says about one well-known Government installation near the District of Columbia:

I am an honorably discharged Navy veteran of this war. I lost a kid brother, also Navy, in a Veterans' Administration hospital. I spent 3 months at the X hospital. What I have witnessed out there would make your hair stand on end. Especially, in the psychoneurosis division of the hospital.

Nearby Virginia reports the following:

On my three visits there when things were supposed to be at their new best, I came away so depressed that I could scarcely bear it; and then began a red-tape process to get my brother out, and at the same time retain his veteran's status. It took 3 months to do that.

There was much display of uniforms, etc., among doctors and nurses, and the patients seemed to be secondary considerations. My brother, when we would go there, would be brought to visit with us for a limited time in a little dark room, with one window, and a sofa and a chair, and it was like having a prisoner brought out by a guard.

From a Naval hosiptal in California:

We are most certainly thankful that we have seen the day when the conditions we have been forced to undergo have at last been brought to light. Many of us have had terrible days overseas and suffered many hardships. Now we have had to come back to conditions much harder to bear.

Here is an incident that would make the blood of any true American reach the boiling

point. A mate of ours here was sick and required a 24-hour watch. Meanwhile, the Captain's dog became ill and the corpsman was taken from the bedside of this man and detailed to sit up that night watching the dog. Next day, our mate died.

We have seen our mates who are bed patients chained to their beds because of infraction of a rule; while others have been taken from their beds and put into the brig on bread and water for as much as 10 days because they were not in bed at the time bed check was made.

We know men returning from overseas and hospitalized for a period of 60 days or more are entitled to a convalescent leave of 30 days, but these cannot be gotten here. These are just a few of the things that are an everyday occurrence here, and God only knows it would take pages to print all the others.

We sincerely hope and with a fervent prayer in our hearts, ask that you include this concentration camp in the investigation. We are with you 100 percent in bringing the ones responsible for these conditions to justice

Massachusetts again:

The conditions here are not as satisfactory as they could be, due mainly to the shortage of beds The waiting list is tremendous. In fact, recently a veteran who needed hospitalization very badly was required to wait 2 months before they could take him into the hospital. This condition should not exist as a veteran very ill many times cannot wait that length of time without serious results.

The two mental hospitals in this State are packed and the waiting lists there are very large also, and, of course, this is a very sad situation.

This one about Pennsylvania:

Under no circumstances should Congressmen of the particular congressional district or United States Senators of that senatorial district be allowed to carry on an investigation for the simple reason that some time or other they have asked favors from the heads of these institutions for one or more of their constituents.

A real progressive head of a Veterans' Administration would advocate that all tubercular, arthritis, and asthma patients be placed in a hospital situated in a climate that would be favorable to their recovery.

Why keep patients in a hospital such as the one located at X, Pa., where dampness and fog make conditions unbearable and all the medicine they might give them will never lead to recovery?

California, again:

After they looked me over they decided that all they could do for me was to take out the ribs on my left side. The doctor who would do the work was not very experienced, so I left and went to a private surgeon. This man operated on me and was able to do what was necesary without removing my ribs.

The surgeons at the Army's largest tuberculosis hospital were unable to do the job on me that was necessary and the veterans' hospital was likewise unable to help except by the most drastic of measures. Yet, I have found two men in the San Francisco Bay region who do this operation. The veterans' wouldn't call in outside help on my case, yet the same man who operated on me was called in by the veterans' to operate on another case.

Here is another from California:

Investigation will prove that conditions in the hospitals are but the outward manifestations of a deep-rooted evil system set up, within the Veterans' Administration; a system by which the personnel of that one Government agency constitutes the investigators, the examiners, the prosecutors, the adjudictors, the judge and the jury. From their decision there is no appeal. As a result, claims are presented and adjudicated on the basis of favoritism rather than rights under law. Justice is made to curry favor.

The average monthly payment for service-connected disability is $30.67. Is this what the people mean when they say, "Nothing is too good for our boys; when they come home disabled we are going to see to it that they receive the very best this great Nation can afford"?

From Texas, I have the following:

I was a witness in a Federal investigation, and after they found that out, those who testified for the Government have not been able to light there and no other veterans' hospital after they find out who you are.

Again, concerning naval hospitals here and overseas:

I contracted filariasis during a 14-month stay in American Samoa. At the time, the medical authorities knew (and told us) that any man staying there over 3 or 4 months was likely to get it. Knowing this, we were kept there for over the time limit, and between the time we left and the time we went into action, nearly half the men were afflicted with it.

Our kick is not with field hospitals and aid stations, it is with mobile and base units far behind the lines. I spent some time in nine different hospitals, and of the five, in back areas, only two could possibly be considered fit places for a man just out of combat to get decent treatment.

Mobile No. X in New Caledonia, and especially base No. Y in New Zealand, and the B Hospital in the States, are much nearer concentration camps than hospitals.

Base No. A was as beautiful a spot as I have even seen. When we men first saw it we were enraptured. It was high on a hill, surrounded by fir-covered ridges, hillsides blanketed with wild flowers, and from the foot of our hill, a broad valley was centered on a lovely stream. And all around the hospital was an 8-foot barbed-wire fence.

What we wanted was peace of mind, not medicine. Instead we were bound up in all kinds of petty rules and regulations; we couldn't sleep in our bunks during the day no matter how tired we were, couldn't use the library in the evening, could only see certain shows, use the sanitary facilities at certain times, and liberty—the one thing everyone had lived through hell for—was forthcoming only after many hours of work a day.

Doctors seldom agree on a diagnosis and I've known men to be treated for three different ailments by three different doctors in as many hospitals, and in the end, all three were wrong. Several hundred of us "patients" came back on the same "hospital" ship—a merchant marine Victory ship. Our meals consisted of an apple and Spam sandwich at noon and a fairly substantial (in quantity) meal in the evening. This lasted for 21 days. The patients also swabbed and swept the decks.

The same writer describes conditions at a naval installation here in the United States:

So we spent 6 hours a day in the sun, with picks and sledge hammers, tearing out the walls, making little ones out of big ones, as they say at Leavenworth, and carrying away the pieces. Hard work for patients, but either that or go to sleep at night as you had done for years.

By the time you reach the States, another corpsman or nurse's aid (WAVE) has been added; four people taking care of the now almost-recovered men. And they talk of a manpower shortage.

Please do not use my name in connection with this, as I have no desire to be transferred to China.

A widow from California writes me as follows:

He entered the (X) hospital at 3 p. m. February 9 and died April 12 at 3 a. m. He had five fractured ribs on the right side, three on the left side and a fractured sternum bone. Also a large bruise on his jaw. He had no bruises when he entered the hospital. That was brought out at the coroner's inquest. * * *

At the inquest, it was brought out by the testimony of their employees (husband, aged 75) was tied hand and foot in bed with shackles on his feet and arms and a heavy restraint sheet over that tied to the bed in a ward with 15 violent patients and was kept in that cruel and inhuman position for 10 hours.

I could go on indefinitely citing the evidence. I have not even scratched the surface; I hope that I have clearly manifested and emphasized to this committee my own impartiality and lack of bias in this matter. I desire to be fair to everyone concerned and I desire that every official of this Government shall have fullest opportunity to rebut and contradict charges that may be made against any hospital or facility or any other thing or matter in his charge.

I am endeavoring to point out the immediate pressing need for this inquiry, which I think is generally admitted, and then, to impress upon you the desirability and necessity, if we are to have an investigation at all, of authorizing not a limited, but a sweeping, fearless, impartial, and thorough investigation of all these matters and all of the very many charges of neglect, incompetency, maladministration, omission, and inhumane treatment that have been leveled against various programs which Congress has set up for the benefits of our returning veterans.

We cannot delay any longer to deal with this vital matter without being confronted in the very near future by a national scandal that will shock the country to its roots. Let us move now, therefore, to direct the kind of an inquiry by this House that will prove to the Nation that we of the Congress are determined to carry out the oft-expressed and inflexible will of the American people that our beloved veterans who have offered their lives to our country and who have returned to us broken and shattered in body and in mind shall receive the very best treatment that this Congress can provide, and that we propose promptly and fearlessly to uncover and speedily to correct policies and actions by administrative officials of the Government or of our armed forces, whoever they are, which militate against the adequate and proper care, consideration, and treatment of our wounded or disabled or mentally afflicted veterans.

As I said before, I desire to be fair in every respect to the distinguished and very able gentleman who has proposed a different, limited, and a circumscribed investigation of these matters which may well be misinterpreted by the country because it does not go far enough. I should be perfectly willing to let the House decide the issue that I raise here today, let the full membership decide whether it wants a limited inquiry containing necessarily certain jurisdictional disabilities and complications I have al-

luded to or whether it wants a clear cut, unlimited, sweeping, independent, complete, and fearless investigation that will go over the entire rehabilitation program from the top to the bottom hospitals and everything else and set it right once for all, so that it may be said of our Congress and our House that we have done our full duty by those who fight and die for our democracy and our liberty.

I regret exceedingly that the leadership of the House has exerted its powerful influence to kill House Resolution 172 and advance the resolution calling for a limited and uncoordinated investigation for consideration. I particularly deprecate the fact that this action was taken right on the threshold of a recess when many Members are not present and also when it is not possible to have adequate general debate on the matter. For my part, I stand my ground, because I know that when all the facts are disclosed the country will not be persuaded that a limited, curtailed inquiry is in the true interests of our beloved veterans and service men and women.

Meat Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday; March 24, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, Federal Reserve Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was very gratifying to me to note in the papers this morning that your agency is planning to issue regulations which will halt the cornering of the cattle market by a few large packers and will allocate cattle to all slaughterers.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of remarks which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 23, and a press release thereon, outlining some of the things that were causing the maldistribution of meat, and citing principally that the local nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses were being unfairly discriminated against in all meat orders starting with Meat Restriction Order No. 1.

I hope that your statement in the paper means what it says and that there will be no discrimination between nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses and those which are federally inspected. If there is discrimination you will face the black market on two fronts. First, the large packers with control of the greatest proportion of meat refuse to ship into the territories they formerly served, and are holding the civilian supply of meat for territories immediately surrounding their slaughterhouses. This results in more meat per capita being available in that close area than there are ration points to absorb it and the surplus reaches the black market. Second, if the order discriminates against the small nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses, the man with live cattle on his farm in areas of meat shortage will butcher and sell in the local black market and will have no trouble in disposing of his meat.

The only way to prevent these two black markets is to provide that all slaughterhouses, both federally and nonfederally inspected, shall be permitted to kill the same proportion of their meat that they killed in 1941, and that they shall serve the same customers and areas in exact proportion to the permitted civilian poundage as compared with the civilian poundage available in nonrationed base periods.

There is little or no difference between the requirements of Federal inspection and non-Federal inspection, insofar as health requirements are concerned; the principal difference is architectural, in connection with height of ceiling in rooms in which dressed meat may be hung.

The military needs could be provided for by setting aside poundage in all slaughter houses in the United States, and accepting the health certification of the local veterinarians to cover inspection.

Your attention is also called to the fact that the meat grading service has been extended to nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses without undue hardship on the Government agency providing the grading service, and the meat-inspection service could be extended similarly without undue hardship on any governmental agency. Further, the elimination of duplicate meat inspection by the Army and the Department of Agriculture would release a large number of veterinarians to cover the inspection in the small nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses.

There is just no excuse for a continuation of this discrimination between federally inspected slaughterhouses and nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses. I trust that the regulation proposed will authorize equal supplies of live cattle and hogs, in proportion to their 1941 kill, for both federally inspected and nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses.

Very truly yours,

E. J. GARDNER.

Bretton Woods Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on Bretton Woods by Hon. Charles G. Binderup, former Member of this body.

The older Members of this House will remember Mr. Binderup as a conscientious, hard-working liberal. They will remember the eloquent half-hour addresses on the money question that he delivered from the well of this House. They will remember Mr. Binderup as an authority on both the national and international monetary situation. Mr. Binderup was not only a Democrat but he was also a student. He was not a partisan. He voted for the best interest of the people regardless of partisan politics.

I feel that his article is thought provoking. I have long felt that the Bretton Woods agreement was nothing more or less than a clever contrivance to fleece this Nation, or should we say the taxpayers of this Nation, out of another $17,000,000,000 in addition to the lend-lease billions. I am sure that his many friends in Congress, and throughout the Nation will be pleased to get his views on Bretton Woods.

Here is former Congressman Charles Binderup's article:

We must destroy the Bretton Woods conspiracy or the Bretton Woods conspiracy will destroy us. For it is as impossible to reform our corrupt money and banking system by going in partnership with Morgenthau and his international bankers as it would be to reform hell by going in partnership with the devil and his imps.

Bretton Woods, where was first displayed that strange creation that silently and secretly emerged from the Nation's most dishonored and immoral spot, Wall Street, the cancer at the heart of our Government.

Whose offspring is this illegitimate child so foreign in a great representative government? That bastard child for who they have chosen as foster father Henry Morgenthau, out of the President's Cabinet.

The first news of the birth of this miserable brat came, as usual, from England, where it seems all of these guarded secrets leak out. At first Morgenthau remonstrated "impossible," but later modified his denial, saying, "It was offered only for the reason he wanted the kid dressed up a little nicer before presented to the public."

When it became generally known the baby had been born, everyone pointed the accusing finger to Maynard Keynes of London, but Keynes came to Bretton Woods with his own brat right from Downing Street.

Keynes and his kid were not welcome at Bretton Woods. His child was dressed up somewhat, but it lacked the gold corpuscles in its blood stream. So after Bretton Woods had looked it over one round, they tied the weight of gold around its neck and drowned the baby.

We have looked in vain for the real father of Morgenthau's baby, but everybody said, "No, not me." Didn't know a thing about it until I heard the gossip from London. Yes, when the pie was opened the birds had flown away.

Let us stop for a moment and remove the beautiful, glittering, glimmering, swaddling clothes, so spendidly prepared for public consumption, and view the kid in its nakedness. Lo! and behold! the bastard laid bare. It is the skeleton of the old gold-standard witch all padded up with its face lifted, the same old son-of-a-witch we buried in 1934, resurrected by the international bankers, fostered by Morgenthau, and promoted by President Roosevelt in the same voice that sang the swan song at the funeral, directed to the London Monetary Conference, "we are not interested in stabilizing the English pound or the French franc, we are only interested in stabilizing the American dollar so it will have the same debt paying and purchasing power, now and generations hence," and the refrain, "we will drive the money changers out of the temple and move the capital out of Wall Street back to Washington." And do you remember we shouted back, "Amen, amen; thank God for a leader who is for America first, who will lead us in the terrible unequal fight against Wall Street and international bankers, the Nation's most ruthless dictator," and with profound faith we waited for action to give force to his magnificent words, but the words died away, drowned by the noise of the clicking of the coin in the cash register of the international bankers.

Yes; let there be no mistake about this, the Bretton Woods agreement is only and purely for the purpose of putting us back on the old corrupt gold standard that we repudiated long since.

For 12 long years we have wondered why all at once without any explanation, all the

gold and gold certificates belonging to our citizens was conscripted into our Treasury by the President's edict in 1933 for $20.67 an ounce and we were compelled to take in exchange money created for the Federal Reserve banks that was not legal tender for our gold, but now we see.

For 12 long years we wondered why we bought, until we had three-fourths of the gold of the world at $35 an ounce from foreign lands and put it in the Kentucky hole, when we didn't use the gold, didn't want the gold, as we were off the gold standard and never wanted to go back, but Bretton Woods explains.

For 12 long years we wondered why all this gold collected was given to the bankers in gold certificates, a mortgage on the gold that can only be redeemed by taxation, and we add to the gold gift we give to the bankers currency amounting to 60 percent more than the face value of the gold certificates, but Bretton Woods explains it all.

For several years we have wondered why and how Morgenthau could secretly and silently without the knowledge or consent of Congress take of what gold we had left in the Treasury and buy the worthless I O U's of foreign nations, but now we know for it was thus the 40 nations, destitute of gold, could qualify at the Bretton Woods conference and go on the gold standard, with 25 percent gold back of their currencies.

So it didn't surprise us, when last week Morgenthau advised the gold requirements back of bankers gold certificates should be reduced from 40 percent to 25 percent, thereby according to the same plan the bankers would receive another donation from the people amounting to $4,800,000,000 including the 60 percent bankers privilege.

In this letter we have only given a brief prelude to the Bretton Woods conspiracy. We beg the privilege of writing you further in letter that follows. Believe me Members of Congress, of all the diabolical schemes hatched out by the international bankers and hidden in false propaganda, nothing has ever equaled this Bretton Woods conspiracy. Congress must defeat this vicious so-called agreement.

St. Patrick's Day in the Evening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert a poem commemorating St. Patrick's Day by an Irishman born in Ireland on St. Patrick's Day 81 years ago, John P. Delaney, of Long Beach, New York:

PADDY'S DREAM

(By J. P. Delaney)

Sure me ould heart is light and me spirits are gay,
For Oim filled wid the jys of this St. Patrick's Day,
An' out thru the smoke av me durlin dudeen
I see Erin's lakes and the hills that are green.
Far beyant o'er the green in a boggish brown patch
Is a small little cot with a weather-worn thatch,
An' there in the dure is a face with such charms
As I never saw equaled, and a pair of fond arms
That are eager to clasp me close to her breast.
Says she: "Thanks be to God, bye ye have come home to rest."
Ah though plainly I heard Mother whisper me name,
Me dudeen has gone out an' I wake from me drame,
But me ould heart is light and me spirits are gay,
An Oim drinking the joys of this St. Patrick's Day.

Hey, Skinny, Fight!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of March 22, 1945:

HEY, SKINNY, FIGHT!

In a recent moment of extreme rashness, the New York Herald Tribune took on the State of Texas for bragging and listed a motley of products and pursuits in which, it asserted, other States than Texas excel. As soon as news of this overt act reached Fort Worth, Mr. Amon Carter's breech-loading Star-Telegram let go with both barrels, and the charge wasn't paprika. There was no bluster in it. The Ft. Worth newspaper merely called the roll, beginning with military personages—Eisenhower, Nimitz, etc.—great leaders in international affairs like Senator TOM CONNALLY, and going through to "roses, sheep, goats, hides, mohair, pecans, onions, mutton, spinach, turkeys, highways, pipe lines, cottonseed, land in farms, sorghum, grains * * * and total number of domestic animals," in which the Lone Star State leads in a gallop. It grants that Texas may come off second best when it comes to lying, and suggests that laurels in that classification must go to the writer of the Herald Tribune editorial.

Hostilities thus having commenced, each of us can take his stand as his conscience tells him. While a scattering of Tennesseans have settled around the fleshpots of Gotham, the plains of Texas literally are populated with Tennesseans at once removed. It is estimated that as high as 50 percent of Texas traces to Tennessee extraction, and it well may be 51 percent. Blood is thicker than seltzer water. Texas has always been Tennessee's favorite suburb. The Tennessean heeds the ties of kinship, knotted long ago at the Alamo and consecrated on a hundred battlefields under the Bonny Blue; we enlist with the cactus carbineers, kneel, aim, correct for the variable wind, and contribute to the volley. A flag for Texas. A fig for New York.

And it matters little that the writer of the Tribune editorial to which Texas justifiably takes exception sounds suspiciously like an ex-Texan himself—Mr. Stanley Walker in pinstriped pants. It matters nothing. Your New Yorker by adoption ordinarily contracts the near-sightedness chronic to the natives in its most virulent form and never again looks across the Hudson save in scorn.

But Mr. Walker or another, the Tribune's writer, in a city as monstrous for sheer noise and pompous show, for prententiousness and superciliousness and patronizing posturing, as New York has no cause to look down his nose at Texas. O city that would starve in 3 days without the produce trains from the South and West in disparaging the quality of Texas beef commits the top folly of quarreling with its bread and meat. The prettiest showgirls on the White Way may indeed come from Texas, as the Tribune's writer grudgingly concedes; but it is the strutting little mayor of New York, not the justices west of Pecos, who, in callous defiance of wartime defense measures, has moved to keep open the clipjoints where the jaded strip-teasers unhook after midnight to relieve the boredom of metropolitan wasters.

Texas brag? In a million efforts it could not approximate a fraction of the self-puffing, the public preening, the insufferable condescension that has characterized the New York attitude since the ancestors of the present toffs escaped from the melting pot of the Bowery into their pigeon-roost skyscraper apartments—and overstuffed editorial offices—uptown. The trouble with the New York point of view is that it is expressed by men who have had to live with artificialities so long they simply cannot recognize facts when they encounter them.

Whatever Texas says it has got, it has got, in all probability. And the Tennesseean, of the State from which most of Texas sprang, shares Texan resentment of the doubts and slurs pointed South by the professional sniffers of Broadway. We have taken up arms about it, and will join the van whenever the indignant Texans set out with their incomparable bullwhips after the impertinent mediocrities of effete Manhattan.

Poles Keep Fighting in Face of Disaster—Army, Overwhelmed in France, Builds Anew in Britain to Good Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell that appeared in the Detroit News of March 22, 1945:

POLES KEEP FIGHTING IN FACE OF DISASTER—ARMY, OVERWHELMED IN FRANCE, BUILDS ANEW IN BRITAIN TO GOOD PURPOSE

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

The Poles acted quickly after their country's fall. The Polish Constitution provided that in an emergency, the president could appoint his successor. This enabled President Moscicki, interned in Romania, to name a head of the Polish state who could and did establish a Polish government-in-exile, with headquarters in France.

The first task of the new government was the formation of a Polish army, made possible by the steady influx of Poles from Romania, Hungary, Lithuania and Latvia—whither they had espaced from the Germans—and by the presence in French and Belgian industry of many thousands of Polish workers. By 1940 this new army numbered some 70,000.

The shock of losing family, home, country, possessions was deep tragedy but instead of being discouraged, the Poles were determined to regain their independence, and salvage what was possible of earlier achievements. Poles do not beg for liberty, it is said; they fight for it. As Paderewski once remarked in my presence, Polish history is the record

of a thousand years of fighting. Poles have always fought to win and maintain their independence.

LOVERS OF LIBERTY

When other peoples have been deprived of their liberty, Polish sympathy has gone out to them, particularly if the victim has gone down fighting. I recall the Polish attitude toward Ethiopia when Mussolini extended Italian sovereignty. In the spring of 1940, the Poles were the first to apply for inclusion in the British and French expedition to Norway.

That was a bad chapter in Allied annals but the Poles won merited praise for their achievements from the French general in command.

Polish troops next met the Germans in France. The two Polish divisions, with the very inadequate and often antiquated equipment the French supplied, fought till the last. A part of the 2nd division lost 2,000 men covering retreating French forces.

Every unit of that division was decorated with the French Croix de Guerre. The Polish First Division, fighting with the Twentieth French Army Corps, lost approximately 45 percent of its combat strength. When Marshal Petain asked for an armistice—I was in Vichy that day—General Sikorski, the Polish commander, ordered what was left of the Polish Second Division to cross into Switzerland, where it was interned; ordered the remnant of the first, farther west, and men in training camps to make their way to the coast any way they could and thence to Britain.

NEW POLISH ARMY

Those who succeeded became the nucleus of a second Polish army formed in exile. The Polish Government had, of course, been obliged to leave France, just as its predecessor had been obliged to leave Poland.

Here conditions for training were much better, equipment was excellent and the group was daily augmented by the arrival of Poles who had traversed half Europe to reach the British rock, each man with a tale of fantastic adventures.

The Polish land forces were assigned to the defense of a section of the Scottish coast. But it was the aviators who had their chance in Britain.

When that country had its September it came off better than did Poland, thanks to Polish aviators who shot down every eighth German plane destroyed, spelling the difference between British victory and German invasion.

The British fully recognized that fact. By the end of 1944 the Poles had destroyed more than 1,000 planes and 223 flying bombs. Polish aviators have maintained their record in every phase of air activity, in transport as well as combat and reconnaissance, whether their base be Britain or Africa.

LAURELS IN AFRICA

Poles had fought in Norway's snows. Now they were to experience the heat of African sands and learn desert war technique in defense of Tobruk. Again they won laurels. The ill-starred Greek expedition was to include them; and when that failed they were set to be a part of a great Allied expeditionary force going into the Balkans—Churchill's cherished plan that went into the discard at Tehran.

Italy was next for the Poles, this time men who had been brought out of Russia and equipped and trained in the Middle East, plus the Polish brigade from north Africa.

This group is now the Second Polish Corps, the base of the First being in Britain and that of the Third, now forming, in Egypt. Tens of thousands of Poles who had been forced into the German armies and now are falling prisoners to the Allies are recruits for this new corps.

Of the constant activities of the Polish Navy and merchant marine, both of which have achievements to their credit out of all proportion to their size, we hear little or nothing. Up to 1944 the Polish Navy had accounted for 2 German destroyers, 1 auxiliary cruiser, several submarines, 35 transports, and many smaller fry. It had served in over 600 convoys and as many patrols.

HOME ARMY FIGHTS

And lastly, that powerful factor, the Polish home army. Its operational units in the summer of 1944 numbered 250,000 men, living in barracks hidden in remote forest regions, always ready for combat or sabotage. The Germans had to keep 19 divisions besides some 350,000 SS men, special guards, and police in Poland because of them. Sabotage accomplished by the Polish home army was of inestimable value to the Soviet Union, since it prevented men and supplies reaching the Germans on that front.

In June 1944, for example, the Polish home army derailed 54 trains, staged 42 railway hold-ups lasting from 3 to 90 hours, damaged 177 engines and 956 cars, burned 49 railway transports, 38 times interrupted telegraph communications for long periods, killed 379 Gestapo agents. And that is by no means the whole of the month's work.

The material contribution of the Poles to the conduct of the war is impressive, but the moral contribution is no less important, perhaps more so. With their losses in killed and missing in battle, dead, or murdered in concentration camps, deported to forced labor in Germany, even at the beginning of 1944 amounting to 18 percent of Poland's total pre-war population, the Poles show no sign of breaking. They continue to fight for justice and a free world.

Incident Affecting Negro Soldiers at Jackson, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] on March 21, 1945, page 2546 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in speaking in behalf of a discharge petition that he filed to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of H. R. 1698, known as the antilynching bill, quoted from the Plaindealer, a periodical published in Kansas City, Kans., issue of March 16, 1945, which article stated:

On Tuesday, March 13, 1945, a group of civilian police in Jackson, Miss., severely beat with blackjacks a group of Negro overseas veterans because they were fraternizing with some white soldiers whom they met in the railroad station at Jackson. These men had fought together overseas and had congregated in the lobby of the station between the Negro and white waiting room. The police, seeking to preserve southern custom, informed the men that they could not mingle together in Mississippi. When they did not immediately break up the conversation, civilian police armed with sawed-off shotguns and tommy guns, beat the Negro soldiers about the head with blackjacks and formed them to immediately board their train en route to Camp Shelby.

Mr. Speaker, after my colleague from New Jersey made the foregoing statement, I immediately called Leland Speed, mayor of the city of Jackson, Miss., to ascertain if this was true. Mayor Speed advised me to get in touch with Colonel McIlhenney, of the prisoner of war camp at Clinton, Miss., who is in charge of the military police in that area and secure a statement from him, that Colonel McIlhenney would confirm the statement he was giving me. Mayor Speed gave the following account of the happening on this date:

A troop train bearing Negro soldiers arrived at Union Station, Jackson, Miss. Two or three Negro soldiers who were drinking, jumped off the train, ran into the station and created a disturbance. A military policeman accosted them and when he did so, they knocked him down. This military policeman called for other military policemen and they, in trying to arrest the Negroes, followed them back into the train. When the military policemen entered the train the Negro soldiers in the car pulled out their knives and other weapons and ran the military policemen out. The military policemen then called upon the civilian police for aid in the arrest of the perpetrators who had caused the disturbance. The military policemen with the aid of the civilian police, finally quelled those in the train and picked out the culprits and placed them under arrest. The civilian police were under the direction and jurisdiction of the military police during the entire time.

Mr. Speaker, if those who are fostering a campaign for the advancement of the colored race and also a utopia for all persons do not cease misrepresenting happenings like this and adhere to the truth when a disturbance between the races occur, we all know that a continuation of the misrepresentations that emanate from those who claim to be working for the advancement of the colored people will the more so cause friction between the white and colored races.

As I have said on the floor of the House several times, the actions of the administration and the lady in the White House in trying to promote social equality between the white and colored races, and the manner in which they are doing it, will cause more bloodshed to correct the situation than was shed during the entire Civil War.

The white and colored races will get along harmoniously if let alone. Certainly they will in the South, because there are no people in the world who are better to the good colored people than our southerners. The good colored people of the South are today trying to put on a campaign to stop the trend that is being created by the work of the radical whites and radical colored, who are causing this tense situation.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to correct the false reports published by the Plaindealer relative to the incident happening in the capital city of my State and quoted by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Extension of National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a problem that is going to become more and more pressing as time goes by.

Under title VI of Public Law 801 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Government life insurance was made available to members of the armed forces. This act of Congress made available to our fighting men a maximum of $10,000 worth of national service life insurance at low-cost rates. This insurance can be applied for only by members of the armed forces. It is a 5-year term insurance policy that is convertible into ordinary life insurance during the force of the contract.

The premiums of these policies are based upon the ordinary risks according to the American table of mortality during the 5-year period to be covered by the policy. The premiums are based upon the expected mortality of the age group, to which the applicant belongs during the following 5 years. This type of insurance costs the serviceman less than half of the amount necessary to carry a like amount of ordinary life insurance.

Because of its low cost, this type of policy means a great deal to a serviceman who is carrying the full amount permissible, and has a dependency allotment as well. A man with a dependency allotment, and who is carrying the full amount of insurance, were he forced to convert this insurance into ordinary life, would find that he had very little coming to him at the end of the month. And out of the little he had left he would still have to pay his laundry, tailor, and other bills. There is no question, but that a jump of $10 a month in his insurance premiums would work a great hardship in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, an additional allotment of 10 percent of their pay to cover the increased premiums of an ordinary life insurance policy would be too steep. Especially when the serviceman, already, has allotments amounting to as much as one-third of his monthly income, and in some cases even more.

I know that no Member of this body desires such an occurrence to take place. I know that they will not permit it. Nevertheless, the first contingent of inductees and National Guard men to answer the call of their country very shortly shall either have to execute new allotments of this very nature or else give up the protection that Congress intended that they should have. This first contingent were called into the service in the fall of 1940. That means that their policies will expire this year unless converted or Congress does something about it.

Since such an increase in insurance costs would work a hardship in so many cases, I introduced H. R. 2441 on March 2, to extend the force of these policies another 5 years without an increase in premium rates.

This bill provides for the automatic extension of the life of these policies for men who are serving at the front, fighting. For them it eliminates the necessity of taking time out in a fox hole in order to fill out papers so that the protection of their loved ones at home may be continued.

For the serviceman who is still here or has returned from overseas, but who, as we all know, is liable to go across at any time, all that is required is that he fill out a simple form extending the force of his policy. And all of this is done at no extra cost to those who are fighting our battles in defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge upon this body the necessity for an early consideration of this bill to extend the force of national service life insurance policies owned by our fighting men, H. R. 2441.

Life Magazine Discusses Its Concept of An Un-American Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, without confirming or contradicting any of its statements, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an interesting and thought-provoking editorial from the March 26, 1945, issue of Life magazine; the editorial discusses the nature of the un-American activities which the editors of Life feel should rightfully come within the purview of the newly created permanent House Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is gratifying to know that a magazine with the circulation and influence of Life has thus gone on record in pointing out the need for a congressional committee on un-American activities and that it has defined an area of activity in which it believes a properly conducted continuing investigation can render real service to this Republic in protecting it from enemies who would bore from within in their efforts to replace our system of government with something imported from the bloody laboratories of Europe or Asia.

The editorial follows:

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES: WHAT ARE THEY?—THE SUCCESSOR TO THE DIES COMMITTEE IS TRYING TO FIND OUT

What was wrong with the late Dies committee? One thing, certainly: The prejudiced and primitive methods of its chairman, Martin Dies. In 6 years he spent $675,000 investigating un-American activities. At the end of it he had so many enemies, so few friends, that he decided not to run for reelection. But though Martin Dies is politically dead, his committee is not. Congress has established it on a new and permanent footing.

The new committee's auspices are better. One of its Republican members, KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, has begun his job in a very serious and public-spirited manner. Seeking advice, Mr. MUNDT has written to both friends and foes of the dead Dies committee, including Eleanor Roosevelt, Henry Wallace, Harold Ickes, officers of the American Legion, and Knights of Columbus, and the editors of Life and other publications. "Too often," he writes, "we are inclined to attribute un-Americanism to political, economic and social theories with which we disagree. Obviously this is not the proper test." test."

Then what is it? Mr. MUNDT wants to know.

One piece of advice to the new committee is easy: Avoid Martin Dies's obvious bias and errors. Toward the end he ran a one-man show, issuing committee reports which the other members had not even read. He attached as much importance to gossip and opinion as to evidence and facts. The facts he got were often wrong and seldom corrected. His star investigator was one J. B. Matthews. As an avowed fellow traveler in earlier life, Matthews had made irresponsible attacks on good conservative Americans. So he tried to atone by making equally irresponsible attacks on good liberal Americans. The Dies committee's high-handed methods and procedures are easily corrected if the new committee obeys a single injunction: Play fair.

WHAT "UN-AMERICAN" IS NOT

The Democratic mayor of Jersey City, Frank Hague, once said in a speech: "We hear about constitutional rights, free speech, and the free press. Everytime I hear those words I say to myself, 'That man is a Red, that man is a Communist. You never heard a real American talk in that manner.'" That is one definition of un-Americanism. Is it also an example of it? The New York Times has called the Dies committee itself un-American. Is the poll tax un-American? Is anti-Semitism? Anglophobia? Anglophilia? The Anti-Saloon League?

The doctrines of Americanism are gloriously many and diverse. Only in totalitarian countries is the national dogma so flat and bounded that heresy can be readily spotted. Nevertheless, there is something peculiarly American about the impulse that starts an investigation of un-American activities. A restless national conscience is always driving us to examine and reexamine our own beliefs and behavior. The quest may do much good if it does not get lost in false objectives.

First of all, the committee is directed (by resolution) at "un-American activity." As Representative VOORHIS has pointed out, this does not mean thoughts. There is no such thing as an un-American thought. To hold any views, popular or not, is "a fundamental, moral, and constitutional right," says VOORHIS, "so long as they are openly and honestly held and so long as the ends sought * * * are pursued only by open, peaceful, democratic, constitutional means." Even this may be too restrictive a charter. Jefferson prescribed "a little rebellion now and then" for a healthy nation. Lincoln spoke of the people's "revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow" the Government. Such views are American enough. Against incitement to crimes of violence there are specific laws, whose violators may safely be left to the courts and police. So much for what the Japanese call dangerous thoughts.

In the second place, all that is non-American is not necessarily un-American, even if it is clearly activity. Pulaski remained a Pole, Lafayette a Frenchman, but their activity was not un-American. Non-Americans have

defended American interests in every war we have fought. We need no congressional investigation of foreigners as such. They may be left to the Immigration and Naturalization Service—and in some cases to the Hall of Fame. So much for aliens.

Not even all that is criminal activity is un-American. To err is human and so sin—like virtue—is international. Jesse James, Richard Whitney, and G. I. cigaret hijackers in France are all sons—erring sons—of our Nation. So are the convicts who volunteer as guinea pigs for wartime malaria experiments. Care of all such may be left to our penal code. So much for lawbreakers.

And, finally, not all foreign-directed activity is un-American. Ambassadors, consuls, visiting lecturers of all nationalities who are financed from abroad speak for foreign interests. Some may even be anti-American; but they are not what we mean by un-American. They are required by law to register as foreign agents. Care of them may be left to the State Department.

THE MASKED

Thus many activities which are non- or even anti-American have been foreseen and their handling provided for by law. What then remains for a congressional committee on un-American activities?

If we bear in mind that the main function of this congressional investigating committee is not to convict, not to indict, not necessarily even to propose legislation, but to study and expose, the answer becomes a little easier. Its chief target should be political activity which pretends to be what it is not.

Both of the world's great revolutionary organizations—the Communist Party and the Nazi Party—are adepts at the masquerade. They employ sympathizers to perform innocently or at least legally what they cannot effectively do themselves. Thus Social Justice, Father Coughlin's magazine, used to carry articles which pretended to be written from one American to another, but which were actually written in Berlin in pursuit of Nazi foreign policy. Assuming that Father Coughlin knew what he was doing, he was un-American. He may tell himself that his end—a technocratic, theocratic America or whatever the h—— it is—justifies the means—concealed collaboration with a foreign power. But one basic tenet of Americanism is that ends never justify means, the means are just as important.

So with the Communists. America needs strong radical parties as a challenge and stimulus to free capitalism. The Communist Party (or political association, as it is now called) cannot fill that usefully competitive role because it has no scruples about means and because its first loyalty is to the national interest of a foreign (however friendly) power. The Communists operate through numerous and ever-changing fronts, from labor groups to share-cropper rallies. These fronts often hold good American aims. But so long as the Communist interest in them is concealed, we need a committee with sovereign powers to keep unmasking it (to use a favorite Communist word). The subsequent fate of the exposed front is no business of the committee.

AND THE UNBELIEVERS

The Swiss dealt with the Nazi and Communist masquerade by outlawing both parties. That was the easy way. For us to do so would seriously weaken our Bill of Rights. Yet this fact brings up another reason why these and other parties, such as the Ku Klux Klan, need exposure. Although they are protected by the Bill of Rights they do not respect its protection of others and if they came to power they would abolish it.

It would be un-American to deny the protection of the Bill of Rights to its enemies. In the center of that paradox lies the vital area where a committee on un-American activities can usefully operate. Let it, without fear or favor, ceaselessly look for the unbelievers and the masked. Not to persecute, but to expose and identify. A good labeling job would be worth many times the $675,000 which Martin Dies misused. And if the labels are correctly affixed, our Bill of Rights will survive its foes and our political fortunes may be safely left to the good sense of the American people.

Investigation of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and I welcome your investigation of the many allegations recently published relative to the operation of the Veterans' Administration and particularly of charges directed at the hospital and medical services.

Within the Veterans' Administration itself, I have already launched an investigation designed to inform me whether or not there is any truth in the charges that have been made. This was done as soon as these charges were called to my attention and was prompted by a very real fear that, whether true or false, they would create anxiety and worry among those most directly affected—soldiers, sailors, veterans and families, and friends.

Because an investigation made by our own people might be opened to the suspicion that it would be ex-parte or colored or controlled, I also invited to Washington, the National Commanders of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In conference, I asked the cooperation of these organizations in developing a program to reveal the facts about the hospital, medical, and other services rendered veterans through the Veterans' Administration. A plan was agreed upon and I received from these leaders a pledge that they will exhaust all their resources to gather the truth through their experienced officials in all of the States.

However, my efforts to secure all available data have extended beyond the three organizations I have named. Since meeting with them, letters have been sent to numerous other veterans' organizations and civic associations, requesting each of them to submit all factual information they possess or may be able to develop.

In each instance I emphasized that in an investigation of this sort opinions are of little value. Because of this I have requested that they supply me with specific facts, as it is upon facts that we must base any changes or corrections that appear justified.

Last December I announced the appointment of an advisory group selected from among the most eminent medical men in the Nation. The gentlemen serving on this group are acting as advisers to me in all matters pertaining to hospitalization and medical services for veterans.

There are now 16 outstanding physicians and specialists on this group. I have writeen each of these gentlemen requesting that he visit veterans' hospitals which are accessible to him and make a thorough investigation and report to me on the conditions as they find them.

In making this request, I urged that each of these doctors take as much time as possible to complete a comprehensive study.

I feel sure that in its survey of the Veterans' Administration, your committee will insist upon witnesses presenting factual information in support of charges. Opinions not only differ but are also often incapable of support and little progress may be made unless concrete proof is presented.

At this time I cannot furnish complete factual evidence in answer to all of the numerous lay opinions and allegations which have been directed at the Veterans' Administration in newspapers and magazines. I can, however, assure you from my personal knowledge of the treatment of patients in Veterans' Administration facilities that third-rate medicine is not practiced.

I can also assure you that the charges which have been leveled at us are, on the whole, either gross distortions of the facts or misrepresentations.

As our investigation progresses, this committee will be kept informed as to our findings. At the present moment the reports are still far from complete, but I have already received sufficient information to prove that certain specific charges brought against us are without foundation in truth.

I trust the committee will grant me and my associates other opportunities to appear before it so that we may report the results of our determined effort to establish the entire truth concerning our services to and treatment of veterans.

At this time I would like to give you an outline of the organization and purposes of the Veterans' Administration, together with an indication of the work-load handled by the various services, and to suggest the tremendous increase in the volume of our work.

While this information does not go into great detail or show the many ramifications of our service, it will point out to some extent our present difficulties as well as our accomplishments.

ORGANIZATION

The organization of the Veterans' Administration is highly departmentalized. Policy-making officials and certain operational divisions are centered in the Washington office. But services to veterans are operated through regional offices, facilities, and field offices which have been established in the various States and Territories. Full responsibility for this organization is vested in me as Administrator.

There are three assistant administrators, each of whom is responsible for definite divisions of the work, an executive assistant to the Administrator, a solicitor, and a chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. These constitute the top policy-making body.

Maj. O. W. Clark is assistant administrator in charge of compensation, pension, vocational rehabilitation, and education. In his office are: Claims for compensation or pension filed by living veterans of all wars and of the Regular Establishment in time of peace; the dependents claims service which handles claims for compensation or pension filed by dependents of those who have served in the armed forces, the vocational rehabilitation and education service which handles all matters pertaining to vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and education or training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.).

Each of these services is under a director who is responsible for all functions within his

service both in the central office and in the field stations.

Mr. Harold W. Breining is assistant administrator in charge of finance and insurance. Under him, the director of the finance service has charge of all matters relating to accounting for public moneys, for the personal funds of patients, the guarantee of loan to veterans under title III of Public 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, and administration of readjustment allowances under title V of the same act.

The director of the insurance service administers the provisions of the War Risk Insurance Act as amended, Government Life Insurance and National Service Life Insurance, and article IV of the Soldiers and Sailor's Relief Act of 1940.

This includes all claims for insurance payments involving either death, permanent and total disability or waiver of premiums because of total disability.

Col. George E. Ijams is assistant administrator in charge of medical and domiciliary care, construction and supplies. Under him, the director of medical and hospital service is responsible for providing not only medical and hospital care, but also out-patient treatment and examinations for returning veterans who are entitled to such care or treatment. This includes the operation of all hospitals.

The Director of the National Homes Service is responsible for all matters relating to the domiciliary care of veterans and the operation of domiciliary homes.

The Director of the Construction Service is responsible for developing sites for new facilities and preparing plans, specifications and estimates covering construction, alterations and repairs of plants and equipment, maintenance of buildings, grounds, and mechanical equipment and the operation of utilities at all facilities.

The Director of the Supply Service is responsible for the procurement, maintenance and distribution of all supplies and equipment. He is accountable for Government property and property accounts, contracts (except construction contracts), leases and agreements and traffic management.

The Executive Assistant to the Administrator, A. D. Hiller, responsible for the work of the Investigation Division, the Office of Budget and Statistics, Office of Personnel, Office of the Chief Clerk, including records and auxiliary administrative services, the Regulations and Procedure Division, the Contact Division and the Press Relations Section.

The Investigation Division conducts audits, investigations and inspections as ordered by the Administrator. He compiles and coordinates reports on investigations and maintains contact with the United States Secret Service.

The Budget Officer and Chief of Statistics prepares budget estimates and maintains control of statistics and liaison on budget matters with the Appropriations Committees of Congress and Bureau of the Budget. He makes surveys of related functions in field stations and maintains records for annual reports to Congress or other necessary reports, and prepares recommendations concerning legislation involving the expenditure of funds.

The Director of Personnel is responsible for all personnel activities and maintains liaison with the Civil Service Commission and other Government agencies on personnel matters.

The Chief Clerk is responsible for records, mails and files, the procurement and distribution of printed matter, and custodian of property and equipment.

The Chief of the Regulations and Procedure Division is responsible for editing, compiling, and coordinating regulations and other issues of the Veterans' Administration. He maintains contact with the Federal Register and National Archives, making studies of policies, methods, and procedures pertaining to organization and territorial assignments.

The Chief, Contact Division, is responsible for furnishing information and assistance to veterans and their beneficiaries or representatives pertaining to benefits provided by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. He assists them in the presentation of their claims before rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration and maintains liaison with service and welfare organizations and otherwise assists veterans in all ways compatible with the law.

The Director, Press Relations Section, prepares statements to inform the public concerning the operation of the Veterans' Administration and assists representatives of the newspapers and periodicals in securing information regarding these activities. It also maintains contact with representatives of radio and picture services.

The Solicitor, E. E. Odom, is responsible for drafting opinions on legislation relating to the Veterans' Administration and submits to the Attorney General, claims for damages; recognition, suspension, disbarment of attorneys and agents practicing before the Veterans' Administration. He cooperates with the Department of Justice in civil and criminal investigations involving the Veterans' Administration or its officials in their official capacity.

In his office there is a legislative counsel who has general supervision of matters pertaining to legislation and Executive orders affecting the Veterans' Administration. It is his duty to maintain a history of all bills and enactments in the compilation of Federal laws pertaining to veterans. The guardianship service is responsible for general supervision and directs all guardianship affairs, including litigation in State courts, foreign countries, and insular or territorial possessions.

The chairman, Board of Appeals, R. L. Jarnagin, is responsible for determinations and decisions on all laws and motions in appellate status.

FIELD ORGANIZATION

Offices and facilities of the Veterans' Administration are located throughout the United States, in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska. There are 94 facilities for the hospitalization of veterans. These are divided into three types: 51 are general medical and surgical, 30 are neuropsychiatric, and 13 are tuberculous. Specialized clinics and diagnostic centers are operated in connection with many of the larger facilities. Ten of the facilities are also especially prepared for the domiciliary care of veterans, and 1 is devoted entirely to domiciliary purposes.

Nine area offices are now operating. The records of all persons now being discharged from the armed forces because of disability are sent to these offices and initial awards of compensation or pension are made there.

For administrative purposes, the United States is divided into 53 regions. In each of which there is a regional office or a facility having regional office activities. These offices render medical out-patient treatment; and they make physical examinations for pension, compensation, and insurance purposes. Claims for disability and death compensation or pension are adjudicated in them. They also handle the vocational rehabilitation and training of disabled veterans under Public Law 16 and the education or training of other veterans under Public Law 346. They maintain a guardianship service; issue loan guaranties on homes, farms, and businesses and private information and assistance to veterans in all matters within the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Branch offices and contact units operating under regional offices also extend services to veterans. There are at present 89 branch offices and 159 contact units which have been authorized. In addition to these, contact representatives have been assigned to Army and Navy separation centers and to Army and Navy hospitals where service personnel may be discharged because of disabilities. There are in all 370 field stations of the Veterans' Administration which have been established or authorized to render services to veterans. This does not include the representatives at Army or Navy installations. A break-down of these field stations shows them to be classified as follows:

Regional offices	16
General medical facilities	51
Neuropsychiatric facilities	30
Tuberculosis facilities	13
Facility with domiciliary care only	1
(37 of the GM, TB, and NP facilities have regional office activities.)	
(10 of the above have domiciliary activities.)	
Area offices	9
Insular offices	2
Branch offices	89
Contact units	159
Total	370

PERSONNEL

In view of an increasing work load we have opened new offices and are constantly adding to the number of hospital beds available to veterans. But we have been unable to secure the necessary personnel to keep pace with the increasing work load.

We first began to feel the pressure of World War No. 2 in February 1943. Since that time our work load has increased about 300 percent but we have been able to add only 14 percent to our personnel.

One of the best over-all measures of work volume is the mail handled. In Washington, D. C., only, we are now receiving approximately 1,500,000 pieces of mail each month. This is a far cry from January 1942, when we received about 926,000 pieces, and the year before, 1941, when we received less than 700,000 pieces of mail during January.

As a further indication of the increase in work, let me give you a few comparisons I recently had compiled.

At the end of February 1943 we had only 32,435 World War No. 2 disability claims filed. By last February 28 we had 693,146 such claims filed.

By February 1943 we had only 14,000 death claims filed on account of service in the present war. By last February we had 144,980 such claims filed.

By February 1943 we had only 18,588 National Service Life death claims filed. By February 28, 1945, we had 259,557 such claims filed.

As of February 1943 we had adjudicated 23,985 disability and death claims of all types concerned with World War No. 2. At the end of February this year we had adjudicated 734,580 such claims.

It should be kept in mind also that at the end of February 2 years ago we had no nonservice-connected hospitalization for veterans of the present war; no vocational rehabilitation to teach the disabled new ways of earning their living; and no G. I. bill of rights with its partial guaranty of home, farm, and business loans, educational benefits and readjustment allowances as the unemployment benefits are called.

These activities, as you are aware, have been superimposed upon the many which were already in existence, and as I have just indicated, some of these latter have now been enlarged a great many times.

I think all of us realize that Veterans' Administration expansion is still in its initial stages, and that by far the greater part of it is yet to come, considering only the administration of the laws now on the books.

On January 31, 1945, we had authorized 68,149 positions in the Veterans' Administration. Of these, 52,610 were in the field, 7,896

in the central office in Washington, 7,443 in the New York branch of the central office.

At that time we had on duty a total of 54,088 employees, of which 41,794 were in the field offices, 6,395 in central office in Washington, 5,899 in the New York branch of central office—a shortage of 14,061 in spite of a constantly increasing work load. However, this shortage has been somewhat alleviated through help we secured from the armed services. We had actually on duty in the field medical and hospital service 4,315 enlisted men serving as hospital attendants and approximately 1,500 ommissioned officers who are physicians and surgeons. All of these except some 500 are our own militarized personnel.

In the medical and hospital service we had authorized 1,871 full-time doctors, 5,062 nurses, 702 technicians, and 15,814 attendants.

On this same date, January 31, 1945, we had on duty 4,213 nurses, so that we were short approximately 841 nurses, and this shortage is daily becoming more acute as the work load increases.

Our authorized number of attendants is now 15,814. We have on duty 12,181, exclusive of the military personel that has been loaned us. In this emergency, the Army has agreed to let us have a maximum of 8,000 military personnel to meet our attendant needs. These men, of course, are not trained hospital attendants and, therefore, require more supervision than would be necessary if we could secure qualified personnel. This in turn emphasizes the urgency of our need for nurses.

Our shortages, other than doctors, nurses, attendants, and technicians are growing. We now have 29,361 authorized positions in all other categories, including clerical and stenographic. Some 5,000 of these positions are currently vacant and need to be filled.

In the central office at Washington we have 1,500 positions which are now vacant.

In New York we had 1,544 positions which we were unable to fill. And as the work load is increasing daily, this shortage becomes an increasing handicap to the Administration in its effort to keep up with its work load.

In anticipation of the increased need for workers we began the recruitment of workers through our field offices more than a year ago. As this did not result in the procurement of the necessary personnel we have more recently organized and are now conducting a Nation-wide campaign to secure the personnel needed to fill vacancies both in the field and in the central office.

HOSPITALS AND CONSTRUCTION

On March 8, 1945, the Veterans' Administration was operating 94 hospitals with 76,248 beds. In addition there were 11 having domiciliary facilities providing 14,885 beds. Of these, 13 hospitals were for the care of tubercular veterans. These had 6,544 beds, of which 5,684 were occupied.

There were 30 neuropsychiatric hospitals having 42,706 beds with 39,937 patients receiving treatment.

In 51 general medical and surgical hospitals there were 26,997 beds, of which 21,916 were occupied.

Of the patients in the tuberculosis hospitals 2,497 were World War No. 2 veterans; 9,293 World War No. 2 veterans were in neuropsychiatric hospitals, and 6,202 in general medical and surgical division.

So that on March 8, out of a total of 91,133 hospital and domiciliary beds available in our facilities, 77,142 were occupied, and of these, 18,345 patients were from World War No. 2. In addition some 4,346 veterans were being cared for in hospitals not operated by the Veterans' Administration.

It is expected that the percentage of World War No. 2 cases in our hospitals will steadily increase from now on as battle casualties are just beginning to be released from the Army and Navy hospitals, and the number of discharged veterans needing hospitalization is of course increasing.

In anticipation of this increased load, we have planned a building program which is expected to keep abreast of the demands made on us. Between now and July 1 of this year, we will complete and have ready for occupancy some 8,250 additional beds, and between the 1st of July and December 31, 1945, construction will be completed on 4,600 more. Other projects which are already included in our program but will not be completed until after January 1, 1946, will provide approximately 6,400 more beds before July 1, 1946. Our construction program for the fiscal year 1946 has already been submitted and is awaiting final action by Congress.

This program contemplates building 14,100 beds and construction under this program is expected to be completed not later than January 1, 1947.

While it is compulsory that we wait for the appropriation contained in the 1946 independent offices bill before undertaking any of these projects, considerable progress has been made in the acquisition of sites for 18 new hospitals included in that program.

In addition to the programs I have just outlined, we expect in the very near future to acquire approximately 3,500 beds in facilities which we have obtained by transfer from the Army.

When our present program and that authorized for 1946 have been completed we will have increased the number of Veterans' Administration facilities from 94 to 120, and will have available 127,000 beds in our own facilities which will provide a wider distribution of hospitals and make hospitalization more easily accessible to veterans throughout the country.

The extension of our hospital service which will be required for the care of World War No. 2 veterans is being continuously studied by the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization, and I expect to appear before Congress in the near future and request a material expansion of our construction program.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

At the end of February 1945, disability claims had been filed by 693,146 World War No. 2 veterans. Of these 66,476 are still pending and 626,670 have been adjudicated. Of those adjudicated 422,088 were allowed and 204,502 disallowed.

In March of 1944, the Veterans' Administration established area offices which have since that time relieved both regional offices and the central office of much of the work of adjudicating disability claims. Since that time these offices have received 225,228 claims and have allowed 187,848 of these and disallowed 34,469, an average of 84½ percent allowed. These are all claims of veterans who have been discharged from the armed services on account of disability and have filed claims at the time of their discharge. The claims of veterans who are discharged into Veterans' Administration facilities for further treatment are not adjudicated by the area offices. During this same period the regional offices allowed 148,081 claims and disallowed 75,262, an average of 66.3 percent allowed. These claims are mostly from veterans who did not file claims at the time of their discharge or who were not discharged because of disability.

On February 28, 1945, there were 403,525 veterans of World War No. 2 being paid pensions because of service-connected wartime disabilities. This is a greater number of pensions of this type than were paid to veterans of World War No. 1 for similar purposes at any time in the 23 years from 1918 to 1941, as the maximum number of World War No. 1 service-connected beneficiaries was 349,724. In addition to these, 317 World War No. 2 veterans are now being paid pensions because of permanent and total disability not the result of service and 4,574 are receiving pensions for disabilities incurred in previous peacetime service. The average pension paid veterans of World War No. 2 during February was $31.93 a month.

Claims for death pension on account of a person who served in World War No. 2 have been received at an average rate of 10,000 a month for the past 6 months. At the end of February 1945 a total of 144,980 such claims for death pension had been received. Pensions had been approved and payments ordered in 78,518 of these cases and 29,392 claims were disallowed, the greater majority of these because the dependency of parents was not demonstrated. There are still 37,070 claims for death pension that are pending; that is, action is being withheld on them awaiting evidence in proof of relationship or dependency which it is necessary to obtain from the claimant before a pension can be allowed.

The number of these claims filed is not an indication of the number of veterans involved, as more than one person may file dependency claim because of the service of a single veteran.

Every effort is made to adjudicate all claims as rapidly as they are received and in the great majority of cases, a prompt decision is reached if the evidence submitted is complete. Every effort is, of course, continuously made to keep these claims current.

EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION

The vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans is authorized under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. To be eligible for rehabilitation under this act a veteran must have a pensionable disability which constitutes a vocational handicap, and be in need of rehabilitation to overcome such handicap. He must have been in service after September 16, 1940, and have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

In cooperation with the War and Navy Departments the Veterans' Administration has adopted a procedure which assures that all disabled veterans are informed of their right to file a claim for pension and to be assisted in filing such claim. Each pension claim when it is review is also checked to see if the veteran is entitled to rehabilitation under Public Law 16. If he is found to be entitled, he is immediately notified of this fact. Already 257,910 disabled veterans have been notified that they are eligible for vocational training. Of these, only 56,202 have made application for rehabilitation, and up to February 28, 1945, only 11,937 had actually entered training. Of these, 8,673 are attending institutions of learning and 3,264 are being trained on the job. As of this same date, there were 363 veterans who had been rehabilitated and attained the employment objective for which training was given; 1,788 cases in which training had been interrupted, and 977 cases where training had been discontinued. This compared with 858 World War No. 2 veterans who were receiving rehabilitation on January 31, 1944.

Special advisory and guidance groups have been established to assist and direct disabled veterans in selecting courses of training which are best suited to their abilities, inclinations, and handicaps. These advisory groups are operating in 53 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration and contractual agreements have been made with 63 educational institutions for them to operate such guidance centers. Contracts for similar centers are now pending with 34 other educational institutions and 180 others have been contacted as a preliminary to making such contracts.

The advisement of veterans who are being rehabilitated under Public Law 16 is a legal requirement. It is not required in the case of veterans who are undertaking education under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, but the services of these advisement

centers have been made available to these veterans. Under this latter law, any veteran who has been in active service after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the war who has seen 90 days of service and has been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable, is entitled to at least 1 year of education or training. Under some conditions they are entitled to additional training or education up to a maximum of 4 years.

Under the law the Veterans' Administration is not permitted to exercise any curbs on the veteran in the selection of his training so long as it is in an approved institution. Upon application, the veteran is issued a certificate of eligibility which he presents to the educational or training institution of his choice. If he is acceptable to the institution the Veterans' Administration pays both the institution and the veteran at rates established by law. While not required to seek advice or counsel, these veterans are encouraged by the Veterans' Administration to accept advice and guidance before entering training in order that they may secure the maximum benefit from this legislation. While the Administration is not permitted and has no desire to interfere with or alter either directly or indirectly the educational system as in operation, it has been the practice to report to the proper State agency whenever it is found that training institutions are following policies which adversely affect the training of veterans.

Already 52,682 veterans have applied for education or training under Public Law 346. Of these, 48,555 have had their eligibility determined and the veterans have been notified. Forty-six thousand five hundred and sixty-nine of these have been found eligible for training and authorized to start their education. As of January 31, 1945, 17,583 had actually entered their training courses.

To assist me in solving problems connected with vocational rehabilitation and education, I have appointed a special committee of educators. On this committee there are two college presidents, the financial heads of two colleges, the presidents of two junior colleges, and a vocational school director.

INSURANCE

By the act of October 8, 1940, national service life insurance was inaugurated. Between that date and March 20, 1945, 17,093,500 applications had been received representing $131,149,409,500. By comparison, during World War No. 1 there were filed 4,529,889 insurance applications, representing $39,606,743,000. Thus the load on the national service life insurance has so far been considerably over three times that experienced in the First World War.

In this connection it is thought that it also might be of interest to state that the total amount of life insurance in effect on the books of the several hundred commercial insurers within the United States aggregates only something in excess of $140,000,000,000.

The average amount per insured life under national service life insurance is $9,180, which is several times that under commercial insurance. There have been received 259,557 death claims and 99,310 claims for waiver of premiums under national service life insurance. Two hundred thirty-nine thousand two hundred and sixty-five death claims have been awarded representing insurance totaling $1,474,438,272.

In addition, 63,883 waiver-of-premium claims have been allowed. There are now pending 21,826 death claims and 25,151 waiver-of-premium claims. However, the connotation "pending" does not mean that the Veterans' Administration has not taken any action in connection with these claims, but rather that they are claims which have been filed but not completed, great numbers of them being in the category of awaiting evidence from the beneficiary.

Some conception of the work that has been accomplished may be gained from the fact that over 50,000 more death claims have been awarded under national service life insurance than have been awarded under war-risk insurance from 1917 to date.

In all frankness I cannot say to you that insurance claims are settled with the promptitude I desire but this has been occasioned by the great difficulties we have experienced in the obtaining and training of the necessary personnel. The situation is most acute in the higher executive classes where it has been impossible to supplement the force which was on duty prior to the emergency, so it has been necessary for the same small group of executives, who previously administered the life insurance carried over from World War No. 1, to assume the additional burdens of this tremendously expanded insurance program which is many times larger than any other life insurance activity that has ever existed. Given the personnel necessary to carry the load I am sure that the work could be brought to a degree of currency within a reasonable time so that it could be handled with the dispatch we all desire.

Almost 3 years ago it was recognized that personnel and space were not available in Washington so that to cope with the situation arrangements were made to have the great bulk of the national service life insurance work performed in New York City. This location was chosen because it offered the best opportunities for space, manpower, and proximity to the central office. While at first the manpower and space situation in New York was satisfactory in the last year or so there has been a tightening of both these elements with the result that it has been most difficult to obtain persons with the background and training needed efficiently to perform the work.

In appraising what has been accomplished under the national service life insurance program you may find it worthy of consideration that while the burden of work has been over three times that of World War No. 1 the maximum number of employees engaged on such work has been less than 50 percent more than the number of employees on insurance work during World War No. 1.

Summarizing, I think it fair to say that while insurance claims are not handled as quickly as I am sure you and I desire, they are being handled orderly and not chaotically and any delay is largely attributable to inadequate personnel. I do not believe anyone will disagree with me when I say that these claims should be handled with the utmost dispatch and that every effort should be made to provide the facilities for making awards and mailing checks promptly.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

The readjustment-allowance program under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 has resulted in payments being made up to March 3, 1945, to an aggregate amount of $9,621,802. Twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and ninety-two veterans being on the pay rolls for the week ending March 3, 1945, and receiving for that week $652,964. Readjustment allowances are paid through the several State unemployment compensation agencies except in Puerto Rico where it was necessary that the Veterans' Administration set up its own system and organization.

I believe that mechanically the readjustment allowance program is functioning satisfactorily although I am giving constant study to the question of whether the numbers on the rolls are in balance with the presently existing manpower situation.

LOAN GUARANTIES

Under the loan guaranty operations authorized by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—1,406 loans have been guaranteed representing $2,416,743 and guaranties have been rejected on 304 applications. Eleven thousand eight hundred and forty-three certificates of eligibility have been issued. There are comparatively few loan-guaranty applications pending action in the Veterans' Administration so that it would appear that numbers of veterans have applied for certificates of eligibility but have not as yet completed the loan transaction to the point of submitting the loan to the Veterans' Administration for a guaranty.

In making this statement I have attempted to present an over-all picture of our operation and of some of the problems confronting us as well as to suggest what we are doing and plan to do to meet these problems.

I have not attempted to make specific answers to any accusations as it has been my experience that answers of this kind are more clearly developed in reply to direct questioning, and I imagine you will prefer to develop the answers in this manner.

I again want to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you and to assure you that I and all of my associates will be happy to assist you in every way possible in developing the true facts about conditions in the Veterans' Administration.

I, and the members of my staff will all be ready at your convenience to discuss with you specifically and in detail the several separate phases of our work, and to present such facts as you may desire to answer any and all adverse criticism which may come to the attention of your committee.

What Is G. I. Joe Thinking About Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to all of us back here on the home front to get some insight into what the boys are thinking about over there in the European theater—especially those who have been wounded and have plenty of time to think over their past, present, and their future. We have a lot to answer for to those boys, and it is not easy to reply to some of the pointed questions that they ask.

Under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter typical of several I have received from wounded boys, together with my reply thereto:

ENGLAND, *March 2, 1945.*

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: In writing this letter, sir, I am hoping that you personally will read it. First, I want to state that I have only been overseas 3 months—all time spent in the front lines with the Infantry. I was very seriously wounded a month ago and this letter is being formed in a hospital bed. The writing probably will be poor but hope you will bear with me.

Last evening a news program from the States stated that the Secretary of War made the statement that all possible men in the E. T. O. would go to the South Pacific as soon as the war in Europe was over. The men were all very discouraged. We on the western front have eyes and a little sense of fair play. The United States has four complete armies on this front with at least one in reserve. The French have one sup-

plied completely by our equipment. The British have two with one being made up of Canadians, Indians, Scotch, Welsh, and probably other nationalities. Why are we able to spare so many American men to protect countries that can't or won't do their share? We are doing at least the bigger part of the fighting and suffering on the western front—why?

In the eastern front, the Russians are making a great fight; true, but if looking back at the start of Germany's invasion of Russia, the Russian Army suffered all defeats. When did this stop? Not having official figures, I for one cannot say that our vast amount of war matériel that started to reach Russia was the turning point; at least I believe this to be true, their supply lines are kept going by American-made trucks; their air force is kept up by our country sending planes by the thousands to them—tanks, jeeps, and supplies of every description. This I believe is true in every part.

Third and last, but not least. Are we to have an army of 8,000,000 men, plus our great Navy, sent to the Pacific to fight an army of 4,000,000 Japs? What are the countries of Europe, that we fought and died for, going to supply for moral support; are their men going to sit and listen to the war over the radio to see how the Americans are doing in the Pacific while eating the food and wearing the clothing and using the supplies that we shall be sending to them for some years to come? Are we slaves to Europe that we fight for them? That we will fight the Japs by ourselves practically, and then come home and pay the bills of this war for the next 20 years, or even longer? What will our American people gain over here in Europe? Nothing but headaches for our Government. Russia will be a major power. England will still rule as she always has. France will be restored to a major power. How did all these things come about? Well, by our people at home working like slaves and our men dying on the Western Front for what gain for us? Did I hear somebody mention that the Allies will fight the war in the Pacific together? Then why are we sending all our great Army and Navy to eliminate a Jap army of 4,000,000 men.

I hope that this letter will be thought about in the same way that I am writing it. Give the Americans a fair break. Let us believe that we will not have our children doing the same, being slaves and puppets to the rest of the world by the use of high-powered propaganda. The American man has a good mind and knows how we were brought into this war and how we have been made the tool of other countries. Isn't there some way that some fair man can get this mess cleaned up? You can, I believe, although you are only one man. You have my complete permission to use any part of this letter or the complete letter in any way that you think is proper. I am hoping to get an answer, sir, and will wait for it with great hopes and patience.

Thanking you.

MARCH 24, 1945.

MY DEAR SERGEANT: I am extremely grateful to you for your thoughtfulness in writing me as you did under date of March 2 and March 17. You will be interested to know that your letter of March 2 reached me on the 19th and your March 17th letter reached me on the 23rd.

I assure you that I have not only read your letters very carefully and with a great deal of interest, but further because of the statement which you made, "You have my complete permission to use any part of this letter or the complete letter in any way that you think is proper." I am today inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my reply, so that all of our membership and people all over the country who get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the privilege of reading it also. Enclosed with this letter is that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which it appears. You will note that I have omitted your name, believing that to be in your best interest, and I am sure you understand what I mean by that.

Now, I will try to reply to you in detail. I note that you say you have been overseas 3 months and all of that time spent at the front lines with the infantry. While I did not see the statement by the Secretary of War to which you refer, nevertheless, I have heard it frequently said here in Washington that it would undoubtedly be necessary to send many of our European theater troops into the Pacific theater of action if we are to continue our program of unconditional surrender. I have no doubt, however, that probably many of you will be given some sort of a 30-day furlough back home—if you are lucky—before being reshipped. That may be considered by some—but I know it won't be by you boys over there—as a sop to your feelings.

Likewise, we in Congress hear many questions from the home front and from your folks which are similar to those posed by you, namely, as to why seemingly we should be carrying not only the manpower but the financial burden of this war on several fronts. Frankly, it is as much of a puzzle to me and as alarming to me as it is to you.

As one individual Member of Congress, I am embarrassed when I go back home to my Congressional District and I am asked by the parents of boys like you why is it that we should crucify American boys on foreign shores, especially on islands in the Pacific, only to have the flag of one of our allies raised at the masthead when the invasion has been completed. Frankly, I cannot answer. We must all admit—especially after talking with some of those boys who have been over on those islands—that certainly there is little that is desirable about them to make them permanent possessions of ours especially if we had to ask our boys to protect them. On the other hand, there are many over here who have been asking us why it is that Russia can take a large slice out of Poland—to say nothing of the Baltic and Balkan nations—as she has done—while we in the Pacific continue our policy of recapturing our allies' property and returning it to them. Then, there are others of our returning Pacific veterans who ask why it is, for instance, that in some of those islands our allies' military governments have taken over full control immediately after recapture while we continue to do the police work and the mopping-up work for them. Their military government set-up has in some instances even gone to the point where they prevented some of our occupying officers and troops from enjoying a little Christmas cheer unless their government collected the import duty on certain products brought from the United States and purchased by voluntary contributions on the part of the occupying troops. Others asked me why it is that while they are still policing some of these islands with thousands of well-armed Japs still at large in the mountains, caves, and jungles, that the native population is permitted to get hold of food from our own supply depots and smuggle it out into the hills to the Japs, receiving payment therefor which our allies military government set-up would exchange for their own "coin of the realm."

I agree with you that it does not make sense and it certainly seemingly is a gross injustice to our own flesh and blood who are spending it on foreign soil. However, we are committed to a world-wide war which, as one Member of Congress, I tried my utmost to avoid but which nevertheless we seemingly must see through to its complete conclusion.

You ask about the Russian situation on the eastern front and when the turning point came. While I personally have no doubt that Russian military supplies were at a very low ebb at the conclusion of the first German offensive and that our supplies were then and undoubtedly are still very urgently needed and doubtless were in large measure responsible for Russia's rejuvenation, still I believe there is another answer. I have been told that the real turn-about came when the Russians began to recognize merit and stopped their previous policy of electing their company officers rather than promoting them based on their merit to command. I was told that on good authority and I am inclined to believe it because the story has a sound ring to it to say the least. In other words they gave up their old-time Marxian Communist methods of running things and got wise to themselves.

We seemingly have not learned that lesson in this country yet—at least not down here in Washington.

Referring further to the Pacific we get constant reports that the British and Dutch and others of our allies are going to send us ever-increasing reinforcements of naval and aircraft and ground troops as well. We can all hope that they will make good on their promises because, believe me, from all the information I can get from those who have returned from the Pacific theater, we have an awful long and an awful rough road to travel if we are going to overrun Japan; if we are going to push the Japs out of China; if we are going to push them out of the Malay States; to say nothing of the many islands on which hundreds of thousands of them are still sitting tight and undoubtedly building up their defenses. We must all realize that gratifying as have been our naval victories and our air victories in the Pacific; and gratifying as has been General MacArthur's success in island hopping his way back, nevertheless we have not yet launched a real out and out land assault on the Japs in strength but have been merely out-foxing them and setting up air bases from which we can launch an aerial offensive on Japan's home front. And the fact further remains that despite the promises of our allies, all the information I have been able to gather from the Pacific is to the effect that so far very little of their promised reinforcements have as yet been forthcoming and we are being asked at this present time to shoulder at least 90 percent of the Pacific war, to say nothing of what we are doing in the European theater with which you are familiar.

And that isn't all that you boys have to worry about. We recently have made very generous arrangements for you boys to borrow money to set yourselves up in business and go to school and various other things under the so-called G. I. bill of rights. And we provided that you can borrow money at 4 percent. Just the other day our State Department consummated a new lend-lease agreement with the provisional government of France to lend-lease them $2,575,000,000 of American heavy equipment merchandise for the reconstruction of their country; some of which will be paid for, I hope, within the next 30 years and bearing an interest rate of 2⅜ percent—figure that one out. And it is our information that this is but the first of several such arrangements now in the making; one of which, we understand, is to Russia for something like $6,000,000,000 of lend-lease merchandise for post-war reconstruction. True, in the last lend-lease bill we added a clause which theoretically outlaws the use of lend-lease for post-war reconstruction, but the best commentators in Washington point out that it can be very easily gotten around.

I share with you your sincere worry as to how and when we are ever going to repay all of this and I shudder to think of the tax load that is going to have to be borne by your children, your children's children—and probably theirs too.

However, in conclusion, I repeat what I said earlier—I did my level best as one lone Member of Congress to keep us out of this

war. I voted against all of the measures which we were assured by this Administration "would keep us out of this war" and which we now find in accordance with my belief at that time actually led us down the road to war. Nevertheless, we are in the war with both feet and it is only thanks to the courageous efforts of you boys out there who are doing such a bang-up job of it and showing so much downright guts—and due to the ingenuity of American mechanical genius on the home front and American know-how in the industrial world, and the cooperation by and large of American labor (not American labor leaders in many instances) and in spite of Government interference—thank Heaven we are not in the war over our heads yet, but we have come awful close to it on more than one occasion. I am hopeful that today we can see the distant shore of peace in the European theater, but unfortunately it seems a long way off on the other side of the globe. It seems to me that the main thing that you boys have to concern yourselves with right now—and you must make your pressure felt on Congress and on the administration—is to be sure that when peace does come it be made a lasting peace and that is not going to be any easy job, believe me.

It is my further hope that you men who have fought this war under many adverse circumstances and disappointments remember on your return to the United States in civilian life that these matters are settled in America in a constitutional manner peacefully by the ballot—which right no man can take away from you. Keep the Constitution intact and fight for that right after you get home just as earnestly as you fought for it in somebody else's backyard—and exercise that franchise inherent to every American to correct inequities in government by voting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BRADLEY,
Member of Congress.

Letter From Mr. Jay B. Plangman, Technical High School, Fort Worth, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am calling attention to a letter I have received from Mr. Jay B. Plangman, Technical High School, Fort Worth, Tex., in which he outlines the true situation which recently was erroneously interpreted by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana from newspaper articles which he had read. It is clear from this letter that the statement about Texas were not answers by students in any historical examination, but that they were inspired by a desire to send some cheer of levity to our brave boys fighting in the various theaters of war. Mr. Plangman's letter follows:

FORT WORTH, *March 21, 1945.*

Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Today's Associated Press wires carried a story from Washington on "answers" given by Fort Worth high school students on a history test. The Dallas News carried it on the front page and the news broadcasts gave it a big spot.

There was no test and no answers as Representative MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana represented. Mr. MANSFIELD probably got the idea from a reproduction of the enclosed card that was run in the New York Herald Tribune Sunday, March 11, and at no time was anything said about any student answering any history question. That part was MANSFIELD'S idea and I would like very much for you to call his hand on it by reading the entire card before the House and explaining that it was printed as a morale booster for the more than 700 Technical high school boys in service.

Incidentally, since the postcard was reproduced in the Herald Tribune I have received letters asking for additional copies from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Connecticut, New York and Canada. These requests all take the card for what it is—a bit of humor to enliven the day of a soldier or sailor 1,000 or more miles from home. One boy wrote me from France that he was offered $1 for his card and I am mentioning this fact in order to show that it is really appreciated by the boys who are doing the fighting.

Inasmuch as the story of Representative MANSFIELD'S inspired interpretation of "The History of the United States—Texas Style" will probably appear in many papers throughout the nation I feel that we Texans should at least explain that it was not answers by students.

Very truly yours,

JAY B. PLANGMAN,
Technical High School,
Commercial Art Department.

The Late Senator Charles Dick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal of March 15, 1945:

SENATOR CHARLES DICK

Many readers of the Beacon Journal among Akron's augmented population of war workers possibly were surprised yesterday at the space and attention devoted to the death of former Senator Charles Dick. To them the name was not a familiar one in the news columns.

That could not have been said a few years ago. For Mr. Dick was a national figure in the public life of America following the Spanish-American War, in which he won honors and promotion in the service of his country.

The home which he built on West Market Street, on acreage which he bought on the then western edge of the city, was the scene of important political conferences and brilliant dinners that brought to Akron the social, political, and business leaders of the country.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and later of the United States Senate, Mr. Dick left his impress on the events of that period. He was the author of tariff legislation that shaped the course of industry and business. He sponsored bills on military affairs and the National Guard that were the basis for our military organization.

His life span covered three great conflicts, the Spanish-American War, World War No 1, and the march toward sure and ultimate victory in World War No. 2.

He was disappointed when he could not take an active part in the military affairs of the First World War and he watched as the Nation swept back toward isolationism after the defeat of Germany in 1918. To the last he was a keen and shrewd observer of events that carried the world toward the present conflict and put the United States again in the path of world cooperation toward peace.

In our opinion the outstanding characteristic of Mr. Dick throughout his life was his forward-looking philosophy. He had no time and little patience with those who looked only backward. In the later years of his life when he could only watch from the sidelines he constantly turned his vision to the future of the community and Nation.

But, while concerned for the future, he did not abandon his friends and memories of Akron at the turn of the century.

He spent many happy hours recalling events of the past, as his contribution toward founding Akron's unique Fifty Year Club testifies. He took great pride in the organization and its parties, bringing together his friends of the years.

Senator Dick has long held a place among Akron's first citizens. He will retain that honor in our memory.

Our Political Immorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by R. H. Markham, from the Christian Century, and sent to me by Miss Aniela Poray, of Royal Oak, Mich.:

OUR POLITICAL IMMORALITY

(By R. H. Markham)

It seems to me that America is letting itself be carried away on a wave of immorality. I am not referring to Hollywood, juvenile delinquency or sexual looseness, deplorable as these are, but to prevailing political attitudes.

I have spent most of my adult life in central and southeast Europe and have recently returned from a long sojourn in that vicinity as an employee of an American war agency. For many months I was in close contact with events in eastern Europe and could not fail to see that something ominous is taking place. Developments there may radically affect the future of America and of all other peoples. They may determine to what extent the nations of the world will retain freedom, self-government and self-respect. Yet many Americans try to escape recognition of this unpleasant prospect and of responsibility for overcoming it, preferring to ride along on a current of euphonious self-deceit.

The most striking demonstration of this irresponsibility is a prevalent American attitude toward Poland. Here are some indisputable facts in the situation:

It was partially on the insistence of Great Britain that Poland took the stand which led to Hitler's attack on her. Poland faced the full power of the Nazi war machine alone and without military help. She fought well and, since defeat, has remained faithful to the Allies. She has an excellent record of loyalty and bravery.

POLAND AS A TEST

When Poland made her stand against Germany, Russia was siding with Germany and helping the Nazis. All Russia's admirers in all lands, including the United States, were then on the side of Germany. They were extremely active in working against Great

Britain and its allies. Russia and Germany partitioned Poland, both for imperial reasons. Russia's spokesman callously said that Poland was liquidated and advised Great Britain against trying to help her.

We should keep in mind that there are 25,000,000 Poles in a fairly compact mass and only 48,000,000 Britishers. We should also recall that for the sake of the security and well-being of those 48,000,000 Britishers the British Government intends to preserve its whole Empire intact, thus continuing domination, control, or ascendancy over 400,000,000 non-Britishers. This means that the security of 48,000,000 Britishers is considered of supreme importance, while the security of 25,000,000 allies is treated as a bagatelle.

It should also be added that Russia partitioned Poland at about the time of our Revolutionary War and later seized most of the country, as Germany took the rest. The Poles were held in a terrible bondage until 1918. Perhaps it is not strange that the Poles cannot forget that a partitioning was the prelude to Poland's complete enslavement.

These are plain facts. It is also a fact that the Russians, after being attacked, have fought magnificently; along with the Americans, other United Nations and Britain itself, they have saved Great Britain. Having done this, Russia again insists on partitioning Poland and on setting up its own Polish Government. The second policy is far from vital than the first, though both seem to be part of a single plan. Poland, after more than a century of complete subjugation, followed by barely 21 years of liberty, again finds itself on the point of being controlled by a puppet government.

REMEMBRANCE OF THE PAST

London backs Moscow in this plan and many Americans applaud. Russia and hard-pressed Britain are completely subordinating Poland's interests to their own. Thinking of this, one cannot but recall that Germany, for its security, threatened to take part of Poland, that Mussolini, as Mr. Churchill is now doing, urged Poland to accept, and that Japan applauded, as many Americans are now doing. And recalling this, one cannot but ask: What did the heathen Axis do more than we freedom-loving nations? Do we not even the same?

The main issue is not boundaries. I think that at an international conference Poland's boundary might well be changed. The vital thing is that we rob an ally of independence and pretend that this is right, liberal, and progressive. Would it not be just as right for us Americans to impose a government on Canada that would give us all territory west of Winnipeg and would promise to do anything, else Washington demanded? Would it not be just as right for us Americans to impose a government on Canberra that would take Australia out of the British Commonwealth of Nations and bring it into our sphere of control and security? Is it not interesting that Britain does not expect to relinquish one island or piece of the mainland in the Americas, but tries to impose upon Poland a government that would presto-chango give away Lwow and other areas which Poles consider just as vital as Britain does North Ireland or Wales? And is it moral for Americans to applaud such an attempt in the name of "liberalism"?

AMERICAN NAME CALLING

Because 25,000,000 Poles refuse summarily to accept vassalage, many Americans call their government reactionary and fascistic. Many Americans call the Poles undemocratic because they hesitate to accept a government imposed upon them by a dictatorial neighbor. It is true that Poland needs land reform, even though a far larger proportion of our own American land is in great private holdings than that of Poland. It is also true that Poland has had reactionary ministers. But it is likewise reported that America has had some pretty bad ministers, or rather secretaries. I heard of one who accepted bribes in connection with oil lands; and it has been rumored that Chicago, Albany, and Philadelphia are not perfectly governed, that Mississippi is not quite a utopia, that Boston's school system has slight defects, and that Texas' university is not utterly free from the control of slightly conservative men. However, I haven't heard responsible Americans seriously say that America should be made a vassal of a foreign dictator because of these fascistic practices.

A DISSERVICE TO THE WORLD

Many Americans in their attitude toward Poland are adding two insults to an injury. Not only are they giving up an ally to partitioning and subjugation, but they are calling that act moral and are trying to salve their consciences by calling Poland immoral. It is as though Jezebel had called the little peasant immoral because he wouldn't give his field to King Ahab. When Americans call wrong right to salve their consciences and to bring peace to their souls they perform a disservice to America and to the world.

Let us look at another aspect of the political situation. Our press and broadcasters constantly praise the Balkan partisans as democrats and bearers of freedom. I have just spent months in direct contact with them and though I have the warmest admiration for their courage and energy I saw that they are by no means democratic.

They are among the world's most fanatical autocrats. We should praise them for being as brave as Nazis, as devoted to their cause as the Japanese to their Emperor, as firm in their faith as Moslems. Bravery, devotion, and faith are admirable qualities, but they do not constitute democracy. The partisans are terribly intolerant. They have divided humanity into Fascists and anti-Fascists and are determined to liquidate, dominate, or exploit the Fascists. Anyone whom they dislike they may call a Fascist and thus place him beyond the pale. This attitude makes democracy impossible. It cannot serve as the basis for a good new world.

The prevalent talk of a world revolution for little people is a sad delusion which we fondly nourish to make us feel good. We resemble desperate Christians who have given up the long, hard struggle for the Kingdom of God on earth and sit around, self-hypnotized, singing of the second coming. The people's world revolution is apocalyptic politics of the most regrettable sort.

REVOLUTION FOR LITTLE PEOPLE

Where is the world revolution of little men? What I have seen on the spot is that little men are furiously killing little men. Little Serbs kill little Serbs; little Croatians kill little Croatians; little Slovenes kill little Slovenes; little Greeks kill little Greeks; little Germans kill little Americans; little Hungarians kill little Russians. In Albania, young girls and boys are busy in the killing.

Of course, since the time of Amos little men and women have yearned for a better world. How beautifully and poignantly the Hebrew psalmists sang about it! What an inspiring Messiah they envisioned! The early Christians ardently expected a millennium. So did the French revolutionists and so did the Nazis. All of us little men have been longing for a better world for millenniums. But there are no indications that it will arrive through a second coming of any sort. When we stake all on an apocalypse, we destroy what has already been created. We go backward and not forward. We become defeatists.

So let us quit fooling ourselves about a good world revolution as little people butcher one another. Let us face facts, pray God for strength, consecrate ourselves to love and service, prepare to rebuild ruins and resolve to help the little men gradually get back as much freedom as they had 50 years ago.

And take the sad case of Greece. All good men deplore what is going on there. But it is easy for us to deceive ourselves about it. The liberals have cried for intervention every place. They have constantly agitated for us to interfere in order to make people do right—in Italy, Spain, the Balkans, everywhere. Well, here is intervention. American guns are killing Greeks. That's what intervention in other people's affairs means. Napoleon did it; Maria Theresa did it; Hitler did it; Mussolini did it. Now our allies are doing it.

It must be pointed out that this is a sample of Big Three cooperation. That is how the regional set-up works. Britishers shoot Greeks in the British region; Moscow kills Poles in the Russian region—and incidentally a hundred times more than the British. This is a foretaste of a world arranged by deals, with each empire getting its shooting preserves. Never in history has it been good for the common man when two or three conquerors divided the nations among themselves. We have no excuse for fooling ourselves about that.

STOP FOOLING OURSELVES

If we in America, who know what right and freedom are, approve of such a plan, instead of a beginning of real collective security it will mean that we have allowed ourselves to be led into immorality. We live in a very tense time and are in danger of giving way to mass emotions. We tend to become political Holy Rollers. As we shout happy slogans about big power domination, democracy, one world, people's revolution, we deceive ourselves and debase truth. Let's leave such incantations and return to integrity, honesty, and intellectual decency.

We should not be foolish perfectionists, and we shall have to accept practical arrangements which we don't like, but let us quit humiliating ourselves by calling wrong right, slavery freedom, and the subjugation of an ally the basis of international justice. Let's get clear in mind. If we still have to keep some of our neighbors in slums, let us not call those slums beautiful architecture or a paradise for little people. Let's recognize them as slums, and with all our might keep on trying to clean them up.

Broadcasting Congressional Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and scholarly, liberal Senator from the State of Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER, and I introduced in the Congress identical bills providing for the broadcasting of congressional proceedings over the radio.

My bill is known as H. R. 89. This proposed legislation has evoked from thoughtful people throughout our country great interest; newspaper editorials have discussed the idea pro and con.

Naturally, in broadcasting congressional proceedings, tact and discretion must be employed. All debates are not interesting to the public, nor are they all of national or international import, but if the public, following the lead set in New Zealand, could hear their representatives on the radio, they would be in

a position to appraise their solons and would also be greatly enlightened and educated in more ways than one.

The eminent writer and progressive thinker, Jack H. Pollack, has written a very clever and well-documented article in Liberty magazine, in the issue of February 17, in which the whole idea is explored. I commend its reading to my colleagues and to the country. Here it is:

SHALL WE BROADCAST CONGRESS?

(By Jack H. Pollack)

The United States Senate was debating the peace treaty. It was November 1919.

Bewhiskered Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, rose to speak.

"Will the Senator allow me to interrupt for just a moment?" he asked.

"Surely."

Measuring his words, the irreconcilable legislator announced, "There will be no adjournment, if I can help it, until we vote on the treaty again. When we vote on it—be under no misapprehension—it is final."

Would world history have taken a different course if the American people had been properly informed of these proceedings? There is a growing belief that had Americans been able to hear with their own ears how the League of Nations was being butchered, they would have stopped the butchering.

Today Congress once again is grappling with problems of peace. But most Americans must depend on the often incomplete newspaper and radio reports if they want to know what their elected Reresentatives are saying and doing. For the first time, many Americans wish they had a direct pipe line to Capitol Hill.

A bill to put Congress on the air was introduced in both Chambers of the Seventy-eighth Congress by two liberal legislators: Florida's silver-tongued CLAUDE PEPPER in the Senate and Washington's JOHN COFFEE in the House of Representatives. It was not acted upon, but it is expected to be reintroduced in the new Congress.

Under the bill, any station or network could send Congressional proceedings over the air waves, but none would be required to do so. A station could make a "live" broadcast of Congress in action. Or it could buy a transcript at cost price, since "a complete and continuous" legislative recording would be made by Uncle Sam. Of course, both Senate and House would retain the right to keep off the air any debate they wished.

Opinion is divided on whether to broadcast Congress. Some scoffers insist that nobody would listen. Advocates, on the other hand, argue that such a program would be "popular." They say people would tune in their congressmen the way they do baseball games, Frank Sinatra's voice, or Jack Benny's jokes. Weren't millions glued to their radios on election night and during the political conventions?

Congressmen themselves have mixed feelings about the proposal. Forward-looking legislators in both parties favor it strongly. But some of their colleagues are terrified at the thought of being put on the air, chiefly because they won't have a chance to amend "for the permanent RECORD" their inaccurate and sometimes ill-advised extemporaneous remarks. Naturally, a handful of demagogic lawmakers are not overjoyed at the prospect of having constituents hear their inflammatory or asinine oratory. One forthright Senator groaned, "Broadcasting us would make people think we're bigger boobs than we are."

A long prejudice has existed on Capitol Hill against ordinary microphones, let alone broadcasting equipment. Every so often someone suggests that our lawmakers should be made more audible—even to one another. Elderly senators such as JOHNSON of California and CAPPER of Kansas, speak scarcely above a whisper.

Yet many of the people's choices are opposed to all newfangled talking contraptions. About 15 years ago it was urged that mikes be placed in back of each Senator's desk. This prompted a testy South Carolinian, the late Senator Coleman Blease, to grumble:

"Now they want to put a radio back here, right behind me, so as to broadcast what is going on in the Senate. I do not know anything about radios; I never listened to one of them in my life. I do not know what they might do. They might fill that thing up with gas, some deadly gas, and just about the time the crowd assembled in this Chamber—everybody in control of the United States—some fellow might turn on a machine down here and just gas out the whole business."

And not many years ago, when John Nance Garner was Speaker of the House, a loudspeaker microphone was placed before him. Shortly afterward he was told that a Member wanted to deliver a speech. Forgetting that with the mike the slightest whisper could be heard throughout the Chamber, the plain-spoken Texan roared, "Now what in the h— is that —— —— —— —— going to talk about?" While the Chamber rocked with laughter, "Cactus Jack" ordered electricians to "get that —— thing out of here."

However, it was later put back, and today the Speaker not only has an ordinary mike in front of him on the rostrum, but he can use a "breast mike" if he wants to move around. When Members address the House, they come to the front and use a mike. Majority and minority leaders also talk through loud-speakers, as do the clerks. All told, the House now has 7 microphones plus an operator controlling voice volume from the gallery. Should it be decided to broadcast House proceedings, half the technical job is already done.

The austere Senate, however, has remained suspicious of speaking devices. In fact, Congress generally has viewed with jaundiced eye any departure from its traditions. As a recent example, a movie screen was set up in the Senate Chamber to show Army films. The purpose was to supplement the Senators' knowledge of many of the subjects they debate. When Senate officials got wind of it, they immediately ordered the screen removed.

Those who advocate the broadcasting of legislative sessions contend that it would improve the make-up of Congress. It would expose the stupidity and unfitness of some legislators and strengthen many an able, hard-working Congressman whose words too often reach only the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the sparsely filled Capitol galleries.

Alert New Zealand has improved the quality of its legislative body since it began airing parliamentary proceedings 9 years ago. The Labor Party complained that it was not getting a square deal in the country's press. M. J. Savage, who later became Prime Minister, asserted, "I would sooner put up with the publication of my remarks over the air than with the reports which I read in the newspapers."

So when the Labor Party came into power in 1936, it immediately began to broadcast legislative sessions. To meet objections of those claiming not to be interested in parliamentary broadcasts, it was arranged for a special government station to carry them. At first only the most important debates were aired. But so enthusiastic were listeners that complete proceedings, including the opening prayer, were soon sent over the air waves.

Today New Zealand's most powerful station, 2YA, a 60,000-watt station in Wellington, broadcasts the lawmakers from 2:30 p. m. to 11 p. m., with time out for dinner. Daily newspapers list parliamentary programs with scheduled speakers and topics.

The legislators don't talk directly into a microphone; six mikes are suspended from the ceiling. The debate is lively and extemporaneous because members are not allowed to read speeches while on the air. Most popular listening hours are between 7:30 and 10 p. m.

Seated in a corner "covering" the event is a radio announcer. Whenever a representative rises to speak, the announcer switches on the microphone nearest him to control voice volume. During lengthy debates he whispers the names of the speakers for the benefit of late tuners-in. Committee hearings are also broadcast.

The speaker has great authority. Occasionally a representative will try to "grandstand" for the benefit of the home folks at the dial by prolonging debate. But the speaker will speedily stop him. Any time he sees fit—say, for reasons of national security—the speaker can press a button underneath his desk and shut off debate from the air.

After hearing their representatives, New Zealand voters decided to make some changes. Nevertheless, many of the nation's poorest orators continue to be reelected, indicating that New Zealanders can be educated without being entranced. Nor has the novelty of listening to their legislators worn off. Thousands of fans follow their favorite voice, and so popular have the broadcasts become that the opposition party has promised to continue them if it is returned to office. And with it all, New Zealand's legislative tradition—faithfully copied from the British House of Commons—has been zealously maintained.

Although New Zealand is the only country in the world now broadcasting legislative sessions, other nations have experimented with the idea. In 1926, Finland, then a liberal-democratic republic, began to air debate of the 200 members of the Finnish Diet. A similar movement was afoot in Germany during the '20s. Even in imperial Japan, the proceedings of the Japanese Diet were aired in 1925.

In March 1926, the question of broadcasting debates arose in the British Parliament. The broadcasting committee urged Prime Minister Baldwin to put Parliament on the air. But Baldwin demurred, as have successive Prime Ministers despite widespread British interest and the ease with which it could be accomplished under the government-owned B. B. C.

Occasionally a municipal station in the United States will broadcast local legislative sessions. Outstanding was the experience of WNYC, which aired New York City Council proceedings for 2 years (1938–40). A howling success, it made blasé New Yorkers vastly more civic-minded. Manhattan cave dwellers found the broadcasts both educational and entertaining—admitting in a survey that they preferred hearing city council to live on canned music. But Gotham's councilmen whimsically voted themselves off the air.

"I wish they'd go back on," a listener complained. "Broadcasting them made the councilmen work harder, be on their toes and more apt to do the right thing by us." WNYC's manager agreed that the broadcasting "raised the quality of the discussions * * * the councilmen * * * were more prepared, since a corrected copy or handout could not be given to the press."

And how does the radio industry itself feel about broadcasting our national lawmakers? A large segment of it has been cool to the idea, especially the networks. Many a hard-boiled radioman, while admitting it wouldn't be any problem to wire Congress for broadcasting, insists that Congress would be too high-brow and dull for the average listener. Who, such men ask, wants to hear the long-winded reading of a 35-page appropriation bill? One official insists radio would soon find itself "betw en congressional pressure

on the one hand and audience disinterest on the other." Another protests that "debate would have to be staged and we would be merely putting on a show instead of attending to the business of Congress." A leading radio magazine declares that "if a poll were taken, the public would vote for less rather than more congressional speechmaking."

And many broadcasters freely admit that they are not overanxious to surrender hours of lucrative time. Under the Pepper-Coffee bill, stations wouldn't be paid for airing Capitol Hill. Congress on the air would be a public-service sustaining program. Stations couldn't very well stop every 15 minutes for a commercial. Of course, Congress might have its own station, but this probably would be regarded by broadcasting officials as drastic Government encroachment on their ether domain.

Nathan Straus, president of independent WMCA and a long-time champion of broadcasting Congress, recently polled radio officials on the question. Of those who answered, 69.2 percent favored the idea, as against 13.5 percent opposed. However, while Straus sent questionnaires to 875 stations, he received only 133 replies. Of these, 26 stations agreed to carry Congress. None were network giants. Most of them were small stations—250-watters. Ten were affiliated with the Mutual and 6 with the Blue Network.

A Georgia radio executive believes the program would result in sending more capable people to Capitol Hill. The owner of a Cleveland station protests. "There's no valid reason why Congress, with nothing to hide, should attempt to block this method of bringing the public more complete knowledge."

Meantime, while waiting for Congress to make up its mind, Straus has done what he considers the next best thing. Each Sunday, between 3:30 and 4 p. m., WMCA now broadcasts a Halls of Congress program in which professional actors portray Washington lawmakers in dramatizations of texts taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the week.

Rural folks are among the most spirited supporters of the proposal. At its latest convention, the Farmers Union strongly urged putting Congress on the air. Paul Sifton, the union's Washington representative, has been one of the most vocal champions of the idea. Small-town editors, lacking access to full press wires, admit that it would benefit them greatly.

Other advocates include the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. locals, Southern Methodist churchwomen, the Writers War Board, and the Union for Democratic Action. Much of the support stems from the far West and northernmost New England.

Objections, aside from those already mentioned, are many and varied. A common complaint is that Congress would lose its dignity by being open to public inspection. Since the Senate and House are in session simultaneously, which should be broadcast? Wouldn't the daytime audiences be limited to women? Since it isn't possible to broadcast all debate, wouldn't whatever was broadcast be false and misleading? What good would it do to broadcast floor proceedings when the real work is done in committee? Will Congressmen still enjoy congressional immunity if their remarks go over the air?

Other critics of congressional broadcasts have been more flippant. One columnist thinks the program should include a House vocalist warbling When the Sol Bloom Is on the Rose in the Good Old Jessie Sumner Time. The Washington Post slyly suggests Two Chambers Hath the Heart as a congressional theme song, while Time magazine quotes Congressmen as finding the whole idea nightmarish.

Proponents of the plan counter all objections with a potent argument. Today, they say, when popular government has collapsed in so many nations, the greater citizenship participation resulting from the broadcasting of legislative sessions would serve to strengthen our democracy. People today, they insist, are Congress-conscious. They are taking the actions of their legislators more seriously, as indicated by their rejection of isolationists in the last election.

These men admit there are operational problems, but insist they can be met. They point to the popularity of network forum programs as evidence that Americans are hungry for scrappy discussions. And they feel that listeners will prefer the oral frailties of their public servants—all the "ers" and "ahs" and the "hmms"—to the stock streamlined speeches.

Since the expense is not prohibitive, congressional broadcasting champions propose to give the idea a trial and then measure audience interest. Senator PEPPER warns, "If we don't broadcast our proceedings and keep step with radio, people are going to begin asking whether we're afraid to let them hear what we're saying. After all, it's their business we're transacting."

In the days to come, Congress will be debating questions touching every American's life; post-war jobs, social security, taxes, low-cost medical care, compulsory military training, etc. Advocates emphasize that were Congress on the air, American democracy could prove that it is possible for a government to grow huge and complex and yet remain close to its people.

But the most overpowering argument suggested is that broadcasting Congress would give millions of Americans front-line seats in the making of the coming peace. All-outers for Congress on the air hold that radio can render no greater service than this.

Two-thirds Rule for Treaty Ratification Should Be Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article advocating the Sumners amendment to have treaties ratified by Congress, instead of two-thirds of the Senate.

The article is written by Jack H. Pollack, well-known Washington correspondent, and published in the March 1945 issue of the magazine This Month. The article is as follows:

One hundred and fifty-six years ago, George Washington notified the Senate that he wished to consult with it about an Indian treaty. But Members of the upper Chamber, jealously guarding their constitutional right, did not wish to discuss the treaty in his presence. So the Father of Our Country was kept cooling his heels outside the Senate door for 2 days. Infuriated by the snub, Washington vowed that "he would be damned if he ever went there again."

For over a century and a half all his successors have followed suit. During that time, every important treaty negotiated by the United States has enkindled bitterness between the President and the Senate. Biggest thorn between them is that redoubtable constitutional clause giving the President power to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Historians have called this two-thirds clause the great mistake of the Constitution.

Over a hundred years after the signing of the Constitution John Hay wrote, "A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into the arena. No one can say just how or when the final blow will fall. But one thing is certain—it will never leave the arena alive."

In recent times, the most tragic example of the two-thirds rule was the Senate's long and stormy consideration of the League of Nations. One Senator, Henry Cabot Lodge, was able to attach 14 different delaying reservations to the treaty.

A sick President Wilson carried his case to the country. The final note on March 19, 1920, showed 49 Senators favoring ratification with 35 against. Though a majority, it was seven votes shy of the required two-thirds. On that day, a little group of willful men, The Irreconcilables, gave wings to the Second World War.

In Washington, down Pennsylvania Avenue, it is only about a mile from the White House to the Capitol. But in ratifying the Nation's treaties, it is the long mile. A generation ago, a treaty suffered a deadly blow in making that trip. It went down the avenue but never came back.

Very soon, a treaty will once again be traveling that long mile. In it will be embodied the peace terms—an agreement to form some kind of association to discourage man from killing his brother. One-third of those present in the upper Chamber on R (Ratification)-day control the coming peace. Even if it is the best treaty in the world, a handful of Senators representing a handful of Americans can scorn it and give birth to World War No. 3.

On treaties, it takes two cooperationists to equal one isolationist. The two-thirds rule enables a Senator representing a State with 110,000 population (Nevada) to have an equal voice in treaties with a Senator representing 13,000,000 people (New York). In other words one Nevada voter has the same say in international affairs as 120 voters in New York. It is possible for Senators repereseenting 8 percent of the country to reject a treaty supported by the rest of the Nation.

Many people believe some basic United Nations peace treaty could muster the necessary two-thirds Senate vote today. But a peace treaty will only be the beginning. After that, treaties dealing with food, finance, aviation, oil and shipping will arise. Today, with the world contracting, these questions demand international solution. If each treaty must risk veto by one-third of the Senate, the dearest hopes of the American people are in danger.

The Constitution's framers gave the House of Representatives no voice in foreign affairs. Throughout American history, members of the House have resented this Senatorial stranglehold. Today they point out that the welfare of the country should take precedence over an eighteenth century tradition.

Some even go so far as to contend that the power to ratify treaties belongs exclusively to the House. Isn't the House closer to the American people? Doesn't its Members, elected every 2 years on the basis of population (instead of every 6 like Senators), more nearly reflect the popular will? Isn't a filibuster impossible in the House, whereas in the Senate this weapon can kill a measure that has not only the overwhelming support of the American people, but even of the Senate itself?

A movement to modernize and democratize our treaty-making machinery is now under way. Increasingly, many national organizations are demanding that the Constitution be amended so that treaties can be ratified by a simple majority of both Chambers. Not

waiting for the stand-pat Senate to take action, the House is boldly knocking on the treaty-making door.

Before the Seventy-eighth Congress died, the House Judiciary Committee voted to seek a constitutional amendment repealing the two-thirds rule. The resolution was introduced by Representative HATTON SUMNERS (Democrat, Texas), an eminent constitutional authority. But pressure of closing business prevented the House from voting on it.

The resolution is being reintroduced in the present (79th) Congress and will undoubtedly pass the House by a huge vote once it reaches the floor. Before it can become law, however, it must pass the Senate—by a two-thirds vote—and then be approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

Conditions which led to the adoption of the two-thirds rule have long since disappeared. Actually, the two-thirds clause was a compromise, a concession to the small States fearing large-State domination. And so the New England States which didn't want their fishing rights bargained away by treaty and the Southern States, determined to keep the Mississippi open to navigation, were given an equal voice in the Senate. That is why the impractical, obstructive two-thirds rule was put on the books.

Virtually every President and Secretary of State has had bitter experience with the two-thirds rule. One minor treaty was held up in the Senate for 21 years. Despite having rejected outright only a dozen or so of the 800 treaties submitted to it, the Senate has amended, never voted on, or by-passed hundreds of them.

Sometimes, it is true, the Senate keeps the President or Secretary of State from making serious treaty mistakes. Occasionally, it even exhibits farsighted statesmanship as when it secured the Panama Canal for exclusive American control.

But more often the two-thirds rule has been a stumbling block in American history. A treaty to annex Texas in 1844 was rejected by the Senate. A half century later Hawaii could not be annexed by treaty. Stumped by the two-thirds bug-a-boo, Presidents Tyler and McKinley were forced to resort to the subterfuge of joint resolutions to acquire both these territories. Had Texas not been annexed, at least a third of this country would now be foreign soil. Had Hawaii not been annexed, Japanese soldiers might now be fighting on this continent.

On different occasions Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt have championed American adherence to the World Court but none could circumvent the two-thirds jinx. As late as 1935 public opinion forced its consideration in the Senate. Though over a majority favored it—52 for and 36 against—7 votes were again lacking to meet the two-thirds requirement. Without this hurdle the United States could rightfully have taken its place in the family of nations supporting the only World Court that ever existed.

The two-thirds rule mocks democratic principles, giving too much power to too few men. History has shown that there have always been Republican Senators who opposed a treaty negotiated by a Democratic administration and vice versa.

The only way to circumvent the two-thirds rule is by Executive agreement or joint resolution which requires merely majority approval of both Houses. Some foes of the two-thirds rule are now suggesting that the coming peace treaty be submitted to the Senate as an Executive agreement, cheerfully pointing out that 1,200 compacts with other nations have been concluded this way.

But these optimists ignore American history. Forty years ago, for example, Secretary of State Hay negotiated agreements with several foreign governments to arbitrate legal differences. Each arbitration dispute was to be a "special agreement" and not to be submitted to the Senate. Promptly, the supersensitive Senate proclaimed it had a right to pass on each specific dispute and proceeded to amend the treaties by substituting the word "treaty" for "special agreement."

The question of treaties versus Executive agreements is bound to become more confusing in the days ahead. Most important objection, however, is that since an Executive agreement is obviously an attempt to avoid the Constitution, even if approved, it will never be considered as binding as a treaty.

Upholders of the two-thirds rule contend that it is safer to entrust our destinies to 66 Members of the Senate. Defenders of this ancient rule likewise argue that any attempt to amend the Constitution while the boys are overseas, would arouse bitterness among them. These adherents claim that in any case it would take at least 2 years to pass a constitutional amendment. (The prohibition amendment became law 10 months after voted upon in Congress.)

Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, insists that "the House shares in the substance of foreign relations in a manner where it is safe for the House to share." Other lawmakers proclaim that most foreigners are too crafty for us and therefore for our own protection, we should be deterred from negotiating with them.

It would seem logical that if we can trust a majority of both houses to declare war, we should be able to trust a majority of both houses to ratify the peace. The two-thirds rule is a constitutional anachronism, an obsolete appendix to a great human document. Majority vote is the general rule of the Constitution. Congress may pass laws by majority vote. The Supreme Court and lower courts render judgment by majority vote. Congress can even annul treaties by majority vote.

Kenneth Colegrove in the American Senate and World Peace concludes that "If simple majorities in both houses cannot protect the country, the Nation is already lost."

The real fight for repeal of the two-thirds rule will be in the Senate. Many Senators have open minds on the subject. The stubborn ones may begin to yield when they see defenders of the two-thirds rule picked off at the polls. Senator Straddle will then face a battle.

Americans do not want the peace of the world quibbled away on the floor of the United States Senate. They have paid too dearly in this war to risk losing the peace again by leaving control over treaties to one-third of the Senate plus one.

Memorial to Tadeusz Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial to Tadeusz Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski adopted by Sarmatia, with headquarters at New Bedford, Mass., March 24, 1945:

In this most crucial era when mankind in all parts of the world finds itself fighting for that most precious of heritages—liberty—we, members of Sarmatia, an organization of Polish youth, assembled in our respective states, pay tribute today, March 24, to Tadeusz Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, two sons of Poland who devoted their lives not only to the restoration of Polish freedom, but to the restoration of American independence as well.

One hundred and fifty-one years ago, on March 24, 1794, Tadeusz Kosciusko, with a handful of Polish peasants, rose against the despotism of the Tsarist regime when his beloved country, Poland, was threatened with a third partition.

On this same day, 151 years hence, we, the Polish youth of America, pay tribute to Poland's great crusaders of freedom, reminding the world, and our statesmen in Washington, in particular, of the great services rendered to America, in the past by patriots of other lands who sacrificed their all in the cause of American liberty.

These men were not mercenaries, not soldiers of fortune. The urge which impelled them to fight with the American colonists sprang from their love of liberty. They wished to help establish in the New World what had been proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, "Liberty throughout all the land."

They saw clearly that an effort was being made to establish a new order in the world in which the individual would be assured certain inalienable rights and in which government would derive its powers from the consent of the governed. Wherever the torch of liberty was being raised, they considered it an obligation, as well as a privilege, to support the hand that raised it. They understood that freedom is indivisible; that it is meant to be shared and enjoyed equally by all; that where the liberty of peace-loving peoples is concerned there can be no compromise.

The principles of human liberty and justice are the same in every clime, and Tadeusz Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski were eager to resist a mighty empire that was trying to wrest these precious heritages from a struggling people, a people whose slogan was "Give me liberty or give me death."

Kosciuszko's services were many. He fought throughout the Revolution as colonel of engineers, prepared the defenses at Fort Ticonderoga, planned the fortification for the Battle of Saratoga, and engineered the construction of the works at West Point. On October 13, 1783, Congress awarded him with a brevet commission of brigadier general.

When Kosciusko arrived in America on his second visit after his unsuccessful struggle for the liberty of Poland, Washington said, "No one more sincerely wished during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty and your country that it might be crowned with success."

Before his death Kosciusko once more did service to America. In 1800, in Paris, he wrote Manoeuvres of Horse Artillery for the United States Army. The War of 1812 was fought by artillery in accordance with these "manoeuvres". It may be justly and fairly claimed that Kosciusko was the father of American artillery.

Like Kosciusko, Casimir Pulaski devoted his life to the cause of freedom. Like his famous compatriot, General Kosciusko, who, when he appeared before Washington and was asked by him what he could do, answered, in a quiet way, "Try me and see," Pulaski did not wait for an appointment from Congress, but, on hearing that the enemy was attacking General Washington's forces, hastened to join them as a volunteer.

Pulaski struck his first blow for American independence at the Battle of Brandywine on September 11, 1777. At Brandywine, Washington's Army was repulsed and a large part of it might have been captured had it not been for the masterly aid given by Pulaski. Four days after this event he was appointed

by Congress to the command of the Cavalry, with the rank of brigadier general.

Dissatisfied with the condition of the American Cavalry, he urged Washington and Congress to strengthen this branch of the Army. Congress would not appropriate any money for this purpose. Pulaski asked Washington and Congress to give him leave to organize an independent corps, known later as the famous Pulaski Legion. It is estimated that Pulaski advanced $50,000 of his own money in forming and equipping his Legion. The scheme of independent legions proved of the greatest importance in the subsequent operations of the war and, above all, in the southern campaigns.

Pulaski played a valiant and helpful part in America's struggle for independence until his death, October 11, 1779, as a result of a wound received in the siege of Savannah.

Thus ended the brilliant career of the illustrious and gallant officer, a heroic figure of two continents, who had written to Col. R. H. Lee on August 13, 1778: "Honor and a true desire of distinguishing myself in defense of liberty was the only motive which fired my breast for the cause of the United States."

In the American Military Biography containing the lives and characters of the officers of the Revolution who distinguished themselves in achieving our national independence, the author says: "Perhaps a braver man than Pulaski never drew a sword"—and in describing his death at Savannah—"Thus fell, in a most bold and daring achievement, the distinguished Polish patriot, and hero in the cause of American liberty; his memory is entitled to our veneration, as his life forms an item in the price of our independence."

That the love and admiration for Kosciuszko has not died out in America is attested by the words of Joseph Grew, Under Secretary of State: "His name has been written in marble and bronze throughout our country; his deeds of valor in fighting for a cause which he was great enough to take as his own are written deep in the annals of history; but the true character of the man who, a century and a half ago, fought for the ideals which have inspired the progress of Poland and the United States is enshrined in the hearts of all of us; and it is from our hearts that the call goes forth in salutation from our people to the people in Poland: Kosciuszko lives."

As these two great sons of Poland will live forever in the hearts of all freedom-loving individuals, so may the sacrifices made by the valiant Polish fighting forces in World War No. 2 become enshrined in the hearts of mankind for generations to come. Like Kosciuszko and Pulaski, the brave defenders of Warsaw, Narvik, Tobruk, Mount Cassino, Ankora, Falaise, Breda, and Arnhem fought not for their independence alone, but for the independence of all humanity.

We, the Polish youth of America, are proud that Tadeusz Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski and other distinguished men of Polish blood stood by the cradle of American independence and helped to lay the foundation for a new government in the New World, dedicated to the principles of human liberty and justice. May the memory of these two great men and the sacrifices they made for liberty bring renewed hope to our hearts that out of the present chaos a better world will evolve * * * a world wherein will abide love for all and malice toward none.

God grant that our honorable statesmen, in making decisions which will seal the fate of liberty-loving nations for generations to come, be guided by the words of Lord Halifax, uttered in the House of Lords on August 24, 1939: "In failing to uphold the liberty of others, we run the great risk of betraying the principle of liberty itself and with it our freedom and independence."

God grant that America refrain from appending its signature to a fifth partition of Poland; that freedom be restored to every nation in the world and that the Polish fighting forces and the Polish refugees scattered all over the world be allowed to return to their homeland and to a government truly representative of the Polish people.

God bless America.

God save Poland.

Sarmatia: State of Massachusetts, Anna Maria Zajac; State of Connecticut, Joseph Kryszak; State of Rhode Island, Constance Krasowska; State of New York, Henry Kin; State of New Jersey, Leon Cetela; State of Pennsylvania, Eva Wisniewski; State of Ohio, Mildred Wozniak; State of Indiana, Pvt. (1st cl.) Tadeusz Wachel; State of Illinois, Leopold Sobanski; State of Minnesota, Mary Wojcik; State of Michigan, Fred Beller; Washington, D. C., Helen Pulawski.

While the Buck Is Passed, You Go Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of March 22, 1945, which I believe is expressive of the sentiment of New England people regarding one phase of the food situation and the current methods for regulating the distribution of meat to civilians. The editorial follows:

WHILE BUCK IS PASSED YOU GO HUNGRY

The New England section will be the hardest hit of any when the 3 months' 12 percent reduction of meat supplies goes into effect April 1.

This is the word of the secretary of the Massachusetts Grocers' and Provision Dealers' Association.

His contention is that the Government should give more margin to allow meat packers to raise prices providing their products were "distinguished more equitably in New England than they are now being distributed."

"Until O. P. A. and W. F. A. allow these changes and the packers agree to increase local supplies," he says, "the retail purchaser will remain in the middle."

Meanwhile, in another newspaper, but on the same evening, there was a featured story to the effect that a meat dealer in nearby Melrose had a chestful of meat and butter, but couldn't sell it because his customers had no points left; that he had been selling meat back to wholesalers and to other dealers who had no meat, and that he had lost 50 customers. He said he called O. P. A. and was advised to write to his Senator.

The War Food Administration is blaming black markets, Army, and lend-lease exports as among major reasons for the present shortage. Meat dealers add to those classifications the fact that Government regulations of the feeding of cattle and uncontrolled slaughter at the farm is helping to deplete civilian supplies.

Does all this add up to the fact that neither the O. P. A. nor the War Food Administration can control what they have been appointed to direct and regulate?

Disposition of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a statement by the American Labor Party on promulgation of appropriate regulations by the Surplus Property Board and for necessary amendments to guarantee the most productive disposition of surplus property.

PROMULGATION OF APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS BY THE SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD AND FOR NECESSARY AMENDMENTS TO GUARANTEE THE MOST PRODUCTIVE DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

The estimate of surplus war property is $100,000,000,000. If this surplus war property is properly disposed of, so that the factories, consumer goods, scrap, land, and ships are used to the fullest extent rather than taken off the market or out of production, a substantial advance will be made toward our goal of 60,000,000 jobs.

On the question of surplus property, President Roosevelt has stated, "Surplus-property disposal should contribute to filling the needs of production, domestic and foreign. It should be carried on with full recognition of the objectives of price stability." Further, he has said, "Every effort should be made to achieve full civilian use of plants built for war purposes when they are no longer needed for war production * * * temporary lease arrangements may facilitate early productive use while permanent arrangements for transfer are being worked out."

The Surplus Property Act of 1944 is preeminently sound, and if properly administered, will be workable. It sets forth a clear-cut program for using surplus property to help develop and expand our economy. It provides specific protections against the acquisition of surplus property by monopolies or speculators. It sets forth a program for using surplus Government land to promote family-type farming. It provides protection for small business. It protects the Government against fraud.

However, since its efficiency depends upon its administration, it is absolutely urgent that all members of the Board and its staff be vigilant in using the act to further the goal of full employment and full production.

We therefore make the following proposals:

A. ADOPTION BY THE SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD OF AN AGGRESSIVE POLICY TO INSURE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT, AND TO INSURE COOPERATION TO THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION BY THE OWNING AND DISPOSING AGENCIES

1. Surplus war property should be made available to small businesses.

2. We propose that surplus machine tools and equipment should be disposed of to small businesses which are loaded down with obsolete tools, so that small business can obtain the most modern machinery, tools, and equipment declared to be surplus.

The administrators of the act should accomplish this either by selling the tools at a specially reduced price to such businesses which may turn in or dispose of their old tools as junk, or by leasing the tools on a hire-purchase system with the privilege of return when the tools are no longer needed. The latter method is followed by the largest machinery corporations in the country.

3. The Administrators of the Surplus Property Act should insure the greatest and most

efficient production by the 180,000 small plants in the country.

4. The act should be administered to prevent the growth of monopoly, by making available the billions of dollars worth of plants and facilities with their modern construction and equipment to small businessmen, either singly or in groups.

B. PROMULGATION OF APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS BY THE SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Regulations should be drawn with the objectives and directives of the Surplus Property Act in mind, so as to give the act full force and effect by providing for:

1. Rules setting forth adequate public notice of the proposed disposal of surplus properties.

2. Establishment of appropriate procedures to avoid disposal of surplus properties to speculators and to guarantee the preferences intended for small businessmen, small farmers, veterans, etc.

3. Establishment of appropriate safeguards of the right of small enterprises to have access to contractor inventories.

Opportunity should be given to industry committees, consisting of representatives of management and labor, small business and farmers to consult with the Board with respect to the proposed regulations.

C. LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT

1. Providing adequate guarantees in the conditions of transfer, sale, or lease which will insure that the purchaser will maintain all its plants and facilities in substantial operation and production for a minimum period of 2 years next succeeding the date of their acquisition and to permit the Government the right of repossession in the event of a breach of this vital condition.

2. Authorizing the Surplus Property Board to direct the declaration of property as surplus and order its disposal pursuant to the terms of the act.

3. Requiring publication in the Federal Register of the terms and conditions of the proposed sale of properties valued at $1,000,000 or more.

The A. L. P. statement to Senator MEAD and former Senator Gillette was transmitted by Hyman Blumberg, state secretary of the American Labor Party.

Resolution Adopted by the Polish-American Clergy of the Diocese of Hartford, State of Connecticut, at Their Meeting Held March 20, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas at the recent Crimea Conference held at Yalta by the leaders of the three great powers, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Marshal Joseph Stalin, plans were formulated for the settlement of world affairs with a view toward the pr vention of future wars; and

Whereas as part of the permanent solution of the problem of Poland it was decided to partition Poland by granting to Russia all territory east of the so-called Curzon line; and

Whereas it was decided to reorganize the Polish Government by adding to the so-called Lublin government various other unidentified Polish leaders and recognizing this reorganized group as the true Government of Poland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby strongly condemn as an outrageous act of injustice such a decision on the part of the three leaders to thus partition Poland, an undaunted ally who was the first to take up arms in a seemingly hopeless cause against the mighty Nazi aggressor and has longer than any other Allied Nation fought ceaselessly against the common enemy and has borne sacrifices which exceed those of any other nation. This cavalier treatment of Poland, which thus punishes her worse than any of the satellite Axis countries for her loyal and steadfast devotion to the Allied cause, outrages our consciences, and, we truly believe, the consciences of the great majority of the American people; be it further

Resolved, That the recognition of any government except the sole, legal, and constitutional Polish Government in exile in London makes a mockery of duly constituted authority and the processes of democratic government. Such slavish submission to the Soviet-sponsored puppet government on the part of our leaders is truly a cause for shameful self-reproach; be it further

Resolved, That as American citizens we bitterly resent and condemn this radical departure from the idealistic principles of the Atlantic Charter in favor of power politics, the continued adherence to which we feel will surely lead to another great world conflagration in the future; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives and Senators from Connecticut in the United States Congress and to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Hon. Harold S. Stassen, Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg, Senator Tom Connally, Senator Charles A. Eaton, and Representative Sol Bloom.

Rev. Lucian Bojinowski, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stanislaus Musiel, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John L. Ceppa, Very Rev. A. Mazurkiewicz, C. M., Rev. Stephen Bartkowski, Rev. Francis M. Wladasz, Rev. S. Woroniecki, Rev. J. P. Kowalski, Rev. S. Wlodarczyk, Rev. L. B. Nowakowski, Rev. P. P. Sroka, Rev. J. Swaltek, Rev. C. Pacherski, Rev. S. F. Nalewajk, Rev. John Wanat, Rev. John S. Kolek, Rev. Julian Bartkowski, Rev. A. Smialowski, Rev. Eugene A. Solega; Rev. L. B. Blecharczyk, Rev. George Bartlewski, Rev. Theophilus Kotowski, Rev. Paul J. Bartlewski, Rev. Alexander Tanski, Rev. Boleslaus Rarus, Rev. Marion T. Karwacki, Rev. Edward J. Radzevich, Rev. Lucien Siedzik, Rev. Edward Zyskowski, Rev. John J. Zyskowski, Rev. John Breen, Rev. Benedict Sutula, Rev. Joseph R. Barlowski, Rev. John A. Jankowski, Rev. John J. Sobolewski.

Knowing Your Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., March 16, 1945:

KNOWING YOUR CONGRESSMEN

Every industrialist and businessman should get acquainted with his Congressman, both House Members and Senators, the National Association of Manufacturers has counseled its members. In giving the advice, the association made observations which might well be considered by all the constituents of the Congressmen—wage earners, salaried men and women, professional people, and even citizens of leisure.

The 531 Members of the House and the Senate are just everyday American citizens; a Congressman is a human being. The fact that they are Members of Congress does not change their nature or their emotions. A pat on the back is appreciated as much by them as it is by you and a slap in the face arouses their anger as readily as yours. All these points are made in a booklet entitled "Know Your Congressmen."

It is a good idea. If we knew our Congressmen better probably we'd get greater service out of them. It would be found, in many instances, that the Congressmen themselves are eager to give service to their constituents. He must know their problems to understand them, and to gage his course of action and his stand on various bills in accordance with good understanding.

Aid to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a statement by the American Labor Party on aid to veterans:

To hasten the victorious conclusion of the war and to lay the foundation of a lasting and stable peace, adequate provision must be made to insure the economic and physical well-being of the people of our country. Jobs for all and the establishment of a decent standard of living are indispensable requisites for the attainment of those ends. Unemployment and insecurity breed ill-will and disunity and would impede and impair the building of lasting and democratic peace. In this light, the welfare of the veteran and the civilian are inseparably one. However, the returning veteran does present problems that require special consideration. In a large measure these problems have been recognized by the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (G. I. bill of rights) and other related veterans' legislation.

We wholeheartedly endorse the general aims of the existing veterans' legislation, but we are aware of certain defects in that legislation and therefore urge the adoption of the following amendments:

1. The returning veteran should have a legally enforcible right to medical care and treatment, with the right of review by a qualified civil tribunal without expense to the veteran.

2. Veterans shall be entitled to hospital and medical care at convenient public and private institutions at Government expense, where Veterans' Administration facilities are inadequate or unavailable.

3. The absolute right to educational benefits should be extended to all veterans.

4. The allowances to war veterans during educational training should be increased to provide at least the amounts received under the Servicemen's Dependent Allowance Act.

5. Provision should be made to enable veterans to obtain low-rent housing facilities, as well as loans to purchase homes.

6. Veterans' pensions should not be subject to attachment, execution, or garnishment.

7. The interest rate on loans to veterans should not exceed 2 percent.

8. The facilities of the United States Employment Service should be enlarged and expanded so that it is capable of coping with the problems of unemployment of war veterans.

9. On returning to their jobs, veterans should be allowed cumulative seniority rights for all time spent in the military service.

10. Present limitations on unemployment benefits to veterans should be replaced by provision for payment for full period of involuntary unemployment.

11. Unemployment allowances should be increased to $35 per week, as proposed in the original veterans' aid bill.

12. Uniform regulations should be promulgated by the Administrator to control in all States.

13 The term "veteran" in the act should be defined to include those engaged in the merchant marine, Red Cross, and similar wartime services

14. The sole physical test of a veteran's right to reinstatement to his former job shall be his ability to substantially perform his work, with liberal enforcement in favor of the veteran.

15. The amendment of the Federal law to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to publish a list of educational institutions which bar entrance of veterans to their schools because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

Kings River Project—Preliminary Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership, just a moment ago granted, I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which recently appeared in the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, an editorial which relates to a legislative subject which is at this moment under study by the Department of Interior Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations.

As the editorial represents the viewpoint of thousands, among them those who would be benefited by the construction of the Kings River project, I hope that it does not escape the attention of those of our colleagues upon whose shoulders rests the burden of decision.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, to which I have referred, is the following:

APPROVAL SHOULD BE GIVEN TO KINGS RIVER MEASURE

The Subcommittee on Interior Department affairs of the House Appropriations Committee has before it a proposed appropriation of $490,000 to finance investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for the Kings River project.

The preliminary work looking toward realization of this vital and long discussed project would be carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation under congressional authorization granted on February 10, 1940.

President Roosevelt has voiced his support of the Kings River project as a multiple purpose development by the Reclamation Bureau, and approval of the $490,000 appropriation has been given by the Budget Bureau.

Early and favorable action should be taken by the subcommittee on this appropriation measure so the machinery may be set in motion at the earliest practical date to bring about this much needed development in the interest of the people of the San Joaquin Valley and indirectly the whole State of California.

On February 7, 1944, the President wrote the chairman of the House Flood Control Committee anent the Kings and Kern Rivers projects as follows:

'These projects should be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and that portion of their cost to be charged to irrigation should be financed on the basis of the prevailing Federal policy of 40 annual payments by irrigation beneficiaries. These projects should be maintained and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, but operation for flood control should be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The President's letter sets forth clearly the White House attitude in regard to the Kings project, and likewise should clarify the atmosphere with respect to the Chief Executive's wishes on construction and operation.

Organization of a World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is once again my privilege to call to the attention of the House the attitude of the people of New Hampshire toward post-war world organization. Last Monday it was my privilege to notify the House of the vote of the town meetings in emphatic favor of preservation of peace and freedom and their approval of an organization similar to that proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

Today I have received from the New Hampshire Legislature a joint resolution, approved March 20, requesting the Representatives in Congress, of New Hampshire, to support legislation in favor of the organization of a world federation and requesting the President to initiate procedure to form a constitution of the federation of the world. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include this joint resolution providing for a declaration of the federation of the world:

Joint resolution providing for a declaration of the federation of the world

Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in the declaration of the federation of the world.

Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities; the city, the State, the nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly but purposefully through the centuries, civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without governments perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

Governments can be established only through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organize the international community; totalitarianism and democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicated upon principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship and enslaves men; the latter, a proved bulwark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the consent of the governed, embodies the will of freemen and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The cornerstone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its favors; the foundation of democracy is man whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence; of the latter, freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambition; the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation.

One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. The present conflict is irrepressible and decisive. It is the challenge of the ages to the generation of today, and represents those spiritually cosmic forces which visit the world at critical periods in human history to shape the destinies of men. This world cannot remain half slave, half free; half totalitarian, half democratic. The laws of civilized society prevent intercourse between slaves and free men from being either congenial or profitable. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be ruled by tyrants, and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples; and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order.

Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guaranties against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as are provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics,

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civilization now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function, they capitulate on the fundamental principle of the reason for their existence. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by diverse national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual and as a citizen, and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence, and assets of society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional, or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service, and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations.

It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

That man should be forever free, and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience;

That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy;

That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, as a consequence of the present war, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals;

That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government;

That the present conflict will determine the survival of free institutions throughout the world and that it is morally incumbent upon this generation, as one of the declared objectives of the current war, to federate the nations, in order to make secure, and hereafter unchallenged, freedom for all peoples everywhere, and in order to impart to those who are called to give their lives and fortunes for the triumph of democracy the positive assurance of the incorruptible utility of their sacrifice;

That world federation is the keystone in the arch of civilization, humanity's charter of liberty for all peoples and the signet authenticating at last the union of the nations in freedom and peace;

That the universal ordeal, through which mankind is now passing, marks the birth of a new epoch that will affirm for all time the indestructible solidarity of civilization and the abiding unity of the human race;

That there are supreme moments in history when nations are summoned, as trustees of civilization, to defend the heritage of the ages and to create institutions essential for human progress. In the Providence of God, such a crisis is this hour, compelling in duty and unprecedented in responsibility—a fateful moment when men meet destiny for the fulfillment of historic tasks:

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened:

That the general court of New Hampshire does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as The Federation of the World; and to that end it hereby endorses the Declaration of the Federation of the World as is specifically set forth in the preamble hereof, and makes said declaration a part of this resolution in the same manner as if same were recited herein; and request the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of New Hampshire to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States approving the principle of world federation and requesting the President of the United States to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for The Federation of the World, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification;

That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of New Hampshire.

NORRIS COTTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
DONALD G. MATSON,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

Approved March 20, 1945.

A Great Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past week official Washington made a great discovery. J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, announced it. Just who pioneered in the thought which brought it about has not yet been disclosed. It is of great importance not only to us here at home but to the people of all the world. This discovery, which may have far-reaching effect not only upon our war effort but upon the future of millions of the people of other nations was stated by Mr. Krug in substance as follows: "There is a limit to what America can produce."

Analyzed, I gather it means that someone here in Washington, connected with the Administration and in a position of authority, has learned that milk has an existence before it reaches the groceryman's store in a can, or the back door in a bottle. Someone has discovered that, before the milk can be put in a can, there must be a cow; before that, a calf, and that incidentally someone must feed and milk the cow.

Other investigators now finally concede that, if the farm machinery is taken from those who work the land; if the men who plow, disc, roll the soil, sow or plant seed, cultivate, harvest and transport and process crops; the men and women who tend the chickens, gather the eggs, kill and dress the poultry; those who feed and tend the cattle that produce not only milk but beef, worked in war industries or were drafted for the armed services, there might—yes, possibly some day there would—be a shortage of food even here in America.

Putting two and two together, these bureaucrats finally arrived at the conclusion that, if there was not enough food to adequately feed civilians here at home and our armed men in foreign service, including also those in war industries, it might be some of those abroad, in whom the administration is so greatly interested and whom it has heretofore insisted must at all hazards—no matter how much it took—even though they were not contributing to the war effort—be fed, clothed and sheltered in comfort, would not get all that the Administration desired them to have. Even the President said we might have to pull in our belts.

And, in the meantime, while bakers and housewives were calling for lard, an administrative agency admitted that it had bought, stored and let spoil 20,000,000—yes, 20,000,000—pounds of lard, which will now be sold to make soap. But please don't criticize the administration.

Yes, sir, officials high in administrative councils discovered all that, but it

was only after, in the Senate, a threat had been uttered to the effect that, if the planners did not mend their ways and their plans, legislation would be introduced requiring them to mix with their decisions a little common sense.

In the House, by a vote of 122 to 33, the Lemke resolution, providing for an investigation of the drafting of agricultural laborers and requiring the administration to obey the Selective Service Act as applied to the drafting of farm labor, was adopted. All of which leads to the conclusion that finally and in the last analysis, if you step on the toes of enough people; if a sufficient number suffer from bureaucratic misdirectives, Senators and Congressmen will finally hear from their constituents so forcefully that they will venture to oppose some of the theorists, some of the planners. That is something now, is it not? Odd that the people's Representatives must be kicked good and hard by their real bosses—the people—before they can forget that the do-gooders, the pressure groups, do not really know it all.

So please remember that, while those who kick and criticize and find fault, and whom you sometimes criticize for finding fault, do occasionally bring about some good by the kicking. Folks back home should be cheered by the thought that, if and when they see something radically wrong in their Government, if they, in sufficient number, make themselves heard, there may ultimately be a remedy, even though it seems somewhat slow in coming.

When enough people are hurt; when rules, orders, and directives pinch hard enough on enough people so that those who are losing something—maybe a son or husband—outnumber those who are getting something from the Government, the unsound policies will end. Sorry, reform must await that day, but that is the way it looks from here. I hope a better day, not too long delayed, is coming.

Here in Congress, I am doing what I can to put that hope into a reality. I hope that we will finally insist that nature be permitted to take its course; that the law of supply and demand be permitted to operate without too much interference from those who would fix everything by the writing of a law.

Yes, sir; there will be plenty to eat if the administrative agencies let the home folks alone and do not give too much away.

Burial of Deceased Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, there is growing sentiment for the Federal Government to determine in the near future its position on the issue of providing for the proper burial of its veterans of all wars. Two lines of thought have been advanced. One group feels that the Government should authorize the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money to defray the burial costs and to purchase suitable lots in private cemeteries in which other members of veterans' families may be buried. A second group believes that in addition to the first program the Federal Government should establish at least one national cemetery in every State in the Union, in which veterans of the armed services of the United States may be buried at the expense of the Government in the full knowledge that the cemeteries will be suitably maintained throughout the years to come.

It is interesting to note that the General Court of Massachusetts has adopted resolutions urging that "the Federal Government procure land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery."

In fact, the Quartermaster General of the War Department proposes that national cemeteries be established at Boston and Springfield.

Congress has not yet acted upon the War Department plan. Therefore, the Quartermaster General has furnished some interesting information about existing national cemeteries in which I am sure all Members will be interested.

At the present time, there are 78 national cemeteries in the United States. The first was established in 1861, although Congress did not enact operating legislation until 1867. A good many of these earlier cemeteries were merely enclosures around battlefields, hospitals, and so forth. In recent years, cemeteries have been established in 1937 and 1938 and the latest in 1939. Including Civil War dead, both of the Union and Confederate armies and those buried later, approximately 470,000 veterans of our wars are buried in national cemeteries.

Of the various cemeteries located in all parts of the country, only six or seven are what might be termed active at the present time. Arlington National Cemetery, in nearby Virginia, is, of course, very active, since we look upon it as the outstanding national cemetery of the Nation. The new cemetery at Farmingdale, Long Island, is also very active, and I am advised that burials there have been as high as 1,400 a year. Another located at San Bruno, Calif., had nearly 1,100 burials last year, and a new cemetery near Fort Snelling, Minn., had 400 burials in 1944. Likewise, the cemeteries at Fort Bliss and Fort Sam Houston, Tex., have had an increasingly large number of burials in recent years.

It is the plan of the Quartermaster General to increase the number of national cemeteries in the United States to 90, so that each State will have at least one.

I am glad to bring these facts to the attention of Congress, which I expect will soon consider the manner in which the Government shall provide its honored veterans with suitable resting places on their death.

Keeping America First in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 23, at noon, before a notable audience, composed of members of the National Press Club, officers and members of the armed services, and Government officials, there was delivered an address which I think will be of great interest to Members of Congress and all others who are interested in aviation and its future. Mr. John F. Victory, secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, was the speaker and his subject Keeping America First in the Air.

It was my great pleasure and privilege to hear this splendid address and I take much satisfaction in knowing that as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, I have sponsored for many years appropriations for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which made possible their achievements. The House Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy, of which I am chairman, has just concluded interesting hearings on scientific research and development in the post-war period. This committee will be interested in Mr. Victory's address. The address follows:

Mr. President, members of the National Press Club, distinguished guests, and friends: The honor of being invited to address this distinguished organization is especially appreciated because to me it evidences your interest in keeping America first in the air. Your curiosity about the work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (N. A. C. A.), which I have the honor to represent, is encouraging.

The overwhelming influence of German air power during the first year of the war in Europe awakened the American people to the danger of having to pay taxes to the Axis. With the invasion of France and the Low Countries the President sounded the burglar alarm with his call for 100,000 airplanes, and American industry responded with the miracle of aircraft production. No single measure has had more far-reaching effect in changing the whole course of the war.

Subsequently, in the battle of Britain there was a demonstration of the relative value of superior numbers on the German side, versus superior performance by Britain's aircraft. That test made it clear that the airplanes that America was destined to produce in great quantity must have superior performance. The dollar cost of the aircraft program was alone sufficient to require enormous expansion of the work of the N. A. C. A. in order to assure a sound return upon the investment. But in time of war money loses significance alongside the imperative military requirements for superior airplanes.

Although the Congress, too, can seemingly work miracles in its field, it cannot legislate superior performance into an American airplane. But it can set science to work. It did so, and that is where the N. A. C. A. comes into the picture.

There is no natural law known that today fixes a limit upon either the speed or the

size of aircraft. All types of American airplanes in production today, and many foreign types, make use of fundamental design data from the laboratories of the N. A. C. A. Let me emphasize, however, that in the development of America's air power the N. A. C. A. has been only one member of the firm, a silent partner, so to speak, of the military services and of the aircraft industry. The over-all progress is the result of the organized effort of millions of Americans involving many organizations, governmental and private, including not only the military and manufacturing establishments directly concerned with aeronautics, but many supporting agencies and industries. Developments in aeronautics have been extremely rare, for which any single organization or individual, in or out of the Government, deserves all the credit.

The airplane and the tank were introduced in World War I, but it remained for the present war to develop their dominant role. In like manner, we may expect that the new weapons recently introduced in this war may be but the forerunners of a whole new line of weapons that may dominate the future.

Aviation is entering an era of revolutionary change resulting largely from the development of new methods of propulsion. Entirely new fields of research must be explored. The new propulsive systems open up extraordinary high speed possibilities which must be studied and evaluated.

At the close of World War No. 1 the top speed of a typically good pursuit airplane was 135 miles per hour; its ceiling, 22,000 feet; and, its maximum endurance 1 hour and 40 minutes. Scientific research gradually penetrated the veil of the unknown as it existed at the time and made possible in a single generation the remarkable improvements in aircraft performance which are now well-known to you. We are just piercing the veil in the field of gas turbine and jet propulsion development and can at this time but faintly glimpse the possibilities in the great unknown fields of guided missiles and supersonic aircraft.

Other nations may be succeeding better than we know. Present American developments as yet undisclosed would, alone, change the character of future warfare. It is staggering to contemplate the full potentialities of present reasonable probabilities as they may be developed for the future. Continuous scientific research is the best insurance that America shall not again fall behind. Neglect of research, even for one generation, may jeopardize freedom in the next.

It appears certain that never again will a nation considering aggression give us a year or more to prepare our offensive. We may expect that no nation considering aggression will attack America in the future, or provoke it into war, without having the capacity to hurt us at home, and to do so promptly and in great strength. What with self-propelled rocket bombs, and supersonic aircraft already looming on the horizon, it does not require much imagination to see, in the shape of things to come, no security against sudden attack by new scientific weapons, unless our defense is such as to discourage attack.

The favorable box score in aerial combat in this war, which has averaged upward of 4 to 1 in our favor, is, no doubt, due in large part to the careful selection, and to the fine fighting qualities and superb training and leadership of our airmen, but it also reflects superior performance of American aircraft.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was established by the Congress 30 years ago "to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution." It is a committee of 15 appointed by the President and serving as such without compensation. The membership includes General Arnold and General Echols of the Army Air Forces; Vice Admiral Fitch and Rear Admiral Richardson; the heads of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Smithsonian, and 6 technically qualified experts from private life.

Out of N. A. C. A. research has developed the engineering basis for a rapidly advancing technology. Consequently, America had, when the war started, a healthy nucleus of a strong, competitive aircraft industry. Had it not been so, we might now be studying German and learning how to do business with Hitler.

The country can be grateful to the Congress that had the vision 30 years ago to establish the N. A. C. A. as a separate agency to advance aeronautical science, although that Congress was quite cautious about how it appropriated the taxpayers' money. It started the N. A. C. A. with an appropriation of "$5,000 a year for 5 years, or so much thereof as may be necessary." It was not clear whether the phrase "so much thereof as may be necessary" related to the $5,000 or to the 5 years.

However, from that modest start the N. A. C. A. has, with continued far-sighted support of the Congress, grown to an organization of 6,500 employees, with an annual operating budget of $26,000,000, and with three major research stations at the Army's Langley Field, Va.; at the Navy's Moffet Field, Calif.; and at the Cleveland Municipal Airport, Cleveland, Ohio.

Experience through two great wars has enabled the N. A. C. A. to blaze new trails in aeronautical research, and to lay the foundation in America for the new science of aeronautics. Under the leadership of able chairmen from Dr. Durand in World War No. 1 to Dr. Hunsaker, present Chairman, and including the illustrious names of Charles D. Walcott, Joseph S. Ames, and Vannevar Bush, the N. A. C. A., with the invaluable assistance of Dr. George W. Lewis as Director of Aeronautical Research, has worked as one with the Army, the Navy, and the industry to gain for America definite leadership in aircraft development.

This first became generally recognized in the late twenties. I recall that in the early thirties there was a meeting in the United States of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale. Discussions by European leaders after visiting the N. A. C. A. laboratories at Langley Field were to the effect that America was at that time 10 years ahead of any other nation in the development of aeronautics. I asked how they measured time. They replied that, if progress were to cease in the United States, and Europe were to continue at its own pace, it would take any European nation 10 years to catch up.

Then came Hitler and the resurgence of German militarism. Setting about quietly at first to build a superior air force, Hitler authorized Goering and Udet to do all things necessary to build for Germany the strongest air force in the world. Did they rush into mass production of airplanes based on 1933 designs? They did not. Realizing that the struggle for supremacy in the air must start in the research laboratory, Germany expanded and multiplied its research facilities until at the time of the pact of Munich in 1938, the German aeronautical research establishment had grown to five times the size of that of the United States. By that time Germany had also built its great air force and was then the strongest power in the air.

The N. A. C. A. had started in 1937 to anticipate the oncoming emergency, and to expand its research facilities. It is most fortunate that these additional facilities were constructed in time to increase the effectiveness of the whole aircraft program in this war. Let us see how that has been done. The problems are too numerous to recount in detail, but I would like to give you a few examples.

The aircraft program required enormous quantities of aviation gasoline and lubricating oil, involving first of all a determination as to the kind of petroleum stocks that could be used to produce high octane gasoline in the quantities needed.

In cooperation with the oil industry's laboratories and with the Army and Navy, the N. A. C. A. was able to bring forth research data upon which decisions were based for the early expansion of the aircraft petroleum industry. The shortage of natural rubber made it necessary quickly to reach decisions as to the petroleum stocks to be used and N. A. C. A. research served as a guide by indicating how different products would perform in an aircraft engine.

The chief tool for aerodynamic research is the wind tunnel, which is, generally speaking, an apparatus or structure for measuring the various characteristics of airplanes under simulated flight conditions.

Tests are made at the throat, or smallest section, of the tunnel where the air velocity is greatest. Throat sizes vary from 4- by 18-inches to 40- by 80-feet, the latter being the largest in the world, and large enough to test a full size airplane. The N. A. C. A. has in operation about 30 wind tunnels used for different purposes; such as, to investigate stability and control; to increase lift and reduce drag of wings; to improve streamlining in general; to develop engine installations; to study propeller efficiencies; to make airplanes controllable when spinning; to prevent ice formation in flight; to improve operating characteristics at high altitudes; and to explore the possibilities and obtain fundamental data in the entirely new field of flight at speeds above the velocity of sound, roughly 750 miles per hour at sea level.

Speed is still the most important single characteristic of an airplane. Through the ages the speed of man's travel has increased slowly up to the time of the conquering of the air. Since then improvement has been rapid. One of the greatest developments in the evolution of the aerodynamic or streamline form has been the N. A. C. A. high-speed wing. This wing makes possible under flight conditions as much reduction in wing drag, or resistance to forward motion, as all previous research had accomplished in this respect since the original Wright airplane first flew in 1903.

The first significant application of the N. A. C. A. high-speed wing was in the P-51 Mustang. That airplane was voted by Europe's outstanding aeronautical experts as the best fighter airplane on either side in the European war. Since Pearl Harbor the N. A. C. A. has investigated, on request of the Army alone, 42 types of bombers, 50 pursuit types, and about 40 miscellaneous types, and a comparable number for the Navy. As an example of what the N. A. C. A. does on a new type of airplane, let me tell you of some other aerodynamic characteristics of the P-51 which are also the product of N. A. C. A. research: Air scoops to provide combustion and cooling air, which greatly reduce the drag of air intake openings as formerly used on airplanes; filleting, that is, the fairing at the junction of the wing and the fuselage; the windshield and canopy shape; N. A. C. A. flush-type rivets; and improved controllability in dives. The N. A. C. A. also provided the basic data for the design of exhaust stacks on the P-51 in order to get additional speed by the use of the exhaust as a form of jet propulsion.

The early versions of the Mustang had a 1,000-horsepower engine. The design of the airplane was such that no fundamental bar to speed increase existed, so that when engines approximately twice the power became available, they were used. The resulting large increase in speed caused serious rumb-

ling and strong vibrations around the radiator scoop. The causes were investigated by the N. A. C. A. in a wind tunnel at 600 miles per hour. By application to the air scoop of the same principles as used in the high-speed wing design, the rumbling and vibration were cured. This simple improvement permitted a full realization of the speed possibilities of the Mustang design.

The basic principles of the N. A. C. A. high-speed wing are gradually coming into general use on American airplanes where high speed is desired. The Bell P–59 Aircomet, the Bell P–63 Kingcobra, the Douglas A–26 Invader, and the Lockheed P–80 Shooting Star are mentioned as a few examples. In the present state of knowledge, it is now regarded as practically a physical requirement that all new high-speed airplanes apply the principle of the N. A. C. A. high-speed wing.

The new Lockheed P–80 Shooting Star jet-propelled airplane recently announced by the Army, the Lockheed Co., and the General Electric Co. was investigated in model form in a wind tunnel at over 500 miles per hour to determine its high-speed control characteristics and to obtain an estimate of its performance. It was confirmed by those tests that the N. A. C. A. high-speed wing which the Lockheed Co. had chosen would permit the P–80, with its new jet power plant, to fly at a higher speed than any previous airplane. Extensive flight tests were made by the N. A. C. A. flight research staff to correlate the performance data obtained in the wind tunnel and in flight, and to make full-scale load measurements by recording the air pressure on the wings and tail surfaces during various high-speed maneuvers. This information is of exceptional value to designers because it is the first ever obtained at such high flight speeds. The N. A. C. A. test pilot who conducted the flight tests on the P–80 flew, in those tests, faster than any other human being, without, however, bothering to establish an accredited world speed record.

As airplane speeds approach the velocity of sound new problems are encountered because the character of the air flow over the wing, in obedience to natural law, changes abruptly at that speed and causes an important loss of lift and serious increase in drag.

Although the speed of any airplane can be increased through the simple use of more power, this method has serious limitations because constantly enlarging the power plant would increase weight and fuel consumption, and reduce useful load. The major objective of aerodynamic research, therefore, is to increase speed by reducing the drag of the whole structure. The ability steadily to achieve progress in this direction has distinguished aviation from other forms of transportation. For example, to increase the speed of an ocean liner 5 knots would require twice the horsepower. To increase materially the speed of railroad trains would require not only more power, but greatly improved roadbeds and rolling stock. Likewise, to increase materially the speed of automobiles would not only consume more gasoline and tires, and cause more rapid depreciation and more accidents, but would also require improved superhighways.

On the other hand, the onward march of aeronautical science shows increases in speed being attained with increased efficiency. For commercial aircraft this will mean increased speed at less cost per passenger-mile. And the more we learn how to improve the performance of the airplane, the greater and more practicable of accomplishment seems to become the need for further improvement. Of course somewhere in the course of airplane development there will come into the equation some limiting factor of diminishing returns, which will impose a practical limit on speed and size. But, if we judge the future from the past we will, as limits are approached, merely raise our sights a little higher and press for some further scientific development that will permit us to carry on.

As an example, the N. A. C. A. has demonstrated by recent research that flight at supersonic speeds, that is, above the velocity of sound, is possible with new types of power plants, and is conducting further research to make it an actuality.

Despite such development, large increases in drag will still occur at speeds between present flight speeds and supersonic speeds and represent one factor in hindering the immediate development of higher speed airplanes. It is essential that the drag of high-speed airplanes be made as small as possible. This problem is being intensively studied in high-speed wind tunnels and in flight, and considerable progress has already been made in the development of improved configurations not only for wings but also for fuselages, tail surfaces, cowlings, air intakes, windshields, and canopies.

The huge passenger airliners of the future may be powered by gas turbines of 5,000 to 10,000 horsepower per engine, using low-grade nonvolatile fuel. The gas turbine has many fundamental advantages over the reciprocating engine. It has, for example, fewer moving parts, is considerably lighter in weight and smoother in operation, and its relative efficiency is superior at high altitudes and at high speeds.

The N. A. C. A. is pushing research on the metallurgical and aerodynamic problems involved in the development of light, powerful compressors. Aircraft turbines will also require research to develop materials that will keep their strength at high operating temperatures.

The idea of a gas turbine has been known for 2,000 years and has been used for at least a score of years in other forms of transportation and in stationary power plants. Why has it only recently attracted such attention that it is hailed as the engine of the immediate future for aircraft? One reason is because since 1939 the N. A. C. A. has initiated and sponsored research by others in the development of new alloys having high strength at high temperatures.

German turbine development so far has been accomplished without using such high-temperature alloys, but this has required a complicated system of cooling which would not have been necessary had they the high-temperature alloys that have been developed in America. Another N. A. C. A. contribution was the improvement through research of the efficiency of supercharger compressors from below 70 to 85 percent and higher. These improvements enabled us, after a slow start, to gain the lead in this most important field.

The N. A. C. A. initiated steps for the development of jet propulsion in this country. Several years ago the N. A. C. A. formed a special committee on jet propulsion and got three large firms interested in accepting membership; namely, General Electric, Westinghouse, and Allis-Chalmers. As a result, each of these firms developed designs of jet propulsion units, two of which are now in production. The third was more expensive and seemed better adapted for post-war development and, therefore, has not been pushed.

Parallel with that activity, General Arnold saw what the British were doing with the Whittle engine and in conferences with our committee, it was agreed to get an American firm to manufacture the Whittle engine. The General Electric Co. was indicated as the most hopeful organization for that purpose and the Army made a contract with General Electric resulting in the production of the Whittle jet propulsion engine, first used in the Bell P–59 airplane.

Flowing directly from their original interest in the subject, the General Electric Co. went on further and developed the jet propulsion unit, now used in the Lockheed P–80 Shooting Star. In the P–80 we have something fully as good and perhaps superior to either the German or the British.

The P–80 has been studied by the N. A. C. A. to show where modifications could be made or must be made to obtain satisfactory performance at altitudes for both winter conditions and summer conditions.

There is no way to measure the value in war of superior performance of aircraft. It may mean the difference between winning and losing a war. The Battle of Britain in 1940 is a case in point. But the scientific research of the N. A. C. A. has also a tremendous economic value which can be measured in part in dollars and cents. Take for example the B–29 which has so rudely awakened the Jap leaders from their comfortable dream of world conquest by putting so many of their industries to sleep. That airplane is at present the great white hope of the Army Air Forces in the long-range bombing of Japan, although the Army has three new bombers coming along which are expected to be more powerful and capable than the B–29. They are the Consolidated B–32, virtually a parallel project to the B–29; the Northrop B–35, and the Consolidated B–36, which is larger than the B–29. The American people are putting into the B–29 program alone several billion dollars. Now what is the end product of that great expenditure? Transportation of bombs for long distances. Recent N. A. C. A. research indicates a possible fuel saving which could very materially increase the return upon that investment either in terms of dollars and cents, conservation of material resources, or by making more bombings sooner, to shorten the war. And that research cost only a few thousand dollars.

I could give you another interesting example of research as applied to the B–29. That airplane was designed for a certain gross load. Military necessity required that it carry a greater load. As a result, the engines had to produce more power, which resulted in their overheating. This in turn shortened their service life and sometimes caused failure in flight, and endangered the airplane and crew. N. A. C. A. research showed where the overheating was critical and pointed to a partial remedy which is being applied and is resulting in greater safety in operation and considerable lengthening of the service life of B–29's.

One of the most serious hazards to flying is ice formation. The N. A. C. A. exhaust heat deicing system for the prevention of ice formation on aircraft is being applied on several types of military aircraft now in production and has permitted safe flight in weather conditions which otherwise would have grounded airplanes. It is one of the greatest contributions to the safety of flying ever made.

In time of war the N. A. C. A. operates as a research and engineering facility of the Army and Navy. Its work is the most fundamental activity of the Government in connection with the development of aircraft and its relations with the military services and with the aircraft manufacturing industry are constant and intimate. It is this teamwork that has made possible the great development of America's air power in this war. The results of N. A. C. A. research will continue to be reflected in the steady improvement in the speed, range, carrying capacity, stability, controllability, maneuverability, ceiling, and rate of climb, and, in short, in the general military effectiveness of America's aircraft.

One of the outstanding lessons the present war teaches is that the problem of insuring America's future security is inseparable from the problem of keeping America first in the air.

N. A. C. A. research on military problems will be largely applicable to commercial and private aircraft after the war, with this significant distinction: In military aircraft superior performance must be achieved, if at all possible, even at the expense of lowered safety and economy. In the development of civil and commercial aircraft the research emphasis must be primarily on safety and economy of operation.

Following the war the world will enter the aerial age about which men have dreamed. Air transportation to all parts of the world will shrink time and distance and bring the peoples of the earth closer together in forceful emphasis on the fact that we all live in one world. Underwriting America's future in the aerial age, and underwriting America's investment in such future preparedness in the air as will effectively preclude attack, is its liberal support of research in aeronautics. America's aeronautical research policy is thus, in the military sense, an insurance policy on the very life of the Nation, and in the commercial sense it is a sound investment assuring America a position in the forefront of progressive nations when the progress of civilization is resumed after the war.

There is one unique wind tunnel I would like to speak about. The N. A. C. A. altitude wind tunnel has just recently been placed in operation at the Cleveland laboratory. That extremely important equipment has been the most difficult project ever attempted in the realm of aeronautical research anywhere in the world. In an air stream 20 feet in diameter, flowing 500 miles per hour, there are maintained altitude conditions of temperature and density existing at elevations up to 50,000 feet, i. e., about 67° below zero (Fahrenheit) and a pressure about one-ninth of that at sea level. And this despite the fact that the power output of the engine under test and the energy of an 18,000-horsepower motor to create the wind must be absorbed as heat by the rarefied air stream while the temperature is kept to 67 below. The N. A. C. A. altitude wind tunnel is the only place on the surface of the earth where the performance of jet-propulsion engines can be investigated under altitude conditions. Without it many months and the running of dangerous trials would be needed to obtain flight data that can be obtained with ease and safety in the altitude wind tunnel in a very short time. It should give America a definite advantage in the development of jet-propulsion airplanes.

Whereas a year ago only a few types of airplanes in all the warring nations could attain a speed in level flight of 400 miles per hour, the United States, England, and Germany now have airplanes in the 500 mile-an-hour range. Now N. A. C. A. scientists, and no doubt those of other nations as well, are preparing to enter the entirely new field of aerodynamic problems involving flight of aircraft and of guided missiles at speeds above the velocity of sound. In order to explore these possibilities the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is actually constructing new supersonic wind tunnels having airspeeds much faster than the speed of sound, ranging up to the neighborhood of 2,000 miles per hour.

N. A. C. A.'s John Stack, chief of the Langley laboratory's compressibility research division, and recognized authority on high-speed problems, indicated in the last annual Wright brothers lecture the possibility within a few years of aircraft traveling westward at clock-stopping speeds. This would mean a speed at our latitude equaling the earth's speed of rotation on its axis and giving the effect of keeping the sun in a fixed position, or, in other words, regular air transportation leaving Washington, say, at 12 noon and arriving at San Francisco at 12 noon the same day!

Resolution of American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter from Hon. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the resolution endorsing the proposed International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, adopted at the twenty-sixth annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, December 14, 1944:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: I am sorry that as yet I have not had an opportunity to appear before your committee relative to the Bretton Woods proposals, but I appreciate your courtesy in promising to hear me at a later date.

In case you have not seen the resolution of our national annual meeting on this subject, I am enclosing a copy of the same. I hope you will read them and give them your earnest consideration.

As you will note, the American Farm Bureau Federation favors the participation of the United States in the proposed international monetary fund and the proposed international bank for reconstruction and development, as outlined in the Bretton Woods monetary conference.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION DECEMBER 14, 1944

2. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ON MONETARY PROGRAMS

The American Farm Bureau Federation favors the participation of the United States in the proposed International Monetary Fund and the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as outlined in the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference.

In adopting these new international institutions, it should be realized that they are not substitutes for sound domestic fiscal policies. Unless sound domestic and foreign trade policies are adopted by the nations of the world, no plan of international monetary stabilization or monetary cooperation will succeed.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank should not be used as relief agencies in the post-war period, but should be conducted on a business basis, leaving relief grants to other agencies of government. In adopting this plan, it should be clearly understood that the United States will not provide funds to perpetuate uneconomic trade practices or unsound monetary policies through the operation of the stabilization fund. Foreign trade must be developed upon a basis of the exchange of goods and services among the nations of the world, and not upon the basis of extending credits.

These proposed international institutions should be operated in such a manner as to promote stability in the general level of prices within the various countries of the world.

Since the proposals by necessity leave wide discretionary powers to the administrators of the two institutions, the individuals chosen to operate these institutions must be high-type men, representative of the various segments of our economy, experienced in international affairs and free from political domination.

In Justice to Scrooge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, a formerly highly respected and valuable Member of this House, entitled "In Justice to Scrooge," as follows:

IN JUSTICE TO SCROOGE

Scrooge in his countinghouse. Old Scrooge. I have always been grateful to Charles Dickens because he made me hate this grasping clutching old man.

I reread the Christmas Carol the other day. I pondered over one passage I had never thought of before. It tells of Scrooge when he was a boy and how fond he was of his little sister. If he loved her, he might have loved another fellow's sister also, and grown up to be the kind of man whom Dickens gave us in the last page.

Yes; Scrooge had been young. He wasn't always Old Scrooge. Once he had been Young Scrooge—carefree, happy, full of hope, and enjoyed a hot grog with the other young bloods on a frosty night.

Why did Young Scrooge become Old Scrooge? What happened to curdle Young Scrooge into a miserable old misanthrope?

I resolved to find out.

It was bleak and cold when I reached his door—the same biting weather Dickens described. Probably the old miser was in a worse humor than ever. The knocker on the door bit my fingers with its frost.

Getting no response and thinking the old duffer might be ill, I opened the door. There he was bent over his counter, a large sheet of paper in front of him, dozens of smaller sheets scattered about covered with scratches from his quill.

I recognized the large sheet. It was an income-tax return.

With a start he realized there was someone in the room. Without turning, he snarled, "Get out."

"Mr. Scrooge," I said.

"Get out," he screamed, reaching for a huge iron inkpot.

"Will you answer one question first? What do you think of Charles Dickens?"

I saw I had him. His face grew purple. The veins swelled on his forehead.

"Dickens!" he hissed. "I don't think anything of him. That libeler. That ignoramus. I'll fix him. I'll sue him. I'll take him to court. Wait till I get through with him. Thinks he's smart. But what does he know? Nothing. Nothing, I say. Marley said the same thing. He knew what it was to be in business these days.

"Listen," he shouted, "did Dickens ever make out an income-tax report? Not he. That would have taken the grin off his face. He wouldn't have gone around caroling everybody if he had.

"See that pile of papers filling the Tank? Questionnaires! Did Dickens ever fill out a questionnaire? Just one? Not he. Who reads 'em? Nobody. Who fills 'em out? Scrooge. They killed Marley with the damned things. Killing me, too.

"Rules and regulations! And directives! Ha! That's a new one! Had to rent another room to put 'em in. 80 volumes, 80,000 pages, 80,000,000 words! Did this pansy-smelling Dickens ever decipher 80,000,000 words? No. He spends his idle hours telling what soulless grubbers Scrooge and Marley are.

"Yeh, Scrooge and Marley. Did Scrooge and Marley ever leave a debt unpaid? Did they ever beat a rent bill? Did they ever cost the Crown a shilling? Did they ever live in a poorhouse? No, not yet. Not yet! All we do is pay the taxes to build the jails and poorhouses. For that we get kicked around. Slandered. Villified.

"Miser, huh? Who's going to scatter his dough with new taxes every year and God knows how much anyone will have left?

"Did this Dickens dandy ever figure how long it would take him to get into a poorhouse if his profits doubled every year? No.

"So he goes about saying, Cheerio, cheerio, cheerio. What's there to cheer about, I want to know? No cheers for a business man. All he gets is a kick in the pants.

"Had a row with Bob Cratchit over his pay. One thing. Cratchit's been here 24 years and never missed a pay check. That's something, ain't it? Somebody has to say, No, once in a while to keep ahead of Morgenthau. No-one ever paid his help with a tax receipt, did he?

"Bob and I would have settled it. But they send a smart aleck out from Washington—a thousand miles—somebody born in Russia! Peter the Great! Bah!

"Yeh, Santa Claus. Who's going to pay for Santa Claus? The politicians? No, Scrooge and Marley and Bob Cratchit. They'll pay for Santa Claus all right when we get over the fool notion that we can spend ourselves rich. Humph! Rot! Bah!

"Who made the assets for the politicians to mortgage, anyway? Scrooge and Marley, and thousands like us. They leave us the debts while they skim off the political credits! Do they ever worry about a debt? Never. Onward Christian Soldiers! Every Scrooge a crook, every politician a hu-man-i-tar-ian, ha—one of those fellows who goes about doing good with other people's money. Sir Galahad! Lady Bountiful! Fair Harvard! Lucky to have a rich old man, ain't it?

"Scrooge and Marley started from scratch. The competition was tough. No silver spoon for us. We're not perfect. We might have done more. When I was young I thought of a lot of things I wanted to do.

"Take Bob Cratchit. Faithful fellow. Late only once in his life—the day after Christmas, too. He's got a crippled boy. I never had a boy. Nor nobody. Nobody but Marley. And Marley's dead. Now I'm an old man—Old Scrooge. I'd like to do something for that boy and Bob, too.

"But the snoopers and wasters have got to get off my neck first. Did Dickens ever write a carol about them?"

He got up, hobbled to the wall and tore a leaf from the calendar. He looked. January 1944.

Turning, I thought I saw a faint toothy grin on his gnomelike face.

"Tell this blighter Dickens if he'll write a book about bureaucrats, I'll buy a copy! And dismiss my suit!"

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

NEW YEAR'S, 1944.

Broadcasting Proceedings of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein a resolution passed by the King County Democratic Central Committee in my home State of Washington. I wish to preface the resolution by calling the attention of my colleagues to the fact the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress is giving careful consideration to the proposal of which I am the sponsor, namely House Joint Resolution 89. The resolution follows:

Resolution requesting that the proceedings of Congress be broadcast so that the people will understand clearly the functions of democracy in the making

Whereas the affairs of Congress and of government in general are vital to every citizen; and

Whereas no present method exists to provide full information to the average citizen about the real happenings in our Congress; and

Whereas radio is the simplest and most effective medium for communicating with every American in every part of the country; and

Whereas New Zealand adopted a program of short-wave broadcasts of the proceedings of its parliament, and has successfully demonstrated that full knowledge by citizens of the affairs of government stimulates and strengthens the democratic system; and

Whereas our Congress could lease radio time from one or more networks, several important and powerful stations, or broadcast by shortwave all important debates, excepting such matters as might jeopardize national security during the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we propose and urge upon Congress enactment of the necessary measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of its proceedings; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress, to the press, and to the legislative sponsors.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the honor of being present at the White House with 100 mothers of servicemen, Americans of Lithuanian descent, representing practically every State in the Union, who were received by Mrs. Roosevelt and who presented a petition of 1,000,000 signatures, requesting President Roosevelt to help Lithuania regain her independence. There were many Gold Star Mothers among them.

Lithuanians, ethnically, are neither Slav nor Teuton. Therefore, any allotment of her territory to, or subjugation by, any of her neighbors would prove to be a disturbing influence upon the future peace of Europe.

Just as Americans of Lithuanian extraction contributed to the progress of the United States, so also, it is an established fact, did the Republic of Lithuania contribute to the cultural progress of Europe, a right which she has been deprived of by her aggressive neighbors. During her period of independence she justified the trust placed in her and proved to the civilized world her capacity to properly govern herself, true to the established principles of democracy.

It is my sincere hope that the delegates to the San Francisco Conference will adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, so that Lithuania and other small nations will retain their rightful place in the sun.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a copy of an address by the Minister of Lithuania, which was made last night at a banquet to further the cause of Lithuanian independence:

ADDRESS OF HON. POVILAS ŽADEIKIS, ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF LITHUANIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies, and gentlemen, we are gathered here tonight in an atmosphere of friendly concern over the freedom of small nations in general and of Lithuania in particular. Among us is a group of Lithuanian American mothers of servicemen. Our thoughts turn to those who are at this very moment performing military duties, in circumstances very different from ours here tonight. I have in mind the gallant American soldiers. To many nations of the world, and also Lithuania, they are the living symbols of the ideals of freedom and democracy, since they are fighting not only for the honor and security of their native land, America, but also for the liberation of enslaved nations of the world.

These American mothers of Lithuanian descent have come to Washington to present a petition bearing hundreds of thousands of signatures to their government because—and I quote from the petition—"they are shocked at the announced intention of Soviet Russia to deprive Lithuania of her freedom and independence." They have respectfully requested their Government to aid in the restoration of the independence of the land of their forefathers—Lithuania. Though each of them is busy with her own tasks and duties as citizens, they nonetheless find time to make such a journey to speak in Lithuania's defense.

I take this opportunity to thank these Lithuanian American mothers of servicemen, and all Americans of Lithuanian descent, for the moral and material support they have given and are giving to the cause of Lithuania's freedom. I would like to say to them in the tongue of their ancestors: "Aciu, aciu Jums labai, kad nepamirsote savo senosios tevynes Lietuvos kurios ateityje matosi begaliniai pavojai."

Indeed, as I have just said in Lithuanian, my country finds herself in deadly danger at the present time. Permit me to open a few pages in the book of Lithuanian realities and hopes for the future.

Though Lithuania declared her neutrality early in 1939, she fell a victim to aggression, and during 5 years of World War No. 2 has seen three foreign occupations. Huge armies of warring Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia

have passed five times over Lithuania. The terrific devastation caused by modern, highly mechanized warfare can readily be imagined. Whole areas of Lithuania have been completely depopulated. Executions and deportations to Siberia and into the interior of Germany are frightful and spell extermination. The cultural gains and material progress achieved by the diligent work during the period of 22 years of independence have been swept away.

By October of 1944 Soviet armies had wrested Lithuania from the Germans. Theoretically Lithuania could be considered among the liberated countries. But the treatment of the peaceful civilian population by the Soviets shows that they are not acting as liberators. Today Lithuania is in the throes of a new Soviet occupation. After 3 years enslavement by the Nazis comes Soviet Russian domination. Though news from Lithuania is scarce because of a rigid wall of Soviet censorship, and no foreign correspondents, observers, or representatives of relief agencies are permitted, we know that Lithuania is being ruled from Moscow by the system of a puppet government. There are indications that deportation of Lithuanians is now proceeding on a large scale. Soviet police are cross-examining the entire population, and compiling lists of all men and women who do not sing the praises of communism for deportation to Siberia. No one is sure of their rights or their future. The people are simply frightened, and those who succeed in escaping abroad are considered lucky. The new wave of executions and deportations certainly dispels the myth of Soviet propaganda that 99 percent of the population once voted in the Soviet's favor. There are no valid arguments that would justify Soviet claims to Lithuania. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is under moral obligation not to seek territorial aggrandizement.

It is argued that small nations are not able to develop a sound economy and a decent standard of living within the framework of national independence. A look at Lithuania's record of 20 years of post-war independence will prove the contrary. Lithuania organized a successful agricultural economy on a sound cooperative basis. Her budget was uniformly balanced. There was no unemployment.

The people are convinced that the restoration of national independence is the only adequate compensation for the suffering of the people and the only sure remedy to raise Lithuania from the ruins left by war and aggression. The Lithuanian people reject the Moscow-made liberation. They demand the termination of the present Soviet domination, and they pray for the restoration of their country's independence. Lithuania bases her hopes for a happier future on moral law; she tenaciously clings to the idea that, after all, right and not might alone will rule the destinies of mankind.

ADDRESS OF ANTHONY A. OLIS, PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN LITHUANIAN MISSION

The American Lithuanian Mission is strictly an American organization. We are here as Americans who are proud of our Government, proud of our representatives in that Government, and we are particularly proud and grateful to the many United States Senators and Congressmen who honor us this evening by their presence. We also wish to thank the many members of the press and radio who are here tonight representing newspapers and broadcasting outlets from many parts of the United States.

These are critical days because of the war and we would not have imposed on your valuable time were not the purpose of this gathering related to the war effort and the winning of a permanent peace. We are concerned about the rights of small nations to self-determination after the war is won. We are concerned because it is our conviction that there cannot be a permanent peace unless people in both small and large nations are free from political as well as economic bondage.

Now, we understand that there are many problems to be solved and that the length of the war has increased the complexity of these problems. We understand also and we fully subscribe to America's foremost purpose that we must first win a military victory, but under the heavy pressure of the many burdens of war little time has been available for a restatement of the principles which guide us in this conflict. We say we want a permanent peace, but at the same time there has been a tendency to avoid discussion of the principles that should guide us to prevent aggression against small nations and to prevent the very causes which led us into the present war. There has been much talk in Washington that we will have to make concessions, that we will have to sacrifice certain principles, that some small nations and their innocent people are bound to get hurt in the setting up of our post-war world.

It is the view of the American Lithuanian mission that there is not only no need for making concessions or sacrifices of our principles but that it would be fatal to a permanent peace to do so, and it is with a sincere desire that we as American citizens, as constituents, have called this gathering this evening to voice our views to our representatives in our Government upon this vital war issue.

The Atlantic Charter, proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, sets forth that one of the principles for which we are fighting the enemy is the right of small nations to self-determination as independents. The charter states:

"Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

"Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In a speech on September 12, 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull reaffirmed these principles in declaring:

"All peoples who, with a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its enjoyment.

"Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

"All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs."

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania. The Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. However, from the earliest times the Lithuanian people had developed their own language similar to the ancient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions. They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. It is therefore not surprising that they desire independence as self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language—in short, their way of life.

During its days of independence since the last war, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind and by its progress in its economical and cultural life it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence. In light of the above it would seem therefore that on the basis of justice and right, and of the principles announced in the Atlantic Charter and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull there should be no question about the restoration of the independence of Lithuania and yet, though nearly everyone agreed that the rights of small nations must be protected in the post-war world, there is some hesitation on the part of some of our representatives in government to openly voice their support of these principles as to the Republic of Lithuania. They say: "What about Russia? Russia intends to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Lithuania was a part of Russia before the year 1918. Lithuania, they say, was torn away from Russia in the closing days of the last war when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution."

Well, the answer to that question is that historically Lithuania was not a part of Russia because if we go back to the fifteenth century in the days when Lithuania was a nation with borders from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, Russia was a part of Lithuania. Furthermore, it is not anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania deserves to be an independent nation because Russia has heretofore solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania.

These agreements were made, not at the time when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution but in the years when the Soviet Union had a strong government. On September 28, 1926, a nonaggression treaty, which is still in effect, was entered into between the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. This treaty was extended to December 31, 1945. The language of the following articles of said pact is as follows:

"Article 2: The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

"Article 3: Each of the two contracting parties undertake to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

"Article 5: Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions."

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual assistance pact; article 7 reads:

"The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state."

Soviet Russia is our ally and we have a full right to assume that our ally will keep its promises and its treaties and therefore it is not anti-Russian to take the position of the independent Lithuania which Russia solemnly agrees to respect in all circumstances by its treaty which by its terms is still in effect to December 31, 1945.

The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. Its position in this matter is that the Republic of Lithuania is an independent nation.

Americans of Lithuanian descent know from personal correspondence with their friends and relatives in Lithuania that the people of this little country do not want partial autonomy under the domination of any power whatsoever, but rather do they want the restoration of an independent Lithuania.

The Yalta Conference has suggested the manner and method by which small nations may elect a free and democratic government. Lithuania is one of the small nations which should have the same opportunity to have

a plebescite wherein candidates of all democratic parties in Lithuania may have the right to submit their candidacies to the electorate. The election should be under the supervision of an Allied commission with representatives of all of the three Allied Powers to assure an election free of outside interference.

These views are held by a large portion of the citizens of the United States and should be represented by delegates to the San Francisco Conference. If this is done and the principles heretofore voiced in the Atlantic Charter are supported in the San Francisco Conference and the peace conference to come after the war, the rights of small nations to self-determination will be protected and in this way aggression against the small nations will be prevented and a permanent peace will be assured.

Joint Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, March 16, 1945.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith copy of House Joint Resolution No. 10, as introduced by Representatives Berman, McCabe, Skyles, White, and Sullivan.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

House Joint Resolution 10

Whereas Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS has introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, providing for the establishment of a Commision to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; and

Whereas this memorial would symbolize the fundamental American spirit of tolerance and would perpetuate the unselfish idealism which prompted our forefathers to enunciate the doctrine of equality and which ever since has influenced our Nation's political concepts; and

Whereas it has been repeatedly demonstrated during the present international conflict, as well as in previous wars, that devotion to country is not the peculiar attribute of any particular creed but is common to all; and

Whereas a fitting tribute to the memory of those who so nobly have championed the cause of democracy and the dignity of the individual against the hate-inspired forces of totalitarian bigotry and greed should be erected to proclaim for all time our belief in the brotherhood of all men: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we endorse the proposal contained in Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be delivered to each Member of Congress from Illinois.

Adopted by the house, January 30, 1945.
HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representavites.
FRED W. RIEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, March 13, 1945.
HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Future Government of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on other occasions I have spoken in the House in behalf of the people of Poland. They were the first to offer organized resistance to the Nazi military forces. Their men have fought heroically in the armies of Great Britain, Russia, France, and the United States since their country was overwhelmed.

Today the United Nations are endeavoring to determine a peace formula which will insure military and economic security for all the peoples of the world for generations to come. Most Americans desire that the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter in August 1941 be the bases for such treaty or treaties as may determine the relations between nations after the present war. In previous speeches on this subject, I have told you of my views and I have urged that the final determination of the future government of Poland and of the future boundaries of Poland be based upon the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In view of the message sent to Congress by President Roosevelt on August 21, 1941, and deposited in the files of the Clerk of this House, it is difficult to understand why both Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt have sought to disclaim the authenticity of the Atlantic Charter and to abandon it as a joint declaration on their part of the principles to be followed by them in seeking a just and equitable world arrangement after the war.

It is significant to note that the people of the United States have accepted the Atlantic Charter as a formal declaration by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill of principles to be followed by the representatives of Great Britain and the United States in any treaty negotiations. The people of Massachusetts desire that the problems of Poland shall be solved by application of the cardinal principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. In resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and memorializing the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government, the members of the senate and the house of representatives have expressed their concern over present conditions in Europe. They call attention to the fact that the territorial boundary lines of the European nations are a matter of universal concern. They express the view that boundaries should be subject to determination by conferences of all the United Nations rather than through the decision of one, two, or three individuals even though they are the heads of governments.

These resolutions, contained in a memorial to Congress, come at a significant time since the people of Poland apparently will be refused representation at the conference in San Francisco which will commence next month. The General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Members of Congress to take such action as may be necessary to insure unto the people of all small nations all of the rights and privileges enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

I believe that these resolutions which have been set forth in full on page 2519 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1945, are worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress.

Naval Officer Comments on Proposal To Establish West Point for Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in the October issue of the Coronet magazine, an article, written by me, was published entitled "Why Not a West Point for Diplomats?"

The proposal set forth in the article evoked much comment from men in the armed services. Among the most interesting of the thousands of letters received by me was one from a naval officer, whose name I will hold in confidence.

I commend the reading of this letter to those interested in the State Department and the need for its improvement.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1945.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: I have just read your most interesting article in Coronet Magazine, titled "Why Not a West Point for Diplomats."

As a former employee of the Department of State (8 years), a former aspirant for a commission as a career—Foreign Service officer—and above all as an American intensely interested in the well being of his beloved country and in international affairs, I most heartily endorse your views.

It is my earnest hope to corroborate at least to some small degree, from actual first hand observation and experience some of the main reasons why this institution suggested by yourself should be established.

Before I cite actual examples, let me explain that I am not seeking a Foreign Service career, nor do I have any axe to grind over seeming past failures, but only an honest desire to see that this Nation establish the most enlightened diplomatic corps under the sun.

In the first instance I will cite briefly my own experiences in quest of a Foreign Service appointment, which will illustrate the difficulties confronting the average applicant under the prevailing system.

I transferred from the United States immigration border patrol at El Paso, Tex., to the diplomatic mail section, United States Department of State, Washington, D. C., in June 1930, in accordance with civil-service regulations, at a substantial financial sacrifice, for the sole purpose of attending Crawfords' Foreign Service School, in preparation for a diplomatic and consular career. This school had been highly recommended to me by consular officers on the Mexican border. Moreover, fellow students with master's degrees from Georgetown foreign-service school, Georgetown University, and other outstanding universities have since told me that they actually learned more about foreign service in 5½ months at this school than they had acquired in 5 years at the foregoing institutions. Mr. Angus McDermott Crawford has since passed on, but for your information he was a former college professor and Foreign Service officer.

The tuition at the above-mentioned school amounted to $75 per month. Practically the whole group attending this institution, with the possible exception of myself, were the sons and daughters of Foreign Service officers, Army, Navy, or Marine Corps officers, relatives of high-ranking politicians, and in general of considerable wealth, some students being worth $3,000,000 to $10,000,000 in their own right, but all seeking a $2,500 per year position.

The Foreign Service examinations were conducted for the Department of State by the Civil Service Commission semiannually to fill approximately 30 to 35 billets. The papers were later farmed out to various colleges and universities for grading. On the two entrance examinations which I took, fully 99 percent of the appointees were selected from the group referred to in the preceding paragraph, and in no instance was the son of Foreign Service officer, Army, Navy, or Marine Corps officer rejected. Nor do I recall any graduates from a certain university failing. There were a number of young women found disqualified for reasons described on a subsequent page, and a small number of wealthy or political proteges, members of the party out of power, that failed to receive an appointment, all of which illustrates that candidates possessing ability and merit alone, without political prestige, wealth, or relationship were barred by a closed door.

The examinations were divided into three phases, consisting of a written examination lasting 3 days, covering a wide variety of subjects, such as international, maritime, and commercial law; political economy; world history; economic geography; language and arithmetic (mainly foreign exchange and bookkeeping) and others. Next was the oral language examination. The final hurdle consisted of an oral examination conducted by a board of five members, headed by the then Assistant Secretary of State Wilbur Carr (since deceased), and included a representative from the Civil Service Commission. In order to receive an appointment, you were required to attain an average of 80 on all three examinations. Consequently, if the board did not vote in your favor, you were automatically given a stock mark of 60 on the oral examination, thereby necessitating an impossible average of 100 percent on the other two examinations. Needless to say, I was awarded the standard mark of 60, even though I answered correctly every question propounded by the board.

Since I was employed by the Department of State, I made no effort to obtain political endorsement; in fact, it was understood that the Department frowned upon such procedure, but when I discovered that my name was not included in the list of successful candidates I requested a friend high up in political circles to ascertain from Assistant Secretary Carr, the reason for my failure of appointment. I was not given an answer but my friend was told to inform me to take the next examination in the fall of 1931, which I did. I received an 80.59 on my written examination which was graded by various college professors throughout the Nation, and an 89 on my oral Spanish, from a Foreign Service officer who had attended the University of Mexico and was a specialist on languages, but again to no avail.

I was naturally anxious to discover the reason for the second defeat especially after having been advised to take the examination a second time, so that I might correct any faults or traits of character, and although I was employed in the same Department and in the same building, Assistant Secretary Carr was so inaccessible that it required 4 years to obtain an interview with him, which even then had to be arranged by a friend outside of the Department.

During the interview Mr. Carr averred that it was the lack of academic training although I had graduated from high school, completed two business colleges, two naval aviation schools (one with flight training in balloons), one Spanish school, and Crawford's Foreign Service School. However, Mr. Carr was instrumental in placing me in a better position in the Department, where I was reviewing, editing, censoring, and grading reports submitted by Foreign Service officers on commercial, economic, and political matters. Many of these officers had attained the rank of class I Foreign Service officer, with salaries of $10,000 per year, although my salary was $2,000 per annum. In addition, he, the Assistant Secretary, later recommended me for admission to the United States district court and United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, upon graduation from law college and passing of the bar examinations, and I was admitted to those courts and later the United States Supreme Court.

The wide disparity and contrast between the procedure following by the oral examining board in the case of unsuccessful and successful applicants can best be shown by a few examples. For instance, the board discovered that one young man had the same name and was a collateral descendant of a famous American, and although he had only averaged 75 on the written and oral language examinations, he was given a 95 on the oral examination just to make certain that he would pass. This same individual was shortly thereafter serving as "chargé d'affaires" ad interim in a friendly nation to the south of us, in the absence of the Ambassador who was on leave in Paris, when a political defeat at the polls caused an uprising ,and this young man picked the "wrong horse," thereby estranging this Nation from its oldest and best friend south of the border, until the Ambassador could return to his post and repair the damage done.

One of my fellow students worth $3,000,000, who married the daughter of a minister representing a foreign nation at Washington, came to me a week before the written examination was held and requested the loan of my notes consisting of 650 typewritten pages, in order to have them copied by a public stenographer. The Under Secretary of State at the time was a fellow alumnus of Harvard with my friend, and told the minister's wife (my friend's mother-in-law) that they wouldn't be able to appoint her son-in-law at that time, but they would in the next group some 6 months hence. Needless to say he was appointed. This same friend later told me that he wouldn't have passed the examination without my notes, and when he returned the notes he sent me a check for $40.

Another fellow student, a Harvard graduate and Rhodes scholar worth $10,000,000 was dining regularly with an Assistant Secretary of State and other high dignitaries, and naturally he received an appointment, but was later released from the service for trying to promote a barter system between this country and one of our neighbors.

Still another member of my class, the son of an Army officer, was informed that he had failed both the oral and physical examinations. He immediately contacted the protégé of a certain western Senator, a powerful member of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, and told him of his misfortune. The protégé notified the Senator, who was back with his constituency, whereupon the Senator called the State Department by long distance telephone and threatened to denounce the whole affair on the floor of the Senate if the young man was not appointed. Apologies and an appointment followed shortly thereafter.

Notwithstanding the fact that there were a number of very intelligent young ladies in my class, including the niece of a former Vice President of the United States, and a daughter of America's outstanding Air Corps general and prophet, among others, they were all denied appointment, simply because one of our two lady "Foreign Service officers" had married a British vice consul at Bagdad just prior to the examination. It is common knowledge that a considerable percentage of our male diplomats are married to foreigners. In passing, the futility of women seeking appointment to the Foreign Service is best illustrated by one of the questions asked one of the young women by the oral examining board, to wit, "Do you think that women can do anything that men can do?" Upon an affirmative reply, the interrogator said, "Well, why didn't you attend West Point?"

While admittedly these are only a few isolated instances, which could be multiplied, nevertheless they do present some idea of the system involved in the selection of career Foreign Service officers.

In addition there are numerous instances where former automobile manufacturers, meat packers, and other magnates have been appointed ambassadors and ministers direct from civilian life, without training or experience, allegedly for a consideration, namely a contribution to the slush fund of the party in power (reputedly running as high as $150,000 for an ambassadorship), be it Democrat or Republican. In fact, one such individual was appointed to a Central American nation, and he had the misfortune to run into a native oxcart, thereby damaging the oxcart to the extent of $3.50, and notwithstanding the fact that the accident was solely the fault of the American Minister, he requested reimbursement from the State Department for damage to the oxcart, because the accident occurred in the line of duty.

The fallacy of the present system of selection, which relies almost entirely upon obtaining its foreign-service representatives from the wealthy, aristocratic, political patronage group, etc., rather than a cross-section of all classes, suggested by yourself, is in my opinion, that the majority of this group does not truly represent nor reflect the American people as a nation. Hence, the misconceptions formed about us by other nations.

Let it be thoroughly understood that I have no individual battle to fight nor quarrel to pick with any class or group of people, as I have friends in all classes, but I do strongly

feel that the selection of Foreign Service career personnel should include all red-blooded Americans, and not just a select few. In other words the same opportunities would remain as before, to worthy and meritorious individuals of wealth or social position, based upon their ability, but not to a discriminatory or exclusionary degree.

I had an opportunity to attend an address given by Assistant Secretary Carr before the Foreign Service School of George Washington University, Washington, D. C. During the questions-and-answers period, he was asked, "Is it essential to have a private income in order to serve in the Foreign Service?" The reply was an immediate "yes," which might shed some light on the policy motivating the selection of Foreign Service applicants. However, I have not seen nor heard of any requests by State Department officials to correct such a situation, if it does exist, possibly because it might upset the status quo on the method of appointments. As a taxpayer I am in sympathy with a sound national economy, but if an investigation by the proper congressional committees should disclose the necessity for a revised wage scale to accomplish the desired results envisaged in your suggestion, and thereby eliminate personal fortunes as a prerequisite for appointment in favor of recruiting only the best available talent to promote a more thorough understanding between nations and thereby aid in the maintenance of the peace of the world, then I feel that such a request would receive the hearty approval of the Congress and of the American people. The careless or inexperienced handling of a simple problem has been known to cause serious misunderstandings between nations.

According to your learned article in Coronet magazine the graduate of the proposed Foreign Service Academy will speak the language of the country to which he or she is assigned as fluently as he or she speaks English. This suggestion is both commendable and desirable. Unfortunately, for some mysterious reason, it has not been the policy of the Department of State in the past, with the exception of Foreign Service officers assigned to China or Japan, where they are designated language students in most instances and left in the Orient for 10 years. For example, in many cases, a fluent Spanish student has been assigned to France, Germany, Turkey, etc., although there are 19 Spanish-speaking nations in the world. By the same token French students have been sent to Holland, Yugoslavia, South America, and so on ad infinitum.

Such an unenlightened policy has resulted in a wastage of linguistic talent. The only way to speak a language is to think in that language, which requires constant usage and practice to maintain fluency. In other words, it would appear that there is an inane fear on the part of the Department, that if our Foreign Service officers are specially trained in the language of the nation to which they are assigned, that they might enter into a conspiracy or collusion because of that knowledge. In this same connection reliance upon interpreters is not desirable, because you run the risk of being misquoted or receiving an erroneous interpretation due to possible inability or deliberate misinterpretation on the part of the interpreter.

One other item of interest is that under normal peacetime conditions there was a continuous transfer of Foreign Service personnel throughout the world—apparently seeing the world at the taxpayers' expense. However, I feel sure that your proposal will effectively eliminate this condition by assigning personnel to a specific area in conformity with their specialized training.

In conclusion it is, indeed, gratifying in these days of seeming darkness and chaos as the result of years of diplomatic bungling, to see an article so clearly expounded, based on reason and logic, on a subject so vital to us all. It is my sincere hope that your proposal will receive the widespread publicity and careful consideration from every thinking American, to which it is so justly entitled, thereby culminating in the creation of a Foreign Service academy for the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,

Lieutenant Commander, U. S. N. R.

Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 23, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Frank T. Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and which is an answer to recent criticism leveled at the manner in which the life insurance for veterans has been handled.

General Hines' letter is as follows:

MARCH 15, 1945.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: Response is made to your letter of March 5, 1945, enclosing copy of editorial from a newspaper published in your congressional district on the subject Insurance requesting my comment on the statements made therein and stating that you desire to use my reply for publication.

The editorial cites no authority, but some of the statements contained in it are not correct. It is not true that the Veterans' Administration is doing nothing "to correct the handling of Government life insurance for the members of the armed forces and their families," nor is it true that "the system is rapidly bogging down." The editorial as a whole obviously gives a false impression as to the manner in which national service life insurance is being administered by the Veterans' Administration.

It is the established policy of the Veterans' Administration to effect settlement of claims for death benefits arising out of the deaths of the holders of national service life insurance certificates as rapidly as possible. In the cases of men dying in service, action is taken as soon as an official report of death is received from the service department. In the cases of men dying after discharge, action is taken as soon as notice of death is received from a responsible source. In each case a form letter is dispatched to the beneficiary advising as to the manner of perfecting claim and enclosing necessary forms. When claims properly executed are returned to the Veterans' Administration they are adjudicated in order of receipt. Contrary to public belief there is no red tape involved in the settlement of these claims. On the contrary, requirements have been reduced to an absolute minimum. For example, under the law the beneficiaries of national service life insurance certificates are restricted to a limited claim and the amount of benefits paid to beneficiaries is dependent upon his or her age on the date of the insured's death. Because of these requirements of the law the Veterans' Administration might properly insist in every case upon submission by the beneficiary of proof of relationship and proof of age. Because of the tremendous volume of the work and the realization that such proofs might not in many cases be readily available, the Veterans' Administration accepts in every case beneficiary's own statement as to age, and in all except a few doubtful cases beneficiary's own statement as to relationship, subject to later submission within a reasonable period of the required proofs. Settlements are authorized upon these statements, and in no single case have payments been suspended because of a failure to submit proofs of age and relationship. This policy, which I believe you will concede is a very liberal one, has met with the approval of the beneficiaries and has proven very effective.

As of the close of business March 10, 1945, the Veterans' Administration had received 247,605 claims for national service life insurance death claims. Of these it had allowed 223,095, disallowed 5,345 and there were pending settlement 19,153. Since the beginning of the calendar year 1945, settlements have been effected at a rate in excess of 900 a day. It will, therefore, be immediately realized that the entire pending load represents a turnover of about 3 weeks' work. This would hardly indicate that the Veterans' Administration has done nothing in the matter of handling claims for national service life insurance benefits nor that its system is bogging down.

I must frankly admit that claims are not being disposed of with the dispatch that I would desire but that has been occasioned by the difficulty that has been experienced in obtaining personnel due to the prevailing serious manpower shortage. However, in this regard I can assure you that I am exerting every effort with the purpose of expediting action to the greatest possible extent the situation permits.

I shall be pleased to furnish such further information on this subject as you may desire. The copy of the editorial is returned as requested.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

The Bright Future of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered Monday last, March 12, in Madison Square Garden, New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are winning the war. We are not only going to win the peace, we are already winning it. One of the pillars of that peace and of future prosperity as well, is the World Labor Congress, to which, led by your delegation to the London conference, you have already made so great a contribution.

Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace, has said that we are entering upon the "century of the common man." He might have

said "the working man is coming into his own in the world." Organized labor has had its own great part in that victory. It is going to have yet a greater part in greater victories which lie just over the horizon. So are agriculture, and industry, and science, and education, and art, and health coming into their own with great and growing power in the coming new world. We must have not less, therefore, but more such world working-together of the people themselves through their respective organizations and associations.

There has been a great deal of talk lately about what voting procedures should prevail in the security council of the United Nations organization which will be established in San Francisco next month. I do not believe that we can minimize the importance of the attempts of our Government representatives to find a voting formula that will in truth facilitate the terribly important task of maintaining the peace of the world.

Yet, isn't it a fact that world peace depends far more on the trust and confidence and friendship that the governments and peoples of the world repose in each other than in any mechanical voting device however perfectly conceived?

Our governments have been cooperating. They have led the way in building the trust and confidence and good will that is so necessary for our future well-being. At each meeting and conference, our great United Nations leaders, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, have strengthened the ties that bind all peace-loving peoples together in our common task. They have not permitted isolationists and defeatists to divert them from their work. They have been able to proceed as they have because they know that the people in their own countries and in all the United Nations will support them in the great undertaking they have begun.

But Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin would be the first to acknowledge that it is not enough that governments alone cooperate to win a war and build an enduring peace. To complete the job that has been so well started, they must have the united articulate support of all of their peoples and of all groups within the population, whether they are workers, farmers, or business and professional men and women.

To me the deep significance of the London conference of trade union representatives is that it is the first step taken by a major nongovernmental group to cement relations among the peoples themselves, to give form and expression to the profound desire of the common people in all parts of the world for a United Nations victory and a United Nations peace, and to provide the basic support that is so essential to the success of our governments in their efforts.

It is heartening to know that labor throughout the world has accepted its responsibility and has taken the lead in building the peace just as it has played so splendid a role in assuring victory by its magnificent record on the production front. Thus the London labor conference has strengthened the unity of the people of the world for victory and peace.

You are to be congratulated for having provided at the London Labor Conference for the greatest labor organization the world has ever seen—the world labor congress. Let us look forward also to a world business congress, a world agricultural congress, a world scientific congress, a world cultural congress, a world congress on health, which shall also forge hands across the seas into a world understanding and cooperation to preserve the peace and promote the welfare of all the people of the world, just as did this great labor conference.

Indeed, what could better assure the peaceful and profitable living together of all peoples than for the workers of the world, the farmers of the world, the businessmen of the world, the artists and scientists of the world, the people in all the many vocations, to make worldwide their own organizations and constantly working together for both the world and the individual welfare. We may ask if there may not be one day held in some fitting place a congress of congresses, made up of representatives of all the many world-wide organizations. Such a congress would be truly not a congress of governments, but a congress of people in their private capacities, knitting together tens of millions of people and building mightier and grander edifices of human security and satisfaction than man has ever seen.

It is indeed in the deliberations of a world labor congress and of congresses of business and agriculture and others that our hope of an enduring peace lies. The unity and determination thus forged will be our guaranty that our Governments may proceed with confidence to build a United Nations organization. They will be our guaranty that this time the peace will be kept; this time the people of the world will be given the opportunity to build the kind of world they want their children to inherit.

We all see now that as much as a police force is necessary to keeping world peace through an international organization, that alone cannot maintain peace. We must strike at the causes of wars and remove them if we are to have a real peace. There must be, therefore, effective international machinery through which wronged nations and people may seek and obtain redress. And there must be effective tribunals through which the righting of wrong may be assured.

But even this is not all—there must be established the instrumentalities through which the general welfare of the nations and the people of the world shall be promoted. That means that the health, the education, the standards of living of people in any part of the world is the concern of the people in all parts of the world. For we now know also that the economic well-being of any nation is to a very large degree tied to the well-being of other nations. We can no more have isolated prosperity in one nation than we can have isolated prosperity in one American State.

We see the recognition of these principles in the wise policies of our President, the President whom you so much helped to elect—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—providing in the Atlantic Charter that the principal objective of nations today is the welfare of the individual man, woman, and child; providing in the Bretton Woods agreement the real foundation of international economic well-being through an international stabilization fund and an international bank; providing in the Dumbarton Oaks Charter, among other things, a social and economic council, the function of which it will be to improve the conditions of life of the people of the world.

You know that under this social and economic council provision is made for an international labor organization, an international monetary fund, an international bank, an international food and agricultural organization, and other social, economic, and humanitarian agencies which shall from time to time spring up to meet the challenging economic and social problems of the postwar world. It is not too much to say that this social and economic council in its direct and indirect functioning can do more to keep world peace even than an international police force.

I know that those who shall direct this social and economic council will seek the constant guidance and help of such international associations as the World Labor Congress and other international organizations, the members of which shall be seeking to serve, not only their separate interests but the interests of mankind.

There is truly world understanding and cooperation in the hearts of men today—not just on their lips; otherwise, how do you account for the fact that the London Labor Conference and the great Conference at Yalta, without any communication one with the other, arrived at almost the same conclusions?

The agreement arrived at in London, worked out in many languages, is a new dedication of mankind to democracy and to the whole principle of the brotherhood of man. Here, truly, was the preview of San Francisco, and it came from the source which must be the real security of any effective world organization—not the governments of the world but the people of the world. It embodied the sentiment of the Atlantic Charter that the aim of all government is the health, the safety, the security, the well-being of the family and individual man, woman, and child. It recognizes what the foolish seem never to learn, that the strength of the people is the strength of the state and the world.

We all must be encouraged to see all that is being done now to keep the dead and the maimed and the dead-minded from having given themselves in vain in this war. Just let your mind rush back 3½ years, and you will see the towering mileposts of the future world—the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration, the Moscow Conference, the Fulbright resolution, the Connally resolution, Teheran, the London Education Conference, the Atlantic City U. N. R. R. A. Conference, the Hot Springs Food Conference, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, the International Air Conference in Chicago, Yalta, the London Labor Conference, the Chapultepec Conference, and, on the horizon, San Francisco. Is it not significant and satisfying that so many of those conferences have met in the New World? At last the United States has marched into the leadership of international working together. God helping us, we shall never turn back nor falter.

We have learned now that isolation is a false god and that the faith of isolationism leads only to damnation. The America of today is the America of vision and faith and courage. We have cut ourselves loose from all moorings which have bound us to any policy inconsistent with our strength and obligation to ourselves and to our fellowmen. We are today committed to sink or swim, to survive or perish, to live or die, with the decent God-fearing people of the earth.

I say that is the course of America. I mean that is the sentiment that is in the minds and hearts of the people of this great Nation. Whether it shall be in the mouths and in the votes of the politicians is yet to be decided. That will depend upon how determined the people are that they shall not let false prophets be their spokesmen; upon how strongly the people are determined that they shall not let their sons and substance be squandered on the orgy of war again. That depends upon how strongly the people will it that their governments shall truly speak the sentiments of humanity which today echo from human heart to human heart all over the earth. Whether we shall go on to the promised land of the future will be determined by whether the future world is to belong to the people or to somebody else.

Yet you will see that there are today strong forces striving to delay and eventually to defeat the progress we have made in setting up the many instruments of international collaboration. When the issue is only political collaboration among nations, the opposition is pretty much confined to the isolationists. But, when the instrument we seek to set up for the world working together has economic significance, such as the British-American Oil Agreement, Bretton Woods, or the Chicago Air Conference,

then private interests are touched and there spring into the opposition, not only the champions of the private interests affected, but also the economic conservatives and reactionaries who oppose the general welfare of the world as they do the general welfare of the people of the Nation. When they thus mistakenly and shortsightedly press their opposition to the specific measures needed to implement the peace, they also undermine the peace and prosperity of all, and to that extent if they but knew it, they are working against their own welfare and are undermining the authority of their own power. Every man and woman, therefore, who really seeks peace and prosperity in the Nation and in the world, must rise up as a militant warrior to protect and promote every part of this great international program to preserve the peace and promote the well-being of mankind which has been worked out. Do not be deceived nor divided nor delayed by the blind who cannot see or the selfish who will not see.

It is said that there is a Chinese symbol for the word "crisis" which has a double meaning—one meaning is danger, the other opportunity. Only the foolish person would say we are out of danger. Rivers of tears are yet to flow from loving eyes, unspeakable anguish is yet to be wrung from broken hearts and over all the earth is yet to be strewn the wreckage of death and devastation.

Yet, who has ever seen such vistas of opportunity? Such hope for the heart? So many old dreams within realization as now? Surely wide is the gate and broad is the way to the future. If we but under the canopy of peace, mobilize for the service and the satisfaction of mankind the immeasurable facilities and capacities which have been mobilized for war—if we will but achieve it, we can make the old nursery rhyme come true: "The world is so full of a number of things I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings."

And, labor will have its right dignity everywhere in the world because the personality of man will have its own respected integrity.

If there are any who are yet of little faith, any who sit in the scorner's seat and hurl the cynic's ban, let them lift up their eyes and scan the range of history and see the sequence and continuity of this struggle of man for brotherhood and for betterment. From the sparse settlements where man burst into consciousness, across rivers and oceans and mountains and deserts, through forests, men have come together and larger and larger have become the social units, until today we see single nations of hundreds of millions of citizens proud of their identity one with another. We see great commonwealths which are one in spirit and sentiment, though vast oceans keep them physically apart. We see almost our whole hemisphere united in aspiration and purpose. Now we see the crowning glory of the edifice of the world when nations are knitted together by a magnificent world-wide organization with faith in the future. And we see the strong foundations of such an order in the World Labor Congress, and in the congresses of business and agriculture and the arts and all the other organizations of world-reach, yet to come into full birth.

Yes, we, even me, to whom the future not so long ago seemed so dreary, shall live to see Tennyson's dream come true:

"Far along the world-wide whisper of the southwind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder storm;
Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

Conscientious Objectors Create Serious Situation That Must Be Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to join my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] in calling upon the Director of Selective Service to take immediate steps to correct deplorable conditions that have been permitted to exist at a camp for conscientious objectors at Germfask, Mich.

These conditions, which could easily lead to a serious situation in northern Michigan, are well described in the following statement made by Charles J. Gray, department commander of the American Legion, at a recent meeting of the executive committee, Department of Michigan:

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT COMMANDER CONCERNING GERMFASK CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS CAMP

At the request of authorities in Washington who have a conscientious objectors camp under control, last November while in Indianapolis at a meeting of the department commanders and adjutants, I was requested that if, at any time, I should be in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, I would visit the conscientious objectors at Germfask, Mich.

On January 25, when on a tour of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, I visited that camp with others of the Legion who were interested in the situation, including Harvey Quick, district committeeman from the upper Eleventh District at Manistique.

In the interim between November and January, I had received various reports including one from the prosecuting attorney of the county in which Germfask is located advising me that he had brought to the attention of Selective Service the fact that the situation there was entirely out of hand but that he had received no assurance that these conditions would be cleaned up. In addition to that, the cities of Newberry, Mich., and Manistique, Mich., had brought to my attention on several occasions the deplorable conditions in that camp and had made various reports in regard to the situation including one, that these boys had even gone into the churches of Manistique and accosted the women and girls there.

So, on January 25, as I say, I visited the camp. I found a camp foreman and one cook as the only employees of that camp with two additional men as foremen allotted to the Seney wildlife project and I visited with all four of them. They took me on a tour of the camp. In barracks No. 1, the condition was not too bad. It was composed largely of the conscientious religious objectors. The barracks was in fair condition but nothing to brag about. It was really below standard.

We passed on to barracks No. 2 and there we found the filthiest camp that I had ever seen. The majority of the men were in bed. The floor of the barracks was filthy and had not been cleaned apparently since the men had been sent to Germfask. There was exhibited on a table all subversive activities that you could think of and the general attitude of those to whom we talked with was that the Selective Service Act was unconstitutional There were men there who were college graduates who wanted to argue that point and there were men in there that had lawbooks and other accessories. In the far end of the hall was an elaborate electric set-up where the men used the quarters for their poker parties at night. The report of the foreman was that they had no power to shut off the lights, and if they did, there would be trouble and that when these men got hungry, they would break the lock on the refrigerator containing supplies for the morning breakfast. If they did not find what they wanted in there, they would go to the larger refrigerator stationed in camp quarters, break the lock and take the food they wanted.

In the kitchen quarters, everything was more or less filthy and anybody that attempted to clean up was reported as beaten up. So, as a result, the kitchen was in a filthy condition. In addition to that, a certain body of the men would take food that was prepared by the cook for breakfast and, without any reason, would throw it out in the snow.

The medical situation was one in which the medical officer appeared in camp every other day and the moment he was gone they all reported to one of their members who was in charge of that office, again reporting on sick call. One, in particular, attracted my attention. A man said he was allergic to blizzards and other equally frivolous diagnosis

As far as the woods detail was concerned, the foreman said that they would get out as much wood as they needed for their own purposes but if anybody got too energetic, he, too, got in trouble.

In my judgment, the majority of these men who have been assigned to conscientious objectors' camps did not belong in that classification. They took advantage of the situation by absenting themselves for days at a time, on frequent occasions from 4 to 9 days, and as long as they did not exceed the 10-day limit they could not be picked up by the F. B. I.

There was also a representative in camp who had the means to provide a $2,500 bond for men who did exceed the 10 days when they became subject to F. B. I. control.

The general attitude of the camp was distinctly poor and it is a blow on the State of Michigan to have any such camp in its midst. Reporters have gone up there and verified the situation. So far, although almost 2 months have elapsed, no report has been made to the American Legion through its authorities as to what corrective measures have been taken to control this situation. It is perfectly obvious that one camp foreman who is the only man left at the camp at nighttime cannot control this situation. He has had no police power and on one occasion they have gone to him and slugged him.

I do not believe, as commander of the American Legion Department of Michigan, that Selective Service or anybody else can be cognizant of such a condition and allow it to continue. I am asking that immediate steps be made to correct these various delinquencies by men who are supposed to be under supervision. We want police supervision for this camp so that it may be made healthier than it is at present and not the cesspool for the delinquents from other camps.

CHARLES J. GRAY,
Department Commander, the American Legion, Department of Michigan.
MARCH 17, 1945.

Following Commander Gray's statement the executive committee unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the United States Government has established at Germfask, Mich., a camp for conscientious objectors, so classified by the Selective Service System; and

Whereas there have been sent to this camp conscientious objectors from various States

who by their character and attitude have been problem cases in other camps; and

Whereas the accompanying report by the department commander of the American Legion, Department of Michigan, reveals conditions in the Germfask camp which are not only deplorable but which constitute a national disgrace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the department executive committee of the American Legion condemns this as un-American, unpatriotic, and, in the biggest sense, dangerous to the public morale and war effort of this Nation and urges immediate investigation and proper action to correct the conditions revealed in the accompanying report; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and the report attached be sent to the Governor of Michigan, each Senator and Representative from this State in the Congress of the United States, and to the Director of Selective Service, press, and radio, including Walter Winchell and Ernie Pyle, as representatives thereof.

Labor Against Proposed Twenty-second Amendment Sponsored by Fascist Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while reading some of the arguments expounded by a proponent of the proposed twenty-second amendment which would repeal the sixteenth amendment to our Federal Constitution and limit the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances to 25 percent, I came across the following:

Workingmen would be hurt more than any other class by any tax system that depletes capital or unduly retards its accumulation. I believe in individualism, rugged individualism, but not ruthless individualism. Any man so imbued with the laissez-faire doctrine that he would not prevent the abuse of concentrated capital is public enemy No. 1, and any man who through high taxation or outright confiscation would unduly slow down or prevent the accumulation of capital is labor enemy No. 1.

I miss my guess if within 10 years all forward-looking labor leaders, having the best interests of labor and the country at heart, will not take a leading part in the inevitable movement for the outright repeal of the income tax amendment, or at least in some drastic modification that will limit the power of the Federal Government to levy destructive and unconscionable taxes. Income and inheritance taxes are an alien importation.

That is one of the many weak arguments which have been directed by the proponents of the proposed amendment to the laboring man. They would have him believe that it would be to his best advantage, even at the cost of raising his own personal income tax, to enable certain people to accumulate great masses of wealth. This accumulation of wealth would be accomplished by a drastic curtailment on income taxes on high incomes while it was being made—and also a drastic curtailment of taxes to permit its being transferred from one generation to another with a minimum shrinkage and also through a drastic curtailment of taxes while these accumulations were being juggled around as gifts to further gain tax advantages.

And how is labor taking these arguments? I believe that question can best be answered by the articles and editorials which have appeared in many of the labor periodicals. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the RECORD a splendid example of labor's answer. This is an editorial by Mr. J. J. Guenther, president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor which appeared in The Unionist of February 16, official newspaper of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor.

Incidentally, I might call your attention to the fact that the standard 25 percent limit proposed by the proponents has been upped to 30 percent in the proposal as submitted to the Nebraska Legislature. I have an idea that the proponents are fully aware by now that there is no chance whatever of foisting upon the public the ridiculous proposal they have been advocating and are now backing water, anxious and willing to make what they believe are concessions and salvage what they can from the tremendous investment in both time and money which they now have in this plot.

Mr. Guenther's editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

(By J. J. Guenther, president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor)

This article proposes to discuss as dispassionately as possible, not a pending bill before the State legislature, but Resolution No. 5 introduced on January 29, 1945. Since that date this resolution has laid dormant and we wish that it would cointinue to maintain that status. But because that has occurred in several other State legislatures until the closing days of their sessions and then when there was haste to adjourn it was quietly raised and passed we have chosen to point out the viciousness of this resolution and to ask you to study the same and make your objections known thereto.

The rules of the Nebraska Legislature provide "Rule 16, resolutions, section 2. Resolutions proposing constitutional amendments, granting money, or requiring Governor's approval: Consideration and adoption. Resolutions which propose amendments to the State constitution, propose the ratification of amendments to the Federal Constitution, provide for the grant of money out of the contingent or any other fund or require the approval of the Governor, shall be considered and adopted in the same manner as billls. (Const. art III, secs. 13, 14, art. XVI, sec. 1.)"

This rule provides the same safeguards about Resolution No. 5 as is provided relative to any proposed legislative bill. It means that this resolution, because of its nature, must come up for a committee hearing before being introduced onto the floor of the unicameral. Thus, opportunity is afforded to all who oppose such legislation to voice their opposition to the committee. Because it is our belief that such opposition should be voiced we ask all of the citizens of Nebraska to carefully study this resolution and become fully informed as to its intents and purposes. The Resolution No. 5 quoted in full follows:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"Whereas excessive Federal taxes threaten to absorb the revenues necessary to the operation of State and local government; and

"Whereas the legislatures of a number of States have become interested in a cal' by Congress for a convention for the purpose of proposing ar amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nebraska believes it to be for the best interest of the people of the United States and of Nebraska that such an amendment be adopted: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on with respect to or measured by income, however, shall not exceed 30 percent. In the event that the United States shall be engaged in a war which creates a national emergency so grave as to necessitate such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress, by a vote of three-fourths of each House, may, while the United States is so engaged, suspend, for periods not exceeding 1 year each, such limitation with respect to income subsequently accruing or received; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby, is requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

Following our oft-repeated statement that we will not indulge in personalitits, we do not name the introducer of this resolution. Further than that we will state for the record we do not hold the introducer responsible for the content of the resolution. It has been and is our contention that the Senators in the Unicameral are here as the representatives of their constituents, both majority and minority members, that it is not for them to finally determine when requested to introduce either legislation or resolutions as to the need or lack of need for the same. That final determination rests upon the legislative body as a whole after the resolution or legislation has been introduced and considered. We ask you to consider the merits of this resolution in the same light. Is it for or against the best interests of Nebraska and the United States that this resolution be concurred in by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska?

We submit the following information: The chief national sponsors of this legislation appear to be the Committee for Constitutional

Government and the American Taxpayers Association.

Sixteen State legislatures have already adopted similar resolutions. We say similar resolutions, for like all such legislation sponsored by the above-cited organizations and similar ones, such as the Christian-American, etc., the wording of the various resolutions submitted varies slightly but their effect is cumulatively the same. For instance the Nebraska resolution says 30 percent while several other States, 25 percent; while the State of Massachusetts in its resolution proposes that additional revenue not be raised by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increases of rates of estate and gift taxes. Of the 16 States whose legislatures passed the resolution, we would also state that the Governor of Pennsylvania vetoed that State's resolution as did also the Governor of Indiana.

The Treasury Department of the United States was asked to make an analysis of this amendment as proposed in this resolution. We quote verbatim from the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department:

The credit of the Federal Government rests on its power to levy taxes to discharge debts—and on the fact that several times in the Nation's history this power has been used to bring about a rapid reduction of the national debt. Under the proposed 25-percent limitation * * * (Note that the Nebraska resolution makes this 30 percent; why?) parenthesis ours * * * the Federal tax powers would not permit getting revenues at all above the level of expenditures in a year of prosperity. In fact, the limitation would have very much the effect of a constitutional prohibition on reducing the national debt. For emergencies, unless they involved actual participation in war (so that the limitation would be suspended), there would be no tax powers in reserve. In such a situation as that of 1940, for example—when rearmament became necessary but we were not actively at war—it would be necessary to increase borrowings without taking steps to increase revenue."

In other words, facing a probable national debt of $300,000,000,000 at the close of this war with an annual carrying charge of $7,000,000,000 with the additional expense of carrying on the operations of government in that critical period, with this proposed amendment in force, the tax moneys which we would raise would just about meet the charges without reduction of the national debt and with little or nothing remaining for veterans' benefits and social security to the unemployed, the aged and other dependents. Surely such enactment would make all of our present promises to veterans and others mere lip service and double talk.

Now what does the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury predict relative to the market value of Government bonds under this proposed amendment? Read these ominous words and recall of past history. We quote:

"It is well known that when municipal governments operate under tax limitations and have no further tax powers in reserve, their bonds commonly are regarded as second grade or lower, and in such emergencies may bring a sudden and sharp decline in their credit standing. To put hobbles on Federal taxing power would likewise weaken Federal credit and expose it to shocks. Since we have been through two great wars and a great depression without Federal credit being called in question, it is easy to forget that such a thing is possible. But there have been times in the past when Federal credit deteriorated and if we sacrificed the Federal Government's reserve of taxing power it might happen again (as in the instance of the run on the Treasury during the silver difficulties of the 1890's).

"If Federal credit suffers, State and local credit will suffer with it. Any real shock to public faith in Federal securities would undoubtedly involve State and local securities sympathetically. Furthermore, any such shock would weaken the banks and other credit institutions and hinder them in assisting State and local governments. It must not be forgotten, either, that the support of the Federal Government was very valuable to State and local governments in the depths of the depression of the thirties and that Federal credit stood back of State and local credit in this emergency. Could a Federal Government with impaired credit have rescued mortgage debtors through H. O. L. C. and F. C. A. in 1933–34, and enabled them to pay up their back taxes? Could it have rescued the shaky bank system through R. F. C., the mortgage agencies, and F D. I. C.? Could it have financed needed local public works through R. F. C. and P. W. A.? The confidence of investors in State and local securities rests partly on the knowledge that in a major depression emergency Federal credit would always be in reserve."

What would be the effect of the proposed amendment on Federal revenue? The Treasury Department analysis above referred to says:

"If the proposed limitation were adopted, it would mean reducing to a 25-percent level the bracket rates that now exceed 25 percent. It would mean lowering the 40 percent corporate normal and surtax, sharply reducing the estate tax, and reducing all individual income tax rates to about the present first-bracket level of 23 percent. If no other adjustments were made, such cuts would involve revenue losses in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000 a year. This would eliminate the prospect of a Budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year."

Now let us consider how this loss of revenue might be made up. In other words, let us look into this "pay off" and who will "pay off." The Treasury report has this to offer:

"Part of the revenue loss from rate reduction brought about by the (proposed) limitation could conceivably be made up by measures designed to increase the tax base. In the corporation field, the carry-forward and carry-back of losses could be abandoned, percentage depletion could be eliminated, and deductions for contributions denied, along with pension trust and perhaps other deductions.

"In the individual income field, deductions (for State and local taxes, contributions, interest, and similar items) could be disallowed; forms of income not now included as taxable (for example, interest on State and local bonds and some forms of annuities) could be included in taxable income; personal exemptions could be lowered; and the especially favorable treatment of capital gains could be abandoned."

But threatening as all these measures sound the real "pay off," the thing to "make the rich richer and the poor poorer," the real threat to every man of labor who earns his bread by the toil of his hand and the sweat of his brow is contained in these final words of the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department's analysis of the proposed amendment, we quote:

"It would be possible to make some tax increases outside the restricted field. But since the proposed restriction covers estates and all kinds of incomes and the Constitution already stands in the way of Federal property taxes, the only major unrestricted field is that of commodity taxes, i. e., sales taxes and excises. If one disregards considerations of equity, the repressive effects of commodity taxes on business activity and employment and competition with State taxes, substantial revenues can be raised from these sources. Under war conditions a 5-percent Federal retail sales tax would have yielded about $3,000,000,000; under post-war conditions, with shortages of goods relieved, the figure would be somewhat higher. But in view of the necessity to avoid seriously repressive effects of commodity taxes and of the many other considerations that point toward reducing war excises below the levels provided in the Revenue Act of 1943, a net gain of more than $1,000,000,000 or so in the commodity tax field would imply drastic use of commodity taxes. Congress might prefer instead to make adjustments involving a reduction of revenue in this field."

We do not want to be classed with the alarmists. Yet we cannot refrain from expressing the opposition of organized labor to all forms of sales taxes. We will oppose them on the State level and we will oppose them on the national level. Therefore it behooves every one of us to oppose this Resolution No. 5, which would be the opening wedge whereby those States which would not pass a sales tax of their own would become the abettor and accessory to a national sales tax. Also bear in mind that as cited in the Treasury Department analysis that sales tax would not be a 2-percent tax but more probably a 5-percent tax. Keep American labor free labor; we do not need this twenty-second amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Tribute to Alfred E. Smith by John S. Burke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. John S. Burke at the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, on March 17, 1945. The address is a magnificent tribute to Alfred E. Smith. I have heard many tributes to great Americans, but Mr. Burke's is one of the finest to which I have ever listened. As one of Al Smith's oldest friends, I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Burke.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I first looked over the list of speakers who have responded to this toast in the past, I felt discouraged; there were judges, lawyers, Cabinet members, college presidents and even the president of a railroad, but no merchant. I realized, of course, that merchants as a rule have no standing as speakers except about their own goods; indeed my predecessor in business, a sagacious man, warned me that when a storekeeper got a repute as a speaker, his stockholders would be wise to transfer their investment elsewhere. Yet it seemed strange as I thumbed over the yearbooks decade after decade that no merchant had appeared articulate enough at least to talk about the Irish. But when I got back to the early days of the society, my spirits brightened; the merchants seemed like Abou Ben Adhem, for their names led all the rest. I learned that the society had been founded by a group of merchants and soldiers; that a merchant was its first president; that he had served not for one, for three, or a half dozen terms, but for 34

years. So I am happy that they are back again on the dais, and I hope that their present representative will do nothing to return them to that limbo of silence to which they have been confined for over a century.

Today all over the world men of Irish blood commemorate the life, the deeds, and the death of their hero saint, for it was on this date almost 1,500 years ago that St. Patrick died and, as the Book of Armagh states, "was carried to heaven." In that long stretch of time no man has approached his influence on the Irish. He led them out of the bondage of paganism, as did Moses with the Hebrews of old; his spirit has guided them and held them straight on their course like some spiritual polar star in peace and in war, in plenty and in poverty, in union and amid disunion. He remains their greatest hero.

And as the finest tribute that can be paid to a father is to tell of the goodness of a son, we shall offer our veneration tonight to St. Patrick by recalling the virtues of one of his devoted sons, that most illustrious son in the long and glorious history of our society, that son to whom we say tonight our final ave et vale, Alfred E. Smith. The lives of many men of renown are recorded in our annals—statesmen, poets, priests, soldiers, heroes on the land, on the sea, and in the air—and, with the same care the tie that binds us to men of little note but with as sure a claim to our love and recollection has been kept in our memory and in our chronicles. But in that long list of lives, paralleling since 1784, the course of our Nation's history, the name of no man is more firmly fixed, no hero is given higher place than he to whom we here give the hail and farewell of the friendly sons.

We do not worship a hero as did the pagans of old or as do the pagans of the new barbarism. We honor his virtues; we praise his achievements; we are inspired by his example to be better men and to lead better lives, as, in a deeper sense we are inspired by the virtues of a saint, such as that modern saint from the sixteenth century, Thomas More, whose life with its civil activity, wholesome wit, and lack of bitterness at the price paid for spiritual loyalty compares strikingly with the life of Al Smith.

It is thus that we cherish the memory of this uncommon man formed from our own common clay. We honor him for his fruitful use of those special talents that God gave him. We hold him as our ideal of a Christian gentleman in the true sense of that term; a Christian gentleman who loved his neighbor because he loved his God, and so found that neighbor among all men of good will, whether it was in a ditch on the road to Jericho, in the palace of power, or in the mansion of the rich.

We are not concerned here with the detail of his deeds. There is neither the desire nor the skill to draw his figure in all its grandeur. We are too close in friendship and association to fix his place in the Nation's hall of fame. We leave to others to mold the "storied urn," and to time with his sure and supple hands to sculpture the animated bust, as time has done with that other hero of the common man, Lincoln, who like Smith reached down from the heights to lift his neighbor up.

We are concerned with the heart and the spirit; we wish only to record the imprint of his character on us. He was a simple man. There was nothing complex about him. It would be folly, indeed it would be false, to complicate his character now with embellishment in thought or word. He seems to have been one of those rare beings blessed by God with an instinctive sense of the eternal verities. The story that Justice Frankfurter told in a beautiful letter to the New York Times indicates this. Al spoke for an hour to the cream of the Cambridge intellect; when he had finished one of the professors said "How Aristotle would have liked that address." Al could talk to the men in the Fulton Market or to the professors at Cambridge and be understood, because he saw the truth simply and expressed it the same way.

We know that his place in history is secure, that moving up and forward from the warves and streets of a striving city, through the crowded arenas of the Nation's life, he climbed the mountain top of fame with his head pointed constantly toward the stars but with his feet firm on the ground of common sense. But not for this alone, great as it was, do we grant him our accolade of heroism. It is more that, in a world where honesty of purpose should be a common possession instead of an uncommon virtue, his honesty of purpose was like a lighthouse shining above a troubled sea, warning us away from the treacherous shoals of expediency. In one of his rare flashes of clarity, Carlyle said that the essence of heroism is true sincerity; that all truly great men have it, though they must be unconscious of its possession. Al Smith had that essence of heroism; he was without guile, he did not comprehend it; his tools were wisdom, understanding, fortitude, integrity, charity. His whole character was enriched by that true sincerity, a golden thread which ran through the tapestry of his life giving color to his story and form to his conduct; he was ennobled by a God-given humility; that good humility which is strong but unselfish, steadfast but patient, which is born of courage, not of timidity. He had a sturdy self-respect combined with that charity for his neighbor which St. Paul described so beautifully, that essence of goodness with no "sounding brass or tinkling cymbals."

Al Smith knew that God gives each man an individual dignity, and so he respected his neighbors and was humble among them. His life was lived not in the solitudes but amid the passions and ambitions of men. He saw the dross of selfishness and envy surrounding and sometimes obscuring the gold of respect and esteem, but he gathered that gold without soiling his heart or his hands; conscience and reason commanded his will.

It is for this that we honor him, for this we hail him our hero, and as our Ave is muted on the strings of affection into a softer vale, we dare to project our thought even beyond this world. We like to think of our gay and happy friend gazing without fear toward the shore of eternity, while the Master of the Heavenly Harbor sends out an angelic pilot, to guide safely and speedily into port that son, who in the last few minutes of his earthly life, renewed his pledge of allegiance and faith; we dare to imagine that, when the Happy Warrior came home to his beloved Katie, as he drew near the throne of his Divine Master there was a gentle whisper around that throne, fainter even than that "noiseless noise" that Keats heard among the morning leaves, a gentle whisper among the angels and the saints, "Why, there's Al Smith."

Contract Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in view of the importance of the settlement of terminated contracts at this critical period in our war production, I wish to insert in the RECORD the comments on the excellent work being performed by the Office of Contract Settlement under Robert H. Hinckley, Director, as published in the Bulletin of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, the official publication of this important group which has played such a vital part in our war production.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bulletin of the National Association of Purchasing Agents of March 14, 1945]

The Office of Contract Settlement, under Robert H. Hinckley, Director, rates a pat on the back for a job well done. Without fanfare, it is making real headway in getting policies and procedures set for the termination job, which will jump to tremendous proportions after the war is over.

O. C S. is concentrating on two objectives in its work—speed and elimination of red tape. Its job of interpreting the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and translating it into definite procedures is well advanced. It rates a medal, for no criticism is heard.

The framework of its procedures is now laid down in 14 specific regulations. Be sure that your file of O. C. S. regulations is complete. The Bulletin of October 18, 1944, listed and summarized the first 7 O. C. S. regulations; this article brings you up to date on Regulations 8 through 14. The two most important ones are probably No. 10 and No. 14.

REGULATION 8. SETTLEMENT FORMS

Success or failure of an administrative job largely depends upon the simplicity of the forms to be used in handling it and on the clearness of the instructions for the use of tnese forms.

O. C S. is working with only eight basic forms and the instructions for the use of these standard forms make up only four printed pages. The forms apply to fixed-price war-supply contracts only. The same forms are used by prime contractors for filing with the Government, and by subcontractors for filing with the company from which the notice for termination is received.

Short form

Form 1 (a) eliminates all red tape ii the handling of small-settlement proposals. If this form is used, the net proposal must be less than $1,000, and you must retain or dispose of all the termination inventory at the best price obtainable. The Government may examine your books and records related to the proposal; and if you are a subcontractor, your customer must be satisfied with respect to it. Acceptance of this proposal will constitute approval of the price which you offer for the entire inventory, including the proceeds of any sales which you have made.

"At the best price obtainable"—quoted from the instructions—apparently means just that. There are no complicated formulas to apply or market tests to conduct.

Neither the inventory schedules (Forms 2 (a), (b), (c), (d)) nor the schedule of accounting information (Form 3) are to be submitted with this form.

Inventory schedules

Termination inventory schedules which are filed either with or in advance of the settlement proposal (other than the short form) serve two principal purposes:

1. To support the amount of inventory costs included in the settlement proposal; and

2. To aid in arranging for the removal, storage, sale, or other disposition of the termination inventory.

Items having a cost of less than $100 need not be listed separately but may be lumped together in a "sundry" column, with only a general description of the type of items; pro-

vided the aggregate amount included does not exceed $5,000 or 20 percent of the total inventory cost, whichever is less.

REGULATION 9. GUARANTEED TERMINATION LOANS

Regulation 9 spells out policy and procedure for guarantees by the services, of termination loans to war contractors from public financing institutions; that is, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

REGULATION 10. INVENTORY CLEARANCE

Plant equipment clearance as laid down in O. C. S.—Regulation No. 4, and inventory clearance from plants of war contractors, will be handled in the same manner. The idea is to clear the plants for normal production as quickly as possible. The deadline is 60 days after the receipt of satisfactory inventory schedules by the contracting agency unless the contractor agrees to a longer period. However, "every effort should be made by the contracting agencies to remove or store the material in less than 60 days after receipt of satisfactory inventory schedules."

It is up to you

The speed with which plants are cleared of war production equipment and inventory largely depends upon the speed with which satisfactory inventory schedules are prepared and submitted by the contractor.

O. C. S. provides the forms (see Regulation 8), but it is up to you to fill out these forms and submit them to the contracting agency.

Four steps

The contractor has several choices and he must make up his mind on these before he hands in his inventory lists. It is up to him to:

1. Make tender of title to the Government for all contractor-owned material listed;
2. Make an offer for any of the material he desires to retain;
3. Make recommendation as to the material to be scrapped; and
4. Inform the contracting agency whether he has, or can make, available storage space for any or all of the material.

Time limits

O. C. S. is determined there should be no avoidable delay as far as the contracting agencies are concerned. The same three-time limits established in regulation 4 for plant equipment, also apply to termination inventories.

Within 10 days after receipt of the inventory schedules, the contracting agency must notify the contractor if they are not satisfactory. Otherwise the schedules are deemed to be satisfactory.

Within 20 days after receipt of satisfactory inventory schedules the contracting agency shall, if practicable, notify the contractor which items, (1) may be disposed of as scrap, (2) the Government will require for its use, (3) the war contractor will be permitted to retain at prices agreed upon.

Within 60 days of the receipt of satisfactory inventory schedules, or such longer period as the contractor may agree, all termination inventory on the schedules not disposed of to or by the contractor shall be removed by the contracting agency or stored under agreement with the contractor in space made available by him.

If a subcontractor wishes to take advantage of the plant clearance time limits he may do so by submitting copies of his inventory schedules directly to the contracting agency, at the same time he files with his next higher tier contractor.

REGULATION 11. KEEPING RECORDS

The Contract Settlement Act (in section 19) sets stiff penalties for the destruction of records of war contractors relating to settlements or the disposition of termination inventories.

Records must be kept for 5 years and the strict rules reach down to war contracts involving only $25,000 or to the disposition of termination inventories involving only $5,000.

This means a terrific post-war filing job for all war contractors. Regulation 11 has the purpose of simplifying this job by permitting the application of modern filing techniques such as the use of photographs, microphotographs, or microfilm.

REGULATION 12. CLAIMS UNDER DEFECTIVE CONTRACTS

Fairness is the keynote of the Contract Settlement Act. Section 17 specifically prevents any contractor from being gyped out of fair compensation just because a formal or technical defect or omission is discovered in his contract; or because he relied in good faith, without a formal contract, on written or oral instructions of a contracting officer.

O. C. S. regulation No. 12 sets the procedure under which this mandate of the Contract Settlement Act is to be carried out.

REGULATION 13. PENALTY FOR OVERSTATEMENTS

The Contract Settlement Act states (in section 8) on interim financing under paragraph (d) that in case of an overstatement by any war contractor of the amount due on his termination claim in connection with any interim financing under the act, such contractor shall pay to the United States as a penalty an amount equal to 6 percent of the amount of the overstatement. But the act adds that the Director may suspend or modify any such penalty if, in his opinion, its imposition would be inequitable.

O. C. S. regulation 13 does two things:

1. It delegates the authority to modify and determine the penalties for such overstatements to the heads of each contracting agency, including such agencies as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the War Production Board; and
2. It prescribes the standards to be observed in determining whether or not a penalty would be inequitable.

This is a procedural short cut taken to enable war contractors to estimate their partial claims on war contracts with greater ease of mind.

REGULATION 14, ACCOUNTING PRACTICES

The success of the contract settlement job will primarily depend upon the way the determination of costs to be allowed in the settlement of contracts is handled. It is here that the realistic and constructive attitude of the Office of Contract Settlement is showing to best advantage. Its endeavor is to do the job with as little red tape as possible and to follow to the greatest extent feasible the established accounting practices of war contractors. Moreover, O. C. S. believes that efforts and results should be in proper relationship and that "the Government should not insist on undue effort on the part of the contratcor to obtain precise information which is not readily available if reasonable estimates or approximations may be satisfactorily substituted."

Basic principles

Regulation 14 spells out * * * how the cost philosophy embodied in the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is to be carried out. Its purpose is to clarify accounting practices and to assure greater uniformity in their application without, however, putting them in a strait jacket that would defeat the basic intention of the Contract Settlement Act that the accounting practices of the contractor are to be recognized wherever they are reasonable and appropriate.

No strait jacket

The memoranda are intended to serve as guides to prime contractors, subcontractors, and contracting agencies. They represent a standard of accuracy and acceptability in the accounting treatment of the costs to which they relate. However, Regulation 14 is quite emphatic that "accounting data may be accepted when determined on bases different from those set forth in the memoranda if such bases nevertheless represent recognized commercial accounting practices and yield equitable results."

Particularly where the amounts involved are relatively small, O. C. S. has no intention of insisting that the accounting methods outlined in the memoranda must be followed literally. It is frankly admitted that in such cases the "possibility of greater accuracy to be derived by an exact application of the memoranda may not justify the increased time and effort involved in their use."

Recognized practices

All that O. C. S. wants of a contractor in accounting practices is that they may reasonably be expected to produce "acceptable results when consistently applied considering the contractor's proposals in the aggregate, rather than those which might be especially suited to a particular termination."

As long as the spirit shown by these definitions prevails in the Office of Contract Settlement, the termination job should be easily managable by the company executives that ordinarily handle contracts. The use of special legal, accounting, and technical experts, except in large and specialized war plants, would seem to be wasted manpower and unnecessary expense.

Excerpts From Statements on Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of excerpts taken from statements made by men prominent in public life and in business and industry, relating to the full-employment bill now pending before the Senate. I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing this matter. It is $156.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTATIONS AND EXCERPTS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

I. DO WE WANT FULL EMPLOYMENT?

Eric A. Johnston, president, United States Chamber of Commerce, Cosmopolitan, December 1944, pages 170, 171:

"Virtually everyone agrees that we must have high employment, high production, and high purchasing power to make our economy click. * * *

"The consumer is the kingpin in our economy. His ability to buy and his decisions to buy or not to buy give us good times or bad times. It is he who determines whether there will be jobs for all."

Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of General Motors Corporation, address at annual meeting of the Investment Bankers Association, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, November 28, 1944:

"I just want to say that if the problem of jobs is not solved as part of the post-war problem, in my opinion, democracy and free enterprise are likely to pass out with the war itself. * * *

"There is an opportunity to recognize the fact that the levels of national income prewar died with the war. We ought to do a better job. We must do a better job; we must move toward a greater utilization of our increased economic resources—material, manpower, capacity—and there is a responsibility on the part of the management of American enterprise to step up and do the job, even if they did, by so doing, take a risk. They must plan aggressively. They must go forward. We cannot go backward."

Thomas E. Dewey, Chicago acceptance speech, June 28, 1944:

"We Republicans are agreed that full employment shall be the first objective of national policy."

Thomas E. Dewey, San Francisco speech, September 21, 1944:

"Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore, it is the business of Government."

Alvin Hansen, National Resources Planning Board, After the War—Full Employment, January 1942:

"A positive program of post-war economic expansion and full employment, boldly conceived and vigorously pursued, is imperative. Democracies, if they are going to lead the world out of chaos and insecurity, must first and foremost offer their people opportunity, employment, and a rising standard of living.

"If purchasing power is maintained at a high level, we need have no fears that private manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, and farmers will not come forward and supply the market with the goods demand by the public. * * * Private enterprise can and will do the job of production. It is the responsibility of Government to do its part to insure a sustained demand. We know from past experience that private enterprise has done this for limited periods only. It has not been able to insure a continuous and sustained demand.

"A positive governmental program looking toward full employment would greatly vitalize the invigorate private enterprise. An expansionist program would permit private enterprise to operate at high output levels."

E. J. Phelan, acting director of the International Labor Office, New York Times magazine, April 30, 1944:

"JOBS: A WORLD-WIDE PROBLEM

"The time has gone forever when men and women, able and anxious to work are to find that no one has any use for their services, that they are economic outcasts whom the community will perhaps not allow to starve but who otherwise are condemned to a hopeless and aimless inactivity and to the frustration of all their legitimate hopes and ambitions. It will not be regarded as sufficient that the public authority should provide them with some kind of minimum subsistence allowance or shepherd them into relief works in an unsuccessful attempt to disguise their unwantedness.

"What they expect, and will indeed demand, is precisely the opposite. They want to be wanted. They want to feel that they have a real place in the community and a real and acceptable contribution to make to its general productiveness and prosperity. They want, in short, a position of dignity and not of degradation, and they want, too, to be able to feel that the road of opportunity is open to them, that they can aspire to such heights as their abilities justify.

"* * * There is need also for national social action providing the machinery whereby jobs and men can be brought together and whereby workers may be trained and given the opportunity of reviving their skills which the changing features of industry and demand may require."

James H. McGraw, Jr., Business Week, January 6, 1945, pages 94–95:

"WHAT DOES AMERICA WANT?

"Here there is space only to indicate in broadest outline what I conceive to be desirable foundations for an economic policy of the United States:

"I. The attainment of high and sustained level of business activity and employment in the United States and in the world." (Out of five points, this is first.)

Business Week, editorial, February 5, 1944:

"Full employment is, after all, a social goal, as unemployment is a social danger. And social measures to reduce unemployment are as proper, if not so important, as economic steps to increase employment."

Henry A. Wallace, address before the American Statistical Association, Washington, D. C., December 27, 1944:

"Full employment in the United States is the first step on the road to permanent world-wide peace. * * *

"Jobs for all should and will be the economic battle cry of all the world for the next 20 years."

Portsmouth (Va.) Star, editorial, December 26, 1944:

"It [1] opens with a laudable declaration on which there can be no argument: 'Every American able to work and willing to work has the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or offices, or farms, or mines of the Nation. * * *'

"Everyone is in favor of jobs for all."

Chicago, Ill., Journal of Commerce, editorial, December 19, 1944:

"The post-war employment challenge to the Nation is obvious, and there should be no dissent from the Senate subcommittee declarations that every man and women willing to work and capable of working has the right to a job."

Kansas City Kansan, editorial, December 27, 1944:

"It [1] opens with the entirely laudable sentiment that 'every American able to work and willing to work has the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops, or offices, or farms, or mines of the Nation.' That's fine."

Chicago, Ill., Chicago Sun, editorial, January 8, 1945:

"The companion piece of national service in wartime is realistic acknowledgment of national responsibility for full employment in peacetime."

New York Journal of Commerce, editorial, January 10, 1945:

"There can be no debate over the desirability of full employment."

Washington Post, editorial, December 28, 1944:

"Undoubtedly, it should be the aim of Government to create conditions under which private industry can function successfully—that means with profit—and thus create an active demand for labor.

"* * * It does not follow, because we disapprove of taking on such large and indefinite responsibilities, that the Federal Government should do nothing whatever to supplement the efforts of private enterprise to lift employment levels. Far from it. Government has a distinct responsibility not only to counter business depression but also to encourage the attainment of full employment. * * *

"Business activity in the United States in post-war years will be a political stabilizer the world over."

Portsmouth (Va.) Star editorial, December 26, 1944:

"It seems logical that the first step in our post-war employment program should be creation of an economic atmosphere in which an unprecedented 60,000,000 jobs can exist."

[1] The preliminary draft of the full employment bill, as it appeared in the Year-End Report of the War Contracts Subcommittee to the Committee on Military Affairs, December 18, 1944.

Ernest G. Draper and Walter R. Gardner, Federal Reserve Bulletin, November 1944, pages 1052–1053:

"GOODS AND DOLLARS IN WORLD TRADE

"While this can be said regardless of whether or not we have full employment, it is apparent that a domestic program which carried reasonable assurance that unemployment would not again be permitted to develop on a substantial scale in this country would be of inestimable help in getting American farmers and businessmen to accept the sort of readjustments in our foreign trade that will be necessary if a sustained gold inflow is to be prevented. Once assured that the economic outlook is favorable, they might be ready to see our tariff duties steadily lowered and exchange rates placed at levels at which foreign enterprise could offer effective competition in the markets of the world. Moreover, a full production economy in the United States would directly swell our demand for foreign imports, since most of the commodities we import from the world are materials for further processing. From every point of view an adequate domestic program must remain the paramount need of the American people."

John Bell Conliffe, the International Economic Outlook, 1944 edition:

"It may be argued that the greater part of the vigorous economic activity which was so productive of social advancement in the latter half of the nineteenth century was national rather than international. That is true Indeed, it has always been true and must be true in the future as in the past, if prosperity is to be restored. In particular it must be true for the United States, which is now the greatest manufacturing country and therefore the greatest buyer of raw materials in the world.[2] Unless there is active production and employment it is unlikely that this country can take an active part in organizing an effective system of international trade. If it does not do so, the changes of such a system being organized are remote. Yet it is as unrealistic to consider national economic activity apart from its international repercussions as it is to draw a distinction today between the home front and the battle lines. The connection between domestic and international economic policy is so inimate that for many practical purposes they constitute a single entity."

The London Times, editorial, November 24, 1944:

"The critics contend, however, and are entitled to contend, that the Bretton Woods arrangement in the field of monetary relations can have the desired result of more regular and more expansive world commerce, larger world output, and higher standards of living only if certain conditions—about which, among other things, Lord Keynes has presumably been conferring recently in Washington—are fulfilled. These conditions include both an effective decision by the participating nations, and especially those possessing the largest industrial and financial resources, to keep their resources fully and continuously employed and a willingness, on the part of the same rich and powerful countries, to buy as well as to sell."

Dr. Calvin B. Hoover, Post-war Goals and Economic Reconstruction (pp 288–291):

"AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT

"A second point to be emphasized is that the volume of imports and exports is itself more affected by cyclical fluctuations in the United States than it is affected by changes in our tariffs. That is another very interesting fact. As we follow the annual fluctuations in the amount of imports and exports, we find that the factor that determines the volume of trade is the volume of our own

[2] Cf. Hal Lary and Associates, "The United States in the World Economy," Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Economic Series No. 23, Washington, D. C., 1943.

industrial production. If we have prosperity, then we have high imports and exports. If we have depression, the opposite is true. Now we cannot tell with certainty about the effects of the tariff in all this; but we can make some sort of statistical analysis. We know, for instance, that the changes in volume of trade in commodities on which duties were raised during the Hoover administration were not so strikingly different from the changes in the volume of imports of other commodities upon which duties were not raised. Moreover, when we try to calculate the effect of lowering prices through tariff reduction on the quantity of goods imported into this country, we find that this effect is not likely to be as great as that due to changes in industrial activity, that is, due to shifts from depression to prosperity.

"In short, if we asked what would increase our exports and imports more than anything else, we would have to answer: 'Anything which would insure a high level of employment in the United States.' Now that is a very interesting and striking thing, and it needs to be emphasized. The most important thing that would increase the volume of our foreign trade would be increasing the level of employment in the United States. We would increase trade not beyond what it is now but beyond what it was in the thirties during the period of the depression. Any policy that produces relatively full employment will have a salutary effect on our imports and exports, an effect more significant than changes in import duties."

II. How Can Full Employment be Achieved?

Thomas E. Dewey, San Francisco speech, September 21, 1944:

"Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise.

"If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours."

Wendell L. Willkie, fourth of series of seven articles setting forth suggested policies for Republican Party platform in 1945, June 15, 1944:

"Industry, labor, and government—local, State, Federal—should set up a cooperative mechanism which will act as a clearing house for information and constructive programs. Through such a mechanism capital goods expenditures—such as the building of roads, public works, industrial plants—so important a factor in the wide fluctuations of our economic cycle, can be spread and leveled over the years. * * *

"But we must be realistic enough to acknowledge that the best efforts of private industry, even supplemented by such intelligent cooperation—with labor and government—will not always be enough. In addition, the Federal Government must exercise a countercyclical influence against depression in order to preserve a reasonably high level of employment.

"Some of the obviously necessary measures to this end are: Direction of the capital market to encourage the flow of new capital when depression threatens and to discourage it in the face of a boom; the undertaking of legitimate Government projects at Government expense, but by private contract, the moment depression sets in—projects, for instance, that will improve the health and welfare of the people, create new markets, new purchasing power; broad social insurances which will both protect the individual and help to stabilize consumer industries and agriculture. * * *

"Also, in order that industry may function venturesomely, new and effective methods must be found for counteracting and controlling the tendency toward monopoly and monopolistic prices.

"The Republican Party cannot meet the need of the post-war period by merely passing resolutions in favor of 'free enterprise.' It must realize the inevitability and the justness of the people's demand for both protection and opportunity, and it must find the answers which exist unquely within a responsible enterprise system."

Beardsley Ruml, chairman of Federal Reserve Bank of New York address before Southwestern Pennsylvania Group of the Investment Bankers Association, February 21, 1944:

"It would be folly to expect that buiness can make the transition from full wartime employment to high peacetime employment without cooperation from public government at every level—Federal, State, and local. * * *

"It must be clear that planning of the sort we are thinking about does not mean regimentation.

"In certain quarters there is a prejudice against the word 'planning' that probably springs from apprehension that planning may lead us to a regimented way of life. I feel that just the opposite is the case.

"Regimentation arises after planning has failed. Regimentation must depend on force and violence to implement its intuitions and its fantastic will. Free, open, democratic planning, thinking about our national future out loud, will contribute to the success of our form of Government by bringing abiding satisfaction in the American way of life.

"Thus planning will render regimentation always distasteful, unnecessary. * * * Business today does not accept either regimentation on the one hand, or the statistical inevitability of mass unemployment on the other. * * *

"* * * the national state, through a clear and workable fiscal and monetary policy, must complement and supplement the activities of private business in the maintenance of high production and high employment. * * *

"Business wants a fiscal program that will help it create good products, good jobs and good investments. Business does not expect a national fiscal policy to do the work of business for it. It does ask for cooperation in maintaining a flow of purchasing demand that will have some general correspondence to what agriculture, labor, and business are able to produce and distribute."

Paul G. Hoffman, president of Studebaker Corporation and chairman of Committee on Economic Development, and Frazier Hunt, Cosmopolitan, January 1945:

"BET ON TOMORROW'S AMERICA

"We have to have an equitable and stable economic climate. The establishment of such a climate can only take place in an atmosphere of friendliness and cooperation between Government, business, labor and agriculture."

Leverett S. Lyon, chief executive, office of the Chicago Association of Commerce, address at Conference on Post-War Goals, conducted by New York University Institute on Post-War Reconstruction, October 13, 1943:

"The ability of business to give full employment will depend upon the adoption of national policies which will make it possible for those who want work to be employed, which will make it impossible for monopolies * * * to prevent the benefits of technical advance from being passed on to consumers, and which will make it advantageous and profitable for the business system as a whole to expand. * * *

"The national policies which will make these things possible cannot be established in directors' meetings. They must be established primarily in national legislation."

New York Times Magazine, October 29, 1944, page 41:

"HENRY KAISER FORESEES PLENTY OF JOBS

"* * * When peace comes, I don't think a single factory need stand idle nor that any man or woman need be jobless. It goes without saying that some Government assistance will be necessary. This does not mean that the Government must go into business. It will play its part in helping both capital and labor, for it cannot help one without aiding the other. Take it from me, this is no wild dream. It's just plain common sense."

Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board of directors of United States Steel Corporation, The Outlook for Post-War Industry, address before one hundred and fiftieth dinner of the Economic Club of New York, Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., December 5, 1944:

"'Full employment' is both a most significant and a most puzzling problem. Some people seem to think that its solution rests solely within the control of the American industrialist. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is equally a problem for Government, labor, and every other segment of our society. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that before the war manufacturing accounted for only about one-quarter of the total number of those employed in this country * * *.

"More and better goods are produced and more and better jobs are created, only because some person, either singly or with others, hopes or believes that he can locate a sufficient number of customers and can sell to them his products or his services at a price which will leave him a profit after all costs have been met. He is willing to risk his savings and to devote his energy to that end. If we are to have more and better goods and more and better jobs, then that hope or belief, wherever it appears, must be permitted a fair trial; it must not be unreasonably or unwisely curbed, regulated, or opposed. The creation of new jobs is as simple as that, in my opinion. With it all, there must be a general feeling of confidence and self-reliance, rather than a defeatist attitude of mind."

Alvin H. Hansen, professor of economics at Harvard, special advisor to Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System. Address before American Federation Forum at Hotel Commodore, New York City, April 12, 1944:

"To offset the inevitable post-war slump we need to prepare a compensatory public investment program. We should have Federal, State, and local public improvement and development projects planned clear through to the blueprint stage. * * * Adequate planning ahead and proper timing of public investment can do the job. Boldly thrown in on a sustained basis, public investment outlays could have prevented the ever-widening breach which we did experience in 1929 and 1932, and which brought us close to national bankruptcy. * * *

"A program of public investment can provide not only a stabilizing balance wheel to our economy; it can also open and enlarge private investment opportunities, revitalize private enterprise, and give us in the generation ahead an expanding economy with rising levels of income and employment. * * *

"The spending programs of the thirties was essentially a salvaging process. * * * we now need a positive program to prevent serious depression. Yet the fact is that we are still making no adequate preparation. We have done nothing so far which gives us any assurance whatever that we shall not again be confronted with a devastating depression. * * * Without useful and productive public improvement projects planned ahead, we shall again be forced to resort to boondoggling. Our utter lack of a well-developed public investment program is a shocking revelation of economic and financial irresponsibility."

Chester Bowles, O. P. A., in an October 15, 1944, letter to James C. Patton, New York Times, October 16, 1944:

"While Federal underwriting of total investment is not the only measure required to

convert our economy to full peacetime activity, it is an essential elements in a post-war program for full employment.

"We should, of course, do everything possible to encourage increased investment of risk capital by private business.

"* * * if private business were assured that the Government stood ready, through public investment, to underwrite the huge markets that go with full employment, there might be very little need for the Government actually to undertake investment above the normal amount involved in immediate essen- the public works."

Leon H. Keyserling, general counsel, National Housing Agency, in the American Economic Goal (prize winner ($10,000) in Pabst post-war employment awards):

"Democracies do not want totalitarian unity. But any system, to go ahead, requires some agreement on fundamentals. * * * We must evolve some economic rules of the game, and some economic ideal to strive for, so that we can plan and work and prosper—and not bicker our way to post-war disillusion instead of America's post-war promise.

"* * * The American economy should enable all the people to enjoy material comfort, good education, security, jobs, and creative leisure. * * *

"Maximum standards of living depend upon full employment of manpower, skills, plant, and resources. This is the American economic goal. * * *

"Achievement of full employment is predominatly a task for the system of American enterprise, including industry, agriculture, and labor. * * *

"Congress should establish an American economic committee as the first practical step in an evolving democratic teamwork by American enterprise, Congress, the Departments, and the President toward an American economic policy and an American economic goal.

"The Government should provide incentives to American enterprise to expand toward full employment, beginning with: a Government policy stable enough to encourage enterprise to plan; direct incentives to enterprise to plan, including tax incentives wherever workable; governmental research and fact-finding where enterprise needs facts but cannot get them alone * * *; timely simplification of restrictions and regulations peculiar to wartime. * * *

"Insofar as additional incentives are needed to expand American enterprise toward full employment, the Government should prepare fiscal incentives, moving from narrower to broader commitments in this suggested order:

"Governmental insurance or guarantees, such as those stimulating $4,000,000,000 of private housing investment without public cost.

"Public credits, providing cheaper money in the city and on the farm.

" 'Marginal' public expenditures to general private investment. For example, interest subsidies on insured, long-term, low-rate loans for acquiring and cleaning blighted urban areas.

"We should boldly explore additional incentives, using systems and funds to encourage employment at least as willingly as palliatives for unemployment, and discarding the paralyzing doctrine that utilizing American enterprise is incompatible with planning. * * *

"Where all these incentives fail to achieve full employment by American enterprise, direct Government programs represent bedrock civilized responsibility. Profiting by experience, these programs should be readjusted as follows:

"We should abandon defeatism, such as * * * planning public works on the assumption that seven to ten million post-war 'unemployed' are inevitable.

"We should integrate spending, taxing, and regulations with an American economic policy, measuring their long-term effect upon all employment, and using them primarily as incentives to full employment by encouraging a healthy balance of prices, business activity, savings, investment, and consumer expenditures, instead of just using them to cure maladjustments after they occur;

"Public works and related undertakings to provide jobs, instead of being planned in isolation, should be coordinated with plans for expansion of American enterprise, so that they will be really supplementary to the employment capacity of American enterprise."

Business Week, editorial, December 23, 1944, page 120:

"Just as the National Budget proponents recognize the possible danger to our institutions in a continually expanding role of Government and would prefer steps to encourage private business to carry the entire full employment load, so also do most businessmen now agree that the course of economic events cannot always be permitted to run unchecked. * * *

"Having agreed on trying to avoid both mass unemployment and the replacement of private enterprise by Government, the problem comes down to one of degree.

"Economic theory gives no clear-cut general answer to the question of whether, in the long run, Government investment tends to inhibit or release private investment. * * *

"Can Government forecast business at the start of each year? We may or may not agree to rely on such predictions, but the extensive additional information required for them would, in any case, be helpful for private or official use—on business investment plans, on consumer spending habits, on private employment expectation."

Report of the Senate Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, June 12, 1944, page 4:

"THE PROBLEM OF POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT AND THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN SOLVING IT

"* * * This country never has had and never will have real prosperity without full employment. A man vainly seeking a job is not a potential customer for the products of American farms and factories. * * *

"* * * It therefore seems fundamental that the first consideration in the shaping of Government policies should be to inspire confidence on the part of management, the investor, the employee, and the consumer.

"* * * Careful consideration should also be given to the preparation of a portfolio of useful public works that can be started quickly and terminated quickly, to be held as a reserve, and to be utilized only when necessary. In order to avoid Government works projects merely for the purpose of providing work—to which everyone apparently is opposed—useful public work projects in the field of road building, reclamation, irrigation. flood control, and probably many other fields are thoroughly justified * * *

"Congressional attention to these matters cannot wait. Prompt action on them is of transcendant importance, and this committee feels most strongly that no extended congressional recess should be considered pending their disposition. The very destiny of the Nation may depend upon wise and prompt decisions in respect to them."

Washington Daily News, editorial, May 24, 1938:

"If the first group (those who believe the 'world do move') could only get busy and vocal to the extent of selling the second (those who yearn for the 'good old days') that it's time to wake up, the futile fight between business and Government might be turned into an harmonious advance toward better days and finer democracy."

St. Petersburg Fla.) Times, editorial, December 26, 1944:

"The bill [3] is an interesting start toward a realistic solution of the problem of providing 60,000,000 jobs. It recognizes the principles of planning on a national scale with the cooperation of all economic groups. This is the basic principle essential to full employment of the Nation's labor and resources."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, December 21, 1944:

"We wish the subcommittee luck in finding a way between the Scylla of unemployment and the Charybdis of the authoritarian state. * * * The legislation which charts a safe course between these two perils would do a great deal toward straightening out a very greatly confused country—even, one might add, a puzzled and groping world."

International Latex Corporation, of Dover, Del., advertisement appearing in local papers on January 8, 1945:

"The creation of that assurance [of full employment], of that public confidence, is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Whenever the public fails to spend enough to make possible 60,000,000 jobs, Government must first supply incentives for private business spending and private business activity. In adition thereto, Government also must stand ready to provide funds for useful job-making public projects so that the total adds up to 60,000,000 jobs."

Report of Special Committee of the London Chamber of Commerce appraising the British white paper on employment policy, quoted in New York Times, December 23, 1944:

"Budgetary policy can and should be used to control the level of the national income and thence to achieve a high and stable level of employment."

From a summary of an article in the London Banker, December 1944:

"In its main outlines, the Beveridge analysis does not differ basically from the now conventional approach embodied in many recent publications, from the Unilever pamphlet to the Government's white paper on employment policy. The need for maintenance of aggregate demand as a condition of full employment is a doctrine now accepted by all political parties and all schools of economic thought."

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Rocky Mountain Herald of March 17, 1945, and which was written by Thomas H. Ferril. Since this editorial deals honestly with the problem of world peace, it is entitled to a place of distinction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Why don't people have the guts to come out and say what's going on? This time

[3] The preliminary draft of the full employment bill, as it appeared in the Year-End Report of the War Contracts Suocommittee to the Committee on Military Affairs December 18, 1944.

we're trying power for a change—Russian power. American power and where Britain can slip it in, British power. What's more, it may work. It hasn't been tried for a long time and certainly can't fare any worse than the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact or Locarno. Neither philosophy has anything to do with preventing the disease of war. It's like arguing that to prevent smallpox it's wiser to beat on a hollow oak than a hollow banyan. We're simply repeating the same behavior that's been going on since the days of Agamemnon. Our current approach is, however, a bit novel. We have drifted into a Big Three power situation, but we are going to give lip service to a world-security organization in which the meek and small will be told that they have equal rights. The adroit chore of Mr. Roosevelt and his State Department is to manipulate the San Francisco World's Fair in such a way as to convince the small nations and the United States Senate that their objectives are identical with the objectives which "Russia, Britain, and I" have already decided on. The lions and the lambs are to lie together, with the lions doing most of the lying. Yet it's likely to work out better than if it were on the level. A powerful Russia and a powerful United States may keep some sort of peace going for the next half century, provided, of course, that they don't get to helping each other too much in the Orient only to find out that they're on different sides of the fence.

The Midnight Curfew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper report of March 23 containing the results of a Gallup poll on the midnight curfew, which shows that an overwhelming majority of the American people approve without hesitation the midnight curfew as put into effect by Mr. Justice Byrnes.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDNIGHT CURFEW APPROVED BY OVERWHELMING MAJORITY

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 23.—Although now the subject of sharp controversy with Mayor LaGuardia's announcement that New York night clubs may remain open until 1 a. m., the Byrnes midnight curfew nevertheless has the approval of a vast majority of people across the Nation.

More than 8 out of every 10 included in a recent survey say they approve of the idea of closing all places of entertainment at 12 o'clock, in line with the Byrnes request. The survey was completed, however, before the LaGuardia announcement.

Even in the great metropolitan centers (cities with a population of 500,000 or more), majority sentiment is in favor of the midnight closing, but it is also notable that the curfew is less popular in these areas than elsewhere.

Taking as a group the large cities where interviewing on the issue was conducted, the institute finds about two-thirds among those interviewed approving the curfew ruling.

In making the survey, field reporters for the institute put this question to a cross-section of the adult population:

The War Mobilization Director has recently requested that all places of entertainment be closed by midnight to conserve fuel and other war resources. Do you approve of this?

The vote of the Nation:	*Percent*
Approve	82
Disapprove	13
Undecided	5

People who have a relative in the armed services are more inclined to favor the idea of the curfew than are those who do not. Women are more inclined to favor the curfew than men.

Moreover, a break-down of the vote in the survey by age groups shows that the older the person interviewed, the more inclined he is to look with approval upon the midnight-closing regulation. This is shown as follows:

By ages	Approved	Disapproved	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
21 to 29 years	75	18	7
30 to 49	82	13	5
50 years and over	86	10	4

Balancing of International Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of this morning dealing with the possible contribution of foreign travel by Americans to the balancing of our international exchange following the war, and the studies being made on the subject by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE SPUR SEEN IN TRAVEL ABROAD—WALLACE ENVISAGES POST-WAR SPENDING OF ONE AND ONE-FOURTH BILLION A YEAR AS AIDING OUR EXPORTS

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Secretary Henry A. Wallace, believing funds that will be spent abroad by Americans will become an important factor in our foreign trade, intends to take into account these invisible items in estimating our foreign trade balance.

The Secretary of Commerce has stated that he would make every possible effort to obtain maximum exports and imports on a permanent basis. This program, he said today, would require widespread education of businessmen and others regarding the economic laws concerned.

For example, to have large exports the United States must also have large imports and invisible items such as foreign travel with payment for services rendered by foreigners to United States citizens.

Studies made by the Department of Commerce indicate that, assuming a high level of economic activity and national income in the United States and conditions abroad attractive to tourists, gross expenditures by Americans on foreign travel may be as high as $1,250,000,000 a year, which would supply dollar exchange for a large volume of our exports.

The previous peak in our foreign travel came in 1929, when it reached $693,000,000, including $483,000,000 within foreign countries and $158,000,000 paid to foreign carriers and $42,000,000 to American lines.

It is pointed out that in the 1920's the relationship of travel outlays to national income was dynamic, the former rising much faster than the latter. Since other factors are imponderable, it is assumed that travel outlays in the post-war years will occupy somewhat the same relation to national income as at peak levels in the past.

National income in 1929 was estimated at $83,300,000,000, and gross travel outlay at $693,000,000, a ratio of .83 percent. Projected on the 1929 ratio with national income at, say $150,090,000,000, in the early 1950's gross travel outlays could reach $1,200,000,000.

However, since travel outlays rose more rapidly than national income in the 1920's and since many of the stimulative influences operating then would again come into play, the gross figure may even reach $1,500,000,000 after a period of rehabilitation abroad.

For foreign travel is the most important luxury commodity Americans buy abroad. In 1929 the expenditures for it constituted 70 percent of total payments to foreigners for goods, services, and other current transactions.

It is significant that about a fourth of travel outlays have gone to foreign carriers. The amount of travel money accruing to them after the war will depend in part on the division of traffic between them and American lines, especially on air routes.

My Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prayer composed by Mrs. Cora Lou Abart, of Bassett, Nebr., which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY PRAYER

Dear God, Father of us all, we humbly come to Thee in prayer; we thank Thee for the landing of our Pilgrim Fathers on American soil.

Seeking right to worship Thee as their conscience might dictate in this loved land without turmoil.

We thank Thee for the blessings of freedom for which they struggled through bitter hardships and won;

And, Father, we pray very earnestly that we may always realize the blessings of achievement at end of day and work well done.

Oh, God, we pray with all our hearts that Thou will lead us, and all other nations of the earth, through these dark days of flaming hell of war to happy years when again the latchstring is out on every neighbor's door.

And please strengthen us to keep on singing the songs of steadfast faith and courage our pioneer parents voiced on a rock-bound shore.

Help us, Father, to heed their call, then, from beyond the mist, to protect our rights to freedom and live according to the constitutional laws which they founded on the Christian way of life as written in Thy Holy Book and bequeathe to us as a precious heritage to keep—a heritage of faith, courage, justice, virtue, truth, and love,

Which bring an award of clear conscience and untroubled rest from Thee above.

We pray that peace may be our constant watchword, that we not seek war but have courage under the banner of righteousness to defend our own.

And may we have that unbounded faith of our fathers which brought their frail ship across mighty waters its only power through lashing foam.

Great God, will Thou drive home with might to all our hearts—our President, Congressmen and Senators, the leaders and soldiers of our armed forces, and to all Thy world of people—the conviction that without Thee as partner and without Thy guidance we can do nothing. Guide us, then, back on the beam of Thy love which bringeth peace to all nations. Now, Father, to Thy glory we pray to attain that "Peace on earth and good will toward men."

We ask in the name of Jesus. Amen.

—*Mrs. Cora Lou Abart.*

BASSETT, NEBR.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "It Isn't Too Late To Win the Peace!" by William Henry Chamberlin, from the Progressive of March 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALTA WAS MR. ROOSEVELT'S MUNICH, BUT—IT ISN'T TOO LATE TO WIN THE PEACE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

"The more it changes, the more it remains the same," a wise Frenchman once remarked. Between the Munich Conference of September 1938 and the Yalta Conference of February 1945, there was an interval of more than 6 of the most destructive and tragic years the human race has ever known. Millions of human beings perished in frightful agony. Uncounted old cities, with the very breath of civilization in their monuments and buildings and streets, have been reduced to piles of rubble by that most appropriate symbol of twentieth century "civilization," the block-buster bomb. There have been immense changes in the balance of power as between various states.

But one thing has not changed at all. This is the habit of the strong, in international politics, to prey on the weak. As between Munich and Yalta there was a change of scenery and of personalities. There was no change whatever of spirit and methods.

For Hitler read Stalin. For Daladier and Chamberlain read Roosevelt and Churchill. For Czechoslovakia read Poland. The rest of the two stories is identical almost to the last comma. A hard-boiled dictator, holding the trump cards of power politics, got what he wanted. Two democratic statesmen got what consolidation they might derive from the scanty fig-leaf of pious phrases that bear not the slightest relation to the realities of the situation.

In each case a people with an ancient history and a keen sense of newborn freedom was subjected to dismemberment and subjugation to the will of a stronger neighbor without even being accorded the criminal's traditional right to a word in its own defense.

Americans who are gullible, or who wish to be fooled, may take consolation in the setting up of an international commission to help select the new Polish Government and to watch the future election. But the Czechs got exactly the same kind of assurance in the Munich Declaration. And the French and British members of the commission proved completely helpless in resisting Hitler's ever increasing demands.

Nothing is to be gained by shutting our eyes to reality. Our entry into European politics, so long advocated as a guaranty of a just world order by many idealistic Americans, has been inauspiciously marked by acceptance of one of the most unsavory traditions of European power politics, the spoliation and subjugation of Poland.

PURRING PHRASES VERSUS REALITY

This analysis of the situation may be a shock to unsophisticated Americans who have been nourished on such bland and soothing generalities as the following Pollyanna statement of Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew:

"One of the greatest steps forward on the road to victory and to the establishment of enduring peace that has yet been taken in this war. * * *

"The great constructive achievements of the meeting have immeasurably strengthened the unity of purpose and action of the participants and may well gladden the hearts of peace-loving people everywhere."

Such purring phrases may temporarily confuse the minds of Americans who are vague as to east European history, geography, and ethnography. But they will bring little consolation, one may believe, to a Polish soldier who was blinded at Monte Cassino or who lost a leg in Holland, fighting for the United Nations cause, and who now finds his native town handed over to the Soviet Union, the independence of his country stolen away.

Perhaps we should have been prepared for the compromises of Yalta by the Roosevelt administration's preliminary attack on perfectionism. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, led the way in a pre-Yalta speech.

People who pronounced the Atlantic Charter a flop, he said, had simply not grown up. And then he struck the plaintive moratorium note:

"Nobody ever said it [the charter] could all be put into effect day after tomorrow, or even at the end of the war."

This same wistful groping for an "out," this same effort to make "perfectionism" the scapegoat for a peace that is being lost even before the war is ended, was reflected in President Roosevelt's message to Congress.

"Perfectionism no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics may obstruct the paths to international peace," he said.

Coming, as they did, on the eve of the widely promoted Crimean meeting of the Big Three who have assumed a dictatorship over the destinies of the world, these sentences do not sound like a call to the creation of a brave new world under American inspiration and leadership. Instead they accurately forcasted the weary mood of a man who knows that he is going into the conference beaten in advance, forced to accept a whole series of accomplished facts which by no conceivable sophistry can be brought into harmony with the ideals of freedom and self-determination for which America was professedly fighting the war.

There is a fundamental fallacy in the idea of a moratorium on the Atlantic Charter. The same fallacy lies behind the unfortunate adverb "permanently" which Senator VANDENBERG used to qualify his declaration of unwillingness to guarantee the spoils of an unjust peace.

This fallacy lies in the assumption that an unjust territorial settlement may be amended and improved with the passing of time. But not a single unjust frontier line drawn after the last war was changed except by force or threat of force.

Impossible financial exactions may cease when it is found that they cannot be collected. A regime of foreign occupation may be shortened by protests from the folks back home. But a bad territorial settlement is almost certain to stand until it is challenged by force.

President Roosevelt at Yalta signed his name to a document which embodies a number of important features of the post-war settlement. And Director of War Mobilization James F. Byrnes, who was present at the Yalta meeting, specifically credits Mr. Roosevelt with initiating, as well as endorsing the Polish settlement and the "compromise" on voting procedure under the Dumbarton Oaks project of world organization. And on the strength of these two proposals it is easy to understand how the President "got along fine" with Marshal Stalin.

Consider first the Polish settlement. Before the Yalta meeting there were two governments that claimed to represent the Polish people. The Polish Government in London had been recognized and dealt with as the legitimate Polish regime by Great Britain and the United States throughout the war. Until very recently it included representatives of the four strongest parties in pre-war Poland. Two of these were comparatively conservative, the other two, the Socialist and Peasant Parties, were distinctly to the left in their political and social programs, and spoke for large numbers of organized Polish workers and peasants.

A POLISH WHO'S WHO

Communist propaganda has made a systematic effort to smear the Polish Government in London as reactionary, Fascist, anti-Semitic. The best comment on this misrepresentation, which also sometimes took the form of confusing the Government in London with the authoritarian Colonels' Cabinet which ruled Poland before the war, is to note that the former Prime Minister of the Government was the leader of the Peasant Party, Mikolajczyk, that the present Prime Minister is the veteran Polish Socialist, Tomasz Arciszewski, and that 2 Jews have been members of an 11-man cabinet.

The Polish Government in London has been closely linked up with one of the most active and courageous underground movements in Europe. The most dramatically conclusive proof of its popular support was the heroic and amazing uprising in Warsaw, which began last August at the initiative of the London Government when the Red Army was at the gates of the city. Suddenly and mysteriously deserted by the Russians, who stopped their advance for no visible reason, the underground forces in Warsaw fought the powerful German garrison for 2 months, until supplies of food and munitions had been exhausted and Warsaw itself was reduced to a desolate ruin. The independence of this Polish Government was proved by its refusal to bow to the dictation of Roosevelt and Churchill and accept the dismemberment and enslavement of its country.

The authority of the London Government is achnowledged by the Polish forces which are fighting in France and Italy. It is also supported by an overwhelming majority of Poles in this country, who are free to express their opinion and who can be depended on to distinguish patriots from traitors.

WHAT THEY SAID BEFORE

What of the Provisional Government of Poland, the Stalin-sponsored puppet regime, which the Yalta declaration virtually recognizes as legitimate, with a little soothing palaver about reorganizing it on a broader democratic basis?

Its President, Boleslav Bierut, is a notorious agent of the Communist International who spent little of his adult life in Poland. The Minister of War, Michal Rola-Zymierski, was expelled from the army in disgrace and sentenced to 5 years in prison for graft under the pre-war Polish regime. Other members of the government have an equally shady or obscure past.

Churchill, who is often more forthright than Roosevelt in public declaration, let the cat out of the bag in Parliament when he said that the Lublin Committee, in his opinion, would not have come into existence if the London Government had submitted to Stalin's dictation on the border question. Walter Lippmann, who often leans over backward to defend the purity of Stalin's motives and actions, referred once to "the unrepresentative and essentially puppet character" of the Lublin regime. The New York Times, in an editorial which took a very optimistic view of the Yalta settlement, speaks of "the present puppet government set up by Russia's unilateral action."

If there ever was an issue on which America would have stood on firm moral ground it would have been flat, uncompromising refusal to admit the legitimacy of such a crude agency of foreign rule. But the Roosevelt plan for Poland implicitly recognizes the Lublin set-up with the verbal anesthetic that it should be broadened to form "a Polish provisional government of national unity, pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."

The joker in this plausible suggestion is that the Soviet puppet regime in Poland, with the expert assistance of the Soviet political police, has set up a reign of terror and has been liquidating by deportation or execution every Pole it can lay its hands on who is loyal to the London Government. There is a mass of specific testimony on this point from the Polish underground movement.

Equally unhappy was Mr. Roosevelt's debut in assuming "international responsibility" in the matter of the Polish boundary. Here he meekly accepted Stalin's demand for the annexation of about two-fifths of Poland, with the derisory concession of "5 to 8 kilometers" (3½ to 5 miles) to the east of this line.

Needless to say, this annexation, without any pretense of a free plebiscite, is in complete contravention of the Atlantic Charter, allegiance to which is solemnly reasserted in the Yalta declaration. Equally inconsistent with the Charter is the statement that "Poland should receive substantial accessions of territory in the North and West." For such accessions could only take the form of annexation of solidly German regions in East Prussia, Silesia, and Pomerania.

In the matter of voting procedure in the "Dumbarton Hoax" organization Mr. Roosevelt also made a masterly exchange of substance for shadow. The "compromise" on this point has now been semiofficially revealed. For questions which do not involve punitive sanctions, which are therefore of a secondary nature, Stalin has consented to waive the claim to vote in his own case.

A FIVE-POINT GOAL FOR AMERICA

But in important questions, involving the use of military and economic sanctions, Stalin has won his point that every great power should vote in its own case. And this reduces the proposed world security organization to the hollowest kind of a shell. It is often suggested that the new organization will possess the teeth that were lacking in the League. But if the Dumbarton Oaks type of organization, not the League, had existed in the 1930's, not one act of aggression, neither Japan's seizure of Manchuria nor Italy's onslaught on Ethiopia nor Germany's attack on Poland nor the Soviet invasion of Finland could have been legally checked. For in each case it was a great power that committed the act of aggression. And great powers, under the new voting arrangement, will be above and outside the law.

The final proof that we have less reason to feel secure now than at any time in our history is the President's demand for peacetime compulsory military training, without even a hint that friendly negotiations among the leading victorious powers might lead to an all-around scrapping of this system. Here surely is decisive evidence of the emptiness of the propaganda that no one of the United Nations could conceivably be an aggressor. It would be a pretty low order of intelligence that would assume that peacetime conscription is necessary to protect us against a broken, shattered, and disarmed Germany and Japan.

The Dumbarton Oaks project is so full of loopholes that it will probably not get us into any undesired war. Its greatest danger is that it will convey a false sense of security and will stultify our moral perceptions by making us underwrite what, in the light of what has happened in Poland, the Baltic States, Iran, Bulgaria, Greece, and Italy, is a downright hypocritical lie: "the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states."

America will have to wage the struggle for peace from scratch after the shooting in this conflict is over. I suggest that we hitch our foreign policy to five objectives: Self-determination for all politically conscious peoples, elimination of imperialism, agreed limitation of armaments, equality of economic opportunity for all peoples, and freedom of news reporting and exchange of ideas throughout the world.

Take a look at how these ideals have, or have not, been realized about 1955 and it will be possible to know whether the world is moving toward stable peace or toward the unimaginable horrors of a third world war.

One Munich does not mean a total and irreparable defeat of American foreign policy. The people must take over where the Government has failed. Not only Mr. Roosevelt's honor, but the honor of the American Nation is involved in pressing for the creation of conditions in Poland that will make a genuinely free election possible.

Minimum conditions in this connection will be the release of political prisoners and deportees, the admission to Poland of all Poles who have been fighting abroad for their country's cause, complete freedom of press, and of political organization and agitation, freedom for American correspondents and representatives of Polish-American organizations to travel freely in Poland.

If the people can learn the truth and pierce through official shams, glosses, and propaganda devices, America still possesses enough moral prestige and physical strength to turn diplomatic defeat into victory, as it has already turned military and naval defeat into victory.

Post-war Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Post dealing with post-war economic problems, and particularly quoting an article from the London Economist, which is discussed by Mr. Leo Wolman, the writer of the article, which seems to me most desirable as a matter of reference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE GRAND PROMISES NOT ENOUGH TO SOLVE FULL UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT

(By Leo Wolman)

Sooner or later Americans will be forced to move out of the universe of promises and guaranties and address themselves to the conditions required for full, or expanding, or good employment after the war.

Public officials and private authorities on economic policies are doing this country a great and probably lasting disservice by professing to know precisely how full employment, economic expansion, and rising standards of living can be achieved in the future. By assuming this air of omniscience, they are arousing false hopes in the minds of millions of people and they are diverting attention from many basic problems, upon whose wise solution the future of economic welfare of this country depends.

Democratic societies can ill afford to allow their leaders to indulge in grand promises which they are unable to fulfill.

As the close of the war approaches, the English are beginning to think about the numerous detailed economic decisions which taken together, constitute a nation's economic policy. Having undertaken to guarantee everyone a job after the war, the English are now trying to find out how this can be done. The general goal of public policy they stated in their white paper on post-war employment policies, just as we have stated ours in the bill sponsored by Senator MURRAY.

The intellectual foundation of this policy the English find in Sir William Beveridge's latest book, just as we find ours in the writings of American economists during the last decade.

Their post-war problems are intrinsically not unlike ours, much as they may differ in detail and in degree.

EXPORT INCREASE ONLY ROAD TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

For the English at least one element of their future economic policy is clear.

To meet their obligations, to prosper and to furnish satisfactory employment, the British Isles must find the means of increasing their export trade.

What this requirement involves is the subject of an editorial in the London Economist (January 27, 1945) entitled "Export or Die," which everyone concerned with the prosperity of the post-war world should read and ponder.

"The dominant factor (in post-war exports)," the Economist writes, 'will be the price of British goods relative to those of other nations. British costs and prices were high before the war and they are much higher now. British labor has grown accustomed to a standard of living that it was hard to justify by its comparative productivity even before the war. * * * Moreover, British industry has reinforced this tendency by its addiction to restrictive practices and high margins. During the war, ideas about standards of living have perceptibly risen, cartelism has been strengthened and the country's competitive position has worsened."

NO REMEDY FOUND—IT'S GAME MANY CAN PLAY

For this condition the Economist finds no remedy in familiar panaceas or tricks. "Exchange depreciation," it goes on to say, "is a game that many can play. Schachtian

strong-arm tactics, exploiting the attractiveness of the British market to force expensive goods on those countries that sell here, will work only until the victims find means of escaping.

"Open export subsidies would give rise to a world-wide outcry and world-wide retaliation. Indirect subsidies—the cartels recouping their export losses out of higher prices to the British consumer—are even more obnoxious.

"There is only one permanent solution," the editorial concludes, through such a great increase in productive efficiency as will reconcile high wages with low selling prices. * * * But on this, the representatives in the Government of business and of the trade-unions are one in blocking any approach to action, even of the timidest'"

These are mundane considerations of costs, prices, efficiency, and productivity which the Economist urges as the means of attacking the problems of Britain's foreign trade They are far removed from the simple expedients of government spending and government investment. They are relevant to prosperity in domestic as well as in foreign trade.

As such, they deserve some study and discussion in this country.

Establishment of National Cemetery in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

Concurrent memorial requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

To the SECRETARY OF WAR:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The State of Arizona, due to climatic conditions highly beneficial to persons afflicted with certain diseases, has attracted to its borders many war veterans.

Due to this migration into the State, from all parts of the Union, of veterans desirous of receiving the benefits of these favorable condtions, the veteran population is greater, proportionately, than in almost any other State.

For the same reason that the veteran population is high the mortality rate is also high. It has been estimated that prior to the outbreak of the present war the number of deaths of veterans in Arizona, within 14 years, had numbered about four thousand, since which time the number has greately increased, and will increase much more rapidly as the result of the casualty rate of World War No. 2. A large percentage of such veterans will require burial in a national cemetery.

These facts show that a national cemetery is needed in Arizona at the present time, and that it will become more and more a necessity.

Wherefore you memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, requests:

1. That the Secretary of War cause a survey to be made of feasible sites for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona, for the purpose of ascertaining the most desirable location therefor.

2. That the results of such investigation be conveyed to the Governor of Arizona, and that steps be taken looking to the establishment of such national cemetery.

Adopted by the senate January 23, 1945, by the following vote: ayes 18, nays 0, not voting 1.

Adopted by the house February 8, 1945, by the following vote: ayes 56, nays 0, absent 0, excused 2.

Filed in the office of secretary of state February 9, 1945.

International Security Conference at San Francisco

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to call to the attention of the Members of the Congress resolutions demanding that the International Security Conference at San Francisco be open to the public through representatives of the press and radio and that no more secret commitments be made by the President or any other person in authority without the advice and consent of Congress.

These timely resolutions follow:

Whereas a secret agreement, understanding, or treaty by any representatives of the Government of the United States of America with any foreign representative or government has never held a place in our free form of government, and is apt to interfere with the freedom of the people; and

Whereas free access of American citizens to all information on international agreements for open discussion and debate is a fundamental principle of a free republic; and

Whereas the present national administration is now committed to a policy of international cooperation requiring agreements, understandings and treaties with foreign nations; and

Whereas the decision on all final treaties with these foreign nations rests with the Senate of the United States, whose every action is made daily available to the people, the press, and the radio through the published CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, article 2, section 2, reads, "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"; and

Whereas the executive branch of our Government has violated the principle of this section of the Constitution by making secret agreements and understandings with the representatives of other governments without the advice and consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, that the Allen County Republican Club of Fort Wayne, Ind,, sponsor a movement in this and other communities looking toward an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving all agreements and understandings between this Nation and any other nation the status of international treaties;

Secondly, that a completely detailed report of every agreement, understanding, or treaty by the President or other person in authority be immediately made to the Senate for its advice and consent, and that ratification requires a two-thirds concurring vote by the Senate;

Finally, that such a constitutional amendment would prevent the insidious practice of making agreements whose provisions are kept secret from the American people and would guarantee:

1. The balance of power of the three branches of Government as set forth in our Constitution will be maintained.

2. The people will be promptly informed of all actions on foreign policy taken by their Government, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the press and radio; and, finally,

3. Assure the people that the sovereignty of the United States of America will be preserved at all times in its relationship to other nations.

Whereas the International Security Conference is to be held in San Francisco during the month of April 1945: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allen County Republican Club sponsor a movement in this and other communities urging that all sessions of this Conference be open to the American public through representatives of the press and radio; and be it

Resolved further, That in the event an international governing body be set up at the International Security Conference that a day-to-day record of the complete proceedings of this body, similar to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be published and be made available to the American people, press, and radio as a safeguard to the sovereignty of the United States of America.

NEWS-SENTINEL GIVEN HONOR BY G. O. P. CLUB — RESOLUTION PRAISES FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Editorial policy of the News-Sentinel in combating un-American doctrines seeking to undermine the foundations of American freedom and constitutional government is praised in a resolution adopted by the Allen County Republican Club at its meeting at the Y. M. C. A. Wednesday. Robert Richey, president of the club, presided at the meeting which was addressed by Victor Jose, attorney and orator of Marion County.

The resolution praising the News-Sentinel's stand against the movement designed to rob Americans of their freedom, is as follows:

"Whereas the Allen County Republican Club of Fort Wayne, Ind., is deeply interested in furthering in every way true Americanism in not only its own community but throughout the entire State and Nation; and

"Whereas the News-Sentinel is outstanding in its featuring of columnists who not only uphold and stand for the finest principles of the real spirit of America but exposes those individuals who attempt to poison the minds of the people with their un-American doctrines: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the club extend its thanks and full appreciation to the News-Sentinel for the most excellent help and cooperation being given us, and for the maintenance of that newspaper's splendid editorial and news policies."

PLEADS FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM

County Attorney Lee J. Hartzell was chairman of the meeting. Cochairmen with him were Deputy Sheriff Ira Summers, Ruth Scott, and Ouina Evans. Mr Hartzell introduced Mr. Jose who reviewed the struggles of the pioneers in developing the country and establishing the American freedom under which the country grew to be great. He said that it was for the express purpose of establishing and developing that freedom that the pioneers came to these shores.

"The present national administration is endeavoring to stifle these freedoms," said

Mr. Jose. "However, there are enough Americans who value this freedom so highly that with the backgrounds of their illustrious ancestors they will defeat the purpose of these defilers of American liberty. The unconquerable spirit of these pioneers who founded the country will rise to restore all these freedoms unimpaired and will wipe out the ulterior influence which the present national administration has left on American life."

BLAMED FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The speaker blamed the present national administration for being the principal factor contributing toward the "alarming increase in juvenile delinquency in recent years."

"By putting a premium on deception and bad faith in our National Government and by justifying any means to gain a desired end, the leaders of this administration have given our youth a false picture of moral values and code of ethics and the Nation-wide spread of juvenile delinquency has been the natural result.

"Fort Wayne and Indiana is indeed fortunate in having such an aggressive, loyal American organization as the Allen County Republican Club."

"Every American city should have such an organization to help safeguard and restore rights gained for us by our sturdy, heroic ancestors and to help restore the moral values and conceptions of honesty which have been crushed into the dust by those who would irretrievably stifle our American liberties."

The speaker also deplored at length the great waste of the substance and wealth of the country in the "tremendous sums which are being given away to people all over the world by the present administration."

"This waste of the people's money and the Nation's resources is unconscionable," said Jose.

Nazis for Last-Stand Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lester Allen from the Boston Post of March 11, 1945:

NAZIS FOR LAST STAND BARRIER—HOPE "INNER FORTRESS" IN WILDS OF SOUTH GERMANY WILL HELP THEM TO DELAY FINAL DAY OF DOOM

(By Lester Allen)

High in the cruel terrain of the Apennines in Italy, where American soldiers have been fighting a "forgotten war" against the best remaining troops left to the Germans in a single army unit, the Germans have staged a dress rehearsal of the final stand in the mountain fastnesses of southern Germany, Austria, and the Tyrol.

It has not been noticed, perhaps, in the excitement of the victories of the Cologne plain, that special American mountain troops have been sent into action against the crack German Army kept together in Italy by Von Kesselring. In this army are found no volksturm or volksgrenadier units, no "cannon fodder" scraped up from the bottom of the German manpower barrel. Von Kesselring's men are crafty fighters who know how to sow minefields and cling to mountains.

NAZI "LAST STAND" COMING

There has been much speculation as to the time when the Germans would pull these crack troops out of the Po Valley, out of Italy to the line from Switzerland, through the Tyrol, the Dolomites, and the Carnic Alps. It is virtually certain now that this army will withdraw when the Germans abandon the north German plain before the unbearable squeeze of American and British Armies from the west and the Red Armies from the east.

The German high command has withdrawn and set up headquarters in southern Germany where a succession of mountain chains, covered with heavy forest, gouged by shadowy valleys which are commanded by peaks, make it difficult for modern armies employing tanks and aircraft to maneuver. Bit by bit this mountainous "inner fortress" has been armed and provisioned for the last stand.

During the past 6 months cattle, grain, and canneries have been removed from other parts of the Reich and established in this inner fortress. The Todt organizations have been put to work constructing military defenses of the roads and passes leading to this fortress.

The civilian population dislocated from the cities and towns of the Cologne plain, northern Germany, Silesia, East Prussia, Pomerania, and Saxony has been combed out, and the hardy Nazis of die-hard persuasion have been shipped to the inner fortress, while the remainder have been rejected.

INFORMATION LEAKING OUT

This information has come from Germany piecemeal through neutral foreign countries. A Swiss, making his way home from Holland to Zurich, ordinarily a trip requiring less than 30 hours on the slowest trains, was 5 weeks in passage, for the trains rolling southward were crammed with elite Nazi civilians, bound for the inner fortress. Freight trains bore stocks of live cattle, piled-up bags of grain, guns, and other armament, all rolling down through Wurttemburg away from any of the present fighting fronts.

With our armies on the Rhine in possession of the only feasible bridgeheads where large armies can cross at Arnheim, Cologne, Mayence, Mannheim, and Kohl, the direction of the attack upon Germany is foredestined by the nature of the terrain. General Eisenhower has made so secret in three addresses directed to the German people, the German soldiers, and the German officers that he plans to cut up the German armies in the field.

These statements of the supreme commander are not mere threats, but promises, for it has been the settled policy of the Allied command to say nothing unless it is possible to accomplish what they have set out to do. Thus, cutting up the German armies in the field must be carried out where it is possible to maneuver with great weight and speed.

This plan impels our forces to burst into the north German plain. The best bridgeheads on the Rhine for this undertaking are Arnheim in southern Holland, where the British forces are poised, and Cologne where the Americans are building up and regrouping for the river crossing.

Patton's Third Army is exerting its effort to swing northeastward along the Moselle River to effect the capture of Coblenz. It is possible that Patch's Seventh Army will be left the task of clearing the Rhine left bank from Coblenz to Strasbourg, while the Third, First, and Ninth Armies plunge into Germany across the Rhine.

PROBLEMS FOR EISENHOWER

To halt across the Rhine and attempt to clear the right flank by turning into the Odenwald would send our troops against terrain where they would be stymied for weeks and months by warfare identical with the fighting at the forgotten front in the Apennines, and the purpose of the Rhine crossing would be nullified.

Two problems face General Eisenhower in the Rhine crossing, and neither of them concern the crossing itself, but what happens after the crossing. He must have a strong force on his right flank, now filled by Patton's Third Army to guard against the Germans using any troops from the Italian front in a surprise blow similar to the one by von Rundstedt through the Ardennes in December. And the second problem is the possibility of a defensive position set up by the Germans on the River Weser to impede his incursion into the north German plain to attack and take the great ports of north Germany—Hamburg and Bremen.

If the all-Nazi citadel of mountainous south Germany, Austria, and the Tyrol is to be employed—and every sign points to its use for the last stand, General Eisenhower must plan either to wheel and retrace his course after he has cleaned out the north German plain, and at the same time plan to change the whole character of the fighting from a war of maneuver to a war of position in which mountain troops, infantry, and artillery, fighting much as they did at Cassino and as the forgotten Fifth is now fighting in Italy, inch forward slowly against a fanatical enemy.

It isn't an easy task allocated to American arms in the present set-up of occupation of Germany, for the toughest job has been assigned to the Americans. Virtually all of the almost impregnable positions which the die-hards will defend are in the American occupation zone, and to occupy this zone the Germans must be routed out with all their arms.

EQUIPMENT SENT SOUTH

There are ominous signs, too, that the key workers and all the machinery needed to continue the struggle in the inner fortress have been removed into the fastnesses of the mountainous area, together with all the best locomotives and roling stock looted from Europe. It has been noticed, too, that foreign workers have not been employed in the hidden war factories of south Germany, Austria, and Bohemia for over a year, but these foreigners were shifted to north Germany, the Ruhr, Silesia, and north Saxony, all areas which will be or have been overrun by invading armies.

There is an opportunity to frustrate this Nazi plan, however, by swift and decisive action when the moment is ripe. Any defensive plan the Nazis contemplate for the inner fortress must be implemented by at least 80 divisions of troops at the outset of the withdrawal into the fastnesses of the mountainous country chosen for the last stand.

The withdrawal must be excellently organized, perhaps with the same skill displayed in the retreat from Stalingrad, and must be based upon iron discipline of troops not disheartened by one defeat after another. In the army on the Po, which for so long has conducted a holding against Gen. Mark Clark's Fifth Army, the Germans have 15 divisions of excellent soldiers, not at full strength but kept together as a unit. The kind of defensive warfare they have employed as a specialty is in mountainous terrain with the lavish use of land mines and patrols.

UNITED STATES HAS MOUNTAIN FIGHTERS

In the Fifth and Seventh Armies, one in Italy and one in Alsace-Lorraine, we have two field forces which have learned a great deal about mountain fighting against the Germans. The Seventh has fought in Italy and in the Vosges Mountains in France, and the Fifth has specialized almost entirely in mountain fighting. These two armies must be the nucleus of the force to be employed

in routing the Germans from their last fortress.

No doubt the swift and decisive moves which will be taken when the Nazis seek to retire into the inner fortress will include a dash by the Third Army across the lines of communication of the Wehrmacht as it seeks to retire southward from the north German plain, while both strategic and tactical air forces hammer at the roads and railroads to disrupt and halt the retirement.

The German forces which faced the Russians in Hungary, or at least that portion of the forces saved from the siege of Budapest, have retired into Austria and northern Yugoslavia to hold that defensive position. The German forces around Breslau, holding that flank against Russian attack, will fall back upon the Sudetan Mountains and Bohemia.

Military plans discussed at the Yalta Conference more likely concerned the unified action to minimize and break up this retirement into the inner fortress for the last stand than the concerted pincers attacks of the American, British, and Russian Armies, which were already prepared and in their middle phases when the Yalta Conference was held.

The final chapters of the war in Europe may only be written after Germany has been defeated in the field and the remnants driven into the mountains, for, as long as the Nazis can preserve an army in being, they still can bargain with the hangman.

Patton Rings the Bell Again Amidst Gasps of Admiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Capt. Lowell M. Limpus:

PATTON "RINGS THE BELL" AGAIN AMIDST GASPS OF ADMIRATION

(By Capt. Lowell M. Limpus)

"Old Blood and Guts" Patton's latest lunge is carrying him into key territory again, and this time he's ringing up a five-fold achievement which has military men here once more gasping with admiration:

1. He's smashing through the center of the German line and threatening to circle around and outflank four Nazi field armies.

2. He's swinging into another strategic position where he can strike in any one of three different directions and yet pierce the heart of central Germany whichever way he goes.

3. By so doing he now threatens to cut off the expected retreat of Hitler's northern garrisons into the mountains of central Germany.

4. He also automatically endangers three more badly hurt German armies facing two Allied armies to the south.

5. He's threatening another 10,000 square miles of key German territory, which he may add to the 8,000 he helped to knock off during the past 3 weeks.

ONE FOR THE BOOKS

Lieutenant General Patton accomplished all this when he circled around and smashed across the upper Rhine after one of the prettiest samples of military broken-field running that the history books will ever record. And it was this run which carried him into his present position, where he's a looming menace on the flank of the Germans struggling to stop Eisenhower's plunge across the upper Rhine.

Up there two German Army groups, totaling four armies, are trying to check two Anglo-American Army groups with six, while Patton himself makes seven.

The old cavalry veteran lived up to all expectations when he once got loose and his opponents scarcely laid a hand on him, after he broke into the clear. When his Third Army broke through the west wall at Trier he sent his tanks racing northeast for 65 miles, through the hills above the Moselle Valley. At Coblenz, he suddenly spun about and came plunging down the south bank of the Rhine.

He then turned south for 50 miles and crashed into the rear of the Siegfried Line, which was still holding Patch's Seventh Army at bay. Together the two Americans wrecked the second third of the West Wall, but Patton wasn't through yet. He whirled straight east and went plunging across the river to establish our second big bridgehead below Frankfort.

ANY WAY IS GOOD

This performance was more than War Department observers had counted on. They hadn't expected any Rhine crossing just yet.

An extra dividend is his present position, at the edge of the Frankfort plain. Now new opportunities are opening up, labeled Hesse, Thuringia, and Franconia. Each is a logical target for his next plunge, and contains some nice new autobahnen—superduper highways.

One such highway runs northward up a nice valley from Frankfort through Hesse to Kassel, at the edge of the north German plain, right behind Eisenhower's advance; another extends northeastward through a second valley to Fulda and Eisenach in Thuringia. A third valley runs northeast from Stuttgart to Wurtzburg, in Franconia, and it has a superhighway only 60 miles east of Patton now.

All three possibilities are presented to "Smiling Albert" Kesselring, plus the additional one that Patton might turn back and swing up the Rhine toward Cologne. (He isn't apt to, though, because he can do more damage in the other direction.)

Thus the traditional cavalry-style superraids of the Third Army's commander again prove to be a valuable asset for our side.

Today, therefore, finds Patton poised for what may be his third great sweep of the war. The first carried him out of Normandy across France. The second out of France across the Rhineland. The third out of the Rhineland across—where?

Well, that's apt to be "Smiling Albert's" $64 question.

India Aroused at Congress' Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Releigh Register, Beckley, W. Va.:

INDIA AROUSED AT CONGRESS' ACTION

BOMBAY.—A committee vote in the United States House of Representatives to postpone consideration of the Indian immigration bill aroused a bitter press reaction in India today.

The postponement "comes as a tragic anticlimax to reports which flooded India giving the impression that American opinion was overwhelmingly pro-Indian in this matter," the Free Press Journal declared.

"For this, American news agencies and the United States O. W. I. have to thank themselves," the newspaper asserted, "by cabling lengthy reports of individual opinions they had created a false atmosphere of misplaced faith in American intentions."

The publication said the committee vote "goes to show that, in spite of Roosevelt and Joseph Grew, Under Secretary of State, the Americans are not so idealistically minded that they can look upon even mild reforms with anything but selfish eyes. Is this a foretaste of things to come at San Francisco?"

Indians, it was said, had been looking toward the San Francisco world security conference, April 25, as the possible beginning of consideration of the Asiatics' position in the light of the "four freedoms."

Earlier, Indian Nationalists had reacted sharply against the Indian Government's choice of the viceroy's council members as delegates to San Francisco. They charged in the press and elsewhere that the council members would represent only British authority.

Indians said that the proposed immigration of 100 persons annually carried no threat to the American way of life and that the vote of the House committee reflected only racial antagonism.

The Wilners Make Their Supreme Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the accomplishments of members of B'nai B'rith and their heroism displayed on the field of battle. Today, I want to pay tribute to a B'nai B'rith father, Joseph A. Wilner, of Washington, D. C., a great American whose two sons, namely, Major Bernard and Captain John, of the United States Army, made the supreme sacrifice. Captain John served with General Patton's Third Army Tank Corps.

I want to pay personal tribute to Joseph Wilner, double gold-star father, who finds some measure of consolation in the fact that his sons died for the noblest of all causes—for their God and country.

As part of my remarks I am pleased to include the editorial comment entitled "The Wilners Make Their Supreme Contribution" which appeared in the current issue of the National Jewish Monthly:

THE WILNERS MAKE THEIR SUPREME CONTRIBUTION

Last night I went to a meeting of my lodge. There were no well-known speakers. There was no entertainment. There was no fine-spun oratory. Yet throughout the evening the program held the audience in rapt and even profound reverence. They had braved the icy weather to come to a B'nai B'rith meeting in order to dedicate a memorial to

two brothers, Maj. Bernard and Capt. John Wilner, of the United States Army, who had made the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country.

It was to be a memorial different from other memorials. It wasn't something carved of bronze or stone. The 30 boys of the new Wilner AZA Chapter represented a living symbol as they were drawn up on the platform to receive their charter denoting their acceptance into the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization. They were faced by Joseph A. Wilner, father of the two heroes. We who knew the boys, both those who had gone before and these fresh-eyed youngsters who were to carry on an honored name, wondered what Joe would say. We wondered whether he could stand up under the strain and how he would take it.

Our fears were soon allayed. With voice firm and strong, Joe told us, in simple and kindly words, of his great love for his sons, which had run together through the years with his love for B'nai B'rith. His sons had not been called. They had gone to war early and voluntarily. Bernard, the eldest, was over draft age; John, the younger, could have stayed on this side because of a physical defect which only an operation could cure. He had insisted upon the operation, and then joined General Patton's Third Army Tank Corps. Both passed to the Great Beyond a few months apart. Joe Wilner, exemplar of B'nai B'rith's devotion to its country and people, spoke of them with the pride of his patriarchal forebears and a true American parent.

He told us how he wanted the new chapter named for them to carry on in the way his own boys would have wished, and in the tradition of B'nai B'rith. He recalled how the B'nai B'rith youth movement had been born when he, as a delegate to the convention in 1925, had voted for the adoption of AZA and the Hillel Foundations by B'nai B'rith. He looked forward to its future growth, when it would express the greatness of our people and help advance human progress even more than at present.

We sat there and our heartache disappeared. Then we knew. We knew why Jews live and live on. We knew that not even the rantings of the paperhanger of Munich, not even the furnace at Lublin to which our innocents had been led, can quench the spiritual fortitude our people can summon in their critical hour.

Joe Wilner, double gold-star father, expressing the spirit of his sons, their mother, their widows, their children, who sat quietly through the ceremony, and the boys of the Wilner AZA chapter who felt profoundly the message given to them—this was B'nai B'rith that spoke out that night at just another lodge meeting.

MAURICE BISGYER.

Telephone Wire on Wing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article appearing in the Rutherford Republican under date of March 23, dealing with one of the newest developments of particular value in connection with the prosecution of the war—that of laying telephone lines by aircraft.

I am particularly proud of the fact that one of my close friends, from my home town of Rutherford, N. J., Paul W. Blye, played an extremely important part in the development of this method.

This great accomplishment is one of many examples of results obtained when the technical forces of private enterprise join those of our Army and Navy.

The article follows:

TELEPHONE WIRE ON WING—ARMY'S NEWEST—PAUL W. BLYE, RUTHERFORD, BELL LABORATORY TRANSMISSION ENGINEER, ASSISTS IN PERFECTING NEW METHOD

Rutherford citizens who were listening to the March of Time radio program last Friday evening, were thrilled at the report and flight demonstration of laying telephone lines by aircraft.

Participating in the program was a Rutherford man, Borough Councilman Paul W. Blye, of Woodland Avenue, transmission engineer, Bell Telephone laboratories, New York City, who with Army Technical Command officers, developed this new boon for military uses in war.

Mr. Blye was on the air to report the technical phases and accomplishments of the new method, this being the first release to the public.

BELL LAB AND ARMY AIR

Supervising the demonstration were Capt. R. R. Ford, project officer of the Air Technical Service Command Equipment Laboratory, and Mr. Blye.

The wire was laid out from a field laboratory set up at Fort Dix, more than a year ago as the base for continued experiments conducted with the close cooperation of Col. L. T. Jones, commanding officer of the base, and Major K. E. Miller, of the equipment division of the Air Communications Office in Washington.

Maj. Lawrence M. Proctor, Jr., commanding officer of the Four Thousand One Hundred and Forty-ninth Air Base Unit at Fort Dix, who with his men handled the C–47 on the scores of test runs, flew the same airplane in the press demonstration Friday evening.

The demonstration climaxed months of research and experiment. Officials revealed in detail their process of laying up to 16 miles of telephone wire over any type of terrain under battle conditions from a twin-engined C–47 cargo airplane at the Fort Dix Army Air Base.

HOW IT WAS DONE

In a few minutes the C–47, flying at an altitude of only 200 feet and a speed of some 125 miles per hour, threw off a 36-inch parachute carrying one end of the wire ballasted with a 20-pound weight, laid out the wire over a 6-mile course, dropped the other end at a designated point, and a conversation was established over the wire.

During the wire-laying, newspapermen on the airplane were able to talk by telephone with other press representatives on the ground where phone equipment had quickly been hooked on to one terminus of the wire.

A short time ago telephone wire on the wing was unheard of. Before long it can be a commonplace on the battlefield, say the officials.

Its battle applications are endless they say, and they all involve saving precious time and more precious lives. Isolated tanks can be linked with distant operating bases. Previously impenetrable jungles and impassable mountain ranges will be obliterated as communications obstacles by flights of a few minutes to connect operating forces and coordinate the activities of Allied battle units.

ATTAIN MAXIMUM, 16 MILES

The achievement witnessed Friday by newspapermen at Fort Dix of uncoiling wire smoothly without snarls or breaks at speeds exceeding 200 feet per second required considerable study and experiment, including more than 200 test flights at the Fort Dix air base.

Gradually the number of successful runs increased and test lengths mounted from 1 mile to 2 miles and then to 4 and 6. That was run up to 16, the specified maximum, and then success of the development was signalized when 16 miles of the wire were laid over the rough terrain of the Great Smoky Mountains in 6⅔ minutes.

Friday's run was 6 miles and constituted the first time the process had been demonstrated to the press. Soon it will be demonstrated with all its speeding of the art of war and elimination of lost lives, as a commonplace feature of American technique of making war in Asia and the far Pacific, says Mr. Blye.

WINDING THE WIRE

In the airplane Friday night a number of coils of special telephone wire, previously wound by a small automatic machine to look something like a ball of twine at a grocery store, only larger, were lined up across the cargo floor. Cased in wooden boxes, the coils each holding two miles of wire were connected together. The containers were placed one behind the other in a line extending diagonally across the cargo floor from the doorway forward toward the pilot's compartment.

Beginning with the first container at the doorway, wire from the outer turns of the coil were drawn through container openings and spliced to wire in the core of the second coil. Splicing was repeated between succeeding boxes until all coils were spliced together to form a continuous length of wire. In all, the C–47 could quickly have unraveled 10 miles of telephone wire.

STARTING THE RUN

A short tube was thrust out of the doorway and attached to the front opening of the first box.

As the plane approached its target area where the line was to start, the pilot gave a signal and the man moved back to the open doorway. On the next signal, he threw out the parachute and weight with line attached.

The parachute opened and started the wire plying out. The weight dropped the line end quickly to the desired target area and the pay-out process settled down to a steady thrumming of wire leaving the plane.

No modification was required for the plane. Containers were loaded and tied down like any other cargo, except for being placed in line.

From the Record of the A. F. of L.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following selection from an article by William Green in the American Federationist for July 1943 is, in my opinion, decidedly worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For two reasons: First, because it brings out clearly the instinctive foresight which these American workers had, in the years before the war, of the inevitable and disastrous consequences of tyrannical government to the peace of the world; and second, because it expresses so forcibly the determination of labor that another period of mass unemployment, threatening as it certainly

will, free democratic institutions, shall not come upon our country or the world.

[From the American Federationist of July 1943]

AMERICAN LABOR IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(By William Green)

Workers throughout the world are determined to prevent for all time the recurrence of mass unemployment, of industrial depressions, and to forever prevent the rise of totalitarian dictatorship which the resulting mass privation and mass suffering inevitably breed.

The great depression of the thirties swept over the entire world. In one short and disastrous period, it destroyed millions of jobs and rent asunder living standards which organized labor in America and other free nations had built up over generations of struggle for the workers' betterment. In Europe the depression swept away with it the very foundations of the democratic order and gave rise to a wave of fascism which destroyed not only the rights of labor but also the most basic human rights.

In the years of economic disintegration, democratic nations failed to meet the challenge of Fascist dictatorship by failing to act in concert.

It seems prophetic now that the American Federation of Labor took a determined stand years ago in warning the people of democratic nations against the future enemy and in urging that totalitarian nations, governed by tyrants and dictators, be dealt with firmly before it was too late. Ten years ago the American Federation of Labor convention voted a boycott against German goods in protest against the suppression by Hitler of the right of working people to organize into free trade-unions and against the repressive policies of the German Government and its persecution of minority races. This boycott and this protest were made stronger by each succeeding convention of the American Federation of Labor, and Hitler and his Nazi followers grew more aggressive and vicious every year.

The 1934 convention of the A. F. of L. charged the Nazi government with promoting ends which endangered the peace of the world, and enslaving thousands of men and women whose only crime was devotion to liberty.

In 1937, 5 years before Pearl Harbor, the American Federation of Labor declared a boycott against Japan. The convention declared:

"We hereby call upon the people of the United States to condemn the outrageous acts of Japan and to denounce its militarist and conscienceless policy. We recommend that the United States Government prohibit its citizens from selling war material, including scrap, or lending money to Japan until that nation has ceased its barbarous methods of conquest."

* * * And who is there today who does not now wish from the very bottom of his heart that we had refused to sell thousands of tons of scrap to Japan and thus help in the attack upon us; that we had refused to temporize with and appease Fascist dictators until they became strong enough to wage this war on a world scale?

Regulation of Bank Holding Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert a letter I have received from Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and a statement in regard to a bill which I have introduced this day entitled "A bill to control and regulate bank holding companies; to control and regulate relationships between insured banks and their affiliates; and for other purposes":

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 23, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: As you know, the Banking Act of 1933 was in part designed to regulate bank holding companies and the Board has had the express responsibility for administering that part of the act. The reasons and need for regulation were fully developed in the extensive hearings and reports at the time and need no restatement.

However, the laws enacted at that time have not proven to be as effective as was intended and the problem continued to be one of serious concern to the Board. This has been true also with respect to the other Federal banking agencies which, while not having the primary responsibility, do have a real interest in the subject matter.

In his message to the Congress on April 29, 1938, the President pointed out the great economic power that might be wielded by a group acquiring domination over banking resources in any considerable area of the country and recommended that the Congress enact legislation that would effectively control the operation of bank-holding companies.

The Board, in is annual report for the year 1943, recommended the enactment of comprehensive legislation designed to correct certain abuses and to achieve certain objectives which, to the Board, seem highly desirable in the public interest. A copy of the report is enclosed and you will find the section dealing with the Board's recommendations on page 34. Since its report numerous individual banks and associations of banks have importuned the Board to offer the precise form of a bill which would carry out the Board's recommendations or to lend its support to other forms of suggested bills. Representatives in Congress have made similar requests. There has been neither improvement nor change in the situation since the report was made which causes the Board to feel any less concern, and the abuses described in the report continue unabated and uncontrolled.

When the board was considering its annual report for 1943, a draft of a bill designed to carry out the recommendations made in the report was prepared by the board's staff. The board has asked that I deliver a copy of this draft to you for your consideration with the hope that such a bill will be introduced by you and will receive favorable consideration by the Congress. It is enclosed herewith. The board will be glad to respond to any request for further information and to assist you and your committee in any appropriate way.

The matter of the introduction of the enclosed bill has already been taken up with the Bureau of the Budget and under date of March 22 the board received a letter from the Bureau in which it was indicated that "there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress," although, of course, the Bureau made no commitment as to the relation of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

I am also enclosing a statement of the purposes of this bill which may be helpful to you if and when you introduce the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROPOSED LEGISLATION AFFECTING BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

On April 29, 1944, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made its annual report to Congress covering operations for the year 1943. Included in this report was a recommendation for immediate legislation to deal with bank holding companies. It is extremely desirable that every Member of Congress who has not already done so should carefully read and study these recommendations. The proposed bill was drafted in the light of the experience of the Board in administering those provisions of the Banking Act of 1933, which dealt with bank holding companies, and to supply the needs recommended by the Board in its 1943 report.

The present bill would incorporate all provisions respecting bank holding companies into one section of the Federal Reserve Act. This section would become section 23A of that act, which now deals with "relations of affiliates" of member banks. Existing laws respecting affiliate relations would be reenacted in the proposed bill and would become section 23B of the Federal Reserve Act. This would not effect any substantial change in the present law on affiliate relationships, except that the law which now covers only member banks would be extended to cover all insured banks.

Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act, as it would be amended by the bill, would confine the business of a bank holding company to the operation of its subsidiary banks, all other unrelated activities being prohibited. This would be accomplished by a direct prohibition, by requiring bank holding companies within a reasonable time to divest themselves of nonbanking companies which they may now control, and by a prohibition against acquiring stock of nonbanking companies in the future. Provision is made, however, for the retention, under appropriate safeguards, of nonbanking companies which are merely an incident to the holding company's main business, such as, for example, the retention of a safety deposit company.

Bank holding companies would be defined to meet the inadequacies of the present definition and more nearly in the manner in which Congress has defined holding companies operating in other fields.

Bank holding companies would be prohibited from purchasing any more bank stock. However, in order to protect existing minority interests who might otherwise have no market for their bank stock, the prohibition would not apply to a situation where the holding company already owns more than 50 percent of the stock of such bank, provided that the same offer to purchase is made to all minority holders. The bill would require bank holding companies within 2 years after the effective date thereof to divest themselves of bank stock acquired after the beginning of 1943. The expansion of existing bank holding companies would thus be curbed while at the same time the bill would make it unlawful for other companies to become bank holding companies by the purchase of bank stocks.

Finally, the bill would improve the present ineffective controls over the operation of bank holding companies. The deposits of their subsidiary banks in due course would have to become insured. "Upstream" loans and intercompany sales of securities would be prohibited, except as they may be authorized under certain conditions by the Board. Dividends out of other than operating income would be regulated; and exorbitant or unreasonable managerial fees would be prevented. Provision is made for the examination from time to time of bank holding companies and for the submission by them

of reports similar to those required of the banks which they now control. Penalties are set up as well as means of enforcement; but there are also appropriate provisions for court review of all orders which the Board would be authorized to issue. The Board would be required to report back to the Congress before the expiration of 5 years the results of its administration of this act.

The United States Must Be Saved, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the New Orleans Item of Wednesday, March 21, 1945.

THE UNITED STATES MUST BE SAVED, TOO

It is now clearly conceded by the highest New Deal officials that the productive resources of the United States have been already strained to the danger point by mountainous contributions of all sorts which the Government has made to peoples overseas, in lavish outlays and exports through too many unsystematized agencies. It is admitted that these expenditures of money and materials are now threatening the stability of our own economic structure, and will reduce our own people below reasonable standards of living even for wartime—if not rationally checked in order to avert national disaster.

All this abundantly appears in a move by Director of Mobilization Byrnes, our "Assistant President" himself, on March 11. He announced that day that he has set up a committee over the most important of these spending and exporting agencies "to protect our domestic economy and support our war effort" by correlating their scattery operations to put proper checks upon the tremendous overseas floods of our money and goods.

Mr. Byrnes' position has thus been summarized, in part:

Military needs come first; then relief supplies in the wake of battles. All other bids for relief, rehabilitation, and other export goals must then be balanced against "our own minimum essential civilian economy."

His committee is to prevent overcommitments by a number of independent agencies. It is to examine all factors which pertain to our capacity to export things for support of the war, other than direct lend-lease military commitments. * * * It must develop a uniform program for aid to other countries, with full knowledge of all such obligations accepted up to date, and of the needs of our own domestic economy. The following warning is given in his own terms:

"Consideration must be given to commitments which were made in the past, but now appear capable of fulfillment only with serious impact on our own civilian economy. And it may be necessary to reconsider these commitments with the countries to which they have been made."

This is the first sign of realism in a long riot of loose spending and exporting. It is strong medicine and won't be liked abroad; but it needs to be administered. For if our home-economy is threatened with undermining by previous excesses in this way, what must be the blighting effect upon us of the enormous and variegated forms of lavish outlay which are constantly being pressed upon us for the post-war future?

Congress, becoming alarmed, is already about to restrict lend-lease spending rigidly to war purposes, and prohibit it for foreign relief, rehabilitation or anything else, after the war. But within 24 hours after Mr. Byrnes spoke, Director Lehman, of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, made a gloomy statement foreshadowing "the tragic consequences of failure" to make "adequate provision" for relief in the countries already liberated. And never forget that other demands will be made on Uncle Sam, already groggy, for countries that have not yet been liberated.

We don't speak against reasonable aid where needs are worst. But it must be held in check, lest we ruin this country too. America can't give the rest of the suffering world all its people need—to say nothing of all they want. To do that would exhaust our granaries, mines, and money. It would kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, and reduce us to the evils that have overcome most of the warring peoples overseas.

Already we have heard rumors of long-term credit of $9,000,000,000 to Britain, to help rebuild or repair her economic structure and maintain her commerce. And now we are hearing of a bid from Russia for $7,000,000,000 for similar purposes. Nor can there be any doubt that China and France will be in the bidding too. And so will every smaller country that has suffered by the war. We are also invited to assume billions of financial risks for an international bank. And the calls upon us are and will be swollen incalculably by other calls for outright or disguised gifts all over the map.

These bids are sometimes supported by specious assertions that all these other nations are fighting to save the United States from nazidom. Nothing could be more untrue. They are fighting for themselves, in a war which we had nothing to do with starting, which they did nothing to prevent while failing to prepare to fight it. Into that war we were dragged by our sympathy with them. From the direst consequences of it we have saved them by the most titanic investment of blood and treasure that any nation ever undertook in such a case. Yet we were 3,000 miles farther from it than any of them, and were never in such danger from our present enemies as they were.

Let such things be candidly and rationally considered when dire necessity for our own survival requires us to measure how far we can go to ease a whole world's woes.

Mr. Byrnes has sounded a sane note. We hope that enough of his New Deal friends will realize it to save this country from a situation in which it will itself need help which cannot be found.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on March 24, 1945:

Speaking for the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, which was established on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation, under a constitutional government.

From the earliest times it had developed its own language, similar to the ancient Aryan language of the Hindus, its own culture, and its own traditions.

Its people are not related to the Slavs, but have been welded together into a distinct nationality, through common interests and ideals.

As early as 1569, Lithuania showed a determination to achieve independence.

During the period of popular representation, 1905 to 1914, Lithuania revived the autonomous movement.

In World War No. 1 Lithuania had to bear hostile invasion and suffered severely, the country being devastated alike by alleged friend and avowed foe.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania.

This independence was lost for no other reason than its geographical location.

It is occupied by other nations during World War No. 2 for the same reason that the countries of Belgium and Czechoslovakia are now occupied.

The Republic of Lithuania has maintained friendly relations with its neighbors.

When it asks for independence, it asks only that its national identity, its culture, language, and traditions be preserved.

Americans of Lithuanian descent are mighty proud to be citizens of the United States.

And as Americans they are doing their share in fighting this war.

The records of the Treasury Department in Washington will reveal that Americans of Lithuanian descent have purchased in excess of their quota of War bonds and that they are among the first at the head of the list of nationality groups.

The fact that many of them have only been Americans for one generation or possibly two gives them a stronger appreciation of the blessings of American citizenship.

More so, perhaps, than is the appreciation of many of their fellow citizens whose families have never known another land since the Mayflower established one of its first beachheads on this continent.

It is only natural, though, that they have an affection for the land of their forefathers, just as our fellow Americans are concerned with other lands.

Many have a special concern for China or France, for England or Switzerland.

Americans of Lithuanian descent have a special concern for Lithuania.

As Americans, they are sending their sons and husbands overseas, on all fronts, to fight our enemy, primarily because they do not want them to have to do this same fighting on the shores of America.

They are determined, like all Americans and their allies who are engaged in this world conflict, to rid the world of those who seek to destroy democracy, and to reestablish freedom and independence in those countries whose innocent peoples have been trampled upon.

We are hopeful that Lithuania will remain as an independent nation when peace comes to this world.

And as the Atlantic Charter, proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, sets forth, as one of the principles for which we are fighting the Axis, the right of small nations to self-determination and independence, and I quote:

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned:

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In a speech on September 12, 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull reaffirmed these principles in declaring—and I quote:

"All peoples who, with a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its employment.

"Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

"All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs."

Knowing the Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know no great patriotic group of Americans, whether this be the land of their birth or the land of their adoption, who have steadfastly fought for independence.

No man can know a Lithuanian without discovering that a never-dying passion for the independence of his country is eating into his soul.

Out of the depths there comes a cry from this nation which for centuries has been forced to be inarticulate.

It is not a demand for privilege, for territory to which it might have only a historical claim; it is a cry for life, and if we really believe in our own professions if the traditions of 1776 have not been effaced, if the definition of self-determinism with which President Wilson sought to change the evil systems of lust and avarice in Europe and the rest of the world, after the First World War—we Americans must listen to this cry from the core of the hearts of the Lithuanians.

We cannot close our ears to it.

Equal Rights or Unequal Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article entitled "Equal Rights or Unequal Rights?" by Elizabeth S. Magee, general secretary of the National Consumers League, which article appeared in the January 1945 issue of the Woman's Press. The article is as follows:

The professional woman who supports the so-called equal-rights amendment with the expectation that by some abracadabra it will open doors of opportunity for her is doing wishful thinking. If, instead of concentrating on the glittering catch phrases of the proponents, she would read the wording of the proposed amendment, she would see that it is phrased:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Note that phrase "under the law." There are no laws requiring that women be hired in the same proportion as men any more than there are, or ever could be, laws compelling the public to patronize women physicians or women lawyers. These are matters of tradition and custom and while conditions may change, and indeed have changed, it has not been the result of passing a law.

The amendment would not result in equal pay for equal work for men and women throughout the United States, no matter what extravagant promises its supporters are making for it in that direction. It provides for "equality of rights under the law." In the absence of any law stipulating equal pay for men and women, the amendment would have no effect. Only five States, Michigan, Montana, Washington, Illinois, and, most recently, New York, have laws on their books making statutory equal pay for equal work whether performed by men or women. A united drive, supported by 12 national organizations, is under way to secure the passage of equal pay laws in other States.

The National Consumers League believes that the passage of such equal pay laws would be an effective way of eliminating the double-standard pay roll, and the league is giving its hearty support for such legislation.

The amendment not only would not achieve what certain professional women might hope from it, but would create a genuine disaster for their wage-earning sisters in industry.

There is little need to remind anyone who has been associated with the Industrial Department of the Y. W. C. A. that women are the most easily and most habitually exploited element in the labor market. The reasons for this include the weaker bargaining power of women, the fact that they are not so highly organized into trade unions as men, and the unhappily well-founded theory that "you can hire a woman for less." In depression periods this "less" frequently falls below a subsistence wage.

Thorough investigation and years of unremitting struggle have resulted in a system of laws in the various States to prevent this exploitation. These include statutes covering minimum wages, maximum hours, days of rest and rest periods, dangerous work or night work, or work in places deemed unwholesome to the morals and health of women, inadequate lunch periods, the lifting of excessive weights, provision of seats, separate and adequate sanitary facilities, and exposure to industrial substances and poisons particularly hazardous to women. All these laws were passed because this Nation has recognized, as all nations must if they are to survive, that if the health of its mothers is not protected, the race will be endangered.

The constitutionality of every one of these laws would be thrown into jeopardy, if not actually outlawed, by passage of the equal rights amendment. Douglas B. Maggs, solicitor for the United States Department of Labor, says unequivocally:

"The amendment itself, without the aid of legislation enacted to enforce it, will strike down as unconstitutional and invalid all provisions in existing and future laws which, on the basis of assumed or accepted differences between the sexes, give men or women rights which are not accorded in equal degree to the other sex * * * in seeking to achieve an illusory equality it will result in women losing deserved advantages."

A large proportion of women workers are young women, 18 to 24, who have gone to work in the years preceding marriage and child-bearing. Statistics show that they are more susceptible to tuberculosis than any other group. They must be protected from overlong hours and particularly from extended night work. Reliable scientific research has proved that some occupational diseases, such as lead poisoning, lead to sterility in women. It is inconceivable that a civilized nation should tie its hands constitutionally so that it could not protect its potential mothers from these hazards.

Proponents of the law point out that a number of laws, particularly the Fair Labor Standards Act, have been passed which are applicable to men as well as women. The answer to this argument is double-barreled. First, the Fair Labor Standards Act applies only to workers in interstate commerce and is not applicable to more than half the workers in the United States. Second, it has been found to be very difficult to enact State minimum wage legislation applicable to both sexes. Thus it is both doctrinal and theoretical to suggest that we wait to get protection for those who most need it until we can get it for everyone.

Not only the wage-earning woman but the wife and mother at home would lose some of the genuine rights to which she is entitled if this amendment were to be adopted.

Social workers know that the period of a wife's pregnancy is a favorite time for the husband to desert. The amendment would make it impossible for the law to protect her special rights or to give her preference. In fact, it would make both husband and wife equally responsible for the support of the family—a responsibility that the wife might find a trifle difficult to meet while engaged in her normal child-bearing function.

The old-age insurance paid to wives and the survivors' benefits paid to widows under the Social Security Act would be jeopardized, as would the widows' grant under workmen's compensation laws, a grant now mandatory when the husband is killed in an industrial accident.

For all these reasons and others which space will not permit me to detail, I submit the suggestion that the name of the proposal be changed to the "gold brick" amendment. I am confident that the intelligent and socially minded women of America will not buy it.

Speaking Program of Hall Furlough Clubs' St. Patrick's Day Dance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses:

SPEECH BY MRS. VIOLET GRASSI, GENERAL CHAIRMAN OF HALL FURLOUGH CLUBS, MARCH 17, 1945

Members of the Hall Furlough Clubs, service men and women, friends, we are gathered here this evening to celebrate, along with St. Patrick's Day, the accomplishments throughout the past year of these patriotic women in the interests of their men in service.

There are now 24 clubs in Broome County and several more outside and in Pennsylvania. They are composed of women of all ages who have either husbands, brothers, or sons fighting for their country.

I want to thank the members of Club 5 for the fine job they did in organizing the party. Recognition should also go to the members of all other clubs in supporting this function.

One of the outstanding jobs our clubs have performed is the canteen work. This was organized in a small way in the baggage room at the Erie station. Since then it has grown through hard work by the members to be known as the favorite stopping place for thousands of soldiers all over the country.

Credit for building up the Hall Furlough Clubs' canteen should go to Mrs. Alice Ervay, canteen chairman, and her committee. I hope all clubs will support Mrs. Ervay in her patriotic work.

Mrs. Mildred Ellsworth, president of Club 7, has started out her club on another venture. She is taking charge of a hospital-visiting program and is doing wonderful work among the wounded men.

We should not forget the editor in chief of the Hall Furlough Canteen, Mrs. Anna

Egan, and praise her for the splendid newspaper she is now editing called the Canteen. She tells me the paper which describes all club activities and is our official news organ is read on all the battle fronts, in all the hospitals, and is distributed among soldiers visiting the Erie canteen. More power to you, Mrs. Egan.

We of the Hall Furlough Clubs urge you people to join with us in making our efforts for the boys really count. The people of our section deserve consideration. Our Congressman, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, is on the job to see that they get it. We are here to see that he gets the backing he is entitled to.

And now, as general chairman of the Furlough Clubs, it is my pleasure and privilege to call on the man who receives more letters per day than anyone I know of and who answers them just as fast as they come. These letters are not fan mail because they contain some of the most urgent requests that people can possibly make. This man is called upon by at least 50 people from our section every day to help their loved ones in the Army or Navy. This man holds the highest elective office we can give him in this district. He is the soldier's friend in the Congress of the United States Moreover, he is our friend in Congress. We look forward to hearing at this time from the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Representative in Congress from the Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

REMARKS BY HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL OF NEW YORK

Mrs. Grassi, members of the Hall Furlough Clubs, soldiers, guests, and friends. Thanks so much for this nice reception. I wish I could attend these parties more often. They give the folks back home, your wives, mothers, sweethearts, and sisters of those who are away a chance to talk over your mutual problems of keeping the home front in order. You are deserving of great praise and I commend you for all you have done to make our great community a better place to live in.

We know many of these who are moved will be slated to be sent against the Japanese. But for my part, I think the boys who have borne the brunt of the battle the longest should be sent home.

I don't know by what method their future will be decided, but I say the military ought to give consideration to all men over 30 who are married and especially those with children. Every effort should be made to bring them home as quickly as possible.

I am now working on legislation which I will soon place before the House to give reasonable furloughs to every American veteran of the European war, after victory in Europe. These furloughs should be administered with more generosity and better eye for justice than is now being shown.

We all realize that America must contribute her share to guarding against the danger of Germany rising again, but after VE-day furloughs and discharges can be distributed and awarded on a vast scale with an eye to the complete return of married men and heads of familiar to their civilian lives.

Articles by Dr. Dilworth Lupton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, among the columnists today who are writing on the international crisis, none has shown a stronger grasp of the moral implications involved than Dr. Dilworth Lupton, columnist for the Cleveland Press. As an indication of this fact, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD three of his columns appearing March 19, 20, and 21 in the Cleveland (Ohio) Press:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of March 19, 1945]

MAY SWEEP COUNTRY

The Jews, Catholics, and Protestants of Cleveland have an opportunity to inaugurate a peace movement that would be unique and perhaps historic.

Last January, for what I believe to be the first time in the history of the United States, three Congressmen of separate religious affiliations offered in the House of Representatives a concurrent resolution. They were MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN (Democrat), of Ohio, Catholic; CHARLES LAFOLLETTE (Republican), of Indiana, Protestant; and SAMUEL A. WEISS (Democrat) of Pennsylvania, Jew. Through their resolution these gentlemen urge that the House declare itself in favor of basing the future peace of the world upon certain moral principles which 17 months ago were agreed upon jointly in a public declaration by leaders of the three faiths.

These three Congressmen and Father Edward A. Conway, S. J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, will speak about this resolution before the Cleveland Round-table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews at a lunch in the Cleveland Hotel on Wednesday. Then Thursday night at 10:35, they will be heard over Station WTAM.

Passage of this congressional resolution, if supported by millions of Americans, would do much to strengthen our delegates to the San Francisco Conference in their moral determination to create a just peace.

That support could best be brought about through an avalanche of letters and telegrams sent to their Congressmen by individuals. Such a trireligious movement could sweep the country.

Indeed, this possibility that the Feighan-Weiss-La Follette resolution might be a force toward enduring peace is so apparent that every Jew, Catholic, or Protestant should familiarize himself with the religious principles upheld.

Among the Protestant endorsers of this pattern for peace are leaders like Dr. Blanchard, of Cleveland, and Bishops Oxnam and Tucker. Jewish signers include Rabbis Brickner and Silver, of Cleveland, and Rabbi Wise. Among the Catholics are the names of Archbishops Mooney, Curley, and McNicholas.

In condensed form, the principles endorsed are as follows:

1. The moral law must govern world order.
2. The rights of the individual must be assured.
3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial people must be protected.
4. The rights of minorities must be secured.
5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized.
6. International economic cooperation must be developed.
7. A just social order within each State must be achieved.

These principles in more detailed form can be obtained at the office of the Cleveland Round Table, 864 Union Commerce Building.

Religious people will welcome this opportunity to demand a just peace.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of March 20, 1945]

PAYING FOR FOLLY

"How did it happen," I asked MICHAEL FEIGHAN, "that you a Catholic, Congressman WEISS a Jew, and Congressman LAFOLLETTE a Protestant came to present that concurrent resolution in Congress last January?—That resolution which would demand that the future world organization be based on the trifaith pattern of peace written jointly by leaders of your three faiths?"

To which the Cleveland Congressman replied: "It seemed to us that no permanent international institution could be established and developed through the coming critical decade except according to certain moral principles taught over the centuries by churches and synagogues.

"Back of any such organization there must be the awareness that it is not only reasonable and practical but that behind it is a moral imperative of justice to all peoples demanded now by the interdependence of the family of nations.

"That trifaith declaration deserves close study and popular and enthusiastic support."

The organization of the United Nations which Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill have promised to set up at San Francisco next month will be like a concrete structure. If we are to use it as a permanent defense against a possible war No. 3 (and it's the only one we will have), it must be increasingly strengthened by the reinforcing steel of religious principles. Take, for example, the second point in this trifaith declaration which Congressmen FEIGHAN, WEISS, and LAFOLLETTE are sponsoring in their resolution:

"The dignity of the human person as the image of God must set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights. * * * States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights."

In a great conference such as the one to be held in San Francisco, men are likely to forget the dignity of the human individual in the face of gigantic armies and navies and the equally immense forces of human selfishness.

Or consider point 3 in the tri-faith declaration: "The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern."

The violation of this principle was one of the prime causes of this present war. When Japan attacked Manchuria, when Italy attacked Ethiopia and when Hitler seized Czechoslovakia, the big nations considered these matters but local affairs and shut their eyes.

For their folly and ours, we have already paid to the extent of over three-quarter million American casualties.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of March 21, 1945]

VANDENBERG INSISTS

Senator VANDENBERG insists that the projected international organization have in it workable machinery for changing wartime political decisions which might prove unjust. This important demand offers another reason for the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews of America giving full support to their trifaith pattern for peace which is being discussed today at a meeting of the Cleveland Round Table.

You will notice that point 5 of the pattern stresses the necessity of making it possible through collective action for nations to change treaties when injustices are being suffered. Point 5 reads, in part: "An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law, guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and (N. B.) revise them when necessary. * * *"

If Mr. VANDENBERG found that his plea for the moral necessity of such a provision had

the enthusiastic support of millions of individuals, it might immeasurably strengthen his position.

Unless in the international machinery to be set up at San Francisco full provision is devised for peacetime changes, future war will become increasingly probable.

History should teach us that. For example, Hitler might not have come into power if back in the early thirties the Allies had listened to the pleas of Stresemann and Bruening that changes in Germany's status were imperative. But their arguments were unheeded, and before long the desperate Germans were an easy prey to promises of a new-born fatherland. Hitler gained for Germany changes far beyond those asked by Stresemann and Bruening, not through peaceful negotiations or through the existing machinery of the League of Nations but through force and bloodshed.

Scores of similar instances, each paving the way to World War No. 2, are part of the record.

In my columns these past 3 days, I have tried to make clear some of the seven points in the pattern for peace. Others are of equal importance.

Consider them one by one. The signers demand: That "national governments and international organizations must respect and guarantee the right of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood."

That the organization of nations "assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments."

That an "international economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace their present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states."

That "steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the coming good * * * and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare."

From the Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner, written by James G. Stahlman:

FROM THE SHOULDER

(By James G. Stahlman)

The Communists—where have I heard of them before?—yes, the Communists are not only organizing industry in Tennessee, but they are now trying to organize the farmers of Tennessee, as well as other States.

Tennessee farmers are usually pretty level headed. Normally they keep their feet on the ground they plow. They don't fall for phonies and charlatans as a rule, so I'm hoping they won't be taken in by the Communists.

The current drive by the Commies is being staged from Highlander Folk School, that hot-bed of radicalism on Monteagle Mountain.

Highlander has been in print many times before. Its red teachings have been aired in most papers in the State, including those in Nashville. So the public, by now, should be fairly well apprised of the character of institution which Highlander actually is.

Representatives from Highlander are now seeking to form a farmers' union, local cooperatives which will work in affiliation with the National Farmers Union. Of course, you know that Aubrey Williams, now before the Senate for confirmation, but certain of rejection, as head of the R. E. A., jumped to the National Farmers Union, when he lost his job after Congress abolished that other reddish outfit, the National Youth Administration.

Aubrey just natchally hankers for things red, radical, and ruinous, so it was no surprise when he affiliated with the National Farmers Union. The members of that organization may not realize that they are playing with the Commies, but that's what they're doing, and no foolin'.

Now, when the Commies send out Highlanders to organize locals in Tennessee to cooperate with the National Farmers Union, it's time the farmers of Tennessee wised up to the fact that they are being asked to join in a movement that will eventually communize the farmers here, just as they've been communized in Russia.

If that's what the farmers want, I don't believe it. The American farmer, the Tennessee farmer, is an independent individual. He usually owns his own land. He makes his own living. He keeps his own books, drives his own car, lives under his own roof, works his own crops, raises his own family, cooperates with his own neighbors, worships his own God, and looks every man squarely in the eye.

Is that the Russian way of life? It is not. Is that the Communist way? Positively not. What is the individual's status under the communal system? That's for farmer, worker, merchant, everybody.

Well, here's how they work it—First they take all your property. Then they turn that property into a common pool. The state (government to you), owns all the property in the pool. The state then tells you where you can work, what you can do, how much you get, what and where you can buy and at what price. The individual is reduced to a common level. That's why they talk so much of the common man. He's in a common pool. He has a common status with everybody else. He can't be his own boss, he can't own anything, he can't accumulate for the future. He's just a common man in a common pool, doing common work, for the common pool.

There are lots of other things he can't do; some that he must do. But the above ought to be enough to convince any sane American farmer, particularly one in Tennessee.

The Marines Hear About a Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a letter from a friend of mine in Ohio asking that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the enclosed letter printed in the Chicago Tribune of March 19, 1945. I comply with this request because this letter seems to reflect somewhat the attitude of our boys who are fighting in the far-off places of the earth. The letter is as follows:

THE MARINES HEAR ABOUT A PARTY

SOMEWHERE IN THE PACIFIC, February 28.—Here is a paragraph from a letter received recently, written by one of the thousands of employees at the Dodge Chicago plant, located in the southwest end of Chicago:

"Sure wish you could have been here at the plant the day before Christmas. We celebrated, and what a celebration, liquor and more liquor—bottles kept popping up continuously. From the self-styled Romeos we have for bosses in this division down to the laborers, whisky was brought in, drunk, and enjoyed the whole day long. I think everybody in this Rockwood division will remember the gala, loud, and drunken time we all had for many a year. Most of the girls working here are married, whether they admit it or not, and have husbands overseas, so the drinking was carried on after work in their apartments and homes. Usually these girls have moved from the neighborhood where they and their husbands were known, so all was well."

Some of us have wives working at this plant and a few of us have wives working right in that Rockwood division, much to our sorrow. All we can do is to ask that God, please, please take care of our little sons and of our little daughters whom we entrusted to these female rats. We can fight our yellow enemy out here because we can find and reach him as we do know who and what he is, but you who are our yellow, despicable, and treacherous enemies, who feel so safe and secure, having the knowledge that we cannot reach you, we leave to God. May all his wrath, may all the damnation possible fall upon your filthy, unworthy souls. Now, to those who are truly our friends, carry on. We are proud of you, and it's for you and all you stand for that we are fighting to keep and preserve. We know our Tribune is the only possible chance for any voice back home, so don't let us down there. We will not let you down out here—ever.

A FEW CHICAGO MARINES.

Bretton Woods or What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Observer:

BRETTON WOODS OR WHAT?

The Banking Committee of Congress now have before them the question of "Shall the United States become a part of the International Bank that is to stablize the world money market or not?"

There can be no question as to whether we should or not. If the people of the United States want to surrender the military victory that has and will be achieved, then they can listen to the turtle type of isolationists who still screech for this country to once again withdraw into its shell of internationism which was in a measure responsible for World War No. 2.

The Bretton Woods proposal is not something that the world can do without. The recovery from the war damage that has been done to the fighting nations of the world cannot hope to be repaired with what little financial support and raw materials that are now within these countries.

It will take money, backed by sound financial banking to do this job.

There are the regular channels open to these countries, if they wish to shop around after hostilities have ceased, but will have to

pay the rates of interest that these same war mongers have charged in the past to any nation that is willing to pay their price to get hold of the cash or credit to rearm to start another war.

The Bretton Woods set-up would first stop any chance of this happening again.

This in itself would be an assurance of sane rebuilding by these war-torn nations.

If permanent peace is to be more than just a dream, then there must be a financial stop put upon the means of gaining financial support from any source other than that controlled by the nations that are to assure and control that peace set-up.

Had there been an international bank in control of the financial loans given to Hitler, he could not have used this money to rearm Germany.

This lesson in itself should stop all question of the value of this set-up, as a medium of control.

The World Court idea of settling all differences that might arise in the future is not enough to hold the power to overcome the banking interests that will eventually get control over the World Court, unless some solid set-up like the one that has been proposed at Bretton Woods by the representatives of the 44 nations taking part in that Conference.

These national representatives have agreed to the terms laid down at the Conference. Just what chance there is of the Members of Congress, other than some stupid radicals, and that does not mean Communists or that type of radical, but rather those iron-bound minds, who, still after what has happened in the world, which was the real cause of World War No. 2, believe that the United States can exist in the confines of its own borders.

No loan would be made to any nation unless it was approved by the entire group from the different nations that were in control of this bank.

In that way, it would not loan money to any nation that wanted to use said loan for any purpose that would be other than for economic expansion or the building of its trade by industrial plants of commerce.

The nations of the world have been bled white of their food, housing, gold, and other needs to recover from this long war.

If the solvent nations are not willing to help out at a time when these nations are without a government, food or any means of starting life once again, what chance is their of the solvent countries ever being able to trade with these former importers of goods from the solvent nations?

On the other hand, the shadow of bloody revolt is ever ready to raise its head in protest against the lack of food and housing, which will, as in the past, cause the old cry to go up that the winning nations are not friendly and in that way cause these nations to turn back toward nazi-ism and all that Hitler has preached for the past 15 years.

This must not happen, but will, unless the Congress of the United States gets busy and forgets the old cry of the isolationists that we can live in the small world that is within our own borders.

The rationing of half of the things that has made life so hard to endure, during the period after Pearl Harbor, is the results of lack of foresight in being able to kill off these silly notions of self-support and the ability to carry on without the raw materials and other needs that we find so necessary to our everyday life.

Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods are so closely connected that one without the other spells failure to the chances of eliminating the World War No. 3.

Money is the root of all evil, so it is said, but it is also today the medium of controlling all evils that have been responsible for past wars.

Let us have an international bank. Not international bankers, who have in the past been responsible for all our mass killings, in the name of war.

Until the root of all evil is placed under control there can be no assurance of a lasting peace.

The stopping of hostilities will bring to the three great powers the job of feeding the world or having chaos breaking loose with all its fury.

The trained killers who will be loosed upon society will not stand idly by and starve, or see their loved ones in that plight very long. They will turn to the group who suggests the easiest way out.

That is where the Nazi Party hopes to pick up the loose ends of what the United Nations fail to tie up.

This is where the 44 nations who, after careful deliberation, came to the conclusion that the Bretton Woods set-up was the only plan that would be workable and fair to all who wanted to assure the world that life could go on, even if with at reduced budget, less food, and even a hovel for a house, until the money would be forthcoming to guarantee a brighter future than had ever been assured the victors of any war since the beginning of time.

It is the duty of every citizen to read and become familiar with the Bretton Woods set-up so that if Congress should try and break down this set-up, the people of this Nation could demand that favorable action shall be taken and know what they are talking about.

Write your Congressman and see that he supplies you with the information if you have not followed the plans of the Bretton Woods Conference in the past.

Proposed Representation of the Armed Forces at the Peace Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 18

Whereas it is important that peace of the Allies be a just, firm, practical, and lasting peace; and

Whereas the youth of our Nation has been tested physically, mentally, and morally, and found competent; and

Whereas the youth of our Nation are most concerned because of their age, the age of their families, and the problems confronting them; and

Whereas in every war it is the youth who shoulder the arms and give their blood and lives and know the horrors of war, the beach heads, pill boxes, and sacrifices; and

Whereas these men who have given so much of their lives and time to our public welfare and have the interests of their country and the philosophy of our republican form of representative government at heart: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Iowa respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States immediately take the necessary steps to provide for a qualified representation of the young men and women of the military forces of World War No. 2, who have seen active service on the foreign battlefields, to serve as members of the commission or delegation representing the United States of America at the peace table and that they have an active voice in determining the peace policies of the world. The members of the armed forces have served us all and we know would serve us well in really establishing a just and lasting peace; it is further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed and authorized to send copies of this resolution to the Iowa Representatives and Senators in Congress and to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C.

HAROLD FELTON,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH A. EVANS,
President of the Senate.

Dean Arthur L. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, word has just reached me of the passing of one of Montana's grand old men, Dean Arthur L. Stone, founder and builder of the Montana State University School of Journalism. Words are hard to find to express the admiration, respect, and love of the people of the State of Montana in general and of his colleagues in the newspaper field in particular for Dean Stone. A special word should be said for the many fine students who took their journalism courses under the dean and who in so doing formed friendships which were not only lasting to both the dean and his students but beneficial as well.

His passing leaves a void in the heart of Montana and he will long be remembered for his kindness, his courtesy and his consideration for all who came within the ken of his acquaintanceship. He was one of God's noble men and we will miss him very much.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including with my remarks editorials taken from various Montana newspapers:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of March 20, 1945]

DEAN STONE

The last leaf of a book has been turned, and the end of life has come to Dean Emeritus Arthur L. Stone, founder and builder of the Montana School of Journalism. Four score years have come and gone in this span of useful service to journalism, and to the civilian progress of the State for which he had such an abiding affection. From the days of his youthful reporting to the quieter and more recent years, with graceful writing and purposeful sincerity, his part in the making of Montana has been as sturdy as the great mountains where he loved to spend his leisure hours.

He was happy with the news of the day. The truthful comment of his editorial pen was always kept within the kindness of a loyal heart, and a soulful sympathy that

could not hurt a friend. The keenest sorrow of this hour will be in the hearts of the family and those who have profited much by his teaching in the school that he founded—who have gone out to help make newspapers in the cities of America. At the working desks of the daily and weekly newspapers of Montana there are those who likewise in their student days learned from him how to write, and knew the fine citizenship he taught and lived.

The passage of years touched Dean Stone lightly. He will always be remembered for the keenness of his wit, for refreshing youthfulness, for quiet understanding, and impressive tolerance. The teaching in his school and the fine life that he lived among the thousands of friends who knew him best will carve the finest monument to the memory of Dean Stone.

O. S. WARDEN, *Publisher.*

[From the Daily Missoulian of March 20, 1945]

ARTHUR L. STONE

Arthur L. Stone, dean emeritus of the school of journalism of the State university and a veteran practical newspaperman of long experience in this State, was one of the writing men who have had great influence on the newspapers of Montana. He had a part in building up the old Anaconda Standard, now the Montana Standard, and the Daily Missoulian, of which he was editor from 1907 to 1914. But, of course, his strongest impression upon the newspapers of Montana came through his teaching at the State university.

Dean Stone built the school of journalism from nothing. Hundreds of the young men and women to whom he taught the craft of newspaper work now represent him in newspaper offices the country over, with, of course, the majority working within the State. He taught them the values of journalism, of living in general, passed on to them his ideals. His influence has been large and good.

[From the Montana Standard of March 21, 1945]

DEAN A. L. STONE

Arthur L. Stone, who was Dean Stone to hundreds of young Montanans on the campus at Missoula, has passed on. Founder of the school of journalism at Montana State University, veteran of Montana's newspaper game in the early part of the century and chronicler of Montana lore, the refreshing little man with flowing Windsor tie, is mourned by many.

It was in 1914 that Montana's journalism school blossomed forth in a borrowed Army tent. Later it was in a little bicycle shed, then in "the shack" near the old Science building, once in tar-paper barracks, and finally in its present fine modern building, the long-time dream of Dean Stone, who presided over the school during all those years of steady progress.

From those journalism buildings young men and young women from all parts of Montana and from other States went forth to enter the newspaper business. Some of them are top-notchers in their profession today, others are routine reporters or desk men, but all left the halls of journalism with the imprint of Dean Stone's fine influence and his kindly counsel, for he understood youth and he knew how to impart the fundamentals of the profession to those who showed an interest and aptitude.

Dean Stone was long prominent as a working newspaper man. An accomplished writer, and later an executive, he was connected with the old Anaconda Standard, and later the Missoulian. In 1914 he founded the school of journalism, where he held forth as a leading educator in his field until 1942, when he retired to become dean emeritus.

Dean Stone had a deep affection for Montana, where he lived for 57 years, an affection that was as abiding as that held for him by the boys and girls who came and went from his school, well tutored for a fling in the field in which his diligent labors and stellar ability brought him well-earned renown.

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent-Record of March 21, 1945]

DEAN ARTHUR STONE

Death of Dean Arthur L. Stone at the age of 79, closes a career of more than 60 years as chemist, newspaperman, and teacher. The six decades of his active and useful life were spent in Wyoming and Montana, starting in territorial days when venturesome railroad executives were pondering whether to risk tying the West to the East with bands of steel.

Starting his western life as a railroad chemist in Wyoming in 1884, he came to Helena 4 years later to become science instructor in the local high school. His next teaching assignment was in Anaconda, where he started his newspaper work in 1891. It was in 1914 that he founded the school of journalism at the State University at Missoula. As head of that school he was known intimately by hundreds of Montanans.

Like all pioneering projects, establishment of the journalism school was no easy task. Dean Stone literally buit it from the ground up. The quarters assigned to the journalists were distinctly not of the most modern type, even according to the standards of 1914. On cold days the wintry blasts caused much discomfort. On rainy days it seemed that more than the average portion of the moisture fell on and seeped into the journalism building. But, under the dean's directorship the school expanded. His graduates were welcome in all publishing offices. He usually found and exploited some particular attribute in each graduate. And, it was his pleasure to follow through on his recommendations. Much of his vacation time was spent calling on his graduates and their employers to be certain they were doing all right.

Dean Stone was a curious man. He never fully satisfied the desire to blaze new trails, developed in early western days. He felt there were good points in everyone and in everything. This pioneering urge led him into virtually trackless forests along Montana's continental divide. He liked nothing better than to start out with a companion in a car "that can climb trees if necessary," in the hope he would find a new scenic route to recommend to the engineers. Sometimes he would cover a route several times before he accepted or rejected it as worthy of recommendation for expert study. He carried that characteristic bent for thoroughness into his classrooms. When Dean Stone urged something on his pupils, they well knew he had explored all angles.

When historians finally compile all outstanding material on the transition from territorial to modern days, Dean Stone's activities will have a prominent place. His service to others ranged through the period from the advent of railroads to the acceptance of passenger airplanes as routine. He will rank as one of Montana's greatest teachers. Many people can assimilate the lessons of life, but few can interpret and disseminate the wisdom accumulated over several decades. That rare gift was his. All who knew Dean Stone well became better citizens because of that privilege.

[From the Kalispell (Mont.) Times of March 22, 1945]

DEAN STONE PASSES AFTER LONG ILLNESS

The gradual decline of Arthur L. Stone, 79, dean emeritus of the school of journalism at Montana State University, whose death occurred Monday in Missoula, came as a shock to his many friends, although he had been a hospital patient for many weeks. Fifty years ago he was assigned to Missoula by the Anaconda Standard, from where he edited the Sunday edition. Later he took the desk as managing editor of the Daily Missoulian, which he retained for 7 years, when he became dean of the school of journalism when that school was established at the University of Montana. He was a trained and efficient newspaperman and author; some of his sketches of Montana deserved to become famous.

His long association with the youngsters in his school won him lifelong friendships from these boys who grew up to become leaders in journalistic fields of the United States. At one time it was stated that half the editors and reporters in San Francisco bore Dean Stone's kindly brand, and there are lots of strays in the Mississippi Valley, the Atlantic cities, and the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Stone served as dean of the journalism school until about 3 years ago, when he became dean emeritus and retired after nearly 30 years of service. His wife died in 1917. One son, George P., graduated from Montana University, was on the Missoulian staff for several years, served in World War No. 1, and passed away in Chicago, where he edited the Chicago Daily News, in 1926. Another son, Percy N., also a graduate of Montana University, was in the first war and is now on the staff of the New York Herald-Tribune. The younger son, John B., followed the newspaper trail and is now in Washington, D. C., with the O. W. I. There is another son, Dr. Emerson Stone, and a daughter yet alive.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of March 22, 1945]

DEAN ARTHUR L. STONE

The passing of Arthur L. Stone, dean emeritus of Montana University's school of journalism, is a source of regret among people in and outside the newspaper business in the State. He was responsible for the development of a fine school, the quality of which is attested by the success of not a few of those who received their training at the university and are now engaged in the newspaper business in different parts of the country and in foreign lands.

Dean Stone's devotion to the university will long be remembered by both students and faculty. They will cherish the memory of a personality whose idealism was a stimulus to anyone associated with him. Newspaper folk who started their career under his guidance will reflect, upon his passing, that to have been one of his students was an inspiring experience.

A Dark Chapter in Our Nation's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following strong and moving editorial from the Review-Appeal, Franklin, Tenn., written by a close friend of mine, Leonard H. Armistead:

A DARK CHAPTER IN OUR NATION'S HISTORY

(By Leonard H. Armistead)

One of the darkest chapters in this Nation's history was begun when 18-year-old boys were inducted into the Army and sent to the front lines with only some 16 weeks of training. It is horrible enough to draft an

18-year-old for front-line service with the infantry—but to send him over the top with a paltry few weeks of preparation for attack and defense is inconceivable, to say the least.

The Nation cannot retract its steps with regard to those lads who have already been the victims of inexcusable injustice, but it can correct the practice and should do so now.

An 18-year-old is a boy; he is not a man: he has not reached his maturity in physical stamina, mental ability, nor judgment as to how to take care of himself or destroy the enemy. As each week goes by, yea nearly every day, reports from far-flung battlefields bring sorrow not only to the families of lads thus victimized but to hundreds of citizens who did not even know them.

The Government promised these boys a full year of training before they saw active service and has in no sense lived up to that assurance. And to make it worse the Army chiefs now say that for the next 3 months all boys 18 and 19 years old will be placed in the Infantry as soon as inducted.

No man who has seen service in this war, or any other, will say that there is any branch of the Army which is more dangerous or requires more stamina, of mind and body, than the Infantry. There never has been a war, in all history, that the foot soldier did not have to fight his way, with the great and essential aid of all other branches of the service, to most objectives to be taken.

It is beyond our power of conception that the heads of our Army would want, much less even demand, 18-year-old boys, with or without a year's training, for front-line duties.

There are 8,000,000 or more men in the Army. It should not be, and is not, necessary or sensible to use boys in the spot so continuously dangerous and requiring great physical endurance.

In God's name, we ask Congress, Mr. Roosevelt, General Marshall, or all three to correct this horrible practice now.

Wichita Firms Explode Theory That Rural Folk are Poor Plant Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal a few weeks ago and that was reprinted in the Wichita Magazine at Wichita, Kans.

This article is most interesting and informative. It is proof that rural people are among the best plant workers. Wichita war plants are among the highest in record of output in this country. Absenteeism is low and there have been no strikes during the 5 years we have been at war.

I commend this article to you. The people of Wichita and of the State of Kansas have good right to be proud of this record:

A long-accepted presumption that rural folk make unsuitable factory hands has been exploded here at Wichita.

Four years of war production have shown, to the contrary, that help recruited from the farms and villages is definitely superior to the national average.

This should hearten those chamber of commerce executives in Middle Western agricultural trading cities, who for 50 years have been stymied from corralling the industries they sought for their towns because their claims of an available labor supply failed to convince industrialists.

FACTORY HELP JUMPS FROM 8,532 TO 60,000

How much Wichita had to rely for war production on rural help is revealed by the fact that the 1940 census takers counted in the city only 8,532 persons employed in manufacturing, of whom 1,262 were airplane workers. Today the city's factories employ about 60,000 persons, of whom approximately 52,000 are building planes, according to Brig. Gen. Ray G. Harris, commanding general of the midwestern district Air Technical Service Command. Practically all the increase was recruited from Wichita itself and from the towns and farms on the Southwest Great Plains.

These novices, after a mechanical training course in the Wichita schools, varying from 2 or 10 weeks, depending on the type of work they intended to do, were graduated into the factories where they have made an enviable record.

In 5 years not a strike has occurred in a Wichita war plant, according to C. W. Corsaut, Wichita district manager of the United States Employment Service. Every plant is abreast of its war production schedule today.

The employees have won 20 efficiency citations from Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission authorities in the following order: Five Army and Navy E citations for efficiency to the employees of Boeing Airplane Co.; 5 to employees of the Cessna Air-Craft Co.; 4 to the employees of Beech Aircraft Corp.; 2 to Coleman Lamp & Stove Co.; and 4 maritime M citations to Watkins, Inc., employees for efficiency.

ABSENTEEISM FAR BELOW NATIONAL AVERAGE

Records of absentees of the three largest plants for 1944, complied in the office of General Harris and compared with the average of national absentees reveal another claim to superiority. Typical are figures for Cessna. Less than 2.9 percent of its employees were absent, on the average, in the last 7 months of 1944. In June, September, and November this was reduced to only 2 percent, as compared with 6.5 percent, 5.7 percent, and 5.6 percent, the national average of absenteeism for the same 3 months. Cessna's highest absenteeism for 1944 came in February with 4.9 percent, against a national average for that month of 7.8 percent.

This record has resulted despite the fact that it is impossible for Wichita to provide housing for all the workers. Many thousands live in villages and county-seat towns more than 30 miles away, and many hundreds of others travel 50 miles or more to work daily.

Wichita workers have constructed 23,934 warplanes, ranging from the Culver Aircraft Corporation's trig little military plane up in size to the greatest of them all, Boeing's B–29 Superfortress. The Wichita Boeing plant produced the first B–29 and from the initial giant bomber attack on Japan last June 15 to December 1, all Superfortresses to blast Japan were Wichita-built. Since then the production from plants in three other cities has increased the B–29 fleet, but the Wichita plant is still the leader and is hatching each month enough of the giant sky fighter birds to extend 3 miles if flying abreast with their wing tips touching.

Other Wichita production has included 31 percent of all trainers for the Army, 74 percent of all twin-engine trainers, a fleet of gliders, unrevealed thousands of wings for the A–26 Invader, and many other types of war matériel.

SET UP MANPOWER TESTING LABORATORY

This high production interested Dr. I. T. Shultz, professor of psychology at Friends University here. Early in the war, before Wichita had contributed 20,000 men to the armed forces and when factories still could pick and choose their help, the Wichita Chamber of Commerce sponsored the organization of Search-Service, a testing laboratory to weed out the unfit with a view to saving them the expense of taking specialized training.

Dr. Shultz was engaged as consulting psychologist because of his previous experience in industrial research at the University of Pennsylvania. He directed the tests in Wichita of 7,000 persons for mechanical aptitude, employing for this purpose the same nationally accepted quizzes used in eastern industrial cities.

Not until this winter did Mr. Shultz have these classified. He was gratified to find they forecast the production record since attained. The mechanical aptitude of 71 percent of those examined was higher than the average score for eastern industrial cities and 28 percent of the applicants passed the intelligence quiz for foremen. Fifteen percent exceeded the average score for engineering freshmen, and only 4 to 4½ percent were graded as neurotic as compared with a national average on the identical tests of 10 percent neurotic.

INHERITANCE AND GEOGRAPHY FACTORS

Dr. Shultz asserts that a good inheritance from hardy pioneer stock and geography combine to raise the score.

Further, these people live in a highly mechanized agricultural region where, so the census shows, more tractors are owned per hundred Kansas farms than in any other State. Automobile ownership is close to the top, with 91 cars per hundred families in Kansas, compared with 68 for Missouri, 62 for New York, and 49 for West Virginia. Repairs for power farm equipment are made either on the farm where it is in operation or in the nearby village shops.

Geography, so Dr. Shultz asserts, plays an important part. The soil of the Great Plains, he explains, is richer in calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, and other minerals than in the areas to the east, which results in the production of food rich in essential minerals. This, in turn, improves the physique and makes for emotional stability, which, incidentally, is one of the factors in reducing strikes, he argues.

"If other cities in agricultural regions will make a similar showing," comments one Wichita citizen, "the presumption that rural folk do not make good mechanical workers will go the way of the ancient folk tale which has it that the moon is made of green cheese."

Speak Up for Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Max Van Horn, adjutant, Department of Iowa, Veterans of Foreign Wars, over radio station WHO, March 11, 1945:

Since it was founded in 1899 the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has won the respect of the Nation as a two-fisted, militant, progressive veteran fraternity devoted chiefly to two principal objectives—the national welfare and the welfare of the veteran and his dependents.

As a nonpartisan, nonsectarian, war-veteran association, the V. F. W. has been closely identified with the enactment of every important piece of legislation which has contributed to the welfare of veterans of all wars.

As an organization of veterans—one that is composed exclusively of men with overseas military service—we have been strengthened by the experience of more than two-score years. This is why we believe we are especially qualified, by heritage and tradition to help solve the post-war problem of the men in military service in this war.

I don't think that I have to dwell very long on the value of our achievements in this field to date. Today, mainly because of our efforts, the men who are serving with the armed forces have this definite assurance—they know they can look forward to the sympathetic assistance of the Federal Government when the time comes for them to resume their former places in civilian life. Already definitely assured for the veterans of this war are many benefits which were not available to our comrades of the First World War until just a few years before Pearl Harbor.

Nearly anyone today who wants to be quoted on the subject is happy to tell you what he thinks the veterans of this war will want when they come home. A great many persons—especially many who have never been soldiers, sailors, or marines themselves—are eager to discuss the questions at the drop of a hat. If their advice was inspired by the emotions of personal experience, they would have a real right to demand respect for their opinions. But most of these people were strangers to the whole problem of veteran welfare during the years between 1918 and 1941. As a result, they have no background in veteran affairs on which they can form intelligent conclusions today.

We veterans of the last war find it difficult to take these persons very seriously. We have a pretty good hunch they will disappear from the scene when the demobilization of our armed forces becomes fully effective. Instead of being concerned about the problem of veteran welfare, we predict they will turn their attention to matters of personal interest. In fact, we even suspect they will be the first ones to suggest that the job of looking after returning veterans rightfully belongs to the veteran organizations. And that's where we come in—the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. We think that we are qualified to tackle the job because of several reasons. First, we know something about the thinking process of veterans—and especially overseas veterans. We know considerable about their personal problems and the obstacles which they must overcome. Furthermore, we are familiar with the laws, rules, regulations, and procedure which affect the veteran. For a very good reason, too. We have been responsible for most of the veteran welfare legislation which the Congress has approved—not only for the veteran of other wars but also for the men who will return to their home communities when this war is over

Some day the last shot of this war will be fired. And when its echoes have died away, there will be a great silence—a silence heard around the world. And in that silence, mud-caked American boys will emerge from their foxholes, and lay down their guns, and turn their faces toward home. They will have won the victory, and they will look forward to reaping the fruits of peace.

We here on the home front have done a lot of thinking, and a lot of talking, about the man in uniform. We know that when he comes marching home again he will loom large in the American scene. He and his comrades will number in the millions, and they will receive top priority on the agenda of American affairs. We are already calling this prospect the "veteran problem," and some of the talk we hear is giving this problem a lot more heat than light.

You can hear the discussion wax hot and heavy on street corners, in restaurants and cocktail bars, in the newspapers and on the radio, in the average American home. Practically everyone is saying that nothing is too good for our boys when they return from the wars. In Washington alone, 120 agencies, public and private, have been set up to deal with the so-called veteran problem. We are already prepared to go all-out in terms of mustering-out pay, unemployment insurance, loans, educational opportunities, vocational rehabilitation, etc. There is nothing wrong with any of these things, and the dollars we are going to spend on them will be well spent.

Let me make this point, however. These benefits, in themselves, are not enough. They will not do the job alone and they will not satisfy the veteran. For what your son—and mine—wants above all when they come home again is understanding and an economic system based on full employment.

When the soldier, sailor, or marine is mustered out, he will have to make a transition from Army to civilian life. The mere fact that he takes off his uniform—and dons a business suit or a pair of overalls—will not automatically make him a civilian. He has led a hard life of discipline and danger. It will not be easy to adjust himself to peaceful ways again. It will take every ounce of understanding and cooperation we can give him. We must help him settle down into his job, his club, his church, his school, his community. He must be made to feel welcome, or putting it another way, to be one of us again.

The returning veteran will want employment, not only for himself, but for everyone. He does not want doles or benefits or handouts. He wants the same thing we all want—a chance to work at a lathe, or a desk, for a weekly pay envelope that will give him self-respect as a useful member of society, the wherewithal to support his loved ones, and the opportunity to build for the future. Give the veteran a chance to earn his own living by the skill of his hands, the sweat of his brow, or the ingenuity of his brain, and he'll be happy. In short, give the veteran understanding and a useful productive job, and the so-called "veteran problem" will fade out of the picture.

Here in our own country, some faint-hearted and weak-minded alarmists look upon the homecoming of men in service with foreboding. They are spreading rumors thick and fast. They whisper that there is going to be bitterness between the worker and the returning veterans; that labor and management will fight like cats and dogs; that industry will use the reconversion period as the time to smash the unions; that labor will run wild with strikes—and so on.

These rumors have no foundation in fact, for the fact is that there are no real clashing of interests between the worker and the veteran. Both have the same problem, and both will want the same thing. As Harry A. Millis, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, puts it:

"Both veterans and war workers face new jobs, wait upon the reconversion plans of industry * * * both want security. Each has served his country in war. Millions will travel back to their homes * * * the soldiers from their fox holes and the migratory workers, clear across the country, from jobs which urgently needed them for war production. Their interests are one and the same."

Here is the truth to remember. The ground on which both worker and veteran stand is common ground. Therefore, it should be fertile ground for unity and cooperation. And it is up to us, here on the home front, to prepare for the homecoming of our men and women in uniform by preparing ourselves first to meet him on that ground.

When the American soldier comes home again, he will bring with him a new viewpoint, and a healthy one. In fox holes, in bombers, in tank destroyers, and on the decks of ships at sea, he has learned the meaning of teamwork. He has seen Americans of every race and creed fight and die beside him. In the white-hot crucible of this experience many of the petty racial, religious, or political prejudices he once knew have melted away. He has learned, the hard way, that men fight a common danger more effectively when they fight together. He has seen this lesson written in red blood on the black mud of many a battle field. And he will come home in this kind of mood, this mood for teamwork. He will expect to find it here. And if he doesn't, he is going to be disillusioned and angered.

It is then that he will be ripe to become the deluded follower of some nationalist or Fascist movement which will seek to glorify him and his comrades as a separate, master-status, special special privilege class. Demagogues who hate democracy will promise to restore his faith in a cause, a faith that he has lost with the passing of his comradeship in arms, and has failed to find at home. Subversive agitators will see in this bitterness a golden opportunity to split the American people into two great masses, veterans and home front people. They will work unceasingly to agitate one group against the other. The end product, of course, would be the destruction of democracy, and the loss of every ideal and principle for which we fought this war.

Turn the pages of history, and you will find that it has happened before. In Italy, Germany, and France disillusioned veterans, angered by what they found at home and misled by self-seeking demagogues, formed such fascist organizations as the Squadristi, the Brown Shirts, and the Cagoulards. Any such movement here would be the greatest tragedy of our time.

The veteran then is going to expect to find the same teamwork here as he found in battle. This is our job, and we cannot betray him. Just as the crisis of war made all of us understand that we must become a great team of Americans working toward the same end, so too, must labor and industry pull together. For the veteran, as I said before, will want a job, and this is the special province of both labor and industry. Labor must understand that all employers are not anti-union. Industry must understand that all union members are not gangsters nor radicals. Labor and industry together must create an economic system of full employment. Jobs for all is the biggest post-war job we face, but we can do it with teamwork. We must do it. We have all the tools—new technologies, new materials, new machines, new consumer needs. Together we must take the road ahead, not the road back to the "good old days," when unemployment was considered a necessary evil.

When the veteran comes home again, he will want understanding on our part, and a useful job to help him recover his identity as a civilian. He will want to find us ready to work together, and therefore with him, not against him. This, and not sympathy or charity, is what our soldiers, sailors, and marines want. And this is the answer to the so-called veteran problem.

Light on Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the great propaganda drive is on to crush all criticism of the Bretton Woods program. This is the technique developed by Hitler in dealing with the German people. "No," say the New Dealers, the American citizens must not inquire into the infallibility of the New Deal, or question its proposals. Not so, however, with English officials or of English citizens. They have full permission to call in question any legislation or government proposal which by any stretch of the imagination could violate a vital interest of the British Empire. If the English officials refuse to be bound by the proposed terms of the Bretton Woods agreement, why should the American officials or the people they represent be forced to remain quiet while their country is being misled and betrayed. I refuse to be deprived of free speech. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune March 22, 1945:

LIGHT ON BRETTON WOODS

The Writers' War Board, a group of writers and radio commentators formed for the purpose of helping to win the war by popular education, has apparently turned its talents to propagandizing the Bretton Woods program. It is now circularizing releases in which criticism of the Treasury plan and isolationism are employed as interchangeable terms. "Urge all who hear or read your words," is the refrain of its messages to columnists and radio broadcasters, "to wire their Congressmen and their Senators demanding passage of Bretton Woods as it stands." Only a handful of Representatives and Senators "know what Bretton Woods is all about," it seems, so this group of outstanding monetary experts—including Clifton Fadiman, Franklin P. Adams, Paul Gallico, Samuel Grafton, and Russel Crouse—have taken on the task of reducing this foreign-exchange business to simple, understandable terms terms which even a Representative or a Senator can grasp.

Did we say task? That was silly of us. It is true that when Lord Keynes began to scrutinize the experts' final report he is reported to have demanded, "What is this, Cherokee?" But Mr. Samuel Grafton, of the Writers' War Board, seems not to have found the document indigestible. (On the contrary, one might say that with him it was virtually predigested.) The Bretton Woods program, Mr. Grafton tells us in his column in the New York Post, is really quite simple. "The nations of the world," he writes, "pledge to keep their currencies at stable value. Is that complicated?"

No, that isn't complicated; and now here is a dispatch from London, under date of January 19:

"Both Sir John Anderson, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Keynes have declared that the British Government will adjust the value of the pound whenever Whitehall considers it necessary.

"The Chancellor even said that the policy pursued here would be similar to that of 1933. He said that the Government would commit itself only to consult the international monetary fund before changing the value of the pound sterling, reserving its right to persist with its intention should the fund refuse consent."

Summed up, what this means is that Britain hasn't the slightest idea of keeping its currency stable if it finds that such a course interferes with its domestic financial and social policies. That isn't complicated, is it? But now try putting the two together and ask yourself, "Is that simple?"

Somehow Mr. Grafton's approach to the Bretton Woods controversy reminds us of that judge who made a practice of keeping awake while one side was presenting its case and taking a nap when the other side was being presented. Listening to both sides, he explained, always confused him.

The Late Justice John H. Clarke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator, relative to the late Supreme Court Justice, John Hessin Clarke, who passed quietly away in his sleep Thursday, March 22, at San Diego, Calif.

Justice Clarke wrote his own epitaph—a life consecrated to the betterment of his fellow man and an unceasing endeavor to make the world a better place in which to live.

The editorial follows:

JUSTICE JOHN H. CLARKE

"Thou hast embarked thyself with them that love, and seek, and choose, the best things; and number is not weight with thee."

William Penn's brave words to his friend Sydney apply just as well to Justice John H. Clarke, who died quietly in his sleep yesterday in San Diego, Calif. They describe him as he was all his life, for, young and old, he was always the same. His powerful mind, strong character, and cultivated tastes were formed early, and he was essentially the same man when he came to Youngstown in 1880 to practice law and write for the Vindicator as he was in 1916 when President Woodrow Wilson appointed him to the Supreme Court of the United States, and later when he resigned to work for American entrance into the League of Nations.

Justice Clarke knew, and his friends here knew, that he was destined for great things. Besides having unusual ability he had rare strength of purpose. He wasted no time and nothing turned him aside from his goal. Perhaps an early misfortune proved to be a spur to him. His father, a lawyer in Lisbon, had made an investment which turned out badly and died leaving a debt of $10,000. That amount would be equal to $100,000 today, but the son decided that his first earnings must go to pay it off. He spoke long afterward of how little he had lived on in those early years. It may be that he had had good practice in his school and college days, for the institution he attended at Hudson has since been famous as "Hard-scrabble Academy." Boys went there to learn, so that they could make something of themselves, and the lessons Justice Clarke learned at Hudson he never forgot. "Reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man, and writing an exact man," and before he came to Youngstown Justice Clarke had formed the habit of all three. He had a love of great books, particularly Shakespeare, on whose plays he often lectured; the Bible whose words became part of the warp and woof of his mind; "wise old" Ben Franklin, Lowell and the other American writers who had determined the character of their country. Justice Clarke's thought then was on a higher plane than that of ordinary men, and whatever was cheap or trivial was always foreign to him.

Justice Clarke's friends in those early years all looked for him to be President. They did not reckon with the fact that he was a Democrat in a strongly Republican State. He was a Democrat by principle and conviction, because his sympathies were with common men who needed someone uncommon to fight for them. He fought for them in his own party and lost a nomination for United States Senator. He fought for them later as the candidate of his party for the Senate, and was again defeated by the power of great wealth, which in those days could be used without restraint. In time his ability made him wealthy, but his sympathies and his convictions remained the same. On the Supreme Court his views alined him with the great liberals, Holmes and Brandeis; but as the composition of the Court changed he found himself so constantly in the minority and so regularly outvoted by the extreme conservatives whose disregard of the Nation's necessity led later to popular reaction, that he felt he was wasting his time and resigned to devote himself to the cause of world peace on which he had set his heart.

In Youngstown Justice Clarke had two friends, tried and tested, whom he loved above all others: William F. Maag, his associate in the Vindicator, and his law partner, Cecil D. Hine. Always fond of writing, he bought an interest in the Vindicator to indulge his hobby and—more important—to influence local and State affairs. The paper became a power for good. At the risk of all they had, its owners fought bigotry as represented by the American Protective Association—the know-nothings of the 1900's—and the Ku Klux Klan a generation later. It worked for good government when corruption and public indifference were the rule. It fought for the rank and file, the mill men and miners, and all who needed someone to speak for them. It preached the duties of wealthy men. It lent its aid to the preservation and development of Mill Creek Park, when Volney Rogers—the first to see the possibilities of this "bit of Switzerland set down in Ohio"—was considered a visionary. It worked to build up the public library when books were held to be expensive luxuries. It taught the advantages of higher education, and Justice Clarke become the paper's first columnist to offer his weekly observations, Wise and and Otherwise, on men, affairs, and the amenities of the cultivated life.

In broader fields the Vindicator was one of the first to lend its support to civil service, one of its early owners having become the first Civil Service Commissioner of the United States; it opposed the folly of national prohibition; it advocated the short ballot and worked for the enactment of the beginning of social legislation embodied in the workmen's compensation law, so badly needed when so many workmen were injured by the crude machinery of those days and were so rarely able to obtain justice from their employers or the courts.

Cecil D. Hine was head of Youngstown's leading law firm of a generation ago. He was

older than Justice Clarke; a man of fine mind and high character. He was a conservative Republican, whereas Justice Clarke was not only a Democrat but among the well-to-do of the town was looked on as a radical. To his surprise, Mr. Hine invited him to his office one day and asked him to become his partner. What was more, Mr. Hine invited him to come into the firm on equal terms, and further demonstrated his trust and confidence by saying that they would not even bother to sign a contract. The relationship was as ideal as any could be. The two men, so different in their political views, became the firmest of friends. Justice Clarke outlived Mr. Hines by many years, but their association was something he always looked back to with affection, pleasure, and pride.

Later, in Cleveland, Justice Clarke's closest friends were Tom L. Johnson, who, as mayor, gave Ohio and the Nation an example of good city government; and Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War in Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet. When in Washington he came to know Wilson well, his regard for the First World War President approached veneration.

In appearance Justice Clarke stood out in any group. He was tall and powerfully built, his features were strong and clear-cut, and gave every indication of the strength of his mind and character. Even as a young man, his hair was snow white. His gaze was keen and penetrating. He was so distinguished that he seemed like a Roman senator or an early American statesman whose statue is placed in a hall of Congress. As he grew older his manner became courtly and dignified, fitting his high position. His strength showed in his handwriting, which was as clear and firm at the end of his life as it was 50 years ago, when he wrote out his editorials in long hand.

As an example of how methodically Justice Clarke ordered his life: When he decided that his main work was done, he considered where he would spend the rest of his days. First he looked over the east coast of Florida, then the west; he went to New Orleans, Arizona, and New Mexico; and on west to San Francisco. While he was there a friend invited him to San Diego. The city's perfect climate and lovely location so enchanted him that he decided at once that it would be his home. He never regretted his choice. The windows in his apartment, high up in the El Cortez Hotel, overlooked both the broad horseshoe of the bay, which before the war was usually teeming with warships, and the mountain range which protected the city from the heat of the desert. In Youngstown he had begun his days with a walk around Wick Park; he had continued his daily constitutional in Washington, and in San Diego the people could set their clocks by the hour when he set out every morning for beautiful Balboa Park. When he did not appear at his accustomed hour yesterday he was found to have passed away in his sleep.

Like all profound men, Justice Clarke was deeply religious. All his life he was one of those whom Aristotle called the nobler sort of men. His views were larger, his aims loftier and more generous than most. He was a statesman by nature, a patriot by choice and training; and he used his life to the benefit of his country and mankind. Although not a regular churchgoer, he thought more about religion and more deeply about it than most men. The language of the Bible came naturally to him, and it is significant that in almost the last line he wrote he expressed himself in the language of the Psalmist. "I continue," he wrote, "not 'as a strong man to run a race' but surprisingly strong, all things considered." Evidently his strength was the strength which often precedes the end. To all to whom his life was an inspiration and a challenge, the news of his passing must have brought a shock, as if a giant tree had crashed in the forest.

Equal Rights for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Post today by Richard L. Neuberger. Mr. Neuberger is a distinguished author and journalist. He has written a number of interesting articles about Alaska. In this article Mr. Neuberger tells of an antidiscrimination bill recently passed by the Alaska Legislature and signed by Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska, and refers to the views of the Governor and Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, on this legislation. Attention is also called by Mr. Neuberger to the interest of Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the creation of an Indian Claims Commission.

ALASKA STATUTE—EQUAL RIGHTS FOR INDIANS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Negroes have not been the only victims of prejudice and discrimination. The descendants of the original inhabitants of the North American Continent have suffered this treatment, too. Discrimination against Indians is an old and sorry tale in the far West and Alaska. People with a hatred of foreigners still manage to justify intolerance toward men and women whose ancestors saw the first Europeans land in the New World. Because of all this, a law enacted last week by the Legislature of Alaska is a historic event in the relationship between whites and Indians in this hemisphere.

Alaska has a larger percentage of North American natives among its inhabitants than any other place under the Stars and Stripes. Of a civilian population of 72,170 nearly half are natives. Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts in Alaska number 32,458. Yet despite this high proportion of the populace, natives have consistently been made the object of discrimination. "We do not cater to native trade" has been a familiar sign in many Alaskan restaurants, hotels, inns, theaters, and taverns.

Henceforth such signs will be illegal. Discrimination against natives is no longer within the law.

The statute recently passed by the Territorial Legislature provides that "all citizens of Alaska shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of accommodations, advantages, and facilities" of any public place. The law also stipulates that no person shall "display any printed or written sign indicating a discrimination on racial grounds of such full and equal enjoyment."

Violation of these legislative orders can bring a jail sentence of 3 months and a fine of $250. No longer can the descendants of Alaska's original inhabitants be shoved from taxis and barred from cafes and barber shops.

GRUENING PRESSED PASSAGE

This proposal did not become law in Alaska without prolonged controversy. Many Alaskans, led by Gov. Ernest Gruening, had futilely demanded its passage at previous sessions of the legislature. These people blushed with shame when they saw doors slammed in the faces of men and women whose ancestors had watched Capt. George Vancouver and the Russian explorer, Vitus Bering, land on Alaska's shores in the eighteenth century. But other Alaskans used the same phrases to justify discrimination against Indians and Eskimos as are employed elsewhere to rationalize prejudice toward Negroes, Jews, foreign-born Americans, and Japanese Nisei.

A famous story, perhaps apocryphal, concerns the haughty white storekeeper at Wrangell who pointed to a family of Tlingit Indian salmon fishermen and asked, "Why don't those pests go back where they came from?"

But gradually public opinion in Alaska was mobilized against this point of view. (The Indians and Eskimos held tribal councils and spoke up for themselves. "After all," more than one white was heard to venture, "this is really the homeland of these people we are persecuting." The present session of the Alaska Legislature, now meeting in Juneau includes among its membership two full-blooded Indians. The bill outlawing discrimination passed the House, 19 to 5, and last week went through the Territorial Senate by a vote of 11 to 5.

"This is a milestone in Alaskan history," said Governor Gruening as he signed the measure. E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Alaska's Delegate in Congress, believes the measure will do much to unite the population of the Territory. "No prejudice can be justified," said BARTLETT in Washington this week, "yet prejudice against Indians and Eskimos is the most unjustifiable of all. We live in the native land of these people. Can we discriminate against them in their own country? That is certainly adding insult to injury. I am delighted that the Alaska Legislature has taken this great forward step."

BARTLETT also has suggested that the Alaska equal rights bill will have a beneficial effect in Latin America, where millions of natives closely scrutinize the treatment of their fellow natives north of the Rio Grande. Discrimination against Indians and Eskimos has not made the people of South America feel particularly kindly toward the United States, for many South Americans are Indians, too. Thus the success of the recent Pan-American Conference in Mexico may be augmented by a law enacted within the shadow of the Arctic Circle.

COMMISSION TO RIGHT WRONGS

Prejudice toward the natives of North America has not been so conspicuous as that directed against other minorities. Yet it has existed for many years. Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, believes that an Indian Claims Commission, to right old wrongs, is one of the ways to remedy this situation. The Alaska antidiscrimination bill is another step. A third would be drastic measures for improving the health of our Indians and Eskimos, who still are ravaged by tuberculosis.

Few Americans familiar with our own Indians will fail to be enthusiastic over Alaska's new antidiscrimination law. I remember the sunny afternoon that I fished with an old Indian at Celilo Falls on the Columbia River. Late in the day we drove in my car to a tavern above the river. "You can't come in here with that Indian," a man in a greasy apron shouted. I looked at the old fisherman. Tears of humiliation filled his eyes.

"You write for papers," the Indian said to me. "Tell your friends that my grandmother saw Lewis and Clark come from across the mountains. At her knee I learned of this. They were sent by Mr. Jefferson, a man we learned of in our schools. They were great chiefs. My grandmother and her people ate with them beside this river. But now there is no place for us. Let your white friends know of this."

In the glow of the sunset the great river glistened and gleamed. And I thought that no tears of humiliation need fill the old Indian's eyes. It was the white man whom such an incident humiliated and weighted down with shame.

Coal: An Essential to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, coal is such a common article of commercial use that most people do not realize that it is an absolutely essential and basic product not only for the maintenance of civilian life and activity but, even more, it is an absolutely essential and basic product for the continued prosecution of the war. A moment's concentrated thought on the subject will, of course, suggest the multitudinous essential uses for war to which coal is put.

For instance, high explosive chemicals are made in whole or in part from bituminous coal—TNT, picric acid and tetryl for flame throwers, guns, mortars, bombs, and mines, are some of the war uses to which coal is essential. Coal is also the base for 85 percent of all war plastics for gas masks, bomber noses, radio apparatus, telephones, and life rafts. Hundreds of antiseptics, insecticides and drugs, including the life-saving sulphas, synthetic quinine, and aspirin are made from coal. So are chemicals for waterproofing and mildew-proofing clothing; and so are war-useful textiles such as nylon for parachutes and rot-proof mosquito netting. In addition, coal helps make the steel to build the ships, planes, and trucks and to power the trains that transport food, ammunition, and equipment by land and the ships by sea. Thirty-two thousand tons of coal go into the making of every dreadnaught; 50,000 tons into every medium tank; and 18 tons into every 4-ton Army truck. The guns in the hands of our soldiers are made of steel, and a ton and a half of bituminous coal is needed to make every ton of steel. The wartime steel industry alone has to have 1,743,000 tons of bituminous coal every week. Last year, to supply the vital needs of the battle fronts and the home front the coal industry produced 620,000,000 tons, which was more coal than has ever been mined in any year in any country in all history.

The foregoing are some of the uses of coal in the war effort, but coal is no less essential to civilian life and activities. Our houses are warmed by coal. The burning of coal is necessary in the generation of the electricity that lights our streets and factories and is used in multitudinous capacities in the production of civilian goods. Truly the production of coal is essential to the prosecution of the war and to comfortable civilian life as well and coal is one of the basic products of this modern civilization.

Notwithstanding these facts, however, the production of coal is a most hazardous business. It is hazardous for the men who own or operate the coal mines, because coal comes into competition with other fuels; namely, natural gas and oil, and the price for which coal can be sold is conditioned upon the price at which competing fuels are sold. Because at times there has been overproduction of coal and because of the low cost of competing fuels, many coal operators have found themselves unable to produce coal at as low a price as the market paid, and consequently, scores and scores of operators, especially operators of small coal mines, have been forced to the wall and compelled to lose or sell their coal mines.

But the production of coal is also a most hazardous business for coal miners. The dangers attendant upon the mining of coal to the men who do the mining are multitudinous. Few industrial workers face more varied and ever-present dangers than the coal miner. Death rides with him into the darkness of the mine and follows at his heels while he works in the dim light of the lamp on his cap, and sometimes—all too many times—it catches up with him, usually suddenly and without warning. Sometimes it catches him in a blinding flash of light caused by a short circuit from the high-voltage trolley wire strung just below the roof of the entry through which he walks and within reach of his head or hand. Sometimes it catches him with a rumbling string of empty coal cars and leaves his body crushed and dismembered between the rails over which the coal is hauled. Sometimes it suddenly catches him in a narrow place in the entry and crushes his life out between the coal cars and the rib or side of the entry. Or sometimes it crushes him between the clashing steel bumpers of the cars. At other times it may suddenly and without warning drop upon him with crushing weight, as the roof—coal and rock—over his head gives way and buries him under tons of debris; or it creeps upon him stealthily in the air he breathes, loaded with the poisonous gases found in many mines; or sometimes an accidental spark or the backfire from a miner's shot ignites the coal dust and sets off an explosion that may travel hundreds of feet down an entry or haulage way.

When we contemplate these facts concerning the mining of coal, most fair-minded men I think will be willing to say that the prices they have to pay for coal are not unreasonable in view of the hazards which the coal operator in the conduct of his business encounters, and that the wages paid to the men who mine the coal are not commensurate with the risks they take. Most of us who have had no experience in coal mining would feel that the enduring of such hazards cannot be adequately compensated in money. However, as I have heretofore said, the price for which coal can be sold is conditioned by the price for which competing fuels are furnished. This stern economic fact limits the wage of the coal miner and the price for which the coal operator can sell his product. Over a long period of years, in almost unbroken sequence, the men who work in the mines and those who operate the mines have conducted the business upon the basis of written agreements as to wages and conditions of work and employment.

The existing wage contract will expire on March 31 of this year. Already the leading coal operators of the country and representatives of the coal miners, under their great leader, John L. Lewis, are negotiating for the terms of another contract. Only a few more days remain in which these negotiations must be successfully completed in order that the production of this basic and most essential product in the prosecution of the war may continue uninterrupted. The situation calls for statesmanship of the highest order on the part of the representatives of the coal operators and the representatives of the coal miners. These men are faced with the most delicate task of adjusting in the new agreement the legitimate claims of the coal miners and the returns necessary to the coal operators to successfully continue the mining of coal. I am convinced that in this hour of war crisis when our armies and navies on all fronts are winning astonishing victories, and when our enemies are back on their heels with their backs to the wall, and increasing the war effort will shorten the war, the statesmanship of the men in the coal industry, both miners and operators, will be sufficient to solve their difficulties and to write a new contract before the existing contract expires.

The tragic and overwhelming needs of our men in the fighting services on the land, in the sky and on the sea—thousands of whom come from the homes of those who work in the coal mines and from the homes of those who operate the mines as well as those boys of ours who come from other walks of life, but who are like the sons of coal miners and coal operators in our armed forces, are dependent for their safety and success upon the products of the mines—all require that the powers of statesmanship of coal operators and coal miners alike be exerted to the extreme in the formation, before the end of March, of a new contract that will insure a continued output of coal for our armed services. The eyes of the Nation are upon the coal operators and the coal miners in these wage negotiations. They must not, and I am confident they will not, fail us.

Our Merchant Marine's Substantial Aid to the Victorious Progress of Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no man in the United States better qualified to judge the importance of the American merchant marine as an agency of our national defense than Admiral Nimitz.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I quote the following editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

Admiral Nimitz, in recou ting American naval victories over the Japanese Fleet, paid

tribute to our merchant marine, whose great service in this war has not always been generally recognized.

The admiral doesn't want us to overlook the fact that the Navy's substantial progress would not have been possible without the supporting role of the fleet auxiliary, whose duties include the all-important mission of keeping the fighting ships supplied with ammunition, food, and other essentials.

The American merchant marine, as Admiral Nimitz points out, must not only be strong during war but it must be kept strong in time of peace, to insure an adequate national defense. We made the mistake after the last war of disposing of most of our merchant ships. He hopes we won't commit that blunder again.

"This war," Admiral Nimitz says, "has fully confirmed the necessity for a strong and sound merchant marine to be maintained in time of peace so that it may be employed as an auxiliary of the Army and Navy in time of war."

This is a fundamental fact not to be overlooked by the American people and the American Congress. A strong peacetime merchant marine will help to prevent war, and it will enable this country to maintain a commanding position in international trade.

Mr. Speaker, the policy established in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, predicated on the fact that an adequate merchant marine is a necessary arm of our national defense, has made Admiral Nimitz's commendation of its role in the present conflict possible. His recommendation for a strong and sound merchant marine should be continued in effect. Steps must be taken to change the strangling policy laid on our merchant marine by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying American ship operators the right to provide air service as an adjunct of their surface overseas shipping. And, further, proper weight should be given the admiral's statement in the consideration of H. R. 1425 now before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries providing for the sale of ships of our merchant marine. Every encouragement should be given to American-flag operators to purchase these ships and operate them, instead of, as the bill is now written, giving an unfair advantage to foreign operators to purchase these vessels and remove them entirely from the American merchant marine.

The Seven Points That Dumbarton Oaks Forgot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following article by former President Herbert Hoover should be read and reread by every American.

THE SEVEN POINTS THAT DUMBARTON OAKS FORGOT

(By Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States)

The most fateful Conference in all American history is that which meets at San Francisco to formulate the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks into a world charter of organization for maintenance of peace. During those fleeting moments the future of mankind may be molded for the next 100 years. A third world war would return the world to the barbarism of the Stone Age. These discoveries of new methods of killings; this shift from wars between men to war against women and children, and the gigantic destruction of men's toil of centuries makes certain the extinction of civilization.

If the charter at San Francisco emerges with a reasonable hope of success, the United States must take its full part in carrying it out. When we in America took up the sword to secure peace, we were committed to join in holding the sword if we would preserve peace as against the inevitable hates and violences of a generation to come.

The modern world has seen these gigantic explosions into World War and revolution before. Each time, from the bitterness of its travail, it has groped for organization to preserve a lasting peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are in most ways patterned upon the world's last great experiment—the League of Nations. The League was a partial success and its failures present vivid experience which it would be folly to ignore. In the light of these experiences, there are some important additions which should be infused into the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and thereby greatly strengthen this chart of peace.

I state them at once and I shall in later articles amplify the reasons for them.

1. Positive standards of the political rights of men and nations, and the establishment of a world committee to promote these political rights; this committee to rank with the economic and social committees already proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

2. Provision for revision of onerous treaties between nations at, say, 10-year intervals, in order to assure that the peace settlements are dynamic and not static.

3. Regional organization of the organization to preserve peace in three areas, Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere; the regional organizations to be subject, of course, to the Security Council.

4. Absolute disarmament of the enemy powers.

5. Immediate relative disarmament of the United Nations and the establishment of maximum limit of armies, navies, and air power among them.

6. While it is probably not a part of the charter itself, when it is adopted by the Congress, the authority to use force should not be given the American delegate on the Security Council, but that power should be delegated to the President of the United States with the provision that he be bound by the majority of the joint Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House as to whether a vote to employ American force shall be submitted to the Congress as a whole.

7. Take enough time in formulating the charter of peace to do it right.

LESSONS OF GRIM EXPERIENCE

There are three general methods by which peace can be preserved:

First, through measures of force to stop aggression.

Second, through pacific methods, the immediate effect of which is to settle controversies between nations by negotiation, arbitration, and judicial decisions.

Third, beyond all this are the moral, spiritual, political, and social forces which either foment conflicts or allay them. If we are to have lasting peace, we cannot rely wholly upon stopping quarrels. We must set in motion these forces which build for peace.

The weakening of the power to stop military aggression in the Dumbarton proposals by the voting formula now agreed renders it even more imperative that the great underlying forces building for peace should be more greatly developed at San Francisco than they appeared at Dumbarton Oaks. The League of Nations proclaimed its base as the maintenance of honor and justice between nations. Even that wholly nebular enunciation of a standard of conduct between nations does not appear in Dumbarton Oaks.

The great principles of political rights of nations and men, the standards of conduct among nations and the curative functions which eliminate the cause of war are wholly absent from Dumbarton Oaks. These forces must underlie not only the whole basis of international law, but of moral and spiritual progress of nations toward peace. We are in danger of setting up a purely mechanistic body without spiritual inspiration or soul.

Delegation of Legislative Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it might be well for the Congressmen of the United States to weigh carefully the meaning of some of these laws when they are passed and to observe with care that they are not abdicating their congressional responsibility.

I urge that every Congressman read the editorial which follows, entitled "What Fools These Congressmen Be":

WHAT FOOLS THESE CONGRESSMEN BE

Never in the history of the Constitution of the United States has the people's governing body, the Congress, been so grossly insulted as it was the other afternoon by a Rooseveltian stooge by the name of Mrs. Ethel Gilbert, head of the O. P. A. Office of Industry Advisory Committees, when she ordered Representatives JIMMY MORRISON, HAROLD EARTHMAN, and JOHN JENNINGS, JR., to leave a meeting between O. P. A. heads and strawberry growers of the South. The growers had requested the presence of MORRISON, a Democrat, from Louisiana; EARTHMAN, Democrat; and JENNINGS, Republican, both of Tennessee, at the meeting for their own protection.

The three Congressmen, acting the roles of chastised school children, accepted this woman's directive to leave the room while members of the Office of Price Administration's price panel "fixed" prices on strawberries.

What fools these two Democrats and one Republican were to permit themselves to be pushed around by a woman who wastes her time and our money sitting around Washington thinking up little rules that exclude Representatives of the people at meetings where she enacts the role of a czarina.

What fools our Congressmen have made of themselves in permitting Franklin Delano Roosevelt to set himself up as lord and master of the O. P. A., which in turn has permitted him to hand down this kind of advice to a woman who flaunts Congress' mistake of giving her and F. D. R. such far-reaching powers.

When Congressman MORRISON demanded the reasons for his exclusion from the meeting he was told in no kindly tones by Mrs. Gilbert that she controlled the policy for these industry advisory meetings and that she would not let Senators and Representatives attend. When the gentleman from Louisiana demanded to know by what au-

thority she exercised this power he was immediately informed by Mrs. Gilbert:

"The authority you Congressmen gave me—believe me, I use it."

Right here is the initial warning to all Congressmen that unless they immediately strip the President of many of his dictatorial powers the Constitution of the United States will find itself classified with the Atlantic Charter—a piece of paper that's not worth the words written on it.

Such things as the chasing of three of our Congressmen from an O. P. A. meeting by a power-crazed skirted dictator must be stamped out the way we would a rattlesnake before it had a chance to strike the second time. Certainly, if she is permitted to get away with barring Congressmen from her secret meetings, there is no reason for us to believe otherwise than she will take advantage of the millions of innocents who are forced to abide by the O. P. A. rules.

The Congress of the United States has been made to appear very foolish in the eyes of the American people and unless it corrects its policy of blind obedience of all Presidential directives it will go down in history as having been inhabited by more fools than any other law-making body in the world.

Sergeant-Technician Colin R. Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Sergeant-Technician Colin R. Wise, engineer and tail-gunner on a B-26 Marauder medium bomber, was killed in action on January 11, the War Department announced Friday in a telegram to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Russell S. Wise of 50 Albion Street, Passaic, N. J.

Sergeant Wise had completed 47 combat missions in the North African and Italian theaters of war before he went to France. At the time of his death he had passed the 50 mark on the western front.

His last letter to his parents was received on January 8, 3 days before he met his death and there was inserted some verse he had penned between missions.

As we now receive the news that several of our armies have crossed the Rhine and victory is definitely in sight, I know the House will be touched by these inspiring words of a great American boy I was privileged to know, one whose dreams of coming back have been denied.

The Army gave me silver wings
To ride the skies so blue,
And e'en as they bear me away
They bear my love to you.

This Christmas for the second time
I'll be across the sea,
But in my heart I'll be with you
As you will be with me.

And as the ones I love so dear,
The chi'dren—grown-ups too—
Meet to feast on Christmas Day,
This boon I ask of you:

At dinner set one empty place,
Turn down one empty glass,
For I'll be there in spirit
To help the Noel pass.

You'll feel my lips caress your cheeks
Beneath the mistletoe,
You'll feel me in the very air
When Christmas candles glow.

You'll know I'm there on every side,
And there I'll be to stay
In spirit, till the time shall come
When war has passed away.

Till weary men can lift their eyes
Lift up their hearts and see
A Christmas blessed by love and peace
Throughout a world that's free.

And then I'll hasten home to you,
As will ten million more,
All hasten home to those who wait,
To those they all adore.

Till then, dear parents, keep my love,
My hopes, my dreams secure,
And I, in turn, will fight my way
Toward Victory's purpose pure.

Investigation of Operation of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the Washington Daily News of March 26, 1945:

NO WHITEWASH IN VET PROBE

If the House follows the lead of its Rules Committee and ducks a broad inquiry into the operation of the Veterans' Administration it will be taking on a heavy responsibility.

The Rules Committee, which is a sort of traffic manager, sidetracked the Philbin resolution for a wide investigation of the agency and instead recommended the narrow and mild inquiry proposed by Representative RANKIN. Mr. PHILBIN says he wants to investigate reports that wounded veterans are "being treated by third-rate doctors, using outmoded methods." Mr. RANKIN would investigate the efficiency of the Veterans' Administration.

The kind of investigation Mr. RANKIN would conduct was tipped off when he announced, in advance, that "General Hines (Veterans' Administrator) is doing a splendid job under difficult conditions."

Moreover, Mr. RANKIN indicated before the House Rules Committee that he was more interested in investigating those who were criticizing the Veterans' Administration than he was in examining the Administration itself.

Well, if General Hines is doing such a splendid job, why head off a real inquiry?

Congress owes it to the thousands of veterans whose affairs are being handled by the Veterans' Administration to let the country take a look at it; and the broader the look, the better.

If the House refuses to permit a real investigation, then it must accept, together with the Veterans' Administration, responsibility for whatever conditions exist in hospitals operated by the agency. That might turn out to be a heavy load.

PHILBIN FIGHTS "WHITEWASH"

(By Ned Brooks)

The House was given the choice today of voting an independent inquiry into the handling of veterans' affairs or approving a restricted investigation by a committee whose chairman already has assumed the role of defender of the Veterans' Administration.

Chairman JOHN RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi), of the House Veterans' Committee, was lining up support for his resolution to have the inquiry conducted by his group. The Rankin measure would confine the investigation to matters under direct jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

ANTI-RANKINITES RALLY

Anti-Rankin forces were rallying behind a rival resolution of Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat, Massachusetts) proposing a broader inquiry by a special 11-member committee, including five members of the Veterans' Committee. The Philbin measure would permit an examination into hospitals and other servicemen's facilities operated by the Army, Navy, and other servicemen's facilities operated by the Army, Navy, and other Government branches, as well as the Veterans' Administration.

Representative RANKIN won the first round Saturday when the House Rules Committee by a split vote, reportedly 4 to 3, gave his resolution right-of-way over Representative PHILBIN'S. The House test will come, probably today, when the New Englander attempts to have his measure substituted on the floor.

HE PRAISES HINES

Representative RANKIN has fought for nearly three weeks to head off the full-dress inquiry proposed by Representative PHILBIN. He asserted he saw "no need" for creation of a special committee, and that he believed Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, was "doing a splendid job under difficult conditions."

The Rankin resolution was offered 12 days after Representative PHILBIN introduced his measure and criticized conditions in veterans' hospitals.

Referring to recent published articles describing hospital conditions, Representative RANKIN told the Rules Committee he had been "getting a good deal of information about the complaints and the men making them."

One of the writers, he said, "was mentioned 11 times in the last Dies (un-American activities) committee report as being connected with subversive organizations."

"If this were a civil matter, these charges would make the author liable to criminal prosecution," he asserted.

Representative HOWARD SMITH (Democrat, Virginia) said he "wouldn't like to see the investigation directed at the men who are making the charges," and Representative EARL C. MICHENER, Republican, Michigan, observed that "evidence of guilt sometimes comes from unsavory sources."

Representative RANKIN replied that he could "sense an ulterior motive by some writers who have been interested in a conspiracy to overthrow this Government.

"I think we can show it," he added.

HINES IN DENIAL

Representative RANKIN was accompanied by General Hines, who earlier had told the Veterans' Committee that charges of maladministration in hospitals were "unfounded." He said he "welcomed" an investigation.

Urging the broader inquiry by an independent group, Representative PHILBIN said he had received scores of complaints from veterans and their families about hospital conditions and the administration of various benefit programs.

"If there are no irregularities to uncover, I can't see why anyone should object to a thorough and impartial investigation," he said.

The complaints reaching him, he said, indicated widespread "neglect, mistreatment, disregard, and disrespect for returning veterans." He cited instances of food poisoning, abusive treatment, and incompetence and neglect by doctors and attendants.

Challenge to Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, at the first annual dinner of the Liberal Party of New York, New York City, March 23, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Liberal Party; it is a great pleasure for me to be asked to talk to you on the first anniversary of the Liberal Party on the topic—Challenge to liberalism. That is no easy assignment, for although the origin of the liberal movement is clear, its growth has been along lines of experience rather than logic. Has the liberal of today an intellectual link with his past? Does he share the same beliefs, the same fervors? What, in short, is the modern liberal? So many claim the title who are in disagreement about pretty nearly everything. Does any central impulse units their thinking?

Since the liberal approach is dissatisfied with existing social inequalities, difference of opinion is inevitable. Behind liberalism is none of the cohesive unity of the conservative. Discontent with the injustices of our modern industrial society finds outlets in a variety of plans for its amelioration. Almost by definition liberals disagree. Therein lies both the strength and weakness of the liberal tradition—its strength because its growth is fluid, experimental, and creative; its weakness because its organization tends constantly to fall apart and disintegrate. The impulse to change tends to variety and difference. The force is from the center out, not toward the center.

Plato may have had this in mind in his amusing definition of democracy as a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike.

The conservative movement, on the other hand, tends to hold life in orderly and traditional forms, sometimes long after they have ceased to represent the needs of a growing world. Between these two tempers of thinking democracy achieves, in normal times, a balance in the steadiness and yet resilience of its growth.

We must not think of the liberal movement or the conservative movement solely in political terms, or claim that our two great parties can be thus easily cataloged. Historically the Democratic Party has, on the whole, been more hospitable to the liberal than the Republican. Yet there have been periods where the two seemed indistinguishable. The vitality of our political movements and the degree of their interest in social improvement has depended chiefly on the capacity for creative leadership in the men in whose hands power is placed. And we must also count Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt when we remember Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and Franklin Roosevelt.

Labor's participation in the political arena has been healthy—not only for Republicans but very healthy, too, for us Democrats. All political parties, as they grow in age and tradition, tend at times to fossilize. They become professional in a narrow way, emphasize organization at the expense of policy, and patronage at the cost of efficiency. Labor has brought into our political life a new set of values, has insisted on specific things that needed to be done; has been increasingly positive and vigorous, where in the past the country has often been asked to make choices that were neither clear-cut nor important.

If the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, surely the test of liberalism lies in our capacity for indignation. The mark of the liberal is his vigilance in preserving and protecting human rights.

Liberals will not accept the evils that exist simply because they have always existed—illiteracy, submarginal living standards, unemployment. They will see men's proven capacities for creating a good standard of life and will compare them to what has been accomplished. They will hate intolerance.

Yet they will remember that the present is a part of the past, and continually be conscious of the overlap of history.

When we declared our independence we proudly said that all men were created free and equal, with the right to pursue their own happiness. In our Bill of Rights—our great charter of civil liberties—we wrote into our Constitution guaranties for freedom of worship, for freedom of speech, for trial by jury.

But that was not enough.

Human slavery lived along with these guaranties, which were not universal, until we abolished slavery by war and adopted the three great Civil War amendments to the Constitution.

Now in the midst of another war, fought to preserve and to extend those decent and precious attributes of free democratic men, we have not sacrificed in the pressure and the urgency of battle those same liberties. For even as all our will is bent to the war effort our courts are open, the press is free, and we have not found it necessary to pass any alien or sedition laws. Lord Acton said: "The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." We have met that test, even since the dark days that followed Pearl Harbor.

But that is not enough.

Racial hatreds have not disappeared, and the cruel discriminations of race and color and religion continue here in our own democracy, even as we fight to overthrow a system in Germany based on the exploitation of these discriminations.

Liberals must not lose their capacity for indignation.

There is another freedom that we have not achieved and which is not found in the Bill of Rights. Jefferson, writing from Paris, where he was the American Ambassador, suggested that we should insert in our Constitution a clause outlawing monopolies. Monopoly was the prerogative of the sovereign, and we had cut loose in the Revolution from the will of any sovereign except that of our own people. Almost exactly a hundred years later we wrote Jefferson's suggestion into our law by making unlawful combinations that restrained trade and competition. For we had come to know that freedom in trade—economic freedom—was essential if we were not to be ruled by the great trusts that had developed in our economy—that economic power concentrated in great monopolies was incompatible with the preservation of individual liberty.

The liberal of a hundred years ago, the liberal of the Manchester school in England, and the pioneer liberal in this country believed that the removal of restrictions on trade and commerce would greatly expand production and increase general well-being. The feudal world had been established largely on the restricted plane of monopoly. Privilege to trade was no universal right, but largely a gift of the sovereign. Production was localized, communities largely self-supporting, exchange of goods limited, price-fixing by ordinance not uncommon. Against this system the early liberals revolted. Free trade, individual enterprise, absence from restraint—these were fundamentals to the liberal who followed the teachings of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill. A revolution in production and distribution followed this revolution in ideas. The nineteenth century was built on the free market, and government restraints were not permitted to interfere with its functioning.

The underlying theory of these liberal economists was that regulation of prices and the distribution of goods could best be achieved by competition. If prices rose above the competitive level automatically cheaper goods were drawn into the market. If prices dropped below a profitable return the business was driven out of existence by the healthy process of bankruptcy, and the fittest survived. This system of laissez faire was flexible, sensitive, and responsive to daily trends. It avoided artificial regulation, and substituted control of the market by the market itself.

But from the beginning the ruthlessness of laissez faire, which sacrificed everything to competition, became apparent. Since human labor was one of the factors in competition its price, like that of goods, was fixed by the market with little consideration for social values. And the system swept children of tender years to work and crawl in the coal mines for 10 or 12 hours a day.

And since the market was not subject to control, industry was free to combine into great organizations of immense power, was free to drive out its competitors from the field or buy them up. Thus monopolies, which as creatures of the sovereign had been driven out of the economy, returned to plague it in the form of private power that actually challenged the very government which permitted them to exist. The free market—the dream of the liberals—was apparently destroying itself.

Liberals saw these evils and took steps to check them. In England the Liberty Party caused the passage of the Factory Code in 1833 and the Public Health Act in 1848. But progress was slow, for laissez faire had moved to the level of a national religion and it was considered impious to interfere with its workings. Trade unions were not legalized until 1871; and such comparatively modern reforms as workmen's compensation and old-age pensions were introduced a few years after the turn of the century, again by the English Liberal Party. So that the name you have adopted has a great and an honorable record.

With us almost from the beginning tariffs protected our new industries and standard of living. In 1886 the Interstate Commerce Act outlawed the rebates that had built up Standard Oil; and 4 years later the antitrust law forbade monopolies and combinations that restrained trade.

The market then has never been wholly free. On the one hand, laws have been passed to protect human beings from its abuses; on the other, statutes enacted to stop its drift in the direction of monopoly and to keep open the opportunity for competition.

The dilemma that has faced the liberal from the beginning, that still faces him today, is the choice between freedom and control. He has seen that one cannot exist without the other—that freedom cannot operate in a vacuum, or without a frame of law, or on the unchecked impulses of men who care solely to follow their personal advantage. For freedom is not only a personal way of life but is part of the life of the community itself.

Today a sector of that choice is presented for decision. The free market has worked pretty well to produce and distribute the good things as well as the necessities of life. The conservative believes that much of the present social and regulatory legislation has interfered with its productive capacity and should be removed. The liberal insists that such legislation is necessary if the free market is to function for the good of men and women and not merely to serve some abstract economic theory. Somewhere between the two views a balance is struck.

But the choice I refer to—the choice that must be made in the post-war years—is whether we really wish to continue with the competitive system of free enterprise. And here both liberals and conservatives are confused and uncertain.

The choice is not obvious or altogether apparent. But we can see how it is beginning to shape up. There is a movement on foot which looks with favor on cartels and advocates the repeal of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act; which would permit the fixing of prices, the allocation of territories, the control of particular markets; which says that monopolies are inevitable and should be regulated by further Government control. We have had a taste of that kind of regulation in our brief but unhappy N. R. A. experience.

I realize that competition is threatened. I know that there are large segments of our industry where it has disappeared. I am conscious that much thinking in Europe is against the competitive theory. Yet I dread what will become of a world where cartelization is accepted; where enormously increased regulation by the government necessarily follows, so that eventually the individual's choice of work, even his choice of where to work, will be directed.

I cannot believe that the liberal will accept such regimentation on the argument that it is inevitable. He has seen the inevitable happen to Germany, but he has not accepted it. He has set his whole energy toward a fuller production, and he will not understand why arrangements to limit that production are desirable. He will not be comfortable in any system that plans to contract rather than to expand the market. The market in our modern world must be considered in its entirety. The pressures for its control are sectional, representing separate segments of industry. In resisting them the terms of the liberal's thinking must be national and even universal. The liberal of today must see the world steadily and see it whole.

Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California, at Liberal Party dinner, March 23, 1945:

In the President's report to Congress and the Nation upon his return from the Crimea, he said:

"The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or one party, or one nation. It cannot be an American peace, or a British, a Russian, a French, or a Chinese peace. It cannot be a peace of large nations—or of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world."

"It cannot be a structure of complete perfection at first. But it can be a peace—and it will be a peace—based on the sound and just principles of the Atlantic Charter, on the conception of the dignity of the human being, on the guaranties of tolerance and freedom of religious worship."

The task of the liberal is to give leadership in the work of helping to build this structure of world peace. It will take all of us to do the job.

It is the task of the liberal to work to prevent World War No. 3.

When the President gave his quarantine speech in 1935—from that time on liberals began in ever-increasing numbers to rouse the people to the dangers of a Nazi-Fascist dominated world. I was a member of the William Allen White committee and the Fight for Freedom committee. We toured the country. We worked day after day, month after month, trying to awaken people from their lethargy.

From 1935 on, there were two tasks before us. The first task—to make people see the danger that threatened us. The second task to help them to believe that we could combat this danger.

I shall never forget Herbert Agar as he moved across the country telling the same story over and over again—telling it eloquently with his mind and with his heart—pleading with America to wake up before it was too late.

A liberal is one who is free—open minded. One capable of facing facts however disagreeable they may be. One capable of mental reflexes.

For such people there are two tasks clearly defined today. One, to crusade again and make all understand that this half-shattered world cannot survive the shock of another war.

Two, to make all understand that the nations of the world can find a common ground for peace.

The President has said this is a people's peace. The people of the earth must learn now to work together or there will be no people.

Liberals must work for a greater understanding between the peoples of the rest of the earth and the people of our own country.

And like the President, liberals must not for an instant waver in the belief that an agreement to insure world peace and security can be reached.

For if we fail to believe, we perish.

Certain techniques of obstruction threatened us in the pre-war days. Certain techniques of obstruction today stand between us and a free and peaceful world in the future.

One of the techniques of the fearful, the blind, the greedy who revolve in their own personal little world, is the technique of fighting all change by calling it impractical idealism. Every program for the betterment of our people, has been branded by these self-styled realists as impractical, idealistic, a dream of visionaries.

"Peace is impractical. Peace is a passing fancy. Peace is a dream."

Now, when peace is called impossible, impractical, who is doing the dreaming? Is war in the future our dream or is it the private nightmare of those who call us impractical because we insist on preventing it?

The alternative to peace is war. The alternative to the cooperative peace that is being attempted now, is a war of extermination of the human race, or a succession of wars which must mean eventual race suicide.

Is that practical? Shall we listen to these dreamers of nightmares, who run about with their feet in the clouds of battle smoke, as the only authorized counsel to humanity?

Yet that is one of the principal techniques of today's wreckers.

"You can't change human nature," they tell us. "It is human nature to make war. So long as we walk upright on two feet, we shall have wars. Look at history."

They tell us, always, to look backward, never to look ahead. And when they are asked, "Well, what would you do?" what is their answer?

It used to be, "Build a wall. Make America impregnable. Isolate us. Then we can forget the rest of the world."

But they cannot give us that answer any more. Buzz bombs have already changed that story.

So what they are really telling us, these wreckers who read and write the New York Daily News and the Chicago Tribune, is simply this:

We have mastered the air, the land, and the sea, but we can't learn to get along together so we will just have to sit by and watch the peoples of the earth commit suicide.

Hitler's greatest secret weapon was and is the belief that discord can be sown amongst the United Nations. The President reminded us of it again on March 1 when he said:

"It was Hitler's hope that we would not agree—that some slight crack might appear in the solid wall of Allied unity which would give him and his fellow gangsters one last hope of escaping their doom. That is the objective for which his propaganda machine has been working for months."

"But Hitler has failed."

Yes, he has failed up to now, but the poison his gangsters have injected into the blood stream of the world is still working. Disunity can wreck our future as it can still wreck our war effort.

Unity is our strongest shield now. Our greatest hope for the future.

Then there is the second type of wrecker or breeder of World War No. 3—the perfectionist. He, I suppose, is the most deadly. He looks so good.

His is the technique of the "Yes, but" group.

In 1918 when no other way sufficed—when it was known that four out of five Americans wanted the League of Nations—the technique of perfection was used at the end to wreck the hope of the world. And it worked.

Peace is a good thing, the perfectionist will tell us. I am for it, but—

Of course, any instrument that the nations of the world may create to keep the peace will not be perfect to begin with—not as the perfectionist sees it and not as we may see it either. But while we sincerely lay a base and hope to build on it in the future, the perfectionist digs under that base to plant a stick of dynamite.

And when you ask, "Well, what would you do?" what answer do you get?

The answer will vary, but it will always be impossible to put into practical operation. Let me give you a sample.

A substitute peace plan was offered recently on the floor of Congress. It was a perfect example of perfectionist thinking.

The plan called for an immediate division of the world into regions, which would replace national boundaries. Each region was to have its own government, its own money, its own set of laws applying to all the peoples within that area. National entities were to be wiped out in one stroke of the global eraser.

Now, contrast this example of perfectionist thinking, this floundering around in the clouds of conjecture, with the way the representatives of the United Nations have undertaken the job.

We have witnessed a realistic procedure which takes into account the reality of men, of peoples, of nations, of their history, their geography, their economy. The purpose is to improve on the world we have, not to try melting it down to fit a new mold. And that is the only way we can proceed.

They began with what they actually had to work with, knowing that what they would produce would be not perfect, but that it would be working start; that there would be a beginning.

They did not try to ignore the fact that there is a settling of accounts coming out of this war.

The perfectionist wants to skip blithely over that. He wants to let bygones be bygones. He expects concessions from victor and vanquished alike, concessions not necessarily in the real interest of peace and a safer world, but concessions to his own personal idea of peace. And when he doesn't

get these concessions, he starts calling names.

Well, nations just don't work that way. A nation that has been overrun by an invader may want to cooperate 100 percent in preventing another war. But it has not forgotten about the last one. It cannot be expected to do so.

People who have seen their cities laid waste by the aggressor, their families torn apart, their women ravished, and their children murdered—such people know better than we shall ever know, how terribly important it is to stop World War No. 3.

But don't expect them to stick their necks out in the same place where they had them when World War No. 2 broke upon them. If you come to them with a plan to prevent another war, they may welcome you with open arms. But if you tell them that first as a prerequisite to your scheme, they must give up any safeguards they may happen to consider necessary against new conspiracies and new attacks from outside their borders, that even before you yourself can sign up in your own plan, they must stick their necks out once more, your reception may not be as polite as you have liked.

The critics of the Dumbarton Oaks conference and those who have been complaining about what went on at Yalta take none of this into account.

Fortunately, the men at Dumbarton Oaks and the men at Yalta did not take any such unrealistic attitude.

Then, there is still another source of opposition to the Roosevelt peace program—the opposition of very special interests, people who have, or think they have, something to lose in the way of a preferred financial or political position. They are afraid that a lasting peace is going to cost them money.

Their voice is just beginning to be heard, and it's not a nice voice.

This group may well be called peace profiteers. They are no better, they are no less dangerous to our country, than the war profiteers who value dollars over doughboys.

A good example of this peace profiteering is the opposition of certain large eastern banking interests to the proposal of an international fund.

One of the major threats to peace, we all know, is economic unbalance. The equilibrium of world economy requires for its maintenance and protection, a system of checks and balances, a mechanism that will not only keep open the channels of commerce between nations, but will serve as a safeguard against any attempt to wage economic warfare through those channels.

Last June, therefore, the representatives of 44 nations met to set up some kind of working control of the world money market, so that certain international manipulators, racketeers, and gangsters could no longer menace the peace of the world by rigging and manipulating that market as the Nazis did from 1933 to 1939, and so that the flow of finance among nations would be kept free of other obstructions.

The men who were sent to Bretton Woods from all parts of the world were the best qualified to speak for the 44 nations they represented. The plan that was there drawn up and agreed to was no sudden creation of an offhand meeting. These experts had been working on it for 3 long years.

The fact that they were able to reach an agreement was in itself a triumph and a heartening sign of world accord.

The Bretton Woods program is definitely one of controlled and regulated world finance. The control and the regulation is to be exercised in the name of, and for the benefit of, the people—all the people of all the nations.

But what happens? Immediately, there arose a violent protest.

An international stabilization fund and a world bank were proposed at Bretton Woods. Both must come into being if the Bretton Woods plan is to work. The would-be peace profiteers, who don't dare come right out and say they don't like Bretton Woods, endorse the bank but say they don't like the international monetary fund. They know that if they can kill the fund, the Bretton Woods whole program will die a-borning.

What they really dislike is the fact that this fund which is to be used to insure stability of exchange, might abridge their old chances at private profit from speculative ventures in the world market—ventures which have no productive value, no possible benefit to society.

Now, let's nail the very incomplete statement that bankers oppose the Bretton Woods plan as a very complete falsehood.

Bankers do not oppose Bretton Woods. A certain group of eastern bankers, Wall Street bankers, who are more accurately described as speculators in the international market, parasites in the woodwork of our world economic structure, peddlers of unsound foreign bonds to the American public—those particular bankers are opposed to Bretton Woods.

Numerically, a far greater number of American bankers support the Bretton Woods program than oppose it, and have so expressed themselves.

The banker on Main Street is not opposed to Bretton Woods. His organizations have gone on record in favor of the program.

And not all of Wall Street is opposed to it. Bankers in that center of finance also support and insist upon the Bretton Woods program. The objection comes from a single group, small numerically, but powerful financially, and very hungry for continued power, continued profits, let the peace of the world fall where it may.

When the conferees at Bretton Woods proposed an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and an International Monetary Fund, to be participated in by all the United Nations, what they were really doing was to propose machinery which will insure the world of a new beginning by protecting the post-war world against unstable currencies. They were proposing an agreement not to engage in currency warfare.

When some Wall Street banks oppose Bretton Woods because it might cut into their post-war profits they are really trying to break down that protection. They are inviting currency warfare in the post-war world, and when you invite a war of currencies you are inviting a war of guns and planes and tanks.

Bretton Woods is the economic cornerstone of a "people's peace."

And finally, it is the duty of a liberal to remember at all times that today the United States must assume a very large share of responsibility—even a disproportionate share—in the building of peace.

When this war is over, even with all the strain our people will have endured and the losses they will have suffered, this Nation will still be less tired than our major allies.

Our soil has not been occupied nor has it been a battle ground. Our industries have not been bombed nor have our towns and cities been ravaged.

Our own domestic problems will be simpler. But we must and will solve these problems so that there will be a prosperous and healthy America.

For only a prosperous and healthy America can help secure a world of peace.

A healthy and prosperous America means jobs—people working and producing. Jobs mean happy people—hopeful people.

Just as we have made the struggle against fascism a people's war, just as we are resolved that it shall end in a people's victory, so must we also support and insist upon a people's peace.

That means a cooperative peace. It means an obligation on the part of the American people to back up the President of the United States in the making of such a peace.

It means to support and defend against attack the part of the President's program that was formulated at Dumbarton Oaks, the part that was agreed upon at Bretton Woods, and the negotiations that were made with our allies at Yalta and that will be furthered at San Francisco and in conferences still to be scheduled.

And as the President said: "I am confident that * * * the American people will accept the * * * beginnings of a permanent structure of peace upon which we can begin to build under God that better world into which our children and grandchildren—yours and mine and the children and grandchildren of the whole world—must and can live."

Prospects for Light Metals Production in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 22, 1945, I appeared before the Senate Committee on Small Business and delivered an address in which I discussed the situation affecting light metals now and the prospects for the post bellum exploitation of light metals in the Pacific Northwest.

My speech covers the field rather extensively and encompassed the danger of monopoly control in the aluminum and magnesium field.

It refers to the Aluminum Co. of America and the attitude of that gigantic concern toward the encouragement of competition or the expansion of potential rivals.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at the outset, I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Montana and the members of his committee for devoting its attention, as part of the great work in which it is engaged, to the question of the future of the light-metals industry. Your consideration of the policies which the Federal Government could best pursue in disposing of the great aluminum and magnesium plants which have been constructed at Government expense to aid the war program is a timely one. Naturally, the Government, I am sure, does not propose to proceed with the disposal of its gigantic investment in light-metals plants until such time as the war has been brought to a successful conclusion—a war that requires, for the manufacture and fabrication of the implements of warfare, quantities of aluminum and magnesium that literally stagger the imagination when compared with the prewar use of these metals. The people and the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest have made a monumental contribution to the production and fabrication of the light-metals products used by our armed forces in conducting the war against the enemy on land, sea, and in the air.

WHAT PROGNOSIS FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST LIGHT-METALS PRODUCTION?

What is to become of this great new industry in the Northwest, given such impetus by reason of the exigent demands of wartime production? It was no easy battle for us to convince the Federal Government, in

the early days of the war, that we should be given an opportunity to play a large part in the light-metals-production program of the Nation. As one Member of Congress who was happy to play an active role in cooperation with many of my colleagues and business leaders in the Northwest, in breaking down the opposition of those Federal officials charged with responsibility for the production of aluminum, I am frankly apprehensive when it comes to reposing too much responsibility in the hands of these same officials in determining what shall be the future course of light-metals production in the Pacific Northwest. I have sufficient reason for being bluntly dubious about the sincere concern of many Federal officials for the post-war successful continuation of our light-metals production and expansion picture.

THE ATTITUDE OF ALCOA

This committee has already heard expert testimony on the degree to which aluminum production was controlled by a monopoly corporation; namely, the Aluminum Corporation of America, prior to our involvement in World War No. 2. Alcoa has never openly proclaimed its desire to remain a monopoly industry in the aluminum field. But its every action and the every move of certain officials in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Metals Reserve Corporation, and the War Production Board, who seemingly acted as agents for Alcoa, was designed to impede, if not block entirely, the initial ventures of other corporations into the aluminum-producing field.

THE SHIPSHAW PROJECT

In support of the foregoing observation, I would like to cite, at the risk of repeating what has been said to the committee before, a number of examples of action taken by Government agencies which bear out my expressed fears:

In 1941 the Metals Reserve Company, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, executed a contract with the Aluminum Co. of Canada, a subsidiary of Aluminum, Ltd., whose stock is owned 100 percent by the stockholders of Alcoa, to furnish aluminum to the United States Government from what is now commonly referred to as the Shipshaw project. The R. F. C. loaned the Aluminum Co. of Canada $68,500,000, interest free, to use in paying for the construction of the project. Our Government further arranged to provide working capital to the extent of almost $35,000,000. We agreed to buy this aluminum at fancy prices with an escalator clause in the contract which would safeguard the profits of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, regardless of the course of the war and the subsequent changes that we might make in their delivery schedules. The War Production Board issued high priorities covering the materials and equipment needed to get this plant into operation. Turbines and generators, originally scheduled for power dams in the Northwest, which could then furnish more and cheaper power to light metals plants in our area, were diverted for the use of the Aluminum Co. of Canada Shipshaw operation on the Saguenay River.

SHIPSHAW CONTRASTED WITH TREATMENT OF AMERICAN COMPETITORS

This committee will find no parallel example of such tender and solicitous concern for the welfare of any other company desiring to produce aluminum in the United States, using American materials, American resources, and American manpower for the development of an industry in time of war that bids fair to provide large-scale employment, with its complementary businesses, for American soldiers of World War No. 2 when they return to American soil. On the contrary, this gigantic aluminum monopoly corporation, operating through its Canadian counterpart, expected to use American taxpayers' money in the building of a power project to furnish electric power for an aluminum plant in a remote section of Canada, which plant, in turn, could utilize the extremely cheap power and the cheap labor available in that area to produce aluminum at a figure which would enable them, at the propitious moment, to undersell American competitors in a fashion that might well-nigh threaten the continued existence of financially less powerful aluminum-producing companies who had the temerity to engage in competition with the Aluminum Co. of America and its twin brother in Canada.

MY COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION OF SHIPSHAW SHOULD HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of 1943 I received disturbing rumors about this whole shoddy business. In April of 1943 I introduced House Resolution 212, which provided for the establishment of a five-member committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the effect of these Alcoa, Metals Reserve Company, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and War Production Board machinations on the power and light metals production of our country, not only in time of war, but in terms of the post-war future of the light-metals industry. I regret to say my resolution never saw the light of day. I presented a voluminous array of facts to support my proposal that a committee of the Congress should look into this obviously odorous manipulation, executed for the most part in a hush-hush manner by some of the highest officials of the Government. From all over the Pacific Northwest came demands from businessmen, granges, public power groups, and others that such a committee be established. I am proud of the fact that most of my colleagues of both parties from Pacific Northwest States joined in support of my pending resolution. But Mr. Jesse Jones, until lately head of the R. F. C., and officials of the War Production Board argued against the approval of this resolution as they vigorously whitewashed their own previous action. To those of us who serve in Congress, this is an old and familiar routine.

MONOPOLY SHOULD NOT PRE-EMPT COMPETITIVE FIELD

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to burden your committee with a description of the alumina, aluminum, and aluminum-fabricating plants and extrusion facilities which we now have in operation in the States of Washington and Oregon. The maximum potential capacity of the plants in operation is a matter of record in this committee. The potentialities of aluminum and magnesium production in the Pacific Northwest has also been discussed for your benefit. It may seem strange to some, but my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest know only too well what a difficult job we have had in trying to prevent arbitrary close-down orders, affecting our Northwest pot lines, from being used by War Production Board officials. On many occasions, northwest congressional delegations have called on Dr. Arthur Bunker, Light Metals Division Chief of the W. P. B., formerly an official of the Lehman Corporation, financial representatives of Alcoa; and upon Mr. Charles Wilson, head of General Electric Co. and former vice chairman of the W. P. B. (whose company, incidentally, is one of the biggest customers of Alcoa) for the purpose of convincing them there was no justification for closing down our pot lines in the northwest while allowing higher cost plants in the east to continue. I have always felt strangely aware of a certain coincidence between the fact that most of the aluminum plants in the east are owned outright by Alcoa, while most of our plants in the west are owned in the Government and only operated by Alcoa as agents for the Defense Plants Corporation.

Keeping in mind the practices and policies of corporate monopolies, which have run afoul of the antitrust laws, even as Alcoa, it does not require any great stretch of the imagination to realize that such a giant monopoly in any field, whether it be aluminum, copper, or steel, would not shed other than crocodile tears over a damaging blow that might be dealt to new competitors or to potential competitors who might some day utilize the Government-built plants, whose cheap production costs would threaten their monopoly position in our post-war industrial economy.

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN PRONE TO ESPOUSE MONOPOLY VIEWPOINT

I have listened closely, gentlemen, each time the Government, through some official of questionable background, from the standpoint of being an impartial, unprejudiced, objective administrator, threatened to close down the pot lines operated by Alcoa in the Pacific Northwest. But my ears have never detected the slightest peep of a protest from Alcoa because it was going to be denied the responsibility of continuing the operation of the Government-owned plants. In the aluminum industry, it is recognized that the stoppage of reduction plants may well result in a plant condition which may make the reopening of that plant an economical impossibility. No, Mr. Chairman, the protests have come from the businessmen, the workers, the farmers, and the plain citizens of my section of the country, who are determined that monopoly groups operating outside of, and covertly inside of, our Government framework shall not be allowed either to ruin or severely handicap the future growth and development of a light-metals industry, which, with all of the collateral small business enterprises that will stem therefrom, seems destined to be one of the industrial mainstays of our Pacific coast.

That Pacific coast, "where nature smiles a thousand miles," has added to its population in this war by tens of hundreds of thousands. We look forward to a permanent emancipation from the colonial economy status in which we have been held, in part, by the inability of our local industrialists to secure a place for themselves in the sun in competition with corporate monopoly industries concentrated in the East. We have a superabundance of available and potential extremely cheap water power. We have astronomical quantities of aluminous-bearing clays from which we can produce alumina. We have now, and at the conclusion of the war, with the return of our soldier and sailor boys from overseas, will have even more skilled, energetic craftsmen to operate our industries. We feel that we have vision. We are alert to the post-war commercial potentialities offered by the market for fabricated goods made from aluminum, magnesium, and we hope some day, steel, offered by the consumer requirements of the populations across the stretches of the Pacific, ranging from Siberia to India.

INDEPENDENT OPERATION SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

Before this Government proceeds to dispose of its light metals plants in the Pacific Northwest, I think it should be satisfied that sufficient laws, rules, and regulations are in full force and effect as will guarantee that no potential purchaser of any of the Government's plants will be given consideration if there exists even the slightest suspicion the plant will either be shut-down at some future date or operated in such a manner as will redound to the competitive advantage and benefit of monopoly corporations in the same field struggling to maintain or recapture the dominant position they hold or once held in the field of light metals production. Better than have this happen, let

the Government reclaim the plants and contract for their continued operation under satisfactory terms. Somewhere along the Rhine, or in the jungle fastnesses of South Pacific islands, there are young men from Montana, Idaho, Oregon, California, and Washington States who will want to find employment in a growing and expanding light metals industry on the Pacific coast. It can provide them with post-war economic security. This committee is happily dedicating itself to the problem of making a contribution toward the achievement of that objective. I appreciate deeply the opportunity of presenting some comments and information which may be helpful to the Senate Committee on Small Business in its deliberations on the policy which should guide the Federal Government in disposing, if such becomes advisable, of its tremendous investment in light metal industrial plants in the Pacific Northwest.

Farm Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an outline form for a written agreement between a farm tenant and a landlord which has been worked out by the Southern Tenant Farmers Union:

FARM AGREEMENT

This farm agreement made and entered into this the____day of_____19__, by and between_____, landlord and_____, tenant, witnesseth:

The landlord leases to the tenant to occupy and use for farming purposes according to the terms hereinafter specified, the following described property, located in_____ _____county, State of_____:

_____

consisting of_____acres, more or less together with all buildings and improvements thereon.

The landlord agrees that he is the owner of this property and has signed same or if signed by his agent, that Mr._____ is the duly authorized agent of the landlord and has the right to execute this farm agreement and to give tenant possession under this agreement and, will, so long as the agreement remains in effect, warrant and defend tenant's possession against all persons whomsoever.

The life of this farm agreement shall be from the above date to January 1, 19___, and shall continue from year to year unless terminated by 30 days' written notice given by either party.

The crop arrangement, acres, and rent shall be as follows:

Number of acres of crops planned:

_____acres of cotton.
_____acres of corn.
_____acres other crops.
_____acres garden.
_____total acres to be used.

List share or rent on each crop:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

The landlord agrees to furnish the tenant $____ per month for_____months, beginning on the____day of_____, 19__. Interest rate per annum of ___ percent is to be charged for use of money advanced. The tenant will furnish all labor necessary for breaking all land, planting, cultivating, and harvesting of the above crop and will perform all labor in a husband-like manner at the proper time.

Seeds, fertilizer, teams, tools, and other necessary implements for the making of the crop shall be supplied as follows: State clearly who will furnish each item:

_____

The crops will be harvested, prepared, and marketed as follows: State clearly all arrangements:

_____

It is mutually agreed by landlord and tenant that the payment of rent or the division of crop proceeds shall take place at the time the crop is harvested and marketed. All accounts shall be submitted in writing on or before November 1, 19___, and shall be settled in full as soon as sufficient crops have been harvested and marketed.

The tenant agrees to care for and protect all buildings, farm implements, livestock, and improvements entrusted to his care by the landlord and at the end of this agreement to return same to the landlord or his agent in as good condition as when delivered to him, ordinary wear, tear, or loss by fire or flood or other causes beyond control of tenant excepted.

In witness whereof, the parties have signed this agreement in duplicate on the date first above written.

_____
Landlord

By _____
Agent

_____
Tenant

Witnesses as to both signatures:

_____
_____

O. P. A. Minimum Price Regulation 580

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has recently issued MPR–580, which is intended to provide for exact pricing rules for some 300,000 of the Nation's retail stores selling clothing, textiles, furniture, and house furnishings. The issuance of this order has caused a storm of protest principally from the independent retail stores of the Nation, because of their inability to file the required reports within the time limited by the order, to wit, April 20.

The retailers of this country, harassed by employment problems, lack of skilled help, and continuous consumer demands for merchandise, find themselves confronted with the task of preparing a price chart upon which they are required to list all of the net-invoice costs which they paid for goods covered by the regulation and offered for sale on March 19, 1945, the base date. Opposite each cost the retailer must also list the price at which the article of merchandise was offered for sale on the base date. Its offering price is his ceiling for an article of that cost. The cost and offering prices must be listed separately by categories of merchandise and with each category the retailer must list the different costs for all articles included in that category and offered for sale on the base date. For different articles having the same cost but offered for sale at more than one price, the retailer must calculate his average mark-up for the different prices in the category.

From the voluminous correspondence which I have had on this subject, the principal objection lies in the fact that the time limitation does not give sufficient notice so that the retailer can comply. Failure to comply and to file with his O. P. A. district office by April 20 makes it illegal for a retailer to sell or deliver any goods covered by the regulation until acknowledgment of his filing has been received from the district O. P. A. office.

I trust that the Administrator of the O. P. A. will recognize the tremendous burden placed upon the retail stores of this country and will extend the time 30 days in which to comply with this order.

O. P. A. Regulation 580

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received in the mail this morning the following letter sent out by the Grant County War Price and Ration Board of Marion, Ind., dated March 21, 1945:

GRANT COUNTY WAR PRICE AND RATION BOARD 31–27.1,
Marion, Ind., March 21, 1945.

You are a retail merchant under the new O. P. A. Regulation 580. Do you want to be in business after April 20?

Then attend a community meeting of all retailers in Grant and surrounding counties at Marion High School auditorium Wednesday night, March 28, at 7 p. m. It is the most important part of your business to learn the real features of this regulation as it pertains to your business.

Mr. Gabriel, of the Indianapolis office of O. P. A., will be here to conduct this meeting and answer any questions you may have concerning this regulation.

James D. Strickland, Indiana O. P. A. district director, pointed out that every apparel, dry goods, and house-furnishings retailer is required to prepare three copies of a pricing chart. This chart is to be based on the costs and selling prices of the goods offered for sale on March 19, 1945 (base date). On or before April 20 each retailer must file two copies of this chart with the O. P. A. district office in Indianapolis. One copy must be kept in the merchant's store.

"In cooperation with retailer's organizations we are making plans for the organization of a merchant's committee in each community to help war price and rationing boards get accurate information about these charts to every retailer," Mr. Strickland said. "Merchants should watch for announcements of the appointment of local committees to provide this assistance.

"By summer more of the clothes in stores will be in low and medium price ranges. Through pricing charts retailers will find the job of figuring ceiling prices greatly simplified."

J. W. TORRANCE.

In other words, if they do not attend the meeting they are going to be put out of business by the O. P. A. on April 20.

Yugoslavia

REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, in finding the common ground for peace about which the President spoke, we must strengthen the bonds of friendship between ourselves and sister nations. One of the best ways to strengthen the ties between people and nations is to show understanding and appreciation of the contributions which they have made to the community and to the world.

Today, I want to speak of Yugoslavia. March 27 is the fourth anniversary of Yugoslavia's resistance. On March 27, 1941, the Yugoslav people defied Hitler by throwing out the government that had signed a pact with the Nazis, giving them permission to cross Yugoslavia in order to invade Greece. The Yugoslav people refused to be a party to such treachery and chose rather to be invaded themselves. This heroic and spontaneous decision had an important influence on the course of the war. Morally it was of the greatest possible value.

The Yugoslavs flung Hitler's challenge back in his teeth at a time when the Nazi-Fascist power appeared to be invincible. Their defiance inspired all of the subjugated peoples of Europe with hope and courage. Physically, the fact that the Germans had to invade Yugoslavia instead of just marching through, dislocated their time schedule and postponed their projected attack on the Soviet Union.

Although the regular Yugoslav Army was quickly defeated by the Nazi-Fascist invading horde, the Yugoslav people were never defeated.

They developed an entirely new type of warfare and have kept from 15 to 20 enemy divisions fully occupied ever since. The value of this contribution to Allied victory cannot be overestimated.

What would have happened at the battles of Stalingrad and El Alamein if the Germans had had the use of 20 or even 10 extra divisions?

This unrelenting struggle on the part of the Yugoslav people has liberated most of their country, with very little assistance from the Allies, and has, therefore, spared the lives of many American boys. The Yugoslav partisans have saved the lives of hundreds of American aviators who were shot down over Yugoslavia on shuttle-bombing missions. They have never counted the cost.

Partisan men and women protected these brave flyers with their bodies, from German machine-gun bullets. In one instance, 16 partisans gave their lives in order to carry 1 wounded American aviator through the enemy lines to safety. General Eaker has gone to Belgrade in order to thank Marshal Tito personally, on behalf of the American Army Air Forces, for the assistance given to American aviators by the Yugoslav Army of Liberation.

The 27th of March this year marks the culmination of 4 years of heroic and victorious struggle on the part of the Yugoslav people against the enemy. It completes 4 years of steady and fruitful striving toward unity among the south Slavic peoples.

The new Government of Yugoslavia, of which Tito is Prime Minister, has given broad representation to all sections of the country, all national and religious groups, and all democratic political parties. The Yugoslav people have thus been the first to implement the decisions of Yalta by creating a truly democratic federated Yugoslavia. In so doing they are unitedly making an important contribution to the new world of peace which we are all striving to build upon the only possible foundation—that of freedom and justice.

Widespread Approval of My Position Against Abolishing the Two-thirds Rule of Making Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a speech delivered by me in the House on March 2 in opposition to the plan to amend the Constitution so as to substitute a majority vote of both branches of Congress for a two-thirds vote of the Senate in the ratification of treaties has brought immediate reactions throughout the country, and I think it is significant that every letter and every editorial comment that has come to my notice supports the position I have taken.

Running through the letters and editorials I have received, there is a deep-seated conviction that the adoption of this change in treaty-ratification procedure would sell America down the river.

Popular government in America never was at lower ebb than it is today and the adoption of this constitutional amendment would abolish popular government as far as the treaty-making power is concerned.

Our Government is suffering from too much direction from above and not enough direction from below. When I say "from below" I mean from the people. If the centralization of power in the executive establishment is still further increased by the adoption of this amendment, Congress will become a mere rubber stamp in the tremendously important function of ratifying treaties on which the future welfare of our people depends.

The power of the Executive in international matters is such that it would be easy for any President to secure a majority of Congress for a treaty. The only effective congressional check on treaty making is a two-thirds check. Abolish the two-thirds check and you may as well say to the President, "Go ahead and make treaties to your liking."

I am not willing to surrender congressional authority over the making of treaties. To do so would wreck the checks and balances wisely set up in the Constitution. Instead of making itself a rubber stamp in respect to the ratification of treaties I would like to see Congress fight for its rights and recapture many of the other powers it already has unwisely surrendered. Neither the President nor the State Department has asked for this proposed amendment or even intimated in the most remote way that they would like to see the two-thirds rule abolished. Do we, then, as Members of Congress, sworn to uphold the Constitution, seriously propose to voluntarily weaken ourselves and pusillanimously turn over to the Executive the sacred right which Congress now enjoys of being a real factor in the ratification of treaties? I do not think so. I have the highest respect for the gentlemen who are proposing this change but I do not believe they have thought the problem through.

All of the leading papers of Indiana, my home State, have endorsed my position in this matter and I quote their editorials, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star of March 7, 1945]

STICK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

Representative LUDLOW of Indianapolis serves a timely warning when he calls on Members of Congress to stop, look, and listen before proposing to amend the treaty-making provision of the Constitution. It would be a grievious mistake to repeal the present requirement that a vote of two-thirds of the Senate be required to ratify a treaty and give that authority to a majority of both Houses of Congress.

The fundamental fact should be kept in mind that Senators, in passing on a treaty proposal, are acting as spokesmen for their States. Each State has two Senators. Indiana has the same voice as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or California. And Nevada has just as much to say as any of its sister States.

An amendment to put ratification up to a majority of both Houses would nullify the object that the founding fathers had in mind. They did not intend that treaty making should be a popular function. Ratification means the approval of the States, as States. It is intended as a check on Executive authority and has worked well from the beginning.

[From the Indianapolis Times of March 9, 1945]

CONGRESS AND TREATIES

Representative LOUIS LUDLOW is quite correct in his assertion that the proposed constitutional amendment to approve treaties by a simple majority vote of both House and

Senate would further weaken Congress. It would do more. It would also weaken treaties.

There has been much criticism lately of the fact that 33 Senators—one more than one-third of the membership—can prevent the United States from making a treaty with another nation. But the provision didn't get into the Constitution by accident.

A treaty is an obligation of all the people, not just of one party or one administration. It is binding upon succeeding administrations and has to be carried out by them. Unless it is made with the overwhelming support of the people—with endorsement far beyond the momentary whim of a bare majority that may change with any election—it is likely to be repudiated as lightly as it was approved.

The requirement that no treaty can be made until two-thirds of the Senate have approved it is simply a safeguard against binding this Nation to an agreement which does not have the general support of the people. Perhaps it has, in the past 150 years, prevented the making of some treaties that should have been made. It has also almost certainly kept us out of some we wouldn't have liked, over the long haul, even though they looked pretty good at the time they were proposed.

The classic example, and one constantly mentioned by proponents of easier ratification, is, of course, the Wilson proposal at the close of the last war. Under the constitutional amendment now proposed in the House, those treaties would have been approved. Yet the vote at the next national election, with this as the major issue, was overwhelmingly against the proposals. One wonders what would have been the result—in the twenties and the thirties, if we had been bound to a course of action which a large majority of the people of this country vigorously opposed.

The international commitments of this Nation have never been repudiated. Our national word is good—because we have made it good and because we have never given it lightly. Treaties with the United States of America are binding contracts and not scraps of paper or matters of temporary expediency. One of the reasons is that we don't make a treaty until we are sure we all want it and intend to keep it.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 15, 1945]

TREATY RATIFICATION

When proponents of American participation in the movement to set up a world organization for permanent peace were worried about the strength of the so-called isolation vote in the Senate, they started a vigorous propaganda to weaken the possible opposition of this group. They did not work directly on the group with their propaganda, but assumed that it was a fixed obstacle and that it was numerous and strong enough to muster more than enough votes to block the ratification of a world peace organization treaty.

The campaign was directed to amending the Constitution with a view to reducing the effectiveness of the group. The petition was laid before Congress. It calls for a resolution to refer to the people a proposal to amend the Constitution by providing that a treaty must be ratified by a majority vote of both houses, instead, as now provided, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

American faith in majority rule, plus the enthusiasm of the proponents of the resolution, won a good reception of the suggestion. It was supported directly by many. Others, who were not fully convinced, but wished to do what seemed to be necessary to assure this country's participation in a world peace movement, supported the proposal on the ground that the people would have an opportunity to vote on the question.

In recent weeks, however, discussion of the proposal has brought out the original reason for the provision and has led a good many pepole to wonder whether the amendment, if accepted, would, in practice, strengthen the treaty-making function of Congress.

The provision was put in originally to protect sections of the country from exploitation by other sections through the making of trade treaties. Now it is being said, notably in a speech by Representative LUDLOW, that most treaties are not peace treaties, but trade treaties which affect the interest of farmers, labor, industries, transportation and communication. Mr. LUDLOW also pointed out that Congress cannot repeal or abolish a treaty. The decision of the Senate is final unless a general policy is changed.

The proponents of the proposed plan have not abated their enthusiasm for it, but they have brought out new phases of opposition and assured a more deliberate discussion of the change than at first seemed likely to develop.

[From the Fort Wayne News Sentinel of March 21, 1945]

STRANGE REASONING

To Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana Democrat, goes credit for making some of the most pertinent points yet to be used against the dangerous proposal to eliminate the two-thirds rule for Senate ratification of treaties.

Speaking in the House against the resolution which proposed an amendment to the Constitution providing for this change, Congressman LUDLOW said:

"By a strange process of reasoning, the proponents of the resolution to provide for ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses, instead of by two-thirds of the Senate, say that the purpose of the resolution is to give Congress authority over treaty making. Instead of giving, it takes away. It dilutes toward nothingness the authority which Congress now has over treaties by the operation of the two-thirds rule at the Senate end of the Capitol."

Congressman LUDLOW agrees with most other sincere persons who have made a careful study of the system of checks and balances in the American Republic, that a majority rule for ratifying treaties would remove all congressional control, and open the way for the President—any President—to make treaties at will.

As he says, "If this resolution passes, we shall witness the amazing spectacle of Congress voluntarily offering to surrender its effective authority over treaty making. * * * We shall witness Congress * * * weakening its power still further by removing the only effective barrier against executive usurpation in respect to treaties."

As everyone familiar with the Constitution knows, the provision for treaty ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate was written into the original document.

For more than a century and a half there was no serious attack on the logic of that system.

A treaty with one or more foreign countries is an extremely serious matter. Once made and ratified, a treaty should be respected by the United States until or unless one or more signatories abrogate its provisions.

We should be begging for trouble if we eliminated the power of Congress to operate as a balancing wheel for the whims of the Chief Executive, regardless of who he is.

Congressman LUDLOW, rather than weakening the congressional power, would strengthen it by making a two-thirds vote of both Houses necessary to ratify treaties.

Obviously, if any change is to be made in the ratification procedure, the two-thirds rule for both the Senate and the House would be the only logical one. Any removal of Congress' control would be the utmost foolishness. That the institution of a majority rule in both Houses would completely strip Congress of any control, is plain to be seen.

"In view of the fact that it is possible to make a treaty that would fundamentally and radically change our form of Government," Congressman LUDLOW said, "I think it is highly important that Congress should keep its hand on the throttle. We hear it charged on all sides that Congress is breaking down. Let us not, my colleagues, be guilty of breaking ourselves down."

Among the distinguished constitutional authorities who have written to me expressing agreement with my position is Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University.

Armed Services Replacements

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House passed a bill to extend the draft law for another year. The fact that this bill was passed without including any limitations on the Army or Navy in their handling of the men in service, represents the willingness of Congress to refrain from interfering with the military conduct of the war.

Congress no doubt has been right in this position.

I know well the need for replacements that exists. I know, too, that there have been many Members of Congress, of whom I am one, who have plead with the Army and Navy to relieve men who have been over long in combat areas. But I cannot refrain Mr. Speaker, from raising my voice to appeal with all the earnestness at my command to the military leaders of this Nation that so far as humanly possible consistent with absolute military needs they do not send young teen-age men into combat only a short time after they have first put on their uniforms.

It is true that no firm commitment was ever made to the effect that every man would have at least a year of training before being sent into combat, but, nonetheless millions of parents throughout the country understood it was to be a year; and while I agree that the speedy winning of the war will be incomparably the one best thing our military leaders could do for the country, and while I know it is the one thing to which they are devoting their every effort, I, nonetheless, cannot refrain from expressing the earnest conviction and heartfelt hope that at least a reasonably long period of training be given to these youngest of our fighting men before they are sent into combat. I do not pose as any expert in such matters, of course, but I cannot feel that 15 weeks is long enough for that purpose.

I do, however, ask consent to include with my remarks a forceful letter on this

problem just received from the Under Secretary of War, since, of course, the position of the War Department and the efforts they have made should be set forth here with my remarks:

MARCH 22, 1945.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: I have your letter of March 14 inquiring as to our replacement training program and appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you a matter of such general concern at the present time.

As for the War Department's previous comments on the subject, they unquestionably established our position in opposition to a statutory training limitation. You will recall that General White, then chief of the General Staff Personnel Division, categorically advised the committee concerned that no assurance was possible that soldiers of any age group would receive a minimum of a year's training before proceeding overseas. You may be interested in the attached copy of a letter General Marshall sent Senator Reynolds during the consideration of this problem. General Marshall sent an identical letter at approximately the same time to Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, and the Secretary's statements to the press at the time reflect the same viewpoint. I believe you will find, therefore, that an analysis of our expressions on this subject will reveal that the War Department definitely opposed the restriction to which your correspondence refers.

I have become aware of a general tendency to confuse the length of our training with its adequacy, this misunderstanding giving rise to many inquiries such as you perhaps are receiving. It must be realized that now that our Army has been completely mobilized and, in the main, is overseas, our overwhelming requirement is for replacements—qualified infantry replacements. It should also be kept in mind that these replacements are not formed into new units and sent to battle. Instead, they are filtered into old, experienced units where the leadership from the noncommissioned grades upward is in the hands of veterans. By association with battle-wise men, the uninitiated replacement has the advantage of advice and example and quickly assimilates the knowledge which others have gained by experience. Reports from the battlefields reveal that these men measure up well in combat. General Marshall and his staff are firmly of the conviction, and I agree, that never before in our history have our soldiers been so carefully prepared for battle as is the case at the present time.

I do not believe that the adequacy of the training is properly open to question. (The present 15 weeks' course of training for Infantry replacements has been developed over a long period and reflects knowledge of the needs of combat in the present war.) The training is thorough and meticulously conducted. Intensive methods are employed. A large number of the instructors are themselves battle veterans. You may be interested to know that during the replacement training period, an Infantry rifleman receives 107 hours of training solely with the rifle and carbine; he receives 62 hours with the light machine gun and over 100 hours with other Infantry weapons. He devotes 48 hours to day and night scouting and patrolling, 62 hours to scouting tactics, both offensive and defensive, and over 40 hours to other small-unit tactics. This, of course, is in addition to such subjects as military hygiene, physical training, marches, bivouacs, and the like.

It also is important to realize that during the course of instruction each man is constantly observed, so that when his training is completed the War Department can be assured that he is ready to take his place in the team overseas. Men who fail to qualify, either because they have missed some of the essential instruction or because they assimilate instruction very slowly, are held back for further training.

As the War Department pointed out while this matter was under debate by the Congress, retention of any age group in the Army within the continental limits of the United States for specified periods would be administratively impossible from a military standpoint. Nevertheless, we have made every possible effort consistent with the military situation to hold to a minimum the number of 18-year-olds entering combat. In February of last year, for example, instructions were issued that 18-year-olds with less than 6 months' training would be used as replacements only after all other replacement resources had been exhausted. In the following June orders were also issued that no Infantry or armored force replacements would be sent overseas before they had reached the age of 19.

These policies were rigorously observed and continued until their further observance became impossible for military reasons. These reasons were our urgent needs for Infantry and armored replacements, needs which developed in early fall of last year and could not be deferred without serious effects on our operations overseas. I discussed this matter with the press on December 7, 1944, and I am attaching a copy of my comments for your information.

I am aware of the general concern over this subject and consider it very unfortunate that so much misinformation has been circulated as to occasion unwarranted and unnecessary anxiety on the part of the parents of our men. I hope you and the Congress will feel free to assist us in making it clear to the American people that the training these men are receiving is thorough and—I wish to emphasize this—that our choice in the matter is very limited. Either we must delay our operations in Europe and in the Pacific, thereby greatly increasing the cost in life by prolonging the war and perhaps even jeopardizing its outcome, or we must continue our present procedures. We have no other alternative.

I hope this will serve as an adequate reply to your inquiry.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

S. F. A. W. Is SNAFU

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Dr. New Deal has announced how much coal each one of us is going to get next season and is even telling the dealer when it is to be delivered.

B. N. D.—before the New Deal—the dates of deliveries by the coal merchant depended not alone of his supply of coal but also on his available manpower and equipment, on the size of our coal bin, and on whether or not we had the money in the summer to lay up our winter's supply of coal.

But, like the history of so many other things from the "horse and buggy" days, all that is to be changed. Washington-inspired regulations have planned it another way.

"Consumer declarations" must be filed by every consumer of coal and the retailer must vouch for the correctness of the declaration. Fines up to $10,000 or 10 years imprisonment, or both, may be imposed on either consumer or dealer for a false statement.

Whether you operate the most worthy or the most notorious business in the world won't make any difference. You will get 80 percent as much coal as you did last year. So says the Solid Fuels Administration.

Policing and enforcement of such a scheme would require an even greater swarm of policemen than O. P. A. in its balmiest days ever dreamed of. The plan is doomed to failure before it is started.

Following is a letter on the subject addressed to me from the Indiana Coal Merchants Association, together with a statement by the association on that same subject:

INDIANA COAL MERCHANTS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 22, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT A. GRANT,
Representative, Third Indiana District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRANT: The Solid Fuels Administration has just issued a series of new regulations which are supposed to regulate distribution of solid fuel for the 1945–46 heating season. For obvious reasons, this association is interested primarily, of course, in the particular regulations which affect retail coal dealers and the solid fuel users of Indiana which our retailers serve.

The enclosed digest of what the Solid Fuels Administration proposes in the new regulations will give you a clear conception of just what both coalmen and the people of Indiana will face in the coming fuel year, if the Solid Fuels Administration is permitted to have its way. The official orders have already been signed, effective April 1, and have appeared in the Federal Register.

The country's leading producers, no less than organizations like ours, seriously question the attitude of the Solid Fuels Administration and other Federal bureaus in regard to coal production. Representative producer organizations like the National Coal Association and Bituminous Coal Institute have condemned the defeatist attitude of S. F. A. W. particularly. Restricted distribution under both the producer and retailer-consumer regulations takes root in a coal shortage as an accepted fact. There is no attempt to increase production; S. F. A. W. merely produces a regimented device for spreading a reduced production around by cutting down the amount producers may ship, or retailers may sell, or consumers accept.

You need no elaboration from us to know how your own townspeople and the folks in your district are going to react to coal rationing—which is what this regulation amounts to with its percentage limitations on deliveries by dealers and permissive receipts by customers. Aggravating the situation, and adding further to public irritation, is the imposition, by this order, of what S. F. A. W. calls consumer declarations. Every delivery is contingent upon the filing of such a declaration by the consumer.

There is, as you have probably read and heard, a paper shortage, although this consumer declaration idea gives no indication that S. F. A. W. officials know about it. The last report we have is that several million consumer declarations are now in process of

being printed by the Government Printing Office on Government post-card stock in a size 5½ by 8½ inches. It will actually require about 25,000,000 of these consumer declarations to cover the retail fuel-users market. Further emphasis on the rationing aspect of the regulation itself lies in the fact that the Solid Fuels Administration intends to distribute these consumer-declaration cards through local war price and rationing boards throughout the country.

If regulation No. 26 is permitted to stand, including the consumer-declaration scheme, it will materially affect the operating cost of retail yards. We believe you are aware that coal dealers have already been compelled to absorb labor and other cost increases under frozen O. P. A. ceilings. The coal retailer is at the end of his rope. If O. P. A. should permit adjustments to cover the increased costs created by S. F. A. W.'s new regulation, the coal-consuming public will become the innocent victims of Solid Fuels Administration efforts at further regimentation, which are palpably nothing more nor less than more regulation merely for the sake of regulation.

We consider it high time that congressional effort be made to stop the parasitic growth of bureaucratic control which is invariably advanced under the guise of a wartime necessity. Instead of complacent acceptance of arbitrary and uncalled-for controls by agencies which were originally delegated only administrative powers, a decision seems to be in order soon between what is sane and what is senseless, between what is necessary and what is a needless imposition. We know that regulation No. 26 will provoke a storm of protest which will grow as the months pass by and the public ire is more and more aroused. If Government is not going to turn a hand to assure larger production and we must ask people to accept 80 percent of their normal requirements, then the sensible solution is to discard all percentage limitations and restrictions on deliveries except as to 80 percent over-all figure, and, by all means, to eliminate the regimentation-inspired consumer-declaration idea, which will only irritate and harass the public and the coal dealer. May we have your help to these ends?

Sincerely yours,

INDIANA COAL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
J. S. WEBER, *Executive Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING FEDERAL RESTRICTIONS ON SOLID FUEL UNDER S. F. A. W. ORDERS NO. 26 AND NO. 27

The Solid Fuels Administration has promulgated the following regulations, effective as of April 1: S. F. A. W. order No. 26 (affecting the retail distribution and consumer purchase of solid fuel), order No. 27 (affecting shipments of bituminous coal to retailers), order No. 28 (affecting anthracite shipments), and order No. 29 (affecting distribution of domestic coke).

Under order No. 27, bituminous coal shipments by suppliers to retail outlets will be restricted to 80 percent of the tonnage shipped to a particular retail outlet in the period April 1, 1943, to March 31, 1944—plus any additional coal supplied to that particular retailer during the 1944–45 heating season on directives or orders of the Solid Fuels Administration.

Under order No. 26, the retailer is prohibited from delivering, and the consumer from accepting, more than 80 percent of the amount of solid fuel which the consumer had used last year. The prohibition applies to all kinds of solid fuel, regardless of the district in which the coal was produced, and including anthracite and coke.

The 80 percent restriction is rooted in the Solid Fuels Administration's "estimate" that the Nation will need 620,000,000 tons of coal next year, and that only 570,000,000 tons can be produced. It disregards the fact that 620,000,000 tons of coal were produced in 1944, and that it is entirely possible to meet such a production figure again with proper governmental cooperation.

The producers of coal contend, and the evidence of past production bears out that contention, that national wartime requirements can be met in full. If the mines are permitted sufficient manpower. If the Government agencies will cooperate in seeing that machinery and parts are available when needed. If adequate transportation can be provided. In other words, adequate production depends not merely upon what the coal industry does but, and equally important, upon what government does to make such production possible. What has government done * * * or what does it propose to do?

Coal mining, now highly mechanized, depends upon machinery as well as men to assure high, sustained production. As a result of War Production Board cutbacks, machinery and parts replacements necessary to uninterrupted production threaten to be wholly inadequate. Railroad requests for steel needed for track replacement, and new freight car requirements for replacement of wornout equipment, as well as expanded facilities needed to carry the wartime load of freight, have suffered equally serious cutbacks at the hands of the War Production Board.

More than 50,000 of the Nation's younger and most productive miners are already in the armed services. Selective Service was preparing to drain 25,000 to 30,000 more lower age-group miners, and this additional manpower loss has been stopped only recently by protests which rocked Washington officialdom into a sense of actuality. Had these protests not been made, anticipated production would have suffered still more.

These are the facts behind the forecasts of a 50-million-ton coal shortage in the 1945–46 fuel year—the facts behind the proposal to cut coal consumption to cover a shortage instead of seeking a cooperative Government-industry plan to make production adequate. The responsibility lies with Federal agencies and boards—and not with the coal industry. It will not be corrected until these same agencies adopt a realistic viewpoint toward the vital necessity of coal to the war machine and to the needs of the Nation, whether in war or in peace.

THE EFFECT OF ORDER NO. 26 ON COAL RETAILERS AND THE PUBLIC

The focal point of S. F. A. W. Order No. 26 is the proviso that prior to September 1, 1945, a dealer may deliver up to 50 percent of the amount of solid fuel to which a consumer is entitled, but that he must deliver 30 percent by October 1, 1945.

The experience of the past winter proves that unrestricted bin-fills must be permitted in summer and early fall to those who are able to accept such deliveries, or servicing of later demands of hand-to-mouth buyers will be virtually impossible with the limited manpower available to retail coal yards. Restrictions as to delivery percentages and time are unworkable. The dealer's ability to deliver is contingent upon his available manpower and equipment. The size of the customer's bin determines whether he can accept 30 percent delivery, 20 percent delivery, or even 10 percent delivery; the customer's financial status also determines whether he can pay for the coal which the dealer has available. No Washington-inspired regulation can provides the pattern which controls the dealer's or the customer's circumstances.

In order to regiment retailers as well as consumers of solid fuel in the mazes of its percentage-reduced planning, the Solid Fuels Administration proposes to control retail delivery and consumer supply by what it calls "consumer declarations." The consumer must indicate on such "declaration" the building to be served, the number of rooms to be heated, the tonnage and kind of fuel ordinarily burned, and the name of the dealer with whom the declaration is filed. The retailer must obtain a signed consumer declaration from the customer prior to any delivery and is required to vouch for the correctness of the consumer's information and also to record in a space provided on the consumer declaration all deliveries made against the 80 percent to which the consumer is entitled.

The consumer declarations provide for a fine up to $10,000 or 10 years' imprisonment, or both, for a false statement or representation by either the customer or the dealer. This is in keeping with the arbitrary custom of purely administrative agencies to prescribe penalties for their regulatory pronouncements.

There is no more reason for consumer declarations in the 1945–46 fuel year than there was in the 1944–45 heating season, when 90-percent limitation rather than 80-percent limitation was the rule. Their imposition upon consumers and retailers is needless and unjustifiable. Coal dealers are already overburdened with filings and reports required by the alphabetical welter of Federal agencies. Consumer declarations are nothing more nor less than a thinly disguised form of rationing—of a type with which the public is unfamiliar, relating to an agency with which the public has had no direct dealing, and promising to be productive of nothing but further public irritation. Policing and enforcement would be a practical impossibility; this is admitted by coal men and even Solid Fuels Administration officials.

The operation of retail coal yards under the 80-percent restrictions means a reduction in the volume of business handled and a consequent increase in the handling cost per ton. To this must be added the extra work and cost of obtaining, checking, and recording consumer declarations. Estimates reveal total increased dealer costs of from 42 to 61 cents per ton—none of which can be absorbed under already reduced margins resulting from frozen price ceilings. Addition of these costs to ceiling prices must either be authorized by O. P. A.—and passed on to the consumer—or retail yards will be compelled to suspend business operations in many localities with paralysis of retail distribution as a result.

Prepared and distributed by membership service department, Indiana Coal Merchants Association, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Schools for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 27, 1945:

SCHOOLS FOR VETERANS

The post-war educational opportunities promised to veterans in the G. I. bill of rights will require something more than the mere appropriation of funds. It will require the establishment of adequate and appropriate facilities and the training of teachers in the special techniques that must be employed in dealing with students who are mature in years and experience. Because veterans are adults, their education must be adult educa-

tion. Their needs cannot be satisfied by the kind of teaching which is satisfactory for children. They cannot be expected to go back into the classrooms they left when called into service or to feel comfortable and happy in the company of pupils much younger than themselves. In short, they cannot be made to fit into a school system designed for other purposes; the schools must be adapted to fit their needs.

It is estimated that some 15,000,000 men will have been discharged from the armed services when the war is at last completely won. More than half a million will have no more than a fourth-grade education. About 4,000,000 will have had from 4 to 8 grades of schooling, and another 5,000,000 will have had from 8 to 12 grades. The Federal Government will make available to these veterans, if they want it, funds to enable them to take advantage of opportunities for resuming their studies. But the actual opportunities are still to be created. Few American communities possess facilities of the kinds these men will want. Moreover, a majority of the veterans most in need of further education come from rural and small urban communities, where the facilities are poorest and where the difficulties of making additional provision are greatest.

A working conference of educators, called together recently under the auspices of the National Education Association, has come to grips with this problem and has made some recommendations for its solution. These call for action principally at the State and community level. Obviously, there is no time to be lost in putting them into effect. The conference suggests the formation of National, State, and local committees on veterans' education to work with the responsible Federal agencies in coordinating community services for veterans. The challenge here is a very great one. Only through education can the young men of America be equipped to realize the potentialities of the victory they have won in battle.

Prizes for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a very fine national magazine has recently announced that it will award $10,000 each to a Senator and a Representative who, in the opinion of a committee of distinguished citizens headed by Owen D. Young, do most for the country this year. The criterion announced will be statesmanship and national service, not party loyalty or "partisan political activity in behalf of some particular section, group, or bloc."

I have no doubt that this prize is offered in the utmost good faith, with the purpose of strengthening Congress, and adding to the prestige and importance of congressional service. After discussing this matter with my colleagues and reviewing the traditions and the laws affecting Congressmen, I am of the opinion that this prize is not in accordance with our best traditions, that its offer or acceptance may possibly be a violation of the law, and that it may establish a very bad precedent which the donors do not contemplate. I have discussed this with members of the committee studying ways of strengthening our legislative machinery. I do not believe that any additional changes in our machinery, our rules, or the laws affecting Congressmen are necessary in order to prevent the offering or acceptance of such prizes.

The American tradition expressed in our present rules and laws, is that no lawmaker should receive any extra financial consideration for doing his duty, or for doing his duty better than his colleagues. Simply because this is so thoroughly imbedded in our thinking, we are prone to forget that Congress itself has written this into laws which affect Congressmen themselves.

United States Code, title 18, section 199, provides for a triple fine, imprisonment and forfeiture of office for any Member of Congress who shall "directly or indirectly, ask, accept, receive, * * * any money, property, or other valuable consideration, * * * (or) gratuity, * * * with the intent to have his action, vote, or decision influenced, on any question, matter, cause, or proceeding, which may at any time be pending in either House of Congress or before any committee thereof, or which by law or under the Constitution may be brought before him in his official capacity." United States Code title 18, section 200 provides a triple fine, imprisonment for whoever offers any "gratuity" or other thing of value for such purpose.

The law makes no distinction as to whether "the influence" of the "gratuity" is good or bad; the purpose is clearly to prohibit any outside financial consideration whatsoever from influencing any action whatsoever by a Congressman. By these laws and others, Congress has attempted to prevent any outside pecuniary influence upon the judgment and action of its Members.

I concede the utter innocence and the high purpose of this magazine and the distinguished committee which has consented to serve in the awarding this $10,000 prize for Congressmen. The fact remains that they are private citizens who will be reviewing the actions of Members of Congress. When they make the award they will no doubt refer to the actions of the recipients which have influenced their decision.

Then suppose the prize is made an annual prize? Human nature being what it is, will Members of Congress utterly ignore the preference of these private citizens and of this great magazine in the type of public officials who have been awarded, their records, their activities? Suppose other organizations and institutions, such as business groups and labor groups, decide to award congressional prizes based solely on statesmanship and national service? Some of these groups could afford to award extremely substantial amounts. They might persuade very distinguished citizens to serve on their prize committees. Does anyone believe that practice could grow and flourish without influencing Members of Congress? The fact that such influence might be with the best intentions is beside the point; these influences would be by private individuals, involving a cash prize for what they considered good law making. It is easy to imagine some very ridiculous, and some very vicious results.

The strain on the human nature of Congressmen is very heavy at present, Devotion to duty and fear of punishment rather than hope of special reward is still the stimulus that keeps us working. The pay we vote ourselves is supposed to be the only substantial reward we receive for our work. We should consider, in the full blaze of public view, whether we are not worth more. I cannot conceive of our voting that some Congressmen are worth more in dollars and cents to the country than others. I hope that no action by Congress will be necessary to dissuade private citizens or groups of citizens from attempting to give prizes to Congressmen. Sound patriotism, good taste and a respect for the laws and traditions of our republic should be all that is necessary.

The men in our armed forces are forbidden to accept prizes for heroic or outstanding action. Some of our great war heroes have refused very substantial prizes in obedience to this regulation. The same rule applies to Congressmen in war, and in peace.

Post-War Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, today the farmers have an income of over $20,000,000,000 a year. Their savings, bank accounts, and bonds are the highest in history. During the last 12 years they have come from the poorest financial condition that they had ever been in—from an income of around $5,000,000,000 a year.

At that time they were losing their farms to mortgages and were unable to sell the crops that they did raise. The farmers in Iowa, unable to sell their corn, were using it for fuel for heating houses and cooking meals.

Farmers do not want to go back to those conditions. They are desirous, along with labor and other groups of people in America, of maintaining a high standard of living.

I have long been an advocate of cooperation between farmers and labor to help maintain a high purchasing power in the Nation. If we are able to maintain 60,000,000 jobs after the war, it will make prosperity not only for the workers but it will also create a market for farm products that will maintain prosperity for the farmers. The resulting purchasing power of the workers and farmers will create prosperity for business and manufacturers all the way along the line.

This way we can keep our national income above the $100,000,000,000 a year

mark, which is an absolute minimum in order to maintain prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the extension of my remarks an editorial written by the master of the State Grange in the State of Washington, appearing in the Grange News of March 24, 1945:

SIXTY MILLION JOBS

One of the first problems to receive the attention of Henry A. Wallace after taking the oath of office as Secretary of Commerce, was a plan for fulfilling his pledge of 60,000,000 jobs for our people in post-war years. In this instance, are we depending on Henry to do it? Are we looking to our economists, industrialists or labor, or are we planning on taking a hand in this tremendous problem ourselves?

It seems that in making these blueprints for post-war planning, a survey of how industry and agriculture could be brought more closely together is worthy of study. There is definite need for linking the farm and the factory together. Surplus urban labor cannot all go back to the farm following the war, and it is not always feasible to establish a factory to process agricultural commodities right in the area in which they are grown. There are instances, however, where this type of location would benefit farmers, laborers, and consumers, as well as industrialists who are handicapped by high city taxes and space limitations.

Just because we can point to some few factories built in agricultural areas as failures, it is not by any means proof that logical planning could not make them highly successful. Quite the contrary it true, for the habitual concentration of all industries in crowded areas has cost the Nation untold wealth in needless freight and handling of the product—shipping the raw material from its source to the factory and then back to the consuming public.

A sensible decentralization of industries for purposes of economy and better living conditions will not likely meet with the approval of large controlling interests already concentrated in certain areas, but if our Nation is to be economically sound and prosperous, there must come a day when we adhere more closely to the theory of the greatest good to the greatest number. Then, perhaps, we will not have to admit shamefully that 10 percent of our population controls 60 percent of our Nation's natural resources.

When we realize that the success of one group of people aids in the success of another, we will have gone a long way in establishing a permanent happy and healthy Nation, and out of this simple basis for doing things will come a job for every ablebodied worker in our country.—H. P. C.

Be Thankful You Are No Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a splendid description of the conflicting problems confronting Members of Congress is contained in the current edition of Washington Backgrounds, a regular service publication prepared by U. V. Wilcox, well-known Washington newspaperman and radio commentator.

He ably states the situation when he says, "Members of Congress constitute the funnel for the conflicting opinions of the Nation."

Recent trend of the administration, however, to withdraw from the tax-box funds with which to propagandize Congress and the Nation for legislation on which all contributors to the tax box are not wholly agreed presents a further complication in the funneling process.

Mr. Wilcox's article entitled "Be Thankful You Are No Member of Congress," follows:

WASHINGTON.—Of all the economic hot spots in these United States, Congress is on that spot. The national legislators have need for all the understanding, appreciation, and sympathetic counsel that can be extended.

This is an unnatural city of pressures. Not only the obvious pressures to vote money, or favor a bill backed either by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, or the National Manufacturers Association, the aviation, shipping, railroad, farm groups, but also the indirect kind. There are always the labor, farm, and capital pressures. But now, something new has been added.

The administration itself has gone into the business of putting on the heat, and is doing it as consistently, as thoroughly, and as relentlessly as any lobbying organization. And it is the taxpayer's money that pays for this kind of pressure.

The differing views now existing among thinking men and women, even among bankers and businessmen, react upon Congress, making for more confusion. Sharp divisions within industries loosens the legislator's moorings.

Food shortages exist. This impinges on foreign policy and also on price control. It makes the ordinary citizen sore and it creates black markets. It is a temptation to weak bureau officials to tell more than they should and personally profit therefrom.

There are surpluses in war goods, in war plants, in land. Any disposal creates friction and trouble and unlawful gains, for someone, but rarely for the ordinary taxpayer, or even for the little businessman, unless he wears the right political button. There is confusion on the inflation battlefront. Shall there be fringe wage raises or shall the stabilization premise be used to prevent it?

There is a very real division of views between groups of bankers over international monetary stabilization. Country bankers want the administration's program, and some city bankers do and some don't. There are charges and countercharges of insincerity and obstructionism. Enemies of banking are making the most of it.

There is a sincere desire to see organized a permanent institution to keep the peace, yet there is deep-seated suspicion of one of the Big Three nations.

Members of Congress constitute the funnel for the conflicting opinions of the Nation. When there is interindustry conflict, Congressmen find the going harder.

So, what would you do if a Congressman? This very questioning at Bretton Woods hearings, when witnesses were asked, "How would you vote if you were in my place?" is something more than a trick question. It is revealing.

Congress is no better than the sum of its averages. It is a cross section of any town or city. But, unlike the average voters in a city, a Member of Congress is held responsible no matter what. Perhaps a little more understanding, a little more encouragement with sane counsel, would help in arriving at compromises. No public question is all right or all wrong.

The Stewart Field Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to speak briefly concerning the Stewart Field Band and its leader, Chief Warrant Officer William D. Carney.

Stewart Field is a part of West Point and of my congressional district. We are proud of the Stewart Field Band and of the fact that it was selected to come to the National Capital to replace the Army Air Forces Band when the latter organization was temporarily sent to Europe.

We, the Americas, a stirring inter-American march, performed its premiere in the appropriate setting of a War-bond ball, March 12, 1945, sponsored by the Latin-American Embassy Daughters and the Senate Daughters.

Composed by Chief Warrant Officer William D. Carney, band leader of the Six Hundred and Sixty-ninth Army Air Forces, Stewart Field, N. Y., temporarily stationed at Bolling Field, the composition was inspired by the recent Inter-American Conference successfully concluded in Mexico City on March 8, 1945.

Mr. Carney composed the words and music for this new march, basing the lyrics on the bonds of unity forged at Mexico City, and mindful of the unremitting work that lies in the years ahead of peace is to be preserved in our hemisphere.

In addition to its debut before the audience at the War-bond ball, We, the Americas was the featured highlight of a short-wave broadcast to Latin-America.

Chief Warrant Officer William D. Carney, son of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Carney, 1607 Holland Avenue, Utica, N. Y., was born at Ilion, N. Y., in 1920. His musical training was started in the public schools of the State. Upon completion of high school, Mr. Carney decided that music was to be his career. His enrollment in the Ithaca College of Music, Ithaca, N. Y., logically followed. It was in the spring of 1942 that Mr. Carney completed his work and received the degree of B. S. in music.

For several months Mr. Carney was associated with Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians, and in June 1942 he entered into active service for his country.

Following the basic training given all men upon entrance into the Army of the United States, Mr. Carney was assigned, in view of his extensive background in music, to the Army Music School, Fort Myer, Va. Upon completion of his training there, he was, in January 1943, assigned to Stewart Field, Newburgh, N. Y., and charged with the task of organizing the Six Hundred and Sixty-ninth Army Air Forces Band for duty at that air base.

The Six Hundred and Sixty-ninth Army Air Forces Band was temporarily

stationed at Bolling Field, D. C., in the absence of the Army Air Forces Band which is completing a tour of Royal Air Forces bases in England.

Still the Best Fed Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 25, 1945, entitled "Still the Best Fed Nation":

STILL THE BEST FED NATION

"Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of our farmers, and in spite of the tremendous food needs of the direct war effort, we remain the best fed Nation of the world, wartime or peacetime."

We ought to paste this statement of Chester Bowles, National Price Administrator, up in our kitchens or our dining rooms—to read when we think we have difficulties. Of course, it isn't as easy for many to prepare tasty, varied meals as it was. But that's about the extent of our food casualties on the home front. On the other hand millions of our fellow countrymen are living better and eating better than they did through the long dreary 1930's.

The discomfort, the inconvenience, the mild murmuring of the average American are being exploited by groups and newspapers which want to gain some kind of advantage. Some of the exaggeration is for political profit, some of it is mere sensationalism. All of it adds up to a reckless disregard of the responsibility every citizen, every official and newspaper holds for keeping the American war effort high through faith and true understanding.

There will be less meat for home consumption during the next quarter, probably during the rest of the year. The Bureau of Agricultural economics estimates that there will be 21 percent less meat consumption this year than last. That is only an estimate, and the estimate at the beginning of last year was greatly exceeded by the actual supply. Still 21 percent is an appreciable difference. But the significant thing is that 21 percent less than 1944 means only 8 percent less than the 5-year average before war broke out.

The food is going to the support of our war effort and the hastening of victory. We are not "feeding the world," as excited headlines suggest. We are not "playing Santa Claus." We are seeing that our men, 10,000,000 of them, have plenty to eat and the assurance that the supply will keep up. Then there is lend-lease, chiefly to Britain and Russia, just as much part of the war as food to our men.

Then there is U. N. R. R. A., whose Director, former Governor Lehman, of New York, has just given us some figures. The United States is asked for 788,000,000 pounds of food. If this seems big, here is what it means, as Mr. Lehman gives it—1 pound for relief of 60,000,000 war-stricken people to 60 pounds left us for civilian consumption. What American grudges 1 pound out of 61 to keep millions of suffering fellow men alive?

There is no hint of actual privation here at home. There isn't even any appreciable tightening of our belts. There is need for a mental adjustment—an adjustment which will be easier to make as soon as we realize that what we are sending abroad is exaggerated by men who put some kind of selfish advantage ahead of pushing the war and keeping up national unity.

We are still the best fed—far and away the best fed—people in the world.

Howdy, Mr. Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an editorial appearing in the issue of the Tulsa Tribune of March 21, 1945, on the occasion of the visit of Lord Halifax to Oklahoma, as follows:

HOWDY, MR. AMBASSADOR

We have our share of silly citizens who have an un-American adulation of royalty and fancy panhandles to names that denote title to traditional estates. You will have them crashing the gates to see you. But it is for the real Americans, the genuine Americans, that we venture to speak. And we, Mr. Ambassador, are honored to have England's personal representative in our tidy town. We bid you welcome, sir, a hearty welcome. And with the freedom you yourself exercise, we want to tell you, sir, how the real Americans feel toward your England.

You talk of partnership. That's it, sir. That is exactly what we want. We have played the partner part. It is your England, sir, that has failed. Go home and talk this partnership plan there. Go home and tell them how we feel here. Go home and remind them of all we have done to make a partnership with you.

Your advance man, Lord, tells us you will condescend to dine with a selected 200 of us. Nice of you. We can assure you there will be a lot more who will want to see you.

You stipulate that you want at least 20 percent to be laboring men. Doggone it, Lord, if you aren't democratic. Twenty-percent democratic.

Well, Me Lord, let us tell you that we are all working folks in America. You are class-minded. We are not. Just another difference.

We appear to be a funny people to you Britishers. You have always told us so. Years ago your great novelist, Charles Dickens, came over not to lecture to us, but to lecture us. And he was a riot. We filled his pockets with gate fees to hear him tell us how ridiculous we were. And a few years later your distinguished Rudyard Kipling, after touring our country, dismissed San Francisco with, "It is a city of plug hats and spittoons." And he wrote off Chicago with, "It is a city of butchers, having once seen, may I never see it again."

The fact that both of these cities flowered into great art centers, symphonies, and universities entirely escaped the "observing" British eyes. Just as with you who come to hunt a wolf and see a feathered face.

What about the town that was nothing but plug hats and spittoons? From its harbors today go our ships, and not yours; our ships that sail to save your Pacific empire.

What about that butchers' town, Chicago? Out of its steel furnaces are rolling the weapons that our boys carry to fight your fight. And out of that butchers' town come the beef and the grain that is feeding your armies, and feeding the English people, who cannot feed themselves. And you stole the foodstuffs we sent you to send to Greece. You intercepted and stole the food we sent to starving Europeans.

So, sir, we suggest to you in your goodwill enterprise to observe the altitude of our attainments where the seeds of our creative culture were sown.

I have forgotten which one of our Ambassadors it was, but some years ago when our Ambassador was to be presented to your comic-opera King at his court he was informed that he would have to wear silk stockings, satin breeches, and buckled boots. Our John Winant of that day told you fellows he would go to court in pants—the American way. He did. And why not?

We have always had a liking for old Cassius Clay of Kentucky. He was one of the Boone boys, you know. When he was our Ambassador to Russia, on an occasion a photograph was taken of the diplomats at St. Petersburg with the Czar in the center of the group. All hats were off except the Czar's and Cassius'. Cassius explained that the representative of the American people took his hat off to no man who didn't take his hat off to him. Atta boy!

You see, Mr. Ambassador, we are fundamentally different. And that is why we hope you really look at us rather than the faces that are only feathered for your look. And there are only a few left who will even accommodate with a feather.

When your Lordship comes into New York harbor what is the first spectacle that meets your astonished eye? The Statue of Liberty. Symbol of freedom and human rights such as you British never knew.

And what is the first thing the American is shown in London? The London towers where the ancient beef eaters parade. There are the vaults that are supposed to make secure the jewels of the King's crown. We don't use crowns over here. You take us to see your London towers where your crude, uncouth, and coarse kings severed the necks of little ladies who stood in their matrimonial way.

You British are a parasitic people. We are a benevolent people. You have lived off the people of India, Africa, Anglo-Egypt, the West Indies, Australia, Oceania, Canada, and you tried to live off us, but it didn't work. But you are living off of us plenty right now. And what is this run-around now? Trying to soften us up for another big touch?

We would like to have you tell us, Mr. Ambassador, when did England ever free a people as we did Cuba? We have waged no wars for conquest. We have pillaged no people. Twice we have saved your empire from disaster. Twice you tried to destroy us.

You banned the paintings of Verestchagin from your kingdom and you burned every canvas of his that you could seize because his pictures told of the terrible tortures your English armies of conquest inflicted on the people of Burma, whose sole offense was they loved their land and their liberty.

You are going around, Mr. Ambassador, urging us to be England's partner, as if you English are all eager for it and as though we Americans are not cooperative and must be persuaded. If you mean what you say, Mr. Ambassador, Tulsa is not the place for you to come. Take that plea to London. Sell your own English on the big idea. We have made every generous gesture to go on a partnership basis with England. It is you English who have failed to respect our specific and generous partnership performances.

If you mean what you say, Mr. Ambassador, go tell your own people to at least share with us the Pacific islands you claim and that we perfected as your fortifications.

Like Dickens, you are lecturing us. It is time our State Department in plain United

States told you that we have gone all the way to meet your England on a partnership basis. And you have the impudence, sir, to talk to us as if we hadn't done one thing. It is up to your own John Bull, and not our generous Uncle Sam, to put into performance the partnership you preach.

We are eager, sir, honestly eager, more eager than you know to like you English. We would like to be neighborly, good neighbors, mutually helpful. And God knows, Mr. Ambassador, you need us and you know it. It is time for England to treat with decency the best friend England ever had.

We have more than done our full part to show our friendliness and our friendship. It is now up to you, Mr. Ambassador, to convince us of the sincerity and honesty of the goodwill you exercise your rhetoric to radiate. Friendship, sir, is a two-way affair.

When a good neighbor borrows a cup of sugar, he returns a cup of sugar. That is a little matter of nice behavior you British do not know. England never returned anything. A gentleman, sir, pays his debts. John Bull is not a gentleman. Can you teach him to be one?

And speaking of a cup of sugar, sir, you owe us exactly $6,263,764,782.58 cents in the First World War account and you know bally well that you have no intention of returning that cup of sugar.

Your debt on this World War, sir, is beyond your own arithmetic comprehension. It is more than $20,000,000,000. And you never expect to pay a dime of it. What do you expect? You expect us Americans to go on and pay your bills, lend you all you want. It is time your leisure class went to work and paid your honest debts. That, sir, makes good will.

We know you have suffered, and we sympathize with your suffering. We have suffered some ourselves. We gave you farm implements which we needed for our own soil. You gave those implements to other peoples as your benevolent gift. You sold them and put the cash in your pocket. And there is no Charles Dickens or Rudyard Kipling who can make that performance either pretty or funny. That, sir, was just plain treachery and dishonesty.

Mr. Ambassador, we have been good to your people. We have been very good to your people. It has been our heartfelt wish to be generously good to your people. And if you have one atom of sincerity, one ounce of elemental honesty in your professions of good will, go back and tell all the king's horses and all the king's men that the good will is here but it is not over there.

Tell your Parliament boys to quit calling us "Uncle Shylock," which you fellows rudely did after we pulled you out of the disaster where you could not help yourselves. How appallingly crude, ill-mannered, and uncouth you British are.

We trusted John Bull as a gentleman of honor and we have found him without honor. We have radiated our good will, sir. Our greetings to you, sir. It is not perfunctory. It is honest, it is earnest. We cordially invite you to urge your Government to learn good international manners and be a good neighbor.

Your own Army reports reveal that there are 12 American boys to 1 English boy in the European battle today. Our boys have borne the brunt of your battle while you told Greece what kind of government "free Greece" could have.

Of necessity, sir, we have been united to fight a common, vicious foe. But you will treat our hospitality with boorish rudeness unless you tell the good people of this stanch American town that when the war strain is over you Britishers are going to have the elemental decency to quit insulting us for saving your England's life.

Life magazine characteristically tips us off with Halifax "is a high-minded peer who gets along well with plain Americans." And with all that, Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, First Earl of Halifax, Third Viscount Halifax, First Baron Irwin of Kirbyunderdale, Fifth Baronet, Knight of the Garter, Privy Counselor, Grand Commander of the Star of India, Grand Commander of the Indian Empire, Fellow of All Souls College, Chancellor of Oxford, and Master of Middleton Hunt, is a very pious gentleman. We are told that every day he seeks a consecrated altar before which to pray. But, will he tell us while about town that he prays to have his Empire obey the Golden Rule?

Mr. Speaker, after the editorial was published, his Lordship apparently questioned the veracity of the author of the above editorial, or the authenticity of some of his statements. Thereupon, the editor and publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, under date of March 22, 1945, addressed Lord Halifax and commented editorially again in the issue of March 23, 1945, as follows:

A LINE TO HALIFAX

MARCH 22, 1945.

LORD HALIFAX,
British Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is the editorial that I addressed to you in public print yesterday. While here in Tulsa you are reported to have said, "That is exactly the kind of stuff some people think worth writing. It pulls away from a statement of truth."

Your British, sir, have lied to us American people long enough. Now I challenge you, sir, to address a communication to the citizens of Tulsa and tell them wherein I departed from the truth in a single syllable of a single word.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD LLOYD JONES.

YOU CAN'T BEAT THE BRITISH

What we said on this page Wednesday about the parasitic nerve of the British was revealed in the performance of Halifax right here in our own town. He flies into town in a Douglas plane made here. Made by American money, but bearing on it the British insignia. Halifax is England in this country. He fills his plane up with gas at our pumps and charges the supply to the American people.

You can't beat the British for gall and bad manners.

"Kangaroo Courts" Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD a statement, issued by the Department of Justice, concerning the King County jail, Seattle, Wash.:

The Department of Justice today announced that Director James V. Bennett of the Federal Bureau of Prisons has disapproved the King County jail at Seattle, Wash., for further housing of Federal prisoners.

Mr. Bennett said that this decision resulted from a careful inspection of jail conditions by Inspector Roy Casey of the Prison Bureau following the fatal beating of John Emberg, a 16-year old prisoner, held in the jail on general charges of delinquency. Emberg, not a Federal prisoner, died on January 16, as a result of torturing and mistreatment by a "kangaroo court" maintained in the jail by the prisoners themselves.

Inspector Casey's report showed that local officials had failed to abolish the kangaroo court following Emberg's death and that the sheriff continued to permit the "court" to prescribe and enforce rules and fine or discipline the prisoners.

According to Director Bennett, the Bureau of Prisons inspection disclosed that administration of the jail was "lax and almost wholly within the hands of the prisoners themselves." Food, sanitation, and medical service, he said, "did not begin to approach acceptable standards."

"Another basis for the action," Mr. Bennett added, "was the fact that the sheriff in charge (Sheriff Callahan) had made little effort to put into effect any of a number of suggestions made to him in writing on February 12 by the Federal jail inspector."

Mr. Bennett said that the United States marshal has been instructed to transfer the 32 Federal prisoners now held in the Seattle jail to other jails in the vicinity.

A copy of the report by Inspector Casey has been filed with United States Attorney J. Charles Dennis and United States Marshal Donald Miller, in Seattle, for such further action and recommendations as they believe pertinent. The report may also be inspected in the office of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, First Street and Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

The Place of the States in Field of Watershed Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the important questions to which the Congress must give consideration this year concerns the procedures under which our river watersheds can be developed effectively. There are several bills before us to provide for the creation of Federal regional watershed authorities patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. This method has been suggested for the Missouri River Basin, the Columbia River watershed, and the Arkansas River Valley.

The February issue of State Government, a monthly publication of the Council of State Governments, is devoted entirely to the subject Water Resources—Use and Control. In it is an article by Hon. Ellwood J. Turner, Chairman of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, on The Place of the States in the Field of Watershed Development. In addition there are other discussions on the subject, one being by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Inasmuch as Mr. Turner's discussion indicates that there are methods other than those patterned after T. V. A. for the development of our interstate river systems and since Mr. Lilienthal's views already have been published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A138. I ask unanimous consent to have a part of

Mr. Turner's very interesting and constructive article also printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the interest of continuity I should explain that the first part of Mr. Turner's article—which is not to be published—explains the background and circumstances which led to the inclusion of the congressional declaration of policy in the 1944 Flood Control Act and in the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act just recently approved by Congress to recognize and protect States' interests and their rights and responsibilities in the development of rivers and their watersheds. Designating this accomplishment as a part of the movement to restore an improved balance in the activities of Federal and State governments in water control policies, Mr. Turner's discussion continues as follows:

NEED FOR UNIFIED WATER POLICY PROGRAMS

Of the several things that were brought out by the movement to restore an improved balance in the activities of the Federal and State governments in water-control policies, one was made crystal clear. In the future the development and execution of water problems cannot be done on a disconnected piecemeal basis.

It is now generally agreed that no program for the wise utilization and conservation of the water resources of river systems can be formulated on the basis of that resource alone. Management and control of the use of the land, and of the minerals and the products of the soil, are an integral part of the problem. Land, water, and human requirements—all must be considered together.

Secondly, if the job is to be done right, there must be a single unified plan in which all of the component projects for the utilization and conservation of natural resources and for the betterment of human equities will be properly evaluated, adjusted, and carried out.

In an interstate watershed, to whom shall the duty of envisaging the problem in its entirety and of devising and supervising the execution of the resultant over-all plan to meet it be entrusted? There seem to be but two answers to the question. The problem either must be delegated to an agency which is under the control of Congress, or to one primarily responsible to the States in which the watershed is located. Which of the two methods is better, both for the short- and long-term pull, poses a problem which deserves careful and serious consideration.

FEDERAL REGIONAL AUTHORITIES

The first alternative—control by the national administration—is exemplified by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Much has been written in recent months about the accomplishments which have resulted from this approach. Complimentarily colored, but particularly convincing, is the book T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, by the Authority's Chairman, David E. Lilienthal.

Without question, T. V. A. has done wonderful things for the Tennessee Valley. But there is nothing amazing about this. Except that its soils had become old and barren as the result of years of careless management, and some of its forests were despoiled for the same reason, the region was relatively undeveloped and a fertile area upon which to build a program when the T. V. A. project was started. With the full faith and credit of the National Treasury behind it, with no obligation to make an accounting to public investors, when a large part of the cost could be charged off to navigation of dubious value, it has been no great task to build the grandiose and awe-inspiring structures which make up this huge and complex project.

It seems apparent that the project has been well managed. Whether it actually can be proved a success from the national point of view, if all pertinent factors are properly taken into account, cannot be stated. Its advocates can make a strong case in its favor. But the findings of others, not henchmen of the Power Trust, who have made a thorough study of the project, are startlingly in variance.

T. V. A. TYPE OF ORGANIZATION NOT ALWAYS FEASIBLE

But even though T. V. A. is a success, it does not follow that the method can be repeated with similar results anywhere and everywhere. For example, in the Delaware River Basin, with its long-established municipal developments and industrial enterprises, the application of the same kind of programs would lead to confusion and chaos.

The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin is not opposed to Federal authorities. The commission believes that if the people in a river watershed region want such an agency they should have it. But it strongly feels that there should be no effort on the part of the Federal administration to clothe itself with all-encompassing powers in the over-all control of watershed development until the States directly involved have been afforded a fair opportunity to accept and meet their obligations in this field and have failed to meet that challenge. It recognizes that it may not be possible to bring the States amicably together in certain regions because of wide differences in social policies, political philosophies, and other factors. Where that is the case a Federal authority is probably desirable.

VALIDITY OF FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

But even then, provision for Federal jurisdiction certainly ought to be accomplished in a manner about which there can be no reasonable doubt concerning its constitutionality. This condition cannot be said to apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The question as to whether Congress, in creating that authority, was exercising powers not delegated to it by the Constitution was raised but never settled. In a suit brouht by the Tennessee Electric Power Co., decided in 1939, the United States Supreme Court refused to decide the issue. It observed that only the States and local governments could object to the right of Congress to invade fields of action normally reserved to such units and that the governments affected in the Tennessee Valley seemed to support rather than oppose the program.

Although a ruling was avoided, the court's observation in itself is an admission that there are reasonable bases for questioning the validity of Congress' action in creating Federal authorities. In a country which is proud of its democracy, which boasts of its grassroots philosophy, which respects, reveres, and is rightly grateful for its Constitution, that doubt should be clearly dispelled for all time. Though the need for and the benefits of Federal authorities in certain regions may be admitted, it does not follow that their establishment should be accomplished by interpretive rulings or short-cut methods which are subject to questioning.

Our founding fathers who framed the Constitution intended that revisions necessary to meet new and changing conditions should be accomplished by constitutional amendments. This applies particularly when it is obvious that they could not possibly foresee the circumstances which necessitate the change and that any other alternative would be a proper subject of debate. Let Federal authorities be provided under the terms of a constitutional amendment. Done in that way and at the expressed desire of the people of the region affected, they would constitute an inspiring example of democracy on the march.

Legislation creating Federal authorities under a constitutional amendment should include adequate provision for the protection of the interests of the States and of the people of the region, and for participation in the programs. It also should require that such part of the cost of projects constructed primarily for the benefit of the region and not for the Nation as a whole should be borne by the beneficiaries.

REGIONAL CONTROL BY INTERSTATE ACTION

But Incodel is further convinced that the States in most cases can do a better job for and by themselves if banded together cooperatively for the promotion of their common problems and welfare than any Federal agency created for the purpose. Being closer to the people, they can see their problems with greater clarity and with a more healthy and intimate interest and understanding. Democracy at the grass roots starts at home in the region, not at the national Capitol in Washington.

THE INCODEL ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—slowly, perhaps, but surely—are proving this point in dealing with the Delaware River watershed. In creating the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin in 1936, these four States agreed to act in unison and harmony toward the common goal of envisioning that drainage region in its entirety and of devising, adopting, and supervising programs upon which the valley may be developed to serve present and future generations more advantageously.

In contrast to the organizational pattern of T. V. A., consisting of a 3-man board appointed by the President, and similar to the set-up which is being suggested in the present proposals for other Federal regional authorities, policy determinations concerning the Delaware River watershed rest with the 20 legislative, executive, and administrative officials who make up the membership of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin. These 5 members from each of the 4 participating States—1 a State Senator, 1 a Member of the House of Representatives, 1 a member of the Governor's cabinet, 1 an official of the State planning board, and 1 a delegate-at-large—are directly responsible to the people of the region. Programs which they develop and sponsor actually—not theoretically or expediently—must incorporate grass-roots policies. Contrary to the Federal method, the policies of Incodel cannot be otherwise.

The interstate cooperation and regional approach as exemplified by Incodel has not involved the creation of a superimposed governmental structure; it has not entailed the addition of a new set of governmental officials; it has not supplanted or superseded any existing governmental agency. It fully utilizes the services of Federal agencies and those of the State's legislative, executive, and administrative officials. No new fields of activity have been created.

The dangers inherent in centralized planning, ownership, and control have been carefully avoided. There has been no interference with the functions of local self-government. Each State, each municipality, is free to determine the details of its own programs. Nor have there been any conflicts with the activities of Federal agencies operating in the region. Every effort has been made to promote cooperation and to help the projects of these and all other agencies to move forward harmoniously. By taking advantage of the Incodel machinery for cooperation, projects of all governmental units are being shaped and adjusted to key into a well-rounded and practical plan for the entire watershed region.

In the Delaware River Basin democracy is really on the march. By coordinating the efforts and programs of existing agencies of Federal, State, and local governments with the people of the region actively participating, Incodel, while perhaps not spectacularly, certainly is carefully and surely framing and causing to be carried out in a truly democratic

way a practical over-all program for the efficient development of the natural and human resources of the Delaware Valley.

FEDERAL AUTHORITY OR INTERSTATE COOPERATION?

Federal authority or interstate cooperation commissions—which method will bring about the most efficient management and development of the natural and human resources of a river watershed? Federal authorities, like totalitarian governments, may bring quicker results But we who devoutly believe in democratic processes of government are convinced that the use of the interstate cooperation method will keep the planning for and control of our river basins from becoming so concentrated at the National Capitol, so distant from the life of ordinary people, as to wither and deaden the average citizen's sense of participation in governmental affairs. "For in this citizen participation lies the vitality of democracy." In determining the vehicle to accomplish our ends we must not lose sight of the human elements in the promises of national benefits

Truly the method of interstate cooperation should not be deserted until the need for a Federal authority in any basin has been clearly demonstrated.

Intolerable Jail Conditions Deserve Public Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, following my intention, as announced on the floor recently, to publicize intolerable conditions in county jails, I submit an editorial from the Washington Post of March 26, 1945:

MARYLAND JAILS

Maryland citizens are manifesting a good deal of concern over the conditions that the Federal Bureau of Prisons has uncovered in their county jails. Governor O'Conor sought the aid of the Bureau last year and a thorough survey of county jails was made by Edgar M. Gerlach, Federal prison inspector, and Richard W. Wickes, probation officer of the circuit court of Baltimore County. On the basis of their report, James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, drew up a list of recommendations from which proposed corrective legislation has taken shape. The bills are now before the general assembly.

There is good reason for the stir which this report on county jails has produced. A variety of unspeakable conditions were found. As to the county jail at Ellicott City the investigators had this to say: "From the point of view of administration, common decency, sanitation, public neglect, opportunity for immorality and, all in all, the providing of a degrading experience for those incarcerated therein, this jail is about as bad as one could imagine." It was in this jail that a trusty left in charge by the sheriff attacked a 14-year-old girl held for investigation in connection with her application for a marriage license. "Discipline," the investigators found, "was conspicuous by its absence." The mattresses provided to male prisoners were unspeakably filthy. Sanitation facilities were a disgrace to any institution.

Howard County's jail at Ellicott City, moreover, is one of several where the vicious fee system still prevails. The warden collects 75 cents a day for each man committed. If he can feed them for less than that, the saving goes into his pocket. Under such a system it is foolish to expect that the prisoners will be given adequate food. At Ellicott City they were getting two meals a day. At other county jails the investigators found prisoners surviving on meager fare while the sheriff in charge was living on delicacies at their expense.

Aroused by these findings, Governor O'Conor is attempting to push two bills to enactment. One would charge the State Board of Corrections with the inspection of county jails and the setting up of standards for their operation. Should the counties fail to meet those standards, the board could go into court and get an order to transfer the prisoners to some other institution at the county's expense. The second measure is a resolution instructing the legislative council to study the fee system and submit recommendations for legislation 2 years hence. These are mild and unobjectionable reforms. We surmise that public opinion in the Free State is overwhelmingly in favor of their adoption.

Control of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Gallup poll from the Washington Post of March 25, 1945:

IGNORANCE ABOUT CANCER SHOWS NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

While much progress has been made in the campaign to control cancer, there is still a startling lack of knowledge about the disease, and misconceptions indicate need for raising millions to promote cancer education.

With April set aside as Cancer Control Month, a Nation-wide survey finds one-fifth of the civilian adult population still thinks cancer is contagious, and another fifth are not sure whether cancer is something you "catch" by exposure. This means about 30,000,000 people are confused as to what cancer really is.

Moreover, about 20,000,000 still think cancer is incurable.

Fewer than half of all the people polled thought they knew the signs of the disease, and the public is to a large extent baffled as to the causes of cancer. Those willing to guess named "injury" or "irritation," although some made guesses, such as too much salt, mental attitudes, horse bite, cooking in porcelain pots, small peas eaten from tin cans, gold teeth.

JOHNSTON HEADS DRIVE

To educate the public and to aid cancer research the American Cancer Society is sponsoring a drive to raise $5,000,000 in April, with Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, heading the drive.

The institute's survey was conducted to see how effective recent educational campaigns have been, and what remains to be done.

"Do you think cancer is curable?"

Results today, as compared to a 1940 survey, follow:

	Percent Today	1940
Curable, if caught in time	62	56
Incurable	26	27
Don't know	12	17

The next question was:

"Do you think cancer is contagious (catching)?"

The vote:

	Percent
Yes, it is contagious	21
No, not contagious	59
Don't know	20

An analysis by degree of education shows that among Americans who have attended college, 1 in 10 thinks cancer is contagious.

WOMEN MORE CONFIDENT

"Do you happen to know any of the symptoms of cancer?"

	Percent Today	1940
Yes	43	38
No	57	62

Only 38 percent of men polled said they thought they could recognize a cancer symptom, as against 48 percent of women.

The majority of those claiming to know signs of cancer named one or more of five symptoms generally listed by physicians: (1) persistent lump, particularly in the breast, (2) sore that does not heal normally, (3) irregular bleeding or discharge from any body opening, (4) persistent and unexplained indigestion, (5) sudden change in rate of growth of a mole.

The Global War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Thomas H. Chunn, national secretary of the Global War Veterans, national headquarters of which is in my district at Columbia, Tenn.:

The Global War Veterans, the first veterans' organization in America for the veterans of this war, was organized September 8, 1943, by 2 Navy enlisted men, 5 Army veterans, and 1 Navy veteran in Columbia, Tenn. The organizers were William Derryberry, yeoman first class, who saw action in 3 major sea battles in the Pacific, and some 16 minor engagements; Joseph W. Richardson, United States Navy, who was stationed at Great Lakes Naval Training Center, Chicago, Ill.; Harry H. Huckaby, who served with the Army Air Forces; Thomas H. Chunn, who served with the First Armored Division, Fort Knox, Ky.; Cromer A. Colvin, who had served in the United States Navy; Willard A. Hargrove, an Army veteran; J. D. Garner and Thomas Andrew Bryant, also Army veterans.

After forming their local post the idea met with such hearty approval locally, that the group felt that if a veterans' organization of their own was good for Columbia, Tenn., it would be equally good for other veterans of this war in all of the cities throughout the United States.

As a consequence, the newly formed local group set up a tentative national organization and elected Harry H. Huckaby as na-

tional commander; Thomas H. Chunn, national secretary, and a little later, Jacob W. Shapiro was elected as national treasurer; and five members were elected as directors.

In order to get the organization off to an effective start, Thomas H. Chunn, the national secretary, agreed to devote his entire time to the organization. The tentative organization functioned until the first national convention, or conference, which was held in Memphis, Tenn., September 8 and 9, 1944.

At this conference, William L. Allan, of Memphis, Tenn., was elected national commander; Rufus W. Fontenot, of New Orleans, La., national first vice commander; Earl F. Turner, Nashville, Tenn., national second vice commander; and a board of directors composed of the national officers, Kenneth E. Gamble, Russell F. Kamper, Ida R. Benson, Paul A. Rhodes, and Paul Bumpus.

The Memphis conference enabled the Global War Veterans to make their first real bid for national recognition. The delegates took up many matters necessary to set up the machinery to extend the Global War Veterans from coast to coast. In the few months since the organization was formed posts have been set up from coast to coast. These posts and their post commanders are:

Post No. 1, Columbia, Tenn., Samuel E. Erwin, commander, 1812 Highland Avenue, Columbia, Tenn.

Post No. 2, Nashville, Tenn., Earl F. Turner, commander, 412 North Sixteenth Street, Nashville, Tenn.

Post No. 3, Los Angeles, Calif., Irving Markheim, acting commander, 5213½ Stratford Road, Los Angeles, Calif.

Post No. 4, Memphis, Tenn., William O. Butler, commander, 3174 Southern Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

Post No. 5, St. Louis, Mo., Russell F. Kamper, acting commander, 8521 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.

Post No. 6, Columbus, Ohio, Paul A. Rhodes, acting commander, 76 West Starr Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Post No. 7, Mount Pleasant, Tenn., James C. Couch, acting commander, South High Street, Mount Pleasant, Tenn.

Post No. 8, Jackson, Tenn., Robert W. Wallin, acting commander, 125 Poplar, Jackson, Tenn.

Post No. 9, Lewisburg, Tenn., James M. Jones, acting commander, Nashville Highway, Lewisburg, Tenn.

Post No. 10, Chattanooga, Tenn., Kenneth E. Gamble, acting commander, 721 East Fourth Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Post No. 11, Atlanta, Ga., John J. Conway, acting commander, 87 Harris Street, Atlanta, Ga.

Post No. 12, Hartford, Conn., Winslow G. Place, acting commander, 347 Garden Street, Hartford, Conn.

Post No. 14, New York, N. Y., Arthur G. Rapport, acting commander, 20 Exchange Place, New York 5, N. Y.

Post No. 15, Seattle, Wash., Oliver K. Klemm, acting commander, 1625 East Madison, Apartment 3, Seattle 22, Wash.

Post No. 16, Utica, N. Y., Paul J. DeAngelis, acting commander, 1626 Lansing Street, Utica, N. Y.

Post No. 17, Burlington, Iowa, William L. Stout, acting commander, Morning Sun, Iowa.

The Global War Veterans launched their official publication in 1944. Many names for the "new baby" were discussed and finally it was decided that this was a G. I. war, and that the publication should be a "G. I." magazine. At present the organization is printing and mailing to all the States in the United States, as well as all the battle fronts, some 4,000 copies per issue.

The total membership of Global War Veterans and the various posts is modest as compared with the older established veteran organizations. However, the membership represents veterans and service men and women who live in 23 of the different States of the United States. Plans are being laid for an extensive membership campaign in 1945.

The membership of the Global War Veterans is limited to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States since July 1, 1940. They must now be serving in one of the several branches of the armed forces, or they must have been discharged, other than dishonorable, in order to be eligible for membership in the Global War Veterans. Probably the organization is the first in the Nation to include women in its membership.

From an organizational standpoint Global War Veterans will follow the same pattern as that of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. The proposed purposes and preamble to the constitution of the Global War Veterans as this time are:

"We, the veterans of the Global War, associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To give our unwavering support to the Constitution and laws of the United States and to defend the democratic institutions which they protect; to guard especially the rights of free speech, freedom of worship, and the right of all citizens freely to vote.

"To organize the men and women who serve the United States during this war and to perpetuate throughout our lives the comradeship and ideals which we experienced while serving in the armed forces;

"To perpetuate the memory of our dead, and consideration for their dependents.

"To urge private enterprise and Government to work together toward the goal of stable employment for all veterans and citizens.

"To support a policy of international cooperation embracing all Nations which will at least isolate future outbreaks of violence among nations, and to develop the United Nations into an organization strong enough to suppress would-be aggressors quickly.

"To foster ideas and constructive plans for better government—local, State, and national.

"To work for conditions under which all Americans of every race, creed, or color, can live together in peace.

"To encourage all special interests to be tolerant of the problems of other groups.

"To express to the proper authorities the opinions of global-war veterans on vital questions of public policy; to avoid participation in party politics as an organization, but to promote interest and activity in civic affairs.

"To keep the United States a citadel of freedom in which all groups work together for the common good."

These aims and purposes are still in a fluid stage and may be changed at the next national conference of Global War Veterans which will be held in St. Louis, September 7, 1945. These changes may be made necessary by the changing conditions brought on by the war or by the desires of veterans as more of them return from the fighting fronts.

Most members of the Global War Veterans feel that the United States should participate in an effective world organization to keep the peace. They feel that this is the most significant of all purposes. It is the almost universal feeling among the members that the United States' participation in such an organization is imperative if this country is to remain out of another global conflict.

It has been suggested by some of the men and women fighting this war that veterans of this war should have a representative at the peace table when the Allies and Germany sit down to work out the surrender terms, and also at the peace table when the Allies and Japan sit down to work out the surrender terms. It is felt by many veterans that the mere presence of a man who has seen the blood of his buddies spilled on the field of battle, would be a staying influence on the men who represent the United States, Great Britain, France, China and Russia. Too, some feel that this representative should be an enlisted man of average means. They feel that he should represent an average American.

The Global War Veterans will call a conference of all existing veterans organizations formed for the veterans of this war, at St. Louis. The conference will be held 2 days prior to the Global War Veterans' annual conference which will be held on September 7 and 8. At this conference of all veterans' groups it will be proposed that the delegates select a veteran of this war to sit at the peace table should peace terms be discussed prior to the 1946 conference as proposed above.

The Global War Veterans are made up of men and women who will insist that the organization will carry out a program as determined by the majority of its members. The officers wish to act as representatives of the membership; acting on behalf of its members rather than set up something whereby the leaders run the organization as they see fit, instead of taking into consideration the desires of the majority.

The organization is not backed by any special interest, such as labor, capital, political, religious, or otherwise. The organization is financed primarily by the dues of its members. At this time, all national officers serve without pay. Perhaps in later years, the national officers will be compensated for their services. However, such compensation will be determined by the Board of Directors. There are no affiliations of the Global War Veterans with any other veterans organization now existing. However, there has been a close working agreement, especially with the Disabled American Veterans and other veterans groups. Certainly there should be harmony and understanding between any organization that proposes to represent the interests of veterans. It is the hope of the organization that all veterans groups will work together on matters of mutual interest.

A member of the Global War Veterans is compensated for the money he pays as a member by being afforded the opportunity to enjoy the fellowship of his fellow veterans. Local posts lend assistance to veterans wherever or whenever possible. It is hoped that within a few months that the organization can be recognized by the Veterans' Administration in order that service officers of the Global War Veterans can prosecute claims. At this time no present war veterans' organization has been so recognized. However, there are many services that an organization, such as the Global War Veterans can perform other than that of prosecuting claims. They can, for example, make out muster-out pay applications, as was the case a few months ago. Aid in keeping veterans in contact with suitable employment; cooperate with the various Government agencies; and in assisting a war-worn veteran back to the normal civilian life, etc.

The national commander, William L. Allan, served in the United States Army. Before entering the service Commander Allan practiced law in Memphis. Later, after his discharge, he resumed his practice of law, with offices in the Commerce Title Building in Memphis. On November 18, 1943, Commander Allan was approached by Thomas H.

Chunn, of Columbia, Tenn., and asked if he would serve as acting commander of a local Memphis post. Commander Allan accepted this challenge, along with Thestus F. Steadman, and proceeded to organize an effective local post. After several months of hard work of establishment, the post began to be known throughout the city. Commander Allan through his experience in organizing the local post, is well aware of the problems of a new acting commander. He has demonstrated his sincerity and unselfishness, and although he has not had an opportunity to serve overseas, the organization feels particularly grateful that he has taken on the job as national commander.

Rufus W. Fontenot, first national vice commander, served as director of internal revenue in the State of Louisiana before being asked to take a commission in the Army. He saw duty on General Eisenhower's staff with the rank of major, and stationed in England. During one of the bombing raids a near miss injured Major Fontenot, which resulted in his retirement in 1944. He is now serving with the Internal Revenue Department in Washington, D. C.

Earl F. Turner, national second vice commander, served with the Sea Bees in the United States Navy. He is one of the few men serving in this war to have a son on active duty beside him. Vice Commander Turner received a spinal fracture as a result of concussion while going ashore on Rendova Island in the Pacific. He was hospitalized for about a year and after his discharge became interested in a veterans organization for the veterans of this war and accepted the office of second national vice commander at the Memphis conference in 1944.

National Secretary, Thomas H. Chunn, was ordered to active duty with the First Cavalry at Fort Knox, Ky., July 10, 1940. He saw the birth of the armored forces as we know it today. When ordered to active duty the United States had no armored forces, but the First Cavalry Division had been mechanized, and a few months after his arrival the First Cavalry Regiment was activated into the First Armored Regiment. It was during the fall of 1940 that this newly formed armored force was being taken through its paces by the Army in order to prepare it for inevitable war, although at that time American citizens felt that the United States could remain out of the European conflict. The Army felt that a vigorous training program should be instituted with the least possible delay, and it was during this rigorous training that Secretary Chunn received a spinal injury while the First Armored Division was maneuvering in rough country near Fort Knox. Later he was placed in Walter Reed Hospital, where he spent about a year. During this time he partially recovered, and was later retired as a second lieutenant on December 16, 1941. After returning to Columbia, his original home, he became interested in seeing the veterans of this war have their own organization and offered his services as national secretary of the organization when it was founded September 8, 1943. Since that time he has been devoting his full time to the Global War Veterans.

National Treasurer Jacob W. Shapiro attended Vanderbilt University prior to his entrance into the Army. He also attended officers' candidate school and was commissioned a second lieutenant. He saw active duty with the armored forces. Later he was discharged because of asthma. After returning to his home in Columbia, Tenn., he was asked to serve as treasurer of the Global War Veterans. He accepted this thankless task graciously and has served in that capacity until the present time. Mr. Shapiro is professor of the science department of Columbia High School, Columbia, Tenn. He has devoted much of his time in assisting the national secretary to carry on the work of the Global War Veterans.

Tennessee Valley Compared to Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the National Union Farmer of March 1, 1945. The writer of the article answers a recent statement of Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, to the effect that Nebraska does not need a development of the T. V. A. kind. The article is as follows:

United States Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, told the Nebraska Reclamation Association recently that the Missouri Valley and Nebraska do not need a Missouri Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is all right in its place, he said, but "it was conceived for an admitted backward region, a region exploited by many private power companies * * * filled with economic distress * * * containing already a great Government project which was lying idle.

"None of these conditions fit the Missouri Valley today * * * it is not poverty-stricken * * * its people do not live in log cabins * * * its electric rates are not exorbitant."

Senator BUTLER thus substituted flattery for fact, to the hurt of his own people.

Comparing the central State of the Tennessee Valley, Tennessee, with Senator BUTLER'S own State of Nebraska, here are the facts:

COMPARISONS

In 1929 Tennessee manufactured $687,000,000 worth of goods; in 1939, $728,000,000, a gain of 6 percent.

In 1929 Nebraska manufactured $351,000,000 worth of goods; in 1939 goods worth $278,000,000, a loss of 23 percent.

In 1929 Tennessee had retail trade of $650,000,000; in 1939 it had $606,000,000. In 1929 Nebraska had retail trade of $600,000,000; by 1939 it had regained only $397,000,000, or two-thirds of that.

In 1929 the people of Tennessee had $906,000,000 in total income; in 1942 they had $1,455,000,000, an increase of $459,000,000.

In 1929 Nebraska people had a total income of $764,000,000; in 1942, of $965,000,000, an increase of $201,000,000.

In 1930 Tennessee had 2,616,000 people; in 1940 she had 2,915,000, an increase of nearly 300,000.

In 1930 Nebraska had 1,377,000 people; in 1940 she had 1,315,000, a loss of 62,000.

NEBRASKA LOST PEOPLE

This loss has continued. By 1943, according to United States Census Bureau estimates, Tennessee had 2,863,000 civilian people, a loss of little less than 2 percent since 1940. Nebraska had 1,198,000 civilians, a loss of 115,000, or nearly 10 percent—and a gross loss of 177,000 since 1930.

In 1929, Tennesseans reported $213,576,000 in personal income to the United States Government. In 1939, they reported $253,495,000, a gain of $40,000,000.

In 1929, Nebraskans reported $171,228,000 personal income to the United States. In 1939, they reported only $148,376,000, a loss of $23,000,000.

Tennesseans employed by industry made $132,000,000 in wages and salaries in 1929. In 1939 they made $137,000,000, a gain of $5,000,000.

In 1929 Nebraskans made $43,000,000 in wages and salaries in industry. In 1939 they made $28,000,000, a loss of $15,000,000.

In 1930, of all Tennessee's farms, 46 percent were run by tenants. In 1940, tenantry had declined to 40 percent.

In 1930, 47 percent of all Nebraska's farms were run by tenants—in a country so rich and pleasant that, according to Senator BUTLER, it needs no progress. By 1940, the proportion of tenantry in Nebraska had risen to 49 percent.

TENANCY DOWN, UP

In 1930 Tennessee had 113,500 tenant-operated farms; in 1940, only 99,735.

In 1940, Nebraska had 61,020 tenant-operated farms; in 1940, it had 63,947.

Now for a few comparisons which reveal some of the reasons why Nebraska economy is stagnating or declining, Tennessee's going ahead.

In 1929, there were 1,307,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy generated in Tennessee; in 1940 there were 2,453,000,000, a gain of nearly one and one-half times, or 150 percent.

In 1929 there were 575,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity generated in Nebraska; in 1940 there were 892,000,000, a gain of about 40 percent.

FARMS ELECTRIFIED

In 1934, 9,544 Nebraska farms were electrified. By 1944, 34,400 had electricity, a gain of 260 percent.

In 1934, 9,927 Tennessee farms had electric service, almost exactly the Nebraska number. But by 1944, 61,700 Tennessee farms were electrified, nearly twice the Nebraska number, and a gain of 534 percent.

RATES COMPARED

Now Senator BUTLER says electric rates in the Missouri Valley are not exorbitant. They may not be from his viewpoint, but in 1942 electric power cost the Missouri Valley's domestic consumers, over-all, an average of 4.11 cents per kilowatt-hour.

In 1942 electric power cost the people of the Tennessee Valley, in contrast, over-all, about 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

In 1942, electric power cost the industrial and commercial consumers of Tennessee Valley about three-fourths of a cent per kilowatt-hour. In 1942, such power cost the industries and commercial enterprises of the Missouri Valley an average of 1.62 cents.

In 1942 the average cost in Nebraska was 3.86 cents per kilowatt-hour for domestic consumers of electricity, and 2.26 cents for commerce and industry, compared to the T. V. A. rates.

Footsteps on the Pathway to Enduring World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, to live at peace is the natural way for man to live. Therefore, when man lives the natural way he must live at peace with his neighbors. Yesterday was Palm Sunday. Easter is but 6 days away. The heart of all Christendom will this week be anticipating the observation of the resurrection of the Prince of Peace. As this great legislative body recesses to reconvene after Easter but a few days before

the epochal international peace conference at San Francisco on April 25, I thought it appropriate to remind the Members of the House of certain footsteps on the pathway to peace, each of which footsteps has been taken by us under the leadership of our President.

Our great Nation has already planted its feet firmly in the sands of international cooperation in pathways to peace, by reason of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, having personally attended 12 international conferences during his 10 years of office as President of this great Nation. I asked our Congressional Library to supplement my own research in this matter, and for your information I herewith set out the international conferences which I designate as footsteps on the pathway to enduring world peace:

Date convened	Participants	Place	General subject
Dec. 1, 1936	Foreign Ministers of all the pan-American nations.	Buenos Aires	Discussed the strengthening of political, economic, military, and intellectual ties between the American nations.
Aug. 10, 1941	Roosevelt, Churchill	Atlantic Ocean aboard the *Augusta* and *Prince of Wales*.	Atlantic Charter.
Dec. 22, 1941	do	Washington, D. C.	Declaration of the United Nations.
June 18, 1942	do	do	Preparation of strategy for the invasion of north Africa.
Jan. 14, 1943	do	Casablanca, North Africa	Unconditional surrender.
May 11, 1943	do	Washington, D. C.	Talks probably dealt with the war in the Pacific.
Aug. 11, 1943	do	Quebec, Canada	Allied command and strategy.
Nov. 22, 1943	Roosevelt, Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek.	North Africa (announcement made from Cairo).	Pacific war strategy.
Nov. 28, 1943	Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin.	Teheran, Iran	Allied command and strategy.
Dec. 4, 1943	Roosevelt, Churchill, M. Ismet Inonu.	Cairo, Egypt	Allied strategy with particular reference to British-Turkish alliance.
Sept. 11, 1944	Roosevelt, Churchill	Quebec, Canada	Allied command and strategy mainly concerning the Pacific.
Feb. 5, 1945	Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin.	Yalta (in the Crimea)	Planned the defeat, occupation, and control of Germany; the Polish-Russian borders; and the policies regarding liberated Europe. Called a United Nations conference and arranged for regular consultation between the Foreign Secretaries of the Big Three.

The very listing of these 12 conferences, personally attended by our President, beginning December 1, 1936, compels us to the proposition that our Nation has now placed its feet firmly on the pathway to enduring world peace and cannot retrace its steps. Certainly, any patriotic American, thinking either in terms of our own national safety or of our world responsibility, desires that we do not turn our footsteps backward. In fact, every reason—geography, self-preservation, common sense, and duty to ourselves and humanity—these all compel us to perform our full share for an enduring world peace.

The life of my own late distinguished son was not more dear to me than the lives of hundreds of thousands of other sons of American parents. Yes; even the sons of our enemies who have died in this hellish, global war were also dear to their parents and to their nations. Wars must cease, and America must keep her feet planted firmly on the pathway to permanent peace.

As we, the Representatives in this great legislative House, return to our respective congressional districts this Eastertide, I challenge your thinking and action to the proposition that we shall disseminate sound, unselfish, constructive thinking, together with reverent and sincere prayer; that out of this peace conference on April 25 at San Francisco there shall evolve in the hearts and minds of all the leaders of all the great nations a good-faith determination and dedication to the proposition that there shall be established a firmly working world order sincerely dedicated to enduring world peace. Gentlemen, I have included in my remarks a reference to sincere and reverent prayer, because prayer is the universal language of all mankind. There can be no firm foundation for enduring peace which does not include a cementing of spiritual force and power. Therefore, I respectfully challenge you to the proposition that as we return to our respective districts we likewise challenge the thinking of our people therein, to the end that they shall renew and restrengthen their determination for world peace, so that as we return here to legislate after the Easter recess, we shall come with our hearts, minds, and spirits strengthened and firmly set in the pathway to enduring world peace. Let us, you and I, individually and as a group, do our utmost to the end that those who have already died in this global conflict shall not have died in vain, and that never again by reason of any lack on our part shall there be global war. This, gentlemen, requires 100-percent dedication on our part, individually and collectively.

Yes, gentlemen, nothing less than this very dedication to an enduring world peace at this Eastertide in connection with the San Francisco Conference, April 25, will be doing our duty by our Nation, by the world, and by our Creator. Our posterity must not be slain in wars by reason of what we fail to do here.

Certainly, never in modern history has a like opportunity existed to initiate a world cooperation for world peace, world understanding, and brotherhood. I am aware that the world machinery foundation at San Francisco will be essentially political, but this, gentlemen, is essentially the foundation of world cooperation in matters of trade, commerce, money, health and other international and related major problems. This world has been catapulted into one world neighborhood, and unless we think and act in such terms, the world civilization cannot survive. Already our Nation has made footsteps on the pathway to international cooperation in matters of trade, commerce, aviation, and money. International commissions and conferences have already mixed a great deal of international understanding, goodwill, and cooperation. These foundations will immediately be built upon after the San Francisco Conference. We have entered a new era. Without shackling or diminishing our own political or economic security we must and shall shoulder our world neighbors' political responsibilities. Nothing less than this permanent footstep in the established pathway to permanent peace by our Nation at San Francisco will endure. Nothing less than unanimity after the San Francisco Conference in support of it by the people of America will make an enduring world peace.

What's Below the Surface?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for the May-Bailey bill when it was before the House, the nurse draft bill, and every measure which had been recommended in aid of the gallant and successful war effort carried on by our armed forces. I cannot, however, support the conference report, which substitutes a completely new bill for the bill heretofore passed by the House.

The bill substituted by the committee of conference was not, so far as I know, recommended by any military authority. The only argument that I have heard seriously advanced in its behalf is that it is better than nothing. It seems to me on the contrary, it is worse than anything that has been proposed to the Congress for some time.

There is not one word in the proposed legislation which will put one slacker to work. According to the pious preamble contained in section 2, every individual, which means men and women of every age, shall have an obligation to serve the Nation in an essential activity. There is nothing in the bill which enforces this provision. It is wholly ineffective for this purpose.

Instead, lurking beneath the cloak of alleged national service, we find a seizure of all industry and all labor, which hereafter will not be controlled by labor and management, which have done such a magnificent job in the prosecution of this war, but will be vested solely in the authority of one man. He may designate the number of workers by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, which may be employed in any area of the United States. All persons are prohibited from working, and workers are prohibited from accepting employment without the blessing of this one man. Whatever employer or employee violates any one of the multitudinous regulations, which are bound to be promulgated under this act,

is subjected to a fine of $10,000 or a year in jail, again because one man says so. Is it argued that the bill provides for an appeal? The appeal tribunals are created and regulated by this same one man.

There is no one living, regardless of his good will or great ability, to whom the United States should be surrendered lock, stock, and barrel.

This measure on the one hand is ineffective, and on the other hand is exceedingly dangerous. I have in the past, and will in the future, support to the limit the prosecution of this war; but under the guise of such support, I cannot be lured into such a drastic concentration of power vested in this or any other administration.

Investigation of Station KFI, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there are some things which we in America must protect above all. The right to speak up at any time is one of our most treasured rights. This possession of free speech is still with us in great degree. I do not believe, therefore, that a public-communications facility should abandon, through bias, a policy of presenting all sides of all issues.

In the past year or so we have heard much about certain members of the radio broadcasting industry limiting the right of expression of several news analysts, even though the Federal Communications Commission did not find them objectionable, nor was there a lack of sponsors in these instances. Unless the public was much misinformed, these denials of broadcasting facilities were simply arbitrary decisions on the part of the management of the radio companies involved.

At the moment, we in southern California have a similar problem. It is a sudden, deliberate, and arbitrary denial of broadcasting facilities to commentators whose views did not coincide with those of a station's owner. Six news commentators were put off the air. Five sponsors of the products they advertised were financially affected. Thousands of radio listeners were denied the information they sought on this station.

This action is not, to my mind, serving the public interest. An arbitrary whim, allowing no one else but the station's owner to express his views, cannot be judged as freedom of speech.

It was with this in mind that I, together with my colleagues, drew up the following resolution, asking a reconsideration of its policy, by radio station KFI:

Whereas radio station KFI, in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., has suddenly and arbitrarily denied its facilities to a number of well-known and publicly favored radio news analysts; and

Whereas the public resentment displayed to the undersigned and the Federal Communications Commission has been voluminous; and

Whereas it is felt that this is censorship on a medium of public communication; be it therefore

Resolved, that the undersigned Members of the Congress of the United States urge and advise radio station KFI, that said public facility look into its present policy to determine if this policy is in the public interest.

Ellis E. Patterson, Ned R. Healy, George P. Miller, Franck R. Havenner, Jerry Voorhis, Gordon L. McDonough, Clyde Doyle, Chet Holifield, Helen Gahagan Douglas, John Phillips.

Hoover Says Political Rights Must Be Assured in Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, following is the second of a series of articles by Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, on the coming conference at San Francisco:

HOOVER SAYS POLITICAL RIGHTS MUST BE ASSURED IN CHARTER

(By Herbert Hoover)

In the last article I stated that positive standards of political rights of nations and men should be incorporated at San Francisco if we are to mobilize the moral and spiritual forces of the world in the charter of peace.

Some of these principles and ideals are stated in the Declaration of Independence. Mr. Wilson stated part of them in his Fourteen Points. Part of them appear in the Atlantic Charter. Some of them are referred to in the Moscow Declaration and the Yalta Declaration. Many of them are thus accepted by the United Nations, but they are not impressed in any binding treaty. It would not seem unreasonable that they should be codified and specifically stated in the new charter of peace. If so, we may at least have a hope that the day may come when they will prevail.

PRINCIPLES CONDENSED

From these declarations we can condense some of these specific principles and standards of conduct between nations:

1. No aggrandizement or annexations, territorial or other.

2. No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

3. The restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of them.

4. The right of all peoples to choose their form of government by free and unfettered elections and secret ballot.

5. Equality in trade.

6. Freedom of the seas in peacetime.

7. Disarmament of aggressor nations.

8. Reduction in arms of all nations.

Of equal importance to these standards of conduct between nations, the history of the last 30 years cries out for the establishment of definite rights and protections to individual human beings. These principles have been eloquently proclaimed time and again as elements of peace by the leaders in this war. They include:

9. Protection from execution or imprisonment without fair trial.

10. Prohibitions against compulsory labor or slavery in any disguise.

11. Protections to minorities and backward peoples.

12. The freedom of the press and religion.

And why not again fly those great banners at the masthead of the charter?

13. Renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy.

14. The relations between nations must be founded upon honor and justice.

PROPOSAL OUTLINE

My proposal is therefore, first, that such fundamental principles and ideals shall be set out in the charter itself. The security council would then have standards of conduct upon which to make decisions. And of equal importance, if they be proclaimed to the world, at least public opinion can define, judge, and support. Without them the San Francisco charter will not be a chart of peace. It will be simply another transitory pact or a declaration.

My second proposal arises from the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks plan includes the creation of one world committee to promote economic welfare and another to promote social welfare. Therefore, I propose the creation of a third world committee to promote political rights. It is a more important function than the other two world-wide committees, great as they are.

If we are to delegate any part of our national sovereignty, we have a right to know exactly what the standards of conduct of other nations are to be. If the five great nations are to be above the law through this voting formula, it becomes all the more important that we definitely express the standards of conduct to which they are committed in relation to the smaller nations and ourselves.

Seven Salient Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Raymond Moley is a very able evaluation of the contribution that former President Herbert Hoover makes to the success of the San Francisco Conference by the series of articles now appearing over his name.

As Mr. Moley points out, the American delegates to that conference have been assured that they will be free agents, and "thus they are not bound by the stubborn Washington policy of refusing to use the great ability and rich experience of the former President."

Mr. Moley's comments follow:

SEVEN SALIENT POINTS

(By Raymond Moley)

Herbert Hoover's proposed seven additions to the Dumbarton Oaks plan should be one of the bases of the American delegation's contribution at San Francisco. Neither political differences nor the personal antagonism of the administration to Mr. Hoover himself should lead our delegation to ignore suggestions like this. The President assured Senator VANDENBERG that the delegates were to

be free agents, and thus they are not bound by the stubborn Washington policy of refusing to use the great ability and rich experience of the former President.

Two general principles dominate all seven of the Hoover proposals. The first is that peace plans already prepared or to be adopted at San Francisco should recognize that the ultimate building of peace should be evolutionary. Plans should provide room for change and growth. First steps should be cautious, but should be carefully aimed at a long-time goal. In short, the direction, not the length of the step, is important.

In line with this principle, Mr. Hoover proposes a periodic revision of treaties at intervals of, say, 10 years. Provision should also be made for progressive disarmament of the United Nations after the complete disarmament of the enemy has been assured. This would presumably be a slow but progressive process. The final Hoover point on this score is that peacemaking should be slow. The chief reason for this would be to permit the hot passions of war to die away before the shape of the world is fixed.

The second Hoover principle is that we should avoid putting too much weight on a general world organization, at least in the first years of its existence. Hence, his belief in regional organizations to provide means close to each nation to deal with matters which are not of world-wide concern. He would provide regional councils in each great area to deal with matters affecting the nations in that area. Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere might be such regions.

Probably the most original of Mr. Hoover's proposals deals with the controversial issue of whether our delegate on the Security Council should be empowered to authorize the use of force without the approval of Congress. Mr. Hoover would not give such power to our representative but to the President. But he would bind the President by a majority of the Joint Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees on the question whether the final decision should be submitted to Congress. This, in effect, would provide a restraint on the President and at the same time would make prompt action possible in a crisis.

Mr. Hoover's suggestions embody the wisdom of experience.

The Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the powers granted Mr. Byrnes in this new manpower bill are amazing in an America dedicated to the preservation of liberty and most certainly reflect on that private enterprise and free labor that have outstripped the world in production in this war. Every contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship under which an individual undertakes to perform a service for another comes under the terms of this bill with its regimentation and jail penalties. I do not want to have Mr. Byrnes or anyone else ring this kind of curfew in the United States and like Representative McDONOUGH, of California, whose five sons are in our armed forces—one with Patton on the road to Berlin and another with our naval forces striking close to the Jap mainland—I do not believe our fighting men want their families back home thus strait-jacketed.

The War Imposes a "Hard" Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

THE WAR IMPOSES A HARD PEACE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Take one German city, Cologne, where Allied troops are now in charge. Or, more accurately, take what is left of it. Cologne had a built-up area of 3,320 acres. Today only 1,320 acres of it remain. Fully 2,000 acres have been utterly destroyed because the Nazis have forced their victims to fight to the bitter end.

Cologne was bombed 167 times altogether. It suffered five times as much damage as Stalingrad. Devastated Cologne is like other German cities which have preceded it to substantial destruction. It is the pattern of destruction to come if Hitler is determined to pull all Germany down with him, as he is showing every sign of doing.

These facts have a political meaning as well as a military meaning. They mean that there is no longer any real argument among the Allies as to whether a hard peace or a soft peace should be imposed on Germany. The military people are certain that the issue is rapidly settling itself.

It is being settled not primarily on the drafting board of the peace-framers, but by the extent of devastation of Allied bombing which the Germans have brought upon their country.

In the condition of Germany today there is little that is like what prevailed in Germany toward the end of World War No. 1. Then, it is true, the inflow of raw materials was cut off by the blockade. Food supplies were running desperately low. Morale, which didn't have Hitler's gun at its back, was fast ebbing.

But there are differences which are more significant than the parallels. At the end of World War No. 1, Germany's industrial plant was left intact. Its ability to recover was largely unimpaired. Today its industrial plant is in the process of being bombed to bits. In his fanatical fight to gain a few more weeks or a few more months, Hitler is acting to throw his whole industrial plant into the fire. At the end of World War No. 1, German territory had hardly felt the singe of battle; the Allies hadn't laid a glove on the German homeland. They have today.

And there are additional reasons why Washington concludes that the issue of a soft versus a hard peace—even as a matter of degree—is now largely foreclosed by the events of the war. They are these:

The air people here, American and British alike, are reporting that the experts who have moved into the Rhineland in the wake of the ground forces are finding more rather than less damage from Allied bombing, and that almost uniformly air reconnaissance had underestimated the destruction. They are finding, according to the evidence reaching Washington, that the devastation is at least 15 percent greater than aerial photographs disclosed. This is true in all the German centers recently occupied and in consequence the experts are increasing their estimates of the damage done to cities still in Nazi hands.

Cologne has not even been the worst. Other cities have already been blasted harder; Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg, and the large industrial centers in the Ruhr have been subjected to comparable, perhaps even harder, bombing. Essen and Dortmund, there is reason to believe, will be found to be as badly off as Cologne when Allied troops move in. The Russians have razed much of the industrial areas of Silesia and are justly appropriating most of what remains.

The military fact is that as the Germans continue to resist, other already hard-hit cities and industrial centers will have to undergo the same but more sustained treatment. If Hitler thinks of defending Berlin to the last German in a prolonged siege, the Reich capital will be virtually wiped out. German manpower has been sapped. German transportation is sagging to the breaking point.

The political conclusion is that the war is already imposing many of the peace terms on the enemy. Of course, Germany can be rebuilt. But not for many years to come. Allied strength will never come from Germany's weakness, but American official opinion is taking the view that German weakness is going to be self-imposed—through the whirlwind she has brought upon herself—for, perhaps, a half century.

Division of Poland Held Mortal Sin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the people of Indiana's First Congressional District are distressed and disappointed over the Yalta decision regarding Poland. Americans of all nationalities are hoping that the San Francisco Conference will correct the wrong done our ally. Dr. Stojowski has correctly termed Poland's plight in the following statement:

Describing Poland as an outpost of western civilization and a bulwark of Christianity, Dr. Sigismond Stojowski, New York Polish-born pianist, expressed sadness in Denver today over the partitioning of Poland and termed it "The mortal sin of Europe."

Stojowski said Poland was not without its faults, but the division of Poland in the eighteenth century and again in recent days is a mortal sin and an evil that can only engender more evil.

"The world at large is too busy and too shallow-minded to see what is happening," said Stojowski, as he held out little hope that Dumbarton Oaks or the approaching United Nations conference in San Francisco can do anything to promote permanent world peace "if the diplomats perpetuate injustice and dispense with a moral foundation."

"At the risk of displeasing the Communists, who indorse that philosophy only because they don't know its practical applications when it is armed with physical force, the suppression of eastern Poland is like turning the powerful light of Christian civilization

away from the masses yet untutored and in need of Christ.

"As a citizen," Stojowski said, "I am deeply saddened that America's first commitment with what is called the United Nations should be participation in the mortal sin of Europe. In my opinion it is an act of political short-sightedness and moral inequity."

The Fighting One Hundred and Sixty-third

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a newspaper article carried in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of March 23. This article portrays the outstanding achievements of the Forty-first Division in the Pacific, and especially the magnificent part performed by Montana's own One Hundred and Sixty-third. It is my privilege to know many of these boys, and their fighting record is on a par with any other outfit and speaks for itself.

The One Hundred and Sixty-third Infantry won the first Presidential citation awarded the Forty-first Division. It is an outfit that we of Montana and the Nation are proud of. We salute the regiment, and the division to which it belongs, for its valor. Our debt to those boys is one we will never forget.

However, Mr. Speaker, the following article states the case of the One Hundred and Sixty-third better than I can, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD:

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD REGIMENT FROM MONTANA PART OF OLDEST COMBAT OUTFIT

HELENA, March 22.—Somewhere on Mindanao today doughboys of Uncle Sam's oldest World War No 2 combat division in point of continuous overseas service—the Forty-first—will observe their third anniversary of struggle with the Japanese.

But the doughfoots probably will pass the anniversary as usual—scrapping. Tuesday night they repulsed Jap counterattacks above San Roque on the Philippine Island.

Since March 22, 1942, the division has blazed a trail of accomplishments across the South and Southwest Pacific, sharing honors with the Thirty-second Infantry as the United States Army's first combat outfits to go overseas. The Forty-first is comprised of men from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Men of Michigan and Wisconsin make up the Thirty-second.

Made up of National Guard units, the Forty-first has established itself as one of the outstanding divisions in the Pacific. The organization made the first amphibious landing in the Southwest Pacific when it crashed ashore at Salamaua, setting the pace for many such operations to follow.

SEVERAL CAMPAIGNS

The doughboys of the Northwest division fought through the Buna-Sanananda-Gona campaign; then later smashed the Japs at Aitape, Hollandia, Wakde, and Biak. Most recently they invaded Mindanao at Zamboanga; have proceeded briskly to gain the upper hand over a stubborn foe.

At Salamaua the Forty-first set a record for continuous fighting, slugging it out with the Nipponese for 76 days and nights without relief. When the Forty-first trudged away from that encounter they were acclaimed by their buddies as "the fightingest lugs in the Pacific."

The Forty-first has also been a godsend to Army Intelligence. It had taken more Jap prisoners, prior to the Leyte invasion, than any other division.

Its share of honors has come to the Forty-first. A total of 1,218 awards and decorations have been pinned on doughboys of the division, and three Presidential citations have been bestowed to outstrip every other outfit in the Pacific theater.

MOSTLY MONTANANS

The One Hundred and Sixty-third Infantry Regiment of the Forty-first Division is comprised almost wholly of Montanans, but of late has changed a little through combat replacements. A National Guard unit, the One Hundred and Sixty-third won prominence in the Battle of Sanananda which was fought from January 2 to 23, 1943. For this battle the One Hundred and Sixty-third received the first Presidential citation awarded the Forty-first Division. They killed 1,391 Japs and took 10 prisoners. A single battalion of the One Hundred and Sixty-third captured Wakde.

A perusal of the complement of the One Hundred and Sixty-third would touch practically every community in Montana, including:

Headquarters Company, Helena; band, Bozeman; medical detachment, Whitfish; Service Company, Bozeman; Headquarters Detachment of First Battalion, Whitehall; Companies A, B, C, and D of the First Battalion, Sidney, Poplar, Bozeman, Harlowton, and Whitehall, respectively; Headquarters Detachment, Second Battalion, Bainvile; Companies E, F, G, and H, Culbertson and Wolf Point, Kalispell, Glasgow, and Billings, respectively.

Headquarters Detachment, Third Battalion, Billings; Companies I, K, L, and M, Great Falls, Lewiston, Billings, and Chinook-Bainville-Harlem, respectively.

The One Hundred and Sixteenth Quartermaster Regiment was comprised of National Guard Reserves from Bozeman and Malta, while the One Hundred and Sixteenth Medical Regiment came from Great Falls. The Antitank Platoon in the One Hundred and Sixty-third Infantry Regiment was composed of Livingston residents.

Soviet Secret Police Direct Lublin Group—Miss Cardwell Says Poles Are Subjected to Mock Trials, Then Deported to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell that appeared in the Detroit News of March 24, 1945:

SOVIET SECRET POLICE DIRECT LUBLIN GROUP—MISS CARDWELL SAYS POLES ARE SUBJECTED TO MOCK TRIALS, THEN DEPORTED TO ASIA

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

In late July 1944, the U. S. S. R. recognized the Lublin Committee of National Liberation, which arose at the call of the Polish patriots in Moscow. Six months later this group was replaced by a provisional government of Poland. To clothe this body with a semblance of decency and legality, mass meetings attended through compulsion and managed by the NKVD (Soviet secret police) were reported to have demanded such a government.

From the character of the men in that Government it is evident that the voice of the people was faked. Bierut, the president, has been a Soviet citizen since 1921; Osupka, the premier, was an employee of cooperative societies in pre-war Poland and had no experience whatever in international affairs or diplomacy—to mention only the leaders.

From Lublin and Moscow broadcasts, from American journalists, from reports of the Polish underground—admitted by Americans who know to be the world's most efficient—and from a few persons who have come out of Poland, it is possible to know what has been happening and what are the conditions of life in that country.

NKVD COLLECTS EVIDENCE

As Germans are driven out of a district the Polish Government, which is in all its aspects controlled by the NKVD, sends representatives to that area to set up local administration and, most important of all, organize tribunals to try immediately traitors, Fascists, and all collaborators.

Under these heads come members of the underground government and all who have given them the slightest assistance; the Polish Home Army, whose one occupation was opposition to the Germans; priests, professors, teachers, peasants who had been friendly to the home army and anybody who had cooperated with it in any way; professional people of all categories, and all others suspected of being enemies of the people, which means disapproving of Soviet ideology. NKVD agents themselves collect the evidence.

Arrests and mock trials result in execution or deportation to Asiatic Russia.

All reports show that what has happened and is happening in Poland since its so-called liberation is a repetition of Soviet procedure in eastern Poland in 1939–40. Trainloads of human cattle again are moving across Polish plains to unknown destinations. Tens of thousands have thus disappeared already. From the little town of Tarnow alone some 800 school children have been deported.

EVERYONE A SUSPECT

No one is above suspicion; during the first 2 months 60 employees of the ministry of the interior were arrested and disappeared. But the home army is first on the list. It has been declared Fascist, and its complete extermination demanded. Yet it was not loose guerrilla bands but an integral part of the Polish armed forces, a national army and so recognized by America and Britain.

In a Red army commander's order—August 24, 1944—that fell into Polish hands, General Bor is called the commander of the Nationalist Polish Army.

That Russian order, let me say in passing, concerned the strict prevention of any aid reaching the Poles in the Warsaw uprising, although during the latter part of July the Moscow radio had continually incited the Poles to rise and on July 30 called Warsaw to arms. August 1, the Red army being at the doors, the Polish home army, with the cooperation of the entire Warsaw population rose. The outlook was excellent.

Immediately Russian fighting on that sector ceased, Moscow and Lublin began accusing the Polish Government in exile and General Bor of ordering a premature uprising and collaboration with the Germans.

Red armies waited at the Vistula while the Germans made rubble of the Polish capital and killed or took prisoner its people. Calumination of General Bor, President Racz-

kiewicz, and General Sosnkowski, then commander in chief of the Polish Army, filled the Moscow and Lublin press and broadcasts. It happens that I know President Raczkiewicz and General Sosnkowski personally; men of the highest character, long public service, and a credit to any nation.

COMMUNISM IN SCHOOLS

Schools function but the teaching is Communist. Announcement is made that 8 universities are open in Lwow, where there was 1 university and 1 engineering school before the war. Libraries, laboratories, and shops were plundered, buildings damaged or destroyed, the 1939 population (320,000) is much reduced, professors and students killed or deported. The idea of 8 universities and 12 technical schools in that war-ravaged community is fantastic.

Rural reform is a major theme with the Lublin group. September 6, 1944, it confiscated without compensation all holdings larger than 125 acres and everything on them; likewise smaller properties belonging to "enemies of the people," some of these peasants, and divided them among the landless, measuring the allotments by stepping them off. Statistics given by the official in charge show an average of 4.5 acres to a man, in certain instances 1 acre.

Dissatisfaction is general among the recipients. In some districts peasants have refused to share in the parcelation, disapproving both of the method and the results.

Agrarian reform implies more than giving a man a few acres. In Poland it should mean parcelation with compensation, consolidation of scattered holdings, so prevalent in eastern Poland under the czars; credit, insurance, price stabilization, agricultural education, and a lot of other things.

ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-THREE THOUSAND AND SIX HUNDRED NEW HOMESTEADS

The pre-war Polish Government had made an excellent beginning, having created 153,600 new homesteads averaging 23 acres and enlarged 503,000 others by an average of 4.9 acres between 1919–38. Consolidation had produced 859,000 profitable holdings. A total of 225,000 acres had been used for model farms and scientific purposes. The work was continuing in 1939; but by 1938 only about 14 percent of Poland's arable land was in holdings exceeding 125 acres.

Great landowners played a wholly insignificant part in pre-war Poland, having practically disappeared from the political scene when Poland was restored in 1919. They did not control wealth. I recall that a school for sons of the aristocracy had to close in the 1930's because parents of the boys could not find cash to pay the very modest fees.

Stabilizing Manpower on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RANDOPH. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I supported the compromise manpower bill. It is my hope that the Senate will reaffirm what the House has done in connection with the final passage of this legislation. There are some misguided persons, and some individuals who should know better, who attempt to characterize the legislation as anti-labor, or the enslavement of the worker. These expressions, Mr. Speaker, are not true.

It has been my purpose, in keeping with the following editorial from the New York Times, March 10, to support the requests of the President, and the leaders of our armed services, in this matter:

FAILURE IN THE SENATE

The long debate in the Senate over the adoption of a manpower bill has ended with the adoption of a weak and watery measure which will do none of the things that President Roosevelt, General Marshall and Admiral King have asked Congress to do in order to give adequate support to our fighting forces. This is not a work-or-fight bill. It is a duck-the-issue bill. If it should be enacted into law it would not add a single compulsion, either for the purpose of recruiting additional workers for war production or of keeping such workers on their jobs as long as there is a threatened scarcity of manpower to produce the weapons needed by our fighting men. The Senate bill is a surrender to inertia, to complacency and to political expediency. It is instructive to note that among those who voted for it are some of the Senators who have been doing the most and the loudest talking about all-out support for the war effort.

The present situation is not entirely hopeless. The Senate bill now goes to a conference committee representing both branches of Congress, which will have before it not only this weak-kneed thing but a genuine work-or-fight bill, the May-Bailey bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on February 1. With the President again expressing yesterday his preference for the May-Bailey bill, it is possible that out of the work of the conference committee there will come an acceptable bill patterned more closely on the House version than on the Senate model. If so, something can be salvaged from the long delay of the last 5 weeks. If not, and if the Senate bill wins out, there will not be much point even in having a final vote on the whole business. For the Senate bill would be worse than useless, in the sense that it would merely deceive some people into believing that something effective had been done by Congress to answer the appeals of General Marshall and Admiral King.

In this case the best thing to do about manpower legislation would be to forget the whole thing until such time as the Senate is ready to make good the promise it gave when it helped to declare war on Germany and Japan—the promise which said, "To bring the conflict to a successful termination, all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by Congress."

Mr. Speaker, the manpower compromise, through the processes of give and take between the House and Senate, is now before us for final action. I believe the editorial from the Washington, D. C., Star of last evening is a fair statement of the situation. It follows:

MANPOWER COMPROMISE

Out of a very good House bill and a very poor Senate bill the conferees on manpower legislation have reached a compromise which ought to meet the need for the rest of the war.

Enforced by penalties applicable against both employers and employees guilty of willful violation of regulations to be issued by Director of War Mobilization Byrnes, the effect of the legislation will be to make manpower available in critical areas or plants engaged in production of vital war materials and to freeze employees in their present jobs.

Administration of the legislation presumably will be delegated by Mr. Byrnes to the War Manpower Commission. That administration may be difficult and, judging from past experience in, say, New Bedford, Mass., may cause a resentment from workers which in its practical effect could nullify the intent of the legislation.

But if approved, as it should be, by both Houses of Congress, this program will have a legal standing and a resulting prestige which manpower regulations based on Executive orders have never possessed. There is ample reason to believe that the American people will accept it, when they understand the necessity and the purpose, as they have accepted other reasonable wartime restrictions on their personal liberty of choice.

In that connection, the declaration of policy in the proposed compromise legislation is highly important. That declaration explains that in order "adequately to support the Army and maintain the Navy during the war and to carry into effect the provisions of the declaration of war pledging all the resources of the Nation to bring the conflict to a successful termination, every individual not in the armed forces shall have an obligation, when called upon, to serve the Nation in an activity essential to the war effort."

That declaration of policy is excellent. The only trouble with it is that it is about 3 years late. American production has been one of the marvels of the modern world. But it has been marred by the flaws in utilization of manpower and the waste from voluntarily idle manpower which in the main resulted from a failure, at the outset of this war, to strike some parallel between the obligation of the citizen drafted for service at the front and the obligation of the citizen who is exempt from military service for reasons of sex, age, physical condition, or the nature of his employment.

This legislation makes an attempt to establish that parallel, to the extent that is practicable at this stage of the war. Its compulsion, which will be used only when and where necessary, is not to be compared seriously to the compulsion under which men are fighting against the Germans and the Japanese. But it is suggested. And clothed with the dignity of a law of the land, it is reasonable to believe that the legislation will be accepted by our people in the realization of the pressing necessity not to weaken here at home until Germany's unconditional surrender in Europe has been duplicated by Japan.

Many Poles Vanish in Soviet Fastnesses—Officials Hunt Vainly for Thousands Deported From Red-Occupied Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell, that appeared in the Detroit News of March 23, 1945:

MANY POLES VANISH IN SOVIET FASTNESSES—OFFICIALS HUNT VAINLY FOR THOUSANDS DEPORTED FROM RED-OCCUPIED AREAS

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

A new chapter in international relations was opened when Germany attacked Russia in 1941. For Poland this move had special significance. In 1939–40 Soviet authorities had deported some 1,500,000 Polish citizens

to remote districts of the U. S. S. R. and, disregarding international law, had held elections in Soviet-occupied Poland, as a result of which all that area had been incorporated into the Soviet Republics of the Ukraine and White Russia.

These two actions on the part of the U. S. S. R. and all the attendant results might have been regarded by the Polish Government as sufficient cause for refusing to have anything to do with the Soviet Union until the Government of the latter manifested willingness to atone for past actions, even though Poles and Russians now were fighting a common enemy.

However, General Sikorski's government chose to be magnanimous and in July 1941 signed the Polish-Soviet pact establishing diplomatic relations, providing for the release of Poles held in the U. S. S. R. and the organization of a Polish army in that country.

Theoretically, the outlook seemed promising. Strained relations between Poland and Russia appeared to be easing. Britain and America were pleased and hailed unanimity of purpose—the defeat of Germany.

DEPORTEES SCATTERED

Hopes were not to be fulfilled. Ambassadors were accredited and received, but from the moment of the Polish officials' arrival in the U. S. S. R. obstacles cropped up in the path of everything they tried to do, as I know from conversations with persons who were a part of that establishment. The Polish Embassy was given no assistance in locating the deported, who had been scattered over north Russia, Siberia, and Kazakstan.

In consequence, no more than 620,000 of the deported were located by the Polish delegates. Of these, 271,323 reached Polish headquarters and only 140,000 had been permitted by the Soviet Government to leave Russia before diplomatic relations with the Polish Government were broken, bringing to an end all army recruiting and relief work by Polish Government agencies.

From the time of the Polish officials' arrival in the U. S. S. R. they had sought in vain to locate some 8,300 Polish officers known to have been Soviet prisoners; but Soviet authorities denied all knowledge of them. The Poles traced large numbers of these lost men to certain prisoner-of-war camps and traced their removal, but whether they could not discover. The disappearance of these thousands, plus other groups with them making a 10,000 total, remained a mystery.

In the spring of 1943 the Germans announced the discovery of mass graves in the Katyn Forest, and area they had occupied in the U. S. S. R. A medical commission investigated and issued a statement declaring that the bodies found were those of Polish officers interred not later than the spring of 1940. The date was determined from the condition of the bodies, the scrub birch growth on the graves and the innumerable letters on the murdered men. The number of bodies was estimated at approximately 10,000.

POLES SUPPORT UNITY

This statement is detailed and lengthy. Compared with it the later Soviet attempt to establish German guilt in the matter seems wholly ineffective.

Unwilling to jeopardize the unity among the United Nations, the Poles did nothing further, declaring their readiness to resume friendly relations whenever the Soviets were willing to meet the reasonable terms they asked, chief of which was permission to evacuate the families of Polish soldiers from the U. S. S. R. They would leave the boundary question until after the war.

Meanwhile, the Union of Polish Patriots, sponsored by the Soviets, had come into existence in Moscow, and a Polish army to fight beside the Red Army was being trained by Red Army officers.

HOME ARMY BACKS EXILES

After General Sikorski's tragic death in July 1943, Polish-Soviet relations underwent no change for nearly a year. Premier Mikolajczyk, Sikorski's successor, hoped that the Kremlin would be conciliatory and said and did nothing which might offend. The Polish underground regime loyally backed the London policy. Even when the Lublin Committee for the Liberation of Poland was set up and approved by Moscow, with the prospect of its being transformed into a Soviet-recognized Polish government, Mikolajczyk did not protest.

The Polish Premier's willingness to conciliate and compromise suited Britain and America, which did not want the perennial Polish problem coming into the limelight. They wanted to keep the Russians fighting Germans. Who knew what might happen if the Poles started to make trouble?

When Red armies reached the Polish-Soviet frontiers, driving the Germans back across Poland, the Polish Home Army—the underground—was ordered by the Polish Government to come out in the open in the areas where the Red armies appeared and cooperate with them. This order was obeyed, with the result that while home-army help was accepted as long as the battle was on, immediately thereafter officers were imprisoned, executed, or deported to the U. S. S. R. and their men given the choice of being incorporated into the Red Army or General Zymierski's Polish army.

These occurrences, with dates and names of places and officers and troops involved, were reported to the Polish Government. Yet it still was so desirous of doing nothing to spoil a possible rapprochement or embarrass Britain and America that it ordered a continuation of its policy of cooperation with Soviet troops.

Such was the situation up to the date of the Warsaw uprising of 1944.

Who Is Getting the Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me on March 26 to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a very excellent editorial entitled "Who Is Getting the Food?" which appeared in the Reporter Dispatch published at White Plains, N. Y., on March 23, 1945:

WHO IS GETTING THE FOOD?

There is no more generous nation in all history than the United States of America. The record is voluminous with prompt and liberal contributions to any nation which has faced disaster either through war or violence of nature. Even Japan and Germany, our bitter enemies, have been included in the past in the list of recipients of heavy contributions from the American Red Cross as well as from official funds. Wherever ravages of war came or whenever nature struck with hurricane, volcanic eruptions, or floods, America has been quick in sympathetic response.

It is, therefore, in view of this magnificent record, no sense of penury or selfishness which drives many citizens today to ask for information on where goes the foodstuffs which this country is sending abroad. Figures are quoted from Washington to the general effect that 73 percent is being consumed here at home, 17 percent is being sent to our armed forces abroad, while the remainder is sent abroad either on lend-lease arrangements or as succor to those in liberated countries who might otherwise face starvation.

If those figures are correct, there is no reason, either of military secrecy or other cause, why they should not be broken down to show exactly how much food is now stored in the bins and reservoirs of our Allies, how much is being distributed monthly to nations unable to produce sufficient for the needs of their own peoples, and how much is being sent to nations outside the combat zones, and why. In other words, the American people who produce this food, who gladly ration themselves for sake of fairness, have a right to the full facts

If Washington has bungled anywhere that should be publicized, for only through such publicity will there be strong deterrent for future errors; if some of our allies have exaggerated their current needs and have accumulated surpluses which are not entirely essential, we have a right to that knowledge also. For, while America is generous, it wants knowledge of how generous it is—and it distinctly does not wish its generosity utilized as a political bargaining weapon by diplomacy. It is no secret that promises of food to other nations are being dangled over the heads of their emissaries as they approach the peace conference next month at San Francisco.

We want our soldiers and sailors to continue to be the best-fed men in uniform, with delicacies, even, which are denied the American homefront table; we want insofar as is necessary to aid in feeding our allies' armed services; and we are willing to aid any and all nations from starvation of their peoples.

But what America does not like is news of grain rotting in the fields while there are other reports of meat shortages because of lack of grain to feed the cattle. American housewives cannot understand why butter is piled high in their grocery shops but ration points continue so high they cannot afford to buy. It is difficult to understand why lard is now hard to get when it is reported 20,000,000 pounds were permitted to become rancid for lack of proper and prompt distribution facilities.

And, to make it specific, who is getting the steaks? The American family knows it is not; their sons and husbands and fathers write from their service posts that they are not; presumably this would not go to refugees when our own servicemen are denied.

Let's have the facts on the food shortages—all the facts. We are prepared to be extra generous; but we want to know that our food is not being wasted and that it is not being given away extravagantly. No "military secrecy" argument should offset our right to that knowledge.

Which Way Will America Choose?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the People's Lobby, I am inserting herewith with my

remarks a recent statement by that organization, entitled "Which Way Will America Choose?"

Mr. Benjamin C. Marsh, the executive secretary of the People's Lobby, has frequently appeared before congressional committees to testify cn various types of legislation.

WHICH WAY WILL AMERICA CHOOSE?

This war has proved that the United States of America has sufficient farms, experienced farmers, factories, techinicians, mechanics, and natural resources—such as coal, iron, and oil—to supply a good standard of living for all our people.

In spite of having 11,500,000 men and women in our armed forces, our production is such as to enable the majority of our people to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world—and still send goods to our allies, at a time when we are producing enormous quantities of guns, ships, airplanes and munitions.

This is not the result of "private enterprise." Many of our big manufacturing plants would not, or at any rate did not, convert from peace production to war production, until the Government guaranteed them prices to cover all costs, including a lot of wasteful advertising—costing the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Government-planned war production, which is much harder to plan than peace production, because submarines, shifts in the fighting, casualties and the enormous distances goods must be carried, upset calculations.

Government takes all the risks in war.

After this war will we go back to "one-third of our people ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed," as we did after World War No. 1?

If we do—World War No. 3 becomes almost inevitable.

America is the one great nation where nobody needs to "go short" if willing to work.

We could be the storehouse of democracy in peace, as we are the arsenal of democracy in war, if we do not return to the system under which we never produced and distributed enough to maintain peace.

From 1922 to 1936, when this war really started in Spain, our productive machine ran one-third short of maximum production, therefore our people ran short.

You can't eat your cake if you can't make it.

America has all the makings of all the cake Americans can eat—and enough to share some with the world.

Big corporations make more money out of scarcity, and the resulting high prices.

That is the reason American trusts and international cartels were started.

When the owners talked about "the law of supply and demand" they meant that they wanted a law that would keep down supply and increase demand—that would increase profits.

About 20 years ago, big corporations got less than half of all profits, now they get about two-thirds and would be willing to have 99½ percent.

Can we block their game?

Yes; if enough Americans like you protest.

Early in the war, the Government spent about $9,000,000,000 on plants to produce airplanes, machine tools, steel, aluminum, synthetic rubber, gasoline, magnesium, etc.

The Government now owns about half the machine tool factory facilities.

The Government owns a tenth of steel productive capacity—and enough of many other plants to control much important production.

The big corporations want these plants.

Private ownership of factories, mines, and other things essential to production gives the owners the right not to produce the things the people need—unless they get the profits they want.

This is a dangerous form of dictatorship.

It would be as bad policy to give up Government plants in peacetime as to give up our ships in war—if we want to ensure full production.

There is only one way to raise the living standard of all Americans.

That is to have full production of everything Americans need, and pay producers enough to buy the products of industry and farm, out of current income—not by general installment buying.

To get this American standard for all—the People's Lobby is trying to get the Government to keep the factories and plants it has built for war production—and convert all possible, to peace production.

Most of them could be converted in from one to six weeks.

They would be operated through public corporations—by production engineers and technicians who have proved that they know their business—as American mechanics have, by their war production records.

What will happen if we don't have all factories, plants, mines, and so on, run to meet America's needs?

The United States Department of Commerce reports that in 1946—

"Even with an average workweek 5 hours shorter than in 1940, there would be more unemployed than the 13,000,000 in 1932."

Aren't 13,000,000 unemployed 13,000,000 too many?

If you want to learn more of what to do to get, and keep, full employment—which American never has had in peace, but always could have, in peace as in war—

Write People's Lobby, Inc., rooms 307-308, 1410 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

The People's Lobby is trying to get the Government to adopt the principle of paying as large a part as practical of the costs of war by current taxation, based on ability to pay, exempting income essential to health and well-being, as determined by Government agencies.

It is also working for:

1. Government direction of farm production, and control of processing and distribution of farm products, during the war economy, with direct payments where needed to marginal farmers.

2. Effective Government control of prices and of quality of essential consumer goods.

3. The participation of the United States Government in international arrangements, such as the control of money, credit, trade, natural resources, and cartels.

The Excess-Profits Tax and Its Effect Upon the Expansion of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Elgin Groseclose, eminent economist, distinguished author and novelist, is a resident of Washington, D. C. He and his charming wife are the parents of four lovely children. In their pleasant home a remarkable atmosphere of perfect home life prevails. Mrs. Groseclose, as well as her versatile husband, is outstanding in her own right. She is an expert on child welfare and devotes much of her time and talents to recreation and education for the underprivileged.

Dr. Groseclose was formerly a special agent of the United States Department of Commerce, and until recently an economist with the United States Treasury Department.

Not so long ago Dr. Groseclose was guest speaker at the luncheon meeting of the tax group held at the Union League Club in Philadelphia. Among notable guests present were Dr. E. S. Magaw, dean of the Temple University Law School, and A. T. Shuster, collector of internal revenue in Philadelphia. Dr. Groseclose was presented to the tax group by Leighton P. Stradley, who sponsors the tax group's meetings.

Dr. Groseclose's address was entitled "Expanding Business and the Excess Profits Tax." I have known Elgin and Louise Groseclose, his wife, for many years and entertain for him a profound admiration, sincere affection, and deep respect for his intelligence, integrity, and character.

For those concerned with excess-profits tax—and who is not, for everyone is directly or indirectly affected thereby—the speech hereinbefore will prove instructive and illuminating.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith, by unanimous consent of my colleagues, Dr. Groseclose's address in full:

EXPANDING BUSINESS AND THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

When one is wandering lost in a jungle, it is a welcome sight to meet a fellow wanderer, even though the fellow wanderer is also lost and the only advantage of the meeting is to share a common misery. Being one of those who are lost in the maze of the excess-profits tax, and especially in that deepest jungle of it, section 722, I find it very cheering to be here with you today, who, I take it, are equally lost else you would not be here. I am indeed very appreciative of the kind invitation of your chairman, Mr. Stradley, to come here today, and I only hope that I shall not requite his kindness by leading you deeper into the jungle.

Wonderful things have happened in the field of tax administration in recent years that an economist may stand before a gathering of tax lawyers and accountants and discuss the administration and application of a tax. Tax administration, which for many years has embraced the two professions of law and accounting, has now gone, in a big way, into economics. During years in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, when I was the only economist on the pay roll, I often felt very lonely, among so many attorneys and accountants, for an economist in the service was something unheard of and contrary to the traditions of the fathers. Recently, however, the Bureau has recruited a substantial staff of economists to advise and assist in the determination of excess-profits tax.

To those who look for guidance through the wilderness of section 722, I offer the example of Moses, who led the children of Israel through the wilderness of Sinai.

I do not recall, in the story of these wanderings, that Moses engaged the services of cartographers, or surveyors, or scouts, or even economists. As I read the story, the children of Israel did not escape the wilderness until he had given them a moral law in place of the superstitions and witchcraft of Egypt, and if that story has any moral for today's situation, it is that we must look to morals and equity as our guide rather than legal procedures, accounting surveys, or economic formulae.

The essential problem in the excess profits tax, and, its conceptual counterpart, the

Contract Renegotiation Act, is the determination of what is a fair and just profit in the case of an individual business.

The principle of the excess-profits tax is to consecrate, to war purposes, earnings of a corporation that are in excess of the fair and just amount representing normal earnings of the taxpayer. The principle of the Contract Renegotiation Act is to limit the profits on a Government contract to a fair and just profit. Now, in the early days of economics, that is, prior to the eighteenth century, a great deal of thought was given by the economists to considerations of a fair price or a just price, which is in essence the problem of a fair and just profit. Saint Thomas Aquinas and other among the schoolmen, who were the economic thinkers of that day, wrote a great deal on the subject of a fair price. With them the question was essentially a moral question.

The thinking done by those scholars has long since been forgotten and is largely lost. With the advent of Adam Smith and the modern development of economic thought, the question of a just price, or a fair and just profit, was discarded as not belonging within the realm of economics. Prices and profits, it was proposed, were governed by iron-clad economic law functioning inexorably through such principles as the law of the market place, the law of supply and demand, the law of rent, and the like. This viewpoint has been generally accepted for the past 168 years. Except for certain tentative essays in the field, in the case of public utility regulation, in the determination of fair return, economists have given no thought to the question of the essentials of a fair price or a just price or a fair and just profit.

With the bursting upon us of wartime legislation, however, in the contract renegotiation statute, and the excess profits tax, interest has revived in this age-old problem, and renewed demand has been made upon thinkers for light. The solution to these problems must be approached from the viewpoint which the earlier scholars concluded long ago was the only sound viewpoint—that our economic system does not function through an iron wrought mechanism of economic law but in the moral atmosphere of human rights and obligations, and that the question is essentially one of morals and equities, rather than mathematical formulae.

Now, while these basic concepts have been absent from our formal processes of political and economic science, they are still vital in the conscience of the people, and are as a wind moving over the land. In relation to taxation, the essence of these concepts is a regard for equity, justice in the levy of tax, and the avoidance of discriminatory or arbitrary procedures.

The very complexities of our tax laws are testimony both to the validity and virility of these concepts, and recognition of a fact which economists, and I may add many lawyers and accountants, are prone to overlook, namely, that the administration of tax, as well as other phases of government, must be had with a high sensitivity to questions of equity. I, for one, do not look upon the complexities of our tax laws as evidence of bureaucratic incompetence and bungling nor as the result of the influence of privileged classes or the pressure of special interests upon our lawmakers. While it is conceded that a great deal is required in the way of simplification of the act and clarification of the regulations and better drafting of the statutes, the essential fact to be made clear is that these complexities are the result of the earnest efforts of our lawmakers and tax administration to provide for essential equity in the administration of a tax, to assure that the individual taxpayer is taxed not only in accordance with public policy and public necessities but in relation to his relative ability to pay and with reference to the special circumstances of his individual case. This is the view which, I submit, must be held both by the tax administration and by the taxpayer.

The relief section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code is undoubtedly the outstanding example illustrative both of the complexity of the tax determination process and of the sound underlying public policy of equity in taxation. Students of the history and experience of excess profits taxation, both here and abroad, and those who have followed the evolution of the excess profits tax in this country agree that the present statute, for all its apparent complexity, represents a great advance over the 1917 and 1918 acts, and is superior to the British and Canadian statutes, while the relief section 722 constitutes an earnest attempt to alleviate any inequity or discrimination which the act would, but for this section, impose.

The economic necessity for the tax is the need for financing the war with as little resort as possible to the inflationary process of borrowing; the political philosophy of the act is to obtain the needed funds with as little impairment as possible of the essential productive processes of the country; the moral necessity of section 722 is to achieve these objects without discriminatory or arbitrary treatment of taxpayers, and to levy the burden of war as equitably as possible among taxpayers. Certainly it is folly to wage a war to destroy tyranny abroad and root out systems of government that give in the scheme of things sole importance to the state and none to individuals and individual rights, and in the process to destroy at home those very fundamentals upon which a society of free men rests, namely, equity and justice before the law.

There is, it is charged, a disposition on the part of the tax administration to overlook these concepts of public policy written into the statute, and to attempt to reduce the administration of the tax to a formula, such as a set of tables of comparatives. It is, we must realize, a tremendous burden to process the thirty-thousand-odd applications filed under section 722 of the code, not to mention the multitude of tax returns and claims for tax equity. There is a great public outcry against bureaucratic red tape and complicated forms and the like. And there is also a public suspicion of large so-called tax refunds—I say so-called tax refunds since a refund is not a refund tax, but more correctly a repayment of money improperly paid or levied as tax. For these and other reasons the tendency may appear to regard the relief provisions of the excess-profits tax with distrust, and taxpayers who make application for relief under such provisions, with suspicion—in other words, a fear lest section 722 become what is called a gravy train or a Treasury raid. This fear may perhaps be discerned in the regulations and memoranda which have been issued, as well as in the attitude of the examining agents toward section 722 applications.

On the other hand, the fear may equally be expressed that taxpayers do not appreciate the sound values of public policy written into these provisions, and fail to do their part to conserve them, and that this failure may lead to an increase of public distrust and suspicion of the tax levying process, and a demand for more rigid formulae.

If taxpayers are to preserve the great benefits of a tax policy directed to the cure of inequities in a general provision, and maintain public respect of tax agencies, they must likewise approach the problems posed in the excess-profits tax with a sense of their own public responsibilities and trusteeship. They have excellent opportunities to do so. The act sets forth a formula for the computation of the excess-profits tax, but it also provides, in section 722, that where such formula results in an excessive or discriminatory tax, the taxpayer may make application for an adjusted determination. In such applications, the taxpayer is required to show what is, in essence, a fair and just amount of tax. In the 1917 and 1918 acts, the taxpayer had no such privilege. The determination was made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Taxpayers today, therefore, share, as never before, in the tax-administration process. And sharing, they accept certain responsibilities. Applications for relief should therefore be filed in good faith. Claims made should be properly substantiated by a showing of such economic evidence as is available persuasive to a reasonable mind.

Turning now to certain specific aspects of section 722, since it is obviously impossible in the time available to go into a comprehensive discussion of the section, I would like to draw attention to one or two portions of the section which should receive corrective attention either through legislation or regulation.

The first of these is the provision of section 722 of the act prohibiting, with certain exceptions, reference to events or conditions occurring or existing after December 31, 1939. The excess-profits tax, to repeat what you already know, is a confiscatory tax levied upon all earnings in excess of normal earnings, which normal earnings are determined either by reference to a percentage of the average invested capital as defined by the act or the average earnings of the taxpayer for a 4-year base period, roughly the years 1936 through 1939. In the case of most taxpayers the average-earnings method is applicable.

The purpose of section 722 is to afford relief in those cases in which the excess-profits tax computed by the statutory formula results in an excessive and discriminatory tax. In making application for relief, the taxpayer must establish that the tax as computed results in an excessive and discriminatory tax and must also establish, in lieu of the normal earnings as computed by the formula, what would be in the circumstances a fair and just amount representing normal earnings.

Now, it is obvious that in the case of any business, what are normal earnings is something highly conceptual, and that in order to bring this out of the realm of guesswork and theorizing, and to arrive at a figure which may be said to represent normal earnings, all the circumstances that would have any bearing, or shed any light, or offer any guide, should be considered and weighed. This is particularly true in the case of taxpayers who started in business, or made changes in management, capacities, or character of business, during the base-period years. The section, however, prohibits the taxpayer, in presenting such showing, from considering events or conditions affecting the taxpayer, the industry of which it is a member or taxpayers generally occurring or existing after December 31, 1939. Some exceptions are allowed to this rule. The theory behind this prohibition is that all events subsequent to December 31, 1939, are to be regarded as abnormal, affected by war economy, and in consequence defective as a measure of normal earnings.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue takes a strict view toward this prohibition, and no quarrel can properly be taken with the Bureau's attitude since it is plainly written in the statute. The error of many taxpayers, it may be stated, has been to introduce into their relief applications data and statistics derived from business operations subsequent to the date line. "Peeping beyond the curtain" is the phrase that has grown up to characterize the use of post-1939 data.

The problem is especially complicated because of the 2-year push-back provision. This provision, as you know, allows the taxpayer, in presenting his determination, to consider what level of earnings the business would have reached had the changes in the character of the business—which have invalidated the statutory formula as a measure of normal earnings—had the changes been made 2 years earlier than they actually were.

The problem here becomes one of determining, say in the case of a business that brought out a new product in 1939, what level of earnings would have been reached had the product been introduced in 1937. But in doing so the taxpayer is prohibited from any use of sales or earnings data subsequent to December 31, 1939. Especially difficult is the case of a manufacturer who introduced a completely new article, for which no previous market existed. Thousands of such articles, patented articles often, new to the public, for which an instantaneous market may exist, or for which markets have to be developed slowly, are constantly being introduced. Many of these products fall in industries which experienced little or no stimulation from the war until well after 2 years beyond the close of the base period.

Yet in all these cases, the taxpayer is precluded from any reference to data for periods after December 31, 1939.

From the standpoint of the economist, the prohibition is not an insuperable obstacle to the determination of normal earnings As a task in applied economics, it is frequently simpler to operate in the actual statistical climate of the base period than in the statistical climate of the war period, to project a determination of the effect of business changes upon the base of pre-1940 events than it is to attempt to separate from post-1939 data the effects of the war and the normal effects of business changes. Certain procedures are available to the economist by which reasonable and, in many cases, adequate answers can be given to the questions—procedures that have long been in use in practical business affairs in estimating the probable results of a course of action, the reasonable expectancy of return investment, and the like.

Nevertheless, from the standpoint of equity, the prohibition against use of post-1939 data appears to be onerous and in many cases discriminatory. The framers of the section should, I suggest, be more familiar with that admirable treatise on the law of evidence by Wigmore. In equity, no fact possessing authentic evidentiary value should be excluded from the record and to rule out arbitrarily certain classes of evidence is to usurp by legislation what is essentially a judicial function. It should rest with the judicial agencies of the bureau and with The Tax Court, following established principles of evidence, to determine what is and what is not admissible evidence bearing upon the determination of normal earnings in the case of a particular taxpayer.

Not only, however, does this provision appear incorrect and inequitable in principle but because of the exceptions, the application of the provision is full of confusion which is only heightened by the relative regulations. Regulations 112, paragraph 30.722-3 (d) state:

"Events * * * occurring after December 31, 1939, may not be taken into account in determining the constructive average base period net income of the taxpayer which during the base period has * * * changed the character of its business."

Section 722 allows an exception, however. After providing that no regard shall be had to events occurring after December 31, 1939, section 722 (a) adds:

"Except that, in the cases described in the last sentence of section 722 (b) (4) * * *, regard shall be had to the change in character of the business under section 722 (b) (4) * * * to the extent necessary to establish the normal earnings to be used as the constructive average base period net income."

The Regulations, at paragraph 30,722-3 (d) (5), discussing a change in the character of the business deemed to exist on December 31, 1939, that is, cases of changes made after December 31, 1939, as a result of commitments made prior to January 1, 1940, state:

"To the extent necessary to determine the nature of the change in capacity for production or operation, and the extent to which such change has been reflected in the taxpayer's business, regard may be had to facts existing after December 31, 1939. Although no regard shall be had to actual earnings after December 31, 1939, as indicative of the amount of normal earnings attributable to the change, ratios existing between such earnings and earnings from other operations of the taxpayer or of similar taxpayers or an industry of which the taxpayer is a member may be taken into account."

Now, the effect of this is somewhat paradoxical, from the viewpoint of evidence. If a change has been consummated on December 31, 1939, no regard may be had to any data, statistical or otherwise, that dates later than December 31, 1939; but if the change has been consummated on January 1, 1940, or thereafter, a large area of statistical and other data is opened for examination. This appears to give an advantage to those businesses which were fortunate enough not to have consummated changes until after the base period. The cure to this inconsistency is to concede that no data or evidence should be excluded from the record that offers valid indications as to the normal earnings level of a business entitled to relief. Such broadening of the provision would in no way impair the general principle laid down, that the normal earnings level attributable to business changes shall be determined on the assumption of the normality of the base period as an index of normal earnings.

A further aspect of the excess-profits tax which would seem to require legislative correction relates to cases of taxpayers whose businesses were expanding or in the process of change when the war broke out. Two provisions are applicable to such taxpayers. The first is the growth formula of section 713 (f). Section 713 (f) was designed to offer an alternative computation of the excess-profits tax credit in the case of taxpayers whose earnings were expanding, and which in the latter half of the base period exceeded those of the first half. Under this provision, however, the maximum excess-profits tax credit allowable may not exceed that based upon the highest actual net income attained in any year of the base period; that is, the highest earnings attained in the years 1936 through 1939.

The second provision relating to expanding businesses is the relief section 722. Under this section it is provided that where changes have been made in the character of a business such as to qualify the taxpayer for relief under this section, the constructive earnings may be determined by an assumption that the changes were made 2 years before they actually occurred. In the case of the growing business, the effect of this provision is to allow a 2-year projection of normal earnings computed with reference to the effect of the particular changes made.

The purpose of the act is to tax war profits, or excess profits, at one rate and normal profits at another rate. It is obvious that, in the case of a growing or expanding business, normal profits in 1944 would not coincide with normal profits in 1942 or 1939 In the case of many products new in the market, a longer than 2-year period is necessary in order to establish the product on the market at a normal earning level. In many instances the cumulative effects resulting from the introduction of a new product, or of changes in management, or sales methods, and the like, do not manifest themselves in earnings until some years later.

It is a well-known principle of financial management that when an enterprise embarks upon the marketing of a new product or service, or makes large capital investments in the expansion of facilities in anticipation of the development of new markets, financial reserves should be available to meet a possible series of deficits before earnings can be established. The principal cause of business failures in this country, as is well known, is lack of working capital and this lack is especially apparent in the case of businesses embarking in new fields of enterprise. The 2-year limitation upon a consideration of the effects of a given change in the business seems to be unduly restrictive in the determination of a normal earning level for a particular taxpayer qualifying under this provision of the relief section.

Moreover, let us consider the case of a taxpayer that has started a new business during the base period, say a chemical process of cleaning steam boiler tubes. The present method of cleaning boiler tubes is mechanical: that of pushing a vibrator through the tubes which knocks off the scales. This mechanical method takes as long as 2 weeks in the case of a large steam-generating plant, requires the removal of thousands of boiler-tube heads, and is sometimes dangerous to life and limb. The chemical cleanser does the same work in a day, at much less expense, and avoids the loss of idle boiler time. The market for the cleanser is limited only by the number of steam-boiler installations. It may reasonably be expected that within a few years the method will completely supplant the old method.

Now, the development of the normal market for this process is retarded by the war, because of the diversion of chemicals to war uses, and the inability to organize the technical and sales personnel necessary to place the product on the market. Nevertheless, its sales, despite these difficulties, continue to expand. Under normal peacetime conditions, an equal, if not greater, expansion would be a reasonable assumption. Under such assumption, that is, had there been no war and no war economy, sales would have grown during the years 1939 through 1943 in the order, say, of 50, 100, 150, 200, 250.

Yet, because of the limitation of the 2-year prohibition, we must chop off this projection of growth at 150.

Let us assume that because of the large installations of marine boilers the business of the company actually did grow in the following order: 50, 100, 200, 300, 400, but this growth has not occurred in its normal market area of steam generators. We concede, for purposes of illustration, that at the end of the fourth year the earnings are in excess of what would have normally been realized, by 400 over 250. But because of the limitation of the 2-year provision, all earnings above 150 are taxable at the steep excess-profits rates. The effect is to tax at the confiscatory excess-profits rate earnings that would normally be taxable at the normal tax rate. The net result, of course, is to add to the retardation of the normal expansion of the business, resulting from the company's inability to develop its normal market, the further retardation caused by taking away profits which under normal conditions would have been available for market development, and which should be available for post-war market development.

It is a reasonable view, therefore, that in the determination of the normal level of earnings, for excess-profits tax, recognition should be had to the normal dynamics of business, and that the normal earnings of a particular taxpayer be determined with reference to what would have been normal for that taxpayer in the taxable year, under conditions prevailing during a period of normal economy.

Now may I refer for a moment to the interpretation of one vexatious provision of the section, that is, the manner of reconstructing constructive average base period net income in the case of taxpayers which have made changes in the character of the business, and to which the 2-year push-back provision is

applicable. I have discussed this in some detail in an article in the September 1944, issue of the Temple Law Quarterly, and I will here only outline the problem.

Let me state the problem by illustration. Let us assume that a taxpayer has earnings during the base period of the following order: 10, 10, 10, and 15. In 1938 new management had been installed as a result of which the earnings rose from 10 to 15. Let us assume that under normal operations the earnings in the next 2 years would have been 20 and 25. Now, I have seen it stated in several places that the constructive average base period net income is to be determined simply by pushing back this series of earnings with results as follows: 10, 15, 20, and 25, with a resultant average of 17.50.

I do not see how this procedure can be justified under a plain reading of the act and the regulations. The act refers to the "earnings level which it (the business) would have reached" if the taxpayer had made the change 2 years earlier. Now 17.50 does not represent an earnings level attained as a result of the change, which we have assumed to be 25. Furthermore, the regulations, paragraph 30.722–3 (d) state:

"If the business of the taxpayer is considered to have been commenced or changed in character 2 years prior to such event, normal earnings for the entire base period shall be based upon the level of normal operations, and upon the character, nature, and size of the business which would have been developed by the end of the base period if the business had been commenced or changed at such earlier date."

The remaining question is that of adjusting this level of normal earnings, that is, 25, to the relative levels which would have been attained in the several years of the base period under the general business conditions prevailing in those years.

One further comment which I would like to make relates to the administration of the section. Under the code, the determination of the adjusted tax or the amount of relief rests with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, from whose findings appeal may be had to the Tax Court, but to no other court. Now, since the commissioner's determinations are subject to appeal, such determinations should rest upon facts that can be placed in the record.

There is an observable tendency upon the part of the bureau to make determinations of the normal earnings of an applicant taxpayer by reference to a set of comparatives, following the procedures of the 1917 and 1918 acts. In the bureau files are business records of a host of taxpayers, which records are not available to the applicant taxpayer. The bureau draws out of these records a list of taxpayers which it regards as comparable in character to the applicant taxpayer, averages their earnings, and announces this to the applicant as the amount it will allow. Now, comparatives, as anyone who has worked in this field knows, are quite tricky. Comparability must rest upon a variety of factors, including not only size and earnings ratios, but comparability of management, product, operating methods, and the like. Two farmers growing wheat, a standard product on adjoining fields, may be completely incomparable as relates to their normal earnings.

If the taxpayer asks to examine the comparatives used, he is told, and correctly, that the data are confidential and cannot be revealed. Possibly, if the taxpayer takes the case to the Tax Court, the bureau may have to disclose, for the record, the bases of its determination, and this would be awkward, for the data are still confidential under law. In such cases, probably, the bureau would be compelled to shift its ground of defense.

But the great majority of taxpayers are reluctant to fight a case so far. Many taxpayers, those having small claims, are deterred from seeking such equity by the expenses of litigation. Now, justice should be cheap, not expensive. A great many people, and I am among them, believe that the economic salvation of this country rests upon the restoration of a balance between big business and small business, and departments of this Government are engaged today in consideration of ways and means of stimulating and preserving the small business interests of this country. The one Government agency, however, that touches all businesses, great and small, is the tax administration. It is highly desirable therefore that in this field every effort should be made to assure the small taxpayer the same opportunities for equitable adjustment of excess-profits tax as are enjoyed by the largest taxpayer.

I have in mind a small manufacturer in the Middle West. He had started in business during the base period and had not reached his normal level of operations by the end of 1939. He had an unusual product in his field. The taxpayer sought relief. The amount was small. The field office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue made an examination of its files, found a list of manufacturers which it regarded as comparable, and announced a figure. The attorney handling the case wrote me as follows:

"The Government, of course, has access to the records of earnings of comparable companies and we do not, and have so far been unsuccessful in obtaining such data. The Government is unwilling to disclose to us the names of the companies on the operations of which its figures are based and we do not believe that the companies really are comparable, either because they do not make the same type of product or because their volume is probably less if they are engaged in the same type of business."

He goes on to say:

"I realize that there is a possibility that we may be able to subpena records of other companies but the client is desirous of avoiding litigation. We have now come to the conclusion that the chances of obtaining any information from any comparable competitors is so remote that we have concluded to settle the case."

I have in mind also the recent Bureau release giving a list of 34 industries as to which it has made a tentative determination that such industries were not depressed in the base period. I made request of the Bureau for the data or information, or a summary thereof, upon which such tentative determination was made with respect to a certain industry. The reply which I received to this request stated: "It is not feasible to make available to the public particular data or other information which were considered in making the tentative determination for a specified industrial group."

Now, in the mimeograph, the Bureau, specifically admitted the tentative and inconclusive character of these determinations, and even without this disclaimer any tyro in economics could point out numerous particulars in which the determination is defective.

Now, may I ask what purpose is served first, by issuing the release, and second, by refusing to disclose the bases upon which these tentative determinations were made? The only answer I can see is to deter taxpayers from submitting applications for relief. But what taxpayers will be so deterred? Certainly not the large taxpayers able to engage statisticians to test the determinations. It will be the small taxpayers, with only minor claims for adjustment. The total sums claimed by these small taxpayers can under no hypothesis amount to a Treasury raid. But the processing of such small claims is of course burdensome administratively, and presumably it is in the Bureau's interest to limit its work as much as possible. I fail, however, to see good grounds in the general public interest in what actually amounts to discrimination against the small taxpayer.

Such a policy, of discouraging the little fellow from seeking equity, and, if he dares apply, of treating him arbitrarily, of announcing a determination, but declining to disclose the basis of fact upon which such determination is made, is the essence of bureaucratic tyranny, and governmental dictatorship, repugnant not only to the principle of the excess-profits tax, as laid down by Congress, but contrary to the whole spirit of our institutions, our American concepts of equity and fair dealing, and the well-founded procedures of our administrative and judicial processes.

A question and answer period followed Dr. Groseclose's address. Mr. Stradley announced that next week's speaker would be Edward N. Polisher, member of the Philadelphia bar, author of Estate Planning and Estate Tax Saving, lecturer, and member of the faculty at Dickinson Law School. The subject of Mr. Polisher's address will be Family Partnership Under the Income Tax Law.

The C. E. D. on Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the New York Times issue of Sunday, March 25, 1945, on the statement issued by the Committee for Economic Development on the Bretton Woods proposals:

THE C. E. D. ON BRETTON WOODS

The research committee of the group of outstanding businessmen known as the Committee for Economic Development has published a statement on the Bretton Woods proposals. This statement reads like a compromise arrived at in order to obtain agreement from all 14 members of the committee. As often happens with such compromises, the position taken lacks clarity and embodies some inner contradictions.

The committee fears, quite properly, that as the agreements stand at present the principal demands upon the international monetary fund will come, not from temporary imbalances of trade, but from the very serious distortions in production and international trade relations caused by the war. It fears that great pressure will be put upon the management of the fund to make what will be in effect long-term loans, to do it whether these loans are likely to be repaid or not, and to do it without having the power even to lay down the conditions under which the loans are made. It suggests, therefore, that establishment of the fund be postponed unless the international bank is given the express power, which it does not have at present, to make loans for long-term and short-term stabilization purposes. If the bank were granted the power, the committee argues, the managers of the fund would be relieved of this pressure, because they could then refer to the bank those transactions for which the fund is not intended, and the bank would be able to require a country to correct unsound policies in return for the loan.

The committee is right in wishing to give the bank this power to make stabilization loans. The American Bankers Association also made this recommendation. But the A. B. A. report, as well as that of the New York State Bankers Association, pointed out that if the proposed international bank were granted this power, the fund would then become unnecessary. It is difficult to understand why the C. E. D. committee recommends retaining the fund, particularly as it is now drawn up, once the international bank has been granted this new power. There would be no important function left for the fund to perform, and it is not drawn up to perform its proposed functions well.

The first requirement of any International monetary fund, if it is to be adopted, is that it should be drawn up on the same basic principle as the proposed International Bank. The managers of the fund should retain the right of discretion at all times. They should be able to insist, whenever they think it necessary, that a nation having access to the resources of the fund should put and keep its own financial house in order—that it should, for example, refrain from discriminatory trade practices, or the imposition of unreasonable barriers on trade, that it stop an inflationary expansion of bank credit or the printing of paper money, or take steps to balance its budget. Unless the fund has the clear authority to insist upon such conditions in return for its loans, its resources will be dissipated to no purpose or to harmful purposes, and it will never accomplish the objects that its advocates hope for from it.

The C. E. D. committee itself lays it down as one of five basic principles that "loans should be truly loans; currency transactions should be currency transactions; and gifts should be gifts. Lack of clarity as between intent and method at this point will produce * * * misunderstanding and bitterness between countries. If a gift cannot be made as a gift, it should not mask behind the facade of a loan." On this principle alone the fund as it is at present drawn is unsatisfactory. But if the proposed International Bank is granted the power to make discretionary long-term or short-term stabilization loans, as the C. E. D. committee recommends, the fund will not be necessary.

A Tribute to Hon. Robert F. Jones, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad under a privilege to extend my remarks to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper item taken from the Cincinnati Enquirer and written by Charles M. Dean, one of Ohio's most respected newspapermen:

APPROPRIATIONS SLICED BY OHIOAN IN HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POINT OF ORDER RULE—LIMA REPRESENTATIVE SAYS PRESENT GOVERNMENT GROWS LIKE TOPSY

(By Charles M. Dean)

WASHINGTON.—Amid the debate that raged on Capitol Hill concerning manpower, nurses' draft, and the meat and food situation, the House of Representatives worked on the $259,000,000 appropriation bill for Commerce, State, and Justice Departments. It was evident the cost of government was going up all through the procedure. The appropriation for these departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, is $37,356,808 higher than it was for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1945.

In the House Appropriations Committee, which consists of 25 Democrats and 18 Republicans, various appropriation bills are divided among subcommittees. Representative ROBERT F. JONES, Lima, Ohio, is a member of the subcommittee which considered the current bill. JONES is a Republican and the Republicans have not enough votes to reduce appropriations by amendments. But the Ohioan resorted to a new form of attack. By raising points of order which contended that appropriations were being made in violation of existing laws, he was able to knock several million dollars off the bill. His points of order also eliminated a number of provisions for the transfer of funds because this required legislation in an appropriation bill which House rules do not permit.

JONES and a number of other Congressmen who enlisted in his cause also staged what they called a "keep 'em honest" campaign by eliminating indefinite appropriations and requiring department heads to proceed under the statute which requires receiving bids in making certain purchases. The Ohioan was well satisfied with his work even though he failed to send the bill back to the committee. Certain of the appropriations knocked out may be put back in the Senate, but JONES is convinced that all those who watched the record agreed with his statement that the Government "grows like topsy."

One of the many things that makes it difficult to fight an appropriation bill is that the testimony heard on the appropriation is received in executive sessions of the subcommittee. This testimony in printed form is released when the bill reaches the floor of the House. It is very interesting reading, but it is not likely that any Congressmen read all of the 1,170 pages in four pamphlets of closely-printed matter. Even the printed records of the hearings do not tell the full story in war times, as one frequently comes to a line "off the record." Many Members of Congress agree if there was time to study the record of the appropriation hearings the cost of government might be reduced.

All through the record it is apparent that JONES's contention that the Government "grows like Topsy" is correct. For instance, in the State Department hearings, Representative KARL STEFAN, Nebraska, brought out the fact that in 1933 the department required an appropriation of $16,000,000. The current appropriation for this Department is $78,000,000. In the office of the Secretary there were 858 employees in 1932. Today there are 4,141. In the Foreign Service that year there were only 3,991 persons. Now there are 6,277.

The committee went into a great deal of detail. Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State for Public and Cultural Relations, was asked for a complete report on his policy. MacLeish told the committee that cultural cooperation was a most important feature of his work. He said the investment in this work is one that will pay great dividends. "The Germans learned long ago that trade follows the book," he said. "The Germans provided textbooks, the technical and scientific books for all of Europe, and the result was that all Europe bought its laboratory, scientific apparatus, and machinery in Germany."

MacLeish said we have a "golden opportunity" now in the liberated areas of Europe. These people, he said, need the things that we are able to export to them. "We have the printed matter," he said, "the scientific materials, the laboratory materials to help them help themselves." He promised that if we do help them it will increase good will, promote understanding between nations, and produce an increase in trade.

The committee even went into an item of $10,000 needed as traveling expenses for lecturers. The State Department produced biographies of 27 persons who have traveled throughout this country to talk on Dumbarton Oaks. In this list was Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, with most of his activities since he was born September 20, 1897.

Incidentally, Charles P. Taft was one of the State Department witnesses. He needed $45,500 for the President's War Relief Control Board. He was greeted in much the same manner as he had greeted other officials when a member of the finance committee of the Cincinnati Council. "I notice that you have an increase of $730," the chairman said. But Taft, like many others, did not think it was an increase. The difference was in the matter of paying overtime, he indicated. Nevertheless, Taft produced 10 pages of testimony. Taft received a compliment few others received. Representative JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina, Democrat, dismissed him with thanks and said: "We are deeply impressed with the fine work you and your board are doing." The relief board is only a small part of Taft's assignment in the State Department.

In his addresses on the floor, Congressman JONES' principal criticism of the State Department was concerned with its expenditures in South America for pamphlets and magazines.

The best JONES and his aides could do on the State Department budget was to eliminate certain transfers and require the receiving of bids and reduce the appropriation by $1,466,000 desired for improvement of embassies, legations, and consulates in the Far East. All of this was done by point of order. The point of order on the building plan was that an existing law limits such expenditures to $1,000,000 a year. As a result, there will be a drive in the Senate to put the $1,000,000 back, but JONES' fight prevented, certainly, the expenditure of $466,000.

Another item attacked by JONES in the bill was a $3,000,000 increase in the appropriation for "sample census." The sample census which Congressmen call a Gallup poll census is to be taken annually at a cost of $4,500,000. The Census Bureau insists the annual sample census is needed and they won the battle for the appropriation.

JONES waged a war against Francis Biddle, Attorney General, during the debate. Treatment of Mrs. Earl Browder by the Department came in for special criticism. JONES suggests that all Members of Congress read the testimony concerning the Criminal and Claims Division of the Justice Department and he quoted the Comptroller General as having said the Government stands to lose $50,000,000,000 because of waste, mismanagement, and fraud in the war effort.

JONES demanded that all the appropriations but one be reduced to last year's figures. The exception was the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The committee raised the F. B. I. appropriation after testimony by J. Edgar Hoover to the effect that estimates were made on the supposition that the war in Germany would be over by June 1. Thus expenditures in the original estimate were limited to a one-front war.

JONES' charges concerning laxity in handling war-fraud cases and that the State Department is planning to extend to the entire world our cultural relations with Latin-American countries may have their effect in other bills, but the Ohio Congressman was unable, fighting hard for a week, to prevent the topsy-like growth of the Federal departments, and the taxpayers will have to continue to pay the bills.

Where Is the Money Coming From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Where Is the Money Coming From? delivered by me on March 25, and broadcast from radio station WIBW.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, it was a little more or a little less than 5 years ago—I have forgotten exactly which—that the people of the United States were advised officially to "forget the silly old fool dollar sign." During the months of World War No. 2 that have followed, the United States has done just that thing. Under the war emergency, and the decision by this Nation to put everything into the war, we have cast aside every other consideration except winning the war. And that has been proper.

But now we are beginning to be reminded of that dollar sign again. The House has passed, and the Senate will pass—perhaps before this discussion goes out over the air waves by electrical transcription over WIBW and the Kansas network—a bill increasing the statutory debt limit to $300,000,000,000. That is pretty close to the assessed valuation of all the tangible property in the United States. It amounts to a debt of $10,000 each on 30,000,000 families in this Nation. It will require $6,000,000,000 a year in taxes to pay the interest alone.

It has been very easy to forget the "silly old fool dollar sign," to quote the words of President Roosevelt, while we have been borrowing and spending these dollars in billion dollar chunks. But we are going to be reminded of that same dollar sign pretty regularly from now on. Those working for salaries and wages will be reminded every pay day, as nearly one-fifth of the pay check is deducted to take care of the income tax. And the rest of the taxpayers will be reminded at least four times a year, as they meet quarterly income-tax payments.

In connection with the increase in the national debt limitation to $300,000,000,000 (and next year it will have to be raised again; if Japan has to be finally conquered in China it may go to $350,000,000,000 or even $400,000,000,000) Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, gave the House some interesting figures. But not conducive to the idea that we can keep on forever forgetting the "silly old fool dollar sign." For example, Veterans' Administration costs for the present fiscal year ending next June 30 will be one and one-half billion dollars plus. The next fiscal year it will be two and three-quarters billion dollars. And for the fiscal year 1947 more than $4,000,000,000; is likely to rise steadily thereafter. That means more than $10,000,000,000 for Veterans' Administration and interest on the public debt in the fiscal year 1947.

War expenditures for the next fiscal year—assuming that the German war ends this summer—will be more than $70,000,000,000. And probably will continue at about that figure until the Japanese war ends. That might possibly be in 1946, possibly in 1947, perhaps 1948, or even later. For the immediate post-war years, Chairman DOUGHTON summarizes the probabilities as follows, and I am quoting Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, a North Carolina Democrat:

"During the first post-war years we probably shall still have large forces of occupation overseas," predicts Chairman DOUGHTON. "War expenditures may amount to something like ten to fifteen billion dollars. Interest on the national debt, six billion to seven billion dollars; veterans—under existing legislation—three to four billion dollars; aids to agriculture, under mandatory price supports and other programs, one and one-half to two billion dollars; social security—under present program—one-half billion dollars; public works, one to one and one-half billion dollars; government, general, one and one-half billion dollars.

"Total expenditures, during the immediate post-war period may therefore amount to from thirty to thirty-five billion dollars," in the opinion of Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee. "When we can withdraw most of our forces of occupation, war expenditures, I hope, can further decline between five and ten billion dollars annually. By that time I think that a total Budget of perhaps $25,000,000,000 can be expected."

Personally I am inclined to believe that Chairman DOUGHTON is on the optimistic side. He makes no allowance for the planners' program of lending five billions or so abroad annually to bolster up world economy and promote world trade. He makes no allowances for larger veterans' benefits, for unemployment and public works programs calling for more billions a year. I hope that his estimate is close to the market, but I fear the Federal Budget will be closer to thirty billions for years to come.

Another measure having to do with dollars is on its way through Congress. This is the bill to authorize the use of close to $6,000,000,000 of United States funds to start the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These are the two institutions proposed in the so-called Bretton Woods agreement, made last year by representatives of 44 nations meeting at Bretton Woods, N. H.

Then we have a number of programs for increasing Government expenditures at home, on a scale never dreamed of until recent years—bills for every conceivable purpose, calling for additional billions of dollars annually to insure full employment, more unemployment compensation, more services to the individual by and from the Federal Government, Federal aid for education at a cost ultimately of at least a billion dollars a year.

Nearly all of these proposals have attractive and worthy objectives. The objectives of Bretton Woods no one can quarrel with. And similarly with many other proposals for increasing Government expenditures. Just the same I propose to, and I think the people of the country who in the long run will be required to foot the bills should, scrutinize the means and methods and costs involved in these proposals. The mere fact that a desirable objective is stated in the preliminary language in a bill authorizing or appropriating billions or tens of billions of dollars should not blind us to the other fact that these billions have to be paid in as well as paid out.

I am well aware that it is unpopular, especially in official government circles, for anyone to suggest caution in expending Government funds, or to suggest a consideration of ways and means to meet future obligations when it is suggested that this group, and that group—ultimately everyone—get a living from the Treasury of the United States.

And especially it is unpopular to suggest that there may also be a limit to what the United States can do in the way of carrying the burdens of the rest of the world, in addition to providing everything for everybody here at home. After all, my friends, there are some 2,000,000,000 of people in the world, and there are only some 140,000,000 of us. Neither our manpower, our resources, nor our economic system utilizing men and resources, is limitless. We have been discovering this in the past few months. Our armed forces need more young men of military age than apparently we are going to be also to furnish without crippling our food production, our war plants, our transportation system, and necessary services.

In the past few weeks we have been warned of food shortages, made necessary by the tasks we have undertaken. Not that we are really in danger of famine in this country, even a meat famine. But just the same, the discovery so suddenly made that we have made commitments to provide more food than perhaps we can deliver, is a warning to America and Americans that there are limits to what we can do.

One reason I am saying this to you this afternoon, my friends, is because there are what might be termed "flying squadrons" covering our entire Nation these days, pointing out a number of objectives that certainly sound desirable, that it is easy to find a lot words to prove are necessary as well as desirable.

And I know also that when anyone raises the question, "How are we going to do this?" someone promptly demands to know, "Are you opposed to this desirable and admittedly necessary objective?"

I say that when you are asked, or I am asked, or the American people are asked, to make a commitment to do something, or get something, or give something that seems desirable, or even can be argued to be necessary, you or I or the American people should be entitled to know how we are going to do it, as well as told what it is we are going to do, and I do not consider it out of order at times even to ask "How much is it going to cost?"

Just look where we have arrived because I happened to think of calling attention to the bill to increase the statutory debt limit to $300,000,000,000.

Now there are some folks who are not in the least afraid of a $300,000,000,000 national debt. In fact some of them even want it to go higher—the higher the national debt figures, the greater the basis of our national credit, these maintain, and add, knowingly, after all, we just owe it to ourselves.

On the supposition that we will have an annual income of $150,000,000,000 after the war, there are those who point out that a $300,000,000,000 debt is only twice the size of the national income. Then they further point out that Great Britain's public debt is not just two times Britain's national income but is two and one-half times the national income.

Well, my friends, if you could hear the arguments and pleas that are being made to us here in Congress that we must take care in the post-war world to see that Britain has shipping, and planes, and opportunities to increase her foreign trade—that unless all these international arrangements we are formulating and getting ready to put into effect take into account the plight of Britain in the post-war world—

I say if you listened to the continuous stream of arguments along this line you might get the idea that the British people do not regard a public debt two and one-half times the national income as being without its drawbacks.

My position on programs for the post-war world, domestic and international, is simply this: America must, and will do everything reasonably possible to promote world peace and prosperity. Also to better the conditions of our own people and all peoples. But I also maintain that before making commitments to do or to give, we certainly should investigate how we are going to meet

the commitment, what we are going to meet it with, how we are going to say these billions, as well as be informed how desirable it is we make the commitment.

Poles Vow Support of Exile Government—London Group Is Neither Landlord Nor Fascist, Miss Cardwell Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell, that appeared in the Detroit News of March 25, 1945:

POLES VOW SUPPORT OF EXILE GOVERNMENT—LONDON GROUP IS NEITHER LANDLORD NOR FASCIST, MISS CARDWELL ASSERTS

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

Despite Moscow's attitude toward the constitutional Polish Government, Premier Mikolajczyk did not despair of achieving Polish-Soviet cooperation. Yielding to British pressure, he twice visited Moscow in 1944 even though he knew that Stalin disapproved such steps. Soviet recognition of the Lublin Committee of Liberation, agreement with that committee on administration of Polish territory taken from the Germans, editorial comment at the time of Mikolajczyk's arrival that he had come too late and that only Poles agreeing with the Lublin committee would participate in the future Polish Government—all this showed the Soviet attitude.

Lublin committee representatives, arriving August 5, were received with all honors due high foreign officials—Mikolajczyk's party, arriving July 30, had not been—and housed in the Polish Embassy Building.

In a conference with Stalin, previous to their arrival, Mikolajczyk, acting contrary to instructions from his Government, had agreed to meet these men. As hosts they received him at the Polish Embassy, informing him that he was received not as Premier of Poland but as head of the Polish Peasant Party.

Thus Stalin cleverly gave the Polish-Soviet problem the appearance of a Polish factional quarrel.

NEGOTIATIONS STYMIED

By immediately demanding abrogation of the Polish Constitution, on which the legality of Mikolajczyk's premiership depended, the Lublin group made negotiations impossible, and having played their Kremlin-instructed part, attended with all honors left Moscow August 9. Mikolajczyk left the day after, with only humiliation for his pains, although the heroic Soviet-instigated Warsaw uprising, for which he had begged help, was at its height.

Yet when in October Churchill, already in Moscow, summoned him thither, Mikolajczyk went. Osupka arrived the same day.

Mikolajczyk's memorandum, drafted by the Polish Government and approved by the Polish underground, provided that vital questions, except boundaries, which were to await post-war handling, might be discussed. None of these, it appears, were allowed to come up.

Mikolajczyk had been summoned for but one purpose—to get his signature on agreements to Stalin's demands, namely, the so-called Curzon line, with possible changes of a few kilometers in Poland's favor, as the boundary, and the establishment of a Polish government based on the Lublin committee and including a few Poles from outside, himself among the number.

HE COULD NOT AGREE

Obviously Mikolajczyk could not agree. Both the Polish Government and the Polish Nation would have repudiated the action, for it would have meant not only the loss of almost half of Poland but loss of independence as well.

Churchill, in an hour's conversation, brutally pressed the Polish premier to sign, not because he thought it just and right but because Stalin was threatening to cut the British Empire's Mediterranean lifeline unless he got Poland.

Mikolajczyk calmly but stubbornly refused to "sign his own and his country's death sentence" and two days later Churchill apologized for his loss of self-control and the scene he had created.

At Yalta Stalin got from Roosevelt and Churchill what could not be forced from Mikolajczyk at Moscow. Stalin conceded nothing. From the first his policy has been to accept nothing less than capitulation regarding Poland; which does not prevent his acceptance and use of democratic methods as a cover for his own procedures.

The charge that the Polish Government in exile is not representative is not a matter concerning outsiders. It is the legality of the Polish Government that concerns us, and the Polish Government is just as legal, whatever its composition—it is neither "reactionary," "fascist," nor "landlord" but socialist in character—as is our own, and more legal than Stalin's revolutionary Bolshevik government. And it is actively defended and supported by loyal Polish citizens everywhere.

ASSURANCES POUR IN

Cables and letters assuring support to Premier Arciszewski, successor to Mikolajczyk after the latter's compromise policy had failed, have poured in from Polish political and social groups and associations in Britain, France, Iran, Turkey, the Argentine, Australia, east Africa, Egypt, and from Polish Christians and Polish Jews, separately and together, in Palestine.

And from a Pole who has unparalleled opportunities for knowing what the 8,000 interned Polish soldiers in Switzerland are thinking and saying comes word that fully 90 percent of them are for the Polish Government in London.

The character of the many messages is illustrated by these two sentences from that sent by Polish miners and factory workers in a French area:

"We assure the President and the Polish Government, at the head of which stands the tried and heroic fighter for freedom and democracy, Premier Arciszewski, that we continue to follow and obey orders of the legal government of the Republic of Poland. Nobody had the right to decide the fate of the Polish people against their will, which can only be expressed in free, secret, and democratic elections."

As for the Polish Army, now numbering over 200,000, General Anders expressed its attitude in a cable to the Polish president: "In view of the recent Big Three declaration, so tragic for us, I report to you, Mr. President, that the Second Corps will not recognize the decision surrendering Poland and the Polish people as loot to the Bolsheviks. In keeping with our soldier's oath we shall continue to recognize you, Mr. President, as the one and only representative of the sovereign majesty of Poland, and the government appointed by you in London as the only legal government of the Polish State."

ARMY EDITORIAL CITED

And from an editorial in Bialy Orzel (March 4), one of the Army papers, come these passages:

"As long as the war lasts, as long as our country is at war with Germany, as long as Poland does not enjoy real independence, as long as there is an occupant on her lands making unilatera decisions in our affairs and using terror, just so long may we not weaken our effort to regain full national freedom.

"And what does full freedom mean for us? Out of our own experience we know well. No attempts at falsification or criminal misinterpretation of freedom can mislead us. The Polish State will be independent only when a constitutional Polish president assumes authority on Poland soil; when Poland is governed by a government led by that president; when its citizens are subject to laws made by themselves and not imposed upon them by foreigners; when there is neither political nor social serfdom; when a foreign secret police does not control the government; when there is no terror, violence, deportation, or forced labor; when there are no concentration camps and no persecution, and the Polish soldier who for 5½ years has been fighting for freedom is not shot or shamefully treated but is master in his own land. * * * A country to which Polish soldiers taking part in this war cannot return without endangering their lives cannot be called free."

Filipino-American Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, as the story of the progressive liberation of the Philippines unfolds new instances are brought to light of the efficiency of American-Filipino guerrilla cooperation.

The accomplishments of the guerrilla army on Mindanao under the leadership of Col. Wendell W. Fertig are examples of the employment of directed force against the Japanese enemy during 3 years of occupation. It was from a Mindanao air base—known by the Japanese, but which they were unable to capture—that American fighters covered the Zamboanga landing. American-Filipino guerrilla cooperation, both in designing and building that field, made possible the saving of hundreds of American lives and the speeding up of American ground progress in that region.

A like situation confronted the American landing force on Panay. Not only did the Filipino guerrillas, under Colonel Marcario Paralta, Jr., aid the American liberating group in the freeing of the capital city of Iloilo, but they had practically cleared the interior and the coastal zones of Japanese before the Americans landed.

While the relationship of American and Filipino fighters as brothers of the battlefield is well known in the United States, Americans have been cheered recently by reports reaching here of the Chinese branch force, composed of Chinese residents of the Philippines, who have kept up unabated warfare against the Japanese enemy since 1942 in Luzon.

The universality of integrated Filipino guerrilla resistance throughout the

Philippines has been one of the outstanding features of this campaign. This comradeship of courage will continue to be called upon until their homeland is free. They have made a contribution to the understanding between Americans and Filipinos which will long endure as a tribute to the selfless sacrifices.

The Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Manpower Bill Seen Embodying Fascism," by David Lawrence, published in today's issue of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER BILL SEEN EMBODYING FASCISM—THEORY BACK OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE NOT BEING APPLIED, WRITER SAYS

(By David Lawrence)

Fascism abroad, which is a partnership between capitalistic interests and the state, has regimented workers and forced them to work for the private profit of management. That same totalitarian doctrine has been embodied in the new manpower bill which has come from a conference committee of members of the House and Senate.

If passed, this bill means that workers in America will lose their right to quit work and that they must take jobs the Government gives them and work for designated employers.

The theory back of the much-talked-of universal service is not being applied. When a man is ordered into military service, he gets $50 a month and nobody makes any profit out of his service to his country. But now the Government, claiming it is fulfilling a war purpose, orders American workers to serve private employers who make profits. If the workers refuse they are subject to jail penalties.

FREEDOM ISSUE RAISED

This strange development has been fostered by a small group of universal service advocates who think they can spare the profit system from similar treatment. Instead they will bring the kind of controversy that should never have been permitted at this stage of the war. For the issue of freedom versus involuntary servitude is raised and, in effect, the Government is saying that the patriotic efforts of the upward of 50,000,000 men and women who have done the war production job must now be subjected to penalties and intimidation.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Democrat, of the liberal and progressive school of thought, rightly condemns the proposed legislation as regimentation such as Hitler used and Stalin promulgated to get control of the workers in Germany and Russia, respectively. Organized labor has asked the Congress to defeat the measure.

The proposed legislation is vicious in that it deprives an aggrieved citizen of any court appeal. It offers, to be sure, an administrative or interdepartmental committee to hear complaints but, under recent decisions of the courts, there would appear to be no possibility of review by the courts of decisions made by the bureaus enforcing such legislation. There is certainly no opportunity for relief within the time limits of the bill.

It is fallacious to say that if the Government can order a man into the Army, it can order him into a war plant. Such a position would be consistent if the Government managed all the war plants and there were no private profits involved. The logical sequel of the situation created by the new manpower bill would be to abolish all profits and put all governmental and nongovernmental activities under complete governmental control so that there would not be a single dollar of profit made out of the use of patriotism to force workers to stay on their jobs. Maybe organized labor will soon begin to press for such legislation.

NAZIS MAY WELL SMILE

Opponents of democracy will derive considerable satisfaction out of what is happening. Hitler and the Nazis may well smile at the spectacle of a democracy, which calls itself free, finding that it cannot organize itself on a voluntary basis to win the war but must threaten jail sentences to get the war-production job done. Hitler is losing the war, but apparently his philosophy is winning.

Will the Senate and House acquiesce as did the Reichstag in Nazi Germany and as have parliamentary bodies also at other great moments in history when the steam roller of military necessity rides roughshod over them and demands action? Or will Members of Congress stand on their rights and insist on a truly voluntary plan?

The real reason for the manpower muddle has been inefficiency in the administration, which now seeks a way out by drastic measures that will cover up its mistakes. It is tragic indeed that, as American armies are winning a great victory, this democracy is asked to adopt totalitarian methods. Fascism has always been simpler than democracy, but the American people, up to now at least, have preferred the cumbersomeness of democracy to the efficiency of fascism.

If we were losing the war by our methods it would be different, but we are winning. The administration's idea of reward evidently is to force workers to become part of a strait jacket which deprives them of the oldest right in American history—freedom to work without State-made rules of enforced work or slavery.

Polish Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from this morning's Washington Post:

POLISH SILENCE

More than 6 weeks ago President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin jointly agreed at Yalta that "the provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad." The task of supervising this reorganization was entrusted to a commission composed of Foreign Commissar Molotoff and the American and British Ambassadors at Moscow. So far, however, there is not the slightest evidence that this commission has made any progress in the direction of setting up a truly representative Polish regime.

Nor is there any evidence that the Lublin Poles are in the least receptive to the idea of broadening the base of their regime by including such personages as former Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. On the contrary, Mikolajczyk, though regarded with favor both by the British and American Governments, has been the particular object of venomous attack by the Lublinites, whose past record makes it clear that they do not lift a finger or speak a word without the approval of the Kremlin. The time has thus come to raise the question whether Russia has the slightest intention of carrying out the so-called Yalta compromise on Poland. If it has, the pronouncements and activities of its Lublin stooges certainly constitute a peculiar way of showing it.

Time is running out while the conferees are doing dothing. If nothing is done, Poland, the first nation to fight the Nazis, will be left out of the San Francisco conference. That would be a tragedy. To avert that tragedy the administration should leave nothing undone to promote the effectuation of the Yalta pledge.

A Great Leader of Public Opinion Dies—John H. Clarke, Former Associate Supreme Court Justice, and Native of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of former Associate Supreme Court Justice John H. Clarke, a native of the State of Ohio, has taken from us a valiant fighter for democracy, and for the cause of international peace and justice by collective action of the nations of the world.

Justice Clarke was a man of powerful convictions. He believed that the lawyer was expected not only to battle for his clients, but likewise for good government in all its aspects. Clients did not form his opinions. Often he was found espousing principles that seemed in variance with the financial interests of his associates. He thought it not beneath his dignity to spend himself in political campaigns—even to submit himself as candidate for high office.

While a lawyer, he wrote editorials for the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator, an outstanding Ohio newspaper in which he held substantial interest. Knowing his point of view, I was always able when reading that newspaper to pick the editorials that came from his pen. They were marked by extreme independence of thought, and the language was full of force and vigor and revealed the wide and varied reading of the author. Wealthy as he was, he considered his opinions his greatest asset.

He resigned from the United States Supreme Court when he was still strong in mind. Its work he considered of less importance than his passionate desire to establish machinery for the preservation of world peace. He was thus a crusader

to the last in a cause that, at his death, seems nearer to achievement than ever before in the world's history.

Under leave to print, I am reproducing herewith an editorial from the New York Times reviewing his life work:

JOHN CLARKE, OF OHIO

It must have been a melancholy satisfaction to former Justice John Hessin Clarke in his declining years to see the American people forced by a second world war, more catastrophic than the first, to turn to a new league of nations as the best hope of future peace. After the death of Woodrow Wilson, John Clarke was perhaps the most fervent and brilliant advocate of American participation in the League. A flaming Liberal of the Ohio school of Newton Baker and Tom L. Johnson, he devoted the prime of his life and his remarkable oratorical gifts to preaching international cooperation as the one safeguard against future wars. He felt so deeply on this issue that in 1922, at the age of 65, he resigned as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States in order to give all his time and energy to the cause he believed in.

This sacrifice of a career to a cause was characteristic of Justice Clarke. He was a kind of major prophet in his day, a prophet justified in his own lifetime by the relentless logic of events. "Those who think the League dead will see it rise again," he said in an address at Harvard in reply to President Coolidge's first message to Congress. "We may confidently predict that the American conscience will refuse to be satisfied until our Government shall leave the wrong side of the road and get on the right side of the greatest moral question which has been presented to the American people since slavery was settled."

The voice of the American Liberal of a generation ago echoes in the speeches the former Justice delivered up and down the country in the complacent twenties. He was a vivid figure in his native Ohio as a lawyer, jurist, antimonopolist, antiprohibitionist, hard-hitting and eloquent political campaigner who packed the memorial halls and the fairgrounds in dozens of lively debates. But the League and the World Court were the causes for which he spent a life that lasted through the full turn of the cycle to end, with a poetic justice that he must have enjoyed, on the eve of a conference initiated by the United States to organize a new society of nations.

Eleven Airplanes Spot Coyotes for Lord Halifax in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Lord Halifax has just visited the State of Oklahoma, and while there he was entertained royally. The entertainment in the western part of the State centered around a coyote hunt near Elk City, Okla. The newspapers of March 20 and March 21 described in detail this famous hunt in honor of the Ambassador.

Apparently a few, perhaps 3 or 4, small prairie wolves were turned loose in front of 200 or more dogs from Arkansas, Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma, said to be the largest assembly of fine, trained hounds in the annals of coyote hunting. Some 60 persons accompanied his Lordship, Lady Halifax, and their son, including the Governor of the State and other notables.

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most spectaclar feature of the hunt was that 11 airplanes were used as spotters to show the hunting party the direction in which the coyotes were traveling in their attempts to evade their pursuers. It is said that it was extremely difficult to hear the baying of the hounds for the noise that was made by the motors of the 11 airplanes overhead. This was unusually spectacular and the subject of much adverse criticism because of the strict rationing of gasoline among the citizens of Oklahoma, many of whom rather indignantly watched and read of the royal hunt. It was probably even more irritating to faithful workers in the war plants and industries of the country who have to beg for their gasoline rations. How will it sound when truly reported to the men in the armed forces?

A Congressional Committee That Woke Us Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser of March 24, 1945, summarizing work of a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee on housing and congested areas at Pearl Harbor and the city of Honolulu. Hearings were held by the Naval Subcommittee for 5 days, beginning on March 15, 1945:

A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE THAT WOKE US UP

The congressional committee investigating congested housing conditions in Honolulu has come and may be gone before these lines are read. The sound and fury has died down. The testimony is in the book to be studied, digested and turned into a set of recommendations for action.

For 4 days public officials, civic leaders, and plain John Citizens joined the parade before a body of probers who brought into the open many matters that for 2 years have bobbed beneath the surface of Honolulu's seething housing shortage.

"Was anything accomplished—will anything come of it?" those who have pinned their faith on one hope after another, only to be let down, want to know.

Yes, something will come of it.

Already two things have happened, and better are to follow.

First. The Army and the Navy through commanding officers, who with a nod can influence civilian economy strongly, have given the nod to full approval of closer and more considerate cooperation with the plain war workers of the island.

Perhaps this consideration could not have been given so fully while Hawaii was a combat area. But the visit of a congressional committee precipitated acknowledgment of the fact that combat area days are over. The forgotten man on the home front is worthy of more attention, after 3 years and 3 months of close adherence to strictly military affairs, it now seems.

Second. A new strength has been found for war weary John Citizen to erect a renewed hope upon. He has learned that there are able men in Congress who are not content to maintain a status quo of indifference, apathy and neglect of community affairs in America's spearhead of the Pacific

He reveled in the pointed remarks that certain ears in the paradise of the Pacific had never before burned to Being an American, J. Citizen is pitifully eager to believe in simple ideas to follow sane but enthusiastic leadership.

He was a bit chagrined that his own home town did not evidence much of this kind of leadership.

He hung his head a little when the officials he has elected and those that have been thrust upon him by appointment, revealed that since December 7 they seem to have advanced not one iota in their ability to think ahead, to plan and to be able to present, at least in public, an appearance that would instill full confidence in important visitors from elsewhere.

Although a united front, in asking for sufficient housing to take care of Honolulu's immediate needs—and a plan to care for those sure to be with us a year from now—was urged when it was known the congressional committee would come here, he saw, or heard, no such united front in action.

Instead, he heard the Governor first say that housing distress was newspaper talk and then declare the need of 10,000 housing units—the Governor's housing executive gives another figure—a civic group another. Nowhere was mention made of a long-range plan that looked beyond today

He heard public officials, who are supposed to know all the ins and outs of obtaining benefits for their city, county, and Territory, admit ignorance of funds and acts that would build schools, provide teaching staffs, widen and repair roads—all as a result of war damage or war-induced causes—and which have been tapped by every progressive American city.

He heard the Congressmen acquaint them with these simple facts of public life.

The local boys evidently had not bothered to inquire were such funds in existence.

The tom-tom beaters for immediate statehood for Hawaii must have blushed in private, if not in public, at the distinctly amateur representations made by local talent.

Instead of presenting a picture of a potential state at war—serious in its intentions of receiving adult privileges of salf government, the Territorial legislature reverted to the lowest ebb in recent years.

When a legislator appeared before the committee and made unfounded and unsupported hearsay charges of collusion between an admiral of the United States Navy and a businessman, a mark of instability, lack of poise, of immatureness and finally of irresponsibility was chalked up against the men we elect to make our laws.

It surely must have been evident to the committee that there has been lack of leadership and civic consciousness at Iolani palace.

The negative state of mind, that influences thinking in Honolulu, was apparent perfectly to the Congressmen. No one came forward and said—"Here is the land upon which we want built the houses to shelter our people." No one came forward and said—"Here is the type of house that has been found best for our climate, our temporary need."

Instead those who came forward, by and large, said—"Here is the reason why we can't do this and that."

The residents of Manoa valley said "No, we do not want your housing project in our sacred precincts—we want it somewhere else." But they did not have a constructive plan for locating it elsewhere.

Do not think these things and others were lost upon this committee.

They were not fooled by leis and hulas and cases of rare Scotches drawn from some hidden caches unknown to old J. Citizen.

They are five men and a woman of astute perception, as shown by their aside remarks.

They have gone back to try to aid a community that has shown it has done little or nothing to aid itself.

Why? Because, if the men chosen as leaders of Hawaii cannot recognize it, they recognize that these islands are more important to the United States than we at home know.

They may look upon us as a delightful island people, who play and sing and have a good time. But they are not going to allow us to neglect ourselves as we while away the days in hula musings, with eyes half shut against the grim realities of a changed world.

Yes, J. Citizen of humble means and origin—something good will come out of the visit of the congressional committee.

It may not be liked in certain quarters, which hate to be disturbed in the lethargy of their years of playing their one-string theme song, "It can't be done."

Have faith—aid is coming from outside.

May it inspire an arousing of a community conscience, that will never again let us down to the level our representatives in public life presented to the malihini investigators, who grew into kamaaina stature overnight, by feeding on the facts of Hawaii's self-neglect.

One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, March 24, I had the privilege of taking part in a radio program arranged by St. Sophia Greek Orthodox Church of Washington, D. C., in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek independence. The Honorable Philon Philon, counselor of the Greek Embassy, and I, were guest speakers. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Philon's speech and my own may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. PHILON PHILON

Tomorrow Greece celebrates the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of its independence and the establishment of the modern Greek state.

Ancient Greece for centuries was the cradle of democracy and gave to the world a rich heritage of liberal ideas and the highest concept of civilization. Later, when the Roman Empire was divided, Greek genius hellenized the eastern part of this empire, and created the Greek Byzantine Empire, which for a thousand years was the bulwark of European civilization and of Christianity against Asiatic invasions, until in the middle of the fifteenth century, when it succumbed to the blows of the rising power of the Turks.

During the four centuries when Greece was under the domination of the invaders, civilization and liberal ideas ceased to exist in southeastern Europe. For this reason, when the Greeks rose in 1821 to regain their independence, the movement was applauded throughout the world as a symbol of the rebirth of liberalism and of democratic ideas. The enthusiastic messages sent to the fighting Greeks by President Monroe, Webster, and so many other freedom-loving Americans, greatly encouraged them, and the inspired poems of Byron and Shelley, extolling their heroism, found a warm spot in American hearts. Since the Philhellenism has been a tradition in this country, and the love and devotion of the Greeks to America have become a national institution in Greece. This devotion of the Greeks to America is founded not on political considerations, but in the unshakable faith which the Greeks have in the lofty democratic ideals and the liberalism which characterize this country in all the manifestations of its national life.

Hence, when in October of 1940 Greece was confronted with the alternative of submitting to the Axis or to be ruined fighting for freedom, she did not hesitate even for a moment, although she knew that the whole of Europe lay prostrate under the blows of the Axis. For 6 whole months Greece stood alone with Britain, fighting for the defense of the common cause. Likewise, when in the spring of 1941, having by this time victoriously repelled the Fascists, she found herself face to face with the combined military might of the two empires of the Axis, again she did not hesitate for a second, but threw herself, united and resolute, into the epic defense of her soil, without any substantial Allied help and well knowing the overwhelming odds against her and the cruel fate awaiting her.

Thus, having waged an unequal struggle and having kept up active and incessant resistance against the invaders during the entire period of enemy occupation, Greece is today bleeding, having lost one-tenth of her total population from hunger and the unspeakable atrocities perpetrated by the Germans, the Italians, and the Bulgarians; her industry and agriculture are totally ruined; her railways destroyed by sabotage by the Greeks themselves, carrying out orders from the Allied command.

Almost the entire Greek merchant marine, which ranked eighth in world shipping, has been sacrificed in the common cause. Out of the more than half a million troops Greece put into this fight, there are hardly sufficient forces left to preserve public security. Thus it was, that the great majority of the Greek people recently found themselves unarmed, at the mercy of certain irresponsible elements many of whom were not even Greeks.

And now, I leave it to you, whether Greece is or is not entitled in asking justice from her great allies. The Greeks do not seek charity. They do, however, rightfully expect from their great allies, who have assumed leadership and responsibilities in this war, justice and assistance to get back on their feet. They ask that they may be helped in the reestablishment of their armed forces, eager to continue their active contribution to the common cause until total victory is achieved. They expect that the peace conference will secure to them the union with Greece of those Greeks who remain under foreign domination in the Dodecanese, in southern Albania, and elsewhere; that is, in those areas, which, after the First World War, had been awarded to Greece, but whose union with the mother country was blocked by the rising Italian imperialism. They ask to be protected against a new threat from the north and wish to see there the establishment of safe boundaries. They simply ask to be free from fear and from want.

On the occasion of the national anniversary of Greece, I ask all Americans of good will to bear in mind the unparalleled sufferings of the Greek people and—dismissing from their minds any possible ill-impressions from recent disturbances—to take a hearty interest in this small nation, which gave everything it possessed in the common cause, and which, by its sacrifices and gallantry, elicited the admiration of the world, and which, while it was fighting triumphantly, was looked upon with admiration as an example worthy of emulation for its fortitude and heroic defense of freedom.

SPEECH OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

There has been no moment in all recorded history when Grecian valor and intellect have not been recognized as preeminent. In every period of the long history of mankind's advance, the people of Greece have played a glorious role. It was not by error that the poet spoke of the "glory that was Greece;" nor was it merely a graceful compliment. It was an acknowledgment of superlative merit which mankind has recognized in the Greeks from the earliest times.

It is not for me in this brief tribute to the Greek love of independence to call the roll of the Grecian heroes of the past, nor to praise their achievements. I would speak rather of the racial characteristics which have made the Greek contribution to civilization so outstanding.

We commemorate the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek independence. But that is merely the modern manifestation of the unconquerable soul which has always been the proud possession of the Greek people. There never was a time when the Greek did not love freedom. There never was a time when he was not willing to lay down his life in defense of it. It must be a source of deep emotional satisfaction to every Greek wherever he may live in all this world that his people have again demonstrated in this most terrible of all wars that they still possess the flame which made their ancestors, even in the age of myth and fable, transcendent examples of what the free, human spirit can achieve.

The people of Greece have emerged triumphant through every test of fire and sword. They have suffered at the hands of the barbarians of Asia and of Europe, but they have always had a spirit that could never be crushed. Never was this more clearly demonstrated than in the terrible trials they have endured under the heel of Axis tyranny.

It is the glory of Greece that no tyrant has ever succeeded in crushing her. Tonight as we commemorate this modern anniversary of Greek independence we know that no tyrant ever will.

Greece has bequeathed to all the world a heritage of learning, art, and courage. Each of these is an attribute of the individual, not of the state. Each of these is a quality of the individual human soul, not of any organization. That is the reason why Greece may properly be called the birthplace of democracy.

Greece's gift to mankind, therefore, is the demonstration that a people who are sustained by an abiding devotion to the qualities which make individuals noble cannot be kept in servitude, and that the principle of democracy is immortal like the human soul.

An independent Greece has from earliest time held aloft the torch of human freedom to illuminate the path along which civilization as advanced.

I am happy, therefore, tonight to join with our Greek compatriots and with the people of the United States in honoring the undying spirit of the people of Greece. Never did I doubt from the moment this war began that the independence which was won 124 years

ago would be preserved, and that Greece would be reestablished as a free nation.

That independence has now been rewon. A new era of human advancement is about to begin. It requires no prophet to predict that the people of Greek antecedents, free and independent wherever they are, will continue to exemplify the noblest qualities of free men.

The Manpower Bill—Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am no prophet nor son of a prophet, but venture to assert that even when the shooting war across the Rhine is over, our manpower problems will be as great, if not greater than, today, for reasons that are obvious but too often overlooked.

Those who assert to the contrary are indulging in wishful thinking as they construct the straw man of sufficiency of manpower for their defense. There is no such animal.

Unless Japan unconditionally surrenders following and because of the defeat of Germany, we will be confronted by problems such as we have not had to meet, which problems will tax us to the limit in order and to the end that we may as speedily as possible destroy the facilities, and thereby put an end to the potentialities which would enable Japan to prolong the war of fanaticism she fights.

These situations can only be met in the first instance by an overwhelming use of our manpower, which is not today being used, whether we like to admit it or not.

No machine that man can make is greater than the man who makes it and the number of machines of war to be manufactured by us of every type, name, nature, and description, in order to compel the unconditional surrender of Japan, are numerically beyond our comprehension, else why are we appropriating all these new dollars to establish and to rehabilitate plants for the production of those naval and military instruments of war which have proven their worth, as well as for the manufacture of those new instruments of destruction which we will be required to use against Japan because of the nature of the war we must fight against her in order to win?

It is to the credit of all concerned that, though tardily, yet, nevertheless, eventually, we arrived at an appreciation of the fact that our biggest battles lie ahead of us, so, tolerating no optimism and stimulated to action, we will go on to a victory for which we are taking time, in advance, to adequately prepare.

In time of war we might well take a leaf out of anybody's book who has demonstrated how to make manpower work. We Americans have bungled along too long. What we really need is a law with teeth for the duration in order to expedite the end. We are too soft.

People talk as if we could not legislate to repeal any law we enact now to save ourselves, as well as our national self-respect. That is nonsense. Let us straighten out this manpower situation here and now by the use of such force of law as may be necessary and then talk about other things later.

Those who try to scare somebody by asserting this is a bill to enslave us forget that the millions now regimented, fighting and dying for us, are entitled to whatever it takes to make the happy-go-lucky complacent people in this country come to their senses, and now.

As Senator AUSTIN, who drew most of the bill, said yesterday—

> This is not an antistrike bill in any way and cannot be so used. The bill can freeze workers in jobs, or it can penalize a worker who quits a job, but a worker who goes out on a strike has not legally left his job.

The people country-wide are fed up with the inability of Congress to come to some conclusion as to how to supply the manpower the people know we need so desperately; they are in favor of some form of manpower draft bill, and as this compromise is better than the nothing so many wrongfully hoped would be the result of the conference, I am going to vote for the conference report, although I admit I would prefer something else if I could dictate all the terms for compromise.

Labor Draft Bill Bitterly Resented by Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many protests against any form of labor-draft legislation, and particularly against the so-called compromise draft labor bill which is before the House for action today.

The independent, red-blooded American laborers who want to think for themselves bitterly resent the provisions of the compromise labor-draft bill. Organized labor resents the enslavement that they feel will result. People who cherish the American ideals of free labor and free enterprise resent any such un-American ideas. If the Members of Congress will consult their constituents affected by it they will find an overwhelming resentment against this legislation.

There is danger in such legislation, for it tends to destroy the confidence of the people in their Congress. The following is a copy of a letter I received yesterday from one of my constituents, which is typical of the resentment I have described:

> On January 7, 1945, I wrote you regarding the draft-labor bill and asked you to fight against it, and I notice that you did. I wish to thank you for this work.
>
> Now there comes before the Congress the same bill, only in a different form called a compromise bill, and it is even worse than the first. It will give Byrnes the authority and place us under unjust rules, making it a penalty if we quit our jobs unless the Government tells us we may. Now that is one hell of a note. Just how much of this destroying of our rights are you who are in Congress going to let these aliens get by with before it is stopped? What are you all thinking about, anyway? Our armies fight that Europe may be free, and let these New Dealers enslave us here at home.
>
> This bill will be passed, and we will be slaves of the state now and evermore.
>
> So, therefore, I intend to on March 26, 1945, advise the firm I work for that I have quit, because I refuse to bow to any dictator.
>
> If this kind of dictatorship cannot be stopped by legal steps, then there must be other measures undertaken, for there are lots of us Americans who will not surrender to this foreignism of government.
>
> I wish you would again help defeat this bill.

Tribute to Hon. Henry Ellsworth Barbour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in life when our old-time friends are taken from us with tragic frequency. We are never prepared for the separation. I learned with profound sorrow and with a sense of deep personal loss of the passing of my former colleague and dear friend, Hon. Henry Ellsworth Barbour, of the State of California.

Few men have entered Congress during my service in this House who, in so short a time, impressed their ability so firmly upon their colleagues as did Representative Henry Ellsworth Barbour. The days when a majority of the congressional families lived in the old Congress Hall Hotel, which stood on the site of the present new House Office Building, was a period of very warm personal friendship between the families of the Representatives. It was in that hospitable atmosphere that intimate and lasting friendships were created. The wives of Members fraternized, congressional children went to school together, grew up together, and developed lifelong friendships.

There was no family among the many families who lived at Congress Hall Hotel which added more to the social life of Congress than did Representative Barbour, his wife, and two children. Henry Ellsworth Barbour, affectionately known as Harry, made a fine contribution to his country while a Member of this legislative body. The many tributes paid to our departed colleague of former days bespeak the fine character of the man. A brave and good man has passed from this life. The heritage he has left surpasses that of all other riches—that of a good name.

I cannot find words to express the depth of my sympathy and that of Mrs. Reed and my children for Mrs. Barbour and her two sons.

Tribute to Hon. James V. Heidinger, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the death of my dear friend, Hon. James V. Heidinger, of Illinois, came as a very great shock to me. While I knew that he had been ill for some time and that he had gone to Phoenix, Ariz., it was my hope and belief that he had gone to this delightful climate to convalesce, and that he would soon be with us again. I know that every Member of the House held Judge Heidinger in the very highest esteem. This Nation can ill afford to lose men of his fine ability and, above all, a man of his sterling character. The State of Illinois and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the death of a very able representative and statesman.

It is difficult to find words to fully express the sympathy for the loss which his loved ones have suffered. It may be that Mrs. Heidinger and the relatives of her good husband will find comfort in the words "Life is not merely a floating shadow, a momentary spark, a dream that vanishes. Nothing can be grander than a life filled with great and noble thoughts—with brave and honest deeds. Such a life sheds light, and the seeds of truth sown by great and loyal men bear fruit through all the years to be."

Parents Demand 17- to 18-year-old Boys Be Not Forced Into Combat Service Without at Least 1 Year's Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have been receiving numerous telegrams and letters from my constituents vehemently protesting against the policies and practices of the War and Navy Departments in dealing with our 18-year-old inductees. The complaints show that these boys are being sent as replacements into actual combat service overseas with only from 13 to 17 weeks' training. The people were led to believe that these boys would not be sent overseas until after they had received at least a year's training. They are not convinced that it is right or necessary for these youngsters to be put into combat duty with so little training. A fair example of these protests is a letter which I received this morning from one of my constituents which reads as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *March 24, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Parent-Teachers Association of Tulsa and the Tulsa Federation of Labor, along with many other organizations, are at this time very much concerned about the training programs made available to the 18-year-old inductees. The abusive and overbearing attitude of the Army toward these youngsters is sickening.

If it is true that we have the largest Army and Navy ever assembled, we wonder why you in Congress allow the Army to override all preelection promises of at least 12 months' training for 18-year-olds. They have no one to speak for them but their Representatives. They are not old enough to hide behind the worn-out phrase, "essential occupation."

We believe the Army brass hats should be made to reshuffle their huge reserves of manpower already in the Army and who have had from 1 to 3 years' training and use them as replacements. The very idea of sending high-school seniors with 13 weeks' training into combat is too revolting, and you in Congress have allowed this condition to exist in spite of our already huge Army and our thousands of protests.

The Army "brass hats" will tell you it is necessary to do this. If you will consider their statement carefully, you will know it is untrue, and we maintain that just because these boys are not old enough to vote is no excuse for the shabby treatment they are receiving.

Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we'll save England." This administration not only furnished the food and tools but also 12 American boys to every 1 Englishman. Mr. Roosevelt is more concerned about furnishing everything for England than nations under their own sphere of influence, such as Canada. Canadians now say, "No more men for Europe's wars," but we merrily reach down to our high schools to get American boys to send to the rescue. And for what? Canadians say, "No rationing," but we struggle to feed Europe and squander our own reserves, also, in order to be a good neighbor. We know that the price of being a good neighbor is too high in its terrible toll of American dead. This cannot be flippantly cast aside.

We, therefore, demand that as our representatives you not only give this matter serious consideration but see that we send no more green, untrained 18-year-olds with less than 12 months' training into combat areas. You now are in the position to demand the selective-service law have this amendment, and thousands upon thousands of voters throughout the entire country will be watching your efforts.

In a very short time you will receive petitions of protest on the subject matter of this letter. These petitions can in nowise be interpreted as interfering with the national war effort but are plain, everyday protests from plain, everyday people against the use of untrained 18-year-old inductees in combat and a demand that the promise of a 12-month preparatory course be fulfilled.

Respectfully yours,

L. A. SWAIN.

After having received several of these protests, on February 23, 1945, I transmitted a letter of one of my constituents to the House Committee on Military Affairs, explaining that many parents and Parent-Teachers Association members in my district were protesting against the drafting of 17- and 18-year-old boys into the service and sending them overseas without sufficient training. I asked that the matter be given proper consideration and that I be furnished a report on conditions as they actually existed. I received a reply, dated March 5, 1945, signed by the general counsel of the House Committee on Military Affairs, commenting at considerable length on this question. I quote the following pertinent portion of that letter:

In February 1944 the policy was adopted of not sending men under 19 years of age as replacements for infantry and armored units as long as others were obtainable. This further stiffened in June to bar the sending of any such men. This policy was adhered to as long as military operations permitted. In December 1944, the Army announced a change in policy which permitted the 18-year-old soldier to be sent overseas. This was only one of the actions taken to meet the situation. Another was the withdrawing of some 95,000 physically fit and older men from the Army Air Forces and Army Service Forces for retraining as infantry. The process is in effect overseas as well as in the United States. Overseas commanders are kept fully informed of the amount of training each individual has had before leaving the United States.

Originally, the replacement training period was 13 weeks. After some time, however, we found it was possible to meet our needs and at the same time increase to 17 weeks this training period. This was continued until very recently when our replacement demand became so urgent as to require the reduction of the training period to 15 weeks. Carefully worked out training tests and battle experience have demonstrated that the average soldier in 13 to 17 weeks can be brought to a training level that permits him to fill a vacancy in a trained team. In contrasting the training of units and of replacements, however, it should be understood that a replacement joins a trained organization. He performs acceptably well, and learns quickly in combat. He is flanked by men who are experienced. He follows their lead and is guided by their advice.

The replacement joins a unit made up of experienced soldiers and benefits from their knowledge and skill for his final training on the job.

Replacements are not formed into new units, but are infiltrated into trained, and for the most part, battle-seasoned organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I have transmitted all official information I have received and all explanations offered by the War Department and the House Committee on Military Affairs for the use of the 18-year-old boys in replacement combat duty with only 13 to 17 weeks' training. But this does not begin to satisfy anxious mothers and fathers, and they are protesting more vehemently than ever. A thorough investigation should be made and if conditions do not warrant a continuation of this practice, it should be stopped by a congressional mandate. The public is entitled to know the facts and whether or not the policies now being enforced are justified.

Battle Veterans Air Criticism of Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article by Don Whitehead, Associated Press correspondent, taken from the Washington Post dated March 27, 1945:

UNITED STATES VISIT OVER, BATTLE VETERANS AIR CRITICISM OF HOME FRONT

(By Don Whitehead)

With the United States First Infantry Division across the Rhine, March 26.—If a lot of people at home could see themselves as they appear to battle veterans after 2½ years of combat they would not be proud of the picture.

But that's how it is. The men told their stories today as they waited in a little room near the front for an officer to escort them back to the Twenty-sixth Regiment, which they left January 12 for home leave.

There were 19 of them. All had been overseas with the First Division from the time it landed in north Africa. Most wore the Purple Heart, and many had decorations for bravery. They were going back into the line with vivid memories of home, but not all of them were happy.

GOOD TO GET HOME, BUT—

Sure it was good to be home again and just sit around and do nothing but listen to the radio and eat home cooking, they agreed. The girls were wonderful and more sympathetic than most of the boys thought they would be. Home was just like it always was, but still:

"Things have changed," said Staff Sgt. Howard Ashby, Martinsburg, W. Va. "Sometimes I didn't think the people thought much of a soldier or the way we acted. Maybe it was just me.

"There were not many of my friends left at home. Most of them are in the Army and there were just a few guys left. Somehow you were disappointed in seeing you didn't really mean anything to a lot of people, even if you had been fighting for more than 2 years. Your family's not that way, of course, but other people are."

"Yeah," said Sgt. Michael Halko, of Stockton, Pa., "some people feel the war, but others don't give a damn. They are making a lot of money and doing all right.

"OTHER PARENTS RESENT RETURN

"Then some people who had sons overseas seemed to resent the fact that I was at home and their boys were not. They would ask me why was I allowed to come home when their boys weren't. All I could say was that I didn't have anything to do about anybody getting home. It wasn't my fault."

Staff Sgt. John Duda, Adah, Pa., said:

"When you tell 'em a story they won't believe it. They say it couldn't be that bad and then most people start talking about their own troubles and how tough it is at home with rationing.

"Old veterans knew what we were talking about. They understand what the score is and don't ask too many questions."

Capt. Linwood Billings, Dover, N. H., said that was the way most of the men felt.

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT "DON'T GIVE A DAMN"

"Most people don't know what is going on," he said "I would say 75 percent of the people at home are behind the war effort and the other 25 don't give a damn.

"It is different in smaller towns because they feel closer to the war. In Dover people know just about all the boys who are overseas and they are glad to see them when they get home. Most everybody there is doing war work, too, or trying to do something to help."

Lt. Steve Phillips, Jr., of Greenville, S. C., said:

"I felt lost at times with most of my old friends gone. All I wanted to do was stay at home with my wife. I told her I guess she thought I was crazy just sitting and listening to the radio and reading the papers, but she said she was happy and that was all that mattered. That was enough for me."

Three Hundred Million Pounds of Pork Go to Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Howard Rushmore, from the Boston Record of March 25, 1945:

THREE HUNDRED MILLION POUNDS OF PORK GO TO REDS

(By Howard Rushmore)

NEW YORK.—To the harried neighborhood butcher who seeks for new methods to assuage the pangs of his pork-hungry customers we suggest the following:

Tell them about tushonka, that delicious canned pork recipe made of selected lean meat, sprinkled with onions and bay leaves.

It must be good, for 10,000,000 hogs have gone into its manufacture. It's packed under rigid Government supervision in Chicago and more than 300,000,000 pounds of select dressed weight pork a la tushonka were canned in 1944.

And where can you buy it?

Only one place—Soviet Russia.

In fact, the comrades, who are receiving this pork under lend-lease, consider this a great delicacy and prefer it over the pork chop, an old American dish fast becoming extinct.

And because of this vanishing staple of the blue plate special and the at-home diners, Congressmen have been besieged by pork-hungry constituents to investigate why more than 2,200,000,000 pounds of Federal inspected pork have been exported under lend-lease.

According to Wesley Hardenbergh, president of the American Meat Institute, tushonka is packed in Chicago and other meat centers under "exact specifications as propounded by a Russian commission which met with Government food agencies."

Writing in the Breeders' Gazette, Hardenbergh said:

"Tushonka is made from tender pork trimmings and must not contain more than 20 percent fat. There are from two to four pieces in the 12-ounce can, and from three to five chunks in the 16-ounce can.

DOUBLE SPICE, TOO

"These chunks of tender pork, according to specifications, should not be thicker than 2 inches. One bay leaf must be inserted in the bottom of each can."

According to Hardenbergh, the Russians supervising the packing insist that the Ceylon bay leaves be doubled in the 18-ounce and 32-ounce cans.

Figures released by the office of distribution, War Food Administration, show that more than 500,000,000 dressed weight pounds of pork a la tushonka were sent to Russia in 1943–44.

This is a considerable portion of the total of Federal inspected pork exported which amounts to one-quarter of domestic production.

In contrast, the armed forces of the United States in 1944 received only 14 percent of the total of Federal inspected pork production.

One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech which I delivered March 25, 1945, in observance of the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek independence in the city of Lynn, Mass.:

War, the world's one major crime, does serve one useful purpose. Its primitive, desperate challenge brings us to the realization of what we are and what we hope to be. It took the shock of Pearl Harbor to sweep away much of our lazy, selfish thinking and make us aware of a unity that many of us had never experienced before. Today, purged by pity and fear, we are better Americans. Common danger has brought us closer together. We know that for the privileges we enjoy we have responsibilities in return. We are free to develop our individual lives because of the over-all guaranties we have written into law, which we observe and respect. As one member of the family, though free in his thought and action, has a responsibility to the family as a whole, so we, as individual Americans, have obligations to the larger family which is named the United States of America.

Too long have we been the "prodigal sons," indifferent to our mutual obligations, neglectful of our heritage, until common danger brought us home again to unite in defense of our American way of life. Through blood and sacrifice on the battlefields; through the labor, the anxieties, and the prayers of those of us on the home front, we are finding our central faith again. Refined and purified at such cost, that faith will help us to build a better nation and a better world in the days to come.

Our enemies have said, "You have liberty, yes; but with it you have had neither peace nor order within your own rich country. Surrender your liberties, and we will provide a world order."

Our answer is: "For all of time the individual man has struggled upward from slavery to freedom. We shall not be seris to tyranny, even though it has the appearance

of order. We believe that freemen, responsible men, can build a fair and peaceful society. We have accomplished much of that in our own country. Much more remains to be done, but we are not going to scrap the building, to begin all over again. For we have built upon firm foundations, upon the brotherhood inspired by religious faith, and upon the reason which we have inherited, to cherish and develop, from the civilization of ancient Greece."

We freely admit that the 1920's and 1930's revealed weaknesses in our social and economic structure which we mean to repair. After generations of peaceful development, during which we did the groundwork in our Nation, we are now suddenly confronted with engineering problems for which there is no ready solution. The remedy lies not in wrecking what we have built so far. Rather we must work to find the answer through reason, through faith, through confidence in curselves and each other, working together to promote the common welfare.

In every civilization the time comes when some of the old techniques must be discarded if our society is to survive. Our American way of life has the flexibility to adjust itself to changing conditions. We shall retain what is good from the past and reject that which stands in the way of progress.

It is time to take inventory of our assets and as we do so we become conscious of the great debt we owe to the Greek mind and the Greek spirit. Here, for the first time in history, we find a government of laws and not of men. No longer did man have to cower before the whims of a personal overlord. Even the humblest Athenian felt secure, protected in his life and property by practical and equitable rules. Solon, the lawmaker, when asked what made a well-balanced and progressive state, replied; "When the people obey the rulers, and the rulers obey the laws." To his legislation, Attica owed the liberation of its farmers from serfdom. He encouraged the independence of the peasant proprietor class whose ownership of the soil gave to the little armies of Athens the will to preserve her liberties for many generations. Under Solon, trade and industry were freed from financial inconveniences and soon developed to the point where Athens was the commercial leader of the Mediterranean. Science and education were stimulated by this free environment and the way was prepared, materially and mentally for the birth of a culture, which, in many respects has never been equalled since.

Athens grew wealthy. To all outward appearances she was prosperous, talented, and happy. It seemed that the golden age has come to stay. But with her wealth came growing tensions and inequalities and the failure, as we have witnessed in our own time, to achieve a more equitable distribution of that wealth. Individualism is stimulating, it is th power which creates wealth, and concentrates it dangerously. More bitter than the war of Greece with Persia, or of Athens with Sparta, is the war of class with class. Young men conscious of ability and frustrated with poverty, point out the contradiction between political equality and the mounting economic inequality. The poor follow communism and the rich embrace fascism.

This happened in ancient Greece over 2,300 years ago. But how close it seems to the challenging problems of our own time. We, who have not found the solution in 1945, would do well to inquire, "What did Athens do about it?"

She did not surrender to either extreme. Being reasonable, she compromised. Athens survived economic civil war because at heart every Athenian, rich or poor, was an individualist. She survived because her government found a practicable medium between socialism and individualism in a moderate regulation of business and wealth. It set a limit upon the size of dowries, the cost of funerals, and the dress of women. It enforced fair weights and measures and honest quality. By keeping a reserve of grain in state-owned storehouses and pouring this upon the market when prices rise too rapidly, the people are guaranteed that the price of bread shall never be exorbitant, that millionaires shall not be created out of the hunger of the people, and that no Athenian shall starve. The state regulates wealth through taxation as we are attempting to do today. At least during the emergency of war, we are trying to provide a fair share for all through the medium of wage and price controls. Under this system of economic individualism balanced by socialistic regulation, wealth accumulated in Athens and spread sufficiently to prevent a radical revolution.

The economic basis of Athenian freedom, enterprise, art, and thought was firmly laid. It could bear every extravagance except the drain of successive wars. From this we can learn much. I believe we have learned much, for never before in the history of the United States have our people been so determined as they are now to cooperate in the establishment of a world agency to outlaw war. For powerful and wealthy as our Nation is, it cannot survive the increasing destructiveness of war. We need a lasting peace in which to work and build and extend democracy to all of our people.

Repeated wars, both civil and foreign, sapped the strength of ancient Athens. She made a final, desperate attempt to unite the quarreling states. Her former subjects and allies had learned the need for a larger security than individual sovereignty. The majority of them combined under her leadership and once more Athens became powerful through her industry and trade.

The change from landed to movable wealth produced a feverish race for money. Goods, services, and persons * * * were increasingly judged in terms of money and property. Fortunes were made and unmade overnight, and were spent in lavish displays that found their counterpart in the United States of the 1920's. Many citizens became poorer in the midst of this plenty and were forced to depend for their existence upon the fees paid for attendance at the assembly. Thousands of others had to be fed by the temples of the state. The middle classes had lost much of their wealth and were no longer able to maintain the balance between rich conservatives and poor progressives. Finally the poorer citizens captured the assembly, and began to vote the property of the rich into the state treasury, for redistribution among the needy and to finance public works that would relieve unemployment. The bitterness of the class war left Greece divided when a neighboring nation attacked her. The corruption of wealth led many rich men to welcome foreign tyranny in preference to domestic reforms. Again we find a parallel in our own times, in prewar France where the wealthy collaborated with Hitler because they were fearful of the social reforms demanded by their own countrymen.

In the midst of greed, luxury, and the concentration of wealth, public virtue languished and Athens, morally weakened, started to decline. The subject states declared a social war of rebellion and won their independence. The greatest city of the ancient world now found herself without allies, without leaders, without funds, and without friends.

I have purposely omitted any detailed reference to the glories of Greek culture which made it the most fruitful period of world history. The shining inspiration of Greek art, science, and philosophy still nourishes all men who value freedom, reason, and beauty.

I have touched upon the causes of her fall as a warning to Americans of today. For the growth of our country, with its strength and its weakness, closely parallels the development of ancient Greece. We form a powerful community of freemen who have yet to achieve a cultural greatness. For as Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court said: "America is not only a place in which to make money. It is a place in which to make a civilization."

As we seek wisdom from our parent culture, Greece, we are aware at the same time of the weaknesses that undermined her triumphs. We know that constant wars and corrupt individualism were the first signs of decay. These might have been cured in time but they were not, and ancient Greece died because of her tragic failure to unite liberty with order and peace.

Today we, as Americans, are faced with the same problem. To protect the freedom of the individual; to provide economic opportunity for all and to achieve a durable peace as a basis for security, this is the challenge. If we fail in this, we shall be convicted before history as men who were not only blind to the lessons of the past, but as men who surrendered their future.

This afternoon we gather to do honor to the independence of modern Greece. We are on the verge of winning a world-shaking struggle against modern tyranny, a tyranny every bit as cruel and devouring as the one your ancestors fought against at Marathon and Salamis. The Greeks of today have fought with brilliant courage and ability. They decisively defeated the large and well-equipped Fascist army that invaded their homeland. They were overwhelmed only when the Nazi steamroller came to the aid of the retreating Fascists. Even then the Greeks did not submit. From the mountains they fought on in guerrilla warfare that plagued the enemy and forced him to maintain large occupational units to hold his uneasy conquest.

This infuriated the Nazis. Finding that brute force and treacherous propaganda could not conquer the Greek spirit, they resorted to deliberate starvation of the people. Greeks died in the streets from hunger and disease, but Greece fought on.

Th long, grim night was ended. The tyrant has been beaten back and Greece is free. But the struggle has left deep and grievous wounds which still throb and pain, and which time alone can heal.

The civil strife which broke out in Greece after her liberation shocked a world which longed for peace. It seemed to indicate a future filled with violence and anarchy. Happily, such was not the case. Fighting has ceased. But Greece, like every other country which has suffered from this, the greatest disaster ever to befall mankind, faces a long road back to freedom, order, and progress.

The brief flare-up of civil war is a sign of Greek vitality. It is proof that the spirit and energy of your people has not been dulled by oppression. It is a warning to all that the people, released from slavery to a foreign power, are determined to remake their nation in a new mold, to free themselves from domestic tyranny and develop a Greek Nation where even the humblest has security and opportunity.

In this, I am confident that she will succeed. As a member of the family of free nations she will go forward with us to achieve economic statesmanship. Greece of today, drawing from the wisdom of her ancient past, can help us to win the high goal which the Greeks of that time aspired to the security in which culture may flourish.

Ancient Greece fathered freedom. Modern Greece will help to extend it so that this time the world may be free.

Conditions in Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 15, 1945.*
COSMOPOLITAN—FRANCES WHITING,
Editor, Hearst Magazines, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR EDITOR: In your March issue you say that Albert Maisel (the author), "spent months collecting the facts," and that in this article he presented them "fully documented and with a sincerity learned on two battle fronts." With this introduction you sponsor to the public Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men. Maybe the Veterans' Administration can be helped by an investigation, but such articles can be only harmful. I have studied the entire article, and await the April issue.

I wish to comment only on one instance (the Schwiebert case), as the journalistic technique employed in this case is typical of the whole article. If the Schwiebert instance is a sample of "fully documented facts," and "a sincerity learned on two battle fronts," is is a sad reflection on editorial integrity and reportorial capacity.

What was the date of the letter written presumably to Dr. H. H. Brueckner (superintendent of the District Tuberculosis Hospital at Lima, Ohio) and quoted (omitting date) in Dr Brueckner's letter of June 29, 1944, to Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D.? You disclose that "Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D., last year resigned from the Veterans' Administration Medical Advisory Council, where his efforts at reform have been met with the utmost cynicism by the Veterans' Administrator, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and his underlings in the central office."

Did Dr. Brueckner ever answer the letter received from Harold W. C. Schwiebert?

Schwiebert wrote this letter to Dr. Brueckner presumably before June 29, and Schwiebert died July 2, according to Dr. H. H. Brueckner's follow-up letter of July 6 to Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D.

Did Dr. Brueckner see the deceased Schwiebert during the last few weeks of his life?

Was an autopsy performed on Schwiebert?

How does Dr. H. H. Brueckner know that there was an "effusion in the deceased man's chest, which caused death on July 2 of apparently cardiac failure and a cardiac embarrassment, probably because of severe mediastinal shift caused by effusion"?

Such a diagnosis in the absence of an autopsy, and by a person who had not examined the patient and his clinical record in life, is pure assumption, and worthless.

There is nothing in Schwiebert's own account of his condition and treatment to indicate anything except that he was dissatisfied with the treatment and results; and that he was bewildered. Who would not be bewildered after nearly a year of invalidism? He was naturally discouraged; but this does not indicate that there was any improper treatment or neglect in his case. If there was effusion in the deceased man's chest, its removal on June 29 might have been as effective as it seems to have been abroad and in July and August 1943. It may be that there was no fluid or effusion present when "nothing was done but being fluoroscoped and X-rayed once in a while."

About a year ago a veterans' hospital patient phoned me that he had left the institution in disgust, and his reasons were: "Those doctors don't know anything" and "They told me I had tuberculosis, and you know, Doctor, that is silly for a man of my age to have tuberculosis." He had left the hospital against medical advice. I advised him to return immediately and to observe the advice and recommendations of the veterans' hospital. He refused, however, and I lost sight of him for a while. A few months later I located him in a municipal hospital dying of tuberculosis. He complained that he was being neglected and getting no benefit, and asked me to get him back into the veterans' hospital, where he could get "proper scientific investigation and up-to-date treatment." As a physician I recognized that he was approaching death, and took steps to have him reinstated into veterans' hospital. In the short delay that was necessary to effect his transfer he died of tuberculosis.

I had friendly relations with another patient that I met when I was a patient at veterans' hospital. He told me his whole story and what they had done for him. He was sent to the veterans' hospital at Hines, Chicago, Ill., and wrote to me of the successful operation by an expert at Hines who had removed a cancer of the bowel in the appendix region. The diagnosis had been correctly made at the first institution and verified at operation and in the laboratory. Some months after I saw this patient at his work, and he looked like a cured case. He may yet die of cancer, but he was given the best treatment possible, and appreciated it.

I have had frequent contact with the Veterans' Administration at various times since its start. I have been a patient in one of the facilities and am familiar with the high-class medical service that the patients receive in these institutions. There are well over 60,000 patients in the institutions and the capacity is pushed to the limit. I'm satisfied that most of these patients receive a much higher grade of medical service than they are capable of acquiring in their own communities through private facilities. I am also convinced that no group of 60,000 patients in any group of hospitals receive attention from any more capable and devoted staff of physicians, technicians, specialists, nurses, and attendants than does the group in the Veterans' Administration facilities.

Your comparison of statistics would be more valuable if it were possible to state how much the percentage of "recovery, improvement, and so forth", was influenced by the number of veterans treated or discharged in nonveteran facilities, private and public. Lacking this comparison the statistics quoted are not illuminating.

This date, two years ago, I was taken to the veterans' hospital, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., in an ambulance, helpless, and weighing 75 pounds. I was thought to be hopeless, and about to die. I desired to die. I had general arthritis, and was unable to feed myself, and felt generally miserable, useless, and unhappy. I was not a case that any doctor would clamor for, but was not made to feel unwelcome. I was handled excellently at home and at private hospitals by my fine professional brothers for over a year, before complete disability forced me to give up. Every help was available at the veterans' hospital, and was generously extended me. On November 25, 1943, Thanksgiving day, I was discharged under my own power, weighing 170 pounds, and have practically recovered, and have continued to improve to a point where I have been active enough to be able to pay on this income tax day a considerable sum on my earnings during 1944.

During my recovery in the open sunshine at veterans' hospital on the Mississippi, I mingled much with the patients, and became a sort of "curbstone consultant" to many bewildered patients. In discussing their cases I heard many humorous stories, and derived much satisfaction from clearing their misunderstandings concerning medical terms and procedures.

My experience has been duplicated by many who have received the fine services of the Veterans' Administration doctors and nurses. I sought no favors, and received none not available to all, and with most of the Veterans' Hospital patient group, I am grateful for the high type of medical and humanitarian service extended to the worthy and unworthy alike. I look back on my hospitalization at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., from March 15 to November 25, 1943 (8 months and 10 days), with the utmost satisfaction and gratitude—a happy interlude in my life.

I reach my estimate of veterans' hospital services, not through gratitude alone, for in my professional life I am not unfamiliar nor inexperienced in all phases of hospitalization—planning, administering, appointing professional and nonprofessional personnel—serving. Since dictating the above paragraphs, I have again carefully read Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men, and in no less degree than at the first reading, I have the impression of a skunk-like aroma pervading the whole article.

Is there nothing good or fine about the Veterans' Administration? The passion of the American people for fair play and honesty will compel them to accept your unfair and untrue charges at the very low face value so apparent in Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men. Any informed hospital authority will recognize the great work of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and his underlings at the central office. The accomplishments are evident to those who would see. This is not to imply that no improvements could be progressively made in the future, as in the past. I do believe, however, that the central office gang are more pragmatically idealistic and ambitious for progress than many of their incapable and inexperienced critics.

There are reasonable and valid explanations for all irregularities which do and must occur in all large organizations. These should not be condoned, if avoidable or correctable. The corrective measures recommended in the article are amateurish. If carried out they would effect a change, but not necessarily an improvement. It cannot be assumed that the present Veterans' Administration has a large pool of experts and specialists to draw from. Neither would its successors. Any Veterans' Administration would have to adjust itself to war conditions with the dearth of personnel of all types.

The present Veterans' Administration has done a magnificent job, and is entitled to all the constructive, honest help and encouragement the American people, through their Congress and administration, can effect. Pardon my lengthy comment.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. MORFIT, M. D.

Mood of Practicality Seen Sweeping Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of March 26, 1945:

MOOD OF PRACTICALITY SEEN SWEEPING NATION—OBSERVER ASKS IF RETURNING SOLDIER WON'T SEE THROUGH SHAM

(By David Lawrence)

A strange mood of "practicality" is sweeping the United States at the moment. It is one of the phenomena of the war most difficult to explain. It extolls "compromise" and looks askance at those who insist on adherence to "principle."

One wonders what the soldiers and sailors will think of it when they come home—whether they, too, will join the ranks of the so-called "practical" who says "principle" is theoretical or idealistic. One wonders, on the other hand, whether the servicemen will not see through the sham of the "practical" philosophy and ask some searching questions.

For if it is right to be "practical" in 1945, why wasn't it right, they may ask, to have been "practical" in 1939? The records show that Russia, for instance, was negotiating with Great Britain early in 1939 and wanted assurances concerning certain Polish territory, but the British felt that adherence to the pledges which guaranteed the territorial integrity of Poland was paramount. If Britain had been more "practical," would Stalin have signed the alliance in 1939 with Hitler which gave the Nazis their hoped-for assurance of a one-front operation and which enabled Germany to start the war?

LESSON OF APPEASEMENT

There's another question, too, which will have to be answered by the school of thought which espouses the "practical." Hitler wanted the city of Danzig. He argued that the Polish Corridor set up by the Treaty of Versailles really bisected German territory. In the case of the Suedeten section of Czechoslovakia populated by Germany, the Munich Conference of 1938, which was governed wholly by practical philosophy, gave Hitler distinct encouragement.

If the British and French statesmen had been practical in 1939 and had given Hitler his Danzig and revised the Polish Corridor set-up as simply a mistake of 1919, just as Mr. Stalin now argues that the failure to grant the Curzon line to Russia was a mistake of the Versailles Conference, would not such appeasement in 1939 have kept Europe at peace as it did in 1938?

If a small matter of European territory, thousands of miles away from us, is unimportant—as so many of the "practical" folks are saying about the partition of Poland—then why was the European war permitted to break out in September 1939? If weak nations like Poland are to be carved up in 1945 why couldn't they have been carved up in 1939 and saved the millions of lives and the maiming of millions more in this war that now has gone 5½ years?

The "practical" folks may not be able to answer those questions without revealing their own inconsistency and their own lack of logic. The adherents to principle, who are sometimes called perfectionists, can, however, answer those questions unhesitatingly and can face the returning servicemen without equivocation. For the idealist believes implicitly that this war was begun and will be fought to the end to secure respect for "principle," to maintain the pledged word of states, and to revive morality among states. The basic "principle" behind the worth-while sacrifices being made today in this war is a belief in fundamental justice. Along with that belief goes a condemnation of evil, no matter whether it rears its head on the side of an ally or a foe.

REASON FOR THIS WAR

The believer in "principle" cannot condone in an ally any behavior that emulates that of the totalitarian enemies now being brushed by the sword. The reason for this was, as the defenders of "principle" see it, is that neither Hitler nor any other totalitarian ruler can be trusted to keep the peace no matter what concessions are given. Appeasement and compromise never pay in dealing with the selfish or with those greedy for power or with those who exclude the "four freedoms" from their people.

Fortunately, in the democracies, public discussion of these issues is still permitted though some of the "practical" school of thought think that criticism of an ally for failure to adhere to the "four freedoms" should be suppressed. It would appear that fears of disunity have been widely exaggerated. Practically speaking, Russia and the United States and Britain are bound together by a common aim to defeat Germany aided by our manpower and supplies.

Despite the criticisms of Russia, for instance, it appears that her armies are proceeding vigorously and so are the armies of Britain and France and America. Evidently nothing that has been said in this country by the minority of believers in "principle" has given Goebbels enough ammunition to bolster his armies to defeat ours. The Allies seem to be making wonderful progress across the Rhine anyway.

The sooner the victory is won, the sooner discussion on fundamental issues can be carried on without the hysterical cry that to speak the truth about ourselves is to aid the enemy.

Fascism in America Not Dead—Sneak Devastating Attack Being Made on Constitution of United States by Fascist Group Representing Most Sinister Lobby Ever Organized to Make Rich Richer and Poor Poorer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while our 12,000,000 fine, brave, American boys are all over the world, upon 55 battle fronts, fighting and dying for our country, there has been, and is now, a comparatively small group of greedy, selfish men and women who are trying to change our form of government in order that they may escape their just and fair share of the burden of taxation which will be necessary to pay the enormous war debt.

It is said that our doughboys are entitled to the greatest credit because of the extra hazards of warfare and the unusual hardships which must be faced by them. Without in any way minimizing the importance of any branch of our armed forces, it can be said that the man on foot with the rifle and the grenades, in the end, actually wins the battle and conquers the foe.

THE "DOUGH BOYS" HERE AT HOME

While our doughboys on the battle field are fighting it out with the enemy at close range, oftentimes in hand-to-hand fighting with bayonets, the greedy, selfish group to which I have referred is trying to do something for the "dough boys" here at home—but in this case, many of the "dough boys" are those who have made so much money by reason of the country's misery and misfortunes caused by this war. These "dough boys" want to protect what in common parlance is referred to as their "dough"; among them are the new crop of "dough boys" of World War No. 2.

THE SCHEME

Their scheme, hatched up at the beginning of this war, is to repeal the sixteenth amendment to our United States Constitution, which permits Congress to levy taxes on incomes and inheritances.

They recognize that an open fight would not get them anything. Their plot could not stand the light of day, so therefore their efforts must be concealed and conducted in the dark. They know that any success must of necessity be the result of a campaign of deceit, misrepresentation, treachery, and fraud.

So this group began to operate. First, they prepared a resolution petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of repealing the sixteenth amendment to our United States Constitution and substitute a proposed twenty-second amendment, which would limit the amount of taxes that could ever be levied upon incomes, estates, and inheritances to 25 percent.

FEW FAMILIES WOULD SOON OWN ALL THE WEALTH

This would mean that one who was fortunate enough to have, for instance, a patent right or monopoly right or a great inheritance which would permit him to receive millions of dollars of income per year, would never have to pay more than 25 percent taxes. It would also mean that this person, when he died, could pass the fortune on with no more than 25 percent inheritance tax. This would enable a few families in a comparatively short period of time to acquire practically all the wealth of our Nation.

Such resolutions were introduced one after another in the respective State legislatures. There was no publicity given and very few people in the country knew that such a proposal was pending.

Under the fifth article of the United States Constitution, it is contended that when 32 States—two-thirds of the total number of States—petition Congress to call a convention that Congress has no other recourse and will be compelled to call a convention for the purpose stated in the petitions of the 32 State legislatures. This is a new approach to slip through an amendment.

JOB HALF FINISHED BEFORE DISCOVERED

Before I knew it, and before it was generally known, 14 State legislatures had adopted such a resolution and soon thereafter 3 more adopted it. This meant that if 15 more States had adopted such a resolution, the Congress would have been compelled to call a convention, and while our 12,000,000 fighting men were away, this great question would have been passed upon with the possibility of our Constitution being amended overnight to shift the burden of war taxation from the rich to the backs of the fighting men who had saved our country upon the battlefields of the earth.

This is the most sinister plot that has ever been known in American history. It is referred to as the millionaires' amendment and is also known as the tax-dodging amendment.

FASCIST GROUP

The sponsors of this vicious plot are a group masquerading under the name of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The mainsprings in this Committee for Constitutional Government are the following: America's No. 1 Fascist, Samuel Pettengill, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who is now devoting his talents at oratory and writing to concocting misleading and vicious propaganda for the group. We also have at the head of the group the millionaire publisher, Frank Gannett, who has a string of newspapers which he utilizes to spread Pettengill's propaganda. Mr. Gannett was once a Republican candidate for the Presidency. Also, one of the brains behind the vicious movement is Edward A. Rumely, who was convicted after the last war and sentenced to and served in the Federal penitentiary for acting as an agent for the German Government. The fourth member of this unholy quartet is Fascist instructor, Samuel McClure, who absorbed a little too much of fascistic teachings.

SO-CALLED CHRISTIAN AMERICAN GROUP

There are other groups throughout the Nation that could well be considered subsidiaries of the above organization. Among these we find a group with the audacity to call themselves the Christian Americans. I have in my possession a confidential report addressed to friends of the Christian American movement, and dated November 20, 1942, in which we find the following:

> The Alabama Legislature met Monday of this week and adjourned Friday, considering only the six subjects included in the Governor's call for the session. Labor legislation and taxation were not included.
>
> During our visit here we have made contact with the influential leaders, and we are assured that the session early in 1943 the following measures, sponsored by the Christian American organization, will be introduced and favorably acted upon:
>
> (1) A memorial to Congress to submit an amendment to the Federal Constitution limiting the taxing powers of Congress to a maximum rate of 25 percent on individual and corporate incomes, gifts, and inheritances.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> VANCE MUSE,
> *Secretary-Treasurer, The Christian American, Houston, Tex.*

This organization is one of many organized by Vance Muse. He is also associated with the Committee for Constitutional Government. Doubtless other Southern States were similarly propagandized by Muse.

I do not know how this resolution reached the Alabama Legislature. I am not impugning the motives or questioning the integrity of any member of that great legislative body but I venture to say that the members did not have all the facts on this resolution or it would not have been endorsed.

My information discloses that the resolution was introduced in the Alabama Legislature on June 22, 1943—House Joint Resolution 66. It passed the house, it passed the senate, and it was adopted on July 8, 1943.

I cite Alabama just as an example to show what kind of support the resolution had—what organizations were behind it. Other States have passed a similar resolution. In fact, 17 States have passed it to my knowledge; they are as follows, and I include the year of passage for your information:

Alabama, 1943; Arkansas, 1943; Delaware, 1943; Illinois, 1943; Indiana, 1943; Iowa, 1941; Kentucky, 1944; Maine, 1941; Massachusetts, 1941; Michigan, 1941; Mississippi, 1940; New Hampshire, 1943; New Jersey, 1944; Pennsylvania, 1943; Rhode Island, 1940; Wisconsin, 1943; Wyoming, 1939.

STOPPED IN THEIR TRACKS

However, since our fight was instituted to expose the vicious nature of the proposal and show just who was behind it, not one single State has come out in favor of the resolution. In fact, the sponsoring group has suffered a severe reverse by having 4 of the abovementioned States refute their endorsement by passing rescinding resolutions. These 4 States are Arkansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois. This brings the score down to 13 endorsing States instead of 17. Other States are also considering similar rescinding resolutions.

ENDORSING STATES SHOULD RESCIND

I wish to call your attention to the fact, however, that even though all of the necessary 32 States did not pass the resolutions during a single year, it does not mean that the action of the endorsing States is nullified by adjournment of the respective legislatures. Once a State has passed an endorsing resolution, that action is effective for year after year; the only way to get those names off the endorsing list is to have them pass a rescinding resolution, and to keep those States which have not already passed an endorsing resolution from doing so.

STAKES HIGH

Remember that the stakes in this game are the highest; they involve the incomes, estates, inheritances, and gifts of the millionaires. They can readily afford to spend terrific sums and fight a concentrated fight in one State at a time if they feel it will be to their advantage. If they could secure the endorsement of 1 State a year for the next 19 years and none of the 13 already endorsing did not rescind, their mission would be accomplished. They would have the 32 States necessary and which they are striving with every crooked, sordid campaign which they can devise.

Just to show you that their activities are still a threat, here is a sentence taken from a New York newspaper clipping of February 20 of this year:

> By a vote of 24 to 24, a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to propose a constitutional amendment limiting taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts was declared lost today in the Senate.

Fortified with the near-success as expressed by the tie vote, the proponents evidently launched a new campaign in that State. The result is evidenced by this clipping of March 21, 1945:

> The senate today approved a resolution asking Congress to clear the way for a constitutional amendment limiting estate and personal income taxes to 25 percent. The vote was 30 to 22.

Unfortunately for the proponents, the New York Legislature adjourned before they could make their attempt to get the concurrence of the house.

FARMERS AFFECTED

In analyzing the devastating effects which the adoption of the proposed Gannett-Pettengill twenty-second amendment to the Constitution would have upon the various groups in our Nation, too little thought has been given to the calamitous results this proposal would have on the farmer and his annual income.

It is gratifying to note that those of our farm States which have learned the true facts about this vicious proposal have acted quickly through their State legislatures to rescind the actions of former legislatures which, for lack of sufficient information, endorsed the measure as being in their best interests. As I have noted, Iowa, Wisconsin, Arkansas, and Illinois have adopted rescinding resolutions which cancel out their former legislatures' precipitate actions. The selfish millionaires who have tried to dupe the agricultural interests of the Nation for their own personal gain have learned in 1945 that the farmer can quickly repel attack on his pocketbook once the truth is told him about the real motives and purposes behind this sinister proposal.

These millionaires who hope to double and triple their own net incomes after taxes through the adoption of this amendment are not the ones who provide the big market for farm products. They are only a handful of greedy money grabbers who are willing to see the small farmer burdened with a permanent peacetime burden of 25 percent Federal taxation upon his personal income, instead of his normal 10 or 12 percent tax, in order that they—the selfish few—may be saved the millions in Federal taxes which the Government normally collects from the wealthy few who are possessed of idle funds.

These millionaires would not devote their surplus funds to improving the lot of the farmer. They would only use them for luxury-investment purposes or for industrial investment which could not directly benefit the farmer to any degree.

As I have stated many times before, this vicious "millionaires' amendment" would result in the following if it should become part of our Constitution:

First. The principle of "ability to pay" in Federal taxation will be discarded.

Second. Small business will be wrecked because big business will be able to keep so much of the huge profits that they make that little business will be unable to compete and will be quickly and easily crushed and destroyed.

Third. The Government will be unable to collect sufficient money under the restriction to provide for more than the payment of the interest on the national debt when the war is over. It is estimated that our national debt will be around three hundred billion when the war is over. If the interest rate is kept down to 2½ percent, the carrying charges will be $7,500,000,000 per annum. Therefore, it is very doubtful that the Government can raise more than enough to carry this enormous carrying charge on the national debt with this 25-percent restriction.

Fourth. Dependents of those who gave their lives for their country in this and other wars will no longer be able to receive relief from the Federal Government.

Fifth. There will be nothing left for the Federal Government to provide for those who can no longer carry on due to injuries and wounds received in battle while protecting our country in this and other wars.

Sixth. The aid for old-age assistance will have to be discontinued and much of the social-security program generally will be wrecked.

Seventh. There can be no soil-conservation payments to farmers.

Eighth. There can be no help by the Federal Government for construction of highways and roads; nor for the improvement of our rivers and harbors.

These are just a few of the benefits that will have to be stopped immediately if this amendment becomes effective.

LITTLE TAXPAYERS WOULD BE HARMED

In practice the 49,200,000 taxpayers in the lower brackets will not only not have their taxes reduced under this amendment, but their taxes will actually have to be increased to make up for the savings that will be granted to the few who now own and control so much of the wealth of the country.

FARMERS SHOULD DEMAND DEATH OF PROPOSAL

The fight against this sinister lobby is far from won. The farmers have a vital interest in this campaign for the protection of their own personal interests. I sincerely hope that the agricultural groups in every State in the Nation will take cognizance of the activities of Committee for Constitutional Government and will advise their accredited representatives in the various State legislatures just where they stand on this vital question.

The term "full employment" would be meaningless if the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution should be adopted as proposed by these selfish interests. Unless the farmers maintain a vigilant watch on their various State legislatures, the fine actions already taken in Iowa, Wisconsin, Arkansas, and Illinois, may be of no avail.

This selfish group believes it is all right for Congress to be allowed the privilege of taking all a citizen has, in time of war, if he only has a life to give; but if it is money, property, or income, the citizen is asked to contribute, there should be a limit of 25 percent. No wonder they want to operate in the dark.

Pollution Is a Menace to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped and expected that one of the challenges which will be met by the Seventy-ninth Congress soon after it resumes regular sessions after Easter is the matter of stream pollution. In that connection, I desire to take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country an editorial published in the February 28, 1945, issue of the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn.:

CONGRESS BILL TO CURB STREAM POLLUTION IN UNITED STATES SHOULD GET SUPPORT OF CONSERVATION-MINDED

United States Representative KARL MUNDT has introduced a bill, H. R. 519, which deserves the support of citizens throughout the country who recognize the threat of continued and unending stream pollution to the health, money, and recreation possibilities of the Nation.

Several times reference has been made here to a bill now before the Tennessee Legislature backed by the Conservation Commission, which would constitute at least a step toward curbing stream pollution in our State.

Which consideration leads to a conclusion long held by experienced conservationists that no ultimately effective clearing of our streams is possible without a national antipollution law. This is what the Mundt bill will be, if enacted.

As the readers of this family journal have probably suspected, the Knoxville Journal is extremely jealous of the rights of the individual States in their relationship to the Washington Government. These have been so reduced and weakened under the Roosevelt regime that such few as we have left become precious indeed.

But on this matter of stream pollution we are ready to concede that only the Federal Government can act as a last recourse in the fight we hope the people are going to make to reclaim their streams. Happily, it is as a last recourse that the Mundt bill is drawn. Section 5 of it states:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress in the administration of this act to encourage State and interstate compact agencies to exercise their statutory authority in prevention and abatement of pollution and that action by the Federal Board will be taken only after such existing authorities have been given an opportunity to act, and 6 months after written notice by the Board have failed to do so."

Thus it is seen that the bill in question is so drawn as to mesh perfectly with whatever effective State legislation there exists to combat stream pollution.

As was pointed out here yesterday, most of us have become so accustomed to the tragedy of seeing the value of our streams for recreational purposes destroyed; of seeing them become menaces to public health and breeders of economic waste, that we fall into the conviction that there is nothing we can do about it. Because we recognize that doing something about it will take much more than our lifetimes, we pass it by for accomplishments that may be perfected within a year or a decade.

We believe, however, that the time is ripe for conservation-minded people all over the country to form themselves into an unpaid lobby to really get antipollution work going. Nor is a campaign to get the Mundt bill enacted out of place even in wartimes. These streams and lakes that raw sewage and industrial waste are now depreciating in value belong, especially, to the younger generation that comprises our armed forces. This fight started now will pay big dividends to them when they are as old as we.

The reader is urged to write his Congressman and his Senators asking support of the Mundt bill. The number, again, is H. R. 519.

Treaty With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial entitled "Better Go Slow," written by James M. Langley, editor of the Concord Monitor, under date of March 27. The editorial relates to the Mexican treaty, and in view of the current discussion of the treaty, I think it is most timely and cogent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER GO SLOW

There is agitation to get the treaty with Mexico through before the world meeting at San Francisco. The treaty would establish what amounts to an international T. V. A., a regional river valley (the Rio Grande and its tributaries) authority operating in two countries.

This is a new venture in international affairs. Under the proposal the waters of the great watershed would be divided between Mexico and the United States. In both the ultimate use of these waters to their maximum will help convert arid areas to conditions of fertility. Several States are interested on this side of the border, but under the treaty there would be a greater authority than their own and they would lose whatever sovereign rights they now possess individually, though they would have a minority representation in the Government of the United States, which would be a party to the treaty.

This sort of treaty is not something to be entered with haste. The proposal has been before the Congress for some time, but now that it is slated for action there should be deliberate consideration and debate. For the Rio Grande is not the only watershed which might become involved in international treaties. In this part of the continent the watershed of the St. Lawrence is even greater and more important. The pattern set with Mexico might become the formula adopted concerning the St. Lawrence.

The theory advanced by those who would hasten consideration of and action upon the treaty with Mexico is that its approval now would help to bring the nations of the western hemisphere to San Francisco with a show of good neighborliness. Once more Uncle Sam would be cast as a good Samaritan. This time he would be giving

the much smaller and weaker nation to the south a generous share of the waters of the Rio Grande, most of which originate within the United States.

The theory is not sound. It gets the United States nothing to be perpetually presented in such a role. In the first place to be so presented doesn't impress anyone with our sense of justice. It only makes the United States appear to be profligate. It is right for us to be fair, but when we slop over and go beyond mere fairness and distribute our wealth, natural or otherwise, to all comers we are merely exhibiting poor sense in the judgment of even those who benefit. We do not win their respect. In fact, we lose it, if we ever had it.

Mexico has within herself the great natural resources upon which she could, if she would, build a great civilization. The United States, her neighbor, has developed civilized skills which she can observe and copy, if she will. If Mexico is a poor relative, it is because she has not yet chosen to change from an essentially agrarian character to an industrial nation. To grow greater she must make the decision herself and attain industrialization by her own efforts. If we give Mexico partial industrialization and development, we not only do not win her respect, but she will not attain the self-respect necessary to sustain civilized advancement.

In our good-neighbor policy there is a superficial show of treating the smaller nations to the south of us as equals. But somehow we do not manage to impress them with our sincerity, for we aren't sincere the way we go about it. We don't really feel they are equals, and they suspect as much. We seem to think, like a lot of individual Americans do, that everything can be bought for a price, including good will. International amity is not for sale for so many dollars, in either goods or services. It can be attained only through mutual self-respect.

If to procure a treaty with Mexico we give up water rights we now possess, though we have future need of them, we are making a mistake. Yet this is virtually what we seem to be doing under the proposed treaty. The Rio Grande is fed by great rivers which flow entirely within the United States, and the Colorado River, also involved, is also mostly within the United States.

The States within which these rivers flow have or had rights to them. But now the Nation considers these rights hers, rather than rights of the States. Even under the newer concept, they are still rights of the United States. Now some of these rights are to be handed to an international authority by agreement with another nation. That is a sufficiently important step to warrant anything but the haste now sought in bringing the agreement into being within a few days.

Training of 18-Year-Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress has received protests against the current policy of the Army with reference to the use of 18-year-old boys as infantry replacements in combat service after having been given only 13 to 17 weeks' training. I have received a number of letters from the parents of such boys and it has been brought to my attention that in a number of cases 18-year-old boys have become casualties soon after being sent in as replacements at the front.

I have brought to the attention of the War Department the fact that American fathers and mothers were given the impression at the time the draft age was lowered that their young sons would not be sent into service without a year's training. I do not know of any specific assurances which the War Department gave to this effect, but undoubtedly the War Department, like everyone else, knew that this impression prevailed and it is unfortunate that nothing was done to correctly advise the public, especially the fathers and mothers, of the facts. I have made specific inquiry of General Marshall as to the character of training which is given before our young boys are sent as replacements to the front lines and shall include his reply as a part of these remarks. It is my understanding that these young boys have not been sent to the front lines without further training overseas except in cases where there was a lack of trained troops in a crisis like the battle of the Ardennes. Now that the situation has become less critical I hope that it will be the policy of the Army to see that these young soldiers are given a longer period of training before being rushed into combat.

I think it is only fair to the Army to say that no army in all history has given as much concern to saving the lives of its men through the use of superior equipment, unexcelled medical and hospital care, and sound and brilliant leadership as our Army has done during this war. I feel that our losses have been kept at the minimum considering the number of men involved and the size and character of our operations.

The letter from General Marshall to which reference has been made is as follows:

MARCH 9, 1945.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: I have your letter inquiring as to the training our infantry replacements receive before they enter combat. The following is the information you requested.

Infantry replacements are sent overseas under completion of their replacement training. Subject to changes in military needs, they receive additional training in the theater. Because of military emergencies, such as the recent German attack in the Ardennes Forest, some of these men may arrive in the front lines with no training other than the replacement training they received in the United States.

I am concerned over the current tendency to confuse both the time required for the training of units with that of individual replacements and also the length of training with its adequacy. As for the former, a unit such as a division requires a year or more to train, but the individual soldier who is to be placed in a seasoned, veteran unit can be properly trained in much less time. As for the adequacy of our training, it is based upon extensive military experience relating specifically to the present war, and the training is largely in the hands of men who have had recent combat experience. I have personally inspected camp after camp to make certain that this work is being conducted in the most efficient manner practicable. It should be kept in mind that all of these men, after their replacement training is completed, are assigned to units with long combat experience where the leadership from the noncommissioned grades upward is in the hands of veterans. Our reports from the battlefields reveal that these men measure up well in combat, and I am firmly of the conviction that never before in our history have our soldiers been so carefully prepared for battle as is the case at the present time. Attached are the comments of Mr. Stimson to the press which explain this situation and our efforts to meet it.

I hope that you and the Congress will feel free to assist us in making it clear to the American people that our choice in the matter is this: Either we must delay our operations in Europe and in the Pacific, thereby greatly increasing the loss of life by prolonging the war, or we must continue our present procedures. There is no other course in view of the present manpower situation and the fact that we have already thoroughly combed the forces here and in noncombat areas overseas to insure that men suitable for infantry replacements are retrained in the infantry and assigned to combat units.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mexican Treaty Constitutes Repudiation of Solemn Pledge Given War Veterans by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of my colleagues in the House to the fact that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has just reported favorably on a bill giving the same preference to veterans of World War No. 2 as was extended to veterans of World War No. 1 in the settlement of newly irrigated lands in southwest Arizona and southern California.

It may interest the Members of the House to know that the passage of the Mexican treaty will make impossible the utilization, by the veterans of this war, of the benefits conferred under this bill, and will constitute an ignoble repudiation of a solemn pledge given to the war veterans of the First World War by the Federal Government.

Several hundred thousand acres of public and potentially productive land located along the lower Colorado River in southwestern United States for some 16 years have been held in trust for war veterans. Up until the building of Boulder Dam the land appeared to be only a useless desert waste, because there was no dependable water supply to irrigate these acres.

When Boulder Dam was built it made possible the regulation of the Colorado River and the conservation of its floodwaters. When Congress adopted the Boulder Canyon Project Act in 1928 it

was generally believed by the people of America that the water salvaged by the great dam would be made available for use within the United States, for the benefit of citizens of the United States.

In fact, the Boulder Act, in section 1, contains the explicit provision that the water salvaged and stored by Boulder Dam is to be made available for use "exclusively within the United States."

But Congress in adopting the act went even further. It provided, in section 9—the section which is amended by H. R. 2742 and just reported as mentioned before by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation—that all public land that could ultimately be irrigated by water from Boulder Dam was to be withdrawn from entry, and reopened for entry as and when facilities for irrigating the land were brought into existence. And it was further provided that when such land was reopened for entry, United States war veterans were to be given preference in the settlement of this land. Now, during the past few years, the All-American Canal, watering the Imperial Valley of California, has been constructed and placed in operation. From this canal it will now be possible—if the water is there—to irrigate some 150,000 acres of public land. This is a part of the total acreage of similar public land that was withdrawn from entry back in 1928. Much of this particular area is part of the Imperial Valley, the irrigated portion of which is one of the most productive areas in the entire United States—reclaimed from desert wasteland by the application of water from the Colorado River. These additional areas, reserved for veterans, can become equally productive, if the water Congress has dedicated to their use is not given to Mexico, as the treaty proposes, and provide a large number of homes for returning war veterans.

In the Gila Valley in Arizona an even larger area, over 500,000 acres, was similarly withdrawn for the aid of veterans and included, by section 11 of the act, in a project to be investigated by the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Government by solemn legislative enactment back in 1928 promised its war veterans that they should have the first right to take up and settle upon these public lands.

Now, we find that this pledge will be ignobly broken and cast aside if the proposed Mexican water treaty is ratified by the Senate. This is true because, after the Colorado River water guaranteed to Mexican landowners by the treaty is sent on down below the international border, there will not be sufficient water available in future years to assure a dependable supply of water for much of this public land. The land, of course, is worthless unless it is assured and actually gets a dependable supply of water. It can only get that water from the Colorado River.

The head of the Veterans' Administration has said that all of these withdrawn lands will be needed for returning veterans.

Engineering studies, I understand, clearly reveal that many hundred thousand acres of potentially fertile land in the southwestern part of the United States cannot be reclaimed and developed if Mexican landowners are to be given a guarantee in perpetuity of 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water annually. Included in the American land that is thus doomed to remain forever a desert, by the terms of the proposed treaty, are thousands of acres of land that have been held in trust for our war veterans.

The veterans of World War No. 1 have not forgotten the pledge that has been made by the Federal Government to give ex-servicemen a chance to establish homes on land made usable by water from the Colorado River. During the long years when forward looking Americans were seeking to bring about the adoption of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, one of the strongest and most consistent sources of support for Boulder Dam came from the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Year after year at their national conventions, starting as early as 1921 and going on through until the Boulder bill was adopted in 1928, these great organizations of American war veterans adopted resolutions supporting the Boulder project. One of the authors of the Boulder Project Act was Congressman Phil D. Swing, a veteran of World War No. 1.

The veterans of the World War strongly supported the Boulder Dam project because they knew it was an essential development project for the benefit of the entire country. They also saw in this project an honorable and worth-while plan to give thousands of ex-servicemen opportunities to establish homes—and support their families by their own labors—on land that, they thought, would be made productive by the application of Colorado River water conserved by Boulder Dam.

Representatives of the national veteran organizations came to Washington and appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and protested the ratification of the Mexican Treaty because they saw in that treaty an instrument that would make it impossible to reclaim much of the land which has thus far been held in trust for returning war veterans.

One of those who appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee was John R. Quinn, who has been a member of the national executive committee of the American Legion for the past 18 years, and is also a former national commander of the Legion.

To the pleas that have come from ex-servicemen, it appears the State Department and a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee has turned a deaf ear. They have ignored these pleas in continuing to support the Mexican Treaty.

I say the veterans of World War No. 1 have not forgotten the pledge which their Government made to give ex-servicemen the opportunity to settle upon and develop thousands of acres of potentially productive land with Colorado River water. The act by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation extending the benefits of this law to the veterans of this conflict is a further sham and delusion unless the Mexican Water Treaty is defeated.

Let Justice Be Our Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of a letter written by a former patient in the Veterans' Administration Tuberculosis Hospital at Oteen, N. C., with enclosure, which every Member of Congress should read and reread.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Oteen, N. C., March 27, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: I am enclosing an article headed "Let justice be our creed," published in our Sunday morning paper and which is self-explanatory. It deals with the article published in the Cosmopolitan magazine. The writer of this enclosed article was a patient in this institution twenty-odd years ago when, as you know, I myself was a patient for 4 years. He is a veteran of two wars and is a close student of hospital technique, especially in the field of tuberculosis.

For your information, the criticism of conditions alleged existing in veterans' hospitals by the author of the article appearing in the Cosmopolitan is unwarranted and they do not exist in any veterans' hospital in this State. We have one of the finest hospitals for the treatment of tuberculosis in the country here at Oteen. It is well staffed and is headed by Dr. Frank B. Brewer who has twenty-odd years experience as manager in veterans' hospitals.

The writer of the enclosed article and I, who as I stated have been treated in this hospital in the early twenties when it covered a 100-acre field and old Army barracks were used for wards compared with the present magnificent fireproof buildings which are equipped with the very best clinics and staffed with physicians trained in the treatment of tuberculosis, wonder just what kind of mysterious and better treatment this critic can advocate for the patients in veterans' hospitals of this type.

I was sorry we did not have our annual meeting of the rehabilitation committee this year as in the past and at which time it is always a pleasure to call on you, but I hope everything is well with you and I know you are carrying on for the veterans as you have in the past. The RECORD tells the story. I always like to read of your skirmishes in the Halls of Congress. I know no one is more sincere in what he advocates than you; it is sound Americanism in every respect.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

C. A. PENNINGTON.

The enclosure to which he refers was written by another former patient at Oteen and reads as follows:

LET JUSTICE BE OUR CREED

EDITOR OF THE CITIZEN-TIMES:

The gentleman who is making himself notorious by his present venomous campaign against our veterans' hospitals and their professional personnel, should be challenged on account of the direct harm he is doing to the

patients in these hospitals. In giving vent to his highly stimulated imagination he is, by false assertions and inferences, creating unrest among heretofore perfectly satisfied and contented patients thereby disturbing their rest, which is so essential to their recovery, and also increasing the labors of the already overworked doctors and nurses. And, worse yet, he is torturing the minds of families who have loved ones in the veterans' hospitals. Though the patients, as is well known to all that have daily contact with them, are receiving the very best of attention and care, their families are falsely led to think they are being neglected. How could man commit a more dastardly crime? Further yet, in his anxiety to condemn our hospitals, he gleefully quotes figures on those leaving the hospitals against medical advice and, to support his venomous tirade, manufactures the false reason of dissatisfaction with the hospital. But, he seems not to realize that his own ravings about neglect are giving those who want to leave anyhow not a reason but an excuse to leave. He is, in reality, creating what he is complaining about.

He tells the public about these men leaving the hospitals, which a certain percentage has always done, but what he does not tell is that every one of them will, in time, be back, and many on stretchers, too far gone to save. Those of us who have gone through the process of obtaining an arrested case and have been put on our feet, through the years, have seen them come and go. Through this experience and observation we well know that if a case of tuberculosis, in its early stages, can be put to bed and treated with comfortable rest, a cure is almost certain and in a much shorter time. It takes years to learn all there is concerning the relation of a patient's behavior to his recovery; yet, this gentleman running from hospital to hospital, filling his little bucket of slandermud from anyone who cared to contribute, not only has gotten so much of this mud in his own eyes that he can see no good at all but has learned more about the treatment of tuberculosis than those with years of experience. What a wonderful man. I venture to say there is not a thinking patient, in any hospital, who has read this man's condemning accusations, that has not come to the clear conclusion that he is very, very ignorant of his subject.

To belittle the accomplishments of the Government's tubercular hospitals he makes some, apparently, startling comparisons of figures on cures and deaths in Government hospitals and in State hospitals, which are, as we will see, absolutely meaningless. He makes these contrasts to show us, he thinks conclusively, that State hospitals have a different and better treatment for tuberculosis than our veterans' hospitals. Assuming that the State figures he gives are truthful, they still mean nothing. But, as we will see, the common human behavior that created these figures does tell us the truth.

The underlying causes of a State's more favorable figure is not in a difference in treatment, as he implies, but in a better behavior of the patient. For these patients are admitted through charitable reasons and have no money to create the desire of a good time, as the so-inclined veteran has; therefore they are obedient to medical regulations from the time of admission until discharge. They do not have patients leaving against medical advice and coming back later in a developed condition that makes recovery impossible, but the veterans' hospital has.

In contrast to this, upon which the Government must rest its case, is that a certain percentage of veteran patients abuse the privilege of liberty, however obtained, by getting drunk and indulging in all the detrimental conduct that is common to a man in this state. Public records and hospital disciplinary records furnish undeniable proof how some veterans, who might otherwise get well, destroy their chances of recovery. It is not pleasant to have to mention these regrettable things but the good doctors and nurses, who are working their heads off to help us to our feet, richly deserve protection from the present abuses that are being so unjustly heaped upon their defenseless shoulders. Besides, honest, open-minded truth is the only thing that will destroy these condemnations which are founded upon falsity.

There are, regrettably, many patients who have left the hospital against medical advice to return in a broken-down state with the odds for recovery decidedly against them. The Government cannot, as State hospitals do, put into effect regulations preventing these suicidal behaviors. And, even if it had the power to do so, it could not do it without bringing unjust hardships upon the vast majority of patients who are sincerely trying to get well and who do not abuse liberty.

From the entire absence of any of these detrimental behaviors among the patients in State hospitals, it may be readily seen why they should have a higher percentage of cures and a lower death rate. If this is not true, then it is absolutely proven that debauchery does not injure a tubercular patient.

Some careless, and some headstrong, patients who refuse to be guided by medical advice provided for them are perfectly willing to listen after they have destroyed their chances of recovery. But, then it is too late and, unfortunately, the records must show another death.

Might it now be asked, in justice to our doctors and nurses and to the Veterans' Bureau, in what way can they be held accountable for the result of human behavior over which they have no control?

Withal we must see, in comparing the two sets of statistics, that the truth is in the behavior of the individuals that created the figures and not in the figures themselves at all.

Let justice be our creed.

HERRMAN M. KNAUTH.

OTEEN, N. C.

Employment Service Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at the very inception of the employment service agencies administration was vested in the several States. By and large the work was carried on successfully on a State level. There has been a continued effort on the part of the Federal Government to federalize this service. This has been accelerated by the war, and they have exercised the opportunity afforded by the war to place this service under the War Manpower Commission.

Now we find that the deficiency appropriation bill was passed with an item $2,295,557 for veterans placement, also under Federal jurisdiction. This is another device used by the Federal administration to bring under its control the employment of returning veterans.

This case is parallel with the administration of farm security, and all adds up to the Federal bureaucracy reaching further each day for ever-increasing control of the lives of the American people. It is time for the Congress of the United States to view this movement with great alarm, and start reversing itself. The issue is as serious on the Democratic side as it is on the Republican side.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter on this subject from William M. Schantz, Director of the North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, which states in understandable language the trend of events, and the disapproval of the States of the appropriation recently passed for veterans placement:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION DIVISION
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 23, 1945.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: There is submitted herewith a mimeographed copy of letter to Mr. Ray R. Adams, Chief of the Readjustment Allowance Division, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. This letter relates to a requested deficiency appropriation of $5,500,000 to be made available to the Chairman of the Veterans' Placement Service Board. In our opinion, this requested deficiency appropriation is not urgently needed and we have set forth our viewpoints in the matter to Mr. Adams. We cannot help but feel that, despite the many previous unsuccessful efforts to extend federalization over the 51 separate Employment Service agencies, the efforts of the Federal bureaus are not being relaxed. We continue to stand on the proposition that employment-security problems can be more intelligently solved at the State level as against a federalized system.

Your attention is directed to the fact that at the request of the President of the United States, acquiesced in by each of the Governors of the several States, and for the war emergency, the Employment Service offices were placed on a loan basis to the Federal Government. When the lending arrangement was made the President definitely acknowledged that the loan was on a temporary basis and that after the war emergency reversion to the prior status would occur. We observe many attempts to depart from this arrangement.

Your attention is directed to Senate Resolution No. 7, adopted by the 1945 North Dakota Legislative Assembly, memorializing Congress with respect to "leaving administration of the provisions of the unemployment-compensation law in the hands of the States" and "limiting the activities of the Federal Social Security Administration to advisory matters as against regulation of State laws." While we did not become acquainted with this resolution until after its passage, we cannot feel other than that this resolution is in good order and well timed. It also supports the resolutions adopted by the Hershey (Pa.) Governors' Conference.

The administrators of the several State employment security agencies are justifiably proud of the fact that the States' record is good and that in the more than 8 years of operations no problems became so serious as to invite Federal control or supervision. It is our sincere belief that State administrators are much better acquainted with the local problems and by that token frequently reduce a condition before the same becomes alarming. We hold that the Federal processes are too slow, too involved, and too cumbersome. Therefore, we recommend that instead of expanding Federal control efforts should be made to speedily reduce such control. To that end we recommend that instead of approving increased appropriations to Federal agencies that consideration be given to making such increased appropriations available, in part at least, for the more

efficient operations of the several State agencies.

Thanking you for your thoughtful consideration.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM M. SCHANTZ, *Director.*

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, practically every public speech we hear today is prefaced by the statement that we are confronted with two great pressing problems. One is to win the war at the earliest possible date, and the second is to provide for a just and lasting peace.

Our military leaders, with the cooperation of our armed forces, seem to be doing everything possible to solve the first problem for us and our civilian leaders have not been idle in devising plans designed to solve the second problem.

A few months ago we had a conference of civilian leaders representing the various Allied Nations in this war. The leaders met at our seat of Government in a conference from the latter part of August until the early part of October 1944, the deliberations being held at what is known as Dumbarton Oaks, a former residence of John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina. Matters agreed upon for submission to the people of the conferring nations have recently been publicized, and it has been agreed that another conference will be held on April 25 of this year with the hope that a definite program with permanent peace as its objective can be definitely submitted to the people of the conferring nations for ratification, and it is hoped in the meantime the American people will give full and free expression of their feelings as to the wisdom of the suggestions embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

I have not seen an explanation or analysis of any kind of these proposals, and I would, therefore, not feel justified in undertaking to explain any of them further than to give an expression of my personal interpretation of the proposals as they appear in the report, and what I shall say should not be intended or considered as a criticism but more in the nature of an inquiry for a better explanation of such proposals. It is agreed that the people of all civilized nations generally are in favor of permanent peace, and a great majority of them are prepared to subscribe to any reasonable program that would insure a fair and permanent peace. A tentative formula is incorporated in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and the problem now before the Congress and the American people is whether we shall accept them in toto. The matter is of more significance than any submitted since the writing and ratification of the Constitution of the United States. It will be recalled the Constitution was not written and ratified within a few days, a few weeks, or even a few months, but was carefully studied and analyzed for a few years, and I am venturing the guess the people as a whole understood and were better advised as to what was contemplated in the Constitution at the time of its ratification than any generation of our people since that time. It will be recalled that it was not supported unanimously, and it was supported by many with some apprehensions and misgivings as to whether it would be successful, but for the past 100 years the American people have been practically unanimous in their support and loyalty to this great charter of liberty and freedom.

It is not only appropriate but highly important that we carefully study and attempt to interpret these proposals in the light of history and experience for a great international organization is to be created primarily or mainly with the hope it may provide for a just and lasting peace. It should be made clear that this is the only purpose for which the organization is created, and it should not be empowered with any additional authority or powers, because we are not ready for a federation of the world or a universal empire, although such a state has been the vision of poets and the dream of geniuses for centuries.

After a most careful study I am convinced that if the proposals are accepted in the spirit of cooperation in which they are prepared the organization will be able to obviate the possibility of war for many generations. However, it seems that chapter 9 of the proposals, providing for the creation of an economic commission, social commission, and a humanitarian agency, might prove to be entering a field much larger than contemplated by many of us. It appears that if these agencies were to function in accordance with the language used they would sooner or later be establishing economic, social, and humanitarian standards of life and business in the several member states and if the organization should have power to make them regulatory, I can vision the day when the member states would lose their identity and become incorporated into what may be known as the United States of the World. We do not have to go far back in history to find an illustration and justification of this conclusion. Every student knows that in the creation of our Government of the United States the powers and functions of the several States were generously guaranteed when they undertook to form a more perfect union, and every well-advised person knows what has taken place in this century and a half, and today there are apprehensions, serious apprehensions, on the part of many that the original functions and powers of the States have been completely absorbed by the Government of the United States created at the beginning with limited powers but which has grown and developed to a point where it exercises practically unlimited powers, not only over the States but over the individual population. Therefore, in order that the people of my district may read for themselves and know just what is involved or contemplated in the organization to be created with the idea of guaranteeing a permanent and just peace I am asking, Mr. Speaker, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals may be incorporated in my remarks at this point:

PROPOSALS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

There should be established an international organization under the title of The United Nations, the Charter of which should contain provisions necessary to give effect to the proposals which follow.

CHAPTER I. PURPOSES

The purposes of the Organization should be:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and

4. To afford a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

CHAPTER II. PRINCIPLES

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in chapter I the Organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

2. All members of the organization undertake in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the Organization, to fulfill the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.

3. All members of the Organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

4. All members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.

5. All members of the Organization shall give every assistance to the Organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

6. All members of the Organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the Organization.

The Organization should ensure that states not members of the Organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER III. MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving states.

CHAPTER IV. PRINCIPAL ORGANS

1. The Organization should have as its principal organs:

a. A General Assembly;
b. A Security Council;
c. An International Court of Justice; and
d. A Secretariat.

2. The Organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section A. Composition

All members of the Organization should be members of the General Assembly and

should have a number of representatives to be specified in the Charter.

Section B. Functions and powers

1. The General Assembly should have the right to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the Organization or by the Security Council; and to make recommendations with regard to any such principles or questions. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

2. The General Assembly should be empowered to admit new members to the Organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

3. The General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council. The General Assembly should be empowered, upon recommendation of the Security Council, to expel from the Organization any member of the Organization which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter.

4. The General Assembly should elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council provided for in Chapter IX. It should be empowered to elect, upon recommendation of the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the Organization. It should perform such functions in relation to the election of the judges of the international court of justice as may be conferred upon it by the statute of the court.

5. The General Assembly should apportion the expenses among the members of the Organization and should be empowered to approve the budgets of the Organization.

6. The General Assembly should initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in political, economic and social fields and of adjusting situations likely to impair the general welfare.

7. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the coordination of the policies of international economic, social, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the Organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the Organization.

8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council and reports from other bodies of the Organization.

Section C. Voting

1. Each member of the Organization should have one vote in the General Assembly.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the Security Council; election of members of the Economic and Social Council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote.

Section D. Procedure

1. The General Assembly should meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require.

2. The General Assembly should adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its President for each session.

3. The General Assembly should be empowered to set up such bodies and agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions.

CHAPTER VI. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Section A. Composition

The Security Council should consist of one representative of each of eleven members of the Organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, should have permanent seats. The General Assembly should elect six states to fill the non-permanent seats. These six states should be elected for a term of two years, three retiring each year. They should not be immediately eligible for reelection. In the first election of the non-permanent members three should be chosen by the General Assembly for one-year terms and three for two-year terms.

Section B. Principal functions and powers

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the Organization, members of the Organization should by the Charter confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should agree that in carrying out these duties under this responsibility it should act on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

3. The specific powers conferred on the Security Council in order to carry out these duties are laid down in Chapter VIII.

4. All members of the Organization should obligate themselves to accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

5. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Chapter VIII, Section B, paragraph 9, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments for submission to the members of the Organization.

Section C. Voting

(NOTE.—The question of voting procedure in the Security Council is still under consideration.)

Section D. Procedure

1. The Security Council should be so organized as to be able to function continuously and each state member of the Security Council should be permanently represented at the headquarters of the Organization. It may hold meetings at such other places as in its judgment may best facilitate its work. There should be periodic meetings at which each state member of the Security Council could if it so desired be represented by a member of the government or some other special representative.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to set up such bodies or agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions including regional subcommittees of the Military Staff Committee.

3. The Security Council should adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

4. Any member of the Organization should participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the Security Council considers that the interests of that member of the Organization are specially affected.

5. Any member of the Organization not having a seat on the Security Council and any state not a member of the Organization, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, should be invited to participate in the discussion relating to the dispute.

CHAPTER VII. AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. There should be an international court of justice which should constitute the principal judicial organ of the Organization.

2. The court should be constituted and should function in accordance with a statute which should be annexed to and be a part of the Charter of the Organization.

3. The statute of the court of international justice should be either (a) the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, continued in force with such modifications as may be desirable or (b) a new statute in the preparation of which the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice should be used as a basis.

4. All members of the Organization should ipso facto be parties to the statute of the international court of justice.

5. Conditions under which states not members of the Organization may become parties to the statute of the international court of justice should be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

CHAPTER VIII. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY, INCLUDING PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF AGGRESSION

Section A. Pacific settlement of disputes

1. The Security Council should be empowered to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. Any state, whether member of the organization or not, may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the general assembly or of the security Council.

3. The parties to any dispute the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement, or other peaceful means of their own choice. The Security Council should call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

4. If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above fail to settle it by the means indicated in that paragraph, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. The Security Council should in each case decide whether or not the continuance of the particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security and, accordingly, whether the Security Council should deal with the dispute, and, if so, whether it should take action under paragraph 5.

5. The Security Council should be empowered, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

6. Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Security Council should be empowered to refer to the Court, for advice, legal questions connected with other disputes.

7. The provisions of paragraph 1 to 6 of Section A should not apply to situations or disputes arising out of matters which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the state concerned.

Section B. Determination of threats to the peace or acts of aggression and action with respect thereto

1. Should the Security Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with procedures indicated in paragraph 3 of Section A, or in accordance with its recommendations made under paragraph 5 of Section A, constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, it should take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

2. In general the Security Council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

3. The Security Council should be empowered to determine what diplomatic, economic, or other measures not involving the use of armed force should be employed to give effect to its decisions, and to call upon members of the Organization to apply such measures. Such measures may include complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations.

4. Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the Organization.

5. In order that all members of the Organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the numbers and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should in each case be subject to approval by the Security Council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

6. In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the Organization there should be held immediately available by the members of the Organization national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in paragraph 5 above.

7. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken by all the members of the Organization in cooperation or by some of them as the Security Council may determine. This undertaking should be carried out by the members of the Organization by their own action and through action of the appropriate specialized organizations and agencies of which they are members.

8. Plans for the application of armed force should be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in paragraph 9 below.

9. There should be established a Military Staff Committee the functions of which should be to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, to the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, to the regulation of armaments, and to possible disarmament. It should be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. The Committee should be composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the Organization not permanently represented on the Committee should be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work. Questions of command of forces should be worked out subsequently.

10. The members of the Organization should join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

11. Any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of measures which have been decided upon by the Security Council should have the right to consult the Security Council in regard to a solution of those problems.

Section C. Regional arrangements

1. Nothing in the Charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

3. The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER IX. ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

Section A. Purpose and relationships

1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the Organization should facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in an Economic and Social Council.

2. The various specialized economic, social, and other organizations and agencies would have responsibilities in their respective fields as defined in their statutes. Each such organization or agency should be brought into relationship with the Organization on terms to be determined by agreement between the Economic and Social Council and the appropriate authorities of the specialized organization or agency, subject to approval by the General Assembly.

Section B. Composition and voting

The Economic and Social Council should consist of representatives of 18 members of the Organizations. The states to be represented for this purpose should be elected by the General Assembly for terms of 3 years. Each such state should have one representative, who should have one vote. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council should be taken by simple majority vote of those present and voting.

Section C. Functions and powers of the Economic and Social Council

1. The Economic and Social Council should be empowered:

a. to carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;

b. to make recommendations, on its own initiative, with respect to international economic, social, and other humanitarian matters;

c. to receive and consider reports from the economic, social, and other organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the organization, and to coordinate their activities through consultations with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies;

d. to examine the administrative budgets of such specialized organizations or agencies with a view to making recommendations to the organizations or agencies concerned;

e. to enable the Secretary-General to provide information to the Security Council;

f. to assist the Security Council upon its request; and

g. to perform such other functions within the general scope of its competence as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

Section D. Organization and procedure

1. The Economic and Social Council should set up an economic commission, a social commission, and such other commissions as may be required. These commissions should consist of experts. There should be a permanent staff which should constitute a part of the secretariat of the organization.

2. The Economic and Social Council should make suitable arrangements for representatives of the specialized organizations or agencies to participate without vote in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it.

3. The Economic and Social Council should adopt its own rules of procedure and the method of selecting its President.

CHAPTER X. THE SECRETARIAT

1. There should be a Secretariat comprising a Secretary-General and such staff as may be required. The Secretary-General should be the chief administrative officer of the Organization. He should be elected by the General Assembly, on recommendation of the Security Council, for such term and under such conditions as are specified in the Charter.

2. The Secretary-General should act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, and of the Economic and Social Council and should make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

3. The Secretary-General should have the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

CHAPTER XI. AMENDMENTS

Amendments should come into force for all members of the Organization, when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and

ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the members of the Organization having permanent membership on the Security Council and by a majority of the other members of the Organization.

CHAPTER XII. TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Pending the coming into force of the special agreement or agreements referred to in Chapter VIII, Section B, paragraph 5, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, October 30, 1943, the states parties to that Declaration should consult with one another and as occasion arises with other members of the Organization with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. No provision of the Charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the Governments having responsibility for such action.

NOTE

In addition to the question of voting procedure in the Security Council referred to in Chaptel VI, several other questions are still under consideration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 7, 1944.*

The Racket of Petrillo and Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will curb the activities of such men as Petrillo and John L. Lewis and other organizations who might want to collect a royalty from giving service to the American people. Mr. Petrillo, the music king, has defied the United States Government. He has coerced workers into becoming members of his union. He collects a royalty on every music record which he makes. Radio stations are blackmailed into paying tribute if they expect to use any music made by members of the musicians union.

Many of the powers now exercised by Mr. Petrillo and which Mr. Lewis seeks to use were conferred upon them by acts of Congress as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Congress has made it illegal for employers to discourage membership in a labor union but has refused to make it illegal for unions to coerce workers into membership. According to the Supreme Court, labor unions have sweeping privileges under the antitrust act and under the antiracketeering acts. Congress never intended that labor unions should get the green light to commit acts that would be illegal if committed by anyone else. Mr. Petrillo and John L. Lewis or any other racketeers who decide to take advantage of the provisions of the law may exact a bounty and tax from every individual in the United States. The telephone union is now giving consideration to the charging of the 5-cent tax or toll on every long-distance telephone call. Unions might well demand a royalty on every plane that is manufactured or every radio.

Unions in the steel industry could follow Mr. Petrillo's or John L. Lewis' example and demand royalty for the steel they produce. This was never intended by Congress and should be corrected by law. It is the worst type of slavery the common man and the public has ever had to endure from organized union racketeers. Such tactics, if continued, will destroy unions. As long as the situation exists, we will find other Petrillos and Lewises proceeding to extort payment from the public through thea media of the law which now permits such acts of racketeering. It will take legislative action to curb the racket of Petrillo and Lewis.

Address by Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am pleased to include a copy of a speech by Dr. Paul J. Raver, delivered at San Antonio, Tex., in January.

Many views exist as to matters of policy that will affect the future of electrical development and expansion.

I feel that this body, and all of the people of the areas directly affected, are entitled to every information available. I feel that Dr. Raver's speech is definitely informative and urge you to read it notwithstanding what particular view you may hold.

Gathered here in this auditorium today are people from all parts of this country. Each of us here represents in most particulars the thinking which is peculiar to his own region, conditioned by geographical, climatic, or social conditions of that region. But because our broad problems are exactly the same, it is good for us to be able to come together in this way for an exchange of ideas and an interchange of the knowledge and experience each of us has gained through meeting his special problems.

I have been asked to talk to you today about the outlook for the development of the Pacific Northwest from the point of view of the Bonneville Power Administration. Most everyone here, I imagine, is familiar with the origin and functions of this Administration, but for the benefit of those of you who have some confusion as to just where Bonneville fits into the Northwest scheme, I would like to say a few words about how the Bonneville Power Administration came into being.

In 1937 the Seventy-fifth Congress drew up an act the purpose of which was to provide a marketing agency for the power generated at Bonneville Dam. Basically, the Bonneville Power Administration was established in the Department of the Interior to provide the transmission facilities and the marketing organization necessary to encourage the widest possible use of all the electric energy that can be generated and marketed, and to prevent monopolization by limited groups of the power developed in the Northwest by the Federal Government.

The act also provided that the Bonneville administrator, in disposing of electric energy, is to give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives. This provision was placed in the act for the specific purpose of insuring that the facilities for generation of power at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public and particularly of domestic and rural consumers.

In August 1940, by Executive order of the President, the Bonneville Power Administrator was directed to make the same disposition of the energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam.

Although I shall make some mention of it later on, I would like you to take special note of the fact that the same policies which governed the writing of the Bonneville Act have been supported by the Congress in succeeding bills, including the flood-control bill which was signed by the President only a few weeks ago, the rivers and harbors bill and the defeat of the Bailey amendment.

Just how the Bonneville Power Administration has progressed is well summarized in a year-end report recently released by my office. The release states that more than 50 percent of all electric energy consumed during 1944 in the five Northwest States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Utah was supplied by the hydroelectric power plants at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. During the past 12 months, the Bonneville Power Administration delivered approximately 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to Pacific Northwest war industries, military establishments, public distribution agencies, and private utility systems. This represents an increase of 30 percent over 1943 deliveries and brings our total sales for the first 6 years of operation to nearly 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Gross revenues from the sale of Bonneville-Grand Coulee power during 1944 totaled approximately $22,200,000, an increase of 36 percent over 1943 revenues. Our gross revenues since the first sale of power in 1938 reached $52,000,000 with the close of 1944 business.

Despite the loss of approximately 300,000 kilowatts of load through cutbacks in Pacific northwest light metals production, power demands have continued to increase. In fact, on January 2 the system supplied a record peak load of 1,411,000 kilowatts. Rated capacity of both Columbia River plants is 1,316,000 kilowatts.

One of the largest contributing factors to the 1944 record output from the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system was the steadily increasing demand for power by other Northwest utility systems. As the year 1944 drew to a close, other public and private utility systems in the Northwest power pool, which is comprised of the major utility systems in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Utah, were taking as high as 600,000 kilowatts of Bonneville-Grand Coulee power to help meet their peak loads without consuming critical supplies of hog fuel and oil.

Use of Bonneville-Coulee hydroelectric energy for displacing oil-fired steam energy saved more than 3,750,000 barrels of oil during 1944 in the Seattle and Portland areas alone.

War industries continued to take a major share of all power generated at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants. During 1944 the Bonneville administration delivered more than 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to Pacific Northwest war plants and military establishments. Deliveries to other B. P. A. customers included 822,000,000 kilowatt-hours to publicly owned utilities, and 1,932,000,000 kilowatt-hours to private utility systems.

Although Northwest aluminum production was cut back during the year, the region's five reduction plants utilized sufficient Bonneville-Coulee power to turn out approximately 500,000,000 pounds of this vital war metal—about one-third of the Nation's total.

Columbia River hydroelectric energy also was a major factor in the Pacific Northwest's record production of ships during 1944. Two of the region's largest shipyards, Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation and Kaiser's Vancouver yard, used Bonneville-Coulee power in the production of 138 vessels, including 30 transports, 32 Victory cargo ships, 11 Liberty ships, 31 escort carriers, 31 AP5 transports and three C–4 type transports.

In addition, a large percentage of the output from other shipyards in the Portland-Vancouver and Puget Sound areas must be credited indirectly to Bonneville-Coulee power, because the Bonneville Power Administration supplied large blocks of power throughout the year to the public and private utility systems serving these plants.

Other vital war materials produced in Pacific Northwest plants during 1944 through use of Columbia River power included approximately 17,000,000 pounds of magnesium and large quantities of calcium carbide, ferro-alloys and other critical war metals and chemicals.

In the 5 short years since our first transmission line was energized in December 1939, the Bonneville-Grand Coulee transmission grid has mushroomed into a region-wide network of more than 2,700 miles of high voltage lines. Today, 55 substations, with transformer capacity of more than 2,000,000 kilovolt-amperes, deliver power to vital war loads throughout the Northwest.

To enable us to carry out the policies laid down by Congress in the Bonneville Act to the fullest possible degree, we have set for ourselves certain objectives. Although the demands of war have to some extent limited us in carrying out these objectives, we still hold them before us as a guide in the interest of securing the greatest possible benefit from the resources of the region for the greatest number of people.

Our first objective is to make power a tool for the development of wealth. In other words, to make the chief and abundant electric power of the region the means of opening new opportunities for investment, enterprise, and employment—for agriculture, for new industries, for small business, and for the individual.

Secondly, we believe that increasingly large quantities of power at constantly decreasing rates should be provided in order to create new opportunities for free enterprise. In industry and agriculture, the key to the whole power question is price and whether this tool—hydroelectric power—is to be used for turning the wheels in a mill or pumping irrigation water for operating a farm freezing unit, cost to the consumer will determine finally the extent of its use.

A third objective is to make low-cost hydroelectric power provide new sources for tax revenues. New farms and new industries mean taxpaying population. New industries attracted to the region as a result of the availability of cheap power are providing a broader tax base and increased wealth for the entire Northwest.

Fourth, we believe that the hydroelectric resources of the Northwest should be the means of providing asset-building jobs for returning servicemen and war workers who will have to look elsewhere for employment with the return of peace.

A final objective is to return to the people of the United States their investment in the Federal power facilities of the Northwest. That this can be done at the lowest wholesale rate for power in America—$17.50 per kilowatt-year—has been demonstrated. By the end of the calendar year 1944, our net revenues, after payment of all power costs, operation and maintenance expenses, and depreciation and interest on the Federal investment in the Bonneville-Grand Coulee transmission system and power facilities at the two Columbia River plants, amounted to more than $12,000,000. All we have to do is keep the generators in use.

I might add at this point that final determination of the cost allocation for the construction and operation of Coulee Dam has been made, and revenues from the sale of power will meet $633,960,585 of the total reimbursable cost of $781,304,085. This includes all construction costs, interest on the portion allocated to power, replacement costs over the repayment period, and operation and maintenance expenses.

In other words, revenues from the sale of power developed at Grand Coulee Dam will repay to the Federal Treasury not only all investment in the power facilities at the dam, plus interest on the power investment, but also a very substantial part of the investment in the irrigation facilities.

As a result of the careful allocation and repayment studies which we have completed in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, it has been determined that at present rates revenues from Bonneville-Grand Coulee power will be more than sufficient to meet all financial requirements and assure repayment to the Federal Government of the full investment in the Grand Coulee project. Not only does power pay a major part of the cost of irrigation but the low rates attract new industries to support an increased population, which, in turn, provides new markets for the products of the newly irrigated land. Thus, power and irrigation are not opposing developments but rather complementary.

Toward the accomplishment of the objectives which I have mentioned, the Bonneville Power Administration has set up a program for research into all phases of present and potential power utilization coupled with investigations into other lines of development which would be adjunctive to the growth of new power-consuming industry as well as to the over-all development of the resources of the region. This program depends considerably upon the cooperation of other Federal and State agencies within the region. It might be even broader, were funds available with which to enlist the assistance of the various universities and research organizations in the region through grants and fellowships.

Considerable work has already been started in the direction of analyzing the potentialities of the region and the possibilities for future development. We have, for instance, prepared a number of county-wide surveys in the States of Washington and Oregon, with the help of the various chambers of commerce, industrialists, and local agencies within those counties. These economic surveys are in increasing demands but their production has been somewhat limited by lack of manpower.

In addition, during this past year, Bonneville produced the Pacific Northwest Opportunities report, with which some of you may be familiar. This report, which presents a comprehensive analysis of the various possibilities for industry, agriculture, and other forms of resources utilization and development, has become widely known and just as widely acclaimed as a blueprint pattern for the development of the region. We are continuing our special investigations into additional load-building possibilities, such as railroad electrification, electric-steam generation with accompanying studies in steam processing, and electric house heating.

A very considerable portion of our investigations is being carried on in the field of farm utilization and farm service. The opportunities in this field are so many and so varied that I can only touch on a few of the ways in which farmers can increase their production and decrease operating costs through expanded use of electric power. Here are a few:

Electric dehydration units; farm freezer boxes; larger scale electric soil-sterilization units; electric greenhouses, using no glass, completely air conditioned, with fluorescent lights and ultra-violet and infra-red lamps; electric sterilizers for the dairy industry, using germicidal lamps in places of present chlorine compounds; sun lamps for poultry houses; portable electric heating units for drying fruits, nuts, and vegetables, and for preventing freezing in storage cellars and warehouses; large heating units for the large-scale drying of forage or other crops; a portable electric-power unit for the small farm; new types of farm-home appliances, such as low-priced electric ranges, with or without kitchen-heating units; small distilling plants for the salvage of waste farm products. All these things are possible. Many of them have already been proved successful. All of them will provide a power market for Columbia River electricity, providing this electricity is sold at a price reflecting its low cost.

I would like to cite a couple of highly interesting accomplishments in our effort to assist our public distributors in the development of a new loads:

One of these had to do with the installation of a milk-drying plant in McMinnville, Oreg. The development of this plant was carried out by our industrial engineers working in close cooperation with members of the engineering staff of the McMinnville, Oreg., city lighting department. This plant, which will soon be in full operation, will yield dollars and cents benefits to its operators and at the same time will add some 600 to 1,200 kilowatts of load to the municipal plant.

In the same city our engineers cooperated in the development of a potato dehydration plant which has added another 400 kilowatts of load for the municipality. The potato dehydrator has been in very successful operation for nearly 3 months.

Our studies have gone into various aspects of soil treatment, heating and sterilization, and into expanding use of electricity for profitable poultry and dairy farming. Our findings will unquestionably be reflected in considerable eventual load building for the various rural electric cooperatives throughout the region.

Consistent with the Bonneville Power Administration policy of building in advance of the market, plans are already in readiness for expansion of a number of lines in rural areas, construction of which will begin as soon as the availability of material and manpower will permit. This expansion will make low-cost power available in new areas, thereby stimulating increased use. As a result, revenues will be increased and distributors will be able to finance construction of three-phase lines to replace present single-phase lines, bringing to outlying areas the benefits of power now enjoyed by urban and suburban areas.

I would like to give you some idea of what low-cost Columbia River power already has meant in savings to our cooperative customers. Power costs of 11 Northwest cooperatives dropped from $179,500 to $67,250, a saving of $112,250 when they began using Bonneville-Coulee power. Since then we have reduced our power rates to cooperatives by 20 percent, and our cooperative distributors now are saving 70 percent on their power bills as compared with rates charged by the private utilities from whom they formerly purchased their power supply.

By passing these savings on to their customers, the cooperatives are helping us carry out the mandate of the Bonneville Act—that low-cost power be distributed as widely as possible throughout the region for the benefit of the general public and particularly for domestic and rural consumers.

Another instance of broad cooperation, still leading toward the accomplishment of our objectives, has been our experience with the Northwest States Development Association. This association, which is composed of the

Governors of the five Northwest States and their advisory committee, has done much to further the programing of balanced and integrated development of the Pacific Northwest and the Columbia Basin.

The special interest of the association is in maximum utilization of the water resources of the region through irrigation, improved navigation, hydroelectric power development and flood control. This planning body, presenting a truly grass-roots approach to the problem of the development of the region, suggests a course at once sound, practical, and entirely feasible.

The association, in its initial report on the Columbia Basin program, states: "It is believed that the rapid advance in Northwest development and production must continue. This advancement must be supported by a progressive and dynamic national and regional post-war reconstruction program. The basic development projects of the Pacific Northwest—begun before the war—have paid tremendous dividends in the war effort. They will continue to pay dividends after the war."

The program set forth by the association involves a total expenditure of approximately $600,000,000 for projects, including numerous irrigation, navigation, and flood-control improvements in the five States. Several of these projects have already been authorized by Congress for post-war construction.

Gearing its own plans to the multipurpose projects outlined in the five State Governors' report, the Bonneville Power Administration has set up an advanced construction program involving approximately $100,000,000 in new transmission lines and substations designed to coordinate existing and proposed dams and load centers in a region-wide transmission grid system.

In round figures, the combined programs outlined by the Northwest States Development Association and the Bonneville Power Administration will add about 1,000,000 acres to the 3,500,000 acres of land now under irrigation in the region, and will provide improved water supplies for several hundred thousand more. This is in addition to the 1,000,000 acres to be irrigated in the Columbia Basin project. It will increase regional power capacity by about 2,000,000 kilowatts—adding about 60 percent to the total regional capacity through new plants and up-stream storage. The combined effects of the program will be broader and more diverse development, new uses for power on the farm, including sprinkler irrigation, the establishment of new industries, new opportunities for employment—for business—for private and public enterprise and for investment.

In addition to increasing materially the real wealth of the region and the Nation, the program will have the effect of bringing about a greater maturity in the Northwest regional economy, particularly through a more advanced development and use of resources, as well as supplying a base for substantially larger population. It follows that public investment will induce at least as much more wealth—in land, improvements, plant, and communities—a prospective increase of some one and a half billion dollars.

The immediate post-war program of asset-building, self-liquidating public works will produce some 50,000 construction jobs for returning servicemen and demobilized war workers. In operation the program will produce more than 100,000 continuing new jobs in agriculture, industry, and service, with an accompanying increase of some $200,000,000 in annual income for the region. A program of the kind suggested will conceivably provide, if continued during the next 2 decades, a base for new regional population of at least 2,000,000. This will mean, averaging 4 persons to the farm home, 200,000 people on 50,000 new farms; 800,000 people dependent upon 250,000 new industrial jobs and approximately 1,000,000 people dependent upon 350,000 new service jobs.

The importance of such a balanced and unified program of development in the Columbia River drainage basin as one of the major factors in providing for maximum post-war employment in the Pacific Northwest is obvious. It suggests, however, the evident need and value of a single agency to integrate and coordinate a program of such expansive proportions.

The question then arises, What type of agency and what method of procedure will best accomplish these purposes? The idea of some type of Columbia Valley Authority has been suggested by the President, and many people are probing the possibilities in this direction. I have summed up my basic views in a statement for the United States News, which I would like to quote:

"Regional agencies to integrate physical resource planning and Federal development work should be established in many, if not all, of the major river basins. What powers they should be given, and necessarily how they should be organized should depend upon the special physical, social, and governmental characteristics of each region. These vary greatly. But if due allowance for significant differences is made, it would be a great forward step to give each region a Federal entity endowed with authority and funds to give responsible leadership in the effort to attain maximum sustained use of regional resources to stimulate private and public investment and enterprise, and to work toward the highest practicable standards of living.

"I am inclined to believe that such an entity could be set up in such a way as to recognize the interests of the people of the region and responsibilities of the States and to retain the advantages of the departmentalized and specialized development of agencies of the Federal Government."

I have purposely raised this point at this time because to me it has a direct bearing on the relationships, both present and future, of all governmental agencies whether Federal, State, or local. The associations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration as Federal agencies, in cooperation with such organizations as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, have been particularly favorable and harmonious. That they can continue to be so during periods of wide expansion has been evidenced thoroughly in the operations of the T. V. A. It follows, however, that in the national interest, from a point of view of economy and in the regional interest from the viewpoint of speedy and consistent progress, there must be an integrating force to eliminate duplication of effort and guarantee the necessary cooperation between all Federal, State, and local organizations in carrying out an over-all plan for regional development.

Let me summarize this for you in the following way:

First, the national picture. To maintain economic prosperity in the United States after the war the following conditions (in very approximate but realistic terms) must prevail:

1. Gross national product—a total output in goods and services—worth $175,000,000,000 a year.

2. National income—net output of goods and services produced, or returns in wages, salaries, and business income—of $125,000,000,000 a year.

3. Fifty-seven million jobs.

To make these three conditions possible there must be a total investment, both public and private, of about $35,000,000,000 a year.

In the past, private investment has never totaled more than about $20,000,000,000 a year. During much of the time it has fallen far below that level. Investment must be stepped up to give full employment, and private enterprisers claim they can do it, given the proper "climate."

If private investment in plant, machinery, business, transportation, housing, etc., can reach $25,000,000,000 per year a public investment (Federal, State and local) of $10,000,000,000 a year will bring us to our goal.

Whenever private investment climbs above $25,000,000,000, public investment can be cut accordingly.

Whenever private investment drops below $25,000,000,000 annually, public investment must be stepped up accordingly.

It is probably safe to assume that in the years immediately following the war a public capital investment of at least $15,000,000,000 a year would be required.

If these figures are sound—and many leading economists believe they are—some governmental entity with power to integrate the problem of Federal investments, should be created. Regional authorities may be one solution to this problem.

What is the share of the Northwest in this?

The five States of the Pacific Northwest region comprise something like three percent of the total United States population, but the region is underdeveloped and very large in area. It should be an intensively developing and growing phase after the war. It would need an annual capital investment in a larger proportion than some other regions of the United States, and in some ways its needs and possibilities are more suitable for public investment than for private investment.

Thus, to maintain its share of the national prosperity, the Northwest would require:

1. Regional gross production in goods and services worth seven to eight billion dollars a year.

2. Regional income in wages, salaries, dividends, etc., of about $5,000,000,000 a year.

3. About two and a quarter million jobs.

To make these three conditions possible in the Northwest region, there must be a total annual investment, both public and private, of something like $1,400,000,000 annually.

Feasible private investment in the Northwest might be very roughly estimated on the order of $700,000,000 to $900,000,000 a year, leaving a necessary public investment of something like $500,000,000 to $700,000,000, which must be supplied by Federal, State, and local governments.

Of this total public investment the five States and subdivisions and local governments can probably undertake an estimated share of $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 a year. This money would be spent in all kinds of capital improvements such as State and municipal institutions, roads, plant, facilities and other public works.

This would leave an annual public investment of from four hundred million to five hundred million dollars per year to be provided in the five Northwest States by the Federal Government for all of its programs.

Just how this program is to be set up and accomplished is one of the major problems facing the region in its post-war development. Intelligent students of the problem are turning their attention to a regional authority as a possible solution.

At present there is no sure way in which this outline plan can be carried out.

At present there is no way in which this program can be expanded to include on an integral and sound basis not only the major flood control, power, and land developments, but broad conservation and development in soil, forest, range, park, fishery, mineral, transport, and other vital fields.

The plan is good as far as it goes, but it is not wide enough in scope or concrete enough to do the job required.

There is no one agency upon which responsibility for its unified development and execution can be fixed.

There is no one agency which can program the plan in detail, budget it, hold it together, and carry it through in full cooperation with local and State agencies.

Its success is endangered by the pulling and hauling of special interest. Groups interested in navigation, groups interested in reclamation, and groups interested in airways, roads, and other developments tend to work against each other for the promotion of their special interests.

These groups have small tendency to see the problem of development as a whole.

As things now stand, these groups will undertake to carry out small portions of the program on a piecemeal basis; yet, investments on a necessary scale for full employment over a period of years cannot be made effectively if they are undertaken piecemeal.

Piecemeal development will result in essential parts of the entire program being left out.

The program will fall short of its goal and it will be impossible to fix responsibility for the failure.

Cooperation, however willing, is not enough. It is passive. Dynamic, objective, creative, over-all leadership and control are essential.

What is true of the region is true on a national scale. Therefore, the problem has stirred national interest.

But, because the problem is so far reaching, it has also set the forces of opposition in motion. We would do well to bear in mind constantly the concerted plotting on the part of various selfish elements to forestall a logical, coordinated regional development program. One of the most obvious moves in this direction has been the desperate effort by the private interests to preempt the great hydroelectric resources of our rivers from the people and monopolize them for private gain. This attempt was plainly evident in the unsuccessful attempts to write amendments into the recently passed flood-control bill which would have prevented the construction of the transmission lines from Federal dams and required the sale of power at the bus bars.

Similar efforts were made to alter the river and harbor bill. Although this bill was not passed, it was not because of any change of policy on the part of Congress regarding the construction of the transmission lines but an attempt to include in the bill an amendment which had no bearing whatsoever upon the purpose for which the bill was originally written. All phases of the bill dealing with the sale of power and the construction of transmission lines were supported by the Congress, and especially by the Northwest delegation.

Approval of Federal construction of transmission lines was even made a portion of the platforms upon which the successful congressional delegates from the Northwest ran for office. The defeat of the Bailey amendment is another indication of congressional policy.

To my mind the attitude of Congress is exceptionally well expressed in a speech made by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, on the floor of the Senate during the discussions on the river and harbor bill. The Senator said:

"It is good government to provide for the multiple purpose development of our rivers so that they may carry the commerce of our Nation through their navigation works, so that they may no longer waste the lives and property of our people through destructive floods, so that they may irrigate our arid lands, and so that their falling waters may produce power for the benefit of our people. It is good government to see that all of these benefits are widely spread among our people and that none of them is made the possession of the few. It is good government to see that Federal power is made available throughout the area of its economic transmission—to lower the cost of farming, to lower the cost of running the home, and to lower the cost of making goods and providing services in industry and business."

In concluding his remarks, Senator HILL said:

"Because it is good business and good government to sell federally produced power in a manner that will prevent its monopolization and that will spread its benefits widely among the people, I am opposed to any amendment that would restrict sales of power to the site of the dams. I favor giving preference to municipalities, public agencies, and farmer cooperatives. Where it is necessary for the Government to construct transmission lines for such preference to be enjoyed, I strongly favor such construction by the Government."

That, I think, presents a clear picture of the prevailing attitude of Congress. Such an attitude well merits the support of each one of us who has at heart the interest of the fullest and most equitable development of his particular region. No more effective means could be found for evidencing support of such a meritorious congressional policy than the concerted effort of such groups as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to challenge every move on the part of the monopolistic interests which seek to detract from the perpetuation of these policies.

Everyone here agrees on the desirability of full development of our resources and the fullest possible use of electric power on the farm and in homes and industry.

Special interests are continually trying to divide our people—to discredit the R. E. A., the Bonneville Power Administration, the idea of an authority—in short, these interests are doing everything in their power to discredit the idea of public power.

The grave problem of post-war jobs is one issue that transcends all of the efforts of these private interests to defeat our program. The stark necessity of realistically meeting the challenge of providing 60,000,000 jobs for our people in the post-war years requires intelligent leadership and the cooperation of all interests. Unleasing of the great tools of production—power, water, and land—offer one vital contribution. We must work together to accomplish that end.

The Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to make it unlawful for labor unions to maintain an absolute closed shop. The bill will make it possible for an individual, particularly a returned soldier, to work in vital industries without belonging to a union. He may join a union or not. The decision will be up to the individual.

It is my opinion that the labor unions have been wrong in the past in demanding that anyone who works in industry must belong to a union. Personally, I believe in unions—would belong to one if I were laboring in industry. I do feel, however, that it is an individual's given right to make a decision as to whether he cares to belong to any particular union.

Some labor leaders have the childish notion that when you criticize them on any labor policy you are antilabor. This is a sign of emotional immaturity. It is an undemocratic idea. Democracy thrives on the clash of opinion. Critical observations are not always unfriendly.

Some unions have grown too large for the public good. Unions should remain the servant of the member who joins and not the master. We have had the same condition in government where bureaus want to be the master and not the servant of the people. It is an evil of a growing bureaucracy. Unions should serve the members they represent. There are too many union leaders and racketeers who make huge profits off of their members. Not many years ago the railroads thought they were larger than the public. They had to be put in their place. A few years ago big business was dominating everything in America. It, too, had to be dissolved. The unions are ruled by men who have selfish desires. There are too many arrogant and supermen drunk with power that now control unions.

Labor unions, if they seek to be the big boss in local, State, and National politics, will soon run into the opposition of public opinion which will eventually overwhelm them. It is a form of extortion and blackmail which the public will not long endure.

I believe that the forced maintenance of union membership in order to hold a job is not in the interests of the public. It makes slaves out of the individual member who must join a union or starve. He must remain a member throughout the life of the contract. If he ceases to be a member by failing to pay dues or other departure from union rules and discipline, the employer must discharge him. In some instances the head of the union informs an employer that a worker has ceased to be a union member through violation of union rules and must therefore be discharged. The maintenance of membership is much the same as a closed shop. The worker must remain a member of the union or lose his job. The check-off system is also an evil which goes with the closed-shop provision. This means that the employer must deduct union dues from the workers' wages and pay the dues directly into the union treasury.

It is my opinion that the rank and file of union members want their unions to be their servants and not their masters. If the union leaders persist in being the masters, it will eventually lead to the destruction of free unions. It will destroy that sacred principle of the individual man—his right to work, his right to say who shall represent him. Unions should not be a vehicle which union leaders may use to advance their own personal powers.

Threat to Oil Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous development of

the oil-producing industry in Louisiana, Mississippi, and other Southern States, I am gravely concerned over the recent decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which ruled against permitting producers to continue the long-established practice of charging either to expense or to capital account the intangible cost items in connection with drilling operations.

Such a decision, if permitted to stand, will paralyze oil production throughout the country. Its effect on the war effort especially and on domestic petroleum needs can be quickly realized.

The court action is a drastic blow to the smaller operators whose courage, initiative, and industry in developing new sources of oil were responsible in a large measure for the fact that the United States had such large and vital oil reserves ready for use when the war began.

Despite the fact that through all these years the intangible-costs option regulation has been in effect and has come to be recognized as part and parcel of the tax structure of the oil-producing industry, the Treasury Department has expressed opposition. This became evident in 1942 when the Department attempted to have Congress adopt a statutory declaration against the regulation. Hearings were conducted by committees of both the Senate and House, and representatives of the Treasury Department and of the petroleum interests were heard. Both committees were convinced there should be no change in the law, but the move against the regulation by the Treasury continued. Finally the matter got into the courts, when the Bureau of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions of such option to two independent operators in Texas. The operators appealed to The Tax Court of the United States and lost. They then carried their fight to the circuit court, where they again lost.

It is interesting to note that the Treasury Department is apparently not altogether convinced of the justice of its opposition. The court, in its decision, revealed that the "legislative mind" of the Department feels the option should be continued, while the "administrative mind" is "bent on whittling it away."

The time has come for Congress to decide this matter promptly and decisively and I am greatly interested in legislation designed for that purpose. The immediate need is for the amending of the Internal Revenue Code in order to expressly provide that the intangible expenditures for wages, fuel, repairs, hauling, supplies—all of the items incident to the drilling of wells and their preparation for production of oil or gas—can, at the option of the taxpayer, be deducted from gross income as expense or charged to capital account. Similar provision should be made so that the cost of drilling nonproductive wells can be deducted from gross income for the year in which the taxpayer completes such well or be charged to capital account.

This is a matter of national importance, affecting the welfare of not only the oil industry but the protection and welfare of all our citizens, who are dependent to such a great extent upon the development of our natural resources, particularly our great oil reserves.

Labor's Stake in International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the brotherhood of man is today more than merely desirable. It is an absolute necessity if man is to survive. This is the meaning of our present era. Men and nations of men must join hands for their mutual security and prosperity.

Labor understands this better than any other segment of our population, for the workingman's struggle to join with his fellow workers in order to find strength and security in collective action has finally resulted in a revolutionary emancipation and dignity for the worker. The necessity of collective action for achievement of security has been underscored in the workingman's blood and tears too often for him to forget its importance.

The nations of the world are now organizing, are forming a union of democratic countries. Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods are the first clauses in the constitution of this international brotherhood. American labor will support the union wherever it exists. And in a union of democratic nations labor has a greater stake than ever before.

What does labor, what does the workingman, want in the post-war world? For what is he fighting so magnificently the battles of the war front and the production front? He wants the right and the opportunity to useful and regular employment at a fair annual wage, under provisions for safety and health protection. He wants adequate programs of nutrition, child welfare, medical care, and education. He wants minimum standards to prevent exploitation of workers. He wants assurance of a regular flow of income to all those whose employment is interrupted by sickness or injury, by old age or lack of employment opportunity. He wants recognition of the right of freedom of association in collective bargaining and facilities for the training and transfer of labor.

These objectives are implicit in the Atlantic Charter, affirmed in the United Nations' declaration, strengthened by Yalta and the forthcoming San Francisco Conference, and dependent upon United States support of the first clauses of the constitution of the international brotherhood, Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks.

A minimum of 5,000,000 of the 60,000,000 job goal—jobs for those returning from the battle fronts as well as for those now on the production lines—depends on foreign trade. For trade between nations is the only way in which this country can take full advantage of its productive capacity. We must sell at least $15,000,000,000 abroad to sustain at home the full employment in peace that we have attained in war.

World markets must be recreated and expanded, for only a prosperous world can purchase from us. A large part of the materials needed for restoration and expansion will be purchased here, since this is the only major country which will have sufficient men and machines to produce them. These purchases will mean jobs and weekly pay checks for us. The much-feared gap between war production and production of peacetime goods will be bridged to some extent in this way.

Bretton Woods is the key to this necessary expanding foreign trade. It is a guarantee of profits and protection for the American businessman, markets for the American farmer, and jobs for the American worker. The monetary fund will primarily stabilize currency and exchange rates between nations, thus facilitating financial transactions and eliminating the old competitive barter system. It will also make short-term loans for immediate revivification of trade. The bank will be primarily concerned with long-term loans for reconstruction and development, particularly of economically backward countries, guaranteeing private loans and selling stock.

Much of the world engaged in war is now financially prostrate. She must have the loans that the fund and the bank can supply in order to have the means of payment for what we sell her. If she does not get them, economic, political, and finally military warfare is again inevitable. For nations will be forced to begin again the dog-eat-dog system of discriminatory trade practices, restrictive exchange controls, competitive depreciation of currencies, and other forms of economic warfare that have always in the past led to force of arms.

The prosperous nation is the peaceful nation. It was the partial break-down of foreign trade which helped lead to the severe depression of the thirties, to economic chaos, to unemployed men and hungry children. Hitler's influence in Germany grew, in the beginning, directly in proportion to the number of unemployed. The maintenance of peace is assured only insofar as is the ability of nations to guarantee their workers useful regular employment at living wages. Inadequacy of economic policies and international economic cooperation has always been a prime cause of war.

In the development of economically backward countries, the creation of new markets, lies another source of prosperity for the American workingman. More money in the hands of the Chinese, for instance, put there as a result of economic development aided by Bretton Woods, means greater ability on the part of the Chinese to purchase the products of the American worker's labors. To raise the standard of living of the whole

world, means to insure the economic security of every individual nation, and every individual worker.

Dumbarton Oaks—

Says the President—

may be regarded as the keystone of the arch. * * * It represents a major objective for which this war is being fought * * * the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of conditions that make for peace.

These conditions include creation of an international organization of the United Nations to solve social, economic, and humanitarian problems.

Implicit in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals lie those rights for which the American soldier and the American worker fight: Freedom of speech, religion, press, assembly, political association, and organization of labor unions. The right of downtrodden countries to form governments which have the support of their peoples. The right of prostrate countries to be provided with food, medical supplies, and raw materials to meet their needs, in order to help them fully utilize their manpower and productive facilities.

The international scene affects American labor, both industrial and agricultural, as much as does the domestic, for in the shrunken world of today, national and foreign affairs are inseparable. Labor's desires and needs can only be satisfied in a democratic world, in a world at peace, where the dignity of work and of the workingman is fully respected. Labor has always been one of the first victims of fascism and of war. Therefore labor's stake in democracy and peace is greater than that of almost any other group.

The strongest bond of human sympathy—

Said Abraham Lincoln—

outside of the family relationship, should be one uniting all working people of all nations and tongues and kindreds.

Labor, industrial and agricultural, has understood this brotherhood of the workingman. Now labor in America, in California, in every town, city, and county of California, must lend its vast experience and strong support to an organizing job more vast and crucial than ever before: The United Nations must be organized into a brotherhood to insure peace and guarantee justice between nations.

Only a Strong Poland Can Realize Security—Miss Cardwell Suggests It Become Nucleus of an Eastern Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell, that appeared in the Detroit News of March 27, 1945:

ONLY A STRONG POLAND CAN REALIZE SECURITY—MISS CARDWELL SUGGESTS IT BECOME NUCLEUS OF AN EASTERN FEDERATION

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

It requires no special study to realize that if there is to be a free and secure Poland it must also be a strong Poland. Otherwise it is a source of constant temptation to powerful neighbors.

As the largest of the eastern European countries it is the nucleus around which an advantageous federation could be built; for the fate of all its smaller neighbors, as this war has demonstrated, is closely linked with Poland, "the keystone of the arch."

For Russia, Poland is the gateway to Europe. Through it Russia can enter the western cultural and economic world on the roads of peace and greatly enrich itself; or if Poland is weak, it can take the path of disguised conquest, ending in hate, destruction, and finally, if history teaches anything, in its own downfall.

Which of these roads Russia chooses is of vital importance to us, since, say what we will, European war means world war.

A strong Poland is a Poland able to play the role geography has thrust upon it; a free Poland is one that governs itself without outside interference and is nobody's sphere of influence or protectorate. The Poles are not a homeless people for whom a country must be found.

They have occupied the lands within the 1919–39 frontiers for over a thousand years.

The very fact that compensation for loss of their eastern territories is spoken of as a necessity acknowledges Polish rights to those territories which, insofar as they had not always been Polish, were not won by conquest or robbery but by cultural penetration, or added through mutual consent.

NOT A BOUNDARY ISSUE

However, the present question is not primarily one of boundaries. Why should the territory of an ally, first to defend its rights, come into question at all?

The British were not thinking of giving away Polish lands when they signed the agreement to aid in their defense, of giving them to a government that had signed a pact with Hitler and later shared with him in partitioning Poland.

During the 18 years between the signing of the Riga Treaty (1921), fixing the Polish-Soviet boundary, and the Soviet 1939 invasion, the Soviet Union had never complained of boundary injustice.

On the contrary, in the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia and the history of the all-union Communist Party, they wrote of the victory of the Red Army in the Polish-Bolshevik War, and of the Poles being forced to accept conditions favorable to the Soviets because of the exhaustion of Polish troops.

But the real threat to Poland in the Yalta decisions concerns its independence. The Lublin group is to be the dominating element in the promised provisional government. That element, now in control of Poland for over 6 months, has shown the course it will follow, which is nothing less than sovietization.

How fair can be the elections promised at Yalta, even if we were credulous enough to think that Americans and British supervising them in Poland will have the least understanding of what is going on?

We are all familiar with "No taxation without representation," and "Give me liberty or give me death." What is the difference between those proud American slogans and the Polish "nothing about us without us"? Yet we presume to settle matters most vital to Polish national life without one Pole being invited to the conference table.

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

A peace attained by appeasement, if it be attained, is an unjust peace. We have had it dinned in our ears from the day the war began that an unjust peace will never endure. Thus the President himself and many of our officials have spoken.

To quote Senator VANDENBERG, "In my opinion, no permanent peace is possible without a constant, conscious mandate to seek and maintain justice as the basis of peace."

At Yalta, Poland, the ally, received worse treatment than did Germany, the enemy.

Germany is to be administered by a commission from all four of the United Nations. This the Polish Government had previously asked for Poland until such time as a permanent Polish government could be established, and been refused.

POLAND HAD TO ACCEPT SOVIET OCCUPATION ALONE

According to Yalta, Germany, the aggressor, may or may not lose 12 to 15 percent of its territory, as the determination of Poland's western frontier is left for the peace conference.

Poland, defender of liberty, is to surrender 42 percent of her lands immediately.

German prisoners of war of the allies will be safe, well fed, clothed, and housed. Polish soldiers fighting alongside British, American, and French, will be unable to return to their homeland, yet no provision whatever is made for them.

WHAT AMERICA CAN DO

To quiet our consciences we are told that perfectionism is unattainable and must not be expected. That is not an excuse for abandoning ideals, rather an incentive to strive toward them.

America can insist upon the Soviet Union changing its policy toward Poland and other neighbor nations. If the Soviets refuse, then we can refuse them further aid.

Then we would have problems indeed. How could American agriculture and industry ever hope to compete with Russia in world markets? What would then happen to American wages and living standards?

The Polish-Soviet problem ceased to be Polish-Soviet at Tehran and became American-British-Soviet. In striving to save the integrity and independence of Poland, Americans are not being romantic, impossibly idealistic, or even altruistic, but actually acting in defense of their own country's future.

Great patience, skill, understanding and resoluteness, particularly resoluteness, will be required, but it is America's duty, even for selfish reasons, to convince the Soviet Union that friendly neighbors are a much greater asset than hostile subjects, in peace or war.

Remarks by the Honorable Leo Healy at the Ninety-sixth Annual Dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of the Honorable Leo Healy at the ninety-sixth annual dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn on Saturday, March

17, 1945, at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

All men are by nature hero worshipers. Surely there is not one of us who has not at sometime said, "This is my own, my native land." Nor is there one of us whose better nature fails to respond to the silent call of those great men, now dead, who made this country what it is today. Their memory is not permitted to wither and die but is kept fresh and green in the hearts of a patriotic posterity. By feast and by festival the recurring anniversaries of our national heroes are fittingly celebrated for the pride of a nation is in its past and the glory of a people in its illustrious forebears who have bequeathed to their progeny the precious legacy of merited honor and deserved dignity.

And we have gathered again tonight to once more pay our tribute of respect and admiration to a great saint and hero who is revered throughout the world and especially so here in America.

America has no ancestry, properly speaking, unless it be the copper-hued Indians, and they are virtually extinct. She has drawn her force, her strength, and her quality, in a large measure, however, from the sons and daughters of Ireland, the little green isle set in the sea.

St. Patrick's Day is, indeed, a great day for Irishmen and yet it should not be exclusively so. America owes a debt of gratitude to these exiled sons of Erin. They have rushed to her protecting patronage and America has folded them to her breast as adopted children. They have raised their right hands in solemn oath of fealty to America and her institutions but at the same time they have clasped tightly to their hearts the recollection of their trials and persecutions of the past. America pays a price of considerate sympathy for this feeling in exchange for their devotion and loyalty to their new-found haven.

They have framed our laws, regulated our commerce, exercised in a worthy and commendable manner the duties of American citizenship. Would that time would permit me tonight to review the names of Irish men and Irish women who have gained and deserved a place of prominence in our country in the arts, the sciences, and the professions.

But it cannot be gainsaid that they have sealed their loyalty to America by their unstinted patriotism. We have so many people in our country today who have suddenly become patriotic now that war is upon us. So many, whose patriotism only a few years ago was, to be charitable, at least, dormant or perhaps slumbering. Perhaps it might be refreshing to look back for the moment to the record of patriotism manifested by the sons of Ireland throughout the years of our national existence. For instance, that memorable charge of the Irish Brigade at St. Mary's Heights at Fredericksburg should be immortalized in song and story. It was only when the tide of battle had turned hopelessly against the Union forces that the order rang out, "Send up that Irish brigade." And up they went. In solid surried ranks, 1,200 noble Irish lads of the purest Irish stock. In the soldier cap of each there was a sprig of Irish green. In the soldier heart of each there was a drop of Irish fighting blood, and in the soldier eye of each there glistened an Irish tear as the strains of the Wearing of the Green, played by their own fife and drum corps, fell upon the ears of those noble Irish heroes marching to death beneath the fluttering folds of the Stars and Stripes of freedom.

But 200 of them returned to tell the story of the awful slaughter and carnage that met their approach. One thousand of their comrades were left behind on that southern hillside, far from the land of their birth, willing sacrifice to the land of their adoption.

And this is but one chapter out of the enormous volume that records the story of the bravery and the courage of the sons of Erin. Were you to walk the most famous battlefields of the world and read the inscriptions on the tiny tombstones erected to the memory of the soldiers' hearts that lie silent beneath, the Irish names of Irish heroes would meet your gaze at every turn. At Landers and Cremona, at Blenheim and Ramilles, at Fontenoy and Austerlitz, at Vimy Ridge, and at the Marne, at Iwo Jima and Corregidor, at Aachen and Cologne the exiled sons of Erin fought, bled, and died with a reckless valor and courage that has never been equaled in the world.

If it is true that the sun never sets upon the English flag, it is a thousand times more true that the sun shall never cease to shine upon the grave of an Irish hero.

All honor and glory to this love of freedom and liberty on the part of the sons of St. Patrick.

Let our eyes dance with joy and let our cheeks flush with pride as we celebrate his anniversary today and proudly proclaim to the world that we are sons of Erin, the grandest country on God's green earth, and citizens of America, the noblest country under God's blue canopy.

Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials and newspaper article and also two letters:

[From the Seymour (Ind.) Daily Tribune of March 16, 1945]

WILSON'S SPEECH FROM FLOOR OF HOUSE AT COLUMNIST, SPEAKER GETS ATTENTION

BULLETIN

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Representative WILSON (Republican of Indiana) protested today because less than 30 Democrats were in their seats when the House met—and brought from Democratic Leader MCCORMACK (Massachusetts) the retort: "There's nothing to stop a man making a damned fool of himself if he wants to."

It was the second consecutive day that WILSON had raised a point of no quorum when the House met. This action automatically forces a roll call requiring 30 minutes or more.

Ninth District Representative EARL WILSON, of Huron, former principal of the Vallonia High School, jumped into the national news again today when from the floor of the House Thursday, he struck out against either Columnist Drew Pearson or House Speaker SAM RAYBURN in a "personal privilege" speech.

Reports of the speech differed. A Washington, D. C., Associated Press dispatch today said, "Representative WILSON (Republican of Indiana) called Columnist Drew Pearson a 'liar' on the floor of the House Thursday because Pearson accused him of 'hogging' the handball courts of the House gymnasium." WILSON added, "I can honestly say I've never seen a handball."

In a story published in the Indianapolis Star from its Washington bureau, WILSON is said to have "quoted six statesmen as calling Pearson variegated kinds of a liar." "But the Indianan did not call the columnist a liar," the Star story continues. "He did not say that if Mr. Pearson was not a liar, then it was true, as Pearson alleged in his column yesterday, that the Texan (Speaker RAYBURN) had in fact urged Representative JERRY VOORHIS of California to leave the floor so that WILSON would be the only Member left in the House."

The Associated Press story said "WILSON said Pearson was 'a ruthless, diabolical, double-barreled liar' about the handball courts and he added that he didn't believe Pearson's story about RAYBURN and VOORHIS either. "Pearson was not available for comment."

The Star said WILSON said that if RAYBURN had actually accorded him the treatment Pearson had reported, "Why don't you gentlemen in the name of common decency and respect for this body bring in a resolution expelling me from the House of Representatives. I beg of you to do that."

A moment later, Representative JOHN ROBSION of Kentucky, asked, "Has there been any proof that the Speaker did that thing."

WILSON replied, "There has not. I have only Drew Pearson's statement that he did. I am assuming that the Speaker did not do that, and if he in turn calls Drew Pearson a liar, that will make it unanimous."

Speaker RAYBURN said nothing. Members of both parties came to WILSON to offer congratulations.

Representative WILSON said he did not blame the Congressmen who left the House, the Associated Press said.

WILSON noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Associated Press had sent out a 60-word story last Friday reporting the fact that he spoke alone.

"Now that is all right," WILSON said. "I am not criticizing the Members of Congress. I have an editorial from my State paper, the Indianapolis Star, which defends me and to some extent takes Congress over the coals and says it is uncomplimentary of Congress to have business transacted with only two Members on the floor of the House."

In defense of the Members, WILSON noted his remarks came at the close of the legislative day, and said:

"It is not unusual for the membership of this House to leave as early as they can at the conclusion of the regular business of the day and go to their offices and do the work that they have to do. * * *

"I am going to defend them for leaving the floor of the House."

A well-filled Chamber listened to WILSON's remarks Thursday.

[From the Madison (Ind.) Courier of March 20, 1945]

WILSON VERSUS PEARSON

Representative EARL WILSON, attacked without cause by Drew Pearson in his Washington Merry-Go-Round column, has warded off the blows successfully and called attention of the people to a woeful lack of efficiency in Capital departments and even in Congress itself.

The occasion of the attack was a speech WILSON made in the House several days ago. Pearson called attention to the fact that but one or two Members were present when the talk began and that one of them and a page boy left the Chamber during the speech.

Not content with this, Pearson must add a few uncalled-for remarks which proved to be without foundation, and this was shown by WILSON the following day.

The result of the encounter of the Representative and the columnist has been a better attendance at sittings of the House and, it is to be hoped, more efficiency in the departments will follow.

The plea of WILSON for more attention to duty and to the waste in the Capital comes at a very opportune time.

The great boasts of the preelection days have turned into weeping and wailing and pleas for manpower, talk of drafting nurses, threats of food shortages, and admissions that the administration has erred in this and

that, and that while things are going well on the western front and in the far Pacific there is all confusion at home.

More Representatives who will stir up the powers that be and get Washington onto the job of winning the war would be a blessing to the Nation and the Allied cause.

WILSON SLAMS DREW PEARSON—CONGRESSMAN FIRES VERBAL BARRAGE BACK AT COLUMNIST

EARL WILSON, Ninth District Representative in Congress, has fired a verbal barrage in the House of Representatives against either Columnist Drew Pearson or Speaker SAM RAYBURN in a personal-privilege speech which quoted six statesmen as calling Pearson variegated kinds of a liar.

WILSON'S reply to Pearson's charges made in his newspaper column Thursday was broadcast over the networks Thursday night and carried in newspapers today.

Pearson stated in his column:

"Strait-laced Representative 'CURFEW EARL' WILSON, Indiana Republican, is best known to the public for having urged a curfew for Government girls and complaining because they take a few minutes out for coffee or a soft drink. To his congressional colleagues, however, he is best known as a hogger of the handball courts in the House gymnasium. They don't like him."

DOESN'T PLAY HANDBALL

Lowell Thomas commented in his newscast Thursday night WILSON had struck back at Pearson with the support of some of his colleagues, that he didn't even know how to play handball.

In his column Pearson went on to report that the House was vacated the other day while WILSON was delivering a long tirade against the Veterans' Administration.

In his reply to the columnist, WILSON did not call him a liar. He did say that if Pearson were not a liar, then it was true, as Pearson alleged in his column Friday, that Speaker RAYBURN had in fact urged JERRY VOORHIS, of California to leave the floor so that WILSON would be the only Member left in the House.

WILSON said that if RAYBURN had actually accorded him the treatment Pearson had reported, "why don't you gentlemen in the name of common decency and respect for this body bring in a resolution expelling me from the House of Representatives. I beg of you to do that."

A moment later, Representative JOHN ROBSION of Kentucky, asked, "Has there been any proof that the Speaker did that thing?"

WILSON replied, "There has not. I have only Drew Pearson's statement that he did. I am assuming that the Speaker did not do that, and if he in turn calls Drew Pearson a liar, that will make it unanimous."

Speaker RAYBURN said nothing. Members of both parties came to WILSON to offer congratulations.

CALLS RAYBURN PEARSON ALLY IN SMEAR ARTICLE—INDIANAN ASSAILS SPEAKER FOR ABETTING RIDICULE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 15.—Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas, remained silent today after he had been named in the House as having contributed by his actions to a smear attack upon an Indiana Republican.

The Speaker sat in his chair on the rostrum pretending to read a newspaper as Representative WILSON, Republican, aired the circumstances leading up to a quarter-column of ridicule against him written by Drew Pearson, syndicated gossip.

WILSON, at one point, obviously paused to permit RAYBURN to deny the implications of his account, but the Speaker ignored the opportunity.

READS PEARSON STORY

The Associated Press also lent itself to the smear upon WILSON, he declared, sending out a short story which noted that the Indianan addressed the House recently with only two Members present. Such a small attendance is a frequent occurrence late in the day when Members deliver prepared speeches and WILSON wanted to know why he was singled out for abuse by the press association.

WILSON read the Pearson story to the House. It referred to him as "Curfew Earl," best known to the public for having urged a curfew for Government girls and complaining because they take a few minutes out for coffee or a soft drink. He was also labeled "a hogger of the handball courts in the House gymnasium."

QUOTES RAYBURN

Pearson then asserted that the Speaker recently noted that Representative VOORHIS (Democrat, of California) was the only Member present when WILSON recently was delivering "a long tirade against the Veterans' Administration." He quoted RAYBURN as calling VOORHIS to him and suggesting that he leave the Chamber so that "WILSON won't have anyone listening." VOORHIS obeyed, and "WILSON ranted on for 5 or 10 minutes, talking to no one," Pearson wrote.

More than 300 Members were present this time as WILSON obtained the floor on a question of personal privilege.

"Everybody has called Pearson a liar, from President Roosevelt on down," remarked WILSON. "He has been termed in Senate and House debate as a character assassin, a skunk, a polecat of journalism, an ignorant ass.

"I don't know whether the Speaker is guilty of what Pearson charges, of asking that the floor be vacated so that unfavorable publicity could go out concerning a Member addressing the House on the care of the veterans of our wars. If I did wrong by that, then I beg of you to bring in a resolution impeaching me.

"If the Speaker will now call Pearson a liar, that will make it unanimous."

RAYBURN IGNORES CHARGE

RAYBURN paid no attention as WILSON paused. The Indianan then remarked that the charge of "hogging the handball court" was typical of Pearson's petty falsehoods. He said he had never played nor seen a handball game in his life, and would pay $1,000 to anyone who could say he had played one.

Noting that Pearson's radio sponsor, manufacturers of Serutan, a laxative, had been recently ordered by the Federal Trade Commission to cease false advertising, WILSON concluded:

"One of the Commission's findings was that Serutan was an intestinal irritant. I wonder if Pearson has been taking too much of his own medicine and the consequent irritation is responsible for his printed product."

SEYMOUR, IND., *March 24, 1945.*

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: Although I think your column contains a good deal of nonsense, it can now be revealed—in fact, has been revealed—that you are sometimes on the beam.

Your recent reference to "Curfew" WILSON was a topic happily chosen and well handled from several viewpoints. Mary and Jane, who go to work down in Washington at the middle of the forenoon, spend part of the afternoon in the rest room and at the coffee shop, and the evenings at the high spots about town, will like what you say about "Curfew." Pa and ma, who work down here in the sticks 12 hours a day, and are naturally a little solicitous about the girls, like the "curfew" idea rather well, too; incidentally, pa and ma do the voting. It is unfortunate that the other Congressmen may not be inclined toward supporting WILSON, but he has managed to be elected, and reelected, with the biggest majorities ever given a Congressman in this district, although he is a Republican in a section that has been traditionally Democratic for 100 years. It may be that "Curfew" will win even if they all vote against him—there being but 435 or so of them. I ran against WILSON myself for the office a few years back; I like this curfew business so well that I, and I expect nearly all of my relations, are going to vote for him when he runs again.

This is a great piece of work you have done for him—publicity he couldn't buy for money—and the kind of stuff that tickles the ears and the hearts of the curfew contingent down this way.

Yours truly,

J. A. SHIELDS.

WAYNE COUNTY
REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
RICHMOND, IND., *March 19, 1945.*

Hon. EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR EARL: It is now 5:30 o'clock and I have just come in from trying a nasty case that will go on and on during this week.

I had read that you were on the floor last Thursday in reference to Mr. Drew Pearson. I therefore began to go through my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I have just finished reading your remarks and those to whom you yielded.

My comment is to the effect that you very, very soundly smacked the living hell out of Pearson's carcass in such a manner that I doubt if you hear from the guy again.

The only time I ever knew you to be a hog was when it came to getting votes against your opponent in your district.

Keep on punchin'.

Sincerely,

You are busy and this letter does not call for an answer. What th' hell. I don't live in your district and I'm a Springer man from A to Z but I still admire you.

E. K.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 31 issue of the Prairie Farmer which discusses two important reasons for the current meat shortage. There have been and will continue to be many explanations offered for the shortage of meat and other foods, but one fact bears repeated and emphatic statement—farmers cannot produce without help, and unless draft boards stop taking essential workers off the farms we can expect far more serious food shortages than now exist.

PRAIRIE FARMER SAYS: FADING HELP AND BAD MARKETS SPELL MORE MEAT SHORTAGE

On March 16, 18 young men from Mason County, Ill., were in the Prairie Farmer Building. They had come to Chicago to take their physicals, under orders from their draft board. They came in a bunch to our building to listen to Dinnerbell program on WLS.

Because they represent a typical situation of what is happening all through prairie farmer land, we are giving their names and the number of acres in the farms on which they worked. Paul Root, 400 acres; Stanley Nieder, 400; John Montgomery, 280; Dick Stone, 520; Charles Lippert, 700; Harold Kieth, 480; Donald Zich, 160; Porter Garrison, Jr., 420; Paul Behrends, 780; Eldon Frye, 360; Alvin Hackman, 500; Harold Kastendick, 278; Rollan D. Becker, 640; Henry Kendall, 160; John Schafer, 160; Walter Grim, 240; Harold Griffin, 520; William Wendt, 320.

Add these, and you have 7,318 acres which may be deprived of at least one-third to one-half of their labor at the very outset of the spring planting. The average size of farms is 406.5 acres.

NO MEAT WITHOUT FARM HELP

We have held back recently from talking about stripping highly productive farms of their last vestige of young, able men who have had an active part in doing the physical work and the management planning, because it seemed to us inevitable that what is happening, would happen.

It will still continue to happen, and more young men will go from more highly productive farms. We are not talking in behalf of the rights or privileges of these young men, for they have none other than all young men engaged in worth-while work and subject to the call to arms.

But we will continue to talk loud and emphatically about the person who riots in a grocery store in order to get a piece of meat or chicken for Sunday dinner or week-day supper, and who, because of the shortage of food, bitterly berates farmers for not producing all that everyone can wish. Agriculture has a right to be proud of what has been produced in the face of ever-shortening supplies, labor, machinery, and pushing around in the markets when they have sent in their hogs and cattle.

We disagree with the American Meat Institute, which seeks to lay the blame for meat shortages in retail shops, upon growers selling in the black market, and to Government bungling in fixing ceiling and floor prices.

The meat packers have a tremendous load of responsibility for the present short numbers of hogs. They literally pounded the profits to growers out of the biggest production of hogs this country has ever seen, the 1943 crop. Far from paying ceiling prices, they evaded paying legitimate floor prices for hogs. They tried to get away with the idea that the floor was put there to establish what the hog was worth. That, however, was the price at which Government said it would step in to keep the producer from going broke. And when the floor prices were evaded and the bulk of hogs bought at ruinous prices, growers just were forced out of the business.

When the packers realized last fall that the honeymoon in hogs was over and they would have to pay up for the limited numbers of 194 hogs available, the market prices have been right around ceiling all the time. Now packers lament that hogs and cattle are not coming to the big market places but are going into food lockers and into the hands of small packers. Hog growers were pushed in the face so hard when trying to market their 1943 hog crop in the large market places that their noses are still sore and their eyes black.

The public is generally fair when it sees all sides of the story. Here are a couple of sides which are told all too infrequently to the people who live out of grocery stores and meat markets.

Let them all know that the farmer has done his job and has done it well. His help is gone. He has been mistreated in the market places. Government rules have been handicaps. But he enters the spring crop season with courage and determination to do what can be done. All he asks is that the public, his fellow Americans, understand his side of the circumstances, and turn not their wrath upon him when they find a few things missing on the food counters and meat blocks.

Shortage of Freight Cars in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in all sections of the Northwest great distress prevails because the railroads in the East seem to find themselves unable to route into the Northwest badly needed empty cars for the movement of important products, many of which are for war purposes and many for lend-lease.

Although this condition was aggravated by the heavy snowstorms in the New England area, it would seem reasonable now that ample time has passed in order that this bottleneck of freight cars could be removed. Unless some specific effort is expended in this direction the conditions of badly needed farm crops will grow progressively worse daily until in the end loss must be the result, and at the same time, products now manufactured and in storage ready for lend-lease must remain in storage because of the shortage of cars in the Northwest section of the United States.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an important telegram received from Mr. R. M. Stangler, general manager of the North Dakota Mill and Elevator at Grand Forks, N. Dak., which tells in understandable language the seriousness of the Northwest situation:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *March 27, 1945.*

HON. CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Many farmers unable to clean grain for seed because granaries are filled, and they are unable to move grain to elevators because they are plugged and unable to get grain cars to make shipments. We have great amount grain bought from large number elevators who are unable to ship us grain and we in turn have sold large amount flour for Army for export, also under lend-lease, and with critical car shortage we cannot make deliveries. I notice recently in the newspapers it stated hundreds of cars were delivered to western lines daily at Chicago and Peoria. To date there has been very little or no improvement in the car situation in this territory. Of the few cars that are received many are in deplorable condition and only percentage suitable for either grain or flour. We also have sold large amounts durum flour and semolina to macaroni companies, who in return have contracts with the Government and they are pressing us for shipments. Our grain stocks, the same as other mills, are getting less and less and to a point where we will not be able to operate. It is of utmost importance you get this information to the proper authorities with a view of getting reasonable amount of cars for Northwest for grain and flour shipments.

R. M. STANGLER, *General Manager,*
North Dakota Mill and Elevator.

Production Let-down Held Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, as one who supported the compromise manpower bill, and as a believer in the necessity for stabilized production until final victory, I include the following portion of an article by Richard E. Saunders, Washington editor of Aero Digest. It appeared in the March 1, 1945, issue:

If all the prophets of an easy victory could be laid end to end—and kept in that position—it would be a good thing for the country. At least this is the way high military leaders feel about it. And from all indications, the men at the fighting fronts feel the same way, only more so.

The point that both the War and Navy Departments are trying to get across to Congress, and to the heads of civil agencies, too, is that the moment of partial victory is not the time to let down in the war effort; that, on the contrary, it is just the occasion to put all our energy behind a final wallop. While it may seem paradoxical, the truth is that we need to tighten up and not relax controls as we wind up the war in Europe and prepare for new and more powerful thrusts at the Japanese.

Several times before we have seen what a premature rush toward reconversion can do. Workers leave essential war industries in the quest of safer if less lucrative peacetime jobs. Basic materials are diverted from the plants that need them. In short, there is a general disorganization of the war production program.

With Germany folding up, a let-down in effort would be even more serious than it was last year. It is for this reason that Secretary Forrestal of the Navy and Secretary of War Stimson have asked Congress to take some action to guard against shifts of labor. They have endorsed the general principle of the "work-or-else" bill, but are not insistent as to the particular terms.

But the enactment of a measure giving the Government the authority to direct workers to go where they are needed most is only part of the anti-slump program. It is important to build up defenses against propaganda for immediate resumption of regular production which might absorb materials and transportation equipment needed to maintain war production. We simply cannot lick Japan with one hand tied behind our back. It will be safe to let down in production when the final shot is fired, not before.

One War at a Time for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Chiang Kai-shek has found that two wars at a time are too much for his nation. It

was necessary to make a choice between fighting communism at home and the Japanese enemy storming its gates. Chiang Kai-shek listened to Lt. Gen. Alvin Wedemeyer and decided to whip the Japanese first; then, if necessary, he could turn his attention to the Communist forces within China. This historical event is related by Drew Pearson in his column of Sunday, March 25, 1945, printed in the Washington Post.

The following excerpt is from Drew Pearson's column:

It is now possible to reveal just how close the Japanese came to capturing the Chinese capital of Chungking last November.

While Lt. Gen. Alvin Wedemeyer was en route to Chungking to replace General Stilwell, the Japanese were driving on Kunming, gateway to Chungking. It looked as if they would capture it.

By December 22, the Japanese radio was boasting that Wedemeyer would eat his Christmas dinner in New Delhi if he ate it at all. Wedemeyer knew the situation was grave, arranged a conference with Chiang Kai-shek soon after he arrived.

"I need 90,000 men in a hurry," Wedemeyer told Chiang. "And they have got to be good men. Can you give them to me?"

Chiang wanted to know how Wedemeyer would get the men to the front if he could find them.

"I've got 87 big Army transports lying around here and I can move 100,000 men in a few days if I can find them."

Chiang asked what men Wedemeyer wanted. The American general told him he wanted 50,000 crack Chinese troops which had been trained and equipped by his predecessor, General Stilwell, and who were fighting in Burma. Chiang agreed. Then Wedemeyer asked the $64 question.

"I also want about 60,000 of your best men who have been fighting the Chinese Communists in the north. Your Excellency," said Wedemeyer nervously. "I think it is more important that these Chinese troops be fighting the Japanese than that they oppose each other."

Chiang never batted an eye, swiftly gave his approval and Wedemeyer ordered his air transports into action. In 4 days he had enough men at the Kunming fighting line to slow up the Japs. In 4 weeks he had the Nipponese drive stopped cold south of Kunming.

NOTE.—Wedemeyer is doing as complete a reorganization job on the Chinese Army as he can, seems to be getting results.

How Can We Keep the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting discussion appeared in the magazine Look dated April 3, 1945, now on the newsstands, on How Can We Keep the Peace? The article is by TOM CONNALLY, with marginal notes by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, both of whom will fill important roles as delegates to the San Francisco meeting to be held in April by representatives from the Allied Nations to provide the blueprints and agreements by which it is hoped we may provide a durable and lasting peace when the war shall end. The article is as follows:

HOW CAN WE KEEP THE PEACE?

(By Senator TOM CONNALLY, with marginal notes by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG)

As the friend of peace and the enemy of war, the United States of America is given the tremendous opportunity of leading the world in the establishment of international peace machinery to chain the lawless aggressor nations and to chart the future along the ways of peace. The hour is here. Events are forcing the issue. The challenge must be met now and the next step in the development of world order must be taken.

(Says VANDENBERG: Senator CONNALLY and I are in total agreement regarding this objective. We are working together. This is no quarrel.)

The United States has not delayed until the end of the war to begin its preparation for peace. The sessions of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, called at our invitation, have been fruitful, and many of the issues have been clarified.

The tentative draft of organization worked out there, and the understandings reached at Yalta, contemplate an assembly of all peace-loving nations, and an executive council to be the administrative and executive authority of the assembly.

The great powers will be permanent members of the executive council, with additional members to be elected to it by the assembly for stated terms. It is planned that the international organization shall employ conciliation, arbitration, and the channels of diplomacy to settle differences between nations, and an international court is to be maintained to settle issues between nations through judicial processes.

(Says VANDENBERG: It may not have "delayed." But it has been far too silent and too mysterious, about too many things. We are not called upon to be the only silent partner in the grand alliance.)

FORCE MAY BE NEEDED

Yet if peaceful measures are defied, force may be invoked to prevent armed aggression. We have learned full well that gentle words are sometimes not enough. The international organization must be endowed with armed power.

(Says VANDENBERG: "Final 'force' must always be in sight. But these primary peaceful mechanisms—to prevent a dispute from needing the use of force—are the true genius of this great adventure. I think the 'force' argument is overemphasized.")

Differences of opinion begin to appear only when the question of how force is to be used is raised. We agree force must be used if it be required to keep the peace. But there has not yet been a full meeting of minds on what the instrument of force shall be, or upon how it will be decided whether and when force shall or shall not be employed.

(Says VANDENBERG: "These differences will be far less if we first sign a treaty, backed by peremptory force, to keep Germany and Japan demilitarized. After that, we shall be dealing only with our friends. It is far less necessary to have a shotgun in the corner of the dining room when our dinner guests are our own blood relatives—and that ought to describe the United Nations.")

There is some "disagreement" within the United Nations and within the Senate of the United States as to whether or not there shall be military forces under the control of the executive council, how such forces shall be formed, and how they shall be sent into action against an aggressor convicted by the council.

(Says VANDENBERG: "This disagreement should not be allowed to jeopardize the whole, great adventure. Let not league zealots strive for what the President calls 'perfectionism'—at the hazard of defeating everything. That's what defeated Woodrow Wilson 25 years ago.")

Reconciling these differences about how we shall take the next logical step toward world peace is no easy task.

(Says VANDENBERG: "These differences must be reconciled. The American people are not likely to approve an abandonment of the constitutional requirement that only Congress can declare war. It is not necessary. For 150 years the Constitution has also recognized the right of the President to use the armed forces for 'national defense' without prior consultation of Congress. He should still be allowed to continue to do so within these precedents. Our need is to reduce this rule of conduct to writing. But we should agree now that force to keep the Axis demilitarized shall always be available without any further reference to Congress. That is just the lengthened shadow of the present war.")

THREE STEPS TO PEACE

First. Agreement must be reached between the nations to be represented at San Francisco upon questions that still remain in controversy.

Second. The great wartime alliance must perfect means of avoiding the development of misunderstandings over problems arising between now and a future time when an international organization can assume its full functions.

Third. The charter of the organization must win treaty approval from the United States Senate, and the law under which we will be represented in its assembly and on its council must be passed.

The American, British, and Russian chiefs of state agreed at Yalta upon a solution to the controversy that developed at Dumbarton Oaks over the veto power to be exercised by permanent members of the Executive Council of the United Nations.

There is substantial reason to believe the San Francisco conference will find this solution acceptable. By requiring unanimity of permanent members only upon certain kinds of questions, differences heretofore existing may be resolved. Certainly the wisdom and the fairness of both the great and the small powers are sufficient for them to be able to reach conclusions on this issue.

(Says VANDENBERG: I think that it would be immoral for one of the great powers to use its veto against its own conviction as an aggressor. I hope a practical formula may be devised to avoid it.)

Meanwhile it should not be overlooked in this country that possession of a veto power by each of the permanent members of the Council is the strongest guaranty that force will not be used in any international quarrel except with the acquiescence of the representative of the United States.

I have advocated the immediate formation of an Interim Council of the United Nations to take responsibility for the adjustment of problems arising before the permanent Executive Council can begin to function. Such an Interim Council could make certain that immediate problems are handled to the joint satisfaction of the great and small powers, and establish joint responsibility for what is done.

(Says VANDENBERG: I have no objection to an Interim Council.' Certainly all of these preliminary decisions that are being made by our allies should be made by common consent, including us. That has not been the case. Yet, by default, we seem to let our silence give our consent. We have not exercised an authority commensurate with our stake in the war and in the peace.)

Individual powers would, thereby, be relieved of the necessity of taking individual action, and the suspicions that have been generated by criticism of unilateral action might be avoided and allayed.

ALL MUST APPROVE

It is my own view that matters of boundaries, transfer of territories, and similar questions, whatever temporary settlements may be made, must be submitted to all the United Nations and incorporated in the final peace terms. The arrangements for concert and consultation in reaching temporary settlements made at Yalta will be helpful, but all the United Nations have fought the war together, and we have got to make the peace together.

(Says VANDENBERG: O. K. This isn't being done. Perhaps some of these problems cannot escape interim decisions. But the decisions should be temporary. All should be subject to subsequent league review.)

There is considerable misunderstanding about what kind of "policing force" the International Organization is expected to have. Opponents of establishment of an independent military force under the direction of the Executive Council should know that none is planned, unless it be some air units of limited size.

(Says VANDENBERG: Again I say that this "policing" problem is infinitely simplified when once we have permanently demilitarized the Axis. There is no need for an "international standing army." In any event, I agree that it would be utterly impracticable. Potential "force" is sufficient.)

In crises calling for military or naval force the League would call on member nations for troops in accordance with numbers or percentage proportions already predetermined. If a crisis were distinctly local or regional, only the forces of adjacent member nations might be called upon to take action under the direction of the Executive Council.

(Says VANDENBERG: This regional idea is sound. America would never hesitate to join in "regional" responsibility, for example, for peace in the Western Hemisphere. We should have more emphasis upon the "regional" idea.)

The insuperable difficulty with having a separate military force in constant readiness under the command of the Council is that this force would have to be quartered somewhere during times of peace. Experience shows that friction does develop between alien forces and the people with whom they must live from day to day.

Upon the question of empowering the United States' representative on the Executive Council to vote without prior specific reference to Congress, there cannot, in my opinion, be any valid objection to his acting within the scope of the statute authorizing his appointment and specifying his exact powers.

DEBATE CAN BE DANGEROUS

In a case arising before the Council in which an aggressor, thoroughly armed, was ready to strike in defiance of the peace organization, to require that before the Council could take action the matter should be referred to the Congress of the United States, would measurably strike down the usefulness of the Council. It is well known that debate and consideration in the Senate would consume considerable time. An armed aggressor would wreak his vengeance upon his defenseless victim while the lengthy debate was taking place.

(Says VANDENBERG: If we first permanently demilitarize the Axis, this new aggressor, I repeat, is one of our present friends. To be specific, it probably will be either Britain or Russia. If Britain, Russia, and America ever reach an impasse where "force" must be used against one of them as an aggressor, the situation will be so serious that neither our representatives on the Council nor the President himself would think of committing us to force without knowing Congress and the country approve. It would be war. Therefore I think the subject is largely academic.

I think the fear of congressional "delay" is exaggerated. Congress never hesitates in the face of crisis. The Senate declared war on Japan in 13 minutes and on Germany in 5.)

The United States Congress will no doubt enact legislation providing for the selection of a United States representative on the Council. In that act his authority can be defined and delimited, if necessary.

No representative of the United States on the Council would dare to defy the opinion of the President of the United States or of the Congress. I have little fear that our representative would not honorably and diligently and conscientiously reflect the attitude of the American people on any question upon which he should vote in the Council.

FORCE CAN PREVENT WAR

It must be borne in mind that the use of force under the conditions contemplated is not an act of war. It is an act to prevent war. It is essentially a peace measure. The history of international law is full of examples of the use of the display of force, in the protection of the rights of nationals and the defense of property and to repel aggression on the high seas, which did not actually result in war.

(Says VANDENBERG: If our only, or chief, reliance in charting a better world is force, it is not going to be a happy prospectus. I agree that force must always be in sight. I have no illusions that tomorrow's aggressor would respond to anything else. But I think it is entirely possible to discourage or to stop tomorrow's aggression before it starts. I want my emphasis put upon the necessity for a just peace as a starter, and then upon investigation and conciliation and mediation and arbitration and international law (and even economic sanctions) thereafter. I want a peace league and not a war league, in fact as well as name.)

In any case, with the unanimous vote of the great powers who are permanent members of the Council and by a majority vote of the entire Council, no nation would dare to challenge the decisions of the international organization, and no nation would dare to employ armed forces in a campaign of aggression.

ARMIES STRENGTHEN DECREES

The decision of the Council would not only carry the moral influence of world opinion, but the might and strength of the armed forces of the members would overawe and compel the acquiescence of a recalcitrant or a stubborn nation that might contemplate conquest.

Opposition to world peace organization and to American participation comes not so much from those who are against any and all attempts to take this next great step, as from those who staunchly assert they support world organization but "I am for Dumbarton Oaks," these supporters say, "but I can't accept this and I can't vote for that."

I would say to those who are straining to find some defect that it must be remembered that we are building this organization out on the frontier; we are building it in land where no traveler has ever left his foot prints.

(Says VANDENBERG: At this point, I do not think my good friend, Senator CONNALLY, is talking about me. I think my fidelity to the ideal of collective security is fairly well beyond challenge. And I hope he is not trying to discourage perfectly frank and general discussion. This adventure, so freighted with the hope of civilization, must win the approval of the American mass conscience or our participation in it will be a mere empty fiction. I agree that we cannot expect perfectionism. I agree that we are endangered by extremists at both ends of the argument. But let's have the full free argument so that the American decision will be validated by the whole American people.)

We cannot expect to have an international organization that in every particular and detail meets the views of every individual Senator. If we did we should have a score of different plans. We must take the completed work approved by the United Nations, or leave it. We must either have an organization for international peace, or we must reject it.

(Says VANDENBERG: Senator CONNALLY means what he says. He is a deeply devoted friend of world peace. I want to add that in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he is doing a superb nonpartisan job in seeking to keep this problem "out of politics" and on the high plane which its desperate importance to civilization demands.)

It is my earnest hope that the Conference of all the United Nations soon to meet in San Francisco will succeed in drafting in clear terms a treaty to establish an international organization to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent any further armed aggression.

Such a treaty will be the only practicable plan before the world. Its rejection would plunge us again into the uncertainties and dark disaster that at any time may bring about another terrible war.

Let us have peace.

(Says VANDENBERG: Amen.)

Justice for Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Justice for Mailman," which appeared in the March 27, 1945, edition of the Boston (Mass.) Daily Record:

JUSTICE FOR MAILMAN

In thousands of communities and rural areas the mail carrier is one of the most familiar figures.

Throughout the years, in all kinds of weather—to paraphrase the famous line from Herodotus which is the motto of the Postal Service—he goes his "appointed rounds."

Nowadays, when millions of men and boys are away from home with the colors, his visits may be as comforting to anxious households as those of the family doctor.

And in these war years his task has been as endless, and his burdens often have been heavier, than in the times of peace.

For the Postal Service has had to break all records in the volume of mail delivered, and it has had to do this with the most serious manpower shortage the Department has ever known, so that every employee in the Postal Service has had to work harder than ever before.

Their salaries are fixed by law and, because the law is obsolete, the salaries are grossly unfair and inadequate—which is doubly unjust since at this very time the monetary receipts of the Post Office Department are the highest in its history.

This inequity will be corrected if Congress passes the Burch bill which is now under consideration.

The bill will make a complete reclassification of postal employees, the first in 20 years; it will grant an immediate increase of $400 in the annual basic pay, with honest overtime of time and a half for more than 40 hours of work a week; and it will provide for annual increases over a limited term of years as an incentive to keep men in the Service.

In an appearance before the Post Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, warned Congress that the future of the Postal Service will be determined by its action on the Burch bill.

Speaking hopefully for the letter carriers, he said:

"It would appear that at long last the carrier will be given an equal opportunity with his fellow American to share in a decent standard of living."

The country can well afford this act of justice, which has been too long withheld.

The mail carrier and the postal clerk are essential workers in war or in peace.

They should be respected and rewarded as such.

Whites and Negroes Fight Side by Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following item which appeared in the March 20, 1945, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

WHITES AND NEGROES FIGHT SIDE BY SIDE

PARIS, March 20.—For the first time in United States Army history, Negro and white troops now are fighting side by side in the same outfits in both the First and Seventh Armies, according to Stars and Stripes.

The Army newspaper, in a dispatch from the First Army front, said Negro platoons had been assigned to rifle companies in both armies in response to repeated requests from the Negroes themselves for a chance to fight for their country as well as work for it.

The Negroes were chosen from thousands who answered a special appeal from the communications zone commander, Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee, to service troops in his command.

From one company of Negro engineers, 171 men out of 186 volunteered. In a quartermaster laundry company 100 out of 260 volunteered, but only 36 were allowed to go.

Stars and Stripes said about 2,500 volunteers in all had been accepted. Two platoons were in one company which crossed the Roer and helped take Duren.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it gives me great pleasure to include a most able address on the subject of treaty ratification delivered by my colleague, Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Member of Congress, Third New Jersey District, before the Women's Republican Club of Monmouth County, N. J., on March 16, 1945. This is a timely speech, since in the near future the House will vote on House Joint Resolution 60, which contains a proposed amendment to the Constitution permitting both Houses of Congress to ratify treaties by a majority vote. The speech by Congressman AUCHINCLOSS is a scholarly, logical, and convincing presentation of this most fundamental issue. I commend him highly for this splendid effort. The address is as follows:

Perhaps the greatest question of the day, in a day when there are many great questions is, how can we achieve a lasting peace? It is a matter that concerns every one of us in America, and indeed in all the countries of the earth. The statesmen of the world in almost every utterance they make, pledge themselves to the making of a lasting peace, even if it is necessary to use force to enforce it, and people everywhere answer with a loud "Amen." The people of the whole world want a lasting peace at the end of this awful war and are ready to make almost any sacrifice to achieve it. They are determined not to permit the same mistakes that were made after 1918 and will not tolerate those in public office who lack the vision to appreciate our country's great responsibilities to the generations yet to come. Citizens of the United States never again want a few to block the way of the many in determining the destinies of our country. The world has grown at such a pace and our national relationship and responsibilities have become so great and involved that it is not right that a small band of willful men shall have the power to block the will of a larger band of equally willful men in solving the future international relationships of the United States. The need today is for realistic statesmen with the knowledge that our country has to concern itself with world affairs if we are to achieve the peace of our desires.

Under our present system of government we are no better off than we were after the last war. The Constitution of the United States still provides that one more than one-third of the Members of the Senate present may prevent ratification of any treaty which the balance of that body may consider to be wise and for the best interests of our country. Let us examine this situation and by looking the facts in the face, study the evils and seek out the remedy. Let us see if the people of the country, through their duly elected representatives, really do have a voice in the destiny of their country and whether the thoughts and wishes of all the people are given due consideration. If their will can be thwarted by a minority in the all-important matter of making peace or any treaty with the other nations of the earth, it is time for a reorganization of our Government machinery.

In the first place, who declares war? Who has the authority under our Constitution to commit our Nation to fight to the death against any other nation? Who has the constitutional right to order our sons and daughters to become soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators, ready to lay down their lives for their country? We all know what an awful power that is. We all know how war disrupts our homes and our way of life. We all know the seriousness and tragedies of war, and we know of its cost and senseless destruction and waste. We all abhor it and everything connected with it. But under our form of government, only the Congress of the United States—all the duly elected representatives of the people—Senators and Congressmen—by a majority vote of those present can commit us to fight a war. The President does not declare war, but it is his duty to report the state of affairs to the Congress and he may recommend the declaration of war. These powers are well defined in our Constitution and it might aid in our consideration of the matter if we refreshed our memory on what the powers of Congress are. In abbreviated form these powers, as provided in the Constitution (article I, sec. 8) are:

1. To lay and collect taxes.
2. To borrow money on the credit of the United States.
3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations.
4. To establish uniform rules on naturalization.
5. To coin money and regulate the value thereof.
6. To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting.
7. To establish post offices and post roads.
8. To promote the progress of science and the useful arts.
9. To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.
10. To define and punish piracy and felonies on the high seas.
11. To declare war.
12. To raise and support armies.
13. To provide and maintain a navy.
14. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
15. To provide for calling forth of militia.
16. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, etc.
17. To exercise exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia.
18. To make all laws * * * for execution of foregoing powers and powers vested in it by the Constitution of the United States.

One can readily appreciate that Congress has a great deal of authority and responsibility and it must be remembered that the enactment of all laws and resolutions is done by a majority vote of those present of both the Senate and House of Representatives. It should also be noted, however, that nothing is said here in the Constitution about making treaties—the making of the peace treaties. That important matter is considered in article II section 2 and reads as follows: "He (sic, the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur" and so forth. No mention is made of the House of Representatives and although it must vote to put the Nation into war, it is not permitted a voice in the making of peace.

We have seen who has the power to declare war, now let us see who carries on war. Under the Constitution, all revenue for the use of the Government which has to be raised by taxation, must originate in the House of Representatives. We all remember the old battle cry "No taxation without representation" and that philosophy is just as sound today as it was in the days of yore. Members of the House of Representatives, being elected every 2 years, are closer to the people, so it is most fitting that they should be charged with the responsibility of imposing taxes. It follows therefore that the House of Representatives must originate the appropriation bills that provide for the carrying on of war. Vast sums of money are needed not only for the purchase of guns, tanks, airplanes, ships, and ammunition, but also to provide for the operation of such agencies as Lend-Lease, U. N. R. R. A., Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration, and all the other agencies of government, necessary for victory. The House of Representatives must study all these matters and vote on the appropriation of unbelievably vast sums of money to provide the necessities of war.

The House too must pass on legislation covering the draft of our men and women not only for the armed forces but also for the production of goods for war. That the Members of the House have fulfilled their responsibilities in these matters during the pres-

ent emergency there can be no question; is there any doubt that they are equally capable of determining the policies involving treaty making, especially peace treaties? They well know what the cost of war is and they are equally well qualified to know the price of peace.

Who makes the peace? As has been pointed out, the Constitution provides that the President with the advice and consent of two thirds of the Senate present shall make treaties. How was this two-thirds formula arrived at? Let us go back at bit in the history of our country and examine the situation that prompted this provision. The Articles of Confederation in 1787 provided for the ratification of treaties by a vote of 9 out of the thirteen original States. At that time it was doubtful whether 9 of the Original States would join the Union, but it was agreed that if 9 did, the Articles of Confederation would become binding on them. If our original thirteen States had been only 9, there would have been only 18 Senators and two-thirds of the Senate would have been 12 Senators. If a majority vote had been permitted it would have left the all-important matter of treaty making in the hands of 10 Senators with the President and that would have represented only 5 States out of the 9. It would not have been an attractive proposition for the other States to submit to the wishes of only 5 and so the two-thirds rule was adopted. The founders of our country planned well but they never dreamed of the huge success of their undertaking and that some day there would be 96 Senators, representing 48 States, and 435 Members of the House of Representatives. These members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 never were in favor of minority control, but that is just what has developed. With the growth of the country, every reason for the two-thirds rule has disappeared and it should be changed so the wishes of the majority of the representatives of the people should be strengthened and prevail. Today the United States of America stands alone as the only great Nation to employ this cumbersome, obstructive, and senseless two-thirds requirement.

A fundamental principle of democracy is rule by the majority but in treaty making the minority has the power of negating the majority. For example, under our present system, Senators from 17 States voting against any treaty can cause its defeat. Taking the figures of the 1940 census, if these Senators are from States of small population, then a treaty approved by Senators representing 120,000,000 people could be overruled by Senators representing only 10,500,000 people. Furthermore if only a quorum of the Senate were present, then 17 votes of Senators from the smaller States representing about 3,500,000 would overrule the wishes of 32 Senators representing States with a population of over 88,000,000 people. It is admitted that this is an extreme example of what might happen, but it can happen and in the past pretty nearly has happened. The very possibility of its happening should be eliminated—the stakes are too great. On the other hand, if a majority vote of both the Houses of Congress was required, and a bare quorum was present at the time of voting, 25 Senators and 110 Members of the House would be necessary to block ratification of a treaty.

To enlarge further on this point, under the present circumstances the vote of a Senator from Nevada is worth twice as much as that of a Senator from New York, or in other words the power of a single voter in Nevada is the equivalent of 120 votes in New York. Pennsylvania has a population of 9,900,180; the vote of the two Senators from Nevada with a population of 110,247 can override the 4 votes of the Senators from both New York and Pennsylvania, with a combined population of 23,379,322. Such a state of affairs is undemocratic, it is unfair, it does not make sense, and is eloquent testimony why the proposed amendment to the Constitution should be adopted without delay.

The proposed amendment, introduced by Congressman MERROW, of New Hampshire, reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur."

In the last Congress a similar amendment was favorably considered by the Judiciary Committee but was not called up by the majority party for the consideration of the House. In the present Congress favorable action has already been taken by both the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee of the House; therefore it is expected that it will come up for consideration in the near future. It seems to be the general opinion that the House will act favorably on it, and it will then go to the Senate for its approval or rejection. What will happen to it there is a matter of conjecture. The Senate is loath to give up any of its rights and prerogatives, but there is some hope that the progressive and farsighted point of view of the newer Senators will have a strong bearing on the Senate's attitude. If the Senate agrees to it it will then be submitted to the legislatures of the various States for consideration. In this connection it is well to remember that over 40 of our States' legislatures are convening this year and if 36 of these legislatures concur in the amendment, it will become a part of the Constitution of the United States. So there need be no long delay over having this matter corrected, but we must all go to work if action is to be secured. Everyone should write his Congressman and especially his Senator and urge the favorable consideration of this measure promptly. Also the State legislatures should be urged to favorable action.

An aroused public opinion can correct this weakness in our Constitution and it is most desirable that it should be done. We must put an end to making treaties with foreign nations and calling them agreements. This has become the method used to get around this present provision of the Constitution. In the American way of doing things let us bring about this change; let us amend our precious Constitution and conduct our Government as George Washington advised us in his farewell address:

"If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

Air Routes to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago on March 13, 1945:

AUTHORIZATION FOR INTERVENTION ON BEHALF OF CITY OF CHICAGO IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD CONCERNING PROPOSED NEW AIR ROUTES TO LATIN AMERICA

Whereas national policies respecting air transportation among the various countries of the world are now in the making and international air routes are being laid out, and the ports of entry into and exit from this country are being selected for air transportation; and

Whereas air routes between various countries of the world should be as direct and noncircuitous as the convenience and necessity of all peoples concerned will permit, and the selection for air transportation of ports of entry into and exit from this country, should be made to the end that such ports shall, as far as operating conditions and facilities will permit, further the principles of direct and noncircuitous flight; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board (Federal) applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing additional air service in Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean area under section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1936, as amended, and known as Docket 525 et al.; and

Whereas the center of United States industry rests squarely in and around Chicago; and

Whereas Chicago's present population is estimated at 3,450,000, and 7,000,000 people live within a 100-mile radius of this city, and 10,000,000 live within a 150-mile radius, and 42,000,000 within a 500-mile radius, roughly an overnight train ride from Chicago, and within this same 500-mile radius are 72 of America's cities having a population of 50,000 or more, and 17 percent of the Nation's 33 major industrial areas, as compared to 8 major industrial areas on the east coast, 3 on the west coast, and 5 scattered throughout the remainder of the Nation; and

Whereas the Chicago metropolitan area alone has approximately 10,000 industrial establishments which normally produce 7½ percent of the Nation's total of factory-made goods, and Cook County, Chicago's own county, ranks first in industrial production among all the counties of the United States, and Chicago alone has approximately 8,000 wholesale concerns and 47,000 retailers; and

Whereas Chicago is the center of the Nation's railway network, with 21 trunk-line railroads, and has 45,000 daily transient rail passengers, and Chicago's switching district daily handles approximately 46,000 freight cars, or more than New York City and St. Louis combined; and

Whereas Chicago is justly proud of its municipal airport, with its eight major commercial air-line users and dual runways in each direction, which handled 679,083 passengers and 12,600,000 pounds of mail and 340,170 express shipments in the year 1943 and had 21,139 plane arrivals and 21,286 departures; and

Whereas Chicago is the world's fourth largest city and is situated almost at the exact geographical center of North America, and is nearer representative points in Central and South America than is New York City, as follows:

Chicago:	
Canal Zone	2,353
Santiago	5,420
Buenos Aires	5,775
New York:	
Canal Zone	2,394
Santiago	5,461
Buenos Aires	5,816

Whereas the city of Chicago, Ill., is a municipal corporation created under the laws of the State of Illinois; and

Whereas it owns the airport adjacent to it, and which is served as a duly authorized stop on regularly routed and scheduled commercial air service; and

Whereas commercial air services already authorized for the city of Chicago have close relationship to the services proposed in the instant proceedings, because of the community of interest and convenience and density of the city of Chicago; and

Whereas the city of Chicago has a property interest in the instant proceeding, and said interest will not be represented by other parties therein; and

Whereas the public convenience and necessity require direct air service between the city of Chicago and cities in Latin America and the Caribbean area under consideration in this proceeding; and

Whereas this body feels that Chicago's vital interest in obtaining direct and unbroken air service connecting it and said Latin America and Caribbean cities will be passed upon and disposed of in this proceeding and the city of Chicago may not have another opportunity to present its claim for said needed service; and

Whereas the granting of leave for the city of Chicago to intervene herein will not lengthen the proceeding or unduly broaden the issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the city of Chicago, by its mayor, should intervene and become a party to this proceeding, and to any and all other proceedings and hearings, both for international and domestic air routes in which the city's interests may be affected, and file briefs and otherwise participate, that Chicago's interests may be protected and promoted.

2. That the corporation counsel is hereby ordered and directed to take any and all steps deemed necessary to obtain the objective of the next preceding paragraph.

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Members from this State of the United States Senate, and the Members from this State of the United States House of Representatives.

Watching the Murder of 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of an editorial appearing in the Tulsa Daily Tribune of March 24, 1945:

WATCHING THE MURDER OF 1776

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What has become of the spirit of 1776? Is there nothing left of that but a stirring picture of three men with drum and fife and flag? Have we lost all the courage and character that caused this country to be? Are we such a craven or stupid lot that we will allow ingenious forms of corruption to bribe us into citizenship imbecility? It is done in cleverly subtle ways.

Congress is being asked to investigate our bomber plant out here on the edge of town. And it is high time. There is waste of men and money there. It is a private enterprise, operating in a mammoth shop that the taxpayers built. The contractor gets a percentage of the cost of production. The more he can make it cost, the more he gets. Hence excessive wages and more workers than work. And this goes on all over the country. What do we do about it? Nothing, just pay the bill.

Up in Kansas City, while we were rushing income tax checks to the post office to get under the date deadline, one A. C. Utterback, one of the three supervising examiners for the Farm Credit Administration, sat as usual at his empty desk in the basement of the municipal auditorium doing nothing, nothing, and drawing $702 a month from the Government for doing nothing. His is not an isolated case. It is a sample.

And we, who are no longer Americans, who have lost the spirit of 1776, uncomplainingly condone these pilfering practices which would hurl to jail the manager of any private industry who so filched from his stockholders.

Look in your Tulsa telephone book and count them yourself. Listed under the United States Government, exempting the post office, which does an exceedingly efficient job with a genuine shortage of manpower, the agencies of the Government tax absorbers list 49 telephones. More telephones than the city of Tulsa and the State of Oklahoma combined. And all the Federal business that is done in this town could be more efficiently handled if put in the hands of a few efficient men.

Were the "spirit of 1776" still alive the Americans today would not permit their grafting Government to establish one rule for itself and completely opposite rules for private business and citizens.

The Government that we, by election, chose to have is the biggest waster of manpower in these months of desperate war need. And if there be a shortage of manpower that hampers the war effort, then the Government itself comes pretty close to the threshold of sabotage.

For the last year and a half Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has been insistently demanding that Paul V. McNutt, the War Manpower Commissioner, deliver to the Senate of the United States factual records of the need of more than 4,000,000 Federal employees at a cost to the taxpayers of more than $700,000,000 a year.

McNutt refuses to be bothered by the Senate of the United States. In short, McNutt doesn't want to be bothered with the people. What he does with the people's money is none of the people's business. That, in essence, is what McNutt says. There was a time when the "spirit of 1776" dominated the council chambers of our Congress and a McNutt would have found himself out on his neck. But what do we do about it? Not a thing. The "spirit of 1776" is dead.

It is impossible for a private enterprise to raise the wages of an efficient white-collar worker. He may be worth the raise that his company wishes to pay him. But some little two-spot of a Federal official who himself never ran a business, who knows nothing about business, autocratically says, "You cannot raise these wages. But we on the inside, we Federal boys, we can raise our wages because we don't give a whoop what we do with the tax money we make you pay. We are on our gay college-concocted economic jag. Hoopey with the Federal funds."

We are being schooled to accept the leadership that is definitely taking us into a communistic state. Dr. Morley, the president of Haverford College, and Dr. Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, have within recent weeks declared that we are vacating the American principles and practices to accept a socialized state. We are leaving America to go Russian. It is a tragic truth. The "spirit of 1776" today is nothing more than a picture of three men with drum and fife and flag.

Senator BYRD reports a still further alarming fact which confirms the indictment of our Government by these two alert, intelligent, and patriotic college heads.

Senator BYRD reports that a careful review of inquiries reveals "the amazing fact that nearly all the bureaucratic agencies plan to increase rather than decrease their personnel in the post-war era." That means an un-American nation.

What do we do? Nothing. Just take the tax bill and get it postmarked before the deadline. We Americans have become a lot of sheep.

In his investigation Senator BYRD has harvested a crop of letters of digust and indignation written by bureaucratic employees who are magnificently paid for idleness. Picking out some at random he calls attention to such attitudes as this:

One young man, drawn to a lucrative Federal job in Washington, writes: "For days after I arrived in Washington I sat and looked out of the window. Finally I couldn't stand the waste, disorganization, and idleness and resigned. When I did so the head of the department said, 'You are a fool. You might as well have some of this money. If you don't take it someone else will.'" And the majority of the American citizens have voted to maintain this kind of economic rascality and indecency.

In a Federal office outside of Washington there is a lawyer who gives practically his entire time to his private practice, but who, being on the Federal pay roll for $6,500 a year, drops into the Government office to report "present" and collect his political pay. And we, the taxpayers, pay for his pilfering.

Senator BYRD tells Congress that there are over 6,000,000 on the public pay roll now. One person for every two persons in the armed forces of our country is drawing a parasitic pay beyond the worth of the kind of work they could do, if there were work for them to do, while our boys who are bearing the brunt of battle receive a paltry pay, with no right to strike and no regulation of the hours they are willing to put on their job.

The once proud America, the Republic of our songs, our legends, and our literature, is gone. Once every American was inspired by the gospel of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is gone. "Sweet land of liberty" is no longer a sweet land of song. The American people are no longer American, they have become a bunch of spineless saps. And the day will come when this bureaucracy will have no taxable people left to plunder. Then we will be Russian. And that is definitely what this administration is leading us to.

And we, the once strong, self-reliant, proud Americans, stand by to see the "spirit of 1776" murdered. And who murdered the "spirit of 1776"? We ourselves did.

Savings Effected by the Bureau of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a letter addressed to me by Hon. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, concerning mimeographed releases. I am sure this letter will prove interesting. It follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 12, 1945, concern-

ing a press release and surplus property report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. You also raised a question as to the extent Government agencies are issuing mimeographed releases.

A member of my staff has made a personal inquiry concerning the Recanstruction Finance Corporation release. In view of the facts determined as a result of your suggestion, I have recommended that such releases, which appear to be necessary to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's function as a surplus-property-disposal agency, be reproduced on both sides of the paper. This should result in a substantial savings.

With respect to your general inquiry regarding the extent that Government agencies are issuing mimeographed releases, may I report as follows:

I have assigned staff to develop good practices in the entire field of reproduction, conservation, and salvage of paper. This includes continuous liaison with the Government Printing Office, War Production Board, Office of War Information, and other Government agencies, to determine controls and standards which should be established for the further conservation of paper and for proper design of printed materials and use of printing facilities. To date this program has resulted in the issuance of several instructions and regulations to all Federal agencies of the executive branch of the Government. A few specific examples of economies effected are enumerated in the following paragraphs:

During the period July 1, 1941, through September 25, 1942, a joint review of dated periodicals by this Bureau and the agencies resulted in the elimination of 239 publications and in the reduced distribution of 284 more.

The issuance of Budget Circulars A–17 and A–20 reduced the annual use of 7,500,000 pounds of paper valued at $1,250,000.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Government Printing Office estimated that compliance with regulation No. 4 will save 8,500,000 pounds of paper annually.

The above results, and untold numbers of others not listed, although impressive and noteworthy, do not in any way tell the full story. For instance, our Circular A–35 outlines, in detail, essentials of administrative control of these fields for use by all agencies. Savings which are resulting therefrom cannot be estimated.

In addition, this Bureau is required by the Federal Reports Act of 1942 to review all forms to be used for the collection of information by Federal agencies. During the 2-year period, January 1, 1943, to December 31, 1944, there were 1,526 forms disapproved out of a total of 15,347 forms submitted, a reduction of approximately 10 percent. Of the number approved, substantial modifications were made in the number of respondents, number of copies, and format. For example, a recent action involved the printing of 40,000,000 copies. As a result of Bureau initiative, the size of the form was reduced to about one-half resulting in a saving of approximately 80 tons of paper. Also, because of this control by the Bureau, agencies consult with the Bureau and screen their forms more carefully prior to submission for approval which results in large savings which cannot be accurately measured.

The Bureau was also instrumental in setting up, in the Office of War Information, the Inter-Agency Publications Committee which screens the informational publications of the executive branch of the Federal Government. The following savings on informational publications have been reported by that committee:

As a result of the establishment of publication review services in agencies, 42,317,000 copies of publications and press releases were eliminated and mailing lists reduced 3,000,000 more copies per year. This has meant a total reduction of approximately 45,000,000 copies annually.

Paper consumed:	*Tons*
Calendar year 1943	40,000
Calendar year 1944 (estimated)	24,600
Reduction, 38.5 percent	15,400
Periodicals published (500 or more in circulation):	
Number published in 1942	1,100
Number published at present	324
Reduction, 70.5 percent	776
Weight of paper used (base: 1,000 sheets size 25" x 38"):	
Average weight in 1942	120
Average weight at present	80
Reduction, 33.3 percent	40
Orders for clearance received:	
Average number received March 1943	70
Average number received March 1945	14.5
Reduction, 79.3 percent	55.5

In addition to conservation measures, the Bureau of the Budget has initiated an intensive paper salvage program. Since the initiation of this program in July 1943, the paper salvage by the Federal agencies has increased from 12,300 tons per month to 42,100 tons per month in December 1944, an increase of over 340 percent.

As indicated above, this Bureau has stressed the conservation and salvage of paper and reduction of cost which includes determination of the proper method of reproduction of forms and publications. In many cases where a small number of copies are required, mimeographing or other processing has been determined to be the cheapest method of reproduction. Available figures show that during fiscal year 1944, 17,267 processed documents and 19,667 printed documents were reproduced by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. However, processing is recommended only where it is the most economical method.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and my staff will continue its active interest in this field and will investigate any similar instances you may wish to call to our attention.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

Fallacy of Cost-Plus-Fee War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents who are employees in some of the defense industries, and particularly of the Douglas Aircraft Co.'s bomber assembly plant at Tulsa, have written me their experiences and detailed numerous specific instances of a waste of manpower in these plants. The public, in my district and elsewhere, has sensed this situation long ago. They think and say that it is due to the administration's policy of handling these operations on the cost-plus-fee basis. Many consider that this policy will be pointed to as perhaps the No. 1 post-war scandal for investigation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents either write me anonymously or request me not to use their names for fear of losing their jobs or of suffering reprisals. However, they are patriotic citizens and want their Representatives in Congress to know that conditions are not right. Many Members of this House have addressed themselves in this House to this subject, and it must be admitted that the break-down of the policy is due to come before long.

I think the following letter from a worker in the Douglas plant at Tulsa, Okla., is illustrative of my point:

I want to add another person is tired of seeing so many workers in an airplane factory and their orders are to act busy. A short time back a shut-down of the assembly line was made, and about 500 persons were told to act busy, and for 1 whole week they did not turn a screw nor tap. They were told to hide out so the main officials or the Army personnel couldn't see them, so they hid down under the platforms that are built under the planes. They are for the planes before they are put on wheels, and a lot hid inside these planes and some even went to sleep.

Every day there is more time wasted. There are lots that all the work they do could be done in 30 minutes' time.

There is too much time spent in the leadmen hugging and wrestling with the girls.

It is Douglas policy if a boy is eligible for the draft he is promoted at once and a deferment is asked, and I have noticed ever since I have been working out there. I am an inspector out there, and the other day I was asked to try a part on the ship, and the leadman was wrestling with one of the girls until he couldn't stamp it out if he had to do that before I could try it. They won't let me work as I want to. If I step over what they call my position, I am given a reprimand. * * * I could do all I have to do in 3 hours, and the rest of the time I have to make out like I am busy. Here awhile back I would slip over on other places and buy out things when I see a red light on and no one answers it. I can't keep from going over, and I did that until I got sick and was off, so then the supervisor found out then how much I was doing, so when I come back I was given my orders, so they put in more girls, and there is a man that is supposed to go to the Army. He has taken his physical, but Douglas is trying to get him a deferment. He is a married man, but all he does is play with a young girl, and sometimes he is gone out of his position for 1 hour and sometimes longer, and I just can't hardly stand it because I can't answer his light. But that is all right. He is a man, and he is of draft age, so he can do anything. There are lots of men out there that is being exempted that they are not needed at all. There are plenty of older men can take his place. Also an inspector, my supervisor, brags how he sends to Missouri and gets his cigarettes and do not pay State tax and hasn't for some time. It makes my blood boil to hear him boast and brag. * * *

I wish someone would come into the plant and just see how time and labor is wasted.

Please do not print my name, as if they should see it I would lose my job or be blackballed out at the plant.

But I sure want something done.

P. S.—This is in response to the clipping I read in the Tulsa (Okla.) World.

John O'Donnell, of Davenport, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am very glad, indeed, to call the attention of Congress to the outstanding service rendered by John O'Donnell, of Davenport, Iowa, in behalf of our men serving in the armed forces. Mr. O'Donnell has conducted a weekly letter in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat, under the title of "Dear Joe," and his service has been so outstanding as to earn great praise from the readers of that paper which has a very large circulation throughout eastern Iowa.

The service rendered by Mr. O'Donnell is a very good illustration of what can be done on the home front to help the morale of our friends and neighbors who are serving in the armed forces far from home. I am including here a statement of Mr. O'Donnell's service by Mr. Hugh Harrison, managing editor of the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat:

MILLIONS OF WORDS GO OUT TO "DEAR JOE" THROUGH JOHN O'DONNELL'S NOVEL PLAN

(By Hugh Harrison, managing editor)

An idea has grown into a 2,000,000-word proposition encircling the globe and pronounced by many boys in far-distant lands as the greatest morale builder they have seen.

It is the weekly "Dear Joe" letter in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat, a letter which has a weekly minimum of 7,000 words but which more often stretches to 14 solid columns of type and around 14,000 words.

The letter to a boy in service is a Sunday feature.

In August 1942 John O'Donnell, sports editor of the Democrat, mulled over the plan of giving the boys in uniform something extra, something that was not contained in the daily run of news, sports, or otherwise, something that would have the touch of home in it.

He started writing a weekly letter, a two-column affair, to a mythical boy in service he called "Dear Joe." In a short space of time he had the first proof that he had hit on something because the servicemen started to write back.

Before long the letters began to come not only from various parts of the United States but from many parts of the world. Then O'Donnell switched his original idea a bit. He not only printed these letters from the boys but he answered each one in the paper.

So "Dear Joe" grew and grew into quite a big boy. The weekly letter jumped from two columns to four columns, then to six columns and to eight columns, or one full page. It did not stop there. "Dear Joe" reached over to the second page, to 10 solid columns, to 12, to 14, and it has filled two full pages of 16 columns more than once.

Something like 2,000,000 words have flowed through O'Donnell's typewriter since August of 1942 to the boys all over the world. This is not part of his regular job on the Democrat. It occupies his extra hours, and it is gratis on his part for in addition to editing Dear Joe, he fills his regular roles as sports editor and theater editor of the paper, he is a Big Ten Conference, college, and high school referee in football and basketball and he is the third man in the ring at national collegiate boxing matches. In addition, his banquet tour on after-dinner speeches goes around the clock on the calendar. And there are two young sons in his family who come in for their share of attention.

The letters come from seamen, third class, to commanders of the Navy, from privates to colonels in the Army, from privates to majors in the Marines, from the Coast Guard and the Seabees.

The feminine angle of the service is included, too, for writing to O'Donnell, and getting answers in return, are the WAVES, WAC's, ladies of the MARINES, the SPARS, to say nothing of the nurses.

The letters come from Australia to the Aleutians on the Pacific side, from Italy to England on the European side, from north Africa to China—wherever the Americans are fighting, there you will find Dear Joe. In fact, one way to keep up with the advance of the American boys is to follow the weekly Dear Joe for the addresses tell the tale.

O'Donnell's idea is not strictly local in appeal. Boys in uniform who have never seen Davenport have written. The Dear Joe idea appeals to them because through it they get to know what other fellows in service all over the world are thinking and writing. The kid in Saipan reads a letter from a boy in China; a soldier in the Aleutians reads what a sailor who was in on D-day writes, and a flyer over in France gets to learn what establishing a beachhead on Leyte was like, right from a beachheader himself.

Then there is the Dear Joe Club, eligible for which are those in service who have written to O'Donnell or who have been interviewed by him while at home. The P. S. on the official card hits the members just right: "No dues, no officers, no meetings, no collections. Membership period: Forever."

And boys from all over the world have written in, asking to become members. The first 1,000 are now in the club.

That O'Donnell's Dear Joe is building morale among the servicemen is seen in just a few excerpts taken from letters at random:

Joseph A. McGrath, storekeeper, third class, U. S. S. *Nassau*, in the Pacific: "Johnnie, you are doing one of the grandest jobs possible on your 'Dear Joe' sheet, and I, like hundreds of other fellows, wish to add my small vote of thanks. I've seen servicemen's sheets from all over the country, but none of them are in a class with yours."

Corp. Cliff Peterson, the Aleutians: "I want to tell you how much your Dear Joe page does for a guy. It's like a breath of good Midwestern air when it arrives. I receive it from a cousin who works on a rival newspaper."

Lt. G. O. Patterson, France: "I have enjoyed reading the letters of the different fellows I used to know and chum around with but who are at present scattered all over the world. Your page is really the only way I have of knowing where these fellows who are doing such a splendid job are. Don't let up on your efforts."

Corp. Ed. Burlingame, Belgium: "As far as I know there are few men who are doing such a grand job for a bunch of grand guys. The Dear Joe page is really a morale builder. Keep up the good work for, after all, morale is the greatest thing in the Army."

Lt. Richard Corbin, Germany: "Our division has been fighting, dying, and winning in the Huertgen Forest and, perhaps that will be a better explanation for my lack of correspondence, but will you please make me a member of the Dear Joe Club?"

Pvt. (1st cl.) Lee Roy Hennings, England: "I was wounded in one of the big pushes and rushed back here. I'm just getting caught up with my Dear Joe reading. I didn't know what the Dear Joe Club was all about until my membership card arrived yesterday. Gee, Johnny, that's really swell and thanks a lot."

M. Sgt. Ralph L. Johnnston, Italy: "I ran into an old acquaintance of mine and was very pleasantly surprised to find that he had a collection of about 35 back issues of the Democrat. Among them were seven of your famous Sunday issue. I can't tell you, Johnny, just how much I enjoyed reading you Dear Joe page. It was almost like walking down Third Street again. After nearly 18 months overseas, it was just like money from home."

Maj. L. F. Paul, Pacific: "Your Dear Joe page has been coming to me these past 18 months via letters from my parents, and I await each week's patter with anticipation inasmuch as many of my old friends are mentioned."

How World Peace Can Succeed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, March 27, at 10:30 p. m., over Station WTOP, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, I delivered the following address on How World Peace Can Succeed.

It is indeed a great pleasure as well as a great privilege for me to be invited to speak on this program. I am the more deeply honored because I am asked to speak to you at a time when we are facing a dramatic climax in the history of our Republic.

It is true that we are on the threshold of a great decision. That decision may lead us either to an era of peace or to an epoch of suicidal strife and bloody conflict, occasional if not constant. If our decision is sound, our Nation and the world will enjoy a future of concord and prosperity. If our decision is faulty, then we will plunge forward to an uncertain destiny, mingled and perhaps saturated, with the periodic agonies of blood, sweat, toil, and tears.

The next time perhaps, it will be our own cities which will endure the ravages of bombs or the tormentous pain of the gas barrage. That's what our military men say. Failure to respond to the responsibility for the decision for peace means dire catastrophe and painful calamity in the relentless future.

It is therefore and indeed a time for decision. The courses and turns through which the United States was embroiled in this war have proved that we have got to take command of our destiny. That destiny is now only settled by our own will to take up the challenge of whether we shall again be assailed, or whether we will do all in our power to prevent an outbreak of war from ever occurring again. From the length and breadth of the country come the answers that our people are now ready to take up the task of avoiding any further world conflicts. We are ready to accept that undertaking with virile energy and firm determination.

Now to put that purpose to the stern reality of accomplishment, we are forced to adopt methods and plans and systems and schemes of organization. You and I remember that after the last war there was a cry very similar to the present one, that a league of all the powers be formed to guarantee the world against the recurrence of armed conflict again

on this earth. At that, it was not the first time that nations had formed leagues and compacts for the prevention of war. This idea of preventing war has had its beginning very far into the recesses of history.

But every time that one league for peace failed another one in later years was tried to take its place. It is not so long ago—in fact it is within the memory of most of us in these days—when President Wilson went to Paris to found a new world league. President Wilson was a profound student of history and a great scholar in the science of government. With other delegates from Great Britain and France and Italy, he evolved the last League of Nations. We have but to scan the documents of that time to discover how every method and safeguard was adopted to insure that with that organization for world peace, war could never again break out to despoil the races of mankind.

We can read from the records of that time that profound discussions took place to work out the very best means to stop war. No stone was left unturned, either in the military approach or in the idealistic goals. And then, too, as they are doing today, they were careful to make the representation of the small nations as equitable as possible with the big nations. All those questions of voting and deciding came up then just as they do now. They tried hard, just as is being done now, to satisfy all the requirements for all the nations of the world.

And what's more, they tried as best they could to punish and stifle any aggressor. We all know how in and out of Congress the argument is put up that this new world organization should have power to enforce its decisions, and the method now being talked about is the establishment of an international police force. Well, the idea of an international police force was proposed for the old league. It was considered as defeating the idea for which the League was organized, namely, to prevent war. They argued that an international police force in itself would cause war—or a little war, at least—by having to punish or isolate and defeat an aggressor. So what did they do? They gave up the idea of an international police force and decided that they could do much better by an economic quarantine thrown about the aggressor. They argued that if the state which went to war was deprived of the means of making war, then he could not carry on his warlike campaigns. He would be forced to quit. And thus, both the idea of refraining from war on the part of the League and the prevention of armed assault by an aggressor would be safeguarded. War by that procedure would forever be banished from the earth and the world would be on the road to enjoy a long era of peace and prosperity.

But what happened? With all the elaborate safeguards to make a peaceful world, at the very first test the whole structure was incapable of even enforcing these mild safeguards of quarantining an aggressor. The nations belonging to the League were utterly incapable of throwing about the wrongdoer even the slightest cordon of restraint and he went his way committing all the depredations of war.

The first break-down in the old League's efficacy occurred when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, just 12 years after she had put her signature to the Covenant of the League of Nations. Since them she has encroached upon Chinese territory until she has extended her dominion over a large part of the whole Continent of Asia. And yet, while all this was going on, the powers, even the signatories to the League, treated her with a deferent regard, while urging her in soft though ineffective tones to desist from her predatory conquests. We all know to our lamentable sorrow how the United States—just to keep Japan from warring on us—sold her the scrap iron she needed, needed in turn to make war on us.

That was the first break-down. Then there was the invasion of Ethiopia by Mussolini in 1935, the war in Spain fomented by members of the League, and finally the great catastrophe into which the whole world has been bathed in blood.

Now the new world organization, since the old had rejected the idea of an international police, the new world organization is going to adopt it. After all, if the members of the League could not unite on the enforcement of an economic blockade, how will they ever unite on the use of armed forces to put down an aggressor? I say that they won't.

Well, what then?

To make nations satisfied and peaceful we must remove the fundamental causes of war. Reading that masterful book, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, by William B. Ziff, in my view, there we will find a solution. Ziff outlines the causes of war, arising as they do from economic and territorial aims as well as the need for everyone to make a living. The causes of war emanate from the need for markets, the demand for raw material, the desire for tillable land, the necessity of access to the sea, and the chance to live in the world with as much of the world's wealth as is sufficient for their legitimate aims. When these prime essentials in a nation's life are lacking then that nation will fight. The history of the United States has proved this beyond doubt at every turn in the course of our history. What we wanted we obtained; obtained for the realization of our own destiny. Great Britain has done so time and again. Russia is doing it today.

Ziff points out that treaties, pacts, and alliances mean nothing when the national welfare is at stake. I could enumerate a score of pacts in the last 20 years which were entered into in good faith and were broken when the needs of one of the signatories went counter to the provisions of its signed undertaking. These agreements on paper—no matter how well-intentioned—will not prevent a nation from going to war when its national interests are at stake.

Ziff divides the world into economic entities, where these entities are self-contained, where they have all that they need—and hence where all causes for war have been removed because they have what they need. This plan of world stabilization, to me, is well worth studying. I can see in it the answer to many of the questions we are all asking about the new world organization of the United Nations.

So far as I am personally concerned, I have the greatest respect for all the delegates of the United Nations who will meet in San Francisco. I have a very high regard for their efforts to reach the ideal of a peaceful world. As the program stands, however, they are missing the mark—they are not taking into consideration the fundamental bases which can insure the peace of the world.

Already we are hearing echoes from across the seas that with or without agreement, big powers are going to do just exactly what they wish done. Have you not noticed how Russia disliked the Prime Minister of Rumania, Nicolai Radescu, and replaced him with a man of its own choosing in Petru Groza? And even Winston Churchill, when the question of colonies was about to be discussed at Yalta, opposed bringing in colonies at all, even into the agenda at San Francisco, because, as he said, he did not want the fingers of 52 nations fumbling with the internal affairs of the British Empire.

And when Mr. Churchill was answering questions in the House of Commons, a member urged that Britain support a league which had authority to prevent aggression by a big power as well as a small power. Mr. Churchill replied that at Yalta it was decided to differentiate between great powers and between small powers. That reply really shows that he who is strongest will really have the most to say. That reply proves to us that either the big powers will make the pacts or they will interpret them in their own way. The fears and anxiety for a peace by means of pacts and alliances are clouding the horizon everywhere.

In a word—no charter, no treaty, no pledge—no mater how solemnly it is undertaken, can have the slightest real value, unless it encompasses and admits the physical facts—trade, economic necessities, territorial self-sufficiency, markets, raw materials, adequate outlets to the sea, military defense and the social adjustments of this age. These are the real bases for peace. When they are present and in harmony with a nation's own self-determined aspirations, then concord will prevail. When they are not—then war is the alternative. Our next international charter must encompass them all—of that I will have something to say at a later date.

Conservation of Food Products Used in Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MARCH 27, 1945.

Mr. J. A. KRUG,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of W. C. T. U. throughout the Nation join me in respectfully urging that you exercise your food conservation powers to ban additional liquor making holidays and curb similar huge waste of grain and other food products including sugar in the brewing of beer for the duration of critical wartime food shortages.

Shortage of meats and other essential foods will obviously skyrocket the human consumption of grain products and tnese should be conserved for wartime necessities rather than diverted to nonessentials and hangovers which latter are major cause of absenteeism camouflaged as illnesses.

Your attention is called to the fact that the August and January hard liquor holidays cost the country at least 663,000 tons of grain and 29,000,000 pounds of molasses. Eighty-four million barrels of beer consumed last year in United States cost Nation's food stocks some 1,731,000 tons of grain and more than 102,000 tons of sugar and molasses.

Translated into terms of necessities the grain used in two liquor holidays alone were equivalent to food needs for 6 months of 1,265,126 soldiers or 2,319,397 civilians.

Figures quoted are compiled from Government's own and (as to food requirements for soldiers and civilians) from Major General Gregory before the Senate April 14, 1943.

As citizens of our country in its great emergency we ask that you assure us of the discontinuance of this enormous and dangerous food waste.

Mrs. D. LEIGH COLVIN,
President, National Woman's
Christian Temperance Union.

Before Us, the Puritans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Before Us, the Puritans, a poem written by Mrs. Josephine Louise Byrne, the wife of our distinguished colleague from New York. It appeared in the March issue of Spirit, a magazine of poetry published by the Catholic Poetry Society of America:

BEFORE US, THE PURITANS

Immigrants, we came to this land,
Escaping from prince and kingdom,
From caste and protocol,
Asking no more than a door latched against hunger,
A window open to stars.
What legend was bright in our mind,
What hand beckoned across the global arena,
What voice cleaved the confusion of visa and passport?
Was it you, who traded with red warriors at the river bank,
Learning the way of the arrow,
Smoking the peace pipe,
Seeing tomahawk yield to plowshare?
Oh Puritan, Puritan,
Where are the Commandments?
Where are the Scriptures?
Immigrants, we came here,
Learned in husbandry,
To tread in the furrows of history,
To winnow gleanings the harvester left in a field,
But husks are stripped of corn.
And straw is ash on the prairie.
Has the wind risen? Is the tide at flood?
We must anchor by the rock before day fades.
Our Father, Who art in heaven—
There are those who have said,
And they are many,
This land is an oasis in the desert no longer,
The water-hole is fenced with barbed wire,
The fig tree shut behind thorned hedges,
And we have heard
Discourse among the exalted,
Among those whose forbears came here,
Even as we, immigrants,
Escaping from prince and kingdom,
From caste and protocol,
Asking no more than a door latched against hunger,
A window open to stars.

—*Josephine Louise Byrne.*

The Gripe of a Wounded Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Pvt. (1st cl.) William J. Madden, United States Marine Corps, to his father, Francis A. Madden, a personal friend of mine of long standing.

To fully appreciate this letter one should know that Private Madden was reported wounded in action on February 2, 1945, and is presently confined to a fleet hospital. I have no doubt that Private Madden actually expressed the thoughts of our fighting men, whether they be in Europe, the Philippines, or on their way to Tokyo. To my mind, if the people on the home front would meditate a few minutes a day on the sacrifices that our young men and women in the armed services of our country are making, there would be less friction at home.

The unselfishness of our fighting men, their sincere comradeship and unity should be an unforgettable lesson to us at home, but will we ever learn the lesson?

The letter follows:

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM,
SOMEWHERE IN SOUTH PACIFIC,
Friday, February 16, 1945.

DEAR DAD: I don't know as to whether I should write this letter, because today I'm in a lousy humor. A marine is always happiest when he is griping, according to reports, so I should be happy instead of feeling the way I do. There isn't anything essentially wrong; my leg feels O. K., and I'm content down here, but it is something deeper, and I know I'll feel better getting it off my chest. You and I have always been, shall I say, pals instead of father and son, so I'd prefer to have you as my "fall guy" for the gripe. If I tried to speak to others about it, they'd say I was flag waving, but you know that I'm no more patriotic than the next guy. I never have been a great hero, but I never ducked a good fight, and now I feel like hell laying here in a hospital after 2 years of training for the big show, becoming somewhat of an expert in my line, taking all my combat training and reaching perfection physically, then to break my damn leg just as the game is ready to start. Uncle Mike, yourself, and many others have told me never to look for it, or I'd get it. Well, Dad, I hate to speak differently. It's not that I don't think it may be true, but I want to get in there and fight like hell. I have seen results of the Japs around here, and I've heard first-hand stories from these fellows. So can't you understand, Dad, I want to get in there and do my part? That's what I've trained for; not to lay around and pat these fellows on the back and say, "Swell going, fellow; you got the one that was probably meant for me." If I ever want to look into a mirror when I'm shaving and see a man, then I'll have to get out there and take my chances with the rest. I think that you'd want me to, and so would Mom, Ronnie, and Jeanne. Then if I get it, I get it, and there is nothing shameful about giving up our bodies for our country and going home with our souls to God. I'm not the least bit afraid to toss in the towel. I don't relish the idea, true, but I'm not afraid. Other fellows are killed for me just as much as for the people back home in the States. Maybe that's why I want to get in and do my share.

Some people back there should see some of the kids laying around me, and I say kids with the full knowledge that I am only 22 myself. There wouldn't be any strikes for an extra 10 cents an hour, nor a feeling of complacency when they buy a bond a week or so. Do you know what the fellow up the aisle who is maimed and scarred for life is griping about? Injustice? No. Sympathy? No. Lack of steaks? No. Receiving only $54 a month or the terrible working conditions at Peleliu? No. He's griping like the rest around here because the big game is nearly ready to begin and he's laying here. I know that Benny, Hope, Crosby and Dinah Shore have told about it and also many other qualified writers have used their skills to portray such happenings, but for some stupid reason unbeknown to us, they won't tell the American people the true, gruesome details nor show them the real newsreels before they're cut. It does something to a fellow, Dad. I believe that is the main factor in the "boys becoming men overnight." Out here you realize the futility of bigotry and racial hatred. Those bullets and shells didn't stop first and ask "Are you Semitic?" That fellow upon the starboard side, about five beds up, didn't ask the officer next to him if he were a Catholic before pushing him out of danger and catching a big piece of shrapnel in the back. We don't fight for wonderful ideals the way they do in a book or movie. We have our job and we try and do it. The "four freedoms"? No one ever thinks about them, they are just pretty words left to politicians and statesmen. We, out here, are fighting like hell for just one thing. And that is to get home again and live like human beings, not animals.

I didn't want to go on a long spiel, Dad, but I, like all the other fellows, am in a quandary. We're like blind men, groping around looking for an answer. Why are the people complaining? What are the reasons for the strikes? Why must they put on big shows with movie, radio, and athletic stars in order to get people to buy bonds! Why do they have to beg to get blood donations? If the people could see a fellow brought in who is on the verge of death, a sickly green from shock, and then see him after a few shots of plasma, sitting up in bed with a somewhat healthy look about him and smiling. Believe me they wouldn't have to be begged.

All in all, Dad, this letter may sound poetic or like a War-bond program, but it isn't. It is the way I feel and the way the other fellows feel, only we don't talk about it amongst ourselves. That is why I am writing to you. It was on my chest and I had to get it off. I feel like a football player who has trained all season and then at the last practice gets hurt and must watch the game from the side line. Believe me, Dad, it hurts.

Thanks for bearing with me, Dad.

Your son,

BILL.

Two Approaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of March 26, 1945, entitled "Two Approaches":

TWO APPROACHES

It is an established fact that Canada is far better off for meat than the United States. There is much evidence that Canada, with full ice chests and no meat rationing, would like to sell us some of her surplus meat. She would profit financially and we gastronomically by the deal.

It can be done. The first possible approach is the indirect one. Britain is a great drain on the meat supply of the New World. She produces at home a little more than one-third of her meat, imports almost a third from Argentina, one-eighth from the Antip-

odes, another eighth from the United States, and one twenty-fourth from Canada.

If the Canadian proportion were increased, our proportion could be decreased equivalently. Since Canada gets cash on the line for what she sends Britain, Canada would get more money and we would have more meat.

The second possible approach is the direct one. We do not import meat in appreciable amounts from Canada because the 6-cent duty on dressed meat makes it impossible to sell meat under ceiling price regulations at a profit. As a matter of practical politics that tariff regulation probably cannot be changed quickly enough to relieve the present crisis. But with all the money being spent on subsidies, why can't we subsidize imported Canadian meat to the extent of that tariff charge and so make its importation economically practical?

To import meat from Canada is admittedly a very partial solution. We have made an unholy mess of our food program and we must change our basic policies. But until rational policies can restore the natural productivity of the United States, imports from Canada might help to tide us over, especially in these northern cities where the crisis is worst.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including resolutions adopted by a representative group of cattle feeders from eight eastern Iowa counties. These resolutions are worthy of the attention and consideration of every Member of Congress who is interested in solving the emergency that is developing in the meat supply of our Nation at this time:

We, the undersigned, cattle feeders of eastern Iowa, are deeply concerned about the current shortage of meat and its effect on the health and welfare of our people and the prosecution of the war to an early and victorious conclusion.

It is our considered opinion that a large share of the responsibility for this shortage must be charged to errors in judgment on the part of Government food agencies. American farmers are willing and able to produce even larger amounts of meat when price relationships established by these Government agencies allow them to do so.

From the standpoint of the beef producer, it is particularly unfortunate that the present situation should have been allowed to develop at a time when cattle numbers and potential beef supply are the highest in history. We believe the underlying cause of the tight beef situation is failure on the part of these Government agencies to properly evaluate the functions of the cattle feeder in the beef economy.

These functions are, briefly, to improve the quality of meat produced by the Nation's cattle supply, to increase the amount of meat by adding several hundred pounds to the weight of each animal before slaughter and to distribute the beef supply throughout the year.

The cattle feeder is unable to perform these functions without serious financial loss under current price ranges established by the Office of Price Administration for cattle of the various grades. When the feeder goes into the market for replacement cattle, he must not only pay all the cattle are worth for immediate slaughter, but he must also match a substantial slaughter subsidy received by the packer plus a willingness of the packer to pay, under certain conditions, a still higher price in order to obtain cattle to employ plant and labor at full capacity and to meet commitments for meat already entered into.

These statements are vertified by the small number of cattle in feed lots in spite of plentiful feed supplies and by the present unprecedented liquidation of fed cattle which threatens to completely empty feed lots by late spring. Cattle feeding potentialities of eastern Iowa, at least, are not being half utilized at the present time.

As patriotic Americans, we are anxious to make our maximum contribution to the Nation's food supply. Under present price relationships between feeder cattle and finished cattle we cannot do so without suffering financial ruin. High feed costs and high cost of scarce labor make it impossible to feed cattle at prevailing margins limited by the factors set forth above.

We, the undersigned cattle feeders of eastern Iowa, therefore urge the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, the Defense Supplies Corporation and such other Government agencies having jurisdiction over cattle price policies, to immediately take the following action:

1. That in order to stop the present liquidation of half fat cattle and to increase the tonnage of beef available throughout the summer and fall, an immediate renunciation of the proposed July 2 cut-back of 50 cents per hundredweight in live cattle ceiling price is mandatory.

2. In figuring packers' subsidy, require that steer and heifer beef of each grade be figured within its own grade and the slaughterer not be allowed to average his entire kill in earning his subsidy.

3. Readjust price schedules as between grades of beef to insure that cattle that can economically be fed to raise the grade and increase the weight will go to feeders instead of to slaughterers.

Opinion of United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, in Case of United States Against Aluminum Co. of America et al.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit rendered a very important decision on March 12, 1945, relating to monopoly and discussing the case of the United States against the Aluminum Co. of America et al. Chief Justice Learned Hand wrote the opinion. It is a very clear analytical opinion. I think it ought to be read more extensively than merely by those who will see it in the law reports. I am sure that the lawyers of the country would like to read it and I am sure that the Congress would be benefited by it. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer which indicates that the cost of printing the decision will be $572. It is so important that the opinion should be readily available that notwithstanding the cost of printing, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. No. 144, October Term, 1944. Argued January 2-3-4, 1945. Decided March 12, 1945. United States, appellant, *v.* Aluminum Co. of America, et al., appellees. Before L. Hand, Swan, and Augustus N. Hand, circuit judges. On appeal from a judgment for the defendants of the District Court for the Southern District of New York, in an action brought under section 4 of title 15, United States Code. Charles Fahy, Solicitor General, and Lawrence S. Apsey (with whom Norman A. Adler, Edward S. Stimson, Robert L. Stern, Aute L. Carr, Jesse R. O'Malley, Marcus A. Hollabaugh, Maurice Godin, and Irving Lipkowitz were on the brief), for the appellant. William Watson Smith (with whom Frank B. Ingersoll, Leon E. Hickman, Charles E. Hughes, Jr., and William T. Gossett were on the brief), for Aluminum Co. of America, and others, appellees. Timothy N. Pfeiffer (with whom Morris Hadley, Rebecca M. Cutler, and Rudolf B. Schlesinger were on the brief), for Aluminium Ltd., and others, appellees. A. L. Nash, Roger S. Baldwin, and E. Raymond Shephard, submitted a brief for Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co.) L. Hand, Circuit Judge.

This appeal comes to us by virtue of a certificate of the Supreme Court, under the amendment of 1944 to section 29 of title 15, U. S. Code. The action was brought under section 4 of that title, praying the district court to adjudge that the defendant, Aluminum Co. of America was monopolizing interstate and foreign commerce, particularly in the manufacture and sale of "virgin" aluminum ingot, and that it be dissolved; and further to adjudge that that company and the defendant, Aluminium Ltd., had entered into a conspiracy in restraint of such commerce. It also asked incidental relief. The plaintiff filed its complaint on April 23, 1937, naming 63 defendants; 10 of these were not served and did not appear; 1 died, and 1 corporate defendant was dissolved before the action was brought; the complaint was dismissed against another. At the date of judgment there were 51 defendants who had been served and against whom the action was pending. We may divide these, as the district judge did, into 4 classes: Aluminum Co. of America, with its wholly owned subsidiaries, directors, officers, and shareholders. (For convenience we shall speak of these defendants collectively as "Alcoa," that being the name by which the company has become almost universally known.) Next, Aluminium Ltd., with its directors, officers, and shareholders. (For the same reason we shall speak of this group as "Limited.") Third: the defendant, Aluminum Manufacturers, Inc., which may be treated as a subsidiary of "Alcoa." Fourth: the defendant, Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co., which is independent of "Alcoa," as will appear. The action came to trial on June 1, 1938, and proceeded without much interruption until August 14, 1940, when the case was closed after more than 40,000 pages of testimony had been taken. The judge took time to consider the evidence, and delivered an oral opinion which occupied him from September 30 to

October 9, 1941. Again he took time to prepare findings of fact and conclusions of law which he filed on July 14, 1942; and he entered final judgment dismissing the complaint on July 23, of that year. The petition for an appeal, and assignments of error, were filed on September 14, 1942, and the petition was allowed on the next day. On June 12, 1944, the Supreme Court, declaring that a quorum of 6 justices qualified to hear the case was wanting, referred the appeal to this court under section 29 of title 15, already mentioned. The district judge's opinion, reported in 44 Federal Supplement 97, discussed the evidence with the utmost particularity; it took up every phase and every issue with the arguments of both parties, and provided a reasoned basis for the subsequent findings of fact and conclusions of law. For the purposes of this appeal we need not repeat the greater part of the facts; so far as it is necessary, we do so, leaving acquaintance with the remainder to the opinion itself. Although the plaintiff challenged nearly all of the 407 findings of fact, with negligible exceptions these challenges were directed, not to misstatements of the evidence, but to the judge's inferences—alleged to be "clearly erroneoous." For convenience we have divided our discussion into four parts: (1) whether "Alcoa" monopolized the market in "virgin" aluminum ingot; (2) whether "Alcoa" was guilty of various unlawful practices, ancillary to the establishment of its monopoly; (3) whether "Limited" and "Alcoa" were in an unlawful conspiracy; and whether, if not, "Limited" was guilty of a conspiracy with foreign producers; (4) what remedies are appropriate in the case of each defendant who may be found to have violated the act.

"ALCOA'S" MONOPOLY OF "VIRGIN" INGOT

"Alcoa" is a corporation, organized under the laws of Pennsylvania on September 18, 1888; its original name, "Pittsburgh Reduction Co," was changed to its present one on January 1, 1907. It has always been engaged in the production and sale of ingot aluminum, and since 1895 also in the fabrication of the metal into many finished and semi-finished articles. It has proliferated into a great number of subsidiaries, created at various times between the years 1900 and 1929, as the business expanded. Aluminum is a chemical element; it is never found in a free state, being always in chemical combination with oxygen. One form of this combination is known as alumina; and for practical purposes the most available material from which alumina can be extracted is an ore called bauxite. Aluminum was isolated as a metal more than a century ago, but not until about 1886 did it become commercially practicable to eliminate the oxygen, so that it could be exploited industrially. One Hall discovered a process by which this could be done in that year and got a patent on April 2, 1889, which he assigned to "Alcoa," which thus secured a legal monopoly of the manufacture of the pure aluminum until on April 2, 1906, when this patent expired. Meanwhile Bradley had invented a process by which the smelting could be carried on without the use of external heat, as had theretofore been thought necessary; and for this improvement he too got a patent on February 2, 1892. Bradley's improvement resulted in great economy in manufacture, so that, although after April 2, 1906, anyone could manufacture aluminum by the Hall process, for practical purposes no one could compete with Bradley or with his licensees until February 2, 1909, when Bradley's patent also expired. On October 31, 1903, "Alcoa" and the assignee of the Bradley patent entered into a contract by which "Alcoa" was granted an exclusive license under that patent in exchange for "Alcoa's" promise to sell to the assignee a stated amount of aluminum at a discount of 10 percent below "Alcoa's" published list price, and always to sell at a discount of 5 percent greater than that which "Alcoa" gave to any other jobber. Thus until February 2, 1909, "Alcoa" had either a monopoly of the manufacture of virgin aluminum ingot or the monopoly of a process which eliminated all competition.

The extraction of aluminum from alumina requires a very large amount of electrical energy, which is ordinarily, though not always, most cheaply obtained from water power. Beginning at least as early as 1895, "Alcoa" secured such power from several companies by contacts, containing in at least three instances, covenants binding the power companies not to sell or let power to anyone else for the manufacture of aluminum. "Alcoa"—either itself or by a subsidiary—also entered into four successive "cartels" with foreign manufacturers of aluminum by which, in exchange for certain limitations upon its import into foreign countries, it secured convenants from the foreign producers, either not to import into the United States at all, or to do so under restrictions, which in some cases involved the fixing of prices. These "cartels" and restrictive covenants and certain other practices were the subject of a suit filed by the United States against "Alcoa" on May 16, 1912, in which a decree was entered by consent on June 7, 1912, declaring several of these covenants unlawful and enjoining their performance; and also declaring invalid other restrictive covenants obtained before 1903 relating to the sale of alumina. ("Alcoa" failed at this time to inform the United States of several restrictive covenants in water-power contracts; its justification—which the judge accepted—being that they had been forgotten.) "Alcoa" did not begin to manufacture alumina on its own behalf until the expiration of a dominant patent in 1903. In that year it built a very large alumina plant at East St. Louis, where all of its alumina was made until 1939, when it opened another plant in Mobile, Ala.

None of the foregoing facts are in dispute, and the most important question in the case is whether the monopoly in Alcoa's production of virgin ingot, secured by the two patents until 1909, and in part perpetuated between 1909 and 1912 by the unlawful practices, forbidden by the decree of 1912, continued for the ensuing 28 years; and whether if it did, it was unlawful under section 2 of the Sherman Act. It is undisputed that throughout this period Alcoa continued to be the single producer of virgin ingot in the United States; and the plaintiff argues that this without more was enough to make it an unlawful monopoly. It also takes an alternative position: that in any event during this period Alcoa consistently pursued unlawful exclusionary practices, which made its dominant position certainly unlawful, even though it would not have been, had it been retained only by natural growth. Finally, it asserts that many of these practices were of themselves unlawful, as contracts in restraint of trade under section 1 of the act. Alcoa's position is that the fact that it alone continued to make virgin ingot in this country did not, and does not, give it a monopoly of the market; that it was always subject to the competition of imported virgin ingot, and of what is called secondary ingot; and that even if it had not been, its monopoly would not have been retained by unlawful means, but would have been the result of a growth which the act does not forbid, even when it results in a monopoly. We shall first consider the amount and character of this competition; next, how far it established a monopoly; and finally, if it did, whether that monopoly was unlawful under section 2 of the act.

From 1902 onward until 1928 Alcoa was making ingot in Canada through a wholly owned subsidiary, so much of this as it imported into the United States it is proper to include with what it produced here. In the year 1912 the sum of these two items represented nearly 91 percent of the total amount of virgin ingot available for sale in this country. This percentage varied year by year up to and including 1938—in 1913 it was about 72 percent, in 1921 about 68 percent, in 1922 about 72—with these exceptions it was always over 80 percent of the total and for the last 5 years 1934–38 inclusive it averaged over 90 percent. The effect of such a proportion of the production upon the market we reserve for the time being, for it will be necessary first to consider the nature and uses of secondary ingot, the name of which the industry knows ingot made from aluminum scrap. This is of two sorts, though for our purposes it is not important to distinguish between them. One of these is the clippings and trimmings of sheet aluminum, when patterns are cut out of it, as a suit is cut from the bolt of cloth. The chemical composition of these is obviously the same as that of the sheet from which they come; and, although they are likely to accumulate dust or other dirt in the factory, this may be removed by well-known processes. If a record of the original composition of the sheet has been preserved, this scrap may be remelted into new ingot, and used again for the same purpose. It is true that some of the witnesses—Arthur V. Davis, the chairman of the board of Alcoa among them—testified that at each remelting aluminum takes up some new oxygen which progressively deteriorates its quality for those uses in which purity is important; but other witnesses thought that it had become commercially feasible to remove this impurity, and the judge made no finding on the subject. Since the plaintiff has the burden of proof, we shall assume that there is no such deterioration.

Nevertheless, there is an appreciable sales resistance even to this kind of scrap, and for some uses (airplanes and cables among them), fabricators absolutely insist upon virgin—just why is not altogether clear. The other source of scrap is aluminum which has once been fabricated and the article, after being used, is discarded and sent to the junk heap; as for example, cooking utensils, like kettles and pans, and the pistons or crank cases of motorcars. These are made with a substantial alloy, and to restore the metal to its original purity costs more than it is worth. However, if the alloy is known both in quality and amount, scrap, when remelted, can be used again for the same purpose as before. In spite of this, as in the case of clippings and trimmings, the industry will ordinarily not accept ingot so salvaged upon the same terms as virgin. There are some 17 companies which scavenge scrap of all sorts, clean it, remelt it, test it for its composition, make it into ingots and sell it regularly to the trade. There is in all these salvage operations some inevitable waste of actual material; not only does a certain amount of aluminum escape altogether, but in the salvaging process itself some is skimmed off as scum and thrown away. The judge found that the return of fabricated products to the market as secondary varied from 5 to 25 years, depending upon the article; but he did not, and no doubt could not, find how many times the cycle could be repeated before the metal was finally used up.

There are various ways of computing Alcoa's control of the aluminum market—as distinct from its production—depending upon what one regards as competing in that market. The judge figured its share—during the years 1929–38, inclusive—as only about 33 percent; to do so he included "secondary," and excluded that part of Alcoa's own production which it fabricated and did not therefore sell as ingot. If, on the other hand, Alcoa's total production, fabricated and sold, be included, and balanced against the sum of imported "virgin" and "secondary," its share of the market was in the neighborhood of 64 percent for that period. The percentage we have already mentioned—over 90—results only if we both include all Alcoa's production and exclude "secondary." That percentage is enough to constitute a monop-

oly; it is doubtful whether 60 or 64 percent would be enough; and certainly 63 percent is not. Hence it is necessary to settle what we shall treat as competing in the ingot market. That part of its production which Alcoa itself fabricates does not, of course, ever reach the market as ingot; and we recognize that it is only when a restriction of production; either inevitably affects prices, or is intended to do so, that it violates section 1 of the act. *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader* (310 U. S. 469, 501). However, even though we were to assume that a monopoly is unlawful under section 2 only in case it controls prices, the ingot fabricated by Alcoa, necessarily had a direct effect upon the ingot market. All ingot—with trifling exceptions—is used to fabricate intermediate, or end, products; and therefore all intermediate, or end, products which Alcoa fabricates and sells, pro tanto reduce the demand for ingot itself. The situation is the same, though reversed, as in *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1, 77), where the court answered the defendants' argument that they had no control over the crude oil by saving that "as substantial power over the crude product was the inevitable result of the absolute control which existed over the refined product, the monopolization of the one carried with it the power to control the other." We cannot therefore agree that the computation of the percentage of Alcoa's control over the ingot market should not include the whole of its ingot production.

As to "secondary," as we have said, for certain purposes the industry will not accept it at all; but for those for which it will, the difference in price is ordinarily not very great; the judge found that it was between 1 and 2 cents a pound, hardly enough margin on which to base a monopoly. Indeed, there are times when all differential disappears, and "secondary" will actually sell at a higher price; i. e., when there is a supply available which contains just the alloy that a fabricator needs for the article which he proposes to make. Taking the industry as a whole, we can say nothing more definite than that, although "secondary" does not compete at all in some uses (whether because of "sales resistance" only, or because of actual metallurgical inferiority), for most purposes it competes upon a substantial equality with "virgin." On these facts the judge found that "every pound of secondary or scrap aluminum which is sold in commerce displaces a pound of virgin aluminum which otherwise would, or might have been, sold." We agree; so far as "secondary" supplies the demand of such fabricators as will accept it, it increases the amount of "virgin" which must seek sale elsewhere; and it therefore results that the supply of that part of the demand which will accept only "virgin" becomes greater in proportion as "secondary" drives away "virgin" from the demand which will accept "secondary." (This is indeed the same argument which we used a moment ago to include in the supply that part of "virgin" which "Alcoa" fabricates; it is not apparent to us why the judge did not think it applicable to that item as well.) At any given moment therefore "secondary" competes with "virgin" in the ingot market; further, it can, and probably does, set a limit or "ceiling" beyond which the price of "virgin" cannot go, for the cost of its production will in the end depend only upon the expense of scavenging and reconditioning. It might seem for this reason that in estimating "Alcoa's" control over the ingot market, we ought to include the supply of "secondary," as the judge did. Indeed, it may be thought a paradox to say that anyone has the monopoly of a market in which at all times he must meet a competition that limits his price. We shall show that it is not.

In the case of a monopoly of any commodity which does not disappear in use and which can be salvaged, the supply seeking sale at any moment will be made up of two components: (1) the part which the putative monopolist can immediately produce and sell; and (2) the part which has been, or can be, reclaimed out of what he has produced and sold in the past. By hypothesis he presently controls the first of these components; the second he has controlled in the past, although he no longer does. During the period when he did control the second, if he was aware of his interest, he was guided, not alone by its effect at that time upon the market, but by his knowledge that some part of it was likely to be reclaimed and seek the future market. That consideration will to some extent always affect his production until he decides to abandon the business, or for some other reason ceases to be concerned with the future market. Thus, in the case at bar "Alcoa" always knew that the future supply of ingot would be made up in part of what it produced at the time, and, if it was as far-sighted as it proclaims itself, that consideration must have had its share in determining how much to produce. How accurately it could forecast the effect of present production upon the future market is another matter. Experience, no doubt, would help, but it makes no difference that it had to guess; it is enough that it had an inducement to make the best guess it could and that it would regulate that part of the future supply, so far as it should turn out to have guessed right. The competition of "secondary" must therefore be disregarded as soon as we consider the position of "Alcoa" over a period of years; it was as much within "Alcoa's" control as was the production of the "virgin" from which it had been derived.

This can be well illustrated by the case of a lawful monopoly: e. g. a patent or a copyright. The monopolist cannot prevent those to whom he sells from reselling at whatever prices they please. *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476, 484). Nor can he prevent their reconditioning articles worn by use, unless they in fact make a new article. *Wilson* v. *Simpson* (9 How. 109, 123). At any moment his control over the market will therefore be limited by that part of what he has formerly sold, which the price he now charges may bring upon the market, as second hand or reclaimed articles. Yet no one would think of saying that for this reason the patent or the copyright did not confer a monopoly. Again, consider the situation of the owner of the only supply of some raw material like iron ore. Scrap iron is a constant factor in the iron market; it is scavanged, remelted into pig, and sold in competition with newly smelted pig; an owner of the sole supply of ore must always face that competition and it will serve to put a ceiling upon his price, so far as there is enough of it. Nevertheless, no one would say that, even during the period while the pig which he has sold in the past can so return to the market, he does not have a natural monopoly. Finally, if "Alcoa" is right, precisely the same reasoning ought to lead us to include that part of clippings and trimmings which a fabricator himself saves and remelts—"process scrap"—for that too pro tanto reduces the market for "virgin." It can make no difference whether the original buyer reclaims, or a professional scavenger. Yet "Alcoa" itself does not assert that such "process scrap" competes; indeed it was at pains to prove that this scrap was not included in its computation of "secondary."

We conclude, therefore, that Alcoa's control over the ingot market must be reckoned at over 90 percent, that being the proportion which its production bears to imported virgin ingot. If the fraction which it did not supply were the produce of domestic manufacture there could be no doubt that this percentage gave it a monopoly—lawful or unlawful, as the case might be. The producer of so large a proportion of the supply has complete control within certain limits. It is true that, if by raising the price he reduces the amount which can be marketed—as always, or almost always, happens—he may invite the expansion of the small producers who will try to fill the place left open; nevertheless, not only is there an inevitable lag in this, but the large producer is in a strong position to check such competition; and, indeed, if he has retained his old plant and personnel, he can inevitably do so. There are indeed limits to his power; substitutes are available for almost all commodities, and to raise the price enough is to evoke them. *United States* v. *Corn Products Refining Company* (234 Fed. Rept. 964, 976); *United States* v. *Associated Press* (52 Fed. Supp. 362, 371); *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (114 Fed. (2), 80, 85 (C. C. A. 2)). Moreover, it is difficult and expensive to keep idle any part of a plant or of personnel; and any drastic contraction of the market will offer increasing temptation to the small producers to expand. But these limitations also exist when a single producer occupies the whole market; even then, his hold will depend upon his moderation in exerting his immediate power.

The case at bar is however different, because for aught that appears, there may well have been a practically unlimited supply of imports as the price of ingot rose. Assuming that there was no agreement between Alcoa and foreign producers not to import, they sold what could bear the handicap of the tariff and the cost of transportation. For the period of 18 years—1920–37—they sold at times a little above Alcoa's prices, at times a little under; but there was substantially no gross difference between what they received and what they would have received, had they sold uniformly at Alcoa's prices. While the record is silent, we may therefore assume—the plaintiff having the burden—that, had Alcoa raised its prices, more ingot would have been imported. Thus there is a distinction between domestic and foreign competition—the first is limited in quantity, and can increase only by an increase in plant and personnel; the second is of producers who, we must assume, produce much more than they import, and whom a rise in price will presumably induce immediately to divert to the American market what they have been selling elsewhere. It is entirely consistent with the evidence that it was the threat of greater foreign imports which kept Alcoa's prices where they were, and prevented it from exploiting its advantage as sole domestic producer; indeed, it is hard to resist the conclusion that potential imports did put a ceiling upon those prices. Nevertheless, within the limits afforded by the tariff and the cost of transportation, Alcoa was free to raise its prices as it chose, since it was free from domestic competition, save as it drew other metals into the market as substitutes. Was this a monopoly within the meaning of section 2? The judge found that, over the whole half century of its existence, Alcoa's profits upon capital invested, after payment of income taxes, had been only about 10 percent, and although the plaintiff puts this figure a little higher, the difference is negligible.

The plaintiff does indeed challenge the propriety of computing profits upon a capital base which included past earnings that have been allowed to remain in the business; but as to that it is plainly wrong. An argument is indeed often made in the case of a public utility, that the "rate-base" should not include earnings reinvested which were greater than a fair profit upon the actual investment outstanding at the time. That argument depends, however, upon the premise that at common law—even in the absence of any commission or other authority empowered to enforce a "reasonable" rate—it is the duty of a public utility to charge

no more than such a rate, and that any excess is unlawfully collected. Perhaps one might properly use the same argument in the case of a monopolist; but it would be a condition that one should show what part of the past earnings were extortionate, for not all that even a monopolist may earn is caput lupinum. The plaintiff made no such attempt, and its distinction between capital "contributed by consumers" and capital "contributed by shareholders," has no basis in law. "Alcoa's" earnings belonged to its shareholders; they were free to withdraw them and spend them, or to leave them in the business. If they chose to leave them, it was no different from contributing new capital out of their pockets. This assumed, it would be hard to say that "Alcoa" had made exorbitant profits on ingot, if it is proper to allocate the profit upon the whole business proportionately among all its products—ingot, and fabrications from ingot. A profit of 10 percent in such an industry, dependent, in part at any rate, upon continued tariff protection, and subject to the vicissitudes of new demands, to the obsolescence of plant and process—which can never be accurately gauged in advance—to the chance that substitutes may at any moment be discovered which will reduce the demand, and to the other hazards which attend all industry: a profit of 10 percent, so conditioned, could hardly be considered extortionate.

There are however, two answers to any such excuse; and the first is that the profit on ingot was not necessarily the same as the profit of the business as a whole, and that we have no means of allocating its proper share to ingot. It is true that the mill cost appears; but obviously it would be unfair to "Alcoa" to take, as the measure of its profit on ingot, the difference between selling price and mill cost; and yet we have nothing else. It may be retorted that it was for the plaintiff to prove what was the profit upon ingot in accordance with the general burden of proof. We think not. Having proved that "Alcoa" had a monopoly of the domestic ingot market, the plaintiff had gone far enough; if it was an excuse, that "Alcoa" had not abused its power, it lay upon "Alcoa" to prove that it had not. But the whole issue is irrelevant anyway, for it is no excuse for "monopolizing" a market that the monopoly has not been used to extract from the consumer more than a "fair" profit. The act has wider purposes. Indeed, even though we disregarded all but economic considerations, it would by no means follow that such concentration of producing power is to be desired, when it has not been used extortionately. Many people believe that possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift, and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic, and rivalry is a stimulant, to industrial progress; that the spur of constant stress is necessary to counteract an inevitable disposition to let well enough alone. Such people believe that competitors, versed in the craft as no consumer can be, will be quick to detect opportunities for saving and new shifts in production, and be eager to profit by them. In any event the mere fact that a producer, having command of the domestic market, has not been able to make more than a "fair" profit, is no evidence that a "fair" profit could not have been made at lower prices. *United States* v. *Corn Products Refining Co., supra*, 1014, 1015 (234 Fed. Rep. 964). True, it might have been thought adequate to condemn only those monopolies which could not show that they had exercised the highest possible ingenuity, had adopted every possible economy, had anticipated every conceivable improvement, stimulated every possible demand. No doubt, that would be one way of dealing with the matter, although it would imply constant scrutiny and constant supervision, such as courts are unable to provide. Be that as it may, that was not the way that Congress chose; it did not condone "good trusts" and condemn "bad" it forbade all. Moreover, in so doing it was not necessarily actuated by economic motives alone. It is possible, because of its indirect social or moral effect, to prefer a system of small producers, each dependent for his success upon his own skill and character, to one in which the great mass of those engaged must accept the direction of a few. These considerations, which we have suggested only as possible purposes of the act, we think the decisions prove to have been in fact its purposes.

It is settled, at least as to section 1, that there are some contracts restricting competition which are unlawful, no matter how beneficent they may be; no industrial exigency will justify them; they are absolutely forbidden. Chief Justice Taft said as much of contracts dividing a territory among producers, in the often quoted passage of his opinion in the Circuit Court of Appeals in *United States* v. *Eddystone Pipe and Steel Co.*, (85 Fed. Rep. 271, 291). The Supreme Court unconditionally condemned all contracts fixing prices in *United States* v. *Trenton Potteries Co.* (273 U. S. 392, 397, 398), and whatever doubts may have arisen as to that decision from *Appalachian Coals, Inc.*, v. *United States* (288 U. S. 344), they were laid by *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Co.* (310 U. S. 150, 220–224). It will now scarcely be denied that the same notion originally extended to all contracts—reasonable, or unreasonable—which restrict competition. *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association* (166 U. S. 290, 327, 328); *United States* v. *Joint Traffic Association* (171 U. S. 505, 575–577). The decisions in *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1), and *American Tobacco Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 106), certainly did change this, and since then it has been accepted law that not all contracts which in fact put an end to existing competition are unlawful. Starting, however, with the authoritative premise that all contracts fixing prices are unconditionally prohibited, the only possible difference between them and a monopoly is that while a monopoly necessarily involves an equal, or even greater, power to fix prices, its mere existence might be thought not to constitute an exercise of that power. That distinction is nevertheless purely formal; it would be valid only so long as the monopoly remained wholly inert; it would disappear as soon as the monopoly began to operate; for, when it did—that is, as soon as it began to sell at all—it must sell at some price and the only price at which it could sell is a price which it itself fixed. Thereafter the power and its exercise must needs coalesce. Indeed it would be absurd to condemn such contracts unconditionally, and not to extend the condemnation to monopolies; for the contracts are only steps toward that entire control which monopoly confers: they are really partial monopolies.

But we are not left to deductive reasoning. Although in many settings it may be proper to weigh the extent and effect of restrictions in a contract against its industrial or commercial advantages, this is never to be done when the contract is made with intent to set up a monopoly. As much was plainly implied in *Swift & Co.* v. *United States* (196 U. S. 375, 396), where the court spoke of monopoly as being the "result" which the law seeks to prevent; and, although the language on pages 60 and 61 of *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1), is not altogether clear, it seems to presuppose as a premise that a monopoly is always an "unreasonable restraint of trade." Again, the opinion in *Sugar Institute* v. *United States* (297 U. S. 553, 598)—borrowing from *Appalachian Coals Inc.* v. *United States, supra* (288 U. S. 344, 374)—said: "Accordingly, we have held that a cooperative enterprise otherwise free from objection which carries with it no monopolistic menace" need not always be condemned. These were indeed only thrown out as steps in the argument; but *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (312 U. S. 457), was a ruling. That concerned a combination of dressmakers who set up a boycott against all retailers who should deal in dresses copied—"pirated"—from the dressmakers' designs. Before the Commission the dressmakers had offered to prove that "the practices of F. O. G. A. were reasonable and necessary to protect the manufacturer, laborer, retailer, and consumer against devastating evils growing from the pirating of original designs and had in fact benefited all four" (p. 467). All such evidence the Commission refused to hear, raising as sharply as possible the issue whether the combination could excuse itself as "reasonable" because of the benefits it conferred upon the industry. The court sustained the Commission because "the purpose and object of this combination, its potential power, its tendency to monopoly, the coercion it could and did practice upon a rival method of competition, all brought it within the policy of the prohibition" (p. 467). Moreover, the Clayton Act itself (sections 14 and 18, title 15, U. S. C.) shows that practices harmless in themselves will not be tolerated when they "tend to create a monopoly." Perhaps, it has been idle to labor the point at length; there can be no doubt that the vice of restrictive contracts and of monopoly is really one, it is the denial to commerce of the supposed protection of competition. To repeat, if the earlier stages are proscribed, when they are parts of a plan, the mere projecting of which condemns them unconditionally, the realization of the plan itself must also be proscribed.

We have been speaking only of the economic reasons which forbid monopoly; but, as we have already implied, there are others, based upon the belief that great industrial consolidations are inherently undesirable, regardless of their economic results. In the debates in Congress Senator Sherman himself in the passage quoted in the margin showed that among the purposes of Congress in 1890 was a desire to put an end to great aggregations of capital because of the helplessness of the individual before them.[1] Another aspect of the same notion may be found in the language of Mr. Justice Peckham in *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri*

[1] "If the concerted powers of this combination are intrusted to a single man, it is a kingly prerogative, inconsistent with our form of government and should be subject to the strong resistance of the State and National authorities * * *" (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2457).

"The popular mind is agitated with problems that may disturb social order, and among them all none is more threatening than the inequality of condition, of wealth, and opportunity that has grown within a single generation out of the concentration of capital into vast combinations to control production and trade and to break down competition. These combinations already defy or control powerful transportation corporations and reach State authorities. They reach out their Briarean arms to every part of our country. They are imported from abroad. Congress alone can deal with them, and if we are unwilling or unable, there will soon be a trust for every production and a master to fix the price for every necessity of life * * *" (21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2460. See also 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2598).

Freight Association, supra, 323 (166 U. S. 290). That Congress is still of the same mind appears in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, and the Small Business Mobilization Act. Not only does section 2 (d) of the first declare it to be one aim of that statute "to preserve the competitive position of small business concerns," but section 18 is given over to directions designed to "preserve and strengthen" their position. In *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219) a later statute in pari materia was considered to throw a cross-light upon the antitrust acts, illuminating enough even to override an earlier ruling of the court. Throughout the history of these statutes it has been constantly assumed that one of their purposes was to perpetuate and preserve, for its own sake and in spite of possible cost, an organization of industry in small units which can effectively compete with each other. We hold that Alcoa's monopoly of ingot was of the kind covered by section 2.

It does not follow because Alcoa had such a monopoly, that it monopolized the ingot market—it may not have achieved monopoly—monopoly may have been thrust upon it. If it had been a combination of existing smelters which united the whole industry and controlled the production of all aluminum ingot, it would certainly have monopolized the market. In several decisions the Supreme Court has decreed the dissolution of such combinations, although they had engaged in no unlawful trade practices. Perhaps we should not count among these *Northern Securities Co.* v. *United States* (193 U. S. 197, 327), because it was decided under the old dispensation which ended with *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States, supra* (221 U. S. 1); but the following cases were later. *United States* v. *Union Pacific R. R. Co.* (226 U. S. 61, 88), *International Harvester* v. *Missouri* (234 U. S. 199, 209), *United States* v. *Reading Company* (253 U. S. 26, 57–59), *United States* v. *Southern Pacific Company* (259 U. S. 214, 230, 231). We may start therefore with the premise that to have combined 90 percent of the producers of ingot would have been to monopolize the ingot market, and so far as concerns the public interest, it can make no difference whether an existing competition is put an end to, or whether prospective competition is prevented. The Clayton Act itself speaks in that alternative—"to injure, destroy, or prevent competition" (sec. 13 (a), title 15, U. S. C.). Nevertheless, it is unquestionably true that from the very outset the courts have at least kept in reserve the possibility that the origin of a monopoly may be critical in determining its legality; and for this they had warrant in some of the congressional debates which accompanied the passage of the act. *In re Greene* (52 Fed. Rep. 104 116, 117), *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association* (58 Fed. Rep. 58, 82 (C. C. A. 8)). This notion has usually been expressed by saying that size does not determine guilt, that there must be some exclusion of competitors, that the growth must be something else than natural or normal, that there must be a wrongful intent, or some other specific intent, or that some unduly coercive means must be used.

At times there has been emphasis upon the use of the active verb "monopolize," as the judge noted in the case at bar. *United States* v. *Standard Oil Corporation* (173 Fed. Rep. 177, 196); *United States* v. *Whiting* (212 Fed. Rep. 466, 478); *Patterson* v. *United States* (222 Fed. Rep. 599, 619 (C. C. A. 6)); *National Biscuit Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (299 Fed. Rep. 733, 738 (C. C. A. 2)). What engendered these compunctions is reasonably plain; persons may unwittingly find themselves in possession of a monopoly, automatically so to say, that is, without having intended either to put an end to existing competition, or to prevent competition from arising when none had existed; they may become monopolists by force of accident. Since the act makes monopolizing a crime, as well as a civil wrong, it would be not only unfair, but presumably contrary to the intent of Congress, to include such instances. A market may, for example, be so limited that it is impossible to produce at all and meet the cost of production except by a plant large enough to supply the whole demand. Or there may be changes in taste or in cost which drive out all but one purveyor. A single producer may be the survivor out of a group of active competitors, merely by virtue of his superior skill, foresight, and industry. In such cases a strong argument can be made that, although the result may expose the public to the evils of monopoly, the act does not mean to condemn the resultant of those very forces which it is its prime object to foster; finis opus coronat. The successful competitor, having been urged to compete, must not be turned upon when he wins. The most extreme expression of this view is in *United States* v. *United States Steel Corporation* (251 U. S. 417), from which we quote in the margin;[2] and which Sanford, Justice, in part repeated in *United States* v. *International Harvester Corp.* (274 U. S. 693, 708). It so chances that in both instances the corporation had less than two-thirds of the production in its hands, and the language quoted was not necessary to the decision; so that even if it had not later been modified, it has not the authority of an actual decision. But whatever authority it does have was modified by the gloss of Cardozo, Justice in *Swift & Company* v. *United States* (286 U. S. 106), when he said, page 116: "Mere size * * * *is not an offense against the Sherman Act unless magnified to the point at which it amounts to a monopoly * * * but size carries with it an opportunity for abuse that is not to be ignored when the opportunity is proved to have been utilized in the past." Alcoa's size was magnified to make it a monopoly; indeed, it has never been anything else; and its size not only offered it an opportunity for abuse, but it utilized its size for abuse, as can easily be shown.

It would completely misconstrue Alcoa's position in 1940 to hold that it was the passive beneficiary of a monopoly, following upon an involuntary elimination of competitors by automatically operative economic forces. Already in 1909, when its last lawful monopoly ended, it sought to strengthen its position by unlawful practices, and these concededly continued until 1912. In that year it had two plants in New York, at which it produced less than 42,000,000 pounds of ingot; in 1934 it had five plants (the original two, enlarged; one in Tennessee; one in North Carolina; one in Washington), and its production had risen to about 327,000,000 pounds, an increase of almost eight-fold. Meanwhile not a pound of ingot had been produced by anyone else in the United States. This increase and this continued and undisturbed control did not fall undesigned into Alcoa's lap; obviously it could not have done so. It could only have resulted, as it did result, from a persistent determination to maintain the control, with which it found itself vested in 1912. There were at least one or two abortive attempts to enter the industry, but Alcoa effectively anticipated and forestalled all competition, and succeeded in holding the field alone. True, it stimulated demand and opened new uses for the metal, but not without making sure that it could supply what it had evoked. There is no dispute as to this; Alcoa avows it as evidence of the skill, energy and initiative with which it has always conducted its business; as a reason why, having won its way by fair means, it should be commended, and not dismembered. We need charge it with no moral derelictions after 1912; we may assume that all it claims for itself is true. The only question is whether it falls within the exception established in favor of those who do not seek, but cannot avoid, the control of a market. It seems to us that that question scarcely survives its statement. It was not inevitable that it should always anticipate increases in the demand for ingot and be prepared to supply them. Nothing compelled it to keep doubling and redoubling its capacity before others entered the field. It insists that it never excluded competitors; but we can think of no more effective exclusion than progressively to embrace each new opportunity as it opened, and to face every newcomer with new capacity already geared into a great organization, having the advantage of experience, trade connections and the elite of personnel. Only in case we interpret exclusion as limited to maneuvers not honestly industrial, but actuated solely by a desire to prevent competition, can such a course, indefatigably pursued, be deemed not exclusionary. So to limit it would in our judgment emasculate the act; would permit just such consolidations as it was designed to prevent.

"Alcoa" answers that it positively assisted competitors, instead of discouraging them. That may be true as to fabricators of ingot; but what of that? They were its market for ingot, and it is charged only with a monopoly of ingot. We can find no instance of its helping prospective ingot manufacturers. We do not forget the Southern Aluminum Co. in whose origin it did have some part; though that was over before the end of 1914 and was in any event scarcely late enough to count. We are speaking, not of its purchase of the remains of the plant in 1915; we are not suggesting—as the plaintiff argues—that that was a move to keep the plant out of the ingot market; we are speaking of the original venture. In December 1911, Arthur V. Davis was in Europe, engaged in forming the "cartel" of 1912, which we will assume not to have been meant to affect the production of ingot in the United States; for so the judge found. The first form of the project was a corporation in which all the members of that "cartel" were to share—"Alcoa," through its Canadian subsidiary. That plan was abandoned; but the French interests, which had been parties to it, organized the Southern Aluminum Co. in its place; and the correspondence between those interests and "Alcoa" in 1913—especially the French letter of April 16 and "Alcoa's" answer of May 10—even though it may not justify the conclusion that the two were acting in conjunction, leaves no doubt that they were not to be competitors at arms

[2] Justice McKenna for the majority said, p. 451: "The Corporation is undoubtedly of impressive size, and it takes an effort of resolution not to be affected by it or to exaggerate its influence. But we must adhere to the law, and the law does not make mere size an offense or the existence of unexerted power an offense. It, we repeat, requires overt acts and trusts to its prohibition of them and its power to repress or punish them. It does not compel competition nor require all that is possible." The minority through Day, Justice, agreed, p. 460: "The act offers no objection to the mere size of a corporation nor to the continued exerting of its lawful power, when that size and power have been obtained by lawful means and developed by natural growth, although its resources, capital and strength may give to such corporation a dominating place in the business and industry with which it is concerned. It is entitled to maintain its size and the power that legitimately goes with it, provided no law has been transgressed in obtaining it."

length.[3] Perhaps, as the plaintiff argues, "Alcoa" did think that the new project might be useful in persuading the plaintiff, whose attack had just ended in the decree of 1912, that the company was to be a real competitor. Be that as it may, the expected competition was not to be of the ordinary kind.

We disregard any question of "intent." Relatively early in the history of the act—1935—Holmes, Justice, in *Swift & Co.* v. *United States, supra* (196 U. S. 375, 396), explained this aspect of the act in a passage often quoted. Although the primary evil was monopoly, the act also covered preliminary steps which, if continued, would lead to it. These may do no harm of themselves; but, if they are initial moves in a plan or scheme which carried out, will result in monopoly, they are dangerous and the law will nip them in the bud. For this reason conduct falling short of monopoly is not illegal unless it is part of a plan to monopolize, or to gain such other control of a market as is equally forbidden. To make it so, the plaintiff must prove what in the criminal law is known as a "specific intent"; an intent which goes beyond the mere intent to do the act. By far the greatest part of the fabulous record piled up in the case at bar was concerned with proving such an intent. The plaintiff was seeking to show that many transactions, neutral on their face, were not in fact necessary to the development of "Alcoa's" business, and had no motive except to exclude others and perpetuate its hold upon the ingot market. Upon that effort success depended in case the plaintiff failed to satisfy the Court that it was unnecessary under section 2 to convict "Alcoa" of practices unlawful of themselves. The plaintiff has so satisfied us, and the issue of intent ceases to have any importance; no intent is relevant except that which is relevant to any liability criminal or civil, i. e., an intent to bring about the forbidden act. Note 59 on page 226 of *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., supra* (310 U. S. 150), on which "Alcoa" appears so much to rely, is in no sense to the contrary. Douglas, Justice, was answering the defendants' argument that, assuming that a combination had attempted to fix prices, it had never had the power to do so, for there was too much competing oil. His answer was that the plan was unlawful, even if the parties did not have the power to fix prices, provided that they intended to do so; and it was to drive home this that he contrasted the case then before the Court with monopoly, where power was a necessary element. In so doing he said: "An intent and a power * * * are then necessary," which he at once followed by quoting the passage we have just mentioned from *Swift & Co.* v. *United States supra* (196 U. S. 375)). In order to fall within section 2, the monopolist must have both the power to monopolize and the intent to monopolize. To read the passage as demanding any specific intent makes nonsense of it, for no monopolist monopolizes unconscious of what he is doing. So here, "Alcoa" meant to keep, and did keep that complete and exclusive hold upon the ingot market with which it started. That was to monopolize the market, however innocently it otherwise proceeded. So far as the judgment held that it was not within section 2, it must be reversed.

[3] For example, the first letter contained the following: "I do not believe that the political conditions existing in the United States make it advisable to associate our aluminum companies, even for the fabrication of alumina. Mr. Sternfeld, whom I talked with in Paris a few days ago, told me that in his conversations with you on the subject he was under the impression that you are of the same opinion as I, and that it would be preferable for your company, the Southern and the Northern each to work alone in all branches of fabrication and commerce." And again: "It would evidently be better for the equilibrium of the market if we would take a large portion of our supply of power with the view of producing nitrures" (nitrates?) "rather than to employ the whole to increase our production of metal." The answer in part read: "As to whether it is wiser to build at first one plant in the United States conjointly between the Southern Aluminum Co. and the Aluminum Co. of America is to my mind rather a detail, and, if you prefer to have the Southern company build its own plant at Whitney, while the Aluminum Co. builds another for itself, I see no objection to that procedure."

II

ALCOA'S UNLAWFUL PRACTICES

As we have said, the plaintiff also sought to convict Alcoa of practices in which it engaged, not because they were necessary to the development of its business, but only in order to suppress competitors. Since we are holding that Alcoa "monopolized" the ingot market in 1940, regardless of such practices, these issues might be moot, if it inevitably followed from our holding that Alcoa must be dissolved. It could be argued that the new companies which would then emerge, should not be charged in retrospect with their predecessor's illegal conduct; but should be entitled to start without the handicap of injunctions, based upon its past. Possibly that would be true, except that conditions have so changed since he case was closed, that, as will appear, it by no means follows, because Alcoa had a monopoly in 1940, that it will have one when final judgment is entered after the war. That judgment may leave it intact as a competing unit among other competing units, and the plaintiff might argue, and undoubtedly will, that, if it was in the past guilty of practices, aimed at "monopolizing" the ingot market, it would be proper and necessary to enjoin their resumption, even though it no longer will have a monopoly. For this reason it appears to us that the issues are not altogether moot. In spite of the prolixity of the evidence, the challenged practices can be divided into three classes: (a) The "preemption" of bauxite deposits and water power; (b) the suppression of several efforts by competitors to invade either the ingot market, or some of the markets for fabricated goods; (c) the "domination" of the markets for such goods, and particularly of the markets for "sheet" and "cable."

(a) "Preemption" of bauxite and water power

The plaintiff attempted to prove, and asserts that it did prove, that "Alcoa" bought up bauxite deposits, both in Arkansas—the chief source of the mineral in the United States—and in Dutch and British Guiana, in excess of its needs, and under circumstances which showed that the purchases were not for the purpose of securing an adequate future supply, but only in order to seize upon any available supply and so assure its monopoly. The very statement of this charge shows that it depends upon "Alcoa's" intent, for, if the purchases provided for the future needs of the business, or for what "Alcoa" honestly believed were its future needs, they were innocent. In its effort to show such an intent, here and elsewhere, the plaintiff made the whole history of the industry from its beginning the subject of inquiry, with a persistence which left no corner unsearched. The judge heard the evidence with unmatched patience, and punctilious care and minuteness; and with equal industry and detail considered it for almost a year before he gave his opinion, in which he overruled all the plaintiff's contentions. The plaintiff's brief before us seems to intimate that in doing so he was actuated by a bias in "Alcoa's" favor; and, if by that is meant that "Alcoa" completely satisfied him of its innocence throughout, bias he certainly showed. That, however, is precisely the bias which all evidence is intended to create, and which it should create, if a court does its duty. If, on the other hand, it is suggested that into his conclusions there entered motives, not derived from the evidence, the record is utterly devoid of any support for it.

We assume that Rule 52 (a) applies as well to appeals taken under Rule 72, as to those taken under Rule 75, although it makes very little difference whether or not it does, because Rule 52 (a) in substance merely carried over the earlier practice in equity to all trials before a judge. *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company* v. *Bonacci* (111 Fed. (2) 412, 415 (C. C. A. 8)); *Petterson Lighterage & Transportation Corp.* v. *New York Central R. R. Co.* (126 Fed. (2) 992, 995 (C. C. A. 2)); *Katz Underwear Company* v. *United States* (127 Fed (2) 965, 966 (C. C. A. 3)); 3 Moore's Federal Practice, section 52.01. It is idle to try to define the meaning of the phrase, "clearly erroneous"; all that can be profitably said is that an appellate court, though it will hesitate less to reverse the finding of a judge than that of an administrative tribunal or of a jury, will nevertheless reverse it most reluctantly and only when well persuaded. This is true to a considerable degree even when the judge has not seen the witnesses. His duty is to sift the evidence, to put it into logical sequence and to make the proper inferences from it; and in the case of a record of over 40,000 pages like that before us, it is physically impossible for an appellate court to function at all without ascribing some prima facie validity to his conclusions. *Consumers Import Company* v. *Kawasaki* (133 Fed. (2) 781, 787 (C. C. A. 2)). What the plaintiff is really asking is that we shall in effect reconsider the whole evidence de novo, as though it had come before us in the first instance. The impossibility of that at once appears, if we consider what it would have involved, had the appeal taken its usual course and been heard by the nine justices of the Supreme Court. However, whatever may be said in favor of reversing a trial judge's findings when he has not seen the witnesses, when he has, and insofar as his findings depend upon whether they spoke the truth, the accepted rule is that they "must be treated as unassailable." *Davis* v. *Schwartz* (155 U. S. 631, 636); *Adamson* v. *Gilliland* (242 U. S. 350, 353); *Alabama Power Company* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464, 477). The reason for this is obvious and has been repeated over and over again; in such cases the appeal must be decided upon an incomplete record, for the printed word is only a part, and often by no means the most important part, of the sense impressions which we use to make up our minds. *Morris Plan Industrial Bank* v. *Henderson* (131 Fed. (2) 975, 977 (C. C. A. 2)). Since an appellate court must have some affirmative reason to reverse anything done below, to reverse a finding it must appear from what the record does preserve that the witnesses could not have been speaking the truth, no matter how transparently reliable and honest they could have appeared. Even upon an issue on which there is conflicting direct testimony, appellate courts ought to be chary before going so far; and upon an issue like the witness's own intent, as to which he alone can testify, the finding is indeed "unassailable," except in the most exceptional cases.

In the case at bar, the first issue was whether, when Alcoa bought up the bauxite deposits, it really supposed that they would be useful in the future. It would be hard to imagine an issue in which the credibility of the witnesses should more depend upon the impressions derived from their presence. Alcoa relied principally upon the testimony of three of its officers, though there were some issues (the purchase of bauxite was among

them), as to which not all three testified. These were the chairman of its board, Arthur V. Davis; its president, Roy A. Hunt; and Davis' brother, Edward K. Davis, a former vice president. Arthur V. Davis was on the stand for 7 weeks; his direct testimony occupies 844 printed pages on the direct and 1,445 on the cross; Edward K. Davis, called by the plaintiff, was on the stand 6 weeks; his direct occupies 1,727 pages and his cross, 146; Hunt was on the stand 2 weeks; in his case the corresponding figures are 266 and 346. Thus the judge had an unrivaled opportunity to observe how they bore themselves under a most prolonged and searching test; and he went out of his way to commend their candor and credibility. Nor could the issue turn upon the dependability of their memory; they knew why they had bought the bauxite; they were either speaking the truth, or perjuring themselves, not only upon this issue, but elsewhere throughout this amazing record. Evidence must be beyond measure convincing which leads to that conclusion in the face of the most positive assurance from the only impartial observer at the time, that they seemed to him men of honor and veracity. While it is, of course, true that they had an interest to excuse their past conduct and that the transactions admitted a sinister interpretation, neither of these facts was conclusive. Upon this, as upon all the issues, the plaintiff had the burden and must lose unless it succeeded in doing more than leaving the proof in balance. Taking all these considerations together, it seems plain to us that we should be unwarranted in declaring these findings "clearly erroneous."

Little need be added as to the similar charge that Alcoa bought up suitable water power which it did not need; and did so for the purpose of preventing competition. It did buy a number of such sites which it did not fully use; but, considering the extraordinary increase in ingot production which in fact took place even without the witnesses' explanations the inference which the plaintiff asks us to draw would be weak indeed; and certainly we should not be justified in holding that it overbore those explanations.

(b) *Suppression of competitors seeking to invade the ingot market*

The plaintiff relies upon two transactions as showing that "Alcoa" tried to suppress incipient competition by purchasing interests in two Norwegian aluminum companies; and a third, by purchasing interests in water power at the head of the Saguenay River, Canada. The Ford Motor Co., in the winter of 1920–21, wished to secure an independent source of aluminum; and one of its representatives met Haskell, the president of the Baush Co., and consulted him about getting one. Haskell in that winter saw Kloumann, the representative of a Norwegian company, which we may call "A. H. Norsk"; and Haskell got an option on the property. There was a sharp dispute as to whether Arthur V. Davis learned of these negotiations; but we shall assume that he did so shortly after May 18, 1921, in spite of the fact that the letter which conveyed that information was excluded. In the following July, "Alcoa" agreed with Kloumann to buy a half interest in "A. H. Norsk," and bought it in October 1922, after Davis had got permission from the Attorney General in accordance with the requirements of the decree of 1912. In the letter in which he stated the case to the Attorney General, Davis declared that he wished to have the property in order to compete with German producers abroad; and that is the reason which he gave on the stand, and which the judge accepted. This evidence also admits the interpretation that Davis wished to head off Haskell, and perhaps in fact he did; but we cannot see that the issue differs from that which arose over the purchases of bauxite and water power. It is impossible to say á priori what motive actuated Davis; even though he knew that his purchase would interrupt Haskell's negotiations on behalf of the Ford Co., it by no means follows that he did not wish the property for the reasons he gave to the Attorney General. Indeed, the plaintiff did not prove that there were no other sources of foreign aluminum open to the Ford Co.; or even that there were no plants which it could have bought. The purchase of the other Norwegian plant had no accompaniment of cutting out American competition; as to it "Alcoa's" good faith must certainly be accepted.

The last transaction was Alcoa's intervention in a large power development at the source of the Saguenay River in Lake St. John, Canada. This lake is of large area and capacity; and at some time before 1922 James B. Duke, a very rich financier, had secured two water powers close to the outlet, about 18 miles apart, called the upper and lower developments. The upper development was built by 1924, but the lower development was not completed till 1931. In 1922 a representative of Duke proposed to Davis that he should take some of the power from the upper development but nothing was done; but in 1924 Alcoa was planning to build a plant at Arvida, near the Saguenay River; and at some time after October 15 of that year Davis and Duke resumed negotiations, though this time for the purchase of the lower development. These resulted in its purchase in July 1925 by means of a merger into Alcoa of one of Duke's corporations, which owned the property. When Duke died in October 1925 his executors wished to dispose of the upper development also, and Alcoa obtained at 53½-percent interest in it during the spring of 1926. All the power used in Arvida has come from the upper development; and Alcoa, after finishing the lower development, sold the power to others, until Limited acquired the property in 1938.

In October 1924 the brothers, Uihlein, who had formerly been brewers in St. Louis, and had already bought a bauxite deposit in British Guiana, conferred with Duke about using the power of the upper development to make ingot; but nothing came of these negotiations. Davis said that the Uihleins told him that, when he and Duke began to deal with each other in the autumn of 1924, they had entirely abandoned the idea of going into the aluminum business, and so the judge found.

The Uihleins, having given up the bauxite business, sold out their deposits in British Guiana in December 1924 to three equal interests, of which Alcoa was one. (This was one of the purchases considered in the preceding heading.) Haskell on his own account also negotiated with Duke for an interest in the upper development, but these negotiations had ended before Duke's death. The plaintiff argues that Alcoa was aware of the negotiations between Duke and the Uihleins, and between Duke and Haskell; and knew that, once it had secured the lower development, Duke was sure to lose interest in any independent aluminum plant. It adds that the fact that Alcoa has never used the lower development to manufacture ingot, shows that it must have been bought for another purpose. Alcoa answers that its original purpose was to develop the lower development after the Arvida plant had been built, meanwhile taking power from the upper; that it was only after Duke's death that it bought a share in the upper; and that the Uihlein and Haskell projects had nothing to do with its purchase of the lower development. This answer is not so patently implausible an explanation that the judge was bound to reject it, and to find that the plaintiff had carried the burden of proof upon the issue.

(c) *"Alcoa's" domination of the fabricating fields*

The last of "Alcoa's" supposedly unlawful practices was its infiltration into, and manipulation of, some of the markets for fabricated goods. These were three kinds: (1) buying an interest in the Aluminum Castings Co. and Aluminum Manufactures, Inc.; (2) the "price squeeze"; (3) the "piston patent pool." (1) "Castings" were one of the earliest uses of aluminum; "Alcoa" began to make them about 1901, and by 1909 there were a number of companies engaged in the business. Five of these combined in that year to form the Aluminum Castings Co., of whose shares "Alcoa" received 50 percent in exchange for advances made at the time. It does not appear what proportion of the total output these five companies had been manufacturing; certainly the plaintiff did not prove that they controlled the castings market. Later they acquired a sixth foundry, and in 1919 the combination was reorganized as Aluminum Manufacturers, Inc. In 1922 it leased all its real estate and machinery to "Alcoa" for 25 years, and may be regarded as thereafter a subsidiary. We cannot see that in all this the plaintiff has proved anything relevant to the action. If it means that there was a monopoly of the castings market as such, there is no support whatever in the record for such an assertion. If it means that "Alcoa's" intervention in the castings business helps to support its claim that "Alcoa" monopolized the ingot market, the inference is extremely weak. Finally, there was nothing in the transactions themselves which indicated that they were independently unlawful, or that they served to make "Alcoa's" legal position as to the ingot industry less vulnerable than it would otherwise have been.

The Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co. makes cooking and other utensils out of aluminum. It was formed in 1909 by the consolidation of three small companies all its plants are in Wisconsin, and its principal place of business is in that State. At the trial 31 percent of the shares were held by Alcoa and its officers, and this proportion had been 36 percent in 1918. The proportion of the shares held by the three families, which had originally owned the combining companies, was almost 36 percent, and if there were added the shares owned by employees and by residents of the town where the principal business is, the percentage was originally over 50 percent and has so remained. Four of the six directors have always represented the original interests; the other two have represented Alcoa's interest. The four have frequently shown entire independence of Alcoa, and on several occasions have overruled its two directors, although the two companies have, very naturally, usually acted in unison. Again, we are not clear whether the plaintiff means to argue that by its holdings in this company Alcoa monopolizes, or has attempted to monopolize, the utensil market; if so, there is no support for it. If, on the other hand, the charge is that Alcoa invested in the company as part of its monopoly of the ingot market, that may be true. It may have hoped in this way to secure at least a friendly market for its ingot, if ingot competition should increase. As part of its general conduct after the Bradley patent expired, this purchase may thus be relevant, just as its investment in the castings business may be; but, like its investment in that business, there is nothing to support the conclusion that here was a practice or maneuver merely to suppress or exclude competitors; and there was no justification for joining the Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co. as a defendant.

(2) *The "price squeeze"*

The plaintiff describes as the "price squeeze" a practice by which, it says, Alcoa intended to put out of business the manufacturers of aluminum "sheet" who were its competitors; for Alcoa was itself a large—in fact, much the largest—maker of that product and had been the first to introduce it many years before the period in question. The challenged practice ended with the year 1932, shortly after the Department of Justice

took up the complaints of several "sheet" makers, and began to investigate. The plaintiff says that the "squeeze" had been in operation for a long time before the year 1925, and that by means of it Alcoa had succeeded in eliminating four out of eight companies which competed with it. However, it will not be necessary to go back of 1925, for the only question before us is whether an injunction shall go, and a test of that is whether the practice in the years 1925–32, inclusive, was unlawful. If it was, the time when it began is irrelevant; if it was not, it was equally lawful in the earlier years. We shall not describe the manufacture of "sheet"—"sheet rolling"—beyond saying that "rolling ingot," not "notched bar ingot," must be used, and that it is forced between two rollers until it gets to the desired thickness: "gauge." It is made as "coiled sheet" or "flat sheet"; also the metal may be hardened by various alloys to bring up its tensile strength. The "squeeze" is asserted to have been exercised upon five "gauges" of "coiled sheet," four "gauges" of "flat sheet" and five "gauges" of alloyed metal—called "Duralumin."

Between the years 1925 and 1937, inclusive, "Alcoa's" books show the price of all these kinds of "sheet" for the "gauges" in question, together with the cost of making it from ingot. They also show the price of ingot, which was of course the same for all "gauges" and for all kinds of "sheet," as it was the same for all uses of aluminum other than "sheet." We are accepting as a basis the tables appearing as section XVII of the appendix to the plaintiff's brief—which is more favorable to "Alcoa" than those which the judge used. Except for the years 1925–28, inclusive, these tables do not include as an item of cost, "Unabsorbed Burden"; an accounting allowance, computed to cover the expense and loss properly to be attributed to that part of "Alcoa's" plant which was not being used during each year. We cannot see why it was not a proper item to include in the cost of production, for it was to be expected that other "sheet rollers' 'also would be unable to keep their plants fully occupied; and, if so, over a term of years they would have to "absorb" the ensuing loss in the price of the product. Moreover, as we have said, "Alcoa" itself so kept its books for the first 4 years of the period in question. Those were prosperous years during which the item was not likely to have been large, but even though we were to deduct in those years the average for the years in which "Alcoa" deducted it, the difference this would make in the average cost of "sheet" for the years before 1933 is trifling. At the expense of logical consistency and in order not to complicate the computations unduly, we have used the tables as they stand.

The plaintiff's theory is that Alcoa consistently sold ingot at so high a price that the sheet rollers, who were forced to buy from it, could not pay the expenses of rolling the sheet and make a living profit out of the price at which Alcoa itself sold sheet. To establish this the plaintiff asks us to take Alcoa's costs of rolling as a fair measure of its competitor's costs, and to assume that they had to meet Alcoa's price for all grades of sheet, and could not buy ingot elsewhere. It seems to us altogether reasonable, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to suppose that Alcoa's rolling costs were not higher than those of other sheet rollers; and, although it is true that theoretically, imported virgin was always available, for the reasons we have already given when we were discussing the monopoly in ingot, we think it could at best be had at very little less than Alcoa's prices. As for secondary, there were a number of uses for sheet for which the trade would not accept such of it as was available in the years in question. Beside, the spread between suitable grades of secondary and virgin was also very small.

Compressing into reasonable compass what the tables show, the result is as follows. For all the five gages of coiled sheet for 8 years, 1925–32, the average profit open to competing rollers was .84 cents a pound, as against 4.7 cents for the 5 succeeding years, 1933–37. The corresponding figures for flat sheet were .59 cents and 4 cents; and for duralumin, 4.9 cents and 11.8 cents. Moreover, in 31 instances out of 112 there was no spread at all; that is, the cost of ingot plus the cost of rolling was greater than the price at which Alcoa was selling sheet. Obviously, there was in the 8 years little or no inducement to continue in the sheet business, and Baush, the only roller of duralumin, gave up in 1931, although Alcoa insists, and the judge found, that this was because of its inefficiency. There can be little doubt that Alcoa changed the price of ingot in 1933 because it feared some action by the Department. True, it dropped the cost of ingot only about 2½ cents, and that advantage did not all inure to the profit of sheet rollers, for the price of the majority of the gages in all three kinds of sheet fell as well. However, the cost of making sheet also fell for every gage, and that in some part offset the fall in the price of sheet.

There resulted an average net gain in 1933 in all gages of coiled sheet of 2.84 cents a pound; and the corresponding figure for flat sheet was 4.49 cents, and Duralumin, 3.14 cents. Moreover, although this advantage necessarily varied during the years 1934–37, the cost of ingot—the most important factor—continued to be lower than in 1933 for all the following years except 1937, and then it was higher by only a quarter of a cent. The judge held and we agree that the squeeze was eliminated by lowering the price of ingot; and to do so Alcoa had to reduce the price, not only to sheet rollers, but to all customers who bought ingot for any purpose. The drop of 2½ cents in 1933 went along with an actual—though it is true a very small—increase in mill cost, which left a margin of 4.62 cents for overhead expenses. Since 1925 that margin had never been less than 10 cents except in 1932, when it was 7½ cents. It is of course possible that the reduction in the price of ingot was accompanied by a corresponding drop in overhead; the record is silent; but it seems to us unreasonable to make that assumption; sudden changes of such magnitude are not be expected. Rather we think that the plaintiff made out a prima facie case that Alcoa had been holding ingot at a price higher than a fair price, and had reduced the price only because of pressure. If that was not so, it should have rebutted the inference.

In spite of this evidence the judge found that in these years "Alcoa" had not intended to monopolize the "sheet" market; or to exclude others; or to fix discriminatory prices, or prices of any kind; or to sell below the cost of production, measuring ingot price as part of the cost. The last of these findings presupposes that "Alcoa" could not have known the cost of "rolling sheet," for obviously it knew the prices at which "sheet" and ingot were selling. It says that it did not know, because the cost of "rolling sheet" varied from year to year, and could not be ascertained till the end of the year, so that it could never tell in advance what part of the gross "spread" between the "sheet" price and the ingot price would be left as profit. That is indeed hard to believe; but, assuming that it could not, since the judge so found, at least as early as 1930 the complaints charged it with notice of the effect of what it was doing; and yet it kept on until the Department began to move, when it at once found means to cure the situation. Since we have not the question whether competitors were in fact damaged, but only whether there was enough evidence on which to base an injunction for the future, the only doubts are two: First, whether, when "Alcoa" came to know the effect of the "squeeze," as it did, the "squeeze" became unlawful; and second, whether the issue has become moot, which we will reserve until we come to discuss remedies. That it was unlawful to set the price of 'sheet" so low and hold the price of ingot so high, seems to us unquestionable, provided, as we have held, that on this record the price of ingot must be regarded as higher than a "fair price." True, this was only a consequence of "Alcoa's" control over the price of ingot, and perhaps it ought not to be considered as a separate wrong; moreover, we do not use it as part of the reasoning by which we conclude that the monopoly was unlawful. But it was at least an unlawful exercise of "Alcoa's" power after it had been put on notice by the "sheet rollers' " complaints; and this is true, even though we assent to the judge's finding that it was not part of an attempt to monopolize the "sheet" market. We hold that at least in 1932 it had become a wrong.

The same considerations do not apply to cable, of which Alcoa is the only fabricator. The plaintiff charges that Alcoa secured a monopoly of this by setting the price so low that there was no adequate spread. That may be true, but aluminum cable must in any event compete with copper cable, and the plaintiff failed to show that, even though the price of ingot were reduced so as to realize only a fair profit, it would have been possible to compete with copper cable and leave an adequate spread for cable fabricators. Complaints still continued after the squeeze in sheet had ended in 1933. The evidence permitted the conclusion that Alcoa may have had another intent in selling at a loss than to monopolize the market, or to suppress competition; and the finding was that it did. Such relief as the plaintiff can have, if any, upon this feature of the case, must therefore be limited to that against the monopoly in ingot.

(3) *The piston patent situation*

The plaintiff charges Alcoa with three kinds of misuses of patents: (1) An unlawful limitation of the production of licensees of its own patents; (2) accepting a license agreement from another patentee that unlawfully limited its own production; (3) using its own patents to force the purchase of ingot upon licensees. The situation was somewhat complicated. In 1922 a number of persons owned 53 design patents for automobile pistons; and Alcoa owned 45 such patents; it also owned some process patents for making pistons. All the design patents were put into a pool, and Alcoa was made the exclusive licensee of all with power to sublicense. It then issued sublicenses to three companies of all the patents, limiting the number of pistons which each licensee could make. The plaintiff argues that, although this limitation was lawful as to the design patents, it was not lawful as to the process patents, because such a limitation is a way of extending the monopoly.

We need not pass upon that proposition, although the sixth circuit upheld it in *Barber-Colman Co.* v. *National Tool Co.* (136 Fed. (2) 339) refusing to follow our decision in *Straight Side Basket Corp.* v. *Webster Basket Co.* (82 Fed. (2) 245), which was to the contrary. The decisions of the Supreme Court plainly show an increasing tendency not to allow a patentee to make use of the sanctions which follow upon an unrestricted prohibition of the right to make, vend, and use. Although even at common law a patentee was not allowed to attach any condition upon the resale of a patented product, made, and sold by himself, he was free to limit the price at which a licensee might himself sell what the licensee made, and it is not apparent to us what difference there is between that, and setting a price upon, or limiting the quantities of, a process. However, the whole subject is plainly in flux, and we do not wish to pass upon it unless we have to do so. In the case at bar we do not, because, granting all that the plaintiff says, it did not prove, in the case of any of the sublicensees, that the pistons were not

covered by the design patents, as well as by the process patents; and if the limitation was valid upon the design patents, it made no difference whether or not it was invalid upon the process patents.

The next charge arises from a transaction between the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation and Alcoa in 1927. The Bohn company had a product patent for a strut-type piston, which Alcoa wished to make; and the Bohn company agreed to give Alcoa a license under this patent in exchange for Alcoa's license under the design and process patents. Alcoa's liability for royalties were to be computed as follows: It was not to pay any royalties, unless it made more than 5,000,000 pistons of all sorts in any year; but, if it did, it was to pay a royalty upon the excess until it had paid upon all pistons made during that year under the Bohn patent.

The plaintiff argues that it was unlawful for the Bohn company to license Alcoa under an agreement which exempted it from any royalties so long as it kept its total production of pistons below the stint, and that, if so, it was equally unlawful for Alcoa to submit to such a limitation upon its production. It is, of course, true that a patentee may not use his patent as a sanction for extending his monopoly beyond its terms: the cases cited by the plaintiff support that proposition. *Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co.* v. *United States* (226 U. S. 20). *National Harrow Co.* v. *Hench* (83 Fed. Rep. 36 (C. C. A. 3)), *Blount Manufacturing Co.* v. *Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.* (166 Fed. Rept. 555), *United States* v. *New Departure Co.* (204 Fed. Rep. 107). Moreover, the agreement offered an inducement to Alcoa to limit its general production of pistons, since it would in this way avoid any royalties to Bohn. We will not say that that was not an unlawful extension of the Bohn company's monopoly, and conceivably if that company were a party to this action, we might enjoin further performance of the contract; though we could not do so in the absence of the patentee. However, the agreement was made in 1927, and any patent which it covered has now expired, and with it, of necessity, the contract. It might still be argued that Alcoa ought to be enjoined from entering into any other such arrangement; but the point has become trivial to the last degree and appears to be raised for the first time in this appeal. We refuse to consider it. *Helvering* v. *Wood* (309 U. S. 394).

Finally the plaintiff charges that in 1929 Alcoa and Aluminum Industries—one of the original three sublicensees of the pooled patents—agreed, as one of the considerations for its license, that the sublicensee should buy its ingot from Alcoa. The theory here is that this was part of Alcoa's effort to monopolize the ingot industry. This would be an unlawful practice, if proved; but the judge decided that no such agreement had been made, and the evidence certainly admitted that conclusion. We find nothing in Alcoa's dealing with the piston patents which demands any change in the judgment.

This concludes all that we think it necessary to say about Alcoa's supposed unlawful practices. We have omitted consideration of any supposed conspiracy with foreign producers to protect its domestic monopoly, because it will be more convenient to deal with this as part of the organization of Limited, and of Alcoa's use made of Limited both before and after 1931 when the Alliance was founded, as will appear. The plaintiff's position in general is that Alcoa was independently a party to such combinations until the advent of the Alliance. We do not understand, however, that it asserts that this continued thereafter, except insofar as Limited is to be understood as always acting as Alcoa's agent or affiliate.

III

"LIMITED"

"Limited" was incorporated in Canada on May 31, 1928, to take over those properties of "Alcoa" which were outside the United States. Only two were excepted: a Dutch company which owned bauxite deposits in Dutch Guiana, and a Canadian power transmission company which supplied "Alcoa's" Massena plant. "Alcoa" also retained until 1931 an Italian company which it was using for experiments, and apparently for a few months forgot a small Norwegian power plant, which was transferred in October 1928. For special reasons the Alcoa Power Co., which owned the Lower Development on the Saguenay, was not conveyed until 1938, although both parties meant from the first to include it, and indeed it would have been useless to any plant in the United States.

In exchange for all the properties conveyed, "Limited" issued all its common shares to "Alcoa's" common shareholders in the proportion of one for every three; and it thus resulted that the beneficial ownership remained what it had been, except for the interest of "Alcoa's" preferred shareholders, who were apparently considered amply protected by the properties in the United States. At first there remained some officers common to both companies; but by the middle of 1931 this had ceased and, formally at any rate, the separation between the two companies was complete. At the conclusion of the transfers a majority, though only a bare majority, of the common shares of "Alcoa" was in the hands of three persons: Andrew W. Mellon, Richard B. Mellon, his brother, and Arthur V. Davis. Richard Mellon died in 1933, and Andrew in 1937, and their shares passed to their families; but in January 1939 the Davises, the officers and directors of "Alcoa," and the Mellon families—11 individuals in all—collectively still held 48.9 percent of "Alcoa's" shares, and 48.5 percent of "Limited's"; and Arthur V. Davis was then the largest shareholder in both companies.

The companies had a number of transactions with each other, upon which the plaintiff relies to prove that they did not deal at arm's length, but that "Limited" was organized only as a creature of Alcoa. As one instance, Limited apparently would have been able at times to sell aluminum in the United States at a profit but did not do so, because—the plaintiff argues—they had agreed not to compete. The inference is not strong: to break into a new market protected by a tariff subject to change, particularly a market for long in the possession of a single powerful producer, is a step which an outsider might well hesitate to take. Another supposed instance of cooperation is the manufacture of some of Limited's ore into alumina at the East St. Louis plant of Alcoa during the years 1928–36. Limited had no alumina plant of its own—except one of an experimental nature—until the end of 1936; yet, although Alcoa did make all Limited's alumina until 1932, thereafter Limited bought a great deal from foreign manufacturers. Although Alcoa sold this alumina to Limited at a lower price than it billed alumina to its own aluminum plants, Alcoa's intramural accounts are without significance. Alcoa also did some fabrication for Limited from Limited's own aluminum, and did it at only mill cost without overhead. That substantially ended by 1931; but, while it lasted, it was confessedly a favor, and indeed for a short season Alcoa undoubtedly did cast a kindly eye upon its fledgling, as Arthur V. Davis called it. Alcoa also bought three parcels of Limited's aluminum: the first two in 1929, and the last in February 1938. The first were perhaps at a lower price than Limited would otherwise have obtained, (the judge however found the prices were "fairly representative"); but they are not important, for they were both at the beginning of Limited's business, while there had as yet probably been little, if any, separation of interest between the two groups of shareholders. The third purchase was of quite a different character; it was part of the consideration for the conveyance to Limited of the Alcoa Power Co.

In 1928 Limited was not able to pay for this property, although, as we have said, it always expected eventually to receive it. The price, as finally fixed in 1938, was $35,000,000, of which Limited was to pay $20,000,000 in mortgage bonds issued by the company itself and the remainder in payments of two kinds: Limited was to pay Alcoa for power at a fixed rate, which should amount to at least $330,000 a year and Alcoa was to have an option upon 75,000,000 pounds of aluminum, at 13 cents, which was less than the market rate.

There was also some evidence that Alcoa took part in the formation of the Alliance—a foreign cartel, which we shall describe later. This consists very largely of declarations of Arthur V. Davis, put in his mouth by other witnesses; of a cable of Edward K. Davis to one of Limited's other officers; and of the improbability that the Alliance should have been set up without the active cooperation of Arthur V. Davis, especially as he was concededly in Europe and in communication with some foreign producers at about the time that the Alliance was first bruited. Edward K. Davis was the originator of the Alliance; he gave as his reason for it that he feared that the other foreign producers who had already joined in a cartel would shut him out. When these producers came to Canada in 1931 to arrange for the Alliance, they visited Arthur V. Davis and made an extended visit to Alcoa's plants in the East. As anticipatory confirmation that the Alcoa had had a share in forming the Alliance, the plaintiff also introduced evidence to show that before 1928 Alcoa had already had an understanding with foreigners as to prices. This consisted largely of the statements of what others had said about an agreement to keep their prices the same as Alcoa's. The plaintiff rested particularly upon the testimony of Haskell, who testified not only upon this point but more generally, because, when Haskell testified, although he had been one of the important figures in the Baush Co., he had made his peace with Alcoa, which had employed him in some advisory capacity. It must be remembered, however, that he had already testified in the action of the Baush Co. against Alcoa and that he could scarcely have repudiated what he then said.

The Davises, in answer to all this evidence, swore that "Limited" had been organized for three reasons, quite different from controlling prices in the United States: First, there was at that time a growing nationalism in the British Empire—where "Alcoa" sold most of its foreign aluminum—which manifested itself in the slogan, "Buy British," and which would be better satisfied if the properties were owned by a Canadian corporation, even though its shareholders were American. Next, "Alcoa" had neglected its foreign properties—relatively—and they would better prosper under a management singly devoted to them. Finally, the time was coming when Arthur V. Davis wished to take a less active part in affairs, and there would be embarrassment in choosing between Hunt and Edward K. Davis as his successor. Both said that the separation between the companies had been actually as complete as it was in form. Arthur said that, although while in Europe shortly before the "Alliance" was formed, foreign producers had spoken to him, he had then and always referred all their inquiries to his brother. He had discussed little with Edward any questions of policy about "Limited"; they had talked for the most part only

about the history, development, and future of the properties. He had indeed seen a preliminary draft of the agreement forming the "Alliance," but not its final form until the time of the trial, and he had had nothing whatever to do with its formation. As for the trip of the foreign producers in the United States, it was purely social—a good-will excursion, so to say—in which the relations of "Alcoa" and foreign production was not discussed.

Upon the whole evidence the judge found that by 1935 Limited had become altogether free from any connection with Alcoa, and that Alcoa had had no part in forming the Alliance, or in any effort at any time to limit imports, to fix their price, or to intervene in price-fixing cartels in Europe—except the early ones. In short, he again felt persuaded by the testimony against any inferences to be drawn from the conceded facts, and from the declarations put in the mouths of the Davises. As before, to do otherwise he would have had to find that both these men had deliberately perjured themselves; and we cannot see that these findings present us with anything different in substance from those on which we have already passed. Considering the interests in Limited which Arthur V. Davis and both the Mellons had, it would perhaps have taxed our credulity to the breaking point to believe that they knew nothing about the formation of the Alliance. Arthur V. Davis did not go as far as that; and that he and the Mellons should have put into the hands of Edward K. Davis the whole management of Limited, does not appear to us to pass the bounds of reasonable entertainment. Alcoa had had collisions in plenty with the plaintiff and others before 1931; the first Baush action, which challenged the price squeeze, had been filed in April 1928, and the second in July 1931. It was not unreasonable to believe that Arthur V. Davis and the Mellons, seeing that some kind of cartel might be an inescapable incident to continuing business abroad, wished in 1931 to keep Alcoa as far removed from it as possible.

Even so, the question remains whether Alcoa should be charged with the Alliance because a majority of its shareholders were also a majority of Limited's shareholders; or whether that would be true, even though there were a group, common to both, less than a majority, but large enough for practical purposes to control each. It is quite true that in proportion as courts disregard the fictitious persona of a corporation—as perhaps they are increasingly disposed to do—they must substitute the concept of a group of persons acting in concert. Nevertheless, the group must not be committed legally except insofar as they have assented as a body, and that assent should be imputed to them only in harmony with the ordinary notions of delegated power. The plaintiff did not prove that in 1931, to say nothing of 1936, there was not a substantial minority in each company made up of those who held no shares in the other; and the existence of the same majority in the two corporations was not enough by itself to identify the two. Alcoa would not be bound, unless those who held the majority of its shares had been authorized by the group as a whole to enter into the Alliance; and considering the fact that, as we shall show, it was an illegal arrangement, such an authority ought convincingly to appear. It does not appear at all. For support of this proposition we need look no further than to the decisions of the Supreme Court under the Commodity Clause. *United States* v. *Delaware & Hudson Co.* (213 U. S. 366); *United States* v. *Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.* (220 U. S. 257); *United States* v. *Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R.* (238 U. S. 516); *United States* v. *Reading Co.* (253 U. S. 26); *United States* v. *Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.* (254 U. S. 255); *United States* v. *Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway Co.* (298 U. S. 492). There was in all these cases strong reason to hold that the railroads had an indirect interest in the coal moved, yet the decisions uniformly assumed that the ownership, not of a majority of the shares, but even of all the shares, did not make the corporations coalesce. Except when there was evidence that those in nominal control of one of the two corporations, exercised no independent decision, but followed the directions of the other, they were treated as juridically separate. Indeed, were it not so, a minority of shareholders would always be compelled to see to it that a majority—perhaps even a controlling fraction—of the shares did not pass to a confederated group who had a similar control over another corporation. For these reasons we conclude that Alcoa was not a party to the Alliance, and did not join in any violation of section 1 of the act, so far as concerned foreign commerce.

Whether "Limited" itself violated that section depends upon the character of the "Alliance." It was a Swiss corporation, created in pursuance of an agreement entered into on July 3, 1931, the signatories to which were a French corporation, two German, one Swiss, a British, and "Limited." The original agreement, or "cartel," provided for the formation of a corporation in Switzerland which should issue shares, to be taken up by the signatories. This corporation was from time to time to fix a quota of production for each share, and each shareholder was to be limited to the quality measured by the number of shares it held, but was free to sell at any price it chose. The corporation fixed a price every year at which it would take off any shareholder's hands any part of its quota which it did not sell. No shareholder was to "buy, borrow, fabricate, or sell" aluminum produced by anyone not a shareholder except with the consent of the board of governors, but that must not be "unreasonably withheld." Nothing was said as to whether the arrangement extended to sales in the United States; but article X, known as the "conversion clause," provided that any shareholder might exceed his quota to the extent that he converted into aluminum in the United States or Canada any ores delivered to him in either of those countries by persons situated in the United States. This was confessedly put in to allow "Limited" to receive bauxite or alumina from Alcoa, to smelt it into aluminum, and to deliver the aluminum to Alcoa. Edward K. Davis gave as an explanation of this that "Limited" needed some protection against Alcoa's possible refusal to convey Alcoa Power Co., which Alcoa had never actually bound itself to transfer.

Although in 1931 "Alcoa" had all the producing capacity which it seemed likely to need—and so the event proved, for the clause was never invoked—Davis said that he did not know whether in the future the demand might not outrun that capacity, and whether "Alcoa" might not therefore be tempted to hold onto the Lower Development, unless "Limited" would smelt its alumina. That does indeed seem a somewhat far-fetched reason, but on the other hand it is hard to suppose that "Alcoa" really feared that it could not meet its future needs and meant to lean upon "Limited." The incident may be thought to have a bearing on "Alcoa's" implication in the "Alliance," but its only substantial importance, so far as we can see, is as showing whether the 1931 agreement was intended to cover the United States. That question arose very shortly after the agreement was made, and Edward K. Davis took the position that the United States was included, relying upon absence of any exception in the general language. His interpretation would seem to have been plainly right, not only for the reason he gave, but because otherwise there would have been no occasion for the "conversion clause." However, the other shareholders overruled him, and until 1936, when the new arrangement was made, imports into the United States were not included in the quotas. The issue turned out to be unimportant anyway, for the annual average of imports during the 5 years was in the neighborhood of only 15,000,000 pounds.

The agreement of 1936 abandoned the system of unconditional quotas, and substituted a system of royalties. Each shareholder was to have a fixed free quota for every share it held, but as its production exceeded the sum of its quotas, it was to pay a royalty, graduated progressively in proportion to the excess; and these royalties the "Alliance" divided among the shareholders in proportion to their shares. This agreement—unlike the first—did not contain an express promise that the "Alliance" would buy any undisposed of stocks at a fixed price, although perhaps section 3 of subdivision A, of part X may have impliedly recognized such an obligation. Probably, during the 2 years in which the shareholders operated under this agreement, that question did not arise for the demand for aluminum was very active. Nevertheless, we understand from "Limited's" answer to an interrogatory that the last price fixed under the agreement of 1931 was understood to remain in force. Although this agreement, like its predecessor, was silent as to imports into the United States, when that question arose during its preparation, as it did, all the shareholders agreed that such imports should be included in the quotas. The German companies were exempted from royalties—for obvious reasons—and that, it would seem, for practical purposes put them out of the "cartel" for the future, for it was scarcely possible that a German producer would be unable to dispose of all its production, at least within any future period that would be provided for. The shareholders continued this agreement unchanged until the end of March 1938, by which time it had become plain that, at least for the time being, it was no longer of service to anyone. Nothing was, however, done to end it, although the German shareholders of course became enemies of the French, British, and Canadian shareholders in 1939. The "Alliance" itself has apparently never been dissolved; and indeed it appeared on the "Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals" of September 13, 1944.

Did either the agreement of 1931 or that of 1936 violate section 1 of the act? The answer does not depend upon whether we shall recognize as a source of liability a liability imposed by another State. On the contrary we are concerned only with whether Congress chose to attach liability to the conduct outside the United States of persons not in allegiance to it. That being so, the only question open is whether Congress intended to impose the liability, and whether our own Constitution permitted it to do so: As a court of the United States, we cannot look beyond our own law. Nevertheless, it is quite true that we are not to read general words, such as those in this act, without regard to the limitations customarily observed by nations upon the exercise of their powers; limitations which generally correspond to those fixed by the "Conflict of Laws." We should not impute to Congress an intent to punish all whom its courts can catch, for conduct which has no consequences within the United States. *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.* (213 U. S. 347, 357); *United States* v. *Bowman* (260 U. S. 94, 98); *Blackmer* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 421, 437). On the other hand, it is settled law—as "Limited" itself agrees—that any State may impose liabilities even upon persons not within its allegiance, for conduct outside its borders that has consequences within its borders which the State reprehends; and these liabilities other States will ordinarily recognize. *Strassheim* v. *Daily* (221 U. S. 280, 284, 285); *Lamar* v. *United States* (240 U. S. 60, 65, 66); *Ford* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 593, 620, 621); Restatement of Conflict of Laws, section 65.

It may be argued that this act extends further. Two situations are possible. There

may be agreements made beyond our borders not intended to affect imports, which do affect them or which affect exports. Almost any limitation of the supply of goods in Europe, for example, or in South America, may have repercussions in the United States if there is trade between the two. Yet when one considers the international complications likely to arise from an effort in this country to treat such agreements as unlawful, it is safe to assume that Congress certainly did not intend the act to cover them. Such agreements may on the other hand intend to include imports into the United States, and yet it may appear that they have had no effect upon them. That situation might be thought to fall within the doctrine that intent may be a substitute for performance in the case of a contract made within the United States; or it might be thought to fall within the doctrine that a statute should not be interpreted to cover acts abroad which have no consequence here. We shall not choose between these alternatives; but for argument we shall assume that the act does not cover agreements, even though intended to affect imports or exports, unless its performance is shown actually to have had some effect upon them. Where both conditions are satisfied, the situation certainly falls within such decisions as *United States* v. *Pacific & Arctic Railway & Navigation Co.* (228 U. S. 87); *Thomsen* v. *Cayser* (243 U. S. 66); and *United States* v. *Sisal Sales Co.* (274 U. S. 268). (*United States* v. *Nord Deutcher Lloyd* (223 U. S. 512) illustrates the same conception in another field.) It is true that in those cases the persons held liable had sent agents into the United States to perform part of the agreement; but an agent is merely an animate means of executing his principal's purposes, and, for the purposes of this case, he does not differ from an inanimate means; besides, only human agents can import and sell ingot.

Both agreements would clearly have been unlawful, had they been made within the United States; and it follows from what we have just said that both were unlawful, though made abroad, if they were intended to affect imports and did affect them. Since the shareholders almost at once agreed that the agreement of 1931 should not cover imports, we may ignore it and confine our discussion to that of 1936; indeed that we should have to do anyway, since it superseded the earlier agreement. The judge found that it was not the purpose of the agreement to suppress or restrain the exportation of aluminum to the United States for sale in competition with "Alcoa." By that we understand that he meant that the agreement was not specifically directed to "Alcoa," because it only applied generally to the production of the shareholders. If he meant that it was not expected that the general restriction upon production would have an effect upon imports, we cannot agree, for the change made in 1936 was deliberate and was expressly made to accomplish just that. It would have been an idle gesture, unless the shareholders had supposed that it would, or at least might, have that effect. The first of the conditions which we mentioned was therefore satisfied; the intent was to set up a quota system for imports.

The judge also found that the 1936 agreement did not materially affect the * * * foreign trade or commerce of the United States; apparently because the imported ingot was greater in 1936 and 1937 than in earlier years. We cannot accept this finding, based as it was upon the fact that, in 1936, 1937, and the first quarter of 1938, the gross imports of ingot increased. It by no means follows from such an increase that the agreement did not restrict imports; and incidentally it so happens that in those years such inference as is possible at all, leads to the opposite conclusion. It is true that the average imports—including Alcoa's—for the years 1932 to 1935 inclusive were about 150,000,000 pounds, and that for 1936, 1937, and one-fourth of 1938 they were about 33,000,000 pounds; but the average domestic ingot manufacture in the first period was about 96,000,000 and in the second about 262,000,000; so that the proportion of imports to domestic ingot was about 15.6 percent for the first period and about 12.6 percent for the second. We do not mean to infer from this that the quota system of 1936 did in fact restrain imports, as these figures might suggest; but we do mean that nothing is to be inferred from the gross increase of imports. We shall dispose of the matter therefore upon the assumption that, although the shareholders intended to restrict imports, it does not appear whether in fact they did so. Upon our hypothesis the plaintiff would therefore fail, if it carried the burden of proof upon this issue as upon others. We think, however, that, after the intent to affect imports was proved, the burden of proof shifted to Limited. In the first place a depressant upon production which applies generally may be assumed, ceteris paribus, to distribute its effect evenly upon all markets. Again, when the parties took the trouble specifically to make the depressant apply to a given market, there is reason to suppose that they expected that it would have some effect, which it could have only by lessening what would otherwise have been imported. If the motive they introduced was over-balanced in all instances by motives which induced the shareholders to import, if the United States market became so attractive that the royalties did not count at all and their expectations were in fact defeated, they to whom the facts were more accessible than to the plaintiff ought to prove it, for a prima facie case had been made. Moreover, there is an especial propriety in demanding this of Limited, because it was Limited which procured the inclusion in the agreement of 1936 of imports in the quotas.

There remains only the question whether this assumed restriction had any influence upon prices (*Apex Hosiery Company* v. *Leader, supra* (310 U. S. 469)). To that *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* v. *United States, supra* (310 U. S. 150) is an entire answer. It will be remembered that, when the defendants in that case protested that the prosecution had not proved that the distress gasoline had affected prices, the court answered that that was not necessary, because an agreement to withdraw any substantial part of the supply from a market would, if carried out, have some effect upon prices, and was as unlawful as an agreement expressly to fix prices. The underlying doctrine was that all factors which contribute to determine prices must be kept free to operate unhampered by agreements. For these reasons we think that the agreement of 1936 violated section 1 of the act.

IV

THE REMEDIES

Nearly 5 years have passed since the evidence was closed; during that time the aluminum industry, like most other industries, has been revolutionized by the Nation's efforts in a great crisis. That alone would make it impossible to dispose of the action upon the basis of the record as we have it; and so both sides agree; both appeal to us to take judicial notice of what has taken place meanwhile, though they differ as to what should be the result. The plaintiff wishes us to enter a judgment that Alcoa shall be dissolved, and that we shall direct it presently to submit a plan, whose execution, however, is to be deferred until after the war. It also asks a termination of all shareholding in common between Alcoa and Limited; and that injunctions shall go against any resumption of the putative unlawful practices. On the other hand, Alcoa argues that, when we look at the changes that have taken place—particularly the enormous capacity of plaintiff's aluminum plants—it appears that, even though we should conclude that it had monopolized the ingot industry up to 1941, the plaintiff now has in its hands the means to prevent any possible monopolization of the industry after the war, which it may use as it wills; and that the occasion has therefore passed forever which might call for, or justify, a dissolution—the litigation has become moot. Limited on its part argues that, so far as concerns the Alliance—the only practice which we are holding unlawful—the war has killed it forever; and, more particularly, that the decision in *United States* v. *Hamburgische-Amerikanische Packetfahrt* (239 U. S. 466) is on all fours. We do not agree with either side; but, before giving our reasons, we must determine for what purposes we may look outside the record.

Both sides agree that the judgment in this action should speak from the time of its entry, like a decree upon an old bill in equity (indeed, until the advent of the new rules, the action would have been a suit in equity, though the bill was until then more properly described as a petition and the plaintiff as a petitioner). There is no reason why an appellate court upon deciding an appeal from such a judgment should not direct the district court what judgment to enter, and so it often does. Nor is there any reason why in deciding what judgment to direct, it should not advise itself from outside the record of such facts as appear to admit of no genuine dispute, i. e., should take notice of whatever the district court itself might take notice. Indeed, it would otherwise be impossible for an appellate court ever to dismiss an action upon the ground that it had become moot. We may, and we do, accept the figures of aluminum production in the report of the so-called Truman committee as of March 1944, which showed that the annual production of Alcoa's plants was about 828,000,000 pounds, that the production of plants owned by the plaintiff which it had leased to Alcoa, was about 1,293,000,000 pounds and that the production of the Reynolds and Olin plants was together 202,000,000 pounds; a total of about 2,300,000,000 pounds. The case is otherwise as to any facts already existing in August 1940, such as the amount of bauxite in Arkansas, as to which the Truman report also contains figures. Even though we took notice of these, the report would not be conclusive, or more than evidence. We could not constitutionally substitute it for the findings of a court after a trial—facts which a court may judicially notice do not for that reason become indisputable. Wigmore, section 2567a. At most we could do no more than treat the report as newly discovered evidence, and send the issue back for another trial, which in the present case we should under no circumstances be willing to do. For these reasons we refuse to take notice of facts relevant to the correctness of the findings, but we do take notice of those relevant to remedies.

After doing so it is impossible to say what will be Alcoa's position in the industry after the war. The plaintiff has leased to it all its new plants and the leases do not expire until 1947 and 1948, though they may be surrendered earlier. No one can now forecast in the remotest way what will be the form of the industry after the plaintiff has disposed of these plants upon their surrender. It may be able to transfer all of them to persons who can effectively compete with Alcoa; it may be able to transfer some; conceivably it may be unable to dispose of any. The measure of its success will be at least one condition upon the propriety of dissolution, and upon the form which it should take, if there is to be any. It is as idle for the plaintiff to assume that dissolution will be proper as it is for Alcoa to assume that it will not be; and it would be particularly fatuous to prepare a plan now, even if we could be sure that eventually some form of dissolution will be proper. Dissolution is not a penalty but a remedy. If the industry will not need it for its protection, it will be a disservice to break up an

aggregation which has for so long demonstrated its efficiency. The need for such a remedy will be for the district court in the first instance, and there is a peculiar propriety in our saying nothing to control its decision, because the appeal from any judgment which it may enter, will perhaps be justiciable only by the Supreme Court if there are then six Justices qualified to sit.

But there is another, and even more persuasive, reason why we should not now adjudge a dissolution of any kind. The Surplus Property Act of 1944 provides the method by which the plaintiff's surplus properties shall be disposed of: aluminum plants, and facilities among the rest, section 19 (a) (1). The Surplus Property Board, section 5a, is to designate one or more Government agencies to act as disposal agencies, section 10 (a), and they are to have responsibility and authority for the disposition of such property, and for the care and handling of such property, pending its disposition, section 11 (d), subject to the Board's regulations. These agencies may dispose of the properties by sale, exchange, lease, or transfer, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, and upon such other terms and conditions as the agency deems proper, section 15 (a). The following, among other objectives, are to regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property; (b) to give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free independent private enterprise; (d) to discourage monopolistic practices and to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small business concerns in an economy of free enterprise; (p) to foster the development of new independent enterprise; (r) to dispose of surplus property as promptly as feasible without fostering monopoly or restraint of trade * * *. So far as consistent with the usual and customary commercial practice preference is to be given to smaller purchasers, section 18 (b); to whom, when proper, money may be lent, section 18 (f). Finally, no disposal agency shall even begin negotiations to sell a plant which has cost over a million dollars without advising the Attorney General of the probable terms or conditions of the sale; and he in turn must tell the agency whether the proposed disposition will violate the antitrust laws. The act must not be read to impair, amend, or modify those laws, or to prevent their application to purchasers of surplus property.

In view of these declarations of the purpose of Congress, the "agency" which the Board "designates" to dispose of the plaintiff's "aluminum plants and facilities" may well believe that it cannot do so without some plan or design for the industry as a whole, some comprehensive model which shall, so far as practicable, reestablish free independent private enterprise," "discourage" monopoly, "strengthen" small competitors, foster independents and not foster "monopoly or restraint of trade." If it should find this method desirable, it would have to learn what purchasers were in the market, how strong they were, what units they could finance and operate, and in what position they would be to compete. In such a model or design the "agency" would have to assign a place to "Alcoa," and that place no one of course can now anticipate. Conceivably "Alcoa" might be left as it was; perhaps it might have to be dissolved; if dissolved, the dissolution would depend upon how the other plants were distributed. If the "agency" should find it wise to proceed in this way, it may succeed in inducing "Alcoa" to accept the place assigned to it, particularly if the plan has not been prepared ex parte. If it does not succeed, then, but then only, will it be appropriate for the district court to act. We do not of course mean that in deciding whether to dissovle "Alcoa," or how to do it, that court must be governed by any plan which the agency may have devised, if it does devise one. But, plan or no plan, it must wait until it learns what the "agency" has in fact done. Moreover, if the "agency" does form a plan, it will have been an attempt to realize the same "objectives" for which the court itself must strive; and the court may well feel that it should accord to the "agency's" plan that presumptive validity which courts are properly coming more and more to recognze in the decisions of specialized tribunals. Nothing which we now say ought in any measure to limit the discretion of the "agency" to proceed in this way. Therefore we shall merely reverse the judgment, so far as it held that Alcoa was not monopolizing the ingot market, and remand the case to the district court.

From what we have already said, we must deny the plaintiff's prayer that those shareholders who own shares in both Alcoa and Limited, shall dispose of one or the other. Since we have affirmed all the findings as to unlawful practices except the "price squeeze," again it follows that no injunction will go as to these. As to the "price squeeze" itself, "Alcoa" insists that, even if it was unlawful, it has been discontinued now for 12 years, and that there is no likelihood that it will ever be resumed. "Alcoa" might add that, since there can be no "squeeze" if "sheet rollers" can buy ingot at competitive prices, there can be no need of an injunction, if that privilege is assured to them; and that, since it will be assured to them when the final judgment is entered, an injunction would only bring coals to Newcastle. We defer for the moment any general discussion as to when abandonment of a practice ought to bar an injunction, for we shall have to consider it more specifically in the case of "Limited." It is enough here to say that, since "Alcoa" abandoned the "squeeze" only after it became aware that it was under investigation, it is in no position now to complain of whatever stigma there may be in an injunction; in such a setting there is no place for sensibilities; nor should lapse of time secure immunity. More can be said for the argument that "Alcoa" will be unable to "squeeze" at all, if it loses its monopoly; but no one can be sure how the industry may change, and it is impossible to say that the same practice may not in the future commend itself to those who may come into control; and at any rate there can be no injustice in making assurance doubly sure. An injunction will go against any resumption of the "price squeeze"; the terms to be decided by the district court.

Unless the issue has become moot, Limited also must be enjoined from entering into any cartel, or agreement like that of 1936, covering imports into the United States; and even though it had become moot we should have to reverse the judgment, though we should then dismiss the complaint without prejudice, as in *United States* v. *Hamburgische-Americanische Packetfahrt, supra* (239 U. S. 466). We think, however, that the issue has not become moot, and that there are vital distinctions between the situation before us and that then before the Supreme Court. A number of steamship lines had there agreed to apportion between them the carriage of steerage passengers upon a noncompetitive basis. Two or three of the lines were German, and the agreement was to end in any event on December 3, 1915. Moreover, it provided that "the withdrawal of any one of the lines from the contract should release all others from all future obligation unless the others agreed among themselves to continue," page 472. The decision was rendered on January 10, 1916, after the contract had come to an end, and after war had been waged for over a year between Germany and the Allies. The Court treated the last circumstance as putting an end to the contract which certainly it did, so far as concerned the German lines. As between the other parties the contract was also terminated, if the exclusion of the Germans because of the war was a "withdrawal from the contract," as it should have been regarded. Besides, the contract was of such a kind that the exclusion of the German lines probably made impossible the realization of its purposes in any part; for the traffic divided was only between European ports and the United States and Canada, and it would scarcely have value to any of the parties unless all the large lines joined.

The agreement of 1936, on the other hand, was to last for 99 years, though it could be terminated on 6 months' notice by any shareholder who held 200 shares, and all held as many as 200. As we have seen, the two German smelters had been exempted from royalties, and it is not altogether clear what future part remained for them in the enterprise, although some past obligations were compromised. It is true that some 18 months before war was declared the other shareholders ceased to perform the agreement, but no one ever gave the prescribed notice of dissolution and, formally at least, the agreement continued, and still continues. Indeed, it is possible that all but the German shareholders can start up the system again without renewal, if they please. The only doubt is whether the termination of the Germans' connection by the war automatically put an end to the agreement as between the others, and at least a strong argument can be made, in view of the provision for dissolution by notice, that it was not to be dissolved by the mere withdrawal of shareholders—certainly of shareholders who were not within the quota and did not share the royalties. Finally, the two situations differ in the fact that "Alliance" itself, as a corporation, still persists, and all the original shareholders presumably remain such. The mere cessation of an unlawful activity before suit does not deprive the court of jurisdiction to provide against its resumption; a "case or controversy" may remain to be disposed of. There are plentiful authorities so holding. *Southern Pacific Company* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission* (219 U. S. 498, 514–516); *Goshen Manufacturing Co.* v. *Myers Manufacturing Co.* (242 U. S. 202); *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Greyhound Lines* (303 U. S. 261, 271); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Goodyear Company* (304 U. S. 257, 260); *Walling* v. *Haile Gold Mines* (136 Fed. (2) 102, 105 (C. C. A. 4). To disarm the court it must appear that there is no reasonable expectation that the wrong will be repeated. That is not true in the case at bar. Unless we are to grant an injunction, we ought not pass upon the issue; if we do not pass upon the issue, we are by no means persuaded that "Limited," when peace comes, will not enter into another cartel which again attempts to restrict imports. It has insistently argued that the act does not cover such an agreement, and it alleges that it was forced into the cartel if it was to do a European business at all. It may be forced to do so again unless a judgment forbids.

The judgment dismissing the complaint against the Goods Co. will stand. The injunctions granted will embrace the officers of those corporate defendants against which they run.

Judgment reversed and cause remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with the foregoing.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Legislature, now in session, has approved House Concurrent Resolution

No. 24 memorializing the Congress to not create a Missouri Valley Authority with practically unlimited powers. As one interested in an early development of all the resources I heartily approve the action taken by our State legislature. Hon. C. C. Green, of Courtland, Kans., the author of this resolution, has for many years been active in the promotion of a program for the full and beneficial use of our water run-off. Congress is fully aware of the need for a planned program of this type and has on several occasions enacted legislation and appropriated funds for this purpose. Outstanding in this regard was the approval of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the river and harbor bill recently passed in this Congress. Both of these bills contain what is known as the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments. Those who are advocating a Missouri Valley Authority either overlook the important features of these two amendments or are more concerned about a Federal bureaucratic control of the entire valley than the actual accomplishments. The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments provide:

1. A congressional policy to recognize the interests and rights of States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders, and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control to preserve and protect established and potential uses for all purposes, and to limit navigation works to those in which substantial benefit to navigation will be realized.

2. Investigations which form the basis of any such plans shall be conducted in such manner as to give the affected States, during the course of the investigations, information developed and opportunity for consultation and opportunity to cooperate in the investigations with the Federal agencies in charge. If there is disagreement on plans, as between the Federal and the State agencies, the Federal agencies must submit the State point of view to Congress along with their own recommendations.

3. The use of water in the arid half of the Nation for domestic municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes are given a prior claim over that for downstream navigation.

4. The Secretary of War is authorized to make contracts with States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals for domestic and industrial uses for surplus waters in flood-control reservoirs.

5. The Secretary of the Interior can build reclamation works to utilize surplus water of flood-control reservoirs for irrigation under the Reclamation Act.

6. Congressional approval of a joint Army Engineer-Bureau of Reclamation plan for development of the entire Missouri River Basin, and the authorization of $200,000,000 to each agency to undertake the work.

7. An increase in the number of dams on the Snake River in Idaho and Washington from four to enough to provide slack water for navigation without a waste of water that could be used for irrigation.

In my opinion, no well-informed person in the West would permit these gains to be traded away for a federally controlled regional authority of any kind. The Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service are established agencies that are cooperating and coordinating a program for the entire valley. Congress has complete confidence in these agencies and I am sure will be most cooperative with them in the post-war period. These agencies have plans that will be of great benefit for the entire area as soon as they can be carried into effect. Why waste our time quibbling over a Missouri Valley Authority?

Following is a copy of the House concurrent resolution approved by the Kansas Legislature:

House Concurrent Resolution 24

Concurrent resolution relating to flood control and improvements in the Missouri River Basin and memorializing the Congress to not create a Missouri Valley Authority with practically unlimited powers

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for additional flood control and also for a further development of navigation on the Missouri River; and

Whereas plans are being made for an even greater development of the Missouri River, including a great development of irrigation; and

Whereas said improvements should be made at the earliest possible time in view of the destruction of life and property and the loss to industry, agriculture, and commerce caused by recent floods and the continuous waste of valuable water resources within this basin; and

Whereas improvements of the type contemplated have been carried on in the past by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, department of the Interior; and

Whereas the said Government agencies have had charge of such developments for many years and have planned and are prepared to execute the said works of improvement with no delay at the concusion of the war; and

Whereas it has been suggested that in order to further the progress of this development a Missouri Valley Authority should be formed with broad powers similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we endorse the aforementioned improvement program and recommend and urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, as now authorized by law, be given immediate adequate appropriation so that the plan can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy.

SEC. 2. That we commend the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for their action in effecting coordination of their activities within the Missouri River Basin.

SEC. 3. That while it may be necessary to create some permanent administrative coordinating agency to regulate the use of the water resources when development has been further advanced along the Missouri River and there is no objection to calling it a Missouri Valley Authority, we object, however, to granting to such administrative agency unchecked authority to engage in private business, operate farms, remove hundreds of thousands of acres of land from the tax rolls, take over the administration of education and of local and State laws and, in general, to do the economic planning for the entire area.

SEC. 4. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Kansas in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the legislature of each State bordering or through which the Missouri River flows.

States Sponsor Job Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "States Sponsor Job Bills," by Peter Edson, which appeared in the Washington Daily News March 27, 1945, together with copies of the California bills to which Mr. Edson makes reference.

There being no objection, the article and bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES SPONSOR JOB BILLS

(By Peter Edson)

Movements to introduce in State legislatures full employment bills patterned closely on the national full employment bill introduced in Congress by Senators MURRAY, of Montana; WAGNER, of New York; THOMAS, of Utah; and O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, are being watched in Washington with closest interest.

California is leading off this procession, with a State full-employment bill sponsored by the 36 Democratic Members of the State legislature. Accompanying the California bill is a resolution memorializing Congress to pass a national full employment bill as a necessary companion piece of legislation.

A similar bill is expected to be introduced in the New York State Legislature soon, and from advices there may be other State lawmaking bodies considering such measures this year, when 44 of the 48 are in session.

The California bill follows closely on the pattern of the parent United States Senate full-employment bill introduced, with the one important exception that it makes the primary responsibility for supporting maximum employment a function of the State government, and calls on the Federal Government to supplement the State aid.

By incorporating this provision in the California bill, one of the major criticisms of the Federal bill has been removed. When Senator MURRAY transmitted to the Senate without recommendation the first draft of a full-employment bill late in 1944, one of the cries raised against it was that it was more Federal paternalism.

One of the big kicks against W. P. A. was that it bypassed local government. By having a State government assume the primary responsibility, the Federal Government's load would be materially lightened and the move to put more of the functions of government back on the State level would be considerably furthered.

Aside from this one change, the California bill picks up much of the language of the revised Murray-Wagner-Thomas-O'Mahoney bill as introduced in the United States Senate in January.

The Governor would be required to submit to the State legislature an annual budget estimate on the total State economy, public as well as private, for the following year. Included in the budget would be an estimate of the labor force, and the number of job opportunities. On that basis the State legislature would be called upon to develop new industries, develop its resources, and encourage through State action public works and nongovernmental expenditures which would take up the slack.

Assembly Joint Resolution 18

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact the full employment bill of 1945

Whereas during the war the United States has expanded its economy to unprecedented levels, our total national production of goods and services at the end of 1944 reaching an annual level of $196,000,000,000; and

Whereas in California the impact of the war has resulted in similar expansion. Our civilian labor force has increased by over 1,000,000 and now numbers three and one-half million people despite selective-service withdrawals. The net income in California in 1944 amounted to some $14,000,000,000 as compared to $5,000,000,000 in 1939–40; and

Whereas, in considering the magnitude of the Nation's economic problems, we must remember that the present level of production has been reached through huge Government expenditures for war, and that, unless an economic substitute for war contracts is found, mass unemployment will become a serious threat; and

Whereas, in January 1944 the President of the United States in a message to Congress outlined the second bill of rights, one of its declarations being "the right of a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms or mines in the Nation." A few months later the President stated, "To assure the full realization of the right to a useful and remunerative employment, an adequate program must provide America with close to 60,000,000 jobs"; and

Whereas no thoughtful American—no matter what his creed or station in life—would deny that every man or woman in this country who is willing to work and capable of working has a right to a job; and

Whereas this right must be made meaningful by Government responsibility to insure continued employment; and

Whereas now pending in Congress is a bill introduced by Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, THOMAS of Utah, and O'MAHONEY, intended to maintain the post-war employment level at close to 60,000,000 jobs; and

Whereas this bill gives Government and private enterprise joint responsibility of preventing extreme fluctuation of business volume and insuring jobs for all, assigning to private enterprise the primary task of making the economy fruitful, with Government stepping in when private enterprise fails to balance the economy budget; and

Whereas said bill requires the President to submit to Congress an annual estimate of how much spending business can be expected to do and how many jobs this spending will support. If these figures are too low, the bill further requires the President to submit to Congress a program of Government spending and investment to raise the number of jobs to full employment; and

Whereas the welfare of California is intimately linked to the Nation's welfare; we cannot expect to have an island of joy and prosperity in California amid a national ocean of depression; and

Whereas the specialized nature of California's new productive capacities, both industrial and agricultural, can only find outlet in mass markets overreaching both State and national boundaries; and

Whereas it is essential for the economic security and stability of California that our plans form a part of a national over-all plan for full employment as provided in the Murray bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact the Murray full-employment bill of 1945 and to do so as early as possible in order that national machinery for employment security may be set in motion immediately; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

Assembly Bill 2136

A bill to add article 19 comprising sections 700 to 705, inclusive, to chapter 3 of title 1 of part 3 of the Political Code, relating to cooperative action between the State and the Federal Government, local governments, industry, labor, and agriculture for the purpose of assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, and to repeal chapted 631 of the Statutes of 1943 establishing the State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 19 is added to chapter 3 of title 1 of part 3 of the Political Code, to read:

"ARTICLE 19. PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGETS

"700. (a) The legislature declares that the maintenance of continuing full employment in the State of California and the Nation is essential to:

"(1) The fostering of free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the State of California and the Nation;

"(2) The assuring of the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all citizens of the State and of other States of the Nation who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise their right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment;

"(3) The promotion of the general welfare of the State and the Nation;

"(4) The protection of the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life;

"(5) The raising of the standard of living of the American people;

"(6) The provisions of adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans;

"(7) The full utilization of our national resources;

"(8) The development of trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations;

"(9) The strengthening of the national defense and security; and

"(10) The establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the responsibility of the State to cooperate with industry, agriculture, labor, local governments, and the Federal Government in achieving continuing full employment.

"(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the State to discharge such responsibility by

"(1) Cooperating with the Federal Government in determining

"(a) The estimated size of the labor force, including the selfemployed in industry and agriculture and elsewhere;

"(b) The estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force;

"(c) The estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

"(2) Pursuing such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will help stimulate and encourage the highest feasible level of employment opportunities through nongovernmental investment and expenditure;

"(3) Providing, to the extent that additional Government investment and expenditure are necessary, the largest feasible volume of such investment and expenditure through the State of California and the subdivisions thereof, thereby reducing the need for Federal investment and expenditure; and

"(4) Assuring that such investment and expenditure by the State of California and the subdivisions thereof are designed to contribute to the wealth and well-being of the State and the Nation and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

"701. The governor shall transmit a State production and employment budget to the legislature on the first day of each regular session, and in the years in which no regular session of the legislature is held on the second day of January to the joint committee provided for in section 703 hereof. Such budget shall set forth in summary and detail, for the ensuing year or such other period as the governor may deem appropriate:

"(a) The estimated size of the labor force in the State of California, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture and elsewhere;

"(b) The extent to which the number of employment opportunities will be consistent with the estimated size of the labor force, together with an analysis of the various factors, both national and local, affecting the number of employment opportunities;

"(c) A general program for encouraging, through State action, such nongovernmental investment and expenditure in the State of California as may best contribute to the achieving or maintaining of sufficient employment opportunities; and

"(d) A general program for providing such investment and expenditure by the State of California and its subdivisions, as may be necessary to help achieve or maintain sufficient employment opportunities;

"(e) A presentation of the relationship between the program set forth in accordance with (c) and (d) hereof and any national program of national production and employment budgeting which might be established by the Federal Government.

"702. (a) The State production and employment budget shall be prepared under the general direction and supervision of the Governor in consultation with the several heads of the State departments and commissions and with the officials of local governments throughout the State.

"(b) The Governor shall transmit to the several State departments and commissions and to local governments throughout the State such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years in the preparation of the State production and employment budget.

"(c) The Governor may establish such unpaid advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act, but the Governor may not delegate his ultimate responsibility for the presentation of the budget described in section 701.

"703. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee on the production and employment budget, to be composed of four members, two to be chosen from the membership of each house by the party caucus of each house of the legislature, one member from each house being representative of each of the major and minor political parties. This joint committee on the budget shall have the force and effect of a joint committee of the legislature and of an interim committee.

"(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) To make a study of the State production and employment budget transmitted to the legislature or to said committee by the Governor in accordance with section 701; and

"(2) To report to the senate and the assembly its findings and recommendations with respect to the State production and employment budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of the legislature dealing with legislation relating to such budget.

"(3) To meet on call of the Governor at any time when the legislature is not in session to receive any report of the State employment budget.

"704. (a) The Governor shall review quarterly all State investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which changing economic conditions warrant any change in the volume of such State investment and expenditure.

"(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of State investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the Governor may determine necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment.

"705. Chapter 631 of the Statutes of 1943 is hereby repealed and the functions therein assigned to the State reconstruction and reemployment commission and the director of reconstruction and reemployment are transferred to the Governor."

Florida's Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the third day of March was the one-hundredth anniversary of the signing by the President of the United States of the resolution which authorized the admission of Florida and also the admission of Iowa as States of the Union. On that day the Library of Congress, in Washington, had very fitting ceremonies in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of Florida's statehood. It was my privilege to deliver an address in Coolidge Auditorium, in the Library of Congress, on that occasion. I should like to have the RECORD bear permanent testimony of my gratitude and the gratitude of the government and the people of the State of Florida to the Library of Congress for the fitting exhibit, which now is in progress there, of things pertaining to Florida, and I also desire to have the RECORD show our gratitude for the celebration on the occasion to which I have referred.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address which I have mentioned printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My first pleasant duty is to express the profound thanks of all of Florida to the Library of Congress for this occasion and all that it means, for the magnificent exhibit which we shall all see and all that has been done to make this centennial significant, not only to the State but to the Nation.

And also to express our deep gratitude to the Post Office Department and to all those who have had a part in the issuance of the commemorative stamp which has given immeasurably more meaning to this Florida centennial and will preserve it in so distinctive a record.

And to all those who have thought of us on this occasion, we shall be ever grateful.

THE CONQUERORS OF IMMORTAL YOUTH

In 1893 the United States was surviving a business depression, and hearing the usual lament that opportunity had ceased because the frontier was gone, and there were no more fields to conquer. The still young State of Florida, less than 50 years old, could take these dismal stories lightly. For it was the country's last frontier about to enter an age of growth seldom equaled in history.

In that year the literary world was thrilled by the appearance of a small volume containing a series of exquisite sonnets, called the Trophies, written in French by a Cuban-born aristocrat, Jose-Maria de Heredia. His ancestor, Don Pedro de Heredia, founder of Cartagena in Colombia, had known the waters of Florida, for he had touched at Habana on his last voyage home to Spain. The romance of the Spanish conquests was familiar to the poet from childhood, and one of his finest sonnets was dedicated to Ponce de Leon. Heredia must have brooded intensely over that historic landfall, a little north of St. Augustine, on Sunday, March 27, 1513. It was the Easter season and perhaps the odor of flowers came out to sea from the woods:

"Through lonely seas his galleys bore
Until beyond Bermuda's misty shore
Rose Florida from skies no cloud obscured.
Blessing his madness, the Conquistador
Planted his pennon with a shaking hand
In the bright land so soon to be his grave.
Old Dreamer, happy was thy fortune for
Despite thee death made fair thy visioned land
And Glory to thee Youth immortal gave."

The poet used his sources freely: Ponce de Leon, wounded in Florida, died in Cuba.

Floridians agree not with his contemporaries who said that his search for the mysterious island of Bimini and the fountain of youth was a temptation from the devil. A long line of illustrious explorers laughed that opinion to scorn. It didn't frighten Diego Miruelo, who skirted the west coast only 3 years later, discovered Pensacola Bay, and started all Cuba to talking of Florida's wealth. After him came many others, including Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon, and Panfilo de Narvaez (1529), whose men launched the first ships built by Europeans in the United States, at Apalache Bay. Only four survivors, after ghastly hardships, returned to civilization. One of them was Cabeza de Vaca, whose narrative is the source of this story.

Then came the incredible Hernando De Soto, who landed at Tampa Bay on June 25, 1539, and soon plunged into the wilderness to explore Florida, which meant one of those vast, vague regions claimed by European nations, with magnificent gestures. Heredia dedicated another sonnet to the dark romance of his burial in the Mississippi:

"With Florida his conquests were not staid.
For such a death shall no mean tomb be made:
Let the great river keep him in its ward."

Florida was a beachhead for the early explorers, on their amazing marches into the continent in search of the fabulous golden cities and magic springs, which always lay farther and farther on. Death and disaster often were their portion: they were not seeking the right things.

As the vast, sprawling Spanish Empire expanded, and its wealth of mine and ranch began to pour across the ocean, its masters saw the need of guarding its gates. One of them, the Strait of Florida, then as now was a point of departure for shipping lanes. Through it, for generations, went the fleets that bore to Spain the luxuries of the Indies, and the bullion that provided the means of war and diplomacy. From that need sprang the Spanish plantation of Florida, leaving traces still visible in the romance, monuments, and culture of the State.

King Philip II, brooding over the problem, found the right leader in a hard-bitten soldier, Pedro Menendez de Aviles. He was a perfect model of the conquistadors, those sunburnt, bearded men in steel corslets, who left their indelible mark on this hemisphere from Florida to Patagonia:

"Glory has grooved the furrows on thy brow
And seamed thy cheek, illustrious cavalier;
The scars of wars and scorching suns appear
On that bold front that none could force to bow."

Appointed Governor and Captain-General of Florida, he established St. Augustine in 1565, after driving the French from Fort Caroline on the St. Johns River, by the simple expedient of the sword.

The French, led by Jean Ribaut, landed there in 1562. There were devout Huguenots among them, and on May 1, at Batten Island, they celebrated (probably) the first Protestant service in North America. And at Fort Caroline were born the first white children born in North America outside of Mexico.

Historians have disputed the morality of Menendez ever since; but historians do not found empires. He was not a pleasant foe; empire builders often are not. Neither was that tough seadog from the Zuider Zee, Jan Pieterszoon Coen, an early governor of the Dutch East Indies. One can imagine the fate of Menendez, had he fallen into the hands of Sir Francis Drake.

The coming of a practical city builder marked the end of wandering in search of Eldorado, and the beginning of settlements, garrisons, missions, and trade. Florida was no longer a dream or a poetic ornament, and became an outpost of empire, part of the "Rim of Christendom." The fortifications that rose at St. Augustine, under his orders, prophesied Florida's role for two centuries. He founded the city so solidly that it survived a raid by Sir Francis Drake in 1586 and one by the buccaneer John Davis in 1665. The better qualities of Menendez appear in stiff letters to his royal master. He was the real founder of Florida—a stern fighter whose gentler side inspired his wish to be buried in the habit of the Franciscans.

FOR CROSS AND CROWN

We often consider the Spanish empire as a caravan of miners, gauchos, and adventurers, and forget its solid and permanent everyday life, generation after generation. The quick blooming of modern Florida has obscured the old plantation that flourished much longer than the time since our government took over in 1821. From Menendez to Andrew Jackson—men who might have appreciated each other—was a stretch of over two centuries. St. Augustine had flourished over 50 years when the *Mayflower* anchored inside Cape Cod. It is our oldest city, the oldest to be made the see of a Catholic bishop. The parish of St. Augustine has a full record of parochial acts from 1594. That long period dotted the map of Florida with names suggesting Spain's veneration of the saints, and established the traditional architecture. In a distant and incredible future, a successor of Philip II, perhaps a trifle wistfully, would decorate the founder of Coral Gables, for adopting Spanish architecture for his dream city, hewn from the same coral rock that went into the ramparts of St. Augustine.

Volumes have been written about the old cities, soldiers, and missions. And the work of uncovering that past is still in progress under the auspices of the Florida Historical Society, one of our oldest, organized in 1857. The society's publications, edited by Dr. James A. Robertson, comprise one of our richest mines of source material from original records. A company of brilliant historians and archivists, for many years, has been revealing to Americans the heroic story of Spanish Florida.

From these researches has emerged the portrait of a conservative society of soldiers, planters, and priests, founded upon loyalty to the altar and the throne. It was not devoted to mere adventure, for there is excellent evidence of its stability in the fact that Spanish colonists and missionaries are credited with introducing nearly 200 cultivated plants into America. In Florida, that society was an outpost of empire, after 1700, confined by French Louisiana and the British colonies. Small garrisons held its borders, and its remotest reach was to Pensacola, founded in 1696.

Meanwhile, no terrors of wilderness or martyrdom halted the Catholic missionaries—first the Jesuits and then the Franciscans—who roamed from the Everglades to the sea islands of Carolina and Georgia. They went where no soldier ever trod, and many paid with their lives. The Franciscans stayed about 2 centuries, and at one time had about 70 priests and brothers directing 44 missions with 30,000 Indian converts. A Quaker, Jonathan Dickenson, cast away on the Florida coast about 1696, noted the civilizing influence of those friars. In deserted places of Georgia and Florida, one still finds traces of their buildings.

New Englanders glory in the translation of the Bible for the Indians, by John Eliot, in the seventeenth century. A lay brother of the Jesuits, Augustin, compiled a catechism and grammar in the Yamasee language about 1568, on the island of Guale (St. Catherines). And on Fort George Island, sometime after 1597, Father Francis Pareja composed catechisms, treatises, a grammar and a vocabulary, in the Timuquan tongue of Florida. The missions bore such names as St. Rose, St. Joseph, Holy Cross, Ascension, St. Vincent, St. Michael, Holy Faith, St. Mary, and Name of God. One, planted in 1567 and called Tegesta, was in the region of Miami.

All this became nearly forgotten, when Florida felt the onset of a more aggressive and commercial society. Although it had a governor, the province was thinly peopled, for immigration was a mere trickle beside the stream to Mexico and Peru, and the flood that poured into the English colonies. The English won because they brought their wives and hacked farms from the forest. Florida could boast of agriculture; orange trees grew at St. Augustine before 1575, and there were coffee plantations on the lower coast. But the Spanish Floridians were mostly soldiers and traders who liked towns, and left the soil to the Indian and the friar. When the United States took it in 1821, the peninsula was still mostly wild.

The English invasion was only a matter of time and population. After the founding of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1670 and 1732, clashes between Spain and the northern neighbors became frequent and sometimes bloody. Florida had become a pawn on the international chessboard, where great powers maneuvered for prestige, colonies, and trade, in the unmoral game of power politics. St. Augustine changed hands repeatedly, and now enjoys the fame of having been under five national flags—Spanish, French, English, United States, and Confederate. When Spain sided with France in the world-wide Seven Years War, one of the penalties she paid was to yield Florida to England in 1763.

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS

The commercial wand of the Anglo-Saxon made its first pass over Florida in the period 1763 to 1783, when the two civil governments of East and West Florida were established. From that rather casual gesture sprang the endless question of the West Florida boundary, whose intracacies make good training in historical research.

The field was wide open to the speculators and planters, whose grandiose plans brought Florida's earliest land "booms," which occur on an average of once a generation. The first of the "paper towns" was on Amelia Island, where in 1769 William Fuller laid out New Town on the site of Old Fernandina. By 1784 the dream city had mushroomed into two or three huts. About the same time, 1769, the fascinating Andrew Turnbull planted his colonists from Greece, Italy, and Minorca, at New Smyrna, named for the home town of his Greek wife. The idea was to cultivate indigo on a grand scale. Englishmen snapped up large tracts in East Florida, the Government tried to lure colonists from Louisiana and build up seaports, and Pensacola became a prosperous trading center. More than 25,000 whites poured in, including thousands of American loyalists, and roads began to supplant the age-old waterways.

Reading the brief history of British rule, one catches the modern tempo of Florida, and hears familiar themes in the hurried composition. In the 1760's Jesse Fish planted his internationally famous orange grove on the west side of Anastasia Island, near St. Augustine. By the seventies he was shipping to England, not only in bulk, but also the juice, sweetened with sugar and preserved with spirit. The famous Bartrams, father and son, came down from Philadelphia to botanize, and marvel at the rare new flowers and gentle climate. They were among the earliest of a long succession of scientists, including James Audubon, who roamed Florida to study its birds. The publicists were not idle, and we see the father of a familiar breed in Bernard Romans, whose Natural History of East and West Florida appeared at New York in 1775. He praised the mild climate and "prodigious vegetative power" of Florida, and noted how the Spaniards of Habana visited there for health. There was even a short-lived newspaper, the East Florida Gazette, issued at St. Augustine in 1783–84.

But the struggle between two worlds was not over, for although Spain was declining, she was too proud to give up without a flash of the conquistador spirit. The embarrassment of Britain in the Revolution was a chance to recapture a lost jewel. In 1779–81, West Florida succumbed to a force led by Bernardo de Galvez, a name suggesting the glorious days of De Leon and Heredia. The treaty of peace in 1783 restored both Floridas to the Spanish Bourbons.

Their grasp was relaxing, the missions were gone, the Indians were restless. Loose characters and fugitive slaves abounded, and involved worried Governors in growing troubles. And what were the boundary treaty of 1795, and the small garrisons, against the turbulent intruders from Georgia and the Carolinas? Typical of the new element, although more respectable than some, was the vigorous and irrepressible John Houston McIntosh, a former revolutionary officer from Georgia. The annals of Florida, after 1800, abound in the escapades of this stormy petrel, whose presence foretold the inevitable Americanizing of the peninsula. Many squatters flocked over the border and calmly took lands, without the form of a grant from the helpless Spanish officials.

After Thomas Jefferson squelched his constitutional scruples and purchased Louisiana in 1803, the interminable haggling about the west Florida question irritated American and Spanish diplomats. Long and tortuous negotiations, spun out through three administrations, finally meshed into the treaty of February 22, 1819, which recognized the inevitable by ceding the Floridas to the United States. It was not a purchase, as Spain never got any money at all. The Government of this country merely assumed about $5,000,000 in claims of our citizens against Spain. There was some grumbling, but generally the Nation agreed with Niles' Register that we had made an excellent bargain. The mystery behind that tangled skein of diplomacy, is still unfolding its riches.

For Spain, there was sadness in the transaction. The old outpost was a freak, as the empire south of the Gulf was dissolving in revolutions, and the treasure fleets were only gorgeous memories, buried like sovereigns in their robes of state. There was also some humor. As a result of the Georgians' invasion of east Florida in 1812, the Spanish Governor Kindelan prepared a challenge to a duel to send to President Madison. The very idea of "Little Jemmie" Madison, and pistols for two, is irresistibly funny.

FLORIDA, THE TERRITORY

The challenge might better have gone to General Andrew Jackson, but perhaps the Governor knew that man too well. For "Old Hickory" really was the stern nurse, under whose rough ministrations Florida moved toward the status of a Territory of the United States. The short-lived republics of West and East Florida, in 1810 and 1812, and his invasions of 1814 and 1818, were simply preludes to Spanish acceptance of the inevitable. Jackson's irruptions into Florida affairs were meteoric, and his brief quasi-military government in the transition period (1821–22) was in character. He soon departed for Tennessee, with his usual frankness admitting the impossibility of applying to restless Americans the practically absolute powers, inherited from the Spanish authorities. "I am clothed," he said, "with powers that no one under a republic ought to possess." This is interesting coming from one whose determined spirit often subjected him to the charge of being a dictator.

His insight was confirmed by the early political trend of the Territory, which did not favor paternalism. The President appointed the Governor, but the civil administration organized in 1822 did not long remain without a democratic element. Due to popular insistence, in 1826 the legislative council became elective.

The change was not too soon, as the publicists were busy again. William Darby lost no time in getting out his Memoir on the Geography, and Natural and Civil History of Florida, a fascinating volume which appeared in 1821, extolling this "invaluable acquisition." Two years later, appeared a similar publication for prospective settlers, by Charles Vignole, a world-famous civil engineer. Probably most effective of all these early "puffs" was James Grant Forbe's Sketches, Historical and Topographical, of the Floridas (1821). These writings—some of them treasures for a rare book collection—sound the note of modern Florida, stressing the potential wealth in the kindness of the climate to orchards, gardens, and health, and the favorable position of the peninsula near strategic routes of ocean commerce and naval action.

Naturally, a boom was soon in full blast. The outbreak of the Seminole War and the panic of 1837 took the hot air out of it, but left the territory firmly grounded upon the essentials of Florida's prosperity from that day until now. It is refreshing to test the popular notion of Florida, as a purely modern boom State, by the colorful material patiently collected by her scholars from the yellowing newspapers and magazines of the long-neglected territorial period. Florida's economy rests upon the produce of its forests, fields, and gardens, moved over a net-

work of railroads, which bring the seekers for health and pleasure, and many students to the growing schools.

Before the peninsula attained statehood, the economic and social pattern of today was emerging clearly. Sugarcane held favor with the planters for 10 years after American occupation. But King Cotton soon ruled west of the Suwannee, and in 1822, 226 bales arrived at New York from Apalachicola. The forest wealth of Florida amazed the pioneers, and in 1829 the naval station at Pensacola started the conservation and nursery of live oak timber for shipbuilding. In 1838–40 Dr. Henry Perrine, encouraged by the United States Government, became the pioneer horticulturist of south Florida. His nurseries of tropical and semitropical fruits, at Indian Key, were the forerunners of a mighty industry. The editor of a Tallahassee paper looked into the future, when he published this little item in 1829: "The planters wear smiling faces, especially those that are raising sugarcane." Cultivation of tobacco, dating back to the British occupation, was a mainstay of middle Florida by the forties, and in the preceding decade a brief enthusiasm for silk culture brought fabulous prices for mulberry groves about St. Augustine. In the winter of 1847 the editor of the Jacksonville News enjoyed a gift from the plantation of Henry Floyd, near Micanopy. It was a surprise to him—but Florida "segars" are not longer a novelty.

As plantations cut into the woods, and bales piled on the wharves, the first short railroads appeared—precursors of the mighty systems built by Plant and Flagler half a century later. Construction of the Tallahassee-St. Marks began in January 1835, but the locomotives were "hay burners"—horses and mules. The first completed service, from Bayou Columbus to St. Josephs, was opened on April 14, 1836, with a big celebration in Florida style.

Even before the rails, came the health seekers, who began to reach St. Augustine on sailing vessels in the 1820's. They were called invalids, and apparently didn't mind. Regular steamboat service in the forties swelled the stream, the railroads of the seventies and eighties broadened it, and the auto made it a flood. The attitude of the natives also broadened, as travelers became winter visitors and then tourists.

All that remains to round out the modern scene is brushed in by the educational movement, which brought Florida into the contemporary crusade for the lyceum and the free public school. In 1821 a public meeting, in the courtroom at St. Augustine, started the public library, which soon received well-known periodicals and newspapers. Twelve years later a city ordinance established a free public school, supported by taxation. The final touch of modernity was a petition in 1845, for a post office at the village of Miami.

By that time the society of Florida had "jelled" into the mold it retained for generations, as plantations spread over the northern counties, and politics revolved around the leisurely little capital at Tallahassee. For a frontier, Florida boasted a cultured and highly sociable people, charmingly described in a chapter of Sidney Walter Martin's recent scholarly book, Florida During the Territorial Days (1944). At Tallahassee there was a group of planting and political families, whose hospitable houses were the scenes of capital dinners and conversations. The people high and low, liked religious celebrations, oratory, banquets with toasts, racing, and politics. Public life was very personal, and blew the fires of journalism to the point where no blast was too hot. Editors went the limit, undeterred by the recognized right of appeal to the duel.

The early Baptist and Methodist preachers, who lost no time in crossing the border, were rather shocked by the occasional levities of that gay society and undertook to tone it down somewhat. They have had their reward, although the going was rough then, for today some three-fourths of the church members in Florida belong to their faiths.

That frontier territory produced a surprising number of eminent persons who left traces in American life. The Dictionary of American Biography, up to 1936, includes 13 native Floridians, of whom 11 were born in the British and territorial periods.

Long before 1845 the eyes of the country turned toward Florida. There was fought the devastating Seminole War, which dragged on from 1835 until 1843. Pressed from their hunting preserves by the tide of planters, the Indians took to their fastnesses and fought. At a cost of 1,500 soldiers and some $40,000,000, most of them were removed to a western reservation. The remnant withdrew still deeper into the wilds, where they remain. Not until 1926 did they petition to swear allegiance and become citizens. Theirs was the stubborn spirit of Osceola, the head war chief, who was seized at a parley under a flag of truce. Clapped into Fort Marion and finally Fort Moultrie at Charleston, he died in a few months, January 30, 1838. His name, meaning "Rising Sun" (from the hour of his birth), became world-wide, on post offices, trade-marks, and ships. One would like to hear Osceola's comments, if from the Indians' Happy Hunting Ground he knows.

The Seminole War killed many a fine soldier, and for others was a testing and a chance for distinction. Several young officers who served in it, gained high rank in the Union and Confederate armies. Among the naval officers was young Lt. Raphael Semmes, who commanded the Confederate raider *Alabama* and became one of the most famous seamen in our history.

FLORIDA THE STATE

At a banquet given in 1830 to do honor to Joseph M. White, Florida's Delegate to Congress, this toast was drunk: "Florida, as impatient to break into the Union as South Carolina is to break out."

Florida's ambition was realized when she was authorized to become a State of the American Union March 3, 1845. The resolution of admission authorized the entry of Florida and Iowa at the same time.

On June 25, 1845, 2 days after the general assembly received with great sorrow the news of the death of Andrew Jackson, Hon. William D. Moseley before a large, a joyful and noisy crowd, was inaugurated as Florida's first Governor. The inaugural ceremony was concluded by the raising of the two flags—the flag of Florida and the flag of the United States, attended by the firing of cannons and the singing of the stirring strains of Yankee Doodle. A little sidelight on the occasion appears in the Florida Sentinel of July 1, 1845:

"The capitol was thronged with belles and beaux—the crowd of the masculine gender without was unprecedented—the day was terribly warm and the arrangements, by and large, were not half so good as they ought to have been. Nevertheless, when at the conclusion of the Governor's speech the editor of the Floridian, standing immediately behind His Excellency, called out, 'Three cheers for Governor Mosely,' the delicate request was complied with to the extent of some 20 voices, which, indeed, forms a respectable basis for the exulting remarks of the editor aforesaid: 'The shouts and cheers of the immense concourse of citizens testified their pride and joy and their young State was organized.'"

It may have been an ominous suggestion of said future events that the first flag of Florida consisted of five horizontal stripes, white, blue, orange, red, and green, with the words "Let us alone" printed on its folds. It might be added that Governor Moseley triumphed over a Whig candidate when he became Governor. No doubt there are still some who think the Democratic Party is what some called the then Democratic Party of Florida (no doubt the Whig enemies) Locofoco.

Until the Civil War Florida rapidly grew and prospered, the State being spared much of the severity of the depression of 1857. On January 10, 1861, by a vote of 62 to 7, the Florida Secession Convention passed the Ordnance of Secession and the local militia took over Federal property and forts. Rockets and roman candles spurted over the live oaks of Tallahassee on the evening following the vote.

Florida gave generously to the Confederacy and suffered cruelly from the war. Although Tallabasseee, the capital, was never captured, Federal forces blockaded the ports and raided the State to destroy supplies of cattle and sugar. In 4 years the assessed value of real and personal property sank by one-half and by the spring of 1865, 5,000 Florida soldiers were dead, martyrs to that cause for which they, too, "gave the last full measure of devotion."

After the war came the tragic era. Florida had to wait until 1868 to regain her statehood. It might be interesting to note that by the Constitution of 1868 Florida's boundary on her west coast extends three leagues, nearly 10 miles, out into the Gulf of Mexico. It was 8 years before the State regained self-government and reconstruction has passed as much as possible into history.

After 1876 northern capital began to flow into Florida. The two great builders of the new Florida were Henry B. Plant and Henry M. Flagler. Plant, who first saw Florida when he arrived, rather primitively, by water on a trip for his wife's health, lived to traverse the State in a private car over the rails of his own company, the Atlantic Coast Line. With his railroads, hotels, and other private enterprises, he was the great builder of the west coast of the peninsula.

Henry M. Flagler built his railroad from St. Augustine, finally to Key West, and dotted the east coast with his magnificent and magnetic hotels.

These dynamic men not only opened the State to tourists but to agriculture and to growing industry. Two great Governors of Florida were contemporaries of Plant and Flagler—Gov. William D. Bloxham coming right after Reconstruction, and Gov. Napoleon B. Broward a little later. It was Governor Broward who started the fulfillment of his dream to drain the Everglades of Florida for agriculture. This area embraces some 5,000,000 acres of some of the most productive land in the world.

When yellow fever was conquered about 1900, Florida bounded ahead. When DDT becomes available for general use after the war, I am sure we can promise you that not even a harmless mosquito will mar the paradise of any part of Florida.

When Florida appeared in the United States Census of 1830, settlement was a narrow, irregular band along the northern border from St. Augustine to Pensacola, and there were only about 35,000 souls in this great territory. It took 30 years for the figure to reach 140,000, and then the wavering line had advanced down the west coast about to Tampa Bay. On the Atlantic side the march was even slower, and the census maps of 1890 and 1900 leave the whole Southeast looking empty and forlorn. When Bishop William Crane Gray, of the Episcopal Church, came from Tennessee to take charge of his vast missionary district of South Florida in 1892, he found himself on the frontier, with primitive means of travel.

By 1912 Mr. Flagler saw his causeway extend the Florida East Coast Railway to Key West. By 1930 Florida had gained a population of 1,468,211 people, had had a roaring real-estate boom, and its own colossal depression closing hundreds of its banks. It had experienced two disastrous hurricanes;

it had even gone for Hoover—literally been through the wringer—and yet it survived them all and was still strong and unafraid; still possessed of a determined and dynamic spirit.

In the decade following 1930, after all of its catastrophic twenties, Florida led the Nation with a 29-percent gain in population. Our population of 66,500 of 1845 has today grown into over 2,000,000. We have 45,000 miles of paved road, 7,500 miles of railroad, 153 airfields, and through our port of Miami passes the largest volume of air commerce in the Nation. Over 2,000,000 tourists a year, in normal times, enjoy Florida's climate and hospitality—and, I may add, leave some $300,000,000 very happily behind.

We produce almost 70 percent of the Nation's phosphate. Florida produces a greater variety of products of the soil than any other State—2,000,000 acres in farms and groves, citrus, tropical fruits, vegetables, cotton, corn, oats, hay, tobacco, potatoes, pecans, truck vegetables, sugarcane—totaling in value a hundred and fifty million dollars a year.

Florida, with 328 species, leads all Southern States in the variety of native trees. Our total production of lumber, naval stores, and pulpwood is valued at $50,000,000. Some 30 percent of the world's supply of naval stores, now critical war materials, come out of Florida's forests. Thanks to a great American, Dr. Charles W. Herty, Savannah, and modern methods of forestry conservation, we should have a perpetual supply of quick growing soft pine, producing pulp and pulp paper.

Those accustomed to think of Florida only in terms of palm trees and bathing beauties should know that we have many fine looking cows in Florida too. We have something like one and a half million head of cattle valued at $45,000,000, and we are now the twenty-eighth cattle State in the Nation and the largest producer of the South Atlantic States. In fact, the Lykes Bros. Ranch near Lake Okeechobee, has over 400,000 acres in a contiguous tract and many thousand head of cattle.

Today we are turning out $200,000,000 worth of manufactured products—ships, small boats, aircraft, machinery, trucks and trailers, amphibious tanks, lumber, canned foods, processed foods, fertilizers, phosphates, wood products, pulp and paper, brick and tile, clothing, cigars, and beverages. From the longest coast line of any State we derive marine products of more than $25,000,000 annual value. We believe that we produce principally through the most Hellenic city in the United States, Tarpon Springs, the finest sponges in the world.

The sugar industry, which was of considerable importance in the 1820's has had a real new birth and today is a great and growing industry in the Everglades, which we call the "sugar bowl" of the world. This great industry has but to be let loose by restrictive legislation to furnish from a million or more acres of the fallow Everglades a considerable part of the Nation's sugar supply at low cost.

New products, ramie, a fiber five or six times stronger than cotton, which entered into the garments of Egypt's ancient mummies, is having a new birth in Florida and, besides the great war use which it serves, will in the future be a great source of materials ranging from delicate window curtains to wearing apparel, rugs, and heavy cordage.

Industries are now making from palmetto roots of which we have, as you recall, an abundance, not only a material more resilient than cork, but a peacetime source of wall board and building materials. From ramie leaves, from bagasse, the product left when the juice is squeezed out of sugar cane, and from citrus peel, are being made some of the best cattle feed. Thousands of acres of tung oil groves now produce tung oil, the fourth most important chemical we import. Modern science and increasing research applied to Florida's large natural resources, offer an inviting contribution to the Nation and the world.

Good harbors around our long coast on the Atlantic and on the Gulf have made possible great ports and in wartime mighty ship yards. The State is uniquely served by inland water ways and by a large canal system which when completed will provide a 12-foot deep intra-coastal canal from Jacksonville to Key West and down the entire west coast from Pensacola to Miami and with the St. Johns River, a canal bisecting the peninsula from Jacksonville to Lake Okeechobee; also, two canals of the same depth, one across south Florida and one across north Florida, connecting the Atlantic and the Gulf. The north Florida canal is a realization of another dream—the recommendation of John Quincy Adams in 1826, that there be across north Florida an Atlantic-Gulf canal.

It is easy to say that Florida, to the surprise of the casual observer, is rapidly becoming a great industrial State, following the example of its esteemed rival, a State of which you have no doubt heard, California. With the mean average temperature being between 69 and 72 degrees, with many local resources to be processed, with water transportation available to almost every part of the State, and eventually access to the great northern markets through non-discriminatory freight rates, with a labor supply of steady and skilled people and a favorable citizenry and government, a government which has no State income tax or inheritance tax, one can well anticipate that Florida will be a great industrial State, especially small nonsmokestack industry, whose workers will live in comfortable homes, exempt to the value of $5,000 of any property tax, till fruitful gardens and beautiful flowers, and will still have hours a day to spend where their former bosses languished in luxury in the surf or eventually at the races.

I have not spoken, because it is not a unique contribution among the States, of Florida's more than 200,000 sons and daughters in the armed forces, nor of Colin Kelly, nor Lieutenant Ninninger, nor of all the others who are winning back the right of men and women and little children to live happily in lovely and inviting lands under God's good sun and his providence, all over the earth. May God make us ever worthy of those who do not come back.

We are proud too, of those who shall come back, back to the land which some say the Vikings visited; the sands, the coral reefs and the luxurious foliage which John Cabot may have glimpsed; the fair land Ponce de Leon viewed and called Pascua Florida; back to the land of the conquistadors and the missionary and the Indians and the sturdy English, and the ever-pressing Americans; the land of Andrew Jackson and of his wife, Rachel; the land of Governor Eaton and Peggy Eaton of Washington; the land where Napoleon's nephew, the son of the King of Naples, rests beside a Prince of the Soul, a boy who gave his life to save another; the land of five flags and four successive civilizations; the land of color and the sunshine of life; the land of the faithful farmer and worker; the land of Osceola and Bloxham and Broward and William Jennings Bryan and Thomas A. Edison, of Plant and Flagler; the land where St. Augustine still keeps her stately vigil of nearly 4 centuries over a continent which has truly become what the conquistadors held it to be "the hope of the old world."

Florida in America—America's Florida.
May God continue to bless and to keep us is our prayer.

Our Accidental Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, noted author and lecturer and friend of many Members of Congress, has recently delivered an address of historic value on Our Accidental Presidents. He said in part as follows:

It is a surprise to many Americans to know that only 19 of the men who have served the Nation as President were active candidates for a party nomination and became President because a majority of the American people voted in their behalf. Twelve of the 31 Presidents may be called accidental Presidents, this for the reason that three of them, John Quincy Adams, Rutherford B. Hayes, and Benjamin Harrison became President despite the fact that there were other men who received more votes than they, at the time of their election. Three others, James K. Polk, Franklin Pierce, and James A. Garfield were not seekers for a Presidential nomination, but were taken up by their respective parties in nomination in an eleventh hour deadlock, nominated for the Presidency and later elected by a majority of the American people. Six others became President because they were serving as Vice President when the President under whom they served died in office. That six were Tyler, Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge. Of this number, only Roosevelt and Coolidge were able later to win the Presidency in their own name.

Let us look at this fortunate 12. John Quincy Adams, son of John Adams, our second President and, like his father, a Harvard graduate, scholar, diplomat, and statesman, was chosen by the House of Representatives as President, though Andrew Jackson had received both more popular and more electoral votes than Adams in the previous November election. The homes of the two Adamses, both their birthplaces and homes as ex-Presidents, were near each other in a small village near Boston, and their bodies now rest near each other in an old church in their native village of Quincy.

Rutherford B. Hayes received 250,000 fewer popular votes in the entire country than did Tilden, his Democratic opponent in the campaign of 1876. When a contest was entered, a strange commission was chosen by Congress, called an Electoral Commission, which voted in favor of Hayes by one electoral vote majority only Hayes, himself, was never sure of his own title to the high office which he held for 4 years only.

Benjamin Harrison of Indiana, grandson of William Henry Harrison, a former President, received 100,000 fewer popular votes than did Grover Cleveland, Harrison's opponent, who, like Andrew Jackson many years before, was three times the choice of more people for President, though he only held that office for two terms. Cleveland even carried Indiana, the adopted State of Harrison.

James K. Polk, our first dark-horse President and the only former Speaker of the House and graduate of a State University to be President, was a protégé of Jackson and was born near the birthplace of Jackson, not far from Charlotte, N. C. He was an

honor graduate of the University of North Carolina and was also the only ex-President who had his mother at his bedside at the time of his death.

Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire was put forward by Virginia delegates in a Democratic convention at Baltimore in 1852, the same city in which Polk won his dark-horse nomination, after a long-drawn-out effort to nominate other candidates. Polk had gone to the Mexican War a private soldier and had returned home a general. His opponent for the Presidency when he won was General Winfield Scott, who had been the head of all the armies in the Mexican War, when Pierce had first entered it as a private soldier. Pierce lived farther north than any other President.

James A. Garfield, our third dark-horse nominee for President, was the only President who went directly to that office from the office of Congressman. He went to Chicago as the champion of John Sherman, of Ohio, who actively sought the Presidential nomination which was thrust upon Garfield as the result of a brilliant address which Garfield made in nominating Sherman. Garfield had had an unusually brilliant career, having become a college president, a State senator, a Member of Congress, and a general in the Civil War, all in less than 7 years from the time he graduated from Williams College. His death at the hands of an assassin less than 1 year after he became President was one of the tragedies of American history.

John Tyler, who succeeded William Henry Harrison 30 days after Harrison had taken his oath of office as President and died, had been an obscure candidate for Vice President in 1836, 4 years before he was put on a ticket with Harrison, for the reason that other men had refused such a place. Among that number was Daniel Webster, who also spurned the Vice Presidential nomination 8 years later, accepted by Fillmore, who, like Tyler, became an accidental President. Tyler and Harrison were natives of the same county in Virginia, Charles City County, and each was the son of a former Governor of Virginia. Harrison went to Congress from the northwestern territory when 26 years of age, and Tyler was a Virginia Congressman at only 25 years of age. Tyler's career as President was a stormy one, since he was a Democrat with a Whig Congress on his hands. He had the largest family of any President, 14 children in all, the youngest of whom, Mrs. William Ellis, now lives on a farm near Shawsville, Va.

Millard Fillmore, of New York, became President after the death of Zachary Taylor, of Louisiana, the last southerner to go to Washington as President, 96 years ago. Fillmore had been defeated both for a Vice Presidential nomination and also for Governor of New York prior to winning the Vice Presidential nomination which later put him in the White House. Eight years after his election as Vice President he tried in his own name to be President and carried only the State of Maryland in the November election.

Andrew Johnson, a native of North Carolina, who succeeded Lincoln as President, won eternal fame as the one lone southern Senator who opposed secession. At Lincoln's request, he was Lincoln's running mate in the campaign of 1864, when the war was on, and fell heir to the Presidency when Lincoln died so tragically at the hands of Booth, his assassin. Johnson, by one vote only, escaped losing the Presidency in the impeachment trial which took place in the Senate Chamber, where he had won fame as the defender of the Union. Ben Wade, of Ohio, Speaker pro tempore of the Senate, would have been President had Johnson been removed from office.

Chester A. Arthur, a native of Vermont and adopted son of New York, was put on the Presidential ticket with Garfield to appease the forces of Grant, who had tried to win for Grant a third-term nomination for President. Arthur had held only one political position before—that of collector of the Port of New York, from which position he was removed by President Hayes for pernicious political activity. Despite his efforts to win a place as a great President, his name is obscure.

Theodore Roosevelt was put on the ticket with William McKinley in the campaign of 1900, primarily to shelve him as a political figure. He had already been successful as a historical writer, as a soldier in the Spanish-American War, and as Governor of New York, and was only 42 years of age. When McKinley fell at the hands of an assassin at Buffalo after, making a historic address Theodore Roosevelt, only 42 years of age, became then and now our youngest President. He was the first of our accidental Presidents who won that high office later in his own name. Theodore Roosevelt's body rests in a rural cemetery near his home at Oyster Bay, N. Y. Like the tombs of Jefferson, Cleveland, and Coolidge, there is nothing upon the tomb of Theodore Roosevelt to tell you that he was once an American President.

Calvin Coolidge, the last of our accidental Presidents, was a native of a small Vermont village where he was born in the rear of a small store, in which village he took the oath of office at an early morning hour by the light of an oil lamp, at the hands of his justice-of-the-peace father when President Harding died in 1923. Coolidge had lived his life as a public man largely in Massachusetts and it was in that State that he won the fame as Governor, which made him first Vice President and, later, President. He has been correctly called a Puritan in Babylon. He was President during an era of our history which has probably not yet been correctly defined by historians. He won distinction primarily as a man of silence, and like Theodore Roosevelt, was able to win in his own name the high office which had first come to him purely by accident.

Of the 31 men who have been President of the United States, 29 of that number now sleep the sleep of the dead. We have only one living ex-President, Herbert Hoover. When Lincoln first became President, there were 5 other living ex-Presidents, Van Buren, Tyler, Fillmore, Pierce, and Buchanan, the immediate predecessor of the unfortunate Lincoln.

Our present President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, though he has been elected four different times by the American people, is only one of three of our Presidents who has been three times or more the choice of the voting public. Jackson and Cleveland were the other two.

Woll Opposes Bill To Permit President To Cut Tariffs Anew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of organized labor are fully alive to the implications of the most recent Roosevelt demand that the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act be continued, and that another 50 percent cut in tariff rates be permitted, is indicated by a statement issued by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, who is known throughout this country as one of the sanest, soundest, and most patriotic men we have. I submit the following newspaper article incorporating Mr. Woll's statement for the information of the House:

WOLL OPPOSES BILL TO PERMIT PRESIDENT TO CUT TARIFFS ANEW

Unalterable opposition to President Roosevelt's request for authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements lowering further this country's tariff rates was registered yesterday by Matthew Woll, a senior vice president of the American Federation of Labor, speaking as head of the American Wage Earners' Protective Conference.

Woll, in a statement to the Post, acknowledged that he favored extension of the power to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties on the existing basis for only 1 year, instead of the 3 requested, with the proviso that the authority be restricted to prevent the importation of goods below American cost of production when American goods are once again commercially available.

Other officials of the A. F. of L., which has thus far remained silent on the tariff issue, are believed to favor the administration's program, along with large elements of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Republican opponents of the administration's plan which calls for authority to lower tariffs a total of 75 percent below original levels or 50 percent below present levels have stressed the importance of a high tariff policy to both farmers and wage earners.

Woll's statement said:

"The chaotic world conditions which will continue at least until the end of the present war do not warrant an extension for the authority to enter into trade treaties for more than 1 year. * * *

"We are unalterably opposed to the request for authority to reduce present tariff rates an additional 50 percent. Tariff rates have already been reduced to less than the difference in costs of production as found by studies of the United States Tariff Commission.

"We favor an amendment to the authority to enter into trade treaties which would provide that no competitive foreign-made goods be permitted entry at total landed costs, tariff duties paid, which costs are less than American costs of production when American goods are commercially available."

Another Rebuff for the Would-Be Tax-Dodge Advocates—Illinois Joins Rescinding States—Score Down to 13 Endorsing Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted for the RECORD on several occasions charts which showed the status of endorsing or rescinding resolutions passed or being considered by the various State legislatures relative to the limitation of the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes on incomes, estates, and inheritances.

These status charts have shown that April 13, 1943, House Joint Resolution 32 was introduced in the Illinois Legislature memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the tax-limitation amendment to the Constitution.

House Joint Resolution 32 passed the house on May 15, 1943, and the senate concurred in the House action on May 26, 1943, placing the State of Illinois on record as favoring this vicious amendment. I do not know what representations were made to the legislators by the proponents, but I am sure that if the facts had been known to the members of that legislative body, they would never have endorsed this insidious plot. I know that many of the citizens of that State were incensed to discover that this had been put over without their even having seen any publicity about its being considered.

For instance, a member of the clergy from Illinois addressed a letter to me early this year and had this to say:

It seems that this issue has gone pretty far already in some States, and it is about time we start a little opposition. I note that Illinois is among the States which have already adopted a resolution to put through such legislation. They certainly have kept this matter very quiet, for I have not heard of it. I'll be interested in knowing who was responsible for its inception at Springfield.

On January 8, 1945, a rescinding resolution, House Joint Resolution 7, was introduced in the Illinois Legislature. This rescinding resolution would undo the damage done by passage of House Joint Resolution 32 back in 1943.

I was very much pleased to receive, on March 13, a telegram from one of the Illinois House members, as follows:

Illinois House of Representatives repealed Committee for Constitutional Government resolution.

And yesterday I received the following wire from two members of the Illinois House:

Our senate today voted to rescind constitutional amendment.

That is another expression by a group of legislators who have been given the facts. That expression also reflects the opinion of an informed and aroused constituency that has passed on to the legislators its feelings after it has had an opportunity to receive and study the facts. This is another group of legislators who are to be commended for prompt corrective action—the same commendatory remedial action which was taken by the legislators of Iowa, Wisconsin, and Arkansas.

From all the information I have been able to find the proponents are still clamoring that they have the endorsement of 17—one advocating organization goes so far as to say 18—States—they say nothing of the rescissions. However, they are cautious enough and clever enough to phrase their remarks so that they say that many States have passed the resolution—this is another example of the deceit and misrepresentation with which the group's activities and propaganda have been characterized.

As long as the Committee for Constitutional Government and the other proponents continue to hand out their falsehoods, I shall have to continue to periodically bring out the true score. Of the 17 States which have endorsed the principle of the twenty-second amendment, we now have 4 which have rescinded, and, regardless of the proficiency and convenience with which plain arithmetic problems are juggled by our friends, Mr. Pettengill, Mr. Gannett, Mr. Rumely, and Mr. McClure, the score is down to 13 endorsing States. What is of particular disturbance to the above four gentlemen is the fact that other States are considering similar rescinding resolutions.

As I have mentioned, once a State has endorsed, the only way to get that endorsement off the scoreboard is to have the legislature of that State pass such a rescinding resolution. An endorsing resolution remains good year after year unless rescinded, and it is upon this fact that the proponents have so relied. The game which they are playing is a big one—naturally, they would very much like to have had this thing put over quickly, but in the absence of that possibility they could well afford to work year after year, slowly adding one State after another to their list until their goal was reached.

Little did they dream that anything could interfere with their past successes—that any State would reverse its position was something that they had not taken into consideration. Well, unfortunately for the sponsoring group, I, for one, along with others, had the nerve to expose them and cause just such reversals—with full knowledge that I and the others who have dared raise our voices against their activities would be subject to every despicable tactic which could be conceived by the fertile brain of the four horsemen mentioned above—tactics devised expressly for the purpose of getting us out of their way so that their little plot would roll along to success. The group must be wondering what hit them to find their score rolling backward instead of forward. The light has been turned on.

I am including herewith an editorial which has come to my attention relative to the proposed amendment—the editorial is titled "An Unwise Tax Limit," and appeared in the Jackson, Miss., News of March 15. I wish that all of the citizens and legislators of that State would read it carefully and then delve into the motives and the motivating forces behind the proposed tax-limitation amendment. I am sure that if they would do this, they, too, would be as anxious as the people of Arkansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois to correct their former mistake. As you know, Mississippi passed an endorsing resolution back in 1940. It is still effective. It has not been rescinded.

The editorial follows:

AN UNWISE TAX LIMIT

Spreading like a malignant disease, a creeping paralysis, through the State legislatures, is a proposal to make 25 percent the maximum tax that may be levied by Congress on any income, inheritance, or gift. This would be achieved by constitutional amendment. Already 17 State legislatures have adopted resolutions asking Congress to call a convention to move for such an amendment. If 32 States should adopt the resolution, the constitutional convention must be called to draft and submit such an amendment. If 36 States should then ratify it, the proposed ceiling on those particular taxes would go into effect.

This plan to protect the recipients of large incomes, inheritances, or gifts, against taxation based on their ability to pay, is not a natural growth. It is something that has been developed and quietly maneuvered through one legislature after another by an organization which calls itself the committee for constitutional government, or, sometimes, the committee to uphold the Constitution. Names with it are those of Frank Gannett, New York newspaper publisher; Sam B. Pettengill, an ex-Congressman; and Edward A. Rumely, convicted of being a German agent during World War No. 1 and now under indictment, awaiting trial, for contempt of Congress—refusal to reveal the names of contributors to the committee for constitutional government.

The success of this group thus far has mystified Washington. More than that, it seems to have mystified some of the States. Members of some of the legislatures, now on record as having voted for the resolution, say they were unaware of what was happening at the time.

The attention of Congress having been called to the matter by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, members of the House Ways and Means Committee are becoming disturbed. Some of them, at least, do not like the prospect of writing post-war tax bills with their hands shackled by such a constitutional restriction. The proposed amendment would apply only to peacetime taxes, but Congressmen point out that the Government's need for revenues will not cease the day the war ends. They have in mind heavy expenses of the transition period, the care of veterans and so forth. They agree that lower taxation on large incomes would mean higher taxation on small incomes; that the 25 percent, in effect, would become the minimum, as well as maximum, for many taxpayers now required to pay less. Those opposed to sales taxes and excessive excise taxes believe that such taxes would become inevitable if the proposal to relieve the big taxpayers should be carried out.

Marriner S. Eccles, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, sees another threat in the Gannett-Pettengill-Rumely plan. "I can't imagine any action that would be more inflationary," he told the House Banking Committee.

Under ordinary times and conditions it may seem that a 25 percent take by Government from large incomes, estates, and inheritances is quite liberal, and the take should not go beyond that figure, but it must be borne in mind that these are not ordinary times and conditions under which we are living. They are extraordinary times and they may develop such unusual conditions during the post-war period that a levy heavier than that named will be imperative. Certainly, in this topsy-turvy and highly uncertain period restrictive legislation of any kind is unwise.

The State legislatures that have fallen for the plan apparently have been persuaded that relieving big incomes from heavy taxation would release a great flood of risk capital. This capital, it is asserted, would flow into all kinds of active enterprises and vast numbers of jobs would be created.

Maybe so, but there is much room for doubt. The builders of America's great industries, and of America's small industries for that matter, have not been the kind of men who band together to protect their constitutional right to hold on to everything that comes into their hands.

The industry builders have been men ready to take a risk, men with the courage to compete with established concerns, men driven

by desire—or necessity—to produce something, some article or service, better than has been produced before.

The promoters of the proposed amendment, on the other hand, seem to be asking the Government to guarantee their riches for the rest of their lives and the lives of their children and grandchildren. They are asking to be freed from the need to hustle. They want a sure thing.

Tax experts in Congress and out are seeking a formula of incentive taxation that will lead to widespread investment in productive job-making enterprises. They cannot see in this proposed constitutional amendment anything remotely resembling the formula they seek.

Post-war Chemical Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, in the extension which follows, I find much food for thought. Mr. Gaston du Bois is one of America's leading chemists and an executive of Monsanto Chemical Co. in St. Louis, Mo.:

[From Chemical and Engineering News of January 25, 1945]

POST-WAR CHEMICAL PLANNING

(By Gaston Du Bois)

In and out of favor during 1944 as the tide of war ebbed and flowed, post-war planning still remains of vital importance. Such planning should go deeper than just reconversion. We are dealing with the future of America—with the creation of new jobs through new industries and new activities. This process involves research, trials, delays—an incubation period, when expenditure of materials and labor is relatively small. Baruch put it aptly in a report to the President: "Victory is our first and only duty, but just as we prepare for war in time of peace, so should we prepare for peace in time of war."

Last November the Nation suddenly awoke and found that America was short of many essentials for warfare. Since then post-war planners have been about as popular as were interventionists before Pearl Harbor when they advocated America's preparation for and entrance into the European war. We entered the war unprepared and it took us 1½ years, or until June 1943, before we were able to attack effectively on the western front.

It has been very convenient to have allies holding the line between us and the enemy while we were getting ready, as England, France, and Russia were doing in the last war and are again in this war. We shall not always be so fortunate, nor can we hope to be so favored when we face domestic post-war problems.

We are now asked to soft-pedal post-war planning. In reviewing this request we in turn ask: Is it not more healthy and desirable to go counter to conventional thinking because the situation is serious enough to justify thorough examination from every angle? Why not wake up to realities and face our problems unemotionally and without partisanship?

We all agree with Mr. Baruch's statement in a letter to the President: "Victory is our first and only duty, but just as we prepare for war in time of peace, so should we prepare for peace in time of war."

The one thing which strikes me very forcibly is the fact that practically all of our post-war planners—and there are many—talk of reconversion only. Business and labor think in terms of reconversion; our administration in terms of reconversion in America and rehabilitation of foreign countries. Why are we so blind as to think that the economic development of our Nation is mainly a problem of reconversion? We chemists who have had experience in the development of new job-creating projects should know better. We know that a large part of our present manufacturing operations is the result of research of the last few years and we agree with a spokesman for one of our large chemical companies who recently said:

"The great research laboratories which have been established in America since the last war represent a national asset of extreme importance in the solution of future problems, particularly the problem of providing adequate employment at our high American standards. In 1942, 46 percent of my company's gross sales consisted of products that either did not exist in 1928 or were not then manufactured in large commercial quantities."

Bradley Dewey, who was so closely connected with the administration of our synthetic rubber program, recognizes that our success was due not merely to good administration and production, but to a far greater extent to developments which preceded our actual entrance into the synthetic rubber field. Mr. Dewey's recent statement recognizes the fact that notwithstanding the knowledge brought to this country by foreign contacts of one of our leading oil companies, our synthetic rubber plants "could not have been built without utilization of the great technological developments of the last two decades."

We had at hand fully developed the arts of high-temperature cracking and high-alloy steels, the art of welding these metals, also the marvelous and intricate control of continuous operations by means of instruments. These developments were necessary to and preceded our synthetic rubber production. Despite these prior developments, our synthetic rubber manufacture was purely a war project where cost was not of prime importance. We had to have rubber, and we went ahead, regardless of cost.

In peacetime such procedure would not be practical. An expensive plant would not be competitive with a plant built at a much lower cost, and we must realize that post-war planning is far more difficult than planning for war, because we cannot now afford to spend another $200,000,000,000 for jobs. This time we must invest—not spend—and investing requires more careful planning than does mere spending.

Our future economy and jobs will depend, among other factors, on reconversion, which is generally understood, but perhaps even more so on creation of new activities, a fact which is not well understood.

Reconversion, as generally understood, means simply the restoration of pre-war manufacturing status. We are determined to deal with the reconversion problem promptly after V-day, and on the whole, both Government and industry are cooperating in the solution of this problem. When I say "cooperating" I mean just that, because industry and Government should not overlap; they each have clear-cut tasks.

The Government has its particular tasks in connection with post-war problems which are important and should be done efficiently. The Government should conscientiously dispose of $100,000,000,000 worth of surplus property. It should take care of our foreign relations, and in particular, create the proper atmosphere for the development of foreign commerce. It should clean its own house, discharge unnecessary help, discontinue unnecessary jobs, and, needless to say, in so doing eliminate as far as possible all partisanship.

A TASK FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

The creation of new jobs through new industries and activities under our system of Government is primarily a task for free enterprise—that is, for anyone who has the will to take risks and do things. It is up to industry, to farmers, to transportation systems, to business in general—to all those who pay their employees directly out of earnings and not through taxation.

It should be emphasized that our problem is not merely one of reconversion, but also, and quite as important, it consists in the creation of entirely new things, new demands, and new activities, which alone can give jobs to an increased number of workers working shorter hours and at higher rates than before the war. That is truly a major problem and one which cannot be solved by reconversion alone.

The creation of new industries is a slow process extending frequently over a period of many years, during which time and capital are expended without certainty of return. This creative process involves research, trials, delays, or, in a nutshell, a certain incubation period, during which time the expenditure of materials and labor is relatively small. Nevertheless, this incubation period is an essential part of any new development and cannot be bypassed nor materially shortened, and it therefore follows that any hindrance to this incubation period will mean a delay in the development of the project.

But here is a blind spot in our vision, because in the face of these conditions we are told that nothing can be done now to prepare for the future until the critical war period is over, meaning probably until Germany has been defeated. War work comes first—that is well understood—and I see no objection to the attitude of the War Production Board which precludes for the time being any so-called reconversion activities. Reconversion will require much labor and material. For instance, if we start now to make automobiles for civilian consumption, that would be reconversion, but because of the heavy consumption of materials and mass utilization of labor, such a project would certainly affect our war program.

When we first started making automobiles at the turn of the century, we created a new industry, which is something quite different from reconversion. The development of this industry required, in its initial stages, a relatively small amount of labor and material. Jobs do not spring out of the ground. Our free enterprise system creates these jobs, which are very important to our future economy. Therefore, we should not be satisfied to let a Government bureau tell us to what extent it will be necessary to restrict the development of new projects.

We are dealing here with the future of America and the proper handling of a problem of this kind should involve consultation between Government and industry so as to determine how and when a start should be made. It is not up to the Government to command; it is up to both partners to consult with each other, particularly in a case where one of the partners knows very little about creation of new industries, and when there is a distinct possibility that these creative efforts can take place, to some extent at least, without interfering with the war effort. If any controls are necessary, industry will gladly yield, but it is just as necessary that the Government control its own preparations for post-war, just as industry does.

Is it true that 40 Diesel electric generating plants are being built in this country for Russia, to be used for rehabilitation of devastated Russian territory? How much help is

the Government giving to aid in the long-range hemisphere development for the industrial expansion of Latin American countries? Many of these Government projects were started primarily to secure important raw materials, but we may well inquire whether such activities which have to do with post-war planning for the benefit of Latin American countries are subject to the same limitations and restrictions as apply to our own internal developments. These are important questions which should be considered by both partners, Government and free enterprise.

We technologists should look beyond reconversion because we realize that full employment can only be attained through the creation of new enterprises. We realize that such developments require a certain incubation period which, if delayed, will delay the creation of new jobs. It should be possible for industry to pilot plant these new developments now, even though we delay reconversion work, and to do so we must sell this idea to our partner in Washington, so Government, in turn, can cooperate with us.

Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the growth of a true cooperative organization is most commendable, provided it is on its own capital, but the growth and expansion today in the very large so-called cooperatives, at the expense of Government money, provided by all taxpayers, is another subject entirely. Easy credit money to these cooperatives, supplied by the bank for cooperatives, derived from taxpayers' money, is becoming a most serious question. As I understand it, their money comes from the United States Treasury, at a low cost of 1 percent. Some of this money is then invested in debentures or Government bonds, and a profit is shown, all of which is a bookkeeping transaction and profit derived at the expense of the American taxpayer. This question is one that must be met soon. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert an analysis of a manufacturer on this tax question, which will prove most interesting:

I have read the twenty-first annual report of the Southern States Cooperative. It is dated November 1, 1944. Of its 14 pages of comment, two and a half are devoted to an attack on the National Tax Equality Association. The cooperative does not believe that it should pay any Federal tax. I submit that no line of logical reasoning can fail to conclude that it should.

The cooperative as of June 30, 1944, shows a capital structure as follows:

Total capital stock	$3,670,760.53
Total capital reserves (surplus)	3,244,473.85
Total stockholders' and patrons' equities	6,915,234.38

This is the concern which insists that no matter who pays for the war, it will not. It did a total business of $57,850,787 last year. It did not pay any Federal income tax and has not paid any even though its surplus totals over three million. In 1944, our company incurred an income tax of $875,000 and was allowed to transfer only $221,024 to surplus.

What are the reasons offered by this cooperative for its right to operate free of this crushing impost. As a matter of fact, the cooperative, which has as its ultimate goal the superseding of present competition, is operating on benefits and funds provided by those very competitors in part. Here are its reasons, as stated in the twenty-first annual report, and my comments thereupon:

1. Only farmers may be members.

Answer. Note the use of the word "members" in place of the more correct "stockholders," for if the members didn't get stock or its equivalent, there probably would be no Cooperative. Because its stockholders are farmers this corporation should be exempt. The absurdity of this as a valid reason needs no further comment.

2. The vesting of control in membership rather than in money. Cooperatives are organizations of individuals, not of money. In a true cooperative, it is the individual who counts and votes, each individual having only one vote. Private business corporations are organizations of money and it is the invested money which counts and votes.

Answer. We gather from all the above that if our corporation so amends its bylaws that each stockholder is entitled to one vote only, we, too, may be Federal tax-free. Reason No. 2 is simply a play on words, because the Co-op members certainly have money invested to the tune of nearly seven million for 154,831 members. To intimate that a mass of 154,831 members can actually of individual free not piloted decision control by their annual votes the operation of this giant enterprise is ridiculous. Some inner circle runs it just as such a circle runs most other organizations whether cooperative, corporation, or country club.

3. The limitation of the interest or dividends which may be paid on invested capital. The Federal Statutes impose a maximum of 8 percent. The Virginia statutes under which Southern States operate impose a maximum of 6 percent per annum.

Answer. Here is another play on words, because 6 or 8 percent is a mighty good and acceptable corporate dividend in any language, and no restrictions are laid upon the accumulation of undistributed earnings as surplus.

4. The treatment of all users alike, whether members or nonmembers.

Answer. I see no essential point of difference here with our own company. We do not give stockholders any special price nor do any other corporations in which I hold stock.

5. The requirement that cooperatives shall do business at cost—shall be nonprofit organizations.

Answer. The cooperatives violate this provision by the accumulation of surplus: they retain profit; therefore, they do not do business at cost. If they did, there would be no profit nor would there be the growth and expansion of which they brag.

5 (continued). Any overcharges for services performed must be returned to the patrons in proportion to the use they made of its services.

Answer. I doubt that the cooperative actually makes a refund to every customer. I doubt that they have the necessary records covering any and all sales. I say they cannot refund overcharges "in proportion to use" because the man who spends $100 for lubricating oil contributes far more to the cooperative profit than the man who spends $100 for cattle feed, yet he does not get more refund. Therefore, we again have a play on words, a policy which is not actually translated in equitable action. Furthermore, the cooperative should report all such refunds to patrons to the Income Tax Department. They are just as surely an increase in the recipient's income as any dividend ever declared.

5 (continued). A cooperative can have no profit for its own account.

Answer. This would seem to be the premise on which the cooperative claims tax exemption. But what is the item of $3,244,473.85 which appears on its balance sheet as capital reserves? If it isn't profit transferred to surplus as ordinarily thought of, what is it? It can only be retained profit; therefore, this cooperative is violating its own rules, and we are offered another play on words. In the cooperative language, surplus is reserve.

5 (continued). No stockholder can, in the event of liquidation or under any other circumstances, receive in his capacity as a stockholder more than the par value of the securities he owns plus interest not to exceed the minimum fixed by law.

Answer. But what becomes of his interest in the total capital reserves of $3,244,473.85? Who gets his share of these profits held back for one reason or another? If he gets his share, then he is participating in what can only be profits despite the fact that the cooperative is not allowed to have any. If he does not get a share, then someone later on will. I do not see any so-called "margins" in the capital reserves of their balance sheet which could not properly be termed "surplus." Profit is the margin between the sales and the cost thereof of our corporation. We could call it "margin" but that wouldn't fool the Income Tax Division.

SUMMARY

Cooperatives have unlimited ambition. They intend to do an ever-increasing share of the Nation's business. They are, I believe, financed by Federal funds when first organized. If successful, such loans may be repaid in full. Thus, we, the taxpayers, finance an organization whose ultimate victory means our collapse.

Following affairs to a logical conclusion, the so-called "private" corporation will have the choice of so reorganizing that it too can escape Federal taxes, or laboring under steadily heavier handicap. Presumably, if our dealers were our stockholders, and we dealt only with them, we would qualify provided each had only one vote no matter what his stock holdings.

There is one fundamental fault in present income-tax laws which tax only profit. The concern which fails to make profit escapes, yet has had all the rights, privileges, and protection afforded by the Government to whose support we contribute heavily. By claiming to make no profit, the cooperative and the unsuccessful private firm both avoid taxes. This fundamentally unsound, illogical plan or method of taxation which penalizes hard work and superior ability must be abandoned. All who benefit from the expenditures of government must share in its support. The only equitable tax is one based upon a certain percentage of net sales. Food and fuel should carry a rate just one-half that applied to all other commodities, and there should be no exemptions. The sooner Federal taxes are recognized as a definite part of the cost of doing business, yes, of even existing here, the sooner we will get out of the present morass of complicity and confusion.

There would be no just complaint by taxpaying corporations if it were not for the present double taxation imposed upon corporative profits. The cooperative has as its avowed purpose the increasing of its stockholders' annual earnings by the reduction of their costs. The taxpaying corporation also is dedicated to increasing its stockholders' earnings, but before such earnings can be

passed on they are heavily taxed to the corporation, then taxed again as dividends. All profits disbursed as dividends should be tax free to the corporation. I am a stockholder in Pure Oil, and I'll resist all men who say that it is wrong for Pure Oil to increase my earnings and right for any co-op to increase those of John Farmer.

DON B. TOLLEY.

FEBRUARY 9, 1945.

The Jewish Legions in World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 18, in the Hotel Astor, New York City, at a meeting held under the auspices of the New Zionist Organization of America, I delivered an address on the Jewish Legions in World War No. 1. I ask unanimous consent to have the address published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are met here tonight to commemorate the creation of the Jewish legions in the First World War. We cannot add to the glorious exploits of the heroic Jews who, shoulder to shoulder with other patriots, in World War No. 1, struck such telling blows for God and humanity. That is not our purpose on this particular anniversary. Rather we are met here to interpret in present-day realism that significant event of history.

The creation of the Jewish legions might well be pictured as the awakening of a sleeping giant, ready once again to assume his responsibilities in the family of nations. After centuries of dispersal throughout the world, after centuries of cruel persecution, Jewish patriots, on the 17th day of March 1915, rallied once again, organized the Jewish legions, and fought the forces of evil and tyranny which would enslave both Jew and gentile. While it marked the first time in centuries that an organized Jewish military unit had fought for righteousness and justice as Jews, it was no mere accident. The Jewish legions sprang to life and action in 1915 with a full realization of their own obligation to mankind and the crisis that faced civilization. Theirs was the natural response of an aroused people to the clarion call of humanity for help and assistance.

It would be a mistake to insinuate that Jewish participation in man's fight for a better world is something new. It is nothing of the sort. Whenever and wherever permitted, in peace and in war, with the weapons of the spirit or the weapons of physical combat, Jews of all countries and in all centuries have taken part in the never-ending struggle for a better world. But Jews, as Jews, have not had the credit. Always that has gone to the countries in which they lived.

How many know that in the First World War, 1,055,000 Jews fought in the ranks of the Allies? That figure places the Jewish contribution to our cause in World War No. 1 as next to that of the so-called Great Powers and far ahead of the contribution of the smaller nations. In that war 116,825 Jews were killed in the ranks of the Allies—almost double the number of our own dead.

In the present war enough Jews are fighting under the banners of the United Nations to constitute one of the greatest armies of all time. Five hundred thousand Jews are fighting in the ranks of the Soviet Union and 600,000 under the Stars and Stripes; 80,000 Jews fought for France; 53,000 are fighting for Britain; 8,000 under Canadian colors; 16,000 accepted certain death as guerrillas; 250,000 Jews fought in the defense of Poland and 32,000 of them paid the supreme price of their devotion.

One hundred and thirty-five thousand Jews in Palestine voluntarily registered for war service. Thirty thousand of them finally succeeded in begging their way into the British ranks. They had to beg for the privilege of defending their own soil and one out of every four of them were finally allowed to fight the common enemy. We have heard much of the three and one-half million helpless, defenseless Jewish martyrs massacred in the slaughter pens of central Europe by the unspeakable Hitler, but very little indeed of the one and one-half million Jewish fighters who are taking an active part in the armies of the United Nations. That has been a military secret.

American Jews do have a flag and a country, and as Americans they should fight as they are fighting for that flag and that country. I am not contending otherwise. But there are in this world Jews not accepted as nationals by any country. As such they constitute an international problem; and while it is far more than a Jewish problem, and while its solution will affect all mankind, the Jew himself should have a voice in its solution. To assert himself, to assert his right to live as a member of a free people, is a matter of first and vital importance to him and to us all. True equality the world over is a freeman's most dependable security. The creation of a Jewish state in which unwanted and persecuted Jews might voluntarily repair to live in dignity would not only transform them from pariahs to acknowledged members of responsible society but would raise the stature of mankind everywhere.

It has been obvious to me all along that there is no more eloquent, no more elementary way of proclaiming this status, no clearer way of gaining recognition and deserving to be recognized than for unattached Jewish soldiers, under a Jewish banner, to join the United Nations in the titanic and common struggle against tyranny and injustice. Nothing could proclaim more convincingly the indomitable will of the Jews to constitute a nation once more—then their claim to the dignity of nationhood would not longer be overlooked and sidestepped. Had young Jews been permitted to mobilize an army and to demonstrate their devotion and purposes side by side with other peace-loving nations, they would not now be ignored, as they are being ignored, in the conclaves assembling to prepare peace terms for the world.

We, who all during this war have proclaimed the right of the Jews to form a Jewish army and join the United Nations, have comprehended the complicated situation all too well. It is because of our understanding of the real issues involved that we have kept nagging bureaucratic-minded governments and have kept arousing an uninformed public opinion in this matter of a Jewish army. We have no apologies to make for our efforts, and only regret that in this fight for a fundamental principle we have not been more successful.

We do not agree that the Jewish brigade created a few months ago by the British Government is even an incomplete answer to our prayers. It is merely a feeble and utterly insufficient step in the right direction, and any significance with which it might have been clothed has been nullified by the very belatedness and by the reluctance with which it was finally undertaken. It is another case of "too little and too late."

Nor was this accidental. The very reasons which prompted us to persist in our demands for a Jewish army inspired the British refusals of its formation. Now, when the war in Europe is approaching its final stages and our minds are diverted to the numerous world-wide problems of peace, British objectives become obvious. It was not an army alone that was denied to the Jews; nationhood was denied them.

Nations who have made no contribution whatsoever to mankind's fight against the Axis—indeed, nations who have sympathized with the Nazis and actively sabotaged our war effort—these nations, now that Germany has lost the war, are gaining admission into the bosom of the United Nations at the cheap price of hypocritical lip service.

On the other hand, the Jewish people, despite the oceans of Jewish blood spilled on all the battle fronts and in all the torture chambers of central Europe, find that door closed to them.

It is discouraging to note what small progress for national life has been made since that great day in history, March 17, 1915, when "Zion's mule corps" raised Zion's flag at Gallipoli. How far from success we really are on this thirtieth anniversary of that great day has been vividly demonstrated to us by an incident in connection with the recent trip of the President and the Prime Minister to the Near East. There is little doubt that Palestine was a subject vital to some of the diplomatic and secret conversations. I listened with sorrow when the President said in his report to Congress that he had learned more about the Jewish question in a 5-minute talk with Ibn Saud than he could learn from a dozen letters. This unfortunate aside remark dramatizes the spirit in which the whole subject of Palestine has been approached by those who would shape the world of tomorrow.

With all due respect to the President and King Ibn Saud, I must say that the choice of the desert king as an expert on the Jewish question is nothing short of amazing. With respect to the Jewish question outside of his kingdom, I imagine that even Fala would be more of an expert; and as for Jews within his kingdom, I understand there are none.

Senator BREWSTER and I are members of the Senate Committee of Nine on Middle East Petroleum. We possess first-hand knowledge of the magnitude of the huge oil reserves there, and of the pottential vital strategic and trade positions incident thereto. Indeed, if the United States is to carry her share of responsibility for world peace and world affairs, it is prudent that we should take cognizance now of all of the factors involved in the stability of that region.

As I see it, a strong, free, dependable, and friendly Palestine should be the cornerstone of our inescapable participation in the affairs of the Middle East. The fabulous billions of barrels of black gold in that general area may well become the casus belli of World War No. 3. Therefore, one cannot but agree and welcome the formation of an American sphere of influence in the Near East. That much we grant. But I deny that an American sphere of influence must result in a betrayal of the aspirations and the hopes of the Jewish people. I reject, as baseless and unfounded, the theory that to protect the world's interest in Arabian oil the United States must assume a pro-Arab and anti-Jewish position. Arabian oil does not weigh more than Jewish blood.

I deny, too, that we went to war, strained our credit to the breaking point, dispatched 12,000,000 of the flower of our youth to all the battlefields on the earth for colonial empires for anyone, or for that matter for the betrayal of our real friends. I contend that we can effect the proper utilization of the petroleum resources of the Middle East in the promotion of world peace and stability, and at the same time preserve our devotion to democratic principles, and discharge our

obligation to the Jewish people should we assist them to realize their aspirations for nationhood in their ancient homeland. I deny that a better world and a better life for Americans can be had by betraying the one people in the Middle East who will remain loyal and devoted to us, come what may. If we are to fulfill the role that destiny has shaped for us in that region we need an independent and free Jewish Palestine as an anchor and a bulwark.

Insofar as Zionism is concerned we have failed miserably on the political front in Washington and in London, but the Jewish repatriates in Palestine have not failed. They have measured up to their opportunities magnificently. They have caused the desert to bloom as of old and they have converted a dreary stultification into a beehive of activity and prosperity. Their constructive accomplishments in the Holy Land have earned for them the plaudits of the world and what is more important—the right to nationbood.

Let me take advantage of this opportunity, therefore, to warn our British and American political leaders that we shall not rest until the first victims of Nazi brutality have been given a fair chance for national renaissance in the Holy Land. The American people, once they understand the issues involved, will support us wholeheartedly in this endeavor.

In spite of discouragements, we are inspired in our difficult task tonight by the example of the intrepid patriots who, in the days of the First World War, with powerful opposition facing them, without precedent to guide them, succeeded in bringing to life the first Jewish legion since the destruction of the Jewish Kingdom of Palestine 2,000 years ago.

Gone are Jabotinsky, Trumpeldor, and Rutenberg; gone are Sidebotham, Wedgewood, and Balfour. But others of that little gallant band of crusaders are with us still. One of them is here tonight. The officer who commanded the Jewish legions in 1915 and who in the years that followed has spearheaded the movement to create a Jewish army and a Jewish state; the man who personifies the noble and sacred cause to which we dedicate our efforts; that great and fearless soldier, John Henry Patterson is here.

Colonel Patterson, I salute you and through you the Jewish legions which you led. Colonel Patterson, we honor you tonight and always for the great cause with which you have identified your life and which we are pledged to uphold—the cause of righting an ancient wrong, the cause of supporting a race of martyrs on their road to honor, and to freedom and to peace.

Stern Justice, Not Vengeance, Urged By Hoover for Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, following are the third and final articles which former President Herbert Hoover has written on the coming San Francisco Conference. Again I recommend them for the reading and rereading of every American:

HOOVER OPPOSES "STRAIT JACKET" FOR WORLD IN SECURITY PLANNING

(By Herbert Hoover)

The second proposal I have made for the San Francisco Conference is that there be provision for revision of onerous or inapplicable treaties or of the wrongs of imposed settlements. There is no such suggestion in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

The future of nations cannot be frozen. The forces which will arise out of this war cannot be foreseen.

If we are going to accomplish anything in our time, we must approach our problem in the knowledge that there is nothing rigid or immutable in human affairs. History is a story of growth, decay, and change. If no provision, no allowance is made for change by peaceful means, it will come anyway— and with violence.

LEAGUE PROVISION CITED

There was an indefinite provision for change of onerous or inapplicable treaties in the Covenant of the League of Nations, but it was never allowed to function. This failure to recognize inevitability of change became one of the definite causes leading to World War No. 2.

There is one over-all effect of both the Covenant of the League and Dumbarton Oaks proposals which the American people should understand.

Once we settled down to peace again there will be treaties defining boundaries and other relations or imposed relation of nations. The yardstick of who is an aggressor then becomes one of determining who violates the then existing situation or law. Thus the world organization automatically becomes the guarantor of the existing situation—that is the status quo.

Experience demonstrates that there are unpredictable areas of most dangerous controversies which rise from the pressure for change in the relations between nations. Among them are provisions imposed during the heat of war emotions, shift in economic pressures and population, the growth of ideas and inventions. There are shifting rights of minorities and the development of backward nations which become conscious and capable of self-government.

CHANGES CALLED CERTAIN

Oppressed peoples will agitate and even rebel against oppression. They are hardly likely to go on considering themselves bound by a bargain entered into unwillingly by their fathers. As a rule they would be willing to readjust matters without going to war.

Boundary and peace treaties are not inspired documents. Certainly the whole experience after the last war shows that peace can be preserved, not by preventing change and putting the future in a strait jacket, but by seeking to control change and direct it. Any attempt to maintain the status quo indefinitely is a direct cause of war—for peaceful means being denied, the change can come only through force. War becomes the only available solvent.

Each and every plan for preserving peace, whether it be the Pax Romana, the balance of power, the legitimist theory at the Congress of Vienna, or collective security of the league, however divergent they may appear outwardly, have this one thing in common. They set up a new order, and knowing it to be good, they provide that the new boundaries and other conditions shall be kept and anyone who violates it is evil. Never yet, however, have settlements been made after firing ceases that held against growing and changing forces after the war.

After the last war whenever there was an appeal for revision, the world was flooded with speeches on the "sanctity of treaties," and it was represented that any attempt to reconsider a single article of the Versailles Treaty was nothing less than a sinister attempt to undermine the whole fabric of peace which must be resisted as such by all law-loving peoples.

"STATUS QUO" CRITICIZED

Many people were led to believe that all change was to be resisted on high moral grounds. We can agree as to the sanctity of the pledged word—but most of this talk meant something quite different. What was really meant was not the "sanctity of treaties" but the "sanctity of the status quo."

And this question becomes far more important to Americans today than ever before. The peace settlements, the form of governments, and the boundaries of many nations have not yet been determined. Unless there be provision for revision of treaties, we will at San Francisco become the blind guarantors of the peace settlements of which we, as yet, know nothing.

To meet this problem, Mr. Gibson and I made a suggestion 3 years ago and I again propose that there be a definite provision in the United Nations charter that the application of any nation for revision of treaty provisions, not sooner than 10 years after its conclusion, should be considered and, if advisable, negotiated by the committee on political rights, which I have suggested.

There will be continuing gigantic wrongs in the world. Americans for all time will sorrow for the fate of Finland, of Estonia, of Latvia, of Lithuania, the partition of Poland, and other states that will be partly or wholly submerged by this war. We cannot even think of another war to secure their freedoms, but we do not need to sacrifice our ideals by acquiescing in their plight.

We could at least leave a hope open for their long future.

REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

My third proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that there should be a much more definite regional organization of the whole machinery of the charter at San Francisco than that suggested at Dumbarton Oaks.

Three years ago Mr. Gibson and I proposed that regional organization should be the foundation of the whole machinery and that the three regional groups should be established—the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. A year later Mr. Churchill publicly supported this idea.

In the Western Hemisphere the long development of the Pan American Union pointed in that direction, and the recent agreement at Mexico City advances it one step further. The success of the nebulous "concert of Europe" in preventing world war for nearly a century pointed in that direction for Europe, and the practical problems which developed in the League of Nations abundantly confirmed the need for that form of organization.

Such regional councils should embrace all United Nations' areas and should deal in the first instance with all controversies that might lead to war. If they fail to secure settlement by pacific methods, then, and only then, should the world security council intervene.

SIX BENEFITS LISTED

If regional organization were established at once it would bring six powerful benefits:

1. It would give the smaller nations a greater voice, for they should be more largely represented in the regional councils and could well be given equal standing;

2. Policies which would prevent conflict are different in the three great areas and need separate organization;

3. These regional organizations would relieve the security council of many problems and controversies before they reached it;

4. Such an organization would relieve the whole mechanism of much of its present color of a military alliance of a few great powers;

5. Regional organization at once lessens the pressure for military alliances; and

6. Such a regional organization would greatly relieve the anxieties of the American people and probably most nations lest they be constantly involved in secondary problems all over the earth.

There is no reason why the proposed economic, social, and political rights councils

should not also be recognized for the better handling of problems peculiar to those regions. Their top world councils would be the more free for coordination of the three great areas. It might also be worth consideration that the World Court be organized with three regional courts which would act as courts of first instance in questions involving nations in that region alone.

Some objection has been raised that there would be some implied rivalry of interest between regions which would be thus emphasized. The contrary is the truth, for such decentralization would make cooperation the more easy.

STERN JUSTICE, NOT VENGEANCE, URGED BY HOOVER FOR TREATIES

(By Herbert Hoover)

My fourth proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that agreement upon continued and total disarmament of the enemy nations must be entered into either as part of the United Nations charter or a separate agreement. In any event it will have to be enforced by the security council. And it profoundly affects the whole question of peace.

Three years ago Mr. Gibson and I proposed that the enemy States must be completely disarmed and kept disarmed for an entire generation. We pointed out one of the great errors of the Treaty of Versailles in which Germany was permitted to retain a professional army of 100,000 men, supposedly for purposes of maintaining internal order. She was permitted to have a navy limited only in tonnage and types of ships.

We stated that this leeway perpetuated her professional armies and navies. It perpetuated the warrior caste and all its traditions. It afforded a skeleton army and navy of skilled men ready for quick expansion. It insured the continuity of the general staff with its military skill, brains, and ambitions. It perpetuated their know-how to make war.

EXPERIENCE CITED

Repeated experience with the warrior caste of these nations in their intimidations, aggressions, blitzes, and attacks without even declaration of war should be enough for the world in this particular. We must make a better job of it this time.

We should require total dissolution of the military establishments of all enemy nations and the substitution for purposes of civic order, of a constabulary of the police type, excluding the whole officer and military caste from such organization. And we should prohibit the manufacture of arms of any kind. We could thus assure the disappearance of them and their know-how from the world.

And if this were done an occupying force of men of the United Nations of a hundred thousand men in Germany and a hundred thousand in Japan would suffice. But it will need be kept there for a generation.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENT

My fifth proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that disarmament of the United Nations be more definitely dealt with. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals appear to contemplate a reduction of arms of the United Nations. But having regard to the fate of the same proposals in the League of Nations, a more positive program should be introduced.

Obviously our present war establishments will need be reduced. But they should be reduced relatively to each other and systematically. And, obviously, huge military establishments are themselves a threat of aggression which it should be the purpose of any world peace organization to reduce—and quickly.

In 1932 I proposed to the then World Disarmament Conference that these aggressive weapons be suppressed in order to throw the military advantage into the hands of the defense and thus into the peace-loving nations. That proposal was accepted by over 40 nations. It was renewed by Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. At least it is worth reconsideration.

But of more importance is agreement now upon the maximum size of armies, navies, and air power for the principal United Nations. We should remember that after the disarmament of the enemy the only dangerous armaments are those in the hands of our allies, and it is imperative that we arrive at a method by which we do not start competition with our friends with all the dangers to good will which would flow from that.

The Covenant of the League of Nations provided for limitation of armaments at some future time, and the time never came so far as the efforts of the League were concerned. Therefore there should be incorporated in the new charter of United Nations a much more definite program for limitation of the size of military establishments in the United Nations than that provided in Dumbarton Oaks if we are not to repeat this failure of the League of Nations.

POWERS OF COUNCIL DELEGATE

My sixth proposal refers to that most thorny question for the American people of whether the American delegate on the security council will be given the authority to make war. This is no doubt outside the provisions of the charter, but it will face the Senate when that treaty comes up for adoption.

I cannot bring myself to the delegation of such power to any one human being. That is what happens if he votes to apply either economic sanctions or military force against an aggressor. The most vital determination that can be made under the democratic process is war. It means thousands of our people are sent to death in foreign lands.

To give that power to some one man who represents us is the negation of the democratic process. The other side of the question, however, is that to delay decision against an aggressor presents dangers that the whole world security may break down at some critical moment.

Extremists are perhaps exaggerating both positions. A study of a hundred years of conflicts which have led to world-wide dangers indicates very few instances, if any, where there was not time for ample consideration by the Congress.

Upon this I offer the tentative suggestion that this power should not be given to our delegate on the security council but to the President, and the President should be required to secure the majority vote of the joint Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House on whether the issues should be submitted to the full Congress.

Thus, Congress would have a voice in determining both the urgency and the dimensions of responsibility. In minor and urgent undertakings there would need to be no full congressional action. If action means war with a great power, the approval of the whole Congress is essential.

My seventh proposal for action at San Francisco does not as much concern that text as the procedure of the governments in this crisis.

I have time and again urged that we should not attempt to determine a final organization for lasting peace until we have laid secure its foundations in the post-war settlements between nations.

We should take time to cool off from the hot emotions of war. Our indignation may lead us away from stern justice into vengeance. Victory with vengeance means ultimate disaster to the victor. We cannot have both peace and revenge.

The men who led the world into this war should be hanged for murder and those guilty of other crimes must also be punished, but the masses of great races must be given a chance to enter the paths of peace where fear, hate, and revenge may be turned aside and die. Our purpose must be to create a regime of law and justice in the world, not regencies of hate.

We do not know the shape of things in the immediate settlements of this war. And we should take time better to understand the now unknown forces that will come out of this gigantic explosion. No human being can foresee them today. No one foresaw them at Versailles. Such forces will be more powerful than any signed documents.

I suggest, therefore, it would be great wisdom if the peoples of the world should have time in which to consider and perhaps perfect any agreement at San Francisco.

Every thinking man and woman prays for a successful issue of the conference. The destruction of war is now so terrible and the animosities among nations have become so deep that failure to assure a lasting peace now means the end of all hopes of humanity. America has fought this war for the greatest purpose of all time. That is to secure a lasting peace.

Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from economists of Duke University and the University of North Carolina on the Bretton Woods agreement:

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.,
DURHAM, N. C.,
March 5, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM O. BURGIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGIN: We, the undersigned economists from Duke University and the University of North Carolina, respectfully urge your careful consideration and support of the Bretton Woods agreement providing for the establishment of an International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In our judgment the proposed international financial institutions will provide the facilities for orderly international payments, aid in the sound expansion of international investment, and increase the total volume of international trade. There is ample room to believe that, in time as these processes unfold, employment in the several member countries will be increased, income raised, and standards of living enriched.

We recognize the fact that the proposed institutions are not perfect, but they provide a mechanism of international finance capable of modification in the light of subsequent experience. Inauguration of the two institutions will go far in meeting the problems brought about by the changed circumstances of modern international trade. They are designed to facilitate the maximum practicable freedom of international trade, but at the same time provide adequate latitude to each member nation in the control of its own domestic economy. The fund may be expected to curb such undesirable financial practices as unrestricted unilateral changes in exchange rates, bilateral bartering, and multiple currency devices which breed and accentuate economic warfare and prepare the soil for world catastrophe. Similarly, the Bank will facilitate increased international investment without inducing a

repetition of the reckless lending of the period prior to 1929. Without such international investment economic progress will be retarded and the conflicts between alleged "have" and "have not" nations will be intensified.

It is our considered judgment that the proposed international financial institutions provide the facilities by and through which international financial problems can be worked out in concert and to the mutual advantage of all parties. Hence, we respectfully urge you, as our Representative in Congress, to give them your full support.

Respectfully yours,

D. D. Carroll, H. D. Wolf, Clarence Hur, D. Cowden, Milton J. Heath, John B. Woosley, Paul S. Brown, J. M. Lear, F. Gutmann, R. J. M. Hobbs, Frank C. Delyer, Joseph J. Spangler, Wilford J. Eteman, Richard A. Lester, John H. Shields, Robert S. Smith, B. U. Ratchford, M. L. Black, Jr., F. Bulitz, Ben F. Lemert, C. B. Hoover.

Address by Anthony A. Olis at American-Lithuanian Mission Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on March 23 it was my privilege to attend a dinner of the American-Lithuanian Mission at the Hotel Statler. There I heard an address delivered by Anthony A. Olis, an attorney, of Chicago, which made a great appeal to me. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the belief that it will command the sympathetic interest of the American people in the plight of this small nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Lithuanian Mission is strictly an American organization. We are here as Americans who are proud of our Government—proud of our representatives in that Government and we are particularly proud and grateful to the many United States Senators and Congressmen who honor us this evening by their presence. We also wish to thank the many members of the press and radio who are here tonight representing newspapers and broadcasting outlets from many part of the United States.

These are critical days because of the war and we would not have imposed on your valuable time were not the purpose of this gathering related to the war effort and the winning of a permanent peace. We are concerned about the rights of small nations to self determination after the war is won. We are concerned because it is our conviction that there cannot be a permanent peace unless people in both small and large nations are free from political as well as economic bondage.

Now, we understand that there are many problems to be solved and that the length of the war has increased the complexity of these problems. We understand also and we fully subscribe to America's foremost purpose that we must first win a military victory, but under the heavy pressure of the many burdens of war little time has been available for a restatement of the principles which guide us in this conflict. We say we want a permanent peace but at the same time there has been a tendency to avoid discussion of the principles that should guide to prevent aggression against small nations and to prevent the very causes which led us into the present war. There has been much talk in Washington that we will have to make concessions, that we will have to sacrifice certain principles, that some small nations and their innocent people are bound to get hurt in the setting up of our post-war world.

It is the view of the American Lithuanian Mission that there is not only no need for making concessions or sacrifices of our principles but that it would be fatal to a permanent peace to do so and it is with a sincere desire that we as American citizens, as constituents, have called this gathering this evening to voice our views to our representatives in our Government upon this vital war issue.

The Atlantic Charter, proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, sets forth that one of the principles for which we are fighting the enemy is the right of small nations to self-determination and independence. The Charter states:

"Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

"Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In a speech on September 12, 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull reaffirmed these principles in declaring:

"All peoples who, with a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its enjoyment.

"Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

"All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs."

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania. The Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. However, from the earliest times the Lithuanian people had developed their own language similar to the ancient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions. They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. It is therefore not surprising that they desire independence and self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language—in short, their way of life.

During its days of independence since the last war, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. By its progress in its economical and cultural life it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence. In light of the above it is apparent that on the basis of justice and right—on the basis of principles announced in the Atlantic Charter and by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, no one should question Lithuania's right to independence. And yet—though everyone agrees that the rights of small nations must be protected in the post-war world—still there is hesitation on the part of some of our representatives in government to openly voice their support of these principles as to the Republic of Lithuania. They say that Russia intends to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union; therefore it is anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania should be independent. Russia is our ally. We must not offend our ally. Furthermore, they say, Lithuania was a part of Russia before the year 1918. Lithuania, they say, was torn away from Russia in the closing days of the last war when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution and should therefore be returned to Russia.

Well, as to the proposition that Lithuania was part of Russia before the year 1918, one might answer that this is somewhat like the question as to which came first, the chicken or the egg. Because if we go back far enough in history to the fifteenth century in the days when Lithuania was a nation with borders from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, Russia was part of Lithuania. It should not be a question of which was part of what, the important consideration is that the Lithuanian people are a distinct people with a history, culture, language, and ideals, not related to that of other nations. Furthermore, it is not anti-Russian to maintain that Lithuania deserves to be an independent nation because Russia has itself said so, at a time when Russia was strong and completely free from internal or external pressure; Russia has heretofore solemnly agreed and covenanted that it would respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania.

These agreements and treaties, I repeat, were made not at the time when Russia was helpless because of internal revolution but in the years when the Soviet Union had a strong government. On September 28, 1926, a non-aggression treaty, which is still in effect, was entered into between the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia. The language of the following articles of said pact is as follows:

"Article 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and indivisibility of each other.

"Article 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertake to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

"Article 5. Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions."

This treaty was by its terms to be in effect until December 31, 1945, and is therefore still in effect today.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual assistance pact. Article 7 reads:

"The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their State, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one State in the internal affairs of another State."

Soviet Russia is our ally. We must have confidence in our allies. We must assume that our ally will keep its promises and its treaties. Therefore it is not anti-Russian to take the position that there should be a restoration of the independent Lithuania which Russia solemnly agrees to respect in all circumstances by its treaty which by its terms is still in effect to December 31, 1945. After all, the independence of Lithuania is not the only problem which the post-war world will have to solve. As the years roll by questions concerning the rights of small nations will recur again and again. Certainly we do not intend to permit aggression against these small nations to repeat itself in the future as it did in the days of Munich. No matter who the aggresor may be in the future we have learned the hard way that appeasement in the past did not pay. Certainly, therefore, we should bend

every effort to treat with our allies to the end that they too should embrace the high principles which we so solemnly announced at the time of our entry into this conflict. It cannot properly be said that this position has any anti-Russian character.

The State Department of the United States has continued to recognize and still recognizes the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. Its position in this matter is that the Republic of Lithuania is an independent nation. Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew recently announced to the press that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were still recognized as independent countries, even though Russia had occupied their territories in the drive against the Nazis. Americans of Lithuanian descent know from personal correspondence with their friends and relatives in Lithuania that the people of this little country do not want partial autonomy under the domination of any power whatsoever, but rather do they want the restoration of an independent Lithuania.

The Yalta Conference has suggested the manner and method of which small nations may elect a free and democratic government. Lithuania is one of the small nations which should have the same opportunity extended to other small nations to hold a free and democratic election, after armies of other nations have left and Lithuanian refugees have been repatriated, an election wherein candidates of all democratic parties in Lithuania have the right to submit their candidacies to the electorate. The election should be under the supervision of an Allied commission with representatives of all of the Big Three Allied powers to assure an election free of outside pressure. These views are held by a large portion of the citizens of the United States and should be supported by delegates to the San Francisco Conference. If this is done and the principles heretofore stated in the Atlantic Charter are maintained in the San Francisco Conference and in the peace conference to come after the war, the rights of small nations to self-determination will be protected and in this way aggression against the small nations will be prevented and a sound program for a permanent peace will be assured.

Official Statements on Foreign Policy by National Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated March 9, 1945, addressed to the President of the United States by Ulric Bell, executive vice president of Americans United for World Organization, Inc., together with an enclosure entitled "Official Statements on Foreign Policy by National Organizations."

The Public Printer has estimated that the cost of printing this material will be $260. I believe that the importance of the declaration warrants the expenditure.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 9, 1945.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a group somewhat unique because of our nonpartisan and widely representative make-up, as the roster of our board of directors will attest, we believe we can make a contribution to the climate pervading the momentous negotiations you and the other chiefs of state have initiated toward fashioning a world organization for preventing war.

We, therefore, present for your consideration a hitherto unpublicized compilation showing the state of public sentiment in the United States in favor of a strong and democratic world organization based on the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

The statement attached is by no means a complete record, but it covers a remarkable representative cross section of American life, showing action on the part of 34 of the very largest national organizations prior to the Yalta Conference in favor of American cooperation in a world agency to discourage and prevent aggression. It reflects the views of business, large and small; labor, including both its main branches; the war veterans, the largest and most comprehensive women's groups; the main religious groups and many denominations; the bar; all the organized farmer, youth, educational, and other groups in a continuing procession. Action by these organizations alone constitutes without doubt an overwhelming majority of the articulate opinion of the United States.

It was the recent privilege of Americans United to invite various national organizations to Washington to be enlightened by the Secretary of State and the other Dumbarton delegates respecting the proposals. Ninety-six major associations responded, as they have also done in many regional meetings we since have arranged in cooperation with the State Department. One hundred and five such organizations responded more recently to a similar invitation by us to learn about the collateral Bretton Woods proposals from the Treasury and State departments.

It is needless to remind you and your confreres of the significant formal steps taken through the Fulbright and Connally resolutions in the House and Senate, the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill undertakings, the Mackinac declaration, and the recent manifests of freshly elected Senators and Representatives. Nor is it necessary to dwell on the stands taken by the national political parties and their major candidates or upon the outcome of the last elections in their effect upon candidates opposing international cooperation.

In the incomplete summary we submit, it is manifest that the desires of the American people go beyond the establishment of a world organization that would preserve the peace by persuasion, sanctions, or force. They want a world organization democratically constituted and promising the goal you have set of a people's peace following a people's victory. They hope that the Dumbarton basis can be built upon at San Francisco so that the outcome there will be in the spirit of "we, the people"—the people everywhere—more than in the spirit of the "high contracting parties." They call for revitalization of the principles of the Atlantic Charter in such strong terms that men everywhere can progress toward a world free of the social and economic as well as the political and military fears and frictions making for insecurity.

On our part, we commend to you and the delegates to San Francisco the most earnest consideration of adequate provisions in the charter of the world organization for future amendment and improvement of this charter in its democratic and humane aspects.

We likewise urge the incorporation of a declaration respecting the essential human rights and provision for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

"We believe that the prime requisite of the world agency will be its power to act without delay in security matters under authority constitutionally granted in advance by the nations concerned."

An impressively understanding attitude respecting the difficulties of international agreement in a world still at war has been shown by the American people. This, we believe, is due to their resolve that world criminals hereafter must be stopped in their tracks whenever they threaten the peace; that there must be a rule of law backed by force; and that the United States cannot escape involvement in wars unless it becomes involved in the world enforcement of peace.

For them, too, many gold stars now mark the tragic mistake of isolationism in the past; too many shudders derive from the thought of another war in a world already half-shattered in this one by cruelly modern bombs and rockets. Manifestly, our people will not be denied this time the chance to count on a secure and tranquil life, even though San Francisco produces no perfect plan—even though the Golden Gate is less than the portal of a Golden Age.

Once the maximum best of the United Nations Conference is before their representatives in the form of an agreement, they will tolerate no unreasonable dallying with the peace. Those who stand in the way will do so at their own terrible risk.

Trusting that the enclosed summary will be useful, we remain, Mr. President, with the deepest respect,

Yours sincerely,
AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION, INC.,
By ULRIC BELL,
Executive Vice President.

OFFICIAL STATEMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY BY NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander, national headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind.)

From summary of proceedings, twenty-sixth annual national convention, Chicago, September 18–20, 1944:

"Resolved, As the war progresses toward total victory, the American Legion again insists upon unconditional surrender by Germany and Japan. Only by complete and devastating defeat of these militaristic aggressor nations can any peace be worth its untold cost in blood and treasure.

"After hostilities have ceased, Germany and Japan must be permanently disarmed and rendered utterly unable again to wreck the peace of the world. After subjugation, Germany and Japan must thereafter be occupied and controlled in such manner and to such extent as to bring home to the German and Japanese peoples—and to the fanatical, despotic leaders whom they have followed with such blind enthusiasm—a full realization of the folly and disastrous consequences of their ways.

"When peace has been restored to the world, we must be ever vigilant to protect it. Bitter experience of the past proves that peace cannot be preserved unless aggressor nations are promptly and sternly suppressed at the very beginning of any movement inimical to general peace and welfare.

"The cost of maintenance of peace is insignificant compared to the cost of war. Every thinking person now realizes that neither the United States of America nor any other single nation, however great and

strong, can maintain peace by its own independent efforts.

"We adhere to the following declarations of the 1943 national convention:

" 'We repeat our declaration of 1942 that "no peace, however welcome, however promising, can long endure unless it be made secure by the nations which have won it; nations which must ever be prepared in every sense to fight for the rights of freemen and of freedom-loving peoples." That "we cannot escape, we will not evade, our own responsibility for the maintenance of that peace. We must not forget our stake in it. Every consideration of national interest dictates that we prevent recurrence of the conditions which led to this war."

" 'Our own national interests must ever be our first concern, and we believe that our Nation can best serve and protect its national interests, commensurate with its power and responsibilities, by participation in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war. It must be obvious now to all the world that no peace can be lasting and secure for nations that are not fully prepared to maintain peace.

" 'We affirm our faith in the foreign policy of our Government.

" 'The consummation of the policies and principles declared at the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences should command the united support of all Americans.'

"We respectfully urge upon our Government that, as often and as fully as our national interests permit, our people be advised of developments in the field of foreign relations."

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Statement included in the 10-point program submitted by Foreign Wars Commander Jean A. Brunner to the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, January 22, 1945:

"Policies permitting the United States to participate in a world association to maintain peace, using force if necessary, and with full publicity as to all preliminary negotiations between the United States and its Allies."

THE NATIONAL GRANGE

From speech by Albert S. Goss, master (president), November 1944:

"The National Grange has a long-standing record in favor of a world court. Collaboration with other nations is not without its dangers, but the world faces no danger so great as that of another world war.

"For some years substantial policing must be done by someone. It would seem safer as a joint venture. We should not lose sight of two most important features. First, the overwhelming majority of all peoples on earth want permanent peace. They live in peace among themselves and have developed for themselves forms of government to assure peace which they respect and cherish. They have no basic cause of conflict among themselves or with peoples of other nations. It is the few who seek power or an undue advantage who contrive war. If the great majority of peoples of all nations earnestly strive for peace, it must be possible to control those who contrive war. Second, while certain sacrifices may be necessary, the overwhelming advantage of a stable peace so far overshadows any possible handicaps and sacrifices as to render them negligible, and make some real practical effort worth while. The most flagrant cause of war lies in aggression. Let us insist that we start with clean hands. Both Germany and Japan, through centralized control of education, have raised a generation which believes that the destiny of their countries is to rule the world. It is altogether probable that no defeat could be administered so crushing as to rid them of this ambition, but peace will never be lasting until this thirst for conquest is wiped out. Peace must be based on mutual agreements not to resort to war, but the governments of neither Germany nor Japan can be trusted to keep their agreements. They not only must be forced to keep them, but it may also be necessary to direct the education and the internal economy of those nations until it becomes clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that they, too, truly want peace.

"If either of these cancerous spots is allowed to frame their educational processes or their national policies with an aim to resort to war at some future time, war will probably come. We believe in freedom for others as well as for ourselves, but we must face the fact that those who fail to abide by law cannot be permitted to run at large, and somebody must exercise restraining control until the world is fully assured that the complete control of these nations lies in the hands of those of their people who truly want peace."

From action taken by the Grange at annual session, November 1944:

"The endorsement of an effective international organization to insure world peace; establishment of a world court with adequate enforcement powers.

"The Grange recognizes that permanent world peace is of paramount importance. Steps to achieve this should include:

"(a) An effectively implemented organization of sovereign states including a world court, but with the right to declare war retained solely by Congress.

"(b) Development of international trade on an equitable basis.

"(c) Rehabilitation of productive industry in devastated lands."

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

From resolutions adopted at the annual convention, December 1944:

"We specifically recommend cooperation with other nations along the following lines:

"1. A general international organization for maintaining world peace. The American Farm Bureau Federation favors the participation of the United States in a general international organization for maintaining world peace, in accordance with the broad principles contained in the plans developed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. The United States should accept its rightful share of the responsibility with the proper executive authority for the enforcement of the decisions of the Security Council, by military force, if necessary.

"2. International cooperation on monetary programs: The American Farm Bureau Federation favors the participation of the United States in the proposed international monetary Fund and the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as outlined in the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference."

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

From program adopted by annual convention for 1945:

"Full participation by the United States in a world organization based on political and economic justice, governed by law and with power to enforce its decisions, and in which all peace-loving nations, great and small, cooperate.

"Full adherence to world trade policies that will give all peoples everywhere real opportunity to make a decent living. Trade barriers contributed to World War No. 2 and, if permitted to continue, will bring on World War No. 3. When peace comes we must freely exchange substantial parts of our farm and industrial production with other nations, receiving from them products which we need."

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

(President: Howard A. Coffin, Detroit)

Plan outlined at national council, October 1944:

"The national council of the Y. M. C. A. went on record today as favoring an international organization for peace consisting of a judiciary body and a police force. A resolution adopted at the closing session of the 3-day meeting called for:

"1. An international organization composed of representatives of all people whose nations accept the rule of law.

"2. An international judiciary devoted to attainment of political and social justice; and

"3. An international police force to prevent aggression and insure enforcement of law and order."

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

(Mrs. James Irwin, chairman, international relations)

From the proposed public affairs program of the national board of Y. W. C. A.:

"World organization: The United States must assume its full responsibility in the great task of building a world order based on law which will promote the common welfare, secure justice and freedom for all peoples, and banish war from the earth.

"We will: Uphold as an immediate necessity, acceptance by the United States of membership in the United Nations Organization, and full support of its principles as a step toward the greater development of international organization. We urge that the United States work in the United Nations Organization for peaceful change of conditions which become unjust and which might otherwise lead to war."

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

(Mrs. Olive G. Ricker, executive secretary, Chicago, Ill.)

From the report of the special committee (headed by William L. Ransom) to study and report as to proposals for the organization of the nations for peace and law:

"Recommendations:

"1. We recommend that we commit ourselves to the establishment of a general organization of the nations, a general security organization of the nations, of which the United States shall be a member.

"2. * * * commit ourselves to the support of a proposal to maintain an international judiciary as an integral part of the international organization.

"3. * * * commit ourselves to the support of the establishment of an assembly representative of the nations.

"4. * * * of a council for the use of the nations."

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD

(Hon. Robert Kenney, president)

"Endorsing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a world-security organization, the National Lawyers Guild expressed today the opinion that 'there is no constitutional barrier to vesting in the American representative on the Security Council authority to use our armed forces in restraining aggression.' The statement was sent to President Roosevelt and all Members of the United States Senate.

"Guild members scouted statements that such an authorization would violate the Constitution in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress.

" 'It is true,' says the statement, 'that the Constitution vests in Congress the power to declare war. But the power to commit a specified number of armed forces for the prevention of aggression is wholly distinct from the power to declare war. Law enforcement is not war. This is a basic concept of our constitutional law and of international law.' "

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Eric Johnston, president)

From Measures to Promote International Law and Order, April 1944

"Declaration 3:

"1. An international political organization is necessary for the purpose of maintain-

ing peace and security among nations. Such an organization should be based upon the principle of reciprocal collaboration among nations and should not take the form of a superstate. The principles upon which are based the joint Four Nation Declaration at Moscow of October 30, 1943, and the November 5, 1943, resolution of the United States Senate, as well as the House resolution of September 21, 1943, are therefore approved. The Moscow Declaration and the Senate resolution recognize the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"2. This peace and security may best be safeguarded through the use of the armed forces of peace-loving nations acting through the combined Chiefs of Staff organization, developed to meet further conditions."

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

(W. Randolph Burgess, president, New York, N. Y.)

From report of economic policy commission, September 1, 1943:

"Today there is general agreement in this country that there must be, at the conclusion of the war, mechanisms and guaranties to prevent war. As yet this sentiment has not crystallized in specific forms. The principal move in this direction beyond the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations declaration of January 1942 has been the mutual-aid agreements which have been concluded by the United States with the United Kingdom, China, Russia, Belgium, Poland, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Norway, and Jugoslavia. While these agreements lay down the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of peace as well as war, they provide no specific commitments or mechanisms.

"Two things seem clear. First, that there must be an international organization or organizations of some sort for the consideration of international problems; and second, that the United Nations must commit themselves to placing their force back of the essential decisions for peace.

"It is not proposed here to make a detailed recommendation on this point, but simply to emphasize that such a guaranty of peace in our time is a necessary basis for full economic recovery. The risks of war block long-term economic planning and enterprise. Peace is even more essential for prosperity than prosperity is for peace."

NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL, INC.

Final declaration of the thirty-first convention, October 9, 10, 11, 1944:

"We hail the accomplishment of the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks Conference as an epic step in the direction of the establishment of an international organization that will insure this and all peace-loving nations against a resurgence of aggression and disaster."

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-SECOND NATIONAL CONVENTION, OCTOBER 21–25, 1944, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

"The world needs international organization to attain justice, peace, and prosperity for all nations and for all peoples. We believe it to be the duty of all citizens to work urgently for this purpose. The tentative proposal for an international security organization released by the Great Powers as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is a good beginning, although it is incomplete and has defects which, lacking a right spirit, can be most serious; while the actual structure of an international organization is important, the spirit in which it is operated is more important.

"We urge full and immediate discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal in the light of the papal peace program. We urge, furthermore, that wide publicity be given to these discussions in the Catholic and secular press. Only in this way can the weight of Catholic opinion, expressing both fundamental moral principles and willingness to cooperate through organization for a better world, make itself felt in the final proposal and in its acceptance by the nations."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

(Kathryn McHale, general director, Washington, D. C.)

"The A. A. U. W. has consistently supported development of a closer international collaboration to be begun now among the peoples resisting the Axis Powers, and expanded as rapidly as possible into suitable international institutions. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals clearly constitute an important step toward the establishment of such international institutions, and the A. A. U. W. therefore urges their prompt adoption by the United Nations, recommending the further strengthening of interntaional machinery so that it may be truly adequate for the maintenance of peace."

THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMENS CLUBS

(Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, Washington, D. C.)

Resolution adopted April 1944:

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Womens Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, urges the Government of the United States:

"To take definite steps to accomplish the codification of international law;

"To further necessary procedure to obtain international commitments to include collective force to prevent or stop aggression;

"To cooperate immediately with other United Nations in setting up a United Nations Council now to proceed with the formation of the general international organization in accordance with the principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Connally resolution—to the end that important decisions affecting world security and international policies, many of which now seem to be made independently, shall be concerted decisions of the United Nations."

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

(Mrs. Wm. A. Hastings, president, Chicago, Ill.)

Program for planning adopted by this organization November 1944:

"The National Congress of Parents and Teachers endorses the following program for planning on an international basis:

"1. The creation of an appropriate international organization with power to enforce a just and lasting peace, of which the United States shall be a member.

"2. The establishment of an international organization for education to develop educational reconstruction and to promote cultural understanding among the nations.

"3. The development of an international program for the care and protection of children and youth throughout the world."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC.

(Flora R. Rothenberg, executive director, New York, N. Y.)

Adopted the following resolutions:

"*Long-range program for world organization*

"World Organization

"Resolved, That the National Council of Jewish Women endorses the principle of world organization, and urges the United States Government to continue collaborating with the United Nations to formulate and execute plans for its realization.

"International Police Force

"Resolved, That the National Council of Jewish Women favors the creation of an international police force to be used by a world organization for collective action against aggression, to obviate the need of competitive armaments by individual nations, and to make possible a system of collective security."

NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE

(Elizabeth Chrisman, executive secretary, Washington, D. C.)

Adopted the resolution as follows: "Support of United States participation in a general international organization along the lines of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; meanwhile support of international bodies already created, or about to be created, in the social and economic fields, such as United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Bretton Woods Conference, and so forth.

"Support of the change from a two-thirds majority to a simple majority in ratification of treaties by the Senate."

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS

(Margaret A. Hickey, president, New York City.)

Adopted the following resolution:

"Support of participation by the United States of America in international organization with adequate enforcement machinery for the maintenance of peace and security; and support of a foreign policy embracing international social development, economic and financial stability, and the peaceful settlement of international disputes."

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

(Anna Lord Strauss, president, Washington, D. C.)

Program supported January 1945:

"The League of Women Voters favors the immediate establishment of a strong democratic international organization for the purpose of maintaining peace and creating the conditions in which peace is most likely to exist. To this end it endorses the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a working basis for such an organization. It anticipates that the final charter, drawn up by representatives of all peace-loving nations, will expand and strengthen the initial machinery suggested in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

"The League of Women Voters recommends that the State Department indicate the confidence of the people of this country in the international process by urging that there be no requirement of unanimous vote in the security council, and that no nation be given a veto power. It favors empowering our delegate on the security council to vote for the use of military force without reference in each instance to Congress.

"The inevitable differences between nations must not divert the American people from the solution of our international problems, which demands a United Nations organization."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

(Mrs. Jeanetta Brown, executive secretary, Washington, D. C.)

From resolutions taken at annual workshop of National Council of Negro Women, October 1944:

"World peace can be secured only through a universal recognition and application of the democratic principles of liberty, equality, justice, and the essential dignity of man. No lasting peace is possible without a complete and unequivocal acceptance of these principles by all nations and with respect to all peoples, irrespective of race, color, creed, or national origin.

"The world powers, now preparing the blueprint of the post-war world, must recognize that no lasting peace can be possible until the world is purged of its traditional concepts and practices of racial superiority, imperialist domination, and economic exploitation. The non-white populations of the

world, the oppressed and underprivileged of every complexion, who have contributed unstintingly to the inevitable victory, must be liberated and given full opportunity for development. The character of the new world organization must include provision for the ultimate self-government of the dependent peoples, and for the full political, economic, and social emancipation of racial and cultural minorities. The benefits of the peace must accrue to all of the peoples of the world.

"The Dumbarton Oaks proposals do not give assurance to the nonwhite peoples, the dependent peoples, and the minority groups of the world that a new page of history affecting their welfare is about to be written. It is recognized that Dumbarton Oaks was only a beginning, and that the outline devised there is yet to be filled in. The world powers should realize, however, that there is growing doubt and skepticism about their intentions in the minds of the hundreds of millions of nonwhite peoples who make up the preponderance of the world population.

"Realizing that the problems of world organization are complex, the Council is not prepared at this time to submit a comprehensive program or proposals for the protection of repressed groups. It pledges itself, however, to the task of working toward this objective, and supports the following broad principles:

"1. An unequivocal statement on the equality of races and nations must be inserted in the charter of the general international organization.

"2. The general international organization must insure a liberalized and enlightened administration for all colonial areas and subject nations in the interest of all the people, with self-government as the ultimate objective. Specific plans to this end must be outlined, and the responsible powers committed in advance to faithful execution of these plans.

"3. As a major power, the United States of America must exert a strong leadership toward the realization of the foregoing objectives both at home and abroad."

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

(Philip Murray, president, Washington, D. C.)

The seventh constitutional convention, November 1944:

"The Dumbarton Oaks Conference of representatives of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China has already laid a firm basis for the formation of an international organization to secure an enduring peace. The wide area of agreement reached by these great powers is the strongest assurance of success since a lasting peace must be based upon their continued and firm determination to act together and united. We pledge our unswerving effort to this endeavor. The people of this Nation have given a mandate to our President and Commander in Chief that the formation of this organization should not await complete cessation of hostilities. American participation in such international organization must not be rendered ineffective through reservations or the hamstringing of the authority of our representative. The members of this permanent organization, including the United States, shall supply to it contingents of armed forces and other facilities for the purpose of preventing or defeating any acts of aggression. The American representatives must be authorized to act on bshalf of the American people and to vote for the use of force by the international organization under those conditions."

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

(William Green, president, Washington, D. C.)

Report of proceedings, convention resolution, November 28, 1944:

"Resolved, That our foreign policy be directed towards support of the principles of the 'four freedoms' and the Atlantic Charter, and the promotion of commercial relations between the nations of the earth as a means of advancing their respective economic stability and well being."

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

(A. F. Whitney, president, Cleveland, Ohio)

February 2, 1945:

"The brotherhood holds that the groundwork laid at Dumbarton Oaks constitutes a real step forward in cementing cooperation between all nations interested in maintaining world peace. It is heartening to note that the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China—as different as they are from each other in economic, political, and social structures—have nevertheless determined to act together in behalf of the world community of nations.

"The outstanding characteristic of the proposed international organization is the authority given the major powers to move quickly to curb aggression or threats of aggression. Provision is also made to investigate international disputes and settle them, if necessary, through a Permanent Court of International Justice.

"While certain details are yet to be worked out, it is already clear that some such organization as envisaged at Dumbarton Oaks must be established if Germany and Japan are to be prevented from once again threatening the peace of the world. At the same time, aggressive movements by any other countries would likewise be checked."

WORLD GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

(Mrs. Stanley P. Woodard, president, New York, N. Y.)

Resolution passed October 5, 1944:

"Whereas our State Department offers the assurance that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are a remarkable basis of agreement reached among nations so divergent in their traditions and government structures; and

"Whereas a more democratic form of world government will naturally be evolved as the other nations, large and small, join the assembly of the world organization and assume their various responsibilities; and

"Whereas international functional organizations, coordinated with World Government but not under its dominance, will help in solving the world problems which cause war, thus gradually reducing the necessity for the use of force.

"*Resolved*, That the World Government Association urge the Congress of the United States of America to ratify the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

"Resolution passed that world police, properly organized, could prevent aggressive war."

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

(Joseph M. Proskauer, president, New York, N. Y.)

Annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee, January 1943:

"At this time when our country is engaged in an epoch-making war, we who are united with our brethren of all faiths in the common bond of American citizenship, we pledge every effort and every sacrifice to the winning of the war, the achievement for the whole world of the 'four freedoms' and the blessings of the Atlantic Charter and the establishment of a just and enduring peace."

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Declaration by the War Emergency Conference of the World Jewish Congress:

"The Jewish people look to the United Nations for the establishment of a new international democratic order based on the 'four freedoms' and the Atlantic Charter, embodying inter alia:

"(a) The promulgation of an international bill of rights securing full protection of life and liberty for the inhabitants of all countries without distinction of origin, nationality, race, faith, or language, and the enforcement of such a bill of rights by an adequate international machinery."

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

(Frank W. Hubbard, director, research division, office of public relations, Washington, D. C.)

Resolutions adopted by representative assembly July 6, 1944:

"Maintenance of peace: The National Education Association believes that enduring peace must be supported by a permanent organization of peace-loving nations. The association, therefore, urges the President of the United States and the Congress to take immediate steps toward the calling of a council of all the United Nations for the purpose of working out plans to establish and maintain world peace; such council to be called at the earliest possible date.

"Education and the World Peace: The National Education Association is convinced that history demonstrates the power of education to shape young minds into nationalistic war patterns, and proves the necessity of an enlightened world as a basis for enduring peace. The asscciation, therefore, urges the immediate establishment of a United Nations Council on Educational Policy, and recommends that the Government of the United States, when the peace is made, use its influence in the creation of a permanent international agency for education as a means of promoting good will among all nations."

KIWANIS CLUB

From address by Hon. Ben Dean, Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Kiwanis International, at a meeting of the Kiwanis Club of Washington, D. C., in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of Kiwanis, January 25, 1945:

"The Kiwanians must throw the weight of their influence in their 2,250 communities against a let-down of the war effort—against the inevitable war weariness which will follow victory in Europe—against those vicious subversive influences on the home front which seek to divide and sow doubt and distrust.

"The second objective of Kiwanis is: Use our influence to establish and maintain world peace.

"It was just 25 years ago next March 19, in the United States Senate that the votes of 35 Senators—7 more than necessary—barred this Nation from joining the League of Nations, and changed the course of history. These 35 Senators believed they had public opinion behind them. People were disillusioned, embittered. They wanted to isolate themselves from European quarrels. They welcomed President Harding's normalcy.

"There can be no effective international force for peace unless America plays a leading role.

"This, then, is the task of all Kiwanians and like service groups, to build a strong and vocal public opinion that demands a lasting peace. We must use our Kiwanis Clubs as forums and platforms to mold in each community a public opinion that will be powerful and insistent. In a democracy it is the people on whom the peace depends. Let the people speak with a common voice from the towns and the country, from the hills and the plains, and Congress will hear. Across this broad land must be built a public opinion that cannot be ignored in Washington, that will be clear and unmistakable to our allies, that will be a sharp and insistent directive at the peace table. To this task Kiwanians and all like-minded Americans must dedicate their energies in this fateful year."

BISHOPS' STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL ORDER

By the Catholic bishops of the United States and signed in their names by the ad-

ministrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, November 16, 1944:

"The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations, large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a Security Council with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case. Frankly, it must recognize that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must, therefore, provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations.

"The function of the international organization must be the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of international cooperation and the adoption of common policies for the solution of common economic, social, and other humanitarian problems. In the maintenance of peace it is reasonable that the organization have at its disposal resources for coercing outlaw nations even my military measures."

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

New York, N. Y., January 19, 1945:

"The Synagogue Council of America greets with profound gratitude the labors of the leaders and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and our own country as set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security. Although these proposals are admittedly tentative, and constitute only a preliminary and incomplete statement of a hope yet to be fulfilled, the Synagogue Council acclaims the temper in which they are drawn. The statesmen of the four Allied Nations testified to the faith that resides in the human spirit and bespeak our own conviction that men and nations can and will cooperate to free the world of the curse of war.

"The Synagogue Council of America is in full accord with the recommendation in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to establish a security council, an international court of justice, and to develop such measures as shall advance the possibilities of universal peace.

"The security council would be empowered to employ force to maintain or restore international peace. Use of force to suppress the persecutor and to vanquish the oppressor is a recognized principle of Judaism."

SOUTHERN BAPTISTS COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE

(J. M. Dawson, chairman)

Speech before Southern Baptist Historical Society, August 29, 1944:

"1. No isolation: We believe that the command of Jesus 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' is a condemnation of the policy of isolation on the part of any nation. No nation is justified in seeking to separate itself from the rest of the world—its needs, its problems, or its life. We are inevitably members one of another.

"2. A democratic world: Believing that God has created all men free and equal and has given to them certain inalienable rights which must ever be respected, we assert the right of all nations, both great and small, to self-government, and the obligation of the strong to protect the weak, whether small nations, racial minorities, or underprivileged people in the exercise of their God-given freedom.

"3. Organized for peace: In order to guarantee security for all nations against aggression, invasion, or attempted domination by any other nation, we believe an international organization should be set up which by economic sanctions, or if necessary by police power, shall restrain any such attempt at aggression, invasion, or attempted domination.

"4. Economic opportunity for all nations: Many nations are retarded in their development because of poverty and lack of economic opportunity. The erection of tariff barriers for the protection and enrichment of stronger nations may be as serious a hurt to weaker nations as military invasion."

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Proposed in a report by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist area of New York to a session of the National Study Conference on the Churches and a Just and Durable Peace, at Cleveland, Ohio, January 18, 1945:

"We recommend that the churches support the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as an important step in the direction of world cooperation while at the same time we urge the following measures for their improvement:

"1. Development of international law: Operation of the organization under international law should be clearly anticipated in the charter and provision for the development and codification of international law should be specifically incorporated.

"2. Voting power: A nation while having the right to discuss its own case should not be permitted to vote when its case is being judged by a predetermined body of international law.

"3. Amendment: In order to permit such changes in the charter of the organization as may from time to time be necessary, the provision for amendments should be liberalized so as not to require concurrence by all the permanent members of the Security Council.

"4. Colonial and dependent areas: A special agency or commission should be established wherein the progress of colonial and dependent areas to autonomy, and the interim problems related thereto, may become an international responsibility.

"5. Human rights and fundamental freedoms: A special commission on human rights and fundamental freedoms should be established in addition to the economic and social agencies proposed under the economic and social council.

"6. Eventual universal membership: The charter should clearly specify that all nations willing to accept the obligations of membership shall thereupon be made members of the organization.

"7. Limitation of armaments: More specific provisions should be made for promptly initiating the limitation and reduction of national armaments.

"8. Preamble: A preamble should reaffirm long-range purposes of justice and human welfare which are set forth in the Atlantic Charter and which reflect the aspirations of peoples everywhere.

"The proposals are the only plan which governments have thus far evolved and therefore are the only available index to the extent of agreement which is now possible.

"They set forth certain purposes and principles essential to world order and peace.

"They provide for continuing collaboration of the United Nations, and in due course of other nations.

"They provide through the assembly for the periodic consultation of all member nations and for promoting cooperation in the interest of the general welfare.

"They provide an economic and social council for facilitating solutions of international econmic, social, and other humanitarian problems and for coordinating international policies and agencies in this field.

"They provide, through the Security Council, for continuing consultation of representatives of the greater powers and of selected lesser powers with a view to a peaceful settlement of disputes and the restraint of aggression."

The three discussion groups of the conference, including all the delegates, voted unconditional endorsement of Dumbarton Oaks but reserved the right of the conference and of churchmen in general to continue their efforts at improvement.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the United States Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a joint resolution by the Maryland General Assembly congratulating the United States Naval Academy on the approaching one hundredth anniversary of its founding, and expressing the hope that the present Naval Academy will be expanded to meet any further need by the Navy for officer personnel.

House Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution by the Maryland General Assembly congratulating the United States Naval Academy on the approaching one-hundredth anniversary of its founding and expressing the hope that the present Naval Academy will be expanded to meet any further need by the Navy for officer personnel

Whereas the United States Naval Academy, the home of naval officers, will on October 10, 1945, attain the one hundredth anniversary of its founding at Fort Severn, in Annapolis, Md.; and

Whereas the State of Maryland shares the Nation's deep appreciation of the achievements and accomplishments of the United States Navy, and is warmly sensible to the essential part played in such achievements and accomplishments by the Naval Academy in its century's service of training the officers of the United States Navy; and

Whereas the State of Maryland esteems the decision of the many Naval Academy men electing to become legal residents of Maryland, some commencing as midshipmen and continuing as officers with their families when in duty residence, and frequently consummated by their adoption of the State for permanent residence at the time of retirement from the United States Navy, with the result that the State has gained in these citizens valuable leadership, experience, and cosmopolitan views and knowledge, all in keeping with the highest standards and traditions of Maryland; and

Whereas the State of Maryland enjoys the most cordial and cooperative relations with the administration of the United States Naval Academy and with the regiment of midshipmen; and

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland that to establish supplemental institutions apart from the century-old home of the Naval Academy in order to provide increased needs for naval officers, as has been proposed, would, by competitive and extraneous influences, rend the common heritage of naval officers, the tradition of Annapolis brotherhood; and

Whereas it is the conviction of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland that there is available in Annapolis, Md., contiguous to

the present reservation adequate areas to accommodate expansion of the United States Naval Academy to a dimension that will permit the training of sufficient officers for the post-war Navy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Delegates of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, That the most sincere congratulations be extended by the State of Maryland to the United States Naval Academy on this the occasion of its centennial, together with an expression of the convictions that the accomplishments of the future will equal those of the Naval Academy's glorious history, and that the cordial spirit characterizing the State relations with the Naval Academy will continue through the years; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the conviction of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland that facilities for the training and education of such additional officers as the United States Navy may need can, and should, be established, with obvious spiritual and economic advantages, by expansion of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., where it was founded and where, in the century being rounded, it already has expanded many times; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the journals of the senate and house of delegates, that copies be presented the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Maryland in the Congress of the United States, and that by this resolution the State of Maryland delegations in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress are petitioned to lend every aid to the retention of the Nation's one Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md.

Proposal for Joint Executive-Legislative Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Gould Lincoln's column entitled "The Political Mill," from the Washington Star of March 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, Democrat, has proposed a drastic—and novel for America—change in our governmental set-up. Appearing before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, the Arkansas Senator suggested a joint executive-legislative cabinet to be composed of the President's Cabinet and the chairmen of the proposed new streamlined joint standing committees of Congress. He argued that such a cabinet would make possible much closer collaboration between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

One power proposed for this joint cabinet, if granted in the future, would make the Government much more responsive to the popular will. That is the power to dissolve Congress, in case of a deadlock between the two branches of Government over some issue of major importance, and force a general election. This veers toward the British system of parliamentary government, although it would retain the executive as a separate and strong branch of the Government. Senator FULBRIGHT's plan, if a general election were forced, would call for the election of all Members of the Senate and House, and a President and Vice President. He maintains that no such action would be taken unless the issue involved in a dispute between the President and Congress were of vital importance.

The country has had two examples in the last quarter century when an impasse existed between the Chief Executive and Congress at times of stress—and, Mr. FULBRIGHT believes, there may be another coming up. The first was when the late President Wilson split violently with the Senate over the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations, and second was when former President Hoover, faced with a disastrous depression, had a recalcitrant Congress on his hands when he undertook to get through measures he believed would help. In both instances the President faced a Congress in which the opposite political party held control of one House, as a result of a prior election. This split in party control has occurred many times in the history of the United States—indeed, in nearly 30 different Congresses out of a total of 79. When it occurs, the Government is more or less hamstrung.

This country is on the threshold of important events, particularly in the field of foreign affairs, but by no means exclusively so. Suppose, as might happen, either the House or Senate, or both, should fall under Republican control in the elections next year. The situation for the American people, with their Government thus divided, would be pathetic, with Mr. Roosevelt and the Republican leaders in Congress working at cross purposes. Should the issue become grave enough, and a general election could be forced, the situation might be cured.

Members of Congress have been more and more aroused—and this goes for Democrats as well as Republicans—over the fact that the executive with its present vast powers, is either disregarding the intent of Congress in administering the laws or is actually assuming to write the law through Executive orders and myriad regulations. They resent this bitterly. They point out that when the Constitution was written it was with a clear intent that the executive should not have kingly powers, and the legislative should be strong. Development over the years, however, has finally brought to the Chief Executive greater powers than monarchs have held in other countries, certainly far greater than the King of England holds today.

The Fulbright plan to give a joint cabinet the authority to dissolve Congress and force a general election would require a constitutional amendment. Senator BALL of Minnesota, Republican, who has sympathy for the proposal, is of the opinion it would be well to hold another Constitutional Convention generally to bring the Constitution up to date.

Commendatory Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article and letters:

[From the Noblesville (Ind.) Daily Ledger of March 26, 1945]

Those Hoosier boys seem to think they want to be in the House when great, or even the smaller, matters are before the body, and they even go so far as to think a quorum should be present.

One of these scrappin' Members got into the limelight, but he was right and stood the light very well, even when he was called names.

That was that young fellow EARL WILSON, a former school teacher and one, no doubt, who wishes he were back in the schoolroom where, at least, he could keep order and have a quorum present when study was needed, and when it was well for each pupil to be able to answer the roll call in person.

It is difficult for a former school teacher to reconcile himself to the discussion of a topic when only two or three Members of the House are present, and so he calls for a quorum, now and then, and those who have been there for years do not want to be forced to pay any real attention to what is being discussed—they let a few leaders think for all and say what shall be voted through, and just peep in for a roll call.

Congressman WILSON also has trouble reconciling himself to the fact that so little attention is paid to the passage of bills which means an addition to that debt of $7,000 a family for all the people of the country, and the Congress has already agreed that it can go on until the whole debt reaches the untold sum, in all history, of three hundred billions, and, as Professor WILSON says when the Government has asked even little children to save their pennies and purchase War bonds.

This matter of the billion debt was being discussed and when only a few of the Members of the House were present, Dr. WILSON asked for a quorum and the majority leader called Professor WILSON a "d——n fool," and the EARL did not like that. But Mr. WILSON did not fight back and, of course, being a school teacher, he does not know all those names which are sometimes used in a disrespectful way, but he did get the quorum in the House.

And he did get a discussion of the matter, and he also may go so far as to teach the Congressmen that the people back at home wish that they shall know what is going on at Washington and that they shall understand that the people back at home do not hold the Congress in as high an estimate as they would if they really knew that each and every Member was earning his salary by really being in the Congress and not merely getting the news from the newspapers, whose Representatives there are on the job all the time.

ATKINSON, N. H., *March 25, 1945.*

The Hon. EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Since listening last evening to the People's Platform I have hoped and prayed that you would not regret your stand.

I live in a small country village to be sure, but friends from cities have told me of loss of efficiency, absenteeism, and accidents due to drink. Of course, not all frequent night clubs, but twice since the "midnight curfew" I have heard reports of fewer arrests, less crime, fewer auto accidents, apparently because in many cases midnight ended indulgence in worse than foolish "fun."

May you be always on the side of right, however loud the protestations from the wrong. I always rejoice to know of Congressmen who are seeking to answer the prayer "Thy kingdom come." May God give you wisdom and courage.

Sincerely,

CLARA M. RIDGEWAY.

From Dr. Frank Laubach:

"The glad news I want to shout from the housetops is that America can work a world miracle, if we care enough and serve selflessly enough.

"You don't have to be powerful; you don't have to be bright; you don't have to see the whole way ahead. All you need is to be sure of what He wants done, trust enough to venture, and obey every minute."

PUTNAM, CONN., *March 24, 1945.*

DEAR MR. WILSON: You done well, Mr. WILSON, the other two speakers made me mad. You told the truth. We don't have to read or hear about it. We see it night and day, and this is not New York or Detroit.

Yours truly,

DAVID FAHLSTROM.

THE CORPS OF ROYAL CANADIAN ENGINEERS,
CAMP ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Barriefield, Ontario, Canada, March 25, 1945.

Mr. EARL WILSON,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., United States of America.

DEAR SIR: I listened to the broadcast in which you took part, and curiously enough, had just read an article by one of our columnists, anent the 12 o'clock midnight curfew, which I am enclosing.

It might be interesting to you to get the views of one of your Canadian neighbors.

Sincerely yours,

Corp. D. D. WILSON.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *March 24, 1945.*

Congressman EARL WILSON,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I just have heard your broadcast over the Columbia network and I must compliment you upon your dignity, sense, idealism, fairness, and strength. Hayes was everything you weren't. He stands for a group of people who want to do what they want to do, when and how they want to do it. He's a disturbing example of a group of people who can get pleasure only in one way—in satisfying himself and let the rest of the world go to the devil. His idea of a good time means drinking, heavy drinking probably, and going to night clubs. He never would understand your having fun and relaxation in a fine, wholesome way. He doesn't even sense you hard working Congressmen can get fun out of serving people of the United States as a whole.

Hayes made a plain fool of himself. He lacked control and any idea of altruism. He's interested in making money and furthering his own personal ideas.

Congratulations for your work on the radio and your work to bring about better support of our boys who are giving their all for us.

I think all our boys aren't interested in getting home so they can get dead drunk and get some girl dead drunk in some "den of vice." I know several who aren't cut on those lines, but who want to come back to the kind of United States you would like to have and are willing to work for.

Truly yours,

LOUISE S. STEINWAY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 24, 1945.*

Hon. EARL WILSON,

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your stand on the curfew question as given over WGAR on the People's Platform. Your remarks were inspiring and splendid and all for our great war effort.

The United States is proud of your endeavors.

Gratefully yours,

JULIA M. SMALE.

Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Invaluable Service" published in the March 8, 1945, issue of the Oglethorpe Echo, of Lexington, Ga.

This article relates to the Soil Conservation Service, one of the outstanding agencies of the Government benefiting the farmers and costing the Government very little money:

AN INVALUABLE SERVICE

Since the advent of the New Deal many services have been inaugurated designed to be of benefit to the masses of people.

All of them, however, have not worked out that way. Many of them proved unwise and have since been discarded.

But there is one that is proving of vast benefit to the people, and its benefits increase with time. We are speaking of the soil-conservation service.

This service is fundamental and basic. There can be no revival of agriculture without it. The years of neglect and wrong tillage methods on the vast majority of our lands has rendered them incapable of producing a living and a profit to the husbandman.

The soil-conservation program was designed to correct this situation, and is doing so. Of course, it will take years to bring the land back to a high state of fertility, and as time passes more and more improvement will be noted in the economic condition of our people. One can readily see that 50 bushels of oats per acre will be more profitable than 25. This is true of all other crops. This program is doing just this.

This article was inspired by the series of weekly news stories being run by John T. Conger, Jr., and Edge Thomas, the gentlemen who have this program in charge in Oglethorpe County. We were impressed with the news that Mr. So-and-So has had a soil-conservation plan made out for his farm; that so many acres were being planted to kudzu this spring; that terraces were being laid out; lespedeza was being planted; and perennial cover crops were being planted in water-disposal areas. In the years to come great benefits will be noted from these efforts.

A ride through Oglethorpe County will convince one of the vast changes in the rural scene within the past 10 years and the next decade will effect a change just as radical. Remember the old brown cotton fields being washed away by winter rains? Now you see acres upon acres of green growing crops; oats, wheat, rye, barley, and clover, producing the very finest of feed and at the same time conserving and enriching the soil for more and heavier yields as the years pass.

We know of one farmer in the county who, last fall, planted 100 acres of bale-to-the-acre cotton land to crimson clover and other pasture grasses, fenced this area, and will use it for pasture land. It is our purpose to tell you more about this later on. When the warm days of spring come this field, or pasture, will be a thing of beauty, and will become more and more profitable with the passing years.

Economic gain is by no means the only benefit to be derived from this program. As more and more minerals are added to the soil a great improvement in the public health will take place. Relief from economic stress and disease and sickness will have its beneficial effect upon the public morals of the masses of people. These benefits are cumulative and one improvement leads to another. After the war more machinery will be used upon our farms as this type of farming is adapted to its use. Fewer and fewer row crops will be planted, livestock will be more and more stressed, relieving our farm men, women, and children of back-breaking drudgery in the fields and at the same time producing a higher standard of living.

Of all the agencies created by the Government designed to benefit the people we believe the soil-conservation program to be, by far, the greatest of them all.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before Foreign Commerce Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of foreign commerce, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Foreign Commerce Club at their annual Port of New York Night banquet, at New York City, on March 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is highly fitting that this discussion of foreign trade and shipping is being held in the city of New York. Occasionally the great role of the port of New York is obscured by more glamorous aspects of the city as a center of finance, of art, and of entertainment. And yet, this great mountain, made by the hands of man, rests essentially upon its trade, its foreign and coastwise shipping and all the attendant services and industries which are dependent on trade.

Half the volume of our national exports and imports move to and from the world through the gateway of the port of New York. Back in the peacetime year of 1937 it was estimated that nearly 2,500 ocean-going departures or arrivals on the Manhattan side of the river alone carried more than $1,300,000,000 worth of merchandise in a single year. In coast-wise trade in that year there were 5,300 departures or arrivals, carrying more than 4,000,000 tons valued in excess of $1,000,000,000.

It will be upon the margin represented by the trade passing through here after the war that national prosperity or depression will depend. And considering the vast necessities that will be present in this country for employment, for goods and for the use of a great industrial plant, our margin of foreign trade, while relatively small, will be the critical balance on which our well being may well depend.

It is good that leaders in the shipping industry are looking ahead toward the improvement of this great port. Basil Harris,

president of the United States Lines, speaking for the Propeller Clubs of New York last year forcibly called attention to a number of basic facts. He pointed out that while the speed of ocean-going ships prior to the war averaged 10½ knots, the average speed in the post-war era will be in the neighborhood of 15 knots.

Mr. Harris made another vitally important point. The awful destruction visited upon such European ports as London, Cherbourg, Bremen, Rotterdam, and other ports promises them at least one post-war advantage. The rebuilding of a city or a port under modern conditions is a comparatively rapid process. When these ports are reconstructed they will be built according to the latest designs. Their facilities for loading and unloading will be unparalleled. Our port of New York, untouched by the ravages of war, will, on the other hand, carry the marks of antiquity. That ironical fate we must avoid by a program of modernization. Mr. Harris proposed $2,000,000,000 for the modernization of this port. It is a suitable purpose for any major public works program. It is essentially a responsibility of the Nation as a whole, and it would be the most prudent of public works, since it would be abundantly self-liquidating, it would provide jobs and industrial activity, and best of all, would keep the United States in line with the maritime industry of the world.

I am not going to indulge in prophecies about the amount of our foreign trade after the war. There are many such estimates—some modest, some utterly too hopeful. But what we know is that in the business that will follow this war foreign trade is certain to play a very large part. The important thing is not to indulge ourselves in estimates, but to set to work now to develop the changed national viewpoint which will make a large increase in foreign trade possible. That is a task to which business, labor, and Government can well devote their united strength.

It is a hopeful sign that in both political parties there is developing an increasing interest in foreign trade, and in consequence a recognition that the modern position of the United States in the world makes it necessary that we reconsider many of the tariff policies of the past. Under the great leadership of Secretary Cordell Hull, this change of attitude has taken form in our reciprocal trade policy. That policy was sound, but in its beginnings it was experimental, tentative, and modest. But now that American prejudices in favor of higher tariffs are subsiding before the great facts of American efficiency and necessities, we may more resolutely proceed in the direction of enlarging our imports. A test of opinion on this subject will come later this spring when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act comes up for renewal. If the vote is close, it may mean that the administration will hesitate to move resolutely toward a larger exchange of goods. If the vote is by a wide margin, we may expect sentiment in both parties to move progressively toward a real reconsideration of our tariff policies.

We hear a good deal about increasing our exports, but not so much about the necessity of imports. It is time for a considerable change in this emphasis, if we are to take steps in the direction of making it possible to liquidate our prospective post-war loans.

But in our preparations for post-war responsibilities we must break off the habit of delay. Too much of our financial machinery consists of an apparatus for putting things off. A great part of our credit system consists of means of postponing payments through notes, mortgages, and the like. The financing of foreign trade seems to be arranged in the same spirit of delay. And in that trade the parties are farther apart. Decisions are postponed, procrastination governs our actions and all too often we postpone settlements until they can no longer be made without defaults. These delays in the past, which were largely due to the complicated machinery of international finance, resulted in some very serious international problems. The weight of our trade balances became so heavy that collapse finally resulted. Depression swept the world, and war came in its wake. There is nothing new in this deadly cycle. Philip II, of Spain, long ago decided to have done with all of the financial machinery involved in his foreign borrowings and he simply repudiated, throwing weaker countries into chaos and ruin.

The danger of postponing settlements in foreign trade is similar to the old habit of long-delayed reparations after a war. The fact is that the longer actual payments of reparations are deferred, the greater the danger is that no reparation will be paid.

We must, as Americans, resolve to walk squarely up to these questions of how we are going to be paid for our exports and face them honestly. Republican Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, gave some sound advice to his party in a speech in January. He said, "If we are going to sell abroad, we must buy abroad." And I would add to this statement of Senator WHERRY that if we are going to lend abroad, we must accept goods from abroad.

We are going to need more from the rest of the world than we have ever needed before. We have scraped to the bottom of the barrel in many of our resources. Some of our resources of which we still have considerable quantities, such as ur forests, might well be given a rest in order that they may grow again. We shall have to import more zinc and lead, more iron, petroleum, and timber. The development of our new industries which will follow the war will require much more of materials that we have in the past imported in small quanti ies, such as manganese, nickel. wool, vegetable oils, and oil seeds, pulp, and and paper. The list is extensive and impressive.

There are a few items, such as rubber, of course, in which the process will be reversed, but the trend will be toward large imports of raw materials.

We will have to do some importing of things that we shall need for essential defense, such as the elements necessary for steel alloys. Our stock piles should be here and not in Arabia or central Africa.

There are other offsets to trade, things which have traditionally helped us to balance our accounts. There is foreign travel, for example. There will be more of that. There will be foreign investments which leave money abroad. All these factors will still leave room for greater imports of luxuries and goods of general utility, and our tariffs always must be adjusted to take account of them.

But the greatest necessary adjustment must be in our thinking. The great argument for high tariffs in the past has rested on the fallacious belief that there is just so much work to go around. Our thinking on this subject has looked upon work as a constant and sterile substance which, having been measured and weighed, need not be measured and weighed again. But the amount of work in the world is not a sterile and unchangeable commodity; it is a vital organism capable of growth. We shall have to revise the thinking on the basis of which we have sought short cuts to limited employment, such as shorter workweeks and other share-the-work plans. We shall have to revise the belief, so widely prevalent in this country that if somebody else makes any kind of goods which can be made here, then somebody here loses his job.

It is time that we realize that there is no limit to the quantity of the many things we could import and consume in this country and, on the other hand, that there is no limit to the amount of goods in the production of which we unquestionably excel—goods that are made in accordance with the highest standards of efficiency the world has ever seen.

If we are going to bring about this readjustment of trade, of our laws governing trade, and of our past and obsolete thinking which lies behind those laws, the time to do it is when European production is being slowly and gradually resumed. If we take time by the forelock and prepare now for this new era in our economic policies and thought, the amount that we will have to accept will be small at first and increase only gradually. That is because European production must, of necessity, be slow in moving back to its normal capacity. In dealing with our tariff laws we might well learn a lesson from the philosophy of Secretary Hull, which viewed tariff adjustments as a matter for progressive action. The Tariff Act of 1933, provided for five biennial reductions. Such a progressive plan make it possible for business to anticipate changes, plan ahead, and meet slowly increasing imports with new programs of essential production.

Our adjustments to reductions in tariffs may not be as great as we think. Our merchandise imports came pretty close to balancing our merchandise exports from 1922–29. Indeed, if the growth of our foreign trade had continued from 1929 at a steady rate, we would not now be viewing the trebling of our peacetime trade as a distant goal. We would already have attained something like that proportion.

A good deal has been said for the view that a prosperous America is the best single guaranty of a prosperous world But this statement, however true, needs to be spelled out in terms of what it takes to make a prosperous America. A prosperous America is an America going forward, with investment at home and investment abroad, with confidence in the essential friendliness of its Government, with confidence that there may be profit in trade and in international finance, with confidence that obligations, public and private, will be honored.

We talk of how a prosperous America can carry the benefits of its prosperity to other countries. How can we do this best? Should we merely tell them that they ought to raise their wages, or should we enable them to engage in a trade so profitable, through buying their goods, that their wages will increase as a natural consequence?

The grim handwriting is on the wall for everyone to see. Unless we do arrange in some way to obtain payment for our goods—and now is the time to start arranging for that—then we risk having to go through the experience of another great series of defaults. Once more, we may have the bitter experience of unpaid debts, of hard feelings between nations, of a paralyzed trade and of the unpredictable results beyond. I have spoken of the danger of another series of defaults. Three of these have already come within the memory of most of us.

The first consisted of those debts to American private investors contracted abroad in the 1920's. Not all of these failed, by any means, but a lot of good American money went down the drain.

The second series of defaults took place in the early 1930's. They were the debts to our Government by other governments, contracted during and after the First World War. This series of defaults led to the passage of the Johnson Act, which was the expression of a country which was sick and tired of all dealings with foreign nations. It was a gesture of isolationism, but to be perfectly frank, it was a gesture which rose out of despair, anger, and disillusionment.

The third series consists of lend-lease obligations which we are probably going to forgive in large part, as a portion of the cost of winning the war.

Let us not go beyond this and permit defaults to occur in a fourth series of loans—loans which are proposed in such institu-

tions as those suggested by Bretton Woods. Let me make it clear that I am not objecting to these loans. I am trying to make the point that when we make them, we must adjust our economic thinking to a proper means of permitting those loans to be repaid.

Let us face these problems squarely. Let us admit that if we are going to lend abroad, we must buy abroad. Let us put our tariffs in such order that we can accept payment in the only way in which payment can be made. Let us make loans to Europe, not necessarily out of our generosity, but out of our business sense, because Europe will need loans for her reconstruction. The impoverished countries over there will need, on the physical side, industrial and transportation equipment, building materials and tools of every kind. A Europe rising from her ruins will be a good customer, and a good supplier of valuable products to us; if we are willing to accept them in payment for what we sell.

In our attitude toward countries which, in the past, have been in the main merely suppliers of raw materials, let us encourage them in their efforts to develop an industrial system. Always remember that our greatest volume of trade has always been with nations industrially developed—not with poor and backward countries. The great economic paradox in international affairs is that our greatest benefits come from countries which are our natural competitors.

Once our thinking is adjusted to these principles, we need not spend our time and energy talking of employment first. Employment is a result and not a cause. Employment will come from increased confidence among nations, from a sound maintenance of international credit and, above all, from the promises of a lasting peace.

That, of course, is the theme to which all thoughts return—a lasting peace. And it is the thought of lasting peace that brings my mind back again to the fact that this important and delightful occasion is taking place in the port of New York, which has been changed so much by war, and which has so much at stake in the establishment of a just and lasting peace and in the world-wide prosperity which can be made to follow.

There are thousands of New Yorkers like myself who have more than the American's normal interest and pride in the fame and fortune of this, the world's greatest seaport. We have a sentimental attachment to this harbor and its metropolis because it was to the port of New York that our forebears a century or more ago came to seek, and to find, spiritual and political freedom and economic substance for themselves and their descendants. I think it can truthfully be said that more people from all sections of Europe entered the land of opportunity through this magnificent and thrilling gateway than through all the other American ports put together.

Yet twice within living memory we have seen the unmatched facilities of this ocean terminal turned aside from their proper purposes devoted to the agony and destruction of war. Twenty-five years ago there left this port thousands upon thousands of young Americans bound for Europe or the open seas in defense of their country. And in the past 4 years not thousands, but millions, of the finest of our youth and many thousands of our young women have left this port to fight in every theater of war, be it land or water. This is sad to relate. Even sadder is the fact that many of them will not come back. I pray, as we all do, that never again will the port of New York be used to send either men or supplies to wars in other lands, but that for centuries to come it will be a port of entry for unnumbered thousands bound for a better life in our wonderful land.

I know that in this will also be the prayer of our young warriors as their returning transports steam up the harbor past the Statue of Liberty. God grant they may have that welcome sight before many months have passed.

Bureaucratic Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this House, by an overwhelming vote, has twice gone on record redefining the Tydings admendment, in language so plain that even an eighth-grade schoolboy can understand it, yet General Hershey and his staff does not seem to be able to interpret the wish and the will of Congress when it passed the Tydings amendment. They are still continuing to reclassify essential, irreplaceable farmers and farm workers as I–A and inducting them into the armed forces.

Congress can pass laws but it is the duty of the Executive and the executive departments to enforce them. When the executive, the law enforcement branch, not only ignores the law, but knowingly violates it, there is danger to our form of government. We are at war and Congress, for that reason, may not have taken more drastic steps, but if this provocation continues, Congress may be forced to take further steps. It may be forced to take the steps that will let the Nation know who is responsible for this wholesale interference with our war effort—who is interfering with the Nation's food supply.

One bureau of the executive tells us of a food scarcity. Another of the danger of a famine. Then comes the Chief Executive and tells us that we must pull in our belts, that we must feed the starving of other nations. Then along comes General Hershey and denudes the farms of the Nation of essential farm workers. This in violation not only of the spirit, but of the plain letter of the Tydings amendment. I get letters every day "Why does not Congress do this and why does not Congress stop this madness?" My answer is that Congress passes the laws and the executive's duty is to enforce them and not to violate them.

May I suggest that if the Federal Government fails to enforce the laws, then it is up to the governors of the various States. I want to take my hat off to a few of these governors. These few have accepted the responsibility. They have directed the State director to obey the Tydings amendment. These directed the local draft boards to obey it. To my knowledge, one of them used the radio and informed the local boards that the Tydings amendment must be observed. Unfortunately, some of the governors have not given this matter due consideration.

To show that the pressure upon the State directors and the local draft boards comes from the Director of Selective Service here in Washington, I am inserting a paragraph of a letter written to James E. McDonald, Martinsburg, W. Va., by the State director:

It might be stated, however, that our general understanding is that this case is no different from that of many others in that section and with the pressure now being put on Selective Service for the induction of men in the lower age groups, we believe it would be well for all employers to make preparations to release men under 26 who are otherwise eligible.

Under these conditions, it seems to me that the Senate should take prompt action and pass House Concurrent Resolution 29 which was passed over a week ago by an everwhelming majority in the House. When the committee provided for in that resolution is set up, it can call in the State directors and some of the local draft boards that have resigned, or have been asked to resign, because they refuse to ignore the Tydings amendment and we will fix the responsibility where it belongs. It may be that Congress will feel inclined to take the proper steps to see that the laws of this Nation are not only obeyed but enforced.

I further wish to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that not only are the farms being denuded of farm help but they are compelled to work with insufficient farm implements. I have been informed that this year 16 percent of the production of farm implements is going to foreign countries as against about 7 percent last year.

This being the case, the surplus property suitable for agriculture should be sold by the Government direct to the farmers. But that is not being done. Some of it has been sold to speculators. Recently I listened to the testimony given before the Committee on Agriculture by Capt. John H. Stanbaugh, who stated that he knew instances where the Treasury Department sold trucks suitable for agriculture for as low as $150, and which were in turn sold by the purchasers to farmers for $750.

This kind of performance should be halted. It is better to put a few in jail now than to wait until after the war. Then, I am afraid, there will not be jails enough to hold them. Here again is a letter I have just received from a person who works for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This letter speaks for itself. I, too, hope that this party will not be dismissed because he is letting us know what is going on.

Dear Representative LEMKE: I am with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and feel deeply concerned over the disposal of certain materials which are so badly needed by our farms. To mention a few, we have 10,000 home-lighting units, gas or Diesel driven, highly suitable to farm work. Then there are the following: electric motors, power pumps, metal piping and fittings, bare copper suitable for lightning rods, electrical supplies, tractors, Diesel and gas engines.

I feel that this surplus material should be sold direct to the farmers on suitable terms where necessary, and give them all of the direct benefits.

Your comments would be greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

FREDERICK A. BERLIN.

P. S.—You are privileged to read this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that it does not result in my dismissal.

These are strenuous times. While our boys are about finishing their work on foreign battlefields, and while their names have been used without authorization in putting over the slave bill in this House, nothing has been done to stop this alleged graft or to find out just what the facts are. While the farms are being denuded, House Concurrent Resolution 29 is sleeping in the Senate. The time has come for action. Let us stop wasting time on the slave bill and pass House Concurrent Resolution 29. Let us not put a stain upon the remarkable performance of labor and the American people in this war by insulting them with an unconstitutional slave bill.

Shall We Choose Insanity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a challenging and thought-provoking address on the subject now uppermost in men's minds—the future peace of the world—was delivered over radio station WFBM at Indianapolis on March 22 under auspices of the Indiana Committee for Victory by my distinguished constituent, Booth Tarkington.

I think that this address, so pregnant with meaning and sound philosophy, so illuminating and inspirational that it may be said to be wholly unique, should be read by every person in the United States, and I have secured the unanimous consent of the House to insert its full text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Shall We Choose Insanity? was the subject chosen by Mr. Tarkington, and his address was as follows:

We learn from Stephen Bonsal's book on the French who came to help us win our Revolutionary War that George Washington's best friend among the French officers was the Chevalier de Chastellux. This Chastellux, a professional soldier, and a member of the French Academy, fought upon more battlefields than that of Yorktown, and he thought hard about war. His conclusion was that there ought to be a league of nations to prevent war. History and his own experience proved to him that mankind stupidly inflicts terrible injuries upon itself; but he thought that sometime, when warring nations got their eyes open enough to notice a certain thing, they would form an international league for permanent peace.

This "certain thing" that Chastellux thought people would sometime surely notice was that in any way, the victor is almost as horribly damaged as is the vanquished. So when the people of this world became wide awake enough to notice the price paid by the winners of any war, Chastellux believed they would have at least sense enough to settle disputes without using a method that always ended by leaving both parties in a miserable condition. Chastellux, in the eighteenth century, believed that the time would come when most people would understand this and a league of nations to enforce permanent peace would be formed.

Was Chastellux right, and now at last, in 1945, have enough people got enough common sense to understand that merely because of the price paid by the victorious, if for no other reason, wars between nations must be prevented and prevented permanently?

We could not evade this war. Heroism, skill, and energy make us the winners; but what price are we paying for our just and righteous victory? And what price shall we continue to pay for it in the future? Years and years from now the tears of mothers, widows, and orphans will still sometimes fall because we had to have this victory. Fifty years hence blinded men will still live in the dark, crippled men will still hobble and old wounds reopen. Fifty years hence, because of this war's back-burdening taxes, every family and every individual in the country will have to give up buying things that could make life more comfortable.

There are people who believe that we are paying for this war as we go. We are not doing so and could not. We are just beginning to owe for it. We had not finished paying for the last war when we began to owe for this one, and that war was ended 25 years ago. In good young lives, in family tragedies, and in the wealth of our Nation, that war cost us far less than half of what this war has cost us, is costing us, and will continue to cost us. If we do not prevent a third World War, what will it inevitably cost us, even if we are victorious?

We were lately astonished by the 22,000-pound bomb the R. A. F. was dropping on Germany. We were also horrified by the equally terrible rocket the Germans were dropping upon England. In the next war such bombs and rockets will be obsolete, too small, too slow, and too feeble.

Militant science now foresees an object, which we may call the atomic energy bomb, to be projected in quantity to anywhere in the world by the pressing of a button and capable of destroying a city like Chicago so horribly that a human being couldn't safely approach that locality for some months afterward. That is, we deal now in such explosives as the 11-ton bomb and the V-2 rocket; but in the next war opponents will eliminate one another with earthquake and cyclone. Victor and vanquished alike will have all their cities laid flat at the outset. That is, if mankind goes on producing war, the end—not far off—will find a few broken tribes living in the deepest recesses of such shelters as Mammoth Cave, clad in rags and fighting for bones. Some of these remnants may take a little pride in hailing themselves as the victors; but that pride would be all they possess. Man will have exterminated himself, and the long slow civilization that rose from the stone age will have been in vain. Man will have lived to no purpose, perishing from this planet because his intellect enabled him to make deadly machines that he hadn't common sense enough not to use for his own suicide.

We had to fight this war because, in a world trying to be civilized and sane, there were two tribes, Germany and Japan, inwardly eaten by the old, old moral and mental disease of egomaniacal jingoism. We didn't comprehend their insanity in time and so did not take their weapons from them and force them to deal with the rest of us in a sane and civilized manner. At terrible cost, that is now our hard task. Only fools would trust a madman with any weapon at all, and, till the murderous lunacy of Germany and Japan shall have utterly passed out of them, we have to provide them with strong attendants who will see that they harm no one.

All of us know that this has to be done, and thoroughly done; but a far, far more important undertaking is now before us, for upon it depends not only the permanence of civilization but the actual survival of man himself—except as a lonely savage—upon this globe.

I know there are people who believe that wars between nations cannot be eliminated. Such people feel that war is so profoundly established in the very nature of man that only well-meaning and futile dreamers hope to abolish it. There have always been people who have honestly believed in the nonsense that long and historically established customs and institutions cannot be changed, so it's wasted energy to try. The answer is that we have changed almost all of the worst of them. Human sacrifice in religious ceremonies was once so virtually universal that anybody who thought that God didn't need to be cajoled by the offering of men's blood would have been called a dreamer, possibly a well-meaning one but wholly unrealistic. We emerged from a time, not completely at an end even in the seventeenth century, when the burning of witches was both legal and meritorious. We have ceased to hang the pilferers of sixpence, and as late as during the Presidency of Thomas Jefferson, a great ex-Secretary of the Treasury had to let himself be shot to death by the Vice President of the United States because the institution of dueling was too ironclad to be denied and people who thought it could be done away with were not held to be quite practical-minded—yet we have so thoroughly abolished dueling that we wonder how so crazy an inhumanity could ever have existed.

The most deadly and cruel of all man's relics of barbarism is war, and we have not yet done away with it. Washington's friend, Chastellux, did not think that mankind would abolish war merely because war is deadly and cruel. He did not give human nature that much credit. But he did believe that some day men would wake up to the fact that their own self-interest demands permanent peace between nations. Not good will, not universal brotherhood, not even natural-born love of peace could be depended upon, he knew; but mere practical selfish self-interest could.

Well, in 1945, now, only the village idiot does not know that it is to the self-interest of every living man, woman, and child on earth that wars between nations shall be forced to belong to the horrors of man's past. What is to the self-interest of all these millions of individuals is, of course, to the self-interest of the nations of which they are citizens, and the leaders of 44 of those nations are entering into counsel with one another, praise be to God, to determine how best this great act of common sense can and shall be done.

The State of Indiana in the United States of America has decreed through its Governor and the representatives of its citizens that this present week shall be a period for its people's thinking and speaking upon this, the most important matter to be thought about and spoken of by them in the whole of their lives. The future of mankind is on the scales of this present every moment. What was done at Dumbarton Oaks was only the beginning of the beginning. What shall be done at San Francisco is only the continuance of the beginning. Beginnings and their continuances are always imperfect. Rome was not built in a day nor will the final constitution of permanent peace be built in a year; but we must see that it is builded.

It is a hundred and sixty years since Chastellux said that the day would come when there would be enough common sense in the world to organize permanent peace between nations. Has not our common sense—our mere sanity—yet learned that the day he foresaw must be now?

Let us put our faith where our hope is; but better than either having faith, or merely hoping, let us use our common sense for

our own self-interests and at last, every soul of us, help to establish the peace, the peace that thousands of years of agonized history and millions of young men's deaths should long ago have taught us how to make and to enforce.

The Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods Conference Formulas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and thoughtful address delivered last Saturday night over the Columbia Broadcasting System, by Hon William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, on the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods Conference formulas, which are now in the public mind.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Someone has said that it is easier to make war than it is to make peace; he might have added that it is easier to make peace than it is to keep the peace.

But the San Francisco Conference has the responsibility of setting up an international organization to do just that—to keep the peace.

Any organization designed to accomplish this purpose must deal with the economic as well as the political aspects of war and peace.

I wish to speak to you this evening about some of the economic conditions which are essential to the preservation of peace.

It so happens that these conditions are also highly desirable for their own sake.

Expanding world trade, increased production, free and equal access for all nations to the raw materials and trade of the world, and higher levels of living for all peoples everywhere are essential conditions to the maintenance of world peace. We know that our own security and economic well-being are closely linked to that of other countries. If other countries are suffering from depression and unable to buy our goods, our factories must reduce their output and lay off workers; our farms will have food and fiber that cannot be sold. The seeds of war find fertile ground when economic conditions throughout the world are unsatisfactory.

A solid foundation for peace means that there must be a high degree of international cooperation in the world, not only in the political field, but in solving the difficult economic problems that are so important to all peoples. We must not return to the unhappy conditions of the 1930's when nations engaged in vicious economic warfare. This period was marked by rising tariffs and other barriers to trade, by restrictions on the purchase and sale of foreign currencies, and by competition to depreciate currencies so as to gain a temporary trade advantage. The results were stagnant trade, unemployment and, in some countries, the growth of Nazi and Fascist philosophies, leading to war.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which are to be considered further at San Francisco, include provision for an economic and social council wherein the member nations can agree upon policies to promote economic health throughout the world.

In addition to this economic and social council, plans for cooperation include several specialized international institutions, two of which are the financial institutions proposed at the conference held at Bretton Woods last July. These are the international monetary fund and the bank for reconstruction and development.

Let us suppose for the moment that each State in this country had its own currency. The United States would then have 48 different currencies with fluctuating and uncertain relations between them. A person in Massachusetts selling goods in Ohio would receive Ohio money which could not be spent outside of Ohio. If a merchant in Philadelphia desired to purchase goods in New York, he would first need to acquire some New York money with which to pay for the goods. The rate for New York money would be frequently changing. Let us assume, furthermore, that in order to purchase or sell the currency of another State a license were required, and that applications for licenses were frequently denied. A person who had sold goods in another State would thus be unable to bring home the proceeds from his sale.

It is clear that such conditions in the United States would be intolerable, and would reduce trade to a fraction of its present volume. Yet, these are the conditions which have existed for 10 to 12 years throughout much of the world. The purpose of the Bretton Woods proposals is to eliminate these conditions, and thereby to quicken and expand the exchange of goods and services between countries.

According to the provisions of the International Monetary Fund, all member countries would agree to maintain their exchange rates at a stipulated relationship to gold. A change in rates could be made only in the case of some fundamental maladjustment, and then only by consultation with the fund. If the change were more than a limited amount it could not be made except with the approval of the fund. These provisions for exchange stability would mean the end of competitive currency depreciation which was the source of so much economic trouble before the war.

Another important provision is that countries would agree to abandon restrictions on the making of payments and the transfer of funds between countries for current transactions. This is a significant provision and would free foreign traders from their past difficulties of not being able to bring home the proceeds of their foreign sales, or not being able to buy the currency of a country in which they desired to make purchases. It would mean, for example, that an American exporter would get paid in money that he could convert into American dollars and at known rates. He would not end up with some blocked foreign currency.

The agreement provides that each member pay into the fund a certain amount of its own currency and a less amount of gold. The amounts to be paid are determined according to quotas assigned the different countries. The United States quota is about 28 percent of the total. This common pool of resources would be available, under certain safeguards, so that a member could buy from the fund with its own currency the currency of another member. Member countries would, therefore, be able to obtain foreign currencies to tide them over temporary periods of difficulty.

For example, if an agricultural country that was a heavy exporter of its products suffered a crop failure, it could go to the fund, and if everything were in order, it could acquire from the fund needed foreign currency so that it could continue to import necessary goods. This pool of resources would thus provide a supply of currencies to help make currencies interchangeable one for the other, and also to equalize fluctuations in the demand and supply of a member for foreign currencies. It would give a country that was short of foreign currencies time in which to adjust its affairs without being compelled to alter its exchange rates or impose exchange restrictions. Access to this pool of resources is carefully protected by provisions to prevent its abuse and to provide for its automatic replenishment by countries using it.

One of the significant things about the fund is that the experts of 44 nations, after many months of discussion and study, have agreed upon the basic elements of currency stability, and on what have been called the rules of the game. Any country which joins the fund undertakes to abide by these rules and to cooperate with other countries for the good of all.

The fund is to be managed by a board of governors consisting of one governor appointed by each member country. Voting power is in proportion to a country's contribution, as determined by its quota. The United States would thus have 28 percent of the total votes.

A companion institution to the monetary fund is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This bank is designed to assist in the investment of funds in productive enterprises wherever they are needed. It would help to finance the reconstruction of devastated countries, enabling them again to become productive. It is highly important to the United States, that the industries of such countries be rebuilt and that their cities, ports, and transportation systems be reconstructed so that they can again buy our goods and have the means with which to pay for them.

The bank would also help finance the development of other countries where this could be done on a sound basis. Its loans would be made only after a thorough investigation.

The bank would not take the place of private lending institutions, but on the contrary would assist such institutions by guaranteeing such of their loans as had been approved by the bank. Most of the capital of the bank, in fact 80 percent, would be available only for the purpose of such guaranties. Where private money, however, was not available on any reasonable terms, the bank would be permitted to make loans itself. All loans made or guaranteed by the bank would first be guaranteed by the national government of the borrower.

If there should be a default in a loan made or guaranteed by the bank the loss would be spread throughout the entire world since such loss would be shared by all member countries.

It is important for the United States, as well as for other countries, that the flow of investment capital be restored. Foreign countries will need many products which the United States can supply, but these countries are not in a position under present conditions to make immediate payment for these goods. They need initial credits if they are to buy. The United States has at the same time enormously increased its productive capacity, especially in heavy capital goods such as machinery, equipment, and tools. Its production of such goods will be far in excess of its own requirements. If we are to attain a satisfactory level of employment after the war, we must find markets abroad for our surplus production.

Such markets certainly exist in almost unlimited volume. In order for the United States to take advantage of these potential markets, it is necessary to assist foreign buyers in acquiring dollars with which to pay us until they can restore their own productive capacity.

In the end we must import if we wish to export. Trade is a two-way street, and we cannot continue to sell abroad unless we are willing to buy abroad. We must, therefore, eliminate trade discriminations and reduce

our own tariff barriers if we wish to facilitate the expansion of world trade and to increase our real incomes here at home.

The Bretton Woods institutions are designed to assist in the development of this expansion in world economy, with greater production and consumption and rising levels of living for all peoples everywhere.

If democracy and private enterprise are to survive in the world they can only do so by measures which will prevent a resumption of the type of international economic warfare which was indulged in by practically all nations between the two World Wars.

The part which the United States is to play in this program depends in the end upon the decision of 135,000,000 American citizens.

That decision is certain to be right if the issues involved and the measures proposed are fully understood.

Maryland and Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on March 27, 1945, Vice President TRUMAN delivered at Baltimore, Md., before the Maryland Historical Society, of which I am president, a very eloquent and highly appreciated address on Maryland's precedent-making doctrine of tolerance, which has played such a momentous role in history. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a special pleasure to be here in Baltimore tonight with the Maryland Historical Society. It is an extra privilege to be here with my good friend and colleague, Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, president of your distinguished society. Your society has already completed a century of service and education.

The Free State of Maryland has a glorious history, which must be carefully preserved to inspire other Americans to revere the past and to face boldly the future. Of all the Thirteen Original States, Maryland stood out as a real champion of tolerance and freedom. While many other States began as a haven for religious freedom for one faith, Maryland extended that freedom, not merely to those of the faith of Lord Baltimore but also to those of all other religions as well. Truly, Maryland became, and has remained, the Free State—the progressive and liberal link between the North and the South.

Fully 100 years before the Father of our Country, George Washington, was born, King Charles I granted to another George called Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, a charter to all land between the Potomac River and the fortieth parallel. After much dispute, this boundary finally moved slightly north to become our famous Mason-Dixon line, which post bellum good will has gradually transformed into a bridge of friendship instead of a border between intolerant opposition.

It is difficult to realize that Maryland is one of the smaller States of the Union, with only seven being smaller in size. This is merely another classic example of the importance of a State far beyond its physical size; for Maryland, the great champion of real democracy, has made its historical influence felt a tremendous distance beyond its borders, just as great ideals cannot be confined to physical limits.

You members of the Maryland Historical Society also are rendering a lasting service far beyond the borders of Maryland. All America can well be inspired by the annals of your historic State, by the deeds of your inspiring leaders, who had the courage and the fortitude to stand boldly for tolerance, when it required real character to withstand the passion of religious bigotry.

At the Nation's Capital, in front of the Archives Building, on Pennsylvania Avenue, there stands a monument under which is inscribed the statement, "What is past is prologue." Those five words describe, as well as I know how, what you members of the Maryland Historical Society realized years ago. Truly, all history is but an introduction to the future. The greatest tragedies in history have been made by people who did not read and analyze history.

History, of course, does not actually repeat itself. Unfortunately, certain people do, however, repeat history in its less happy chapters. The pages of history remain open for all to read. They stand as an eternal warning against the tragic disasters of the past. Before the world, even greater disasters may be waiting for those who will not read the record of time.

Happily, however, thoughtful people, who appreciate the real importance of history, have worked long and hard to preserve the precious heritages of the past. These act as living milestones to guide us and help avoid the mistakes of the former generations. Of course, every generation must meet new problems in light of new developments, but surely they must profit by the experience of the past.

Science informs us that the preservation of experience is one of the basic differences between rational human beings and animals. The former should profit by the history of their race, tragic though it may be, while the latter must learn anew, the hard way, with each new generation.

As rational human beings there surely can be little of more importance than that of preserving the precious heritage of the past. This is the one secure record which will help us find our way into the difficult future. All available records seem to indicate that the future will be what we Americans make it.

America is confronted today with the greatest problem in its long history. In colonial days we struggled for survival. At the present we are charged with the grave responsibility of leading the entire world to a sound order, an order which will guide suffering humanity to the haven long sought, the haven which the colonials of Calvert's day thought they would find along the shores of the Chesapeake.

At no time in the entire history of the world is there a greater call for tolerance. The fires of bigotry and hatred have been fanned for years by the enemies of democracy. The poison of intolerance has again been injected into the social blood stream of America. There is no lasting cure except that found in the impartial records of history. Only dispassionate and accurate information can lead mankind back to the road to reason.

When enemy agents are working overtime to confuse the issues and to deny the facts of democratic vitality the important service of historical societies can hardly be overestimated. For decades millions of people have been misled by the propaganda of our enemies. They hate tolerant people. There remains only one cure for the deadly disease suffered by these people. It is the cold light of sound reason. The diatribe of demagogs cannot withstand the impartial scrutiny of students of history.

Your contributions of the past century to help Americans retain a proper perspective are of lasting value. We as a nation have made many mistakes which could have been avoided if we had the adult wisdom obtained only by hard experience, a common synonym for history.

It is obvious that we should not expect all Americans to profit from the experience of the past. It is the rare individual indeed who has the intellectual fortitude to rise above personal experiences. That is where the historical societies of the entire world may make contributions, which cannot be measured by material standards. Ultimately, if we do not profit by the past, we are doomed to repeat mistakes in the future.

The future may be far more complicated than any historical society would dare to predict. Your real contribution consists in presenting the facts of the past. The past is the potent key to the future. There is frequently fundamental difference of opinion as to historical events, and the proper evaluation of these events is possible only in the clear light of truth. For sound progress we must face the facts.

We of the democratic world have many disagreeable facts to face. Our enemies cannot be conquered by force alone. We must help to reeducate them to the ideals of truth. Truth is a virtue which scientists and historians always seek. However, for years our opponents have conditioned their people against acceptance of this most simple of all virtues.

Throughout history, truth has suffered under the prolonged attack of partisan propaganda. When the history of this tragic era has been written it will reveal that many liberal souls have died to advance the ideals of truth and justice.

At no time in the annals of mankind has there been a greater need for the spirit of tolerance. The tragic failure to realize the essential necessity for practical tolerance is one of the basic failures of our time. Only the records of history will help all of us to keep our perspective, and achieve harmony and brotherhood among men.

While intolerance is running rampant throughout the world, we need more friendly people, like those who first pioneered the Free State of Maryland. American requires the aid of such people to guide the world to basic ideals.

In the years to come our world will have many hard problems to solve. I feel confident that Americans fully intend to have their say as to the future destiny of mankind on this shrinking planet. Americans never were prone to follow others meekly. On the contrary, history records our people usually among the leaders, especially when the public welfare is involved.

No matter how grave the post-war problems may be, I am sure that our American sense of proportion and our regard for our glorious past, will see us through to victory. Like the brave pioneers of Maryland, we shall continue to do our task with characteristic American energy and enthusiasm.

The most pressing problem before us remains the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment to save precious human lives. That requires a mighty national effort and united harmony on the home front.

Surely, this is no time for petty, partisan politics. This is a time for greater national unity—for greater sacrifice for our national interests. Both winning the war and winning the peace are not partisan objectives. They are the all essential American objectives. They must be attained if our country is to continue to exist and prosper. Let us, therefore, all close ranks and remain strongly united until these vital ends have been accomplished.

When the last gun is fired on some remote enemy stronghold, we must still continue the ceaseless crusade for a just and durable

peace. When we recall the heartache and suffering caused by this world-wide conflict, we must dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the cause of lasting peace. This requires patience and persistence—tolerance and time. When the people of the world fully realize that the public welfare is really the supreme law, we may at last have real peace on earth—and lasting good will toward all mankind.

Meaning of Easter to This Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Meaning of Easter to This Day," prepared by myself. Next Sunday is Easter Sunday. In my 6 years in Washington I have never seen a more beautiful springtime. Life seems to be expressing itself through every channel. I prepared this statement at the request of another.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two thousand years ago this coming Easter Sunday, the Man of Galilee walked forth from the tomb, thus showing to tired, fearful humanity the assuring fact that life has continuity.

Easter commemorates that fact. It is not a day of sorrow. It is not a day when we think of the Cross. But it is a day of victory—a day of victory of the spirit over the flesh.

If we translate the lesson of Easter into our lives today, our individual Golgothas and the world's Golgotha now being experienced will have their Easter morning.

Springtime this year in Washington, with its budding flowers, singing birds, and evidences of newness of life, is one of hope, fearlessness, and great expectation. We are beginning to loose the heavy weights. We are beginning to sense that no matter how weighty the problems, how long the journey is still ahead, the world can, if it takes the lesson of the first Easter to heart, find its Easter morning of world peace.

There are many factors present which argue for man's inability to find the way out of man's imposed limitations. Simply looking at the factors which will be present at San Francisco, one might well say the case is hopeless. That is just what many said after Golgotha. They believed that the Cross was the end, that Rome was all-powerful, that the centurion's sword wrote the last word. They saw that hate, malice, force, and evil ruled the world.

Then came Easter with its message: "He is not here; He is risen." The significance of that assurance is that it exploded man's ancient concept of life, and death no longer was the victor. The statement, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," took on to mortal minds added vitality. Not only was the stone rolled away from the tomb, but the impediments of hate, fear, and doubt were rolled away from men's minds. The other statement, "I am the light of the world," took on added significance and power.

Yes; in this period of the world's history, this Easter brings a vital promise to mankind. The message of Easter is one of triumph, of victory—of triumph of life over death, of the resurrection over the grave, of the spirit over the body. We know that as Jesus rose from the tomb, so can we individually and as a Nation, break through the shackles which bind us, and rise from the debris of limited human concepts.

It is this thought which makes us say—while the world in the past has failed in its congresses for peace—that is no reason why we should fail now if the nations of the earth have learned the inner message of Easter. They can rise from the graves of their failures. Important as the mechanism will be upon which the nations may agree, it dwindles in significance compared with the importance of whether or not there is the will among the nations to keep faith: there is the understanding among the nations of the significance of the Easter message.

You will remember Jesus taught that, "This is life eternal to know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent"—this was putting life eternal in the present tense; is a thing of spiritual or divine awakening; it is a matter of man constantly working for the renewal and the strength which comes from labor in the Father's vineyard.

Yes; 2,000 years ago, because of the Resurrection, there broke through the darkness of mortal thinking a gleam of light which has brought to countless millions the reassurance that God lives and He is looking after His own; that our lives are as indestructible and eternal as the Potter who made them.

Tomorrow—The Veterans' World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I noticed in the public press several statements quoted from the valedictory address made by Patrick E. Carroll, of West De Pere, Wis., during the graduation exercises held in the Rose Room of the Washington Hotel on Monday, March 12, 1945, of the first of two groups of handicapped veterans of World War No. 2, who had finished a specialized 10-week semester course of academic training at the American University, here in Washington, D. C., after which they are to receive on-the-job placement training for a period of up to 18 months under three different experienced national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans; thereupon they would be rehabilitated and employed by the Disabled American Veterans as full-time national-service officers.

It is my understanding that this is the first time that any veterans' organization has requested the Veterans' Administration to grant vocational training to handicapped veterans to become employees of the sponsoring organization. The Veterans' Administration, under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is authorized to provide vocational training, and on-the-job placement training for handicapped disabled veterans of World War No. 2, designed to lead to their suitable gainful employment. Industrial organizations have heretofore, following the precedent established after World War No. 1, provided on-the-job placement training for handicapped veterans on an apprenticeship basis.

It is my understanding that the D. A. V. has gone into this program in a big way, starting out with the first group on October 16, 1944, and sponsoring the enrollment, each 10 weeks, of successive groups of up to 50 handicapped veterans, at the American University, for the preliminary academic training of 20 weeks, followed by their assignment to the supervision of former national service officers who learned the job by doing the job. The D. A. V. has in mind to train up to 400 or more of these national service officers who will become specialists in helping other disabled veterans.

Having noted a few of the statements made by Mr. Carroll, I requested my friend, Millard W. Rice, National Service Director for the Disabled American Veterans, to furnish me with a complete copy thereof. Many of the statements therein are significant as representative of the viewpoint of at least a segment of returned veterans of this war and I desire to make his remarks available to all Members of Congress. Mr. Carroll, incidentally, was brought up in Wisconsin, and is now 31 years of age; he was graduated from the St. John's Military Academy at Delafield, Wis., and subsequently from the St. Norbert College, with a B. A. degree, specializing in economics, and with considerable pre-war experience as a salesman. He served in Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy, and was discharged with a front-line-incurred disability on July 25, 1944, with the rank of sergeant. Mr. Carroll, as valedictorian of the first graduating class from the American University of D. A. V. national service officer candidates, has had such a background of education and experience as to cause his observations and recommendations to be of real importance as indicative of the feelings of returned veterans of World War No. 2. Mr. Carroll's valedictory address follows:

On this day of graduation, I wish to extend on behalf of the graduation class our sincere appreciation for the help and encouragement, that has been given us by the persons who were responsible for the first class of national service officers who are to be graduated from American University today. To the American University, to the disabled American veterans, and to the Veterans' Administration, we feel deeply grateful for the opportunity that we have received.

Today we hear a great deal of talk about the veteran and the veteran problem. You hear it everywhere: in the papers, in magazines, in books, and from the radio and from platforms. I expect to go to the movies some evening and hear Donald Duck give his interpretation of the G. I. bill. Today is the era of planners; everybody has a plan, from those who advocate plans for the veteran to those who plan to supply a quart of milk daily for the Hottentots. The consensus of all this talk, and it is just talk, is that this country faces a grave veteran problem. It is a paradox, that the men who do all of the talking about the veteran problem have never done

any of the fighting, and those who have done the fighting never do any of the talking.

I don't admit that there is a veteran problem, that the public has any problem with the veteran, but I am willing to admit that the veteran has a problem with the public. That problem is the attitude towards the discharged veteran today.

For example, one case, which illustrates the point, happened to a member of our class, a boy who had lost a leg at Guadalcanal, was called a faker. Another, a disabled veteran who had lost a brother in the Southwest Pacific, who himself had serious gunshot wounds in the abdomen, which had necessitated the removal of a large part of his digestive tract, had this experience: Walking down the street one day a lady called to him from across the street and said "You're a nice healthy looking young man, why aren't you in the Army?" A third case, a young sailor who had served in the Pacific for 30 months, who had taken part in nine major naval engagements, who had had a ship shot out from under him was being discharged from the Navy. A woman, a member of a national organization, who was supposed to help the young veteran prepare his application for pension, put in the following personal observation in writing on his claim, "I don't believe this man's injuries are service connected."

Now, I don't want to convey the impression that this attitude is general among the public, although it would be possible to multiply these incidents by the thousands—yes; by the hundreds of thousands. In themselves these events are not important, but what is important is the fact that they are signposts and guides which point the way the wind is blowing. If these things can happen in time of war, when the spirit of patriotism is flaming, what kind of treatment can the veteran expect when the war is over and the fires of patriotism have burned low? Let us take a look at history and see just what has been the history of the treatment of veterans.

After the Revolutionary War, the veterans were not only not paid any pension but were cheated and swindled out of the miserably small wages which they had earned in the Army. Then, in the year 1792, recognizing the fact that the veteran had not been treated justly, the Government granted a pension ranging from $6 a year to $51 a year for total disability. Imagine—$51 a year for total disability.

From this meager beginning the pensions were gradually raised until after the Civil War a veteran who had both legs amputated drew a pension of $24 a month. These conditions prevailed until the veterans of the Civil War got together and organized the Grand Army of the Republic. The G. A. R. became very powerful politically—so powerful, in fact, that they caused President Harrison in 1888 to appoint one Corporal Tanner as Commissioner of Pensions. Tanner had boasted that he would "drive a six-mule team through the Treasury." He did, in fact, disburse pensions so freely that he had to be relieved from office after a few months.

The Spanish War veterans were in general accorded the same pensions as the Civil War veterans. The World War No. 1 veterans received a little more than previous veterans. For men who were totally disabled the allowance was $30 a month. However, there was one new innovation—World War No. 1 veterans were given a bonus on discharge—the magnificent sum of $60. So that, if a veteran had spent 18 months overseas in combat duty he received a gratuity of 10 cents a day, not even the price of a good cigar a day, for risking his life in deadly combat.

That brings us down to the present and World War No. 2. What are the conditions at present? It is true that the scale of pension rates has risen somewhat. Today if a veteran is totally disabled, he receives a pension large enough to provide the necessities of life ($115 a month).

However, we see the same mistakes being made today as were made in the past. Our traditional policy has been to neglect our veterans for a period of years after the end of a major war. During this period of neglect uninjured veterans take up the broken threads of their lives as best they can, struggle against discouragements to compete successfully, force their way into economic, social, and political life, while the injured, maimed, gassed, tubercular, and mentally unbalanced contrive to live by such little jobs as their conditions permit; learn to beg, steal; become paupers or just starve and are forgotten, together with their widows and dependents. Then some years after the veterans suddenly emerge as a powerful political force. Still burning with resentment over their own wrongs, they see to it that ample provision is made for unfortunate veterans. But it is too late then to do justice, too late to help many who have died or been ruined beyond hope of reclamation.

We waste the golden years in which rehabilitation is possible, then spend billions in fruitless penance for wrongs which can never be righted. Our policy is to pay too much too late and to the wrong people. We have spent many billions on veterans' claims, and most of it has been wasted. We have never spent enough at the right time or on the right persons.

What is needed in this country is a new spirit of approach in the treatment of the veteran. The attitude of both the Government and the public is that pensions are a gratuity, that they are not something which the veteran has earned, at a cost of blood, sweat, and maimed bodies but a favor extended by a generous government and public. Until such time as this attitude is wiped out, until the concept that the veteran deserves better treatment than he has ever received is thoroughly ingrained into the public then and then only can any program for the veteran succeed. If this country has the right to send 10 percent of its population to fight its wars, then the remaining 90 percent has the moral duty to see that the veteran is adequately compensated for the services he has rendered.

It is not solely a question of monetary benefits, for how can you repay a veteran for the wasted years of his youth, the pain, the suffering, the lost limbs and the loss of mental health? No, I believe that there is necessity for a new approach to the treatment of veterans and that approach is justice for the veteran—something that he has never received.

In order to do this, what is needed is a program to put the veteran back into civilian life just as quickly and efficiently as possible. Some points to be considered in any such program are:

1. A realization on the part of the public that every veteran is in need of rehabilitation. To realize that it is not possible to take a peace loving youth, turn him into a killing machine, and then turn him back into society without repercussions. I know it is not possible for the general public to understand the veteran. For, how can the people whose only problems were how to get an extra gallon of gasoline or an extra pack of cigarettes, appreciate the veteran who has had tremendous emotional conflicts, who has had a rendezvous with death and lived through it? Veterans will have ingrained into the very fiber of their being the emotions of love, hate, fear, life, and death. Just one example:

The other day, a member of my class, a veteran of Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy was walking along Pennsylvania Avenue, when a passing car backfired loudly. His next conscious action was to pick himself up sheepishly out of the gutter where he had thrown himself at the sound of the backfire. His action was wholly instinctive, the result of his training and experience. How can the civilian understand such an action? So, let me repeat, the veteran will become a normal citizen again if given time and if given the proper treatment and understanding by the public.

2. A program of education is perhaps one of the quickest and best means of bringing the veteran back into his place in society. But the real goal of an educational program must emphasize the fact that it is for the purpose of training the veteran for a job in a highly competitive business and industrial world. The veteran will have certain definite objectives and the schools and colleges must streamline their courses if the veteran is to gain any real benefit from education. It is a mistake to suppose that the veteran will conform to the standards of the academic world. Dr. Robert Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, in a magazine article in the Post, said that the G. I. bill would make hobo jungles out of the colleges. I heartily agree with President Hutchins. Colleges can and will become hobo jungles if the colleges do not adapt their curriculums to the veteran. Unless college professors attempt to give the veteran a sound, practical course of study instead of the sophistry and "tombstone-dusting" type which is now prevalent, education will harm the veteran more than it could possibly help him.

3. Perhaps the most beneficial aid to the rehabilitation of the veteran will be his employment at the highest level of his abilities. A job, which will make the most of the veteran's capabilities, is vitally necessary to the adjustment of the veteran into society. The disabled veteran especially needs the therapy of knowing that he can take his place as a useful and self-supporting member of society. There should be a course of instruction made available to all employers to show them that disabled veterans can perform a useful job, not on the basis of charity, but on a basis of real merit.

4. Finally, in any program, one must come to a consideration of the legislation which has and should be passed. There have been laws which have raised the pension rates; such laws are all right insofar as they go, but they don't entirely solve the problem. An attempt was made to do this with the passage of Public Law No. 16 and Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress. Public Law 16 is, as a great many of you know, the vocational-training program for disabled veterans. In most respects Public, 16, is a fine thing, although the training allowance for the most part is quite inadequate. Now, we come to the consideration of Public, 346, the so-called G. I. bill of rights. A great many people with whom I have talked seem to think that the G. I. bill solves all of the veterans' problems. What a sad awakening those people have in store for themselves. The G. I. bill is one of the greatest hidden ball of tricks of all time. It has two main provisions—the educational benefits and the loan provisions. A veteran who goes to school under the regulations of the G. I. bill receives $50 per month if single, $75 a month if married or with minor children. How any veteran will be able to go to school on $50 a month with the present high cost of living is beyond my comprehension. The sum of $75 a month for a married man with a family of children is so ridiculous as to be laughable. I doubt if 10 percent of the men eligible to educational benefits will be financially able to afford to go to school under the G. I. bill. In regard to the loan provisions of the bill, a prominent New York banker referred to them not as a bill of rights, but as a bill of lading. In order to obtain a loan, a veteran must have such qualifications as would enable him to borrow from a private banker, four or five times the amount which is guaranteed by the Government. What should have been the most important part of the G. I. bill is only hinted at—I refer to the mention of an adjusted compensation, more

commonly known as a bonus. The bonus is the only just and fair means of adequately compensating the veteran. Such a bonus could be used to gain an education, to start a business, or as a nest egg for the future. But, it should be given now when it will be of the maximum amount of help in rehabilitation of the veteran, not 15 or 20 years from now, when the need for rehabilitation will have passed. The passage of a bonus is inevitable—are we going to once again have a policy of "too much, too late, and to the wrong people."

Today it is possible to start a rehabilitation program for the veteran that will be impossible later. The period from the end of the war and for 5 years thereafter is the crucial time. Whatever is left undone then can never be accomplished.

I have been speaking of the veteran individually, for the need of justice for the veteran as an individual, but it seems to me there is a broader and deeper significance to the picture than that—the influence that the veteran will exert on the Nation in the future.

Tomorrow will be a veterans' world; it will be a world run by veterans for veterans. Whether you like it or not, it appears to me to be inevitable that the veterans will be our future leaders. There will arise after the war, either from one of the existing veteran organizations or from a new organization, the most powerful political veteran group this country has ever known. This group will make the G. A. R. seem trivial by comparison. If each of the veterans, some fifteen million strong, can influence four people, just in his immediate family, then they will have a potential vote of sixty million; truly a tremendous political force. Such a group could become the greatest single pressure group in this country—a constructive or a destructive force.

The veterans will be the husbands and fathers of a coming generation. As the heads of the future families they can exert a terrific influence on their children, yes, on their children's children. Let no one suppose that the effects of this present war will pass away when the last shot has been fired. One hundred years from now sociologists will be able to trace the social changes back to World War No. 2.

The veterans will gradually, and I believe inevitably, become the leaders in business, in industry, in labor, in politics and in government. They will become our doctors, our lawyers, our teachers, our professional men, and our elected Government officials. It is from the veteran group that we will derive the mayors of our cities, our State governors, our Congressmen, and, if we follow the precedent of history, the veteran group will even furnish this country with a President of the United States.

Truly the picture is full of potentialities; for the constructive good of this country or as a destructive force. Let us take a look at the worst side of the picture first. If the 15,000,000 veterans of World War No. 2 receive the same treatment as the veterans of other wars; if they carry over into civilian life, the bitterness and hates of their army experience; if they are not assimilated into the social and economic life as quickly as possible and on as high a level as possible; if they fail to take their place as leaders of the family, of industry, of labor, and of government, then this country will be a "howling mess" in 25 years.

And, what kind of a heritage of leadership can the veteran look back upon? In the last 25 years, this country has had two major world wars and the greatest and most prolonged depression this country has ever known. Do we want the same kind of a future? Today, this country faces a need for leaders as never before, and it is from the veteran group that the leaders of tomorrow must come.

Let us quickly run over some of the problems it will be necessary to solve in the post-war era:

1. One problem will be to enforce a lasting peace. Even today, it is possible to see the seeds of a source of probable discord. After the men who will write the peace terms will have passed from the picture, other leaders, veteran leaders will be faced with the problem of enforcing the peace and policing the world.

2. It has been estimated that this country will need 60,000,000 jobs in the post-war era. This is a vital question; who is going to provide those 60,000,000 jobs. Will private industry? Will the Government have to do it? A very grave problem seems to me to be—whether the capitalistic system as we know it can survive or whether it will fail and its functions will have to be taken over by some system of state socialism? That is a problem for the veteran.

3. What part is labor going to play in the years following the war? Are the obvious abuses of labor and its leaders going to be checked or are they going on their way unrestrained by any regulations.

4. In the political sphere there has been some great changes in the past few decades. There has been a growing tendency on the part of the National Government to perform duties and functions that were formerly the prerogative of the State governments, of private industry, and of individuals. More and more by regulation and restriction the National Government has taken a trend toward socialism, in its best sense.

During the present war this tendency has been tremendously speeded up. One notable example is the current work-or-fight bill. Such legislation would have been unthought of a few years ago. Do we want this trend to continue? This is another problem for the veteran.

These are some of the problems that the leaders of the future will encounter. They are going to be faced by veteran leaders. Now is the time that the public has an opportunity to shape and mold the course of future events. Any program for the veteran must be organized now. After the war will be too late.

I am reminded of the story of St. Peter. During the early days of the Christian Church in Rome, the early Christians were being persecuted and killed by the Romans. St. Peter, as Bishop of Rome, became so discouraged that he fled from the city. And, as he was leaving the city, he heard a voice coming to him from out of the clouds saying "Quo vadis?" St. Peter stopped and began to reconsider his flight, and turned back to the city to resume his former position.

Today the public is faced with a choice. They are at the fork in the road so far as the treatment of veterans is concerned. One road leads to destruction and chaos; the other to the traditional way of American life.

I would like to ask the public this one question—"Quo vadis?"—"Whither art thou going?"

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by myself, which appears in the April number of Reader's Scope on the subject What Shall We Do About Compulsory Military Training?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING?

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

At this moment, we Americans are discussing proposals for the training of our youth in the post-war period. The President, the War Department, the American Legion, private citizens and many Members of Congress have expressed varied opinions as to the need for an over-all program which will prepare the young men and women of the Nation to serve as a powerful shield against aggression. The War Department offered a concrete and detailed plan for universal military training, as the basis for a citizen army and as a guarantee of national security and future world peace.

I am, of course, in favor of all measures necessary for maintaining the national security. The logic of our recent history points inescapably to the urgent necessity for youth training. Twice within the past 3 decades, the United States has been forced into a war. In 1917 and again in 1941, precious time was lost while an adequate armed force was trained for defense and ultimate victory.

We must not again be caught virtually unprepared.

Under the Selective Service Act of 1940, approximately 12,000,000 young men and women have been mentally and physically fitted for war. This process has been slow. In its early stages, volunteer enlistments diluted the universal and therefore the completely democratic character of selection. Even now, age and health standards vary among various branches of the armed services.

Moreover, examination of draftees has resulted in the rejection for physical unfitness of 50 percent of our youth in some sections of the country; even in States with the highest health standards, at least 22 percent of men called have been rejected because of disabilities.

Furthermore, many millions of those accepted have spent long months learning everything from reading and writing to radar.

Inadequate health and educational standards have therefore reduced the quality and quantity of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and have added to the war's cost in time, money, and human lives.

I believe that the immediate establishment of a national civilian health and education program is an essential element in maintaining national security, both now and in the future.

This war has exposed serious defects in the physical condition of our young men and women. It has made us realize the necessity of establishing and maintaining higher health standards, both as a factor in individual happiness and in national security. The time to correct faulty vision, to save sound teeth, to eliminate defects, and to arrest tendencies toward disease, is in earliest childhood. A comprehensive national health program, conducted with special thoroughness during childhood and adolescence, and available to all, will provide the Nation with stronger sinews for security.

The war has brought into sharp focus the necessity for a broadened educational program with emphasis on civic, cultural, and vocational fields. It is a shameful blot upon our educational system that young men have been rejected by the armed forces because they could not read the simplest orders. Today educators are confronted with 48 policies in the 48 States. There

is no reason why the States should not remain in control of education, but we must fight illiteracy by giving aid to those States which are unable to provide adequate schools and teachers.

I advocate a program of education for all American youth as an indispensable element in national security.

Will such a program be too expensive? I have been accused of wanting to spend money solely for the sake of spending money. The soldiers' education bill, which I offered to Congress, has been incorporated into the G. I. bill of rights. If returned veterans of this war are entitled to educational benefits, then the youth of the future, who may also be the guardians of the Nation's security, should also receive such aid. As for the cost—if 1,000,000 ex-soldiers, each with a wife and one child, should apply for educational rights under the present law and express the intention of attending the most expensive university in the country, the total cost would be less than that of 2 days of the present war. A similar educational program, available to all, would shorten the length of time required for training for any future war, and consequently reduce its cost.

It is my opinion that no purely military training program could supply these essential health and educational services. From the health standpoint I do not believe that purely military training, concentrated in a single year, could accomplish what health experts would achieve by building the physical fitness of all our youth from earliest childhood to manhood. On educational grounds I do not believe that a purely military training program could render services comparable to that which would be provided by trained educators in schools and colleges.

The administration of any program of national security should be entrusted to those who are professionally competent. The health program should be carried out by health experts. The educational program should be carried cut by educational experts. If we adopt a military program, it should be carried cut by military experts.

Military education as such is an essential part of civic, cultural, and vocational training. People think in a groove. War is complex. War moves too fast for groove thinking. The way to national security is to build healthy, skilled men and women—and to train them not only in traditional and contemporary military techniques but also for all the infinite demands of modern warfare.

Our present Army is not only a fighting unit. It is the world's greatest industrial organization, the finest merchandising outfit in history, an army not only of soldiers but of buyers and sellers. Nothing in the business world equals it. It was not evolved by Army men, but by our citizenry as a whole. In addition to soldiers, the Army of the future will need scientists, merchandising men, transportation experts, mathematicians, meteorologists, electrical engineers, and all the thousands of other kinds of specialists required in the complex modern world.

An army conscripted for no other purpose than for purely military training would be as ineffective as the French Army was in 1940. If we had had such an army in 1939, it would undoubtedly have been equipped with .75-millimeter guns and Springfield rifles of the 1918 type. In our minds would have been embedded the Maginot line psychology which helped drag France to her downfall.

Any long-range security system worthy of faith will have elements of weakness or strength. But an army drawn from the ranks of conscripts with a brief period of purely military training would lack the knowledge and use of techniques upon which the security of a wartime army rests.

In other words, I believe that the problem of national security is not a matter for the Army and Navy alone. I am not convinced as yet that our national security requires the enactment of a peacetime military conscription law. Nor do I believe that any such method would be, as it has been described, universal. No system of conscription can be applied universally—exemptions have been made in the Selective Service Act in time of war and would undoubtedly be made during a period of peace.

At the same time, I shall continue to study the question of compulsory post-war military training with an open mind. If I become convinced that such a program is necessary to the best interests of national security over a long period, I shall support such a program.

In the meantime, I advocate a continuance of the Selective Service Act after the present war to maintain the strength of whatever peacetime army and navy the Nation requires. To this law should be added a national health and educational program such as I have outlined. I visualize such a program as placing the responsibility for choosing candidates for military training in the hands of civilian draft boards, as at present.

In this way the health program would not be interrupted by the necessity for a full year of military training. Instead, military trainees could attend camps to study and master the purely military aspects of the general security program during vacations. While in school, they would acquire that invaluable esprit de corps which is vital to military morale.

Their military training, in other words, would not lie apart from the general area of their interests and activities, but would be an integral part of their lives.

As for the operation of such a military program, it should, of course, be conducted by military men. It should also envisage the strengthening of the National Guard of the several States, with increased opportunities for the advancement to officership of National Guards men. This policy would make the National Guard more popular.

Backing up the central corps of trained military men would be organized reserves of veterans of the present war and the healthy, educated, basically trained youth of the Nation, who would be called upon in emergencies to swell the armed forces of the Nation.

Against such a force no aggressor would dare move to attack our national security. It would be a people's army, in fact as well as in name.

Service Center for Veterans and War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, to the huge number of servicemen returning to this country every month the problem of community service is an increasingly important one. Dr. Harry J. Carman, of New York, has made a survey of that situation, and presents a very enlightening proposal for community service, advocating a purely voluntary set-up in the various communities of our land.

I ask unanimous consent that the survey be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF DR. HARRY J. CARMAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE HONORABLE FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA, SUBMITTING THE DAVIS PROPOSAL FOR A SERVICE CENTER FOR VETERANS AND WAR WORKERS

1. The proposal designs to bring together in the local community, as a community-sponsored function, forces intending to provide special services for relocation, readjustment, and rehabilitation.

2. It is an attempt to utilize existing facilities primarily; to avoid duplication; to provide appropriate supplementary services only.

3. It calls for grouping and coordinating existing services under an administrator for more economic and effective service.

4. It makes no attempt to provide services which supersede private enterprise. On the other hand, the activity is the essence of cooperation between public service and private enterprise so as to speed up and maximize the individual's opportunities for rehabilitation in the transition period.

5. The services are designed for both veterans and war workers. The impact at the war's end will fall directly upon both groups. If rehabilitation facilities are extended to one group only, the probable unemployment and loss of income in the second group spreads and is reflected throughout the entire community, tending to reduce instead of stimulate employment in those areas not directly affected at the outset. Furthermore, those who have retained their employment and income must face the responsibility of taking care of the less fortunate unemployed, either directly or by making heavier tax contributions to a government acting in their behalf. In other words, taxes may have to be increased while income is diminishing. Conversely, as full employment is approached, aggregate income is higher and the relative tax is smaller. Thus the promotion of full employment not only carries with it direct benefit to taxpayers and all of New York's citizens but it is basic to the welfare of the veteran himself.

6. Finally, experience has indicated that within a wide range, the needs of both veterans and war workers are identical. It is, therefore, both economically and administratively feasible to set up one organization to serve both functions.

For the committee:

HARRY J. CARMAN,
Chairman.

Committee members: Dr. Thomas E. Coulton, Dr. J. Edmund Woods, Mr. Edward Mayman, Mr. George F. Piggott, Jr., Dr. Walter A. Knittle, Mr. Louis Bennet, Mr. William C. Davis Mr. William Finkle, Miss Winifred Fisher, Dr. John A. P. Millet.

PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF A COMMUNITY-SPONSORED CENTER OF INFORMATION, REFERRAL, AND SERVICE TO VETERANS AND WAR WORKERS

(By William C. Davis, assistant to the president, the City College of New York)

In accordance with the mayor's request, a study has been made for the purpose of assisting the mayor in his provision of timely and suitable means of aiding veterans and others displaced by the war to be restored to normal civilian life. The results of this study, the recommendations based thereon, and their adaptation to the site of 500 Park Avenue follow:

The results of the study reveal:

1. The direct impact of the war's conclusion will fall principally upon two groups, veterans of the armed forces and war workers.

2. The general welfare justifies provision of facilities for both groups.

3. There is a need for community-sponsored efforts to alleviate dislocation arising out of conclusion of the war.

4. Existing public and private agencies cover the principal field of need, but can improve their services by coordination and some complementary facilities provided by the city of New York.

With these considerations in mind, your committee recommends the establishment at 500 Park Avenue of a veterans-war workers center. Such a center will have three objectives:

1. To afford the city's veterans information, assistance, and advice with respect to their rights under the law, educational and employment opportunities, and special social services available to assist them and their families in finding progressive restoration to a normal civilian life in the community; and

2. To provide similar benefits to the thousands of war workers who gave up civilian pursuits to enter war production and who are in equal need of assistance in securing a permanent foothold in peacetime production to secure the future for themselves and their families in the community; and

3. To facilitate these objectives by grouping and coordinating key services and benefits provided by public and private service agencies and to provide such supplementary services as appear to be necessary and appropriate according to the aims of the program in the face of developing and changing needs so as to minimize the detail and time of rehabilitation.

The center shall be charged with:

1. Collection of data and information as to the facilities, services, and employment opportunities available to veterans and others displaced through contribution to the war effort.

2. Provision of a central contact between 500 Park Avenue and Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for special services to veterans and displaced war workers.

3. Providing a central location appropriately staffed to furnish aid to veterans and war workers in obtaining benefits under Federal and State laws and readjustment to civil life.

4. Providing such supplementary services to veterans and war workers as are not provided by Federal, State, or private agencies but which arise out of the set of conditions peculiar to New York City.

5. Setting up and maintaining a reference library of all laws, regulations, and information pertaining to veterans.

6. Providing the mayor with such reports on the activities of the center and recommendations thereon as the mayor shall request.

The key agencies to be grouped and coordinated at the center and their services are as follows: [1]

Federal agencies:

1. Veterans' Administration:
(a) Pensions, claims, insurance, appeals, etc.

2. U. S. Employment Service:
(a) Job counseling and placement.
(b) Selective placement for the disabled.

3. Selective Service:
(a) Reemployment aid.

4. Veterans' Service Center:
(a) Diagnostic and consultation service—
(1) Medical and psychiatric problems.
(2) Personal, financial, and family problems.
(3) Vocational rehabilitation.
(4) Loans, businesses, priorities, etc.
(b) Miscellaneous information.
(c) Referral to community agencies.

5. United States Department of Agriculture:
(a) Farm counselling.

6. United States Civil Service Commission (on staff of Veterans' Service Center):
(a) Counselling and placing in Federal Civil Service.
(b) Establishing veterans' preference for Federal Civil Service.

State agencies:

1. Division of placement and unemployment insurance.
(a) Readjustment allowance (Federal benefits).
(b) Unemployment insurance (State benefits).

2. Division of vocational rehabilitation (on staff of Veterans' Service Center).
(a) Vocational rehabilitation.

3. Industrial, commercial, and labor organizations.
(a) Business opportunities and counseling.

4. Civil service.
(a) Counseling and placement in State civil service.
(b) Establishing veterans' preference for State civil service.

New York City agencies:

1. Department of public welfare, veterans' division.
(a) Temporary financial aid.
(b) Case work services to individual and family.

2. Municipal civil service commission.
(a) Counseling and placement in New York City civil service.
(b) Establishing veterans' preference in New York City civil service.

3. Board of education; board of higher education.
(a) Educational consultation and aid in admission and matriculation.
(b) Aptitude tests and vocational consultation.

4. Board of health.
(a) Bureau of tropical diseases.
(b) First aid services.
(c) Clinics (information).

5. Housing vacancy bureau.
(a) Housing service.

6. New York City department of commerce.

Private agencies:

1. Veterans' and other organizations.
(a) Power of attorney—pension claims, appeals.
(b) Aid in appealing types of discharge.
(c) Certification of veterans' relief.

2. Mayor LaGuardia's business advisory committee.
(a) Business counseling.

3. Cultural and art organizations.

These agency services, summarized with respect to function, would cover the following areas:

1. Retraining and rehabilitation.
2. Employment and reemployment.
3. Education.
4. Personal and family problems, including medical and financial.
5. Legal rights and benefits.
6. Business and loans.
7. Housing.

Activation of these recommendations will require an organized over-all administrative department and a policy-making committee.

1. Committee.
2. Director and staff.
(a) Administrative departments: (1) Liaison service; (2) research; (3) public relations and information.

The following are general recommendations as to policy:

1. Policy committee of seven to determine over-all policy of operation of center and, among other things, to aid in the selection of.

2. Advisory committee, to be appointed by mayor.

3. Clear definition of authority of director and his staff.[2]

4. Administrative agreements to be worked out between center and agencies represented in center.[3]

5. Integration of all services in center under leadership and over-all direction of director. This is to be a cardinal principle in the operation of the center.

6. Over-all administrative set-up to be financed by city of New York.

7. Agencies at center to finance their own operations, except for light, heat, and custodial services. Telephone expenses to be apportioned on basis of ration of outgoing calls to total cost of telephone service, including telephone rental charges and telephone operators' salaries.

8. Services to be provided at the center shall not duplicate existing services already functioning well in the community.

9. The center itself shall not be permitted to act as an agent for any individual in filing claims for benefits under Federal, State, or local law.

10. Any food dispensed on premises shall be paid for, on a low cost basis. There should be no free meal handouts. The mayor suggests that this should be checked with the Red Cross to see if it agrees.

11. The general reception room on main floor to be handled by veterans' service center staff.

12. In view of the nature of the job to be done, its uncertain duration, its changing scope and direction, etc., the over-all administrative staff should be selected, at least at the outset, without regard to municipal civil service requirements.

A proposed budget for the over-all administrative staff is set forth below. The salary schedules are set at a level that will justify both professional and highly competent nonprofessional personnel undertaking the work. Great credit to the community will arise out of proper coordination of this program and outstanding service to the public. But this can only be accomplished by superior personnel. While it may be suggested that this same principle will apply normally to any field, it is particularly significant for this activity not merely because the undertaking is a public service but also because it deals with strained and perplexed personalities. There is thus a dual responsibility in dealing with this particular segment of our society which demands that the staff be qualified to render service with both a sympathetic understanding of human need and the analytical expertness of professional grade.

Annual budget

	Salary range	Salaries (computed at total average)
(1) PERSONAL SERVICE		
A. Professional and administrative:		
1. Director (1)	$10,000–$15,000	$12,000
2. Assistant director (1)	7,500– 10,000	8,750
3. Assistant directors (3)	6,000– 7,500	6,750
4. Chief of Research (1)	3,600– 5,000	4,300
5. Chief of Information Service (1)	3,600– 5,000	4,300
6. Chief of Liaison Services (1)	3,600– 5,000	4,300
7. Assistant business manager (1)	3,600– 5,000	4,300
8. Librarians (2)	3,000– 3,600	3,300
9. Recreation supervisors (2)	3,000– 3,600	3,300
10. Research assistants (5)	3,000– 3,600	3,300
11. Liaison assistants (5)	3,000– 3,600	3,300
12. Information assistants (5)	3,000– 3,600	3,300

[1] See appendix I.

[2] See appendix II.

[3] See appendix II.

Annual budget—Continued

	Salary range	Salaries (computed at total average)
(1) PERSONAL SERVICE—con.		
A. Professional and administrative—Continued.		
13. Accountant (1)	$3,000-$3,600	$3,300
14. Procurement and supply clerk (1)	1,800- 2,400	2,100
Total		126,300
B. Secretarial and clerical:		
15. Secretaries—assigned (10)	2,400-3,000	2,700
16. Supervisor of stenographic pool (1)	2,400-3,000	2,700
17. Stenographer-clerks (15)	1,800-2,400	2,100
18. Typists (12)	1,560-1,920	1,740
19. File clerks (2)	1,560-1,920	1,740
20. Mail clerks (4)	1,560-1,920	1,740
21. Messenger (3)	1,560-1,920	1,740
22. Supervising telephone operator (1)	1,800-2,400	2,100
23. Telephone operators (5)	1,620-1,920	1,770
Total		108,690
C. Maintenance and custodial:		
24. Head janitor (1)		2,400
25. Elevator operators (6)		1,320
26. Foreman cleaner (1)		1,620
27. Male cleaners (7)		1,440
28. Female cleaners (15)		1,040
Total		37,620
(2) MATERIALS, SUPPLIES, AND SERVICES		
A. Operational		27,650
B. Building maintenance and operation		13,100
Total		40,750
Grand total		313,360

The following is the suggested allocation of space:

Floors:

1. Reception; lounge; canteen.

2. Veterans' library, reading rooms, music rooms, photostat services; art and cultural organizations; office of one assistant director.

3. Civil service commission, State and municipal New York City board of health, bureau of tropical diseases, first-aid station, and clinics (information); conference rooms, staff library, staff rest rooms; telephone operators.

4. United States Employment Service selective service; State division of placement and unemployment insurance.

5. New York City board of education.

6. New York City board of higher education; other educational representatives; veterans' service center.

7. Veterans' service center (business and loans); War Production Board; Office of Price Administration; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Mayor LaGuardia's business advisory committee; New York City department of commerce.

8. New York City department of welfare, veterans' division; veterans' organizations.

9. Over-all administrative staff.

This proposal is both sound and conservative. It does not represent any effort on the part of government to supersede the functions of any private agencies. On the other hand, it is the essence of cooperation between private and public enterprise to maximize the individual's opportunities for rehabilitation in the difficult transition period following cessation of hostilities. It offers a method whereby productve work may be done now instead of waiting until conditions become critical. Furthermore, it will bring to the very door of New York City's people a direct understanding of the service its community provides as a normal part of the community life.

Appendix I

Owing to rules restricting the reproduction of pictorial matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following charts are omitted: (1) Referral and information center organization chart; and (2) Referral center flow sheet. The flow sheet is of prime importance to an understanding of the plan because it indicates the manner of coordinating all participating agencies and shows the operating procedure. All comers (veterans and war workers) enter a central receiving center, staffed by expert interviewers, who make a general analysis of the individual case. From the receiving center, the applicants are directed to a general "waiting and day room" where they await appointments arranged for them with a series of skilled consultants on employment, rights, and benefits, physical and mental health, education, and training, personal and social problems, and housing. These consultants then direct the applicants to the specific agencies—Federal, State, local, and private—capable of rendering immediate aid in the solution of applicants' problems. The coordination of community services is therefore simplified to three steps or levels: (1) General interview and analysis; (2) Expert consultation; (3) Immediate aid by the agencies best qualified and equipped to assist the veteran and war worker. The Davis proposal provides the administrative organization by which these ends are most efficiently achieved.

Appendix II

Subsidiary to sections 3 and 4 of the general section on policy recommendations, the following three principles are fundamental to the success of operation.

1. All applicants for service shall be routed through intake interviewers and primary consultants, except as specified otherwise by the director.

2. All applicants for service, except as specified otherwise by the director, shall consult with primary consultants for original diagnosis.

3. All applicants for service, except as specified otherwise by the director, shall be referred by the primary consultant to such service organizations as his diagnosis shall indicate appropriate.

Medical-Care Provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Social-Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 3, 1943, during the last Congress, I joined with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] in introducing a bill (S. 1161) to amend the Social Security Act. Our bill was intended to strengthen and broaden social security for the people of our country.

Our bill received much attention throughout the country. It is supported by the principal labor organizations and by many important civic groups. It has been widely discussed at public meetings, on the radio, and in millions of homes.

It did not, however, receive a hearing before the committee to which it was referred. The Senator from New York and I are preparing a revised bill, which we hope to introduce in this Congress before long.

During the past year and a half our bill has been the object of widespread attack from certain propaganda organizations. Fortunately, the friends of social security for the American people have also had a say, and many millions of people have come to the conclusion that our bill has been misinterpreted, that it is sound, and that it should be enacted.

Among the attacks on our bill there was one that came from the American Bar Association. A special committee of that association prepared a report which disapproves of the medical-care provisions of Senate bill 1161. The national committee on social legislation of the National Lawyers Guild studied our bill as a whole, and published a very valuable report on it entitled "The New Wagner-Murray-Dingell Social Security Bill, a New Social Security Charter for America," in the Lawyers Guild Review for November-December 1943. Though their report was enthusiastically favorable to our bill, it was not without criticism. However, such criticism as that committee made was constructive and useful. The Senator from New York and I thank them for their help.

Now the same committee of the National Lawyers Guild has published a second report. This one deals specifically with the medical-care provisions of the bill, and makes an analysis of the report issued by the special committee of the American Bar Association. In its latest report, published in the Lawyers Guild Review for November-December 1944, the committee of the National Lawyers Guild shows that the American Bar Association was grossly in error both as to the need for medical-care provisions and as to legal and constitutional questions raised with respect to our bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have this report from the national committee on social legislation, National Lawyers Guild, printed in the RECORD.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the report will require four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $208.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT ON THE MEDICAL-CARE PROVISIONS OF THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL SOCIAL SECURITY BILL BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL LEGISLATION OF THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association has adopted [1] the report [2] of a special committee of three which disapproves the medical-care provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. The national committee on social legislation of the National Lawyers

[1] American Bar Association Journal, April 1944, pp. 198-199.

[2] Summary of report printed in American Bar Association Journal, May 1944, p. 275; report printed in full in the journal of the American Medical Association March 11, 1944, vol. 124, No. 11, p. 716.

Guild, having previously studied and reported upon the entire bill[3] and having arrived at a conclusion regarding the medical-care provisions contrary to that of the special committee of the American Bar Association, deems itself obligated to examine and evaluate the report of that committee, which has received wide circulation among the medical and legal professions and in the press.

The special committee was appointed pursuant to a resolution of the house of delegates "to study, analyze, and investigate Senate bill 1161."[4] Only the medical- and hospital-care provisions of title IX of the bill, and some of its financing provisions were considered by the special committee.

With respect to the one portion of the bill with which the special committee is solely concerned, its medical-care provisions, we find that the special committee has come to erroneous conclusions based upon a misreading of the bill and a misconception of its effects.

THE MEDICAL-CARE PROVISIONS OF THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

Briefly stated, title IX of the bill would provide medical and hospital care for insured persons and their families. Insured persons include all employed and self-employed persons. They are covered when they have specified minimum earnings during the 18 months preceding the benefit year. The benefits are paid from contributions of employer, employee, and self-employed. For complete coverage under the act for unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors' insurance, medical and hospital care, temporary and permanent disability benefits, and other benefits employees and employers would each pay 6 percent of wages up to $3,000 per year. Self-employed persons would pay 7 percent of the market value of their services not exceeding $3,000 per year, but they would not be covered for unemployment, temporary disability, and maternity benefits. Medical care and hospitalization would be paid for by one-fourth of the contributions paid by employers and employees and three-sevenths of the contributions paid by self-employed persons. The medical and hospitalization benefits would be administered by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. All general practitioners licensed to practice would have the right to treat insured persons under the act; all insured persons would have the right of free choice of physicians; and physicians would have the right to treat or refuse to treat particular persons. There would be no interference with the confidential relationship between doctor and patient. Physicians need not qualify under the act and may freely engage in private practice, or they may combine the treatment of insured persons under the act and noninsured patients in private practice.

1. The need

A proper evaluation of the medical-care provisions of the bill requires an examination of the need, which these provisions seek to meet. The Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board has estimated that approximately 7,000,000 persons in our country are disabled by illness on an average day.[5] In a recent article Fortune magazine points out[6] that the people of the United States lose about 1,500,000 man-years of work annually; that from 30 to 50 percent more mothers (and about 50 percent more infants in the first month) die than would die if all received good medical care; and that with more surgery and radiation treatment, 30,000 cancer victims a year could be saved. It concludes that "too few Americans are getting the medical care that they need, and that the community needs for them."

In a documented statement of the need, the Report of the National Committee on Social Legislation of the National Lawyers Guild[7] referred to the many studies which have demonstrated the widespread and compelling need for security against sickness and the cost of medical care. That report stated:

"The economic burden of ill health falls more heavily on the largest segment of the working population, which cannot afford adequate health service and at the same time suffers the greatest amount of illness.[8] The social wastes involved must be measured in terms of the loss of millions of man-hours and man-days of productive labor and in the avoidable deterioration of the human wealth of the Nation.[9] Our failure to provide adequate health insurance and medical care has resulted in the alarmingly large percentage of young men called for military service who have been rejected because of physical defects and ailments.[10] The American Medical Association has published an analysis in which it declares that, aside from the indigent, families earning up to $3,000 a year are unable to meet the costs of major sickness and need some measure of assistance.[11] This means that 92 percent of our population need assistance in meeting the costs of medical care.[12] Thus an adequate health program providing medical care and disability benefits is urgently required in the interests of the national welfare and is indeed a wartime necessity. Our country has lagged behind the rest of the civilized world in failing to create a health insurance system."[13]

The American Bar Association report would deny or minimize the existence of the need by claiming (1) that the medical care now provided in the United States affords the highest level of health and the lowest death rate ever known under similar circumstances; (2) that there are being developed in this country and under our system of free enterprise many plans for providing adequate medical care without paying the price of "socialized medicine," including group and hospital insurance and Blue Cross plans under principles approved by the medical profession, ant now covering more than 15,000,000 people, thus providing for the moderate means class, on which hospital bills fall heavily. From this it concludes that the bill would safeguard a minimal percentage of the population, which has difficulty in obtaining complete medical service, and that the bill would put all the people in a medical straitjacket under the supervision of the Federal Government for an alleged service which the vast majority either do not require or are able to provide for themselves.

There is no justification for the assumption by the special committee that, because the United States has the lowest death rate, its people are healthiest. Length of life expectancy rather than death rate is considered a basic test of the health of a people. Prewar statistics showed that there were four countries in which the life expectancy of males at birth was greater than in the United States for white males; it was greater at age 20 in 8 countries; at age 40 in 11 countries, and at age 60 in 12 countries.[14]

Even the coverage of 15,000,000 persons, principally for limited hospital care, under private plans too costly for the low-income groups, who need medical care most and receive less of it, does not begin to solve the Nation-wide problem. Less than 4 percent of the population is covered today by voluntary medical care plans, as distinguished from hospitalization plans. Most of these medical plans provide only limited classes of services.[15] The rate of growth even of the hospitalization plans is not encouraging in terms of national needs. If these plans continue to enroll as many members each year during the next 10 years as they did in their very best year, they would cover less than 25 percent of the population in 1954.

It is still true that in an ordinary year, one-third of the population receive no medical or

---

[3] The New Wagner-Murray-Dingell Social Security Bill, a New Social Security Charter for America, Lawyers Guild Review, vol. III, No. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1943).

[4] American Bar Association Journal, October 1943, p. 602.

[5] Need for Medical-care Insurance, bureau memorandum No. 57, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., April 1944, p. 3: "An estimate of the prevalence of disability for the entire population indicates that, on an average day of the year, about 7,000,000 persons are disabled by sickness. Of these, about half have been disabled for less than 6 months; the remainder for longer periods.

"Almost half of the 7,000,000 people disabled from illness on any day are in the labor force, that is, when they are well, they are either employed or look for work."

[6] United States Medicine in Transition, Fortune magazine, vol. 30, No. 6, December 1944, 156, 157.

[7] Supra, note 3.

[8] Proceedings of the National Health Conference, 1938, Washington, D. C., pp. 56–57; The Costs of Medical Care, by I. S. Falk, C. Rufus Rorem, and Martha D. Ring, Chicago, 1933; Medical Care for the American People, final report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, Chicago, 1932; Factual Data on Medical Economics, American Medical Association, 1939, ch. XXIX, p. 66; Health in Handcuffs, by John A. Kingsbury, ch. IV; report of the Technical Committee on Medical Care, The Need for a National Health Program, published February 1938, and its report, A National Health Program: Report of the Technical Committee on Medical Care, transmitted to Congress by the President on January 23, 1939 (H. Doc. 120); Shall We Tax Ourselves To Pay the Doctor?, Helen Weigel Brown, Liberty magazine, August 19, 1944, pp. 15, 53; United States Medicine in Transition, Fortune magazine, vol. 30, No. 6, December 1944, pp. 156, 184; Medical Care in a National Health Program, an official statement of the American Public Health Association, American Journal of Public Health, vol. 34, No. 12, December 1944; Principles of a Nation-wide Health Program, report of the Health Program Conference, New York, November 1944; Need for Medical-Care Insurance (supra, note 5), pp. 6–11.

[9] Summary by Dr. Kingsbury in Health in Handcuffs of findings of the Technical Committee on Medical Care (see footnote 8). The cost is about $10,000,000,000 annually. Seventy million sick persons lose over a billion days from work or customary activities yearly.

[10] Brigadier General Hershey, address May 27, 1941: Four hundred thousand unfit from first million examined in draft; "we are physically in a condition of which nationally we should be thoroughly ashamed." New York Times, May 28, 1941.

[11] Factual Data on Medical Economics, 1939, American Medical Association, Bureau of Medical Economics, p. 66.

[12] National Resources Development Report for 1943, part 3, National Resources Planning Board, pp. 22, 945.

[13] International Labor Office, Compulsory Sickness Insurance, No. 6, and Voluntary Sickness Insurance, No. 7 (series M), Geneva, 1927; John A. Kingsbury, Health in Handcuffs, ch. VI.

[14] Estimates of Future Population of the United States, 1940–2000, report by Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton for the National Resources Planning Board, Washington, 1943, p. 7, table A5.

[15] Prepayment Medical Care Organizations, by Margaret C. Klem, Bureau Memorandum No. 55, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, June 1944.

dental care whatever,[16] and, as has been found by a distinguished group of experts in the field of medical economics: "At least nine-tenths of our population need protection against the uneven and unpredictable costs of sickness".[17] This demonstrates that our existing arrangements for providing medical care need much improvement, and that proposals for making adequate medical care available to everyone require our most careful and earnest consideration in the interest of the public welfare.

II. Constitutionality

As lawyers, we are specially concerned with the issue of constitutionality raised by the American Bar Association's special committee, who say: "S. 1161 is utterly beyond the powers of Congress." No argument or citation of authority is presented in support of this assumption. It would seem that the constitutionality of legislation to promote the general welfare of the people was authoritatively established by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, in upholding the Social Security Act, which established an unemployment insurance system and a system of old-age security.[18]

In *Helvering* v. *Davis*, Mr. Justice Cardozo, speaking for the majority of the Supreme Court, said (p. 640):

"Congress may spend money in aid of the general welfare. Constitution, article I, section 8; *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1, 65), * * * There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision * * *. There is a middle ground or certainly a penumbra in which discretion is at large. The discretion, however, is not confided to the courts. The discretion belongs to Congress, unless the choice is clearly wrong, a display of arbitrary power, not an exercise of judgment. This is now familiar law. 'When such a contention comes here we naturally require a showing that by no reasonable possibility can the challenged legislation fall within the wide range of discretion permitted to the Congress.' *U. S.* v. *Butler*, supra p. 67 * * *. Nor is the concept of the general welfare static. Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times."

The Supreme Court said further (p. 641):

"The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when journey's end is near."

Similarly "the hope" behind the medical care provisions of this bill "is to save men and women" and children "from the haunting fear" of ill health and inability to procure adequate medical care.

The considerations which justified the original Social Security Act fully justify this bill. These were stated by the Supreme Court as follows (p. 644):

"The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least, had a basis for that belief. States and local governments are often lacking in the resources that are necessary to finance an adequate program of security for the aged. This is brought out with a wealth of illustration in recent studies of the problem. Apart from the failure of resources, States and local governments are at times reluctant to increase so heavily the burden of taxation to be borne by their residents for fear of placing themselves in a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighbors or competitors. We have seen this in our study of the problem of unemployment insurance. (*Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, supra.)

"When money is spent to promote the general welfare, the concept of welfare or the opposite is shaped by Congress, not the States. So the concept be not arbitrary, the locality must yield" (p. 645).

Legislation to provide adequate medical care for the people of the Nation is as much for the general welfare as the provision of unemployment insurance and old-age security.

III. The private practice of medicine and the authority of the Surgeon General under the bill

The principal objections of the Bar Association are: (1) That the bill would abolish the private practice of medicine; and would create a system of "socialized medicine;" and (2) that all medical care would be put under the complete power of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States, who would have complete and arbitrary authority over all physicians and patients and would deprive the citizens of this country "of their rights and liberties." These objections are, indeed, the basis upon which the report was approved by the house of delegates. At its meeting, one of the delegates stated that the report had not been distributed until it was presented and asked that action on it be postponed until the report was made available for study.[19] Postponement was objected to by another delegate. He appealed to the assemblage of lawyers, asking what the reaction of the delegate who asked for postponement would be "if Mr. MURRAY (Senator MURRAY) introduced in the Senate a proposed bill whereby the Attorney General would tell each lawyer in the United States who his clients shall be, what he can charge them, and that he can represent no other person.[19] Thereupon the delegates, all lawyers, adopted the report. Since it is evident that no one, except the members of the special committee, had studied the bill or had had an opportunity to consider the report, no one told or was able to tell the speaker that the dire example, which he had presented to the assembled lawyers regarding their own profession, in no way resembled the provisions of this bill. For, under the bill, the Surgeon General cannot tell every doctor in the United States who his patients shall be, what he can charge them, and that he can treat no other persons.

Throughout the report, the committee insists that the bill would create a system of socialized medicine. An examination of the provisions of the bill demonstrates this to be clearly untenable. Socialized medicine is the operation of all medical facilities in a country by the government, including employment of all physicians by the government and furnishing medical care to everyone without direct cost.

The system of medical care provided by title IX of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill has no resemblance whatever to socialized medicine. It is merely an insurance system by which, on insurance principles, employed and self-employed persons contribute to a fund from which payments are made for medical and hospital services for those within the insurance scheme and their families. There is nothing socialized about that. Indeed, the insurance system proposed is merely an extension of the familiar and accepted principles of workmen's compensation, which provides medical care and cash benefits in cases of industrial disability. And the suggestion that workmen's compensation is a system of socialized medicine would be regarded as patently preposterous not only by lawyers, but by doctors themselves.

The emphasis upon the claim that the bill would place the practice of medicine in this country under the control of one man—the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service—ignores the fact that any plan of health insurance or medical care requires administration. What better person could be found for that administration than the eminent doctor who is the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service with the vast experience of that Service in the field of national public health.

In particularizing the objections to the powers granted the Surgeon General by the bill, the report contains numerous errors in statement, interpretation and conclusions in respect of the authority granted to the Surgeon General. The report asserts that the Surgeon General will have the power to prescribe rules under which legally qualified doctors shall be qualified to furnish services, and rules under which an insured person may change his selection from among those "designated by the Surgeon General." The broad statement that the Surgeon General has the power to designate doctors, including those who may qualify to render medical benefits, is contrary to fact. The fact is that the bill specifically provides with respect to general medical benefits that "Any physician legally qualified by a State to furnish any services included as benefits under this title shall be qualified to furnish such services * * * in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed" (sec. 905 (1)). There can be no exclusion of any such qualified physician.

The statement is made that "the measure will subject to bureaucratic control and supervision the intimate and confidential relationship between doctor and patient;" that the freedom of choice of doctors and patients will be impaired; and that it "would seriously disturb existing intimate relationship between doctor and patient." On the contrary, the fact is that there will be no interference in the normal relationship and confidence between doctor and patient. Every person insured under the act will have the right, the absolute right, within the framework of unavoidable practical limitations and subject to the right of the physician to refuse to accept a patient, to choose the doctor who may treat him (sec. 905 (2)); and since every qualified physician has the right to practice under the act (sec. 905 (1)), the choice will be no more limited than it is now. No doctor is compelled to render services under the act, and no doctor is compelled to accept any person as a patient whom he does not wish to treat (sec. 905 (2)) and of course, any physician who does not wish to treat patients under the insurance system may continue his private practice and private practice may also be combined with practice under the system. These freedoms of choice remain unimpaired. When an insured person is refused by a physician he has the right to make another choice, and of course, subject to routine regulations, will have the right to change physicians (sec. 905 (2)). Even today patients meet with obstacles in changing physicians during treatment.

A dire objectionable result is foreseen, by repeated emphasis, from the provision that the Surgeon General will have the right to allocate among the doctors in an area those patients who have not made selection of a physician, and to prescribe the maximum number of insured persons who may be on a doctor's list. It is asserted that these provisions nullify the freedom of choice between doctor and patient, compel doctors to treat patients whom they do not wish to treat, and compel patients to be treated by doctors by whom they do not wish to be treated. The lack of justification for this assumption becomes obvious when we exam-

[16] Reports of the Technical Committee on Medical Care, supra, note 8.

[17] Principles of a Nation-wide Health Program, report of the health program conference, New York, November 1944, p. 11.

[18] *Helvering* v. *Davis*, 301 U. S. 619; *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, id., p. 548.

[19] Journal of American Bar Association, April 1944, pp. 198–99.

ine the provisions of the bill which are claimed to be the basis of the conclusion.

Among the methods of payment, which the physicians in any area may themselves select by the democratic procedure of a majority vote as the method under which they will be paid for rendering services to insured persons under the act, is the per capita method of payment. Under that system, every doctor is paid a certain amount periodically for every insured person who has selected him as his physician, whether or not that person requires any treatment. In turn, the physician is obligated to render treatment to every such person who has selected him and whom he accepts as a prospective patient. Thus, a physician is paid per capita for every insured person on his list. Of course, the act provides that the physicians in an area may choose other methods of payment, viz, fees for services actually rendered, a salary for whole or part time, or a combination of any or all of the three methods.

Obviously, in an area where the physicians have decided that they wish to render services on a per capita basis, it is important to assure: (1) that the doctors in the area receive payment for all the insured persons in that area—those who have not selected a physician as well as those who have—because with this particular method of payment the aggregate amount of the doctors' income properly depends on their being paid for all such persons: (2) that all insured persons who have been refused by doctors and who have not made another selection or have been unable to find a doctor who will accept them, be assigned to some doctor so that they may receive care when necessary; and (3) that a doctor shall not accept on his list such a large number of persons as not to be able to render proper service to them, for it is obvious that, if a physician accepts 5,000 insured persons on his list, he cannot render adequate service to all. It is also reasonable that a salaried physician should not undertake to care for more persons that he can treat adequately.

Accordingly, the Surgeon General is given authority to limit the number of persons which any doctor may have on his lists. He also is given authority, but only in those areas in which the per capita system of payment is chosen by the doctors, to allocate pro rata among the doctors in the area the persons who, after due notice, have not made selection of a physician, and those who having made a selection, have been refused. For those persons who have not selected a doctor, the allocation in practice is of dollars, not of patients. This is merely an arrangement to assure doctors all the money they are entitled to under capitation. The rights of doctors and patients are fully protected. There is no interference in the private and confidential relationship between physician and patient, and—except in the extraordinary case of the patient who cannot find a doctor to accept him—no doctor is required to treat anyone whom he does not want as his patient. The only condition under which an assignment would be made to a doctor is when an insured person has been refused by all available doctors (under sec. 905 (11) and (12)). When we consider how few persons will be affected and the reasons for these provisions, the argument of that special committee becomes insignificant.

The statement is made in the report that the Surgeon General, to whom authority is given is not "an elected servant of the people and who is not amendable to their will." Obviously, it is unwise, if not impossible, that the director of every administrative agency or bureau, especially those involving specialized technical skills, be elected by direct vote. There is no reason in this situation for failing to follow the usual procedure under our system of government of having such directors subject to the control of the Executive and Congress, whose Members are elected by the people and are amenable to their will.

The report states that these provisions constitute a direct attack on the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country; and that the Surgeon General is given the power arbitrarily to make rules and regulations having the force and effect of law which directly affect every home; and that there is no safeguard against the "arbitrary or capricious action of one man."

The specific provisions of the bill completely refute these assumptions. Even on general principles of law, no arbitrary or capricious action of the administrator would be sustained by the courts. The law is well settled that rules and regulations promulgated in administering any statute must comply with the provisions and purposes of the statute.

But in addition, the bill specifically limits the power of the Surgeon General with respect to the issuance of regulations. Section 905 of the bill sets forth at length, specifically and explicitly, guilding principles and provisions for administration for the guidance of the Surgeon General. Section 914 provides:

"SEC. 914. The Surgeon General, after consultation with the Social Security Board, and with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, shall make and publish such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with other provisions of this act, as may be necessary to the efficient administration of this title."

It is thus apparent that the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who is said to have unlimited power to control and enslave all the doctors and hospitals and all the patients, comprising practically all the people of the United States, by his "rules and regulations," can make rules and regulations only "after consultation with the Social Security Board, and with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator," and these rules and regulations must not be "inconsistent with the other provisions of the act," and they must be "necessary to the efficient administration of this title." Therefore, the Surgeon General cannot adopt rules which are "arbitrary" or "capricious" as the special committee claims. Obviously, any rule or regulation which does not meet these limitations would be rejected by the courts.

Equally unfounded is the claim that the bill fails to provide for any appeal to any court from any action of the Surgeon General. The special committee itself states that the Surgeon General is given all the powers conferred on the Social Security Board by sections 205, 206, and 208, and in a footnote it endeavors to summarize the provisions of these sections. But it omits to mention those provisions of section 205 which specify at length and in detail the manner of judicial review. It is the intent of the bill, as stated by its proponents, that the provisions for judicial review contained in section 205 of the act shall be applicable to title IX. While there may be difference of opinion whether the language of section 1108 of the bill includes subsection (g) of section 205, one would expect the special committee to state that it may have been intended to include section 205 (g) and that there was doubt whether the language used accomplished that intent. If there be any doubt of the effectiveness of the language used in the bill to grant the right of judicial review provided by section 205 (g), we are certain that the proponents of the bill will make that section applicable by definite and unmistakable terms.

IV. Factual errors and omissions

The report of the special committee contains many errors and omissions of fact and errors of interpretation in relation to the provisions of the bill.

Hospitals: It is error to say that there is no freedom of choice of hospital. The bill provides no restriction on the choice of hospital. It is reasonable to assume that present practice will be followed, that a patient needing hospital care will be sent to the hospital recommended by his physician.

The intimation that hospitals will be entitled to participate only if selected by the Surgeon General ignores the provision of the bill that in establishing lists of participating hospitals the Surgeon General must follow general standards worked out with the advisory council (sec. 907 (b)). These, it is safe to say, would be the same or similar to those now followed by the American Medical Association and the American College of Surgeons in listing acceptable hospitals.

There is no foundation for the statement that Senator WAGNER erred in stating that there was freedom of choice by hospitals of types of payment. The bill provides that hospital treatment may be paid for at certain specified rates per day (sec. 915 (g)), which could be paid as reimbursement to the insured, or the Surgeon General may make contracts with hospitals for payment on the basis of rendition of services at specified rates (sec. 915 (g)). The hospital will have the choice as to which type or method of payment it desires. There is no compulsion upon any hospital to accept any proffered contract.

Canadian plan: The report compares the proposed Canadian plan for medical care with that provided by this bill, and comes to the conclusion that the Canadian plan is preferable. The special committee prefers the Canadian plan because Canada respects its constitutional limitations against a federal plan and provides for the adoption of a model bill by each province, drafted by the Dominion, under which the Canadian Federal Government will merely provide subsidies to the provinces. The special committee fails to indicate that a national plan is not constitutional in Canada and that Canada's limitation is, therefore, not a guide for us where a Federal plan is, as we have demonstrated, constitutional.

The committee prefers the administration of the Canadian plan by a commission appointed by the lieutenant governor in council whose chairman must be a doctor. But the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is a doctor, and his administration of the plan must be in consultation and cooperation with the Social Security Board, the Federal Security Administrator, and an advisory council, representing physicians, hospitals and other groups. There is also an adivisory council to the Social Security Board composed of representatives of employers, workers, and the public.

And finally, it emphasizes the contrast in cost: that the Canadian plan would cost $250,000,000 a year, while the plan for the United States would cost $3,000,000,000 a year. It fails to note, however, that the population of the United States is 12 times that of Canada, and that a cost 12 times as great as Canada's is, therefore, not excessive.

The indigent: The special committee criticizes the plan by saying that the indigent who are most in need of free medical care are not covered by S. 1161.

The National Lawyers Guild, in its report on the bill, recommends that the indigent be included in the single unified system of medical care provided for insured persons, and that the cost of providing such care for the indigent be paid by contributions by the Federal Government to the medical care and hospitalization account established in the bill.

However, it is error to say that the bill makes no provision whatever for the medical care of the indigent. Under title XII, which deals with a unified public assistance program, provision is made for reimbursement of the States for money advanced

to the indigent for medical care and for direct expenditures for that purpose (sec. 1205 (a) (2)). Such contribution is to be not less than 50 percent of the State's expenditure and may be as high as 75 percent for the least prosperous States. Sections 910 and 913 (c) of the bill also authorize local and State public agencies responsible for the care of the indigent to make payment to the Federal health insurance system for medical and hospitalization benefits for their indigent. Under such agreements, the indigent would receive the same medical and hospitalization benefits as other insured persons, and the Federal Government, by virtue of the provisions of title XII, would pay 50 to 75 percent of the cost to the States.

State medicine: The committee is against State medicine but it mentions with approval the fact that 42 percent of expenditures for hospitals and doctors in 1942 "were either tax-supported or otherwise without cost to the patient," and it also says that in this country, "no form of State medicine is in effect." The committee apparently forgets that nearly all hospitals for mental and nervous diseases and for those suffering from tuberculosis are public institutions, accounting for more than one-half of all hospital beds in the United States, with approximately 70 percent of our hospital services already administered by "State medicine," [20] and that we have public systems of medical care for veterans, for merchant seamen, for the indigent and others.

V. "The rights and liberties of the citizens of this country"

As a final conclusion, the report states that the bill constitutes "a direct attack on the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country" and that "The vicious system whereby administrative officials judge, without court review, the actions of their subordinates in carrying out orders issued to them is extended in this bill to a point foreign to our system of Government and incompatible with the adequate protection of the liberties of the people." There is nothing "foreign to our system of Government" about the provision of medical care for the people of our country by an insurance system. It is no more "foreign" to our system of government than is the system of old-age security and unemployment insurance. In fact, the very first health insurance system introduced in the modern world was established in the United States in 1798 when Congress enacted the health-insurance system for merchant seamen. With some variations, this has existed for nearly 150 years.

The report views these provisions of the bill as a direct attack upon the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country. Providing its citizens with the right to medical care, with the opportunity to enjoy health, with the ability to prevent suffering and destitution caused by illness and the inability to obtain medical treatment is not an attack on the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country. On the contrary, it establishes conditions of health and decency under which citizens of this country can enjoy their rights and liberties.

Nor is the issue of local government at the expense of a decent available system of medical care to those who cannot afford it of such importance as to justify abandonment of the provisions of this bill. There is nothing incompatible between a national system of medical care and local administration. Such a system is, in effect, provided by the terms of this bill, which speaks of areas in which physicians are listed and different methods of payment may be adopted. Authorization is also given for the establishment of local and regional boards, committees, or commissions (sec. 904 (b) (8)). The reasons for adoption of a national system of health insurance and medical care rather than waiting for the adoption of separate systems by the several States are as cogent as those which exist in the case of old-age security and unemployment insurance. Those reasons were stated by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Helvering* v. *Davis*, quoted above. They are so apposite that they will bear repetition:

"The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. * * * States and local governments are often lacking in the resources that are necessary to finance an adequate program of security for the aged. This is brought out with a wealth of illustration in recent studies of the problem. Apart from the failure of resources, State and local governments are at times reluctant to increase heavily the burden of taxation to be borne by their residents for fear of placing themselves in a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighbors or competitors."

The committee says, "Of all like plans in foreign countries, none are like this, except in Russia, which involves the complete socialization and regimentation of medicine. Such a course, if followed here, would produce the same result." The system proposed here, as pointed out above, is in no way similar to the Russian system, where state socialized medicine exists. The system provided by this bill in no way resembles such a plan. The committee is apparently not acquainted with systems of medical care in other countries. The system here proposed is to a large extent similar to that existing in Great Britain for over 30 years and now about to be greatly extended to cover everybody; in Germany before Hitler, where it was first established in 1883; and in the 50 countries which had health or sickness insurance before the war.

The special committee says that "under the pretext of the general welfare" this legislation "either inadvertently or with deliberate subtlety constitutes a direct attack on the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country." The report thus accuses those who are trying to provide social security, "freedom from want," for the people of this country, as plotting to destroy its liberties. The special committee ignores the fact that under present methods of payment, nine-tenths of the people cannot afford to pay for the cost of adequate medical care and catastrophic illness; that before the war, one-third of the population of this country received no medical care at all; and that hundreds of thousands of deaths annually are preventable by the provision of adequate medical care. It fails to learn any lesson from the over 40 percent of rejections on physical grounds of young men for military service, young men at the age which should make them the healthiest group in our population.

The report ignores, as do all opponents of health insurance, the fundamental problem which health insurance is designed to meet: How to distribute the cost of medical care so that those who need it can receive it. As we have heretofore stated in our report (p. 5): [21]

"It is because sickness is unpredictable that it is impossible for the majority of the American people effectively to budget to meet its costs. It is because catastrophic sickness most frequently falls upon those who can least afford to pay for its cost, that a method to distribute the cost is necessary. It is because the whole Nation is concerned with the health of all the people that this problem must be solved on a national scale. The bill provides a sound and effective method of dealing with the problem."

The report of the special committee fails to offer any plan to meet the need for adequate medical care, the greatest need of the American people in the field of social security.

S. 1161 COVERS A VAST FIELD OF SOCIAL PROTECTION

The special committee's report is concerned only with the medical-care provisions of the bill. The bill also provides a unified system of social security for our country covering many social benefits besides medical care—extension and improvement of old-age and survivors insurance, federalization and extension of unemployment insurance, reorganization and extension of public assistance. Moreover, the bill would insure against the loss of income because of disability by creating a system of cash disability benefits for temporary and permanent disability. These provisions have seemed to us to be of enormous benefit to the American people.

CONCLUSION

Upon analysis, we conclude that the medical-care provisions of the bill are urgently needed for the protection of the health and welfare of the American people. We find nothing in the bill which will diminish or impair "the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country." On the contrary, its enactment would serve to make these rights and liberties real and effective. For the sick are not free, and only a healthy America can exercise its rights and enjoy its liberties.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL LEGISLATION,
LEO J. LINDER, *Chairman.*
MORRIS A. WAINGER, *Secretary.*

[20] Kingsbury, Health in Handcuffs, p. 18; Need for Medical-Care Insurance (supra, note 5), p. 23.

[21] Supra, note 3.

Small Business Needs Administrative Law Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 7, 1943, I submitted to the Senate, on behalf of the Small Business Committee, a statement which among other things included the following:

The Senate Small Business Committee (and the same committee in the House of Representatives) has for many months been holding hearings and studying the problems of the smaller businessman under war emergency regulation. It is obvious that there is a great deal of meritorious complaint, not with the laws which Congress has passed, but with the execution of those laws.

Nor do I mean to say that the administrative arm of the Government has acted with complete abandon or in reckless disregard of the laws of Congress or the rights of citizens. Because either the laws are fragmentary or incomplete, or because of the limitations on the right of private parties to defend themselves and have the benefit of those laws, some administrators may have felt that they had reason to assume that some provisions contained in acts of the Congress are merely advisory. I do not think that Congress so intended.

Legislative correction in the field of so-called "administrative law" has become a recognized need. The Commit-

tee on the Judiciary now has before it for consideration legislation to provide a simplified administrative procedure and a day in court for every party subjected to the unjust application of administrative regulations. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the February 1945 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society. I feel that the article is worthy of the attention of everyone interested in good government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW AND ADMINISTRATIVE GOVERNMENT

(By David A. Simmons)

(NOTE.—The author is a member of the Houston, Tex., bar, president of the American Bar Association, and past president of the American Judicature Society.)

The professor of legal history in the University of London, writing in the dispassionate and scholarly style of the true historian, describes in the following language a crisis in common-law history at a time when lawyers were called serjeants:

"The serjeants from the beginning held a high place in the legal world; we soon find Parliament referring hard questions to the serjeants as well as to the judges, and quite early in the fourteenth century the Crown adopts the policy of recruiting the bench from the outstanding men at the bar. * * *

"The courts of equity—chancery, star chamber, court of requests—were differently organized. The permanent clerical establishment of each of these courts undertook the duties of attorneys, and so professional attorneys had no place there. Still, there remained numerous duties of a quasi-legal character which had to be done, and litigants soon found it convenient to have a sort of law agent who would set the complicated machinery in motion by engaging and conferring with the various branches of the profession as occasion required, and doing other duties, sometimes of a legal and sometimes of a business character. * * *

"The rise of new courts and the extension of the jurisdiction of old ones had far outgrown the limits within which the serjeant cared to act. * * * Indeed, the position of the law had changed considerably under the Tudors. Justice was no longer the exclusive concern of judges and serjeants. * * * It was now an affair of state requiring constant attention from the Crown, which was viewing with some anxiety the activities of its courts. * * * There was a chance of the Crown turning to the civilians for exponents of a newer technique of law and government; but in the end a sort of compromise was worked out. * * * The law was brought once more into vital contact with the world of affairs and politics. That contact was necessary if the law was to continue as a growing system, but the dangers were of the gravest, as the history of the Stuart judiciary will show."

Professor Plucknett (Concise History of the Common Law, second edition, 1936) there presents a parallel with the present situation in the United States, except that the result of the situation here still hangs in the balance. New institutions have been created, each with its permanent clerical establishment in which attorneys are said to have a dubious place. Justice, if such this form may be called, has again become an affair of state. There has been more than a little turning to the civilians for exponents of a newer technique of law and government.

Indeed, the struggle of which the distinguished historian speaks is more than a parallel, for it was a part of the tradition out of which America was born. That was not only the period when the legal institutions of what is now the English-speaking world were reaching their modern form, but the period when the American Colonies were founded.

One needs but to reread the Declaration of Independence and the 27 paragraphs of indictment against the King and Parliament to have a very clear picture of what to them constituted tyranny. We have become so accustomed to thinking of the Declaration of Independence only in the terms of its grand pronouncements as to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that we are prone to overlook the very practical aspects of that document which defined the grievances of the colonies and of the individual citizens caused by the arbitrary and unbridled exercise of power by King and Parliament.

Among other things, it charged (a) that the King had made judges dependent upon his will alone; (b) that he had created a multitude of new offices and had sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance; (c) that he had combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, unacknowledged by our laws, and contrary to the forms of our government; (d) that he had deprived us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury; (e) that he had altered fundamentally the forms of our government; and (f) that King and Parliament had suspended our own legislatures and had declared themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

Those were charges that were said to justify a revolution, and there are those who now say that the same acts of tyranny in modified form have appeared among us again. I am perfectly willing to let each thoughtful person reason out the comparison for himself, but I believe most of us will agree that bureaucracy, with its absorption of all powers of government, is in violation not only of the spirit of this country as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, but is in violation of the very letter of our Constitution. Certainly our form of government is now entirely different from anything envisioned by the founders.

The problem today, of course, concerns no usurpation or oppression from afar. The question is whether surrender shall come from within, as so well stated in the seventh and eighth chapters of First Samuel:

"And Samuel judged * * * And he went from year to year in circuit. * * * Then all the elders * * * came to Samuel * * * and said unto him, '* * * Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.' But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, 'Give us a king to judge us.' * * * And he said, 'This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you. * * * Ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you * * *. Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, 'Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations.'"

Though history, whether legal or biblical, usually speaks in terms of kings, the point is always arbitrary government. Samuel's people, short-sightedly weary of the effort required in democratic government, wanted to be "like all the nations." The Tudors and the Stuarts, and the House of Hanover, which lost America for England, in order to free themselves from the restraints of law championed what Professor Plucknett rationalizes as "a newer technique of law and government."

Nothing indicates that these urges will not remain so long as men inhabit the earth. The question at any time is whether enough people with enough intelligent vigor remain to preserve the gains of law over insidious and multiform despotism. Today arbitrary power, as the concomitant of either war or political philosophy, rules the greater part of the world. Indeed, most of its people have never known a different governance.

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

At the close of the eighteenth century a constitution was adopted creating the United States, in which it was expressly provided that a Congress of elected representatives would do the legislating for the Nation and a system of independent courts of law would supply the necessary judicature. With the advent of the twentieth century both legislation and judicature, with mounting frequency, have been combined with executive powers in a nonrepresentative and nonjudicial arm of government called administrative. That this is a second revolution in American Government is not denied by its partisans, who not only advocate these institutions and stoutly defend them but, like the Tudors and the Stuarts, wage unremitting war against the supremacy of law.

It has been said that neither court nor administrative agency "should repeat in this day the mistake made by the courts of law when equity was struggling for recognition as an ameliorating system of justice" (*United States* v. *Morgan*, 307 U. S. 183, 191 (1939)). But on the law-making side Senator CONNALLY, the present chairman of what is now and for some time to come will be the most important legislative committee in the world, has said that in placing transcendent powers in administrative agents, "the Congress seemingly has divested itself of its own judgment and its own discretion and its own legislative wisdom." (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 11156.)

Administrative government is one of the great facts of our time. Reaction to it takes many forms. There are those who refuse to recognize it as legitimate, though its proponents point out that revolution, like monarchies, create their own legitimacy. There are those who find no praise too high for it, although in other affairs they would be the first to deplore such an extreme. There are those who study it to an infinity of words and documentation, though it is no new phenomenon. And then there are those who assay the more arducus task of fitting it into our institutions in such a way as to preserve their free nature without preventing government from achieving its present-day purposes. Let us see what has been or may be done in support of this latter attitude.

In the 1920's the problem of administrative government was treated in terms of judicial review—that is, the relations of administrative agencies to courts—whereas we now know that mere court review is sterile where Congress confers unlimited discretion. Senator GEORGE, during the debate on the war-contract renegotiation bill, called it "arbitrary" legislation. (90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 21, 1944, p. 533.) Special administrative courts were once suggested by a committee of the American Bar Association (S. 1835, 73rd Cong. 1st sess.; S. 3676, 75th Cong. 3d sess.; 58 A. B. A. Rep. 203, 426 (1933); 59 A. B. A. Rep. 539 (1934); 60 A. B. A. Rep. 136 (1935); 61 A. B. A. Rep. 220, 233, 721 (1936) and by the minority of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure (Senate Document No. 8, 77th Cong. 1st sess., pp. 203–209 (1941)). In 1937 the President of the United States recommended a comprehensive plan for the separation of judicial and prosecuting functions in administrative agencies. He stated that the present form of administrative tribunal, which performs "administratve work in addition to judicial work, threatens to develop a 'fourth branch' of the Government for which there is no sanction in the Constitution." (Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, with Message of the President and Special Studies, 1937.) So far as these proposals mean a trial de novo by an independent tribunal on the order of the Board (now Court) of Tax Appeals, they are a solution of only the problem of the judge-prosecutor

combination found in administrative agencies. Special courts have at least four disadvantages: (1) Because they are specialized, they are subject to the pulling and hauling of special private and governmental interests; (2) they weaken the jurisdiction of the regular courts of the land with which citizens are familiar and to which they are accustomed to resort for justice; (3) there is more to the problem than mere separation of judge and prosecutor, for the judge must have some law to apply, which he does not have so long as administrative powers are conferred in practically unlimited terms; and (4) courts can exercise only powers of adjudication and hence furnish no solution for the increasingly serious problem of administrative rule-making typified in general price, wage, rate, and food regulations.

More recently legal thought has turned to matters of procedure, in some part, perhaps, as a result of the movement for the revision and uniformity of rules of procedure in the Federal trial courts. An administrative procedure act was passed by Congress but vetoed by the President. (Walter-Logan bill, H. R. 6324, 76th Cong., 3d sess.; H. Doc. No. 986, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) Meanwhile, the Attorney General of the United States in 1938, as a part of the movement for reform of judicial procedure, recommended that attention be turned to the procedure employed by the administrative process; and the President authorized a thorough and comprehensive study of existing practices and procedures with a view to detecting deficiencies and pointing the way to improvements. (S. Doc. No. 8, supra, pp. 251–252.) Pursuant thereto the so-called Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, after elaborate studies, made its report in 1941. (S. Doc. No. 8, supra.) The Senate held hearings on the legislative proposals growing out of the work of that committee (hearings, Administrative Procedure, on S. 674, S. 675, and S. 918, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), but suspended consideration with the imminence of war. The current World War, however, has been more than an interruption, for it has given us further experience with administrative agencies and has increased the awareness of administrative government on the part of every citizen and every group or interest. We believe we now know more than we did when the Walter-Logan bill was drafted or when the Attorney General's committee reported.

It has recently become common to approach administrative government by a method of search and publicity. The search is for shocking cases of bureaucratic government. The publicity feeds undiscriminating appetites for public scandal. A little thought will demonstrate, however, that such investigations have a limited usefulness so far as maintaining orderly legal processes are concerned. Of course, legislative investigations have an assured place in all matters of government, but, as the Senate Small Business Committee has so well put it (89 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 5411, 5412):

"We, the Congress, cannot examine into individual cases or regulations beyond what is necessary to determine whether parties should have legal protection. Our function, once we are satisfied that the conditions so require, is to pass laws not only so that administrators may have power under them, but also in order that the people may have the protection of those laws. * * * Laws without enforcible rights are a mirage. Administration without or beyond the law is doomed to failure. * * * The way to make it workable is to grant the necessary powers to the administrators and the necessary rights to those who are regulated, including the means of protecting those rights in any administrative or judicial proceedings."

LEGISLATIVE NEEDS

The immediate lines of approach are necessarily legislative, and it seems clear that they must take two separate but related courses. First, there must be an Administrative Procedure Act. Second, Congress must—as it now seems firmly to recognize—more specifically state and limit the powers which it has delegated to administrative agencies. The latter is essential in order that jurisdiction may be understood by both the regulators and the regulated. The former is equally essential to furnish the regulators and regulated with a basic blueprint of methods of operation and means of control.

An administrative procedure statute, such as is proposed in the widely supported McCarran-Sumners bill (S. 7 and H. R. 1203), must have three principal features: (1) It must provide for publicity of administrative law and procedure. (2) It should differentiate and state at least the minimum requirements of the two types of administrative action, rule making and the adjudication of particular cases. (3) It must specify and simplify the methods of judicial review. In addition, two further matters are desirable; a statement of the incidental procedural rights, such as those relating to appearances or investigations, and express limitations upon the sanctions which administrative agencies may impose. Within each of these different items there is, of course, much room for inclusion and exclusion. There is a minimum beyond which such legislation may not be reduced, and this seems to be about the position taken in the McCarran-Sumners bill. Additional and tempting features to add to such a measure there surely are, but wisdom dictates against any proposal which may sacrifice fundamentals for detail.

If both an administrative procedure act and a more precise definition of administrative powers can be secured, at least we will be assured of some measure of law in administrative government. But that need not and should not end efforts at further improvement. Some functions of the agencies should be recaptured by the Congress and some function should be returned to the ordinary courts.

Congress should recapture its legislative power even in the fields of lesser Federal legislation. If necessary, it could act through its own Bureau of Legislation working under the immediate direction, supervision, and control of the Congress and its various committees. The congressional establishment has only a few thousand employees to assist the 96 Senators and 435 Congressmen. If Congress does not have the time nor the means to investigate and draft all the subordinate rules and regulations needed to supplement its acts, it can certainly take out of the executive departments and the administrative agencies the people engaged in composing, writing, and expertizing these minor laws. It is estimated that there are thousands of these. If they functioned as part of the congressional establishment, they would have a legislative esprit de corps and a broad general outlook on legislative problems distinct from that of bureaucrats anxious to expand their own authority. Certainly the draftsmanship of all rules and regulations would become more uniform and more consistent with the spirit of our institutions.

Congress should also give thought to returning judicial functions to the ordinary courts. Why not create a system of minor Federal courts similar to that of the States and cities, with jurisdiction in controversies arising under minor Federal regulations? Of the uncounted thousands now exercising judicial functions in the bureas and commissions, those who are qualified might well be placed under the courts as masters, commissioners, and examiners, where they would properly become a part of the judicial establishment and have the outlook, impartiality, and esprit de corps of the judge. They could be localized throughout the country in Federal courthouses and thus be available for the prompt hearing of complaints involving the thousands of minor governmental regulations.

At some time this Nation will surely stand, without knowing it, at a crossroads which point one way to freedom and order and the other way to bondage and chaos. Many people cite good reasons for saying that the day of choice is at hand. If we pass blindly on, we may find ourselves so used to bargaining rather than adjudication, and so accustomed to politics rather than legal administration, that we will neither recognize nor appreciate a government according to law. This is not said in a spirit of legal isolationism. The antidote for arbitrary power is not a strugge against all power—to the point of depriving governments of the means to govern and protect. Dictatorship versus Anarchy, though delusively opposite and conveniently simple labels, are extremes and not alternatives. They currently stand for things which are equally opposed to that government under law which the civilized world has sought for more than 2,000 years and has occasionally achieved. We have achieved it here on this continent, and the issue is whether we shall retain it or see it frittered away, bit by bit, as expediency and indecision dictate.

When VE-Day Comes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Allied Nations draw nearer to the day of victory in Europe, it behooves us now to resolve that when that victory comes, and as we rejoice over its achievement, we must also restrain ourselves from the false assumption that it means the end of this war.

We must not let the jubilation of victory slacken our efforts against our enemies, the Japs, for until they are also defeated this war must continue.

An editorial in the New York Times of today upon this subject is worthy of reproduction, and under leave granted is submitted herewith:

WHEN VE-DAY COMES

Perhaps the footless and fantastic rumors that have flooded this country as our armies sweep through Germany can be made to serve a useful purpose. They should serve as a warning to us against breaking into too frantic a celebration of VE (victory in Europe) day when it actually comes.

Even VE-day will only relieve in part the intolerable agony of a tortured world. It will not end it. It will not automatically and at once spread good-will among men. We can certainly afford to be proud and happy because of our victory, for it will have been stupendous. We can rejoice that the God of Battles gave us the decision. But our sacrifice has been too heavy for hysterical jubilation, for "frantic boast and foolish word." We cannot forget the feelings of mothers and fathers whose boys lie dead on foreign soil, of wives who have lost their

husbands, of all who have lost someone dear to them.

Peace in Europe will be only partial peace. We have another war to fight on the other side of the world, a long one and a hard one, with thousands more of our bravest called to die. No one with any feeling could regard such a prospect lightheartedly. No one with any judgment could relax the effort each of us must still make. VE-day will entitle this Nation to a sigh of relief. But it must also serve as a day of rededication for that total victory we have still to win.

Reaction to British White Paper on Employment Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the full employment resolution adopted at the last meeting of the International Labor Office Conference, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a study made by one of the members of our own Department of Commerce, entitled "Reaction to British White Paper on Employment Policy."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REACTION TO BRITISH WHITE PAPER ON EMPLOYMENT POLICY

Parliamentary reaction to the employment policy white paper was recorded during a 3-day debate in the House of Commons. The majority of the House, regardless of party affiliation, looked with critical approval on the paper, welcoming the proposal that the State would hereafter be responsible for maintaining a "high and stable level of employment," but questioning the scope, emphasis, and adequacy of the Government plan.

In giving their support, the conservatives and liberals stressed those sections of the white paper which dealt with the importance of reestablishing and expanding of foreign trade, making British industry more efficient, and securing sound central finance. On the other hand, the Parliamentary Labor Party emphasized that the task of maintaining full employment would be made easier if substantial sections of the economy were brought under public ownership; that, while the revival of the export market was important, the Government must be prepared with domestic policies if foreign trade failed; and that it had no confidence that an energetic and affirmative policy to maintain full employment would be carried out by any conservation or coalition government.

The only real differences of opinion during the debate arose over the question of the future ownership of industry. This, in spite of Labor Minister Bevin's clear statements that the "proposals of the white paper will operate whatever the ownership of industry may be" and "the question of how you can give effect to the decisions as to who will own industry is not prejudiced by this white paper." Aneurin Bevan, Labor Member of Parliament, claimed that the white paper was unworkable and a fraud. He stated that it admits by implication that unemployment is endemic under a system based on private enterprise carried on for profit, yet refuses to apply the necessary basic remedy which is socialist ownership.

The opposite extreme was voiced by Sir Herbert Williams, representing the die-hard element of the Conservative Party. He assailed the white paper only on the ground that it was an unnecessary, unjustified, and unauthorized interference with free enterprise and private property and would lead inevitably to socialism, regimentation, inflation, and national bankruptcy.

It should be noted that Bevan and Sir Herbert were supported by only about a half-dozen members who completely rejected the paper for varying reasons. The Government's proposals were in general favorably received, criticism being directed at the indefiniteness and apparent ambiguity of some of the specific measures proposed.

Before the motion on which the debate took place was carried several members insisted on making the point that it committed them to approval of nothing beyond the acceptance of responsibility by the Government for securing a high and stable level of employment, and not to approval of the methods by which this end was to be attained.

Press comment on the paper and debate followed party and sectional interests for the most part, with the conservative press reaffirming its faith in private enterprise, but making no criticism of the Government statements that there was a place for public as well as private ownership, the official labor press noting that the white paper closed no door to socialism and the business press reserving its support until it was clear what the specific legislative measures were to be and their effect on finance, industry, and trade.

The Conservative Party has been among the strongest supporters of the plan and has generally approved it, at the same time stressing the need for an expansion of exports, and expressing a fear that under it the budget was going to be unbalanced, if need be, to provide employment. The ambiguity of this section of the paper on central finance may be illustrated by the fact that the Labor Party came away equally convinced that the budget would not be unbalanced, if need be, to provide employment.

The Liberal Party's report on the white paper accepts and endorses the proposals in large part, but suggests that the proposed measures are inadequate to maintain full employment. The basic error is, according to the criticism, the adherence to the old concept of a balanced budget. This will have a deflationary effect, and thus prevent the expansion of purchasing power, which is an indispensable condition of full employment. Adjustment of the income tax, not social-insurance rates, should be used to increase public purchasing power. World-wide freedom of trade is advocated, and the Liberal Party insists that the fall of exports was not the chief cause of pre-war unemployment. Another error of emphasis, they say, is that the white paper is designed to deal with the problem of cyclical unemployment rather than with the important problem of how to absorb the hard core of workers, 10 or 12 percent of the working population, who remained unemployed even in the boom years between wars.

Commonwealth Party post-war plans state that the achievement of full employment must be through the establishment of common ownership without which national resources cannot be mobilized to meet human needs.

Sir William Beveridge compares the Government white paper with his own book, Full Employment in a Free Society. His comment parallels that of most other views in that the paper represents within the limits set a sincere attempt but that its practical proposals are inadequate. He goes on to say that its action is inhibited by a sense of values that is wrong—treating private enterprise as sacrosanct, a foreign power independent of the state; and treating the maintenance of budgetary equilibrium as of equal importance with full employment. The Government plan he regards as only a public works policy and argues that the policy of compensatory public expenditure to offset declines in private expenditure will not work, partly because the over-all national policy will not become effective in all sectors of the economy, and partly because the unplanned market economy is incapable of creating at any time a demand for labor sufficiently strong and steady to maintain full employment.

While the Government objective, as stated by the Chancelor of the Exchequer, is to "reduce to a minimum the period of unemployment for people willing to work but who are excluded from work because of conditions obtaining for the time being," Sir William says the policy of his report is full employment, defined as meaning "always more vacant jobs than idle men."

The council of the London Chamber of Commerce generally endorses the white paper's plans. However, in the chamber's view, the white paper attaches too much importance to influencing public expenditure and not enough to influencing private expenditure as a method of regulating the volume of consumption, and contends that the variation of the rate of income tax allowances for obsolescence and replacement of plant and machinery would be an even more direct way of affecting the level of capital expenditure than varying social insurance contributions. Complaint is voiced on the failure of the section on central finance to give a clear picture of the financial aspects of the employment policy.

The general line of the Labor Party was one of welcoming the victory of a "case which labor has pressed in Parliament for half a century" but adding that the Government's policy will not be brought to full fruition unless nationalization of basic industries is greatly extended. Other complaints are the modesty of the proposals; the absence of any reference to a comprehensive national-development plan; the vagueness of Government plans, if any, to force private enterprise into line on planning; and the inadequacy and impreciseness of the Government's foreign trade policy.

Dick Sanders, Youngest General in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in my opinion, the State of Utah has made as outstanding a contribution to the war effort and program as has any other State in the Union. I am sure my colleague the able senior Senator from Utah

will agree with that statement. Utah's metal production for war purposes is not surpassed by that of any other State, but the greatest contribution which the State of Utah has made to the war program has been her young men and women who are now in the armed forces.

Recently my attention was called to an article in Look magazine for April 3, 1945, on the youngest general in the United States Army. This young man is 29 years of age and is a brigadier general. He is Richard C. Sanders, of Salt Lake City. His progress in the Army may well be described as miraculous. His record is one of outstanding achievement. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is very timely and appropriate to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article, which is very brief, concerning this fine soldier. So, in behalf of the senior Senator from Utah and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNGEST GENERAL—DICK SANDERS IS A 29-YEAR-OLD EX-SODA BOY FROM UTAH

(By Luther Davis)

At 29, Brig. Gen. Richard C. Sanders is the youngest man since Custer to become a general officer in the United States Army. He earned the rank without any spectacular heroism, by solid Air Forces service.

Two years ago he was a colonel, on routine combat duty in North Africa. He was just one more pilot who quietly carried out his orders. Flying a B-24, he made 25 missions from bases in north Africa—a total of 200 combat-hours, during which, by some miracle, no member of his crew was injured. His plane was never hit.

One afternoon over Tripoli, his B-24 was bracketed by intense flak. His tail gunner reported, quaveringly: "Sir, the bursts are getting closer and closer all the time."

Said Sanders: "Well, soldier, let me have a full report when one hits."

AN EASY-GOING ADMINISTRATOR

Such calm at tight moments explains the slick ease with which Sanders, no West Pointer, has risen in the Army. Youthful, unmarried, good-looking (he's blond and blue-eyed), Sanders stands 6 feet 2, weighs 220, handles a very tough job without apparent effort.

He's administrative officer of the IX Bomber Command, that part of the Ninth Air Force controlling all American medium bombers in England. He is responsible for a mass of administrative and operational detail that would make the average man a total wreck. Yet Dick gets it all done in a short working day, and without raising his voice.

His only bawlings-out are strictly for laughs. Once he shouted for his adjutant and held out an enormously complicated directive from higher headquarters. The first page, dotted all over with formulas, references, and footnotes, looked like a musical score. Thrusting it at the adjutant, Dick barked: "How dare you send this in without a trombone!"

HOW TO BE A GENERAL

If you would like to follow in Sanders' footsteps and become a general early and practically painlessly, here are some helpful hints. Get born a Mormon in Salt Lake City, to what Sanders calls a "one-car, no-servant family that hates thieves and people who don't vote." In the public schools you take life easy, get dignified but unspectacular grades. Pin money comes from working after school, delivering things for a drug store.

After 4 years of this, your industry is rewarded. At least Dick Sanders' was. He was promoted to soda jerker.

HE WORKED HIS WAY

At the University of Utah, he paid for his clothes and a secondhand car by running an elevator at the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, where he is remembered as a conservative pilot who made landings precisely but at half throttle.

He always owed money to the college bursar. But his grades were A's. The general-to-be wanted to be a doctor in those days. It was to get the money for medical school that he decided, after graduation from college, to go into the Army for a year.

In July 1937, a shiny new second lieutenant, he reported to Fort Lewis, Washington. He liked the life—"enjoyed playing soldier," as he puts it—and took competitive exams for a Regular Army commission.

Although his grade was good, other candidates did better. So Dick applied for Air Cadet training, just as a means of getting into the Regular Army. He had never been up in a plane but his attitude was, "If others can do it, I can too." He prevailed on an Army pilot at Fort Lewis to take him up.

Fists clenched, face green, Dick was introduced to every acrobatic maneuver in the book. Finally, the pilot flattened out and asked: "Do you want to be sick?"

"No, thanks," said Dick. "I don't feel that well."

CAME MORE EXAMINATIONS

But he got through flying school and was assigned to Mitchel Field, New York. There he took more examinations for a Regular Army commission. This time he scored the highest grades at Mitchel Field and the fourth highest in the country. This was the beginning of the long series of efficiency reports with which his commanding officers have milestoned his Army career. A superior general recently described Sanders as "mature beyond his years and having good judgment and tact."

As a commander of men of superior age and military experience, he needs tact. His trick of listening instead of talking, now famous in the Ninth Bomber Command, helps him deal with older officers.

HIS SILENCE IS ELOQUENT

Once a group commander, a colonel who felt he had been treated unfairly by headquarters, crashed into Dick's office to resign his command. He ranted for over an hour, during which time Dick just stared at him and nodded sympathetically.

Finally, the colonel, meeting no argument, talked himself around to the opposite view, apologized for his rashness and agreed to try the new tactics that had made him angry.

Young General Sanders' own combat record in north Africa—he holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal, each with two Oak Leaf Clusters—is respected by his men.

They know that he was one of the few especially skilled pilots chosen shortly after Pearl Harbor to initiate American heavy bombardment in the Mediterranean area. Dick got one automatic promotion before going overseas, and—on the same day—an additional up, from captain to major, in recognition of his position as squadron leader.

When the time came for him to leave the group, Dick was a full colonel and group executive. As such he had exhibited qualities which caused Lt. Gen. (then Maj. Gen.) Lewis H. Brereton to make him chief of staff of the new Nineteenth Bomber Command.

THE FINAL STEP TO GENERAL

Those who were on the spot explain the sudden elevation this way: Because the new command was small, it had escaped the notice of Washington; otherwise some older head might have been sent out from the States to take over the job. It was mainly an operations job, and Brereton felt that a man who knew the problems of combat should be chosen. Dick Sanders filled the bill.

The Ninth Air Force completed its desert chores and moved to England in the winter of 1944. The following June, Colonel Sanders' superiors reported that he had "efficiently performed the duties of the next higher grade" for 8 months in Africa and 5 in England. And he was promoted to brigadier general.

HE HASN'T CHANGED A BIT

Today Dick is still the same smiling, unhurried guy he was back at Fort Lewis and in flying school. He addresses other brigadiers, all of whom are older than he, as "Sir." And he is often mildly surprised when lower-ranking men salute him.

Dick is not only unmarried, he is not even corresponding with any girl, in Salt Lake City or elsewhere. After getting through his working day in record time, he spends long evenings playing poker, augmenting his $846 monthly Army pay by winning almost constantly. He plays late and regularly, smiling blissfully to himself as he rakes in each pot.

In his poker playing he exhibits some of the qualities that made him a boy general. "He always has the cards to back his bets," says one officer, who owes Dick 3 months' salary. "He never bluffs, never overvalues his hand. Hell, he does it just right, that's all."

So, if you want to be a general at 29, there's your answer. Just do it right, that's all.

Good Prospects of Irrigated Land for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the land hunger which veterans have on returning from the wars is well known to us and has been evident after each war in our history. There is every reason to believe that the veterans returning from this war will have the same land hunger as in the past and that there will be far more of them who would like to own a home on a productive piece of land. Public officials are expecting such to be the case when the veterans of this war return, and many officials in Washington and in the various States are planning to do something about it. This planning is particularly true in the Western States where reclamation has yet to attain its greatest development and reach its highest productivity.

The circumstances confronting the returning veterans of World War No. 2 are quite different from those which faced the veterans of other wars. After the Revolutionary War there was an abundance of land beyond the eastern mountains and in the Ohio Valley in a humid

climate where land could be had for the taking and homes might be established easily. After the War between the States many of the men who wore the blue and those who wore the gray went farther west beyond the Mississippi to establish homes on the land under a liberalized Homestead Act for their benefit. These veterans, for the most part, were still able to find good lands in a humid region.

By the turn of the century the greater part of good land had been preempted, homesteaded, or had passed into private ownership, leaving the vast area of public domain in a dry climate where conditions of homesteading were exceedingly hard. Nevertheless, after the First World War many returning veterans hoped to be benefited by the liberalized Homestead Act, and many attempted to go out into the desert and own a piece of land. Because these western lands lack water and can only be made productive by great irrigation projects and expensive construction, too many of the veterans of the First World War were unable to satisfy their desire for farm homes which could be made productive. On every hand we hear it said now, "Conditions must be made better for the veterans of the Second World War." It is that matter I wish to discuss today.

It is an almost empty gesture merely to liberalize our homestead laws for the benefit of veterans, for out of the vast public domain there is relatively little on which the veteran could make a living without great reclamation cost. However, by reclamation a large area of the West, and that, too, in the most favored sections of the West, may be made highly productive. It will take great engineering constructions and heavy costs, but it is assumed that the Government will be willing to make such expensive outlays even if there were only the one reason as a reward to the Nation's defenders. Of course, it must be borne in mind that every dollar thus spent is an investment which will return to the Treasury manyfold. All costs for reclamation are reimbursable and are repaid to the Government, but even such repayments are but a part of the ultimate return to the Public Treasury.

During the four decades through which the Reclamation Bureau has been at work, the Government has invested nearly a billion dollars, and a large portion of this has already been repaid to the Government by those who benefited from the work. The farmers who are water users on reclamation projects repay the cost to the Government over a 40-year period amortized at 3 percent interest. Under a recent modification of the reclamation law, the consumers of hydroelectric power bear a large portion of the cost of repayment to the Government. Surely no right-thinking official would oppose the investment of Government funds in sound and feasible reclamation projects, nor furnishing the machinery and equipment which is a part of the installation, when it is seen that such construction immediately following the war will give employment to thousands in the West and other thousands east of the Mississippi River. Surely no Government official who recognizes the value of home ownership on productive land would furnish any opposition to such a program that will give thousands of veterans a piece of land in private ownership on which he may make a living.

PENDING BILLS

Two pieces of legislation are now pending before Congress to which I want to call attention. H. R. 2742, introduced by the gentleman from Florida, J. HARDIN PETERSON, was reported out by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and is now on the House Calendar. The committee report on that bill is No. 397. This bill amends the Boulder Canyon Project Act so as to extend the benefits and preferences to veterans of the Second World War as the original act extended them to veterans of earlier wars. A second bill, on which the House committee has not yet held hearings, is H. R. 520, which is designed to give preference to all veterans on all new reclamation projects in the entire country. Hearings for that bill are scheduled to begin within a few days.

When we consider that as much as 20,000,000 acres of land might still be irrigated, over and above what is now being irrigated, it will be seen that a great amount of construction lies ahead for the Government. With it veterans and war workers may hope to have employment after the war in carrying out this program, and many qualified veterans may hope to get some good land in private ownership. There are more than three hundred possible projects within the 17 western States feasible of development. Each of these is a potential center of wealth and agricultural production.

Some of these projects could duplicate, in a given time, the history of that project now surrounding Phoenix, Ariz., where about a quarter of a million acres of land in the last 12 months produced $40,000,000 worth of food and fiber. What has this project cost Uncle Sam? Still speaking in round numbers, the United States Government has put about $20,000,000 in it. Its physical value today is approximately $50,000,000, and the assessed valuation of the property, which has depended upon its existence as an economic base, is more than $200,000,000. Thus, in one lifetime, a wise investment by Uncle Sam of $20,000,000 in round numbers has caused the growth of a rich community assessed in value at 10 times the Government's investment, and it has in the 1 year last past produced in cash double what the Government had invested. The great question is whether our Nation will want, with the coming of peace, to repeat such an investment many times over to ward off depression after the war and stabilize our economic life on a sufficiently high level.

At the moment, I want to point out the possibilities through the enactment of H. R. 2742. I believe that fully a million acres of land along the lower Colorado River, in Arizona and California, may be newly irrigated and veterans' preference made to apply to it. Being convinced of this, I wrote a form letter to veterans in the Southwest, a copy of which I herewith enclose. Following my letter, I wish also to enclose the accompanying article from the March 24 issue of the Arizona Farmer entitled "Making History on Yuma Mesa."

DEAR FRIEND: Enclosed herewith is Report No. 397, dated March 27. This report on H. R. 2742 comes from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 2742 is a bill amending section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and giving preference to veterans of the Second World War on any lands irrigated under that act in the same way that preference was extended to earlier veterans. This measure is one of several which I have sponsored or am sponsoring to give veterans opportunity for homes on newly-irrigated lands with good and sufficient water rights. Naturally, the benefits of this measure will apply only to lands watered from the main stem of the Colorado River and then only when those various parts of the project are opened for settlement.

In view of the fact that there may be as much as 500,000 acres of land in southwestern Arizona and probably another 500,000 acres of land in southern California capable of being developed through irrigation from the Colorado River, this preference bill should be of great interest to land-hungry veterans who would like to make their homes on irrigated land in this favorite section of the country.

How long before such lands will be available? It shouldn't be very long after the end of the war. Let it be remembered that Boulder Dam is completed, the Imperial Diversion Dam is finished, the All-American Canal is constructed and in operation, and the Gila canal on the Arizona side is now ready for use and is being used. Thus, many millions of dollars of the basic construction costs of this great project have already been expended and what remains is applying the water to the lands. When any portion of these lands are declared open for settlement by the Secretary of the Interior, the veterans' preference contained in H. R. 2742 will apply.

Although I am asking Secretary Ickes to open hearings April 12 on another measure—my bill, H. R. 520—which is designed to give veterans preference on all irrigated projects in the 17 Western States, I felt that you would want to know now about the provisions of the first mentioned bill which is also one of the links in the chain of development for which recent and pending legislation is laying the legislative foundation for great post-war development.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Member of Congress.

[From the Arizona Farmer, Phoenix, Ariz., March 24, 1945]

MAKING HISTORY ON YUMA MESA

Nature's dusty face is being changed and new pages in reclamation history are being written on Yuma Mesa.

Alfalfa and potatoes already grow on nearly 2,000 acres of desert sand, and only a beginning has been made. The way that desert smiles when it is leveled and wet with Colorado River water is astonishing the natives.

What is happening there portends much for the future of Arizona and is of deepest interest to every man who hopes to locate on a farm as a veteran of World War No. 2. For a new Bureau of Reclamation policy is being given its first try-out. It is very possible that this policy will be extended to every post-war project that the Bureau undertakes.

Instead of merely providing water and leaving the settler to wrestle with the problems of land subjugation, the Bureau is doing the subjugating. It is leveling the

land the way it ought to be leveled, getting it planted to a soil-building crop, and "set."

Any veteran who is fortunate enough to get a farm on Yuma Mesa won't have to wait and toil and hope for years before he starts to make a living. He can begin harvesting crops, or, at least, alfalfa, right away.

Now, let's back up and see how all this came about.

YUMA MESA—TWO UNITS

The Yuma Mesa spoken of here is unit A of the Gila irrigation project. It is not to be confused with unit B of the older Yuma project. That lies south of the upper Yuma Valley and is irrigated with water pumped out of the main Yuma Valley canal. Unit B has about 1,500 acres in production, mostly citrus.

Unit A totals around 75,000 acres, south and southeast of Yuma and east of unit B. All but a little, right at the south edge of town, lies between United States Highway 80 and the Mexican border.

Water comes from Imperial Dam, on the Colorado north of Yuma. A canal extends southeast from the dam and crosses under the Gila's dry bed through an inverted siphon 11 miles east of Yuma. At the south outlet of the siphon is a pump lift which raises the water 53 feet to the level of unit A.

When the war came along the Bureau of Reclamation had the canal completed, the pump lift partly installed, and a beginning made on a distribution system for unit A. Under orders from the War Production Board, construction was suspended.

But the Army took over Fly Field, the airport 10 miles southeast of town, and converted it into the huge Yuma Air Base for flyer training. Sand blowing in from the desert, where there were only a few sparse bushes to tie it down, began causing all kinds of motor trouble. Extra repairs, it was estimated, were costing $1,500,000 a year. Besides, working conditions were very bad for everyone stationed at the base. Efficiency was lost.

At Army request, therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook a dust-control project. The pump lift was completed. Canals were dug and concreted to serve 8,500 acres. Laterals were also dug but they have not yet been concreted, although they certainly should be.

About half the 8,500 acres are public domain, the rest in private ownership. The Bureau's dust-control project consists of leveling 4,200 acres and seeding them to alfalfa.

Ian A. Briggs, associate agronomist at the University of Arizona, was borrowed half-time by the Bureau to supervise this planting program. He now spends every other week at Yuma. There he is directly responsible to J. K. Rohrer, Bureau engineer in charge of the Gila project and also the All-American project over in California.

Briggs' services were almost indispensable because of all the alfalfa he had grown at the university's experiment station on Unit B. No one else had enjoyed his opportunities to become acquainted with that loose soil under varying conditions.

HENRY SEAMANS, TOO

The University of Arizona did the Bureau another big favor by consenting to have Henry Seamans, superintendent of that station, double as irrigation supervisor of the dust-control project. All the Government alfalfa gets water strictly in accordance with Seamans' orders.

Alfalfa planting began in the fall of 1943 with 300 acres; 1944 plantings were 800 acres; since January 1 the total has risen to 1,222. Plans calls for the rest of the 4,200 to be seeded next fall.

In the meantime, some astonshnig hay yields are being harvested from the alfalfa old enough to be in production. Last year five cuttings were had from blocks seeded the previous fall, and the total output was five and a quarter tons to the acre. This year those blocks were mowed for the first time in the latter part of February. Yes, February—weeks earlier than even the very early Yuma Valley. For Yuma mesa is practically frost-free. Briggs predicts that there will be six more cuttings this year and that the yield will be seven or eight tons.

BENEFIT OF VETERANS

Now, where does the veteran come in?

Ultimately unit A will be thrown open to homestead entry, with World War No. 2 veterans given a 90-day preference. So you can bank on it that unit A will be a veteran colony. They aren't going to pass up that chance to get land in a semitropical climate, perfectly leveled, already in production.

That much is certain. Nobody knows, though, how much land one veteran will be allowed to hold, nor what the terms will be. Those points are yet to be decided by Congress.

But the delivery of subjugated land, to veterans or anyone else, will be something new in the annals of America. The Bureau of Reclamation, up to now, has been concerned to get water onto land. Beyond that, it was up to the people who undertook to farm that land. It is scarcely news that many went broke before they could get their fences up, their ditches in, their land cleared and leveled, their crops planted, and their first harvests to market. Nor is it any secret that much of the land was never properly subjugated, since the settlers did not have the means to do so, and that it has never produced to its capacity.

Long before anybody dreamed of a war with Japan, there was talk that the Bureau might pursue a different course with the Gila project—Congress willing. High officials were strongly inclined to the idea of getting unit A, at least, leveled and into crops before dividing it into farm units. War and the W. P. B. sidetracked their hopes for a time. Then the necessity for protecting the Yuma Air Base from dust provided an unexpected opportunity to give the proposed new policy a trial.

There seems to be good reason for hoping that the Bureau won't have to stop with any 4,200 acres. Without too much trouble, the canals could be extended to cover 23,000 acres, of which about 15,000 acres is publicly owned. Nearly all the remaining 52,000 acres in unit A are public land.

ROLL AND WELLTON

Now, it is not contemplated that the canal down from Imperial Dam to the Gila, the siphon and that costly pump lift, will be used solely for irrigation of unit A on Yuma Mesa. The Bureau is most evidently proceeding on the assumption that Colorado water will eventually be supplied to 80,000 acres farther up the Gila, east of the Gila Mountains, and embracing the Roll-Wellton area. The engineering investigations have been made and the plans are drawn.

Nearly all that is privately owned land. Much of it has been farmed and some is still in cultivation; but a large percentage has gone back to the brush. That is because of a falling water table in the wells, and saltiness of the water pumped from lower depths. Pumping costs and salt increasingly vex the farmers who remain and manage to produce those surprising crops of alfalfa and Bermuda seed for which the Roll-Wellton country is famous.

Those farmers are most evidently confident that they will not be forced out, but that Colorado water will come in time to save them and to make fertile farms over an area half again as large as Yuma Valley. To tell the inside truth, there is plenty of basis for their confidence.

Union Now—United Nations—Super United States of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years there has been a small but well-financed and vocal group who want to surrender some portion of our independence and sovereignty; who want to superimpose upon the Constitution of the United States a Constitution of the United States of the World. They would also unfurl, above the Stars and Stripes, an international flag. More than 2 years ago such a flag was presented to me.

The original advocates of a one-world government apparently believed that by bringing all nations and all peoples of every race and creed under one organization the whole world would profit. Perhaps they thought they might be more successful than those who attempted in earlier days the same experiment at the Tower of Babel. It may be that a somewhat similar idea, plus a desire to establish an enduring, universal world peace, was back of the League of Nations.

Be that as it may, since the present World War came on, there has been a renewed and widespread drive to convince the American people that at least some of our sovereignty and independence should be surrendered to an international organization which would, by force if necessary, compel all nations to avoid war. Just why a condition brought about and maintained by force—war—should be described as peace, was not explained.

Early in this war, we were given—at least we thought we were given—a document entitled "The Atlantic Charter," under which our armies were to carry and maintain the "four freedoms" throughout the world. Later, we were told by the President there was no such document, though the principles enunciated at what was believed to have been its birth would be followed.

Then came Dumbarton Oaks, a conference of the representatives of many nations. They, according to the principles proposed, provided in brief for a general assembly of the representatives of all nations; a security council composed of the representatives of Russia, the British Empire and Northern Ireland, the United States, China, later France and the representatives of six smaller nations, to be designated by the larger nations.

Under the plan, there was to be, when the war was over, an international police force, to which each nation should contribute its quota of money, materials and men. There was also to be an international standing army, which, under the command of an international staff, could impose force upon any aggressor nation.

Then came Yalta, where Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt met, and out of which, we were later told, came the agreement that any one of the big nations could veto not only the use of force but economic measures, as against not only itself but any smaller nation.

Still later came a statement from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, published in Look magazine of April 3, which stated that there was some disagreement as to whether or not there should be a military force under the control of the executive council, as to how such forces should be formed, and how they should be sent into action. The same article also stated, and I quote:

> There is considerable misunderstanding about what kind of policing force the international organization is expected to have. Opponents of establishment of an independent military force under the direction of the executive council should know that none is planned unless it be some air units of limited size.

So it may be noted that, from a hard-and-fast international organization, with teeth—and heretofore every advocate of such an organization has insisted that it must have teeth, if it was to be anything other than an international debating society relying upon moral suasions to enforce its decisions—we now have before us, if some of its proponents are accurate in their statements and conclusions, the proposition that we will bring about and maintain peace throughout the world by inducing all nations to submit their grievances to some sort of a world council and that, through appeals to a sense of justice, and through Bretton Woods—by loaning or giving money to develop other nations, enable other people to live in greater comfort—we might create a state of contentment which would take away any desire for war.

We may all hope that such a highly desirable objective may be reached, but confidence in the success of the San Francisco Conference scheduled for April and which was to follow through on the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta Conferences, was handed a severe jolt this week, with the forced admission by the White House that Roosevelt and Stalin had entered into a secret agreement at Yalta that Roosevelt would support the proposed Russian demand for three votes in the assembly of the international organization, in return for Russian support for three votes for the United States, to balance Britain's six votes—one each for herself, the four Dominions, and India. This, of course, would increase the big three's control of the Assembly, in addition to their veto rights through the Security Council.

A major controversy has been started, which has led to expressions of surprise and concern by the representatives of the smaller nations. One official of the French Foreign Office exclaimed, "What next?" One radio commentator stated that some Americans had been "naive enough to believe that no secret agreements" had been entered into at Yalta, but that this forced admission of the Roosevelt-Stalin agreement had raised the concern that there might be others.

One of the arguments which has been used by the big three in favor of the international organization was that, in the Assembly every nation would be equal, retain its sovereignty. Now that powerful argument is destroyed by the admission of the secret agreement of three votes to Russia and three to the United States.

Although it is contended that this is all tentative, nothing definite, the so-called three-votes announcement has done not a little to undo the effect of the propaganda currently circulated by the administration to induce favorable sentiment for the international organization.

As stated, while we all hope for an enduring world peace, some of us believe that the United States of America can best contribute to that world peace by admonishing the victors in this war that a just peace must be established; that they, not the United States, when Germany lies prostrate at their feet, must prevent her from again rearming for a future war.

That, in addition, we can serve the cause of world peace best by building an invincible Army, Navy, and Air Force. Then tell the rest of the world that, if they insist upon fighting each other, we will not aid either, but will do our utmost to see that no trouble, no war, comes to the Western Hemisphere.

We have established our power in this World War No. 2. There is no reason why we should not maintain it when victory has been won. As the most militarily powerful, most productive, Nation in the world—and Churchill said we were—we will be in a position where our voice, speaking for peace, will be persuasive.

Trojan Horse Tactics of Committee for Constitutional Government in Public Schools—Long-Range Planning by This Group Through Vicious Tactics in the School System of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you an example of the vicious and unscrupulous tactics to which the proponents of the so-called twenty-second amendment will stoop in their program for what they hope will be ultimate victory in getting their millionaires' tax limitation scheme written into the Constitution of the United States.

This will prove to us just how vigilant we must be for outcroppings of new schemes by the master planners of the Committee for Constitutional Government. This whole plot is like an epidemic of weeds. If we are not constantly on the alert for the first appearance of the pest, it will just be that much more difficult to eradicate once it gets roots started without proper control measures being taken.

The Committee for Constitutional Government is at present very slyly and quietly sowing seeds in our school system which they hope will grow into a very profitable crop.

I shall outline the plot, briefly, and then I shall elaborate a little on the ramifications which will arise from this supposedly innocent-appearing and patriotic gesture on the part of the noble "upholders of our American Constitution and our Bill of Rights":

The Committee for Constitutional Government is offering for sale "a decorative four-color, embossed wall piece, which carries the Bill of Rights in English and 11 other languages." They are urging that firms and individuals purchase these wall pieces and distribute them to the classrooms of our Nation. This, on the face of it, is something that none of us should be able to criticize and we should all assist in—if only we did not know the caliber of the men behind this movement and know the motivating influence which governs their every move. What, then, is behind this apparently patriotic gesture?

Here is what they claim they are doing, and I quote Dr. Rumely:

> The main purpose was to stimulate in the schools more intensive study of the Constitution.

That comes from Dr. Rumely, who personally is such a splendid example of a believer in our American form of government that he was sentenced to the penitentiary after the last war for collaborating with the German Government.

Again, then, what is behind this? The purpose is twofold:

First, and of immediate benefit, it provides a method by which the proponents of the "twenty-second amendment" movement believe they can secure additional funds for the financing of their propaganda operations—and a method by which their supporting contributors are supposed to be able to make political contributions which can be claimed as legitimate income tax deductions and also free from the scrutiny to which political contributions are subject.

Second. They hope by educating the students in our schools in their own particular interpretation of the Bill of Rights that enough of these students will, by the time they become of voting age, have become sufficiently indoctrinated in this philosophy that additional support will have been gained to put over their millionaires' tax-reducing scheme. This, indeed, is long-range planning of a most subtle nature.

Now to elaborate a little on their first objective—that of providing new working capital for their nefarious propaganda machine: Here we must take stock of the inevitable answer which comes in reply to any question directed at this group which has a tendency to probe into their political activities; and again I quote from our good friend Mr. Rumely:

> This is an educational, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. Its trustees devote time

and contribute money to the committee's work. We are not a pressure group. We want nothing from Government but freedom. We clamor for no subsidy. We foster no raids upon the Treasury for special interests. We lobby for no legislation favoring special groups, exalt no class above another. We make no political deals, back no candidates for public office. This committee has never spent or contributed a dime to the support of any candidate for public office or the defeat of any candidate.

These are quotes from a letter from Mr. Rumely to the Special Committee of the House to Investigate Campaign Expenditures.

Yes; I will admit that it is an educational organization; this vicious attempt to influence the thinking of our children into their way of thinking is proof that it is an educational organization. It is nonprofit to the extent that all funds available are spent in additional propaganda coverage. Naturally its trustees devote time and contribute money to the committee's work. They want nothing from our Government but freedom; no truer words were ever spoken. Freedom, however, from questioning as to their motives and freedom to ply their sordid propaganda upon all sections of the country. They do clamor for a subsidy, however, with every piece of propaganda issued by them—clamoring for contributions to subsidize their own operation. Ask the Treasury Department itself whether or not the proposed twenty-second amendment does not constitute a raid upon the Treasury for special interests. The answer is quite evident in the Treasury Department's Division of Tax Research reports of May 31, 1944, and February 1, 1945.

And as to their emphatic denials of political activities, permit me to quote from the splendid talk made on the floor of the House on March 13 by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a member of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee, which asked some rather embarrassing questions of the Committee for Constitutional Government group. Our colleague said this:

> Now, the interesting thing is that this organization which dishes out political propaganda in its every release, claims to be entirely nonpolitical and has had the effrontery to attempt to obtain rulings which would permit funds given to it to be deducted in income-tax returns as a proper business expense. While the Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives in 1944 was doing its work, we came across many evidences of this intention and desire, and we found that corporations, particularly large corporations in Texas, were being solicited for funds on the basis of a legal opinion that it was proper to give money to the Committee for Constitutional Government for the purchase of books and that thereby those provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act which prevent contributions from corporations for political purposes, might be either evaded or avoided.

The legal opinion setting forth that it was proper to give money to the Committee for Constitutional Government to which Mr. ANDERSON refers, was an opinion written, strangely enough, by one of the four mainsprings of the Committee for Constitutional Government, our well-known Mr. Samuel B. Pettingill, "the gentleman from Indiana," as he calls himself. Mr. Pettingill, in his opinion, which so conveniently influences contributions from the big boys, states that the Federal income-tax laws expressly permit corporations to make contributions for educational purposes, and that they may deduct a certain percent against gross income and that, for instance, a Texas corporation can legally make such expenditures within the following limitations:

> (a) If the money is not contributed to a political committee of a party or a committee sponsoring the election or defeat of any candidate for public office, or the passage or defeat of any specific legislation pending before a legislative body—Federal, State, or municipal. (b) If the money is used for the nonpartisan, nonpolitical education of the public in the broad principles of constitutional government and the free-enterprise system.

Ah, yes, there it goes again—nonpolitical education of the public. As a result of my activities in exposing this group, I had a taste of some of their "nonpolitical education of the public" down in my own district in Texas last summer and fall.

Quite by accident, I am sure, the Committee for Constitutional Government just happened to institute their educational program in my district about primary election time. Mr. Pettengill just happened to be down there and made a very fine talk in Texarkana, my home town, in his efforts to further this education program. One of Mr. Pettengill's articles which was being freely circulated about that time down there by the Committee for Constitutional Government made very splendid contributions to this education program with such unfounded and untruthful statements as the following, quote:

> Your city will tell a similar story. I mention Texarkana because it is the home of Congressman PATMAN who is one of those who thinks nothing of debt. He proposes to go right on going into debt when the war is over. The thought of putting any limit on debt and taxes is very obnoxious to him.

Fortunately for me, my constituents having known me for many, many years, just did not believe Pettengill's tripe. A tip to you, Mr. Pettengill—the people in Texarkana and my district are not the gullible people who will fall for such falsehoods as you use in your educational program—try your teachings elsewhere in more receptive localities. I am proud to be the Representative here in Congress of the people of the First Congressional District of Texas and if they ever voice their disapproval of me at the polls, I will know that it will be for some good reason and not because you have been expounding on some of your nonpolitical educational theories down there.

And now let us take a glance at the double-purpose financing plan mentioned earlier in this talk. The House Campaign Expenditures Committee tried to determine the cost of the Bill of Rights wall piece. These are supposed to be sold by the Committee for Constitutional Government at 75 cents for single copies and down to 40 cents in quantity purchases. It was discovered that it cost this group about 4½ cents each for one order of 200,000.

You can readily see what would result in a large purchase of these wallpieces by a corporation or an individual who was very much interested in the work of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The purchase could be nothing more than a camouflaged contribution to this group's vicious political propaganda machine under the guise of its being a contribution for educational purposes so that the contribution could be set up as a legitimate income-tax deduction. That is a clever scheme for which we must take off our hats to this group. The profits can go for propaganda and political activities and the vehicle used—the Bill of Rights wallpiece—can be distributed to schools with the hypocritical gesture of their active support in "stimulating in the schools more intensive study of the Constitution." This is the lowest and most despicable tactic yet perpetrated by the Gannett - McClure - Pettengill - Rumely syndicate—hiding under a cloak of righteousness, they are stooping so low as to pervade our very classrooms in an attempt to instill in our children their teachings and concept of what the Bill of Rights and our Constitution should mean.

If you would be aware of Pettengill's interest in our school system and our school children, write and ask him to send you a copy of his syndicated release of March 6, 1945—Release No. 648. This entire release is a tirade against Federal aid for schools, with the whole theme being that Federal tax money would have to be turned over to the States. He claims that if the States want better educational facilities let them spend their own money.

Truly, Mr. Pettengill, can you have the nerve to come out against an emergency fund which would tend to equalize the inequities that have arisen as a result of our wartime dislocations in teacher supply and enormous shifts of population—with resultant excess burdens on some sections? Can you sincerely come out, Mr. Pettengill, against a fund which would be used in the post-war period to more equalize the educational opportunities throughout the country? Would you come out and insist that if some States could not, for some reason or other, afford to provide sufficient funds for full educational opportunities, that status quo should be maintained in that respect—that the Federal Government should not assist in what we must recognize as our national duty?

Keep it up, Mr. Pettengill. Rant and rave against the National Education Association, the school teachers, the millions upon millions of fathers and mothers of our school children, and even the Federal bureaucrats, as you call them, who are sponsoring this method of equalization of our educational opportunities. Your efforts, I can assure you, will prove to be the most successful example of a boomerang ever displayed in this country.

The Bill of Rights should be a part of every classroom, I will admit. But, in the name of common decency, should it be used for the purpose that the Committee for Constitutional Government intends to use it? Should it be accom-

panied with distribution of propaganda written by this same Mr. Pettengill who so forcefully fights improvement of our educational system in the hope that his efforts will result in still more reduction of his millionaire bosses' taxes? Yes, Mr. Pettengill's interpretive propaganda would accompany the Bill of Rights wall piece. This propaganda would, through very subtle innuendo and distortion, Mr. Pettengill hopes, gradually educate the children to believe that nothing can save our Nation except an amendment to our Constitution which would limit the power of the Federal Government to tax incomes, gifts, estates, and inheritances.

Here are some quotes from Pettengill's primer on education:

You have seen pictures of Nazis leading a gentle-faced cow away from a farmer and his weeping wife. Could your cow or any property you own be taken by our Government without compensation? No. Why not? The Bill of Rights.

That sounds far-fetched enough to be harmless, but it is all part of a pattern which is far from harmless. Let us continue with a quote from Mr. Pettengill's particular brand of education which would define for our children just what type of liberty we should be guaranteed by the Bill of Rights:

What is a liberty? It is a limitation upon the power of government. Which chiefly limits the powers of government? The American Constitution.

There it is. A "limitation upon the power of government." Does the pattern become evident now? The particular bit of limitation which the respective members of the Committee for Constitutional Government would sell their souls to have incorporated in our Constitution is the proposed twenty-second amendment which would limit their millionaire's taxes to a maximum of 25 percent.

In an article showing arguments of the proponents for the tax limitation, I find the following which is another piece in the jigsaw puzzle of their most generous high ideals of fostering study of the Bill of Rights, and I quote:

Proponents claim that adequate constitutional safeguards against abuses of the taxing power are as essential for the protection of citizens as the provisions of the Bill of Rights which protect freedom of speech, press, and religion, the right of jury trial, etc. They claim that the Bill of Rights was instituted to protect people against the abuse of governmental authority, and that it is as important to protect them against the abuses of the taxing power as against other types of abuse. It is contended that Congress abused its power to tax incomes and estates during the 1930's by imposition of heavy rates and that the limitation proposed would protect against future abuses of this particular power.

This group believes it is all right for Congress to have the power to compel a citizen to give his all in war if he has nothing but his life to give, but consider it wrong for a citizen to be compelled to give more than 25 percent of his income.

There is the answer to the "educational" program which the Committee for Constitutional Government is fostering. What a huge and profitable oak tree they hope to grow by sowing their rotten seeds in our schools today. That is an example of the long-range planning which they are willing to undertake.

Cannot such tactics be likened to the Trojan Horse? The gift which this clever group brings to the doorway of our schools contains within it an infiltrating power vastly more dangerous than the army which was borne within the Trojan Horse. Let us recognize this gift for what it is immediately or that most vicious of all plots will succeed and unleash its deadly cargo within the classrooms of our country.

Petitions in Protest Against Prohibition Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD two petitions containing 59 signatures of citizens of the United States who protest the enactment of any prohibition legislation:

WE DO NOT WANT IT TO HAPPEN HERE AGAIN

This petition is sponsored by Paul Kosow, 778 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

We the undersigned, all voting citizens of the State of New York, hereby protest against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation.

We believe that prohibition, either local or national, would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering.

Cobb Jurist, George Kaaenburn, Harry Merriam, Louis Geller, Sam Horowitz, J. Silverstein, Dave Nebunzahl, O. Silverstein, L. Gifn, W. Meyer, H. Goodman, Frank J. Vojek, Chas. McDowell, C. Schultze, Francis Gregory, Minnie Runge, Gladys Wied, Mrs. Noonen, Ch. Thompson, Rose Grossman, Maria Monalta, Patrick Downs, Domenico Canorcetti, Rose Moran, D. Costa, L. Costa, Marcy Herrold, F. Johnson, Mr. George, Seex Obersold.

This petition is sponsored by Helen Neufeldt, 393 Sumpter Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

We, the undersigned, all voting citizens of the State of New York, hereby protest against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation.

We believe that prohibition, either local or national, would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering.

Dallas K. Fox, Helen Neufeldt, Al H. Baudel, Rose Esehole, Ethel Schwing, Dennis E. Sweeny, Florence Pomerantz, F. A. Schmitt, Lee M. Harley, Walter McCarthy, Walter F. Lundberg, Martha H. Jarcth, Rose Jarcod, L. C. Finney, Winfield Keve, Nicoletta Mirro, Frank Vacek, Marina Pittari, Ann Kolar, Mae Miserandino, Florence Catanzaro, Louis Bonura, A. M. Mortenson, Joseph T. Murphy, John Michelzuk, Ray McGill, Henry Forte, Charles McWilliams, N. Sehlmyer.

For Serious Consideration by the Rural People of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill already introduced to delegate the power to one man to have direct control of our foreign agricultural policy deserves careful study.

The following article in the April National Grange Monthly by Mr. A. S. Goss, master, merits every consideration:

The battle is on again over reciprocal trade agreements. A bill has been introduced in Congress extending the act for another 3 years. The present act permits reductions in tariffs of 50 percent below the rates established by Congress. The new bill permits reductions of 50 percent below the effective duties on January 1, 1945. Since many rates had already been cut 50 percent, the new bill would permit an additional 50 percent slash, or a total of 75 percent.

The Grange believes that the tariff policy should be determined by Congress—not by one man who happens to occupy the office of Secretary of State, whose major concern is international relations, and not the welfare of our domestic economy. Juggling tariff rates up and down at will can keep our domestic economy in a continually upset state and prevent business recovery or expansion.

The Grange recognizes the difficulties in writing tariff schedules in Congress, and advocates a commission for that purpose, on which our major economic interests have representation, such commission to be responsible to Congress.

The Grange has opposed the "most favored nation" clause. Under it, if a tariff concession is granted to one nation, the same concession is granted to all nations with whom we have agreements. Let us assume that we enter into an agreement with Canada in which equitable concessions are made on both sides. We then enter into another agreement with Mexico, in which further equitable concessions are made. Immediately, additional concessions automatically become effective with Canada, and the equity of the concessions originally made becomes unbalanced. We enter into an agreement with Brazil and both Canada and Mexico benefit by it, so that eventually the original equities are completely upset.

Finally, the Grange believes that Congress should have the right to revoke any trade agreement within a reasonable length of time after its adoption. Congress is the people's only representative. It makes the policies and is answerable directly to the people for its acts. To transfer this power to the executive branch of government is contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the Constitution, and places in the hands of the Executive power which can be used in dictatorial ways. This is the way that representative governments are destroyed and dictatorships developed.

History records many cases of representative governments before the United States Government was born. Most of them have failed, and practically all have gone the route of gradually surrendering the legislative power to the executive branch of government. It is so much easier to govern by one-man rule than by representative means that little by little we slip over to the easier

way, until finally a dictator takes over. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. This generation has surrendered too many powers already, and we should be studying means for recapturing the powers belonging to the people rather than surrendering more.

Congress should equip itself to carry out its constitutional responsibility with reference to the tariff and international relations on a practical basis, rather than weakly to surrender such vital powers to the executive branch of government. If time will not permit this to be done before the necessity of renewing the Reciprocal Trade Act, it can at least reserve to itself the right of approval, and can limit the term of extension to 1 year so that it will have time to do something more constructive.

A. S. Goss,
National Master.

What Is Being Planned for You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest:

WHAT IS BEING PLANNED FOR YOU

(By Ralph Robey)

For weeks there has been one Washington rumor after another as to the ultimate program which is being planned for us. The stories all have been of a pattern, which in such cases usually indicates that they are accurate. The various reports fit together into a cohesive program, which should make all of us stop and do some hard thinking. Here are the main points:

1. There is to be established a National Production Council which is to be the over-all "planning agency" and will have the responsibility of controlling the entire economy.

2. Under the over-all agency will be a subagency or subcouncil for each industry, composed of representatives from labor, management, and Government.

3. The volume of production will be set by these councils for each industry, which means, of course, a quota for each company and plant in each industry. This production schedule will be set at such a level that in the aggregate it will insure "full employment."

4. To insure that the full production schedule is carried out the Government will perhaps even "guarantee" the companies against loss by buying any products which cannot be sold on the open market.

5. No new company can enter any field without the approval of the appropriate industry council.

6. Prices will be fixed for each commodity and permanently controlled by the planning agencies.

7. Wages also will be fixed and labor will be guaranteed an annual wage. All wage agreements will be certified by the planning agency and will be frozen a year at a time in order to prevent price schedules from being upset.

8. To offset an anticipated "$125,000,000,000 deflationary gap" when war production stops there must be no cut-back of wages, and workers are to receive as much for 40 hours as they now receive for 48 hours.

9. An enormous program of Government expenditures and expansion of Government activities is to be undertaken. This is to include not only regional developments of the T. V. A. type all over the country but housing, education, airport construction, both transcontinental and local road building, wholesale extension and increase of benefits of social security, and so forth.

This is said to be the specific program of the C. I. O. and its political affiliate, the P. A. C. But from other sources it is clear that the thinking along this line is by no means limited to the C. I. O. And it also is clear that those whose thinking is following this path know exactly where they are headed.

For example, take this excerpt from the Wall Street Journal: "Suppose a man wanted to open a new shoe factory. 'If he's got a new product that's needed and the facilities and materials can be spared, O. K.,' say the planners. 'But if the market is well supplied and leather is scarce, we would suggest some other line of endeavor. If he insisted on going into a business which was not approved, that would be antisocial—in the same class as opium smuggling—and police powers would have to be used.'"

Yes; those who are making these plans know exactly what they are doing. And make no mistake about whether they are smart. They are as smart, and clever, and ruthless, and determined, as any group in this country.

One further point. Do not expect this program ever to be presented as a whole for consideration by Congress. It will be brought out part by part, each apparently designed merely to meet a particular problem of pressing proportions. And every part will be carefully labeled with an innocuous name and wrapped around and around with beautiful and innocent-sounding names especially prepared to cover up the real purpose and intent of the proposal.

So if you happen to be a believer in individual enterprise and freedom, watch for the component parts of this program. And don't be misled by someone's telling you that we are just taking a small step toward "industrial democracy" or a "planned economy." Rather, remember that this same program when it was in effect in Italy was known as fascism, and today in Germany it goes under the name of nazi-ism.

What becomes of the enterprise which has created a great nation, when this program gets going?

Some Additions to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very important contribution made by ex-President Hoover to the Dumbarton Oaks discussion in his recent newspaper articles, four in number, and also that there be published in connection with these suggestions and recommendations of Mr. Hoover the column appearing yesterday in the New York Times by Mr. Arthur Krock, entitled "The Product of Brains and Experience," analyzing Mr. Hoover's proposals.

A statement I have received from the Public Printer indicates that the space occupied by the articles will exceed by half of a printed page the two pages allowed, under the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, without a statement of cost. The estimate of cost is $130.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ADDITIONS TO THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS

(By Herbert Hoover)

(The North American Newspaper Alliance requested former President Herbert Hoover to write a series discussing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the prospects of the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Hoover's long association with problems of world peace and the book, The Problems of Lasting Peace by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, published in 1942, have undoubtedly influenced American thinking and stimulated interest in the views of Mr. Hoover on considering international problems.)

ARTICLE I

The most fateful conference in all American history is that which meets at San Francisco to formulate the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks into a world charter of organization for maintenance of peace. During those fleeting moments the future of mankind may be molded for the next hundred years. A third world war would return the world to the barbarism of the stone age. These discoveries of new methods of killing; this shift from wars between men to war against women and children, and the gigantic destruction of men's toil of centuries makes certain the extinction of civilization.

If the charter at San Francisco emerges with a reasonable hope of success, the United States must take its full part in carrying it out. When we in America took up the sword to secure peace we were committed to join in holding the sword if we would preserve peace as against the inevitable hates and violences of a generation to come.

The modern world has seen these gigantic explosions into world war and revolution before. Each time from the bitterness of its travail, it has groped for organization to preserve a lasting peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are in most ways patterned upon the world's last great experiment—the League of Nations. The League was a partial success and its failures present vivid experience which it would be folly to ignore. In the light of these experiences there are some important additions which should be infused into the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and thereby greatly strengthen this chart of peace.

I state them at once and I shall in later articles amplify the reasons for them. They include:

1. Positive standards of the political rights of men and nations and the establishment of a world committee to promote these political rights. This committee to rank with the economic and social committees already proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

2. Provision for revision of onerous treaties between nations at, say, 10-year intervals, in order to assure that the peace settlements are dynamic and not static.

3. Regional organization of the organization to preserve peace into three areas, Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere; the regional organizations to be subject, of course, to the Security Council.

4. Absolute disarmament of the enemy powers.

5. Immediate relative disarmament of the United Nations and the establishment of

maximum limit of armies, navies, and air power among them.

6. While it is probably not a part of the charter itself, when it is adopted by the Congress the authority to use force should not be given the American delegate on the Security Council but that power should be delegated to the President of the United States with the provision that he be bound by the majority of the joint Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House as to whether a vote to employ American force shall be submitted to the Congress as a whole.

7. Take enough time in formulating the charter of peace to do it right.

These proposals are not counsels of perfection. They are lessons of grim experience.

There are three general methods by which peace can be preserved:

1. Through measures of force to stop aggression.

2. Through pacific methods, the immediate effect of which is to settle controversies between nations by negotiation, arbitration, and judicial decisions.

3. Beyond all this are the moral, spiritual, political, and social forces which either foment conflicts or allay them. If we are to have lasting peace, we cannot rely wholly upon stopping quarrels. We must set in motion these forces which build for peace.

The weakening of the power to stop military aggression in the Dumbarton proposals by the voting formula now agreed renders it even more imperative that the great underlying forces building for peace should be more greatly developed at San Francisco than they appeared at Dumbarton Oaks. The League of Nations proclaimed its base as the maintenance of honor and justice between nations. Even that wholly nebula enunciation of a standard of conduct between nations does not appear in Dumbarton Oaks.

The great principles of political rights of nations and men, the standards of conduct among nations and the curative functions which eliminate the causes of war are wholly absent from Dumbarton Oaks. These forces must underlie not only the whole basis of international law but of moral and spiritual progress of nations toward peace. We are in danger of setting up a purely mechanistic body without spiritual inspiration or soul.

ARTICLE II

The political rights of nations and men should be proclaimed in the charter

In the last article I stated that positive standards of political rights of nations and men should be incorporated at San Francisco if we are to mobilize the moral and spiritual forces of the world in the charter of peace.

Some of these principles and ideals are stated in the Declaration of Independence. Mr. Wilson stated part of them in his Fourteen Points. Part of them appear in the Atlantic Charter. Some of them are referred to in the Moscow Declaration and the Yalta Declaration. Many of them are thus accepted by the United Nations, but they are not expressed in any binding treaty. It would not seem unreasonable that they should be codified and specifically stated in the new charter of peace. If so, we may at least have a hope that the day may come when they will prevail.

From these declarations we can condense some of these principles and standards of conduct between nations:

1. No aggrandizement or annexations, territorial or other.

2. No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

3. The restoration of sovereign rights and self government to those who have been deprived of them.

4. The right of all peoples to choose their form of government by free and unfettered elections and secret ballot.

5. Equality in trade.

6. Freedom of the seas in peacetime.

7. Disarmament of aggressor nations.

8. Reducton in arms of all nations.

Of equal importance to these standards of conduct between nations, the history of the last 30 years cries out for the establishment of definite rights and protections to individual human beings. These principles have been eloquently proclaimed time and again as elements of peace by the leaders in this war. They include:

9. Protection from execution or imprisonment without fair trial.

10. Prohibitions against compulsory labor or slavery in any disguise.

11. Protections to minorities and backward peoples.

12. The freedom of the press and of religion.

And why not again try those great banners at the masthead of the charter.

13. Renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy.

14. The relations between nations must be founded upon honor and justice.

My proposal is therefore, first, that such fundamental principles and ideals shall be set out in the charter itself. The Security Council would then have standards of conduct upon which to make decisions. And of equal importance, if they be proclaimed to the world, at least public opinion can define, judge, and support. Without them the San Francisco charter will not be a chart of peace. It will be simply another transitory pact or a declaration.

My second proposal arises from the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks plan includes the creation of one world committee to promote economic welfare and another to promote social welfare. Therefore, I propose the creation of a third World Committee to Promote Political Rights. It is a more important function than the other two world-wide committees, great as they are.

If we are to delegate any part of our national sovereignty, we have a right to know exactly what the standards of conduct of other nations are to be. If the five great nations are to be above the law through this voting formula, it becomes all the more important that we definitely express the standards of conduct to which they are committed in relation to the smaller nations and ourselves.

ARTICLE III

Revision of treaties

The second proposal I have made for the San Francisco Conference is that there be provision for revision of onerous or inapplicable treaties or of the wrongs of imposed settlements. There is no such suggestion in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

The future of nations cannot be frozen. The forces which will arise out this war cannot be foreseen.

If we are going to accomplish anything in our time, we must approach our problems in the knowledge that there is nothing rigid or immutable in human affairs. History is a story of growth, decay, and change. If no provision, no allowance is made for change by peaceful means, it will come anyway—and with violence.

There was an indefinite provision for change of onerous or inapplicable treaties in the covenant of the League of Nations, but it was never allowed to function. This failure to recognize inevitability of change became one of the definite causes leading to World War No. 2.

There is one overall effect of both the covenant of the League and Dumbarton Oaks proposals which the American people should understand.

Once we settle down to peace again there will be treaties defining boundaries and other relations or imposed relations of nations. The yardstick of who is an aggressor then becomes one of determining who violates the then existing situation or law. Thus the world organization automatically becomes the guarantor of the existing situation—that is the status quo.

Experience demonstrates that there are unpredictable areas of most dangerous controversies which rise from the pressure for change in the relations between nations. Among them are provisions imposed during the heat of war emotions, shift in economic pressures and population, the growth of ideas and inventions. There are shifting rights of minorities and the development of backward nations which become conscious and capable of self-government.

Oppressed peoples will agitate and even rebel against oppression. They are hardly likely to go on considering themselves bound by a bargain entered into unwillingly by their fathers. As a rule they would be willing to readjust matters without going to war.

Boundary and peace treaties are not inspired documents. Certainly the whole experience after the last war shows that peace can be preserved, not by preventing change and putting the future in a strait jacket, but by seeking to control change and direct it. Any attempt to maintain the status quo indefinitely is a direct cause of war—for peaceful means being denied, the change can come only through force. War becomes the only available solvent.

Each and every plan for preserving peace, whether it be the Pax Romana, the balance of power, the legitimist theory at the Congress of Vienna, or collective security of the League, however divergent they may appear outwardly, have this one thing in common. They set up a new order, and knowing it to be good, they provide that the new boundaries and other conditions shall be kept and anyone who violates it is evil. Never yet, however, have settlements been made after firing ceases that held against growing and changing forces after the war.

After the last war, whenever there was an appeal for revision, the world was flooded with speeches on the sanctity of treaties, and it was represented that any attempt to reconsider a single article of the Versailles Treaty was nothing less than a sinister attempt to undermine the whole fabric of peace which must be resisted as such by all law-loving people. Many people were led to believe that all change was to be resisted on high moral grounds. We can agree as to the sanctity of the pledged word, but most of this talk meant something quite different. What was really meant was not the sanctity of treaties but the sanctity of the status quo.

And this question becomes far more important to Americans today than ever before. The peace settlements, the form of governments and the boundaries of many nations have not yet been determined. Unless there be provision for revision of treaties, we will at San Francisco become the blind guarantors of the peace settlements of which we as yet know nothing.

To meet this problem Mr. Gibson and I made a suggestion 3 years ago, and I again propose that there be a definite provision in the United Nations charter that the application of any nation for revision of treaty provisions not sooner than 10 years after its conclusion should be considered, and, if advisable, negotiated by the Committee on Political Rights, which I have suggested.

There will be continuing gigantic wrongs in the world. Americans for all time will sorrow for the fate of Finland, of Estonia, of Latvia, of Lithuania, the partition of Poland, and other states that will be partly or wholly submerged by this war. We cannot even think of another war to secure their freedoms, but we do not need to sacrifice our ideals by acquiescing in their plight. We

could at least leave a hope open for their long future.

Regional organization

My third proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that there should be a much more definite regional organization of the whole machinery of the charter at San Francisco than that suggested at Dumbarton Oaks.

Three years ago Mr. Gibson and I proposed that regional organization should be the foundation of the whole machinery and that the three regional groups should be established—the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. A year later Mr. Churchill publicly supported this idea.

In the Western Hemisphere the long development of the Pan American Union pointed in that direction and the recent agreement at Mexico City advances it one step further. The success of the nebulous "concert of Europe" in preventing world war for nearly a century pointed in that direction for Europe, and the practical problems which developed in the League of Nations abundantly confirmed the need for that form of organization.

Such regional councils should embrace all United Nations' areas and should deal in the first instance with all controversies that might lead to war. If they fail to secure settlement by pacific methods, then, and only then, should the world security council intervene.

If regional organization were established at once, it would bring six powerful benefits:

1. It would give the smaller nations a greater voice, for they should be more largely represented in the regional councils and could well be given equal standing;

2. Policies which would prevent conflict are different in the three great areas and need separate organization;

3. These regional organizations would relieve the security council of many problems and controversies before they reached it;

4. Such an organization would relieve the whole mechanism of much of its present color of a military alliance of a few great powers;

5. Regional organization at once lessens the pressure for military alliances;

6. Such a regional organization would greatly relieve the anxieties of the American people and probably most nations lest they be constantly involved in secondary problems all over the earth.

There is no reason why the proposed economic, social, and political rights councils should not also be regionalized for the better handling of problems peculiar to those regions. Their top world councils would be the more free for coordination of the three great areas. It might also be worth consideration that the world court be organized with three regional courts which would act as courts of first instance in questions involving nations in that region alone.

Some objection has been raised that there would be some implied rivalry of interest between regions which would be thus emphasized. The contrary is the truth, for such decentralization would make cooperation the more easy.

ARTICLE IV

Disarmament of the enemy

My fourth proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that agreement upon continued and total disarmament of the enemy nations must be entered into either as part of the United Nations charter or a separate agreement. In any event it will have to be enforced by the security council. And it profoundly affects the whole question of peace.

Three years ago Mr. Gibson and I proposed that the enemy states must be completely disarmed and kept disarmed for an entire generation. We pointed out one of the great errors of the Treaty of Versailles in which Germany was permitted to retain a professional army of 100,000 men, supposedly for purposes of maintaining internal order. She was permitted to have a navy limited only in tonnage and types of ships.

We stated that this leeway perpetuated her professional armies and navies. It perpetuated the warrior caste and all its traditions. It afforded a skeleton army and navy of skilled men ready for quick expansion. It insured the continuity of the general staff with its military skill, brains, and ambitions. It perpetuated their know-how to make war.

Repeated experience with the warrior caste of these nations in their intimidations, aggressions, blitzes, and attacks without even declaration of war should be enough for the world in this particular. We must make a better job of it this time.

We should require total dissolution of the military establishments of all enemy nations and the substitution, for purposes of a civic order, of a constabulary of the police type, excluding the whole officer and military caste from such organization. And we should prohibit the manufacture of arms of any kind. We could thus assure the disappearance of them and their know-how from the world.

And if this were done an occupying force of men of the United Nations of a hundred thousand men in Germany and a hundred thousand in Japan would suffice. But it will need be kept there for a generation.

Reduction of armament of the United Nations

My fifth proposal for the San Francisco Conference is that disarmament of the United Nations be more definitely dealt with. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals appear to contemplate a reduction of arms of the United Nations. But having regard to the fate of the same proposals in the League of Nations a more positive program should be introduced. Obviously our present war establishments will need be reduced. But they should be reduced relatively to each other and systematically. And obviously, huge military establishments are themselves a threat of aggression which should be the purpose of any world peace organization to reduce—and quickly.

In 1932 I proposed to the then world disarmament conference that these aggressive weapons be suppressed in order to throw the military advantage into the hands of the defense and thus into the peace-loving nations. That proposal was accepted by over 40 nations. It was renewed by Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. At least it is worth reconsideration.

But of more importance is agreement now upon the maximum size of armies, navies, and air power for the principal United Nations. We should remember that after the disarmament of the enemy the only dangerous armaments are those in the hands of our allies and it is imperative that we arrive at a method by which we do not start competition with our friends with all the dangers to good will which would flow from that.

The Covenant of the League of Nations provided for limitation of armaments at some future time and the time never came so far as the efforts of the League were concerned.

Therefore there should be incorporated in the new Charter of United Nations a much more definite program for limitation of the size of military establishments in the United Nations than that provided in Dumbarton Oaks if we are not to repeat this failure of the League of Nations.

Powers of our delegate to the Security Council

My sixth proposal refers to that most thorny question for the American people of whether the American delegate on the Security Council will be given the authority to make war. This is no doubt outside the provisions of the charter, but it will face the Senate when that treaty comes up for adoption. I cannot bring myself to the delegation of such power to any one human being. That is what happens if he votes to apply either economic sanctions or military force against an aggressor. The most vital determination that can be made under the democratic process is war. It means thousands of our people are sent to death in foreign lands. To give that power to some one man who represents us is the negation of the democratic process. The other side of the question, however, is that to delay decision against an aggressor presents dangers that the whole world security may break down at some critical moment.

Extremists are perhaps exaggerating both positions. A study of a hundred years of conflicts which have led to world-wide dangers indicates very few instances, if any, where there was not time for ample consideration by the Congress.

Upon this I offer the tentative suggestion that this power should not be given to our delegate on the Security Council but to the President. And the President should be required to secure the majority vote of the joint Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House on whether the issues should be submitted to the full Congress. Thus Congress would have a voice in determining both the urgency and the dimensions of responsibility. In minor and urgent undertakings there would need to be no full congressional action. If action means war with a great power, the approval of the whole Congress is essential.

Less haste and less hate

My seventh proposal for action at San Francisco does not as much concern that text as the procedure of the governments in this crisis. I have time and again urged that we should not attempt to determine a final organization for lasting peace until we have laid secure its foudations in the post-war settlements between nations.

We should take time to cool off from the hot emotions of war. Our indignation may lead us away from stern justice into vengeance. Victory with vengeance means ultimate disaster to the victor. We cannot have both peace and revenge. The men who led the world into this war should be hanged for murder and those guilty of other crimes must also be punished, but the masses of great races must be given a chance to enter the paths of peace where fear, hate, and revenge may be turned aside and die. Our purpose must be to create a regime of law and justice in the world, not regencies of hate.

We do not know the shape of things in the immediate settlements of this war. And we should take time better to understand the now unknown forces that will come out of this gigantic explosion. No human being can foresee them today. No one foresaw them at Versailles. Such forces will be more powerful than any signed documents.

I suggest, therefore, it would be great wisdom if the peoples of the world should have time in which to consider and perhaps perfect any agreement at San Francisco.

Every thinking man and woman prays for a successful issue of the Conference. The destruction of war is now so terrible and the animosities among nations have become so deep that failure to assure a lasting peace now means the end of all hopes of humanity. America has fought this war for the greatest purpose of all time. That is to secure a lasting peace. And this agreement at San Francisco will determine whether our purpose has been won or lost.

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1945]

IN THE NATION—THE PRODUCT OF BRAINS AND EXPERIENCE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Through this and other newspapers served by the North Ameri-

can Newspaper Alliance former President Hoover has now, in four brief articles, given to the public and the Governments of the United Nations the product of his mentality and experience with respect to the objectives of the San Francisco Conference on world security. The practical common sense and foresight of what Mr. Hoover modestly titled "Some Additions to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals" make his omission from the American delegation to San Francisco the more remarkable.

It is difficult to think of any other country where its only living former Chief Executive would be excluded from such a group. But, in view of two other facts, the difficulty is increased. These facts are that Mr. Hoover is a veteran of the Paris-Versailles Conference in 1919 where a previous attempt was made to set up a world security system; and that his book, The Problems of World Peace, published in 1942 (in collaboration with Hugh Gibson), was the source of the fundamental ideas that were reduced to writing at Dumbarton Oaks. Also, Mr. Hoover is not only a veteran of Paris-Versailles, he was in the top rank of President Wilson's advisers on the League Covenant. And, furthermore, he has had more first-hand experience with the economic and social problems that follow conquest and liberation than any other living man.

Only for personal reasons could a citizen of this distinction and equipment be obliged to make his contribution in such a grave matter through books and the public press instead of in official committee and conference. Had these reasons been rejected by the President as unworthy of the times and the need of the world, Mr. Hoover, as his writings on the subject reveal, would have helped directly to insure the success of San Francisco and of the post-war security system to be drafted by the United Nations there.

HIS SIX POINTS

The four articles are simply and clearly written, and the suggestions they contain cut through many complications. Most important are these:

1. There is little in the Dumbarton Oaks draft that reflects the standards of future conduct to which all nations must adhere if war is to be minor and infrequent. "We are in danger of setting up a purely mechanistic body without spiritual inspiration or soul," wrote Mr. Hoover, and he urged the inclusion of these standards in the Charter. They are, he said, implicit in the Declaration of Independence, the Fourteen Points, the Declarations of Moscow and Yalta, and the shattered codes of international law.

2. Since it may be years before the final peace settlements are determined, including boundaries, and since one reason for the failure of the League of Nations was insistence by the victors that the Versailles peace terms were permanent, Charter should provide for periodic revision of these settlements—say every 10 years—negotiated by a Committee on Political Rights which should be added to the proposed economic and social committees of the projected world organization.

3. There should be more accent on regional peace—keeping machinery as the foundation of a world peace-keeping system, to "deal in the first instance with all controversies that might lead to war." In these small and intermediate nations would have a greater voice than they can have for years under the Dumbarton Oaks Charter. And the anxiety of Americans, among others, that they may find themselves "involved in secondary problems all over the earth" will thus be relieved.

The regional method should also be employed with the social, economic, and political rights committees and with the new world court.

4. Total disarmament of the enemy nations, their internal order to be kept by a constabulary, should underlie the charter, so that occupying forces of 100,000 soldiers each in Germany and Japan would suffice to keep these nations demilitarized—though these forces would have to remain for a generation. But, as a corollary, an agreement should be reached at once on maxima of army, navy, and air power for the United Nations themselves, taking into account the burden of peace keeping on the Big Three for the first few years.

LIMIT ON COUNCIL MEMBER

5. Not to our delegate on the security council, but to the President, should be given the authority for a vote by that delegate that would engage the United States in war. And this power should be limited by requiring the President to abide by the decision of the majority of a joint congressional committee on foreign matters whether he should submit the issue to the whole Congress.

This is not a matter for San Francisco, but it is proposed for inclusion in our treaty of adhesion to the charter of the world security league that is intended to be written there.

6. As many parts of the San Francisco structure as possible should be set up tentatively so that time may be given to perfect them in the light of change and experience.

These six points were the major ones made by Mr. Hoover in his newspaper articles. The Government over which he once presided did not ask for them. But, if the unacknowledged use of his 1942 book is a guide, and the former President's wisdom is received according to its need and value, the suggestions will affect the conclusions.

Questions on Voting Plan Unanswered by Mr. Stettinius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1945, entitled "Stettinius Refuses To Answer 33 Questions on Voting Plan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STETTINIUS REFUSES TO ANSWER 33 QUESTIONS ON VOTING PLAN

Thirty-three questions regarding the Big Three agreement to seek additional voting power for Russia and the United States in the general assembly of the proposed world peace organization were submitted to Secretary of State Stettinius at a news conference today. Twenty-seven of them were prepared in advance by a group of reporters and more were asked verbally. Mr. Stettinius refused to answer the questions but promised he would try to answer some of them next week.

R. H. Shackford, United Press correspondent, read the 27 prepared questions to Secretary Stettinius after Leon Pearson, International News Service correspondent, explained to the Secretary that they had been drafted by a group in the State Department press room as representing "what has come into the minds of most of us regarding this matter."

He added that the questions were presented "not merely in an effort to get a story" but because reporters felt that "more than a general statement of assurance" was necessary to allay apprehension in the public mind.

QUESTIONS RAISED

These were the questions:

1. Were there any other secret agreements on the Dumbarton Oaks plan made at Yalta?

2. Were there any other secret or as yet unrevealed agreements on any other subject made at Yalta?

3. Why did the United States consider it necessary to keep such an agreement secret?

4. Since the assembly agreement was kept secret 47 days and finally revealed only after the Herald Tribune dispatch on it, the assumption is that it was intended to spring the proposal without advance announcement at San Francisco. Do you care to let that assumption stand?

5. If not, why was it held up for 47 days?

POLICY OF SECRECY

6. How does this policy of secrecy fit into the State Department's professed new policy of taking the people into their confidence and of building a people's foreign policy?

7. Dispatches from London this morning said British officials were surprised at the White House announcement, especially the reference to three votes for the United States. Their understanding was that the Yalta secret agreement concerned only three votes for Russia. Can you explain that difference?

8. Will the Ukrainian and White Russian republics have separate representatives and thus a separate vote at San Francisco?

9. Why does the United States consider it necessary for the United States and the U. S. S. R. to have more than one vote in the assembly?

WHAT OF CHINA, FRANCE?

10. If the United States and U. S. S. R. are to have three votes wouldn't France and China be justified in asking for more than one?

11. Wouldn't some of the middle powers like Brazil, the Netherlands, Mexico, etc., be reasonably expected to ask for more votes than El Salvador, Liberia, and Saudi Arabia?

12. Do we consider that three votes for France are provided through Syrian and Lebanese representation?

13. Were France and China advised of the secret Yalta Agreement? When?

14. Were any of the other countries advised of it?

15. Were the members of the United States delegation advised of the secret agreement, and if so, when?

WHO DECIDED ON SECRECY?

16. Whose decision was it to keep the agreement secret?

17. Does the secret Yalta Agreement on the assembly in effect amend the Dumbarton Oaks plan so far as the Big Three are concerned?

18. Does it also nullify principle No. 1 in chapter 2 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which say that the basis of the organization shall be the sovereign equality of all nations?

19. How will the principal of sovereign equality be expressed now that at least two nations want an unequal distribution of votes in the assembly?

20. One of the main arguments against the charge that the Big Three will dominate the new organization has been the equal position of all nations in the assembly. What will be the new United States "line" on this point?

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

21. Has any consideration been given to the possibility of proportional representation on the assembly in view of this development?

22. The United States is now committed by the President to support the Russian proposal at San Francisco. Can you tell us to what length the United States is prepared to go to fulfill that commitment?

23. In the absence of any explanation it is assumed that the Russian move is prompted by a desire for a closer parity with the British Empire in the assembly. Do you wish to let that interpretation stand unchallenged?

24. If that interpretation is not correct, why wouldn't the United Kingdom also demand three votes?

25. Doesn't the fact that she has not asked for parity with the Soviet Union and the United States support the theory that she already has a block of at least sympathetic votes in the dominions?

HOW WILL VOTES BS CAST?

26. How would the United States' votes be cast? Would one man cast all three or would there be separate representatives for such territories as Alaska, Hawaii, etc., such as the Russians contemplate?

27. Do we really want any nation to have more than one vote in the assembly or was our request for three votes merely an indication of opposition to the Russian request?

28. Some of the Latin-American countries are unions of states like the United States. Would not the American countries by the same token be entitled to three votes in assembly?

29. In the discussions between the United States and the Latin-American countries, the United States assured them that the organization would be built on the principle of equality and sovereignty of all states. Does not this secret agreement negate those American assurances?

PERMANENT SEAT FOR BRAZIL

30. Is it true that at Yalta, as has been reported, the Three Powers agree to give one Latin-American country, presumably Brazil, a permanent seat on the council?

31. Was it also agreed to give the inter-American system the right to settle disputes in this hemisphere?

32. Mr. Secretary, this is a matter that perhaps has no relationship to the questions at hand, but is the autonomous status of the White Russian Republic and Ukraine such that we could exchange Ambassadors, just as we exchanged Ambassadors with Canada and other dominions?

33. I wonder if you would deal with the assumption that the State Department regards the British Government as, say, controlling the votes of Canada and Australia?

Faithful to "Their Appointed Rounds"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an excellent editorial on H. R. 2071 which appeared in the Daily Argus published at Mount Vernon, N. Y.:

FAITHFUL TO THEIR APPOINTED ROUNDS

Before the Seventy-ninth Congress is House Resolution 2071 behind which, we are confident, will be the support of a large majority of the residents of this city as well as of Westchester County. It is a bill designed to lift salaries of postal employees to meet increased living costs.

Note that this is not an appropriation measure to offset wartime increases of living costs. Postal employees have not received a salary increase since 1925 and they receive less pay for overtime than they do for regular time.

There is at present a $300 bonus, but this expires on June 30. And even with due consideration of this bonus, 20 years is entirely too long a time to wait for adjustment of salaries to meet the advances in living costs which have come in those two decades.

H. R. 2071 proposes to give mail carriers in city delivery service pay ranging from $1,700 to $2,700. There is also provision for an 8-hour day, compensatory time for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays; overtime pay in emergencies requiring more than an 8-hour workday; a 10-percent differential for night work; a 15-day vacation with pay.

The bill in general raises salaries of postmasters, clerks, and other postal employees, but it is the faithful letter carrier in whom we are most interested. Of these, says Herbert Gebhardt, of Yonkers, secretary of the New York State Association of Letter Carriers, comprising 11,000 members:

"Our contact is the closest of any service employee throughout this Nation, and no matter how tough the weather may be or how large a load we have to carry, our good friends, the general public, look for us around the same time every day. And very seldom do we fail them.

"For some reason, the powers that be have given us the so-called runaround and stagnated us to such an extent that we cannot continue under such a foreign existence. We want to live like real American citizens."

Those are true words. The average letter carrier is a friend to nearly all upon his route. He comes to know the members of the families, their troubles and their jobs, and to share in them, albeit vicariously. To him, the delivery to a family of a delayed letter from a boy over there is as welcome responsibility as it is a comfort to those who receive it—and probably detain him to hear excerpts. Day in and day out, he plods his way with heavy pack but a faithful heart.

It was Herodotus who wrote, and Woodrow Wilson who translated, that excellent tribute engraved upon the facade of the general post office in New York City: "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stops these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

We suggest that the time has come when those who agree with that sentiment should do something about it. The best thing would be to let your Congressman and your Senator know that you favor early passage of H. R. 2071.

The Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial from the Courier and Freeman of Potsdam, N. Y., in favor of this great project:

THE SEAWAY PROJECT

The St. Lawrence Seaway project is being promoted in the Congress again and as usual a few selfish interests are opposing it.

As this newspaper and all its resources have been and are back of the project, it may be in order to restate a few facts about it which are being overlooked in the hysterical headlines being written in some publications.

The suggestion that the project should be further investigated is an idle one. For more than 50 years surveys have been made from every angle. Our great Army Engineers, great civilian engineers specializing in hydroelectric developments, and personnel of the most conservatively operated corporations have found that the project is feasible and economically sound.

In some quarters the suggestion has been made that the water-power phases of the project be developed and the shipway idea dropped. This is not practical, and it is of doubtful origin. For more than 3 centuries our great northern river has been a seaway, and it already carries a great traffic. Provision would have to be made for these river steamers. It has been established that, when the water-development phase of the project is complete, the actual seaway phase requires a comparatively small amount of additional capital and work for its completion. This shipway, it will be remembered, is short. Most of the river is already a deep seaway.

Opponents, particularly along the Atlantic coast, often suggest that because the river is frozen over for 3 or 4 months a year, the project is not economically sound. In the first place winter conditions would not interfere with the making of electric power. In the second place, the suggestion does not follow historical practice on this continent. Our Great Lakes, which are really great inland seas, also are blocked at points for a few short winter months. This natural condition has not stopped the United States and Canada from spending hundreds of millions of dollars to improve the shipways between the Lakes.

This project cannot be branded a New Deal plan either. About 30 years ago a great private corporation tried to get permission to carry out the project. They failed because it was held, truly, that this great natural potential wealth is owned by the people of the State of New York and the people of Canada.

The opposition from railroad groups is based on the premise that the seaway would hurt this great and vital industry. This fear is not borne out by precedent. It is obvious that the great flood of cheap power this project would bring could stimulate the starting of more industries in this and nearby States, making more jobs and more goods, naturally increasing the use of railroads for transporting raw and finished materials.

It can be stated from experience that opposition to the seaway is local in nature in that those who are against the plan are alarmed without cause by the fear that it would harm a particular industry or port.

We in the East have watched great projects like Boulder Dam carried through; it is time that this great natural resource in this region be put to work to make jobs, to make goods, and to end the waste of nature's bounty.

Farmers' Labor Troubles Are Real

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as emphasis is being placed at the moment on the shortage of beef and pork, let us not lose

sight of the imminent, critical shortage of other food products.

I direct the attention of the House to the critical shortage of sugar. Now they tell us the Philippines will not be able to provide sugar even for their own consumption in the present or the near future. The price control program on sugar by the O. P. A. has been based on the theory of freezing consumer prices on sugar at a pre-war level. This sugar price control program of O. P. A., coupled with labor shortages and the disregard of the Tydings amendment by Selective Service in inducting essential and irreplaceable farm workers, aggravated by a shortage of necessary farm machinery, certainly does not indicate that a solution for the shortage of sugar is a possibility in the immediate future.

The Sterling Advocate, of Sterling, Colo., in a forthright and clearly stated editorial in its paper of Tuesday, March 27, 1945, outlines to its readers the serious condition facing the increasing of beet acreage in their community:

FARMERS' LABOR TROUBLES ARE REAL

The Government has asked substantial increase in sugar-beet acreage during 1945. And the request is wholly logical; the quick-energy food is imperatively needed at home and on the battlefronts.

Colorado, and the Sterling district, can do more than any other region to meet this crisis of wartime. The capacity to produce beets has been proved. But—

In the Sterling district farmers have contracted to grow 1,034 acres of beets, with the condition that if their sons or experienced farm workers are taken by the draft the beet production will be canceled. Moreover, 516 potential acres may or may not be contracted for beet production, as the needed workers are left or taken for military service.

In practically every instance, the Advocate is advised, the farm family has given one or two, or even more, sons to the armed forces. Logan County is a farming community; it has not been slacker in any particular of this global war. And no respectable citizen desires it to fail in any responsibility.

The Advocate does not, of course, have documentary evidence. But on basis of many bits of circumstantial evidence, and the statements of numerous persons who have seen much of war industry, we are convinced that relatively the farmers' labor problems are particularly acute, and selective-service officials at the top (the local board is in no sense condemned) fail to comprehend the gravity of the manpower needs in the production of food.

There is no hoarding of labor on the farms—farming would never stand that expense. There are no 40-hour weeks. And there has been no feather bedding.

In the Sterling district, the Advocate well knows, the farm-labor problem is a compelling reality and not a theory. Possibly in a few cases there is maneuvering to avoid military service, but generally the farmers and their few workers are doing a job that for long hours, toil and sweat, if not for danger, compares with the demands of military service.

One of the great faults of selective service, as it has been in the present war, it seems to the Advocate, has been its inability to determine and adhere to a straight line of policy. The unpredictability of its course has kept industry as well as individuals in uncertainty year after year, as the beet growers are now up in the air.

As Broad as Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, nothing has done more to aid farm families over the Nation than has T. V. A. In addition to this aid, I am certain that we are all aware of the great reduction in electric rates made available to the multiplied thousands of homes in the urban districts of the Nation. In the post-war period I hope to see ample funds provided to the Rural Electrification Administration which will cause wholesale expansion and extension of rural electric lines to the farm homes located even in the remote sections.

The following editorial is from the Nashville Tennesseean:

AS BROAD AS HUMANITY

A lot of people have been wondering what T. V. A. is going to be able to do with all its electric power when war uses taper off. A linked question is what is going to happen to T. V. A. revenues ($14,000,000 net last year, or 4 percent on the public's investment in power facilities) when big industrial consumers drop back to a normal rate of production.

These matters were discussed this week by G. O. Wessenauer, manager of power for the Authority. His forum was the Senate Small Business Committee. T. V. A. anticipates, he said, stiff cut-backs in power use in the aluminum industry and in other war-production plants.

"But we will shut down some of the steam plants. * * * We will again offer some surplus secondary power to industries and utility companies, * * * and, most important, we will do all we can to encourage the abundant use of electricity in the homes and on the farms of the Tennessee Valley and in the stores and small businesses which can make so much more effective use of electricity. * * *

"We may not be able to continue to earn a return of 4 percent on the Nation's investment in the T. V. A. power program, * * * but we will stop a long way short of going into the red. * * *

"We are relying primarily upon our conviction that the use of electricity by half a million small consumers in the Tennessee Valley region will show a very rapid growth soon after the war."

Popular use of power has always been the insurance of the success of T. V. A.'s power program, and Mr. Wessenauer has good grounds for the conviction that the half a million small consumers hereabouts will be taking more power rapidly as soon as appliances again are available. Every new consumer on the line will be eager to equip with modern electrically operated devices and old consumers will be eager to add to the comforts and services they already possess. Up to the war, per capita consumption of electric current in this region soared far above the average for the Nation. After the war, the trend will resume where it left off.

For the people of the Tennessee Valley region have in their own homes and the homes of their neighbors a constant demonstration of the lift of living abundant electricity makes possible. They know what they want, and they have put their rivers to work to supply them. And because electricity—cheap electricity—can enter to serve even the humblest home, the support of T. V. A. power is as broad as the humanity it reaches or can reach. Here the curve of power use will continue to rise—and the standard of living with it.

Ratification of the Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, prompt ratification of the Bretton Woods proposals for an international bank and an international currency fund is one of the most urgent problems confronting this Congress. I sincerely hope that we are to have a favorable report on the bill to ratify these proposals immediately after the spring recess.

The Milwaukee Journal, one of the most important organs of opinion in the Middle West, has consistently advocated the ratification of the proposals without amendment at this time. In extending my remarks, I wish to read into the RECORD three editorials from that paper dealing with the Bretton Woods agreement:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 14, 1945]

RATIFY BRETTON WOODS PROPOSALS

The Bretton Woods proposals for an international bank and an international fund to facilitate rebuilding of war-ruined industries and to encourage consequent revival of world trade must be accepted by each of the 44 governments represented at the conference if they are to participate.

Without acceptance by the United States and Britain and Russia, it is doubtful that the bank or fund could prove effective. It is for this reason that President Roosevelt has twice urged Congress to take the lead in ratifying the Bretton Woods proposals.

The arguments for ratification seem overwhelming, with the objections running more to details than to principles. The feeling of Bretton Woods proponents is that if the United States starts quibbling over details, and sets a pattern for other nations to quibble, the entire work of the conference may prove in vain.

No one, even with the greatest optimism, believes that the bank or fund would solve all, or even most, of the problems of foreign exchange and international trade. But the proposals offer hope that some difficulties can be minimized.

In this country, and in England, the principal objections come from bankers, though not from all by any means. Some of the best financial men advocate ratification of the Bretton Woods proposals. Part of the hostility is merely opposition to anything new. Wall Street, for instance, opposed the Federal Reserve System when it was first proposed. One writer has said there is opposition by some bankers who have a kind of dog in the manger attitude and no program for the revival of international lending, but hate to see the Government do it.

In view of the billions of dollars unwisely lent abroad by bankers in the twenties, and subsequently lost by American investors, it does not seem reasonable that the objections of these gentlemen should be given great weight.

A good many of the suggestions of the American Bankers' Association are thoughtful, but—since they agree in principle with the Bretton Woods outline—it would seem wiser to ratify the proposals as the 44 nations worked them out than to risk losing all by starting a confusing series of amendments and changes.

The Bretton Woods proposals, as the president has pointed out to Congress, are not panaceas, nor do they stand by themselves. They are part of several closely related plans for international cooperation—like U. N. R. R. A., Dumbarton Oaks, the Crimea Conference, and the forthcoming conference at San Francisco.

With all of these undertakings we must build toward a peace to be secured by international cooperation. The Bretton Woods proposals should be ratified.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 21, 1945]

REPEAL THE JOHNSON ACT

The Johnson Act was passed in 1934 because of debt defaults related to World War No. 1 and the great depression that began in 1929. It prohibits foreign loans to countries in default to the United States, with certain exceptions authorized by Congress. Even the Export-Import Bank was put under the terms of the act in 1940.

The purpose of the act was more or less to punish delinquent debtors; also, to keep us from throwing good money after bad. Whether it was wise or not—and the evidence is that it was too arbitrary a manner of dealing with a world, much of which was facing financial near collapse—the Johnson Act is now far out of date.

The Second World War has intervened and has created new problems, economic and financial. As we recover from this war, we must start building on conditions as we find them in the world. We cannot stagnate and keep our economic and financial hands tied because of conditions that were caused by World War No. 1 and the depression.

This country, possessing 75 percent of the monetary gold and the greatest demonstrated wealth-producing capacity of any nation, must approach the future without restrictions imposed by the past.

If the Export-Import Bank is to function at its best, if the proposals drawn up by 44 nations at Bretton Woods for an international bank and an international fund are to work, if world trade is to redevelop and commerce revive, we must have a free hand.

We cannot sit brooding over our disproportionate hoard of world credit, refusing to facilitate an international economic revival, merely because some nations defaulted to our fathers and grandfathers.

The Johnson Act has outlived any usefulness it ever had. It should be repealed.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 27, 1945]

BUSINESS AND BRETTON WOODS

The Committee for Economic Development, through its research committee, recommends, on the whole, the adoption of the Bretton Woods program. This is the first stand on the Bretton Woods question that has been taken by large or important representatives of general business.

Although the C. E. D. research committee favors certain minor changes, it says it would not wish to have its suggestions for strengthening the proposed international bank delay approval of the entire plan—that the enlarging of the international bank's powers might be made at "an appropriate time."

The C. E. D. committee makes clear that, while it seeks limited changes, it is not opposed to the fund in the sense that the American Bankers' Association and the New York State Bankers' Association are. The committee, viewing the importance of the long-range goal, if there are "weighty political and diplomatic considerations." There are.

The C. E. D. report is helpful and realistic. It is also important, coming, as it does, from a committee, including such men as two Federal Reserve bank presidents, a vice president of J. P. Morgan & Co., the president of the Studebaker Corporation, and the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Since the Bretton Woods proposals were developed by representatives of many nations, it would seem wise policy for our country to get the plan started by accepting it as it is. If we begin to insist on modifications as a basis for acceptance, many of the other nations may insist on other changes—and we may not get started at all.

The minor objections that have been raised to the international bank, and the somewhat stronger objections to the international fund, do not seem important enough to risk losing the entire program. Let's accept both the bank and fund—and then work for modifications later, if they appear desirable or necessary as experience indicates.

The C. E. D. report is highly heartening, showing a forward looking attitude on the part of big and responsible business interests. It is a far more progressive attitude than that shown by the majority of American bankers. The country has the right to expect leadership from its bankers. We have not received much in the past; we are not receiving it now.

Counsel of Churches Vital to Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column from last week's Washington Evening Star. This column includes some very thoughtful observations by the outstanding columnist and essayist, Mr. David Lawrence:

COUNSEL OF CHURCHES VITAL TO JUST PEACE—OBSERVER RECALLS PRONOUNCEMENT OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS LAST FALL

(By David Lawrence)

Again and again in the last 5 years or more people have cried out: "Why must there be war? Where was the church in the years that led up to the Second World War?"

Sensitive perhaps to this questioning, the Catholic bishops of America and the Federal Council of Protestant Churches, as well as Jewish groups, are expressing themselves rather frankly on current problems and especially on the Bill of Rights or provisions of the general international organization to be set up to maintan peace.

Whether the statesmen or the politicians or the exponents of expediency as against principle will accept the counsel of the churches, with their plainly disinterested advice, remains to be seen. Already the so-called practical school of thought is trying to disparage the defenders of principle and to belittle them as "perfectionists." But it is doubtful whether this will either discourage or drown out the voice of the church groups.

Approximately 2,000 years have passed since the code of Judeo-Christian ethics was given to the world and yet the time for the application of that code is suggested always as being somewhere in the dim distant future—certainly not now.

BASIC EQUALITY OF RIGHTS

One utterance in particular, however, stands out as not likely to lie dormant. It is the pronouncement of the Catholic bishops of America who met for several days last autumn and on November 19 issued their statement of principles, which in part reads as follows:

"We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We feel, too, that it should provide assistance for prostrate nations in reconstructing their economic, social, and political institutions. If justice is compromised, if unreasonable concessions are made to might, grievances will rankle in the bosom of aggrieved nations to endanger the peace of the world. If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving to their peoples fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil. No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust. * * *

"The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations, large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a security council with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case. Frankly it must recognize that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must therefore provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations. * * *"

IDEOLOGY OF A NATION

"The ideology of a nation in its internal life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of the innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace. Just at this moment, in the interest of world peace, our nation is exerting itself to root out some ideologies which violate human rights in the countries we are liberating.

"We hold that if there is to be a genuine and lasting world peace, the international organization should demand as a condition of membership that every nation guarantee in law and respect in fact the innate rights of men, families, and minority groups in their civil and religious life.

"Surely our generation should know that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace. A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to cooperate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom. Such a nation will pursue its own selfish international policies, while paying lip service to international cooperation."

It is interesting to note how the suggestions that are coming from various quarters for amendment of the Dumbarton Oaks plan are founded on these simple basic principles of the great declaration by the Catholic bishops.

Manpower Control and Freedom of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the House of Representatives and the people of the United States will be interested in reading the convincing editorial on the "work or jail" bill, the passage of which was demanded by President Roosevelt of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was written by Mr. Elmer W. Olson, the managing editor of the Daily Republican Eagle, of Red Wing, Minn. The editorial, which appeared in the Daily Republican Eagle on March 28, 1945, is herewith quoted in its full text. Mr. Olson deserves the praise of every true American for his courageous and timely warning against further encroachment upon the lives of freedom-loving Americans.

MANPOWER CONTROL AND FREEDOM OF MAN

For those who juggle records of Congressmen when election time rolls around, it might be well to mention for the record here that Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of this district, was one of 160 Representatives who voted against passage of the manpower control bill passed by a 7-vote margin in the House Tuesday. Representatives GALLAGHER and STARKEY, both Democratic-Farm-Labor Members, voted for passage. Labor has denounced the bill as being a long step on the road to serfdom, a tyranny and a slavery-brought-up-to-date measure. Other State Republican Representatives who voted against were H. CARL ANDERSON and JOSEPH P. O'HARA. Final decision rests with the United States Senate.

If ever there was a measure devised to control the actions of American citizens so that they might dovetail with objectives of the planners who appear to be gradually taking over the conduct of national affairs and guide not only the actions but even the thinking of the people, this manpower edict has all the earmarks of being the one. It would freeze men and women workers of all ages in whatever jobs are deemed essential by those in authority; it would fix manpower ceilings on industries and in any area designated by those in authority as shortage areas; it would give this over-all authority into the hands of one man; it would provide prison terms and heavy fines for either employe or employer who violated the terms.

The time may come when American citizens look back and wish there had been more men in Congress with the courage to vote against a law of this type which strikes at the very roots of democracy and is but another step along the road that leads to systematic planning which, unless checked, can lead only to a regimented and central-controlled existence that will be entirely different from anything Americans who had a hand in making this Nation great, have known. Not even the excuse of war's demands nor the threat of future wars, nor the necessity of preparing to combine with other nations in a hook-up ostensibly designed to maintain peace can be successfully masqueraded as any valid reason for this inroad on the rights of free men and women. And the promise that this and other similar controls are only for the duration and will be shelved once the emergency is over, is only a promise and no guaranty. Too often, as great men in American life have warned time and time again, and the history of other nations proves, rights and liberties freely sacrificed in the time of emergency are never regained once the emergency is passed.

Ghosts of Yalta Rise to Peril League Plans, Frisco Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning:

GHOSTS OF YALTA RISE TO PERIL LEAGUE PLANS, FRISCO PARLEY—F. D. FACING GREATEST DIPLOMATIC CRISIS AS SECRETS ARE BARED AND STALIN BALKS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

President Roosevelt is facing the greatest diplomatic crisis of his career. The fate of his post-war plan for a world peace organization hangs in the balance.

With the withdrawal of Russia from the San Francisco Conference on the Dumbarton Oaks peace league plan or a postponement of the conference looming as possibilities, all is confusion on the New Deal front.

DELEGATION SPLIT

Mr. Roosevelt's handsome, jovial, backslapping Secretary of State Stettinius is at his wit's end and waiting for a directive from the President.

The delegation the President named to the San Francisco conference is hopelessly split on his promise to Stalin to deliver it in favor of three votes for Russia in the new league-of-nations assembly.

The New Deal poet laureate, voluble Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish, has been struck dumb by the revelation of the secret Yalta agreement repudiating his radio script stating that each nation would have but one vote in the Assembly.

STALIN PRECIPITATES CRISIS

The only calm figure in the New Deal aggregation is Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and deputy chairman of the San Francisco delegation. He knows where he stands—with the President wherever he stands.

The crisis was precipitated by Soviet Dictator Stalin's demand that his Russian-sponsored puppet government of Poland be invited to the San Francisco conference and by the refusal of Great Britain and the United States to accede to the demand as a violation of the Yalta agreement.

The refusal of Great Britain and the United States to accede to the Russian demand constitutes a rebuff for the Soviet dictator that he may not be inclined to take sitting down. There are lively apprehensions in official quarters that he will retaliate with a withdrawal of his delegation from the San Francisco Conference.

WOULD BE BODY BLOW

That would be a body blow for Mr. Roosevelt, who has staked his political future on the erection of a post-war peace preservation scheme stamped with his imprimatur. Without Russia a world peace league could not be organized even on paper.

The collapse of the San Francisco Conference would also be a serious blow to the British, who would have lost their Empire but for American aid in this war and seek through a new league of nations to assure American protection in the future.

At Yalta Stalin learned the overweening ardor of Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill for Dumbarton Oaks and made no bones of his contempt for this and other schemes to organize peace.

He underlined this contempt by appointing a delegation to San Francisco headed by a minor functionary, Gromyko, Russian Ambassador to the United States, instead of Foreign Commissar Molotov.

REBUFF FOR F. D., CHURCHILL

This was generally regarded a rebuff for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill and a delicate hint that Stalin was not taking the project seriously and wouldn't hesitate to kick over the traces completely.

Ever since Yalta Stalin appears to have been playing upon Roosevelt's and Churchill's desperate need of him to make San Francisco a success.

As the matter is viewed here, Stalin probably is maneuvering to force Britain and America to agree to the inclusion of pro-Russian members in the reorganized Polish Government under the implied threat that otherwise he will kick out of San Francisco.

He might withdraw from San Francisco because of a refusal to invite his Polish Government just as he kicked out of the International Aviation Conference at Chicago last November, ostensibly because among other participating countries were Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal, which he accused of being anti-Soviet.

Speculation revolves around the possibility that Mr. Roosevelt will seek to appease Stalin sufficiently to keep him in the San Francisco picture. The President began appeasing Stalin at Teheran, where he gave tacit agreement to Russian partition of Poland and continued lend-lease unconditionally because, said New Deal apologists, Stalin otherwise might pull out of the war and make a separate peace with Hitler.

"LAST RESORT" FOR ROOSEVELT

The President continued his appeasement policy at Yalta, where he assented to the settlement of all the matters at issue substantially on Stalin's terms. He agreed to the partition of Poland and to a formula for establishing governments in the liberated countries under which Stalin is having no difficulty in dictating Communist regimes. He agreed to Stalin's demand for a veto on use of force by the peace league against an aggressor and to Stalin's demand for three votes for Russia in the league assembly.

Special Consideration for the Few—Prosecution, Lawsuits, and Fines for the Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Sunday Star of April 1 is another exhibition of what is happening:

MILK PRODUCERS IN D. C. AREA SEEK PRICE BOOST—SUBSIDY TO PREVENT RISE TO CONSUMERS IS HELD LIKELY

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr.)

Milk producers in the Washington area will seek an increase of 49 cents per 100 pounds in the price of fluid milk when the War Food Administration opens a public

hearing here April 16 on proposed changes in the Federal milk marketing order for this area, it was learned yesterday.

The 49-cent proposal would have the effect of hiking the retail price of milk by 1 cent a quart, according to W. F. A. sources.

However, should producers receive the increase, it was considered likely that the increase to consumers would be avoided through some subsidy arrangement.

CALLS INCREASE NECESSARY

Bruce B. Derrick, executive secretary of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, said the price increase was necessary to compensate producers for higher production costs and to more nearly align Washington prices with those paid for milk in nearby markets.

He pointed out that dairymen's wages have risen materially since 1941, while hay now costs between $55 and $60 a ton compared with $25 a ton in January 1941.

Meanwhile, the W. F. A., with the approval of Economic Stabilization Director William L. Davis, announced it was extending unchanged through April its dairy subsidy program with payments ranging between 60 and 90 cents per 100 pounds for milk. The W. F. A. originally had planned to cut the payment back to 35 cents starting today. Producers in this area have been receiving a subsidy of 80 cents per 100 pounds.

OFFICIAL SUPPORT GIVEN

The announcement said the extension was found neeessary after a review of current costs of milk production. Officials thus lent support to the association claim for a flat increase in milk price.

W. F. A. cited higher prices for hay, higher farm-wage rates, and a decreased farm-labor supply as primarily responsible for the postponement of the seasonal cut in payments. Dairy production payments were initiated by the Government in October 1943, when milk production began to fall.

Proposed changes to be discussed at the hearing, to be held in the United States Chamber of Commerce auditorium, include:

Extension of the marketing area to include the urban area of Arlington County and the city of Alexandria, and the extension of the milkshed to include producers shipping milk to a country receiving station at Cumberland, Md.

WANT MARKET-WIDE POOL

Substitution of a market-wide pool for the individual-handler plan now in effect. Under the new plan, the total quantity of milk sold by all producers to distributors in the market would be pooled and each producer would be paid according to the amount of milk he has sold regardless of the use made of the milk by the distributor.

Establishment of a fund from payments due producers encourage greater milk production in the months of seasonally low output. Under the amendment, a specified sum would be withheld from producers' return in April, May, and June (months of peak production) and to be used as a bonus in September, October, and November, when milk production takes a drop.

Reclassification of milk which would define class 1 milk as milk used for fluid consumption, including buttermilk and flavored milk; class 2 milk to mean that used for cottage cheese and table cream; and class 3 milk to mean that used for making ice cream and butter.

When and if you read this article keep in mind some of the situations that have transpired in the past. I do not care to discuss the merits or demerits of these Virginia milk producers' demands but I do ask that you consider their demands in the light of what the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration have been doing to the dairymen of the sections of the country that have really given the increased milk production needed for the war.

First. I wish to call your attention to the fact that these Virginia producers are receiving $4.05 per hundredweight for their milk; a subsidy of 80 cents per hundredweight and now ask another 49 cents per hundredweight which is expected to be another subsidy.

Second. I wish to call your attention to what is going on in Wisconsin at this time. The producers marketing their products through coops are being sued by the O. P. A. although they received less than $2.65 per hundredweight for milk being used as a war food. The details of this unfair attack on these Wisconsin Coops can be found on page 2963 of the March 29 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not upholding any group for violating the law. No law was violated by these producers. There is not even a dollars-and-cents ceiling on their product even today.

Third. We see the milk used for domestic consumption supported, subsidized, and subsidized at the very time the bungling bureaucrats are harassing, persecuting, suing, and exacting fines from the dairymen that are producing the war dairy products. This is not only unfair, unjust, and senseless but these same bungling bureaucrats are and have harmed the war dairy program.

Fourth. You will note the article states that hay is $55 to $60 per ton. Where is the O. P. A.? The producer of hay has a ceiling price on his hay of about $20 per ton. Is the O. P. A. only for the purpose of putting a strait jacket on the producer? The O. P. A. ceiling on alfalfa hay on the farm in Virginia is $24 to $27 per ton, according to the O. P. A.

Fifth. These complaining Virginia producers are able to come to Washington headquarters and personally state their grievances, but out in Wisconsin the producers have to listen to the diatribe of individuals who evidently have their jobs through political expediency and hold them by trying to think up reasons to justify their existence and their jobs.

Sixth. Before too much damage is done the war dairy food program someone had better wake up to the fact that Wisconsin milk goes largely for war uses, and also wake up to the fact that one-fourth to one-third of the increase in national milk production has come from this one State. Even in 1944 with all the ill-advised harassing, Wisconsin accounted for over one-third the increase in national milk production over the previous year. And remember Wisconsin did this at a time that other leading dairy States, such as Minnesota, Iowa, and New York, showed less milk production than in the previous year.

Seventh. Last feed season Virginia dairymen received over $1,100,000 worth of free hay. This hay went to the "needy as well as the greedy." It was handled in a sloppy manner and no one seems to know whose cows ate the hay. Since Virginia produced only 1,600,000 pounds of milk in 1944 this hay gift in this political dust bowl of $1,100,000 is a rather substantial subsidy to be receiving on the side.

Eighth. You note from the article they expect an additional subsidy. Do you wish to provide funds for an additional 49 cents per hundredweight subsidy for a small group already receiving $4.05 per hundredweight, and 80 cents per hundredweight subsidy where the milk is domestically consumed, at a time when a Government agency is suing a large group of dairymen receiving less than $2.65 per hundredweight and 25 percent less subsidy for their milk, and milk that is being used for war purposes?

Ninth. I wish to call your attention to the fact that in 1944 farm labor in Virginia was $54.90 per month and in Wisconsin $82.50 per month and in North Dakota, another low milk price State, labor was $109 per month.

Does it make sense to anyone to urge a group to produce more milk and even pay them 60 cents per hundredweight for increasing the production and then turn around and bring suit against them when the O. P. A. has not to this very day put a dollars and cents ceiling on the product? Are other groups to enjoy a cost-plus formula and the Wisconsin milk producers a cost-minus formula?

Tenth. Before the O. P. A. or W. F. A., or any other Federal agency, provides more supports and more subsidies, or figures out any new schemes to help the few, they had better check on what they are doing in Wisconsin to harm the dairy war food program. These Wisconsin dairymen are producing nearly one-third of the evaporated milk, over one-half of the cheese, and over one-third of the powdered whole milk of the Nation. These are all-important war dairy foods and deserve every consideration.

Do you, as a Member of Congress, and one who has supported every request to furnish the funds to provide food for the war effort, wish to see the dairy war food program continuously jeopardized?

We should maintain this dairy food production for war. Yes, though the few with the price in our midst are not evidently going to even have their cream rationed during wartime.

Present Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following colloquy with Bob Evans over radio station WFBL, at Syracuse, N. Y:

Mr. EVANS. We're happy to greet Congressman HALL. Tonight Mr. HALL is going to talk about food—meat. What's new about that? you may ask; everybody's talking about food. However, Congressman HALL is particularly well situated on this subject. In the House he's a member of the all-important Committee on Agriculture and he has been particularly close to the food picture in Washington for weeks.

Representative HALL. Yes, Bob. I'm going to talk about food—for a change. But first may I say that it is certainly a pleasant experience to find myself your guest once more. I am especially privileged to talk over WFBL because of its wide coverage in Madison and Chenango Counties, which, along with Broome County, comprise my congressional district. But, Bob, let's follow procedure first. So you give that round-up of yours—the week's news in Washington—and then we'll go on to meat.

Mr. EVANS. All right, Ed.

* * * * *

Mr. EVANS. Now, here is Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Representative HALL. Well, Bob, a lot happened in Washington this week, as you've been saying, but most significant to the country, I believe, and most indicative of how the folks back home are feeling, is the fact that the House passed a resolution of its own which sets up a special committee to investigate the increasing threat to our food supply.

Mr. EVANS. The Senate also has a committee for the same thing.

Representative HALL. It has, Bob, and together—and also independently—we're going to set out to find out what's wrong, what has precipitated this present food crisis. A food crisis? you ask. Yes. It is exactly that. We need not kid ourselves. There is a real lack of food for civilian consumption in America today. I know it seems fruitless to say "I told you so" every time anybody complains about the unhappy situation in which we find ourselves. I'm not going to say that again tonight. What I will do is point out some of the mistakes that have been made, with the idea in mind of recommending correction for as many of these mistakes as we still have time to correct.

Mr. EVANS. Well, Ed, you certainly sound as if you're loaded for bear tonight, so let's have some of your suggestions.

Representative HALL. Bob, whether my suggestions will be heeded, I don't pretend to know. In any event, I'm going to get them off my chest. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I have been urging a change in procedure for a long time on the part of those who are in charge of our food program. In the first place, I believe the initial mistake was made 2 years ago when the price fixing of agricultural products was taken out of the hands of the Department of Agriculture and lodged with the O. P. A.

Mr. EVANS. Which reminds me of something I didn't mention earlier. Extension of the Price Control Act for 1 year, without change, was approved yesterday by the Senate Banking Committee. But go ahead, Ed.

Representative HALL. Bob, the knowledge of matters pertaining to the farm always has been a prerogative of the Agriculture Department. I believe the experts in that branch of government would have made a success of the farm program. Certainly, under present conditions, no one can say it has been anything but a failure. In proving this point, I am not going to complain about what has already been done. It is enough to say that the broad general policy of the Government's refusal to allow the American farmer his cost of production in return for his labors, is the chief cause for the shortage now haunting us.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you have to qualify that, Ed. Tell us why.

Representative HALL. I will Bob. The patent argument, at every suggestion to give the farmer a fair price for his goods, is that the increase is too great for the consumer to bear. But the answer to that is that the consumer had paid a high price long before agricultural prices began to retard. Nearly every layman realizes the tremendous margin between the price the farmer receives, and the price the consumer is called upon to pay.

Mr. EVANS. Well, of course, Ed, that has been a fact ever since the effects of modern day living began to complicate the method of distribution. The products of the farm nowadays pass through a lot of hands before they reach the consumer.

Representative HALL. Of course, Bob—but I want to tell you that right now, under this administrative set-up it is my opinion that the farmer can, and should be paid more, while at the same time, the consumer can pay less. The responsibility lies heavily on the shoulders of the officials in charge to prove otherwise. Without the incentive of a price to cover his cost of production, the farmer will fall short of the ambitious production goal set for him by Government bureaus. Without the necessary production of the food, the consumer will not have to worry over what price he pays because there won't be any food to buy. Therefore, I strongly urge an immediate change in the basic price fixing policy as it affects farm products.

Mr. EVANS. Well, Ed, after all, farm production has gone up year and after year in recent years.

Representative HALL. Bob, I don't care how much statistics show that American farmers have increased production. There are enough immediate factors in evidence right now to show that farm-food production is going to be curtailed this year. Increased draft calls, for example, those draft calls which started raiding the farms of men, until Congress stepped in to reaffirm the Tydings amendment and put a stop to it. But one thing is evident, because of all these factors, the farmers aren't producing enough, or we wouldn't be faced with a food shortage; and the best way, the only way, to cause the farmers to produce more is to give them an incentive to produce, by guaranteeing their cost of production. And while we're talking, Bob, we must not forget the dairy farmer of up-State New York and the trouble he's having, trying to produce more milk. He's raised milk output by a substantial percentage. But to meet demands of the Government, five times more milk ought to be produced.

Mr. EVANS. Five times more—does it run that high, Ed?

Representative HALL. That's the way I figure it. Getting down to cases, Bob, I believe the dairymen of our Northeast alone could do the job, if a policy of persuasion were instituted in place of all the handicaps already put in their way. Instead of placing the farmer last on the priority list, why not place him first? Food is as important as armament in winning the war. Instead of making it difficult for New York farmers to obtain feed for milkers, why not get the feed to them at all costs? Enough corn to feed all the cattle in the world has been stored in the granaries of the Middle West for the past 2 years. It is rotting away. Why hasn't something been done to change the disastrous policy of holding back this feed from our dairy herds?

Mr. EVANS. What about priorities on armaments, Ed? This has curtailed grain shipments.

Representative HALL. I know, Bob. I just finished saying that food is as important as armament in winning this war. The grain should be moved too. Then there is the little matter of farm labor. We know what that means in central New York. We know what strain our farm population is under. We know how the women have worked all day outdoors and then done housework half the night to keep their families going. We know the sacrifices they've all made, including the youngsters. This Herculean effort has resulted in a substantial increase in production, but it could have, and should have, been much more. It could have been more if orders from Selective Service in Washington had considered the farmer generally of more value on the farm than in the Army. It could have been more if those allocating farm machinery from Washington would give the American farmer priority over all the others. It would have been more if those issuing orders from headquarters had recognized the farmers as human. That the farmer wants the fruit of his labors just as the worker wants fair pay and the industrialist his profits.

Mr. EVANS. Naturally. No one is going to refute that.

Representative HALL. The production of milk and other foods, Bob, can be increased several times its present capacity and must be if the present food shortage is to be overcome. The special House committee which will investigate this shortage should recognize the mistakes in policy up to now and be in a position to make adequate recommendations as to how more food can be produced. Feeling that this will be the result of the food investigation, I voted for the creation of the committee to handle it. I look for big things to be accomplished. In addition to finding a way to getting more food, the paramount duty of the investigation should be to insist on a fair distribution of the food, with an eye to priorities on who gets it. I don't think anybody will quarrel with me when I say the order for receiving the food America produces must be as follows: First, the members of our armed forces; Second, our civilian population. Then, whatever is left can rightfully go to those of our allies, and to freed territories really in need of it.

Mr. EVANS. You haven't mentioned black marketing, Ed.

Representative HALL. Bob, with a fair distribution of the returns—the profits, with the farmer getting his share along with the others, black marketing will disappear almost overnight. And now, I see its getting late. I've tried to outline in the time we've had available how I feel about the menacing food shortage—how we can avoid a more serious shortage in the months to come, and what policies I believe should be put into effect and recommended by the Food Investigating Committee for which I voted in the House this week. It has been a real opportunity to be with you and the W. F. B. L. audience again Bob. I do hope that we, as Americans, can all join together in a firm determination to solve our wartime problems.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Ed; and it has been a pleasure to have you with us.

Importance of Printing to the War Effort—Address by A. E. Giegengack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very comprehensive address delivered by the Public Printer, Mr. Giegengack, before the Washington Club of Printing House Craftsmen last week. Few of us realize the very important and prominent place which the Government Printing Office has filled in our war effort. It has

promptly, efficiently, and effectively met the needs of the Government in these wartime emergencies.

I believe Mr. Giegengack's address will be read by the Members of Congress with a great deal of profit, and it will be a source of satisfaction to them to know that this agency has been carrying on so well.

The printing of the address, I am informed, will require approximately two-thirds of a page more than is allowed under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, at a total cost of $138.80.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the second time in a matter of a few weeks I have been asked to talk on the Importance of Printing to the War Effort. I do not believe that there is serious doubt anywhere that printing is a vitally important part of our job of fighting. But printing in this World War is playing many new roles, doing jobs it has never been asked to do before, and the audiences to which I have talked seem to find in our work at least a few classes of printing that are unfamiliar to them or used in an unfamiliar application.

I am particularly pleased by the action your officers have taken in inviting members of the Joint Committee on Printing to attend this meeting and I am honored by the presence of Senator WILLIS and Congressman JARMAN at the speakers' table. I believe that even Senator WILLIS, who has given a lifetime of distinguished service to our craft and who, through his unflagging work for the Joint Committee on Printing, is very close to the Government's printing problems, will be impressed by an account of the importance of printing to the war. Congressman JARMAN, who is also a valued member of the Government Printing Office board of directors, by virtue of his post on the joint committee, has already expressed to me his amazement at the scope of the story told by the war printing jobs in our display. Yet he is up to his neck every day in the work of helping to direct the world's largest printing establishment.

We are very proud to have here from Chungking the head of the Chinese Government's Bureau of Printing and his assistant. I hope they can take away from this meeting something which will be useful to them in their work at home.

In order to spare you an account of the thousands of jobs the Government needs, I have had arranged a visual exhibition which is probably different from any that was ever displayed before. This display includes nothing that was selected as an example of typographic display, or use of color, or elegant binding. When I first made my notes on this talk I started to say that if there was an example of fine printing in the whole display it was accidental. What I mean, of course, is that I have tried to bring you merely a cross section of our hundred thousand jobs done in the last year—whether they be simple forms of thousand-page books—arranged to show their use and tell a story.

Every piece of printing in our display, however humble and humdrum it may appear, has a direct connection with the war effort. There's the emergency medical tag book, for example. It's a simple-looking specimen, but let me tell you that the production of several million books of them has been no simple matter, and, humble as it may be, it serves the purpose of identifying casualties and giving the base hospital a history of the emergency treatment the wounded man has received in the field.

When you realize that the wounded man may be your own son or brother, the tag assumes a new importance.

You can trace through these printing samples nearly every activity of the Government and of its military, naval, and administrative organization. Printing is essential, regardless of the way it may be classified.

Our fighting men have reached the high level of efficiency which brought about our military successes because of the printed word which directed their efforts in the use of the tools of war. Hitler bleats that his headquarters is to be in the driver's seat until the Germans win. I think he's got his headquarters where his hindquarters ought to be. Printing puts the emphasis on headwork. Our great military and administrative minds, and the colonels, majors, and captains which make up our team, know that printing is essential. The commanding general of the Army Service Forces states, with respect to printed bombing tables:

"These tables are to be regarded as items which are as essential to operation of the Army Air Forces as the bombs dropped, the bomb sight employed, or the type of aircraft used. No single component of the many which are required to execute a bombing mission can be separated from the combination without impairing the success of the operation."

Let me illustrate the part printing is playing in the war effort by reporting on the activities of the Government Printing Office. Our normal peacetime volume amounted to less than $18,000,000. In the first year of the war civilian functions were curtailed but the volume of needed printing doubled and then tripled. Last year our volume exceeded $70,000,000, and indications are that this year it will surpass even this figure.

Early in the war it was evident that the vast printing job required could not be handled exclusively from Washington. It was also evident that our war agencies could not function at their best without the trained technical assistance and control that the Government Printing Office was created to give. We overcame these objections by decentralization and by the development of programs. To meet the urgency of printing requirements, field warehouses have been established in the cities of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Dallas, and Atlanta, and we have representatives in Philadelphia and St. Louis.

This decentralization gave us access to the principal printing centers of the country, which, coupled with the tremendous productive capacity of the Government Printing Office in Washington, paralleled—in a national sense—the global planning of military activities. Incidentally, this decentralization called for an almost complete reorganization of the Office and put an added strain on our own manpower resources.

A great many of the printing jobs presented to us are the result of General Staff development. They are required for instruction in the training centers throughout the country and often for direction on the far-flung battlefields of the war. This, in turn, required distribution on a grand scale, so we developed that phase of our operation which we call program printing. I can best explain it by briefly describing the program established for the printing and distribution of War Department orders, bulletins, tables of organization, and the like.

A standard format has been established, applying to all of these publications. Contracts have been arranged with nine firms located in New York, Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, and San Antonio. We receive a monthly order from the War Department for all of the work, and we write a production order on each contractor for the month's requirements. The War Department requisition form has been designed to serve also as a printing order blank. All the manuscript comes to the G. P. O., where the type is set overnight; reproduction proofs or mats are air-mailed from the Office on the second day to each contractor in a War Department depot area; and the job goes to press on paper which we keep stocked in his plant. Delivery is made to 12 War Department depots throughout the country at the same time 5 and 10 days after receipt of the copy, and in 5 more days distribution is completed within the Army, down to the company level.

In addition to the printing in the United States, we make extra sets of mats and plastic plates which Army Air Forces delivers overseas to printing presses waiting back of the battle area.

The program arrangement works very well and saves time and effort. The Office controls the job, but the ordering from the contractor is relayed directly from the department after we have established rates, schedules, and method of production. We have eliminated the duplication involved in specifying hundreds of separate jobs, and have even omitted the rewriting of the Army's original specifications, except at the beginning of the period.

Some idea of the size of a job like this can be gotten from the following figures: There is an average of 5,400 separate publications a month, reaching a total of 36,000,000 copies and requiring better than 40,000,000 sheets of paper, 38 by 48 inches. Some of the nonconfidential publications have been made a small part of our display.

This principle of programing and decentralized production is being extended to every kind of work to which we can apply it, such as Army Service Forces catalogs, Navy's technical data manuals, and a hundred or more other classes of printing. You might take a look at the Signal Corps catalogs. The SIG 5 edition shown ran to 3,000 pages; had to be printed in 3 volumes. There are 18,000,000 ems of intricate composition, involving use of many pi characters. I. B. M. cards are photographed to make the copy, which is collated and printed in supplement form prior to the printing of these monthly catalogs. Is the publication important? Only insofar as supply officers cannot order equipment for the field without it. A good operator could set the type in 2 years if he took no leave until he was through. And it's just a part of the program.

These new program procedures have been established with the primary object of reducing use of manpower and of conserving paper and materials. I'd like to cite a couple of examples of how Government and industry have cooperated toward this conservation.

In the early planning for gasoline-ration printing it was evident that the millions of individual coupons could not be efficiently handled from the consumer through the retailer, the distributor, and back into the O. P. A. To simplify this, a gummed bingo sheet, to which 100 stamps are glued, was designed. These sheets could be handled easily and they lent themselves to rapid inspection and test.

The volume of these gummed sheets rapidly increased to the several hundred million mark. We reached the point where the gumming facilities of the country were not in a position to meet our requirements, except at very high cost. Therefore, a substitute method of production had to be developed and we hit upon the idea of printing the sheets on a rotogravure press and applying the gum in the same operation. One of the large gravure companies was contacted and requested to do a little experimental work in applying nonpoisonous and water-soluble gum to the sheet.

After a few weeks of cooperative experimentation with various degrees of coverage

and different gum formulas, including the development of special drying units, tension rolls, and delivery principles, the job was put on a production basis. The press is now producing at the rate of 2,000,000 sheets a day and printing the necessary gummed area from a regular gravure cylinder using glue instead of ink.

I might also mention that many thousands of dollars were saved, as the price was reduced to approximately 65 percent of the original cost. This method of printing with gum on such a large scale was entirely new. It may have a wide application after the war. Perhaps the single sample sheet exhibited with other O. P. A. jobs looks unimpressive, but that single job was large enough to effect wide changes in an entire national industry. I think you might be interested in seeing it because unless you know about this particular job you have certainly never seen anything like it before. It is another G. P. O. first.

Another example of worth-while paper and manpower savings by extensive cooperative planning between the G. P. O. and industry was brought about in the manufacture of the Army Signal Corps message books. As originally designed by the Department, there were only two or three firms in the country who could produce these books, and they could in no way produce the millions of copies required.

After we had taken the full capacity of plants which do the entire job we still lacked the quantity needed. Then we broke down the operations, procured different parts from a dozen printing contractors, and assembled the parts in a number of binderies. By further cooperative planning with industry the message book was recently redesigned with a resultant saving of approximately 115,000 pounds of sulfite pulp for the year.

The present book can be produced on more commonly used equipment, the list of possible suppliers has been greatly broadened, and a much lower competitive price secured. Only by these progressive alterations were we able to meet the urgent appeals from the Signal Corps for delivery. The money saving runs into more than a half million dollars on this single job. The sample takes up only a few square inches to display, but the regular run is scattered from Cologne to Iwo Jima. When Tokyo falls to us at last the first news of the victory will probably be written on the Signal Corps Message Book which was printed by the G. P. O.

Taken as a separate classification, the production of field and technical manuals is probably most typical of our work. The technical nature of the training required in this war has made it necessary to print more manuals for our Army and Navy than in all the previous wars in our history. The field manual has been prepared and printed so that the soldier can have up-to-date information—the latest research developments—on any activity in which he may become engaged. They include, for example, such subjects as sanitation and first aid, unarmed defense, or booby traps and antipersonnel mines. There is a manual for every type of ordnance, dealing with its maintenance and operation; also on enemy armies, camouflage, telegraph construction, and others too numerous to mention.

In a war like this one, which makes use of a thousand and one scientific and engineering developments, the Army needs a thousand and one different field and technical manuals. As soon as something new is developed, we are called upon to print a textbook which will tell our officers and soldiers the whole story.

The Army gives us such a short schedule for printing TM's that special arrangements had to be set up with printers in New York City to produce them. Five contractors are now producing them on a schedule which calls for delivery of any TM 21 days after receipt of copy, and they have guaranteed performance.

This program was established only as recently as February 1. In one 3-day period we submitted orders for over a million press impressions on this one program. Just last week the program was double what we set it up for less than 2 months ago. According to present estimates and production, it will use 15 tons of paper daily and 175 carloads a year. A part of this display is given over to these manuals. We rushed off in 8 days the printing of a manual for the construction of pontoon bridges, which was immediately used in the crossing of the Rhine. That's how significant the time element is in the printing of these texts.

A committee to expedite war printing, formed by the New York City printers, gave me invaluable assistance in securing facilities to produce this manual program—and other work as well.

We have had a new job in the Office for a couple of weeks. While it is not our biggest order, it transcends in importance almost anything else we are doing. This is the printing and distribution of releases of casualty lists to newspapers and radio stations. The Army and Navy were dissatisfied with their past method of releasing the lists, and the Office of War Information proposed bringing the whole problem to the G. P. O., to reduce embarrassing delay in the compilation, reproduction, and distribution.

The lists, as they had been compiled, were Nation-wide and each newspaper and radio station received information concerning casualties in all States of the Union. To reduce this unnecessary listing, the country has been divided into 18 regions relatively equal in population. The newspaper editor now gets copies of only those regions in which he has an interest. It is our job—the saddest we have ever had—to provide for a capacity listing of nearly 100 pages, 8 by 10½, in 6½-point type—about 400,000 ems a day. These must be collated by type of service, casualty classification, and home region, printed in the required quantities and stuffed in air-mail envelopes. All this must be done in 36 hours. The second day of the program the listing was twice the size planned for—7,000 names—but the list was out on schedule. Last Saturday's list exceeded 8,000 names.

By the changes we have made in the method of preparing the releases, paper will be reduced from 300,000 to approximately 75,000 pounds a year in handling of the releases. We also expect a speed-up of several weeks in furnishing the copy to the papers.

I quoted awhile ago the Air Forces' views on the importance of the bombing tables which are used with our famous bomb sight. Before we could get approval to exhibit one of these tables we had to scramble the figures in order to destroy the value of the information. This is a very special job, printed with fluorescent ink in a form which permits the bombardier to read his tables easily either by natural daylight, or under an ultraviolet lamp without impairment of his night vision. We have two contractors on this job, one of whom devotes practically his entire facilities to it.

We have now developed a new plan in which the paper, instead of the ink, is fluorescent. The Department has approved it, and the job is wide open for any classified printer whose press is big enough for the sheet size. The cost will be greatly reduced, and it will be another step toward conservation of manpower and materials.

When I read, a few days ago, that our B–29's had been over Tokyo again, I got a real thrill out of the knowledge that our industry's work contributed to the success of the raids. You and I can feel that we are invisible riders in the raiding planes over every enemy target tonight.

Besides the bombing tables which help the bombardier to make a bull's-eye, he carries printed mosaic maps of the objective, target information charts, and text sheets. The mosaics are detailed aerial photographs of the area to be bombed, large enough to show landmarks and terrain, with the objective clearly outlined with china white. The information charts are in four colors to show varying degrees of target inflammability. In order to give maximum success to every bomb run, the text sheets furnish data regarding construction of the objective and camouflage. They specify the type of bomb or ammunition which will do the most effective damage.

You understand how carefully we must handle this printing, both from the standpoint of quality and security. It is a top secret—every new order is a clue to a coming raid.

Orders have jumped from 100 to 2,000 copies, and we are getting a lot of reprints. This ought to mean—and I hope it does—that 20 times as many bombers are out on missions over Tokyo and Berlin. The Joint Army-Navy Board which is responsible for the preparation and issue of the mosaics, consented to declassify a couple of outdated copies so that I could show them to you. They will give you an idea of what the B–29 crew sees before it dumps its bomb load.

Ration currency printing for the O. P. A. is the sum total of several heretofore unknown developments in the paper and printing industry. The paper processing, the close-together press perforations, the numbering of every small stamp are all new ideas, which called for planning, testing, engineering, machine designing, and maybe a little black magic.

We have used 20,000,000 pounds of safety ration paper up to date. Total stamps produced exceed 77,000,000,000. We have printed as many as 65,000,000 gas coupons in a single day. There are about 15 different types of ration currency to fit as many phases of rationing. They have all been standardized, scheduled, and controlled, and they are produced in one ticket-printing plant in the Midwest. Special equipment has been developed and the entire operation is under armed-guard protection 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We even had to arrange with the city to place special police around the block.

A special paper and printing job on which I should like to increase production is the prisoner-of-war stationery. Under the Geneva Convention prisoners are privileged to write letters home—once a month, I believe. We are not allowed to subject their letters to tests which would deface the messages, and therefore our first prisoners felt safe in transmitting secret reports in invisible fluid ink. Milk, lemon juice, saliva, and other easily available fluids would do the trick on ordinary paper—and some information did get out which might have been damaging. The War Department asked us to do something about it. The director of our laboratories first developed a coated paper, on which invisible acid ink immediately showed up in a bright green. Invisible nonacid ink turned a fine glowing red. We allowed the prisoners to use only this paper for writing their letters, and for a while the censors had an easy time. In the meantime we made several changes and improvements in the coating and production methods.

About a year ago the censorship people got a new headache. The Germans had discovered a substance which could not be detected on our paper. When censorship officials caught up with it, they worked on the problem and finally came over to the Office for help. Within a few weeks we had a new paper, which is sensitive to nearly every known substance, dry or fluid. We are at

work now on an even newer idea. If it meets with the requirements of the Geneva regulations, the only way a prisoner could sneak a message home would be to wigwag it a couple of thousand miles when his guard is asleep.

I am sorry that I cannot report more paper put to this use. We have an order for 20,000,000 pieces of this stationery. I should like to print enough for 10,000,000 prisoners.

I told you at the beginning of my address that I was going to try to let the display speak for itself, but there are approximately 400 samples of our work here to speak for 99,600 other jobs. That is to say, what you see here is less than one-third of 1 percent of the Government's printing. I have not even referred to the War-bond printing, which represents 100,000,000 pieces for the last campaign. The Selective Service System's samples are only 10 percent of the System's forms and 25 percent of its volume.

The display of congressional printing, which, I think, tells its own story better than some of the others, shows only the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the printing used in the passage of a single bill. Only about a dozen of the 120 Federal agencies we service are even represented in the display here. If I tried to talk about them all, somebody would begin laying my address end to end, which might be a very good thing.

These displays are intended to show what a terrific job we have to get the Government's printing done, and I am sure you understand that we cannot do it without the cooperation of every division of the Office. We cannot do it without the cooperation of the commercial industry. I might go on and say that industry cannot give us maximum assistance unless there is cooperation within industry. Let me comment briefly on recent developments within the industry which show the accord being reached between it and the Government and among the associations which represent the graphic arts.

For a long time I have been counseling unity and unified action. At a meeting in Detroit some months ago I made it the subject of an entire address. Now we are beginning to see the fruits of coordinate effort of people who have been working for the same cause. The Joint Committee on Government Relations of the Commercial Printing Industry, which had been doing a fine job, has joined, as you know, with the United Typothetae of America. The enlarged and strengthened organization will be known as Printing Industry of America, Inc. U. T. A. is one of the oldest trade associations in the Nation and has always worked for the betterment of the graphic arts industry. This merger has opened the way for further consolidation of the industry's many associations and will promote the good of all.

It is easy to demonstrate how unity of action can be of benefit. The Joint Committee of the Printing Industry—to give it a shorter name—has been successful after a long, hard fight in protecting the interest of commercial printers and in preventing arbitrary cuts in our paper quotas. I think we are assured that necessary paper-quota cuts will be shared equally by all paper users and that the end-use theory will be discarded.

These are some of the results which we get in industry when we all pull together. We have always known that strength lies in unity, but it has taken the urge for full support of the war effort to make the industry do what we knew it should do.

With the commercial printing industry and the Government, represented by the Government Printing Office, working together and doing our best, the armed forces are getting the kind of printing service to which their own efforts and their needs entitle them. We cannot do less. And we mean to keep that service at such a level that we can say with equal truth that we cannot do more.

Greek Independence Day Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commemoration address delivered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at the celebration of Greek Independence Day, on March 25, 1945, in Symphony Hall, at Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, officers, and members of Greek communities and societies, fellow citizens here, and my radio audience in Athens and all Greece, today is the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek liberation from the domination of the Ottoman Empire. We celebrate that memorable day on which she threw off the shackles of servitude and emerged as a nation of free people. I feel greatly honored in being asked to speak to you on this occasion, for the anniversary of the freedom of any people will always be worthy of commemoration in this, my country—this land of the free. And when I say that I am honored to be here with you today, that statement comes from the heart. It is indeed an especial privilege to address you as representatives of America's citizens of Greek descent, because I am especially interested in Greece.

All of my life Greece has meant much to me, probably more than any other land except America. I was born and brought up in nearby Providence, steeped in independent New England tradition, but very early in life my father, who had spent much time in Athens, taught me that Greece brought a message to the world such as no other country has given. I found my first heroes in the pages of Greek history and the lessons which I found there were the lessons of liberty and freedom. Today this same liberty and freedom is being challenged and the soldiers, sailors, and airmen under the Allied banners are fighting for the same principles as the Greek soldiers fought for 500 years before Christ. Greece failed in those ancient days, because her people were not united. She had great leaders, but they did not work together. So today if we had not combined our strength and resources we might have lost this war and the civilization of centuries might have been trodden down by the brutal Hun. But we are still going to fight together, and we are going to win, if it takes as long as the Greek Revolution, the successful outcome of which we celebrate today.

You Americans of Greek descent have a double heritage. As American citizens your homes are here, your future is bound up in the future of this country. Your loyalties are first and foremost to this nation—the United States of America. If any proof were needed, the numbers of your brave men on our battlefields today, and the names of your honored dead on the casualty lists, would be testimony enough of your devotion to this our country—your country and my country.

There is no such thing as a hyphenated American. There are no French-Americans or Russian-Americans or English-Americans, and there are no Greek-Americans. But most of us in this comparatively new Nation have ties to those older civilizations from which we sprang. Certainly this is true of you Americans who have a Grecian heritage.

The entire modern world owes a tremendous debt to the culture of ancient Greece. Our whole concept of modern civilization would be changed without it—our literature, art, philosophy, and architecture. All of these reflect in a greater or less degree the wonderful sense of proportion which the Greeks developed to a greater extent than any other race which has ever lived. This sense of proportion, which includes appropriateness, is one of the reasons why the Greeks' standards of beauty have ever since prevailed and probably always will prevail. However, today we would rather emphasize an even greater contribution to the civilization which we are defending and which our opponents are seeking to destroy, namely, democracy, to which Greece gave birth.

And the world owes a debt to modern Greece also. This is due to the fact that Greece, this ancient and glorious though small nation, was the first in modern times to regain its independence. Since then, throughout 123 years, Greece has been a factor of peace and stability in the Near East. Although when she established her independence she was weak and poor, yet she felt that it was one of her chief duties to seek the liberation of millions of Greeks left under foreign rule. She not only recognized but was successful in fulfilling that duty.

The continued resistance of the Greek people in our present conflict has been an invaluable contribution, one which they have given valiantly, in the midst of the destruction of their homes and institutions, the bloodshed and suffering of their men and women and children. And for that contribution she has won the admiration of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

At the present time, while Greece still suffers, bruised by the heel of a foreign tyrant, we look forward to the day when she will again arise and again contribute on the side of the democratic powers to the establishment of a lasting peace. In the League of Nations the successive Greek delegations were always cooperative with the efforts made to establish collective security. They thus maintained the highest standards of their ancient heritage.

Let us turn our thought to the terrible impact of this war on Greece, what it has meant to her as a nation and as a people. When that country was overrun by the Germans, she was subjected to what is probably the most complete devastation of any of the occupied countries. In the flush of premature triumph, the enemy used every possible means of despoliation—the machinery of warfare, political confusion, social unrest. Their theme was "divide and conquer." With cold brutality and cunning, faction was set against faction, house against house. Probably not since the days of Tamerlane has a conquered country been subjected to such horrors as was Greece under German occupation.

And yet the phrase "conquered country" was never applicable to Greece. She was beaten and bloody, but she never ceased resisting the invader. The miracle of the Hellenic resistance is the miracle of the human spirit which will not be cowed by brute force.

This is something the Germans seem incapable of learning. Once again in Greece they put to the test the Nazi philosophy of a master folk ruling a slave race. And to the eternal credit of the Greek Nation, once again that philosophy was proven a failure.

But in striving to establish the superiority of German might over free people, the Nazis leveled and utterly obliterated a thousand villages—not one Distomo—but a thousand Distomos. The country's transportation system was completely wrecked. First reports

after the liberation stated that only 6 usable locomotives and 40 freight cars were left in all Greece. Subsequent reports showed that there were perhaps 40 locomotives usable or capable of salvage, but not one of these was under 20 years old. As a result of the war, there was left only one-sixth of the Greek merchant marine which before hostilities had totaled some 2,000,000 tons. In the terrible winter of 1941, thousands died of starvation in the very streets of Athens, and those who still lived had no strength to move the dead bodies from those streets. When the Nazis were gone, Greece was left stripped of all food and medical supplies, of all vehicles and livestock, and 1,500,000 people homeless. However, the greatest sacrifice of all was the war casualties. Cold figures do not convey the meaning of the real loss, but here they are. Killed in action 13,000, wounded in battle 70,000, executed about 10,000, died of starvation and illness about 400,000.

Greece paid the price of her inspired resistance with torture, starvation, disease, and devastation. But the other nations fighting this war for freedom did not forget their debt to her. The Greek relief program has been a unique operation during this war. It has involved the one large-scale breach of the economic blockade of occupied Europe. Almost 450,000 tons of food, medicines, and other supplies were brought into Greece to save her heroic people from extinction.

Through the Greek War Relief Association many of you who are here before me today have contributed toward this work. The Greek Government itself, the American Red Cross, and Greek Red Cross have been helped to obtain supplies and to get them into that beleaguered country. Up to March 31, 1944, relief for Greece had cost more than $40,000,000. The United States Government and citizens had made payments of more than $20,000,000—three-fourths through lend-lease to the Greek Government and one-fourth through the Greek War Relief Association and the American Red Cross. Canada's contribution exceeded $12,000,000. The United Kingdom had advanced some $6,000,000 to cover early relief shipments from the Near East.

Now the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, commonly called U. N. R. R. A., has gone into Greece, one of its member nations, with its constructive policy of helping nations to help themselves. This organization has geared its work in Greece to provide not only food and clothing and other supplies for suffering civilians, but also to provide farm equipment, seeds for planting crops, machinery that will help rebuild the factories, the transportation systems, and the public utilities. These are first steps that must be taken to regain national security for the country of Greece.

For Greece knows that she must unite her people for a great task. She must get back on her economic feet again. She must set up and maintain a stable government, regaining the ground lost through Nazi tactics and the bitterness of civil war that was an aftermath of this insidious type of devastation.

These things the indomitable people of Greece will do. And for these tasks, they know that they have the support and the help of the United Nations. Throughout this whole period Greece has had the friendship of America, and the Greek people have felt, I know, that they had both the interest and friendship of the American people. Certainly President Roosevelt echoed the sentiment of American citizens in a letter which was published a few months ago, when he wrote:

"I am glad to have this opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities. It is the further desire of our Government that the Greek people who have fought so valiantly for democratic ideals will be able to exercise, as soon as possible, the rights of all democratic people and choose freely for themselves the form of government under which they will live."

Let me also quote from a modern Greek poet:

"And the miracle that is America
A rumor mythical to millions untold
Is spreading weakly at first
Then like a prairie fire
Then like an astounding typhoon
From town to town
From factory to factory
From farm to farm
Over the seas and the mountains
The Frenchman and the Norwegian
The Pole and the Russian
The Greek and the Yugoslav
The Dutchman and the Belgian,
All hear of it,
All repeat it,
One to another.
A new Easter of hopes
The great Messiah
From the west."

The Greek Nation knows, and no nation better, that the one chance for freedom and even survival for smaller nations lies in the development of a spirit of friendly cooperation among the nations of the world, a spirit based upon mutual respect and mutual understanding. She has taken a firm stand in favor of plans for a great international organization for world peace and security by supporting the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. While other nations are still pondering the question, deliberating about details, Greece has signified "This is what we want, what we must have."

There has been a great deal of discussion revolving around the question of whether these proposals would produce a democratic organization, one which would give the small countries a chance instead of giving all the power to the big countries. Greece comes within this category of small countries, however large have been her contributions to the world, and she has realized one basic fact about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This basic fact is that these proposals present a plan for safeguarding the rights of the smaller nations and for assigning to them sovereign importance in a world made up of many nations. In Greece, so long dedicated to the democratic principles, as in our own United States, this kind of international cooperation, and this type of machinery for setting it up are seen as great steps toward finding a practical method of promoting true democracy in the modern world.

Upon what does Greece, one of the so-called smaller nations, base her recognition of these basic facts?

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals call for a general assembly to be charged with responsibility for dealing with economic and social and humanitarian problems among nations. They call for a security council to take action whenever the peace and security of the world is threatened. They call for an international court of justice to hand down recommendations on justiciable disputes. They call for an economic and social council that, operating under the general assembly, would give detailed consideration to problems coming under its responsibilities, including the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. What role will the smaller nations play in this set-up?

In the first place, they would become members of the organization on the basis of sovereign equality. In the general assembly their representatives would have an equal voice with those of the larger states. They would occupy 6 nonpermanent seats on the Security Council, giving them a majority. All members of the organization would have equal access to and equal standing before the international court of justice. All would be equally eligible to election as 1 of the 18 members of the economic and social council.

The Government of the United States and an overwhelming majority of our citizens believe in this proposed organization. We believe that with the good will of nations and peoples behind it, the machinery will work. And because we believe this, we look forward with eager interest to the San Francisco Conference, at which the United Nations will come together to draft a charter for such an organization. In the meantime, before that Conference, and even while it is being held, and perhaps afterward, we are going to discuss it at our clubs and organizations and in our homes.

We are going to do our best to promote public understanding that will bring about enlightened support by the people for the kind of international organization best fitted to maintain peace and security. And if this is done, all the sacrifices we have made in the war for freedom, the great courage of nations such as Greece, who have known the horror and suffering of this global war, will not have been in vain. They will have benefited not only us today, but also the whole world tomorrow.

The New Federal Insurance Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the current issue of the magazine, America, for March 31, 1945, a very able article by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] appears. It is entitled "The New Federal Insurance Law." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW FEDERAL INSURANCE LAW

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

When President Roosevelt, on March 9, put his signature to the insurance bill which Congress passed on February 27, after one of the longest and most stubborn legislative battles in recent years, he not only ended a determined struggle by one segment of the insurance industry to divest Congress of all power over the business but he also opened the door for State legislatures and insurance executives to demonstrate to what extent State regulation can protect the public interest in a business the national aspects of which have become obvious and all-important. What the States and insurance leadership do in readjusting State laws and insurance practices to meet the facts of modern business life will go far to determine to what extent we may look for the reestablishment of real State responsibility in our economic life.

Congress by this act has reasserted two fundamental and traditional principles of American political and economic theory: The first is that economic power, like political power, proceeds from the people and should be kept as close as possible to them. The second is that private monopoly cannot be tolerated, and that the power of the Federal Government should be exerted to aid

the States when private monopoly, operating nationally, threatens local economic independence.

OPPOSITION BY MISREPRESENTATION

The position of those of us who opposed the attempt of a part of the insurance industry to induce Congress to repeal the antitrust laws, so far as this business is concerned, was flagrantly misrepresented from the very outset. It was charged that we really sought to establish Federal regulation. We were accused of seeking to enable the Federal Government to seize the assets of the insurance companies for purposes of Federal spending or, at the very least, of trying to take over the insurance business for the Federal Government. All this was said in complete disregard of the incontrovertible fact that the Temporary National Economic Committee, which in 1940 conducted a study of life insurance, specifically recommended the strengthening of State regulation. It was said in total disregard of the fact that the T. N. E. C. issued a warning against the relaxation of State regulation in these words:

"If forthright steps are not taken now to plug the gaps where State regulation cannot do an effective job and to prevent relaxations of regulatory standards in several States such as have occurred in the past to the disadvantage of numerous policyholders, State regulation may eventually decay and all-inclusive Federal control will be required."

The act of March 9, in complete harmony with the recommendations of the T. N. E. C., declares "that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest." It grants a moratorium until January 1, 1948, from the Federal antitrust laws, but declares that, notwithstanding the moratorium, the Sherman antitrust law shall continue to be applicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. Thus is reasserted, in language that is incapable of being misunderstood, the purpose of the new Federal law to reestablish historic principle by strengthening State regulation and prohibiting the evils of private monopoly.

To the insurance business there has now been extended an opportunity to perform a magnificent service for the rehabilitation of fundamental American economic and political principle. No business is more concerned with the individual and his welfare than is insurance. It has been the shield at one time or another of most American families against disaster. It has, indeed, sustained the widow and the orphan in the face of death. It has protected the householder in the midst of disaster. It has throughout most of its long history been geared to the individual; but in modern times, like every other business and industry, it has been geared to the organized commerce of our era. It has lost much of its local aspect and more and more has become a national and international business, operating in a sphere in which both State lines and State laws have little significance. The savings of the people, contributed in the form of premiums on insurance policies, have flowed from all over the country into fiscal reservoirs in a few eastern centers from which they can be redistributed for the support of local and little business only with the greatest difficulty. The big insurance companies of New York City which are confronted every morning with the necessary of investing millions of dollars of the people's money have no interest in business loans in small amounts, because it is too great a nuisance to service small loans. Only big business has had any real access to these funds.

INSURANCE FAVORS BIG BUSINESS

The growth of big business, the expansion of the chain stores, the increasing emphasis on the national aspect of economic affairs, were naturally reflected in the business of insurance, particularly fire insurance. Great national industries with processing plants in a half dozen or more States found it inconvenient to negotiate policies separately in each State, and so a national system was evolved whereby the entire insurance business of such a company, all the way across the country, was handled in a single central office. The result was the establishment of discriminatory rates. Big business could get protection at a lower cost than little business, and gradually developments were such that the householder and the little businessman were carrying an undue proportion of the cost of insurance. There was no uniformity among States nor among communities in the same State, all because the insurance industry had become so national in scope and control, had become so concentrated, that neither individual citizens, individual communities, or the States themselves could always protect the public interest.

There grew up, particularly in the fire-insurance field, a complex system of regional and national private government. It was the National Board of Fire Underwriters that decided for every community whether or not it had taken sufficient steps to protect the community against fire. Regional combinations of underwriters were established, like the Southeastern Underwriters Association, which in fact governed most of the details of the insurance business in groups of States. The whole country was thus subdivided in strict accordance with the pattern upon which many Federal agencies, like the National Forest Service, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, carry on their functions without regard to State lines or State authority.

All of these groups were then, as it were, merged in the Insurance Executives Association, which is a national organization of underwriters in which multiple voting rights are allowed upon the basis of the amount of business done by any particular company. The trustees were authorized to hear charges against members and to punish them under penalties ranging as high as a fine of $10,000 and expulsion from the association. The control of this association was so rigid that during the hearings before the Senate only the president of this organization appeared for the insurance industry. The Interstate Underwriters Board was created to handle national risks with precious little regard for State law. In the aviation field and in the trucking field, as well as in the merchant marine, more and more emphasis came to be placed upon interstate and national matters, while self-determination with respect to insurance law actually began to disappear in the States.

HISTORY OF LITIGATION

This was the situation when the Department of Justice brought criminal proceedings against the Southeastern Underwriters Association in the Federal court at Atlanta, Ga., charging monopolistic combinations in violation of the antitrust laws. The defendants resisted the prosecution on the ground that insurance had always been regarded as being wholly within the domain of State law. Seventy-five years before, the Supreme Court had ruled that insurance is a local business and is not commerce. This was the issue presented in the Southeastern Underwriters case and, when the court at Atlanta ruled against the indictment on the ground that the insurance business was not commerce and therefore not within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws, the Department of Justice appealed the matter to the Supreme Court.

The fire-insurance groups then resorted to Congress in an attempt to secure a law exempting the entire insurance business from the antitrust laws. Such a bill, if enacted, would have had the effect of validating the system of private government which had been built up by national and regional organizations to control and direct the industry. It became the storm center of a legislative struggle, the immediate objective of which, on the part of the insurance companies, was to get a law passed before the Supreme Court had acted on the Department of Justice appeal. The ultimate objective was to place the national and regional organizations of the business beyond the reach of Federal law.

INSURANCE IS COMMERCE

The effort failed. The Supreme Court decision was handed down before the bill was even reported to the Senate from the Judiciary Committee. It held that insurance is commerce and that Federal law applies. By a curious coincidence the Supreme Court handed down two insurance decisions on the same day, one holding, by unanimous vote, that the Federal law known as the National Labor Relations Act applies to insurance, and the other, in the Southeastern Underwriters case, holding by a vote of 4 to 3 that insurance is commerce and, therefore, within the operation of the Federal antitrust laws. How the insurance business could be commerce for the purpose of sustaining a Federal law against unfair labor practices but could nevertheless be held not to be commerce under a law prohibiting unfair commercial practices was a dilemma which the three dissenting justices in the Southeastern Underwriters case tried to resolve to their own satisfaction.

From the moment the Court acted, however, the exemption bill was doomed to failure, and it remained to be decided only what form of legislation Congress would enact to meet the new situation. State insurance authorities, acting through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, immediately sought a compromise, and the final result was the act of March 9, 1945.

This law represents an effort to preserve regulatory and taxing power in the States while clearly recognizing the jurisdiction of Congress over the interstate and international phases of the business. Although the new law grants a moratorium until January 1, 1948, from the antitrust laws, it expressly declares that agreements and acts of boycott, intimidation, or coercion are unlawful notwithstanding the moratorium. It also reasserts the application to the insurance business of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

The new law amounts to an invitation to the States and to the insurance industry to work out in good faith a system of State regulation in the public interest which shall be free from restrictive monopolistic practices although allowing cooperative effort among insurance companies that may be necessary to maintain their solvency, and gives them 3 years in which to do a careful job. It is an invitation accompanied by a warning that if the States do not succeed in protecting the public interest, the Congress reserves the power to act.

NEW LAWS FOR A NEW WORLD

In a very real sense the insurance legislation represents an effort to adjust the law, State and Federal, to meet the new conditions which have arisen in the modern world. It is a recognition of the fact that in this business, as in every other, there is a local interest and a national interest, an individual interest and a corporate interest. It is a recognition of the fact that the just solution of modern economic problems must take into consideration the rights and the needs of all who are affected by the modern economy.

It was inevitable that the technological improvement of our time, which has largely erased geographical boundaries and extended the radius within which business may be transacted, should bring about the development of private understandings and agree-

ments to regulate business. It was inevitable that these understandings and agreements, though working to the advantage of those who initiated them, would also work to the disadvantage of others who were not included. It was natural and inevitable, therefore, that there should be complaint upon the part of those who found themselves barred from entering a particular economic activity because of these private understandings. To put it in another way, it was natural and inevitable that as the field of interstate and foreign commerce expanded, by reason of the improvement of the means of transportation and communication, a system of private government should grow up and that this would be followed by a demand for more realistic legislation in the public interest.

What has happened in the insurance field has happened in a score of other fields. The same problem exists throughout our economy. It is the problem of adjusting the rights and liberties of the individual, of the local community and of the State to the broad sweep of national and international economic organization. The inconsistency of the position in which the managers of big business find themselves when, although establishing their own national and international controls over commerce, they attempt to deny the people the right to regulate national business under the Constitution, was never better illustrated than in this controversy. If the insurance industry accepts the new insurance law in good faith as it was enacted by Congress, it may very well be that insurance will set the pattern upon which the free-enterprise system and local economic independence can be preserved in a world which has apparently been headed toward collectivism and central power.

Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Christine Sadler, published in the Washington Post of yesterday, which describes the work being performed by Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the Army, in supplying the needs not only of the military forces but of prisoners of war and civilians in liberated areas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL GREGORY HAS HUGE TASK SUPPLYING NEEDS OF MILLIONS

(By Christine Sadler)

Civilians who think they have food worries might like to know what Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, the Quartermaster General of the Army, is up against, for he's the man behind those "increasing military needs" they have been reading so much about.

Nobody is happier about a military victory than General Gregory is, but every new batch of prisoners and every new liberated area mean that many more mouths to feed, more clothing and more shelter to be provided.

Already he had food and other supplies going to about 70 different theaters of operation scattered around the world, and now he has all Europe opening up, in addition to new Pacific islands almost every day.

JOB IS GROWING BIGGER

"There were wars when the defeated general handed over his sword, his soldiers all went home, and everybody stopped worrying," he said yesterday, "but that was a long time ago and before 'the wake of battle' became such an important phrase."

General Gregory doubts that Americans fully appreciate how big a job it is to provide for civilians "in the wake of battle" or are well enough acquainted with the fact that this simple phrase has increased the number of persons eligible for military supplies by at least one-third.

"And we think the percentage is going higher," he warned. "When victory in Europe comes our job will be bigger—not less. We are going to need more food, more clothing, and more shoes right along. It would help if everyone realized that, for we cannot afford a psychological let-down on VE-day."

Food needs of the Quartermaster's Office may ease before there is a let-up in its demands for textiles and shoes, he said, adding that, "of course, we are not sure."

SAIPAN AN EXAMPLE

Typical of the way General Gregory's job continues after victory is the situation on Saipan. The Army is now feeding there a population of about 30,000 on Saipan because it is "in the wake of battle."

"The inhabitants of these islands work for us and gradually stores are set up, but we have to see that they get supplies. Sometimes we have a vicious circle because we want work done and that takes men away from the fields in which they could be growing food.

"The Philippines are going to be a considerable supply problem. They always have had to import food, although that is not generally remembered," he said.

Occupants of liberated areas do not receive full military food quotas, General Gregory stressed, and prisoners of war do not get the identical food supplied to American soldiers.

"We watch the calorie content, but we don't feed them steaks," he declared. "Fortunately, Italians and Germans prefer a lot of grains and potatoes in their diet. There's plenty of wheat in this country, of course, but we are having railroad transportation problems."

MOVING EVER NORTHWARD

Considerable clothing has been shipped to Europe for "military relief," General Gregory said, from stocks accumulated by the Foreign Economic Administration and Treasury Procurement. Also, Army clothing and shoes are salvaged and reused for prisoners and wake-of-battle civilians.

"Shoes last just practically no time in the Southwest Pacific," he moaned. "If the coral dust doesn't eat them up, the humidity and heat do—but clothing problems on the southern islands have not been as great as we can anticipate farther north."

The Quartermaster General has a globe in his office and points out latitudes on it to persons who ask why heavy uniforms are needed in the Pacific. "You can see that Tokyo is pretty far north and that we are moving northward all the time," he says.

Vast stores of Army supplies stocked by the Quartermaster's Office in Australia and on nearby islands are now being moved north as the scene of battle shifts.

"It takes a lot of ships for that," he said, "and we are sending more things to the Pacific from this country all the time. Got to have them there when more of the boys arrive."

Views of Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, on San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the April 3d edition of the Baltimore Sun commenting on the views of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with respect to the impending San Francisco Conference. The editorial is so analytical that I think it highly desirable that it should appear in the RECORD and be available to all the Members of the Senate and to the country at large.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING JUSTICE EXPLICIT

Senator VANDENBERG, it is good to note, is keeping his attention focused on the essentials of the impending San Francisco conference.

Peripheral disputes about secondary issues are bringing almost daily alarms. Shall Russia and the United States have one vote or three? Shall the Lublin Government of Poland be invited or will Poland be left out until her new government is formed? What secret understandings were reached at Yalta? Is Russia taking the security organization as seriously as we should like her to do?

These questions are natural, and they are not unimportant. But they are not in the major question. That has to do with the aims and direction of the whole United Nations organization. It is to the aims and direction of the organization that Senator VANDENBERG is making his contribution.

Dumbarton Oaks, for all its excellent work, left out of its published proposals certain considerations which could not be ignored for long. Here is a scheme for an international organization. What principles, what ideals, shall provide its motivation? Peace, yes. But peace is possible only if some effective general rule is set up for the guidance of those who seek peace. Power, yes. But power, unless applied under accepted rules, will almost certainly degenerate into tyranny.

Moreover, whatever the present generation may desire, the world will change. Nations rise and fall. International arrangements wholly suitable today may prove to be a strait jacket tomorrow. To adopt a constitution for the world without making prior provision for peaceful and orderly evolution is to decree that necessary change can be made only by violent means.

Along with many others, Senator VANDENBERG has been giving his major attention to these basic concerns. He has seen that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have given, as they must, full weight to the present concentration of military might in the hands of two or three, or perhaps five or six, great powers. But he has also remembered that those who possess power have an obligation to impose restraints on themselves lest they be tempted to tyrannize over the weak and defenseless.

No one at Dumbarton Oaks, of course, overlooked this truth. The difficulty is to find a way to formulate it and then bring about its acceptance by the present strong powers. The especial difficulty, of course, is to find a formula which will be acceptable to Russia, strongest of the land powers and, unfortunately, the one still harboring the greatest suspicions of her present allies, as so many recent events have shown.

The Vandenberg proposals are specific amendments to the charter which emerged from Dumbarton Oaks. The first amendment he would make discloses the nature of his approach. To the objectives outlined in the charter—maintenance of peace, development of friendly relations, international cooperation in various fields and affording a center where nations may harmonize their actions to achieve these ends—he would add this one:

"To establish justice and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

This seems simple and reasonable enough, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the word "justice" is not now to be found in Dumbarton Oaks. Perhaps it was not an intentional omission. But perhaps, also, it was omitted by design. For the special concept of justice upon which the civil structures of western Europe have been erected is clearly not the same conception of justice upon which other peoples have built their structures. It is not easy to discover what they have in common.

Yet we should not forget that Russia, new as her Government is and revolutionary as it aims to be, still has as its announced aim the protection of the weak against the strong. Dictatorial as it is, the Russian Government still insists that present dictatorship is but a step on the road to ultimate freedom for the individual. Freedom means a limitation on the powers of government. Such a limitation implies the acceptance of the rule of law, with courts to decide wherein justice lies. Let us not jump too quickly to the conclusion that no common denominator can be found between western justice and Russian justice.

To weave the concept of justice into the fabric of the charter of the United Nations is thus the first aim of the Vandenberg amendments. The second follows as a matter of course. It provides a means by which the United Nations association may provide an escape from arrangements already made which clearly promote injustice. The council, it says specifically, may investigate conditions which seem unjust and make recommendations for changing them. This is, in effect, an amendment clause to provide escape from the possible strait jacket of postwar mistakes. It is as necessary to the charter as a whole as the amending clause is to our own Constitution.

These two proposals are the essence of the first clearly defined suggestions for meeting some of the possible shortcomings of Dumbarton Oaks. They are so succinctly stated, they are put forward with such candor and with such persuasiveness, that they cannot be ignored.

Senator VANDENBERG suggests that their adoption or the adoption of amendments of similar import will have great influence in the United States Senate when that body comes to vote on the charter. The suggestion is a reasonable one. Beyond a doubt, most of such opposition as may develop in the Senate to the United Nations association will come from the Republican side. Senator VANDENBERG, as one of the most influential spokesmen for that side, has been high-minded enough to indicate in advance the changes which will do most to lessen that opposition. His is a statesmanlike attitude.

Full Post-war Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with Mr. Beardsley Ruml on the subject of post-war full employment. This interview, by Mr. Charles G. Ross, appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 19, 1945. In it Mr. Ruml stated that the full-employment bill, which is now before the Banking and Currency Committee, is "one of the most encouraging steps taken toward the solution of the full-employment problem."

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN AND JOBS AFTER THE WAR—BEARDSLEY RUML GIVES HIS VIEWS ON HOW TO HAVE REAL POST-WAR PROSPERITY WITH FULL EMPLOYMENT—NO TARIFF RISES, WITH GRADUAL FREER TRADE, IMPROVED FISCAL POLICY, INCLUDING TAX STRUCTURE, FEWER GOVERNMZNTAL CONTROLS THE BETTER

(By Charles G. Ross)

NEW YORK, March 19.—"There are 52 cards in the American pack and four chances of getting a royal flush. There are many more chances of getting a straight flush—and that's generally considered a pretty good hand."

Beardsley Ruml, author of the pay-as-you-go tax plan, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, treasurer of Macy's, member of the research committee of the Committee for Economic Development, chairman of the business committee of the National Planning Association, was talking to the Post-Dispatch correspondent about the prospects for full employment in the United States after the war.

He amplified: We have a full deck of cards. There is no limit to what the American people can do if they play the cards wisely.

Mr. Ruml should know. With the Treasury against him, he had no better than a pair of deuces when he started advocating his pay-as-you-go plan. He finished with a straight flush.

PROBLEMS INTERLOCKED

The writer asked Mr. Ruml to discuss the No. 1 problem of the post-war era.

"You mean," he said, "the No. 2 problem."

"Surely it's the top problem."

"No; the first problem is to establish world peace. But the two great problems are interlocked. It's a truism, but it cannot be said too often, that the best contribution the United States can make to the peace of the world is to get a high level of prosperity at home."

That brought up the subject of foreign trade, and Ruml referred the writer to a memorandum he had helped to prepare for the National Planning Association. In this he had recommended, as a corollary to our fiscal and monetary policy, "a definite, declared policy that there will be no increase in tariffs, followed by a gradual reduction of tariffs and freer trade as higher levels of employment are reached."

"And foreign trade," he added to the interviewer, "means foreign trade. It means buying as well as selling, and over the years in about the same amount.

"International trade will improve the standard of living in the United States by making it possible for us to have things that other peoples can make either of better quality or design, or at lower prices, than we can make them for ourselves, in exchange for our sending them the things we can make better than they can."

ON THE FISCAL POLICY

Ruml lays stress on the imperative necessity for an appropriate fiscal policy if we are to reach the goal of continued high production and high employment.

"Of course," he said, "we can't do the job with fiscal policy alone, but a wrong fiscal policy will make it difficult if not impossible for us to utilize our human resources.

"We have done three very bad things. First, we have raised tax rates against a falling national income; thereby we have drained off purchasing power that might have sustained employment. Second, there has been inadequate planning of expenditures for public works and conservation; we have never had a proper criterion of what should be done in this field. Third, we have set up our social-security program on a deflationary basis by attempting to build reserves in a time of unemployment. It is a fantastic thing that our unemployment insurance funds have tended to create the very unemployment they were designed to relieve.

"There is enormous strength in the American culture—in its intelligence, energy, imagination, competitive spirit, desire to improve the standard of living. And it should be remembered that much of our activity bears no relation to the mere desire to make money. Men work to make a better showing from year to year. They work to gain honors. The spirit which you see expressed in the rivalries between cities, as between St. Louis and Kansas City, is wholesome. The football spirit, not greed animates a lot of what we do.

"I feel that if we can correct our terrible mistakes in fiscal policy and give the people the normal opportunities that Americans will seize if they have the chance we can take a long breath and see what happens. The correction of these errors would be the greatest antidote to regimentation.

"We were told in 1940 that we had to choose between guns and butter in order to equip a two-hemisphere army; today we have a standard of living slightly higher than it was in 1940, and we are putting $85,000,000,000 into war goods. That is called the miracle of production.

"I venture to say there are some more miracles ahead of us in the social and economic field. As a matter of fact, the sheer necessity of creating and maintaining a high level of employment in order to maintain our democratic institutions will force the 'miracles' to come."

What steps should be taken, Ruml was asked, to correct the fiscal errors into which we had fallen? He named three:

"First. We should set our tax-rate structure, regardless of where the burden is distributed, so that the Budget at high employment will be balanced at high employment. This policy will be automatically deficit-creating with underemployment, and surplus-creating with overemployment.

"Second. We should plan and organize our public works and conservation programs to stabilize the construction industry at a high level of activity, between fifteen and eighteen billion dollars annually.

"Third. We must take the deflation out of social security. Broadly speaking, this means that we should finance the old-age security program so that income and expenditure about balance currently; and we should set the rates on unemployment insurance so

that income balances outgo at high employment."

These three measures, he said, would be "automatic stabilizers" of the economy and would be consistent with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY'S pending full-employment bill, which proposes that whenever the prospective "gross national product" falls below the amount needed for full employment measures shall be taken to fill the gap.

ON THE MURRAY BILL

Describing the basic policy and substance of the Murray bill as sound, Ruml said he regarded its introduction as one of the most encouraging steps that had been taken toward the solution of the full employment problem.

"Nobody," he said, "expects the bill to be passed in its present form, but, even if it should be modified in every paragraph, it will have served the important purpose of focusing discussion."

Ruml had praise also for the House Committee on Post-War Planning, under Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, which he said had shown "aggressive and competent leadership," and he felt that some good work had been done on war-contract termination. Public-works planning, he said, had lagged.

"There is no evidence now," he said, "that the executive branch of the Government is operating aggressively in the field of post-war planning. It seems to fear that any such planning now will detract from the war effort. A certain amount of work was being done last fall, but this was dropped when the war took a sudden—and happily short—bad turn.

"I think the suspicion is justified that the executive branch may be deliberately throwing the ball to Congress, so that Congress will see how difficult the job is and how essential it is that appropriate action come also from the executive branch if there is going to be an over-all attack on the post-war prosperity problem. It may be, in other words, that the administration is trying to impress on Congress the need for teamwork."

THE 60,000,000 GOAL

What of the 60,000,000-job goal set by the President and Secretary Wallace?

"The 60,000,000 figure," Ruml replied, "should not be made a football of politics. You will recall that the President spoke of the provision of 'close to 60,000,000 jobs in the post-war period.' If we have two and one-half million men and women in the armed services after the war, these certainly will be in productive jobs. Then, too, you must remember that we must always have more jobs than we have people at work, owing to the fact that there will always be some jobs not yet filled and many jobs will be part-time and seasonal jobs.

"Consequently, I see no inconsistency between the President's statement and the figure centering around 55,000,000 civilian jobs which has been used by the National Planning Association, the Committee for Economic Development, and others. Fifty-five million is as good a figure as I know of.

"Our 40-hour average week I take as an opportune figure. If you go much below that, you are freezing unemployment into the workweek, or else you are creating a situation where people will take more than one job. On the arithmetic of the situation at present price levels, it's simply 55 million people working 40 hours a week and producing $140,000,000,000.

"If you take $100,000,000,000, or one hundred and twenty billion, you have to alter the points of your triangle; you must then accept mass unemployment, a workweek of less than 40 hours, or a lower price level than we have today. Some people would say it is more conservative to take $120,000,000,000 than one hundred and forty billion, but from my point of view the conservative thing is to take one hundred and forty billion.

"A $140,000,000,000 national income means, of course, a higher standard of living than we have ever had in this country. It means a change of between 40 and 50 percent, a historic change of extreme character, one that represents qualitatively a new kind of American life."

ABOUT THE TAX STRUCTURE

How did he think the tax structure should be changed?

For one thing, Ruml replied, the corporation income tax should be abolished and a small franchise tax of 5 percent substituted, this levy representing the value of doing business in the corporate form.

"One main reason for doing away with the corporation income tax," Ruml said, "is that, once it settles down, it tends to raise the cost of goods and services and to keep wages lower than they might otherwise be. You will, of course, get higher earnings per share, but the bulk of the benefits will go in lower prices and higher wages.

"Then, too, the taxation of corporate profits prior to distribution imposes double taxation on dividend income. Millions of small stockholders are the victims of this inequity. The earnings are first taxed in the hands of the corporation at full, identical rates for all stockholders, and then that portion of the earnings distributed as dividends to stockholders is taxed again, but only in the latter case at progressive rates.

"The need is for revision that would eliminate the corporation tax as a cost of production and distribution, that would tax the shareholder only once on the earnings attributable to him, and that would encourage rather than inhibit the distribution of earnings as dividends."

This and other recommendations as to taxes are set out in Ruml's study, in collaboration with H. C. Sonne, made for the National Planning Association. No. 2 is that the principal source of Federal revenue should be the progressive individual income tax. He believes that, at high levels of production and employment, we can cut out the corporation income tax and most of the excise taxes, and avoid a general sales tax, and still reduce the individual income tax by 30 percent over-all. This calculation is predicated on an eighteen-million-dollar post-war Federal budget.

Further recommendations call for avoidance of the general sales tax because it is deflationary and therefore harmful in periods of low consumer spending; for retention of the excise taxes on tobacco, liquors, and perhaps on gasoline to yield some three billion dollars, and for revision of the social security program. "The old-age insurance program should be neither inflationary nor deflationary. * * * The unemployment insurance program should be compensatory, building reserves in periods of excess employment, building purchasing power in periods of unemployment."

The tax reduction that Ruml advocates cannot, he emphasizes, be put into effect abruptly after the war. This is because reconversion and the readjustment of population will not then be sufficiently complete for anybody to say with assurance that we have at that time a potential income of one hundred and forty billion dollars.

"You have to wait," he said, "until reconversion has been substantially completed. But I see no reason why the excess-profits tax cannot be eliminated at once after the end of both wars and why at that time the normal tax on corporations cannot be reduced to 16 percent and the surtax to 8 percent. The next step would be to take off the 8 percent and the next after that to take off the 16 percent or treat it (as in Great Britain) as a credit to the individual on his normal tax."

GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS

What of governmental controls over the national economy?

"Our American competitive way will give us the best results," Ruml replied. "The less interference by the Central Government the better. But some controls there must be—controls to prevent objectionable monopolies, to give reasonable equality of opportunity to the different parts of the population, probably to make technical knowledge and capital more readily available to small business. But all these things can be done without objectionable Government interference and supervision."

Jewish Participation With Allied Fighting Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HART

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting article written by Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut, concerning the participation by Palestine Jews in fighting with the Allied forces.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINIANS FIGHT TO SETTLE BLOODY SCORES WITH "KRAUTS," MRS. LUCE FINDS ON BRITISH FRONT

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE)

WITH BRITISH EIGHTH ARMY, Italy, April 2.—On the British front I visited the Palestine brigade commanded by Brig. Ernest F. Benjamin. The brigade is on a small sector of the Italian ruined country. Its members, who fight for the first time in this war under their own flag, are all Palestinians, though many of them were once refugees from the hinterlands. Their senior officers are all British professional soldiers of Jewish blood.

The formation of the brigade was announced last September 30. On November 1 it sailed for Italy. It had been in the line only a matter of days when I went to see it. Many British officers with whom I talked before and after that visit said there was no more grim and determined unit on the whole Italian front.

After all, many of them have some very bloody personal scores to settle with the Krauts, I certainly have never seen men more eager to do so, or so fiercely glad that when their hour to strike comes they will be fighting as every freeman has a right to fight, armed like the enemy and fighting under his own flag for a homeland where his wife and children are.

I talked to a young Jewish "noncom," Sgt. Channan Levi, of Tel Aviv. He was 6 feet tall, had blue eyes and blond hair and had been born in Berlin. His English was very poor. I tried a few words in German, and he said very quietly,

"I talk Hebrew or English now. I forgot my German when I was driven from my home in 1939. I do not wish to speak it again except to the German prisoners we take. I

will never go back to Germany except with this army. When we have won I shall return to Palestine and to my farm.

"The Jews in Palestine are good farmers. We shall prove here that we are good fighters."

A few of the men I talked to at brigade headquarters were unhappy about only one thing—that political pressure had so long prevented the formation of overseas Palestine forces. They wish that their Jewish military history had not begun so late in this war. They felt that if political action had been taken long ago by Great Britain and the United States, indeed at the beginning of the war, Palestine could easily have put, not a brigade, but divisions into the battle against Germany. They know, as well as informed Jewish opinion on the American front knows, what occasioned this long delay in calling Jewry to arms.

They point with considerable pride to the part that Jewish units have played in British forces all through the bad days of the north African campaign. There has been no conscription in Palestine. Nevertheless, since 1939 Palestinians and refugee Jews coming into Palestine volunteered in many numbers to join the British forces.

For the Yishuv is not only a worker, a trader, a farmer under his own flag in his own home, but he is and must be a fighter when his country calls and his people are threatened, as they have been so mercilessly by Hitler for years.

I was told that upward of 50,000 Palestine Jews, men and women, so far have voluntarily enlisted for armed service in the British Army, Navy, Air Force, and women's auxiliary services.

If an American volunteer army had been raised in proportion to the population of Palestine, the United States of America would have a volunteer army of about 12,000,000. Since the war began, Palestine units with the British Eighth Army have seen service in France, Libya, Egypt, Syria, and Iraq.

In Palestine brigade headquarters, as in all headquarters everywhere in this war, you can hear many stories of heroism in battle. Here they tell of Jewish commando units selected by British officers in the Mediterranean battles for particularly dangerous jobs because the volunteers were all men whose families had suffered horribly at the hands of Adolf's hordes. And there are yarns of fair-haired, blue-eyed Jewish boys who look more like Aryans than you or I do, picked for certain missions behind the enemy lines, who either returned successfully or died fighting because they knew what it meant for an armed Jew to fall into the hands of the Nazis.

NOT TOLD SUCCESSFULLY

The story of the Jewish part in the war effort in the Near East is one which they feel has never been successfully told. They hope the record of this brigade in battle will draw some attention to that story.

What are these Jews fighting for. Revenge? Yes; but also, like Poles, for freedom of their homeland and the liberation of an ancient people—the right to work in peace in shop or field. That's what Sgt. Channan Levi, of Tel Aviv—once Hans Levi, of Berlin—is fighting for anyway.

I did not talk to Sergeant Levi about how he thinks the other Hans Levis of the world would like Madagascar or Eritrea, or British Guiana, or San Domingo for a homeland if the white-paper policy should remain in force in Palestine. I did not ask him for two reasons:

1. His primary task is to kill Nazis, and he is in no mood to be distracted. 2. I think I know how he might answer, anyway.

"I have been part of the great miracle of the rebirth of Palestine. I have been among those who have made the desert bear fruit, and the swamp yield a rich harvest, who have blasted rocks and crushed them to make roads to ancient, forgotten soil of the frontier, who have worked to make the soil of the valley of Jordan free of the Dead Sea salt so it would bloom, who have built universities and schools and there worshipped the God of the Jews who gave us this task to do in the land that He promised us; our home. Talk of no other young Hans Levis of Europe now."

The Housing Situation in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced, and there is now under consideration before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, a housing measure known as S. 610.

In the April 1, 1945, issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Merlo J. Pusey under the heading "N. I. C. B. digest clarifies public-private housing issues for Washington." I commend the entire article, and I ask unanimous consent that a few of the more important paragraphs of the article be reprinted in the RECORD. In doing so I particularly invite attention to Mr. Pusey's comment relative to S. 610, in which he says:

Substance of this report by the National Industrial Conference Board seems to point to the desirability of enacting the bill suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission which makes ample allowance for both private and public housing.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

N. I. C. B. DIGEST CLARIFIES PUBLIC-PRIVATE HOUSING ISSUES FOR WASHINGTON

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Washington's struggle against slums long ago settled down to a question of ways and means. Almost every one now accepts the thesis that wretched housing which breeds disease, crime, and juvenile delinquency must go. The sharp controversy of recent months has been concerned almost solely with questions of how we should attack the problem. Shall a large share of the transformation be assigned to National Capital Housing Authority or shall the job of rebuilding slum areas be entrusted entirely to private enterprise?

Private builders are vigorously bidding for this work for the first time. N. C. H. A., naturally, is eager to continue its own activities. Consequently, the city has witnessed a sharp clash of interests.

Last year Senator BURTON'S subcommittee made a conscientious effort to uncover the facts. It succeeded in getting to the bottom of the controversy, but not in surmounting it. Buried under a seemingly endless flow of contradictory testimony, and volumes of censure and praise for N. C. H. A. as well as plans offered by the Home Builders Association, the busy Senators became more and more bewildered.

Further progress seemed to depend upon unscrambling this testimony and giving it proper weight. The Burton subcommittee had neither time nor proper facilities. So the National Industrial Conference Board was employed, with the aid of Eugene Meyer, publisher of the Post, to examine the voluminous testimony and prepare a digest that would aid the public, as well as the committee, in understanding the issue.

SOME DISAPPOINTMENT DUE TO CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

That digest is now at hand. It will enable any citizen willing to spend a few hours on this vital subject to inform himself as to arguments of N. C. H. A. and the home builders, relative costs of private and public construction, rents charged, and different types of subsidies granted and requested. N. I. C. B. has done a good piece of work in summarizing the pros and cons.

It should be stated at once, however, that the N. I. C. B. has not solved the problem. That was not its purpose. The Board was asked only to find the facts. Even in this limited field it has left many questions unanswered. The chief value of its study is that it reduces the claims, allegations, and charts of contending groups to more manageable form.

The report throws a great deal of light on reasons for N. C. H. A.'s limited accomplishments. That is important, for one of the chief accusations against N. C. H. A. is that it has failed to clear the slums after more than 9 years of effort. Under title I of its act, N. C. H. A. provided only 112 housing units in 5 small projects, although a number of cleared alleys were developed for commercial purposes and still others were sold after being cleared. The reason for this meager accomplishment is not obscure. Congress provided N. C. H. A. with only $865,000 for this purpose. In 1938 it authorized slum reclamation loans to N. C. H. A. of $1,000,000 a year for 5 years.

N. C. H. A. repeatedly sought funds under this authorization, but no appropriation was made. Three years ago, moreover, N. C. H. A. was deprived of even the receipts from the initial investment in slum clearance. Congress forced it to turn its revenues of more than $54,000 into the Treasury and allowed it a wholly inadequate $12,000 to manage its title I properties.

This experiment in slum clearance has been a disappointment largely, if not solely, because Congress strangled it. With such meager funds N. C. H. A. could do no more than demonstrate on a small scale what would be possible with sufficient working capital.

This strangling of the slum-clearance program is particularly tragic because N. C. H. A. was attempting to carry out this work on a self-liquidating basis. Representatives of H. B. A. assert that the title I projects are far from being self-liquidating. N. C. H. A. refutes their charges and the National Industrial Conference Board report gives us no conclusive answer as to who is right. The one definite fact that stands out is that a hopeful approach to transformation of the slums has been thwarted by lack of funds and crippling legislation.

RELATIVE COSTS STUDY SEEMS TO LEAD NOWHERE

N. C. H. A.'s accomplishments under title II have been much more substantial. It has built 2,432 dwelling units in eight projects, eliminating slums in 13 squares. In this program, however chief emphasis was upon construction of low-rental housing with Federal subsidies rather than elimination of slums. Washington's worst slums could not be touched because U. S. H. A. would not permit loans to be made for housing on property costing more than $1.50 per square foot.

N. C. H. A. is now using less than half the subsidy available on these projects, thanks to wartime wages for low-income families and a disposition on the part of the authority to keep subsidies at a minimum consistent with adequate housing. Even so Congress is

not likely to be as lavish with subsidies for public housing in the future as in the late thirties. Certainly if we are going to have large-scale redevolpment of slums, projects will have to be more nearly self-liquidating than contemplated by the old U. S. H. A. when it lent funds for title II projects in Washington and elsewhere.

The N. C. H. A. record, as revealed in this report, indicates a major attack upon slums could be made through that agency or through N. C. H. A. and private enterprise working in their respective fields at the same time. But neither N. C. H. A. nor any other organization could have made an impressive showing on the pittance granted under title I.

Much space is given in this survey, as in the Burton hearings, to the relative cost of public and private housing. But the data assembled seems to lead nowhere. Comparison of certain projects indicates public housing costs more than private. Perhaps the higher cost of public housing can be accepted as a generality. But the N. I. C. B. report points out there is often much variation in the costs of closely similar projects. And projects developed by N. C. H. A. and various private builders are sharply dissimilar.

To summarize, the N. I. C. B. survey throws emphasis on the possibilities of private enterprise operating in slum clearance. That seems wholly appropriate, for the need for a broader approach than can be provided through public housing is evident. But it would be a gross distortion of evidence to say that it warrants abolition of N. C. H. A. and abandonment of all effort toward public housing.

The social approach to housing cannot be abandoned without serious community loss. Public housing has already done much to lift housing standards. Its influence will be needed, especially in the post-war period, if extensive slum clearance is to be undertaken. Even if it were only a matter of demonstrating which method of reclaiming slum areas is the least expensive and most satisfactory in the end, the argument for continuation of public housing would be strong.

Substance of this report, therefore, seems to me to point to the desirability of enacting the bill suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commisison which makes ample allowance for both private and public housing in areas where families are living in hovels fit only for animals.

The Yalta Voting Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered in New York City, last week, on the question "Is the Yalta Voting Agreement a Just One?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The thought just struck me that "the gentlemen talk more now of the peace" than of winning the war. For those of us not now actually fighting and who in some measure have the responsibility of helping to shape opinion for this tremendous task, this is good. It is good because it has suddenly crystallized in our mental processes toward this task—the definite feeling something should be done about this before the war is actually over. G. I. Joe needs the assurance that he is fighting for something more than just the defeat of the enemy. If that blueprint, for his brave new world, is something he can see and feel, the end will come much quicker. We can well be heartened tonight with the news that our great Allied armies are sweeping across Germany, although this is still only the fourth inning of this bloody game. Yet, it is proper that we talk of peace.

But we approach those discussions too often with rose-colored glasses. That is, and could be, disastrous to the ultimate goal. It can be particularly so, when this time—the actors—the authoritative cast making this blueprint is playing to a tough audience. An audience that paid for its admission in blood and an audience that cannot tolerate any more flops. I hope therefore we can be realistic, and talk less of the abolition of wars, and more of an objective that can be maintained, namely, reducing the possibilities of war to the absolute minimum consistent with human nature and the conflicting interests we know will exist. The fighting men will like that better as they proceed to the victory.

The road to that peace goal will be a long one. It is good that we are starting the journey now—that we are on the way. At times it will be difficult. It is, of course, inevitable that when many governments and peoples attempt to agree on a single plan the result should be in the terms of the highest common denominator rather than the plan of any one nation. If we can approach the details in that spirit, we will finally reach the goal. Thus the importance of details in the early stages should not cause too much controversy—they should not be placed higher on the ladder of consideration than they deserve at the time

Tonight we discuss, it is true, an important detail, namely, the voting arrangement of the assemblies and councils we hope to set up. But we must discuss it on the common ground that all of us, with the exception of the actual leadership of our enemies, have the greater will to work it out than the will to deadlock.

That we are and have made progress is indicated by what has happened in regard to the voting procedure in the so-called proposed Security Council. At Dumbarton Oaks nearly everything was agreed upon. We batted 900. The President thinks that is a good average. So do I. On one point an agreement was not reached. Russia held out on her right to forfeit her vote when she was up before "the mast" of the Council. Well, everybody went home and slept on it. In the meantime the critics pointed to this as the prime example of why nations could not get together. Then came the history-making conference at Yalta. There, frankly, a compromise was made. Roosevelt proposed the plan. A concession to Russia, sure—we will make many, they will make many—but we are again more of the will to work it out than to give it up. Crimea produced the compromise. As I understand it, we moved forward, and it was agreed that any nation before "the mast" of the Council, including the five nations who will have the responsibility to maintain this peace we talk about and who can do it—anyone can vote on its own case. It smacks a little of judge and jury procedure, but I defend it on the ground that we have made progress. It is give and take. That's peace, and only that is peace. I defend the voting agreement on the further ground that if Yalta can change opinions made at Dumbarton Oaks, San Francisco can further perfect—and the future planned councils can proceed further up the difficult trail of our hopes for peace.

H. R. 1752, Manpower for War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House, this week, has acted favorably upon very important legislation to insure that the necessary manpower will be available for the production needed to win two wars. Almost simultaneously, the National Labor Relations Board has announced a policy which can easily nullify the action Congress has taken on manpower legislation. This week, in the case of the Packard Motor Co., the National Labor Relations Board has ruled that foremen will receive the protection of the Government in organizing and bargaining collectively. That, in my judgment, was never the intention of the Congress.

Two years ago a similar attempt was made to secure bargaining rights. At that time, I sponsored legislation in the House to prohibit this innovation—an innovation which only could seriously impair and impede war production. When that legislation was pending the National Labor Relations Board decided that the purposes of the Wagner Act would be jeopardized by compelling employers to bargain collectively with their own representatives, their supervisory personnel. That was the decision in the Maryland Drydock case. Now, 2 years later, this same board has reversed by a two to one vote. Calling attention to this reversal Mr. Gerard D. Reilly, a dissenting board member, has said that such a "fundamental change in our established rules cannot but have an unsettling effect upon essential war production."

I insert Mr. Reilly's dissenting opinion:

GERARD D. REILLY, DISSENTING

In my opinion, the decision we are making today does irreparable damage to the delicate balance between the conflicting interests of management and worker which the National Labor Relations Act sought to bring about in American industry. From the very beginning of the administration of this act the Board has recognized that in the mass production industries the interests of foremen lay predominantly with management groups. Consequently in its decisions dealing with unfair labor practices the Board deemed the actions of a foreman the actions of his employer.

Less than 2 years ago a majority of the Board, recognizing that this historic principle was rapidly being fatally compromised by the effects of its then recent Union Collieries decision, decided in the Maryland Drydock case that employers were not required to bargain collectively with labor organizations composed in whole or in part of supervisors. The doctrine of this case has become one of the guiding principles in industrial relations policy in our national wartime economy. Although challenged on the date of its issuance in a dissenting opinion by Chairman Millis as "administrative legislation," there has been no effort made by any Member in Congress to overrule it by legislative amendment. It has been widely accepted as a rule

of decision by State courts, State boards, and Federal arbitrators dealing with cognate problems. Yet for all practical purposes, and at a time when any fundamental change in well established rules cannot but have an unsettling effect upon essential war production, this decision is now being overruled.

While I would be the first to agree with my colleagues that we should not shut our eyes to recent developments and believe emphatically that, to the extent that we have discretion under the statute, any decision of this Board should be overruled if its impact has a disastrous effect upon sound industrial relations, I find wholly unconvincing the arguments now advanced for the view that the Maryland Drydock rule has proved unworkable in practice. In fact, it seems to me that any complete appraisal of the industrial history of the last 2 years demonstrates its essential correctness. As the text of the majority opinion in that case clearly shows, the Board at that time was fully aware that the economic position of the foremen would be improved if the act were extended to facilitate collective bargaining by them. It was concluded, however, that the benefits which might thus accrue to supervisory employees were outweighed by the dangers inherent in the commingling of management and employee functions, and in the possible restrictive effect upon the freedom of rank and file employees.

The dissenting opinion in that case, however, contending that these dangers were not supported by evidence (although, of course, the majority observations were based upon the same premise implicit in the treatment by the entire Board of foremen in unfair labor practice cases) and, relying upon ex parte testimony given by a spokesman for the foremen's organizations in hearings before this Board and congressional committees, argues that the grievances of foremen were so real and numerous that their right to bargain collectively under the protection of the act should not be denied if there was "proper provision for organizational autonomy."

In controversies of this sort, it has been aptly said that "a page of history is worth a volume of logic." Fortunately, on both points the inexorable facts now leave no room for speculation. The experience of the last 2 years has made it clear (1) that the standard foreman grievances, so repeatedly cited in argument before this Board, have by reason of an exhaustive investigation of a panel of the War Labor Board turned out to be largely fanciful; (2) but to the extent to which the organization of foremen has expanded, the danger of collaboration with rank and file unions to the detriment of individual freedom of choice and established management techniques has proved all too real.

In enacting the National Labor Relations Act, Congress in the preamble of the statute stated as one of its reasons an "inequality of bargaining power between employees and * * * employers * * * which tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners in industry." Since one of the crucial questions in this controversy is the intent of Congress, it would seem extremely far-fetched to believe that the Congress had in mind the kind of employees involved in the case before us. While there are undoubtedly some industries in which foremen are underpaid and neglected, the financial plight of the foremen in the Packard Motor Co. can hardly be advanced as the reason for giving such supervisors legal encouragement to organize. As the majority opinion reveals, the employees in the bargaining unit which this decision finds appropriate receive salaries ranging from $5,000 to $6,000, including overtime compensation. The findings of the War Labor Board panel, to which reference has already been made, fill out this picture. The foremen in the industries in which the Foremen's Association of America is active do not fall into the category of that "one-third of the Nation—ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed," for whose relief the social legislation of the New Deal was enacted. Instead, these men, according to the panel, fall into the upper third of the Nation's income bracket. The panel also found that in the very company in the instant case, as well as in the other companies where strikes have been conducted by the Foremen's Association of America, the record did not support the conclusion that these corporations allowed the foremen to be bypassed in handling grievances, or failed to back them up when they attempted to impose discipline. Moreover, with respect to promotions, demotions, and discharges, it was found that there were no serious grievances at Packard.

Recent developments have made it equally clear that in the strongly organized industries, foremen's associations possess no real autonomy so far as effectuating their bargaining objectives unless they ally themselves in their policies and tactics with representatives of the employees whom they are hired to supervise. When this happens, of course, the proper line of demarcation between supervisor and supervised becomes hopelessly confused. It will be recalled that when the Union Collieries case was heard, the organization of mine officials whose petition for an election was entertained was an independent union. Shortly thereafter, it was given a charter by the United Mine Workers. Failing to achieve recognition by the operators, this new affiliate called a number of strikes last fall in various coal mines. Pursuant to section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act, this Board conducted strike referenda in these mines. Although in several instances a majority of the foremen voted against striking, in every case reported to us the strike call brought about a complete stoppage as the miners refused to cross the picket lines of this supposedly autonomous union. In other words, in order to make these strikes effective, the foremen's group found it necessary to achieve the same degree of collaboration with the production workers that exists among constituent unions of the building-trades department of the A. F. of L., on a construction project.

It is common knowledge that under normal industrial conditions, strikes of factory foremen have little chance of succeeding, for the places of the strikers can readily be filled by promotion from the ranks from which the foremen themselves were originally selected. The record of this case reveals that in order to prevent its strikes from being broken, the Foreman's Association of America, the petitioner in the instant case, though nominally independent, has also been driven to resort to treaties of mutual aid and assistance with rank and file unions. In response to a question from the bench, counsel for the petitioner admitted in oral argument that "when the foremen struck there was a direct and express agreement between us and the responsible C. I. O. leaders that members of the C. I. O. Maintenance and Production Workers Union would not be permitted to take the place of foremen." And in answering a question as to whether there was any agreement with the C. I. O. against crossing picket lines of the foremen, he stated that there had been in Republic Steel and that this matter was "adjusted in each plant in each instance." Can anyone doubt that if such an agreement or adjustment was being negotiated on the eve of a foremen's strike, that supervisors would be inclined to think twice before overruling any union steward on grievances, no matter how unfounded, or disciplining, for infractions of the plant rules, employees influential in the rank and file union whose consent was necessary to the strike agreement? Is it theoretical to assume that the average worker, whose susceptibility to his foreman's influence we have so often noted in unfair labor practice cases, would hesitate to advocate adoption by his union of policies evincing lack of sympathy with the objectives of the organization to which his foreman belongs? Under these circumstances, "proper provision for organizational autonomy" is as unrealistic as the former notion—now discredited by the majority opinion—that the mere placing of different levels of supervisors in separate bargaining units somehow achieved the effect of segregating conflicting interests into watertight compartments. It is difficult to find any logical distinction between supervisors' unions which have such alliances with the rank and file groups, and the labor organizations which we have hitherto proscribed because of the presence of supervisors in their councils.

I turn now to the arguments advanced by the majority for the theory that the Maryland Drydock rule has been found wanting in the light of recent developments. Briefly summarized, these arguments seem to boil down to this:

1. Foremen in mass-production industries have lost much of the authority and policy-making functions they possessed in the 1900's and have viewed with some envy and resentment the superior collective bargaining strength of the organized workers they supervise.

2. Consequently, the membership of the Foreman's Association has greatly increased, and, being denied access to the certification procedures of the Wagner Act, it has conducted strikes for recognition which have interrupted war production in several key plants. Therefore, it is urged that, since one of the purposes of the Wagner Act is to promote industrial peace, our rules of decision should be changed so as to compel employers to recognize the Foreman's Association as collective-bargaining agent whenever it represents the majority of any supervisory group.

Other than the fact that there have been strikes I do not find any recent developments to justify this conclusion. There is nothing startling in the finding that foremen in the mass-production industries differ from foremen in the small shops of the 1900's. This was a development which occurred long before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, and the expansion of heavy industry in recent years has simply accentuated the trend. We have adverted to it in prior cases. Morever, it must be remembered that it is in these very mass-production industries that company unionism developed in the 1920's and 1930's, and it is this very class of foremen, whom the Board now depicts as shorn of their management prerogatives, that we have always regarded as employer representatives when we find them engaged in any union activity which runs counter to the organizational efforts of a competing union.

As for the strikes—hardly an unforeseen phenomenon in the light of the prediction contained in the dissenting opinion in the Maryland Drydock case—I readily concede the importance of uninterrupted war production and concede that the particular strikes which occurred in the Detroit plants last spring would probably not have occurred if employers had been compelled to recognize the Foreman's Association. Unfortunately, however, while a certification may take one issue out of the arena, it may merely be substituting the possibility of others. Our own files show that in most of the strikes which have occurred in wartime the organizations involved were unions to which the orderly procedures of this act were available. As we recently noted in our annual report, the bulk of the strike notices seem to arise from dissatisfaction with the decisions of some Government agencies. It is unfortunately no novelty to have disgruntled unions strike and interfere with production because this Board had refused

to recognize units which they proposed as appropriate. Such defiance, however, can scarcely be deemed a justification for retreating from well-established legal principles. If strikes of this sort are sufficiently numerous to bring about substantial impairment of the flow of materials to the theaters of war, a wiser remedy would be legislation conferring upon this Board the same power to invoke judicial process against recalcitrant labor organizations which it now possesses with regard to disobedient employers. And since the foremen's strikes described by the majority were already known to the Board last fall, such recommendation might properly have been included in our last annual report to Congress. The adoption of the alternative course proposed by the majority smacks of a peace-at-any-price policy.

In any event, it would seem that any possible immediate gain in the way of eliminating some of the causes of strife is more than outweighed by the general long range impact of this decision upon industrial relations. A most disturbing feature of the majority opinion is the plain implication that all the bars are down which have hitherto been invoked to confine management and labor within their proper spheres of influence. It is true that the text does give some recognition to the dangers of divided allegiance if the foreman's organization is affiliated with the same union which represents the rank and file, since stress is laid upon the fact that the petitioning labor organization admits only supervisors to membership and is not affiliated with any other group. It also goes on to suggest that the certification could be revoked if any material change in the petitioner's present status should develop. This is rather a curious doctrine coming from this quarter. The authors of the present opinion also comprise the Board majority which has consistently adhered to the proposition enunciated in the plant-protection cases that once the Board had fixed the boundaries of an appropriate bargaining unit, it was powerless under the statute to reject as unqualified any representative selected by the majority. It, therefore, appears that the Board is now claiming a power over foremen's units which it disclaimed in the plant guard situation. If it lies within our discretion to overcome the undesirable aspects of a divided allegiance in the foremen's cases by insisting that supervisors must have a different bargaining agent from the workers they supervise, it would seem incumbent upon us to exercise the same discretion with respect to monitorial employees, where the factor of divided allegiance is present, although in a lesser degree.

It should be noted, however, that the bargaining unit which this decision defines includes persons in different levels of supervision, viz, general foremen, foremen, assistant foremen, and special assignment men, although the higher officials have the power to make recommendations concerning rates of pay, transfer, rehire, lay-off, discharge, and discipline of the supervisors in the next lower bracket, a factor which certainly infringes upon freedom of choice under all the accepted criteria in the company domination cases. A large portion of the opinion is devoted to minimizing the resultant danger of disloyalty by pointing out that the company may always resort to its normal disciplinary powers against disloyal or inefficient supervisors. Such an argument, of course, ignores the administrative difficulties of supervising the supervisor. It is particularly strange to find such a theory advanced in a tribunal created within the framework of Anglo-American jurisprudence which from earliest times has laid down the principle that a fiduciary may not serve conflicting interests, and that the mere possibility of temptation renders voidable any transactions made in a dual capacity, irrespective of their honesty.

Even more significant is the apparent indifference of the Board to the close relationship of the petitioner with unions of production workers affiliated with the C. I. O. which the record revealed. Although the alleged independence of the Foreman's Association, in view of the holding in the Soss case, was one of the pertinent issues in this proceeding, the majority of the Board in advance of the hearing refused to instruct its trial examiner to obtain evidence on this point. Such facts as do bear on the question therefore were either introduced by the company or elicited from petitioner's counsel at the argument before the full Board. Included in this former category were the resolutions of support on the part of the Michigan C. I. O. Council, the refusal of the organized steel workers at Republic to cross the foremen's picket line, and the interference of production workers at Briggs with the plant officials who tried to maintain continuous operation during the strike. A tendency to view these facts as immaterial is also illustrated by the majority's holding certain related evidence to be incompetent, although in other respects the majority opinion makes the widest use of secondary material and even personal experience. It would, therefore, seem that despite the footnote expressing the view of one member that the applicability of the present decision to affiliated organizations is still an open one, there is little doubt as to the form such a decision will take when a case presenting this issue arises.

In making these observations, I am fully aware that there is a school of thought which will regard them as unduly pessimistic, in view of the fact that foremen for many years have been organized in the printing, maritime, railroad, and building construction industries. This state of affairs has frequently been cited as disproving the theory that industrial efficiency is impaired or union democracy frustrated by the presence of foremen and workers in the same bargaining organization. These examples have little relevance to the controversy. For one thing, only two of these industries—the printing and maritime trades—even fall within the scope of the National Labor Relations Act, and the pattern of collective bargaining established in them grew up quite independently of this statute and in some respects is quite contrary to its basic concepts. Because of the traditions of the sea, implemented by the admiralty laws, there is little danger of the officers and crew merging their respective labor organizations. In the newspaper field, where the foreman is traditionally a member of the printers' union, the composing room staff operates almost as independently of the publisher as would be the case if the work was done by a job printing establishment. Then again, in none of the enumerated industries is this country particularly unique, and the technological developments in these fields in recent years have been relatively minor. An entirely different spectacle is presented by the mass production industries, where the constant development of technological science, with the resultant subdivision of labor operations, requires constant attention in the coordination of production with supervisory and engineering techniques. It is these industries which have made this country the foremost industrial nation of the world and contributed so heavily to war production, and it is in these industries that the basic principles of the National Labor Relations Act have been most frequently applied. It therefore seems to me that we may well be forcing these industries and their employees into a Procrustean bed when we project upon them practices which have grown up in entirely unrelated fields.

Mr. Speaker, having taken steps to assure adequate manpower, it is now the solemn duty of this House to take the necessary steps to counteract the devastating effect of this new bureaucratic rule. We should do so now, and to do so would be in complete harmony with the past practice of all the great labor groups and their employers over a long period of years. It has been without question written and carried in collective-bargaining agreements that managerial and supervisory personnel should not be and were not included as employees entitled to collective-bargaining rights. The Wagner Labor Relations Act was surely passed for the benefit of both the employer and the employee, and, having been so intended by the Congress and thus understood and construed by the parties interested, it seems strange that the National Labor Relations Board did not continue to accept the legislative intent and, furthermore, the construction placed upon the act by the parties interested. It is almost universally recognized by courts, business, and litigants that the acts and things done by interested parties to a contract themselves thereby place a construction upon the law by the parties interested, and the courts hold in harmony with this construction that the acts of the parties interested control, and this is sound principle. If the National Labor Relations Board cannot avoid vacillation and doubts as to the meaning of the law, or if there is really doubt as to the legislative intent, then it is the plain duty of the Congress to make clear that intent, for otherwise constant change of front by the Board can only lead to confusion in industry and resulting lack of efficient production. It actually may lead to utter chaos, confusion, and paralysis of production and seriously retard our war effort. Is it possible that we, as authors of the legislation and responsible for its enactment, will permit such confusion of thought to continue without meeting our own responsibility by amending the law so as to remove all reason for doubt? The hour has come, gentlemen, when we must face our own responsibility to clarify our own act, if clarification is needed. When and how shall we meet this grave question? As for me, I am ready to meet my own responsibility and do my duty.

The Aircraft Carrier "Enterprise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the opportunity at one time in the early part of the war to serve in the armed forces. I was fortunate to be put aboard a great ship of the United States Navy, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, a ship which has not only built a legend, but has done a great deal of fighting for this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able article written at Pearl Harbor regarding this "grand old fighting lady."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BIG E" BUILDS LEGEND HER MEN NEVER FORGET

(By Al Dopking)

PEARL HARBOR.—The *Big E* turned her proud, tough old nose into the wind at full throttle—she had come through the gray mist on time again, this time for the battle for Leyte Gulf. The Japanese Fleet had split and was trying to slip in from three directions against Douglas MacArthur's sitting convoy and the 4-day-old invasion of the Philippines depended on the outcome.

To the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, sole survivor of her class and holder of a Presidential unit citation, it was an old story. She has a habit of casting a shadow across the "Rising Sun." Away back in '41, returning from Wake Island, where she had delivered some fighter planes, she ran smack into the Japanese sneak attack and hers were the only carrier-based aircraft in action that December 7. Since then the 19,500-tonner's exploits have become a legend.

ESCORTS THE "HORNET"

On a map, the train of her persistent hunts for the enemy looks like the scribblings in a child's picture book and takes in most of the major Pacific engagements.

She sallied forth deep into the Marshalls and Gilberts soon after Pearl Harbor for the first American blows against enemy territory.

She escorted the *Hornet* to within 800 miles of Tokyo for Jimmy Doolittle's daring air raid.

Often she hunted alone, for there was a time when Uncle Sam could muster no other carrier for the battle. When the sleek new carriers arrived, she refused to be benched.

She was in on the invasion of the Gilberts and Marshalls; at Truk, Palau, Yap, Woleai, and Ulithi in the Carolines; Jaluit in the Marshalls; Emirau in the South Pacific; Hollandia in New Guinea; Saipan, Guam, the Bonins, the Ryukyus, Formosa, and the Philippines.

In the Gilberts she pioneered with night combat fighters, losing one of her most famous flyers, Lt. Comdr. E. H. (Butch) O'Hare.

OUT FOR BLOOD

In the battle of the Philippine Sea in June 1944, 1 of her planes was first to sight the enemy fleet and later she damaged 2 enemy carriers there and got 32 planes.

At Santa Cruz she and the *Hornet* destroyed 135 enemy planes; damaged 2 carriers, 2 battleships, and 3 cruisers before the *Hornet* was mortally hit.

At Truk her airmen sank 11 ships, damaged 21 others, and destroyed more than 75 planes; at Palau sank 3 ships and destroyed 11 planes.

Now in the battle for Leyte Gulf she was turning her battlewise snout into the breeze once again for blood. Her fliers swarmed off against a huge battleship, Japan's biggest and newest; another battlewagon of the older *Kongo* class, a *Mogami* cruiser, and seven or so destroyers.

With the *Big E* brood still 15 miles away, the Japanese were even firing their main batteries.

The giant battleship, the *Musashi*, was hit with 11 bombs and 8 torpedoes and sank. A new type destroyer was set ablaze; the *Mogami* and another destroyer were left smoking.

CHASES FRANTIC ENEMY

Again next day the ack-ack was terrific. A large carrier was left afire, dead in the water; a battleship was hit; a light cruiser and a destroyer were plastered with rockets. Both the carrier and the cruiser later sank and pilots said the destroyer exploded amidship.

By then, in the words of the air group commander, the Japanese Fleet "was spread over an area of many miles, was fleeing, a disorganized mob."

Before the day ended *Big E* planes sank a small carrier, damaged a light cruiser and a destroyer and, as a parting gesture, gave chase to the frantic enemy, planting five bombs on a light cruiser, and three more on a battleship.

The *Big E* is known as a lucky ship and for the spirit of her men.

There was Midway. Teaming with the ill-fated *Hornet* and *Yorktown*, she had been combing the broad waters without success for the Japanese carrier force only 750 miles west of Pearl Harbor.

If they failed to find the enemy, it might give him the initiative and spell disaster. The *Big E's* air group commander, Lt. Comdr. Clarence Wade McClusky, Jr., decided to take one more look—this time much farther out. Planes were running low on fuel.

MEN ALL FEEL IT

But they found the enemy and history was made that day. Never again has the enemy dared such a thrust.

The spirit of the *Enterprise* is hard to describe. Commander Thomas J. Hamilton, of Columbus, Ohio, her executive officer for 18 months, once tried it.

"You can't really feel it," he said, "unless you've ridden her. It's something that grips men so completely that they subordinate themselves to all else."

Admiral William F. (Bull) Halsey was carrying his flag on her when war broke. He rode her to the Marshalls. His heart still rides her. He told her so in congratulating her on the Presidential citation.

One of the past skippers is Vice Admiral George D. Murray, of 3402 Q Street, Washington. Murray wrote her first battle order, after she had started for Wake with Marine fighter planes in December 1941.

In closing, he said, "It is the tradition of our Navy that, when put to the test, all hands keep cool, keep their heads, and fight. Steady nerves and stout hearts are needed now."

NO TIME FOR GLORY

The *Enterprise* never has been held up in an operation by major engineering trouble; never has had to wait on the rearming crew for a strike. Her gunners have always bagged their share of enemy planes.

She never has time for glory. There was her return to Bremerton, Wash., in July 1943 for overhauling after 26 months in the Pacific. As the Old Lady poked her nose—a little the worse for battle—into port, there were only the guards to greet her. Officially she wasn't there.

Her indomitable spirit, which only the men who ride her know, always seems to impel them to that one extra step like it did McClusky at Midway.

And then there was the young fighter pilot, Ensign Walter A. Wood, Jr., of Grand Rapids, Mich., shot down as he and his buddies plastered the Manila water front.

Later friendly forces found his body and note pad. On it he had scribbled his farewell message to his buddies of the *"Big E,"* "Got three."

War Manpower Commission Regulations on Employment Stabilization Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete regulations of the War Manpower Commission on the subject of employment stabilization programs.

There being no objection, the regulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 29. LABOR—CHAPTER VII. WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION (REGULATION NO. 7)—PART 907. GOVERNING EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION PROGRAMS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission by Executive Orders Nos. 9139 and 9279, and War Manpower Commission Regulation No. 4, as amended effective August 16, 1943, I hereby prescribe the following regulation governing War Manpower Commission employment stabilization programs:

Sec. 907.1. General policy.
Sec. 907.2. Control of hiring and solicitation of workers.
Sec. 907.3. Establishment and approval of programs.
Sec. 907.4. Minimum standards in general.
Sec. 907.5. Optional provisions.
Sec. 907.6. Definitions.
Sec. 907.7. Revocation of previous policies.
Sec. 907.8. Effective date

Authority: Sections 907.1 to 907.8 inclusive, issued under Executive Order No. 9139, 7 F. R. 2919; Executive Order No. 9279, 7 F. R. 10177; part 904 (Reg. No. 4) 8 F.R. 11337.

SEC. 907.1. General policy.—(a) Objectives: The purpose of an employment stabilization program is to assist the War Manpower Commission in bringing about, by measures equitable to labor and management, and necessarily for the effective prosecution of the war:

1. The elimination of wasteful labor turnover in essential activities.

2. The reduction of unnecessary labor migration.

3. The direction of the flow of scarce labor where most needed in the war program.

4. The maximum utilization of manpower resources.

(b) Authority and responsibilities of management-labor committees: The several regional and area management-labor war manpower committees are hereby authorized to consider questions of policy, standards, and safeguards, in connection with the establishment and the administration of employment stabilization programs, and to make recommendations to their respective manpower directors.

(c) Encouragement of local initiative and use of existing hiring channels: To the maximum degree consistent with this regulation and with the objectives of employment stabilization programs, local initiative and cooperative efforts shall be encouraged and utilized and maximum use made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

(d) Special authorization to designated Government agencies: The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission may authorize designated Government agencies to perform some or all of the functions of the United States Employment Service under this regulation in accordance with such conditions and procedures as he may prescribe.

SEC. 907.2. Control of hiring and solicitation of workers:

(a) After establishment of employment stabilization program: All hiring and solicitation of workers in, or for work in, any locality for which a War Manpower Commission employment stabilization program has been established shall be conducted in accordance with such program.

(b) Pending establishment of employment stabilization program: All hiring and solicitation of workers in, or for work in, a locality for which no War Manpower Commission em-

ployment stabilization program has been established shall, pending the establishment of such a program, be conducted in accordance with subsections (a) to (1), inclusive, of section 907.4 of this regulation which subsections shall be considered an employment stabilization program for this purpose.

SEC. 907.3 Establishment and approval of programs:

(a) General: Employment stabilization programs shall be formulated by area or regional manpower directors after consultation with their management-labor war manpower committees, but shall not become or continue operative except as provided in this section.

(b) Area programs: Area employment stabilization programs may be established for any War Manpower Commission administrative area designated by a regional manpower director for employment stabilization purposes.

(c) Other programs: Employment stabilization programs shall be established not later than October 15, 1943, for all portions of States or regions for which area employment stabilization program has been established.

(d) New programs: Employment stabilization programs which are not in effect prior to the effective date of this regulation shall be submitted to the regional manpower director for his approval. No such program shall become operative until approved by the regional manpower director.

(e) Existing programs: All employment stabilization programs in effect on the effective date of this regulation shall be promptly amended by the appropriate manpower director, after consultation with his management-labor war manpower committee, so as to include therein the provisions set forth in section 907.4 of this regulation, and otherwise to conform to this regulation. The program thus amended shall be submitted to the regional manpower director for his approval. Any existing programs not so amended and approved by October 15, 1943, shall cease to have operative effect on and after such date.

(f) Termination of industry programs: No War Manpower Commission industry employment stabilization program shall be established after the effective date of his regulation. No such existing program shall continue in effect on or after October 15, 1943, unless specifically approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

(g) Approval: The Regional Manpower Directors are authorized to approve any employment stabilization program which includes the provisions set forth in section 907.4 of this regulation, and otherwise conforms to the provisions of this regulation.

SEC. 907.4. Minimum Standards in General: Except as provided in section 907.5 (a) (5), every employment stabilization program approved after the effective date of this regulation shall contain the following provisions:

(a) General: A new employee, who during the preceding 60-day period was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity, may be hired only if such hiring would aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Such hiring shall be deemed to aid in the effective prosecution of the war only if:

1. Such individual is hired for work in an essential or locally needed activity or for work to which he has been referred by the United States Employment Service, and

2. Such individual presents a statement of availability from his last employment in an essential or locally needed activity, or is referred by the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission, or is hired with its consent, as provided herein.

(b) Issuance of Statements of Availability by Employers: An individual whose last employment is or was in an essential or locally needed activity shall receive a statement of availability from his employer if:

1. He has been discharged, or his employment has been otherwise terminated by his employer, or

2. He has been laid off for an indefinite period, or for a period of 7 or more days, or

3. Continuance of his employment would involve undue personal hardship, or

4. Such employment is or was at a wage or salary or under working conditions below standards established by State or Federal law or regulation, or

5. Such employment is or was at a wage or salary below a level established or approved by the National War Labor Board (or other agency authorized to adjust wages or approve adjustments thereof) as warranting adjustment, and the employer has failed to adjust the wage in accordance with such level or to apply to the appropriate agency for such adjustment or approval thereof.

(c) Issuance of statements of availability by United States Employment Service:

1. A statement of availability shall be issued promptly to an individual when any of the circumstances set forth in subsection (b) is found to exist in his case. If the employer fails or refuses to issue a statement, the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission, upon finding that the individual is entitled thereto, shall issue a statement of availability to the individual.

2. A statement of availability shall be issued by the United States Employment Service to any individual in the employ of an employer who the War Manpower Commission finds, after notice, hearing, and final decision has not complied with any War Manpower Commission employment stabilization program, regulation, or policy, and for so long as such employer continues his noncompliance after such finding.

(d) Referral in case of underutilization: If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the United States Employment Service may, upon his request, refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

(e) Workers who may be hired only upon referral by the United States Employment Service: A new employee may not be hired solely upon presentation of a statement of availability, but may be hired only upon referral by, or in accordance with arrangements with, the United States Employment Service when:

1. The new employee is to be hired for work in a critical occupation, or his statement of availability indicates that his last employment was in a critical occupation.

2. The new employee has not lived or worked in the locality of the new employment throughout the preceding 30-day period.

3. The new employee's last regular employment was in agriculture and he is to be hired for nonagricultural work provided that no such individual shall be referred to nonagricultural work except after consultation with a designated representative of the War Food Administration, and provided that such an individual may be hired for nonagricultural work for a period not to exceed 6 weeks without referral or presentation of a statement of availability.

(f) Exclusions: No provision of the employment stabilization program shall be applicable to:

1. The hiring of a new employee for agricultural employment;

2. The hiring of an employee in any Territory or possession of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii;

3. The hiring by a foreign, State, county, or municipal government, or their political subdivisions, or their agencies and instrumentalities, or (for purposes of sec. 907.4 (a) only) to the hiring of any of their employees, unless such foreign, State, county, or municipal government, or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality, has indicated its willingness to conform, to the maximum extent practicable under the Constitution and laws applicable to it, with the program;

4. The hiring of a new employee for domestic service;

5. The hiring of a school teacher for vacation employment or the rehiring of a school teacher for teaching at the termination of the vacation period.

(g) Appeals: Any worker or employer may appeal from any act or failure to act by the War Manpower Commission under the employment stabilization program, in accordance with regulations and procedures of the War Manpower Commission.

(h) Content of statements of availability: A statement of availability issued to an individual pursuant to the program shall contain only the individual's name, address, social-security account number, if any, the name and address of the issuing employer, or War Manpower Commission officer and office, the date of issuance, a statement as to whether or not the individual's last employment was in a critical occupation, and such other information not prejudicial to the employee in seeking new employment as may be authorized or required by the War Manpower Commission.

(i) Solicitation of workers: No employer shall advertise or otherwise solicit for the purpose of hiring any individual if the hiring of such an individual would be subject to restrictions under the employment stabilization program, except in a manner consistent with such restrictions.

(j) Hiring: The decision to hire or refer a worker shall be based on qualifications essential for performance of or suitability for the job, and shall be made without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or, except as required by law, citizenship.

(k) Representation: Nothing contained in the program shall be construed to restrict any individual from seeking the advice and aid of, or from being represented by, the labor organization of which he is a member or any other representative freely chosen by him, at any step in the operation of the program.

(l) General referral policies: No provision in the program shall limit authority of the United States Employment Service to make referrals in accordance with approved policies and instructions of the War Manpower Commission.

SEC. 907.5. Optional provisions: Regional and area manpower directors, after consultation with their management-labor war manpower committees, may include in employment stabilization programs provisions such as the following designed to meet special manpower needs in the localities affected, but except as specifically authorized herein, no such provision shall conflict with section 907.4 of this regulation or with any State or Federal law.

(a) Subject to standards and instructions approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, provision for adding to section 907.4 (e) of this regulation the following categories of individuals who must be hired only upon referral by, or in accordance with arrangements made with the United States Employment Service:

1. Individuals for work in specified categories of occupations in activities in which manpower shortages threaten critically needed production, or

2. Individuals for work in specified shortage occupations (in addition to critical occupations), or

3. Individuals whose statements of availability indicate that they were most recently employed in such occupations, or

4. Individuals who can be readily identified as able to meet specifications required for work in such occupations or activities, or

5. All individuals. A program containing such a provision may apply only to a labor market area which, on the date of the approval of the program, was classified by the War Manpower Commission as a group I or group II area. Such a program may, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this regulation, include necessary modifications of section 907.4.

(b) Provisions designed to protect individuals from loss of seniority or other reemployment rights.

(c) Provisions designed to require or promote more effective utilization of their manpower by employers.

(d) Provisions designed further to control advertising or other solicitation of individuals.

(e) Provisions designed to afford individuals a greater measure of protection against arbitrary discharge.

(f) Provisions designed to facilitate the employment of individuals during vacation, probationary, off season, or other short periods in work other than that in which they have customarily engaged, and to facilitate the return of such persons to their customary employment.

(g) Provisions governing the release of individuals by employers by whom they were hired or solicited in violation of employment stabilization programs, provisions for disregarding for purposes of the 60-day clause in section 907.4 (a) hereof, periods during which individuals were employed in violation of employment stabilization programs or in employments excluded from the programs, and other provisions pertaining to the enforcement of a program.

(h) Provisions designed to minimize loss of working time of applicants for statement of availability or referral.

(i) Provisions designed (1) to permit the hiring of an individual by, or of an individual whose last regular employment was with, a small establishment without regard to the requirements of the program, except that no establishment regularly employing more than eight employees shall be treated as a small establishment for the purpose of this paragraph, or (2) to exclude from the requirement of the program the hiring of individuals last employed in domestic service or last employed by foreign, State, or local governments or their instrumentalities, or (3) to exclude the hiring of individuals for supplemental or casual work, or for other types of short-time or intermittent employment, the coverage of any of which would involve undue administrative burdens and would not measurably contribute to the accomplishment of the objectives of this regulation.

(j) Subject to standards and instructions approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, provisions for regulating the hiring of new employees through the establishment of fair and reasonable employment ceilings which limit the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in an establishment or place of employment during specified periods.

(k) Provision for initial issuance of statements of availability by the United States Employment Service in lieu of the individual's employer under some or all of the circumstances set forth in section 907.4 (b) of this regulation.

(l) Provisions which, while conflicting in substantive respects with section 907.4 of this regulation, are approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission after consultation with the Management-Policy Committee and after a finding by him (1) that such provisions are necessary to meet manpower problems peculiar in the locality to which the program applies and are consistent with the fundamental objectives and policies upon which the regulation is based, and (2) that such provisions have previously received the unanimous recommendation of the appropriate area or regional management-labor war manpower committee and manpower director.

SEC. 907.6. Definitions: As used in this regulation:

(a) Agriculture means those farm activities carried on by farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation, or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

(b) State includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(c) New employee means any individual who has not been in the employment of the hiring employer at any time during the preceding 30-day period. For the purpose of this definition, supplemental, casual, or other types of short-time or intermittent employment excluded under the program, shall be disregarded.

(d) Critical occupation means any occupation designated as a critical occupation by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

(e) Essential activity means any activity included in the War Manpower Commission list of essential activities.

(f) Locally needed activity means any activity approved by the Regional Manpower Director as a locally needed activity.

(g) The terms "employment" and "work" as applied to an individual engaged in principal and supplementary employments mean his principal employment.

(h) Employment-stabilization program includes any arrangement involving restrictions on separation or hiring of workers, whether through issuance of statements of availability, referral by the United States Employment Service or otherwise.

SEC. 907.7. Revocation of previous policies: The War Manpower Commission Policy to Prevent Pirating of War Workers, dated July 16, 1942, appearing at 7 F. R. 5500, and part 907, sections 907.1 to 907.21, inclusive, War Manpower Commission Policies for Employment Stabilization Programs Which Include the Exercise of Hiring Controls in Areas of Manpower Shortage, effective February 1, 1943, appearing at 8 F. R. 7227 (as amended, June 20, 1943, 8 F. R. 9182), are hereby revoked, effective August 16, 1943, together with all instructions and procedures previously issued by the War Manpower Commission relating to the formulation and content of employment stabilization programs.

SEC. 907.8. Effective date: This regulation shall become effective August 16, 1943.

AUGUST 13, 1943.

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission.

Incorporated herein are Amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3, effective May 22, May 22, and October 21, 1944, respectively.

TITLE 29. LABOR—CHAPTER VII. WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—REGULATION NO. 7, AMENDMENT NO. 4—PART 907. GOVERNING EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION PROGRAMS

Pursuant to the authority vested in me as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission by Executive Orders Nos. 9139 and 9279, section 907.5 (j) of War Manpower Commission Regulation No. 7, as amended (9 F.R. 5400) is hereby further amended, effective January 3, 1945, by deleting therefrom the words "regulating the hiring of new employees through."

CHARLES M. HAY,
Acting Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1945.

Filed with Federal Register January 5, 1945, 10:14 a. m.

Analysis of Bretton Woods Agreement by John Francis Neylan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the Bretton Woods agreement by a very able lawyer, John Francis Neylan, of San Francisco. I say nothing further regarding the matter, except that he becomes an antagonist of John Maynard Keynes. The brief is well worth reading by all my auditors.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this document. The estimated cost is $728.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT BY JOHN FRANCIS NEYLAN AND ADDRESS DELIVERED BY LORD JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES IN HOUSE OF LORDS, MAY 23, 1944

FOREWORD

The Bretton Woods agreement is the popular designation of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development proposed by the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944.

Admittedly it is only one step in an overall plan which may determine the future economic government of the world. The remaining features of the plan are still undisclosed.

In the words of its principal author, Lord Keynes, it "embodies epoch-making innovations," but nevertheless is only "an iron ration."

Whether the United States can make the sacrifices, assume the additional financial burdens, and live under the restrictions is a matter of vital concern to every citizen.

Whether it is prudent to commit the United States to such a revolutionary plan while millions of its citizens, who will have to carry most of the burden, are fighting overseas is a grave question.

The plan has been designated "an assignment by a creditor for the benefit of debtors." To a limited extent, at least, the description is true.

The matter is now pending in the Congress of the United States.

No other country has acted upon it, because the adoption of the scheme depends upon the willingness of the United States to make the sacrifices, accept the restrictions, and carry the burden.

To enable the reader to have access to the views of the principal author of the plan, and to have a first-hand interpretation of its provisions, a copy of an address made by Lord John Maynard Keynes in the British House of Lords, May 23, 1944, is attached to this analysis.

ANALYSIS

In view of President Roosevelt's message to Congress urging ratification of the so-called Bretton Woods agreement and an appropriation of $5,925,000,000 for our financial contribution, there can be no further doubt that a determined effort is to be made to drive this measure through both the

House and Senate by methods reminiscent of the days of rubber stamps and blank checks.

Obviously, the stage setting has been carefully handled and the build-up was timed for a climatic emotional appeal from the President against the background of the meeting of the Big Three at the summer home of Marshal Stalin in the Crimea.

Without the slightest intention of showing the President any disrespect, it seems evident that he has not had the time to examine the plan critically, and that the message was prepared by a Treasury Department adviser. The President's whole background in relation to financial matters, including his nomination of Vice President Wallace to handle $40,000,000,000 negatives the thought that the Congress should act hurriedly or that it should fail to scrutinize this document with "the most anxious concern."

The President refers to the possibility of a few minor imperfections in the plan. The fact is the document embodies so many basic contradictions, and is so loaded with ambiguities it defies understanding as anything but an elaborate contrivance to give away American money and fetter the United States in the post-war era, almost like a conquered nation.

There is no support in common sense or the experience of mankind for the theory that in the days ahead the United States, staggering under a greater debt than all the rest of the world combined, can carry the same disproportionate burden that it has carried in time of war.

Should the underlying theory of the W. P. A., of unhappy memory, be adopted in the international field in times of peace, only Providence will be able to protect the United States and the world from bankruptcy and economic chaos.

Strangely the so-called Bretton Woods agreement is, substantively, the brainchild of a gentleman whose thinking and writings played such a large part in the early years of the Roosevelt administration, inspiring pump-priming and leaf-raking as means of spending our way out of depression.

The real author of the Bretton Woods agreement with what he has termed its "epoch-making innovations in international plans" is Lord John Maynard Keynes, a director of the Bank of England, adviser of the British Exchequer and the most brilliant exponent of the project of substituting economic imperialism for political imperialism with London and other European capitals as the seats of empire.

Of course, it would be provincialism of a low order to discard any plan solely because its author was not an American. On the other hand, Lord Keynes has never posed as a citizen of the world, and if he has hailed this agreement as a triumph of revolutionary ideas which inure to the benefit, principally, of Europe at the expense of the United States, it would seem to be the prudent course to subject it to searching analysis.

Lord Keynes has outlined to the House of Lords in a remarkable speech the enormous advantages that will accrue to his country, and he has paid warm tribute to the American negotiators because of their broadmindedness, generosity, and good neighborliness. Despite his native reluctance in the matter of displaying emotion he felt that the conferees had merged "a band of brothers."

After reading Lord Keynes' speech and the treatises published by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Dr. Harry D. White, his adviser, I am prepared to accept the development of the fraternal relationship, but I cannot escape the conviction that the brilliant British brother induced an acceptance of the English doctrine of primogeniture under which the eldest son takes the entire estate and the younger boys eke out an existence in the church or the army.

To clarify perspective as to authorship, it is well to bear in mind that in 1943 the British Government issued a white paper embodying what was termed a proposal for "an international clearing union," of which Lord Keynes was the author.

Almost immediately the United States Treasury issued another plan which bore all the earmarks of hasty improvisation.

Lord Keynes frankly stated that his proposed union might become "the pivot of the future economic government of the world." Also to his credit let it be said that his document contained a minimum of thought-concealing phrases. He was forthright about his objectives and blunt and clear in his expressions.

The document created a storm of protest from every quarter, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Undaunted, this gentleman who resigned from the British peace delegation at Paris in 1919 and denounced the Treaty of Versailles as an economic atrocity, headed delegations from his country to innumerable conferences, and in April 1944 there emerged what was called a "joint statement by experts on the establishment of an International Monetary Fund of the United and Associated Nations."

In this statement the experts, including Secretary Morgenthau and his adviser, Dr. White, concurred.

Thereafter, on July 1, 1944, the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference convened at Bretton Woods and when it adjourned on July 22 it produced what is now offered to the Congress as the "Articles of Agreement, International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

It is interesting to note that the United States Treasury and, presumably, the President had this document all through the optimistic days of August, September, and October when the country was encouraged to believe the war in Europe would be over quickly and reconversion and post-war problems were imminent. However, it was not sent to the Congress and it was not submitted in any solemn referendum to the American people, who will be called upon to submit to its restrictions and pay the cost, not only in money subscribed but in intangibles of far greater magnitude.

Avoidance of twisting the lion's tail for political purposes is a weak and transparent subterfuge, because on every issue of sound foreign policy, including lend-lease, both parties united and there was no criticism.

The conclusion is inescapable that there was fear an exposition of the plan with its enormous disadvantages to American finance, foreign trade, domestic industry, labor, and post-war reconstruction generally would be politically harmful to the administration.

Suddenly, on January 26, it was announced that the bills embodying the agreement would be introduced in Congress by Senator WAGNER and Representative SPENCE, and Speaker RAYBURN was quoted as announcing that the House would act quickly once the bill had been approved by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Now comes the presidential appeal from the far-off Crimea.

It is a safe assertion that not 1 percent of the American people have any understanding of the provisions of this revolutionary plan, and that not 10 percent of the membership of the House of Representatives and Senate have ever read the bill which is scheduled for quick passage.

Again and again it is emphasized that this is only one of a number of measures of similar type which will commit the United States in the international field, but that it includes matters which are basic. We are on notice that a host of Olivers will be asking for "more."

In fact this has been termed a mere "iron ration."

Yet it is conservative to assert that this measure constitutes the greatest surrender of resources and economic advantages by any nation in the history of the world, and signalizes the inauguration of a plan under which a prodigally generous nation puts itself at the mercy of its debtors.

One proponent points out that there is a provision for withdrawal. This is true, but the history of mankind shows that once an individual or a nation accords some great advantage, its withdrawal creates enmity and in the sphere of nations lays the foundation for war.

Already it is certain that the 12,000,000 in the armed services of the United States, fighting all over the world, are coming home to the grim reality of a mortgage of more than $300,000,000,000. With their immediate families they will constitute 40 percent of the population and will face life with the realization that a large portion of the $120,000,000,000—which will be their share—was spent to pay for a riot of prosperity far from the battlefields where they were giving everything.

They will experience difficulty in understanding some of the additional burdens being piled upon them while they will be facing the grim and heart-breaking difficulties of readjustment to the all-important responsibility of supporting themselves and their children.

It would seem equitable that these men should have some voice in determining whether the resources which belong to them and their children are to be squandered to enable old political imperialisms to transmute themselves into economic empires and perpetuate their dominion over hundreds of millions of human beings and vast territories they could neither protect nor liberate.

Not a single European nation or empire was capable of defending itself unaided against Nazi Germany or of protecting or recovering its overseas territories, colonies, or other holdings against Japan.

The day of imperialism is dead and gone, and the attempt to perpetuate it under a new guise is doomed to failure.

The Bretton Woods agreement does not contemplate a new world order based upon freedom and expanding development of all the human race. It is a document which seeks to create an economic strait jacket for the benefit of a continent which for centuries has drained the treasure of the rest of the earth to finance its wars and to support it in intervals of peace.

Its adoption by the United States would give notice to the world, wherein hundreds of millions struggle for political and economic freedom, that we have abandoned the maxim of "live and let live" and have succumbed to the hateful dictum, "don't spoil the natives."

In the event the United States becomes a party to the so-called Bretton Woods agreement creating the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Lord John Maynard Keynes, financial adviser to His British Majesty's Government, will deserve to rank second only to the incomparable Churchill. Furthermore it is not inconceivable that he will emerge as the logical successor of the man who "did not become the King's first Minister to preside at the liquidation of the Empire."

Anything less would mark the British as an uninformed and ungrateful people, and no one will allege they are uninformed when their interests are involved. He will also be entitled to the undying gratitude of the French, the Dutch, the Belgian, and the Russian Empires.

Churchill deservedly will receive the credit for pulling the English ship of state off the rocks of Dunkirk, steering it through the tempests and typhoons of war, and ultimately bringing it safely into harbor. After that will come the post-war era with its economic

storms, its contrary winds and mountainous seas to test the seamanship of all nations, and in that day will come a realization of the genius of Keynes.

If anyone should be inclined to feel that I exaggerate or become unduly lyrical in relation to the accomplishments of this distinguished British statesman, I ask only a fair-minded examination of the record. In advance, I pledge the use of only those adverbs, adjectives, and appraisals already used by those bred in the art of understatement.

At the outset let us determine to be frank within the bounds of good manners, because, in the words of Lord Keynes, "the plan introduces an epoch-making innovation in an international instrument," and if the American people should be committed carelessly or improvidently to an agreement which may render their post-war burdens unbearable, the consequences might be calamitous. Again adopting the advice of Lord Keynes to the House of Lords, "we must examine any financial plan to make sure that it will help us carry our burdens and not add to them." In fact, he recommended scrutinizing "with anxious concern."

Let us recognize frankly that the plan should be termed the "Keynes plan for an international monetary fund," because it is simply a modification of Lord Keynes' international clearing union blueprint, which was offered to the United Nations in 1943 and was rejected even by the ardent advocates of a superstate.

It is not cynical to suggest that the Keynes plan now being offered represents the original clearing union program minus those clauses incorporated in the original draft for trading purposes. In this accomplishment Lord Keynes has again demonstrated the genius of the British in working out compromises which concede to the other party the form without disturbing the substance, in fact at the appropriate place, hereinafter, I shall use an extremely apt quotation relative to this feature.

Under the provisions of the agreement the principal office of the fund would be located in the United States, with branch offices in other countries. The location of the principal office means little.

The powers of the fund are vested in a board of governors which will consist of 44 members, 1 being appointed by each of the nations to which a quota has been assigned. Under this arrangement, the United States will have 1 member and the British Commonwealth will have 6, 1 each for Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom.

The operation of the fund is placed in the hands of 12 executive directors. The United Kingdom, the United States, Soviet Russia, China, and France appoint 1 executive director each. Of the remaining 7 directors 5 will be elected by nations other than the Big Five and excluding the 19 American republics and the United States. The remaining 2 are set aside for election by the 19 American republics, other than the United States. Argentina is not a member.

The provisions governing appointment and election of executive directors are complex and intricate to the point of defying elucidation except in a separate treatise. Suffice it to say the United States will have 1 and the British Commonwealth will have a minimum of 2 out of the 12, and conceivably 3. More about this latter.

The board of executive directors will function in continuous session at the principal office of the fund and will select the managing director, who, if this plan is ever adopted, is destined to become the most powerful individual the financial world has ever known. He will be the chairman of the executive directors, he will be responsible for the organization, appointment, and dismissal of the staff of the fund, and according to the terms of the agreement he and his appointees will be expected to divest themselves of all loyalties except to the fund.

In appointing the staff the managing director is enjoined to make paramount the highest standards of efficiency and technical competence—national and geographical considerations are expressly made secondary.

In the abstract nothing could be more correct, but in this practical world it seems unfortunate that at this juncture the United States seems to contain the only considerable body of persons who consider devotion to country rather absurd, while Europe and the rest of the world seem crowded with fanatical nationalists who are expert in matters of international exchange and currency.

Frankly, I find it impossible to imagine the Englishman, Russian, Frenchman, or Chinese capable of divesting himself of fanatical loyalty to his native land who would be permitted a chance of appointment to any job in the fund by Churchill, Stalin, de Gaulle, or Chiang Kai-shek.

Unless we intend deliberately to wreck the future of the United States by indulgence in autohypnosis we cannot be unaware of the fact that even before the war is over these nations are engaged in an intensive struggle to better their economic positions as against us and against one another and that any faltering by a national would be equivalent to treason.

So much in general for the hierarchy of the fund.

The purposes of the fund are set forth in article I of the agreement and are enumerated as follows:

(i) To promote international monetary cooperation through a permanent institution which provides the machinery for consultation and collaboration on international monetary problems.

(ii) To facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, and to contribute thereby to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income and to the development of the productive resources of all members as primary objectives of economic policy.

(iii) To promote exchange stability, to maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members, and to avoid competitive exchange depreciation.

(iv) To assist in the establishment of a multilateral system of payments in respect of current transactions between members and in the elimination of foreign exchange restrictions which hamper the growth of world trade.

(v) To give confidence to members by making the fund's resources available to them under adequate safeguards, thus providing them with opportunity to correct maladjustments in their balance of payments without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity.

(vi) In accordance with the above, to shorten the duration and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in the international balances of payments of members.

To all of these objectives, honestly interpreted, all normal minded people certainly will subscribe.

Unfortunately, all nations do not enjoy access to raw materials and natural resources on an equal basis, and, due to many factors, some nations are far more advanced industrially than others. Additionally, there are many complexities arising from relative advancement toward that state we call civilization, and there are many difficult situations which stem from the desire of large populations for political and economic freedom.

Capital of fund

The capital of the fund is made up of quotas which were allocated on some basis that is shrouded in mystery.

The original quotas are set forth in schedule A, as follows:

Schedule A. Quotas

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia	200
Belgium	225
Bolivia	10
Brazil	150
Canada	300
Chile	50
China	550
Colombia	50
Costa Rica	5
Cuba	50
Czechoslovakia	125
Denmark	(1)
Dominican Republic	5
Ecuador	5
Egypt	45
El Salvador	2.5
Ethiopia	6
France	450
Greece	40
Guatemala	5
Haiti	5
Honduras	2.5
Iceland	1
India	400
Iran	25
Iraq	8
Liberia	.5
Luxemburg	10
Mexico	90
Netherlands	275
New Zealand	50
Nicaragua	2
Norway	50
Panama	.5
Paraguay	2
Peru	25
Philippine Commonwealth	15
Poland	125
Union of South Africa	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,200
United Kingdom	1,300
United States	2,750
Uruguay	15
Venezuela	15
Yugoslavia	60
	8,800

[1] The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the fund after the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign this agreement but before signature takes place.

When we come to the detailed discussion of quotas, which give access to American dollars in exchange for currencies of all varieties the anxiety of all nations for big quotas in the fund will be explained. Such discussion will also suggest the reason for the magnitude of some of the quotas which on their face are inexplicable.

Having seen the outline of the organization and capitalization of the fund, let us examine certain major aspects.

Why the hurry?

Among the many puzzling features of the fund project none is more interesting or inexplicable than the evident anxiety to commit the United States while our armed forces are engaged all over the earth, and in this country all ideas of reconversion have been relegated to the background, although fifteen hundred and twelve businessmen of one belligerent are already traveling abroad drumming up trade.

In his plea for immediate action, Treasury Adviser White suggests that the responsible advocates of delay are aiming at perfectionism, which seems to have become a standard term of derision in international matters. He also hints at the existence of some economic isolationists.

Speaker RAYBURN is quoted as having said the House of Representatives would rush the

agreement through as soon as the Banking and Currency Committee reported.

The paradox is that the enactment of the agreement will immediately isolate the United States, subject it to paralyzing restrictions, and by an express reservation give the British, Russian, French, Belgian, and Dutch Empires a free hand for 5 years to pursue the very practices which the fund is supposed to stop and correct.

Realizing that this statement savors of exaggeration and will naturally be viewed with skepticism, I herewith quote the provision of the agreement and the interpretation of the provision by Lord Keynes in the House of Lords in a speech delivered May 23, 1944.

The provision of the agreement is "Article XIV—Transitional Period," found at page 29 of the official text.

Section 2 of this article provides: "In the post-war transitional period members may, notwithstanding the provisions of any other articles of this agreement, maintain and adapt to changing circumstances (and, in the case of members whose territories have been occupied by the enemy, introduce where necessary) restrictions on payments and transfers for current international transactions."

Obviously, this section makes sweeping exceptions for the British, French, Belgians, Dutch, Russians, Portuguese, Norwegians, Greeks, Czechs, Yugoslavs, and others.

This and following sections emphasize that the abandonment of these practices is within the discretion of such members for a period of 5 years. Furthermore, it is provided that even after the elapse of 5 years these members, with the consent of the fund, may still pursue these practices, and it is expressly provided that in passing on requests of members in such matters the fund shall indulge every reasonable doubt for the benefit of the member.

Fortunately, we do not have to speculate on the meaning or the importance of these provisions.

On May 23, 1944, Lord Keynes, who was then discussing the provision as it appeared in the joint statement of experts at page 8, advised the House of Lords:

"What, then, are these major advantages that I hope from the plan to be of advantage of this country [United Kingdom]? First, it is clearly recognized and agreed that during the post-war transitional period of uncertain duration we are entitled to retain any of those wartime restrictions and special arrangements with the Sterling area and others that are helpful to us, without being open to the charge of acting contrary to any general engagements into which we have entered. Having this assurance, we can make our plans for the most difficult days which will follow the war, knowing where we stand, and without risk of giving grounds of offense. This is a great gain—and one of the respects in which the new plan is much superior to either of its predecessors, which did not clearly set forth any similar safeguards."

In other words, the British, Russian, French, Belgian, Dutch, and other financiers, traders, and industrialists are to be permitted to enjoy all advantages of the fund, while being free not only to maintain all the practices they have heretofore indulged to protect themselves in international trade but to adapt these practices to changing circumstances, and, most amazing of all, to introduce in formerly occupied territory such practices as they consider necessary.

When it is borne in mind that this is only one of the five major advantages Lord Keynes pointed out as accruing to his country it seems incredible that the proponents of the agreement should not be able to make some clear statement justifying a provision which in the guise of an exception turns the purported plan of stabilization of currencies and facilitation of trade upside down, substantively makes the exception the rule, and leaves the United States the isolated victim in the contest for world trade.

Stripped of all the platitudinous utterances which have been indulged in the discussions, this provision of the proposed agreement means that the United States, staggering under the costs of defending not only herself but of defending and liberating these other empires, will be called upon to submit to arbitrary trade discriminations all over the earth, and not only submit to, but finance these harassments.

Certainly, we cannot criticize the delegates from other countries who have sought to gain for their respective nations every possible advantage in the grim and terrible days which will confront men after the war, but before we agree to the amazingly inequitable provision of article XIV some American delegate to Bretton Woods should be required to give some explanation of the demand for unseemly haste.

Sanctions against United States

Another of the features of the proposed fund agreement, which, in the words of Lord Keynes, embodies epoch-making innovations, is that which confers upon debtor nations, present and prospective, the absolute right to repudiate existing debt or debt that may be incurred improvidently in the future and, in addition, take punitive action against the creditor. Admittedly, the provision is aimed at the United States.

I realize this reads like something from Alice in Wonderland, but we have the official text of the proposed agreement, and, in addition, we have the official interpretation by the author, Lord Keynes.

Article VII of the proposed agreement deals with the matter of scarce currencies.

It is recognized that American dollars are the most desirable, if not the only universally desirable, currency in the world. It is also recognized that for some years at least settlements not only with the United States but between other nations will be predicated insofar as possible on dollars.

As a result of war purchases, expenditures by American soldiers abroad and other factors, many nations now have large holdings of dollars and the fund purportedly is to be an agency to enable them to get more at a stabilized rate.

After lend-lease is stopped, presumably, other nations will want goods, foodstuffs, machinery, and every other sort of commodity. Because of other provisions of the fund agreement, the British, French, Russian, Belgian, Dutch, and other nations will be within their rights in resorting to a number of devices to prevent this trade coming to the United States.

However, it is also recognized that in spite of all restrictions and discriminations against the United States these different empires and the other nations may on their own initiative and without any coercion purchase American goods in such large quantities that our exports may exceed our imports and for this and other reasons our currency balances in the hands of others and of the fund might run low.

Then the fund, on the governing board of which the United States has 1 member out of 44, and among the executive directors of which the United States will have 1 member out of 12, steps in.

In the words of American Treasury Adviser White, "the fund might find that the causes of the scarcity were high trade barriers in the country whose currency was scarce, or a failure to undertake adequate international investment, and it would propose appropriate remedies."

Section 3 of article VII confers on the fund power to initiate a boycott, and thereafter under express authorization of section 4 each member has complete jurisdiction to take such steps as it sees fit on its indebtedness to the United States.

In simple language this means that a group representing competing debtor nations would be in a position to invoke sanctions against the United States and relieve other debtor nations of their debts to the generous creditor of all of them. This seems to provoke memories of the Balfour note offering to give away billions of American credits.

Undoubtedly, the word "sanctions" sounds harsh and some might believe its use is for the purpose of creating prejudice. My authority for the description of the power is none other than Lord Keynes.

The amazing fact is Lord Keynes has asserted that the American delegation of their own free-will and honest purpose suggested conferring upon the fund this power to interfere in the vital affairs of the United States and as an alternative punish this Nation. The record, however, shows that while Mr. Morgenthau and his associates might have thought they were originating this idea it was an integral part of Keynes' original International Clearing Union, but even he recognized it was too much to ask a creditor country to accept until such creditor had seen some benefit accruing to it from the fund. In the clearing union proposal he said:

"In the case of credit balances no rigid maximum has been proposed. For the appropriate provision might be to require the eventual cancelation or compulsory investment of bancor credit balances accumulating in excess of a member's quota; and, however, desirable this may be in principle, it might be felt to impose on creditor countries a heavier burden than they can be asked to accept before having had experience of the benefit to them of the working of the plan as a whole."

In the light of this statement made by Lord Keynes in 1943, it seems impossible to understand the following statement made by him to the House of Lords on May 23, 1944:

"There is another advantage to which I would draw your Lordships' special attention. A proper share of responsibility for maintaining equilibrium in the balance of international payments is squarely placed on the creditor countries. This is one of the major improvements in the new plan. The Americans, who are the most likely to be affected by this, have of their own free will and honest purpose, offered us a far-reaching formula of protection against a recurrence of the main cause of deflation during the interwar years, namely, the draining of reserves out of the rest of the world to pay a country which was obstinately borrowing and exporting on a scale immensely greater than it was lending and importing. Under clause VI of the plan a country engages itself, in effect, to prevent such a situation from arising again, by promising, should it fail, to release other countries from any obligation to take its exports, or, if taken, to pay for them. I cannot imagine that this sanction would ever be allowed to come into effect. If by no other means, than by lending, the creditor country will always have to find a way to square the account on imperative grounds of its own self-interest. For it will no longer be entitled to square the account by squeezing gold out of the rest of us. Here we have a voluntary undertaking, genuinely offered in the spirit of a good neighbor and, I should add, of enlightened self-interest, not to allow a repetition of a chain of events which between the wars did more than any other single factor to destroy the world's economic balance and to prepare a seedbed of foul growths."

Evidently, Lord Keynes had forgotten in 1944 that he had originated in 1943 this

revolutionary notion of putting a premium on improvidence in international buying and chicanery in avoiding settlement for goods purchased under conditions known to all parties in advance. Additionally, he seems to have forgotten that in 1943 he did not even hope to have this fantastic proposal accepted until the United States would see some compensating advantage in the operation of the Clearing Union.

Also, when he berates the United States as having been responsible for the world economic mess, he appears to have forgotten that he wrote a book in 1920 entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace."

Having resigned from the British Peace Delegation at Paris, Lord Keynes denounced the Treaty of Versailles as an economic atrocity which was unworkable and which put a premium on chaos in the commercial world. He foretold the setting up of restrictions such as were subsequently instituted by the British and French Empires in the Ottawa agreement and the system of quotas on imports and other foul growths which were sprouted in the seedbed of Versailles.

The reference to the "squeezing of gold" out of these other nations by the United States seems somewhat melodramatic when it is remembered that a nation which claimed to be unable to find exchange to pay $62,000,000 on a discounted war debt could find the exchange to purchase American securities valued in excess of $3,500,000,000 at depressed New York stock market prices.

The record shows inescapably that the plan of putting the United States at the mercy of its debtors was the invention of Lord Keynes.

It seems incredible that the scheme to authorize sanctions against the United States has been given consideration, to say nothing of approval, by American delegates.

The implications and possibilities of the scheme are so tremendous as affecting the future welfare of the United States, it would seem no public servant with a respect for his trust would fail to scrutinize it with "anxious concern."

Because of the revolutionary character of the proposal Lord Keynes really had no hope in 1943 of inducing its acceptance.

In 1944 he classified its acceptance as one of the five major advantages to England in the plan now to be submitted to the American Congress. He concluded that feature of his discussion in the House of Lords as follows:

"This is a tremendous extension of international cooperation to good ends. I pray your lordships to pay heed to its importance."

In passing, we might note the use of the adjective "tremendous" by a gentleman born and educated in the tradition of understatement.

Gold—"A barbarous relic"

There are several other aspects of the agreement which deserve the most careful scrutiny. No sounder advice in this respect could be formulated than that given the British House of Lords by Lord Keynes when he was discussing this very Bretton Woods plan.

"It follows," said Lord Keynes, "that we must examine any financial plan to make sure that it will help us to carry our burdens and not add to them. No one is more deeply convinced of this than I am. I make no complaint, therefore, that those to whom the details of the scheme are new and difficult should scrutinize them with anxious concern."

The noted English economist gave the above advice not only properly but confidently because the plan of the Bretton Woods Monetary Fund constitutes a triumph of the first magnitude for Lord Keynes personally. The proposed agreement not only accepts the revolutionary Keynes plan to destroy the traditional gold standard in international dealings, but it incorporates, with one exception, every substantive objective included in his original plan for an international clearing union which was more bluntly worded than the present instrument.

It can be easily understood that in addressing the House of Lords on the merits of the proposed agreement it was necessary for Lord Keynes to be cautious. There were many American correspondents in London, and even the most conservative newspapers in the United States had denounced his original plan. Yet there are some passages in the very interesting address which might be termed startling.

Discussing the gold proposals in the plan he said:

"That is why I say that those proposals are the exact opposite of the gold standard. They lay down by international agreement the essence of the new doctrine, far removed from the old orthodoxy. If they say so in terms as inoffensive as possible to the former faith, need we complain?"

In another portion of his address Lord Keynes indulged the following very striking claim to being the author of the new orthodoxy:

"Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshippers of the Calf, who wrote that 'Gold is a barbarous relic'?"

These words were uttered by the same gentleman, who at Bretton Woods referred to gold as "the constitutional monarch." No doubt he was mindful that in British politics a constitutional monarch is a very dignified but powerless person; however, Lord Keynes is a gifted writer and was conscious of the fact that in nonmonarchial countries the term "constitutional monarch" is customarily overappraised.

Of course an examination of the proposed agreement confirms every statement made by Lord Keynes in relation to the destruction of the prestige of gold, and must prompt every intelligent citizen of the United States to ask the question "Why did gold become a barbarous relic just when the United States acquired 70 percent of the world's supply?"

In the tradition of the gold standard the $20,000,000,000 of bullion owned by the United States would support a sound and orthodox credit structure of $200,000,000,000, and, intelligently administered, would make this country the financial center of the earth.

Additionally an unimpaired prestige of gold will be of limitless material and psychological value to a nation burdened with a war debt of more than $300,000,000,000.

No fair-minded person will question that in the post-war era it will be extremely desirable if not essential that England be maintained in a position of commercial importance comparable with her past, but there is a very grave question if the United States can indulge in quixotic adventures and sacrifices such as are embodied in this assault on the gold standard.

Much has been written of the material sacrifices made by the United Kingdom. With characteristic courage and clear-headedness Churchill has told his people that they have spent their inheritance and that they are going to have to pull in their belts and toil back to prosperity. Also with characteristic lack of courage and with customary muddle-headedness some American politicians have propagandized our people into the idiotic belief that the years ahead hold only uninterrupted happiness and abundance.

However, the cold facts are that England's war debt is $56,000,000,000, a little more than one-sixth of ours, and we are warned that our sacrifices in Europe and in the Pacific may run for several years.

The assumption that the United States is in a position to fight and finance wars all over the earth, while furnishing billions to its allies, and for the post-war era embrace fantastic and revolutionary schemes to finance itself and others does violence to common sense.

We seem to have been hypnotized into a state of exaltation that has made us forget we had 10,000,000 unemployed in the United States in 1939 when our financial position was based upon solid granite compared with the present foundation of debt.

The sole specific reason for abandonment of the project of returning the world to a gold basis is the statement that the opponents of gold are in the ascendant politically in England. There are also references to other countries which are unharmed.

Mr. H. D. White, adviser of the United States Treasury in currency and exchange matters, attempts to answer criticisms of the proposed monetary fund agreement in an article published in the January issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly Review.

Contrasting Mr. White's statement with that of Lord Keynes the reader must be impressed with the fact that the American delegate to Bretton Woods is driven to vague and platitudinous explanations which do not explain with any conviction, and to questioning the motives of those who are crude enough to ask what advantages the proposed agreement would have for the United States.

Mr. White's discussion of the gold standard feature of the proposed agreement leaves the impression that the American delegation to Bretton Woods was bankrupt in ideas, or at best made a feeble effort to offset the revolutionary ideas of the brilliant St. George who slew the golden calf—turned dragon since it got a new home.

However, the gold standard feature of the discussion, of transcendant importance as it is to the American people, is not the only subject matter which deserves painstaking analysis. And here again, we are indebted to Lord Keynes for clear and forthright pronouncements, while the American apologists come dangerously close to misrepresentation by omission and studied ambiguity.

Maintenance of prestige of London

Of course, every informed American, for sentimental as well as selfish reasons, will favor the maintenance of London as a financial center of first magnitude, but ordinary prudence demands we pay heed to world changes.

In the post-war era hundreds of millions of bewildered human beings in the United States and elsewhere are going to face the day-to-day problem of earning sufficient to sustain themselves and of laying the foundation of something better than a haunted existence. They are going to face this task amid the greatest disorganization of modern times, many of them in great areas where the devastation of war has created economic deserts.

The theory that the people of the United States, staggering under a debt which may be greater than that of all other nations combined, are not going to face grim and soul-trying problems of their own is just fatuous and contrary to common sense.

Under these circumstances it is important that the prestige of London, Paris, Moscow, Brussels, Amsterdam, Chungking, and all other centers from which plans for orderly reconstruction will naturally radiate shall be maintained. However, it is important that the plans for this maintenance shall have some relationship to the year 1945 and that they shall not be predicated upon political and economic conceptions of the eighteenth century.

Only the blind, or those who will not see, refuse to recognize the fact that the world has been, and is steadily, moving away from European political and economic domination. Not only the teeming millions of Asia and India but of all other continents are in revolt against the theory that the rest of the earth was created and held in trust for the benefit of Europe.

The transformation of the British Empire into the British Commonwealth of Nations after World War No. 1 was, in reality, a peace-

ful revolution and simply cloaked a trend toward complete political and economic independence of self-governing dominions. The inability of the mother country to finance or defend overseas possessions not only in the case of the British but also of the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Portuguese, will accentuate this trend.

Another accelerating factor is a vitalized, and prospectively industrialized Russia.

New alinements economically are inevitable and all attempts to push the world back into an eighteenth century pattern put a premium on chaos.

With these facts in mind the anxiety of Lord Keynes as to the future position of London is understandable but likewise it seems clear that he is attempting to achieve the impossible and has warped the whole conception of international monetary cooperation to that end.

Admittedly, Lord Keynes has never posed as a citizen of the world or disguised the fact that his primary concerns were the financial and economic welfare of England and the perpetuation or restoration of the importance and power of London.

As one major advantage to the British of the fund he outlines the amazing exception which permits them to pursue for 5 years whatever trade practices and restrictions they have found useful in international trade and as another major advantage he pointed out the indispensability of the fund in the matter of maintaining London as the financial center of empire countries and many other countries. To use his exact words:

"So far from an international plan endangering the long tradition, by which most empire countries, and many other countries, too, have centered their financial systems in London, the plan is, in my judgment, an indispensable means of maintaining this tradition."

Where is control?

Although the revised Keynes International Clearing Union plan now denominated the Bretton Woods agreement is represented as a plan of cooperation on an equitable basis it is weighted in every feature first in favor of the developed and industrialized nations, and secondly against the United States in favor of the British, Russian, French, Dutch, and Belgian empires.

We do not have to speculate as to the underlying philosophy.

Paragraph 39 of the original Keynes Clearing Union plan stated:

"The Union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world. Without it other more desirable elements will find themselves impeded and unsupported. With it they will fall into their places as parts of an ordered scheme."

Here is a frank statement of purpose.

Now in attempting to meet criticism that the United States will carry the burdens and have only a minority voice, American Treasury Adviser White makes a thought-provoking statement in the January issue of Foreign Affairs:

"Some critics fear," says Mr. White, "that other nations are not interested in maintaining a sound fund, that the fund will be managed by debtors and that the United States will have only a minority voice. This fear is hardly warranted by the facts. The United States will have 28 percent, and the United Kingdom, the British Dominions, and India together will have 26 percent of the total voting power. Provision is made for having the two largest creditor countries on the executive directorate."

1. Mr. White asserts as a fact that the fund will be controlled by the United States and British as against the rest of the world.

2. He confirms the fact that although the British are expressly allowed for 5 years to continue whatever restrictions they have maintained during the war, and to adapt these to changing circumstances and to institute new ones in occupied areas, they will simultaneously have practically equal voting power with the United States in the fund, which purportedly is created to abolish such restrictions.

3. Mr. White takes the United Kingdom out of the category of a debtor nation by his reference to membership on the executive directorate. If this statement is not an inadvertence it would mean that there has been some forgiveness of England's debt from World War No. 1 and a remission of the enormous lend-lease balance without Congressional action. Whatever the wise course may be ultimately in relation to these matters it is incredible that any steps would have been taken along such lines without legal authority or by indirection.

4. Mr. White omits to point out that under the system of voting for the 12 executive directors the United States would have one, and the British would have a minimum of two and possibly three.

5. In classifying the British as a creditor with 26 percent of the votes, which, with the 28 percent of the United States would control the fund, Mr. White obscures the fact that as a debtor with 26 percent of the vote the British would have a common interest with other debtors having 25 percent to control the fund as against the United States.

Again we are reminded of the Balfour note. Great Britain had a common interest with other debtors and led the attack on all debts to the United States.

The financial leadership of the world has gravitated to the United States as a result of developments of 150 years. As a basis of securing billions of dollars in war aid, this has been dinned into our ears by all politicians, foreign and domestic.

Now, even before the savage slaughter is ended, we are exhorted to neutralize or destroy the leadership of the one nation which could point the way to some measure of fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter.

The natural question is, Why do nations other than the European empires subscribe?

There are two complete answers:

1. If the United States enters the compact, the rest of the world is leaderless.

2. For a time at least, and until the day of disillusionment, all member nations will have access to the most desirable currency in the world at a cheap rate—the American dollar.

Certainly, the prestige of London should be maintained, but it should be on a basis of reality and of present-day world conditions.

Quotas and voting features of plan

In discussing the monetary-fund plan as agreed upon with the American experts and subsequently adopted at Bretton Woods, Lord Keynes made an observation which is both interesting and important. He said:

"There were, it is true, certain features of elegance, clarity, and logic in the clearing-union plan which have disappeared. And this, by me at least, is to be much regretted."

All persons who had hoped for something better after this war than the conventional double-talking type of agreements which have been the curse of mankind will join in his regret.

While Lord Keynes' original plan was subject to criticism because of its revolutionary features and the inequitable distribution of advantages and disadvantages, it was a model of clarity and logic if you once accepted unsound premises.

As it emerges from Bretton Woods, the plan, with one exception, embodies all of the inequitable features, some of them mutually destructive, submerged under cross-references and ambiguities. It seems impossible all of these are attributable to accident or poor craftsmanship.

Possibly the key to some of this obscurantism is found in Lord Keynes' discussion of one of the major advantages of the plan from the British standpoint:

"That is to say," said Lord Keynes, "that those proposals are the exact opposite of the gold standard. They lay down by international agreement the essence of the new doctrine, far removed from the old orthodoxy. If they do so in terms as inoffensive as possible to the former faith, need we complain?"

In other words, the bad news about gold was to be sugar-coated for the American people.

The question naturally arises as to whether this type of treatment was also prescribed when it came to the matter of the original setting up and subsequent changing of quotas and the method of voting on the election of the real managers of the fund.

We are not advised as to how the original quotas were fixed. They are found in "Schedule A quotas," attached to the draft of the agreement, and a mere examination of the document will induce curiosity as to the relative amounts.

In connection with this examination, the student should keep in mind the provisions of article III, which govern the method of paying for these subscriptions, because the receipts for these subscriptions will constitute the capital of the fund.

One thing is crystal clear, and that is that one-fourth of the subscription of the United States will be paid in gold, to the amount of $687,500,000, and the balance in dollars, to the amount of $2,062,500,000.

The other nations will have the right to pay in one-fourth of their respective subscriptions in gold, or 10 percent of their respective holdings of gold and American dollars. The balance of the subscription in each case will be payable in the currency of the subscriber.

It takes little arithmetic and less imagination to ascertain the fact that the treasury of the fund, in addition to the United States subscription, is going to receive the minimum of gold and dollars and the maximum of all kinds of currencies of questionable value.

Certainly no enterprise, public or private, was ever launched on such a bizarre basis of contribution by the prospective partners.

The very weighting of the quotas and the method of paying subscriptions certainly substantiate the suggestion that the fund is a labyrinthine process of further handicapping the United States in post-war foreign trade while furnishing the other nations a means of getting American dollars at a cheap rate.

Is it any wonder that Soviet Russia demanded at Bretton Woods that her quota be increased by $300,000,000?

Is it any wonder that Lord Keynes secured a $400,000,000 quota for India, and, simultaneously, the adoption of subdivision g of section 2 of article XX, which enables Great Britain to join on behalf of herself as well as India?

The quotas form the basis for getting dollars and for voting.

Is it any wonder that American financiers and financial authorities almost unanimously condemn this elaborate and complex enigma?

In addition to the dollar-getting value of quotas the varied and complicated provisions for voting by quotas afford the student of puzzles a wide field for the exercise of his talents.

To follow through and analyze all voting provisions would require a separate voume.

There are provisions for votes on a majority basis, a four-fifths basis, a unanimous basis, a preferential basis, a sectional basis, a unit basis, a quota basis, a combined absolute plus-quota basis, and for votes based upon a combined absolute and quota basis plus or minus votes dependent on purchases and sales of currencies.

Articles XII, XV, XVI, XVII and schedule C are of special interest on the subject of voting.

In the board of governors consisting of 44 members, 1 appointed by each nation, are vested certain over-all powers which may not be delegated and in relation to which the voting rights of the United States and of the British Commonwealth of Nations, including India, are approximately equal.

In the creation of the board of executive directors, consisting of 12 members which will really be the governing body, the situation is extremely interesting.

Of the original board of 12 the United States, the United Kingdom—not as a member of the British Commonwealth—Soviet Russia, China, and France will each appoint one.

Of the remaining seven, five will be elected by the remaining members excluding the American republics and two will be elected by the American republics other than the United States.

Following is a list of the nations with the highest quotas—next to the Big Five—which will be eligible to the five elective places:

India	$400,000,000
Canada	300,000,000
Netherlands	275,000,000
Belgium	225,000,000
Australia	200,000,000
Czechoslovakia	125,000,000
Poland	125,000,000
South Africa	100,000,000

Under the system of voting provided by schedule C it is perfectly apparent that one of the British Dominions will elect an executive director.

Out of the four remaining executive directors in this group, does it seem cynical to suggest that Belgium and the Netherlands will each get one, and that the remaining two will be divided between the British and the Russians, one going to a British Dominion and one to a Russian-sponsored Poland or Czechoslovakia or, possibly Yugoslavia.

The remaining two places will be filled by the American republics other than the United States.

In all likelihood the board of 12 executive directors will consist of 1 United States director, a minimum of 2 and probably 3 British, a minimum of 1 Soviet and probably a Soviet sponsored director, 1 representing each of the Belgian, Dutch, and French Empires, 2 representing American Republics, and 1 representing China.

This is the board which will govern the fund and select the managing director, who will hire and fire the staff of the fund, conduct the ordinary business of the fund, and hold office at the pleasure of the board of executive directors.

Let us not speculate on the nationality of the managing director, but is it not permissible to speculate on what Lord Keynes meant when in addressing the House of Lords on the subject of management of the fund he said "that is perhaps a little better than appears"?

Also would it not be interesting to know exactly what he meant when, in summing up the advantages to England, he said:

"But it would require great fool-hardiness to reject it, much more fool-hardiness than is to be found in this wise, intuitive country."

Is it any wonder that the ambiguities, complexities, and interpretations of this document have caused an outstanding American scholar to remark:

"But there remains the fundamental fact that national attitudes are very far apart, so much so that in efforts to get their plan adopted the experts have to engage in what comes dangerously close to double talk."

Cooperation and isolationism

The pleas of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and of his adviser, Dr. Harry D. White, for acceptance of the so-called Bretton Woods agreement by the United States, are extremely interesting.

Probably there could be no more enlightening study than a contrasting of the articles by the two American Treasury representatives in the January issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly Review, and the speech of Lord Keynes in the House of Lords.

Resorting to subtlety only when necessary to refrain from displaying too much of a sense of triumph the adroit coadjutor of Winston Churchill enumerated in clear and concise language five major advantages to his country, and swept away with incisive arguments suggestions that the agreement might subject his country to some compensating disadvantages.

This scion of a race, born and bred in the tradition of understatement, drives home with striking phrases the fact that he has been concerned with the future welfare of his own country, and that he has achieved concessions of epoch-making proportions from the United States.

In all fairness, Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. White had the difficult, if not impossible, task of justifying the same document to the people who are going to be called upon to make the epoch-making concessions on top of other staggering burdens assumed in the common cause.

By contrast, the Morgenthau and White presentations deal in platitudes and generalities. They present weak excuses for the abandonment of standards and fundamental principles which have had the sanction of generations in favor of experiments which have nothing to recommend them other than the hope of staving off the day of judgment on the bill for indulgence in the destruction of war.

Probably the most disheartening aspect of the entire presentation by the American Treasury is the absolute lack of any constructive suggestion or leadership toward getting the world to recognize the need for the nations to put their respective houses in order as a sound foundation on which all nations can initiate a new era of productiveness to overcome the wastage of war and pay something other than lip service to the pious pronouncements of the Atlantic Charter.

The Secretary and his adviser seem to be defeated and resigned to the conception that the primary objective should be the propping up of old regimes and old forms which have lost much of their significance.

Armed with the greatest gold holding in the history of finance, the greatest productive capacity any nation has ever known, and a national record almost free of traditional antagonisms, they emerge from an international conference with an agreement which discredits the prestige of gold, forges fetters for the national productive capacity, and lays the foundation for antagonisms when other nations realize that the post-war United States has grim and heart-breaking problems of its own to solve which will prevent it acting indefinitely as a grand almoner.

Perhaps the weakness of their presentation is most accentuated by their resort to threadbare political slogans to obtain approval. Secretary Morgenthau says:

"We must always keep in mind that other nations are anxiously asking whether the United States has the desire and ability to cooperate effectively in establishing world peace. If we fail to ratify the Bretton Woods agreement, they will be convinced that the American people either do not desire to cooperate or that they do not know how to achieve cooperation."

Treasury Adviser White admits that careful and responsible economists "whose objectives are admirable" have counseled delay, but he complains that theirs is the approach to perfectionism, and that they play into the hands of economic isolationists. Apparently, Mr. White has discovered some people who do not desire to have the United States sell goods abroad.

These two arguments by two gentlemen who represented the United States at Bretton Woods serve to create the suspicion that they succumbed completely to the charm and hypnotic influence of diplomats of other nations.

More than anyone in America they should know from the balance sheet of the United States Treasury the price in money the people of this Nation have paid in cooperating to save Europe not once but twice. They should know that Mr. Morgenthau has just submitted to the National Congress a bill to raise the national debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000 and that the end is not yet in sight.

They should know that the United States has given, under the euphonious designation of lend-lease, billions of dollars to arm and equip, feed and clothe every nation fighting Germany and Japan, and that the United States is financing her own armed forces, not on one front or two fronts, but on fronts all over the world where they are fighting to liberate territories belonging to others.

They could also learn from the War and Navy Departments that the incomplete American casualty lists now aggregate more than 750,000 of the finest men in the world, killed, wounded, or prisoner, some of them in prison camps conducted by inhuman and bestial captors.

They might read the communiques and listen to the stories of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, the Marshalls, New Guinea, New Britain, and other British, French, and Dutch possessions where American marines, soldiers, and sailors have died to restore these lands to empires that could neither defend nor retake them.

They might review the story of China and Burma, where American airmen and foot soldiers have fought and died to retrieve the horrible mistakes in imperial policies which alienated the loyalties of natives, in contrast to the attitude of the Filipinos toward the United States.

They might also give some thought to the front in Italy and to the landing on the beaches of Normandy, followed by the liberation of France, and the make-up of the western front, where four American armies have borne the brunt of the fight.

Even this partial review of the cooperative activities of the United States should be sufficient to stop the claptrap and demagoguery which manifest themselves in the statements of American public servants who presume to coerce the fathers, mothers, wives, and children of 12,000,000 men in the armed services into throwing away the heritage of these very fighting men and their children.

Apparently these Treasury officials give little thought to the fact that out of every billion dollars they dissipate an additional mortgage of $400,000,000 is piled on the backs of the 12,000,000 in the armed services and their families on top of the $120,000,000,000 mortgage already representing their burden of the national debt.

The very introduction of this sort of argument into the discussion of the Bretton Woods Agreement should put the American people on notice to be cautious.

Only "an iron ration"

In considering the fund agreement we must bear in mind constantly that it is only one step in some inchoate over-all plan of which we know nothing.

Perhaps nothing could be more indicative of the scope and implications of the over-all plan than Lord Keynes' outline of the relative position of the fund:

"I emphasize that such is the purpose of the quotas. They are not intended as daily food for us or any other country to live upon during the reconstruction or afterward. Provision for that belongs to another chapter of international cooperation, upon which we shall embark shortly unless you discourage us unduly about this one. The

quotas for drawing on the fund's resources are an iron ration to tide over temporary emergencies of one kind or another. Perhaps this is the best reply I can make to Lord Addison's doubts whether our quota is large enough. It is obviously not large enough for us to live upon during the reconstruction period. But this is not its purpose. Pending further experience, it is, in my judgment, large enough for the purposes for which it is intended."

"An iron ration"—

If the sacrifices to be made by the United States in this matter will afford only "an iron ration," has anyone the imagination to conceive what the full menu is to be?

This statement is not something conjured up by a nonccoperator or an isolationist. It is a deliberate appraisal by the author of the plan who was explaining why he had not secured even greater quotas than the amazing ones allocated to the British Commonwealth.

We are on notice that our concessions at Bretton Woods are not going to satisfy appetites or create any sense of gratitude.

Despite the fact that they would constitute the most amazing forbearance and generosity ever known in international dealings, they would be "an iron ration."

It would be deplorable to import into this discussion some of our sad experiences after the First World War, but it is well to bear in mind in general that after the fighting is over politicians in Europe will justify themselves to their constituents for the nonsolution of problems by finding a scapegoat.

I do not intend to labor this matter of "an iron ration," but a solemn responsibility rests upon us to take notice of the appraisal already made abroad.

Again it is interesting to note that Lord Keynes makes a cryptic reference to a feature of the fund which is certainly not clear from a reading of the agreement. I refer to the matter of supervision of capital expenditures.

"Not merely as a feature of the transition, but as a permanent arrangement, the plan accords to every member government the explicit right to control all capital movements. What used to be a heresy is now endorsed as orthodox. In my own judgment, countries which avail themselves of this right may find it necessary to scrutinize all transactions, so as to prevent evasion of capital regulations. Provided that the innocent, current transactions are let through, there is nothing in the plan to prevent this. In fact, it is encouraged. It follows that our right to control the domestic capital market is secured on firmer foundations than ever before, and is formally accepted as a proper part of agreed international arrangements."

There is a clear interpretation here of a permanent "planned economy" on a scale which has never been publicly admitted in the United States.

Coming, as it does, from Lord Keynes it may well cause inquiry as to whether there are other things concealed in this agreement which do not appear on the surface.

Is it an indemnity?

One of the most interesting features of this amazing project is the assumption that the United States has been the wicked Nation which has caused international economic turmoil, and should not only make a present financial reparation but give guaranties of future good conduct.

All other nations, which apparently have pursued an altruistic course, are to participate in this reparation and have the protection of these guaranties as a matter of right.

It seems impossible to conjure a more complete perversion of history and equity.

At least there is no intimation up to date that the United States was responsible for World War No. 1, and no man living or dead did more to expose the stupidities and the dangers incorporated in the economic clauses of the Treaty of Versailles than did John Maynard Keynes by his book, The Economic Consequences of the Peace, published in 1920.

Mr. Keynes had not yet been raised to the peerage, and had not yet conceived the possibilities of loading on to the United States the consequences of the fantastic and contradictory conceptions of European politicians.

Mr. Keynes savagely attacked the ranting of European politicians about levying $100,000,000,000 indemnity on Germany and simultaneously taking away her colonies, coal mines, railroad equipment, and practically all other means of earning the money to pay the indemnity.

The United States asked for no indemnity and refused to accept any territory. European empires expanded their territories enormously.

Keynes' predictions proved conservative because even he could not anticipate additional activities of European politicians, who immediately devised new methods of carrying out their own designs.

No one knows better than Lord Keynes that at the end of the present war there is going to be little to distinguish victor from vanquished in the matter of debt and economic hardship. Germany and Japan will be hopeless as sources of indemnity.

In looking around for a substitute he found the United States, and apparently is astonished at his own success.

The amazing feature, however, is that Lord Keynes seeks, in principle, to do the very thing he berated in 1920. He seeks to make the United States the pack mule for the financial and economic burdens of the world, and simultaneously tether the mule so as to cut down the grazing space necessary to keep it strong enough to carry the load.

But Lord Keynes is not the only forehanded member of the British Government in the matter of after-the-war trade.

At Bristol, according to the Associated Press, on January 20, 1945, Lord Woolton, Minister of Reconstruction, made a speech which should be instructive to those charged with the welfare of the United States.

He disclosed that governmental departments had made studies of economic conditions in 26 countries, that since July 1944 the British Government had granted exit permits to 1,512 businessmen for foreign travel, that some of the restrictions on exports would be lifted soon, and that the Government was prepared to increase its appropriation for backing export trade from $300,000,000 to $800,000,000.

This may be puzzling to Americans who have sons in the American armies on the western front, in Burma, in New Guinea, and in the air forces based in England, and on the seas all over the world. It may also puzzle those Americans who are being drafted to make munitions and planes and ships to carry on all-out war all over the world for several years if necessary.

However, it is exactly in accord with the plans and purposes of Lord Keynes and Lord Woolton, immediately on the collapse of Germany.

Urging a meeting of British businessmen to look ahead and be prepared to go out and fight for more trade immediately on the ending of the European war, Lord Woolton said:

"The world abroad is hungry for our products and we must not tempt our customers overseas to find other sources of supply."

Certainly, no American would deliberately cause disunity, but does it not seem reasonable to ask these other nations to go after trade if they want to but, at least, not bother us with all these new schemes and burdens while we are fighting to liberate their overseas territories? Conceivably, we may need this iron ration to keep our armies, fleets, and air forces supplied while these other nations are chasing trade.

The bank

I have refrained from a discussion of the bank section of the plan for the reason that although it may have many valuable features, its very existence is dependent on creation of the fund.

The projects have been tied together apparently with the purpose of forcing the United States to accept the fund if it desires to achieve the constructive purposes of the bank.

We have no option to subscribe to the bank's shares and reject the fund.

Conclusion

May I anticipate the criticism that those who advocate rejection of this plan are either perfectionists or advocates of isolationism.

Almost 6 years ago, before the world was devastated and millions of human beings were killed and maimed, I advocated in common with others an intelligent use of our stock of gold to stimulate world trade and stave off the horrors of war.

I suggested as an initial step that the United States offer as a free gift to nations of the world $5,000,000,000 in gold bullion to be used as a base for sound currencies and for the infusion of $50,000,000,000 of credit into world trade.

The plan provided that the gift should be administered by a commission composed of Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of State Cordell Hull, former President Herbert C. Hoover, former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and the late James H. Perkins, chairman of the board of the National City Bank of New York, one of the most respected bankers in the world and a warm friend of President Roosevelt.

The plan received the endorsement of outstanding figures in private life including financiers and economists but was subjected to the one criticism that no one in political office would dare suggest giving away $5,000,000,000. The criticism proved to be sound.

For more than 5 years Winston Churchill and others had been warning the world of the deteriorating situation and of the rising tide of totalitarianism, but their warnings were ignored.

Nations had dishonored their signatures of and commitments under peace treaties which had been executed with pomp and ceremony and high-powered press-agentry.

The Treaty of Versailles had borne all the evil fruit predicted by Lord Keynes, the Locarno and Kellogg pacts proved to be mere scraps of paper, and when Secretary of State Stimson had sought to check Japan's initial crime against China, the other signatories of the Nine Power Treaty coldly refused to honor their bond.

All those nations which had benefited territorially after World War No. 1 busied themselves fencing in economically vast areas of the earth.

Two contemptible figures, envisaging themselves as reincarnations of Napoleon Bonaparte and Julius Caesar, were permitted to create a situation imperiling all civilization, and with a genius for imitation a group of oriental jingoes joined the parade.

The months and years preceding the fateful autumn of 1939 saw the world plunging toward war in the exact pattern that had preceded 1914.

Substantively the statements and speeches that crowded the international press and airways were reproductions of statements and speeches of early 1914. They were angry and provocative in context, tone, and background.

In common with others I feared another war would cost the United States 500,000 casualties and increase the national debt by $30,000,000,000. The casualties are already more than 750,000 and the increase in debt $200,000,000,000.

And before the slaughter ceases we are preparing devious methods of perpetuating all the old errors.

Instead of bold American leadership towards a sound economic basis all over the world, and implementation of the Atlantic Charter, we are listening to the siren song of those who would rebuild all the old artificial economic fences, encourage 5 years more of instability, and substitute inflationary theories for traditionally sound procedure.

Instead of a basis of hope for economic freedom and betterment, hundreds of millions are to be told the Atlantic Charter was a mere pious and informal expression and that the United States is to finance the same old imperialistic designs which have bred one war after another.

Instead of boldly leading the world in courageous reconstruction on a sound basis and in the light of twentieth century conditions, the attempt is being made to commit the manpower and resources of the United States to financing, underwriting, and perpetuating an eighteenth century European conception of economic domination of the human race.

It would seem the American delegates had forgotten that the economic policies of European empires had been responsible in greatest measure for the establishment of the 21 American republics, for the increasing independence of the overseas dominions and territories of these empires and for the unrest and revolutionary upheavals of the teeming millions of Asia during the last 30 years.

Even if the American people were willing to turn their backs on every principle that has made the Nation great and finance reaction, it would be futile.

It would simply mean that when our resources had been drained and we faced inevitable bankruptcy and disorganization, Soviet Russia would take over world leadership.

Thirty years ago the names of Hohenzollern, Romanoff, Hapsburg, and Bourbon connoted strength in more or less degree.

Nothing accentuates the change in human affairs more strikingly than the fact that these, today, are the names of discredited political refugees. They have scattered to the four winds, leaving in their wake a devastated Europe which can never again lead or dominate the world.

The so-called Bretton Woods agreement does not provide for a forward-looking or expanding economy. It is an expression of cynical and selfish determination to turn back human progress, level downward the American standard of living for the benefit of Europe, destroy the hope of hundreds of millions of human beings, and let economy expand only where and as it can be controlled by men who have an eighteenth century outlook.

It should be rejected and the United States should assume the leadership of a movement which will implement the Atlantic Charter and provide for sound currencies based on gold and silver, and improvement of standards of living—not only in Europe but all over the world—respect for the rights of small as well as large nations, the elimination of economic exploitation of the weak, and the encouragement of all people striving for political and economic freedom.

In a world half-slave and half-free, there can be no peace or progress.

The address of Lord Keynes was delivered in the House of Lords May 23, 1944.

Ostensibly the only agreement up to that time was set forth in the Joint Statement of Experts, issued by the United States Treasury on April 21, 1944.

Intrinsically, however, the Keynes address suggests the ultimate detailed plan adopted at Bretton Woods had already been agreed upon.

For instance, it is notable that while the joint statement of April only mentions the total amount of the fund capital, Lord Keynes had detailed knowledge of what the all-important quotas would be.

Other statements in the address which were cryptic and ambiguous as of May 23, 1944, are shown by subsequent events to have been based on absolute knowledge.

The address merits the careful study of every person who desires to form an intelligent judgment of this revolutionary proposal.

ADDRESS OF LORD KEYNES ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF LORDS, MAY 23, 1944

Lord KEYNES. My Lords, it is almost exactly a year since the proposals for a clearing union were discussed in Your Lordships' House. I hope to persuade Your Lordships that the year has not been ill-spent. There were, it is true, certain features of elegance, clarity, and logic in the clearing-union plan which have disappeared. And this, by me at least, is to be much regretted. As a result, however, there is no longer any need for a new-fangled international monetary unit. Your Lordships will remember how little any of us liked the names proposed—bancor, unitas, dolphin, bezant, daric, and heaven knows what. Some of Your Lordships were good enough to join in the search for something better. I recall a story of a country parish in the last century where they were accustomed to give their children Biblical names—Amos, Ezekiel, Obadiah, etc. Needing a name for a dog, after a long and vain search of the Scriptures, they called the dog Moreover. We hit no such happy solution, with the result that it has been the dog that died. The loss of the dog we need not too much regret, though I still think that it was a more thoroughbred animal than what has now come out from a mixed marriage of ideas. Yet, perhaps, as sometimes occurs, this dog of mixed origin is a sturdier and more serviceable animal and will prove not less loyal and faithful to the purposes for which it has been bred.

I commend the new plan to your Lordships as being, in some important respects (to which I will return later), a considerable improvement on either of its parents. I like this new plan and I believe that it will work to our advantage. Your Lordships will not wish me to enter into too much technical detail. I can best occupy the time available by examining the major benefits this country may hope to gain from the plant; and whether there are adequate safeguards against possible disadvantages. We shall emerge from this war, having won a more solid victory over our enemies, a more enduring friendship from our allies, and a deeper respect from the world at large, than perhaps at any time in our history. The victory, the friendship, and the respect will have been won, because, in spite of faint-hearted preparations, we have sacrificed every precaution for the future in the interests of immediate strength with a fanatical single-mindedness which has had few parallels. But the full price of this has still to be paid. I wish that this was more generally appreciated in the country than it is. In thus waging the war without counting the ultimate cost we—and we alone of the United Nations—have burdened ourselves with a weight of deferred indebtedness to other countries beneath which we shall stagger. We have already given to the common cause all, and more than all, that we can afford. It follows that we must examine any financial plan to make sure that it will help us to carry our burdens and not add to them. No one is more deeply convinced of this than I am. I make no complaint, therefore, that those to whom the details of the scheme are new and difficult, should scrutinise them with anxious concern.

What, then, are these major advantages that I hope from the plan to the advantage of this country? First. It is clearly recognized and agreed that, during the post-war transitional period of uncertain duration, we are entitled to retain any of those wartime restrictions, and special arrangements with the sterling area and others which are helpful to us, without being open to the charge of acting contrary to any general engagements into which we have entered. Having this assurance, we can make our plans for the most difficult days which will follow the war, knowing where we stand and without risk of giving grounds of offence. This is a great gain—and one of the respects in which the new plan is much superior to either of its predecessors, which did not clearly set forth any similar safeguards.

Second. When this period is over and we are again strong enough to live year by year on our own resources, we can look forward to trading in a world of national currencies which are interconvertible. For a great commercial nation like ourselves this is indispensable for full prosperity. Sterling itself, in due course, must obviously become, once again, generally convertible. For, without this, London must necessarily lose its international position, and the arrangements in particular of the sterling area would fall to pieces. To suppose that a system of bilateral and barter agreements, with no one who owns sterling knowing just what he can do with it—to suppose that this is the best way of encouraging the dominions to center their financial systems on London, seems to me pretty near frenzy. As a technique of little Englandism, adopted as a last resort when all else has failed us, with this small country driven to autarchy, keeping itself to itself in a harsh and unfriendly world, it might make more sense. But those who talk this way, in the expectation that the rest of the Commonwealth will throw in their lot on these lines and cut their free commercial relations with the rest of the world, can have very little idea how this Empire has grown or by what means it can be sustained.

So far from an international plan endangering the long tradition, by which most empire countries, and many other countries, too, have centered their financial systems in London, the plan is, in my judgment, an indispensable means of maintaining this tradition. With our own resources so greatly impaired and encumbered, it is only if sterling is firmly placed in an international setting that the necessary confidence in it can be sustained. Indeed, even during the transitional period, it will be our policy, I hope, steadily to develop the field within which sterling is freely available as rapidly as we can manage. Now, if our own goal is, as it surely must be, the general interconvertibility of sterling with other currencies, it must obviously be to our trading advantage that the same obtains elsewhere, so that we can sell our exports in one country and freely spend the proceeds in any other. It is a great gain to us in particular, that other countries in the world should agree to refrain from these discriminatory exchange practices which we ourselves have never adopted in times of peace but from which in the recent past our traders have suffered greatly at the hands of others. My noble friend, Lord Addison, has asked whether such an arrangement could be operated in such a way that certain markets might be closed to British exports. I can firmly assure him that none of the monetary proposals will do so provided that if we find ourselves with currencies in a foreign country which we do not choose to spend in that country, we can then freely remit them somewhere else to buy goods in another country. There is no compulsion on us, and if we choose to come to a particular bargain in the country where we have resources, then that is entirely at our discretion.

Third. The wheels of trade are to be oiled by what is, in effect, a great addition to the world's stock of monetary reserves, distributed, moreover, in a reasonable way. The quotas are not so large as under the clearing union, and Lord Addison drew attention to that. But they are substantial and can be increased subsequently if the need is shown. The aggregate for the world is put provisionally at £2,500,000,000. Our own share of this—for ourselves and the Crown colonies,

which, I may mention, are treated for all purposes as a part of the British monetary system (in itself a useful acknowledgement)—is £325,000,000, a sum which may easily double, or more than double, the reserves which we shall otherwise hold at the end of the transitional period. The separate quotas of the rest of the sterling area will make a further large addition to this. Who is so confident of the future that he will wish to throw away so comfortable a supplementary aid in time of trouble? Do the critics think it preferable, if the winds of the trade cycle blow, to diminish our demand for imports by increasing unemployment at home, rather than meet the emergency out of this fund which will be expressly provided for such temporary purposes?

I emphasize that such is the purpose of the quotas. They are not intended as daily food for us or any other country to live upon during the reconstruction or afterward. Provision for that belongs to another chapter of international cooperation, upon which we shall embark shortly unless you discourage us unduly about this one. The quotas for drawing on the fund's resources are an iron ration to tide over temporary emergencies of one kind or another. Perhaps this is the best reply I can make to Lord Addison's doubts whether our quota is large enough. It is obviously not large enough for us to live upon during the reconstruction period. But this is not its purpose. Pending further experience, it is, in my judgment, large enough for the purposes for which it is intended.

There is another advantage to which I would draw Your Lordships' special attention. A proper share of responsibility for maintaining equilibrium in the balance of international payments is squarely placed on the creditor countries. This is one of the major improvements in the new plan. The Americans, who are the most likely to be affected by this, have, of their own free will and honest purpose, offered us a far-reaching formula of protection against a recurrence of the main cause of deflation during the inter-war years, namely the draining of reserves out of the rest of the world to pay a country which was obstinately borrowing and exporting on a scale immensely greater than it was lending and importing. Under clause VI of the plan a country engages itself, in effect, to prevent such a situation from arising again, by promising, should it fail, to release other countries from any obligation to take its exports, or, if taken, to pay for them. I cannot imagine that this sanction would ever be allowed to come into effect. If by no other means, than by lending, the creditor country will always have to find a way to square the account on imperative grounds of its own self-interest. For it will no longer be entitled to square the account by squeezing gold out of the rest of us. Here we have a voluntary undertaking, genuinely offered in the spirit both of a good neighbor and, I should add, of enlightened self-interest, not to allow a repetition of a chain of events which between the wars did more than any other single factor to destroy the world's economic balance and to prepare a seed-bed for foul growths. This is a tremendous extension of international cooperation to good ends. I pray Your Lordships to pay heed to its importance.

Fifth. The plan sets up an international institution with substantial rights and duties to preserve orderly arrangements in matters such as exchange rates which are two-ended and affect both parties alike, which can also serve as a place of regular discussion between responsible authorities to find ways to escape those many unforeseeable dangers which the future holds. The noble lord, Lord Addison, asks how the fund is to be managed. Admittedly this is not yet worked out in the necessary detail and it was right that he should stress the point. But three points which may help him, are fairly clear. This is an organization between governments, in which central banks only appear as the instrument and agent of their government. The voting power of the British Commonwealth and that of the United States are expected to be approximately equal. The management will be in three tiers—a body of expert, whole-time officials who will be responsible for the routine; a small board of management which will make all decisions of policy subject to any overriding instructions from the assembly, an assembly of all the member governments meeting less often and retaining a supervisory, but not an executive, control. That is perhaps even a little better than appears.

Here are five advantages of major importance. The proposals go far beyond what, even a short time ago, anyone could have conceived of as a possible basis of general international agreement. What alternative is open to us which gives comparable aid, or better, more hopeful opportunities for the future? I have considerable confidence that something very like this plan will be in fact adopted, if only on account of the plain demerits of the alternative of rejection. You can talk against this plan, so long as it is a matter of talking—saying in the same breath that it goes too far and that it does not go far enough, that it is too rigid to be safe and that it is too loose to be worth anything. But it would require great foolhardiness to reject it, much more foolhardiness than is to be found in this wise, intuitive country.

Therefore, for these manifold and substantial benefits, I commend the monetary proposals to Your Lordships. Nevertheless, before you will give them your confidence, you will wish to consider whether, in return, we are surrendering anything which is vital for the ordering of our domestic affairs in the manner we intend for the future. My Lords, the experience of the years before the war has led most of us, though some of us late in the day, to certain firm conclusions. Three in particular are highly relevant to this discussion. We are determined that, in future, the external value of sterling shall conform to its internal value as set by our own domestic policies, and not the other way round. Secondly, we intend to retain control of our domestic rate of interest, so that we can keep it as low as suits our own purposes, without interference from the ebb and flow of international capital movements or flights of hot money. Thirdly, whilst we intend to prevent inflation at home, we will not accept deflation at the dictate of influences from outside. In other words, we abjure the instruments of bank rate and credit contraction operating through the increase of unemployment as a means of forcing our domestic economy into line with external factors.

Have those responsible for the monetary proposals been sufficiently careful to preserve these principles from the possibility of interference? I hope Your Lordships will trust me not to have turned my back on all I have fought for. To establish those three principles which I have just stated has been my main task for the last 20 years. Sometimes almost alone, in popular articles in the press, in pamphlets, in dozens of letters to the Times, in textbooks, in enormous and obscure treatises I have spent my strength to persuade my countrymen and the world at large to change their traditional doctrines and, by taking better thought, to remove the curse of unemployment. Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshippers of the calf, who wrote that "Gold is a barbarous relic"? Am I so faithless, so forgetful, so senile that, at the very moment of the triumph of these ideas when, with gathering momentum, governments, parliaments, banks, the press, the public, and even economists have at last accepted the new doctrines, I go off to help forge new chains to hold us fast in the old dungeon? I trust, my Lords, that you will not believe it.

Let me take first the less prominent of the two issues which arise in this connection, namely, our power to control the domestic rate of interest so as to secure cheap money. Not merely as a feature of the transition but as a permanent arrangement, the plan accords to every member government the explicit right to control all capital movements. What used to be a heresy is now endorsed as orthodox. In my own judgment, countries which avail themselves of this right may find it necessary to scrutinize all transactions so as to prevent evasion of capital regulations. Provided that the innocent, current transactions are let through, there is nothing in the plan to prevent this. In fact, it is encouraged. It follows that our right to control the domestic capital market is secured on firmer foundations than ever before and is formally accepted as a proper part of agreed international arrangements.

The question, however, which has recently been given chief prominence is whether we are in any sense returning to the disabilities of the former gold standard, relief from which we have rightly learned to prize so highly. If I have any authority to pronounce on what is and what is not the essence and meaning of a gold standard, I should say that this plan is the exact opposite of it. The plan in its relation to gold is, indeed, very close to proposals which I advocated in vain as the right alternative, when I was bitterly opposing this country's return to gold. The gold standard, as I understand it, means a system under which the external value of a national currency is rigidly tied to a fixed quantity of gold which can only honorably be broken under force majeure; and it involves a financial policy which compels the internal value of the domestic currency to conform to this external value as fixed in terms of gold. On the other hand, the use of gold merely as a convenient common denominator by means of which the relative values of national currencies—these being free to change—are expressed from time to time, is obviously quite another matter.

My noble friend Lord Addison asks who fixes the value of gold. If he means, as I assume he does, the sterling value of gold, it is we ourselves who fix it initially in consultation with the fund; and this value is subject to change at any time on our initiative, changes in excess of 10 percent requiring the approval of the fund, which must not withhold approval if our domestic equilibrium requires it. There must be some price for gold; and so long as gold is used as a monetary reserve it is most advisable that the current rates of exchange and the relative values of gold in different currencies should correspond. The only alternative to this would be the complete demonetization of gold. I am not aware that anyone has proposed that. For it is only common sense as things are today to continue to make use of gold and its prestige as a means of settling international accounts. To demonetize gold would obviously be highly objectionable to the British Commonwealth and to Russia as the main producers, and to the United States and the western allies as the main holders of it. Surely no one disputes that? On the other hand, in this country we have already dethroned gold as the fixed standard of value. The plan not merely confirms the de-thronement but approves it by expressly providing that it is the duty of the fund to alter the gold value of any currency if it is shown that this will be serviceable to equilibrium.

In fact, the plan introduces in this respect an epoch-making innovation in an international instrument, the object of which is to lay down sound and orthodox principles. For instead of maintaining the principle that the internal value of a national currency should conform to a prescribed de jure external value, it provides that its external value

should be altered if necessary so as to conform to whatever de facto internal value results from domestic policies, which themselves shall be immune from criticism by the fund. Indeed, it is made the duty of the fund to approve changes which will have this effect. That is why I say that these proposals are the exact opposite of the gold standard. They lay down by international agreement the essence of the new doctrine, far removed from the old orthodoxy. If they do so in terms as inoffensive as possible to the former faith, need we complain?

No, my Lords, in recommending these proposals, I do not blot a page already written. I am trying to help write a new page. Public opinion is now converted to a new model, and I believe a much improved model, of domestic policy. That battle is all but won. Yet a not less difficult task still remains, namely, to organize an international setting within which the new domestic policies can occupy a comfortable place. Therefore, it is above all as providing an international framework for the new ideas and the new techniques associated with the policy of full employment that these proposals are not least to be welcomed.

Last week my noble friend, Lord Bennett, asked what assumptions the experts might be making about other phases of international agreement. I do not believe that the soundness of these foundations depends very much on the details of the superstructure. If the rest of the issues to be discussed are wisely settled, the task of the monetary fund will be rendered easier. But if we gain less assistance from other measures than we now hope, an agreed machinery of adjustment on the monetary side will be all the more necessary. I am certain that this is not a case of putting the cart before the horse. I think it most unlikely that fuller knowledge about future commercial policy would in itself make it necessary to alter any clause whatever in the proposals now before your Lordships' House. But if the noble viscount meant that these proposals need supplementing in other directions, no one could agree with him more than I do. In particular, it is urgent that we should seek agreement about setting up an international investment institution to provide funds for reconstruction and afterward. It is precisely because there is so much to do in the way of international collaboration in the economic field that it would be so disastrous to discourage this first attempt, or to meet it in a carping, suspicious, or cynical mood.

The noble lord, Lord Addison, has called the attention of Your Lordships to the striking statement made by Mr. Hull in connection with the National Foreign Trade Week in the United States, and I am very glad that he did so. This statement is important as showing that the policy of the United States administration on various issues of political and economic preparation forms a connected whole. I am certain that the people of this country are of the same mind as Mr. Hull, and I have complete confidence that he on his side will seek to implement the details with disinterestedness and generosity. If the experts of the American and British Treasuries have pursued the monetary discussions with more ardor, with a clearer purpose, and, I think, with more success so far than has yet proved possible with other associated matters, need we restrain them? If, however, there is a general feeling, as I think that there is, that discussion on other matters should be expedited, so that we may have a complete picture before us, I hope that Your Lordships will enforce this conclusion in no uncertain terms. I myself have never supposed that in the final outcome the monetary proposals should stand by themselves.

It is on this note of emphasizing the importance of furthering all genuine efforts directed toward international agreement in the economic field that I should wish to end my contribution to this debate. The proposals which are before Your Lordships are the result of the collaboration of many minds and the fruit of the collective wisdom of the experts of many nations. I have spent many days and weeks in the past year in the company of experts of this country, of the Dominions, of our European allies, and of the United States; and, in the light of some past experience I affirm that these discussions have been without exception a model of what such gatherings should be—objective, understanding, without waste of time or expense of temper. I dare to speak for the much-abused so-called experts. I even venture sometimes to prefer them, without intending any disrespect, to politicians. The common love of truth, bred of a scientific habit of mind, is the closest of bonds between the representatives of divers nations.

I wish I could draw back the veil of anonymity and give their due to the individuals of the most notable group with which I have ever been associated, covering half the nations of the world, who from prolonged and difficult consultations, each with their own interests to protect, have emerged, as we all of us know and feel in our hearts, a band of brothers. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the representatives of the United States Treasury and the State Department and the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, whose genuine and ready consideration for the difficulties of others, and whose idealistic and unflagging pursuit of a better international order, made possible so great a measure of agreement. I at any rate have come out from a year thus spent greatly encouraged, encouraged beyond all previous hope and expectation, about the possibility of just and honorable and practical economic arrangements between nations.

Do not discourage us. Perhaps we are laying the first brick, though it may be a colorless one, in a great edifice. If indeed it is our purpose to draw back from international cooperation and to pursue an altogther different order of ideas, the sooner that this is made clear the better; but that, I believe, is the policy of only a small minority, and for my part I am convinced that we cannot on those terms remain a great power and the mother of a commonwealth. If, on the other hand, such is not our purpose, let us clear our minds of excessive doubts and suspicions and go forward cautiously, by all means, but with the intention of reaching agreement.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on January 20 there was a meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association held in Lincoln, Nebr., at which time distinguished speakers presented different phases of the problem that faces those of us who live in the Missouri River Basin with reference to the development of its water resources.

General Crawford, of the Army, Colonel Neff and Colonel Freeman, officers of the Corps of Army Engineers, were speakers, as were many others, including Commissioner Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

A few days ago I received a copy of the address delivered at this meeting by the gentleman who is now the speaker of the unicameral legislature at Lincoln, Nebr., the Honorable C. Petrus Peterson. Having already placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the addresses delivered by other distinguished speakers at that meeting, I now request that the address delivered by Mr. Peterson be printed in the Appendix.

I should like to mention that he elaborates in a very interesting and instructive manner on the three proposals which have been made as to the method to be followed in the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. The first is that a State agency be set up by the States under an interstate compact; the second proposal, one which was made by the Congress in the passage of the flood-control bill and the rivers-and-harbors bill, is that existing Federal agencies, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, in consultation with the States in the area, construct and operate any proposed facilities; and the third proposal, the one made by the President in a recent message, is that Federal cooperation be provided by act of Congress especially to take charge, construct, and operate the project.

Mr. Peterson concludes his interesting statement with these words:

In my judgment, the problem presented, particularly with regard to the operation of the enterprise after construction, will be best solved under the principles of area home rule through a specially established Federal agency, corporate in form, whether called Missouri Valley Authority, or, as I should prefer, Missouri Valley Cooperative.

I ask that the entire address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was Bacon, I believe, who some centuries ago said that the first function of any governmental agency is to extend the scope of its own jurisdiction.

Someone more recently has said that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and its unjust powers from the demands of the governed.

In the development of our American institutions we observe the applicability of both statements. The struggle for jurisdiction has gone on since the early days of the Republic. In no sphere has this been more evident than in the field of water rights.

In Gibbon against Ogden, decided by the United States Supreme Court at the February term, 1824, the Court was called upon to decide the applicability of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution to harbor waters which were in fact an extension of the ocean. It is significant that even this area was then in doubt.

In Oklahoma against Atkinson Co., decided by the same Court June 2, 1941, 117 years later, the issue was the authority of the Federal Government, over the protest of the State of Oklahoma, to construct a dam and reservoir which would impound the waters of the Red River, or its tributary, Washita River, inundating 150,000 acres of land, 100,000 acres of which were in Oklahoma, requiring the removal of 8,000 inhabitants of Oklahoma from the inundated area and the acquisition of the land, some of which was owned by the State, by the Federal Government. It was conceded that no part of the Red River in Oklahoma was in fact navigable.

The Court held that the Federal authority for flood control extends to the tributaries of the river, even though the tributaries are not navigable.

It follows that, as now interpreted, the commerce clause has vested in the Federal Government final jurisdiction of a river system from the ocean to the upper end of the last brook of the watershed.

But it is not only a question of Federal jurisdiction over all the waters of all of the rivers; the Federal Government also has jurisdiction to install and control hydro-electric systems and to sell the current to the ultimate consumer. To this may be added Federal jurisdiction in matters of soil conservation. We have recently discovered that a farmer milking his own cow and selling the milk to his neighbor is engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, because the milk he sells is in competition with condensed milk which moves in interstate commerce. In fact there has been a tidal sweep extending Federal jurisdiction in all areas of our activity.

Nor is this solely a matter of changed judicial opinion. Our undertakings have knit us into an inextricable Federal pattern. In my lifetime, I have seen the highway development go from the precinct, with its road boss, to county systems, to State highway systems, to Federal highways and, in recent weeks, we had an international conference to plan the international skyways.

Now it is not strange that these rapid developments have created problems. We have often sought to fit progress into old forms, the biblical "new wine in old bottles," with indifferent success.

A summer neighbor of ours in the north woods of northern Minnesota built over his model T Ford to give it four speeds forward and two in reverse. He made it work but not without a good deal of growling in the gears.

In governmental matters we have often sought to rebuild governmental machinery where new models were in fact called for.

In our own area, the Missouri Valley, we shall presently be engaged in discussion concerning the type of governmental mechanism best adapted to an undertaking the scope of which staggers the imagination. Something over $1,000,000,000 is estimated as the dollar cost of construction. It will call for 250,000 man-years of labor. If successfully completed, it will quite completely change the economic and social life of people in seven States and can have a very substantial influence on our national life and therefore on the life of the world. Gigantic as the project appears, it is estimated that the benefits, in dollars, is as two and one-half is to one when compared with the cost.

The plan contemplates a single assault on a large group of problems with the purpose of finding solutions for the various problems in a unified plan.

The problems concern—

1. Flood control.
2. Navigation.
3. Irrigation.
4. Power development.
5. Soil conservation.
6. Wildlife conservation.
7. Recreational facilities.
8. Sanitation.

Under the present Federal organization, items 1 and 2 are assigned to the Army Engineers and the remaining six items to the Bureau of Reclamation. These two agencies, after a good deal of difference of opinion as to proper emphasis, have developed an overall plan which has been approved by the Congress and the President.

While the plan has been so approved, the question of what agency or agencies shall put the plan into operation remains unsettled. The act of Congress known as the flood-control bill, signed by the President on December 22, 1944 (H. R. 4485), authorizes construction by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill also declares the policy of the Congress to be that the States shall be consulted in the development and construction of the plan and the operation thereof. The President on November 27, 1944, recommended development and administration by a Federal corporation, modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, and referred to by the President as the Missouri Valley Authority. At the time the President signed the bill he said:

"My approval of this bill is given with the distinct understanding that it is not to be interpreted as jeopardizing in any way the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, the establishment of which should receive the early consideration of the next Congress."

Another suggestion is made by ex-Governor Carr of Colorado, namely, that the agency for the development of the Missouri basin should be an agency of the states involved, resting on an interstate compact entered by the interested States.

We accordingly have three proposals.

1. That a State agency be set up by the States under an interstate compact.

2. That the existing Federal agencies—the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation,—in consultation with the States in the area, construct and operate the proposed facilities. (The proposal of Congress.)

3. That a Federal corporation be set up by Act of Congress specifically to take charge, construct and operate the project. (The proposal of the President.)

What the people in our Missouri Valley need to analyze is not whether a Federal agency, under Federal jurisdiction will be required—the issue is what kind of a Federal agency.

If we are to make an intelligent choice among these three alternatives as the agency to undertake the task of constructing the vast network of dams, hydro-electric plants, transmission lines, flood control structures and navigation facilities stipulated in the Congressional act approved by the President December 22, 1944, (H. R. 4485) and to operate the gigantic enterprise after its construction it seems desirable to try to understand each of these governmental mechanisms, how each is established, how it would probably function and how we would like to live with it.

1. INTERSTATE COMPACT

Except on the theoretical basis that the States should at all times endeavor to resist the extension of Federal activities, the interstate compact proposal seems the least feasible. The development of a compact, in any field, is, in itself, a tedious and difficult procedure; but as a basis for the proposed development, it seems well nigh impossible. When the concept is carried forward to an operating stage with necessity for managerial decisions promptly to be made, it seems well beyond the field of rational possibility. In any event, the compact, if developed and unanimously approved by the interested States, would still be inoperative except upon congressional approval in the form of an act of Congress approved by the President or passed over his veto. Since Congress, not the States, has the final word even under this proposal, the argument in support of the compact theory seems far from convincing. The only real argument for the interstate compact plan is the assumption that the States would function instead of the Federal Government. This assumption being itself invalid because of the necessity of Federal approval of any compact and of any change therein we may as well discard this proposal. Our real choice is between the plan of Congress and the plan of the President.

2. PRESENT FEDERAL AGENCIES

So far as construction of the physical structures are concerned, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation can well be entrusted with the task, particularly if the work is done under competitive bidding. Whatever agency is finally charged with the responsibility of construction, the basis of competitive bidding will be found the most acceptable to the people who finally will pay the bill.

But construction of the physical structures, important as that is, is only a part of the project. The successful continued operation of the project, with its direct contact with the patrons of the utilities developed, is the nub of the problem in controversy. That operation, if undertaken in all details by Federal agencies, such as the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, whose activities must be numberless, will place the patron of the utility, who has specific problems, so far from the seat of authority that understanding will be found totally impossible. Nor does that operation seem to square with our theories of representative government. The Federal Government needs to reduce its areas of friction with the citizen. This in no sense is a criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation which would have the largest part of the operational task. Few, if any, of the Federal agencies have won, now have and deserve to have as complete confidence and respect of the average citizen, particularly in this area, as the Bureau of Reclamation. Its leadership has consistently been of the highest order and its personnel both efficient and tolerant. The difficulty is inherent in the governmental structure itself. There is a fundamental difference between Government and management. When Government ceases to be government and undertakes management, those speaking for the Government become sergeants out of uniform. Every managerial activity of the Government results in an area of friction. Our people willingly obey the laws of the country. They resent being bossed by a Government manager.

It is not by mere coincidence that the agricultural Midwest is predominantly anti-New Deal. Nor is it because there have not been great sums distributed to the farmers by the Federal agencies—much at a time when the need was acute. The factor often overlooked is that every farmer is a manager, and managing managers, without friction, is a task which baffles the best. Whatever may or may not be true elsewhere, the Midwest still thinks of governmental agencies as servants of the citizen, and not as managers. If, however, the existing Federal agencies, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, are assigned the task, not only of construction but also of managing the continued operation, the question arises as to how to minimize that friction. The answer would seem to be to find some practical method of State participation.

All of the States in the area have by appropriate legislation set up committees on intergovernmental cooperation. In the Delaware River Valley this mechanism has been used to establish cooperation between four States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Manifestly, such an organization cannot take on any managerial responsibility nor have any control of the financial structure which may be involved. It is submitted, however, that if the work is undertaken as Congress seems to have provided, and if the proposal of the President for a separate authority is not established, then in the very near future the committees set up in the various States for intergovernmental cooperation ought to become active as a medium through which the States can collectively study the problem and advise with the Federal agencies. This would have, it seems to me, very important consequences; first, it would tend to obviate controversy among the States, which is bound to develop out of their wide diversity of interest; and, secondly, there would develop out of the experience so obtained

the beginnings of an interstate organization confined to the area involved. It might well be that from such experience an effective organization could be established on a basis of area home rule, which I shall later discuss. For the present, this group of committees seems to be the most practical and effective approach to a problem which requires rather immediate attention. Of course, if the President's recommendation is followed and a separate corporate entity is set up, the problem will immediately become totally different, and a different approach will be required. It may be that we ought now to determine which of the two actual alternatives we should support in this area in order that when the issue is presented in Congress relating to the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority we have collectively determined our preference. Our preference may or may not have any important bearing on the final decision in Congress. Being in the position of desiring development and desiring the funds which Congress must yet make available, we cannot afford to be too critical of the methods involved in the execution of the plan.

When we try to visualize the full development of these river-valley activities spread over the United States to include, not only the Tennessee Valley and the Missouri Valley, but the Connecticut Valley in New England, and the Columbia Valley in the Pacific Northwest, the Red River Valley, the Ohio Valley, and a dozen others we readily sense the danger involved in the opproach made by Congress centering all of the detailed activity in the Washington offices of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior, and we come to a consideration of the President's proposal of M. V. A.

3. M. V. A.

There is left the third alternative—M. V. A. I am sorry the letters are "M. V. A." I should prefer "M. V. C." There is a quality about the word "authority" which suggests the policeman's club. In my judgment "cooperative" would not only be more palatable but it can be made to be more nearly accurate. The basic concept here is a specially chartered Federal corporate structure, either to construct and operate the project or to operate the project after the existing Federal agencies have built the physical structures. The one prototype is T. V. A. In our discussions we generally assume that M. V. A. will necessarily be like T. V. A. It need not be.

While the President has indicated a strong preference for that type of corporate structure, his statements have not indicated that suggestions for improvement of that type of corporate structure will not receive consideration.

Just what is the corporate structure of T. V. A.? Mr. Lilienthal, who is now head of T. V. A. (it might be argued that he is T. V. A.) states that it is a corporation with 130,000,000 stockholders. That is to say, the whole population of the Republic constitutes the stockholders and by a parity of reasoning the President of the Republic is president of T. V. A. Congress is the board of directors and the three-man managerial staff is the executive committee. The fundamental defect is that the President does not preside and the directors (Members of Congress) do not direct.

T. V. A. has served as a pilot plant—a demonstration. It may even be—though I doubt it—that for the area served it is in the best form. But the disunity which long prevailed in the managerial triumvirate would indicate that the corporate structure, as there exemplified, can be improved.

Everybody must agree that a project such as is here contemplated will require the highest available skill. It will require continuity of program for the development of long-range objectives. The difficulty with T. V. A. is not to be found in either of these categories. The fundamental defect in T. V. A. is that the corporation functions, in fact, if not in name, without either a board of directors or stockholders.

The ultimate question is—shall the President of the United States be the President, the Congress of the United States the Board of Directors, and the people of the United States the stockholders of the M. V. A.? Or, shall the patrons of the services, who pay the bills, be the stockholders and, in turn, elect a representative board of directors who will exercise some functions of control under the laws of the United States and to the extent applicable, in conformity with the laws of the States in the area?

We are fully familiar with the concept of home rule for cities within the sovereignty of the State. In like manner, it seems reasonable to seek area home rule within the structure of the Federal Government. The cardinal principle is that governmental activities which can be effectively administered locally should not be placed under centralized authority.

The corporation, if one is established, will need to possess attributes which only governmental agencies possess, such as

(a) Power of eminent domain to be granted by the Government of its creation and coextensive with the scope of its operation.

(b) It should be an agency suitable for expenditure of public funds in conformity with legislation making the funds available.

(c) It should be accountable to the Government of its creation.

If Missouri basin-wide development is undertaken, it will clearly be by a Federal agency, either now existing or specially created, but if the latter, that agency can be, and I think should be, given appropriate home rule powers.

The issue is not whether a Federal agency will be required. The issue is what kind of a Federal agency.

I am not suggesting that if a Missouri Valley Authority is established, it should be a corporate structure which is to make its own laws. It should be established under an act of Congress with its powers defined and subject, as all governmental agencies are, or should be, to such modification as experience and change will indicate desirable. It should operate in the several States in conformity with the laws of the respective States insofar as not in conflict with valid acts of Congress, particularly in the matter of water rights and the administration of irrigation laws.

This area of the Nation will not be happy with a managerial triumvirate such as is found in T. V. A., even if it be of the highest type, which will undertake the remolding of the economic and social life of the States in the Missouri Valley on its own initiative and without any voice in policy determination by the people directly affected.

There is a difference between a federal corporation, charged with specific responsibility, on the one hand, and a corporate autocracy superimposed on the present commonwealths in this valley. Our people will expect to have a voice in the determination of their destinies, more effective than that which is pictured by a corporation with 130,000,000 stockholders in which they at best would have only a small minority interest. They are not yet ready to consider that they are so incompetent as to require a national guardianship.

It can be made possible for them to have a voice even though the project transcends State boundaries. The M. V. A., if established, is concededly only one of a large number of similar agencies for the respective river valleys of the Nation. When and if such an agency is established for the Connecticut Valley, we shall fully recognize that the people in that valley will know their own problems infinitely better than we shall be able to know them, try as we will. The same will be true of every other valley. The problems with which we in this area, with its uncertain rainfall, must cope, are peculiarly our own. People in areas which do not have irrigation problems cannot sense either their complexity nor their intensity. Representatives of this area will bring to their task knowledge and sympathy which the representatives of the whole Nation cannot possess.

If I could have my way, local home rule powers would be vested in the patrons of the utility who pay the bills as distinguished from the general electorate. This would tend to take the function out of the area of partisan political activity and recognize the enterprise for what it actually is, a large cooperative economic organization, the stockholders of which are the people who pay the bills, who vote not according to economic strength, but as patrons with equal voice.

If I could have my way, the directorate of the enterprise would be chosen by a delegate assembly. During the period of repayment of Federal funds advanced, the actual management might well be selected, subject to approval by appropriate agencies of the Federal Government.

The extent and completeness of the home rule powers would be determined and modified by experience, but the principle of area home rule should implicit in the fundamental charter of the M. V. A. corporation.

In my judgment the problem presented, particularly with regard to the operation of the enterprise after construction, will be best solved under the principles of area home rule through a specially established Federal agency, corporate in form, whether called Missouri Valley Authority, or, as I should prefer, Missouri Valley Cooperative.

Commissioning of the U. S. S. "Missouri"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very excellent addresses delivered at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Missouri* by former Senator Bennett Champ Clark and Capt. W. M. Callaghan, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE BENNETT CHAMP CLARK AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U. S. S. "MISSOURI"

In this hour of destiny when our troops are landing in France under the guns of the Navy in the greatest military adventure of all time and when the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are cooperating in the far Pacific and around the globe to a degree and with a success never approached in our history, the commissioning of this magnificent battleship is an event of extraordinary pride to all Americans and of the greatest importance and significance throughout the world.

It was my privilege to witness the launching of the old battleship *Missouri* in 1903, one of the finest ships of that day. Today to view this mighty floating fortress with its invincible armament is a revelation of the advancement in the art of naval architecture since those far days of 40 years ago.

The United States Navy in this war has gloriously maintained the bright and cherished traditions of its service from the time

of John Paul Jones and Barry down to the present day. Some of the most memorable and most cherished deeds in all the long annals of American heroism have been performed by our naval personnel in this war.

The imperial Commonwealth of Missouri and all of its people are deeply honored that as this splendid battleship—the most formidable engine of war on land or sea or air—in all the world is today added to the active list of the Navy. She bears the name of that great State. Our hopes and our prayers will go with you on every step of the great adventure. We vision you as shelling the coastal bastions of the Nazi defenses of Europe and ultimately of leading the way in the subjugation or destruction of Japan.

Captain Callaghan, we know that you and your officers and men will faithfully and gloriously uphold the stern and splendid traditions of our service. It is the wise and pleasant practice of our naval service to name our battleships after our sovereign States but the ship's company may be drawn from all of the States. You and all of the company of the battleship, wherever may be your actual residence, will always be honorary citizens of Missouri and will aways find a royal welcome there.

Every American follows the fortunes of every American ship of war with intense anxiety and with pride and affection. But we of Missouri shall in an especial degree follow the adventures of this great ship with all of our hopes and prayers and pride. We wish you Godspeed and safe return and fruitful accomplishment. We know that whatever may befall there will never be occasion for remorse or for regret upon the part of yourselves, your loved ones or your fellow countrymen as to your conduct in the use of the *Missouri*, which today becomes the pride of the American Navy.

ADDRESS OF CAPT. W. M. CALLAGHAN, UNITED STATES NAVY, TO OFFICERS AND MEN OF THE U. S. S. "MISSOURI" AND ATTENDING GUESTS

Mr. Secretary, distinguished guests, officers, and men, I am unable to compress into words and in the time allotted to us on this occasion a full appreciation of what the commissioning of this ship means to the people of the United States and to those of us who are privileged first to serve in the U. S. S. *Missouri*. Despite the handicap of time it would be unworthy of us not to take note of and pay our tribute to those whose minds, hearts, and hands have provided the Navy of the United States with such a magnificent new weapon. To them, therefore, to the designers and planners, the supervisors and workers of the New York Navy Yard and the many manufacturers and their helpers in all parts of the United States, who have built or contributed to the building of this ship, we sincerely and humbly acknowledge our inheritance. Our deepest respect we pay to them for their knowledge, their brawn, their sweat, and for that pride of workmanship with which the competent and faithful worker dignifies and raises a lasting monument to the labor of his hands.

The officers and men who are to man and operate the U. S. S. *Missouri* I must charge with a special responsibility. We must not only admire, but with all the intelligence and talents which God has given us, take this ship and in the shortest possible time develop its full potentialities for waging the wars which two principal and ruthless enemies have forced upon us. No greater honor and trust could be reposed in officers and men of the United States Navy than to be assigned such a duty during time of war. My instructions and advice to you in helping me to discharge our combined responsibilities are simple but basic. I ask that you be true: to the God who created you; to the parents who brought you into the world, raised you, and are proud of you; to the wives, families, or sweethearts you leave behind you; to the country you are privileged to serve; and lastly I ask that you be true to yourselves. If you follow these instructions with the same fidelity that I have every reason to believe you will, I will have no occasion to remind you again in future of what the Commander in Chief expects from every ship under his command—that it be clean, that it be smart, and that it be a fighting ship on which he can wholly depend to carry out his orders.

To the many officers and men of the ship's company who recently have entered the service and who now will be serving in a ship for the first time, I remind that the Navy accepts and welcomes you into a brotherhood afloat, rich in tradition, and rightfully proud of its history and accomplishments. Give it your best, that the Navy may also list you forever with honor and pride as having been one of its own during this hour of need.

With the hoisting of the commission pennant today, the *Missouri* has become something more than a complex assembly of steel, guns, and machinery. It now has the breath of life and your spirit—the same spirit by which it will become known and be spoken of wherever men of the Navy foregather. Make that spirit and reputation known by the results we achieve, and not by idle and futile boasting, the untruthfulness of which is so easily detected.

I do not suppose there are any in this distinguished gathering who imagine that a crew designated to man this ship could walk aboard and assume their duties without a great deal of preliminary training. While much remains to be done to make the *Missouri* an efficient fighting ship of the fleet, much already has been done to prepare us for the tasks ahead. To the officers and men, particularly the executive officer, the heads of departments and their assistants, both officer and enlisted, who have done such excellent work in preparing the organization bills and who have been responsible for the basic training of the *Missouri's* crew, I publicly acknowledge and express to them my appreciation and admiration.

It would be negligent of me not to recall to all of us with emphasis that we are carrying forth into history the name of a great State of our Republic—the third United States ship to be so named. By a happy coincidence in my own case, the previous battleship *Missouri* was the first ship of the Navy in which I served. It was also commanded at another time during a part of the last war by my godfather and uncle, the late Rear Admiral James J. Raby. While it is a characteristic of our national life that we are fiercely sectional in our sentiments and attachments, we are also fiercely loyal to the unity of our country against attacks from within or without. Though most of us cannot claim the privilege of being either native or adopted sons of the State of Missouri, we accept her banner with devotion and shall cast her gage into battle with a determination to win the distinction of becoming honorary sons.

National Program for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and able address on the full-employment bill of 1945, delivered by Representative FRANK E. HOOK, of Michigan, to the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America on March 23, 1945, in Camden, N. J.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL OF 1945

We here in America, you and I, and the common people in all the countries of the world, but especially here in our own country, are faced with perhaps the greatest opportunity ever offered by history to mankind. It is true the opportunity grows out of a horrible and world-devastating war whose cost will be paid by generations unborn. But we do now have the chance, because of the lessons of the war and because we are beginning to understand the nature and causes of the war, to build a future for ourselves and for those unborn generations in which there will be no wars and no poverty which generates wars.

When I say we do have this opportunity to rescue the world from its own vices of poverty and war I mean it very sincerely, and I say it with utmost seriousness. I do not believe that the world as we have known it can survive another world-wide depression or another world war. This is the realization that motivates the plans for peace laid down at Dumbarton Oaks, at Bretton Woods, and at Yalta. It will be the background for the decisions at the San Francisco Conference.

While the results from these international conferences are not perfect, and while many may view them with skepticism if not cynicism, they do constitute a long step down the road of international accord which leads to permanent peace. But all of the plans for permanent peace, all the international agreements arrived at by our statesmen and diplomats, will mean nothing, will serve only as sore reminders of what might have been if the post-war planners do not include a blueprint for a sound domestic economy in this country.

We, in the United States, occupy a position of unique responsibility in shaping the course of world history after the war. Of all the nations involved in World War No. 2, we will emerge the strongest, the least injured by its ravages. Despite the enormity of our losses in manpower and materials, we will be in a position to serve as the democratic arsenal of peace as we have served as the arsenal of war. As a member of the society of nations, it will be our obligation to do this. This will not be international social work, as some of our allegedly hard-headed businessmen have said, it will be just plain horse sense.

We have demonstrated during the war period that our productive capacity can be expanded, can be shaped to fit the consumer needs of the country as a whole. During the war, the products of our tremendously expanded industrial capacity have been consumed in the national fight for survival against fascism. There were cynical and timid men, back in 1940 and 1941, who swore we could not meet the challenge, who called the President's staggering war production schedules fantastic. Who mocked that we were shooting at the moon. Well, you did it, you shot at the moon. You men in the shipyards, your brothers and sisters in shops and factories—and in the fields, too—throughout the country did it. The impossible production schedules were possible. The terrible necessities of war proved what all the years of peace had not done, proved what only a handful of men—called dreamers and idealists—believed possible. It proved that the American economic system could provide jobs for all, could support a program of full employment without abandonment of the fundamentals of democracy.

Right now, our country is turning out goods and services at the rate of $200,000,000,000 a year. Our total national income stands at about one hundred and fifty-six billions a year. The tax yield alone on our national income is greater than the total income itself was for the year 1932.

While this amazing growth is heartening, it is also terrifying when you realize that of the $200,000,000,000 worth of goods and services now being turned out by employed Americans, about ninety-five billions is being purchased by the United States Government for war purposes. The Government for war purposes. The Government's purchases for national defense purposes after the war can be expected to drop to between five and ten billion a year.

Now, these figures of total national income and tax yield and productive capacity may not mean too much to you. Another figure, really the basic figure behind all these billions of dollars, will, I am sure, be more meaningful, have a lot more personal impact than these astronomical terms. In 1932, the year when our total national income was $40,000,000,000, there were 28,000,000 people employed in this country. Today there are 55,000,000 people employed.

That contrast, the difference of more than 20,000,000 people employed, is the guts of the problem that faces us today. Leaving out the improved wage rates, which your unions have negotiated, the increase in the working week, and the other factors which have contributed to a higher income for the individual workers, the real factor in increasing the total national income is the number of people employed. This figure is the lowest common denominator in determining the national economy, in prophesying the national well-being.

If this country is to play its part in stabilizing peace, in contributing to international prosperity which is the only guaranty of peace, we have to see to it that the number of employed Americans does not fall below the 55,000,000 we now have. More than that, our economy must provide jobs for the men and women released from the armed services after hostilities. Taking into account those now employed only because of the war emergency who will voluntarily withdraw from the work force after the emergency, that means in the neighborhood of 60,000,000 jobs. It means that we cannot longer survive in an economic climate of widespread unemployment which we had in 1929, or even in 1940, the year before we entered the war. Another depression like that which grew out of the planlessness of the last armistice and another war the inevitable consequence of the next depression will wither the very roots of democracy, will blast our way of living from the face of the earth. To avoid this by planing now is a simple matter of national survival.

If the American people have the courage and the daring, we can survive, we can avoid World War No. 3 and the total destruction of democracy. We can lead the way out of the wilderness of economic insecurity into a promised land of jobs for all and peace for the world.

Whether we, as a nation, have that courage is another story. Certainly, all of us here want full employment after the war. Most Americans want full employment. But there is an all too widespread, and dangerously defeatist, attitude toward our chances of getting it. A recent Gallup poll showed that almost 75 percent of a cross section of Americans believed that there would not be enough jobs to go around after the war, believe that another depression, sooner or later, is inevitable.

Now, I don't believe that at all. I have every fatih in this country's ability to defend itself against the ravages of peacetime depression as it has defended itself against its enemies in wartime. Not only do I believe that we can do this, but I believe that it is the responsibility of the Government to put as much into the offensive against poverty and unemployment as it has put into the offensive against nazi-ism and Japanese imperialism. The two offensives are part of the same campaign strategy, for if we relax on the peace front after the war is over, we will be giving aid and comfort to the enemy our sons will be fighting in World War No. 3.

There isn't any way of writing a blank check for a rosy future. There isn't any single way we can achieve full employment after the war, no single factor which will compensate for the withdrawal of $95,000,000,000 worth of Government purchases from our economy. You would be rightly suspicious of any legislative plan I would offer you as a cure-all for our post-war ills. There just is no such thing. All the factors of our complicated society must be weighed if we are to have a balanced economy of abundance.

More than any other phenomenon that has been demonstrated by our war experience is the interdependence of all the parts of society—labor, management, Government, and consumer—to break it down only into its crudest economic segments. Whatever planning we do toward the objective of 60,000,000 jobs must take this essential interdependence into account.

There is now before both Houses of Congress legislation which does just that. The Senate bill, titled S. 380 and the House bill titled H. R. 2202, are essentially the same. There are differences in detail, but the objectives of the two bills are the same.

Let me read to you from the declaration of policy which prefaces both bills:

"All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right."

For the first time, the National Congress in the full-employment bill of 1945, states that gainful employment is a right of all people. It does not lay down the principle, as some of its opponents say, that the country owes anyone a living. It simply provides that the opportunity to work should be offered all who need and want to work.

This basic concept was expressed in the recent campaign in the slogan forwarded by President Roosevelt—"60,000,000 peacetime jobs." The idea of full employment behind that slogan was given lip service even by the President's opposition during the campaign. As you know, the most vigorous and courageous proponent of an economy of abundance, both during and after the campaign, was Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace. He recognized that 60,000,000 peacetime jobs was not mere campaign oratory. He know, as he later described it that it would become "the economic battle cry of all the peoples of the world for the next 20 years."

The real test of the sincerity of the campaign allegiance to the concept of full employment came during the congressional battles over the confirmation of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, and over the George bill. I hope you followed those debates very carefully because there you had lined up the forces that will be with you, and those that will be against you in your fight for a job after the war. Just statistically, it may be interesting to you to know that in 1939, there were only 11,446 shipyard workers in this area. There now are about 110,000.

Don't think those debates in the House and Senate have no bearing on these figures. They have a very direct bearing because while political in nature, they were just the preliminary skirmishes of the protagonists of two fundamentally opposed economic philosophies, the economy of abundance with jobs for all after the war, and the economy of scarcity, with profits for the few.

I said that these congressional debates were preliminary skirmishes. We haven't seen anything yet. The real tooth-and-nail fight will come when such legislation as the full-employment bill comes up for debate. I don't believe any more important decision will be made by the Seventy-ninth Congress than with regard to this bill, and because of that, I want to discuss it in some detail with you.

The full-employment bill is not a guaranty that all workers will have jobs after the war. It is in no way an adequate post-war economic program in itself. We just can't pass the bill and sit back to wait for the millennium to arrive. As you will see, the bill in itself recognizes that there is no one cure-all for the problems of the post-war period.

Briefly, what the bill does is this. It gives the Federal Government the responsibility of cooperating with all the parts of our economic structure with the view to achieving full employment. Where necessary, it provides that Federal investment and expenditures would be used to this end where private business fails to do so.

The bill states that: "It is the policy of the United States to foster free enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States."

No one in any walk of life, whether he clips coupons for a living or sweats behind a welder's mask, can object to that.

What some of the coupon clippers do object to is the language of the bill that provides "to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to promote such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise."

If you just substitute the words "national defense" or "the war effort" for the phrases "full employment" and "national well-being—in this part of the full-employment bill, you will have a legislative expression of just what has been going on in this country for the past 4 years—the war years. Where private business was unable to carry the burden of financing war production, the Federal Government stepped in. Where more than financing was needed, the Army and Navy and other agencies built their own facilities and produced their own weapons. The coupon clippers certainly can't kick about their profits during the last 4 years (although of course they do just to keep their hand in), but when essentially the same procedure is proposed for national defense against poverty and unemployment, you hear screams of un-American and communism.

The candidate of these same people who fear that the full-employment bill will mean abandonment of the American system of government, said in September of last year, in the middle of the Presidential campaign—and here I am quoting Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, "Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities," and further in the same speech, he said "* * * if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. This is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government." Mr. Dewey said that.

In addition to stating the broad principle of governmental responsibility for the economic welfare of its citizens, the full-employment bill calls for an annual production and employment schedule, including not only anticipation of Federal investment and ex-

penditure but also that of all groups in the country. This economic schedule whose purpose is to appraise the number of jobs needed to provide full employment in a given period will be presented by the President every year at the same time he presents his annual budget message covering strictly Government expenditures. If the President, after his appraisal of the number of jobs needed, the total of expenditures required to provide those jobs, and the prospective volume of business, finds that there is unemployment or the threat of unemployment he is required, under the bill, to transmit to Congress his program for creating jobs through the stimulation of private enterprise and through necessary Government programs. This program would be accompanied by recommendations for such legislation as is necessary to carry it out.

At this point in the legislative process under the bill, the responsibility for creating full employment falls upon the Congress. And this is one among many regards where this legislation is unprecedented. It specifically directs the Congress of the United States to make a study of the national economy and on the basis of that study to pass legislation designed to maintain a healthy national economy. Now, during the past 12 years there have been proposed and passed many bills designed to promote a healthy national economy. But they have been piecemeal bills, dealing with this or that economic group—the industrial worker, the farmer, the small businessman, etc. And largely they have grown out of desperate immediate need. The difference between that kind of legislation, much of which I supported as necessary to bring the country back from the black depths of the thirties, and the full-employment bill is that it seeks to determine the need before it becomes desperate. I don't know whether the bill in its present form will actually serve as well as some other device might serve in anticipating our employment needs, but it certainly is a step in the direction of applying sound business practice to Government activities. No businessman who hoped to stay out of the red side of the ledger would neglect to very carefully survey the needs of his business before planning his budget. The full-employment bill proposes to apply this sound business axiom to the biggest business in the world—the business of keeping some 140,000,000 Americans well fed, well clad, and decently housed.

I am enthusiastic about the full employment bill not so much because I believe it is perfect—in fact, I expect in operation many defects will show up—but because it is a departure from the old hit-or-miss type of expediency legislation, and it does recognize the basic fact that without widespread purchasing power you cannot have a healthy economy, and that you cannot spread the purchasing power to enough consumers without jobs for those consumers.

I am not going into much further detail about the bill now. I hope I will be able to answer any questions you have after these remarks. But there is one aspect of this legislation that I do want to point out to you, because its proper functioning depends directly on you as working citizens. By working citizens I do not mean men and women who have jobs; I mean citizens who work at their citizenship, who take their democratic responsibilities seriously and who expect the men and women they elected to take their responsibilities seriously.

As I have said, the full-employment bill does provide for the encouragement of private enterprise to create employment, and where it falls down for the Federal Government to step in toward that same end. Obviously, the same conflicting economic interests that exist today will exist after the passage of the bill, assuming it is passed. There will be the widest divergence of opinion as to what expenditures will best create employment and serve the national welfare. There will be a wide cleavage in the ranks of Congress as to what role private enterprise should play in the program, what constitutes the national welfare, and to what extent Federal expenditures should be used. You will still have the boys who grow fat worrying about the national debt and the threat of communism. It is at this point that your responsibility toward the total national welfare comes in, at this point where you help make the decision for or against full employment.

I would like to quote to you a statement about this angle of the bill that Henry Wallace made. He said, "In actuality, the common man would have no guaranty of his right to a job unless he were politically organized to see to it that his President or his Congress adopted those specific policies and those specific programs that would actually assure full employment. Which is just as it should be."

I am sure I don't have to stress to you the necessity of political organization. You in labor showed that you had a pretty thorough understanding of that necessity during the last campaign.

Secretary Wallace, in the same speech, went on to say: "Under the bill * * * the proposed national production and employment budget would provide a method of political accountability to the people of our country, a yardstick by which the common man could measure the extent to which he has been properly served by his representatives in the Government."

You do have a responsibility in seeing to it that we in American don't let our opportunity slip by again. As citizens in the most vital democracy in the world, you have the responsibility to keep that democracy alive for your own sakes and for the sake of the future of the world.

Laws may be passed in Congress, but they are written in the meeting places of the people—the churches, the political clubhouses, the locker rooms of exclusive clubs—and in the union halls. I am not the lawmaker here tonight, all of you are.

I believe the full-employment bill has a good chance of being passed by Congress. If all of you and people like you throughout the country support it as vigorously as you can it will almost certainly pass. It is just one of the ways in which we can make amends for our tragic mistakes of the past. The toll of this war has been too great, the ways of the world have been too changed for us to ignore the signposts now up on the road. If we do not take the road to prosperity and peace, the time will come when we will look back with tender nostalgia for the good old days of World War No. 2. There is a better way to achieve full employment than through war. It is up to us to find that way, and we must find it before we are already on the road to war again.

Memorial Address by Chaplain Roland B. Gittelsohn at Fifth Marine Division Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at the request of Marine Sgt. William E. Wright, a resident of my State who has served through the fighting on the island of Iwo Jima, I ask permission to have placed in the RECORD a copy of the memorial address delivered by Chaplain Roland B. Gittelsohn at the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery, located on the island.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is perhaps the grimmest, and surely the holiest, task we have faced since D-day. Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the sides with us as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us. Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet—to find the way, perhaps, for all to live in plenty, with poverty and hardship for none. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

It is not easy to do so. Some of us have buried our closest friends here. We saw these men killed before our very eyes. Any one of us might have died in their places. Indeed, some of us are alive and breathing at this very moment only because men who lie here beneath us had the courage and strength to give their lives for ours. To speak in memory of such men as these is not easy. Of them, too, can it be said with utter truth, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here. It can never forget what they did here."

No; our poor power of speech can add nothing to what these men and the other dead of our division who are not here have already done. All that we even hope to do is follow their example. To show the same selfless courage in peace that they did in war. To swear that by the grace of God and the stubborn strength and power of human will, their sons and ours shall never suffer these pains again. These men have done their job well. They have paid the ghastly price of freedom. If that freedom be once again lost, as it was after the last war, the unforgivable blame will be ours, not theirs. So it is we the living who are here to be dedicated and consecrated.

We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way they fought and are buried in this war. Here lie men who love America because their ancestors generations ago helped in her founding, and other men who loved her with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor—together. Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination. No prejudices. No hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

Any man among us, the living, who fails to understand that will thereby betray those who lie here dead. Whoever of us lifts his hand in hate against a brother, or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery. To this, then, as our solemn, sacred duty, do we the living now dedicate ourselves—to the right of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, of white men and Negroes alike, to enjoy the democracy for which all of them have here paid the price.

To one thing more do we consecrate ourselves in memory of those who sleep beneath these crosses and stars. We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last battle has been won, there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our backs in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity, and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here: we will not do that. We will join hands with Britain, China, Russia in peace, even as we have in war, to build the kind of world for which you died.

When the last shot has been fired, there will still be those whose eyes are turned backward, not forward, who will be satisfied with those wide extremes of poverty and wealth in which the seeds of another war can breed. We promise you, our departed comrades: this too, we will not permit. This war has been fought by the common man; its fruits of peace must be enjoyed by the common man. We promise, by all that is sacred and holy, that your sons, the sons of miners and millers, the sons of farmers and workers, will inherit from your death the right to a living that is decent and secure.

When the final cross has been placed in the last cemetery, once again there will be those to whom profit is more important than peace, who will insist with the voice of sweet reasonableness and appeasement that it is better to trade with the enemies of mankind than, by crushing them, to lose their profit. To you who sleep here silently, we give our promise: we will not listen. We will not forget that some of you were burned with oil that came from American wells, that many of you were killed by shells fashioned from American steel. We promise that when once again men seek profit at your expense, we shall remember how you looked when we placed you reverently, lovingly, in the ground.

Thus do we memorialize those who, having ceased living with us, now live within us. Thus do we consecrate ourselves the living to carry on the struggle they began. Too much blood has gone into this soil for us to let it lie barren. Too much pain and heartache have fertilized the earth on which we stand. We here solemnly swear this shall not be in vain. Out of this, and from the suffering and sorrow of those who mourn this, will come—we promise—the birth of a new freedom for the sons of men everywhere.

New Hampshire and Dumbarton Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "New Hampshire and Dumbarton Oaks," delivered by State Senator Earl S. Hewitt, of Hanover, N. H., before a meeting of the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, in Washington, D. C., April 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The article appearing in town warrants in the State of New Hampshire under date of March 13, 1945: "To see if the town will vote to support United States membership in a general system of international cooperation, such as that proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, having police power to maintain the peace of the world," was without precedent in the history of New England town meetings. The voting results were also without precedent in respect to affirmative action on an article which was given full and frank discussion before a vote was cast. That is the thing to remember about this New Hampshire town-meeting vote.

The tabulated vote in the secretary of state's office in Concord shows 16,825 votes for the article with 813 against. In the affirmative vote there are 31 towns voting unanimously who failed to tabulate the vote and are therefore counted as having cast 31 votes in the total.

The New Hampshire town meeting as an institution for sounding public opinion carries on the purer form of democracy under our representative processes. It reaches back into the colonial period and has been adhered to throughout the history of all New England. It is still the functional method of approaching financial and administrative problems, and town officials are subject to annual election. During the years the forms of procedure have changed, permitting use of secret ballot for election of officers, but even this method is not yet acceptable in many of the smaller towns. The citizens there walk up and place the name of the favored candidate in the box in full view of the candidate and then return to vote on other matters by acclamation, or by show of hands, or by standing to be counted. Discussion of each article in the warrant is always in order, though budget committees, legalized during the administration of Gov. STYLES BRIDGES—now United States Senator from New Hampshire—have the responsibility of projecting the financial picture for the town.

Arguments between voters on policy cover a wide range of human behavior and reveal at all times the character of the people. In the meetings this year, because of the article on international cooperation, many towns using the secret ballot preferred to discuss the subject in open meeting and vote in the traditional manner. The results now show that, had the secret ballots been used in every instance, the article would undoubtedly have received many more affirmative votes. I make this as an unqualified statement, having made a survey of the tabulations, and having conferred with representatives from the towns now in attendance at the legislature. Many citizens who came to the meeting to vote for officers were unable to stay when the article was under discussion.

The senate joint resolution which passed both houses of the New Hampshire Legislature without debate and with unanimous support was the method employed to project the article into the warrants. It received wide publicity from press services throughout the State. As sponsor of the resolution, I emphatically stated, before the committee hearings, that the phrase "Such as that proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference" represented a challenge to our people to become informed on what those proposals were all about.

The senate resolution reads as follows: *"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, in general court convened,* That the Governor, with the advice and consent of the council, is hereby authorized and directed to request selectmen of towns to insert an article in the warrant of the town meetings holden under date of March 13, 1945, to read as follows: To see if the town will vote to support United States membership in a general system of international cooperation, such as that proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, having police power to maintain the peace of the world.

"Each town clerk is directed to forward to the secretary of state the result of the vote in his town on this question. The secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to canvass the vote on this article as returned to him and transmit his findings to the clerk of the United States Senate."

The efforts made for public education previous to town meeting were of tremendous significance in respect to the vote. Americans United for World Organization led the way, ably assisted by local chapters of the League of Women Voters. Ernest M. Hopkins, national chairman of the board of directors of Americans United, was particularly interested to have his native State organized into local chapters as soon as possible. When the idea of a town-meeting referendum was born at a meeting of the Dartmouth group universities committee on post-war international problems, Dr. Hopkins was present. He later appeared before the State senate in support of the resolution, which was adopted. A speakers' bureau made up of prominent New Hampshire citizens started going to town. They kept going and only the most isolated communities failed to receive a visitor well versed in the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks. The weekly and daily press, as well as the radio news commentators, ably and fully reported these earlier meetings, with emphasis on the Dumbarton Oaks article. During the 11 years I have been editing and publishing a weekly newspaper I have never seen more public interest in a subject, than was represented by this article appearing in the town-meeting warrants of New Hampshire.

The cities had to be left out of the voting, because under their charter forms of government no elections were provided for on this date, March 13. Gov. Charles M. Dale, when signing the engrossed bill, expressed his disappointment that the cities of New Hampshire could not have the same opportunity to test opinions of their citizens. What effect such a vote would have had on the total is of course impossible to know. In the judgment of most people the ratio would have been about the same.

My personal opinion as to the meaning of the vote in New Hampshire town meetings is something to this effect: It definitely reflects a changing attitude on the part of New Hampshire's people. It records their growing awareness of the hard work needed to arrive at our objective—world peace. I believe most of the voters were remembering their fairly recent experience with air-raid warnings and civilian-defense measures, with increasing awareness of the robomb and its threat to all civilized life. They were not forgetting our daily scrutiny of casualty lists, or the new gold star added to the town honor roll. In street conversations our citizens seemed to hold all aggressors strictly accountable for what has happened. No distinction was made between governments and peoples. Daily expressions of comment have carried the thought that one must be tough to wage war and equally tough and determined to maintain the peace. "Going through this business every 25 years is getting nowhere fast" is a fairly common remark from people of all walks of life. In this town meeting vote the people accepted the proposition that it takes more than one nation to maintain peace and that collective security is the only thing that will count from here on. The average voter was not

particularly concerned with the details of the set-up just so long as it got done. In short, trying to read too much into this vote about Dumbarton Oaks might well be mistaken evidence, but we do submit that it was enlightened and from a political minded people, accustomed to standing up and representing themselves publicly in their own affairs. The most discussed phrase in the article was "police power." Those who spoke to the voters in Grange halls and at other gatherings throughout the State were unanimous in reporting back to us the fact that the people wanted to satisfy themselves on the meaning of these words. They were satisfied that we should keep armed forces in readiness for immediate use under a joint command, not to make war, but to prevent it by timely police action. They wanted the war-making power to remain in the Congress, where it does remain under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

As sponsor of the resolution in the New Hampshire Legislature I am merely keeping faith with my son Richard. Under date of December 28, 1944, the lone editorial appearing in the Hanover Gazette read as follows:

RICHARD

Our third son, Pvt. (1st cl.) Richard Dole Hewitt, was killed in action December 3, 1944, in Germany. Our pledge to him has been and will be, as long as we shall live, to work for a system of international cooperation and the organization of a police force to maintain world peace.

Should Labor Unions Engage in Political Action?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before Hartford Diocesan Labor Institute, Waterbury Chapter, at Waterbury, Conn., April 2, 1945:

When Abraham Lincoln, at Gettysburg, said ours is a "Government of the people, by the people, for the people," there were many who doubted and even some who sneered.

Time has vindicated the Great Emancipator, and today we can be sure that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth" so long as the people—all the people, men and women, rich and poor, young and old, regardless of race, creed, and color—conscientiously exercise their rights and perform all that is required of them as free citizens.

If the tragic events of recent years have taught us one thing, it should be this—that democracy can only be defeated by itself, by its own carelessness, by its own failures and neglect of business that is essential to the public good.

The affairs of state in a demcoracy are properly everybody's concern and should engage the widest possible public participation. Every conceivable step should be taken to encourage this. And if any person, or group of people should attempt to curtail us by limiting one of the most essential of our democratic rights—the right of each and every one of us, or any combination of us, to name and work for the election of candidates of our own choice—we should examine them critically and suspiciously.

Public affairs cannot safely be left in the hands of a few. We Americans do not believe in government by a self-chosen, self-styled elite. That is a Fascist doctrine. One of Hitler's first moves, you will remember, was to break the labor unions, and in doing that he destroyed the only organized democratic group in Germany that might have successfully challenged his brutal tyranny.

Our country is—and should remain—a land of equal opportunity in all things, in politics as well as business. In our scheme of things there is no place for discriminatory legislation against labor unions in the political field. It would mean the virtual disenfranchisement of millions of citizens. There can be no justification or excuse for this, particularly when the combined labor-union membership represents the largest single social group and economic interest in the country—some 14,000,000 organized workers and their families, all told, approximately a third of the population.

The question under discussion here tonight is Should labor unions engage in political action?

Yes, I say; they should engage in political action of all kinds, and why not?

Everybody in a democracy should engage in political action, and the fact is that almost everybody does, both as individuals and in groups, so why discriminate against the unions? That would be class legislation of a peculiarly vicious kind.

Business engages in political action at all times and in many ways, not only at elections but in between. Its official spokesmen and agents are constantly in Washington and various State capitals, working to influence legislative matters and administrative policy, seeking through the organized pressure of the National Association of Manufacturers, chambers of commerce, various trade associations, and industrial councils to promote certain measures and block others that are not to their liking.

Farmers are similarly engaged in concerted political action at all times. If any of you doubt that, just come down to Washington and I'll introduce you to the energetic representatives of the Farm Bureau, National Grange, and other organizations representing agricultural interests.

Then there are consumer organizations, and many other groups, all of them taking an active and praiseworthy part in public affairs, constantly engaged in political action.

Yet there are some—fortunately, a dwindling die-hard minority—who almost get apoplexy at the mere thought of labor unions indulging in political action.

Their argument is, of course, that they are only interested in protecting the poor working man both from his fellows and himself. They are quite sure in their own minds that they know better than he does what he wants, and what is good for him—and that if he would only be patient and listen to them, everything would come out all right in the end.

Yet these same self-assured gentlemen would be the first to raise a cry to high heaven, and rightly so, if it was proposed that they should be forbidden to speak or take political action in their own benefit. They would stoutly demand their constitutional right to be heard, either in their own voice or speaking through their chosen agents.

And that right, you may be sure, would be granted them, and that is precisely as it should be.

Why then deny the working man the same right?

Let me illustrate by example how limiting the franchise—and that means limiting political action—plays viciously against democracy even in our country. In some of our Southern States public officials are elected by a small percentage of the citizenry because the laws are such that the rank and file of the people have been unable to exercise the vote. This sorry condition is being remedied, but the situation as a whole is still far from healthy. For many years Martin Dies held his congressional seat by being elected by less than 10 percent of the people in his district. I am sure that Martin Dies needs no explaining to this audience.

The war brought certain industries to Dies' district. And with these new industries came thousands of workers who were determined to vote. Dies saw the handwriting on the wall and withdrew from the race rather than face the defeat which surely would have come to him had he run again. But for some years he had been the symbol of the forces perniciously working against democracy—and need I add that he was one of the loudest labor baiters inside Congress and out—and that he was applauded for his stand by such men as William Dudley Pelley of the Silver Shirts and Colescott of the Ku Klux Klan.

Now, just what is political action?

To clarify the discussion this evening, it is necessary to break down the general phrase, "political action," and define it specifically in terms of its more vital aspects.

First, there is the political action involved in nominating candidates for office.

Second, there is the business of campaigning and electing chosen candidates to office.

Third, there is the continuous process of keeping public servants informed of the needs, desires, and interests of the people who put them in office.

Now, let us consider each of these in turn.

First, the nomination of candidates for office through direct primaries, by convention, by petition, or in any other way.

So far as the Federal law is concerned, there is nothing in the Hatch Act, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, or the Smith-Connally amendment to prevent a labor union or any other group from promoting the nomination of any candidate it sees fit, subject to a limitation on the size of contribution that can be made to any individual candidate, or party, or party committee.

Who are the people who urge that labor unions be singled out and prohibited from engaging in such political action?

You know them as well as I do—these so-called friends of the workingman, usually operating from Wall Street, whose hearts bleed for him every time he puts up a dollar to nominate some liberal candidate.

But their crocodile tears deceive no one and fail to cover up their antilabor antipathies and social prejudices. These are the men who mistake the clamor of a professional claque of labor-baiters for the thunder of genuine popular applause. These are the men—to think back only to last November—who are always so confident of victory at the polls until the ballots are actually in and counted. Set back on their heels, they start looking for a scapegoat to explain their own failures, the greatest of which is the plain fact that they have lost touch with the people. And most of these bitterly disappointed men usually hit upon the same scapegoat—the labor unions—and begin clamoring for a law to exclude them from politics.

Make no mistake about it—the purpose of their drive is to make it easier for them and their candidates to be nominated and elected by hamstringing democracy and paralyzing effective political action by a large part of the electorate.

Here again I can see no legitimate reason why labor unions should be deprived of any rights to political action which they enjoy under the present law. Let's take a look at the Hatch Act, which lays down certain rules and regulations governing elections to Federal office. The act forbids any individual or organization to contribute more than $5,000 to a political party in any calendar year, or to any committee or club supporting

that party or that candidate. This limitation does not apply, however, to contributions made to State or local political committees.

One other point about the present law should be noted. Under the Smith-Connally amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act it is illegal "for any national bank or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization, to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Senator or Representative, are to be voted for."

On the face of it that seems fair enough. But let's see just how this works in practice. The big-money boys were quick to discover that it is quite easy to get around the limitations on individual contributions and easy enough, too, to achieve the ends formerly gained through corporate contributions.

If you have the wherewithal, it's really quite simple—you merely give $5,000 to any number of different political committees and clubs and organizations, all of them campaigning for your chosen candidate or party, or both. And if the family bank roll is big enough, you can have your wife and your children, and your sisters and young cousins and your aunts, do the same thing.

For example, take the contributions hopefully poured into the Dewey-Bricker campaign by the family of Joe Pew, "Lord of the Sun Oil Co." and Republican boss in Pennsylvania. According to the recently published report of the Campaign Expenditures Committee of the United States Senate, various Pews—nine in all—made 45 contributions to the Republican cause, for a total of $96,999.76.

Their generosity, I must say, was not confined to Pennsylvania. It seems they are interested in Connecticut—at least in election years—and decided the poor Republicans in the State needed a helping hand. Joe Pew gave $500 to the Republican State Central Committee, as did J. Howard Pew, Miss Mary Ethel Pew, and Mrs. Mabel Pew Myrin. They also took to heart the plight of poor Republicans in Florida, Maryland, Missouri, Wyoming, New Jersey, New York State, New York County, and Queens County. They also gave generously to the Republican National Committee, National Republican Senatorial Committee, and National Republican Congressional Committee.

Now don't misunderstand me, all of this was perfectly legal. No single contribution exceeded $5,000, and the money came from the Pews and not directly from the Sun Oil Co. and affiliated corporations. But we should keep in mind just how the present law works.

Nor were the Pews the only suckers for Republican propaganda. Six of the Mellons put up $59,000, while one of the du Ponts and his wife contributed almost $35,000 between them. Other members of the du Pont clan chipped in for a grand total of $109,832.83.

All of this, as I say, was perfectly legal, and I haven't heard any particular criticism of it in the press, on the radio, or in conservative circles generally.

But just let a group of trade-union members get together, as the Pews obviously did, and decide to make a modest contribution of a dollar apiece for the support of their candidates and there is an immediate howl from the fat cats. There is a great hue and cry that the foundations of democracy are crumbling—that the country is going to the dogs—that dictatorship, like Mr. Hoover's prosperity, is just around the corner.

Now, let's be quite frank and get this discussion down to brass tacks. The question before us tonight would not be under discussion, and it would certainly not be phrased as it is, if it had not been for the activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee during the last campaign. That's really what we are talking about tonight: Should there be a law to put the Political Action Committee out of business?

The answer will be "yes" on the part of those who look back with nostalgia to the good old days when money—and money alone—talked. They like to think of the time when only their voice was heard, and the workingman was humble and deferential and knew his place, leaving public affairs to those who could better afford the time and money for political action.

For myself—and I am sure I reflect the opinion of the great majority of Americans who believe in progress and the principles of fair play—I say "no." There is no necessity whatever for such a law. What's more, such discriminatory legislation would strike a deadly blow at democracy.

Because there has been so much misrepresentation about it, let me tell you briefly just how the C. I. O. Political Action Committee worked. All that I tell you comes from the official published reports of the House and Senate Campaign Expenditures Committees, which went into the subject very thoroughly and satisfied themselves that the Political Action Committee had stayed well within the existing laws. Just for this reason, it seems, there has arisen in certain quarters a demand that it be penalized under additional legislation aimed specifically at outlawing its activities. I wonder if there would be such a demand if the P. A. C. had been for Dewey instead of Roosevelt?

The Political Action Committee was established on July 7, 1943. Its purpose was to interest all workers, organized and unorganized, in taking an active part in the public life of the country at the hour of its greatest crisis. It aimed at promoting and consolidating national unity under a progressive program leading along the road to peace and plenty—a program that could be accepted by all who were devoted to winning the war as quickly as possible, securing a strong and lasting peace, and providing jobs for all in post-war America.

Some people—and I need hardly name them—tried to represent this as dangerous business, as if political action on the part of organized labor was an alien practice and inconsistent with the democratic process. The arguments of these people were rather strained, it must be said, and they simply didn't know their American history. Like farmers and businessmen and every other group, workers have long been participating through their organizations in the political life of the country. Some 75 years ago they began forming groups to procure better working conditions, better social conditions, safety and health measures for all the people, democratic rights for consumers, arbitration instead of strikes. They have necessarily had to interest themselves in political action to achieve legislation in regard to wages, hours, workmen's compensation, child labor, and related matters. They have necessarily had to interest themselves in political action in such broader social fields as education, public health, taxation, and general economic and business development.

Back in the campaigns of 1908, 1910, and 1912 labor was active as a group, and because they made themselves felt, the Clayton Act of 1914 provided that labor was not a commodity or an article of commerce, such as it was regarded during the slave owning days. It was the persistent activity of labor during the years which preceded the Roosevelt administration which brought forth the progressive measures which have benefitted not labor alone—but the rank and file of the Nation, and have strengthened the foundation of a really vital democracy. For during the years that labor was urging these measures, other progressive thinking people were urging them too. It was necessary only to have progressives in office to put these measures into effect. But the piecemeal legislation that had been enacted in the several States and in the Nation before 1933 had labor's urging—and hence labor's political action. Make no mistake about that. The impetus for legislation—good and bad—comes from without the legislative halls. Never forget that.

And let me say this in passing. The people who now oppose political action by labor are the very people who, just a few years ago, were violently opposed to collective bargaining. There is a basic pattern in all this anti-labor prejudice and agitation.

After the Political Action Committee's program and plans had been approved by a democratically elected convention of the C. I. O., the trade unions in the organization decided how much each should contribute to the work of the committee. All told, $631,214.11 was paid in from this source. The committee wisely decided to concentrate on the registration of voters—whether Republicans or Democrats. They were vitally concerned, about the decline of the total vote from 50,000,000 in 1940 to less than 30,000,000 in 1942, and were determined to do all they could to reverse the trend, which was certainly good Americanism, although there were a number of people interested for obvious reasons in a light vote. They were hoping to sneak into office by democratic default.

The Political Action Committee, as a national organization, endorsed the candidacy of only one man—President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It left the endorsement of senatorial and congressional candidates to the committees in the various States and districts. All it did, when asked, was to furnish the local people with a complete voting record and background of the candidates, and I can well understand why certain people were so upset by this. But remember that the P. A. C. supported and opposed both Democrats and Republicans.

Altogether in the preelection campaign the Political Action Committee spent about half of its funds, or $371,186.56. On July 23, 1944, just after the renomination of President Roosevelt and the naming of the Democratic ticket, the balance of the funds was frozen to obey not only the letter but the spirit of the law and hence that money was not used for the election campaign itself.

From this time forward and all through the election campaign the committee relied entirely upon voluntary contributions from individual members of the unions and anyone else interested in contributing a dollar or more. This dollar contribution did not come out of union dues. It was not an assessment in any form. Men and women were free to give or not, as they wished, a fact conclusively established in the hearings before the House and Senate Campaign Expenditures Committees.

A total of $380,306.45 was raised by individual voluntary contributions for national use and most of it was spent in urging citizens to register and vote—certainly not a dangerous or un-American practice. Yet there were cries in the press and elsewhere about a great "slush fund" being raised to subvert American democracy. As a fund, it was peanuts. Various Republican committees raised and spent almost $15,000,000. The Democrats raised and spent about half that amount. The total amount of money raised by the National Citizens Political Action Committee among the 14,000,000 organized workers and their friends was only slightly more than the contributions of just three families—the Mellons, the du Ponts, and the Pews.

Which, I ask you, is more in keeping with democracy?

Lastly, there is political action involved in pressing for legislation in all fields of particular interest and general welfare. The American Bankers Association has never shown any hesitancy in making its views known and taking political action in defense of its own

interests or what it deems to be desirable public policy. The United States Chamber of Commerce does likewise. So do the farmers, the merchants, and the manufacturers.

Our boys are fighting and dying overseas in defense of our free way of life, resolved to crush the antidemocratic forces in the world forever. Let us make sure that we do not give way to any antidemocratic forces here at home. It would be tragic if our boys came home to find that this was no longer a land of equal opportunity in all fields, that short-sighted men had chipped away part of the freeom for which they had gladly undertaken to sacrifice their very lives.

Electrified Vermont—90 Percent of Vermont Farms Can Be Electrified After the War; 68.8 Percent Already Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to a newspaper article relating to the opportunity afforded which the farmers in Vermont may hope to enjoy and are enjoying so far as rural electrification is concerned.

Incidentally, we have sufficient sources of supply of electrical energy to meet all the demands which may be made in the future to make the program work. There is no necessity for imposing any tax on the people of Vermont in rural areas to meet the expense incident to the construction or erection of tremendous power plants to supply a demand which can and will be met by existing facilities.

The farmers should not be fooled into contributing to mortgage their farms, indirectly, to make a Roman holiday for anybody. "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

The extracts from the report which I am putting into the RECORD should satisfy every farmer in Vermont that his needs can and will be met without the imposition of any additional tax burden upon him in that regard.

That taxes will be higher, post-war, is probably true. Else how will we ever get out from under the load of debt we shall have incurred, part of which was to win the war and part of which was superinduced by the wasteful, wanton spending prior to the war in which the administration of those days so blindly indulged? We will have to tighten our belts to keep from starving and to hold up our pants so that the last nickel we have will not roll out of our pockets to meet make-work programs to help clean up a mess the like of which is not spoken of in recorded history.

We will have to deny ourselves many things. On the other hand, we will have many things which except for the war we would not have had, if we have the money to spend.

So, if Vermonters and the people generally can recover from the orgy of spending and keep at least one foot on the ground, there is a way out. It is going to be hard going, and we will not walk on two feet for a long, long while.

Thrift and common sense applied to national problems reduced to the States' capacities to take care of themselves, as indicated, will help.

The States have shown what they can do despite Federal interference. There is no telling what the States will and can do for themselves when, after the war, they are foot-loose and fully free from Federal domination.

The article from the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of April 4, regarding rural electrification in Vermont, follows:

NINETY PERCENT OF VERMONT FARMS CAN BE ELECTRIFIED OR AT LEAST HAVE POWER AVAILABLE WITHIN SHORT TIME AFTER THE WAR ENDS—AN ELABORATE AND DETAILED REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IS LAID BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE AT MONTPELIER

MONTPELIER, April 2.—The graphic story of rural electrification in Vermont has been laid before legislators in individual town maps, which result from the first complete mapping survey of the State, and which supplement the public-service commission's biennial report.

The maps show who has electricity available and how electric lines may be extended house by house, illustrating the commission's belief that over 90 percent of Vermont farms can either be electrified or have power available within a short time after the war's end.

The survey discloses that 68.8 percent of Vermont farms are now served with electricity, according to Commission Chairman Fletcher Plumley.

Thousands of Vermont farms now unserved are within reach of electricity, the maps indicate. The survey has been the major activity of the commission during the past 2 years in order that the position of every farm in relation to electric power could be locally ascertained. The maps have already been used.

The biennial report contains data on electrification of each county and town, the number of farms electrified, and those to which power is available, as well as the miles of line necessary for extensions.

RANK BY COUNTIES

The comparative rank by counties shows Grand Isle County leading the rest, with 86.4 percent of its farms electrified or "available" in 1944. Franklin County was second, with a figure of 85.9 percent, and Orleans third, with 85.8 percent electrification or available. Essex County ranks last, with 56.9 percent. These figures are compared with the results of proposed extensions and with the county ranking in rural importance with respect to area suitable for cultivation.

The commission has reported rate reductions resulting in savings to customers for the biennium lacking 1 month totaled $50,740.

Rate reductions as a result of new retail schedules totaled $3,500 in 1943 (water and telephone utilities), while reductions for the past year totaled $47,240, and were filed by electric, telephone, and gas companies.

COMPARE ELECTRIC BILLS

The report contains table comparing electric bills for various monthly uses filed with the commission for all systems serving residential and farm customers within the State. The amounts have been tabulated according to size of bill on a 100-kilowatt-hour basis for residential and 1,000-kilowatt-hour basis for farm use.

On this basis Morrisville Village shows the lowest average residential bill as of October 1, 1944, a municipal system, while Shrewsbury Light and Power, a private system, has the highest residential rate. The lowest farm bill is the Morrisville municipal system, while the highest is Plymouth Electric, a private system. Both the Shrewsbury and Plymouth companies have since been acquired by the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation and Vermont Soapstone, a private system, now has the highest rate on the basis taken in both residential and farm bills.

PROPERTY, OPERATING FIGURES

Complete tabulations are given of property and operating figures reported by all electric utilities during the years 1942 and 1943. They are classified according to three groups, those with average electric operating revenue over $100,000, those between $25,000 and $100,000, and those with less than $25,000.

The greatest percent return for the three classifications, respectively, were reported by the Burlington Electric Light Department, 19.15 percent; the village of Ludlow, 31.07 percent; and the village of Johnson, 260.77 percent. Next to the village of Johnson in the unclassified category was Stowe Village, with 19.07 percent.

In connection with its report and distribution of town electrification maps, the public-service commission is holding a display in the statehouse reception room. The display shows the 14 county maps with the distribution of power lines by company in colors.

AREAS SERVED

Colored State maps indicate areas served with electricity, those which are unserved, and those to which, because of lack of habitation, no service is contemplated. There are also illustrated town maps indicating lines in relation to each farm similar to those given representatives.

The commission's expectation of 90 percent electrification is gained on the basis of 68.8 percent present electrification and 6.3 percent of the total number of farms located within a quarter-mile of existing lines. To this would be added 4,000 farms "as soon as the manpower and material restrictions imposed by the war are removed." The mapping survey was supervised by G. W. Clewley of the staff and the field work was done by Lee B. Bates, engineer on loan to the commission by the highway department.

The commission suggested that the public make greater use of its services for the direct solution of individual problems over which it is given jurisdiction. In this connection the statement is made by Commission Chairman Plumley:

"If you have problems involving the services over which the public-service commission has jurisdiction, bring them to us. If you have suggestions as to how we may render an enlarged service to the people of the State, please let us know what your suggestions are. If you have any questions concerning the public-service commission—its power, duties, or function—let us know what they are and we will try to be of assistance to you."

The report was delayed in publication to permit it to be made public with completion of the maps. It is signed by Plumley, E. B. Cornwall, and Charles C. Morse, commissioners for the past biennium.

Problems and Objectives of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very important and informative address delivered last evening by our able and distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, at Chicago, Ill., before the Council on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to come to the Middle West to talk over with you some of the problems and objectives of United States foreign policy.

My father was brought up in St. Louis and began his business career in Chicago. I was born in Chicago and began my own career in business in the automobile industry.

I feel that here I am among old friends and in familiar territory. And I know also what a tremendous contribution the Middle West is making in this war. From your homes, and from your factories and farms, has gone forth a vast outpuring of men and weapons and food to help win victory on battle fronts nearly halfway around the world from Chicago.

We are fighting this war in order that all Americans may gain the opportunity to live securely and in peace. I say "opportunity," for victory in itself, as we all know but sometimes forget, will not be enough. Victory is the essential condition of our success but not the assurance of it.

The foreign policy of the United States is directed toward providing that assurance, in combination with domestic policy. Our objective in all our relations with other nations is to prevent aggression abroad from again disturbing the peace of the United States and to develop those conditions of international life that will make it possible to maintain high levels of productive employment and farm income and steadily rising standards of living for all the American people.

This is a tremendous undertaking. We face difficulties and dangers whose magnitude it is hardly possible to overestimate. Idealism and good intentions will not be sufficient. Our only chance of success is to face squarely the realities and to pursue a course of action firmly based upon these realities. Without bold, realistic, and effective action it will not be possible to prevent this war from being followed by economic collapse and economic anarchy far more disastrous than the depression of 1929; nor will it be possible to prevent another war from bringing bitter sorrow and suffering to every American home.

Of one reality I believe the great majority of the people of the United States are now wholly convinced, and I do not believe the people of the Middle West are any different in this matter from people in other parts of the country. After two world wars and a terrible world-wide depression, all within the space of 25 years, we are convinced that political isolationism and economic nationalism are utterly unrealistic and can only lead on to complete disaster for our country and for the world.

So our foreign policy is based upon the hard facts that if we are to prevent the disaster of another war for the United States we must find the means to act effectively with other nations to prevent aggression anywhere in the world; that we cannot have prosperity in the United States, if the rest of the world is sunk in depression and poverty.

In other words, since we live in a world where every nation has become virtually our next-door neighbor, we cannot achieve our objectives alone, but only in the close cooperation that neighbors in any American town are accustomed to practice in settling affairs that mutually concern them.

Upon these facts the United States Government has based its foreign policy program to help achieve security and prosperity for the United States after the war is won.

The United Nations Conference at San Francisco later this month will mark a critical turning point in the history of the United States and of the world. For at San Francisco it is the purpose of the United Nations to write the charter of a world organization which will become strong enough to maintain peace for generations to come.

I know that many of you would like to hear from me tonight a discussion of temporary difficulties of a political nature that have recently arisen in connection with the San Francisco Conference. I regret that I shall not be able to do so, because the United States Government is at this moment engaged in very active efforts to resolve these difficulties and there is little that I can add tonight to the statement which I made yesterday in reference to some of them.

I do, however, want to say this much. I have full confidence that we shall be able to resolve these difficulties—and others of this nature that will inevitably arise as we approach the end of the war.

We are going right ahead with our plans for the San Francisco Conference and we are resolved to make it the success that it must be. I ask you to remember: first, that the United Nations have repeatedly overcome other difficulties and dangers far more serious in the past 3 years; second, that the vital national interests of the United States and of each of our allies are bound up in maintaining and cementing in the peace our wartime partnership; third, that the extent of our agreement is far wider and more fundamental than the extent of our differences. If we keep these facts constantly in mind, we shall be able to keep our sense of proportion.

Tonight I want to speak to you about other issues that are of fundamental and long-range importance to the future well-being of the United States and to the success of the world organization. They are issues that call for the utmost that we as a people can give to their successful resolution.

Most of the public discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals upon which the charter of the world organization will be based has centered upon the security aspects of the organization—upon its power to prevent or to suppress aggression through the security council.

That is a vital part of the plan, but I wish to remind you that it is, in fact, only half of the task that the world organization must accomplish if it is to be successful. At the conclusion of the Crimea conference President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill declared that the earliest possible establishment of the world organization was, and I quote, "essential both to prevent aggression and to remove the political, economic, and social causes of war through the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples."

It is the second part of that statement to which I refer and about which I wish to speak to you particularly tonight—the removal of the political, economic, and social causes of war. That is the responsibility which will fall principally upon the assembly and the economic and social council of the organization, rather than upon the security council. That is the task to which the energies of the United States and the other members of the world organization must be principally directed now and in the years following the war.

This is so, because no machinery for combined action to prevent or suppress aggression will work for any length of time in a world in which the causes of war, particularly the economic causes, are permitted to poison relations between countries.

Economic warfare, depressions, hunger, poverty, and despair—these are the conditions that undermine democracy and block its development, that breed tyrants and aggressors and that turn nations one against the other. These are conditions that we must fight to master if any international organization is to succeed in preserving peace.

That is another of the realities upon which our foreign policy is based.

As I have said, we face a task of extreme difficulty.

The battles of this war have left in their wake destruction of factories and homes and transport that is unparalleled in history. This damage has to be repaired.

The demands of war production have distorted the economies and the economic relationships of all nations as never before and have made necessary restrictive Government controls of all sorts on normal business and agriculture. The transition from war to peace economy will challenge our patience and ingenuity to the utmost.

We and our fighting allies alike have enormously increased our national debts and our allies have, in many cases, incurred heavy new international debts as well.

Add to all this the fact that when this war began we had an inheritance of years of economic warfare among nations and that we have this earlier damage, as well as the damage caused by the war, to repair. This earlier economic warfare took many forms—restrictive Government monopolies and private cartels, artificial restrictions on exchange, currency manipulation, high tariffs, quotas, and other artificial barriers to profitable foreign trade and investment.

Finally, we have to face the fact that never before in our history, even in the periods of our greatest prosperity, have we attained a volume of production, trade and employment and a national income that came even close to what we have achieved in response to the demands of this war.

In order to achieve high levels of employment after this war—and to make sure that the men who return from the battle fronts will have secure jobs and good wages—it is estimated that we shall have to reach and maintain a national income in the neighborhood of $150,000,000,000, compared to the highest figure we ever reached before the war—less than eighty-five billions in 1929. This, we hope, will provide close to 60,000,000 jobs, year in and year out, compared to the previous peacetime peak of 47,000,000 in 1929.

Our problem thus adds up to this:

We know that we have the physical ability to reach the higher level of production that we must have, because we have done it in this war. We have added enormously to our productive capacity and unlike many of our allies, our factories and farms have escaped entirely the destruction of war. But in peacetime we cannot reach this high level of production unless we can find markets abroad as well as at home for our investment and our goods and services.

We know also that much of the world will emerge from this war in desperate need of supplies and equipment from us to get their own economies going again, but that they will often not have the money to pay for what they need until they have succeeded in restoring their own productive economic life.

We know also that short-sighted economic nationalism, either on their part or on ours, would prevent any real recovery and would therefore destroy the markets we need and lead to unemployment and depression in our own country.

What we have to do is to match our need for full production with the world's need for our products in such a way as to reach and maintain over the years a permanently higher level of international trade—and to maintain it on a sound and profitable basis.

I have already stressed the difficulty of doing this. But I have seen too much of the achievements of American industry, both its management and its workers, and I have too much faith in American enterprise and initiative to think that it is impossible. On the contrary, I believe we as a Nation have before us the greatest opportunity in our history to achieve in this generation the sub-

stantial fulfillment of the purposes of the American way of life.

Once in a while one of my business friends speaks to me of Government planning as if it were either ridiculous or dangerous. I reply that when I was in business, planning was fundamental to successful management and I don't suppose things have changed since. It seems to me that to assemble all the pertinent facts, analyze them, and then plan ahead on the basis of these facts is merely the most elementary common sense. If those of us who are in positions of responsibility did not plan ahead, we would be guilty of criminal negligence.

The United States Government has a well-rounded and carefully prepared program to achieve the results we seek in our foreign economic relations. We have been working actively on this program right through the war, and developing it step by step in consultation with our allies and with the Congress and people of the United States and preparing to put it into effect. The Atlantic Charter; the United Nations Declaration; the meetings at Moscow and Teheran, at Dumbarton Oaks, and in the Crimea; the establishment of U. N. R. R. A.; the conferences on food and agriculture at Hot Springs, on the International Bank and the Monetary Fund at Bretton Woods, and on international aviation here in Chicago; and the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City—these have all been steps in the development of this program.

It is a program that is aimed at expansion, not restriction. It is rooted in the American traditions of freedom and enterprise.

You already know a good deal about this program, but you may not all have seen how each part was related to the other and to the whole, nor how closely linked this program is to steady jobs and better pay and higher farm income in this country and to the assurance that your sons and mine will not have to fight another and greater war 25 years from now.

We begin with U. N. R. R. A., which is an emergency and temporary agency created to assist in meeting the urgent needs of relief in liberated countries. It is already functioning.

The U. N. R. R. A. program is a modest one. Probably four-fifths of the relief job will be done by the liberated countries themselves.

The purpose of U. N. R. R. A. is to help the liberated peoples get enough food to eat, clothes to wear, and a roof over their heads—relief which will make it possible for them to start earning a living again. It will not, however, meet the enormous problems of reconstruction—the rebuilding of destroyed or damaged factories and homes, the provision of raw materials and industrial machinery, and the supplies required for the restoration of agricultural production.

I should like at this point to state again what the President and other officials of the Government have often stated before.

It has never been intended to use lend-lease for post-war reconstruction or for any other purposes except those concerned with fighting and winning the war, and these are the only purposes for which lend-lease has been used. Lend-lease is solely a war measure.

I make this statement because of the repeated distortions and misstatements that continue to be made on this subject. The core of our whole post-war foreign economic program is the expansion of private trade and the encouragement of private enterprise, with such assistance as is required from the Government to maintain high levels of production and employment.

We are resolved that the terms of the lend-lease settlement shall not be such as to endanger this program by placing unnecessary and restrictive burdens upon our commerce with other countries. We do not want war debts to smother trade this time, as they did after the last war, and to poison relations between countries.

On the contrary, article VII of the lend-lease agreements with our principal allies in this war provides that the terms of the settlement shall be such as to expand production, employment, the exchange and consumption of goods, to eliminate all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers.

To meet the urgent needs of reconstruction, many of the countries which have suffered from the war will be able to buy a part of what they need out of their current resources. But the dollars and the gold that they now have or can acquire through their exports in the immediate future will be wholly inadequate to the dimensions of the task.

It is clearly evident that international credits in large volume and at reasonable rates of interest will be necessary to tide them over the next few years. It is also clearly evident that private investment cannot do a job of this magnitude unaided by the Government, especially in the unsettled conditions that will follow the war.

To help meet this and related needs—the plan for an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and an International Monetary Fund was agreed to by the United Nations delegates at the Bretton Woods Conference and is now before Congress for approval.

The principal purpose of the bank is to guarantee loans made by private investors for sound foreign projects of reconstruction and development and thus to extend the scope of private international investment.

Without the bank, I do not believe it will be possible to bring about the economic recovery of some of our best potential customers abroad and the development of the resources of other countries which can also buy products from us in large quantities if they have the money. China and many of the American republics are outstanding examples of countries in this latter category.

This is an important point which is often overlooked or misunderstood. Sound industrial and agricultural development abroad does not take customers away from us. On the contrary, past experience has proved time and again that the countries which buy the most from us are those whose economies are the most highly developed. Great Britain, for example, was our best pre-war customer. Canada, with a population of less than 12,000,000, bought more from us before the war than all of South America with a population of almost 90,000,000.

Economically undeveloped countries are not good customers because they do not have enough income to pay for purchases from us. Therefore the influence of the bank in advancing industrial and agricultural development in such countries will be of direct advantage to our export trade. The more wealth they produce and the higher their national income, the more they will wish to buy from us and be able to pay for.

The essence of the plan for the International Monetary Fund, which your fellow townsman, Mr. Edward Brown, had a part in drafting, is an agreement on rules governing foreign exchange which will provide some assurance in international traders and investors of the value of the money they are dealing with and to exporters that they will get paid for their exports in their own money and not in some blocked foreign currency they cannot use.

The proposed fund will not provide loans for reconstruction. But the substantial stabilization of the world's currencies which it will make possible when it goes into effect will be essential to sustaining a high volume of international investment and trade.

As a supplement to the International Bank and to private capital in the tremendous task of restoring peacetime production and trade in a world exhausted and bled white by war, we plan also to ask Congress in the near future to expand the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. This Government institution has a 10-year record of profitable operations. It operates principally through private banks, manufacturers, and exporters. Its capital is already largely utilized. It will have to have substantially increased capital to help meet the urgent needs for economic reconstruction and for rebuilding trade. And obviously, if lending by private investors or the Export-Import Bank, or by private investors with the guaranty of the International Bank, is actually to take place, Congress must remove the restrictions of the Johnson Act and similar legislation.

Thus we have U. N. R. R. A. and other emergency relief measures, which prepare the way for the tremendous tasks of reconstruction.

We have the International Bank and other financial measures to make possible the financing of this economic reconstruction and of further economic development in the immediate post-war years. And we have the Monetary Fund providing for stabilization of currencies on a basis of gold and for ending economic warfare in the form of currency manipulation and exchange restrictions.

These are the foundations for building up the extensive and profitable international trade which is essential to high levels of production and employment in the United States.

Last year our wartime exports were valued at more than $14,000,000,000. Our greatest previous volume of peacetime exports was scarcely more than one-third of that figure. I do not suggest that it will be possible, or that it will be necessarily desirable, to export $14,000,000,000 worth of products a year in peacetime. But specialists in this field do estimate that it will be necessary to approach the figure of $10,000,000,000 a year if we are to maintain our production and employment at the levels we seek.

Only the most vigorous measures to remove artificial barriers to trade will make it possible for us to reach this goal after the war. We have, first of all, to remove wartime restrictions as rapidly as the paramount requirements of defeating Japan, as well as Germany, will permit.

We have also to work toward a general lowering of the tariff barriers which prevailed before the war.

I hear it often said that high tariffs protect the American living standard. If there are any tariffs that really do that, I favor maintaining them. I also believe in looking at the record in these matters. What does the record show?

It shows that, actually, high tariffs today act as a depressing influence upon the living standard of the American people. The record shows that on the average the wages paid by the highly protected industries are lower than the wages paid by those industries which have little tariff protection or none at all. Our most efficient industries pay the highest wages and need no tariff protection.

The record also shows that consumers—and every American is a consumer—have to pay more for products manufactured by highly protected industries than they would if more of these products were imported. This means they have that much less money to spend for other products they would like to buy.

In thinking of tariffs, we have also to bear this in mind: Our exports are the imports of other countries just as our imports are their exports. If we impose unfair tariff barriers that prevent Americans from buying from other countries products they would like to buy if they could, then we invite retaliation by these countries against our exports of products that we would like to sell to them.

It was this sort of competition in tariffs that strangled trade, restricted production, and stimulated economic warfare before the war. We cannot afford to let it happen again.

We do not need to fear imports. On the contrary we need imports of many commodities in order to live, because we do not produce them ourselves. We need more imports to replace some of our own raw material resources that we have consumed in such tremendous quantities in fighting this war. More imports mean not only more goods for American consumers, but more jobs and income for Americans engaged in the processing and distribution of imports. Finally, without more imports other countries will not be able to pay us for the increased exports that we seek.

For every reason of our own national interest, it is my firm conviction that tariffs must be further lowered in the next few years, both by other countries and by ourselves.

In the last 5 years before the war we sought through the reciprocal trade agreements program initiated by my great predecessor Cordell Hull to repair some of the damage done to our economy by the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. We made considerable progress in spite of the economic warfare which Germany and Japan were then pursuing and the generally unfavorable conditions which prevailed. Recognizing its efficacy, Congress has three times renewed the Trade Agreements Act since it was first passed.

Now it is necessary to move further. The act is again before Congress for extension. As it stands it authorizes reductions in our tariffs up to 50 percent of the excessively high rates in effect in 1934. A good part of this authorization has been used up in the negotiation of the 28 trade agreements now in effect.

We need more bargaining power in persuading other countries to reduce their tariffs against our exports. We have therefore asked Congress to authorize an amendment which will apply the 50 percent limit to the tariff rates as they stood in 1945 instead of the higher rates of 1934. This will give us a new quid pro quo in negotiating new agreements with other countries.

In addition to restrictive tariffs, there are other obstacles to wider trade and an expanding economy for the United States and the rest of the world. Preferences and quotas, for example, are artificial restrictions on trade between nations and export subsidies encourage uneconomic production, upset the world market and invite retaliation. In agreement with other countries we must seek the means by which we can substitute for these practices other measures better calculated to maintain a healthy and expanding international trade.

We must also deal vigorously and effectively with international cartels. These restrictive and monopolistic agreements among private business interests fix prices, limit production, prevent the use of new inventions and productive techniques, arbitrarily divide markets and have in general a dangerous and throttling effect upon international trade. The evil effects of international cartels can be prevented only by supplementing national by international action against them and by taking the other measures which I have outlined to ensure that all nations will be able to live better without such practices than with them.

Some of our most serious economic problems arise out of chronic world-wide surpluses of such commodities as wheat and cotton. You in Chicago remember what happened to wheat farmers in this country after the last war when the bottom dropped out of the market for wheat and tens of thousands of farmers lost their homes and their livelihood. We do not want to see a repetition of that.

It is important that governments act together to deal with the problem of such surpluses primarily by cooperative measures to expand consumption, such as I have outlined tonight. In the exceptional cases where commodity agreements are necessary, they should be directed toward shifting excess productive resources into more profitable lines, and both consuming and producing countries should be fully represented. Otherwise individual governments will continue trying to deal with them by such deceptively easy routes as artificially supported prices and competing export subsidies. As we have learned from bitter experience, these can only lead to economic warfare and in the end make the problem worse instead of better for all concerned.

These problems and others like them can be faced and handled in time only by calling a conference of the principal trading nations of the world. We shall do all in our power to have such a conference convened within the next year. This conference would also prepare the way for establishment of a permanent trade organization within the framework of the world organization, to deal with these problems on a continuing basis.

In the field of food and agriculture, we are further advanced. The President last week asked Congress to approve United States participation in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. This Organization results from the conference at Hot Springs in 1942. Eighteen nations have already ratified the agreement for membership. We should do so, too.

The food and agriculture organization will have powers of recommendation only, not of control or command, but I believe with the President that its work can do much to raise the standards of nutrition of all peoples and to establish and maintain expanding prosperity for agriculture in our country and in all countries.

The food organization, like the other postwar international agencies to which I have referred this evening, would all eventually come within the framework of the world organization when it is established.

I think you will agree that the program upon which we have begun is of great scope. It must be so if we are to deal successfully with problems and difficulties of equal magnitude.

The close cooperation of the United Nations in a program for economic reconstruction and expansion such as I have outlined to you tonight is fundamental to the success of the world organization. Without it the world will be able neither to recover from the effects of this war nor to prevent the next war.

There are many pitfalls ahead of us. So closely is each part of the program interlocked with the other parts that if we fail to carry through on any important sector of this peace front, the whole program and our over-all objectives will be placed in gravest jeopardy.

If we fail, we are not likely to get another chance to fulfill the purposes for which we have fought—the assurance of a secure peace and a decent life for all Americans.

The task will require the utmost of us as a people in clear thinking, in understanding of where our real interests lie, and in the ability to act courageously and wisely—and in time.

I return to the point at which I began. The preservation of peace requires something more than a desire for peace, no matter how strong that desire may be. It requires, in a world as complicated and as closely interknit as this modern world of ours, a great design. It requires, in other words, the same courage, the same boldness and realism in the field of international affairs which the citizens of this Republic, and of this great central valley, have so often demonstrated in the past.

If we Americans are proud of one thing more than of any other, we are proud of the fact that our forefathers were willing to face tremendous and complicated problems and to bring to them new and daring solutions. And there are no Americans who take more pride in that tradition than the Americans of these great Central States.

Believing in America as I do, I am confident that we will meet this greatest crisis of our modern history as we have met all the crises of our history before. I believe that we will act with understanding of where our real interests lie—wisely and courageously and in time—and that we will force the difficult circumstances of our time to yield up to us the sure and enduring peace which we are determined to leave to those who will follow us in this country we love so well.

Global Phonetic Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter dated March 29, 1945, from former Senator Robert L. Owen to Miss Alice Paul, national chairman, National Women's Party, on the subject of a global phonetic alphabet.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD LANGUAGE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1945.

Miss ALICE PAUL,
National Chairman, National Woman's Party, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS PAUL: Please accept my thanks for your invitation to speak at the April meeting of the National Woman's Party.

I am passionately interested in the mothers of the world for whose rights you fight. I am deeply interested in the children of the world as well as in the mothers to whom they must look for guidance. The education and emancipation of the women of the world are vitally necessary for the establishment of the great new era we hope to see in the near future. I shall be glad to present to you a plan of effective world-wide communication which will promote the objects to which you are devoting yourself.

As your meeting precedes the meeting of the United Nations representatives at San Francisco, I shall call your attention to the importance of the World Language Foundation as a means of establishing English as the language of the world.

The records of the French Academy disclosed 2,796 known languages and dialects for 2,200,000,000 people. Few people know more than 2 or 3 of such languages and there is urgently needed 1 language through which the people of all languages and dialects can converse with each other. Many efforts have been made trying to accomplish this through Esperanto, Volapuk, Romano, Interlingua, and last but not least, Basic English. These artificial languages have failed in their benovelent purpose because, except Basic English, they were without any world-wide backing and involved serious difficulty because unphonetically spelled with one common alphabet.

Basic English failed to realize the supreme difficulty of foreigners spelling English words, but it had merit in selecting some 850 words of common use with which, by the use of adjectives and adverbs, great flexibility was obtained. The great difficulty of spelling such words remained.

The Ministers of Education of the European nations represented at London on July 26, 1943, passed resolutions urging one language be made a world language as a means of enabling all nations of all languages and dialects to converse with each other, and to have books which could be read by all people in the world.

The enormous advantage of one world language as a means of bringing together the mutual understanding and good will and cooperative production and commerce is perfectly obvious to all statesmen. The idea has been approved by President Roosevelt, by Mrs. Roosevelt, by Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek.

The World Language Foundation, organized by my friends, has available a mechanism for the first time in human history by which every language in the world can be written, and stenographically written, printed by modern machinery, and pronounced at sight through the global alphabet.

My office is sending you Senate Documents 133 and 250, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and other literature showing you how completely and perfectly this can be done. The records show that the use of the phonetic alphabet in a less desirable form has enabled Russia to increase its production over 400 percent and abolish illiteracy in the entire territory occupied by the Soviet Republics—about one-sixth of the habitable surface of the earth.

The Russian alphabet can be learned in 1 day. All phonetic alphabets can be learned within a day or two. There are 350 phonetic alphabets which have come into existence during the last 30 years.

They are in conflict with each other. They use the same identical forms of letters in very many cases with different meanings attached to the forms. The forms are usually based on the Roman letters, Greek letters, or Arabic.

The global phonetic alphabet consists of letters entirely new in form, but of the simplest form humanly possible. Each letter represents one sound only and is immutable. No global letter is ever silent. The letters can be stenographically written.

Every language in the world can be written, printed, and pronounced at sight with the global alphabet.

We advocate the English language for the world language and we agree with the advocates of basic English that it requires only a small number comparatively of words to enable an intelligent conversation to be carried on in any language.

The basic English advocates 846 selected words. Professor Pei and his associates thought 1,200 selected words would be better. The World Language Foundation employs about 1,500 words. One thousand five hundred words, when combined into sentences, can present millions of thoughts of all shades of meaning and are abundant to enable people to converse freely on social, commercial, and political subjects. The English language represents the highest culture and the accumulation of unlimited knowledge in its libraries, laboratories, and museums. It is excellently adapted to be employed as a world language because of the simplicity of its declensions, conjugation, and syntax.

There has been one very great obstacle to the learning of the English language by foreigners. That obstacle is the unphonetic, antiphonetic, archaic, inherited spelling which President Roosevelt in 1906 called foolish and fantastic. English spelling, although unphonetic and antiphonetic, was inherited from our ancestors and has served magnificently in the glorious past. The weak spot in English spelling, however, can be easily healed with the global alphabet.

In current English, probably between 30 and 40 percent of English words contain 1, 2, 3, or more silent letters. They contain antiphonetic letters pronounced differently from what the spelling would indicate, as in the word "cough." The "gh" is pronouced like "f." Very many such cases occur, and the letters of the alphabet, instead of being confined to one sound and one sound only, have multiple sounds.

I received only yesterday from the Simplified Spelling Society of England a commentary on this subject, in which the circular said:

"The letter a in bat, bath, ball, wash, about, any, and navy has 7 sounds. Similarly the letter e has 5 sounds, i has 3, o has 6, and u has 5. * * * In addition the digraph oo has 5 sounds, ou has 7, ea has 5, and ei 5. * * * The sound a in eh, aid, lady, may, they, weigh, great, grate, gaol, and gauge is spelled in 10 ways. Similarly the sound e is spelled in 10 ways, i in 11, o in 11, and u in 11. This muddle in spelling and pronunciation is the despair of foreigners and the confusion of our children."

All of these difficulties immediately vanish by the use of the global alphabet, where one sound is always represented by one letter or one digraph.

The vocal chords of all human beings have the same structure as much as the human eyes and the human ears and human arms and legs. Therefore, it is natural that the primary sounds of which words are composed should be substantially the same.

No language in the world needs more letters than those presented by the global alphabet. Moses wrote Genesis with 23 letters.

In phonetic writing, all that is needed is that the symbols employed in connection with the sentence and subject matter should bring to mind the meaning and sounds of the words.

The micrometric labors of the professional phonetic experts of the International Phonetic Association have failed to realize this important matter and as a consequence have developed so large a number of symbols as to deprive the masses of the people of the benefits which easily come from symbols restricted to the actual necessity.

You will find from the record sent you that the greatest linguists in the world have given a cordial endorsement to the global alphabet.

Under the guidance of the World Language Foundation, textbooks are now ready for the compositor, teaching English, Spanish, Portuguese, and German. There will soon be ready a trilingual book teaching Russian, English, and Chinese to write, print, read and correctly pronounce the language of each other. These books at present are contemplated being put in the pocket-book form, which would make a volume of about 270 pages. The volumes will include a glossary of 1,500 words arranged in topics. The languages will be taught by suitable phrases, not discussing syntax but teaching the language as children learn it in the family by talking and correctly pronouncing words and phrases.

In addition to these books, it is proposed to have a special book of instruction in English teaching English children to write in global letters phonetic English, and also to write English stenographically using the global letters as a base and the usual abbreviations needed in shorthand systems.

This shorthand will not be competitive with professional shorthand, but will be found useful for letter writing with those who are familiar with the alphabet.

Our great objective is to make war on ignorance and poverty; to open to human beings everywhere in the world through books printed in global English and in global for all languages the accumulated knowledge of mankind.

Through such means the world will discover that other people consist of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters; that they have the same affections and emotions. They will discover the truth of our adage:

"All men are kin and should be kind,
Let each teach each, and friendship find."

Thanking you for your interest in the matter and hoping to be with you at your meeting in April, I remain,

Most respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Voting in the Proposed World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Disturbing," published in the Concord Daily Monitor, of Concord, N. H., on April 2, 1945. It is an extremely interesting editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTURBING

The belated revelation that Russia at the Yalta Conference asked for three votes in the proposed world organization and that the President countered by saying that then the United States would wish three votes has added another tough issue to those which must be considered and settled at San Francisco. The revelation also has produced a feeling of uneasiness, because it is not known what else may have been discussed at Yalta about which the nations of the world have been kept in ignorance.

The smaller nations which will be represented at the San Francisco Conference are protesting the Russian demand. The result has been the organization of considerable opposition to the Soviet request, with the American delegation left in the position of having accepted appointments to represent this country without having been told about the voting issue. The American delegates will probably feel that under these circumstances they are not bound to go along with whatever it may have been the President agreed to at Yalta in respect to votes for Russia and so this country is likely to line up at the Conference with the smaller states.

The voting system worked out tentatively at Dumbarton Oaks would give five big powers special privileges in the organization proposed. Under a compromise to which the President agreed, also belatedly revealed after Yalta, each of the big powers could veto United Nations action taken against it. Russia would be one of the big powers and was the nation which urged the veto power, apparently successfully. With this power the reasons for wanting three votes is not evident, if Russia at the same time wishes to cooperate in creating a world organization which will have a chance of being effectual.

The whole process of international dealing with the Russians has been very much the proposition of yielding to things Russia wants. Stalin has stayed home and Roosevelt and Churchill have had to do the traveling. Russia has had its way with Poland, and though nothing has been said by the

Big Three, probably expects to absorb Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Russia has pretty much excluded Britain and the United States from the Balkan States, and has made unilateral treaties with Finland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, as well as with France.

The Russian attitude seems to be that whatever is done, Russia's own desires must first be attended to; either that or Russia feels that she has had her demands so often satisfied that she may as well keep right on demanding. The American concern is of a different sort. We want a workable world organization through which the nations of the earth can cooperate toward the perpetuation of peace and prosperity. To that end we expect other nations to be impartially treated in setting up the world organization and to be able to obtain justice in its deliberations.

The satisfaction of these desires, not only on our part, but on the part of most of the smaller nations and some of the large nations, we still hope to obtain at San Francisco. To obtain them, however, the nations other than Russia must secure from Russia a greater degree of cooperation than is yet observable, for there will be demands by the nations to which Russia must yield if the sense of justice of the other nations is to be satisfied.

Possibly the whole conflict simmers down to the varying concepts of international morality entertained by the nations. These concepts have their foundation in the political philosophies by which the various peoples are governed and in their attitudes toward such things as the place of religion in this life. That the Russians think differently than the Anglo-Americans has long been obvious. Yet in a bona fide world organization there must be a point of view common to all the nations, if the organization is to work.

The meeting at San Francisco is portentous. It will not be simply another preliminary debate as to possible ways and means but an attempt to actually bring into being the framework of a world organization, and some of the delegations can commit their nations to whatever is devised on the spot, though in this country we must delay final approval until the United States Senate acts on whatever is proposed. The United States delegation should know what it wants when it goes to San Francisco, and it should stick to what it wants to the best of its ability.

Necessity for Retaining Key Bases in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I secured unanimous consent in the House this afternoon to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a communication which I addressed today to the President and to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy. My letter makes reference to the warning which Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King made in a speech in New York last night regarding the retention of key bases in the Pacific and contains the following paragraphs:

As a Member of Congress, and as an American citizen, I respectfully urge that our Government make no commitments which would preclude our retaining after the end of this war the necessary bases which have been bought by American blood and money—bases like Iwo Jima. I certainly feel that the American people want the American flag never to be hauled down from essential bases now being won.

This is certainly my view, and I hope it is the official view of the Government.

I now quote excerpts from the address made by Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King in a speech last night in New York City before the Academy of Political Science.

But more than an adequate merchant marine, we must have bases. Of all the elements of sea power, the United States Navy suffered most at the war's outbreak from the lack of overseas bases. We lacked operating bases in the Alaskan area; had none in the Far East, except for isolated and inadequate Cavite; none in the central Pacific, except Pearl Harbor, and only those recently acquired in the north and central Atlantic outside of Cuba and continental United States. The bases we did possess were not equipped with the requisite guns and planes and men to stem the enemy's initial onslaughts.

I make this point because it is well to remember that the mere ownership of outlying bases means little, if these bases are not maintained and implemented by an appropriate fleet ready for action.

Up to the present, the Pacific war has been largely a battle for bases. Our primary efforts so far have been directed toward wresting from the enemy advance territory from which our naval and military forces can rain body blows upon the inner Japanese Empire. At the war's termination we shall have bases serving our task forces in most areas of operations.

These atolls, these island harbors, will have been paid for by the sacrifice of American blood. They will have been scooped out of sand and rock, coral and volcanic ash, by a generation of Americans giving their service, their ingenuity, and their money.

Failure to maintain these bases essential for our defense raises the fundamental questions: How long can the United States afford to continue a cycle of fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give again? Rich as we are, we do not have the human or physical resources to dissipate our patrimony, generation after generation, in this manner.

* * * * *

Possessed as we are for the moment with naval greatness, it is difficult to believe that we will permit this power to be squandered or bartered away thoughtlessly. We will never do this, I am sure, if we understand what it might mean in terms of America's future in the world of tomorrow.

America cannot afford to disregard these words from Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King.

Maintenance of Coal Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C. April 2, 1945.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JENSEN: At the hearing before the House Subcommittee on the Interior Department Appropriation Bill, I promised you we would issue a statement concerning the necessity for maintaining coal production.

I am attaching a copy of the statement issued by Secretary Ickes and also a copy of his statement requesting the parties to the joint wage conference to maintain production. Both were made available to the press.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. POTTER,
Deputy Solid Fuels Administrator for War.

Following his appeal yesterday to the National Bituminous Joint Wage Conference for uninterrupted coal production, Solid Fuels Administrator Harold L. Ickes announced today that a new survey shows that if war activities continue at their present rate industry faces a heavy cut in coal supplies even though full-mine operations are maintained.

The survey, made by the Solid Fuels Administration for War, indicates that the 20-percent reduction in deliveries to householders and other domestic users next winter will still leave a 10,000,000-ton gap in supplies which cannot be met under present conditions, he said.

Despite the liberalization of draft deferment policy for war-essential coal miners, the lack of mine manpower is expected to restrict bituminous coal production to approximately 575,000,000 tons during the ensuing fuel year. This estimated output is based on full running time by the mines.

A revision of estimates indicates that the Nation will require 615,000,000 tons of bituminous coals during that period.

"These figures indicate an over-all deficit of 40,000,000 tons of soft coal for the new fuel year even if there are no interruptions of production," Administrator Ickes said.

"The 20-percent reduction in deliveries of solid fuels for heating homes, offices, and other buildings is expected to save around 15,000,000 tons of precious fuel. We can look to our diminishing soft-coal stock piles held by industrial consumers for another 15,000,000 tons without disrupting vital industrial operations.

"This points to a gap of 10,000,000 tons in bituminous coals which we lack the means of closing. Any disruption in mine operations or in transportation affecting mine operations will increase the size of this gap. Since the deficit applies mainly to eastern soft coals, including the special-purpose fuel for making steel and other vital war goods, it presents a formidable problem in keeping war activities going ahead at the present rate. Even on the basis of the present size of the impending shortage, industries are faced with the very real threat of having to curtail operations in the months ahead.

"The 20-percent reduction in domestic heating fuel is the most severe cut we can expect the public to withstand without impairment of health and welfare next winter. To meet minimum fuel needs will require the most rigorous conservation of fuel by every user.

"This reduction applies to anthracite users as well as to those who burn bituminous coal, byproduct coke, briquets, and other heating fuels made from coals. We are short of all types. Although we are still studying the anthracite situation, the figures indicate that the production of domestic heating sizes of this fuel is expected to be about 6,400,000 tons short of requirements, and that the buckwheat size will be short an additional 1,900,000 tons.

"At this time we cannot foresee any diminution of war activities which would materially reduce fuel requirements or ease mine manpower. Although the new deferment policy of the Selective Service System deals liberally with mine manpower, present trends indicate that we shall lose an additional 15,000 soft-coal miners during the new coal year. The major portion of this loss will result from natural attrition, such as deaths, accidents, sickness, and retirements because of age. Men entering military service and others drifting away from the mines into other industries will account for the remainder.

"We cannot count upon immediate relief from any early end of the fighting in Europe. The effect of Germany's military defeat on the coal supply problem cannot be accurately foreseen at this time, but it is reasonable to believe that it would not wipe out the impending fuel deficit.

"By April 1 the Nation's coal stock piles will be at the lowest level since Pearl Harbor. A good guess is that they will total about 40,000,000 tons. A great part of this coal is of a type not suited to the special needs of such war industries as the coke and steel plants.

"We not only must get along with less coal but a great section of industry and the public will have to take whatever usable types and sizes of fuel their suppliers can let them have.

"The new distribution program instituted by the Solid Fuels Administration for War was designed to give essential war industries and the public generally the greatest possible protection. Its success will depend upon the cooperation of the producers, wholesalers and the public alike.

"Every fuel user, either in industry, or in the home or other buildings, owes it to his own interests and to the interest of the Nation at war to use his fuel as sparingly as possible and to cooperate to the limit in the successful execution of the new fuel program.

"All means of increasing coal production, except that of taking men away from our military forces and the war industries, have been about exhausted. The total of some 453,000 miners currently employed is the smallest since 1902. The American coal miner is working longer hours and is producing more coal per man than in any other nation. The excellent job he is doing is worthy of the highest recognition.

"What the miner can do to increase his output still more remains to be seen. We must remember that the average age of a miner now exceeds 45 years, a considerable increase over the average age prior to the war. The fatigue factor in such a dangerous, arduous occupation as coal mining has a highly important bearing on production. We cannot expect the mine worker to stay on the job as steadily as is customary with men who are employed in many other industries. However, there is still room for improving the absentee record in some instances, as well as for improvement in the relations between labor and management in some operations. Every man concerned should seek diligently to make good use of every opportunity to increase his production."

Congress and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 4, 1945:

CONGRESS AND PEOPLE

No conclusions are drawn in the first report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. The reason is obvious. The committee has been organized only a few weeks. It is still in the early stages of its study, having taken testimony from only a fraction of the Members of Congress who wish to testify. When all Members of Congress have had a chance to express their views, the committee will hear from various officers of Congress, executive officials, members of the Senate and House press galleries, representatives of civic and professional organizations and private citizens.

The scope of its study will include the staffing of Congress, committee structure and operation, relations between the Senate and House, liaison between Congress and the President, congestion of legislative business and various similar aspects of the subject. We are especially pleased to note that it will give attention to the relations of Congress to the electorate. This phase of congressional duty is often overlooked or misunderstood. There is much complaint about the influence of special interests but not much thought about contact between Congressmen and their constituents, which may often have the effect of undercutting the influence of Washington lobbies.

The necessity for Congressmen to maintain ample contact with the people they represent was appropriately emphasized recently by Representative BROOKS HAYS. The war has kept Members of Congress in Washington most of the time. Their opportunities to learn what the home folks are thinking have been meager. Mr. HAYS thinks that such long absence leads to misunderstandings and loss of confidence by citizens in their representatives. He suggests that the work of Congress be arranged so that Members may make definite plans for sojourns in their districts to answer questions, discuss policies, and establish closer contacts.

It seems to us that some arrangement of this sort is vital to our democratic system. The power of the lobbies is likely to be weakened as the influence of the people is increased. Nor can we forget the great responsibility of Congressmen to educate their constituents as to the value of national policies that may not be properly understood in areas distant from Washington. Incidentally, any plan to facilitate their relations with their constituents should give the reforms which the Committee on Congress is expected to propose a strong appeal for the rank and file of legislators.

Let's Try Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent statement by the editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

LET'S TRY CAPITALISM

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, the Press-Scimitar)

It has been said that Christianity has never been tried.

This saying does not mean that there have not been Christians who have practiced the faith so faithfully and consistently that their lives are above criticism. There have been such people.

What is meant is that there have not been enough people who have understood Christianity clearly enough and practiced it consistently enough, over a long period, to make a Christian society.

Yet, despite this imperfect practice, the teachings of Jesus Christ remain the finest thing we know. We can find nothing better; we can only practice these teachings better.

CAPITALISM, TOO

In the same way, it can be said that capitalism has never been tried.

Yes, we have had its theory with us a long time, but we have departed from the theory so often and so generally that we cannot truly claim to have ever had a capitalist society.

Seeing the evils in society, people have condemned the theory of capitalism, rather than placing the blame where it belongs, on the failure to practice capitalism consistently. They have deserted the theory of capitalism, and rushed off into the madness of communism and fascism. These new systems already stand condemned in theory and practice, for they clamped tyranny on the world, struck it with terror, and then plunged it into the bloodiest and most destructive war it has ever known.

The way to peace and freedom is through the rediscovery of capitalism and its practice in honesty of mind and generosity of spirit.

CAN'T DO WITHOUT IT

You can't do without capital. Capital is stored wealth and the means of producing wealth—mines, factories, trade, and money. Communism and Fascism have not been able to do without capital. Under communism the capital is owned by the state—and the state is run by a gang. Under fascism, the capital is nominally in the hands of individuals and groups, but those individuals and groups are bossed by a gang which runs the state.

Under capitalism the capital is owned by individuals and groups. These individuals and groups are not controlled by the state or bossed by a gang governed by laws which they themselves have made through their representatives. Only under capitalism is there freedom and democracy.

SOMETHING WAS WRONG

Yet something was wrong with the practice of capitalism or people would not have turned to communism and fascism—remedies which proved worse than the diseases of capitalism.

What was wrong with the practice of capitalism?

To work, capitalism must have a market. The owners of capital should get a good return so they can buy goods and services. The managers of business should get good salaries so they can buy goods and services. The workers should get good wages so they can buy goods and services. In the past capital and management have usually been well compensated. But until recently workers have not received a sufficient wage to buy the goods which capitalism is capable of producing in such plenty.

Workers must be employed at a fair wage, and they must be continuously employed, if the market is not to break down. Workers have not been assured of steady employment.

THE WAY IT OPERATES

Capital is invested in a business. It prospers. It makes so much money that the profit on the original investment would be an enormous percentage. So the valuation of the business is arbitrarily increased. Fair enough. The owners who took a risk should be rewarded for their creative enterprise with a capital dividend. But not to the extent that the dividend has often been taken. The workers should share in it. They should share in it by the setting up of employment

reserves, so that when business falls off the business can afford to continue them on the pay roll and they can continue to spend money in the market for the goods produced by industry. Not only should there be reserves for continuity of employment but there should be special funds for profit-sharing, further increasing the purchasing power of workers.

BUYING POWER REDUCED

The purchasing power of workers, managers, and even capitalists was reduced by shoddy goods, adulterated food, and prices that are too high. Laws have begun to cope with such cheating. Savings were dissipated through worthless stocks and bonds until President Roosevelt got the truth-in-securities law; and through bank failures until Senator VANDENBERG got the law guaranteeing bank deposits. Yes; we are slowly but surely making capitalism honest.

TARIFF INCONSISTENT

The chief inconsistency in the practice of capitalism has been the tariff. Capitalism depends on a wide market, with goods flowing freely over national boundary lines. But we have built high tariff walls that stopped the flow. We must buy the products of other nations so they will have money to buy our products. Capitalism can work on no other basis.

THE OLD IDEA

In the old days most capitalists thought of capitalism as something for their benefit. Workers were just employees, something to be used. If they weren't useful, why then, turn them out. Is it any wonder that workers didn't always see the virtues of capitalism but sometimes turned to quack remedies like communism and fascism?

WORKERS ON MARCH

The workers of the world today are awake and on the march. Where they want to go, we will all go, for they are the controlling majority. Where will they want to go?

This writer believes that if capitalism is honestly and intelligently practiced, it is the best system for the good of the workingman that can be devised.

Therefore, let us practice it honestly and intelligently. Since it is the working people we must sell on the virtues of capitalism, let's put the interest of working people first in making any business decision.

If that is done, I predict that not only the workers but managers and capitalists will have a bountiful prosperity such as we have never before enjoyed. And it won't end in a depression.

If workingmen see businessmen practicing that kind of capitalism, they'll run the Reds out of the unions so fast it will be funny to watch.

Capitalism has never been really tried. Let's try it.

Let's move toward plenty for all—and peace.

Let's not make the rich poorer. But let's make the poor a great deal richer.

The Battle for the Agreements Has Begun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Export Trade and Shipper for March 26, 1945:

THE BATTLE FOR THE AGREEMENTS HAS BEGUN

Last Tuesday we heard James A. Farley talk to the Foreign Commerce Club of New York about the future of our international commerce and how to keep its wheels busily turning forward. Parts of his address appear in another part of this issue.

Mr. Farley clearly demonstrated his ability to discuss this subject, even before such a trade-wise group as makes up this club. He spoke not only from his own practical experience as head of Coca-Cola's export activities but as a former member of the President's Cabinet. That is why his talk is of more than casual interest to all exporters, particularly when he said:

"It is a hopeful sign that in both political parties there is developing an increasing interest in foreign trade and, in consequence, a recognition that the modern position of the United States in the world makes it necessary that we reconsider many of the tariff policies of the past.

"Under the great leadership of Secretary Cordell Hull, this change of attitude has taken form in our reciprocal trade policy. That policy was sound, but in its beginning it was experimental, tentative, and modest. But now that American prejudices in favor of higher tariffs are subsiding before the great facts of American efficiency and necessities, we may more resolutely proceed in the direction of enlarging our imports.

"A test of opinion on this subject will come later this spring, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for renewal. If the vote is close, it may mean that the administration will hesitate to move resolutely toward a larger exchange of goods. If the vote is by a wide margin, we may expect sentiment in both parties to move progressively toward a real reconsideration of our tariff policies."

It is to be assumed that Mr. Farley, long a member of the President's Cabinet, knows the administration's mind and reaction to the public—in this case, congressional—sentiment. This being so, the former Postmaster General has set the target for all foreign traders—to obtain the largest possible majority vote in favor of the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, an overwhelming majority preferred.

Congressional approval of renewal of the act isn't going to be easy to obtain this year, for the Department of State not only is asking for renewal but for authority to further reduce the tariff rate, a reduction of 75 percent below the Smoot-Hawley levels, or 25 percent below existing rates. The Department's request is contained in the so-called Doughton bill, introduced into the House of Representatives on March 16.

Republican Members of the House, and some Democrats, immediately marshaled their forces to defeat the bill. Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, Minnesota, declared that "Republicans in the House will fight it to the last ditch."

In senatorial circles one Member of that august group predicted that unless Mr. DOUGHTON agreed to a compromise, meaning presumably the elimination of the amendment concerning lower tariff rates, the old opponents of any sort of trade agreements made by the Department of State on its own would gather strength from those solons who did not oppose renewal as long as tariff rates were not disturbed.

Of course, the old fight to transmute agreements into treaties, with the Senate as the overlord, will come up again, this time probably with greater vigor and from greater numbers. Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, referred to this in a newspaper interview by saying that to him the request for additional powers to cut tariff rates "makes it clearer than ever that Congress ought to review these agreements before they go into effect."

Reverting to Mr. Farley's foregoing statement about the need for a favorable vote with a wide margin, exporters should not rest complacent over the results of the last renewal vote in Congress. That was in 1943, when the United States was desperately struggling to get its full military might in action against the Axis and to demonstrate to the world that we are a united nation, even when such a question of policy as reciprocal trade agreements with other nations is under consideration.

This impelling motive, militarily considered, is missing this year, and also there are many new noses in Congress to be counted in the balloting for the agreements program.

The battle has begun, and every foreign trader should enlist every vestige of his strength in the fight, not only to preserve the old agreements program but also the new amendment designed to lower our unduly high tariff walls so that foreign trade will truly be two-way trade.

Bad Bill No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper correspondent and a Congressman I have been around this Capitol Building 44 years, and it is my considered opinion that this compulsory labor bill is the worst bill that has been introduced in Congress in my time. If this bill becomes a law and is enforced as it could be enforced, it would be the champion home-breaking measure of all time.

A bureaucrat in Washington could say to John Citizen, of Indianapolis: "You are needed to work in an airplane factory in Seattle. Your wife is needed to work in a soap factory in Cincinnati. Your daughter is needed to take a riveter's job at Scranton. Close your happy home and scram."

What will the boys who are fighting and dying in the foreign theaters of war think when they learn what can be done to their fathers, mothers, and sisters under this bill?

This bill would establish right here in America the kind of regimentation and totalitarianism our boys are giving their lives to eradicate from this earth. It would amount to the infliction of involuntary servitude on our people for private profit.

This must not happen. What is needed in this country is more government by the people and less government by bureaucracy. America must remain forever a free country based on law and not bureaucratic ukase.

If the House passes the bill, I hope the Senate will bury it too deep for resurrection, leaving only a bitter memory that such a thing should ever have been proposed.

Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison, manager, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Longview, Tex.:

WORDS

Words are more powerful than dynamite for good or for evil. Perhaps there is less known about words, and more of them used by everybody every day, than any other commodity on earth. Most of the disputes in business over contracts and in diplomacy over treaties arise from confusion about the meaning of words. Scientists say that there is no way to tell whether the color red looks the same to everybody. So how do we know that we are talking about the same things when we say "home" and "liberty" and "cooperation"? Each of us colors the meaning of a word by his own experience.

Every writer and speaker regards words as tools of his trade and he tries to use them well, yet he is in constant fear that his meaning will not get through. There is never much doubt of what a speaker is talking about as long as he uses simple words. The short and stubby four-letter Anglo-Saxon words name simple, intimate things near and dear to us, such as love, home, good, roof, fire, and food. This is the diction of the Bible. It has never been improved upon. Some speakers like to show off their vocabularies and lose their hearers in a maze of polysyllabic persiflage and alliterative arrogance. Short words were good enough for Milton, Shakespeare, and Emerson. They are quite adequate for smaller men if they have anything to say. One of the most terrifying statement in the Bible is that we shall be held acountable for every idle word. A man on fire with an idea can find old familiar words upon which to drape the fabric of his thoughts so that all may see and know.

Semantics, the science of the meaning of words, is not well known. Some politicians know the importance of the names we call things by. We have seen clever examples of the choice of words to sell ideas in this country lately. Social security and client sound so much nicer than public charity and pauper.

Kipling called words "the most powerful drug used by mankind." Disraeli said, "With words we govern men." Lord Chesterfield termed words "the dress of thoughts" and Will Carleton wisely wrote: "Boys flying kites haul in their white-winged birds: You can't do that way when you are flying words. Thoughts unexpressed may sometimes fall back dead; but God Himself can't kill them when they're said."

Words can stir anger, inspire hope, bring a laugh or a tear. Words can make men win battles or scale the heights of success. Words can sear like a hot iron and hurt the heart like a knife, or they can bind up wounds and soothe like a healing balm. Words can ruin a reputation, undermine credit, divide a community into factions, destroy public confidence, wreck a business, or break a bank. Words can leave a trail of smiles and hope or spread fear and bitterness like a plague.

Every user of words might well pray: Lord, help me to bring a simple, helpful, hopeful message that any child can understand. Help me to think of the message and not of myself.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

The Haul of the Wild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under the intriguing title of "The Haul of the Wild," Arthur Hawthorne Carhart, of Denver, Colo., has an interesting article appearing in the April issue of Nation's Business which I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of these remarks. Mr. Carhart significantly points out that hunting and fishing are not only great recreations but that they definitely also come under the heading of big business.

With the greatest pheasant hunting in the world, South Dakota, for example, sold over $1,000,000 in out-of-State hunting licenses last year despite shell shortages and difficulties of travel. The first normal year after the war should see this amount doubled or trebbled and in addition many visitors come to South Dakota each year to enjoy big-game hunting in the celebrated Big Hills or to fish in our streams and lakes.

In planning for our post-war economic picture, Americans will do well to keep in mind the potentialities of the recreational industry as they blueprint the future and prepare to provide employment and opportunity for the millions now in uniform or engaging in 100-percent war work.

THE HAUL OF THE WILD

(By Arthur Hawthorne Carhart)

AMERICA'S 20,000,000 ANGLERS AND HUNTERS, WITH SOME $2,000,000,000 A YEAR TO SPEND, WILL PLAY A BIG PART IN JOB MAKING WHEN PEACE COMES

Take a small fishhook and a .22 caliber cartridge. You have about two and a half cents' worth of merchandise. In these two symbols of fishing and hunting, there's little hint of any great field of business. Yet in peacetime these simple articles represent a business of nearly $2,000,000,000 a year. Postwar, it may be up to $3,000,000,000.

Seems almost unbelievable that each year sane people would spend $1,200,000,000 on fishing and $650,000,000 on hunting.

Sounds crazy.

There's something to that. Anglers and hunters are rabid devotees to their hobbies. Instead of sitting in the grandstand, munching peanuts, drinking pop, and yelling at players and umpires, the outdoorsmen personally participate in their sports. That gives a hint as to why the fish and game sports create a business reaching to such high totals.

A ball fan may spend $30 a year for admission tickets. A fisherman, on the other hand, may spend $30 for a new rod without batting an eye—and he goes on from here to buy armfuls of other equipment. Then he pays for rail or auto travel to his favorite streams—and for room and meals. Perhaps he even hires a guide.

You see fishermen as lone individuals on lakes and streams. Or you see three hunters crossing a stubblefield, shotguns ready, dogs working the fence-line thickets for pheasants or quail. You never visualize the millions of other fishermen or hunters on the tens of thousands of streams and hunting ranges.

The Federal Fish and Wildlife Service tallied the Nation's hunting and fishing license sales between July 1, 1941, and June 30, 1942. In that period—including the 7 months of heaviest annual license sales after Pearl Harbor—8,423,218 persons bought angling permits, and 8,532,354 bought hunting licenses. That approaches 17,000,000 licenses. Some are duplications. Certainly many sportsmen bought both hunting and fishing permits.

Just how many duplications occur is not known. But compensating numbers of others who fish and hunt are not included in the license totals. In many States women, veterans, pensioners, and youths need purchase no licenses. None is required for salt-water angling, and surf and deep-sea fishermen comprise an army. In some States, if one hunts and fishes in his home county, no license is required. It is estimated there are as many in this group as there are licensed sportsmen.

In peace years, at least 20,000,000 hunt and fish in the 48 States or angle along our ocean shore lines.

Actually, we need not discount too heavily the duplications when estimating the purchasing potentials of the entire sportsmen's group. Anyone who is both angler and hunter buys equipment for each sport. He is a double customer. Clothes, boots, tents, boats, and camp duffel may serve for either sport, but a rod and reel will not shoot ducks or deer, and a rifle or shotgun will not cast a trout fly or lure a bass.

War work and restrictions have reduced the number of licenses sold, but only some 7 percent. It hasn't actually reduced the number of sportsmen. War merely keeps them from going into the field.

What happened to license sales during and after the First World War indicates what lies ahead. A recent survey shows that in the 25 States where records were complete enough to provide exact data, total license sales actually increased 1.6 percent from 1916 to 1917; 2.6 percent from 1917 to 1918, and then, after the armistice, in 1919, yearly license sales swept up nearly 30 percent. The boys who had been introduced to outdoor life in the armed forces turned to hunting and fishing in civilian life as a natural field of recreation.

Proportionately more men of the hunting and fishing ages are in the armed forces today. At least a 30-percent increase in license sales may be expected when victory comes. That means at least 27,000,000 customers for outdoor equipment post war.

In addition, a tremendous backlog of replacement and new equipment sales is in prospect for the millions of sportsmen not in the armed services. Practically every fishing-tackle manufacturer is in war production. No tackle has been made for civilians for several years and reserve stocks are exhausted. Arms and ammunition plants are totally devoted to war goods. Meanwhile, rods break, lures are lost, lines wear out, and guns get older. The war experience will produce new tackle and such advanced models of guns that perhaps half of the sportsmen will want to replace old equipment. That is the waiting market.

Expenditures are large

Any analysis of what this market may mean in total expenditure simmers down to what each sportsman, on the average, will spend annually for his favorite sport.

One angler may spend relatively few dollars a year; the next may spend several thousand. That is also true of the hunters. The question is, "What is the average outlay?"

When I consider the average hunter and fisherman I think of the four mechanics at the garage where my car is serviced. These men are in the moderate-income brackets. Their annual bill may suggest what the average per person might be.

They spend from $15 to $30 a year for new fishing tackle and ammunition. They take at least five fishing trips into the mountains each season, travel a minimum of 200

miles per trip, spend a full day and parts of two others each time. They camp, cook their own meals, but certainly spend $8 each per trip.

They all go big game hunting, too. Travel, food, shelter, horse hire, and other costs of this trip would average at least $30 each. They hunt pheasants and rabbits twice each fall and ducks three times. That would cost $5 per trip per person.

We have as minimums, $15 for tackle and ammunition, $40 for fishing trips, $30 for big game, and $35 for small game hunting. That totals $120 a year. If you told those fellows they spent that much they'd deny it—but if they figured all costs they'd probably find ours is a short estimate.

By contrast, before the war, a group of Texans, traveling to Colorado with house trailers and a refrigerator truck, had a big game season budget of $500 each. It was put in a jackpot and had to be spent. That was only one annual hunt for those Texans. They hunted and fished on other trips, too.

Analyzing all figures available, Frank G. Menke, author of the Encyclopedia for Sports and a national authority, has estimated that the average annual bill of each sportsman in peacetime is $143. Any inclusive figure for outdoorsmen would cover not only tackle, arms and ammunition, but clothing, flashlights and camp lanterns, bedrolls, camp axes and knives, travel, lodging, meals, guide services, and other comparable items. The sportsman buys some equipment and services every time he goes into the open. He goes several times a season if he can make it.

The annual expenditure of $143 a person appears conservative. Let's discount that figure and accept an average of $100 per sportsman per year, all costs. If we do that, 20,000,000 sportsmen will spend at least $2,000,000,000 a year.

If you doubt this figure, take yourself to any sporting-goods store, price equipment you must have either to fish or hunt, figure the number of trips you could take each season, add up the total of all costs—well, try it if you disbelieve. You'll spend $50 for bare necessities for trout fishing; $150 if you get better-quality equipment. When you've done that, you've just started. A hunter's outfit costs more than a fisherman's.

The cash outlay resting on the foundation of ample supplies of game and fish has a place in the critical reconversion period. It means lots of jobs.

If technological advancement and volume production developed during the war is applied to sporting arms, if sportsmen can get good guns at low prices, literally millions of men who are single-gun owners today will be two- and three-gun sportsmen tomorrow. Not all arms and ammunition plants can, of course, keep their war workers busy producing sporting arms, but this approach to volume production and sales, with 5 to 10,000,000 rifle, shotgun, and pistol purchasers in prospect, with volume sale of ammunition to follow, can ease reconversion problems in that field.

Fishing-tackle factories show a much wider spread both by location and size. Here is a little shop in Montana, producing a special trout fly, employing a dozen people. A shop in Denver making fine fishing-rod fittings employs a dozen more. A concern also in Denver making fishhooks on automatic machines and tying trout flies now employs 300 workers. They are all set to make plastic bass lures after the war. The big plants at Akron, or at Utica, or at South Bend, or Geneva, will support a pay roll of at least 1,000 names each.

Many fields are helped

All these are set to turn swiftly to civilian production, and practically no labor will be drifting on the market from their conversions. Here is a sizable buffer against unemployment.

Moreover, the ramifications of business underwritten by the wildlife resources go on into many fields. Outboard motors, boats, canoes, even such items as pack sacks, must be manufactured to meet demands. Or, taking another trail, there will be increased demands for private cottages on lakes and streams. Many ex-servicemen, handy with tools, could find employment in just that one field. There will be need for new and increased facilities at resorts.

There will be work on structures, on plumbing installations, on unit electric plants for these establishments, and a demand for furnishings to equip them. The further one goes, the more the outlook of goods and services that hunting and fishing underwrite enlarges.

Just where, as a matter of interest, will this sportsmen's business stand in comparison with manufacturers we have regarded as important in post-war business?

Repeatedly, we have heard of the tremendous demand for electric refrigerators and home air-conditioning units as one type of product of which the manufacture will absorb post-war labor. Let's glance at the record of where these stood just before the war. The Department of Commerce census of manufacturers gives the 1939 figure for total finished-goods value of refrigerators and air-conditioning units as $278,645,540. In the same year all electric appliances, fans, irons, toasters, driers, domestic cooking and heating units, all products in this class, totaled $145,696,194. The two together, much discussed as "buffer" backlogs in post-war economy, totaled $424,341,734—less than a fourth of a total of the sportsman's annual bill in 1939.

Admittedly some segments of post-war business will be much larger than that based on our stock of wildlife. But equally certain is the fact that few in business have realized the magnitude of annual expenditures resting on fish and game.

Hunting and fishing are actually big business.

While Mr. Carhart's article does not draw the moral, the facts which he has marshaled clearly indicate that Congress and American industry should keep in mind the following points as they tussle with problems having a bearing on fishing, hunting, and the other aspects of outdoor recreation to which our citizens are so rightfully devoted.

First. Uniform pollution control made effective enough so that our streams and lakes are preserved in their natural beauty is not only good national hygiene but it is good national economics because it perpetuates the attractiveness of areas which are basically essential if the multi-billion-dollar business of supplying outdoor equipment to sportsmen and recreationists is to continue to employ people and pay taxes.

Second. Money prudently appropriated by Congress to provide efficient operations by our Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and kindred agencies is an investment which earns a profit for the Government rather than a net expense to the taxpayers of this Republic.

Third. Recreations such as hunting and fishing which attract the participation of over 20,000,000 people a year are of such widespread appeal that they should be kept available for the underprivileged and the common man as well as for the well-to-do. Thus public shooting grounds and fishing opportunities should be preserved and private clubs and individuals should never be permitted to monopolize these great pastimes in America.

Fourth. Conservation, which in times of war frequently must give way to expediency, should become a national watchword with the advent of peace. Our forests, our wildlife, our fish, our soil, our wildflowers, our migratory birds, and our clean waters should be conserved with scrupulous care so that present generations while enjoying their blessings can pass them along as an American heritage to future generations.

Fifth. State governments would do well to examine their game and fish administrations and their park and natural-resources boards to be sure that politics is not being played with natural recreational resources. South Dakota phenomenal success with the Chinese ring-neck pheasant is largely because our State has what is perhaps the model game and fish department regulations of the entire country. Politics has for many years been kept completely banned and our recreational facilities are administered by a strictly bipartisan board, serving without pay, and representing equally at all times the two major parties of the State. Game wardens—conservation officers, we prefer to call them—are selected strictly on merit and are promoted according to performance and political affiliation plays no part in their selection or advancement.

Public hunting and fishing comprise a great American tradition. Vigilance is needed, however, to protect this tradition, and our country owes much to the Izaak Walton League of America and similar national conservation groups for their unselfish and effective work in standing guard against the forces of selfishness and despoliation so that today's opportunities may be preserved for tomorrow's citizens.

"Applied conservation" means simply "consideration for others." It is an art the whole world sorely needs today. Here in America let us demonstrate fully the true values of conservation.

Farley Plainly Tells What Is Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Elmira Star-Gazette, Elmira, N. Y., on March 22, 1945:

FARLEY PLAINLY TELLS WHAT IS WRONG

"In our preparations for post-war responsibilities, we must break off the habit of delay," declared James A. Farley in one of his few but pointed speeches made this week. He added:

"Too much of our financial machinery consists of an apparatus for putting things off. A great part of our credit system consists of

means of postponing payments through notes, mortgages, and the like. The financing of foreign trade seems to be arranged in the same spirit of delay. And in that trade the parties are farther apart.

"Decisions are postponed, procrastination governs our actions, and all too often we postpone settlements until they can no longer be made without defaults. These delays in the past, which were largely due to the complicated machinery of international finance, resulted in some very serious international problems. The weight of our trade balances became so heavy that collapse finally resulted. Depression swept the world and war came in its wake. There is nothing new in this deadly cycle.

"We must, as Americans, resolve to walk squarely up to these questions of how we are going to be paid for our exports and face them honestly."

If we sell or lend abroad, we must accept goods in return. That was the nub of his argument; that and his reiteration of the old truth that money borrowed must be repaid, or ruin results.

Eyes on the Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, on March 22, 1945:

EYES ON THE BALL

James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has been known for political acumen rather than clear comprehension of important national issues.

However, in an address before the Foreign Commerce Club the other day Farley made some observations on the post-war economy and this Nation's responsibilities for it that deserve a careful hearing in quarters where much of our planning for the post-war period is being done.

Note the following clear-cut observations on foreign loans and related policies:

"Let us make loans to Europe, not necessarily out of our generosity, but out of our business sense * * *. A Europe rising from her ruins will be a good customer and a good supplier of valuable products to us, if we are willing to accept them in payment for what we sell.

"We must, as Americans, resolve to walk squarely up to the question as to how we are going to be paid for our exports and face them honestly. If we are going to sell abroad we must buy abroad * * *. Let us put our tariffs in such order that we can accept payment in the only way in which payment can be made."

And on the topic of employment which is in the forefront of so much of the discussion of the post-war era, Farley said:

"We need not spend our time and energy talking of employment first. Employment is a result, and not a cause. Employment will come from increased confidence among the nations, from a sound maintenance of international credit, and, above all, from the promise of a lasting peace."

Farley's comment, it seems to us, is particularly timely because of the heavy emphasis currently placed by the administration on adoption, without amendment, of the Bretton Woods proposals, sponsors of the international monetary fund and of the international bank of reconstruction and development would have the Congress and the public believe that adoption of their program is the first important step in a program of sound world reconstruction and effective international collaboration, that after Bretton Woods everything else would follow as a matter of course.

There is no foundation in fact, we believe, for such an assumption. Currencies will not be made sound and kept sound by international agreement or by fiat of the American Congress, nor will sound debtor-creditor relations be established among the nations by the creation of a world bank.

Very possibly the Bretton Woods agreements would contribute something to international financial stability, but under no circumstances must they be regarded as a synonym for it. Scund international economics in all the nations, with balanced budgets, and the maintenance of conditions under which the energies of all people may be profitably and productively employed, will contribute more to exchange stability and the restoration of normal trade relations than all the agreements that can be entered into and all the money that can possibly be appropriated for banks and stabilization funds.

By the same token there need be little concern lest serious unemployment situation develop in this country if in our domestic economy capital can safely be invested and labor profitably employed in the production of goods for domestic and foreign markets.

Farley's speech ought to be required reading in the Department of Commerce and in the Treasury and elsewhere in Washington for the weeks immediately ahead. Widely read and understood it could not fail to redirect our planning into clear channels and to advance enormously the cause of sound post-war reconstruction.

Let's Prevent Chaos in Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Prevent Chaos in Cotton," written by the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and published in the April 1945 issue of Country Gentleman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton, America's greatest business and agricultural crop, upon the growing and handling of which more than 10,000,000 Americans depend for their livelihood, is in imminent danger of collapse, with disastrous repercussions upon the prosperity of Americans in practically every section of the country.

Not only cotton growers but all Americans must face realities and act sensibly if we are to avert such a calamity.

Until the 1930's more than half of our cotton crop was grown for export. Earlier still—prior to World War No. 1—two-thirds of our cotton was exported. In fact, much of the European capital borrowed for the building up of our country was paid for by the export of American cotton. When we became a creditor nation after World War No. 1, we maintained our cotton export business largely by loans to foreign nations. When the effect of these wore off in the late 1920's, cotton exports began to sag. Then came the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930. Cotton, always the chief casualty of a high-tariff policy, soon reacted. Our export market was largely swept away.

Farm legislation raising the American cotton price above the world level, though essential for the economic salvation of our cotton farmers at the time, served further to intensify the difficulty of our export situation. As a result of these succeeding developments, foreign cotton production increased from seven to fourteen million bales a year between 1920 and 1942, while our own exports fell to 1,000,000 bales a year—the lowest since the blockade days of the Civil War. Indeed, what we have done in recent years is to create by Government policies an economic blockade around the cotton export business of the South.

Meanwhile, rayon and other synthetic fibers have captured a substantial portion of the domestic cotton market and threaten to capture more. Rayon staple fiber, once a competitor of silk, today sells for 25 cents a pound, being actually lower than cotton when the cleaning wastage of the latter is considered. If rayon goes to 16 cents a pound in the after-war era, as predicted, how much will be left of even the domestic cotton business?

In 1929, 43,000,000 acres were planted to cotton in America. That acreage has now been reduced to 20,000,000. In the after-war era, when lend-lease markets are gone and American consumption falls to its natural level of around 6,000,000 bales a year, then six to seven million selected acres in the South can supply the entire American requirements for cotton. Millions of cotton growers would be thrown into unemployment and bankruptcy. Meanwhile there still hangs over our heads the largest accumulated cotton surplus in history.

When has a major American industry faced a darker future?

Is there any solution to a situation which has become so serious and so complex? Unless it is solved the industry is certain to collapse, thereby setting the stage for another serious Nation-wide depression.

Many people, recalling how the tractor, the combine, and the corn picker have revolutionized the growing of grains, wonder whether mechanization will not work a comparable revolution with cotton and, by lowering costs, automatically solve the cotton problem.

There seems to be no doubt that the mechanical cotton picker is a success. One machine can do the work of approximately 60 men. Only wartime restrictions on the use of metal are now holding up quantity production.

Equally revolutionary in economic effects are the new flame thrower and four-row tractor-cultivators for eliminating hand chopping and mule cultivation of cotton. These new mechanical pickers and cultivators will, it is estimated, reduce the cost of growing cotton in certain well-adapted areas 60 to 80 percent.

But, although mechanization may save cotton from the domestic competition of rayon, it will not of itself, by reducing costs, insure a foreign market for American cotton. No matter how low American cotton is priced in the world market, foreign nations cannot buy it if they do not have dollar exchange. If we are to grow cotton for the domestic market only, it is inevitable that in the long run this cotton will be produced on a few million selected acres in the low-cost, mechanized areas, resulting in ruin to those sections not adaptable to mechanized farming. Only by getting volume consumption and

volume production can the Old South stay in cotton, yet there is an acute world need for volume production of cotton on every adaptable southern acre.

If mechanization will not of itself solve the cotton problem, what other alternatives are there?

Some thoughtful people advocate diversification as a solution. They suggest that the South devote its millions of acres, heretofore planted to cotton, to small grains, fruits, vegetables, livestock, and dairy products, pointing out that the southern per-acre production, due to the long growing season, is equal to, and in many cases is greater than, that of the Northern or Western States.

The program of gradual diversification now in progress in the South is sound. But a sudden and enforced shift of millions of acres, now devoted to cotton, would bring a tremendous overproduction of these other commodities, with resulting disaster to all farm price levels. It must not be forgotten that, under the A. A. A. program when cotton acreage was restricted by Government fiat, southern farmers were prohibited from selling in competitive markets the corn or wheat grown on these acres. If the South is to grow more of these products permanently, southern farmers will necessarily have to sell them on the open market, regardless of the calamitous effects they may produce.

Under the A. A. A. program in the Cotton Belt, wheat acreage increased 180 percent, the second largest cotton-producing State harvesting more wheat per acre than any major wheat State; milk production jumped 130 percent, cattle 40, and egg production 80 percent. Last year there were more acres in corn on the average cotton-growing farm than there were in cotton. All of these increases in diversification so far are beneficial. They raise the standard of living and increase the prosperity of southern people. But a sound diversification and a wholesale diversion of cotton acreage to competive crops are two different things. The one means better living for the South, the other means bankruptcy for American agriculture from even more overwhelming surpluses than existed before the war. For the welfare of all, whether on farm or in factory, the South must remain in the cotton business.

There is a solution, and a practical one.

Before going into it we must note that there are two schools of thought in the cotton business today. The cotton merchants and the cotton trade generally desire to see the price of cotton reduced to the world level. They say that this is necessary if the vast export portion of the industry is to be saved. The cotton farmer's answer is that to meet world prices his standard of living would be reduced far below the American standard. He says, and justly so, that he should not be expected to starve out foreign competition at great suffering to himself and family. The cotton farmer advocates a parity price, or prices high enough to enable him to support his family at a decent American standard.

To the farmer's argument the cotton trade replies, and with reason, that if the American cotton grower's prices are higher than the world price, then the cotton will be bought from our foreign cotton competitors. It is pointed out that, by artificially holding up our prices, we hold an umbrella over the foreign producer and permit him to expand his acreage, grow more cotton in competition with us, and further depress our prices.

Both producer and merchant are right. Yet each overlooks an important point. The cotton producer overlooks the fact that parity price does not mean parity income if the export part of his business is relinquished for good. The cotton merchant overlooks the fact that low prices do not insure export when there is a lack of dollar exchange to finance it.

To surmount this dilemma we must both pay the American grower the artificial price to which he is entitled and yet maintain the export business, which is vital. One must remember that two things are necessary for the producers of any commodity—price and consumption. One cannot long maintain price unless he also maintains consumption, for surpluses destroy prices. The solution, if it is a solution, must be based on the realization that cotton is grown to be spun into textiles and consumed so that the cotton grower can produce more cotton.

Our present Government cotton program, while temporarily very beneficial because of what it has done for price, has failed as a long-run program because it has not succeeded in moving cotton into consumption. The cotton-exporting business of this country once gave more employment than both W. P. A. and P. W. A. at their peak—and it was wealth-creating and not tax-consuming employment. The more than 105 laws passed since 1933 to assist the cotton farmer and nearly $2,000,000,000 spent by the Government to tide him over failed to solve the basic cotton problem because they never affected the fundamental cause. This cause is the protective tariff.

While a high tariff protects the manufacturer and some important branches of agriculture from foreign goods produced by cheap labor, it does so at the expense of American farmers who produce for export such products as wheat, pork, cotton, fruit, and tobacco. They must meet low-priced foreign competition in agricultural commodities while paying high tariff-protected prices for American manufactured goods. This means that the export-producing farmer has high costs of production but often a net income too low to buy American industry's goods. The protective tariff is the chief cause of the abject poverty of the southern tenant farmer.

Fully as serious as its direct effect on the southern standard of living is the indirect effect of the tariff on that standard, resulting from the drying up of foreign purchasing power. Trade is a two-way proposition. When by high tariff walls we prevent other nations selling us their products, we make it impossible for them to buy our products. Trade is simply an exchange of commodities, and our tariff policies have hit the cotton grower harder than any other group because his product is the one most dependent on the foreign market. We of the South know we cannot repeal the tariff. The answer is compromise—find a way through the tariff wall which will not injure American industry or business, yet will restore the cotton farmer's export market.

Aside from the lack of dollar exchange on the part of foreign nations, with which to buy our cotton, the other factor that has caused the loss of our export market is the necessarily higher-than-world price of American cotton. To restore the export market for cotton we must therefore do two things:

1. Establish a gateway through the tariff wall.

2. Devise a way to bridge a gap between American and world prices of American cotton.

Let us say that a Dutch cotton spinner wants to buy $100,000 worth of American cotton. At the same time a Dutch manufacturer of woven-wire fencing may be seeking to sell $100,000 of his manufactured product to a dealer in America. If the Dutch manufacturer can sell his fencing in America, there will be created $100,000 worth of dollar exchange in Holland, which can be used in payment for the American cotton.

But there is an import duty of $50,000 on $100,000 worth of this type of fencing, which is so high as to make its importation unprofitable to dealers here. To make the importation of this fencing profitable we must reduce the tariff to, say, $35,000. The fencing is then imported for $100,000 plus the $35,000 tariff duty. This $35,000 is put into a special fund known as the Agricultural Export Compensation Fund.

The cotton, worth $100,000 at the world price, would come to $135,000 at the artificially higher American price. How can the American cotton exporter sell this quantity of cotton to a Dutch spinner for $100,000 and yet pay the American cotton producer $135,000 for it? Simply by going to the Agricultural Export Compensation Fund and being permitted by law to take the $35,000 worth of duties segregated there from the tariff collected on the incoming woven-wire fencing. The difference between American and world prices of agricultural products is substantially the same as the difference between American and world prices of industrial commodities, and one difference can be used to balance the other.

But won't American fencing manufacturers suffer a loss of market in America because of this importation of Dutch fencing?

Not at all. It could work out that way, but we shall prevent it by setting up a system of prorated import quotas so that, when the import picture is viewed as a whole, only a comparatively small amount of any one product—as fencing—may be imported. The small amounts of all manufactured products imported in this way will be so limited that they can be paid for solely by America's surplus cotton and other surplus agricultural products. The cash-buying, home market for fencing and for every other type of manufactured product in America will be left undisturbed. Actually, it will be greatly increased by eliminating the price-and-income-destroying effect of surplus farm products.

Specifically, if the American people have annually in the after-war era $100,000,000,000 of cash, with which to buy manufactured goods, and also have an annual cotton or other farm surplus worth $1,000,000,000, we will allow only one one-hundredths or 1 percent as much fencing or other industrial products to come in from abroad as is sold for cash by American manufacturers in America. Thus the imported 1 percent will be over and above the $100,000,000,000 of cash-buying power.

In practice the American manufacturer will not only lose nothing by such a surplus-cotton-Dutch-fencing exchange, he will actually gain. Once the surplus cotton is sold and its price-depressing effect is removed from the American cotton market, our southern farmers will have an income that will enable them also to buy more American fencing for cash. It is rather ironic for our manufacturers to be scanning the foreign horizon for new customers when additional markets can be developed right here at home by raising to normal the buying power of the now artificially impoverished farmers of our own South.

This tariff-gateway plan is not barter. Import and export will take place through private trade channels just as today. We shall simply require evidence of a sale of American farm surplus to a foreign country before permitting a partial tariff lowering on certain items of that country's manufactured goods, such a tariff concession being necessary to stimulate the flow of foreign goods to our shores. Management of the plan will be under a United States surplus export board. Since every nation will be permitted to profit by the plan in proportion to its capacity to use our agricultural surpluses, no nation can view it as discriminatory. It will contribute to an expanding world trade, not hinder it.

This, then, is the plan in a nutshell. Note that it answers all the requirements of a satisfactory solution to the agricultural surplus problem:

1. It benefits both farmer and manufacturer and does not benefit one at the other's expense.

2. It preserves free enterprise.

3. It removes all danger of a cotton cartel.

4. It obviates all need for further regimentation of the farmer.

5. It eliminates all further need for subsidies out of the American Treasury.

6. It is a one-price system for both the domestically consumed and the exported portions of the crop.

7. It gives the American farmer parity for all that he produces.

8. It insures absolute and permanent control of farm surpluses by export to raw-material-hungry nations.

9. It will work for every other surplus farm crop as well as for cotton.

At the International Businessmen's Conference at Rye, N. Y., last November, Robert Gaylord, an official of the National Association of Manufacturers, openly acknowledged that in order "to export goods we must receive payment for them in raw materials and the manufactured goods of other nations."

This is statesmanship. In practice, however, many manufacturers—and organized labor—are not going to advocate any general tariff lowering that would open the way to an unlimited influx of foreign goods manufactured by 80-cents-a-day labor in the Orient and $2-a-day labor in Europe. Such a compromise proposal as this tariff-gateway plan, should, however, meet with the joint approval of American manufacturers, labor, and farmers.

If we can put such a plan into operation immediately following this war—and it may be our last chance to recapture America's one-time export-cotton market—we will raise the farm income of the South from $150 per capita to levels that prevail in our industrial areas. New southern buying power will give a tremendous impetus to factory employment in the North and East, benefiting all by creating better markets for all.

At the same time, the export of American surplus crops will play a vital part in after-war international affairs, constituting an insurance of lasting peace. Destructive economic policies following World War No. 1 had a lot to do with the oncoming of World War No. 2.

If instead of plowing under or piling up our surplus crops we export them, and instead of raising our tariff walls to impossible heights we provide a gateway through them for expanding commerce, we should escape World War No. 3. We need such far-seeing economic statesmanship.

Taxes After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Taxes After the War," delivered by Beardsley Ruml in the nonpartisan forum before the National Republican Club, New York, on March 31, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am particularly pleased to have been invited to speak once again to this nonpartisan forum of the National Republican Club. Evidently my comments of a year ago passed your test of nonpartisanship, and today I shall attempt to discuss taxes after the war in the same spirit.

We have a primary post-war national objective on which there is general agreement, namely, high employment under a democratic private enterprise system, and it is appropriate that national fiscal and monetary policy, including taxation, should contribute to our attaining this objective. But we should not overlook the fact that the basic objectives of fiscal and monetary policy lie elsewhere.

The two essentials of national fiscal and monetary policy are: First, to provide the means of meeting the financial requirements of the Government in such a way that we shall have a reliable money system—a money system that will give the people a stable medium of exchange and store of value; and, second, to provide a system of financial institutions that will give the people a sound banking structure and a satisfactory credit mechanism. These two essentials of fiscal and monetary policy are of themselves of the first importance to the maintenance of continuing high employment under a democratic private enterprise system.

We must recognize that a sound fiscal and monetary policy is not the only condition necessary for attaining high prosperity. We must have Government stability; satisfactory relations between costs and prices; confidence in the outlook generally for business volume and profits; clear and simple laws and regulations; protection against illegal acts of all kinds; fair access to markets, to processes, and to raw materials; and favorable terms on which loan and equity capital are made available. These, and other considerations, determine in any specific instance whether or not employment-creating activities will be undertaken. However, appropriate fiscal and monetary policies will aid strongly in achieving the conditions that will make for high employment.

And so, the question before us is, What fiscal, monetary, and tax measures, consistent with maintaining a reliable money system and an efficient system of financial institutions, would, in addition, promote high employment under private enterprise?

Since taxation is one of the most important parts of fiscal policy, let us discuss basic policy for Federal taxation. The idea behind our tax policy should be this: That our taxes should be high enough to protect the stability of our currency, and no higher. Putting it another way, our taxes should be as low as they possibly can be without putting the value of our money in danger of inflation. The lower our taxes are, the more purchasing power will be left at home in the hands of the people—money that can be spent by them for the things they want to buy, or that can be saved and invested in whatever manner they choose.

Now it follows from this principle that our tax rates can and should be lowered to the point where the Federal Budget will be balanced at what we would consider a satisfactory level of high employment. If we set our tax rates any higher than this, we are reducing unnecessarily the money that private individuals will have to spend and to invest; and, therefore, we make it more difficult for ourselves to get to high employment and to stay there.

Accordingly, in order to set our tax rates, we must have some general idea of what a satisfactory level of employment in peacetime would be. Some people call such a level "high employment"; others prefer to use the term "full employment," although they are careful to point out that there will always be a certain number of people unemployed at any particular time in a country where men and jobs are not strictly regimented.

There is much agreement, fortunately, that a satisfactory level of employment means about 55,000,000 people at work on an average work week of about 40 hours in ordinary peacetime occupations. It might be a little less or it might be a little more; but this standard is close enough to the realities to give us a start on our thinking.

The question is frequently asked, "How do you reconcile these figures, calling for 55,000,000 people employed in ordinary peacetime occupations, with the President's figure, "close to 60,000,000 productive jobs?" I do not presume to give an authoritative reconciliation, but for my own part it does not seem difficult. The 60,000,000 figure may well include two and a half million men and women in the armed forces, since if any jobs are productive, these certainly are. Then too, there must always be more jobs than there are people actually employed. There are jobs that are not yet filled; part time jobs and seasonal jobs. So when we take all these considerations into account, I think there is very little difference between "close to 60,000,000 productive jobs" and "55,000,000 people at work in ordinary peacetime occupations."

If we have 55,000,000 people employed on a 40-hour week, and if the price level is about where it is today, we will have a national income of about $140,000,000,000. I am not predicting that we will in fact have a national income of $140,000,000,000, or any other figure. What I am saying is that if we have a satisfactory level of employment and the present price level, the arithmetical consequence is a national income of $140,000,000,000. It is against this level of national income that our peacetime tax rates should be set.

It would be unwise to rely on tax policy alone to bring us to a high level of employment. Private individuals and public agencies must cooperate all along the line.

Private businessmen in their own companies and in their local and national associations are actively at work on plans for reconversion and expansion. One organization of businessmen of which I am sure you all have heard, the Committee for Economic Development, has as its single purpose the achieving of a high level of productive employment after the war. The committee recognizes that if we are to have jobs at all, the job makers have to go to work first.

The agencies of government are active, too. Federal, State, and local Governments, the executive and the legislative branches are concerned with the problem; and things are beginning to happen. Our tax policies must take these other plans into account.

One measure in particular must be carefully studied. This is the proposed Full Employment Act of 1945, commonly referred to as the Murray bill.

The Murray bill is not a legislative accident. It did not suddenly spring from nowhere on to the floor of the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Murray bill has a long and respectable intellectual and political history.

One of its early beginnings was in September 1921, when a conference on unemployment, of which the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, was chairman, made some very explicit recommendations favoring the use of public works as a means of attacking unemployment. The language of the recommendations which were adopted at that time is interesting.

"Public construction is better than relief. The municipalities should expand * * * to the fullest possible volume compatible with the existing circumstances. The Governor should unite all State agencies * * * in expedition of construction of roads, State buildings, etc. The Federal authorities should expedite the construction of public buildings and public works covered by appropriations. A congressional appropriation for roads would make available a large amount of employment.

"The conference under existing circumstances, notwithstanding various opinions as to the character of the legislation and the necessity for economy, recommends congressional action at the present session in order that work may go forward."

Curiously, no reference to taxation is made in the report of this 1921 unemployment conference.

The unemployment crisis of 1921 proved to be a short one; but the danger of unemployment lived on, and reappeared once more in 1929. This time Federal action became imperative, and in February of 1931 President Hoover signed the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931, which was sponsored by Senator WAGNER, of New York.

The Wagner Act of 1931 also contains some language with a curiously modern flavor. I quote from the act:

"Whenever the President finds that there is likely to exist in the United States or any substantial portion thereof a period of business depression and unemployment, he is requested to transmit to the Congress by special message such supplemental estimates as he deems advisable for emergency appropriations * * *. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to arrange the construction of public works so far as practicable in such manner as will assist in the stabilization of industry and employment. * * * The President is requested * * * to take into consideration the volume of construction in the United States, the state of employment, and the activity of general business. The Board shall collect information concerning advance construction plans and estimates by States, municipalities, and other public and private agencies."

Again, in the Wagner Act of 1931, no reference is made to taxation.

The Murray bill, coming some 14 years later, reflects the experience of the depression of the 1930's and our growing knowledge of the factors that are relevant to the maintenance of high employment. Much more explicit reference is made to the stimulation of private enterprise, no longer are public works the exclusive method of attacking the danger of underemployment, and now we find mentioned among other things, as part of the program, "Federal policies * * * with reference to * * * taxation."

Thus the Murray bill is an evolution from earlier American thinking on the subject of unemployment. It is in the groove. The basic ideas of the Murray bill have had bipartisan sponsorship and deserve nonpartisan standing.

The Murray bill is the American expression of a world-wide recognition that the people, working together through their national government, must protect the individual against the hazard of undeserved unemployment.

The Murray bill should be widely discussed, subjected to every kind of honest criticism, and strengthened and improved in every section, paragraph, and sentence. But it should not be interpreted as a step toward totalitarian regimentation nor as an inspiration of the New Deal to be opposed as such.

My own feeling about the Murray bill is that, standing alone, it attempts to do too much. It should be buttressed by other measures in the areas of public works, social security, and taxation that will tend automatically to bring the economy into reasonable stability at high levels of private, productive employment. With these other measures operating automatically, the problem remaining to be attacked by the methods of the Murray bill will still be difficult, but not, in my opinion, insoluble.

We can now see more clearly the place of Federal tax policy in the over-all picture. Federal taxes must protect the currency against inflation and deflation. But they should also help us get to high employment and should operate as one of the automatic instruments that help stabilize the economy. That is why we can and should adopt as our basic Federal tax policy the reduction of tax rates to the point where the budget at high employment will be balanced at high employment.

Under this policy, what taxes should be reduced, and how much? These questions are matters of both tax policy and public policy. In general, however, it can be said that taxes should be reduced where it will do the most good in increasing the standard of living and stimulating the flow of savings to private investment.

Today, it is generally recognized that taxation has something to do with high levels of production and employment. This is a great gain. It increases immeasurably the strength of the weapons which we can use to achieve prosperity under a private enterprise democracy.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, in his column We the People, entitled "St. Lawrence's Case Bad Pre-War Error—A Pistol at Hitler," published in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of March 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE THE PEOPLE

ST. LAWRENCE'S CASE BAD PRE-WAR ERROR—A PISTOL AT HITLER

(By Jay Franklin)

The visit to the White House of Canada's Prime Minister, McKenzie King, undoubtedly has political meaning in terms of Canada's approaching general elections. With the outcome of those elections, we have no legitimate concern aside from our friendly interest in the maintenance of close and self-respecting relations with whatever government is in power in Canada.

More to the point is President Roosevelt's reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project at his press conference during Mr. King's visit. Our failure to implement our agreement with Canada on this score is perhaps the greatest single indictment of congressional failure to foresee the present war.

Part of this failure can be measured by recent admissions regarding such wartime enterprises as the Canol oil project on the McKenzie River and the Alcan Highway. The cost of these projects was immense and it now seems probable that they must be discontinued because they are entirely uneconomic.

The same amount of money invested in the St. Lawrence project would have converted that river into a pistol pointed at the heart of Hitler's Europe and would have released floods of hydroelectric power for war industries within easy economic reach of the east coast ports.

Might have kept Hitler from war

If Congress had agreed to the St. Lawrence project at the time it was first asked to do so, it might even have stopped Hitler from declaring war in 1939, as it would have constituted evidence of the marshaling of North American power, while our failure to develop that power certainly aided the Nazis in reaching their low estimate of the will and ability of democracy to function effectively against the totalitarian system.

No one has ever satisfactorily explained the curious reluctance of the Congress to increase the natural wealth of the St. Lawrence River and thereby to increase employment, production, and taxable values. Granted that certain privately owned electric utilities were opposed, the experience of the T. V. A. has shown that, in the long run, private utilities would have benefited.

Granted that certain east-coast ports feared loss of shipping traffic, national experience has shown that every increase in industrial facilities and shipping has been shared and that in the end the threatened communities would not have lost, although other communities would have gained.

The plain truth of the matter is that, in the long struggle between the private utilities and the T. V. A., a struggle which ended only with the election of 1940 and the advent of the war, a stalemate position has been established in which nothing new or important could be started. When that struggle ended—as it has with the conservative newspapers defending the T. V. A. against the attacks of Tennessee's senior Senator MCKELLAR—the war was already on us and it seemed unlikely that the St. Lawrence projects could be developed in time to have value in the fight against Hitler.

Laid aside because of labor shortage

As a matter of cold fact, President Roosevelt reluctantly agreed to lay the project aside because it would absorb too much labor and too many materials that could be more swiftly utilized elsewhere.

With the approach of VE-day and the resulting period of readjustment, the St. Lawrence project once more is becoming practical politics and practical economics.

That is why the dust is going to be blown off the blueprints and the St. Lawrence is going to be revived in the forefront of the post-war file of deferred "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" for the people of North America. Once the Mexican agreement concerning the Colorado River is out of the way, it may be time to take up the St. Lawrence project with the Congress.

"Victory" Dinner in Honor of Aubrey Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by Gould Lincoln, author of the column The Political Mill, published in the Washington Evening Star of April 5. This is a thorough and very timely analysis by Mr. Lincoln of

the so-called victory dinner held at a local hotel celebrating the defeat of Aubrey Williams. Mr. Lincoln discusses in detail the launching of a campaign by the P. A. C. and the Farmers' Union, in which many Senators will be interested.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The 1938 "purge" of Democratic Senators who have displeased the White House and the radicals represented by the P. A. C. and the Farmers' Union is already under way. It had its launching last week at the "victory" dinner in honor of Aubrey Williams, defeated by the Senate for appointment to be director of the Rural Electrification Administration. This dinner, organized by James G. Patton, head of the Farmers' Union, was attended by Mrs. Roosevelt, wife of the President; Jonathan Daniels, one of the secretaries to the President; James M. Barnes, administrative assistant to the President, and by two members of the President's Cabinet, Secretary of Commerce Wallace and Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, not to mention a crop of the more ardent New Deal Senators. Mr. Patton previously had made it clear that he and his organization were after the scalps of Senators who voted against Mr. Williams. Nineteen of them were Democrats. Most of them were from the "solid South" and the border States, although Senator MCCARRAN of Nevada and Senator GERRY of Rhode Island were in the list.

Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Wallace both made speeches at the dinner, not only extolling Mr. Williams but also breathing the fire of future attack upon the men who turned him down. The President's wife said she refused to consider Mr. Williams' rejection a defeat because "it has just put before the country a situation. * * * We don't realize until it is forced upon us that we have to fight—we have to fight every step of the way. We can't leave it to others—we have to do it ourselves."

Certainly this dinner was tied in closely with the White House, in view of those who participated. Democratic Senators opposed to Wallace now consider that they have been placed on a "purge" list. Individually they are ready, they say, for any fight which may be made on them.

They do not intend to take attacks on themselves lying down. They recall that President Roosevelt himself, 8 years ago, personally entered into primary contests to defeat some of them who had opposed his Supreme Court packing bill.

The Williams dinner and its implications indicate, on the other hand, that the New Deal administration does not intend to overlook such rebuffs as the defeat of the former National Youth Administrator at the hands of the Senate and stripping of Mr. WALLACE of control over the great lending agencies of the Government. It looks, therefore, like a real fight is on which may tear the Democratic Party still further apart. Further, the more the New Dealers hammer at the group of Senators and Members of the House whom they consider backsliders, the more difficult it may become for the administration forces to control on Capitol Hill.

One of the Democratic Senators who voted against Mr. Williams said frankly he expected the New Dealers to attack him when the time rolls around for his renomination next year. "We will meet the situation when it comes," he said. "It will be a fight between the real liberals in the Democratic Party and the radicals."

The attempted 1938 purge of recalcitrant Democratic Senators failed miserably. Senators GEORGE, of Georgia; TYDINGS, of Maryland; and the late Senator Smith, of South Carolina, all especially listed for the political ax, were triumphantly renominated.

Democratic Senators who voted against Mr. Williams and who come up for renomination and reelection next year are BILBO, of Mississippi; BYRD, of Virginia; CONNALLY, of Texas; GERRY, of Rhode Island; MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; and RADCLIFFE, of Maryland. Mr. CONNALLY is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Mr. MCKELLAR not only is President pro tempore of the Senate, but also the ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee and its acting chairman. Two years later, eight more of these Williams opponents are to run again—Senators BAILEY, of North Carolina; BANKHEAD, of Alabama; CHANDLER, of Kentucky; EASTLAND, of Mississippi; MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas; O'DANIEL, of Texas; RUSSELL, of Georgia; and STEWART, of Tennessee.

Attention will be centered on the 1946 senatorial elections. If the purge fails again next year, it will scarcely be attempted in 1948, when a Presidential election is coming up.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Dr. Philip Marshall Brown, formerly professor of international law at Princeton University and now president of the American Peace Society, dealing with the forthcoming conference to be held at San Francisco, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, as well as an editorial published in the same issue of the Evening Star commenting on Dr. Brown's letter.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLEADS FOR MORE TRUST IN LEADERS SEEKING SECURITY AGREEMENTS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Why all this excitement and uproar about Yalta?

Has it not long been evident that serious differences of views between the great powers have had to be adjusted?

Is it not clear that such complicated and delicate diplomatic negotiations cannot be conducted in the market place?

Surely, never were statesmen confronted with more difficult and dangerous contentions than at this time of the crisis of civilization.

Surely, we owe every gererous consideration to Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin in their efforts to adjust these serious diferences and to prepare the ground for the success of the San Francisco Conference.

The physical and nervous strain imposed on these men in the midst of a stupendous war by their conferences at Teheran, Cairo, Moscow, and Yalta has been extreme. It is a wonder that President Roosevelt has been able to stand up to this relentless strain so amazingly well. It is no wonder that Secretary Hull with selfless devotion and heroism was unable to endure it. It is earnestly to be hoped that Secretary Stettinius may be enabled to carry on successfully in the face of the violent and intemperate barrage of newspaper criticism and questionings which amount virtually to a hostile inquisition.

Surely, this is a time for patriotic self-restraint and generous consideration on the part of the American public.

Surely, we have no desire to embarass our responsible leaders up on the bridge of the ship of state during this international hurricane.

Surely, we have no desire by word or act to wreck any architectural plans for world peace and security.

Surely, we desire the success of the San Francisco Conference.

What justification, therefore, can there be for this general assault by editors, journalists and commentators on the negotiations now going on between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin? Have they not by and large deserved our admiration for their conduct of the war and their labors for peace?

Must the conscientious preparatory negotiations of Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta be undone in order to satisfy demands for full information concerning efforts aimed to forestall dangerous disagreements and antagonisms?

Good sense as well as fair play surely requires of us all that we should continue to repose generous confidence in our leaders, who thus far have brought us well along the road to international safety.

Let us have an end to ill-considered and ungenerous criticism. Never did we need a genuine unity among the United Nations more desperately than at this moment in order that the San Francisco Conference should not be wrecked in advance and all hope for world security abandoned.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

A NECESSARY DISTINCTION

Dr. Philip Marshall Brown's good letter, printed elsewhere on this page today, is a timely warning against giving way to cynical doubt in connection with the Yalta and other understandings. Such a tendency can easily prejudice the San Francisco Conference by creating an antagonistic public sentiment in America.

It is true that the element of the American press which is hostile to the principle of international collaboration, hostile to Great Britain or hostile to Soviet Russia, seizes avidly on every opportunity to discredit the good faith and the motives of our own and the Allied leaders to an extent which indicates a deliberate intent to wreck any effort which does not conform to the particular philosophy of the critics.

Yet it seems to the Star that Dr. Brown and others for whom he speaks should draw a precise distinction, in their generalized references to "editors, journalists, and commentators," between an obviously hostile approach and the plain duty of responsible publicists to bring to public attention facts which demand frank explanation. Especially is this true of facts deliberately withheld from the American people.

The constituted authorities in Government who seek to forward their laudable efforts by creating an impression in the public mind of unanimity and accord, when this impression is disputed by the unofficial revelation of stark fact, can endanger the success of the San Francisco and other such conferences even more than those who deliberately and openly practice their sabotage.

It goes without saying that intelligent Americans have some appreciation of the enormous responsibility of the President as well as the difficulties which he and his advisers must overcome in their attempt to

reach a workable understanding with Russia. We have our own conceptions in this country of some of the ideals which underlie international accord and justice and they do not always conform to those held by the Russians. One nation is a democracy while another is a dictatorship. One has been blessed throughout its history with relative peace and plenty. The other has undergone in recent times one of those internal convulsions which occasionally change the course of human events. One has enjoyed comparative security in this war. The other has been invaded and ravaged by a ruthless foe.

These things are not beyond the comprehension of most Americans and there is no reason why they should believe that the course to perfect understanding is a smooth one. But without accepting the theory that diplomatic negotiations can be conducted successfully in a gold-fish bowl, it still remains that the safest and the best policy to pursue in the long run is one which enables the public to understand the nature of the differences between the Allies in their approach to a common problem instead of minimizing the fact that there are differences.

For one policy leads to the creation of an intelligent and discriminating public opinion. The other leads eventually to inevitable disillusionment far more dangerous and insidious in its effects than the openly hostile attacks of critics.

Mark Clark Lauded for Skill, Tact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE:

[From the Hartford Daily Courant of March 30, 1945]

MARK CLARK LAUDED FOR SKILL, TACT—CLARE LUCE CITES HIS ROLE AS CHIEF OF GREAT INTERNATIONAL ARMY

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Representative in Congress from Connecticut)

FIFTEENTH ARMY GROUP HEADQUARTERS, ITALY, March 30.—Gen. Mark Clark commands, without any doubt, the most international and democratic force of seasoned veterans in the world today.

When the history of this war is written by the biographers and military experts, and by the poets and novelists too, the Italian campaigns will certainly prove to have a far greater world interest and significance than they seem to have now, for they will be seen to be the greatest military experiment in history of the welding of fighting men of many countries in the great common cause of freedom.

FROM MANY LANDS

Clark's two armies, the American Fifth and the British Eighth, include, in addition to United Kingdom, Dominion, and white and colored American units, Indians, Poles, Italians, Brazilians, and a newly activated Jewish brigade, recruited in their historic homeland to fight against Hitler under the flag of Palestine.

The 120-mile front that these heterogeneous troops hold is as varied in terrain as are the men in nationality. Troops fight up and down some of the steepest mountains in Italy and across some of the widest, flattest, and dustiest of plains.

The human as well as the technical and tactical problems presented by this varied terrain offer an immense challenge to both the military and diplomatic skill of a commander. Clark's troops speak five or six different languages and probably some 60 dialects. Their customs are infinitely different, and their equipment and supplies are often not interchangeable. Their diverse eating habits alone are a quartermaster's nightmare.

YALTA POSED PROBLEM

An example of the delicate diplomatic victories achieved by Clark was seen in his application of one aspect of the Yalta decisions to the Italian front. That decision concerned Poland, and it was a black and heartbreaking day for Gen. Wladislaw Anders, Polish commander in chief, when the news reached him. That news meant for Anders and his men the hard and bitter knowledge that Yalta had destroyed for many of them the very aim for which they had been fighting for 6 terrible years—to return to their homes under the Polish flag.

It must be remembered that most of Anders' men were Poles who had been deported by Russia when it moved into Poland when the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact was in force and that, therefore, they are the very ones partitioned out of their homeland by the Yalta acceptance of the Curzon line.

General Clark talked to General Anders in an interview which must someday make good historical reading, for when Anders returned to his troops, the crisis had been averted. He bore the conviction to them that Poles had not less but more to fight for and that in the eyes of the civilized world the way Poland's fighting men took this last most savage blow to their hopes might provide the most conclusive argument of all for Poland's cause at the San Francisco conference.

To restore to the Italian cobelligerent forces a truly offensive spirit against the Germans in the absence of any certainty concerning defeated Italy's position at the peace table was also as much of a diplomatic as a military task for Clark.

To preserve harmonious morale in the headquarters of such an army group and among the men from one end of the line to the other while maintaining complete military flexibility has been no easy job for Clark, and yet today anyone who visits this front is soon aware that he has met that challenge and done that job, for he has forged a striking force which has held and will soon destroy Germany's twenty-five-odd divisions on this side of the Po River.

Polish Representation at the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I have addressed to Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, with reference to the Polish representation at the coming San Francisco Conference.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 4, 1945.

Hon. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time I have been concerned over the fact that there will be no Polish representatives at the Golden Gate Conference in San Francisco.

The Russian request that, in the absence of any other representation, the Lublin Poles be given this recognition has been correctly opposed by our Government. In view of the agreement which was reached at Yalta for a reconstruction of the Polish Government, the fact that no positive steps have been taken should not be construed to mean recognition of the Lublin Poles. That would be an injustice to the London Government, which our Government recognizes.

It may be that the creation of the provisional government specified in the Yalta agreement cannot be achieved by April 25.

For that reason, I suggest to you that the sponsoring governments extend an invitation to both the Lublin Poles and the Polish Government in London to send delegations to attend the Golden Gate Conference as observers without vote.

I make this suggestion in the hope that these two delegations having, for the first time, the opportunity to sit down at a conference table, could satisfactorily resolve this pressing and vital problem. I know the value of meeting face to face and discussing a problem over the conference table. What seem today to be insuperable barriers to agreement might very well be resolved if such a meeting could be held. If an agreement was not reached nothing would be lost.

I am confident that such a means of endeavoring to reach a solution to the critical Polish problem would find substantial agreement with the Poles in Poland itself, the London Poles, and among the friends of Polish independence in our own country.

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN MCMAHON.

Lippmann Commends President's War Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann is not a New Dealer. The well-known columnist and author has in the past been a severe critic of the present national administration, especially some of its domestic policies.

Mr. Lippmann's recent column in the Washington Post, in which he reviews high lights of the international situation, and especially the war strategy of President Roosevelt, Mr. Lippmann's discussion of the roles played also by the State Department and the Chiefs of Staff is likewise interesting and illuminating.

The Lippmann article is one of the best answers I have observed of late to the increased and carping criticism against the administration's international policy,

as well as America's part in the conduct of the war.

The article in question follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE PRESIDENT AS STRATEGIST

In the highest quarters, the White House, State Department, and the Chiefs of Staff, a principal anxiety has long been that the Soviet Union would be drawn into the Pacific war prematurely. Two weeks after Hitler attacked Russia and 5 months before Pearl Harbor (July 6, 1941) Ambassador Grew delivered a statement to Prince Konoye asking for "an assurance" that "the reports of Japan's decision to enter upon hostilities against the Soviet Union are not based upon fact."

The President, who has proved himself to be a remarkable strategist, saw then that if Japan struck at Russia in Siberia while Hitler was striking in Europe, it was more than probable that Russia would be knocked out of the war. Had that happened, the task of liberating Europe and of ejecting Japan from China and the mainland of Asia would have required forces greater than Britain and the United States could hope to raise. In fact, if Germany and Japan had succeeded in making a junction across a prostrate Russia, it is hard to see how they could ever have been defeated decisively.

Fortunately, the Japanese laid their plans on the mistaken assumption that Hitler would take Moscow and thus paralyze the Soviet power, a few days after they attacked Pearl Harbor and paralyzed our capacity to take the offensive.

But even after that lucky break, the dominating consideration has continued to be how to keep the Germans and Japanese from fighting a combined war, and to gain time until Russia, Britain, and the United States were prepared to support one another both in Europe and in the Far East. In the days when we were fighting with relatively weak forces way down around Guadalcanal and the Soviets were fighting for their lives around Stalingrad and the British were in dire peril at the gates of Cairo and the Suez Canal, it would have been a disaster, not an advantage, as some over here imagined, if, in one way or another, the much-talked-about Russian bases in Siberia had become involved in the war.

For not at that time, and indeed at no time until now, was it certain that the Soviets could defend those bases; it was absolutely certain that we could not make the slightest use of them. We could not have used them because there was no way to get to them with the gasoline, the bombs, and all the heavy ground equipment that an air force must have.

What had above all to be prevented was that the Japanese would seize the bases while the Soviets were so busy with Hitler that they could not defend them, and while we were so far away that we could not use them. This can all be said now because Stalin would not have denounced the neutrality pact unless he felt reasonably certain that he is now strong enough, that the American forces at Iwo Jima and Okinawa are now near enough to deal with, and that the Japanese are now too weak to undertake, a preventive war against the Soviets.

The management of this whole affair by Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt is as fine an example of military-diplomatic strategy in global war as one could imagine. They have succeeded in dividing our enemies and in driving them to fight separate wars while they gathered and advanced their own forces, with well-nigh perfect timing, for a unified conclusion to the whole war. In Europe the junction of Eisenhower's armies with the Red Army, and, let us not forget, with Alexander's, is imminent and will destroy the possibility of a prolonged organized German resistance; in Asia the stage is set for another junction which will make it impossible for Japan to make a successful stand either in her islands or on the Asiatic mainland.

Here is the real accomplishment of the conferences at Casablanca, Quebec, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, and Yalta; the forging of a concerted strategy in war and for the period of pacification which we must pass through before the nations can hope to enjoy a settled and ordered peace. There has been some misunderstanding, friction, and compromise. But there is probably no example in history of a coalition managed so successfully on so vast a scale and where there were so many complex and incalculable elements. Here rests the best hope of mankind that we may be able to manage a cooperative peace.

We shall advance that hope if in this country we explode the myth that the President and his responsible lieutenants have been amiable weaklings, suckers, and Santa Clauses, in the hands of stern, shrewd realists, Churchill and Stalin. For cool, objective realism about what really matters most, the President has been quite the equal of the other two. The President has his failings as an organizer and administrator of his policies and he has made mistakes of judgment, and has listened to poor advice, and has indulged his temperament. But taken all in all, and measured by the results achieved, since the summer of 1940 his estimate of the vital interests of the United States has been accurate and farsighted. He has served these interests with audacity and patience, shrewdly and with calculation, and he has led this country out of the greatest peril in which it has ever been to the highest point of security, influence, and respect which it has ever attained.

If we do not recognize that he is a great war President, history will. But we need to recognize it now, not for his sake perhaps, though it would be gracious, not in order to condone complacently his failings and the exasperating errors that occur so continually in his administration of the Government, but for our own sakes in the trying days to come. We have power. We have wealth. We have glory and honor and prestige. But we can squander them again as we did after 1918 if we do not have the self-confidence that gives to a nation steadfastness and resolution. For that we have to believe, and are entitled to believe, that we, too, can find statesmen who are equal to the times in which we live.

Address of Gov. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1945, Gov. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, a former Member of this House, made a talk at the University of New Mexico strongly favoring the setting up of a world organization whose duty and responsibility it is to see that future wars do not occur, and urging the preservation of American democracy.

Because of the timely material in Governor Dempsey's speech, I thought it would be well to make it part of the RECORD and include it in full at this point. The Governor's speech follows:

Judge Bratton, members of the faculty, and students, it is a real pleasure for me to have an opportunity to visit with you again on the campus of the university. I have a warm spot in my heart for the university which dates back to the years when I had the pleasure and the privilege of serving as a member of the Board of Regents.

The wartime progress of the university has been outstanding. Much credit for the growth and development of this university belongs to members of the faculty and the administrative staff.

The university has made, and is making, a great contribution to the war effort, and I want to take this opportunity to compliment everyone who has helped to make that record possible.

It is perhaps in its service to the Navy, and for a period to the Army, that the university has done its outstanding work as a unit.

Young men and women from the university are fighting in all theaters of war throughout the world. More than 2,800 former students are now in the armed forces, and it will not be long before this figure passes the 3,000 mark.

All citizens of New Mexico can be very proud of these men and women, more than 50 of whom have been awarded every type of citation from the Purple Heart to the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The university has already been approved by the Veterans' Administration for the training of men and women who are released from the armed forces, and who are provided with educational opportunities under the GI bill of rights.

One of our greatest obligations is to see that young men and women whose educational training has been interrupted by the war, are encouraged to return to our schools and colleges to receive their diplomas and their degrees, or to receive specialized training.

Here in New Mexico we have been so bountifully blessed by nature with a healthful climate and beautiful scenery that many servicemen will want to come here to complete their education. They will come because of the State's sunshine, our mild winters and long and healthful summers, our dry climate and our mountain playgrounds. But for whatever reason they come, we will always be glad to welcome them.

In providing its course of instruction in the post-war period, as well as while the war is still in progress, our institutions of higher learning have a great obligation to perform.

Recently the press carried a report on the action of Congress in increasing our national debt limitation to $300,000,000,000.

Had the people of America, and especially their elected Representatives in the Congress, had the wisdom and the foresight to outlaw war 25 years ago, our national-debt limitation would not exceed $50,000,000,000.

At the close of the last war Woodrow Wilson was President. He visioned recurring wars unless a security council of nations was set up to preserve the peace. Had America followed his lead, there would not have been a Second World War.

In the years immediately following the last war most of the nations of the world wanted peace. We even scrapped much of our Navy. But Japan did not scrap her Navy. Had we built and maintained our Navy at full strength, instead of sinking our own ships, the cost would not have run our national debt limitation beyond $50,000,000,000. By this action we would have saved $250,000,000,000. And what is far more important, we would have been spared 1,000,000 or more casualties in the present war. Had we been prepared, Japan would not have attacked, and neither would Germany.

I am strongly in favor of setting up a world organization whose duty and responsibility it is to see that future wars do not occur. And I am in favor of giving this organization

all the power it needs to enforce its decisions.

Individually, human beings have learned to live together as good neighbors. Nations can do the same. They are not much different from individuals. But friendships don't just happen. Among individuals friendships are cultivated and nourished and treasured. It should be the same among nations. You can't buy friendship; you have to earn it.

Modern transportation has brought the nations of the world closer together than the cities within nations were only a few years ago. Unless we make provision now to preserve world peace, by force if necessary, then we must rebuild our cities in preparation for the next war, which will be so terrible that no city existing today could survive its devastation.

It is time that the world comes of age. It has lived through its turbulent adolescence and should now assume the responsibilities of mature years. And the foremost responsibility is preservation of lasting peace.

We have learned that wanting peace is not enough. We must not only want peace—we must be prepared to force peace on any nation that wants war.

Right now, while the guns are still sounding, most of the nations of the world talk of devising a plan which will make war impossible in the future. That is something new in this world. It gives us cause for hope.

Formulating world peace plans is primarily the job for our national leaders, with the moral backing of every citizen. Preserving democracy at home, while we discharge our responsibilities as the greatest of the United Nations, is the obligation of each of us.

At the present time the world is undergoing a radical change. We hear of new political philosophies. There are some individuals within our own Nation who would change our form of government. Others have gone abroad and have returned loudly praising the particular type of government practiced by the nation they have visited.

We have several millions of our finest young men fighting on the soil of a score of foreign countries. They have an opportunity to see at first-hand the workings of various foreign governments. We do not need to have any fear of the opinions which will be brought back by our veterans. They will come home convinced that American democracy is the finest system of government ever devised by man.

It is the obligation of those at home, and it is the special obligation of our colleges and universities, to protect and defend our form of government here, as our fighting men are defending it on the battlefields.

We do not want to let any foreign isms infiltrate the home front while the battle is still going on abroad. The only ism that we should be interested in is Americanism.

Occasionally we hear people praising the militar, might of some of our allies. Such a praise is justified, but we should always bear in mind that it was the greatness of our industrial production, the greatness of America, which made it possible for our allies to keep on fighting this war. Without the benefit of the vast stores of military material and supplies which we transported across the ocean and delivered to our allies, we would not today be seeing the final drama of this war enacted on the German homeland.

It is our system of free enterprise, our belief that every man is entitled to make a profit from the fruits of his own efforts, and our encouragement of individual initiative, which has made America the greatest Nation in the world. Nothing should ever be permitted to happen in this country which will deprive the individual of freedom of thought and freedom of action, or stultify his ambition.

It is to all these things that our servicemen want to return.

It is to the America that they remember that they want to come back. And the kind of America they remember is the kind of America they want in the future.

The voice of 12,000,000 young Americans will be a powerful voice.

It is a voice that will not stand for any foreign ism in the democracy they fought to save.

The regimentations of fascism, the phony ideologies of the other isms are not for Americans.

Every American still cherishes in his heart the spirit of the pioneers, and so long as that spirit remains alive regimentation will not take root in this country.

People who protect a free press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech will always be capable of doing their own thinking and of making their own decisions. So long as Americans preserve their liberties, our democracy is safe.

In shaping post-war plans of a global nature some people have envisioned a modern utopia for the world. They would have an equal standard of living for all. That is a fine thought, but these people look to America to make this possible. If America should attempt to bring this about, it would undoubtedly impoverish us, and still not bring the world standard of living up to what we enjoy. It would only lower our standard of living to the level of less fortunate nations.

If world peace is to mean that we must feed the nations of the world, then I believe that charity begins at home. Let us be sure that we take care of our own.

Had we been Santa Claus to the world before the war, we would not have been in the excellent position we were in to help win the war. We have financed, fed, clothed, and provided munitions for every Allied Nation. We were able to do that because of our great strength. It should be the aim of each of us to keep America strong in the post-war years. We must keep America armed. That is insurance against future wars.

These things are brought to your attention, not by way of criticism but as matters that need your thought. These are things that you are going to be confronted with—things that you, as future leaders, are going to have to decide. Because of your training and experience, you will be extremely well informed to make decisions. Our vision was so bad in the past that we failed to prevent the present war. It will be criminally inexcusable to make the same mistake again.

If we have the obligation to administer to the ills of the world, we certainly have the right to keep the world at peace.

You young men of the armed forces will soon be assigned to duty in many parts of the world. I know that you will want to come home to the same kind of America that you left. I know that the people here at home will make certain that our way of living does not change while you are gone. While you are away, we at home will discharge our obligations to see that provision is made for your welfare when you return. That we have promised, and that promise will be kept.

Tariff Based on Living Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting article based on tariff standards appeared in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post on April 1. This article was called to my attention by Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Representative from that district.

Mr. Charles A. Moore, chairman of the board of directors of Manning, Maxwell, & Moore, outlines a plan which, if adopted by Congress, would protect the living standards of the American workers against the low wages and the low living standards of other nations. The Ways and Means Committee will being hearings within the next 10 days on a proposal to not only extend the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but also give the Tariff Commission authority to reduce tariffs 50 percent more.

The article follows:

TARIFF BASED ON LIVING STANDARDS ADVOCATED BY MANNING, MAXWELL & MOORE CHAIRMAN

Commenting that "we appear to be committed to a program of giving to all the rest of the world which may well bankrupt us," Charles A. Moore, chairman of the board of directors of Manning, Maxwell & Moore, last week advocated the adoption of a tariff system based on the relative wage scales of the various countries.

Mr. Moore believes that such a system would protect the living standards of American workers against the low wages and low living standards of other nations.

Before settling down to developing the activities of Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Mr. Moore lived an adventurous life. Born in Lynn, Mass., in 1880, he attended St. Paul's in New Hampshire and was graduated by Yale in 1903. He has been a resident of Fairfield County for many years, living on a farm near Greenwich.

SAILED WITH PEARY

The wanderlust and search for adventure seized him at an early age and when 17 years old he was a member of Robert E. Peary's trip to the Arctic. It was on this trip that the expedition found the famous meteorite now in the American Museum of Natural History, New York. A few years later he chartered a boat and with Capt. Robert Bartlett, of Arctic fame, as first officer, traveled up the Labrador coast, on through the Hudson Strait into Hudson Bay.

The original object of the cruise had been to try and discover a graphite mine, and while no mine was found, plenty of adventures were recorded.

Shortly after he was graduated from Yale, Mr. Moore, accompanied by the late Homer Davenport, then one of America's outstanding cartoonists, decided to go to Turkey to buy Arabian horses for breeding purposes. While in that section of the world they decided to do some real roaming and visited Asia Minor, north Africa, and various European countries.

Some years later Mr. Moore made several expeditions to South America and also explored the mountains of British Columbia, where he did a lot of hunting. One of his kills was of a rare type of goat, which, when mounted, was presented to the American Museum of Natural History. Mr. Moore is a life member of that organization.

SERVED IN WORLD WAR

During the First World War Mr. Moore served at the front as a member of the Fifty-sixth Artillery. He participated in four engagements, including the Meuse-Argonne and Oise-Aisne operations.

Since the World War, Mr. Moore, has devoted his time to the growing activities of the Manning, Maxwell & Moore Co. His beliefs on the necessity of establishing a new type of tariff follows:

Mr. Moore said:

"I have for several years been of the opinion that a tariff system based upon relative wage

scales of the various countries would be workable and beneficial to the United States. I believe that now, more than ever before, such a base for our tariff would be helpful to this country.

"We appear to be committed to a program of giving to all the rest of the world which may well bankrupt us and lower standards of the other nations of the world. Yet our first duty should be to maintain our own standards of living, which have for two generations been the highest in the world, not only for our own advantage, but as a continuing example and inspiration for all other nations.

"It is obviously impossible for us to maintain our high wages in this country, on which our national wealth and living standards have always been based and always must be based, in a world of complete free-trade.

"There are many serious problems of fairer distribution amongst ourselves of our national income. These problems must be met and solved. But without a large national income to be better distributed no benefit to the Nation can accrue to American citizens. So it seems to me that the preservation of our collective national income is the first duty of all American citizens and must always be our first duty.

"The basic plan, therefore, must be protection of our wage scale and living standards against the low wages and low living standards of all other nations.

"If at the same time an incentive could be offered to other nations to raise their wage scales and living standards we would be doing the best service possible to the entire world.

"In a tariff system based on relative wage scales I believe we have the means to protect ourselves, stimulate other nations to aspire to our standards of wages and of living and supply a world commerce with new life.

"Here is a sample outline of the plan:

"The Congress should create a commission to study and set up a relative wage scale for each nation seeking to trade with us. The standards set up would have to be somewhat arbitrary at first. But our American decision would have to stand as arrived at with no modifications for several years.

"Our maximum tariffs would be levied on all imports from nations whose wage scales were under a certain percentage of our own. As a nation's wage scale approximated our own less tariff would be levied. If any nation's wage scale equaled our own no tariff would be levied, or a nominal one only.

"In order to aid the nations to raise their living standards and wages (which go always hand in hand) the entire revenue from tariffs (or any portion decided upon as just to ourselves) would be loaned at a low rate of interest to the nation paying the tariff for the purpose of buying in this country products of American manufacture—preferably machinery and equipment which would tend to make labor more productive and therefore deserving of higher wages.

"Periodically tariffs would be readjusted. The success of the plan would be measured by such readjustments.

"I can think of no way to offer to the labor of all nations hope, inspiration, and assistance of a practical sort comparable to such a plan carefully worked out. It puts a heavy financial burden on us. But it leaves to each nation the job of helping itself and not to be pauperized by charity.

"The influence of such a program upon American standing in the world would be, it seems to me, very beneficial.

"The above is a simplified outline of a very big and far-reaching plan."

Radio Frequency Modulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram received by me today, and which I understand was sent to all Members of the House and Senate, by E. F. McDonald, Jr., head of the Zenith Radio Corporation. It sets forth the serious attempts being made to transfer frequency modulation from lower range on the dial to the upper register. Such a transfer, in the considered opinion of the best experts, would impair the efficiency of FM and entail great financial loss to present holders of that facility. Frequency modulation, the invention of Dr. Edwin H. Armstrong, is such a boon to listeners on the radio, giving a reception entirely free from static, that nothing which threatens its benefits should be permitted. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 9, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I am sending this telegram to you and other Members of the Congress because a new development in radio that is now ready to bring great benefits to your constituents, and provide tens of thousands of post-war jobs, is being threatened by ill-advised Government action.

Radio broadcasting is the paradox of modern inventions. We had long-distance radio service before we had purely local service. It is the baby that ran before it could walk. Our first American broadcasting station, KDKA, could be received all over the United States and sometimes in Europe. It is as though we had long-distance telephones before local exchanges were established.

In 1925 I personally sent the human voice half way around the world from my ship in north Greenland within 11 degrees of the North Pole to Admiral Koontz on the U. S. S. *Seattle,* flagship of the Pacific Fleet, then cruising off Tasmania.

Let's take a look behind the scenes and see what this paradox of radio, which at present is known and appreciated by a relatively few people, means to the American public, to you, and to me.

In the short period from 1921 radio has unfolded its influence in civic and cultural fields as much as did the printing press during its first 200 years.

Now comes the latest invention, frequency modulation, which is purely a local service. It only radiates from the transmitter to an horizon, usually under 100 miles. It creates another paradox by being the only great invention in radio that has not been financed by stock promotion to the public. It has come forward on its merits and was accepted by the public and by many companies already established and adequately financed.

This new frequency-modulation service provides the public not only with its first local service but its first high fidelity and relatively static-free reception. It fills the same position as the home-town newspaper and gives as much better reception as the local telephone gives compared with long distance.

Entirely without stock promotion, frequency modulation made more progress in public acceptance in the first 2 years of its public use, from 1940 to Pearl Harbor Day, than television has in 17 years of existence, even though few cities today enjoy the benefits of frequency modulation service.

Present standard broadcasting, because of limited wavelengths, only allows about 900 stations in the whole United States. These stations are the property of a fortunate few. Some have been sold at high premiums because of the limited number possible. Frequency modulation will make possible 2,000 to 5,000 additional frequency modulation local stations which definitely promise to be a greater menace to the relative monopoly enjoyed by the chains and some present clear-channel broadcasters than anything they have heretofore encountered.

I can well understand opposition of the national chains to this terrific new competitor, and I have sympathy for their position, but I also remember that the stage-coach drivers didn't like to see the coming of the railroads, and in turn our railroad systems did not welcome the coming of good roads and trucks with door-to-door service. Naturally the chains see in frequency modulation not only a serious competitor but also a great additional expense to which they will be put in competing.

A similar situation to that now existing in broadcasting would have developed if the printing press had originally been available only to the national magazines and the supply of paper limited. Naturally these magazine owners would resent the coming of presses and sufficient paper for printing the home-town paper which would dilute and subtract from their national circulation. Here in America the local papers have always been much closer to their people than the national publications. Frequency modulation provides the equivalent of additional presses and additional paper to make the local newspaper possible.

Many small-town standard amplitude modulation broadcasters now have unsatisfactory wavelengths and suffer from interference. Most of the good station wavelengths are in the big cities. Through frequency modulation small-town broadcasters can now have an efficient interference-free station which will cost less money, operate more efficiently, and adequately cover their local service area. One hundred and twenty-five home-town newspapers, realizing the value of frequency modulation, have already made application for permits to erect frequency modulation broadcasting stations post-war. Frequency modulation can provide an interference-free station in every city in the United States over 2,500 population.

In the past, many prominent speakers on important subjects of interest primarily to local communities, have been relegated to the use of day-time radio which has limited their local audience. They have been deprived of the great night audience because of high cost of time and too great an area covered. Frequency modulation cures this.

The chains have rendered a splendid service and they could continue to broaden their system and serve the small town even better by hooking up with these new local frequency modulation stations.

The Federal Communications Commission has proposed to move frequency modulation from its present position in the broadcasting spectrum, where it has given unexcelled service for 5 years, to the proposed hundred megacycle band, which is untried and unproved for broadcasting service. This would obsolete all present frequency modulation broadcasting stations and destroy the frequency modulation value of many millions of dollars' worth of radio sets in the hands of the public.

The record of the F. C. C. hearings indicates this move is unnecessary and undesirable.

The only argument advanced for moving frequency modulation to this proposed untried area is the highly technical theory developed by a former F. C. C. employee that in the present wave band frequency modulation will experience interference.

At both the public and secret hearings held by F. C. C. on the subject of whether or not frequency modulation should be moved because of alleged interference, 7 of the 8 propagation experts, who after all are the only ones qualified to pass on the technical phase of this question, indicated the disturbing of present frequency modulation channels is unnecessary. Of the whole industry, including the broadcasting chains, only 11 individuals or corporations were for disturbing frequency modulation in its present satisfactory position and moving it to the untried and unproved hundred megacycle band against 43 who are for leaving it undisturbed where it is.

Nevertheless the Commission's recent correspondence with frequency modulation set owners protesting the change and its recent theatrical demonstration of converters to members of the press indicate that some of its members are determined to move frequency modulation regardless of the weight of the qualified evidence.

Manufacturers universally concede that if frequency modulation is moved to the higher channels the public will have to pay more money for frequency modulation receivers which will function properly in the hundred megacycle band. This will cause the public to pay to radio manufacturers many additional and unnecessary millions of dollars. Moving frequency modulation to this proposed untried and unproved channel would also set frequency modulation back from 2 to 5 years at a cost of tens of thousands of jobs, because frequency modulation is the one new thing in radio that is ready to go and provide new employment during and after reconversion.

It is the considered judgment of the General Electric Co., the Stromberg-Carlson Co., and our people here at Zenith, the three manufacturers who have had the greatest experience in the building of genuine frequency modulation receivers for the public, that moving frequency modulation to the untried and unproved hundred megacycle band is unnecessary and undesirable and will deliver a deadly blow to the entire frequency-modulation program from which it will take years for it to recover and regain its present position of public service.

If not crippled and delayed by the proposed move, frequency modulation is destined to wield a great influence in America as the local papers have always been closer to their people than the national publications. Frequency modulation, because of the superior service it renders, may even be destined to replace many of the present-day broadcast stations, especially in the smaller towns.

Frequency modulation, if allowed to proceed, will be a great leader in the orderly reconversion from war to civilian production.

Chairman Porter, who inherited this momentous problem when he assumed the chairmanship of the Federal Communications Commission in January, has definitely stated within the past week that he has reached no conclusion himself. In the public interest I believe that Congress should satisfy itself that the entire Commission and their engineers give proper and full consideration only to the qualified evidence that is before them. No one should be swayed by any interests who through fear of competition may seek to cripple an already established great new public service.

If you feel that you would like further and more detailed information on this subject before taking action, I shall be very glad to furnish it to you upon request.

E. F. McDONALD, Jr.,
President, Zenith Radio Corporation, Chicago.

Enforcement of O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials in regard to the enforcement of O. P. A. regulations. I make these comments and submit the editorials pursuant to some remarks I previously made on the floor of the Senate. Following those remarks, I carried on correspondence and held conferences with representatives of the O. P. A. That correspondence and those conferences convinced me all the more that the problem of improving the procedure in hearing O. P. A. cases is of paramount importance. I serve notice that when the O. P. A. Act is before the Senate I shall press for necessary amendments to insure that the people of our country shall have proper trial by due process of law, whereas at the present time I do not think they receive it.

The editorials to which I refer, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix, are as follows: One, entitled "The O. P. A. 'Trials'," from The Dalles (Oreg.) Chronicle, of April 2, 1945; another, from Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, written by C. C. Crow, is entitled "Persecuting America's Best Citizens"; the third editorial is entitled "Judge Tocze's O. P. A. Decision," and was published in the Oregonian for April 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Dalles (Oreg.) Chronicle of April 2, 1945]

THE O. P. A. TRIALS

Investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. That's the status of the O. P. A. Enforcement Division, as demonstrated in hearings held in The Dalles Friday and Saturday.

Little wonder, then, that several local attorneys who attended the trials as spectators were heard to remark as they left the room, "Is this the United States?" The defense attorney angrily charged that Gestapo methods had been employed by the O. P. A. in its handling of one local case.

"Well, that's what the people voted for, when they returned the New Deal to power," a black Republican, who was a bystander, retorted.

"Yes; it looks like we are headed for the very totalitarianism our boys are fighting in Europe and Asia," another spectator declared. "Petrillo and his gang can get away with anything, but let a businessman slip over a bit, intentionally or not, and he's in the clutches of the bureaucrats."

Some of this corridor criticism probably was unfair, but it just about epitomized the reaction of spectators at the trials, which soon took on the aspects of a legal farce, insofar as accepted court procedure is concerned. Instead of being assumed innocent until proved guilty, the various defendants obviously were assumed to be guilty—and "try and prove your innocence."

Consider the stage as it was set. First, O. P. A. investigators moved into town. They were not invited in by the local war price and rationing board, which understands conditions in The Dalles and which has been making a sincere attempt to enforce the multitude of orders and regulations promulgated by the O. P. A. As a matter of fact, John Sell, chairman of the local food panel, testified that he resigned this position when the district O. P. A. office refused to heed his suggestions, which were based on a thorough knowledge of local conditions.

These investigators, we are informed, acted in an arbitrary manner. In one instance they seized the food ration points at a local grocery store, while the proprietor was absent. They took these points to Portland, sorted them, and returned valid points later by registered mail.

In another instance, when a local restaurant proprietor explained his point difficulties by saying that the Army "virtually had taken over his establishment," an investigator advised him not to serve meat to servicemen; that they "got their points at camp" and should eat there. This was testified under oath at Saturday's hearing, and was not denied by the investigator, who was present at the time.

Yet many of the men from Camp Rufus were from foreign battlefields. Some had been on Attu. Others were home from action in the Pacific, instructing other Army engineers in the technique of building bridges. What restaurant proprietor would have the heart to tell a soldier, under such circumstances, to get his meals at camp; that he could not order a steak because steaks were reserved for civilians?

In any event the investigators found quite a few food handlers short of points. Regulations admittedly had been violated, but there was no deliberate attempt at dishonesty. And if the matter had been left to the local rationing board, these points would have been made up, paid in full after the Army moved on from Camp Rufus.

Having found violations of O. P. A. regulations, at least from a technical standpoint, the district O. P. A. next preferred charges. From Portland came an O. P. A. enforcement attorney with the reputation of being "plenty tough" in the prosecution of her cases. From San Francisco came the "judge and jury," in the person of a hearing commissioner. In court were the witnesses for the Government, ready to testify against the defendants.

Notice anything unusual about this arrangement? Well, the witnesses, the "prosecuting attorney," and the "judge," who also serves as a jury, all are paid by the O. P. A.

We asked the hearing officer if the rules of evidence were supposed to apply to such hearings. He assured us that this was the case. Possibly they were "supposed to apply," but many years spent in covering court actions convinced us that we knew nothing about the "rules of evidence," as interpreted by the O. P. A. For instance, when the "district attorney" submitted evidence not even remotely connected with a formal complaint, this evidence was admitted—over the protest of the defense attorney who insisted that his case was being prejudiced.

Furthermore, the "judge" interrogated witnesses frequently, and even called a witness to the stand to clarify points in testimony that were not always pertinent to the charges. He frequently was brusque in his question-

ing. Only twice during the 10 hearings did he seem to think that the O. P. A. had overstepped the bounds of legal propriety and in one of these instances he reversed an original ruling in favor of the defense after he had remarked—audibly—that to take the case off the present calendar might necessitate another trip to The Dalles, and he didn't know when he would be able to come here again.

If local violators of O. P. A. regulations are found guilty, they face suspension of their right to deal in the rationed commodities involved for various lengths of time. This was admitted by O. P. A. officials at the hearings. In the case of restaurants and meat markets that will mean they must close their doors

What this could mean to the community is obvious. Local restaurants and meat markets, attempting to give service despite help shortages, already are swamped. Close some of them up and the situation could become chaotic.

Furthermore, consider the degree of punishment in view of the degree of the offense charged. Close up a restaurant for 10, 20, or 30 days, and the help disappears, to other communities or other jobs. Close up a meat market and the same is true. Deny a large grocery store the right to deal in sugar or butter, and think of the farmers—many of whom drive from 50 to 100 miles to shop in The Dalles. True, other stores will be open, but consider the congestion, yet the O. P. A. declares that public inconvenience is not taken into account in such closures—only public hardship.

And all of this could have been avoided if the district O. P. A. had permitted the local rationing board to handle the situation in its own way instead of moving in with the obvious determination to set an example.

[From Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, Portland, Oreg., of February 28, 1945]

PERSECUTING AMERICA'S BEST CITIZENS

(By C. C. Crow)

Like Hitler's expiring Gestapo, the Enforcement Division of the Lumber Section of O. P. A. in Portland is now bringing into final play all of the ruthless vindictiveness that has characterized its high-handed career of persecution.

For complete indifference to the established processes of administering justice, the history of the activities of the enforcement division of O. P. A. is a record of abuse of authority and the exericising of punitive judicial power which has made this organization a constant liability to the war program as it has run amuck in the ranks of those engaged in doing something genuinely constructive. From the unfortunate victims of the coercive blackjacking of this O. P. A. enforcement division huge sums of money have been taken in the form of fines for loosely established and more loosely calculated, alleged evasions of the terms of price ceilings. Often intricate and complicated in their draft, clear interpretation has not been possible even by the original authors after other legal crackpots have put into words and phrases a conglomeration of meaningless and disconnected provisions that have opened wide the gate for administrative impositions on the unfortunate and busy groups of our citizens engaged in the production and distribution of timber products.

Staffed for the most part by men whose limited experience has deprived them of the responsible jobs in private industry this O. P. A. band of time teredos has come to learn that as a bureau they are held in low esteem and consequently this realization has developed an esprit de corps that has carried them to great extremes.

Busy men and concerns engaged in producing and getting to our fighting forces needed lumber supplies have in cases too numerous to mention here, submitted to outrageous impositions from these New Deal axmen and have paid kangaroo court fines for baseless charges, not due to any sense of guilt but because they could not afford the time and expense to go into court over the amounts involved. In instances without number lumbermen have been told by their attorneys, "From the standpoint of constitutional law these charges are without foundation and you can go into court and beat the O. P. A., if you can get into a court which is not presided over by another New Deal appointee and in this connection the higher up you go the poorer your chances are and we advise paying the extortion and going about your business, because they are out to get you one way or another and the soundness of their accusations is the least important."

Now as time has moved along the attitude of intolerance in the O. P. A. enforcement division has grown with it. When the worst scrub in this marauding organization comes back to the office and reports that he has been offended by some hounded executive, that unfortunate individual is due to get a working over.

The above statements are best proved by reciting a specific case. The Goose Lake Box Co. at Lakeview, Oreg., operated by Sam Jaksick, stepped out of the ranks of mediocrity and into the spotlight by being awarded the Army and Navy E for "practical patrotism" and "distinguished service" in supplying the Government with lumber required in carrying on the war. This aroused jealousy of another Government employee in another entirely different department contacting the pine manufacturers and soon an automobile, burning scarce gasoline and wearing out scarcer tires, was on its long way to the Goose Lake plant to dig up something, somehow.

To make a long story short, an O. P. A. field man slipped into the Goose Lake plant one day like a skunk crawling into a poultry house full of laying hens and proceeded to hunt for something wrong. Without any permission whatever he shut down various parts of the operation so that he might query the employees, who were busy trying to make lumber to help support the boys in the foxholes. Finally, when his arrogant obstruction became unbearable, he was summarily ordered from the property, something that should have been done 5 minutes after he entered. What did this do? When the supersnooper returned to headquarters and reported the temerity and insubordination of Sam Jaksick in insisting that he and his men be allowed to produce lumber for the Government, Goose Lake's fate was sealed.

Recently the O. P. A. filed charges against Goose Lake Box, assessing a triple fine and asking the right to impose a further penalty on another separate charge involving some 280 carloads of lumber and a correspondingly large sum of money.

In the meantime, what has happened? Out of a clear sky the Army and Navy has awarded the Goose Lake Box Co. a second E, and written them as follows:

"To the Men and Women of the Goose Lake Box Co., Lakeview, Lake County, Oreg.:

"I am pleased to inform you that you have won for the second time the Army-Navy Production Award for meritorious services on the production front.

"You have continued to maintain the high standard which you set for yourselves and which won you distinction more than 6 months ago. You may well be proud of your achievement.

"The White Star, which the renewal adds to your Army-Navy production award flag, is the symbol of appreciation from our armed forces for your continued and determined effort and patriotism."

Who is best qualified to appraise the service and lumber which has been supplied to the Government during this emergency, a small group of nondescript bureaucrats or the Army and Navy heads who have been using this lumber?

In receiving the second "E" award the Goose Lake Box Co. stands by itself, as this recognition for service performed and the good quality of material supplied has been given to no other manufacturer of pine in the entire West and that is a real record.

The youthful attorney who heads the enforcement division's office of O. P. A. in Portland is the same man who was caught redhanded last summer on a long fishing trip which he made that involved traveling over 400 miles in an automobile operated by one of his field men, who was paid for its use by the Government Fine sense of honor by a man who is receiving his monthly stipend for the purpose of enforcing the law and war regulations instead of deliberately doing something widely publicized as forbidden.

Sam Jaksick has made a contribution to his country in helping to win the war and has gone far beyond his outstanding record of supplying lumber for the Army and Navy, which has been publicly proclaimed as a top job. Sam Jaksick has also given to the war his 19-year-old son, a promising lad who was late last year so seriously wounded while serving with the Army in Europe that he will be a cripple the remainder of his life. While the head of the enforcement division of the O. P. A. office was on a fishing trip being made with Government-bought gasoline this boy of Sam Jaksick's was in the service of his country, working for a mere pittance and his reward is a shattered body. Would you enjoy this if you were Sam Jaksick? Would it kindle love and kindness in your heart to know that your own son was lying in a hospital in France terribly crippled while a band of able-bodied O. P. A. employees, all of whom should have long since either been working in the shipyards or serving in the Army, was descending upon you purely for spite and pique, trying to intimidate you into paying a fine on a charge of which you were not guilty?

War Mobilization Director, James F. Byrnes, should order the Portland office of the enforcement division of O. P. A. closed at once and the men and women employed there placed on essential jobs, preferably in the Army, Navy, or the shipyards. Sam Jaksick should be immediately relieved of the persecution of boondoggling imposers, who have from the start been a liability to the war program, having done nothing but annoy and delay those patriotic men like Sam Jaksick and hundreds of other producers of lumber who, in spite of O. P. A. snoopers and not with their aid, have made a maximum contribution toward winning the war.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 4, 1945]

JUDGE TOOZE'S O. P. A. DECISION

In a voluminous and thoughtfully considered opinion, Judge Tooze, of the Multnomah circuit court, has held that Congress had no constitutional power to vest State courts with jurisdiction in O. P. A. penalty cases instituted in behalf of the Government itself.

The layman's interest in the matter is not in a legalistic presentation of Judge Tooze's reasoning, but in its bearing on enforcement of O. P. A. price ceilings, if the decision shall be affirmed by the State supreme court.

Briefly stated the decision is founded primarily on the doctrine supported by a fairly long line of decisions that only in courts established by itself can Congress vest any portion of the judicial power of the United States. The State circuit court is a creation of the State legislature, not of Congress. Thus, recourse by the Price Administrator must be to the Federal district court when the Government seeks to recover treble the amount a dealer has charged in excess of his price ceiling, or when the O. P. A. seeks injunction to restrain a dealer from exceeding the price ceiling.

The attempt of Congress to confer jurisdiction on State courts in these matters no doubt arose from a desire and need to facilitate enforcement of the law. Sessions of the State circuit court are held in every county in the State, and in Oregon there are 29 circuit judges. There are but two judges of the Federal district court, who preside mainly in Portland, but conduct terms at intervals in Pendleton and Medford. Under O. P. A.'s universal coverage, price violations may occur in every section of the State, and a consequence of the decision, if it be upheld, will be that these enforcement cases will all have to go before the two Federal district judges, with congestion and delay likely, and also with inconvenience to defendants and counsel in numerous instances.

So far as we know, no State court of final adjudication has passed on the issue considered by Judge Tooze. But in every State a relative situation as respects the greater convenience of State courts exists. The supreme court of one State is not bound by the decisions of a supreme court of another State, but it is the practice to give them consideration. Hence, it may be that the Oregon Supreme Court will have first say on a subject of widespread importance.

While it is expedient that State courts have jurisdiction in the cases in question, expediency does not fall within the purview of a court in making a decision. The court is guided by the law and the facts as he understands them and by naught else. Judge Tooze has based his opinion on careful reasoning and on exhaustive examination of authorities. His is not a court of last resort, however, and the higher court may hold that he is in error in his conclusions. This is not a forecast. It is but mentioned as a possibility.

So long as we must have price controls, it is to the general interest that these controls be observed. But actions instituted by the Price Administrator are not the only way of penalizing the ceiling violator. The consumer who has been charged more than the maximum ceiling price may sue for up to three times the sum of the overcharge, plus attorney's fees and court costs. Judge Tooze holds that the circuit and district courts must assume and exercise jurisdiction in all cases brought by consumers in their own names to recover overcharges for their own use and benefit. It is in actions instituted for the exclusive benefit of the United States that, in his opinion, the State courts have no jurisdiction. There is probably widespread unawareness of the consumer's right to recover for overcharges; also he is generally overcharged without his knowledge, and sometimes he knowingly pays more than ceiling prices to obtain scarce commodities in what is comprehensively called the black market. Enforcement procedure has consequently devolved almost wholly on the Price Administrator.

The O. P. A. and the Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, private enterprise can put meat on the American table if freed from Government regulations. So long as the O. P. A. and War Food Administration continue their many silly and unnecessary regulations, they will continue to drive meat producers out of business. Black markets now flourish everywhere. They exist because under Government regulations it is impossible for men to continue business and make a legitimate profit. Black-market operators pay no taxes.

Subsidies are not the answer. In the first 17 months of Government operation of subsidies, the packers and slaughterers were paid $592,100,000. The consumers benefit by getting meat on a deferred-payment plan at a time when they are able to pay for their meat. The stigma of taking a subsidy rests with the producer while the consumer gets the benefit.

Government regulation and meddling in the hog business has reduced the hog population from 122,000,000 in 1943 to less than 80,000,000 today.

If the Government really wants the farmer to produce pork, they should immediately increase the selling price for fat hogs. They should stop issuing confusing and conflicting orders. The dismal failure of the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. poor case for Government planning as to regulate the pork industry makes a permanent policy. Government planning is a poor substitute for the remarkable record which has been made by the industry in the past. The production of meat should be turned over to the people who know how to produce meat. A reasonable profit must be insured and then there will be no question about the supply. The Government cannot continually make regulations and rules and then change them in the middle of the feed lot or at marketing time and expect the farmer to continue to produce beef and pork.

The ceiling prices on live cattle will do to the cattle industry what was done to the pork industry. The regulation may send more cattle to the slaughtering pens but less meat will be produced because the cattle are lightweight. These cattle should be in the feeding pens gaining two to four hundred pounds in weight. The past 3 months have witnessed the largest run in history of cattle to terminal markets. The country may expect a lessened supply of beef until the grass-fat cattle are ready for the market in the early fall of 1945. The regulations issued by the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration, if continued, will make beef a seasonable item like vegetables and fruit.

The total meat production for March 1945 was 20 percent less than in March 1944. There was 50 percent less pork during this same period.

Mr. Speaker, Washington regulations do not encourage production. The answer is found on the farms of the Midwest. The feeding pens are empty.

Mr. Speaker, I include a letter which I am sending to the Economic Stabilizer, the War Food Administration, and the Office of Price Administration:

APRIL 9, 1945.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
Director, Economic Stabilization, Federal Reserve Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I have just recently returned from a 10-day visit in my district, which is one of the great food-producing areas of the United States. I desire to pass along to you some of the impressions which I have received from the producers of cattle and hogs.

The number of brood sows being retained by the farmers is about 30 percent of what it was last year. You will remember the farmer was urged to produce more hogs. This he did in an overwhelming number. Then came regulations, ceilings, and confusion. The farmer marketed his hogs and went out of the hog-producing business.

When I visited your predecessor, Mr. Vinson, just before ceilings were placed on cattle, I told him that the ceilings on live cattle would produce less meat and encourage the black market. I think that even he will now agree that that has been the result. The cattlemen, the auctioneers, and the feeders insist that if the regulations relative to ceiling prices on the various grades of cattle continue to exist that you will produce the same result in cattle as you have in hogs. Since the ceilings have been placed on live cattle, there have been the biggest runs ever known at all of the terminal markets. These cattle are lightweight and should have been retained in the feed yards for another 3 or 4 months in order to produce the several hundred pounds more per animal which is now needed to relieve the shortage of beef.

There is ample corn in Nebraska. Much of it is spoiling on the ground that ought to be fed to the cattle and to the hogs. A very good suggestion came from John B. Cook, a member of the meat board, in which he felt that inspection of cattle for the military forces should be relaxed. There are not enough Federal inspectors to properly inspect the meat on a uniform basis. He suggested that Federal inspectors should be moved around frequently in order to get a uniform inspection of carcasses. There is a vast difference between the inspection in the Corn Belt of the Midwest as compared to the South, the West, or the Eastern districts. Another suggestion was that the military be permitted to pay a dollar or two more for Federally-inspected meat. Also, that the State inspectors' record should be taken and the meat from other slaughter houses should be included in the military buying program. This would help eliminate the black market and there would be a smaller set-aside order necessary for the military.

The question of weighing cattle and hogs at farm sales and auction sales is still in existence. When farmers, 10 or 15 miles from town or a scales, hold an auction, it is utterly impractical and, in some cases, impossible to weigh these animals. The ceiling price on feeder hogs should be eliminated up to 180 pounds. This will permit the

farmer to buy these light hogs, to which he may feed his wet corn and thus produce more pork.

Everyone I contacted was bitterly opposed to the Government taking over the packing and meat industry. Such a move would certainly not produce more meat.

I am sending these suggestions to your office, the War Food Administration, and the O. P. A., in the hopes that you may consider them constructive and will, in the future, take the advice of the men in the meat industry, which includes the growers, the feeders, and the slaughterers of live animals.

The Congress set up these committees in order to give the Government agencies the proper advice. I am sure, Sir, that you will agree that their considered judgment and advice in the past has not been followed.

I understand that an important meeting is being held this week between the Government agencies and the men who grow, feed, and slaughter live animals. I am hopeful that your office will see fit to take the considered judgment and advice of these men who know the answers to the problems of producing meat.

Yours very truly,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska.

The Fight Against Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement to the Missouri delegation in Congress by F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, as follows:

MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Columbia, Mo., April 3, 1945.

To Missouri Congressmen and United States Senators:

Certain misguided people have been waging a vicious attack upon cooperatives, chiefly through disseminating misinformation in a wholesale manner. We feel sure that Missouri Congressmen and Senators have received their share of this propaganda and, since we anticipate that questions about cooperatives will be raised in Congress from time to time, we are anxious that Missouri Congressmen and Senators have the facts.

Missouri is one of the leading States in farmer cooperative activities. There are no accurate figures, so far as we know, which show how many Missouri farmers participate in cooperative activities of one kind or another, but we estimate the number at around 200,000 of the State's 250,000 farmers.

The Farm Credit Administration, for example, estimates that 173,000 farmers are engaged in cooperative marketing and purchasing in Missouri. Another 153,000 belong to mutual fire insurance companies. There are 86,000 members of the Missouri Farmers Association. Thousands more belong to milk marketing cooperatives in the Kansas City, St. Joseph, and St. Louis milksheds, and to the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. Another 64,700 belong to one or another of the R. E. A.'s 38 cooperatives, while no one knows how many operate their own telephone systems. Obviously there are some duplications—some farmers belong to more than one cooperative—but it would seem reasonable that at least 200,000 Missouri farmers are cooperators.

What is the objective of these cooperatives in Missouri? They are organized for the purpose of increasing the farm income. And what do farmers do with this increased income? They spend it in town. They use this income to clothe their children, to pay dentists' bills, to buy hardware, lumber, and farm implements, to pay taxes, and to maintain their schools and churches. Wide-awake businessmen in Missouri towns have observed this, and that's why most rural businessmen approve of farmer cooperatives. In numerous towns businessmen have helped organize and finance M. F. A. cooperatives, and there are businessmen and bankers who own farms who are members of our various boards of directors.

The enemies of farmer cooperatives—and, frankly, we believe most of them are uninformed and have been misled—make certain charges. They are saying blandly that farmer cooperatives pay no taxes, that they go "scot free," as they put it. And they charge that the Federal Government has been giving cooperatives special privileges; they say the various banks for cooperatives lend cooperatives money at very low rates of interest and without security. Such charges are false.

The St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives, with which we in Missouri are the most familiar, charges 4-percent interest on facility loans, 2½ percent on operating-capital loans, and 1½ percent on short-term commodity loans. This bank secures its loans with mortgages, and will not lend money without ample security. If we found fault with it, it would be on the grounds that it is too conservative. The truth is, M. F. A. cooperatives can very often, and do, borrow money from local banks on more favorable terms and with interest rates just as low as the bank for cooperatives. It is true, however, that the bank for cooperatives, having been established for this special purpose, understands cooperative problems and can usually be more helpful to cooperatives for that reason than other banks. For your information, also, the St. Louis Bank for Cooperatives during its 10 years of service has never lost a cent in principal or interest on any loans made to M. F. A. cooperatives, and we have borrowed millions of dollars from them.

Also for your information, we of the Missouri Farmers' Association feel that the entire Farm Credit Administration is the finest thing Congress ever provided for agriculture. It is founded upon the principle that it is a proper function of the Government to help people to help themselves. We believe in this principle, and that's why we find no fault with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which Congress established to help banks, or with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help business.

And cooperatives do pay taxes. They pay every single kind of tax that all other business concerns pay except income taxes. Some of them even pay income taxes, preferring to do so in order that they may be free to do business with all comers rather than being restricted to doing 85 percent or more of their business with farmers. In 1913 Congress exempted farmer cooperatives which comply with the requirements from payment of income taxes because agriculture was suffering from economic ills, and Congress knew that only through cooperatives could farmers help themselves economically. The truth is that farmers as a class pay more taxes than any other in America because they have no opportunity to pass on the burden in their prices or wages as other classes do.

But a recent court decision (*United Cooperatives, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, 4 T. C. No. 12, decided Sept. 29, 1944) indicates that even without the specific exemption, cooperatives, or any other kind of business whose bylaws require the allocation of savings and payment of same to their patrons, may deduct such patronage refunds from gross income, and need not include them in taxable income. This is just, because any savings a cooperative makes do not belong to the cooperative—they belong to the patrons, and the patrons do pay income taxes on the money they receive.

Profits made by a privately owned business, on the other hand, are profits which belong to the corporation, and if and when they are disbursed, they are paid to a select few who own the stock. These profits, or overcharges, are divided up among stockholders on the basis of stock ownership. None of the money is ever paid to customers, except they be stockholders.

Cooperatives must keep extensive and exact records, since the law requires them to treat all patrons alike. Any savings, or overcharges, are allocated to the patrons on the basis of patronage. Any privately owned business, according to the court decision mentioned, could conceivably do the same. This being, so, where is the inequality that our enemies speak of?

I should like to invite your attention to the fact that when the Nation was young farmers were self-sufficient and they were also much nearer the consumer than they are today. They produced their own cream, manufactured it into butter, and sold it in town. They butchered and cured their own meat and marketed it. In selling their produce, meats, vegetables, and fruits, they reached the consumers directly through established markets in the cities and by peddling their products from house to house. They also produced their own farm power and the fuel for that power. They even made their own tools and farming implements.

Finally, entrepreneurs appeared on the scene. Some took the farmers' poultry, cream, grain, and other processing and marketing away from them. Others manufactured his farm implements. Tractors and trucks have been replacing the farm power, and oil companies have been furnishing fuel for this power. The farmer has at last been left with only one function—production, and as a result he has been maneuvered into a position where he is compelled to sell at wholesale and buy at retail. He has had to accept whatever price is offered for his products, less freight to market, and to pay whatever price is asked for farm supplies plus freight. No other business in America could withstand such an economic onslaught as the farmer has been subjected to during the past 25 years.

I feel that this is one reason why Congress provided the Farm Credit Administration and the tax exemption, to help the farmer to help himself out of economic doldrums into which he has sunken. Moreover, while it is true that farm income is now the highest on record, according to I. W. Duggan, Governor of F. C. A., the rural population is 25 percent of the total population, and at this time receives only 11 percent of the national income. So it is clear that agriculture is by no means out of the woods yet, and will probably face an economic catastrophe after the war.

Because farmers are now a minority group it will be difficult to obtain a high price level for their products in the future, however strongly they might organize themselves.

Organized business and labor and the resistance of the more numerous consumers will prevent it. Hence, the only way left for farmers to increase their income is to extend their farming enterprise upward, vertically, and recoup some of the margins lost to them in processing and marketing. That's why during the past few years farmers have been acquiring feed mills and oil refineries, and creameries and milk plants of their own. These functions are, as mentioned, historically a part of farming and it is perfectly legitimate for them to make such acquisitions.

The invasion of this sacred field of the monopolies and big businesses has seemingly frightened some people and, I think, unduly so. We of the M. F. A. remember that when we began organizing and establishing farmers exchanges in Missouri towns shortly after 1914 local merchants became alarmed and waged war upon us. They had visions of farmers taking over virtually every business in town. But businessmen in Missouri towns have been living alongside M. F. A. cooperatives for 31 years now and the world hasn't come to an end. The same thing will happen in the processing field.

As mentioned previously, hundreds of businessmen in Missouri towns are friends of M. F. A. cooperatives, and for selfish reasons. Cooperatives put money into farmers' pockets, and farmers spend this money in town, and in cities like St. Louis and Kansas City and St. Joseph. It is axiomatic that when farmers have money to spend the whole country is prosperous, and I know that thousands of businessmen, large and small, realize this truth.

The M. F. A. is strictly a self-help organization. We have never received one cent from the Government. We have never accepted, nor been offered for that matter, one gratuity of any kind. If we have been successful thus far, it has been the result of downright hard work—this, plus the tears, heartaches, sweat and toil and sacrifices of thousands of Missouri farmers and their families.

We repeat: The M. F. A.'s cooperatives exist for only one purpose—to raise the level of living of farm families to a higher plane. Upon this premise we rest our case, and we will welcome any inquiry any Congressman or Senator may care to make, and we invite you to pay us a visit and see Missouri cooperatives at first hand for yourselves.

Renegotiation Returns $5,800,000,000 To Treasury in 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Col. Maurice Hirsch, is announcing the actual cash results from the renegotiation of excessive profits in war contracts for 1942 and 1943. The renegotiation of the 1944 contracts has just begun.

The total amount thus far refunded or agreed to be refunded to the Treasury amounts to more than $5,802,452,000. The work for 1942 is practically completed; about 15 percent of 1945 is still in process.

And Colonel Hirsch states that vast additional savings, but impossible to estimate accurately, have come from the operation of the law in the reduced prices on subsequent contracts, or even from reduced prices in the portions of contracts to be performed after renegotiation had demonstrated proper pricing. As the one who introduced the word "renegotiation" into Federal legislation dealing with war contracts, naturally I am gratified with this evidence that Congress has done something toward controlling excessive profits in this war.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, in discussing the matter with me, yesterday stated that the savings in forward pricing would probably equal or exceed the direct refunds. Mr. Patterson further remarked, that were it not for the renegotiation statute, he would not want to handle procurement for the Army in this war. He felt that the risks to the Government in the procurement of new articles from firms without production experience or price history would be too great.

Soon the question will be before the Congress of extending the renegotiation statute to the end of the calendar year 1945, to accomplish which I introduced a bill in the latter part of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and reintroduced as H. R. 376, in this Seventy-ninth Congress. And, I believe, similar bills have been introduced by others. The results accomplished and the state of the war justify extension of the act to the end of the calendar year at least. I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider and report the appropriate legislation promptly.

Renovating Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I desire to include in the RECORD a timely and pertinent editorial from Labor on the proposal to streamline Congress, as follows:

LET'S LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP

A joint committee of House and Senate, headed by Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE, continues to receive suggestions for streamlining Congress. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, would like an arrangement by which Congress, when it finds itself at cross purposes with the President, could call an election and give the voters a chance to decide the issue.

As a rule Labor is in favor of enlarging the jurisdiction of the people. It has been championing the initiative and referendum for many years. As everyone knows that system enables the people to write their own laws and to block obnoxious laws which may be passed by State legislatures.

Perhaps the initiative and referendum would work on a national scale. It would be worth trying. However, Senator FULBRIGHT'S suggestion is entirely different.

He's evidently thinking of the British parliamentary system, which makes the legislative branch of government supreme. It has its good points but also its bad points. Down through the years it hasn't worked any better than our own system.

There is a good deal in getting acquainted with a system of government. The people of a country learn how to secure results. The British and the Canadians have done this. We know a little something about managing our system. We shouldn't make radical changes without mature reflection and until we are sure we have a better system.

Labor still believes that the best way to streamline Congress is to elect the right kind of men to House and Senate. They'll find a way to enact desirable legislation.

Keeping Pay Rolls in Seattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to an action of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., in Seattle, Wash., in my congressional district, which does injury to that community, to its industry, and its workers.

This company derives its profits from the people of Seattle. In fact, before the war, the Seattle telephone system comprised the greatest bulk of the telephone business in the State of Washington, and 75 percent of all profits came from that area.

Yet, this company has decided to take away publication of its Seattle directory from the community of which it is a part and from where its profits come to Los Angeles. This action is unsound business. And it cannot be separated from the fact that the concern which is to be given this large printing business is nonunion.

We are proud of our labor relations in the Pacific Northwest, of the degree of management-labor cooperation we have achieved, or our lack of major strikes and controversies to disrupt our great record of war production. It is inevitable that the selection of an open-shop firm will lead to labor difficulties.

It is with regret that I report this situation within my community, but it is with hope that the Pacific Telephone Co. will conduct itself in the traditions of that great city and correct this mistake.

I would like to include, as part of my remarks, an editorial from the March 30 edition of the Washington Teamster, official publication of the Joint Council of Teamsters, which presents this matter in an excellent manner:

TIME TO FIGHT FOR PAY ROLLS

It is of first importance to all of us to keep Northwest pay rolls in the Northwest, Seattle pay rolls in Seattle. Any concern that does business in any northwestern community has a duty to the people of that district, the duty to help safeguard the business in which it shares. Any firm that fails, or refuses, to recognize that duty is unworthy of cooperation.

Printers of the city of Seattle are protesting now against the decision of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. to transfer the publication of its Seattle directory from this community to Los Angeles. A great many Seattle printers and their families have depended for years upon this pay roll. They, and Seattle business, have a right to expect the telephone company to keep that pay roll in Seattle.

By the arbitrary transfer of this Seattle business and pay roll to Los Angeles, the telephone monopoly strikes a blow at the largest Northwest city from which it draws revenues and profits. Being a monopoly public-service company, it may not care about civic duty. Perhaps it thinks it is big enough to do as it pleases.

This is not a problem that concerns the printers and their families alone; it should be the concern of all civic-minded Seattle business leaders. Certainly it is in the interest of Seattle's welfare to keep this city financially healthy, to see that its people are employed and prosperous. Looking ahead to the post-war period, Seattle should be aroused at the danger of losing such pay rolls.

Seattle needs, Seattle must have, more and more people, and more and more steady pay rolls in the future. The action of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. in this instance is a heavy blow to the Northwest, not alone to Seattle. It is not to be tolerated.

The fact that the Pacific company has transferred this large printing business to a nonunion concern in Los Angeles adds to our concern. We know that out of such unfair procedure, labor trouble inevitably develops.

As to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item:

AS TO WORLD PEACE

We are happy to oblige the New Orleans League of Women Voters by summarizing our views on world peace and kindred subjects.

The Item is opposed to world wars and favors permanent peace for all mankind everywhere. We believe that every possible effort should be made to achieve these objects. Certainly the best way to do this is to form international organizations. To the best of their ability these should eliminate the causes of war, settle disputes, punish offenders, and use force when necessary.

We are tired of our being idealistic in a realistic world. We are impatient with rosy promises of all sorts of good things for future delivery. We are sick of the Government's policy of buying alleged good will abroad with vast outlays of credits and materials. We are nauseated and frightened by any prospect of post-war lend-lease or something similar under another name.

We are happy to restate our opinion as to our reason for being in this war. We are fighting because we were attacked. We would have been forced into the war subsequently anyway, because of the ambition of the Germans and the Japanese to conquer and dominate the world.

We fight them to avoid subjugation. All of our allies are fighting for that same reason. Every one of them is fighting primarily for itself. So are we. The better we can work together the more advantageous it will be for all.

What we want is for our Government to be as tough, practical, and realistic as the people with whom we are dealing. We admire charity and idealism, but want them combined with frugality and practicality. We are tired of Uncle Sam doubling for Santa Claus. The time to stop being a sucker is now. Our people should be told the truth instead of being misled by propaganda. The path to world peace is full of pitfalls and booby-traps. But it must be trodden. The alert will arrive nearer the destination at less cost to themselves.

First for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitism is a crime against American democracy. It is the most important weapon in the Hitler propaganda arsenal against democracy. We have Hitler's own word for that, and I quote him:

Anti-Semitism is a useful revolutionary expediency. My Jews are a valuable hostage given to me by democracy. Anti-Semitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable medium for the extension of our political campaign. You will see how little time we shall need in order to upset the ideas and the criteria of the whole world, simply and purely by attacking Judaism. It is beyond question the most important weapon in my propaganda arsenal, and almost everywhere of deadly efficiency. (Quoted in Hermann Rauschning's book, Hitler Speaks.)

As Hitler, the master anti-Semite, makes amply clear, those who use anti-Semitism strike at all minorities, at all democracy, at the very heart of America.

One of the basest canards of the anti-Semites is the lie that Jewish soldiers are not fighting and dying in this war. I have seen several examples of the gutter verse which is circulated to perpetuate this vile Hitler lie.

It is with this in mind that I am happy and proud to include, as part of my remarks, a survey made by Mr. Bernard Postal, director of B'nai B'rith information entitled "First for Freedom."

Certainly Mr. Postal would agree that Protestants and Catholics and men of all races and of all possible national origin have as many "firsts" to their credit, yet I believe this is not only an answer to the anti-Semites but a document worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress:

FIRST FOR FREEDOM

(By Bernard Postal, director of B'nai B'rith information)

Because the spirit of freedom and liberty for all is an integral part of the religious and cultural tradition of Israel, the Jewish people is probably the only one that has converted a historic event associated with human freedom into an annular major religious festival. Passover, which is known as the Festival of Freedom, not only commemorates the liberation of the Jews from Egyptian bondage, but is symbolic of the Jew's age-old defense of the rights and liberties of all men.

Today, when millions of Jewish men and women in uniform are fighting in the armies of the United Nations to free all peoples from oppression and slavery, it is appropriate to record the list of "firsts" credited to Jewish men and women in the armed forces of the United States to date in World War No. 2. This list of those who have been first for freedom is, of course, but a preliminary compilation, based on material collected only by this writer.

First to raise the American flag on pre-war Japanese territory was Lt. Col. Melvin Krulewitch, of New York City, who hoisted the Stars and Stripes on Namur Island during the invasion of the Marshalls.

First American penetration of German soil was made by Third Armored Division commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of Denver.

First three Americans to enter Aachen, the initial German city captured by the Americans, included Pvt. Max Fingelstein, of Brooklyn.

First American assault boat to hit the shore of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti, of Brooklyn.

First Nazi plane shot down for Uncle Sam is credited to Lt. William S. Beck, of Nashville, Tenn.

First American Red Cross nurse killed in World War No. 2 was Esther Richards, of San Francisco, who died of wounds received at Anzio beachhead.

First American Army nurse killed on western front was Lt. Frances Slanger, of Boston, who died of wounds received in Belgium. The Lieutenant Frances Slanger Chapter of the B'nai B'rith Young Women in Washington is named in her honor.

First B-29 raid on Japan included bombers on which Capt. William C. Goldstein, Indianapolis; Sgt. Morris Kramer, Pittsburgh; and Capt. Stephen Silverman, of Boston, served.

First American unit to break through to relieve the trapped American garrison in Bastogne was a tank unit commanded by Col. Creyton Abrams, of West Newton, Mass.

First American enlisted man to receive the Purple Heart in continental Europe was Sgt. Irving Allen, of Union City, N. J.

First American officer killed in the Philippines was Lt. Henry D. Mark, of Los Angeles.

First American killed in action on North American continent was Pvt. Joseph Sharp, of Philadelphia, who died at Dutch Harbor during a Jap air raid.

First American to kill a Jap in the Burma campaign was Corp. Werner Katz, of New York, a former refugee.

First crew of Army airmen to land in Aleutians included Lt. Harold Weisman, of the Bronx.

First man to bomb Rome was Lt. Sidney D. Gerstenfeld, of New York, who released the first bombs to fall on the Italian capital.

First American League baseball player to joint the armed forces was Hank Greenberg, now a captain, of the Detroit Tigers.

First all-American air raid on Europe, over occupied Holland on July 4, 1942, was made by squadron in which Sgt. Chester Davis, of New York, served as a gunner.

First four-medal winner in American Army in World War No. 2 was Lt. Morris Berenson, of Garfield, N. J.

First American troops to enter Algiers were led by Lt. Col. A. H. Rosenberg.

First member of the WAVE's to be killed in line of duty was Elizabeth Korensky, of Philadelphia, after whom the Elizabeth Korensky B'nai B'rith women's unit in Philadelphia has been named.

First American tank to enter Oran during invasion of north Africa was led by Corp. Bernard J. Kessel, of New York.

First American air raid on Rumanian oil fields at Ploesti was made by squadron in which Sgt. Robert Kessler, alumnus of A. Z. A., B'nai B'rith organization for high-school boys, from McKeesport, Pa., served as radio operator and gunner.

First man killed in action from Minneapolis was Ensign Ira Weil Jeffery, a member of B'nai B'rith, who died at Pearl Harbor.

First American flag planted in the city of Algiers at the start of the north African invasion was carried by Corp. Hyman I. Shakin, of New York.

First soldier from Delaware killed in war was Sgt. Harry Fineman, of Wilmington, Del., who died in the defense of Corregidor.

First war casualty among membership of the American Bar Association was Ensign Robert L. Leopold, of Louisville, Ky., who died at Pearl Harbor.

First Japanese battleship sunk in the war was the Haruna, sent to the bottom by plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

First man from Connecticut to be killed in the war was Kenneth H. Messenger, of Bridgeport, who died in the Philippines.

First Gold Star Mother of World War No. 2 was Mrs. Gertrude Kram, of New York, whose son, Seaman Leonard Kram, was killed in action at sea.

First American soldier brought home for burial on American soil was United States Marine Sgt. Herbert Keilson, of Long Island, who was killed in the raid on the Gilbert and Marshall Islands.

First two war deaths from Philadelphia were Pvt. Jack Feldman, an alumnus of A. Z. A., and Corp. Theodore J. Lewis, both of whom gave up their lives at Pearl Harbor.

First alumnus of City College killed in the war was Lt. Monroe Franklin, of New York, who died in the Philippines.

First American soldier to land on Australian soil with the American Expeditionary Force was Pvt. Ernest Yurman, of Brooklyn.

First American soldier to die on the Australian front was Lt. Milton Kaslow, of Brooklyn.

First boy from Newark, N. J., to lose his life in the war was Pvt. Louis Schleifer who was killed at Pearl Harbor.

First casualty from Hudson County, N. J., was Pvt. Joseph Guttman, Union City, N. J., who was killed in the early fighting in the Philippines.

First man from New Brunswick, N. J., to die in the war was Corp. Carl Schwartz, killed in the Philippines.

First war casualty from Hazleton, Pa., was Sgt. Harry Cohn, alumnus of A. Z. A., who was killed in the Southwest Pacific.

Filipino Bolo Brigades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the high rate of Japanese casualties in the Philippines—over 308,000 since the Leyte landings—is directly attributable to the efficient cooperation of Filipino guerrillas with all branches of the American armed forces.

During the 3 years of Japanese occupation, the Filipino "bolo brigades" accounted for numerous unlisted Japanese casualties while breaking down the morale of the survivors. In the same period of trial, the Filipino guerrillas were in frequent communication with General MacArthur by means of American submarines. They supplied information which led to the sinking of Japanese ships and to the bombing of strategically important Japanese military installations.

This exchange of intelligence was augmented after the arrival of American ground forces on Leyte, Samar, Mindoro, and Luzon. It has been maintained in the operations of Mindanao, Panay, Cebu, and Negros.

One of the most recent instances of Filipino-American cooperation against the Japanese has come to light in the joint campaign to strike at enemy command posts in the central Philippines, Filipino guerrillas informed Thirteenth U. S. A. A. F. bombers of vital enemy objectives. Filipino guerrillas rode with American pilots at low levels to direct them to specific sites. The effectiveness of this combined operation caused Brig. Gen. Paul Wurtsmith of the Thirteenth U. S. A. A. F. to say:

It is no exaggeration to say that the most unpromising job in the Jap Army in the Philippines was being a staff officer in the Visayas. We gave them every attention we possibly could.

The American people are aware of the vast extent of the participation of Filipino guerrillas in our common battle against the common foe. The length of time required to liberate the Philippines largely depends upon the continuation and acceleration of this splendid human relationship within the sphere of military action.

An International Office of Education To Help Train Citizens To Live in a World at Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which if enacted will place the House of Representatives on record in support of participation by the Government of the United States in the organization of an international office of education for the purpose of promoting a better mutual understanding among citizens throughout the world as an essential in the preservation of a just and lasting peace.

Since the resolution is not long, I am incorporating its text in the RECORD at this point.

Whereas the achievement of a peaceful and orderly life among the peoples of the world has become critical as a result of the war;

Whereas the future peace and security of the American and of all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world, the universal application of the principles of the Golden Rule, the application of reason and knowledge to the solution of domestic as well as international problems, and effective education at all levels;

Whereas the Axis countries have pursued a deliberate policy of destroying the technical, professional, and teaching personnel of the countries they have conquered and have encouraged hatred and misunderstanding between nations, peoples, and cultural groups;

Whereas these circumstances present a persisting problem which, if not solved, will result in the perpetuation of conditions of life most likely to cause peoples to resort to violence and war; and

Whereas it is essential to collaborate with other nations to promote educational advancement and at the same time to direct education toward the achievement of mutual understanding among the nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States urges the participation by the Government of the United States in the organization of an international office of education by the nations of the world for the purpose of advising together and to consider problems of international educational and cultural relations throughout the world and more particularly to organize a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations, the exchange of students and scholars, and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups;

Provided, however, That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations or their administration.

Mr. Speaker, international political organizations and an international police force can be developed to enforce peace for a time but in the long run a lasting peace must be reenforced by enlightened mutual understandings, appropriate concepts of equity and justice, and by the application of the principles of Christian brotherhood. Education and religious training are therefore vital factors if peace is to rest on a firm foundation and if selfishness, greed, ambition, and disregard for the rights of others are not again to plunge the world into war at some awful future date. My resolution proposes, simply, to create an agency for the purpose of facilitating the development of appropriate cultural, moral, spiritual, and educational concepts among the peoples of the world.

It is important that statesmen and military leaders work together to prevent war and to that end on January 6, 1943, I introduced in the House the first resolution (H. J. Res. 28) designed to bring together such a conference in this country on a strictly nonpartisan basis. It is equally important that the world's educators work together to set in motion training programs which will promote peace. Such an international office of education as I propose, Mr. Speaker, would do precisely that and nothing more. It is something to which the San Francisco Conference should give attention and if it fails to do so another and

separate United Nations conference should be called for that purpose.

If school children throughout the world can be taught the virtues of human decency and the idealism expressed in the Atlantic Charter, the Ten Commandments, the American Bill of Rights, and other great patterns for correct human behavior instead of being trained to suspect their neighbors and to worship their States, it will give peace a sound foundation supported by church and school and thus make easier the success of international courts of justice and world-wide leagues of peace.

Such an agency as I conceive, Mr. Speaker, should form a basic part of the functioning of any world organization for the preservation of peace which may grow out of the sad sacrifices of this war. Whether such an organization is a closely knit assembly of nations or a loosely drawn association, the needs and the opportunities for an International Office of Education are equally great.

On January 24 of this year I introduced H. R. 1740 for the purpose of providing exchange scholarships among this country and the pan-American republics for use by the student teachers of the Western Hemisphere. The resolution I have today introduced carries this same philosophy another great step forward and expands it to include more than exchange students. I have held several conferences with representatives of the State Department and of the Office of Inter-American Coordinator on these matters, and it is expected that hearings will soon be started to consider H. R. 1740. I hope that the same or subsequent hearings before our Committee on Foreign Affairs will also consider my proposal for advocating the establishment of an International Office of Education.

Mr. Speaker, for a time I was myself a teacher in the public schools of South Dakota both at the secondary and at the college levels. I know from personal experience that the force of education is impossible to overestimate Let us resolve to direct this force insofar as possible throughout the world to the ways of peace and to the activities and attitudes which make peace possible and permanent.

A group known as the American Association for an International Office of Education has for some time been working on the development of such an office. Its president is Dr. Harlow Shapley, of Harvard College Observatory, and its secretary is Miss Mary Stewart French, of New York City. I have had several conferences with Miss French, and she has left with me a list of organizations interested in the development of some type of organized international effort in the field of education. For the information of the Congress and the country, I am including this list as a part of these remarks. The list follows herewith:

M. S. Cartwright, American Association for Adult Education, 525 West One Hundred and Twentieth Street, New York, N. Y.

Roscoe L. West, American Association of Teachers Colleges, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.

Katherine McHale, American Association of University Women, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; alternate: Esther Caukins Brunauer.

Mrs. Marguerite Ann Stewart, American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc., 129 East Fifty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; alternate: Bruno Lasker.

Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies, 1219 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

David Segel, American Educational Research Association, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Bess Goodykoontz, observer, United States Office of Education.

John Patterson, observer, United States Office of Education.

C. O. Arndt, observer, United States Office of Education.

Harry M. Lydenberg, director, Board of International Relations of American Library Association, study room 251, Library of Congress Annex, Washington, D. C.

Guy E. Snavely, executive director, Association of American Colleges, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Rayford W. Logan, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

John Childs, chairman, Commission on Post-war Planning of American Federation of Teachers, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Donald DuShane, Commission on Defense of Demrocracy Through Education of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Ben M. Cherrington, Committee on International Relations of National Education Association, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

Pault H. Sheats, director, New Tools for Learning, Department of Adult Education of National Education Association, 280 Madison Avenue, New York.

Eva G. Pinkston, Department of Elementary School Principals of National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Paul J. Leonard, Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development of National Education Association, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C. Alternate: Harold Fox.

Herbert S. Houston, Institute for Advancement of Visual Education and Vocational Training, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Stephen Duggan, Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.; alternate: Edgar Fisher.

Selma M. Borchardt, World Federation of Education Associations—American Federation of Teachers, Homer Building, Washington, D. C.

Joseph F. Landis, American Federation of Teachers, 506 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Kenneth Holland, observer, Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Commerce Building, Fourteenth Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

James Marshall, American Association for an International Office for Education, Inc., 135 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Ralph Turner, observer, Division of Science, Education, and Art, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

Charles Thompson, observer, Division of Science, Education, and Art, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

John W. Studebaker, observer, Commissioner of Education, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Robert H. Fife, Modern Language Association, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Paul R. Hanna, Commission on Resources and Education of National Education and Progressive Education Associations, School of Education, Stanford University, California.

Mary E. Leeper, observer, Association of Childhood Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Roy G. Ross, general secretary, International Council on Religious Education, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Henry Gratton Doyle, Modern Language Association of America, study room 128, Library of Congress Annex, Washington, D. C.

Paul Elicker, National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Monsig. George Johnson, National Catholic Educational Association, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.; alternate: James E. Cummings.

Harry A. Domincovich, National Council of Teachers of English, Germantown Friends School, Coulter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

I. James Quillen, National Council for the Social Studies, School of Education, Stanford University, California.

Erling Hunt, National Council for the Social Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

William G. Carr, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Vinal H. Tibbetts, Progressive Education Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

George F. Zook, American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Alice Ewen, observer, Association of Childhood Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Our Latin Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times:

OUR LATIN HEROES

(By Frank Finch)

You have only to scan the battle casualty lists that appear in the daily newspapers of southern California to appreciate the magnificent contribution being made in this war by our fighting men of Mexican descent. Day in and day out such Latin names as Rios, Marquez, Castellano, Luna, Guerrero, Garcia, Calderon, Macias, Valles, Ortiz, Olivera, Vasquez, de la Cruz, and Chavez are liberally sprinkled through the ever-lengthening tabulations of dead, wounded, and missing.

Their blood has stained the beaches at Iwo Jima and Saipan and mixed with the mud of Aachen. They have shot Japs on Bataan and bombed Berliners. They performed countless deeds of derring-do in Burma, Tunisia, Sicily, and France.

IN TOUGH OUTFITS

Many are with our toughest fighting units—the Marine Raiders, Army Rangers, and paratroops—outfits in which casualties are inordinately high. Others have bravely manned every conceivable kind of fighting ship afloat.

Actual statistics are not available from the War and Navy Departments, but a well-informed Los Angeles Mexican estimates that there are 200,000 young men of Mexican descent now wearing Uncle Sam's uniform. Some 100,000 of these warriors are from California, with the Southland claiming a substantial majority of that number. Many Mexican nationals have joined the United States service, so keen are they to keep the torch of liberty aflame.

AN EXAMPLE

A striking illustration of the sacrifices they are making is to be found in the casualty list printed in the Times March 22. This list bore the names of 133 wounded soldiers from southern California, names like Dudley, Standerfer, Goldberg, Barnum, Wheeler, and Mitchell. But it also contained 34 names like Obregon, Tapia, Contreras, Quesada, and Dominguez—better than 25 percent of the total number listed.

Out of curiosity I have been watching the official lists of decorations for the last few days. During that time I noted that Staff Sgt. Oscar J. Alvarez, Sgt. Almundo A. Torrez, and Pvt. (1st cl.) Pedro Hernandez had been awarded the Silver Star, the Nation's fifth highest decoration.

OTHER DECORATIONS

Sgt. Jesus M. Luque, Pvt. (1st cl.) Rudolph Rodriquez, and Pvt. Pedro M. Ramirez in the meanwhile have won the Bronze Star, and Technical Sgt. Daniel G. Leyva has had the Distinguished Flying Cross pinned on his tunic. The French Government recently awarded the Croix de Guerre with Palm to Sgt. Edward M. Figueroa, Staff Sgt. Faustino Bandurrago, Sgt. Albert M. Garcia, Sgt. Pedro Manriquez, and Corp. Eusebio J. Garcia in a mass presentation ceremony. There are many others who have received recognition for heroism and bravery—some of them posthumously—but the above list will give you a faint idea of their part in the war.

SEVEN SONS

This piece would not be complete without mention of Rev. and Mrs. Francisco Nevarez, of Los Angeles, whose seven sons all volunteered for Navy duty. Samuel is in the Marines, while Daniel, Frank, Felix, Manuel, Gilbert, and Encarnacion wear the Navy blue.

A prized possession of their proud parents is this letter from Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal: "The splendid manner in which your seven sons have responded to the colors and the fine records they possess reflect the sense of loyalty and patriotism they have learned at home."

Black Hills of South Dakota Proposed as Permanent Home for International Peace Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including in the RECORD at this point a letter of which I have sent identical copies to Senator VANDENBERG and to Representative SOL BLOOM offering the suggestion that the Black Hills of South Dakota be selected as the permanent home for the capital of the international world organization to preserve the peace which right-minded citizens everywhere are hoping will emerge from the sacrifices of this war.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ART: In addition to my suggestion concerning the international peace patrol of the air machinery to be developed at the San Francisco Conference, which I have discussed at length in the accompanying letter, I want to pass along to you this other suggestion for you to carry along to San Francisco with you in your portfolio.

The new world organization will require an international capital somewhere. I have noticed comments in the newspapers indicating that it might be relocated at Geneva or in Prague and that Mexico City is offering to make facilities available. Permit me to add this additional suggestion.

This time let's work to bring the international capital to the Western Hemisphere, where we have such a long and rich tradition of international tranquillity. Let us strive to locate it in the United States, where the world has been accustomed to look successfully for unselfish international behavior and a sincere desire to preserve and perpetuate a peace which is just alike to great nations and small and which is devoid of all vicious expectations of imperialism.

Where in the United States you ask: The people of South Dakota speak with one voice in proposing that this international capital be located among the majestic mountains of the Black Hills, of South Dakota, somewhere in the vicinity of Rapid City. In this age of air travel, South Dakota's Black Hills lie near the center of the universe, equally accessible to all, and completely removed from any possible scene of international conflict or attack by land, sea, or air. In this congenial climate surrounded by the beautiful lakes and mountains of the Black Hills and cradled in an environment of peace and solemnity, the statesmen of the world should approach their labors in an area smiled upon by God and fashioned by the Creator for the greatest task of all humanity—the business of making wars impossible.

Certainly, these statesmen would be inspired and awed by the great statues on Mount Rushmore and these vast works of art would be an object lesson to the good counselors of peace that the workings of justice and of international good will are those which endure throughout eternity.

When President Calvin Coolidge spent his summer in the Black Hills he was inspired to make his historic statement, "I do not choose to run."

Here, indeed, is an environment in which the statesmen of the world can carve out a program which will demonstrate by its effectiveness that the peoples of the world have made a choice not to war again.

If opportunity presents itself, Art, I hope you will call to the attention of the proper authorities the availability of the Black Hills, of South Dakota, as a location for the international peace capital of the world.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Young Infantry Officer Who Routed 200 Nazis Awarded Honor Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 3, 1945:

A 23-year-old infantry officer who used his fists as well as his weapons in putting five German machine guns and many of their crewmen out of a desperate fight near Pompey, France, on September 14, posthumously has been awarded the Medal of Honor, the War Department announced today.

Apparently unwounded in the melee of fists and grenades, during which 17 members of his platoon finally joined him in routing 200 Germans, he was killed in another fight on November 16.

He was First Lt. Edgar H. Lloyd, of Blytheville, Ark., who graduated from the University of Arkansas in 1943 to go into the Three Hundred and Nineteenth Regiment of the Eightieth Infantry Division. Altogether, he and his small platoon destroyed 12 machine guns and killed more than 100 German soldiers in that bit of action in France. At that time he was a second lieutenant.

PINNED DOWN BY FIRE

Lieutenant Lloyd's company, ordered to take the German machine-gun nests, was pinned down by cross-fire 50 yards from the fortified position.

The young platoon leader ran forward alone and jumped into the first machine-gun position.

Knocking out the gunner with a single blow of his fist, he dropped a hand grenade and jumped out before it exploded, destroying the enemy weapon. He moved from one weapon to another, pinning the Germans down with accurate fire from his tommygun until he was close enough to hurl hand grenades. With unerring aim, he put four more guns out of commission.

Inspired by the valor of this one-man attack, and with deadly cross-fire eliminated by Lieutenant Lloyd's actions, Staff Sgt. William B. Humphrey, of Rochester, Ky., led 16 men in a bayonet and grenade charge. They killed and routed the rest of the enemy.

How Lieutenant Lloyd met his death in the subsequent action was not disclosed today.

The Nation's highest award "for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty," will be presented to the lieutenant's father, Edgar B. Lloyd, of Blytheville, Friday, at a Second Army headquarters, Memphis, Tenn.

Lieutenant Lloyd was commissioned a second lieutenant at Fort Benning, Ga., on November 9, 1943, and went overseas as a platoon leader. He was promoted to first lieutenant last October 29.

The Royal Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as a part of these remarks I am including the text of a brief bill which I have today introduced in the House for the purpose of naming the new veterans' hospital in South Dakota, for which construction bids are now being secured, the Royal Johnson Memorial Hospital.

Many of you who are now serving in the House remember with fond recollections the great service which the late Royal C. Johnson rendered in this body for a long series of succeeding Congresses. You will remember, especially, the Trojan work he did as the first chairman of the World War Veterans' Com-

mittee, which is now so ably headed by the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN. Under the leadership of Royal Johnson, this Nation began its great construction program of veterans' hospitals.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress, when in 1939 I first introduced a bill to construct a veterans' hospital in South Dakota, my proposal carried with it the suggestion that it be named the Royal Johnson Memorial Hospital, and many colleagues spoke to me about the matter at that time saying they felt this would indeed by a fitting tribute to the untiring service which Royal Johnson, of South Dakota, rendered the veterans of the First World War.

However, approval for the building of this hospital—which has now been located in Sioux Falls—was finally covered in as part of an omnibus construction bill, so a separate act of Congress is required to officially designate it in memory of Royal Johnson. I am sure that those of you who served with Royal Johnson will join me in my efforts to have this great new facility dedicated to his memory and his service. Your support of this legislation will be deeply appreciated.

A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility to be constructed at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the Royal Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital

Be it enacted, etc., That the Veterans' Administration facility under contract for construction at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., shall be known and designated at the Royal Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

The Benefits of Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an address made by Charles S. Hazen, an engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Rotary Club of Whitefish, Mont., on March 12, 1945, on the subject The Benefits of Irrigation. Mr. Hazen has active charge of the investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation preliminary to the preparation of the report on the irrigation phases of the Hungry Horse project. This project was approved by the enactment of the Hungry Horse Authorization Act on June 5, 1944, which I had the honor of introducing and sponsoring before the House.

Mr. Hazen has stated very clearly the reasons why the Hungry Horse irrigation project is of major interest to Montana:

When Mr. Arnold wrote and requested me to appear before your club, he suggested as a topic the Benefits of Irrigation, and suggested some discussion of what was necessary to be done in order to secure the project here in upper Flathead Valley.

As Regional Director Banks told the Flathead Valley Citizens' Committee, the Bureau of Reclamation is not a promotion agency. We cannot force irrigation on anyone; we cannot give it to anyone; as a matter of fact, most people have to work like the devil to get it, and must be willing to contract for repayment of the reimbursable cost of their system before they get it.

Before discussing this subject, or subjects, further, I would like to say that I do not think that most people realize just how important and valuable water resources really are. When you compare them to other physical resources such as minerals or timber, only then do they take on the aspect of the true value that they really have. When you have cut off a stand of timber or worked out a mineral claim, those resources are gone, but a water resource is permanent and perpetual—it is good forever; you cannot destroy it or wear it out. Therefore each and every community should look toward the ultimate use of their just share of this perpetual source of wealth and think in terms of ultimate use of this resource. We hear time and again that the farmers in the valley do not want irrigation at this time; that may be true, but we, as a water-planning agency, would certainly be remiss in our duty if we did not work out plans for using a share of the water resources of the Flathead River and tributaries in this valley. Eventually the farmers will want irrigation, and they will be appreciative of the fact that someone had the foresight to earmark a few hundred thousand acre-feet of water for them.

Originally any group that wanted a project contacted the Bureau and made a formal request for an investigation and a report. If found feasible then Congress was asked to authorize the project. If repayment contract negotiations were successful then Congress was asked for money with which to build the project works. Nowadays things are different. Instead of each project being planned separately and individually, without regard to its relationship to other developments, it is the general policy of all of the agencies dealing with water to work out the complete plan of ultimate development for an entire river basin. Thus all projects are studied collectively as well as individually, and a plan for over-all development is evolved. In this manner all interests are safeguarded. Hence, many projects are being investigated in advance of a concerted demand for such investigation, in order that a reservation for future use of water will be assured. As far as the Hungry Horse project is concerned, it has been authorized for construction, and there has been congressional authorization for such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the authorizing act. This project consists of two units: a storage-and-power unit and an irrigation unit. Construction of the first unit may proceed as appropriations are made available. However, for the irrigation unit it will be necessary to present a feasibility finding and report before any appropriations will be made for it. Even then no construction will be done before a repayment contract from the water users is assured. This repayment is based on a 40-year period, without interest. That is about the size of the legal and financial aspects of what must be done to secure final congressional approval and action; of course, there still remains the educational and promotional work that must be done by private local interests. The Flathead Valley committee has made a fine start on this program, but there remains much hard work to be done.

As to the benefits of irrigation, first of all I would like to say that irrigation is not a panacea or cure-all for all of the ills of agriculture. The farmer is often beset by two main evils, crop failure and low prices. Irrigation cannot do anything about low prices, but it can end the evil of crop failures due to insufficient moisture.

It is self-evident that irrigated agriculture enjoys three favorable conditions—certainty, abundance, and variety; certainty in that a crop is assured; abundance because the water can be applied at the proper time to insure bumper crops; and diversity because with controlled moisture any crop that will tolerate given climatic conditions can be grown. In this last respect irrigation helps best the evil of low prices due to a one-crop economy and resulting glutted markets.

From certainty of crops come two direct benefits: increased yields and elimination of fallowing. Fallowing has no place in irrigation except as a weed-control measure. The increase in crop values from these benefits is great, often doubling or trebling the income per acre. During the recent drought years it was not uncommon for many farmers to get together and pray for rain. With irrigation, the farmer is assured his run of water, and his activities can be planned accordingly. Also, marketing opportunities are better where crop production is stabilized and yields are assured.

From abundance of crops come greater returns per acre and per farm. After all, the cost of cultivation and harvest is very little more for a bumper crop than for a short one, hence the added increment of crop yield and return tends to make operations more profitable, and allows utilization of smaller farm units, which makes settlement opportunities, in turn.

From variety of crops comes the chance for a farmer to grow not only the ordinary farm crops, but where climatic and soil conditions are favorable, specialty or noncompetitive crops, as well. A whole new field of enterprise may be opened to him through use of irrigation.

Probably the greatest intangible benefit is that soil-building and conservation practices go hand-in-hand with irrigation. The one-crop dry-land type of farming is purely a wearing-out process, as far as the soil fertility is concerned; and there is little incentive or opportunity for soil-building practices with this system. However, with irrigation, conservation of land and water go hand-in-hand. Use of cover crops stops surface erosion and helps build an organic mulch that helps conserve water. Since livestock raising is usually an integral part of irrigation farming, the use of animal manure is almost required as a sanitation measure. Use of these manures and commercial fertilizers is also encouraged by the greater returns from more intensive farming. Crop rotation and diversification results in soil-building, rather than soil-depletion. The soil-building crops usually do very well under irrigation, and, therefore, fit in perfectly under a rotation program. Recent scientific experiments have shown that it is possible to add chemicals, particularly ammonia, to irrigation water, thus making it easier to get the necessary nitrogenous materials into the soil. This field is new, and will doubtless produce some amazing results some day.

In general, where a new project goes in, a family of five can be supported on 80 to 100 acres instead of the usual 160 to 200 acres on dry-farmed land. Thus the farm population of an area can often be doubled through use of irrigation. It has also been the experience on reclamation projects that for every new person on the farm there are two new persons supported in cities and towns serving the area. For each of these new persons in the area the assessed valuations will increase about $1,000. This broadening of the tax base, due to increase in population and the increase of land values themselves is quite an important benefit in itself.

Greater farm incomes on more farms and larger urban populations make added business through increase of local purchasing power. It is estimated that about three-fourths of

the cash income on irrigated farms in the West finds its way east of the Mississippi River, going for manufactured products, insurance, etc. As the irrigated acreage is expanded, this purchasing power will increase, opening up new internal markets.

Franchise values of railroads and other public services are increased, and the spread of benefits from irrigation farming is so great that it is impossible to trace it clear out.

Last year's crop values on the 4,000,000 acres of land that are furnished water by or are included in reclamation projects were just under $400,000,000, or about $100 per acre. In many cases the crop return of last year alone from a single project exceeded the original construction cost of the project. For instance, crop values on the 400,000-acre Yakima project last year were $65,000,000, or $160 per acre. The entire cost of that project was $32,000,000, or about half of last year's crop values.

You often hear the question, Why irrigate more land? The best answer is that in general irrigation does not compete with the agriculture of the Midwest and East; it is complementary to it. The major surplus crops of ordinary times—corn, cotton, wheat, and tobacco—are not raised in quantity on irrigated land. Over half of the irrigated land in the West is used for raising hay and pasture for livestock feed. Other specialty crops such as sugar beets, beans, fruits, nuts, dates, winter vegetables, mint, and many others too numerous to mention, are not in direct competition with other sections of the country. The livestock raised on irrigated land go in part, at least, to the Midwest and the coast for fattening or finishing, and thus irrigated farming and dry-land farming are complementary to each other.

There are 20,000,000 acres in the West now irrigated. Existing unused water supplies will allow—through multiple-purpose development—irrigation of about an additional 20,000,000 acres. Some 14,000,000 persons are supported in the States where irrigation is practiced on a large scale. There is no reason to believe that this population could not be doubled through development of the remaining irrigation possibilities and natural resources of the West. The development of low-cost power will play a large part in this expansion. Today it is said that the reclamation twins—irrigation and power—are inseparable. Tht potential project right here in the valley bears that out.

In conclusion, I think that probably the greatest benefit from irrigation is the establishment of permanent, self-sustaining farms and homes. That was the original purpose of the Reclamation Act and it is the guiding principle of reclamation activity today. Sound and permanent development in the West has always been based on irrigated agriculture, and it is safe to predict that the future growth and development of the West will be ever more dependent on the reclamation twins—irrigation and power.

I thank you.

Liberty Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was Machiavelli, I believe, who in his famous book, The Prince—about 1513—defined the state as sheer political power. He declared that the sole function of princes and rulers was to acquire and to use power, and that in using their power they were the sole judges of the ends to be attained by it, and need not be restrained by the rules of morality and religion that were binding upon private individuals. This ancient and immoral rule has been revived and invoked by the three great rulers of modern time to enslave Poland and to betray the small nations which from the first put their trust in the supposed integrity of at least two of the Big Three rulers. Through the intrigue of three rulers in applying the doctrine of Machiavelli, Poland and her neighboring small countries have lost their liberties which, as in the case of individuals, is equivalent to death. No matter to what extent pious phrases may saturate the atmosphere of the San Francisco Conference, the dark, malignant spirit of Machiavelli will be at the elbow of each delegate reminding him that neither the rules of morality nor religion are binding upon him in dealing with Poland and the small nations. There was a time when our delegates to any international conference could say:

That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country—that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the foundation of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and scepter * * * is character.

In the light of the secret commitments made at Yalta, some of which have now come to light, the declaration of the supreme board of the Polish Women's Alliance of America relative to the Crimean conference can be appreciated by liberty-loving people. Under leave to extend, I insert as a part of my remarks the appeal made by these patriotic women of Polish extraction to the people of the United States, as follows:

THE DECLARATION OF THE SUPREME BOARD OF THE POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE OF AMERICA RELATIVE TO THE CRIMEAN CONFERENCE

After a careful study of the policies agreed upon at the conference at Yalta, we women of Polish extraction approaching this subject from an American point of view cannot understand how a country as liberty loving as the United States of America could agree to the overwhelming demands of Russia for Polish territory, and through this directly aiding and abetting her in extending her influence throughout Europe and the world.

If we study the map of Europe after taking into consideration a defeated Germany and the occupation of the Reich by the American, English, and Soviet Armies, we can see from a geographic position a Poland firmly in the clutches of Russia. This position is as dangerous as was her German neighbor, and starts her off to slow extermination.

We are profoundly disturbed by this gross injustice to the people of Poland not because we share a common heritage of blood, but because like the average American woman we demand a better solution to this problem which we believe as it stands now will plunge the world into another war. We ask, Is this the reward that awaits the Polish soldier for his daring on all the fighting fronts?

Is this the reward that awaits the Polish mothers for sending their men to battle in defense of the rights of others?

We ask again, is this the reward awaiting the Polish Nation for defending her lands and other lands at all times when freedom was at stake?

The Polish people fought their German aggressor; can it be that the world now condones the invasion from the east, and at the same time condemns the invader from the west?

Our position is very clear. We shall never acknowledge the aggression and the outrages committed upon the land of our forefathers, nor upon any other lands. In anticipation of any changes favorable to the Polish Nation, we are at the same time prepared for even a greater disenchantment—to which we shall react—not with tears and supplications for mercy—but shall expend our energies in building a resistance with such strength of character that even the mightiest enemy cannot tear down.

We admit today we are weak and are no match for brutal force; but we solemnly promise the American Nation, though they deal us even a deadlier blow than this, that we shall not waver in our obligations as pledged in the allegiance to her flag, under whose stars and stripes millions first saw the light of day, and under whose stars and stripes countless numbers of our members and their loved ones are fighting all over the globe.

We implore our women in this time of sorrow and national mourning to persevere in dignity. Teach the children to love the United States of America as the land of liberty, and spread this gospel of love until it permeates the hearts of all Americans who believe in the principles of freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, and freedom from superior forces in religious, political, and moral life.

Tell the children that these ideals must serve as a beacon light to this Nation, or else she will become a tool for hidden crimes and a bargainer for evil.

Tell them "to err is human" and that the Nation eventually will follow in the footpaths of her founders and makers of the Constitution, and that in love, great love beyond measure, there is also strength.

Teach the little ones to love truth, freedom, and beauty though there be none around them.

Teach them to sacrifice their blood and fortunes for their country. Tell them of our flag—that the lights in the stars have not gone out—that they are dimmed—and that great love and devotion will make them more brilliant again.

Teach the children thrift; tell them to save their pennies and dollars for bonds to win the war, and when they ask innocently if these bonds will purchase bullets to strike at the hearts of our loved ones across the ocean, assure them that he who breaks faith with our American ideals shall be judged by history and future generations for this treacherous act.

Preserve dignity and honor to the end, and let not malice enter your hearts. The destiny of this world is in the hands of God, and not in the hands of the dictators.

POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE OF AMERICA.

The Missouri River Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 6 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

delivered by Jerome Walsh in connection with a joint discussion with Hon. John B. Gage, mayor of Kansas City, before the open forum of the All Souls Unitarian Church, Kansas City, Mo., Sunday evening, March 25, 1945.

This is a scholarly review of the history and problems of the Missouri Valley and deserves the thoughtful study of the people of that area.

An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that the address will occupy in the RECORD more space that the two pages allowed by the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing without a statement of cost, which is estimated to be $169.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUBJECT

The subject for discussion, when broken down, implies a problem calling for the creation of an authority to deal with it and seeks to determine if the so-called Murray bill is the answer. I will deal with my analysis of the question in that order.

THE PROBLEM

The Missouri River is the most valuable asset the State of Missouri possesses. About a fourth of its length touches or lies wholly within our borders. We, as a people, have done little about it. Looking up the river to its source and viewing its basin as a whole, we, of the Missouri Valley, should admit frankly we have done practically nothing about it.

It has been said that of all the variable things in creation, the most uncertain are the actions of a jury, the state of a woman's mind, and the condition of the Missouri River. The Missouri has troubled and challenged men since the first white man, the Jesuit explorer, Father Pierre Marquette, first saw its mouth in June, 1673, in his travels down the Mississippi. He was frightened by it then, just like so many men today are frightened of its proper development for selfish or other reasons. The navigational problems presented by our river are almost as perplexing now as they were to the man who first charted its course above the Grand—the Frenchman, Etienne Venard de-Bourgmond. It is recorded that he left St. Louis, March 29, 1714. He probably paddled his way to a point a little above Kansas City. After his exploit, he triumphantly returned to France and reported his conquest to the French monarch Louis XV and was promptly given the commission of establishing a fort on the river and to make treaties with the Kansas and Padouca Indians. After much tribulation, he again fought his way up the Mississippi and into the Missouri with 40 men and commenced the construction of a fort, so it is thought, in the vicinity of Waverly in Carroll County.

In connection with his endeavor, I very much fear a precedent was established by the French monarch which has plagued the river and what to do with it ever since. It seems that the French Government conducted its affairs in much the same way as our own Government has conducted its efforts in seeking the solution of the Missouri's problems, for it is historical that when the French monarch commissioned de Bourgmond, he sent two other commissions along to keep him from accomplishing it. The enterprise ended in disaster.

I very much fear, too, that Lewis and Clark, when they went up the mighty stream in 1804 in their mapping of the way to the Northwest country, found the Missouri to be in not much better shape than it is today so far as its usefulness to the people is measured. Eliminate Fort Peck, a dike here, a dam there, and sparse revetment works along its course and I suppose it is just about the same. It is still unruly and unharnessed.

The Missouri Valley problem is vast in its proportions and stupendous in its scope. The river, finding its source at the juncture of the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin Rivers at Three Forks, Mont., flows east and south for 2,424 miles with its watershed draining partially the States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. Four State capitals are on its banks. There are 529,350 square miles in its shed, embracing the easterly slopes of the Rocky Mountains, the Great Plain States, and the territory more familiar to us in this great midwestern territory. Sixty percent of the watershed is north and west of Sioux City. The river cuts through some of the world's most fertile agricultural territory and could be made the useful servant of rich industrial development extending from Omaha to St. Louis. At times the upper reaches of the river and its tributaries above Sioux City are so short of water that life is difficult to sustain. The proper accumulation and fair diversion and distribution of available waters is of the very essence of the problem. Adequate flood control, soil conservation, power development, erosion, and silt control, and many other desirable social and economic ends are equally important elements of it.

The region was devastated by severe floods from Sioux City downward in 1844, 1881, 1903, 1908, 1919, 1927, 1935, 1942, 1943, and another of some proportion in 1944. Floods usually occur twice a year. It is said these floods are characteristic of the Missouri.

Very little rain precipitates these annual floods. The March rise is generally due to the melting of snow above Sioux City and the break up of river ice, while the June floods are occasioned by snow thaws in the mountains. It is estimated that the floods of 1943 alone caused damages in the sum of $35,000,000 in the main stream of the river alone. In short, the Missouri has been a rolling, devouring monster that has been the engine of the people's destruction, spiritually and materially, since the hand of God first carved its turbulent course. The Congress has spent great thought and millions upon millions of dollars for many years, but neither it nor the War Department have controlled the periodic flood stages of the river or even flash floods of local origin which themselves cause great damage.

The great proportion of the expenditure has been in the main stem extending from Sioux City to the mouth 17 miles north of St. Louis. Vast sums of public moneys have been expended, theoretically to control floods and to provide an adequate channel for navigation. To date, neither has been accomplished. We know floods have not been controlled but it is true there are occasional trips of water-borne commerce up and down the Missouri, but those instances represent token navigation and no more. At present there is supposed to be a guaranteed six-foot channel in the main stream, and theoretically, a 9-foot channel is 97 percent complete.

The agricultural lands of the valley are wasting in frightening proportions. The Missouri carries to the Mississippi and into the gulf a ton of soil every year from each of the valley's 400,000,000 acres. There is an urgent need for adequate and scientific soil conservation. The tools are present to work with. Ninety percent of the phosphate supply of the United States is located at the head water of the Missouri and a little beyond. Fertilizer is in abundance with which to remake the soil.

The Missouri Valley covers one-sixth of the Nation's area, but its population is only about 7,000,000, or one-twentieth that of the Nation's. The population has steadily decreased for 20 years. Tested under stress of war, the basin's ability to hold population is weak. It is estimated that 1,000,000 people have left the basin since 1940. For the decade 1929-39 the Missouri Valley group of States declined in a very material degree in the value of its manufactured goods, in wages and salaries paid, in retail trade, and in many fields of commerce. I will detail the figures later.

The development of hydroelectric power is practically nonexistent. It is estimated by the Federal Power Commission on the basis of preliminary surveys that at least 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy per year would be developed in connection with the presently contemplated storage dams without sacrifice of other benefits which th river can give to the growth and welfare of the region. Contrast this with the 35,000 kilowatt unit installed at Fort Peck in June 1943.

Concerning the use of electricity, the United States as a whole produced 96,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy in 1930. In 1940 it produced 145,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, a national gain of 51 percent. In 1930 the Missouri Valley group of States produced 6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours, in 1940 they produced 9,500,000,000—a gain, yes, of 42 percent, but less than the national average.

I think it is safe to say that by all accepted Government and private indices, the valley shows substantial retrogression in place of progress. That situation just has to be arrested.

The solution proposed to date is found chiefly in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 22, 1944, and 14 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved March 2, 1945. Both are purely make-shift. The act of December 22, 1944, is calculated to head off the enactment of the Missouri Valley Authority legislation. It is a hodgepodge that will foster in place of suppress the jealousies, rivalries and animosities of the War, Interior, Agricultural, and other departments that have so long frustrated sound development of the river and its tributaries. It embraces the so-called comprehensive, step-by-step Pick plan, which is no plan at all. It is but a statutory recognition of the controversies and the spurious thinking that for so long has been applied to the valley, and its needs.

Certainly if the plan was a sound one, it would have been decided ere this what best use and control could be made of the waters arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian and how much east. Adequate engineering studies conducted by a unified agency with fixed responsibility, disinterested in the development of any one theory to the exclusion of its concomitants, certainly should be able to determine whether or not there is sufficient water available to serve adequately the needs of irrigation, navigation, and flood control, to say nothing of power development.

Cries of socialism, imposition of superstates upon the people by social dreamers and other untruths will not thwart the advancement, socially and materially, of the people in this valley. The chief cry raised against this far-seeing legislation emanates undoubtedly from the spokesmen for the private electric-light interests of the country. In ostrich-like fashion, the electric industry seems dead set against progress if the methods to be employed suggest interference with its decadent business practices or its profit margin. The success of the Tennessee Valley Authority is living proof in the short space of 10 years that development of a great natural resource aids, not impairs, the private utility interests located in its territory.

A recent issue of the Electrical World, the accepted apologist for the private electrical industry, had this to say:

"Legislation for the creation of additional valley authorities has again come before Congress. That the development of a watershed by a multipurpose project produces benefits for the people in the area can hardly be disputed in the light of past experience with both T. V. A. and Bonneville.

"In fact, if it were not for the constant threat of loss of territory, it might be said that the Federal power competition was not

without value to utilities, for it has resu .ed rather generally in a more aggressive load-development program. And even where the competition has brought very low rates in its wake, there is as yet no indication that they have proven ruinous, even with high taxes. * * *

"It should be clear to the industry by this time that these valley authorities are here to stay. * * *

"The most elementary thinking, then, would seem to indicate that the successful utilities will be those which help these projects to move their power.

"In some areas, forward-looking operators are planning on exactly that procedure. They are likely to have far less difficulty with their Federal competition than operators who employ different tactics.

"Of course, it is not always as easily done as said. When the local authorities are not self-governing but must follow philosophies of anti-utility Washington officials, it is not easy to cooperate. On the other hand, autonomous valley authorities should present an entirely different situation because they want to live in peace in their area.

"It need not be thought, however, that an independent authority will be easy to handle. It will be just as firm and just as hard a bargainer, but it will bargain. Under such circumstances, businessmen come to an agreement that is mutually beneficial. * * *"

If what I say here this evening falls upon the ears of those irreconciliably opposed to Government development of our natural resources because of a fatuous belief that there is already too much Government abroad in the land, then my effort fails, but if there are those present who believe in progress and in the revitalization of our democracy, the facts are present to aid you in formulating the right conclusion.

The story of the Tennessee Valley points the course the Missouri Valley should follow. An infant of 10 years, so far as Government activities go, it has succeeded to the utter amazement of its most forthright enemies and beyond the hopes of its friends. It has converted the Tennessee Valley area, comprising the States of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Mississippi from a denuded backwoods section of the United States to empire proportions.

It has transformed the Tennessee from a rampaging monster to a stream of beautiful lakes, and in its bed a controlled 9-foot channel will be a fact this spring. In 1944 the Authority produced 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. Its program for the production of and application of phosphate fertilizer to the soil is a real national achievement. Thirty thousand farms in 28 test States are harvesting the benefits. Three thousand farmers in Missouri have adopted the Authority's recommendations for soil rebuilding. Siltation has practically disappeared due to the adoption by farmers of soil conservation measures arresting surface run-off. The waters of the Tennessee are now blue, not muddy. These are but a few of the Authority's accomplishments.

The Missouri Valley can find new frontiers too.

While the Missouri Valley States with a population of 7,000,000 from 1929 to 1939 showed a loss of 30 percent in manufactured goods from four and eight-tenths billions to three and three-tenths billions, the Tennessee group with 4,500,000 gained 5 percent from four and seven-tenths billions to five and forty-six thousandths billions. Again, during that same period in wages and salaries paid, the Missouri group showed the astounding loss of 21 percent from 631,000,000 to 496,000,000. On the other hand in the decade 1929 to 1939, the Tennessee group increased 5 percent from 828,000,000 to 870,000,000. You will note all figures I use exclude any year that has felt the impact of war.

The success of the Tennessee Valley is acclaimed by the majority of independent thought everywhere. It has been a laboratory for students and government commissions from every section of the earth, including China, India, Chile, and Peru. They have gone there and studied its accomplishments and potentialities. But more important than any other factor, it has the enthusiastic approval of those it was built to serve—the people of the Tennessee Valley. The following is one sample of what the business people think of the Authority's accomplishments to date. I wish time permitted quotations from scores of similar endorsements. It is written by Clifford Penland, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of Memphis, Tenn. It is this:

"There have been no harmful effects on this community from the operation of T. V. A. On the contrary, the program for flood control and betterment of economic conditions throughout the valley and adjoining areas, along with the expansion in river traffic which is beginning to result in a substantial way from the establishment of a year-around navigable series of lakes in place of a doubtful and capricious river, have, all of them, tended to do much for this area. The benefits of cheap power are immediately to be seen. The benefits from flood control, navigation, and betterment of farm conditions of the State move more slowly, but the Tennessee Valley and adjacent areas are growing in prosperity, which is attributable not only to cheap electric power but to these other phases of T. V. A.'s big program."

In Memphis, for instance, since T. V. A. power first started to flow in June 1938 residential rates have been reduced 45 percent and commercial rates 37½ percent on the average, so says the chamber of commerce of that city. Here is a contrast in electrical rates: In Kansas City for the first 25 kilowatt-hours for residence use, you pay $1.25 and for 250 kilowatt-hours, $7.50. In Knoxville, Tenn., you pay 75 cents and $5 for similar service. On the latter figure the difference is $2.50. To a householder of limited income or to a farmer's wife, the saving is a good start on the purchase of electric refrigeration or an electric pump. The rate for commercial light service in Kansas City starts at $2.70 for 50 killowatt-hours and ranges to $29.70 for 750 killowatt-hours. In Knoxville, it is 50 cents against $14. For commercial power service in Kansas City 375 killowatt-hours costs $16.78 and goes to $179.45 for 6,000 kilowatt-hours. In Knoxville, the range is from $9 to $78. As a reward for serving the cause of free enterprise in Kansas City, industrial service users (the manufacturers, if you will) pay $495 for 30,000 kilowatt-hours and $2,978 for 200,000 kilowatt-hours of power. Knoxville pays $360 and $1,810 for similar service.

Looking briefly to the experience of the private power companies in the Tennessee Valley after the impact of lower T. V. A. rates, five of the six companies in the entire United States which reflected the greatest increase in electric growth were in the southeast. The sale of electrical appliances skyrocketed. For instance, the Georgia Power Co., though twenty-third in size of the country's private utilities, during the first year of its rate reduction, sold more electric refrigerators than any other company in the country, regardless of size. It was the first in the sale of electric water heaters and second in the sale of electric ranges.

The Tennessee Electric Power Co., thirtieth in size in the country, sold the largest number of electric ranges, the second in number of electric refrigerators, and the third largest number of electric water heaters. The Tennessee Electric sold more home appliances than companies in the more populous and richer States of New York and Illinois.

Public Law No. 534 does not require the War Department or any other agency to build penstocks or other facilities whatsoever for the generation or transmission of hydroelectric energy in connection with any dam to be constructed under the supervision of the War Department. Yet spokesmen for the Corps of Army Engineers frankly admit that to build dams along the Missouri or her tributaries without complementary programs of soil conservation, control of water run-off, erosion, and siltration would cause those dams to become "completely silted up within 50 years * * *" and thus rendered worthless. I have never heard of a more uneconomic approach to the solution of a major public necessity. If hydroelectric facilities are made an equal consideration in the construction of the dams now proposed their cost could be amortized in a period somewhat in excess of 50 years with a fair return on the investment and at rates 50 percent less than we are now paying, if the T. V. A. experience in these respects can be employed as a yardstick. It appears that the benefits of low-cost power to our people is in the distant future if the decision is left to the Corps of Army Engineers.

In 1944 the Tennessee Valley residential user purchased his electricity at 1.88 cents a kilowatt-hour, as against a national average of 3.55 cents. The same Tennessee Valley householder used an average of 1,707 kilowatt-hours as against the national average of 1,117. The T. V. A. consumer used 53 percent more electricity, yet his average annual bill was $32.16 compared with the national average of $39.65.

I shall never subscribe to the proposition that our natural resources from which so much of the wealth and power of this country are derived, should be the subject of private exploitation by a powerful few at the expense of the public good. Let me make myself clear; private ownership and operation of private enterprise is right and proper and is an American doctrine that makes our Nation strong. But private ownership and operation of public resources for private profit is another matter. The manifold resources of the Missouri Valley belong to us all. Properly administered for the public good, it can bring the blessings of scientific advance; the elimination of daily personal drudgery to thousands of men and women in scattered and remote towns and farms with resulting enrichment to the lives of numberless of our citizens. Privately owned and operated, they will, it is true, bring tremendous wealth to a fortunate few. But the benefits to be gained by the extension of our public resources by the private operator will be made only on the basis of our ability to pay the private corporations' exorbitant, and in many instances, extortionate fees and not upon the basis of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Let me emphatically repeat—for it is fundamental to our American way of life—the Nation's public resources are a public trust to be administered by public servants for the public good.

David Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, who has magnificently discharged his great trust, flatly lays down the proposition that a river basin should be developed as a whole. In his great book, T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, he says:

"For the practical purposes of Federal legislation, this is a country of regions, not States. * * *

"Modern regionalism, by contrast, rests squarely upon the supremacy of the national interest. It admits that there are problems and resources common to areas larger than any single State—a river basin, for example. It recognizes that certain points of view develop in some portions of the country and are not shared by the Nation as a whole. It affirms and insists, however, that the solution of regional problems and the development of regional resources are matters of concern to the whole country. It proposes to harmonize regional advancement with the national welfare. That concern for and supremacy of the national interest distinguishes 'region-

alism' from 'sectionalism.' Under the banner of sectionalism, States throughout our history have combined to support or to oppose Federal action. Under the modern concept of regionalism, the Federal Government acts to meet regional needs to the end that the entire Nation may profit."

Having thus considered some of the high lights of the problem, let us now explore the possibilities of an answer.

THE ANSWER

What is the answer then to the problem I have attempted to detail? Where is the solution to the mighty turbulence, the social and economic questions of the great Missouri? I repeat, is it to be found in piling Government bureau upon bureau, agency upon agency, and trusting to luck upon the human vagaries and jealousies of the human beings that run them or is there a simpler and more flexible mechanism available. I believe there is. I think it is found in the proposal now pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of Senate bill No. 555, introduced by the junior Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY. Remembering the point of discussion here this evening, "Shall a Missouri Valley Authority be created as proposed by the Murray bill?", we must know what the Murray bill provides in testing the question to see if it affords the answer our subject seeks.

The bill's preamble is this:

"To establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities, and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes."

The touchstone of the act, yes, the very heart of it is the proposal to "provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River." Unification of the various elements necessary in licking the Missouri is the essentiality.

Briefly, what do the 55 pages of the bill seek to achieve? It wants the Federal Government to establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the entire river, its tributaries and watershed, and such surrounding territory as may materially be affected thereby; a special regional agency would be entrusted with the administration of a multipurposed program for the prevention of floods, reclamation of land, use of the waters of the river for irrigation, and other useful purposes to insure navigation, to promote family-type farming, industrial development, and in fostering further utilization of the resources of the region for promoting the general welfare of the United States.

Its headquarters must be in the region and be fully responsible to the President and the Congress. The Authority must utilize to the fullest extent the advice and cooperation of the people of the region, their local, State, public, and private organizations, together with the advice and counsel of existing operating agencies of the Government.

The Corporation must maintain its principal office in a convenient place in the territory. What a grand opportunity for Kansas City lies in this section of the proposal. Lying strategically, you might say, midway along the navigable portion of the river, here at her great right angle, where she bends toward St. Louis, is the strategic, the logical, and the economical place for the headquarters of a Missouri Valley Authority. It's too bad our policy-making city officials and the powerful civic forces of the community are not forward-looking enough to envision the possibility.

The Corporation would be managed by a board of directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to serve from 3 to 9 years. They must be citizens of the United States and would receive a salary of $15,000 per annum. They must not have a financial interest in any public utility company nor any business that may be adversely affected by the success of the corporation. The Board has a right to appoint its own employees without consideration of civil service requirements. No political test or qualification for employment would be countenanced and for violation of the rule dismissal is provided. Any member of the Board who exacts them would be subject to the penalties of law.

Section 6 of the act contains a most interesting and revolutionary innovation in government. It provides for an advisory and consultive committee of the principal officers of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, War, Federal Power, Federal Security and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, together with 9 persons resident in the area of the Authority to be appointed by the President to represent the interest of agriculture, commerce and labor in equal numbers. I believe that the advisory committee, if strongly staffed, would be a powerful instrument in the formation of the broad public policies of the Missouri Valley Authority if it becomes a reality. It would be the answer to the specious charge that M. V. A. is a device of the dreamers to remake the lives of our people.

The corporation would have the usual incidents of corporate life and would be, by law, an inhabitant and resident of the judicial district in which its principal office is located. If in Kansas City, Judges Reeves, Collet, Duncan, and the prospective new Judge Ridge, would be the men who would judicially guide the authority's fortunes and those aggrieved by its action would have recourse to them, together with the other district courts of the United States where proceedings would be instituted. However, if the headquarters were located in Kansas City, these judges would have exclusive jurisdiction in proceedings involving the validity of the act, or of the conduct of its employees under color of the act. In any event, the district court of the residence of the Corporation would have that exclusive jurisdiction.

Getting down to the question of finances, section 8 requires that its funds be obtained by ordinary Budget appropriations; that it make usual financial statements and reports on its business during each fiscal year and its affairs must be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States at such times as he shall determine. The Comptroller General must make a separate report of the authority's operations to the President and to Congress. All net proceeds each year derived from the sale of power, water, and other products manufactured must be paid to the Treasury of the United States. Admitted then a going corporate concern, to what business must the corporation get down to make effectual the provisions of the Murray Act? It is summarized thus:

It would acquire and dispose of real and personal property at any point within its jurisdiction with the exception that the corporation could not sell any real property upon which is located a permanent dam, hydroelectric plant or munitions plant owned by the United States or the Corporation.

In the acquisition of supplies and services obtained by contract, usual advertising must be resorted to with minor exceptions.

Up to this point, we see that there is yet nothing for the Corporation to do. It can't control a flood. It can't provide for navigation on the river. It can build no dam or hydroelectric site. It, in fact, is an impotent and sterile instrumentality. However, section 11 of the Murray bill, the very heart of the legislation, begins to unravel our dilemma. It is so important that I had better give you that one in full.

"(a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to formulate and report to the President and Congress with the utmost expedition, and in any event not later than 2 years from the enactment of this act, its recommendations for the unified development of the Missouri Valley region in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act. Such recommendations shall include a complete plan for the unified control and utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system, which will reconcile and harmonize the requirements for flood control, navigation, reclamation, agricultural purposes, power, and other needs in such a way as to secure the maximum public benefit for the region and Nation: *Provided, however,* That if the board determines that there is or will be an insufficient stream flow from waters arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian to satisfy both the beneficial consumptive uses of such waters for domestic irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes west of such meridian and navigation requirements for such waters east of the meridian, the plan shall give priority to the satisfaction of the said beneficial uses of such waters west of said meridian. In formulating such a unified plan and recommendations, the Corporation shall give particular consideration to the general plans contained in the public documents described in section 12 (b) of this act and shall conduct such additional surveys and investigations as it deems necessary or proper, and shall enlist the advice and assistance of appropriate local, State, and Federal governmental agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations. Particular consideration in such a plan and recommendations shall be given to projects and activities which shall serve the following purposes:".

The section then goes on through four additional subsections delineating the considerations that must be given to the multipurposes of the act, flood prevention, navigation, improvement of the soil, erection of dams, reservoirs, reclamation of arid and semiarid lands, and a world of other minutia, which for years have been points of jurisdictional turmoil and strife between the Corps of Engineers of the Army, the Director of the Budget, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and Lord knows how many more. The division of opinion and authority has been so sharp that even section 11 takes note of the claims for priority between the Bureau of Reclamation fighting for water for irrigation in the upper reaches of the river and the War Department just as tenaciously striving for flood control and navigation. The act makes it the Board's duty to determine the deficiency of flow of waters arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian so that the most "beneficial consumptive uses of such water" shall be made. The ninety-eighth meridian runs just about at Mitchell, S. Dak., and if extended on a line southward, would strike at about Hutchinson, Kans. At the point where the meridian cuts the Missouri above Sioux City is about where irrigation ends, and flood control and navigation begin. How can antagonistic government agencies solve who gets how much water at that point?

As I have mentioned heretofore, if the matter becomes controversial between the War and Interior Departments, what will be the substance of the reports each will make to Congress in conformity with the provisions of the river-and-harbor bill? When the issue is thrown into the lap of Congress, how will it decide the controversy? Will it be done upon engineering, and the region as a whole basis, or will a majority of congressman decide it, because they like Henry L. Stimson better than they do Harold L. Ickes?

One thing is certain, the situation will afford the Congressmen with sectionalized viewpoints a wide range within which to roll out the old pork barrel.

A unified authority not bound by thoughts of agency aggrandisement guided exclusively by the common good could, and I feel would, do it in the best interests of the country and of those our river should serve.

The plan must give due consideration to existing recommendations of governmental departments and must be filed in both houses of the Congress and remain there for its study for a period of 120 days and for a like period should Congress adjourn before the expiration of the first 120-day period. If it is not affirmatively disapproved after such period, it becomes law.

The Fort Peck Dam, now under control of the War Department could be entrusted to the Corporation by the President under prescribed circumstances.

Until a multipurpose unified plan is adopted, only such projects shall be constructed as had been heretofore recommended to Congress by the War and Interior Departments.

The Corporation has wide power to acquire and construct electric energy production facilities by water, steam, and otherwise not inconsistent with the other principally desired ends of navigation and flood control. Of course, it would have the right, after consultation with public business and private corporations, to make contracts for the relocation of existing public and private facilities.

Elaborate provisions are provided for the delivery of surplus water to public and private agencies but whenever any lands are to be benefited within the Federal ownership, the Corporation shall survey, plat, and analyze the land and divide it into units consisting of family type farms. Such farms will include no more than 160 acres of irrigable land and no person would be permitted to own in excess of that figure.

To me this is a most desirable objective. As the excessive concentration of industrial and financial power of the Nation in the hands of a few is destructive of democracy, so is the concentration of the land in large corporate and individual ownerships dangerous to a well-balanced society. Fair and just provision for adequate appraisal of all lanlds to be bought and sold is provided.

Section 14 permits the Corporation to dispose of surplus power generated by it to public and private corporations and to individuals, but the preference is given to public bodies. Its rates should be such as will attract and provide adequate markets for its electric energy so as to encourage the widest possible use thereof. The Corporation's powers in connection with the distribution of its waters are equally elastic and helpful to its widest dissemination and use and at low cost to its purchasers.

In all respects standards of cost accounting consistent with the best practices employed by private business are required and the acquisition cost of such properties as dams and other similar improvements must be allocated to the purpose it subserves.

The Corporation must pay the States whose lands and other facilities have been acquired and removed from the rolls for local taxation purposes, at least 5 percent of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the Corporation upon a proportionate basis among the States affected. Congress must have a full report within 5 years as to the adequacy of the 5-percent payment to the States so that it may be determined that those States have not been deprived of their normal revenue.

Section 20 of the act envisions an orderly, proper development of the natural resources of the valley and gives it the right to establish laboratories and experiment stations for the promotion of its studies and plans for the widest approved use of electric power and water for irrigation and other purposes.

Of course, the Corporation has the right of eminent domain and provision is made for the appointment of the usual court commissioners in the fixation of value of lands condemned by the district court in which the land is located. The Corporation is given access to the Patent Office of the United States so as to enable it "to use and employ the most efficacious and economical processes in the course of its operations," with the right to recovery of damages by the owner of any patent for the infringement thereof.

Section 26 grants the preference in the disposition of any land which the Corporation offers for sale to the veterans of our military service.

The demand for a unified plan in the development of the river, with the possibility of sectional and agency differences eliminated, is thus afforded in the M. V. A. legislation. That the plan is workable is made clear by the experience of the T. V. A. Maybe not today nor tomorrow, but the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority is as inevitable as the onward march of man to a richer life, both spiritually and materially.

Social Security for Domestic Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have long advocated the extension of social security to cover domestic employees. Such employees were excluded from the original social-security law because it was felt in 1935 that the administrative difficulties involved would be so great as to make it impractical to cover them. Since that time we have had 9 years of experience with social security, and have had the opportunity to develop practical and convenient methods for covering workers in household employment. The entire subject of social security for domestic employees and the development of feasible methods for administering such a program are very ably discussed in an article by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, which appeared in the January issue of the Social Security Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Altmeyer's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR DOMESTIC EMPLOYEES

(By A. J. Altmeyer)

From the very beginning of the social-security program, it has been recognized that domestic employees needed the protection of social insurance just as much as industrial and commercial employees. Because general administrative experience was lacking, however, special problems in including domestic employees seemed much more forbidding then than now. Coverage of such employment is complicated by the fact that many persons employed in private homes receive part of their pay in the form of room and board, laundry, and similar wages in kind. More important, relatively few households have more than one paid worker, and a large proportion of the employees work for two or more families in the same week and often in the same day. Employing households therefore may nearly equal, if not exceed, the number of employees. The employment relationship also is frequently brief, and housewives generally keep no record of the wages they pay.

It therefore did not seem wise to attempt to bring household workers into old-age and survivors' insurance under the quarterly payroll reporting plan adopted for obtaining wage records and collecting contributions in industrial and commercial establishments. Housewives could not be expected to make quarterly reports to the Government. The inclusion of household workers in the program was therefore deferred until experience had been gained in administering the program for industrial and commercial employees, and until the special problems of household employment could be studied more fully. As a result, the general houseworkers, cook, scrubwoman, or chauffeur who works in a private home has been excluded, though men and women who do exactly the same kinds of work for business concerns—often with better pay and working conditions—have been covered from the beginning.

HOUSEHOLD WORKERS NOT COVERED BY LABOR LAWS

Domestic workers are included under the old-age insurance systems of Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia. In America, by contrast, they have been excluded not only from social insurance under the Social Security Act but also from nearly all other social legislation. The Federal laws governing wages, hours, and working conditions do not apply to them. Wisconsin is the only State which has a minimum-wage law covering household employment, and Washington has the only State law regulating hours of work in private homes. With few exceptions, the protection of State workmen's compensation laws does not extend to household employees. New York includes household workers among those covered by its unemployment compensation plan, but only where four or more are employed by the same employer. All other State unemployment compensation laws exclude employment in "domestic service in a private home."

The need for social insurance among household workers is particularly acute, because their wages usually are lower than those of any other major occupational group. "There need be little hesitation," the Women's Bureau reported with respect to pre-war wages, "in putting household employment at the bottom of the list of nonmanufacturing employment on the basis of cash wages."

Surveys of household employment by the Social Security Board bear out this statement. A survey of Negro domestic workers in Baltimore in 1941 revealed that the average cash earnings of the women interviewed were only about $330 in 1940. Even the women who had worked throughout the year averaged only $497 in cash. Lack of full-time jobs, as well as inability to work because of illness or home duties, severely reduced the earnings of the women—more than one-third of the group—who worked by the day or had part-time jobs.

A survey of white women working in private homes in Chicago in the winter of 1941–42 found their earnings little higher than those of the Baltimore group. The average cash earnings for the entire group were about $415 for the 12 months from July 1, 1940,

to June 30, 1941. The 780 women who were employed in Chicago households throughout that period averaged only $485.

Even these low earnings were somewhat higher than those reported for the country as a whole by the population census of 1940. Experienced women working in domestic service throughout the year 1939 reported average cash earnings in that year of only $312. This low national figure is in part accounted for by the extremely low level of earnings reported by household workers in Southern States. In Mississippi, for example, the average was just under $150 per year and in South Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, and Alabama it ranged from $158 to $164. The highest earnings were reported by the women household workers employed full time and continuously in Connecticut; they averaged $566 in cash. In only five other States—California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island—did workers with 12 months of employment average annual cash earnings of more than $500.

With earnings at these levels, it is extremely difficult for women household workers—and nearly 90 percent of such workers are women—to lay aside anything against the hazards of unemployment, illness, disability, and old age. Nor can the married women, who comprised slightly more than a third of the household workers enumerated in the 1940 census, expect to get much protection under the present old-age and survivors' insurance program through their husbands' employment in jobs covered by this program. In the Baltimore survey, only about 28 percent of the married Negro women had husbands who were insured under the program at the end of 1940. In the Chicago survey, slightly less than half of the married white women in household employment had some protection through the insured status of their husbands.

Despite the fact that domestic service is, in normal times, one of the lowest-paid occupations and one of the few occupations for women which are still generally unprotected by social insurance and other social legislation, household service still attracted, according to the latest census, nearly 18 percent of all women in the labor force. In 1940, about 11 percent of all white working women and nearly 60 percent of Negro working women were in household employment. Sixteen percent of the single women in the labor force, about 18 percent of the married women, and more than 27 percent of those widowed and divorced were household workers. Nearly 35 percent of the working married women whose husbands were not living with them were in household service. Household service is thus an important source of livelihood for women of every marital status, especially those who are or have been married. It is also normally a principal occupation for girls under the age of 20 and women beyond the age of 55. In 1940, slightly more than 26 percent of household workers were in these age groups, as compared with 17 percent of all working women.

Although the occupation is excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance, household workers frequently make contributions under that program when they shift temporarily to covered employment. Though they then pay for old-age and survivors' insurance at the same rate as other workers, their periods of covered employment are generally too short or too infrequent to enable them to meet the requirements for insured status and only rarely do they obtain protection under the program. In the Chicago survey of white household workers, for example, about 17 of every 100 women had some earnings in covered employment in the period January 1937–June 1941, but less than 2 in each 100 were insured under the program at the end of that period.

The war has sharply increased the extent to which household workers entered covered employment. Perhaps a million such workers such workers have now been drawn into wartime factory and commercial jobs through which they are acquiring rights toward insurance benefits. Those who return to household work after the war, however, will find that, unless coverage has been extended to household has been extended to household service in the meantime, their potential benefits under the program will gradually diminish, and perhaps lapse altogether.

ADMINISTERING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HOUSEHOLD WORKERS

Since 1935, 9 years of experience have been accumulated in the administration of social security, and studies have been made of the best way to introduce a feasible and convenient method of obtaining wage records and collecting contributions from workers in household employment. If the stamp plan were adopted, for example, the housewife would not have to keep any records or to fill out a quarterly wage report on the earnings of her maid or cook. Instead, she would go to any post office and buy social-insurance stamps in convenient denominations, just as she now buys postage stamps and War Savings stamps. When she paid her household help, she would place a stamp or stamps in a booklet belonging to the worker and bearing her name and social-security-account number. Thus, a wage payment of $12 might be indicated by three stamps—each representing $4 or one representing $10 and two, $1 each. The total cost of these, at present contribution rates, would be 24 cents. Half the cost would be deducted from the worker's cash wages as her social-security contribution. The stamp booklet would be turned in periodically to the Board, and the wages indicated by the stamps would be credited to the worker's record by the Social Security Board, just like other wages. In this simple and convenient way the housewife could help to provide the same social-security protection for household help as for other workers.

Because noncash remuneration, such as meals, room, and laundry privileges, is an important part of the household worker's real income, as the Baltimore and Chicago surveys show, these wages "in kind" should be included in the earnings credited to her in the Board's records. To help the housewife set a value upon them, and to avoid the possibility of disputes as to their value between housewives and workers, an official scale of values for wages in kind might be used. Such a scale could readily take account of urban-rural differences in the cost of living.

NEED FOR SOCIAL INSURANCE PROTECTION

Domestic workers have lost much of the older form of security which, at its best derived from the relationship between the family and the hired girl who was a member of their household. Conditions of household employment have necessarily changed to accord with the mobility of present-day American life, and especially to accord with living arrangements in large cities. But so far, the women who cook and clean and launder and care for children in private homes have failed, almost without exception, to gain any of the social safeguards commonly recognized as necessary for other present-day workers. Nor can the conscientious employer, even if she wishes to, herself assure that the people who work for her will have adequate care if they are sick or injured or become old.

Protection under old-age and survivors' insurance, desirable as it is, would only partly solve the security problems of household workers. They, as well as other workers, need insurance against the costs of medical and hospital care and against unemployment. Unprotected by workmen's compensation and working, as they so frequently do, for a number of families, none of which feels responsibility for their care in case of illness, household workers particularly need insurance against the costs of treatment for illnesses and accidents; they can seldom put aside any savings against such contingencies. Like other workers, they face the hazard of involuntary unemployment. The Board's Baltimore and Chicago surveys indicated that regular continuous employment is not characteristic of the work histories of household workers. Those who work by the day are particularly likely, in normal times, to have long periods when they are partially unemployed.

The Social Security Board believes that coverage under a comprehensive social-security program would safeguard household employees from the fear of want in unemployment and old age, and relieve them of the necessity of asking for public care when they need medical or hospital treatment. As workers recognized and protected by a governmental social-insurance program, household employees would then no longer feel themselves ignored or forgotten among America's working millions.

Hon. James V. Heidinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1945, the Honorable James V. Heidinger, Representative in Congress for the Twenty-fourth District of Illinois, passed away. At that time many of his colleagues paid tribute to his splendid character and the wholesome influence which he exerted wherever he was known. In his own community where he had spent his entire lifetime, the high regard in which he was held is truly expressed in the following article which appeared in the Wayne County Press, Fairfield, Ill., on March 29:

James Vandaveer Heidinger, son of William B. and Elizabeth Vandaveer Heidinger, was born on a farm near Mt. Erie in Wayne County on July 17, 1882, and passed away at the age of 62 years, 8 months, and 6 days.

He was united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at Mt. Erie in early life and retained his membership in that church until on last Easter Sunday he transferred his membership to the First Methodist Church of this city. He has ever lived an upright and exemplary life.

Initiated into the Fairfield Lodge of Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons on January 19, 1914, he was a thirty-second degree Mason, a member of the Mississippi Valley Consistory and Ainad Shrine Temple of East St. Louis.

His mother passed away when he was but 6 years of age, leaving a family of five motherless children to the care and responsibility of the father in meager circumstances. With a firmness of purpose, the deceased mastered the difficulties of his circumstances and the hardships common to the life of a rural boy with limited opportunities. He attended the common schools and was licensed to teach. After teaching 4 years in

the rural schools of Wayne County, he attended the Valparaiso University at Valparaiso, Ind., and the Northern Illinois College of Law at Dixon. By his own effort and arduous tasks he supported himself during his college years, graduating from the Northern Illinois College of Law at Dixon in 1908 with a degree of Master of Laws, and was admitted to the practice of law in Illinois the same year.

On his admission to the bar he immediately began the practice of his profession in the city of Fairfield, and shortly thereafter became a member of the law firm of Boggs, Boggs & Heidinger, of which the Honorable Carroll C. Boggs, a former member of the Illinois Supreme Court, was the senior member.

In 1911 he married Bessie Summers, who survives. One son, James S. Heidinger, was born to this union.

In 1914 Congressman Heidinger was elected judge of the county court of Wayne County and served in that capacity for 3 consecutive terms of 4 years each. On retiring from the county court, he reentered the active practice of his profession and became interested in and connected with a number of the city's substantial business institutions. For many years he and Judge Virgil W. Mills operated a law partnership of Mills & Heidinger.

He served as a member of the board of directors of the Fairfield National Bank from 1919 to 1933, inclusive, and has been a member of the board of directors of the Southern Illinois Lumber Co., for more than 25 years. His has been a large part in the growth and development of both the civic and business interests of Fairfield and Wayne County in the past quarter century.

Congressman Heidinger made five races for Congress in this district, and was elected the last three times. In his first race in 1930, he lost the election by only 28 votes to his opponent, the late Congressman Claude V. Parsons, who took the seat in the House formerly held by the late Thomas S. Williams, who had resigned to accept a Federal judgeship. In his second race, in 1934, Judge Heidinger lost to Congressman Parsons by 2,571 votes. But in his third campaign in 1940, he defeated Mr. Parsons by a majority of 6,741. In 1942 he was opposed by LeRoy Barham, of Eldorado, but was reelected by 10,762 votes. In the last campaign, in November 1944, although he was able to do very little campaigning Judge Heidinger was returned to Congress by the largest majority ever given him—a margin of 12,119 votes over his opponent, Early C. Phelps, of McLeansboro.

At the time of his death he was a member of the very important House Naval Affairs Committee.

Although quiet in manner and unassuming, his common sense, nobility of character, and natural dignity immediately won for him the high esteem and general confidence of the leaders of both the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress and others in high authority in the National Capital. Those associated with him in the National Legislative Halls pay tribute to the deceased as a great tsatesman and legislator, but his acquaintances and friends here at home remember him best as a home-loving citizen and a devoted husband and father. They pay him tribute for these fine qualities, for his noble character, sincerity of purpose, and the warmth of his feeling for his fellow men in the common and lowly walks of life with and about him here.

He is survived by his widow, Bessie Heidinger; his only son, Lt. James S. Heidinger, now serving in the United States Navy; his daughter-in-law, Thelma K. Heidinger; two grandchildren, Sharon Elizabeth and James Vandaveer Heidinger III; two sisters, Mary Long, of Hoopeston, Ill., and Katie Ray, of Oxly, Mo.; two brothers, George Heidinger, of Oxly, Mo., and William Heidinger, of Tacoma, Wash.

Radio Forum on National Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on March 11 the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as the guest speaker on the America United Radio Forum, conducted by the American Federation of Labor, delivered a very interesting and informative address on the need for a national housing program. Following the Senator's address the subject was discussed by a panel consisting of Mr. Boris Shishkin, representing the American Federation of Labor; Mr. F. S. Fitzpatrick, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce; and Mr. Paul Sifton, representing the National Farmers Union. I ask unanimous consent to have the address by the Senator from Louisiana and the discussion which followed it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. America united!—united for victory in the war and in the peace. The National Broadcasting Co. makes its facilities available for another in the series of public forum programs designed to unite the workers, the farmers, and the employers of America with their Government for the solution of the basic problems of the present and the post-war future.

Mr. BANGHART. This is Kenneth Banghart in Washington, D. C. Today the American Federation of Labor presents as its guest United States Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana. He will speak on the need for a National Housing Program. After he outlines the subject, it will be discussed around the table by the America United panel, which today consists of Mr. Boris Shishkin, representing the American Federation of Labor; Mr. F. S. Fitzpatrick, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Paul Sifton, representing the National Farmers Union. And now here is Senator ELLENDER.

Senator ELLENDER. The American economy after the war must do two things:

First, it must offer the opportunity of employment to everyone who is willing and able to work;

And, second, it must give every American family a chance to enjoy the high living standards that full employment can produce.

A vast post-war housing program will help to achieve employment. Decent housing, for the millions who do not now have it, will help to raise standards of living. By both of these tests, housing is near the top of things we must do when victory comes. Now is the time to get ready.

We have fought a bigger war than ever before. We have accomplished marvels of production. We have the highest national income on record. The problems of transition from war to peace will be tremendous. After the war one of two things will happen: Either we will have more prosperity and more business activity than ever before or we will have a worse depression than ever before.

We must think bold thoughts. We must make broad plans. We must do big things.

What does this mean in housing?

During the 10 years before the war we built an average of less than 275,000 nonfarm houses each year. In the first 10 years after the war we must raise this figure to almost 1,500,000 houses a year.

Instead of investing only about $1,000,000,000 a year in the building of housing, we must invest seven or eight billion dollars a year.

Every little mind that says, "This cannot be done," is an obstacle to our economic progress. Every selfish interest that says, "We will not allow this to be done," is an enemy to our economic security—an enemy to the fighting men who want jobs after the war—an enemy to the families of these men, who want decent homes after the war.

This post-war housing program is consistent with the American system of private enterprise and individual initiative. It will help to preserve that system. But a large housing program depends upon new and bold measures—for we must grow if we are to live.

We need public funds to expand the slum clearance and low-rent housing program. We also need public funds to raise housing standards on the farm.

We need long-term loans at very low interest rates to stimulate housing for middle-income groups, who do not need subsidy, but who cannot afford to borrow from private lenders.

We need, through better methods, to improve the production of housing for those whom private enterprise and private lenders can effectively serve.

In short, we need a well-rounded housing program serving every need, and serving every need in full.

A forward-looking Congress must take the leadership toward enacting such a program. I expect to introduce legislation toward that end.

But Congress represents the whole people. It depends upon the organized efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor—upon their ability to get together, to work together, and to help develop a united economic program.

That is the reason for this discussion today. I hope that other discussions will follow—expressing the irresistible determination of the American people that we must win the peace at home after winning the war abroad.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Senator ELLENDER, I believe you have pointed the way, and the way that you have pointed is not a winding, narrow path for one separate group to follow. It is broad, like a six-lane highway, that offers room for everyone to march ahead together. The American Federation of Labor has formulated and will support a Nation-wide program for housing big enough to employ millions of men and to provide decent housing for all over a reasonable period of time.

What do you think of the chances of getting what is so important—a Nation-wide agreement among all interested groups so that such a program may get started, and started soon?

Senator ELLENDER. I think the chances are very good. I believe that close cooperation among industry, agriculture, and labor is vital and necessary to our post-war progress. Disunity in dealing with domestic problems would be as harmful as disunity in dealing with foreign affairs.

Housing is such a fundamental necessity to the whole country that unity on housing should be reached quickly among all of our people. At the same time Congress must be bold enough to move ahead on post-war matters, even if there is some opposition. As all of us are aware, it will be impossible to please everybody

Some of the forward-looking legislation enacted by the Congress in the last 12 years—

for instance, the social security, various labor laws, the Securities and Exchange Act passed to help small investors—all of these were passed after hard fights in Congress. They were bitterly opposed. But today everybody is in agreement that much of this legislation was necessary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Senator ELLENDER, you have placed a good deal of emphasis upon the necessity of getting organized efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor to achieve the goal you have so ably outlined. I would like to add to those three interests a fourth one, namely, the organized efforts of our communities.

Now, you know that highway and transit and city planning engineers have found ways in recent years not only to design but to locate entirely new kinds of major thoroughfares throughout a whole city and its suburbs.

The purpose, of course, is to make traffic congestion and excessive noise a thing of the past, but there is another purpose and this is of great importance. This new kind of main thoroughfare can be used to mark off and to protect new neighborhoods, not only throughout the city but throughout its suburbs.

Now, it seems to me that when we get this dynamic kind of city planning into action we will then be in a position to replace our present run-down and slum and blighted areas in the cities with modern housing and good neighborhoods for both grown-ups and children. It seems to me that is largely a community responsibility and I also think that the State and Federal Governments can be of assistance to it in large measures through the State highway departments which can help these communities to get these new thoroughfares not only planned but financed and constructed, and it is action that we want.

Now, my question: Don't you think it would be unwise for us to concentrate entirely upon housing and overlook these other community and city planning factors that I have outlined?

Senator ELLENDER. Of course. It strikes me that in order to get full employment, we must utilize all of our resources. We must produce all those things which make for better communities and better living. Housing is merely a part of the picture, but I do think that housing is the biggest single item for post-war expansion.

That forms a nucleus from which our post-war economy can make a good start.

Mr. SIFTON. Senator, in this country, we need about four million new farm homes. Five years ago the 1940 census found that 8 out of 10 farm homes had no running water within the dwelling. About 9 out of 10 had no bathroom. About 7 out of 10, no electricity. That was 5 years ago. During the war, the situation has not improved in any degree. It is probably somewhat worse due to lack of building materials.

This problem of farm housing has been largely neglected in connection with the housing activities of the Government in the past. What kind of program would you suggest for helping the average farmer to obtain decent housing after the war?

Senator ELLENDER. Well, we have certainly sadly neglected our farm problems, that is the housing end. Decent modern housing on the farm is just as important as in the city.

Mr. SIFTON. But how do we get it?

Senator ELLENDER. I am glad you asked the question. I believe we should provide for loans at low-interest rates, and such help as may be required to enable our farmers to have just as good houses as we want the masses of people in our cities to have. With some modifications, the housing legislation that has helped low-income families in the cities can help low income families on the farms. That will happen just as soon as those living on the farm make their needs sufficiently well known to the Representatives of Congress.

In other words, just as soon as the farmers let their desires be known to Congress, I have no doubt that Congress will respond.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Senator ELLENDER, you place a good deal of emphasis upon the use of public funds for housing. I think that public housing is primarily a welfare activity which ought to be administered and financed by the States and the localities. I have some reservations about such large use of public funds because I am fearful that they will tend to discourage the private home builder and the family that is going to invest its money in housing from going ahead. Will not the large use of public funds for housing projects discourage private investment in housing? I know you don't want to do that and thus be self-defeating.

Senator ELLENDER. I have no fear of that, Mr. Fitzpatrick. It strikes me that private housing should be stimulated and encouraged to do as much of the whole housing job as it possibly can. Additional legislation for that purpose should be enacted. I am somewhat of a realist, when I say that I believe that public assistance is necessary in slum clearance and to rehouse families of low income in the city and on the farms.

This kind of public housing program creates a market for the products of private enterprise. I also believe that a comprehensive program, including both private and public housing, will lift all of our standards of housing demands. These higher standards will provide a bigger and more stable opportunity for private home building. Both kinds of housing are necessary and desirable, and Congress should make sure that there is no competition between the two. My hope is that the private enterprise will undertake to do the whole job, but if it does not and cannot, then I believe that it is incumbent on our Government to take on where private enterprise leaves off.

Mr. SHISHKIN. We agree with you very strongly on that, Senator. We believe in a universal housing market and a necessity of providing the foundation for it by eliminating the worst slum housing and replacing it with decent low-rent homes. Then private enterprise will be strongly stimulated into providing better housing and for the higher-income groups. But we have got to tackle our main problem in the major area of need and that is eliminate with public assistance and through community participation the slums that are now blighting the entire housing market.

Mr. SIFTON. I understand that 41 percent of selectees from farm areas have been rejected because of physical disability. This is an alarmingly high rate, much higher than for the country as a whole. Do you think there is much connection between this health condition and the tremendous amount of bad housing in farm areas?

Senator ELLENDER. To improve the health of the Nation, we must remove deficiencies in medical care, in diet, and in education, as well as in housing. We must move on all fronts at once. If we devote as much effort to the good things of peace as we have devoted to the war, there are almost no limits to what we can accomplish. Undoubtedly, better housing on the farm would make for better health on the farm. That has been proved by the results wherever better housing has been tried.

Mr. SHISHKIN. It's all very well to talk about a big post-war program. But this program will not develop automatically. It will not develop by wishful thinking that all will be well if we do nothing. What can we do, specifically, to get started?

Senator ELLENDER. I do not think we need much more research or study of the subject. That has been going on for years. The broad outlines of what we need to do are fairly well known. Congress should declare a national housing policy, to replace all of our substandard housing over a period of 10 to 15 years. It should improve the legislation designed to give private enterprise the first chance to do as much as it can. Congress should set a goal of about a million or more housing units a year to be produced by private enterprise. It should help enterprise, insofar as necessary to reach that goal. In addition, the Federal Government and the localities should both help local housing authorities to provide public housing for the balance of the need, coming to several hundred thousand units a year. If the Government commits itself to spend one-third of a cent each year for housing, for every dollar it is now spending each year for fighting the war, we can clear up all of our urban and rural slums in about 15 years. I think the American people will want to do that. I think that where there is a will there is a way.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Senator ELLENDER, I believe that our general agreement right at this table is evidence that the American people have the will to give their full support and cooperation to the kind of post-war housing program you have outlined as the most important step toward full employment and prosperity after the war.

Mr. BANGHART. Our time is up, and thank you very much, gentlemen. I am sure that your discussion here today on the need for a national housing program will stimulate public interest in this problem. Our guest today was United States Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and the members of the America United Panel included Mr. Boris Shishkin of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. F. S. Fitzpatrick of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Paul Sifton of the National Farmers Union.

This is Kenneth Banghart inviting you to join us again next week at this same time when our guest will be Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, and the topic, America's Wage Policy.

ANNOUNCER. Printed copies of today's forum may be obtained by writing to Ransdell Inc., printers, Washington 18, D. C., or to the station to which you are listening.

America United was presented by the American Federation of Labor as a public service feature through the National Broadcasting Co. and its affiliated independent stations. This program originated in Washington.

Must 10,000,000 Americans Stay Poor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Must 10,000,000 Americans Stay Poor?" written by me and published in the magazine Digest for May 1945. It deals with compensation of 65 cents an hour, the point being made that anything below 65 cents an hour is a substandard wage.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST 10,000,000 AMERICANS STAY POOR?

(By CLAUDE PEPPER)

I think you'll be interested in a letter I've received. It is from the vice president of a large lumber company in Louisiana, and this is what he says:

"Labor in the South cannot possibly do as much work in a day as can be done in the North. This is because of the heavy climatic conditions—so much rain and a long period of hot months each year. Naturally, this lowers the vitality of the men. Therefore, we cannot possibly get the same production per man-hour from the people in this section as can be had in the Northern States." Therefore, he claimed, he could not be expected to pay the same wages as his competitors in the Northern States and still remain in business.

The lumber official wrote that letter in protest against a wage proposal I had made, that 65 cents an hour be set as the minimum wage for the United States. And at that time a Senate subcommittee was conducting hearings on my proposal.

The lumberman's letter is typical of the economic fatalist. He blames God and his competitors for the low wages which he claims he has to pay. Salving his conscience, he justifies himself by saying that poverty is inevitable.

But we in America no longer believe that poverty is unavoidable. We do not believe that malnutrition and sickness are the necessary rights of any part of our population. The majority of our people are convinced that poverty and substandards of living must go.

But here's the danger. Although we believe that America must banish poverty, we've temporarily been letting the matter slide. Our whole effort has been directed toward winning the war. Many social and economic reforms—even those proposed by the administration and enthusiastically passed by Congress—have been put aside for the duration. When such sacrifices are necessary, no one will object. For all-out production means all-out work; it means long hours. In many sections of the country it means bad living conditions. But in one respect this wartime policy defeats its own purpose—the slow-down of social reform has meant a slow-down of production.

That is a vicious circle. There was no intention that the belt-tightening needed to win the war should be so tight as to delay victory. Yet in a way, it has made victory that much slower in coming.

The fact is that the industries which have paid substandard wages are the very ones which have failed to meet their production quotas. This is a matter which should be remedied now—in order to attain that final spurt necessary to beat Japan, and also to achieve the necessary full production to give us a flying start on our Nation-wide post-war reconstruction program.

Several years ago Congress made a start by passing a wage-hour law which would have raised wages step by step over a period of year. Ultimately this law would have brought wages up to a point where families in industry could enjoy a reasonable standard of health and security. But the war intervened.

It is true that, meanwhile, the natural wartime competition for workers has brought wages in many areas above the minimum standard. Still, some industries have not raised their workers' wages even to the point orginally authorized in the wage-and-hour law. Furthermore, because workers today are faced with higher living costs, the minimum called for in the old law is out of date.

During the past year, at least 10,000,000 workers in this country received an average of less than $1,300 a year. That is considerably less than 65 cents an hour straight time on a 40-hour week, 50 weeks a year basis. And that figure—10,000,000 workers—doesn't include those in agriculture, the professions, or Government or domestic service.

Even with an income of $1,300 a year—and many receive less than that—these families are unable to maintain life on a fair standard, in terms of today's prices. War Labor Board investigators find that an average family of four people should have a minimum income of $1,454.72 a year. That works out to 73 cents an hour. This is the standard, set for relief workers by W. P. A. in 1935, given in terms of today's costs. To indicate how "emergency" the standard is, consider that it allows no newspapers for the family, and less than 25 cents a week for cigarettes and tobacco. This standard sets aside "savings" of $20.80 a year—in the form of insurance premiums—and nothing for War bonds. It provides only one-third the amount needed for adequate medical and dental care.

A family of four would get more than this 73 cents an hour, in terms of dependency allowances alone from the Government, were the father in the armed forces. In addition, of course, the father would be completely supported by the Army or Navy.

Yet more than 10,000,000 workers in industry and trade alone are taking home less than $1,300 a year; less than 65 cents an hour. Unquestionably the wage-stabilization program has been partly responsible for keeping the income of these people down to the starvation level.

Which industries pay wages under 65 cents an hour to most of their workers? They are essential industries—lumber, furniture, tobacco, textiles, and apparel. Even the furniture industry has been largely converted to war production. About 60 percent of all tobacco workers earn less than 65 cents an hour; 58 percent of those in lumber and in textiles; 57 percent in apparel; and 50 percent in furniture. The much-talked-of worker's prosperity obviously has not been felt by these 10,000,000 workers and their families.

We had several witnesses at the hearings who told us just what these low wages mean. One woman—she had four children under working age—said she had to borrow a decent dress before she could come to the hearing. Her coworkers had taken up a collection of pennies and nickels to buy her a hat to wear. As a result of sickness the family was still $80 in debt to the doctor.

A woman tobacco worker with three children told us that her fourth child had died some time before, because she could not afford proper medical care. She said her husband's greatest ambition was to buy her a decent Christmas present and buy himself a suit of clothes.

What effect have these low wages had on our war production? The results have been serious in the production of essential commodities. Workers in the lower brackets very naturally have moved over to higher-paid jobs. That has left the low-wage industries shorthanded. The tobacco worker told us that this fact was responsible for the cigarette shortage. The industry could not retain its workers in the face of much higher wage offers from other plants.

Similarly, production of cotton goods essential to the Army and Navy fell off 2,000,000,000 yards in the past 2 years—a decline of nearly 17 percent. This decline occurred during the period when war production quotas actually called for an increase. The War Labor Board said: "The decline in production has been due very largely to labor shortages. This labor shortage was the result of substandard wages."

Moreover, the annual production of lumber fell nearly 3,000,000,000 board feet in the past 3 years. That was a drop of over 8 percent. Lumber stocks were cut from 17,000,000,000 to 6,000,000,000 board feet, for we had to eat into our surplus to supply war needs. The reason: lumber workers looking for a living wage have left in droves to work in shipyards, where they sometimes receive double the amount they were making originally.

Obviously, substandard wages are not only a crime against our democracy; they have consistently been a very definite hindrance to the war effort. A 65-cent floor to wages is an essential war production measure.

Many employers claim that this is an attempt on our part to slip over some social reforms during the war emergency. Nothing could be further from the truth. The proposal would unquestionably improve production in the low-wage industry.

Moreover, the 65-cent floor to wages would help maintain a minimum standard of living for all American workers today and during the post-war years. It would eliminate much costly labor turnover. I believe that any law which will cut down labor turnover and thereby improve production is a "must" law. It is important to point out, however, that my proposed 65-cent-an-hour level would be in no way a direct order to the War Labor Board.

What would happen if we tried to establish, without any flexibility, a 65-cent minimum wage throughout the Nation? Well, we would probably find ourselves faced with a sit-down strike by management in the low-wage industries. They would continue to close down their plants until we let them raise the selling price of their goods. If we did that, it would endanger the price-ceiling program. Consequently, we would open the doors to inflation. This we must avoid. The laboring man can never keep up with the soaring prices that would result from relaxation of price control; he would be worse off than before.

Consequently, the minimum wage resolution was phrased as a recommendation rather than an order to the W. L. B. The Board Chairman, William H. Davis, made it clear that his organization would use the power granted it with great care.

If both labor and management should agree to raise wages to the minimum level, the Board would immediately approve this action. But should labor request the increase and management refuse to agree to it, the Board would offer a compromise by authorizing an increase that would not jeopardize the price ceiling.

As author of the resolution, I am prepared to accept Chairman Davis' interpretation of it. In order to achieve fullest possible war production we must, of course, give management a chance to make good profits. That is just as fair as it is to provide decent standards of living for labor. At the same time it is absolutely necessary to keep living costs down for the Nation as a whole and so avoid inflation.

But as a human being, I deeply regret having to take this stand. It seems incredible to me that even in the midst of a war we should acquiesce to such a policy. For it means assured malnutrition, guaranteed ill health, and permanent insecurity for a large part of our population. There is a point below which wage increases are not merely an issue in collective bargaining. That is the point where they are an outright demand on our collective caution.

During the hearing before the subcommittee, I said, "As far as I am concerned, I would be willing to authorize a flat increase to 65 cents an hour for anybody who is fully employed. I would like to say to employers, If you work them at all, you must pay these people 65 cents an hour straight time. Then let the remaining part of the economy struggle with the problem. Put the shoe on the other foot for a while."

I take back not one word of that statement. I still believe that it would be best for all of our people to bring the lowest-paid group up to at least a decent standard of living. But if other judgment prevails, then

our first post-war task must be to make an all-out assault upon substandard wages.

After Japan is defeated, I believe we shall have to go beyond the 65-cent minimum. Surely no one can believe that even 65 cents an hour would give our people the kind of life they ought to have. It's all right for us to talk about post-war reconstruction for the rest of the world, but we ought to do some of it ourselves. You cannot build a strong democratic economy upon substandard labor.

And it's not enough to talk about full employment, about the need for finding a ready market for the products of our industry and agriculture. Our people also need proper wages to go with their jobs. They need adequate housing and health and a minimum standard of education.

I think you'll agree with me, therefore, that the 65-cent-an-hour minimum is more than an essential war measure to get that extra effort that will shorten up the war against Japan. For it will also lay the foundation for the security and well-being of our people in peace.

Police Car Conservation and Safety Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very illuminating statement on the subject Police Car Conservation and Safety Program, issued by the Automotive Safety Foundation of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE CAR CONSERVATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM

On next Sunday, April 15, State, city, and local police and sheriffs of the United States, and the law enforcement agencies of Canada, are joining in a vast undertaking which will have an extremely beneficial effect in preserving adequate transportation and in maintaining our war effort.

The law enforcement officials are going to conduct a passenger car conservation and safety program, centering around a brake-check, with the immediate aim of screening out the cars with the most dangerous brakes. That program will aid in conserving our dwindling supply of passenger cars, and will save innumerable lives and limbs.

Extending through June 1, the program also will place emphasis on better car care in general. It is a program that should and must have the support of the entire public.

In a communication addressed to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, sponsors of the program, President Roosevelt has urged mobilization of the law enforcement agencies to make "a concerted attack on this fearful threat (traffic accidents) to our people and to our war effort."

Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, declared in pledging his support, "every automobile in America must be regarded as a weapon in our all out war effort." The Office of Defense Transportation, other Government agencies, many groups of State and local officials, and more than 100 private organizations and agencies interested in safety are actively supporting this timely program.

I am calling this program to the attention of the Congress because of its transcendent importance to our national welfare. We have been warned repeatedly by the Office of Defense Transportation that every possible effort must be made to make our passenger cars last, not only until the conclusion of hostilities, but through the immediate post-war years.

Our economy today—indeed, every phase of daily life on the farm and in the city—is built around the motor vehicle. But we are coming dangerously close to that point where our highway transportation will not be adequate to meet essential civilian and war demands.

The police program is focused on one of the major causes of passenger-car destruction and of traffic accidents. Best estimates are that as many as 10 percent of the passenger cars now on the roads and streets have unsafe brakes.

The brake-check will be given only to passenger cars involved in traffic violations and accidents, and to other cars operated in a manner indicating unsafe brakes. Because of manpower shortages, it will be impossible for the police to check the brakes of all passenger cars. But everyone can cooperate. All motorists can have their brakes inspected and repaired if necessary, and keep their cars in safe operating condition.

The American people have many wartime responsibilities. A splendid job is being done on all fronts. While this problem of conserving our cars and reducing traffic accidents is not a new one, it is getting more serious every day. We must give it the utmost attention. The home front must not be weakened.

Expedition of Capt. John C. Fremont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article from the Kansas City (Mo.) Times of Saturday, May 29, 1943, entitled "John C. Fremont Left This Settlement To Open the West 100 Years Ago Today." In 1845 Captain Fremont filed with the Government his official report on this expedition. It was, therefore, 100 years ago last month when the Congress ordered 10,000 reprints of that report. Consequently it seems to me quite timely, Mr. President, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article by Paul I. Wellman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN C. FREMONT LEFT THIS SETTLEMENT TO OPEN THE WEST 100 YEARS AGO TODAY—IN ST. LOUIS, THE EXPLORER'S WIFE, DAUGHTER OF SENATOR THOMAS HART BENTON, ASSURED THE START OF THE FAMOUS EXPEDITION BY WITHHOLDING FROM HER HUSBAND A RESTRAINING ORDER FROM WASHINGTON—THE CENTENARY WILL BE OBSERVED

One hundred years ago today began from Kansas City one of the most important exploratory expeditions in the history of the United States—the second expedition of Capt. John C. Fremont. It was this expedition, with the consequent publicity attending it, which, more than any other single factor, led to the great rush of immigration to the West.

The centennial of the great journey will be celebrated throughout the coming year, and in spite of the war, memorials of somewhat elaborate form are being planned for it.

Senator Thomas Hart Benton, the great Missouri solon who has been called the father of the West, was chiefly responsible for Fremont's explorations, which achieved exactly what he desired from them—dramatization of the boundless resources of the wilderness for American settlers. Fremont was Benton's son-in-law, having married the gay and charming Jessie Benton, in a runaway marriage which the Senator later forgave, only 2 years before.

Already the young officer, a captain of engineers, had made one trip to the West, having crossed the plains in 1842, to Wyoming, and returned. But that was only a practice march, so to speak. The real expedition was scheduled for 1843, and it was to be the most important single act of Fremont's life.

Leaving Jessie at her father's home in St. Louis, Fremont came to the infant town of Kansas, where he organized his expedition. According to the reports of the times, there never had been an expedition, Government or private, fitted out better than this. Fremont had 39 men, all fitted with the latest and best carbines and pistols. At the head of his guides was the famous Broken Hand Fitzpatrick, one of the starkest of the mountain men, and two Delaware Indians, among the greatest hunters of the West.

POTENT 12-POUND HOWITZER

The equipment included a fine refracting telescope, two pocket chronometers, two sextants, a reflecting circle, a syphon barometer, half a dozen thermometers, an assortment of compasses, a large supply of gifts for the Indians, provisions for the party, a rubber boat, and, most important of all, a 12-pound howitzer on wheels. The latter was to "overawe" Indians in case of trouble—or perhaps to do the same to hostile Mexican or British parties met on the Pacific. It came near to stopping the whole expedition, and was the reason why this day—May 29, 1843—was the starting date of the expedition.

Fremont was not nearly ready. The West Bottoms were crowded with wagons, livestock, and campers. More than 1,200 emigrants were there, waiting to begin the journey to California or Oregon, in addition to many parties of fur traders and trappers, freighters, hunters, and other persons out for adventure or profit in the West. The facilities of the little settlement then existing as the ancestor of Kansas City were taxed to the utmost. Every bed and room in the town was occupied, some bunks doing 24-hour duty on a 3-shift basis.

Long lines of horses and mules fought flies along the banks of the Missouri, and the bellowing of oxen, the swearing of the bullwhackers, the shouts of the roustabouts at the steamboat landing where rows of steamboats stood unloading kept a tumult going nearly all the way around the clock.

In the midst of this Fremont received a letter from his young wife in St. Louis. It urged him to set out for the West immediately. No reason was given, but it was imperative that he depart without hesitation for Bent's Fort.

Fremont knew the judgment and decision of Jessie, and he obeyed her without question. Although he had expected to spend days more in preparation, he ordered his carts and wagons hitched up, and the motley array, with the cannon bouncing along at the rear, moved out of the valley in a rain. The first

day's journey was only 4 miles, but they camped safely out of sight of the village.

AN ORDER WITHHELD

Not until he returned more than a year later did Fremont learn what occasioned this precipitancy. Among the mail addressed to him, which had come from Washington to his wife's address at St. Louis, was a military envelope. Jessie, with feminine intuition, knew she should open it. She did. The letter contained an order for Fremont to return to Washington at once, placing his expedition under command of another officer, and explain why he had taken a cannon along on a peaceful topographical exploration.

Jessie sent her imperative plea for Fremont to move at once. She did not immediately send the order, and of course she could not tell her husband why she urged him to move, for if he knew of the order he would be violating it by failure to comply. So Fremont, with good judgment, moved on faith in his wife's intelligence and address. Later, when the delayed mail arrived at the frontier settlement, Fremont was gone, and he could never be accused of insubordination.

Out across the plains trundled the well-found and well-disciplined little column. For a part of the time, at least, the famous missionary and martyr, Dr. Marcus Whitman, rode with them. They reached the Rockies and glimpsed the great peaks. And there, in the foothills, Fremont's old friend, Kit Carson, encountered the expedition and was engaged on the spot to accompany it.

Later Alexander Godey, another famous scout and trapper, joined the party, and now Fremont had the finest group of guides it could be possible to imagine. Carson, Fitzpatrick, and Godey were among the few pre-eminent adventurers and warriors of the West. They knew the West like the palms of their own rugged hands. What Fremont was going to explore they already were familiar with, but his important objective was the acquaintance of the public with those trails, mountain ranges, rivers, lakes, and natural resources which the inarticulate trappers never could have accomplished.

Over the rugged Oregon trail, Fremont's party pushed its way. As a result of Fremont's description of the Great Salt Lake and its valley, Brigham Young, 4 years later, was to determine to lead the Mormons there and establish his new Israel. Fremont reached the Columbia River in November, and with the cannon still trundling along behind, reached the foot of the Sierras. The country here was barren, rocky, and difficult, but the guides with Fremont told him that beyond the Sierras was plenty. So he determined to cross those forbidding mountains, although it was winter.

GOT RID OF HOWITZER

In early February the ascent was begun over the range which contains many 14,000-foot peaks, and through the passes which were then almost unknown. An Indian served as guide. And here Fremont was forced to abandon the howitzer which he had brought thus far through all difficulties. The gun had not been fired, and was a useless encumbrance anyway. Fremont left it in a rocky canyon in the mountains and went on.

The expedition was fortunate. No sudden blizzard such as those which snowed in the Donner party later, and led to the revolting siege of cannibalism, occurred. They scooped snow, hacked out roads, took turns at the exhausting work, and ate their mules and even their pet dog mascot, Klamath. But by February 20, they had surmounted the range and started down into California.

Sutter's Fort, the site of the later great California gold rush, was visited, and after a rest Fremont began the return to the landing on the Missouri from which he had departed, by way of the desert Old Spanish Trail. At last, on the last day of July 1844, the party, tanned, ragged, and worn, once more reached the town of Kansas, on the banks of the Missouri, exulting, after 14 months of absence, at the familiar scene they viewed.

No time was taken by Fremont for rest. The very next day he took a steamboat for St. Louis, where he was reunited with his wife and the small child he had not seen for more than a year. Then the little family went to Washington, where Fremont prepared his memorable report, second expedition. Congress ordered 10,000 copies of it to be printed, but the printings far outran that. Newspapers reprinted large sections. Fremont found himself the hero of the day and the West became a popular subject of interest.

Recently a bill has been suggested providing an appropriation for the construction of a heroic statue commemorating the Fremont expedition. The site has not yet been selected, nor has the artist, although T. A. Rovelstad, a sculptor of Elgin, Ill., and Washington, has already presented what is pronounced by many to be an excellent design, showing Fremont, surrounded by his scouts, Carson, Godey, and Owen (who took part in a later expedition) with Jessie Benton, on the obverse side, affixing a new star to the flag, in commemoration of the acquirement of California by the Union.

PAUL I. WELLMAN.

Farley Speaks of Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farley Speaks of Future," from the Bridgeport Post of March 31, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARLEY SPEAKS OF FUTURE

The former Postmaster General, now a big-business executive, took time out recently to talk to the Rotarians in Northampton, Mass., giving them his views on what has made America great and what will continue to keep it great in the future.

No man in public life is better qualified after his many years in close touch with the "common man" to express his views about the "average" American than he. He has talked for years with men in every walk in life in every State in the Union. It was his job as the man most responsible for the first election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to know average Americans everywhere.

It took a great many things to create this average American, who built a great nation and is now impressing that sterling American character "upon a wide and distracted world." The man whom Mr. Farley calls average was the product of a problem that may be with us as long as men live on this earth, the product of a Europe which has suffered for centuries from the fact that it could produce more people than it could feed.

Men came to America for a variety of reasons, at various times, but they came to escape from the man-made hardships of Europe to conquer the barriers nature had set up here, to create a free land, and "when men invested their labor and their courage, nature paid them a fair and ample wage."

Mr. Farley showed that out of great experience great men are born and it is out of great enterprise that a great people is born, America was built upon individual men and women, and if the American Nation has, in its resources, in its political institutions, and in its culture, preeminence in the world today, it is because of our great area and richness of resources; the wise policy of the pioneers and founders of our Constitution of individual freedom; the assimilation of all the people who came here through American genius, to create a better life.

In future, beyond this war, our task will be in spite of the suggestions of those who have formulas for security and happiness, to bear in mind that the United States was not built upon formulas. It was built upon the individual. We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American.

Whatever the average Americans of the future have, they will have only if these truly American principles can be retained. The future of American political, social, and economic life should continue to have as a basis true principles of individual liberty. Free enterprise must be reestablished. Government encroachments upon the life and work of Americans must be curbed. The day war ends will be the day when all Americans in and out of the Government's official life must buckle down to the task of restoring that which for 169 years we have considered the American way of life.

As Mr. Farley concluded, the greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured, if no man-made shadows blur the road.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Put Your Cows Together, Boys," published in a recent issue of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUT YOUR COWS TOGETHER, BOYS

Not even the seven sages could penetrate the discordancies of Washington when the master planners get to explaining. It becomes a case where rationalizing has the people so irrational that it is little wonder that so many Americans have become afflicted with jitter complexes.

The meat shortage explanations are a case in point. No less an authority than President Roosevelt took up the issue 2 weeks ago. He said that it was a matter of justice, or rather of decency, that the American people should tighten their belts to keep others from starving.

No sooner had this comment been circulated about the country than in stepped Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, to demolish all the argument that domestic shortage of beef and veal are attributable to foreign shipments. Lend-lease shipments of

these items took less than 1 percent of our domestic products, he said, and, further, we received from our allies under reverse lend-lease about three-fourths as much beef and veal as we sent abroad. The balance, he said, deprived each of us in America in 1944 of only about two and a quarter ounces of beef and veal—for the whole year.

Mr. Roosevelt says we have to keep others from starving. Mr. Crowley says we are not depriving ourselves of anything by foreign shipments. Chester Bowles of O. P. A. says we are eating more meat. Congressmen prove Mr. Bowles' figures are all off for 1945—jabber, chatter, cackle—and still no meat. As Shakespeare had King John saying, "I was never so bethump'd with words."

Government in the Life of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a timely editorial entitled "When Do We Get Enough 'Government'?" The editorial calls attention to a trend in government of which the people are becoming more acutely aware all the time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN DO WE GET ENOUGH "GOVERNMENT"?

The folks who want the "Government" to run things certainly ought to have some very repentant thoughts these days. Now that the "Government" has succeeded in getting the meat situation in a state of almost utter chaos, Solid Fuels Administrator Harold Ickes has seen fit to assert himself as part of the "Government."

Two very significant sentences were found on the market pages of metropolitan papers last week. The first, "Hog receipts were the lowest in 69 years"; the following day, "Hog receipts were 73 percent below the same day last year." It isn't lend-lease; it isn't the need of providing food for liberated countries which is causing the meat shortage. It's the "Government."

Looking over last April's Times-Mail, we find bacon and roast pork advertised, 1 point a pound. We also read that men over 26 will not be drafted; that the stockyards are simply glutted with pork. Today pork has almost disappeared. This should be no surprise. Last summer farmers who had been urged to raise pork took their hogs to market. Instead of getting the ceiling price, they did not receive the floor price. There were plenty of disgruntled hog producers right here in Lawrence County. The present pork shortage was foreseen last August. It is going to be some time before bacon comes back on breakfast tables. It isn't going to come back until the "Government" quits trying to run the food markets of the Nation.

Harold Ickes has been quiet for a long time. He couldn't resist issuing a directive. Coal consumption will be cut to 80 percent next year, he says, and only 50 percent of the year's supply can be delivered this summer. Local coal dealers have not received official word yet, but Ickes has talked for publication. All coal received after April 1 counts on next winter's allotment.

This is the height of the whole asinine performance. No family is going to burn more coal than is necessary. If next winter is mild, less coal will be burned. If it is cold, more coal will be burned. It's that simple. Why would any family burn more coal than necessary? It's just burning up money. But Ickes felt the need of expressing himself Byrnes had clamped on a curfew, cut out horse racing; Marvin Jones arranged to have food shortages. Ickes wanted some publicity. One reason for the coal-use reduction is that freight cars are scarce, yet we read that Mexican railroads have purchased 1,500 freight cars for delivery this year. Why not use the cars here?

Just what is this "Government" that regulates the most minute detail of our lives. In theory the Government is a sincere, impartial, capable something which is superior to any individual. In fact, it is anything but that. The Government is a member of the political party in power—a fallible man who has rarely distinguished himself in any way other than getting votes.

The Government is the O. P. A. prowler who finds a grocer selling 3 or 4 cents over or under the ceiling. The Government is the wage-hour snoop, who tries to ingratiate himself by downright misrepresentation. The Government is the man on the War Labor Board who says you can, or cannot, get a raise in pay. The Government is anyone of the hundreds of people on the Department of Agriculture pay roll, who tells the farmer what he can raise, and how much he can get paid for it. The Government is the policeman on a motorcycle who dashes through the city streets with a siren at full blast, so some second-rate official can have an escort. The Government is the city official who marks off sections of the curbing, so that official cars, bought and paid for by the taxpayer, can have a privileged place to park, close by the public offices. Actually, the Government is just a lot of ordinary people of the party in power, who are responsible to a department head, who is resonsible to the mayor, governor, or President, who is, in theory, responsible to the public; but actually is responsible only for a month before election.

We once asked a Government official how much the travel in his particular department could be cut down without materially affecting the work of the bureau. He answered, "About 80 percent." That's what the lack of responsibility in government creates.

Neither of the major parties can point a clean finger of scorn at the other, although no political group has ever had the audacity to ignore the public as has the group under the New Deal.

This is a very appropriate time to recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, "The best government is the least government." We have certainly strayed a long way from that sage advice.

Individualism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief comment under the heading "Wise words," published in the Boston Post of March 31, 1945.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISE WORDS

In these days when economic and social planning are so popular the sage advice of former Postmaster General James A. Farley should not be overlooked. He reminded a Bay State audience the other day that the "United States was not built upon formulas but upon individuals." And our best guaranty for a successful future, he wisely observes, is retaining "the pioneer spirit in each American."

Blessed Are the Peacemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a sermon delivered by Dr. A. J. McCartney, pastor, the Covenant First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on April 1, 1945, Easter Sunday, on the subject Blessed Are the Peacemakers. This sermon was delivered in prospect of the United Nations Conference to be held in San Francisco. Dr. McCartney is the father of First Lt. Benjamin C. McCartney, who died of wounds received in Italy. To those of us who are privileged to hear Dr. McCartney from time to time, his sermons are inspiring, and this sermon deserves our prayerful study. May we all join with Dr. McCartney in a firm determination that, standing by the graves of 200,000 Americans, we shall dedicate ourselves anew to the cause for which they died. May we devote all our energies and our efforts to the cause of permanent peace in this war-weary world.

The sermon follows:

We come up to this Easter service with the overwhelming fact staring us in the face that more than 100,000 of our young men who have been nurtured in the belief of a life beyond have passed from earth since we met here a year ago. Our concern as to how it fares with them on the other side is no different in quality and character from what it was a year ago, but for hundreds of thousands it is certainly more intense and personal. The other day there came to my study one who was a stranger to me, a young mother of 22, who had sought me out in the hope that I might have some solace for her, who had just received the fatal telegram from the Government that her husband had been killed in action on the western front. "Do you think," she asked, with that wistful pathos which breaks one's heart—"do you think I shall ever see him again?" That I can only answer in terms of the Christian hope that is so dramatized in the New Testament account of the resurrection of our Lord, and the amazing persistence in a belief in life beyond the grave in all quarters of the world, century after century, in spite of all the discouraging evidences with which we are confronted.

In a beautiful editorial in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Good Friday," there is expressed the thought that all the sufferings and anguish of this world's Good Fridays, are followed by Easter:

"In 1945 there are millions of men and women who appreciate as people never did before in 19 centuries the essential covenant between humanity and the Power which rules the universe. They realize that righteousness and justice, fellowship and peace are not to be had for the mere asking. Such blessings must be earned. * * * The young lives that have been expended since 1939 for the salvation—yes, and the expansion—of civilization are not lost. Good Friday will be followed by Easter."

For my own part, it is practically impossible for me, nurtured in the Christian faith as I have been, to dismiss the belief that these alert and blazing personalities we have known are now nonexistent, and betimes there comes sweeping over me the feeling that will not down that their disembodied spirits are finding employment and eager delight in realms yet unrevealed, and perhaps not so distant from us. And that in whatsoever world or condition they be, their lives are unfolding in the presence of God, and their talents and gifts so manifest in this life, must surely find sweet employment in the spacious fields of eternity.

But be that as it may, I feel that we owe a debt that can only be liquidated by an unswerving loyalty and sacrificial dedication to the original purpose of a free world for which we exposed them to danger and to death. So, as a tribute to them, I want to take the occasion of speaking to so large an audience a few things regarding the contribution that we who are Christians should try to make toward the molding of a new world order, which we trust may be effective in adjourning for many generations to come World War No. 3, about which we hear all too much loose and irresponsible talk. I feel that I have a stake in the making of the peace; and if any word that I should speak might be instrumental under God in establishing more firmly the pillars of a just and lasting peace, I shall not have chosen my subject in vain. Not that I would bypass the Easter theme, but standing by the graves of 200,000 American youth, I would like to dedicate ourselves anew to the cause for which they died.

As the war draws to its inevitable climax, and military victory seems assured, the very staggering immensity of the tasks of the post-war period comes into frightening focus. Presently we shall be coming to grips with the appalling moral, social, and material aftermath of Axis rule, problems that will tax the wisdom of a Solomon and the patience of a Job. The real victory in this war will depend upon the clarity of our aims beyond the military defeat of the enemy and the sincerity and completeness of our dedication to these aims.

I wonder sometimes if we here in America, as yet untouched and unscorched by the flames of war, realize that we are living through and the makers of the most changing events in the long history of the race. Do you, young men and women, realize that you are at once the actors and the audience in the greatest drama of all time; a drama that will affect the fortunes and happiness of mankind for good or ill, for centuries to come.

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

To this end there are certain assumptions of a general and popular character which we should recognize. To begin with, everyone hopes that the outcome of the war may result in some kind of world organization that will help to prevent a future war of such destructive proportions. Our major concern is to so organize human affairs that no Hitler, or power-greedy nation, shall ever again plunge this whole world into such a hell. To bring such a hope into fulfillment some sort of organized supreme government, vested with sovereign authority, must be agreed upon. There is no other conclusion, in the face of the insane, idiotic, overwhelming disaster in which our stupidity has involved us.

Another assumption that we all recognize is this: That now is the time for us to do something about it. We must act while the molten lava is in flux. Nor need we wait upon the counsels of perfection. Any leadership that assumes this responsibility must share it in a subsidiary measure with regional groups of smaller nations in terms of the special needs and rightful aspirations of the minority groups concerned, in order to release the restraining economic and social tension, which inevitably issue in revolutions and war.

One further assumption of a general and popular nature would require that any peace that is made should provide the political framework for continuing expanding and growing cooperation among the nations now united, and to make such provision for automatic changes as unforeseen events and conditions demand, and possible doorways for eventual cooperation with neutral and enemy nations.

We believe that this goal, desired by so many peoples of the earth, can be obtained in the measure in which the makers of the peace will be animated by the spirit and principles of Christianity at its best. So, ancillary to these popular and general and world-wide assumptions, there are certain assumptions of specific concern to Christians:

CHRISTIAN ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption 1. God is the Creator and Father of all men, and He purposes that all men and all nations and all races should constitute a family fellowship. God has made all kingdoms and tongues and peoples for to dwell together upon the face of the earth. No casuistry of human argument can get around that central fact of Christianity. The very last thing our Lord said to His disciples was this: Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Any policies which depart from this assumption must eventually lead to failure and disaster, and the makers of the peace will have to be on their constant guard against unsanctified human nature which so insists upon placing their individual, racial and national interests first. The golden rule is going to be a difficult yardstick with which to measure these conflicting interests; but it should certainly be a motto for the peace table, pointing always to an ideal.

Assumption 2. Our chief concern as Christians is the salvation of the soul of the common man, his immortal welfare; and after that, his social welfare. Redemption is an individual affair. So our business is first of all to seek to bring more persons, who constitute these conflicting groups, into submission to, and the subjection of their lives to, the will of God as we see it revealed in Jesus Christ. It is not the business of the church to furnish blueprints for the detail and technique of this vast problem, but it is our task to insist that any supreme counsel that assumes leadership and responsibility should recognize certain things—the freedom and dignity of the individual man; his right to exist and express himself; religion unhampered by the state; justice and punishment swift and adequate without vengeance; and the spirit of the good Samaritan, who made personal sacrifices and cut across social and racial barriers to bring help to a suffering fellow-being.

Assumption 3. All this brings us to the problem of the Christian treatment of the vanquished. Here our Christianity is going to be tested. The end of hostilities and war weariness will make many of us soft and forgetful in the general stampede to get back to normalcy. But God forbid that, altogether apart from the millions of her dead soldiers, we should ever forget that the Axis gamble for power, in its cruel and ruthless prosecution, has cost 20,000,000 innocent lives, in a period of 5 years. Our first duty to the fallen foe will be to provide food and physical relief, and then to set up some supreme authority to establish courts of justice with punishment for the guilty, swift and final, and mercy for the innocent. The screening of the guilty from the innocent is going to be a difficult task. But that is no reason why we should not attempt it. It will not be a choice between rough justice and perfect justice, but it will be a choice between rough justice and none. We must labor, however, toward such just punishments as Christian people both in the country of the victors and in the lands of the vanquished, will be able to see as meet and necessary, and where human instrumentality errs and fails we shall remember that God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. Over against this insistence upon just punishment for the guilty wherever they can be identified, the church lifts up its voice to warn against a vengeful spirit. There must be no place for the ambassadors of vengeance at the coming peace table. To kill every Japanese soldier, every German soldier, will not bring to life a single one of our bonny lads, but prompt, severe, and adequate punishment of war criminals will surely have a wholesome effect in the future. Evil men must be brought to book for all the misery they have brought to this world, but we shall not forget that vengeance belongeth unto God, and He will certainly repay in His own inscrutable and inescapable way; for the Judge of all the earth shall do right. Even from our human viewpoint, God seems to be trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath have been stored, in the lands of the enemy where they are experiencing swift and dreadful judgment in the rubble of their cities and the millions of their graves.

Assumption 4. Mercy and judgment, however, must walk hand in hand, and we shall have a wonderful opportunity to manifest the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, while He suffered on the Cross, said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Ours will be a rare opportunity to reach out a helping hand to the fallen foe, bind up his wounds, and nurse him back to sanity and the hope that some day, some time, his people, purged of their insane thirst to lord it over other peoples, will merit a place in the well-ordered family of nations.

Assumption 5. Last of all, we must refuse to accept the counsels of despair. Cynical voices are already being lifted up, telling us that world order is a hopeless undertaking. The discouragements that in the past we have encountered must not dissuade us from making a new and more determined effort for a just and durable peace. When the American Constitution was being born George Washington said: "It is too probable that no plan that would be proposed will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God." Whatever happens, we must not forsake our faith, or compromise the faith of those young men who have already laid down their lives for this great hope. The prophet Isaiah in a closing chapter recites with terrific indictment the disheartening conditions of his time, which are so amazingly and accurately reflected in our own world. Tidal waves of evil and of savagery were surging over the face of his world

then, as our world now. To quote him—"We look for justice, but there is none, for salvation, but it is far from us. Our sins testify against us. Judgment is turned away backward, and righteousness standeth afar off. For truth is fallen in the street, and uprightness cannot enter." Then, the prophet having called the people to righteousness and to a return to God, makes this declaration: "When the enemy shall come in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord God will lift up a standard against him." Let this statement be a tonic to our souls today, and let it lift a curtain of hope upon the stage and theater of this history-making hour. When I read this verse in Isaiah's majestic language I see the Spirit of God upon the march. I see the emissaries of peace coming together, and the invisible forces of good will brooding over their assembly, and lifting the white standard of hope before the bleeding and wounded nations of the earth. For when the enemy shall come in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him. And around that standard let all the free men of the earth now gather. And blessed be the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

A Fair Price Means a Full Cupboard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the report on the food outlook for 1943, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Lieutenant Colonel Olmstead, Director of Office of Supply, in the Commodity Credit Corporation, stated that pork production would be 18 percent lower than in 1944. I view this as an alarming situation and one which should concern us all. This serious shortage of pork has its roots in the fact that too many broken promises by Government planners have left the American farmer with the feeling he has been definitely short-changed. The farm-labor shortage, the changing of the floor price on hogs last year and the penalty that was placed on farmers whose hogs became overweight have combined to discourage hog production on many farms.

Mr. Speaker, I have received an illuminating letter from Mr. D. H. Cunningham, secretary of the Sioux City Livestock Exchange, Sioux City, Iowa. Sioux City is the sixth in size of all packing centers in this country and last year slaughtered 2,190,000 pigs. The analysis which Mr. Cunningham compiled was written after a poll had been taken in the Sioux City marketing area of over 2,000 farmers, and it merits careful study.

I think that it is important to understand what has happened and to work out a program to insure adequate food supplies for the coming year. It is important that those in charge of the war-food program seek the advice and counsel of packers and marketers such as Mr. Cunningham in outlining future production plans. We must assure farmers that they will not lose money by raising hogs. We can do this if a floor price of $13.75 per hundredweight is guaranteed at Chicago. We must convince farmers that the food program will be adhered to so they will not be caught short again this year or in 1946. Unless a sound policy is adopted in regard to the production of pork, I fear that shortages will become more acute in 1946. We can only carry out plans to feed our Nation and our allies with a food program based on an adequate price and free from uncertainty and distrust.

Mr. Speaker, give the American farmer a fair price for a full crop, sufficient farm machinery, and the bare minimum of help essential to his operations and this country will have a full cupboard while at the same time being able to contribute mightily to the bread baskets of the world.

The letter from Mr. Cunningham follows; it deserves your thoughtful reading:

SIOUX CITY LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
Sioux City, Iowa, April 3, 1945.

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The market interests at the Sioux City stockyards, Sioux City, Iowa, have a radio program of 20 minutes during the noon hour, Monday through Friday of each week. This radio program is not confined strictly to a broadcast of market news alone, but any topic or any move that is pertinent to the welfare of the producers of livestock is given full recognition and accorded the utmost publicity through this radio medium. Our program goes out over radio stations WNAX, Yankton, S. D., and KTRI, Sioux City, Iowa. You are of course fully aware of the fact that WNAX has one of the largest rural listening audiences of any radio station in the United States. Our broadcast over this station has been in full swing for a period of 5 years and we feel sure that upon investigation you will find that we probably have as large a concentrated rural listening audience as does any farm program in the country. As a confirmation of this statement, we need only to direct your attention to how successfully the Sioux City market handled the large hog marketings of 1943 and 1944. We point with pride to this achievement as well as to the fact that at that time the Sioux City market over this broadcast devoted a good deal of time to the question of weights in hogs with the result that farmers of this area were able to save millions of dollars that might have been lost to them.

For some time past we have been fully cognizant of the fact that hog production and hog marketings during this present year have been far below the requirements necessary for a successful war-food production program and a careful analysis of this situation by us here at Sioux City led us to believe that we knew the reasons for this, but we wanted further confirmation from the country and our farmer listeners. We were firmly of the conviction that there were primary reasons for the reduction of hog numbers, and still are firmly of the conviction that if this course is adhered to that we will find ourselves faced with still further reductions this fall of 1945 and spring of 1946.

Our contention is that the farmer and producer of hogs did not forget that he was severely penalized in selling his hogs last year when the hogs became overweight and the way he was treated in this matter left a very bad taste in his mouth and that's putting it frankly. Consequently, he decided not to be caught in the same predicament again and turned away from hog production to other farm activities that he felt gave him more assurance for the future. The second reason was that while he was still in the throes of this marketing problem last year, the floor was reduced on these hogs to $12.50 per hundredweight—Chicago basis—and limited to good to choice 200 to 240 pound barrows and gilts. This really was about the last straw. A dollar and a quarter was taken off the floor and there was further danger of being penalized on weights. He just couldn't bring himself to believe anything else than that he should and would curtail hog production.

As we have said before, we decided to take the case to the Country to confirm our belief in what had really happened and accordingly we talked to our immense rural listening audience, stated our views, reviewed what had happened, and asked them for their reaction to the present ceiling price, what they thought about the present floor price and their effect upon hog production for both this year and next. We also injected into our broadcast the subject of a subsidy to be paid to the producer provided that his hogs would be marketed through federally inspected slaughtering points so that the pork so slaughtered would be available for Government use. We did not advocate a subsidy, we simply asked them what they thought of it.

Now here are the results of our survey. We have had 2,000 letters in answer to our radio broadcast. We feel sure that is a very fine response when one takes into consideration the fact that spring work is in full swing and farmers are extremely busy. Not only have we had 2,000 letters but we've been besieged by telephone and personal calls that bore out exactly the opinions stressed in letters we received and these facts we have found to be the opinion of farmers and producers of hogs.

First, we have noticed with a good deal of satisfaction that the American farmers who have written to us are not asking for an unrestricted chance to get rich during the war emergency. By that we mean that only an infinitesimal portion of these responses ask for any higher ceilings on these hogs and we think that that is a very admirable fact. We have also received comparatively few responses in which the producer has indicated that he is expecting or asking for a subsidy and when such if any is to be paid it should be paid to the farmer or producer and not to the processor if production is to be encouraged. They take the viewpoint that the past record of subsidy payments to processors has not worked out in the way it was intended and has not and is not being passed along to the producer as a further incentive for him to produce or feed either hogs or more cattle. We know full well that this was the real interest of the subsidy program but farmers do not feel that it has fulfilled the expectations of the program to further larger production.

The third thing we have found out is again reassuring in respect to the producers' attitude. As we said before he does not ask for higher ceiling but every letter, every telephone call, and every personal contact brings out the fact that if we are to have a large production of meat in the form of pork that the only thing that will get him to produce the pork in the volume necessary is a raise in the floor price back to the old floor of $13.75 per hundredweight (Chicago basis) and a removal of weight limits. His recent experience makes him shy away from any other program. He would be satisfied with a floor price of $13.75 per hundredweight (Chicago basis) on the average drove cost of the buyer but with nothing short of this.

To sum up this portion of his viewpoint is simply to say that in view of labor costs, higher feed costs, shortage of manpower and

all of the things which now enter into his production picture, the farmer can see no way out for himself except that he be granted an assurance of a $13.75-per-hundredweight floor (Chicago basis) so that he will know exactly what to look forward to in the months that lie ahead. Of course we know full well that this floor if so advanced would do very little to stimulate any larger pig production this spring, but if the hog production for the entire year has to be one of greater numbers then this assurance would go far toward producing a larger fall crop but time is the essential element right now as far as a fall pig crop is concerned, for the producer must of necessity begin to lay his plans for breeding of sows for fall farrowing. A decision one way or another will greatly affect the picture. We're confident that a maintenance of the present floor price of $12.50 per hundredweight (Chicago basis) on good to choice 200- to 275-pound butchers will result in a smaller fall pig crop but we're equally positive that a raise in the floor price to $13.75 without weight limit will brighten the picture no end. The thought is uppermost in the minds of a great many that our hog crop for this year will be considerably larger but all the information we have been able to receive points to the fact that this is not the case and that a further continuance of uncertain floor prices will lessen the chances for hog production in 1946.

One other thing seems also to be paramount and that is if future food production as far as pork is concerned is to be made to reach the necessary requirements that an extension of time on this floor price is absolutely necessary. We believe and our survey shows that the farmer would like to have 2 years of protection after the war is over but if this would be impossible the time limit set on this floor should be at least until December of 1946.

We think, Congressman, that this gives you a clear picture and we're asking you to go to bat for your farmer constituents because we have had hundreds of letters from all over your State and if this program could be carried through it would work out for the mutual benefit, first, for the war effort in which we are all interested, and second, for the benefit of your consituents.

We trust that you will give this matter your early and earnest consideration and that this one thing be a "must" on your agenda.

Yours very truly,

D. H. CUNNINGHAM,
Secretary.

The Egg Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the production of eggs has shown a very marked increase. This increase was first the result of the patriotic desire to produce on the part of both farmers and the people of the villages; second, the result of a favorable feed situation when the large increase in production was attained; third, the fact that manpower shortage did not affect this industry quite as severely as where heavier manual labor is required; and fourth, the fact that a production program was set in motion by the United States Department of Agriculture to obtain eggs and powdered eggs for the war and lease-lend.

Here is a food product that has been produced in abundance. This is the best food insurance for all the people. Eggs have not even been rationed. The production has fulfilled every demand. This production has in fact been embarrassing at certain periods. With foresight other food products could have been produced in abundance the same as eggs have been produced. I have often wondered why not? Is control to outweigh production?

The production by States is shown in the following official table:

Total eggs produced—aggregate

[In millions]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Alabama	529	486	532	633	777	733
Arizona	66	65	62	72	79	77
Arkansas	596	571	593	696	755	807
California	1,661	1,719	1,713	1,909	2,090	2,326
Colorado	322	334	329	420	482	521
Connecticut	342	363	366	421	448	485
Delaware	111	116	115	119	122	132
Florida	198	205	195	211	226	209
Georgia	487	524	509	621	688	703
Idaho	235	240	246	265	301	329
Illinois	2,008	1,932	2,042	2,346	2,642	2,859
Indiana	1,511	1,477	1,542	1,740	1,978	1,973
Iowa	2,739	2,725	2,964	3,613	3,999	4,333
Kansas	1,481	1,467	1,580	1,912	2,170	2,220
Kentucky	847	849	892	1,124	1,288	1,270
Louisiana	311	284	303	349	390	414
Maine	253	273	295	347	400	373
Maryland	368	379	372	400	410	456
Massachusetts	527	571	587	725	800	814
Michigan	1,214	1,287	1,335	1,422	1,518	1,712
Minnesota	1,873	2,063	2,236	2,826	3,477	3,712
Mississippi	466	437	468	546	643	663
Missouri	1,981	2,072	2,171	2,533	2,887	3,052
Montana	182	197	211	236	250	267
Nebraska	1,126	1,129	1,267	1,611	1,858	1,980
Nevada	28	28	31	34	36	41
New Hampshire	234	228	235	280	322	358
New Jersey	764	805	831	924	940	1,038
New Mexico	96	104	108	117	144	155
New York	1,666	1,743	1,810	1,889	2,032	2,172
North Carolina	660	672	715	832	1,010	1,021
North Dakota	324	364	404	534	637	667
Ohio	2,187	2,230	2,351	2,533	2,703	2,867
Oklahoma	983	983	1,103	1,349	1,510	1,665
Oregon	423	432	440	467	497	501
Pennsylvania	2,066	2,062	2,155	2,346	2,611	2,809
Rhode Island	57	63	72	70	71	76
South Carolina	257	254	266	299	326	355
South Dakota	594	595	651	875	988	1,104
Tennessee	785	700	810	970	1,171	1,155
Texas	2,229	2,308	2,430	2,807	3,216	3,475
Utah	256	269	280	300	322	381
Vermont	116	121	126	143	164	169
Virginia	823	867	870	975	1,021	1,065
Washington	767	824	866	866	938	926
West Virginia	422	426	418	481	526	537
Wisconsin	1,594	1,667	1,789	2,052	2,196	2,423
Wyoming	78	75	79	91	106	110
United States	38,843	39,585	41,765	48,331	54,165	57,481

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Crop Reporting Board.

Information from the United States Department of Agriculture shows that about 8,000,000,000 eggs were diverted to lease-lend in 1943 and also in 1944.

The shipments of eggs to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, the armed forces, and exports to other countries also must be taken into consideration.

From the total production it would appear that ample eggs for all purposes are and could be available. They no doubt will be available unless the War Food Administration disturbs the program of egg production. We can at least hope that they do **not** disrupt it.

Commendation of Fred E. Gross by the War Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the present world conflict, we have been aware in some measure of the scientific and mechanical developments that have been achieved through the ingenuity, skill, and patriotic endeavor of many civilians, who share the common desire to contribute their utmost in the prosecution of the war. We are indebted to them for the preservation of lives that are dear to us, for the necessary means of warfare, and for the savings that have been effected to protect our economy.

It seems appropriate to identify one of those who has so contributed, and who is a resident of the district I have the honor to represent. In recognition of his exceptional civilian service, Mr. Fred E. Gross, a civil and electrical engineer of Lonoke, Ark., has received official commendation by the War Department for designing an ammunition box for fuzes, which has become standard for use.

The value of the design, through conservation of critical materials and shipping space, increased production, and in tremendous savings of money and manpower, is evidenced by the detailed statement submitted by Col. W. L. Bell, Jr., in recommending to the Ordnance Office Board on Civilian Awards that the exceptional award be granted Mr. Gross. Colonel Bell's statement follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1944.

Memorandum for: Ordnance Orice Board on Civilian Awards.

Subject: Exceptional award for Mr. Fred E. Gross.

1. In accordance with paragraph 3b (2) of A. S. F. Civilian Personnel Memorandum No. 91, it is recommended the following person receive the exceptional award:

(a) Name of employee: Mr. Fred E. Gross.

(b) Organization: Inspection Branch, Ammunition Division, Industrial Service, Ordnance Department, A. S. F.

(c) Period of service: Employed at Arkansas Ordnance Plant, Little Rock, Ark., from April 20, 1942, to July 31, 1944, when transferred to office, Chief of Ordnance.

(d) Statement of outstanding service which merits the award: Soon after taking charge of the bomb component line at Arkansas Ordnance Plant, the line was faced with a bottleneck for the want of certain bolts, wing nuts, and washers used in securing the vane assemblies in the packing boxes for the 100 series of tail bomb fuzes. Being cadmium or zinc plated, as called for by the specifications, they were rather critical to obtain, and the line would be forced by the lack of them to close down. In view of this fact, Mr. Gross went to work, on his own time, and designed an ammunition box which securely and adequately held the vane assemblies in place, within the box, without the use of any critical materials, having substituted wood therefor.

(1) The design was presented to technical department of the Arkansas Ordnance Plant through channels to office, Chief of Ordnance.

(2) On February 15, 1943, this design came out on the official ordnance drawing No. 76-16-166, being mandatory on all future contracts, and current contracts as soon as the change-over could be made without interfering with production.

(3) This box design was originally used for the AN-M100A1, AN-M101A1 and the AN-M102A1 fuzes. Since then it has become standard for use in the following packing of not only the above fuzes, but the following fuzes as well: AN-M112A1, AN-M113A1, AN-M114A1, M115, M116, M117, M120, M121, M123, M124, and M125.

(4) Unit savings per box were as follows: Displacement, 0.64 cubic feet. Lumber, 1.35 square feet. Zinc or cadmium plated nuts, bolts and washers, 1.50 pounds. Lumber by weight, 2.50 pounds. No. 10 1½" wood screws, 0.25 pound. Less weight per box when completely packed over old style, 3.50 pounds.

Saves 640,000 cubic feet displacement equal to 380 railroad boxcar loads in 1,520 shipped, or 10 merchant transport shiploads in 40 loads, or 250 cargo plane loads per 1,000 loads, $2,500,000 estimated savings; 1,350,000 board feet building lumber equal to 135 seven-room homes, or 96,444 additional packing boxes, $195,781 estimated savings; 1,500,000 pounds steel equal to 750 tons of critical war material, $600,000 estimated savings; 6,000,000 pounds shipping equal to 3,000 tons, or 60 shiploads, $3,000,000 estimated savings.

Furthermore, it saves manpower on the production and assembly lines, eliminates unnecessary processes, and improves existing methods. Improves conditions affecting health and safety of operators. It eliminates excesses, increases production, improves methods of unpacking in the field of operations when assembling onto the bombs.

As the lines of supply lengthen, the importance of these savings is increased proportionally.

W. L. BELL, Jr.,
Colonel, Ordnance Department.

The citation accompanying the award to Mr. Gross reads as follows:

In recognition of his outstanding contribution to the Ordnance Department and the Nation's war effort by the design of an ammunition box which has conserved critical materials and shipping space and has also resulted in tremendous savings of money, time, and labor for the Government.

One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and inspiring address delivered by His Excellency, the Ambassador of Greece, at Worcester, Mass., on last March 25, in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek independence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am most happy to have the opportunity of visiting the city of Worcester, and deem it a fortunate event that I appear at this gathering at the same time with my honorable colleague, the Minister of our good ally, New Zealand. Moreover, I desire to extend my thanks to the United Nations Information Office for their kind invitation to deliver an address on the occasion of the anniversary of Greek independence, which falls on this day.

Having for more than 5 years the honor to represent my country in the United States, I can say from experience that, outside of Greece, in no other country is this anniversary celebrated with more warmth and enthusiasm than in the United States. This is due to the existence here of a large number of Americans of Greek descent, who know how to unite in their devotion and loyalty the two countries—America and Greece—and to the fact that this land by its love of freedom, and its free institutions, and its numerous and recurrent manifestations of a living democracy, appears as the direct inheritor of the spirit of ancient Greece. Today, you may be sure, ladies and gentlemen, that there is no city in the United States, including large or small Greek communities, which does not celebrate in all earnestness this anniversary of the rebirth of the Greeks as a free nation. Our minds turn reverently to the unforgettable great men of the Greek Revolution and the Philhellenes who shed their blood or otherwise contributed to make Greece free.

Everybody knows of the struggle of Greece during the present war and the tremendous sacrifices she has made in order to defend her honor by the side of the freedom-loving people. Today, thanks to the victories of its great allies, Greece again breathes the air of freedom, but the loss of life and the damage wrought by the enemy is appalling. Health conditions are beyond description. Mr. Van Vlach, an American doctor on the staff of the U. N. R. R. A. in Greece, reported lately that 60 percent of the inhabitants in certain regions who survived the war, are tubercular and that malaria has become a real scourge. Other official information shows that for at least the next 2 years Greece, generally speaking, will not be able to use its railroads—so great and so thorough has been the destruction wrought by the enemy to the vital factor of transportation and communication.

Nevertheless, I wish to emphasize in mentioning the frightful figures, that I do not wish to leave an impression of pessimism for the future of my country, but, rather, to place on record how costly freedom has been to Greece. The Greek Nation must be imbued with the consciousness that it should look forward with the determination to rebuild the country and to resume its course in order to fulfill its mission in that part of Europe. No other consideration is more important. The task is formidable and it requires all the patriotism, the spirit of union, and the vitality of the Greek people; the union with the mother country of those well-known territories which rightfully belong to the Greek inheritance in order that Greece might feel secure and fully reestablished in her new frontiers; and above all, the help of the great allies for the reconstruction and rehabilitation for the completely disrupted land. What the Greek people ask for today is that their powerful friends give them the means of work and production. They know how to do the rest. They know that only thus will they find the possibility of restoring their normal life, which, under the most optimistic calculations, will take more than one decade if the country is to be brought back to the conditions it enjoyed in 1939.

Of course, Greece will have to face many problems arising out of the war; problems for the solution of which, as we have mentioned above, Greece will need the help of the great allies. It is a good omen, nevertheless, to be able to give assurance that there are certain conditions in Greece which will facilitate the solution of these problems. Firstly, the social struture of the population. This population in 1939 amounted to 7,600,000. We reckon that we have lost in the struggle 500,000 from causes directly or indirectly connected with the war. So the remainder of the population does not exceed 7,100,000. The rural population represents 60 percent and the urban about 40 percent. Agriculture is still the principle occupation, employing over a million ablebodied peasants with their families. We have no landed aristocracy or privileged class. We have a small capitalistic class of bankers, industrialists, and shipowners. The average Greek is either a peasant or a small bourgeois.

This is the best proof that the recent uprising had no justifiable social causes. I will add that on this point a large segment of American public opinion has been largely misled. Moreover, we do not have to face in Greece the problem of nationalizing existing wealth monopolized by private interests, because this wealth is very limited. We have no landowners, as I said, we have no large mines, and no big banking institutions, and the management of public utilities does not lead to undue exploitation as it happens in larger and highly industrialized countries.

These are the causes for which, in spite of the very critical conditions now prevailing in Greece, we are confident that we will be able to restore the country. Let me say that we expect a great deal from the peace organization which will result from the San Francisco Conference. Greece has always been a peace-loving country and one of the most faithful adherents of the League of Nations. She has always believed in human progress by peaceful means as distinguished from the concept of the predatory powers against whom she resisted so valiantly. But at the same time, the Greek people feel the need of safe frontiers—for such need has been indelibly impressed upon her mind by three invasions during the last 30 years.

In order to clarify this statement, I would point out that in this regard the geographic position of Greece and her security in relation to Bulgaria is in all respects comparable to the position of those neighbors of Germany who have always lived in constant fear of Germany and have more than once in the last three generations been victims of aggression.

It is our hope that in the post-war world we will enjoy freedom from want and freedom from fear in a world rid of the menace of war and so be permitted to follow unmolested the natural inclinations of the Greek people to devote themselves to their obligations arising out of our long history and to the moral uplifting and material improvement of that land which has been our home for thousands of years.

Authorization for Use of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an advance release of the War Production Board stating, among other things, that the Board has authorized the supply of approximately 280,000,000 board feet for use in England and other countries.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lumber authorized for rehabilitation use overseas and for construction in this country of prefabricated housing for export amounts to less than 1 percent of anticipated 1945 domestic lumber production, the War Production Board said today. Amounts authorized total about 280,000,000 board feet, and species and grades being supplied are those that will conflict as little as possible with military and essential domestic civilian requirements.

Quantities of lumber authorized for rehabilitation use to date, including direct shipment and that for prefabricated housing are: 5,600,000 board-feet for repair of dikes in Holland; 23,400,000 board-feet for barracks to house workers repairing French ports, prefabricated in the United States; 4,750,000 board-feet for repairing war damage in formerly occupied countries; 164,000,000 board-feet for 30,000 temporary housing units for England, prefabricated in the United States; and about 80,000,000 board-feet for repair of bomb-damaged structures and other essential uses in England.

Though this lumber is not for direct military use, it will fill needs that have a direct bearing on military operations, particularly in the case of dike repair and barracks for workers at French ports, W. P. B. officials pointed out.

The 30,000 housing units for England will to a small extent alleviate serious housing shortages, W. P. B. said. One-third of all dwellings in England have been destroyed or damaged by bombing, and minimum requirements for temporary dwellings are estimated to be 500,000 units. Specifications for the 30,000 prefabricated units have been drawn up so as to use a minimum of lumber; other materials are being used for sheathing, siding, and roofing. Lumber for hardwood flooring, millwork, and crating is included in the 164,000,000 board-feet authorized for this program.

J. Philip Boyd, Director of the Lumber and Lumber Products Division, in a letter to the lumber industry said: "In view of the desperate needs which the rehabilitation lumber partly serves, I do not believe the amount constitutes an unfair or unreasonable demand on our lumber resources." "The extent of our aid to foreign countries in supplying lumber for urgent needs has been greatly exaggerated through unfounded rumors and misunderstanding," he said.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project in Relation to the Shipshaw Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the St. Lawrence seaway and power project at this time because of testimony just now developing before the Senate Committee on Small Business. Evidence presented before this committee the last few days gives striking proof of the immediate need for completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The evidence further demonstrates the false economy which prominent Government officials have followed in pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the development of the natural resources of other countries, while at the same time development of our own natural resources has been sidetracked and delayed. In brief the facts about the Shipshaw project are these:

In 1941 a few weeks after the United States-Canadian agreement to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power project was signed on March 19, 1941, the Metals Reserve Company, an R. F. C. subsidiary, entered into a series of contracts to make advance payments for aluminum and loans to the Aluminum Company of Canada, Ltd. Under these contracts the United States engaged to purchase over 1,300,000,000 pounds of aluminum at prices running, in some instances, to as high as 22 cents a pound. At the same time, aluminum was being produced in this country at a price as low as 12 cents a pound. These contracts with the Canadian Aluminum Monopoly, owned by the same majority stockholders as the Aluminum Company of America, derived sufficient advance payments, loans, and profits from the United States Treasury to enable that company to build the enormous Shipshaw power project on the Saguenay River in the wilds of the Province of Quebec.

The testimony shows that the Shipshaw project was given precedence over the St. Lawrence development and was rushed to completion in 1941, 1942, and 1943 while the St. Lawrence agreement of 1941 was sidetracked by United States Government officials. What a paradox and what a tragedy.

If such a policy is carried over into the reconversion and post-war period it will result in a ruinous condition. Not only does such a policy check the development of our natural resources but in the post-war period when unemployment may become serious, it fosters the closing of our own factories and will result in unemployment of our own people. How can this Government defend such a ridiculous program? The answer is that it cannot be defended. There is no valid excuse for the delay in passing necessary legislation to authorize and complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power project together with other worthy projects through the Nation.

In contrast with the speed with which the Shipshaw deal was rushed through I wish to present to the House at this time a factual record showing how the St. Lawrence seaway and power project was surveyed, studied, and approved after public hearings by committees of both branches of Congress long before the present World War.

BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY RATIFIED BY THE SENATE IN 1910

In 1909 the United States and Great Britain, on behalf of Canada, signed the Boundary Waters Treaty, which was ratified by the United States in 1910. This was a general treaty for the regulation of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence boundary waters between the United States and Canada.

It extended equal navigation rights to both countries in these boundary waters, provided for diversion of waters at Niagara Falls for the benefit of both countries, and contemplated that future improvements, relating both to navigation and power, might be dealt with by special agreements between the two countries subject to approval by the reciprocal legislation to be enacted by Congress and the Canadian Parliament. In other words, the 1909 boundary treaty, as ratified by the United States Senate in 1910, was broad enough in its terms to provide for future developments and to obviate the necessity of authorizing each of these developments by means of a special treaty.

ST. LAWRENCE TREATY SIGNED IN 1932

On July 18, 1932, the United States and Great Britain, on behalf of Canada, signed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty. In the negotiation of this treaty under the Hoover administration, the State Department chose for reasons which it considered proper, to disregard the agreement method and to follow the treaty method of ratifying this agreement of July 18, 1932. It was recognized at that time that either procedure was proper, as the Assistant Secretary, Adolph Berle, of the State Department, testified at hearings before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941.

The 1932 treaty was submitted to the United States Senate by President Hoover in January 1933 but was not acted upon until after the close of the Hoover administration. President Roosevelt resubmitted the treaty to the Senate with a recommendation that it be ratified in a special message on January 10, 1934.

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate meanwhile had completed exhaustive public hearings on the merits of the project beginning in November 1932 and continuing through February 1933. By a vote of 15 to 5 the committee approved the project and recommended that the treaty be ratified.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL-STATE ACCORDS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE POWER PROJECT REACHED IN 1932–33

In the course of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations the committee took definite action to allocate the share of the construction cost to be assumed by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario in connection with the construction of the dam near Massena, N. Y., in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. It is in this section of the river that all the power is to be developed in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and it is the unharnessed rapids of this section of the river also which at present stand as the chief bottleneck against deep-water navigation from Duluth to the open waters of the Atlantic. In this section of the river 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity is to be developed and at the same time the obsolete 14-foot canals now used are to be replaced by modern 27-foot side

canals with locks of a depth of 30 feet around the dam structures.

It developed during the Senate hearings in 1932–33 that the Province of Ontario had already signed an agreement with the Dominion of Canada under which Ontario was to take over the ownership and operation of the Canadian half of the power project in the International Rapids section and was to assume the cost of construction of the Canadian half of the power project. Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, took the lead in bringing about a similar arrangement on the United States side between the State of New York and the Federal Government. Senator Walsh and the committee initiated conferences between the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the power authority of the State of New York which resulted in a Federal-State accord dated February 7, 1933. Under this accord, the power authority undertook to assume $90,000,000 of the costs of construction of the power project on the United States side and to conduct and maintain the power development to be built in the State of New York. This accord was first presented at public hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and was approved by that committee in its report to the Senate.

In April 1933, a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 157, was introduced in the House by Chairman McReynolds, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and was introduced in the Senate by Chairman Pittman, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to approve and implement the Federal-State accord. The resolution was referred in the House to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was favorably reported to the House by Chairman RAYBURN. The resolution was adopted by the House on April 26, 1933, after Chairman RAYBURN and Representative Snell, of New York, then the minority leader, had urged favorable consideration.

In the Senate, opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, led by Senator Huey Long, of Louisiana, and Senator Copeland, of New York, staged a filibuster to prevent prompt Senate consideration of the resolution passed by the House. Meanwhile, the St. Lawrence treaty of 1932 reached a vote in the Senate March 14, 1934. A clear majority of the Senate, sufficient to authorize any ordinary construction project, voted to approve the 1932 treaty, but, lacking a two-thirds majority, the treaty failed at that time of ratification.

ST. LAWRENCE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATED BY SECRETARY OF STATE HULL

From 1934 until 1941 Secretary of State Cordell Hull conducted negotiations with Canada intermittently to reach a new agreement on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The old treaty, for all practical purposes, was dead and the project had to be revived by new negotiations.

In the fall of 1940 the Power Authority of the State of New York and Governor Lehman joined in a recommendation that engineering surveys and plans be initiated to speed the St. Lawrence development as a part of the national defense program. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army was directed by the President in October 1940 to conduct such surveys and prepare such plans. On the basis of these fresh surveys and plans the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, signed the pending amendment on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. On the same day the Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada signed a collateral agreement allocating costs of $90,000,000 to the province and renewing the Dominion-Provincial accord of 1932.

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT AND BILL APPROVED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE AFTER PUBLIC HEARINGS

A bill to approve the March 19, 1941, agreement between the United States and Canada was introduced in the House in June 1941 by Chairman MANSFIELD of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This bill was reported by the House committee by a 2 to 1 vote on November 21, 1941, after prolonged public hearings. The opponents of the seaway and power project exhausted every device to prolong the hearings and to prevent the bill from coming to a vote on its merits in the Seventy-seventh Congress. They were successful. In its report on this bill the committee cited the fact that War Department, Navy Department, the United States Maritime Commission and all other Federal agencies having to do with the improvement had strongly recommended passage of the bill as a measure that would be of immense value to the whole Nation both in time of war and in time of peace. The committee also reported to the House that both Federal and State agencies had agreed upon the Federal-State accord provisions of the bill, which provisions the committee found were in the public interest.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO DEVELOP OUR OWN RESOURCES AND TO PROTECT OUR OWN PEOPLE AS THE WAR IN EUROPE ENDS

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, companion bills, identical with the former Mansfield bill, were introduced in the House by the late Representative Culkin of New York, Representative WASIELEWSKI, of Wisconsin, and myself. In the Senate an identical bill was introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. Although Senator AIKEN repeatedly pointed out in debate that the Shipshaw project was being rushed ahead of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, it proved impossible to get public hearings on the merits of the St. Lawrence project bill during the life of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Lacking such hearings and without a committee report on the bill, under legislative procedure it was not possible to have legislation enacted.

We now face the need for immediate action on this project in the Seventy-ninth Congress. There is no use to dodge, or alibi, or make excuses for refusal to act on this matter at this time, and in this year.

On January 4, 1945, I reintroduced the St. Lawrence project bill, H. R. 671, in the same form in which it was approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House in 1941. We will fail in doing our full duty to the American people if favorable action on this project is further delayed.

Letter From the President of the University of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a letter from the president of the University of Oklahoma, which I deem worthy of consideration:

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Okla., April 7, 1945.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to call your attention to Senate bill 637 which was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER of Louisiana on February 26 of this year. We ask that you give this bill, or at least the purposes it was intended to serve, your full support.

The situation intended to be remedied by this bill is that confronting our people because of the woeful lack of trained medical personnel that will be available to serve the health of the Nation after the war. The situation is critical. Since 1941 a very large proportion of our able-bodied physicians has been called into military service. Of this proportion, probably one-fifth will not return to practice in any capacity after the war. During the war period civilian training for physicians has practically stopped. Civilian premedical students have been drafted into the service without regard to the future of the profession. Our best premedical students volunteered before they were called. That means that our best materials for training for the profession were lost, many temporarily, and too many permanently. Their places in the schools have been taken by military trainees who were assigned to study medicine and with too little regard for their fitness for that work. Our best premedical students are not given an opportunity to go on with their studies as military trainees.

As to the situation after the war: In the 3½ years since Pearl Harbor a substantial proportion of our former civilian physicians have been disabled or killed or their health impaired so that they will not be available in their profession. There will be a greatly increased need for medical men for the enlarged Military and Naval Establishment that will be maintained in the future. The military and naval trainees who were prepared during the war will not come near meeting this enlarged demand. If we have a system of universal military training for 18-year-olds, an additional large number of physicians will be assigned to the care of their health, a number out of proportion to the needs of those men while they were a part of our civilian population. Greater demands will be made on military hospitals for the care of soldiers wounded or nervously incapacitated because of their war experience. The net result will be that not more than three-fourths and probably fewer of our former civilian physicians will ever serve the civilian public again.

This brings up the question of the adequacy of the relief that will be afforded by the Ellender bill.

It provides that the President may call out from the armed forces not more than 10,000 men ready for the first year of preprofessional medical work and may place them in colleges for training. That not to exceed 4,500 shall be allowed to remain in such preparation beyond the third month of the second year of their preprofessional training. Our

observation, based on experience, is that 10,000 men sent into the colleges for their first year of premedical training will not screen out 4,500 at the end of the second year of preprofessional work, of the quality and capabilities required. Our experience is that not 40 percent of the young hopefuls, as contemplated by the bill, but nearer 25 percent, will ever reach an approved medical school. That would mean that the first-year quota must be nearer 18,000 to furnish even that quota of 4,500 entering the medical schools.

And the number of 4,500 accepted medical students each year will not be adequate. Even if all could graduate and serve the public, it would mean only one new doctor added for about 27,000 people each year beginning about 7 years from now. By that time only a negligible proportion of the doctors who served when the war began will remain. With 4,500 new men entering the medical schools each year, and counting the attrition that will result from all causes, only 40,000 doctors, approximately, will be prepared in the 10 years following 1952. That will give one new doctor for each 3,000 persons in that entire period.

There should be a more urgent campaign to greatly increase this number. Public health is public safety; it is assurance that we will, say in 1960, be able to defend ourselves against an enemy. This is a problem for the Government of the United States, as well as the States. The apparent tendency has been to limit the numbers in the profession and preparing for the profession each year. No limitation should be applicable in the present critical situation as to the supply of competent doctors for the public.

The bill should go further in directing the President to consult the schools as to the best available material now in the armed forces. Since many will have been out of school 2 to 4 years, opportunity for refresher courses should be offered. The number should be increased and, if necessary, the Government should provide subsidies to permit the medical schools to increase their capacity.

I have dealt with the subject at this length because it is a vital one and one too little understood. We ask that our Representatives and Senators be alert to the needs set out above, and that they lend support to every movement to improve the medical situation and the public health.

Cordially yours,

G. L. CROSS, *President.*

Centennial Year of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas on December 28, 1946, the State of Iowa will have completed its first century of statehood, and the year will be celebrated in Iowa as the State's centennial year; and

Whereas there is general desire on the part of the people of the State that the centennial year of Iowa shall be made the occasion for renewed interest in and acceleration of the study of the entire history of Iowa, by appropriate ceremonies in the schools, the churches, and all civic societies, in every city and town of the State, to the end that Iowa people shall have finer appreciation of their own State and the achievements of her people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the fifty-first general assembly hereby endorses and approves the movement made by Hon. KARL LECOMPTE, and other members of the Iowa delegation in Congress, to secure the publication by the Postal Department of a special stamp commemorative of the event, serving to remind all the people of the fact that Iowa was the first free State of the Louisiana Purchase, and of its growth and greatness; and the similar effort to secure the coinage of a special commemorative coin of special Iowa significance, and we hereby add our indorsement to the effort to make not only Iowa but all the world more history-conscious as a background for the higher patriotism affecting all things American.

HAROLD FELTON,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH A. EVANS,
President of the Senate.

Resolution of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions of the Polish-American Congress adopted on March 9, 1945, at meeting of the executive board held at Polish Women's Alliance Building, Chicago, Ill., relative to the decisions reached at the Yalta Conference with regard to Poland. These resolutions are very informative and I am of the opinion they will be of great interest to Members of Congress:

Whereas President Roosevelt named the decisions made at the Yalta Conference "a compromise," an admission in itself that they were unsatisfactory to him—

Whereas they are contrary to the aims of the Atlantic Charter, since they accede to might and not law and justice, giving away half of Poland to Russia without agreement or consultation, without knowledge and without consent of the legal Polish Government, and also without hearing the will of those most concerned, the people themselves—

Whereas the decisions made at the Yalta Conference are contrary to international law, especially in the case of United States adhesion by virtue of signature to declarations of the Hague Convention, which do not foresee the affront to moral righteousness in permitting one ally to dispose of the lands of another ally—

Whereas the decisions made at the Yalta Conference violate the fundamental principle of democracy in international relations, namely, the principle of equality among nations in regard to rights, as recognized by Secretary Hull on March 21, 1944, in the name of the United States Government as an indispensable stipulation for a better organized world in the following declarations:

"Each sovereign nation, large or small is in law and under law the equal of every nation; the principle of sovereign equality of all peace loving states, irrespective of size and strength * * * will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed; * * * all nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs."

Whereas the Yalta Conference decisions deprived Poland of equal rights by deciding her boundaries without her knowledge and agreement, at the same time accepting the principle of "interference in the internal affairs" of Poland as a privilege of the Big Three, a privilege which in actuality serves the Soviet Russian Government—

Whereas thus it was resolved, with the absence of legal or moral basis, to submit sovereign rights of the Polish Nation and people to establish its own government into the hands of the Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Molotov, who is to be aided in this usurpation and misuse of the sovereign rights of the Polish Nation by the English and American Ambassadors to Russia, through this act Poland's independence, expressed time and again by our Government as the necessary fundamental of justice, actually was destroyed—

Whereas through signing such resolutions the United States Government burdened itself and the American people with joint responsibility for the legalization at the Yalta Conference of Russian aggressive acts in regard to the Baltic States and especially in regard to our heroic ally, Poland—

Whereas by the legislation of the Yalta Conference resolves and Russian acts of force and aggression, the United States would take joint responsibility with the American people for all the violent acts, murders, and brutality the Soviet officials perpetrated, are perpetrating, and will continue perpetrating in regard to our comrades-in-arms, the soldiers of the Polish underground army, who through their superhuman sacrifices rendered Soviet Russia and us priceless military aid and who were solemnly acknowledged to possess the right of a combatant ally by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain—

Whereas all decisions of this type strike at the good name and honor of the United States, depriving it of the friendship of the free nations of Europe, depriving it of influence and respect, and lead to an isolation that is a menace to our future—

Whereas as a result of the decisions made at the Yalta Conference Soviet hegemony in the greater part of Europe and Asia shall be solidified, a fact which will threaten our security—the Executive Board of the Polish American Congress hereby resolves to ask that the United States Senate refuse to confirm the decisions made at the Yalta Conference, since they represent the acceptance of might over right, the legalization of aggression, a denial of democratic principles and equality in international relations, and, generally speaking, the recognition of Soviet Russia's hegemony in the whole world—simultaneously the Polish American Congress confirms that:

1. Only the constitutional Polish Government in London today represents the Polish Nation and people, and only the constitutional Government of Poland can and should take part in the Conference at San Francisco.

2. Any "government" brought into being by a foreign power will not be representative of the will and rights of the Polish Nation, and as such cannot be recognized by the United States without violation of the elementary principles of law and justice.

3. Any elections held on Polish soil under Soviet occupation are in the nature of things a distortion and falsification of the will of the Polish Nation, a violation of free conscience and as such are lawless and illegal.

4. Any governing bodies created by a marionette "government" imposed on the Polish Nation through a foreign power cannot be

recognized as Polish governing bodies but should be recognized as Soviet agents.

5. Any disposal of the estates and properties of the State, its citizens and Polish institutions, without agreement and more, contrary to the will of the legal Polish Government and Polish Parliament—will be constituted illegal acts of plunder.

The Executive Board of the Polish American Congress resolves that the above resolution be sent to the President and members of the United States Government, to all Senators and Congressmen, and to all Governors and State Legislators.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President*

Inflation Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Grange Monthly for April, 1945:

INFLATION CONTROL

In assuming the office of Director of Economic Stabilization, William H. Davis has said wisely that the closer we come to the end of the war, the more imperative it is that we hold to our controls against inflation.

The National Grange has deplored the short-sighted control policy we have followed, but having set upon such a course, agrees that it cannot be relaxed or abandoned now without a complete breakdown, and a degree of inflation greater than if no attempt to control inflation had been made. Somehow we must manage to hold the line until production of the things people need catches up with the demand. In the meantime we will have increasing trouble with shortages, more and more regimentation, and we hope we will have learned a lesson in simple economics.

When war came, with its increased demands and increased personal incomes, it was evident that inflation was inevitable unless steps were taken to hold it in check. Either one of two courses could have been pursued:

One way would have been to make use of economic forces by providing conditions which would be an incentive to increase the supply of consumers' goods, while at the same time reducing the demand through taxes and savings. In the case of those items which could not be produced in sufficient supply to meet the demand, the demand could have been adjusted to fit the supply through rationing.

The second way would have been to try to override economic forces by laws, edicts, and regulations, and, by decree, to establish ceilings on the prices of consumer goods.

We adopted the latter course in spite of the fact that it had never succeeded over an extended period. We ignored the fact that costs always go up in wartime, and that if we held ceilings below cost, production would fall off and add to the difficulty. What we actually did was to engage in a desperate gamble, betting that the war would end before we had reduced production by the price-ceiling method so much that we would create want and suffering, with the inevitable growth of black markets and final collapse.

We set out on a program of regulating everything, not stopping to think that when we attempted to save the workingman money by placing a ceiling on the price of his work shirts, we did him an injury when that ceiling drove the work shirts off the market and forced him to buy a shirt costing three times the money.

The statistical indices show we have maintained the price level fairly well. The actual figures show that it is costing consumers much more to live, because they are forced to buy flimsy material or goods they don't want, while many are patronizing black markets at enormously higher costs.

It does little good to point out that we might easily have avoided many of the shortages we now face. The simple fact is that we followed the expedient course, and have created a lot of unnecessary shortages, and we now have to decide which way to go from where we are.

Four years ago, in warning against this danger, the National Grange said that if we embarked on the expedient course of price fixing, it would be almost impossible to back up. That is where we are now, and we agree with Director Davis, that it is very necessary to hold the line now, until we can begin to increase the supplies to meet the demands. Our policies involving ceilings and subsidies will have to be modified gradually if we are to avoid a bad economic upset.

Consumers may be pinched harder before they find relief. Real and lasting relief can come only through increasing production, gradually bringing supply and demand into balance. If, for example, this means an increase of $2 a hundred in the price of hogs, the consumers may have to pay a little more money for their bacon, but eventually they will find relief in a more plentiful supply of meat, and will not have to take so many of the cuts which actually produce less nourishment per dollar of investment. They may have to pay 75 cents for a shirt they could formerly buy for 60 cents, but they will then be able to buy all the shirts they want and will not have to substitute with a $2 shirt, because none of the cheaper shirts are to be had.

We should not expect to live as well in wartime as in peacetime. War causes waste, and waste costs money. If we demand that all our incomes keep abreast of these rising costs we are demanding inflation. We are approaching the most critical days in the big gamble we have undertaken. Now is not the time to turn loose of all controls. Rather it is the time to tighten our belts and take the necessary steps to begin to strengthen our production capacity. Let us not add to the fuel of inflation by increasing costs and maintaining selling prices at figures which curtail production. Let us strike at the cause of inflation and begin to build a program which will work us out instead of deeper and deeper into trouble.

Milk Used in Cheese Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties and the request of Congress to delegate to one man the power to have absolute control of the Nation's foreign agricultural policy is to be considered by the Congress by July 1, 1945.

Before the discussions on this issue become too heated and before the pressure is applied that might result in an unfair approach to the problem, I wish to submit the official price figures for each month from January 1, 1920, to January 1, 1945:

Prices received by Wisconsin farmers for milk used by cheese factories, 1920–35

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual weighted average [1]
1920	2.92	2.63	2.54	2.46	2.25	2.02	2.00	2.13	2.30	2.33	2.36	2.01	2.30
1921	2.17	2.10	1.90	1.30	.98	1.00	1.43	1.53	1.58	1.82	1.70	1.71	1.56
1922	1.68	1.65	1.49	1.24	1.31	1.39	1.50	1.56	1.85	2.25	2.32	2.39	1.67
1923	2.30	2.14	1.90	1.85	1.87	1.87	1.82	2.01	2.23	2.24	2.20	2.00	2.01
1924	1.96	1.80	1.65	1.33	1.40	1.42	1.40	1.53	1.60	1.60	1.70	1.87	1.58
1925	1.96	1.87	1.84	1.80	1.78	1.78	1.76	1.88	1.96	2.17	2.12	2.13	1.90
1926	2.08	1.95	1.72	1.51	1.53	1.58	1.58	1.71	1.93	2.13	2.17	2.21	1.80
1927	2.16	2.00	1.89	1.86	1.90	1.87	1.87	2.05	2.23	2.42	2.34	2.36	2.05
1928	2.30	2.00	1.84	1.82	1.86	1.97	1.99	2.05	2.10	2.09	2.04	2.07	2.00
1929	1.96	1.93	1.89	1.80	1.76	1.71	1.68	1.75	1.94	2.02	1.97	1.90	1.84
1930	1.73	1.64	1.59	1.52	1.45	1.37	1.32	1.43	1.56	1.53	1.50	1.40	1.49
1931	1.29	1.17	1.15	1.00	.90	.90	.95	1.06	1.20	1.23	1.14	1.06	1.07
1932	.98	.86	.81	.76	.72	.69	.71	.78	.90	.93	.90	.92	.81
1933	.83	.74	.72	.82	.95	1.01	1.02	.97	.96	.98	.97	.84	.91
1934	.89	1.06	1.08	.95	.92	.96	.91	.97	.98	1.03	1.13	1.17	1.00
1935	1.31	1.37	1.30	1.27	1.19	1.10	1.11	1.17	1.25	1.34	1.48	1.61	1.27
1936	1.51	1.38	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.27	1.43	1.56	1.60	1.57	1.58	1.58	1.42
1937	1.56	1.54	1.50	1.40	1.34	1.33	1.36	1.42	1.55	1.66	1.71	1.67	1.48
1938	1.50	1.37	1.28	1.16	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.02	1.04	1.10	1.15	1.18	1.16
1939	1.11	1.08	1.01	.96	1.00	1.05	1.05	1.09	1.24	1.38	1.46	1.45	1.14
1940	1.44	1.38	1.26	1.18	1.17	1.19	1.21	1.24	1.28	1.38	1.50	1.55	1.30
1941	1.48	1.38	1.41	1.49	1.60	1.73	1.85	1.98	2.15	2.25	2.30	2.30	1.82
1942	2.27	2.14	1.97	1.89	1.85	1.82	1.87	1.93	2.08	2.26	2.32	2.40	2.04
1943	2.45	2.45	2.44	2.44	2.42	2.43	2.45	2.48	2.54	2.57	2.58	2.59	2.48
1944	2.58	2.53	2.53	2.50	2.49	2.49	2.50	2.50	2.52	2.54	2.58	2.58	2.55

[1] Computed by weighting monthly average prices by average milk production per cow on 1st of each month.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

What do these prices show? First of all they prove that plenty of New Dealers have been making some reckless statements as to farm prices that prevailed during the last Republican administration. You will note that milk for cheese averaged $1.68 per hundredweight from 1920 to 1933 and that this was higher than it averaged any year of the New Deal from 1933 up to 1941, when the cheese price was supported for lease-lend shipments. The 1942, 1943, and 1944 prices of from $2.04 to $2.55 include a subsidy that was provided in December 1941.

Surely, milk averaged only 81 cents per hundredweight in 1932, but you will note that it averaged $1.30 per hundredweight for 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, and that in 1939, after 7 years of the more abundant life and before the war influenced prices, the milk for cheese averaged only $1.14 per hundredweight. You will also note that milk for cheese sold as low as 96 cents per hundredweight in 1939, after billions had been spent in the name of agriculture.

This table shows that many statements made by the New Dealers about milk prices are not accurate when the facts are presented.

Is it surprising that the hourly return for farm labor on the typical Wisconsin family-sized dairy farm was 14 cents per hour in 1939?

This delegation of power, as now proposed by the administration in extending the reciprocal trade treaties, places in one man the opportunity of determining the hourly wage of every person in our land. This problem should be approached from a public welfare standpoint and should not be a political football for any one group or for any one individual. As long as the Congress appropriates $1,000,000,000 a year and employs 200,000 or more part-time and full-time employees on a domestic agricultural program we can well stop, look, and listen before we turn the foreign agricultural program, which program can nullify all the benefits of the domestic agricultural program, over to any individual or any group in America.

When 50 percent of a State's farm income is from milk, and when one-third of the milk production of a State is diverted to cheese production, and when the prices of milk prevail that did prevail from 1930 to 1940, it is apparent what influence these low prices year after year really had on the economy of the State. Is it surprising that more farm mortgages were foreclosed by the Federal land bank than ever before by this institution in Wisconsin? The 100 legislative bills to support cotton, the billions of dollars of borrowed money to support soil-depleting crops, the expenditures of billions in the name of agriculture did not trickle down to the milk producer, whose product did not have the legislative advantages accorded other groups.

An Open Letter From Generoso Pope Urging Invitation of Italy to the San Francisco Conference

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an open letter by Generoso Pope, publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, the leading Italian daily newspaper of this country, to the members of the United States Security Delegation respecting Italy's right to be present at the conference soon to be held in San Francisco. I believe it clearly states the case.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

To the Members of the United States Security Delegation:

You, as members of the United States Security Delegation, realize the great responsibility which rests upon our country for the success of the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. It can be truly said that all America is deeply stirred by this momentous opportunity to lay the foundation for what our esteemed Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, once called "a world organization for peace and advancing civilization, rather than for war and degrading savagery."

The questions and tasks that will face our delegates are the vital concern of the entire Nation. It is, therefore, the right and duty of every citizen to help make this historic gathering fully fruitful. In this spirit Il Progresso urges the United States delegates to give earnest consideration to its ideas and proposals for assuring success at San Francisco.

BUILDING EFFECTIVE PEACE MACHINERY

We believe that the chief responsibility for establishing the new world order rests on those who have participated actively in defeating and destroying the Axis. Devotion to democratic ideals and loyalty to democratic institutions must be the animating spirit of the forces guiding the international security order. Finally, due consideration must be given to the size and importance of every nation, to the strategic location of every country, and to its potential role in the creation of a peaceful community of peoples. As we see it, these are the decisive prerequisites for constructing an effective machinery to preserve world peace. It is our firm conviction that in this approach we are at one with the mood and mind of the American people.

That is why Il Progresso appeals to every member of the American security delegation to have our country move for inviting democratic Italy to the San Francisco Conference. Let no one confound the Italy of today, our fighting partner, with the Italy of yesterday. The new Italy is vigorously anti-Fascist and is opposed to all deals and plans for aggrandizement. Present-day Italy is a valuable and vital source of potential strength for the peace and welfare of all nations. Its heart and soul are in the camp of world democracy; its people are an organic part of the forces of freedom marshalled for the annihilation of Axis tyranny and aggression.

Timely and telling recognition of Italy's role was made by President Roosevelt when he declared, in welcoming Italian Ambassador Alberto Tarchiani: "The American people admire the courage of patriotic Italians in the struggle against the enemy, and they watch sympathetically every sign that the Italians * * * are resolved to build a genuine democracy which will be proof against oppression from within and guarantee Italy's value to the world." Here is a warm-hearted and realistic attitude free from the bitter passions and old hates rooted in long-outlived conditions.

On the same occasion, the President paid tribute to "the hard-working, intelligent mass of Italian people" and expressed confidence "that Italy will build at home, and help to build for Europe, a political and social organization worthy of the heart and mind of her people." He went on to express his gratification that the Italian people are now represented by men "whose faith in human dignity and love of freedom clearly withstood the threats and blandishments of fascism." What a clear and refreshing realization that the Mussolini regime was much more the misfortune than the mistake of the Italian people. What an eloquent appeal that no further indignities and punishment should be inflicted on the resurgent liberty-loving Italian nation.

A WELL-EARNED RIGHT

No more powerful case could be made for the admittance of Italy to San Francisco. Democratic Italy has not been one of those neutral nations that hangs its flag with the prevailing winds. Its declaration of war against Germany has turned Italy into a fierce and bloody battleground. To deny the embattled freedom-loving Italian people representation at San Francisco is to treat them as a conquered foe and not as a liberated friend. No one with a sense of justice would propose such unwarranted distrust and mistreatment for this talented and vigorous Mediterranean nation which is so vital to world peace and prosperity.

Comradeship in arms certainly entitles a nation to the right of representation and cooperation in international conferences. If our soldiers can fight together with Italian troops and patriots for victory on the battlefield, why can't our diplomats and statesmen work together with the representatives of democratic Italy for the triumphs of peace in the sessions of San Francisco? The peoples who have suffered together for a common goal in war should strive together for common aims in peace. The Italian people have received the most glowing praise from our highest commanders for their service under fire. How, then, can our political leaders deny them a voice and hand in the halls of international peace deliberations?

The courage and capacities, the energy and idealistic patriotism of the aroused 47,000,000 people of fully liberated Italy are indispensable to the security and progress of all mankind. Humanity now has its last opportunity to avoid another mad orgy of suicidal world war. The hopes and prospects for an enduring peace rest above all on the ability of the leading nations—Italy included—to concentrate on the task of rebuilding civilization. For the sake of this noble objective we appeal to you members of the American world-security delegation to take the initiative in securing democratic Italy's representation at San Francisco and her recognition as a full-fledged ally.

GENEROSO POPE,
Publisher, Il Progresso Italo-Americano.

Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution by Representative Carlton Moore which was recently passed by the Texas House of Representatives. I feel the Social Security Board should give immediate attention to this matter.

House Concurrent Resolution 25

Whereas the benefits of the Social Security Act and particularly of the Unemployment Compensation Act have been extended by the Congress to cover a major portion of the people of the country who are employed in industry, business, and other private pursuits, but not to that large body of our people who are employed by the several States and their counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions; and

Whereas such State employees are performing work and labor equally essential and deserving of consideration and recognition to that of all others now protected by law; and

Whereas the adherence to such a policy by the Congress is an unfair discrimination against those in essential public service and ultimately will so detract State, county, and municipal employment that worthy and efficient people will seek other employment, all to the great impairment of the civil services and the welfare of the people: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend its benefits to State, county, and city employees; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward a copy hereof to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Texas Representatives in the Senate and House of the Congress with the request that it shall be presented to each body for consideration and appropriate action.

C. H. GILMER,
Speaker of the House.
JOHN LEE SMITH,
President of the Senate.

Address of Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1945, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, United States Navy, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations, addressed the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, New York City, N. Y. In this speech Admiral King made strong recommendations as to the control of certain bases that our armed forces have won in the Pacific. I am sure everyone recognizes the importance of the control of these bases to the people of the United States of America, as they can in all probability become the cornerstones for our future peace and security in the Pacific area. I want to join with the other Members of the House of Representatives who have commended the position taken by Admiral King, and share with them the hope that our representatives at the San Francisco Conference will recognize the importance of the views expressed by him. Because of the importance and timeliness of the material contained in this speech, I deem it quite appropriate to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include it in full at this point:

I wish to thank the Academy of Political Science for affording me this opportunity to speak. I propose to discuss the influence of certain phases of sea power as it has shaped some of the events of the war up to this time. I shall also touch upon the role sea power may play in our future national security.

For almost 3½ years we have been fighting an intense global war. During these months of combat, American seamen have proved themselves the rightful inheritors of naval traditions almost forgotten. During this same period our fleet has been multiplied in spite of war's bitter attrition. By now, however, sufficient evidence has been accumulated to warrant our drawing a few observations and conclusions. They are more than this—they are lessons.

Although sea power contributed much in the founding of our Republic, although it fought to preserve the nation after its birth, the passage of time records that we neglected our birthright. Somewhere along the line we lost the pioneer's vision. Particularly during the latter decades of the nineteenth century and until recent years the American public thought of this nation primarily as a land power. Several factors influenced that thought. Millions of our people lived inland—our territory was contiguous and it was located in a peaceful hemisphere.

But today, the United States is the leading maritime power in the world. And events of this war have proved—if proof were needed—that where international affairs are concerned, sea power is of maximum significance.

Sea power means precisely what it implies: the power to gain and hold control of the seas. It does not mean ships—and ships alone; neither does it mean planes—and planes alone. The term is collective, denoting the sum total of all those instruments by which control of the seas is gained and exercised.

Composed of seven essential elements, we may express sea power as an equation: Sea power equals surface ships plus submarines plus aircraft plus merchant ships plus naval bases plus trained personnel plus the productive capacity to build, equip, operate and fight them.

To be fully effective, sea power must have all of these seven vital elements. The omission of any one tends to upset the equation and renders sea power that much less efficient.

In the present war there have been several instances in which one or another of the belligerents failed to pay sufficient attention to all of the elements of sea power. By neglecting surface ships, submarines, aircraft, merchant ships, bases, trained personnel, or productive capacity, serious consequences were suffered.

Foremost in making such a costly blunder is Germany. The Germans, who have never been effectively sea-minded, launched their program of world conquest in 1939 without providing adequate means for projecting their massive land forces across intervening stretches of water. They placed their reliance upon the plane and the submarine. The submarine is intended, not so much as a means to gain control of the sea, but to deny its use to the enemy. German U-boats attacked the Allied life line to Britain, and the Battle of the Atlantic ensued. The result is well known to all.

Again, by placing their major confidence upon the airplane, the Nazis failed to thrust across the English Channel. Their planes wreaked havoc on British cities, but they could not occupy that defended land. The Germans massed tanks and infantry at the water's edge—and there they stopped. Their provisions for amphibious warfare, which we have since so highly developed, were inadequate. Our mastery of this kind of warfare and our control of the waters adjacent to Europe enabled Allied armies to do in 1944 what the Nazis were incapable of doing in 1940—cross the English Channel.

Japan, too, blundered. Perhaps the weakest link in her naval armor was the inability to protect her merchant marine. In their lightning offense of 1941–42 the Japanese sprawled their forces over an expanse greater than their merchant marine could effectively serve. Means were not available to them to prevent our submarines, and, later our planes, from whittling down Japanese shipping. This deficiency was further accentuated by the inadequacy of trained personnel and shipbuilding facilities to replace these losses. Thus the Japanese found themselves incapable of exploiting their conquered empire; they had no way of linking it with their industrial centers on Honshu and the Asiatic mainland.

In pointing to the mistakes of our enemies, we must also examine our own shortcomings. An inadequate merchant marine was one of our pre-war weaknesses. After the last war we dissipated our store of merchant shipping. We compounded the error by not maintaining our shipbuilding capacity. Consequently, at the outbreak of this war we found it necessary to construct swiftly what has come to be a stupendous tonnage of cargo ships. But so great was the demand and so heavy our shipping losses in the early days of the conflict that new construction could not keep pace with our needs.

For many anxious months it was a nip-and-tuck affair trying to fulfill the shipping needs and at the same time attempting to meet the requirements for offensive and protective operations both in the Atlantic and Pacific.

As you know, the appetite of war is said to be all but insatiable. The demands of this war have almost continuously exceeded the supply. Always, from the first day of hostilities, there seemed to be highly desirable operations that might have been conducted had we but possessed a sufficient pool of supporting cargo vessels. Even with the unparalleled accomplishments of our cargo shipbuilding efforts, severe shortages have made it necessary from time to time to delay operations. We have paid the price in retarded progress.

Recalling the shipping difficulties encountered in this war, and contemplating the armada of bottoms and the expanse of shipyards we have built, we now face a vital question. How much shipping should be retained in fairness to ourselves? Shall we again risk the impact of total war without adequate shipping to deliver the tremendous quantity of materials needed by our forces and those of our allies? Shall we again permit our goods to be carried in foreign bottoms to the detriment of our own shipping needs in time of emergency? In the light of our foreign trade and our naval needs what should we do? This will be one of the

knottiest post-war problems—a problem in which the Navy is vitally interested.

But more than an adequate merchant marine, we must have bases. Of all the elements of sea power, the United States Navy suffered most at the war's outbreak from the lack of overseas bases. We lacked operating bases in the Alaskan area; had none in the Far East, except for isolated and inadequate Cavite; none in the Central Pacific, except Pearl Harbor, and only those recently acquired in the North and Central Atlantic outside of Cuba and continental United States. The bases we did possess were not equipped with the requisite guns and planes and men to stem the enemy's initial onslaughts.

I make this point because it is well to remember that the mere ownership of outlying bases means little, if these bases are not maintained and implemented by an appropriate fleet ready for action.

Up to the present, the Pacific war has been largely a battle for bases. Our primary efforts so far have been directed toward wresting from the enemy advance territory from which our naval and military forces can rain body blows upon the inner Japanese empire. At the war's termination we shall have bases serving our task forces in most areas of operations.

These atolls, these island harbors, will have been paid for by the sacrifice of American blood. They will have been scooped out of sand and rock, coral and volcanic ash, by a generation of Americans giving their service, their ingenuity, and their money.

Failure to maintain these bases essential for our defense raises the fundamental questions: How long can the United States afford to continue a cycle of fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give again? Rich as we are, we do not have the human or physical resources to dissipate our patrimony, generation after generation, in this manner.

The United States Navy now possesses a balanced fleet containing all the essential elements by which the control of the seas can be attained and retained. How this concentration of power has been applied against the enemy—the actions of our fleets speak for themselves. But as forceful as they have been, there are several basic achievements worthy of mention, accomplishments that may not have received sufficient emphasis.

In all wars, the Navy's strategy and tactics have revolved around those weapon-bearers that hit hardest and farthest. Our fleet's adaptation of the airplane to sea warfare may be rated as one of the major military achievements of our age. The air arm of the United States Navy is the envy of other navies throughout the world. By utilizing air, our fleet has been able to make long advances, instead of having to doggedly batter the enemy mile by mile. Without our highly developed and closely integrated air arm, we would, in all probability, still be operating in Allied territory today. Particularly is this true in the Pacific where distances count for so much.

The significant aspects of naval aviation are not only the technological advances that have been made in airplane and carrier but also the manner in which the plane has been integrated with the fleet. It is this high degree of integration that explains much of our sea-air success in the present war. The process of integration began in 1913, when the plane was coming to be recognized as a potent military weapon. In assimilating the plane the Navy treated it as any other new weapon or new weapon bearer—just as it had previously treated the submarine.

When the effective submarine first came into being shortly after the turn of the century, the Navy did not create a separate submarine or underwater corps, commanded by officers who knew submarines and little else. Instead those naval officers of the line who volunteered for submarine duty were considered to have additional qualification above and beyond the normal line requirements.

So it was with the airplane a decade or so later. In accepting the plane the Navy did not junk its other weapons, nor did it give the plane an independent or semi-independent status. Instead the plane was added to the arsenal of the many weapons that are necessary to gain and exercise control over the seas. Naval aviators are naval officers who are additionally qualified for the management and operation of aircraft. That has been the practice down to this day. The Japanese, uniquely among other powers, have copied our methods in the matter of naval aviation development. Had the Japanese carried out such a development independently of our example and had we failed to develop an efficient integrated naval aviation arm, I can assure you that our country would have been confronted with disastrous probabilities.

Wartime developments in the employment of various other instruments of sea warfare are significant. The battleship and cruiser are types in point. The advent of the plane materially altered the technique of their employment, but far from destroying their usefulness made them more than ever essential elements of sea power.

Weapons, however, are not enough to win a war. They must be used with skill and employed in new ways. Although amphibious warfare is as old as history, we have through hard work and battle experience developed and perfected the technique of amphibious operations, in which the Japanese were apparently so proficient in the early days of the war. Such operations have, however, achieved a new importance because of certain geographic factors of this war; and also because modern weapons have made the defense so strong that amphibious attack has become one of the most difficult forms of the offensive. In former times, landing on an enemy shore was a fairly simple matter. Those afloat had more mobility than those ashore. The classic technique was to fool the enemy by a surprise landing where his defenses were weak or nonexistent.

However, in recent years it has become more difficult to outguess the defenders. This is due to the development of mechanized land forces which permits the defenders to move with great speed, and the reconnaissance of aviation which precludes surprise attacks. In the special case of the war in the Pacific, we frequently have had to make frontal attacks against small islands where no soft spots could be found and there was no possibility of surprise. Consequently, new types of vessels and new types of weapons and equipment have been devised. We are still improving, with some of the ablest officers in the armed forces working continuously in applying the dearly-bought lessons of the war. In all such operations the cornerstone of our success has been the proven ability of the Army and Navy to fight as one team. It is significant that amphibious operations have initiated practically all of the Allied successes during the past 3 years.

I do not have the time to mention all the other uses to which instruments of sea power have been put in this war. But one of great importance is our development of the task force or task fleet. The idea was conceived by the United States Navy years before the outbreak of war. It was tested and found to be sound in the various hit-run raids on the Marshalls and Gilberts, Marcus and Wake in early 1942.

Another significant naval development has been in the field of supply. By speeding up the flow of men and materials to the fighting fronts, our fleets have been able to operate against the enemy over protracted and unprecedented periods of time. Never in the history of naval warfare have fleets remained away from their bases so long. Without such logistical support, the Pacific war could not have progressed so far or so fast.

Improvement in naval gunnery has been another outstanding achievement of the war. Prior to the war, the world's prevailing naval thought was that surface craft could not successfully challenge shore batteries. Our fleet has proved that view wrong. The big guns of our battleships and cruisers have successfully slugged it out with coastal guns on several beachheads in both the European-African and Pacific areas. In effect, the guns of the fleet have extended the area of sea control inland from the sea.

As spectacular as have been the achievements of the United States Navy during this war, I wish to add this sobering thought: we cannot patent or copyright them for our exclusive future use. Our successes and our mistakes, our tactics and strategy will be studied and copied or avoided by other navies for years to come. Today we are truly writing the naval textbooks of tomorrow.

It therefore behooves this Nation to keep abreast—no, ahead of the times—in war and peace alike. We must, therefore, continue scientific research in the military field on a sustained basis even after the final victory. We must go still further. If we are to maintain our naval position in future years, we must augment the study of the science of war that has guided us in the past during peace. This has special application, of course, to the officers of our military and naval establishments. It seems unnecessary to expand on this point.

We are today confronted with two powerful warrior nations that have made the scientific conduct of war a continuing study, one of them for more than 75 years. When they struck, they struck swiftly and effectively, while their selected opponents, were mentally and materially unprepared. Only because of our favorable geographic position and the brave delaying actions fought by our allies were we spared even greater reverses than we might have sustained. Never again can we afford to let future aggressors versed in the art of war take advantage of us.

Today there are people who gaze into the future and confidently predict that sea power—control of the seas—will not be a significant factor in determining the outcome of another war. Some of these prognosticators are the same as those who, earlier in this war, sang the swan song of the battleship and consigned the foot soldier to oblivion.

Throughout the ages centers of civilization and power have gravitated toward the water. Access to the seas has made nations prosperous in times of peace. Control of the seas has made them powerful in times of war. There are no developments in this war that controvert the fundamental importance of the sea. Neither is there anything that depreciates the value of sea power—at least, nothing that need concern us of this generation or in the forseeable future.

Because of the exercise of our sea power in this war, a significant twofold result has been accomplished. First, even at the lowest ebb of our naval strength, we were able to keep the conflict 2,000 miles from our shores. The battles to protect the United States from invasion were fought in the Solomons, the Coral Sea, at Midway, and in the Aleutians—not off San Francisco, or Seattle, or San Diego. Second, our sea power has enabled us to maintain at all times the vital sea communications without which we could not support our allies. This gave us an advantage that is not sufficiently understood or appreciated. This is an advantage we must never relinquish.

I wish to point out particularly that the success of international agreements in the settlement of international dispute, especially in the early phases, will rest on world appreciation and recognition that these de-

cisions can be—probably will be—enforced. Sea power will be an essential means to this end.

Moreover, it is well to take thought of the human factor. Just as in this day of mechanized warfare, the machines, ships, planes, tanks, guns, which make war so deadly are as nothing without the men who man them and give them life. So it is with agreements and treaties. Without human will to make them work, or without the physical means to make them effective, they become and are in fact "mere scraps of paper." Theodore Roosevelt was, I think, quite right when he said: "Speak softly, but carry a big stick."

Possessed as we are for the moment, with naval greatness, it is difficult to believe that we will permit this power to be squandered or bartered away thoughtlessly. We will never do this, I am sure, if we understand what it might mean in terms of America's future in the world of tomorrow.

Hence our sea power should be maintained. Furthermore, it should be dedicated, in war and peace alike, to promoting the security and well-being of our people and to the peaceful stabilization of an improving world orderliness. We who have gone through this war have paid the penalty of forgetting the lessons of the years between wars. This time we shall win the victory despite our past mistakes. But next time, the penalty of forgetting may be the loss of America, and of liberty as we have known it.

Against an M. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of Tuesday, April 10, 1945:

AGAINST AN M. V. A.

Representatives of three organizations interested in river development went on record last Friday at a joint meeting in Omaha against the Murray bill, which would create a Missouri Valley Authority. A resolution to this effect was adopted, the full text of which was published in the Journal Monday. The arguments raised against the project are those which commonly are heard from the people who live in the Missouri Valley and do not want an authority to take over the potentialities of the great stream and force upon the area involved a form of state socialism such as a Murray act would succeed in doing.

There were three organizations represented at the Omaha meeting. Delegates from the Mississippi Valley Association, the Missouri Valley Development Association, and the National Reclamation Association plainly said the organizations' membership did not want Congress to create such an authority. Instead, they wished the present law, enacted by Congress and in operation, to continue since it provided the means to employ the river to advantage so all interests—reclamation, power, and navigation—could be served. This, of course, is the set-up under which the Bureau of Reclamation looks after the irrigation interests in the upper reaches of the river and the Army engineers work out plans for both power and navigation.

To throw the entire Missouri Valley into the hands of three, or four, or five men, given absolute power over the economic interests of an area such as would come under their authority would be to hinder development for years. It also would shut off any and all representations from various existing groups that have studied the possibilities for years, that are more familiar with the conditions than the officials of an authority could be, and that also have the interests of the valley at heart because they live along the stream and want the best use of it which common-sense treatment would give.

It would be impossible for a Missouri Valley Authority to be created without there being—and it would not matter who composed it—despotic rule for the region as far as irrigation, navigation, and power were concerned. The whole country has witnessed the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is comparable to the proposal for the Missouri only in the projected administration. The T. V. A. is almost a separate entity, with the men in charge doing just about as they please with everything that comes under their direction and control. A Missouri Valley authority would have far more power for the reason that a greater, richer area would be affected. The Missouri Valley is one of the largest and most important not only in the Nation but in the world. Senator MURRAY may have overlooked an opportunity in drafting his bill by not providing that the chairman of the authority ought to have some kind of crown to wear since he would be monarch of all he surveyed in the Missouri Valley and his right there would be none to dispute.

Finally, it all comes down to this—that the Missouri Valley Authority legislation definitely is a thing which an overwhelming majority of the people affected do not want. The people living in the Missouri Valley from the source of the river to its mouth are against an authority. They fear such a set-up, and if it were left to them they would thrust it aside. So the question, Have Congress and the administration in Washington a moral right to force upon the millions of people living in the Missouri Valley something in which they have no confidence and which they do not want? If in this democracy we have representative Government, the people's wishes on this piece of legislation ought to be respected. If so, there will be no Missouri Valley Authority.

No Hearing Aids Have Been Supplied for Prisoners in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder that the people were disturbed to learn from a radio commentator that our Government is buying hearing aids for German prisoners. I am inserting extracts from a letter I received with respect to the matter, viz:

DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: I am writing you in regard to a report I heard Sunday night given by Walter Winchell, to the effect that our Government is buying hearing aids for German prisoners, at a cost of $60 or $65 each, because they lost their hearing from the noise of our big guns. Isn't that most ridiculous? Is it possible they didn't hear the boom of their own guns when they were shooting our boys? If this is true, and it must be, or he would not have reported it, isn't it time that an investigation was started? Shall we pay taxes and buy War bonds and have the money spent in this manner? And our boys who are prisoners over there going without enough to eat.

I hope, Mr. PLUMLEY, there will be an investigation started, and I shall hope to hear from you in regard to this matter.

Complying with the request indicated I have the following information from the Provost Marshal General:

The Army has never provided hearing devices of any sort for any prisoners of war, German or otherwise, interned in this country and has never contemplated doing so. The International Red Cross Committee has notified belligerent nations that it will make hearing aids available to deaf indigent prisoners of war of any nationality in the custody of any nation, including Americans interned in Germany. The hearing aids which the Red Cross is prepared to supply prisoners upon request would be purchased from the funds of the International Committee of the Red Cross and if furnished to prisoners in our custody would not constitute an expenditure by this Government. The International Committee of the Red Cross, as distinguished from the American Red Cross, serves all persons impartially, and German prisoners of war have contributed to its support. However, the War Department has been informed by the International Red Cross Committee that to date no requests for hearing aids have been received from prisoners of war interned in this country and that none have been supplied for prisoners in the United States.

Reduction in Output of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farm Machinery Cut 23 Percent in Output" published in the New York Times of April 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM MACHINERY CUT 23 PERCENT IN OUTPUT

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Production of farm machinery, one of the most critical of the civilian programs, will be cut 23.8 percent in the second quarter of this year and will remain at the reduced level until Germany falls, the War Production Board announced today.

It informed the Farm Machinery and Equipment Industry Advisory Committee that allocations of controlled materials, steel, copper, and aluminum, for the manufacture of farm equipment will be reduced to 195,000 tons in April, May, and June, compared with 256,000 tons in January, February, and March.

The reduction will be made only in the output of new machinery, since the volume of materials granted for repairs will remain at first quarter levels, officials said.

The committee also was advised that the allotment of the materials for the second half of the year would remain at the lower

level unless the present accelerated demands of the military for steel, due to the pace of the war in Europe, are reduced.

An increase in allotments will certainly follow VE-day, W. P. B. said, because an increase in farm machinery is a must on its list of essential civilian and war-supporting programs.

The W. P. B. also reported that production up to March 1 was an average of 12.2 percent behind scheduled levels, compared with a lag of 13.6 percent January 1. Wheeled tractors were said to be 3 percent behind schedule; repair parts, 9 percent; attachments, 4.4 percent, and all other equipment, 20.4 percent.

Manufacturers predicted, however, that they would nearly complete their approved schedules by July 31, adding that lack of manpower was their greatest problem.

At the same time, they said that they expected to lay off workers in the third quarter because of the sharp cut in material allotments.

Food Waste at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has repeatedly been called to charges of food wastage on San Francisco's water front. Complaints have been made by the longshoremen employed in my district that tons of food from ships' stores are being dumped overboard regularly as garbage. In a recent issue of a San Francisco News, Eugene F. Burke, executive secretary of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Association, was quoted as follows:

The food loss described by the longshoremen is a drop in the bucket compared with the large quantities of food that goes over the side every day because of the practice of port feeding.

Both the War Shipping Administration and the maritime unions have urged shipping companies to eliminate in-port feeding and give seamen subsistence allowances during the time a ship is docked, Mr. Burke stated:

When a company refuses subsistence, it is required that three meals a day be prepared for all crew members—

Said Burke—

Since only a fraction of the men turn up for meals in port, huge quantities of food go to waste in San Francisco every day while civilian supplies tighten. Here is the No. 1 source of water-front waste.

Further discussion of waste of food in San Francisco is contained in the following editorial recently published by the San Francisco News:

DUMPING GOOD FOOD

Even granting the food is not fit for human consumption, which is denied, the manner of disposing of old ships' stores on the water front is in complete disregard of public feeling on the whole question of food shortages.

Water-front workers called attention of The News to the practice of dumping large quantities of foods at the docks to be picked up by scavengers, in order to make room for fresh stores in cargo ships' galleys. Much of this food, according to these informants, was still fit for human consumption, in fact entirely unspoiled. Yet it was disposed of as garbage.

Such wanton waste when civilians generally are being denied normal rations of many foods is not calculated to create good feeling. It is recognized these supplies could not be put back into ordinary channels of trade, but they surely could be given to institutions or disposed of otherwise usefully, thereby lessening demands upon supplies already in trade channels.

For the sake of public relations, if not for other reasons, the Maritime Commission, or whatever agency has the authority, should see to it that this wholly unnecessary practice should stop.

Bureaucratic Control and Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following letter received from a very reliable business firm seems to express the general opinion of bureaucratic control and regimentation. As stated in the letter, "it is high time that Congress took cognizance of this very serious situation."

Congress should take steps immediately to stop such unwarranted actions by these agencies, and to preserve our form of government under the Constitution.

MARCH 26, 1945.

The Honorable NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: Never in our 103 years as retail merchants have we been confronted with such mounting maze of dictatorial and regimenting directives as are being issued almost daily by the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration.

The latest of each being the strangling W. P. B.'s M-388 and the coercive O. P. A. measure presently labeled MPR-578.

A sane, thinking person is forced to the conclusion that both of these agencies have gone hog wild in their efforts to complicate, confuse, and finally condemn the American system of free enterprise.

It would appear that the directives in question were concocted by persons incapable of comprehending the ramifications of their far-fetched and ill-advised brainstorms, nor can they foresee the disastrous results which would follow the enactment of these orders.

The latest newspaper headlines and radio reports all indicate our heroic boys are winning the war on every far-flung battlefront of the world.

Are we in reality winning the war on foreign shores, only to be losing the American way of life here at home? When one glances through MPR-578 and M-388 the answer is self-evident.

For over a hundred years, the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of this country have gone all out to cooperate with every branch of the Federal Government in every instance where their aid was solicited, and even when it was not. Every sensible law enacted during that time has had their whole-hearted endorsement and support.

They have paid hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes and have given employment to millions of men and women.

Now, due to the insidious policies being pursued by certain individuals in both the W. P. B. and the O. P. A., the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of this country are being bombed with a weight of discriminating and obnoxious orders and directives which will prove to be just as deadly and as devastating as any bombs that could be dropped by the enemy.

Were we a totalitarian nation, these dictatorial demands and threats of fines and the suspension of our business, among other penalties, would be taken for granted.

However, as American citizens and businessmen we cannot continue to take the orders being handed out, without making a ringing protest—one that will be heard by our duly elected Senators and Congressmen—and we hope promptly acted upon by them.

These two controversial and communistically inspired measured W. P. B.'s M-388 and O. P. A.'s MPR-578 demand a show-down on the floors of Congress.

These orders and others of their ilk are a serious menace to the future security and prosperity of all business, and of our country.

Additional pages could be filled with glaring injustices which M-388 sponsors, but we believe those mentioned above will be more than ample evidence on which to condemn this measure before its effective date now set for May 1.

We challenge those responsible for M-388 and MPR-578 to justify the necessity for these edicts in the first place, and secondly to defend them as they are written, as being in the best interests of American business and the American consumer.

M-388 and MPR-578 are but two more links in a chain of directives and official orders issued by O. P. A. and W. P. B. which chain is being slowly, but nonetheless surely drawn tighter and tighter around every business in this country to control it, and limit it, and regiment it, and eventually to strangle it. This increasingly dangerous trend is a direct threat to the future of our country and its liberal institutions.

The power and influence now being wielded by the O. P. A. and W. P. B. far exceeds that which was intended by Congress when these two agencies were created. It is high time that Congress took cognizance of this very serious situation, by demanding that all directives from both agencies be submitted for congressional approval before being foisted upon American business.

We are fully aware of the unforgettable fact that America is in the midst of the greatest war in its history. We know that each and every one of us must do all in his power to aid in bringing victory to our arms, and the return of our boys to their loved ones, at the earliest possible moment.

This century-old institution of ours has been in the forefront of every civic and Federal drive since long before Pearl Harbor. We have gladly spent thousands of dollars in newspaper and radio advertising to help in our small way in putting the various War bond drives over the top in this area.

The many Government citations awarded us bear testimony to the helpful results achieved.

To cut down absenteeism, our store is open an extra evening each week to serve the war workers who are serving the Nation.

Everything that can be done to help win the war is being done by us, and by thousands of other patriotic American merchants.

That is why we are so truly alarmed by the restructive, provocative, and un-American course which the W. P. B. and O. P. A. have charted for themselves.

The splendid legislative record you have compiled in fighting to retain the principles

of a free and unshackled democracy is so well known that we are soliciting your cooperation and support for such immediate congressional action as will end, once and for all, the menace of such orders as M-388 and MPR 578.

All we ask is the right to live and to do business as free men under constructive laws and regulations and we have every confidence that you and your able colleagues in Congress will guarantee us this privilege.

The Meat Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is greatly disturbed over not only the shortage of meat, but also the extreme poor quality of beef.

The consuming public is not generally informed of the causes of both shortage and poor quality. I insert, under leave to include, a statement from a Corn Belt cattle feeder which very clearly states the reason for, not only the shortage, but also the very poor quality, dark black-red color, yellow fat, instead of white fat, tough meat, all because of the lack of corn feeding while our elevators are full of corn and almost no boxcars available. The farmer still has his corn and much of it piled upon open ground.

The following is a statement I have from a practical cattle feeder in my district. He makes a statement of fact.

The boys in Washington are having quite an argument about the meat situation, but, it don't look like they are getting anywhere, and I thought I would just as soon have my suggestions in now as think about them later on.

I feed from 800 to 1,200 head of cattle each year, and about the same number of hogs, in fact, I market about a million and a half pounds of live meat each year. I know this is not a great amount of meat, but, a person can lose a lot of money in such an operation if things turn sour and on the other hand, I can truthfully say, that I have not made very much money for my investment, due to the various rollbacks, ceiling-price controls, etc., which have been imposed on the trade in the last 3 or 4 years.

As I see the situation, they have the hog situation in pretty good shape. We can raise hogs, fatten them out and put them on the market for $14.75 and make a little money, with corn at $1.10 per bushel. However, the cattle situation is altogether a different proposition and my thought is that there could be a lot of changes made which would help the trade and at the same time, produce more beef.

In the first place, we have been butchering too many pre-mature animals, that is, animals that have not reached the butchering age. There has been a lot of calves slaughtered, also there has been a lot of yearlings killed that should have been grown and put on the market weighing 1,100 to 1,200 pounds but they only weighed 600 to 700 pounds, and this has caused a big decrease in dressed beef; all this is due to the fact that our planners have overlooked the cattle feeder and they have not made any provision for the job he plans in the meat-production program, and during all this discussion, I have failed to read where he has received very much consideration as yet.

The whole situation hinges on one thing, that is, we are taking care of the western cattle grower and taking his grass-fat cattle for slaughter, when such cattle should have a turn in the feed lot and made better meat and more meat. They have been preaching in Washington for a long time that they don't want to put corn into cattle, and they naturally have succeeded in getting what they want, as there is very little corn going into cattle, consequently, we have an oversupply of corn, and it will be a drug on the market before fall and nothing to feed it to.

Now, suppose, we give the boys who just graze their cattle a good price for them, say 11 cents at the ranch, that would make them a barrel of money, would cost a dollar to get them to the feed lot, give the feeder a 3.50 spread, and you would have a 15.50 fat steer in Chicago. What are they doing now? Paying 14.50 to 15.50 for grass fat steers and they will dress out about 55 to 56 percent. All this is caused by the packers going into the market and outbidding the feeder for such cattle. Well, you ask why they outbid the feeder—because they are in a position to upgrade this grass fat beef and in addition get a subsidy on it, all of this is working out alright now, but it sure is not helping the future beef situation. When the packer pays 16.75 to 17 cents for cattle, there is not much chance for him to upgrade such beef. Consequently, he don't care to buy it except for his trade that demands such beef and won't take the tough grass beef.

I was in Kansas City Monday trying to buy some feeder cattle. I ran across a string of 109 head of cattle that has been on wheat pasture in Kansas; they would weigh about 950 pounds and were carrying just a grass fat kill. He was trying to get 15.15, and finally they sold them to a packer buyer at 15.10. He will kill them and upgrade the beef and get a subsidy on the meat. If I had gotten them, I would have put them on full feed for at least 90 days and added 180 pounds to them and put them on the market and they would have produced approximately 20,000 pounds more beef than they are going to do. However, I figured that if I got the extreme top of the market after July 1 of 17.50 they would have lost me money, so there was no use trying to buy them.

Farmers Who Win Prizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, which tells of the accomplishment of two farmers from my district who have been awarded national honors in the Philip W. Pillsbury wheat award contest. This is a worthy achievement at this time when food is the question uppermost in the minds of the people of the world.

While Utah is not considered a wheat State, these men, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Rasmussen, can take justifiable pride in the fact that they have set a record for quality in wheat. I join with the editor of the Examiner in expressing my hearty congratulations to these men.

FARMERS WHO WIN PRIZES

Certainly a farmer who wins national honors in a contest to determine skill in the production of food deserves the recognition and publicity that would be accorded to a person who makes an unusually long run in a football contest, who kills a bear or makes a hole in one luckily while playing a game of golf.

Therefore, this comment is made about two Utah men, Eldred Murphy, of Salina, in Sevier County and P. H. Rasmussen, of Clarkston, Cache County.

They were awarded national honors in the Philip W. Pillsbury wheat award contest.

Mr. Rasmussen won the national reserve championship for hard red winter wheat grown on his 2,000-acre dry farm, and Mr. Murphy was named grower of the Nation's best soft white wheat. This white wheat came from the same 50 acres he has been tilling for the last 25 years.

To be designated as champion farmers is to receive recognition that must make men proud and happy, indeed. The honor bespeaks agricultural skill of rare quality. It also tells of love of the soil which stimulates care of the soil. Note that Farmer Murphy's prize wheat came from the 50 acres he has been tilling for 25 years.

Good farmers are good citizens. They improve and do not damage their environment. They give more to their communities than they take.

The Curfew Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, since the advent of the Byrnes curfew edict and while fully complying with the provisions thereof in the interest of the success of our war effort, a great many of the constituents of my congressional district have written me expressing their apprehension and fear that this edict is a step toward national prohibition. Only a few days ago I received a resolution passed by the Brooklyn Council-Kings County Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which expresses very succinctly the feelings of all the people of Brooklyn on this subject. This resolution follows:

BROOKLYN COUNCIL-KINGS COUNTY,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In conformity with the mandates of Brooklyn Council-Kings County Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I present the following resolution passed in regular session by that body on March 12, 1945:

"Whereas over 300,000 men and women from the Borough of Brooklyn are now serving in the armed forces of our country; and

"Whereas Brooklyn Council-Kings County Veterans of Foreign Wars consider themselves the guardians of the rights and privileges of these men and women from the Borough

of Brooklyn, county of Kings, city and State of New York; and

"Whereas Brooklyn Council has gracefully accepted all edicts and directives coming from the various war agencies, the last one the so-called curfew law; and

"Whereas while accepting these edicts and directives they have been apprehensive lest these men's and women's rights and privileges be usurped while serving in the armed forces; and

"Whereas the members of Brooklyn Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, composed of men who served in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 on foreign shores and hostile waters remember that prohibition was thrust on us while the manhood of the country was away and unable to voice their disapproval: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Brooklyn Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, inform the rest of the country that they will fight any attempt by any person or group of persons to foist on us any form of prohibition, wartime or otherwise, and will use its full resources to protect the men and women now in the armed forces from any return of prohibition."

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN GARDELLA, *Commander.*
BARCLAY FARENGA, *Adjutant.*

Expenditure Controls in the United States Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, writing under the title "Expenditure Controls in the United States Government" in the Accounting Review, Mr. E. L. Kohler has contributed an interesting and illuminating article on appropriating procedure. Salient points of Mr. Kohler's article are as follows:

PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES

Estimates of future expenditures originate annually within each spending agency. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provides for the appointment by the head of each agency of a Budget officer who prepares such estimates, and the Bureau of the Budget each year issues regulations governing their form and content. For the old-line establishments, the estimates for the fiscal year 1946 must be in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget by September 15, 1944; the war agencies, including the War and Navy Departments, will submit summary estimates on December 15, 1944, and detailed estimates, which will naturally differ in total from the preliminary figures, on March 15, 1945.

No uniformity exists among Government agencies as to the method followed by Budget officers in obtaining future estimates. Only the general content of the estimates presented to the Bureau of the Budget is prescribed. This consists of four items; a brief one- or two-page letter of transmittal which summarizes the agency's estimates; a proposed appropriation bill covering the estimates; a detailed list of jobs the total of which agrees with the labor cost appearing in the summary, a total of each of the other objects of expenditure such as travel and office supplies, and a functional recapitulation, if obtainable; and finally, a narrative describing the proposed expenditures, with particular emphasis upon changes in expenditure rates.

REVIEW BY THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Since 1939 the Bureau of the Budget has been an independent agency which has acted as a direct aid to the President in the preparation of the annual Budget called for by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; it also aids him in other ways. To obtain the annual Budget it combines to estimates of the various agencies after their approval by the Estimates Division and the Bureau's top staff.

The Estimates Division consists of groups of specialists who follow the work programs of the agencies assigned to them, aid the agencies in the preparation of their annual estimates, and advise with them during the year on any major problem that may affect the original work plan or the amount or nature of the expenditures authorized in appropriation acts. These specialists, after their review of formally prepared agency estimates, conduct hearings attended by agency heads and their assistants, thus obtaining a more accurate picture of prospective activities. presentation of the agency's case follows whatever pattern the agency head may determine, and the hearings, which for the larger agencies may require several weeks, are informal. Additional information is frequently asked for, and a number of proposed activities may be eliminated. At the same time the opportunity is offered for policy discussions and clearance at a time and under conditions that cause the least embarrassment to the agency and its staff.

ACTION BY CONGRESS

Relations between the Congress and the spending agencies are maintained through standing committees and appropriations committees. The former exist only for the old-line establishments; war agencies have derived their authority largely from delegations of wartime powers conferred on the President by congressional acts. In general the separation of authorization from appropriation has become a well-established working plan within the Congress. Appropriation bills of the old-line agencies are filled with parenthetical references to enabling statutes, and members of both Houses are insistent on the omission from appropriation acts of legislation creating new powers or jurisdictions.

There is but one appropriation committee in each House, with, however, numerous subcommittees to which specific agencies are assigned and a deficiency subcommittee made up of other subcommittee chairmen. Assisting the committee are a clerk and a number of assistant clerks. By custom, appropriation bills are first considered by the House of Representatives and it is there that they receive their principal review. Hearings are held by the Appropriations Committee of each House, but before the Senate committee they are usually limited to situations in which an agency is dissatisfied with the cuts which the House committee has made in the agency's proposals. The Senate as a rule acts on the basis of its consideration of the House bill, the agency justification, the transcript of the House hearings, and the House report.

The spending power of the agencies has been curtailed by the adoption of numerous controls, the principal ones being:

(1) Most appropriations extend over a single fiscal year. Obligations authorized must therefore be made within a relatively short period; to continue operations thereafter, the agency and its program must be again reviewed by the Appropriations Committee before the end of the period. Occasionally appropriations unspent at the end of a fiscal year do not lapse but, as in the case of current War and Navy appropriations, they may continue over a period not exceeding 2 years. A variant of this last procedure is found in "contract authorizations," whereby a specific sum is named in an appropriation measure permitting the initiation of commitments in the current year and their payment in a subsequent year.

(2) The House Appropriations Committee will consider no request for an appropriation that has not first cleared the Bureau of the Budget. This conforms to the indirect requirement of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 that "no request for an appropriation * * * shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee * * * except on the request of either House of Congress."

(3) Independent investigations of spending agencies are made by the House Appropriations Committee whenever a subcommittee wishes further information. For this purpose experts from other agencies, employed under ingenious conditions which have been established by the committee to keep them away from politically minded Members, study the problems assigned to them, interview agency representatives, review procedures, and make independent reports to the committee, thereafter returning to the agency from which they were borrowed.

CANNON ABLE AND FORTHRIGHT

(NOTE.—Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, author of this investigatory procedure has described it at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 89, p. 11104. His exposition of the safeguards that should accompany legislative investigations of executive agencies is both able and forthright, his insistence on arm's-length relationships qualifies him as a first-rate auditor.)

(4) Limitations of various kinds may appear in appropriation legislation; some of them are inserted by the Bureau of the Budget, but the bulk of them have originated at one time or another in the House Appropriations Committee. Although the Federal system of appropriations is commonly referred to as a lump-sum-appropriation system, the effect of the various forms of limitations, particularly in recent years, has been to create a hybrid which approaches the detailed-appropriation plan of some States and many municipal bodies. A common limitation is the top figure set for certain types of expenditures within an appropriation. For example, the Securities and Exchange Commission is allowed to spend $4,651,704 during the current fiscal year, of which an allotment is made "not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of newspapers"; in addition to the total sum indicated it is permitted to spend $45,000 "for all printing and binding"; no other monetary amount appear in the S. E. C.'s appropriation act.

Many of these monetary limitations are lost in history. Others, of comparatively recent origin, have been occasioned by agency abuses—at least the Congress has so regarded them—of unqualified spending privileges. Other monetary limitations which creep into the appropriations of various agencies relate to such items as travel, attendance at conventions, the purchase of automobiles, and the employment of consultants: particularly in instances in which the agency itself has, in the eyes of Congress, been at fault.

Limitations of a qualitative character appear everywhere in appropriation acts. The appropriation act covering the Department of Agriculture is a document of 45 pages, lump-sum amounts appear for more than 40 heterogeneous suborganizations, and there are more than 200 express limitations on various objects of expenditure. Most of the act is, however, a definition of the particular scope of activity which may be followed during the current year by the various suborganizations.

(5) During hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittees, administrators have frequently been warned by committee members regarding the modification of practices followed by the agency. The impression may have been gained that certain activities or expenditures were contrary to con-

gressional intent. The warnings may be no more than adjurations, but they are often regarded by the agency head as restricting his actions. The same may be said of formal committee statements which accompany the appropriation measures when they are reported back to the House or Senate. A committee cut in an appropriation request may be ascribed in a report to a particular item, but if the language of the act does not expressly prohibit, the agency is free to apply the cut to some other item; although if it does, it may face a hostile subcommittee in the year following.

(6) Interim contacts are a further source of congressional control over individual agencies. These contacts are of two types: Voluntary from the point of view of the agency or involuntary. The voluntary contact arises if a change in an agency's program is brought about by circumstances that could not be foreseen at the time when its future budget was under consideration, or if it finds it has underestimated its future financial requirements and now seeks what is known as a deficiency appropriation in order to carry through the year. At deficiency hearings, the progress to date of the agency's program or a section of it is commonly reviewed. The involuntary review may be made by one of the standing committees or by the Appropriations Committee and is usually occasioned by criticisms of the agency's program.

When a large degree of policy making must be delegated to an agency or when a none-too-certain policy has just been created by the Congress, there has not infrequently been an agitation for congressional representation in the controlling group. Most Congressmen, however, appear to doubt the constitutionality of such a procedure, and are afraid of the consequences that would arise from saddling administrative responsibilities on already overworked Senators and Representatives.

On the whole the work by congressional committee on the affairs of agencies seems to outsiders to be as intelligent and well done as time permits, even though clouded on occasion by the public comments of individual Congressmen whose attempts at intervention in agency administration have been unsuccessful. Party differences have little effect on agency operations—a fact probably insufficiently appreciated outside of Washington. The lay criticism of agency activities, which has so often resulted in better administration of the Government's work program, has been one of the chief contributions by the Congress in the way of controls over administrative practices.

Rejoice America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a very appropriate poem written by Benjamin F. Martin, Esq., a distinguished member of our bar, as it appeared in the Greenville (S. C.) News, January 28, 1945.

REJOICE AMERICA

"Our cause is the cause of all mankind, and * * * we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. 'Tis a glorious task assign'd us by Providence; which has I trust, given us spirit and virtue equal to it, and will at last crown it with success." (Benj. Franklin, 1777.)

"I trust, pray, and hope that America will not fail the world." (Speaker SAM RAYBURN at the opening of the 79th Cong. January 1945.)

O God of Wrath! Thy face is turned
In majesty and might on man!
The seeds of hate and death are sown,
The harvest huge in every land!
No more the arts of peace enthrall,
We execute decrees divine!
Rejoice America! Rejoice!
Thy sons are in the battle line!

Hear now the cries of terror rise
From innocents who look to Thee,
From little ones that do no wrong,
Yet look through tears their fate to see!
We see Thy earth made desolate,
The hosts of hell at liberty!
O God of Justice! let us be
A worthy band to fight for Thee!

A million slaves from happy lands
Beneath the lash of foreign sky,
Uplift their eyes to Thee and pray
To calm the anguished hearts that cry,
The anguished hearts of those at home
Whose thoughts to them forever turn,
O God of Freedom! Grant we be
Thy faithful men to fight for Thee!

O God of Love renew our faith!
We hear Thy call! We come!
We know thy great decrees are right,
And pray Thy will be done.
Our all is least we now can give
To country, right and liberty.
O God of Mercy may we be
Thy worthy men to fight for Thee!

* * * * *

Yon flaming standard onward moves
To execute decrees divine,
Rejoice America! Rejoice!
Thy sons are in the battle line!

—*Benj. F. Martin.*

GREENVILLE, S. C., *January 28, 1945.*

Address of Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of State of Mexico, at Inter-American Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Inter-American Conference held in the city of Mexico, which it was my privilege to attend as one of the delegation of our country, the president of the conference was Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of State and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

Dr. Padilla is one of the ablest men in public life in the Americas, and the brilliant address delivered by him at the opening session of the Inter-American Conference is worthy of reproduction, and under leave granted same is submitted herewith:

Honorable delegates, finally we are emerging from a long night of suffering and danger. In our innermost surely we shiver upon reflecting that, had we lost this war, something that could have happened, our sovereignty and our liberties would have been crushed. The militaristic castes of Germany and Japan would have kept for themselves our countries on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, respectively, to keep us subjugated for centuries to come. The decision, the valor, the heroism of countless multitudes of men and women, millions of whom have already given their lives to the cause they defended, have made our fate a different one. That is why it is possible that, once again, we the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of our sovereign American Republics should gather to deliberate on the destinies of America. It is imperative that in the course of our work we keep in mind that an invisible world of immolation and sacrifices is in flames over our heads.

We must be proud of having placed our destinies in their entirety on the scale of war, in defense of the democracies. We have contributed, in proportion to our strength, to the greatest cause ever faced by mankind. We must recognize with candor that in America the weight of the war fell mostly upon the great democracy of the United States. It is indeed just that we render to it the tribute of our admiration and gratitude. Bleeding itself on all fronts, exhausting immense wealth, leaving hundreds of thousands of homes in mourning, it has defended with imperishable epic greatness not only its seriously menaced destiny but continental integrity and world liberties as well.

What is it that America expects of this conference? The first thing it expects is practical resolutions; resolutions that alleviate the misery, abandonment and indifference in which, to a very great extent, our masses find themselves; resolutions that satisfy the longing of all our peoples for permanent security and a peace based upon justice. If we are to emerge from this assembly more united than ever, it will be because we have known how to ennoble solidarity in war, which has been consecrated by devotion to liberty and by the resoluteness of our peoples, and because we have made it transcend into solidarity in the coming peace. Such new solidarity must consider the poverty of the people, their social insecurity, their undernourishment and unemployment throughout the Americas, wherever it may be, deep in the Amazon or in the mines of Bolivia, on the plantations of Honduras, or on the plains of Venezuela. These iniquities not only are a stigma for the life of the countries suffering them, but also for the dignity of all the Americas.

This war is not all destruction, it is also hope, setting up principles for a just world: the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, and Yalta agreements, the machinery of cooperation in wartime in anticipation of the machinery of cooperation in time of peace, the democratic feeling consecrated by victory, faith in the common destinies of the common man. That is why this war is, above all, a social revolution, the greatest in history. The Americas have the duty and the privilege of gathering the impetuous currents of a new life into the channels of law and justice, of liberty, of sympathy for humans uffering. The deepest and most impressive immediate clamor of this sacrificed generation is permanent world peace. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, in their democratic process of consultation, constitute a scund and noble answer. The observations formulated by some of our nations, Mexico among them, aspire to the full realization of that aspiration. Peace is not everything. Without law it does not even deserve that name. Unless it rests upon justice, peace is merely a dark and gloomy armistice, and nothing else. If peace is not for the full enjoyment of human liberties, embracing the rights and the juridical equality of all nations it shall not have the sincere adherence of the peoples and of freemen. This is why, through its committees of experts, its thinkers, its statesmen, all mankind raises its fervent wishes that the permanent world peace organization be not established as an episode of might nor as a regression to the discredited system of alliances and balance of power,

the complete inefficacy of which, in the course of history, has so many times submerged international life in a deluge of blood; but as a true expression of human solidarity, of proportional responsibility, of the yearning for justice of all peoples, large and small.

In this assembly we must dedicate ourselves to the defense of the cause of human dignity, as the best tribute to those who have died, and will still die for it. We shall strive for the economic expansion of our nations. The Western Hemisphere comprises overy 30,000,000 square kilometers of frustrated lives. We must furnish working opportunities and defend, above all, a fair wage for man and woman, it being understood that a fair wage is not just enough for adequate nourishment and decent shelter for a man and his family, but also for necessary sanitation, pleasant leisure, efficient education for children and, first of all, proper protection against economic insecurity that fills with anguish and uncertainty the present daily life of the worker.

It is necessary that we fight against slave wages for the benefit of the Americas and the world. We are agreed, I am certain, upon the removal of all trade barriers leading first to economic warfare and in the last analysis to actual war; but not only that, we must harmonize this principle with the just expression of the International Labor Office, that the reluctance on the part of any nation to adopt human working conditions is an obstacle in the way of all the other nations wanting to fulfill this inescapable mandate. In the Americas we must put an end to the Danteseque spectacle of man without hope, eaten away by tuberculosis, malaria, malnutrition, silicosis. An end must come in America to the somber picture, that cannot be described in words, of the jobless man who, in the midst of his country's indifference, gets home, night after night, clenching his hands, without bread for his children. We should not come out of this assembly with dignity were we to fail to give assurances to the masses of the determination of our Governments and our States to formulate and comply with all decisions necessary to ensure that in America, for its own sake and as an example to the world, we put an end, for all time, to those curses, just as we put an end to slavery and to the inquisition!

But how can we achieve the expensive organization of social security and economic expansion, surrounded as we are by so much misery of the people of our Latin America? These objectives we could not reach by the mere impulse of private initiative in our countries, nor could we accomplish them with the means available to our respective Governments, not even with a union of our Latin American peoples alone. And this must be said for the benefit of those who think about these problems in terms of Phalangist Hispanicism; these objectives will only be attained by pooling the energies, the resources and the confidence of all the Americas. What does bestow substantial unity on the American nations is the reciprocal support of their energies and the community of their destinies, that coordination of forces that supplement each other and do not fuse into what would be a regrettable and disgraceful standardization of all that is genuine in each one of our peoples. It would be absurd indeed if the sap, the culture and vitality of each one of our peoples were levelled down to a dull and gray unity. Everyone of us would lose by this. The wealth and beauty of the Americas spring from the variety, in the material and in the spiritual, of their sparkling mosaic. The United States and Latin America make up the creative equation of the grandeur of America, each one of these sectors having its own contribution to give.

Technology, the pride of human intelligence, has achieved stupendous power in the United States, as shown by war production. But such power cannot come to standstill upon the advent of peace. Sixty million men and women will claim the permanent continuance of their high wages and high standard of living. Their statesmen are not going to have the people collapse into the hell of unemployment. This means the rapid reconversion of war industries to postwar industrial production. Sixty million men and women with extraordinary qualifications to do their job, an army of first-class administrators and a fantastic modern technology, combined will produce one of the bases that will determine the redemption of mankind: abundance. Thus attained, abundance will find the most outstanding means of distribution in endless fleets of sea and air ships. For the first time in history abundance and means of distribution are limitless. But that production must go somewhere; a coordinating intelligence must organize the buying power of nations. Lest a catastrophe of tremendous implications is invited, there is only one answer to the enormous power of abundance and distribution: the very great consuming power of the masses. Let us organize it in America. Latin America, in turn, awaits the opportunity of developing its resources. There are unsuspected possibilities in our wealth and in our men. There is no cause for pessimism. We should interpret statistics on human terms. Production of Latin American labor often is unfavorably compared with that of Anglo-Saxon labor. But is it possible to make a just comparison between an undernourished worker, undermined by disease, discouraged by infamously low wages, and a worker full of life and the joy of living, strong and highly paid? Let us rehabilitate the man of our America. Let us review the resources of the Hemisphere, to conclude that there is no excuse for the poverty of America. Let us build gigantic works of irrigation, public utilities, rural electrification, land, sea and air transportation, and they will be sufficient to ensure jobs to a whole generation and will create fabulous trade in equipment, machinery and other products manufactured in the United States. Let us organize long-term credits which will mostly pay for themselves, credits as large as are the resources of a whole Continent. Let us become industrialized by building an American world of consumers and high standards of living, by breaking the shackles of our agricultural communities which, incapable of creating large capital for industrialization, have continued producing only raw materials in the old colonial pattern, exploited by the highly industrialized countries.

The coexistence of free, prosperous peoples with slave and poor peoples must be canceled definitely. Only poverty is to be feared. In the same measure the buying power of a people increases, the economy of all grows richer and the security of all becomes solid. Will fabulous sums be needed to carry out this program? Most certainly. But surely what has been done to win the war, can and must be done to win the peace. From this combination of resources, as gigantic as the events we must face, shall emerge a continent in feverish activity. Thus the youth of the Americas will have a constructive program to which they may devote themseles and in which they may nourish their hopes, their well-being, and their pride. The continental idea will cease to be the abstraction that has not as yet entered the humble homes of the American masses. When they derive from it the great benefits of their liberation, then they will learn to love it and to defend it. In a world still crowded with uncertainty, they will know how to live and to die for it. We must realize that we are not facing just an economic problem; it is a moral problem for the Americas, that of preserving our free institutions. The American world must face once more and with greater danger a renewal of the radical struggle between ideologies, a struggle which will have for its stage in the immediate future not actual warfare, but the unhappy lacerated soul of man. One of these ideologies rests upon faith in the constructive power of democracies; the other in the convulsive power of violence. Violent and extremist ideologies—Nazi fascism itself which, even though defeated in war, live as an opportunism until justice and not only might, wins the peace, appeal to the most inflammable sentiments of the human heart and offer some hope; their propaganda only requires the virulence of booklets, the incendiary torch in the hands of fanaticism; they do not need order nor great economic resources; chaos is their element and the poverty of the people their fuel. Peoples in desperation go to the extreme left, governments to the extreme right, under any of the hateful types of Nazi fascism. In the end these movements result always in dictatorship and in the loss of human dignity. But this the people learn too late. On the other hand, democratic ideologies are all persuasive affirmation. Here we find the unevenness of the struggle and at the same time the noble opportunity of doing good, of doing justice, of serving the highest destinies of humankind.

If democracy is not an imposture, it must offer safe, steady work, fair wages, decent homes for the people, it must build schools, hospitals, libraries, parks, but, above all—and this is characteristic of democracy—it must guarantee economic security, not based on dictatorship and slavery, but upon the foundations of true liberty, abundance, fair distribution, social justice, and all freedoms, the authentic freedoms. This is the battle we must fight in America, because liberty is for this continent the pattern and the very essence of its life. We are ascending toward free institutions, and any regression threatens the future of all America. This terrible war, out of which we are emerging together, was caused by the attempt on the part of dictatorships to conquer the world. It has been a struggle against militaristic castes, against governments that were the enemies of liberty; it has been called fighting for democracy. Its postulates have called whole nations to sacrifice themselves in the most devastating war of mankind. And now we must ask ourselves, if millions of men have known how to die for liberty, shall we not know how to live to defend it? It is a sacred duty, an inescapable commitment of the highest moral nature to offer at the pyre, which burns even now, of the suffering and sacrifices we are experiencing, the determination to make of human liberties and democratic principles a collective responsibility of all the American peoples.

Honorable delegates, the hopes of America and of the world envelop us. At this, one of the crucial moments of history, when bleeding, disconsolate humanity, tired of a merciless war, could weaken its faith in the triumph of principles and noble promises, let us demonstrate with fervent action of reciprocal confidence and high intrepid decisions, that America carries within it, as a torch, the unfailing fire of its example and of its faith in the free destinies of man.

The Shortage of Overalls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a shortage of overalls exists throughout the

Farm Belt. A pair of overalls to the average farmer is about as essential as the tools with which he tills the soil.

Suspecting that shipments of overalls were being made to foreign countries under lend-lease and otherwise, I recently directed a written inquiry to the War Production Board with reference to the matter.

The War Production Board advised me that during the fourth quarter last year, 344,724 pairs of overalls left the country for all destinations. With the exception of one lend-lease requisition for 96,000 pairs, all of this trade was on a commercial or cash reimbursable basis. The total export figures for the first quarter of 1945 are not yet available but it is known that one requisition calling for 70,896 pairs of overalls was approved for shipment on lend-lease during that first quarter.

The above figures indicate that at least 415,620 pairs of overalls have left the country during the past 6 months.

Address of D. D. Monroe, Grand Sire, Independent Order of Odd Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the radio address recently made by D. D. Monroe, of Clayton, N. Mex. Mr. Monroe is the grand sire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and his radio broadcast was made over Station KOB, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

His address is as follows:

Friends, it is my happy privilege to extend to all my listeners, and particularly to all members of our fraternity wherever dispersed, the greetings and best wishes of the sovereign grand lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

AN OUTSTANDING FRATERNITY

There exists in every city and town, and in almost every hamlet on the North American Continent, subordinate, encampment, canton, and Rebekah lodges, which are, respectively, bodies of the men's and women's branches of this order. For youth, we have Young Odd Fellow Clubs, Theta Rho Girls' Clubs, and Alpha Rho Coed Clubs. Each represents a valuable unit of world-wide fraternal organization composed of some one and one-half million members belonging to over 22,000 lodges located in 70 States, Provinces, or defined geographical areas in 17 different nations.

Spreading from the mother country, England, where the order had existed for many years, Odd Fellowship had its natal day in America, in Baltimore, Md., on April 26, 1819. It was introduced into Canada August 10, 1843, and subsequently extended from country to country until today it veritably encircles the globe.

LEADS IN RELIEF WORK

The motto of Odd Fellowship is friendship, love, and truth. Its tenets are faith, hope, and charity. Its symbol is the three links. It has been said in truth that the sun never fails to set agleam these golden links, the symbol of this great world-wide fraternity, which has lined the pages of history with more than 125 years of valiant striving for the uplifting of mankind. Uplifting because it constantly admonishes its members of these sacred missions: "To relieve the distressed, bury the dead, comfort the widow, and educate the orphan." The order spends approximately $4,000,000 annually in the relief of distress and suffering; the order maintains 64 homes valued in excess of fourteen and a half million dollars. It has educated and raised more orphan children than all State and Federal institutions combined. There are at present approximately 4,500 residents of these homes. No Odd Fellow or Odd Fellow's dependent ever becomes a public charge.

RELIGION IS ITS CORNERSTONE

But Odd Fellowship is not a mere beneficial society having for its object the relief of its members or the ministering to the necessities of their families. The Order of Odd Fellows was the first to establish mutual aid and benefit associations; its educational foundation and student-loan fund was among the first established; it was the first organization to introduce community singing into its meetings; it does not pretend to supplant the church, but it inculcates a veneration for religion. According to the Gospel of St. James, i: 27, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." This is the basis of Odd Fellowship.

Then, Odd Fellowship, recognizing the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, is democratic in that it is a true democracy, a democracy that teaches, as is so clearly stated by John James Ingalls, "In the democracy of the dead, all men are equal. There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the great republic of the grave." This is the philosophy of Odd Fellowship, a philosophy which directs us to teach men to view and to contemplate "What they are sure to be and what they may soon become." A philosophy which further teaches us that "Perfection comes not in doing extraordinary things, but in doing ordinary things extraordinarily well.

CIVIC AND SPIRITUAL PRINCIPLES

In America, Odd Fellowship is composed of the great middle, industrial classes almost exclusively. Mechanics and workingmen organized this modern institution which has grown steadfastly in numbers and importance, as an organization laboring faithfully for the amelioration of the human race, the field of labor which is coextensive with the globe, representing to the world a unique spectacle that commands and deserves the earnest and most critical examination and consideration of all those who have at heart the welfare of their fellowman. It constantly fights against immorality, vice, and the innumerable woes incident to life. It does not seek a veiled origin in the misty shades of the past to justify its existence in the present.

And, finally, Odd Fellowship is a patriotic organization, teaching its members that in order to be true they must be faithful to their Creator, obedient and patriotic toward their Government and fraternal to their fellowmen. Every Odd Fellow (and by the term Odd Fellow I include not only the adult male members of the organization, but the Rebekahs, the Young Odd Fellows, the Theta Rho girls, the Patriarchs and Ladies Militant, the all other affiliates) is pledged to lend every effort, not only by the giving of money, but by giving of personal services and personal sacrifices to the allied effort until victory has been achieved in the present emergency and thereafter to strive valiantly for the winning and the perpetuation of an everlasting peace. The dream Fruit Tree of Odd Fellowship and the goal toward which we strive is the day when one law shall bind all nations, tongues, and kindred of the earth—and that law shall be the law of universal brotherhood.

In a society which has become largely commercially minded this statement may seem commonplace and trite, because of its idealism and altruism. We, of this age, seem to have drifted away from the spiritual values, and away from humanities, and tend to stress price rather than value. Yet today the boy over there, the kid at war, dreams not of prestige, and power, and wealth, but of days back home, the neighborhood gang, the old jalopy, a warm bath, comfortable relaxation. It's funny, how all these little things add up to make the biggest, most important thing of all to the kid. Because of these little things, because of the hope of keeping these little things in his way of living, the kid is willing to give his everything, his life.

There is hope of a better world of tomorrow for everyone. Yet a better world will come only if a better race of people survive the terrible conflict which is now raging.

Here in America too many of us are still more interested in racing for our trains than we are in training for our race. We are changing the face of the world. How about its heart? The day may never come when all men will think alike, but we believe that the day can be made to come when all men will feel alike, and it is in men's hearts and not in their heads, that a possible, feasible basis for the solutions of the problems of the world may be found.

INTERESTED IN FUTURE WELFARE

It is my honest conviction, and I firmly maintain, that the constructive forces of the world are far superior to and will eventually conquer, the destructive forces. The ancient world had its Alexander the Great. The medieval world had its Ceaser. The modern world had its Napoleon. But where are they? Their memory lives only to be despised and shunned. Today we have Hitler, but he will soon, very soon, go the way of his predecessors. The pathways of peace are more pregnant with power, more vital with strength, more imbued with permanency than all the waging of war.

You are all familiar with the story of the contest between the wild wind and smiling sun in an attempt to compel the traveler to shed his cloak. The more furiously the wind lashed at him the closer the traveler wrapped his cloak about him, while the warm smile of the sun soon made the traveler take off his cloak and carry it on his arm. The wrath and fury of the storm brings only wreckage and destruction. So with war. Not until the hatred and fury and carnage of the battlefields are forever a thing of the past can we start our march of progress toward a better and a fairer world in which to live. But we can look ahead now and visualize that world. The end of this war is going to be followed by the greatest social revolution in all history. There will be no precedent to follow. There will be no administrative rule to guide us, because the world will be in ruins, some countries physically, some geographically, some financially—and most nations' morale will be reduced to the lowest ebb ever known in human history. A new world, entirely revolutionized (so say most of our social scientists) will have to be built and it will have to be reconstructed day by day.

BELIEVES IN LEADERSHIP OF YOUTH

I am not afraid of that world placed in the hands of the millions of our youth who have borne the brunt of this conflict. I am afraid of it if it is left in the hands of those who plan only diplomatically and commercially, striving for power and position without thought of moral and spiritual values. I feel sometimes that I would like to apologize for the leadership of our "older" generation to our young folks. I agree with Richard N. M. Snyder: "After 2,000 years of Christianity, my generation has dragged the flower of our youth through the worst depression this world has ever seen, and now

we are immersing them in the most horrible blood bath civilization has ever known. The mess we are in today is a flagrant case of adult delinquency. And I frankly believe that the teen-age youth of today, with their jitterbugging, boogie-woogy, and bobby socks, represent a more mature mentality than our slot machines, crooked politics, and selfish, materially minded power and pressure ideology. We haven't yet learned to live among ourselves. The war must be won at the battle fronts, but the peace must be won in every city, town, hamlet, and in every community and cross roads in the world, and in every organization, society, church, and school, and in every single home in America. If we don't have peace at the mess table, we're sure to have a mess at the peace table."

Only day before yesterday I received a copy of a letter written by an overseas veteran home on furlough. He had become too fed up on the smug complacency of our people, the "what's in it for me" and "I don't care what happens just so it don't happen to me" temperament so prevalent throughout our civilian population. The feeling upon the part of his own parents that the war would soon be over and that everything would be O. K. again. So fed up that he slipped out of the house early one morning to return and rejoin his buddies at the front, and he left a letter, addressed to his mother, pinned on his pillow, telling her that he was going back into the battle. I want to quote just a few paragraphs of this letter: "We'll be looking very brave and confident. And that's just the point. I may as well jump in with both feet right now. We won't be confident. At least, I won't. The old man fought in the Argonne to make the world safe for democracy, and here we go again. It was tough in his generation, but it's tougher in ours, because we aren't going to be filled with the faith his crowd felt. We've seen how you older people can lose the peace after we've won the war. We're going with our fingers crossed, and it's hard to fire a gun with your fingers crossed.

"We don't doubt democracy is worth fighting for, and we're not afraid to go. I don't think I'm a coward—I'm not afraid to die, but I'm afraid of dying for nothing. You see, we're afraid of the old shell game.

"I see the truth now, but it was hard to come by. 'I am my brother's keeper.' It's brotherhood this time or else.

"Sorry, I had to scold, but it's time you older people grew up. You've been the loveliest of mothers. But the point is, the world is not made only of lovely people like you. I wonder if just being a lovely person is enough any more."

"This time it's brotherhood or else." That is the thinking of the kid in uniform and under fire today. Listen to this poem by my good friend, Maj. Victor Grant:

" 'Twas in the war when first we met
'Mid the carnage round Marquette,
He loomed up through the night with grim intent;
There was blood lust in his eye
And my own, I can't deny,
Revealed that I was there on murder bent.

"His aim was not so good
So I shot him where he stood,
He quaked, then swayed a while and fell;
All the hate within me died
As I knelt there by his side,
He tried to smile, then sort of waved —'farewell.'

"Could I have known him better
I might have called him 'brother'
And greeted him with cheer and hearty laughter;
May we meet with kindly glances
Under higher circumstances
And share a soldier's faith in this hereafter."

IN CONCLUSION

Through brotherhood and fraternity we hope to fulfill our obligations to these men, and to do our part in the building of that better world of tomorrow.

It has been aptly said that "A man who is too busy to serve God and his fellow man is just too busy." Years ago Elbert Hubbard said "One great, strong, unselfish soul in every community could actually redeem the world." It is our hope that through the practice of the principles of friendship, love, and of truth, of faith and hope and of charity, we may so direct public thinking as to create in our communities strong, unselfish kindred feelings—foundations upon which we may build toward the better world of tomorrow. Believing in the Fatherhood of God, struggling to expand the brotherhood of man, we here and now rededicate ourselves to the great task that lies before us, pledging ourselves and our order to extending the ideals of this great fraternity in the hope that we may contribute toward the day when, after the passage of the decades of time, we have taken our place only in history, it may be that the sentry of those passing days, pacing his rounds on the watchtowers of civilization and hearing rung out the challenge "Watchman, what of the night," shall answer in vibrant tones, "Man, redeemed and disenthralled from the slavish life of his passions, has now asserted his high birthright and owns the tie that binds him in universal consanguinity with his fellow man, God is in Heaven, all is well with the world."

Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Dr. Joseph S. Davies, director, food research institute, Stanford University, on the question of compulsory military training in peacetime.

This statement was prepared at the request of the editor of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, of New York, and published in that paper on February 1, 1945. It follows:

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IN PEACETIME?

(By Joseph S. Davis, director, food research institute, Stanford University)

This question is not yet ripe for effective public discussion or decision.

Thoroughgoing preparation for defense of the United States is certainly one of the essentials for the peace period ahead. As our delayed participation in two world wars has shown, adequate defense requires readiness to fight overseas, if need be, early rather than late. We have never had a good defense program. It is urgent that one be carefully drafted and adopted, after discussion in the Congress and by the public at large, without protracted delay. But what such a program should contain is quite beyond the power of the general public at present to judge.

The drafting of a well-rounded defense program is a proper job for a commission made up of our ablest citizens with the aid of experts in several fields. In a very different field, the Baruch committee on rubber showed what can be done. Compulsory universal military training, if included in the defense program, could at most be only a part of it. Another highly important part consists in our vigorous participation in the maintenance of world peace, to which both political parties and most of our people are committed even before details are worked out.

Such a commission might well have been appointed several months ago. Pending its investigation and report, the recommendations of President Roosevelt, if not those of General Marshall, were premature. So also are the Gurney-Wadsworth and May bills now before Congress. The best that can be hoped from them, and from such symposia as the Chronicle is conducting, is that they will lead to the early set-up of a suitable investigating body.

Meanwhile, I am not ready to go on record for or against compulsory universal military training or national service, of 1 year more or less, for young men alone or for young women as well. If something of this sort is essential to adequate defense, I shall be for it. At present I very much doubt that it is. Decades of compulsory military service did not save Czarist Russia from defeat in 1917 or the nations of western Europe from conquest in 1940, Switzerland alone, excepted. Lack of it did not prevent Nazi Germany from vanquishing these nations, or bring the British Empire down to defeat in either World War. After fighting this war in unorthodox fashion, Americans can be pardoned for doubting whether our future preparations for defense must involve copying continental Europe's old system in this particular.

In any event, I feel sure that a really competent investigation would reveal the great importance of other elements in a desirable defense program, some of them entailing much more brains but much less cost in human terms if not in financial burdens. The general public, even the more thoughtful portion of it, is in no way ready to pass upon the apparently simple but very complex question now being raised, out of any relation to other issues that are even less understood.

Great Britain Seen in Strong Post-War Shipping Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce, dated April 11, 1945, entitled "Great Britain Seen in Strong Post-War Shipping Position."

GREAT BRITAIN SEEN IN STRONG POST-WAR SHIPPING POSITION—CARGO FLEET OF 19,000,000 TONS DUE THIS YEAR—MORE BUILDING PLANNED

(By Stanley Ferguson)

Great Britain, although it has lost about 40 percent of its pre-war tonnage in ocean liners, appears destined to emerge from the war with a far larger fleet of the cargo ships which are actually essential to its economy than either the British or American public has generally been led to expect, a survey of such official British figures as have thus far been made available indicates.

In cargo ships of 10,000 tons or less, a classification which includes tankers and small coasters and which makes up the core of almost any merchant fleet, Great Britain is expected to have at least 19,000,000 and possibly 20,000,000 deadweight tons at the end of this year, indicating that her net losses in this class since 1939 have not exceeded 16 or 17 percent.

LINES NOT REPLACED

Britain's current relatively strong position in cargo ships, as compared with every other country except the United States, is due in part to the fact that the heaviest losses have been incurred among the larger passenger and passenger-cargo liners, and in part to a well-executed if little-publicized merchant shipbuilding program which has been concentrated entirely on cargo ships of the 10,000-ton class and upon smaller types.

Thus the 16 to 17 percent drop in freighter tonnage compares quite favorably with a net less of 40 percent in liners and with an over-all net loss of 23 percent in vessels of all categories in excess of 1,600 gross tons to the end of 1943.

However, when it comes to surveying the actual types and speeds of the new cargo vessels being built for the British merchant marine, students of the problem both here and abroad, run up against a wall of secrecy that is unprecedented in almost any other major field of British wartime endeavor. The United States has announced monthly the number and type of virtually every merchant ship built in American yards since the beginning of the emergency building program, but the British Government has disclosed less about its merchant shipbuilding program than about its naval building, its production of aircraft, and so on.

From the middle of 1941 until last November, reports of losses at sea were suspended. In November the British Government published a White Paper giving the number and tonnage of British vessels lost up to the close of 1943 on a year-to-year basis. The white paper also disclosed the tonnage, but not the number, of merchant vessels built—the aggregate amounting to approximately 4,500,000 gross tons from September 1939 to December 31, 1943.

BRITISH RESUME SILENCE

The most careful study of the White Paper figures revealed only that the British merchant fleet, aggregating 17,500,000 gross tons of ships in excess of 1,600 tons in 1938, stood at 15,500,000 at the end of 1943; and when allowances were made for vessels that would have to be returned to other countries, the total was 13,500,000 tons. Since then the British Government has resumed its long silence on all details of its merchant shipbuilding.

Even well-informed Britishers outside Government circles appear to have been kept in the dark as to the current status of the British cargo fleet and as to plans for its replacement. The influential London Economist, for example, estimated the size of the fleet at 10,000,000 gross tons, just before the White Paper put it as 13,500,000 (a figure which did not include small coasters and vessels returnable to other countries after the war). Lord Winster, taking a particularly gloomy view, predicted last year that Britain would come out of the war with needs for 30,000,000 dead-weight tons but with only 15,000,000 dead-weight tons on hand.

Recent piecemeal disclosure as to the losses of the major British liner companies have provided the key to the puzzle of Britain's position with respect to freighters. Since there have been no replacements in vessels of the liner class, save through launching of a few large units such as the *Andes* and the *Dominion Monarch*, which were planned before the war, it is clear that the British merchant marine is stronger today on a tonnage basis than many American shipping circles would have believed possible a year ago.

NEW BUILDING PLANNED

Liner losses of 40 percent, although serious are not as crippling as comparable losses among freighters for two reasons. First, Italy, Germany and France, Britain's chief competitors in the liner trades, have lost more heavily still and two of them may probably be counted out of the running for some time to come. Second, the airplane is expected to cut into the liner passenger and mail business anyway, with the result that the post-war need for large fast vessels of this type will probably fall below that of the period before the war.

Lord Leathers, British Minister of War Transport, disclosed last month that British shipyards are now turning from the standard 10,000-tonner to more varied types of ships. In addition to the 10,000 to 11,000 deadweight ton Empire class vessels, Britain has been building fast cargo liners running up to 12,000 dead-weight tons and 18 knots maximum, tankers, refrigerator ships, colliers, ventilated fruiters, heavy-lift derrick ships, and other odd types—but how many in each class is a well-guarded secret.

British Motorship, an excellent technical monthly published in London, has been carrying some details of these various types, month by month, but American readers have been interested to note that some of the most important data that would furnish a clue to the actual competitive value of the ship such as dimension of the engines and shaft horsepower, is invariably missing, whether by design or inadvertence.

BASIS OF COMPUTATION

When Britain's current position as to freighters is computed on the basis of (1) white-paper figures, (2) liner losses, (3) probable losses of old and new ships based on prevailing war-risk rates and on reported losses by other allies, and (4) the proven capacity of British shipyards, a very conservative estimate would put Britain's strength in freighters, tankers, and coasters of all types of 10,000 gross tons and under at 13,000,000 gross or 19,000,000 dead-weight tons at the end of 1945. This would compare with a fleet of 15,500,000 gross tons, or 25,500,000 dead-weight tons before the war.

In computing these figures, the output of British merchant shipyards, which produced 1,158,000 gross tons in 1941, 1,302,000 in 1942, and 1,204,000 for 1943, has been calculated at 1,000,000 tons for 1944 and 1,000,000 for 1945. Actually, it is expected output may be higher because repair yards, which absorbed one-half the manpower available for merchant ship work through 1943, is expected to fall off sharply with the collapse of Germany.

Must Keep America Off the Road to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I desire to include in the extension of my remarks in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Greenville News, Greenville, S. C., April 8, 1945, as follows:

MUST KEEP AMERICA OFF THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

It is a wholesome sign for this country's future, we think, that Congress has recently been showing evidences of apprehension that efforts may be made to maintain many of our wartime controls and restrictions after war needs have passed, with a view to keeping the Nation's economy under the constant and expanding control and direction of the Government in the postwar period.

It is being more and more widely realized both in Congress and among the general citizenship that one of the first jobs this Nation will face when the war recedes will be that of freeing it from all measures of governmental control and regimentation whose only justification is the existence of conditions of war.

But there are those of socialistic tendencies who see in the present war-emergency policies of complete Government domination of the Nation's economic life a most favorable setting for carrying on and expanding further a program of complete Government direction, planning, and management of the Nation's economic activities. Getting rid of these controls which only war justifies may, therefore, not be the easy task that it might seem, for we are doubtless going to hear many arguments, and seemingly plausible ones, too, of the necessity for maintaining various controls to meet other emergencies.

One of the greatest dangers that will face this country in the fairly near future, as many thoughtful citizens see it, is that we shall be carried into actual socialism through this process of steadily expanding the directive and managerial powers of Government over business enterprise generally, leading to a replacement of private initiative and business management by what will in effect amount to actual Government operation, which is essentially socialism.

It can be conclusively shown, we think, that socialism is incompatible with real individual freedom, and that in a socialist state the citizen is virtually a political slave, since his very means of existence are constantly under the direct and complete control of a governmental authority. Socialism, in short, brings a completely dictatorial government through its virtually absolute powers over the economic resources and activities of the citizens.

Socialism and communism are alike in their basic political philosophy and effects. The difference lies chiefly in the means of gaining their political objectives. While communism believes in gaining control by any means necessary, including force and revolution, Socialists profess to seek these changes through democratic processes, and many Socialists, we dare say, are sincere in their belief—mistaken as we are convinced it is—that a socialist state can continue to be a democratic state. But socialism is the doctrine of Karl Marx, and would have the state own and operate the Nation's economic activities, and that is exactly communism's program.

And because of this difference in political methods, socialism is a greater danger to America than communism. For we may be persuaded, if we are not constantly alert, to approve step by step, on the plea of meeting some special conditions, measures of steadily broadening governmental control which in the aggregate will eventually transfer to governmental bureaucracy the actual responsibility and management in the conduct of business and industry generally.

As we approach the end of the war emergency, we shall need increasing vigilance to prevent the carrying over into the peace period of extraordinary measures of governmental control which would be injurious to private enterprise in a free economy and which would serve to advance the ultimate aims and objectives of socialists. This may prove to be our most crucial attle in postwar America—to curb the designs of those who believe that utopia can be established by placing the managerial powers over all economic activity in the hands of the Government.

Our Responsibility for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Tribune:

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR VETERANS

No more important postwar task confronts the Nation than that of restoring the men discharged from the armed forces to civilian life speedily, satisfactorily, and with a minimum of fuss. Our responsibility is to see that the veteran gets a fair deal, that the sacrifice he has been required to make be compensated, insofar as possible, by opportunity to finish his schooling or get on with his business or work. It is the intention of every decent American, of his representatives in Congress and in legislatures, of elected officials and civil servants, that this responsibility be acquitted well. Yet there is evidence in the experience of the first men discharged that we have, in spite of the multiplicity of good intentions, got off to a poor start.

In a current series of articles in this newspaper on veterans' problems, Peter Kihss says that disillusionment has come to many of the 1,500,000 already discharged. It has come because what is virtually a competition among Federal, State, and local government agencies and private organizations has resulted in confusion. It has come because the widely advertised G. I. bill of rights seemed to promise so much. It has come because the slow-functioning and hyper-cautious Veterans' Administration is swamped by a 300-percent rise in work load accompanied by only a 14-percent rise in personnel. Red tape in Washington occasions endless frustration; veterans wait weeks for answers to applications; the loan program hits snags in the law's wording, runs afoul of priorities and regulations of war agencies.

So many Federal agencies are involved that the usual Washington remedy has been applied—a super-coordinating board. It is called the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, is charged with general supervision of the activities of all agencies except the Veterans' Administration engaged in retraining, vocational education, and rehabilitation, etc. It is also "to confer with existing State and local agencies" for purposes of coordination. The head of this coordinating superstructure is Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administration Chief.

The Veterans' Administration, superimposing new tasks on old looms, as Charles G. Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, has said, "as the post-war colossus of Government agencies." Yet this very Bureau is the target of complaints indicating that especially in the field of hospital and medical care it was not as competent as it should have been before all these new and expanded functions devolved upon it. (Mr. Kihss will have more to say, as shall we, on veterans' hospitals and medical care.) The complaints have been aired in Congress by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN and others. Mr. PHILBIN urges "a thorough investigation of the entire rehabilitation program from top to bottom." That may be, alas, what is required if intelligent reorganization of veterans' facilities is to precede the advent of 12,000,000 more veterans to a society which is not doing well by 1,500,000.

The United Nations' Conference on International Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a very carefully prepared article by Soterios Nicholson, an attorney of Washington, D. C., author of War or a United World, on the subject of the United Nations' Conference on International Organization, which article follows:

The avowed purpose of the impending conference of the United Nations in San Francisco is to organize themselves in such a manner and cooperate in such a spirit as to prevent the recurrence of war once peace is secured.

Anthony Eden, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of England and head of the British delegation, who has intimate knowledge of the serious problems which will arise in the conference, thought it expedient to make two pertinent remarks:

First, that this may be "the world's last chance to create an effective peace organization combining responsibility with force."

And second, that "there should be no bullying of the small nations by the big powers."

These fundamental observations were prompted by the fear of failure and the duty of warning. The ominous phrase "the world's last chance" is logically untenable, yet its very irrationality makes it dramatic. Any intelligent person understands why the San Francisco Conference cannot be the last chance of the world to create peace. Since there is hope as long as there is life, the human race will have many opportunities to realize its dream of peace. There is more than one chance for anything in eternity.

As to the bullying of the small nations by the big, the secret Crimean agreement in regard to multiple votes for Russia and the United States was an ugly gesture, a faux pas which may wreck the conference before it convenes, no matter how cleverly this political crow will be dressed and served to the public by the cooks of international triplomacy.

The coming conference, being the second great attempt in our times by the civilized nations to attain peace, offers a brighter hope to humanity. Those responsible for its success will be able to avoid the mistakes of their predecessors, if they be willing to profit from experience.

In our opinion, the most pernicious pitfall in the path of the present pioneers is the faith of many internationalists that Europe should be organized on the pattern of the United States of America. In fact, there are some even more sanguine idealists who think the time ripe for a United States of the world under a central government on Jeffersonian lines of democracy. We trust that such utopian notions will not be coddled too much by the balmy breezes of the bay region and the rosy dawns on the Pacific shores. They are the mellifluous songs of the sirens leading to the oblivion of reality and to destruction.

We hold this to be an obvious truth: Today every nation of the world in general and of Europe in particular is more than ever before intent on keeping and perpetuating its separateness and distinctness from every other nation, irrespective of racial relationship or geographic contiguity.

Nationality is a persistent force which it is practically impossible to suppress. Externally, nationality is founded upon geographic conditions. Peoples are divided into national groups, owing to the difference in the configuration of the earth and in the climate of the various localities in which they live, these differences breeding concomitant divergence in the features, temperaments, customs, and languages of these communities. Now, these characteristics of the physical-geographic situation cannot be appreciably modified, and consequently, inas much as the surface of the earth will continue to present different physical features in different localities, the differences of nationality are bound to persevere.

Internally, nationality persists because it is sustained by a powerful instinct—the sentiment of nationality. The force of this instinct is so great that it induces man to suffer sacrifice, even that of life itself, which almost no other situation can persuade him to undergo.

Thus, nationality appears to be a fairly permanent possession of the human race, a factor to be taken into account and used to advantage, and not to be looked down upon as evil or dispensable. It is an aspect of the basic law of self-preservation, and the problem is what use we shall make of it to serve the highest interests of humanity. The proposed scheme of international organization supplies the answer. Organize the states in which the souls of the nations incarnate themselves into a coherent system, and you will integrate humanity into a cooperative society working efficiently for peace. Wars arise mostly from a conflict of interests, but in the establishment of our scheme the interests of the various nationalities will be mutually adjusted, and this cause of war will cease to exist.

The universal confederationists may object that the sentiment of nationality substitutes smaller loyalties for the spirit of loyalty to humanity and patriotism to one country for patriotism to the whole world. But it must be remembered that feeling, if expended on too broad and heterogeneous a surface, thins out and loses its power. The average man can feel strongly for humanity as such, only if he concentrates his interest upon a particular and limited section of it, namely the one closest to himself. Otherwise, if he is required to feel in equal intensity for all humanity, he will fail to keep his object definitely in view and his loyalty will degenerate into a sickly sentimentality with no outcome of active service. We insist that loyalty to one's own country, instead of serving as a substitute for love of humanity, is really its concrete and particularized embodiment—charity begins at home.

Finally, to those who call for a general deletion of all lines of national cleavage, because they think that nationality erects walls of separation among the members of our race, and they desire humanity to be one, we reply that distinction according to nationality supplies precisely that element of diversity of equipment which economists find to lie at the root of the mechanism of the division of labor, so indispensable to the successful prosecution of the business of life itself. Each nation possesses something unique, which being contributed by it to the common stock, supplies a virtue enriching humanity, and which, being adjusted into the fabric of the contributions of the other nations, makes humanity a single complex organism—single, because characterized by identity of ends; complex because diversified by the varied nature of its functioning parts. In the sacred mosaic picture of humanity, each nation represents an individual precious stone of different size and color. Nationality is a permanent and useful factor

of life and progress. Its justification carries with it the justification of the institution of the state, and consequently, the scheme of international organization of states as such is left intact and unshaken by any assaults from unfriendly quarters. The state unit must be conserved and the new league should be built on the basis of nationality.

We shall now proceed to consider how the proposed international organization will serve to prevent the occurrence of wars, and how, if wars arise, it will deal with them. The international organization will embody the ideal of cooperation as against the rule of mutual conflict, but an ideal is not identical with an attainment. There will always be a falling short of the ideal, to a varying extent. Organization will be the purpose, and recognition of the rights of other states will be the normal attitude, but the condition of war will not be excluded as a possibility or as a fact. Nevertheless, the occurrence of war will be within the bounds of expectation only as an exception, a violation of the accepted custom and the prescribed law. Hence, the establishment of international organization, although not implying the absolute cessation of war, will mean making of it an abnormal condition, from the legal as well as from the purely natural point of view, to be dealt with as it arises. What, then, will be the attitude of the international organization toward the problem of war? How will it aim to prevent its occurrence?

(a) According to the plan tentatively agreed upon at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the machinery of the international organization will be objectified through its General Assembly, its World Court, and its Security Council, corresponding respectively to the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of our Federal Government, the members of the organization corresponding to the individual States of the United States of America.

War, to a large extent, arises as a protest against injustice, but the organization, because of its transcendence of strictly national bonds, will be enabled to treat all states impartially and fairly.

If the salutary suggestions of Senator VANDENBERG be accepted at the San Francisco Conference, the General Assembly will be enabled to discuss all matters submitted to it by any of its members, and as far as possible it will endeavor to satisfy the legitimate demands of each state, preventing exploitation of one state by another.

(b) The General Assembly should be entitled to create, in the spirit of justice, a comprehensive system of law, relating to the mutual adjustment of the rights of all states and bearing in general on all international affairs, so as actually to meet any difficulty between states, or even to anticipate any dangerous situation which might arise, indicating methods for their solution. We consider this function of the General Assembly as fundamental and of the utmost importance.

(c) A fruitful cause of wars and desire for wars at the present is admittedly the fact that each state is armed to its very teeth with appropriate tools of defense and offense, so that, the instrument being ready and fit, the disposition to put it to use is fanned and intensified. The tool runs away, so to speak, with the hand that holds it, and the state becomes hypnotized by the magnitude and splendor of its armaments to provoke war. Moreover, given that one state is more strongly armed than another, the former will always be tempted to attack the latter. In the international organization no individual state should be allowed to equip itself with an army, a navy, or military aircraft. Of course, each state will possess its own police force to maintain peace and order within its jurisdiction, but no armed force whose field of operation must necessarily lie within the borders of another state. Obviously, such an operation is an interstate affair—a matter to be controlled and regulated by the organization.

In acknowledgment of the same principle, under the present system of government in any civilized nation, individuals within a state are forbidden to carry arms on their persons, as instruments of offense or defense, and it is expected from the state to deal with the situation in the adjustment of their mutual obligations and prerogatives. Similarly, when the parties concerned are states, offense and defense are affairs exceeding their authority. The right and the means to deal with the situation must be taken out of the hands of the latter and be vested into those of the organization.

(d) The creation of law does not, as such, insure its own enforcement. No matter how many possible pretexts for engaging in warfare are eliminated, the states will in all probability be apt, sometimes, to trample on each other's rights and create situations where rigorous action by the organization will be necessary. We must, therefore, consider punitive measures for the prevention of war, which will aim specifically both to prevent the occurrence of war at all and to bring war to a stop when it has started. To this purpose the court of the organization will judge between all states in litigation. When an actual offense has been committed against the international law, the court will cause punishment to be administered to the offender through the security council.

The instruments of punishment will be twofold—economic pressure and the use of military power. The former will consist in the maintenance of a commercial boycott against the offending state, enforced, if necessary, by the establishment of a blockade by land, sea, and air, by the prohibition of any credit to that state, and generally by severance of all business ties and transactions with it.

The use of military power will be effected, whenever occasion arises, by the sending of a sufficient portion of the organization's army, navy, air armadas, or any combination of them, to the precincts of the offending state, threatening to compel it by force to comply with law. If the state refuses to yield, its territory will be invaded and all necessary measures taken to effect the cessation of hostilities, until the state agrees to subject itself to the decisions of the court.

In the San Francisco Conference, if the United States, England, France, Russia, and China will be concerned more with their selfish interests than with justice for all the United Nations, they will expose themselves before the world as politically deaf and morally blind. The United Nations are clamoring for liberty, equality, fraternity; they are crying for justice in the name of humanity and God. The success of the conference depends entirely on the great powers, on their faith in democracy and their vision. As history will credit them with its success, so she will hold them responsible for its failure.

But we must not despair if they fail again, if they insult again the aspirations of the ages, if they mock again the passions of crucified humanity, the death and misery of millions of forgotten men and women. We must remember that since the days of the amphictyonic councils in ancient Greece and the league of the Iroquois Indians in the New World, the steadfast resolve of man is to attain peace. He will do it, be it sooner, or be it later, but "if eventually, why not now?"

The two great dangers ahead of the conference, like Scylla and Charybdis, are the fears of the extreme rightists and the desires of the extreme leftists. The modern Ulysseses of the United Nations, traveling to the blessed home of peace "over shadowy mountains and deep-sounding seas," should be careful to steer the good ship to safety by keeping as close as possible in the middle of the swirling waters.

To those who, seized by hysterical confusion, blunder as to the issues; and to those who, anxious to get rid of war in a mad hurry, act as if it were a bubble to be blown out with a mere whiff, we address the warning of the ancients, "Make haste slowly." We remind them that quick remedies are usually quack remedies.

If we are patient, we shall see happier days. He who expects at once to achieve the maximum, the ideally good, will be disappointed. As Senator VANDENBERG puts it, "We must avoid attempted miracles." But he who, shutting his eyes to schemes of Utopian perfection, aims only at the better and from that moves on to the still better; who is not discouraged by failure but makes of obstacles stepping stones for further progress in a path of which he does not see the end, a practical idealist, one who believes in evolution, will surely get his due reward.

Purchase of Army Surplus Material by Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WONEWOC, WIS., *March 26, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Third Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to call your attention to some of the things going on right here near your home in our great State of Wisconsin. There is any amount of material up at McCoy on the camp grounds that farmers can put to good use in getting in their crops. We are very short of help with all our boys overseas and many of them coming home all broken up. We need materials of all kind to run those farms so we can get the things the boys need and everybody else needs. There is an abundance of this material in question at McCoy. It is for sale, but the personnel at this point won't let us buy what we need for the farm. It must be obtained under sealed bids, etc. We need this material now—we want it now if it is going to do us any good in getting in the crops and working the crops. If you put in a bid for anything you have to bid in the whole of any item. For instance, if you want a jeep you must bid on all the jeeps. No one individual can do that. Only big corporations can do that.

As my Congressman and as all my sons are overseas, I ask you to send me a permit so that I can go in to McCoy and get the necessary material I need that is listed for sale on the list. There is plenty of it there. I know you can do this, and do it by return mail. I am an American; I want to be treated as an American. Big shots, if you don't act, will grab onto everything. Act now and don't leave us holding the empty sack. That will save me the time writing my sons overseas on the matter where I am sure of action. Excuses are not going to work this time. We want this material which is no good for anyone only farmers who are producing and feeding the world. I was going to take this up with our farm organization, but I know you can do this with the scratch of your pen.

Kindest and warmest greetings and sincerely yours for cooperation,

ROBERT M. RING, Sr.

Post-war American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, commander in chief of the United States Fleet, speaking before the Carnegie Peace Foundation conference on post-war problems, said:

This time we shall win the victory, despite our past mistakes. But the next time the penalty of forgetting may be the loss of America and of liberty.

In his address before the Academy of Political Science on April 4, 1945, Admiral King also said:

Recalling the shipping difficulties encountered in this war, and contemplating the armada of bottoms and the expense of shipyards we have built, we now face a vital question. How much shipping should be retained in fairness to ourselves? Shall we again risk the impact of total war without adequate shipping to deliver the tremendous quantity of materials needed by our forces and those of our allies? Shall we again permit our goods to be carried in foreign bottoms to the detriment of our own shipping needs in time of emergency? In the light of our foreign trade and our naval needs what should we do? This will be one of the knottiest post-war problems—a problem in which the Navy is vitally interested.

Certainly the answers to Admiral King's questions are not to be found in H. R. 1425, now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This bill provides for the disposition of 57,000,000 tons of ships constructed with some seventeen billion dollars of American taxpayers' money. Under the terms of the bill as introduced, rather than encouraging American shipping companies to operate an adequate merchant marine, it discourages them. As written it provides for the sale of these ships to foreign ship operators at lower prices or under more favorable terms than to American ship operators. In this respect it abrogates the permanent policy established under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 providing for an adequate merchant marine as an arm of our national defense.

Admiral King apparently recognized this when he further said in his address before the Academy of Political Science:

In pointing to the mistakes of our enemies, we must also examine our own shortcomings. An inadequate merchant marine was one of our pre-war weaknesses. After the last war we dissipated our store of merchant shipping. We compounded the error by not maintaining our shipbuilding capacity. Consequently, at the outbreak of this war, we found it necessary to construct swiftly what has come to be a stupendous tonnage of cargo ships. But so great was the demand and so heavy our shipping losses in the early days of the conflict that new construction could not keep pace with our needs.

For many anxious months, it was a nip-and-tuck affair trying to fulfill the shipping needs and at the same time attempting to meet the requirements for offensive and protective operations both in the Atlantic and Pacific.

If another war comes upon us it will come as a bolt out of the heavens. Technological advances in weapons of modern warfare have been such that there will be no time to again build a merchant marine to meet the needs of national defense.

We have that merchant marine now. We must maintain it. We must encourage its private operation in post-war commerce. We must increase the proportion of American-made goods shipped abroad in American bottoms. We must increase the flow of our international commerce. We must overthrow the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board in preventing American shipping lines from operating overseas air lines, a policy which is in direct contravention to the policy expressed by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to encourage the development of an adequate merchant marine. We must take whatever legislative steps are necessary to insure the equality of competition of American shipping companies with foreign shipping companies. Other maritime nations are following the realistic policies necessary to develop their merchant marines. We must do likewise.

United States Gold Pile Is Dwindling While Our Allies Fatten Theirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the large gold reserves of the leading countries of the world, why should this Nation now deplete its own gold reserve at a time when our national debt is rapidly approaching $300,000,000,000? Those who have purchased Government bonds have felt that our gold reserve would maintain the par value of Government securities, even if other resources should fail to sustain them.

Under leave to extend, I shall include as part of my remarks an article by Walter Trohan which appears in the Washington Times-Herald, April 12, 1945:

UNITED STATES GOLD PILE IS DWINDLING WHILE OUR ALLIES FATTEN THEIRS—RESERVES FALL TWO AND ONE-HALF BILLION IN 3 YEARS; FRANCE AND ENGLAND ARE DOING WELL

(By Walter Trohan)

Gold stocks of the United States are dwindling while reserves of the monetary metal of Allied Nations are mounting as the United States is dealing out billions in lend-lease aid, and is being asked for further billions to underwrite the industrial and economic rehabilitation of the world.

In 1 year the gold stocks of the United States, largely in the repository at Fort Knox, Ky., have dropped $1,122,185,262.

WE DECLINE—OTHERS GAIN

In the last 3 years the gold reserves of the United States have dropped by almost two and one-half billion dollars while those for the rest of the world have increased by roughly $3,000,000,000.

As of April 5, 1945, American gold reserves were $20,417,497,099. A year ago the same date they stood at $21,539,682,361.

Over one billion of the $3,000,000,000 of increased gold reserves in the rest of the world went to South American nations. Neutrals, namely, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, and until recently Turkey, showed heavy increases in gold reserves. However, Allied Nations generally have shown increases while the reserves of the United States dropped.

The increase in outside gold cannot be laid to gold production, according to experts, because most of the gold produced during the last 3 years has accrued to unrecorded reserves, particularly in Russia, and there has been a general decline of gold production as nations concentrated on the production of war goods.

AFRICAN PRODUCTION OFF

Production in South Africa, which accounted before the war for one-third of the world output, including Russian production, dropped from $504,000,000 in 1941 to $448,000,000 in 1943. Canadian production dropped from one hundred and eighty-seven to one hundred and twenty-eight millions, and that of the United States from one hundred and sixty-six to forty-eight millions. Output in Austria was cut in half from fifty-two to twenty-six millions and in the Gold Coast from thirty-one to twenty millions. Nothing is known about Russian production.

Under lend-lease the United States has given $45,000,000,000 worth of assistance to Allies and has approximately $25,000,000,000 worth of additional allotments under way. It has been conservatively estimated that Allied Nations are seeking $40,000,000,000 in gifts or easy loans for post-war rehabilitation.

The nations seeking to share in American spending are getting mounting gold reserves out of United States outlays. Britain and France are replenishing gold stocks under New Deal financing, which pays American soldiers serving abroad in the currency of the country in which they are stationed.

BRITAIN IS DOING WELL

The United States has been a heavy buyer of British currency for several years. The dollar balance obtained under this purchasing has been used by Britain to buy gold from the United States Treasury and not to make any repayments on lend-lease.

This financial program has placed the United States in the peculiar position of paying gold to Britain at a time when the American Treasury has a large credit balance with the British. In normal procedure, British gold should be flowing to the United States.

Various units of the British Empire are benefiting under this program. Troops stationed in India get their pay in rupees, those in Australia in Australian pounds, those in Canada in Canadian dollars, and the like.

FRANCE IN A GOOD SPOT

France is benefiting even more heavily than Britain. American soldiers in France are paid at the rate of 50 francs to a dollar at a time when the American dollars on the unofficial market will buy 200 francs. This means the United States is making the French Government a gift of 150 francs every time it pays 50 francs to the millions of American soldiers stationed in that country.

The Netherlands has the major portion of its half-billion-dollar gold reserve frozen in this country. France has a gold reserve of $2,000,000,000. Some $285,000,000 of French gold has been stored in gold coin in Fort Desaix's casements at Martinique, French island in the Caribbean Sea.

Latin-American countries and neutrals have made substantial purchases of gold, along with Allied nations. Little of this gold has actually left this country, but is

earmarked for the account of new owners. Some gold was taken to China, but this was withdrawn from Chinese gold reserves in this country. Most belligerents have such reserves here.

Gold itself has not been lend-leased. Profits of lend-lease have been used to purchase gold in the United States. More than $100,000,000 in silver has been lend-leased to several countries for the making of silver coins.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on April 7, 1945:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, tonight marks my return to WNBF after several months' absence. It is therefore most gratifying to enjoy the privilege once more of talking to you in my home section.

These broadcasts, sponsored by the patriotic women of the Hall Furlough Clubs will come to you each Saturday at this same time.

As your Congressman, I am well into my fourth term and busier than ever before. I receive 50 letters from home each day. They contain all sorts of requests. Most frequent, however, and most welcome are the messages from you wives, mothers, sisters and relatives of our heroic men in service.

To my audience this evening, I would like to say, if you have any problem that I can help you with in Washington or back home, please don't fail to write me. Remember, I have the very best contacts in our Nation's Capital, especially with the War and Navy Departments. Remember, the heads of those departments and every other division of our Government are told to give first attention to calls on them which come from your Congressman in the interest of his home folks.

In spite of the extension of Veterans' Administration Offices into my district, I find many people are turning to me for help and information about veterans' affairs. To those veterans or veterans' relatives who write me about any problems which they are facing, I will say, write me, your letters are welcome and I am equipped not only to handle the veteran's request but also in many instances, to grant that request.

The same goes for the service man or woman. To them and their families, I say, write me because I know what you're up against and I am in a position to help you.

Under our system of government, those in Washington and in other places who have Government jobs are expected to put the people's desires above everything else. That is constitutional government in which the will of the people is supreme.

Unfortunately, today, there is the belief among a few individuals in United States bureaus and agencies that the people's will can and should be superseded by the personal whims of the men in power.

As the Congressman from the Thirty-seventh New York District, it has been my steadfast determination since I have been in Washington to challenge that theory of government. We Americans have enjoyed the blessings of a century and a half of freedom. We are fighting and winning the greatest war for freedom ever waged.

While our mighty armies are struggling on fronts as far apart as the poles themselves, we in Congress and you folks at home owe a serious responsibility to the heroes of those armies and Navy. We must keep the faith here in America. We must preserve the freedom they are dying for.

From now on, whenever you hear me on this weekly program, you will know that my voice is raised in defense of our fundamental American rights and our constitutional privileges. I urge you to meet with me regularly each Saturday evening at this hour and we will explore together the ways of keeping the United States free to men and women of every race, creed, and color.

During the past 6 years while I have had the great honor of representing you folks in the Congress of the United States, I have visited the Supreme Court Building many times. On the front of this magnificent structure of priceless alabaster, there are chiseled four words destined to live through the ages. They read, "Equal Justice Under Law." You and I must never allow any other condition to exist in America. To all our people, our beloved flag, our Constitution, our country must continue to mean perfect equality and justice and the symbol of liberty and hope so long as life on earth shall endure.

Calvary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a poem written by Lt. Mitchell T. Ancker, Chaplain Corps, United States Naval Reserve, for years pastor of Central Brick Presbyterian Church, East Orange, N. J., who has been in the Pacific for about a year rendering a splendid service as a chaplain. The poem, Calvary, is dedicated to Chaplain John W. Moore, who is on the staff of the commander in chief, Pacific and Pacific Ocean areas.

CALVARY

Three crosses stood on Calvary,
Dark Calvary, where Jesus died
Upon the tall, hard, central one,
Nailed, bruised, and crucified.
I came upon the awful scene
And stopped inquiring to assay—
When held by some mysterious hand
I listened helpless to one say,
"Choose you the cross that will be yours
At either side of His that stands
Between thy Paradise and Hell."
I stood as held by iron bands,
Froze by fright at the single thought
That I must choose my destiny;
How was it then that I had learned?
"Salvation is of God alone";
Sweet freedom that such mastery
Of holy thought and tenet bring!
In marked disdain I could not help,
I turned to leave the frightening scene,
When once again the voice I heard,
Awful, deep, and rapier keen,
"Choose you the cross that will be yours
At either side of His that stands
Between thy Paradise and Hell."
I stood as held by iron bands,
Froze by fright at the single thought,
How I must choose my destiny.
For now my mind became convinced
That I must choose one cross to bear;
It was not at the pain I winced,
For now upon my mind it dawned
That freedom lay within the choice,
Now I could drink at freedom's spring,
Quaff the fresh waters and rejoice;
What mattered pain of cord and cross
With freedom mine to bless me twice,
When once again that freighted voice
Spoke in authoritative tone,
"Freedom's to Hell as well as Paradise!"
I stood fast-rooted to the ground,
And once again all pleasure left,
Cringed at the thought that I must choose
Between the crosses no men knew;
I felt of wisdom all bereft,
But moved in some bewildered faith
To cry for mercy at the feet
Of Him who hung upon the tree;
I only heard the voice repeat,
"Choose you the cross that must be yours
At either side of His that stands
Between thy Paradise and Hell."
"Then choose I will to break the bands!"
I spoke impassioned from my soul,
"I'll chance another hell than this
I know in bondage of my will,"
That to the right of Him who hung
There in the center limp and still,
I took without a doubting thought
That cross, and felt the tight'ning thongs
Impress me to the rough hewn wood.
At once I knew an ecstasy
That painful to the free belongs;
But wanted something more than this,
That martyrs feel in any cause,
Good and bad, or true or false;
I longed for Paradise and Heaven;
The sense that by God's righteous laws
I'd chosen right not merely brave
The cross I bore because I must.
In longing now I turned my eyes
To Him who said, "He came to save
And not condemn the world of men."
And as I gazed he looked at me
With countenance of mingled mein,
A look of hurt and pain and love
Came from his eyes that seemed to see
My very soul—and all the sin
That lurked in darkness in my breast;
It hurt and burned, like heated darts
Stabbed into pained wounded flesh;
There rose to height as to a crest
A flame of searing, hot remorse
That forced a cry of anguish, loud,
"Forgive me God, that I have brought
This shame and suffering to my Lord."
I looked, but not in manner proud
Or 'quisitive as once I did—
With eyes of shame, and furtively,
I now glanced at my dying Lord,
And lo, the heavens opened wide,
No pain, no cross, no thongs I felt,
As on His face, through bitter tears,
I saw a smile, and kindly look
In which there was no hurt or pain,
And ere he spoke the blessed words
That for all sinful men suffice,
I felt I was in Paradise.

—*Mitchell T. Ancker,*
Lieutenant, Chaplain Corps, U. S. N. R.
Dedicated to Chaplain John W. Moore.

Servicemen's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SERVICEMEN'S PRAYER FOR THOSE IN THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

(By L. Monfried)

O gracious God, Lord of the universe, Father of all mankind! To Thee I open my heart in this solitary moment, when my mind is isolated from earthly thoughts and is devoted only to Thee, my Heavenly Father. Before I pray to Thee, I plead for Thy merciful goodness to forgive any sins I may have committed against my God and fellow men, so that I may come before Thee without shame and remorse.

And now, Almighty God, I beseech Thy blessing of strength and well-being for our Commander in Chief, our noble President, and all those in the service of our Government. Grant, O Lord, boundless might and courage to all those bravely engaged in protecting our country and defending our flag at all times. May we succeed in defeating our enemies whenever they threaten the sanctity of our democracy, so that the sacred blessings of justice, equality, and freedom may continue to prevail.

As for Thy humble servant, I beg of Thee, O gracious God, to bestow upon me the courageous strength and wisdom to serve my country with heart and soul, ready to sacrifice my life for the high ideals symbolized by our glorious flag. May Thy great Spirit guard my tongue and lips against uttering, and my hand against writing, anything that may give information to our foes. May the sacred spirit of our heroes, who gave their lives for our country, guide me along with my comrades of the forces of land, sea, and air toward total victory and triumph over all aggressors and enemies of democracy, and may peace, security, and happiness be with us and with all mankind forevermore. Amen.

Seventh War Bond Loan Drive—Letter From Joe McGuire, Somewhere in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I wish to include an appealing and powerful letter from Joe McGuire, whose family I have known for many years in Oakland, Calif. On the eve of the Seventh War Bond Loan drive Joe's letter is timely, beautifully written, and so true. It should appeal to all of us, safe at home, coming from a 23-year-old boy, who has seen years of active service fighting for his country.

I am proud to have the honor of inserting this wonderful and patriotic letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and we should take his soul-stirring words to heart. We should show Joe and his fighting buddies that we believe every word he writes by making the seventh War bond drive a thrilling success. This will be, and must be, our answer to Joe and our brave boys who are giving their all on the fighting fronts.

Joe's letter follows:

SOMEWHERE IN THE PACIFIC,
Thursday, March 15, 1945.

DEAR DAD: We have just heard of the coming War bond drive sometime during the month of April. I believe that it will be the last one for all time but only if you and every loyal American citizen does his utmost to try and buy a $100 bond. By doing this you will furnish us with food, clothing, fighting equipment, and ammunition, and that is all that we ask of you back home.

I am sure that if the folks at home could look into a hospital out here and see the fellows who have returned from what they call their job and duty in such a condition that they will never again be able to see or walk and of the thousands of others that gave up their lives so that you at home would never have to see these things happening in our beloved America.

If they could see their boys attacking a hill knowing that death was waiting for them somewhere along the way, but never once with the idea of stopping or turning back because they believe that what they are fighting and dying for is right and that it is the only way to keep American what it is and always will be—the home of the free.

I wonder if the folks at home realize what losing this war really means. It does not mean that the war is over and we have lost. It means that from now until the end of time ourselves and our sons and daughters will be under the rule of such things as Hitler and Tojo.

When you back home buy a bond you are investing and saving, saving not money alone but the lives of thousands of men which God forbid may include your son. A lot of us have spent 3 or more years overseas and we want to return home and be once more a free American, living in a free America. The only way that this is possible is for you back home to invest everything you have in War bonds.

We do not have an 8-hour day or any overtime and we are not asking for any. All we ask is for your help. There are millions of men overseas that are here not because they were made to come out but because they believed that there was a job to be done. You can thank Almighty God for men like these because without them there would be death and blood in the streets of America.

The news at home sounds very good and there are no doubt many of you that feel that the war is as good as over. If, however, you saw your buddy shot dead at your side you would realize that it is not over and will not be over until the enemy has been defeated everywhere. The quickest and surest way to bring this about is for you at home to buy all the bonds that it is humanly possible for you to.

Don't buy a bond for us alone but buy one for your own protection and to insure a safe and free home for your children.

Your loving son,

JOE.

P. S.—Please buy more bonds.

Address at Testimonial Meeting to Hon. Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a speech delivered by me at the testimonial meeting to Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, delegate to San Francisco Conference, on Friday, April 6, 1945, at Riverside Plaza, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, members and friends of the American Labor Party, New York is proud to have one of its distinguished citizens representing the United States of America as a delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Hon. SOL BLOOM, a Member of the House of Representatives, from New York, has served his district with honor and distinction for the past 24 years. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives he has been a leader in carrying out the legislative program of President Roosevelt's foreign policy. His devotion to this task will be long remembered in the legislative halls of the Nation and throughout the country. As chairman of the New York County American Labor Party I am happy that we have the distinction to accord this testimonial meeting to Congressman BLOOM. We know that at the San Francisco Conference his experience, his ability, and his generalship will contribute greatly toward the establishment of an organization to secure democratic and permanent peace for the people of the world.

I particularly want to extend to him my personal thanks for having accorded a hearing on my House Joint Resolution 99 which calles for the recognition of Italy as an ally. This hearing will take place on next Wednesday before the committee of which he is chairman. I now avail myself of this opportunity to present Italy's cause to the members of my party and their friends. I plead Italy's cause as her cause is inexorably part of the program for speedy victory, for a democratic and lasting peace, and for post-war domestic and international stability.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five is the year of decision, undoubtedly the most tremendous military decision in the world will be made in Europe soon. That military decision will signalize the extirpation of fascism not only in Europe but everywhere in the world and will strengthen the fight in these United States to destroy the forces of domestic fascism. February 1945 marked the announcement of the most far-reaching political decision in the history of mankind. The decisions at the Crimea Conference constitute implementation on a world-wide basis of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Atlantic Charter. Lasting and democratic peace are dependent entirely upon the grand coalition cemented at Crimea and to be further reinforced at San Francisco.

The immediate success of this war is dependent upon the success of this grand coalition composed of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Only the other day we saw living proof of this when the Soviet Union delivered a hammer blow against Japan in announcing the abrogation of the neutrality pact. I do not want to see that coalition impaired under any circumstances. It is in the interest of the world of today and tomorrow that all questions be subordinated to the problem of the preservation and strengthening of this coalition. In making my plea for Italy I do so in the hope that her problem will be solved within the structure of the coalition. In making my pleas for Italy I do so with the full realization that Italy's cause, the cause of all nations, can be saved only as a result of the success of the coalition, as a result of the success of its decisions, and as a result of the further strengthening of the coalition. The chances for a democratic Italy, a democratic Greece, a democratic world are dependent entirely on the success of the coalition of these three great nations and the fruition of the decisions made at Yalta by the leaders of these great nations. If San Francisco fails, if the coalition is disrupted, Italy's cause, the cause of all other nations, the cause of the world will fail. Therefore, I again say that in-

pleading Italy's cause I do so not in contradiction of the great decision at Yalta but with the full understanding that the cause of a democratic Italy is an integral part of the living flesh and blood of the Teheran agreements, of the agreements of Yalta, of Dumbarton Oaks, and of the great meeting which will take place at San Francisco. For this reason alone Italy cannot be left out of the meeting at San Francisco.

Fascism was imposed on the Italian people from the outside, with foreign guns and foreign funds. For 21 years the Italian people had to live with a bayonet at their throats. The traitor Mussolini supplemented the tyranny of Italian fascism with that of the might of the Nazi wehrmacht. By 1939 the Fascist peninsula had become a Nazi concentration camp. Italy no longer had sovereignty, no longer freedom of action. Its traitor, Il Duce, had surrendered the people of Italy to Adolf Hitler. Thus in 1940 when the Italian Fascists entered this war it was not any choice on the part of the people; it was a mere declaration on the part of the Nazi warden, Benito Mussolini. An imprisoned nation could have no choice. Time and events have demonstrated that it had none, except to revolt. The Italian people did revolt. They used the only method that was possible for them, and that was voluntary surrender of hundreds of thousands of its soldiers. The Italian people are not cowards.

The history of Garibaldi and his legions will always remain glorious pages in the history of world heroism. Men and women of Italian origin of these United States, over one million of them in the armed forces, their exploits and their achievements in this war will always give the lie to anyone who snidely charges cowardice to be an Italian characteristic. The 300,000 Italian partisans now engaged against the common enemy have been described by General Alexander: "The resistance movement in Italy has been more effective in fighting the Germans than any other resistance movement in Europe." Up to date more than 250,000 Italians have lost their lives in that resistance movement. No, the surrender of hundreds of thousands of Italian soldiers was not an act of cowardice, it was an act of revolt, revolt against Fascist, Nazi tyranny. It was the only form of revolt that a people with a bayonet at its throat could undertake. Italian soldiers can fight for liberty and freedom. History has demonstrated it. Italian soldiers refused to fight for tyranny and slavery. Events of only yesterday have demonstrated it. All that Italy seeks now is that she be permitted to fight against the common enemy as an ally. I can say with full confidence that Italy is ready to declare war against Japan just as she has declared war against Germany. All she asks is that the fetters of the armistice which deprive her of the right to declare and make war be removed. That the dignity of her people be restored by recognizing as allies these people who are now actually fighting on our side, whose patriots are actually fighting and dying on our side, whose navy is actually engaged in warfare on our side. All she asks is to be permitted to mobilize her forces, to be assisted in doing so, by removing the shackles of the armistice and granting to her the status of what she actually is and what her people have always been, allies, and to grant her the right to participate in the building of a world security organization for democratic and lasting peace at the San Francisco Conference.

Italy has earned this right with the blood of her men, the famine of her children, and the suffering of her women. To continue Italy to be humiliated by refusing her the recognition of an ally, by barring the doors of San Francisco to her, while at the same time her people are fighting against fascism at home and abroad, restricted by the impossible terms of an unrealistic armistice is not in keeping with the spirit of the agreements at Teheran and Yalta.

Italy's contribution to Allied victory began long before the armistice. It was not only the blows of our military might that brought about the overthrow of Mussolini, but it was also the act of revolt, the surrender of Italian soldiers at the front, the sabotage of fascistic military efforts by the Italian people at home.

In a report to Congress on the subject of the progress of the war made on September 17, 1943, the President stated, "Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied, have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender, the Italian Fleet has come over to our side and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people." It must be remembered that when we invaded Italy we at all times stated to the Italian people that we were entering Italy as liberators and not as conquerors. This was said truthfully as we recognized that the people of Italy would have no truck with a Fascist-Nazi war. In a radio address to the Nation on July 29, 1943, following Mussolini's overthrow the President promised: "Eventually Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality. In the meantime, the United Nations will not follow the pattern set by Mussolini and Hitler and the Japanese for the treatment of occupied countries—the pattern of pillage and starvation." And again on September 11, 1943, immediately following the armistice in a joint statement, both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill said to the people of Italy: "Take every chance you can, strike hard and strike home. Have faith in your future. All will come well. March forward with your American and British friends in the great world movement towards freedom, justice, and peace."

I sincerely believe that all of these messages and promises were made in good faith and it is my firm belief that the President will do his utmost to see to it that these promises made to the Italian people are kept. It is my firm belief that an overwhelming majority of people in America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union do not desire a status of conqueror and conquered between them and the Italian people, but of liberator and liberated.

It is with regret that I must state that the events subsequent to the armistice in Italy have not conformed to the spirit, honor, and letter of the pledges made. The armistice itself restricted Italy's army to 11,000 and now that the restriction has been slightly lifted to allow Italy an army of a little better than 50,000, Italy's 300,000 partisans are fighting the enemy behind the lines. Her soldiers are at the front and her navy is doing a good job. Although it is extremely doubtful whether under the terms of the armistice Italy will be permitted to declare war against Japan and pool what she has into the war in the Pacific, for Italy cannot under the armistice declare war without permission of the Allied Commission, I am confident that Italy will make war against Japan, if permitted, and will do an effective job if material assistance is given to her.

I am not going to discuss the economic terms of the armistice except that they place on a country impoverished by the rapacious forces of the Nazis a burden that no nation can ever carry. I do not care to give a recital of the indignities imposed on the Italian people by the Allied Commission as it would serve no purpose at this time. I will simply give you those instances which will apprise you of the nature of the conqueror role that the Allied Commission has played in Italy: One. With the exception of the slight increase from 11,000 to some fifty-odd thousand in the armed forces, the Allied Commission has consistently denied the appeal of the Italian Government to permit her to raise an effective fighting army. Two. Even on the matter of relief the Allied Commission for months refused to carry out the President's order to increase the daily bread ration from 200 grams to 300 grams. The President issued this order sometime in October. It was finally put into effect on March 1, 1945. Three. When a national government composed of all anti-Fascist political parties was established in June of 1944, the Soviet Union sought to extend diplomatic recognition of that government, the Allied Commission in an arrogant letter to Prime Minister Bonomi informed the Italian Government that it could not enter into diplomatic relations with any government, including an ally.

It is not necessary for n e to recite the conditions of famine and disease now rampant in Italy. These are well known, and for those who do place the blame on the Italian people, may I remind them that the retreating Nazis took along with them all the cattle they could seize, all the grain, all the food, clothing, bedding, and other household furniture. What they could not take they destroyed. In many towns the Italian people were left without food and shelter, and yet these people still refused to have truck with the Nazi-Fascist war lords and welcomed those who came as liberators. Disillusionment followed soon, caused not by our soldiers, nor by the people of the three great nations, but caused by an Allied Commission which sought to play the role of Caesar rather than that of a Lincoln.

We all welcome the news of the easing of some of the restrictions. Italy now is permitted to govern most of the liberated territory, although its national liberation committee is still denied jurisdiction in areas that are now being liberated. The people are being allowed a greater degree of self-government and Italy today may enter into diplomatic relations with other nations. In fact, Italy today is in diplomatic relations de facto and de jure with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. There is an Italian Ambassador in Washington and an American Ambassador in Rome; and yet we have the incongruous situation of having diplomatic relations with a nation, with that nation and its people suffering and at war with the common enemy, and still refused recognition as an ally and representation in the family of the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference.

How will this situation affect us here at home? Will it contribute to that post-war stability which is so necessary to carry out our program for 60,000,000 jobs and a healthy agriculture? Let us bear in mind that no nation can gain for itself prosperity over another nation, particularly one fighting on our side, which is prostrated and gradually forced to the brink of political chaos and complete economic disintegration. Unless we aid Italy the pressure on the present democratic government of Italy will be so great that it may bring about its overthrow, that it may be supplanted by a government of reaction composed of former fascist forces. Italy, so governed by these elements would be another hindrance toward that democratic world for which decisions were made at Teheran, Yalta, and Dumbarton Oaks, and for which nations are meeting at San Francisco. Shall we force upon Italy another fascist regime without black shirt, but nevertheless fascist in character? Shall the war criminals in Italy be permitted to become the masters once again of the Italian people? The answer to that question lies in the determination of the question whether or not we in America will lead the way toward recognition of Italy as an ally, toward having her represented at the San Francisco Conference.

Spring will soon come to the unliberated regions of Italy. The rivers will overflow. The floods will add to the untold hardship of the winter that has just passed. The destruction of those valleys will not make

for post-war economic stability. Unless we aid Italy now by extending lend-lease aid to her as an ally, to assist her in reconstruction, to help her to prevent further damage, to help her mobilize her forces fully so that they can join with us in defeating fascism, Italy will be a liability and a serious drag in the post-war world.

Is it not sound economics as well as justice that Italy be permitted and enabled to assist in the full dignity of a member in building the post-war democratic world? This question too lies in the determination of Italy's status—conquered country or liberted country, a cobelligerent or an ally, an outlaw nation or partner at the San Francisco Conference. It is my considered judgment, my earnest conviction that to recognize Italy now, to extend to her lend-lease aid now, and to invite her to participate at the San Francisco Conference will be in the interests of American agriculture, American labor, in the interests of 60,000,000 jobs, in the interest of a healthy, free Europe, in the interests of domestic and world stability and in the interests of a democratic world. These interests are our interests, the interests of the American people. They are in the interests of an America that is on the march of the far-flung battle fronts of the world, in the interests of a great America of today and of a greater America of tomorrow, in the interests of keeping alive, yes, everywhere in the world, the truths of our great Declaration of Independence and the Atlantic Charter, in the interests of establishing and perpetrating, yes, everywhere in the world, the cardinal motivating doctrine of mankind—all men are created equal.

Keep Political Hands Off the Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Antonio Express:

KEEP POLITICAL HANDS OFF THE ARMY ENGINEERS

United States Army engineers do not particularly care—and certainly they do not need the publicity, the way some other branch here and there evidently has felt it did, in times past—but the American people are long overdue on knowledge and appreciation of the quality of work done by Army engineers in both war and peace. Some other service branches have been storied in tale and film—some to satiety, and past. Even the indispensable, triple-tough Seabees have received a modicum of publicizing.

Now, under the lash of the engineers' achievements in Europe, recognition is forcing itself upon the public. Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, lately inserted a striking address on the subject into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was a pip. It told compactly and stirringly a few high points in the Army engineers' record from D-day to the Rhine crossings. Past that, the engineers even have been mentioned in a few press dispatches lately.

Not long ago an anonymous Army engineer in Germany gave a correspondent a summation of his corps:

"The engineers have the easiest job in the Army. All they have to do is throw bridges across rivers, build roads and railways, remove booby traps and mines—all under fire—and then take the Infantry by the hand and show them where to go."

That engineer could have enlarged on the list of "all they have to do" virtually without limit. For one example, they landed on the Normandy beaches 30 minutes before H-hour, where their job was to blow great holes in the antitank wall. They succeeded—under fire that subsequently almost swept following Infantry units from the beaches.

Of such men, the recent story about the pontoon bridge which was thrown across the Rhine in 9 hours, after the commanding general had estimated that it would require 48 hours, is but typical. That special quality which enables them both to fight and work effectively and at the same time, is one which only engineers and Seabees understand. It is a quality beyond words.

It is that quality—and the spirit of scornful, incorruptible integrity which it bases—that underlie the Army engineers' service in peace, when they determine the need for, and direct work on, flood control and river and harbor development. It is a quality and a spirit which have given the United States a long period of service by Army engineers without the slightest breath of scandal ever so much as touching their activities or decisions. It is a quality and a spirit which have maintained in those activities and decisions a level of technical excellence unsurpassed, if equaled, in any other land.

All that is the main reason why now—when some politicians would remove such work from the engineers' jurisdiction—the American people should know the breed of men who constitute the United States Army engineers. They are fighters; they are workers; they are men of superb technical attainment and absolute integrity.

The American people must let no meddling politicians touch their Army engineers.

Iowa Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas on December 28, 1946, the State of Iowa will have completed its first century of statehood, and the year will be celebrated in Iowa as the State's centennial year; and

Whereas there is general desire on the part of the people of the State that the centennial year of Iowa shall be made the occasion for renewed interest in and acceleration of the study of the entire history of Iowa, by appropriate ceremonies in the schools, the churches, and all civic societies, in every city and town of the State, to the end that Iowa people shall have finer appreciation of their own State and the achievements of her people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the fifty-first general assembly hereby endorses and approves the movement made by Hon. KARL LECOMPTE, and other Members of the Iowa delegation in Congress, to secure the publication by the postal department of a special stamp commemorative of the event, serving to remind all the people of the fact that Iowa was the first free State of the Louisiana Purchase, and of its growth and greatness; and the similar effort to secure the coinage of a special commemorative coin of special Iowa significance, and we hereby add our endorsement to the effort to make not only Iowa but all the world more history-conscious as a background for the higher patriotism affecting all things American.

HAROLD FELTON,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH A. EVANS,
President of the Senate.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17

Be it resolved by the senate (the house concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for additional flood control and also for a further development of navigation on the Missouri River; and

Whereas plans are being made for an even greater development of the Missouri River including a great development of irrigation; and

Whereas said improvements should be made at the earliest possible time in view of the destruction of life and property and the loss to industry, agriculture, and commerce caused by recent floods and the continuous waste of valuable water resources within this basin; and

Whereas improvements of the type contemplated have been carried on in the past by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and

Whereas the said Government agencies have had charge of such developments for many years and have planned and are prepared to execute the said works of improvement with no delay at the conclusion of the war; and

Whereas it has been suggested that in order to further the progress of this development, a Missouri Valley Authority should be formed with broad powers similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

1. That we endorse the aforementioned improvement program and recommend and urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, as now authorized by law, be given immediate adequate appropriation so that the plan can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy.

2. That we commend the corps of engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for their action in effecting coordination of their activities within the Missouri River Basin.

3. That we oppose Senate bill 555, introduced on February 15, 1945, and is now in the Committee on Commerce, because such bill would—

(a) Create a Federal corporation clothed with the power of government, fortified by law with a functional flexibility of a private

corporation and freed of all the legal restraints which experience has demonstrated are necessary and desirable.

(b) Place the States within the Missouri Valley Basin, subservient to a superstate controlled by three men, so far as the control and development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley Basin are concerned.

(c) Stifle industrial growth, individual enterprise and agricultural development inasmuch as the proposed Federal corporation would be in control of a basic economic resource.

(d) Establish a precedent for the establishment of a similar authority in the Missouri Valley Basin, which would be detrimental to the best interests of the State of Iowa and the Nation at large.

4. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of senate to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Iowa in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the legislature of each State bordering or through which the Missouri River flows.

G. R. HILL.
DE VERE WATSON.
A. D. CLEM.
E. K. BEKMAN.
RALPH E. BENSON.
J. A. NEWSOME.
ARTHUR JACOBSON.

We, Kenneth A. Evans, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-first General Assembly of Iowa.

KENNETH A. EVANS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of Senate.

Deferment of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. and Mrs. F. M. McFeeters, of Gravette, Ark., which speaks for itself, and is positive whether you agree with them or not in their conclusions:

GRAVETTE, ARK., *March 4, 1945.*
Hon. JIM TRIMBLE,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you on the day that my eldest son would have been 27 years of age. He gave his life for his country when the U. S. S. *Princeton* was lost. I am writing in his behalf and in behalf of another son who is fighting on the battle fields of France and because I feel a grave injustice has been done to all the boys who are fighting and dying on the battle fields of the world.

It was with a feeling of shock and of having been betrayed that I read of the Senate's recent action in regard to the deferment of farm boys.

Our boys were excellent farmers, as good as you could find anywhere. You of course are aware of the fact that a large percent of our armed forces are made up of farmers. These of course come from the family sized farm mostly. This is the group that is not represented by the powerful farm bloc.

Just why is the Senate bowing and scraping to this bloc that represents the big business men of farming? Could it be they prefer the vote of these to keeping faith with our fighting men—the heroes both dead and living?

We feel the Tydings amendment has been of great benefit and help to these and a temptation and encouragement to the draft boards to play politics.

We are farmers. We have a third son who will be 18 in July. We feel the Tydings amendment should be repealed. We want to see the Army have all the ammunition it needs and all the young men it needs so we can get the war over with and all our boys can come home. Then, too, this amendment judges a man by what he owns and not by his ability. This is another case of granting special favors to those who have.

* * * * *

Why not let some of our war-weary farmers who have been in battle come back to the farm and some of the deferred farmers take their place?

We feel Congress is meddling too much in the War Department's business. Surely our Army officers know better than Congress if they need men, food, or ammunition most. We have heard nothing of a food shortage. Surely all of us could do on less.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. F. M. MCFEETERS.

Federal Income Tax Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Joint Resolution 7

Whereas the sixty-third general assembly adopted House Joint Resolution No. 32 thereby making application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing a suggested amendment to the Federal Constitution, the effect of which would be to fix the maximum income-tax rate at 25 percent; and

Whereas the sixty-fourth general assembly considers the proposal made by such resolution inadvisable and is opposed thereto: Therefore, be it,

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That it express its opposition to the application and intent of the resolution set forth in the preamble hereof; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house, March 13, 1945.
HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
Concurred in by the senate, March 28, 1945.
HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Special Committee To Investigate Food Shortages

REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of House Resolution 195 creating the Special House Committee to Investigate Food Shortages, the Speaker appointed the following Representatives to conduct the investigation: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman; STEPHEN PACE, EARLE C. CLEMENTS, MARTIN GORSKI, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, and HAL HOLMES. During the past 10 days the committee has been in daily session and has held numerous conferences with Federal officials representing food-claiming and policy-making agencies. It was deemed advisable to secure all available data on supplies, requirements, and commitments of food before public hearings were held. The committee has also heard representatives of processors, producers, and distributors. With this background, the committee feels that it is now in a position to hold public hearings.

Hearings will be held in Chicago on April 16 and 17; in Cleveland, Ohio, on April 18; at Boston on April 23; Providence, April 24, and in New York City on April 25. It is anticipated that other hearings will take place in other parts of the country, and dates will be announced later as arrangements are made.

As a member of the committee, I am convinced that the break-down in our system of distribution of beef, pork, and poultry is largely due to a lack of coordination and proper understanding of the problem by Federal officials charged with the responsibility for securing an abundance of food and distributing it. Thus far, the Office of Price Administration, as I see it, is largely responsible for the break-down in the distribution system because of the many unsound policies initiated by the O. P. A. which have greatly discouraged production and seriously retarded the flow of processed and other foods into the channels of consumption.

The O. P. A. has utterly disregarded the intent of Congress when it initiated policies which were contrary to customary business practices. Many processing concerns have been put out of business because they were not permitted to receive a fair and equitable margin of profit over their cost of production. Unless the O. P. A. changes its present policy so as to permit processors to receive a fair and equitable margin, and to further follow the law, I am convinced that there is little hope to remedy existing shortages of meat and other vital products.

I will not attempt a discussion at this time of the detrimental policies now in operation which retard the production of vital foods. That will be done by members of the special committee when the

first report is made to the House by May 1. I do, however, want the record to show that your committee is constructively engaged in an effort to secure such changes in administration policies that will bring about an increase in the production of food, to help win the war and write the peace and to adequately take care of civilian requirements. To disclose, in part, what the committee has sought to accomplish with reference to securing an increase in hog or pork production for consumption in 1946, I am inserting herewith a letter written by me on March 31, 1945, to the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and the statement of the War Food Administration dated April 11, 1945, which change in policy was announced after a conference by your committee with Mr. Jones, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Davis, and other administration leaders:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 31, 1945.

In re: Hog production for 1946.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: As a member of the special committee to investigate the food shortage situation in this country I have a suggestion to make to you in regard to securing an increase in the production of pork for 1946. While our committee has not been provided with information as to commitments of beef and pork made by the various agencies for 1946, I desire to stress the need for additional hog production, in the event that commitments have been made which might exceed anticipated supplies. It will take at least 12 months to produce additional pork in this country.

The present shortage of pork in the United States is largely due to the lowering of the support price in the spring of 1944 from $13.75 a hundred to $12.50. If we are to have additional pork in 1946, farmers must make their plans within the next 30 days, and I therefore wish to suggest to you that if commitments have been made by the Government to supply foreign consumers with pork in 1946, beyond anticipated supplies, that the War Food Administration increase the support price at once to $13.75 for hogs weighing between 190 pounds and 300 pounds, and that such support price remain in effect until our commitments have been taken care of and civilian supplies restored. I wish to urge prompt action in this matter.

Hoping that my suggestion will be of value to you, and trusting that I may address you on various food subjects as our investigation progresses, I remain

Sincerely yours,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 11, 1945.

HOG SUPPORT PRICE RAISED—LARGER FALL PIG GOAL ANNOUNCED

Increase in the hog support price and a larger 1945 fall pig production goal, planned to insure the largest practicable production and marketing of pork products, were announced today by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones.

The national fall pig goal has been set at 37,000,000 head, 18 percent more than the number raised last fall. The hog support price has been increased from the present $12.50 to $13.00 a hundredweight, Chicago basis, for good and choice butcher hogs, all weights up to 270 pounds. The new support price will become effective immediately and continue to September 1, 1946—through the period when 1945 fall pigs will be marketed.

At the same time, Price Administrator Chester Bowles announced that there would be no reduction before September 1, 1946, in the ceiling prices for live hogs from the present levels of $14.75 a hundredweight, Chicago basis, for butchers and $14 for sows.

"Expected continuance of heavy demands for pork makes it advisable to maintain hog production at the highest possible level," said Administrator Jones in discussing the price support and goal announcements. "As has been the case all through the war years, the 1945 fall pig production goal calls for the largest number for which it is safe to plan in view of prospective feed supplies. I am confident our farmers will set their sights to reach this new goal, continuing the record production which has meant so much to the war effort."

The record pig production of 1942 and 1943 was made possible by using the reserve stocks of grain which were on hand when the United States entered the war. Since these reserve stocks have been reduced as far as it is safe to go, hog production is dependent on the current level of feed production. Crop goals for 1945 nearly 5 percent larger than last year's actual acreage have been announced previously.

About 240,000,000 more bushels of corn are available for livestock feeding now than a year ago. If normal yields are obtained on the 96,000,000 acres of corn, which farmers indicated on March 1 they intended to plant this year, sufficient feed supplies should be available to fatten a 37,000,000 fall pig crop, as well as meet the other feed and industrial requirements for corn.

Montana County First in Seventh War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure that I report to Congress the outstanding achievement of Daniels County, Mont.—and this is not the first time—in already surpassing its quota for the Seventh War Loan drive.

This outstanding Montana County thus becomes the first in the United States to meet and oversubscribe its quota. We of Montana are proud of this record and we know that all our other counties will follow the road Daniels has already trod.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting an article which appeared in the Helena Independent-Record of April 8, 1945:

ONE-DAY DRIVE PUTS DANIELS OVER WAR LOAN QUOTA

SCOBEY, MONT., April 7.—More than a month before the Seventh War Loan drive officially opens, Daniels County, in the northeast corner of Montana, reported late tonight that it had surpassed its quota by almost 20 percent.

The wheat farmers came to town today and laid down $250,000 cash for E bonds. Approximately $70,000 in F and G series bonds were also bought, Burley Bower, War loan committeeman, declared.

The small wheat-raising county, with one exception, met its quota long before the past six War loan drives started.

Said Bower:

"Looks like we're first in the Nation. * * * And remember, these sales are just for 1 day—just wait 'till we really get going."

The Cotton Belt's Interest in the Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation at large, and every segment of its population, is deeply interested in the outcome of the international conference which will be held at San Francisco in a few days.

Realizing the stake the cotton belt has in the outcome of this Conference and particularly the action that will be taken on the Bretton Woods Proposals, Hon. Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council of America, issued a very informative statement on the subject on April 6, 1945, which should be given careful study by all groups of our people dependent upon the cotton industry. No man in America has a better understanding of our cotton problems here and abroad than has Mr. Johnston. He has given great thought and study to the future of the cotton industry and I feel that his statement on this very timely subject should be given the widest possible circulation.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted, I am inserting the statement made by Mr. Johnston, which is as follows:

At the annual session of the National Cotton Council, which convened in Memphis, Tenn., January 24, 1945, the delegate members of the council unanimously approved the Bretton Woods program as that program had been announced. Because of this action on the part of its membership, I, as president of the council, am authorized to speak for the council in support of the Bretton Woods program.

The delegate membership of the council is composed of representatives from each of the six raw-cotton interests, namely: cotton producers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, spinners, and cottonseed crushes, The delegates to represent each interest are selected by their respective interest organizations within each of the 18 States in which cotton is produced. I speak, therefore, with respect to this subject matter, as the accredited and authorized representative of the entire raw-cotton industry.

The South and the Cotton Belt should urge the Congress to approve the Bretton Woods monetary pact and the proposal for the international bank for reconstruction and development without substantial changes. In our opinion, both represent steps forward toward the restoration of a stable and expanded international trade after the war. The cotton industry has a greater stake in the restoration of trade than have most other industries. The alternative to a flourishing international trade after the war is a return to economic nationalism and more and more Government controls on

the cotton industry and every other industry. If we are uneasy over the spread of totalitarianism and the expansion of bureaucracy, we should work to combat the forces which cause them by doing all in our power by reviving world commerce.

There seems little controversy over the proposed bank and a good deal of controversy over the proposed monetary pact. The monetary proposal has been criticized by committees representing the American Bankers Association. I have examined these criticisms. They come from capable and experienced men and must be weighed carefully and yet I feel the reasons for approving the monetary pact outweigh the reasons for rejecting the pact or modifying it substantially.

One does not have to be a monetary expert to know that trade between nations had become increasingly difficult for several years prior to World War No. 2. A cotton exporter, for example, might sell several thousand bales abroad only to find that he could not convert the foreign currency he received as payment for his cotton into dollars. To get anything out of the sale, he would have to buy something in the country in which he had sold his cotton. If he did not want to purchase anything there he would find himself with a credit which he could not use. Numerous other examples can be given illustrating the anarchical situation which prevailed with regard to foreign exchange before the war. The Honorable William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State described conditions extremely well in a recent radio address:

"Let us suppose for the moment that each State in this country had its own currency. The United States would then have 48 different currencies with fluctuating and uncertain relations between them. A person in Massachusetts selling goods in Ohio would receive Ohio money which could not be spent outside of Ohio. If a merchant in Philadelphia desired to purchase goods in New York, he would first need to acquire some New York money with which to pay for the goods. The rate for New York money would be frequently changing. Let us assume, furthermore, that in order to purchase or sell the currency of another State a license were required, and that applications for licenses were frequently denied. A person who had sold goods in another State would thus be unable to bring home the proceeds from his sale.

"It is clear that such conditions in the United States would be intolerable, and would reduce trade to a fraction of its present volume. Yet, these are the conditions which have existed for 10 or 12 years throughout much of the world. The purpose of the Bretton Woods proposals is to eliminate these conditions, and thereby to quicken and expand the exchange of goods and services between countries."

It was to avoid just the situation so accurately portrayed by Mr. Clayton that our Union of States was formed and our national monetary system adopted by our Congress, followed later by the adoption of a national banking system and still later by our Federal Reserve System.

The representatives of the Bankers Association propose that the bank plan be approved but that no action be taken on the monetary proposal at this time. Instead the bank would be given the responsibility for arranging and negotiating agreements between countries with respect to the stabilization of currencies, and the removal of exchange controls.

The Bankers Association takes the view that the International Bank can function sufficiently well without the fund until it can be definitely determined whether the fund is needed; that this country is not sufficiently protected under the monetary-fund proposal and that the fund is too loosely drawn and therefore subject to many risks and hazards.

Judged by ordinary banking rules, the criticism that the fund's operations are subject to certain risks and hazards undoubtedly would be justified. But the situation in which we find ourselves is by no means an ordinary situation. This country has invested billions upon billions of dollars, to say nothing of something infinitely more precious, the lives of thousands of its young men, in world peace and stability. We are in the position of a man who has put a lot of money and sacrifice into a costly project but who is likely to lose everything he has ventured if he does not press forward and invest more. We do not believe that it is a practical matter to put upon the bank the responsibility for negotiating currency-stabilization agreements between countries. We do not believe that an effort to negotiate agreements country by country would be practicable. The situation after the war will be confused and chaotic in many countries. It is in the interest of all concerned that exchange rates be stabilized and that restrictions on exchange transactions be eliminated as soon as possible.

Some critics of the fund make the point that exchange stability can be restored by restoring the gold standard. In view of our experience with the gold standard before the war, I feel that requiring countries to define their currencies in terms of gold is as far as we can go at this time. Nor do criticisms that too much leeway is given for the adjustment of a member's currency seem valid to me. A member country is permitted to decrease or increase the initial par value established for the currency by 10 percent. In view of the uncertain situation which will prevail after the war, this seems a wise precaution.

Since the criticisms of the fund seem debatable, I think the Cotton Belt should examine them in the light of its own interests. Obviously, we have a great stake in the restoration of a flourishing intercourse between nations. Obviously also, this is no time to be hesitant or timorous, or to be afraid to try something because it departs from familiar and often traveled paths. The entire world finds itself in a situation without parallel, and it is plain that a good many new things must be tried.

The Cotton Belt in the past has suffered perhaps more than any other section from restrictive trade policies. Because of tariffs and other handicaps to trade, we have sold low and bought high. All of us are aware of the effects of tariffs and quotas. It is not generally recognized that currency depreciation and manipulation operate as tariffs and quotas and are just as destructive to orderly and prosperous trade.

The countries of the world have embarked upon an effort to bring order out of the disorder which has prevailed in foreign exchange for years. The monetary fund proposal may not be perfect. Few proposals are, but, rightly operated, it can help establish the orderly and peaceful world which despairing mankind is seeking. Its rejection or emasculation would be a hard blow at this juncture. It would cast doubt on our willingness and ability to cooperate in a new world order. Therefore, the South and the Cotton Belt should see to it as quickly as possible that Congress hears its views on this subject.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Joint Resolution 28

Whereas the postal employees of the United States have not received an increase in base pay for over 20 years; and

Whereas during the present emergency they are receiving a $300 a year bonus (said bonus expires on June 30 of this year); and

Whereas these loyal employees of the Postal Service must have an increase in wages if they are to maintain a normal standard of living: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we go on record in favor of H. R. 2071, now before the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the United States House of Representatives, which provides for a reclassification of salaries for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to the Honorable Senators LUCAS and BROOKS, to the Illinois Members of the United States House of Representatives and to the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Adopted by the house March 28, 1945.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate April 5, 1945.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Dismissal of Proceedings Against Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of three letters to the President of the United States, all of them urging the dismissal of deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader. One of the letters is from Harry C. Huse, Washington State chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee and a leading businessman. Another is from the Honorable Jerry O'Connell, former Member of Congress from Montana and executive secretary of the Washington State Democratic Central Committee. The third letter is signed by 73 members of the Washington State Legislature.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered printed, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Seattle, Wash., April 2, 1945.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As State chairman of the Democratic Party of Washington, I wish to express to you the sincere desire of our people out here that you dismiss the deportation proceedings now pending against Harry Bridges, the west coast's outstanding labor leader.

As the chairman of the party and as a businessman I feel that Mr. Bridges' contribution to the war production effort should

be rewarded by permitting him his American citizenship. I am sure that you'll see that this comes about.

With best personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

HARRY C. HUSE,
State Chairman, Democratic State Central Committee.

Copy to Washington delegation.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Seattle, Wash., April 2, 1945.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter constitutes a sincere request that you use your high office to bring about the dismissal of the deportation proceedings now pending against Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's Union.

I am sure that you realize the tremendous contribution which Harry Bridges has made to the war effort by his outstanding leadership in the labor movement. He has been one of the Nation's outstanding production soldiers, and deserves the adulation of the Government instead of its persecution. I feel that both labor and management appreciate the stability which he has brought to industry on the Pacific coast.

As a leader of the Democratic Party in the State of Washington, I wish to express the sincerest gratitude of our people for his exceptional assistance, through his union, in the recent election campaign. Along with our new governor, Mon C. Wallgren, I feel that the people desire you to dismiss the proceedings against Mr. Bridges.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

JERRY O'CONNELL,
Executive Secretary, State Democratic Central Committee.

Copy to Washington delegation.

MARCH 8, 1945.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the following members of the Legislature of the State of Washington, have signed the following resolution asking that you dismiss the Bridges case in the interest of national unity and victory.

"The order to deport Harry Bridges is a blow at all the forces of unity." These are the words of C. I. O. President Philip Murray, who described the decision as a "burden on the conscience of the American people." American labor in the coming period must contribute even greater effort, service and sacrifice to the total war effort. The morale of American labor and the whole nation will be strengthened by immediate dismissal of the Bridges case.

The proceedings against Harry Bridges violate the basic principles of our Constitution, which protects citizen and noncitizen alike. Continuance of this case jeopardizes not alone the rights of one man, but the rights of millions of aliens who have made their homes in our country, traditional haven for the oppressed of all lands.

Power to dismiss the Bridges case rests with the Attorney General and the President of the United States, who can clear the way for Harry Bridges to become a citizen of the country he has served so loyally in peacetime and during the critical war years.

Therefore, we transmit to the Attorney General and to the President of the United States this urgent request that the Bridges case be dismissed without delay, as a major contribution toward national unity and victory.

Yours respectfully,

MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURE
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Copies to Attorney General Biddle, Congressmen, and Senators.

MEMBERS OF WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE

Senate: H. S. Bargreen, E. A. Beck, J. R. Binyon, D. Black, E. S. Coe, G. G. Dixon, A. E. Edwards, Lady Willie Forbus, M. J. Gallagher, A. J. Hanson, H. N. Jackson, E. H. Kohlhase, C. C. Mohler, M. T. Neal, E. T. Olson, T. C. Rabbitt, R. R. Ray, A. D. Rosellini, J. V. Sapp, P. G. Thomas, C. V. Tisdale, J. N. Todd, T. R. Waters.

House: George N. Adams, Anders Andersen, H. C. Armstrong, Robert Bernethy, Violet P. Boede, Dwight Bunnell, Edward T. Chambers, Martin V. Easterday, U. S. Ford, MD, John A. Goucher, H. D. Hall, Julia Butler Hansen, Al Henry, Edward B. Henry, Chas. W. Hodde, Louis E. Hofmeister, George S. Hurley, Harry M. Ingersoll, Levy Johnson, William H. Jones, Agnes Kehoe, Chet King, Lloyd Lindgren, Fred J. Martin, Harry J. Martin, Floyd C. Miller, Richard H. Murphy, Homer O. Nunamaker, John L. O'Brien, Francis Pearson, Blanche Pennick, William J. Pennock, Edward L. Pettus, Chart Pitt, William H. Price, A. L. Rasmussen, Emma Abbott Ridgway, Edward F. Riley, Hugh J. Rosellini, Mrs. Jurie B. Smith, Willard Taft, Pearl G. Thrasher, J. K. Van Buskirk, Robt. F. Waldron, Max Wedekind, Olaf A. Wiggen, Percy Willoughby, Andrew Winberg, R. C. Young, George F. Yantis.

Thomas Jefferson and Inter-American Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Thomas Jefferson and inter-American unity, before the meeting of Latin-American Judge Advocates, Monticello, Charlottesville, Va., April 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends and fellow citizens of America, the moment, the place, and the circumstances of our meeting today invite me to discourse, even though briefly, on a point of interest common to every American. The achievements of Spain in America were not, as some are still wont to think, the result of mere chance. In the sixteenth century Spain not only possessed the impulse but the capacity to discover, and these by reasons of her history and of her culture. As a result of the discovery, the conquest, and the colonization of the New World the geographic extension of the Spanish language and of Hispanic culture, together with the wealth of natural products which exist in the Spanish and Portuguese speaking nations of the New World, has made of these republics an essential factor in the economic and cultural life of the modern world, and there is no doubt but what these nations will acquire an even greater importance in the years to come.

We North Americans do not ignore the importance of Spain's contributions to the history, the tradition, and the culture of our country, considering that even a cursory reading of the chronicle of America reveals vividly the magnitude of this contribution. In 1512 Ponce de Leon baptized Florida; in 1519 Alvarez de Pineda discovered the mouths of the Mississippi; in 1528 Panfilo de Narvaez and his 600 companions crossed the forests and swamps of Florida, and in the years 1529 to 1536 Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca and his 3 companions, Castillo, Dorantes, and the Negro Esteban, the only survivors of the Narvaez expedition, crossed on foot the vast territory from Texas to the Gulf of California. In 1540, after his return to Spain, Cabeza de Vaca was appointed adelantado of the Province of the River Plate. In 1541 Hernando de Soto discovered the great Mississippi, after having passed through the present States of Florida, Texas, Georgia, Alabama, the Carolinas, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana. In 1543 Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, a famous Portuguese navigator in the service of the Spanish crown, explored the coast of the Pacific as far north as San Diego Bay, and with Rodriguez Cabrillo's death his companion, Bartolome Ferrelo, continued on as far as the coast of the present State of Oregon. In 1565 Menendez de Aviles founded St. Augustine, in the present State of Florida, the oldest city within the present continental limits of the United States.

In 1526, Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon founded San Miguel de Guadalupe somewhere in the present Carolinas, and in 1566 and 1570 Spanish explorers reached the Bay of Santa Maria, today Chesapeake Bay. These men, according to some historians, were the precursors of those who discovered the Potomac River which the Spanish called El Rio del Espiritu Santo, that majestic stream which rolls along to eventually irrigate the gardens of Mount Vernon. The words of Tovar and Cardenas were those that thundered in the depths of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado in 1541, these illustrious captains being members of the expedition of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, the first explorer of the present and my beloved New Mexico.

Neither do we forget that the great Venezuelan, Francisco de Miranda, served with distinction in the North American wars of independence, coming to enjoy the intimate friendship of Alexander Hamilton; we also recognize that had it not been for Bernardo de Galvez, it is not pleasant to think how things might have gone with us against the English during the Revolution in the southeastern part of our country, particularly in the famous battles of Mobile and Pensacola. As a result of these conflicts the English were forever driven out of this part of the United States.

The temptation to extend this catalogue of Spanish achievement is great indeed, an achievement which in all reality forms those golden links which unite the republics of the Western Hemisphere. The first imprints of our European culture were Spanish, and various regions of the United States, of North America, such as Florida, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California, carry to this day the impressions of that culture. And, gentlemen, in my own New Mexico and up to the present day we still learn the language of Cervantes, of Santa Teresa, and of Fray Luis de Leon from the lips of our mothers, and we still extract our every day philosophy from those so gracious dialogues between Don Quixote and his lovable companion, Sancho, which for every Spanish-speaking person are nothing less than honey itself.

The descendants of these Spaniards are found today on every battlefront fighting for the maintenance of Democratic ideas, and the casualty lists published weekly by the War and Navy Departments of the United States regularly include the melodious names of Gonzalez, Garcia, Valdez, Sanchez, Gomez, Trujillo, Cordova, Gallegos, Romero, Lucero, and so forth.

It is not well known that the eminent Thomas Jefferson not only enjoyed a fine knowledge of the language of Castilla, but he also was a sincere friend of what later came to be known as the Bolivarian ideal.

The historian, Van Wyck Brooks, in his book, The World of Washington, has the following to say with relation to this matter:

"We know that Thomas Jefferson composed an epistolary essay on the pronunciation of the Greek language, writing part of this work in Spanish, in view of the fact that he was convinced of the importance of the Spanish language for every American. He anticipated future relations between his country and Spanish America, and upon more than one occasion expressed his ardent desires to some day witness the actuality of a pan-American hemisphere free of every foreign influence."

This illustrious American, the son of a rich Virginia planter, initiated his legal practice in 1767, and 2 years later was elected as a representative in the Colonial Legislature. He soon was recognized as one of the leaders of the opposition and became prominent for his anti-English ideas. After the dissolution of the Virginia Legislature he performed important tasks in the free convention and wrote a document, Summary Views of the Rights of British America, a succinct exposition of the rights of the English Americans. This document is a prelude to the Declaration of Independence. In 1775 he was elected to the Virginia Congress and composed the reply of the Virginians to Lord North, a document which was received with great enthusiasm, for it expressed more clearly than any previous composition, the will of the North American people to be independent. In 1776 Jefferson was given the task of proposing a declaration of independence and was named president of the commission charged with the responsibility of editing it. This precious American document, written entirely by Thomas Jefferson, was adopted with slight modifications on the Fourth of July of the same year. Possibly the most important contribution of Thomas Jefferson to the edifice of North American democracy was a formulation of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, and which embrace the fundamental laws with relation to the personal rights of the citizen.

Thomas Jefferson was named Governor of Virginia in 1779, and as soon as his term was over in 1781 he again occupied a seat in the National Congress where, among other things, he was responsible for the adoption of our present monetary system. In 1784 he was sent to Europe to assist Benjamin Franklin and John Adams in the negotiation of commercial treaties, and in the following year he replaced Franklin as American Minister in Paris where he remained until 1789, when he was named Secretary of State.

In 1801 Jefferson was elected President of the United States, and reelected in 1805. His two terms of office being most beneficial to the new Republic. In 1809 he refused a third term and retired to Monticello, the very house in which we are today gathered, where he occupied his time in myriad tasks, outstanding among them being the founding of the University of Virginia.

When Jefferson began his political career, he was the possessor of a considerable fortune, and after having spent 8 years as President of the United States he was in a state of near bankruptcy. So precarious was his material condition that he found himself obliged to sell to his Government, which he had served so long and so well, his magnificent library, in order to satisfy his debts and to be able to carry on. He died in these sacred halls on the 4th of July of 1826, the same day which witnessed the passing of John Adams and fulfilling exactly 50 years from that distant day when the Declaration of Independence was signed.

Jefferson is one of the founders of the United States of America and the most characteristic representative of democracy, dedicating his efforts to maintain the rights of his people. Of solid culture and deep-rooted convictions, it is interesting to observe that he never spoke in public, in spite of which he exercised a determining influence on the political and social life of this country.

I should not end this short discourse without expressing my most heartfelt thanks for the privilege of being with you. I do hope, in all frankness and good faith, that this gathering of such eminent Americans at one of the most sacred of North American shrines, will operate toward the establishment of that harmony and good will among our peoples which we so zealously desire.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before Maryland Bankers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on April 12, last Thursday evening, in the city of Baltimore, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, and a former member of the Cabinet, delivered a very interesting and thought-provoking address to the Maryland Bankers' Association. I think this address can be read by everyone with great profit, and I therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy and honored to be your guest speaker this evening—happy to be among my good friends of Maryland—and honored that your association should invite me to address your annual dinner meeting. To be perfectly candid, until a friend of mine suggested a possible explanation, I was not clear about why I was invited to take part in your program. My friend reminded me that as Posmaster General I had supervision of the Postal Savings System, a banking set-up which at one time was thought to be unique because its investments were limited to United States Government bonds. "With that background of experience," my friend told me, "you are a natural to talk to bankers these days." "Bank statements", he pointed out, "are getting to look more and more like the statement of the Postal Savings System." "Your banker friends," he warned, "will want you to tell them where this trend in banking will eventually lead or, better still, how it can be reversed."

These are difficult questions and I know you don't expect me to supply all the answers this evening. You will recall, I am sure, that such reputation as I may have as a forecaster of future events was gained in a field having little in common with banking. Moreover, there is a good deal of the element of chance involved in any kind of prophecy.

Our primary task, that of winning the war, is one in which Maryland already has an outstanding record. Several billions of dollars of war contracts have been filled by the industries of Maryland on schedule and according to specification, notwithstanding the labor shortage in many areas which has seriously multiplied the problems of management. In ordnance and shipbuilding, in the production of steel, aircraft, chemicals, and many other vital products, your State has written a chapter in her glorious history never to be forgotten. In this great effort I know that you bankers have played an important part.

Directly, and through the Government, you have helped to supply the credit that was needed, and in other ways have facilitated the operation of the financial machinery essential to Maryland's great contribution to the war effort. It goes without saying that you will gladly continue to give your full energies to the winning of the war until the job is completely done. While still deeply engaged in war work you are and sh uld be concerned with the welfare of the human factors and the well-being of our national economy. The questions are: Will our Government, after the war, live within its income and foster business growth, or will it take the easy way of deficit financing leading to political regimentation of business and unavoidably to the destruction of the American system of free enterprise?

As I consider these questions my mind goes back to 1933, when I went to Washington as part of an administration committed to the principle of a balanced Budget, to the correction of certain practices in our security markets, to the strengthening of our banking system, to the extension of certain benefits to labor, to the establishment of a plan of social security, and to certain other reforms—all of which, as then contemplated—were thought to be consistent with the tenets of free enterprise. In the years that followed, this purpose was sometimes lost to sight in the scramble by opposing groups for power, for benefits, and for the advancement of pet theories of government. As Government yielded to the pressure of one group, others were encouraged to increase their demands and to exert greater pressure for the special advantages useful to them. Where, we are prompted to ask, is this trend leading us? The question, casually considered, may seem remote from everyday bankin , but I submit that the changes which have occurred in your balance sheets in recent years are, in a large measure, merely symptoms of this growing tendency to look to Government for subsidy, for credit, for insurance; in short, for security against risk of every kind. I am speaking now of a trend which was pronounced at the time of our entrance into the war, and not of activities assumed by the Government in the promotion of our war effort. The question now is, Whether at the end of the war this trend will be accelerated, or whether we may look forward to a period in which a serious effort will be made to balance the Budget, in which business can be reasonably free from the threat of more controls and more Government competition, a period in which we can test by experience the value of the many new laws which have been placed on the statute books during the past few years.

The prospect is not altogether encouraging. The appetites of many special groups have been whetted in past year by the tender morsels served them at the Washington table. They have succeeded in placing representatives in many important places in Government, and their spokesmen have become adept in special pleading. Let us consider the problem of attaining a balanced Budget. It is estimated that the annual cost of servicing the debt after the war may equal or exceed the total National Budget for any peacetime year prior to our intensive preparation for war. This fact alone should be sufficient to direct the thinking of all Americans along the lines of effecting, when the war is over, every possible economy in Government expenditures. Instead, we find that the groups which advocated liberal spending in the past have even more grandiose plans for the future. One such advocate had occasion not long ago to expound this philosophy of Government to a committee of the United States Senate. The statement was a sort of blue print for a fuller, richer life.

No man interested in the welfare and happiness of his fellow citizens could read it without hoping that the time may come when Americans may enjoy the great advantages there enumerated. The first point mentioned was the need, when the war is over, for full employment, with higher wages and shorter hours. This, it was argued, should be accomplished by having the Government stand by, ready at all times, to provide employment for those not absorbed by private business. Nor was the farmer forgotten. It was proposed that Government place a floor under farm prices and so insure the farmer against a fall in the market value of farm products. And that is not all. The farmer would be provided with better housing, and rural electrification would be expanded to the utmost to make rural life more comfortable. Turning to the problem of improving the health of the American people, this remarkable document would have the Government assume the responsibility of building hospitals in all communities not now having such facilities, and of providing adequate medical care for all citizens. Likewise, under this philosophy, better education would be made available to everyone. The statement was made that technical and higher education must, in the future, be made just as universal as secondary education has been in the past. There were other recommendations for Government guaranty of a better life and greater individual security. Many were laudable objectives, but there was one point, to some of us a very important one, which received only casual reference. I refer to the simple question of "Where is the money coming from?"

The school of thought which has been prominent in recent years in advocating public spending would answer simply by saying that if Government sees to it that we have a high national income, the Budget will take care of itself. One group of self-appointed experts on budgetary matters would go even further and assure us that a balance between income and expense is not necessary, and that there is no reason why the Government of the United States should not go on indefinitely spending more than it collects. We can be thankful that this brand of "progressive" thinking is not accepted by the great majority of our Representatives who make the laws and administer the various departments of Government. The fact remains, however, that the advocates of liberal spending are still retained in important official positions. Periodically they are allowed to expound their views on financial questions under circumstances seeming to indicate that they have substantial official backing. This sort of thing has been a constant deterrent to the development of confidence in the financial policies of the Government on the part of people in every walk of life. It is my considered opinion that nothing could contribute more to the building of confidence in the future of this country, here and abroad, than unequivocal assurances, backed by action, that we will strive to attain a balanced National Budget at the earliest possible time. In this respect perhaps we could learn a lesson from Prime Minister Churchill, who recently had occasion to define the position which he believes the British Conservative Party should take in the next general election. He said: "There is one thing we shall certainly not do. We shall not bid for votes or popularity by promising what we cannot perform, nor shall we compete with others in electioneering baits and lures. It would be very easy for us all to promise, or even to give each other, presents, bonuses and gratuities in a most enthusiastic manner; but if we woke up in the morning and found that the pound sterling only bought 5 shillings' worth of goods or services, we should have committed a great crime."

We must, of course, achieve and maintain a high national income after the war, and we must reconcile ourselves to carrying a heavy tax burden for many years. At the same time we have to recognize that the levying of taxes is not the sole means of bringing the Budget into balance. Control of expenses is also important, and we must give due regard to both factors if we are to solve the enormous financial problem which will confront this country at the conclusion of the war. This is no time to lay plans for things which are not essential and which we cannot afford, no time to encourage pressure groups, no time to lead people to think that all self-denial and sacrifice will end with the armistice.

I want this gathering to understand distinctly, that in what I have to say about the need for economy in government I have made no reference to post-war expenditures for the maintenance of our armed forces. I would here give great weight to the advice of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal and Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations, as to the extent of our military and naval needs in time of peace. They are entitled to our respect and confidence on questions concerning appropriations for the Army and Navy in the years ahead.

Just as there has been no absence of convincing assurance that all possible effort will be made to balance the Budget after the war, so we are left to speculate on the question of the post-war attitude of Government towards private business. Businessmen are aware of the challenge confronting them. Their appreciation of the importance of maintaining high employment is evidenced by the fact that they speak of the number of post-war jobs which they hope to offer as an objective of at least equal importance with the volume of goods which they plan to produce. It can be said with certainty that business leaders are in a frame of mind to make free enterprise work more effectively than ever before. But what will be the attitude of Government? Will business be encouraged to go forward, to expand and improve plants and to make commitments with labor, with producers of raw materials and the distributors of finished products? This question is uppermost in the minds of bankers and businessmen throughout the Nation. Not that we are fearful of the avowed enemies of the free-enterprise system. They are few in number and they seldom attain positions of power. The men who will bear watching are those who profess to believe in free enterprise, but with certain conditions always attached, such as: provided it is helped by government, supplemented by government, regulated by government, protected by government against its own weaknesses, etc., etc. These are the same self-styled friends who say: "If industry doesn't provide full employment, government must step in and take over," having all the time a plan for that purpose in their inside pockets, ready to be flashed on the public the minute industry fails to perform to their liking.

This constant goading of business, of threatening more regulation and more Government competition has prevented us from realizing the full benefits of a free economy. You bankers have had first-hand experience with Government competition. I understand that in the lending field you are required to compete with 46 different public agencies, and that you are now being threatened with more. You have indeed had a full experience with that technique by which officials soberly proclaim that credit for this or that is needed, and that unless the bankers meet the situation Government will do the job. This kind of announcement, as we have seen many times, is an invitation to all groups to come in and ask for help. Soon a new pressure group is organized, and free enterprise is threatened with the loss of another foot of precious ground.

In the early years of the depression it was necessary for government to supply credit for certain purposes which could not for good reasons be satisfied by private lenders. The need then was obvious to everyone. Today the situation is entirely changed. Our capital markets are functioning vigorously and effectively, both as regards equity and long-term debt. The banks are on the job looking for chances to lend money. I know that you are pounding the pavements and pushing into the byways looking for businesses requiring bank credit. I have been particularly interested in reading of the formation by banks in various parts of the country of your so-called "bank credit pools." The wisdom of adopting these measures is clearly apparent. By these means you have made certain that no credit application need be denied before it has been carefully scrutinized by a group specially set up to find ways of satisfying credit requirements which, for one reason or another, fail to meet the tests of a particular lending institution. To me, and I am sure to many people, these credit pools are symbolic of the desire and determination of bankers to make sure that no legitimate business will be hampered by lack of bank financing in the great program of production and employment to which we look forward after the war.

What more can bankers do to insure a healthy economy after the war? What more can they do to help arrest this invasion of Government into the sphere of business? The methods of influencing Government which have been most popular in recent years are not available to you. You cannot go to Washington and, by the sheer weight of your numbers, computed in terms of ballots, have your views accepted, no matter how sound they may be. You have to rely instead upon your ability to search out the truth and lay it clearly before your fellow citizens. Your motives will often be questioned by people who claim to know better, and your recommendations will be trampled upon by groups bent upon immediate gains without regard to final consequences. In time, however, your opinions will be heeded, and it will be found that you have contributed greatly to intelligent public thinking. It is vital that you continue to study and express your thoughts on the great issues confronting us. All have financial implications, all have a bearing on the momentous question of whether we shall restore order to our domestic financial affairs, and so maintain the strength to exert wise and constructive influence in the solution of international problems.

The banks have made a real contribution in keeping inflationary tendencies under control. From the beginning of our war effort your leaders have been outspoken in recommending measures to prevent prices from getting out of hand due to the high national income and a limited supply of goods. Bankers have welcomed the opportunity to play an important role in the plan to divert income into Government bonds. They have gladly carried a heavy burden, both in spreading the Treasury message to save, and in processing the sale of bonds. Thus far we have been remarkably successful in keeping prices under control, but the threat is by no means ended. As purchasing power piles up the task is likely to become more difficult. We must remember, too, that a return to the manufacture of civilian goods will not, in itself, end the threat of high prices. The process of making such goods also generates purchasing power, which in turn adds to the pressure on prices. The fight against inflation will therefore go on even after the struggle on the battlefield is won. To you who appreciate the importance of the effort, to you who are capable of devising means of combating this threat to the integrity of our economy, falls the duty of continuing leadership.

Another problem, in the solution of which the Nation will look to you for guidance as the war draws to a conclusion, is that of reconverting our industrial machinery from war production to its normal peacetime

functions. Bankers are specialists in credit operations essential to the full production of war goods. From now on you will be called upon increasingly for expert assistance by industries which are planning for peace. The prospect of Government contract cancelation is grim, indeed, for industries whose working capital is largely tied up in receivables, inventory, and partially completed goods. They must find ways of converting these assets into cash if they are to contribute to the production of goods and the employment of returning veterans. You can't solve all such problems, but you can advise customers and exert wise influence in dealing with such cases.

In recent months it has become important to consider some revision in the law to enable companies to have the benefit of their post-war refund during the period of reconversion, when some of them may face a serious struggle for survival. Likewise, it is important to remove from the tax laws impediments to post-war business activity. I am not suggesting that the Government can do with less income. Everyone recognizes that tax receipts in the future must exceed by a wide margin our pre-war revenues. But we should use the taxing power in ways that will encourage and sustain the spirit of enterprise. Whether we call it incentive taxation or something else, the fact remains that moderate taxation on a large volume of business is much to be desired over high taxes and only moderate business.

We must not permit the magnitude of the task ahead to dull our hopes or determination to build a better America and a better world. We can find encouragement in the emphasis which Government leaders now place on the need for post-war jobs. Perhaps this is a sign that Government in the future may give more consideration to the problems of the great body of American employers. Perhaps it foretells a renewal of faith in the dignity and strength and ingenuity of the individual, whether he be a worker on the line, a scientist, or just a plain business manager.

In mobilizing its great human and physical resources for war production American business sought no favors, only a fair chance to meet the greatest challenge in its history. It asks no favors now, only a fair chance, when peace arrives, to accomplish reconversion and set in motion our great industrial machinery in the interest of a better life for all.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 31st of March, Hon. James M. Cox, of whom Florida is proud, and whom she shares jointly with the great State of Ohio, gave one of his rare interviews to the Associated Press on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. The interview with Governor Cox was carried in the Miami Daily News of April 1st. Senators will remember Governor Cox as three times an eminent Governor of Ohio, and as the nominee for President of the Democratic Party when our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has just passed away, was the nominee for Vice President. There is much advice to the citizenry of the country and to the Congress in this outstanding interview with this distinguished American, and I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES M. COX, AT 75, FORESEES "LONG CONTINUED WORLD PEACE"

(By The Associated Press)

James M. Cox, who carried the banner for the League of Nations in the Presidential campaign of 1920, saw Saturday a promise of "long continued and perhaps permanent international peace."

He sounded the cheerful note in one of his extremely rare interviews, granted to The Associated Press because Saturday was his seventy-fifth birthday.

The former Governor of Ohio observed the anniversary at a time when United States' participation in a post-war international organization is a live issue, just as it was in 1920 when he became the Democratic nominee for President and fought for the league envisioned by Woodrow Wilson.

"A new age opens before us," he declared. "That shouldn't be alarming. Every generation has a new world to face. We confront swifter change than in past times, but we have better means of adjusting ourselves. Man's life has been an age-long struggle to rise to larger stature. Some have succeeded in the adjustment and have gone forward progressively. Others have missed the mark and vanished from the race.

"A constant evolution has been going on. It has taken ages to develop our civilization and there are ages yet to go. All this tells us we must be patient, yet everlastingly at the present pressing task.

"We enter into the strange new day in the midst of widespread grief and desolation yet with every prospect of new and better things ahead. There is promise of long continued and perhaps permanent international peace. The world has been punished and in a chastened spirit has come to its senses at last.

"We shall have the benefits of scientific achievements. The mysteries of nature are one by one being solved and the material way of life, if we manage well, will be easier and happier. We have won many battles against disease and shall win many more. Because of this, we shall be a happier people, for health brings happiness. A healthy body, moreover, promotes that wholesome state of mind which begets understanding and harmony among men and nations."

Mr. Cox was asked whether the present war could have been avoided.

"This war did not need to be," he replied. "The conviction of that fact will grow as we demonstrate that an outlaw nation cannot run at large, and that disputes can be settled without resort to war. Time will reveal even more clearly than it has already done that the conspiracy which wrecked the project for peace after the First World War was the most tragic and sinful chapter in our history.

"I sometimes hear it said that in the coming cooperation of nations for peace, the errors of Woodrow Wilson will be avoided. The whole structure that is being built now is laid out from the blueprints embedded in the mind and soul of that martyred President. There will be changes in detail, but not in principle.

"Time brings its compensations. The wisest of men is the county coroner who gets the last look at things. Those who would cast discredit on Woodrow Wilson are only trying to cover up their own guilt in the conspiracy of 1919. If there still be active now some remains of the sinister movement of that time, it must be because an enduring peace will expose the wrong which they accomplished then. If a league of nations succeeds today, it would have succeeded had these political plotters given it the chance a quarter of a century ago.

"But enough of the past. The wisdom which the past has taught warns us that the path to peace is too sacred to be befouled by personal or partisan spite. The evils of today come from the neglects of yesterday. Our tomorrow will be what we make it today."

At 75, Mr. Cox directs the activities of his five newspapers and three radio stations. He has been particularly busy during the war while his son—"my mainstay"—Lt. Comdr. James M. Cox, Jr., is serving in naval aviation.

He looks 20 years younger than his calendar age and plays a game of golf which would be a credit to a man 40 years younger. He scores in the low 80's, and last Saturday carded a 38 for nine holes.

How does he do it?

"One cannot lay down a formula for health," he explained. "He only knows what he has found to be beneficial.

"He should not retire from business, and in addition to his own affairs he must have his mind tied to the current of world affairs.

"Physical exercise should be kept up, but temperately."

In connection with domestic affairs, Mr. Cox said "there is a disquieting situation."

"We Americans seem to run too much to extremes," he commented. "We have two forms of radicalism as we had in prohibition. Then we went from the open, uncontrolled, disgraceful saloon to the menacing gangsterism under prohibition. In time the pendulum struck center.

"Right now we have the radical reactionary on the one hand who can see little virtue in progressive economic and social policy. Anything which comes from the administration in Washington is condemned.

"On the other hand, there seems to be forming a sort of cult in this country which appears to believe that we are going backward if we don't have a new reform every day.

"These two radical movements fail to recognize an important fact, which is that extreme reactionaryism leads to the other radical extreme and if we do not maintain an orderly progress we can very easily—once the war is over—have a man on horseback giving us real fascism.

"If we can only develop a sense of balance in this country, our conditions will be very much more reassuring. A considerable part of the world is to be built, and with our material resources of raw products and skilled labor we can assume and maintain a leadership.

"If, however, we run into violent inflation out of which can easily come a pestilence of labor troubles, then we may lose our opportunity."

Of the living Presidential candidates, only Charles Evans Hughes antedates Mr. Cox. Mr. Hughes, who will become 83 years old April 11, was defeated in 1916.

The Vice Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket headed by Mr. Cox was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Post-War Employment for War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief

statement made by John Thomas Taylor, national legislative chairman of the American Legion, together with an address delivered by Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at a dinner recently given by the Legion's national employment committee, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion has just completed an historic conference here in Washington. Outstanding leaders in the field of industry, labor, agriculture, education, veterans' affairs, and government have met at the invitation of the Legion's national employment committee to chart a coordinated course toward the fullest possible post-war employment for our veterans—and for every American.

It was the Legion's purpose, in the words of Lawrence J. Fenlon, chairman of the Legion's employment committee, to draw from the combined experience of the participants new strength, new life in what is certain to be one of the most critical of all post-war problems. Mr. Fenlon said:

"If we do nothing more than to serve notice to veterans that their country is concerned with their future, this conference will not have been in vain."

The conference certainly did that. But out of the frank interchange of ideas and ideals there has sprung a new understanding of the nature of the task ahead; a new and firm basis for cooperative effort. The Legion recognized that no one organization, no one group, can assure maximum post-war employment, but that it can be done by the concerted effort of every group, every individual in America, working together as a single great team.

The focal point of the Legion's campaign will be the American Legion program for maximum employment, which is described as a program of action to stimulate the sales, the market from which production and jobs must spring. In that program the Legion warned:

"It will be only inviting disaster to try to create jobs without creating demand for the services the people in those jobs will perform."

Forty percent of post-war employment, the Legion found, must be created in the sales, service, and distribution fields. And selling is a grass-roots problem—one that must be done at the community level where the people live and work. The Legion believes it can be particularly effective there—for, more than any other organization, the Legion reaches into every city, every town, every village crossroads through its 20,000 Legion posts and auxiliary units.

The purpose of the Legion's campaign—and the inspiration which has been drawn from the important national employment conference held at the Statler Hotel, April 5 and 6, was forcefully stated by Edward N. Scheiberling, the Legion's national commander. I commend it to my fellow Senators for their closest attention:

ADDRESS BY EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION

This date, April 6, is the twenty-eighth anniversary of the entrance of the United States in World War No. 1. The experiences of that war—the problems of demobilization and in the heartbreak of readjustment—are still fresh in the minds of all Legionnaires. They are behind the thinking of the Legion in its effort to ease the impacts of readjustment on veterans of World War No. 2.

As a result the Legion has lifted the horizons of its vision and adopted broad policies and programs designed to aid veterans of two wars. We realize fully the responsibilities we are assuming as a two-war organization. We cheerfully accept these responsibilities.

One of these responsibilities is to utilize our strength, our resources, and our facilities to help veterans of World War No. 2. The Legion is ready to do everything possible—to face any and all obstacles—in fitting back into our pattern of life the millions who are now on the fighting fronts.

Contrary to belief in some circles, these veterans are not coming back with the feeling that our country owes them a living. They are coming back with confidence that our country owes them the opportunity to earn a living. The Legion is dedicated to giving them that opportunity.

One of the definite ways in which we are undertaking to do this is through our national committee on employment.

There is being concluded in this room what I believe to be an unprecedented conference. Perhaps for the first time, representatives of every segment of our economic life have gathered in a single open assemblage, voluntarily partaking in a frank and open interchange of views.

The American Legion is grateful that it has had the opportunity to be host to this assemblage of outstanding leaders in the field of post-war employment planning. This has been a gathering, not of theorists, but of practical men of action—the men who will play an important role in providing jobs.

But this conference, noteworthy as it is, represents only the start of what must be a great, unified national cooperative campaign for maximum employment—one in which every organization, every individual in America must take part. The question of post-war employment must be taken off the drafting table and into the field. It must be done speedily. Time is of the essence.

We have been thinking of the post-war period as belonging to the future. Yet it is almost with us. Victory in Europe may be proclaimed in a matter of hours, days, or weeks. Developments of the last few days on the diplomatic front give hope that the Japanese war may come to a victorious end earlier than we had dared hope for.

And with the end of war, millions of our men will come home, calling upon us to redeem the pledges we have been solemnly making.

There is no time left for talk. There is no time left for slow or cumbersome planning. We have had years for talking and planning. Now we must be prepared to act.

Most of you are fully familiar with the American Legion's program for maximum employment. It is a program for action. And, as we leave here tonight, the Legion gives its pledge to the men and women now in service—its pledge, indeed to all America—that it is going out into the field with an active fight to create the markets, the sales, that produce jobs.

The Legion's national employment committee is taking its program to the country through a series of 12 regional meetings in every section of the United States. In the next 60 days, that program, the demand for urgent and immediate action, will be brought to every organization of the American Legion.

But we do not presume to undertake this job alone. We know that no single group, no single organization—not even Government—is strong enough, far reaching enough to achieve alone the maximum employment we must attain.

In the series of regional conferences to come, we shall make use of the combined experience, the combined judgment, planning and skill represented in this conference. In every section of the United States, as the regional meetings are held, we shall bespeak the cooperative ideas, planning and help of business, labor, education, church, agriculture, and government, both National, State, and local. These regional conferences will be, in the realest sense, conferences of the people, meeting together to consider what is, essentially, the people's problem.

We believe that, through the American Legion's program for maximum employment, we have made a real contribution toward the attainment of maximum employment for all. Yet we know that ours is not the only thinking, planning, and action. Here in this room, we have demonstrated that every segment of American opinion is united in the belief that we must have jobs for all. We have, we hope, laid the foundation for the type of cooperative effort America needs to accomplish the task ahead.

We welcome the statements made this morning by representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations that we must all undertake seriously to work out a program to achieve full employment for all, and their assurances that labor stands ready to cooperate in such a program.

It is toward that precise goal that the Legion has been thinking, planning, and acting not for days or months, but for years. From its inception, the American Legion has actively fought for the fullest opportunity for every American.

We are undertaking to carry through the Legion's program with full awareness of the problems involved. We recognize that war needs must come first. But these needs must not be made the "cover-all" for inadequate planning or hampering and confused restrictions. We recognize that the Federal Government owns and controls vast production facilities. The manner in which they are liquidated will have a telling effect on the ability of our private production system to provide employment.

War techniques have speeded the tempo of production facilities with the result that even those of pre-war days can now produce far beyond our normal peacetime requirements. Thus, the manpower needs for post-war production cannot be estimated until reconversion is under way and production levels anticipated.

Against this background is the fact that the great bulk of jobs must come in the sales, distribution, and service fields. These cannot be stimulated until the productive wheels are turning out peacetime supplies in the quantities needed. Even public works programs, the Government's direct aid to employment, cannot get under way until materials are available.

On several occasions I have cited two principles that will ease the impacts of demobilization. I repeat them again and will do so many times They are:

"First. That the rehabilitation of veterans and their readjustment to civilian life are as much a cost of war, as much a part of the over-all cost of defending our country and our way of life as any phase of actual warfare. We cannot afford to spend billions upon billions in wartime and then quibble over those few millions needed for the rehabilitation and readjustment of our fighting forces when peace comes.

"Second. That the men and women in our armed forces, by every rule of right and fairness, should be entitled upon their return to pick up a competitive position in civilian life. Obviously, they should not be expected to start all over again to win the place in life they held before war came. Any attempt on the part of any segment of our people to maintain wartime advantages gained solely because of the absence of millions of men and women in the service will create one of the most tremendous employment problems we have ever faced. I am confident that public opinion will be on the side of those who are now on the global fighting fronts."

It is true that the fullest possible employment must be—and is—our goal. But it is equally true that no plans, no goals, no single

thing must be permitted to overshadow the obligation we owe to fighting men.

We made them a promise when they were taken from their families, their communities, their jobs, and sent off to fight for our preservation In effect, they were told to go and fight with a mind free from worry about the future, we will take care of that when you come back.

The Congress of the United States said in no uncertain terms: Your job will be waiting for you when you come home.

That was the intent and purpose of the Congress. That was the avowed purpose of the American people. There was no uncertainty, no question, no compromise to it. And it was with this assurance that our men went to war. They left with confidence in the people of the United States. They must not come back in an attitude of suspicion or doubt.

To the millions of those who were not employed when they left for war, we gave another promise. It was that they should be granted, on their return, a full share in the prosperity, the economic security for which they have fought.

We must make good such promises as these.

There shall be no beribboned apple peddlers after this war.

No hero of Bataan, of Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, or the Normandy beachheads shall be forced to pawn his medals to eat.

Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on the morning of April 12 an able and persuasively worded analysis of the Bretton Woods proposals appeared in the Sun of Baltimore. The article was written by Hamilton Owens, brilliant editor and historian. He is editor in chief of the Sun and Evening Sun. Both newspapers are published in Baltimore.

This article by Mr. Owens, reflecting the views not only of himself but also of the two Sun papers, is an illuminating and highly informative contribution to the study of the tremendously complex and important problems involved in the Bretton Woods proposals. I ask unanimous consent that this exceedingly valuable editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST SUPPORT BRETTON WOODS

Because the Congress is now considering the Bretton Woods agreements, it is important to understand the role these monetary proposals are designed to play in the postwar world.

There are two proposals. The first would set up an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, its capital subscribed by all the member countries. The necessity for such a bank is universally admitted. There must be a vast store of capital to rebuild and restore the disrupted parts of the world. In the early stages, most of it probably will flow from the United States, to England, France, and Holland, and a few other countries whose normally high productive capacity can be quickly restored if their industries are given access to credit. Other countries, weaker in industrial potential but important, nevertheless, as suppliers of world commodities, must likewise have capital aid to bring them back into production.

The function of the bank will be to select the good risks among the would-be borrowers and lend to them directly or, in most cases, underwrite and guarantee their borrowings to private investors. This is equivalent to saying that it will act in most respects precisely like a traditional investment bank, with the management and directors obligated to consider the safety of principal first of all. The working capital will be subscribed by the participating governments, but if the plan is widely used, private investment capital will be the main reliance. The bank's guarantee of the bonds will be a mere insurance factor if the loans are judicious.

There is no effective opposition to the speedy adoption of the bank proposal, chiefly because full authority is given the management and directors to exercise normal banking prudence.

The International Monetary Fund, second of the Bretton Woods proposals—indeed, first, if we remember the original reasons for calling the Conference—is in much different case. The primary function of the fund is to recapture and restore some measure of that currency stability which the world enjoyed in the long period in which gold was the standard in international exchange.

The melancholy story of the abandonment of gold as a fixed standard is familiar to everyone. The governments of Europe and even, in 1933, the United States, were unable to withstand the political and social pressures created by the dislocations of the last war and devalued their currencies one by one. Having made this decision, most of them were unable to find a fixed resting place. Their weakness in this respect was made to appear like strength by the emergence of a group of economic thinkers who, in seductive language, argued that the gold standard was a wicked and destructive fallacy.

Unfortunately, they provided no effective substitute for the thing they were bent upon destroying, leaving the world with no ultimate recourse but bilateral bartering, which is the very antithesis of free-flowing trade. But trade must flow freely after the war or else the nations, or small groups of them, will become so many isolated camps, each seeking the impossible goal of self-sufficiency and each finding, instead, a declining standard of living.

It is easier to leave the path of righteousness than to return it. Even the well intentioned countries of the world have got themselves into such a tangle of tricky bilateral devices, often adopted with laudable motives, that they are hog-tied. It is only by common agreement that they can begin to rid themselves of the shackles which they have put on. The difficulty, of course, is to work out some basis of agreement.

This is what the fund seeks to find. In the nature of things, its proposals are highly technical (for money, since the undermining of the gold standard, has become the most complicated subject in all economics) and only a few specialists can hope to understand all that they imply. Many bankers, indeed, oppose the fund not because they disagree with its purpose but because they are lost in the mazes of its implications.

What the fund says, in effect, is that as of any given date, most of the important currencies of the world have a relation, expressed in the exchange rates, to the American dollar. The dollar has a definite tie with gold, so that there will be, as of the selected date, some general agreement as to the relative value of each nation's money. The objective, then, is to hold to that value as far as may be possible, so that international trade may be carried on without the harassment of monetary fluctuations.

The fund requires that the member nations set up a common pool, each contributing according to its abilities. The whole pool will amount to $8,800,000,000, of which the United States contribution will be $2,750,000,000. That is the extent of our primary risk. The sums put up by other nations will be in their own currencies, with a certain percentage of gold, the quota of each to be in gold or in terms of United States dollars.

A nation buying from Britain will need pounds; one buying from the United States will need dollars, and so on. If trade is balanced—which is to say if each nation's goods and services sold exactly equal the goods and services bought, the fund will have no function. But if, as usually happens, a nation's purchases temporarily exceed its sales and so put its accounts out of balance, it may exchange a portion of its currency in the fund for an equivalent amount of the currency it needs to make its payments to its creditor. When the balance is restored by further trading, it will buy back its own currency with dollars or pounds and so reestablish its normal relation to the fund.

Nations which allow their relations to the fund get too far out of balance by overbuying may, under certain conditions, be refused further access to its services. Those who continually sell more than they buy (or finance by long-term credits) will find their currencies in such demand the fund's supply of them approaches exhaustion. The fund will then have the right to report on this situation and make suggestions for correcting it. These corrective measures, if adopted, should restore the sought-for stability.

If a country is operating under trade practices which impair the free flow of goods, its credit with the fund will soon be exhausted and it will have to consult the fund as to its further course. If, on the other hand, that country struggles toward achieving a trade balance, it will tend to reduce its commitments to the fund and find less and less need to call upon the fund's resources.

But, as is all too evident, there will be many forces working to prevent such relative stability, many of them political in their nature and hence unpredictable. Take the case of Great Britain, for example. If she is to restore her economy, she must buy and sell in the world's markets upon a scale greater than ever before. "Export or die" has become the British slogan, and it precisely expresses her need. But Britain has other needs, of which housing is an example, which press upon her mightily. If too large a percentage of British labor and British material is diverted to housing, the remainder available for export goods will not be sufficient to pay for her import needs. This dilemma is fundamental in British politics today. At best, internal pressures will force her to use to the full every avenue of foreign credit open to her, with a consequent political strain upon her currency for a long time to come. Politicians, as we know from sad experience, tend to seek to relieve such strains by devices which often do more harm than good.

One good argument for the fund is that it aims to strengthen the arms of those governments which are conscientiously seeking to avoid currency manipulation despite internal political and economic pressures. To that extent it can justly be called political, which is one of the epithets which suspicious persons have applied to it. To that extent it departs from the purely banking function. But it is surely admirable to provide a mechanism and a pool of money to uphold those political forces in a nation which are seeking stability.

How, then, will the fund operate to achieve this goal? In the first place, it will put a limit on currency devaluations. It does not say flatly that no country can devalue its currency in terms of the American dollar. But it does say that a country which finds devaluation necessary must inform the fund of its intention and in no case can it devalue more than 10 percent. If a country insists upon its rights to go further than this, it cannot do so against the advice of the management of the fund and still remain a member in good standing.

What this adds up to, as we have said, is encouragement to governments to cease using money tricks either to get themselves out of political dilemmas at home or to advantage their exporters in international trade. The agreement to consult is the basic strength of the fund. The threat of loss of membership is the stick behind the door.

Now it is obvious that such an organization touches only a small part of the tangle of difficulties which will face the world after the war. It can affect only indirectly such matters as tariffs, quotas, bilateral agreements, cartels, and all the other devices to which a harassed world resorted when ruin threatened. It can exert only moderate force upon those nations which, in short-sighted desperation, resort to governmental spending and deficit financing.

Also, the fund would lose all its persuasive powers, insofar as we are concerned, were we to make the tragic error of failing to renew the Hull Trade Agreements Act, which provides for the gradual reduction of tariffs.

The fund, in brief, will achieve its full usefulness only if it is a part of the whole complex scheme of international collaboration which we are now attempting to work out. In such a scheme, its complexities would tend to disappear, for it would work almost automatically for the more stable and better-governed countries and would become a source of strength for those whose political bases are more uncertain. It would never, of course, be as exact and as demanding a standard as gold was in the old days. But it would be an anchor to windward during most of the storms which could affect a well-intentioned and reasonably well-ordered world.

The risks taken by the United States in the establishment of the fund, as in the establishment of any of the several international agencies now under discussion, will be great. They will, in fact, be exactly commensurate with our position as the most powerful nation in the world. But the authority conferred upon us will be in equal measure. The fund cannot exist without our collaboration. Likewise, it cannot function successfully unless we accept the responsibility entailed.

The alternative to assuming these risks and accepting this responsibility is a return to the tragic dislocations of the thirties, with bloody war as the inevitable outcome. The Congress of the United States should prove to the world our coming of age by voting for both the bank and the fund.

Casting Bread Upon the Waters!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Casting Bread Upon the Waters," by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers' Journal, and published in the April 1945 issue of the journal. I believe a reading of the editorial by Senators and the American people will give them some food for thought not only in connection with labor but in connection with capital and management.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTING BREAD UPON THE WATERS!

The war, like everything else, must some day end. However, there are a lot of individuals connected with labor unions who seem not to realize this fact. Their actions lead one to believe that they don't want the war to end, and I can well understand their attitude, because most businesses with whom they deal, through the conditions of the war, are not able to operate in strict conformity with good business policies, and many labor leaders, through this condition, are getting by with murder.

Unions, generally speaking, have done very little in lines of casting their bread upon the waters of public opinion. The leaders—not all, but a good many of them—have been displaying the attitude of "will you, won't you, or else," with the inevitable reaction of distaste in the mouths of the citizenry as a whole.

Workers are being told that unless they join a union, and pay the toll demanded by the leaders, they will not be allowed to work. Employers are being told that unless they collect this toll from their workers through the check-off system, they will not be allowed to operate their business. The public is being told that if it does not like it, it can take a good jump into the lake, and all of this is practically telling the men in the armed services that if they don't like it they can jump right into a fox hole. In short, unions had better start casting their bread upon the waters if they don't want to be engulfed in the deluge of adverse public opinion which is bound to arise after the war is over.

This writer believes in collective bargaining; in legitimate strikes; in fact, in all prerogatives conducive to good Americanism. But I do not believe in unnecessary strikes over unreasonable demands; in jurisdictional-disputes strikes affecting innocent parties, who suffer for the inability of unions to set up specific organizations for specific occupations. I have no sympathy for the so-called sympathy strikes arising out of grievances in an industry having no actual bearing on the sympathizers.

Unions are selling themselves short on the market of public opinion in more ways than one. When this war is over, and business gets down to business, and if matters stand as of today, little will have been done to sell unionism to the worker, the employer, and the general public. The leadership of labor—and let the chips fall where they may—should hide its head in shame for its part in selling organized labor short during this war. Unions are missing their golden opportunity by not placing the welfare of this Nation beyond everything else at a time like this. In my mind, Americanism holds priority over unionism, now and at all times.

We, on this side of the two oceans, sit very complacently by while our armed forces are giving their all to further guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all of us. Believe me, when this war is over and the boys return to find that unions have sold them short, I believe they are not going to like it, and it is not going to take them very long to do something about it. Yes, unionism is on trial and the jury is out—out fighting a bunch of Nazis and Japs, people who do not believe in the individual's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But one of these days, this jury is going to file in to the court of public opinion with their findings, and I am afraid their recommendations and the sentence of the judge is not going to do organized labor much good. I pray that the innocent people of organized labor, who have done their all during this war, will not be made to suffer for the actions of the guilty.

It is recorded that employers, prior to the establishment of unionism, were damnably unjust to their workers, and in many instances lost sight of the fact that the Almighty God is greater than the almighty dollar. Everything was secondary to the earning of the dollar. The workers' welfare meant nothing to them. They operated their businesses as if workers were nothing more than slaves, people in bondage; as if God only endowed them with the right to be treated as humans.

The inhumane treatment of workers over a period of years built up resentment to a point of rebellion against man's inhumanity to man, and out of all of this came the workingman's right to protect himself against the industrial Simon Legree, the worker's right, by law, to collective bargaining. No fair-minded person will argue against this as being a forward step in human relationship. Therefore, it is apparent that unions came into being in order to keep "Legreeism" down to the minimum. But lo and behold, what do we have now? In place of abuse to the worker by the crooked employer, we are daily evidencing treatment equally dishonest, and meted out, if you please, by the very people trusted to guard against all abuse to the man who earns his living by toil.

Many unions (and the word many is not an exaggerative word in this instance) are putting the almighty dollar above everything else. Unless workers pay tribute in amounts not always conducive to the actual safe operation of a union, they are not allowed to work, which places them in a worse position than the slave of years ago, because from what I read about slaves, their masters provided food and shelter.

In examining the financial statements of our big unions of today, and coming across the item of surplus, one begins to wonder, "Are these big unions, or are they big business"? Their financial resources are staggering, which makes this writer wonder if unions are not also trying to get wealthy at the expense of the worker. Really I would like to see a healthy financial surplus in every union, but when I see their financial resources grow, and grow, and grow, and no actual evidence of betterment for the constituency, no assurance of longevity, then I can only conclude that unions are becoming vast financial institutions, with the almighty dollar as their main objective, and this, my friends, is a hell of a condition of unionism.

Unless the rank and file revolts against this treatment, it will become so repugnant to the general public that laws of restriction will be enacted. These laws may mean the end of unionism in this country, because their enactment will invariably be under pressure of mob hysteria. If this comes about, I feel sorry for the people who have to earn their livelihood through toil, because it will not be long after restrictive union legislation that the Simon Legrees of industry will start popping up again and lashing their workers as they did before the coming of unions. We need good unions, and we need good industrialists, but to have these we must, at all times, have enlightened, honest leaders "casting bread upon the waters."

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor.*

The President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the forceful, dynamic Franklin Delano Roosevelt has reached the end of the road we are all traveling, and only the coming years will disclose the effect which his policies, his life will have upon the lives of our people, the future of our Nation.

Some hailed him as the champion of the common man; others, equally sincere, considered his policies destructive of all they hold dear and sacred.

The book has been closed, and neither the most extravagant praise nor the bitterest condemnation can change the record which has been written. Only the future will disclose whether the ultimate result of those policies—those acts—will to our people—our Nation—be beneficial or otherwise.

In his place, a position from which, perhaps with one exception, can be exerted the most powerful influence upon world events for the next 100 years, we have Harry S. Truman.

President Truman, unlike former President Roosevelt, was not born of wealthy, socially prominent parents. Unlike former President Roosevelt, he was not born an aristocrat. He did not live among, and his early associates were not, those who, fairly or unfairly, considered themselves a little above the average American in worldly possessions and educational attainments. President Truman was born, lived with, grew up among, and associated with people who were just average Americans.

Born on the farm, a small-town, country lawyer, rising to political power and position, becoming a United States Senator, there has been nothing spectacular or out of the ordinary in his life and career. The only thing his political enemies have said against him is that his rise to power was aided by corrupt political machines. But who has not, at times, received the aid of those with whose policies and principles he had nothing in common?

President Truman belongs to that great class of people—the common people—of whom Lincoln is reported to have said, in substance, "The Lord must love them because he made so many of them."

President Truman is an average American possessing the good sense, the honesty, and, we believe, the faith and confidence in American institutions which is the heritage and security of the average American.

As a United States Senator, he was faithful to the trust reposed in him and, while he has been a loyal party man, there is no reason to believe that he ever has, or ever will, let party or political advantage work to the detriment of the welfare of our people as a whole, of our national stability and security.

President Truman has and, until there is some sound, overwhelming reason to do otherwise, will continue to have as President the confidence and the support of all political parties and of the people as a whole.

We ask for him divine guidance, the strength to perform the enormous tasks which confront him.

Address of Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, at the Meeting in Honor of Hon. Sol Bloom, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, at the meeting in honor of Congressman SOL BLOOM at the Hotel Riverside-Plaza, New York City, April 6, 1945, under the auspices of the American Labor Party, New York County Committee, over Station WMCA:

As long ago as July 1943, an American statesman said: "Only a lasting peace as well as a just peace will now satisfy the United States and the world." And he added, prophetically. "If we are willing to shed our blood and pour out the Nation's wealth to achieve a just peace, we certainly are willing to cooperate with other free peoples to make it a lasting peace. We are not fighting for a 25-year peace, no matter how just it might be. We do not intend to have our boys killed in another war."

I quote these words to you as just one example of the clear thinking, the far-sighted thinking, of the man who is our guest of honor tonight—SOL BLOOM.

SOL BLOOM is a man of varied interests and strong enthusiasms. He has tasted the romance of America. He knows its history, and he knows its people. Human causes attract him irresistibly. He is, in fact, a great democrat—with a small as well as a capital D. The record of his public services is long and distinguished.

But I think that nowhere have his qualities of mind and heart been of greater service to his country than in the Congress itself. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives during the past 17 years, and as its chairman for the past 6 years—among the most critical years of our history—it has been his responsibility to lay before his committee, before the House, and eventually before the Nation itself great questions of foreign policy for debate and decision. On all these great controversial questions, the issues were always clear in SOL BLOOM's mind. The decisions for which he fought were right—as time has so abundantly demonstrated. Nevertheless, being the great democrat—small d—that he is, SOL BLOOM saw to it that all points of view were never denied a fair and a full hearing.

He has not overlooked the importance of an informed public opinion, and the deliberations in his committee room and on the floor of the House have helped millions of our citizens who were puzzled or in doubt to clarify their own thinking and better understand the great issues of these times in the field of our foreign relations. Let me give you just one classic example—the debates on the Lend-Lease Act in January and February of 1941.

We sometimes forget how deeply the Nation was divided on the issue of lend-lease, how many sincere and thoughtful people were still unconvinced that the Axis had aggressive designs on us. For weeks the eyes and ears of the Nation were riveted on the committee room where SOL BLOOM presided while scores of witnesses from every walk of life had their say. Patiently the committee listened and asked questions. All over the country people were listening and asking questions too. Americans stationed thousands of miles from home followed the hearings closely, knowing full well that our Nation stood at a crossroad in its history.

When H. R. 1776 finally reached the floor of the House on February 3, so clearly had the issues already been defined, that it was debated for only 5 days. It is not generally known, I think, that on each of these days SOL BLOOM and his colleagues of the committee met before the debate started to arm themselves with facts and figures, and to anticipate and discuss questions which might arise on the floor. As a result, the debate was a model of precision and clarity. Facts won the day—facts diligently amassed, accurately and convincingly presented by SOL BLOOM and his colleagues.

There you have an example of practical and responsible leadership. There you have one clue to his statesmanship, which has exerted such a profound effect on the course of legislation in the past 6 years. I think it may be said that at no period in our history has the House of Representatives played a more useful or influential role in the formation of our foreign policy.

It is, therefore, eminently fitting, from my point of view as Secretary of State, that you are doing honor to SOL BLOOM. It is also wise in my judgment that SOL BLOOM and his distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative CHARLES EATON, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, have been selected to go to San Francisco as delegates to the United Nations Conference. We have good reason to rejoice that SOL BLOOM is to have a hand in writing the charter of a world organization to maintain the lasting peace for which he has fought and worked so well and so long.

It is also a source of great satisfaction to me that the Congress of the United States is to be so fully represented at San Francisco. Not only will SOL BLOOM and CHARLES EATON be there are Members of the House, but two distinguished Senators—TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan—will also be in the United States delegation. Half of the members of the delegation will be Members of Congress.

The executive and legislative branches of our Government are thus brought into close cooperation in the great task of laying the foundation so ardently desired by all our people.

The very active role to be taken by Senators and Representatives in the forthcoming conference is a good omen. As Administrator of the lend-lease program and in my present position, I have had many associations with Members of Congress during these last critical years. I have found them deeply conscious of the great responsibilities which the United States carriers in the shaping of an orderly and peaceful world. And I know, too, that from the Members of Congress, Americans in all sections of the country obtain much of their information on the issues of the day.

So I am glad when Members of the Senate and House are able to undertake additional responsibilities in the solution of these issues. During the Conference of American Republics at Mexico City, it was invaluable to have at our side as advisers, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont, and Representatives EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and LUTHER JOHNSON, of Texas. Recently the President sent on a special mission to China Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD, who once had served in the Orient in the United States marines. And I think it is a good thing that so many Members of Congress have visited the fighting fronts and seen for themselves what it has meant in effort and sacrifice and suffering to win one more chance to establish secure peace in the world.

Men like Congressman BLOOM, of New York; Senator CONNALLY, of Texas; and Congressman MANSFIELD, of Montana, bring to us in the State Department views and in the conduct of our foreign relations and opinions which are of invaluable assistance in gaging public opinion. And we, in turn, know that they also bring to their colleagues in Congress fuller understanding of the problems and efforts of the executive branch of the Government.

You of labor are honoring SOL BLOOM tonight. I can think of no economic group with a greater stake in the sort of world which SOL BLOOM and the rest of us hope to make possible by the deliberations at San Francisco. Millions of men from the ranks of labor are fighting on the battlefields. War exacts from the working people of the world a terrible price. War retards that social progress and that wider opportunity and security which labor seeks.

A major task of the world organization will be the establishment of those economic and social conditions which make for peace. Economic rivalries, poverty, and oppression breed wars. Economic security, rising standards of living, and freedom are the climate of peace. They represent the aspiration of working people all over the world.

Speaking to the first session of the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City in February, I said, "The United States intends to propose and support measures for closer cooperation among us in public health, nutrition and food supply, labor education, science, freedom of information, transportation, and in economic development, including industrialization and the modernization of agriculture." That represents our policy, not only in our relations with the other American republics but with the rest of the world.

These are objectives in which labor has a fundamental interest. They can be attained, both in this country and in other countries, only in a world secure from war and the constant and eroding fear of war.

The very fact that success of San Francisco is necessary to the future of all nations is itself the best insurance of success. It sometimes seems to me almost incredible that our civilization, which has produced the amazing technical developments of this century has not had the genius to establish a world order in which this inventive skill will be used to satisfy the highest aspirations of man, rather than to maim and kill him. Yet that is the point where we now stand in history.

President Roosevelt said nearly 10 years ago that this generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. Such a rendezvous with destiny will begin on the other side of this continent 15 days from now. I rejoice that at our side, in this critical hour, will be a man with the steady wisdom, the lofty ideals and the long experience of your Representative in the Congress of the United States—the honorable SOL BLOOM.

House Joint Resolution 131

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on March 19, 1945, House Joint Resolution 131, to provide for authorizing the American representative on the International Security Council to pledge the use of American armed forces immediately upon need to prevent World War No. 3.

In support of this proposal, I would like to quote the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, who is quoted as having said to the Rotary Club here in Washington, April 12, as follows:

"It must be borne in mind," the Senator said, "that the use of force under the conditions contemplated is not an act of war. It is an act to prevent war. It is essentially a peace measure. The history of international law is full of examples of the use of and display of force for the protection of the rights of nationals and the defense of property and to repel aggression on the high seas which did not actually result in war.

Upon the question of empowering the United States' representative upon the executive council to vote without reference to Congress, there cannot, in my opinion, be any alternative. It is absolutely essential that our representative have power to act in all cases of emergency.

We have learned that aggressor powers can and do act promptly, and unless the council is able to act promptly, there would be little use in acting at all.

The United States Congress will no doubt enact legislation providing for the selection of a United States representative on the council. In that act his authority can be defined and limited if necessary. No representative of the United States on the council would dare defy the opinion of the President of the United States or of the Congress.

Senator CONNALLY'S suggestion is provided for in House Joint Resolution 131. In it I provide first that the representative of the United States to the Security Council shall have authority after consultation with the President, the Secretary of State, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, if it can be done. My phraseology there is as may be practicable under the circumstances, to act immediately to pledge the use of the armed forces of the United States as may be required to enforce the decisions of the International Security Organization.

We all know how deeply our beloved President, whose death has laid on us all added responsibility to carry to completion his objectives for international order, desired adequate definition of this phase of our responsibility. In his speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City, October 21, 1944, he voiced his concept of the procedure by which the United States should share in the decisions of the International Security Council:

Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and when there is available power to enforce it.

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the town council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another World War. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace.

General Hines Finally Persuaded To Revise Veterans' Hospital Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing with bowed heads as bureaucracy and obnoxious red tape gnaws its way into our homes and business institutions destroying the very principles upon which our country was founded. In this connection let us pause for a few minutes to pay tribute to an American Legion post that had the courage and resourcefulness to call upon Congress to fight a giant Government octopus and clip from it a few of its outstretched tentacles.

On September 7, 1944, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution handed to me by Vice Commander Joe Leib, of the Costello Post, Washington, D. C., demanding the deletion of a number of objectionable questions that appeared on the application form for admission to veteran hospitalization.

In addition I introduced two bills calling for the revision of the form.

Five months later, on February 7, 1945, the Veterans' Administration released a new streamlined application form which took out 75 percent of the questions objected to. The fight to eliminate the other 25 percent of objectionable questions will be continued, and I hope that hearings will be held soon on my bill H. R. 599.

It is reassuring and heartening to make a comparison between the new form which is now only one and one-half pages long, while the former application was four pages in size. Here is the new streamlined form:

[New]

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
Form P-10 (Rev. December 1944)

APPLICATION FOR HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE

The applicant should forward this form, when fully executed, with the original or a certified copy of his discharge or release from last period of service, to the Veterans Administration facility nearest his home, which is located at _____
(Location of facility)

1. I, _____ C-No. _____ Social Security No. _____ hereby apply for
(Print) (Last name) (First name) (Middle name)
admission to a Veterans Administration facility for *(hospital treatment) (domiciliary care) _____

_____
(Date of birth) (Color) (Sex) (Place of birth) (Present place of residence)

2. My entire service in the active military or naval service of the United States has been as follows:

Enlisted		Serial No.	Discharged		Rank and organization	Character of discharge
Date	Place		Date	Place		

NOTE.—If you served under a name other than the one used in this application, indicate the name under which you served and the period of service _____

3. Have you filed claim for pension, compensation, or retirement pay? _____
(Yes or no)
What office has your case file? _____
(Location)

4. Give the name and address of your wife, or nearest relative, or guardian, or other person to notify in event of emergency.
_____
(Name) (Relationship) (Address)

NOTE.—Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service-connected by Veterans Administration, questions 5, 6, and 7 need not be answered.

5. Are you entitled to hospital care by membership in a lodge, society, community group treatment plan, etc., or as a beneficiary of an insurance company, workmen's compensation commission, industrial accident board. etc.? _____ If "Yes," give name of agency or organization _____
(Yes or no)

6. Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? _____
(Yes or no)

7. Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans Administration facility? _____
(Yes or no)

8. Have you received hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans Administration? _____
(Yes or no)

If "Yes," state when _____ and where _____
(Give most recent dates) (Name of facility, home, or hospital)

8a. If discharged against medical advice, absence without official leave, for disciplinary reasons, or given an enforced furlough, underline applicable term.

I * {have read / have had read to me} and understand all questions and answers on this form, and the printed provisions on the reverse hereof.

The answers to all questions are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The foregoing questions and answers are made a part hereof with full knowledge of the penalty provided for making a false statement as to material fact in this application.

Witnesses to signature by mark (X)

1. _____ _____
(Signature) (Signature of applicant or representative)

_____ Post office address _____
(Address) (Number) (Street)

2. _____
(Signature)

_____ _____
(Address) (City) (State)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19____, by _____ claimant, to whom the statements herein were fully made known and explained. I certify that the questions and answers thereto have, in my presence, been *{read to / read by} the claimant.

[SEAL] _____
Notary Public.

PENAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO TITLE I, PUBLIC NO. 2, 73D CONGRESS

SECTION 15. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in any wise procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this title, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

REDUCTION OF PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT PAY WHILE RECEIVING HOSPITAL OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month, provided that the amount payable for such disabled veteran entitled to pension under Part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for nonservice connected disability shall not exceed $8 per month, and provided further, that where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof has a wife, child, or dependent parent, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

NOTE

This application is made with notice of Public Law No. 382 approved December 26, 1941 (38 U. S. Code 17-17j) which in effect provides that upon the death of any veteran receiving care or treatment by the Veterans' Administration in any institution leaving no widow (widower), next of kin, or heir entitled to inherit, all personal property, including money or balances in bank, and all claims and choses in action, owned by such veteran, and not disposed of by will or otherwise, will become the property of the United States as trustee for the Post Fund.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE

A careful physical (including mental) examination of the applicant discloses these findings and diagnosis:

(1) Brief history:

(2) Symptoms:

(3) Physical findings:

(4) Diagnosis:

(5) Strike out the clauses not applicable: The applicant (is) (is not) ambulant. He (is) (is not) mentally competent. He (will) (will not) need an attendant during his travel. The proposed attendant's name is _____ address _____ The attendant (is) (is not) a relative of the patient. It is proposed that travel to the hospital will be made by (train), (bus), (automobile).

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
(Date) (Signature of examining physician) (Street) (City) (State)

*Strike out inapplicable words or phrases.

OLD APPLICATION

Mr. Speaker, now compare the two forms. Note that the Veterans' Administration removed the penal provisions from the front of the old form and had it inserted at the rear of the new application. This was obviously done so that the threatening clause would not be so noticeable. The Veterans' Administration was not sure of the justification of this clause or it would not have taken this unusual step.

Worthy also of attention is the note under question No. 4 on the new form. This means that if a veteran makes application for hospitalization for a condition for which he is held service-connected he need not answer questions 5, 6, and 7 or otherwise known as a pauper oath.

But if a service-connected veteran desires medical attention for an ailment other than cause of discharge he is forced to sign the pauper's oath and certified by a notary public. Here is the old application:

[Old]

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
Form P-10—Rev. Aug. 1943

APPLICATION FOR HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Penal Provisions Applicable to title I, Public, No. 2, 73d Congress

SECTION 15. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in anywise procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this title, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

REDUCTION OF PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT PAY WHILE RECEIVING HOSPITAL OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month, provided that the amount payable for such disabled veteran entitled to pension for disability the result of injury or disease incurred after active military or naval service shall not exceed $8 per month, and provided further, that where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any policital subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

The applicant should forward this form, when fully executed, with a certified copy of his discharge from last period of service, to the Veterans' Administration facility nearest his home, which is located at _____
(Location of facility)

1. I, _____ (Print) (Last name) (First name) (Middle name) C-No. _____
hereby apply for admission to a Veterans Administration facility for (hospital treatment) (domiciliary care)* _____
_____ (Date of birth) (Color) (Sex) (Place of birth) (Present place of residence)

2. My entire service in the active military or naval service of the United States has been as follows:

Enlisted		Serial No.	Discharged		Rank and organization	Character of discharge
Date	Place		Date	Place		

NOTE.—If you served under a name other than the one used in this application, indicate the name under which you served and the period of service _____

3. Have you filed claim for other benefits? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes" at what Veterans Administration office? _____ (Location)
What office has your case file? _____ (Location)

4. (a) Do you receive pension? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (b) Do you receive compensation? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____
(c) Do you receive retirement pay? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (d) Do you receive Government insurance pay? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month $_____ (e) From what other source do you receive income? Amount per month, $_____ Social Security No. _____
_____ (Source of income)

5. What do you believe to be the total value of your property, both real and personal? _____ Do you care to qualify your answer to the question immediately preceding? _____

6. Are you single? _____ Married? _____ Widowed? _____ Divorced? _____ (Write "Yes" in proper space) (a) If married, are you living with your wife? _____ (Yes or no) (b) Have you any child or children under 18 years of age? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state number of children _____ (Number) and their ages _____ (Ages) (c) Have you other persons dependent upon you? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state relationships _____ (Relationships)

7. Give the name and address of your wife, or nearest relative, or guardian:
_____ (Name) (Relationship) (Address)

8. Are you entitled to hospital care by membership in a lodge, society, community group treatment plan, etc., or as a beneficiary of an insurance company, workmen's compensation commission, industrial accident board, etc.? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," give name of agency or organization _____

9. Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? _____ (Yes or no)

10. Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility? _____ (Yes or no)

11. (a) Have you received hospital care as a patient of the Veterans' Administration? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state when _____ (Give most recent dates) and where _____
_____ (Name of hospital)
(b) Have you received domiciliary care in a Veterans' Administration facility? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state when _____ (Give most recent dates) and where _____
_____ (Give name of Veterans' Administration facility)
(c) Have you within the last 12 months, while hospitalized as a patient of the Veterans' Administration, left the hospital: (1) Without official leave; (2) against medical advice; or, (3) been discharged for any disciplinary reason? _____ (Yes or no) (d) Have you within the last 12 months, while under domiciliary care in any Veterans' Administration facility, (1) been dropped from the rolls for absence without leave or demanding papers; or, (2) have you been given an enforced furlough; or, (3) requested and received your discharge while under sentence or on an enforced furlough? _____ (Yes or no) (e) if your answer to either (c) or (d) above is "Yes," state when _____ (Date)
where _____ (Facility where action occurred)
and why _____ (Use one of reasons above. If answer to (d) (2), or (d) (3) is "Yes," state length of such furlough)

*Delete inapplicable phrase.

12. This application is made with notice of Public Law No. 382 approved December 26, 1941 (24 U. S. Code 136) which in effect provides that upon the death of any veteran receiving care or treatment by the Veterans Administration in any institution leaving no widow (widower), next of kin or heir entitled to inherit, all personal property, including money or balances in bank, and all claims and choses in action, owned by such veteran, and not disposed of by will or otherwise, will become the property of the United States as trustee for the Post Fund.

I {have read / have had read to me} and understand all questions and answers on this form. The answers to all questions are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The foregoing questions and answers are made a part hereof with full knowledge of the penalty provided for making a false statement as to material fact in this application. The penal provisions appearing on page 1 hereof and the statement in item 12 have been read {by / to} me, and are fully understood.

Witness to signature by mark (X)

1. _____ (Signature)
_____ (Address)
2. _____ (Signature)
_____ (Address)

_____ (Signature of applicant or representative)

Post office address _____ (Number) (Street)
_____ (City) (State)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19___, by _____, claimant, to whom the statements herein were fully made known and explained. I certify that the questions and answers thereto have, in my presence, been {read to / read by}* the claimant.

[SEAL]

_____ *Notary Public.*

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE

A careful physical (including mental) examination of the applicant discloses these findings and diagnosis:

(1) Brief history:

(2) Symptoms:

(3) Physical findings:

(4) Diagnosis:

(5) Strike the clauses not applicable: The applicant (is) (is not) ambulant. He (is) (is not) mentally competent. He (will) (will not) need an attendant during his travel. The proposed attendant's name is _____; address _____. The attendant (is) (is not) a relative of the patient. It is proposed that travel to the hospital will be made by (train), (bus), (automobile).

_____ (Date) _____ (Signature of examining physician) _____ (Street) _____ (City) _____ (State)

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY

(Applicant is not to write on this page)

Referred to Veterans' Administration facility at _____ (Location) on _____ (Date)

1. Dates of enlistment and discharge, rank, organization, and character of discharge from each period _____
_____
(If service was other than wartime, and the claimant served in an occupation, expedition, or rebellion, give designation thereof and period of service therein)
2. If the applicant's only active service was during peacetime, was he honorably discharged for disability incurred in line of duty? _____ (Yes or no) If yes, name disease or injury _____
3. What diseases or injuries are service connected? _____
4. What diseases or injuries are not service connected? _____
5. Amount of pension or compensation being paid for disability due to service _____ Not due to service _____
6. Information relative to infractions of facility discipline, as shown by Form 2593, Record of Hospitalization or Domiciliary Care, in the case file. If there is no such record so state _____
7. Has applicant ever received domiciliary care? _____ What years? _____
8. Applicant's most recent (hospital treatment) (domiciliary care), as shown by (his case file) (Form P-10 filed at this station) was at _____ from _____ (Date) to _____ (Date)

_____ (Date)

_____ (Manager) or (Adjudication Officer) or (Director, Veterans Claims Service)

---

* (Eligibility) (ineligibility) for *(hospital treatment) (domiciliary care), other than as to medical considerations, has been determined.

_____ (Date)

_____ (Signature of certifying officer)
_____ (Title)

Medically *(eligible) (ineligible) for *(domiciliary) (hospital) care for _____ (Diseases or injuries)

_____ (Date)

_____ (Signature of medical officer)
_____ (Title)

---

* (Approved) (disapproved) for admission for *(domiciliary) (hospital) care for _____ (Diseases or injuries)

Applicant notified accordingly on _____ (Date)

Admitted to Veterans' Administration facility _____ (Location) on _____ (Date)

Register number assigned _____

_____ (Signature of manager or designate)

* Delete inapplicable word.

NOTE.—This completed form will be retained at the Veterans' Administration facility to which the applicant is admitted, or at the facility or regional office authorizing admission to a contract hospital, Government or civilian. It will be filed in the applicant's correspondence folder at facilities and in the applicant's medical folder at regional office.

*Strike out inapplicable words or phrases.

Regular Veterans' Survey To Aid Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, many plans have been advanced to aid the service people returning from the wars. We are all concerned about getting these brave young people—our young men and women—back on good paying jobs as soon as they have rested and are able to again assume their place in civilian life.

To assist in this tremendous program, the Regular Veterans' Association has sent out a questionnaire through its official publication, The Regular, which will assist veterans in adjusting themselves to civilian life. The questionnaire provides the veteran with an opportunity to outline his qualifications and his reactions as to the type of work he wants to engage in when he returns home.

Because I feel that this survey is of great importance and significance, I am inserting herewith the article and questionnaires which appeared in The Regular of April 1945:

REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION FORMS JOB COUNCIL—PREDISCHARGE EMPLOYMENT GROUP HEADED BY ENGSTRUM

National Commander William M. Floyd has announced that the National Advisory Council of the Regular Veterans' Association has approved and established in the organization's national headquarters in Washington, a predischarge employment advisory council, and they appointed Regular Paul Engstrum, of Washington and Los Angeles as its national director.

Regular Engstrum is well known in business and professional circles as a consulting and industrial engineer and organizer, and enjoys an enviable reputation in his chosen field of endeavor throughout the Nation.

Regular Engstrum is a veteran of the last war, having served in our Navy in France as a special engineer, and was decorated by the Republic of France with the Croix de Guerre with Palm Leaf.

The National Predischarge Employment Council of the R. V. A. is national in scope and will operate through its posts and auxiliaries throughout the Nation. This predischarge employment advisory council has two main objectives: First, to get the members of our armed forces into private employment of their own choosing, for which they are qualified by education, training, and experience, as quickly as possible after their discharge, by arranging for their employment while they are still in the services. To accomplish this purpose the R. V. A. is sending to the members of the armed forces a simple questionnaire which came off the press today, and which when filled out should be returned as quickly as possible to our national headquarters here in the Nation's Capital. When the questionnaire is received in the national headquarters it will be given individual attention and each case will be handled according to the specific instructions outlined by the individual. Our second objective is to have the veteran assume his rightful place in his community as quickly as possible and to conserve his weekly unemployment allowances as provided for by the G. I. bill of rights—by that we mean we desire that the veteran be placed in a suitable position as previously outlined in our first objective. As you know, a discharged veteran is entitled to $20 per week unemployment compensation for a maximum period of 52 weeks. Nobody expects one to live on that, and it is for that reason that the Regular Veterans' Association has set up this council, by which it will put forth its best efforts to find suitable employment for members of the armed forces while they are still in the service. It was amazed to learn that for the week of March 17 alone, this year, the Government paid out $642,207 to unemployed veterans.

Now, no one begrudges these veterans a single bit of that money, but this is wartime, jobs are plentiful, and this unemployment compensation should not be used up at this time, but should be kept in reserve for an emergency, which at this time is not foreseeable.

Commander Floyd said the new council on employment will consist of Regular Engstrum as director, himself as the ex officio member, the administrative council of 21 members, 13 zone councilmen, and representatives from each of the various services.

In a joint statement following Engstrum's appointment, they described the plan in detail, as follows:

1. Employment applications are being sent to men and women in the services. These will seek the usual information about ability, vocation, past experience, and will also seek to determine peace-time location preference, family status, references, and other pertinent facts such as the whys and wherefores of any desired changes in employment status or location.

2. Upon receipt at R. V. A. headquarters the cards, 6 by 10 inches, will be made up in several copies and forwarded to regional and State R. V. A. employment officers who will immediately consult with prospective employers and help to arrange the job opening on an if-and-when basis.

3. Once the job has been obtained the R. V. A. will seek housing conditions, costs, and other facts, conveying them to the service person in detail.

4. There is no charge for this service to the service person or the employer.

5. The members of the armed forces to be eligible must have been honorably discharged.

Pointing to the growing cost of supporting discharged personnel on the $20 per week donation by the Government, Commander Floyd and Paul Engstrum said that for the week only of March 17, 1945, a total of $642,207 was paid out to 28,566 discharged persons who did not have private employment.

They said, and the War Department agreed, that a million and a half persons had been discharged up to the end of last year. Commander Floyd said that "unless something is done like our plan immediately, there is a good chance these weekly so-called Government unemployment checks may reach the staggering total of 30,000,000 annually."

And, added Regular Paul Engstrum, "Who wants our veterans who have given so much to try and get along on $20 a week. This permits of too much time to get into mischief; too much time to get into little side lines for added income, some of which could be illegal with bad results. The R. V. A. has taken upon itself the task of preventing as far as possible this very thing. Employers will be asked to hire these men on an if and when basis. We expect a great majority of these arrangements will hold until the discharged person reports for work, at a decent living wage which will make it unnecessary for the Government to hand out this dole, for that is what it is, a dole, a sort of discharged veterans' W. P. A. Our boys do not want that."

The weekly payment referred to by National Commander Floyd and Director Engstrum is paid to the discharged veteran after he has applied to the United States Employment Office and the U. S. E. S. has certified to the Veterans Administration that there is no job for the veteran. The Veterans Administration then pays out the money until the U. S. E. S. notifies them the veteran has been placed, or until the maximum payments have been made over the 52-week period.

The council, Paul Engstrum said, will cooperate with U. S. E. S. offices throughout the Nation. He will give all assistance to such offices. Engstrum, who coined the phrase, "When Termination Comes—Will You Be Prepared?" now is a consulting engineer in Washington on termination of Government contracts. He formerly was an engineer with the War Department. He is the son of the late founder and operator of the F. O. Engstrum Engineering Construction and Manufacturing Co., on the west coast and has spent much of his life engaged in aviation, transportation, shipbuilding and allied fields. He is a native Californian, attended Stanford University and others and holds membership in the Shrine, many patriotic and civic organizations, advertising, engineering clubs and others. He lives at the Hamilton Hotel in Washington and the Bryson Apartment Hotel in Los Angeles.

THE REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION—PREDISCHARGE EMPLOYMENT COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

(Paul Engstrum, national director)

Date _____

Name _____
Armed forces address _____
Branch of service and serial number _____
Home address _____
Race _____. Social security number _____
Date and place of birth _____
Married or single _____
Number of dependents _____
Physical condition _____
Number and location of draft board _____
Or enlisted _____
Date of enlistment _____
Date of discharge _____
Still serving _____
Education and training (circle number of years completed):
Grade school: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
High school: 1, 2, 3, 4.
College: 1, 2, 3, 4.
Major.
Trade school: kind.
State experience and qualifications _____
_____
Name and address of last employer before entering armed services _____
City _____. State _____
Do you wish to return to school or college?
Yes _____. No _____
Name school and location _____
Do you prefer a trade school?
Yes _____. No _____

WHEN TERMINATION COMES WILL YOU BE PREPARED?

Do you intend to return to your old position? Yes _____. No _____
What was last work performed? _____
_____
Do you prefer a new position?
Yes _____. No _____
If answer is yes, explain briefly _____
_____
Do you prefer a new location?
Yes _____. No _____
Give city and State _____
Reason for new city, State, or Territory _____
_____
Do you intende to go into business? _____
State line of business _____
Were you engaged in this line of business before? Yes _____. No _____

References (other than relatives); at least two (Name, address, city, and State):

1. ----------
2. ----------
3. ----------

How soon after discharge will you want a position? Explain ----------

----

Comments ----------

Signature ----------

Address and telephone for ----------

The Regular Veterans' Association, National Prediscbarge Employment Advisory Council, Washington, D. C.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Vickery and a summary from the Maritime Commission showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through the end of March 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation showing the tonnage delivered each month under the Maritime Commission's program through the end of March 1945.

Last month American merchant shipyards completed 126 vessels with a total deadweight tonnage of 1,294,432. Between December 7, 1941, and April 1, 1945, deliveries totaled 4,699 ships of approximately 47,600,000 tons deadweight.

Last year, as you know, the Maritime Commission resumed the pre-war practice of contracting for ship construction on a fixed price basis (which includes both the lump-sum and selective price forms of contract). Moreover, during recent months numerous cost-plus-a-fee contracts have been converted to fixed price. During March, however, the Commission awarded the first shipbuilding contracts which it has let by competitive bidding since before the war. While certain wooden barges and tugs were the subject of competitive bidding in 1942 and early 1943, the vessels just awarded are 230-foot steel tankers of the T1-M-BK1 design for Lend-Lease account. Pursuant to invitations published on February 16, 1945, proposals were submitted by some 24 bidders and opened on March 16. Contracts for a total of 24 tankers were awarded to the three lowest bidders at prices well within the range of the Commission's estimates. Henceforth it is the Commission's intention to place any future ship construction contracts by competitive bidding.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January	----------	30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864	1,300,340
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	1,294,432
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	----------
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	----------
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	----------
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,433	----------
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	----------
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	----------
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	----------
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	----------
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	----------
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	----------
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	1,677	----------

He Planted the Flag on Mount Suribachi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, seldom has America thrilled as it did to the picture of the raising of the American flag by the United States marines on Mount Suribachi. But there is a sad postscript to that picture. It is told in epic form by Technical Sgt. Keyes Beeck. I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SGT. ERNEST I. THOMAS, JR., WAS UP FRONT LEADING HIS MEN WHEN HE DIED

(By Technical Sgt. Keyes Beech)

IWO JIMA.—A Navy hospital corpsman tells of the death of Platoon Sgt. Ernest I. Thomas, Jr., of 112 East First Avenue, Tallahassee, Fla., the marine who raised the American flag on Mount Suribachi:

"We were up on a sort of ridge," said the corpsman, who was with Thomas, "and we had to cross an open area. Before we jumped off Tommy sized up the situation and said: 'It's going to be rough going over there.'

"But it wasn't so rough at first. I think we got across that open space without a casualty. Tommy was up front, where he always was, when we came to a rocky area.

"Then we began to get rifle fire from all directions. There were caves all around us and we couldn't tell where the fire was coming from.

"Tommy stopped beside a rock. He was holding his rifle straight up with the butt on the ground and was reaching for a phone when a bullet knocked the rifle out of his hand. You see, we had a wire-laying man with us to keep up communications.

"Tommy didn't do anything but glance at the rifle. He just went on talking over the phone to the first sergeant. He was telling him he didn't think we ought to advance any farther without some protection from the platoon on our right.

"Then he got hit and pitched over. The telephone fell out of his hand. He never knew what hit him."

"You can say this for the platoon," said the corpsman. "We'll never have another platoon leader like him."

Capt. Dave E. Severance, 26, of Seattle, Wash., his company commander, said of Thomas: "He was a damned good marine."

I knew Thomas, too, and this is not an easy story to write. But one thing helps. From where I sit, I can see the flag over Suribachi.

Sergeant Thomas was killed several days after planting the flag on Suribachi. His mother, an employee of the Florida State road department, was notified Wednesday by Lt. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, that her son died March 3, his twenty-first birthday.

War Veterans Should Keep Government Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Institute of Life Insurance is doing a wonderful job informing veterans of this war that they should keep their Government life insurance. The institute is carrying a very valuable message to this effect to the servicemen, veterans, and their families through 300 daily newspapers with approximately 30,000,000 circulation.

Mr. Holgar J. Johnson, president of the institute, in a letter to me recently, stated:

INSTITUTE OF LIFE INSURANCE,
New York, N. Y., April 3, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Approximately 16,600,000 National Service Life Insurance policies have been issued to members of our armed services, to the amount of more than $127,000,000,000.

This means that the average soldier, sailor, or marine has nearly $10,000 of service life insurance in addition to what he has in the regular life-insurance companies to sustain his family, or to serve as a foundation for building an estate when he returns to civilian life.

This insurance can give a measure of security to several million Americans and their families after the war, and the life insurance companies in America feel they can render a real public service by encouraging veterans to keep these policies in force.

Attached is proof of an advertising message which the life-insurance business is publishing in cooperation with the Veterans' Bureau. This message will appear in 300 daily newspapers with approximately 30,000,000 circulation throughout the United States, and in the leading military service publications.

This is but one feature of an organized program placing the facilities of the life-insurance business at the service of all veterans and their families in an advisory capacity in connection with National Service Life Insurance. Life-insurance agents in each community will cooperate with local veterans' organizations, and public officials or other groups interested in the welfare of those returning from service in our armed forces.

We will welcome the aid and endorsement of all leaders of public thought in this effort to have as many service men and women as possible take permanent advantage of this special life-insurance opportunity.

To assure widest possible circulation of this message to veterans, reprints similar to the enclosed will be furnished gladly upon request.

Very truly yours,

HOLGAR J. JOHNSON,
President.

The advertisement which appeared in the 300 daily newspapers is as follows:

A MESSAGE OF IMPORTANCE TO VETERANS[1] AND THEIR FAMILIES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

To the Policyholders of Government Insurance:

Persons who actively served in the armed forces since October 6, 1940, have had the opportunity of applying for national service life insurance. Those who bought this insurance made a wise purchase. National service life insurance is low-cost insurance because the Government bears all losses due to the extra hazard of military and naval service and, in addition, pays all the expenses of administration.

When a person leaves this world he cannot take anything material with him but he can leave behind something of value to his loved ones. I know of no better way of protecting against their want than by means of adequate life insurance.

The insurance made available to you in the service was term insurance convertible without physical examination. It is a valuable asset which cannot be replaced. Continue to carry it. If you have let it lapse, reinstate it. When you are in a position to plan a long-range insurance program convert your insurance to a permanent form.

The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the National Association of Life Underwriters, which represent the great majority of the life-insurance business, have all gone on record as indicating a desire to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Veterans' Administration in protecting the interests of service persons.

I welcome this cooperation and believe it will be a force for the accomplishment of great good. Accordingly I urge that you continue your Government insurance in force and I join with these life-insurance organizations in urging you not to exchange your Government insurance. Other insurance should supplement rather than replace Government insurance for veterans.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

FIRST STEPS TO TAKE WHEN DISCHARGED

Discharge from service in no way affects your Government insurance, except that premiums can no longer be deducted from your service pay, and you must now pay them direct.

Ordinarily, the premium for the month of discharge is deducted from your final pay settlement. Make a note of the date when the next premium is due (see your Form 53) and remember you must pay it within 31 days of that date.

Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. Pay the premiums even though a premium notice does not reach you. It is most important to give your full name, birth date, present address, policy number, and your service serial number.

The financial health of America as a whole depends upon the financial health of every individual.

Recognizing this, America's life-insurance companies take this opportunity to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration in the conservation of life insurance issued to millions of individuals under the National Service Life Insurance Act.

As part of their educational program in the interests of all owners of life insurance, they wish to draw the attention of every man and woman in the armed forces, and their families, to the above letter of General Hines.

In cooperation with the Government, the life-insurance companies are advising their field forces and branch office personnel on the rights of veterans in regard to their national service life insurance.

Representatives of life insurance in the field will cooperate with various local veterans' organizations to provide a consultation service for veterans and veterans' organizations and to distribute the Veteran Bureau's official booklet, Continuance of National Service Life Insurance.

The life-insurance companies and their agents again welcome an opportunity to be of public service.

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES IN AMERICA,
New York, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, this organization is to be commended for its generous contribution to the welfare of our veterans and their families, which is a contribution to the general welfare of our Nation.

[1] Even now, service men and women are being discharged at the rate of 70,000 a month.

President Truman at the Helm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Barnet Nover entitled "President Truman at the Helm," published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AT THE HELM

(By Barnet Nover)

The death of President Roosevelt has been followed, swiftly and spontaneously, by a closing of the ranks behind his successor.

This spirit of unity is a magnificent demonstration of the soundness of the political instincts of the American people.

Everyone is aware that President Truman has suddenly been called upon to bear greater burdens than were ever imposed on any American statesman of the past. And it is universally realized that he and the Nation over whose destinies he now presides will need the help of us all, Republicans and Democrats, New Dealers and Old Dealers, conservatives and liberals alike, to bring us safely through the difficult days that lie ahead.

No one is more aware of this need than President Truman himself. The plea for the cooperation of all Americans that he voiced in his address to the Congress on Monday was no rhetorical expression but the product of a clear-eyed awareness of the difficult and complex problems he has been called upon to deal.

But the President himself has greatly fostered the present mood of unity by his words and by his actions during his first days in office.

There was, for instance, his prompt decision, taken only an hour after he took the oath of office, that the San Francisco Conference should be held on schedule. There was his summoning from retirement of Justice James F. Byrnes to seek the latter's wise counsel. And he made a very favorable impression not only on his former colleagues in Congress but on the Nation as a whole by his informal visit to the Senate soon after his elevation to the Presidency.

The greatest problem that confronts the United States and the world today is the problem of organizing the peace that is to follow the war we are now certain to win.

In this field President Truman, as he himself would be the first to admit, lacks the special knowledge, the broad experience, that President Roosevelt possessed. But no one, like the writer, who has had the opportunity to discuss matters of international importance with the new Chief Executive, can have any doubt as to where he stands.

As Senator he supported every move looking in the direction of a realistic American policy of cooperation with the peace-loving nations of the world. He helped inspire and gave powerful support to the Burton-Ball-Hatch-Hill resolution. In his brief tenure as Vice President he was ceaselessly exerting himself behind the scenes to help make the San Francisco Conference a success.

His address to Congress is a clear indication that there will be no deviation in his administration from the broad lines of policy laid down by President Roosevelt. The goal is precisely the same.

The first great hurdle that President Truman has confronting him in this field is, of course, the San Francisco Conference.

It is enormously encouraging that at the very outset of his Presidency he has won a real triumph by persuading Marshal Stalin to reverse his earlier decision not to send Foreign Commissar Molotov to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

President Truman's message to the Russian leader, sent by way of our Ambassador at Moscow, was polite but pointed.

Ambassador Harriman was instructed "to assure the Marshal that the coming of Foreign Secretary Molotov to the conference at San Francisco would be welcomed as an expression of earnest cooperation in carrying forward plans for formulating the new international organization as laid down by President Roosevelt and confirmed by the Yalta Conference."

Since Yalta many doubts have arisen regarding Russia's course.

The failure to designate Mr. Molotov as Russia's principal delegate was regarded by many as symptomatic of the Soviet Government's unwillingness, despite Yalta, to pursue a policy of wholehearted cooperation with the other members of the Big Three.

There was the complete lack of progress on the Polish issue, seemingly settled at Yalta. There were the irritations arising out of Russia's unilateral intervention in the Rumanian situation. There were the obstacles placed by Russia in the way of admitting American observers to the liberated regions adjacent to the Soviet Union.

We can only hope that Marshal Stalin's reversal regarding San Francisco reflects a

changing mood at Moscow; an awareness there that cooperation among the United Nations is essential to the well-being of all the nations making up the Grand Alliance. At any rate, the skies over San Francisco look a bit brighter today as a result of President Truman's wise démarche.

Open House at Ordnance Plant—Army Planning and War Situation by Major General Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Red River Ordnance Depot, located near Texarkana, Tex., had open house recently. About 10,000 people passed through the gates and were permitted to observe the ammunition areas, tank and maintenance shops, and acres of concrete storage space for tanks, guns, tank destroyers, and various other types of weapons. This plant is operated by Col. Robert N. Bodine. Incidentally Colonel Bodine's father at one time served in Congress from Missouri. This was a fine gesture of good will on the part of Colonel Bodine. The people generally appreciated it very much.

At a luncheon held that day, Maj. Gen. Richard Donovan, commanding general of the Eighth Service Command, Dallas, Tex., delivered a very interesting and timely address. Permission having been granted, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this time. It is as follows:

Events in Europe, as all of us can clearly see, are bringing the war to one of its most important climaxes. You can easily imagine that the fall of Germany, when it comes, will mean a shift in Army planning. We shall have to undertake a very difficult switch of direction. From striking eastward—with backhand passes at the west—we shall have to turn full-front knockout blows on Japan. That will be a tremendous job. We are already carefully preparing for it.

You, as influential citizens of a war-industry area can understand that the Army's change of strategy is bound to require reorientation of civilian effort, too. Though I am not in a position to tell you exactly what that reorientation will be, I can indicate some of the things likely to be expected of you in the months to come.

At the beginning, I must warn you of one thing: It takes neither a gift of prophecy nor inside information to realize that the collapse of Germany will not mean relaxation of your effort—even in the slightest degree. On the contrary, we will then be tackling the worst problem of all—licking an enemy over a 5,000-mile ocean. If any of you are wishful thinkers who feel that, with Germany out of the way, we can make short shift of Japan, I would remaind you that the marines couldn't make short shift of Iwo Jima. The advantages of position on that island, as in Japan's home islands, obviously belong to the defenders.

The States of Texas and Arkansas are each one rich in natural resources and energy. Thus the meeting of the two States here in Texarkana has made your city and the surrounding communities a concentration point for those resources and energies. You have been of great importance to the war effort—particularly as a source of the materials of war. So, as we undertake the big supply job of overcoming Japan, it is hardly likely that you will be called upon to supply less than before.

As part of the Eighth Service Command, the Texarkana area is tightly linked with all the domestic operations of the Army Service Forces. Since your war effort is so closely allied to ours, what we plan to do will certainly affect you.

The most significant fact to be recognized is that the big job of organizing, training, and initially outfitting our Army has been completed. Our troops are no longer in camps. They are on the battlefields of the world. From the States of the Eighth Service Command we have sent 33 infantry and armored divisions to battle in Europe and the Pacific. The ordnance battalions, organized and trained here at your own Red River Ordnance Unit Training Center, have also gone—and are now applying at the battle front the specialized skills they learned here. I feel sure some of them are very busy these days, keeping General Patton's tanks in running order.

But the fact that the units which used to populate Red River have now left this continent does not mean that the facilities of the training center are no longer needed. Training an army is only the beginning. It must be maintained at the proper strength through constant replacement. It has to be continuously supplied and serviced, and, when the emergency passes, it will have to be disbanded in an orderly fashion.

The facilities here at Red River Ordnance Depot, like certain Eighth Service Command camps, are probably destined to play a significant part in what is likely to be the most difficult maneuver of the war. That will be the transfer of millions of men from Europe to the Pacific. Hundreds of units will have to be brought back to this country, reorganized, refitted, and perhaps retrained for combat in a vastly different theater. That is why we do not abandon certain of our camps, now that training is largely completed. We merely close them down—place them on a stand-by basis for the day when they will be essential to us again.

The continued success of our forces overseas is sharply reflected in two service-command activities which are of great consequence to the two States represented here today. Battles are usually won at the cost of many casualties. As our forces advance, it nearly always follows that the number of wounded sent home to our care increases. Similarly, victories result in the capture of enemy soldiers, which means more prisoners of war for us to guard.

The number of wounded being returned to this country has recently been averaging around 1,200 a day. Thousands of these men are each month assigned to beds in the six Eighth Service Command general hospitals located within Texas and Arkansas. Now we are in the midst of a broad expansion program to make it possible for most of these hospitals to take even more patients. Each one of the hospitals is adapted to specialized study of a particular type of wound or illness. With the three other general hospitals within the Eighth Service Command they make this region an important medical center in the Nation.

At the present we have within the Eighth Service Command almost a third of all the prisoners of war now held in this country. That means we have custody of around a hundred and ten thousand Germans and Italians in 40 base camps and more than 90 branch camps. A base camp is a permanent prison compound, set up like a Regular Army camp; a branch camp is a temporary location for housing prisoners near some work project during the time required to do a certain job.

You may not be aware of the importance of prisoners of war as a source of labor in your communities. We never put them to work on any civilian project until the War Manpower Commission certifies that no civilian labor is available in the area. When you realize that in 1944 prisoners of war harvested about one-half of the total rice acreage in Texas and picked over 33,000 bales of cotton in Arkansas, you can understand that they gathered for you crops which, if they had not been on hand, might not have been harvested at all. According to reports submitted by the respective extension services of Arkansas and Texas, prisoners of war also did essential crop-saving work in the corn and sorghum and small grain fields of both States. For the last week about 2,000 of them have been extremely busy in flood prevention control work on Arkansas and Mississippi River levees.

Our handling of these prisoners is exactly in accordance with what is known as the Geneva Convention—an international agreement titled "The Articles of the Prisoner-of-War Convention," signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, by most nations of the world, including the United States, Germany, and Italy. In general, the provisions of this Convention establish rules for the care of prisoners of war and protect them against violence, insults, and public curiosity; further, it provides that prisoners of war shall receive the same food, the same housing, and the same medical care as soldiers of the army which holds them in custody. Collectively, as agents of an enemy government, these prisoners of war may be looked upon by some of our people as criminals; but, as individuals, they are soldiers who, no matter how deluded and wrong they may be in supporting criminal governments, nevertheless, believe they are doing their duty. That, according to the rules and standards of war as they have existed through the ages, gives them the status of honorable soldiers and the right to be treated as such. Not only does the Government of the United States comply with the letter as well as the spirit of the Geneva Convention but it also treats these prisoners of war in such a way as to offer enemy governments no excuse whatever for so-called retaliation against any of our boys who may be in their hands.

The Eighth Service Command is part of the Army Service Forces, the link between your production achievement here and the soldiers' fighting achievement at the front. For nearly 4 years we have been working together, you, the civilians of this area, and we, the soldiers of the Army Service Forces. Often our activities have been so closely coordinated it has been impossible to define the division between civilian and military effort. Thus, when our overseas forces are successful, you have a right to be proud—not only of your sons who compose those forces but of yourselves for your contribution of the materials of war.

We sometimes hear that the home front is complacent—doesn't know the war is going on. Without discussing the justice or injustice of such a charge, I should like to say that it should be carefully weighed before being leveled at such a community as this. Our forces stormed the Normandy beaches—and took them; they stormed the formidable Rhine—and crossed it; they have hit and conquered one Pacific island after another. And always, as men in the combat forces readily testify, the overwhelming force of the matériel of war which people like you have put in their hands is, in a large measure, responsible for their success.

Our armed forces have undertaken the most prodigious campaigns in military history, and practically every battle has been fought in lands completely stripped of natural resources. So what has been done was accomplished on food and arms shipped from

the United States—strength supplied by civilians in the greatest concerted production effort of all time.

It must be most gratifying to you people to know that your community has been the source of much of that strength. Your people have furnished the energy for two war plants which are models of wartime efficiency and which contribute each day directly to the downfall of our enemies. When you read about the Third Army, you must be very pleased to think that some of the tanks in it once rolled around Red River Ordnance and are now rolling through Germany, thanks to ordnance soldiers trained at Red River. Each morning when you read of our Air Forces' latest raid on Tokyo, you must be pleased to think that among the bombs were 500-pounders loaded at Lone Star Ordnance.

I have been told that if something "moves, explodes, shoots, or is shot, you'll find it at Red River Ordnance Depot." A look into any of the vast ordnance parts warehouses of Red River or a quick estimate in your mind of the terrific firepower stored in those ammunition igloos make that seem an understatement. It also makes you very proud of the sheer strength of our armament and of the people who have built it.

You may be sure that V-day in Europe will mean no let-up for the people of Texarkana and the communities around it. We will begin then our assault on the water-walled Japanese in earnest. You know from the demands of our primary blows that the conquest will require everything you can produce here.

When victory in Europe comes, all of us will naturally feel a sense of relief. The first objective of our war will have been achieved. It is imperative, however, that the relief never be allowed to become relaxation. We want to pause only long enough to get a compass bearing on our next objective—the islands of Japan. We want to stop work only long enough to evaluate the importance of our job in our westward drive. We will have a right to celebrate on that day, but we should remember that the most fitting celebration will be intensification of our war effort.

For we must not forget that the men who paid most to win the day will not be on hand to celebrate it. They, the dead who lie in north Africa, Italy, Belgium, and France, will expect much more of us than cheering in the streets because we fight, not that we may celebrate a day of victory over our enemies but to live henceforth a secure nation in a free world. Not even victory over Japan, which must be bought with labor and lives in the coming months, is our true objective. Whether they or we have ever consciously stated the fact to ourselves or not, our men have died, and we continue fighting over their bodies, to arrange a world in which our sons and grandsons will not have a wade from landing barges to foreign beaches 25 years from now.

So far as I can see, there is no relaxation in sight for this generation. When the last pillbox is burned out and the last Japanese sniper lies dead, we still will have work to do—the greatest undertaking mankind has ever faced—the building of an enduring peace.

No past generation has solved this problem. But this generation of Americans has done many impossible things—things beyond the conception of any man only a couple of years ago. When the time comes, let us undertake the problem of peace with the same vigor and skill we have used to conquer the Axis. Let us tackle it with the same spirit and courage with which our men in service have tackled and taken foreign beaches. Just as they won, we can win, too—through sheer American determination to win.

Address by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris at Roosevelt Memorial Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Sunday afternoon an impressive memorial service was held in Constitutional Hall, in this city, in memory of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. On this occasion Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, delivered a very beautiful, eloquent, and moving address in tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The President looked very much worn and tired—the lines of vast responsibilities, intricate questions and demands of life and death cut deeper than ever upon his face—yet he had all the old goodness, sadness, and canny shrewdness underneath the furrows * * * a combination of purest, heartiest tenderness and native manliness."

That might have been written by one who sat near the President, watching every expression of his face, as but recently he came to the combined session of Congress to report on the Yalta Conference. But this description of a face worn and tired, into which the lines of vast responsibilities, intricate questions and demands of life and death had cut deeper, is Walt Whitman's depiction of Abraham Lincoln, as he observed him at close range during dark days that tried men's souls. But it is also a perfect etching of President Roosevelt as he appeared on that last great public occasion with proud triumph in his tired voice. And now as in all the world the mourners go about the streets we are uttering the still unbelievable words, "He is dead."

More millions today mourn the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt than have ever mourned the passing of any man in the history of the world. More eulogies will be uttered as haloes to his memory than have ever been woven before out of affection and appreciation for any leader of men who has ever walked this earth.

That can be said because now the whole world is a whispering gallery, where voices carry to earth's remotest bounds. Even when the President was at Yalta and at Teheran he was not away from Washington.

It can be said because in this one world, with all barriers down, the man in the White House carried the banner of human hope for all mankind. Men and women under all skies, exploited and enslaved, degraded, debased, deceive, kept from a more abundant life, found in him a white-plumed knight whose shining sword was dedicated to their cause. Born to special privilege and to move in circles of the elite, he became the sympathetic servant of all, the very symbol of the hopes and yearnings of little men and humble people. For he learned the supreme secret of how to walk with kings nor lose the common touch.

In this truly global war, waged for the paramount dignity of the individual and for the rights of the common man, Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more than any one individual to defy the pagan powers of darkness, to unite the world-wide forces of decency and democracy against the common enemy, to fuse into one invincible phalanx the scattered battalions of freedom against the diabolical designs of a foe without pity or conscience and to make our America the arsenal of democracy's weapons for imperiled freedom everywhere.

One of America's greatest newspapers, which by no means always agreed with the President's policies, speaks what we believe will be the verdict of history when, upon receiving news of his death, it declared editorially:

"Men will thank God on their knees a hundred years from now that Franklin D. Roosevelt was in the White House, in a position to give leadership to the thought of the American people and direction to the activities of their Government in that dark hour when a powerful and ruthless barbarism threatened to overrun the civilization of the western world and to destroy the work of centuries of progress. * * * His was a foreign policy designed at all cost to prevent the United States from being driven into isolation, robbed of its friends, ringed by its enemies, and cornered finally in a maelstrom of national destruction."

Now, just as the bugles are sounding for the victory which he did so much to achieve, suddenly the trumpets sounded for him on the other side. And today we are saying, "Now, too, he belongs to the ages" and to the tomorrows that sing. Every white cross on far-stretching God's acres on alien soil is a belfry from which already victory is ringing. Thank God he heard their triumphant peals before he went. But today our weeping hearts are crying:

"O Captain, my Captain,
Rise up and hear the bells.
Rise up! For you the flag is flung,
For you the bugle trills,
For you bouquets and ribboned wreaths,
For you the shores—acrowding,
For you the call—the swaying mass
Their eager faces turning.
Exalt, O shores! And ring, O bells!
But we with mournful tread
Walk the deck our Captain lies
Fallen, cold and dead."

But Franklin D. Roosevelt is not dead. He hears the bells. He sees the flags of victory. As the massed forces of freedom move with steady step toward the bright new world his soul goes marching on. He calls to us today in those words his pen wrote last Wednesday—words his lips were not to utter. It is his last message, his marching orders to all the armies of freedom and to his fellow citizens everywhere. Listen—he speaks:

"Let us move forward with a strong and active faith. The only limit to our realization of tomorrow is our doubts of today."

Yes; he being dead will forever speak. His heroic triumph over bodily afflictions and disability is a precious gift to all servicemen who return to face the same test. His belief and practice of a brotherhood which is based on deeper affinities than strutting uniformities of race or class is a warning and a rebuke to all who would drag Americanism to the level of differing backgrounds rather than to lift it to the dream of common goals.

His spiritual insights are indicated by the sentence he broadcast again and again to those who represent the different faiths of America. Said he: "I doubt if there is any problem, social, political, or economic that would not melt away before the fire of a spiritual awakening."

At a blessed Christmastide it was my high privilege to bring the message at a service where the President was a reverent and attentive worshipper. The subject was "The

Word Made Flesh." The personal response that the heart of Christmas made to him has warmed my heart ever since. Afterward, when that message was put in print, I dedicated it to him. It was to that dedication that I turned when first I entered my study after the startling news came from Warm Springs. I found myself reading on the fly-leaf of that little volume:

"To Franklin Delano Roosevelt who, in the most influential office in the world is, in his personal courage, his faith in democracy and his passion to help the underprivileged and exploited, a word of justice and of hope made flesh in this torn and troubled generation."

How truly he has fulfilled that estimate of him in the decisive decade that followed its writing! The peace that is to be, and a world united for peace and progress and to an ampler life for all mankind, must be the high and white monument which will leap to the skies in his memory.

Review by Marguerite Young of Louis Bromfield's Book "Pleasant Valley"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, recently the apostle of gloom, Squire Bromfield, from Ohio, wrote a book entitled "Pleasant Valley." Miss Marguerite Young reviewed the book in the book-review section of the New York Times of April 8, 1945. I ask unanimous consent to have the review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUIRE BROMFIELD

(By Marguerite Young)

Louis Bromfield tells here the story of Malabar, his cooperative farm in the Ohio hill country.

His story is spacious and leisurely, since he has wished to include many impressions and ideas which would not have been possible in a more technical study. He has canvas enough to give attention to his China pigs, his dogs, his opossums feigning death, his bumble-bees—to the beautiful barns which were built by farmers who believed in witches, to the beautiful old houses built before the age of streamline. His statistics are enlivened by blackberry bushes, May apples, the flight of the pheasant. He has read his Ohio landscape in several ways—considering in one paragraph a program of green manure or reforestation, in another the delicate footsteps of birds, of foxes. Beyond these items, there is a running commentary on this region's legendary human figures, past and present—both Mr. Bluebaugh, who is very much alive, and Johnny Appleseed, who died in a hedgerow on or near the Ohio-Indiana border line.

What Mr. Bromfield adores with religious fervor is eccentricity of person and place, and, more narrowly, eccentricity as a paying proposition. All in all, he recreates an area of Ohio and furnishes it richly—both with its ordinary life and that extfaordinary life which exists nowhere but under his own hat. Here are Mr. Bromfield's personal mysticism and its conflicting principles—his distrust of the machine, his employment of the machine.

Also, he airs his political and economic views. Perhaps, indeed, his mysticism cannot be divided from his politics. He wants to get back to the good old days when men were men and snow was deeper, to live as his grandfather did on a farm that was a fortress of security. His grandfather had to buy little more than salt, sugar, coffee, tea, and spices. All else he produced out of the earth he owned and cherished. So Mr. Bromfield (with this dream of the past in mind) has started a back-to-earth movement which he hopes will inspire its imitators in at least the remote future.

The impetus for improvement will not be effective, he believes, if it comes from Washington and hare-brained theorists. He has been, in his own project, eminently successful—and without so much as a tip of his hat to Mr. Wallace. With the old pioneer's suspicion of a highly centralized government and other artifices, he considers himself the new pioneer of a program to restore the top soil. He certainly does not believe that farmers, poor farmers, should be subsidized. Rather they should investigate both sides of nature, the spiritual, the material. Only the good man can make things grow. The farmer, however poor, must cooperate with God toward the ultimate end which is security.

The trouble is, Mr. Bromfield does not tell us precisely how he intends to make his individual experience the universal one. Are all farmers to write novels before they turn to plowing? There are many poor farmers who do not have, as Mr. Bromfield has, the benefit of an extra support lent by M. G. M., and so forth. Perhaps they can still lift themselves, in the traditional manner, by their own boot straps. Whatever happens they have at least the shining example of Malabar—a cooperative farm or aggregate of farms based upon the Russian principles, but with an important difference or two which cannot be ignored. The most important difference is that Mr. Bromfield, as capitalist, takes the place of the state in that harmonious economy. He financed his farm exactly as he would finance a factory, and he gets a return on his investment.

What weakens the book is not Mr. Bromfields' practical knowledge but the mysticism of his political philosophy. He makes many general statements which, under investigation, dissolve into nothingness. He talks too much of racial stocks, for example, too much of the blood in his veins and what that peculiar inheritance implies. His dream of returning to the soil is somehow bound up with various repugnances to various aspects of peoples.

His seems a mechanized romanticism, a little dangerously near Sir Walter Scott and company. He is living at Malabar, in a kind of feudal grandeur—surrounded by his loving sheep, who will be served up on a golden dish tomorrow. They sport, not knowing what he intends for them. Perhaps, after all, what he is presenting is merely a human picture and very local. In France he had thought of his distant Pleasant Valley as a haven from what he calls the European sickness—and a haven, more or less, it is. The book, however, far from being a public, is a private document, and expressive of a dream like the opossum's feigning death.

In short, the solution to the world's ills offered by Mr. Bromfield is no solution at all, in any large sense.

The book may be summarized (although it suggests so many interests) as an eloquent argument against the food that comes out of a tin can. Mr. Bromfield was perpetually haunted, he tells us, by the terrible economic insecurity which a mechanized and industrial civilization imposes upon the individual. He meant to have as nearly everything as possible. Not merely chickens, eggs, butter, milk, vegetables, fruit, and the things which many foolish farmers buy today, but also guinea fowl, ducks, geese, and turkey (which might be cultivated in a half-wild state), grapes in abundance, plums, peaches, currants, gooseberries, asparagus, fish. All these he has acquired. He has even put the bumblebees to work for him. But the vast majority of physically depreciated Americans may, like squatters, look over the gates, with their golden hieroglyphs of the beautiful past that never was and wonder—What next?

Absentee Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Absentee Senators," published in this morning's Washington Post. The editorial presents a very excellent discussion of the problem which recently has received so much attention.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABSENTEE SENATORS

Senator BARKLEY'S denunciation of chronic absenteeism on the floor of the Senate has afforded Senator LA FOLLETTE an opportunity to make two suggestions for improving attendance. First, he asked enforcement of the regularly ignored rule that no Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave. That means that he should remain within calling distance. Otherwise permission should be asked to go downtown or leave the city. Senator LA FOLLETTE also called attention to a statute, honored in the breach rather than the observance, requiring deductions from salaries of Members of Congress for each day of absence for reasons other than sickness. His final suggestion, which was carried out on Wednesday, was to abandon the practice of recording Senators as present on a quorum call, unless they are actually present to answer to their names.

Enforcement of these rules would, no doubt, assure better attendance, especially at times when important issues were pending. But the problem of senatorial absenteeism is not going to be met satisfactorily by disciplinary measures of this type. For, despite Senator BARKLEY'S remarks about the irresponsibility of the absenteeism, we doubt that poor attendance is explained by lack of zeal or desire to evade the duties of senatorial office.

The principal cause of poor attendance is, on the contrary, attributable to a distracting variety of duties that keep Senators in their offices interviewing constituents, or sitting at conference tables in committee rooms, instead of being in their places on the floor of the Senate when debates are in progress. To most of them, it may seem to be time wasted to sit through long debates on issues on which they have already reached decisions or on matters that are of minor concern. Moreover, if they are within calling distance they can be summoned in case of need to cast their votes.

Nevertheless, chronic absenteeism, even for most plausible reasons, in the end injures the reputation and detracts from the solid achievements of a deliberative body such as

the Senate. Its Members may believe that the specialized work done as committee members and the contacts with their constituents are of more immediate importance than debating or merely listening to the arguments of others. But it is in the give and take of debate that legislators form opinions and give the country the sort of service the voters expect of them.

There is danger that legislators immersed in committee work will become specialists inclined to overemphasize certain issues and disposed to take their opinions second-hand on many matters of equal importance. We need legislators who are generally well informed on, as well as experts in, certain lines. And to have that combination of qualities, Senators must be afforded time both to serve on committees and to deliberate.

That appears to be increasingly difficult under present conditions. So Senator BARKLEY'S blast is another reminder that there is pressing need for a simplification of congressional procedure. Senator LA FOLLETTE, chairman of the Joint Committee to Modernize Congress, realizes that the primary cause of excessive absenteeism traces back to the inadequacies of internal organization. But correction, he thinks, is likely to take a long time. Meanwhile, he would apply a necessary bit of coercion to enable the Senate to make a better appearance before visitors.

Control of Mississippi River Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "T. V. A.—M. V. A.—O. V. A.," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald and other newspapers served by the News Syndicate Co., Inc., on April 11, 1945.

The editorial brings to our attention the deplorable spring floods now ravaging the lower Mississippi, and the damage being done to life and property, and urges that speedy action be taken to enact the pending Missouri Valley Authority legislation and thereby help eliminate these recurrent disasters.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. V. A.—M. V. A.—O. V. A.

The regular spring news of floods on the lower Mississippi is now coming in. Various Louisiana parishes are largely under water; some 40,000 persons are estimated to have left their homes for higher ground; numerous civilians and soldiers; plus quite a few German war prisoners, are working to plug, heighten and strengthen numerous levees. The Red River of the South, big Mississippi feeder that cuts down slantwise across northern Louisiana, is being especially troublesome.

THE SAME OLD FLOOD STORIES

These things happen every spring, always to many people's surprise and disgust.

Hadn't we better, as soon as possible after the war, get going on some long-range projects to bring the Mississippi under better and more systematized control than can be done by means of levees?

Floods in the Tennessee River system have been brought under control by the Tennessee Valley Authority's series of dams for regulating water flow so successful is this project that the city of Paducah, Ky., where the Tennessee River empties into the Ohio, advertised the other day that it was unhurt by recent Ohio floods.

Already before Congress is a plan, backed by various western Senators, Representatives, civic groups, newspapers, etc., to set up a Missouri Valley Authority to bring the Missouri River system under control. An Ohio Valley Authority is talked about.

We believe both an M. V. A. and an O. V. A. should be established, to get busy as soon as possible. Problems of both would be different from those solved by the T. V. A., because of different terrains, but we understand the best engineering opinion is that all these problems could be licked. Should an M. V. A. and an O. V. A. succeed, the Mississippi's two biggest feeders would be regulated—which should mean fewer and less serious floods on the Mississippi itself.

Incidentally, but importantly in view of the expected post-war upsets, both projects would make a lot of jobs for a long time.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Polish Central Council of New Haven at its meeting held April 11, 1945:

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Marshal Joseph Stalin recently met at Yalta in the Crimea for the purpose of laying the foundation for the future peace with the avowed purpose of preventing thereby the causes of future wars; and

Whereas as a part of the agreement reached by these three leaders, it was proposed to partition Poland by ceding to Russia all territory east of the so-called Curzon Line; and

Whereas it was decided to recognize as the Government of Poland the so-called Lublin Government after reorganizing the latter by adding thereto various other Polish leaders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby register our strongest protest against such a flagrant act of injustice entailed by the decision to partition Poland, which has been one of the staunchest members of the United Nations and has fought against the common enemy longer than any other nation, and has contributed to the common cause by sacrifices exceeding those of any other Allied nation. This decision, which punishes rather than rewards Poland for her steadfast and loyal devotion to the Allied cause, acutely offends our consciences and, we believe, the consciences of most of our fellow American citizens; be it further

Resolved, That the recognition of any government save that of the only legal and constitutional Polish Government-in-Exile in London, would be a political expedient which would in no way accord with the facts of duly constituted authority, and would make a mockery of our previous continued recognition of the Polish Government in London. To thus recognize in effect the Soviet-inspired puppet government of Lublin would be an act of submission hardly consonant with our rightful heredity of political independence; be it further

Resolved, That as American citizens we emphatically and bitterly condemn the abandonment of the noble principles of the Atlantic Charter in favor of political spheres of influence, which will surely sow the seeds for future discords and wars in Europe and in the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives and Senators from Connecticut in the United States Congress and to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Hon. Cordell Hull, Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Senator Tom Connally, Representative Charles A. Eaton, Representative Sol Bloom, and Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, with the earnest request that the aforementioned decisions reached at Yalta regarding Poland be revised at the forthcoming United Nations Conference at San Francisco so that justice may be accorded Poland as befits her sacrifices against the common enemy.

POLISH CENTRAL COUNCIL OF
NEW HAVEN,
By RICHARD T. MOKRZYNSKI, *President*.
By STANISLAW DLUZNIEWSKI, *Secretary*.

The Fair Employment Practice Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, today, as never before in the history of our country, nothing should be done to cause disunity. We have just lost a great President. The task of our new President will be most difficult with all of us working in harmony to aid him in carrying out his program. Strong pressure is being brought to bear for the early passage of H. R. 2232, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry. To my humble way of thinking, the passage of this bill will create so much disunity in this country that President Truman's administration will be wrecked and any hope for lasting peace will be dashed on the rocks.

Whenever the Congress by law delegates the authority to any man or bureau to force American employers to employ against their will any person, that day democracy dies. It is just as reasonable to attempt to legislate whom one's friends should be or whom one should marry as it is to attempt to legislate whom an employer should employ.

Under the terms of H. R. 2232 a publishing house owned and operated by a religious institution could be forced to employ believers in other faiths. A Protestant could force a publishing house owned and operated by the Catholic Church to give him employment as an editor of a religious paper, or vice versa; or a Mohammedan who is otherwise qualified could force a theological college owned and operated by Baptists to train Baptist preachers to employ him

as a professor. An atheist who is otherwise qualified could force a Jewish synagogue to employ him to sing in the choir if choir members are hired. The same thing would be true of employers of religious bookstores, who cater solely to members of certain faiths.

In many communities where people of the same national origin, culture, and religious belief live, it is good business to employ people in stores and other businesses who are members of this particular group. This is as it should be, for it is human nature and good business to have harmony among employees.

If this bill were in effect now, it would be a violation of the law for a manufacturer who is manufacturing highly secret war materials to refuse employment to a qualified Jap or German. A Jap or German, under the terms of this bill, could force his employment in our munitions factories, our aircraft factories, our radar factories, and our shipyards. Why should we jeopardize the security of our country in an effort to get votes?

Of course, there are those in our midst who ridicule the American system of free enterprise. They much prefer the Russian system, where fewer than 4,000,000 party members control the destinies of 170,000,000 Russians—where it is almost impossible to break into the selected inner circle.

Where would our production be today if our armament manufacturers were haled into court every time a person sought employment and was turned down because he happened to be a Jap or a German sympathizer?

A lot of people are laboring under the illusion that this bill is to force the upgrading in industry of the Negro. This bill is to force Americans, against their wills, to employ people of any race, color, or creed. It could force Negro undertaking establishments to hire white undertakers, and you and I know what a howl would be raised if that were to happen. Any American who is worthy of being called American desires to select his own employees without dictation from Congress, the President, or any Government bureau.

If we want to precipitate race riots, destruction of property, and the abandonment of the system of private ownership, there is no better way to accomplish this end than to pass this bill.

There is not a Member of Congress who would stand by for one moment and permit an executive agency to force him to employ secretarial and clerical help against his will. Why should not we give our manufacturers the same privilege? Why should not we give our educational institutions the same privilege? Why should not we give our eleemosynary institutions the same privilege? Why should not we give our labor unions the same privilege? We should have more interest in the well-being of our country than in holding political office.

Many Members who are supporting this bill today are sincere in their belief that it will accomplish the impossible; but I predict here and now that if this bill ever becomes law, an aroused American public opinion will drive from office every person who votes for its passage.

Goals for San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint study of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant pronouncements on world organization entitled "Goals for San Francisco."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOALS FOR SAN FRANCISCO—A JOINT STUDY OF CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT PRONOUNCEMENTS ON WORLD ORGANIZATION

Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant pronouncements have made clear the moral principles of a just world order. Our joint study of these authoritative statements convinces us that the agencies which issued them are agreed on 10 constructive recommendations for the United Nations Charter to be drafted at the San Francisco Conference. These agreements offer practical guidance to all men of good will. The pronouncements upon which they are based include the "Pattern for Peace," issued by leaders of the three religious bodies in October 1943; the statement of the Catholic bishops in November 1944; the statement of the Federal Council of Churches in December 1944; the statement of the Synagogue Council in January 1945; and the statement of the Cleveland Church Conference in January 1945. Our formulation of these recommendations to support and improve the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a world organization is as follows:

1. NEED FOR ORGANIZATION

The sacrifices and hardships of this war and the need of mankind for an organized peace make it imperative that the San Francisco Conference succeed and the general security organization be established.

2. PREAMBLE

The charter of the United Nations Organization should acknowledge in its preamble that the actions of States are subject to the same moral principles as govern the conduct of individuals.

3. MEMBERSHIP

The charter should specify that membership will be open to all States willing and able to fulfill the obligations of the charter, so that membership may become universal.

4. INTERNATIONAL LAW

The charter should provide for the codification and development of international law and for its impartial enforcement.

5. PEACEFUL CHANGE

The charter should provide more explicitly for the revision of treaties and other agreements when such action is required by justice and the good of the world community.

6. SMALL NATIONS

The charter should safeguard the economic and political rights of small nations and assure them an adequate share in shaping the policies of the organization.

7. DISARMAMENT

The charter should provide a clear purpose and procedure for the limitation and control of national armaments, as collective security is established.

8. VOTING POWER

The charter should provide that no one nation be allowed to veto judgment in any dispute covered by international law.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS

The charter should include an international bill of rights and provide for a commission or commissions to protect and further the rights and liberties of the individual and of racial, religious, and cultural groups, especially those uprooted by war or oppression.

10. DEPENDENT PEOPLES

The charter should provide for a commission to supervise the administration of mandated territories and to promote the advancement of non-self-governing peoples toward economic well-being, cultural development, and political responsibility.

Rev. EDWARD A. CONWAY, S. J.,
Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.
Rabbi AHRON OPHER,
Secretary, Committee on Peace, Synagogue Council of America.
Rev. RICHARD M. FAGLEY,
Secretary, Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

APRIL 5, 1945.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the delegates representing organizations of Americans of Polish descent in Connecticut at a convention held at New Haven, Conn., on Sunday, February 25, 1945:

We, the delegates of organizations representing some 300,000 Americans of Polish descent who reside in Connecticut, in convention assembled at New Haven, Conn., feel conscience bound to express their most profound grief and bitter disappointment in the conclusions reached at the recent Yalta Conference participated in by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of England, and the Marshal Premier of the U. S. S. R. These sentiments, we find, are not confined to the 300,000 Americans we represent but are shared by many thousands of other Americans of this State who are outspoken in their belief that the gravest injustice that yet has been recorded in history will take place if the proposed plans, as published, will be put into effect.

If all human emotions have been abandoned; if all the sacrifices, loyalty to a cause, the suffering and insults to a people are to be swept aside to satisfy the demand of one power; if the privation, starvation, deportations, and cruelties inflicted upon an ally are to be forgotten and if the punishment imposed by the deliberate refusal to admit relief unless selfish political demands of one of the powers are met are to be tolerated; if all the promises of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" are to be ignored, then let us at least apply the light of truth to the situation.

President Roosevelt in his report to Congress of the doings at Yalta stated that the decisions concerning Poland were not satisfactory. This in itself indicates compromise. A compromise reached at the expense of an Allied country whose record is one of untiring effort, sacrifice, and zeal in its strife for justice in a cause from which it has not wavered. This is a compromise at the expense of a nation which paid; and paid more than its share and now when very little is left is called upon to suffer further agony by being called upon to pay more.

Poland has made sacrifices, and any nation should be willing to make sacrifices, if such sacrifices insured future peace in the world. But is it not here that the seed is planted for World War No. 3? Is this not appeasement of a great power at the expense of a small country? We have seen what this kind of appeasement does to the peace of the world by events as rcent as 6 and 7 years ago. An agreement reached on the theory of appeasement is treacherous. The unilateral declarations of one power with respect to the small nations adopted by the three powers at Yalta establishes a precedent for similar future conduct by any power.

There is no escaping the fact that the conclusions reached lead into another scheme of balance of power, the underlying cause of World War No. 1 and a powerful factor in World War No. 2. The so-called sphere of influence, merely a convenient substitute in terminology for balance of power, violates all of the precepts of the Atlantic Charter.

No matter how solemn, no matter how strong, no matter how sound the peace agreements may be, what guaranty and what respect can there be for the terms of any peace arrangements when precedent shows that these have been ignored conveniently and all principles abandoned? Promises have been broken, pacts have been discarded, and smaller countries have been subjected to the whims of greater powers which not only are superior in arms but who stoop to the use of deceptive propaganda unjustly to accuse a smaller country and place the blame upon it to conceal their injustices.

Can lasting peace be obtained with this kind of an approach?

Can any peace be reached unless it be based on justice?

We surely would be remiss in our responsibility if we did not take this opportunity to demand from our leaders the taking of immediate steps to prevent future wars which will involve our country, the United States.

We ask that the problem be met now. This is the time to solve it courageously. As citizens of this State and Nation we disagree with our Government's participation in the partitioning of any country, large or small, with its enforced expulsion of millions from their native countries and homes.

We commend the honesty and courage of the Polish Government-in-Exile in London for confronting this issue directly in the face of threatened catastrophe. We hope that the pitfalls and dangers to be found at diplomatic tables will be avoided. We stand firm in insisting that the war which will be won on the battlefields by our courageous soldiers be not lost at the peace conferences.

We have further resolved to send these resolutions to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, Senators, and all Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Connecticut, and to the Honorable Harold S. Stassen, Senators Arthur H. Vandenberg and Tom Connally, Representatives Sol Bloom and Charles A. Eaton, Virginia C. Gildersleeve, and Edward R. Stettinius, Secretary of State.

Dr. B. L. SMYKOWSKI,
President.

Rev. JOHN J. SOBOLEWSKI,
Secretary.

The Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all civilization mourns the passing of our late beloved President, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his memory will be revered and honored for time immemorial.

An editorial entitled "President Roosevelt Answers Final Summons," which appeared in the Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald, of April 13, 1945, is one of the finest tributes to this great humanitarian that I have read. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ANSWERS FINAL SUMMONS

The announcement of the death of President Roosevelt yesterday afternoon has cast a pall over the entire universe. That the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, the great humanitarian who had assumed world leadership in the plan to establish an enduring peace for all peoples at the end of the present global war, should suddenly pass out of the picture at one of the most critical stages of the war with Germany was an eventuality that few were prepared for. The shock provoked by the announcement of his passing was universal, for wherever want, insecurity, suffering, and oppression were endured, the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt constituted almost the single ray of hope that a better day would soon dawn.

And while countless millions are not only stunned but grieved that he should be struck down at the height of his usefulness, there is consolation in the thought that the foundation for world peace has been laid and the machinery installed and readied for operation as soon as the post-war era shall dawn. Only the finishing touches remain to be applied at San Francisco the latter part of this month. That the President could not live to participate in this all-important conference, indeed to witness his arduous efforts translated into action in the world of tomorrow, is tragic; however, it is believed that his spirit and the noble precepts he stood for will dominate the San Francisco Conference, as well as the actions of the subsequent peace negotiators, for his conception of a world organization to effectively guarantee peace and security for all peoples has so thoroughly permeated the thinking of every race and creed that they will not be denied.

In these days President Roosevelt is thought of mainly as our war President, the man whose planning and leadership are responsible for transforming the vast resources of this Nation from a peacetime to a war footing in a miraculous, brief period and for quickly moulding a war machine that has never been equaled since the beginning of recorded history; yet the early days of his administration were equally as outstanding. Accepting the reins of government at a time when the greatest nation on earth was in the depths of despair with unemployment and discontent so widespread that our cherished democratic principles were in jeopardy, he invoked first one bold stroke and then another, with the result that fear gave way to confidence, unemployment was diminished, and prosperity restored.

A man of quick decisions, one who did not regard precedents when they stood in the way of what he conceived to be progress and the welfare of the greatest number, Mr. Roosevelt naturally invited criticism, which is inescapable for one who occupies the highest post in the land for so long a time, yet his policies were always vindicated by the people who looked to him as the champion of their rights and prerogatives, and when his historians assess the net accomplishments of the 12 momentous years of his administration, the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will rank high, if not topmost, among the immortals of all time.

The Vice President, Harry S. Truman, acceded to the Presidency 2 hours after the death of Mr. Roosevelt. Accepting this responsibility at the most critical period in world history, President Truman realizes the colossal aspects of the burden that has descended upon him, and it is reassuring in this dark hour to know that his first official act was the decision to retain the entire Roosevelt Cabinet with a view to following the policies inaugurated by President Roosevelt, including the continued vigorous prosecution of the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion, and the establishment of the kind of peace in the post-war world that his distinguished predecessor envisioned.

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my own native State, Missouri, bows with the Nation and the world in sorrow at the loss of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Missouri voted for Roosevelt four times for President and in his passing Missourians feel and fully recognize an irreplaceable loss. However, Roosevelt in death will live vividly in ideals and in spirit. America and the world are now more determined to make realities the ideals for which he lived, toiled, and died.

As we bow in the presence of divine providence and have committed a national leader to the ages, we must carry on. New hands must take up the tasks of national leadership. Missouri is honored to present to the Nation and the world the new American leader, President Harry S. Truman.

Harry Truman, born and reared on a Missouri farm, elected county judge, sent to the United States Senate, selected by President Roosevelt as a running mate, elected Vice President, and now President of the United States, is typically Missourian and typically American. What could more truly represent the American tradition and spirit than "from farm boy to President."

President Truman has made the slow ascent from humble position to eminence by merit and no eminence of station will ever cause him to forget that all of us make up America.

Mrs. Truman, Margaret, and Harry will bring to the White House another truly American family. Let us rejoice that the first family will continue to carry on and truly represent our American way.

This is the first time my beloved State, Missouri, has furnished a President. We are happy that it is Harry Truman. In sharing Truman with the Nation and the world we Missourians offer no apologies since we are convinced that apologies would not be in harmony with facts as they exist. His honesty, ability, frankness, experience, and humility fit him for the very heavy tasks which lie ahead. He is equal to the occasion. America is united for action, world order is reshaping; then let us go forward under the guidance of divine providence into the dawn of a better day.

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the surplus property disposal presents one of the most serious post-war problems on the horizon. Unless this is handled in a common-sense and orderly fashion it can do great harm to the economy of the country. On the other hand, however, if a sane and sensible program is followed, this vast surplus can undoubtedly be absorbed into the economy of the country without injury to private enterprise.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Times of March 26, 1945, together with a letter written to the New York Times under date of April 2, 1945, by Ody H. Lamborn, president of Lamborn & Co., Inc., with offices at 99 Wall Street, New York City:

[From the New York Times of March 26, 1945]

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Estimates of the volume of surplus supplies when the war ends have exceeded $100,000,000,000. The magnitude of these supplies is so enormous that there are bound to be serious repercussions upon our economy if we do not have a carefully formulated program of disposal. While greater progress has been made in this direction than during the First World War, we still seem to be only in the preliminary stages of policy formulation and organization. In this connection the findings and recommendations of the Mead committee concerning developments to date must be given careful consideration.

Among the findings were these: The Surplus Property Board has formulated no general policies. The "administrative organization for surplus disposal has been extremely confused." Sales of these supplies should be given more "immediate and wide publicity" than in the past. The operations of the Surplus Property Board have been handicapped because of inadequate funds. Surpluses have not been declared promptly, and where they have been declared have not always been promptly sold. For example, only about 15 percent of the goods declared to be surplus had been sold up to February. The armed forces have not laid out the procedures to be followed when the European War is ended, or determined which items shall be declared surplus and which they expect to use in the Pacific. Lack of coordination is indicated by the fact that some items have been declared to be surplus in some plants, while shortages of the same items prevail in other war plants. Finally, the committee reported that unless immediate action is taken to correct the present inadequacies, the result might be "as chaotic a situation as we had at the end of the last World War."

These findings indicate the need for a prompt overhauling of surplus disposal policy. It is now about 6 months since Congress enacted legislation creating the Surplus Property Board. While this legislation is inadequate in some respects, it does furnish the basis for prompter action than has thus far developed. The committee is justified in its criticism that the formulation of general policies is "long overdue." It will be highly unfortunate if we should find ourselves only partly prepared to handle the problem of surplus disposal despite all the attention that has been focused upon it. In this field, as in many other phases of our post-war policy, the sands of time are running out rapidly without sufficient progress being made.

WHY NOT A UNITED STATES SURPLUS COMMODITY EXCHANGE?—A SUGGESTION FOR A BUSINESS-LIKE APPROACH FOR THE DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUSES

LAMBORN & CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1945.

The EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest the excellent editorial contained in your issue of March 26, entitled "Surplus Disposal." It is timely. In it you say in part:

"Estimates of the volume of surplus supplies when the war ends have exceeded $100,000,000,000. * * * In this connection the findings and recommendations of the Mead committee concerning developments to date must be given careful consideration.

"Among the findings were these: The Surplus Property Board has formulated no general policies. The 'administrative organization for surplus disposal has been extremely confused.' Sales of these supplies should be given more 'immediate and wide publicity' than in the past. * * * Surpluses have not been declared promptly, and where they have been declared have not always been promptly sold. * * * Finally, the committee reported that unless immediate action is taken to correct the present inadequacies, the result might be 'as chaotic a situation as we had at the end of the last World War.'

"These findings indicate the need for a prompt overhauling of surplus disposal policy."

It is commonly known that the handling of Government surpluses growing out of the last World War was very inefficient. It resulted in many scandals which reflected on the Government as well as individuals. There are still repercussions from it, as recent press reports indicate.

Since the problem of the disposal of surplus materials is again before us, but on an infinitely greater scale than in World War No. 1, it is obviously vital that an intelligent procedure be followed so that the public interest will be served.

The average citizen usually hears about sales of Government property after the disposal has been made. He sometimes hears of huge profits being made by what he considers a favored group. All of this leads one to believe that proper publicity is not given to offerings on the part of the Government and the impression, however untrue, develops that the business is done on a confidential basis with privileges granted to those who are "in the know."

The problem is one of Gargantuan proportions. The present "machinery" for disposal is obviously inadequate. The entire program should be studied by Congress and provisions made for the streamlining of surplus disposal.

The Government could well afford, in the disposal of surplus property, to follow the tried and true system used for the marketing of commodities by private industry, as expressed by the commodity futures exchanges of the country. Under that system there are no confidential deals; the public knows where to go to buy and sell, and the seller can offer, and the buyer can buy, for "future delivery." I refer specifically to such instrumentalities as the Chicago Board of Trade, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, and other exchanges of a similar nature. Those exchanges provide distinct advantages to the public, some of which are:

(a) A centralized market place where buyer and seller may meet to trade in a given commodity;

(b) An active market;

(c) A buyer or seller, if not situated in the city in which the exchange is located, has an agent representing him to keep him, wherever he is located—here or abroad—informed on trades taking place on those exchanges and on prospects of things to come—crop developments, demand potentialities, market price trends, etc.;

(d) There is nothing secret about exchange transactions. Trading is done in the open and any citizen is enabled to know just what is going on;

(e) The exchanges make it possible for the newspapers of the Nation to quote the market on any commodity accurately. Nothing is done behind closed doors.

From the above it will be seen that the exchanges of the country are representative of the "American Way" at its best and are typical of genuine democracy at work.

A basic reason for the existence of these exchanges is that a broad market is provided not only for products required for immediate use but for commodities which may temporarily be in excess supply and carried, pending ultimate absorption, by related industries. This is a function of exchanges and would certainly apply to an organization properly adapted for the sale of any surplus material.

Drawing from this in considering the matter of the Government surplus commodities, let us assume that there is established by our Government what would be known as, say, the United States Surplus Commodity Exchange. Let that exchange be established in any city that seems logical, whether it be Washington, Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Chicago, or San Francisco. It would then be the focal point for the sale of all Government surplus commodities. With the establishment of such an exchange any and all industries in the United States and in foreign nations could have agents representing them on such an exchange. Those agents would act as liaison officers between those they represent and the Government representatives. This system would simplify the problem of disposal and provide intelligent marketing of surplus commodities.

The Government, in addition to other means it might use, would make available from time to time schedules of merchandise to be sold by the Government and the dates on which such merchandise would be offered. Such schedules would be made up sufficiently in advance for the agents to communicate with their principals and for the principals to have time to consider their own positions and the amount that they might be able to bid on such commodities. The United States Surplus Commodity Exchange would be the centralized point to which all could go for

information and for trading. Thus, for example, our Government would say today that on June 15 it would dispose of X,000,000 pairs of shoes; on June 16 of Y,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, etc. Where quantities to be disposed of were exceptionally large, the length of the trading period would be extended.

Through the agents and through the press the public would be informed of such offers and of the date on which purchases might be made. When the date rolled around for the disposal of any particular commodity as previously advertised by the Government, the trading would begin, the agents having limits as set by their principals as to the price they would pay on any given commodity. Thus the Government would be assured, as a result of such bidding, that the highest possible price would have been received, the public would be satisfied that there had been no special favors shown to any particular group, and the materials purchased would move into normal channels. And, of course, offerings should be in small enough units to give an opportunity to the small businessman as well as the larger.

The press would naturally report the developments of each day to the public, and, in general, a clean-cut method would have been used to dispose of surplus property. Everything possible should be done to permit the light of day to shine upon all activities in connection with this great project.

It would, of course, be necessary for the Government to use market judgment so as not to dump on the market at one time too much of any one commodity. The Government would not attempt on one day to sell all of the surplus airplanes it owned. It would, by intelligent offerings, prevent sharp price dips. Naturally it would want to follow such a course not only in order that it might secure the highest possible price for its merchandise, but also in order that it might do as little damage as possible to the then current production schedules, thereby causing as little dislocation as possible in the established industries.

Obviously, immediately after the war, or before, with the United States public lacking everything, while reconversion is going on, the country can absorb a much greater percentage of surplus goods than will be possible after we have completely reconverted. Therefore, it would be logical for the Government to establish such an exchange as soon as possible and to let out known surpluses through such an exchange as rapidly, and in as great a volume, as possible.

This is the simple, businesslike way to handle the situation and is, of course, not new at all, for since time immemorial throughout the world we have had market days, when the seller and the buyer in the market places got together and exchanged merchandise for money or exchanged one product for another product. In following any other method the Government is merely attempting to create a complex system that does not do justice to itself or to the American people.

In suggesting the establishment of a United States Surplus Commodity Exchange, I consider it a necessary, but temporary, expedient for the unloading of huge stocks built up by the Government during the war. As is the case with many millions of Americans who do not believe in all-pervading State control, I deplore the tremendous inroads Government has already made in the sphere of commercial activity, tending, as they do, to nullify our free enterprise system. If Government efforts in this direction continue unchecked they will destroy free enterprise.

Basically to the degree that it is possible, the Government should confine itself to the art of governing. And it is an art which has long been neglected in this country. I mention this so that you will not misconstrue my suggestion or think that I am advocating the entry of Government even one step further into business. I would also like to point out that the above suggestion is submitted only in broad outline. No attempt has been made to cover the many details that would have to be worked out in establishing a United States Surplus Commodity Exchange.

Yours very truly,

ODY H. LAMBORN,
President.

Humphreys County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article describing Humphreys County, Tenn., prepared by a civic club in Waverly, Tenn.:

HUMPHREYS COUNTY, TENN., THE LAND OF PROMISE

AGRICULTURE, LIVESTOCK, HUNTING, FISHING, BOATING

Humphreys County, with a population of 12,254, is located on the western edge of middle Tennessee, 60 miles southwest of Nashville, on the Broadway of America, Highway No. 70.

Tennessee River borders it on the west, and it is traversed by Duck and Buffalo Rivers, and White Oak, Richland, Trace, Blue, Hurricane, and Tumbling Creeks, and numerous smaller streams.

The pool formed by the Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville covers the western portion of the county.

Waverly, with a population of 1,318, is the county seat, and is located in the center of the county. McEwen, slightly smaller, serves the eastern portion of the county.

Every type of soil may be found in this county from the richest Duck River bottom to the upland clay.

There are thousands of acres of wooded lands that can be cleared and converted into the finest of pastures for cattle and sheep.

There is an abundant growth of young timber—oak, poplar, ash, etc.—over the great acres of this county.

The county has a garment factory at Waverly that works about 600 people, and one is now being installed at McEwen that will work some 200 people—also a modern sand and gravel plant, rock and lime crusher, canning factory, and numerous sawmills. Labor in normal times is plentiful.

The people are native Anglo-Saxon, hardy, energetic, and life-loving.

The county is traversed from north to south by State Highway No. 13, and from east to west by Federal Highway No. 70; and has 700 miles of good graveled secondary roads well bridged. These roads reach all parts of the county.

The lands are comparatively cheap, and are traversed by living water from numerous springs and sparkling creeks.

The Tennessee Valley Authority furnishes the electric power, and rural electrification covers a great portion of the county, and post-war plans call for complete coverage.

There are some 50 miles of beautiful shore line along the edge of the Kentucky Dam Reservoir; and hundreds of acres for camp sites, summer and vacation homes, and permanent homes overlooking this pool of clear, blue water, teeming with fish—bass, crappie, catfish, buffalo, pike, etc.

Humphreys County is a thriving community with modern homes, good farms, good roads, good schools and churches, friendly folk, and genuine southern hospitality.

The Kentucky Dam is T. V. A.'s largest dam, creating the longest man-made lake in the world. It cost $110,000,000, and is 184 miles long and has a shore line of 1,580 miles. It is a veritable fisherman's and duck hunter's paradise.

Humphreys County is served by the N. C. & St. L. Railway in addition to busses traveling the above-mentioned highways. It is approximately 160 miles from Memphis, 60 miles from Nashville, and 75 miles from Jackson, and 50 miles from Clarksville.

There are no better opportunities for:

1. The purchase of productive lands at most reasonable prices.
2. The building of homes in the fairest of southern lands.
3. The living of life in leisure among beautiful hills and pleasant streams abounding in game and fish.
4. The promotion of industry that is fast bringing the South to the forefront.
5. The utilization of the vast resources of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Why Should I Be Afraid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the length and breadth of our land the people are greatly disturbed and distressed. They are thinking and they are praying; they are getting closer to God, and it is well that the Christian spirit is now abiding closer than ever before. In these days of distress during the most frightful war of all times, it is well that the people resign themselves to the power of thought and prayer. The angel of death has come to the untold thousands of homes in our country, and the people are bowed down in grief; they are giving more thought to Christianity than ever before.

In my home community that is evidenced greater than ever before. Mr. Frank M. Crawford, of Connersville, Ind., the grandfather of a fine boy who gave his life in this war that the people might be free, has written many beautiful poems. He is one of the finest American citizens, and it is a distinct privilege to insert his recent poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which touches the heartstrings of those who read and think of our future destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the beautiful poem, written by Mr. Frank M. Crawford, of Connersville, Ind., which is as follows:

WHY SHOULD I BE AFRAID?

Why should I fear to walk the way
Along the path which all before me trod?
Why should I fear when comes the day
To pass the gate and meet a just, forgiving God?

In my life's span I've played my part
No sacred trust have I betrayed,
But ever kept a kindly heart.
Why should I be afraid?

I have not always prayed aloud,
Nor bowed my head in public place,
Yet sinner I may be allowed
The benefit of saving grace.

If God be God, he knows it all;
He knows how much, how far I strayed—
And God doth note the sparrow's fall.
Why should I be afraid?

—*Frank Crawford.*

Forest Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by former Senator James P. Pope, now director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Wayne County, Tenn., Forest Protective Association rally:

THE WAY OUT

(By James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority)

It has been said that there are three stages in the history of man and nature—wilderness, desolation, and renewal of nature's balance.

In the first, men adapt themselves to nature, not trying to exploit the earth but subordinating themselves to its processes. This is the primitive and pastoral stage, when men live on game and fish and wild fruits, or when they follow their herds and flocks wherever the best grass may be found. The early American Indians were examples of the primitive, and the early Persians and Babylonians were examples of the pastoral. Men then lived in harmony with nature. In every country this first long stage of man's relation to nature is evident.

PRIMITIVE MAN IN HARMONY WITH NATURE

In America the primitive stage lasted until the white man came. The balance of nature was in no wise disturbed for the long centuries before, and even for many decades after the settlers came. These were the days when fish and wildlife were found everywhere in profusion—the days of the beaver, of the roaring buffalo herds, and of the skies darkened with passenger pigeons. Never had there been seen such broad wildernesses of trees, such wide expanses of grazing land, such varieties and quantities of wildlife. These resources were so great and the number of people so small that men hardly made a dent in them for generations. This was then the land of individual effort and opportunity. There wasn't a single unemployed man in all America in 1700, unless he was in jail. Men's rewards in those days were just about in proportion to their energy and their initiative.

Then the second stage began—the period of expansion and development, and of exploitation and waste. Railroads came, but the beaver and the buffalo passed. The passenger pigeon disappeared and wildlife everywhere had to be protected. An empire of grazing lands became almost exhausted. Thousands of acres of buffalo grass were plowed up for wheat, and a few years afterwards the skies were darkened, not with passenger pigeons, but with millions of tons of the best soil of the West. Men were also digging and boring into the earth for metals, for coal, and for oil. The process of rapid exhaustion began in these resources and is still continuing.

SPOLIATION OF FORESTS

And about the timberlands? Nowhere did this stage of spoliation apply so relentlessly as to the Nation's forests. First, of course, came the assault upon the pines and hardwoods of the Atlantic coast region, then upon those in the Middle States, then upon the pines and hemlocks of the Lake States region, then upon the yellow pines and hardwoods of the South, and finally upon the firs and other evergreens of the Pacific coast. The more millionaries there were, the more vigorous the attack became.

The big sawmills ran day and night. Vertical blades, which cut 5,000 feet a day, gave way to the circular saw, which cut three or four times that much. Then the endless blade of the band saw revolutionized the whole process. In one mill on the Columbia River 1,000,000 feet a day was cut. One pity of all this was that seven-eighths of the timber was wasted. The young growth was cleared out by the swampers, or it was broken and gnarled by the falling of the large trees. The slash was piled 30 feet high in some places—huge firetraps. And the forest fires came, of course, the like of which had never been seen before

FOREST FIRES

Dr. Walter Havighurst of Miami University, Ohio, in a remarkable article written several years ago, dramatically described the atmosphere of these great fires He said:

"I grew up in a Wisconsin lumber town. In the autumn months there was always the terrible fog of forest fires in the air, and the sun was a dull dollar in the sky. At night there were no stars and people slept tensely with that faint fear in their throats, wondering if the wind would change in the night."

When I lived in Louisiana around the turn of the century, this process of cutting and slashing and burning was going on all over the State. A large sawmill would rarely be in one place more than 10 years. It would cut and slash the timber, leave the place desolate, and move on. It has left many ghost towns in its wake. One lumber town in Louisiana had 5,000 people in 1917. It had churches, schools, paved streets, and parks. By 1927, the mill and the timber had gone and the town had one inhabitant. Literally the grass was growing in the streets and the houses were occupied by bats an wild animals.

From 1909 on for 25 years I lived in Idaho. There I saw the same process going on in the West The most desolate lands I ever saw were those in Washington, Oregon, and North Idaho where the lands had been denuded of their finest fir, tamarack, and white pines, and laid waste. No attention was paid at first to selective cutting, to preservation of the young timber or to fire prevention.

DESOLATION

Dr. Havighurst again describes the process of desolation in graphic words:

"When all the forest was ruined," he said, "they blew the long whistle and the town was abandoned. When the echoes died away, desolation settled down. Grass grew up in the streets, the saloons and dance halls decayed in the sun. The landing that had swarmed with teamsters and loaders and whistle punks became a burrow for muskrats. The vast piratic enterprise left its empty camps and its abandoned towns scattered over the ruined North "

It all adds up to this—of almost 1,000,000 acres of original forest land in the United States, only one-half, or about 460,000,000 acres, are now available for producing timber. Nearly all the finest forests are gone and on millions of acres the seedbeds for the best trees have been burned. It would take a long time for such lands to seed themselves and to grow forests like the original, if they ever would. And in some sections of the country, particularly the West, it takes a hundred or more years to grow the big trees. There is in the statehouse at Boise, Idaho, a crosssection of a large western pine with markers showing how large the tree was at different important events in the history of the United States. It was a good-sized tree when Washington was President.

STILL GOING ON

The process of destroying the forests of the country is still going on, not so rapidly as in the past but faster than they are being replaced by growth. There is much less waste now than before, and cutting practices are gradually improving everywhere. There is more selective cutting, more cleaning up of slash, and more fire protection than ever before. But there is still a long way to go. Government holdings—national parks and forests and State timberlands—have largely increased within recent years. Improved practices for cutting on these lands and for fire protection have not only benefited the timber in these reserves but have spread into cooperative efforts by and with private owners on their lands.

In spite of all this, however, there remains much to be done. In a recent report by a special committee of the Department of Agriculture, it was pointed out that the war has taken a heavy toll of timber in both public and private holdings; that the consumption of wood products is far exceeding the amount that is being grown. The committee found that the need is "to double the present growth of saw timber and all other timber as well." The restoration of these forests to full productivity, the committee concluded, would provide employment for hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people.

TENNESSEE GOING THROUGH SAME STAGE

Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley, of course, have been going through this same stage for more than a hundred years. The lumber industry was one of the first major industries developed in the Tennessee Valley. During the early years, most of the lumber was produced by small circular mills and used by the settlers for homes and other construction purposes. Later on, when transportation facilities improved, large mills were brought in from the North where they had just finished cutting the virgin timber. These operators bought large tracts of timber and by the close of the nineteenth century lumbering operations had reached large-scale proportions. The peak came in 1909, when more than one and one-half billion board-feet was produced. Since then production has been going down, except during the present war, when production has been about 1,000,000,000 board-feet per year. Most of the virgin timber is gone, and most of the large mills have abandoned the territory.

In 1939, when the T. V. A. made a study of the situation, it was found that about 90 percent of the lumber produced was by small mills with a daily capacity of less than 20,000 feet. And it was found also that for a long time there has been a steady and increased loss of forest capital. The drain has far exceeded and is now exceeding the growth of saw timber. It is estimated that this drain has been and is now about one and three-tenths times as great as the annual growth of saw timber.

AN EARLY REPORT

The timberlands within the valley have practically all been cut over, many more than once. And they have been burned over repeatedly. One of the most interesting documents that has come to my attention is a report in 1874 by the State of Tennessee on the resources of the State. It discusses timber resources at considerable length. It deplores the destruction of the forests that was

then going on. Among other things, the report stated:

"The annual conflagrations that sweep like a devouring fury through the old coaling lands, destroying the young sprouts and rendering barren a large scope of country, should be checked. Old fields are lying idle and unfenced in every portion of the State that could be reclaimed by being planted in trees. They are now unsightly and hideous pictures in the landscape, worthless to the owners and to the State."

The report concludes by saying:

"He who shall be instrumental in restoring the lost fertility of those worn places and making them things of beauty and profit, may well be numbered among the benefactors of the State."

Those were brave and prophetic words in 1874. Nevertheless, the depletion from cutting and from fires has gone on. The old, exploitive cutting practices have continued, and there have been and now are something like 10,000 fires every year in the Tennessee Valley and about three-quarters of a million acres of land are burned over annually.

DRAIN EXCEEDS GROWTH

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that our capital in the Tennessee Valley forests is being depleted at a serious rate. Instead of being built up, or even holding its own, it is running down at a pretty rapid rate. If the capital in our banks, in our businesses, or in any of our other institutions was being impaired at the same rate, we would know bankruptcy would soon be inevitable.

In spite of the continued depletion of the good saw timber in the Tennessee Valley, however, the forests of the region support an industry of over $100,000,000 income a year. There are some 3,500 sawmills and wood-using industries within the area. When one realizes that the total income from farm products received by the farmers in Tennessee in 1941 was only $109,000,000, the importance of this industry and of the remaining timber resources of the valley is very evident. It is estimated that 1 family out of every 12 gains its livelihood from work in this industry.

What is the future, then, of the timberlands and the woodworking industries in the Tennessee Valley? Will it be necessary for the few large mills to close down in the course of a few years because of the lack of good timber? Must the income from this industry constantly decrease? Is there a way out?

THE WAY OUT

Not only can the industry be maintained, but those who know most about forestry development and management insist that its annual income can be doubled or even trebled. They say also that the forest lands can be improved and their effectiveness for watershed protection be greatly increased. It can be done by management—by a widespread program of society cooperating with nature. This is the third stage of man's relation to nature.

Let us see what this means and what has been done within the last few years in that direction. Through the combined efforts of the State forestry agencies, the Extension Services, the United States Forest Service, and the T. V. A., there have been set up in the valley several industrial and institutional forest management demonstrations, and hundreds of farm woodland demonstrations. All these have been based upon the principle of sustained yield. There have been adopted selective cutting practices, reforestation and erosion control, and utilization of what had been regarded in the past as waste materials. Forest-fire control has been largely extended in all of the valley States, although it is still far from being adequate in many sections. Surveys have been made of kind, quality, and amount of forest growth.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION TREES

In the last 12 years more than 150,000,000 seedlings from T. V. A. nurseries have been set out in the valley, in addition to other millions produced in the State nurseries. An educational program conducted by the several State and Federal agencies is making people conscious of forest deterioration—conscious of the bad cutting practices, conscious of the waste, conscious of the fire menace. Efforts have been made to create an anti-forest-fire attitude, an anti-soil-erosion attitude. Up to June 30, 1944, there had been held nearly 6,000 meetings of farmers and landowners in the region, with an attendance of close to three-quarters of a million people, where these problems have been discussed. This included hundreds of meetings with school children and teachers. More than 20 community forest-fire-control plans had been put into operation, and organized fire control has been extended to 15 additional valley counties.

There is no better example of progress than that found here in Wayne County. Recently I saw an article written about Wayne County developments. The writer began the article in this way: "I have seen a miracle." Of course I read on, delighted with the story of what has taken place in this county during the last 3 or 4 years. I shall not, of course, go into the details of the story for you know them. It is the story of your achievements. It tells how you had long been subjected to the inequities of forest exploitation, how you finally broke with the past, how you took stock of your remaining timber resources, and how you have much improved a situation that a few years ago seemed almost hopeless.

WAYNE COUNTY EXAMPLE

For the sake of those who do not live in this county, however, let me summarize the story. It is one of which all Tennesseans may be proud. It is one in which the people here have adopted a policy of growing timber instead of merely cutting it. Eighty percent of Wayne County is in timber and probably always will be. Its 13,600 residents are classified by the Census Bureau as rural; and Waynesboro, the county seat and largest community, has a population of a little over 1,000. For 50 years the valuable hardwoods were cut and barged to St. Louis, Cincinnati, and New Orleans. Some of the operators gave little thought to the future of the county. It was their policy to buy land and stumpage cheap, skim off the cream, and move on.

By 1940, only cut-over remnants of a once unbroken timber stand remained. Yet about half of the able-bodied men in the county worked at least part time in the wood-using industries. In that year a T. V. A. forester, working with the State Division of Forestry, moved to the county. He traveled up and down the county, getting acquainted with the people, holding more than 300 meetings and talking about the timber situation. He wrote articles for the newspapers, tacked up posters, and talked about forest fires.

WHAT COUNTY IS DOING

Late in the year 1941, a group of interested landowners met and formed the Wayne County Forest Protective Association. They raised among themselves $450 which was matched by the State; a motorized crew was set up to look after fires on 60,000 acres around the Waynesboro lookout tower. Later on your Lutt's tower was built of wood because no steel could be obtained. This overlooked 75,000 acres and was taken care of by another motorized crew. In 1943 the county court contributed $1,000 which was matched by the State and two more crews were installed. There are now six lookout towers and six crews. During the 5 years preceding these efforts there had been an average of 12,000 acres burned over; in 1943 there were only 3,000 acres burned. Sentiment had grown so strong in the county that an old trapper remarked: "Mister, I'd shoot my own brother if I caught him firin' the woods."

Not only had Wayne County people been working on reduction of forest fires, they were changing their ways of cutting the timber. The landowners took hold of this matter with the same vigor they did fire protection. Hassell & Hughes Lumber Co. has done one of the most encouraging things that has come to my attention in the whole field of forest conservation. In 1943 this company had to make a major decision. Most of the pine saw-timber had been cut on their 70,000-acre holdings. Should they complete the liquidation and go out of business or should they revise their cutting practices and plan a permanent operation?

PERPETUAL HARVEST

T. V. A. foresters made an inventory. They estimated that the present stand of timber is growing new wood at the rate of 5,300,000 board feet each year. If 3,000,000 feet were cut each year the annual gain would be 2,300,000 feet. After 10 years of this kind of management the volume of timber would have increased to 100,000,000 board feet. This suggestion has been followed by the company, and by so doing it will in 20 years have a stable industry based on a growing stock of 150,000,000 board feet of high-quality timber, and a perpetual annual harvest of 7,500,000 board feet. By making other adjustments the company has continued to run without decreasing its income or the number of its employees. I take off my hat to the people of Wayne County and to the Hassell & Hughes Lumber Co. You have performed a miracle.

The work in this county has served as an example for a number of other demonstrations in the Tennessee Valley. It has led six owners of properties aggregating 210,000 acres in Virginia, Tennessee, and North Carolina to explore the possibilities and to initiate similar demonstrations on their own properties. It has encouraged the hundreds of farmers who are using their woodlands as demonstration projects. This is applied resource development based on the natural law of sustained production.

There has been much talk about the 24,000 agricultural demonstration farms in the Valley, and people come from all over the world to see them. The woodland demonstration farms and the industrial forest demonstration areas may likewise create Nation-wide, if not world-wide, attention. The results that are coming from these forest demonstrations, and especially the Wayne County demonstration, would seem to be as significant in forest conservation as the demonstration farms in soil conservation. It would be difficult to find any conservation demonstration more heartening than that in your own county.

WHAT OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE DONE

There are other countries in the world that have practically solved the problem of forest conservation. As far back as 1752, Sweden classified her land in a land-use survey. The United States is just now thinking of such a survey. In Sweden there are sawmills that have been in continuous operation for 200 years. Of course, they cut the timber only when it matures; they protect it from fire; they carefully protect the young growth of timber. After two centuries of large-scale lumbering, there is more timber in Sweden now than there was in the year 1700. Denmark has twice as much forest now as she had 50 years ago.

The people of the Tennessee Valley can do the same thing whenever they make up their minds to it. Wayne County is pointing the way.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt and President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four editorials, two being from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, one entitled "Franklin Delano Roosevelt" and the other "President Truman," one from the Philadelphia Record entitled "He Died in Service," and another from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Franklin Delano Roosevelt" all of date April 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 13, 1945]

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

President Franklin D. Roosevelt has expended the last ounce of his strength in the service of his country and passed on. This tragedy befalls at the most critical moment of the world's history.

Not alone is our President stricken, but hundreds of millions who looked to him for leadership feel the blow. He carried the flaming torch of victory to the very verge of triumph. His skill and his indomitable will were counted upon to shape the future security of the family of nations.

President Roosevelt had risen to his position of world preeminence by way of a succession of steps that won him first the esteem and confidence of his own followers and the respect of his political opponents. He had, to begin with, broad knowledge of public affairs, a magnetic personality, a sense of humor, a deep sympathy for the underprivileged, a keen political acumen, and a dogged determination to conquer his physical infirmity that won universal admiration.

With these assets and a record of achievement in public service, he came into control of domestic affairs at a time of economic upheaval that threatened to end in chaos. He adopted drastic measures to cope with the fear that lay at the bottom of the national unrest of that period. He followed up with advocacy of almost revolutionary social reforms. His was the unprecedented distinction of winning four elections to the Presidency.

This eminence in a country of commanding wealth, natural resources, and industrial development made President Roosevelt's convictions about foreign affairs matters of supreme international importance. The world took notice when he spoke his mind—and it was the American mind—in condemnation of aggressor nations. He tried by warnings to divert the dictators from self-destruction through pursuit of their ambitions. He saw more clearly than most of his countrymen whither the world was heading.

When war came, President Roosevelt shaped his course to safeguard American interests. What the outcome of his struggle to unify national sentiment might have been but for the incredible stupidity of the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and Hitler's declaration of war none can say. The folly of the aggressors fused American national will overnight. It stood four-square behind its leader's determination to beat Germany and Japan into unconditional surrender. It subscribed to his belief that the price we must pay now for freedom is less than the cost of world submission to a hateful tyranny.

Upon our entry into the war the President plunged, unsparingly of himself, into an active personal participation that would have worn down many a man of stronger physique. Regardless of risks to health and life, he repeatedly crossed the oceans to confer with the leaders of our allies. He took a direct hand in the planning of military and political strategy. He devoted himself to ironing out difficulties. He cemented ties that produced unity and assured victory.

And now, with military triumph over Hitlerism apparently only a matter of days—or at most of weeks—now, with the nations about to assemble at San Francisco to go over the blueprints for a shock-proof structure of world security; now, with the world leaning more heavily than ever upon his council and guidance—he pays the price of a devotion to duty, a courageous acceptance of overbearing responsibility, that carried him beyond his strength.

Truly, the United States has lost a great President, the United Nations a powerful champion, the world an outstanding humanitarian leader.

In this hour of consternation and grief petty political considerations are forgotten. Americans will see Franklin Delano Roosevelt in a clearer perspective. History will record in indelible words the devotion of his extraordinary talents to the realization of humanity's hope—peace and prosperity for all.

A stunned and sorrowing world pays tribute to his memory. His is a name that will ever be remembered in his own country with gratitude and pride.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Normally a change in the Presidency caused by death has been of real concern only in this country. But the transfer of Presidential power due to the passing of Mr. Roosevelt is a matter that stirs the whole world. For possible changes in American policy might affect all humankind.

The world must needs ask, what manner of man is Harry S. Truman? How does he stand as to prosecution of the war? The making of the peace? The fulfilment of the hopes of the peoples everywhere for security against other wars, new aggression?

The answer of his record is reassuring. It will comfort the friends of freedom, deprive our enemies of even the faintest hope that the change in Washington will save them from their just fate.

The new President has been one of the most useful Members of Congress in promoting effective prosecution of the war. The Senate inquiry over which he presided has served to prevent delays, cut out abuses, and curb morale-shaking profiteering.

On every issue concerning the war, the peace, the due punishment of our enemies, he has been on the right side. The record supports the pledges he now makes.

He comes from simple folk, of the sturdy stock that has given the Nation some of its best Chief Executives. His is a call to meet the need not only of the present, but of future generations, that would challenge any American to offer of his best.

As the war enters its closing phase in Europe, thoughts naturally center more and more on the problem of security. There is matter for encouragement in the belief that President Truman's influence with the Senate, born of a decade of service in that branch of Congress, will be helpful in getting that body in line with the people's will.

The American people have faith today that their new President will measure up to the high responsibilities to which destiny beckons him. Regardless of party, they will rally to his support in this hour of grief and crisis.

[From the Philadelphia Record of April 13, 1945]

HE DIED IN SERVICE

The only tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt we can put into words tonight is one we pay in common with millions more throughout the world.

President Roosevelt was our friend. We were proud of that.

Millions were proud to call him friend. That was the quality of his greatness. He was a friend of all mankind.

Now, at the floodtide of victory in Germany, even as our highest Army officers forecast the end of hostilities "in a few days," our President joins the gold-star honor roll of American war casualties. He was just as much a war casualty as any G. I. Joe laid low by an enemy bullet.

Few of us have realized how hard Franklin Roosevelt drove himself, how he spared nothing, least of all his strength and devotion. Perhaps he knew it would be this way, that he decided all he had to give must be given before it was too late.

We may grieve that he has not lived to see completion of the Allied triumph which he planned so brilliantly and with such uncanny foresight. Yet before he passed on he could have no doubts that triumph was inevitable and imminent.

Posterity will think of us as "the Roosevelt generation." Often with envy. There never has been any doubt that his place in history was preeminent and secure.

History also will record that he was as great in peace as he was in war, a recognition already given him by the Nation—through unprecedented election to four terms in the White House.

Yes, he was a valiant leader; loved by his people because he wholeheartedly loved them.

He is gone. And the only mitigation of the Nation's sorrow is the realization that providence gave him to America when America needed him most.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 13, 1945]

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Immeasurably shocked by the sudden death of their President, the American people feel an acute sense of loss that is intensified by the especially tragic circumstances of his passing at the climax of his long and devoted service to his country's welfare.

To be deprived of Franklin D. Roosevelt's militant leadership just as the day of victory over America's cruel foes is beginning to dawn, just as he was preparing to exercise his powerful influence toward insuring the future peace of the world, constitutes a stunning blow to the Nation as it bows its head in sorrow.

Few of his illustrious predecessors had been forced to bear so many and so grave responsibilities and burdens. None had been called upon to contend against such a grievous physical handicap as marked his long years of office.

President Roosevelt's splendid triumph over his grave disability, which would have caused a lesser man to give up in despair, will ever remain an inspiring object lesson to American youth. His death at this particular hour of the Nation's history recalls poignantly the tragedy of Abraham Lincoln, who, also laden with the cares of a great war, died only a few days after the preservation of the Union had been assured.

History will appraise Mr. Roosevelt's true place among the world's great statesmen, but at this moment of national mourning certain facts stand out, in the amazing career of the

man who was four times elected President of the United States, that admit of no dispute.

From early manhood and during his service as a member of the New York Legislature and Governor of the State Mr. Roosevelt had evinced a keenly sympathetic interest in the lot of the poor and underprivileged.

After he became President it was natural that he should continue this humanitarian interest by proposing and urging far-reaching measures of social reform, including the system of social security which provides pensions for the aged unable to earn a living.

Shortly before his death, Mr. Roosevelt had lent his active support to plans for greatly expanding these benefits to our people.

The Nation-wide campaign for the prevention and cure of infantile paralysis will ever be associated with Mr. Roosevelt's name. The famous institution at Warm Springs, Ga., was especially near to his heart, and the March of Dimes has become an annual national enterprise productive of untold good to countless sufferers from the dread disease. His leading part in this beneficent work will never be forgotten.

At a time when the danger signals were flying over unhappy Europe, Mr. Roosevelt was prompt to perceive the gathering storm and to warn his countrymen to be prepared.

In his memorable and striking speech in Chicago, he clearly portrayed the perils to America of a world ablaze with war and urged the adoption of measures to quarantine and curb all would-be aggressors.

He was quick to realize the folly of attempting to appease such bloodthirsty monsters as Hitler and Mussolini and to advocate preparations for the defense of our own country on a scale commensurate with its huge material and military resources.

A beginning was made toward strengthening our Nation's bulwarks, but only a beginning, for it was difficult to overcome the obstinate prejudices and shortsightedness of those isolationists who foolishly believed that the United States could withdraw into a watertight compartment and be secure.

Then came the Japanese stab in the back at Pearl Harbor, unparalleled, as Mr. Roosevelt so righteously declared, in the annals of infamy, and an aroused Nation leaped into the war under his vigorous leadership.

Long before America was forced to join the fight against the international gangsters, Mr. Roosevelt had perceived the impossibility of pursuing a neutral course. With scant regard for precedents and technicalities, he had moved to obtain for our Nation strategic outposts of defense which were later to prove their inestimable value.

When war came, President Roosevelt did more than issue a clarion call to arms. Under his direction, Congress moved swiftly to fit the Nation for a conflict which, he warned, would be long and arduous.

He initiated the program for building the greatest Navy the world had ever seen and witnessed its successful conclusion. He stressed the need for harnessing every major industry in the land to the war effort. Today we are reaping the fruits of this enterprising, enlightened leadership.

In order to further the progress of the war, Mr. Roosevelt never spared himself but endured the dangers and hardships of long-distance journeys by air and sea to confer and plan with the leaders of our allies.

It was natural that the stress and strain induced by these extraordinary exertions, enough to break down a healthy man of half his age, should have given rise to constant fears and anxieties on the part of all good Americans. The supreme tragedy is that he did not live to see his efforts for victory and an enduring peace brought to final accomplishment.

It may be said of President Roosevelt that he gave his life for his country as truly as the soldier who is slain on the firing line. He died in the path of duty. He could have wished for no better epitaph.

Why Italy Should Be Accepted As An Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, April 11, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, April 25 will mark the beginning of a new era. The conference at San Francisco will decide whether or not the "four freedoms" mean what they say and apply to all nations.

Representatives of the United States have been invited to attend the conference to discuss the new world peace organization. America and other Allied Nations have it within their power, by extending the hand of friendship and encouragement to the Italian people and backing up this gesture with lend-lease aid, to avoid chaos and destruction and to imbue them with new hope, faith, and trust in the United Nations.

Conditions in Italy have become such that unless new life, encouragement, and hope are extended to the people of Italy, it will be plunged into a protracted period of chaos and despair, which would be calamitous for the peace and progress of the 45,000,000 people of Italy.

The people of Italy, by the shedding of their blood and by the endurance of starvation and other privations, are giving unquestionable proof of their sincerity of purpose in attempting to destroy and defeat all Nazi and Fascist military and nonmilitary forces and influence. Their courage and sacrifices have been recognized and praised by the leaders of the United Nations, and in all their actions and deeds, the people of Italy have proven themselves to be the firm friends and allies of the United Nations.

The plight of the people of Italy demands early and effective action by our Government and the other Allied Nations, so as to continue to secure the cooperation and support and confidence of the democratic peoples of Italy. I believe that recognition of Italy as an ally of the United Nations would be a strong force in giving the people of Italy the uplift, new courage, and a new spirit in their struggle to build a genuine democracy.

Certainly the Italy of tomorrow, the democratic Italy that we American citizens of Italian origin have labored to create, at the request of our Government, first, by our appeals beamed over the air waves to the people of Italy to revolt against their Fascist-Nazi oppressors, lay down their arms and accept the guaranties of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"; and now, by the blood and sacrifices of soldiers of Italian origin, 1,000,000 strong, fighting on every battle front in the American service, have given and are giving ample proof of their devotion and valor, and are laying their lives on the field of battle; and the 7,000,000 loyal American citizens of Italian origin residing in America, and many millions of others interested in true democracy, have expressed a sincere desire and hope through their organizations, their leaders, the press, and the labor organizations, that such sacrifices and hopes and sincere cooperation on the part of the people of Italy shall not go unrecognized by our Government and other Allied Nations.

I urge that the United Nations extend their formal recognition to Italy as an ally of this World War, and also extend to Italy an invitation to attend the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to thank you for extending to me the courtesy of permitting me to appear before you today to urge that Italy be recognized as a full and equal ally.

Government by Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to the constantly growing volume of "directives" and regulations today pouring out of the Federal agencies here in Washington. This is a matter of serious concern to Members of Congress and to people in all parts of the United States. The question, which I ask again today, is pointedly, "When is Congress going to do something about it?" Quite a few of us asked this question last year when the renewal of the Emergency Price Control Act gave Congress a simple and excellent opportunity to make certain amendments to that act.

With that in mind, and with another renewal coming up shortly, it is interesting to read the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 8, 1945. It was written by Warren B. Francis, the Times staff correspondent in Washington. The Octopus, to which Mr. Francis refers, is a mimeographed sheet put out weekly by C. J. S. Williamson, the Washington representative of the California State Chamber of Commerce. It shows briefly the regulations, orders, directives, and other evasions of the constitutional intention to make the Senate and the House of Representatives the lawmaking bodies of Congress. It has surprised and interested me as much as it did Mr. Francis, when he wrote this editorial:

GOVERNMENT BY DECREE

(By Warren B. Francis)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Few people seem to do anything about the weather, as Mark Twain observed. Nor do they do anything about Government by decree.

Several years ago an enterprising advertising man won a seat in Congress by promising to repeal a law a day. The time seems to be ripe for a candidate who will promise to hold down the issuance of directives to one a day.

Careful checking of the official records shows that miscellaneous Government agencies issued 1,338 orders, rules, regulations, amendments, and other instructions in a 3-week period. Lawyers, businessmen, Washington observers, and even bureaucrats cannot keep up with this stream of decrees unless they devote full time to checking on the revisions, modifications, changes, and interpretations.

A GREAT FLOOD

Historically, Executive orders signified a White House decision. They were aimed at other Federal agencies, at assorted Government officers. They have come from the President's office in legitimate fashion for generations. These formal documents bear the President's signature.

The stream of proclamations, ultimatums, and other directives lately has reached the proportion of a surging flood. They have the standing of Executive orders, though signed by a host of individuals, and also the effect of congressional enactments.

In the case of laws, presumably some debate and discussion and deliberation precedes final approval. In the case of Executive orders, there is no such assurance.

SOME OF THE FACTS

The degree to which the administrative branch of the Government has taken advantage of hastily conferred authority to tell the people where to head in cannot be appreciated without a few statistics.

Thanks to the research of an enterprising Californian, some of these vital facts are available. The Washington representative of the California Chamber of Commerce, Charles J. S. Williamson, has noted there were, on a single day, 33 pages of "detailed amended instructions in relation to meat inspection." He adds, pointedly, "What meat?"

In one 7-day period the output of rules, orders, decrees, and other directives ran from a high of 168 to a low of 62, totaling 444 for the week. One order carried nearly 50 footnotes, referring affected parties to earlier versions.

This "octopus," to steal a phrase from the industrious Californian, seems to be an insidious animal. He is infiltrating into the home-front ranks with the persistence of Japanese. He is using a streamlined model of the "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em" vehicle. He is using the war effort as a smoke screen to cloak his movements.

Significant warning about the dangers of government by decree can be found in a congressional report warning about the number of orders signed by the President. This does not enumerate the volume of decrees from such agencies as the O. P. A., W. M. C., W. P. B., and other alphabetical conglomerations.

HOW LONG?

Ironically, the "do this—or else" notices derive the force of law by being printed in the Federal Register. Not one is enforceable—as in the case of the curfew—until it appears in that publication. The Federal Register, incidentally, bears the motto, "Littera Scripta Manet." Loosely translated, this means "The written word remains."

A review of the orders, etc., prompts two questions: How long does the written word govern the conduct of the Nation? When is somebody going to do something about it?

The Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. William S. Bennet, president of the Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution, on the death of President Roosevelt at a meeting of the New York Chapter, S. A. R., at the Hotel Plaza April 12, 1945:

As president of the Empire State Society, S. A. R., I feel that we should all leave this meeting with a united thought. We are all Americans. Eighty years ago this month Abraham Lincoln lay dead at the hand of an assassin. That also was at a time of great crisis. Here in this city, Gen. James A. Garfield was called upon to address from a hotel balcony a vast throng of silent, anxious people. He said but one sentence: "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives." Today, also, that is the guiding thought of every true American.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

After a careful consideration of the policies adopted at the Yalta Conference we, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at a meeting of the United Polish Societies, consisting of all (23) the Polish-American organizations in the city of Hartford, Conn., February 28, 1945, at the Polish National Home, 100 Governor Street, Hartford, Conn., approaching from an American point of view cannot approve of the stand adopted by the President of the United States, a country for which our predecessors have fought to establish a truly democratic and liberty-loving system of government and we condemn the high-handed treachery at Yalta of our American ideals.

We have never had any occasion to complain, and believe us we hate to reproach our President, but we are profoundly disturbed by this gross injustice to the people of Poland, not because we share a common heritage of blood, but because like the average American we demand a better solution to this problem, which we believe as it stands will have sown seeds for hatred and resentment which will eventually plunge the world into another World War and in which the United States will again be involved.

Is this to be a reward that awaits the Polish fighting men and women on the battlefields far flung from their native land and those unsung heroes of the Polish underground? Do you think, that in an attempt to salvage the hurt pride and outraged feelings of the fighting Polish forces, to offer them asylum in this country, will be sufficient and a satisfactory solution of their predicament in face of being outlawed from their native land by Moscow imposed puppet regime? Is this to be their reward for their important part they played in defense of Great Britain, for their bloody sacrifices at Tobruk, in Italy and other battlefields, on land, in the air and on the sea? Is this to be a reward awaiting the Polish nation for defending her heritage as well as the heritage of other freedom-loving nations at all times, when freedom was at stake? Is this the gratitude shown by the Democratic nations of the so-called Western civilization, to throw the Polish nation to the well-predicated fate and mercy of the most brutal dictatorships in the history of the world? In return for being the bulwark of the western civilization against all the aggressions which have always come from the east.

The Polish people, although not alone in their struggle against the German aggressor, are being discriminated against. Britain and the United States are condoning the aggression from the east, at the same time exacting a heavy toll of lives to bring down Germany to its knees.

Our position is very clear. We shall never acknowledge any aggression and the outrages committed upon the land of our forefathers. Our troops are driving out the invader from lands belonging to the English crown. In anticipation of any changes favorable to the Polish nation, we are at the same time prepared for even a greater enchantment, to which we shall react not with tears and pleas for mercy, but shall expend all our energies in building a resistance with such strength of character that even the mightiest enemy cannot tear down.

Today, we may not be a match for brutal force; but we, solemnly promise the American nation, though they deal us even a deadlier blow than this, that we shall not waiver in our obligations as pledged in the allegiance to our flag under whose stars and stripes countless numbers of freedom-loving peoples saw the light of day, and are fighting to preserve the untarnished tradition our flag represents.

We shall teach our children to love truth, freedom, and beauty, though there be none around them. We shall coach them carefully to follow in the footsteps of the founders and makers of our Constitution and we shall assure them "that he who breaks faith with our American ideals shall be judged by history and future generations for his treacherous acts."

We shall preserve dignity and honor to the end, and let not malice enter our hearts. The destiny of the world is in the hand of God, and not in the hands of the dictators.

We agree that amongst the Polish people there are certain tendencies toward disfavor and distrust in regard to Russia. But if those tendencies exist it is only fitting to ask why.

The answer is clear. Despite the best of intentions it is impossible to forget through one generation all that Russia has done to Poland for the last century and a half.

For a century and a half Russia had tortured the Poles, as she is doing now. Thousands were sent to Siberia, thousands thrown into prisons, as she did with several million of the best part of her own population, the Ukrainians particularly. The use of Polish language was forbidden, worship of God was interfered with. Every tiny glimmer of national Polish life was quickly and rigorously extinguished, same as it is being done now with the aid of the treacherous Moscow-sponsored puppets of professional Communists.

Can all this be forgotten and so quickly disregarded? And now let us pass to the period of Soviet rule in Russia. This period began with splendid and lofty promises and assurances made by the U. S. S. R. to Poland. In a sweeping gesture the Bolshevik leaders broke with all acts of violence Poland's rights to the integrity of the territory and her sovereignty. And this was not done in the moments of Russia's weakness, as some subsidized publicists and agents try to influence the American public opinion. Poland was in fact weaker militarily. But her spirit was undaunted and it will remain undaunted.

However, in spite of these lofty disavowals by the Communist leaders, continuous struggles were fomented within Poland by Moscow Communist agents.

We are deeply convinced that if Russian people had understood the necessity or given the change to determine the necessity for an amicable and honest policy toward Poland, honest in our sense of the word, then without a doubt, friendly relations based upon a mutual respect and the recognition of their respective interest between the two countries could have been established.

International laws, international justice and international morality must be equally applied to all nations and then cannot be opportunistically stretched one way or another to make them applicable to current needs of some single nation, because as practice has shown such a procedure inevitably leads to catastrophe: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the press, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Connecticut, to the members of the American delegation to the coming San Fransisco United Nations Conference, to the Secretary of State, and to our parent organization the Polish-American Congress in Chicago.

Furthermore, we urge our Government to use its good offices in facilitating and speeding relief to the destitute people of Poland, now that the Nazi aggressor has been driven out of that country. This alone will demonstrate most effectively Russia's willingness to cooperate with the United Nations.

Adopted at Hartford, Conn., February 28, 1945.

STANLEY A. OZIMEK,
President.
EDWARD I. JAKOWSKI,
Secretary.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas it has been a matter of common knowledge for several decades that our Federal postal employees are among the hardest worked and poorest paid of all public servants; and

Whereas the exigencies of war have greatly increased the labors and duties of these faithful servants to a point where a large proportion of them are working to the very limits of their capacity; and

Whereas a temporary war bonus of $6 per week, the postal employees' first pay increase of any kind since 1925, will expire in June of this year; and

Whereas H. R. 2071, now pending before Congress, and planned to permanently replace above temporary increase, must pass by July 1, 1945, else postal employees' wages will revert to their former status, and instead of receiving a small merited increase over what they now receive, postal workers will suffer a cut of $6 per week: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this councilmanic body of the city of Los Angeles, representing one of the most significant war production centers in America and a city of magnificent distances which add materially to the requirements placed upon our postal workers, does hereby petition and pray the Congress of the United States of America for the speedy passage of H. R. 2071, to the end that further injustice may be prevented to a large and loyal group of public servants; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in Washington, D. C., and to Members of Los Angeles County's delegation in the House of Representatives, and to California's two Members of the United States Senate.

Boxcar and Grain Storage Situation in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report from the Kansas State United States Department of Agriculture War Board covering the boxcar and grain storage situation in Kansas at the present time.

This report clearly indicates the necessity for getting more boxcars into Kansas at once if we are going to avoid a shocking loss of food and livestock feed:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
U. S. D. A. WAR BOARD,
Manhattan, Kans., April 14, 1945.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Kansas State U. S. D. A. War Board submits the following summary statement as a second report on the boxcar and grain storage situation.

1. The April 10 Kansas Crop Report issued by the Agricultural Statistician for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the State Board of Agriculture shows that farm stocks of grain on Kansas farms are 33 percent larger than those of a year ago.

2. Stocks of grain in practically all country elevators make impossible the acceptance of deliveries from farms unless some loading out into grain cars is accomplished. The January 1, 1945, stocks of wheat in interior mills, elevators, and warehouses were 21,360,000 bushels compared to 16,500,000 bushels a year ago and 16,644,000 bushels for the years 1935–43.

3. County agricultural conservation committees report that 650,000 bushels of grain sorghum and about 2,450,000 bushels of corn are on the ground at present and deteriorating in quality.

4. The moisture content of much of the grain sorghum and corn now in storage is very high and quality will deteriorate rapidly when warm weather arrives.

5. The Kansas Crop Report indicates a 1945 wheat crop in Kansas totaling 231,557,000 bushels. If this production is secured, it will be the second largest crop on record. Favorable moisture conditions continue to benefit most of the major grain producing areas of central and western Kansas.

6. There has been no noticeable change in the boxcar movement into this area recently. The very large stocks of grain in bins and elevators and the moisture content of much of this grain makes it imperative that it be moved. Failure to move the grain will cause loss and will choke the outlets for 1945 crops.

7. It is highly probable that 75,000,000 bushels of wheat and other grain will have to be piled on the ground at harvest time unless all intensive efforts possible are taken to prevent this condition.

8. Agricultural agencies are encouraging farmers to provide adequate storage for at least a portion of the grain which they expect to produce in 1945. Bins owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are being sold and rented and all such bins will be used. Judging from the applications for farm lumber or grain storage construction received, it is our opinion that not enough farmers are availing themselves of the lumber and building materials now available for grain storage. More individual farmers should make their applications at this time before the harvest season arrives.

9. The prospective winter wheat crop is 40,000,000 bushels above last year. April 1 farm stocks of grain (including corn, wheat, oats, and barley) are 23,000,000 bushels above a year earlier. Very heavy farm reserves of sorghum grain (January 1, 1945, farm stocks were 32,000,000 bushels), with grain stocks much heavier than last year, have caused country elevators to become blocked. The situation is becoming extremely critical, particularly throughout the western two-thirds of the State.

It is the opinion of the war board that the only satisfactory solution of the present problem is that more grain cars be made available immediately to move stocks of grain from country elevators.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE NORTON, *Chairman,*
Kansas State U. S. D. A. War Board.

The Expansion of Japanese Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article appearing in the Shipping World of January 31, 1945, entitled "The Expansion of Japanese Shipping, Built for the Purposes of War":

THE EXPANSION OF JAPANESE SHIPPING, BUILT FOR THE PURPOSES OF WAR

(By Sir Archibald Hurd)

The rise of Japan as a commercial sea power was the most sensational event in the history of shipping in the past 50 years. It was largely fostered and financed by the state in pursuit of the policy of aggression to which it has increasingly been committed for many years though the plans were skilfully camouflaged.

At the beginning of this century, Japan owned about half a million tons gross of shipping, other than sail; by 1913 the figure had been trebled; by the end of the First World War, during which the other allies had been preoccupied in defeating the common enemy, suffering heavy losses of tonnage, Japan's merchant shipping had rapidly increased, and by 1919 it was of 2,325,000 tons gross; when she made her treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor and subsequently overran British, French, and Dutch territories, she possessed no less than 5,630,000 tons, all of which was employed in the various amphibious military operations on which she had embarked.

Thus, since the beginning of the century, the expansion has been from about half a million to upwards of five and one-half million tons, and that movement, it is now apparent, was undertaken in preparation for her policy of conquest—quite as clearly as was the development of her Navy. The Japanese taxpayers paid vast sums in expectation of a rich reward. In The History of World Shipping (Fayle), it is stated that "the highly subsidized Japanese lines made

profits so large that they could have distributed a handsome dividend even without the subsidy, which thus became a sheer gift from the nation to the shipowners." The shipping, as well as the shipbuilding industry, was nursed by the Japanese Government, as has since become evident, for the purposes of war.

EARLY OPERATING AND BUILDING SUBSIDIES

As long ago as 1896 laws were passed to encourage the shipping and shipbuilding industries. Under the navigation law of that year any Japanese subject or any commercial company whose partners or shareholders were all Japanese subjects engaged in carrying passengers and cargo between Japan and foreign countries or between foreign ports in their own vessels—which had to be of at least 10,000 tons and registered in the shipping list of the Empire—became entitled to subsidies proportionate to the distance run and the tonnage of the vessels. Under the shipbuilding law, bounties were given for the construction of iron or steel vessels of not less than 700 tons by any Japanese subject or any commercial company whose partners or shareholders were all Japanese. This policy proved costly to the Treasury at Tokyo, but it was regarded as a national investment. Shipyards were laid out, and shipping became a very prosperous adventure, practically without risk of loss. But the expansion of shipping did not keep pace with the ambitions of the Government, and ships were purchased abroad and, of course, qualified for the liberal navigation subsidy.

Year	Built in Japan		Purchased abroad	
	Steam	Sail	Steam	Sail
1898	479	1,301	194	9
1899	554	2,771	199	12
1900	653	3,302	206	7
1901	754	3,559	215	6
1902	813	3,585	220	6
1903	855	5,304	233	8
1904	947	3,324	277	8
1905	1,028	3,508	357	11
1906	1,100	3,859	387	11
1907	1,150	4,033	419	12

Japan had plenty of sailors in the fishing industry, and training schools for officers and men were established, so as to fit them for service in the merchant ships. Japan rapidly developed into a maritime nation of the first rank. Whereas about 77 percent of her exports had formerly been carried in foreign bottoms, Japan's ships were carrying 39 percent by 1902. Her success encouraged further schemes of expansion.

JAPAN AND GERMANY'S SHIPPING

When the last war closed, Japan had not decided what her future relations with other nations should be, for the Anglo-Japanese alliance still existed and was a useful cloak for her warlike policy. As one of the allies, she agreed that Germany, whom she then regarded with jealousy as a rival, should surrender all her oceangoing and half of her smaller ships by way of reparation for the injury she had inflicted on the victors, and in the distribution after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles Japan shared. When the present struggle is over, she will have to surrender all her oceangoing ships if official opinion in the United States is any guide to the course which the peace settlement will take, and she will be barred from the trade routes—for a time, at least.

It is impossible to withhold some measure of admiration for the way in which Japan strengthened her position on the trade routes of the world between the First and Second World Wars without exciting wide suspicion of her ultimate objective. The story of the means which she employed in developing her mercantile marine was not told—and then only partially—until a report of the imperial shipping committee was issued early in 1939 on the eve of the present struggle, when it attracted little attention in or out of Parliament. All the Dominions were represented on the committee, as well as India, while Mr. W. Lionel Hichens, Sir Kenneth Lee, Mr. D. T. Lewis, Mr. Robertson F. Gibb, and Mr. T. Harrison Hughes were also members as "persons experienced in shipping and commerce." The inquiry, over which Sir Halford Mackinder presided, was concerned generally with "British shipping in the Orient." In view of the events of the present war, the revelations as to the manner in which Japanese shipping, as well as shipbuilding, was fostered by the Government, are of particular interest.

The abnormal conditions prevailing during the Great War of 1914–18 diminished the need for subsidies, but soon after the war the annual amount of operating subsidies tended to revert to the dimensions of 1914. From 1922 to 1929, operating subsidies were of the order of 10,000,000 yen a year or, say, £1,000,000 sterling. During this period the Government did not give direct shipbuilding subsidies, but assisted shipbuilders by means of bounties on domestic steel production and certain exemptions from import duties.

In 1929 the Government framed a program for the assistance of shipping in the form of loans on easy terms for shipbuilding. A loan fund of 30,000,000 yen (about £3,000,000 sterling at 1929–30 rates of exchange) was made available, but owing to the world economic depression which followed, little use was made of this facility.

THE POLICY OF SCRAP AND BUILD

In 1932 a new marine policy was initiated with a view to modernizing Japanese shipping. The first of 3 scrap-and-build schemes came into operation in October of that year and provided for the construction of 200,000 tons gross of new shipping, on condition that 2 tons of vessels of 25 years and over were scrapped for each ton of new vessels built under subsidy.

Each new vessel had to be 4,000 tons gross or over, had to be capable of at least 13½ knots speed, and had to be built in a Japanese yard. The subsidy varied between 45 yen per ton for vessels of 13½ knots and 54 yen per ton for vessels over 18 knots. The scheme resulted in the scrapping of 94 vessels of about 400,000 tons gross and in the building of 31 new vessels of about 200,000 tons gross. Fifteen of the new ships are capable of a speed of 18 knots or more, and 13 of these have a gross tonnage of between 6,000 and 8,000 tons. It was estimated that the expenditure involved in building the 31 ships was a little less than 55,000,000 yen. The total Government subsidy was nearly 11,000,000 yen, or about £650,000 sterling at 1934 rates of exchange.[1]

The second and third schemes, which took effect in 1935 and 1936, respectively, were on a smaller scale than the first. Their combined result was the scrapping of 100,000 tons gross, and the construction of 17 vessels of about 100,000 tons gross, the rate of subsidy being little more than half that under the first scheme. The vessels built have a gross tonnage of 4,000 tons or more and are capable of over 14 knots speed.

THE AUTHORITIES WERE NOT SATISFIED

By the early part of 1937 the three scrap-and-build schemes had resulted in the scrapping of some 500,000 tons gross of old tonnage and the construction of 48 fast new ships of some 300,000 tons gross. These 48 ships included more than four-fifths of the total number of Japanese vessels of over 4,000 tons gross and less than 5 years old. At that time, Japan had more tonnage under 5 years of age in proportion to her total tonnage than any other country.

A fourth scheme came into operation in April 1937, and provided for the subsidized construction of high-class passenger and passenger-cargo liners of not less than 6,000 tons gross and 19 knots speed, at rates of subsidy approximating, in some cases, to half the building cost. In a supplement to the Official Gazette of July 1937, it was stated that the subsidies, though payable by installments spread over 18 years, would be paid in respect of construction during the next 4 years of 150,000 tons gross of passenger vessels and 150,000 tons gross of passenger-cargo vessels. It was proposed to spend a total of over 50,000,000 yen (£3,000,000 sterling at current rates of exchange) on this scheme during the 18 years beginning with 1937–38.

GENEROUS CREDIT FACILITIES

The Imperial Shipping Committee's comment on the expansionist movement was as follows:

"In addition to providing direct subsidies, the Japanese Government has always been ready to provide credit facilities for shipping and shipbuilding enterprises. The Government has made arrangements with the Industrial Bank whereby loans for shipbuilding are made at low rates of interest, the rate in mid-1937 being 3.7 percent per annum. The Ministry of Finance adds 1 percent, bringing the bank's receipts from interest on such loans up to 4.7 percent. The Ministry also undertakes to pay to the bank up to 70 percent of any capital lost in case loans are not repaid.

"The system was instituted in 1930, and the bank is at present authorized to make loans of this kind on certain conditions, up to a maximum of 100,000,000 yen within 4 years from 1937–38. The loans may be made only in respect of the building of steel ships of 4,000 gross tons and over and of a speed of 13½ knots or over, but in exceptional cases may be made also in respect of the building of cargo ships of 2,000 tons or over and a speed of 11 knots or over. It is difficult, for obvious reasons to assess the cost to the State of these facilities."

In the opinion of the committee, in comparison with the assistance for building ships, the subsidies for operation were of minor importance. From 1931 to 1938 operating subsidies averaged about thirteen and one-half million yen a year, or, say, £1,000,000 sterling. About half this sum was paid by the Central Government for transoceanic services, and half was paid by the Central Government and the Governments of Formosa, Korea, the South Sea Mandated Territories, North Sakhalin, and Kwantung for coastal services and services to China, Java, and Singapore.

By far the greater part of the estimates for transoceanic subsidized services represent payments to be made to the N. Y. K. and O. S. K. in respect of the following six services. (The figures are taken from the estimates for the financial year 1938–39.)

	Yen
N. Y. K.:	
Japan-San Francisco Line	2,501,231
Japan-Seattle Line	1,190,521
Japan-West Coast of South America Line	408,670
O. S. K.:	
Japan-East Coast of South America Line	1,035,314
Japan-East Africa Line	300,000
Japan-West Coast of Africa Line	300,000

In addition, 150,000 yen is to be paid to the Yamashita Line for the Japan-Persian Gulf service.

[1] The differences in the sterling values of the yen as quoted in the committee's report are accounted for by the rapid and heavy depreciation of the yen after Japan abandoned the gold standard in December 1931; by 1935, while the pound stood at about 60 percent of its former parity with gold, the yen stood at no higher than 35 percent.

Services operated by the N. Y. K. between Japan and London receive payments for the carriage of mails, the amounts varying in recent years between 500,000 and 750,000 yen.

All these payments for the transoceanic services were made under the Ocean Lines Subsidy Law of 1909. Under the original terms of this law, vessels operating the services had to be over 3,000 tons gross and 12 knots speed, less than 15 years old, and built in Japan. The payments were made according to the length and nature of the route traveled and the speed and age of the vessels, and were subject to the conditions that mail and certain government officials were carried free, that the voyages to be made and the number and kind of vessels to be used were all to be subject to government control, and that the ships were liable to be requisitioned by the government in time of war.

AID TO TRAMP SHIPPING

Of the principal competitors of British tramp shipping in the Orient in the years before this war, Japanese tramp shipping alone was subsidized in 1938 in respect of operation. Tramps under some other flags were subsidized, but very few were engaged in Oriental trades.

In the Japanese budget for 1937–38, provision was made for the first time for a subsidy for tramp ships amounting to some 1,100,000 yen, and it was stated that this was to be the first installment of a total amount of some 10,500,000 yen (say, £620,000) to be distributed in 5 years among tramp vessels continuously employed outside Japanese waters for more than 180 days. The vessels were to have a gross tonnage of over 4,000 tons and were to be less than 25 years old. The basic subsidy was 90 yen per ton of gross tonnage to be paid for each 30 days of the voyage, so that a ship of 5,000 tons gross continuously employed outside Japanese waters for 12 months would receive a maximum of about 54,000 yen, or £3,000 sterling at the prevailing rates of exchange. A British tramp ship of the same tonnage would have received about the same amount of subsidy from the United Kingdom Government had the subsidy granted in 1935 and 1936 been continued.

Japan had the advantage of cheap ships built with State aid which she could operate cheaply owing to the low standard of living of the country. The committee declared that the relative lowness of the costs of Japanese shipowners was "beyond dispute." It added that "the effect of low costs is different in times of good and bad trade."

At a time when the merchant shipping of the world is fully employed, the advantage of low costs takes the form of high profits. On the other hand, when the merchant shipping of the world is under-employed, any country with exceptionally low costs can afford to cut rates, and may be able to keep its ships fully employed, the main burden of under-employment being thrown upon its competitors. The Mitsubishi Economic Research Bureau explained the exceptional activity of Japanese tramp shipping in oceanic trades in 1933 as due to the depreciation of the yen; at that time a large proportion of oceangoing tramp shipping under other flags went out of commission. It is obvious that a country with the advantage of low costs will tend to expand its mercantile marine.

The committee made some interesting comparisons. It stated that the annual charges for wages and victualling on board a medium-sized British cargo liner in 1936 were about £8,000 sterling and those on board a comparable Japanese ship were about £4,000. The figure of £4,000 was arrived at after taking into account various allowances paid to the Japanese crew. As regards shore staff and management, it appeared from the evidence that the rate of wages and salaries was lower in Japan than in the United Kingdom, but that greater numbers of clerical workers were usually employed for a given volume of work in Japan. "It may be assumed that other operating costs, such as fuel, harbor dues, pilotage, and stevedoring, were at the same level for the two vessels."

Summing up the matter, the committee claimed that the annual operating cost of the British vessel was about £40,000, and that the annual operating cost of the Japanese vessel, because of the lower cost in wages, victualling and management, might be taken at about £35,000, or £5,000 less.

COOPERATION OF MERCHANTS AND SHIPOWNERS

The Japanese Government not only paid large bounties on shipbuilding and subsidies on ship operating, besides indulging in other maneuvers, but the commercial community cooperated by ingenious means to feed Japanese ships. Practically the whole of the large-scale enterprise of Japan was under the financial control of one or other of three great family businesses (known in Japan as "Zaibatsu," or money-groups)—Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, and Mitsui. The Mitsui and Sumitomo families had been important in Japan as financiers and bankers for over 200 years. Mitsubishi was of relatively recent origin, but all three were founded on the property and enterprise of feudal Japan.

It was upon these great preexistent houses that the Japanese Government had to rely, after the Restoration of 1868, for the execution of its policy of creating rapidly the industrial equipment of a great power in a country with scanty resources and with little or no experience of Western technique. Apart from the three major groups, practically the whole of the remainder of the Japanese industry and trade is in the hands of a vast number of small businesses. In the Zaibatsu and in the Government are now concentrated almost the whole of the mobile capital and business experience of Japan.

The organization of the Zaibatsu is on an elaborate scale, and it is often difficult to detect the ramifications. Each of the Zaibatsu consists of a group of families. In the case of Mitsui we understand that there are 11 kindred families. But more important is the organization of their greatly varied interests in a network of companies.

Each of the Zaibatsu owns one of the six great banks of Japan, and controls a series of commercial and industrial companies. For example, Mitsui owns the Mitsui Bank and controls the Mitsui Bussan Kaisha (M. B. K.), a great merchanting company which handles between one-third and one-half of the coal, wheat, raw silk, sugar, and cement in Japan's foreign trade, and owns a considerable and rapidly-growing fleet of cargo vessels. Toyo Menkwa, a Mitsui concern, is the largest importer of raw cotton and exporter of cotton textiles.

Steelworks, paper companies, engineering works, cement works, electrical apparatus, manufacturing firms, sugar mills, flour mills, coal mines, cotton mills, and chemical works are under Mitsui control, including some of the most important plants in each of those industries. We do not enumerate the many interests of Mitsubishi and Sumitomo, but they, too, are vast, though neither is quite as large as Mitsui.

The committee glanced back to the genesis of the Japanese organization of commerce and shipping:

The three Zaibatsu control a large number of industries ancillary to shipping, including shipbuilding, insurance, warehousing, and stevedoring. Thus, a single Zaibatsu can build ships in its own yard, operate them, provide them with fuel from its own mines or storage tanks, insure them and their cargoes, load and unload them, warehouse the cargoes, and discount the warrants at its own bank. Its merchanting companies provide a considerable proportion of the cargoes carried, both outward and inward, and of these goods in turn a substantial part comprises raw materials for its own factories, or finished articles produced by those factories.

The policy of the Zaibatsu appears to be that each of the many concerns controlled should maintain its position as an independent entity and work for its own profit. We have been assured, for instance, that a Mitsui producing or trading firm would not hesitate to put even a foreign shipping company into competition with Mitsui vessels if the foreign company offered better terms. None the less, it is obvious that in the main the whole group of companies financially controlled by a family interest will normally play into the hands of one another.

The general comment of the imperial shipping committee in reviewing Japanese policy was that the combination, under the same financial control, with those industries on which he depended for his business was an important source of strength behind the Japanese shipowner. In the traffic between Japan, on the one hand, and Australia and India on the other, the Japanese exporter, selling manufactured goods, sold c. i. f., and the Japanese importer, buying raw materials, such as wood and raw cotton, bought f. o. b. In each case the Japanese merchant had the power of routing cargo; the Japanese shipowner, provided he could offer as efficient a service as his competitors, was assured of traffic in both directions.

JAPAN AND THE CONFERENCES

Space will not permit to trace in detail the methods by which the Japanese shipowners forced themselves into one conference after another until they had secured, in some cases, a dominating position. It must suffice to cite the general conclusions of the committee. It recorded that Japanese shipping and most of the other principal competitors of British liner shipping in the Orient received subsidies, whether for operating or building, or both, on a fairly substantial scale, and that the German and Italian and particularly the Japanese subsidies had enabled their mercantile marines to be modernized with fast and efficient vessels. It also stated that, apart from subsidies, the cumulative effect of currency depreciation and of the different standard of living made it possible for Japanese vessels to be operated at a cost which in 1936 was perhaps of the order of 10 to 15 percent below the cost of operating comparable British vessels. It added:

"The major part of Japanese ocean-going shipping and also of Japanese overseas trade is under the financial control of a few great houses which have interests in banking, merchanting, and manufacturing, and in shipbuilding yards and other firms and industries ancillary to shipping; and, as a result, it is possible to bring powerful financial and commercial support to the aid of the Japanese shipowners in competition with the foreigner."

What is to happen after the present war? As is now apparent, Government aid was given to Japanese shipping and shipbuilding in pursuit of her policy of aggression, for an island state needed plenty of ships for use as transports for troops as well as for the carriage of munitions and stores. If Japan is permitted to restore her shipping, what guarantee is there that she will not pursue the same policy as before the war? It is certain that if Japan had not had a large volume of tonnage at her disposal, she could not have entered upon her policy of aggression. Merchant ships, it may be realized, were as necessary to the attainment of her objective—the domination of the eastern world—as was the Imperial Navy. The one was complementary to the other and both were supported by the state for the same end.

SHIPS FOR WAR

By the use of seapower—ships of war and ships of commerce—Little Japan, completely surrounded by the sea, became, in the course

of a lifetime, Great Japan, the Land of the Rising Sun. Formosa, Pascetories, Sakhalin, the Kwantung Peninsula (with its fine port, Darien), Korea, the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands, and Manchuria. Such was the rapid and progressive expansion of Japan that the area subject to the Emperor's rule was increased from less than 160,000 square miles to 262,000 square miles. It was achieved at small cost to the Japanese people—though their standard of life remained low. Nothing succeeds like success, and nothing is so intoxicating. The revolution in China seemed to offer another opportunity for a cheap victory. So on July 7, 1937, when Japan was strong by sea, land, and air, and China was weak, what was to have been a short war of conquest was entered upon. But China did not fall an easy victim to the aggressor. Japan was still deeply involved in this, the most ambitious of all her amphibious operations, when her Axis partners in the West seemed to be winning; Europe had been overrun, the British had been compelled to withdraw their ships from the Mediterranean, and it looked as though the seizure of the Suez Canal would link up Germany and Italy with their eastern partner. In December 1941 Japan, supreme as a naval power in the Pacific and with merchant fleets of five and a half million tons to serve the purposes of war, treacherously attacked Pearl Harbor, sent expeditionary forces to all the territories which formed the perimeter of her offensive scheme, and even prepared to overwhelm India. Everything, at first, went according to plan, but Tojo and his fellow gangsters assumed that command of the sea, essential to their success, could not be wrested from them. Their miscalculation will cost Japan all her ill-gotten territorial gains of the past 50 years. If the Americans are not overruled at the peace settlement, which is beyond the bounds of possiblity, they will also cost her her shipping—that is such of it as remains after the huge losses which have been sustained.

JAPAN'S SHIPPING DEVELOPMENT

In another column, a correspondent recalls the measures which were adopted by the Japanese Government to dominate the Pacific Ocean. His account of the movement is based, as will be seen, on the report of the Imperial Shipping Committee, which was issued only a few months before the Second World War opened and was overlaid by the swift movement of events. Its conclusions were published but were forgotten before they could be digested, much less action taken. The report is already out of print, and its revelation of Japan's ingenious plans for fostering her shipping has been forgotten. So it is not inappropriate that a summary of this report should be published now that Japan in the East faces defeat as inevitably as does Germany in the West. Her Navy has been crippled and one-half, or perhaps more, of her merchant shipping has been sunk. Like the British peoples, the Japanese cannot continue to fight without ships of defense and supply. Her sun, which was rising, is now setting. Will she be permitted to resume her policy of aggression after an interval of 10 or 20 years, or will her teeth be drawn so effectively that she will never again, being without ships, be able to threaten her neighbors? To us, as an island people, as well as to the Australians and New Zealanders, the future of shipping must be a primary interest when the terms of the peace settlement come to be discussed. The Germans, Italians, and Japanese must never again be permitted to indulge in discriminatory measures and thus prepare for another war. The freedom of the seas must be preserved, and the victors must take the necessary measures to prevent shipping being built and operated not for the purposes of peace, but for those of aggressive war.

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD upon the subject of meat, I also wish to insert with my remarks an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 9, 1945, entitled "No Real Solution in Sight."

Mr. Speaker, what is the mystery of meat? The committees in the Senate and in the House have been busy investigating all phases of meat production and distribution. They have had conflicting reports. Many people are wondering if they will bring out a constructive program which may provide more meat in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I have just recently spent 10 days out in the bread basket area of America, where they actually produce meat and all kinds of food. I find that people are hungry for meat. They want meat and not reports from a committee.

The United States is faced with a serious shortage of meat, not only for the people at home but for all our armed forces. It has been a problem of production, distribution, and consumption—all of which has been in the hands of governmental agencies. The folks out in the Midwest realize more than the consuming public that Washington regulations do not encourage production. Regulations by Government bureaus have greatly discouraged the production of meat. I have found the feed pens of the Midwest practically empty. There are more cattle on the ranges of Nebraska than ever before. There is corn spoiling that should be fed to cattle, hogs, or sheep. During January, February, and March of this year all of the terminal markets receiving cattle had an unusually large run of cattle. These cattle were lightweight. They did not carry the 300 or 400 pounds of additional meat which would have been put on them had they been properly fed.

Mr. Speaker the Federal agencies, principally the O. P. A. and the W. F. A., have issued many orders and regulations covering the production of meat. They have ranged from price ceilings on hogs, subsidies, roll backs, ceiling prices on live cattle, and intricate regulations which, to date, have forced the feeder and slaughtering houses out of business. Even the large packing houses complain that they are losing money. The man who ordinarily feeds cattle may lose from $20 to $50 a head if he properly fattens the animals for market. The total production for meat in March is 27 percent less than in March 1944. The production of pork was 50 percent less. Surely something is wrong with Government rules and regulations which do this to the beef-production industry of our country.

In the matter of hogs, the population has declined from 122,000,000 in the fall of 1943 to around 80,000,000 today. Few sows are being kept for farrowing purposes. The farmer was urged to raise more hogs in 1943, and he responded. Then the Government agencies suggested ceilings, market quotas, and froze corn, which, with other regulations, so thoroughly discouraged the producer of hogs that he quit that business.

Today there is a flourishing black market. It is freely admitted by the O. P. A. and other agencies that it does exist and that they are unable to do anything about such a condition. The operators of black markets pay no taxes. They sell their product at an enormous increase in price. The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. are responsible for this condition.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I suggested that there should be a housecleaning in the O. P. A., as this agency is principally responsible for the shortage of meat as it exists today. It has been due to the inexperience of those in charge of price control. The Nation should not tolerate the blundering mistakes of the O. P. A. This agency has refused to take the considered judgment and advice of the men who grow, feed, and slaughter livestock. The men responsible should be forced to resign, and in their place should be men of practical experience in the production of meat. These pencil-pushing planners are responsible for crippling the meat industry. They were warned of what would happen, but they took no heed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest, following these critical remarks, a remedy which will in a short time make more meat available. There are no regulations that can produce meat tomorrow or next month, but some things can be done which will encourage production in the near future. In the case of hogs, it is possible to have a plentiful supply of pork within 6 or 8 months.

I want to suggest that the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. raise the ceiling price on pork where it will insure a profit to the producer. They must set forth a program covering at least the next year, in which they do not change the rules. The only way to get production and, at the same time to discourage the black market, is to insure the producer of pork a reasonable profit.

In the case of cattle, the live ceilings which were placed on cattle about 3 months ago should be either removed entirely or adjusted upward. The price of meat to the consumer will, naturally, be adjusted upward but I am certain the consumer would prefer to pay a little more and be able to get meat. The consumer now has more money than ever before for the purchase of meat.

The subsidies, as soon as practical, should be entirely removed. The producer takes the stigma of subsidies but the consumer receives the benefit in a deferred payment plan for his meat.

The price of labor and everything going into production of beef has gone up. Therefore, the feeder must have an adjusted ceiling on live fat cattle if he is going to feed cattle and thus produce more good meat for the country. It cannot be done under present ceilings and regulations.

The meat producing business should be turned over to the men who know how to produce meat. It should be freed from the entangling red tape of today and, with a reasonable profit assured, there will be no question about the supply.

As long as the Government insists that finished cattle are a waste of corn and grain and discourages their use by price regulation there will be a shortage of beef.

Mr. Speaker, the dismal failure in the attempts of the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. to regulate the amount of pork makes a poor case for further Government planning as a permanent policy. It is a poor substitute for the remarkable record which has been made by the meat industry in the past.

In my opinion, meat should be accepted from a larger number of slaughtering houses. The Army could afford to pay from $1 to $2 a hundred more for its meat. Slaughtering houses that have been State-inspected should be acceptable to the military.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the key to the increased production of beef, pork, and lamb products is that of insuring a reasonable profit, not only to the grower but to the feeder and the packer. It cannot be done by Government regulations, subsidies, and other artificial means being advanced by the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. These agencies have had their chance. They have failed. Their jobs should be turned over to individuals who know about the production of meat. If this is done, we can reasonably expect within the next 6 months or a year to have an ample supply of meat for not only the civilian population but for our armed forces and the Allied needs.

The editorial referred to follows:

NO REAL SOLUTION IN SIGHT

As the meat shortage becomes progressively more difficult, protests to Washington will increase in volume and vigor. On the one hand, O. P. A. is still arguing that there is more meat for civilians than before the war; on the other, O. P. A. is struggling desperately to relieve the situation. And that is just going through motions—nothing more. There is absolutely nothing that can be done to make more meat available overnight, when the meat just doesn't exist. But does that faze O. P. A.? Not at all. It has appointed John J. Madigan to head a "livestock allocation program," the gentleman who posted his number on the occasion of the Kansas City cattle ceiling meeting last fall. Allocating all the livestock in America won't make more pork chops. It will only create more confusion and add to the aggravation of producers. In addition, the all-wise boys are engaged in juggling the subsidy, a bit up here and a bit down there, to take effect then, if not when, till every packer has to maintain a battery of lawyers and accountants to try to keep out of jail. And then there are those prosecutions for ceiling and other violations, which are just about as effective as is the scratching of a dog on the flea population.

And all this needn't have been, had the boys in the saddle paid any attention to sincere counsel and informed warning. Today's critical meat situation wouldn't exist had production been permitted to move along somewhere in the neighborhood of meat needs. So long as meat supply is so far short of needs, live animals and the products thereof will be sold outside the ceilings, required points will be counterfeited and stolen, and some will get all the meat they want while others will starve for it. And nothing much can be done to correct such evils. For meat is of first necessity of practically all the people. They will do most anything to get it. The situation is and will be infinitely worse than prohibition bootlegging, for in that disgraceful period in our national life only a small percentage of the people felt that they had to have liquor.

And still nothing is done to get at the root of the trouble. It still takes the better part of a year to make a marketable hog. It still takes about 3 years from breeding to put a good steer on the market. Hog production is picking up only a little, and the effect of that little won't appear till late next fall. While on the cattle end, the production trend is now definitely downward.

And still nothing is done to provide real production incentive, with respect to any class of meat animals.

Farm people, unless they have close contact with city relatives, will scarcely appreciate how serious the meat shortage in the cities is. It is a fact that there just is hardly anything in the meat line to buy.

United States Board Hails New York Trade Zone Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign Trade Zones Board, from the Journal of International Economy, March 10, 1945:

UNITED STATES BOARD HAILS NEW YORK TRADE ZONE RESULTS—URGES OTHER GATEWAY PORTS TO INSTALL THIS FACILITY

(By Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board)

Sounding a note of warning that needs of the armed forces for domestic port facilities will continue after actual fighting has ceased, the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, of which the Secretary of Commerce is chairman, recently reported to the Congress that our ports should be prepared to replace such facilities immediately upon the termination of the war. The report, bearing the signatures of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War pointed out that our post-war fleet will consist of larger and faster ships, but these advantages will be lost unless adequate terminal facilities to service these ships are provided in our ports.

NEW YORK PIONEER ZONE

Although legislation permitting the establishment of foreign-trade zones in our ports of entry has been on the statute books for the past decade, the New York foreign-trade zone was the only one in operation at the close of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944. Established on Staten Island in 1937, the New York Foreign-Trade Zone increased its activities progressively each year until 1942, when a substantial part of the zone area was taken over for war purposes. Foreign-Trade Zone activities were then transferred to North River piers in Manhattan where many operations formerly carried on at the original zone site were continued.

WAR DELAYS PORT PLANS

When the New York Foreign-Trade Zone had progressed beyond the experimental stage, both commercially and financially, its admitted success prompted officials of several other major ports to reappraise the advantages of establishing similar facilities in their own harbors. However, the European War had already dislocated world trade and later on, following Pearl Harbor, all available port facilities were acquired or occupied with our own war demands. This situation, linked with the shortage of critical material for commercial construction, therefore, necessitated further postponement of plans for establishing several additional foreign-trade zones which previously had been announced by local harbor officials.

Ports which have applications for foreign-trade zones pending with the Foreign-Trade Zones Board include New Orleans, La.; San Francisco, Calif.; Houston, Tex.; and San Juan, P. R. While the Houston and San Juan applications are presently inactive, harbor officials at San Francisco recently advised the Foreign-Trade Zones Board that they were prepared to proceed with the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at San Francisco as soon as war conditions permit.

NEW ORLEANS ACTS

Plans for establishing a foreign-trade zone in the port of New Orleans are rapidly taking definite form. In addition to submitting all the necessary exhibits in support of the application, the Board of Commissioners for the port of New Orleans has selected a proposed foreign-trade zone site on the Industrial Canal and a hearing on the project was held in New Orleans on January 15, 1945.

The report reminds American port officials, who share the responsibility for developing our foreign trade, that they should not underestimate the potentialities of the foreign-trade zone for attracting and holding transshipment and reexport trade. Although showing brief promise at the conclusion of World War No. 1, it can be stated with assurance that the United States has not enjoyed transshipment, reexport, and consignment business mainly for the reason that we have failed to provide adequate facilities for servicing this class of trade. Excessive port expenses resulting from multiple cargo handlings and transfers along with costly formalities stifled the development of this lucrative traffic.

TRANSIT TRADE BECKONS

Much of the world's so-called colonial trade—running into millions of tons and valued at billions of dollars—has heretofore relied for redistribution on ports and other facilities razed by the ravages of war. Inasmuch as this traffic will be resumed long before port facilities can be rebuilt and channels of distribution restored, a substantial part of this trade will perforce seek at least a temporary haven here. Traffic diverted from hostile areas might well be retained to our advantage, provided our ports are equipped to handle this business economically.

HANDLING COSTS VITAL

Shipside storage and more extensive use of mechanical equipment, including pallets for the handling and warehousing of large units of packaged merchandise, will reflect considerable reductions in terminal costs of cargo intended for reexport or transshipment. While the foregoing facilities should be regarded as standard equipment at all deep-water terminals, the foreign-trade zone has the added advantage of reducing the cost of surveillance. The stabilization of charges in a foreign-trade zone are an added protection for foreign merchants who intend to utilize a zone's facilities for extended periods. Improved banking facilities and a better knowledge of world trade on the part of our merchants and traders also augur well

for the future development of important consignment markets here.

LAW'S BASIC PURPOSE

The purpose of the law authorizing the establishment of foreign-trade zones, approved June 18, 1934, generally is to provide enclosed and policed areas, under Federal supervision, in or adjacent to ports of entry where foreign and domestic merchandise may be landed without application of the customs laws.

In such a facility goods may be stored, processed, or otherwise manipulated, but not manufactured or exhibited to the public, and may be exported or brought into customs territory subject to the laws and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandising.

To qualify under the law for consideration as a foreign trade zone the area covered by an application, among other things, must have adequate ships, docks, wharves, warehouses, loading and mooring facilities, where the zone is adjacent to water, and, in the case of an inland zone, must have adequate loading, unloading, and warehouse facilities. This latter provision for inland zones is especially significant in the light of the amazing development of air cargo transport.

WORLD'S CROSSROAD

The purposes of a foreign-trade zone are amply illustrated in the 1943 annual report of the city of New York, which was transmitted to Congress with the Board's report. After stating that considerable business has been lost to the zone because of the lack of accommodations, the report also reveals several interesting instances which reflect the shifting trends in world trade resulting from a global war.

SINGLETS FOR SENEGALESE

During 1943 more than 5,000,000 pounds of cotton thread valued at $6,000,000 were shipped from the United Kingdom to the New York Foreign-Trade Zone and then redistributed to 26 foreign countries, including all Latin America, Soviet Russia, and British West Africa. Another significant trade development revealed by the city's report on the foreign-trade zone concerned the purchase by African natives of large quantities of cotton piece goods and singlets from Mexican mills. Lack of direct services between Mexico and African ports resulted in a considerable part of this merchandise being transshipped at the New York Foreign-Trade Zone during the year 1943. Prior to the war Japan had supplied the natives of Africa with these articles.

The report of the New York Foreign-Trade Zone shows that during 1943 Switzerland sent substantial quantities of aniline dyes to the zone for sampling and reexport to Central and South American countries, Africa, and New Zealand. During the same period, large consignments of burlap sugar bags from India were held in the zone awaiting transshipment to Cuba, Nicaragua, and Iceland.

The handling of Sumatra tobacco continued to be an important operation at the foreign-trade zone. More than 100 persons were employed in the tobacco warehouse erected by the Dutch growers at the Staten Island zone site. The contents of each bale of tobacco is carefully examined and all substandard leaves removed. Originally this rejected tobacco was destroyed, but recently a foreign market has been developed for this commodity.

LIQUOR LAWS OUT

The right to store and manipulate imported liquors in the foreign-trade zone without regulation by the New York State Liquor Authority was clearly defined in an opinion of the appellate division of the Supreme Court of New York County. In *During* v. *Valente*, decided February 11, 1944, the court said: "The imposition of these (New York alcoholic-beverage control law) complicated regulations upon foreign commerce in liquor within trade zones would not only interfere with the exclusive control of Congress over this commerce but would seriously impair, if not defeat, the purpose for which these zones were established."

INCOME AND EXPENSES

Although the total amount of warehouse space available for storage and manipulation was reduced by 80 percent as compared with similar facilities at the original Staten Island zone, the 1943 operating revenues amounted to $504,709.95. This was only 25 percent less than the $691,000 gross income for the last full year's operation on Staten Island. The operating and administrative expense for 1943 amounted to $385,735.64. This sum included the cost of customs service, which has been substantially increased due to the necessity of policing three widely scattered zone areas. It also included the zone operating company's profit which the city continued to carry as an administrative expense. The net operating profit to the city for 1943 amounted to $128,049.31.

In 1943, 194 different commodities from 51 foreign countries were received at the zone. While the tonnage of foreign goods reexported was lower in 1943, its value, $14,453,355, was the highest in the zone's history.

Cargo received in the zone in 1943 was transported by 2 vessels engaged in foreign trade, 426 inland waterway and harbor craft, 1,689 motor trucks, 3 rail car, and 8 parcel-post and hand-lot deliveries.

WAR SLOWS ZONE PROGRESS

The activities of the zone since January 1, 1940, are reflected in the data shown below.

ZONE HIGHLIGHTS

In 1943, 45 percent by weight and 44 percent by value of all foreign merchandise forwarded from the zone was reexported or transshipped abroad. Similar figures for 1942 show reexports and transshipments were 50 percent by weight and 40 percent by value of all foreign merchandise forwarded from the zone.

Distribution of merchandise in 1943 from the zone to 67 countries amounted to 39,234 short tons, valued at approximately $35,000,000 including that imported into the customs territory of the United States which weighed 22,383 short tons and was valued at $20,466,977. The merchandise remaining in the zone on December 31, 1943, weighed 22,406 short tons and was valued at $19,363,866, which was substantially the same tonnage but a considerable decrease in the value of the merchandise in the zone at the start of the year 1943. Merchandise shipped from the zone in 1943 was transshipped by one vessel engaged in foreign trade, 408 inland waterway and harbor craft, 3,630 motortrucks, 6 rail cars, and 79 messenger deliveries.

In order of importance by value, the leading commodities handled at the zone in 1943 were: Cotton thread, $4,533,731; watches, $3,959,666; distilled spirits, $3,480,844; watch movements, $2,855,223; cotton piece goods $1,766,069; cotton, $1,285,039; sugar bags, $943,500; woolens, $777,472; tobacco, $729,543; and canned foodstuffs, $519,346.

In order of importance, by value, of merchandise received in the zone, the leading countries of origin in 1943 were: Switzerland, $7,038,081; United Kingdom, $6,531,036; Mexico, $1,881,264; Cuba, $1,741,250; Egypt, $1,308,689; United States, $1,272,719; Virgin Islands, $1,227,645 British India, $1,058,871; Canada, $642,631; and Netherlands Indies, $526,340.

Merchandise forwarded from the zone during 1942 and 1943, including exports, reexports, transshipments, and imports

Item	1942		1943	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Short tons		*Short tons*	
Foreign goods reexported	31,237	$12,817,244	16,685	$14,453,355
Foreign goods imported	31,644	18,253,468	20,606	18,660,561
Domestic goods exported	8,651	6,204,805	165	49,433
Domestic goods imported	1,345	203,109	1,310	312,051
Foreign and domestic exported [1]	1,158	315,737		
Foreign and domestic imported [1]	13,174	6,147,833	468	1,494,365
Total	87,209	43,942,196	39,234	34,969,765

[1] Consists mainly of foreign merchandise repacked in domestic containers.

Merchandise received	1940	1941	1942	1943
Lots (number)	2,952	4,216	2,378	2,609
Short tons (do)	215,658	136,860	45,542	36,876
Value (dollars)	83,434,000	88,623,194	36,894,635	25,212,174

In order of importance, by value, of merchandise shipped from the zone, the leading countries of destination in 1943 were: United States, $20,466,977; Cuba, $2,434,080; Colombia, $1,392,459; Chile, $1,191,078; Belgian Congo, $817,876; Venezuela, $762,004; British West Africa, $706,355; Mexico, $614,482; Canada, $528,366; and British India, $521,276.

IMPORTERS MANIPULATE IN ZONE

According to the Deputy Collector in Charge, a number of important manipulations and forms of processing covering numerous commodities were carried on in the zone during the year. Despite limited accommodations and restricted space, many importers found it convenient to perform these activities in the foreign-trade zone. Some of the principal types of manipulation included: Maturing, examining, reconditioning, sampling, weighing, destroying damaged leaves, and repacking tobacco; examining and replacing watch movements for reexport via parcel post; examining, cutting, sampling, combining part of different lots with domestic products, and repacking cotton and woolen piece goods for export; examining, reconditioning, and repacking raw cotton; the examining, sampling, recoopering, bung-filling, gaging, affixing strip stamps on liquors (brandy, rum, wine, and whisky); examining, labeling, repacking into domestic cartons and destroying and reexporting rejects of pork and beans, tomatoes, and South American canned meats; trimming leather; grading, cutting off fringes, and repacking rugs and fringed merchandise; examining, grading, and repacking fur skins; examining, segregating, camphorizing, and repacking household effects; examining and repacking pharmaceuticals; reduction of the alcoholic content of toilet water.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS SOAR

The collection of customs duties and excise taxes on merchandise imported into customs territory from the zone during 1943, amounted to $11,285,623. For the previous

years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the amounts were $1,931,296, $2,867,352, and $1,998,851.70, respectively. The huge increase in the collection of customs revenue is attributed to the fact that importers of spirits have found the zone of considerable advantage for the handling of this commodity prior to customs entry.

WAR EFFORT AIDED

Ninety-five steamships and 4,170 lighters, engaged in war work, used the zone piers for berthing space only without any zone lading or unlading. The steamships were accomodated through an arrangement with the War Shipping Administration because of the lack of berthing facilities at piers in customs territory. While in the zone these vessels discharged ballast, took on stores, and underwent repairs.

Stock Piling of Strategic Raw Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last month, in the March 9, 1945, issue of the Pathfinder there appeared an item with respect to the stock piling of strategic raw materials which prompted two questions that were submitted to the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. I wish to submit the exchange of correspondence with the Foreign Economic Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1945.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The current number of Pathfinder magazine says that the Foreign Economic Administration is developing a plan for stockpiling raw materials from South America and considering increasing the capital of the Export-Import Bank to permit such purposes.

Will you kindly advise me whether this is correct and whether any legislation is contemplated in this connection with relation to domestic production of strategic raw materials?

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: In your letter of March 20, 1945, you ask whether a news item in Pathfinder to the effect that the Foreign Economic Administration is developing a plan for stockpiling raw materials from South America and considering increasing the capital of the Export-Import Bank to permit such purchases is correct. You also inquire whether any legislation is contemplated in this connection with relation to domestic production of strategic raw materials.

In reply to the first question, no plan is presently contemplated by the Foreign Economic Administration which would involve an increase in the capital of the Export-Import Bank to permit purchases of raw materials from South America for the purpose of stockpiling.

With respect to the second question, I notice that the story in Pathfinder of March 19, 1945, states that legislation may be sought limiting our domestic production of strategic raw materials. The Foreign Economic Administration is not contemplating any such legislation.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Bottleneck in Boxcars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 14, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capitol for Thursday, April 12, 1945, on the critical boxcar situation. I am in thorough accord with the viewpoint which is so ably expressed in this editorial:

BOTTLENECK IN BOXCARS

Too many Washington officials continue to adopt the sneering attitude that the Midwest simply doesn't know there is a war on, as evidenced by the caustic remarks of Col. J. Monroe Johnson, head of the O. D. T., with respect to Grain Belt pleas for boxcars.

The truth is, everybody in the United States knows there is a war on—but a great many Washington bureaucrats fail to realize that every State has a part in that war.

We cannot win this struggle with eastern steel plants alone. We cannot win with western coast shipping alone. We must win it with wheat from Kansas, with corn from Iowa, with oil from Oklahoma, with cotton from Texas, and with every resource required for victory.

We can win more quickly, and with less expense in terms of human lives as well as material things, if the high command in Washington will only coordinate the efforts of the entire country in a sensible and efficient manner. Washington frequently blames the people for failing to cooperate, but at the same time it persists in muddling the situation and confusing the people to such an extent that those who try wholeheartedly are accused of impeding the war effort.

That is exactly why there is a boxcar mixup threatening to contribute to the destruction of millions of bushels of potential food needed for consumption at home and abroad.

At a meeting of midwestern representatives Tuesday in Kansas City, it was made clear that this region has been drained of its boxcars by train movements to the east coast. And once the cars reach the East, most of them stay there. Some railroads have as few as 5 percent of their own cars on midwestern lines. Most of the grain cars which do return are "battle axes," old and worn and unfit to hold grain.

Every State in this region has vast amounts of corn and other grains piled on the ground. Much of it has rotted, and corn being sent to market brings as little as 17 cents a bushel. Because of O. P. A. manipulations, there is comparatively little livestock to absorb the grain. Farm storage places are filled to overflowing, many country elevators are glutted and have been forced to quit business, and the great terminals are clogged. Millers are shutting down production because of inability to ship. On top of all this, one of the biggest grain crops in history is forecast—and it will begin rolling out within a few weeks.

This means economic losses for farmers, grain dealers, millers, and all who place financial dependence upon such crops. But what is of highest importance is that it means a criminal waste of potential food—the destruction of a weapon of war.

Colonel Johnson gives the official O. D. T. reply to requests for boxcars in the Midwest when he calls appeals for cars "presumptuous." It is anything but presumptuous to insist upon helping carry the war load. It is an act of patriotism, and those making the appeals deserve, as Governor Schoeppel says, "commendation instead of a kick in the pants."

Everyone realizes that certain types of war goods must take precedence over others. If all of the boxcars in the East were needed for the shipment of highest priority goods, no one could complain. But there seems to be ample evidence that the cars are used for shipping goods which would be shipped in other types of cars and which, for that matter, need not be shipped at all.

Railroad men in this area are doing what they can to ease the strain, and they have succeeded in achieving a great deal. But it is not enough. Unless cars are returned from the East, there will be a tragic spoilage of potential food.

H. B. Lautz, general manager of the Santa Fe system, typifies the spirit of midwestern railroad men when he accepts problems philosophically and works with his associates to overcome them whenever this is possible. Refrigerator cars, he discloses, are being made over and used for grain hauling. Double-decker sheep cars are being revamped for the same purpose. And livestock cars of every description are being boarded up in order to contain grain. Open gondolas are pressed into service. But in spite of all the ingenuity which can be brought to bear, the railroads can haul only comparative drops out of a big bucket.

If they could get lumber and labor, farmers might build additional storage space on their own farms. Hybrid corn, in some areas, yields so high that available space is inadequate. And because of peculiar weather conditions, some grain which can be stored will not keep for long periods.

The situation boils down to the fact that, in spite of every effort here in the Midwest, the engineers at the throttle up in Washington must solve the boxcar problem or put a big dent in our war effort.

Instead of coordination in the Nation's capital, there is confusion.

Instead of agreement on needs, there are contradictory policies.

There are too many little czars, each trying to outdo the others in regulating the people.

There are too few public servants dedicating themselves to the best interests of the people as a whole.

And the red tape of Washington contributes to shedding the red blood of young Americans overseas.

A delegation of midwesterners will go to Washington and attempt to present the boxcar picture in a factual way. Perhaps the bureaucrats can be made to see the light. If not, it will be tragic for this Nation.

What is needed, of course, is common-sense coordination, based upon the top needs of the country at any given time as this war is pushed to its conclusion.

First. Every governmental agency connected with the war should be represented in a general council. Decisions should be made, and every department should be required to act accordingly. That is not being done now. One agency demands that farms produce more and more food, and a shortage of food here at home is predicted by some. Almost everyone says that vast quantities must be sent overseas to help win the peace. But at

the same time, such men as Colonel Johnson ignore the importance of food.

Governmental agencies should agree that so many tons of munitions will be shipped first, then so many tons of food, then so many tons of something else. Irrespective of the priority order, it should be agreed upon and enforced.

Second, every organization and individual should be required—through rationing or any practicable means—to fit in with the general plan. This is being done quite generally with respect to gasoline and to several other commodities. Why can't it be done with boxcars? Why should the East be permitted to hoard the cars while the great food production center of the world—here in the Midwest—is asked to raise crops and then let the crops rot on the ground?

Colonel Johnson and those of his stamp have not even attempted to prove that the East has a war priority on boxcars. But the Midwest is accused of being presumptuous in asking for a share of them.

Perhaps it was also presumptuous for the Midwest to send its quota of fighting men to the fronts; to buy its share of War bonds and to contribute its full part in salvage drives; to develop a network of industrial plants; to pour into this war all of its resources, ingenuity, and patriotism.

Presumption of that kind is winning victories on both sides of the world. It must continue, in spite of the red tape and the bureaucrats and the shallow thinkers, until the peace is won.

Resolution Adopted at the Death of the President by the Iowa Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the joint convention of the fifty-first general assembly of the State of Iowa:

"Resolution of the joint convention of the fifty-first General Assembly of Iowa

"Whereas we, with all other Americans, have heard with deep sorrow of the great bereavement that has befallen this Nation and the world in the loss of our great President at this most eventful period in our national history; and

"Whereas regardless of party affiliation, we all bow in sincere sorrow and profound grief at the untimely passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose great leadership was most outstanding and most essential to all the world in these most trying and crucial times; and,

"Whereas we recognize the devoted patriotism, the arduous labors, the zeal for liberty for all men everywhere, which characterized his untiring service for humanity: Now therefore be it

"Resolved by the Joint Convention of the Fifty-first General Assembly, That, in behalf of all the people of this Commonwealth, we express our deep sorrow in the loss of this great American and our most sincere sympathy to his bereaved widow and family; be it further

"Resolved, That the portraits of the late President Roosevelt now in the Senate and House Chambers shall be suitably draped in crepe for a period of at least 30 days; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be duly certified and permanently preserved in the office of the secretary of state, and that a copy so certified be sent to Mrs. Roosevelt."

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the joint convention of the fifty-first general assembly meeting at Des Moines, Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa, this 12th day of April 1945 A. D.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Clerk of the Joint Convention.

Achievement at Bremerton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to relate here, under the privilege which has been extended me, a story of this war which deserves especial recognition. It is a story of the great ingenuity and devotion to duty of the war workers and naval personnel, working together as a team, at the Puget Sound Navy Yard in Bremerton, Wash. It is a story of how this great teamwork put back into action one of our baby flattops at least 4 weeks ahead of schedule.

This flattop, the U. S. S. *Suwanee*, is now again in action against the Japanese, a part of our great fleet which is roving the Pacific at will and driving ever closer to the homeland of our enemy.

Four weeks were saved by the great men of Bremerton—the sailors of the homefront. Our enemy can gain little comfort from this story, told so well in an article from the April 6 issue of the Bremerton Sun, one of those vigorous American newspapers which is contributing so much to our homefront morale.

The planning of our naval personnel at Bremerton, coupled with the ingenuity of workers who could produce needed replacements simply from photographs of the battle damage to the *Suwanee*, and the tireless efforts of both officers and workmen, has certainly changed the meaning of the old bromide "soldiering on the job."

For this was "soldiering" in the new sense which this war has given the term.

I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to give some especial recognition to this accomplishment of our homefront production, and to the men and women of the Bremerton yard. Under unanimous consent, I include here the complete story of this achievement as it appeared in the Bremerton Sun:

ADVANCE PLANNING SAVED 4 WEEKS IN REPAIRING "FLATTOP"—PUGET SOUND NAVY YARD MEN PRAISED

Crew of the U. S. S. *Suwanee*, "baby flattop" of the Pacific Fleet, will long remember with mixed pride and some annoyance, that Puget Sound Navy Yard workmen are efficient and swift when it comes to overhauling a battle-scarred fighting ship.

Anticipating that their proud vessel would be hospitalized for some time, they looked forward to longer periods of leave when they could return to their homes. But it didn't work out that way. Here's what happened:

Shortly after the battle for Leyte Gulf, Puget Sound Navy Yard was alerted to expect at an early date a new peak load of battle-worn ships, with the instructions to "get them repaired and back into the battle line with all possible speed."

ADVANCE INFORMATION

Yard workmen, already confronted with a huge overhaul and new construction load, welcomed an opportunity to assist the fleet and show what a speedy repair job could be done—especially on the *Suwanee*, which the fleet needed. So a plan was worked out to obtain advance information on the repairs that vessel would require. If photographs and a comprehensive description of the battle damage could be obtained, planners, shop masters, and their assistants believed, a large part of the necessary work could be started in the yard shops while the ship was still on her return trip to the United States.

So well in advance of the arrival of the "baby flattop," the ship's first lieutenant, D. R. Dodson, arrived with pictures which showed gaping holes in the flight deck, shrapnel-torn superstructure, and a tangled mass of wreckage that once hauled planes up to the flight deck from the hangar deck below.

With only the pictures and Lieutenant Dodson's report to go, the planning section, under George A. Hastings, chief planner and estimator, consulting with Principal Marine Engineer R. E. Johnson and Principal Naval Architect H. T. Schairer, were able to produce blueprints and assemble other information in advance, and get production started on all major items. Shops were fabricating material for the *Suwanee* while she was still many hundreds of miles at sea.

Ship fitters, under the direction of Master Ship Fitter Herman Petersen, a veteran of 43 years' service at Puget Sound Navy Yard, started construction on a new flight deck elevator. Welders began the prefabrication of large stretches of deck plating to be cut to accurate size as soon as measurements could be taken after the ship finally arrived. When the outside machinists were shown a photograph of a mass of twisted steel in the carrier's catapult room, one quick look convinced them that they should start construction immediately on a new plane launching mechanism. Master Machinist E. C. Jolly, who came to Puget Sound Navy Yard from the Cavite Navy Yard in the Philippines, directed the building of the new catapult.

Boilermakers, headed by Master Boilermaker George W. Penketh, and inside machinists under Master Machinist Theodore Peterson, were shooting at the same goal—to have necessary repair material ready and waiting for the *Suwanee* before she came to rest in drydock at Bremerton.

Work was well under way when the carrier arrived at the entrance to Puget Sound. Estimators, planners, and heads of departments—a mixture of civilian and Navy personnel—took a fast boat and boarded her prior to her arrival at the yard. They looked the ship over, discussed battle damage and construction problems with its officers, then made accurate measurements so that shops back in the yard could incorporate them into their plans. Suggestions were made to the ship's company regarding the areas and compartments that had to be cleared of ship's gear before she docked. This "prior arrival" visit to the ship allowed the shops to crystallize many of their estimates and plans into factual information without loss of time or the chance of error in production.

ARRIVES DAY EARLY

Late on a blustering Sunday afternoon the *Suwanee* nosed her way alongside a pier at

the yard—one full day ahead of schedule. Thirty-six hours after the *Suwanee's* lines were secured the ship-fitter shop had finished manufacturing a new flight-deck elevator, and riggers under the direction of Master Rigger Walter H. Bruns, were easing it down the dock with the yard's largest crane.

Many hours, and much material were saved by cutting two huge slices of deck out of the ship and taking them to the ship-fitter shop, where the girders and plating were heated and reshaped. It is estimated that the job, if it had been done with new materials would have required 33⅓ percent more man-days. Work continued day and night at white heat. Electricians installed approximately 55 miles of cable. Pipe fitters estimate that they replaced enough damaged pipe to carry a stream of water 7 miles. Ship-fitters used iron enough to cover a football field. Painters, under the direction of Shop Master Harry Jaixen, coated the repaired sections as fast as the other shops could complete them. When the *Suwanee* steamed out she sported 4,200 gallons of new-type paint on her frame—42 tons of paint.

At least 4 weeks were saved by careful advance planning and by starting the manufacture of sections of the *Suwanee* before she arrived in Bremerton. Wholehearted cooperation between departments and shops in the yard is credited with saving an inestimable amount of time. And, while damage repair work proceeded, the ship received a complete routine overhaul * * * all of the work which is ordinarily necessary after long months of wear and tear which results from cruising thousands of miles from home.

Aboriginal Claims of Alaska Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas until Congress by specific legislation definitely extinguishes all aboriginal claims of Alaska Indians the Secretary of the Department of the Interior will create or will threaten to create further reservations of lands, shore space, and waters in Alaska for the exclusive use of Alaskan Indians; and

Whereas such reservations and the threat to create them causes an uncertainty as to the use and tenure of use of the natural resources of Alaska, not only by Alaskans but also by industry generally, and has retarded and does retard the progress and development of Alaska and prevents the use of such natural resources for domestic, industrial, and other purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Alaska Territorial Chamber of Commerce, That the Congress of the United States be promptly petitioned to immediately enact legislation definitely and forever extinguishing any and all aborigine rights, if any, that the Alaskan Indians ever held or possessed and all claims now, heretofore, and hereafter asserted to such, if any aborigine rights, and authorize Alaskan Indians to sue the United States of America in the United States Court of Claims, or other appropriate court, for the recovery of the value of such, if any, aborigine rights now or ever held or possessed by them, and provide that in the event of such, if any, recovery, the United States of America shall pay said Indians in money therefor.

Passed and approved unanimously March 23, 1945.

ALASKA TERRITORIAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By HOMER GARVIN, *President.*
Attest:
MARTHA WENDLING,
Executive Secretary.

House Joint Resolution 99

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Albert P. Morano in support of House Joint Resolution 99, made before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, April 11, 1945:

Mr. Chairman. at the very outset let me ephasize and make very clear that this statement in support of House Joint Resolution 99 does not necessarily reflect the position, attitude, or views of my boss, CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

I shall confine myself merely to the military contribution being made by Italy in the present war.

On September 8, 1943, an armistice was signed between Italy and the United Nations. Immediately after this armistice the Italian Regular Army and the underground forces (which had been fighting fascism and nazism) were actively engaged against the German forces occupying Italy. The slow development of the very difficult military operations on the bridgehead at Salerno rendered vain the fighting put up in the different sections of the peninsula by the Italian Army against the Germans, but already in those days following the armistice many Italian units sustained heavy losses. Let me quote from President Roosevelt's speech last Columbus Day:

"And there are also Italians themselves fighting bravely for the liberation of their country. They are fighting in the Allied armies and they are fighting in the underground forces behind the German lines."

With the declaration of cobelligerency, the Italian Government started the reorganization of the Army. Today, according to various publications and reports made on the military participation of Italy in the war, one can safely state that more than a million men are contributing, either on the Italian front or in other theaters of operations, in the rear lines or elsewhere, to the war effort of the Allies.

At the front itself Italy has already five divisions fully trained and equipped, fighting at the side of the Allies and on many occasions the Italian forces have been mentioned in connection with some hard operations and fighting. Two weeks ago there was an extensive report regarding the occupation of an important position on the Adriatic coast by Italian forces. If no more than five divisions are actively engaged, this does not depend from the will and desire of the Italian Government and people, who have repeatedly requested to be allowed to give a more active and substantial contribution. Also well known is the valuable work done by Italian transport units bringing materials to the Allied forces fighting in the very difficult theater of the Appenines, where they had to overcome enormous difficulties in the accomplishment of their task. Moreover, more than 250,000 Italian soldier are employed in labor units in the rear lines, thus relieving a substantial number of Allied forces from similar duties.

The Italian press has also published interesting reports on the splendid fighting of the Brigata Garibaldi against the Germans beside Marshal Tito's forces in the Balkans where it has sustained very heavy losses which range to more than one-third of the effectives operating under extremely hard logistic conditions.

Concerning the contribution given by the Navy, it should be observed that the entire Italian fleet is now at the disposal of the Allies, and a recent report of the Allied Commission has made special mention of the services rendered by the Italian ships in escorting convoys, operating against enemy forces in the Adriatic and, as it has been revealed, forcing harbors on two occasions, with submarines or light torpedo boats. One can reckon, according to pre-war figures and subsequent reports, that the Allies can count on at least 5 battleships and 400 ships of different sizes.

Mention must be made also of the 300,000 Italians still called prisoners of war, who have joined service units and are now working for war purposes with the Allies throughout the world.

One has also heard of the progressive reorganization of the air force and of the various war missions it has accomplished.

Special mention must be made of the activity shown by the armed patriots fighting in northern Italy, who are continuously growing. One has to recall the difficult situation in which they found themselves during the winter months, especially after the announcement made in December by General Alexander asking them to lay down arms for the time being and return to their houses, because military operations were in a stalemate. On the contrary the patriots enduring the most difficult hardships, have valiantly pursued their various activities—sabotaging of power plants and German military installations, endangering German ways of communications, actual fighting, and so forth—and their number has also been increasing every day. According to a recent announcement, they number about 200,000, which constitutes the highest figure of partisan forces fighting for the Allied cause in the occupied territories of Europe. Recognition of this fighting unit is seen in the proclamation of General Clark of 10 days ago, when he called on the partisans to take up arms to fight against the common enemy, in the final offensive to drive the Germans from Italian territory.

On the economic and financial side much could be said, even ignoring the terms of the armistice which have not yet been made public. One knows that through requisitioning, mobilization of industry, utilization of materials and machinery still found available, the important work of the navy yards, the Allies have practically at their disposal all the economic resources of the country. Thus is found the actual participation of the whole Italian economy in the war effort.

Then too, one can gather how heavy is the burden borne by the Italian Government and people in the financial field if one gives attention to the problem of the issuance of the money of occupation. The Treasury Department has stated, in this respect, that neither the American Government nor the other allies can be held responsible for this money of occupation, whose redemption and responsibility lies with the Italian Government. President Roosevelt announced in September, however, that a credit was to be granted to the Italian Government for account of amlire issued for the American troops' pay in Italy. Figures have begun to

circulate estimating the amount of this credit at $150,000,000. Nothing, however, has been provided for the rest of the issuance, regarding payment of Allied troops or the amlire paid for the services and materials bought with amlire on Italian soil by the fighting armies. Accordingly, it can safely be stated that the Italian Government and people are still bearing a considerable amount of the cost of war fought on their own territory, including the devastation and destruction brought on the Italian Peninsula. It is no longer a question of the Italians having to bear the financial burden of the occupation of the Allied armies, but they are now contributing effectively and extensively to the whole Allied war effort in Italy.

A form of agreement as the one concluded with the French, on a reciprocal aid basis, would recognize these efforts and give shape to the present financial disorderly relations between the two countries. In this agreement all that America on its part is now contributing to the Italian economy (foodstuffs, raw materials, weapons, machinery) could be earmarked as American and not appear as it has with the present system, as a general contribution of the Allies. Moreover, from this point of view, important advantages would derive.

Against the argument that the war in Germany will soon be over is the fact that the underlying fundamental principle of the lend-lease agreements is the one previously laid down by the President of the United States: "Until the unconditional surrender of both Japan and Germany, we should continue the lend-lease program on whatever scale is necessary to make the combined striking power of all the United Nations against our enemies as overwhelming and as effective as we can make it."

Not Wholly Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

NOT WHOLLY GONE

It is not so much because of his greatness as President that the Nation genuinely mourns today for Franklin Roosevelt. It is not the remembrance of that greatness that fills millions of Americans with a sense of personal loss. It is something else. It is the remembrance of his bright spirit, his gallant and affirmative approach to life, his smile, his voice, his pleasant and handsome face. It is the remembrance of the warmth he irradiated, the goodness of heart he so frequently displayed, and all the other traits and mannerisms that made his leadership so splendidly human.

More than any other President, with the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt was endowed with a personality that could not be changed or made to seem remote by the tremendous pressures and august power of his office. He liked the people, and by and large he remained close to them to the end. There was a quality in him, a spark, an intangible force not readily defined, that called forth an affectionate response from legions of men and women—young and old alike—who had never met or seen him in the flesh but who nevertheless felt personally attached to him as to a tried and true friend.

It is because they remember him now in that light—as a friend who inspired and encouraged them as a man whose greatness in office never detracted from his magnetism as a human being—that multitudes of Americans feel individually bereaved by President Roosevelt's death. And it is a further measure of his unique stature and personality that the same feeling is widespread abroad and that in places as distant as London and Moscow obscure people wept when they heard that he was gone. Perhaps the soundest explanation of all this is the simple one: That he won so many hearts because his own heart was so much and so consistently for humanity.

Today Franklin Roosevelt is at the White House for the last time, and tomorrow the earth at Hyde Park will take him to itself forever. But death cannot triumph over spirit, and his spirit, like that of his great predecessors, will be part of this Nation—and through this Nation part of the world—for as long as our history is written. In that sense, surely, it may rightly be said on this day of mourning that he is with us yet.

Let Us Begin Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over State-wide broadcast in the State of North Dakota on the San Francisco Conference:

My fellow citizens of North Dakota, it seems a long time since that eventful day when the broadcasting system announced to our country and to the world the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. Immediately thereafter, we dedicated ourselves, and we pledged our resources by an act of Congress to an all-out war. We have kept the faith and filled the bill. We have raised one of the greatest armies in all civilization. We have built a greater navy than will probably ever be built again. We have changed the production line of the airplane to produce thousands. This has all been done under the American system.

Well may we rejoice tonight in the fact that we are Americans. We can rejoice in the great genius of our industrialists—in their patriotism, despite here and there a criticism of excessive profits. We can rejoice in the noble contribution of labor, despite here and there an unworthy strike. Both of them, working together, have astounded the world. Not alone have we supplied our own forces—and remember, we started almost from scratch, but we have very materially aided our great allies with food and with war supplies. Without our help, none of them could have remained in the fight. Each succeeding day, as we add to the list of liberated peoples, food from the farms of America is rushed to them. When General MacArthur gallantly returned to the Philippines and began the liberation of those islands, their liberation became our problem because their people needed food. France needed food, Holland needed food, Greece needed food, Italy needed food, and, finally, so will Norway. What a crown of glory must rest forever upon the brows of the American farmers.

In my days in Congress, I have recognized the fundamental importance of food in this war, and despite some criticism, I have fought with great courage to retain the farm boys on the farms of North Dakota. I have stated and restated that there does prevail the Tydings amendment—a law of the United States Congress which protects these men and their families in their rights. I have said again and again that men who remain on the farms must be given every conceivable consideration. Their work is vital. Their work is noble and in every sense a highly important part of the war effort.

We all recognize with grateful hearts the glorious contributions that have been made on the fields of battle, on the ships of the sea, and in the air. History books for generations will record the gallant deeds of these American men and women, and as a Member of the United States Congress, I pledge you tonight that I shall stand committed to full and complete recognition of the honors and the rights that are theirs, and I shall courageously take my part to see that they receive them—the most important of which, in my personal judgment, is to create through Congress an economic climate under which these men and women can return and start life over again.

There must never be another war. We must have peace—permanent peace in this world, and that means that something must be done about it now. Some people will charge me with being idealistic. Perhaps it is an ideal—but idealism is but the expression of a wish, and it must always precede planning and action.

The planning and the action have begun. Great criticism has been heaped upon Dumbarton Oaks, and grave concern is expressed about the San Francisco Conference. The President is charged with double dealing. Much debate is being heard about the ratio of votes at the Conference. We hear about the ambitions of Marshal Stalin, and great skepticism of England.

Well, let us not forget, my friends, that much as we want peace, those countries want it just as completely. The lands of Russia that will have to be rehabilitated, cover a territory almost as large as half of continental America. That is a task that will take a generation to effect. Russia must crave peace. England can never rebuild her Empire—can never rebuild her trade lines—can never continue as a great Nation unless she has peace. These countries have been our allies in war. Each has performed her task steadfastly and courageously. Never have we had cause to question their sincerity, and their contribution. Our faith in them has been fully justified in the prosecution of this war. Russia's final act—her break with Japan—is but a further and more satisfying proof of her sincerity. England, Russia, and America are the countries most deeply concerned with peace because we have paid the greatest price in the war. Then, it seems to me that the criticism we are hearing about the voting ratio—Dumbarton Oaks—and Bretton Woods, is somewhat academic. Ours is a land in which the individual has been developed. England develops the individual, too. Russia is a country strangely different from us in thought and action, but, yet, through it all, we have a common goal, and that goal is lasting peace.

I believe the people of this Nation, even though disturbed and rightly concerned about some phases of the situation—even though there is some doubt about the intentions of England and Russia—even though we see in their practices "power politics" and efforts being expended to enhance their positions in days to come, I repeat, I believe the people of this Nation are

saying "Come what may, let us try something that will stop war." I believe the American people are demanding, by and large, that we participate in the San Francisco Conference, that we take a leading part, that we make reasonable compromises, that we do not go too far and become involved in a situation that might become dangerous; I believe the American people are saying, "Let us begin here."

You will recall the problems that beset, years ago, our own Constitutional Convention. The men who met there, met the deep convictions, with hearts and souls dedicated to the building of a new nation. Outside, there was great criticism, there was grave doubt, there was deep skepticism, and many people questioned whether or not the efforts of that Convention could bear fruit. I think it is safe to say that very few people believed the Constitution would stand.

But those men moved wisely and courageously to set up the framework. They waited for the element of time to play its part. The Bill of Rights came later, and out of it all came a nation that in this dark hour is leading the peoples of the world out of the wilderness. Is it not reasonable to hope—yes, to believe—that a similar situation could occur at San Francisco?

Yes, our task is difficult. Yet we live in an age when facilities for enlightenment, for education, and for knowledge are far greater than was the case at the time of the Constitutional Convention. They were prompted with a desire to build a nation that could be free and independent. This meeting is prompted with a desire to build a structure for permanent peace. It has a chance to succeed, and a good chance to succeed because back of it all rests the spirit of the people of Russia, of England, and of America—the spirit of burning zeal to build a framework for enduring peace.

We, as the United States, must be brought forcibly to learn that peace cannot come to us by accident. It cannot endure by accident. If we are to have and maintain a lasting peace, machinery must be set up, and we, as a nation, must resolve that we shall take our place to make it endure. There are certain fundamental things that must claim the attention of the San Francisco Conference. In this connection I want to read to you from an editorial in the Bismarck Tribune under date of April 3, written by its editor, Kenneth W. Simons. I quote:

"At the end of the last war we made the mistake of believing that peace would take care of itself. When the guns were silenced we went back to minding our own business, neither noticing nor caring what went on in other lands. Ethiopia, we thought, was far away. Fascism, unpleasant though it sounded, we discounted as a way of life peculiar to Italy. Even the rise of Hitler found most of us unmoved. We dismissed him as a 'crackpot' and laughed at his rantings. Thus it went on until we saw that we had missed the forest for the trees. The 'local incident' in Ethiopia led to aggressions in Spain, Albania, Greece, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Fascism, once peculiar to Italy, spread like wildfire over Europe. And that German 'crackpot' who began by attacking minorities in Germany, finally became the greatest single enemy humanity has even known. The small flame that consumed at first the rights and freedoms of a very few, soon spread until it threatened to devour us all. The protection of individual rights, wherever they may be threatened, is no longer a question of altruism. Most of us have stopped feeling like Santa Claus, because we are doing our share to bring peace to the world. For now we know that the only hope for our own security lies in a peace that protects the rights of all peoples, wherever they may live."

In this San Francisco Convention, so soon to assemble, there must be first and foremost, a spirit of candor, there must be frank discussion. Remember, every nation will have the veto power at San Francisco. From that effort must come a finished product in the form of a treaty that is satisfactory to every sovereign nation. There will be no way in which a nation can be compelled to join.

I quote you here the thought so ably expressed by David Lawrence. He says:

"The San Francisco Conference, fortunately, is to be unlike Yalta. It is to be open. It is to be free from bargains and trades related to the continued prosecution of the war. It will have compromises and adjustments, no doubt, but in the direction of achieving the objective that the whole world seeks—namely, a means of insuring peace." He goes on to say: "Let us ratify the charter that comes out of San Francisco, but strive ever to improve it and make it the ideal instrument that it can become when the principles of representative government and the "four freedoms" are accepted by all nations as a prerequisite to world peace. For no matter what is written in the San Francisco agreement, the most powerful influence in the preservation of the peace will not be in the wording of the charter, but in the character and integrity of the statesmen of the member governments of tomorrow, who are to rule over vast populations. One-man government can plunge a country into war overnight and disturb world peace. Governments that must act through parliaments and congresses can be influenced by moral force."

While we, as Americans, enter into this event prompted by the noblest of desires—that of peace—let us not forget that having made the beginning in that direction, there rests upon the shoulders of all of us a responsibility to make it work. We must not overlook the fact that in addition to our responsibility here, we must labor long and hard to retain forever our American plan of life.

Great new forces, resulting largely from war, have invaded our country. Bit by bit, they take their measure. America at peace, with its great farms, its huge industries, its free and intelligent labor, possesses without question the essential things for leadership of the world. The mantle falls upon us. The place once held by England is ours today. We must keep this country a country of individuals. It must never be leveled off under these new influences, masquerading under the guise of patriotism. Bit by bit, they hand us their insidious ideas, veiling them under the name of democracy. I say to you tonight, my friends, they are the antithesis of democracy. As for myself, I shall have no part with these new ideas that belittle or deny the value, the strength, and the greatness of our American way of life. There is nothing so vital, nothing so fundamental, nothing so worthy of our diligence and our effort as to keep this America in tune with the spirit of the men who met in Philadelphia in the year 1789.

Easter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the editor and publisher of the Half Moon Bay Review in Half Moon Bay, Calif., has written the following thought-provoking editorial. I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of my colleagues.

EASTER

Easter has an eternal and immeasurable significance for mankind. The resurrection of the great Nazarene was the highest and most convicing proof of his teachings. It gave to humanity unquestionable evidence of the immortality of life.

The resurrection serves as a permanent reminder to the world that although the forces of tyranny and oppression at times seem invincible and able to defy the very power of heaven, they are inevitably swept to destruction by the onward march of truth.

Today darkness still covers much of the earth, but the forever fact that right makes might is again being demonstrated. Since last Easter the great rock of despotism has been rolled away from many a nation. In Europe nazi-ism and all that it stands for reels toward its doom. In Asia the days of its counterpart are numbered.

Christian men and women would much rather settle differences between nations by peaceful means. But they have learned that it is wiser to take up the sword in defense of democracy and decency than to permit their God-given rights to be lost even temporarily.

Christian civilization believes in the individuality of man. It holds that even the lowliest and most humble of men are deserving of respect and consideration from their fellow beings. Christianity is the antithesis of totalitarianism.

The teachings of Jesus are something infinitely more than can be expressed in rites or rituals alone. They find their true manifestation in practical goodness in daily life.

At this Eastertide each one of us can renew his efforts to make this world a better world by making his life a better life.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the people, not only of my district but of the entire State of Wisconsin, are vitally interested in the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. They firmly believe that this project would aid immeasurably in stimulating postwar trade and helping to achieve our goal of full employment.

Evidence of the widespread interest of the State in this matter is shown by the recent passage by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin of the following joint resolution:

Assembly Joint Resolution 8

Joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to enable development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway immediately upon termination of the war

Whereas the President has termed the proposed development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway for travel by seagoing vessels more important to the country's public than any other project of this nature; and

Whereas for 50 years outstanding Americans in official and civilian life, concerned with the economic welfare of the people of this country, have urged this undertaking as vital to the full development of the country's resources and inland transportation facilities; and for 20 years the Governors and Legislatures of the State of Wisconsin, regardless of political affiliations, have gone on record as favoring such a project; and

Whereas every effort in the past to make this seaway a reality has failed because of vigorous opposition from selfish interests; and

Whereas the urge for this seaway is today strong and virile and will continue so to be until the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is made adequate for navigation of seagoing vessels and furnishes Midwest farm, factory, mine, and shipyard products access to the markets of the world; and

Whereas a seaway from the Great Lakes to the tidewaters of the Atlantic will increase our national security in time of crisis, aid in the restoration of our foreign markets after the war, stimulate development of the resources of the Midwest and lower transportation costs; and

Whereas, if authorized and undertaken as an immediate post-war works program, such project will provide a cushion to the employment shift when the eventual change from war to peace time conditions arrives, and will furnish a full measure of opportunity for employment to the returning soldier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to make such treaties and to enact such legislation as is necessary to authorize development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway for navigation of sea-going vessels immediately upon termination of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to both Houses of the Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof, to the governing bodies of Wisconsin port cities, and to the major cities bordering the Great Lakes with a fervent plea for aggressive action in furthering this cause.

DONALD C. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
CONRAD SHEARER,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Wanted, a Modern Joseph To Prepare for Food Famine on Today's Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Call, of Paterson, N. J.:

WANTED, A MODERN JOSEPH TO PREPARE FOR FOOD FAMINE ON TODAY'S HORIZON

One year ago the Morning Call made a plea for more aid and encouragement to the farmers of the Nation, warning of an inevitable food famine for curselves as well as the scorched and plundered nations in the battle zones.

Our shortsighted food administrators, however, still blinded by the false and godless philosophy of prosperity through economic scarcity, refused to listen and slumbered contentedly on, obvious to the fact that the continuous turning of plow-shares into guns and farm hands into soldiers has been slowly but surely depleting our farms of both manpower and equipment so necessary to keep our farm lands at full production. Now as a result, according to James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, we are likely to lose 25 percent of our potential food production this year, at a time when food and more food is the need of the hour. Already the great surpluses of which our Department of Agriculture boasted last year are dwindling like ice in a summer's sun, due to the unprecedented and apparently underestimated demands of the starving peoples which our victorious armies have been liberating by the millions. Our War Food Administrator also underestimated the supposedly "vast surpluses on hand in the Army warehouses," for only last week Assistant Secretary of War Patterson revealed that the 108-day Army supply at overseas ports had been reduced to less than 70. In fact the entire reserve at home and abroad is now so low that if it were all released it would not feed our civilian population for 1 week.

Already as our loyal housewives are daily finding out, where only last year there were bulging surpluses as reported by our Secretary of Agriculture, shortages have already developed in meat, fats, oils, sugar, and dairy products. Even the faithful chicken has suddenly become as scarce on the market here in Paterson as an egg in England. And it is not all going to our half-starved allies either, for early this past winter the Bureau of Agricultural Economics revealed that we did not even then have enough to take care of Europe's barest relief needs in four of the six prime food necessities—meat, fats, and oils, sugar, and milk.

So in spite of last year's bumper crops, blessed with good farming weather, scarcity in this land of wealth and plenty looms in front of us at a time when the whole world is crying for food. Should there be a Nation-wide drought this year to add to our mounting food troubles (and it is pretty near time Dame Nature decreed one) how long will our fast vanishing stock piles fill the breach? It takes no divine prophecy to foretell another food famine to plague the world, thanks to the wasteful and destructive follies of mankind, as it did 3,660 years ago in the prophet Joseph's time.

What Egypt faced then, America may face in 1945. Would that we had another Joseph in Washington today to foresee and prepare for its coming; a Joseph, who would step up spring farm plantings all over this long blessed land, who would rebuild and provide modern farm machinery, and construct vast granaries and storehouses to meet the famine that will descend and bring tragedy upon us in the wake of war if we are as criminally unprepared as we are today to meet it.

The Wailing World's Heart-Felt Good-bye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE WAILING WORLD'S HEART-FELT GOODBYE

G–one from the earth, deeply mourned by mankind
O–f every race, for whose freedom he stood—
O–n world occasions, the Roosevelt mind
D–ared to direct, for humanity's good—
B–orn to become a great leader of men,
Y–ea, a creator of national thought,
E–verywhere have both his voice and his pen

T–actfully told the world, time and again,
O–f the great battles that had to be fought.

P–resident Roosevelt laid his own life
R–eadily down, to retrieve the lost world—
E–ver advancing, he led in the strife,
S–milingly, under Old Glory unfurled—
I–n a great way, he did more than he should—
D–aily he sought divine aid from above,
E–ven for wisdom to teach humanhood
N–ational justice, for man's common good,
T–hus overcoming his hate with God's love.

R–ight was his helmet and truth was his sword—
O–n these he counted, in every combat—
O–ver his problems his best thought he poured,
S–eeking solutions through prayer, pleading that
E–ven this war may continue until
V–ictory shouts, too delighting to cease,
E–ver may—his dying wish to fulfill—
L–ast, in accordance with God's purposed will,
T–ill every land shall enjoy endless peace.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

In Service to His Country He Paid With His Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Frank E. Gannett, president, the Gannett newspapers, Rochester, N. Y.:

IN SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY HE PAID WITH HIS LIFE

(By Frank Gannett)

Tragedy struck our country yesterday and the entire Nation mourns the passing of its President, a great leader, a great person, a friend of mankind, whose name will be written large in the annals of history.

Even his bitterest political opponents are saddened by the passing of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for he rarely made a personal enemy, even among those with whom he differed on Government policies.

For 12 years he faced the torments of the most perplexing problems the world has even seen—the problems of a depression never equalled in intensity, the problems of the bitterest, bloodiest war of all time. For 12 years he faced these problems with a smile, the same indomitable courage and determination that helped him, when stricken and crippled, to overcome the disease which laid him low, as a young man.

He had a kindly, friendly charm which won for him millions of faithful, loyal admirers, a following such as few leaders in public life ever have had.

Yes, he had fortitude seldom surpassed or equaled. He must have been aware last fall that his strength was fast ebbing, but he drove himself on through a hard campaign to reelection believing, without a doubt, that it was his solemn duty to carry on in this crisis regardless of all personal consequences. In service to his country he has paid with his life as much as if he had died on the battlefield.

What a pity that he could not have lived to see the magnificent military forces he did so much to develop, overwhelmingly defeat our fiendish enemies. He did, however, have the gratification of seeing the approach of a glorious victory and he died knowing that triumph was near.

His passing could not have come at a more unfortunate time, at the peak of a world crisis.

It is for us now to redouble our efforts for the beloved country which he strove so hard to serve, and for which he gave his all. It is for us to rally to the support of our Government, to forget partisanship and to help with all our might to win victory and to win the peace.

On his successor in office have fallen tremendous burdens and, besides, to him has come a great opportunity to serve mankind. That he may rise to the great emergency we face and give us wise leadership, is the hope and prayer of all Americans.

The End of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in an old-fashioned garden at Hyde Park on yesterday, a distinguished company of sorrowing friends said a final good-by to President Roosevelt. It was not my privilege to be in the distinguished company but I am sure that it must have been impressive. A very great man has left us. One who, in my humble judgment, will grow in stature as the coming years permit us to appraise his life and work objectively.

Were a star kept on high,
Forever would it's light
Still traveling downward
Through the sky
Fall on our mortal sight.

So, when a great man dies,
For years beyond our ken,
The light he leaves behind him
Falls upon the paths of men.

America today mourns the passing of a great President. The lovers of freedom and liberty the world over have lost a great champion.

I think one of the splendid things that has happened in the last few days in the way of an expression of great esteem and appreciation of the President was the very fine way in which American radio responded. The several broadcasting chains, as well as individual stations, laid all commercial activities aside and brought only appropriate news ano information in the hour of mourning. In my judgment, one of the classics of the several programs was the description of the ceremony at Hyde Park made immediately thereafter by Baukhage, a distinguished analyst and commentator of the American Broadcasting Co.

I believe this description should be preserved and, under leave granted me, I herewith include the same:

Baukhage talking from a little house down the Boston Post Road—a bit from Hyde Park where I've come, following the President's funeral. A little way from the rolling farmland, the woodland and hedgerows, and stone fences, and plowed fields, the old home behind the trees where Franklin Roosevelt first saw the light over the hills of the Hudson, and where I've just left him in the midst of his own acres, taking his last long rest.

I'm not going to talk about the death of the President today because I'm thinking of something else. I'm thinking about an American—like others who fell at Lexington, Appomattox, at San Juan Hill, and Chateau-Thierry, on the Normandy beaches, on Guadalcanal, at Aachen, and now at the very gates of Berlin. I am thinking of Franklin Roosevelt that way because of the last broadcast I made from Hyde Park on September 8, 4 years ago on a mellow autumn day. On that day thousands in America were not thinking of the most thought-about man in the country then in terms of politics or policies or rank or title or achievements or failures. But they were thinking of him humanly and vainly trying to share the grief that a son alone must bear when he repays with the anguish of parting, the debt in travail of her who bore him. That was the day when Sara Delano Roosevelt passed away. And that is what I said then—then, not a President but a man mourning for his mother.

And today a Nation mourns not for a President but for a loss made the more poignant by the sorrow of the mothers all over the Nation whose sons have been lost on the wide battlefields of the world. To me there is no question whatever but that Franklin Roosevelt died in the service of his country, a service grown too great for any single man to bear, just as other mothers' sons have died for their country, the ones who gave their lives in action. To me, this ceremony that I have just witnessed is part of the great panoply of sacrifice that men since time began have made, giving their life to preserve an ideal which lived on because they were willing to exchange their own lives for it. A part of the eternal miracle of nature when earth takes back her seed only to return it in the rich harvest, in flower and stalk, to be the nourishment of others that mourn.

I have come, as I say, from Hyde Park where in an ancient old-fashioned garden, protected by the high walls of a hemlock hedge, another American has gone to rest on the acres where he was born, the acres he loved. He chose this spot among the old-fashioned blooms, now only brown shoots, I noticed before me, brown and unobtrusive compared to the mountain of riotous color heaped above the grave. But those were plucked flowers—they will fade. The others, they will bloom again in this eternal miracle of spring. Over the boxwood hedge the old red barn looks down. Thousands of those red barns are on America's farms. Beyond and hidden by the great trees is the old home and beyond—the Hudson River flowing gently to the sea.

And now as I have taken the notes down I'll give them to you:

First there was the roar of planes overhead and then the sharp order "Attention," the salute, and then echoing over those deep hills of the Hudson, like Hendrick Hudson's bowling balls, came the salute of 48 guns. And between those shots all was so silent that you could hear bird songs everywhere. And then "Present arms," and then the planes coming back. And then last in the distance, the low tap of the muffled drums from the West Point band and then the sound of the slow rhythm of the dead march which grew louder and louder as they entered the grounds. And now they come in before us, and the West Pointers follow at that strange slow march, and finally the caisson is outside the hedge, you can hear it. It halts just beyond the little entrance where I am standing. The bombers soar over and now the colors are advanced—the Stars and Stripes, the gold of the Presidential Flag. And now "Order arms," "Present arms," and the bugles sound off, the Star-Spangled Banner, and at that moment the cool wind from the Hudson River blew and whipped out the flags. "Order arms," "Parade rest," and now softly the band began Lead, Kindly Light. And now a choir boy with the crucifix comes in, behind, in white surplice, the white-haired minister, and then the coffin with the pallbearers, soldiers and sailors and marines, and next the wife and the daughter and the son, Elliott, and then President Truman. The coffin rests, a flag upon it—the flag is raised and held above it. And now the minister speaks, there comes a prayer, and then the poem that he reads with this refrain: "Father in Thy gracious keeping leave we now Thy servant sleeping." And then after the silence, bird songs again. And then the sharp order to the firing party: "Fire three volleys," "Ready," "Aim," "Fire." The shots ring out—three times the volleys are shot over the grave—and after each the bark of a little lonely dog. And then that sweetest and saddest of all music—the bugle sounds Taps. There is a pause as the echoes die and the coffin is lowered into the earth. The sergeant, with military precision, marches over and lays the flag that decked the coffin in the hands of Mrs. Roosevelt. And so, an American has gone to rest in the green of the garden, in the shadow of the old red barn, and his spirit, like that of all his fallen comrades on the battlefield, rolls on like the eternal river flowing softly to the sea.

The Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Gannett:

FRIEND OF MAN LOST TO UNITED STATES, SAYS GANNETT

Tragedy struck our country yesterday. And the entire Nation mourns the passing of its President—a great leader, a great person, a friend of mankind, whose name will be written large in the annals of history.

Even his bitterest political opponents are saddened by the passing of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for he rarely made a personal enemy, even among those with whom he differed on Government policies.

For 12 years, he faced the torments of the most perplexing problems the world has ever seen—the problem of a depression never equalled in intensity, the problem of the bitterest, bloodiest war of all time.

For 12 years he faced these problems with a smile and the same indomitable courage and determination that helped him when stricken and crippled to overcome the disease which laid him low as a young man.

He had a kindly, friendly charm which won for him millions of faithful, loyal admirers—a following such as few leaders in public life have ever had. Yet, he had fortitude seldom surpassed or equalled. He must have been aware last fall that his strength was fast ebbing. But he drove himself on through a hard campaign to reelection, believing, without doubt, that it was his solemn duty to carry on in this crisis, regardless of all personal consequences. In service to his country, he has paid with his life as much as if he had died on the battlefield.

What a pity he could not have lived to see the magnificent military forces he did so much to develop overwhelmingly defeat our fiendish enemies.

He did, however, have the gratification of seeing the approach of a glorious victory and he died knowing that triumph was near.

His passing could not have come at a more unfortunate time, at the peak of a world crisis.

It is for us now to redouble our efforts for the beloved country which he strove so hard to serve and for which he gave his all. It is for us to rally to the support of our Government, to forget partisanship, and to help with all our might to win victory and to win the peace.

On his successor in office have fallen tremendous burdens, and besides, to him has come a great opportunity to serve mankind. That he may rise to the great emergency we face and give us wise leadership is the hope and prayer of all Americans.

Lincoln and Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Work of the Department of Agriculture of the United States at a memorial service held at Ford's Theater here in Washington on Sunday, April 15, 1945.

This occasion was sponsored by the Lincoln Group of Washington, assisted by the National Park Service of the Government, commemorating the eightieth anniversary of the death of President Abraham Lincoln:

This day is a peculiarly sad day, just as April 15, 1865, was a historically sad day. This meeting, which it has become a custom of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia to hold each year on April 15, was planned to assist in the noble purpose of revering the memory of Lincoln. Yet fate has decreed that within the last 4 hours the mortal remains of our great war President, our Commander in Chief in this war to preserve democracy and Christianity on the face of the earth, have been laid to rest in the peaceful mother earth of his ancestral home which he loved so well. It is one of the odd circumstances of history that significant dates of three of our greatest Presidents lie within the small compass of 4 days. Franklin D. Roosevelt died on April 12. Thomas Jefferson was born on April 13. Abraham Lincoln became immortal on April 15.

Today is a day that the living will never forget. Eighty years ago our fathers and mothers, our grandfathers and grandmothers, were shocked by the sad news of the most dastardly tragedy of history, which was enacted in this room. Today we are shocked by the death of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The suspense and tragedy of war made "Father Abraham" almost a member of the family circle of many of our ancestors, and friend to those soldiers and sailors who served under him. For the same reason, war and modern ways of communication made Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, an intimate friend, a friend to us all.

There are many similarities that are much more than surface traits of these two men—Lincoln and Roosevelt. While it is true that both had different backgrounds, different types of ancestors, different opportunities as young men, yet both were truly American and were products of the soil, and of the people of our great Republic. With both, there was that hope and courage so characteristic of democratic society that led their spirits to become triumphant over handicaps that would have overcome lesser men.

In Roosevelt there was the great triumph over illness that would have incapacitated for life a less hardy soul. Lincoln triumphed over the lack of educational opportunity and the other handicaps of a humble pioneer boyhood. Yet both, when the opportunity for service to mankind came, when the crisis had to be met, developed into the greatest of the leaders of mankind. Above all, both had a peculiar and deep sympathy for humanity, for all humanity, regardless of race, creed, or color. I think both men were in this respect different from most men. By deed and works they proved their love for their fellow man. No matter how humble the person, they were always ready with understanding sympathy to assist the troubled, the sick, and the insecure.

While the domestic policies of all our Presidents have to be evaluated ultimately in the light of historic perspective, and subsequent events in the government of the Nation, I think I can quote with propriety at this time the following comment appearing in this morning's New York Times:

"In one of his state papers Mr. Roosevelt remarked that his own philosophy of government could be found in a quotation from Abraham Lincoln which said, 'The legitimate object of government is to do for the community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot do as well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.' "

Both Lincoln and Roosevelt rose to the highest peaks of greatness when there appeared the crisis of their age. For Lincoln, the crisis of the unity of the Nation. For Roosevelt, the crisis of the threat of the most cruel and inhuman totalitarian philosophy which challenged the whole of our democratic and Christian way of life. Both became world figures that were looked to with hope by most of mankind, and both were taken away by an all-wise Providence when, like Moses, they could see the fruits of their labors and victories and look into the promised land.

In the words of the Lord, as He spoke to Moses in sight of the Promised Land, so may we also regard the Lord as having said to both Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither" (Deuteronomy, 34, 4).

All of us consider the Gettysburg Address as one of the few great expressions of a great soul that will live as long as democratic Christian civilization lives. It possesses the literary movement and thought of the Bible more than any other speech of modern times. We can apply the thought in the last paragraph paraphrased to apply to these two men:

"It it for us the living, rather, to be dedicated to the unfinished work they have thus far so nobly carried on. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * and that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, and that this Nation, this world, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

A Great Time To Be Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a lecture given to Burrall Class, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., by Miss Margaret K. Patterson, assistant teacher, Sunday morning, March 11, 1945. Miss Patterson is administrative principal of the Fillmore-Hearst Schools in the District of Columbia. I consider this a most worth while article and I believe Members of Congress, as well as others, will be interested in reading it.

First, may I say that the lesson this morning was inspired by that recent little book of Dr. Fosdick's, A Great Time To Be Alive. I've drawn particularly upon the first chapter which bears the same title as the book itself. You who have read the book will realize that I have followed his development and his wording rather closely in the first part of the lesson.

The title, "A Great Time To Be Alive," catches our attention immediately. It rather startles us and stimulates our thinking. We find ourselves in a questioning attitude as we exclaim, "A great time to be alive. What do you mean by that? Were times ever more terrible or more terrorizing than they are just now?"

Dr. Fosdick, realizing, no doubt, that such a title sets up a debatable question, starts out by agreeing with our first reaction. His very first sentence in the book is, "This certainly is a ghastly time to be alive." He continues, "Our earth has seldom, if ever, seen the unheralded mass of human misery which exists," in spite of the headlines of victory for the Allies in practically every theater of war. " 'Because of the last war,' says Dr. Hambro, late president of the League of Nations, '35,000,000 human beings died of starvation and epidemics, but that is only a drop in the bucket compared with this war's disaster.' "

We don't need Dr. Fosdick or anyone else to remind us that "we are living in a grim and hideous time." For example:

When we read of especially constructed death chambers erected for the sole purpose of snuffing out human lives en masse, including women and childen—chambers so devised that those who planned them can sit by and look through glass at the success of their experiment.

When we read that masses of people in the recently liberated countries are practically starving to death and are so destitute that they have even become impatient with their liberators because of the slowness of supplies coming through.

When we look at pictures of men and women who have spent months in enemy prisons in the Philippines and see in their faces and bodies evidences of slow starvation.

When we think of the anxiety of one family—a family we know—whose son was over

there going through the most horrible experiences that civilized man has ever endured—and then, later, that family was plunged into sorrow on the arrival of the ever dreaded message "Missing in action" or "Killed in action"—and multiply that one family by thousands in both Allied and enemy countries.

When we know of one case, at least, where a father counseled and worked out a plan with his own son before the son went over, that if he were captured by the Japanese, he would take his own life rather than take a chance on being subjected to debasing physical and mental torture.

When we read that our own Allied officials, after much thought and deliberation, have decided on terror bombing—that is, bombing of residential districts, of civilian population centers, of roads and streets filled with fleeing and terror-stricken evacuees.

And finally, when we begin to contemplate the mass hatred that is filling the world and will continue to permeate it for generations to come.

Truly, with one accord, we can say with Dr. Fosdick, "This is a ghastly time to be alive." We are prone to ask the same question as the writer of the fourth psalm, "Who will show us any good?"

Can any good come out of it all? If we really think seriously about the problems facing us of both a personal and public nature, how can we stand up under the pressure? What will sustain us? Dr. Fosdick emphasizes that "ours is a day when we cannot seek for ease but must seek for adequacy. Some eras are like a lullaby; some are like a spur. Which of the two is likely in the end to be greater?"

History helps us to answer these questions.

Look at the era in which Thomas Jefferson lived. He called it "appalling," feeling that the gains of civilization were completely dissipated. He wrote, "Those moral principles and conventional usages which have heretofore been the bond of civilized nations * * * have given way to force, the law of barbarians, and the nineteenth century dawns with the vandalism of the fifth." And yet today, as we look back, we glory in the generation in which Jefferson, Washington, Hamilton, Marshall, and others lived. It was a time, to be sure, that was far from being a time of ease; it was a time that called for adequacy, and, rising with all the best that was in them, they made of it a great time.

Dr. Fosdick tells of Victor Hugo's success as a young man—a success seldom equaled in France—and the tragedy which followed, with Napoleon III's growing power and tyranny. Banished from his country he became an exile for 19 years. Hate it as he did, his greatest work came out of that period. He "seemed miraculously inspired," writes his biographer, and "became twice the size of the man he had been." Even Hugo himself was led to exclaim, "Why was I not exiled before?"

War is the denial of everything Christ stood for, and yet example after example in history shows that in just such times as these, turbulent and revolutionary, whole generations have been brought to their senses; strong souls called on for adequacy have proved adequate; creative gains have come which long afterward were recognized as having tremendous value, and gave glory to the period in which they were born.

Christ, too, "had His hours of serenity and ease when He looked with joy upon the flowers of Galilee and said that 'Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.' But at last He came to another kind of place, where no ease was His but fearful crisis, demanding adequacy, as in Gethsemane He prayed for insight and strength. That, too, was a great day."

Such times as these "drive us back to the fundamentals" and cause us to ask, "What shall it profit a man or a nation to gain the whole world and lose the soul?" Such times as these show up the weaknesses and the falsity of the things we have trusted in, have relied upon. For example, we have put great trust in inventive science and it has done wonderful things, but the power it has furnished mankind has been put to destructive ends and it has failed to solve human problems—it has only complicated them. "There is no more scientifically competent nation on earth than Germany."

We have put our trust in education and great achievements have been made. We are thrilled at "the spread of literacy, the invention of printing, the dispersion of books, the privilege of schools." We know that education is a power, but we also know that "There is no more literate and educated nation on earth than Germany."

What, then, can we trust? What can we rely upon? What will hold and carry us through times like these? How can we make it a great time to be alive?

Recently I heard Dr. Alexander Stoddert, superintendent of the Philadelphia schools, speak at one of our meetings, and I should like to pass on to you the essence of three statements that he made—the extent to which they are accepted by an individual, he said, revealed the extent to which that person is educated. I should like to go further than Dr. Stoddert and say that I believe the extent to which we as individuals can accept and practice these three ideas, to that degree can we make this time in which we live, great.

First. The extent to which we are capable of being concerned with what is going on in the world that is not directly connected with us.

It is easy enough to be concerned with things which affect us personally and directly. It does not take any special effort on our part, nor is it of any special credit to us to be concerned with the rationing program, for example, the income-tax legislation, housing legislation, provided that it may affect our living arrangements, the illness or distress of our own friends and relatives here or elsewhere, but when it comes to the more impersonal and indirect problems, that of the starving peoples of the war-torn areas, of the suffering of the peoples of bombed countries, of the plans set up for the enemy countries when the fighting ceases, the principles laid down at these great conferences which will determine the world's future as to peace or war, are we vitally concerned? Concerned enough to take the trouble to become enlightened, to add our support whenever an opportunity presents itself, to ally ourselves with some organization which is working toward the great ideal of world peace, to speak out in behalf of minority groups that are so frequently and so unjustly maligned?

What did Christ say along this line? Let us listen to His words in the fifth chapter of Matthew on being concerned with those outside our own little circle:

"For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?

"And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so?"

I like Moffatt's translation on this last verse:

"And if you only salute your friends, what is special about that?"

It is true that Jesus had been talking here about loving one's enemies, but I believe that He would also include those to whom we are totally indifferent, in whom we show no concern.

No; this cannot be a special time, a great time for you and for me, nor a great era, if we fail to widen our horizons to include a real and an active concern for peoples, problems, conditions, and events outside of and beyond our own immediate interests.

Secondly, we can make this a great time to be alive to the extent that we can be concerned here and now with what will happen in the world when we are no longer here—when we are dead and gone—so concerned that it makes a difference in what we think and do now.

With children, rewards and satisfactions cannot be postponed—they must be immediate, else interest is lost in the doing. Some of us have not advanced very far beyond our childhood in that direction, I fear. Probably none of us here will live to see some of the great ideas and ideals being born now, or being advanced, having been born in earlier generations, come into fruition, and yet, not for one moment must be relax our zeal, our interest, and our support, either in our convictions or in our actions.

Lincoln, in the face of bitter opposition, fought for his great conviction on the slavery question, well knowing that he would probably never have to experience the joy and satisfaction of the fulfillment of his great act.

Said Wilson, in his zeal for world peace and his belief in an international organization to bring it about. "I would rather fail in a cause that will some day triumph than triumph in a cause that will some day fail."

And writes Laurence C. Staples:

"Not for this day, but for long years before us,
Far distant years our eyes will never see,
We plant the seeds of life surpassing wonder—
Peace, justice, love, for all humanity.

"Man truly lives in life that is beyond him;
His harvest waits for reapers yet to come;
Far in the future, hidden from our seeing,
Ripen the fruits of fields which we have sown.

"Out of long toil, there comes the great achievement;
We strive for peace, peace will at last prevail.
Though sharp the pain and struggle of the moment,
Our children's children will our strivings hail."

Finally, we can make this a great time to be alive to the extent that we have faith.

First. Faith in ourselves. We must believe in the worthwhileness of ourselves as individuals, and that what we do counts. How often we've said during a great moment when some ideal which we held important and significant was at stake, "I'll write a letter," or "I'll see my Congressman," and then later when our ardor cooled and we failed to follow through, we rationalized, "What would one individual's opinion matter anyway? Who am I to commend or protest?" Let's try to remember that everything we do in support of that which is good and strong and right is worth while, and that we cannot always measure the value of our action. It may be that your letter, your visit, your act may be just the deciding one, following an accumulation of similar protests or commendations. Yours may be the turning one.

Again, haven't you had the experience that long after you've said some little thing, expressed some opinion perhaps, so long that you've forgotten the incident altogether, someone recalls to you what you said or did and tells how that one little thing has influenced him ever since?

Let us have faith in ourselves as individuals and believe that what we do counts.

Faith in ourselves is not enough. We must go one step further and have faith in God, that Power which we cannot see but of which we know. These days are ghastly for many people, but how much more so they would be without that faith. What else can carry them through except a great faith that somehow, out of it all, our vision will clear and that the awful things endured now will not have been in vain. Our vision is so limited—we must trust, though we cannot see. Paul knew that when he said, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and then he goes on, you remember, to relate in that 11th chapter of Hebrews, the great achievements

resulting from faith, citing individual after individual who acted upon and triumphed by faith.

We read last Sunday in our little devotional booklet, The Secret Place, of the chaplain who was sailing along in a bomber, 6,000 feet above North Carolina's coast line. He was greatly impressed by the grandeur of the ocean sweeping out to the horizon on one side and the beauty of the landscape on the other, but troublesome questions kept coming to him "Why? Why all this training for destruction? Why this terrible war?" He kept reminding himself that we have limited vision and cannot see the whole picture. We have to go ahead.

Just then he looked down upon the expanse of clouds below and saw a circular rainbow. For the first time in his life, he saw the rainbow, not semicircular, an arc, incomplete, but a complete and perfect circle. He regarded his experience as symbolic—a symbol of God. "There is the whole picture," he said, "even though I just see a fragment." There are complete and satisfying answers to these baffling questions and these dark days, and our faith and faith alone in a God that is dependable, that never fails, will carry us through. "We must be still and know—Thou art my lamp. O Lord, and Thou wilt lighten my darkness."

"Strong Son of God, immortal love
Whom we, that have not seen Thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove.

"We have but faith; we cannot know,
For knowledge is of things we see;
And yet we trust it comes from Thee
A beam in darkness; let it grow."

Resolution of the Capital District Affiliate of the Polish-American Congress, Schenectady, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which was sent to me by the secretary of the capital district affiliate of the Polish-American Congress, Schenectady, N. Y.:

Mindful of the tragic historical role that Poland, the loyal Ally of the United Nations, has played since the beginning of the present global war; convinced that one of the main goals of this bloody conflict is to assure complete freedom to all nations large and small; fortified by the act that the principles of self-determination, the right of a people to govern themselves, has never been denied by the American Nation to any other people—we, the representatives of the Capitol District Affiliate of the Polish-American Congress, representing over 60,000 Americans of Polish origin, embraced in 145 societies and organizations, gathered together on this 25th of March 1945 at the Polish National Alliance Home in Schenectady, hereby solemnly resolve as follows:

We go along with our fellow Americans in staunchly supporting the military decisions calling for unified action against our enemies as outlined by the Big Three at the Yalta Conference. We approve all political decisions pertaining to regulation of our conduct toward our common enemies. We warmly support the idea of a world organization to keep the peace. But, we are greatly disturbed and strongly disapprove of the decisions reached at Yalta regarding the small nations of the world. It is apparent from those decisions that in the future only the large and powerful nations will have the freedom of self-determination while the small nations must accept control and be limited by the welfare of the larger nations. If such a situation comes to pass, the people of the small nations will be deprived of all those democratic and moral principles emphasized so strongly in the Atlantic Charter and in the international bill of rights. The present war will have been fought in vain.

At Yalta the Big Three solemnly agreed to set up a provisional Polish Government on the basis of representation of all Polish democratic elements in Poland and abroad. Yet, despite the assurance of a positive program of reorganization of the Polish Government, it is now becoming evident that this agreement is finding great difficulties at the meetings held by the three representatives of the great powers, namely, Kerr, Harriman, and Molotov. No really democratic Polish Government has yet appeared. Then, too, despite the Yalta agreement about the form of the Polish Government, the present Lublin government is usurping its powers and fast eliminating all individuals who were and still are loyal to the Polish Government in London. As proof of such violations, which are absolutely contrary to the spirit of the agreement at the Yalta Conference, we need only to cite the recent charges of the British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, against the Lublin government: Poles being punished for being loyal to their nation and because they remain true to their convictions. That does not augur well for a free Polish Nation, though we have the utmost confidence that the original plan of such a truly representative Polish Government will be carried out without variation if the wishes of Great Britain and the United States prevail.

We have the assurance of the great majority of American citizens that the arbitrary eastern boundary line drawn for Poland at Yalta, ceding two-fifths of all of Poland, with 13,000,000 inhabitants, without allowing those people to participate in a free and impartial, secret referendum or plebiscite to determine their future, is a procedure contrary to all moral and democratic principles governing human beings and nations. Such cession of territory of an allied nation is a new and unique departure in modern history—one which violates the high sense of American feeling of justice.

We believe that Poland has become the acid test of the United Nations and also the cause célèbre of all small nations. Unless the Polish problem is resolved with justice to the Polish people and in accordance with democratic principles in international relations, there can be no lasting peace after this war.

It is with deep sorrow that we approach the San Francisco Conference for it seems now that an empty chair will be found at that Conference, the chair in which rightly the Polish representative should be found, the representative of a people who have suffered so horribly during the past 5 years.

We, therefore, appeal to every freedom-loving man and woman in these United States, both official and layman to petition and prevail on our representatives at the forthcoming San Francisco Conference, to restore justice to the Polish people and to insure freedom for all nations in the post-war era, and to remove the threat that now hangs over small nations who are so unfortunate as to find themselves in the orbit of large powers. The dangers to world peace lurking in the compromises made at Yalta are only too real—those dangers must be removed before they become festering sores which ultimately would destroy all chance for world cooperation and lasting peace. Sanctity of international obligations must be guaranteed, and international bill of rights must be brought into existence—decency in international relations must become a fact—might must succumb to the principles of right—otherwise the bloody sacrifices of our men and women on hundreds of far flung battlefields all over this plant will have been in vain. Let us not fail those making the supreme sacrifice. It is the solemn and bounded duty of all American people to win the peace as well as winning the war.

Adam Stepan, Chairman, Schenectady, N. Y., John Lapinski, Secretary, Watervliet, N. Y.; Lucian Szczepkowski, Albany, N. Y.; M. A. Rekucki, Schenectady, N. Y.; W. Lesiakowski, Amsterdam, N. Y.; Mrs. Caroline Milos, Troy, N. Y.; John Nieckarz, Cohoes, N. Y.; John Bator, Albany, N. Y.

Bretton Woods Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of radio address I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, 10:30 to 10:45 eastern war time, April 10, 1945, relating to the Keynes-Morgenthau or Bretton Woods scheme:

KEYNES-MORGENTHAU OR BRETTON-WOODS SCHEME

Fellow Americans, in the short time at my disposal this evening I want to tell you a few things about the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, or what is now being so widely publicized by the Government as the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Monetary Fund.

Numerous Government departments, particularly Treasury and State, are flooding the country with propaganda, at a tremendous cost to taxpayers, to force Congress to adopt this scheme.

But the spokesmen for the scheme seem to be very careful not to tell you what it really provides and what it would do should Congress approve it. They describe it in glittering generalities, tell you it would bring about stabilization of currencies, internationa cooperation, provide millions of jobs by stimulating our export trade, and form one of the main pillars of the peace structure.

Those are expressions of praiseworthy objectives, but from my study of this proposal I am convinced that it will not accomplish any of them. It might cause spurts of false prosperity. In my judgment it would, in the long run, destroy more jobs than it would create, destroy what real international cooperation is still left, and endanger world peace rather than sustain it. Indeed I look upon this proposal as an immeasurable peril to our Nation and people.

Why call it the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme? Because Lord John Maynard Keynes, an English nobleman, contrived it and Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the United States Treasury, has assumed responsibility for selling it to the American people and inducing Congress to adopt it. Just as Mr. Morgenthau copied his proposals for an international monetary plan from Lord Keynes' international clearing union scheme so practically all of the main provisions in the Bretton Woods proposal for an international

monetary fund were derived from the same source.

This scheme proposes that the United States be shorn of her power over her money and that this power be handed over to foreign countries. Actually, this power would be taken from Congress and given to the President of the United States and 43 foreign countries. The President would have only 28 percent of the voting power, and much less than this after other nations not now included became members of the scheme. This means that the President would be outvoted by about 3 to 1 and that foreign countries would be in control of our money.

Control of its money is the lifeblood of a nation. In fact, a nation cannot exist without this control.

The founding fathers, in writing the Constitution, vested all power over our money in the Congress. This has never been disputed. The courts have on numerous occasions upheld the right of Congress to control our money. How does Mr. Morgenthau justify this suicidal proposal? Here, in substance, is his answer: If at any time in the future the United States wishes to regain her power over her money, she may do so by first withdrawing from the international monetary scheme.

That, of course, answers nothing. It is the grossest subterfuge, because he and all of the other proponents of the scheme avow that it is to be permanent.

First, they tell us that the world will go to pot unless the United States permanently adopts this international monetary scheme, which implies the permanent surrender to foreign powers of the control of our money. Then to justify the destruction of our independence as a nation, they tell us the Constitution would not be violated because we could regain control over our money by withdrawing from the scheme.

The essence of their proposition is something like this: It is necessary for the United States to permanently surrender to foreign countries her power over her money in order to whip up export trade, provide jobs for our people, and to form one of the main pillars of the peace structure, but if at any time in the future the United States should take a notion to regain her power over her money and again become an independent nation she could do so by destroying our export trade, throwing millions of people out of work, pulling the foundation out from under the peace structure, and starting World War No. 3. That is precisely the mess the proponents of this scheme get themselves into when they are driven to explain their true position.

Russia could not give up any part of the power she exercises over her money because of her communistic system. Lord Keynes, the man who devised the scheme, and other prominent Englishmen, have asserted that Great Britain intends to retain control of her money and that she will join it only on that condition. Great Britain and Russia would exercise control of our money, but we would have no control of theirs.

To lose control of our money to foreign countries would be to lose our nationhood to them.

The scheme proposes that the United States furnish, to start with, billions of dollars to be loaned to about 40 countries without any interest to her, or any time limit. The borrowing countries being in control they would dictate to the United States the terms upon which the loans to them would be made. Did you ever hear of anything like this before?

The dollars loaned to foreign countries would be used by them to buy American goods. The process would be essentially one of giving our goods away.

The scheme involves the adoption by the United States of a policy of pledging her resources to support nearly all the rest of the earth's population. It would confer upon them the right to share in the fruits of American labor and enterprise. This would have the effect of lowering our standard of living to that of the rest of the world.

The scheme contains a provision for periodic world inflation. This would have the effect of repudiating international debts and domestic government debts as well. Mr. Henry Hazlitt, editor of the New York Times and a keen student of this scheme, has pointed out that this provision would cause the following:

"Commodity prices would rise. Everybody's cost of living would go up. Those who lived on pensions, either private or part of Government social-security systems, would find them buying less than before. The holders of Government securities would find the real value of their securities greatly cut. All those with fixed incomes would find themselves subjected to an invisible but real and ungraduated income tax. All those with savings accounts and insurance policies would find them cut by an invisible but real and uniform capital levy. In short, private citizens, as before, would be cheated by their governments."

But the proponents of this provision will tell you that it can't be put into operation until Congress passes another law saying it shall. But why should Congress pass a law which recognizes the need for repudiation of international and national debts, and the destruction of the purchasing power of the dollar?

As stated, the United States would put billions of dollars into the scheme at the start. Everybody agrees that the borrowing countries would consume the dollars at a rapid rate. The time would come when dollars would become scarce. The scheme would then ration dollars out to the countries wanting them. That means that exports would be rationed, industry and employment dependent upon export trade would collapse and depression would intervene.

It is provided that if dollars should become scarce, the operators of the scheme could petition Congress to pour more dollars into it. How possibly could Congress refuse such a request? Manufacturers, farmers, wage earners, and who not would be on every Congressman's neck to vote more funds to keep the scheme going. You can readily see how pouring dollars into it and giving our goods away could become an endless process, or could continue until the United States would be bled white.

Or the operators of the scheme could say to the United States, "We are not going to borrow any more dollars from you. Instead you must lower or abolish your tariffs and open up your markets to us. In that way we will get all of the dollars we need to buy American goods." That would mean sudden dumping of cheaply made foreign goods into our domestic market, throwing many of our people out of work, reducing the income of our wage earners, farmers, and others and forcing them on to a lower standard of living. One of the main objects of the scheme is to compel American workers to compete with poorly paid foreign labor.

Lord Keynes made a speech in the House of Lords in which he boasted of this provision, and even spoke about it containing a sanction, that is a penalty, which could be used to force the United States to her knees. He ought to know what he is talking about because he wrote this provision.

The Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a scheme to set up world communism. Avowed Communists were quick to see this and to rally to its support.

Soon our soldiers will be returning from the far-flung battlefields of the world to their homeland, leaving behind them hundreds of thousands of their comrades who made the supreme sacrifice. Millions of them returning will be casualties for the rest of their lives. Upon their return they will find their share of the public debt burden to be $120,000,000,000 or more. In the face of that load their G. I. bill of rights will be as nothing.

All of us, of course, want to give as much help as possible to the war-torn peoples of the world, but in view of all the sacrifices that we have made for our allies the time has come when we must begin to look after our own.

But over and above this we must stop the Keynes-Morgenthau, alias Bretton Woods, scheme from being passed by the Congress. If we fail in this, 12,000,000 soldiers will return to their homes to discover that the Nation they fought and bled for has been handed over to foreign powers and made a vassal state. Let not such everlasting shame come upon this Nation.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and after long and careful study of this scheme, I am convinced that it presents a most perilous threat to American independence and plead with you to do all within your power to prevent its consummation.

Thank you and good night.

The Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, that great American, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, even though he has departed from the political arena, is continually giving his life and services for and in behalf of every movement, the purpose of which is the upbuilding of his country and progressive advancement in every phase of the human life.

He finds time to travel throughout this land and address the business, civic and other organizations wherein that great and magnanimous heart of his directs that he can be of service; doing this regardless of the many manifold duties devolving upon him in his business career.

At the celebration of the Boy Scouts of America's thirty-fifth anniversary, Jim Farley paid a fine tribute to this organization, which was commented on most favorably by the editor of the Charleston, Miss., Sun. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein this editorial:

THE BOY SCOUTS

This week the Boy Scouts are celebrating their thirty-fifth anniversary. The Sun has always been strong for the Boy Scouts, and knows that youth has come a long way since the beginning of that movement a generation ago. When this editor was of Scout age—and that was a long, long time ago—there was no such organization, no one to direct us as a body, no places for recreation, no Camp Tallaha, no anything, as we know it now.

How infinitely better the world would be if all observed that part of the Scout law which reads: "A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion." If that had been the law for boyhood all over the world, there would have been no racial persecution in Germany, and the world would

not now be embroiled in the bloodiest war in history.

We wholly agree with that fine tribute James Farley paid to the Scouts on their anniversary and in which he said:

"There is nothing the matter with our boys and girls today except the same thing that has always been the matter. The problem is not juvenile delinquency, but adult indifference. Boys want adventure. Of course they do. They always have. The thing to do is to give them the right sort of adventure. The time to stop juvenile delinquency is before the boy becomes delinquent.

"There are four things to my way of thinking that play a very important part in the life of a boy, that have everything to do with fixing the way his future life will be. First is the home. In nine times out of ten if a boy gets into trouble, you will be able to trace the cause of it to bad conditions at home, bad example, indifference, neglect.

"The second great influence on a boy is the church. It is impossible to overestimate that influence. Religion should be a real and compelling thing in the life of a boy.

"The third important influence on youth is the school. There is no need to elaborate on that. We all know how necessary a good education and vocational training are for the future of a boy. What the home and the church do for the heart and soul, the school does for the mind.

"But in our complex modern life when the home and the church and the school have done their part, there still is need for something more in the lifetime of a boy. He is a social being. He naturally looks for companionship, and he looks for adventure, something to do in his spare time. That is where the Boy Scouts of America comes into his life and does a job which, in my judgment, no other organization can do more effectively."

A Nation Mourns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N. H., of Friday, April 13, 1945:

A NATION MOURNS

Today a Nation mourns after hours of stunned silence, the passing of one of the great leaders in history.

It is one of the tragedies of our times that he died before his work was finished. Like Abraham Lincoln, he lived through bitter years of struggle, but died before the reconstruction of those years could begin. That calm, yet forceful leadership which carried us to within sight of victory, would have been an even greater influence for the good at the peace table ahead.

Few men in our history have been the subject of so much controversy as Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Yet in him the people placed greater confidence than in any American since George Washington. The center of partisan strife through more years than any other President, he led the Nation through the ravages of a terrible depression, and through the sordid years of a great war. His was a burden greater than that of Lincoln or Wilson.

Whatever his virtues, whatever his faults, history will finally judge his place in the archives of this Nation, and of the world. And history will find a place for him along side Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and another Roosevelt.

Despite a Groton and Harvard background, Roosevelt was essentially a man of the people, the champion of the common man. He was a man who fought physical adversity from early youth, and weathered over 12 years of partisan criticism in the highest public office, yet kept his smile and personal charm intact.

His death at this time, with his work unfinished, comes as a crushing blow, not only to followers of his leadership here in this country, but to our allies in this great war. Franklin D. Roosevelt was not only a man of the people in his own country, but the champion and defender of little people all over the world.

At the peace table he would have been the most powerful man in world history, and much of his power would stem from a personal honesty and sincerity which were above reproach or suspicion. In England, in France, and in China his passing is mourned today even as it is in these United States. In Russia, in India, and in South America he was looked upon as one of the key men in the world security organization to come.

While mourning his passing, as the world has seldom sorrowed for the loss of an individual, we must look ahead to insure the carrying out of those principles which made him great.

Today, in our sorrow, we have a new President of these United States. His is a terrifying task, that of carrying on for his beloved chief. To him, as the symbol of America's leadership, we owe our allegiance, with all the tolerance and understanding so inherent in our American sense of fair play.

We must not make another Andrew Johnson of Harry Truman. The shameful chapter in American history after the death of Abraham Lincoln must not be repeated in this hour of crisis. The bickerings of Congress and of aspiring politicians must not persecute this President as they did the sincere figure of Johnson.

If Roosevelt leaves behind a mandate to fulfill it is to form a world organization which will insure the "four freedoms." If he leaves a legacy it is one of leadership and influence which we must not tear down from within for mere political gain.

In this hour of mourning it is hard to look ahead with hope and vigor. But Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "All we have to fear—is fear." These are reassuring words in this dark hour.

He did not live to finish his work, as few men do. But he lived to see the foundation laid for the downfall of those forces of evil and aggression which he fought so well.

History will remember Franklin D. Roosevelt as the man who led us from our lethargy and isolationism to a state of preparedness. It will remember him as the man who bolstered a beaten Britain and supplied a threatened Russia. It will remember him as the man who gave us the greatest fighting machine and productive capacity in world history, and then turned that mighty force loose upon Adolf Hitler and his satellites.

He lived to see Pearl Harbor avenged in a shower of bombs on Tokyo. He lived to see the London blitz erased in devastation rained on Berlin. He lived to see Americans march back to Bataan. He lived to see the yoke of aggression lifted from Greece, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and much of Holland. He lived to see the war won. A few weeks longer and he would have seen the final collapse of Germany, one he planned and executed.

A great leader, a great statesman, and a great humanitarian died last night at Warm Springs, Ga.

It is, perhaps, fitting that Warm Springs should have been his last habitation here on earth, for it was at Warm Springs that the personal side of Roosevelt was best known. It was here that he devoted much of his effort of saving little children from the ravages of the dread disease polio. It was typical of the great man that he should have been the guiding figure in the March of Dimes, and this effort may in years to come be as important to mankind as the winning of World War No. 2. In this field alone he leaves behind a fitting memorial—a living memorial—to his memory.

Through our sorrow we may still take pride in his achievements, and in the position his leadership has placed this Nation.

The world is thankful that he lived, as it now bows in sorrow at his passing.

The Late Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the untimely death of Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox, president of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., on January 30, 1945, I include an editorial from "The Concordiensis," the student newspaper, by Prof. H. A. Larrabee.

Dr. Fox's death was a startling shock to the college, the community, the leaders in education all over the world, and the hundreds of his friends, associates, and admirers. Dr. Fox, the twelfth president of Union College, had been in office 10 years. During these years many changes have occurred at Union—its academic standards are higher; its reputation among colleges and universities of all types is high, and for many of these things, Union owes a debt to its president—to his foresight and leadership, to his progressiveness and determination, to his imagination and persuasive power. Scores of tributes have been paid to Dr. Fox, and one of the most fitting is the following:

A LEADER HAS FALLEN

(By Prof. H. A. Larrabee)

There is a sense in which President Dixon Ryan Fox was just as much a casualty of war as any Union man who has gone down before the hail of bullets or bombs. For he met the challenge of wartime acceleration and uncertainty by redoubling a tireless devotion to duty that had long been a marvel and a source of concern to his associates. Never one to spare himself in any good cause, he gave to Union 20 or 30 normal years of service in the space of 10, by packing extra hours of toil into each day, extra days into each month, and extra months into each year. For the college and the country which he so ardently loved, he labored to the last ounce of his strength. He died in harness, and he would not have had it otherwise.

Colleges like Union inevitably take their shape and color from their presidents, and that is particularly true of a leader like Dr. Fox. It is useless to attempt to put into words what the presence of his warm and rich personality on the campus has meant to the men of Union in the past decade. Prexy has entered into the immortality of the living legend of Union that dwells in the hearts and minds of all of us.

For we are what we are, in part, because he spent himself utterly in our behalf. The only way in which we can repay that debt is to keep on striving for the goals he cherished and for which he freely gave himself.

President Dixon Ryan Fox, administrator, historian, author, dramatist, and moderator, will be remembered long and for many constructive achievements, but perhaps longest in the minds of many of us because he was so unfailingly kind in little, unexpected ways. He went out of his way to make people feel that they were appreciated. He really loved to find occasions for praising others. He must have written literally thousands of such letters in the course of his incredibly active life Wherever he went, he made friends for Union Few men have been liked so much by so many different kinds of people.

A leader has fallen; and our hearts are heavy with grief. But the war goes on—the never-ending war which he fought against ignorance and ill-will and apathy and pettiness of spirit. A leader has fallen; but we must close our ranks and go forward, even as he would have gone.

Activity in Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the American evaluation of the superb war effort of the Filipino guerrillas is not confined to limited groups or limited areas of the United States.

We believe, as Tomas Confesor, Philippine Secretary of the Interior, said recently:

> If the common man had not asserted himself in this war, democracy in the Philippines would have been lost.

Although the legislator, the worker, the business executive, the miner and the farmer in this country are interested in the contribution of the Filipino guerrillas, it is the American military leadership—whose task it is to save as many American and Filipino lives as possible while driving the Japanese out of the Philippines—who have paid the highest tribute to guerilla activity in this area.

United States Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson said at his press conference Thursday that:

> The American Division on Cebu and the Fortieth Division on Negros and Panay, in conjunction with Philippine guerrillas, have practically cleared up these islands of the Visaya group.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, emphasized these views later in the same day when he said:

> Large portions of the islands have been liberated by Filipino guerrillas, who have rendered great service to our own troops and to their own people.
>
> The attitude of the Filipino people in their period of trial and endurance and their vigorous, aggressive fighting now, I think, are great tributes to them as a people.

The American people know what the Filipino guerrillas have done to advance the liberation of the Philippines. They know of the scores of guerrilla groups, such as that in northern Luzon commanded by Col. Russel W. Volckmann. In order to join Volckmann's command the candidate had to kill a fully equipped Japanese soldier and to take from the enemy a full bandolier, rifle, canteen, steel helmet, and 2 weeks' supply of rations. It is no wonder that the one group has inflicted more than 16,000 casualties on the enemy.

No matter in what part of the islands these groups operate we learn of their deeds of valor. Our sympathy and understanding, as well as our material support, goes out to these bands of heroes fighting grimly and efficiently in the common cause of liberation.

President Roosevelt's Last Letter on Domestic Policy Reaffirms His Faith in Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, on behalf of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to submit for inclusion in the RECORD a letter received from our beloved late President. It was delivered to me by White House messenger at the opening of a committee hearing on Thursday, April 12, 1945, just a few hours before the President's death. That letter thus is one of his last official papers. It relates to a hearing by my committee on H. R. 520, a bill to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, and it is perhaps the last outstanding pronouncement made by President Roosevelt on national domestic policy. The letter was read at the opening of the committee hearing in the presence of Secretary of the Interior Ickes and Commissioner of Reclamation Bashore. All in attendance there were deeply impressed by the recognition Mr. Roosevelt reiterated of his great interest in Federal reclamation in the West, and of his sincere desire that opportunities for settlement on irrigated land will be available to our returning servicemen.

I will reserve my tribute to the leadership and statesmanship of President Roosevelt until another time, but I am sure that the Nation will be impressed by the significance of this typical manifestation of his deep concern for the welfare of the men and women as they return from the wars.

The letter is eloquent of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency. In the midst of weighty matters of war, he was attentive to the problems that the young men of this Nation will face in the peacetime life for which they are fighting. While directing the fierce might of our armies and navies to destruction of the enemy, Franklin Roosevelt also planned the permanent conservation and full beneficial use of our national natural resource wealth.

This letter speaks of pioneering, a way of life that we prize as a national heritage. It speaks of the opportunity to make a secure livelihood and home for a family, the privilege that, throughout our history, has been the most valued grant to veterans. Those frontiers of opportunity are linked in Franklin Roosevelt's letter, as they were throughout his Presidency, with the wise development of the entire Nation and with the full enjoyment by all of the people of fruits of their full productive employment.

APRIL 10, 1945.

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman, House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MURDOCK: In connection with the hearings that, I understand, will shortly be held by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 520, "A Bill to Facilitate Settlement of Returning Veterans on Farms in Projects Constructed, Operated, and Maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation," may I bring to your attention certain broad policy considerations.

On July 28, 1943, I outlined a minimum program to assist servicemen in meeting the problems of readjusting to civilian life after their discharge. The G. I. bill of rights is the legislative foundation of such assistance. In addition to that general measure, numerous complementary authorizations are needed for specific programs. Every area of this country and every sector of national life is represented among the 11,000,000 men and women who will have served with the armed forces. Each of these will have special problems in once more becoming a civilian, engaged in satisfying and productive livelihood. To deal adequately with the great multitude of these varying situations, individual measures consistent with a general national program and policy are required.

As I stated in my message to the Congress of January 13, 1944, demobilization starts long before the war ends, and it is essential that programs of assistance to veterans be authorized and adequately prepared now. One such program has been under active study and is in the advanced stages of planning through the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. I have frequently spoken with pride of the accomplishments of this Administration in Western Reclamation projects. The great Columbia Basin project in the Northwest, the projects in the Missouri River Basin, and others of equal significance, will, as I said at Chicago on October 28, 1944, be golden opportunities for returning veterans. Such projects constitute great increases in national wealth and income. They also offer splendid opportunities for secure and abundant livelihood to men and women willing to engage in the arduous, though stimulating, tasks of pioneering these latest frontiers. I commend and urge your favorable consideration of Federal Reclamation projects as an important opportunity for returning veterans.

The men and women who settle on Reclamation projects after the war will, however, face problems more complex than those of the earlier pioneers. It now is more difficult and more expensive to establish a farm and a farm home than it was 40 years ago. In offering to veterans an opportunity to settle on Federal Reclamation projects, we should also provide such forms of assistance to them as will be needed to make their pioneering efforts fruitful to the country and truly beneficial to themselves and their families.

A program to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms can be of great value in assisting them in returning to civilian life. It can also be of great value in the reconversion of our national economy to a fully prosperous peacetime basis. Full enjoyment of the great productive resources of this Nation by all of the people requires that all have opportunity to engage in productive labor. The purchasing power created by Reclamation projects is a stimulus to industry and commerce, thus promoting full employment throughout the Nation. Those engaged in agricultural production should secure ample livelihood so that they can participate in enjoyment of the products created by full industrial employment. Measures in addition to those dealing with Federal Reclamation projects will be needed to round out a comprehensive program in this regard.

I have not examined the bill that is before your Committee and, therefore, I am unable to comment upon it specifically. I desire, however, to endorse the foresight which has led to preparation now of legislation to authorize needed programs.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to present this, what is probably his last state paper. I am deeply honored to be its recipient. Yet it is in truth addressed to all of us in the Congress. This letter is a last testament, bequeathing to us the abiding responsibility to enact a postwar program that will build an ever finer America, to develop this land of opportunity for which have died so many American soldiers and their Commander-in-Chief.

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is resolved to carry forward its share in formulating such a postwar program. The bill which is the subject of President Roosevelt's letter is a principal item of our legislative agenda. Hearings on that bill will be resumed on April 19 and will be continued each succeeding week until the committee can report to you a legislative program that meets the purposes stated by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Lands for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion about settling the returning veteran on the farm. The Congress has talked about this problem at some length.

The first practical, down-to-earth suggestion that has been made came in the statement by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, when he appeared before the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of this House on April 12, 1945. Mr. Ickes spoke in support of H. R. 520, a bill by Mr. MURDOCK, of Arizona, that would give veterans a 90-day preference on lands open to settlement by the Bureau of Reclamation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement by Secretary Ickes:

One of the most valuable privileges ever conferred upon veterans by the Government would be granted by the Congress through the enactment of H. R. 520, the bill upon which this hearing has been called. If this bill should become the law, servicemen returning from the present wars who might wish to acquire rich, irrigated farm lands on projects constructed, operated, or maintained in the West by the Bureau of Reclamation would be given preference over all other purchasers for a period of 90 days. This opportunity would continue for 20 years following the enactment of H. R. 520.

This would mean that as the irrigation of more lands becomes possible, qualified veterans would be given first choice of several million acres of good land, if the Congress should authorize the postwar program of the Bureau of Reclamation, and provide funds for the construction of the engineering works proposed. An opportunity to purchase reasonably priced irrigated lands, at a time when most farm values will tend to be inflated, is a privilege not to be discounted.

I wish first to tell you how this proposal for the development of our western States fits into the national and international scene.

We all are now aware how the march of modern technology has advanced by leaps and bounds in recent years through the annual expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on scientific research in the laboratories of great corporations, universities, and governments throughout the world. The knowledge obtained from this research has enabled us to make far greater use of the world's natural resources than ever before, and, therefore, has increased their value tremendously. But science also has enabled us to use the products of research to much more deadly effect in warfare than ever before. Control of the deposits of petroleum, coal, iron, aluminum-bearing clay, and other resources carries with it economic and military control. Linked to the tremendous electric energy that can be derived from water power, and the chemicals which can be extracted from the air, ownership of the natural resources of the earth has assumed a significance far beyond the importance of such resources to private industries.

It was for the control of these resources throughout the world that Germany reached out for mastery over everything on this planet. It was partly because of Russia's developing technology, which, fortunately, had advanced much faster than most of us realized, that the Soviet Government was able to turn the tide in the present European war.

Now the whole world has become conscious of the newly discovered wealth that every land possesses in its water power and mineral resources. The future strength and greatness of every country depends upon its ability to organize the development of its own natural resources and avail itself of raw materials shipped from other countries.

We have discovered in this country, partly through the 43 years of experience of the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of the water resources of the West and partly through experience in the Tennessee Valley, that the most economical and efficient manner in which to obtain the greatest use of our natural resources is through coordinated engineering of an entire river basin.

In this manner not only are millions of acres of dry land reclaimed from the desert by irrigation and the destructive effects of floods eliminated or lessened, but river transportation is provided and low-cost power is supplied for use in homes and the expansion of industry. Power development helps to carry the cost of land development, and, applied to mineral resources, low-cost power also means the extraction and smelting of minerals not hitherto practicable and the manufacture of new alloys for many purposes. The reservoirs that are built for impounding power and irrigation water also provide new water supplies for cities, towns, and factories. Reservoirs also create new game refuges and fishing in many streams that once were dry in summer. The advantages of coordinated river basin development can be measured in dollars and cents, but they can be measured also in happier living, which, after all, is the object of all of our activities—if we could only remember it.

This new approach to river-basin development is spreading today throughout the world. John L. Savage, chief designing engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation and one of the world's greatest engineers, over a year ago was loaned to the State Department, and as one of its cultural relations men was sent to assist other nations in making plans for postwar progress. Mr. Savage designed for the Bureau of Reclamation the great Boulder, Shasta, and Grand Coulee Dams, as well as scores of others throughout the West. Now he is designing for the Chinese a dam that may some day be constructed in the gorge of the Yangtze River, and which would develop five times as much electrical energy as the Grand Coulee Dam, now potentially the greatest hydroelectric power producer in the world. He has advised the Chinese where they could build numerous other dams on tributaries of the Yangtze.

In India, he has looked over some of the great rivers that flow from the snows of the Himalaya Mountains, and advised what might be done to harness the energy of these rivers and use their waters for irrigation. On his return trip, he visited Australia to give similar advice.

But it is not China, India, and Australia alone that are determined to develop the resources of their river basins to the utmost. There have been great plans proposed for the Danube River, which, in time, may bring about cooperation among the nations that live along its banks, and become a potent force for keeping the peace of Europe.

America early caught this vision of natural resources, conservation, and development. Throughout this country there is a growing consciousness of how greatly national prosperity can be stimulated through this type of enterprise, when guided wisely. Upon this new concept is based the great post-war plan of the Bureau of Reclamation, which looks to the coordinated natural resource development of 15 river basins in the West—plans which contemplate the construction of some 415 separate projects. The total cost would mount to approximately $5,000,000,000, more or less, depending upon the conditions under which the work should be done. Within a few months the Bureau of Reclamation will have completed reports on the coordinated development of 15 river basins throughout the West.

Through the sale of electric power and of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes, a major part of the expense of this development would be paid for in cash over a period of from 40 to 60 years. But the benefits of flood control would be paid for through the elimination of incalculable human misery and the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars in relief. The benefits from improved navigation are fairly obvious. And the provision of new recreational facilities and the preservation of game and fish not only would bring a financial return in the stimulation of many businesses, but satisfactions hard to measure in dollars and cents.

In connection with irrigation projects there will spring up villages and cities, as they have in the past. From the low-cost power industrial areas will come into being. The indirect benefits through stimulating creative energy and the development of trade and industry will repay the monetary costs

many times over—even if reckoned only in tax collections.

The construction of these projects would begin soon after appropriations have been made by Congress; but as the work got under way it would require the services of more and more men, until the number employed at the sites of construction would mount to some 400,000 workers. This would include everyone from chief engineer down to the man who worked by the day or hour shoveling dirt or mixing cement.

Naturally, a very large number of the men employed to build dams, irrigation canals, and powerhouses would be ex-servicemen. By using the most modern machinery for moving earth and materials, the cost of construction could be kept down and the wages of the men employed could be maintained at a high level, which is necessary, if we are to keep our economic machine running in high gear after the war. The cost of the new irrigation farms would be kept low, and the power generated at the dams which we built could be sold at a price that would make it available even for cooking and heating.

This tremendous construction activity taking place in the wide open spaces of our western lands would be reflected in the mills and factories of the East, which would manufacture the equipment used in construction, which would make and fabricate the steel, cement, and other materials necessary in building dams and canals, and which would construct generators, cables, and other electrical equipment.

I could explain at length the benefits which arise from well-conceived reclamation projects, which bring into being new towns and industries, which can mean the doubling of populations. Most of you know that story, however. Many of you have profited by it.

Let me explain a little more in detail, however, how today's approach differs from that of the past. In the past, each separate project has been justified on the basis of the possibilities of repayment from the project itself. A specific example is that of the Columbia Basin project, which included the building of the most massive concrete structure in the world—the Grand Coulee Dam. The final construction cost of this project will be about $487,000,000, which does not include replacements and other operating expenses. Even distributed over more than a million acres of land to be irrigated, this cost would be far beyond what is practical, if the entire expense were borne by the irrigation project, itself.

But when the Grand Coulee Dam is fully equipped with generators, it will be by far the largest producer of hydroelectric power in the world. Even when this energy is sold at very low rates, it will be possible for such sales to repay at least three-fourths of the cost of the project within about 60 years.

The share of the cost which will be allocated to irrigation will make possible the development of farms at a cost that will place them in an excellent position to yield a good return upon prudent investment, if efficient management is used.

In our present approach, however, we go one step further. We ask whether the development of the entire river basin will return benefits to the people who live within it commensurate with expenditures. This cannot be measured alone in direct cash returns, but in the economic development that will be stimulated, the abatement of the menace of floods, the benefits from river transportation, the value of municipal and industrial water supplies and other satisfactions which come from health-giving recreational facilities. This is something new in reclamation of the West.

The promise which this holds for veterans is something more than money can buy—it is the opportunity through hard work to build a place where they can spend their lives in comfort, good living, and happiness. It will depend, of course, upon the character and intelligence of the men and women who settle these new acres how prosperous or how happy the communities which grow upon them will be.

But the Department of the Interior is ready to do its part in assuming a responsibility for giving technical advice and other aid to all who will join with it in making this development a desirable place in which to work, live, and rear their families. Through the cooperation of the people with their local, State, and Federal Governments, services can be rendered which will prevent many of the hardships and trials which settlers on new lands generally must experience.

Some will say that privation and suffering are good for people—that such is the manner in which our Nation became strong. Well, that may be true. But men are also made strong and become good citizens when good food, good schooling and opportunity for leisure and travel make their lives richer and expand their opportunities for understanding the modern problems of society. In fact, I think that I can say that unless more Americans achieve the leisure which will enable them to follow the complex problems of national and world affairs and better understand them, democracy eventually will give way to some order in which a chosen few who have leisure will take the management of the world into their own hands.

So you see, I do not conceive of coordinated river-basin development merely as the completion of great engineering enterprises, but of laying the economic foundation for richer and happier living, which will enable our men and women to perform their necessary economic tasks with less effort and greater profit, and to devote more time to citizenship and cultural growth. That is the way not only to preserve our freedom and independence as a nation, but to becoming a nation of men and women who will be regarded by other nations as wise and generous, to be envied, not for our wealth alone, but because we understand and appreciate what is good in life, including a sense of international justice.

Now I shall ask you to go just one step further in evaluating the Bureau of Reclamation's post-war program. The creation of prosperous and happy communities benefits more than the people directly involved. Such communities contribute value to the entire Nation. Their industry enriches the Nation and provides a market for all manner of goods produced in other sections, just as the development of the West has done since our beginnings.

In closing, let me explain a practical point I raised at the beginning to the effect that a 90-day preference to veterans in the purchase of land on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation is a very great privilege that you gentlemen could confer upon returning servicemen.

It does not take a great deal of calculation to realize that the price of farm land is climbing steadily beyond the point at which it is economical, from a long-term viewpoint, to buy a farm. The boom in farm real estate today is comparable to that which occurred during the last war and immediately following it. It threatens to undermine one of the economic foundations of farming in the United States.

Reclamation farms will be the very best priced farms on the market in the years that immediately follow the war—and a 90-day option on the purchase of one will be a very great privilege, and one possessed only by veterans. This is an opportunity about which every serviceman who can qualify for the purchase of an irrigated farm might give serious thought.

Moreover, it is true that a Reclamation farm is a good purchase at any time. Under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 there is a real working partnership of the settlers and the Government in the development of the West, which is still a land of opportunity for young men and women. Here there remains rich promise for the farmer who operates intelligently and puts in the hard work necessary for success on any farm. Here is to be found a better than average chance of making his venture successful.

Our Irrigation Prospects Are Good and Reclamation's Future Achievement May Be Brilliant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 at a hearing of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House, Commissioner Bashore followed the Secretary of the Interior with a statement amplifying the broad outline of policy which the Secretary had announced earlier in the hearings with regard to the future of reclamation. The Commissioner summarized plans and prospects and detailed the feasible outlook of reclamation, as he and his staff of engineers view it, as an aid to the Congress. Even to those of us who have long been members of the Reclamation Committee and who have for years been giving study to these problems, the Commissioner's statement was very enlightening. He set some goals in reclamation toward which the Government should work and gave detailed expressions to the policy of development which the Secretary of the Interior had laid down, based squarely on the cornerstone so well laid by the President himself in regard to this wise construction. Commissioner Bashore's statement follows:

There isn't a sane man in the United States today or in our armed forces throughout the world who isn't concerned with the post-war economic outlook. H. R. 520 is an important step in the direction of full post-war employment and a high level of national income, because it offers servicemen an important stake in a program which looks toward a tremendous expansion of agriculture, industry, and trade in the West.

By giving veterans a 90-day preference in acquiring irrigated farms on Bureau of Reclamation projects when the farms are made available for purchase, this bill gives the exserviceman who can qualify an opportunity to own a fertile irrigated farm on which an adequate water supply is assured, and upon which he can build a home that should provide him and his family with secure and healthful living through the years. The price will be so fair that the purchaser can expect a reasonable return on his investment. The reclamation program already authorized for post-war construction will provide about 100,000 new farming opportunities in the early years, and additional projects under study when authorized would provide an additional 100,000 such opportunities.

If you will stop and think about that for a minute, you will conclude that it is a substantial proposition H. R. 520, the reclamation soldiers' settlement bill, would offer. Yet the significance of the reclamation pro-

gram to returning servicemen goes further than that. In fact, as I look upon the matter, the outline which I shall present today is one step in the direction of assuring what everyone wants—a high-production, high-income-level economy after the war.

It is against this broad background of the need for a sound public program that I shall discuss the importance to the returning soldier of the Bureau of Reclamation's post-war plans, for unless we can assure our men a chance to work when they return, nothing else that we can do has any meaning. Here are some figures which suggest what we shall be up against:

We are today spending around $5,000,000,000 a month on munitions production—seven billion a month for all war purposes. When the war ends this will stop. But with the men coming back from the fighting to the working ranks, we shall have more workers available, despite the fact that many women will return from the factories to their homes.

This look as though we would have to increase our production for peace purposes if we want to keep our domestic economy operating on the high level that will mean continued prosperity. Support of our domestic economy will not be brought about by mere spending, which would contribute to inflation, but rather by construction of permanent, productive works. That is the reason for the planning now of an extensive public-works program as an essential part of the total construction program. The requirements for such a works program has been variously estimated. Conservative estimates by responsible Federal agencies place the need for construction at from fifteen to sixteen billion dollars annually, of which from four to five billions a year would be a public-works program.

Now the inventory of projects offered by the Bureau of Reclamation is not a complete answer to a statesman's prayer, but it is significant. It calls for expenditure during a 10-year period of a sum, figured at 1940 prices, which is less than 1 month's total war expenditures—about the same as 1 month's munitions production. This may not seem a lot of money in the light of present destructive activity, but it would give a tremendous boost to the upbuilding of the West and would set in motion a train of constructive forces that would spread throughout the Nation.

The construction of these projects would not make jobs for anything like all of the returning veterans, but it would help. If funds are provided by the Congress for these projects, at its peak the construction would give employment at the site to some 400,000 workmen, and to about 640,000 more in mills and factories and on transportation systems—more than 1,000,000 altogether. Those 1,000,000 jobs mean much, if one remembers that when the work is completed almost 200,000 irrigated farms will have been created to enrich the Nation permanently and provide incomes and homes for many servicemen, and that around those farms will grow towns and villages, and that from the power produced at reclamation dams new industries will spring up. It is just the opposite of what happens in warfare.

Today about 2,500,000 more people live and obtain their livelihood, mostly from war industries, in the 11 far Western States, which are arid or semi-arid, then resided in these States in 1940. This is an increase of 17.8 percent in the population of these States, compared with a national increase in the same time of only seven-tenths of one percent. Many of these new residents of the West will remain in the West. An increase in the basic irrigated agriculture of the area will be essential to support and sustain this growth and a continuing industrial livelihood for them. In addition nearly 1,000,000 Western boys will be demobilized from the armed forces, and they will probably more than offset the number of war workers who leave their new homes and return to the East.

And when one places this picture against the background of river basin development that is emerging from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior, as Secretary Ickes outlined it for you, you begin to see a proposal so productive of wealth and well-being that you wonder why we haven't been smart enough to do these things before.

I think the reason is simple enough, though. We have been building up gradually to these great multiple-purpose and basin-wide developments. The small projects were built first, the easy diversions have all been made. We have learned to build great dams and complex engineering works. As a Nation, we are now ready to undertake the development on a unified basis of whole river basins. I believe we are on the threshold of a new era in the conservation and use of our resources, the most important of which, in the West, is water. Evidence of the opening of this new frontier is found in the Missouri Basin plan.

Last June the Bureau of Reclamation presented to the Congress an inventory of post-war projects which looked to construction of some three billion dollars of projects. Since then, the Congress has approved the Missouri River plan and authorized many of the projects. Today, I lay before this committee a more comprehensive inventory, including some four hundred and fifteen projects, the cost of which would amount to about $5,000,000,000.

Of these, more than 100 projects ranging from small pumping plants to interrelated multiple-purpose projects, and estimated to cost about $1,338,000,000, already have been authorized by the Congress. Work upon them will be initiated as soon as men and materials become available, provided we are able to complete the engineering plans.

I want to emphasize right here that the speed with which our projects will be started after the war will depend largely on how thoroughly engineering plans have been prepared for them before that time. It costs money to prepare engineering plans. Detailed surveys have to be made. Core drilling at proposed dam sites is essential to determine the foundations of the dams, and hence the type of dams to be constructed. Working drawings have to be made to estimate the amount of materials and to prepare specifications which can be used as the basis of asking bids on contracts. I have consistently advocated the preparation of the engineering plans in advance of the need, and, within the funds provided, we are doing just that.

The Bureau of Reclamation has presented the Missouri River plan and is preparing similar proposals for the 14 other major river basins of the West.

Let me summarize the post-war inventory of authorized projects. Construction of these would irrigate about 5,600,000 acres of land in the arid and semi-arid regions of the West on which will provide about 80,000 new farms. At the same time they would bring much needed supplemental water supplies to maintain the existing agricultural economy of some 5,700,000 additional acres so that by closer settlement some 20,000 additional farms could be established on authorized projects. Additional power installations would total 2,612,000 kilowatts capacity.

The over-all inventory includes these authorized projects and those now under study. The whole group—authorized and proposed—would bring water to 10,809,000 acres of land which never before has been irrigated, upon which some 154,700 new farms could be created, and supplemental water for some 10,617,000 acres, upon which about 38,600 new farms would spring up. That makes a total of 21,426,000 acres to be served, and 193,300 new farms to be set up. The estimate of total construction cost at 1940 prices is $4,792,372,000, which, let me repeat, is less than the cost of 1 month's munitions production during this war.

At this point I would like to present for a statistical summary of the Bureau of Reclamation's present post-war inventory tabulated to show State by State what projects are included.

All of you may know that the Bureau of Reclamation, for whose activities I am responsible, is the largest producer of power in the world, but I do not think this fact is generally known. During the fiscal year ended last June, output of Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric plants was more than 13,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours as compared with combined steam and hydro power of 11,000,000,000 by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Some of the power produced by this Bureau was marketed by other Department of the Interior agencies, but most of it was sold at wholesale by the Bureau itself to cities, cooperatives, the Rural Electrification Administration, and private utilities. That is a fact more Americans ought to know.

The present capacity of our plants is 2,440,000 kilowatts. The post-war program calls for increasing the capacity of present plants to 4,863,000 kilowatts principally by adding generating units for which space was provided in original construction. Additional installations in the post-war inventory call for the addition of generating units which would give Bureau of Reclamation plants a total capacity of 9,324,000 kilowatts.

Part of the plan for the upbuilding of river valleys lies in the orderly development of mineral resources and processing industries which would use a large part of this additional power. The balance would be used to lighten work upon farms and to bring greater comforts and conveniences to the homes of our 17 Western States.

This means that the projects in the post-war inventory would create not only immediate construction jobs for returning servicemen, but jobs in factories and workshops throughout the country which manufacture materials and machinery for the construction projects and power plants—and then for a long time to come it means jobs on farms, jobs in servicing the people who live on farms, jobs building the towns and villages that spring up to serve the farms, and jobs in the industries which low-cost power brings to life.

While the entire impact of these projects upon the national economy cannot even be estimated, we can do a little figuring upon the most immediate results of the jobs we have laid out. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that for every hour of work at the site of a reclamation project about 1.6 hours of employment will be provided off the site. It must be realized that these are only extremely rough estimates. Of some four and one-quarter billion man-hours of labor estimated to construct the authorized projects and the others in the inventory, roughly, 1,650,000,000 man-hours would be required at the site, and three-fifths of the total, or 2,600,000,000 man-hours, would be spent working throughout the Nation. This distribution of labor also means a comparable distribution of expenditures.

Iron and steel, cement, electrical equipment and supplies, foundry and machine-shop products and lumber from their beginnings as raw materials, their transportation to the factory for fabrication, their processing, and again their transportation to the place where they are used, this material requires millions of man-hours of labor in mines, forest, and factories, and in transportation, distribution, and administration. Thus, every State in the Nation is affected by western construction.

These figures mean that part of the great labor force of 60,000,000 which will be available will be needed in the forests of Washington and Oregon and in the southern pine region, in the coal mines of Alabama, Colorado, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and in the iron mines of the Mesaba Range. Southern labor will be needed to supply cotton to make tarpaulin and miles of wire braiding; the workers in the Ohio and Indiana area will have jobs building road machinery and drag lines.

Many man-hours will be spent in New York State on making cranes. Men will be working in Birmingham and Mobile, around Pascagoula, Baltimore, and Gary, Ind., fabricating great high-pressure gates and valves.

Electrical equipment will come from New England, generators from Milwaukee, Schenectady, and East Pittsburgh. Orders for hydraulic turbines will reach Virginia, subcontracts for special castings will go to the Southeast, and others for iron and steel fabrication to the Middle Atlantic. Add to that money in weekly pay envelopes which will buy clothes, fresh fruit, and vegetables, canned goods, radios, watches, and automobiles.

The importance of this construction viewed from the public works angle is that it permits a quick get-away. Provided with funds and manpower to complete field investigations and preconstruction work, as well as appropriations for actual construction, the bureau could put from 150,000 to 200,000 men to work at project sites the first year. Peak employment could be reached in the second or third years. Although construction would be centered in the western States, more than half of the resulting employment would be in mines, mills, and factories of the Midwest, East, and South.

Eastern interests look on western development as a good means of underwriting their own prosperity. It has been estimated that the construction of these projects, the building of these new homes will increase western purchasing power for products of the North, South, and East by about $2,000,000,000 a year.

There is one point which I have not emphasized sufficiently up to this point. It is that the benefits of this work we are proposing do not end with the construction of the engineering works, but continue from generation to generation in wealth-producing activity. This continuing benefit, also, is not confined to the western area in which new farms and industries are created, but is spread perpetually throughout the Nation. It required a devastating depression to bring home how dependent each part of the country is upon every other part. Just as the drying up of income in one place affects every other place, so does the production of new income. Cotton farmers in the South benefit from doubling the population in the West. So do the manufacturers of refrigerators and automobiles and cameras and fishing tackle—everything that we use for work, convenience, and pleasure. And this goes back and forth and around the Nation.

It is not too soon now to take definite steps to meet the situation that will be upon us before very long. VE-day appears to be nearer every day. No one can tell when VJ-day will arrive; but we should be prepared when it does come to move rapidly on post-war jobs for returning soldiers and sailors, and provide settlement opportunities on irrigated land. As a matter of fact, demobilization already is going on at the rate of about 100,000 a month, although war activity is still absorbing those who need jobs, and are physically fit for work.

We hope that in considering the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation, Congress will regard them as a whole. We present them as the basis for a soundly conceived program for post-war work. The major part of the investment will be self-liquidating. Flood control does not pay cash, but saves the Treasury more than the cost of the engineering involved by avoiding large cash-relief payments, and by protecting property values against destruction. Municipal water supply makes direct cash returns; and the preservation of wildlife and game, and the creation of park areas around reservoirs in the West pays indirect returns in pleasanter living. The stimulation of travel and the industries that thrive on recreational activities are directly wealth producing.

Any way you figure it, the projects which we propose will more than pay for themselves. This would be true if one figured only the additional income taxes resulting from prosperous farms and industries which are created.

Construction of these projects which we propose will form the firm foundation which will give value and importance to the privileges which you could confer upon veterans under the terms of H. R. 520, which is now before you.

A Tribute to the Late President Quezon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we have had the extreme opportunity of listening to the Honorable CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, who has told us today of the ravages that have been visited upon the Philippine people during the occupation by the Japanese, and of the terrible destruction that has been wrought by the cornered barbaric Jap fanatics.

We are most grateful for this authentic first-hand report. Judging from the hearty reception General ROMULO has received here today, there is no doubt in my mind that the sympathies, best wishes, and support of this House are with his valiant people.

Just yesterday I had an opportunity to read a letter which was addressed to General ROMULO by P. W. Reeves, a congressional secretary, who has spent considerable time in the Philippines. I am a member of the House Committee on the Territories, and am interested in both Territorial and insular possessions. It has been suggested that I insert Mr. Reeves' fine tribute to Manuel Quezon, the late President of the Philippines, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very glad to do so.

It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 9, 1945.*

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Resident Commissioner,
Commonwealth of the Philippines,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL ROMULO: It was my rare privilege to meet the late Manuel Quezon in 1935. I talked with him again on one of his trips to Washington in 1937, when he was the guest of honor at a luncheon given in the National Press Club. I saw him several times at his office in Manila in 1937. I corresponded with him after I left Manila. I saw him for the last time about 1 year before he was taken from us.

When I learned the shocking news of the passing of this great man, I wrote to Mr. Gil Montilla, Judge Sabino Padilla, Mr. Raf. Alunan, Mr. Vicente Carmona, Hon. Jose Yulo, and others. I told them how I had been saddened by the death of this man among men. I also wrote to General MacArthur because he knew how greatly I admired his departed friend. I wanted you, as Resident Commissioner, to know that those of us who knew President Quezon mourn his passing.

Because of his fine friendship, I shall never forget him. Because of what he did for his country and his people, the world will never forget him. His passing is a loss to the world because he was a statesman of the highest type. He was, indeed, one of the most remarkable men I have ever known or read about. Whether one knew Manuel Quezon intimately or merely watched his activities as an onlooker, all admired him. So many fine things can be said about him that it is extremely difficult for one to choose any particular quality upon which to dwell.

President Quezon was endowed with that extraordinary clarity of vision, that vivid imagination, which is the mark of the truly great man. He had that boundless energy which brought into execution dreams which he had dreamt. He could see what others could not see. He could see further than others could see. And he could see before others saw.

There was not a coarse fiber in the make-up of this great leader. His love and devotion for his people was beyond compare. He gave his life to the cause of his people. The full extent of his sacrifice will never be known. He was modest beyond description. He was a man of great learning and high ideals. He had a warm heart and a sympathetic personality. With his wonderful qualities and his vast experience, he devoted himself unsparingly for the benefit of his people. He was a slave to his honest convictions, and he could not be swerved from them. He feared no man or combination of men. Political expediency never entered into his calculations or decisions. His bitterest enemies never challenged his honesty of purpose. The impelling force which guided this man throughout his eventful life was his desire to help the Commonwealth of the Philippines. He never shirked a duty. He never wearied in his efforts. He never hoisted the white flag of defeat. He spent himself utterly. He had no thought of his own comfort or his own welfare. He was at all times completely at the service of his Commonwealth. He died as he lived, fighting for the welfare of humanity.

The example set by your former President will forever stand out as a beacon light, typifying the quality and character that go to make up a great man in all senses of the word. He used his great talents to advance the cause of justice. One of my dearest friends in Manila is also your friend—Judge Sabino Padilla. One night when I was a dinner guest at the home of Judge Padilla he told me that President Quezon sent for him and said: "We have not agreed on many things, but I want you on the court of appeals." Judge Padilla thereupon said to President Quezon: "Mr. President, I have been one of your severest critics." President Quezon then said to Judge Padilla: "Yes, I know you have differed with me many times but the Commonwealth needs you now." Judge Padilla accepted the appointment from his President and still serves on the court of appeals. Like all great leaders President Quezon had bitter opponents. One of his opponents for many years was the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, now President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. In 1935 President Quezon won Mr. Osmeña over to his side, as you know. From that date right up until August 1, 1944, when Mr. Quezon was taken from this earth, Sergio Osmeña remained one of Quezon's staunchest friends and supporters.

Enemies of the late President Quezon said he was a despotic ruler. He was obliged to rule firmly in order to accomplish his ambitions for the Filipino people. There were a few selfish interests in the islands which spent vast sums of money in opposing Quezon, but a large majority of the people were with Mr. Quezon in all of his undertakings. The American press printed a great deal more against Mr. Quezon than in favor of him. Opposition and criticism always make good copy for the papers. I was not in Manila very long before I discovered that most of the criticism of Mr. Quezon came from the very people whose interests had been best served by President Quezon's reforms and progressive leadership. The critics seemed unmindful of the fact that their business profits and well being came about because of the wise leadership of their great President. Yes, President Quezon ruled with an iron hand, but he was not a dictator. He permitted the minority party to have a strong voice in island affairs. He personally saw to it that the Philippine constitution contained definite safeguards against the concentration of power in the hands of one man.

Labor troubles, unrest, uprisings, and revolts in the islands ceased after Mr. Quezon became President He gave to his people opportunities which they had not known before. Beautiful homes, modern office buildings, and fine highways were built. Up-to-date school buildings were erected. Manila was provided with adequate transportation and lighting facilities. There are few cities in America which are better lighted than Manila at night. Prior to the Japanese invasion, Manila had a number of wonderful hotels. The hotels which I saw there 7 years ago would be a credit to New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, or Boston. In my opinion, no hotel in America could compare with the Manila Hotel before the Japs destroyed it. The thoroughfares in Manila were beehives of activity. Places of business were crowded at all times. It was just as difficult to find a table in a restaurant or a seat in a moving-picture theater from 1935 until Pearl Harbor as it is in Washington today. Everyone had money and enjoyed what money would buy. No depression was felt in the Philippines at any time while Quezon was President. The people in the streets, in the stores, in the homes, in the shops, in the mills, in the mines, on the plantations, in the hotel lobbies, in the cabarets, in the dance halls and night clubs, on the benches for miles along Dewey Boulevard around Manila Bay—yes; the people everywhere were happy and contented, with smiles on their faces and songs in their hearts. Sir Thomas More must have envisioned Manila and the islands when he wrote Utopia.

After Mr. Quezon improved business conditions, living conditions, working conditions, etc., for his people, he wanted to improve the national defense. He always appointed the right man to the right place. And he sought the right man to organize the national defense. He knew General MacArthur was the man he wanted. The achievements of General MacArthur— in the islands before Pearl Harbor and in the South Pacific since Pearl Harbor have shown the world that Quezon was again right in his judgment of men. Right up until Pearl Harbor, when the rest of the world was in a state of war or confusion, and when our own country was suffering from a depression, thanks to President Quezon the Philippines were enjoying an uninterrupted era of prosperity which started less than 1 year after he became the Commonwealth's first President.

Your country and your people are fortunate in having such a worthy man as Sergio Osmeña succeed Manuel Quezon. I saw a great deal of Mr. Osmeña in Manila and I talked with him frequently during the time he lived in Washington. It is difficult for me to believe that he was ever at any time an opponent or antagonist of Mr. Quezon. No man in the islands understands better than Mr. Osmeña, the aims of Manuel Quezon. No man in the islands is better fitted to carry out those aims than is Sergio Osmeña. The prosperity in the islands which existed under Quezon will continue under Osmeña.

Yes, indeed, President Quezon was a real patriot. He gave to the cause of civic righteousness his stalwart support. He fought against every form of oppression and discrimination. He was a great lover of humanity and he used his wisdom, his influence, his energy and his material means to help those who needed his help and guidance. He was ably equipped for every emergency which confronted his people.

We can say of Manuel Quezon that which was said of Abraham Lincoln, "He now belongs to the ages." Only history itself will be able to present the true size and stature of your former president Amid the sad times in which we are now living, the dauntless soul of Manuel Quezon will be a shining light and example. He was stricken down at a moment when he was most needed in his people's cause. Yet our grief at the overwhelming loss we have sustained is tempered by the realization of the fact that President Quezon lived to bring about the crowning achievement of his life—the granting of full independence for his people.

The goal of the late President Quezon was to have "a country where poverty is unknown, and where justice is the watchword, and democracy and freedom the motto." No president could have a higher goal.

A great soul has departed. His understanding mind, his profound sympathy, his moral courage, his fearlessness, and his memory will be an inspiration and blessing and an illustration of how a great personality can utilize the opportunities of the land—our America—which he so deeply loved.

In the hush and awe of this dark hour there need be no eulogy of the late Manuel Quezon other than lies in the simplicity and purity of our love for him. I know the world is richer and happier and better because Manuel Quezon lived in it. Death can have no fears for such a righteous character.

When the breath of the eternal morning touched his brow and for him the final summons came, I know he went to his Maker tranquil and unafraid, to stand before Him face to face with the same brave, calm consciousness with which he faced and performed his every duty. In that region of the blest I know that the noble soul has reached its home and is at peace.

Sincerely yours,

P. W. REEVES.

Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a few excerpts from a newspaper, when a few weeks ago Prime Minister Churchill said some things in a speech before the annual conference of his Conservative Party which should be of interest to all us Americans. Here are a few brief excepts:

Let there be no mistake about it—it is no easy utopia of airy phrases that lies before us. This is no time for windy platitudes. The Conservative Party had far better go down telling the truth and acting in accordance with the verities of our position than give a span of shabbily bought office by fickle froth and chatter. * * * Woe betide those public men who seek to slide into power down the slippery slope of vain and profligate undertakings. * * *

No restriction upon the well-established liberties that is not proved indispensable to the prosecution of the war and the transition from war to peace can be tolerated. Control for control's sake is senseless. Controls under the pretext of war or its aftermath which are, in fact, designed to favor the accomplishment of totalitarian systems, however, innocently designed or whatever guise they take, whatever liveries they wear, whatever slogans they mouth, are fraud which should be mercilessly exposed to the British public.

At the head of our mainmast we fly the flag of free enterprise. We are determined that native genius and the spirit of adventure and of risk taking, in peace as in war, shall bear our fortunes forward, finding profitable work and trade for our people, and that good, thrifty housekeeping both national and private, shall sustain our economy.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, a great tragedy has befallen the whole world, a truly great man has passed away. He served mankind until the very last. History will record his great deeds, his humanitarian interests, his love of the poor and downtrodden, his leadership of the democratic nations and his blueprint for world peace. The world will miss him more than we can realize now. In the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, America has lost a great President and mankind a great friend.

As we mourn the loss of our late and beloved President, we pledge our full support to our Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman, for a speedy victory and a lasting peace for which President Roosevelt has worked, fought, and died.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, every man, woman, and child in our country, and most of the peoples of the world were shocked and stunned by the announcement of the death of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

When the sad message was flashed over the radio, I was in my office in my home town of Opelousas, La. My office

is in the largest hotel there, and after hearing the details, I repaired to my room in the hotel for meditation, and to pray for the President, his successor, and our country.

I had not been seated long in my chair until I looked out of the window which gave me a view of the post-office building and our county courthouse when I saw simultaneously and in unison the flags from the staffs of the post office and courthouse buildings being lowered at half mast, and in perfect unison.

For several minutes both of the flags remained motionless in their position, as though bowing and reflecting the terrible grief of our people in the loss of our great leader and our beloved President.

Then, at the precise moment, both flags unfurled in the breeze, straightened out, and boldly and bravely continued to fly outstretched, sadly but gloriously defiant, and as I watched the lags fly I envisioned emblazoned in their center the seal of our great country, with our motto "E pluribus unum," and thought that while we had sustained a terrible loss in the death of our great President, this mirage on our glorious flag and all that it represents, was a challenge to me and the rest of our country and the world. We must go on under the leadership of our new President, Harry S. Truman. May God bless him and us.

Radio Statement of Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram received by me from my colleague from Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD:

COLUMBUS, TEX., *April 12, 1945.*

EWING THOMASON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

I am informed that Walter Winchell has stated over radio that I have given some person authority to send out postal matter under my frank. This is infamously false, as no person has ever had authority to use my frank for any purpose. Please place this in the RECORD.

J. J. MANSFIELD.

Memorial to the Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the people of the United States that as a fitting memorial to our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a hospital be erected at Warm Springs, Ga., by public subscription, for those afflicted with infantile paralysis. This would be a living memorial and, in my estimation, more fitting than a monumental stone.

Tribute to the Late President Roosevelt by Former Senator Jackson, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this morning I received a rather unusual letter from a newspaperman in Fort Wayne, Ind., with which he enclosed a copy of a radio address in tribute to the late President Roosevelt delivered by our former colleague, former Senator Jackson, of Indiana. The circumstances are so unusual, and the address itself is so eloquent, that I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the copy of the address enclosed with it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOURNAL-GAZETTE CO.,
Fort Wayne, Ind., April 16, 1945.

Senator CARL A. HATCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am enclosing a copy of a radio address delivered by former Senator Samuel D. Jackson from Westinghouse Radio Station WOWO, in Fort Wayne, Ind., late in the afternoon on which President Roosevelt died.

It seemed to me that it was worthy to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; in any event, I thought you would be interested in reading it. The full text was published in our newspaper, the Journal-Gazette.

When the news of the President's death reached Fort Wayne, Senator Jackson was attending a meeting of the Scottish Rite here. The radio station had some difficulty in locating him; when it had he went immediately to the station, where he was asked to make an address. He went into the studio, rested his head in his hands for a short time, and then said: "I am ready." He was put on the air and delivered this address without notes or manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK ROBERTS,
Executive Editor, Journal-Gazette Co.

P. S.—A recording of the address was broadcast to the Nation Saturday night over the Blue network.

AT LONG LAST HE CAN REST—EX-SENATOR JACKSON PAYS A STIRRING TRIBUTE

Former United States Senator Samuel D. Jackson paid glowing tribute to the leadership of President Roosevelt in a statement he read last night over Station WOWO. The statement follows:

"Ladies and gentlemen, and my fellow countrymen, the President is dead. At long last he can rest. Rest from his labors, rest from his ambitions for his people, rest from the lance of his enemies. Rest from all that burden which he carried. For 12 long years with a broken body he has taken upon himself the cares of the people of the United States of America, and much of the trials and tribulations of a weary hell-ravaged war-torn world. Let those who doubt democracy learn a lesson today.

"Within a few minutes after the death of the President of a hundred and thirty million people, with 12,000,000 men and women under arms, a new one takes his place. The war will proceed to victory, and peace will follow the footsteps of victory. The world will be well again.

"The President is dead. He brought to political life in the United States of America a handicap little-mentioned while he was active in politics. In the area of political campaigns those who disagreed with him most violently were kind about that.

"Last year was an election year, and during that year the people of this country, of all political persuasion, had by and large three main hopes: The hope of an early conclusion of the war; the hope of an abiding and enduring Christian peace; the hope for the restoration of the United States after the war. They concluded that the answer to all three of these hopes was the great world leader who was called home today. Today the angels touched down his eyelids forever; he belongs to history.

"THE GREAT DEMOCRAT

"I remember my first impression of President Roosevelt was when he was Democratic candidate for Vice President, with Governor Cox, of Ohio, running for the Presidency. I saw him in the great parade at the fair grounds in the county seat outside Dayton, Ohio. On the occasion when Governor Cox was notified of his nomination for the Presidency, I saw this young man walking in the parade starting in before the grandstand about the three-quarter-mile post, thin and straight and strong, well, and brisk. No man could have dreamed his future. At a glance you could see that he was a scion of some distinguished and wealthy family. He was, indeed, something of an aristocrat. He was the aristocrat who turned to be the great Democrat, or rather he was the great Democrat.

"You know, those of you who are interested in the mystic things of this world, I am sure, had your attention arrested as I did when I first read of a tiny incident which may mean nothing. When he was a young man at the age of about 28 he met his affliction. But prior to that time in his early college years, he formed an attachment for a chap who was a sculptor, and the young man began to carve out of ebony a figure about 2 feet in height, a figure of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And he worked on it, while they were together, and a year would go by and he would work on it again, and finally the crude black piece took form and shape. That giant head took expression, and from its photograph now, it appears to have the same facial expression the President wore 'til the closing days of his life. There is the great broad torso, there is the deep chest, the great arms, the extraordinarily large hands. Now, when the worker got down to about his lap it was to be a sitting figure—for some mysterious and unexplainable reason, though the subject was in full health, something attracted the attention of the sculptor or something intervened. No one seems to know what, and there the working of the rough piece stopped. And so nothing was thought of it, of course, at the time, but it sat upon his mother's mantel in his mother's home after his affliction and after he became a President of the United States, it was indeed a tie to the infinite to see how the incident presaged the man's great affliction."

WHY THEY LOVED HIM

"I saw him one time in 1936 when he was on his way to the Dust Bowl to confer with Governor Landon, his then opponent, with reference with what should be done with the

windstorms of the West. On his way to Iowa he stopped at Garrett, Ind., and I was invited to go to the train and to meet with him and visit with him. I went with a quartet of men; we went into the station, learned the train was soon to arrive. There was a crowd of a couple of hundred persons waiting for the train to come in the railroad station. We looked way down toward the east and saw the black dot which we knew was the President's Special. It puffed and poured its smoke out, and threw itself down upon us. But, as it came close to the crowd, the engineer slowed down to just so it moved and that's all. It came into the midst of that crowd and stopped and Secret Service men dropped from all the steps of those fine and splendid coaches and if you've never seen a Presidential Special you should see one. It's a great bar of steel, bearing a precious cargo. Made up of a thousand moving, acting parts. The cordon of police closed in about the steps to guard that precious passenger and finally someone from the steps of the last Pullman car, motioned to us to come on and I was the last of the four or five of us who went in. We went down the side aisle of that car to the end which was furnished as a living room and I heard the voice of the President, and I knew, of course, that I would soon be in his presence, for it was the first time I would meet him for conversation. There he was, sitting in an overstuffed chair, wearing a seersucker suit. He stopped to visit with me and we had time to talk. He asked about the crops, the weather, and about Indiana, and he talked about things, as if he wanted to know things and about situations. I looked at that great head again with those blue eyes. I looked at that big body. I looked down at the almost empty trousers of that seersucker suit, and saw the cruel steel braces, and when I heard that matchless voice and saw the sympathy which he used in inquiring about the interests of his people in this locality, I knew then how it was that so many people loved him. And they said: 'Mr. President, if you're going to speak to this crowd you'll have to go out on the back platform now and you men who are visiting, if you'll go on the outside you can hear him better.'

"The arrangements were made and in the twinkling of an eye we were standing out on the railroad track looking up at the back platform, and the President was talking. I heard him speak for the things for which he aspired. Then it was I knew why so many men hated him. Then all too soon the radio apparatus was disconnected and the train started almost imperceptibly to move away and the last I saw was the President waving his hand at us and smiling with that smile which won him both ridicule and tears. And as that B. & O. train sank down to another dot in the west I somehow had a feeling that there was one of God's own chosen men no matter what any man might think of his political career or policies."

MANY GAMES TO PLAY

"And so last year without any partisan reference at all, the people elected him, and may it be said to the very lasting praise and patriotism of his political opponents though they may have disagreed with him in his policies in this trying time when the fate of this republic is in the balance, they prayed for his health and hoped for his continued guidance.

"The President is dead. All cannot agree with what he did, and what he stood for, but we can all recognize that he was a master at government. He, like the expert chess player didn't have one chess game to play, he was like an expert that plays 40 men at once, and wins every game.

"Men who criticize him undertake to set up their judgment against his, so often we've heard that. But he had not one chess game to play, not two, he had a hundred. He had the Japanese chess game, he had the European chess game, he had Hitler, he had Churchill, and Stalin, he had Congress, the Senate, he had all of his administrative bodies, he had all of his boards and bureaus, he had everything that goes to make up the long story of government for 12 long years.

"Perhaps more will be written about him than any other President who has ever served the United States of America. Such a long story of government. So we are deeply sympathetic to all of the other people of this country. We are deeply sympathetic with the armed forces, and we know they will never waver nor falter. We're sympathetic toward his family, but when we think about it all the most important consideration to us is we are to dedicate ourselves to the task which remains before us. Let none despair; heaven rescued this land. God will preserve it."

The President Is Dead; Long Live the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Woodford Sun is a newspaper published at Versailles, Ky. The president of the Woodford Sun Co. is our colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. There was recently published in that newspaper an editorial entitled "The President Is Dead; Long Live the President." The concluding paragraph of the editorial reads as follows:

To the late lamented President we pay our profound respects. To the new President we offer our heart and hands in humble service. With millions of other Americans we say, "The President is dead; long live the President."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD; LONG LIVE THE PRESIDENT

This Nation, and by far the majority of the citizens of other nations all over the world received a great shock last Thursday afternoon when it was announced that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had "slept away" into eternity in the Little White House at Warm Springs, Ga.

To most people, President Roosevelt's death came as a complete surprise. To others, however, who had been intimately associated with him during recent weeks, it was not wholly unexpected. The steady and alarming decline in his health had been viewed by his intimate friends and associates since early in this year. They believed that only a miracle would enable him to live until the end of his fourth term as Chief Magistrate of this Nation.

No President, perhaps, has had more arduous duties thrust upon him than were encountered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt from 1933 to 1945. He took over the Presidential office for his first term in one of the most trying eras of the Nation's history. He was forced to lead the Nation out of the wilderness of depression and despair in a period when fear gripped every American heart and rendered unsteady every American hand.

Then came the trying days of the war in Europe, and eventually this country's declarations of war against Germany, Italy, and Japan. As Commander in Chief of this Nation's armed forces President Roosevelt, already heavily burdened with domestic and foreign problems, found the load increasingly burdensome. The strain upon his physical endurance became heavier and heavier as the months and years passed by. The peak of that endurance was reached last Thursday afternoon at Warm Springs, Ga.

Future historians will appraise the life and works of the late lamented President and future generations will learn of the services and sacrifices he rendered not only to this country but to the entire world.

While universal sorrow prevails throughout this Nation and most of the other countries of the world, precipitated by the sudden death of President Roosevelt, the people of this Nation do not face the future with feelings of despair. Their late President has gone to join the ranks of the world's immortals in that land from whence no traveler e'er returns. They are, however, buoyed up by the belief that God still reigns, and the Government at Washington still lives.

Taking their lesson from the pages of sacred and secular history, the people believe that no mortal is indispensable—that others can and will carry on when their predecessors have passed to the Great Beyond. Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead, but there are those who can and will carry on where he left off.

Modest, unassuming Vice President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, has stepped into the role of Chief Magistrate of this Nation. He has pledged himself to carry on the great work just laid down by his immediate predecessor. Under his courageous, considerate, and conservative leadership this Nation undoubtedly will carry forward the war against the Axis Powers and continue to play an important part in the establishment of an enduring world peace.

As time goes on, there probably will be changes in the domestic policies of this Government under the guidance of President Truman. Many changes have appeared to be inevitable, and the new Chief Executive assumes his duties at a time which seems ideally suited for the kind of leadership he undoubtedly can and will give to this Nation.

To the late lamented President we pay our profound respects. To the new President we offer our heart and hands in humble service. With millions of other Americans we say, "The President is dead—Long live the President."

Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt by Walter F. Howard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, a great deal of beautiful language has been used in paying tribute to our late President, but very little of it has been in poetry. I have received this morning from Delaware poems by Walter F. Howard which

depict the President, his coming, his ministry, and his passing. I should like to have the poems printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be so printed.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS COMING

By the grace of God and His holy wisdom, America is given Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Whence will, O God, the veil be lift;
Whence will the son of man
Receive release from blindness
Thy will to understand.
Out of a darkening East he came
When first we knew him near,
Declaring with simplicity
Man's greatest foe was fear.
Declaring that on Thee he looked
For Thou wouldst be his guide
And lest his foot be dashed 'gainst stone
He'd stay close to Thy side
Calling on Thy holy name,
Girding Thy crusade lance.
He then went forth to battle
For the "meek's inheritance"
Conquering, that the "lowest," "least"
Might view the daylight sun
Thy newest of disciples
His ministry begun.

—*Walter F. Howard.*

APRIL 12, 1945.

HIS MINISTRY

The ministry of America's greatest American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Permit, Almighty Father,
That I might choose this man,
And not blaspheme reviewing
His ministry of Thy land.
Tho longer was his ministry
And older when began,
Not since Thy holy coming
Has world so loved a man.
Godlike is Thy countenance,
Spiritual Thy thought,
But mortals few as closely lived
The teachings Thou has taught.
Out of the dark of chaos
His ministry took form,
The world was in "confusion,"
His faith rode out the storm.
Unwavering and confident,
His smile dispelled our "fears,"
Thy blessing gave him wisdom,
Error lessened with the years,
Like Thine in great adversity,
His stature gained full height
To meet and master Satan
In his glorious "righteous fight."
This friend of those who suffered—
The halt, the lame, the blind—
Was one who subjugated self
That others peace might find.
Mistake not that his work is done,
Lest frost his vineyard kill
While tiredly he sleepeth,
A sleep not of his will.
'Tis certain that "Thy will be done,"
And reverently we yield,
As did this true disciple
That labored in Thy field.
Ministering to the humble,
Ministering to the weak,
To the strong who paused to listen,
To that he sought to speak,
And suffer did his ministry,
Misunderstanding friends;
But with its purpose understood,
Their faith returned again.
His virtue and humility,
His urge to do Thy will,
Engenders beauteous memory
With voids no man can fill.
For such are Thy disciples
Who've passed in endless chain,
Whose teachings grow e'er brighter.
Their brilliance never wanes,
For stewardship is holy trust,
And ministry endowed,
Fulfillment of this sacred trust
Still keeps the head unbowed.
Unless unto Thy holy shrine
We bend in reverent prayer,
For Thou hast promised where Thou art,
Thy servant shall be there.
God, rest this tired traveler,
In reverence, we pray,
And on Thy right hand seat him
When comes the Judgment Day.

—*Walter F. Howard.*

APRIL 12, 1945.

HIS PASSING—WARRIOR'S REST

With dauntless faith and courage
He served his native land
Though wounded was this soldier
Yet wounds stayed not his hand.
The danger ever threatened, lurking.
Stealthily poised to strike
Conviction held him to the course
No compromise for right.
The magnetism of his voice
Inspired the wavering soul
Encouraging the fight that wins
And ends in victory's goal.
A warrior leading at the front
To stem onrushing horde
With hero will to conquer
In faith blessed by the Lord.
No earthly force e'er stops such men
Their steel withstands each test
No hero's spirit ever dies
It just lies down to rest.
Arising it soars to heaven's height
To saint and spirit shrine
And dwells with the immortals
Where rest is peace sublime.
God rest this noble patient soul
And grant his last request
That peace this time shall bless us;
What more could he bequest?

Dedicated to the greatest champion the cause of peace has yet known—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

—*Walter F. Howard.*

APRIL 12, 1945.

Feeding at the Public Trough

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the grain-producing States of the Middle West are short a hundred thousand boxcars in order to move last year's wheat, corn, and sorghum crops. They are also unable to purchase lumber needed for building storage space for millions of bushels of grain which is now stored in the open and deteriorating every day.

An article in the March 15 issue of the California Lumber Merchant may shed some light on both of these problems.

For instance, 4,744,680 feet of high-grade lumber was shipped from California to a manufacturing concern in New York to be made into 29-inch troughs. It took 190 cars to transport this lumber to New York. It took many more than 190 boxcars to move this material back to California. Is it any wonder the Middle West is short of boxcars? Approximately 5,000,000 feet of lumber was wasted in this transaction. I don't know what the troughs could have been made for, but those of us who grew up on the farm know that 2,400,000 wooden troughs would feed a lot of pigs. It would relieve the pork shortage if we did have pigs drinking out of all these troughs.

The article from the California Lumber Merchant reads as follows:

Probably the greatest wooden trough sale ever heard of in the history of mankind is being conducted at the present time by the United States Government. Just a small matter of 2,400,000 wooden troughs, 29 inches long, are piled up on the Southern Pacific Railroad siding at Benicia, Calif. They are made from ponderosa and sugar pine, and it took 4,774,680 feet of lumber to construct them. They are offered for sale to the highest bidder by the United States Treasury, Procurement Division, Office of Surplus Property, 30 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

A circular has been issued by this department offering these wooden troughs for sale, describing them, and stating the terms under which they will be sold. What the troughs were made for in the first place is not stated. Whether or not they were ever used is likewise not stated. All this huge amount of lumber was shipped to a manufacturing plant in New York, where these 2,400,000 troughs were manufactured, and now this lumber in its manufactured form is back in California where it came from, and being offered for sale in the shape of troughs

Figuring 25,000 feet to a car, this huge amount of lumber required 190 cars to take it east, and more than that number to bring it back west in the shape of troughs. This appears to be one of the biggest, most unusual, and most interesting transactions that the Surplus Property units of our Government have had to handle; at least from a lumber standpoint.

New York Legislature Approves Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, public interest in House Joint Resolution 71, introduced by me in the House on January 16, 1945, and the companion or similar resolutions introduced by other Members in the House and in the Senate, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as follows: "Equality of rights under the law should not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex" appears to be growing in favor among public officials and the citizens of the country. One of the recent declarations on this important subject was the adoption of a resolution by both branches of the New York Legislature at its recent session on March 24, 1945, memorializing Congress to take favorable action on this proposal. This resolution declares that "the rights of women

before the law are abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women"; and it further declares that "this legal discrimination against women on account of sex is a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women in other fields of endeavor."

Other official groups and many organizations as well as many pominent individuals, men and women, have recently declared their support of this proposed amendment. The adoption of the resolution by the New York State Legislature brought forth the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of date Thursday March 29, 1945:

NEW YORK FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

Another creditable deed of the 1945 legislature, one which has escaped attention in most summaries, was its espousal of the equal rights amendment. The Brees resolution memorializing Congress to write equal rights for women into the Constitution was passed by both Houses on March 24, the last day of the session. "The rights of women before the law are abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women," the resolution reads, and is "a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women * * * in other fields of endeavor."

It may be that one more resolution from a State legislature will not move a Congress having wartime difficulties enough with manpower. But those difficulties may, just possibly, have taught its Members that it is harder to be unfair than to be fair when defining rights and assigning responsibilities. In that case, they will decide not to go on being unfair to women, some of whom they must, almost perforce, tap on the shoulder and say, precisely as they say to young men, "Put on a uniform and go to the aid of your country." And they will forthwith decide to submit the equal rights amendment to the States for approval.

The Republican and Democratic Parties, at their national conventions in 1944, placed in their platforms a plank urging the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution that would do away with discrimination against either men or women on account of sex. President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, as the candidates of their respective parties, accepted their respective platforms with this plank. All Members of the House and Senate of both parties ran on their respective platforms and they were elected on their respective platforms, pledged to do away with this discrimination.

It seems to me that we are all honor bound to submit this question to the American people for their consideration.

The legislatures of various States are passing laws against discrimination against persons on account of race, creed, or color. If such legislation is justified, how can we continue to discriminate against women on account of sex? This matter is of such public interest and such importance that the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate should, in my opinion, report this proposed amendment to their respective Houses, and the House and Senate should then submit the question for approval or disapproval by the people. It certainly will be the American way to give the American people an opportunity to express their will on this important matter.

Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I herewith tender, to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas with reference to the service of the Civil Air Patrol, which organization was initiated voluntarily at the beginning of the war by private, patriotic civilians who tendered to the Government their airplanes and their services without compensation. I understand Col. D. Harold Byrd, of Dallas, Tex., was the leading spirit in this movement. This resolution refers to his activities also:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Whereas immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese in 1941, a voluntary organization was formed by thousands of civilian airmen and airplane owners throughout the United States, known as the Civil Air Patrol; and

Whereas throughout the 3 years of American participation in the war the Civil Air Patrol, now an auxiliary of the United States Army Air Forces, has been called upon for various emergency active duty missions including antisubmarine patrol of our coastal waters, border patrol, tow-target, and antiaircraft training, radar testing, forest-fire patrol, search and rescue, and the enlistment and preflight training of thousands of Army Air Forces aviation cadets; and

Whereas there are now more than 130,000 adult and cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol who volunteer their services and give their time from civilian life to work without compensation, a total of more than 5,000 adults and 5,000 teen-age cadets of these volunteers being attached to the Texas Wing of the Civil Air Patrol under the command of Lt. Col. D. Harold Byrd, Texas C. A. P. wing commander; and

Whereas the large number of Texans who volunteered for active duty service in the antisubmarine missions, border patrol, forest-fire patrol, and other active duty assignments calling for the use of privately owned airplanes and voluntary personal services, have brought honor to the State of Texas for their heroism and sacrifice over and above the call of duty, including those who gave their lives in the service of their country; and

Whereas Civil Air Patrol members of Texas through their unselfish contributions of time and money have preserved and extended the State's civil aviation facilities during wartime through training of Texas youth, education, good citizenship, and airport operations to the end that Texas has a strong base for post-war aviation expansion and employment; and

Whereas Lt. Col. D. Harold Byrd has contributed several planes, a great part of his time and considerable money to the successful operation of the Texas Civil Air Patrol, and his sacrifice and leadership has been followed by other leaders and members of the organization, and the results of their work having been evidenced in their patrol of the great forest fires in East Texas which were patrolled, investigated, and ended through the Civil Air Patrol's cooperation with other State officials; and

Whereas the members of the Civil Air Patrol risked their lives in flying planes in search of submarines and disabled boats along the waters of the Gulf and Atlantic coasts and the members of such organizations should be recognized and commended by the State of Texas for their splendid work: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the forty-ninth legislature recognize the excellent accomplishments of the Civil Air Patrol of the State of Texas and express its appreciation to Wing Commander D. Harold Byrd, the officers and enlisted membership, and that the organization be commended for its unselfish and patriotic services in the preparation and the defense of this State and Nation against sabotage, espionage, invasion, and attack by the enemies of this country.

Gilmer; Adams; Allison; Atkinson; Baker; Barber; Barnes; Bell, of Bexar; Bell, of DeWitt; Blankenship; Bond; Bridges; Brown; Bundy; Calhoun; Callaway; Cato; Celaya; Chambers; Chapman; Coker; Colson; Conner; Counts; Cousins; Covey; Crawford; Crosthwait Cummings; Davis; Deen; Donnell; Duckett; Dunn; Elliott; Ellis; Evans; Fant; Favors; Fenley; Fertsch; Files; Floyd; Foster; Gandy; Gardner; Gathings; Gerron; Gray; Green; Greer; Grisham; Hanna; Harris; Hartzog; Heflin; Helpinstill; Henderson, Holstein; Hoyo; Huddleston; Hull; Humphrey; Hydrick; Isaacks; Johnson; Jones, of Bosque; Jones, of Hunt; Jordan; Kirby; Lanier; Lansberry; Lee; Lehman; Leonard; Leslie; Leyendecker; Lightfoot; Little; Lock, of Angelina; Lock, of Rusk; Love; Lucas; Luedemann; Mabe; Manford; Mangum, of Dallas; Mangum, of Hunt; Markle; Messer; Mills; Montgomery; Moore, of Comanche; Moore, of Harris; Moore, of Red River; Morgan; McAlister; McFarland; McLellan, McMurry; Nicholson; Parkhouse; Parton; Pearson; Peterman; Pickens; Pigg; Price; Proffer; Pruett, of Travis; Pruett, of Wise; Rampy; Ramsey; Read; Reader; Reed; Roark; Sadler; Sallas; Sellers; Senterfitt; Sharpe; Simpson; Smith, of Bastrop; Smith, of Hays; Smith, of Jack; Smith, of Jerrerson; Smith, of Lubbock; Smith, of Tarrant; Spacek; Sparks; Storey, Stubbs; Suiter; Svadlenak; Swanson; Thomas; Vale; Voight; Walker; Ward; Westbrook; White; Williams; Williamson; Winfree; Wiseman; Wood; Woods; Yezak; John Lee Smith, president of the senate; C. H. Gilmer, speaker of the house.

I hereby certify that house concurrent resolution 28 was adopted by the house on February 21, 1945.

[SEAL] CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that house concurrent resolution 28 was adopted by the senate on March 15, 1945.

NOEL K. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate.

How High Are United States Tariffs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the American Tariff League:

SUMMARY AND BRIEF COMMENT ON HOW HIGH ARE UNITED STATES TARIFFS?

The study entitled, "How High Are United States Tariffs?", published by the American Tariff League, reveals that the level of American import duties, contrary to the general misunderstanding, is among the lowest of the world's great trading nations.

Of 19 nations whose tariffs were studied, the United States was found to rank seventh from the bottom. The United Kingdom, popularly considered a free-trade nation, was ninth from the bottom—two above this country. Comparative averages (taking the United States as 100) were as follows:

Spain	465.0
Turkey	359.6
Germany	279.0
Brazil	239.4
Greece	166.0
Hungary	160.0
Italy	150.5
Mexico	149.0
Egypt	130.0
Switzerland	128.0
United Kingdom	118.3
Argentina	110.0
United States	100.0
Japan	98.0
Belgium	96.8
France	85.0
Canada	76.3
Netherlands	37.4
Sweden	32.8

Compared were import duties on 10 separate groups of commodities: farm products, foods, hides and leather, textiles, fuels, metals, and metal products, building materials, chemicals and drugs, house furnishings, and miscellaneous.

In five groups—food, fuels, metals, building materials, and chemicals—the United States ranged among the bottom six. In two groups, textiles and house furnishings, it ranked tenth. In only one, farm products, was it in the upper half.

In all, 170 commodities figured in the study. They were selected in accordance with their relative importance in consumption in the United States. Amounts and prices of each were based on the total quantity and value of each in the combined exports and imports of both the United States and the United Kingdom.

Figures used were for 1937, last full year before World War II for which statistics were available. The Soviet Union was omitted because it operates under a closed economy and the necessary data were not obtainable.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, of course, many rates have been reduced since 1937. Inasmuch as the study was based on figures for 1937, it does not reflect the real status of our tariffs. Today they are even lower than shown in the report. Furthermore, the duty collected by the United States on all imports, free and dutiable, was only equal to an average of 15.6 percent in 1937 and has fallen every year since—so that in 1940 the figure was 12.51 percent.

Three years were spent on the study. Only fully qualified experts participated, and every precaution was taken to make it thoroughly objective. With tables and appendixes, it runs to 65 pages.

(NOTE.—For a complete list of commodities used in the study, see p. 7. For tariff percentage levels of the 19 countries by category, see p. 14.)

The American Tariff League is a nonpartisan, fact-finding organization founded in 1885 to carry on continuous research into all the facts and forces brought into play in trade between the nations. It makes these facts available in an educational effort designed to provide a better understanding of the effect of these forces on the prosperity of American labor, agriculture, and industry.

Following is a list of the commodities considered in the study "How High Are United States Tariffs?":

Farm products: Apples, barley, calves, corn, cotton, eggs, hogs, oranges, potatoes, steers, tobacco, wheat, wool.

Foods: Bacon, bananas, beef, butter, canned peaches, canned asparagus, canned peas, canned tomatoes, cheese, cocoa beans, cocoa (powdered), coffee (raw), corn starch, dried apricots, dried prunes, dried raisins, flour, ham, lard, milk (condensed), milk (evaporated), pork, poultry, salt, sugar (granulated), sugar (raw), tea.

Textile products: Burlap, cotton cloth (not bleached), cotton cloth (bleached), cotton cloth (dyed), cotton collars, cotton hosiery, cotton overalls, cotton shirts, cotton underwear, cotton yarn, linen handkerchiefs, raw silk, rayon staple, rayon piece goods, rayon yarn, silk hosiery, wool overcoats, wool piece goods, wool suits, wool underwear, wool yarn.

Chemicals: Alcohol, ethyl; alcohol, methyl; aluminum sulfate; ammonium sulfate; camphor; caustic soda; citric acid; cocoanut oil; copra; creosote oil; dyes, indigo; dyes, direct black; dyes, sulfur black; dyes, vat blue; fertilizer; glycerin; nitrate of soda; phosphate rock; potash, crude; potash, muriate; potash, sulfate; salt; soda ash; sulfur; superphosphate; tallow; tankage.

Building materials: Brick, common; cement; doors, wood; lime; linseed oil; lumber; paint; plate glass; rosin; shingles; turpentine; varnish; window glass.

Metals: Aluminum; barbed wire; copper; copper wire; cultivators; harrows; lead; manganese ore; motor vehicles; pipe, black steel; pipe, cast iron; pipe, galvanized; pig iron; plows; shovels; steel billets; steel plates; steel rails; steel sheets; steel sheets, galvanized; steel, structural; tin; typewriters; wire nails; woven wire fencing; zinc.

Fuel: Coal, anthracite; coal, bituminous; fuel oil; gasoline; petroleum, crude.

House furnishings: Carpets; chinaware; electric refrigerators; furniture, wood; linoleum; pillowcases; sewing machines; sheets; wool blankets.

Miscellaneous: Cameras; cigarettes; cigars; diamonds, cut but not mounted; films; furs, undressed; matches; newsprint; perfumery; radios; rubber; rubber tires; soap, laundry; soap, toilet; starch, cassava; starch, corn; starch, potato; whisky, Scotch; wine, champagne; wine, still; wood pulp, chemical; wood pulp, mechanical; wrapping paper.

Hides and leather products: Gloves, women's; hides; leather, calf upper; leather, sole; shoes, men's.

The chart below shows the comparative treatment accorded various groups of commodities by the 19 nations figuring in the study, How High Are United States Tariffs? All percentage figures are equivalent ad valorem rates:

	Percent
Farm products:	
Egypt	119.8
United States	95.8
Turkey	91.8
United Kingdom	89.0
Spain	80.5
Japan	65.1
Brazil	64.0
Greece	50.0
Farm products—Continued.	
Mexico	50.0
Switzerland	46.2
Germany	37.9
Canada	33.0
Argentina	24.9
France	24.2
Italy	17.9
Hungary	9.1
Sweden	8.8
Netherlands	6.7
Belgium	6.4
Fuels:	
Germany	308.0
Spain	269.3
Belgium	149.5
Switzerland	124.8
Turkey	122.8
Greece	111.0
United Kingdom	88.6
Hungary	82.1
Brazil	59.2
France	55.6
Argentina	53.4
Netherlands	33.0
Mexico	31.6
Japan	29.8
Egypt	26.8
Italy	23.0
Canada	12.2
Sweden	.5
United States	0
Foods:	
Spain	354.0
Turkey	346.0
Brazil	228.0
Hungary	212.0
Germany	172.3
Italy	121.0
Greece	98.2
Belgium	92.8
Mexico	87.8
France	79.2
Argentina	64.4
Switzerlan	62.2
Egypt	60.8
Japan	48.6
Canada	47.5
Netherland	41.1
United States	37.0
United Kingdom	33.7
Sweden	32.4
Metals and products:	
Spain	229.0
Italy	87.5
Germany	79.6
Turkey	49.5
Argentina	43.0
Brazil	31.8
Hungary	30.3
France	30.2
Switzerland	22.3
Belgium	18.7
Mexico	17.3
Japan	16.3
Greece	15.5
Canada	12.7
United Kingdom	11.7
United States	10.7
Egypt	10.4
Sweden	7.2
Netherlands	4.0
Housefurnishing goods:	
Spain	253.5
Mexico	123.0
Turkey	112.0
Greece	70.5
Italy	58.7
Japan	54.4
Germany	53.4
Canada	51.0
Argentina	43.8
United States	43.3
Brazil	42.6
Hungary	37.7
Switzerland	33.0
United Kingdom	30.3
France	20.3
Egypt	19.1
Sweden	18.0
Netherlands	10.8
Belgium	10.7

Hides and leather products:	Percent
Turkey	308.5
Spain	254.0
Argentina	228.0
Brazil	94.0
Greece	93.7
Mexico	85.0
Japan	75.4
Hungary	64.5
Italy	52.8
Germany	30.5
Switzerland	22.8
Egypt	21.0
United States	17.0
United Kingdom	15.5
Sweden	14.2
Canada	11.6
Belgium	7.6
France	7.2
Netherlands	6.4
Building materials:	
Spain	182.0
Greece	179.1
Brazil	129.2
Germany	98.5
Argentina	74.2
Hungary	72.8
Turkey	71.8
Switzerland	62.1
France	52.5
Mexico	48.2
Egypt	38.5
Italy	38.2
Japan	35.5
Sweden	33.6
Canada	16.2
United Kingdom	12.8
Belgium	11.1
United States	10.6
Netherlands	5.5
Miscellaneous:	
Germany	168.5
Italy	119.2
Turkey	108.7
Brazil	87.2
Spain	78.5
Greece	77.3
Switzerland	63.0
Mexico	55.2
United Kingdom	52.5
Argentina	50.5
Japan	45.5
Canada	44.5
United States	34.2
Hungary	31.0
Egypt	26.2
Belgium	15.3
Sweden	8.4
France	7.9
Netherlands	6.6
Textile products:	
Spain	316.1
Turkey	163.0
Brazil	117.6
Mexico	86.8
Greece	58.8
Germany	55.2
Switzerland	40.0
Canada	39.8
Hungary	37.4
United States	32.3
Argentina	31.2
Japan	30.0
France	22.7
United Kingdom	21.2
Belgium	19.3
Egypt	19.1
Sweden	18.9
Italy	15.3
Netherlands	7.6
Chemicals:	
Mexico	295.8
Spain	143.4
Turkey	85.0
Greece	74.5
Germany	73.2
Brazil	30.3
Argentina	24.4
Japan	16.7
France	15.9
Egypt	15.0
Chemicals—Continued.	Percent
Canada	13.7
United Kingdom	13.3
Hungary	13.2
United States	12.1
Italy	11.4
Switzerland	10.1
Netherlands	7.8
Sweden	2.8
Belgium	1.8

America Was Never a One-Man Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include this editorial from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press:

THE UNITED STATES NEVER WAS A ONE-MAN COUNTRY

As Franklin D. Roosevelt goes to his eternal rest, the unspoken thought on the lips and in the hearts of his countrymen poses the question: "What of the future?"

Without detracting anything from the stout-hearted leadership of the late President, we can as a people be comforted by the knowledge that in a land as great as ours, no man was ever intended to preside over our destinies in perpetuity.

Six other Presidents of the United States have been taken by death or the assassin's bullet while in office. But the Nation did not wither and die with the passing of the immortal Lincoln or the great McKinley. Other men, stanch and stalwart Americans, carried on. And so it will be again.

Franklin D. Roosevelt will ever be remembered for his inherent love of humanity, his unfailing courage and resourcefulness in meeting one crisis after another, and his abiding conviction that the future peace of the world lies in nations working together as good neighbors.

I would be somewhat less than truthful if in the hour of the country's loss, I were to represent that our views were ever in complete consonance.

I resented the needless promotion of class warfare and the constant sniping at equally patriotic Americans who were bold and courageous enough to disagree with administration measures, which, they feared, would permanently alter and undermine the foundation of a great republic.

I resented the deceptive half measures and lulling of the public conscience which brought us to the brink of war. I disliked our moral dishonesty and the devious measures by which the American people were "conditioned" for war. In reflection, I disliked them then, and even more now.

But when the blow came at Pearl Harbor, this newspaper pledged its unlimited support and loyalty to the President.

It has ever been faithful to the pledge.

President Truman is not a great man as world leaders are judged. Though personally forthright, his political background is none too savory.

However, it is a truism in American political life that average men, suddenly elevated to positions of the greatest public trust, often find themselves and grow in stature and understanding.

Our new President revealed capacity as chairman of the War Investigating Committee bearing his name. It was there that he was first brought to national attention. He has a very real capacity for teamwork and a fine sense of modesty, attributes which should aid him tremendously in these grave and troubled hours.

Disturbed as we are over the sudden death of a President destined to occupy a very high place in the history of the world, there are these reassuring factors which should impel us to hold steady.

1. Under the capable leadership of General Marshall and Admiral King, there need be no fear that our war effort against the enemies of civilization will lag or diminish in force.

2. The San Francisco Conference for establishing world security proceeds on schedule and will, I believe, make a very real contribution to the cause of world peace, because everyone now realizes that civilization can never again withstand the ravages and devastation of another world war.

3. President Truman understands the necessity for helping to rehabilitate the crushed and broken victims of Hitler's mad ambitions. We shall and should do our part. But I think he will also understand that we cannot reconstruct world economies on a firm footing and at the same time be constantly sapping our own. World prosperity depends in great measure upon a prosperous America. The cause of world peace will not be advanced if we are overly lavish with our own resources. Let us aid but not endow.

4. From his experience as a United States Senator, President Truman will appreciate the importance of friendly cooperation between the Congress and the White House.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was ever supreme. Such congressional rebuffs as he received developed because of his insistence upon pushing measures and appointments that were an open affront to members of his own political party.

President Truman's stature as a national leader will rest largely upon his ability to bring the dissident forces in Congress to see that a truly united war effort demands teamwork in the finest sense of public service.

We think he will succeed in accomplishing that desirable and essential end.

5. President Truman's Middle Western background offers a guarantee that his advisers will be truly representative of the country at large. His administration should be free from the radical fringe which has successfully been reshaping the Nation to conform to ideologies not in keeping with our own.

6. There will be a great and sadly needed rebirth of party responsibility.

The Republican leaders have a splendid opportunity to prove that they represent something other than party negation.

The Democrats can once more reassert themselves as a national party rather than a strange assortment of opportunistic politicians who have continued in office through the ignoble expedient of clinging to a greater man's coat tail.

Representative government in this country can once more be restored. It is sadly needed.

Saddened as we are by the passing of a valorous leader, there is, nevertheless, no reason for an outbreak of disillusionment or fear. The Nation's destiny does not hang upon the life thread of a single man nor is there any reason why it should not forge ahead to the realization of our greatest dreams.

Peace on earth and better living for all can be achieved if we have the will and the intelligence to push ahead. The United States of America is still the greatest country on earth, the envy of the world.

In this unhappy hour there is solace and comfort to be found in the following quotation:

"God grant me the serenity to accept those things I cannot change, the courage to change those which I can, and the wisdom to know the difference."

An era is over.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington News on Wednesday, April 18, by the distinguished and beloved wife of our late President, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt:

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

MRS. F. D. THANKS SYMPATHIZERS AND WHITE HOUSE STAFF

TUESDAY.—Of one thing I am sure. When people's hearts are freed by sympathy and sorrow, it makes them wonderfully kind. I have had evidence of this during the past few days.

My husband's friends and associates have come to assure me of their desire to help me in any way. From all over the country messages poured in, wanting to know how the senders could be of assistance. For the moment, of course, the only people who can actually do something are the people in our secretarial staffs under Mrs. Helm and Miss Thompson's direction. They have worked day and night and will continue to do so until we leave on Friday. The people who were on my husband's staff, his secretary, Miss Grace Tully, and the others in the Executive offices have a terrific mountain of mail to attend to. Up to last night, 25,000 letters alone faced them!

Also under great strain are the ushers. With the help of the workers who bring a President's family into the White House and take them out again, they have to work on all the details, not only of removing such belongings as we may have, but of getting the White House in order for President and Mrs. Truman. Then there are the staff of the White House, the housekeeper, Mrs. Nesbitt, and all the employees and their families, who must still carry on despite the people coming in and out. One of the people to whom I am most grateful is Mrs. Mabel Webster, who has been my personal maid ever since I came here and who now finds herself packing from early dawn to dark.

Yesterday I took Mrs. Truman all through the White House. In the years that we have been here I have taken many people through the House, sometimes only in the formal rooms, sometimes on the family floor, very rarely to the attic and the kitchen. I always have a pride in the beauty of the rooms—their proportions, the interesting furnishings, which remain the same no matter what individuals may live here. It was good to find Mrs. Truman so appreciative of the things that I have loved.

One of my great joys has been in the flowers which were always around us in profusion. When the White House greenhouse was taken down, the other greenhouses in the city still provided us with all that the flower room needed to keep the White House beautiful. Sometimes it was gay, sometimes more subdued, but always the men who worked in that particular department have seemed to love and appreciate the beauty of the job they did. No one will be more grateful than I am to all the various people with whom we have been in contact because we lived in this house, and who made life not only possible but pleasant and gracious.

Jones Mills Aluminum Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following communication and its enclosure, which was sent to me under date of March 21, 1945, by members of an organization known as the Ouachita Area Development Council:

OUACHITA AREA DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL,
March 21, 1945.

Congressman W. F. NORRELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NORRELL: We have an organization known as Ouachita Area Development Council to promote the full interest of four counties in this area. We expect to take in a few additional counties in this immediate area.

While our purposes are general and will cover all subjects that we think will be particularly helpful to this area, we are very much interested in the operation of Jones Mills aluminum plant and the construction and operation of the power plant at Jones Mills by private enterprise. We are against the Government going into any further business, or any branch of the Government operating the aluminum plant or the power plant at Jones Mills. Our recent legislature passed unanimously a joint resolution to this same effect, a certified copy of which is enclosed.

We think we represent the almost unanimous feeling of the people in this territory, and we do hope you will take this request and this legislative resolution seriously. In fact, we believe it expresses the views of yourself and the other members of our delegation.

We cannot afford to have more Government operations. We must have taxpaying institutions. If the Government is to go into the aluminum business and the power business in this area, it will likely next be in the banking business or most any other kind of business.

The undersigned is the committee named to represent the people of this area.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. Cuffman, chairman, Malvern, Ark.; H. A. Daugherty, vice chairman, Arkadelphia, Ark.; J. W. Ramsey, secretary-treasurer, Malvern, Ark.; George Lindahl, Malvern, Ark.; Zera Caldwell, Malvern, Ark.; George S. Dews, Arkadelphia, Ark.; Leon Bond, Arkadelphia, Ark.; Billy Anderson, Hot Springs, Ark.; T. W. Stone, Hot Springs, Ark.; Prince Cook, Hot Springs, Ark.; Henry J. Gingles, Benton, Ark.; W. R. Alsobrook, Benton, Ark.; H. W. Anderson, Benton, Ark.

Sponsored by the chambers of commerce of Hot Springs, Arkadelphia, Malvern, and Benton, Ark.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, C. G. Hall, secretary of state of the State of Arkansas, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached instrument of writing is a true and perfect copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 of the fifty-fifth general assembly.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at office in the city of Little Rock, this 20th day of March 1945.

[SEAL] C. C. HALL,
Secretary of State.
By V. COLLIE,
Deputy.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17

Whereas the Jones Mills aluminum plant, located on Lake Catherine, is near the richest aluminum deposits of the United States, and Whereas due to the adequacy and suitability of labor and abundant markets, the Jones Mills aluminum plant should operate continuously in the future, and

Whereas continued operation of the Jones Mills plant will also assure operation of a substantial portion of the important Hurricane Creek aluminum plant at Bauxite, Ark., would encourage establishment of additional factories related to the aluminum industry, including aluminum fabrication, and would necessitate completion of a large power plant at Jones Mills: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Senate of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly (the House concurring therein), That enthusiastic approval be given to operation of the Jones Mills aluminum plant continuously in the future, together with any other plants constructed therewith; and be it further

Resolved, That completion of the power plant heretofore undertaken at Jones Mills be urged at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That the Arkansas General Assembly respectfully endorse and urge that the construction and operation of all plants herein named be undertaken by private enterprise, it being the considered opinion of this Arkansas General Assembly that private enterprise is preferable to public construction and operation.

Approved March 20, 1945.

The American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Batavia (N. Y.) Daily News, of March 27, 1945, concerning a speech delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at Northampton, Mass., on March 26, 1945:

THE AMERICAN LIFE

Addressing the Rotary Club of Northampton, Mass., last night, James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, did a good job in reminding Americans who talk about the American way of life that a way of life is, "in the last analysis, the product of human beings."

Our attention is called to the fact that a way of life "is not a social or a political philosophy that someone has thought out and handed to other people as a guide for their activities," but that it is rather "a name that we give to the habits and methods and characteristics in their relation to other men."

The same problems that helped to create the average American, he contends, exist today and "may be with us as long as men live upon this earth" because these problems are problems of Europe which he describes as

a section of the earth which has "suffered for centuries from the fact that it could produce more people than it could feed."

Recalling that those who made America left a "barren and unfruitful continent for many reasons," Mr. Farley points out that they used the elements of culture, and constitutional Government, and the interest of workmanship, and technical skills with which Europe, despite its limitations, provided them and with which they made this land of promise the America we know and live in and fight for today.

We are furthermore reminded that we still have the courage and enterprise which produced the American way of life for the price which this land exacted and which they were willing to pay. Then he tells us that we have "stretched out our hands to the unhappy people of Europe" and have "offered them opportunity for a better life," asking only that they have "strong hands and loyal hearts."

Finally, he asks us to remember that "the United States was not built upon formulas; it was built upon the individual" and that "we shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American. The door of opportunity must be kept open."

Thirty-three Members of the United States Senate Must Not Have the Power to Kill Peace Treaties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Hon CHESTER E. MERROW, on the subject of treaty ratification over the Columbia network, from the studios of WTOP in Washington on Tuesday, April 17, 1945.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we are to build a just and lasting peace, 33 Members of the United States Senate must not continue to have the power to kill peace treaties. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution is as follows: "He"—the President—"shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." This places in the hands of a Senate minority, one-third plus 1, or 33 Members, life and death power over all treaties. Very presently the House of Representatives will vote on a resolution to submit to the State legislatures for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving to both Houses of Congress the right to validate treaties by a majority vote. Aside from winning the war, this is the most important single question before the Nation. The Seventy-ninth Congress will not be required to pass judgment on any measure of greater significance than the amendment now under discussion to revise our constitutional peace-making machinery. I hope that the House will adopt the treaty resolution by far more than the required two-thirds vote, and that the measure will be acted upon immediately by the Senate. This would then afford the State legislatures an opportunity to vote on the amendment this year.

The work of making the Constitution of the United States did not begin with the great Convention of 1787, nor did it end when the framers of that immortal document finished their task. Their ancestors had been working on the Constitution for centuries. Their descendants have labored ever since the Constitutional Convention adjourned. Twenty-one amendments to the Constitution have been adopted. In addition to these formal changes, the Constitution has grown by means of statutes, judicial decisions, and usages. Political systems must constantly change to meet different conditions at different times. They must undergo modification to fit the demands of a changing environment. The Constitution of the United States has proved itself to be highly adaptable. The fathers knew that developments would come and therefore provided four ways to amend the original document. If the United States of America is to assume its proper place as a world leader, then we must strike from the Constitution the antiquated treaty-ratifying procedure.

For the future salvation and the continued progress of our civilization, for the protection and the promotion of the self-interests of the United States, this Nation is in dire need of a positive foreign policy, a dynamic foreign policy, an enlightened foreign policy, a foreign policy based on expanding international cooperation. Developments within the last half century have made this imperative. Foreign policy can only be effected through the mechanism of international agreements and treaties. The nature of the agreements and treaties to be decided upon during the next 15 or 20 years will determine whether or not a dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation will be successful in averting future wars. Treaties and agreements are the only means whereby such a policy can be translated into cooperative action in a world of sovereign states. Not only will it be necessary to secure the ratification of treaties written at the cessation of hostilities but for several years many international undertakings supplementing the original treaties will have to be acted upon by this and other Governments.

The United States is the only great Nation requiring a two-thirds vote of one branch of the national legislative body to ratify treaties. The reasons motivating the writers of the Constitution to insert the requirement have long since disappeared. The Articles of Confederation providing for treaty ratification by a vote of 9 out of the 13 States were in the immediate background as the makers of the Constitution did their work. The continuity between the Constitution and the Articles of Confederation, which is to be found at so many points, is also present in certain fundamental aspects of the treaty provision. Under the Articles of Confederation the treaty power was exercised by a Congress in which the States were not only represented as States but voted as States. The power to make treaties was regarded as one of the fundamental attributes of State sovereignty.

Demand for the two-thirds rule came from the jealousies and suspicions of the original States. The South was interested in navigation on the Mississippi River. The New England States were concerned in protecting fishery rights. Sections were fearful lest treaties might be made which would interfere with their respective economic interests. With the growth of the country the conditions which caused the insertion of the two-thirds rule have long since passed off the stage and today the United States of America stands alone as the only great Nation to employ the cumbersome, obstructive, and senseless two-thirds requirement.

The record of the Senate in the disposition of treaties for the settlement of international disputes is most disheartening. In writing this record the Senate has ably demonstrated its inability to act constructively in international affairs. Peace treaties and treaties of arbitration have suffered irraparable mutilation at the hands of the Senate. Since the Spanish-American War the United States has been a growing world power. Again and again during the last 50 years the Senate has frustrated moves to substitute the peaceful settlement of international disputes for war. The Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty of 1897 was rejected. The Hay Arbitration Treaties of 1904 were emasculated. The Senate maintained a strangle hold on the Root Arbitration Treaties of 1908 and 1910. The life was taken out of the Taft Arbitration Treaties of 1911. The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations were defeated by the two-thirds rule of the Senate. On January 29, 1935, the World Court was rejected by a vote of 52 for to 36 against. In recent years few treaties of any great consequence have been ratified. One is forced to the conclusion that no treaty of far-reaching importance in connection with the establishment of peace can be validated under the two-thirds rule.

A fundamental principle of democracy is majority rule. The present method of treaty ratification is undemocratic in the extreme. The population of Nevada, for example, is 110,247; of New York; 13,479,142. Since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment Senators are elected directly by the people. In rejecting treaties the vote of a Senator from Nevada is worth twice that of a Senator from New York who votes approval. The power of a voter in the State of Nevada in this connection is the same as that of a hundred and twenty voters in the Empire State.

Opponents to the proposed amendment call attention to the unanimous consent required of juries; to the two-thirds provision for the impeachment of a President; to the two-thirds vote necessary to override a Presidential veto; and say that more than a majority should be necessary in certain decisions of grave importance. They then conclude that in the matter of making treaties we should retain the two-thirds rule. These cases are not analogous to the two-thirds provision for treaty ratification and have no bearing on the question at hand.

A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to enact Federal statutes. A majority is deemed ample to commit the republic to such a program as land-lease and other policies of great national and international moment. A simple majority of Congress is sufficient to take us into war. Surely the formulation of the peace is as grave a matter as making war, yet it is easier for this Government to declare war than to write a peace. There is no conceivable reason why a majority of both Houses is not enough to validate treaties. Under the present system a treaty of far-reaching importance, a treaty embodying principles on which the structure of world peace might be erected could be rejected by a militant minority of the Senate even if a majority of the Senate wished to ratify it; even if a majority of the House of Representatives desired its acceptance, yes, even if a majority of the American people demanded its validation.

The House which is in a better position to reflect public opinion than the Senate, should have a voice in treaty making. So intricate have become human affairs that domestic laws are closely interwoven with foreign policy. The statutes affecting the merchant marine, the size of the Army, the exchange of materials of war, tariffs, and

appropriations to implement treaties are illustrations of subjects in which the House has a voice and are matters closely connected with foreign policy. It is impossible to draw a line of demarcation between local problems and the issues connected with foreign affairs. Few treaties can be sustained without implementing legislation requiring the concurrence of both Houses of Congress. No foreign policy agreed upon by the Senate can long endure unless it has the wholehearted support of the people. This can best be given by including the House of Representatives in the process of ratifying treaties.

The proposed constitutional amendment should be imediately adopted in the light of an imposing array of cogent arguments.

First. The present method is archaic and unsuited for this great Nation in the modern world revolutionized by science.

Second. Under the two-thirds rule it will be impossible to develop a dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation adequate to establish and to guarantee the continuation of a just and lasting peace.

Third The present method for legislative review and approval is neither clear nor workable.

Fourth. The reasons for including the two-thirds rule in the Constitution no longer exist. This is the only great power to have such a stumbling block in the effective execution of its foreign policy.

Fifth. The two-thirds rule is undemocratic in the extreme.

Sixth The House of Representatives, much closer to the people than the Senate because it is elected every 2 years, should have a voice in treaty making.

Seventh. The Chief Executive of the United States works under a tremendous handicap in international conferences because he cannot negotiate with anywhere near the freedom possessed by diplomats from other countries.

Eighth. The two-thirds rule weakens the legislative branch of the Government; first, because the House has no voice in treaty making and, second, the Senate is under the domination of a small minority.

Ninth. There exists confusion concerning the relationship of joint resolutions and treaties. This would end with the adoption of the proposed amendment.

Tenth. The two-thirds rule in its present form emphasizes sectional and minority interests at the expense of national and majority interests. The Nation's primary interest today is to have a positive national foreign policy supported by and responsive to a majority of the people.

Eleventh. The conclusion of international undertakings being increasingly imperative for the protection and furtherance of the Nation's interests, the practical choice is either to compromise the Nation's interests through failure to conclude adequate international undertakings or to find an alternative to the unworkable two-thirds procedural requirement for treaties.

Twelfth. The two-thirds rule is a constant political barrier to the development of an adequate, generally recognized majority action procedure through the use of joint resolutions; and

Thirteenth. A majority of both Houses is more likely to represent the views of more people and more organs of public opinion than is a one-third minority or a two-thirds majority of the Senate. The foregoing are sound and compelling reasons for immediately adopting the amendment under discussion.

It is the duty of this Congress to give the people a chance to pass judgment on this amendment through their State legislatures. The responsibility for refusing to submit this amendment is so terrifying that those who oppose giving the Nation a chance to express its will must ponder long and seriously on the position they take. The eyes of the world are upon this Congress as we consider the revision of our constitutional machinery for making peace.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include two speeches in memoriam on a special program of the Catholic Hour of April 15, 1945, dedicated to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one by Msgr. John A. Ryan, and the other by the Reverend Timothy J. Mulvey, O. M. I.:

IN MEMORIAM

(A special program of the Catholic Hour on April 15, 1945, dedicated to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt)

INTRODUCTION OF MONSIGNOR RYAN

Thirty-nine years ago a young American priest wrote a book entitled "The Living Wage." In it he urged that Government had the responsibility not merely of suppressing crime and civil strife, but of intervening actively in the social arena; that it had the responsibility of assuring justice to the underprivileged and the oppressed. Twenty-seven years later he saw this principle embraced by a great President of the United States. His feeling for that great man—his admiration, his affection—has grown with the years. On the occasion of the late President's second inauguration and again last January on the occasion of his fourth inauguration, this priest, born on a Minnesota farm, was privileged to give the benediction. Now in his seventy-sixth year, he is here in the studio to pronounce the last final farewell to his departed friend. I present Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

MONSIGNOR RYAN'S TRIBUTE

In this broadcast, the Catholic Hour offers a sorrowful and affectionate tribute to the memory of a supremely great American, a supremely great President, a supremely sincere lover of his fellow men. Many of the comments that have appeared since his untimely death emphasize his interest in the common man, in the lowly, the weak, and the oppressed. All this may be summed up as a deep abiding concern with social justice. Let us glance at a few illustrations.

At the very beginning of his first administration, he induced Congress to pass a law for the insurance of bank deposits, up to $5,000. For upwards of 12 years now, persons of modest means have not feared to entrust their money to the banks. So accustomed have the American people become to this protection that they have mostly forgotten the dreadful years of the early 1930's, when thousands of banks failed and tens of thousands of depositors suffered grave losses. Other Roosevelt legislation vastly improved the condition of the farmers and provided means by which farm tenants could become farm owners. Through the W. P. A. and the P. W. A. millions of the unemployed were enabled to support themselves at self-respecting labor, instead of being condemned to live on doles and inadequate relief. To be sure, these measures did not completely abolish unemployment. Neither Congress nor public opinion would have sanctioned adequate public spending. Our political and business leaders were, and probably still are, misled by antiquated and false economic theories. Let us pray God to give them enlightenment before they are confronted with ten or twelve million servicemen demanding jobs after the war.

Finally, I would mention the three most effective pieces of legislation for social justice enacted during the Roosevelt administrations. These are the National Labor Relations Act, which has made real the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively; the Fair Labor Standards Act, which has abolished the starvation wages formerly paid to thousands upon thousands of American workers; and the Social Security Act, which has provided some measure of insurance against unemployment and old age. I have no hesitation in asserting that these three laws have done more to promote social justice than all the other Federal legislation enacted since the adoption of the Constitution.

Social justice has international as well as national aspects. To this international social justice President Roosevelt made a far-reaching contribution. Long before the majority of his countrymen, he realized that the philosophy and designs of nazi-ism constituted a dire threat not only to the United States but to all the countries that have been touched by Christian civilization. Today the vast majority of the American people are convinced that he was right, that nazi-ism must be destroyed and that we must have an international organization to preserve peace and establish social justice in the relations between states. In defense of these aims Franklin D. Roosevelt laid down his life.

He was a great idealist, but he was also a genuine realist. In a letter written a little less than a year ago to congratulate me on my seventy-fifth birthday anniversary, he said:

"The things for which you have fought ceaselessly for twoscore years will not be easy to achieve. Much, however, has been accomplished. We must not be discouraged. The workers grow old, the work is never done; but the future is big with promise of better things."

Our beloved President has gone from this troubled world, but his place in history is secure. I confidently believe that his place in eternity is likewise secure; but it can be hastened by our prayers. All who accept the biblical declaration that, "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins," ought to petition God for the repose of the soul of Franklin D. Roosevelt. If he could do so, I am sure that he would address us in the dying words of King Arthur to Sir Bedivere: "Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of."

INTRODUCTION OF FATHER MULVEY

During this month the Catholic Hour has been presenting a series of plays written by the gifted radio dramatist, Rev. Timothy J. Mulvey, O. M. I. Father Mulvey has written for this occasion, "Lines to a Departed President," which he will now present as his tribute to our fallen leader.

LINES TO A DEPARTED PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is, indeed, strange that we, who never had the privilege of speaking to you face to face in this life, should address you, directly, now. For while it is the high intent that a Chief Executive should be intimate with his citizenry, it is the unfortunate necessity that he should be removed from the citizens.

We are not removed from you, now, Mr. President. When your heart stopped beating; when you relaxed to that level which is the inevitable inheritance of pauper and prince, peasant and President—in that sad and historic moment, you were a child once again, stricken to that helplessness which is the sign of our mutual frailty, and the badge of our common humanity.

So, you are dead.

But, we can speak to you, now.

We can speak to you, Mr. President, by the three convictions of faith, hope, and charity. By faith, because it is our belief that your soul, even as the souls of all men, is immortal; by hope, because it is our common prayer that you have attained that final end for which you, and all men, were created; and by charity, because love is the law and the prophets, binding us to you as brother to brother, in life and in death.

Dear Mr. President, it will be no exaggeration to say, now, that few men of this or any other age have realized better than you how turbulent are the tides of this life. It will be no exaggeration to say that there have been few men of this or any other age, who have been called upon to guide the ship of State through more perilous waters. It is significant, now, that you loved the sea and ships. We have a strong recollection of you, leaning on a rail, looking out over the waters with the sun and wind in your face. You were a sailor at heart.

Dear Mr. President, it is in the nature of things that a man, entrusted with a national responsibility, should be willing not only to attack but to suffer counter attack in this arena we call political government. For it is both the process and the privilege of democracy to agree or disagree. You have been agreed with, heartily. You have been disagreed with, violently. This was not surprising, for a glorious predecessor of yours said, once:

"If I tried to read, much less answer all the criticisms made of me, and all the attacks leveled against me, this office would have to be closed for all other business. I do the very best I know how, the very best I can. I mean to keep on doing this to the very end."

That was the way Abraham Lincoln expressed it. That was the way you lived it, Mr. President. And you were not afraid. For when the last shot was fired, all America knew in its heart and soul that you had stuck to your guns to the very end. You were, also, a soldier at heart.

Dear Mr. President, and we say this now with the sympathy and affection of friends, the physical space your body required could have been circumscribed by the dimensions of a single wheelchair. The flesh was weak. But your heart, Mr. President, was ranging solicitously not only from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboards, not only from the Halls of Montezuma to the Shores of Tripoli, but to every lake and island and hill—wherever despotism raised its ugly head, and wherever the crying of oppressed humanity lifted its voice to ears that wanted to hear. You heard. You were, also, a Marine at heart.

But, dear Mr. President, this is what we really want to say to you, now that a new twilight is hanging over the Hudson that you so dearly loved, and beside which your spent body is resting for the first time, tonight.

They escorted you all the way from Warm Springs, Ga. The escort is only a casual incident for the page of some future historian.

They allowed you to rest for a few hours in the East Room of the White House. This is the remembered detail of a journalist.

But, Mr. President, between the coming and going, a monument grew so large and spontaneous in the hearts of the people as to challenge the best efforts of a grateful posterity. They prayed and sang for you at the way-stations. They wept unashamed all the way north. And above the hoofbeats of the white horses, and the rumbling of the caisson that carried you up Pennsylvania Avenue, thousands of men and women called out "God bless him."

That is what we want to say.

"God bless you."

For you did speak of God, Mr. President.

And you believed in God, Mr. President.

And the last magnificent effort of your life was dedicated to the principle that men—all men—should be free and equal under God.

This is the precious ideal you left us. We won't forget it. We will work for it. We will fight for it.

But in the meantime, "God bless you, and keep you eternally, Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maryland:

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Baltimore, Md., March 27, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Re: Maryland Senate Joint Resolution 4—proposed amendments to Social Security Act.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I herewith enclose copy of a joint resolution that has passed both the Maryland House and Senate. I thought you might want to insert it in the RECORD.

Kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. MILTON PATTERSON, *Director.*

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution requesting the Representatives from Maryland in Congress to urge that certain amendments to made to titles I, IV, and X of the Federal Social Security Act, dealing with public assistance to the needy

Whereas the purpose of public assistance is to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health; and

Whereas the Social Security Board, State departments of welfare, and many other agencies have pointed out the need for amendments to the present Social Security Act so that States can more adequately provide at least a minimum of economic security by supplying basic maintenance to needy persons who are not otherwise provided for: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the representatives from Maryland in both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, be, and they are hereby, requested to take whatever steps are possible to have the following amendments made to the Social Security Act:

1. To include a fourth category of general assistance so as to provide for those in need but who under the act are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children.

2. To remove completely from the aid to dependent children law the maximum of $18 for the first child and $12 for other eligible children.

3. To provide for uniform residence requirements with 100-percent reimbursement from Federal funds for persons who do not meet the minimum requirements.

4. To provide that reimbursement be made to the States for direct payments to doctors or hospitals for medical care.

5. To make uniform Federal matching of administrative costs by providing 50 percent of the cost of administration to the States for all of the programs administered under titles I, IV, and X of the act; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to each of the representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress, and a copy to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board.

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 14, 1945:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

In one of the great moments of American history there steps into the office of the Presidency of the United States, and into a position of world-wide influence and authority such as no other living American has ever held, a man who is less well known to the people of this country than many other public figures and almost totally unknown abroad. This man is a farmer's son from the Missouri Valley, a veteran of the last war, self-styled "practical politician," a two-term Member of the Senate, a compromise candidate for the comparatively obscure office from which fate, with dramatic suddenness, has now catapulted him to power. We look at this record, and we look behind the record at the man himself, and we find much in both that is reassuring to the people of the United States and to our comrades in arms throughout the world.

That he was admittedly a compromise candidate for the office of the Vice Presidency—"the second Missouri compromise," we called him—seems to us the first and far from the least important item in the record. "Compromise," in the sense in which it was accurately applied to Mr. Truman's nomination—compromise in the sense of finding an acceptable middle ground between more extreme positions on either side—is not a bad recommendation for a man whose enormous responsibility it will be to find an acceptable middle road for the American people in the difficult post-war years, and to help put together the pieces of a broken world. When a great war ends, and when there is a sudden lifting of the pressure which has held men to a common effort, there comes a swift and inevitable tendency of groups within nations, and of nations themselves, to fly

apart. We have the soundest of reasons for believing that we shall find it valuable, in such a period of shock and readjustment, to have in a position of authority a man who is President today primarily because of the very fact that his candidacy was acceptable to every group and could unite rather than divide, hold together rather than splinter, the factions which compose the dominant political party of the United States. It is part of the record that, once nominated, he received the genuinely sincere support of left and right, North and South, of Democratic trade-unionist and Democratic manufacturer.

It is part of the record, too, part of the longer record of American political life, that out of the ranks of the practical politicians and out of the hard, tough schools of the ward machines have come men whose experience in the practical ways of accomplishing sound public purposes made them particularly useful to their country in a time of crisis. There is no need to blink at the one-time association with Pendergast. He is there, a part of the early story. But there was Croker, too, and there was Murphy. And there was a political machine on the Atlantic coast, as hard boiled and as sordid as any in the Missouri Valley, that produced a great and gallant Governor whose public service, as a practical man in politics will be long remembered. What is the chief practical problem of politics before the people of the United States today, beyond the victorious completion of the war itself, if not the avoidance of the ghastly error of the last war and the engineering through the Senate of a treaty commiting the American Republic this time to uphold the peace? We believe that in this great and necessary task the experience and the common sense and the native shrewdness and the Senate friendships and the practical politics of Mr. Truman will all be useful to his country.

We believe, too, that in the still unfinished business of the war itself the country will promptly find that it has no novice in the White House. No Member of the Senate, no elected officer of the Government of the United States, has had a better and more intimate view of the whole war machine than the man who directed the activities of the Truman committee of investigation. Delays in the production of aircraft, shortages of shells and powder, deficiencies in the production of aluminum and rubber, continuing problems of manpower, all came within the purview of a Senate group which dug hard into the facts before it and did not hesitate to fix responsibility even in the highest quarters. On the whole, the work of the committee was well done. Its chairman, by the general agreement of his colleagues, had the greatest part in it. It is not to be forgotten now that on the basis of his direction of the committee's work, Mr. Truman was chosen by the well-informed newspaper correspondents in Washington as the civilian who, next to President Roosevelt himself, "knew most about the war."

These facts we count as assets. We count it as an asset, too, that Mr. Truman takes over a going concern in Washington without being compelled to make changes in the direction either of the war effort or of the peace negotiations, as he would be compelled to do, for political considerations, if he came into power as the leader of an opposition party. We are thinking now not of the top military and naval commands—which would not have been changed even if a new party had come suddenly to power in a great crisis of the war—but of the civilian Cabinet officers who direct the war effort, the civilian under-secretaries who have established such close and invaluable relations with the military and naval personnel, the chairmen of the great committees of Congress. Mourn as we must the loss of the inspiration of Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, it remains none the less true that there will prevail in Washington a continuity which, with the unfinished business of the war before us, will stand both Mr. Truman and the country in good stead. This is particularly true in the field of foreign policy, where Mr. Truman's experience is most limited and where he will accordingly find himself most handicapped in the work that lies ahead. There is reassurance in the fact that Mr. Truman will have behind him a Democratic Party which, however great its internal disagreements on domestic issues, has achieved a high degree of unity in matters of foreign policy. There will be no necessity, in this crisis, of finding a line of action on which all factions of a party can agree. The line is there. From repeal of the Neutrality Act and the adoption of the Hull trade program, through lend-lease and the Atlantic Charter, to Dumbarton Oaks, and Yalta, and San Francisco, the road is clearly charted.

Finally, we count it as an asset, and perhaps the most important of all assets in the reassurance which it gives, that Mr. Truman now takes office with an immense fund of good will at his disposal. Surely, just as no other man has ever succeeded to the Presidency at so fateful a moment in the world's history, so no other man has ever found the American public so completely united in wishing him the fullest possible success in meeting the immense responsibilities which he now accepts.

Of this we may be sure. There is no American, of whatever party, creed, or section, who will not volunteer in this historic hour to aid his President and serve his country.

Concerning John Herling, Chief of the Division of Labor Relations of the Office of Inter-American Affairs—A Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, I made an address, discussing Latin America, in the course of which I referred to John Herling, Chief of the Division of Labor Relations of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Unfortunately, I inadvertently ascribed to Mr. Herling certain qualities which, I have now been advised, were ill-founded. I have no desire to do an injustice to any public official.

At the request of several friends, I am inserting hereinbelow a factual statement which I have been reliably advised, is a fair and accurate appraisal of the division over which Mr. Herling has charge. The statement is as follows:

Nelson Rockefeller, while Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, emphasized the importance of labor relations among the organized groups of the Western Hemisphere. To carry out this policy John Herling, Chief of the C. I. A. A.'s Division of Labor Relations, has had the advice and counsel of Robert J. Watt, international representative of the A. F. of L., and James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the C. I. O.

This Division has carried on a regular service to the labor movement in the United States. More than a hundred top leaders of both organizations and the railroad brotherhoods receive regularly information for the use of their membership. More than 700 local labor organizations receive monthly the Inter-American Labor Notes prepared by this Division. Recently, under the work of this Division, outstanding leaders of the cooperative movement in Venezuela and Colombia came to the United States as guests of the Cooperative League of this country. A Who's Who in Labor and Social Welfare in Latin America, which I strongly recommended some time ago, has been in preparation. Such a compilation will prove an invaluable reference to the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and many Government agencies. The great interest on the part of organized labor is extremely gratifying to me and found expression in a special visit made by three representatives of the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and Railroad Brotherhoods to Latin America, accompanied by Mr. Herling, last year. The recent representation of labor as members of the United States delegation to the Mexico City Conference by Julius G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association; David J. McDonald, secretary-treasurer of the United Steel Workers, C. I. O.; and George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., is an expression of this interest which this Division has sought to cultivate.

The A. F. of L., at its annual convention in New Orleans November 1944, passed a resolution on the importance attached to the work of this Division and stressed the help it expected in that organization's expanded program. Similar assistance is rendered to the C. I. O. and railroad brotherhoods.

Franco—A Johnny-Come-Lately Convert To the Coalition Against Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, as the author of a House joint resolution, the purpose of which is to express the will of Congress that diplomatic relations be forthwith severed between the United States and Franco Fascist Spain, I have been a keen student of Spain and Latin America for many years.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the tremendous number of daily newspapers in America which are now commenting upon Franco Fascist Spain and its policies and attitudes in world affairs.

One of the interesting recent editorials appears in the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier of March 28, 1945. Here it is:

FRANCO HATES JAPS—NOW

The Spanish Government has instructed its diplomatic agents not to act in behalf of Japanese interests in belligerent capitals. General Franco is energetically agitating himself over Japanese "atrocities" to Spanish nationals in the Philippines; and there is talk of a Spanish declaration of war on Japan.

In the ruthless and deceitful game of international politics, everybody must hate a loser and Franco is attempting to compensate for his previous mistakes by jumping on the United Nations bandwagon. In Italy, every Italian who has any hopes of getting away with it now says he hated the

Fascists. Germans are now saying that they hated the Nazis. And Franco, whose pro-German policies permit no back-tracking on that score, hopes at least to take on the disguise of a Jap-hater.

This, at least, should be good for a laugh. The only way the Spanish Government can win any friends among the Allies is to permit all Spanish refugees to retur. to Spain, grant freedom of press and assembly and, after a suitable time, call a free national election. But nobody has any illusions about the possibilities that Franco will do this.

If the Spanish Fascists now hate Japan, they should of course be allowed to fight the enemy. But the United Nations naturally will require proof of sincerity. Should Franco and 30 of his leading ministers volunteer to descend by parachute into Japan to carry out sabotage, the Allies might conclude that adequate proof had been offered. Surely Franco will realize that this presents an admirable solution to his dilemma.

Farm Training for Negro Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, during the session of the General Assembly of Arkansas which was recently concluded, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas the Farm Security Administration has been directed to sell what is known as the Lake Dick Plantation in Jefferson County, Ark., and lands held under similar circumstances and conditions by that agency; and

Whereas if said sale is effectuated, this plantation and lands similarly held, would be conveyed to individuals who, in the main, are intent on acquiring the same purely for speculative purposes and with a view to disposing of said lands at exorbitant prices to war veterans; and

Whereas the aforesaid Lake Dick Plantation, or project, provides a facility which is ideal for the training and education of returning war veterans, who are inclined to adopt the vocation of farming as a career; and

Whereas the Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal School for Negroes (Pine Bluff, Ark.) has been engaged by the Veterans' Administration to provide training in agricultural pursuits and related courses of study for eligible discharged colored members of the armed forces residing in the State of Arkansas, and would be enabled to furnish every advantage to such veterans to obtain the maximum opportunity in agricultural lines if the plantation is made available to said college: therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the fifty-fifth general assembly (the senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, hereby respectfully requests and enjoins upon the Congress of the United States immediately and forthwith to withhold from sale the Lake Dick Plantation project with a view to its immediate conveyance or lease to the Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal School for Negroes (Pine Bluff, Ark.) to be used solely and exclusively for the education and training in agricultural pursuits of the discharged Negro members of the armed forces of the State of Arkansas, who apply and are found eligible, for such training and education; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to announce it as the definite policy that all lands held by the Farm Security Administration suitable for agricultural purposes be withheld from the market with a view that all Government owned lands be impressed with a veterans preference in favor of returning war veterans who desire to pursue agriculture as a livelihood and who may seek to acquire and own farm size type farms, to the end that such lands be made available to said veterans for a reasonable consideration and under such terms and conditions as will be commensurate with the ability of such veterans ultimately to acquire a fee simple title thereto without undue burden or hardship.

Mr. Speaker, for the effectuation of one of these recommendations, all of which I heartily approve, I have introduced H. R. 2829, which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The proposal to use this land in the training of Negro veterans with a farm background is in line with sound economic and social principles and its adoption would be an appropriate evidence of the Nation's interest in the veterans' welfare.

Provision Should Be Made for Scientific Development—H. R. 2937 Would Be Beneficial If It Became Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in this global war both sides, winner and loser, suffer terrible losses in human life and economic disruption. The bigger the war the higher the price. In this conflict, the most catastrophic in history, human slaughter is the largest of all time. The cost in dollars and cents, to government, business and industry, has never been higher.

The curtain is drawn for those of our sons who have died. We cannot restore their lives and our condolences seem woefully inadequate.

The same finality does not apply, however, to the economic and social factors. Here, we can gather the threads and weave a new fabric.

In fact it is within our power, and we have every reason to believe that we will exercise that power, to enter an era of economic development in the post-war world that will raise the living standard of mankind and do much to implement the peace that will one day be written.

This development will stem from two sources: (a) from the rebuilding of much of Europe, England, and the Far East; (b) from new technological and scientific devices.

During the course of this war, and this is probably the only constructive aspect of war, science has produced countless devices, now used as weapons, that will have important peacetime applications. New products and chemicals have been discovered. New manufacturing and assembly processes have come into existence.

All these innovations can have a profound effect on our future economy. They can lead us to the heights or if not wisely used they can drive us to even greater economic chaos.

I hope to do everything in my power to see that our scientific and technological developments are wisely used. Toward that end I have introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill (H. R. 2937) to provide for the continuous study of the social and economic aspects of such developments. It is my belief that this measure, if passed by Congress, will serve as a valuable guidepost in the orderly recovery of peacetime economic prosperity.

Corp. Anthony P. Damato, United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, Corp. Anthony P. Damato, United States Marine Corps, whose family resides in my district at Shenandoah, Pa., has been posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The presentation of the Nation's highest award for heroism on the battlefield was made in behalf of the United States Government by Brig. Gen. Maurice C. Gregory, United States Marine Corps, acting for the President, to Mrs. Frances Damato, mother of the young hero. The touching ceremony took place in the Lincoln School building at Shenandoah, April 9, 1945.

Only time will heal the wound that is now so deep in the heart of Mrs. Damato and the other loved ones in the Damato family. Yet I feel that the recognition that has been given, even in death, will in a small way help to alleviate the great sorrow caused by the personal bravery and love for his fellow men which was shown by Corporal Damato when he made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of the country he loved so well.

At this point I include in the RECORD an editorial written by Mr. James F. Haas in the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald of April 9, 1945:

CORP. ANTHONY P. DAMATO, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—"SEMPER FIDELIS"

Some thousands of miles separate the present resting place, in the Marshall Islands, of the mortal remains of Corp. Anthony P. Damato, U. S. M. C., from his home town, Shenandoah.

Yet, we would like to think his spirit was present in the Lincoln School this morning when his beloved mother, Mrs. John Damato, received the Congressional Medal of Honor in his behalf at the hands of a General of the Marine Corps at the direction of the President of the United States. For that matter, who dare say the spirit of Corporal Damato was not present?

Knowing the background of this boy as we do, of his views and attitude toward life, his intense pride in being an American, and, to be sure, his pride in "the Corps," we maintain Tony Damato would have been astonished at today's ceremonies.

Certainly, he never dreamed of the honors that would be accorded him in death on that memorable night in the fox hole in the Marshalls.

When that grenade rolled into the fox hole, Tony Damato acted fast. He had two particular buddies in that fox hole with him. All three had gone through bloody campaigns before that night. So, when Tony threw himself upon that grenade with a shout of warning to the others—Corp. Herman F. Dohms, Jr., and Pvt. (1st cl.) George W. Gale—he figured they would escape.

As we know, they did. Later, Private (1st cl.) Gale joined Tony Damato in a more peaceful world, for Gale gave his life during the assault upon Guam. Corporal Dohms was badly wounded in the same action.

No, there were no thoughts of any future honors that flashed through Tony's mind when he made the supreme sacrifice. He sought to spare his buddies and, that night, he did.

Now just suppose, for example, that the other two marines had been killed within a short time after Tony Damato's life had left his body. There never would have been a Medal of Honor issued at the President's order. Tony Damato would have been one more name on the Marine Corps roster of the dead. He would have been just another gold star on the service flag of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church and the Borough's service flag and honor roll.

You see, the service is very exacting in its procedure in granting the Nation's highest decoration. The heroism in question must be verified fully, and there is a good deal of investigating done in such cases.

But the men whom Tony saved survived that night, as did their platoon leader, Lt. Richard M. Pfuhl, who was the original officer to make the recommendation on behalf of Tony Damato. Today, the Shenandoah boy got his reward. How many, many other unsung heroes there must be on the various war fronts of the world? No one will ever know of their deeds.

Are we presumptuous in saying that God must have been aware of all these things and that He saw to it that Tony Damato's act of heroism was not to go unrewarded on this earth? We think not.

How proud Tony's father would have been to have witnessed the presentation. He loved his family and he was proud of his boys. John Damato died May 27, 1941. Tony was at home then and he was given his father's gold signet ring. This ring was fastened to a chain which held Tony's "dog tags" the night he was killed in the south Pacific. Today, it reposes, highly prized, among Tony's other personal effects which the Marine Corps sent to the folks back home.

Yes, indeed, John Damato's heart would have figuratively burst with pride today. A stonemason, who worked around various local collieries, John Damato never foresaw that one of his boys would become one of the Nation's immortal heroes.

All John Damato was interested in was rearing his family as best he could and teaching them to show their gratitude to this Nation for the liberties they enjoyed. He came over from Italy some 40 years back, and when he met Frances Speranza here in Shenandoah married and settled down to become a good citizen of Shenandoah.

Well, Tony Damato showed his appreciation to his country; he more than carried out his father's instructions. Don't miss extracts from some of Tony's letters to his family which we have reprinted elsewhere in these columns. There are real lessons in true Americanism in some of Tony's letters.

Then, think of Capt. Neil J. Damato, whom we have referred to elsewhere as the absent brother, missing in action for over 17 months in the European theater of war. How Captain Damato would have swelled with genuine pride had he, too, been present. Tony was Neil's kid brother and they were closer than most brothers. Need we say more?

And Mrs. John Damato, herself, who accepted the Medal of Honor today. We still don't think she fully comprehends the high honor conferred upon her son. The main thing in her thoughts is that Tony is dead and Neil is missing.

The rest of the family, of course, realizes the significance of today's events as do the people of Shenandoah.

We feel the story of Tony Damato should go into our town's history, never to be forgotten. It should serve as an inspiration for all other men in the service; for boys growing up into manhood. There was a man whom Shenandoah can be proud of for the rest of its days—Corp. Anthony P. Damato.

The Marine Corps, of course, is intensely proud of their fallen comrade. Let us cite part of a letter from a brother marine, one who played with Tony when they were boys. Here is what Corp. Frank R. Brutto, 532 West Penn Street, now in the Pacific area, had to say about Tony in a letter to the latter's sister, Miss Mary Damato:

"My being a marine and being in the South Pacific, I can easily understand what a courageous thing your brother had performed. I showed the clipping of the news story to some of my friends, and each time they'd answer, 'He sure was a real marine.' The boys down here know what it means for a man to do what he did. We all admire him greatly down here and want to send our sympathy to you and the family, for we know how you feel.

"There are many of us marines down here in the South Pacific, and so when something like what happened to your brother happens we all naturally stand up and take notice. It isn't every day a man sacrifices his life, as Tony did, to save a few of his buddies who might possibly get hurt.

"The marines in the South Pacific would like you to know that we admire him and recognize him as being a hero and a real marine. He shall not have died in vain."

That is a very fine tribute from a marine; is it not? We reprint it because we think it tells the story how the marines feel toward Tony Damato a great deal better than we could attempt to express it from second-hand information.

The motto of the United States Marine Corps is Semper Fidelis.

"Always faithful," that was Corp. Anthony P. Damato.

An Air Corps Officer Comments on the Coffee Proposal of a West Point for Diplomats

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, last fall there appeared in the October 1944 issue of Coronet magazine an article by me entitled "Why Not a West Point for Diplomats?" This evoked comments from thousands of readers throughout our country and the world.

Many of these letter writers are officers and enlisted personnel of the armed services of the United States. I have been greatly encouraged and inspired by the fact that so many of our gallant fellow citizens in uniform have taken time out from the valuable work in which they are engaged, sometimes with the enemy very close at hand, and have manifested such a keen and intelligent interest in the foreign policy of the United States and the conduct and ability of our diplomats. These correspondents have a universally expressed desire for reform in our State Department.

One of the most challenging of the letters was sent me by a distinguished officer of the United States Army Air Corps. It will be noted that the author of the letter had discussed my article with his squadron commander, Col. Earl Aber, and quoted directly from the latter's comments and suggestions relative to my article. Dramatically and tragically, Colonel Aber was killed in a crash, as described in Major Monroe's communication, a few weeks ago.

Here is the letter:

JANUARY 5, 1945.

The Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE,
Representative from Washington,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have indicated in your article, West Point for Diplomats, that you were anxious to hear the public's reactions to your proposal. I hope that members of the forces can be included in that category, for I am convinced that there you will find the most gratifying of reactions if the men only have the time to orientate their thoughts for a reply.

In order that you may be able to correctly assess the value of this reaction, perhaps it would be well to give you, as a background, the few incidents that preceded my reading your article. I was on an air base in England, spending a very quiet evening with three of the officers with whom I came overseas in September of '42. It had been almost 6 months since my last session with them, and the champagne I had taken from Paris with me made it an even more auspicious occasion. Our discussion began with the usual things, sex, combat, acquaintances, the progress of the war, Allied policy, and finally postwar Europe and America. Someone made the inevitable statement that American foreign policy could have prevented the war in 1934 or 1935, if it had been truly representative of a well informed American public. You can imagine the trend the conversation took at this point. There were among us two engineers, a doctor, and a radio announcer, the oldest is 28 years of age. I'm sure that our comments were inconclusive, erratic, and possibly not too well founded, for all of us have had so little opportunity to observe carefully the events of the past 3 years, except those with which we've been personally concerned.

I decided to make known my plan to reenter college after my release from the Army. I explained that I was aware of the seriousness of the prospects of a married man who may perhaps be 30 or 32 years of age, discounting a long and tedious education and 6 or 7 years' technical experience to reeducate himself for a job in our Government which does not even exist at this time. My statement was received in the most surprising manner. Earl Aber (who is now the commanding officer of our old squadron) excitedly declared that he was in the process of making the same decision. Eagerly we compared our ideas and plans. Both are aware

that a law course is not adequate; nor is just the normal course in journalism nor economics nor sociology nor government nor history nor psychology. Our study of the sciences, though certainly no handicap, was not adequate. Then where were we to study for this job that certainly needs a transfusion from the young blood of America? Aber remarked "What we need is a 'West Point for Diplomats'" and opened a copy of Coronet to your article.

As soon as I began to read, I was aware that your article had acted as a sort of subconscious guide to Aber's conversation. He was so deeply infected by the germs of thought which your ideas had planted, that he in turn was infecting others—or in those already infected, he served to fan the flame of interest and decision that was already burning. This I am sure, you hoped to accomplish with your article. Yet your writing has accomplished more. It has served to restore to a great degree, the confidence which at least two thoughtful responsible persons lost in the process of cleaning up the debris left by the last soiree which our poorly prepared diplomats attended.

JAMES L. MONROE,
Major, A. C.

MARCH 6, 1945.

P. S.—As I came across this letter from day to day in my desk, my decision as to whether it should be sent has wavered from fear that you would not receive it in the tone it was meant, to self-derision for writing crank letters * * * that would probably have continued until the letter was lost had it not been that my decision was rudely crystallized by the death of Colonel Aber last night. He was killed in a crash just off the coast of England while returning from a night mission over Germany.

This seemed a fitting tribute at this confused moment, to offer his encouragement and mine in a task in which he had placed such great hopes.

J. M.

Labor Body Endorses Dumbarton Oaks Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Labor Council, which is composed of official representatives of all of the labor unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in the city which I have the honor to represent, has gone on record as endorsing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals by the adoption of the following resolutions:

Whereas last summer and autumn at an old mansion named Dumbarton Oaks, representatives of Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union met with our United States representative, Edward Stettinius, and his aides and worked out draft plans for a world security organization; and

Whereas these plans, known as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, were given a searching examination at the Crimea meeting of the Big Three and all problems concerning these proposals were worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned; and

Whereas at the Crimea Conference a United Nations meeting was called, starting April 25, 1945, at San Francisco, to work out final agreement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, namely, the establishment of a world organization to maintain the future peace and security of the world, in short to prevent another world conflict; and

Whereas in actuality what the United Nations Conference means is that wartime unity of the democratic countries of the world will be carried over into a permanent world organization, set up for the purpose which all suffering humanity desires at this time, that peace must and will be kept; and

Whereas once the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are given the finishing touches by all the delegates at the United Nations Conference, then the next step is the ratification of the proposals by each member nation, opening the greatest fight of all for Americans, guaranteeing that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will be ratified by the United States Senate; and

Whereas it is the duty of all peoples everywhere to guarantee the acceptance of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, essential to maintaining the future peace of the world, and certainly all know that the sufferings of the peoples in this war have been on a greater scale than ever before in history, and that if there is another war certainly the suffering will be on a greater scale: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Labor Council assembled this 6th day of April 1945, does hereby go on record endorsing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, recognizing that their ratification by the United Nations is necessary for the future peace and security of the world, and that we call upon the United States Senate to ratify the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all affiliated locals of the San Francisco Labor Council, asking that they concur and so notify their Senators and, in the name of the council, to our two California Senators, the President of the United States, and our two San Francisco Congressmen, and to the press.

Across the Sunset Hills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 15, 1945:

ACROSS THE SUNSET HILLS

It is March 4, 1933, and high noon in Washington.

On the streets around the Capitol, streets wet with the downpour of the previous night, hundreds of thousands stand.

Their faces are buried in the collars of their coats, upturned against the drizzle, and their mood is reflected in the overcast skies.

This is a moment grave with trepidation, shaken with uncertainty, dark with prospects and fraught with fear.

We have touched the depths of depression. The factory gates are locked. Farmers sow haphazardly. The banks are closing. This is the bottom.

The day, in ordinary times a gala one, is no holiday. The loudspeakers shout, the bands play, there are sporadic outbursts of cheers for dignitaries. But the hearts of those waiting belie the gladness.

Herbert Hoover, outgoing President, takes his place on the platform to one side of the dais. The burden on him has been heavy. His head bows slightly. His wife clasps his arm.

Mrs. Sarah Roosevelt, a rare mother privileged to see her son President, arrives, her white hair marking her, and by her side Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, tall and striking in a powder-blue suit.

A seemingly endless silence and then he comes, down the ramp slowly, on the arm of his tall son. He is solemn, erect, and thoughtful.

In a minute it is over, so simple and so quick the actual swearing in, a mere repetition of the oath after Chief Justice Hughes. The voice is clear and strong, "I, Franklin Delano Roosevelt——"

In what seems like an instant, he turns and with two hands grasps the rostra, looks out over the throng to the distant hills, and the new President of the United States speaks.

The first sentence is like an electric shock. It is firm and resolute. There is no hesitation. Confidence is in the tone.

America, that a moment before stood at the crossroads, in a manner stagnant and sterile, in a way cautious and waiting, marches again along a new road to a new destiny, as a new era for an old nation begins.

The Commander in Chief has taken charge. There is no question about that. People forget the rain and listen, listen carefully and hopefully, catching not only the words but the meaning, seeking a sign of hope.

"For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and devotion that befit the time."

"We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity."

"In the field of world policy, I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor."

"We do not distrust the future of essential democracy."

Then came the climactic thing, the single, ringing sentence that summed it up, that gave the new outlook and faced the future, and that will endure to guide and guard us down the long years ahead.

The thunder of the cheers that greeted it rolled out across the Potomac, across the Nation, and around the world. America, created and sustained in darker hours by those who knew no fear—the Pilgrim, Washington, Lincoln, Wilson—caught the implication. The long, uphill struggle began.

In other days adown the years, it will come back to us. Across the sunset hills that guard the approaches of the Great Beyond, the voice will ring again to lift the heart if skies are overcast:

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

The Forty-fifth Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New York Times:

THE FORTY-FIFTH CHAIR

There will be 45 chairs at the San Francisco Conference. One chair will be vacant

unless it is filled by virtue of decisions that must be made within the next few days. It is the chair reserved for Poland, first victim of Nazi tyranny in the present war.

Tass, official news agency of the Russian Government, reiterated yesterday its insistence that this chair must be filled by a representative of the Soviet-sponsored Polish Government at Lublin. We hope it will be found that Tass, despite its official status, was not speaking with the full authority of the Russian Government, just as it was found a few days ago that the celebrated journalist, Ilya Ehrenburg, was not speaking with full authority.

This matter was discussed thoroughly at Yalta. It was agreed then by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill that the Russians were to have the frontier in eastern Poland, approximately along the Curzon Line, which they thought essential to their safety. But it was also agreed, as a direct corollary of this decision and as an integral part of the same three-power understanding, that the Lublin Government "should be reorganized on a broader democratic basis, with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad." This has not been done.

Tass now expresses the hope that at the last moment the United States and British Governments will change their minds and invite Lublin to represent Poland at San Francisco. But this is to express the hope that at the last moment the Yalta agreement will be broken. Surely there are much better reasons for hoping that it will be observed.

We believe that it lies within the power of Marshal Stalin to see that it is observed. We are certain that if he does see that it is observed, in time for Poland to be represented at San Francisco by that broader democratic government which was pledged at Yalta, his action will pay rich dividends in American good-will and in the general confidence with which the San Francisco Conference begins its work.

For Whom the Bells Toll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a touching and effective editorial to our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, appearing in the April 13, 1945, issue of the Bulldozer, a fine paper published by the men of the United States Navy stationed at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Camp Endicott, Davisville, R. I.:

FOR WHOM THE BELLS TOLL

"And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

John Donne wrote these words long ago. In recent years Ernest Hemingway chose some of them to title his eloquent plea against fascism. Today—April 13, 1945—they take on a new meaning. Today the people of America are not asking for whom the bell tolls. They know too well. They know it tolls for all of us; for every serviceman and every civilian, for every man, woman, and child in this country and in the other United Nations.

Yesterday we lost our President. Franklin Delano Roosevelt left us—his task unfinished.

Today it is up to us, the living, to finish that task as he would have done.

We owe our President much. We can attempt to repay that debt by fighting for the things he fought for; by believing in what he believed; by righting the wrongs he wished righted.

The German and Japanese Fascists won a great victory yesterday—their first in months. We were the losers. Let us not try to minimize that loss; let us try rather to fight that much harder for the country our President loved.

Our Commander in Chief is dead, but the bell tolls for us.

Flags for Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a lamentable fact that Memorial Day will find us with insufficient flags to properly decorate the graves of our hero dead. It is also a shame that patriotic citizens will be unable to secure new flags to display on that day. It is now too late to adequately correct the situation prior to May 30, but I hope that the existing situation will be remedied without further delay.

The following authoritative letter should be read by the Members of Congress and the War Production Board:

AMERICAN FLAG DAY ASSOCIATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 16, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There has been brought to my attention as an officer of this organization and by an article from our local papers, a situation I think should have attention, and I would even suggest an investigation be made to determine who is responsible for the condition existing. The matter referred to is the fact that there will not be sufficient flags this year to place on the graves of our soldier dead. To me this is a very sad and serious condition. I understand this has not happened in the 77 years since Commander in Chief John A. Logan, of the G. A. R., issued General Order No. 11, May 5, 1868, which reads in part: "Let us then, at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains, and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime; let us raise above them the dear old flag they saved from dishonor; let us in the solemn presence renew our pledge to aid and assist those whom they have left among us, as a sacred charge, upon a Nation's gratitude—the soldier's and sailor's widow and orphan." Truly the only national debt that can never be repaid is to those who have given and those who shall yet be called upon to give the last full measure of devotion, their lives, that our way of life might be preserved. Let us not forget or neglect them. Let there be flags on their graves ever hereafter.

I feel the trust committed to us who remain, and whose obligation to render this tribute has been violated by someone and without any legitimate reason. These particular flags are made of cotton material, and there seems to be plenty of articles made of cotton for sale on the market, but regardless of this, the manufacturing of these flags should not have been restricted by Government regulation. I understand other flags of larger sizes will not be available to civilians; again, I think this is all wrong.

On investigation I find flag manufacturers have endeavored to get favorable action and permission from the War Production Board to procure material and manufacture flags, but without success. People generally are not aware of this condition, and it is going to come as a keen and heartbreaking shock when on Memorial Day this is discovered. What is going to be the effect when the loved ones of our soldier dead and particularly our boys who at this very time are fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world and heroically dying to place our beloved flag on the objective they have been commanded to take and are taking, as we so well know.

Recently a photograph was taken of six soldiers placing Old Glory on Iwo Jima's Mount Suribachi. This picture, I understand, will possibly prove to be one of the most famous pictures of this war, will be featured in the Seventh War Loan drive, and used on our postage stamps; I concur with both of these ideas, but how can they consistently do this with the condition I write about existing. There is another flag picture so dear to us all that will be missing, that is the plot of the G. A. R. dead, in our cemeteries with the flag waving over that grave where they sleep; of course, the springtime flowers will be there, for an unchanging God in his infinite goodness provides them at the appointed time.

Congressman, I feel you would be doing a real service if you will bring this failure to the attention of Congress, with the view of having it corrected. However, I think it is too late to manufacture and distribute these flags before Memorial Day. I understand our county commissioners and our county American Legion post have protested with Washington, but without results.

Perhaps the persons responsible will try to justify this shortage of flags, but it will have to be a very good reason before the relatives of soldiers dead and living accept it.

Cordially yours,

A. G. TRIMBLE,
Vice President.

Honors Paid Nazis at Como Camp Mocked the Murdered Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following timely and constructive editorial from the Clarion-Ledger, one of the leading daily papers of Mississippi, in the issue of April 13, 1945, as follows:

HONORS PAID NAZIS AT COMO CAMP MOCKED THE MURDERED AMERICANS

Many Clarion-Ledger readers, we know, were impressed and shocked, and many probably were moved to anger, resentment, and disgust, by the grim contrast between two stories printed in the same column on the front pages of our Monday's issue, these stories dealing with the treatment of war prisoners in this country and in Germany.

One story reported in detail the burial of a German major general in the cemetery of the prisoner of war camp up at Como. It described the full military honors rendered the dead enemy officier who had died of a brain ailment in a Memphis Army hospital

despite every aid modern medicine and surgery could give him.

The story described the honors rendered him by other Nazi prisoners of war with the cooperation of the camp officials and guards, and the honors paid him by the United States Army. The body "lay in state" with alternate squads of German officers serving as guards of honor. It rested in a Swastika-draped casket. It passed between lines of German prisoners who rendered the Nazi salute. All the military honors were rendered the dead prisoner—ruffles of muffled drums, a muted 16-piece band led by a Nazi in uniform, floral sprays, with prisoners permitted to march unguarded to the cemetery a mile from the camp. And a United States Army squad fired the volley of honor over the open grave!

The second story, sent by a reporter with the United States Third Army in Germany, described the horrors of a concentration camp at Ohrdruf, described the bodies of Americans and others murdered by the Nazis, the stripped and skeletonized bodies lying unburied, "naked and horribly bruised * * * sprinkled with quicklime * * * many of the skulls having been crushed * * *" the bodies of Americans who had been captured in battle and "who did not die of malnutrition but were beaten to death with clubs."

This was the black contrast between the stories—the German officer dying of a brain ailment despite the best possible medical and surgical care, the American prisoners in Germany dying of skulls crushed by Nazi murderers; the German officer buried with all military honors by his fellow prisoners and by the United States Army; the American prisoners not even given decent and Christian burial but piled in naked rows with quicklime thrown on them.

This was the contrast that angered and sickened many Clarion-Ledger readers, and the pictures on page 7 of the same issue, pictures revealing the living skeletons of American soldiers who had survived 3 months in German prison camps, added to that anger.

Anger, resentment, and demands for vengeance were the natural reactions of American readers, and we shared them.

To honor a captured or fallen foe who had fought gallantly is an American tradition, and our people would not change that tradition, but the Nazis, by their barbarous treatment of American prisoners, have forfeited all right and claim to such consideration, to such honors, and respect for their men, their flag, and their uniform. That's why this story of the pomp and ceremony attendant to the burial of this Nazi general in a Mississippi prisoner-of-war camp angered most of those who read it, especially parents and wives of soldiers overseas.

To live up to the letter and spirit of the Geneva agreements governing the treatment of prisoners also is an American tradition, and we would not change that, either, but the Nazis, by repeated and flagrant and wholly unnecessary violations of these agreements, have forfeited any right or claim to any excess of kindness or consideration over the minimum requirements of humane treatment.

We, and we think we speak for the average Mississippian, for the average American, in this respect, do not demand vengeance upon the individual Nazi prisoners in this country. We do not demand that they be starved, beat, tortured, mutilated, and killed to revenge the starvation, murder, and torture of American prisoners in Nazi hands. But we do demand that all pampering of Nazi prisoners be abandoned, and that spectacles such as that reported at Como not be repeated.

It is folly for Army officers in charge of prisoner camps to tolerate such encouragement of or pandering to Nazi "morale" by permitting the Nazi salute, by encouraging Nazi officers to command the respect and obedience of Nazi enlisted men in the prison camps in this country, by tolerating Nazi programs and meetings in the camps, by paying respects and honors to the Nazi flag and the Nazi uniform.

It is foolish, needless, and unfair to the American people, in any exaggerated observance of the Geneva agreement, to give to all Nazi prisoners the identical food that the American soldier gets under the best conditions, to feed them in almost unlimited quantities, to allow them regularly bacon and butter and other articles of food so scarce and high that most of our people often cannot get them and many of our people cannot afford them.

The American people do not demand vengeance upon Nazi prisoners in this country for crimes committed against American prisoners in Germany. But they demand an end to all pampering of such prisoners, that they be treated humanely but firmly, that they be fed an adequate diet, but nothing more, and that they be disciplined and worked not unmercifully but rigorously.

And the American people demand, in the name of the murdered American dead, in the name of the starved and tortured American prisoners, and in the name of their loved ones, that every Nazi official, officer, or private who can be identified as having any connection with these crimes against American soldiers be given summary trial and then be hanged or shot with short shrift.

Telegrams of Polish-American Congress of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two telegrams sent respectively to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman by the Polish-American Congress of Chicago, Ill.:

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT AND FAMILY,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

Deeply and profoundly moved by news of the death of the President, a loss the more tragic because it occurs when so momentous and vital issues are at stake involving the future welfare of men, we of the Polish American Congress bow before the omniscient and inscrutable way of Divine Providence in a sense of tragic bereavement. May we extend to you, Esteemed Madam, our sincere and wholehearted sympathy in your deep and great sorrow, shared in by the Nation and the entire world.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of North America,
Washington, D. C.:

The Polish American Congress desires to extend to you, Mr. President, its felicitations and sincere wishes on this so momentous to you and the Nation occasion. We desire to assure you on behalf of our membership of our sincere solidarity and support in all efforts for the preservation of the welfare of this Nation, of assuring the benefits of liberty to all freedom-loving nations, particularly to those like Poland who suffered so much to attain and preserve it for herself and for others, and in the establishment and preservation of a just and enduring peace for the entire world. May Divine Providence guide your efforts.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, my constituents have often heard me say that, in my opinion, the greatest man, in the true sense of greatness, who has ever directed the destinies of our country is Franklin Roosevelt. My period of observation has been a long one, for I have known him 28 years. He was my friend from the day we together watched the first Armistice Day parade from a balcony of the old State, War, and Navy Building across the street from the White House.

However, my loyalty to him was not entirely due to that friendship but even more because I was convinced that in his every move he was striving to better the lot of his fellow man. His accomplishments in our behalf speak for themselves and they prove that divine providence not only equipped him with vision seldom granted to mortal men, but approved his efforts and guaranteed their success.

Now he is gone. Some work remains unfinished. But what he leaves undone can only be a challenge to the rest of us to achieve the highest degree of accomplishment of those things in which he deeply believed. I for one accept that challenge and I pledge unremitting efforts to that end. May his soul rest in peace.

First Two Legislative Steps in Seventy-ninth Congress Conferring Reclamation Benefits on Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, two measures originating in the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation enlarging and establishing the policy of giving preference to veterans on newly irrigated lands are now in process of enactment. I refer to H. R. 2742 and H. R. 520 which are the first two bills carrying reclamation benefits for service men and women which may be shortly placed upon the statute books. There will be other items of legislation to be

called up presently of which these are the forerunners.

Yesterday Congressman GEORGE MILLER of California and I, together, placed in the RECORD the opening statements of the hearings on H. R. 520 held by our committee on April 12, these three statements being a communication from President Franklin D. Roosevelt—perhaps his last official statement to Congress—a statement by the Secretary of the Interior covering the general program and a statement by the Commissioner of Reclamation elaborating on the possibilities somewhat more in detail. It should be understood that the bill upon which hearings are now being held is a general bill affecting all future irrigation projects for the benefit of veterans.

I am glad to say that on April 17 the House passed H. R. 2742, which the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had reported out on March 27, which amends section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act so as to give preference to veterans of this war in the same way as had been given to veterans of earlier wars. The nature of benefit to veterans in H. R. 2742 just enacted by the House on April 17 is the same as that in H. R. 520, except that H. R. 2742 applies only to projects on both sides of the river in the lower Colorado River Basin.

It must not be supposed that the new lands covered by the preference in H. R. 2742 are of little consequence, for my estimate is that no less than 1,000,000 acres of good land will be reclaimed on both sides of the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California in the best agricultural section of our Southwest. Land hungry veterans who can qualify as entrymen on these projects will be interested to follow the enactment of this legislation and the administration of it by the Bureau of Reclamation. Of course, these benefits also depend upon appropriations made to enable the Bureau to prepare the land properly for the entrymen.

Lincoln Filene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article written by Louis M. Lyons and appearing in the Boston Globe of April 5, 1945, on Lincoln Filene, of Boston, an outstanding American and philanthropist, whose visionary progressive mind has always been and is today, years ahead of his time. A close and valued friend of our late beloved President, Lincoln Filene's whole life has been constructive—a builder of real human values—in his eightieth year, but mentally young, he is still thinking and planning for a better future for mankind.

AT FOURSCORE A DISTINGUISHED BOSTONIAN LOOKS AHEAD

(By Louis M. Lyons)

Before the big eightieth birthday party for him at the Harvard Club last night, Lincoln Filene yielded to what he called the first interview of his life. "A flabbergasting experience," he called it. "Don't generalize," he admonished at the first question about the future of Boston. Talking was never his long suit.

As to Boston, he finds enough talking but not enough action. But he applauded the activity for development of the Port of Boston. "A direct outcome of thinking in terms of the future of the city," he called it.

Associates in the Filene store laughed when asked if he was still active in the business. "The day of the big blizzard when the stores didn't open, he was the first executive to get in," one said. That same week he made a business trip to New York. When his return train arrived 2 hours late, after midnight, he found no taxi at Back Bay and walked the mile and a half to his home with a suitcase, stopping in a snowbank to put on his rubbers.

While his associates were preparing for his birthday dinner, he was planning a management meeting of the store, starting according to his habit with a roomful of charts "to show what we think our problem is."

"The question he asks me most often," says one of the store executives, "is 'If we do that, where will we be 15 years from now?'"

Research, cooperation, and association have been cardinal principals of Mr. Filene's business life. Always a student, he was prevented from going to college by reverses his father suffered when Lincoln Filene was in school in Boston. But he holds an honorary degree from Dartmouth College, was elected an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa, national college honorary scholarship society, and he served for almost 25 years on the Massachusetts Advisory Board of Education. Keenly interested in the Harvard graduate school of business administration from its start, he has always taken seriously his duties on the visiting committee.

The human side of business he has always rated of equal importance with production and distribution. "Personnel relations is a job that is never over," he says. "There's something new coming up all the time, just as there is in a family. It has got to be as continuous as production. Our large industries are becoming more responsible about personnel relationship. It will be a very hopeful sign if management and labor can get together. Neither labor nor employers can be catered to. They must be dealt with."

"Of course, there are difficult problems coming up," he says. Asked to name them, he answers, "I don't know. We've got to study and find out."

One of the activities in which he takes greatest satisfaction is his personal organization of leading merchants of the country 28 years ago, at a time when business was traditionally secretive, into the Retail Research Association for exchange of information. From this came the Associated Merchandize Corporation for cooperative buying, which grew from a $25,000 budget to one of $2,000,000 a year. He was president of the Retail Research Association for 26 years until 1943. One of his treasures is a cabinet filled with gavels presented to him by his colleagues in this organization.

"You can do constructive things in a group if everybody trusts one another," he says of this experience. "If there are suspicions you don't get group action."

Always a buoyant, genial personality, with a zest for hunting and fishing, Lincoln Filene's method in bringing his fellow merchants into close association was to follow his life-long precept that people need to play together to understand each other. He has always adjourned the R. R. A. annual meeting at noon and organized for the afternoon on the golf course or in some other recreation.

Mr. Filene is bullish on the prospects for Boston and New England. "There is a distinct advance now," he says, "from the period when the cotton and shoe industry were slipping away from here.

"We have learned our lesson," he says, "New England's only role is for quality and style. We never should have produced gray goods in our textile mills. That was only good for the South. Style leadership is our chance. We have the finest workers in the country. We can absorb all the tendency of big business to decentralize and establish small plants for making parts. Textiles can pay good wages by making style goods. New England is no place for cheap quality.

"Here we have designers and education in design. We have all the potentialities for anything we need for leadership. Boston is the center of the skirt industry, and of the leather industry and in men's clothing. How little we capitalize on the fact that we are the center of these important industries. We wouldn't have the skirt and raincoat industry here if we didn't have fine designers. Raincoats have to have style nowadays. We are the center of style footwear. It is designed here. People don't realize what's going on around here. They don't realize the influence Boston has on the clothing industry. Up in Lawrence the Pacific Mills are doing a great job now. And our underwear people are putting style into their product. That style show in underwear we had here awhile ago that they headlined 'From red flannels to black nighties' shows that our old-line textiles have changed their ideas."

Mr. Filene sat at a desk equipped with all the modern tools for work. But the work itself was out of sight. The desk was cleared. A picture of Lincoln hangs over his desk and under it a mask of the late Justice Brandeis. Photographs of his present and former store associates hang on the walls opposite his desk, among them his late brother, Edward, long his partner in William Filene's Sons Co., and the late Louis Kirstein, for many years president of the company. Lincoln Filene was the quiet partner. He has seldom been in the papers. But his associates say that he sees every employee who has an important anniversary and personally writes letters to employees who have serious illness in their families.

A table close to the desk is covered with framed photographs of his family, in groups and singly. They are his two daughters, Mrs. Jouette Shouse, of Washington, and Mrs. George E. Ladd, Jr., of Providence; a granddaughter, Mrs. Daniel Robertson, of Washington, wife of a naval lieutenant, and her two small children, David and John (his great-grandchildren); and four grandsons, William Shouse, a marine; George E. Ladd 2d, on a submarine in the Pacific; Lincoln Filene Ladd, in the Navy; and Robert M. Ladd, a student at Middlesex School.

Exports of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1945.
Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE TARVER: On March 21 you introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of your remarks a letter written by Mr. H. W. Parisius, Director of the Office of Food Programs of this Administration, subsequent to his appearance before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The purpose of Mr. Parisius' letter was to supplement his testimony before the subcommittee so that you might have in your possession more up-to-date figures than we could, under the regulations adopted in the interest of military security, furnish you as a matter of public record. Since Mr. Parisius' letter was of this character it did not purport to tell the entire story of the importance of our exports of farm machinery to the winning of the war. I am, therefore, taking the liberty of writing you this letter in which it is my intention to summarize some of the more important information orally presented by Mr. Parisius, in the hope that you will see fit to introduce it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Our exports of farm machinery may be divided into three categories—lend-lease exports, commercial exports controlled by the Foreign Economic Administration under the export control law, and exports to Canada controlled by the War Production Board under its powers to allocate our productive resources. While these three types of export differ with respect to financing and techniques of control, their purpose in our joint war effort are identical. The export of farm machinery represents a specialized application of the principle of pooling United Nations resources, both of manpower and of machinery, which has played such an important part in speeding the day of final victory.

In this common war effort the provision of food and other agricultural products for our allies has been an important aspect of wartime strategy. The soldiers of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, other parts of the British Empire, France, Belgium, Brazil, and many other of the United Nations have fought side by side with our own fighting men. The valor in the field of battle of our Russian and Chinese allies is known to all. It was an obvious necessity of our strategy that our fighting allies be supplied with all the food and fiber and other products of the soil which they needed in order to fight along with us. Similar necessities dictated the provision of food for the war workers of our allies both in the factory and in the field. To some of the United Nations has fallen the task of fighting with us on land, on sea, and in the air at the same time that they were making important contributions to war production both in factory and in the field. In the case of others the most intelligent use of their resources of soil, climate, manpower, and other instruments of production required that they should primarily be called upon to supply needed raw materials from field and mine for use in the common war effort.

Vast as is our agricultural production in this country, we did not and could not have assumed the task of feeding all these soldiers and war workers of our allies. We could not produce enough for that. Many of the products which they needed could not be produced under our soil and climatic conditions. All of the United Nations had to adopt extensive agricultural production programs to supply the major portion of the food needs of their armed forces and workers—a burden which all of our allies have borne. Many of them were called upon to increase their agricultural production so that they could make exports of food, fiber, and other agricultural products available both to us and our allies.

If agricultural production was to be maintained abroad, our allies required agricultural machinery. Many of them had largely depended upon us for agricultural machinery prior to the war. Some of them, notably United Kingdom and Canada, are themselves important producers of agricultural machinery but required additional farm machinery which we alone could make available respite the fact that British production of farm machinery was increased during the the war and Canadian production has been maintained at high levels. Since all other sources for the export of farm machinery were unavailable to the United Nations, it became necessary for the United States and Canada to assume the full burden of the provision of farm machinery to the United Nations in the interest of the production of food and other agricultural products which were necessary to the winning of the war. In this connection, it is worthy of note that Canadian exports of farm machinery to the United States in 1944 were about equivalent to one-third of United States' exports to Canada in the same year.

Lend-lease farm machinery has enabled such areas as the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand to increase their food production sharply during the war, in part, to meet the needs of the large numbers of the United States' and other United Nations' forces in the war theaters in which those areas are situated. For example, lend-leasing of farm machinery has aided the British in increasing their farm production by 70 percent. The food received as reverse lend-lease for our own armed forces from Australia and New Zealand up to October 1, 1944, is equivalent to 16 times the value of the farm implements supplied these two countries under lend-lease. In fact, Australia and New Zealand now provide under reverse lend-lease virtually all of the food consumed by the United States' forces in the South Pacific and a substantial portion of the food in the entire Pacific. This has enabled our forces to be supplied with an abundance of foods, such as meat and dairy products, which could not otherwise be provided because of the extreme shortage of refrigerated vessels.

Of equal importance is the saving in shipping space which results from the export of farm machinery. Approximately eight times more shipping would be required to ship a given amount of food abroad than is required to ship the agricultural equipment which can produce that amount of food within a single year.

The commercial export of farm machinery has been under very careful control. The War Production Board allocates a relatively small amount of steel for farm machinery for export. These allocations have consistently resulted in a large reduction in the production of farm machinery for export. In addition, the manufacture of spare parts for export has been restricted while, as you no doubt know, the manufacture of spare parts for domestic use has been permitted to proceed without restriction.

To supplement the control thus exercised by the War Production Board, this Administration has utilized its licensing power under the export-control law so as to restrict the export of farm machinery and spare parts. While recognition has thus been accorded to the importance of minimizing exports of farm machinery in view of the pressing needs of American agriculture, it has also been felt important to permit the exportation of a limited quantity of farm machinery so that these countries can contribute most effectively to the war program.

As for these commercial exports, I am sure you will agree that it has been necessary to endeavor to supply at least the minimum requirements to enable production of food for war and for wartime public health and safety of friendly and Allied countries, both in war theaters and in this hemisphere. Many Latin-American countries are fighting allies. Brazil has sent an expeditionary force to Italy and has taken over a large part of the antisubmarine patrol in the South Atlantic, as Mexico and other Central American republics have done in the Caribbean. In addition, many of these countries have made important contributions to the war effort by supplying us with agricultural and other commodities which we do not produce or which we do not produce in sufficient quantities for our needs. Among the agricultural commodities which we are now obtaining from Latin America for United Nations' purposes are cinchona from Guatemala, Costa Rica, Peru, and Ecuador; hard fibers from Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Haiti, and Mexico; pyrethrum from Brazil; rotenone from Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela; loofa sponges from Cuba and Mexico; beans, peas, and lentils from Chile; rice and fats and oils from Brazil; fats and oils from Uruguay; sugar and molasses from Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic; and alcohol from Mexico and Cuba.

While, as Mr. Parisius indicated, exports to Canada have not been under license control under the export control law, this has been because of the fact that the two nations have been able to reach an across-the-boards agreement as to the pooling of productive resources for the war effort. Canada has been an important supplier of agricultural products to the United Nations, mostly to the United Kingdom and to the newly liberated peoples of Europe. But it has also supplied this country with significant imports of farm products. For example, last year when this country's feed supply was extremely precarious, we were able to import large quantities of wheat for feed in order to supplement our domestic supply. Canada has restricted in the same degree as we have the manufacture of beverage alcohol and has thus been enabled to export to us large quantities of industrial alcohol which we have so badly needed for war purposes. We have also imported from Canada large quantities of flaxseed both for feed and for oil.

While the export of farm machinery has been of this great importance in winning the war, exports of farm machinery during this wartime period have been of a very limited character. Out of a total scheduled production of farm machinery during the fiscal year 1944–45, of 2,183,000 short tons, 2,020,170 are scheduled to remain in the United States. Eighty-three thousand one hundred and sixty-six short tons are scheduled for export to Canada and 79,664 short tons are scheduled for export to all other countries to which the F. E. A. has responsibility under the Lend-Lease Act and under the export control law. In other words, only about 4 percent of our production will go to Canada and about 3½ percent to all other importing countries, leaving about 92½ percent which will remain at home to assist our farmers in making their important contribution to the war effort.

We of the Foreign Economic Administration are aware of the difficult situation which American farmers face in meeting their requirements for farm machinery. For this reason, we have done everything in our power to keep exports of farm machinery down to the absolute minimum consistent with the requirements of our allies. I am sure that you will agree that the minimum farm machinery program I have described is essential for the winning of the war.

Should the need arise for any further information on the subject, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Roosevelt Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, at the memorial services honoring our late President Roosevelt, which were held at Sienna Heights College, at Adrian, Mich., on Friday, April 13, a very appropriate eulogy was presented by Sister Thomas Marie, O. P. Pursuant to the unanimous consent granted to me by the House, I include that eulogy, which is as follows:

PAX TECUM

Stalwart warrior for peace,
Stanch friend of the oppressed,
Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
In every land thy memory blessed.

America hails thee, reveres thee,
America, land of liberty.
Thirteen stars that set her free
Now wave for world-wide amity.

America, pledged throughout all time
To feel the beat and hear the rhyme,
In Freedom's call over land or sea,
Freedoms Four her destiny.

O nations purged in Victory's blood
For fellowship on earth—above
Discordant sound of want and fear,
Hark, hearken to thy brother's ear.

For we hold highest pledge to be
That all men their God may see,
And praise and bless, hold loved ones safe,
And with our dead—keep faith.

On every heart Four Freedoms pressed
In every land thy memory blessed.

Later Than We Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the March 31 issue of the magazine America:

LATER THAN WE THINK

As the date of the San Francisco Conference draws nearer, there is a growing realization of the urgent need for a mobilizing of the moral forces of the Nation, if the United States is to play a part worthy of its Christian, democratic tradition.

Father Edward Conway, S. J., in his nationally syndicated column for February 23, warned his readers of the urgency of the present situation:

"Sixty days may determine the history of the world for the next 60 years. * * *

"I wish—oh, how I wish—that these words were hands so they could reach out from this paper you are reading—reach out to grab the American public by the shoulders—to shake that public vigorously—to say: 'Wake up! For America's sake, if not for the world's sake, wake up! You have 60 days.' "

About a year and a half ago a wonderful opportunity for this moral mobilization presented itself in the statement known as the Seven-Point Pattern for Peace, sponsored by about a hundred and forty Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant religious leaders. For the Catholics, 24 archbishops and bishops and a large number of priests signed the Pattern, as well as many laymen prominent in Catholic life. It seemed just the opportunity that Catholics and religious-minded non-Catholics had been praying for.

The results, while good, have so far failed to come up to the high expectations of the signers and promoters of the Pattern. The Pattern, which should have become a household word and a rallying cry among all who seek a just and moral peace, seems unknown to far too many.

There have been notable efforts to publicize it—in Syracuse, N. Y., Gary, Ind., Toledo, Los Angeles, Kansas City, and other places, public forums were held and the people were made conscious of the Pattern. But there was not—as there might have been—an intense national consciousness of the Pattern and a firm national demand for its adoption as the minimum basis of a just peace settlement.

In his Christianity in the Marketplace, Michael de la Bedoyere shows a possible source of our weakness:

"It would be very much easier if Christianity could, as it were, condemn the whole world root and branch, stand away from it, preach the truth and wait for men to recover their sanity. * * * It is, however, unChristian, first because it is a false method and, second, because it is stupid and impracticable. Good and evil are inextricably confused in the world * * * and the Christian fidelity to truth lays upon the world the duty of trying to trace the good, to support it, to bring it back to the right path * * * to reintegrate it into the good."

The accent, to quote Father Conway again, is on action. And in his March 9 column he suggests positive steps. The catholic who continues to depore the injustices of Yalta without taking some of these steps stands self-condemned. Here they are:

1. Write to your Congressman urging passage of House Concurrent Resolution 21. This was introduced by Representatives Michael A. Feighan of Ohio, Charles M. LaFollette of Indiana and Samuel A. Weiss of Pennsylvania, and expresses the adherence of the Congress to the moral principles of the pattern for peace and its resolve that "the implementation of these principles shall be the objective of this Nation."

2. Write to the State Department, advocating certain amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, such as: a preamble acknowledging the sovereignty of God and the moral law; guaranties of the independence of small nations; a commission on human rights, international law and non-self-governing peoples; provision for future revision of wartime settlements; effective disarmament; elimination of the "unlimited veto."

3. Write to the American delegates to the San Francisco Conference to the same effect.

4. Call for the proclamation by the President of a national day of prayer on the Sunday preceding the opening of the conference.

It is very late; but not too late. It is only a few days since our Holy Father, Pius XII, reminded us that God holds in His hand the hearts of "the men who believe they have in theirs the destinies of the world." He can produce in those hearts "thoughts and sentiments that will inspire a peace corresponding to His designs and to the hopes of men of good will."

But, adds the Pope, God expects our cooperation. No Catholic—no one who acknowledges God—dare, in this moment of the world's history, refuse it.

One Nurse's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a nurse in Honolulu, the wife of a Navy lieutenant on active duty, came a letter stating:

I'm ashamed of Michigan. There are lots of the servicemen very indignant about all those strikes. It looks like we are almost fighting ourselves to see the boys winning the war and the people at home striking. Maybe they should see some of the returned prisoners of war. It might help.

The strikes to which the nurse refers are described in the newspaper clipping which she enclosed and which reads as follows:

FULL SHUT-DOWN OF ALL DETROIT'S WAR PLANTS THREATENS

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The War Labor Board today called a hearing for tomorrow morning in an effort to end a strike at the Chrysler-Dodge main plant in Detroit.

Chairman William H. Davis, in a telegram to management and union representatives involved, termed the walkout a violation of labor's no-strike pledge and said it constitutes a direct interference with our war effort.

DETROIT, March 2.—Vice president of the United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.), Richard T. Frankensteen, warned the National War Labor Board today that this arsenal city faces a complete war production shut-down unless the W. L. B. changes its policy of handling disciplinary changes.

The warning came as two strikes made more than 25,000 war workers jobless at the Chrysler Motor Co., and the Briggs Manufacturing Co. plants.

In both cases the strikes were in protest against the firing of workers by company officials.

Chrysler's Dodge plant strikers at a mass meeting last night announced they would not return to work until eight workers discharged for loafing were reinstated.

A Treaty or No Treaty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents have, during recent

months, asked me how I stood on the pending water treaty with the Republic of Mexico. I have in reply pointed out that the Senate has the constitutional function of ratifying treaties and that Members of the House have no vote on treaties. Therefore any influence a Congressman may have on treaty making is probably the personal influence which any other citizen may have.

As to my attitude and thought toward this water treaty, I have long felt that there ought to be a treaty between these two countries respecting the disposition of their international rivers. I welcome some such treaty. I was not entirely pleased with the precise terms of the proposed treaty, as I shall mention later. However, it takes two to make an agreement. A treaty which I might draft might not be acceptable to Mexico.

When I first heard of this treaty about a year ago, and saw that it guaranteed Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually under stipulated conditions of their choosing, I did not like that provision for I thought it too generous. I knew of course that that was about twice what Mexico had been able to use out of the Colorado River before Boulder Dam was built. I also knew that there are millions of acres of good land in the United States which cannot be irrigated even if we used every drop of water in the Colorado River within our own borders, because there is not enough water in that river basin. Such being the case any water guaranteed to Mexico means just that much lost to some good and thirsty acres in the United States.

However, when I learned that in the last year 1,800,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River had actually been put to beneficial use within the Republic of Mexico, I was forced to modify my previous views as to the proper amount of water which might reasonably be named in such a treaty. I was further convinced of the need of a treaty when I saw the possibility that Mexico could use, beneficially, not merely 1,800,000 acre-feet, but probably twice that amount, or more, annually, and in the absence of a treaty, could establish a claim to that larger amount which we would be bound to recognize as valid. This knowledge not only enforces the need of treaty stipulation but goes far toward justifying the amount of 1,500,000 acre-feet which at first had seemed to me excessive.

Certain reservations have been talked of, and no doubt will be acted upon to make the treaty more acceptable than the bare original provisions. If we are guaranteeing Mexico annually 1,500,000 acre-feet of water—except in times of great drought—I would like to see that made a maximum limit as well as a minimum limit to which the Republic of Mexico may have legal and perpetual claim. In other words if 1,500,000 acre-feet of water is to be a "floor" it should also be considered as a "ceiling." I believe that is the understanding and no doubt will be made definite in some way.

Having mentioned two of the most pertinent criticisms of the original treaty as I see them, I wish to mention one other which seems to me to be important but not having heard anyone else at Washington speak of it, it may be considered either unimportant or not germane. This is the thought that struck me on first reading the treaty: "This treaty abrogates an important provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 and the Gadsden Treaty of Purchase of 1853 with Mexico without putting any compensating provision in the present proposal." This is the thing to which I refer.

Both of the afore-mentioned treaties provided for the free navigation of the Colorado River by the ships and commerce of both Nations. The proposed treaty abolishes the navigability of the Colorado River without providing any substitute provisions for international commerce between the United States and the Gulf of California. To my mind there should be an international agreement for a right-of-way for some system of transportation—be it automotive, railway, or canal—between the United States and the Gulf of California. If some such international transportation provision is not jointly agreed to in this treaty or in some supplemental treaty, both Nations will be losers, but our Nation will be the chief loser.

The Legislature of the State of Arizona and Arizona's highest officials have gone on record as approving the treaty, and I believe, in the light of all the circumstances, that undoubtedly the adoption of a treaty—perhaps this treaty with proper reservations—will be a wise solution of this international problem.

The Views of a Typical American Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a constituent came the following letters:

MARCH 22, 1945.

DEAR FRIEND: * * * Of course you know both of our boys are in the thick of the mess in the Seventh Army under General Patch. Their reports in the paper and radio tell what that means.

A has been in the worst of it, where B is in an ordnance base and not in combat. Because of A being an engineer and at the lines, we get much different letters from him than from B. A studies things out in a deeper way and therefore writes interesting letters.

We have been surprised to find some of them pass the censor, and have mentioned it to him. His reply was, "You need not worry about what I write you for everyone over here, both officers and men, feel the same way and think it is high time some of the things going on over here should reach the American people. The truth should be told so you wouldn't believe the reports that are published by the press from the commentators and politicians when they return from a so-called visit to the front lines.

Only men in uniform ever see the lines, he said. They do talk with the men who have just returned from the front and still in a dazed condition ready to tell wild stories of things that don't make sense. The things that should be told are the things that hit the hardest that caused them to forget what really went on. After that they are not responsible for what they tell or do! That is what makes the front lines a living hell and can only be described in those words. After they live through that stage one bombing is no different than the other. If it hits you, O. K. If you're taken prisoner, that's fine, too. What's the difference, for nothing counts to them any more anyway.

Thirty days at a time of such strain would make any mind break. They had 8 days rest with only C rations to eat. Then back to the lines. He said over the Christmas holiday there was two barrels of beer rolled into his tent. The beer there is just like poison. It effects the mind as much as the nerves and stomach. He was one of four who did not drink and they had to clean up the effects of what the others drank—it was awful. Then they left for the lines January 1.

I am enclosing two letters from A which talk of the news they are allowed to read. Only what they want them to read (D) papers.

The clippings are taken from the Stars and Stripes and written by the boys themselves to express their feelings in some way, hoping, I expect, it will reach someone human enough to realize what it all means and maybe do something.

In a Kazoo paper we read a piece telling Mr. HOFFMAN said the conditions would remain the same as long as the home people here took them and did nothing about them.

Knowing you as we do here and knowing your advice has been a great help and comfort to a lot of * * * people, we have been wondering what you would advise us to do and still be legal.

We are compelled to do so many things that seem impossible for a human being to stand.

* * * * *

There is no law so binding on anyone in civilian life as there is on a man in uniform. They can alter their conditions by divorce, change living quarters, even climate, most anything, pay fines, but they get out some way. Even get out of prison. All that's done is go back in. But if a man in uniform does the least little thing he is court-martialed or shot. They have been forced to take the oath when they are drafted. I am enclosing a clipping which explains reason for some of these things that bring about such treatment, and it makes me shudder when I know my boys would break just as soon as the rest under the strain they are compelled to live. A asks us if he spells his words right, if his letters made sense. He is afraid he might be breaking, I guess.

Enclosed is also a clipping on how the boys feel about rotation furloughs. The report they sent back to SHERIDAN (Democrat) of Pennsylvania on his speech to the American people.

The one on compulsory military training I had put into our paper for him and it is a clipping from that paper. It was also from the Stars and Stripes.

It is a load off their chest when they can write these pieces. Maybe they think it will reach someone who will do something to bring about a rest for them before they have to be sent to the Pacific after the Germans are wiped up.

We have to listen to the reports of the torture of our boys in the islands, where there is a bond drive on to make us more war-minded, and then expect to allow our 18-year-old boys to go to be treated the same way and must do nothing about it. It's all wrong.

A piece in last night's paper told of four Negro WAC's who were sentenced to 1 year hard labor and then a dishonorable discharge because they refused to obey an order, but

Mayor LaGuardia of New York can get by, by frankly saying he won't obey the head of the country. He will run New York City, which is his job, and F. D. R. can do the same.

I can't see how the boys in uniforms in New York can keep their hands off from him. They'd no doubt take theirs off gladly and put it on him only they have sworn to respect the Army uniform.

Our country is like a wheel. It has to have all the spokes or cogs in good shape to keep the wheel true to form. And cities like New York are the spokes or cogs. Let one break or weaken and the load is thrown on the one nearest it, and it isn't long till the wheel cracks.

Naturally other cities will hold out if he is allowed to do as he wants and not made to obey orders the same as the armed forces. They always get ordered around and then yelled at to hike. Like making them leave the streets at midnight, even if he does stay open. The boys are still human, every mother's son. If it wasn't for the mothers in America, there wouldn't be any boys to fight this war for the Big Three; just a political job and money back of it.

I feel I can speak for thousands of other mothers when I say that the mothers will have to stick together to get something done to stop the slaughter of American boys and men.

* * * * *

Mr. VANDENBERG asked for letters from the armed forces before he goes to San Francisco, and I don't think it would do any harm to let E know how some of his friends feel. We thought it would be better to send this to you; but it's for him, too. * * *

Sincerely.

The letters from the boys in the service read as follows:

MARCH 9, 1945.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: I feel good tonite. Two letters came from you. The ones that you wrote February 16 and 18 and told about getting three of my letters for a change.

I finally found A. B. He had his air compressor over where we were working on the rifle range. He, too, has been wanting to find C. D., but he didn't realize how close he came to seeing him, because when we were on the line he was in ——— with the motor pool. At that same time, E. F. was there on detached service. A. B. wasn't on line with us, but his mail was no doubt held back the same as ours was, and it all went out at the same time.

The city that E. F. is in now is off limits to all troops except those few that are stationed there. That makes things much more pleasant for them.

We didn't build roads and bridges when we were on line, we just stayed in holes and watched for things that we didn't want to see.

I have never seen the Chicago Tribune, nor any part of it since I came overseas. The only paper from the States that I do see very often is the Lorain, Ohio, paper, which is strictly a Democratic paper. Anything that I write home in my letters are strictly my own ideas unless I say that someone else said or thinks something. I have sent, and will continue to send clippings from our paper that other fellows write to let you know what they think.

Now that our opinion of war bonds is being passed around and being commented on, perhaps I had better try to explain why I feel that way. How about comparing the war with a big show. For example "Gone with the Wind."

While that movie was being planned and made, it started getting publicity as an outstanding picture. The war was the same way. We knew that it was coming way back 10 years ago and we knew that it would be a bad one. When the picture was finally released, tickets were bought weeks in advance before its grand opening in various cities. In this other big show the same thing was done, only they were called defense bonds, because it sounds better. Everyone knew what it meant though. Just tickets to a big fight, and as in boxing, the promoters, managers, and such get all the profit, while the fighter gets a black eye and a life after retirement in poverty.

After the movie was open to the public it was publicized still more and prices for tickets was raised and more tickets were purchased. When we the people were told that there was something in it for us, the purchase of War bonds also went up. After all, what do we little people know of the big time affairs except what someone tells us.

When the movie box office receipts slackened a bit, the movie moved to new areas and later back to the old area in a different theater for those who missed it the first time, and still wanted to see it. Similarly new bond drives were made at varied and strategic parts or points of the war. All this time each of them held the interest of the public, but it couldn't be held for ever. To overcome this for the time being, last minute corrections were made in the movie. It was cut in length and prices were lowered. Then it was brought back to the screen for a last chance to see Gone With the Wind. It went over big and broke all records. The war was no different, it, too, got tiresome and seemed about over so the brains got together and proposed a one last victory drive. No direct statements, but many implied that the war would last as little as 6 weeks. That was last summer, but now after the big drive, which went way over the top, it seems that this show, too, will run a little longer. Roosevelt and Churchill each made statements this winter that the war would last from 18 to 24 months longer. What can we do but believe them. We over here must obey orders. We can hope that this show like the other one, will gradually fade away and also soon be gone with the wind.

As far as having anyone shot for saying that War bonds prolong the war; well, the Jerries and Japs have been trying for quite a while now, but we still think the same way.

MARCH 2, 1945.

DEAR FOLKS: This just happens to be my day to stay in again. All necessary work is completed and now to write home.

The only letter for me yesterday was from "A." He wrote it February 22, in Germany, and he was O. K.

This morning a chaplain happened to be here before anyone worked, and since we so seldom have any church services, one was conducted at 8 o'clock today. We were given several small pamphlets, some duplicates that I may send home from time to time.

Two fellows worked in the washroom across the hall all morning and finally have showers rigged up, as well as washbowls. I took a hot shower right after dinner.

I wish that you could see the pretty green valley below that I can see as I look out this window. It is a long distance to the bottom, but way out on a distant hill beyond the valley is another town with its red tile roofs very similar to this one.

Overhead I can hear the roar of 4 P–47's as they continually patrol the skies. Last week I saw more planes than I have ever seen before. Although there wasn't a cloud in the sky for 2 days, the blue was hidden by the white trails left by the high-flying planes. It is really pretty if one can forget the destruction that they carry with them. Down in Italy it was common to see 200 planes flying over in formation, but last week just in one wave I counted 7 flights of 50 or 60 planes each; all abreast or side by side across the sky. That was 1 wave. Those waves kept up one after the other for 2 days and nights. A continuous roar in the sky, coming and going. It is a wonder that they didn't get tangled up.

In this letter I am sending a short editorial that I found in an old magazine. The title is "Closer to the Stars." It is just interesting, you don't need to save it. I'll also send a poem about G. I. movies.

I have a lot of unstamped air-mail envelopes now, but no stamps. If you can get some 6-cent ones please send some, a few at a time, in your next few letters.

I am also going to mention a few little things for you to send to me. When you have enough to fill a box, send it. First is a bottle of ink, any color, but don't send Quink if you can get anything else. A few big handkerchiefs. Color and design don't matter. We work in dirt all the time. A couple pencils, and something to eat.

That is all that I can think of now, but I'll add more in my next letter.

Tribute to the Late President Roosevelt by Dean Alfange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a magnificent and eloquent tribute to our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which was delivered by Dean Alfange on April 17 at the memorial services of the Liberal Party at Manhattan Center, New York City.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Words are tyrannical things, so unavailing are they to portray our inner feelings.

Even Demosthenes, Cicero, or Webster would be taxed to rise to this occasion.

Daniel Webster reached his greatest heights in his tribute to his native State. "I need not," he said, "deliver an encomium upon Massachusetts. There she stands. Behold her and judge for yourselves. There is her history. The world knows it by heart. The past at least is secure. There is Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill and there they shall remain forever."

Were he alive today, he could paraphrase this eulogy to say: "I need not deliver an encomium upon Roosevelt. There he stands. Behold him and judge for yourselves. There is his history. The world knows it by heart. The past at least is secure. There is Casablanca and Teheran and D-day and there they shall remain forever."

Roosevelt needs no monuments to his name. So deeply is it engraved upon the hearts of men, that it will last as long as time itself.

There has never been an American in history—indeed any man in history—who possessed the trust, devotion, the reverential love and affection of so many human beings on the face of this earth as Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

No death in the recorded annals of man has brought mourning to so many millions throughout the earth or has caused so many to feel that they would cheerfully have laid down their lives if by so doing they could have saved Roosevelt to complete his mission to the world.

His far-sighted vision in a blind world saved Britain in the darkest hour of her struggle against the combined forces of bru-

talitarianism. When he saved Britain from Hitler, he saved Russia from Hitler, saved western civilization, saved you, and me, and all of us, including those who are now counted as our enemies.

His prodigious accomplishment on the domestic front which has delighted and astonished our allies, dumfounded and shattered our enemies, and which will cause future historians to write down this war as the most brilliantly and successfully conducted war in the history of the world—this accomplishment was the result of his planning—a planning initiated and carried on with the purpose of harnessing and driving together in harmonious cooperation all of the great forces of industry, agriculture, labor, transportation, communications, invention, and science that go to make up the genius of our great American system.

Our children's children and their children's children will kneel on bended knees and thank God for Roosevelt. And so will freemen everywhere. Countless biographies will be written, millions of orations rendered by men yet unborn extolling his exertions for humanity and his monumental achievements for mankind. Wherever men shall breathe the fresh air of freedom, his name will be worshiped and his fame enshrined. The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms shall be the Bible of political and economic salvation until the end of time.

Roosevelt is gone, but his spirit shall forever attend us. His vision enlightened the world, his courage strengthened it, his generosity enriched it. He has bequeathed to us a challenge that ought to stir the hearts and souls of men to action.

If Roosevelt had written his own epitaph, it would be two simple words—carry on.

And so, the finest tribute we, the living, can pay his memory is to carry on his work.

Christ said to his disciples (John 14, 15), "If ye love Me, keep My commandments."

The spirit of Roosevelt cries out to us and says, "If you love me, keep my policies."

To keep his policies should be the high resolve of liberals everywhere.

Many who added to his wartime burdens, fomenting strife and dissension at home, now place roses on his grave. Behold the praise of his erstwhile detractors But no sooner shall these roses wither, when they shall desecrate again the ideals for which he gave his life.

We who truly loved Roosevelt rededicate ourselves tonight to carry on his work. Let not the New Deal perish. Let bigotry and hatred and terror and fear vanish from the hearts of men. Let oppression, tyranny, and exploitation be rooted out from the soil of the earth. Let the nations of the world live in peace and dignity. Let godliness reign in the inner conscience of men, that there may be justice and equality and freedom from want and from fear.

That was the hope, the work, the life of Roosevelt. Let it, therefore, be our work to carry on, to give flesh and life and content to that magnificent framework of peace, security and freedom which he created in his lifetime and which he left as a legacy to all the peoples of the world.

The Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the Members of the House for granting unanimous consent to me to set forth certain facts and information concerning the Congressional Medal of Honor. This is the highest decoration which can be awarded by this Nation to any officer or enlisted man serving in the armed forces of the United States. It can only be awarded to an officer or enlisted man who shall, in actual conflict with the enemy, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command, or of the command to which he is attached. It matters not what service any officer or enlisted man may render, or what courage he may show, unless this courage and great service is involved in actual combat with the enemy and unless he distinguishes himself conspicuously by gallantry and at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty, he cannot be considered for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

This decoration was first authorized by an act of Congress December 21, 1861, when it was limited to noncommissioned officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for deeds of gallantry in action. In 1862 Congress authorized the presentation of this decoration to enlisted men of the Army, and under the same conditions as to the enlisted men of the Navy. For the first time by an act of Congress March 3, 1863, the President of the United States authorized to provide these Medals of Honor for commissioned and noncommissioned officers as well as privates who had thus distinguished themselves or who might thereafter distinguish themselves in action.

In 1863 the law was amended to make it a permanent award during war or peace, for acts of heroism in the Army and to include officers, but the award of the Naval Medal of Honor to commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was not authorized until March 1915.

The act of July 9, 1918, provided for Medals of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, and the Distinguished Service Medal. The reference for the Congressional Medal of Honor is as follows:

That the provisions of existing law relating to the award of medals of honor to officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates of the Army be, and they hereby are, amended so that the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor only to each person who, while an officer or enlisted man of the Army, shall hereafter in action involving actual conflict with the enemy distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command or to the command to which attached.

A similar bill was passed for the Navy on February 4, 1919. But in order to justify an award for the Congressional Medal of Honor the naval officer or enlisted man, as in the Army, had to perform in action a deed of personal bravery or self-sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty so conspicuous as to clearly distinguish himself for gallantry and intrepidity above his comrades, involving the risk of life or the performance of more than ordinarily hazardous services.

Congress approved a special design for the Congressional Medal of Honor for the Army, and also a special design for the Congressional Medal of Honor for the Navy.

According to the Army and Navy Register of date March 17, 1945, 159 commissioned, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have, in this war, been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In the Army these range from buck privates to General MacArthur and Brig. Gens. James H. Doolittle and Theodore Roosevelt. In the Navy they range from seamen to Rear Admirals Callaghan and Kidd; and in the Marine Corps from privates to Lt. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift.

Some two or three others have been awarded this great honor since this list was reported and published. Among these was Pvt. (1st cl.) Wilburn Ross, of Strunk, Ky. It was he who repulsed, according to the records of the War Department and of his own officers, 9 attacks of a German company, and he killed more than 40 Germans and wounded more than 18 others, killing and wounding in all, 58 Germans, and he forced the Germans to retire. The Germans killed or wounded all of the members of his company except himself and 8 of his comrades. He placed himself 40 feet out in front of his company with a machine gun and held his ground while the Germans made 9 attacks. He was not wounded. He saved his comrades. This was in France in October 1944. It was only recently that he was awarded his decoration. Before that he had been wounded twice—once seriously—in the Italian campaign. He had a brother who was severely wounded in General MacArthur's invasion of Leyte Island and a brother about 18 who recently went overseas.

I spoke at length about Private Ross in the House a few days ago. Private Ross makes two in my congressional district who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor in the present war. Up to that time there had been inducted into the armed forces approximately 14 000,000 men, and they have fought courageously on land and sea and in the air on all the battle fronts and all the seas of the world. The fact that only about 160 have been up to this time awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor indicates how much courage and daring one must display in actual combat with the enemy to be awarded this medal.

The following is a list of the 159 heroes as it appears in the Army and Navy Register of Washington, D. C., March 17, 1945:

ARMY

Lucian Adams, staff sergeant; Addison E. Baker, lieutenant colonel; Van T. Barfoot, second lieutenant; Carlton W. Barrett, private; Stanley Bender, staff sergeant; Willibald C. Bianchi, first lieutenant; Arnold L. Bjorklund, first lieutenant; Orville E. Bloch, first lieutenant; Richard I. Bong, major; Robert D. Boker, private; Maurice L. Britt, captain; Elmer J. Burr, first sergeant.

Jose Calugas, sergeant; Ralph Cheli, major; Ernest Childers, second lieutenant; Robert G. Cole, lieutenant colonel; James P.

Conner, sergeant; Robert Craig, second lieutenant; Demas T. Craw, colonel; William J. Crawford, private.

Charles W. Davis, major; Arthur F. DeFranzo, staff sergeant; Ernest H. Dervishian, second lieutenant; James H. Doolittle, brigadier general; Jesse R. Drowley, staff sergeant; John W. Dutko, private, first class.

Walter D. Ehlers, staff sergeant; James H. Fields, first lieutenant; William G. Fournier, sergeant; Thomas W. Fowler, second lieutenant.

William W. Galt, captain; Eric G. Gibson, technician fifth grade; Kenneth E. Gruennert, sergeant; Lewis Hall, technician fifth grade; Pierpont M. Hamilton, major; Lloyd C. Hawks, private, first class; James H. Howard, lieutenant colonel; Paul B. Huff, corporal; Lloyd H. Hughes, second lieutenant.

John L. Jerstad, major; Leon W. Johnson, colonel; William J. Johnston, private, first class; John R. Kane, colonel; Neel E. Kearby, colonel; Charles E. Kelly, corporal; John D. Kelly, technical sergeant; Patrick L. Kessler, private, first class; David R. Kingsley, second lieutenant; Gerry H. Kisters, second lieutenant; Alton W. Knappenberger, private, first class.

William R. Lawley, first lieutenant; Floyd K. Lindstrom, private first class; James A. Logan, sergeant; Douglas MacArthur, general; Troy A. McGill, sergeant; Joe P. Martinez, private; Archibald Mathies, sergeant; Jack W. Mathis, first lieutenant; Edward S. Michael, first lieutenant; James H. Mills, private; Nicholas Minue, private; Jack C. Montgomery, first lieutenant; John C. Morgan, second lieutenant.

William L. Nelson, sergeant; Beryl R. Newman, first lieutenant; Alexander R. Nininger, second lieutenant; Arlo L. Olson, captain; Truman O. Olson, sergeant; Harl Pease, Jr., captain; Frank J. Petrarca, private first class; John J. Pinder, Jr., technician fifth grade; Leo J. Powers, private first class; James W. Reese, private; Paul F. Riordan, second lieutenant; Theodore Roosevelt, brigadier general.

Joseph R. Sarnoski, second lieutenant; Henry Schauer, private first class; Robert S. Scott, captain; Charles W. Shea, second lieutenant; James D. Slaton, corporal; Furman L. Smith, private; Maynard H. Smith, sergeant; Joe C. Specker, sergeant; Junior J. Spurrier, staff sergeant; John C. Squires, sergeant.

John J. Tominac, first lieutenant; John R. Towle, private; Walter E. Truemper, second lieutenant; Leon R. Vance, Jr., lieutenant colonel; Junior N. Van Noy, private; Forrest L. Vosler, technical sergeant.

Kenneth N. Walker, brigadier general; Robert T. Waugh, first lieutenant; David C. Waybur, first lieutenant; Thomes W. Wigle, second lieutenant; William H. Wilbur, colonel; Raymond H. Wilkins, major; Homer L. Wise, staff sergeant; Rodger W. Young, private; Jay Zeamer, major.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The following personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps have been awarded the Medal of Honor during the present war and to include February 8, 1945:

NAVY

Mervyn S. Bennion,[1] captain; John D. Bulkeley, commander; Daniel J. Callaghan,[1] rear admiral; John W. Finn, lieutenant; Francis C. Flaherty,[1] ensign; Samuel G. Fuqua, captain; Howard W. Gilmore,[1] commander; Nathan G. Gordon, lieutenant; William E. Hall, lieutenant; Edwin J. Hill,[1] chief boatswain; Johnnie D. Hutchins,[1] seaman, first class; Herbert C. Jones,[1] ensign; Reinhardt J. Keppler,[1] boatswain's mate; Isaac C. Kidd,[1] rear admiral; David McCampbell, commander; Bruce McCandless, commander; Edward H. O'Hare,[1] lieutenant commander; John J. Parle,[1] ensign; Oscar V. Peterson,[1] chief watertender; John J. Powers,[1] lieutenant; Lawson P. Ramage, commander; Thomas J. Reves,[1] radio electrician; Milton E. Ricketts,[1] lieutenant; Albert H. Rooks,[1] captain; Donald K. Ross, lieutenant; Herbert E. Sconland, captain; Norman Scott,[1] rear admiral; Robert R. Scott,[1] machinist's mate; Peter Tonich,[1] chief watertender; Franklin Van Valkenburgh,[1] captain; James R. Ward,[1] seaman, first class; Cassin Young,[1] captain.

MARINE CORPS

Richard B. Anderson,[1] private, first class; Kenneth D. Bailey,[1] major; John Basilone,[1] gunnery sergeant; Harold W. Bauer,[2] lieutenant colonel; William J. Pordelon,[1] staff sergeant; Gregory Boyington,[2] major; George H. Cannon,[1] first lieutenant; Aquilla J. Dyess,[1] lieutenant colonel; Merrit A. Edson, brigadier general; Richard E. Fleming,[1] captain; Joseph J. Foss, major; Robert E. Galer, lieutenant colonel; Henry Gurke,[1] private, first class; Robert M. Hanson,[1] first lieutenant; William D. Hawkins,[1] first lieutenant; John B. Power,[1] first lieutenant; Mitchell Paige, first lieutenant; David M. Shoup, colonel; John L. Smith, lieutenant colonel; Richard K. Sorenson, sergeant; James E. Swett, captain; Herbert J. Thomas,[1] sergeant; Clyde Thomason,[1] sergeant; Alexander A. Vandegrift, lieutenant general; Kenneth A. Walsh, captain.

[1] Deceased.

[2] Missing.

"Last Butcher House Closes Down in Washington"—Read It and Weep, While Chester Bowles Dances With Glee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, in Wednesday's Washington Daily News, on page 5, appeared this headline: "Last Butcher House Closes Down Here." The only difference between that headline and those in the rest of the United States is that the markets and butcher shops have already been closed in other parts of the United States while in Washington they hung on a little longer.

Yet with all this uncalled-for misery and trouble laid squarely to the stupid blundering of Chester Bowles and the O. P. A., they have not put forth one remedy. As a matter of fact it seems to have increased their arrogance and ego.

Tossing out three or more Congressmen from an important O. P. A. meeting when these Congressmen were endeavoring to aid their oppressed constituents is just a little simple gesture on the part of the O. P. A. to show the country that the O. P. A. is not only arbitrary and arrogant but that it is all-powerful and can teach Himmler a few tricks, too.

Many Senators have come out publicly and said, "There is something crooked about the O. P. A." In the large cities, in Washington and elsewhere, you hear these ugly rumors, "To get along with the O. P. A. all you have to do is to pay off the right fellow; boys, it is just like the old bootleg days."

And yet Chester Bowles—who refuses not only to see Congressmen but Senators as well about official business—goes serenely on with all the overbearing tactics of a Gestapo chief, apparently answerable to no one for putting thousands of businesses out of business without logic, rhyme, reason, or necessity.

Just remember what a "little bird" said he heard via the grapevine, "Chester Bowles"—he is reported to have already feathered his nest—"and the others in O. P. A. do not have to answer for their crimes and sins, but who will?" The answer is simple: The Congressmen and Senators, and that is why some new faces will show up in 1946, unfortunately, in Congress.

Eliminate Need of Administering Estates of Deceased Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when yesterday I introduced bill H. R. 2941, it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I respectfully and specifically call your attention to the fact that this bill is to authorize the payment of the entire amount found due in the settlement of accounts of deceased members of the armed forces without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate.

Having been president of the bar association in Long Beach, also having been a member of the board of conference of bar delegates of the State of California, as well as having been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and having specialized in probate law in my own private law practice, I think I am aware that the lawyers of America are not interested in making legal fees from administering the estates of deceased members of the Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guards, or officers of the Public Health Service, or any other unit of the armed forces. They gain no professional pride or satisfaction in having it necessary for the deceased veterans' widows or children to pay them fees out of the few hundred, or very few thousand dollars which is received by them from the United States of America. The lawyers of America know that these widows and children will need every cent of the money they receive, as a result of the death of their supporter. Therefore, I offer this bill confident the bar of America will be pleased to see its enactment.

I am aware that thousands of lawyers have already acted as legal counsel in administration of such estates without charging any fee. I compliment them on so doing.

This bill, of course, does not cover life-insurance proceeds—that is covered by the policy itself and goes direct to the

beneficiary named therein. This bill only pertains to the cash which has accrued in favor of the veteran by way of accrued salary, wages, compensation, bonuses, remittances unpaid, or any other unsettled accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men. I am informed that for many years $500 would be paid to a deceased veteran's widow, children, or legal heirs, without it being necessary to have legal representative appointed. I am informed that, presently, up to $1,000 is being thus paid. Is there any Member of this House who can give me one sound reason why all amounts thus accruing and due the widow or children should not be paid by Uncle Sam, at a minimum of cost and delay? Do you know of any reason, sound in public policy, as to why the fundamentals of my proposal are unsound or contrary to the best interest of either the National Government or the legal survivors of these distinguished veterans who have given their lives in our protection, and who, therefore, are removed from the possibility of being the honorable legal support of their families? I know of no reason. If you do, I invite you again to state it to me.

Not only will hundreds of thousands of dollars be saved in law fees to the widows and children under my bill but hundreds of thousands of dollars in court costs will also be saved. For instance, in California, it costs $10.50 to file such an estate with the county clerk; it costs $10 per thousand for surety bond; it costs a dollar here and a dollar there until the court costs alone average about $50. I am told the costs run about the same in other States. Whereas the amount involved coming from Uncle Sam to these suddenly made widows and half-orphaned children runs from about $500 to never over $5,000. This bill, of course, does not apply to doing away with the requirement of administration of other items of property, real or personal. It only applies to the cash which is due the veteran at the time of his decease, by the United States of America.

I say again, it does not include life insurance, which is specifically due and payable to the beneficiaries named in the policies.

If you ask me why I have not provided a limit as to amount upon which estate administration shall not be required, then, Mr. Speaker, I reply there is no legal or practical reason for stipulating a limit. If anyone can think of one, please state it to me. It being admittedly sound, sensible, and right public policy that widows and children of deceased veterans shall be paid up to $1,000, as is presently, generally, done, on account of such accruals being in the hands of this great Government—then, why is it not equally sound, sensible, fair, and right that Uncle Sam now make unnecessary the spending of any money whatsoever by these widows and children for law or court fees? The law fees in such estates would run from $25 to $250 and the court costs from $15 to $50. I know of no reason why these widows and children need to be longer required to waste these sums in an act unnecessary, either to protect creditors—for there are none—or to establish heirship—the Government has complete lists of the heirs. So neither of these sound reasons for administration of ordinary civilian estates exists in the case of estates of deceased veterans.

I say again there is no need for a limit in such cases. The practical situation dictates that this position by me is sound. To illustrate, if a veteran dies and has a sum due him from Uncle Sam, which sum amounts to $1,500, under the present procedure the widow and children would have to pay law and court fees to administer the $500, even if Uncle Sam pays them $1,000 of the total sum. If, of course, the sum over $1,000 happens to be $200 or $300, then the widow and children could well be expected to forfeit that amount on account of the fees, and so forth, involved. For, not frequently, administration fees of such small estates might well consume $150 or more. I know it is true at present seldom do such accruals of cash due veterans at the time of their death amount to as much as $3,000. But, the exceptional case when it does, is just as essentially worthy of the effective result of the enactment of this legislation as is a lesser cash estate. In fact it might be the widow and children of the veteran leaving an estate in cash from Uncle Sam of over $2,000 or $3,000 who might need these fees saved by this bill, for their very maintenance and the children's education more than some widow and children would where the estate in such case happens to be considerably less. There might be other estate or other source of income or wealth for the education of the children and the maintenance of the family.

I say again, as a civil lawyer who has handled in the probate courts of California many hundreds of estates in my private practice, I know of no sound reason or argument against the practical and beneficial application and results which will accrue to the widows and children and everyone concerned, including the Government, if this bill is enacted as a national policy and law.

Paper Salvage

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has suggested that we turn in the old ballots to the waste-paper campaign. I am very happy to tell the gentleman from California that in my home county of Allegany the board of election supervisors have already turned their used ballots over to this campaign.

I include the following news item from the Cumberland (Md.) Daily News:

BALLOTS WILL BE ASSIGNED TO LOCAL WASTE-PAPER DRIVE—RYAN AND KENNY CITE NEED FOR SCRAP PAPER IN WAR EFFORT

Ballots cast in the 75 Allegany County precincts during the primary and general elections of 1944 will be turned over to the waste-paper drive and sent to the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. mill at Luke, Md., instead of being destroyed by burning as heretofore, it was announced yesterday by Edward J. Ryan, attorney to the Allegany County Board of Supervisors of Elections.

Ryan discussed the matter with James E. Kenny, of Westernport, chairman of the election board, and it was agreed that since other counties in the State are turning over their ballots to waste-paper collection drives they could see no reason why Allegany County should burn the ballots during an emergency when scrap paper is in such great demand for the war effort, due to the critical paper shortage which faces the Nation.

MUST BE HELD 4 MONTHS

The board attorney pointed out that election laws of Maryland specify that ballots shall be kept for the space of 4 months from the date of such delivery at the courthouse, after which the board shall destroy, or cause to be destroyed. The law fails to state that ballots must be burned, but that has been the procedure of destroying them in the past.

Attorney General William C. Walsh stated that inasmuch as a paper shortage exists he could see no sense in burning the ballots if such paper could be used to further the war effort.

Thomas Stephens, of Mount Savage, messenger to the election board, who has charge of destroying the ballots at the expiration of 4 months after they were locked up in the basement of the courthouse, said he will gladly cooperate in seeing that the ballots are turned over to the waste-paper collector as soon as he is officially notified by the attorney to the board. He suggested that the collector provide boxes or containers in which to place the ballots as they are moved from the courthouse to trucks. Stephens said that arrangements may be made to dispose of the ballots the latter part of this week.

Baltimore County has turned over all of its ballots to the waste-paper drive, baling the paper at the courthouse in Towson before it is turned over to the collector.

COLLECTION SET NEXT WEEK

Emmett A. Dougherty, waste-paper collector, is anxious to pick up the ballots this week as the monthly collection for Cumberland and vicinity is scheduled for next week starting on Monday at which time his trucks will pick up paper in LaVale, Corriganville, Bowman's Addition, Baltimore Pike, outside the city limits as far as Miller's service station and Bedford Road from Nave's Crossroads to the Pennsylvania State line.

D'Alesandro Asks Roosevelt Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Baltimore Sun:

D'ALESANDRO ASKS ROOSEVELT MEDAL

WASHINGTON, April 18.—Representative D'ALESANDRO, member of the Appropriations Committee, today introduced a bill authorizing President Truman to award, posthumously, a Congressional Medal of Honor to President Roosevelt.

The bill cites that President Roosevelt "gallantly and unselfishly gave his life in

the service of the Nation as Commander in Chief of its armed forces and devoted leader in the cause of world peace."

Representative MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, commended Representative D'ALESANDRO and referred to him as "one of the most loyal supporters of President Roosevelt." He also recalled that President Roosevelt at one time referred to Mr. D'ALESANDRO as his most loyal supporter.

Ernie Pyle

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, America mourns the death of Ernest Taylor Pyle—plain Ernie to America's fighting forces and the millions of people at home to whom he has brought G. I. Joe's story.

Far too old and frail by any military standards to endure the rigors and hardships of war, hating and fearing every minute of it, Ernie nevertheless slogged and suffered his way through it from the opening Allied offensive in north Africa in 1942 to the present action in the far western Ryukyu Islands, which cost him his life.

Ernie Pyle was a plain, simple, humble man who understood people and loved them. He was born at the turn of the century in the little farming community of Dana, Ind. He grew up in that wholesome Midwest atmosphere, attended Indiana public schools and Indiana University. His start in the newspaper field he made at La Porte, Ind. Ernie was in every sense a true Hoosier gentleman. This Hoosier vagabond traveled up and down the country back in the days of peace just making friends with the folks he met, and writing homely, intensely human stories about them. Like that other great American, Will Rogers, Ernie Pyle might well have said, "I never met a man I didn't like," for in all the Pyle dispatches I have ever read, I do not recall an occasion when he ever spoke unkindly of an individual. Ernie was born with the simple touch and an abiding interest in human values.

It was natural, then, that Ernie Pyle should emerge as the G. I.'s reporter, the one man qualified to write the epic of the men and women who are fighting this war. Ernie made no pretense as an expert in military strategy, or global politics. He was received as cordially by world ranking military and political officials as he was by the men in the fox holes, but he measured them by the same human yardstick he wielded in all his appraisals; and his stories from high sources were about people rather than policies and programs. Perhaps as well as any individual could, he knew the terrible immensity of this war, and the magnitude of the force we have thrown into it. But this knowledge never once obscured the individual fighting man who, he knew so well, is the heart and muscle of our military machine.

Ernie Pyle knew and understood G. I. Joe. He felt his pain and suffering. He shared his hopes and aspirations. He realized his nobility and courage. Ernie told Joe's story the way Joe wished it told. And Ernie conveyed that story to Joe's family and friends at home in a way which has earned him a peculiar and lasting place in the history of war correspondents. Ernie Pyle is dead. But Ernie Pyle will live forever in the hearts of our fighting men and the millions of Americans to whom he has told our warriors' story.

Ernie Pyle—G. I.'s Pal

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Ernie Pyle is dead. This sad news yesterday, following so closely the death of our beloved President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has shocked Capitol Hill.

LOVED SLUGGING FOOT SOLDIER

Ernie Pyle was unquestionably the most famous war correspondent of World War No. 2. He enjoyed writing about and living with the infantryman, the slugging foot soldier. Following the infantryman for almost 2 years in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy, he suggested that the Congress recognize these boys by enacting a "fight-pay" bill allowing combat soldiers a 50-percent increase in pay equivalent to the flight pay granted to men in the Air Corps, paratroopers, and the 50-percent increase allowed servicemen on submarine duty. The hazards of the infantrymen are undoubtedly greater.

In a personal letter to me from England, dated May 21, 1944, Ernie wrote:

Our original motive was to give recognition to that poor old —— —— —— —— who lies up there in the mud and cold and rain for weeks at a time, never dry, never warm, eating cold food out of cans, dirty and unshaven and sleepless, and constantly under mortar, artillery, or rifle fire. Usually he is an infantryman, although others do sometimes come into such sustained combat, such as Rangers, paratroopers, and SS troops.

Ernie Pyle lived with our doughboys. He knew their temper. He spoke their language and he wrote it more eloquently than any other correspondent in this or any other war. When he could no longer stand the smell of death Ernie Pyle returned to the States from the European theater for a rest. But he didn't stay long. He didn't exactly want to go to the Pacific theater, but then he knew that neither did G. I. Joe, so he went. There he continued his brilliant writing and praise of the "slugging foot soldier" in the hell holes of the Pacific.

Yesterday on the island of Ie Shima, a tiny island off Okinawa, Ernie Pyle was killed in action. His death is mourned by all, particularly by the servicemen, and more so by the foot soldiers, who reverently loved and admired him. And here at home the millions of Americans to whom Ernie Pyle endeared himself by his frank reporting of the sacrifices and heroism of their gallant fighting sons are saddened by his death.

FIGHT PAY FOR FIGHTING MEN

As a result of Ernie Pyle's suggestion I introduced a bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress and reintroduced this same measure in the Seventy-ninth Congress—H. R. 775—to grant fight pay to fighting men.

GALLUP POLL FAVORED BILL

Dr. Gallup's Nation-wide poll conducted April 20, 1944, reported that 70 percent of the American people favored combat pay for front-line soldiers.

As Ernie Pyle wrote me:

When I was at the front the last time several Infantry officers brought up the same suggestion. They say "combat pay" would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him in a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

TRIBUTE TO ERNIE PYLE

The greatest tribute and memorial we could pay to Ernie Pyle would be for the Congress to enact into law the Ernie Pyle bill—"fight pay for fighting men"—and make this act retroactive to November 7, 1942, the day of the invasion of north Africa. It would reward our gallant and courageous slugging foot soldier now in the outskirts of Berlin and Tokyo and at the same time it would honor the efforts and sacrifices of the Nation's most famous war correspondent, Ernie Pyle, the G. I.'s pal.

O. P. A. Says, "Don't Blame Them"—Not One of the Poor 60,164 Overworked Employees of O. P. A. Could Find Time or Talent To Testify Before Senate Investigating Committee Last Wednesday—It Couldn't Happen Here, But It Did

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate food investigators Wednesday asked O. P. A. to send someone up to answer the questions regarding the meat crisis and shortage, they were informed that the O. P. A. had no one competent to answer questions, since Mr. Chester Bowles and Mr. James Brownlee were busy. Mr. Bowles was reported camping on the White House steps—evidently he was hoping against hope to hold on to his job as Administrator. Of course, after all, what is a measly little senatorial investigating committee in the lives of an arrogant, dictatorial, whitewashed champion like Mr. Bowles?

Mr. Brownlee was reported busy working on the meat situation, while daily thousands of butcher shops and meat packers all over the United States are closing as a result of foolish, stupid, arrogant, unreasonable, and arbitrary rulings of the O. P. A.

Typical of Mr. Bowles, though, to run to the White House after he has made the worst mess out of the O. P. A. as its maladministrator in the entire history of Washington bureaucracy.

With 60,164 employees and yet the O. P. A. could not find one employee competent, able, intelligent, or with sufficient time to send to testify before an important Senate hearing.

Of course, to Bowles, O. P. A. and company, a little thing like a Senate committee means little, if anything, to them. They are bigger and more important—in their own estimation, judging by their arbitrary acts—than both the Senate and the House and the entire country as well.

Of course, bear this in mind, that the testimony of the O. P. A.'s representative, Mr. Emerson, before the Senate committee was the most ridiculous testimony ever heard on Capitol Hill.

Looks like the rumors of a new O. P. A. Administrator being appointed are about to come true—the sooner the better.

Retention by America of Key Bases in Pacific—House Concurrent Resolution 41

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 41, which would express the will of Congress that America should retain key bases in the Pacific. It is encouraging to observe the almost universal support which this resolution appears to have. This is emphasized by the debate in the House yesterday.

In view of the favorable sentiment expressed in the House yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and others, I wish to repeat that the House should immediately adopt this resolution in the interest of American security and in clarification of American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it was on April 3 that Admiral King warned that America should not give up key bases in the Pacific which are now being won by American arms. On the following day in a speech in the House, I commended Admiral King and made public portions of letters which I had addressed to the President and to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, urging that these key bases not be surrendered at the end of the war, and that no commitments be made now which would preclude our retention of these bases.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall retain possession and control over all islands in the Pacific Ocean which are liberated by American arms and which the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations designate as necessary for the maintenance of world peace or the defense of the United States, its Territories and possessions: *Provided, however*, That if any such island was formerly owned, mandated, or otherwise occupied by one of the United Nations, the United States shall retain possession and control of such island only until such United Nation is in a position to reoccupy and provide a comparable armed force for the maintenance of the peace and the security of the world, or until the United Nations make suitable arrangements for the joint occupation and control of such island.

The Home Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was prepared by Vice President Truman and was to have been delivered last Friday at the graduating exercises of the National Police Academy, Federal Bureau of Investigation. The exercises were canceled because of the death of President Roosevelt. The subject of the address is The Home Guard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a special privilege to be present at the graduation of you guardians of the home front. It would be more than tragic if while fighting a world-wide war to preserve our democratic ideals we would neglect the constant battle against evil forces at home.

Fortunately, the specialized training provided here at the National Police Academy, under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, assures America that we will continue to have well-equipped specialists to maintain peace and order within our borders.

Please permit me to pay special tribute to the man who, in addition to founding the National Police Academy, has played such an important part in improving law enforcement throughout the United States. I refer to your distinguished leader, the moving spirit behind the Federal Bureau of Investigation, my good friend the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

You men have been especially fortunate in being selected for intensive training at the greatest crime clinic in the world. Here you have learned the wonders of modern scientific methods. You have acquired skill in using the latest weapons available. Even more important, here you have been taught the all-essential need of quick cooperation with all law-enforcement agencies, local, county, State, and Federal. If we hope to make sound progress for the benefit of all society, we must carry on a well-coordinated, all-out attack on crime.

You officers have had the opportunity to study the most modern methods of crime prevention and crime detection. Your intense training here at this most efficient center should pay you and society great dividends in the years to come. You learned not merely the use of scientific methods in combating the enemies of society but also the urgent need of effective cooperation with all the other useful agencies. Only by a Nation-wide, coordinated campaign by all law-enforcement agents can we achieve the highest degree of efficiency, which in itself will be one of the most effective means of preventing antisocial acts. Certainty of criminal apprehension is the most powerful check on crime.

Tremendous progress has been made in criminology during the last century. In the past the criminal was punished in a spirit of revenge, without proper consideration of the many factors which gave rise to this problem of social maladjustment. Criminals are not born such. They are usually the unfortunate product of their environment, experience, and social background.

In view of the many economic and health factors, which frequently give rise to criminal tendencies, there remains a tremendous job for society to accomplish. Our statesmen must eliminate most of the outstanding inequities in our social structure, providing greater individual security, improved health, and a better economic opportunity for all our people. Then a most important step will be taken in removing some of the main reasons for crime.

The war has greatly complicated the problems of law-enforcement agencies. In the first place, there remains the constant danger of saboteurs, spies, and enemy agents, all anxious to undermine our military power and the public morale. Furtunately, the splendid work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the able direction of Mr. Hoover, has made these enemy efforts of little value. However, constant vigilance is still necessary for the preservation of life and property at home.

Another factor, which hit agencies charged with the maintenance of law and order, has been the call to arms of many of our most active officers. Yet despite all handicaps, utilization of modern scientific methods have made possible the record achieved. As in all matters mortal, there still remains room for improvement.

The most distressing aspect of the current criminal record in America is the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. Youngsters, still in their teen age, constitute one of the major groups of our criminal offenders. For the average layman, it is difficult to realize that the most frequent arrests in any male age group is 17, 18, and 19 years, respectively.

In a review of the 1944 figures, it is especially shocking to learn that, in a democracy where the voting privilege is denied until the age of 21, our youth under 21 years committed 35 percent of all robberies, 52 percent of burglary, 35 percent of larceny, and 63 percent of auto thefts. Of 110,000 crimes committed against property, fully 40 percent of the offenders were less than 21 years old. What a sad commentary upon the training of the youth of America.

As officers charged with the duty to protect society from crime, you have a most serious responsibility. You will require the active cooperation of all law-abiding citizens. For the most effective discharge of your duty, you need the help of every social agency created to improve living conditions in your community.

It is far better and cheaper to prevent crime than to pursue the criminal, and, after detention, try to rehabilitate him. For example, to direct the excess energy of youth to the gymnasium of a boys' club may prevent his joining a juvenile gang.

The future of America depends upon the character and quality of our youth. The primary problem is one of home training, general education, and character building. However, as leaders in the cause of a progressive order, you should actively promote and help coordinate all welfare and social agencies which can be utilized to ease your burden.

Present social conditions naturally reflect the great dislocations caused by the war. Mothers with patriotic purposes work in war plants, while their neglected children become social problems. The strong guidance of fathers in service is missing in many homes. Children, who should be in school, are working long hours and, though helping the war effort, sometimes associate with the wrong kind of people. Many spend their salaries seeking release from wartime emotions.

Americans dare not wait until juvenile delinquency becomes more critical before combating the causes. We must act now to protect the welfare and future of our youth.

The total number of selected law enforcement officers from every State of the Union, as well as leading foreign police agencies, who have graduated from the National Police Academy, now total 1,049 men. These officials all know the methods taught here. They are all disciples of modern crime detection. These officers can and will be of great assistance in the fight for a decent social order.

Real peace and order cannot be obtained by vast armies of policemen merely trying to use force and arms to crush crime by old-fashioned methods. Today, more than ever before, we need quality, not just quantity, in our law-enforcing agencies. Small, but efficient groups, operating carefully and intelligently, can accomplish far more than a large untrained force. You are being sent forth to assist your community by applying the latest scientific methods placed at your disposal by this specialized training. You will guide others to appreciate the great benefits of modern techniques and efficient Nation-wide cooperation in combating crime.

Today millions of our young men are fighting throughout the world for the preservation of democratic decency. It would be tragic indeed if they came back to find that the home front had fallen down on the job. Our veterans have the right to expect us to safeguard their homes and their relatives, despite all wartime difficulties.

In this sacred trust, the home guard will not fail.

At home here we still have a tremendous task ahead of us. The dislocation of families by war work in distant plants, the growing threat of juvenile delinquency, and the psychological reactions of individuals exposed to the emotional hardships of war, all present problems of the first magnitude. If we intend to insure the proper social climate which will permit orderly progress in keeping with our ideals, all of us must face these new problems frankly and act effectively.

The modern law-enforcement official needs far more than a night stick and a gun to maintain peace and order. The efficient officer must know the nature and extent of local social problems. He must use scientific tests, as well as psychology. As a progressive leader he should effectively mobilize all available agencies in his locality, and throughout the country, for the prevention, as well as the detection of crime. This is a large order but the times call for men of large stature.

As bigger social problems are presented, America needs better trained men to solve them. You are indeed fortunate in having the opportunity of association with the best and receiving the finest training available in your specialized profession. By your conduct and character you can make your profession one of the most progressive and useful in our national life

In a few months the National Police Academy will celebrate its tenth anniversary. During this decade tremendous things have been accomplished by its graduates. If we had time it could be shown how much money society was saved by the special training of these graduates. We could list also the arrests made, convictions obtained, and pardons recommended by these officers.

No set of statistics, however, can adequately convey the heartache averted, nor the deep-felt gratitude for crimes prevented, for lives saved, for missing people recovered, and for the countless worthy services rendered. Even the most comprehensive reporting system cannot reveal these things. For all such essential services, society is indeed grateful to the law enforcement officers, especially to the graduates of this splendid academy.

Our fighting men on all fronts are today going through a most strenuous ordeal. They are bravely offering their lives so that we may live our democratic way. The heroes on the battle front surely deserve all praise and credit for their noble fight.

The general public, unfortunately, does not fully appreciate the fact that right here at home other heroes are waging a relentless war against another deadly foe—the modern criminal. This public enemy is resourceful, crafty, and efficient. His attacks are frequently powerful and against the weak. Your bitter conflict against crime is endless.

To check the constant ravages of crime requires character of the highest order. As well expressed in the motto of the National Police Academy, to win your war you need "Knowledge, Courage, Integrity." The omission of any one part of this trinity of virtues makes the other two practically useless. Like the three-legged stool, it simply cannot stand on two.

The world would be a much better place if more people possessed these great virtues—knowledge, courage, and integrity. I am confident that, after your practical experience and intensive training, you will continue to be the strong champions of law and order. With your essential character and tested ability, you will render a lasting service to your community and to your country.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of universal military training, delivered by Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at the Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., on April 18, 1945. I hope that all Members of the Congress will take time to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet tonight at a time when the hearts of all America, of all humanity, are filled with the hope that a just and enduring peace may be within our reach at last.

In every community of our land, in every corner of the world, freedom loving men and women, weary to desperation of war and death, are turning toward San Francisco with new inspiration and new courage.

In the hands of the delegates of the free nations, as they assemble there next week for their historic conference, lies an opportunity such as has never been given to men before in the history of this globe—the opportunity to free their fellow men from the dread fear and fact of war.

With them into their Conference go the prayers of all the world, the prayers of the common people who fight and die in wars, the prayers of the men who have fought, and are now fighting, on the battlefields of the world. It is men who know the grim agonies of war who best know and cherish peace.

If the seats at San Francisco were to be filled with men who have seen their comrades die on Tarawa, on Okinawa, and Iwo Jima, in Italy and Germany; the gallant fighting men of America, of England, France, Poland, Russia and all the rest of our allies, war would speedily be condemned forever: as it must be!

We of the American Legion—we, whose ranks include men from both World Wars, have confidence in the work that will be done at San Francisco. We have confidence in the leadership of President Harry S. Truman, in his ability to carry out the peace plans launched by his great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As the largest organization of veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 alike, we pledge him all of our support, all of our strength, in carrying the San Francisco Conference to a successful conclusion.

The American Legion is dedicated to the principle of an association of free nations, armed with the force needed to keep the peace, cloaked wth the authority to use that force. Again and again at our national conventions the Legion has spoken. At Chicago last fall the Legion said:

"When peace has been restored to the world, we must be ever vigilant to protect it. Bitter experience of the past proves that peace cannot be preserved unless aggressor nations are promptly and sternly suppressed at the very beginning of any movement inimical to general peace and welfare.

"The cost of maintenance of peace is insignificant compared to the cost of war. Every thinking person now realizes that neither the United States of America nor any other single nation, however great and strong, can maintain peace by its own independent efforts."

In Chicago last fall, as at the 1943 convention, we adhered to the principles stated at our 1942 convention, when we said:

"No peace, however welcome, however promising, can long endure unless it be made secure by the nations which have won it; nations which must ever be prepared in every sense to fight for the rights of free men and freedom-loving peoples.

"We cannot escape, we will not evade, our own responsibility for the maintenance of that peace. We must not forget our stake in it. Every consideration of national interest dictates that we prevent recurrence of the conditions which led to this war."

In 1943 the Legion said:

"Our own national interests must ever be our first concern, and we believe our Nation can best serve and protect its national interests, commensurate with its power and responsibilities, by participation in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent recurrence of war."

We cannot, the Legion has said, forget our stake in peace.

Our stake in the peace. You will find it tonight in every city, every town, every village crossroads in America, where mothers, wives, and sweethearts await fearfully for word of loved ones marching against enemy

guns across the seas. You will find our stake in the hospitals, where the wounded men of this war are fighting their way back to health. You will find it wherever soldiers live and fight and die.

In the months that have passed, I have traveled the length of our land. I have talked to countless men and women—in every walk, in every position of life. I have talked with civilians, with veterans of the last war, and of this.

And I find them united in this determination: That now we must find the way to prevent such another world holacaust as this.

They believe in peace—as we of the Legion do. They believe it is possible to attain it.

They must not be disappointed.

But I have found that, with the clarity of vision which comes to men and women in times of great trial, they believe another thing:

That this time America must be prepared to accept her responsibilities; that America must be ready to preserve and maintain the peace. This time, they tell me, America must be strong, able to meet any challenge that the future may bring.

Wherever I have gone, they have asked me about universal military training. America believes in universal military training today—accepts it as a sure, firm bulwark against whatever the future may bring.

Wherever I have gone, men and women, civilians and veterans alike, have asked me when universal military training was to be enacted into law. I have found the overwhelming sentiment in favor of immediate enactment of such a program.

So great is the demand for action that I have asked the Legion's national defense committee, and the national legislative committee, to gather here in Washington. They have been in session together all day. The members of these committees, too, have been in contact with men and women throughout our Nation in recent months. And their experience has been identical with mine; their judgment coincides with mine: that now—now, before the San Francisco Conference begins, is the time for the Congress to begin consideration of this vital legislation.

They have decided to call upon the Congress for immediate consideration of universal military training and they will do so with all the urgency at their command; with all the strength the Legion possesses.

Behind them, in this decision, lies the full power of the 2,000,000 men and women of the American Legion; in the Legion's 20,000 posts and auxiliary units. Behind them, I know, lies the eager backing of every soldier—and every veteran—of this war. And behind them, too, lies the support of our people.

We have marked time enough. Last winter, active support for universal military training reached a high peak, but factors beyond the control of the American Legion prevented immediate action on this legislation at that time. Interest throughout the country is again high—we must not now disappoint those who have placed their confidence in us. This time we must do all that we can to see that a program of universal military training is enacted into law.

It is the belief of the Legion's national defense and national legislative committees—a belief which I heartily endorse—that immediate consideration of universal military training will strengthen the work of the San Francisco Conference.

America is the hope of the world today. It is in our vast strength, our fresh leadership, our unselfish devotion to the cause of freedom, that the structure of world peace must be built. We must say to the world, as its representatives gather on the coast, that America is prepared to assume the responsibilities of peace; that America is ready to do her share.

We know that peace cannot be won by appeasement; it cannot be won by idle wishing. This time we shall achieve a militant peace, a peace based on justice and on strength. Inherent in the plans for world peace machinery is the armed power needed to put an instant stop to any aggression. We do not contemplate today that never again shall an aggressor power arise. We do believe that in the future we shall be well enough organized, well enough prepared to prevent another Hitler from precipitating us into another world holocaust.

We believe that a strong America is the first step toward success in any plan for peace. And we know that America cannot be strong, cannot be ready to fulfill her role of world leadership for peace, unless her sons are ready and trained to fight.

There will be no time in the future for long preparation. The nature of war has changed. It is possible today for an aggressor nation to strike with the speed of lightning; literally faster than the speed of sound. The next war may see bombs, flying thousands of miles, which can destroy whole cities. That is not a dream; it is almost within the realm of possibility. If, as we confidently believe, the machinery for peace is organized at San Francisco, it must be organized on a basis of reality; ready to meet the conditions of today.

We speak of a world organization prepared to put an immediate stop to aggression. What does that imply?

We know what the aggressor's weapons will be—flying bombs and similar terrors. There is only one answer to the weapons of the future. It is difficult—almost impossible—to turn them back in the air, as England found. Those fantastic weapons of destruction can be defeated only by capturing the sites from which they are discharged. Not until the continent of Europe was seized was England released from their deadly attacks.

Putting an instant stop to aggression in the future means swift mobilization of the aggressor forces of the free world, swift invasion of the aggressor nation, immediate occupation of the aggressor's land. Only in that way in the future can we hope to win a war. For it may well be, in any future attack, that if we must wait to draft, and train, and organize an army, our cities, our factories, the whole productive power on which we depend for victory will be wiped out before we can begin to fight.

That is what is in the minds of the people of America tonight. That is the horror they are determined to prevent.

And it is for that reason that the American Legion urgently asks immediate consideration for universal military training—not as a weapon of war, but as a weapon of peace; as a vital, irreplaceable adjunct to the San Francisco Conference.

War is no longer a soldier's war alone. The people of France, of Poland, Belgium, Holland, will tell you that. It is a war of all the people. Preparing for peace is a civilian task. And universal military training is a civilian program—administered, of course, by the Army and the Navy.

The legislation proposed is a civilian legislation, and I say that with full deference to the members of the Army and Navy sitting with us tonight. We need their support, their united efforts, if this legislation is to succeed. I know that we have it and will continue to have it.

But I say to you tonight, with all the urgency at my command, that universal military training must be given immediate consideration in the Congress.

We must give evidence now before the San Francisco Conference of our intention. We must show that we are ready to work for, and fight for, peace.

A veteran of the European campaign said recently:

"We've got to have military training.

"Next time we've got to start even with the other enemy. The enemy always gets ready a long time before the war starts. He knows there's going to be a war, and he knows when it's going to start.

"We don't. We've never been ready. We always started out behind the enemy, and a lot of our fellows died because of that.

"Just give us an even start next time—and the war won't be so tough. That's all an American asks in a fight—just an even break."

And, by the grace of God, we of the American Legion will do all that we can to see that, in whatever lies ahead, American boys shall have an even break, in training and in the tools of war.

The Legion will not delay, it will not temporize or hesitate, in this campaign.

We must have peace. We must be prepared to maintain the peace. And in that belief the Legion will forge steadily ahead.

Tribute to Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday here in the Senate, and throughout the Nation, tributes were paid to Ernie Pyle. He was employed by and wrote for the Scripps-Howard papers. In the Washington Daily News of today appears an editorial entitled "Ernie." I think it would be appropriate if the editorial from his old associates should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERNIE

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

Ernie Pyle's death diminishes mankind as do few deaths in a world of tragedies. We think you understand why that is so.

He literally was a member of millions of families. Into homes where no one had ever met him he was the well-loved guest.

Rare, but explainable, we think. For few men are truly humble. Few can walk with kings and keep the common touch. Fame, even in its mildest manifestations, inflates the ego.

Ernie went into war as one newspaper correspondent among many. He came back a great figure, as great in his way as Eisenhower or MacArthur or Nimitz. His fellow newspapermen acclaimed him as the top correspondent of this war. Crowds met his plane when he returned to America, gathered when he appeared on city streets.

Yet Ernie went quietly on his way, back to the old home in Indiana, then to New Mexico and his little picket-fenced place at Albuquerque, to sit in the sun and take what rest he could before he went on to another war—in the Pacific.

And never a swelling of the head. Always the frank admission that he hated to go. He felt that his number was up—that he would never return alive. He had no wish to be a hero, or to die a hero's death. He hated war with all his gentle soul. But, believing that it was his job to go on with the story of the

brave men who are fighting this war, he went with a bravery of his own.

So the bell tolls for one of the greatest and most modest souls.

In perhaps the most unforgettable of his war stories, Ernie told of watching as the bodies of many Americans were brought by muleback down a moonlit road from a hill-top battlefield in Italy. Among the dead men was a well-loved captain. In Ernie's words:

"'This one is Captain Waskow,' one of them said quietly.

"Two men unlashed his body from the mule and lifted it off and laid it in the shadow beside the low stone wall. Other men took the other bodies off. Finally there were five, lying end to end in a long row alongside the road. You don't cover up dead men in the combat zone. They just lie there. * * *

"The unburdened mules moved off to their olive orchard. The men in the road seemed reluctant to leave. They stood around, and gradually one by one I could sense them moving close to Captain Waskow's body. Not so much to look, I think, as to say something in finality to him, and to themselves.

"One soldier came and looked down, and he said out loud, 'Goddamit.' That's all he said, and then be walked away. Another one came. He said, 'Goddamit to hell anyway.' He looked down for a few last minutes, and then he turned and left.

"Another man came; I think he was an officer. It was hard to tell officers from men in the half light, for all were bearded and grimy dirty. The man looked down into the dead captain's face, and then he spoke directly to him, as though he were alive. He said, 'I'm sorry, old man.'

"Then a soldier came and stood beside the officer, and bent over, and he, too, spoke to his dead captain, not in a whisper but awfully tenderly, and he said, 'I sure am sorry, sir.'

"Then the first man squatted down, and he reached down and took the dead hand and he sat there for 5 full minutes, holding the dead hand in his own and looking intently into the dead face and he never uttered a word all the time he sat there.

"And then finally he put the hand down, and then reached up and gently straightened the points of the captain's shirt collar, and then he sort of rearranged the tattered edges of his uniform around the wound. And then he got up and walked away down the road in the moonlight all alone."

We on the News who for many cherished years were Ernie's comrades in newspaper work feel about him—though we can't write it that well—as Captain Waskow's comrades felt.

Here in the office, where he used to work, we remember the times he dropped in to call. We were all his friends—the editor, the printers, the newest office boy. We loved him for that shy, unassuming, kindly manner of his, because he understood us, because he was Ernie—a thoroughly nice guy.

And he was like that, wherever he went. In the filling stations and little homes he visited in the years when he went about the country, they remember Ernie. In the fox holes on the fighting fronts, in the camps and stations and the ships at sea, they remember Ernie. He was the man who came to them, and shared the mud and the cold and the danger; he was the man who told their story and expressed their deepest thoughts and feelings, he was the man who wrote for G. I. Joe, simply, movingly, and without heroics. Yes, we all remember Ernie—those of us who worked with him, those to whom he wrote and those he wrote about, the millions of little people of the world.

Though he knew in some hidden depths of his subconscious that his luck had run out, he went out to meet death because he could do no less than those millions of others who were willing to give their lives for something precious.

Address by Father Flanagan, of Boys Town, Nebr., at Banquet in Tribute to Henry Monsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Father Flanagan, of Boys Town, in my State, in tribute to Mr. Henry Monsky, of Omaha, Nebr., who is one of our most distinguished citizens. The address was delivered on the night of February 26, 1945, at a banquet tendered to him by the B'nai B'rith, in honor of Mr. Monsky, at the Commodore Hotel, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we have come here to honor a great man—a man with a brilliant mind and a loving heart—a man whose outstanding virtue is his love for his fellowman founded on the higher precept of his love divine.

Mr. Monsky is a great American, for he possesses those cardinal virtues that make for greatness of the individual, and a nation's greatness is made up of such individuals.

Tonight America is honoring this great man. Most of you distinguished guests know him as the international president of the magnificent organization of B'nai B'rith. I would like to tell you why Mr. Monsky is a great man—for he was great when he came to you. Unlike most of you here, I have known him as a boy; a student at the university; a young lawyer entering upon a professional career—a fellow worker with whom it was my privilege to engage in charitable and welfare fields. He is a member of the board of Father Flanagan's Boys Home, the legal council for Boys Town, and my own attorney. He is my personal friend.

I know that some of the things that I have to say here tonight may be personally embarrassing to our honored guest. I would be greatly disappointed in him if they weren't. They are not said for that purpose, however, but rather to acquaint the members of this distinguished audience with certain things you would not know nor could you be expected to know, for our honored guests is a very humble man.

Mr. Monsky comes from a very honorable and religious family. His boyhood years were closely associated with his school, his home and the synagogue. Unlike most young boys of teen age of his day, young Harry Monsky was a very serious boy, a most exemplary son of a deeply religious parentage; with an ideal home life where Orthodox Jewry was strictly adhered to in his home.

Endowed with a brilliant mind, but unlike most of this type, he was a student too. He worked hard; reading much serious literature, and giving much profound thought to the great problems of life; not only the problems of his current day, but the age old problems that have confronted all the peoples of all times. He had an analytical mind, and could see through problems that have confused and confounded the minds of people, and wondered why these same problems could not have been solved in an easier manner. Young Henry Monsky knew what the world of strife and confusion lacked, and that was love.

His whole life from early childhood was nurtured by that most necessary vitamin. His parents, according to the tenets of their belief, learned to know God, love Him and serve Him. They loved their home and guarded and protected their cherished little ones; establishing for them a sanctuary that was peaceful and attractive; a home full of the ancient traditions of Orthodox Jewry which produced such magnificent and constructive citizens, not only in this country but throughout all the nations of the world.

His school life was not marked by any special outstanding event except that Henry stood at the head of his class in all his subjects. This was not to be wondered at since he possessed a brilliant mind, and applied that mind to serious study under the benign and intelligent supervision of his loving parents. He was not a proud boy. He was not a boastful boy. He seemed to feel that the outstanding success he had in school was only natural, and any credit went to God, his loving parents, and his conscientious teachers.

When he finished his legal education at Creighton University, where he was an A honor student during his whole course, he felt prepared to render legal service to humanity. But Mr. Monsky realized that his life was to be lived in a richer way than just rendering legal service to clients. His home training and total character development fitted him for something greater and more all-absorbing. His mission was to serve humanity. Just like the great Spiritual Doctor and the great Medical Doctor who administered to the spiritual and physical ills of humanity, so did Mr. Monsky, with his brilliant and analytical mind, start out to extricate enslaved minds and hearts from the entanglements of petty quarrels and strife that have become the cancer and poison of hearts and minds of small, puny, and sinful little people. I say little people advisably, for it takes strength and nobility of character, much perseverance, and much prayer to Almighty God for hearts and minds to rise above the sordid, monotonous, sinful, and ugly everyday environment; and through that spiritual strength they become noble and generous, and appreciative of the proper recognition that all good things come from God, and every defect comes from our own depraved and selfishly sinful nature.

I have known and worked with Mr. Monsky in his public life in the city of Omaha for over 30 years. As an attorney he has given his service to the poor, and has participated in the social, charitable, and welfare problems of his community. That service has been given most generously. Were he to give of his legal talents to his clients alone, Mr. Monsky would have become a very wealthy man. He has chosen, however, to give a large percentage of his time to the service of humanity that he might carry out the earnest purpose of his life; namely, to help humanity love instead of hate.

This great purpose of Mr. Monsky's prophetic mission was and is to assist people to live in peace and unity as founded on the great second commandment of love which says "Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God." He wished to teach the whole world by his life which has been a noble example of that commandment, that if man learns to love his fellowman as a son of God and a brother member of the vast family of the human race, he cannot fail to make the effort to love his fellowman at any cost. This brings us to the serious problem that confronts our beloved Nation.

Today America is engaged in a great war. It is a war that will, in many respects, set back civilization for at least 100 years, and needless to say, much evidence of culture will be destroyed, never to be restored.

America is fighting a sacred war. It is a combat between the forces that possess and uphold the justice and rights of individuals as against forces that would destroy those

rights and make for world slavery. When our Nation entered this world conflict, it did so in protest to the totalitarian philosophies of fascism, nazism, and Tojoism. These false philosophies were founded on hate, brought about by nationalism, sectarianism, racial and religious prejudice, segregation and discrimination.

The forces for evil had grown to such proportion that they eclipsed and overpowered among those totalitarian nations all the agencies striving to uphold the dual commandment of the love of God and the love of fellowman. These forces for evil become so many-sided that they stifled every public vestige of religious thought and religious action; set up a machine of propaganda for hate and established a program of elimination by persecution unheard of within the annals of history. Today our American young manhood—the noble flower of our youth—is fighting and bleeding and dying on the battlefields and oceans of the world that the rights of free man—God-given inalienable rights—be preserved for man throughout the whole world. These young men of America, joined with the forces of our allies, are being called upon to uphold with their lives the principles of democracy which emblazon the noble escutcheon of our American Constitution and Bill of Rights. These young men of our Nation are proud of the privilege of upholding those rights, and it is to them and their ultimate victory over the enemies to our Democracy that America must look with gratitude and appreciation.

Among those heroes, living and dead, there existed no distinction as to class or creed or nationality. Side by side in the foxholes of Europe, Asia, Africa, Italy, and the South Pacific, were the Jew and the Christian. They were buddies. They were partners in this magnificent program of heroic self-sacrifice that you and I here at home, the fathers and mothers and children of America, and the whole world, might be able to carry on unhampered by the fear of totalitarian slavery.

We, here at home, have a tremendously important mission to perform. We owe a debt to our patriotic American soldiers that we, in our lifetime, can never pay. It will take the sacrificial devotion of suceeding generations by their recognition of those men of World War No. 1 and 2 to pay that debt, but we must start paying that debt now. What do we owe them? We owe them gratitude for saving the Constitution which guarantees our life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, just as we owe our gratitude to the fathers of the Republic who wrote, and fought and died for it.

How are we going to show this gratitude? There is nothing which our American heroes want from us of mercenary nature. We could not pay for such gratitude with material exchange. They want appreciation of our hearts and minds. They want to see us uphold the great blessings of liberty as exemplified in our daily lives. They want us to learn to live in peace and harmony with our fellow citizens in this great republic. They want us to respect the rights of all our fellow citizens whether black, brown, or yellow; whether Jew or gentile; whether Catholic or Protestant. They want us to realize that no particular race, no particular class, no particular creed is responsible for the building of this great Nation under God, but its wealth, power, influence, and culture have been brought about by all of these working together harmoniously; each respecting the other's viewpoints, his traditions—religious and racial. They want us to live in peace and harmony and prosperity; helping one another; respecting one another; loving one another as we love our Heavenly Father through whom we live, move, and have our being. When we have learned this great lesson of love and good will and unity, then we have started to pay back the debt of gratitude we owe Almighty God, the fathers of the Republic, our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and the noble and patriotic men and women who have defended with their lives these sacred and inalienable rights ever since.

My friends, America is far from acknowledging this debt of gratitude. Many are oblivious of owing any debt to anyone, even God; and the men and women suffering from such lack of faith, selfishness, stupidity, and blindness are groping along life's pathways full of hate, poison, and selfishness; getting what they can out of life from whatever victim who becomes enmeshed in their plans; robbing and stealing his money and destroying his good name. These are the people who have no divine faith, who recognize no God, and who laugh at you and me when we strive to observe in our lives, God's code of moral precepts. These are the little people who, when they grow to such proportion and become a sufficiently important national force, pick for themselves a Tojo, a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Quisling who will sell the interests of his country to dictators. These are the people from whose so-called homes generate the germs which poison the babe in the cradle; germs which grow and multiply and destroy all that is fine, beautiful, holy, and innocent in those innocent little gifts from God. These are the people who are responsible for what people improperly call juvenile delinquency—a monster that is destroying all that is sacred and holy in our society and costing our Nation $20,000,000,000 a year. These are the people who traffic in vice, and that so-called commercialized entertainment partially cloaked with respectability by working around the scum edge of protection by law. These are the people who are encouraging fathers and mothers and adults to come in and taste of the bitter fruits of gambling, drinking, social vice of every kind as they pass along the ugly and sinful pathways of life. These are the people who make our citizenry less capable of being proper teachers by example and precept of the youth of our land. Gentlemen, from such people spring the poison of segregation, and from such sources are born hatred and prejudice of race and creed.

How can this cancer be eliminated? My friends, it is not so easy. This cancer is very deep-seated. It cannot be eliminated by calling names or finding fault with this class or that group, this religion or that race. The men and women so depraved from the vices I have mentioned have become so because they have cast off all that was noble and good from their particular class or creed or race. This defect made it possible for them to become fomentors of race and religious bigotry. We must attack this cancer at the source. We must use every means at our disposal to rebuild the family home into the sanctuary which God intended, that it may become again a fit and holy, sacred, and attractive sanctuary for our beautiful and innocent children. We must encourage those parents to get back to their family prayers, upholding the sanctity of family life and resting it in the bosom of the God of Love—our Creator. We must get back to our churches and our synagogues and become a living, vital part of those sacred edifices of God's worship. We must make these churches houses of prayer and worship, and not places of social entertainments or meeting places for political platforms. We must release our children from our public schools every day at a certain stated time for religious instruction by the various and respective ministers, priests, and rabbis, and their coteachers, that these children be given an opportunity of knowing and learning about God and His commandments.

Let us attend to first things first—our God-given duties. Parenthood is the most sacred office, endowed with the highest responsible duties ever given to man and woman. There are very few parents so depraved who would want to destroy and poison in the cradle the complete future of their little offsprings by failing to give them those necessary spiritual vitamins that will insure strength and beauty and sanctity for their adult lives. Any adult treatment rendered by the conference of Christians and Jews help much, but it is not sufficient. Much effort of this fine organization is wasted on adult men and women who are not sufficiently interested in problems of race and religious persecution. While they, themselves, may not be affected with such poison, they may consider themselves unfit to become apostles and missionaries for the cause. We have always such types who are indifferent to the important and basic principles of democracy. They wish to enjoy all the good things of life for themselves—freedom, equality, rights and privileges, but they let the others do the fighting and worrying and working, and sacrificing. It just reminds me of the so-called conscientious objector in times when the very heart of American democracy is bleeding to death, and with it our noble sons and daughters. It is very convenient indeed for some to say "I cannot bear arms. I cannot kill my fellowman." Those very same people would hardly put up an argument if they were face to face with an enemy who threatened to kill or rob or destroy the sanctity of their individual homes or their loved ones in that home. They would fight to the death to protect them. However, it is quite convenient for them to put forth this argument of the conscientious objector so long as they know there are enough Bill Joneses and John Smiths down the block who willingly answer the call of our country to protect the sacred sanctuaries of the homeland, and safeguard the future of America from slavery.

I believe you will find at the bottom of much of this bigotry, racial and religious prejudice, and indifferent attitude on the part of many people enjoying the blessings of citizenship. To their way of thinking it does not concern them. Let others more active, more interested, get into the fight. Such people remind me of the blindness and lack of foresight of those who live up on top of the hill and see their fellowman down in the valley floundering beneath the raging and onrushing floods that claim life and property and destruction of every vestage of man's handiwork. "It's not my property. It's not my concern," they will tell you. As long as we have a cancer affecting the heart of America, and have people indifferent to the existence of it, ignoring it by not striving to eliminate it by their personal assistance, we shall have serious difficulty in rooting it out and destroying it.

I consider racial and religious prejudice one of the greatest and most insidious of all ills that attack our social life today. It is dangerous because it works from within, within the very minds and hearts of human beings whose actions against their fellowman are a direct result of such inner thoughts. These thoughts are dangerous because of the moral transgression of the fundamental law of God's love which should rule the hearts and minds and be the motivation of man's actions. These indifferent classes of people do not realize that by their laissez-faire attitude they are inviting a condition which can easily become one of great concern to themselves some day. If we remain indifferent to the expressions of hate being vomited in our presence against someone or some class, such indifference gives encouragement to those messengers of hate who will grow bolder and become more and more aggressive in their satanic program enlisting others to their cause. I remember such a case. It happened within my own personal experience. A soap-box orator of the fire-brand type, with a political ax to grind, considered it beneficial to his particular cause to denounce a certain minority

group of foreign-born citizens living in and around a large industrial center. They were poor people trying to make an honest living, learning the ways of democracy and striving in every manner possible to obey the laws of God and man as best they knew them. This politician was defeated for some office and was bitter against this small minority group because he felt they did not vote for him. He succeeded in arousing enmity against these poor people by inciting a number of young hoodlums who stealthily during the night, broke windows in their homes and humble places of business, beating them when they came forth to protect those homes and loved ones. While no lives were lost, many had to be hospitalized and many thousands of dollars of damage to property ensued.

The matter passed on; nothing was done about it, and most of these poor people had lost their life earnings—all because of one selfish man inciting a mob of hoodlums who liked excitement and a fight.

This grand and noble organization over which our honored guest is the international president is to be commended for its far-reaching influence toward bringing to public attention, the duties and responsibilities of Americans, and the urgent need for greater unity and amity among the various nationalities and creeds which make up this family of American democracy. The B'nai B'rith has for over 100 years been developing a constructive program that is aggressive and patriotic. It has a twofold purpose—that of elevating the minds and hearts of the Jewish people toward a higher and more spiritual level of patriotic citizenship, and teaching by example and precept their fellow citizens of other races and creeds the necessity for brotherly unity and a cooperative program that will solve our great national and local problems.

This is the mission that Mr. Monsky set out to do as a young man over 30 years ago. This was and is his unselfish program. It is a part of him. How well he has done this, you and I know. We are here tonight to offer him our humble appreciation. Anything we could say to him will not make him any more important, will not cause him to become proud. We cannot add to his social and mental stature. He is beyond being spoiled by praise. But we want you to know, Mr. Monsky, that we do appreciate the fine patriotic work you have done and are doing for America, and our hearts are grateful to God for the unselfish sacrifice you have made of your time and your God-given talent to make your fellow man a better citizen, and America greater because of you.

God bless you, Mr. Henry Monsky.

Rehabilitation of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the February 11 issue of the Miami Daily News appears a very informative article by Hon. W. D. Pawley, of Miami, Fla., on the subject of the future of India and India's contribution to the well-being of the world provided the countries interested in India's future properly cooperate. I ask unanimous consent that this very illuminating article, which comes out of a vast experience and a wide background, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

INDIA: ITS FUTURE BRIGHT FOR POST-WAR JOBS—PAWLEY SEES VAST TRADE IF BRITAIN, UNITED STATES COOPERATE

(By William B. Pawley)

The rehabilitation of India constitutes one of the great post-war problems of the world, in my opinion.

Here lies the opportunity for American and British collaboration in the industrialization and agricultural development of a state which I find to be eager for such assistance as technologists and industrialists with the know how can give to it.

Here lies the opportunity for jobs for millions of men and women now engaged in war work—American men and women and British men and women.

Can some understanding be reached by the United States and Great Britain where the best interests of both nations will be served and India placed on a self-sustaining basis? I merely pose the question. The answer must come from those who formulate national policies.

PLANS LAID FOR FERTILIZER PLANT

On September 15, 1943, while in Delhi arranging for the United States Army Air Forces to take over Hindustan Aircraft, the Secretary of Supply for India requested me to call on him for a discussion of a matter important to India's war effort. Accompanied by L. C. McCarty, our chief engineer, I called at the Secretary's office, where several hours were given to a discussion of the possibility of the Intercontinent Corporation undertaking the construction of a 50,000-ton ammonium sulphate (fertilizer) plant.

The secretary of supply told me that it would be a great contribution to the war effort if I would undertake to do this job; that seven plants were required, but he thought we were fully qualified to undertake the construction of one. He asked me to look into the matter, to make a study of the subject, and let him know if we would undertake it.

Immediately I cabled my company's New York office to proceed with a complete investigation of ammonium-sulfate manufacture. McCarty returned to Bangalore where our engineers were instructed to obtain all available information on the subject. Sir Jnan Chandra Gosh, president of one of India's leading technical institutes and one of the world's great scientists, assisted materially. He and his staff had been making a study of this subject for some time and placed at our disposal much data. It was Dr. Gosh who telegraphed the prime minister of Travancore suggesting that our company be requested to undertake the construction of a fertilizer plant for that state.

VAST RESOURCES ARE REVEALED

The maharaja and prime minister of the state of Travancore extended to Mrs. Pawley and me an invitation to visit their state. They placed at our disposal facilities to travel extensively throughout the entire state to inspect the various industrial projects already in operation or under construction, such as the aluminum plant, the hydroelectric power facilities, and the reclamation of vast areas of submerged lands.

This latter project was a tremendous undertaking. Water in many cases was 6 and 7 feet deep. Dams had to be constructed, large electrically operated pumps had to be installed for pumping the water out when the dams were completed. Irrigation systems had to be installed because water must flow slowly over rice paddies during the early stages of rice growth. We visited schools and colleges.

Everywhere we went we were received with a kindness and consideration that causes one to feel so friendly to India. We found it to be a most progressive state. Everyone connected with the government of the state of Travancore appeared to be keen, intelligent, educated, and ambitious for the development of his state and his country. There was much curiosity on the part of students in schools and universities we visited regarding many of the new ideas being developed in the United States.

After touring the state we returned to Trivandrum for conferences with the prime minister. I was invited to undertake the building of their ammonium-sulfate plant. The recommendation of Dr. Gosh had been sufficient. I signed a contract to build this factory.

JOURNEY TO DELPHI

The prime minister, several officials of a Travancore industrial organization who were assisting the government in the financing and development of the state of Travancore's first large chemical plant, and I journeyed to Delhi to obtain the blessing of the Indian Government, and to secure the United States dollar exchange, which the Indian Government must, in all cases, get permission from the London-United States Dollar Control Board to authorize. The United States exchange was necessary for the purchase of machinery and plant in the United States.

Some months previous to my original discussion of this matter with the secretary of supply for the Government of India, a board had been formed consisting of a number of leading Indian and British experts and scientists to study fertilizer requirements and the best way to cope with a permanent eradication of India's famine problem. This board had recommended the construction of seven 50,000-ton ammonium-sulfate plants to be built in various parts of India, in the centers of the largest agricultural regions.

When McCarty and I visited the secretary of supply, he permitted us to read some statistics that had been gathered by this board on the production of rice and other products per acre for many parts of the world, and the quantity of fertilizer per acre consumed by these countries. India was at the bottom of the list in the use of fertilizer and also on production per acre. This document stated that by the use of 100 pounds of ammonium sulphate per acre in India, rice production coud be increased from 750 to 1,800 pounds per acre.

RICE IMPORTS

India had been importing large quantities of rice from Burma and Thailand, but this supply had been cut off because of the war. This, coupled with other natural causes, had produced tremendous suffering for India's vast population. The peak of the crisis was in late 1943, but famine continued to exist in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Malabar, and Travancore. It was estimated that direct deaths from starvation in 1943 exceeded 1,000,000 and famine orphans were far in excess of 100,000. Tens of thousands of widows and children were rendered destitute.

There exists today tens of millions who continue to survive starvation, but who are weak and undernourished. This great population is constantly subject to and is easy prey to diseases that are so prevalent in that part of the world—such as dysentery, cholera, malaria, and pneumonia.

There have been great epidemics of malaria raging in Bengal. The people of Travancore were also greatly undernourished, although this is one of the most progressive states in India. They did not have sufficient rice paddy land for cultivation. They produced only 45 percent of their requirements.

SUBSTITUTE FOODS

These people for centuries had depended mainly on rice as their staple food. It would

not be easy to teach them the use of a substitute, although the Maharajah and the Prime Minister were active in efforts to have substitutes grown. Thousands of acres of tapicca were planted under government supervision and direction.

I was told by the Prime Minister that this was a temporary substitute; that it did not have sufficient nourishment to carry his population through for many years; that the rice production of their State must be increased because there was apparently no immediate hope of obtaining shipments from abroad. Thailand and Burma were cut off because of the war; shipping facilities were not available and even if stocks were available, it would have to be distributed throughout India to care for 300,000,000 people, whereas his state of Travancore had only a population of 6,000,000.

DIFFICULTIES FACED

When the prime minister, Mr. Menon, chief engineer of Travancore, Mr. Sesasayee, president of the Chemical Fertilizers, the company undertaking to help the state in the development of this plant, and I had arrived in Delhi, we were hopeful that in a few days the entire matter would be approved and the United States dollars made available. This was not the case. We ran into difficulties. We found it was not easy for the Government of India to okay the construction of a plant for the state of Travancore to be built by an American firm and to be financed with United States dollars allocated by the London Control Board. Travancore had ample funds in sterling and in rupees, but she is not a free agent in the use of United States dollars, even though that state may have received millions of United States dollars for its products sold to the United States.

India needed 350,000 tons of ammonium sulphate. It was hard for the Government of India to decide just where the seven plants were to be located. To approve a plant for one state would raise the problem of possibly other states immediately making similar demands. Three and a half million dollars were necessary for the purchase of that portion of the plant which had to be bought in the United States. The equivalent of another three and a half million would be spent in rupees or sterling for that portion of the plant which had to be constructed in India.

REACTIONARIES BALK

There are always a few reactionaries in every government. In Delhi there were officials who were not sympathetic to permitting Americans to "get their foot in the door." We argued for days in an effort to convince the Government of India of the necessity for this project; that it was essential that this plant and other similar ones be constructed without delay. We argued that it would contribute to British-American relations because we did not believe it was healthy for American periodicals and magazines to show pictures of people starving on the streets of Calcutta and writing stories of this great famine problem which so many people were willing to lay at the door of the British Government.

Having lived in India three and a half years, I did not agree that this great famine could be attributed to British Government neglect. The 1943–44 famine was, to a great extent, a man-made catastrophe, although contributing to it were factors such as floods, cyclone and an extremely poor crop year.

BLAMED ON WAR

The main cause had been the war, which tied up all rail transportation on high priority for military traffic. You could not get permits or priorities for adequate food and medical supplies to be moved by rail. Water transportation had been badly crippled by requisition and by great destruction of small boats. Large numbers of India's ablest personnel were either in the Army or engaged in war work, and, unfortunately, many were political prisoners.

I sincerely believed if either London or the officials in Delhi procrastinated or deliberately prevented the construction of Travancore's ammonium sulfate plant and other projects of this nature purely on the basis of an American firm doing it, or for the industrialization of India, which many Indians think England does not wish to occur, I would then know that future famine difficulties could be attributed directly to London.

Obviously the people of India had to be fed; the millions of dollars being collected in the United States from benevolent sources for famine relief for India would not even temporarily alleviate the trouble. This was a well-known fact. Permanent measures must be taken.

EFFORT LIMITED

Charles Taft of the State Department was in charge of handling the benevolent dollars collected in this country and with this money medical supplies, and so forth, were purchased and shipped to India. On arrival at Calcutta, relief supplies were handled by the Friends, the Quaker organization, who in turn were using the facilities of other charitable organizations in Bengal. Yet I was frequently told by these people that while the effort seemed large, it was not touching the surface of their demand. It was for this reason that I felt permanent measures, such as the building of fertilizer plants to increase the quantity of food produced by the Indians themselves, was the only sound basis. I tried to point out that I was not coming into this project as an outsider. I had been invited to do this job by the secretary of supply—an Englishman. Three months had intervened and vested interests had appeared. Some opposition from London apparently also had developed.

It was at this time that I read in a Delhi newspaper that $1,200,000 in United States benevolent funds, of the United States British War Relief Fund, collected by Americans, had been allocated to Indian famine relief. I could not reconcile the failure of an American firm to obtain permission to do a very necessary work with the public's willing contribution of millions of dollars to this same famine condition which we were trying to relieve on a more permanent basis.

APPEAL TO WASHINGTON

I could not remain in India any longer as pressing matters required my return to America. In Washington, I placed before members of the American Government the details of our project. Everywhere it met with sympathetic understanding. Many officials in various departments of the Government were glad to help. I am told that London was approached on the subject, and approximately 1 year from the day the matter was first mentioned, approval was obtained; the dollar exchange was authorized.

I had been invited to do this job by a high official of the Government of India—an Englishman. I traveled extensively in India and saw the results of a terrific famine. My company had undertaken this job as a contribution to the war effort, without profit. I know how difficult it would be for England to spare the machinery and equipment at this time to do the job. I understand thoroughly England's post-war problem and her necessity to hold on to the major portion of her export trade. I am not anti-British. I believe that all who are familiar with the facts would agree. Yet I am willing to fight, if necessary, in order that a job of this kind be done where the benefits were so great and the need so urgent.

FIRST PLANE FACTORY

My original visit to India was at the request of the Indian Government. I had been invited to Delhi to discuss the construction of India's first aircraft factory. This job we did at Bangalore, India. We operated it for 3 years, and in September 1943 it was taken over by the United States Army Air Forces. We had obviously been invited to build and operate this aircraft factory because of the experience gained by our organization in building and operating three factories in China for the Chinese Government.

The Intercontinent Corporation was the first group ever to undertake aircraft manufacturing, either in China, Burma, or India. The Japanese destoyed the plants in China, but the one in India employs 14,500 Indian technicians and is contributing materially to the war effort in India.

This plant has been converted to a maintenance and overhaul base for all American aircraft operating in the China-Burma-India theater.

During my 3½ years in India, I had an opportunity to meet many of India's leading industrialists, scientists, educators, and statesmen. I found a real sympathy for American methods, American production, American speed, and American "know how."

We had done a good job at Bangalore.

Throughout Indian this plant was well known and I found splendid collaboration between our American technicians and our Indian staff. They worked together in complete harmony and understanding. Hundreds of times I have been told by leading Indian industrialists that they greatly appreciate the American approach to the Indian situation. I had agreed to do the Travancore fertilizer plant on a no-profit basis because I felt it was essential that it be done, and much opposition could develop if it could be demonstrated that our only objective was a selfish one of profits. I did feel, however, that there is and must be great opportunity, post-war, in India and other similar parts of the world, where American ingenuity and American technicians could assist in post-war world industrialization and rehabilitation.

I have been repeatedly told by important industrialists and statesmen that America would be welcome in India's post-war rehabilitation and development. This is essential to the United States in that millions of people now engaged in the war effort must return to civilian occupation. There is not sufficient opportunity and jobs unless we participate in world development and post-war rehabilitation.

Again I must say that I am not unmindful of England's great contribution to the war effort or how badly hit, financially, she has become as a result of the war. I also realize that she needs and must have a large share in the export trade of the post-war world. I am sincerely in favor of America and England reaching an understanding which will enable the peoples of both countries to operate post-war without the animosities and hatreds and problems that will develop unless some such understanding can be had.

Importance of Air-Power Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the country is tremendously interested in subjects relating to the importance of American air power. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that editorials entitled "Preserving Our Air

Power," "The Role of Air Power," and "Surplus Planes," which recently appeared in the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where they may be studied by the Congress and the country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 16, 1945]

PRESERVING OUR AIR POWER

The importance and the complexity of the problems involved in maintaining the preeminence which the United States has achieved in the air and discussed in the spring issue of the Harvard Business Review. The article, Preserving American Air Power, is the work of Prof. Lynn L. Bollinger and Prof. Tom Lilley, authors of the widely discussed Harvard studies on the Disposal of Surplus Aircraft and the Financial Position of the Aircraft Industry, and Albert E. Lombard, Jr. Taking the position that our continued leadership in air power is threatened by the absence of either an adequate, up-to-date, national air policy or a consistent plan of action, the authors pose the following significant questions:

What size peacetime air forces will meet our military needs and still be economically feasible?

What Government policies should be adopted to stimulate a healthy rate of technical progress?

How can a properly balanced and rapidly expansible nucleus of productive capacity be maintained in peacetime?

To what extent should plans for any future wartime expansion rely upon the peacetime aircraft companies, and to what extent should such an expansion involve conversion of automobile and other nonaircraft industries?

What role should civil aviation and exports play in supporting our peacetime military aircraft industry?

What plans for transition from the present war to peace should be made in advance to assure the preservation of an industry adequate for tomorrow's tasks?

How should the air forces and Government civil agencies concerned with aviation be most effectively organized?

The authors believe that in any future war the immediate need for air-transport equipment and skills is likely to be far greater than it was early in this war. They believe, however, that the development of certain military aircraft engines and components closely parallels the development of civil transport equipment, and they also maintain that it will be necessary, if our air-power policies are to be carried out effectively in the future, to de fine clearly just where the functions of the Government cease and where those of private organizations begin, especially in view of the fact that more than 80 percent of all aircraft manufacturing facilities erected during the war now are Government-owned.

The study reveals that various plans are being discussed to meet the obvious need of coordination among the closely interrelated problems. These include the setting up of a committee composed of top representatives from each executive department concerned with aviation; the use of an existing or a new congressional committee to make recommendations on basic issues, after hearing testimony of executive agencies and private groups, or the appointment of a Presidential board similar in general character to the Morrow Board.

A final point is that unless some means of arriving at consistent policies for air power now is adopted, the economic costs and military risks of "muddling through" can be disastrous.

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1945]

THE ROLE OF AIR POWER

The war in Europe is roaring toward its close in swift and furious campaigns unprecedented in history. Over superhighways or across the open countryside, through towns bedecked with white flags or surrendering in advance by telephone, the mighty columns of Allied tanks and motorized infantry and artillery are racing ahead from 20 to 50 miles a day, overrunning all opposition, surrounding and bypassing stubborn centers of resistance for later liquidation, chasing the remnants of a once-proud German Army before them in a fantastic pursuit, while behind them service troops organize communication lines, build bridges, and bring up supplies in record time.

It is a field day for the ground troops who, of necessity, must still finish any war, occupy enemy territory, and force capitulation upon even the most fanatical foe. It still means blood and sweat and tears, but the ground troops are the first to rejoice that, for the most part at least, they have left the misery of the trenches and the fox holes behind them, and that each additional mile they cover brings them that much nearer to victory.

The main credit for this spectacular performance goes, of course, to the courage, the skill, and the zeal of the ground troops themselves and their commanders. But it is likewise true that the basis for their success was laid long ago, and is still being laid every day, anew, by that other mighty Allied arm, the Air Force, which first turned the tide of Hitler's success, which smashed his arsenals and crushed his own air arm, which literally blazed the trail for the Allied armies from Normandy to Berlin, and which is now protecting them from enemy interference behind their advancing spearheads. As General Kuter, Acting Chief of Staff of the Army Air Forces, emphasizes, "strategic bombing has paid off in Germany, and Eisenhower's men on the ground are receiving the dividends today." Just how the Air Force work paid off, and how great the dividends are, are being revealed only now as the Allied armies proceed with the occupation of Germany.

Wherever the Allied armies go, they find Germany's major cities in ruins, their armament factories crumbled into dust, their transportation systems destroyed, their workers living under conditions which greatly decreased their efficiency and productivity, their populations so terrified that they hail the Allied troops, not as the conquerors they come, but as the liberators, which they are—liberators from the incessant rain of destruction from the skies that ceases with their arrival. By driving their people to the limit of human endurance, by hiding their remaining factories in forests or below the ground, or moving them to less exposed areas, the Nazis have been able to maintain sufficient armament production to keep large armies in the field, and as a weapon which was to win the war alone the air arm fell short of exaggerated expectations. But in the end the destruction of matériel and morale began to tell. And if today the Allied armies are nearing Berlin, if their losses are running at only one-twelfth of the enemy's, and if the war has been really brought home to the German populace, the Air Force can claim a good part of the credit.

It can claim further credit for the incalculable boon that while every enemy movement is immediately subject to air bombardment, and has been ever since Normandy, the wide-open movements of the Allied armies and their sometimes tenuous communication lines are wholly safe. For the German Air Force, which was virtually driven from the skies in more than 2 years of aerial warfare, but which tried to stage a comeback during the Battle of the Bulge and scored its last success in the destruction of the Remagen railroad bridge, has now been knocked out definitely. No fewer than 1,800 German planes have been destroyed in 1 week, and the remaining members of the once wholly Nazified Luftwaffe have so little stomach left to tackle the Allied air armadas that they are beginning to flee to neutral countries, and according to some reports, actually staging a revolt.

More persuasively than ever before, the final phase of the war has demonstrated that while air power alone cannot win a war, the loss of airpower entails inevitable defeat. That lesson, already written in the skies over Germany, is now being written in the skies over Japan. And that lesson may be also assumed to fix the final role of air power in a modern war.

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1945]

SURPLUS PLANES

The airplane technical committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce is studying ways to make good use of surplus aircraft no longer needed by the armed services. Tentative plans call for scientifically controlled crash testing of as many as 10,000 fighters, bombers, and transports for the purpose of uncovering new secrets in design and performance and accelerating the development of greater safety and efficiency for civil as well as military aircraft. The aircraft industry has recommended that the program be handled by a Government-sponsored board with representation from the Army, Navy, Civil Aeronautics Administration, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, airplane operators, and aircraft manufacturers.

A survey made by these agencies has already shown that more than 50 separate types of structural and performance tests, impossible without quantities of cheap and flyable airplanes, could be conducted under such a program. They would include flight tests under conditions exceeding normal requirements to fix performance limits. It is believed that such tests, in which the pilot might have to abandon the plane in flight, could well provide answers to present riddles of stability and control, as well as flutter and vibration characteristics. Investigations of engine life at extreme high powers could be carried on with a sufficient number of aircraft to provide statistically acceptable results. The scientific crashing of radio-controlled or pilot-abandoned aircraft in the view of high-speed cameras would doubtless provide additional information on structural failures under crash conditions. This procedure might well result in developments of safer techniques in forced landings.

Aircraft declared surplus by the armed forces, including both combat and transport types, have served their country well. Under the research testing program now proposed many of them might write a final chapter of usefulness which would lead to further marked advancement in the efficiency and safety of flight.

Tax Abatement for Injured Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week a young fighter pilot from Nanticoke City in my district came into my office for some advice as to his income tax. He had lost one leg in action and part of his left arm. He owed $165 back income tax. I never felt such a shock in my life. No one in the revenue office could do anything for him. They all felt as badly as I did. This boy was not seeking a favor, he was not protesting, he merely wanted information as to who to pay and how and when. I am doing the protesting unknown to him—for him and his fellow servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Internal Revenue Code having to do with increasing tax abatements for men injured and disabled in the armed services by disease, wounds, or other injury when approved as a total disability by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and I ask as well for other tax abatements for men and women in the armed forces, including cancelation of income tax during certain periods, repayments for certain payments made and other increases of exemptions, added abatements, and repayments as set forth in my bill which I now present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Publicity of Proceedings at the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Commendable Action," from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of April 4, 1945, which urges that the proceedings at the San Francisco Conference be made public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENDABLE ACTION

The Allen County Republican Club is deserving of commendation for its pioneering a double-headed drive, which could develop into a national movement, for halting the Government's continuing practice of making secret agreements.

Two resolutions recently forwarded to Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE, of the Fourth District, as well as the two Indiana Senators, are particularly pertinent at this time, with the San Francisco Conference less than a month away.

The first resolution commits the club to leadership of a movement "in this and other communities" to demand that all sessions of the San Francisco meeting be open to the public through the press and radio; and that in the event an international governing body is set up at the conference, a day-to-day record of its proceedings be kept and published, as are the proceedings of our own Congress.

The second resolution deals more specifically with the practice of Mr. Roosevelt and Administration spokesmen in making secret agreements, whereby the Nation is committed to things of which its people know nothing.

The resolution calls directly for steps leading toward the presentation to the people of a Constitutional Amendment, "giving all agreements and understandings between this Nation and any other nation, the status of international treaties;" and that a "completely detailed report of every agreement, understanding or treaty by the President or other person in authority be immediately made to the Senate."

The result of such an amendment would be, of course, to give the Senate a chance to approve or disapprove, under the two-thirds rule, any agreement made by Mr. Roosevelt or any of his representatives.

Such an amendment has long been needed, but lack of it has done the Nation more harm since the advent of the Roosevelt regime than ever before. Secret agreements between officials of this country and others have been executed now and again for many years.

Mr. Wilson, of recent history, and his personal representative, Col. Edward House, performed their share of such acts at the time of World War No. 1.

But the fact remains that Mr. Roosevelt has probably made more extensive use of this pernicious instrument than any of his predecessors, and it is a foregone conclusion that he will continue to make use of it until he is forcibly restrained by constitutional provision.

The President has discovered that within broad limitations he can make virtually all-inclusive "executive agreements," and thereby completely bypass the constitutional provision, which simply says that treaties must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The logical way to stop it is to put all agreements in the same class with what the Constitution refers to as treaties.

It is to be hoped that the movement started here by the Allen County Republican Club gains wide attention and subsequent action.

A Labor Leader Pleads for New Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a reprint of an article which appeared in the Reader's Digest for December 1944 which carried the message of one of America's outstanding labor leaders, Mr. Matthew Woll, seems so timely to me and of such great general interest to the Congress and the people of the United States that I wish to insert that article in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Woll's article first appeared in the magazine Future, the magazine for young men, and created such an interest among its readers that it was condensed for republication in the Reader's Digest.

For many years he has been a vice president of the American Federation of Labor and a member of its executive council. By trade he is a photoengraver. For 25 years he was president of the International Photo-Engravers Union. During all of that time he has been regarded as one of the outstanding men in organized labor.

Because the incentive principle for the establishment of new businesses is of such great and underlying importance to the creation of new enterprises, I feel quite certain that those who read this article will recognize that the interests of labor will be served best by recognition of the fact that no man or group of men will hazard their money in starting new ventures if there is not a reasonable chance of regaining the investment with a profit.

As Members of Congress we cannot ignore that fundamental fact. We must provide the means for unshackling business so that it can proceed under its own natural momentum.

Mr. Woll's article is as follows:

A LABOR LEADER PLEADS FOR NEW ENTERPRISES

(By Matthew Woll)

One of the most important things this country must do is to foster a healthy birth rate of new businesses, if we are to be ready for the great change-over from war work to peaceful production. There is always a high death rate; recorded business failures range between 12,000 and 15,000 a year in normal times, and many more thousands of enterprises quietly fold up without going through a formal legal process. Every death of a business throws people out of work, reduces by a few or by thousands the number of available jobs.

In the past we could count on a business birth rate which, like our human birth rate, would more than offset the deaths. After the war I do not think we can count on this, unless we wipe out some of the restrictions which add up to throttling birth control.

This is the way businesses are born: An ingenious and industrious mechanic devises a new and better way of doing an old task, or he invents a new product. With his own savings, and perhaps the savings of some friends, he sets up a little shop of his own. He employs a few men, eventually hundreds of men; and not infrequently his little enterprise becomes a great industry giving work to thousands.

We have always thought of this as a typical American story—this system of opportunity for individual enterprise—despite its admitted imperfections. It has worked, in the main; it has, over the years, provided an ever-improving standard of living for an ever-increasing number of workers.

But now our Federal tax system, which has grown up haphazardly, and besides has been distorted by war necessities, strongly discourages anyone from bringing a new business into the economic world.

For example, if the mechanic I mentioned wants to start his own shop now the tax outlook is enough to deter him.

New business ventures do not commonly make money from the outset. The little shop probably will lose money for 3 or 4 years. Then, its early mistakes corrected, its reputation established, its clientele built up, the shop begins to earn profits. Thereupon the tax collector steps in. Taking no reasonable account of the losses incurred in the struggle to get established, he taxes the earnings heavily. "Heads, I win; tails, you lose," says the tax law.

Suppose the new shop does somehow keep out of the red from the start, manages to break even, or a little better, and at the end

of the inevitable lean period of the early years begins to earn a reasonable return on the capital invested. The tax laws do not call such earnings reasonable at all; they call the increase over the meager returns of the early years excess profits and soak them hard.

In spite of this, our ambitious mechanic perseveres, puts earnings back into the business, buying new and better machines, hiring more and more people. Eventually, because he is old and wants to retire, or maybe because he wants to start another business, he sells out. Then he is taxed on "capital gains." He originally put in perhaps $10,000; he sold out for $100,000; most of this represents income he denied himself over the years, sacrifices he made to build up his business. But the tax laws treat him just the same as if he had won $90,000 in a lucky fling on the stock exchange.

Suppose he doesn't sell out. His corporation pays an income tax on its earnings. The stockholders get their dividends—and pay more income taxes on the dividends. This may not mean much to the man who has bought 10 shares of some big corporation as a place for some of his savings, but it is particularly discouraging to the smaller business owned by the men who operate it. They and their business both have to pay taxes on the same earnings.

The giants of industry are not all of America by any means. They count for less, in the long run, than the little firms employing 15 or 30 people, managed by ambitious, imaginative employers, dreaming of growth. These are enterprises started by men who saved and borrowed capital while they were at the bench. Such enterprises are the backbone of a free United States. Furthermore, this is the way most new things get their start. and without new processes and new products we are lost in the post-war world, on both the home and international fronts.

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation began to build planes in 1933. It had only a few thousand dollars, lots of borrowed money, liabilities far in excess of its assets. It fought its way ahead with venturesome courage. Now, as we all know, it employs thousands of workers and is an important part of our national strength. Harvard University's School of Business recently analyzed the history of the company, year by year, and showed that under present tax laws it could never have grown—or even survived. Yet, as Harvard remarks, "unless risk-taking of the type illustrated by Lockheed is multiplied many times over in the post-war economy, the Nation's hopes for peace-time prosperity, and high employment by private enterprise, will be tragically shattered."

But risk taking won't be multiplied unless there is an incentive. It's human and entirely American to start a new business in the hope of profit. It's not human nature to risk money and effort with small chance of profit. To recognize this in our tax legislation is simple logic.

There are many steps which may be taken for expanding production and employment after the war without relying at all on Government help. All that Congress need say to business is, "If you take a chance with your money and go into a new line or broaden your present activities, you are doing your country a service. You're employing more people and giving your fellow citizens a new or improved product. So, as a reward for taking this risk, we'll give you some consideration in your tax bill."

New enterprises might be given freedom from all taxes for, say 3 to 5 years. Or these businesses might be taxed more lightly than old, less daring concerns for a certain time. However, such special consideration should not be allowed a company that denies its employees equal consideration—that is, the right to promote their economic welfare.

Special provision might be made for the averaging of losses by new firms over a 5-year rather than a 12-month calendar. There is no lack of possible methods. Once our tax policy recognizes that we must encourage the birth rate of new business, the details can be worked out.

We shall win the bitterest war this Nation ever has known through the magnificent efforts of our fighting men and of the men and women who are producing the implements of victory. We shall win largely because of the qualities our way of life has developed in us—resourcefulness, ingenuity, individual initiative. These are the qualities which regimentation thwarts.

When this war is won, the millions of men now in uniform, the millions of war workers will need peacetime jobs. These energetic, intelligent, ambitious workers—the best in the world—will not tolerate a protracted period of idleness and frustration. They will demand and they will get jobs—somehow, from someone. The question is, how and from whom?

If business should fail in this greatest test, I fear the result would be that the people would demand that the Government provide work. I, for one, do not want to see individual opportunity and freedom smothered by such state capitalism.

Payments on our wartime obligations, in addition to other services which will be the duty of our Federal Government, will increase our annual budget to somewhere around $20,000,000,000. We shall be able to meet that budget with normal taxation if we have a high national income, which can come only from a high level of production and a high degree of employment. The graduated income tax should be our main dependence—with every person making a contribution, though for some people it might be only nominal. At the same time should come relief from the hidden burden of indirect taxation.

There is no time to lose. Overnight, the problem of employing millions may be upon us, and when it arrives enterprising men and capital must not be in hiding awaiting a favorable tax climate. The duty of Congress to act in time, before the end of the war and before the job problem arises, is inescapable.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Bretton Woods, published in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRETTON WOODS

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—With both feet firmly planted in thin air, let's start today's column in the stratosphere and work our way down to the Bretton Woods monetary agreement.

The moral life is indivisible. What I mean is this: A man or woman in search of moral perfection cannot pick or choose among the virtues. He or she can't elect to retain the pleasant vices and eradicate only those weaknesses that have no particular appeal. It's eggs or shells. It's all or nothing. It's strictly a do or don't proposition.

So what has all this high-flown discourse got to do with the Bretton Woods monetary agreement, and what's Bretton Woods, anyway?

Bretton Woods is an agreement among 44 nations based on the following premises:

1. The expansion of world trade and of international investment is eminently desirable in the post-war world.

2. We cannot have the above without stability, order, and freedom in exchange transactions.

3. We cannot have stability, etc., without international economic cooperation and an effective mechanism for attaining that cooperation.

The Bretton Woods agreement was worked out last summer, after 2 years of exploratory conversations by the best economic brains of this and 43 other countries. It is their idea of the closest approach to an effective mechanism for attaining the cooperation referred to above. The House Banking and Currency Committee is presently engaged in hearings on a bill to put the United States into the Bretton Woods pact. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the business.

If Bretton Woods is torpedoed, or even heavily weighted down with reservations by Congress, the whole theory of collective action for peace is washed up. We cannot pick and choose our virtues. Either we have a collective action at every level or we don't have collectitve action. We can't say "no" to economic collaboration and then send delegates to San Francisco in April to talk about political and military collaboration. The failure of the Bretton Woods legislation almost inevitably would mean a return to the law of the jungle in our international economic life. It would mean that individual nations could again use foreign exchange as a weapon of aggression. It would mean economic isolationism.

Remember this: The technical details of a monetary agreement are such that few of us laymen can hope to understand them fully. But we can understand the principles underlying the agreement. We can understand the difference between prosperity and depression, between expanding trade and shriveling trade, and that's what's involved in Bretton Woods.

There are some critics of the monetary agreement, and in my own uncertainty about tchnical details, I hesitate to impugn their motives or to assume that they are speaking for the international banking fraternity on Wall Street, whose control of the destinies of nations would be seriously crippled by Bretton Woods.

I will say this, however, even at the risk of being repetitious—if your Congressman is opposed to Bretton Woods, you are entitled to have from him his alternative to Bretton Woods, an alternative in plain words, without breast-beating and cliches. Make him tell you how he will protect us against the economic anarchy of the past quarter century. It's your future that's involved, and you're entitled to a good answer.

America's Communities in the Changing War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very excellent speech delivered

by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, while at Chattanooga, Tenn., on April 5, 1945:

Today the thoughts of America's communities, their hopes and their prayers, are with our fighting men who are invading Germany.

Here at home in a typical American community like Chattanooga we are far away from the massive march of history.

We seem left behind in another world, the world of the home front.

The simple clarity that exists on the war fronts is something we read about and perhaps envy.

Here at home many of us are confused by the hundred-and-one opinions that characterize an American sifting and weighing its domestic issues.

Reconversion, the post-war, taxes, surplus war goods, price control, manpower—all these issues are whirling in front of the eyes of the average American like the three rings in a circus.

I would like to point out that there is still plenty of truth in the old American saying that warns us to keep our eyes on the ball. True, the German war machine is about to have the third strike called on it—but until Germany is declared out, until the Japanese war machine is declared out—we home-front Americans must keep on pitching.

The current debate on domestic issues, the endless newspaper columns, the editorials, the radio commentators, the talk in the pool rooms and barber shops, on train smokers, and at bridge parties, must not distort our focus to see first things first.

Every American war worker, every American foreman, superintendent, or manager in a war plant—here in Chattanooga and in every American community—has helped our magnificent armies to smash across the Rhine.

Modern war is a war of machines and modern war is based on the sweat and muscle and know-how of America's Chattanoogas.

The men and the women working in our plane factories, in our shipyards, in the munitions plants, in the textile mills, in the secret projects whose full story cannot be revealed until after victory, have created the home-front bridgeheads without which there would be no Rhine crossings and no final victory.

America's Chattanoogas and Knoxvilles, America's communities, large and small, have enlisted for the duration like their millions of sons. This very minute, war goods made in Tennessee are being used in the climactic battles in which Tennesseans are fighting and dying.

This basic unity of American community and American fighting men is the heart meaning of this total war.

Our Constitution speaks of "the common defense" and joins the idea of "the common defense" to the ideas of promoting the general welfare of the Nation and securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and those who will come after us.

Today, our common defense against the Axis has become the common offense. The coordinated power of our total industrial force, wielded by our armies and navies, is destroying the totalitarians. In this sense Chattanooga and Knoxville and every smaller community of the old Volunteer State have also crossed the Rhine.

Tennessee's workers in iron and steel and aluminum,, in ordnance and in textile, and in other important projects, have all crossed the Rhine.

We in the War Manpower Commission salute the war workers of Tennessee. And we say to all of you: "Until your sons and brothers and husbands return, you know what you have to do. You do not need advice or slogans. You know what you have to do."

We in Washington are happy to know that Chattanooga is adequately handling its local problems although its requirements have increased.

That the employment of women is continuing at a high level.

That absenteeism, by and large, is being reduced.

In Knoxville, absenteeism has also decreased during the last 3 months. And employment in its war industries has risen from 29.8 percent in May 1944 to 33 percent in January 1945.

How did this come about? The answer is the community. Community campaigns.

Community reliance on management-labor committees. Community initiative. Community patriotism.

The War Manpower Commission was based on America's communities, and designed for local autonomy. Of the Commission's 26,000 employees, only a 1,000-odd workers are employed in Washington. Through the management-labor committees and decentralized organization of the regional, State, and area and local offices, the Commission's policies have been and are today community policies.

The War Manpower Commission has its core not on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, but on the main streets of America's cities and towns.

The 1,500 full-time and 2,300 part-time local offices of the United States Employment Service are run by local men and women bound up in the affairs of the community.

Knowing its problems, the special problems that distinguish one community from another.

Knowing its potentialities. Since July 1, 1944, placements by this net work of employment offices have jumped to 1,100,000 workers a month.

This achievement is the result of cooperation between American management, American labor, and America's communities.

When an individual worker or an employer felt that he had been discriminated against by any decision of the War Manpower Commission, the appropriate management-labor committee sat as a board of appeals in the case.

As I recite these facts, known to all of you, I can see a question forming in your minds: "What about New Bedford? Will he mention New Bedford?"

Gentlemen, I most certainly will mention New Bedford. As you know, the New Bedford problem concerned the staffing of the tire cord plants situated there. The one urgent fact was the need for tire cord.

The one urgent fact was that military tire production could not be impaired.

Last summer the manpower problem in New Bedford started to become acute. With the community we tried to work out a program which would man the tire cord plants through voluntary efforts.

It seemed necessary to us that the ceiling program which is successfully manning urgent war plants in other cities with full community support be installed in New Bedford.

Meetings were held between the New Bedford area management-labor committee and the National Management-Labor Policy Committees, but no plan agreed to by all the participants was submitted.

The only solution seemed to be a forced-release program.

But this is not binding—if the officials of the C. I. O. and the A. F. L. and New Bedford management will agree to and submit an alternative plan, signed by all parties, which will do the job of staffing the tire plants, the War Manpower Commission will be willing to lift its forced-release program.

The disagreement at New Bedford is exceptional.

Its highlights, however, the complexities of the manpower problem.

Manpower cannot be stockpiled or blueprinted or cut to pattern.

The manpower problem was and is today the problem of gearing and regearing war production and war workers to the needs of America's fighting men.

First things first.

From the beginning, millions of American workers, human beings, had to be synchronized to the demands of the military.

Our generals and admirals, Eisenhower, Marshall, Patton, Patch, Nimitz, Halsey, King, were not crystal-ball gazers who could predict to the last decimal point every military need for months ahead.

They were students of the science of war.

Only battle experience could truly determine what was needed, how much was needed, and where it was needed.

For example, in November 1943, there was no concern over the steel supply. December 1943 brought military reverses and and requests for ships, airplanes, landing mats—for steel and more steel.

Manpower had to be found, allocated, trained, transported into the steel fabricating plants and mills. In December 1944, 1 year later, it was estimated that 130 workers would be needed for small-arms ammunition plants. But 2 months later, the War Department sharply revised peak manpower requirements so that the ultimate goal was increased to 161,500 workers.

But you know these facts here in Chattanooga.

Chattanooga has supplied a good deal of the manpower for the Clinton Works, in Knoxville.

There isn't a community in America that hasn't been confronted with the sudden need to expand war production or else to help man "must" war production in other communities.

Battle experience will continue to affect war production here at home.

The production needs of the Pacific war are different from those of the European war.

As our armed forces advance from Iwo Jima up the Japanese island stepping stones toward Tokyo—as we plan possible beachheads on the Chinese coast where the bulk of the Japanese Army awaits our challenge—there will be further shifts, fluctuations, changes, and cut-backs on the home production front.

The Chattanoogas of America are awaiting the signals of our military leaders.

The Chattanoogas of America know that home-town boys will be in the fleets cutting into Japan's home waters, in the armadas, in the air-borne armies, in the infantry.

Not only has home-front manpower been synchronized to the changing war—manpower also had to be synchronized to the industrial geography of this Nation of ours.

Many industries could not be shifted to loose labor markets because of physical barriers.

Many of our great plants are expansions of already existing industries.

The Detroits, the Philadelphias, the Chicagos, the New Bedfords have all multiplied their plant facilities with the war. Other industries were located near their sources of supply. New industrial facilities had to be built in relatively nonindustrial areas.

There were mistakes, conflicting opinions. Of course.

But the main job is being done.

We Americans are not a perfect people like the so-called supermen. But with our allies we are defeating and destroying the Germans and Japanese who had divided the world between them according to their perfect plan.

War has always tested the ability of a people to meet and overcome obstacles—both physical obstacles and the more subtle moral obstacles that arise in the minds of men facing a crisis.

War not only tests the ships, the planes, and the guns we make.

War also tests our beliefs and our principles.

War for the United States of America has been a test of our democracy and our institutions.

American management and American labor have been tested in the course of this war and will be tested in the complex days ahead.

Today, when the Germans seem to be on the edge of total defeat, some of us will have a tendency to relax.

This is only natural.

A winning ball team, with three games won out of five and ahead in the fourth game will tend to ease off.

But war is not baseball.

War in a democratic nation is measured by the lives of our fighting men.

We Americans do not look upon our soldiers as robots as do the Germans and the Japanese.

Our soldiers are our sons, our fathers, our brothers, human beings, whose lives were disrupted by the Fascist aggressors, peace-loving Americans now in uniform.

War in a democratic nation is sparked by the resolve to get our fighting men back to America as soon as possible with the minimum in deaths and casualties.

This is the goal of all Americans, of American management and American labor.

Their responsibilities to the American people will not end with victory in Europe.

Management's and labor's responsibilities to the American people will be intensified after the defeat of Germany.

Management and labor will have the responsibility of manning the war plants and meeting war schedules.

Management and labor and government will have the responsibility of planning for and helping achieve full employment for all Americans in the transitional period between the fall of Berlin and the fall of Toyko.

The responsibility of full employment in the post-war is on the horizon.

Management will have the responsibility of maintaining and expanding wartime's industrial democracy when peace comes. The women, the overage workers, the handicapped workers, the minority workers who all will have had a share in helping defeat Germany and Japan by their war work in all the Chattanoogas of America must surely have a share in the peace.

American management and American labor have joined together to create the greatest industrial team in history.

Management-labor committees in all the Chattanoogas and Knoxvilles of America have sat down at the same table to work out the common problems of war production.

Labor in the interest of the war effort has accepted controls which in peacetime would have been unbearable.

Labor has recognized that in time of war, teamwork between such "normal" opposites as labor and management had to be achieved.

Nobody in America, no group, no individual could escape initial responsibility to the common American people and to the representatives of the people on all the global war fronts—the common soldier.

Responsibility to the soldier must continue when he returns home, a veteran in an army of veterans.

The communities of America will not forget their veterans or their war workers.

Teamed together in war, teamed together in the coming victory, America's armies of fighting men and America's production armies of war workers will together, in every community, forge the beginnings of a new America in which all who will want jobs will have jobs.

A new America built on the new and expanded industries created by war in all the Chattanoogas of this Nation of ours.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which was sent to me by the clerk of the Assembly of the State of New York, with reference to a revision and reclassification of the wage system of the United States Postal Service:

Whereas over the entry to every post office in the United States is written these immortal words, "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds"; and

Whereas there is one group of workers in wartime America that has received comparatively little attention—the workers of the Nation's Postal Service; and

Whereas ever since the outbreak of this global war the workers who comprise the Postal Service have been shouldering a work load far in excess of normal and under the most exacting conditions, and the vast Postal Service being vital to the war effort, our Government called upon the letter carriers and the entire postal personnel for the fullest measure of cooperation; and

Whereas the call did not fall upon deaf ears; and

Whereas time was when the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker could set their clocks by the arrival of the morning mail, and since Pearl Harbor, however, things are somewhat changed. The postman's deliveries have become less frequent and not quite so punctual; and

Whereas that is because more than 15,000 experienced letter carriers have joined the armed forces, and all told there are now more than 50,000 postal workers in the United States military service; and

Whereas except for a few highly trained inspectors there have been no deferments for postal personnel, vital though postal work is to the war; and

Whereas letter carriers are more than mere deliverymen for the United States Government. They are the direct and daily contact between the public and its Government, and their peacetime activities have fittingly qualified them to meet any emergency that might arise in a country at war; and

Whereas, despite manpower shortages and all other obstacles strewn in their pathway, the postal employees have performed yeoman-like service throughout the entire year; and

Whereas a glance at the postal revenues shows an increase of $15,000,000 for the month of September 1944; and

Whereas Christmas 1944 found this loyal group of postal workers ready and eager to take on the additional burden, although it will require 12, 14, or more hours per day for each week; and

Whereas the ever-faithful postal employee does not receive time and a half for overtime; and

Whereas the top-grade letter carrier or postal clerk receives straight time for all work in excess of 8 hours per day, which amounts to approximately 86 cents per hour; and

Whereas the man in the blue-gray uniform has not had an upward revision in basic pay rates in almost 20 years; and

Whereas Congress establishes wage standards, hours of work, and nearly all other working conditions applicable to postal employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the people of the State of New York, acting through the legislature, hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to give immediate and favorable consideration to a revision and reclassification of the wage system of the United States Postal Service; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress when elected from the State of New York, to the end that appropriate action be taken at once to correct the present inadequate and unequal pay now in effect throughout the Postal Service.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk*.

In senate, March 24, 1945. Concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk*.

Let Peace Be His Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial entitled "Let Peace Be His Monument," which appeared in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., on Friday, April 13, 1945:

LET PEACE BE HIS MONUMENT

The last thoughts of Franklin D. Roosevelt must have been concerned with the forthcoming peace conference at San Francisco over the details of which he had worked on his last day upon this earth.

Already there had come to him the definite knowledge that victory was to come to our arms, although it is tragically ironical that upon the eve of this victory the man who had led as Commander in Chief should himself become a casualty.

Yet, with this foreknowledge of certain victory upon the field of battle, his thoughts must have been chiefly upon his program for permanent peace. It is, then, incumbent upon all who would honor his memory that we carry forward that program. We must pick up the torch. We shall keep it aflame.

Gratifying must be the conviction in these trying circumstances that ours is a republic of destiny, so firmly founded that even the loss of him who will rank in history as one of our great Presidents cannot stop its march. The Nation has stumbled for a moment; there is a sharp, painful catch of the breath—and then under a new commander we press forward to complete victory and toward permanent peace.

There were differences of opinion in the minds of millions as to the domestic policies of the New Deal. This is not the time to dwell upon that phase of President Roosevelt's administration. But what is important is to stress that from his first formulation of foreign policy in his Chicago attack upon aggressor nations he would quarantine, all the way through the Atlantic Conference, Tehran, Dumbarton Oaks, and now the San Francisco Conference, he was right.

As, then, we emerge from the terrible crucible of war, let the fruition of his dreams for a world in which peace would forever triumph, in which reason would overcome brute strength, in which right made might—let

this be our monument to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In our mourning let there be also the strength of determination that he, like those who perished in combat, shall not have died in vain. Let us consecrate ourselves anew to the pledge that the scourge of war shall forever pass from the face of the globe and a just and lasting peace be the inheritance of those who come after.

That is the most magnificent monument which can be manufactured to the memory of this man.

Our Late Beloved President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me I am inserting in the RECORD several editorials and articles that came to my attention concerning not only the greatest American but the world's outstanding personage—our departed President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, more than any other man, will be remembered for his courageous and humane activities in the interest of the common people of our country and the world over. When history will be written he will be properly credited with the defeat of the Hitler-Nazi murder bund and the treacherous Jap beasts. He led us successfully out of the greatest depression and brought us back to prosperity. He has done more for humanity than any other man and for his activities in that direction has been most shamefully assailed and abused by the Fascist and Nazi ideologists. In that connection, I insert an editorial appearing in the C. I. O. News and an editorial and an article appearing in the A. F. of L. Weekly News Service. These articles evaluate the great services and accomplishments of the late President and more fittingly pay tribute to his work than I could possibly express. The editorial and articles are as follows:

[From the C. I. O. News of April 16, 1945]

THE CHAMPION PASSES, BUT HIS WORK GOES ON

No other American has meant so much to so many as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It was his greatness to sense the innermost feelings of ordinary folks, to share their hatred of oppression and misery, and to become the living, fighting expression of their hopes and aspirations.

So he won the personal devotion of millions of Americans who never knew him personally.

He was "The Champ" to them, not only because of his election victories, but more because he was the people's champion.

To the working people, in particular, Roosevelt was "their man," just as he was "that man" to the selfish and reactionary who sought to bar the path of social progress.

The record of his New Deal has been written in greater health, happiness, security, and opportunity for the less privileged majority.

It gave the labor movement its chance to grow to its present strength, and included countless measures to advance the economic welfare and democratic rights of the common people.

But Roosevelt became the people's champion in an even broader sense, when the dark clouds of Fascist aggression appeared on the horizon. His was among the first voices to warn of their danger to America. He became the builder of national unity for winning the war—the champion of the whole American people.

Roosevelt's greatness also went beyond national limits. Just as he built national unity, he also built the unity of the United Nations.

Along with Churchill and Stalin, he was the outstanding leader of the great coalition of all the freedom-loving peoples. With them he devised its victorious strategy.

As a world leader, Roosevelt looked far ahead. He had the vision and statesmanship to work for the continuing unity of the United Nations after the war, to bring lasting peace and growing prosperity to the world.

He died on the eve of the most far-reaching triumph of his triumphant career, the San Francisco Conference to establish a united world organization.

So Roosevelt's death is felt as a deep personal tragedy not only by the working and common people whose cause he championed, but by all Americans, and not only by all Americans, but also by countless millions of people in all countries.

But it seems wrong to speak of Roosevelt in the past tense. For while the man has died, as all men must, his name will live through the ages, and what his name stands for is as alive and growing as it ever was.

In fact, Roosevelt's great work has just begun. It will be carried on by President Harry S. Truman and his administration, by the Congress and armed forces of the United States, by our representatives at San Francisco, and by the United Nations.

But most of all, Roosevelt's work must and will be carried on by the people of the United States, by ourselves and our neighbors, and by folks like us in every country of the world.

The C. I. O., proud of its long and active support of Roosevelt's ideals and policies, will be in the forefront of those who honor this great champion by carrying on his work.

[From the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service]

F. D. R.

So proudly we hailed this man who can never be forgotten—because he remembered the forgotten man.

Through the perilous night his vision was sure, his course certain, his heart unafraid.

So gallantly, so courageously, he faced the trials of our Nation.

While we watched from the ramparts, he lifted America out of the worst depression in its history.

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," he said, and those challenging words inspired all America with new hope and courage.

Long before the rocket's red glare was visible to us, he saw the world conflagration coming and resolutely prepared us for it.

When the bombs burst over Pearl Harbor, America mobilized under his direction into the mightiest armed force the world has ever seen.

Yes; there were doubters, there were chiselers, moaners, and critics—but now, with victory almost within our grasp, the Star-Spangled Banner still waves o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

At the twilight's last gleaming, the hostile voices are stilled and all the world bows in reverence.

And in the dawn's early light labor arises in sorrow, but with reinforced determination to finish the job that must be done according to his blueprint for tomorrow.

[From the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service]

Franklin Delano Roosevelt may go down in history as the architect of world peace or as an outstanding military strategist, but to the men and women of labor in this country he will always stand as the great champion of the cause of the underprivileged.

To them the true test of his greatness was that he never lost touch with the common man.

It is far too early to attempt to evaluate in terms of lasting importance the vital economic and social reforms instituted by President Roosevelt to strengthen and amplify the American way of life. The list is tremendous. But to the workers of the Nation these measures appear outstanding.

1. The National Recovery Act, which sparked the stalled economic machinery of the Nation back into motion and served a highly useful purpose even though it was later invalidated by the Supreme Court.

2. The National Labor Relations Act, regarded as labor's Magna Carta, which gave official blessing to collective bargaining and and guaranteed the right of workers to organize and join unions of their own choosing.

3. The Social Security Act, which, though still imperfect, helped to banish the fear of poverty in old age and in temporary unemployment.

4. The Fair Labor Standards Act, which set a floor for wages and a ceiling for working hours and helped millions of workers in oppressed industries to escape from starvation conditions.

5. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act, which insured and protected the hard-earned savings of the masses.

These were the big reforms of the Roosevelt administration. But above and beyond these, was the spirit which initiated them and which was ever ready to give prompt and sympathetic attention to the troubles of labor.

Franklin D. Roosevelt made mistakes, too. But they were the mistakes of a warm heart. He could be stern as well as kindly. He could reprimand as well as praise. But labor always found him just and responsive.

Labor's loss in his death cannot be expressed in words. He will be mourned—mourned by men and women who never saw him in the flesh, who never spoke to him, but for whom he will always remain a symbol of kindliness and decency.

The Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, no words can tell better than his own the greatness and the humaneness of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Already, like the man, they take their place among the great works of all time. And it is proper that the Nation for love of which he died in line of duty, should treasure his words, from which I quote:

First inaugural address, March 4, 1933: "This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly * * * This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear

itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

At his second inaugural in 1937: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little."

His "moral order" statement on January 6, 1941, before Congress: "We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms:

"Freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

"Freedom from want—economic understanding securing every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants.

"Freedom from fear—world-wide reduction of armaments so thorough that no nation would be able to commit an act of aggression against any neighbor.

"This is no vision or distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation."

War message before Congress, December 8, 1941: "Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. * * * No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory. I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost, but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us."

Message to Congress, March 26, 1945: "The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will eithe move forward toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperative world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live."

There are many among us who grieve that our great departed Commander in Chief could not have been spared to witness the triumph of our arms, the workings of the peace organization. But his great triumph is the triumph of his life's work. His is the triumph of immortality, for he led the Nation out of the depths. He helped the Nation to find itself and then to go on to those heights which have made it invincible in war and the inspiration of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

We must and we shall realize that his passing left each of us with a greater responsibility and a greater task. And with full confidence in the right, we shall rally behind the man who has been given to us to carry on the work of our beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt. We shall stand with and support President Truman in the final task of defeating the transgressor nations, and as certain victory comes nearer we shall plan also for those greater tasks which must come with peace. We shall accept without fear or compromise the task of properly readjusting into a useful and happy private life the 15,000,000 men and women who will have been sent to fight this Nation's battles and to win its greatest war. We shall attack without hesitancy the terrific responsibility of providing gainful jobs in private industry for the millions who are now engaged in war production, knowing that in gainful jobs lie the surest basis for prosperity. We shall not allow this Nation to sink again into the misery of depression.

I beg to quote again the prayer given to us by President Truman in his first message to Congress and to the Nation. You will recall that it is from the words of Solomon:

Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge Thy people that I may discern between good and bad; for who is able to judge this Thy so great a people? I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people.

Surely with this as a guidon, we shall not fear the future.

Back Up Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

BACK UP OUR PRESIDENT

President Truman's speech to Congress Monday brought rays of hope and promise to the Nation in a dark hour of sorrow.

Humble but determined, he convincingly pledged that he would carry on the program of winning the war and winning the peace. His vigorous spirit was reassuring to an allied world which had looked to America for enlightened leadership and may have wondered whether this Nation would falter after its war leader had fallen.

Encouraging, too, was his stout declaration that "we shall never cease our struggle to preserve and maintain our American way of life."

The new President's address made clear his realization of the tremendous task that confronts him, and left no doubt of the courage and sincerity with which he approaches it. In simple, eloquent words he envisaged, too, the immensity of the opportunity that beckons—the opportunity to bring the war to a triumphant culmination, to establish a coalition of the United Nations for lasting peace, and, finally, to guide the Nation successfully through the reconversion and reconstruction periods.

How successfully this opportunity will be grasped will depend largely upon the support and cooperation of the American people. Mr. Truman has the ability, the experience, and the temperament for the job. And there is every reason for the people and their representatives in government to uphold his hand; no reason for them not to.

His sudden accession to the Presidency is a ringing challenge to every good American to get behind him—Democrats and Republicans, New Dealers and anti-New Dealers, liberals and conservatives. No class or group has it in for him; Republicans and Democrats in Congress like and have confidence in their former colleague; every indication points to their cooperation, which he frankly told them is essential to the completion of "one of the greatest tasks ever assigned a public servant."

President Truman asked for divine guidance and called upon all Americans to help him keep the Nation united. Thus he made his titanic job the job of all of us. His administration offers a magnificent opportunity for complete American harmony and consequent achievement. It is our obligation to back him up, cooperate with him, the sooner to win the war, bring the boys back home, and get the wheels of peacetime industry humming again.

Nazi-Jap Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days the American people have been horrified by the revolting news pictures and reports of the atrocities committed by the Japanese soldiery in the Philippines and the torture and starvation suffered at the hands of the Nazi—not only of our and United Nations prisoners of war but of the civilian populations of German-occupied countries. I am inserting several articles which appeared in the Washington Star describing some of these atrocities, and I do so in order that certain groups within our country may not forget the barbarous and inhuman acts which the Nazi and Japs committed against the prisoner-soldiery of the United Nations and the civilian populations of the overrun countries. It is my hope that the reading of these articles will serve to deter any "soft" groups in any effort to extend leniency to the barbarians who have been responsible and guilty of inflicting the most fiendish tortures upon millions of prisoners of war and civilians and who have murdered hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children in cold blood. The beastly acts of these oppressors cannot be condoned, and neither time nor circumstance shall temper the scales of justice in meting out the deserved punishment to these arch criminals. The articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Star of April 18, 1945]

THOUSANDS OF DEAD AND DYING FOUND IN NAZI HORROR CAMP—29,000 STILL ALIVE AMID PILES OF BODIES; DISEASE IS RAMPANT

(By William Frye)

BRITISH SECOND ARMY HEADQUARTERS, GERMANY, April 18.—Prisoners in the Belsen concentration camp, a filthy horror, were freed Sunday by Gen. Sir Miles C. Dempsey's men.

The camp contained 29,000 persons still alive and uncounted dead.

It contained typhus, typhoid, tuberculosis, nakedness, starvation, dumps of unburied corpses in vast heaps, mounds covering great burial heaps, one cavernous pit half filled with blackened bodies.

There were children—500 of them—in the midst of this.

Babies were born there daily.

These were the findings of a senior medical officer of the British Second Army who has been at the camp 3 days and says, "Anything you have seen doesn't even begin the story."

The living are being moved to the relative luxury of a nearby Army barracks. Soon none will be left here except those with communicable diseases too ill to move.

Eventually, says this officer, the only conceivable disposition of this Nazi monument will be destruction by fire.

There were 2,000 women in three compounds in this camp and nearly 12,000 men in two other compounds. In adjacent barracks in one corner of the vast Nazi camp are 15,000 more prisoners who are fairly recent arrivals.

"Horror camp" is what the medical officers call it.

After his arrival at the camp SS guards under the direction of their commander were still shooting prisoners who were trying to steal potatoes. The SS had failed to abide by the surrender terms to turn in their arms because they feared the vengeance of the emaciated victims of their inhumanity.

The SS men were promptly disarmed when discovered and are now assigned to cleaning up the camp as a slight measure of retribution.

How many died here there is no way of knowing. Indefinite reports say 30,000 died in the last few months.

In the middle of the camp there is a mound 80 yards by 30 yards of the naked bodies of women piled table-high.

While the medical officer was inspecting the camp he saw four girls carry another corpse from the hut and add it to this fearful stack of death, which was in plain view of the children's compound. A woman laid the body of her own child on the heap.

Most of the dead were victims not of disease, but starvation. The rations were three daily issues of watery soup made of meal and a few vegetables. Once or twice a week a few bits of meat were thrown into the cooking cauldrons. But the issue was by huts, not individuals. Each hut leader sent four persons with large metal containers to bring the rations, but in practical effect the distribution was not supervised and those too weak to fight for their own food got none.

MANY DIE IN HUTS

They would lie on the floors of the huts until the last thin trace of life had disappeared and no one noticed.

The insufficient bunks were occupied by wasted remnants of two to three persons. One double-decked bunk might contain six diseases, six stages of advanced starvation.

People still are dying. The medical officer said that even with the best possible care and most careful diets thousands cannot be saved. Doctors among the prisoners told the British they were treating 1,714 women with acute cases—there are bunks for 474.

Of the men there are 2,242 acute cases occupying 1,900 bunks.

The improvised hospitals arranged by the prisoners received 125 women and 60 men daily. All the doctors have had typhus but recovered.

PARCELS WITHHELD

The officer said large consignments of Red Cross parcels sent by Jews reached the camp but never were distributed and were not used by the Germans, withheld apparently out of sheer malevolence. There is yet no indication what proportion of these civilian prisoners is Jews, but the assumption is that it is high.

Some inadequate medical stores were found in the camp. The officer said that two bright spots were that the kitchens were clean and well kept and that the children were in comparatively good condition. The women had used their wasting strength to keep the children clean and to get them as much food as possible.

The SS masters occasionally gave the children small bits of candy the prisoners said.

CRUELTIES OF GERMANS WILL BE DISCUSSED IN COMMONS TOMORROW

LONDON, April 18.—Published accounts of German concentration camps which have been stirring Britons for several days will be brought up formally in Commons tomorrow when Prime Minister Churchill will be asked if the infamous Buchenwald camp will be preserved to remind future generations of Nazi cruelties.

The matter of the guilt of Nazi leaders in the mounting list of war crimes was the subject of exchanges in the House today. The shaping of new questions stems from British convictions that Germany and the world must not be allowed to forget the pain the Germans have inflicted and that those responsible must be punished.

"Six thousand famished men and women," or "One thousand burned by the Germans" are samples of London newspaper headlines. Three separate stories on the front page of today's News-Chronicle were under the single editorial note: The lid is being lifted from the cauldron of horrors that was Nazi Germany.

"Let German doctors and nurses be compelled to tend the survivors of Nazi brutality", suggested the Star. "Let German forced labor, recruited from all classes, demolish these plague spots. By every means ram it home that Germans must atone for these deeds."

SOLDIER, REACHING FOR CANDY, KILLED BY 9-YEAR-OLD GERMAN

DULUTH, MINN., April 18.—The slaying of an American soldier by a 9-year-old German boy was related by Second Lt. William Barnes, of Duluth, in a letter from Germany received this week by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Barnes, Duluth.

"We had stopped to re-form when a small boy, 9 or 10 years old, asked a soldier for some chocolate," he writes. "He was a cute-looking youngster, and from force of habit the soldier put his hands in his pockets to see if he had any.

"Then the cute little boy drew a pistol from his clothes and shot the man through the abdomen. He couldn't miss, he was so close."

The soldier died of his wounds, Lieutenant Barnes wrote.

"Would you feel like giving a toy to a child after that?"

(Lieutenant Barnes' parents said they had inclosed some small toys for refugee children in their Christmas boxes to their son.)

"And now do you suppose I take my eyes off a civilian for a minute? I've already had to kill one in self-defense. No, Mom; I'm not giving toys to German children."

Lieutenant Barnes, now 20, was commissioned on his eighteenth birthday. Wounded March 1 in Germany, he is now in an English hospital.

He is a nephew of Julius Barnes, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The Forgotten Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE FORGOTTEN FIGHTERS

"They need everything except courage. They had plenty of that to begin with and 7 years of suffering has not diminished their supply." So Martha Gellhorn writes of the remnants of the Spanish Republicans in southwestern France—the men, women, and children who fought the first great fight to stem the Nazi-Fascist rebellion against our civilization, who escaped across the Pyrenees after the first great defeat, who were thereafter shunted through one concentration camp and another, who fought with the Maquis in the liberation of France and who now, in the first great dawn of victory for their cause, find themselves still persons without a country, find the Franco despotism recognized by all their Allies and find that they cannot even look for relief to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration because "Spain is a neutral."

Something like half a million of them are supposed to have crossed the frontier after the murder of the Spanish Republic. Most have been absorbed, in one way or another, into the strange and bloody times which that great crime initiated. They were deported by the Nazis. They went into bondage to French collaborators. They died. Many joined the Maquis; but with the end of the guerrilla fighting they are again men without homes or work, even though, as Miss Gellhorn dryly observes, "everybody appreciates very much what they did." In all there are about 80,000 still in dire need in the Toulouse area—composed mainly of those crippled in the civil war or with the Maquis, and the families of men who were deported or have died in the guerrilla fighting. If they are inclined to look now with a certain Spanish cynicism on words of praise and applause for their heroic fight, one can hardly blame them. But it is possible to send more than words. The Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, 192 Lexington Avenue, New York, is sending every dollar which it raises to the Unitarian Service Committeefor distribution to these forgotten fighters for our common freedom.

Tribute to Vision of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Tuesday, April 17, 1945:

BUILDING AMERICA

Illinois can be proud of the social vision shown by Senator SCOTT LUCAS in his sponsorship of a bill that would increase the resources of the Rural Electrification Administration by half a billion dollars. If passed and approved, as it probably will be, the Lucas bill will permit an immense and rapid extension of electric service among the farms of the country.

Few public improvements have equal social importance, for the reason that electricity on a farm is the key to better living in every possible way. Electricity frees the farm wife from slavery to the pump. It is the agency that brings water into the house, eliminating an age-old drudgery. It brings light, for better reading and study; cleanliness; refrigeration for a better diet. A thousand tasks that wore out human bodies and dulled minds are easily performed by electricity. Better citizenship follows the high lines.

It is within our power to gain so much, from an amount of money that would be consumed in a few days of war, it would be stupid not to grasp the opportunity. And even the

half billion will not be a permanent debt upon taxpayers; it will be advanced in self-liquidating loans to be repaid over a term of years.

Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as soon as opportunity will present itself and I will have the privilege to see the President, I shall urge that he endeavor to obtain the consent of the greatest woman of our Nation—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—wife of our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who has so splendidly cooperated and aided him during his tenure of office in carrying on his tremendous activities and duties, to accept some post with the Government. Regardless of how high the assignment may be, I know her great ability will enable her to fill it to the entire satisfaction of the American people. Her keen interest in the welfare of the people and her proven desire to aid humanity in every way makes her a citizen of the first value who should not be lost upon our Government. Aside from her life as the wife of a great President she is entitled on her own right to have a place of major importance in our Government—either in its domestic aspects or in our relationships with the rest of the world. She is truly a great person. The President could make no finer—yes and wiser—move than to offer her any assignment that comes within the scope of his office. In this connection, I insert an article by Josephine Ripley, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Eleanor Roosevelt, Private Citizen," as follows:

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, PRIVATE CITIZEN
(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—After 12 years as wife of the President of the United States, Eleanor Roosevelt closes the door of the White House behind her this week to become a private citizen.

No President's wife in the history of the country has traveled as widely or been as active in public affairs as Mrs. Roosevelt.

While the change which has come upon her so suddenly will lead her into different paths, few believe it will mean her retirement from public life.

Eleanor Roosevelt has always been an active woman, keenly interested in people and in affairs. Since coming to the White House, her viewpoint has broadened. She is a person who thinks today in the terms of nations—the United Nations in which her husband had such hope.

She is not one of the great women thinkers of the day, but she is, nevertheless, a person of many talents and wide experience in various fields.

In her many speeches over the radio she has acquired an admirable technique, a field in which the feminine voice meets its severest test.

She is equally at home on the lecture platform. She is the author of a number of books, including "The Moral Basis of Democracy," "When You Grow Up to Vote," "It's Up to the Women," "This Is My Story," and "My Day."

Mrs. Roosevelt has written numerous magazine articles and contributed the now-famous My Day newspaper column.

Before coming to the White House she edited a magazine called "Babies, Just Babies." She was vice principal of a school for girls. She founded and directed a furniture shop and was actively interested in public housing as a member of the Housing Association of New York City.

She served at one time as State Democratic committeewoman and has had a lifelong interest in social welfare. At the beginning of the war Mrs. Roosevelt was made Assistant Director of the Office of Civilian Defense. Her administration of the job was severely criticized, however, and she resigned later.

Numerous avenues of activity which were closed to the wife of the President will undoubtedly open up to Eleanor Roosevelt, private citizen. There is no question but what the demand for her services will be many when she is ready to reenter public life.

She would be the last to shirk what she feels to be her responsibility, and she has often stressed the responsibility of all citizens to do their part in helping to win the war and maintain the peace.

Last November, after the election, she told reporters that she thought the next 4 years would be "probably the most difficult the world has ever known, for we have to win a war, make a peace, and rebuild a world. I can't think of anything more difficult," she said.

After the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, she expressed the belief that "there should be a woman on every working committee." Not that women should take a dominant part in the peace-keeping, she explained, but that it is desirable for men and women to work together in that cause.

While the Nation, almost as stunned as Mrs. Roosevelt with the sudden change in her affairs, wonders what her role will be in the future, she herself is wholly occupied in moving out of the White House.

Upon her shoulders rests the responsibility of disposing of the 12-year accumulation of family belongings and the personal possessions of President Roosevelt, including his stamp collection, his marine prints, his ship models and books.

But even with the burden of this task, she did not forget that the new White House mistress would need help, and she spent more than an hour on Monday showing Mrs. Truman over the White House and explaining the duties which would be hers as the First Lady of the land.

Although some have criticized Mrs. Roosevelt in the past for taking the prominent part that she has in public affairs, there is nothing but deep admiration today for the remarkable fortitude with which she has met this great crisis in her life.

And the good wishes of millions all over the world follow her as she prepares to take up her new life as Eleanor Roosevelt, citizen.

Recognition of Italy as an Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 17, 1945.

The Honorable W. G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I have received your letter of April 6, 1945, enclosing a resolution recently adopted by the Federation of Italian-American Societies, of Buffalo, N. Y., together with several expressions signed by your constituents urging that Italy be recognized as an ally.

Your constituents urge that this Government recognize Italy as a political as well as a military partner and that she be accorded the status of full ally. In this connection, it may be pointed out that while references to our "allies" are now in common usage, we have no formal treaty of alliance with any power. The admittance of Italy as a member of the United Nations would be the equivalent of recognizing Italy as a political partner, to the extent that the other nations are recognized. However, it must be understood that such a step is not for consideration and decision by this Government alone, but would require the concurrence of other United Nations.

You may assure your constituents that the United States Government gives constant and sympathetic attention to its relations with Italy, which have developed considerably toward a friendly and normal basis since the Italian surrender in September 1943. Formal diplomatic relations between the two countries have now been resumed. The Italian Ambassador presented his letters of credence to the President on March 8, 1945, and this Government is likewise represented in Italy by a fully accredited Ambassador.

The enclosure to your letter are returned to you herewith.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Citizens Committee for Military Training of Young Men:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR MILITARY TRAINING OF YOUNG MEN, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 4, 1945.

The Citizens Committee for Military Training of Young Men, Inc., just formed and chartered as a nonprofit organization in the State of New York, is the outgrowth of a small group which played a leading part in organizing the Plattsburg Camps of 1915 and 1916, the War Camps of 1917, and the adoption of the Selective Service System in 1940.

It is now directly interested in the subject of a military training program, both Army and Navy, for young men at about 18 years of age, to begin after this war is over and the Nation comes face to face with the realities of the future in maintaining peace and avoiding war.

Such a military training program has become an issue of the day, as you well know, and much is being said and written pro and con on whether this program should be enacted into law.

This committee realizes that a law of this kind will affect the life of every male citizen in the United States and that it marks a

complete change in our military policy of the past 150 years.

Therefore we feel, most deeply, that the subject should be fully and openly debated throughout the country in every city, town, and hamlet, without prejudice. Above all, we feel that public opinion should be clearly crystallized on just what is meant by military training and its advantage to the Nation.

When the committee uses the term military training for young men, we mean just this and nothing more.

We are convinced that 1 year of continuous progressive military training divided as follows: 9 weeks basic training, 9 weeks specialist training, 13 weeks small unit, 13 weeks large unit, and 8 weeks maneuvers (Navy to have corresponding program) would not make a nation of militarists nor would it interfere with or change in any way the American tradition of public and private education.

Our World War No. 1 Army and Navy did not make a military caste, nor is there any sign that our Army and Navy of World War No. 2 will make a military caste. Certainly it is hard to conceive that 1 year's military training will give any young fellow anything except better health, a keener mind, a fundamental knowledge of military science, and a primary equipment for the pursuit of personal advancement.

Bluntly speaking, this committee would stoutly oppose any imposition of political indoctrination and propaganda by the present or future administration in Washington. But our chief concern now is to get the whole subject before all Americans—irrespective of race, color, and creed—for open debate.

To accomplish this we are forming a Nation-wide group in order to provide the opportunity for such debate, so that the Congress will know what the people are thinking.

We are a volunteer organization and represent no special interests of any kind.

Our funds will be publicly subscribed by individuals. We shall not accept corporate moneys. Our books will be audited by a nationally known firm of auditors and they are open for public inspection by any responsible source.

Our purpose in writing you personally is to identify this committee, its objective, its beliefs, and its plan of activities.

In stating our views we would welcome an expression of opinion from you.

Sincerely yours,

JAY COOKE, *President.*

Resolution of Durham Hosiery Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N. C., of April 17, 1945:

HOSIERY MILL UNION APPROVES RESOLUTION

In a formal statement textile workers at the Durham Hosiery Mills, No. 6, expressed deep regret yesterday concerning the death of President Roosevelt. The statement follows:

"We, the members of T. W. U. A., Local 602, wish to express our deepest and sincerest sorrow in the death of one of the most beloved Presidents in history. Never before has there been such a Presdent who had at heart, as he did, the working people and their conditions and took steps to better their conditions, making them feel freer and believe that they were actually Americans free to take part in organizations to help their fellow-workers. Through him the textile workers, the miners, farmers, and laboring people of every trade could build a freer and better America in which to live, winning better working conditions, better pay, and fairer policies not only for themselves but for their employers. Thank God for such a President.

"May God grant our beloved and faithful President more relief from his labor than he had on earth. May God grant all of this Nation a thankful heart, and courage to keep fighting for the cause our President worked for.

"May God bless our new President, Harry S. Truman, as he carries on the work as he believes Roosevelt would want it done."

The statement is signed by Paul R. Williams, secretary-treasurer of the union.

Astounding War Production of the Chrysler Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it has been my custom during the progress of the war to announce to the House the astounding production of various manufacturers of the Michigan area.

Our State can rightfully be called the major producer of the tools of war and has been referred to in these trying times as the Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy.

Today in speaking of the production of the Chrysler Corporation, I spoke from that hub extends to their Dodge Chicago plant from which was recently shipped its ten thousandth Wright B–29 engine, which production, I am informed, was ahead of schedule. Here it might be well to refer to the miracle of construction of the very plant wherein this production took place. For only a little over 2½ years ago the Dodge Chicago plant was a set of blueprints.

Today—

As Mr. K. T. Keller stated—

it is one of America's largest war operations, and is another example of how industry has met the challenge of war production.

My colleagues will be pleased to learn that the Chrysler Corporation has shipped more than 34,000,000 spare parts for B–29 engines, 5,000 B–29 assemblies consisting of nose sections, leading wing edges, and cowling sets, 23,000 tanks, 12,000 tank engines, 170,000 rockets, 50,000 Bofors guns, three thousand million rounds of ammunition, 2,000 Radar units, 400,000 Dodge Army trucks, 100 miles of submarine nets, 5,500 Sperry gyro-compasses, 7,800 marine tugs and tractors, 26,000 marine engines, 9,000 Navy pontoons, 4,500 Curtiss Helldiver wing sections, 8,000 Vought Sikorsky Corsair landing gears, 10,000,000 duraluminum forgings, 370,000 bomb shackles, and 60,000 Army field ranges—all products of a great corporation, resulting from the unity of the brawn and brain of man.

Just as the name of Chrysler is known and feared by our enemies in time of war, so it is known and cherished for its production of comfort goods in the days of peace. May God speed those days.

Let There Be No Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Argus, published at Mount Vernon, N. Y., on April 14, 1945, and was titled "Let There Be No Fear":

LET THERE BE NO FEAR

As the simple but saintly solemn rites of his church are being read in the White House this afternoon over the body of Franklin Roosevelt it is both proper and pertinent that the people over whom he ruled for 12 years dedicate themselves to carry on in this hour of national peril. Not even for the obsequies of a Commander in Chief can the armies of this Nation relax a moment, and that same obligation should bind those of us who are not upon the combat fronts.

There were faint-hearted folk who last year questioned the advisability of conducting a Presidential election in the midst of a deadly war. They were proved wrong, and by virtue of our ability to follow the Constitution even in the days of the most extreme emergency the pillars of this Republic were strengthened. So, today, as we gird ourselves to renewed battle at the gates of Berlin, as we push home in the Pacific the righteous blow which is to give freedom to that part of the world, let us put away fear from our minds.

It was President Roosevelt himself who at his first inaugural said:

"This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive, and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

Berlin and Tokyo need expect no relaxation upon the part of those in command of our armies and our fleets. Marshall and King, Eisenhower and Nimitz and MacArthur, will remain in control of our strategy. President Truman has promptly given assurance to that effect. The Cabinet at Washington will, for the time at least, remain intact. There will not be the slightest interruption in the fighting at the front and there must not be any let-down in the production here at home of the weapons of war and their shipment to the fields of combat.

So, too, there is grave responsibility upon all of us upon the home front that we carry on without lapse, that we shoulder our burdens and press forward as do brave soldiers under new command, that, above all, we do not relinquish in even momentary panic one single item in the master plan designed to force the unconditional surrender of our enemies.

Instead, as Franklin D. Roosevelt is being borne tonight to his last resting place above

Westchester upon the Hudson, let the wreath which we place upon his bier read:

"Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee."

The American Legion Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter written to me by C. J. Western, commander, and J. L. Workman, adjutant, Columbia Post, No. 34, American Legion, Washington, D. C., together with a resolution adopted by Columbia Post concerning the commissioning of members of the Communist Party in the United States Army.

The letter and resolution follow:

COLUMBIA POST, NO. 34,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: The members of Columbia Post, No. 34, American Legion, at a regular meeting held April 4, 1945, went on record to commend you in your open attack on communism in making known to the public facts and accomplishments undertaken by that organization. Your effort is a worth-while step forward to defeat these un-American ideas so rapidly gaining headway in the United States.

The members of Columbia Post know you as a worthy friend of the veterans, and are familiar with your untiring efforts to accomplish anything that might be a benefit to all veterans.

Many times you have battled in favor of the veterans' cause, sometimes against heavy odds, but always with courage. We are confident that you will carry on to a successful finish the task that you have begun in defeating communism.

The enclosed resolution passed by the post against communism is a clear understanding of how the members feel about communism and should there be anything in any way in which they might aid you they will be ever willing and cooperative.

Very truly yours,

J. L. WORKMAN.

Whereas it has become the avowed policy of the Department of War to permit members of the Communist Party or persons with communistic leanings to receive commissions in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the members of Columbia Post, No. 34, District of Columbia, American Legion, as well as all legionnaires, having previously dedicated themselves to a 100-percent Americanism; and

Whereas having served in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 to uphold Americanism; and

Whereas the members of Columbia Post, No. 34, District of Columbia, American Legion are of the opinion that this policy of the Department of War is dangerous and inimical to the safety and welfare of the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Columbia Post, No. 34, go on record as opposing this policy of the Department of War, and protest the granting of commissions in the armed forces to persons advocating and believing in communistic principles or other subversive action; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of Columbia Post No. 34 reaffirm and rededicate themselves to the principles of the United States of America, and oppose the principles of all subversive actions that are dangerous to the welfare and liberty of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution, if it meets the approbation of the department convention of the District of Columbia, be brought to the attention of the next national convention for approval.

War Department Warns Against Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to a warning issued to the armed forces overseas against foreign and domestic fascism. I want to congratulate the War Department on the issuance of this warning as many of our soldiery have been misled by the false Fascist propaganda. While the warning will be beneficial to the members of our armed forces, I feel it will also be helpful to American civilians in bringing to their minds the need of being alert and guarding against subversive propaganda. I insert the War Department warning on fascism:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1945.

FASCISM

Note for this week's discussion: Fascism is not the easiest thing to identify and analyze; nor, once in power, is it easy to destroy. It is important for our future and that of the world that as many of us as possible understand the causes and practices of fascism, in order to combat it. Points to stress are: (1) Fascism is more apt to come to power at a time of economic crisis; (2) fascism inevitably leads to war; (3) it can come to any country; (4) we can best combat it by making our democracy work.

You are away from home, separated from your families, no longer at a civilian job or at school and many of you are risking your very lives because of a thing called fascism. * * *

We Americans have been fighting Fascists for more than 3 years. When Cecil Brown, one of the leading war correspondents, came back from the battle fronts he went on a trip that took him into big cities and small towns all over America. He talked and listened to all kinds of people. He found that most Americans are vague about just what fascism really means. He found few Americans who were confident they would recognize a Fascist if they saw one.

And are we in uniform any more certain what fascism is—where it came from—what made it strong? Do we know how fascism leads men to do the things done to people at Maidanek? Do we know how it leads them to attack helpless nations? Are Maidaneks and war inevitable results of fascism? Do all Fascists speak only German, Italian, or Japanese—or do some of them speak our language? Will military victory in this war automatically kill fascism? Or could fascism rise in the United States after it has been crushed abroad? What can we do to prevent it?

Perhaps we ought to get to know the answers. If we don't understand fascism and recognize fascism when we see it, it might crop up again—under another label—and cause another war.

FASCISM AND BUSINESS

Fascism is a way to run a country—it's the way Italy was run, and the way Germany and Japan are run. Fascism is the precise opposite of democracy. The people run democratic governments, but Fascist governments run the people.

Fascism is government by the few and for the few. The objective is seizure and control of the economic, political, social, and cultural life of the state. Why? The democratic way of life interferes with their methods and desire for: (1) conducting business; (2) living with their fellow men; (3) having the final say in matters concerning others, as well as themselves. The basic principles of democracy stand in the way of their desires; hence—democracy must go! Anyone who is not a member of their inner gang has to do what he's told. They permit no civil liberties, no equality before the law. * * * They maintain themselves in power by use of force combined with propaganda based on primitive ideas of "blood" and "race," by skillful manipulation of fear and hate, and by false promise of security. The propaganda glorifies war and insists it is smart and "realistic" to be pitiless and violent.

Question. How does fascism get in power? How can a violent program that enslaves the people win any support?

FINANCIAL INTERESTS BEHIND FASCISM

Fascism came to power in Germany, Italy, and Japan at a time of social and economic unrest. A small group of men, supported in secret by powerful financial and military interests, convinced enough insecure people that fascism would give them the things they wanted * * *.

At the very time that the Fascists proclaimed that their party was the party of the average citizen, they were in the pay of certain big industrialists and financiers who wanted to run the people with an iron hand.

The Fascists promised everything to everyone. They would make the poor rich and the rich richer. To the farmers, the Fascists promised land through elimination of large estates. To the workers they promised elimination of unemployment—jobs for all at high wages. To the small businessmen they promised more customers and profits through the elimination of large business enterprises. To big businessmen and the industrialist they secretly promised greater security and profits through the elimination of small business competitors and trade unions and the crushing of Socialists and Communists. To the whole nation they promised glory and wealth by conquest. They asserted it was their right, as a "superior people," to rule the world.

As soon as these methods had won them enough of a following to form their storm troops, the Fascists began using force to stifle and wipe out any opposition. Those who saw through the false front of fascism and opposed them were beaten, tortured, and killed.

The Fascists knew that all believers in democracy were their enemies. They knew that the fundamental principle of democracy—faith in the common sense of the common people—was the direct opposite of the Fascist principle of rule by the elite few. So they fought democracy in all its phases. * * * They played the political, religious, social, and economic groups against each other and seized power while these groups struggled against each other.

LITTLE BUSINESS BETRAYED

Question. How could the Fascists keep their contradictory promises, once they got in power? How did their program actually work out?

It was easy enough for the Fascists to promise all things to all people before they were in power. Once they were actually in power, they could not, of course, keep their contradictory promises. They had intended in advance to break some, and they did break those they had made to the middle classes, the workers, and the farmers.

As soon as the Fascists were in control of the government, the torturings and killings were no longer the unlawful acts of a political party and its hoodlum gangs. They became official government policy. Among the first victims of this official policy were those farmers, workers, and small businessmen who had believed the promises that had been made to them and who complained that they had been "sucked in." Some simply vanished. Often they came home to their families by return mail in little jars of ashes. * * *

The Fascists "solved" unemployment by converting their nations into giant war machines. The unemployed were either conscripted into the army or organized in labor battalions and put to work in war plants.

WHY FASCISTS ARE ANTI-UNION

Deprived of their unions, the working people could be driven to work longer and harder for less and less money, so that those who subsidized and ran fascism could grow richer. By wiping out all internal competition—especially the small medium-sized business firms—profits were increased still higher for the handful on top. In some cases, the fascists then gobbled control of the top corporations. The living standards of the masses of the people declined, of course. As they earned less and less, they were able to buy less and less of the goods they produced. * * *

Once the Fascists were in control of the government, not even the gang on top was safe from its own members. There would be more loot and power per Fascist leader if some Fascist leaders were eliminated. Some of the party "big shots," and some of those who had helped them take over were therefore purged. Many would-be partners in the dictatorship, including some industrialists, wound up in jail, in exile, or dead.

CAN IT HAPPEN HERE?

Some Americans would give an emphatic "no" to the question "Can fascism come to America after it has been defeated abroad?" They would say that Americans are too smart, that they are sold on the democratic way of life, that they wouldn't permit any group to put fascism over in America. Fascism, some might say, is something peculiar that you find only among people who like swastikas, who like to listen to speeche from balconies in Rome, or who like to think that their emperor is God. Their reaction might be that it is something foreign that Americans would recognize in a minute, like the goose-step. They might feel that we'd laugh it out of existence in a hurry.

UNITED STATES HAS 100 PERCENT AMERICAN FASCISTS

Question. Do all Fascists come from Germany, Japan, or Italy?

In a good many European nations, the people felt the same way some of us do: that fascism was foreign to them and could never become a power in their land. They found, however, that fascist-minded people within their borders, especially with aid from the outside, could seize power. The Germans, of course, made efficient use of fascist-minded traitors whom we have come to know generally as "the fifth column."

In France, which was considered a leading democracy of Europe, the betrayal was spearheaded by a powerful clique of native 100-percent "French" Fascists. Norway had its Quisling who was as "pure-blooded" a Norwegian as Laval was a "pure-blooded" Frenchman. The Netherlands' Musserts were "100-percent Dutch," Belgium's Degrelles "100-percent Belgian," and Britain's Mosleys "100-percent British." The United States also has its native Fascists who say that they are "100-percent Americans." There were native Fascists in the Philippines, in Thailand (Siam), in China, in Burma, in many other countries—all waiting to become willing puppets of the Axis. Not one of these Fascists is a foreigner who had to be imported from Germany, or Japan, or Italy.

Question. Have any groups in America used Fascist tactics and appeals?

Most of the people in America like to be good neighbors. But, at various times and places in our history, we have had sorry instances of mob sadism, lynchings, vigilantism, terror, and suppression of civil liberties. We have had our hooded gangs, Black Legions, Silver Shirts, and racial and religious bigots. All of them, in the name of Americanism, have used undemocratic methods and doctrines which experience has shown can be properly identified as Fascist.

CRACKPOTS AND ALLEGED SEDITIONISTS

Can we afford to brush them off as mere crackpots? We once laughed Hitler off as a harmless little clown with a funny mustache.

In January 1944, 30 Americans, many of them native-born, were indicted by a Federal grand jury on charges of conspiring with "the Nazi party to accomplish the objectives of said Nazi party in the United States." These objectives, according to the indictment, included undermining and impairing "the loyalty and morale of the military and naval forces of the United States." The case ended in a mistrial caused by the death of the presiding judge. The question of reindictment is still under consideration.

Whenever free governments anywhere fail to solve their basic economic and social problems, there is always the danger that a native brand of fascism will arise to exploit the situation and the people.

CAN WE SPOT IT?

Question. How can we identify native American Fascists at work?

An American Fascist seeking power would not proclaim that he is a Fascist. Fascism always camouflages its plans and purposes. Hitler made demagogic appeals to all groups and swore: "Neither I nor anybody in the National Socialist Party advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods."

Any Fascist attempt to gain power in America would not use the exact Hitler pattern. It would work under the guise of "super-patriotism" and "super-Americanism." Fascist leaders are neither stupid nor naive. They know that they must hand out a line that sells. Huey Long is said to have remarked that if fascism came to America it would be on a program of Americanism.

THREE WAYS TO SPOT UNITED STATES FASCISTS

Fascists in America may differ slightly from Fascists in other countries, but there are a number of attitudes and practices that they have in common. Following are three. Every person who has one of them is not necessarily a Fascist. But he is in a mental state that lends itself to the acceptance of Fascist aims.

1. Pitting of religious, racial, and economic groups against one another in order to break down national unity is a device of the "divide and conquer" technique used by Hitler to gain power in Germany and in other countries. With slight variations, to suit local conditions, Fascists everywhere have used this Hitler method. In many countries, anti-Semitism (hatred of Jews) is a dominant device of fascism. In the United States, native Fascists have often been anti-Catholic, anti-Jew, anti-Negro, antilabor, anti-foreign born. In South America, the native Fascists use the same scapegoats except that they substitute anti-Protestantism for anti-Catholicism.

Interwoven with the "master race" theory of fascism is a well-planned "hate campaign" against minority races, religions, and other groups. To suit their particular needs and aim, Fascists will use any one or a combination of such groups as a convenient scapegoat.

2. Fascism cannot tolerate such religious and ethical concepts as the "brotherhood of man." Fascists deny the need for international cooperation. These ideas contradict the Fascist theory of the "master race." The brotherhood of man implies that all people—regardless of color, race, creed, or nationality—have rights. International cooperation, as expressed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, runs counter to the Fascist program of war and world dominion. * * * Right now our native Fascists are spreading anti-British, anti-Soviet, anti-French, and anti-United Nations propaganda. * * *

3. It is accurate to call a member of a Communist Party a "Communist." For short, he is often called a "Red." Indiscriminate pinning of the label "Red" on people and proposals which one opposes is a common political device. It is a favorite trick of native as well as foreign Fascists.

Many Fascists make the spurious claim that the world has but two choices—either fascism or communism, and they label as "Communist" everyone who refuses to support them. By attacking our free enterprise, capitalist democracy, and by denying the effectiveness of our way of life they hope to trap many people.

HITLER'S RED BOGEY

Hitler insisted that only fascism could save Europe and the world from the "Communist menace." There were many people inside and outside Germany and Italy who welcomed and supported Hitler and Mussolini because they believed fascism was the only safeguard against communism. The "Red bogey" was a convincing enough argument to help Hitler take and maintain power. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis, whose aggressions plunged the world into global war, was called the "Anti-Comintern Axis." It was proclaimed by Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito as a "bulwark against communism."

Learning to identify native Fascists and to detect their techniques is not easy. They plan it that way. But it is vitally important to learn to spot them, even though they adopt names and slogans with popular appeal, drape themselves with the American flag, and attempt to carry out their program in the name of the democracy they are trying to destroy.

HOW TO STOP IT

Question. How can we prevent fascism from developing in the United States?

The only way to prevent fascism from getting a hold in America is by making our democracy work and by actively cooperating to preserve world peace and security.

Lots of things can happen inside of people when they are unemployed or hungry. They become frightened, angry, desperate, confused. Many, in their misery, seek to find somebody to blame. They look for a scapegoat as a way out. Fascism is always ready to provide one. In its bid for power, it is ready to drive wedges that will disunite the people and weaken the nation. It supplies the scapegoat—Catholics, Jews, Negroes, labor unions, big business—any group upon which the insecure and unemployed can be brought to pin the blame for their misfortune.

We all know that many serious problems will face us when the war is over. If there is a period of economic stress it will create tensions among our people, including us as returning veterans. The resentment may be directed against minorities—especially if undemocratic organizations with power and

money can direct our emotions and thinking along these lines.

CITIZEN'S JOB TO FIGHT FASCISM

The Fascist doctrine of hate fulfills a triple mission. By creating disunity, it weakens democracy. By getting men to hate rather than to think, it prevents men from seeking the real cause and a democratic solution of the problem. By fake promises of jobs and security, fascism then tries to lure men to its program as the way out of insecurity. Only by democratically solving the economic problems of our day can there be any certainty that fascism won't happen here. That is our job as citizens.

Citizenship in a democracy is more than a ballot dropped in a box on election day. It's a 365-days-a-year job requiring the active participation and best judgment of every citizen in the affairs of his community, his Nation, and his country's relations with the world.

Fascism thrives on indifference and ignorance. It makes headway when people are apathetic or cynical about their government; when they think of it as something far removed from them and beyond their personal concern. The erection of a traffic light on your block is important to your safety and the safety of your children. The erection of a world organization to safeguard peace and world security is just as important to our personal security. Both must be the concern of every citizen.

Freedom, like peace and security, cannot be maintained in isolation. It involves being alert and on guard against the infringement not only of our own freedom but the freedom of every American. If we permit discrimination, prejudice, or hate to rob anyone of his democratic rights, our own freedom, and all democracy is threatened.

What is true of America is true of the world. The germ of fascism cannot be quarantined in a Munich brown house or a balcony in Rome. If we want to make certain that fascism does not come to America, we must make certain that it does not thrive anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I only regret that the rules and regulations of the War Department precluded the naming of outstanding American Fascists, such as the Duponts, the Pews, the Girdlers, the Weirs, Van Horn Moseley, H. W. Prentis, Jr., Merwin K. Hart, and others, including the 30 Fascists charged with conspiracy and seditious activities and tried, but due to the untimely death of the trial judge, they are still at large.

Addresses of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD, in order that Members of Congress and others may have the opportunity to read them, two speeches delivered by that silver-tongued Filipino voice of freedom, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

The first of these speeches was delivered by General Romulo on the occasion of the reestablishment of the Philippine Commonwealth in Manila, Malacanan Palace, February 27, 1945.

The other speech was delivered on March 2, 1945, by General Romulo over the Voice of Freedom on the occasion of his return to Corregidor.

These speeches follow:

DAY OF FULFILLMENT

(Broadcast delivered by Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, on the occasion of the reestablishment of the Philippine Commonwealth in Manila, Malacanan Palace, February 27, 1945)

Today is for us a day of fulfillment.

Today the Philippine Commonwealth, founded in trust and loyalty, is reestablished on its unshakable foundations, in this, the capital city of the Filipino people.

This morning, President Sergio Osmeña, standing in historic Malacanan Palace, seat of Filipino sovereignty, received in the name of the Filipino people, from the hand which grasped the sword of liberation—the hand of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the civil government of the Philippines.

After 3 long years of untold suffering, the Filipino people again know the heart-lifting feeling of freedom. After 3 long years of subjection, of stifling humiliation, they breathe again the air of liberty. The gratitude of a people, unlike that of an individual can never be adequately expressed. It is such a gratitude, beyond description, that they feel toward their deliveries, the American forces of liberation.

We enter our capital, the city of Manila, and we find a pyre of ruins and ashes—evidence of Japanese savagery at a new low. Cornered and at bay, the smashed remnants of Yamashita's defeated army, vented their spleen in an orgy of murder and destruction; leaving this our Pearl of the Orient a mound of wreckage for a hecatomb of helpless civilians.

But not even this dastardly crime of a Japanese soldiery committed in compliance with orders from Tokyo can daunt the people of the Philippines. After the fall of Bataan, this people, without food; its commerce ruined; its normal ccurse of living disrupted; its deepest spiritual sanctions violated—this people resisted the blandishments of Japanese duplicity, remained undaunted. As the weary months and years of subjection dragged on, this people, without arms, without ammunition, sometimes even without hope, still found the inner strength to resist Japanese brutality and terrorism, still remain undaunted.

Today, the wanton destruction of Manila before their eyes sharpens the determination which was inevitably born during those black years of subjection: The determination to carry the fight forward—across the northern seas—to the shores of the Japanese islands—to the heart of Tokyo itself.

With this in view I know I echo the ardent desires of my people when I ask, in their name, for the privilege—nay, for the right—of the Filipino soldier to share in the invasion of Japan.

The American people have given their dearest possession—the beloved youth of their land—as a sacrifice to liberate us from Japanese tyranny and oppression. We feel that gratitude for our liberation imposes on us, as men, the duty and obligation to march, arms in hand, beside America; to share in the burden which she has undertaken; to destroy forever, by a direct assault on that stronghold of tyranny, the standing menace to freedom that is the Japan of today. We feel; and we believe that the world should know, that Filipino gratitude is expressed not in words, but in deeds. We feel that it is our right to share in this task; and we ask for the privilege of fighting beside America.

To the people of America I say, this is for you, too, a day of fulfillment. The pledge, sealed in blood in the hills and along the shores washed by Manila Bay, has been redeemed. Bataan and Corregidor have been avenged. American honor has been vindicated.

To my people I say that the long, dreary night of our captivity has ended. A new day begins. There is work to be done—a man's work, on the battlefield and in the field of toil. Tyranny is to be destroyed, and the dwelling place of freedom, wantonly ravaged by the tyranny which hates freedom, is to be rebuilt. A people that through 3 hopeless years of darkness held fast to its loyalty to the heritage of freedom, will not fail to respond as loyally to the call to work—work with the armament of war in the necessary task of destroying tyranny, and work with the tools of peace to rebuild the House of Freedom. Filipinos all, let us to work!

RETURN TO CORREGIDOR

(Broadcast delivered by Brig Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Philippines Resident Commissioner over the Voice of Freedom, March 2, 1945, on the occasion of his return to Corregidor with General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur)

Bataan is heroism, Corregidor is martyrdom.

Old names, but today they have new meanings. For we will never again hear the word "Bataan" but we will recall the unsurpassable heroism of our men who fought there. And we will never hear the word "Corregidor," but we will pause in reverence to the memory of our men who, with hope gone, everything gone but life and honor, did not hesitate to give up life.

I have seen Corregidor again.

With General MacArthur and those of his staff who were with him in those tragic days early in 1942, we returned yesterday to that rock where we had seen, and had been part of, the beginning of that drama of martyrdom. As our PT boat swept on, and as the stark outlines of the island and its brood of outpost rocks took shape before my eyes, a rush of memories flooded my thoughts; and I was again back in those grim days—amid the acrid fumes of cordite—the incessant reverberation of bomb bursts—the crash of falling masonry. I could feel that terrifying sense of entrapment that had come to us with the knowledge that the swaggering hordes of Japan were all about us—a yellow tide, irresistible, crawling slowly but inexorably closer.

We went ashore. I stood once more at the entrance to a familiar tunnel. In the semidarkness I saw the point within where once stood the radio broadcasting unit. From this unit there used to come the inevitably fading Voice of Freedom. The time was to come when that voice was to grow in volume and to resound again over East Asia. We knew this, then; but we did not know when it would come, or whether we should hear it. I saw again the place where once stood the dock from which we departed; the place which was really the beginning of the long, hard but glorious journey back to redemption and freedom.

Upon bomb-shattered topside I saw again the flagstaff, its frame bent, but still erect, still waiting for the flag that belonged on it; and I heard General MacArthur tell the commander of the men who had brought the flag back: "I see the flagpole still stands. Have your troops hoist the colors to its peak, and let no enemy ever haul them down."

These were words of joy and triumph, words that brought a throb to every heart on that sun-blistered plateau. But to me they also brought the memory of a great man, whom fate forced to drink the bitterest cup of all. It was the memory of the soldier who stayed to breast that crawling yellow tide. The heaviest burden was hit, but also the greatest honor—the honor of the rearguard that holds, and dies, that the greatest cause might

triumph. Lt. Gen. Jonathan Wainwright was the man who carried that burden. He bore the cross of defeat; he saw his flag come down. But because he did this we now see the sun of victory, we have seen the flag rise again, never to come down again.

And, as this memory of Jonathan Wainwright came to me, I sensed, amid that throng of the living about me, the near presence of my old comrades who had fallen there on the rock. They were beside me and around me, with their unshaven, mud-streaked faces, many with their bloody bandages, and all with that inextinguishable light of courage in their eyes. And I spoke to them; and I spoke the words I knew America and a liberated Philippines wanted me to speak. I said to them: "You who have fallen here that we the living might come back—you have never died. You shall never die. You live today under that flag that because of your martyrdom again waves over you. You live in the green buds that are now springing from this shell-blistered earth. You live in the thunder of those planes that at this moment, and within sight of your resting place, are avenging you. You live, and you shall forever live, in the bond that your sacred blood, your martyrdom of Corregidor, have sealed two free peoples."

The Polish Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution of the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress adopted on April 8, 1945, at the Polish National Home in Chicopee, Mass.

This resolution indicates the great interest being displayed by American citizens of my district in the momentous Polish question. In order that the Members of Congress may know of the sentiments of this group, I am having it inserted in the RECORD so that all may see it:

Resolution of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress adopted on April 8, 1945, at meeting of delegates at Polish National Home, Chicopee, Mass.

Whereas the decisions made at Yalta Conference destroy the independence of a faithful ally, Poland, by giving away half of its territory outright to Russia and by placing the remaining part under the domination of Russian puppet government, so-called Lublin regime;

Whereas the decisions made at the Yalta Conference violate the principles of the Atlantic Charter and four freedoms for the sake of power politics and political expediency;

Whereas the decisions at Yalta Conference violate the fundamental principles of democracy in international relations;

Whereas the decisions made at Yalta Conference are contrary to the American traditional respect for law and order since in matters pertaining to Poland they were made without knowledge and without consent of the legal, constitutional Polish Government in exile and without hearing the will of the Polish nation;

Whereas since the Yalta Conference the Soviet puppet regime in Poland has, with expert assistance of the Soviet political police, set up a reign of terror and has been liquidating by deportations or executions members of the Polish Underground Army who for 5 years have been fighting heroically the Nazis and rendered Allied Nations priceless military aid;

Whereas Poland who was the first to take up arms against the mighty Nazi aggressor, has fought against the common enemy on land, on sea, and in the air, from Narvik to Tobruk, from Cassino to Aachen and has borne sacrifices which exceed those of any other nation;

Whereas the world's peace based on fundamental justice and self-respect will be to the honor of Allied Nations, while peace based on appeasement, expediency and might well sow seeds of other, even more disastrous wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we strongly condemn the partition and subjugation of Poland and we protest and bitterly resent the imposition of Soviet's agents, the Lublin regime, while legal, constitutional Polish Government, represents Poland and her people;

Resolved, That we petition the United States Senate to disaffirm that part of Yalta decisions which pertains to Poland since they violate the inalienable rights of man to life and liberty.

Resolved, That a copy thereof be sent to the Vice President, the Secretary of State, our Senators and Representatives and to the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference.

RT. REV. BOLESLAW A. BOJANOWSKI,
Dr. KAROL SMOLCZYNSKI,
Atty. PAUL P. FLAK,
WACLAW J. SZEWCZYNSKI,
Committee on Resolutions.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, letters come to my office daily making inquiry about veterans' legislation and the rights and privileges of servicemen generally. In an effort to be helpful to servicemen, their friends and families, I wish to insert in the RECORD a brief summary of some of the more important laws passed by the Congress pertaining to veterans' affairs. During 1943 and 1944 this Congress passed more than 50 bills relating to people in the service and their dependents. It was my privilege to support all of this legislation, realizing that much of it was imperfect, and that we would need to pass a great deal of perfecting legislation during the present Congress.

We realize, of course, that there is no way to compensate men disabled in the military service. There is no way to repay their families for anguish and suffering. A grateful country should never cease to help disabled veterans, their families and others who suffered other losses because of military service.

Recently there has been great interest and many inquiries as to the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights. In order that there may be general knowledge of the provisions of this bill, as well as other legislation of benefit to veterans and their dependents, I am summarizing briefly some of the provisions of these laws.

Promptly upon his discharge there are a few things a veteran should do: First, report to his selective-service board in person or by letter within 5 days of his discharge. Second, apply for his old job within 90 days of his discharge. Third, pay the premium of his national-service life insurance in order to keep it in force. Fourth, put his records in order for the future. These records include his service serial number, discharge papers, disability claim number, insurance policies, social-security card, birth certificates of himself and his dependents, marriage certificate, any divorce decrees, last will and testament, selective-service registration card. I cannot lay too much stress on the importance of such records. Many a veteran's claim for compensation has been delayed because records were not in order.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

A veteran, except one who falls within one of certain excluded groups, discharged under honcrable conditions, is entitled to receive mustering-out pay ranging from $100 to $300, depending on his length and place of service. A veteran discharged before the law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service, if his application is filed within 2 years from date of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944.

SECURING A JOB

The United States Employment Service has offices throughout the country, and maintains a special representative in each office whose duty it is to assist veterans in finding suitable positions.

Those who were civil-service employees, other than temporary, at time of entry into the armed forces should apply to the agency where last employed within 90 days of discharge or to the Civil Service Commission in event difficulty is experienced in getting reinstated.

Those veterans who did not have civil-service positions but wish to enter the Government service will be given special preference in civil-service examinations. This preference is also extended to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

Virtually all the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which will prepare them for skilled jobs. Information may be obtained from the United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration, which for our section is the Veterans' Administration, 1009 Wyandotte Street, Kansas City 6, Mo.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

A veteran who has a service-connected disability resulting in an occupational handicap can probably be taught a new type of work which will not be hindered by the disability. The Veterans' Administration is in charge of this training. If the disability is not service connected or occurs after discharge, vocational

training may be secured through the State board of vocational education, which is a Federal-State program, or the veteran may be entitled to education or training as hereinafter mentioned.

EDUCATION

Veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to determination of the present war and who were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days or more service exclusive of any period assigned for a course of education or training under the Army Specialized Training Program or the Navy college training program which course was a continuation of their civilian course and was pursued to completion, or the time assigned as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or who having served less than 90 days was discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, are entitled to receive education or training if they were not over 25 at time of entrance into service, or, if over 25, can show that their education or training was interfered with by service, may be furnished a refresher or retraining course. Such education or training, or refresher or retraining course, must commence not later than 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later.

The length of training consists of 1 year or its equivalent in continuous part-time study or for such lesser time as may be required for the course of instruction chosen by the veteran. If the veteran completes the course, except the refresher or retraining course, in a satisfactory manner, he will be entitled to additional education or training not to exceed the time he spent in active service—exclusive of the time assigned to the A. S. T. P. or Navy college program or the period he was a cadet or midshipman, as stated above. No course of training shall exceed a total period of 4 years.

For an ordinary school year the Veterans' Administration will pay up to $500 in tuition, fees, and certain other expenses for the education and training of a veteran. In addition, a subsistence allowance of $50 a month is paid the veteran with no dependent, and $75 a month to those with dependents.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Weekly allowances, not to exceed 52 in number, of unemployment compensation, known as readjustment allowances, are provided for eligible veterans of World War II who are unemployed, the number of weekly allowances being dependent upon the time spent in active service. If the veteran is entitled for the same period to an allowance or benefit under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law, money received or accrued from such source is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan, 8 weeks of allowance is payable for each month of the qualifying 90 days' service and 4 weeks' allowance is made for each subsequent calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, up to a total limit of 52 weeks. Self-employed veterans are entitled to receive the difference between their net earnings for the month and $100.

LOANS TO VETERANS

The Veterans Administration will guarantee loans bearing interest not to exceed 4 percent obtained by veterans of World War No. 2 up to 50 percent of any such loan, provided the amount guaranteed may not exceed $2,000, and will pay the interest on the amount guaranteed for the first year. The applicant must show that the borrowed money will be used in purchasing a farm or farm equipment or business property, or for purchasing or repairing a home. Special provisions are made where a principal loan is approved by a Federal agency and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, subject to the $2,000 limitation. Veterans eligible for loan guaranty benefits under the G. I. bill are eligible for loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act under certain circumstances.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE

Medical service, dental care, and hospitalization, including out-patient service, are provided if the veterans' condition was caused or aggravated by his service in the armed forces. Hospital treatment is also made available, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, to all war veterans and certain peacetime veterans unable to pay the cost of treatment for disasbilities not shown to be due to service. Domiciliary care is also available under certain conditions in Veterans' Administration facilities.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION OR PENSION

Veterans discharged from the armed forces under conditions other than dishonorable and who have a disability due to service may be entitled to compensation or pension. The amount payable, based upon wartime service, ranges from $10 a month for 10-percent disability to $100 a month for 100-percent disability. Beginning June 1, 1944, these sums were increased by 15 percent. There are special rates and allowances ranging as high as $265 for specific injuries and more serious disabilities. The peacetime rates are approximately 75 percent of the foregoing rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

As distinguished from compensation or pension paid to veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, pensions are payable to war veterans for non-service-connected disability. Such pension is payable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, World War Nos. 1 and 2 when the disability is held to be permanent and total, and provided the annual income of the veteran, if single, does not exceed $1,000, or, if married or with minor children, does not exceed $2,500. Service pensions, based upon permanent disabilities or age are also payable to veterans of the Indian Wars, Civil War, and Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection or Boxer Rebellion under various service pension laws.

SOLDIERS' HOMES

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to a national or State soldiers' home for disabled, of which there are many located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care. Some of the State soldiers' homes admit the wives, widows, and children of veterans.

CIVIL RELIEF

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as law suits for collection of debts, contracts, repossession of property, collection of certain taxes, sale of property for taxes, eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent, insurance premiums, and rights in public lands. Under this act the Veterans' Administration is authorized to guarantee premiums on commercial insurance policies carried by men in the armed forces up to a maximum amount of $10,000 insurance.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of a veteran of any war, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, a veteran of any war in receipt of pension or compensation, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Men and women who die in line of duty while in the armed forces, and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Under certain circumstances arrangements may be made for the burial beside him of his widow, and in some of these cemeteries for the burial of minor children and unmarried adult daughters. In most cases an American flag for draping the casket of a veteran may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration or any county seat postmaster.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, Washington 25, D. C.

DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCES

Most people are familiar with the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act whereby the Government contributes to the support of dependents of enlisted men in the armed forces, and with the provisions of the law extending maternity care to the wife of any enlisted man in the service who is in the four lowest pay grades. Free medical and nursing care is provided for the wife and infant, and the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life. The maternity-care program is administered by the various States.

PRISONERS AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a service man or woman is a prisoner of war or interned in a neutral country, or is listed as "missing" or "missing in action," and presumption of death has not been determined, dependents continue to receive family allow-

ances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

GRATUITY AND BACK PAY

When a man dies while in the armed forces a gratuity payment in an amount equal to 6 months' pay is made to the widow or children of the veteran or to a designated dependent relative, or other dependent relatives, subject to certain regulatory provisions of the service department concerned. The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service is paid to the next of kin. Unpaid portions of mustering-out pay may be claimed by a surviving wife; if none, by surviving children; or if no surviving children, by a parent or parents.

INSURANCE

A serviceman may take out national service life-insurance policies in amounts not less than $1,000 in multiples of $500, up to $10,000. Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans' Administration should be notified and will furnish the necessary blanks to the beneficiary named by the insured, or otherwise provided by law. Payments of this insurance are not made in a lump sum but in equal monthly installments, under one of two optional settlements, depending on the age of the beneficiary.

This insurance is originally issued on what is called the 5-year level-premium term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, it may be converted into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life. The original policy must be converted before the expiration of the 5-year period in order to keep it effective. The new policy will have regular cash value after the first year from which a veteran can borrow if necessary. All veterans are urged to keep their insurance in force.

DEPENDENTS' PENSIONS

When a member of the armed forces dies in action or in line of duty, or a former serviceman dies as a result of service-connected disability, his dependents are entitled to compensation or pension benefits. The rates of these pensions, for wartime service-connected death, which are the same for dependents of veterans of all wars including World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The rates payable to the widow, child or children, and dependent parent or parents of any veteran whose death resulted from service-connected disability based upon peacetime service are as follows:

Widow, no child	$38
Widow, 1 child (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $75)	49
No widow, but 1 child	19
No widow, but 2 children (with $8 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $75)	$28
Dependent mother and father:	
Each	20
Or 1 only	30

The widow and minor children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 who was released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after serving 90 days or more, or for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, and whose death was not due to service, are also entitled to pensions. In World War No. 2 cases, there is a requirement that the veteran must have had a service-connected disability at time of death. Rates of these pensions are as follows:

Widow, but no child	$35
Widow, with 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow, but 1 child	18
No widow, but 2 children (with $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided)	27
No widow, but 3 children (with $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided)	36

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $74 in any one case.

Under Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children of veterans of World War No. 1 for non-service-connected death, under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, were increased, and the benefits of that law were extended to widows and children of veterans of World War No. 2. Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, provided compensation for non-service-connected death for the widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans but required that the veteran must have had a service-connected disability at time of death.

Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 14, 1944, removed this requirement in World War No. 1 cases but continued this requirement as a condition prerequisite to payment of pension for non-service-connected death in World War No. 2 cases.

Another important change in existing legislation accomplished by enactment of Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, was the change in the delimiting marriage date as applied to widows of veterans of World War No. 1. Prior to this act the widow of a veteran of World War No. 1 was defined as a woman who married the veteran prior to May 14, 1938. This term is now defined to mean a woman who was married prior to December 14, 1944, for 10 or more years to the person who served. As a result of this liberalization of the delimiting marriage date, many widows of veterans of World War No. 1 who were married subsequent to May 14, 1938, will be eligible for pension for non-service-connected death if otherwise eligible.

Widows and children of veterans of the Indian Wars, Civil War, Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion, are also entitled to pension for non-service-connected death under the various service pension laws. The monthly rate for a widow is $30, increased to $40 at age 70—or at age 65 in Spanish-American War cases, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion—and $50 if the widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his war service, with $6 monthly for each child. The monthly rate for one child, if there is no widow, is $36 with $6 per month for each additional child. In Spanish-American War cases, the rates for children beyond age 16 to 18 years, or to age 21 if pursuing a course of instruction in an approved educational institution, are those set forth above for World War No. 1, non-service-connected death.

I count it a privilege to be of all possible assistance to all veterans or their dependents. Please write me about your problems, or address your inquiries to the Veterans' Administration, 1009 Wyandotte Street, Kansas City, 6, Mo., whose duty it is to furnish veterans with full information about their rights and privileges.

President Truman's Approval of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the first major pieces of legislation signed by our new President was the extension of the Lend-Lease Act recently passed by Congress.

This bill, H. R. 2013, was signed by the President on April 17, and at the time of his doing so he issued a statement which is significant, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON SIGNING THE THIRD LEND-LEASE ACT

This is the third time that the Lend-Lease Act has been extended by the Congress—each time by overwhelming majorities.

This mighty instrument for victory is one of the growing monuments to the boldness, imagination, and effective statesmanship of Franklin Roosevelt.

At a critical time in the history of this country, he saw the vital need for aiding those who were fighting against Axis aggression and oppression all over the world.

The wisdom and effectiveness of that vision are being shown every day on the battlefronts all over the world.

On the western European front—the British, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians and other Allied forces have been equipped in part with lend-lease guns and other munitions; and, shoulder to shoulder with our men, are fighting their way into the heart of Nazi Germany.

In Italy—American, British, Polish, Brazilian and other Allied armed forces are joined in a common effort to speed final victory.

On the eastern front—the Soviet forces, aided by lend-lease supplies, are striking blows which are breaking the back of Nazi military power.

In the Far East—the Chinese, the British, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the Dutch and other fighting allies, have joined with us in a combined attack which is now beating at the doors of Tokyo.

Lend-lease has been an effective instrument to help assure a complete United Nations victory with the least cost in American and Allied lives.

Lend-lease will be carried on until the unconditional surrender or complete defeat of Germany and Japan.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt—A Memorial Address by Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the memorial address delivered by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, before a joint session of the Oklahoma Legislature, April 13, 1945. The joint session was to hold memorial services for our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Governor Kerr's address follows:

Mr. President of the Senate, Mr. Speaker of the House, ladies and gentlemen of the joint session, and my fellow Oklahomans, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead.

The words reverberate like thunder rolling amid mighty mountains.

Their impact is felt around the world.

The ranks of the Big Three are broken.

There is sorrow in the Kremlin where Joseph Stalin, directing Russia's mighty war effort realizes that Roosevelt is dead.

There is sorrow in Whitehall and at No. 10 Downing Street where Winston Churchill contemplates the onrushing sweep of democracy's fighting forces on the western front and knows that his most stalwart comrade is gone.

There is sorrow in Chungking as the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek feel the shock of a loss not only to themselves but also to their people.

There is grief in the hearts of the leaders of every nation on this earth who are striving and fighting for freedom.

There is lamentation from where the shadows of Chapultepec fall across the palace of President Avilla Comancho, all along the Isthmus, and from Panama to where the southern peaks of the Andes rear their snow-capped heads above the waters of Cape Horn.

There is deep sorrow in far-off Australia, in New Guinea, in the lands which still writhe under the heel of the loathed Jap invader; in the Philippines, whose coral strands reflect the rays of sunlight which had been in eclipse but which have returned.

The symbol of their liberation is dead.

There is sorrow in the hearts of our military commanders, as the greatest generals and admirals of America's proud history weep unashamed at the bier of their fallen Commander in Chief.

Roosevelt is dead!

The hearts of the people of America are heavy as they bid farewell to their beloved President.

A shadow has fallen across the hearth of every American home, of the rich and of the poor.

American workers will make a greater effort today in tribute to the sacrifice of the life of the best friend they ever had.

The farmers of America will raise their sights and increase production goals in loving recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by the champion who advanced their welfare more than any other.

The rank and file of American citizens wherever they are will work a little harder and dedicate themselves anew in honor of the heroic death of the great leader they loved so well.

The aged stand with heads bowed and bared as they mourn the passing of one who implemented his affection for them by bringing to them an economic security they had never known and which, without him, they would not have.

The fighting men and women of America around the world, on the sea, on the land, and in the air, will surge forward with greater resolve and greater power, inspired by the heroic death of their matchless Commander. They will rededicate themselves, that they may insure winning the objectives which were so dear to him and which they had expected to win with him.

His most fitting monument is in the hearts of the people who loved him, as he loved them, and who will cherish and treasure his memory until time ripens into eternity.

But, my fellow Americans, in the darkness of our sorrow the light of gratitude and determination breaks upon us.

We are grateful that Franklin Delano Roosevelt has lived.

We are thankful that his genius led us out of the Nation's greatest depression.

We are happy in the knowledge that his transcendent courage and brilliance have led us through the danger and the carnage of the most terrible war in history, until today, we, with our brave allies, have achieved victory over Germany, and know that we and they are likewise winning certain victory over Japan.

We are grateful that his spirit will lead us patiently, but surely, in achieving an abiding peace. We can never be thankful enough that he was willing and able to give all that he had in the service of his country and that the security and welfare of his people were more precious to him than his life.

We will meet the crisis brought about by his death in the light of the examples he gave us while he lived.

Do you remember the fateful morning of March 4, 1933?

Let the words of courage which he spoke then challenge us anew:

"Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper.

"So first of all let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

"In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days."

Do you remember his courage, his superb confidence, and his infinite faith as he stood before the joint session of the National Congress after Pearl Harbor and called America to arms to meet the challenge of Japanese aggression, in these words:

"No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people, in their righteous might, will win through to absolute victory.

"With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God."

We face our future today in the light and inspiration of his words spoken to the Congress and to the Nation on January 7, 1943:

"Therefore, let us, all of us, have confidence, let us redouble our efforts.

"A tremendous, costly, long-enduring task in peace as well as in war is still ahead of us.

"But, as we face that continuing task, we may know that the state of this Nation is good, the heart of this Nation is sound, the spirit of this Nation is strong, the faith of this Nation is eternal."

We are richer far than we have ever been in every phase of our national life by reason of his life and service, and of the giving of his life to his country's cause.

We will honor him by giving our confidence and full support to and by holding up the hands of his successor, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, who is today President of the United States.

We will follow the example of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by rededicating all that we have and all that we are to completing the unfinished task that is ahead.

With an even greater unity among us because of his sacrifice, with steadfastness of purpose worthy of the ideals for which he lived, America moves majestically and irresistibly forward and upward to her greatest destiny.

United States Merchant Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article which recently appeared in the Army and Navy Journal. This article speaks for itself and every Member of Congress interested in the maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine should read it:

Lewis Douglas, who was Deputy Administrator of War Shipping in 1942 and 1943, publishes in the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly an article proposing that the United States sell or lease to friendly maritime nations all of our war-built fleet at "nominal prices" or "nominal rentals," and that the American merchant fleet be reduced to the 10,000,000 dead weight tons it totaled before this war.

The arguments and conclusions with which he supported this startling proposal are challenged by Government officials and shipping men familiar with the facts. For example, he set up as his thesis the statement that "it is urged by some that the United States in the future maintain a huge merchant marine." As a matter of fact, although the United States will have by the end of this year a war-built tonnage of 40,000,000 gross or 60,000,000 deadweight tons, as against about 10,000,000 deadweight tons before the war, no serious official or shipping man has proposed that anything like the total tonnage should be maintained in active operation. Admiral Land has suggested from fifteen to twenty million deadweight tons, mostly of the fast-cargo ships and tankers, with appropriate passenger types. Yet, Mr. Douglas repeatedly referred to the "huge" merchant marine and finally made the unsupported statement that a fleet of 20,000,000 tons would cost from two hundred to three hundred million dollars a year in operating subsidy alone, an estimate which authorities at the Maritime Commission declare a fantastic overestimate, since a substantial part of whatever merchant marine the United States maintains will be in coastwise trade and therefore not eligible

to operating subsidy. Another substantial part will consist of tankers not eligible to subsidy and a part of the fleet operating in foreign trade will probably not require subsidy. For a total of 16,000,000 tons the subsidized portion would, in the opinion of competent shipping men, require not more than $40,000,000 a year in operating subsidy. It is impossible at this time to estimate the precise amount by which American operating cost will exceed that of foreign vessels, which is the measure of operating subsidy.

The national defense need of a substantially larger merchant fleet than we had before the war is only slightly acknowledged by Mr. Douglas who proposed to meet it, not by maintaining a substantial active American merchant fleet with trained personnel from the 200,000 officers and men now serving our merchant fleet with an efficiency which our Army and Navy leaders have enthusiastically acclaimed. Mr. Douglas proposes that when we sell or lease our ships to other nations, we will arrange that they be given back to us if we are threatened by war.

The article is replete with errors, such as listing the Liberty ships as of 10-knot speed, when their performance ranges upward of 11 knots. Also a grave error is his declaration that the British merchant marine has suffered losses reducing it by one-half, whereas Britain has nearly regained her pre-war tonnage and the total shipping of the British Empire exceeds pre-war figures.

Although the pre-war American merchant fleet was requisitioned 100 percent, ships, personnel, and management, by the Government and the privately owned American shipping companies have been the actual operators, under Government direction, of the ever-growing merchant fleet, Mr. Douglas utters no word of commendation for the service rendered by the merchant marine. In fact, he deprecates the possibility that the United States has been in modern times, or can be in the future, a competent maritime nation, although it is a fact that the American merchant fleet of 10,000,000 dead-weight tons was second in size only to that of Britain.

Mr. Douglas pictures shipping as a source of difficulties between nations if it is subsidized, ignoring the fact that, in the form of preferences and otherwise, the British and other governments have always provided certain advantages for their own shipping, even if they did not take the form of money payments. He repeats the exploded theory that other nations derive a large part of their national income and of their purchasing power for imported merchandise from shipping earnings, whereas the Department of Commerce has officially published the fact that pre-war shipping earnings provided only 1.3 percent of the British national income; with other maritime nations only slightly higher, Norway was the only nation deriving a substantial part of its national income from shipping earnings, namely, 11 percent. (These facts are set forth in an article by John S. Smith of the Department of Commerce, entitled "World Income From Shipping," an official publication.)

Mr. Douglas enthusiastically supports the contention that if a larger American merchant marine should reduce the earnings of foreign shipping derived from carrying our trade, our own economy would be pretty well wrecked. However, factual analysis demonstrates that in the 20 years, 1913–33, the net balance derived by foreign countries from shipping services to the United States amounts to only approximately 1 percent of the value of our exports during that time.

All of the foregoing is by way of background for a notable and statesmanlike utterance from Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, warning the country that it must not dissipate its seapower, including merchant shipping. It was significant that Admiral King chose to make this statement in specific terms at a dinner of the Academy of Political and Social Science in New York City on April 4, at which Mr. Douglas presided as president of the academy.

It was a sharp contradiction of Mr. Douglas' proposal. Briefly, Admiral King declared that "lack of ships was one of our pre-war weaknesses"; that lack of ships had retarded the impact of our armed services overseas and on the sea; and that only when this was corrected by the magnificent shipbuilding effort which the United States belatedly put forward were our military objectives attained and eventually brought near. Admiral King's address brings down to date the basic exposition of the lessons of seapower which Rear Admiral Alfred T. Mahan, United States Navy, made in the nineties. Admiral King, in no less powerful terms, has brought into the seapower equation the submarine and the aircraft which did not exist in Mahan's day. Mahan declared that merchant shipping and personnel was an indispensable element in seapower.

Fleet Admiral King's declaration was a challenge to Mr. Douglas' proposal that we go back to the pre-war merchant shipping status which Admiral King declares and demonstrated was inadequate for either defense or commerce and which he prayed his fellow citizens to avoid in the future.

Briefly, Mr. Douglas decries the operating subsidy necessary to offset the higher cost of operating American ships. He says they will create frictions with other nations. Yet, he proposes to subsidize foreign merchant fleets against us by selling or leasing them ships at nominal price. He proposes to thus force the American merchant fleet back to the 10,000,000-ton size which proved inadequate for both commerce and defense before this war and which Admiral King warns his countrymen must not happen again.

Longevity in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I call attention herewith to a recent editorial appearing in the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., pointing out that the most recent health statistics of this country show that South Dakota has the lowest mortality rate and the highest longevity rate of any State in the Union. Thus is disproved for once and for all the old fable that only the good die young.

The good people of South Dakota, Mr. Speaker, live long and stay well because residence in the Sunshine State of South Dakota gives them much to live for and an abundance to live with.

A year ago, South Dakota was second in the list of most healthful States in the Union. It was exceeded only by its sister State of North Dakota. I used to believe that North Dakotans lived longer than South Dakotans only because they held on to life's tender strings more vigorously with the hope that if they lived long enough they might some day be fortunate enough to move down to South Dakota. Apparently that hope has either been achieved or else it has been dissipated because South Dakota now outranks North Dakota in healthfulness although our sister State retains its place on the honor roll among the first five.

Returning war veterans, workers leaving war industries, young people fresh out of college and old people seeking peace and prosperity for their declining years would do well to look to South Dakota as a possible home for after the war. Here is a State with no income tax laws, with no State tax on real estate, with vast opportunities and a friendly, healthful climate. Here is a State kissed by Nature and nourished by Providence where good health abounds and whose people manifest a hospitality exceeded only by their optimism.

When Horace Greeley said, "Go west, young man," it seems increasingly evident that South Dakota was the destination which he had in mind:

LONGEVITY

A current bulletin from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. presents statistics to show that South Dakota has the lowest mortality rate in the Nation with 7.9 deaths in each 1,000 of population annually.

Other States below 9 per 1,000 but above the South Dakota figure are Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma.

This group constitutes States that are in the mid-central part of the United States.

South Dakota, of course, is proud to head the list and naturally interprets the statistics as a tribute to its excellent climate, its variable seasons and its constructive way of life.

Hog-Pork Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the St. Louis Live Stock Exchange, National Stock Yards, Ill.:

HOG-PORK SITUATION

The hog-pork situation in the United States has reached a critical stage. Due to various causes, both natural and artificial, the Nation's hog supply has been reduced so drastically that constructive steps should be taken immediately to repair damage done and start production of hogs on the upgrade. This is a very vital matter affecting the farmers who raise and feed the hogs, the civilian population dependent upon an adequate supply of pork and lard, the armed forces abroad who must have sufficient supplies, and the growing hosts of refugees, etc. We have two specific suggestions to offer and will greatly appreciate your help in endeavoring to interest and influence the O. P. A. and W. F. A. in carrying these out. These are the two Government bureaus whose conflicting rules and orders have been partially responsible for the acute hog and pork shortage and they are the bureaus that have the authority and the power to remedy the situation along the lines we suggest. Our proposals are:

I

That the War Food Administration immediately increase the price guaranty or

"floor" for barrows and gilts, 180 pounds up, to $13.75 Chicago basis, same as a year ago, this to be continued in effect until at least March 31, 1946. Our firm belief is that this will greatly stimulate hog production. If a hog surplus is created next winter or spring, the Government could well afford to make good the support price, as the monetary loss would be inconsiderable in comparison with packer subsidies, etc., now being paid.

II

Our second suggestion is that the O. P. A. immediately take steps to stop the diversion of hogs away from regular terminal market channels by establishing larger ceiling differentials for the markets. This will send a larger volume of hogs to the open public markets, giving the Federal inspected packing houses an opportunity to buy more hogs than they now obtain. At the public terminal markets, the Government has every necessary facility and personnel already established to regulate the flow of livestock through the markets and make it available to the slaughterers that operate under Federal supervision.

To substantiate our statement that the diversion of hogs away from terminal market centers is of great volume, we call your attention to the fact that Government figures show that a total of approximately 8,566,000 hogs were slaughtered under Federal inspection in the United States for the 2 months of January and February 1945 combined, this representing a 44 percent shrinkage from the same period in 1944. Hog receipts at the 12 principal markets of the United States for the first 2 months of 1945 totaled approximately 2,491,000 head, representing a drop from their combined receipts, same 2 months in 1944, of 58 percent.

If the situation is to be relieved, action must be taken immediately by the W. F. A. and O. P. A.

ST. LOUIS LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas in His infinite wisdom Almighty God has seen fit to take from this world its outstanding citizen the President of these United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas the untimely death of our peerless leader is mourned by all the peace-loving peoples of the entire world; and

Whereas we the members of the Thirty-fifth Ward Democratic Club of the City of Philadelphia particularly mourn his loss because the entire history of our organization is entwined with the years during which he was at the helm of our Ship of State, and throughout that period we supported him whole-heartedly as we appreciated his greatness during his lifetime rather than await future historians to measure his greatness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Thirty-fifth Ward Democratic Club of the City of Philadelphia join the peace-loving peoples of the world in mourning the loss of one who so ably fought and died for the oppression of aggression and the establishment of a just and lasting peace; and further be it

Resolved, That this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and made a permanent record of this organization; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded our Representative in Congress with the request that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the New York Times and other newspapers throughout the country carried a story from the pen of my fellow Kansas Citian, Mr. Roy Roberts, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, about the great Missourian, President Harry S. Truman.

For many years Mr. Roberts was one of the outstanding Washington correspondents and served as preseident of the Gridiron Club here. From that wealth of experience in national affairs and from his personal knowledge of President Truman from the days when he was an official of Jackson County, United States Senator, and Vice President, Mr. Roberts has painted one of the best pictures of the abilities of our new President.

While the shock of the death of President Roosevelt was a stunning blow to the Missourians I met while at home recently, they unanimously expressed confidence in the abilities of President Truman to carry on successfully for the best interests of all Americans. Those appraisals came from men who knew Harry Truman, the man, and his public career.

Because Mr. Roberts' article summarizes so capably the feeling of the people of Missouri I wish to insert it into the RECORD at this point. The article reads as follows:

TRUMAN TO SHELVE PERSONAL RULE; SENATE WILL BE HIS ADVISER—WILL DIFFER SHARPLY FROM ROOSEVELT SET-UP, FELLOW MISSOURIAN SAYS—MANY NEW FACES DUE TO APPEAR IN CAPITAL

(By Roy Roberts)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—What may the Nation expect from its new President? For the time being, simply carrying on.

The Nation may take confidence on that score. Harry Truman, the new President, is no man to rock the boat. He's not as cautious as Calvin Coolidge, who took office under somewhat similar circumstances more than two decades ago. But he has the innate, instinctive conservatism in action of the Missouri-bred countrymen. They want to know where they are going before they leap. And they are not fond of leaping just for the pleasure of headlines.

It may be forecast with considerable certainty—not from what the new President has said but because of knowledge of the man—that after the address to Congress Monday and the speech to the servicemen overseas Tuesday night, there will be silence from the White House for many days and lots of silence. The country will have opportunity to settle down, accept the change, and find that it can, and still is, functioning without a Roosevelt in the White House.

The new President is taking over a going concern. Each department or bureau head will be expected to go ahead and run his show. If they make good, fine. If they come a cropper—well, Truman is not the sort who will hang to them long. There won't be any setting up of new bureaus or commissions to supplant the old to save face. There will be many new faces in Washington. As a result, Cabinet and department heads are more on their own right today than any time since the gradual but steady concentration of all power and all final action in the White House made the Government practically a one-man or personal government.

SHARP SHIFT IS FORECAST

It's been written so often already in the past 48 hours it has become almost bromidic. But the real significance will be the shift from personal government back to what is called, for lack of any better term, constitutional government, or government by consultation.

What does all this mean to the Nation?

Primarily, the biggest thing is that the seat of power shifts from the Hudson River to the Missouri River. That's an easy way of describing it and it carries many implications. Through the years of F. D. R. the Cabinet and most of the controlling department heads gradually became New Yorkers or closely allied to New York or the East.

There were exceptions, of course, but most of those who sat in the seats of the mighty were Roosevelt intimates, men or women he knew how to deal and work with. It was natural. The late President probably didn't recognize, himself, how narrow the circle had become in recent years, with the stress and worry of global war.

But slowly the West and South were out of the picture and not only the so-called palace guard but nearly all those in seats of power were eastern—in viewpoint, at least. PM, a left-wing newspaper in New York with small circulation; The Nation; the New Republic were the gospels of the New Deal. And few over the country at large read them or had heard of them—that is the public, at large. They were bibles in Washington, D. C.

WILL BE SLOW TO MOVE

The new President will be slow to move. But when he does move it will mean new geographical faces—at least in the Nation's Capital. Harry Truman is not unsocial in his political objectives by any means. But he is an entirely different type from the late President. He doesn't know nor did he circulate in the same circles F. D. R. did. His closest friends are two types, the home folks from back in Missouri; the national friends he made are confined almost exclusively to Capitol Hill. That's why, when changes come in the Cabinet and places of power, President Truman will turn to the Senate or House for them or for recommendations. They are the people he knows best and depends upon.

What are vital differences between Roosevelt and Truman in breeding and make-up?

Roosevelt was essentially the brilliant patrician. The conservatives said he turned on his class, which was bunk. Roosevelt had great gifts as a political leader. Few could sense what the man in the street thought as he did, in spite of his Groton tie and exclusive bringing up. But, always, he was the patrician, which was why he could understand and get on with Churchill, the brilliant Britisher, so well. They were blood brothers, one working the liberal side of the street, the other clinging to conservatism.

Harry Truman is as far apart from both Roosevelt and Churchill as Hyde Park is from Independence, Mo. The new President is the average man. He has plowed corn—

and his mother bragged he plowed a straight row; he sold haberdashery, and failed at it. He worked in a mailing room. He fought bravely in his country's war. Then he started climbing the ladder in politics, with a political machine, his sponsor, as the worst handicap to overcome in any possible climb to the Presidency.

REAL STORY OF DEMOCRACY

What a story in democracy, that a man approaching 40 and still looking at the rear of a horse as he plowed the corn rows, apparently not a success in life, just a little less than 20 years ago, should find himself today President of the greatest and most powerful nation on earth. The average man who became President in one of the great crises of the world. What a test of democracy if it works. And the sheer fact he is this average man, understands the average man and his quality, is probably Truman's greatest asset as he undertakes these new overpowering responsibilities.

There won't be the color, the drama nor the personal leadership that Roosevelt gave. But President Truman, shy but not afraid, believes that our system of democracy means drawing strong men together, applying common-sense decisions and that the country can and will carry on successfully. He will go up or down these next few years upon his ability, not to make correct decisions but his ability to resist the sinister pressure groups that always descend upon every occupant of the big White House on Pennsylvania Avenue.

What sort of a man really is Truman?

Humility probably would be his first characterization. Then loyalty, perhaps excessive loyalties that sometimes get high officials in trouble; common sense; deep patriotism; and above all an abiding faith in his country and its democratic system. Harry Truman couldn't go in for personal government under any circumstances. He doesn't believe in it or wouldn't know how to operate.

DEEP FAITH OF COUNTRY MAN

Scratch under the hide of the new President and you will find not a politician, a statesman, nor a man with overweening ambition, but a country man with deep faiths. The country thinks of Truman as a Kansas Citian. He isn't. He's a rural Jackson Countyite—down where they really fought the Civil War.

The offspring of a Confederate veteran, he is really more southern in viewpoint than midwestern. A Baptist, once Grand Master of his Masonic Lodge of Missouri, he will think as the average man does, at least outside the big cities. If he develops a weakness, it will be in not always understanding the newly aroused mass consciousness of industrial labor.

In the Senate Truman's closest friendships were with the Old South. Back home, his closest friendships were with the old Battery B of the One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Field Artillery, the men with whom he fought in France. It is entirely possible that this feel of the average man may make him a mighty leader for his Nation in the years just ahead.

The city's official tribute was complete change in tempo. It will get it in Truman. Harry Truman hasn't got a really deep-seated enmity in Washington. This capacity for making friends made him the common denominator at Chicago in a bad situation politically for the administration. It put him in the White House. It may bring about a smoother working combination in Government.

What Cabinet changes will Truman make?

None for the present unless forced to, by resignations insisted upon. Most of the old palace guard Roosevelt relied upon will go in time. Then on Capitol Hill will be the new President's closest advisers. There will be a return of an era of good-will between the lawmakers and the Executive side of Government. Francis Biddle, as Attorney General, Morgenthau, as Secretary of Treasury, Mrs. Perkins, as Secretary of Labor, are those most apt to go first.

The new President, aside from calling Jimmy Byrnes back to his side, has not even given thought to changes. If he had a new Treasury head to pick he likely would take a man of the type of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia. John W. Snyder, executive vice president of the First National Bank, in St. Louis, is mentioned by some as having the call for the post of handling the R. F. C. billions. Byrnes, whom the President regards as the ablest man in public life, will be the figure around whom any new administration will build.

MUST HAVE OWN PROGRAM

It's all well and good to say as Truman did that he wants to carry on the Roosevelt program. He does. But short of 82 days, the new President will occupy the White House a full term. He can't just carry on. He must and will develop a Truman administration and a Truman program. All political bets as to '48 are off with the change. If he wants reelection, the party will have to take him or repudiate not just a short carry-on but a full administration.

Loyalty is one of his outstanding characteristics. On war and on peace he will attempt to carry to a successful conclusion what his predecessor began and bequeathed him. Truman saw eye to eye with Roosevelt on both war and peace. On post-war plans for the country any Roosevelt plans will be tempered by the innate conservatism of the Missourian.

On labor, the new President will be sympathetic and understanding. He has always had labor's support. But again, his program is apt to be tempered by his Midwest agrarian upbringing. He will be a party man, but he will work closely even with the Republican leaders on Capitol Hill. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Representative JOE MARTIN, House Republican leader; and Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH are close friends. Power and decision will divide between Capitol Hill and the White House.

THE PARLEY ON WEST COAST

What about the San Francisco Conference which opens April 19?

That's the worst hurdle Truman faces and he realizes it. Roosevelt had all the strings in his own hand and expected to run the American policy and make his influence felt among the other nations of the world.

Suddenly, everything has been dumped in the new President's lap without facts, information, and the little side agreements that may exist. Truman intends to give the American delegation to San Francisco, headed by Secretary Stettinius, full and complete authority to handle. If they come to an impasse where a decision is needed, he will make it and will have Byrnes, who accompanied Mr. Roosevelt to Yalta, at his side for counsel. It is unfortunate the new President did not have more time to prepare, but the bold decision was made to go ahead, that the world might not think the tragic death of Roosevelt had changed our policy.

How is the country reacting to the new President?

Except for the San Francisco Conference, President Truman might anticipate a honeymoon of at least 6 months before real troubles begin. The country has reacted in splendid fashion with a spirit of giving him every chance. Even the hostile Hearst-McCormick-Patterson press have pledged support and assistance to the new President in the crisis. These United States of ours always unite and form solid lines in real emergencies. They have done so behind Truman. He has his chance.

Moving Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by a former Member of the House, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill:

MOVING DAY

Soon troops will be leaving Berlin, via the Suez and Panama Canals for Tokyo, 12,000 miles away. General Marshall and Admiral King will direct the biggest moving job ever attempted by human beings. It will strain our shipping and our nerves to the utmost. Nothing in the world's history ever approached it.

We read of the hordes of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, the Mongol conquerors of centuries ago. But it is doubtful if the vast armies of either ever exceeded 700,000. Alexander the Great, who conquered Babylon when 25 and died master of the world at 33—weeping that it was the only world he had to conquer—never had more than 40,000 foot and 7,000 mounted soldiers, although the defeated Persians under Darius are said to have numbered 1,000,000.

But no army of the past ever equalled in size, had so much gear, or traveled such distances, by land and sea, as the military migration from Europe to Asia which we are to undertake. Instead of supplying an army 3,000 miles across the Atlantic, supplies will have to move 7,000 miles across the Pacific. Add, too, the width of the American continent from the industrial East, where the bulk of our gear is produced, where there are a dozen good ports, to the west coast, where ports are few. Once moved to the Philippines as the Asiatic jump-off, they have only one good port and are still 600 miles from the Asiatic mainland, as aganst the machine shops and ports of Britain, only 50 miles from France.

The war is not over. In many ways the going gets tougher. More critical days are to come.

As General Marshall says, our people "must understand the urgent requirements of the situation. They must be persuaded to support us in a last great effort to hasten the end of the war."

We have not yet been in contact with the major units of the Japanese armies. Enemies are softened up by air and sea power, but only land armies win wars. And, due to their birth rate, there are more Japs living today than there were at the time of Pearl Harbor.

The problems confronting our military leaders are not those of logistics alone—the service of supply over immense distances. There are problems of morale—of the spirit of men and women at the front and at home. A vast complex of warm human emotions, natural, understandable, patriotic, even in normal times, will soon be at work—the hunger for home, "his native home deep imaged in his soul," as Homer wrote in his Odyssey of warriors long ago.

I quote General Marshall again: "The moment hostilities cease in Europe there will be an overwhelming urge in every man to rejoin his wife or his family or to see his girl, to leave the scenes of destruction and desolation in which he has fought and labored at such great risk to life and limb. Yet at that very moment it is imperative that we

start the movement for the acceleration of the campaign in the Pacific. Any delay, any loss of momentum in that campaign means the unnecessary loss or mutilation of more young Americans."

Fathers, mothers, wives, and the girls behind the men may feel that the fighters in Europe will have done their stint and that others should finish off the Japs. They may feel like saying so in letters to the front. Don't do it. The Pacific war will be won more quickly and with less loss by veteran troops than by green men.

With our shipping strained to the limit in moving our armies to fronts twice as far as Europe, the problem of getting food to the starving populations of Italy, France, Holland, and Greece will increase. It could easily happen that hunger may make the populations in the liberated areas come to hate us worse than the Germans. If so, the war will be lost—after it has been won. The only fortunate thing in the situation is that Hitler's grip is being released at the beginning of the crop season rather than at the start of another winter.

It is a grim business we are in. We must stand behind Marshall and King and postpone the bell ringing. It is the last act that commends the play.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Pattern for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas in October 1943, representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths enunciated the following pattern for peace, a seven-point program for a lasting peace and a just world order:

1. The moral law must govern world order;
2. The rights of the individual must be assured;
3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected;
4. The rights of minorities must be secured;
5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized;
6. International economic cooperation must be developed;
7. A just social order within each state must be achieved; and

Whereas at Dumbarton Oaks, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China proposed to give international sanction to human rights; and

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 21 proposes that the Congress of the United States resolve that the said seven-point pattern for peace shall be adhered to as the basis for the establishment of peace and a just world order, and that the implementation of these principles shall be the objective of this Nation; and

Whereas representatives of the United Nations will convene in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, for the purpose of planning an association of nations which will achieve peace through justice; and

Whereas the subscribers to this resolution have been duly designated, as representatives of the members of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths in the Bridgeport area, to transmit to our Senators and Representatives in Congress our deep concern with the vital necessity for a translation into action of the pattern for peace that its realization will promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms: Now, therefore, reaffirming these principles of the moral law: Be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are urged to exert their every effort to obtain the immediate adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, and that they exercise their good offices to the end that those representing the United States at the San Francisco Security Conference provide for the adoption of a program which will assure the carrying out of the terms of said resolution.

JOHN F. MCGOWAN,
Chairman, Federation of Catholic Organizations.
BERNARD H. TRAGER,
President, Jewish Community Council.
MRS. J. L. KENNELLY,
President, Bridgeport Council of Catholic Women.
THEODORE J. GALLARNO,
Protestant Delegate at Large.
REV. WILLIAM H. ALDERSON, D. D.,
President, Bridgeport Pastors' Association.
RABBI ALBERT L. MARTIN,
Congregation B'nai Israel.
REV. THOMAS F. HENAHAN,
Chaplain, Bridgeport Council of Catholic Women.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a meeting held at the South Side Armory Hall, Milwaukee, Wis., Sunday, April 15, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Americans, this afternoon's meeting was originally called for the purpose of protesting the disposition made of Poland and the small nations of Europe at Yalta. Had we known earlier what we know today, the motive and tone of this gathering might have been changed, for it hardly seems proper that a meeting of protest should be held on the day that the remains of our Commander in Chief are being laid into their final resting place. It would be far more fitting for us to spend this time in prayer and meditation in tribute to our President, who is as much a casualty of this war as any American who dies in battle in this global war.

At this very hour, in a peaceful corner of the Roosevelt garden at Hyde Park, the tired body of our Chief is laid to rest. No other man in modern times has labored so tirelessly in behalf of the oppressed peoples at home and abroad. No other man has espoused their cause more ably. Like President Wilson, however, Franklin Delano Roosevelt died a disappointed and disillusioned man. The fact that he had to compromise his high ideals and principles regarding the rights and privileges of small nations, as embraced in the "four freedoms" and in the Atlantic Charter, contributed more than anything to his speedy departure. His inability to fulfill his mission, his disappointment, sapped his strength and hastened his end. Anyone listening to his report on the Yalta Conference to the Congress and the Nation must have been impressed with his sincere sorrow and regret that a compromise of principles in the treatment of Poland was found necessary.

But even at that moment he gave no evidence of considering the matter closed. Franklin D. Roosevelt was not a quitter. He had not ceased his fight in behalf of Poland and the small nations of Europe. I am confident that it was his intention to exercise the full weight of his influence and power to have the Yalta Agreement amended in order that Poland, the Baltic, and the Balkan countries might be accorded treatment in keeping with the American ideals of justice and fair play.

In the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Poland lost a great friend. I recall quite vividly the early days of the war, when that gallant Polish leader, General Sikorski, was at the helm of the Polish Government. President Roosevelt would frequently call that great Polish Premier from London, to confer with him at the White House. After the untimely death of General Sikorski, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk took over. He, too, was quick to gain the confidence and respect of Franklin D. Roosevelt and was frequently called to Washington for consultation and advice with our Commander in Chief and his staff.

It is most unfortunate that have having led our country to the very shadows of victory, Franklin D. Roosevelt could not remain with us to the fruition of his plans for military victory and the establishment of world order and lasting peace thereafter. However, our Maker has seen fit to take him away from us. Death visits men in high and low places alike.

President Harry S. Truman, who has succeeded Franklin D. Roosevelt to the office of President and Commander in Chief, is not well known to most of us. However, the prompt manner in which he has assumed command and pledged his support of the policies so often pronounced by our late President has inspired confidence in the hearts of the American people. With our cooperation and aid, the new Commander in Chief will bring about the realization and fulfillment of the promises made by our country to the little peoples and large nations of the world alike.

The course of our military and naval war was placed in able hands by our late Commander in Chief. The end of the war is in sight. The valor and resourcefulness of our fighting men and their leaders surpass our highest hopes. We all feel confident that President Truman will retain the same commanders in the field until victory. As a Member of the United States Senate, and during the approximately 3 months he has served as Vice President of the United States, our new Commander in Chief has had an opportunity to become fully acquainted with the aims and purposes of our Nation in this war. Undoubtedly, because our late President Roosevelt had confidence in the ability of Harry S. Truman to carry out our American aims in this war, he favored his nomination for the Vice Presidency. In the course of the last political campaign and during his tenure in office as Vice President, Harry S. Truman has undoubtedly had frequent occasions to discuss with the President the problems ahead. There is no question in my mind but that among the many matters discussed, those most difficult and unfinished have been studied most thoroughly. Since Franklin D. Roosevelt considered the Polish situation open and unsolved, his successor certainly will consider it encumbent upon him to bring about its just and moral settlement.

I have every confidence in the integrity and ability of our new Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman. His success or failure in the fulfillment of his duties will be determined in a large measure by the support he receives from us in the task that lies ahead. If Franklin D. Roosevelt could speak to us now, I am confident that he would say: "My friends, help Harry finish the job." The humility of our new President and his un-

hesitating assumption of leadership struck a responsive chord in the people of America and the world. His request that the people of the Nation remember him in their prayers gives us reassurance that here, as in Franklin D. Roosevelt, we have a man with the common touch.

Let us, therefore, in our prayers this evening, remember not only Franklin D. Roosevelt, but also his successor, Harry S. Truman, ask God to give him strength and vision to guide him in the fulfillment and realization of our fondest hopes. Let us pray also that we may not falter in our duty and obligation to support him to that end by giving him our wholehearted support and cooperation in order that early victory and lasting peace, based on justice and morality, may be established throughout the world—a world in which Poland, as well as other nations, may fulfill its destiny.

Resolution of Toledo Division, Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Toledo division, Polish-American Congress, adopted April 15, 1945, at mass meeting held at Central Catholic High School, Toledo, Ohio:

Whereas Poland stands as a symbol of liberty and justice for all other law-abiding nations, especially the smaller nations; and

Whereas the Crimea Conference decisions regarding Poland are contrary to the aims of the Atlantic Charter, since they accede to might and not law and justice, alienating two-fifths of Poland to Russia without agreement or consultation, without the knowledge and without the consent of the legal Polish Government, and also without hearing the will of those most concerned, namely the people themselves; and

Whereas the Yalta Conference decisions deprived Poland of equal rights by deciding her boundaries without her knowledge and agreement, at the same time accepting the principle of interference in the internal affairs of Poland as a privilege of the Big Three, a privilege which in actuality serves solely the interests of the Soviet Russian Government; and

Whereas through signing such resolutions the United States Government burdened itself and the American people with joint responsibility for the legalization at the Yalta Conference of Russian aggressive acts in regards to the Baltic states and especially in regard to our heroic ally, Poland; and

Whereas all decisions of this type strike at the good name and honor of the United States, depriving it of the friendship of the free nations of Europe, depriving it of influence and respect, and lead to an isolation that is a menace to our future; and

Whereas Poland was the first nation bravely to resist aggression upon the boundaries which had been solemnly guaranteed by Great Britain and freely recognized in treaties by Soviet Russia and whereas even in defeat Polish citizens continued an heroic resistance both through underground forces and in open combat as a faithful ally of the United Nations: Therefore

The Toledo Division of the Polish American Congress hereby resolves, Respectfully to ask that the United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference refuse to confirm the decisions made at the Yalta Conference in the above premises since they represent the acceptance of might over right, and legalization of aggression, a denial of democratic principles and equality in international relations; and, in the belief that the Yalta decisions are not final, to appeal to the President, the Government of the United States, the United States Senate, and to the whole world, that the unjust decisions of the Yalta Conference, concerning Poland, be revised in a spirit of equity and good conscience.

Resolutions Committee: Anthony Lewandowski, Thaddeus A. Rutkowski, Steven L. Markowski, L. W. Matecki, Stanley J. Thorzynski, Veronica Kocinski, Frank Adamski.

The Miner Gets No E Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the men in the mills are doing a superhuman job in outproducing the world in ships, planes, tanks, guns, and shells, and accordingly they are receiving proper recognition for their efforts. But the forgotten man is the man in the pits—the coal miner. Yet without coal this record-breaking production schedule would not be possible. Let us take time to pat the miner on the back and give him a boost occasionally. He deserves credit, and after being kicked around from pillar to post by a number of our press and raido commentators, a little praise and recognition will aid the coal miner's morale.

As part of my remarks I am happy to include an editorial which appeared in the March 26, 1945, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser entitled "The Miner Gets No E Award":

THE MINER GETS NO E AWARD

There is a psychology in this country that inclines the mind toward blaming the striker first followed by a disinclination to find out the cause of the workingman's decision not to work. It is a lamentable fact that the American mind, ordinarily given to fair play calls a halt on neutral thinking when labor and capital engage in one of their periodic differences.

The coal miner, for example, has been the butt of much severe criticism, directed at him from both the battle and home fronts. At present, there is a conflict of views between soft coal operators and the United Mine Workers. The miner is asking for more money.

A white-collar worker behind a clean desk in a well-lighted and well-ventilated office may have difficulty in appreciating the position of a coal miner—at his best a molelike worker who burrows miles beneath the earth in dank shafts, bad air, his mouth, perhaps his lungs, caked with coal dust. Ever present is the danger of cave-ins and the sudden appearance of the deadly, strangling gas.

Wartime finds the miner working steady, eating just as steady. But in peace, it's a different story. He works when there is a demand for coal—which by no means is a year-around matter. His dollar or so an hour is forced to stretch a long way.

In war, however, he is expected to forget the hardships of the past, the rough and tumble struggles of former years to win for himself a decent living. The miner, in the public mind, is expected to go on without a grumble, without so much as an Army and Navy E coming his way, yet all the war effort starts with coal.

Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following personal statement by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Bishop of the Methodist Church, New York City, relative to the Bretton Woods agreement:

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF BISHOP G. BROMLEY OXNAM

The Bretton Woods agreement should be adopted. It is an indispensable part of the total pattern of peace. Peace cannot be guaranteed by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the Bretton Woods agreement, the understandings reached at Hot Springs concerning food and agriculture and at Atlantic City in the matter of relief and rehabilitation; but within these proposals lie the possibility of peace. Without them, we face the certainty of another war.

When the military phase of the last war ended, fighting less violent but none the less deadly continued in the economic sphere. Unless certain fundamental economic problems are solved, similar conflicts will follow the present war. Peace calls for a general international organization. Such an organization must be established at San Francisco, and the United States must become a member But much more is required and there are issues that must be faced now. Among them are the questions of stable currency and the flow of capital to undeveloped or war-devastated areas. These are among the most important. They were faced at Bretton Woods by the representatives for 44 nations. The agreement there reached represents the judgment of the ablest experts the nations could assemble. It seeks to end the manipulation of currency by national governments such as occurred following the last war and which proved to be a weapon whose use was in effect the continuance of war. The flow of capital must be constant and at reasonable rates, and must cease to be a tool used by great interests or great powers in such fashion as to bankrupt or control the economies of other peoples.

Bretton Woods is called a highly technical matter. From one point of view, that is true. It takes economic competence of a high order to draft the concrete proposals essential to reaching the desired objective. Nevertheless, the objectives are clear. We desire a post-war America free from depression. This means full employment and full use of plant and these ends are dependent upon international trade. The barriers that stand between us and an unimpeded world market must be removed.

If a nation can manipulate its currency so as to weaken or bankrupt another nation trade becomes war. An American who sells automobiles abroad expects to be paid in

currency that is worth the value held at the time of contract. One of the great assets of the United States is that barriers do not exist among the States, that currency is stable, and the flow of commerce unimpeded. Bretton Woods takes two important steps, each necessary and each really dependent upon the other, toward a similar end in world affairs. If the economies of war-devastated areas are to be restored, vast undeveloped areas are to become productive, if our own economy is to be maintained, the Bretton Woods agreement should be adopted, and, in the light of experience, improved in the years ahead. Economic matters of this kind really become moral issues.

BISHOPS OF METHODIST CHURCH SPEAK ON BRETTON WOODS

NEW YORK, April 11.—Convinced that the lack of organization in the economic and monetary field has been a major factor leading to war, the council of bishops of the Methodist Church today released through its secretary, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of New York, the following statement on the Bretton Woods proposals:

"In the crusade for a new world order, wherein the fundamental necessity of international collaboration was a basic consideration, it was stated that the proclamation of principles was not enough. Such collaboration becomes effective only when the practical means to give expression to the ethical ideal are discovered and utilized.

"Hence we must deal with concrete situations and problems. We must not refuse to do this. The new world order is not to be shaped in a vacuum. Recent expressions of principle in the fields of relief and rehabilitation, and food and agriculture have been approved by the representatives of the people in Congress and have won wide support among the people generally.

"The United Nations monetary and financial conference reached agreement on the stabilization of currency and the provision of capital loans for economic development. In such highly technical fields we are dependent upon expert knowledge. We ourselves do not profess this knowledge. But common consent concerning economic measures must be achieved if war is to be avoided. We must find a way. Delegates from 44 nations assembled at Bretton Woods, N. H., reached a common decision. The proposals were adopted unanimously. The United States delegation was bipartisan.

"We consider the economic and monetary issue one of the most momentous in modern history. Here is an initial venture in international economic cooperation. We must make a beginning if the economic chaos that has repeatedly followed war is to be prevented. Heretofore the lack of organization in this field has been a major factor leading to war.

"All of us are concerned. In our churches and communities we should carry forward our discussion, and in accordance with the practice in the Crusade make our opinion known at the place decision is made before it is made to the end that an ordered and peaceful world may emerge."

H. R. 1872

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, Victory Chapter, No. 33, El Dorado Spring, Mo.:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
VICTORY CHAPTER No. 33,
El Dorado Springs, Mo., April 16, 1945.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
Congressman, Ohio,
Washington, D. C.

Re H. R. 1872.

DEAR MR. RAMEY: You may easily recall the plight of veterans in Ohio when pensions and compensation ratings were lowered by the infamous Economy Act and subsequent poverty when disabled veterans were refused relief and W. P. A. work because they got a Government check. Some of those families tried to exist on $8 per month. I know, because I was there. We were forced to steal food wherever there was opportunity to feed our starving families. We had no medicine when our children were sick and the results of insufficient food and improper food is today evident in the Army records of our sons. And those records are used against our boys every day when disabled veterans of this war apply for pensions and are told they had disability before they were drafted.

Here in Missouri I have several scholarships for daughters of disabled veterans, but the girls also show results of malnutrition and sickness and very few of the cases considered for free scholarships can be considered because of personal defects.

Such conditions among disabled veterans is a strange contrast when we consider that fathers of these children passed very high physical tests for the Army of 1918. Surely we must not remain silent and see another generation of disabled war veterans subjected to the same sort of treatment.

H. R. 1872 would provide some small allowance for the veteran's family and we urge that this bill be released from the Veterans' Committee and sent to the House for a vote. Our understanding is that the Veterans' Administration blocked this bill several years and that is the only force opposed to enactment of the bill. The recent publications are merely a symptom of public resentment against such policies, and the Veterans' Committee should follow the trend of public opinion. Living costs have climbed steadily and pensions are still based on a standard of living which cannot meet the needs of disabled veterans' families.

Yours truly,

C. RALPH SMITH, Ph. D.

A Veteran Comments on Latin-American Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1945, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives entitled "Hemisphere Ties, Labor and the State Department."

The speech evoked considerable comment in many widely scattered quarters. Among the letters received was an interesting epistle sent me by the commander of the Los Angeles Post, No. 904, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Frank P. O'Brien.

Because Mr. O'Brien reveals a remarkable grasp of Latin-American problems, I am requesting that the letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The letter is as follows:

LOS ANGELES POST, NO. 904,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 21, 1945.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COFFEE: Your speech, Hemisphere Ties, Labor and the State Department, appearing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 15 issue, is, to my mind, one of the finest I have read on that subject in years.

Every statement is true and the deductions made, as well as the predictions as to what should be done, and the prospective results that could be achieved, show profound knowledge of the many factors involved.

Our entire approach to the Latin-American problem should approximate the outline you have presented. I say this, not because you delivered the address in question, but because it discloses objectivity based on the historical, economic, social, cultural, and spiritual forces entwined.

Some 12 years ago, when the Republic of Chile was prostrate and when conditions in our own country were bleak, too, I submitted the enclosed study to President Aliessandri and to others in that country.

Much of interest could be unfolded regarding the reactions that followed.

Perhaps you would care to read it. If you do so, keep in mind it was written 12 years ago.

To dream of a better mode of existence is not difficult, but, to reach up and capture such and, subsequently reduce it to a blueprint for further leasurely study, addition, refinement and, with no other thought than to substitute happiness for despair, peace for chaos, progress and enlightenment for ignorance and superstition—that, you will agree, is something else again.

Looking forward personifies a certain eagerness for advancement—a newer and broader conception of life.

On March 1, 1945, I had occasion to write to a friend in Washington, D. C., in which I took occasion to say, among other things:

"If the knowledge of the sciences that is available, plus the yearnings of all decent people for peace, is channelized into a series of activities dedicated for the advancement of all, according to their immediate capacities and future possibilities, why then you and I and others could actually be pioneers in a new type of development.

"Today in Mexico City is an assembly of Latin-American statesmen and others. Much rhetoric will develop. But, the basic problem confronting them is poverty.

"The solution of such a problem not only in Latin America but in the United States, also, can come only with a reversal of activities heretofore cultivated and maintained deliberately and for centuries.

"When I say departure—I do not mean immediately, nor without thought, nor according to plan. Rather do I mean the encouragement of scientific attitudes with economic security and human happiness as the goal.

"If the future of our country is to be secure, we must begin to advance more intelligently, sympathetically, and naturally those things which will make for the contentment of our own people and, coincidentally, just slightly behind, for others.

"We cannot live alone. And we cannot continue to live at the expense of others.

"We need the raw materials; mental and physical resources and consuming capacities of other people—all over the world. The development of such calls for the participation of many minds and capacities. Such cooperation can materialize quickly and easily if projects mutually advantageous to the people of the countries involved are set

up and really organized to succeed. Not for a year. But for decades—possibly longer.

"Take Mexico, for example. At our door. Fabulous resources. Abysmal poverty. A few fine, talented people. A great mass needing education and stimulation along many lines.

"Aiding in the advancement of Mexico, satisfactorily, could lead to one of the most stupendous developments in history. Such an activity, integrated with a program for the further broadening and use of the resources of the United States for our own people could, reciprocally, bring balanced, sustained and highly desirable progress to both countries.

"And similarly to the other Latin-American countries.

"A dream?

"Maybe so. But infinitely better than our present nightmare.

"Something like that suggested will come, eventually. Why not within the lifetime of our sons?

"The development and progress of our people is primary, of course, but that hinges on the future peace of the world. Events now shaping themselves, if not forestalled, could lead to a grave situation in and throughout Latin-America during the next two decades or less.

"If those countries are left to fend for themselves, if they are to continue poverty stricken, then we will pay a terrible price for contributing to or sustaining such a stupid policy. On the other hand, if, as is apparent, a new philosophy and a new appreciation of the benefits of cooperative action are advanced, then, the borebodings dwelt upon can be avoided.

"Making work for a man's hands, or, for his mind; creating and maintaining buying power; putting bread in a man's stomach; clothes on his back; constructive thoughts in his mind; knowledge at his command; happiness in his heart, to me, seems much more important than making him envious, frustrated, or maniacal.

"When I say man—I mean men and women—of the United States of America—of the world."

As I read your message, Mr. COFFEE, the thought occurred you might want to know there are those who respect your great ability, and are grateful for the fact you can see serious matters through the eyes of a scientist, that you are a man capable of evaluating and harnessing economic and social forces for the enrichment and ennoblement of man, rather than to permit them to run amok and destroy civilization.

Sometime, when it is convenient, I shall be pleased to learn of your reactions to the 12-year-old report enclosed.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK P. O'BRIEN.

Salvage From the Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator of Sunday, April 15, Salvage from the Disaster.

SALVAGE FROM THE DISASTER

Wise commentators are saying that while President Roosevelt's death is a severe blow, it need not be fatal, because the great decisions have been made at home and abroad and cannot now be undone. That is a sound reassurance, and there is also another hope for salvage in the prospect of a stronger sense of responsibility among the public men whom Mr. Roosevelt had to consider and through whom President Truman will have to work.

The Presidency is a man-killing job, as Thursday's tragedy reminded us. Shakespeare makes Henry V cry out against his heavy responsibility:

"Upon the King! Let us our lives, our souls,
Our debts, our careful wives,
Our children, and our sins, lay on the King!"

Concentration of responsibility is even greater in the American Republic than in the early English monarchy. Always the Presidency is a double task: the President must be the Executive of the Nation and the leader of his political party. In wartime he must also be Commander in Chief. Everything is laid on his shoulders, from Pearl Harbor to the price of meat.

This is not less true, but more, when the President is a strong man. His very strength encourages lesser men to shift still more of their own responsibilities to him. It works in another way also: hostile partisans will oppose a necessary measure, knowing that they can do no harm in the end because the President can carry it through, and meanwhile they may gain some advantage by embarrassing him.

In Mr. Roosevelt's case, there was still another factor. Many Americans sincerely opposed some of his policies. Their very sincerity misled them into fighting good policies merely because "that man" had proposed them.

All this sort of thing may be expected to diminish under President Truman. Admittedly he is not so strong a personality as Mr. Roosevelt. That is a real and serious loss in times when strong, sure leadership is still needed, even though the main decisions have been made. But there is at least the consolation that other public men may feel that they must now themselves assume some responsibility for the country, instead of putting everything "upon the king." They may hesitate to oppose necessary measures for partisan purposes, since the risk that they will succeed is greater. There is a chance for better national unity in the disappearance of the anti-Roosevelt prejudice. And those who know Mr. Truman best say that he is a stronger man than the public suspects.

As the Nation strikes out on uncharted and dangerous courses, both at home and abroad; the removal of Mr. Roosevelt's farsighted leadership is a grave misfortune. But it need not plunge the country into despair, or make it think that as one on the street said in the shock of the first news, "everything will go to pieces." The loss requires every American to quit laying his responsibilities "upon the king," and to do his own duty better than before. With that determination Americans can follow the path on which Franklin Roosevelt set their feet, and attain the goal he saw ahead.

Wanted: A Polish Poland, Not a Soviet-Lublinized Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting and able article written by Rev. Edward Wilowski, Wilno, Ontario, and which appeared in the Evening Citizen of Ottawa, Canada, on Wednesday, April 4, 1945:

WANTED: A POLISH POLAND, NOT A SOVIET-LUBLINIZED POLAND

The world placed great hopes on perhaps the greatest conference ever held, the Crimea Conference, in which took part the greatest American four-term President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the head of the greatest democracy; the greatest British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, heading the Government of the greatest empire; and the greatest Russian ruler, Marshal Joseph V. Stalin, dictator of the greatest armed force in history. The result, however, of this conference may prove to be the greatest tragedy by which the world was ever shocked. The Allies went to war to save Poland from Hitler and are ending the war by handing Poland to Stalin. The world appreciates Russia's efforts in this war and everyone desires the indispensible unity and nonfriction but not at the humiliation of seeing all the small nations gobbled up by Soviet imperialism and beaten into Siberian slavery. One would imagine Pearl Harbor, Stalingrad, destruction of so many Russian cities, Battle of Britain, Warsaw, Cassino, and Tobruch would sufficiently create unity and nonfriction policy among the Allies for the successful prosecution to end this war against Germany, without dismemberment and virtual annihilation of an ally, the Polish Nation, condemning it to the Siberian concentration camps, because the Soviets will it. The whole world helped Stalingrad and now the Allies are expected to pay Russia for every move toward Berlin and Tokyo—with lend-lease, with sacrifice of Poland, and with other small nations plus a $6,000,000,000 diplomatically called loan to Russia. Is that America's price for overadmiring the Soviets? Perhaps the poet had the Crimean Conference in mind when he wrote, "Into the valley of death rode the six hundred."

WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED AT CRIMEA

At the Crimean Conference the Treaty of Riga was scrapped; the Anglo-Polish pact was violated; international law was thereby trampled, earmarking all pacts and treaties as worthless; the Atlantic Charter was drowned in the Black Sea; the "four freedoms" were shamefully abandoned; Russian aggression on Poland was sugar-coated for Soviets; Warsaw was forgotten; dismemberment and Lublinizing of Poland approved; Russian occupation of Estonia, Lithuania, Yugoslavia and other countries permitted; the fate of the millions of Poles herded into Siberia never thought of; the Moscow-made governments for other countries applauded; reducing diplomatic recognition to a farce in legal diplomacy, thus shamefully degrading world diplomacy. Poland along with all small nations were betrayed at Teheran and Moscow; were condemned and executed at Crimea. Thus the Moscow dream of Soviet Eurasia is becoming a realization and her interest in foreign real estate is explaining her so-called realism. One newspaper called this the "crime" conference, supposedly by typographical error. Here were imposed by force, terms proposed at Moscow last October, to which the Poles refused to put their signature, while Mr. Churchill so persistently insisted.

THE MAIN FEATURE OF THIS WAR

"The big feature of this war," says S. Sagar in the Weekly Review, "is that there is a new diplomacy abroad in the world—or perhaps it is only a crude modern development of a feature in the old diplomacy. The Nazi and Communists have developed a technique in diplomacy of which the essence is the abandonment of all morals and manners. Its exponents do not seek to attain their ends by treating with the responsible

government of a neighboring state, but by fostering a faction within that state, exaggerating the extent of this faction, broadcasting lies about the way the responsible government is acting, insinuating that it is a minority government out of sympathy with the people, and without democratic credentials, or any other thing that happens to be fashionable at the time. The object is to prepare the way for revolution and the establishment of a government favorable to themselves. We must keep our eyes on the big feature, the new diplomacy. For the new diplomacy means the ends of all pretense of morals or manners in relations between states, which in the long run means the end of all pretense of morals and manners in relations between individuals. It means the negation of all for which Christendom and the colonies of Christendom are fighting. It means that there is nothing on which any world order can be built. Any world order built on another partition of Poland will be one more ramshackle structure built on another historical crime." How true of Crimea where even such great men like President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill were lulled by this Soviet diplomacy.

SOVIET DUPLICITY

President Lincoln said, "We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing." True in his day, how much more true today. The Soviet English or diction differs from American English or diction. The Russians sugar-coat their brutal policy of force with the euphony of our American democratic language. They use in the Soviet sense such terms as liberated countries, freedom, free elections, agrarian laws, democracy, cooperation, friendly governments, peace, nonaggression, and similar expressions which mean one thing for us but to the Rusisans are meaningless. By such terms are veiled, force, terror by Ogpu, arrests, concentration camps, tortures, starvation, deportation to Siberia, death by firing squad, Moscow-made governments for all countries, etc. It is impossible for a Russian mind even to imagine freedom or free elections as there never was a free election in Russia, since there is no freedom of speech, of press, of travel, of religion, or any kind of freedom, neither in Russia nor in the liberated countries. One cannot just go in and out of Russia as one pleases, not even Russians, nor can you go here or there as you like. not even resident Russians. Mr. White assures us of that. They have perpetual selective service and no private initiative is allowed. True, that is their business. But how can such people speak and mean of freedom in liberated countries as we understand? That is why it is so important that American English and not Soviet diction be used at conferences and in agreements, or else world diplomacy will pale into white sepulchre, hypocritical diplomacy, and ostrichlike politics, heralded by famous empty declarations but eventually ending in appeasement to dictators. Allies, beware of this Soviet duplicity. Beware the Ides of March.

REMEMBER WARSAW

"The blame for the fate of Warsaw can without scruple," says J. S. Mix, "be placed squarely on the shoulders of Moscow and the Lublin Committee of Liberation. Unimpeachable evidence shows that they are responsible for what happened to Warsaw and to a large extent for what is still happening to Poland. In 1944 the so-called Committee of Liberation or Lublin Commitee had called upon Warsaw Poles to rise in rebellion, only to leave them to slaughter, while the Russians looked on from across the Vistula as Nero once looked on burning Rome. The Russians did not intend to help. As their commanders later spouted with mendacious anger, the uprising was premature, not authorized by Moscow. That is just what the Russians had ordered. By lying and murder they have managed to get their German enemies to liquidate the Poles for them. Moscow had everything to gain by helping the Polish underground army oust the Germans; and the Committee of Liberation, if it is composed of Poles, as the Russians claim it is, should have come to the aid of their brethren." If the "Lubliners" are Poles, why do they deport Poles to the Russian Siberia? Duplicity is treacherous, maybe prophetic are the words of the Polish Prime Minister Arciszewski as recorded in the press, "Great Britain and the United States may be disillusioned by Russia in the near future." He understands Russia as most of us do not.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DISMEMBERMENT

Poland is a constitutional state, constituted under international law with boundaries defined, free, sovereign, and independent nation, a very ancient state over 1,500 years old, with a distinct language and strong, powerful racial sense. Belonging to the western civilization, possessing a great degree of culture, having produced many learned scientists, musicians, poets, writers, painters, and sculptors, to mention only a few as Copernicus, Chopin, Paderewski, Conrad, Mickiewicz, and Madame Curie. Poland was the first country in Europe to have a democratic constitution and government, that is why Russia and Germany in the eighteenth century partitioned Poland. Poland was the first country in Europe to have a ministry of education. The University of Krakow is the third oldest university in Europe. Poland had the most democratic form of government of any country in the world at one time, as all the decisions of the Polish Parliament had to be unanimous by virtue of the Liberum veto, which gave to any member of Parliament the right to overrule Parliament if he did not like the measure in question. It is true it eventually brought ruin on Poland but it shows unmistakably the Polish love of freedom and freedom of government, but not the Crimean kind. That is why Poland will never consent to Soviet servitude, Churchill or no Churchill. Now, how can anybody and by what authority just take parts away or give away parts of Poland contrary to the wishes of the legal government of Poland? Due to wartime conditions, Poland like Belgium, Holland, and other countries has her legal government in London, which government is based on the principle of legal continuity and is the successor to the government of General Sikorski, whom Mr. Churchill clasped so warmly by the hand vowing friendship in life and death, saying, "We shall conquer together or we shall die together." Thus spoke Mr. Churchill in 1940. Well, now Poland is dying, does it mean the British Empire is beginning to crumble? The Polish Government in London is recognized by the Polish Nation; an army of nearly 200,000 men is sworn to this Government; the Polish underground is likewise sworn to this Government; President Raczkiewicz the head of this Government holds the reins of authority in his hands; this Government is recognized by all the countries in the world as the legal government of Poland, even Russia recognized this as the legal government of Poland until for sinister reasons she thought she better make a Moscow-made-OGPU-ruled committee of Soviet citizens backed by Russian bayonets the so-called Lublin Committee of Liberation.

LUBLIN RESHUFFLED

It is a known fact that the leader of the "Lubliners," Mr. Bierut, is a high official in the Soviet Ogpu, the Russian gestapo, while the majority of the others are professed Communists and most of them are not citizens of Poland. Now the only authority this body enjoys is Russian force. And believe it or not, the Big Three are going to recognize it as the legal government of Poland, of course, in a reorganized form—but even regrouped or reorganized or additioned there unto, it still will be only a Lublin gang, without any legal authority, only another puppet government imposed by "foreign force." And how can civilized countries like Great Britain and the United States stoop so low as to turn away from the real legal government and recognize an ill-smelling imitation. The reorganization is to be executed by Messrs. Molotov, Harriman, and the British Ambassador. Do you not remember it was Molotov and Ribbentrop that decided how Germany and Russia were to divide Poland, and got Hitler and Stalin to meet and sign the arrangement? And after Russia accomplished her atrocious act of aggression, even though she had a nonaggression pact with Poland, it was Molotov that proclaimed loudly to the world, "Poland is dead. Poland ceased to exist as a state." And now this same man is entrusted with the task of making a new government for Poland. Is it hard to imagine what kind of government he is going to form for Poland? It is funny that President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill did not realize this before they condescended to betray Poland's fate into such hands. If the Big Three did as they did, to be sure Molotov will run the small three. And this is one of the tragic results of Yalta.

Will the promised free elections be really free as we understand it? Will they be held under auspices of American agents trained in handling an election? Will the 2,000,000 deported Poles into Siberia return to vote or are they lost to Poland forever? Will the Polish forces which so valiantly defended Britain share in the voting? Will the Polish refugees scattered by the fates of war get a vote? Or will the Polish Nation vote with a Russian bayonet facing it as in 1939 a most farcical plebiscite? In all countries occupied by Russia there is no freedom of the press, of speech, of assembly—what prospects of freedom and free elections, another Churchillian red herring. Since liberation the Russian political police, the Ogpu, and the Russian secret police, the N. K. W. D., are combing Poland from end to end; terrorizing, arresting, deporting to Siberia, and as one example on January 1, 1945, mass arrests took place in Bialystok and Grodno in which 15,000 Poles were arrested. Seizure of Polish underground officers and soldiers was often accomplished with brutality, in some cases beaten with barbed wire, pin pricking, and breaking of ribs had taken place. Lubliners closely corroborate with Ogpu and the N. K. W. D. not only in the political sphere but in the economical sphere of activity. Beyond the Curzon line mass arrests are still going on, we are assured, and despair has overwhelmed the Bialo Russian peasants living on the eastern Polish territory as they definitely want to belong to Poland. Mr. Shapiro gives his own impression in his personal visit to the Polish forces in the Canadian First Army saying, "The Polish soldiers remain bound by voluntary loyalty and solemn oath to the Polish Government in London. Mr. Bowman, of Ottawa Evening Citizen, tells us that the Lublin government denounced Polish General Anders and his soldiers who fought at Cassino as "Fascist-Nazi sympathizers and traitors," which also applies to the heroes of the Battle of Britain and of Arnhem. Thus also all the Allied forces fall under the same sweeping slander, because they also are fighting the Germans. How long are we going to tolerate such Soviet-made dirt to be flung at the Allied forces, Polish, British, or American? A spokesman for Lubliners condemned as traitors President Raczkiewicz, Mikolajczyk (according to Churchill the best-liked Pole in world diplomacy today), and even the great hero General Bor; what, therefore, are the prospects of a free election and free Poland under such Lubliners?

MR. CHURCHILL ON CRIMEA

Mr. Churchill's speech proved to be despairing in tone; unworthy of a British statesman;

humiliating to British prestige from the moral point of view disgraceful; politically unwise; in sentiment contradictory to international law; disastrous to allied war effort and purpose; negating all prospects of lasting world peace; built on weak arguments; disappointing to public opinion and hopes; simply revengeful, having absolutely surrendered Poland to Russia, condemning it to the brutal heel of the Ogpu the Russian gestapo, thus betraying the British pledge made to Poland. The Anglo-Polish pact says, "that Great Britain obligates herself to support Poland not only against armed aggression, but against any attempt to undermine Polish independence, by processes of economic penetration or in any other way." President Roosevelt once called Poland, "the conscience of the world." Mr. Churchill by his speech closed the mouth of the Polish Nation with the Ogpu seal, so the conscience could not speak to the world. That is why Poles outside of Poland have to speak on her behalf to public opinion. Hillaire Belloc said, "The test is Poland; watch Poland; see what they do with Poland." Capt. Allan Graham said, "Poland is the test case for European civilization. If Great Britain deserts Poland, Europe will desert Britain; and that will be Great Britain's ruin." Congressman O'KONSKI so bravely defended Poland in Congress as did many members in the British Parliament. A parliamentary vote of confidence is no proof of the confidence of the world and public opinion, the Edinburgh and Glasgow demonstrations against Churchill show that, and above all the demonstrations in all juistice-loving hearts the world over.

MR. CHURCHILL'S ARGUMENTS

Mr. Churchill said, "In 1940 we were alone." Let us quote Mr. Thomas who said in the House of Commons, "If it had not been for the Polish airmen who fought in the Battle of Britain we might have gone under in 1940, for the margin was very narrow." Another argument used, "no frontiers were guaranteed Poland." We will let the words of the British Parliamentarian Mr. Pickthorn answer this, "I beg especially the Members of the Government Front Bench, not to use the argument against us that this country have never guaranteed any specific frontier. If anybody ever guaranteed the British Isles or the British State, it would be taken to guarantee its boundaries at the time of the guaranty." The Prime Minister claimed that the Crimean Russo-Polish boundary was some 300 miles east of the Tsar regime boundary—the Tsar regime boundary was a result of aggression so was the Crimean-declared-boundary. He said, that if the Polish Government had listened to him, "there would not have been a Lublin committee." Mr. Churchill cannot prove that. The fact is, had the Polish Government in London signed off half their country, there would have been a Lublin committee anyway and the signing would have been used to discredit the legal Polish Government. Why, the Russians had a Moscow-made-committee-of-liberation for Poland already in 1919 only they could not get anyone to help them park it in Poland. Churchill did a magnificent job for the Soviets. As Russia never alone partitioned Poland, but always with the help of Germany and now with Churchill, or considering the vote of confidence it can be said "with Britain." Is it not peculiar that the Polish forces are good enough to fight on all the Allied fronts but it takes the Red Army to police Poland according to Mr. Churchill. We heard about the great "concession" Marshal Stalin made when he allowed Molotov to reorganize the Lublin committee.

CHURCHILL DISBELIEVES HIMSELF

Mr. Churchill while claiming Russian demand just; while decrying the Polish Government in London for not signing voluntarily the partition of Poland at Moscow; promises a free and independent Poland and free elections—and immediately knowing deep in his heart it will not be a free Poland but a Soviet mess—he offers the Polish forces the British citizenship; which though a priceless privilege in itself; that is not what the Polish soldier died for on the Allied battle fronts. That is not why the 9,000 Polish airmen died in the Battle of Britain, while another 4,000 at Arnhem and that many at Cassino and many are still fighting on the fronts and why? They want a free Poland for Poles not for Soviet citizens, a Poland that would ever be grateful to the Allies for their help. What did the world's best organized Polish underground and the Polish nation fight Hitler for, for 5 years, just to be doomed by British diplomacy to the heel of the Soviet O. G. P. U.? The Soviet terrorism going on in Poland since "liberation" and even at this moment proves this and Mr. Churchill sensed this state of affairs in opening the British Empire to the Polish soldiers who could only return to Poland to be liquidated, like the Polish underground army. Mr. Churchill revealed his finger was caught in the Moscow trap set for the Polish legal government, and thus the disgrace and humiliation of the dismemberment of a most loyal ally, Poland, falls on Mr. Churchill's broad shoulders.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH

President Roosevelt's speech, though a little more sincere, lacked the dynamic force of the Roosevelt that said "that all men are born free and no nation has the right to be master over others"—Russia excepted—or the Roosevelt that proclaimed the "four freedoms" for all—but Poland. The freedom of religion is not even mentioned at Crimea and we heard all along that this was a war in defense of Christianity; maybe it was, but it is not any more for. indeed, we must not be less brave to be Christian, nor less Christian to be brave. It was also supposed to be in defense of democracy and we are making secure the world's greatest absolute dictatorship of Kremlin. The declaration of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter will go down in history as the shrewdest pieces of deception ever foisted upon peace-loving and peace-desiring nations. Frail, indeed, were the arguments of the President in defense of his complacent approval of the Soviet aggression and occupation of Poland—weaker even than the reasons Mr. Stalin had for grabbing and gobbling up Poland, and he had none. Poland has two governments, we are told—no distinction is made between a legal government of Poland in London and the usurping bogus Soviet stalk horse the Lublin committee empowered by foreign force; also, we hear that Poland is supposed to be a "potential source of trouble," from without, however, not from within. The way we heard it, it was Hitler and Stalin pounced on Poland and not that Poland attacked Germany and Russia—at least, that used to be the history before Crimea. We are assured that there will be no balance of power in Europe. How could there be if Stalin has it all? Russian aggression accounted for the fact that there was no Polish government before the last and perhaps after this war. One argument of the President, however, deserves attention because he is either well-informed or ill-informed when he says that the majority of the people east of the Curzon are "definitely not Polish."

According to statistics, before the war the greatest single group in eastern Polish territory was definitely Polish; all the others together were in majority but they are definitely not Russian because there is as much difference between Ukrainians and the Moscow Russians as there is between Ukrainians and Poles. This is well to remember. However, if the President was assured by Mr. Stalin at Crimea of the present reality, then Marshal Stalin confirms the pro-Soviet press boast "that there would not be a Pole left east of the Curzon line by January 15, 1945," and thus that is real news and consequently the President was well informed. Because the Russians were only 1 percent of this population before the war. The Ukrainians and White Russians belong to the western civilization while the Moscovites belong to the Asiatic sphere of culture. The President's personal disappointment of Yalta leaves room for hope.

PRO-SOVIET ARGUMENTS UNMASKED "IN THE SOVIET SENSE"

One is amusingly reminded of the proverbial absent-minded professor by the assertion made in Brantford lately, "Poland need have no fear of Russia because there are no political, diplomatic, or economic facts to dispute Russia's friendship to Poland." Russian aggression on Poland in 1939 must have been out of kindness; Poland plundered, and over 2,000,000 Poles deported into Siberia, probably could be classed as friendship; 10,000 Polish officers killed in a concentration camp near Smolensk was undoubtedly out of kindness, German or Russian; dictators are known for no other sort of kindness; Moscow-made bogus government for Poland might also be out of friendship, of course, in the Soviet sense, and this is what the professor forgot to mention. It seems that a Negro even born in Warsaw would still like watermelon.

"CURZON MORE RUSSIAN THAN STALIN"

Some argue: Curzon line is right because the western nationalities proposed it and Stalin cannot be less Russian than Curzon. The fact is the Curzon was never meant to be permanent, nor a dividing line between Polish and Russian peoples, and the Soviet statesmen and Lenin never recognized the Curzon line as just, as it was too far west and thus settled at Riga. Lenin certainly was not afraid of being less Russian than Curzon. Lenin would have laughed at such a comparison as Curzon is well known for his anti-Soviet attitude.

"Russia was twice attacked by Germany." Firstly, in 1914 and 1941 the Russian frontier was farther west, how can the Curzon line be expected to protect Russia in the future? Secondly, why reproach Poland as Poland at those times did not exist on account of Russian and German treachery. History shows that when Russia with Germany destroyed Poland it was to the detriment and peril of Russia. If Poland were independent then and corroborated with Germany, then the charge would hold, otherwise it is false and pro-Soviet propaganda. So even the Russo-British partition of Poland at Crimea may prove detrimental both to Russia and England.

"POLISH GOVERNMENT FLED TO ENGLAND

"The Polish Government fled to England while Lublin stayed in Poland and fought in the underground." The truth is: There was no Lublin Committee till after the tragic death of General Sikorski which is an unpleasant coincidence. Arciszewski for 5 years fought in the Polish underground and demonstrates the backing of the Polish underground for the London Polish Government since he heads it now. Most of the Lubliners for years before the war were outside of Poland, in Russia.

"SOVIETS LIBERATED POLAND

"The Soviet Army liberated Poland. Poland is behind the Soviet fighting lines." A double argument used to discredit the western allies in the eyes of the Polish Nation. While the British, American, and Polish forces and others having liberated Africa, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and France, will Great Britain and United States of America seize half of those countries or place puppet governments in those countries as Russia does? Russia's claim is not founded on any argument but on sheer power.

"POLAND ACCUSED OF DICTATORSHIP

"Poland is accused of dictatorship government. The fact is: Poland is condemned for something that is glorified in Russia. What is happening in Italy, Belgium, Greece, and

other places where Communists are disrupting authority? It is the Communist creed to keep obstructing peaceful government and refuse cooperation till they themselves are in power and then do as they please. Can any one doubt that to control government where Communists, with their trickery, always cause trouble, may be the only way is, by dictatorship? And with dictators in most countries why should Poland be condemned for having had a dictator, is it because she so effectively kept communism out of Poland?

"POLAND IMPOSED ON RUSSIA AT RIGA"

Strong Poland imposed its will on weak Russia. What an absurd argument. Poland in 1919 had just finished serving her term of 150 years of servitude in Russian and German bondage after being partitioned in 1772. Who is so dumb as to claim that Poland was then strong? Furthermore at Riga Lenin moved the Polish offer farther east than Poland desired. And Lenin and his statesmen were Russians and they took less than Poland was offering them. Is that imposing one's will?

"Poland should be thumbed to the penalty box." If Poland was playing hockey she would be thumbed to the penalty box for disobeying the three referees at Yalta. What a poor sportsman that editor be, who claims that. If a referee or umpire ran a game contrary to all the rules of the game, and with spite and injustice to a team not only the players would protest but the fans would use the umpire in no uncertain manner and police escort would be necessary for his safety, in fact he wouldn't be an umpire very long. Poland was cruelly and unjustly treated at Yalta as an Allied ally, in fact she is used worse than an enemy state, like Italy and even Germany whose independence and sovereignty is assured by Crimea. Why is Poland condemned to Russia occupation? Why was she dismembered if not for appeasement? The world is due for a great awakening.

Other writers when they can't prove or state something in favor of Russia they cast doubt on the other side. "It is not certain who is to be blamed for Warsaw," they say, or "it is doubtful who killed the 10,000 Polish officers"—surely the Poles did not. Russia could have shown up German cruelty, but instead pointed a guilty finger to herself when she broke off relations. Some arguments are pure simple power politics; just because Russia is occupying Poland with her army, does not give her the legal title to it no more than the Allied armies possess Belgium and Holland. We are supposed to be allies and not individual grabbers, or are we?

NOT YET THROUGH

The war is not yet through. While no one is finding fault with the United States of America in not fighting for a European frontier, we are all fighting in self-defense and in self-preservation and in defense of one another. But England has a special pledge and agreement or pact with Poland which Poland honored and sealed with her blood while Britain repays with dismemberment and Ogpu occupation. Where is British fairplay? The silence of Ottawa is oppressive and ominous. How everyone was up in arms when Poland was attacked, how the world was aroused when little Pearl Harbor was attacked, and now, when Poland is half gobbled up and the rest under occupation of Red forces, when her life is at stake, when she is doomed to extinction as a nation, the allies betray her and, adding insult to injury, they repudiate her legal government. And while pro-Axis governments like Argentina will be at San Francisco, the Polish legal government is made an outcast. A government with 200,000 soldiers, a government that did more for England and Russia than most nations. If Hitler could have thrown those extra divisions that the Polish underground forced him to keep in Poland, if he could have put them into Stalingrad, what a different history it would be today, and Russia repays her gratitude with aggression and occupation; if Hitler could have thrown those extra divisions at England there would have been no Churchill at Crimea carving up Poland. And still Poland is not invited to San Francisco. Maybe it will be Poland's luck to be spared the humilitation that awaits the others? For with Stalin having developed a habit he will dominate, there as at Teheran, Moscow, and Crimea. And what about the peace conference, ditto. If less talking was done and more justice distributed the world might be the better for it. These observations are not made in a spirit of criticism but in a spirit of apprehension for Poland, for all small nations, for the allies and the western civilization. I will conclude with the words of the Honorable Mr. RAMEY, of Ohio, "My resentment is based on the sound concept of justice and common decency and respect of freedom."

Rev. EDWARD WILOWSKI.

WILNO, ONTARIO, CANADA, *March 15, 1945.*

The American Legion on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has always taken an active part in immigration matters. The Legion makes a study of immigration problems and what it has had to say on the subject of immigration from time to time is worthy of the consideration of patriotic men and women everywhere. At this time when some might desire to weaken our immigration laws, it is well to give thought to what this great patriotic organization has said. It is anticipated that there will be an effort upon the part of a great many people to come to this country after the war, just as was done after the First World War, and I think it is timely to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a résumé of various resolutions on the subject which have been passed by the American Legion at the last Chicago and previous national conventions. For the benefit of all interested persons, I include the following résumé of their resolutions:

Resolution 268, Chicago national convention, September 1944, asks that the immigration laws be amended and treaties be concluded accordingly to provide for the immediate deportation of all naturalized citizens whose citizenship has been or may be revoked due to subversive activities.

Resolution from the November meeting of national executive committee, 1942, asks that alien enemies of this Government not be permitted to become American citizens or hold Government jobs for the duration of the war.

Resolution 375, Chicago national convention, September 1944, puts the Legion on record as favoring and taking the necessary steps to have enacted into law by the Congress an act prohibiting an alien from speaking over or using the radio facilities on behalf of or under the auspices of any political party, or for or against any candidate for public office.

Resolution 287, Kansas City national convention, September 1942, recommends that the navigation laws of the United States be amended to prohibit any alien from owning or operating any vessel in the coasting or fishing trade of the United States and the same penalty be provided for the violation of this amendment as those applying to the violation of other acts governing the documentation of vessels of the United States.

Resolution 66, Kansas City national convention, September 1942, asks that legislation be enacted to detain for deportation from the United States and its territories aliens who have positively refused to fight and forever forbid their reentry or residence under our flag.

Resolution 427, Omaha convention, September 1943, condemns the activities of all groups and organizations which advocate refusal to bear arms for the United States or show proper respect for the flag, and call upon all loyal American citizens to eradicate these un-American activities and influences, through education and by all other legal means.

Resolution 442, Boston national convention, September 1940, asks that the Congress of the United States be requested to amend the naturalization laws to provide that aliens who have resided in the United States for a period of more than 5 years without filing an intention to apply for citizenship, or who having filed do not complete same within the time required by law, shall not thereafter be entitled to make such application.

Resolution from the May meeting of the national executive committee, 1944, favors legislation to strengthen and standardize the educational requirements for naturalization, however, without relaxation or suspension of any literacy requirements now in force.

Resolution 379, Chicago national convention, September 1944, states that the American Legion will oppose and condemn all individuals and groups who parade and emphasize their origin or descent as a means of securing personal aggrandizement, or group superiority.

Bay Area and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I wish to include the following editorial from the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif.:

BAY AREA AND POWER

Officials of San Francisco and other bay area cities would do well to take to heart the remarks of Congressman GEORGE MILLER, of Alameda, in a statement made in Washington this week.

MILLER described the San Francisco region, so far as future industrial development is concerned, as caught in a nutcracker between Los Angeles and the Pacific Northwest, both of which have limitless sources of public power.

The Congressman further stated:

"Either Portland, Seattle, or Los Angeles can undersell us by about one-third. When the Aluminum Co. of America was looking for a site for a coast factory they passed up all our advantages, including a supply of bauxite, for the power the Northwest could offer."

The San Francisco Bay area also has a potential source of low-priced electric power in the Central Valley project, but has done little in the past to avail herself of it.

San Francisco, Oakland, and other bay cities, above all others, should be put out in

front fighting for a power transmission line from the Shasta Dam. They are the ones which would derive many of the major benefits from C. V. P.

Until these cities are provided with a large source of low-priced power they can expect to see the new industries—post-war as well as war-time—established in southern California and the Pacific Northwest.

Shall War Production Facilities Be Retained?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted by both the executive committee and the board of directors of the Greater Muskegon (Mich.) Chamber of Commerce. It urges that a specific program, as part of our future over-all national defense policy, be adopted for the preservation and maintenance of production facilities, recognizing that adequate, properly distributed production capacity is necessarily of first importance in any national defense program worthy of the name. I am sure the resolution, which follows, represents the business sentiment of its own community and many another as well:

MUSKEGON, MICH., *March 27, 1945.*

The experience of the past 25 years has made it abundantly clear that treaties between nations and a world security organization are not in themselves sufficient to maintain a lasting peace. Aggressor nations do not become aggressor nations overnight; there is a long period of quiet preparation in which vast armaments are built in the expectation that a sudden onslaught will find the other nations defenseless and unable to withstand the terror. Mobility in war has been tremendously increased by the introduction of the airplane. The airplane carrier and mechanized armies demonstrate that the width of oceans and vas continental distances are no longer the security they once were.

The only assurance, therefore, of permanent peace is that this country be vigilant and fully prepared at all times to meet any threat against its security. This does not necessarily imply the continuance of a large body of men under arms. It does imply that we have in instant readiness an industrial plant capable of supplying, on short notice, the vast quantities of material which modern warfare requires. In World War No. 2, as in World War No. 1, the courage and stamina of our allies gave us the time to build such plants. However, it was not until 1944, 3 years after we were attacked and 5 years after the inception of World War No. 2, that this country was in a position to apply sufficient pressure on the aggressor nations to force them to surrender their conquests.

World War No. 2, therefore, teaches us that the great principles enunciated by one of our early forebears, "Put your trust in God and keep your powder dry" still applies if we are to remain an independent Nation. We are of the opinion, therefore, that our war plant, built up in the United States at such a prodigious cost, should not be scrapped for a mere pittance but should be preserved intact. Those facilities that fit in with civilian production should be disposed of to private enterprise, preferably the operators, under guaranty that they will be properly maintained, reasonable wear and tear excepted, so as to be useful in another emergency. Those facilities, useful for war purposes only, particularly machinery and equipment, should be stored and kept in a proper state of repair so as to be immediately useful in the event of another conflict. Purely temporary facilities, built for the duration only, such as war housing, camps, and cantonments, etc., should be scrapped. Surplus commodities should be disposed of in an orderly manner, the emphasis being on preservation of facilities as distinguished from more-or-less perishable products.

A suitable board, composed in part of civilian and part military representatives, should be established to effectuate this program.

Experience, both after World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, have abundantly demonstrated that maintenance of war plants is far more economical than the creation of new facilities in the event of a national emergency. Moreover, World War No. 2 has taught us that in all probability this country will lack sufficient manpower to do the triple job of creating necessary facilities, producing war products with those facilities, and supplying the Army and Navy with the men they need in a conflict of global proportions.

The United States, as the richest and most powerful Nation, can only become the guarantor of peace and world stability if it maintains the facilities and forces necessary to insure such a peace. For this country to return to the state of unpreparedness that existed in 1939 is unthinkable.

Resolved, therefore, That Board of Directors of Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce recommends to Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to the representatives of this State in Congress that they employ their best efforts to develop a program for the preservation and maintenance of our war plant in accordance with the principles set forth in this resolution.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Endres, Coshocton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to your attention the family of six sons, now serving in our military units, of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Endres, of Coshocton, Ohio, my home county, which I have the privilege to represent. This fine American couple has a service flag hanging in their home which is almost solid with stars, representing their sons who left this home to serve their country.

The first son, Sgt. Jerry Endres, left for camp in March 1941; has been serving somewhere in India with the One Hundred and Eighty-first General Hospital, but is now on his way home for a furlough. Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph P. Endres served in the South Pacific with an Infantry unit, and has recently been returned to the States, and is now assigned for duty at Camp Gordon, Ga. Sgt. Carl R. Endres is now serving in Italy with the Quartermaster Corps. Cpl. Albert J. Endres is with an engineering battalion in Germany. Cpl. William J. Endres is with an engineering battalion in Belgium; and Pvt. (1st cl.) Maurice E. Endres is in the Army Air Forces and stationed at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

I fully realize that all parents, regardless of the number of sons and daughters they have serving in the armed services, are sacrificing and contributing to the war effort, but I feel that special recognition should be given to those parents who have six of their family group serving in the uniform of our country, and carrying the banner for victory.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I salute and pay respect to Mr. and Mrs. Albert Endres, of Coshocton, Ohio.

America and the World Lose a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial written by Mr. Alfred D. Mynders which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, April 13, 1945, immediately following the passing of our great leader and President, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This editorial, I feel, expresses what is in the hearts and minds of the people all over the world today.

AMERICA AND THE WORLD LOSE A LEADER

"Now he belongs to the ages."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead on the field of honor, and Edwin M. Stanton's remark concerning the dead Lincoln applies to Mr. Roosevelt beyond the power of anyone to cancel half a line in a record illustrious in world history.

He belongs to the ages, for in the greatest crisis in the Nation's history, he guided his country to certain victory against the mightiest forces of evil ever marshaled against the free peoples.

President Roosevelt died at Warm Springs yesterday of a cerebral hemorrhage. This fateful month of April, so filled with memories of national sorrow, was also the month of Mr. Lincoln's death, 3 days later in the month than Mr. Roosevelt's death. And President Roosevelt died on the eighty-fourth anniversary of the beginning of the War between the States, April 12, 1861.

Mr. Roosevelt was a war casualty. He gave his life for his country as tens of thousands of our youths have done. His death is the most terrific shock this country could sustain, for his labors were unfinished. Having guided us to eventual victory, he was to guide the world to organized peace.

His idolaters, of whom there are countless thousands, will be inconsolable in their sorrow. For them, broken indeed is the golden bowl, loosed the silver cord. But from the ranks of the opposition party will come tributes to his war leadership. Out of the unity which these two opposing forces must now reach for their country's good, may come a march to the peace with honor, the peace with enduring links of steel, which was the passionate desire of the dead President.

In 12 years 1 month and 8 days as President of this country, Mr. Roosevelt's administration of that office was epochal not only in length, but in the variety of the crises which confronted him. It was a burden which would have long since broken a man of less resolution and zeal.

Mr. Harry S. Truman has taken the oath as President. Mr. Truman's heavy task must also recall the period of Lincoln when Andrew Johnson came upon similar burdens. But Mr. Truman comes to the White House in an hour of world stress. The Civil War had just been ended when Lincoln died, but this war is not ended. Mr. Truman can call upon the best leadership of this country, and no man can deny him his support.

In a period of supreme shock like this, Americans rally together. We must uphold President Truman as we have rallied to every need of this country since Pearl Harbor.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, born in Hyde Park, January 30, 1882, came into the Presidency in the midst of a great depression. This is no time to weigh the New Deal issues, though the country weathered the storm of unemployment, a financial panic, closed banks.

It was in 1940 that Mr. Roosevelt showed a prophetic power in originating the great lend-lease system, a year before America was drawn into the war. Through this far-seeing system, over $35,000,000,000 has been advanced to the war cause of the United Nations. Without that lend-lease and without America's stupendous war production, Premier Stalin himself said at the Teheran Conference the United Nations could not have won the victory.

Although his critics have pictured Mr. Roosevelt as obstinate, history will recall that in his domestic policies he was a compromiser. Most of the major legislative proposals of the executive branch of the Government since March 4, 1933, have failed to get complete acceptance in Congress, but Mr. Roosevelt was willing to accept the compromise. These compromises eventually gave the administration much of what it had originally demanded. Not Henry Clay but Franklin D. Roosevelt may be known in future American histories as the great compromiser.

America was unprepared when the Axis storm swept over the world. But we began laying the groundwork for our defenses. We adopted peacetime conscription of our armies. We began to change an unwise Neutrality Act in order to prevent the utter defeat of our great ally, England.

In all of these many facets of the war problem, Mr. Roosevelt was the leader. He was given a fourth term in the Presidency because his record as a war statesman was like a shield on the arm of this great country.

The combined strategy exercised by Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Stalin cannot be credited solely to any one of them. But it has been a miracle of wise conduct of a war. As Mr. Walter Lippmann said in an article only this week, these three "have succeeded in dividing our enemies and in driving them to fight separate wars while they gathered and advanced their own forces, with well-nigh perfect timing, for a unified conclusion of the whole war."

In all of the meetings of these three titans, America has known that her cause was in good hands. The conferences started even before we entered the war, with that great Atlantic meeting between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill when they propounded the Atlantic Charter in August 1941. Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, Teheran, and Yalta were mileposts in our steady emergence from defeat into the light of victory. And Mr. Lippmann's comment, written, of course, before the President's sudden death yesterday, is worth quoting in the cold light of reasoning rather than shock and grief which all Americans must feel at the passing of one of our greatest men.

Mr. Lippmann said that it was necessary "to explode the myth that the President and his responsible lieutenants have been amiable weaklings, suckers, and Santa Clauses, in the hands of the stern, shrewd realists, Churchill and Stalin, about what matters most. The President has been quite the equal of the other two."

In cool judgment, in willingness to compromise rather than to risk a tragic break in the grand alliance, Mr. Roosevelt may be ranked as the greatest of the three.

The death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is a loss to all peoples, a world shock of the first magnitude. But he dies at the height of his power. He never knew that eclipse which comes to most great men. He is spared the unhappiness which comes to fallen idols.

Consider that remarkable career, one to place beside that of any statesman in the annals of time. A rather light-hearted Assistant Secretary of Navy in his early political life, Mr. Roosevelt was stricken almost unto death, and was left a hopeless cripple.

Out of that helplessness, he arose to be twice Governor of the great State of New York, four times President of the United States, one of the acknowledged leaders of the free world in a crisis which threatened to turn back civilization to the Middle Ages.

Unsuccessful candidate for Vice President in 1920, Mr. Roosevelt was undaunted, his ideal of service to his country was undimmed, and since 1932, he has been the most powerful figure in the public life of this country.

What he has started, cannot be undone. America will rally stronger than ever behind Mr. Roosevelt's ideals of complete victory and organized peace. Like Woodrow Wilson, he has fallen in the struggle, his life a sacrifice to his country's cause. Unlike Woodrow Wilson, Mr. Roosevelt had every reason to feel that his country would follow him in the difficult path of peace, even as it has so valiantly followed him down the hard road of war.

The power of his leadership will sustain his successor; America will prove her greatness in the future difficult months as she has proved it in the past 3½ years in war. For even in the untimely passing he has given us momentum to carry us on. In Markham's words:

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down,
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of H. R. 2800 and explanatory notes thereon.

On March 27, 1945, I introduced House Resolution 2800, a bill "to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended." The bill with explanatory notes is as follows:

SECTION 1. That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in each State and Territory of the United States in which there is not situated on the date of enactment of this act a national cemetery, a suitable site for the establishment thereon of such a national cemetery.

Section 1 authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a suitable site for the establishment thereof of a national cemetery in each State and Territory of the United States in which there is no such cemetery.

Note: The above section increases the authority of the Secretary of War, as per United States Code, title 24, sections 271, 272, and 273, to accept land by donation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in States (including the District of Columbia) having a population of 500,000 or more, and in the Territories and possessions of the United States, (1) suitable sites for the establishment thereon of such additional cemeteries, and (2) land adjoining existing national cemeteries for the extension of such national cemeteries, as the Secretary of War may determine to be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last dischage therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of War to acquire land for the establishment of national cemeteries in States—including the District of Columbia—having a population of 500,000 or more and in territories and possessions of the United States—first, for establishment of additional national cemeteries; second, land adjoining existing national cemeteries for extension of same as he may determine to be necessary.

Note: This section repeats authority the Secretary now has for establishment of national cemeteries. However, such authority was given in Act of 1867 and this proviso renews this authority. In view of length of time old law was enacted there has been some question as to whether it is still in existence.

SEC. 3. Upon the acquisition of such land by the United States, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and construct thereon national cemeteries, and to provide for the future care and maintenance of such national cemeteries.

Section 3 authorized and directs Secretary of War to establish and construct national cemeteries on land so acquired and to provide for their future care and maintenance.

Note: This section does not change present law—United States Code, title 24, section 278—as the establishment of cemeteries necessarily includes construction. However, there has been some question as to whether establishment meant construction and this section clarifies the situation.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to do all things necessary to accomplish the

purpose of this act, by contract or otherwise, with or without advertising, under such conditions as he may prescribe, including the engagement, by contract, of services of such architects, sculptors, artists, or firms or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as he may deem necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States.

The Secretary of War is further authorized to spend in accordance with the provisions of this act such sum of money as may be placed in his hands as a contribution additional to the funds appropriated by Congress.

Section 4 authorizes Secretary of War to do all things necessary to accomplish purpose of act by contract or otherwise, with or without advertising, under such conditions as he may prescribe, including engagement, by contract, of services of such architects sculptors, artists, or firms or partnerships thereof and other technical and professional personnel as he may deem necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing employment and compensation of employees of the United States.

This section also authorizes the Secretary of War to accept contributions of money in addition to that appropriated by Congress.

Note: The above provision would allow the Secretary of War to do all work necessary in the establishment of a cemetery in the most expeditious manner with or without contract, in order to have them available for burial upon repatriation of the American dead from overseas at cessation of hostilities; to secure the advice of the best talent in the architecture of these national shrines, calling upon such architects, sculptors, and artists for consultation without awaiting the authority of Civil Service. Furthermore, the names of the most prominent personnel of this caliber are not on the civil service rolls and can only be obtained without reference thereto. Such other technical and professional personnel such as architectural engineers, landscape gardeners, civil engineers, and so forth, may be secured in the same manner. These cemeteries are nonmilitary activities and the architecture of each is individual and nonrepetitive.

Paragraph 2 of this section provides that such funds as may be contributed by individuals, patriotic societies, and organizations may be used for additional embellishments such as stained glass windows, ornamental doors, bronze plaques, and so forth, in general keeping with the general design and spirit of the buildings.

SEC. 5. Before any plan or design is accepted for use as a national cemetery, the Secretary of War shall obtain with respect thereto the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Section 5 provides that the Fine Arts Commission render advice on any plan or design that may be considered for use as a national cemetery.

Note: This section needs no explanation.

SEC. 6. The establishment, construction, care, maintenance, administration, and operation of the national cemeteries herein and hereafter provided for and all existing national cemeteries shall be a function of the Quartermaster General directly under the Secretary of War.

Section 6 provides that the establishment, construction, care, maintenance, administration, and operation of the national cemeteries herein and hereafter provided for, and all existing national cemeteries, shall be a function of the Quartermaster General directly under the Secretary of War.

Note: This section is designed to place the whole subject of national cemeteries (which have no connection with the Military Establishment whatsoever) directly and solely with the Quartermaster General under the direct control of the Secretary of War, eliminating any military intermediary supervision by the General Staff or the Army Service Forces. Under General Orders 68, 1879, the Secretary of War placed the responsibility for the establishment, which included construction, care, and maintenance of national cemeteries under the immediate jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General and they remained under his direct control until 1942 when the Army Service Forces was created and these functions were absorbed by the Army Service Forces, a military organization established solely for military purposes and only for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

National cemeteries are nonmilitary activities established, constructed and maintained by nonmilitary funds procured under the Civil Functions Appropriations Act of the War Department, the same as rivers-and-harbors activities are procured under the Chief of Engineers. They have no relation whatsoever to the military; furthermore, the intimate individual nature of each of these monumental expressions of our National and State gratitude to these honored dead prohibits standardization of architecture as evidenced by military construction.

SEC. 7. The provisions of United States Code, page 24, section 275 (sec. 4874, Rev. Stat.), are amended to read as follows: "The superintendents and assistant superintendents of the national cemeteries shall be appointed under schedule A, Civil Service Rules and Regulations, and shall be selected from meritorious and trustworthy soldiers, sailors, and marines, either commissioned officers or enlisted men who have been honorably discharged from the service of the United States, and who must have been disabled for active field service in the line of duty."

Section 7 provides for the appointment of superintendents and assistant superintendents of national cemeteries under schedule A, Civil Service Rules and Regulations, and extends the privilege to ex-servicemen of all arms of the service.

Note: The present law restricts such appointments to military personnel only. There is at the present time no law for the appointment of assistant superintendents. This class of personnel are all ex-servicemen and this is one position which the ex-serviceman can obtain and be assured proper quarters and living. The superintendents and assistant superintendents must have some disability incurred in line of duty and as long as this disability does not interfere with their ability to perform light manual labor they can be selected. Furthermore, in order to be eligible for retirement at 70 years of age, an appointee must be under 55 years of age at the time of appointment.

In view of the technical nature of a superintendent's duties, it is thought advantageous to the Government that examinations be held by the Quartermaster General's office to determine the qualifications for the job. This method was used until 1940, when the Civil Service insisted that superintendents had been inducted into civil service under Executive Order 7916, June 24, 1938, effective February 1, 1939. Prior to that date the Quartermaster General held examinations, maintained an eligible list, made appointments, classified, and had authority to dispense with the services of any superintendent who was not satisfactorily performing his duties without reference to civil service. This procedure was to the interest of the service, but since the Civil Service has had control the interest of the service has not been the dominating factor—extent of physical disability, age, and suitability for the job have not been considered as factors by the Civil Service.

In order to have these cemeteries properly maintained as national shrines to our heroes, it is essential that proper personnel be obtained and it is considered that this can best be done by putting this class of personnel under schedule A of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations and making the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Quartermaster General, responsible for securing the proper qualified superintendents and assistant superintendents for these important shrines.

SEC. 8. The act entitled "An act to provide for a national cemetery in every State," approved June 29, 1938 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 24, sec. 271a), and "An act to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at Honolulu, T. H." (Public Law 298, 77th Cong.) (ch. 477, 1st sess. (H. R. 588)), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. In order to carry out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $122,938,331, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $63,312,173 of which shall be made immediately available for civil functions administered by the War Department, "Cemeterial expenses—War Department," to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Quartermaster General and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the services of such additional technical and clerical personnel as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the Office of the Quartermaster General.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the boxcar shortage

in the Middle West, as the result of which the entire Middle West, and more particularly the grain producers, are in most acute difficulty in the effort to move grain, not so much locally as to move the grain into other markets where it is vitally needed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some notes on the grain car situation in Iowa just published by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, located at Fort Dodge.

There being no objection, the notes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES ON GRAIN-CAR SITUATION IN IOWA

The Farmers Grain Dealers Association, through its grain department, deals almost daily with some two hundred of the more than three hundred of its farmer-owned and farmer-controlled members. This gives those making these daily contacts a very comprehensive picture of the transportation problem that has faced the country elevators and their farmer patrons.

Last December we clearly foresaw the difficulties that we thought were ahead for those of us who have some responsibility for marketing the Iowa farmers' production at a maximum return to the farmer producer. There was every indication that the shortage of grain cars was going to be serious and that it might grow progressively worse. We had become more or less reconciled to this point of view and we were formulating plans for a campaign that would persuade the farmer that unless he made provision for saving his corn on his own farm that serious losses of grain needed in the war effort, as well as the money value of much of the grain then on farms, were inevitable.

Early in January the writer happened to be in Chicago and stopped in the office of the Regional Director of O. D. T. I had expected to discuss the car situation and had anticipated the Director would confirm our opinion that too few cars would be available to the Iowa farmer to avoid outrageous losses, unless the farmer took such action as might forestall these losses. However, instead of having these fears confirmed, we were assured, without the slightest equivocation, that cars were not only going to be made plentiful for the movement of wet corn but at that very instant trainloads of empty grain cars, or what they termed "block trains," were being rushed from eastern territory through the Chicago gateway, and that more were to follow—and that we could go home and tell this to our membership. We did so and on the strength of it bought considerable corn, some of which is still on our books unshipped as we write these notes.

Repeatedly after that date we had every assurance that cars were going to be available within a few days or, at the most, within a few weeks. We had every right to believe that these promises were sincere and that the responsible officers of the responsible agencies were taking the necessary steps to see that cars were made available.

The mouse that the mountainous promises finally brought forth, in Iowa at least, was some six or seven hundred cars that were brought in from the east and delivered to the C. & N. W. Otherwise I would say that 95 percent, perhaps 98 percent, of the cars that have left Iowa in the past 3 or 4 months loaded with grain came into Iowa loaded with merchandise. And at one time the carriers were actually taking these merchandise cars away from Iowa points when they were emptied and were sending them to Dakota in order to load wheat that had been in storage there for months, and so far as spoilage was concerned, could have remained in storage for many more months.

In the writer's opinion, the reason that all these promises failed to materialize is extremely simple. The natural flow of traffic under wartime conditions is toward the seaboard. When these cars were emptied there, the eastern lines had insistent demands from their shippers for every available empty. Being human, they probably took care of their own patrons and when the orders were issued that were to return these cars to the western carriers, the people operating the eastern lines found the language in these orders that permitted them to circumvent the plain intention of the orders. (You and I would probably have done the same thing if we had been operating an eastern rail line.)

The committee that is to investigate the grain-car situation should, in the writer's opinion, give careful consideration to a review of I. C. C. Order 244. We regard this order as most unfair; in fact, we think it confiscated a considerable percentage of the volume of business of many of our member companies. This order goes to the very heart of the question of car distribution, and, as we have seen it in operation, it deprives the member of a cooperative of the right to market his grain through his cooperative. In the case of corn, with which we are most familiar, it will result in a reduction of from 2 or 3 percent of his gross income on corn sold, and will run a considerably higher percentage of loss when translated into a reduction of the net income of corn sold. And, of course, the loss of volume to his cooperative tends to destroy his local cooperative and cooperatives in general.

We would especially urge that the committee making this investigation give cooperatives the opportunity to be heard on this issue.

Another matter that the investigating committee should consider is the carriers' responsibility for expediting the movement of grain that, due to its condition, is subject to spoilage. In order to earn the maximum revenue for their own line, initial carriers often route grain over a circuitous rather than the most direct route. Carriers are beyond the reach of claim if they move a car at the rate of 50 miles a day. This is just about the speed at which our armies have moved across Germany. This horse-and-buggy-50-mile-a-day provision is unfair to the shipper. The carrier should be required to assume responsibility for moving grain that is likely to go out of condition at least at the rate of 75 miles a day, and should be made responsible for giving distressed grain the most direct routing.

We can cite instances where cars have moved just within the 50-mile-a-day-limitation that could have been moved in half the consumed time, and losses of as much as $1,000 a car to the shipper could have been avoided.

As an illustration of how vicious these losses are we might point out that a few days ago we had 4 cars of corn in the Chicago market that had been kiln dried and on arrival in Chicago these cars graded No. 3 or better and were all sold at the Chicago ceiling prices. On the very same day we had 4 cars of corn that were originally of as good or better quality than the 4 cars that had been kiln dried, but because they were out of condition sold at 39 cents, a difference in value on each of the 4 cars of 77 cents a bushel. Assuming that it costs 17 cents a bushel to dry this corn, which is a liberal estimate, this left 60 cents a bushel difference in the net proceeds, or an average of more than $1,000 a car.

Now if this corn could have been moved last winter when farmers wanted to move it and begged for the transportation that was necessary in order to move it, these four cars alone would have netted the producers $4,000 more than they actually received.

There have been hundreds of such cars going to market and all of it has been on the waiting list of some elevator for weeks and in many cases for months, and often has been listed with several elevators for that length of time.

We would want further to state our opinion that had the matter of transportation for wet corn from Iowa been given adequate attention, practically all the difficulties that have been encountered could have been avoided without affecting the transportation necessary to our military effort. The additional transportation required was relatively insignificant. Had Iowa had 130 percent of the cars that were furnished and had the distribution of these cars been better, our difficulties would have been overcome.

The association wouldn't want to be identified with any group that is unreasonably critical of those responsible for the Nation's wartime transportation. This would be true of Government officials, O. D. T., and other agencies whose efforts have been directed toward expediting the movement of grain, as well as the operating officials of the railroads. On the whole a wonderful job has been done and at no time have we seen any evidence that these people haven't every intention of doing the right thing, and always we found them ready to meet anyone half way who had anything constructive to suggest.

An investigation by a committee of the United States Senate is unquestionably the surest way for all concerned to get a fair hearing and to provide a background for a policy that will fully utilize all the grain-box equipment available and give those cars a more uniform distribution.

The Nation Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been said that life and death are equal kings. Death is no respecter of persons, no respecter of positions; in the republic of the grave, all are equal kings. So in the midst of our million casualties—amidst the tears of the mothers, fathers, wives, daughters, and sons mourning their loss on foreign battlefields—our President was suddenly stricken in a moment when he and the world least expected it.

The Nation is recovering from the shock of the President's sudden death. This is the third similar shock that many of us have experienced. We have witnessed the death of the third President in office. The first was the assassination of President McKinley, then the sudden death of President Harding, and now President Roosevelt. These three Presidents had one thing in common. All three had personal charm. No one could meet any one of these three without feeling perfectly at home. There was no formality, no stiffness, but friendliness.

The Nation was all the more shocked because the death of the President was unexpected. It was shocked because European victory is at hand. It was doubly shocked because of the uncertainty of our future—of civilization's future. It was stunned because of the closeness of the San Francisco Conference—a confer-

ence which must write and win a just and lasting peace or else our victories on the fields of battle will have been lost. Our million casualties will have been in vain.

Many people expect that the San Francisco Conference will produce a just and lasting peace. We all hope that justice will triumph over greed and aggression at that conference. The late President seemed worried over the Polish, the Finnish, the Romanian, and the Lithuanian situations. He must have been dissatisfied with the results at Yalta. Disappointment was plainly visible when he addressed Congress upon his return.

Now that he is gone, time alone will pass upon the merits or demerits of his foreign and domestic policies. What this verdict will be no one can foretell. There will be many side issues, side lights, and facts discovered before time renders its final verdict.

All who met him liked President Roosevelt personally. Some, because of his personal charm, agreed with everything he did. Others admired him personally but disagreed with many of his domestic and foreign policies. There is one thing that we can all agree on, and that is that the President made this Nation, perhaps the world, conscious of the fact that there was an underprivileged class. Let America arouse itself and demand that the San Francisco Conference bring about a just and lasting peace for all nations as the final monument to our departed President.

Nothing in this world is permanent but change. On Easter Sunday, April 1, Mrs. Lemke and myself met Vice President and Mrs. Truman at an afternoon tea given in their honor at the home of close personal friends, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley James O'Connor. Little did we think that we were shaking the hands of the man and lady who within 12 days would become the President of the United States and the First Lady of the land. Not only has Mr. Truman become President, but he became the most powerful single individual in the world.

In his address to Congress, the new President made it plain to the world that he was not the master of our people, but their servant. He did not threaten the smaller nations with the might of the three great military powers. He said that the great powers must not dominate, but serve, the smaller nations. We hope that some of our allies, who are just now attempting to grab everything in sight; to grab everything above and beneath the waves—heard and understood that language.

Under these conditions, President Truman will have a trying time. He will have to make decisions that will affect not only our own future, but the future of the world. If successful, he will have to meet these issues courageously and without bias. If he does this, he will have the full cooperation of the Congress and the American people. He has our best wishes in the work that lies before him.

Universal peace has been the desire of mankind throughout the ages. It is our desire. No sane person wants another world war or any war. Universal understanding and brotherhood is the teaching of Christ. But the solution of how to end all wars has not yet been discovered. It cannot be brought about by selling America down the river. In our desire for universal peace, let us be on guard lest we follow false prophets and plunge civilization into World War No. 3.

We cannot get permanent peace by putting our stamp of approval upon the liquidation of 1,800,000 Poles. We cannot get it by sanctioning the grabbing of part of the territory of Poland and Finland, and all of the Balkan states. We cannot get universal peace by force. We cannot get it by subjugation of the smaller nations.

Alexander the Great wanted one world and universal peace by force. Caesar wanted the same thing. Charlemagne and Napoleon attempted it. Mussolini and Hitler's dream of world domination by force has collapsed.

The attempted betrayal of the smaller nations by two of these great powers is repugnant to our very sense of justice. The suggestions that are coming out of Yalta are repugnant to the civilization in which we live. These suggestions will not prevent future wars. If followed, the inevitable result will be wars. There can be no permanent peace unless it has for its foundation universal justice and decency.

Let us stop following false gods and prophets. We all want permanent peace. Such a peace cannot be built upon liquidation, hatred, and aggression. It cannot be secured by surrendering our sovereignty. It cannot be acquired by lowering our standard of living for international trade—American Steel.

The curb for the overambitious—for the lust of power—for personal aggrandizement—intrigue and conspiracy among the rulers of nations—has not yet been found. We hope that President Truman, by insisting upon justice for all nations, will find it at San Francisco. If he will call the bluff of the overzealous nations who wish to grab that which is not theirs, then permanent peace may be in the cards. If he does this he will have the backing not only of a united Congress and a united people at home, but of the thinking, intelligent, and peace-loving people of the world.

Does History Repeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by Eric Underwood, If History Does Not Repeat, It Very Nearly Does:

At the time of the Presidential election last fall I had occasion to draw attention to a remarkable modern parallel with an occurrence in Roman history over 2,000 years ago.

In the year 507 B. C. Publius Valerius completed his third term as consul. A third term as consul was in itself an unusual event, but not satisfied with his achievement Publius decided to run a fourth time. The people of Rome found no impediment and coined what afterwards became a Latin proverb: "Qua ter quater" (What has been done three times can be done a fourth). Publius, too, had a nickname suggestive of American popular drinks of today: "Poplicola" (cultivator of the people, i. e., Democrat).

It was during the second term of Publius that Horatius Cocles, famous in Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, held the bridge singlehanded against the hosts of Lars Porsena.

Also in 1944 there occurred an equally remarkable coincidence in connection with the Anglo-American invasion of France.

The people of England at the present time are considering the making of a second Bayeux tapestry to commemorate pictorially the chief events in that invasion. The original Bayeux tapestry, it will be remembered, consists of several hundred feet of needlework made by the ladies of the court of William the Conqueror, the first Norman King of England. On it are embroidered scenes depicting his conquest of England in 1066, the first colored comic strip, for much of it is deliberately comic, and what was not designedly so is humorous to modern eyes by reason of the archaic uniforms and stereotyped gestures.

The first event leading up to that conquest occurred at the little seaside village of Bosham in Sussex. From there Harold the Saxon set sail on his ill-fated voyage to Normandy to meet William. Harold's visit terminated in the decision of William to invade England. The first scene on the Bayeux tapestry shows Harold in the Church of Bosham—"Ecclesia Bosham," says the Latin legend—near by the shore where Canute ordered the waves to retire.

In the same quiet waterways of Bosham in the spring of 1944 were assembled the prefabricated harbors which made possible the invasion of Normandy by British and American troops, and there, too, took place the rehearsals of the tactical exercises which were to drive the Germans out of France. In choosing this locale, it is possible that romantically inclined English generals—if such there be—remembered poetic justice. But it is highly improbable that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, in selecting the leaders for the American and British armies for the expedition were influenced by the choice of his generals which William the Conqueror made 900 years before. William chose Taillefer to lead the attack and Robert de Montgomerie as his second in command. Now, "Taillefer" is French for "hewer of iron," and the Germanic for this is "Eisenhower."

So an Eisenhower and a Montgomery commanded the Norman invaders of Anglo-Saxon England in 1066, and an Eisenhower and a Montgomery commanded the Anglo-Saxon invaders of Normandy in 1944, and the prologue to both dramas was played at Bosham.

Some say that history repeats, some that it never does, but it certainly plays curious tricks.

Will He Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, other than the news from the battlefronts, uppermost in the minds of most Americans

is the question as to the course which President Truman will follow.

Senators and Representatives who know him are convinced that he believes in and, if left to his own inclination will, as President, follow a course which will restore constitutional government to the people.

President Truman is not, in the ordinary meaning of the term, a great man, for which many are thankful. Alexander, Nero, Napoleon—many others—were great men, but millions of people died because of their ambitions and none, so far as we know, added to either the welfare or happiness of his people. Washington and Lincoln were truly great men but they had an understanding of the needs and desires of the common man in addition to their other virtues. They were exceptions to the rule that so-called great men bring little of good to their country.

The President's parents were average Americans. Born on a farm, growing to manhood in a small community, without a university education, with the experiences which come to the average farmer and small-town dweller, he is just an ordinary man with the background of a Lincoln. That is why so many of his associates have faith in him. That is why so many believe he may prove to be in some respects another Calvin Coolidge.

President Truman is a Democrat, a loyal party man. In the Senate he gave ample evidence that he was honest, efficient and had first in his mind the welfare of our people. He has never shown any indication of being a New Dealer; of harboring ideas looking toward the remaking of America, the destruction of constitutional government. His whole life, private, business and political, indicates that he believes the laws should be made in Congress, interpreted by the courts, and enforced by the executive department; that the people, through their chosen Representatives, should determine the Nation's policy, its future course.

Though the Pendergast machine in St. Louis and Missouri gave him material aid; though, after Pendergast served a term in the penitentiary, Harry S. Truman attended his funeral, there is nothing in his record to indicate that he ever believed in, or will support, corrupt city machine policies.

The only question which, in the mind of his former associates, throws any doubt upon the course which he will follow is the realization of the great pressure to which he will be subjected as President.

There is in Washington a powerful, well-financed group of individuals, a number of organizations, intent upon substituting for government by law through constitutional process, government by men, headed by a dictator. These individuals and groups were all-powerful in the late administration; in many things dictated its policy. They are still in Washington, firmly entrenched in policy-making positions. They can make life miserable, almost unbearable, for anyone who opposes them.

When they take Harry S. Truman to the top of the mountain and tempt him by painting a pleasing, alluring picture of the false goals which they seek; describe the disagreeable situation which may arise if he opposes their wishes, will his good sense, his courage, and his determination, be sufficient to foresee and spurn their aid? In short, will he fulfill the promise made by a former President to drive the money-changers out of Washington?

It will require all of President Truman's courage, determination, and ability to either circumvent or overcome their plans, defeat the accomplishment of their purpose.

Republicans, as well as a majority of the Democratic representation in Congress, will stand squarely behind and give every possible aid to the President in any and all efforts to restore our Government to the people.

The Islands of the Pacific

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal, including very fine statements from Admiral Ernest J. King, regarding the post-war ownership of the islands of the Pacific. It is not necessary to ask our men who are fighting and dying in the Pacific how they feel regarding the post-war ownership of the islands. Senator THOMAS C. HART, in his able radio speech yesterday pointed out how important a part public opinion will play in connection with the post-war ownership of the islands. He says it is not only helpful to the United States from a military point of view, but an excellent thing for the people in the islands to have our guidance. Certainly the United States has done well in its friendly and helpful directing and governing of the Philippines. It has been satisfactory to the people of the Philippines. Their loyalty to the United States and their contribution in this war proves that.

Before Senator THOMAS C. HART became Senator, he was an admiral in the United States Navy on active duty. He served his country in the United States Navy for 52 consecutive years which is the longest period of service ever given by anyone in the history of the Navy. As he saw much service in the Pacific, he is a fine authority concerning it. I hope that every Member of Congress will read his speech and that it will be given wide circulation throughout the United States.

This speech by Senator HART was delivered over station WRC, April 22, 1945, and is as follows:

During the last few days some officials have made statements concerning the post-war status of the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands. Several articles have been written about the future ownership of those numerous groups of islands, which stretch across the entire western half of the central Pacific. A resolution has been introduced into Congress urging that the United States retain permanent possession and control of all islands taken by us during the war which were in the possession of Japan before December 1941.

The arguments advanced in favor of such a project are principally concerned with the strategic-power position of the United States in the large area of the Pacific over which those islands are spread. It has been represented that we must hold a string of air and naval bases throughout those islands for two reasons:

The first is based on the belief that, under some form of a United Nations agreement, developing from Dumbarton Oaks, we will accept a large share of the responsibility for keeping the peace and maintaining law and order over the vast expanses of the Pacific Ocean. That includes, of course, a large part of the duty of insuring that Japan does not again disrupt that side of this world. In order to meet such commitments, our naval authorities insist that a system of bases, over which our power can be projected to the western side of the Pacific, is absolutely essential.

The second reason is narrower in scope but it is quite similar. Whether an international organization for world security evolves or not, many hold the opinion that we are morally committed to underwrite the security of the Philippines, at least for some years.

Our pre-war position in the Philippines, with Japan's power established throughout the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands, was very weak. We saw the results in the tragic history of the early days of the war. Our original military mistake lay in flying our flag in the Philippines and at the same time allowing all those islands on the road there to pass from Spain to other foreign hands. We permitted them to go to Germany in 1899 and then to Japan 20 years later. Consequently, we have been fighting a difficult and costly war across the central Pacific in order to restore the situation. Never again, say the military; if charged with the security of the Philippines they must have those same bases.

So much for the strategic-power aspect of the subject, except to say that the case of the naval authorities is good and their arguments are unanswerable if their premise is accepted. But the situation—and the problem of the Pacific islands—does contain factors other than those which directly concern the Army and the Navy.

It is not surprising that Americans generally knew so little about the islands of the Pacific before the war. In intrinsic value, a whole dozen of them may amount to very little. Many of us began to learn a few of their names, and a little about them, only when we read that our forces had assaulted this island or that. Some received the tragic word that their husbands, sons, or brothers had been killed while pushing the Japanese off some far-distant island, the name of which they had never even heard before.

As you contemplate those almost countless islands scattered over the central Pacific, you are, first of all, struck by the fact that the geography is both large and small. It is large in that the total areas of the seas dominated by those islands is enormous. You might be helped in visualizing things by remembering that the Pacific Ocean is larger than are all the five other oceans combined. However, the islands themselves are very small. A great many of them are scarcely more than sand spits. There are no large land masses among them, except for the Fiji Islands and some others still farther to the southwest which, comparatively speaking, are near Australia.

The Pacific islands are also small and unimportant from the standpoint of economics. With scant exceptions, there is no mineral wealth. The area for agriculture is so small and the soil is so poor that many of the islands could not feed their own inhabitants. Therefore, the islands are—and probably always will be—economic liabilities to any nation which carries responsibility for them. The only economic value will lie in facilitating sea and air communications across the Pacific.

In demography—the science of peoples—there is another marked incongruity. The social structure of the Pacific islands as a whole is both simple and complex. The number of inhabitants on most of the various clusters of islands is only a few hundred; and the sum total of the inhabitants of all the islands in the Pacific is not great. The inhabitants are a primitive and a simple people. Many of them are of good stock and few of them are poor stuff. They are a deserving people and—once again—a simple people.

In political organization and institutions, however, the situation is extremely complex. Several nations hold sovereignty or its equivalent in responsibility. In fact, no less than four governments besides our own are involved; and their holdings do not fit the geography. There is the United Kingdom, nearly on the opposite side of the earth, but holding full sovereignty over many islands spread over a large area of the Pacific. France, also acting from the other side of the earth, holds sovereignty over many far-flung islands in the south-central Pacific. In the case of the French islands, the political situation is particularly difficult, and with the seat of administration so remote, the affairs of the widely scattered people cannot at best be well handled. Australia and New Zealand are also in the picture but, from the standpoint of geography, their situation is favorable. Thus, a casual glance at the map shows a mingling of United Kingdom, of British Dominion, and of French sovereignty distributed over a vast area, with very little realistic integration for the welfare of the inhabitants.

As an example, take the New Hebrides, governed through a French and British condominion, that is, a combination of coequal officials from far-away Europe which handles the affairs of several islands. Not only does this governmental device result in complexity within, but those islands are surrounded by some which are under various other sovereignties.

Then there are the Samoan Islands, which furnish an illustration closer home to ourselves. The Samoans are one of the best of the island races and their tribal affinity is great. However, part of the small group is under our flag and part is governed by New Zealand under a mandate. Obviously, the Samoans would be better off under a single good administration. We of the United States have a particular interest in the welfare of the Samoans because we have been associated with them for a long time.

In general, the Pacific islands constitute what we now call a "region" and the lot of its peoples has never been good. The disruptions of the war years have made their lives much worse. Under wise and sympathetic administration, conditions for those peoples can be much improved. Being a region, such improvements can be facilitated if the problems come to be handled on a regional basis much more than has been the case in the past. It is to be sincerely hoped that the post-war years will bring some simplicity of political organization into the Central Pacific. If the full advantage of regional organization is to be attained, in the interests of the inhabitants, some political changes are essential.

Now to narrow this down to the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands. I don't think their future is necessarily something which should be settled at San Francisco, say, next month. That future will be a proper subject for the action of the international organization which is to come out of the conference which begins this week. Quite possibly the problem will not be solved until the peace conference that will be held after Japan is crushed. However, it is time to be thinking it over.

Japan, of course, must be evicted from those and some other Pacific islands where for years they have broken faith with the world, and exploited the natives. Their departure will leave a vacuum which someone must fill for the welfare of what will remain of the poor natives—if for no other reason.

Much advantage can accrue if all the islands of those three groups are under one government. As a region, there is, for one thing, considerable possibility in economic integration. For instance, one island can supply one product and another, not too far away, can produce something else to good advantage. All of them are in the typhoon belt and instances of complete devastation from such cause are too frequent. Such ravages are best remedied under a regional organization. And, in general, those islands can come closest to self-maintenance in the world of the future if they can deal and act as a unit.

The march of history, our record and standing before the world in treatment of the people of the Philippines, Guam, etc., and our prospective responsibilities for security of the Pacific, all point to the United States as the Nation to take over those islands from which our forces will have evicted the Japanese.

Based on assumptions that we are to do so, considerable discussion is ranging around the word "sovereignty"—which still happens to be a word of definite meaning. Then too, the word "mandate" gets into the picture. That word has come to have indefinite meanings and perhaps the whole international situation will become clearer if "mandate" goes out of the dictionary. Another word in the discussion of the day is "trusteeship". Whatever it may mean need not concern us because our record in the Philippines clearly proves that we have been a true and proper trustee over dependent people of other races—in the best and most inclusive meaning of the word.

There is another word which is being used in some circles, though not extensively. That word is "accountability." It is a sort of doctrine under which any nation holding authority over colonies or other alien territory accepts some measure of accountability to an international organization. The doctrine is still nebulous; and just what the world will do about it can't be seen today. But we need not fear or worry over anything which may develop under such a doctrine. Being the kind of people we are, we need have little concern about being held to any kind of accounting for the welfare of those islanders by anyone with a conscience that is more strict than is our own.

The foregoing is, in brief outline, the situation which the country is discussing. After years of thought and study of the Pacific Islands region, I venture the opinion that sovereignty of the United States will best meet the situation of those islands, from which our splendid forces are evicting the Japanese.

In the final analysis, American public opinion will play an important part in deciding this problem. And so, ladies and gentlemen of the N. B. C. audience, I urge that you think over and discuss the question of our taking charge of the Marshall, Caroline, and Marianas Islands for the welfare of their inhabitants and for the insurance of future peace in the Pacific.

Inefficiency and Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is investigating the food problem, food shortage, and other things that have to do with the producers and consumers and everybody else who handles food. It is rather sad to note that Congress has to make an investigation. However, such drastic procedure has become necessary because meat and some other foodstuffs have gone off the market. Naturally, somebody is responsible for this situation. In this country, which has always been able to produce surplus, there is no occasion for a food shortage if some sensible consideration is given to that old economic standby, the law of supply and demand.

Having in mind the problem of inflation, and the problem of price control, Congress passed legislation in keeping with world war developments, so that there might be price ceilings and controls which would prevent speculation, excessive costs of food, and so forth. The Office of Price Administration was created to meet that situation. Its policy-making officials apparently have fallen short of their purpose. They must have developed some wrong policies in connection with the production of food, and certainly they have made a failure in connection with supplying the American people with food. I think it fair to suggest that the Office of Price Administration is allergic to food. It may be that they can manufacture a good alibi. Alibi means blame the situation on somebody else. Anyhow, the food situation does create a serious problem. It is a serious problem for the person who runs a restaurant, hotel, or eating house. Just recently numerous complaints were made to me because the men who operate restaurants were unable to get points in sufficient amount to enable them to buy meat so as to stay in business. Then those who could get some points, found out there was no meat to be had. It seems to me that it is about time to abolish some of these Government agencies which have failed miserably in accomplishing the objects for which they were created. While their excuses for a bad situation are all earnest and plausible, these excuses do not take the place of food.

Congress ought to establish its own set-up, in an effort to give the American people relief. Congress could certainly do no worse than those in charge of present agencies. I could quote many items from the daily press, but the following item from the Times-Herald, Sunday, April 22, 1945, illustrates the situation:

VAIN HUNT MADE FOR MEAT, FOWL—LIMITED SUPPLIES QUICKLY SOLD OUT

(By James W. Booth)

Harried Washington housewives sought mostly in vain yesterday for meat or poultry to grace their Sunday dinner tables.

What few dealers had limited supplies on hand were speedily sold out, while others restricted sales to favored customers.

A citizen reported chicken-hungry residents descended early yesterday upon the market, Fifth Street and Florida Avenue NE, by the hundreds to pay as high as $9 for one fowl. At the same time similar throngs pushed and shoved in an effort to buy chickens at Tenth Street and Maine Avenue SW. The supply did not last long at either place.

All semblance of an effort to hold prices at O. P. A. ceiling levels was abandoned at the farmers' market it was reported. Some farmers simply sold their product to the highest bidder, and sales at $5 and $6 were common, another citizen reported.

This quotation, Mr. Speaker, illustrates the very serious situation which confronts the housewife in this day and age of our history. Now, someone is to blame. As I have indicated, we started out with this O. P. A. program, and naturally its first objective should have been the production of food. Every fourth-grade school student knew that the United States would be called on to feed not only our people but the rest of the world. Regardless of the man or men responsible for the present mess, policies and regulations were adopted by the executives of the O. P. A., which had the effect of reducing food production, and particularly livestock. It is high time that a bunch of these Government agencies which serve no proper purpose be abolished and some agency created by and responsible to Congress do something to relieve conditions. In the interest of straight thinking, just remember that Congress gave the administration all the power it needed to handle this food problem, and the administration has failed. Do not blame Congress for what somebody else has done.

Irrigation Projects in Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein certain figures in connection with proposed irrigation projects in my State.

Mr. Speaker, on April 12, Secretary of the Interior Ickes and Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore appeared before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in support of H. R. 520, a bill to facilitate the settlement of returning servicemen on Federal reclamation projects in the West. This measure introduced by the distinguished chairman of our committee, Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona, is designed to give veterans of World War No. 2 90-day preference in securing homesteads on public lands which may be irrigated by the Bureau of Reclamation or on lands which the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to purchase for the purpose of establishing irrigated farms for veterans. The committee is continuing hearings on this bill and from the interest shown I believe a measure will be reported which will receive the support of the House as a constructive program to give returning servicemen an opportunity to settle on irrigated land in the West, become self-sustaining, and contribute to the permanent development of the West and the country at large.

Commissioner Bashore presented to the committee an inventory of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects which could be included in a post-war public-works construction program by the Bureau of Reclamation. This inventory included more than 400 projects in the 17 Western States. Of these projects, more than 100 have already been authorized under the reclamation law or other legislation, and I hope to see the Bureau of Reclamation provided with funds for preconstruction purposes so that actual work may be provided for returning servicemen who will be looking for jobs in the West when they are demobilized.

My State of Wyoming is intensely interested in the current and prospective programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, which has already contributed materially to the agricultural and other development of the State through irrigation and facilities already in operation on the Shoshone, Riverton, and the North Platte projects. These projects, together with the Kendrick project, also develop power distributed through an interconnected system. The use of the irrigation facilities on the Kendrick project await water supplies. I hope that will be soon.

In the inventory, Wyoming has more than 60 projects or units which would require an investment of more than $239,000,000 to complete. Of these listed projects, 24 have been authorized. Most of these authorized projects are units of the Missouri Basin project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Others authorized include the completion of the Shoshone-Heart Mountain, Riverton, and Kendrick irrigation projects, on which work was stopped because of the war. Heart Mountain and Riverton developments include large acreages of public lands which could be made available for settlement as soon as the irrigation facilities are completed. Work on the Eden project was stopped by the War Production Board, but it will be resumed as soon as conditions permit.

The completion of all the projects in the inventory would provide about 12,000 additional irrigated farms in Wyoming which could be made available for settlement. The construction of the power facilities would add about 150,000 kilowatts of power capacity for the mineral and industrial development of the State.

Most of the sixty-odd projects are included in the Missouri Basin plan of the Bureau of Reclamation outlined in Senate Document 191. More than 20 of them were authorized by the Flood Control Act. Another 20 were included in the approved Missouri Basin plan yet to be authorized, and about 20 others are under study by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri and Green River Basins.

The Wyoming projects in the inventory are listed in the several categories as follows:

Projects in operation consist of the following:

Project	Irrigable area	Power installation
	Acres	*Kilowatts*
Kendrick		32,400
North Platte	55,292	6,209
Riverton	42,500	1,600
Shoshone	73,412	5,600

Construction of Eden project was approximately 16 percent complete when stopped by order of the War Production Board on December 12, 1942. Eden project will supply water for a total of 20,000 acres of land and will cost approximately $1,817,000 to complete.

Uncompleted portions of the following projects remain:

Project	Irrigable area	Cost
	Acres	
Kendrick	35,000	$1,584,000
Shoshone (Heart Mountain Division)	41,000	1,900,000
Riverton [1]		

[1] Included in Missouri River Basin authorization.

Projects authorized under the Missouri River Basin plan, H. R. 4485

Project	Acreage		Power installation	Cost
	New	Supplemental		
			Kilowatts	
Big Horn pumping unit (14 units)	20,000			$1,955,000
Big Horn project (Boysen Dam)			10,000	8,202,000
Glendo Reservoir		200,000		4,000,000
Kortes			30,000	5,545,000
Owl Creek		14,400		1,138,000
Paintrock	2,700	6,000		476,000
Riverton extension	57,500			3,000,000
Shoshone extension	76,100	5,200		10,678,000
Total	156,300	225,600	40,000	34,594,000

PROJECTS APPROVED UNDER THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PLAN

Hunter Mountain Reservoir (power)			8,000	8,300,000
Thief Creek Reservoir (power)			4,000	14,177,000
Sunlight Reservoir (power)			13,000	3,433,000
Bald Ridge (power plant)			19,000	7,419,000
Fremont	56,000			7,823,000
Little Wind River		34,000		527,000
Popo Agie		14,700		1,498,000
Hudson Bench	5,700			1,039,000
Shoshoni	16,600			1,192,000
Bad Water	1,100	2,700		618,000
Shell Creek		10,200		2,116,000
Kane Reservoir (flood, silt, and power)			46,000	12,035,000
Sheridan Canal		38,000		3,183,000
Tongue River (pumping)	26,100		9,000	2,790,000
Piney		9,600		847,000
Buffalo		10,400		3,181,000
Crazy Woman	9,400	6,900		2,845,000
French Creek		3,850		394,000
Kaycee	10,400	6,400		3,238,000
Arvada	17,700			1,602,000
Ucross	6,860	5,050		833,000
Keyhole Reservoir	(1)	(1)		750,000
Edgemont Reservoir	(1)	(1)		1,560,000
Total	149,860	141,800	99,000	81,400,000

[1] Lands in South Dakota.

Other projects in the investigation stage in Wyoming include the following, most of which are in the Green River—Colorado River System—Basin:

Project	Acreage		Power installation, kilowatts	Cost
	New	Supplemental		
Lyman	3,100	20,910	-------	$2,363,000
Little Snake River	-------	15,700	-------	310,000
Stump Creek	-------	20,000	-------	560,000
Powder River	84,100	46,200	-------	18,858,000
Seedskadie	40,830	-------	-------	4,600,000
La Barge, Fontenelle, Shell Creek, miscellaneous	12,000	20,000	-------	2,500,000
Evanston	(1)	25,600	-------	2,000,000
West Side	29,050	37,000	-------	27,500,000
Daniel	5,160	-------	-------	
Elkhorn	134,030	-------	1,000	
Paradise	4,490	-------	-------	400,000
Lower Big Sandy	11,850	-------	-------	900,000
Opal	16,020	5,400	-------	3,600,000
Henry's Fork	9,190	21,090	-------	2,500,000
South Pass Diversion	-------	-------	-------	1,200,000
Hams Fork Diversion	-------	-------	-------	5,600,000
Green-Bear Diversion	-------	-------	5,000	38,000,000
Total	349,820	211,300	6,000	110,881,000

[1] Amount of new lands undetermined.

Transmission lines authorized and under study amount to $7,000,000.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Gerald H. Poland

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the unanimous consent of the House to the insertion in the RECORD of a poem written by Mrs. Helen Poland, of Woodstock, Maine, the mother of Pvt. (1st cl.) Gerald H. Poland, of the Seventeenth Airborne Division, killed in action in Belgium on January 6, together with an article concerning him. Two of Gerald Poland's brothers are in the armed forces. Mrs. Poland makes the suggestion that after the war our flag should be carried at half mast for a substantial period as a tribute to those who gave their lives for our victory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the poem and the article to which I have referred are as follows:

WHEN THE BLUE STARS TURN TO GOLD

Give us time for our sorrow,
The heart must master the dread,
For us there seems our tomorrow
Has gone with our valiant dead.

Hope in the heart is arrested,
And from our arms has been torn
That which once they cradled,
No bier over which to mourn.

Every path must be traveled,
Where their young feet have fled,
For them no glad tomorrow,
Our own beloved dead.

—*Helen Poland.*

PVT. (1ST CL.) GERALD H. POLAND

Pvt. (1st cl.) Gerald H. Poland, of the Seventeenth Airborne Division, who was reported missing in action in Belgium January 6, is now reported as killed January 6, according to a telegram from the War Department received by his mother, Helen K. Poland, of Woodstock.

He entered the service August 1943 and trained at Fort Benning, Ga., and later at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp MacKall, N. C., and Camp Forrest, Tenn.; going overseas August 1944, and trained in England for several months. The last letter he wrote was to his mother, December 27, 1944, from France. He belonged to the Seventeenth Airborne Division, Company G, Five Hundred and Thirteenth Paratroop Infantry.

Besides his father and mother, Leon and Helen Poland, of Woodstock, he leaves a grandfather and grandmother, Mr. and Mrs. Abner Benson, of West Paris; three brothers: Leon A. Poland, fireman first class, in the South Pacific; Corp. Vernon Poland, Italy; and Phelps Poland; three sisters: Dorothy, Evelyn, and Andrea Poland; four uncles: Wesley Poland, of Woodstock; Kenneth Benson, Woodstock; Gerald Benson, Norway; and Maurice Benson of West Paris; two nephews: Leon A. Poland, Jr., Kenneth Eugene Poland; and one niece: Beverly Poland; one aunt: Mrs. Evelyn Appleby, of Woodstock, and one great aunt, Mrs. Arvilla Silver of Woodstock; three great uncles: Eli Benson, of Saco, and Samuel Benson of North Conway, N. H., also, Charles Keith, of Bryant Pond; besides several cousins. Before entering the service he was a student of Woodstock High School and of the class of 1944.

Devastating Tornadoes

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday April 12 tornado twisters swept across the State of Oklahoma spreading destruction and death in a dozen cities and rural communities. Collectively, the tornado toll was the worst since the destructive twister of 1942, and the latest figures, though not final, lists 106 dead, 584 injured, 628 homes destroyed, 583 homes damaged, 416 buildings destroyed, and 1,420 people directly affected.

HOME TOWN OF CONGRESSMAN STEWART HARDEST HIT

Antlers, Okla., home town of Congressman PAUL STEWART was the most seriously hit community in the State. The tornado sweeping through this city of 3,000 like a lawn mower cut a path half a mile wide and 1¼ miles long and left 50 percent of the community in ruins. The latest figures show a fearful toll of 83 dead, 250 injured, 379 homes destroyed, 307 homes damaged, 254 buildings destroyed, 431 buildings damaged, and 600 people affected.

Congressman STEWART who was at his home in Antlers for the Easter recess of Congress escaped injury as well as his family although the path of the tornado came within 100 yards of his house. The Congressman had made arrangements to return to Washington on Friday the 13th but after the storm struck he canceled his trip and has remained in the stricken town to aid in the relief and rehabilitation work. From all reports the Congressman has done a heroic job for his people and his home town in their tragic hour of need.

Oklahoma citizens continue to pay tribute to the part played in rescue operations by the American Red Cross and a contingent of soldiers dispatched to the scene from Camp Maxie immediately after the devastating storm had laid waste to the town of Antlers. Col. Robert O. Annin, camp commander, upon receiving a call to Camp Maxie, for aid, dispatched soldiers to the scene, and within less than 2 hours, scores of doctors and first-aid men from regional hospitals and other personnel from the Army base arrived. Two first-aid stations were set up, headquarters were established in the Methodist Church, and hundreds of persons were taken and given temporary aid, and then swiftly taken to the regional hospital or other nearby hospitals in ambulances. American Red Cross, under the direction of H. C. Suydam, area director from the Red Cross headquarters in St. Louis, was on the job forthworth directing relief operations. In addition to furnishing immediate relief, the director began a survey of what will be needed to replace the homes and personal belongings which were destroyed and scattered over a wide area, doing everything humanly possible to aid, assist, and comfort the needy and the homeless.

Texas A. & M.'s Part in the War

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday, April 21, was what is known in Texas as San Jacinto Day, it being the anniversary of the decisive battle of that name in the Texas revolution, when Texas won its independence and thereafter became a republic.

Texans always celebrate this historic event, but the House not being in session Saturday, I was unable to make remarks in the House commemorating this event.

There is one institution in Texas that consistently and almost religiously observes San Jacinto Day, and that is the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, known as Texas A. & M. On April 21, former A. & M. students, wherever they may be, hold annual muster meetings in which they renew allegiance to Texas and also their alma mater, and commemorate A. & M. students who have passed away since their last muster meeting.

On April 21, 1942, just before the fall of Corregidor, there were a large number of officers and men in the Army stationed there who were former A. & M.

students, and they held their annual muster meeting, which proves that conditions never become too grave for Texas Aggies to remember their muster-meeting celebrations. Texas A. & M. men, following a tradition started in 1903, this year met together at their annual April 21 musters all over the world. For the first time in the tradition's history, this year found more musters held overseas than in the States, and Aggies, as former Texas A. & M. students are affectionately known, joined hands all around the world.

Saturday night, here in Washington, the National Capital Texas A. & M. Club held their annual muster meeting at the American Legion Club, which was attended by a large number of former A. & M. men stationed in Washington, 170 being present at this dinner, and the club had as its guest speaker the Honorable E. J. Kyle, beloved and known in Texas as Dean Kyle, who only recently retired as dean of agriculture at Texas A. & M. College, after having been connected with that college for 43 years, but who has recently been appointed Ambassador of the Government of the United States to the Republic of Guatemala, and who will within a few days leave for his new assignment.

About 2 years ago I made a brief speech in the House in which I recounted the active part which Texas A. & M. and its students played in the winning of World War No. 1 and are playing in the winning of World War No. 2, and I shall not at this time reiterate what I said then. However, I would like to point out a few significant facts with reference to Texas A. & M.'s part in World War No. 2.

Over 16,000 former students of Texas A. & M. are in the armed services today. During the years between 1918 and Pearl Harbor, Texas A. & M. was the largest military school in the United States, During the "soft" years, Texas A. & M. remembered its duty to train men both for peace and to defend their country. One highly important result was that when war came nearly 7,000 graduates of the college held active Reserve commissions and were immediately called to duty.

Twenty-seven former students of Texas A. & M. now hold the general's rank. Three former students have received, since Pearl Harbor, their Nation's highest military honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Five hundred former students of Texas A. & M. have already given their lives in the present war, and that roll is not complete.

Since the student body at Texas A. & M. is confined exclusively to men, attendance has been reduced during the war, since the fighting forces have taken most of the young men eligible for attendance there.

The size and accomplishments of Texas A. & M. are best told in reciting that this college produced more officers in time of war than West Point, and that its student body, before our participation in World War No. 2 was more than eight thousand.

Texas and the Nation is proud of this great school and the magnificent part it has played and is playing in the winning of this global war.

McGregor Introduces Bill To Assist Veterans in Post-war Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I firmly believe merits the consideration and prompt action of this body. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to furnish enlisted personnel with transportation to their homes and with 30-day leave immediately prior to their honorable discharge from the armed forces

Be it enacted, etc., That each enlisted member of the land or naval forces of the United States shall, when it is determined that he is eligible to be honorably discharged from such service, be furnished the cost of transportation to his place of residence by common carrier and by the best available route, and shall be granted a leave of absence or furlough with full service pay for such time as he may require to return to his place of residence and for 30 additional days. Upon the termination of such leave of absence or furlough if he so desires he shall be immediately discharged from such service at his place of residence. For the purpose of this act, any such person may designate as his place of residence either his actual place of residence, the place of residence of his wife, or the place of residence of one or both of his parents.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

This is a bill to assist the economic stabilization of the post-war period. This legislation gives to those in military units an opportunity to return home, analyze fully what it means to return to civilian life and then allows the veterans to determine whether or not they want to be discharged at that time, or remain a part of the military services.

Rumors tell us, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department contemplates basing the program of discharge upon combat activities, terms of service overseas, dependency, and age. I cannot help but feel that when some of our veterans return to their homes and find conditions different from when they entered the service, they will not be anxious to immediately return to civilian life. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the veterans who are designated to be eligible for discharge should be given the opportunity to decide whether or not they shall be discharged or remain in the service. Thinking that possibly a number of those who would be eligible for discharge in the first group would desire to remain in the military units, I believe the bill I have introduced will give them that opportunity, and if they do not desire discharges their places in the discharge quotas may be taken by some who possibly have or have not seen actual combat service, some who have dependents and some who have positions waiting for them upon their return to civilian life. I believe this legislation will open the way to those who desire to remain in the services, as well as give those who desire to return home the opportunity to accept positions in civilian life which they have recently vacated. It is my firm opinion, Mr. Speaker, this will be a major contribution to the rehabilitation program which we hope will be realized in the near future.

The San Francisco Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Conference to shape world affairs is one that will be keenly observed by the American people, and I might say if there is to be equality of voting rights in world affairs, let there be equality of sacrifice of those who are our allies in this war.

How are matters shaping up? At the San Francisco Conference, I understand, good old Uncle Sam gets one vote, Uncle Joe Stalin gets one vote, and John Bull gets six votes. Not a bad set-up for the British Empire and its Dominions.

However, I feel that if the British Dominions and our allies have equal voting rights in world affairs they should amend their national service acts so they have equal fighting rights.

Certainly we in America all pay tribute to the British Empire, its dominions, colonies, mandates, and protectorates. In fact, all parts of the United Kingdom, for the magnificent effort, the courage, the fortitude, and brilliant performance of those men and women who have carried on whether in Britain during the blitz, Dunkerque, Dieppe, north Africa, Italy, France, Germany, on all fighting fronts, a performance that has won for them the undying gratitude of the people of the world. Their losses have been terrific, as have ours, and I have been advised their losses are in line with ours but it must be remembered they have been in the war longer than we have. Today, however, the South Pacific area is costing the lives of thousands of American boys and I am of the opinion that the final result will be that Burma, Singapore, and Hong Kong will be returned to the British, French Indochina returned to France, the Dutch East Indies will be given back to the Netherlands, Manchuria, Formosa, and China, which the Japs now hold, will be returned to China, and those parts of Russia that were taken in the past will be returned to Russia and we are paying a great price in American youth to bring these conditions about. It is already suggested that we merely act as trustees for those islands

that our boys fought and died for. If we ever let loose of those islands I would say we are fit subjects for some mental institution.

Let me ask, is it not fair that our allies get into the South Pacific area with all the manpower they can muster to give us the necessary help for final victory?

However, I recently heard a Canadian broadcast which stated that no conscriptees who are now or who have been fighting overseas would be transferred to the South Pacific unless they volunteered for South Pacific service. It was recently announced by our War Department that our fighting troops in Europe would go direct to the South Pacific area. So, it looks as though the American boys will be called upon to do most of the fighting in the South Pacific when the European warfare ends.

Upon inquiry I find that in Canada the draft for military duty covers men from 18½ to 42 years of age, inclusive. Until December 1944 drafted men were not sent overseas unless they volunteered, in spite of a law that had been amended to provide they could be sent out for active overseas duty.

How extensively Canadian fighting forces are going to participate with us in the South Pacific no one is able to say.

Now in reference to Australia in the South Pacific where most of the fighting is now going on. I might say the Australian boys who have done the fighting and dying have turned in records that will live forevermore; their courage and performance have been outstanding. However, it must also be remembered that a couple of years ago Australia's back was up against the wall and they appealed to us for men, supplies, and equipment to repel the Jap invasion. Now Australia had a law on the books which read that members of the defense forces who are members of the military forces shall not be required, unless they voluntarily agree to do so, to serve beyond the limits of the Commonwealth or any territory under the authority of the Commonwealth. This act was changed in 1943 to take in a little additional territory known as the Southwest Pacific zone, which about covers New Guinea, parts of Borneo, and Netherland East Indies, or the approach to Australia from the north.

The Defense Act No. 2 of 1943, article 3, states,

> In this act "the southwestern Pacific zone" means the area bounded on the west by the one hundred and tenth meridian of east longitude, on the north by the Equator, and on the east by the one hundred and fifty-ninth meridian of east longitude.

Or, in other words, as I understand it, unless a conscriptee volunteers he would not be compelled to do any fighting except within the territorial limits outlined in the act.

Certainly, we are all in this war together, and if the Dominions have equal voting privileges, they should have equal fighting opportunities. No reservations should be made on conscriptees or any other fighting forces as to when or where they shall be sent to fight.

We take our boys here at home, give them 15 to 17 weeks of basic training and land them in France, Germany, or the South Pacific, or wherever we want to send them. It is not a matter of volunteering here as it is in the Dominions for overseas service. They are just shipped anywhere the War Department needs manpower. No reservations are made. Away they go.

Certainly Uncle Sam has responded nobly with our manpower and equipment in the European theater of war and in the Southwest Pacific. Prime Minister Churchill states our losses have been 60 to 1 on western front. The record speaks for itself and our boys have turned in a brilliant performance on every fighting front throughout the world.

Therefore, I believe the service acts of the Dominions of the British Empire should be changed so all conscriptees are on an equal basis with no reservations made. If we had the same kind of laws on our books it might be a question of how many mothers in this country might want their boys at the age of 18 to volunteer for overseas service. Let there be no special privileges, if we conscript our boys at 18 our allies should do likewise.

I want this understood to be an appeal to interest the Dominions to put up their manpower on the same basis as we are, as it is only fair to the Canadian, Australian, and American boys who have done the fighting and dying and who have turned in records throughout the world that will live forevermore.

Now some of our men have been overseas in the European theater for 2 or 3 years and would like a chance to come home for a period of readjustment. Heaven knows a great many of them need it and they all deserve it. Now we are out to win this war and just as quickly as possible, so for military expediency I presume our men will go direct from the European fighting area into the south Pacific. We all want to bring this war to a rapid and early conclusion to save the lives of our thousands of boys, get this job done, and crush forever the totalitarian powers of Europe and Asia.

I feel the National Service Acts of our Allies should be on the same footing as ours and no reservations or restrictions made in any of the Allied countries. Certainly we make no reservations. There should be no reservations. All of these boys from the Allied countries, and I mean the Dominions, fighting this war ought to be given the same consideration. It is just as unfair to their own boys as it is to ours. And our fighting troops in the South Pacific should be given the support necessary to bring this war to an early close.

So, if equal voting rights are granted to the British Dominions in world affairs, their National Service Acts should be amended to give us the unquestioned support necessary to fight with us in any part of the world to destroy our treacherous, fanatical enemies.

I am of the opinion it would have pleased and bolstered the morale of our American people if some Canadian, Australian, British, and South African troops had been with us at Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, particularly from countries which are nearer to these islands than we are.

I do not like to feel this South Pacific war is our war alone because outside of the Philippines we have little or no possessions to battle over and our allies will benefit to a greater extent in the South Pacific than will the United States.

When the European war ends all the manpower of the Allies and total resources and equipment should go into the South Pacific for a speedy and total victory.

The Attitude of American Youth Toward Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constituents, Miss Therese Zuccaro, a student of St. Vincent De Paul School, Mount Vernon, Ohio, who is one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio. This contest was entered by approximately 150,000 of our State.

I congratulate Miss Zuccaro on being one of the 11 winners and upon her achievement, and respectfully urge the membership of the House of Representatives to read her splendid essay.

I also compliment the American Legion of Ohio for sponsoring such a worthwhile program; and they have today brought these 11 winners as their guests to the greatest capital of the world.

The essay follows:

In my opinion compulsory military training is the best means of insuring ourselves against war. We must be ready when our country calls upon us. It is the only real security of our Nation against other nations who become jealous and wish supreme power over all the world.

In January 1790, in a message to Congress, the most war-weary and peace-minded of our Presidents said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual ways of preserving peace—a free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined." These words were said by George Washington, the Father of our Country. The two basic arguments for military training in time of peace are summarized in these two sentences. Washington was prefacing an administration bill, that, as a common obligation of citizenship, provided for the universal military training of young men. The defeat of that bill has cost the United States millions of lives and billions of dollars from that time down to today. If the effective and democratic system which Washington so earnestly advocated had been in force two and possibly three of our great wars would probably never have been fought.

Our repeated failure to maintain military power has drawn us into wars, wars which could have been prevented if we had held it. The best and cheapest way of repairing our historical mistake is military training. Furthermore, it is an excellent way of defending ourselves against and forbidding other nations to wage war.

Physically, we are a vast country. We have hardened into social and economic

classes. We need new leveling forces, and effective ways of renewing our democracy.

I sometimes hear it argued that the possession of military power makes nations militaristic and must lead them into war. The truth is quite otherwise, as Washington told Congress. Lack of power, indeed, may make war inevitable. Lack of it led us into war with the Barbary states and with Great Britain in the early years of the nineteenth century. Our lack of it enabled Germany to defy us in the First World War and to disregard us when preparing for this one. But possession of power does not necessarily lead to war. For more than 60 years the French Republic had a powerful army based on 2 years (and part of the time, 3 years) of universal military training, and never once committed aggression against her neighbors. For nearly 20 years Russia was developing the mighty armies which saved us from defeat by securing time to organize the forces we ought to have had to begin with and never once had to make an aggressive move against anyone.

Military training will make our young men stronger, healthier, more disciplined, and more self-reliant It will mature them emotionally, help them to be courageous, teach them understanding, and give them a knowledge of their country.

Clearly it is the most important instrument that democracy can bring to the job of safeguarding its future.

Government Life Insurance Policies

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am offering a bill to embody in national service life insurance the advantages which are contained in United States Government life insurance. The enactment of my measure will provide that all national service life insurance policies which are now in effect or which later may be issued to the members of the armed forces shall include those additional benefits that are contained in the United States Government life insurance policies. National service policies are issued to persons having active service in World War No. 2, but United States Government policies are limited to persons who served in World War No. 1.

The advantages of United States Government life-insurance are positive ones. Consequently, my measure affects directly the welfare of each of the 15,000,000 American men and women who have or who will have seen service in the armed forces by the end of World War No. 2. This is borne out by no less an authority than The Adjutant General of the United States, Maj. Gen. J. A. Ulio, who stated on December 31, 1942, in a general memorandum on life insurance to the armed forces that United States Government life insurance has the following advantages over national service life insurance:

(a) They contain a permanent and total disability benefits clause.

(b) There are no restrictions as to the individuals who may be named beneficiaries, including estates.

(c) Death benefits may be paid in a lump sum, or in stated amounts for a limited period or for life.

(d) Premium rates are lower.

My studies of this important question lead me to believe that there are still further advantages, some of them material ones, in United States Government life insurance, and I have had prepared a table which shows in outline form the principal differences between the two types of insurance:

Principal differences, national service life insurance versus U. S. Government life insurance

Difference	National service life insurance	U. S. Government life insurance
1. Reserve basis	3 percent	3½ percent.
2. Disability income	None	$5.75 per $1,000 monthly.
3. Additional disability income	do	Do.
4. Automatic death benefit	Beneficiary under age 30, $5.51 per $1,000 monthly for 240 months. Beneficiary age 30 and over, life income, 10 years certain.	$5.75 per $1,000 monthly for 240 months.
5. Settlement options	Two: (1) "Automatic" settlement; (2) refund life income, regardless of beneficiary's age.	Four: (1) Cash; (2) monthly income, 3 to 20 years; (3) life income, 20 years certain; (4) life income, 10 years certain.
6. Eligibility	Active duty World War No. 2	World War No. 1 service.
7. Effective date	Any day of month	1st day of month only.
8. Medical examination required	After first 120 days	At all times.
9. Number of permanent plans	3	6.
10. Beneficiary eligibility	Restricted	Unrestricted.
11. Proceeds payable to estate	Only excess of reserve (on converted policy) over payments made to qualified beneficiary.	Permitted for entire death benefit.
12. Proceeds payable in 1 sum	Not permitted	Permitted.
13. Reinstatement	Comparative health statement, VA-353, while in service or within 6 months after discharge, or within 3 months of lapse thereafter.	Medical examination required after 3 months of lapse.
14. Provision for payment of first premium by advance of Government pay.	Yes	No.

Mr. Speaker, the question of placing national service life insurance on a more equitable basis with United States Government life insurance is one which cannot in justice be postponed. Many thousands of claims are being paid out each year. World War No. 2 veterans and their families are being differentiated against unduly each day the present differences remain in effect. I trust that we may speedily obtain action on this matter. It is a $100,000,000,000 problem, which directly affects every serviceman and a majority of the families of this Nation.

Observations on Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thought-provoking article on the dangers to our whole price-stabilization program arising from the enormous and steadily increasing amount of money in circulation today:

Recent more or less official opinion of the need to suppress speculation to prevent rising prices of capital assets is a typical example of the universal tendency to blame bad results on effect rather than on cause. This is particularly true when it would have been unpopular or difficult to deal with the cause.

Basic human reactions to fundamental conditions change but little from one generation to the next. We were particularly struck with this thought as we read "War and Inflation in Spain 1780–1800," by Earl J. Hamilton. This article appears in the November issue of the Quarterly Journal of Economics. Mr. Hamilton writes, "Throughout the ages, inflation-minded ministers have attributed currency depreciation to speculation," and he quotes from a decree of the Spanish crown issued in 1799 as follows: "Men who having abandoned callings useful to society and not being restrained by honor or virtue are the instruments that speculators employ for the nefarious, cunning, and perfidious maneuvers through which, to satisfy their greed, they degrade the paper money of the state, nothwithstanding the religious punctuality with which the interest is paid, a part of the capital is amortized, and other promises are fulfilled."

When prices begin to rise due to continued deficit financing building up an excessive supply of money in the hands of individuals, the tendency to attempt to control the effect (rising prices) rather than the cause (surplus money) results in part on a failure to understand the rather peculiar effect which an overabundant supply of money has upon price levels. The effect on prices of an overabundant supply of money is less familiar to us than the more well-known price factors such as supply and demand, wage costs, etc. This is understandable because it is only rarely that the supply of money is not more or less in balance with business needs.

Obviously, our cost of living or over-all price structure is the total of the cost of a vast number of individual and often wholly unrelated articles. We are accustomed to dealing with these individual prices and the factors affecting them. We can see that, if one of these articles is in over-abundant supply, the price will decline, or conversely, when demand exceeds supply, we must pay a higher price. Changing manufacturing costs such as wages, manufacturing efficiency, etc., are likewise familiar and easily understood. We usually deal with these various price questions, however, in an economy where the supply of money fluctuates more or less with the requirements of business from year to

year and hence, money supply can be disregarded as a price factor.

The total amount of money and the total ways in which this money can be spent constitutes the framework within which these individual price factors function. This can be expressed in simplified form as money in use equals general prices plus trade.

Trade is the entire economy of the country and is all inclusive, even to real estate and other capital transfers, service and business payments, etc. When the equilibrium between money in use and trade is broken, we either inflate or deflate.

When money in use increases at a greater rate than the requirements of trade, the resulting increase in price is inflation. In our opinion, the word "inflation" should be reserved for such an increase in price resulting from monetary causes and not be applied to rising prices resulting from changes in cost or supply and demand factors affecting particular prices.

It is evident that when the amount of money in use increases at a greater rate than the requirements of trade, the general price level must rise. This does not mean of course that the price of every particular article making up this general price level must rise. The supply and demand for each particular article as well as actual manufacturing costs will continue to operate within the monetary framework, and particular prices will fluctuate accordingly. It is the over-all effect that is confusing where an increase in money in use establishes the framework of general prices within which each particular price moves.

There is no argument about the increased monetary purchasing power in the form of deposits and currency created in the United States during the war. The extent of this increase, however, is not always appreciated. As a matter of fact, even without allowing for the vast potential purchasing power which is held in the form of savings deposits and Government bonds, demand deposits and currency in circulation alone have increased both absolutely and percentage-wise at a greater rate than at any time since the disastrous inflation of the Revolutionary War. We have made the following estimates:

Change in per capita cash purchasing power

	War years		To post-war peak	
	Absolute	Percent increase	Absolute	Percent increase
1812	$8	71	$10	90
Civil War	21	96	22	100
World War I	38	27	92	67
World War II	480	180	(?)	(?)

There is no reason to believe that we have as yet reached the end of this expansion of deposits and currency. In fact, there is every likelihood that the increase will continue, certainly until the end of the war and possibly for a number of years thereafter. There appears to be no evidence of a change in philosophy on the part of policy-making officials in Washington and "spending for recovery," which has been a basic tenet of the New Deal, seems as strong as ever. Anyone who thinks otherwise should read the speech titled "Post-war Problems and Policies" made by Dr. Goldenwiser, who served for many years as Director of the Division of Research and Statistics of the Federal Reserve Board, and is now economic adviser to the Board. Dr. Goldenwiser's speech is reprinted in the February 1945 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

There is every indication that plans are being formulated for another deluge of public spending if the post-war reconversion period leads to what is considered to be excessive unemployment and cuts in wage payments.

As we have increased the supply of money, its use has tended to decline. There are a number of reasons for this, among which we think the following are the most important: (1) There are many things we would like to buy which are actually not being made today. (2) There is the uncertainty of the continuation of war jobs and the desire to set aside part of earnings against a possible period of unemployment. (3) There is a sincere unwillingness to spend freely during the war and a willingness to abide by price control and rationing as an aid to the war effort. When the war is over and the patriotic motive no longer prevails, we are extremely skeptical as to the willingness of people to continue to buy with restraint. We think they will spend more freely for something, although we would not venture to guess what it might be.

Where and when the increased use of the superabundant supply of money would be felt cannot in our opinion be forecast. As far as we have been able to learn, there has never been in the world's history a period following a continued and rapid increase in money supply when people have not eventually spent freely, and we believe they will again with the consequent inflationary effect upon the general price level.

If it should be found that this excess money was beginning to be used to purchase capital assets with corresponding rising prices and some such measures were adopted as were recently recommended by Marriner S. Eccles, we doubt their effectiveness in controlling the inflationary problem. Assuming they were successful in preventing expenditures on capital assets, we believe that once having created the desire to exchange money for goods or property, the money would merely be spent elsewhere. It might even be driven underground to black markets which we think would be far more harmful, particularly if this spending happened to break out in commodities and foodstuffs which, through rising basic living costs, would affect everyone and the poor more than the rich.

We question Mr. Eccles' argument that as the tax measures would be applied only to purchases made after a certain date during the war, they would tend to dry up buying rather than selling. It is our belief that when the cause of rising prices rests in a disequilibrium of the monetary framework—inflation—people buy not as a speculation on short-run prices but because they fear a decline in the purchasing power of their money and are interested in acquiring property which they believe will tend to maintain its value. We discussed this phase of the question at length in our comments of February 12, 1945. If this assumption is correct, the fact that newly acquired capital assets could be sold only at a heavy penalty would not restrain one from buying. The motive would be long-term preservation of purchasing power, not a short-term speculation in price.

Since any funds realized from the sale of old assets not affected by the new taxes would immediately come under the new restrictions when reinvested, we think that such sales would be made only under great provocation. Therefore, it seems to us that rather than having the desired effect on restraining the rise, capital values would be forced higher than ever through a restricted supply, while demand stemming from the increased money supply was unaffected. If our analysis of the reasons for buying capital assets as a protection against rising prices is correct, it seems to us that those who share our beliefs would be benefited rather than harmed by these proposals which Mr. Eccles recognizes deal with effect rather than cause.

Many people are counting on a tremendous volume of production of peacetime goods to keep prices down after the war. Generally speaking, however, production creates the purchasing power with which to buy itself. This, therefore, still leaves us with the excess money supply built up during the war with which to deal. This excess money supply is largely based on Government debt and its reduction depends upon debt retirement or purchases by individuals of bonds now held in the banking system. This seems most unlikely.

Because price controls and supply and demand operate within the monetary framework, they are effective in determining relative prices of particular things once money in use expands at a greater rate than trade requirements. They have never been known to be a solution to the rise of general prices growing out of disequilibrium between money and trade. As long as we attempt to deal with the effect rather than the cause, the unknown is, in our opinion, merely when, where, and how much prices will rise.

ECONOMIC TREND LINE STUDIES.
M. D. MOREHOUSE.

Missouri Legislature Pledges Support to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1945, the Missouri Legislature passed a Senate concurrent resolution in which it pledged to President Harry S. Truman, Missouri's first President, its loyal support in the performance of the arduous duties recently thrust upon him.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the feeling of the people of Missouri and, I believe, of the entire Nation. We all realize that these are critical and eventful days in our country's history and a time when our Commander in Chief and Chief Executive should have the united, loyal support of every true American. If we give him that support and backing President Truman will give every ounce of his being in bringing to us and to the world a speedy victory over the focs of democracy and a lasting peace.

Under leave granted, I insert at this point the resolution, which is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

Whereas by that inexorable decree of fate from which there lies no appeal, a native-born Missourian, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, has been exalted to the high office of President of the United States of America in, we hope, the last days of the most devastating and extensive war of all history; and

Whereas we take considerable pride in the fact that a native-born Missourian, for the first time in the history of the United States, occupies the office of Chief Executive of the Nation; and

Whereas it is vital to our national interest that we, of whatever political faith and regardless of whatever views we may entertain as to domestic policies, stand solidly together in all things affecting the interest, the power, the prestige, and the perpetuity of our beloved Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of Missouri (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we express our implicit faith in His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, as Commander in Chief of our armed forces and as our new leader in world affairs; that we pledge to him our undivided loyalty and support in the discharge of the onerous duties that confront him; that we are confident he will, with our allies, continue the prosecution of World War No. 2 to final victory,

and may Divine Providence so guide us in the adjustments that must be made by and between the peace-loving nations of the world that in winning the war we shall also win the peace—peace that shall bless the world for generations to follow and through the ages to come; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be printed in the journal and an engrossed copy thereof sent to His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America; to the Honorable FORREST C. DONNELL and the Honorable FRANK P. BRIGGS, Senators in Congress from Missouri; and to each of the members of the Missouri delegation in the House of Representatives.

Address of Prime Minister Eamon de Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include therein a touching tribute to our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, made by Hon. Eamon de Valera, Prime Minister of Ireland, on April 13, 1945, in moving the adjournment that day of Dail Eireann "as a mark of respect and of sympathy with the American people on the death of their President."

I also include herein a copy of the resolution of adjournment, and a copy of Prime Minister de Valera's message to President Truman:

REMARKS OF PRIME MINISTER EAMON DE VALERA IN MOVING THE ADJOURNMENT OF DAIL EIREANN, APRIL 13, 1945

I wish to move the adjournment of the Dail as a mark of respect and of sympathy with the American people on the death of their President. We have very special reasons for sympathizing with the American people, so many of whom are of our own blood, and we should like to let them know from this house how deeply we sympathize with them in the loss of their great leader who has led them successfully through so many trials.

President Roosevelt will go down to history as one of the greatest of a long line of American Presidents, with the unparalleled distinction of having been elected four times as head of the United States. That was the greatest tribute that could be paid to any man. It is also a measure of his loss. Personally, I regard his death as a loss to the world for I believe his whole career had shown that he could ultimately be depended upon when this war had ended to throw his great influence behind and devote his great energy to the establishment of a world organization which would be just and which, being just, could hope to save humanity from recurring calamities like the present war.

We should also like to express our deep sympathy with President Roosevelt's family to which he was so deeply attached.

Guidhim Trocaire De air a anam agus go dtuga De solas da mhuintir.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY DAIL EIREANN ON APRIL 13, 1945

Resolved, That Dail Eireann extends to the people of the United States its deep sympathy on the death of President Roosevelt and as a tribute of respect to his memory that the House do now adjourn.

MESSAGE SENT BY MR. DE VALERA TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON APRIL 13, 1945

On behalf of the Government, of Dail Eireann, and of the people of Ireland, I wish to express our deep sorrow on the death of President Roosevelt and our very great sympathy with his family and with the American people in the calamity which has befallen them. America has lost a great man and a noble leader.

May God give solace and strength to his family to bear their great trial.

Valiant Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, fellow Missourians have called my attention to an editorial in the New York Daily Mirror of April 14, a eulogy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The editorial appears anonymously but I have learned that it is from the gifted pen of Glenn Neville, a native of St. Joseph, Mo., the editor of the Mirror, and as it is one of the most beautiful and eloquent tributes paid to the late President, I have asked that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

PRAYER

The day is beautiful with spring.

The valiant leader goes home through the land he loved for the long rest and the vast forever.

GALLANT LEADER

Laughing as he fought our battles, parrying our own barbs with twinkling wit, the chin outthrust, upraised, the cigaret at the jaunty tilt, the spectacles catching the light.

BRAVE LEADER

Stirring the chill blood in our hearts, challenging, chiding:

"This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive, and will prosper—the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Learning patience in pain. Learning the anodyne of pain in work. Learning the leaven of humor:

"I hope you will pardon me for the unusual posture of sitting down. I know you will realize it makes it a lot easier for me in not having to carry about 10 pounds of steel around on the bottom of my legs."

VICTORIOUS LEADER

Demanding the difficult. Assuming the impossible.

Calling upon America for 100,000 planes. ("Impossible!" some said.) Calling for 75,000 tanks. ("Impossible!") Calling for 10,000,000 guns, 10,000 ships. ("Impossible!") The impossible becoming the usual. And the quiet, terrible might of America outstripping every goal.

Our armies shattering the evil idols. Smashing the ridiculous egotists of the East and West. Our flags astream, our victory near, and then—

In the newspaper offices, the radio stations, over the air, into the homes, the bullet-like shock of the words—the President is dead.

The finality and the beginning.

For him who phrased the freedoms, who believed in "the triumph of the ideal," who hated war, who died that men might not senselessly die again, we to whom the grief is close, and humble, millions through the world, beseech the grace of God.

Post-war Planning in Economic Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Post-war Planning in Economic Adjustments," by Cecil Wright Pemberton, executive secretary, Florida Tax Information Association, Inc., before the Riverside Woman's Club, April 4, 1945:

In the very kind invitation given to be guest this morning, every assurance was given that my guess would be as good as anyone's, the subject being Post-war Planning in Economic Adjustments. However much we might wish to write a formula or a blueprint for a post-war world, the vagaries of human nature doom such a process to disappointment. Indeed, despite the effort at world organization, and the grandiose plans for a parley on world problems, the effort has serious obstructions at the outset. Omens of ill will and suspicion precede it.

While total war is conducted by methods which change as to tactics and equipment from day to day, always being perfected, the world statesmen continue with equipment of about the fifteenth century. On the record of history down to the present hour, there has been no improvement in man's relation to man from decade to decade, nor from century to century except to get worse. Behold the present. Witness the past. Then guess the future.

While men fight and die under the most horrible conditions all over the globe, the hope of the world has been focused on the slim possibilities of the slogan, "This must be the last war." Before the firing ceases or the guns grow cold, a framework of international cooperation is suggested in two ways: 1. Dumbarton Oaks; 2. Bretton Woods agreement.

JUST WHAT IS DUMBARTON OAKS?

This is the name given to the Washington estate where statesmen came together in 1944 and made preliminary arrangements for the later meeting to be held in San Francisco, Calif., on April 25, 1945. The tentative understanding was that 44 nations were to participate; that the rights of all nations were to be recognized within the framework; that voting privileges would be equal; and the right to establish governments of their own choosing would be acceptable carte blanche. This was supposed to rest on declarations of the Atlantic Charter, but suddenly it was discovered that the Atlantic Charter did not exist beyond some verbal transmissions, easily entered into and just as easily disregarded. Such is the record of Dumbarton Oaks past. The record of San Francisco is yet to be written.

During 1944 the international aviation conference (Chicago, Ill.) was ignored by Russia, who declined to send delegates. At the Yalta meeting of the Big Three, it now ap-

pears there was appeasement, and voting balance was secret agenda. Russia demands the Lublin committee be seated at the San Francisco conference, which both the United States and Great Britain stoutly reject. On top of that, and as fuel to the flames, Russia sends only her Ambassador to the United States to attend at San Francisco, which Great Britain and the United States again protest in strong terms, for this shows contempt for the whole effort.

PESSIMISM DEVELOPS; GLOOM PERVADES

Despite these obstructions, depressing as they are, the effort should not be abandoned; and they should have the prayers and support of the peoples of the world who yearn for peace after the greatest blood bath of all history; a war which stretches from pole to pole, reaches over every continent of the earth, shattering life and wealth accumulations of the centuries. However much or little that may come out of San Francisco, the lesser known and confused Bretton Woods proposal is history making in portent and objectivity.

JUST WHAT IS BRETTON WOODS?

Located in New Hampshire, it was a convenient meeting place during 1944 for bankers, economists, and internationalists.

WHAT WAS DONE AT BRETTON WOODS?

Two items of the cumbersome agenda seem to sum it up: (1) There was proposed an international loan fund of $9,000,000,000 the United States to contribute $3,000,000,000; (2) There was proposed an International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, which would supposedly dispose of international fiscal policies and financial adjustments. It is noteworthy that this conference was dominated in great degree by the personality of Lord Maynard Keynes (which is pronounced Kanes), whose theoretical schemes have been put to practice more in the United States than the United Kingdom during the past decade.

As to the bank, this has not received any serious objections but the loan fund has become the target for mounting attack and defense. It is well to regard these contentions, pro and con, for it is the loan fund which activates the process of a so-called international accord. The San Francisco Conference is to give over considerable time to an international police force (called security council), but this idea has been frowned on by Russia who flatly declare they (Russia) will not be policed if adjudged wrong. Since the whole conference procedure is like giving a pledge to a lodge, church, or sorority affair—a pledge more often observed in the breach than in the performance—the stability of the double talk coming out of San Francisco must be finally hinged on Bretton Woods economics, and what comes out of that.

Thus we find Bretton Woods is superior to Dumbarton Oaks; and we discover that within the Bretton Woods proposal, the loan fund is superior in importance to the bank of reconstruction.

THE MECHANICS OF THE LOAN FUND

Out of the total of $9,000,000,000 contemplated, the United States is accorded the high honor (??) of putting up three billion. Where money is involved, the United States is always elected, and this is no exception. Our status thereafter is 28 percent of the voting power. It is further provided that we place into the fund actually $600,000,000, which is divided 10-percent gold ($60,000,000 gold), and the balance in dollars of the Nation's currency. Our full liability, of course, is $3,000,000,000, and must be added to the gross debt of this Nation when adopted.

At this point, the advocates and opponents divide into two camps.

Pro-loan fund: The supporters claim with mounting enthusiasm that we are spending at the rate of $260,000,000 daily to prosecute the war, that we have a gross direct net debt of $234,000,000,000: and three billion more or less is of no consequence when it will put the world on its feet. This argument proceeds further to urge that loans will make purchases, purchasing will turn the wheels of industry (whose wheels?) business will boom and the golden era will be upon us. Wars will not happen and just can't happen, assert the advocates. Added to this is a long parade of economic supporters, which just about clinches the argument beyond contention. Any criticism, therefore, is reactionary, unprincipled, and unchristian.

Con-loan fund: On the other hand, we have the kill-joys who come out flatly that it just won't work. They declare, and with considerable force, that loans and gifts will march hand in hand in any such a deal; that the United States will be the sucker. The authorities, they assert, paraded as economists are all socialists of the first water, and actually a nondescript, conglomerate bunch of left wingers with a decided red, at least pink, glow and complexion. Opposition is stubborn, insisting the contrivance not be swallowed full blown in the bottle without removing the cork to see what it smells like.

Both positions are extreme, of course. But the pressure to have this approved without fullest discussion and analysis make it suspicious; it suggests added caution and conservatism in dealing with the question. The loan fund is probably a lend-lease under another name. The bank of reconstruction handles long-term loans, which come due in 1980 in the main. There have been discovered some glaring omissions as to controls in both the bank and the loan fund. While currencies are held to be the focus for stability, this divides into two schools of thought, of approval and disapproval. One group insist the dollar and the pound sterling be held in line, while the opposite group demur to this procedure; they would make all currencies a case study and artificially pump them up. The assumption is therefore made that money will do the whole job, while common sense—and the record dictates—that control be exercised over added factors.

CARTELS, TARIFFS, NEWS, AND PROPAGANDA FACTORIES

Loaning money outside the United States has always been a risky business, not alone because of the political complexities but more because of the way business is conducted in secret fashion. Our whole lending power underwrites this loan fund despite the power to withdraw. While we put up $3,000,000,000, or its equivalent, just what the balance of the nations can or will put up is interesting conjecture. Almost all of them are broke or without resources that are not already pledged. Through August 1944, the British Ministry of Economic Warfare announced the Nazis had looted $24,600,000,000 from the occupied countries. Great Britain is little better off.

A word of caution on Dumbarton Oaks. Dumbarton Oaks is not another Treaty of Versailles. It does not assume nor presume boundaries, fix reparations, nor seek revenge. Dumbarton Oaks is simply a parley intended, among other things, to settle on some kind of international security council, primarily, to contain the peace of the world—if and when we get it.

Since war making has become more of an economic process than either political or military processes, the omissions of Bretton Woods, and its decided lack of clarity on some phases, must be taken—even stressed—as weaknesses. Stability of currencies within nations, individually, is assumed as a prerequisite of peace. Nothing could be further from the truth. Unless cartels are controlled, tariffs are policed, and propaganda outlets curbed, there will be war in less time than 20 years. Let us address ourselves to these problems.

Cartels: A cartel is an arrangement between producers who control prime sources of materials and output for the marketing and distribution of this output in specified areas. It is not a trust. It is not a corporation. It is not an individual; but is an aggregation which, in other circumstances, would be competitive. The cartel smothers competition.

Although the cartel has functioned since ancient times, even in Biblical days, it has been the modern world of the last century to give it Frankenstein appearance. There are, of course, good cartels and bad cartels. It is of capitalistic creation, but the Russians have utilized it and made it at home in a communistic economy.

The financial operations are always shrouded in great secrecy. Its natural inclination for greed has brought it more and more to the attention of governments everywhere. In some instances, the government aids and abets it, as for example the Nazis. Cartels penetrate tariff barriers, batter down trade obstructions, cross frontiers, and continents. They know neither nationality nor confinement. During the interim between World War No. 1 and No. 2, Germany perfected the cartel in not only production and prime materials but in patents as well.

Although some cartels are good, the majority are malign. Thus we have a black market about us all the time wherever they reside. And despite the war, cartel agreements are like arrested TB, ready to break out again and return to power in even stronger and more virile form. Effective world front action must be taken against them. The war makers are not absent from this group.

Tariffs: With respect to tariffs, the proposal makes some references, mostly superficial, and without teeth. Tariffs are the device by which domestic production is protected against outside competition. To build a productive machine without it in a growing economy is quite impossible. But with its completion, tariffs are a clot in the stream when they become extreme. The Republican Party in this Nation has been the traditional party of high tariff, while the Democratic Party has been free trade and for revenue only in the tariff field. Tariffs, which are barriers, created much of the hate and bitterness prior to the 1939 debacle. Our own tariff of 1922, the Hawley-Smoot Act, was a predicted hate maker at the time of enactment.

As we discuss primary hopes and laudable ambitions of the post-war world, we must face up to the facts. Perhaps the first fact is this war is not over when the shooting stops. The struggle of the century will then begin. Mr. Churchill said this at the close of World War No. 1: "The battle of the giants has ended; the quarrels of the pygmies has now begun." This time the battle of the giants will not abate except as to form. In this twilight zone, military operations will subside and then the inexorable law of economics will begin to exact harshest penalties. Even the boldest optomist pales before the pandora's box from which shall spew forth grotesque creations, the like of which we have not yet dreamed or contemplated.

A lapse into nationalism is inevitable: The Continent of Europe, looted and ravaged by the Nazis to the extent of $24,600,000,000, is completely prostrate, all production and agriculture smashed. Materials values have vanished, but more important spiritual values have gone with them. Driven like

animals by the gestapo, the jungle law of survival is the rule and not the exception. Millions have been uprooted from home and families, which they shall never see again. Other millions have been put to death by torture, beating, and cremation in the abbatoirs of Poland. Dante's Inferno is but a feeble and improvised imagination which pales in comparison. This is less than 60 hours from where we stand and sit today. For the survivors of this horror is there any possibility for rational composition of the hate, the revenge, and the sure-fire reckoning which has been planted in their hearts?

News freedom; the propaganda menace: Under this heading, we have the past as a harbinger of the future. Mr. Kent Cooper in his book, The Free Press, submits shocking evidence against the news agencies of the world. Operated almost as private institutions, he calls the roll of Reuters of London, Havas of Paris, Tass of Moscow, the Italian and Japanese news agencies as cesspools of iniquities. There can be no peace, declares Mr. Cooper, so long as these institutions thrive unchallenged and uncontrolled. Always, and at all times, they act for their secret masters to foment unrest, suspicion, and even war among the peace-loving peoples of the world. This is not, he goes on to add, a recent development but has been going on for years. Lie factories must be stopped.

THE DOMESTIC DEBT SITUATION

The Bretton Woods proposal is a world arrangement, say its authors, and discussion must therefore cover the whole water front or range of international discussion, neglecting the local and provincial problems. When the mounting debt of this Nation is even timidly suggested as a talking point, the uproarious advocates of Bretton Woods howl that we owe the money to ourselves, that the issue is trifling, and forget it.

Should we accept the premise that we owe the money to ourselves, then certainly it must be admitted we owe the money to each other. On accepting the second premise, the authors of the first premise find themselves in difficult position. For regardless where we owe the money, we do owe it and it must be paid if we are to be honest about it. In the absence of payment, we rob our own people and disgrace the national position. As of March 30, 1945, the gross net direct debt was $234,858,029,960.86.

The debt limit is set by law and has been changed—upward—from time to time and very often during this war. The latest bill raises the limit to $300,000,000,000, which is expected June 1, 1946. Compare this with $50,000,000,000 in 1938 which very soberly was declared by economists to be the top limit we could carry.

We have a debt situation to which nobody can point with pride and some have been forthright with gestures of alarm. It does precious little good to dismiss it by saying "we must win the war." This is the flight from reality which spells danger. During 1944, the daily spend was $300,000,000, which is now reduced to $260,000,000 daily—more than $10,000,000 an hour.

BASIC PHILOSOPHIES

As we turn again to the Bretton Woods financial arrangement for a world fund, we find two philosophies facing each other. One is the capitalistic world, which has spread successive layers of debt on the structure over the centuries, and is now accumulating debt faster than ever before. On the other side, we have the communistic world where repudiation and debt cancelation is the rule. Moreover, the latter system makes it quite impossible for debts to be created in a communistic world, and it is inconsistent with the principle.

Basically, the revolutions and social upheavals of the centuries past have been an effort to improve living conditions of existence. It was the Russian revolution of 1916 which wiped out the Czars debts and began from scratch. Debt repudiation and hope of better existence, always cruelly hard, was the promise of that upheaval. In all the techniques worked out by the totalitarian governments, including that of the Nazis, the system of debt repudiation has been prime motivation. At what point explosions may or can occur at certain debt levels is unpredictable.

This circumstance has given some concern to the internationalists over the status of the European bonds. Having in mind the smashed economic machine of the Continent, how can the Europeans recover themselves under this load? On the basis of the old European system of conglomerate states and so-called separate economic entities, it just can't be done. This will encourage the Russian influence. The Balkan states and the Baltic states are already well within the orbit, with France and other states about to join.

The best authorities on the subject of European organization view impossible the small state existence, and see its exit in the post-war world. This development of spheres of space and resources foredooms the old scheme of phony frontiers and comic-opera nations with their entertaining pomp and circumstance, all without substance, and completely without economic stability to perform. This shift of political organization along lines of space and resource would therefore seem to make four great divisions: (1) The United States of America, (2) Russia, (3) China, (4) Brazil.

Where is Great Britain in this projection? She just isn't, that's all. The economic machine of Great Britain is topsy-turvy. Although a Conservative, Tory government has held together by coalition (consent) and fought out the war, it—this same government—will not outlast the war. With the rise of the Labor Party, who now clamors for political power and will surely have it, Britain turns left. Beset from within and without, the old order has seen its best days and will of necessity bow out to the coming labor power which now clamors for control—a party which turns toward Russia. Absentee landlordship across miles of ocean and continent has already passed into the memory lane of history. It was Mr. Churchill himself who not so long ago declared the Russian position was a puzzle wrapped inside an enigma.

Post-war economic adjustments are only dimly outlined. Faced by increasing interference and overlordship by government in every department of our lives here at home, and which has been accelerated by war necessity, I humbly submit the Constitution of the United States for the divine guidance of the San Francisco Conference. Instead of "We, the people of the United States," it should declare "We, the peoples of the world."

The original Constitution has caused miracles.

The alternative is too horrible to contemplate.

Schedule of votes and percentage, both International Monetary Fund and Bank of Reconstruction and Development—Source: Federal Reserve Bank

Country	Monetary Fund		Bank of Reconstruction	
	Number of votes	Percent of total	Number of votes	Percent of total
1. Australia	2,250	2.3	2,250	2.2
2. Belgium	2,500	2.5	2,500	2.4
3. Bolivia	350	.3	320	.3
4. Brazil	1,750	1.8	1,300	1.2
5. Canada	3,250	3.3	3,500	3.4
6. Chile	750	.8	600	.6
7. China	5,750	5.8	6,250	6.1
8. Colombia	750	.8	600	.6

Schedule of votes and percentage, both International Monetary Fund and Bank of Reconstruction and Development—Continued

Country	Monetary Fund		Bank of Reconstruction	
	Number of votes	Percent of total	Number of votes	Percent of total
9. Costa Rica	200	0.3	270	0.3
10. Cuba	750	.8	600	.6
11. Czechoslovakia	1,500	1.5	1,500	1.5
12. Denmark	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
13. Dominican Republic	300	.3	270	.3
14. Ecuador	300	.3	282	.3
15. Egypt	700	.7	650	.6
16. El Salvador	275	.3	260	.3
17. Ethiopia	310	.3	280	.3
18. France	4,750	4.8	4,750	4.1
19. Greece	650	.6	500	.5
20. Guatemala	300	.3	270	.3
21. Haiti	300	.3	270	.3
22. Honduras	275	.3	260	.3
23. Iceland	260	.3	260	.3
24. India	4,250	4.3	4,250	4.2
25. Iran	500	.5	490	.5
26. Iraq	330	.3	310	.3
27. Liberia	255	.2	255	.2
28. Luxemburg	360	.3	350	.3
29. Mexico	1,150	1.2	900	.9
30. Netherlands	3,000	3.0	3,000	2.9
31. New Zealand	750	.8	750	.7
32. Nicaragua	270	.3	258	.3
33. Norway	750	.8	750	.7
34. Panama	255	.2	252	.2
35. Paraguay	270	.3	258	.3
36. Peru	500	.5	425	.4
37. Philippine Commonwealth	400	.4	400	.4
38. Poland	1,500	1.5	1,500	1.5
39. Union of South Africa	1,250	1.3	1,250	1.2
40. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	12,250	12.4	12,250	12.0
41. United Kingdom	13,250	13.4	13,250	13.0
42. United States	27,750	28.0	32,000	31.4
43. Uruguay	400	.4	355	.3
44. Venezuela	400	.4	355	.3
45. Yugoslavia	850	.8	650	.6
Total	99,000	100.0	102,000	100.0

[1] To be determined when the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign.

Voting: Each member has 250 votes plus 1 additional vote for each part of its quota equivalent to $100,000. Except as otherwise provided decisions shall be by a majority of the votes cast.

The percentage of total votes is calculated on the assumption that only those nations represented at the conference will join the fund. As other countries join the fund, each individual country's share of the total votes will decline.

NOTE.—Of the total number of votes, the British Empire controls 25.3 percent; Continental Europe, exclusive of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 16 percent; and Latin America, 9.7 percent.

The monetary fund:

Total	$8,800,000,000
United States share	2,750,000,000

The Bank of Reconstruction and Development:

Total	$9,100,000,000
United States share	3,175,000,000

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at the First Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans., Sunday evening, April 22, dealing with some of the problems presented by the Dumbarton Oaks conversations, and the Chapultepec Pact.

I earnestly recommend a careful reading of Mr. Landon's careful analysis of the basic differences between the two proposals—Dumbarton Oaks and Chapultepec—and his suggestions as to the responsibilities of the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Conference of the United Nations which convenes in San Francisco next Wednesday is the most momentous event in modern history. We can hardly overstate, overemphasize, or exaggerate what the outcome of that conference means to the future of the world. And I am not sure that all of us are thinking clearly about it.

It is made all the more difficult by fundamental differences in the ideologies of the nations of the world.

Ostensibly, we all believe in democracy. The Russians tell us that Soviet Russia is more democratic than the United States. But we say the Soviet Government is a totalitarian despotism.

The Englishman will tell you that the British Commonwealth is the greatest of all democracies, but when Mr. Churchill says he will not liquidate the British Empire there are those who wonder how imperialism can be reconciled with real democracy.

We, in our proud Republic, glory in our democracy, but the Russians and even the British are not the only ones who say that we are an oligarchy ruled by economic royalists. I have heard 100-percent Americans say the same thing. So perhaps we may be as wrong in our estimate of the essence of the Soviet and of British imperialism as they are wrong in their estimate of us.

I believe there is a greater desire for an international peace organization—a great interest on the part of the average man to strive for it—and a greater willingness to make concessions toward building a workable peace structure than there was in 1919.

Now is the time to move constructively at San Francisco.

At Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, primary emphasis had to be laid on achieving victory. Everything had to be subordinated to building victory by three men, Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin.

Each of those men held in his hands the economic, political, and military power of the three great countries he represented and headed.

One was truly an autocrat. The other two—under the stimulous of all-out war—proceeded on the same basis.

The result of their acts was the same. There was little substance of democratic diplomacy in any of their policies. The result is an old-fashioned balance-of-power world organization.

The fundamental interests of the three men, outside of winning the war, were widely different.

The mental make-up and the methods of Stalin and of the people he rules are practically the opposite of those of the other two.

The result of this is the present world political climate. The real world-wide desire for serious experimentation in the development of democracy, which existed at the conclusion of the First World War, is largely missing from the present picture.

The great difference between 1919 and 1945 is that at Paris the all-important victorious powers were desirous of a peace structure—if it fit their individual national interests.

San Francisco will be a horse of a different color. Russia and Britain have in mind a totally different idea for world security—partly perhaps because neither is very sure of us.

The glorification of Dumbarton Oaks beyond reason and facts has contributed to that uncertainty. It is stifling intelligent thinking—not only as to the proposed form of world peace organization but of infinitely greater importance—the kind of peace on which it is based.

Sympathic and constructive suggestions for amendments like the Council of Churches report, the bishops of the Catholic Welfare Conference, Mr. Hoover's, and the Chapultepec pact are immediately weakened by the attitude that we will take whatever we can get.

That way of thinking might have been all right for Dumbarton Oaks—as a start—when primary emphasis had to be laid in achieving victory, but the primary interest has already changed as the result of Allies' victories from building victory to building permanent and lasting peace.

We are the most powerful people in the world today. No nation can afford to stand in the way of right organization unless we ourselves fall down. We cannot fall down if we have the courage to stand up.

We are exactly the same inexperienced people in international politics who have done an incredible job of standing up against the professional, highly trained armies of the world.

We can do the same incredible job of building peace. It is no harder for peace than it is for war.

We don't have to clash with Russia and Britain. It is inevitable that we approach our problems from a different angle. We must not get all sentimental about anybody, any more than we have to hate anyone.

The place and the time to speak is at San Francisco.

In any case, the San Francisco Conference must not be steam-rollered even though many people get sentimental or frightened about touching anything already set up.

What we need right now is cold courage and cold common sense. We have a lot of that whenever we choose to use it.

There is plenty of opportunity to amend the Dumbarton Oaks plan—and it needs to be amended. That's what the San Francisco Conference is for. There are many highly important unanswered questions inherent in the Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and other meetings, that as far as I am concerned must be answered before I can decide either for or against. I mean the failure to have a clear meeting of the minds, one way or the other, is fatal to the success of any plan. In light of events since Yalta, that meeting of the minds does not exist now. I mention a few that are more than mere details. The extent and duration of our military and financial undertakings in post-war Europe and Asia, particularly in the government of our part of Germany, on reparations in kind, or the use of slave labor, spheres of influence and boundary questions that involve the mass movements of populations around like cattle. But the biggest and most important of all the questions that must be settled beyond any doubt is, Where will be the power to amend the Dumbarton Oaks Pact?

Some hold the power to block any amendment or to hold any investigation rests in the hands of any two of the Big Five. That must be changed so that the charter can be reviewed and amended in the light of events, changing peace needs, and improved faith in international cooperation. As it stands today, Dumbarton Oaks proposal's great weakness is its failure to develop basic world-wide law, or to provide the means to facilitate its gradual development in the future. The San Francisco Conference must, like our Constitution, contain provisions which will make the development of a body of international law inevitable.

The alternative is not the Dumbarton Oaks plan or international chaos or anarchy. We have positively the alternative of rallying the democratic nations behind the pact of Chapultepec—already adopted by all the great nations of this hemisphere.

That is not an autocratic arrangement as is Dumbarton Oaks. At Chapultepec there was no surrender of fundamental principles that are not only morally desirable but better statesmanship. Therefore, Chapultepec does not leave misgivings as to the stability of the results that Dumbarton Oaks does.

Not the least of the reasons of the great promise of Chapultepec was the way it was done. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of both political parties took an intimate and responsible part in the conference at Mexico City. Representatives of the labor unions and the press were brought in. It was a great demonstration of the ability of free peoples to unite freely on a set of fundamental principles.

The result of Chapultepec is definitely not the act of a regional bloc of nations such as Russia is insisting on for her protection. It is truly the act of a body of American nations united only on certain definite principles, leaving all other matters to the solution of free men.

Now the State Department's function at Dumbarton Oaks and Chapultepec was to help formulate American needs and aspirations and give them logical shape. But Dumbarton Oaks is based on an entirely different theory than Chapultepec. It is based on the balance-of-power theory, actuated by the Big Three and the ghost of the holy alliance.

The Chapultepec pact contains the following clause "* * * The activities and procedures referred to therein shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organizations when formed."

The momentous question is, will the Chapultepec pact be amended to fit the ancient balance-of-power theory of Dumbarton Oaks, thus blocking the first positive step toward true cooperation of free and united nations? Or will the preliminary Dumbarton Oaks report be altered to fit the Chapultepec charter?

The President's untimely death, which has plunged civilization into sorrow, undoubtedly gives the American delegation at San Francisco a freer hand to decide America's policies on highly important and still undecided questions. For until the Senate—and there may well be some questions that involve the functions of the National House of Representatives—ratifies the post-war settlements, they are still undecided as far as America is concerned. Undoubtedly the weight, the prestige, and the influence, especially of the delegates that are Members of the Congress, are enhanced.

Chapultepec has demonstrated the pattern. It incorporates all the substance of the Council of the Churches recommendations. It is an American pattern. It is good. It is not based on the interests of three powers dominating the world, but the cooperation of 21 nations working together under a reign of law for peace. At Chapultepec there was created no spheres of influence to curse the world. Chapultepec goes ahead with the efforts of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact—to outlaw war.

The Dumbarton Oaks provisional proposals reverse the 25-year effort to outlaw war and legalizes war in the future unless the Big Three decide otherwise unanimously.

At Chapultepec the use of power is pooled. At Dumbarton it is left competitive. In other words, at Dumbarton, we threw out the window the concept of law. At Chapultepec we restored it. Which is it to be at San Francisco?

The United States must strive long and hard to reconcile the differences between the advocates of democratic procedure for peace and Big Threeism. Mr. Truman is confronted immediately with constructing a foreign policy out of mysteries, secrets, and chaos. The foreign policy he inherits is not routine. It will be his job to bridge the widening gap in our unity on post-war proposals caused by the ever-growing protests, "Why weren't we told about this?"

Almost like an embattled general, he has the heavy strain of making his decisions in the field. Encouraged by the hopes and the prayers of his fellow citizens—inspired by the spirit of his exalted office, he has the opportunity to inspire the same unity of purpose in peace that is behind him in war.

The Lord give him strength and courage and fidelity to bear what he must bear.

Peace and Prosperity—Our Share in Establishing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a statement entitled "Peace and Prosperity—Our Share in Establishing It," delivered by me before the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, in Cleveland, Ohio, April 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is no formula which can guarantee peace and there is no automatic pilot which can steer the world to peace and prosperity. To attain peace and prosperity we must steer our course by a star which has been chosen with the greatest of care to lead us to our ultimate goal, and at the same time we must be alert and capable in handling our ship so that we can ride out the storms and keep clear of the reefs on our left and the rocks on our right as we move ahead. To put this in the terms of international policy we must have a deep faith in a fundamental guiding policy and we must provide and operate whatever political and other mechanisms are required to meet the emergencies of everyday life.

The faith needed is that fundamental faith in God and man and ourselves, which led to the founding of America. It is faith in the right of individuals to be free. Lincoln stated this faith when he defined democracy. He said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." This reasoning is the answer to the philosophy of dictatorship by whatever name it may be known. It is the true test of our belief in democracy. It is easy for individuals and nations to meet the first test, for no person wishes to be an individual slave and no nation wishes to be enslaved by another nation. But until we meet this second test, we do not, either as individuals or as a nation, catch the inspiration of true freedom for mankind. Lincoln wished to be free himself and wished his nation to be free, and he also wished all other people and all other nations to be equally free.

America is the natural leader in this crusade to freedom. America is not so much a place within a boundary as it is a people with a common purpose. Millions have come to America, not so much because of their interest in its location or in its physical advantages as because of their devotion to the freedom of spirit which they seek here. While we sing of our love for the rocks and rills and templed hills of America, this is not because they are so different from others, but because of the things that have been done here among them. They have been consecrated to freedom by the brave men and women, living and dead, who have struggled here. They are the symbols of our faith and our freedom.

The world, therefore, naturally looks to the people of America to lead the way to a promised land of peace and prosperity where the Golden Rule is applied to men and to nations.

Woodrow Wilson also emphasized the need for strength of spirit, as well as for perfection of the mechanisms of peace, when he said, "The world can be at peace only if its life is stable; and there can be no stability where there is no tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right." Having in mind, therefore, the necessity for faith and a deep dedication of ourselves to the cause of freedom, we may appropriately turn to the features of our international mechanism which may help to assure us of the peace and prosperity we seek, and which we failed to attain in the period between World Wars Nos. 1 and 2. At an infinite price, the young men of today have won for the world a second chance to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace on earth. It is for us at home to make sure that we are doing our full share in establishing here the peace and prosperity for which our armed forces fight and which they expect to find here when they return.

After the last war we tried the experiment of doing little or nothing about it, and that course failed.

On November 5, 1943, the United States Senate, by a vote of 85 to 5, decided to adopt this time a constructive course, including the formation of a general international organization which would be flexible enough to meet the issues of the future with an increased chance of disposing of those issues without resort to war. In the field of international political stability the foundation program therefore has been determined upon and the issue now is how best to implement that program. The most important sentence in the declaration of policy by the Senate is that which contains the agreement made at about the same time at Moscow between the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. As expressed in the Senate resolution, this is as follows: "The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security." The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are an attempt to implement the foregoing statement of policy. I believe that they come well within that policy and while the proposals are subject to improvement, I believe they could be accepted as they stand if that were the best basis of agreement which we could obtain from the many other interested nations. I mention four important features of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which deserve special attention and which are important features of it. These are:

A. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks is not the use of military force but the substitution of justice for force through various mechanisms. These increase the chances for peace in the future while by no means guaranteeing peace.

B. The vote in the security council is an ingenious compromise which has the great merit of bringing all nations, large or small, before the bar of the world when any question threatens the peace of the world and the parties to the dispute are not permitted to vote on the policy to be recommended.

C. Settlements of local disputes through regional arrangements or by regional agencies are encouraged upon a level between that of nations and of the general world-wide organization.

D. An economic and social council is provided to deal with economic and social issues which may hold in them the keys to the peace and security of the future.

In addition to the mechanisms included in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals it will be necessary to meet numerous other issues of an international nature if we are to secure post-war peace and prosperity and to do our full share in making the victory of our armed forces worthy of the price paid for it. These issues are unavoidable. The Congress is considering, or is about to consider, numerous proposals to meet them. In America there exists the extraordinary opportunity for private citizens especially informed on the several issues to contribute their full share toward meeting these issues by presenting their views to Congress and Members of Congress. The proposals already under consideration have constructive merit, but in most cases are subject to modification and improvement, and suggestions to that end will be welcomed by Congress. Solutions will have to be reached and when these are reached it is hoped that they will have the cordial support of the public, and unless the public has suggested better solutions the public will share in the responsibility for any damage that may come from these solutions. The important thing which I wish to impress upon our community now is the existence of these international and domestic problems. Among the international problems immediately before us are the following:

1. Relief and rehabilitation of allied occupied nations, recognizing an important distinction between their wartime and post-war needs. To the extent of our wartime obligations under the lend-lease program and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, I recommend the carrying forward of the program we have authorized, terminating it as originally proposed and then considering our post-war obligations on a separate basis as a part of our post-war economic program in the light of our own needs and of our own domestic and international economic recovery.

2. The stability of credit and foreign exchange. This is a necessary element in post-war recovery. The proposal before Congress provides for an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, together with an International Monetary Fund. These proposals having grown out of the international conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944. The soundness of the International Bank and the proposal for the establishment of international credit has been generally approved, but there is divided opinion as to the value of the International Monetary Fund program. This latter program is widely misunderstood. It is not a banking program. It is one intended to supplement the establishment of international credit with standards of international trade which will avoid consequences similar to those experienced between World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 through the devaluation of national currencies and a general resort to cut-throat competition among nations. These practices contributed to the world-wide depression. While it is recognized that this feature of the plan requires much further

consideration and clarification, it is important that some better substitute means of stabilizing international exchange be provided if this plan is not to be attempted.

3. Food. The need for increasing efficiency in the production and distribution of foods and the general raising of the level of nutrition available in the world is one of importance to ourselves and to every other part of the world as contributing substantially to its peace and prosperity. The food and agricultural organization developed at Hot Springs, Va., in May 1943 is an attempt to reach this need.

4. The educational systems of the world are fundamental to the peace and stability of the world and their importance increases in proportion to the reliance placed upon the principle of self-government in the world. The major educational problem to be encountered within the Axis nations is of grave concern to the United Nations, but as yet no program has been publicly considered as to it. On the other hand, an important emergency problem exists also in the restoration of the educational systems and cultural institutions of the allied nations which were destroyed by the Axis powers. This involves not merely the securing of ordinary school equipment but also the recourse to America and Great Britain for guidance in scientific and industrial processes, including laboratory equipment, in place of the recourse formerly had to Germany. The important opportunities involved in this need were considered at the conference of Allied Ministers of Education held in London in April 1944, at which the United States was represented by a commission under the chairmanship of William J. Fulbright, now a Member of the United States Senate.

5. International civil aviation presents one of the most important fields of international development. America, due to the war, is the world's leader in aviation today. There will be substantial competition, however, for international civil aviation in the post-war period, not only on the part of Great Britain but on the part of other nations. The peace and prosperity of the world are closely related to the policies to be adopted in this field. Consideration was given to them at the civil aviation conference held at Chicago in 1944. An issue is being drawn now as to the best method by which the United States may regulate the participation by American interests in international aviation. This issue is before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, of which I am a member, but it is not appropriate for me to discuss the issue in advance of the conclusion of the hearings.

6. International communications and their regulation are more vital than ever to the access by America to the rest of the world, and for the conduct of international trade. In past years there has existed the Universal Postal Union and the Communication and Transit Organization in connection with the League of Nations. New issues are now presented in the fields of cable and radio communication. The policy of the United States on this issue is yet to be developed.

7. International Labor Organization: This important activity has survived the general abandonment of other League of Nations activities. The United States of America has been a member of this organization since 1934, and the organization is now being carried on with offices primarily in Canada. The importance of the international labor issue was recognized at the international labor conference held in Philadelphia in 1944. While this field may yield even more critical and important developments domestically than internationally, the international issues are vitally important to the future peace and prosperity of the world.

8. General international trade and travel: The development of international post-war trade is of primary importance, not only to the United States but to all nations. The degree to which we and other nations will find it necessary to protect home industries presents issues of an economic and commercial nature which usually can be better solved in detail by administrative bodies fully informed on the facts, than by legislative bodies, except on issues of general policy. In this field comes the question of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This raises, for example, the question as to the extent to which administrative bodies should be permitted to adjust tariffs up or down from tariffs prescribed by legislation. Under the law of the United States, this authority now exists to the extent of a 50 percent variation from the tariffs fixed in 1934. It has been suggested that this discretion be enlarged so that the 50 percent variation shall apply to the tariffs as in effect in 1945. In cases where the tariffs already have been reduced by 50 percent from what they were fixed in 1934, this would mean granting authority to reduce them by a further 50 percent of the present rate, thus making a total reduction of 75 percent. Such an extension amounts to an extraordinary substitution of administrative discretion in place of legislative discretion. The normal procedure would be for the legislative body to adjust the basic tariff rather than to give an administrative body the right to change a legislative determination by more than 50 percent. Apart from international trade in the ordinary sense, there will exist a new opportunity for international travel which carries with it tremendous possibilities for benefits both to the United States and to foreign nations. Tourist travel would transport American credits abroad in exchange for pleasure that would not come seriously in competition with American productive industries. It would improve international relations and help to place funds abroad where they would help to develop a market for American-made goods.

9. The United States merchant marine will present a major international problem. Following the war we shall have by far the largest merchant marine fleet in the world and if we are to maintain a Navy of substantial proportions, we shall need to maintain a large merchant marine as an auxiliary to the Navy. This will present added reasons for a Federal interest in a large merchant marine service.

10. International freedom of expression and of the press. This subject is related to the issue of cable and radio communication but it is broader than that. It has become clear that a vitally important factor in the maintenance of international peace will be access to and publication of the truth in the news of the world. America's interest in this extends not only to the news to be published in America but in the news to be published about America throughout the world. While this is a major question of international policy it has not as yet received the public recognition to which it is entitled.

11. International Court of Justice: It is of the utmost importance that justiciable questions be determined by a court of justice in international as well as national fields of jurisdiction. The Permanent Court of Justice connected with the League of Nations has made important contributions to this end. There should be little difficulty in securing general adherence to a statute providing for an international court of justice in connection with the United Nations program.

12. Trusteeships of dependent places and people: It is essential that the United States obtain clear and complete control of such strategic places as this war has demonstrated are essential to her safety. There must not be a repetition of the uncontested seizure by others of those strategic points which the United States recently has been compelled to recapture at great human cost. In the event of war we should not have to recapture our essential defensive outposts. Also the development toward independence of the dependent people of the world is one of the major trusteeships resting upon the free sovereign nations of the world. The principles of the Atlantic Charter, as incorporated in the Declaration of the United Nations, recognize this fact. Conditions may well vary with each location and with each group of people involved but the general right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live is an important part of the faith of America.

13. Treaty-making processes of the United States: If the United States enters the general international organization and assumes its full share in the international problems of our time, there will be presented to the United States Government an increased need for consideration by it of future treaties bearing on these relations. The Constitution of the United States now provides for the passage of laws affecting the internal affairs of this Nation by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and the Senate, together with the approval of the President. This makes possible constructive and rapid action based upon the will of the majority as reflected through the two Houses of Congress and the President. On the other hand, our Constitution, in the case of treaties, does not provide the same facility for their approval. It requires the consent to them by two-thirds of the Senators present. This places a veto power over treaties in one-third plus one of the Members of the Senate. This results in a negative control of our foreign policy by a minority in that one House of Congress in which States, rather than population, is made the basis of representation. Accordingly, in the event of our entry into the United Nations treaty and its approval by two-thirds of the Senate at that time, that same two-thirds of the Senate, and also two-thirds of the House of Representatives, will owe it to the people of the United States to give them an opportunity to determine whether or not, in view of the increasing foreign interests of the United States, they will not wish to amend their Constitution by putting the approval of treaties under the majority control of the two Houses, in much the same manner as statutes of the United States are now enacted.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

Equally important with international stability is our domestic stability. As international stability is a domestic necessity, so also our domestic stability and prosperity is an international necessity. In this domestic field the problems are more familiar to our public. For that very reason these problems represent an even closer responsibility on the part of individual American citizens than do the international policies. They include such problems as the following:

1. National solvency: This deals with the vital problems of stopping the increase of our national debt, carrying the load of our present debt, and adjusting taxes so that they will be stabilized and also will encourage, rather than discourage, production.

2. Increased production and full employment: This calls for understanding and cooperation between management, labor, agriculture, and government. It calls for a recognition of the need for ever-increasing production as the key to ever-increasing prosperity.

3. Inventions and new products: Many of these offer the promise of infinitely greater returns from human efforts in the future than has rewarded corresponding efforts in the past. Progress in such fields as those of aviation, radio, automotive power, light metals, wood, glass, plastics, electric welding, electronics, sulfa drugs, improved

housing facilities, and in countless other fields, suggests the new values based upon human ingenuity which can become available to a civilization that is appreciative of their value.

4. Improved housing: Looking to the elimination of the still disgraceful slums on blighted areas of our largely populated centers, there is offered in this field an opportunity for private, as well as for public, housing in meeting the need. Legislation along these lines is being considered in Congress and in some States.

5. Improved health conditions, safety programs, and physical standards: These all make direct contributions to productiveness and prosperity. Attention has been called to them by the many physical defects disclosed in connection with the draft of men for military service. There is a need for hospital facilities in many rural and other areas of this Nation. These should be developed through privately owned, as well as publicly owned, agencies.

6. Educational progress for the foundation of democracy. The need for improved education in many parts of the Nation has been emphasized by the lack of education disclosed in the attempt to qualify men for military service. The Nation as a whole suffers from such educational defects in its citizenry, and it is important that means be found to overcome such lack of facilities while at the same time protecting the local control over education of policies against encroachment by Federal policies.

7. Military training: This will present an issue which cannot, at this time, satisfactorily be determined. It will be largely affected by the quota of military forces which it may become the obligation of the United States to maintain, especially in the Navy and the Air Corps, as a part of our obligation under the general international organization proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks conferences. I believe it is premature to pass upon such a subject in advance of a more clear understanding of what our obligation to supply armed forces is to be as a member of the United Nations in the years immediately ahead of us.

8. Fair employment practices: These present an important issue which should be met with thorough consistency with our national purposes and ideals. It is important to consider which practices should be put under local, as contrasted with Federal control. Following the precedent set during this war, such Federal regulations naturally would extend to employment that is supported by taxes which are collected without racial or other discrimination and therefore should be expended without such discrimination. The success of policies affecting such matters will depend primarily upon the general public support of the policy involved.

9. The development of a code of fair industrial and labor relations as the foundation of industrial production upon which our standards of living depend is a matter of primary importance both to labor and to management. If there is to be industrial peace and prosperity it is vitally important that the utmost fairness be applied to all parties concerned in such production whether they be employers or employees, and whether they be members or officials of organized labor or industrial organizations, and whether they be members or non-members of any organization whatever.

10. The importances of combating inflation: This relates not only to the national solvency of this Nation, but also to the voluntary observance of policies designed to safeguard the Nation against inflation. One vitally important policy at this moment is the heavy subscription by individuals to the Seventh War Bond Drive. The conversion of savings bank deposits and especially of hoarded cash into War bonds should be carefully considered by everyone and undertaken to the greatest extent possible.

Prevention of Beach Erosion Essential to Shores of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and responsibility of being a member of the important Rivers and Harbors Committee of this Seventy-ninth Congress. It is said that a larger percentage of the beach shores of the great metropolitan city of Long Beach, Calif., are owned by municipalities, than is the case with any other municipality of North America. The entire coastline of California, the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, of the Gulf States, and all of the great river shores of our Nation are all concerned in matters of erosion.

There are two important measures pending in this Congress, looking to the aid and protection against erosion. The first is H. R. 2032, which gives authority to a shoreline investigation, having in mind the prevention of shore erosion by currents, waves, and tides, and to the determining of the best method for the protection, development, restoration, and preservation of the great bathing beaches of our shores. It provides that the cost of these important investigations shall be borne entirely by the Federal Government. This, I believe, is as it should be. The prevention of erosion is not a State matter, it is a national matter and concerns the health, safety, and recreation as well as having a definite bearing on coastwise commerce and river transportation and navigation.

The second measure is H. R. 2033, now pending, which provides that the United States Government shall share in the cost of protecting the shores publicly owned. It declares it to be the Federal policy to aid in the construction, but not the maintenance, of works for the improvement and protection against erosion of the shores, whether ocean, gulf, or river, of the United States, and which shores are owned either by States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions. But, provided, however, that the Federal share of contribution toward the construction of such protective works shall not in any case exceed one-third of the total cost thereof.

Mr. Speaker and Members, while it may be considered that the policy as proposed in H. R. 2033 is the declaration of a policy by the Federal Government not now in effect, I earnestly and respectfully urge to your attention the desirability—yes, the necessity—of such a policy. Increasingly, as distances between our coast lines, and our gulf and river shore lines shrink, by reason of speed and frequency of rapid transportation and for other reasons as well, this proposed national policy aiding and assisting in the construction of publicly owned shores of the United States is not only wise and fundamentally sound—it has become an absolute necessity. Therefore, as a Member of this distinguished House, who lives in one of the coastal congressional districts, to wit, the Eighteenth District of California, and who has served about 15 years as president of the Recreation Commission at Long Beach and, therefore, has intimate knoweldge of the worthwhileness and the coastwise acquaintanceship with its essentiality and wisdom, I ask unanimous support of these two measures, H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033. The distinguished gentleman from Los Angeles [GORDON MCDONOUGH] is also a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and on the subcommittee thereof on beach erosion.

My great native State of California is well aware of the desirability and need of Federal cooperation, as may be evidenced by the resolution introduced by Assemblyman Middough, on April 19, 1945, at the California Legislature, at Sacramento. Assemblyman Middough, author of this resolution, is one of the three State assemblymen from the Eighteenth District of California. He also served for about 10 years on the Recreation Commission of the city of Long Beach, Calif., and knows whereof he speaks. I incorporate the text of this resolution for your specific attention.

Assembly Joint Resolution 38

Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to adopt H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 in furtherance of preventing beach erosion

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States two measures designed to aid in the protection of beaches along the shores of the United States, which measures will shortly be heard before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and

Whereas the first of these measures, H. R. 2032, authorizes general shore-line investigations, with a view to preventing shore erosion by waves and currents and to determining the most suitable methods for the protection, restoration, and development of bathing beaches, the cost of such investigations to be borne wholly by the United States; and

Whereas the second of these measures, H. R. 2033, authorizes Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property, declaring it to be the policy of the United States to assist in the construction, but not the maintenance, of works for the improvement and protection against erosion of the shores of the United States that are owned by States, municipalities or other political subdivisions, provided that the Federal contribution toward the construction of protective works shall not in any case exceed one-third of the total cost; and

Whereas the purposes sought to be accomplished by these measures are of particular interest to the coastal State of California, its political subdivisions, and its people in that thereby damage to public property may be prevented and healthful recreation may be promoted and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the investigation and protection of beaches; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and

the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to Mr. J. Spencer Smith, president of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J., and to Mr. George P. Larsen, executive secretary of the Shoreline Planning Association of California, Inc., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

Justice for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, Sunday, April 22, was made a day of prayer for Lithuania and peace at the cathedral of the archdiocese of Boston. The Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of the diocese of Boston, in his address to the large gathering, made a powerful plea for the freedom of Lithuania, and eloquently described her sufferings and present status.

I ask that the address delivered on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have assembled in this majestic cathedral to offer prayers to Almighty God for your beloved, sorrowing fatherland, Lithuania. In spite of treaties and friendly assurances the whole of Lithuania was occupied in June 1940 by the Russian Army. Then the mass deportation of the people to Siberia started. Tens of thousands of people were uprooted. During one year Lithuania suffered a total manpower loss of 65,000 persons.

On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia and her armies crossed into Lithuania. The Nazis were no better than the Communists. Many Lithuanians were sent to German concentration camps, others were murdered. In July 1944, the German armies were driven from Luthuania and the Soviet Army reentered the country. The result is well known. From all appearances Lithuania has been incorporated into the Soviet Union.

War is a terrible calamity and a harrowing experience, but in the midst of all its horrors there is the hope of a lasting peace. Only when we have gone through the fire of warfare can we fully evaluate the worth of peace. Your fatherland, however, finds itself in a peculiar situation. Even the end of the war will scarcely mean for her an end of her present agony. She is being occupied and subjugated by a power which recognized only the law of might. Recent and bitter experiences have taught Lithuania that the second return of the invader means further destruction, if not total absorption.

What are these bitter experiences?

Lithuania is being sovietized and is suffering from a famine, while thousands of her people have died from starvation. She is undergoing a most terrible process of extermination. More than 200,000 have been deported. The Soviet puppet president boasted over the radio that 83,000 Lithuanians voluntarily left for work in the Soviet Union.

She is being subjected to steady transformation according to Communist standards. The so-called reform is to be concluded by the end of this year. Demands are being made that nonparty officials be removed, for they have been sabotaging this work of absorption.

Lithuania is hungry. Her people are bloated from hunger, dying from hunger. The president of the Lithuanian Writers' Association, while discussing working conditions of writers, admitted that they are often hungry, yet he urged them to write about the Soviet Union, the achievements of the Red Army and other forms of propaganda. The immediate future is dark with foreboding. By an obvious act of aggression, without legal foundation or moral justification, Lithuania has temporarily, at least, lost her independence. It is no exaggeration to add that America is the only hope.

And Lithuania has every reason to look to America, for on July 23, 1940, during the Stalin-Hitler pact our State Department issued the following statement:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however, weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests. The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

In reading official reports of current peace discussions we are impressed by the great silence of the three great powers on Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Contrary to the protests of our Government 4 years ago, and to the assurances of Soviet authorities even before that time, the indications are that they will be absorbed, without their free and unfettered consent, in an alien system of government. The sympathy of all lovers of freedom goes out to them in their misery. We hope that when the final peace treaty is framed and approved, it will not be recorded that our country condoned the enslavement of these freedom-loving nations. We hope too that our Government will discharge its full responsibility in reestablishing all the liberated nations of Europe under genuine democratic regimes which will accord to all their citizens the full enjoyment of their human rights and open to them an era of prosperity. We entered this war to defend our democracy. It is now our solemn responsibility to use our full influence in safeguarding the freedom of all peoples.

The cause of your beloved fatherland, my dear Lithuanian friends, may appear hopeless. The difficulties may seem insurmountable. But remember that injustice, oppression, evil of any kind can thrive for a while and no longer. Justice and liberty eventually prevail. Probably God alone can save Lithuania. That is the reason why we are here in this Cathedral of the Holy Cross praying to the Almighty to save her from losing her identity among the nations of the world. Almighty God is our greatest hope. Lithuania is 85 percent Catholic. The late Pope Pius XI called it "Terra Mariae", the land of Mary. And the present sovereign pontiff, Pope Pius XII addressing the Lithuanian Minister to the Vatican said: "If, in the midst of present events, Christian nations are particularly entitled to our solicitude and our pastoral vigilance, our sons and daughters of Lithuania can understand how close we are to them. We are united with them also by our unshakable assurance of their fidelity to and confidence in God, whose all-powerful aid can open new roads to progress and prosperity in a pacified Europe, returned to a sense of justice, fraternity and its Christian vocation."

Since the triumph of evil can prevail for a while and no longer we pray today that Almighty God may hasten the time when Lithuania will be free again. Such prayers will not go unanswered. Liberty and justice, with God's will behind them, will eventually prevail.

Citizens' Dedication to a Lasting Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relating to our dedication to a lasting peace plan, made yesterday at a local observance in Washington.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The best memorial to any one of the present generation will be the recognition of his part in establishing a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. This was the prayer of President Truman in his message to our armed forces last week. This has been the prayer of President Roosevelt for 3 years. This was the prayer of President Lincoln 80 years ago. In such a memorial there is room for all who share in building it.

On November 5, 1943, the Senate of the United States established America's policy when it resolved that—

"The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Agreement to that policy had been given a few days before by the representatives of Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States.

This week the United Nations will meet in San Francisco to implement that policy. They will not produce a guaranty of peace, but they will seek to establish an important new mechanism of peace. In the words of Senator VANDENBERG, "The genius of the proposal agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks and to be considered at San Francisco is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius

lies in the organization of these specific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant, moral, and spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery."

To this mechanism the world must supply the infinite power of its faith in the commandments that "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and that "whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you do ye even so unto them."

Let us join hands with Lincoln, with Roosevelt, with Truman, and build the greatest of all memorials—the road to a just and lasting peace dedicated to the brotherhood of man.

Anniversary of Birth of Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 10, 1945, there was broadcast from Station WOL in Washington over the Mutual network, by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], a very brilliant and able address on the birthday of that great benefactor to mankind, Thomas A. Edison. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends and fellow countrymen, we are told in the first chapter of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said 'Let there be light' and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good."

Ever since that first birthday of light God has continued to give light to the world with ever-increasing brilliance and beauty. Thomas A. Edison, whose birthday we honor today, was one of God's great hands in giving this ever-increasing inheritance of light to mankind. For Thomas A. Edison lived with the infinite and the deep force which other men—good men—failed to so or to know. He tapped the deep seams of the earth's mysteries. He was attuned to the secret whisperings of the invisible. To him was committed the mastery of those mighty and magic powers reserved for the dominion of those blessed only with understanding almost divine.

The story of Thomas A. Edison is the story of the progress of civilization in recent decades. We can hardly think of the world without the living monuments of his greatness which are part and parcel of our daily lives. True, we have become so accustomed to them, that wonderful as they are, we give them no more than passing notice and recognition. Yet all around us those great things that Edison dreamed and created, are the things which make up the marvel of our modern life. And many things that we do not know about, begun by Thomas A. Edison, have flowered into creations which are helping us to victory in war and will ever enrich the lives of all people everywhere in peace.

Yet great as are the works of Thomas A. Edison, perpetual monuments to his honor, as they shall ever be Thomas Edison never created an electric light which has shown upon the earth with greater brilliance and beauty than his own noble character.

You will remember that this so-called genius and wizard, himself described genius as 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration. He taught the greatness of work. The kind of work he exhibited was creative and constructive work—work that did good and made the world better. He gave himself as a sacrifice unto his great aspirations for all of his life he was a man of unceasing work.

Nothing little, nothing petty, nothing selfish, nothing sordid was in the life of Thomas A. Edison. On the contrary his ideal was service. Truly he put service above self.

This year we celebrate 100 years of statehood for Florida. Our history runs back at least four and a quarter centuries. We have had our Ponce de Leon, our Osceola, our Andrew Jackson, our Dr. Corrie, and other great, but if the people, the school children, history, were to select our greatest Floridian, they would name the man who spent 40 of the most creative years of his life, including the last days, when from our foot stool he moved on up to join the greatest Inventor, they would name Thomas A. Edison, of Fort Myers, and all Florida.

Floridian, American, patriot, student, scientist, humanitarian, altruist, inventor, businessman, husband, father, benefactor of mankind—Thomas Alva Edison.

Eulogy of the Late President Roosevelt by D. D. Monroe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent address delivered on April 13 in eulogy of the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, by the Honorable D. D. Monroe, grand sire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, who lives in my State, at Clayton, N. Mex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prof. RAYMOND HUFF. I present Mayor Douglas Cornwall, who will introduce the speaker of the day.

Mayor CORNWALL. Professor Huff, ladies, and gentlemen, among other organizations President Roosevelt was for many years a member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. We have, living in Clayton, the executive head of that great international fraternity and we have asked him to deliver the eulogy on this occasion. I present to you the Honorable D. D. Monroe, grand sire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

Grand Sire MONROE. Mayor Cornwall, officials of Clayton and Union County, officers and members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the other fraternal societies, and churches of Clayton, members of the board of education, faculty, patrons, and students of the Clayton schools, my fellow citizens all, there are times when one feels inadequate to the performance or accomplishment of a particular thing in the manner or extent in which he desires it to be performed or accomplished. This morning I received a wire asking that I issue a statement of 150 words commenting upon our President as a member of the organization I represent. I found it very difficult to find words adequate to express what I wanted to say in that statement, and again now I feel inadequate to the occasion and incapable of finding, as I would like to do, words which will express and interpret the emotions all of us are experiencing.

The ceremonies of this hour reveal the utmost reach of human aspiration. Regardless of the extent of our successes or the greatness of our accomplishments, either as an individual, or as a group, or as a part of a great Nation, no accomplishment of human endeavor will ever rival the hope of immortality which we cherish here today.

I believe it was Carlyle who said that man carries beneath his hat a miniature theater wherein are enacted all of the great dramas of life, beginning and ending in eternity. The more we consider this statement, the more convinced we become of the truth of the theory that life is largely the result of one's own ideas and one's own determinations, and that to achieve immortality, one must, himself, be immortal at heart.

Today we pause to meditate upon the life and character of a great humanitarian, who has completed, only yesterday, that interim between the two great eternities—the great eternity of the past and the great eternity of the future. Just yesterday he was the most powerful executive in the world. Now, in just a few more hours, escorted by his family and a few close friends, his body will complete the journey back to the soil from which it came. Only the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will be left to those he loved and who loved him.

The death of President Roosevelt is a world calamity! However intimate the study of his life, however minute the scrutiny of his conduct and character, and performances, the conclusion is inescapable that he alone of all his contemporaries could have met the various responsibilities that had to be faithfully and capably discharged to guide our Nation through the succession of emergencies which have confronted us during the past decade.

It will be hard to fill his place. When a great tree crashes in the forest it leaves a space which is not filled again for many many years of time. There is little we can say or do here other than to pay our respects to his memory.

Memorial services are sometimes delinquencies in that they offer opportunity for delayed tributes and kind expressions which could have been applied to far greater encouragement if made during the lifetime and activities of the one memorialized. Yet it has been aptly stated that a tree is best measured after it has been cut down, and our purpose here is not so much to pay delayed tribute or to extoll virtues as it is to measure the leadership of our great President, that we may use them as the yardstick and pattern for our own conduct and character as we carry on our part in our own lives.

His life was characterized always by intense patriotism and devotion to duty. Always, until the last few moments of his life, he was to be found discharging efficiently and ably the important duties of his position. The world has been enriched because he has lived. His congenial disposition, his captivating personality, his genuine sincerity, endeared him not only to a grateful and appreciative Nation but indelibly enshrined his memory in the hearts and breasts of countless devoted friends and associates throughout the world. His was a sympa-

thetic and magnanimous nature, revered, respected, and admired by all who were privileged to know him intimately.

Franklin D. Roosevelt now takes his place beside such great Americans as Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson. Volumes will be written by the score, dealing with the life and events of this great President. Every conceivable angle of his career as a soldier, cabinet member, military strategist, diplomat, Chief Executive, and country gentleman will be arduously covered by masters of the pen and brush.

He now becomes more than a man. He becomes a living symbol, loved and venerated by noblemen of all nations. He will grow greater with the passing of the years. So long as nobleness, courage, truth, love of God and love of country are recognized as cardinal virtues, the name of Franklin Roosevelt will remain green in the hearts of many peoples of many lands.

Regardless of differences of opinion. Regardless of how we may have opposed him politically, Roosevelt, the man, commands the highest respect. Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief, commands the most ardent admiration. Roosevelt, the statesman, commands the everlasting gratitude of the people of the United States. It is in all three roles that he stands now in the light of the years, as the one man of his generation who could accomplish the task that was set for him, the task of advancing and maintaining the greatest of all nations.

The utility of President Roosevelt to his people will not terminate with his death. His philosophy will be institutionalized in manners and customs of thought and codes of laws. It is the duty of the heirs of his labors to strive to comprehend his purposes, and to protect and advance them.

Roosevelt never meant to be a great soldier or statesman. He preferred to be a man of peace and devote his capacities to peacetime pursuits. He does not belong to what we ordinarily term the galaxy of genius. He may not have been intellectually dazzling, like Hamilton, nor brilliantly learned, like Jefferson, nor overwhelmingly eloquent like Patrick Henry. Yet he had, in combination, a set of intellectual and moral qualities which lift him, head and shoulders, above any of these men. He lives, and will live, because what he did was for the exaltation of man, the enthronement of conscience, and the establishment of a government which recognizes all the governed. In spite of all adverse circumstances, he takes his place, as a great name, like unto the name of the greatest of men that are on the earth.

Mrs. Roosevelt, speaking for the family of the President, said yesterday: "I am more sorry for the people of the country and the world than I am for us." Thus she expressed a comprehension of the excruciating sorrow which all of us who are here feel deep down within us. President Roosevelt died on the eve of the greatest triumphs of his Nation. These words of mine are, I fully appreciate, inadequate to the occasion. I can only here repeat the words of Lincoln, that it is rather for us, the living, to here rededicate ourselves to the great cause for which he gave his last full measure of devotion. As we remember the glorious history of our Nation and realize the blessings of our citizenship, as we review the splendid record of our departed President, our visions should become clearer, our hearts throb with new life and enthusiasm, our purpose become strengthened and made more determined by our memory of him, of whom it may be said, paraphrasing the words of a poet whose name I do not now recall:

"He was a blend of mirth and sadness, smiles and tears,
A great knight errant of the pioneers.
An international hero, born of star and sod—
A citizen prince—a masterpiece of God!"

Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me in opposition to compulsory military service in peacetime, before the Massachusetts Women's Political Club—nonpartisan—in Boston, on Sunday, April 22.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peacetime conscription—compulsory military training for all the male youth of our country—in my opinion is objectionable whether it be viewed as a military device for promoting national security in the post-war world or be viewed as a social device for promoting racial betterment. It will do neither. It will not make for strength in arms. It will not make a better America. But on the contrary, it will work incalculable injury to the rising generation, while at the same time undermining the political and social structure of our Nation.

I have always favored a policy of preparedness and strong weapons of national defense. The lessons of the present war have strengthened my convictions that America in the future must needs maintain a large navy, a large air force, naval and air bases throughout the world, a large merchant marine, a professional mechanized army, stock piles of strategic materials, and a military establishment far larger than we had in the pre-Pearl Harbor years. But universal compulsory military training in peacetime is not a necessary ingredient. In my judgment, it is not the sound approach to the problem of post-war military manpower requirements. It does violence to the meaning of words to call military conscription the more democratic method of raising armed forces.

The permanent policy of peacetime conscription which Congress is now being pressed to adopt would make it compulsory for all able-bodied young men between the ages of 17 (or 18) to 21 years, to undergo a year of continuous military training under the exclusive control of the Army and Navy. After the year of training, the trainees would be enrolled as reservists in the land or naval forces for a period of 4 or 8 years and take such additional refresher training as may from time to time be prescribed by law.

Let it be clearly understood that this proposal has nothing to do with fighting the present war.

It is not intended to affect the operation of selective service.

It is not envisioned as a means of shortening the period of service of the men now under arms or who may be called to arms under selective service.

It is not designed as a method of providing an army of occupation after the defeat of Germany and Japan.

Our military experts do not claim that 12 months' military training is sufficient to make expert fighting men and officers in this present age of mechanized warfare. The year's training which is envisioned in the present proposal before Congress is, from the standpoint of the military experts, a compromise for reasons of political expediency. They would rather have it 2 years.

On the other hand, some civilian proponents of peacetime conscription are linking it with such matters as improving physical fitness, developing habits of character and discipline, indoctrinating in the democratic way of life, and removing illiteracy. We have in effect a proposal that is in one breath advocated as a military necessity and in the next breath is advocated as a scheme for improving the minds and conduct of youth, when in fact it will accomplish neither of these objectives.

But one thing is certain, namely, that purely military control over 18-year-old boys 24 hours a day for 12 months, with an intensive program of indoctrination would largely fix life outlooks. It does so in other countries, and it would here

Universal conscription of youth has long been the foundation stone of autocratic and militaristic European regimes which gave place in due course to dictatorships. It is alarming to contemplate that having fought a global war to rescue the world from dictators and ruthless military machines we are now asked to take this leaf out of the dictators' book and make compulsory military service a part of America's peacetime way of life. Under no circumstances should this subject be acted upon until the peace treaties are approved and the 10,000,000 or more in the military service return home and their views appraised.

The Jewish Problem and Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 18, William B. Ziff, a well-known author, publisher, and military and political strategist, delivered an address at the Hotel Astor, in New York City, at a meeting to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the creation of the Jewish Legion in World War No. 1. Since Mr. Ziff's New York address is an important contribution to a troublesome current world problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JEWISH PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago I returned from a visit to Europe, convinced that that continent was in the throes of violent social change which would show itself in chauvinist reaction of the blackest kind.

I wrote at that time that unless the Jews of Europe were taken out of there they would all be slaughtered under conditions unequalled on this earth since the bitter days when the ruffian hordes of the wild Cossack Chmielnicki ravaged eastern Europe.

A HOPELESS SITUATION

It was clear that in the old world at least the Jewish problem was a universal problem. More accurately, perhaps, it was not a Jewish problem at all but an anti-Semite problem. In any case it represented a pathological condition which only could grow hopelessly worse as it went along. This was a potentially desperate situation, which obviously

could not be cured by the use of such mild political poultices as pacts, agreements, or minority clauses, or the assurances embodied in so-called educational measures. The remedies of socialism and education were also to prove valueless. It was in Germany, the most highly socialized and best educated of all the western countries, that the lightening of hatred and cultural cannibalism struck first and hardest.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?

It was apparent that the only common-sense solution for this major problem was to allow the Jews to normalize their lives by becoming like other nations, rather than to flit through history as an apparition whose very identity was in question. The persecuted Jews of Europe who wished to live as nationals under a Jewish government could then do so. Those who wished to merge their identities with other peoples, and perhaps disappear as Jews altogether, also would be free to do so, relieved for the first time of those ghostlike conventions by which they were linked, in the popular judgment, with an alien and gypsy past.

JEWS EVERYWHERE AFFECTED

Thus, this became a question affecting not only the Jews who were persecuted, but in a certain sense, Jews everywhere. Its solution patently meant giving the Jewish people a home, a territorial base where Jews were in the majority and Jewish culture dominated. This would bear the same relation to Jews elsewhere as Italy or Ireland bear to their scattered sons and daughters, people whose interest in the motherland is purely a matter of sentimental and perhaps, remote concern.

FIGHTING AGAINST THEIR OWN INTERESTS

This reasoned and common-sense solution to the Jewish problem was naturally to encounter a certain amount of serious opposition, as the self-interest or prejudices of others became effected by it. Perhaps its most conspicuous foes were to be found among a great sector of the Jewish people themselves, many of whom were in mortal fear of having their own lives and attachments confused with the purposes of this movement. It was they, on the basis of one pet theory or another, who cried the loudest against the forthright solutions embodied in the law of the nations under the Palestine Mandate. And it is they, in consequence, who must bear much of the responsibility for the millions who died at Oswiecim, Treblinka and Majdanek. It was behind this powerful cover of influential anti-Zionist Jews that the Imperialistic politicians of Whitehall were able to carry out that great betrayal of the Jewish hope with which we now, unfortunately, must deal.

ZIONIST LEADERSHIP INADEQUATE

Zionist leaders were for the most part unworldly and inexperienced, a group of cloistered intellectuals whose souls had been captured by this great vision of a reborn Israel. Denied that support which should have been their first bulwark against the pressures of hostile British and Arab politicians, they were thrown into ignominious retreat.

Step by step the Jewish position under the mandate deteriorated. Palestine, which was to have been the homeland of the Jews, became the only area outside of Nazi Europe which was governed by a body of anti-Jewish laws. This result took place over a period when the physical position of European Jews was visibly becoming more and more precarious.

PROPHETIC WARNINGS IGNORED

Prophetic voices arose to warn both Jewry and the world as to the nature of the terrible crisis which was impending. One of them was that great and tragic figure, Vladimir Jabotinsky. Among others were the glorious Englishmen, Lord Wedgewood and Lord Strabolgi. Not least among these men was that noble English soldier, and my own dearly beloved friend, who sits with us tonight—Col. John Henry Patterson.

These men were ignored. In some cases they were berated and condemned, their motives impugned, often by whole sections of Jews themselves. Living through those times, I could not help but think: "Forgive them, Lord, they know not what they do."

THE PROBLEM CAN YET BE SOLVED

At this moment the curtain is rising on the last act of this terrible and forbidding drama. The hour of another and perhaps final decision is striking.

We cannot bring back to life the four million who died in the torture chambers of Poland. But this we can do: We can rescue the few who remain. We can solve, once and for all, this entire problem which has become an intolerable festering sore on the body of Europe, and which threatens from there to contaminate the world.

To accomplish that result at this late moment, must mean that at least the Jews themselves abandon all opposition to this program, and take a positive and vigorous interest in its success. Western Jewry can no longer shrug its shoulders and exclaim self-righteously: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

This is not now a fight for Zion alone but for international law and international morality, of which Zion is a symbol.

THE CRUCIAL TEST

If we cannot erect a new world order on the ashes of this suicidal conflict, an order based on the humanities, on large-scale social engineering, and on a settlement of all major problems at their source, then we have fought this war for nothing. We have fought it to enthrone greed and the gangsterism of pure applied power and self-aggrandizement.

For the statesmen who now talk of international charters, pledges, and laws, the test is clear: Let them adhere to the sacred pledges to which they are already bound. As long as they continue to honor these in the breach rather than in the observance, it is difficult to see how any value can be attached to any new commitments they may make. One cannot blow hot and cold on the matter of honor and good faith. They either exist, or they do not exist.

In the future world, every people must have the right to live and be secure. The Jews, too, must have this right. We cannot countenance an act by which they are to be despoiled of their patrimony by the predatory minions of a great power, covetous of their little inheritance.

As long as free men can speak forth boldly, we must make it our business to see that the infamous white paper which now restricts the immigration of Jews to Palestine is withdrawn, and that the present anti-Semitic regime which now disgraces that country, is smashed with it. Palestine must be thrown open to the Jews as a Jewish commonwealth, to which its children can return in accordance with their need or inclination.

MUST BE REPRESENTED AMONG UNITED NATIONS

Jewish Palestine now should be represented as one of the United Nations at the San Francisco conference. It has fought shoulder to shoulder with the other United Nations in what should be a common war for liberation. The little Jewish community of Palestine gave to the Allied Armies 70,000 soldiers, compared to 7,000 for the whole of Arabia, including Arab Palestine.

The Arab states who had previously made no secret of their pro-Axis sympathies, recently met in Cairo. At this last belated moment, they finally declared war on the Axis, for the frank purpose of sitting at the San Francisco Conference to protect their own interests there.

What a diabolic and scurvy trick of fate this is: Pro-Axis Arab kings, men who made no secret of their dislike for the United Nations, are now to sit with us as equals at San Francisco, to dispose perhaps of the affairs of Jewish Palestine, which will not be represented, and which has fought bravely at our side since the beginning.

Here is a situation on which all good men should become vocal, a travesty on the first elements of honor, morality, and common decency. It is a situation in which we who seek a peaceful and decent world order must speak first. It is our indignation which would spark the resistance that will put an end finally to this evil business.

PROMISES SHOULD BE TRANSLATED INTO ACTION

Perhaps as free citizens it is not too much for us to remind the President of the United States that at a moment when he was running for the distinguished office he now occupies, he made certain promises referring to the early establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. These assurances he acknowledged again a few days ago. They should be placed into effect now.

If there is any validity at all to the whole plan for international organization, our major contribution must be political morality. Its essence is the abandonment of the vicious rule of expediency and power politics, and the erection of a truly human and cooperative world. Such a world cannot exist unless among its autonomous units is one called by its ancient name Eretz Yisrael, the Land of Israel.

If this expectation is to be trampled underfoot; if it is to be buried with the mouldering bones of the countless Jewish dead of Europe—then the hopes of mankind, insofar as they are based on honor, justice, and social sanity, will lie buried with it.

Address of Associate Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday one of America's most distinguished citizens, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, at the Washington Monument Grounds, delivered an address which people everywhere should have an opportunity to read.

It is a touching and reasoned tribute to a great people and their fallen leader. It is a warning to the sleepy and selfish, but a hope and a goal for decent people throughout the world.

It is a statement that I should like to see in every home—an understanding that good people should all possess. It comes from one who had the confidence and affection of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the people he spoke for—had it because he earned and merited it. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of the address:

President Roosevelt's death has left the Nation he led shocked and grieving. People loved him. Millions who never had a chance to know him are mourning the loss of a personal friend. All over the country people knew his voice and his face just as well as they knew the members of their own family. His name was on a casualty list which entered every home in the land. It was as if

he belonged to your family and to mine as well.

But President Roosevelt didn't belong just to us. He belonged to all the people all over the world who thought of him as a leader. He belonged to those in the rice fields of China. He belonged to freedom-loving men who had been made slaves in Europe. They did not know him very well—not any better than many Americans knew him back in 1933, when he came into the White House amidst the break-down of our industrial production and our banking system. He said to us then that we had "nothing to fear but fear itself."

We listened—some doubtfully. And others—people who like statistics—said that was hardly a scientific plan for getting the country going again. But after a little while it turned out we were not afraid any more. And the wheels were starting to turn again. President Roosevelt's confidence had sort of reached around and gotten in the hearts of our people until, finally, it got into the machinery of our economy too.

Our system is a machine. But it is a machine that runs on human energy. President Roosevelt believed in the energy of America. He dedicated it to the welfare of the individual.

Look at what we have accomplished. He has won his bet with history because the men and women of America of all ranks, creeds, and races proved worthy of the confidence he placed in them.

All over the world today there are people like us here in America who need a chance to stop being afraid. We know they're like us, because they have sent us their brothers and cousins and sons for a hundred years to be our citizens. I do not believe the people who stayed behind are very different from the people who came over here. I expect that if they had a chance—a chance to talk freely, a chance to go ahead and do their own work without looking over their shoulders to see who was watching them, a chance to worship and to think as they please—I expect those people, led by the veterans of the underground, might make a pretty good thing out of old Europe even yet. They had come to think about President Roosevelt as we did in 1933. He was promising them a chance. The decent folks of other lands who will remake their countries do not want more than that. They don't want charity.

It seems to me that it is up to us to see that they get that chance. Not just for their sakes, but for our own. War in Europe doesn't stay in Europe. War in China doesn't stay in China. It takes our young men and young women. It asks every kind of sacrifice.

In a physical sense this war has not been hard on the ones who stayed at home. One of our bastions—Pearl Harbor—was bombed. The Japanese conquered and occupied the Philippines. And its people, who are our brothers and friends as well as our allies, know from cruel experience what enemy rule is like.

Next time we may all know what it is like. If the world is stupid and selfish and blind enough to let war come once again, it will not spare the United States. It will be our cities here at home that are turned into rubble, and our children who before they can talk learn to cringe at the sound of an airplane. And this great, rich, proud country—America—may then even know what starvation means.

No one man could prevent that. No one man could build a lasting peace. President Roosevelt knew that, probably better than any man living. He wasn't trying to do something for us. He was doing something with us, something that all of us agreed on and knew had to be done. It's a big job, the biggest the world has ever faced.

When Franklin Roosevelt died, we lost an engineer who knew that job intimately, and who had been working at it with all his heart and all his strength for years. But he did not die fearing that the job would not be done because he was gone. He knew it could be done by the rest of us, if we worked at it with as much patience, and conviction, and unselfishness as he used.

I am not going to say that if we fail we shall betray Franklin Roosevelt. I am sure he would say that if we fail, we shall betray ourselves. If we fail, we shall betray not what we admired and loved in President Roosevelt; we shall betray the part of ourselves that loved him—the great progressive strength of America that could produce such a leader and recognize him, and back him up through the hardest years of our national life.

After the last war we betrayed ourselves. As a friend recently told me, an empty room containing the personal belongings of his boy who died at Guadalcanal is a continuous reminder of that betrayal. Franklin Roosevelt had been a part of that war, too. He thought his responsibility did not end when the Germans surrendered and the boys who were still alive came home. Some people did. All of them were not in this country. Men in many nations, who should have known better, felt that the world could afford to go back to the kind of international anarchy that had made the First World War.

Franklin Roosevelt did not feel like that. He campaigned in 1920, with Governor Cox, for the program and ideals of Woodrow Wilson. Governor Cox and Franklin Roosevelt were beaten. I doubt if defeat mattered very much to them personally. What mattered to them, what they knew would soon matter to the rest of us, was that a chance for peace had been lost.

No one would say today that we can afford to go back to international anarchy. We know too well what it can bring. If there are any Americans who are still doubtful, the Army and the Navy and the marine corps can tell them. The Filipinos can tell them. The men who survived Bataan and the death march and the Japanese concentration camps can tell them.

All of us living today are responsible in some part for this part. If there is another war, that responsibility will come home to us in America just as fully as it came home to the English and the French and the Russians and the Chinese—just as fully as it is at last coming home to the Germans and the Japanese. We have one more chance.

If we really take our responsibility, we can make a peace that will last. That peace is essential if we really are to have a world in which we can live the kind of life we want to live right here at home. Our national aims in the end come right down to that.

Peace is not made once. In the last war, the Germans said that a treaty was nothing but a scrap of paper. And in terms of power politics, perhaps they were right. Peace is made not once but again and again, day after day, by work and responsibility and devotion as great as any that is asked of us in war.

One step will be taken next week in San Francisco. What matters is not what is said in the speeches at that Conference, important as they will be. What really matters is the determination of the people who will be watching that Conference from Omaha and Houston, Winnipeg and London, Moscow and Belgrade, Mexico City and Chungking.

A conference can draw up plans, and Prime Ministers and Presidents can sign treaties. What Franklin Roosevelt knew, what he fought for all the days of his life, was a peace that would be stronger than an empty treaty; a peace that would not be a scrap of paper; a peace made out of the tough hearts and the aspiring souls and the devotion of men.

His death has brought home to us with dramatic emphasis the tremendous, united effort we must make today and tomorrow and throughout the years if victory in peace is really won.

Ceiling Prices on Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution Z

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to permit the sale of North Dakota butter within ceiling prices on the basis of its true commercial value, and to cease unjust discrimination against butter made in the State of North Dakota

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That, whereas the creamery industry contributes materially to the aggregate economy of the State of North Dakota and is the only branch of agriculture in which practically all the processing of the products is carried out within the borders of the State; and whereas the Office of Price Administration has adopted a policy in dealing with our North Dakota creameries based on the erroneous conclusion that top-quality butter cannot be produced in North Dakota, and pursuant to said policy has classified North Dakota as a B grade butter State;

And whereas this action is doing irreparable harm to our dairy industry as a whole and particularly to the producer, as any action that compels creameries to market butter on the theory that Government grades are the sole and only basis of its commercial value will automatically reduce the price the creamery can pay to the producer in this State for butterfat; and whereas if damage actions by the Office of Price Administration succeed as against creameries which have bought and paid for butterfat to the producer on the theory that such butterfat could be and was processed into butter that could be lawfully sold for a price actually based on its real commercial value, within ceiling price limitations, and judgments for damages against said creameries are obtained, then and in that event, as to cooperative creameries, the damages will be collected from the pockets of the farmer producer, and as to independent creameries, the judgments will have to be collected out of the working capital, as in truth and in fact the prices that were paid to the farmer were based on the prices the creameries have received for the butter, and in truth and in fact, no damage has accrued to the consumer; and if the present program of the O. P. A. is carried out, no benefit can or will accrue to the consumer. The North Dakota producer will be materially damaged and the ultimate consumer will receive no benefit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of the O. P. A. in connection with the matters hereinbefore referred to, and to urge Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to issue such regulations as may be required to permit North Dakota creameries to sell North Dakota butter within ceiling prices on the basis of its

true commercial value, and that the present program of the O. P. A., based on alleged upgrading, be forthwith terminated; it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States; to Chester Bowles, Administrator; and to each of the North Dakota Members of Congress.

(NOTE.—The above concurrent resolution was passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate without any opposition by voice vote.)

Meat Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of meat shortages must be solved at once. I understand we have in this great country of ours more cattle now than at any other time in the history of our country. Our economic structure has been built upon supply and demand. Why cannot we get some of this meat? Why do we have false shortages? Why do we have the black market? Why do the butchers not have the necessary meat to sell their old-time customers?

Why does not the O. P. A. let this surplus come to legitimate markets? With a large supply of meat on the market the prices will go down and the black market will disappear. Does the O. P. A. want this to happen? Do they want low retail prices? If so, then act and allow the surplus to come to our retail stores throughout the country.

Sometimes, I wonder.

Under permission granted I am including a letter from a constituent.

THE BUFFALO STOCK YARDS,
Buffalo, N. Y., April 19, 1945.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
Representative, Forty-fourth New York District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am attaching hereto a resolution adopted by the American Stock Yards Association, as presented to the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration.

The resolution is self-explanatory, and any support that you can give to its adoption will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

W. L. MUSTARD.

Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Stock Yards Association on April 6, 1945

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has repeatedly stated that it had no intention of changing the normal movement of hogs through the usual marketing channels, and the Office of Price Administration has been repeatedly warned since its hog ceiling price set-up was announced that such price relationship would inevitably change the normal market movement of hogs; and

Whereas the present Office of Price Administration hog-price ceiling set-up is resulting in:

(a) Wasteful buying expense by packers;

(b) Increasing abuses in hog-buying operations;

(c) Increasing country slaughter of hogs, resulting in increased black-market operations;

(d) Increased country buying which has increased the cost of hogs to the packers with no increase to livestock producers, which has an inflationary effect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That as a practical and simple means of improving these situations we recommend to the Office of Price Administration that:

1. Fair and reasonable differentials be initiated at markets operating under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, sufficiently high, as compared to unsupervised buying points within the same area, to reestablish the normal market movement of hogs; and

2. That the failure of the Office of Price Administration to provide prompt and effective relief from the present intolerable conditions in hog marketing will result in the ever-increasing flow of livestock to black markets; and be it further

Resolved, That the above representations be aggressively presented to the proper Government officials and committees in Washington.

What the Situation Might Be if All the Proposed Levees Were Already Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Mr. C. F. Byrns which appeared in the Fort Smith Times Record, published at Fort Smith, Ark. The article appeared under date of April 18, 1945, and contains some useful evidence of the substantial qualities of river improvements designed and supervised by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The article is as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

WHAT THE SITUATION MIGHT BE IF ALL THE PROPOSED LEVEES WERE ALREADY BUILT

Let's imagine what the flood situation would be in the vicinity of Fort Smith if all the levees approved in the 1944 Flood Control Act had been in service when the flood came.

Many hundreds of families have moved out of the lowlands in Braden, Camp Creek, Moffett, and Crawford County bottoms within 25 miles of Fort Smith. Many hundreds of homes will be flooded, leaving damage which cannot be estimated in advance and can hardly be calculated when the flood is over. Thousands of acres of land will be covered by flood water with varying results, depending upon the length of time the water stays on and other factors which vary somewhat with every flood.

At least a hundred blocks of Fort Smith were vacated. A considerable section of Van Buren was flooded. The furniture factory district of Fort Smith was emptied of virtually everything movable.

The damage will be much less than it was in 1943, because people got out ahead of the flood with no argument and took with them all the valuables they could carry. Yet the damage will be heavy and hard to estimate accurately.

Suppose we had been able to get built all the levees the Corps of Engineers recommended as a result of the 1943 flood, which were authorized by Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act. What would be the picture?

The levees authorized in that act were designed by the Corps of Engineers to protect against a flood of the 1943 magnitude, assuming Fort Gibson Reservoir on the Grand River to be also in service. That assumption was logical, because Fort Gibson Reservoir had been authorized, the money to build it had been appropriated, and the engineers were ready to let construction contracts when war stopped its construction. It was not intended that the newly recommended levees should be built until the war emergency has passed. Fort Gibson Reservoir will be built as soon as materials and manpower are available. So the design was properly made to handle a flood with the Fort Gibson Reservoir in service.

The engineers say the Fort Gibson Reservoir plus the recommended levees would protect all the lands and the towns behind those levees from a flood as big as 1943, with a foot and a half of levee to spare in the rural areas and 3 feet in Fort Smith and Van Buren.

The present flood is almost as big as that of 1943. But it would give little anxiety if we had those levees and that one reservoir in service, insofar as the lands behind these levees are concerned. But protection for those lands and towns behind the levees is not enough. The levees would not protect all the lands which are damaged by such floods as these. They would protect only the lands whose average annual damage is sufficient to justify the cost of the protection. All the reservoirs recommended upstream will be needed to give us the type of protection we really need.

But, you may be thinking, what good are these levees, when levees go out in every flood? Since the heavy rains began a few weeks ago to push up the water levels in the White, the Black, the Ouachita, and the Red, getting around to the Arkansas in earnest only this past week, the papers have been full of stories about breaking levees. Some people think levees promise protection they do not deliver.

There is one fact about levee breaks that our people ought to understand and probably don't.

The levees that break were not built originally by the Corps of Engineers, but by levee districts. Every levee that has gone out in Arkansas this spring was a levee district project, not a Corps of Engineers project. Some of them had failed in previous floods, but in those instances they were rebuilt only to their original grade—not to the level the Corps of Engineers would have built them if they had been doing the designing.

It was true in 1943, it has been true in 1945. I cannot remember any time when it wasn't true. The levees the Corps of Engineers build stay built. The failures of levees are not the failures of the engineers.

A School for Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the Members of the House for granting unanimous consent for me to set forth certain information in regard to my proposal to establish a school for diplomats.

On the first day of the present session of Congress, I introduced H. R. 405,

to create and establish a Foreign Service Academy.

Copies of H. R. 408 were mailed by me to certain persons, firms, and corporations engaged in foreign commerce, to certain educators, to a few newspaper editors and to a few other persons, connected with the Government, as well as to other persons in private enterprise, with the request that they give me their opinion upon the proposal.

The response was most enthusiastic. Many of them went into great detail to discuss the necessity of a school for diplomats, in view of our expanding foreign policy, and quite a few of them offered detailed suggestions in regard to H. R. 408 and in regard to the operation of the proposed academy.

As a result of many suggestions which have been made to me, in regard to the proposal, I have decided to make some revision in the original bill and to reintroduce the proposal as revised. Consequently, I have revised the bill and have today introduced the revised bill in the House of Representatives.

The new bill is known as H. R. 2980.

I will greatly appreciate it if those of you who may read this extension of remarks would communicate with me and let me know whether you are in favor of establishing a school for diplomats.

The new bill, H. R. 2980, reads as follows:

A bill to create and establish a Foreign Service Institution

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "Foreign Service Institution Act of 1945."

CREATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTION

SEC. 2. There is hereby created and established a Foreign Service Institution of the United States, to be located in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., on a site to be selected by the State Department.

SEC. 3. The State Department shall acquire and provide such grounds and buildings as may be necessary for the purposes of this act. Such grounds may be acquired by purchase or by condemnation proceedings, and such buildings may be acquired by purchase, condemnation proceedings, or by construction. For such purposes, the Department of State is given the right to acquire property under the right of eminent domain and is hereby granted priorities equal to those of the Army and Navy for materials, supplies, space, and facilities.

SEC. 4. Until such permanent grounds, buildings, and facilities are provided, the Department of State is authorized to provide temporary facilities.

SEC. 5. An appropriation sufficient for the purposes herein set forth is hereby authorized to be made.

SEC. 6. The time for the opening of the said institution shall be designated by the State Department, at the earliest time which is feasible and practical, but in any event not later than January 1, 1947.

SUPERVISION AND GOVERNMENT OF INSTITUTION GENERALLY

SEC. 7. The supervision and charge of the institution shall be in the Department of State, under such officer or officers as the Secretary of State may assign to that duty.

SEC. 8. The officer named by the Secretary of State, and in his absence the next in rank shall have the immediate Government and command of the institution.

BOARD OF VISITORS

SEC. 9. The board of visitors to the Foreign Service Institution shall consist of one member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof, together with two distinguished members of the academic world and one representative respectively from agriculture, labor, commerce, industry, and the press to be selected by the Secretary of State and one representative from the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Interior, and the Tariff Commission, respectively, to be chosen by the heads of these Departments and agencies. The board will annually select its own chairman and secretary.

SEC. 10. It shall be the duty of the board of visitors to inquire into the work of the institution during the previous year and to render a report thereon to the Congress.

SEC. 11. The members of the board of visitors appointed, as herein provided, shall visit the Foreign Service Institution annually as a group at such time as the officer in charge of said institution shall appoint, and the members of said board may visit said institution together or separately as the said board may elect; and the members of the board shall be paid their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said board, and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest route.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 12. The Secretary of State shall appoint an advisory committee of the Foreign Service Institution, which shall consist of not to exceed five persons of distinction, who shall serve without pay. The members so appointed shall advise with the director of the institution from time to time and visit the institution as a group at least once during the academic year on the call of the officer in charge, for the purpose of discussing the subsequent year's program for the institution and advising the Secretary of State relative thereto. The actual expenses of the members of the advisory committee, while engaged in these duties, including their actual expense of travel, shall be defrayed under governmental travel regulation from any appropriation available for the authorized work of the Foreign Service Institution.

STAFF OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS

SEC. 13. The Secretary of State is authorized to employ at the Foreign Service Institution such staff as in his opinion, may be necessary for the administration of the institution and the proper instruction of the students; and individuals so employed shall receive such compensation for their services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State shall report to Congress each year the number of individuals so employed and the amount of compensation prescribed for each.

STUDENTS

SEC. 14. The number of students admitted to said institution, and the time for their admission, shall be determined by the State Department.

SEC. 15. The admission of students shall be determined by the Secretary of State, under rules and regulations to be promulgated by the State Department in accordance with the training requirements of the Foreign Service and the Foreign Service Reserve.

SEC. 16. Students shall be subject at all times to do duty in such places and on such service as the Secretary of State may direct.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF STUDENTS

SEC. 17. Each student shall receive quarters and subsistence and such other allowances as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of State.

COURSE OF INSTRUCTION

SEC. 18. The courses at the Foreign Service Institution shall be for such periods of time as the State Department may determine. The courses shall include such instruction, to be determined by the Secretary of State, as will best fit each student for his duties in the Foreign Service or the Foreign Service Reserve. The Institution may prescribe a special course of study and training at home or abroad for any student.

SEC. 19. Each student at the Institution who shall satisfactorily complete a course of instruction shall receive a certificate of competence.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 20. The Secretary of State is authorized, in his discretion, and subject to regulations to be established by him, to admit to the Institution, to receive instruction in courses regularly offered at the Institution, a limited number of private citizens of the United States employed or recommended by some person, firm, or corporation engaged in foreign commerce, provided such private citizen, so admitted, shall pay to the Institution such sums as will fully compensate for such privilege, and provided the admission of such special students shall not require any increase in the facilities or staff of the Institution.

SEC. 21. The Foreign Service Training Division of the Department of State is hereby transferred to the Foreign Service Institution, to be integrated into the Institution under rules to be prescribed by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 22. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and empowered to promulgate rules, not inconsistent with this act, for the supervision, government, and management of the Institution.

Feeding Savoys to the Cows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a clipping from the Daily Herald in England, dated February 26, 1945. The article is entitled "Feeding Savoys to the Cows":

FEEDING SAVOYS TO THE COWS

(By B. A. Steward)

East Anglian farmers, with hundreds of acres of cabbages and savoys, have almost given up all hope of finding a market for them. So some of them are turning their cows into the fields to eat up these unwanted crops.

On one Essex farm a big field of spring cabbages has already been ploughed in and the land prepared for the spring corn.

A grower with 70 acres of savoys on his hands—representing about 500 tons—tells me he is holding on till March, and then, if there is still no trade, folding them off with sheep.

One of the main difficulties is the lack of road transport. And prices of savoys on the farm have reached a record low level.

"They are always a gamble," said one farmer. "Last year I sold mine for £100 an acre; this year I have been glad to get £25 an acre for a 7-ton-an-acre crop."

RUSH TO SELL

One trouble, he added, is that everybody cuts and markets these savoys as soon as there is a rise in price. The market is therefore glutted and prices tumble again.

I have heard of one grower who sent 32½ hundredweight of savoys to Covent Garden a few weeks ago. After all deductions he received £1 3s. 3d.

Meanwhile spring sowing of corn goes on apace. On the lighter lands big acreages of peas and oats have been drilled during the past week.

Farmers on the heavy lands are still waiting for drying winds.

Mr. Speaker, apparently the English farmer is experiencing the same difficulties that the farmers have experienced in some sections of the United States—one of overproduction or bad distribution. Here is a farmer in England who is finding it necessary to turn his cattle and sheep into the cabbage patches because there is no sale of the cabbage.

Historical Documents of the Roosevelt Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Congress to a set of interesting and destined to become some of the most historic documents of the Roosevelt era. They are the original signatures, on three large sheets of parchment, of the majority of the men and women who enacted into law the most far-reaching social legislation ever to be placed on the statute books of this Republic. Never before in the history of the United States has such a collection of signatures been assembled. In the hands of the political and judicial leaders representing the three branches of the Government who signed these documents rested the welfare and the future of the American people during one of the greatest economic and political crises in our history.

Of the membership of the Seventy-third Congress there remains today only 98 Congressmen and 26 Senators of all political parties.

There are three documents in the set.

No. 1 contains the signatures of the Democratic membership of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third Congress, which was the original Congress of the New Deal administration. There are 250 signatures on this one document. Heading the list is the late Henry T. Rainey, who added, after signing his name, "Speaker of Representatives." Following this appears the signature of the late Joseph W. Byrns, who under his name wrote "Majority Leader." Byrns later succeeded Rainey as Speaker. Down in the center of the large document appears the signature of the late William B. Bankhead, who later became Speaker himself. Above this appears the signature of the present Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, but he was then merely a Member of the House as was JOHN MCCORMACK, now majority leader. Many of the House Members later became United States Senators and some Governors of their States. Edward W. Crump, political leader of Tennessee, who was then a Congressman, signed the document. Many other interesting political figures who were then in the House are among the signers.

No. 2 contains the signatures of 78 Members of the United States Senate. The late Key Pittman, President pro tempore, heads the roster. Among many Senators who have passed on appear the signatures of John Hamilton Lewis, Morris Sheppard, Gibbs McAdoo, Huey P. Long, Joseph T. Robinson, George W. Norris, James Couzens, and Royal S. Copeland.

Hugo Black, now of the Supreme Court, and James Byrnes, who was appointed to the High Tribunal, later resigned to become assistant to the late President Roosevelt, signed the document as Senators.

On the bottom of the Senate sheet is the Roosevelt Cabinet. Jim Farley signed the document with his famous green ink. Henry Wallace, now Secretary of Commerce, formerly Vice President, signed the document as Secretary of Agriculture. On the bottom of the Cabinet roster appears the signature of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. President Harry S. Truman affixed his signature as a Senator.

No. 3. On a third sheet are the signatures of the original Supreme Court at the beginning of the Roosevelt term. This was the famous Court which declared many New Deal laws unconstitutional and created one of the greatest political controversies in the history of the Republic. Chief Justice Hughes was the first to sign the document. Next comes the signatures of Van Deventer, Brandeis, Butler, Roberts, McReynolds, Sutherland, Stone, and Cardozo. At the top of this document is printed: "The Supreme Court of the United States during President Roosevelt's Administration," and so forth.

The collection was started soon after March 1933 and was completed in 1936 when it was signed by President Roosevelt in the White House. These signatures were secured by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, No. 15, Washington, D. C., and he will present the parchments to the Roosevelt Historical Library at Hyde Park, N. Y. There have been only a few newspaper stories written about these documents. Here they are:

[From the New York Times of June 24, 1934]

REELECT ROOSEVELT CLUB JOINED BY 275 IN CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Vice President Garner and 48 Democratic Senators, and Speaker Rainey and 225 Members of the House have joined a Reelect Roosevelt Club formed by Joseph Leib, original 1930 Roosevelt leader in Indiana.

All the Democratic Senate and House leaders, Senators GLASS, BYRD, and Copeland, together with Representative Cullen of New York and other Tammany members who opposed Mr. Roosevelt's nomination at Chicago, are among the charter members.

[From the Washington Times (Greatest Show on Earth column) of August 27, 1936]

It is a charter which contains the signatures of 225 Members of the House and 52 Senators. It contains the signatures of the men who voted for and put the New Deal legislation on the statute books. It is also valuable for the fact that it contains the supporting names of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, and Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, who changed their minds several times about the New Deal. Despite this, they are down there for Roosevelt.

[From the Washington Post of January 17, 1937]

Picture of the signatures and owner of the documents, on the bottom of the photo it says:

"A Roosevelt man since 1928, Joseph Leib, ardent Democrat, has the signatures of Democratic Senators and Representatives and the Cabinet members. And, finally, on December 31, President Roosevelt signed the document himself. Leib calls it a New Deal round-up. In reality it is a petition calling for President Roosevelt's return to the White House. Leib began work on the 'who's who' back in 1933."

Communism in America: How It's Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mathew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, has long been recognized as a labor statesman. He calls his punches and names people and things. In recent months he has engaged in rendering this Nation an outstanding service by pointing out just how the advocates of totalitarianism operate to control vital organizations in and out of government.

On April 5, 1945, the New York Journal had an interesting editorial on this subject. I incorporate it as part of my remarks:

COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, gave the Rotary Club of New York City—and all thoughtful Americans—something to ponder over when he spoke of the growing trend in the United States toward "totalitarianism in small but influential groups."

Not only in labor unions, in which the Communist brand of totalitarianism has conducted its most active and successful campaigns of infiltration, is this trend evident, said Mr. Woll.

"Chuch organizations and cultural bodies have adopted the ever-changing Communist party line," he warned.

"But most disquieting is the Communist penetration of conservative business groups.

"Interests close to some of our largest banking institutions have become fellow travelers, strange as it may sound."

This is something easily confirmed.

Communist cells have covertly and cunningly snuggled themselves, as small but influential minorities, into almost every American field of enterprise—particularly but by no means exclusively into the fields of labor, Government, and education.

They do this with deliberate purpose.

They know perfectly well, as Mr. Woll says, that opposed to them is "the allegiance of

the overwhelming percentage of the American people to the democratic way of life."

They know the American people are inclined to put too much reliance in the fact that the great majority of them do not believe in communism in America.

Too many Americans delude themselves that because acknowledged and avowed Communists are not numerous in the United States they are not dangerous.

Purposely, therefore, the Communist penetration makes no attempt to gain numerical superiority in the United States.

Instead, it is content to take over the key positions in American life—making no effort to win the majority of the members of wholesome and important American organizations to its views, seeking only to control them and speak for them and act in their name.

That is why so much communistic enterprise is carried on in the name of American labor, and of American education, and of American government, and even of American business, industry, and finance—when actually these vital fields of American enterprise are not communistic at all, and the vast majority of the people affiliated with organizations in those fields are not communistic.

The spread of totalitarianism in the United States and the great danger posed by it, as Mr. Woll says, is in "the gullibility with which some respectable sections of the community have accepted the brand of political and economic eyewash sold by the American Communists."

"American communism can thrive best in a totalitarian atmosphere," he said in his New York speech.

"Every move to concentrate greater power in the hands of government meets with a chorus of American Communist approval, and since it is generally agreed that big government is the enemy of economic voluntarism or free enterprise, and since communism in America today is completely behind the growing tendency toward total control over the Nation's industrial enterprise, those in business who soft-pedal communism are, in effect, digging their own graves."

Mr. Woll has effectively and courageously and honestly raised the storm warnings against the Communist disaster that impends in America.

But the American people have never been without honest and adequate warning of this disaster, which accounts for the imminence of the disaster.

It is not enough for America to hear such a voice as Mr. Woll has raised, but it must be heeded and acted upon, unless as he says we are to "find ourselves with military victory on our hands but unwittingly encumbered by the enemy's social philosophy."

More Than Coincidence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., of April 16, 1945.

MORE THAN COINCIDENCE?

"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away."

Can it be more than coincidence that the day on which Franklin D. Roosevelt died missed by only hours the birthday anniversary of Thomas Jefferson?

True, a wide expanse of years separated these two great Americans and world figures whose hearts and minds paramounted the common man and his rights of liberty and equality under the law. But surely the passing of the one almost on the natal day of the other serves to emphasize the divine way. Other great leaders followed Jefferson, Roosevelt one of them; and other great leaders will follow Roosevelt, one of whom may have been born on the very day of his demise.

So long as the world is and mankind needs leaders to fight their battles, these leaders will arise. Their ideals, their influence, their courage, their vision, and their strength of character are part of civilization's accumulation, each making the foundation and the fabric stronger and more enduring.

Jefferson's birthday anniversary brings Roosevelt's necrology. There is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them though tyrants and assailants of the dignity and the rights of the common man, with the spirit which burns within him, may.

"Blessed be the name of the Lord."

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Ancient Argument of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded the other day to receive a printed document, the title page of which reads as follows:

The St. Lawrence seaway power project, statement advocating permanent abandonment as economic fallacy by Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., 233 Broadway, April 1945, New York 7, N. Y.

This document was signed by G. E. Mace, manager, transportation bureau, 233 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y. I understand that my colleagues have been furnished with copies of this document, but in the event that it went in the wastebasket I want them to know about it so they can request another copy for perusal. This document is really worth reading. In my opinion no greater bunch of economic fallacy has ever been tied together with binder twine. After reading over the alleged arguments in this document I was reminded of that historic debate in 1941 between Mr. R. V. Fletcher, who was attorney for the Association of American Railroads, and Adolph Berle, who was Assistant Secretary of State. These two distinguished gentlemen took part in a radio discussion about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Mr. Fletcher said in substance that the development would be disastrous because it might permit the importation of foreign goods in the Mid-West area served by the Great Lakes. He thought that would be strictly bad. Mr. Berle's caustic reply was, "Oh, oh, wait a minute, do you advocate filling up New York harbor? Has the importation of foreign goods ruined the city of New York?" Of course, this was over the radio, but I think a doctor gave smelling salts and it was not necessary to call an undertaker to take care of the opponent of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

On some other occasion I expect to discuss rather fully the alleged arguments advanced by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc. Needless to say, they have opposed the St. Lawrence project and used the same stale arguments against it over a long period of years. They admit in their own document that they have used these same arguments ever since the year 1919.

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in commenting at this time is to call attention to hearings on the St. Lawrence project bill before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House of Representatives on July 15, 1941, when a representative of this association appeared before our committee and testified against the project. I refer to Mr. George H. McCaffrey, and in order that we may be 100-percent accurate the following is taken verbatim from the testimony:

Mr. PITTENGER. Your argument is, and your reason for not building this now is, because it will not be available for 8 or 4 years?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. That it will not help defense, but will hinder it.

Mr. PITTENGER. For 3 or 4 years?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. So that if you came before this committee 4 or 5 years from now you would be opposed to the project, or for it?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. I do not know; I would have to know the conditions.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did you appear before the Senate committee in 1934?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. I did not.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did you take any action on this matter at all?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. I did not; the association did.

* * * * *

Mr. MCCAFFREY. The reason given by Mr. Chandler, who was our representative then, was that it was economically an unsound proposition, particularly from the standpoint of navigation and shipping.

Mr. PITTENGER. And you believe that too, do you not?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Personally yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. And your association will go on believing it for a long time?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. No; I do not think that for a moment.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did you think you might change your mind 4 or 5 years from now?

Mr. MCCAFFREY. It will depend on what the conditions are at that time. (Pp. 1293–1297, hearings.)

Many of the statements made by Mr. McCaffrey to the Committee were in direct conflict with the testimony of Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, Maj. Gen. Thomas N. Robins, Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones and many other witnesses who testified on the need for the St. Lawrence project, both for defense and for peacetime purposes. By a vote of 17 to 8, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors approved the project at the conclusion of extended public hearings and in its favorable report on the bill rejected the arguments advanced by Mr. McCaffrey and other witnesses who had questioned the defense value of the project.

In response to my questions, Mr. McCaffrey said:

Mr. PITTENGER. Then you are willing to let that power go to waste?

Mr. McCAFFREY. Until such time as there is a sound plan for the development of it and for the distribution of it proposed.

Mr. PITTENGER. Can you suggest any better way of distributing this power than the plan which is proposed in this bill, which is a nonprofit plan for the benefit of the consumer?

Mr. McCAFFREY. Yes; I can suggest a better plan than they have there.

Mr. PITTENGER. What is it?

Mr. McCAFFREY. To develop it and sell it to the private utilities under the regulation of a public service commission.

Mr. PITTENGER. You would even go so far as to grant the New York utilities the opportunity to get a license from the legislature and then build a dam for themselves, and then exploit this power to their own profit at the expense of the consumers?

Mr. McCAFFREY. No, sir; develop it publicly and sell it at the bus bar, but do not go into a distribution system. (P. 1298, hearings.)

At the same hearings, before our committee, official representatives of the State of New York, charged by the Legislature with the development of the St. Lawrence River for power and navigation, took direct issue with the testimony of Mr. McCaffrey, who was the representative of this association.

Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, Lt. Gov. Charles Poletti, and the power authority of the State of New York testified that the St. Lawrence project was urgently needed, not only for the national defense and war production, but also for the benefit of the people of that area in time of peace. The substance of the testimony of these official representatives of the State was that the adoption of Mr. McCaffrey's plan would mean placing the St. Lawrence under the control of a single gigantic utility company in New York State, the Niagara Hudson Power Corporation, which could purchase the production of the publicly built plant on its own terms. It would call for the repeal of the Power Authority Act, as sustained by Republican and Democratic governors and legislatures of the State of New York over a period of 14 years. It would also run directly counter to the policy and practice pursued in the case of all the major power projects which have been constructed over that period under State ownership in South Carolina, Texas, Nebraska, and in other States, and under Federal ownership on the Colorado River, on the Columbia River, in the Tennessee Valley, and in other areas. It is fair to say that only a few spokesmen for private utilities have had the hardihood to suggest such a reversal in public policy and a return to the unrestrained private exploitation of natural resources of hydroelectric power in vogue a generation ago.

Thou Shalt Not Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post in which reference is made to the protest of the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, to legislation permitting sterilization.

This practice is a violation of the rights of man; a forerunner of mercy killings, which are nothing but legalized murders. Remember the command of God: "Thou shalt not kill."

The article follows:

ARCHBISHOP FIGHTS STERILIZATION BILL

Citing authorized sterilization of mentally deficient persons as "a clear-cut example of governmental encroachment on the rights of the individual," the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, today has asked District Commissioners to reject proposed sterilization laws.

Startled to learn of sterilization policies employed at Gallinger Hospital for the past 12 years, during which 16 women have undergone such operations, Archbishop Curley offered a three-point argument against legislation to legalize the activity: (1) It is a basic principle of sound reason as well as a fundamental tenet of Americanism that every human being has certain personal rights of which he may not be lawfully deprived; (2) legislation permitting sterilization of the feeble-minded betokens an approach to totalitarianism; (3) once a person holds that the State may sterilize at the discretion of the civil authorities he logically could hold that persons could be put to death by the State if their mental or physical conditions render them helpless burdens.

Settlement of Accounts of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I file herewith copy of H. R. 2941, the Doyle bill, introduced April 18, 1945, in this distinguished legislative body, and which bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of this bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. R. 2941

A bill to authorize the payment of the entire amount found due in the settlement of accounts of deceased members of the armed forces without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended by Public Law No. 465, Seventy-eighth Congress, which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, is amended to read as follows:

"Hereafter, in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men of the Army, where no demand is presented within 6 months from the date of the death of any such officer or enlisted man by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts, provided the father has not abandoned the support of his family, in which case to the mother alone; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before the settlement by the accounting officer."

SEC. 2. The paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes," approved May 27, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 34, sec. 941), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, is amended to read as follows:

"In the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, where no demand is presented within 6 months from the date of the death of any such officer or enlisted man by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if the decedent left no widow, or widow be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts, provided the father has not abandoned the support of his family, in which case to the mother alone; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers."

An Overdue Wage Adjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch:

AN OVERDUE WAGE ADJUSTMENT

Postal employees are still paid on the basis of permanent wage scales established many years ago. Some have received momentary benefit through a temporary cost-of-living bonus that expires June 30; aside from that,

their only offset to higher living costs consists of overtime pay, and that in many instances is computed under a paradoxical rule which actually fixes a lower rate for overtime than for regular hours worked.

Some two dozen bills were introduced in the last session of Congress to correct these various inequities. The only one to reach a vote was adopted unanimously in the House only to be defeated in the Senate through a last-minute point of order raised by BAILEY, of North Carolina. The new Burch bill, now ready for a vote in the House, would substitute a basic readjustment of wage scales throughout the department for the present hodgepodge of amendments to the act of 1925.

For years there has been a strong popular sentiment in favor of wage adjustments for postal employees. The Minnesota Legislature, in an action which reflects public opinion here, has memorialized Congress to support the current measure. The Burch bill should pass without delay, together with the companion Senate resolution.

Personal Loss Is Felt by All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dave Egan, from the Boston Record:

PERSONAL LOSS IS FELT BY ALL

(By Dave Egan)

It would be futile to attempt a sports column today, for, like millions of plain people the wide world over, I feel that I have lost a good friend.

The baby, though he has not yet arrived at the age of 2, knew this. He was in my arms, looking out the sunporch window and admiring the first tulip that had come along to join the jonquils. The unbelievable news came like the clap of doom from the mouth of the radio. He knew, with the great wisdom of all babies, that something had saddened and maybe even frightened his old man, and he offered the baby comfort of a hug and a kiss and a smile.

I tell this simple and personal anecdote, for this was the greatness of Franklin Roosevelt, that so many millions of persons, exactly like myself, felt a personal loss. They start by saying:

"I was just paying my check in the restaurant, and my wife was waiting for me, when a waitress asked me if I had heard the awful news. My wife broke down."

Yes, you were just paying your check or you were looking out the sunporch window or you were just sticking a fork into the potatoes to see whether or not they were cooked when you heard that the head of a Nation had died, and felt as you felt when your father had died.

FRIEND OF MEN WHO TOIL AND SWEAT

This man, they said, had climbed where only eagles climb. Look. He had climbed where eagles dare not and cannot climb, for this man had soared into the heart of humanity. Yellow men on the continent of Asia, black men in the fastnesses of Africa, men of all colors and all creeds in all lands mourn him today, for he was the friend of men who toil and men who sweat.

He had spoken imperishable words of single syllables on their behalf. He had given hope to submerged millions. He had placed the rights of a human being above the rights of an adding machine. He had set, as a goal, freedom from want and freedom from fear, and such words as those are imperishable. The Franklin Roosevelts of the world do not die. They live forever, in just such words as those.

Coolies in rice fields know what they mean. Colored athletes, in town to seek a tryout with our baseball teams, know what they mean. The son of the immigrant and the man with calluses on his hands know what they mean. Freedom from want, they chorus in many tongues, and all who ever have known the pinch of poverty join the chorus.

They ask for little, these millions. Just the security of a job; that's all. Just the dignity of a human being; that's all. Just a crust of bread and a bowl of milk; that's all. All they ask, in fact, is the right to hope that the world of their children will be a better and a kinder one than the world of their fathers, and it was Franklin Roosevelt who kindled that hope in millions of humble hearts.

PRESIDENT OF THE POOR MAN

That is why all of us who once knew or now know the definition of poverty and the utter hopelessness of it felt frightened. This man was our champion and our advocate, who fought for us and pleaded for us. There were many who could not understand why we voted for him three times and then four times, and would have continued to vote for him as often as he might run. But they would have understood, I think, if they ever had known hunger and ever had felt that the world was a jungle. They would have joined the rest of us, I think, and voted triumphantly for him, for he was the President of the poor man.

Now the staff on whom so many millions leaned has broken under the enormous weight. Our good friend has died, and his death has frightened us, for he was our sword and our shield. So there is nothing much that a man can say, but there is an old, old story that a man can tell.

"Do you," someone asked the Chaplain of the United States Senate, "pray for the Senators?"

"No," replied the chaplain, "I look at the Senators and pray for the country."

I feel now as the chaplain of a century ago did. I feel like praying for the United States of America.

Let Us Invite the New City of Peace to the New World—South Dakota Provides Ideal Location for Capital of World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 7 I addressed identical letters to Senator VANDENBERG and Congressman BLOOM asking them to extend the invitation of South Dakota to the delegates to the San Francisco Conference, inviting them to select the beautiful Black Hills of our State as the permanent peace capital of the world, once a new organization is created for the purpose of maintaining just and peaceful international relations. A copy of my letter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 9.

I have received replies from both of these good colleagues of ours, Mr. Speaker, and the invitation will be carried along to San Francisco. It is submitted in all seriousness and with the earnest hope that it will be accepted. The more one reflects upon the Black Hills of South Dakota as the logical home for a world organization to preserve peace, the more one is impressed by its appeal.

Governor M. Q. Sharpe of South Dakota on April 20 released a press statement putting the force of his office back of this invitation and setting forth some excellent reasons why it merits the acceptance of the determining officials. He has created a committee of prominent South Dakotans to emphasize the availability of South Dakota as the permanent capital of the new world organization.

Mr. Speaker, both the State of South Dakota and the Federal Government have spacious park areas in the mountainous section of our State. I am sure that either or both of these park areas could be made available to the extent necessary, without delay and without cost, for the purpose of developing the campus and buildings for this organization. This new organization will carry with it the hopes and the prayers of all the world and it will be greater and mightier and more important than any city now extant. Governor Sharpe's suggestion that the Capital of the World be a new city developed in its own time, in its own way, and with its own name is sound and sensible. The Black Hills of South Dakota provide an ideal site for the development and permanent growth of such a city of peace in the heart of America—in fact not far from its exact geographical center—where peace has always found such a ready haven and justice such a friendly home.

The statement by the Governor of South Dakota follows:

Our efforts will be conducted as official activities of the State of South Dakota and on the plane of having something useful to offer and wanting to be of service to the cause of permanent world peace, rather than an attempt to secure anything of commercial advantage to us.

Some of our general reasons which will be presented to the San Francisco Conference in support of our invitation to locate the new peace capital in South Dakota are:

1. Our country was the first to declare as a national policy and ever after to carry it out, an idea which was really the first basic step upward an eventual world organization for permanent peace: All men are created free and equal.

2. The history of our country shows without exception that all races, creeds, colors, nationalities are here accorded equality of rights under the law and equality of opportunity in economic and social affairs. So thoroughly have we been influenced by that idea that we have fought various wars to maintain it at home and abroad. Therefore, the United Nations would find here an environment where all believe in and practice an idea that must be one of the basic foundation stones of an organization for permanent world peace.

3. Our country and especially our State of South Dakota has always maintained the policy of complete separation of church and state and complete freedom of religion for all. Therefore, the Christians, the Buddhists,

the Mohammedans, and all other great religious movements of the world would find here an environment in which they can build their churches, temples, mosques, and practice their religion as they desire without interference by the state or objection by the people.

4. South Dakota is located around the geographic center of the North American Continent. It is about equidistant from both the Occident and the Orient. Delegates and visitors from Europe, Asia, and Africa could meet here free from the local influences and past history and with a feeling of freedom from the advantages of location to one or the other. It is the most convenient to all and the most impartial location available for all for a world capital.

5. In the Black Hills of South Dakota exist areas of impressive grandeur, majestic mountain peaks, beautiful rolling hill country covered with stately ponderosa pine and ornamental timber in profusion, interesting geological, flora, and fauna conditions of all kinds, mountain streams and lakes having no superiors anywhere for pure water supply, and an equable, energizing climate with never an extreme of heat or cold, wind or rain, all of them suitable and appropriate for a world capital.

6. In this same Black Hills area are numerous spacious sites for establishment of a world city which will be an international area not blanketed by the proximity of any other large city and where the world may construct from the virgin, primitive conditions existing, its own city in its own time, in its own way, and with its own name. Ample transportation and communication opportunities of all kinds exist.

South Dakota has much of real worth and use to offer in the way of natural facilities for what will be one of the essential requirements of the world organization, a site for its headquarters and capital.

M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor.

Issues of the 1946 Congressional Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Republican district convention at Lewistown, Mont., Monday, April 16, 1945:

Fellow Republicans, it is to me both a pleasure and an honor to appear before the delegates assembled here this afternoon to nominate a candidate for Congress to represent the Second District of Montana. What you do today will have a far-reaching influence upon the political trend of America. Indeed, you are firing what may be termed the opening gun of the 1946 congressional campaign, the outcome on which so much depends.

We may safely conclude that the 1946 campaign will be a prelude to a Republican victory in 1948, hence it is of the utmost importance that the Republicans in the Second District nominate a man who can and will win in June. Victory in the Second District will spur Republicans all over the land to greater efforts.

The issues are clear-cut. The New Deal must be uprooted and destroyed as something un-American, which is alien and repugnant to our philosophy of Government. It rests on class hatred, deficit spending, waste, and discrimination. The policy of scarcity which the New Deal has fostered since its inception has brought us to the brink of want and hunger, while their wasteful spending has brought us to the abyss of bankruptcy.

When the New Deal took over in 1933 the national debt was $22,000,000,000. Twelve years of New Deal misrule has increased that load to the staggering figure of almost three hundred billions, which is nearly the total wealth of America.

Not long ago Comptroller General Lindsay Warren told the Congress that the war is costing us 25 percent more than it should because of waste and squandering. When we consider we are spending more than all the other belligerent countries combined, that statement is not surprising, but it should arouse us to the urgent need for a change. We must have a change.

Huge New Deal spendings have necessitated the passage of 14 tax laws in 12 years, despite increased revenues, and each one greatly increased the tax burden of our people. The tax rates on both individuals and corporations are now so high as to discourage business expansion or the creation of the new industries so necessary to provide jobs for our returning veterans, and those engaged in war work. With present tax levels it is impossible for a young man or woman to start in business for themselves unless amply financed, and that road leads to serfdom.

To again open the door of opportunity to the youth of America shall and must be one of our earliest objectives, once the war is over.

On several occasions the late President Roosevelt referred to America as the arsenal of democracy. Indeed, it has been that and more in both World Wars. What made us the arsenal of democracy? It was the industrial plants, big and small, that are scattered over the length and breadth of the land. May I remind you that all these factories were made possible by the wise policy of protection, fostered and promoted by the Republican Party since the days of the immortal Lincoln. So I am not making an overstatement when I say it was the Republican policy of protection that on two historic emergencies saved the world from dictatorship and totalitarianism. More than that, the Republican policy of protection made us the greatest and most prosperous nation on earth. Protection made the full dinner pail a reality instead of a dream.

We recall how, following World War No. 1, imports from abroad, encouraged by the Underwood Free Trade Act, became so great and menacing it was necessary for the Congress to enact the so-called Emergency Tariff Act, which restored the American market to the American producer. History has a way of repeating itself.

Under the New Deal, tariff rates on nearly 1,200 items have been lowered by as much as 50 percent. Now, the administration is asking the Congress for authority to make an additional reduction of 50 percent on rates in effect January 1 last. That would mean a total reduction of 75 percent on many of the items referred to, most of which are agricultural. Do you want that?

To comply would in effect place the country on a free-trade basis, close the workshops of America, and pauperize our agriculture.

You gentlemen live in a great agricultural and mineral State. What would happen to your ranchers and farmers were beef, mutton, wool, and grains from all over the world allowed to take over the great American market, which is the only cash market in all the world? I need not tell you. However, I cannot forego reminding you sheepmen that we now have a 4 years' surplus of wool on hand which must be protected against ruinous competition from abroad if you are to stay in business. The same holds true with the grain raisers, and in a lesser degree with you cattlemen.

New Dealers would have us believe that tariffs breed wars and depressions. Let them tell that to the Hottentots, but not to intelligent Americans. We have learned, to our sorrow, that free trade can be as ruinous as war.

Now we know that the depression of the thirties was not due to the Hawley-Smoot tariff but rather was a direct result of the war the Democrats promised to keep us out of back in 1916. We also know that the depression came first to free-trade England, and later became world wide.

We believe in being good neighbors, but we do not believe in friendships that we have to buy at the expense of our own people. Such friendships are built on shifting sands and endure only so long as they are profitable to the other countries.

We are for world collaboration to maintain future peace. However, such cooperation should not be one-sided. Neither should it obligate us to rehabilitate and police the world once the war is over. As a corollary to collaboration we favor maintaining an Army, Navy, and Air Force that will give us complete security at home and earn for us the respect and consideration of all foreign nations.

When the treaty of peace is written it must not be said that we spent nearly three hundred billions, and sustained one million and more casualties merely to substitute Stalin for Hitler. We are not fighting against individuals so much as we are fighting against alien and repugnant idealogies.

All foreign commitments should be open and aboveboard. There should be no secret agreements secretly arrived at. Such commitments should be aboveboard and be based upon our national needs and security.

The American people, as a whole, condemn and repudiate the secret agreement made at Yalta, which would give to Great Britain six votes, Russia three, and to the United States only one vote in the Council that it is proposed to create for world supervision after the war.

America has contributed more matériel to the fighting of this war than all the other allied countries combined, in addition to arming twelve and one-half million men, and our men are fighting on all fronts. As a sovereign nation of one-hundred-and-thirty-odd million souls that has contributed so vitally to the war effort we are entitled to just as much voice and representation in any councils that may be set up as are any of our cobelligerents, and equal representation should be made a prerequisite to American participation.

In order that we may give to the world maximum help after the war it is necessary that we keep America free, strong, and prosperous. Unfortunately, in late years many of our American people have chosen to ignore the fundamental fact that all wealth comes from creative toil, and that there is no short cut to prosperity.

The system of Federal grants inaugurated by the New Deal has seriously undermined the morale of the American people in that it has encouraged them to look to Washington to do for them the things that they should do for themselves. This great and glorious country was not builded and made great by subsidies and grants, but rather through courage, self-reliance, and a sublime faith in the future of our common country. The builders of the great West did not sit around and wait for things to happen. They went out and created their opportunities.

Away with needless and wasteful bureaus that hamper business, stifle initiative, and rob us of our freedom. The Republican Party is pledged and dedicated to the repeal of all dictatorial laws and the abrogation of all

Presidential decrees and directives. Our aim is to restore fundamental and constitutional Americanism, law, order, full employment, and personal opportunity. We would also make every act of the Federal Government subject to judicial review.

Let me give you a short outline of what the Republican Party stands for:

1. An early peace with complete victory for the Allied Forces.

2. Fullest possible cooperation with our cobelligerents to preserve the future peace of the world, but no surrender of any part of the sovereignty which makes us a free and independent nation.

3. The maintenance of an Army, Navy, and Air Force strong enough to protect us against possible future aggression, and make the Stars and Stripes honored and respected throughout the world.

4. The retention of such Pacific islands as are necessary to our future national security.

5. Providing returned veteans with the same oppotunities that their fathers had.

6. The early revision of Federal taxes downwad, through the elimination of all wasteful and needless spending, and the abolition of all needless bureaus.

7. Encouraging expansion of present industries and creation of new ones to provide work for all at good pay.

8. A protective tariff that will be based on American cost of production. Without such protection the American farmer and laboring man cannot compete with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia for the home market which rightfully belongs to him.

9. Maintaining American standard of living and we pledge ourselves to the enactment of all legislation necessary to that end.

10. Sound money, the value of which will be permanent, and recognized and honored throughout the world.

11. A system of reciprocal trade relations that shall be confined to those crops, commodities, and articles of which we have an exportable surplus; and such crops, commodities, and articles which we need but cannot, or do not, ourselves produce. This has been a cardinal principle of the Republican Party since the days of McKinley and Blaine.

With such a platform the Republicans of America may face the future with confidence and assurance.

We will discard all false isms which seek to destroy those sound and immutable principles which have made America great, strong, and prosperous; there is no substitute for sound and tested principles of Americanism. There can be none.

The Republican Party is not unmindful of the fact that we are but custodians of a precious heritage, handed down from the glorious past, that must in turn be handed on to future generations virile and unchanged. We will continue in the future as in the past, the party of true Americanism, ever dedicated to the best interests of our glorious land and its great people.

McGregor Urges Repeal of Unfair Use Tax on Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1945, I introduced H. R. 2707, a bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats. This bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and I am asking that the membership of the House aid me in carefully analyzing this legislation and assisting me in having this discriminatory tax removed from our statute books.

Following is a letter I have sent to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, under date of April 20:

On March 21 I introduced H. R. 2707, which reads as follows:

"To terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(k) Termination of tax: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply with respect to any period after June 30, 1945.'"

I would respectfully ask that you advise me the earliest possible date on which this bill can be given consideration by your committee.

Under the present law a $5 Federal use tax is imposed on all motor vehicles. I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this is unfair and discriminatory. The use tax is not based upon a value of the motor vehicle or the number of miles traveled by that vehicle. For example, Mr. A may own an automobile worth $3,000 which has traveled 30,000 miles per year, and Mr. B may own an automobile worth $100 which travels 1,000 miles per year—yet both are forced to pay the same tax, namely, $5.

The records prove, Mr. Chairman, this law has never been enforced and I think you will find upon careful study that only approximately 65 to 75 percent pay this tax. I am of the opinion if we are going to have the tax, let us see that it is enforced and all pay it, or do away with the tax entirely.

A few days ago there appeared in two of the major newspapers of my District, editorials as follows:

From the Mount Vernon News (Republican), Mount Vernon, Ohio: "Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of the Seventeenth Ohio District, of which Knox County is a part, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to repeal the auto use tax. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate. Action by Congress should be favorable. There never has been any good reason why this tax should be maintained, and there is less now than when it was levied. It is not strictly enforced. Consequently some motorists buy their stamps annually and duly display them on the windshields of their cars, and some do not. Those who do not drive just as freely as those who have paid their tax, apparently without fear of detection and punishment. As far as that is concerned, it is preposterous to require a motorist to pay a use tax for the privilege of driving his car after he has paid the innumerable levies which are necessary before he can run it out of the garage."

From the Mansfield News-Journal (Democrat), Mansfield, Ohio: "Slow recognition of the unfairness of that Federal $5 automobile use tax is gradually developing in Congress, it appears, as three bills to abolish this tax have been introduced, including one by Congressman J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of this District. This tax is easily and widely evaded and doubt has been expressed by Secretary Morgenthau as to whether receipts from it are worth the cost of collection. Then, too, gasoline and tire shortages make such a tax obviously unfair, as an A card holder is required to pay the same tax as B and C card holders. And, frankly, many motorists—possibly a majority—feel no obligation to pay this tax, and, so far as can be learned, no effort to collect it has ever been made in this vicinity."

I believe these two editorials accurately and adequately give the opinions of the majority of the people of this Nation. Trusting that you will be able to see your way clear to give consideration to this legislation at the earliest possible date,

I am,

Respectfully yours,

J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

Peace—Have We Lost It Already?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of that important conference which is about to convene in San Francisco it is important to review briefly what has happened since the Yalta Conference. We ought not bury our heads in the sand merely for the sake of appeasement. Facts must be found and tough decisions made if we are to make any real effort to establish a just and lasting peace. A lasting peace, based on justice can only be attained in an atmosphere of frankness and honest dealing.

A pertinent article recently appeared in the March 10 issue of the Tablet, a Catholic weekly, published at Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. Speaker, I insert that article as a part of my remarks:

SHALL WE LOSE THE PEACE?

Successful armed warfare is slowly being supplanted by struggling diplomacy.

On two fronts the United States policy is being revealed.

In the Pacific, in the Philippines area, our policy is consistent, logical, straightforward, honest, and idealistic. The partnership we are exercising with the Filipinos is enlightened, open, and not imperialistic. The Philippines are really being liberated and the populace is not being encouraged to war of one against the other. We make no distinction; liberation was our goal and the Philippines will enjoy freedom. Rightists and leftists underground forces and those who have remained passive, all stand as one despite 3 years of occupation by the enemy.

In the European area the policy is different. Here, it would appear, we have jumped head first into the mire of power politics, imperialism, cynicism, secrecy, inconsistency and a lack of ideals. Enough has been learned of the Crimea Conference to make every peace lover wonder; what is to follow is even more a source of worry.

There were two issues—aside from the determination to defeat the common enemy, whose fate has already been sealed—upon which every American had his eyes at Yalta. They were: (1) the fate of Poland and the small nations and (2) the establishment of a general international organization to secure a permanent peace. What has been decided in these two fields?

1. (A) The war was commenced over the freedom of Poland. We entered, dedicated to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and we loudly proclaimed the "four freedoms" to the entire world. However, nearly one-half of Poland has been seized and given to one nation, and this in violation of oft-repeated pledges.

Poland, contrary to promises and elementary fairness, was not represented at Yalta and her people were not consulted as was pledged, on their fate and one nation of the Big Three joined in voting herself aggrandizement.

Heroic Poland was not even treated as well as a criminal, for the worst lawbreaker is given a trial, a hearing, an opportunity to state or defend a case.

True, Poland is offered a large part of Germany, a deal which the London Universe describes as follows:

"The Poles will be expected to incur the odium of stealing as much of other peoples' property as they can lay their hands on."

The Universe headline is: "Unconditional Surrender in the Crimea."

The hideous nature of the betrayal was revealed on Wednesday when Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden in the House of Commons said he had asked that the Poles who had defended their country be not persecuted by Russia and her puppet Lublin regime. This comes after Prime Minister Churchill is reported to have said the returning Polish soldiers would be subjected to "witch-hunting" and he offered British citizenship to those now fighting for the Allies outside of Poland, believing, no doubt, they would be sent to Siberia like many of their compatriots if they returned to their native land. And this in the name of democracy and at the hands of "liberators"!

(B) Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the small Baltic nations, have been given the brutal German U-boat formula of the last war, Spurlos Versenkt, "sunk without trace."

These three states are not historically, culturally, enthnographically or morally an integral part of Russia, yet they have been seized by the Soviet, and apparently without protest.

Both Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt in their addresses ignored them as though they never existed, and this notwithstanding that the Soviet on its own initiative, and voluntarily, recognized all three in 1920 and up until 1944 had treaties of non-aggression and neutrality with each. As late as October 31, 1939, Foreign Commissar Molotov, of Russia, said:

"We stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity and we declare that all nonsense about Sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs."

What was nonsense in 1939 has become a tragic reality. And England and the United States apparently have consented to what Sumner Welles, when Under Secretary of State, called "predatory activities" carried on "by the use of force" and which he denounced on behalf of the United States Government as intervention "in the domestic concerns of any sovereign state, however weak".

Alas, the first of Pope Pius XII's principles of peace has been violated, namely, "the will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed upon another."

The conscience of Winston Churchill was stirred fiercely in 1938 when he condemned Neville Chamberlain for the agreement at Munich. Said Mr. Churchill:

"All is over. Silent, mournful, abandoned, broken, Czechoslovakia recedes into darkness. She has suffered in every respect by her association with the western democracies."

For Czechoslovakia, substitute Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia; for Munich, substitute Yalta; for Chamberlain, substitute Churchill; for Hitler, substitute Stalin.

2. The new security organization starts off with the bitterness of the small nations and the fixed impression in the minds of many people that the seeds of future war have been planted in the fields of broken pledges and injustice.

What is more, the demand of Russia that millions of Germans, irrespective of war guilt, be sent to the Soviet as slave labor is bound to thwart future world peace and prosperity and to build enmity on injustice and cruelty.

The acceptance by other Allied Nations of this Asiatic viewpoint calls to mind that for 1,900 years nations and men have sought to keep Asiatic ideology and movements out of Europe and now, it is freely said, a few individuals have in a round table discussion thrown open the doors to influences which must create apprehension all over the world.

In published information on the future security association is the decision that any of the big five nations can veto action against itself thus the principal guaranty seems impotent. If the new organization had been in existence in 1930 neither Japan's seizure of Manchuria, nor Italy's seizure of Ethiopia, the German and Russian attack on Poland, nor the Soviet invasion of Finland could have been prevented for in each instance it was a "great" power which was guilty of aggression. Regretfully, too, many see no word of agreement on disarmament, indicating the emptiness of the propaganda that none of the United Nations could be an aggressor. Meanwhile peacetime compulsory training is advocated to protect us against a defeated and dismembered Germany and Japan.

On April 25, 1945, over 40 of the nations will assemble at San Francisco in the city named after the gentle, kindly, peaceful St. Francis.

Poland, the worst victim of the war, has not received an invitation because she has not yet expressed a desire to participate in the robbery of her country—and peace-loving and peace-experienced nations like Switzerland, Sweden. Portugal, Eire, etc., have not been invited.

What influence the ordinary people of the war—those who fight and die—will have at San Francisco we cannot say.

This, however, can be asserted. There is no reason why Americans cannot agitate at San Francisco for the fulfillment of the Atlantic charter and the "four freedoms" under which banner we marched to conflict and to ask that these ideals be invoked all over the world.

This can be done by organizations and individuals writing to the American delegates who will attend the conference asking them to sponsor principles which will lead to a just and lasting peace.

Let God Almighty whose name was barred at Yalta be invoked to guide humanity. Let democracy and open covenants rule. Throughout the land we can re-echo the cry we have heard so frequently—although not lately—that law must supplant force; that state tyranny, regimentation, seizure of small nations, enslavement of peoples, secret agreements without consulting the people affected are all part of the Nazi and Fascist ideology which our wealth and blood have been pledged to blot off the face of the earth.

Yes, we have sacrificed flesh and sweat, let us not sacrifice principle.

Faith must replace force; law, not the gun, must reign; freedom, not enslavement; liberty, not tyranny; man, not the state; God, not Belial, must rule.

We have won the war; let us not lose the peace.

Veterans' Hospital at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VAN BUREN, MO., *April 16, 1945.*

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I hear you are on the committee investigating veterans' hospitals. I can only speak for one, that is Jefferson Barracks, Mo. I have two boys honorably discharged from the Army. They were both at home last December. One was suddenly stricken and his brother said, "We have a good hospital and I will have him in there in a few hours."

He went to Van Burean and he and Brownie called the hospital and he was told to bring him on. Driving conditions were bad and they did not arrive until 2 o'clock a. m., but in a few hours they had operated on him and he did splendidly. His wife and the brother cannot find words to give the praise the hospital deserves. His wife was allowed to be with him all through the day and the brother could see him at night.

I wrote to General Hines telling him of the excellent treatment my boy had at Jefferson Barracks and had a personal letter of thanks from him.

I have told you in my own simple way of the treatment and courtesies shown my own boy.

Yours truly,

W. C. SAMPLES.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Floyd County (Ky.) Times:

AND ON THE OTHER SIDE

Last Thursday, as American soldiers crossed the last river barrier before Berlin, Franklin D. Roosevelt slipped silently out and across his last river.

Since that time, the great of the world, its newspapers, statesmen, rulers and military leaders, have joined in paying eloquent tribute to this great voyageur. So well have they spoken and written of the late President's major aims and achievements that comment by this newspaper, a week later, would be the retelling of an oft-told tale.

Permit us, then, to write of the comparatively little things in Franklin Roosevelt's life, the things which made him so beloved of all the little people of the earth.

To us, the outstanding achievement in the life of that other war-martyred President, the immortal Lincoln, was not his freeing of the slaves, noble as it was. What stands out in the Great Emancipator's career in our mind is the cumulative effect of all the little homely traits, all the tenderness and humanities that made him noble. His poignant letter to the widow Bixby, the solemn measure of his Gettysburg address, his mercy to soldiers condemned to die, his never-failing sense of humor, his unostentatiousness—these are among the things which add up to the Lincoln the people still love.

And so it is with Franklin Roosevelt.

We do not have to go to Teheran or to Yalta to see the great-souled man that left the world bereft only a few days ago. A trip down to Warm Springs, Ga., to the crippled children there whom he cheered with his gaiety, to whom he gave a new lease on life through his own courage and joyous heart in the face of the same disease which blighted

their young lives—there is found one bright facet of the many-sided Roosevelt personality.

Listen to a youngster there choke out his grief as the President's body left Warm Springs; hear the old Negro accordion player squeeze out the loved hymns the President had often had him play.

You do not have to read the Atlantic Charter to find the true Franklin Roosevelt.

Men, far back up the hollows, men deep in the slums muttered. Hope was gone. A Negro child cried for food. An immigrant woman complained that she could not buy medicine for her sick baby. Franklin Roosevelt heard them with ears attuned to the breathing of men and things down to earth.

"I can't get help here—I'll write the President," men threatened. And they did write. And the President answered. And things were done for such men.

Always the friendly heart, the loving spirit in these two martyred Presidents who, some day, will share history's brightest pages together. A story in homely humor by the one to shake from his shoulders the cloak of melancholy, a flash of wit from the other to shed his mounting load of care—both contributing to the world's laughter.

So very human—that is why humankind loved them.

It would be no small measure of consolation if those who cherish the memories of these two of this Nation's greatest could believe that Abraham Lincoln was waiting with outstretched hand on the other side of that last river—waiting for that kindred spirit, Franklin Roosevelt.

Addresses of President Sergio Osmeña

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 20, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD at this time two speeches delivered in Manila by President Sergio Osmeña of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

These are great speeches. Every American should read them not only because President Osmeña in words of stirring eloquence has voiced the hopes and patriotic sentiments of the Filipino people but because both of these great utterances are moved by a spirit of devotion and love of liberty which is dear to the heart of every true American.

These speeches for generations to come will be read and appreciated not only by millions of Filipino people who will thank him for his inspired leadership at this time but also by thoughtful Americans who will realize that he spoke as a chosen instrument for the purpose of keeping alive the fires of liberty in that far-off oriental country.

I commend both of these speeches to your thoughtful reading:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT SERGIO OSMEÑA ON THE OCCASION OF THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES IN MANILA, FEBRUARY 27, 1945

My fellow countrymen, this is an historic event in an historic city. From the time our Malay ancestors founded it more than eight centuries ago, colonial powers have fought for its conquest and domination. The Spaniards, the Dutch, the English, a Chinese pirate, our revolutionary fathers, have all vied with each other and shed blood for its possession; because its conquest has always meant the ultimate control of the entire archipelago. But today's event is different from any of the previous conquests and victories. The present victory of American arms is not a victory for power, control or domination, but a victory for freedom, democracy and independence.

In sharing with you today the exultation over the triumph of American arms, let us bow our heads in reverent memory of our sacred dead and the dead of our Allies, whose lives are the forfeit that these, our liberties, might be restored. We mourn the destruction of our once beautiful capital city of Manila and the murder of thousands of innocent people by the Japanese vandals, but this latest dastardly act of a savage enemy which has aroused the conscience of an outraged world should steel us to the firm resolve to continue the fight with every ounce of our strength until he shall have been completely vanquished.

To President Roosevelt who, in our grim days in Corregidor and Bataan, solemnly pledged to us in the name of the American people, the men and resources of the United States for our liberation, this day must be also a day of happiness over a pledge fulfilled. We shall be forever grateful to him and to the American people.

To General MacArthur this campaign has been a crusade. Friend and defender of our race he never lost faith in the spiritual strength of our people. In this crusade he is finishing the noble work begun by his illustrious father, Gen. Arthur MacArthur, who, on August 13, 1898, successfully led another American army to free Manila from a European power. Gen. Douglas MacArthur will go down in history not only for his signal military successes but also for consistently following truly democratic methods in dealing with Philippine civil affairs in areas retaken from the enemy. Instead of taking advantage of military operations to maintain military government over territories already recaptured, he has been faithful in his role as liberator in the truest American tradition. Thus, 48 hours after the occupation of Tacloban by the American forces, he turned over the functions of government to our Commonwealth. And now, in this city of Manila, he is following the same procedure.

To all the gallant members of the United States forces I bespeak the immeasurable indebtedness, the highest admiration, and the eternal gratitude of our people for their victorious accomplishments. They have come as brothers in arms enlisted in and dedicated to the sacred cause of restoring our liberties.

The time has come when the world should know that when our forces surrendered in Bataan and Corregidor resistance to the enemy was taken up by the people itself—resistance which was inarticulate and disorganized at its inception but which grew from day to day and from island to island, until it broke out into an open warfare against the enemy.

The fight against the enemy was truly a people's war because it counted with the wholehearted support of the masses. From the humble peasant to the barrio school teacher, from the volunteer guard to the women's auxiliary service units, from the loyal local official to the barrio folk—each and every one of these contributed his share in the great crusade for liberation.

The guerrillas knew that without the support of the civilian population, they could not survive. Whole towns and villages dared enemy reprisal to oppose the hated invader openly or give assistance to the underground movement. It is thus that the Filipino people drew the ire of the Japanese who has never followed the rules of civilized warfare. And now his conduct toward the civilian population has become more cruel and brutal, embittered as he is by his failure to enlist the support of the people. For this reason, it is imperative that the war against him be prosecuted all over the country relentlessly and with dispatch in order that the people's agony may not be prolonged and precious human life may be salvaged.

As I take over the civil functions of the Commonwealth government in our country, I cannot but pause in all humility, for guidance and inspiration before the figures of Jose Rizal for his patriotism, Andres Bonifacio for his indomitable courage, Apolinario Mabini for his far-sighted statesmanship, and Manuel L. Quezon for his devotion to the cause of independence.

That no time may be lost in the complete restoration of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the executive and judicial branches will be reestablished with utmost vigor and dispatch and I now call upon all the duly elected members of our congress who have remained steadfast in their allegiance to our government during the period of enemy occupation, to be in readiness to meet in Manila as soon as conditions permit for the reestablishment of the legislative branch.

I am fully cognizant that problems of great national significance must be faced immediately. The reestablishment of law and order in areas already liberated, the reopening of schools, the reorganization of the Government, both national and local, are among the complicated problems that have arisen as a consequence of enemy occupation. Foremost among these problems is that a relief and rehabilitation, the urgency of which cannot be overemphasized.

This war has not only caused untold misery and suffering to the individual; it has also brought about wanton destruction, economic dislocation and financial bankruptcy to the nation at large. Farms and industries have to be rehabilitated; banks and credit institutions have to be reopened; roads and bridges have to be repaired; schools and hospitals have to be rebuilt; destroyed and damaged properties, both public and private, have either to be rehabilitated or indemnified. The legitimate claim of the common laborer and of the small farmer who has lost his only work animal and nipa hut must be given preferential attention.

So that these manifold problems may be faced with promptness and energy I shall enlist the assistance of all those possessing not only proven ability and loyalty but also the confidence and trust of the people. In Leyte, as a recognition of the guerrillas who so valiantly fought the Japanese, I appointed Col. Ruperto Kangleon as the Acting Governor of that Province. Today I have the pleasure to announce that, as a tribute to the civilian elements of our country who resisted the enemy with courage and fortitude, I have chosen Gov. Tomas Confesor as the ranking member of my cabinet, appointing him Secretary of the Interior, and in charge of the reorganization of the city of Manila.

Our independence is a settled question. Our five decades of consistent struggles, in peace and war, have come to a definite, successful end. Our Government, when in exile, was considered as possessing the attributes of an independent Nation. We are one of the United Nations. We have President Roosevelt's word that when normal conditions have returned, law and order reestablished, and democratic processes restored, our request for the advancement of the date of independence will be granted. I hope this can be accomplished on August 13, 1945, the forty-seventh anniversary of the landing of the American forces in Manila. Thus Occupation Day will become Philippine Independence Day.

The gravity of our new problems demands the collective effort of all the people. The

Government cannot undertake to solve them alone. It needs the support of the people—a united people. More than ever before, now that the rapid advance of our forces is widening its field of action, the Government needs a united popular support to enable it to undertake successfully its tremendous tasks. Not by dissension and bickerings, not by resort to violence and lawlessness can we serve the national interest. It would be tragic indeed if at this last state of our crucial struggle for nationhood, we should fall apart and be divided against ourselves. We have had enough misfortunes and sufferings in this war; we cannot bear any more. To plunge ourselves into the abyss of disunion would be suicidal.

As the head of your duly constituted Government, I therefore appeal to you, my people, to remain united. I urge you to forget petty political differences, to bury the hatreds and animosities engendered by the struggle, to obey the rule of law, justice, and reason, and to remember that we all belong to one common country, our beloved Philippines. United we will continue assisting effectively in the successful prosecution of the war and in the rehabilitation of our country. United we can speedily achieve the full restoration of the constitutional processes of our Government, disrupted by the enemy. United and in close cooperation with the United States, we can win for ourselves and our children all the blessings of democracy, freedom, and security for which we have sacrificed so much in this titanic struggle against the brutal forces of tyranny and oppression.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT SERGIO OSMEÑA ON THE OCCASION OF THE INDUCTION INTO OFFICE OF THE MEMBERS OF HIS NEW CABINET AT MALACAÑAN, MARCH 8, 1945

My fellow countrymen, today I have inducted into office the members of my new cabinet. I wish to take advantage of this occasion when the heads of our various executive departments are installed in their posts to summarize in rough outline the developments of the war during the last 3 years as they affected the functioning of our Commonwealth Government and the carrying out of the independence program as agreed upon between the United States and the Philippines. I wish also to lay down the basic principles that will guide us as we reestablish the Commonwealth Government in our capital city.

I would like my coworkers in the government to always bear in mind two cardinal thoughts: First, That there should always be a close relationship between the people and their government, and to achieve this the government must take the people into its confidence. Second, that our government, as it is today, is the product of Philippine-American collaboration and that every effort should be exerted to maintain and foster closer relationship between the two peoples.

The Japanese occupation of the Philippines was not only a military invasion; it was also an ideological and cultural invasion. It was an attempt to foist on our people the invader's totalitarian ideas, his spirit of conquest and exploitation, his theories of the superiority of the Yamato race, his way of life.

The Filipinos soon found this out, and closing their ears to the alluring promises of the enemy, put up a brave and determined opposition. They continued the struggle even after organized military resistance, so gallantly maintained by American and Filipino soldiers, had to cease before the overwhelming numerical superiority of the enemy.

Now that the veil of secrecy imposed by military necessity surrounding the Philippines has been lifted, the outside world has obtained glimpses of the brave and heroic deeds of our guerrillas, the intrepid exponents of popular resistance. All honor to these soldiers of liberty who brilliantly continued the epic fight of the heroes of Bataan. It would be an error, however, to believe that the struggle was limited to the sphere of action of the guerrillas. The fountain springs were wider and deeper—they were in the very soul of the people itself. Coming from the ranks of the people, the guerrillas were in reality the people's army. For this reason, the enemy, inherently despotic and cruel, laid violent hands on the people. But in spite of his repressive measures, resistance persisted all over the country—on the plains as in the mountains, in the population centers as in the remote barrios, in the northernmost islands, in the southernmost tip of the country. It was the common will of the people; it was the entire nation, resolved to oppose at any cost, domination by the invader.

Throughout 3 long years of misery and suffering, of persecution and sacrifices, the Filipino people remained faithful to their ideals. The military control by the enemy in certain areas, especially near the coasts, did not for a moment break the absolute and complete moral resistance of the people through the length and breadth of the land.

To represent this will of the people and to act on their behalf abroad, and especially in the United States, the highest officials of your constitutional Government accepted the invitation of the President of the United States to evacuate Corregidor, transferring the seat of government to Washington. This step was authorized by an act of the national assembly. The Commonwealth officials realized that so long as we maintained the nucleus of the Commonwealth government abroad through its head, the President, and his cabinet, and by means of the emergency powers given him by the national assembly, our legal status under international law would not be changed, even if the enemy were able militarily to occupy all of the Philippine Territory. It is well known that mere military occupation of a Territory does not confer sovereign rights on the invading army. Thus, despite the Japanese invasion, our constitutional government was not only saved from destruction, but continued to function in Washington. It was officially recognized by the United States and the other 42 countries constituting the important international group known as the United Nations.

Working closely with the Government of the United States, your government, during its stay in that country, set before itself the following objectives:

1. To maintain the interest of the American people in the redemption of the Philippines as a sacred obligation which had been assumed by the United States:

2. To speed up the preparation of the necessary men, matériel, and plans for the reconquest of the Philippines;

3. To accelerate the advent of our independence;

4. To obtain adequate guaranties of the permanence of our political independence;

5. To work for our economic rehabilitation and stability as the material foundation of our independent structure.

All these objectives have been substantially achieved.

The successful landing of the liberating forces under the command of General MacArthur in Leyte, Mindoro, Lingayen, Zambales, Batangas, Bataan, and Corregidor, followed by the complete occupation of the city of Manila, represents a partial but eloquent reply to our appeals to the United States for aid in our redemption. The might of America which has destroyed in a few weeks all the power built up by Japan in years will continue to be employed until every vestige of the invasion has disappeared from our soil.

We were on the road to independence in accordance with the program agreed upon between the United States and the Philippines when Japan treacherously attacked us, bent on taking away that freedom from us. The leaders of your government have taken the necessary steps in the United States so that the realization of this independence program would not be delayed in spite of the war. Not only is the speedy realization of this program already assured, but we have obtained a new and important concession from the United States: the formal pledge that our independence will be guaranteed.

Having been a member during the last 20 years of various Philippine missions sent to the United States, I may say that during our negotiations for independence with the leaders of the two principal parties in the United States, we had never before found any interest among them in the protection of our independence, once granted. The best that we heard from our sympathizers was that since we wanted to be independent, and since independence had been promised, it would be given to us; but once given, our political connection with the United States would be definitely terminated. This aroused in the minds of many of us serious concern as to the future of our independent Philippines. Living in the Orient, surrounded by countries with enormous populations, some of them possessing the spirit of aggression and conquest, never in the past had we discovered a completely satisfactory answer to the question frequently addressed to us as to how we could assure the inviolability of our territory against aggression from a first-class power. It will be recalled in this connection that after our revolutions of 1896 and 1898, when our people succeeded in establishing a republican government in Malolos, the leading officials of that government opened negotiations with the United States for the independence of the Philippines under American protection. The proposal failed of acceptance. It will also be recalled that throughout the long period of our peaceful campaign for independence, all of our political parties always had in their platforms planks expressive of the desire of our people to obtain guaranties of our independence, after its concession by the sovereign power. In these platforms, especially in that of the Nationalist Party, the idea of the neutralization of the Philippines was repeatedly included.

On December 28, 1941, President Roosevelt promised that our independence would be established and protected. This was the first time that a high American official came out with the promise of protection after independence. This promise which gave great encouragement to our soldiers in Bataan, then fighting side by side with the Americans, was an important factor in our decision to transfer the seat of government to the United States to continue there the campaign for independence which seemed to be on the verge of defeat in the Philippines despite the loyalty and heroism of our people. With our reverses on the battlefield, the next phase would have to be fought in the field of diplomacy. If the leaders of the Commonwealth government had committed the grave error of placing themselves within the power of the enemy, not only would every semblance of constitutional government have disappeared, but such a step would have given rise in the United States to the belief that our people had renounced their long-desired independence, the real independence pledged by America, and had resigned themselves to the status of a mere vassal of the Japanese Empire.

I take great satisfaction in informing our people that the promise of independence with American protection made by President Roosevelt on December 28, 1941, which was reiterated by him on August 13, 1943, was given legislative sanction when Congress approved Senate Joint Resolution 93 and which became law on June 29, 1944. This joint resolution was introduced in the Congress of

the United States at our request. We gave it our firm support while it was under consideration by both Houses of Congress and it was finally approved without any party division. In fact, the vote in both Chambers was unanimous.

Thus, the protracted negotiations for our independence which were initiated by the first parliamentary mission to the United States in 1922 under the chairmanship of Manuel L. Quezon, at that time President of the Senate, were happily concluded under the authority of the government of the Commonwealth which functioned in Washington, D. C., from May 13, 1942, to October 3, 1944. The independence of which Rizal and all the other martyrs in our history dreamed, and for the realization of which the heroes of our revolutions gave their lives, will not only be a reality but there is now positive assurance that the blessings of liberty which that independence will bring shall be permanent and enduring.

Foreseeing the serious problems brought about by the ravages of war and the imperative need for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the country, your Commonwealth government urged the passage of the necessary legislation by the Congress of the United States. Such legislation was approved on June 29, 1944, and under its provisions a Filipino Rehabilitation Commission has been created, composed of nine Americans and nine Filipinos. It is now sitting in Washington and is investigating all the war damages and other rehabilitation needs for proper action, and is formulating plans for our future economic relations with the United States.

Among its most urgent tasks, which likewise is an inescapable duty of the Commonwealth government as a whole, is that of giving the utmost possible aid to the war victims in our country—the war veterans, especially those disabled or crippled; to the widows and orphans who have lost their loved ones in this holocaust of war and misery; to the lonely fathers and mothers who have sacrificed their beloved sons on the altar of freedom and democracy; to the peasant family who has lost its work animals and seen its productive fields devastated by the enemy; to the artisans and the factory workers who are now jobless and in want; to the homeless city dwellers, fire victims who now live in shambles and in crowded rooms unfit for human habitation; to the survivors of the wholesale massacres in Manila and other places in the Philippines.

In the realization of the ideal of independence guaranteed by the United States, the roots of which may be traced back to the glorious days of the Philippine Revolution, the attitude of the Filipinos in Bataan and throughout the whole country has been a vital factor. This is so because it has inaugurated a new era in Filipino-American relationship. It has sealed forever the ties of friendship and understanding binding the two peoples. In the American people it has created a permanent interest in our welfare, our freedom, and our security. Into our people it has infused a new spirit of high responsibility and it has strengthened the friendship and goodwill towards the United States. To the other democracies of the world this attitude has brought the conviction that the Filipino people have already come of age and as a result, these nations, anticipating the date of our independence, have treated the Philippines as an independent nation so that throughout our stay in Washington our representatives met the representatives of these nations on a basis of complete equality.

It is for this reason that in the first words I uttered upon my stepping on Philippine soil in Leyte in October 1944, I affirmed that we came not only to restore the functions of the government of the commonwealth which existed at the time of the Japanese attack on December 8, 1941, but to reestablish the Commonwealth government in a more advanced and progressive form. With this advanced status, we will enjoy new powers which we propose to exercise with care and with the welfare of our people as our sole guide. Obviously, this new situation imposes likewise wider responsibilities which we should shoulder without vacillation.

At this moment when we reestablish our government in the capital city of the Philippines, it is fitting that we make known the ideals and principles which will guide our actions.

We hereby reaffirm our faith in and adherence to the principles of freedom and democracy—a faith and an adherence born in the early days of our Malay history, nurtured by 400 years of western contact, consecrated by our revolutionary fathers, invigorated by the teachings of America, ratified in the constitutional processes of our commonwealth, and now sanctified by the blood of the thousands of Filipino martyrs and heroes of the present war.

We condemn the totalitarian ideology which the enemy has sought to impose on us under a government by self-constituted or God-chosen rulers, and we hereby reaffirm our devotion to the principle of popular sovereignty, of a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

We believe in the superiority of a responsible democracy, peaceful and law-abiding, loyal to its institutions and determined to fight for its way of life over a degenerate fascism and totalitarianism with its regimented lives, devoid of wills of their own.

We shall reestablish in our country a social and political system which is founded on mutual faith, honesty, and confidence and not on suspicion, corruption, and fear, and in which government officials and employees are not the masters of the people but their servants, acting as necessary instrumentalities through which the public good and the individual welfare may be advanced and safeguarded.

We denounce the barbarous doctrine of collective responsibility for individual acts under which thousands of innocent men and women have met their death.

We stand for the individual liberties, guaranteed by our Constitution, for the right of every man and woman to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We reject the theory of the existence of chosen or superior races; we hold to the self-evident truth that no particular race has a monopoly on the capacity for progress and self-government.

We believe in the universality of culture, and we shall seek the implements of progress in whatever source they may be found.

We reaffirm our faith in the principle of Philippine-American collaboration, its workability having been successfully tested both in peace and in war. This principle has been responsible for the unparalleled progress of our country during the last 46 years. It is a guarantee for the permanence of Christian civilization in the Orient.

We reiterate our adherence to the Atlantic Charter signed by the United Nations, of which we are one, for in that document they expressed their desire to effect no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed will of the people concerned, and "to respect the right of all peoples to chose the form of government under which they will live."

We believe in the efficacy of the principle of collective security as a guaranty of world peace and the best assurance of the settlement of international disputes not by the arbitrament of arms but by the processes of peace and justice. The legislation providing for the use, after the independence of the Philippines, by the United States of naval and air bases here for the mutual protection of the Philippines and the United States is a concrete example of the application of this principle. It is a mutual agreement designed not only for the protection of both nations but as a contribution to the peace of the Pacific region and the collective security of the nations of the world.

We stand for a new world free from want and fear, provided with greater safeguards for lasting peace and offering ample opportunities for friendly negotiations and judicial adjudication of international disputes and the self-development of nations. We are ready to take part, in close association with the United States, in any international pact based on justice and directed toward the organization and preservation of the peace of the world.

On these principles we take our stand.

By the miseries, the sufferings, and the sacrifices undergone by our people during their long night of captivity;

By the smoke that even now rises from our ravaged cities, towns, and villages;

By the blood, Filipino as well as American, which was poured out so unstintedly at Bataan and on Corregidor; in the hills of Leyte, the mountains and plains of Luzon, and all over the Philippines;

We call on the God of Nations to witness, for ourselves and for a people welded into one in the crucible of fire, this pledge to consecrate to the determined prosecution of this war until final victory is achieved, our lives, that which our fathers have bequeathed to us and without which life would be meaningless—our sacred honor.

Resolution Memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Federal Agencies Concerned To Amend S. F. A. W. Regulation 26 Effective April 1, 1945, To Eliminate Certain Restrictions Contained Therein With a View of Preventing Undue Hardship to the Consuming Public and Dealers in Solid Fuels in the State of Minnesota

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Federal agencies concerned to amend S. F. A. W. Regulation 26, effective April 1, 1945, to eliminate certain restrictions contained therein with a view of preventing undue hardship to the consuming public and dealers in solid fuel in the State of Minnesota.

Concurrent Resolution 13

A concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Federal agencies concerned to amend S. F. A. W. Regulation 26, effective April 1, 1945, to eliminate certain restrictions contained therein with a view of preventing undue hardship to the consuming public and dealers in solid fuel in the State of Minnesota.

Whereas on the 14th day of March, 1945, Solids Fuels Administrator for War, Harold L.

Ickes, issued a directive effective April 1, 1945, providing among other things that consumers be allotted only 80 percent of their normal annual yearly requirements of scarcer solid fuel from April 1, 1945 to March 31, 1946; that the retail dealer cannot deliver to a consumer more than 50 percent of his annual yearly normal requirements of solid fuel before August 31, 1945; that solid fuel dealers shall be required by the regulation to verify consumers' normal annual requirements of solid fuel; and that retail solid fuel dealers are frozen to old contracts which they previously served and are not permitted to accept any new business with schools, municipal buildings, and government agencies, and

Whereas 80 percent of the consumers' normal annual requirements is not sufficient solid fuel to properly insure sufficient heat and to assure healthful conditions during the long winter months encountered in Minnesota particularly in view of the fact that firewood is not available in sufficient quantities which can be used for heating purposes due to the fact that pulpwood is selling at such a high price; that labor is not sufficiently interested under the present conditions in cutting firewood; and

Whereas because of the severity of the weather conditions in the State of Minnesota causing bad road conditions due to snow, storms, and blockades, which prohibit wintertime deliveries and because of the necessity of providing fuel to the farms, rural schools, industry and homes, a sufficient stock must be on hand at the docks to provide enough fuel to supply this area and therefore the restriction that the retail dealer cannot deliver to a consumer more than 50 percent of his annual yearly normal requirements of solid fuel before August 31, 1945, is not only impractical but is bound to cause severe hardship; and

Whereas the provision to verify consumers' normal annual requirements of solid fuel by the dealer will entail such tremendous amount of detail and office work that it will be practically impossible under the present wartime conditions to secure sufficient help to properly check and provide this information and will add to the already high cost and burden of handling distribution of solid fuel in Minnesota; and

Whereas the provision contained in S. F. A. W. Regulation 26 prohibits dealers from contracting to supply new patrons during the heating season from April 1, 1945, to March 31, 1946, is unconstitutional and by the provisions of the regulation creates an abnormal distribution of solid fuels in the State of Minnesota and places certain consumers in a position where they may not be able to obtain solid fuel without great inconvenience and unnecessary delay; and

Whereas the provisions contained in the regulation have been given serious study and consideration it appears obvious to those who are acquainted with the weather conditions in Minnesota, the manpower shortage, the lack of equipment, and other burdensome wartime delivery restrictions will make the regulation impossible of performance without creating great hardship and suffering on the part of the people. Compliance with S. F. A. W. Regulation 26 will create a shortage which will result in severe hardships on the consuming public and retail coal dealers creating a back-log of solid fuel orders during the winter months; and

Whereas Minnesota receives nearly all of its coal requirements via the Great Lakes; whereas it is necessary to obtain an adequate supply at the docks before navigation closes; whereas any deficiency in movement via the Great Lakes cannot be supplemented except via all-rail movement; whereas facilities for all-rail movement are already overburdened and cannot be relied upon to bring coal into Montant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to Harold L. Ickes, Solid Fuels Administrator for War, and to each Member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress, with the request that S. F. A. W. Regulation 26 be amended to permit sufficient coal to move via the Great Lakes docks during the navigation season and to eliminate the provision pertaining to 80 percent of the solid fuel allocated to the coal-consuming public, and by striking out dealers' verification of consumers' requirements, and to eliminate the restriction providing that only 50 percent of the consumers' normal annual requirements can be delivered before August 31, 1945, with a view of eliminating the plight of the solid fuel industry and the consequent impairment of the solid fuel supply for Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

Approved by the house of representatives, the 16th day of April 1945.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved by the senate, the 17th day of April 1945.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed April 19, 1945.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Such Legislation as May Be Necessary To Provide for Additional Hospital Beds in the State of Minnesota for Disabled War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to provide for additional hospital beds in the State of Minnesota for disabled war veterans:

Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to provide for additional hospital beds in the State of Minnesota for disabled war veterans

Whereas there are at the present time approximately 2,400 beds in the State of Minnesota which are available for injured and disabled war veterans, and

Whereas this number is entirely inadequate and there is an acute shortage in this State of beds for this purpose, and

Whereas there is at the present time a waiting list of about 800 such veterans who are in need of hospitalization, and

Whereas the number of returning veterans who need hospital treatment is increasing daily and will greatly increase in the immediate future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, (the House of Representatives concurring), That the State memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to provide in the immediate future for additional beds for disabled veterans in the State of Minnesota; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

C. ELMER JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE C. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 23d day of March in the year of our Lord 1945.

HY TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 7th day of April in the year of our Lord 1945.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved, April 12, 1945.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed April 12, 1945.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

"My Friend"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by George W. Ward, of Washington, D. C., formerly from Greenville, S. C.:

"MY FRIEND"

My Friend! yes he is with us yet,
Though we can't see him through eyes still wet.
His body is laid in Hyde Park sod,
But his soul is at home with God.

Yes, a world weeps for his passing;
But his spirit will e'er be lasting,
For his love was from top on down,
Loving the common man where e'er found.

Ah! My friend, words now immortalized,
By him who the world would so liberalized,
Lifting man to a higher plane,
And planning world peace e'er to remain.

Following Christ who came with a plan,
Saying, "Peace on Earth, good will to men".
Was the supreme hope of our President,
Who worked and worked with that intent.

He traveled far, he traveled near,
Willing to go most anywhere,
For the joy of peace and all its worth,
Planting fellowship throughout the earth.

Though maimed in body and denied of walk,
He inspired the world with fireside talk;
Speaking fatherly in family appeal,
Encouraging righteousness its power to weal.

Why this world citizen and fallen hero,
Was taken now we're at a loss to know.
But he'll live on and on in the hearts of men,
Inspiring them to an upward trend.

This handsome man of human touch supreme,
And filled with a humanitarian theme,
Has left a world much more inspired,
By a sacrificial life to be admired.

Loved and honored by those of foreign lands,
As well as by his own fellow countryman;
For he sought a universal brotherhood,
That nations be loved and understood.

Mourned by both friend foe,
For since he was called and had to go,
They now can better understand,
His aim was ever the uplift of man.

Crowds, crowds viewed the bier along the street,
Of him they so oft did victoriously greet,
Knowing as he traveled along the highway of life.
He rejoiced in aiding those burdened with strife.

Like Moses of whom in the Bible we are told,
He was denied reaching the cherished goal,
But was permitted sure victory to see,
Before being called by God with him to be.

So with eyes filled with sad tears,
We glance down through coming years;
Thanking God, Franklin D. did a pathway blaze,
That we will not enter peace talk in amaze.

Now from the quiet and stillness of the hour,
Though burdened with grief for our friend of power,
We must lift the saber left by his passing so,
And march on as he would have us go.

GEORGE W. WARD.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the U. S. D. A. Club of Dallas, Tex., composed of the 800 employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Dallas, at a meeting held on April 18, 1945, adopted a memorial on the death of our late President. The members of that organization are to be commended on this timely and appropriate resolution. Feeling that this resolution should be preserved I am herewith placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IN MEMORIAL

Whereas it has pleased God in His infinite wisdom to remove from our midst the immortal spirit of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas he was greatly beloved for his humanitarian acts and his qualities of leadership in a troubled world; and

Whereas his espousal of the cause of the common man and his untiring fight in behalf of social, political, and economic justice rekindled the fires of brotherhood in America, and his great wisdom and his fearless action directed our way through darkest depression and bloodiest war; and

Whereas he relayed to us from the Divine the belief that universal peace is entirely possible and that a society of nations is the hope for such peace and boldly courted the friendship of all liberty-loving peoples everywhere to lay the foundations for such a society of nations; and

Whereas his name will be esteemed throughout all ages, world without end; and

Whereas we, the 800 members of the United States Department of Agriculture Club of Dallas, Tex., seek to make known our heartfelt grief and our sincere appreciation of what he has meant to humanity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby recognize our great debt to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-second President of the United States of America—world citizen, leader immortal—and further, that we inscribe these things in our hearts, and these words in the minutes of our organization, and that we transmit a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Roosevelt; to the President, Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard; and to each member of the Texas delegation in the Congress.

Submitted by William F. Farrell, Chairman; E. Lee Ozbirn; W. E. Farwell; Meno Schoenbach; William R. Thompson; Latham White; E. B. Johnson; Tom W. Dawsey, Resolutions Committee, U. S. D. A. Club of Dallas, Texas.

Statement of the United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein a statement issued by the Maritime Commission in answer to, and comment on, an article which appeared in the Atlantic Weekly entitled "What Shall We Do With the Ships?" written by Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, former Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration.

I desire particularly to refer to a very complete answer to Mr. Douglas' article which appeared in the Army and Navy Journal and was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from California, Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, on April 19, 1945. This will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD at page 1826. The statement of the Maritime Commission follows:

Lewis W. Douglas, former Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, has published in the current issue of the magazine Atlantic Monthly an article entitled "What Shall We Do With the Ships?"

This article has been widely quoted and discussed in other magazines and newspapers. Because of Mr. Douglas' former connection with wartime shipping, most of the writers have naturally assumed that his figures are correct. However, Mr. Douglas' official duties had no direct connection with the specialized subjects he presumes to discuss.

Many of his statements are in error, and because of the importance of the entire subject, the Maritime Commission believes the record shall be set straight, insofar as several of the author's principal errors are concerned.

He writes that if the United States were to have a postwar merchant fleet of 20,000,000 deadweight tons, it would cost the taxpayers an operating subsidy of $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 annually. This figure is grossly in error. The maximum operating subsidy paid before the war was $13,000,000 in 1 year. If our foreign-trade fleet were doubled after the war, it would be absurd to assume that the operating subsidy would exceed $30,000,000 maximum.

Mr. Douglas failed to mention in his article that there is a recapture clause in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 under which the Government will have returned to it over a period of years possibly as much as 50 percent of the operating subsidies paid. The more business done by the merchant fleet the greater the recapture.

Mr. Douglas also fails to explain to his readers that only a small proportion of the merchant marine is subsidized. Coastwise, intercoastal, and lake shipping, which constitute the bulk of the fleet, are not subsidized at all. Tankers are not eligible for subsidy, and only a part of the foreign-trade fleet recives such benefits, and these are paid primarily to maintain the wage scales and living standards of American seamen against the lower wages and living standards of foreign seamen.

In attempting to minimize the merchant marine's activities before the war, Mr. Douglas states that we carried only 20 percent of our foreign trade. The correct figure is 26 percent. The postwar goal is about 50 percent.

Mr. Douglas characterizes the Liberty ship as the "slow 10-knot tramp." This ship, designed for 11 knots, has consistently done better than 11¼ knots, and has been the bridge over which a very large portion of the arms, ammunition, tanks, planes, fuel, food, and other supplies have moved to our armies and the armies of our allies throughout the world.

The American merchant marine is generally considered to consist of dry cargo vessels, tankers, combination ships and passenger ships. Mr. Douglas, however, late in his article, makes the passing comment that he has been referring only to dry cargo ships. Does he mean, then, that his hypothetical fleet of 20,000,000 deadweight tons shall consist exclusively of dry cargo vessels? If so, why?

Similarly, does his reference to the carriage of 20 percent of our foreign trade refer only to dry cargo?. If so, why? Foreign trade is not confined to dry cargo.

In discussing the British maritime position, Mr. Douglas uses obsolete figures (November 1944 in one case, and December 1943 in another). The result is to give a false impression of British losses and her recovery from a substantial amount of those losses.

Maintenance of a strong and vigorous merchant fleet as a naval auxiliary in war and for the transportation of foreign trade in peace is of basic importance to the defense and the economy of the United States. It is a subject which should be thoroughly discussed and understood by every citizen. Opinions may differ on this problem as they do on most others. But they should rest upon facts and not upon error.

International Air Transportation To Be Great Industry in Postwar Period, Says W. A. M. Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention excerpts from a speech on International Air Transportation by William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. It is most informative material, and I include

it at this point, as it appeared in the American Aviation Daily for April 20:

BURDEN PREDICTS FIFTY MILLION A YEAR NORTH ATLANTIC AIR-LINE BUSINESS

Conservative estimates indicate that 6 to 7 years after the war the total revenues of United States air lines in international service may amount to $126,000,000 an amount equal to the entire domestic industry today, William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, said in an address before the Bond Club of Chicago today.

"A conservative estimate is that within 5 or 6 years air transport will have diverted 50 percent of first-class passenger traffic from the steamships and created an amount of new air travel equivalent to the amount diverted," Burden said.

"This would mean forty or fifty millions a year of passenger business for American airlines on the North Atlantic. To be sure, the traffic might be carried in relatively few very large aircraft (costing two to three millions a piece) but it would nonetheless be a big business."

Burden said that there was reason to believe that air transport will become the safest form of transportation, and forecast that within 8 or 10 years after the Japanese war, "the revenues of the domestic industry may be 500 to 600 millions or as much as the total passenger revenues of all our domestic railroads before the war."

He said that in looking toward the future "it is well to begin with the outlook for the manufacture of military airplanes. Contrary to popular estimation, commercial aviation—is not likely to grow to such gigantic proportions that military sales will assume negligible importance in the postwar period."

On the contrary, he continued, "if the United States should decide to maintain a 20,000-plane air force as compared to the 4,000 military planes it had in 1940, annual sales of military aircraft would be twice the total commercial sales which can be hoped for even 8 to 10 years after the defeat of Japan."

The armed services, he said, "are fully aware of the catastrophic effect on the industry of the almost complete cessation of military purchases which followed the last war and are almost certain to recommend purchasing policies to avoid a repetition of this situation."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution duly adopted on the 18th day of April 1945, by the Polish-American Congress, western district of New York, at its regular meeting held in the Polish Union of America Building, 761 Fillmore Avenue, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y.:

Whereas the reconstruction of a free Poland, undiminished in her border in the east and rectified in her borders in the west, is an indispensable moral issue and condition precedent to a permanent peace in Europe and the most substantial assurance for the United States against involvement in future wars.

Whereas the Polish Nation, which through its decision to resist German aggression, gave the free nations of the world the opportunity to prepare for victory, paying the supreme price measured by the death of every tenth Pole and the banishment from its ancient domain of one-third of its best sons and daughters of the Nation by both aggressors: Be it solemnly

Resolved, That we unite our efforts and pledge ourselves:

To defend the principle that obligations are sacred.

To defend the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

To defend the rights of enslaved nations.

To defend the sacred rights of the Polish Nation, based on Poland's moral credit earned by her bravery and martyrdom; it is further

Resolved, That the decisions of the Yalta Conference concerning Poland are incompatible with the spirit of Christian civilization, because they violate its moral foundations; they are inconsistent with international law, because they were made without the participation of Poland and are not to be imposed on her by force; they are incompatible with the principles of free nations, because they violate the rights of such nations; they are not in harmony with the traditions of the United States which has always stood in defense of wronged nations; they are repugnant to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, because all the United Nations have accepted these principles as a symbol in their fight against the use of force; they are also inconsistent with the commitments of the United Nations, who officially recognize the Polish Government in London. Poland, during 5½ years of fighting, gave proof of unexampled sacrifices, heroism, and faithful loyalty toward her allies and she has a right to rely upon the unalterable loyalty on their part.

As Americans dedicated to the freedom of Nations, we feel duty bound, in the name of justice, to take a stand in defense of the full rights of our ally—Poland.

In belief, that the Yalta decisions are not final, we appeal to the Government of the United States, to the United States representatives duly designated to represent the United States of America at San Francisco, California, Conference on April 25, 1945, the Congress and to the whole world, that the unjust decisions of the Yalta Conference concerning Poland, be revised in a spirit of good conscience and equity.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
By STANLEY E. CZASTER, *President.*
ADAM FELERSKI, *First Vice President.*
ROSE BIEDRON, *Second Vice President.*
MARIAN WOZNICKI, *Secretary.*
ANTHONY KELLER, *Treasurer.*
JOSEPH S. MATALA,
Member of Supreme Council.
MATTHEW KOWALSKI,
Member of Supreme Council.

Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Durham Herald-Sun, Durham, N. C., April 22, 1945:

ERNIE PYLE'S BIG HEART KNOWN TO DUKE PHYSICIANS YEARS AGO

The big, warm, human heart of Ernie Pyle became known to millions of Americans since the beginning of the war. But members of the staff of Duke Hospital have been knowing about it for 9 years.

In 1936 Pyle, then a roving reporter, wrote to Dr. W. C. Davison, dean of the Duke Medical School, about a pathetically afflicted child he had chanced to see suffering from a strange disease, and offered to pay the expenses of diagnosis and treatment.

That was long before the famous war correspondent was "in the money" and it meant no little personal sacrifice on his part.

As the result the child, a 12-year-old boy, was brought to Duke, treated and studied. Later a long scientific paper on the case was published in the American Journal of Diseases of Children, contributing much to the medical knowledge of such afflictions. The case is frequently referred to by medical professors.

The disease in its final stage was an incurable type of calcification of the flesh and skin, and the child died in about 18 months.

"Please understand," Ernie Pyle wrote, "that I realize that the child itself cannot be saved, but maybe others could in the future if doctors knew what was the matter with this one. * * * I have been extremely worked up over this case. It was too horrible to write for my newspapers, so nothing has been written about it, and nothing will be.

"* * * it was the most horrible sight I have ever witnessed—and as a newspaper reporter for many years I have seen some pretty bad things * * * it takes a long stretch of the imagination to consider the object lying there on the box a human being. * * *"

In the light of this case and of his later famous dispatches from the fighting fronts throughout the world, it is clear that Ernie Pyle's quick response to human suffering was a noble, ingrained trait, that he made no effort to avoid his own sense of responsibility. He suffered with the suffering.

Powers of Our Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing on April 14, 1945, in the Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn. This editorial raises the question of the American delegate's authority in an international organization with which my bill, House Joint Resolution 131 treats. It approves the use of our armed forces in a preventive policing operation without consulting Congress.

POWER OF OUR REPRESENTATIVES

One great issue in the establishment of a world security organization, as far as the United States in concerned, is the extent of the authority which our representative on the Council shall have to commit the country to the use of its armed forces in an emergency.

The isolationist position is that he should have no authority, and that every such proposal must go to Congress for decision.

Congressman KOPPLEMANN recently stated a view, which also has been expressed by ex-President Hoover, that our representative should have power to agree to use of our forces, after consulting with the Secretary of State and the Foreign Affairs Committee chairmen of the House and Senate.

Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and a delegate to the San Francisco Conference, expresses the opinion that the United States representative should have the power to vote "without reference to Congress."

This issue will be keenly debated when the plan completed at San Francisco comes before the Senate. Our participation in the new league of nations may be at stake. Certainly our effective participation will be.

Our position will have to be determined within the boundaries of the Constitution. No treaty, no act of Congress, and no agreement with other nations can amend that. Until the Constitution is amended only the Congress can declare war. At the same time, established policy imposes upon the President, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the duty to utilize these forces whenever the safety of the Nation is endangered.

Neither of these prerogatives can be set aside. Our representative in the world organization therefore cannot commit us to war, even by consulting with congressional leaders.

On the other hand, if it is deemed that the safety of the United States—which might means the averting of war—requires the use of our armed force, then we believe that our representative, as the agent of the President and at his instruction, might, without consulting Congress, or any Members of it, agree to use of our troops, Navy, or Air Forces, in a preventive policing operation.

We believe that the Congress could not, constitutionally, interfere with such use by the President of his prerogative, whether a world organization exists or not, and that a President would have to ignore attempts to do that. By the same token, we believe it would be going beyond the Constitution to require our representative, who would, of course, be a member of the executive department, to consult with congressional leaders before the President, through him, can assume an obligation to defend the country which the fundamental document places upon the President.

The determination of the authority of our representative probably will be governed by those factors.

From His Grave to the Paths of Peace and Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N. C., April 16, 1945:

FROM HIS GRAVE TO THE PATHS OF PEACE AND HOPE

The last rites have been said. The rose-banked garden of the Hyde Park estate hides from curious eyes the last resting place of a great man. But the years ahead will mark a beaten path to that garden gate as thousands seek the privilege of standing as in a hallowed presence where rests in eternal sleep the man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Quietly on Sunday morning, among his friends, they said the final words. The words of the minister intoning the chosen scripture, the carefully worded prayer, and the words of the old hymn of committal, Leave We Now Thy Servant Sleeping, closed the service.

Turning from that little garden, and that new-made grave, were those who for their own sakes and for his, must carry on the work to which he gave his life, and for which he was as much a casualty as any man who has fallen on the fields of fire and blood.

God was gracious to Mr. Roosevelt in death. He did not suffer. His end came after busy days, and immediate busy hours. Death came when he was at the height of his long and arduous career. Death came when he was the acclaimed leader of the world in its struggle back through the labyrinth of destruction and devastation seeking a way of peace.

It is no time to guess the future. The confidence that he had in a God of ruling power may be ours, too. But it is no idle sentiment that Franklin Delano Roosevelt will be strong in death as he was in life. He bids fair to be even stronger. For he left upon his associates, and upon all of us who thought with him toward the security of a war-wracked world, the nobility of a stewardship from which none would escape.

No move will be made in Washington, in the White House, on Capitol Hill, in San Francisco, and in the war and peace conferences of the world, but there will be first a thought as to what he would have said or done. Thus a spirit is not buried; it lives; and shall live. And America will pick up the torch.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Cleveland Federation of Labor as well as the whole world has learned with profound regret and sorrow of the death of the late President of these United States of America, Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, greatest friend and sponsor of the people of these United States, and especially the laboring man; and

Whereas as a token of honor and recognition of his eminent public services to the labor movement as well as to the whole world, we the officers and members of the Cleveland Federation of Labor, offer our deepest sympathy to the members of the family and the friends of the late President, in their bereavement; and

Whereas we as workers who were his particular friends, in that all his efforts were directed to a better life and a better world for the workers to have and enjoy; and

Whereas his departing from this life has brought desperation and sorrow to the hearts of the citizens of these United States and the freedom loving people throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Cleveland Federation of Labor, in meeting assembled this 18th day of April 1945, in reverence to the memory of the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and in gratitude for his accomplishments on behalf of the working people, rise and in silent prayer pay tribute to our departed friend; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the board of business agents meeting, as well as the minutes of the Cleveland Federation of Labor and forwarded to the dear wife, and the members of the family, as well as to the Senators and Congressmen from this district in the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this Cleveland Federation of Labor, go on record pledging its full support to the new President of these United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, in his endeavor to carry out the aims of his predecessor, namely, the winning of this great war, and then the winning of the peace; so that all peoples may enjoy the world of the future so fondly cherished and sought after so vigorously by the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

CLEVELAND FEDERATION OF LABOR.
WILLIAM FINEGAN, *President.*
THOMAS A. LENEHAN, *Secretary.*

Address of Capt. Donald J. Ramsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Capt. Donald J. Ramsey, legislative counsel in the office of the Judge Advocate of the Navy, delivered at the annual meeting of the Bergen County Bar Association, Hotel Astor, Saturday, April 21, 1945:

When Congressman TOWE first spoke to me about addressing you tonight he stated that you were desirous of saving someone talk to you about the peace, which we hope will follow the present wars. I rather think he was afraid that a naval officer could not talk about peace. I can assure you, however, that all of us in the Navy are as vitally interested as any group of citizens in peace, and particularly in the postwar world and our postwar problems. I can safely say that we in the Navy are not interested in keeping up a large Navy just for the sake of perpetuating our jobs. We do not wish to inflict upon the taxpayers of the Nation a burden which is unnecessary, but we are interested in keeping a Navy large enough to insure that we can keep the peace.

There are several other problems relating to the keeping of peace in which we have a vital interest. There has been some talk, and there will be more as days go by, of the organization of our postwar Military and Naval Establishments. There are those who advocate a consolidation of the War and Navy Departments into a Department of National Defense, with one Cabinet member. There have been several different combinations suggested as to how the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces should be set up in this one department. Under one setup there will be Under Secretaries of War, Navy, and Air. Under another there will be one Under Secretary for the Army, with its air force, and one for the Navy, with its air force. To effect this consolidation some have gone so far as to advocate one uniform for all services.

Most of the reasons advanced for a consolidation have had to do with efficiency and economy. You, of the legal profession, are trained to give intensive study to problems which are presented to you, and I ask you to give this question of consolidation your deep thought. There is much more involved than the alleged increase of efficiency and economy. In considering this question we are misled sometimes, I believe, by the reports and descriptions of our operations, particularly in the Pacific, where the Army

and the Navy work in joint operations as a team.

You sometimes hear that all officers and men wear the same uniform, are under the same commander, and perform the same duties in battle. But there is more to it than that. We must, of course, have close coordination and cooperation between all branches, but this can be effected without any such proposed consolidation. We are given as examples the battles for the coral atolls where Army, Navy, and Marines at times performed identical duties. But where you are conducting operations against a very small island every man, whether he be a boat coxswain or a private, is on the battle line. At times all hands—storekeepers, repair crews—must pick up a rifle and join in the fighting. This is not justification for assuming that every man can be a jack of all trades.

Even should we have a consolidation into one Department of National Defense, it will of necessity break itself down into an Army and Navy. Modern methods of waging wars have made naval and army personnel specialists in their own fields, although no one can argue that in a joint operation of land and sea and air forces there should not be a supreme commander with a unified command organization.

We must have a Navy and a Marine Corps for they are specially trained in just the type of military operations which may be necessary in the postwar world. Even the most ardent advocates of the air arm of our military services must admit that air power alone cannot adequately defend this Nation or wage an offensive war against an enemy. Any military operations beyond our continental limits in the postwar world or from now on will be amphibious in nature. We shall have no need for a large standing army. We shall not again for many a day engage in operations requiring large armies overseas. The Navy will thus become the dominant military arm. We shall have need for a large Navy and a number of troops trained in amphibious warfare. We already have a well-integrated organization in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and naval and marine aviation. Our marines are trained to serve on board ship and when so serving they are an integral part of the ship's organization. They man guns and perform other duties not requiring special training. On the other hand, the record of our marines in this war will clearly show that in fighting on land they have no superiors.

In a democracy where military organizations play a minor part in peacetime, there has been less emphasis in the way of traditions. I feel that what tradition and pride in organization we do have in the Navy and in the Army and in the Marine Corps are therefore important. I am not speaking with too much pride when I say that the Navy has glorious traditions, and so has the Army, and these traditions mean much. We should think a good deal before we merge the two services and they lose their identity. In other words, let us give weight to the personnel factors in our efforts to achieve efficiency and economy. Let us be sure that in the search for the latter we are not destroying a vital factor in the former.

I would like to call to your attention something of which I am sure you are all well aware and that is the esprit de corps of all the armed services and particularly that of our marines. That is one of the secrets of their success. Their esprit de corp has been maintained despite the large expansion which has taken place in that corps. It is still small enough so that all of the senior officers know each other and have worked together for a considerable period of time. Would you destroy this organization with its fine records and great traditions by merging it with the Army and thus cause it to lose its identity? If this is done, in my opinion, the Nation will suffer an irreparable loss.

We will have no need after this war for great strategic air fleets. What we will need will be small, efficient air groups operating from our bases or from our carriers. We cannot afford to support great strategic air fleets, monster planes. Progress in aviation design will necessitate constant changes. That will be tending away from the efficiency and the economy we are seeking. Such needs as we do have for strategic bombing can be taken care of by our marine air arm. They are closely integrated with our marine ground forces. They work together and they are thoroughly trained in amphibious operations. We do not have to go farther back than the beginning of the present war to discover the disastrous effects of not having air forces working in close cooperation with the land and sea forces.

You cannot have close cooperation, coordinated effort, unless your aviators understand the operations of the ships and of the ground troops. They must all be trained in the same school of thought and action. So in the cause of efficiency and economy, I suggest the Navy and the Marines with their air arms as our postwar military organization for all operations beyond the continental limits of the United States. The Marines and the Navy have traditionally taken care of our need for military operations in peacetime.

We can, to some degree, consolidate the services in some matters of procurement and in the military industrial set-up. We now have closely coordinated effort between these activities, but I am strongly of the opinion that competition between the two services along some lines, such as the development of weapons, development of aircraft, has been extremely healthy with very little loss in efficiency or of economy. I feel certain that a little rivalry between the Army and the Navy has been helpful.

There is one further thought I should like to present for your consideration. Is there not some danger in concentrating all of the military forces in one department under one head? Is it not advisable to decentralize the military organization and power in a democratic form of government? Is there not some danger that the member of the Cabinet who heads the combined military services will overshadow in importance other Cabinet members? He will have control of a very large amount of money. We do not wish to become a militaristic nation. This Cabinet member will be the head of a very powerful organization and might carry more weight in the affairs of this Nation than you and I would care to see.

Beach Erosion on Lake Erie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE LORAIN JOURNAL,
Lorain, Ohio, April 17, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER B. HUBER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUBER: The question of beach erosion mentioned in your letter of April 12 is one of utmost importance for the parts of Ohio bordering on Lake Erie.

It is a question that has been long neglected, a neglect that has already resulted in millions upon millions of dollars loss in land as a result of the encroachment of the lake on the shoreland. Even as far back as November 6, 1878, the minutes of the Ohio-Pennsylvania boundary commission report the shore as being washed away at the rate of 2 or 3 feet per annum. The recent report of the Ohio postwar program commission says that 174 of the 185 miles of lake shoreland in Ohio are subject to constant erosion.

The situation is particularly aggravated so far as Lorain County is concerned. Mile upon mile of beach frontage west of Lorain has been made virtually useless by erosion. Some property owners have told me that they lost close to 20 feet during the past winter alone. Older residents of Lorain say that their boyhood playgrounds are now hundreds of feet out in the Lake.

Lake Erie is one of nature's richest bequests to the State of Ohio. Without it, the Buckeye State would be landbound and its industrial, commercial, and recreation possibilities would be as limited as those of Kansas. But because of neglect of the erosion problem, some of the lake's greatest potentialities have been undeveloped.

Close to the center of population of the United States, the southern shores of Lake Erie with the islands a few miles off Sandusky could be made one of America's greatest playgrounds. As it is, the precious assets of beach and soil are being destroyed year by year. Long stretches of farmland, expensive lake highways, residential districts, and many privately owned buildings have disappeared into Lake Erie during the past years.

Various committees and commissions, including the United States Beach Erosion Board, have made studies of these conditions. There is widespread recognition of the problem. But as yet nothing of a constructive nature has been done.

To my mind it seems that if the Federal Government can spend hundreds of millions of dollars creating new soil and new land in other parts of the Nation, it can and should do something about saving priceless land and soil that we already have.

Furthermore, Ohio's claim for some such action on the part of the Federal Government is strengthened by the fact that taxes from the State of Ohio contributed about 12 cents out of every dollar that the Federal Government spent on reclamation projects elsewhere.

Trusting that this information will be helpful in your appearance before the subcommittee of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors April 24, I am,

Sincerely,

FRANK MALOY,
Editor.

Prevention of Beach Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California:

Assembly Joint Resolution 38

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to adopt H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 in furtherance of preventing beach erosion

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States two measures designed to aid in the protection of beaches

along the shores of the United States, which measures will shortly be heard before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and

Whereas the first of these measures, H. R. 2032, authorizes general shore-line investigations, with a view to preventing shore erosion by waves and currents and to determining the most suitable methods for the protection, restoration, and development of bathing beaches, the cost of such investigations to be borne wholly by the United States; and

Whereas the second of these measures, H. R. 2033, authorizes Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property, declaring it to be the policy of the United States to assist in the construction, but not the maintenance, of works for the improvement and protection against erosion of the shores of the United States that are owned by States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, provided that the Federal contribution toward the construction of protective works shall not in any case exceed one-third of the total cost; and

Whereas the purposes sought to be accomplished by these measures are of particular interest to the coastal State of California, its political subdivisions, and its people in that thereby damage to public property may be prevented and healthful recreation may be promoted and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the investigation and protection of beaches; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to Mr. J. Spencer Smith, President of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J., and to Mr. Geo. P. Larsen, executive secretary of the Shoreline Planning Association of California, Inc., 1151 S. Broadway, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference held last summer constructed a skeleton organization for world peace. The San Francisco Conference is expected to put flesh and clothes upon that skeleton in order to make it a living, functioning organization. Every American is in full accord with the objective of world peace and is hoping and praying that the objective will be accomplished. We must not blind ourselves, however, to the fact that the concessions made to Stalin at Yalta and the secret agreements arrived at by the Big Three at Yalta will hamper and handicap the delegates at San Francisco in their efforts to complete the task of building an organization that will insure world peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks peace plan is not a new one. It has been tried twice before in the history of the world and failed both times. First it was tried by the Big Four—Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Austria—in 1815, when they formed the Holy Alliance to keep the peace of Europe after they had defeated Napoleon. The Dumbarton Oaks plan, based upon a Big Three great-power dictatorship to keep the peace of the world, is in all its basic essentials very similar to the Big Four Alliance that was created following the Napoleonic wars. The Big Four Holy Alliance became a Big Five in 1818 when it admitted a chastened, penitent Bourbon France. Its life was a short one, however, because in 1823 Great Britain seceded from the alliance and it broke up.

Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was patterned after the Holy Alliance. It was similar in many respects, but was more universal and more idealistic. Wilson's League of Nations was doomed to failure before it began to function. Because Wilson would not accept some protective amendments, his plan for world peace was turned down by the United States Senate. Without the United States as a full-fledged partner the League was doomed to failure. Will the same thing happen again? Will our leaders become so enamored over the Dumbarton Oaks plan, when it has been made into a living functioning organization for world peace, that they will say, as Wilson did, "It cannot be changed, it must not be amended in any respect, it must be accepted as it is"? If so, will the Senate again turn thumbs down on a program for world peace?

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous consent request, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 21, 1945:

SAN FRANCISCO IS ONLY A START

At the outset let us say that the Post favors American membership in the United Nations organization whose birth cry will be heard at San Francisco next week. Membership in this organization is implicit in the fact of our participation in this destructive world war. The problems which the war has created will remain our problems as much as those of any other nation, and we shall have to belong to the institution which is set up to deal with them. Furthermore, and in spite of a lot of nonsense about isolationists and a new "battalion of death" in the Senate, there is no doubt about American membership in this security organization. We are in it from the beginning, and we shall accept our responsibilities.

However, the reason why we are certain to join the new League of Nations is a contradiction of some of the propaganda which has been circulated about it. There will be no trouble in the Senate about joining, because the voting formula agreed to at Yalta makes the league a powder puff as far as the great powers are concerned. Winston Churchill has frankly admitted that the Yalta agreement "does prescribe for a differentiation between the treatment of the greatest powers and of the smallest powers." Now that it has been decided that force may not be used against any of the big five without its consent—a condition for which the Russians are taking the rap—not even the isolationists, if there are any, will oppose American membership. What we are about to set up is a useful international medium for diplomatic activity, with a considerable chance that it will degenerate into living space for the so-called power politics. It can have great influence, but it cannot carry us to greater heights than its members care to scale.

Unfortunately, there is too much snake-oil promotion connected with all this. Overzealous people try to persuade us that by joining this organization we shall somehow or other prevent war. The same people dismiss the old Geneva-model League of Nations rather snootily, as if its founders meant well, but did not have the stamina to provide machinery which would work in a crisis. Our Dumbarton Oaks league, it is implied has teeth like a cartoon Japanese.

But the propagandists seem none too sure of the teeth, for they are warning us, between ecstatic sighs, that the new league will not work unless we adopt the Bretton Woods monetary stabilization fund without a single amendment. Everybody favors currency stability and expanded world trade, and a little tinkering here and there would meet most of the objections to the fund. For one thing, there should be more precise definition of the right of the managers of the fund to act when a member country insists on maintaining social and economic policies which cause people to doubt the value of its money. But no sure-enough Bretton Woods man will stand for anything like that. The War Writers Board, containing such financial experts as Clifton Fadiman, Samuel Grafton, and Franklin P. Adams, polishes off all criticism of Bretton Woods as isolationism. Financial Expert Orson Welles announces that the fund will "prevent such scandals as International Match King Krueger perpetrated in the roaring 20's." Amendments indeed.

Nevertheless, even with Bretton Woods at its back, the league about to be created at San Francisco starts its career less impressively equipped ot prevent war than the old League was. The 1920 League of Nations did, after all, make most nations believe that an aggressor, regardless of size, would confront the might of an organized world. Even without American membership, that illusion lasted until 1932, when Japan destroyed it. This time no great power need torture itself with any such fear. San Francisco may show the way to a peaceful world, but it will be done by road signs and not traffic cops.

We do not say this is bad, because, as our antiperfectionists are now pointing out, coercion of a great nation is, in effect, war. But we do say it is a bad thing to sell the American people an international consultative organization as if it were a guaranteed, fast-working pain and war killer. The new United Nations organization will be forced, in the words of former Assistant Secretary of Commerce John Dickinson, to "operate through and upon the international facts and forces which actually exist, and adapt itself to them." As a matter of fact, this is all that it undertakes to do despite the propaganda of its supporters. It is not set up to punish Hitler, free India, set up boundaries, assess reparations, produce 60,000,000 jobs per square mile in Java, or do anything except provide legal and consultative machinery for dealing with disputes among nations. If it accomplishes that, it will be of a price above rubies provided it leaves the way open for revision of secret decisions by the Big Three. Of this we are certain to hear plenty from San Francisco, in spite of the preference of the big powers for a meeting with no agenda worth mentioning.

Well-meaning people who try to persuade Americans that a new league will perform the impossible are only inviting the disillusion which happens when a man who was sold a shotgun finds an umbrella in the parcel.

Curtailment and Reduction of Federal Bureaus Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, attention of the public has been directed in newspaper reports Saturday to the testimony of Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States. Mr. Warren vigorously favors an overhauling of the executive branch of the Government. He points out that curtailment and reduction is necessary and that the problems should be tackled by Congress immediately.

Some of us Members of Congress served with Mr. Warren when he so ably represented his North Carolina district in the House of Representatives. All who know him can testify to the fact that while he was a Member of Congress he displayed both ability and courage in his approach to public questions. When he quit his service in the House of Representatives to accept the appointment as Comptroller General of the United States this representative body lost one of its outstanding leaders.

Very seldom does the head of any bureau ever try to offer anything constructive for the American people. Further, such a person, always refrains from any constructive criticism because it might interfere with his efforts to enlarge his own department, increase its activities in a corresponding way, increase his salary, and that of his key subordinates. It is, therefore, very refreshing to note that Comptroller General Warren has disregarded this ancient practice and has boldly and vigorously told the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee that something has to be done. I hope that Mr. Warren's testimony will be available for every Member of Congress to study and that we may translate Mr. Warren's advice into some kind of proper legislation.

The Associated Press report which appears in a number of newspapers and which I have clipped from the Washington Post for Saturday, April 21, 1945, reads as follows:

WARREN URGES MERCILESS AX FOR AGENCIES

Wholesale amputation of Government agencies with a bush-ax or a meat cleaver was recommended yesterday by Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren.

Testifying before a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee in favor of a bill to bring all Government corporations under the financial control of Congress, Warren said:

"If the present trend of creating Government corporations continues or is not curbed, we will soon have a government by Government corporations."

Asserting there now are 101 Government corporations, Warren said:

"They are largely independent of Congressional control and free from accountability to the Executive. This thing we call government has reached Gargantuan proportions and is sprawled all over the lot.

"It has become greater than Congress, its creator, and at times arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress.

"The most necessary thing I know of today along governmental lines is a thoroughgoing reorganization of the executive branch of Government. It should be done scientifically.

"But once the decision is made then a bush-ax or a meat cleaver should be used."

"The only way to reorganize is to reorganize," Warren said with emphasis. "It calls for great courage. Duplication and overlapping are widely prevalent. Untold millions could be saved and efficiency created to a high degree."

"Of course," he added "there would be loud pelks and snarls—that is always true when powers are curbed, consolidations made, or appropriations reduced or discontinued."

Mr. Speaker, not only do I endorse the position taken by Comptroller General Warren, but I offer for consideration of my colleagues a suggestion of another important step that could be taken by Congress and that would be productive of much good. It is well known that most Government bureaus, departments, and agencies always come before Congress and ask for larger appropriations than they really expect to get. If they get more money than they expected to receive from Congress, then they have to get wrinkles on their forehead trying to figure how to spend, and probably waste, whatever surplus money is available.

It would therefore appear reasonable to suggest that we reduce all appropriation bills for the executive departments by about 50 percent and tell the heads of these agencies that such reduced appropriation is all they are going to get for running expenses. Such a step, in my opinion, would go a long way toward a small effort in the way of balancing the Budget.

The Miracle of Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star recently carried an editorial entitled "The Miracle of Supply," which I wish every Member of the Congress could read.

It is a cold factual statement which poses out a few of the problems faced by the Army Service Forces in keeping up the service of supplies to our armies in their breath-taking advances, not alone in Europe, but throughout the world.

Let me quote from that article, a part of which states:

As we follow their sweeping advances upon the map, it does not often occur to us to think of our forces in terms of the supplies they consume—supplies of food, supplies of fuel, supplies of ammunition, supplies of a thousand and one other things needed to keep great masses of men and machines on the move.

Over vast distances, over the oceans, over the face of entire countries, that the fuel and the countless other things—including special materials to bridge great rivers like the Rhine—have been kept moving in prodigious quantities to make possible the military achievements we have been witnessing.

How many of us realize that the men charged with the responsibilities of these supplies from the time of Pearl Harbor are the Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Commanding General of the Army Service Forces.

Never has history witnessed such cooperation, teamwork, and efficiency between civil and military authorities as have characterized their activities.

There was the task of selecting the millions of officer and enlisted personnel. There was the task to clothe, feed, train, equip, transport, and deliver them with full communication matériel to every fighting front.

It was up to those two to inspire not alone the war workers in our mines, our mills, our factories, our vast rail systems as well as on the farms to yield the fullness of their strength in the production of millions of tons of war materials. "Infinite detail, painstaking planning, and an enormously complex organization of every means of transportation to meet the gigantic Allied logistical problem are the basic reason why our arms are now being crowned with success in Europe and why they are simultaneously faring so well against Japan. The men responsible for this, from the topmost commander down to the obscurest private, have covered themselves with glory. Their work, unparalleled in history, has been little short of a miracle. Had it been poorly done, the news we are reading today would be far less cheering than it is."

It was the Under Secretary, Robert Patterson, who planned and effectuated the negotiation and the performance on every last contract.

It was General Somervell who organized the selective service, the Quartermaster, Ordnance, Signal, Transportation, Medical, and other corps of the Army Service Forces.

It is the result of their joint efforts that we find a great Army fully equipped with food, clothing, guns, tanks, munitions, airplanes, communication and transportation facilities, and built into one mighty cohesive fighting unit.

All was accomplished without any fanfare. There was a job to do and they did it. Of necessity, there must have been errors, but if there were they quickly were sought out and corrected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let one who served in World War No. 1 and who from his experiences deeply appreciates the significance of this editorial, submit the same for publication in the RECORD:

THE SUPPLY MIRACLE

Without a pause, after a sensational advance of 50 miles in a single day, the American Ninth Army's Second Armored Division has crossed the Elbe, the last natural barrier on the road to Berlin. Now the shattered nerve center of nazidom is virtually within range of our artillery. Now, too, as our Third Army approaches Leipzig and as all of Eisenhower's mighty forces continue to knife forward everywhere, a junction with the

Russians is imminent and Germany is on the verge of being cut in two.

Within little more than a fortnight after the Allied crossing of the Rhine we are thus seeing Nazi disintegration enter its final stage, bringing organized warfare in Europe—as distinct from mopping-up operations—very close to an end. In achieving all this so swiftly our armies in the west have made military history outshining anything of its kind ever seen before, and not the least brilliant facet of it is its logistical background. As we follow their sweeping advances upon the map, it does not often occur to us to think of our forces in terms of the supplies they consume—supplies of food, supplies of fuel, supplies of ammunition, supplies of a thousand and one other things needed to keep great masses of men and machines on the move.

At present the most forward elements of Eisenhower's nine American and Allied armies are well over 400 road miles from Antwerp and more than 700 miles from Le Harve, and beyond such continental ports as these their life lines stretch back for more than 3,000 miles across the Atlantic to America, their main source of supplies. It is over this vast distance, over the oceans, over the face of entire countries, that the fuel and the countless other things—including special materials to bridge great rivers like the Rhine—have been kept moving in prodigious quantities to make possible the military achievements we have been witnessing.

Infinite detail, painstaking planning, and an enormously complex organization of every means of transportation to meet the gigantic Allied logistical problem are the basic reason why our arms are now being crowned with success in Europe and why they are simultaneously faring so well against Japan. The men responsible for this, from the topmost commander down to the obscurest private, have covered themselves with glory. Their work, unparalleled in history, has been little short of a miracle. Had it been poorly done, the news we are reading today would be far less cheering than it is.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Providing for Wage Readjustment for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for wage readjustment for postal employees:

Whereas employees of the United States Postal Service are today required to perform greater duties than heretofore; and

Whereas employees of such Service have not received a permanent wage readjustment in more than a decade; and

Whereas the tremendous amount of work being done by the employees of the Postal Service is being performed in an efficient manner and is deserving of wage readjustment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, the Senate concurring, endorse wage readjustment for postal employees in order that such employees may receive increased compensation commensurate with their work and responsibilities, and to that end urges the Members in Congress and the State of Minnesota to vote for and support H. R. 2071; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LAWSON B. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 9th day of April 1945.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate, the 17th day of April 1945.

HY TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed April 1, 1945:

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

State Department Changes Its Mind on GI Representation at San Francisco Conference—Costello Post Scores Another Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1945, vice commander of Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., released for publication a letter from the Acting Secretary of State Mr. Joseph Grew, announcing that Commander Harold Stassen would be the sole voice representing the veterans at the San Francisco Conference.

Following this, on April 5, 1945, Costello Post members protested that they desired to have a real GI representation at the forthcoming pariey. This new plea to the State Department appeared in the newspapers as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 5, 1945]

LEGION PRESSES REQUEST FOR SAN FRANCISCO DELEGATE

A request that Lee Pennington, district department commander of the American Legion, take up with national Legion headquarters the State Department's refusal to appoint a veteran of the present war to the American delegation at the San Francisco conference will be made by the Costello Post, Thomas A. Costello, commander, announced today.

Earlier Joseph Lieb, third vice commander of the post, wrote the State Department suggesting such an appointment. He received a reply from Under Secretary Joseph C. Grew saying that Commander Harold E. Stassen, one of the delegates, would represent the viewpoint of men who had been serving overseas.

Mr. Costello said he regarded the answer as unsatisfactory, as the post wanted a GI veteran, not an active officer or anyone connected with politics, as the servicemen's representative. Before entering the Navy, Commander Stassen was Governor of Minnesota.

On April 12, 1945, I discussed this situation on the floor of the House in which I emphasized that the veterans of this war, and the people generally, want a real GI representative to sit at the peace table. They are entitled to a voice in the discussions of our peace for the future, I added, for they waged the war, and they have made the greatest sacrifices. I demanded that their voice should be heard in the peace conference.

At the suggestion of the Department Commander of the American Legion, District of Columbia, Acting Secretary of State Grew's letter was taken up with the National Commander of the American Legion.

Now it is interesting to note that on April 20, 1945, the press carried the announcement that the State Department had authorized the appointment of two GI combat veterans to assist Commander Stassen at San Francisco. Here is the story:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1945]

STASSEN PICKS GI'S FOR 'FRISCO AIDES

Commander Harold E. Stassen today selected two wounded fighting men to help him represent the United States armed forces throughout the San Francisco Security Conference.

Stassen, who is considered the armed forces' representative on the eight-man United States delegation, announced that Army Sgt. John Thomson, of Minneapolis, and Marine Lt. Cord Meyer, Jr., of New York, would be his aides at the United Nations parley.

Meyer lost an eye in the Pacific after surviving the bloody battles of Kwajalein, Einwetok, and Guam. Thomson was wounded seriously last January in the battle for Aachen, Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I also present two of the original articles concerning this situation, which follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 2, 1945]

GI REPRESENTATIVE

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Commander Harold Stassen will be the GI Joe representative at the San Francisco Conference, according to a letter written by Joseph C. Grew, as Acting Secretary of State.

The letter was made public today by Vice Commander Joseph Leib, of the Costello American Legion Post here.

Mr. Leib had written Secretary of State Stettinius suggesting that some combat soldier be given a seat on the American delegation to the United Nations peace meeting April 25.

Under Secretary of State Grew replied, March 30:

"As you may be aware, Commander Harold Stassen has been appointed a member of the United States delegation. It is felt that he will fully represent the point of view of men who have been serving overseas."

Three times elected Republican Governor of Minnesota and prominently mentioned as a GOP Presidential possibility, Commander Stassen has been flag officer to Admiral Halsey in the Pacific.

He resigned as Governor to take the Navy commission.

The Army Times, published here, urged editorially this week that cartoonist Sgt. Bill Mauldin be sent to the Conference to represent the Fox Hole Fraternity.

The Washington Daily News suggested Sgt. Joe McCarthy, editor of Yank, the GI's magazine, referring to his long experience in dealing with the GI point of view, and acting as his spokesman.

Both are long-time, front-line fighters against the Nazis.

The Army Times pointed out that the plea for a combat soldier to sit at the peace table had been approved in polls by 8 of 10 civilians. It was presented to his post last June by Mr. Leib and adopted by the national convention of the American Legion in September of 1944.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1945]

ONLY SERVICE VOICE AT PARLEY TO BE STASSEN'S

Apparently implying that no other serviceman or veteran will be added to the American delegation to the United Nations Security Conference at San Francisco, Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew has declared that Commander Harold Stassen "will fully represent the point of view of men who have been serving overseas."

Grew's announcement came in a letter to Joseph Leib, vice commander of the Costello American Legion Post here, who had written Secretary of State Stettinius urging that a combat soldier be given a place at the peace table. Leib presented the proposal to his post last June and the national convention of the Legion adopted it in September. His letter from the Under Secretary, dated March 30, apparently gave Commander Stassen official designation as the conference spokesman for the men in uniform.

Commander Stassen, who resigned as Governor of Minnesota to take a Navy commission, has been flag officer to Admiral William F. Halsey and recently returned to the Pacific for a few weeks' additional duty before attending the San Francisco parley, which is scheduled to open April 25.

Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Credits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though we have inducted into our military and naval establishments some 12,000,000 young men and women, the flower of our American citizenship, some of whom have been in the service since September 1940, the Congress to this day has failed to enact any legislation or to make any provision for the preservation and protection of their old age and survivors' insurance rights under our social-security laws.

As a consequence of this utter disregard of our legislative responsibility, these young service men and women, some of them in the Army or Navy for more than 5 years, have not been permitted to build up any old-age insurance credits whatsoever, which will be a regrettable circumstance in too many instances to contemplate with equanimity, their only guaranty against old-age dependency, against, perhaps, abject poverty and dire want during their declining years.

Encouraged to do so by the "in principle" endorsement of my bill to rectify this unfortunate situation which I introduced last year, the first one to deal with the subject, by our then President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his message to the Congress of September 14, 1944, the American Legion, in its national convention resolution of the same year, and the more specific approval of its provisions by the Federal Security Agency, speaking for the Social Security Board, I am today reintroducing the measure, again submitting it to the consideration of the membership of the House.

By the terms of my bill, every soldier or sailor who entered the service of his country after September 16, 1940, the day that the Selective Service Act was approved by the President, will be credited on the books of the Social Security Board as if he had entered a covered civil employment, rather than the Army or Navy, and had paid his pay-roll taxes upon the basis, or assumed compensation, of $160 per month.

In other words, had the individual entered private employment under peacetime conditions on September 26, 1940, instead of the Army or Navy, and continued in such covered employment until the date of his discharge from his martial service—whatever that date may be—he would have, in the meantime, paid into the social-security fund pay-roll taxes—which would have been matched by his employer—and would have by the time of the termination of hostilities built up a substantial credit upon his old-age retirement annuity. Under existing legislation he will have been deprived of all of that, this as a sort of a penalty for having answered the call of his country.

If the legislation I propose is not passed and the war continues for 5 or 6 or 7 years, it will mean that our servicemen—our soldiers, sailors, and marines—will be, because of their service to their country during a time of great national distress, without old-age and survivors' credits for the period of their service while those who did not respond to their country's call, the deserters and slackers, as well as the physically unfit, will have acquired theirs.

To withhold this credit from the one who served his country in position of great danger and to freely grant it to another who served in safety in civilian employment is unconscionable. It would constitute a cruel discrimination which, I am confident, no right-thinking citizen will tolerate even for one moment. This bill must be passed and this without delay.

To emphasize the necessity for prompt action, it might be well for me to quote a few words in comment upon my proposal from the understanding pen of Watson Miller, one of the greatest living experts on social security and veterans' legislation, who, in a letter to Chairman Robert Doughton, of the Ways and Means Committee, said:

I urge that immediate action be taken on this proposal. Postponement of action serves only to increase the administrative burden involved. Obviously, the longer the enactment of appropriate legislation is postponed the greater will be the administrative burden of keeping records of service deaths, locating survivors of deceased servicemen, and adjusting cases when death occurs prior to enactment. It must be recognized that the social purpose of the legislation will be impeded by further lapse of time.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Gov. Maurice J. Tobin at the memorial services of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for the joint convention of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and its sister States of the Union, share with all the freedom-loving peoples of the world an hour of deep sorrow in the untimely death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The leader of our Nation has been called to his eternal reward even as events impend which will affect the course of civilization for centuries to come.

It is not given to man to understand the ways of Divine Providence, but as always in our history let us, agreeably to the will of the Creator, accept this burden of grief with a true spirit of resignation, trusting our future to the same capital Providence which has cherished and protected us in all the crises of our national existence.

Appropriately do we recall the inspiring example of the man whose passing we now mourn. We recollect how in his early manhood he was stricken with an affliction which might have destroyed the spirit of a less courageous man. He did not complain in his hour of tragedy, but with sublime faith in his destiny he overcame personal handicaps to go forward to a record of achievement without comparison in our entire history.

As he had faith, so let us have faith in our destiny as a Nation. For truly did Franklin Delano Roosevelt predict that our generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

To recount the outstanding accomplishments of his life, or merely to review the exceptional or noteworthy events in which he was the moving spirit, would require many hours.

As his contemporaries, we cannot properly appraise his tremendous contribution to the welfare of his country and the world. That contribution will appear in its true perspective in future centuries.

Called to the leadership of our Nation in a dark hour of economic crisis, he electrified and inspired us all with his courage and his fearless approach to the solution of problems which had perplexed the country.

Under his inspired leadership our people gathered strength and renewed faith. He attacked every problem of domestic policy with capability and with confidence. Early in his service in the highest office in the land, he foresaw the gathering of forces beyond our shores, evil forces which threatened the security and peace of the world. He clearly saw that when nations deprive their citizens of the enjoyment of their natural rights, such nations could not be expected to respect the God-given rights of the people of other lands.

In meeting the vexing problems of this era, many nations turned to totalitarian forms

of government, but under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt never despaired of our faith in the efficacy of those precepts of government which rest upon the natural rights and dignity of man, and the divinely inspired concept of legitimate government.

Even as we mourn the loss of our beloved President, let us be thankful to the Almighty for the many blessings He has showered upon our Nation through the talents and abilities of His servant, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

No President in all history was as close to the people as he was. We came to know his voice intimately, and we felt his calm assurance and his strong determination as he spoke to us directly and in simple terms of the many problems of our times. This feeling of confidence and trust he transmitted to all the freedom-loving peoples of the world. To them he symbolized and personified their only hope of deliverance from tyranny and oppression.

In this solemn hour of mourning and sadness for the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the free peoples of the world are drawn even closer together in the common bond of brotherhood. His passionate love for mankind knew no borders. His zeal for the liberty of suffering humanity encompassed the whole world. His large heart went out to all who were heavily laden. All he had he gave to humanity. The world knew him not as a ruler but as a friend, a comforter of the afflicted, a champion of the oppressed. Today—wept over by all who are free or seeking to be free—his fame is universal. In the words of the poet:

"He ruled no serfs, and he knew no pride,
He was one with the workers, side by side;
He would never believe but a man was made
For a nobler end than the glory of trade.
He mourned all selfish and shrewd endeavor
But he never injured a weak one—never."

From Franklin Delano Roosevelt's unselfish devotion to the cause of suffering humanity let us draw inspiration and fortitude to fulfill the destiny to which he aspired. The example of his ceaseless and tireless labor for those who suffered and died seeking freedom, must give us in America renewed strength to remain in the forefront in the struggle for peace. To Almighty God, we humbly address our petition to strengthen, fortify, and guide the President who now undertakes the heavy responsibility of leadership in this crucial hour in the history of our beloved Nation and of the world.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MAURICE J. TOBIN, GOVERNOR, A PROCLAMATION

With profound sorrow the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have learned of the untimely death of the President of the United States of America, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In common with all our fellow Americans, we bow our heads in submission to the will of Almighty God who has summoned our beloved leader to his richly merited eternal reward.

In common with all of the freedom-loving peoples of the world we mourn the passing of one who gave his very life for the preservation of human liberty.

For more than 12 years, during a period of unparalleled turbulence in the history of mankind, Franklin Delano Roosevelt bore the most onerous responsibilities ever laid upon the shoulders of a Chief Executive. Inspired by a lofty and unfailing idealism, guided by a vision of enduring domestic prosperity and international concord, and sustained in all his trials by an unwavering faith in the Divine Providence, he proved himself a leader of such transcendent greatness that future ages will join with our own in grateful tribute to his undying memory.

Therefore, as a mark of the love and reverence which our people feel for the late President of these United States, I respectfully request that the National and State flags be flown at half staff on all public buildings for a period of 30 days, and that appropriate memorial services be conducted in all of our houses of worship. I further request that on Saturday afternoon, April 14, during the funeral ceremonies, all business in the Commonwealth be suspended between the hours of 4 and 5 p. m., except in such establishments as are engaged in essential war effort.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston this 13th day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-five, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and sixty-ninth.

Your Boys in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on April 22, 1945, over Station WDRC, Hartford:

Every day I get dozens of letters from my congressional district, and I welcome all of them, especially those that come from you who have sons, or fathers, or brothers, or husbands, or sweethearts now valiantly serving overseas with the armed forces.

"My boy is a marine," writes a naturally anxious mother. "He has been out in the Pacific for 2 years, and now is in the hospital with malaria. Is he being well taken care of?" she asks, "and when can he expect to come home on furlough?"

All of her three sons are in service, writes another mother. Her husband has just died, and she herself is ill. Can her youngest son be sent home to carry on the small family business?

The sister of a family of soldiers writes: "My older brother was killed in France, and the younger is now in Germany, having gone across last summer. Will he be brought home and discharged after the end of the war? She hopes so, for the family needs him badly, as the father is no longer able to work.

All these and many questions like them come to me, and I have been at special pains the past few weeks to get the latest correct information from the War Department.

This broadcast is in the nature of a report to you on these matters that lie close to your heart, and I wish that all of you would pass the information along to any neighbors who have dear ones in service but may not be listening this afternoon.

First, let me assure you that our boys at the front are getting the best of everything and, when hospitalized, could not be better taken care of if they were here at home. The cold, hard facts of the medical records prove this. It is not a mere matter of opinion. There are no better doctors and surgeons anywhere than in our armed forces. Their care of the sick and wounded is the envy and admiration of the world.

Second, let me tell you what I have discovered from the War Department about the granting of furloughs and the policies that will govern the redistribution and partial demobilization of our armed forces after the end of the war in Europe.

These policies, I wish to emphasize, are based upon the expressed preference of the men in service. Months ago it was realized that standards and procedures would have to be established to govern the demobilization of troops both in the Pacific and in Europe after the Nazis collapse. It will obviously take fewer troops to wage war against Japan alone than against Japan and Germany together.

To let our fighting men decide the problem for themselves, questionnaires were sent to our soldiers all over the world, including those on such now inactive fronts as Alaska, the Caribbean, Iceland, Africa, and the Near East.

The men themselves decided to set up four points to govern priority of release from service:

1. Total length of military service.
2. Length of service overseas.
3. Combat-service record.
4. Number of dependents under the age of 18.

At the end of the German phase of the war, every soldier will be given a rating card on which to put down his record on these four points, each of which will be given a numerical value. In general, those having the highest number of points will be demobilized first. In the case of certain highly trained specialists, military necessity may intervene until such time as equally trained men are available.

This system of rating and priority will apply both in the Pacific and European theaters of war—and rightly so. Many men have been out there in the Pacific fighting for more than 3 years, are now battle-scarred veterans of many campaigns, and certainly deserve to come home whenever it can safely be done without jeopardizing the lives of their comrades.

That, ultimately, must be the criterion in this matter—that is, when it can safely be done without jeopardizing the lives of other brave men. This holds not only for demobilization plans but the granting of furloughs.

There is not one of us, I am sure, who would have our sons home again at the expense of the life of the boy next door.

Not one of us, I am sure, would think of allowing our personal desires, however deep and natural, to prolong the war even 1 second beyond what is absolutely necessary. We all want the war won quickly.

And we can all rely, I believe, upon General Marshall to bring final victory in the shortest possible time. We can count on his sound judgment, his tried and brilliant leadership, to accomplish this with the fewest possible losses.

The plans are already well laid for the day when Germany collapses, as I know from my recent talk with high War Department officials. I can't tell you all I learned, of course. But I can tell you—and I hope the Japs are listening—that we are soon going to strike them with devastating blows harder than anyone was ever struck before. We shall give them no rest until they give up and are forced to accept unconditional surrender.

Here, in a general way, is what our President and chiefs of staff have decided upon when the war in Europe ends:

First. We shall fly and ship many elements of the Air Forces directly to the Pacific to to continue softening up the Jap war machine, to keep it from catching its breath or strengthening its defenses and replacing the thousands of ships and planes we have already sunk and destroyed.

Second. We will ship troops—ordnance, quartermaster, transportation, and engineers—to prepare depots and airfields on the

Pacific front, and provide billets for the ground forces to follow.

Military leaders hope to bring back to the United States a large part of the ground forces now in Europe—some to be demobilized under the priority system I have described to you—others to be reequipped and be given rest and furloughs before they receive new assignments in the Pacific.

The rapidity of this movement will depend upon the number of ships available, for the men already on the fighting fronts in the Pacific will rightly have first call on ships to keep them fully supplied. They will need more ships than before as we crowd the Jap homeland ever closer and in larger force.

Some units will necessarily have to be left in Europe as occupation troops, and for these the Army has already devised a broad recreational and educational program. We are planning an Army university which will offer expert instruction in all fields. The men will receive standard college credit for these courses. Those not qualified for college instruction will take high-school courses, either in the classroom or by correspondence. Those who desire it will receive technical training to prepare them for new jobs in the Army or in civil life.

In addition, large recreation areas will be established to which our men can go for rest and relaxation. Many will have an opportunity to travel and acquaint themselves with Europe and the varying ways of life in its many countries, which is an education in itself.

At all costs, and in every way, our men will be kept physically, mentally, and spiritually fit. We can do no less for those who have sacrificed so much to keep the banner of freedom flying so that we here at home can go on enjoying the American way of life.

I know the anxieties and the worries that lie close to the hearts of many of you, and I only wish I could remove them. But in the nature of things I cannot. There is one thing, however, that you and I together can do. We can and should see to it that we never suffer these anxieties and worries again, and it can only be done by outlawing war and making sure that aggressors are stopped dead in their tracks before they start on their bloody path of destruction.

On March 19, 1945 I introduced into the Congress a bill which, in my opinion would do much to prevent war. It would authorize our Government to pledge to any international security organization that may be established the use of armed force against any actual or potential aggressor. This would enable our American representatives on the security council to act promptly without waiting for congressional action, and in concert with other nations, to preserve the peace whenever it is threatened. While it is the right of the Congress to declare war, the Constitution also authorizes the use of extensive police powers, and in my considered judgment, the prompt use of a minimum force to keep the peace falls into police power category.

Many of you have already written me to express your agreement with my point of view. I wish you would discuss this with your neighbors. I wish you would write me. I want to have the fullest possible expression of opinion.

No matter how the goal is achieved, we must make sure that the great sacrifices of all our boys have not been made in vain. We must follow through to attain the objective of lasting peace defined by the great leader and towering statesman we have so recently and so tragically lost. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—an objective reaffirmed in forthright terms by his strong, able, and already highly respected successor, President Harry S. Truman, another man of the people, long a special friend of the plain soldier, for he was one himself in the last war.

Reward Postal Workers for Fine Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the man who delivers the mail, and all his colleagues in the Postal Service are, in my opinion, entitled to a permanent raise in their basic wages. Since 1925 these faithful Government employees have had no increase. During the depression years they had to take a pay cut of 27 percent which was restored in 1935.

In May, 2 years ago, they were granted a temporary annual bonus of $300, half of which they lost immediately to the withholding tax. This fails to meet their situation, and H. R. 2071 should promptly be enacted into law as a reward to a group of Federal employees who, through winter storms and summer heat have never shirked their duty. Their present overtime rates are less per hour than regular pay.

None of the arguments about holding the wage line applies in this case, for if Congress fails to act on H. R. 2071 by June 30, the effect will be that of a wage cut. In all fairness to a most deserving group of Government employees, Congress should promptly approve this legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial written by the Honorable Robert L. Kern, which appeared in his newspaper, the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, on Thursday, April 19, 1945:

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

When the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned it left unfinished an act which a majority in both Houses favored and which, if brought to a vote, undoubtedly would have passed.

That bill, known as House of Representatives bill No. 2071, has to do with the salaries of United States postal employees.

It has been reintroduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress and the campaign for its enactment is again under way.

To be of any help to the thousands of the Nation's postal employees, this bill must be favorably acted upon by June 30, for on that date the $300 bonus law expires.

In lieu of this bonus the current bill proposes a $400 per annum increase of the present postal base pay.

It can be readily seen that all the postal employees are asking is $100-a-year increase in pay at this time.

Other provisions in the bill provide, however, for a $200-a-year increase within the next 2 years, a boost for overtime pay, and longevity pay.

Surely, if any group of workers in this country deserves a raise it is the postal employees.

They have not had an increase in salary in the past 20 years.

During the depression years they even suffered a decrease in pay.

As a body they have given much of their time and effort to war activities.

By their faithful cooperation they have been a major factor in the distribution of soldier's bonus bonds, the taking of the unemployment census, alien registration, War bond sales, and numerous other civic activities—all without extra pay.

Now, despite inadequate earning power and with thousands of their fellow employees in the armed services, they keep up their cheerful and satisfactory service in the forwarding, sorting, and distribution of the mail.

The postal workers have renewed their plea to the present Congress for the speedy enactment of this bill.

It is up to all of us who appreciate their service to help them along.

Legislation of this kind is seldom acted upon by Congress unless there is sufficient pressure brought to bear by the electorate back home.

After all, Senators and Congressmen are only human, and if their constituents display no interest in a proposition it is scarcely likely they will.

The time for action on this bill is growing short; less than 2½ months for the decision as to whether the plodding mail carrier, the men and women we know at the local post office, the railway mail clerks, and workers in all the other branches of the Postal Service will get a deserved boost or a decrease in their pay.

It cannot remain as it is.

The decrease will come automatically if Congress fails to act before July 1.

The increase will go into effect if Congress passes the bill.

Congress undoubtedly will act quickly and favorably if enough of their constituents ask them to.

So let's reward all the fine past services rendered us by our post-office friends by writing to our Congressman and Senators telling them we will appreciate their favorable action on H. R. 2071.

Importance of the Development of Hydro-Electric Power for New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent statement to the press by Hon. R. A. Newton, Massena, N. Y., president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, relative to the importance of the development of hydroelectric power for New York State:

The great need of New York State is the development of all its hydroelectric power if we are to continue to compete with other areas that have hydroelectric power developed by the assistance of the Federal Government. The State of New York has paid from 25 to 35 percent of the costs of these developments, and it is very evident that if we are to continue to be known as the Empire State that we should wake up to the fact that it is very essential that we develop all the natural resources of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers.

At this time I wish to inform the public of what a small hydroelectric development did for Massena. In 1900 Massena had a population of approximately 1,000 people. In 1902 a hydroelectric development was completed here by private interests which developed approximately 75,000 horsepower. As a result of this development the Aluminum Co. of America, which was known at that time as the Pittsburg Reduction Co., leased the power and built some reduction plants

at Massena. At this time the aluminum industry was in the experimental stages. As the aluminum industry developed, the Aluminum Co. kept enlarging the plants at Massena until today they have one of the largest plants in the United States, consisting of blooming mills, rolling mills, wire mills, and many reduction mills. As a result of the industrial activity here, the present population of Massena is estimated at 15,000 people.

The assessed valuation of the town of Massena in 1900 was around $1,000,000. The assessed valuation at the present time is over $20,000,000, or more than one-fifth of the assessed valuation of the county of St. Lawrence.

In 1907 the Aluminum Co. of America tried to develop the power in the St. Lawrence River, and they asked Congress for a 100-year franchise, which was denied them. No doubt if this power could have been developed, the aluminum industry would not have gone into Quebec and developed the tremendous plant known as the Shipshaw plant.

I have been informed that this plant is producing 3,000,000 pounds of aluminum per day. The bauxite ore can be shipped from the mines in South America by water to this plant. One of the officials of the Aluminum Co. informed me a few years ago that the Quebec Government said to the Aluminum Co. officials that they could have perpetual rights to this power providing they furnished employment for labor.

The employment of labor in Canada for the manufacture of aluminum is not much assistance to the labor of the State of New York. This holds true to the manufacture of aluminum and electro-chemical products in Tennessee, California, Washington and the State of Ohio, where these industries have been built up by the development of hydro-electric power. I am in hopes that the labor unions of the State of New York will insist that their Representatives in Congress and the United States Senate give their whole-hearted supported to the promotion of the navigation and power resources of the St. Lawrence River which has been estimated will furnish employment directly and indirectly during the construction period to at least 100,000 people. After it is developed the possibilities of the use of power for industrial purposes should increase the demand for a large amount of labor. Wherever these large hydro-electric developments have taken place electro-chemical plants have been established in their immediate vicinity, for example the development at Niagara Falls.

With the enormous increase in the production of aluminum the result of the building of many plants in various sections of the United States, I question whether the Aluminum Co., at Massena, can continue to make aluminum as cheap here as they can in other parts of the country where more and cheaper power is available. For instance at the Vancouver plant in the State of Washington, power is available for the manufacture of aluminum at 2 mills per kilowatt hour. The Aluminum Co., at Massena, is buying a large quantity of power from Canada to operate this plant. How cheap this power is made available to the aluminum interests I am not in possession of the facts; however it is reasonable to assume that at the Canadian plant power can be produced cheaper than transmitted power.

Here in northern New York we have 2,200,000 horsepower, the cheapest undeveloped electric energy in the United States. It has been estimated by the Power Authority of the State of New York that the power can be developed at the cost of ½ to 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. It is reasonable to assume that if there is a demand for the aluminum that is manufactured that the plants producing the aluminum at the cheapest price per pound are the ones that will continue in operation.

You probably know that the bauxite ore that is used at the Massena plant is shipped from Arkansas by rail and the freight amounts to two or three hundred dollars per car. I feel positive that if the people of the State of New York do not demand and insist that the great natural resources of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers be developed for the benefit of the State, that industries will migrate to other areas where greater quantities of cheaper power are available.

We in northern New York feel that a few selfish interests in the State which we have every reason to believe are opposing this, the Niagara Planning Commission at Niagara Falls, the shipping interest, the elevator interest of Buffalo and the Port of Albany and Port of Buffalo, and the Port Authority of New York have only selfish reasons for organizing to prevent the development of the power at Massena. Of course, their only reason is due to the fact that they do not want competition of cheaper power or water transportation facilities which would be provided by opening the international section of the St. Lawrence River. The shipping interests of Buffalo are afraid if the seaway is developed the boats that now carry large shipments of commodities over the Great Lakes would not break bulk at Buffalo, and the same reason applies to the Port Authorities of the city of New York who fear the possibility of the loss of some business. It is about time Buffalo woke up to the fact that it could become a seaport instead of a lakeport. This certainly should be a great advantage to an industrial city as great as Buffalo as they would be able to ship their products by means of water transportation. With the industrial activity of your city, it might be to your advantage to trade with the rest of the world. Due to rapid transportation facilities, we have become internationally minded. I should also think the city of Rochester would benefit greatly by becoming a seaport.

In my opinion it is an opportune time to start a campaign of education to let the people of the State know the benefits that can be derived by the development of these great natural resources and this can be carried on through the press of the State; and the few selfish interests who are opposing it should not be allowed to continue to block this project which means so much to the future industrial development of the State of New York.

The United States Department of Commerce has conducted a survey of the St. Lawrence to prove that the railroads of the country will not in any way be injured by this development. I feel positive that the opposition of the unions to this project cannot be substantiated by facts, as the increased industrial activity resulting from the developments of hydroelectric resources would mean the employment of many thousands of people.

I am sure that anyone with a grain of common sense should know that the power development of the St. Lawrence River at Massena for which several hundred million dollars would be expended would be a great benefit to the New York Central Railroad as they would be the carrier that would ship all the needed supplies for the development of this project.

You probably know that the St. Lawrence plant at Massena, which was built by the Defense Plant Corporation, was closed down last year, due to the fact that electric energy generated by coal in New York City to operate this plant was costing three and one-half times per kilowatt more than the same current at Vancouver, Wash. I have been reliably informed that this current was costing 7 to 7½ mills per kilowatt.

I feel sure that if the people of the State of New York knew the facts and the importance of this development they would insist that the development be started at the earliest possible date. The best way to let the people know of this situation is through the press of the State; and I am hoping that the various newspapers in the northern, central, and western parts of the State, to whom I am addressing this letter, will favor us with as much publicity in the matter as possible.

I would like to offer at this time a challenge to the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development to participate in a public debate at any time or any place as they may designate. I would suggest the cities of Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Syracuse, Rochester, Albany, or New York. A free and open discussion would help to enlighten us whether or not the so-called organized groups of selfish interests really have sound and legitimate reasons for opposing the project.

Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, my old friend and colleague on the faculty of Montana State University, Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ralph Y. McGinnis, United States Naval Reserve, has drawn a word picture of the fighting at Iwo Jima which I feel merits the attention of the House.

While the article speaks for itself, I was especially struck with Mac's last paragraph, in which he says:

> Tomorrow is Sunday. I shall conduct the usual Sunday morning church service aboard ship. But as I read the service, say the prayer, and give my "short talk," we shall be thinking mostly of those United States marines who were with us in our church service last Sunday, but who died on Iwo Jima so that the rest of us might live a better life in America.

Well said, Mac, and well done. You have expressed the hope of all of us that these gallant men's lives will not have been spent in vain. Let those of us who remain behind put up as good a fight as those at the actual battle fronts, and let us, in the memory of their sacrifices, do what we can to insure lasting peace to the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including Lieutenant McGinnis' story as it appeared in the April 10, 1945, issue of the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont.:

TOO TIRED TO SLEEP AFTER WEEK OF COMBAT, MCGINNIS WRITES ACCOUNT OF IWO JIMA LANDINGS

"When we pulled out of Iwo, I was on the *Conn* as officer of the day—in charge of the ship. The captain had gone below, near collapse from exhaustion. After I came off watch I tried to sleep, but actually I was too tired to sleep. And so I wrote the enclosed account of what I remembered. Censorship restrictions have prevented my mailing the account about Iwo Jima until now," wrote Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ralph Y. McGinnis, United States Naval Reserve, in a letter received here recently by Fred Barthelmess.

"After Iwo," continued Mr. McGinnis, who in civilian life is a member of the Montana State University faculty, "we were laid up for repairs for several weeks. Now (April 2) we are doing 'milk run' duty—hauling military cargo between advanced bases and invasion beachheads.

"Incidentally, anything you read in the papers and magazines about Iwo Jima was true. Imagine, if you can, over 70,000 men on an island 5 miles long and 3 miles wide playing the game of 'who kills who.' Of course the United States marines finally won, and in so doing captured about 23 Japs alive and dispatched about 23,000 to see their honorable ancestors."

The enclosure, which follows, is dated Saturday night, February 24. The Knudsen mentioned in it is Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Sverre Knudsen, peacetime principal of the Paxson School here, who entered the Naval Reserve and received his indoctrination at the Tucson, Ariz., officer training school with Mr. McGinnis.

(By Ralph McGinnis)

"The following is a brief account of what I have been doing for the last 6 days. Perhaps it will support the news reports that this invasion is the bloodiest battle in the Pacific war. And so it is. At least I don't know how it could be any more bloody.

"Last Monday morning we were part of a great convoy steaming toward the Japanese island of Iwo Jima. Reveille was at 1:50 a. m. Chow was at 2 a. m. (the cooks went on duty at midnight.)' We served a big breakfast, the last meal which many of our marine passengers ever ate. By 4 a. m. we were at our battle stations. Ahead of us in the distance the sky was brilliant with shell fire from the battleships, cruisers, and destroyers, blasting away on the invasion beaches. Everything for us was going according to plan. The precision of the whole operation was phenomenal. By dawn we were exactly in our prescribed position and when the appointed minute of H-hour of D-day was at hand, the invasion began. All of our marine passengers disembarked in amphibious tractors on schedule, but not all of them reached the beaches. One of our amphib-tracks, soon after it left the ship, took a direct hit from Jap artillery and sank with the loss of six marines. Ten others, seriously wounded, were rescued from the water. Those "tracks" which were able to deliver safely their marine troops ashore, came back to the ship to haul cargo. During the next 3 days and 3 nights much of our ammunition cargo was ferried ashore by the amphibious tractors."

EARLY RECEPTION

"The Japanese artillery and mortar shelling began before the first waves of Marines reached shore. Much of it came from Mount Surabachi at the south end of Iwo Jima. It was the Japanese Gibraltar of the Pacific. It was honeycombed with tunnels, and hundreds of guns were imbedded in its caves. Incidentally, Mount Surabachi looks somewhat like Mount Jumbo at home. For 5 days the mountain held out against shelling from warships and assaults by marines. And during those five days it fired thousands of shells at our ships and beachheads. Our ship kept position about 3 miles from shore, but some of our largest warships were stationed within a mile of the shore, firing incessantly to cover the beaches. Late in the morning of the fifth day, Friday, one of our lookouts reported that he saw men climbing near the top of the mountain. Through my binoculars I could easily see American marines nearing the summit. When the marines reached the top, we announced over the ship's public address system what was happening. And then it happened. An improvised flagpole was erected. The Stars and Stripes were flying from its top. As the men aboard ship saw the event take place, they just stood by dumbly and smiled and wept at the same time."

THE WORST DAY

"Friday was our worst day. We had driven the ship up to the beach on Thursday afternoon during a very heavy rainstorm, but we were forced to retract because heavy Japanese shelling of the beach made further unloading unprofitable for us. But shortly after Mount Suribachi had been secured on Friday morning we beached again and continued to unload ammunition and heavy cargo. That night when we were just beginning to feel half secure, a terrific Japanese bombardment began from their guns on the other end of the island. At the same time Jap planes came over from three directions. We fired our guns until the barrels were hot and all planes were either shot down or driven off. Although officially our ship did not down any Jap planes, at least we kept them from diving on us and strafing us, and their bombs fell a safe distance away. The red tracers from the antiaircraft shells made the sky appear as though all the Fourth of July celebrations that ever had been held were going off all at once.

"When the Jap planes were driven off, the bombardment from Jap artillery and mortars became intense. Shells were bursting all around us. Shrapnel was striking around us like hailstones. I crouched beside my gun director's tub for protection. The wide-open sky was above me. I saw three direct hits on the LST beside us. We learned later that two of its men were killed and eight wounded. Knudsen's ship had been in its place during the afternoon. (I had seen Knute for about 2 minutes. We were less than 100 feet apart, but we said nothing. Only stood and shook our heads at each other.) There were six casualties on the LSM to our port side. Another LST had 6 killed and 11 wounded. As the shelling continued, I jabbered some sort of instructions to the men at the five guns which were under my command. But I doubt if they heard me very well. They were as frightened as I. The concussion from the shell bursts stunned the senses. Faintly I could hear the shrapnel and shell fragments clatter off the sides of my gun director tub and zing past above my head. The blood in my nose and cheeks tingled and stung and my brain seemed numb and I was cold all over. Suddenly, the big naval guns from the warships offshore opened up on the Jap area that was shelling us. Truly, hearing the firing and seeing the tracers from these 16-inch, 10-inch, and 5-inch shells whizzing over our heads gave me the most comforting feeling that I have ever known. Gradually the Jap shelling slackened, and after 2 hours it became only sporadic. By midnight, ships all around us were reporting in by radio to the commander their numbers of killed and wounded. By some miracle which never will be explained, our ship had no fatalities and only one man was wounded from a shell fragment. There is a shell hole in the captain's stateroom. Bulkheads, hatches, and ship's gear topside are damaged and scarred from shell fragments. But these damages are not serious. The Japs had used medium-sized artillery and large-sized mortars. It was a terrifying experience for us and it is little wonder that today, as the men talk about it, some of them look wide-eyed and wild."

BACK FOR MORE

"When we departed from Iwo Jima this afternoon we were still under occasional Jap artillery fire. So far, the marines have captured about half of the island, but our ship is heading back to an advanced base for repairs and then another load of marines and cargo for another operation. The week has been a nightmare, and I shall never forget it, for these things I have seen:

"Dead United States marines, face down and bloated, floating past the stern of the ship;

"American planes, struck by antiaircraft fire, burn and crash into the ocean;

"Ships and boats afire, listing and sinking from Japanese bombardment;

"A working party of 'CBs' fall like dominoes when a Jap mortar shell landed in its midst;

"Soft-spoken, dare-devil marines, with whom we had eaten chow, played cards and sung songs, die helplessly when their amphibious tractor was shelled and sunk.

"The scenes of death and destruction on the beach were ghastly. One of the news reporters told hardly half of the story when he radioed the States: 'The black volcanic ash around the battle-dressing stations became brown and muddy with blood from the wounded and dying and dead.'

"Throughout this past week there has been only one glorious sight to see: the American flag flying from the top of the Japanese Gibraltar of the Pacific.

"Tomorrow is Sunday, and I shall conduct the usual Sunday morning church service aboard ship. But as I read the service, say the prayers, and give my 'short talk,' we shall be thinking mostly of those United States marines who were with us in our church service last Sunday but who died on Iwo Jima so that the rest of us might live a better life in America."

Radio Address That President Roosevelt Intended To Make at the Jefferson Day Dinner, April 13, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Americans are gathered together this evening in communities all over the country to pay tribute to the living memory of Thomas Jefferson—one of the greatest of all democrats; and I want to make it clear that I am spelling that word "democrats" with a small "d."

I wish I had the power, just for this evening, to be present at all of these gatherings.

In this historic year, more than ever before, we do well to consider the character of Thomas Jefferson as an American citizen of the world.

As Minister to France, then as our first Secretary of State, and as our third President, Jefferson was instrumental in the establishment of the United States as a vital factor in international affairs.

It was he who first sent our Navy into far distant waters to defend our rights. And the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine was the logical development of Jefferson's far-seeing foreign policy.

Today this Nation, which Jefferson helped so greatly to build, is playing a tremendous part in the battle for the rights of man all over the world.

Today we are part of the vast Allied force—a force composed of flesh and blood and steel and spirit—which is today destroying the makers of war, the breeders of hatred, in Europe and in Asia.

In Jefferson's time our Navy consisted of only a handful of frigates headed by the gallant U. S. S. *Constitution—Old Ironsides*—but that tiny Navy taught nations across the Atlantic that piracy in the Mediterranean—acts of aggression against the peaceful commerce and the enslavement of their crews was one of those things which, among neighbors, simply was not done.

Today we have learned in the agony of war that great power involves great responsibility. Today we can no more escape the consequences of German and Japanese aggression than could we avoid the consequences of at-

tacks by the Barbary corsairs a century and a half before.

We, as Americans, do not choose to deny our responsibility.

Nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our children and our children's children, there will not be a third world war.

We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars—yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman, and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments.

The once powerful malignant Nazi state is crumbling. The Japanese war lords are receiving, in their own homeland, the retribution for which they asked when they attacked Pearl Harbor.

But the mere conquest of our enemies is not enough.

We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance, and the greed, which made this horror possible.

Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of the brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe.

Today, science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another.

Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace.

Let me assure you that my hand is the steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move more firmly into the task, knowing that you—millions and millions of you—are joined with me in the resolve to make this work endure.

The work, my friends, is peace. More than an end of this war—an end to the beginnings of all wars. Yes, an end, forever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killing of peoples.

Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight-edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Pan-American Day Address of Hon. Pete Jarman at Santiago, Chile, April 14, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] on April 14, 1944, at Santiago, Chile, at a celebration of Pan-American Day:

Mr. President, Mr. President of the Republic, distinguished guests, and fellow representatives, my colleague and I are thoroughly conscious, and equally appreciative, of the honor which is ours in representing our country on this solemn occasion by joining with you in celebration of the day of the Americas, and we wish to sincerely thank you for the privilege of doing so.

Mr. President in extending the kind invitation to our House of Representatives, you referred to the occasion as one "particularly propitious for consolidating the ties of understanding and co-fraternity among the American Republics." Be assured that your invitation was accepted in exactly that spirit. I am happy to greet you on behalf of the House of Representatives of the United States, to felicitate you and express our best wishes, not only for the success of your deliberations but for each of you personally. Seniority doubtless means much in your body, as it does in ours, and it is our hope that each of you may continue to ably represent your respective constituencies for many years.

I regard the reference to Chile as the California of South America as quite appropriate, even though your Pacific coastline exceeds that of California, Oregon and Washington, our only Pacific States, by 1,450 miles. That is, your Pacific coastline is twice as long as ours plus 250 miles. I have always understood that the customs, dispositions and general characteristics of the people of Chile are very similar to those of citizens of the United States. My delightful association with you abundantly confirms that opinion and causes me to regard the fact as quite complimentary to my people.

Our countries have both been melting pots in which peoples from throughout the world have found havens of peace, happiness, independence, and freedom from fear and persecution. You Chileans are instinctively democratic, just as we are. I am impressed that our political ideals are identical and that the background for the founding of our countries was the same. Your great Bernardo O'Higgins and our great George Washington had uppermost in their minds independence and liberty, as well as cooperation. The world owes much to these outstanding soldiers and statesmen. Patriots of our two countries have throughout the intervening years fought and died to continue the independence and freedom of our respective republics. We have developed cultures, customs, and traditions characteristic of our peoples, our climates, our ideals. Yes; we enjoy a brilliant common heritage, of which every citizen of both countries can be very justly proud. And as our heritage is common, so is our destiny.

While I have referred particularly to Chile, much of what I have said equally applies to the other American republics, some of which certain of you distinguished gentlemen so ably represent. The mutual advantage of closer economic and cultural relations between all of our republics is impossible to evaluate. Suffice it to regard it of sufficient importance that we establish it as one of our main goals. With all American nations working closely together toward that end, strictly on a par as to sovereignty and national dignity, which is the idea of all our conferences and dealings, there is no limit to our possibilities for accomplishment.

Although the good-neighbor policy is comparatively new by that name, inter-American cooperation is as old as the American republics themselves, and let us hope that no deterioration therein will ever occur. As you know, an eminent Chilean, Don Juan Egana, is entitled to credit for the first proposal for pan-American unity. With statesmanlike vision he foresaw as early as 1810 the importance of unity of purpose and policy by the American republics. With the progress of the years we Americans have substituted the equality of states for balance-of-power politics.

Once it was difficult for us to know each other sufficiently because of handicaps of distance and lack of rapid transportation. These handicaps have happily been removed by the airplane, which has so greatly shortened the distance between our countries. The better we know each other the greater is the possibility, yes, the positive probability, of maintenance of hemispheric solidarity. Consequently we of the United States Congress were delighted when your delegation of newspapermen visited us last May, and particularly so, Mr. President, when you so honored us in November. Similarly, my colleague and I are happy to visit your interesting country. However, our diplomatic corps constitute our front lines in this respect. You Chileans are very justly proud of your diplomatic representation in Washington headed by that eminent statesman and excellent diplomat Ambassador Michels, who, along with the members of his staff, is held in the highest esteem and affection in my country. We are equally proud to be represented in yours by one of our ablest and most experienced Ambassadors. We know you enjoy your association and business with Ambassador Bowers and the members of his staff.

Pan-American cooperation is, as I have said, by no means new. Its success has undoubtedly influenced the beginning of cooperation on a much larger scale. The first attempt at cooperation between 44 coequal nations with equal rights, equal privileges and equal responsibilities occurred with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Conference in Atlantic City last November. As we embark on this broad, cooperative effort, so pregnant with possibilities, let us, with determination, indulge the hope that it may prove as successful as has the cooperation among our American republics.

As illustrative of the attitude of the body it is our privilege to represent, all of the members of which, except six, belong to our two main parties, I refer to the unanimity of our Foreign Affairs Committee. I am one of its 14 Democratic members, while my colleague ranks third among the 11 Republicans. Although we naturally sometimes differ on, and argue about, domestic policies, those differences of opinion have not been permitted to interfere with our foreign policy. To illustrate, every bill reported from our Committee since Pearl Harbor has gone to the floor of the House with unanimous approval with one exception, when one member dissented merely because a minor amendment was not adopted. Yes, the sole test has been, not the party to which we belong, but whether the measure under consideration would contribute toward winning the war and bringing about a just and lasting peace. My colleague joins me in assuring you that in the United States, partisan politics stops at the water's edge.

I wish to reiterate the deep appreciation of our House of Representatives and of Congressman CHIPERFIELD and myself of the kind invitation of this distinguished body which afforded us the great pleasure of enjoying this momentous occasion with you. May I also sincerely thank you for the many courtesies with which you have honored us. We have enjoyed every minute of our visit, on which we will always reflect with such pleasant memories as to hope that the happy day is not far distant when we may return, accompanied by our wives, that they too may learn from experience what a delightful country yours is.

As we celebrate the fifty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, organized to promote peace, commerce, and

friendship between the American republics by fostering continued cooperation among them, it is appropriate, I think, that, while offering sincere, heartfelt thanks for what has been accomplished, we emphatically rededicate ourselves to these noble purposes and the furthering of those excellent relations which alone can fully reap the reward to which our peoples are entitled and achieve the common destiny of which I spoke.

Full Employment and Social Security Under a Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Full Employment and Social Security Under a Free-Enterprise System," delivered by me in St. Louis on April 20, last, before the St. Louis chapter of the Missouri Association for Social Welfare and the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, during this past week, Americans everywhere have been thinking with a deeper intensity about the future of our country and of the world. We have lost a great leader at a time when mankind stands at the crossroads of decision. Part of the victory over the evil that threatened the world has been won. But all that we have gained thus far will come to less than nothing if we lose courage now and if we falter from an excess of caution where we should proceed with boldness. The greatest tribute we can pay to our late beloved President, Franklin Roosevelt, will be to push forward with renewed determination toward those goals of freedom, security and opportunity for all men everywhere which he so clearly saw and toward which so many of his policies were directed.

Franklin Roosevelt was guided by a great vision. He was clear in his mind, and gave clarity to the minds of tens of millions of people, that peace, freedom, and security are not only compatible one with another but also are interdependent. He had read history with a discerning mind. He had learned the profound lesson that economic peace and security are essential for political peace and security. We are all grateful that it has fallen to the lot of farsighted and courageous American, Harry S. Truman of Missouri, to take up the reins of government in this critical period and carry on the struggle for economic freedom.

The Economic Bill of Rights presented by President Roosevelt stands as a new charter and a new goal, coequal with the Bill of Rights enacted by our forefathers. We pledge our support to President Truman in all his efforts to achieve this goal. We have full confidence in his ultimate success.

And so, today, I am glad to be talking to you about three related measures which will help carry us toward that goal—measures inspired by ideals which are common to all Americans but which have been given new meaning and new force over the past 12 years. Those measures relate to full employment, regional development, and social security.

I start with full employment because it is so comprehensive that it embraces the other two. Social security and regional development will be an essential contribution to full employment. Jobs for all is the best safeguard of freedom and security for the American people. At a high level of employment we can keep the economic hazards of unemployment, dependent old age, sickness, and dependency within manageable proportions. Similarly, the large and expanding market that accompanies full employment, facilitates regional development of natural resources and creates the most favorable circumstances for progress on cooperative local, State, regional, and Federal projects. At a high level of employment at home, we are best equipped to be good neighbors and good friends abroad.

PREVENTION OR CONVALESCENCE?

Some of you may be wondering why there is so much concern over jobs. It is clear that during the war we have actually had full employment. The never-satiated demands of war have strained our reserves of manpower and womanpower to the very limit. And we are continually reminded by press, by radio, and by personal experience, that the end of hostilities throughout the world will release a vast backlog of civilian needs that necessarily have been pent up during wartime. Even more significantly, many consumers will have piled up large amounts of savings with which to make these demands effective. So why are we worrying now about post-war markets and post-war employment opportunities?

We are worrying about markets and employment after this war, in part, because of our experiences after World War No. 1. We had difficulties then, even though our mobilization for war was far less complete than it is in the present struggle. A much greater segment of our resources and productive capacity is now mobilized for war. More than twice the number of men have been drawn into the armed forces, and a far greater proportion of our population is now engaged in producing implements of war than in 1918.

The boys now fighting so valiantly in Europe know that their fathers who pounded the Germans on those same battlefields the last time found themselves pounding the pavement at home a few years later, or selling apples on the street corner. And they know that their own reinstatement rights on the old job, if they had one, will not amount to much if several other GI's have the same right to the same job, or if the boss does not have enough capital, materials, or confidence in the future to resume peacetime production.

Likewise, civilian war workers are fearful of the war's aftermath. Many millions of them face the prospect of at least several months of unemployment while war factories are being dismantled and reconverted. Farmers have had record earnings during the war, but they can see ahead to the inevitable shrinkage of foreign markets when liberated nations start feeding themselves once more. Businessmen are aware of these things, and the threat they will be to post-war markets.

It is one of the paradoxes of our modern world that we are also concerned because after the war fewer men will be needed to produce the same volume of goods and services we consumed before the war, and because there will be more people available for production. Under the stress of war our industrial efficiency has greatly increased. At the same time, partly as the result of the normal growth in population, our labor force has expanded and will undoubtedly remain larger after the war—even assuming that several million people now engaged in war production who are not regular workers will retire from the labor market when the fighting is over. It has been estimated that 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 people will be unemployed if our production after the war returns to the 1939 level. In order to provide employment for all who may be seeking work, we would have to produce about 60 percent more than in 1939.

The pent-up demand and the savings which have accumulated during the war, if released gradually and in step with the reconversion of industry, can be of help in achieving a high level of employment and production in the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities. They will not, however, be able to assure a continuous high level of demand in the more distant years ahead. Can we, then, maintain a high level of production and employment over the long period?

One thing we have learned since the last war is that the economy will not, if left to itself, automatically stay in balance and provide adequate job opportunities and steadily rising standards of living. Laissez faire had failed a long time ago; but the world did not have the courage and the understanding to disown it. Another thing we have learned—and this is much more important—is that we can, through the kind of cooperative action that we term governmental policy, deliberately undertake to keep the economy on an even keel and achieve those goals which the devastations of depression and war have made even more precious to us—namely, economic opportunity and security for all, and for each an ever-increasing share in the good things of life, within a democratic society based on private enterprise.

We have witnessed the vast extent of our productive capacity when management, labor, farmers, and the Government were mobilized for a single purpose—the successful prosecution of the war. I have a deep conviction that in peace Americans can put aside greed and selfishness and work together in preventing a recurrence of the tragic waste and demoralization of mass unemployment—that we can marshal our large productive capacities and resources for a high and expanding level of national well-being.

WHAT THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL PROPOSES

To reach this goal we need first of all a periodic comprehensive inventory and forecast of significant economic trends for the Nation. Secondly, it is essential that legislative policies should be guided by this analysis of economic trends and directed toward specific measures which this stock-taking may indicate to be necessary for the attainment of our over-all goals.

These are the two basic steps embodied in the full-employment bill, Senate bill 380, sponsored by Senator WAGNER of New York, Senator THOMAS of Utah, Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, and myself; and House bill 2202, by Representative PATMAN of Texas.

The bill places on the President, with the aid of his administrative agencies, the responsibility for putting together in an annual budget—which is described as the National Production and Employment Budget—the best available information for the coming year on the expected total volume of consumption and investment. This total is simply the summation of outlays planned by consumers, farmers, businessmen, and local, State, and Federal Governments—the outlays which taken together determine the level of production and employment for the coming year. The National Budget must give in addition an indication of how far the expected level of total outlays will go in achieving the full employment of our manpower, our capacity, and our resources. A comparison of the expected level of outlays and of the total outlays necessary to keep all would-be workers employed sets the

Nation's economic problem before the administration, before the Congress, and before the American people.

The second part of the job is for Congress to decide what should be done if there is a danger of a significant gap between the expected and the required levels of total expenditures by consumers, producers, and governments. If the expected expenditures promise to be too great, anti-inflation masures will be needed. The other possibility is that the expected expenditures may be too small—equally serious because this would mean unemployment.

The bill does not prescribe the kind of legislation Congress should enact. It requires that the President shall make recommendations to the Congress on a program for full employment. The bill indicates the kind of measures which might be included in these recommendations—such as measures dealing with taxation, banking and currency, monopoly, and competition, foreign trade, agriculture, social security, the development of natural resources, and public works. The bill does not, however, make any commitments as to specific measures that should be proposed or adopted. It does not expand the functions of the Federal Government or prescribe any new economic controls. Nor does the bill grant the administration any blank checks to spend at its own discretion.

The bill does set forth, in unmistakably clear terms, the final objective—the right of every individual who wants a job to have the opportunity to work. It constitutes a promise to the Nation that the Government will never lose sight of this goal. The bill emphasizes that competitive private enterprise should be strengthened and assisted in the achievement of full employment, and that the government should do all in its power to encourage private enterprise to attain this goal. In deciding how to do this it will still be the responsibility of the Congress, as it always has been, to reflect and to reconcile the desires of the many interested groups throughout the country in such a way as best to promote the public welfare.

But—and this is the second new element—the bill requires that Congress should do this in a coordinated and informed fashion. Enlightenment would follow from the solid basis of information provided by the estimates in the President's annual message to the Congress. Coordination would follow from the provision that a joint committee from both Houses of Congress should study the President's message as a whole, and, on or before March 1 of each year, recommend to Congress how each of the various measures likely to come before it can be fitted in with the full employment goal.

The purpose of this program is not merely to fill a gap but to prevent one from occurring. In this way it proposes to prevent unemployment. It reaffirms that the strength and prosperity of a nation is in the health and productive work of its people.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The political implications of this approach go far beyond anything I have time to discuss at length. Let me just point out that it would make for a much more clear-cut relationship between the Executive and the Congress. The opportunity for constructive cooperation between the Federal and the State and local governments would also be increased. To illustrate, let me refer you to the full-employment legislation which was recently introduced in California. This proposal is similar to the national full-employment bill which my colleagues and I are sponsoring in Congress. It indicates a gratifying awareness of the important implementing role which will have to be played by State and local governments.

But no Government action, at any level, will be of much avail unless backed by the cooperation of the functional groups in the country. Our bill provides for an advisory council with representatives of business, labor, agriculture, and the public. Civic leaders like yourselves would have an important responsibility in making your interests and views known to Congress and to your local and State legislatures, and in helping thresh out a realistic and workable program.

As I said earlier, the full employment bill is based on the conviction that Americans can work together, through democratic mechanisms, to make our free enterprise system produce for all the people in peace as effectively as it produced the weapons of war. There can be few men whose imaginations have not been quickened by a vision of the new freedoms for the individual, the flowering of the human spirit, which can grow out of the vast productive potentialities of our modern economy. If the vision is to become a reality, it must be translated into specific goals; goals widely accepted and understood; goals for this year and next year and the year after; goals which will change and expand but will serve continuously to give focus and direction to our many diverse activities. The significance of our full employment bill is that it provides a method by which such specific goals can be developed and can be implemented through legislative action that will back up and reinforce the actual productive efforts of all private and public groups in our society.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

I wish I had time today to illustrate some of the different types of post-war projects, large and small, which are being planned, both by private business and by local and State governments; but that is not possible. I would like, however, to comment on one proposed Federal project, which more than any other I know of, would implement the peace-time development of the States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana. I refer, as you may have guessed, to the much-discussed Missouri Valley Authority.

It is hardly necessary for me to speak to a Missouri audience on the need for harnessing the Missouri River to work for the people and not against them. The unruly Missouri has been exacting a heavy toll through devastating floods and ruined farms. For more than 20 years the Missouri Valley States have been losing population despite their vast natural resources, despite their potential agricultural, and other possibilities. This exodus from farm and town will continue unless the resources of the area can be mobilized to create new wealth in the form of increased productivity, better land values and more and better job opportunities. The holding power, and the drawing power, of any area is directly related to the standard of living it will support.

For a century and a half the people of this country have been trying to cope with the problems of river control and river development, but never until the Tennessee Valley Authority Act have we seen fit to look upon a river as nature made her, namely, a single, undivided whole. Instead we have directed one agency to improve a river for navigation, another to build dams for reclamation, still others for flood control, or for power. We have been tampering with the Missouri for generations, we have spent millions of dollars on flood control and navigation alone. We have failed because we have not had the courage to treat one river as one problem.

Senate bill 555, which I introduced in February 1945, proposes the establishment of a single regional agency, the Missouri Valley Authority, to provide for unified water control and resource development of the Missouri Valley region. The bill does not propose to copy T. V. A., no two river valleys are alike. It does propose, however, to follow the principles and broad policies which have been tested and proved by the T. V. A. in one of the most dramatic chapters of our economic and social history.

Briefly, the M. V. A. bill would set up a regional corporate agency under a three-man board, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The agency would have headquarters in the region; it would be fully responsible to the President and the Congress.

Upon this corporation would rest the responsibility to establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the entire river, its tributaries, and watershed. To this end the agency would utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region, and their public and private organizations, local and State, as well as that of the operating agencies of the Federal Government.

The corporation is authorized to construct, operate, and carry out such projects as would best serve to control and prevent floods, to safeguard the navigable waters, to reclaim the public lands, to encourage irrigation, to promote family-type farming, to foster navigation, and to generate electric power to whatever extent is consistent with its primary purposes.

The agency is charged with the duty of reconciling the conflicting demands of reclamation, flood control, navigation, and power—conflicting demands which have so long served only to plague and befuddle us. It is required to report to Congress within 2 years a unified plan for the development of the Missouri Valley, the plan to become effective only after Congress has had an opportunity to approve or reject it.

Admittedly this is a strong measure. A large and urgent problem and a great need call for a strong measure. Its very strength has been the target for the most concentrated fire from the opposition. With pious claims of agreement with end objectives, they nevertheless fall back on the age-old tactics of trying to defeat by division. They would perpetuate the patch-work approach, the competitive and contradictory agencies which have so long characterized our efforts to control the Missouri. We have acted on their advice in the past. We know how barren are the results. The floods have become more devastating; there has been a negligible development of industry; the productivity of 140,000,000 out of the 316,000,000 acres in the valley is threatened by erosion; 40,000,000 acres have eroded to a point where their use is no longer economically practical; there has been a steady decline in population and failure of business growth.

We cannot avoid the fact that this seeping away of population has been accelerated in the last 5 years, when it is estimated that some 1,000,000 persons have left the valley. How many of the war workers, the young men and women of the armed forces who have left may we expect to return to this area? What promise of future prosperity, of individual opportunity, has the Missouri Valley region to offer? In the vast richness of the river and the valley it traverses we have the answer at hand if we can but find the courage and the determination to make it a reality.

I should like to repeat, I know of no single undertaking that has greater potentialities for sound post-war prosperity than a comprehensive program for the development of the Missouri. Nor can I think of one which would do more to revitalize a region, to encourage new business, or to create a setting more conducive to full and stable employment and to prosperity for an important part of the Nation. Through the M. V. A., the people of this area can be greatly strengthened in their opportunity to provide a high

standard of living for themselves and to contribute in a large measure to our national prosperity.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Let us now shift our attention from problems of employment and regional development to some of the Nation-wide issues of social security. I know these are of equal interest to this audience.

One of the pointed lessons of the war years has been that jobs alone do not guarantee security for all American workers and their families. A program of full employment reaches only the employable; it does not meet the problem of the men and women who are no longer able to work. Nor do jobs, in and of themselves, guard against such hazards as illness and injury which, striking unexpectedly, may leave the worker disabled and his family dependent. We must look toward other measures for protection against the insecurity which results from these personal calamities; we must look to additional measures to rid people of the fears of insecurity.

I believe that the most equitable, and the most economical way of providing security for those who at any time cannot work is through a unified and comprehensive system of social insurance to cover the common risks of old-age, unemployment, sickness, and disability, and the costs of medical care. Under the Social Security Act, we have made a notable beginning in this direction. Almost 10 years of experience has proved that the principle of social insurance is sound when applied to the American system of free enterprise and cooperation. This experience has revealed limitations in our present programs, and it has indicated points at which extension and expansion are needed.

OLD-AGE-INSURANCE COVERAGE

One of these is the extension of coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance. Large groups are still excluded. Among these are the self-employed (in commerce, industry, and on farms), wage workers in agriculture, domestic employees in private homes, and employees in nonprofit institutions and governmental agencies. The 1940 census showed some 20,000,000 persons in these types of employment. There is no justification for further delay in extending old-age protection to these groups. In fact, among this segment of the population are to be found some of the workers whose employment conditions are the most uncertain, whose pay is the lowest and who in consequence are the least able, through individual effort, to safeguard themselves and their families against the risks of premature death or against dependency in old age.

These exclusions from coverage not only bar millions of workers from old-age protection, but they also reduce the size of the benefit to which many eligible workers are or will become entitled. Many workers, in the course of a working lifetime, shift back and forth between types of employment now covered and those not now covered. This results in disqualifying many from insurance benefits; it also reduces the earnings which can be credited toward benefits and thus lowers the amount of the payment to which the worker is entitled upon retiring or to which his widow and orphans are entitled upon his death.

Furthermore, some change is needed in the benefit formula itself in order that payments will be more nearly adequate as a basic retirement income. The revised bill which Senator WAGNER and I plan shortly to introduce, based on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of the last Congress, will provide for substantial liberalization of benefit provisions as well as the numbers of people to be covered.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Changes are also needed in the present unemployment-compensation program. Even if our goal of full employment is reached with maximum speed, some wage loss from temporary unemployment will be unavoidable. It is generally estimated that even in a fully active and smoothly functioning labor market about 2 to 4 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed, at any one time.

Because of its division into 51 separate State and Territorial systems, and because of existing inadequacies in amounts and duration of benefits, the present unemployment-compensation program is not well adapted to the demands of Nation-wide reconversion or of full employment. During the past months, some States have revised their unemployment-compensation laws to make them somewhat more adequate for the tasks ahead. But the changes have been too limited. I am convinced that if we are not to jeopardize our efforts to achieve full employment, we must merge our present separate State systems into one national system, providing more adequate protection, and protection equally available, to workers in all parts of our country. We shall also need, during the reconversion period and afterward, a well-coordinated national system of employment offices, to bring workers and jobs together, and to direct displaced war workers and veterans alike to job retraining and new work opportunities.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

I believe that the time has also come for expanding our social-security program to cover the risks of sickness and disability.

It is not necessary for me to describe to this audience the social and economic consequences of illness and disablement. Many of you know, better and in more detail than I, the deprivation and slow demoralization that follows illness, especially among low-income groups. You know, too, that aside from periods of mass unemployment, sickness and resultant disabilities are the major causes of dependency and poverty among American families. It is estimated that on an average day there are about 7,000,000 disabled persons in the United States, and that of these nearly one-half have disabilities that on that average day have already lasted for over 6 months. Such figures include all age groups and all types of illness. Even among the gainfully employed, however, disability rates are high, with 1 out of every 2, 3, or 4 workers experiencing some job interruption because of illness or injury in the course of a year.

In the main, disability is of two major types. It may be acute with early recovery probable; or it may be chronic and likely to continue for a long time or until death.

Of the temporary disabilities, the majority are caused by diseases or injuries which result in short periods of incapacity, and involve equally brief periods of wage loss. In this respect, temporary disability is similar to temporary unemployment. It seems reasonable, therefore, for temporary disability insurance to be geared into the program for unemployment insurance, with similar provisions as to amount and duration of benefits.

Long-term or permanent disability, on the other hand, very closely resembles old age in its effect on the earning capacity of the worker, for it frequently results in his permanent retirement from the labor market. The consequences for the family may be even more serious than in old age, however, since premature disablement is likely to occur at a period when the worker's children are young, when family responsibilities are heaviest, and when the family has not had opportunity to accumulate substantial savings. Such disabilities often place a double strain on the household in which they occur. If the wage earner himself is incapacitated, family income is reduced or cut off at the time when the family is burdened with the additional expenses of necessary medical care. I propose, therefore, that permanent disability benefits similar in amount to old-age benefits be provided as part of a comprehensive social insurance program.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE

I see the problem of providing economic security against the risks of illness and disability as twofold, and I am convinced that it can be met only by a two-way attack. There is, first, the problem of wage loss during periods of disability, which I have just described. There is the further problem of paying for medical care if it is needed, when it is needed.

It happens that my personal interest in social security began through concern about the problems of health and medical care. In 1939, I was privileged to serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which was in charge of the hearings on Senator WAGNER'S health bill, S. 1620. I was shocked by the evidence which was presented to the subcommittee on the prevalence of poor health and of failure to obtain needed medical care. Many persons go entirely without care, because they cannot afford to pay for it at the time they need it. Many persons receive care no better than their grandfathers received, in spite of the spectacular advances of modern medicine.

Because the costs of medical care are uneven and unpredictable for the individual, the social-insurance method of paying these costs is particularly applicable. Workers can pay in advance and pay at an average rate. The pooled funds under such an insurance system are then available to pay doctors and hospitals and laboratories for all the services which may be needed by insured persons and their families when illness occurs.

In 1943, Senator WAGNER and I, in the Senate, and Representative DINGELL in the House, introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act which included, along with the other social-security measures we have been discussing this afternoon, a proposed plan of medical and hospitalization insurance. This part of the bill has been the target of one of the most vitriolic attacks the American public has ever witnessed. The spearhead of the attack is the so-called National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Services, which boasts of the 15,000,000 pamphlets it has printed and the 18,000 releases it has sent out weekly to newspapers and magazines attacking our bill. This kind of campaign takes a lot of paper and a lot of money, and as I believe the American public knows, is not entirely motivated by concern for the public welfare.

A system of medical and hospitalization insurance, such as that proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill does not affect, nor does it attempt to affect, the essential professional aspects of the practice of medicine. I say this advisedly and in contradiction of the hysterical prophecies of impending doom for American medicine which are coming almost daily from the leaders of the American Medical Association. Under medical care insurance, every eligible individual is guaranteed the right to choose his own doctor from among all those in the community who participate. Doctors remain free to accept or reject patients. The treatment of the patient is entirely the doctor's responsibility. And doctors can receive payment for their services according to the method they prefer. Where groups of doctors prefer to work together to give more competent and more economical service, they can do so under an insurance system more easily than today. Neither doctors nor hospitals would be "regimented." Our new bill will make this even clearer—if possible—than the 1943 bill.

If we had medical and hospitalization insurance, the medical care received by the American people would be vastly improved. Many people who now receive no care or who delay in going to the doctor because of the costs, would, under an insurance system,

have paid in advance and be entitled to care when they need it. Many others who now get inadequate care would have thrown open to them all the benefits of specialists' services and of modern laboratory techniques. Doctors also would have the satisfaction of practicing better medicine, while earning, at the same time, more adequate and more assured incomes than most of them ever earned in peacetime. We are proposing a system of prepaid medical and hospital care, not something that the opposition vaguely calls socialized medicine.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Thus far I have talked only about the insurance aspects of a program of social security. I should like to point out, even though briefly, that no matter how adequate a social insurance system may be, there will always be some families with special needs, and some needy persons who cannot work and do not qualify for insurance benefits. A comprehensive social-security program, consequently, must include provision for public assistance which is granted on the basis of individual need. We must expand the insurance system for those who work and earn an income; but we must also strengthen the existing public assistance program. As I see it, one of the major needs in this area is to develop a unified assistance program which—in addition to present aid to the blind, the aged, and to dependent children—would include provisions for Federal matching of funds for general relief. There is need also for revising the present equal matching provisions so as to give a special Federal aid to States whose economic resources are small in relation to their assistance needs. Only through some such plan will it be possible to achieve more adequate grants to the needy individuals who are dependent on these programs for their maintenance.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCES

Both our present social-security program and our newer proposals have been criticized on certain economic grounds. The general criticism that we cannot afford comprehensive social security is economic nonsense. We cannot afford to be without it. The costs involved already exist to a large extent in the form of the wage loss suffered as a result of old age, unemployment, disability, and death, and of payments now being made individually for medical care and hospitalization. The contributions levied under social security represent, in the main, a method of distributing the burden of these already existing costs among all members of society through relatively small regular payments, rather than permitting the unfortunate families for whom risks actually occur to bear the whole loss.

Without sacrificing the advantages of the insurance method—the use of earmarked contributions and the payment of benefits as a right—we can assure that the rates of the pay-roll taxes are so adjusted that to the maximum extent possible, they work along with—and not at cross-purposes with—other plans and other measures for a high-level economy and full employment. To these ends, we have been studying the problem very carefully. I believe that our revised social-security bill will contain a satisfactory proposal.

A comprehensive program of social security can make many and valuable contributions toward a stable peacetime economy. It would aid greatly in maintaining labor mobility, an important requisite if we are to achieve our goal of full employment. A Nation-wide employment service would facilitate job placement, and would reduce the interval elapsing between jobs. An adequate system of benefit payments would make it possible for aged and disabled persons or mothers of dependent children to retire from the labor force if they wish to do so, thereby reducing some of the pressures on the labor market.

As the years pass, I am increasingly aware of the interrelations between social security and the basic stability of our economy. Social security payments help to put a floor under the purchasing power of the Nation. They help to establish a minimum level of demand for the output of factories and mines, and farms, and thus serve to check decline in consumption. Used as they are for current maintenance of many families who would otherwise be without income, their effect on consumer demand is immediate, and disproportionate to their size.

CONCLUSION

In spite of their seeming diversity, the matters I have spoken about stem from an all-important common denominator—the well-being of the people of this Nation. I see such well-being as having its foundation in a virile and stable economy in which there is an active market for goods and services, where people have the opportunity to work at rates of pay that will sustain a rising standard of living, where all gainfully employed persons have the facilities for pooling some of their funds for mutual protection against the more common risks to their security, and where the natural resources of the country are harnessed to work, not for the privileged few, but for the good of all the people.

A program of full employment and social security under a free-enterprise system will not come to the United States full blown or of its own accord. If we want that program and want it in operation, we have to plan it, work for it, fight for it. There is always powerful opposition to any change in our social and economic life. We were forced to fight for the protection of children from hazardous employment. We fought for a limitation of hours of labor and for workingmen's compensation laws. We fought for the right of labor to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. We carried on a long struggle for an equitable system of income taxes, for a program of social security, and for many other humane measures—the enactment and successful operation of which have contributed immeasurably to our present high standards of living and our national prosperity.

Let us go forward in this period and make democracy in America work to carry us through to a safer and better world. If you believe with me that all this is worth having, join with me in the work and the fight to achieve it.

A Time for Rededication to Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the National Democratic Club of New York on the 27th of January last, the subject being A Time for Rededication to Democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Judge CORNELIUS F. COLLINS. Ladies and gentlemen, our members and guests participating in this session, and of our radio audience, the National Democratic Forum now assembled in regular session at our clubhouse is resuming today, after a lapse of 3 years due to the war, its popular, intensive forum activities for the discussion of timely, patriotic subjects by outstanding guest speakers.

To inaugurate this, the opening session of our 1945 series, the club has the gratifying happiness to welcome as our guest of honor the famous statesman and orator, United States Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida. [Applause.]

He has chosen as his subject of discussion the ideally timeful and potential theme, "A Time for Rededication to Democracy."

Although he is so well known generally as to need no introduction, I would be inclined as chairman of the forum to yield to temptation to formally present him, even if justified only by the desire to express the high esteem in which we hold him, but for the fact that no danger must be incurred to encroach upon his radio time. It is my very happy privilege in behalf of the National Democratic Club to present our distinguished guest of honor, Senator PEPPER.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the National Democratic Club, and kindred spirits of democracy, your distinguished chairman has spoken with characteristic Democratic eloquence and generosity in his kindly words of introduction of me, and I hope I in a properly accredited Democratic spirit may express my deep gratitude for what he has said.

I am deeply conscious of the great honor which you bestow upon me to allow me to come into the list of the distinguished speakers who in your long past have come here to your forum, and I particularly am grateful that you have allowed me today to substitute for one of the great Democrats, one of the great statesmen of America and the world, the Senator whom New York has given to the United States, Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER. [Applause.]

And I may say that I remarked to Mr. Norton, who was gracious enough to escort me here, as I arrived, that I was most happy to see a liberal sentiment housed in such comfort and affluence as one may say is exhibited by your magnificent building here. I think there are a lot of people who are astonished constantly that any Democrat has more than 30 cents of his own [laughter] and to find here an organization which has lasted so long and is so well housed and, if I understand correctly the information I have received, so well off in the world's goods, I am persuaded that you are a living example of the fact that as honesty is good policy in business, democracy is also good policy to pursue.

Today, our country and the world are involved in a ghastly war. There are many causes which might be specified which have led to this terrible tragedy which today bleeds the heart of the world and pours out its treasure, but I think it might be simplified if we said that the cause of this war is the failure of democracy to work in the world.

Democracy is not only a philosophy. It is a process and human beings are the agencies through which that process if successful must be carried out, and somewhere in the world those in authority and those responsible for the course of human events failed to make men appreciate the worthiness of democracy and failed properly to execute and employ the democratic process; for had democracy existed in the world, there would have been no chance for tyranny and totalitarianism. There would have been no opportunity for nations to have made themselves masters of their fellow nations and of the world. There would have been a democratic recognition of the right of all nations to live and move and have their being without trespass from or aggression by other nations, because the essence of democracy is independence.

And now we are fighting that war, this war, in order that we might restore the democracy which has been destroyed by aggressor nations and that nations and men might again be free in the world; but we face the task not only of military victory upon the battlefield and upon the dark and rough oceans and in the thin air of the earth but the greater task of preserving in democratic institutions the victory which we shall win upon the many fields of battle.

There are in the United States Senate and in the country already emerging dangers which jeopardize the security of the peace for which we are daily paying so dear a price. There are some disposed to take advantage of the obsolete technic of our Government through the instrumentality with which we take our part in world affairs.

It is well that you who are concerned with democratic processes and their successful execution examine with a careful eye into the machinery through which your Government and your country alone can have a part in determining the kind of a world ours is to be.

We assume that our President is somewhere in council or soon to be in conference with the leaders of the United Nations and that there they are planning and, we hope, praying that they may succeed in reconciling conflict and finding harmony in which they may prosecute not only the war but make permanent the peace.

But we must realize that our President, if asked what commitments our country would be willing to make as a part of the general plan of world harmony and security, is utterly incapable of giving any advice save that he will do his best in rallying public opinion and in appealing to the United States Senate.

But in candor he must inform his colleagues that he can only submit what he proposes to do to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and that that committee has the right of almost interminable hearings, and then when a treaty or a proposal might be reported out to the Senate there is the privilege of unlimited debate upon the Senate floor, and then the decision must at last be taken by a two-thirds majority of the Senate and of the Senators voting upon the proposal, and they are very practical, and if abused and taken advantage of, very dangerous obstacles to America making that quick decision necessary to maintain equilibrium or to suppress aggression in a split-second world.

It is not within our power in the interval between this time and the necessary consummation of these international agreements that we may change the constitutional process, as some hope we in time will, and make it possible for a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House of Representatives to concur with the Executive in the making of American commitments in international affairs.

All that we can do is to make individual Senators realize their obligation, if necessary, to submerge prejudice or even individual differences in the common good, so that they may not take advantage of this old process which may be responsible for two wars in one generation.

And so through public opinion alone is there any hope that this time we may win the peace after we have won the war, a public opinion which will discipline and chasten those who would dare to jeopardize what we have won at such terrible price.

But this organization which we contemplate setting up must be not only an organization to preserve the peace but an organization to promote the welfare of the world. That doesn't mean that the United States is to be a Santa Claus to anybody.

I had the privilege of being in South America recently and when asked what my views were about American policy respecting other republics in this hemisphere, I said, "Let me first make it clear that America is no Santa Claus to anybody. We want to make all the money we honorably can. We want to grow and prosper in every possible way, but we are intelligent enough to be enlightened in our selfishness and we know that if we prosper our sister republics must prosper as well."

And so we propose to have our part in promoting the welfare of the world, not to squander the taxpayer's money or to dissipate the Nation's credit but to help to make a prosperous world upon the assurance that we with our genius, which is not inconsiderable, shall be able to derive our fair share of the prosperity which the earth may enjoy.

Now shortly the Senate shall have before it the Bretton Woods report which was arrived at by the community of nations' representatives, the hope of which is to achieve currency stability among the nations of the world and to provide an agency through which international capital may find proper investment in the broken areas of the earth and an opportunity to build anew the enterprises which are needed not only for the well-being of the nation in which they may be constructed but for all people everywhere.

We have, therefore, a terrific task facing us. We shall have to be an export nation for a number of years after the war is over, but eventually we shall have to receive goods from other countries and we must not put the obstacle of a dangerous tariff in the way of the receipt of those goods nor deny to those people their ability to sell to us in order that they might buy in turn what we produce in our own fertile land.

But we are more directly concerned in what we shall do here in our own country. We know something of the magnitude of the problem we shall face, with a great Army demobilized, with war plants and factories dismantled, with the economy disordered by war restored to the uncertain ways of peace, a huge national debt that staggers the imagination, and millions of people impregnated with the idea that we fought and worked in this war not only for a better world but for a better country within our own shores.

That leads me to suggest the consideration of the eight-point economic bill of rights suggested by President Roosevelt not long ago to the Congress:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

"The right to a good education."

I have had occasion in the course of the last year and more, as chairman of a Wartime Health and Education Committee of the Senate, to make some inquiry into the Nation's health. My inquiry was initiated after the discovery by Selective Service that over 4,000,000 men within the ages of Selective Service were ineligible to serve their country in its greatest crisis because they were educationally or physically unfit for their country's armed service.

I have often wondered if people appreciated just how intimately related the Nation's health and the Nation's strength are; but when we saw the Selective Service figures, when a family saw a husband and a father go to war maybe not to come back while a single man remained next door out of the war because he was illiterate or because he was diseased or because he was defective from infirmities which long ago could have been cured, then we began to appreciate how intimately the Nation's health was related to the Nation's security and strength.

That illustrates what I should like to leave in your mind about this thing called democracy—those who are liberal Democrats, those who are the exponents of and the warriors for, many of you here among that number for a long time.

There are some—our critics perhaps—who think that our attitude proceeds out of an enmity against someone who may be fortunate enough to have more than we. I think there is no greater fallacy in the understanding or the misunderstanding of what we mean by democracy.

Democracy is right, in the first place, if you believe in the dignity of men and women and children. Democracy actually pays. It pays not only the little man at the bottom. It pays the big man at the top.

The way to build a prosperous society is not as Alexander Hamilton proposed—the way you fill a bottle, from the top down—but as Thomas Jefferson argued—the way you build a house, from the foundation up.

You can take any great industry in America and you will discover that the prosperity of that industry depends upon the well-being of the masses of America's people.

Not so long ago in our great city of Miami—and, of course, I wouldn't want to let this occasion pass without putting in a word for Florida [laughter]—a little while before my recent election, one of my good banker friends, pursuing almost a forlorn hope, decided that he would get some of his colleagues in the business world together for a luncheon so that they might discover that if I had horns at all, they were relatively small horns and very much blunted by a kindliness which perhaps they didn't understand.

We sat around the luncheon table that day and just talked as man to man. It happened that on my right was the head of a big loan association on Miami Beach, and I said, "By the way, what is the average loan that you make?" He said, "I believe about $6,700 for home building."

Then the man on my left was the head of a big saving and loan association in the city of Miami proper, and I asked what was the size of his average loan. He said, "$5,700."

Across the table from me sat the heads of the two largest department stores in the city, and I asked the one who was most opposed to me what was his average sale. He said, "About $3." I asked the other one and he said substantially the same thing.

So when I came to make my little talk afterward, I said, "Gentlemen, I never realized before just what an advocate of big business I really have been, because the policies that President Roosevelt has pursued and I have humbly tried to pursue were aimed at making it possible for people to build those houses with your money and to buy those goods from your stores."

You can take the great motion picture industry built up upon the dimes of children and the half dollars of people all over America and in every business you could find almost an analog.

I regret to see, therefore, so many who still hold out against the idea that to embrace democracy means to sacrifice something you are otherwise entitled to enjoy. There are a great many people. I have had an instance of it in the last 2 or 3 days in Washington in some hearings which have been in progress there. They say that what everybody knows, even the courts know, we lawyers say, and I assume that this well-informed

audience at least has knowledge of the hearings to which I refer.

But the question was earnestly put by able and earnest Senators about this matter of borrowing money and Federal credit, and with fear any possible increase was contemplated. Yet I wonder if those gentlemen realize what would happen to the private budget of an unemployed nation or to the Federal Treasury if the Nation were unemployed.

I have seen a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury that the only possible way to pay off or to pay even the interest off the debt this war has forced upon us is that we maintain a high national income, not less than $150,000,000,000 a year, and far better if it could be maintained at $200,000,000,000 a year. In other words, the aim of full employment for the Nation's people is the greatest assurance of prosperity that the people of this country could possibly have.

I do not speak, therefore, about the political upheaval, about the civil danger, about the agitation in our domestic life which would ensue from unemployment and economic chaos. I suggest that full employment, 60,000,000 jobs for America—not less than 57,000,000—as a national aim effectively and properly carried out will assure not only the greatest abundance that the consumers of this country have ever enjoyed, but a degree of prosperity for the business and the professional man which we have never experienced in our long past.

I can emphasize further the Nation's health, not only 4,000,000 rejects. What we are struggling with is to discover the democratic way of providing for the protection and the preservation of the Nation's health, not by socialized medicine, not by taking away from the patient the right to choose his doctor or his dentist or his nurse, but some plan of coverage which in a proper way will make it possible for us all to cooperate through the insurance principle with one another in providing those things which under the present system are not individually available.

Therefore I know of no greater task which the National Democratic Club could set itself—rather I should say I know of no greater task which you should continue to pursue than this job of forever continuing to improve the democratic process by education.

People in this great democrary must no longer be illiterate, because they are sovereigns who have an influence not only upon the course of our country but upon the destiny of the world. People must not be kept from the enjoyment of the franchise in a democratic society because they have not possessed or have not paid a sum of money for that privilege, no more than should the possession of property be a qualification to the exercise of that franchise.

People in this country must not be throttled in their efforts to have their part, to play their own honorable and effective part in building the free enterprise of this country by tyrannical and monopolistic practices which deny the principle of free competition which is the spirit of American business, and people must not grow up in ignorance because they cannot get the money to go to college. They must not grow up as unskilled workmen because they do not have access to vocational training which will increase not only their income but their capacity to build a greater America and a greater world.

So I should like to leave it with you as perhaps the benediction upon democracy to say that I am told in the days, happier days than now, when a glorious Scandinavian society existed, it was the practice on some occasions when the seamen went down to the sea in ships upon their dangerous journeys to have their priest accompany them to their ships and, as their families stood around them, to stretch his hands above their heads and impose upon them the blessings and the challenge of what is called "The Fisherman's Benediction," and I say it to democracy: "May the Lord bless thee and keep thee, grant thee favoring winds, a prosperous voyage, safe harbors, and stout hearts for the storms." Thank you, very much.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on the 15th of April in the little city of Raymond, Miss., a memorial service was held for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On that occasion the county prosecuting attorney, the Honorable John Bell Williams, who suffered the loss of one arm and had one leg crushed in the present war, delivered the address of the occasion. This able address deals with the life work and services of the late President. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead, he has crossed the river, and rests in the shade of the trees. The Commander in Chief has joined his men, who as he did, gave their lives that we might live.

Four times President of the United States, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, international statesman, humanitarian, Christian gentleman, and devout father and husband—Franklin Roosevelt overcame seemingly insurmountable physical and psychological handicaps to become the most adored and revered man of his day, and the most signally honored man in the turbulent history of his native land.

The story of Franklin D. Roosevelt does not find a parallel in the phenomenal rise of Abraham Lincoln—or even of Roosevelt's successor, President Truman. On the contrary, President Roosevelt was brought into the world in the lap of luxury—he never knew a material want—and the friends and associates of his youth were those, who as he, were far removed from the poverty, hunger, and privation with which every nation and people are ever conscious and beset. But he grew—as did our Saviour—in wisdom as in stature, and the rich and wealthy background of his early days only seemed to enhance and deepen his sympathy for his less fortunate brothers.

As a young man he suffered the ravages of deadly paralysis—the crippler that knows no man but makes visitations on the homes of the rich as well as the poor. This was to leave a mark on the physical being of Franklin Roosevelt that he was to carry to the grave. At this point in his life, Franklin D. Roosevelt made a decision—a momentous decision—that was to play a leading role in shaping the future of the entire world. He could have lived comfortably in the pleasant security of his Hyde Park home, but he chose rather to serve his people, and to devote his life to their welfare and to the struggle for a better world.

In 1933, after more than two decades of honorable public service to his people in various capacities, he became the thirty-first President of the United States. Into his unfaltering hands were placed the reins of a ship of state sorely obsessed of chaos and depression and internal strife and starvation. But his mighty hands were capable, and with the divine help of a gracious and merciful God, our President led this Nation out of depression and want into plenty. It was then that he carved his first niche into the hall of eternal fame.

But when he had completed this task, and was preparing himself for his return to the quiet and peace of private life, another obstacle even greater and more ominous suddenly appeared, which was to compel a weary Franklin D. Roosevelt to remain at the helm; his people demanded that he continue to lead them—for he had now become a living symbol of unity among men.

And now, as did Moses of old, he has led his children to within sight of the Promised Land; and, like Moses, he has been denied entrance, but his spirit shall be watching from its place in the ethereal land of God as his followers march on to the victory that he was to share. And his spirit shall be free.

But Franklin D. Roosevelt left more than victory in this war. By his unerring hands was molded the greatest singleness of purpose and action ever achieved in any nation. He sympathized with the weak and the poor, and he supplanted oppression with tolerance and understanding. Publicly, through the medium of radio, he led his people in humble and reverent prayers for the well-being of a stricken humanity. It was he who proved to us that we had nothing to fear but fear itself.

Heartfelt grief at the loss of Franklin D. Roosevelt is not confined to the mere bounds of his own country—but its scope is international—for he was the shining symbol of freedom, liberty, and hope to countless millions of war-ravaged souls throughout the entire world.

Just as every other human, he had enemies. But his enemies were political—not personal, and even his political enemies join his personal and political friends in mourning his untimely passing.

What mistakes he might have made in the discharge of his duties were the natural result of human weaknesses and the human inability to foresee the inevitable; not as a result of any diversion of the man from his conscience, for sincerity, the love of righteousness, and the love of God was the basis in which he found root for his every move.

Gone is the exuberant smile of F. D. R.; gone his fighting and determined chin, and the familiar comforting voice that stilled the aches in the hearts of millions. These characteristics, which are already a part of world history, will be seen and heard no more. But they shall live among us forever, and shall present themselves in our memories as a ray of hope to give light to our darkest hours. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great man in every construction of the word, and his memory is an inspiration, for indeed, he left footprints on the sands of time:

"Footprints, that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again."
—*Longfellow: A Psalm of Life.*

Roosevelt was not indispensable; but he was irreplaceable. Long after his body has returned to its original dust, and we, who knew him and loved him have joined him in the Great Beyond, he shall live—for he is an immortal, and has joined their exclusive company.

Thus cracks a noble heart. We shall not see his like on earth again. The soil has claimed its own

To the people at home, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President; to the soldiers at home

and on farflung battlefronts, he was Commander in Chief. To me he has been both President and Commander in Chief, and:

"Tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The Flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the Bar."
—*Tennyson: Crossing the Bar.*

To a Great Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To a Great Lady," published in the Washington News of Saturday, April 21, 1945. The editorial is a well-deserved tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO A GREAT LADY

During this last turbulent week, while the country mourned its late President, while news of war and major political change filled press and radio, we all lost sight, to some degree, of the fact that to Mrs. Roosevelt the loss was infinitely greater. Because her dignified, friendly courtesy remained unchanged.

Like the great lady she is, she did the thousand and one heart-breaking things one has to do at such a time, keeping her own special, personal grief locked up in her heart.

So the day came, almost unnoticed, when Washington lost one of its greatest friends. Last night she quietly left the city which has known her for so long.

She has fought to clear our slums, to improve our hospitals, to feed our poor, to nourish our underprivileged school children, to protect our penniless aged and infirm; she has been a good citizen of our town, and we're grateful.

So Washington has lost a great friend and a great lady. In her column, which she will continue to write, she says today: "Now I have spent my last night in the White House. * * * Yet I cannot feel that it is good-bye, for when you are fond of people you are sure to meet again."

Mrs. Roosevelt, we want you to know that you haven't brought more warmth to Washington than Washington gives you.

So we won't really say good-bye either. We hope that when your loss is less near and poignant it will make you as happy as it will make us to visit us often.

Unsparingly Honest Survey Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that when it comes to the question of free trade and of tariff protection for American agriculture and industry, that the economic interests of certain of our people greatly conflict. For example, the cotton South naturally desires free trade to a great extent. But at the same time those several Southern States which today produce the very necessary crop of peanuts consumed by the people of this country, and which crop is taking on great significance in certain areas—that group, of course, would aggressively oppose the elimination of the very high duty per hundredweight which is now assessed against foreign-grown peanuts entering the United States. Thus we have in the crops cotton and peanuts great economic conflict, and in almost the same identical area. Then there is the great automobile industry which operates on a free-trade basis, and which advocates the removal and lowering of tariff barriers. This automobile industry primarily sells its production of both touring cars and trucks to the people whose activities are more or less protected by tariffs which are now imposed against competitive products entering the United States.

The reciprocal trade agreements hearings are now being conducted by the Ways and Means Committee. The Bretton Woods proposal is now being heard by the House Banking and Currency Committee. Within a few days the convention will open in San Francisco, and the representatives of the United Nations will be in attendance, and unquestionably the problem of tariff reduction will be discussed.

Mr. K. G. Pennell has written a thought stimulating editorial which is of interest to millions of our people, and I submit his observations for the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

FILLING IN THE FACTS

(By K. G. Pennell)

Workers once believed that the tariff was a friend; protecting wages and jobs against low-cost products from abroad. Now they are told, by a chorus of influential voices, that the reverse is true. A shrinking tariff is said to be essential to an expanding world trade; low rates, to the "greater prosperity that expanding trade brings." To work these tariff rates down, accordingly, it is proposed to increase the State Department's power in making reciprocal trade agreements, by permitting an additional 50-percent cut in tariff rates wherever the Department sees fit.

Filling in the picture with pertinent facts would be most helpful; and Congress is the agency which should provide those facts through an unsparing survey. Knowing that the tariff touches few if any imports, except those that compete with American products, it is easy to see where the survey ought to be made. It ought to find out what happens to the jobs of workers directly affected by trade agreements.

One instance was reported in this magazine last month by the American Lace Manufacturing Industry. Tariff rates on lace and veilings were sharply reduced by a "trade agreement" made with France in 1935. Imports of those items had averaged only about 16,000 pounds a year up to that time; but rose quickly, reaching 354,000 pounds in 1938. Workers were affected, of course. Sixty-six out of each hundred lost their jobs. How many other such disasters have been silenced by war no one seems to know. Readers, however, are invited to send to the writer, care this magazine, whatever facts they have on the matter. They need to be assembled and aired.

Meanwhile, there are some more general facts which seem to bear directly on the matter of expanding trade and the American tariff. Perhaps the high tariff we had in the 1920's was not responsible, but at least the American people bought a lot of things from other countries at that time, and also had good jobs, good pay and lots of money in their pockets. Our imports grew slim in the 1930's, after jobs and pay got scarce. These facts do seem to suggest, at least, that in this country the jobs at home come first. They suggest, too, that we'd better find out what tariff reduction actually did to those jobs, before dynamiting the dikes any further.

TARIFF THINKING SHOULD BE MADE IN AMERICA

A world perspective is perfectly consistent with the proposition that tariff thinking in this country should be made in America. Everyone knows that heat will make a solid out of eggs, while making a liquid out of butter. Not enough people know, however, that tariffs are a lot like heat in that respect. High tariffs may be necessary to protect high living standards in one country, yet produce poverty in another. That's why our thinking about tariffs needs to be made in this country.

It happens, however, that an immense amount of economic thought over here had its origin overseas. It would be insular indeed to argue that Americans have nothing to learn from Vienna, Berlin, Stockholm, Paris, or London. It would be absurd. But it is equally absurd to overlook the fact that economists are, or should be, practical men thinking about a practical problem. When their lives are or have been centered in Europe, it is almost inevitable that their mental center of gravity should be centered there also.

With respect to the tariff, few of the European countries are situated as we are. Instead, if we imagine Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York as separate nation, Connepenny, with half a dozen independent sovereign powers in our present area, our problems of trade would then resemble those of Europe. Like Britain and Germany, Connepenny would look across national lines for both customers and main sources of supply. Low tariffs within this area would be then as important as they seem to leading European nations; and their thinking would then have promise for our own problems.

FROM "INFANT INDUSTRIES" TO VULNERABLE WORKERS

In days gone by the tariff was defended as a protection for "infant industries." It was a perfectly valid argument then, but does seem worn a trifle thin as we look at those gigantic "infants" of the present day. If America was ever to develop from agriculture, and to provide its people with varied outlets for their infinite individual talents, that protection was certainly essential. Otherwise English and German industries would have crushed American industry in its nest.

Today we are facing something new in the world. Machines are no longer the exclusive possession of western peoples with high standards of living. They have already been taken over by the Japanese—whose products threatened to dominate all the markets of the world, except where held in check by tariffs or some equivalent. They have been taken over by countries like Russia; where totalitarian methods take away the meaning of production cost in international trade. India and China are beginning now to acquire the machine techniques.

Those techniques, to be sure, could most profitably be used to raise the living standards of these new recruits. Doubtless to some extent they will be. But almost without doubt they will also be used in connection with low and coolie-like wage scales to undersell the products of western workers even in

their own home markets. As buyers, of course, individual workers would welcome these low-priced products of the Orient. But as workers they would be pitifully vulnerable; and we know all too well that no prices can be low enough to seem cheap to the man who walks the street without a job. Tariffs will indeed be needful—not to protect industries no longer infants, but to stand guard over workers no longer safe.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—PROMISE OR THREAT?

Nearly all economists are greatly enamored with reciprocal trade agreements. They can readily see the great possibilities for good which lie within this procedure. If men entrusted with responsibility are equal to their task, and understand the real nature of the workingman's need for protection, and what he needs to be protected from, their opportunities for service are truly exceptional. Such agreements could be made to fit the actual need for protection in each case; while never, in any case, shutting us in behind some Chinese wall of exclusion.

So much depends on their competence and objectives. Makers of these agreements sit largely behind closed doors. American workers are their pawns. For one thing, they need the innocence of lambs, the wisdom of elephants, the cunning of serpents. They require economic ideas centered on the economy here at home. Any negotiator who consciously or subconsciously sees the world from London or Vienna or Paris, no matter where he may have been born, may govern his decisions according to yardsticks not suited to New York or San Francisco.

We do not know what kind of strategy is being used on this economic chessboard. We do not know how many pawns, if any, have been needlessly swept off the board. Four years of peacetime progress in making such agreements, however, have gone into history. There must be a record of achievement and of failure which can be found and used for a guidepost to thought and to congressional action.

What is the score on these activities? Not as to agreements made, and preferences given and received; no, not that. We need to know the score in terms of the human workers who are the pawns. That's why Congress should undertake an unsparingly honest survey now. It should neither argue nor vote until the facts are known.

Nazi Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in this morning's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "America Must Not Forget—Again!" The editorial demands that a permanent record be kept of German atrocities so that mankind may always remember or be reminded of what has happened to prisoners in these critical days.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA MUST NOT FORGET—AGAIN!

In all the tragic history of human suffering there is nothing to compare with the wholesale barbarities perpetrated by the fiendish Nazis.

Such frightfulness must never again be tolerated on this earth.

Millions of men, women and children murdered in cold blood; millions tortured; millions starved; millions wantonly and brutally mistreated—every day new evidence of Germany's appalling wartime crimes is being uncovered as the avenging armies of the Allies march to victory over Hitler.

These shocking accounts of the horrors at Buchenwald, Dachau, Oswiecim and other prison and concentration camps are not propaganda tales concocted for the gullible. They are facts, borne out by photographs, affidavits and official records.

But will they be remembered 5 or 10 years from now?

The human mind has an amazing faculty of adapting itself to changing conditions. It can quickly forget pain and sorrow. In particular, the American people are all too prone to forget the hardships, difficulties and mistakes of the past.

Will we ever learn from history? Twenty-five years ago some cynical Americans were saying that the stories of German brutality in Belgium were chiefly propaganda directed—before April 6, 1917—at getting the United States into the European war.

Today there are those among us who not only take no stock in the certified records of German bestiality in World War No. 1 but who scoff at the evidence of unspeakable German atrocities in World War No. 2 as propaganda.

But our soldiers know. Our boys who have been prisoners in German camps know. The British and the Russians know. They know that not a fraction of the full story of Nazi barbarism has as yet been made public.

General Eisenhower knows the truth. That's why he proposed that delegations of Congressmen and editors and publishers speed to the scenes of the Nazi outrages to see the evidence for themselves.

That is as it should be, so far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. Every Member of the United States House of Representatives; every Member of the Senate; every publisher and every editor who wants to see with his own eyes the exhibits of German brutishness should have opportunity to do so. Surely ways can be found to permit a thousand American civilians, lawmakers and publicists, to visit the German crime spots.

We regard as thoroughly sound the suggestion of Representatives BROOKS, GOSSETT, and FLOOD that a full-time agency be set up to keep a permanent record of German atrocities. But more than that is needed to maintain in the public mind a realization of German criminality in this war.

There should be established in Washington a museum to preserve, so long as such a reminder is necessary, factual, authentic documents, photographs and other displays to keep the American people from forgetting the horrors committed by the Germans in the name of nazi-ism and the vile Hitler.

Twice in one generation the people of the United States have been called to help put down mad-dog Germany and save Europe from itself. Twice is enough. There must be no further call for America to join in this task, at a cost of thousands of our sons.

German-instigated wars must be stopped for all time. When this war is over German militarism must be destroyed and the Reich policed. The nations must organize for enduring peace and security. But beyond all this:

Nazi Germany's crimes must be kept blazoned on the consciousness of the world. We must not forget—again!

Should Management Be Unionized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act there is imposed upon ownership and management some very direct responsibility.

Recently the National Labor Relations Board made a ruling in connection with the so-called Packard Motor Car Co. case which is tremendously significant, and which no doubt will be carried to the Supreme Court.

It has been pointed out that granting collective bargaining to foremen will not prevent cut-backs in employment nor make for more supervisory jobs. On the other hand, if the Board recognizes the unionization of management representatives and thus overthrows the rule heretofore established by the Board, such a reversal of ruling will tend to disrupt production and management techqnique in mass production industry and destroy the very thing which made possible almost unheralded production of war materials.

For the record, I submit a statement made by General Motors, which was published in many of the leading newspapers of this country.

It is a matter which Congress will undoubtedly have to deal with, and perhaps through materially amending the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The statement follows:

SHOULD MANAGEMENT BE UNIONIZED?—A STATEMENT BY GENERAL MOTORS

The National Labor Relations Board has ordered a bargaining election among the foremen and other supervisory groups of a Detroit automobile company.

This company is not a part of General Motors, but we are concerned with the principles involved.

This confusing action by the Board means that it is sanctioning and promoting the unionization of management personnel, in spite of the fact that the National Labor Relations Act includes as an employer "* * * any person acting in the interests of an employer directly or indirectly."

We are sure that Congress did not intend to approve unionization of management when it passed the act.

The results if applied throughout industry would be bad for the mangement groups involved, bad for industry, bad for labor, bad for America.

BAD FOR FOREMEN

We think it would be bad for foremen if American industry should be compelled to make a change in its proven type of organization, which would unavoidably reduce the foreman's status, diminish his responsibility, authority and influence, decrease his opportunities for personal advancement.

In General Motors, foremen have always had important responsibilities and authority.

We have always guarded the status of our foremen, and have provided special training to improve their abilities, increase their efficiency and enhance their opportunities

for promotion to even more important management positions. The great majority of General Motors' principal executives at one time were foremen.

We are convinced that it would be impossible for a foreman to follow both management and union leaderships at the same time, and under those conditions to carry on all his duties as they now exist. All elements of management must have a common objective.

It would obviously be impossible, for instance, for him as a fellow unionist with those under him, to perform his functions which relate to their working conditions, wages, promotions, and assignments on the unbiased basis which is essential to good management.

BAD FOR INDUSTRY

From our experience both before and during the war, we are certain that the accepted American method of spreading managerial authority and responsibility among foremen—so that management is in close, direct contact with comparatively small groups of workmen—is the best and only sound method of handling day-to-day relations with the thousands of employees engaged in modern mass production.

Anything which would require a change in this set-up would interfere with employer-employee relations and with production.

For example, there have been many strikes in war-production plants, particularly in Michigan. Charges have been made that workmen have been loafing in plants engaged in war production and that they are being paid high wages for not working. We are conscious that the public feels that there must be something wrong. The attempt to tear down the position and authority of foremen and to unionize members of management is importantly contributing to this condition.

BAD FOR LABOR

As a matter of fact, the close-contact method is about the only way that management and labor can work harmoniously together in large organizations.

Much is said these days about cooperation. It would be a serious handicap to any hopes for teamwork and the pursuit of common interests, if anything were done to remove this facility for knowing and understanding each other.

It is our firm, sincere belief that loss of this close contact would make harmonious relations between management and labor almost impossible and would interfere with practical collective bargaining.

BAD FOR AMERICA

The removal of foremen from their present position as a vital, integral part of management would require reorganization of factory management on a basis far more complicated and decidedly less effective. Necessary factory discipline would suffer, worker efficiency would be impaired.

We believe the effect on you—on the public as a whole—would be very real.

It would interfere with the war effort.

It would make war materials cost more.

It would slow up post-war reconversion to civilian production.

It would delay adequate post-war output of cars, refrigerators, ranges, furniture—all the things people need so much and have waited for so long.

Finally—and, in the long run, perhaps most important of all—it would so increase production costs as to boost prices and the cost of living and make the problem of reasonably full employment much more difficult.

ACTION CALLED FOR

When people have as deep a conviction about anything as we have about unionizing management they ought to do something about it.

If the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act can be so confused as to promote unionization of management—and thus impair the effectiveness of the American production system of which are all so proud—then the meaning ought to be cleared up.

General Motors believes—and hopes others will feel the same—that it is a patriotic duty, a duty to the foremen, to industry, to labor, and to the public as a whole—to oppose the unionization of management by every proper and lawful means.

That is our intention.

THE POSITION OF FOREMEN IN GENERAL MOTORS

In General Motors foremen are the managers of their departments. They participate in establishing management policies in both production and personnel matters. They have full authority to approve or disapprove the hiring, to supervise the work, and to make work assignments of the employees under their supervision. They initiate wage increases, transfers, and promotions. They are directly responsible for the efficiency and safety of their group. They have full authority when necessary to take immediate, appropriate disciplinary action for violation of shop rules and other improper conduct of their employees. They are the first point of management contact and make the first management decision on all matters relating to the employees under their direction.

Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address by a distinguished citizen of Colorado, Mr. W. W. Grant, at a memorial service for the late President held by the Denver Chamber of Commerce on April 13.

I commend this address to all who would appraise the tremendous contribution President Roosevelt made to world history.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We gather today to lay a wreath on the tomb of Franklin Roosevelt. Not for his sake—we can do nothing for him—but for ours. He has gone the way of all the earth.

The ungenerous and the mean-spirited will rejoice, but those who have hoped for a better world with good will toward men know that a great man and a great leader has gone.

It is impossible at this time properly to appraise the significance of President Roosevelt's contributions to his country. His friends are too ardent—they praise his mistakes equally with his accomplishments. His enemies are too bitter—they damn the good he has done indiscriminately with the bad.

He is entitled to praise. He is entitled to blame. Above all he is entitled to that justice which fair-minded men will not withhold from the dead. And justice is the most difficult thing in the world to define and to administer because it differs not only in every case, but in each case with every varying circumstance. The President leaves behind the friends and enemies a strong character always begets.

I think of him it can be said that he typified Bagehot's definition of a successful and popular leader—an uncommon man with an understanding of common ideas.

Courage was his outstanding quality. He was a stubborn and resourceful fighter, not only against the ravages of disease but in the political arena. He comprehended and confronted new ideas without fear. His actions and speeches indicate that when he spoke of "freedom from fear" he was dealing with something in his own experience—a personal victory. He realized and acted on the realization that a new world—social and economic—was in the making; that the good old days were gone forever; and that the era of the 1920's was one with Nineveh and Tyre.

He knew we lived in a world in which everything is global; in which war is no longer sectional or private; a world in which all the nations, crowded into next-door neighborhood, must live in peace or perish; a world so small that a conflict in a little insignificant country on the other side of the planet can give rise to a chain of circumstances that will put your boy into the cockpit of a bomber or destroyer on any one of the seven seas, or in a grave under alien skies.

The mourning for him is as wide as the world he sought to draw together. Last night this was heard in a Brazilian broadcast: "Only the combined effort of all men for the common good can meet this irreparable loss."

It is true that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country and by his own fireside. That means a sense of perspective is denied to those who are too close to either a man or an occurrence. The same people who admire Churchill and dislike President Roosevelt would, if they were English, have the reverse opinion—they would praise Roosevelt and damn Churchill.

The farsighted leader justifies the future by the past. From the past he knows that nothing is constant except change and that the line or trend of change can be apprehended. For instance, only next August will the United States have been a Nation as long as it previously was a collection of colonies. The time is now almost here when in the evolution of history the United States will definitely enter on its next stage of development, which is that of one of two or three of the greatest powers in a shrinking world.

How long it will be until we have a single world government I do not know, but it approaches. One hundred years in the life of a nation or of the world is as nothing compared to a year in our individual lives.

All these things Franklin Roosevelt knew. Opposition to him was not based on the fact that he did not see, but that his approach and his methods were unconventional and that precedents were to him of comparative unimportance. When the time came to change, he changed. Many of his followers did not. That is why many New Dealers from the early days of his administration are today stranded on the sandbars of what was new and necessary in 1932, but is now outmoded and inappropriate to the changing present.

The President was not a magnanimous foe. He was tough and skillful in controversy and he understood the signs of the times better than most. That is why he had the hearts of the average people. And they constitute the vast majority in a democracy. When they vote, they rule. And they voted consistently for him.

A conservative friend of mine said a number of years ago that President Roosevelt understood more about the salvation of all of private enterprises that could be saved than any of his opponents, and he knew better how to save it.

What I am afraid of is that private enterprise has been given so much rope it may hang itself—that in its eagerness to vindicate itself it has undertaken too much. After the war it has tacitly promised to furnish fifty-five to sixty million jobs more or less. It cannot do it. It is inevitable that the Government will have to furnish ten to fifteen million. Thus, when the Government steps in, it will be in response to public demand and not as an interference with business. The President was always astute in laying the groundwork for what he foresaw as necessary or inevitable.

I think after the war people are going to demand more from life than ever before. And they are going to get it. They are going to get it because they have the votes. All this the President knew. He—the uncommon man with the common ideas. He was the symbol to the common man of what he called the more abundant life.

He was a superrealist and consequently a superpolitician. If, as Von Clausewitz said, war is merely the extension of politics into the physical realm, it accounts to a considerable extent for the President's success in carrying on the war and for his judgment of generals and admirals.

That he was a good family man everybody knows, and his sons have not shirked their individual responsibilities in this war but have done as have millions of others. His wife's telegrams to them on their father's death are models of their kind.

Franklin Roosevelt was the greatest and most astute politician this country has ever seen. His policies, both foreign and domestic, were broad in conception and daring in scope and execution. The objections to them were not so much to their merits as to methods of administration. For instance, the United States comprises at least six different geographical and economic regions. No over-all, uniform system of regulation can possibly fit them all. Genuine success in administration depends on adaptation to the particular region. The O. P. A. is a daily recurring illustration that a Government regulation is not the equivalent of judgment though the thing is good in itself.

It is my own personal opinion that Franklin Roosevelt carried the United States through a revolution which, if it had not been expressed in laws, might have been expressed in violence. It was a civilized way of handling necessary, inevitable, and radical change.

The one thing he has lived for during the last 6 years has been an international order to settle international controversies by peaceful means. To that purpose he has bent every energy; and it can be truthfully said that he died for it. The mistakes of Woodrow Wilson he has avoided. Congress is in on the ground floor and both parties are represented. The job is being done about as well as it could be. It will cost something, but war costs more. That is the alternative which he completely understood.

His death, instead of setting the movement for an international order back, will give it added impetus. The personal hostilities he aroused in Congress now have nothing to feed on. As Ruskin said:

"Man cannot benefit those that are with them as they can benefit those that come after them; and of all the pulpits from which the human voice is ever sent forth, there is none that reaches so far as from the grave."

President Roosevelt is the last of the two greatest American proponents and champions of the obvious fact that the world is one. The other was Wendell Willkie. They both knew that though there was ample assurance from practical people that an international order was impracticable if not impossible, they nevertheless were also aware of the fact that the present short range of rocket bombs would be corrected—on the authority of our Ordnance Department; and they both knew that the common sense of the American people would come to the obvious and correct conclusion in spite of the so-called practical people.

With all his human frailties and shortcomings, the President loved democracy and believed in God and leaned on Him. He took the longest step toward a world of truth, unity, and concord that any American has ever taken.

If it is true that every generation makes some contribution to its country, then future ages may judge that our generation deserves well because it first made world peace possible. If that is so, the name of Franklin Roosevelt, for that reason alone, will go down in history as one of the great ones of the earth.

As the French poet said:

"For blessed are those who died for carnal earth
Provided it was a just war.
Blessed are those who died in a final high place
Amid all the pomp of grandiose funerals.

"Blessed are those who die, for they have returned
Into primeval clay and primeval earth
Blessed are those who died in a just cause."

May his vision of world order and peace come true.

May he rest in peace.

May God sustain his successor.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Conference opens this afternoon. The delegates of our country who will attend the conference have had no expression of policy from the Congress concerning any territories, islands, or other lands recently acquired by our Government through conquest in the far Pacific. I feel that it is the duty of the Congress at this time to take a definite stand by expressing its sentiments as to the manner in which these islands, territories, and lands will be held and administered. This must be in keeping with an established policy, which should be adopted by the delegates of the San Francisco Conference. We do not seek to dominate any nation; nor do we seek territorial expansion. However, the overwhelming public opinion in the United States favors the retention, to some degree, of control over the islands and other lands so acquired. Many plans have been devised. Up to the present time, a trusteeship has been the most acceptable, but opposition to this proposed form is rapidly gaining momentum. This dilemma can be overcome by adopting a concept which would be somewhat analogous to the British Commonwealth of Nations. Of course, the problems that would have to be met and overcome in the proposed American commonwealth of nations, which is embodied in the resolution I have introduced today, would be quite different from those which the British Commonwealth of Nations are attempting to work out.

The American commonwealth would include all lands, territories and other lands now occupied or hereafter acquired by the United States, whether in the Atlantic or the Pacific oceans. This concept would be flexible enough to allow complete local autonomy and at the same time provide adequate national defense for both the United States and all other members of the proposed American commonwealth of nations. Such a concept would be broad enough to include the Philippine Islands.

This idea would be dynamic enough to take care of all future acquisitions and at the same time, flexible enough to allow full self-government to all of the lands and territories embraced within it. The inhabitants of these territories are entitled to rule themselves as they see fit, but we cannot allow them to be at the mercy of any nation, or group of nations, seeking expansion. As a practical matter, we are bound to protect and defend them against any aggressor. Therefore, a definite policy must be established immediately. It must be clear, emphatic, just and with sufficient flexibility to insure the fullest autonomy consistent with the common defense.

I ask that all the Members of this House acquaint themselves with the provisions of the resolution I have introduced today calling for the establishment of an American commonwealth of nations and hope for their earnest support.

Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, Miss Dolores Espinosa, a senior in the Immaculata Seminary, has penned some very beautiful words on the death of Ernie Pyle, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERNIE PYLE

A mountain rose from out the ocean floor,
Its sides were shattered by the mortar's roar;
A small craft hurried in, on duty bent,
The man who told the tale, we now lament.
The beach was reached, and then, a landing made;
The small form, with his buddies, unafraid,
Was stilled forever, sharing common fate;
The story teller joined the Nation's great.

—*Dolores Espinosa.*

APRIL 23, 1945.

Appeal in Behalf of Central European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Central European Federal Club of London, England, appealing in behalf of the central European nations.

CENTRAL EUROPEAN FEDERAL CLUB,
London, March 1945.

Members of the following nations: Austrians, Croats, Czechs, Estonians, Hungarians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Serbs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Ukrainians, and White Ruthenians, having met at the Central European Federal Club in London, and having discussed the present circumstances of their conationals in their home countries, decided to address themselves to all men of good will with the following appeal:

In flagrant violation of the Christian principle which places right before might, the leaders of present-day Germany embarked on a policy of brutal force to establish their domination and to impose on mankind their pagan philosophy. Almost the entire world has risen in arms to face this monstrous challenge. Poland was the first nation to take up arms in defense against the aggressor. Other nations followed.

While the conflagration was still spreading, in 1941, the Atlantic Charter, a message of good will, reached the stricken nations and filled their hearts with hope for a better future. Millions of human beings saw in that document the firm resolve and the solemn promise to restore justice on earth. The new charter proclaimed the Christian moral principle of right before might as the fundamental rule for international relations and national affairs. In 1942, 26 Allied Governments affixed their signatures to this document. By this endorsement the good auspices for the realization of the noble principle gained further strength.

Today, however, as the terrible war is nearing its closing stage in Europe, it becomes more and more apparent that the high ideals of human freedom and true democracy are not being put into practice.

The democracies drew the sword in defence of the freedom and integrity of Poland. Today the decisions of the Crimea Conference seem to aim at the partition of Poland along lines similar to those of the Russo-German Agreement of 1939, which filled the world with disgust and despondency. These decisions propose to establish a government against the will of the peoples of Poland and without the participation of her constitutional leaders.

A few years ago a wave of indignation swept the democratic countries when the free and independent states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland fell victims of aggression. Today, however, little or nothing is heard of their plight. When the peoples of Yugoslavia rose in arms against the aggressors the whole world admired their heroism. Today, as a reward for their endurance and sufferings, the Serb, Slovene, and Croat nations are being put at the mercy of a Communist dictatorship.

We mention Poland in the first place because hers is a test case. If Poland were deprived of real freedom and independence, all the other countries of central Europe would be faced with similar circumstances and subject to similar treatment. It would be tragic if entire nations or national groups were to be incorporated into state organizations which they would never join voluntarily; if they would have to accept governments imposed upon them from outside without the slightest regard to the wishes of the peoples concerned.

Furthermore, governments are being set up pretending to command the confidence, approval, and support of the people by virtue of their composition. In actual fact, however, they are composed in the first place of agents of the occupying power; secondly, of individuals tolerated by that power; and in the third instance only, of persons forced into office and compelled to carry out their functions under the threat of death to themselves or their families.

The decisions of the Crimea Conference, it appears, have created conditions the fulfilment of which would be tantamount to a total surrender of more than 12 central European nations to the Soviet Union and their enforced submission to any arbitrary dictation the U. S. S. R. may be desirous to impose. These nations would thus be placed at the mercy of another totalitarian dictatorship whose regime is in irreconciliable contradiction to the laws, ethics, religion, customs, social and economic structure and historical tradition generally recognized and honored in the civilized world.

The decisions of the Crimea Conference are causing deep consternation and anxiety to millions of men and women in Europe. The Continent is, in fact, confronted with developments for which there exists no precedent in history.

This plain statement is no exaggeration and no propaganda. On the contrary, propaganda is aiming at concealing or tarnishing the truth but is unable to put it out of existence. The world must awake to the reality of the situation and recognize that it is essential to guarantee equal freedom and independence to all nations situated between Germany and Russia. Liberated countries cannot remain under the exclusive control of one occupying power, and it is essential for all of them that they should be enabled to develop those vital links between their nations which are indispensable for their peaceful progress and prosperity.

In the reconstruction of Europe after the end of hostilities two periods are, in general, recognizable. In the first, the repatriation of all displaced people, restoration of their properties and reorganization of the civil administration will have to be carried out. In the second period a census will have to be taken for the control of electoral rights, the organization of constituencies and elections to be held for the establishment of democratic governments.

It is easy to hold elections in countries like, e. g., Great Britain or the United States, where the political machinery is intact and where there still exists a measure of political stability. Not so on the Continent, where the machinery for the elections has been wrecked in most countries and no political stability exists today. Hastily carried out elections would only lead to bogus democracies. People pressing for such are only looking for opportunities to fish in troubled waters.

During both periods of reconstruction inter-Allied military governments composed of representatives of the great powers should be set up for joint control. These should only be withdrawn when the political and economic consolidation of the countries concerned is finally secured. Germany and all territories between pre-1938 Germany and pre-1938 Soviet Russia should thus be occupied and no change should be imposed on the inhabitants without their freely expressed will.

In this tragic hour we are approaching all men of good will, all Christian citizens of the world with the urgent plea not to permit the extinction of Christian civilization in the homelands of more than 100,000,000 Europeans.

We submit as immediate measures to be taken:

Cessation of all political persecution such as executions, imprisonment, deportation, and conscription into the so-called national armies of the countries concerned;

Release from imprisonment and places of deportation of all persons, first of all women and children, and granting without delay of all facilities for their return to their homes;

Admission of the International Red Cross and other charitable and religious organizations which would bring help, relief, and consolation to the tortured and starving populations, in the territories occupied by Soviet forces;

Admission to those territories of the representatives of the free press of the democratic countries who should be allowed to work there without the interference of political censorship.

We address ourselves to the conscience of the world. Our kinsmen are being decimated by firing squads, our nations faced with slavery, starvation, death, and extinction. It should not be permitted that this war, fought for the victory of Christian principles and ideals shall be fought in vain. Evil shall not triumph over virtue, might over right.

We pray to the Almighty that He may open the eyes of mankind and enlighten its leaders in securing aid and support for our righteous cause which is also the cause of the whole world.

On behalf of the representatives of the above-mentioned nations.

The Presidium of the Central European Federal Club in London: Peter Pridavok, president; Stefan Pomian, honorary secretary; Jozef Godlewski, senator of the Republic of Poland; Stanislaw Jozwiak, member of the Parliament of the Republic of Poland; Dr. Karel Locher; Gen. Lev Prchala, D. S. O.; Prof. Tadeusz Sulimirski.

Other signatures are affixed to the original of this document preserved in the files of the Central European Federal Club.

What Should Be the Postwar Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have sponsored House Congressional Resolutions 21, 22, and 23 calling for a world security organization to be set up in support of the moral law and the pattern for peace outlined by the three great creeds in America—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—have occasion to be heartened by the news which appeared in the press today indicating that four of the great powers who are sponsoring the meeting in San Francisco—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—have agreed to accept the Chinese plan for a world rule by law.

In the light of these developments, it does not seem wholly inappropriate that I extend into the RECORD a speech which I made on March 29, 1945, at Indianapolis, Ind., before the Indiana Committee for Victory, which treats with certain aspects of this question of rule by law, and particularly with reference to the advantages to be attained by requiring compulsory submission of all disputes to the International World Court, notwithstanding the fact that the world has not reached the point where it is yet willing to accept the theory of compulsory enforcement of the decisions.

The speech follows:

The subject of this meeting, What Should Be the Postwar Policy of the United States? as far as I am concerned, requires a definition by me of one of its terms, namely, the term "postwar." As far as I am concerned, the term "postwar" means all of the future which lies before the United States after the defeat of both of our enemies. It certainly cannot refer to some limited period of 6 months or a year after the termination of this conflict.

I insist upon this definition for the reason that a foreign policy, just like a domestic policy, to be effective must be a dynamic and growing thing if it is to have any force or value. I insist upon this definition, first, because I believe the United States must live in a world in which there is an organization for international cooperation, of which the United States is a part.

I want to further clarify the position I have just stated by pointing out that those who would tell the people that the mere creation of an international organization will guarantee peace are guilty of an over-statement which will do the cause of international cooperation great harm. On the other hand, our experiences in this war, which followed the last war by but 25 years, does justify me in saying that it has been demonstrated pragmatically that if there is no world organization of which we are a part, we will most certainly be involved in another war and that in a relatively short time. Our attempt for 25 years to segregate ourselves from world affairs and by that method to attempt to immunize ourselves from world problems has been demonstrated to be a failure, not by words, but by the fact that we are presently, today, fighting on more fronts and in more parts of the globe than we ever dreamed we would fight upon in the so-called World War No. 1 of 1914–18. Therefore, the need of an international organization and the necessity for the United States to join that organization is firmly established by the scientific method of trial and error, which all of the so-called realists of the world have approved where that method has been applied in the realm of exact science dealing with material things. It seems to me that this proposition needs no further discussion.

I do feel, however, that there is present in America a misunderstanding which greatly endangers the hope of future generations for permanent peace through the advance of the judicial order into the world and that that feeling arises out of an attempt of some to present the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the results of the Yalta Conference as the last word in international cooperation, and that once these proposals become a reality and the Government of the United States becomes a member of the organization which is brought to completion at San Francisco on April 25, that then nothing more need ever be said and done upon the subject of international cooperation, and that we can all sit back and expect peace to arise because perfection has been reached. This is not true. Those who advocate it apparently advocate it because they do not trust the American people or because they feel that those of us who feel that the organization is by no ways perfect, that it does not establish the juridical order in the world, will destroy the chances of our joining any organization by stressing too much the imperfections and limitations which are inherent in the present proposals.

As far as I am concerned, the fears of those who are attempting to sell the present proposals as the ultimate in international cooperation are based upon a lack of confidence in the American people and a consequent fear that they will be carried away by the arguments of perfectionists. I have more confidence than that in the American people. But, on the other hand, I feel that it is my duty to point out that, while the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the pronouncements as to voting procedure which came out of the Yalta Conference are sufficient as an initial step to justify our adherence to them; that they are not perfection; and that certain modifications of these proposals should be urged by the American delegates to the San Francisco Conference to the full extent of their ability, at the same time admitting the necessity of accepting the plan as presently proposed only after it is clearly demonstrated that the extensions or modifications or changes in it, as proposed by the American delegates, because of the present state of enlightenment among world powers, can not be immediately accepted.

As far as I am concerned, Dumbarton Oaks and the Yalta Conference are but a stepping stone toward the creation of a perfected world organization calculated to produce peace with justice; an ultimate organization, free from the danger that power will be exercised without regard to justice, which condition must be the ultimate aim of mankind and without which there can be no permanent peace in the world.

In the first place, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals create a confederacy of sovereign states and not a federation of states having a higher degree of sovereignty over questions involving the international world order. These proposals, therefore, are quite comparable to the proposals found originally in the Articles of Confederation adopted by the Thirteen pre-Revolutionary War States in 1778. The experiences of those States, operating under those articles for 9 years, demonstrated to them the necessity of establishing a federation of States and the calling of the convention which led to the drafting of the Constitution of the United States in 1787. The development of our Government thus demonstrates that perfection in government must, of necessity, be a matter of evolution, and this historical fact alone is the justification for our adherence to a world organization built upon the present Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the proposals arising out of the Yalta Conference with reference to the voting procedures.

The present proposals do not deprive the United States, or any member of the organization, and particularly any of the permanent members of the Council, of any part of their present sovereignty, because, under the veto powers which were created at Yalta, the provisions of chapter 8, section B, which have to do with the enforcement provisions of the charter, cannot be brought to play against any permanent member of the Council without its consent. Nor, indeed, can they be brought into play against any power without the consent of each of the five members of the Council. This being true, there are no grounds whatsoever for saying that the United States is bound by the present proposals, against its will, to use any part of its armed forces to suppress any uprising anywhere in the world or to police any part of the world.

When this proposition is clearly understood it seems to me that even the most violent prewar isolationist must be satisfied and his fear of surrender of sovereignty forever removed. If he is intellectually honest, he must find new arguments against the proposals and forever cast into discard those based upon loss of sovereignty which he had previously expounded and relied upon.

As I stated previously, I am willing to accept these proposals as a minimum, but only on the condition that the people shall be told that this is but a stepping stone toward the elimination of war through the extension of the juridical order into the world; and further on the condition that I may urge certain modifications now with the hope that if they strike a responsive chord in the American people, that they be advanced by our delegates at San Francisco seriously, honestly, and courageously, not for the purpose of preventing the formation of a world organization but for the purpose of bringing into being at this time, as an initial stepping stone, the most perfect organization which can be perfected, having regard to the present capacity of the world for international cooperation.

Basically, I believe that the chances for permanent peace in the world cannot be brought about until the world accepts the moral law and the juridicial order as the basis for world cooperation and world government. I believe firmly in the seven principles enunciated in the Pattern for Peace contained in the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant declarations on world peace, signed by the leaders of those faiths and presented to America and to the world on October 7, 1943. Because of that belief, on January 17, 1945, together with Congressmen FEIGHAN and WEISS, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 22, which embodied these principles. I feel that the cornerstone of the juridicial order should be an international court of justice and not an international political organization. Therefore, I believe that the San Francisco Conference should produce a charter which has within it a requirement for a compulsory submission of all disputes which cannot be otherwise settled and that this compulsory submission should be binding upon members of the permanent Council as well as all other members of the organization. As I shall presently develop, I do not ask for compulsory enforcement by the security councils of the judicial opinions rendered by the court upon the disputes over which it is given compulsory jurisdiction.

I find justification for my proposals of compulsory submission of all disputes in principle number five of the "Pattern for Peace" which reads as follows:

"INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

"5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation, and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

It happens that I believe that the ills of any society, from the family up through an international society, cannot be cured by a declaration of principles or the mere adoption of resolutions announcing principles. It happens that I believe that if a person is to make a contribution to society, he must do more than declare principles or participate with others in the adoption of resolutions. He must then offer and act upon concrete, specific proposals, calculated to carry out and to make effective in the world, the principles and propositions in which he claims to have a belief. He must do this, even though by acting he brings himself onto the field of battle and into the public arena, where his specific proposals may be rejected, and rejected even by those who

have heretofore been satisfied to pass resolutions upon a subject, but have secretely been unwilling to take any action or to run the risk of public disfavor by proposing any action calculated to make effective the principles which he has proposed.

It is my belief that if we are to extend the juridical order into the world, we must dramatize and call to the attention of the peoples of the world the limitations in the law necessary for the government of a world society. And, even before the peoples of the earth can accept a world-wide set of moral principles, they must further understand and have brought to their attention the fact that there is very little law in the world to govern the interrelations of nations or international law. I therefore believe that the very fact that there is presently, today, a most imperfect body of law governing international relations cannot be logically used as an objection to the establishment of compulsory jurisdiction in the proposed international court of justice, but that this very imperfection, in a sense, will never be cured unless the imperfection is brought to the attention of the peoples of the various nations of the earth through the medium of a series of decisions of a world court in which the court recites that it cannot adjudicate a dispute because there is no existing international law or existing principles of law governing the interrelations of nations upon which it can act. I have sufficient faith in the integrity of the jurists who would administer an international court to believe that they would not attempt to extend international law by declaring principles were nonexistent, which would be judicial legislation, which every student of the juridical system denounces; but that, to the contrary, the jurists of this court, if given compulsory jurisdiction over all disputes which cannot be settled by arbitration or conciliation, or in any other peaceful manner, would hand down an opinion that they could not settle the dispute as a court because there was no existing law applicable to the dispute; and this fact alone would force the rulers and representatives of the nations of the world to satisfy an aroused people by making an initial attempt, at least, to create—by legislative action, if necessary—a rule of international law to govern disputes whose constant cropping up would, of itself, evidence the need for law in that particular field of international relations.

I wish to point out further to those who say that this would permit the court to hand down rulings in cases where there was no law, that such an argument is a perversion of the philosophy of law as it has always been understood when applied within nations. Hans Kelsen, a distinguished student of international law who was Oliver Wendell Holmes' lecturer at Harvard in 1940 and 1941, in his most recent work, Peace Through Law, published in 1944, pointed this out very clearly when he said:

"A positive legal order can always be applied to any conflict whatsoever. Only two cases are possible, either the legal order contains a rule obliging one party to behave as the other party demands, or the legal order contains no such rule. In the first case, application of the legal order to the conflict has the effect of admitting the claim; in the second case, the application of the legal order has the effect of rejecting the claim."

It follows, therefore, that those who fear that compulsory adjudication of unsettled international disputes by an international court would result in the parties being subject to a decision affecting a controversy as to which there is presently no rule of international law, results from a misunderstanding of the nature of rule by law.

One great advantage to be gained, therefore, from compulsory adjudication of international disputes is that which I have advocated, namely, that the inadequacy of international law and the vast fields which it does not cover will be accentuated and called to the attention of peoples and rulers of peoples to a greater degree than it has ever been called to their attention before, and thereby the need for the creation of a greatly expanded body of international law will be definitely delineated. I know of no way by which the extension of the juridical order into the world can be accelerated than by the time-honored method of demonstrating the lack of a body of law upon which it must exist, so that from the deficiency thus demonstrated there will arise in the world a demand for the elimination of this deficiency.

The compulsory submission of disputes to the international court would also assist in removing the coat of hypocrisy which, in the past, too often has been used as a cloak to cover a sham claim that a political, and, therefore, nonjusticiable, issue was involved between nations, whereas the actual issue was a legal one covered by the law of nations. The Italian aggression against Abyssinia is one of the most striking examples in relatively recent years of the use of this method and of the danger to world peace inherent in the use of this dishonorable and dishonored device.

A provision for compulsory adjudication of international disputes is also the only method that I can see by which any of the five great powers which are to have permanent seats on the World Council can have disputes involving them subject, at least, to the weight of world public opinion against any of them whose claim against any other member of the world organization—large or small—is not, in reality, founded upon justice or honor. Under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as they now exist, together with the Yalta formula for voting, this is the only effect which a requirement for compulsory adjudication of international disputes could have upon any of the Big Five or any member of the family of nations.

In order to allay the suspicions or the fears of those who would claim that this country would be subject to anything else except to this public opinion, under the proposition which I am advancing, I shall conclude my present treatment of this subject with an analysis of chapter VIII of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the effect of the Yalta Conference agreement as to voting upon it.

Chapter VIII of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals deals with the arrangements for the maintenance of international peace and security, including the prevention and suppression of aggression. Section A deals with the subject of specific settlements of disputes; section B deals with the question of determining whether threats to the peace or acts of aggression exist, and if they do, the action to be taken under the charter with respect thereto; section C has to do with regional arrangements, and while the second sentence of paragraph 1 of section C is covered by the Yalta agreement, my observations upon section A will dispose of my thinking upon section C without requiring specific reference thereto.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals contemplate a security council consisting of five permanent members: the United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and ultimately France; and six nonpermanent members. The conferees at Dumbarton Oaks left the method of voting in the council open because they could not reach an agreement. At Yalta the representatives of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain reached an agreement as to voting procedures which is to be submitted to the San Francisco Conference. Under the agreement, each member of the Council, permanent or nonpermanent, or, as I shall hereinafter respectively refer to them, large and small powers, shall have one vote; on all matters other than those set out in subsection A of chapter VIII and in the second sentence of paragraph 1 of section C of that chapter, decisions must be made by the affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring or affirmative vote of each of the five large powers. This arrangement applies to all decisions for the use of force contained in section B of chapter VIII and its effect is to give a veto against the use of power against itself to each of the five large powers. In other words, under this arrangement, the United States could prevent the use of international force and any action by the military staff of the world organization against itself by the simple process of refusing to vote for the use of such force against itself. Or, more than that, it could prevent the use of international force against any other powers, large or small, by the simple procedure of voting against the use of such force—this is the reason why I stated earlier that even the most violent isolationist should be satisfied with the proposals as they now exist, for the reason that our Nation cannot be forced either to use its own force or to permit the force of any other nations to be used, for policing the world in any case where it is felt that the dispute involved did not justify the use of sanctions, force, or intervention, either by itself or by the joint military power of the four other great powers. The United States also, by its own action could prevent the use of such power against itself. Certainly there can be no loss of sovereignty involved in such arrangements, particularly so far as any of the five large powers are concerned.

It might be expected that with reference to the use of all persuasive means short of force, which are provided for under section A of chapter VIII, that the Council could act without a too strenuous veto upon this power, because such a veto might readily be used to prevent even the moral persuasion involved in an aroused world-wide public opinion from being brought to bear upon an aggressive power through the simple expediency of refusing to permit a dispute which any permanent member of the Council wished to hush up, from being investigated or settled by peaceful means. This condition exists under the present status for the reason, that although any member of the Security Council involved in a dispute is required to abstain from voting, still any one of the remaining three or four large powers—assuming that the dispute was either between two large powers or between a large power and a small one—could prevent any action being taken under section A by the simple device of refusing to concur. This is true because the Yalta voting agreement still requires the concurring vote of all of the noninvolved large powers before any of the instrumentalities for peaceful settlement provided for in section A can be invoked.

Under the Dumbarton Oaks procedures and the Yalta agreement for voting, there is no arrangement by which the Council can be required to order all disputes submitted to the International World Court. Yet, the whole purpose of an organization to preserve the peace should be centered, as much as possible, in making the peaceful means effective, so that the use of force should be resolved into a position of last resort, rather than accentuated as it is presently. I propose that the Dumbarton Oaks and the Yalta proposals with reference to voting be amended to require mandatory submission to the International Court of all disputes which are not settled by any of the other means outlined in paragraph 3 of section A of chapter VIII. I also propose that as to this mandatory power, there be no veto by a large power, either directly or indirectly, and that no member or members of the Council, either large or small, who are parties to a dispute be permitted to vote on this question.

As against those who would say that a dispute endangering world peace should not be permitted to pend before the court for a

decision and thus become so magnified as to endanger world peace, I am further of the opinion that the Council should have the right to exercise the power vested in it under section B of chapter VIII before, concurrent with, or after it ordered submission of the disputes to the international court. In either of these events, the security council, by exercising its powers under section B would be merely occupying a position comparable to that of a policeman who holds the parties to a dispute by the arm to prevent them from harming each other or endangering the community, at the same time taking them before the court and requiring them to submit their cause to the magistrate for decision.

Any action taken by the Council under section B would not constitute an execution of a judgment of the court, because I do not propose to disturb this power in any respect whatsoever. We, therefore, do not have a situation presented where the Security Council would attempt to enforce an order of the court in cases where international law did not apply. The action of the Security Council under the present state of world enlightenment is called into being without regard to the legal rights of the parties. It therefore does not constitute an enforcement of the court's decisions. Nor do I propose a mandatory enforcement of the decisions. But, a decision coming after action under section B would again have the salutary effect of pointing up any deficiency in international law as it now exists. This is one of the fundamental purposes behind the whole proposal to require a mandatory submission of cases to the international court.

I think the effects which can be expected from conferring mandatory jurisdiction upon the international court can be summarized as follows:

First. A mandatory submission to the jurisdiction of the court is all that is asked. We do not propose or suggest, at this stage of the development of international law, that there shall be a mandatory enforcement of the court's decision.

Second. It is the most effective way to force the development of international law by demonstrating, through the court's decisions, the present inadequacy of that law.

Third. A mere novice in the realm of international relations understands the danger to world peace involved in the present distinction between legal or justiciable and political or nonjustificiable disputes. He is also aware of the fact that in the absence of mandatory submission of causes to an international court, many dishonorable and warlike acts, which were, in fact, legal and justiciable, have been hidden behind the hypocritical mask or a professed indignity to national honor or some other form of falsely presented so-called political issue, which the parties refused to submit for adjudication Mandatory adjudication, if it did nothing else, would tear away this mask and make ineffective one of the devices by which the peace of the world has been repeatedly upset.

Fourth. It is the only effective way to bring the weight of world public opinion into action against the five great powers and it is the only procedure by which an abuse of power by them can be subject to any deterrent, either peaceful or forceful.

We are told, and we want to believe, that this power can be granted to the five great powers because they are peace-loving nations. If they are peace-loving nations, then they will not be afraid to submit their action to the decisions of an international court to be vindicated in the eyes of the world. As far as the United States is concerned, I have sufficient confidence that we shall continue in the future to be a peace-loving nation, willing to submit our actions to such an impartial tribunal in order that they may be vindicated before the peoples of the earth. It does not seem too much to ask of the other four great powers that they shall be willing to support this proposal as evidence of their own future intentions.

A critical analysis therefore of the situation which confronts the nations of the world as they face the San Francisco Conference no method better calculated to advance international law. Surely, there is no method by which the cause of peace can be better advanced than by calling into being the public opinion of the people of good will of this world—which is, and shall remain forever after, one world—than the impartial decision of jurists who hold a reputation, both national and international, for integrity and ability.

Personal Items

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of this war many things have happened to bring forcefully to the mind of our people the manner in which our communities and our people back home are so closely tied in with the success of the war. Recently two such instances have impressed me. I realize that these instances are only two among thousands but I do feel that they are typical.

In the article by the late and greatly lamented Ernie Pyle as it appeared in the Decatur (Ala.) Daily on March 30, 1945, the story was told of how one of Decatur's fine young men became an ace. That part of the article follows:

PYLE TELLS HOW ENSIGN TROUP OF DECATUR BECAME ACE

IN THE WESTERN PACIFIC.—The pilot on our carrier who shot down the first Jap plane of our trip was Ensign Frank Troup, of Decatur, Ala. It was a reconnaissance plane, and he got it the day before we got to Tokyo waters.

It was his fifth, and made him an ace. Troup said the only reason he got it was that he happened to be closer than his wingmates when they spotted it.

The boys who fly the patrols say that when they spot a single Jap plane, everybody in the patrol opens wide open, and it's just like a horse race to see who gets within shooting distance first. This time it was Troup.

Next in line to Troup was Ensign Bob Hickle, of (146 Santa Ana Street) Long Beach, Calif. That was the third time they'd been together when Troup got a plane. It had almost got to be a joke. Hickle had gradually worked into the same category as "always a bridesmaid, but never a bride."

Hickle joked, "Now that Troup has got five, he'll have to start helping me get some."

And the very next morning Hickle came back glowing. He had got his first plane. Yes; Troup was with him, but Hickle got it all by himself, without any help.

I asked Hickle how it felt, and he said that he was so anxious to get him that he almost ran into the pieces when the Jap turned over in the air and exploded.

In another item appearing in the Tri Cities Daily, Sheffield, Ala., recently, the story is told of a local paratroop officer making a broadcast just before jumping with his troops behind German lines and how in that broadcast he told of his own feeling of security because of the fact that the fighting equipment and material he was using had come from his own home and surrounding section—the aluminum in his plane from the Reynolds Metals Co., at Sheffield, and the ammunition he was using from the arsenals at Huntsville. The news item follows:

Those listening to the Army Hour Sunday afternoon heard Capt. Harry B. Rahner, son of Mrs. H. B. Rahner, 324 North Court Street, Florence, speaking from an Army transport plane carrying paratroopers behind the German lines along the Rhine. Captain Rahner, in command of the paratroopers aboard the transport, stated that neither he nor his men were afraid, for their plane was of the aluminum made by his friends at the Reynolds plant and that their ammunition was made by his friends at the Redstone arsenal, Huntsville. He spoke just before making his nineteenth jump, but it was to be his first combat take-off. Captain Rahner is an electrical engineer, having received his degree from Auburn in 1935. After his graduation, he was employed by Birmingham Electric Co. for 5 years. An officer in the Reserve, he asked to be assigned to active duty in September 1940, and in November was ordered to Fort Jackson, S. C., as a first lieutenant in the Field Artillery. He was later stationed at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp Blanding, Fla., and it was in October 1942, while stationed at Camp Shelby, that he volunteered for the paratroopers. He was sent to Fort Benning, Ga., where he received his wings March 13, 1943. Captain Rahner's wife, Annie Lee Livingston Rahner, is making her home with her parents in Orangeburg, S. C.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the great San Francisco Conference, the hopes of freedom-loving people everywhere are high that the decisions reached there will guarantee the political integrity of all nations, large and small, who have fought valiantly as our allies against the Nazi aggressor. A great body of American citizens are concerned that Poland be accorded fair treament in the deliberations and in the solutions of the delegates of the difficult problems which are to be solved. In this connection, I wish to insert in the RECORD, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, the following statement of the Federation of Polish Combined Clubs and Societies of Chicopee, Chicopee Falls and Willimansett, Mass. I commend its reading and careful consideration to all Members of Congress:

The decision of the Yalta Conference, with respect to Poland provoked a storm of protest and denouncement from a great mass of liberty loving people in America.

The spirit of fair play so deeply rooted in us since youth, and so typically American, cannot but be outraged at the shabby treatment accorded Poland for her valiant stand against Axis aggression, for the terrible sacrifies and horrible sufferings endured by her people because of their loyalty to the

Allied cause, as proved by German failure to find collaborationists or Quislings among them; and for the unmatched courage, loyalty, and daring of Polish soldiers and airmen in carrying on relentless warfare against the murderous invaders of their country.

Poland has earned, and rightfully deserves, a high position among the nations of the world, instead of being penalized with the loss of one-half her territory.

Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill spoke of compensation to Poland. Clearly, statements of this nature are admissions that a wrong has been committed, for where there is no wrong there is no need for compensation. Poland does not seek, nor does she need, compensation. All she wants is what belongs to her.

The apportionment of eastern Poland is another Munich-like compromise which cannot lead to a permanent peace. Further, it more nearly approximates a ratification of the Molotov-Ribbentrop line, rather than the so-called Curzon line, which never contemplated that Lwow, Wilno, and eastern Galicia should go to Soviet Russia.

Mr. Edward Stettinius, Secretary of State, said: "It has been the consistently held policy of the United States Government that questions relating to boundaries should be kept in abeyance until the termination of hostilities." Mr. Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, said on July 30, 1941: "I also desire to assure you (Poland) that His Majesty's Government do not recognize any territorial changes which had been effected in Poland since August 1939."

When subsequent actions controvert these assertions, is it possible for other countries to have faith and confidence in spoken or written pledges of high Government representatives? Are our American boys fighting and dying for the preservation of power politics? Is this our conception of national honor?

Firm in the belief that our representatives in Congress and our delegates to the San Francisco Conference desire to uphold our national honor and back up America's pledge of freedom and democracy for all countries, large or small, we urge most vigorously that:

1. Poland be accorded the same rights and privileges accorded all members of the United Nations by being represented at the Conference.

2. Boundaries be left unchanged until hostilities are terminated, and residents of areas in question are given an opportunity to decide freely, without coercion from any source, where they wish to belong.

3. An Allied Commission be appointed to prevent the removal from eastern Poland of Poles who are opposed, or are suspected of opposing, the Soviet-sponsored Lublin government. Moreover, the hundreds of thousands of Poles already transplanted from this area should be returned to their homes prior to the elections, or failing that, some method be devised to give them representation in the voting.

WALTER M. GROCKI,
President.
JOSEPH A. NOWAK,
Secretary.
ADOLPH J. GOLEN.
WALTER J. TRYBULSKI.

Problems of United Nations Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the Forum for Democracy entitled "What Are the Problems of United Nations Unity?" Times Hall, New York City, March 2, 1945:

Chairman SAMUEL L. M. BARLOW. Ladies and gentlemen, this is the fifth session of the Forum for Democracy, and I am going to go over the season a little bit for you, because there are some new people. And I warn you that I have a very important announcement to make at the very end of the evening, concerning the Forum. Our last month's session, as you know, concerned itself with job discrimination, and our next will be about the punishment of war criminals. This evening our subject is, as you know, How We Can Maintain Allied Unity After the War.

Those of you who are our regular customers may now do a little quiet digesting of your dinners while I briefly restate why your Forum for Democracy presents these, what I think I can probably call "hot" topics, in its own special manner.

We believe that what affects the body politic affects us; and, combined with that, we believe that one bad apple can contaminate the whole barrel. So we praise, we elucidate, we condemn, but we do not go about gloomily muck-raking. On the contrary, we are hopeful of the future—as our list of subjects shows. We have, I think, a real confidence in the morrow, provided one thing: provided that our citizenry is as alert as it is privileged, for we are an extremely privileged citizenry in this year of grace, 1945.

We might, but for the grace of God, be the citizenry of Warsaw, Chungking, Naples, or Aachen. Or we might be in other hungry and devastated places. And our privileges of security and ease can be held fast only by citizens' action, not by inertia nor by whirling in space like a dervish. And it is exciting—let me tell you it is exciting—to be informed, alert, active! Of course it is!

Now, we also believe this Forum for Democracy is your forum—and I think it belongs more intimately to you than other forums belong to their people. And we believe, when we listen to these other forums that have sprung up rather like mushrooms in dew around these parts, that many of them, in fact all of them, are so intentionally disputations that the residue of one of their sessions is utter confusion. We turn off the radio or leave the hall with no clear thoughts, no informed emotion; above all, with no incentive and, as I have said before in this place, it is unhealthy to emote without action. It is like getting hot without sweating. It is very bad for you.

So, the speakers at your Forum for Democracy start on an agreed basis, a conviction that progress and liberality and the extensions of democracy, as well as peace itself, are the proper business of these United States.

And if the function of education is to turn events into ideas, I am convinced that the function of educated adults is to turn ideas into action. And we cannot act with vigor unless we act with conviction. And our convictions, after all, spring from our knowledge and our true information—what we hope is true, anyhow.

This forum, then, airs for you those things that you are interested in. It airs them through the channel of the best informed, most eloquent speakers we can find. You know them. We have had Malcolm Ross, Raymond Walsh, Hulan Jack, Clayton Powell, Emanuel Celler, Lisa Sergio, Frank Kingdon, Arthur Pope and all the others we have brought to you so far in this very short first year of ours, and those we are bringing to you tonight.

Now, other forums concentrate on what I might call heat, with mental calisthenics predominant. They knock people down or scratch their backs. Here, I might say, we concentrate on light, trying to keep it a lively light, to be sure, and under no bushels. Nor is this forum meant to be a stall for sacred cows. In fact, next year, if we have 5,000 instead of 500 members, and two forums a month instead of one, as well as our weekly programs on the air (which you know we have over WOV) I would like to see, for example, a good evening's discussion of modern art, with, shall we say, Jo Davison as umpire. And you can have a lot of fun.

Now, tonight for example, we here, I think, on the platform, are all agreed that world peace depends on world-mindedness and interdependence, and not on the pharisaical isolation nor aloofness. We thank God, I think all of us here, for Teheran, Moscow, Yalta, and for Dumbarton Oaks. But as somebody said, we are by no means out of the Bretton Woods yet.

And tonight I can see, in spite of our unanimity of basic agreement here, an awful lot of thorny questions, and there will be some from the audience later. I foresee the question of economic expansion. We all agree it is necessary. At all events, it is a fact. Yet Mr. Joseph Grew, in his book, let slip—and I am afraid that is what I must say—he let slip the phrase that the line between economic expansion and exploitation was often hard to see.

Another thing we can trip ourselves over: What are the solvents and reconciliations to be tendered in the postwar period to the Allied uncomfortables—because they make us feel uncomfortable—Marshal Tito, Red China, Greek partisans, De Gaulle, the Spanish underground? I have very definite feelings on those, but I doubt if six other people would have the same feelings.

What is a colonial possession between friends, may I ask? Well, there is Hong Kong. What resurrection do we offer Manila (our own adopted child) or the Jews? How can we curb the old, reactionary political machines in America, as well as in France, and in England, from upsetting the apple cart in their lust to get back in the drivers seat?

Now, some of these will be thoroughly aired tonight. But, as I am told there's a curfew law, we won't get around to all of them. However, I think the moment has arrived to get on with some of these excitements, and I shall now call upon our speakers to hand you the fullest excitement that is before us.

Now, I want to go botanical for a moment. There is a charming flower which in the Elizabethan period was called the "Eye of Day," because it is white and gold. But for all its being white and gold, it has not lost its roots in our plain, home fields. It is, in other words, the day's eye, or the daisy.

There is a lady who, because of her courage, her charm and her intelligence—because of those things which are her passports to any country, I might add—was lately our Envoy Extraordinary to Norway. She is now the chairman of the Committee on Women in Industry of the Council of National Defense, and Democratic National Committeewoman for the District of Columbia. She is also, and very proudly so, vice president of Americans United for International Cooperation. And I would add that she too, to her friends, is known as Daisy.

So it is with great pleasure that I present Mrs. Borden Harriman. [Aplause.]

Mrs. J. BORDEN HARRIMAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is gratifying to have a cheerful subject to talk about, such as unity in the postwar world through a United Nations organization. I do not mean to underestimate the difficulties and the outrages and the misery all around us or the horrors still to face before peace comes. I am only trying to say that the future is

worth fighting for, and must be made in the great mold of democracy.

It has been wisely said that this is a peoples' war, a peoples' revolution. The people of the world are on the march and they must have an understanding and a vision or they will not succeed in their goal. What is their goal? If I read them rightly, they want something different from the last peace, which was not a good peace. It was not what the people of the world, through 4 long years of war, had hoped for.

This time an organization to save mankind from destruction must not be made light of or discarded. The same talent and energy that has been put into erecting the machinery of war should be put into the machinery for peace.

My complete conviction is that there will be a United Nations organization evolved out of the present international turmoil, but I am an optimist. Let me assure you that even I know that we have a rough road to travel before we can be sure of Senate approval of America's participation. But the mere creation of such an organization is only the beginning. It must have behind it, in each country, a mobilized opinion and a working force of people. No government or movement has ever been maintained unless supported by its people—this will be even more true of an international one. Our big job after we get the international organization will be to develop an educated and alert people who will insure that its powers are used really for the benefit of all, and not for the benefit of a few or to preserve a dubious status quo.

The $64 question is, How can we maintain and improve United Nations unity after we get it? To do it we must develop, or find the way to, a sense of belonging to an international community and a feeling for that community such as we now feel for our Nation through patriotism. Patriotism is loyalty. We have found the way to expand our sense of loyalty from the family group to the home town, to the State, and to the Nation. Now we must take the next step—to include all the human race in one family.

As members of a family have different temperaments and tastes, and we fight with them but try for the good of the whole to reconcile our differences, so we must strive to have the same attitude toward our neighboring peoples. It is not necessary to say we love them all, or that we must love them all. Of course, we won't. Many times they will annoy us, and undoubtedly we will annoy them, but the time is here that, whether we like it or whether we don't, we are rapidly being forced into the necessity for intimate contacts with all the world. Now that we are going to be able to breakfast in New York and dine in London, and every great base is within 60 hours of every other great base, we can no longer hold ourselves aloof from any quarter of the globe.

Shortly before he died, Wendell Willkie made the following statement: "I tell you that if a man is not in favor of the closest possible relations of all nations, then it does not matter what else he is. Such a man will be antilabor, even if he praises labor 24 hours a day. He will be antilabor because he will be working for a contracted America, a less-prosperous America. For the very same reason, such a man will be antibusiness, in the deepest sense, even though he may consider himself a servant of business, even though he falls on his knees before business. He will be antibusiness because he will be working for a smaller America, a less-important America. This is the touchstone to a man's entire position in politics today."

How can we go about reaching this ideal? First, we must assume that our joining a world organization is only a beginning. All of us who have been working so long in the international field may be too inclined at that time to relax, to say that now our job is done and we can take a rest. And the United States as a whole has a habit of thinking that to pass a law is all that is required to handle a situation.

This is no time for us to continue that old habit. If the United States Senate approves our taking part in the new international pattern, it will still be necessary to make the machinery work. The officials (our own representatives as well as those of other countries) whose task it is to handle our international problems, must feel behind them the weight of informed and opinionated peoples. They must not be left in a vacuum. The absence of sufficiently powerful organizational support of international law, the free flow of trade and collective security among popular groups was one of the essential reasons for the break-down of the League of Nations.

I myself have heard the foreign ministers, meeting at Geneva, complain that they were too removed from reality—that they needed closer contact with the people—that it took too long in a crisis for public opinion to register.

In this country we have proved that the safest base for sound government lies in the party system. Through the mechanism of the parties we debate our great national issues. Perhaps in time we will come to that internationally. Perhaps not, but for the present we should encourage, and work with our own interest groups—at the international level.

We have many good starts, the International Labor Organization, the International Food Institute at Rome, the new Food and Agriculture Organization, the Pan-American Bar Association, etc. We should extend each such domestic organization to the international field where we can meet with people from all countries whose life interests are our own. If we are social workers, or farmers, clergymen, doctors, or businessmen, we should know our opposite numbers in other nations, and plan our international functions to meet the real needs of all.

Then we will need the same international exchange of political ideas such as is now afforded by the Free World Association. Groups within each country working for the same ideals, must have an international meeting ground, completely independent of government, and their members free to speak their minds. These groups will serve to spur the United Nations into action, or to check their contemplated action if it is not in the people's interest.

We must have all these, and public-spirited persons taking part in their activities, internationally as they do now, nationally. If with these we have a free flow of news by press and by radio, then the next Manchurian crisis will not find a League of Nations too weak, and people everywhere too lethargic to force it into action, but a world of United Nations prepared to protect its peace.

We in the United States passed up the chance before to help in building a family of nations. It is wonderful that we have a second chance. America was never before 1920 afraid of an experiment, and our timidity then has proved disastrous. This reminds me of the famous scientist, Dr. Harlow Shapley, who said, "We should welcome growth, whether it is in social mechanics, or in advancing pure knowledge, or in political orientation, or in enriching the life of the common man.

"The bullfrog for millions of years has conformed with the policy of 'the good days.' He has been sitting on his rotting log in the swamp, croaking and croaking; he has tried nothing new, nothing bold, and the bullfrog remains a bullfrog."

America is only being true to its own life pattern when it faces the future with boldness and imagination. We must not only go forward with the other nations, but must do so with tolerance and patience. We must proceed to play our part in the Court of Nations. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you, Mrs. Harriman.

I enjoyed that story about the bullfrog floating down a river on a Taft—on a raft, excuse me. [Laughter.] Well, since we are being aquatic about this, I can keep right on in the same vein. I don't know whether he can tickle a trout but I know he can kill a Fish. And he did it rather magnificently. Most of the people from New York State don't have to hang their heads in shame when they read who said what in Washington any more. Yes, I think he is a doctor, too. He cured us of trichinosis, which is a disease you get when you have too much bad Ham. [Applause.]

But now to be serious for one moment, if I may. You remember in the Bible, just before David slew Goliath, his friends came and railed at him. Do you remember what David's answer was? He said, "Is there not a cause?"

It is with great pleasure that I introduce Congressman BENNET. [Applause.]

Congressman A. W. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, fellow guests, and members and friends of the Forum for Democracy, this is not my first appearance before a New York audience and I hope it won't be my last. I am a native of New York City. I attended the public schools here and Townsend Harris High School, which I am sorry to say is no more. I always feel at home here in the city. About half my life was spent here, and about half up in the district which I now represent. It is always pleasant to come home again. I hope that somewhere in this audience there may be someone who has shared one or another of my experiences here in the city, and with whom I may have a chance to meet briefly afterward and exchange some reminiscences.

History suggests that there has been the greatest degree of world unity when the world was either dominated by one nation possessing overwhelming economic or military power, or when, in the absence of such a nation, there was the freest possible exchange of goods and services.

An outstanding example of the first condition was, of course, the so-called Pax Romana which, behind the spears of the Roman legions, kept the peace by force for several centuries. I take it that no one here tonight would suggest that we want to attain unity by that method even if we could possibly do so.

Comparative unity in most of the world existed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the sea routes were kept open and international trade was promoted by the British working through their predominant Navy. Of course, there were wars during these centuries just as there were outbreaks while Rome controlled, but on the whole, there was a rapid increase in prosperity for most of the world, a great growth of population, and a substantial increase in the comprehension of other nations' problems, coupled with some effort to definitely plan for stabilized conditions.

An opportunity to re-create the conditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is now, or shortly will be, opened to us. In a sense, we will have available both methods of promoting unity. We can, through the instrumentality of the Security Council, visualized by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, enforce peace and we can also, through a determined effort to satisfy the aspirations of the maximum numbers of peoples and nations, foster good will and understanding.

The first and most essential task in bringing about this latter type of unity is the formulation of a new world set-up after victory which will carry out, as far as possible, the best features of the Atlantic Charter.

It is already obvious that some of the smaller nations are going to be disappointed at the treatment accorded them, but we in this country must use every effort to see that there is the least possible justification for such disappointment.

Primarily we have a sales job and those who sincerely hope for the success of the projected world organization, must use every effort to play down the inevitable incidents which could breed discord and suspicion, especially among our present allies, whose cooperation is absolutely essential if an effective world government is to be created.

Those who use every opportunity to denounce the attitude, for example, of Russia and Great Britain toward specific matters, accomplish nothing toward the correction of the attitudes and merely arouse in the minds and hearts of large segments of our population a bitterness and hostility which will create a formidable obstacle when the time comes to seek ratification by the American people of whatever plan may evolve from the San Francisco Conference.

The rest of us should employ every opportunity to create a good atmosphere by playing up points of agreement between the great nations rather than the points of disagreement.

It is probably safe to say that a vast majority of the American people and of their elected Representatives in Congress, desire to participate in setting up a workable organization which can preserve world peace, promote international trade and eventually establish a forum in which disputes between nations and their citizens can be settled by the orderly processes of law rather than through resort to force. With this favorable condition it will be the fault of people like ourselves if we fail to work out an acceptable plan and then fail to sell that plan to people who are already in a receptive frame of mind.

A rival sales force is already in existence. Isolationism is not dead. Its leaders loudly proclaim that they will be restored to power within 2 years. It could happen. It must not be allowed to happen. It is up to you and others like you throughout the United States of America to determine the outcome and to see that that outcome is the one which is going to make possible the establishment of the form of world organization to which we all aspire. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Well, our speakers have the merit of being almost too brief, it seems to me. Well, you will be able to get back at them very shortly because you are going to ask some questions.

I notice that Congressman BENNET mentioned that he had been to the Townsend Harris High School here, and that name, I think, is very pertinent to the discussion tonight. You may remember that Townsend Harris went with Perry and opened the ports of Japan, and from there went and did the same thing on his own in Siam, unless I am greatly mistaken. And he was one of those people who was anything but an isolationist. Perhaps that is why they closed his school, I don't know. But he was in the great free American tradition which brought us Alexander Hamilton from an English island, and sent American Townsend Harris to China, and sent Joe Barlow to Paris. There were no isolationists in those days. I don't know how it has grown upon us.

Now, I don't know how we procured our next speaker; it is kind of a mystery. He usually is and is expected to be lecturing all over this country to foreign-policy associations, chambers of commerce, to other forums, or to all the universities about his activities in Russia or China or Japan. So what he is even doing in the country, I don't know. However, we are lucky to get him.

He also found time, I may add, to write about a dozen books, with all that. But quite seriously put and simply put, I doubt if in the United States today there is a more experienced and trained authority, with years of training, on the eastern question than he. So it is really no mean privilege to introduce General Yakhontoff. [Applause.]

Gen. VICTOR YAKHONTOFF. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen: "United Nations" is not simply a term coined in 1942 by those who were united in their determination to check the Fascist aggressors, but a reality that was forged by the interdependence of the participants in this World War No. 2, and strengthened by the realization of the fact that victory over Hitler and his coconspirators was possible only through the unity of action, unity of spirit, and unity of purpose of the partners in this titanic struggle. (To use the words of the declaration issued by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin after their meeting at Teheran.)

The latest in the series of the meetings of the big three—that of Yalta—has clearly established not only the durability of the military cooperation, but the determination to extend it after the victory, as a measure of control over Germany. She is to be demilitarized and made harmless, and measures established for maintenance of order in the Reich, under the general direction of a central control commission, representing the supreme commanders of the big three, with headquarters at Berlin. As for Japan, the Crimean Conference tactfully did not discuss (at least officially) the fate of that country, with which the U. S. S. R. is not at war. This status was not only accepted by the others, but clearly underlined by the very wording of the Declaration of United Nations.

For a while, before the Conference at Yalta, we heard people asking if the pacts concluded by some of the United Nations, were not in discord with the spirit of unity. Such were, for instance, the 20-year treaties of alliance between the U. S. S. R. and Great Britain, France, and Czechoslovakia. In the heat of debating this question some critics called these pacts unilateral. Naturally this was a misnomer, for something concluded by two cannot be unilateral, which means onesided. If the critics meant that Moscow acted upon these treaties without consulting her partners, Great Britain and the U. S. A. obviously there was some sort of a confusion. Dr. Benes, of Czechoslovakia, went to Moscow to sign the pact after Teheran; went there from London, and, naturally, not without keeping his host and us posted. The treaty with France, certainly could not be a very different case, if different at all, from the Czech-Soviet agreement and its prototype, the 20-year treaty with Great Britain.

In other words, there is nothing either to object to or to get excited about. Such pacts, obviously, are helping and not hindering the main purpose of building mutual confidence and pave the way toward genuine friendship and cooperation.

As for the question asked by some people: If we, too, should not have some agreements of that kind. The answer seems to be "Why not"? Provided, of course, that such bilateral pacts are not designed to exclude any of the United Nations. But pacts of alliances are hardly what Washington is looking for. Alliances are, certainly, much more than the Isolationists (or whatever their name today) would approve. And their power of obstruction, let us be frank, still is something to worry about.

There is another question that makes many people uneasy and anxious to get more light on it. What about the future of the empire? What about the colonies and the colonial peoples? Most of our people are definitely against the subjugation of other peoples by the Big Powers. This clearly speaks well of American belief in fair play and of prevailing good sense. But, there are some among us who demand control over, if not purely and simply for annexation of, various Pacific islands. Personally, I believe that a more reasonable solution could be found in the establishment of control under general supervision of the United Nations; not annexations, not even new mandates. What is important is the elimination of any danger that those islands be again used by any nation as stepping stones for any attack on others.

To keep in trust, with collective responsibility, is quite another thing than to take; to gain possession.

It is most unfortunate that a few among us were talking of taking over from Great Britain; of the American century and the like, which sounded rather un-American. Fortunately, we do not hear about these plans lately.

As for the colonial and semicolonial peoples, it looks as if the chances for keeping them much longer in that status are getting slim. Wendell Willkie discovered this. Many others know it. Much more will be learned. The twentieth century hardly is favorable for the continuance of the old colonial regimes.

Colonial empires were built by the expanding economies of the old. If they have no extra good chance for survival, what about the more modern expanding tendencies (mostly of economic nature) of the Big Three? Is there no menace for their unity? One of the three, the Soviet Union, is not a menace for the others; it is not a rival, for it is not interested in foreign markets in the same sense as the others are. Its national economy does not depend on any control of foreign markets, it does not seek any monopolistic position, and therefore has to be excluded from this question. As for the others, much will depend on the soundness of the basis on which the competition will develop. Some good steps, apparently, were made at a number of international meetings which were held recently. How will this develop? Let us hope we will not see the repetition of the wild race; restoration of tariff walls; discrimination; cut-throat competition, instead of sensibly regulated foreign trade in the interest of all.

A very interesting opinion on that point was expressed by Mr. Henry J. Kaiser (in his speech at Madison Square Garden, on November 6, 1944) and I quote:

"When Russian industrialism matches our own in volume, when comforts and conveniences are a commonplace for her people, the great mass of mankind throughout the world will be seeking goods and more goods to satisfy their awakened desires. In the New World there will be no place for the theories of overproduction."

"We welcome Russian competition," he added, for "it means vast increase in the supply of essential goods and services." Competition on such a basis, certainly, is not something to be worried about.

And here is the last of the questions I was asked to touch upon. It is about the self-determination of peoples. As anything else, it is good in moderation, i. e., if not stretched beyond logical, sound bounds. It can be overdone, as most things, good or otherwise.

The principle of self-determination, advanced by the Russian Revolution, and included in the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson, and then accepted at Versailles, as applied in the past, proved to be not always to the good. The time was abnormal, if not pathological, as the result of war, revolution in Russia, and revolutionary movements in other countries. The rush for independence was spurred by some outsiders who were interested in the cordon-sanitaire idea for isolation of the young Soviet state, or wanted to have convenient stepping-stones for the attacks on Russia. As a result, a number of small units were built; some of them too small and too weak to resist the schemes of the bigger, more powerful states; and therefore independence proved to be not

more than an illusion. They became pawns in the hands of others, and this aggravated, not improved, the international situation. This much we all know, and have to remember when discussing again the question of self-determination.

Of course, this said experience of the past does not repudiate the principle itself. There is nothing wrong with the desire of any ethnic group to be independent, to be free in developing its own cultural growth, and thereby to contribute the most and the best it can to the whole of humanity. But the application of this good principle should not ignore the reality: The existing political and economic conditions. Certainly it is desirable to give the fullest right to every nationality to establish or restore independence, but with due regard to the actual situation. In other words, it seems reasonable under certain circumstances to advise postponement of such separation simply in order to prevent unpleasant complications.

This natural desire for freedom and independenece of nationalities should not be treated differently from the way any civilized society is treating the desires and inclinations of individuals living in its midst. There is, and obviously has to be, certain limitations of the individual to protect the interests of the whole. We all can imagine what would happen if every motorist would be allowed to ignore the traffic rules and regulations, and do the driving according to his inclinations and taste. We already do know what happened when all the applications for independence were so easily approved at Versailles. Is it not better to be more careful in the future?

We have certainly reason to hope that after this war is over, and the world will be built on the sound foundations laid at Teheran and Yalta, and mutual trust among the nations will be established, and their cooperation will become a happy reality, that there will remain less reason for caution of the sort described. If so, let us hope, sometimes there will also disappear any justification for boundaries, and then the very idea of self-determination would be considered on an entirely new plane. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you, General. Very enlightening.

Now, I was very interested in what the General said when he brought up the question of empires and colonies, and I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea that ultimately there must be wards or trusteeships of a national council; a sort of colonial pool may be one way of looking at it. I am not sure. Of course, there are the snags, but we are here tonight to discuss the snags, and all our beautiful ideas, and to see how we can get around them.

Presumably we are going to fortify Guam against future attack from the Orient, from Japan, because we know perfectly well that we have to disarm Japan totally. Yet we know what happened to Germany, who was totally disarmed 25 years ago—and up she comes again. So we are probably going to—I don't say I like it, but I think that is the future—we are going to fortify Guam. But if we keep Iwo, for example, and we are the trustees or the wards for Iwo under the United Nations, can we fortify that against Japan? In other words, does colonial trusteeship end in defensive fortification? It might well, and it may be a good thing, but I just don't know. How about that, General?

General YAKHONTOFF. Well, it would not be so necessary to fortify Guam or Iwo or any other islands if we have an international trusteeship. The trouble with the islands in the Pacific was the result of agreements reached at a Washington conference as a compromise in order to force the approval by Japan of the plan of these unequal naval quotas. We made a very bad mistake promising that we and the others would not fortify the islands in the Pacific. Japan very easily approved this and started immediately fortifying the islands from which she was able and actually did attack us. And she did not allow anybody to go there and find out, in spite of the fact that the islands were under a mandate of the league. The League of Nations, naturally, ought to have watched that a little bit more closely.

Japan was able to attack us from fortified islands while we honestly continued to stick to the agreement and we did not fortify our Philippines. And we know the result. Neither did we dare do anything about Guam.

Now, if we change the situation so as to make an international trusteeship, with actual control, I don't think it would be necessary to spend money on fortifications.

Chairman BARLOW. I want to see a forest of hands from the floor.

QUESTIONER. If people's governments are established all over the world—and I would like to ask General Yakhontoff whether he thinks there will be such establishments all over the world—will defense mechanism really be necessary? Because I think if people's governments are set up throughout the world there will be no fear of aggression on their part.

General YAKHONTOFF. Well, there is this beautiful idea that if people's governments would be established; in other words, if democracy would prevail, real, genuine democracy all over the world, then there will be no reason to fortify, because there is no chance of war. Well, it is a little bit too farfetched in 1945. It may happen later. But what I said before about Guam and Iwo, and so on, did not mean, of course, that the international group, the Security Council, would not need to take care of some strategic points in the world, to make sure that the jumping stones were prepared in order to check the aggressors. In other words, though being an incorrigible optimist, I still wouldn't go so far as to suggest that we drop our arms completely, and believe that after tomorrow we will have a beautiful world with no conflicts at all.

Dr. SHERMAN. Recently there was issued a statement signed by 1,600 religious leaders signifying that it is their belief that no representative of organized religion should sit at the peace table. That was immediately attacked by the Vatican.

I should like to pose this question to all three speakers and get their point of view on the attitude of religion at the peace conference.

Chairman BARLOW. I will repeat the question. Recently, 1,600 religious leaders in this country wrote and asked that organized religion should not be represented as such at the peace table, and that as a result of that letter signed by 1,600 people the Vatican sent a letter of protest, implying, I presume, that organized religion, sectarian religion, should be represented at the peace table. Have the three speakers got any comment they dare make?

Congressman BENNET. I don't mind making a comment on it.

It seems to me if religion, whether organized or otherwise, is going to play a vital part in the world, it ought to be interested in everything vital that goes on. And I can't think of anything more vital than that peace conference. That conference and its outcome is going to affect the lives of everybody all over the world, including the members of those religious groups.

Chairman BARLOW. Yes, but do you want to add conflict to conflict? In other words, naturally everything that is vital should concern the churches. But the question is, does it? If you remember your history, the Tartar Empire was quite prepared to go Christian instead of Mohammedan, and for 500 years there was a period when it wavered like that, and it was quite late when they decided in favor of Mohammedanism because they had seen the squabbles of the seven sects of Christian monks who had gone there to convert it. Now, that is historically true.

One of the matters that I had in mind tonight, and a good disputatious one it is too, is that to date in history no church that we know of has ever prevented a war, whereas the two great churches that we just mentioned, the Christian and the Mohammedan churches, are frequently indulging in holy crusades. In other words, they make wars; they do not stop them.

Now, I am a church-goer, a believer, which is a very different matter from feeling that I can speak my mind on the past. I certainly think that there ought to be a United Council of Churches, existing in just the way the International Labor Organization exists. It does not need to have any more than labor should have. Therefore, I don't believe that the Vatican, or in place of the Vatican, Bishop Manning, should represent the church. However, I do think that the churches should get together and possibly send an appointee—but try and get that.

General YAKHONTOFF. May I disagree. I rather agree with what Congressman BENNET said, that it is natural that they have interest, but to have interest is one thing and to be active in decision is entirely a different thing. I am very much interested, say, in ballet, but that doesn't mean that I can perform.

As to the suggestion of our chairman that the Council of Churches should be treated in the same way as labor, I violently disagree, because labor is not specializing in spiritual things. And the church, according to our Constitution, is separated from the state, and the church, in my opinion, should not be a part of any decisions of that kind. One thousand six hundred religious leaders—they were not laymen, they were representatives of the church, and they could easily be followed by thousands of others—if approached for their opinion would certainly say "No." Most of the churches do not approve of it, and if some do, that is no reason to agree with them. [Applause.]

Mrs. HARRIMAN. I would like to add that the members who are going to be appointed to the peace table will be members of the different churches, and will be quite equal to representing the thought of those churches.

Chairman BARLOW. I think that is true. It is a perfectly proper answer. Mrs. Harriman said that since the delegates to the United Nations Council would all belong to different churches the churches would automatically be properly represented. [Applause.]

QUESTIONER. What is Italy's position in the United Nations today?

Chairman BARLOW. She is not a member of the United Nations. I think that is one of the things that was not settled. And the President, I think, even mentioned the fact that the position of certain nations had not been made clear. Because after all, don't forget, that half of Italy is still making war on us. Unfortunately, it is bound to cloud the issues. I don't think it would be possible to make a proper decision at the present moment. You can't even get all the Italians together in one free land to vote yet. Italy has been a current thorn, because we love the Italians, and here only half of them are now with us. And it is a very, very distressing picture. There is no doubt about it. But I don't know how you can be categorical and make a sweeping answer to it. As a matter of fact, the answer has not been made.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is something that will be taken up at San Francisco.

QUESTIONER. I wish to address a question to General Yakhontoff: In discussion of the subject of the smaller nations and also in the method of treating colonial and smaller islands, there is an implication that you do not have sufficient faith in the efficacy of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as being able

to control and dominate so that no aggressive developments should take place in those small nations supported by the bigger powers.

General YAKHONTOFF. I believe I even stressed the point that the idea is perfectly all right. But my suggestion is to go slowly, because, with all the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and San Francisco in the future. I don't believe that we will be ready at the end of this war with this new Security Council to yet forget all of the yesterdays. We have to act with care. I do not disapprove of the idea of self-determination, but I only suggested that we go slowly in order not to repeat the mistakes of yesterday, and, as I said, not to create unpleasant situations that will be difficult for the Security Council to settle.

QUESTIONER. I would like to address this question to Mrs. Harriman. Today under military operation and military occupation certain of the Big Three Powers have been allowed to exercise a unilateral influence in certain countries. For example, Britain in Greece, we in Italy. We are exerting an influence and they are exerting an influence to their own interest. Now, how does that square up with this democracy for all nations or for a united government in the world? In other words, why don't we have representatives of the Big Three in Greece, representatives of the Big Three in Italy, each sitting together and each deciding what is best for all?

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Do you want to know what I think? It does not square up.

QUESTIONER. Well, then, it is so negative and so contradictory. We all talk about these beautiful principles, this beautiful world to come. Right now we have a very real chance to put those principles into effect, and we are not doing it at all. How can we do it later?

Mrs. HARRIMAN. I don't think we can say we are not doing it at all. You have given two instances where we have not done it as we had hoped, but I think it will be worked out.

Chairman BARLOW. There is one that has troubled me. But the answer is, not having Dumbarton Oaks yet there is no machinery for doing that. It is one of the great arguments for Dumbarton Oaks. One of the great arguments for Dumbarton Oaks is the mess we get into without it, as we certainly have. And I may add that I would quarrel with my questioner there, that we were puddling around in Italy for our own advantage. I don't see that. There is no doubt that England made errors in Greece with its postwar expansion policy. We have not made less errors without any postwar expansion policy at all in Italy.

Part of your phrase I should say is correct about England, and I would say she was the first to regret it.

QUESTIONER. I have another angle. Maybe I was wrong to say to our advantage, but I could say to the disadvantage of the country.

Chairman BARLOW. Sure, but I say it is because of not having Dumbarton Oaks. And this I do want to bring home to you all. Don't forget that one of the important wings or arms of Dumbarton Oaks is a court of law, and there will be no question of rushing ourselves into battle before the case of an aggressor has been taken to a court of law. There will be no question of oppressing a small country until the small country has had a chance to air its troubles. If we had Dumbarton Oaks now, the Council would be sitting at Geneva, or where have you; it would be now hearing that case before disinterested lawyers of the United Nations. They can't do that now.

QUESTIONER. I would like to hear what General Yakhontoff has to say on that subject, and also Mr. BENNET.

General YAKHONTOFF. My only addition to what was said already is that we shouldn't be in such a hurry to solve all the problems, but we should be alert. And we can see from here that people are worried about it, they are talking about it, they are asking questions, and we are all together trying to discuss it and come to the proper solution.

That is exactly how democracy has to work. I for one am rather optimistic. They exposed the situation in Greece. But to say that we didn't act properly in Italy—I for one wouldn't say it just like that.

QUESTIONER. I wish to ask this question of General Yakhontoff: I understood from the President's report yesterday that the Polish border was going to be set in the east on the Curzon line, and in the west temporarily to take in part of East Prussia. I believe that this is predominately a German territory or German people's territory. Don't you think that it is a cause for future trouble if Poland takes in part of East Prussia?

General YAKHONTOFF. Well, such opinion was expressed by the gentlemen who remained in London. They were worried—and some others joined them. They said that it would bring trouble. But here is one fact, one historical fact, that East Prussia originally belonged to Poland. East Prussia originally was inhabited by Slavs and the Slavs were unceremoniously chased away by the Teutons. And to restore the territory facing the Baltic to Poland, in my opinion is quite justifiable. Poland must have something to be able to exist economically, so in addition, for instance, of Upper Silesia, which is an extremely important addition; much more valuable than what is beyond the Curzon Line, she will get East Prussia. I should even say especially Prussia, because as you all know it is the cradle of Junkerdom. And so, in order to remove the Junkers, it won't be such a bad operation. I think it would not do much harm to the German people. [Applause].

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Might I also add that they are going to get Danzig, which means a great deal.

General YAKHONTOFF. And more than that. They have been promised also that the western border will be somewhere around the Oder River. And here again there is some historical justice. The Poles used to live there. But there is a question mark, of course. And very wisely they decided to postpone this question until—not until the peace conference, which they say won't be convoked at all pretty soon—some time in the future when they will decide these rather ticklish questions.

Congressman BENNET. But Danzig, for example, is somewhere around 90 percent German. Her question was, wouldn't the taking of a German place like Danzig and turning it over to the Poles create a breeding place for another war?

General YAKHONTOFF. But Danzig used to be Gdansk, and it was Poland. I personally remember having a very unpleasant encounter in Pennsylvania at the beginning of the war in one place where too many Poles were in the hall. They vigorously and violently objected when I passed over Danzig lightly. And they said: What do you mean? Danzig is Polish originally, and if there are many Germans there, it is just too bad for them. [Laughter.]

QUESTIONER: Wouldn't it be more important to edit the history books of all the countries instead of fortifying little rocks in the south Pacific somewhere, which can be taken in a week or two anyhow?

Chairman BARLOW. Well, we are doing that, both in England and here. And we have a reciprocal committee to clean up the neutrals. It should be done all over the world.

General YAKHONTOFF. It is a very good idea.

QUESTIONER. I would like to ask in line with this, suppose we had Dumbarton Oaks, how would the problem of Palestine be handled in connection with that?

Congressman BENNET. I suppose if we had this court set up, this question of what should be the boundaries of Palestine and what should be the governmental set-up would be submitted to the court. For the time being Palestine is a protectorate. And as I recall it, Palestine is still predominately Arab, by a very large majority. If that is not satisfactory to the Palestinians they will have to take their case before the international court and try to get whatever relief the court will give them.

Chairman BARLOW. It is not a very satisfactory answer because it is putting off everything into the future. But there again, we can't do much about anything until we have Dumbarton Oaks.

QUESTIONER. Presumably, we have to resort to some basis such as self-determination. That's what Dumbarton Oaks would represent, wouldn't it?

Chairman BARLOW. Yes. There will be a special court under which you plead.

QUESTIONER. I would like to ask the general to explain a little more carefully his remarks on unilateral versus bilateral action of Russia and Poland. The Russians chose to deal with one group, the English the other, and at no time was it taken care of by the Polish people themselves. Where does he get off calling it bilateral?

General YAKHONTOFF. Well, the answer is, I think, that these questions still are in the process of being solved. What was done at Yalta, point 1, was only the recognition of the Curzon line. The existence of a de facto government, formerly the Lublin group, the national liberation group—well, some people like to say it was sponsored by the Russians, some others would go even further and say it was organized by the Russians; that is not the point, I think—depends upon Poles. And all of Poland is now liberated from the Germans, and this was done by the Russians' bleeding and dying; not to take it but to give it back to the Polish people. So whatever Poles are there, those are the Poles who remained and were under the heel of Hitler. They were suffering and fighting while the little group in London who had deserted their people did not fight, did not suffer—only humiliation, of course. [Applause.]

The main point of this answer to the question, of course, is that it was not bilateral or unilateral, but it was multilateral, because at Yalta we know President Roosevelt and Churchill and Stalin were talking about this, and certainly they considered this group which is considered the de facto government in Poland. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. For the moment the question period is over because we are going on the air in 3 minutes. I am going to ask Dr. Charles Obermeier of the N. M. U. to come up and join us for the round table because I have some questions I want to ask him. Our merchant marine is too valuable an arm to be left out of any discussion.

Just before we go on the air I want to quote Dr. Sherman. Since we're a young forum we want to be judged by our virtues and aspirations. We want to bring a warm exciting light to our subjects and our problems—with your help. This is your forum. With your cooperation, we can expand, shed more light, more diverse light, and incidentally knock the spots out of any other undigested or predigested forums in this neck of the woods.

I want to tell you that at the end of this evening, in exactly 31 minutes, I have two very interesting announcements to make concerning the forum and concerning you, and I might also add, contradicting everything I have said to you before. I am now going to sit down. We are going on the air, and we want your applause, but nothing else.

[On the air.]

Chairman BARLOW. Good evening. Mr. Charles has told you where we are and who we are and how we are. We have just had a question period—questions of how to keep alive and vital that unity which we have achieved as a war measure to date. How can we keep it in peacetime? We have had a lot of questions from the floor. Questions such as: If we would have people's governments in every country would that mean the end of armaments? A question like, if there were a colonial pool or trusteeship of colonies, would the trustee be allowed to fortify them, like Guam, for instance? Questions of religious participation at the peace table; the status of Italy; and the Curzon line question; and the question of the Germans in East Prussia?

Now we will go right on on that basis, trying to shed light on those things which seem to us important, and I am going to begin by asking a gentleman I have just asked up to the table, Dr. Charles Obermeier, of the N. M. U., a question. I am going to tell him a little story first.

Mr. William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, made a statement at the Miami convention, I believe it was, concerning German labor in the post-war period as a consequence of the military victory of the United Nations. If I remember correctly, Mr. Green explained that the resulting enslavement, as he called it, of German labor, constituted a threat to American labor, which would then have to face competition by low-paid, unfree, slave labor in the world market.

Now, Dr. Obermeier, what about this as an interpretation? Is it as unsound as I think? Is Mr. Green indicating, possibly indirectly, that he is opposed to the policy of unconditional surrender?

Dr. CHARLES OBERMEIER. I am afraid you are right. I think I would agree with you. One reason why I say so is because Mr. Green has pulled out stubbornly—I say that advisedly—from the World Conference in London; the World Labor Conference. This Conference is the first great attempt for a long time really to unite labor. After a certain amount of disunity and disruption, let us say, from some old elements, they achieved a magnificent unity which represents 60,000,000 workers of the world. It is a very great thing indeed. It is something that will strengthen not only our Yalta Conference but it will also strengthen anything we will be doing at San Francisco.

The question I would like to ask Mr. Green, quite simply, is this: Why, at this very critical moment, when world labor is so involved in the future of the whole world, why did the A. F. of L. not send a representative to London? And in London the Conference stood for unconditional surrender of Germany and for a complete liquidation of fascism. And I cannot for a moment see that a liquidation of fascism can be anything else but the beginning of the liberation of the German workers. And how liberated German workers can do any harm to the American workers or affect the standard of living of the American workers, I fail to see. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Well, I want to ask another question myself, and I am waiting for one of you boys and girls to come on and help me with questions.

I don't want to appear to pick on Russia, because in a sense Russia is the hero of the occasion to a large extent, but General Yakhontoff in his speech this evening earlier said that Russia wants no foreign markets. Now, I see no objection to her having foreign markets. But I just don't happen to agree with the general. I think she does want foreign markets; I think she should want them; in fact, I think she wants them so much that she is very anxious to stabilize the Balkans on almost reactionary principles, I would say, and far from being in the mood to bolshevize or communize the Balkans, she wants something very stable there with which she could do a nice honest bit of trade.

Now, how do you figure that out, General?

General YAKHONTOFF. I said that the Soviet Union, in other words, Russia of today, is not interested in foreign markets in the same sense as the others. What I meant is that the Soviet Union is not interested in a monopolistic position. She is not interested in getting control of foreign markets to the exclusion of others.

Congressman BENNET. Do I understand the general that the rest of us are interested in monopolizing world markets?

Chairman BARLOW. No. But I think he was kind of letting out Russia from wanting to do business by what I would call a very proper way. I think she is interested in world markets, but not at the expense of anybody else. That is the whole point. That is what the Ambassador from Canada said, that it must be controlled, it must be enlightened—it may be self-interest, but it must be enlightened self-interest. And that is perfectly proper, because there is every indication that without stabilization we will not have peace; without sound economy we won't have peace; and that expansion is part of sound economy, but a decent expansion. I think we were very handsomely answered on that.

I want to ask another question, and I want to ask this of Congressman BENNET. We haven't mentioned it but I think in the post-war world it is going to be one of the most important of all, and that is the question of tariffs. Now, I know that Congressman BENNET is a Republican, but I suspect that maybe it was the hand of Isaac that he saw, but the voice is darn well the voice of Jacob. I think he might agree with us that the tariff might as well go "behind the eight ball" if we are not going into full isolationism.

Congressman BENNET. I want it understood that I speak only for myself and not for my party. I do not know what the party attitude is on it. I don't profess to know and don't wish to commit the party. As far as I personally am concerned I think we must have a free exchange of goods and services throughout the world. Prosperity elsewhere will reflect in prosperity here. Just how we are going to go about that I don't know. There must be a lowering of tariffs on some things and a raising of tariffs on other things. That must be done by experts. I think we must have the removal of as many barriers as possible on international trade. [Applause.]

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Could I ask anyone who wants to answer, don't you think that the high tariff we had, had a great deal to do with bringing on the war?

Congressman BENNET. No. I don't think the high tariff had anything much to do with bringing on the war. I think the cause is much more elemental than that. I don't think our tariff policy was a great factor in the renaissance of German power. I don't think it was a great factor in the rise of Hitler.

The thing that brought that about, I think most of us are agreed, was the mistakes made at Versailles, followed up by the mistakes made by all the democratic people of the world in being unwilling to pay the price for keeping German militarism down. There is no question, of course, but that Germany's economic prostration is what brought Hitler on, but I think our tariff played a small part in that. I think the reparations demanded and the other restrictions put down on them were the primary cause of it.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Don't you think they were prevented from paying their debts a great deal because we did not buy from them the way we should?

Congressman BENNET. Why, say "we" did not buy from them?

Mrs. HARRIMAN. I meant our allies couldn't pay their debts to us.

Congressman BENNET. I notice that the present trend is to forget about dollars and cents and the talk is about payment in other mediums. I think that would have been a good policy 25 years ago, but it was not the policy. I think the tariff was only one of the many factors that contributed toward it.

Chairman BARLOW. Definitely. On the question of reparations—we are back on this slave business again, and I would like to put it on the air. You know, the first question that I asked, about the creation of a slave population in Russia of Germans, or in France; taking these troops, these masses of Germans, to work there. I believe that under Dumbarton Oaks—and we come back to the business that we need Dumbarton Oaks so quickly, we need it right now, we shall need it when we start reparations, we shall need it from the first minute, we need it from this second—those men will have a case before the international court. They will be paid, and the reparations will be just. At the present moment there is no tribunal. That is the great trouble; that is why we have gotten in trouble in Italy, in Greece, and a lot of other places. There is no ultimate court. That is why I think we are agreed that Dumbarton Oaks should be established as quickly as possible.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood that Dumbarton Oaks is only a skeleton of what is to come, and what we need is the United Nations Council, which is set up through the plan of Dumbarton Oaks, only enlarged and strengthened.

Congressman BENNET. Not only that, but if I understood the question correctly, Mr. Green's worry is caused because of the possible competition with well-paid American labor against slave labor. I understood the proposal was only for the purpose of rebuilding the destruction of Russia, at least, and possibly other parts of Europe, with which we were not going to be concerned anyhow. We were not going to compete in those markets. We were not going to send our workers there. So I don't see where the competitive element enters into it.

General YAKHONTOFF. Apparently Mr. Green and those who follow him are suffering from some kind of effect of Versailles. They do not see that there is slave labor and plenty of slave labor in Germany. There are some suspicions, of course, that the Russians are planning to treat the Germans in the same way.

From what we heard from the President yesterday; from what we have seen published after the Crimean Conference, apparently nothing of the kind is planned, and to my knowledge the Russians are not planning to starve, to mistreat, or to transform the Germans into slaves. But the Germans will certainly have to rebuild what they have destroyed. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. I have in my hand now a little document by Dr. William J. Schieffelin considering what to do with Germany after the war. I see he is here, and I am going to quote one paragraph from this document, because I think it will create a nice little argument for a couple of minutes. He said:

"There might well be an interim advisory commission to direct Germany composed of Russian, Jewish, Polish, Czech, French, Dutch, Danish, and Norwegian men and women." [Applause.]

You will notice that the English and the Americans are not mentioned. I think it is rather a splendid idea myself. It is putting the mice, a great many mice, to watch the cat. And I think it is a darn good idea myself.

Congressman BENNET. What sort of advice is the committee supposed to give?

Chairman BARLOW. To administer Germany instead of U. N. R. R. A., I suppose, or instead of Mr. Murphy.

General YAKHONTOFF. The trouble is, instead of mice there can be rats, and it will be too bad. [Laughter.]

Chairman BARLOW. I think it is probably not going to take place, but I think it is a nice idea.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. This is going a little afield, but don't you think the consensus is that this country, being the mightiest country in the world, is always too timid and actually afraid of other countries? For instance, in back of Mr. Green's decisions or discussions, don't you think the fear is that we have always been too timid and haven't realized our own power?

Chairman BARLOW. It is the kind of provincialism coming from having once been a colony. [Laughter.]

Congressman BENNET. I think it is tradition over here. We always get the worst of it. Every time we get into an international entanglement everybody is always talking of Uncle Sam losing his shirt. Every time he goes into one of those things——

Mrs. HARRIMAN. He doesn't go in.

Chairman BARLOW. I think it is totally unjustified.

Congressman BENNET. I personally think if we don't take a leading part nothing will happen. And I think the other countries of the world are going to see what we are going to do, and if we hold back certainly nobody else is going to take the initiative. [Applause.]

Mrs. HARRIMAN. If we don't go into the Council there will be no League of Nations.

Dr. OBERMEIER. There seems to be a contradiction there. If we are so very timid and backward in entering all of these things, how come these other nations seem to be afraid of us? Why is England so worried about these great United States? I think there must be something else besides our timidity.

Chairman BARLOW. I think a very dangerous thing has happened, and I think I know what is in back of your mind, Dr. Obermeier. And that is, that quite recently we have been anything but broadminded in the matter of oil or in the matter of control or exploitation of the air, and we have quite definitely let England down. I wouldn't be surprised if you would agree, or expand on the point, that one reason that England has made rather frantic efforts toward maintaining markets in the Mediterranean was because in the small attempts she has made for cooperation with us, we pretty well kicked her in the teeth. I don't know how true that is, but I would like to hear from you on it.

Dr. OBERMEIER. There is a certain amount of truth there, but there is a bigger truth than that. At this Civil Air Conference in Chicago, which was held late in the fall of last year, we decidedly kicked England in the teeth. We came out very definitely for free air, and England wanted a controlled air, she wanted an internationally controlled air. She wanted an air with allocations from different countries, and naturally for herself also. She knew very well that free air meant free competition, and free competition meant that the whole world's air would be full of American airplanes, mass produced. Undoubtedly we can outproduce the whole world in airplanes. Therefore, when in this Conference we came out for this free-air policy, we were throwing our weight around.

There is one thing I would like to mention in that connection, just to see how you feel about it. That Conference in Chicago was a conference largely between England and the United States. There was one great weakness in that Conference, and that was the omission of the Soviet Union. You may remember that the Soviet Union refused to appear at that Conference, for a reason that she gave, which was that Fascist countries, as she called them, like Spain and Portugal, and other countries like Switzerland and Sweden, who were helping Germany, were invited at this Conference.

In other words, this was not a conference in the spirit of Teheran, or of Yalta, or of Dumbarton Oaks, or of San Francisco. It was a conference, really, in which two rivals were fighting it out. It was not a world conference. It was a conference to a certain extent against this new unity which we have built up. And we have begun to learn, I think, that only in real world unity, in a unity in which at the present moment the big powers are are all represented, can this real rivalry between the United States and England be sublimated, because the moment you have the third power present this rivalry seems to lose itself in planning for bigger things.

It is partly a new logic, a new sense of values, if you like, but also a new determinism that is coming into the picture. That is why I think we mustn't be too certain that the United States is always timid. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Well, I sometimes think that the expedition with which we get places, at the same time that we say we lose our shirt, reminds me of a book I once read on eighteenth-century etiquette, which said: "Do not pick and choose the pieces upon the platter; the discerning eye at once sees the best piece." [Laughter.]

Congressman BENNET. When we lose our shirt that's when we engage in diplomatic exchanges. When we don't lose it we are talking about business matters. That's quite a different thing. With all due respect to Mrs. Harriman, we are talking here about oil and airplanes, and that's where our businessmen come in, and they are not losing any shirts that I know of.

I think we ought to bear in mind, too, about being hard-boiled, that we have poured out the oil here, our natural resources, all over the world, for England, Russia, and everybody else. One of the things I am thinking of is, Where are we going to get that back? I would rather get that instead of all the dollars. I think we are entitled to some consideration.

Chairman BARLOW. Am I wrong in saying it was the representatives in Congress that turned down Ickes' adventure in the oil fields?

General YAKHONTOFF. Mr. Chairman, can I add one word? A gentleman from the floor, before we went on the air, asked if it wouldn't be a good idea to have some international editorial board to check on histories. Would it not be proper to discuss at San Francisco, or at this new League of Nations, or whatever the name will be, how to take care of those who are not timid about the cartels and about business going out of the country and creating, if not exactly a situation for war, preparing difficulties? Would it not be proper to include on the agenda, and to insist on behalf of the people, that the cartel business should be very seriously discussed and the nontimid elements should be more timid? [Applause.]

Congressman BENNET. Well, on this cartel business, General—here again I am speaking as an individual—I think that most of the people, at least in Congress, are not going to be in favor of cartels. If there are to be cartels at all, certainly the Government is going to have to have a hand in it. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. There is time for about one more point, and in discussing cartels and tariffs I would like to briefly mention South America. I would like to ask a question about the handling of South America—Argentina in particular—because we are at the present moment going through a phase with Argentina which is the kind of a phase that is going to make or break the success, the later success of the Council of Nations.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Well, I have been very influenced by Mr. Sumner Welles on that subject. I think he did more for the good-neighbor policy than anybody in this country has ever done. I also think he has one of the most brilliant minds we have ever had in our country. On the other hand, it seems to me the situation ought to be a little differently handled, considering it is wartime and what is going on there, with the "fifth columnists," and so forth, that it would be in ordinary days.

Congressman BENNET. I always feel a handicap in discussing these problems, because I don't feel I have the facts to sufficiently form an intelligent opinion. I know, like Will Rogers, what you read in the papers. But I do feel the average citizen feels it is a mistake to show sympathy to people who spend a lot of time trying to hamper the efforts we make to win the war. [Applause.]

I don't think it would be a good-neighbor policy to be tough with Argentina, so to speak, but it certainly would appeal to the natural instincts of most people to be tough with them.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Don't you think it took us a long time to get the confidence of South America, and we have to treat them differently than we do the ordinary neighboring countries?

Congressman BENNET. I think we are treating South America as we are treating all the other countries.

Chairman BARLOW. I think I can interject one word there, and that is, that it is not our attitude that has riled South America but it is the method. I thoroughly disapprove of a great deal we have done down there. We have not been forceful enough down there at the right time, and have made forceful remarks when we didn't mean them.

General YAKHONTOFF. Well, I agree with Ambassador Harriman. I also have the highest respect for the intellect of my old colleague Sumner Welles. Certainly he is a very intelligent gentleman, and he knows and he did a great deal for the good-neighbor policy. But I fail to understand his advice to deal with Argentina with velvet gloves, because it smacks to me too much of appeasement. Argentina today is so definitely a place to watch, and it is watched very carefully by the Germans and some Spaniards, and undoubtedly it is a place where plenty of trouble may occur in the very near future. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. I also might say that my firm conviction is that the other end of the axle is Madrid, and until we clean up Madrid we will have trouble in South America. [Applause.]

Now, in summing up the round-table discussion, a discussion of how to maintain that precious unity, that global cooperation which we have achieved as a war measure—even to the global strategy mentioned yesterday by the President—I think we are agreed, and want everybody here to be agreed, that just as war is people, so, too, peace is people. The present conference in Mexico is concerned with people. Before this, conferences concerned themselves with boundaries, tariffs, and treaties. Now we know that the world is one world, a congress of people—biologically and spiritually, brothers. And, as among people there must be cooperation, if you are going to get anything done, so among groups of people, or nations, there must be cooperation.

We must remember Mr. Joseph Grew's phrase that economic expansion is closely akin to exploitation. (God knows, Mr. Grew is no New Dealer nor ever wi' Wallace bled.) We must remember that without peace there can be no legitimate economic expansion; without stabilized economy there can be no peace. Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks are our springboards. Bretton Woods should end currency inflation. (God knows why any bankers are against it. After the last war you may recall our fabulous bank loans to Germany; loans with which Germany built her war machine. Perhaps prophetic vision and economic myopia make bad bedfellows.) At all events, Dumbarton Oaks is the basis of our future security. And the Atlantic Charter is the flag at our masthead. Yes, it may flap in the breeze, I admit. But keep it there; it's got to stay there. Why delay

in some muddled search for perfection? That kind of delay is properly called obstruction.

These, then, are the springboards of democracy in action. Cooperation is the touchstone. And responsibility lies on each one of us. We must be alert; write our Congressmen; make our will known, for Congress will pass on all these questions. Speak out we must, or we may lose these previous controls over our own future and that of our children. And we will lose them if we sink lazily into the easy corruptions of silence.

As was said lately in this forum, "Speak up, that we may forever after hold our peace." [Applause.]

Now, I have one or two important announcements to make about the forum. Now, this is really extremely exciting to us, and when I said I was going to make an announcement that is going to contradict everything I said before, this is it. You know, the Independent Citizens Committee for the Arts and Science, under Jo Davison—it is a pretty grand committee. This afternoon two of us, Mr. Brooks and I, conferred with Jo Davison and Mr. March and various others—and I may say they went a-wooing. And they went a-wooing because they need a forum. And the proposition was put up to us on the kind of line we like. They said, here we are, two-thousand-and-odd members at our first meeting; 800 turned out for just an ordinary meeting; we have some dough. And they have tremendous names behind them. And they said they had to, to justify their existence in one way or another, set up a forum. That is the way you speak to people nowadays, unless you hire a commentator. And the forum they had a liking to was this forum, because it started from a liberal basis; it wasn't just confusion.

They asked us if we would play ball with them. And with their backing, and with our established forum; with the 500 here that I hope will be 5,000; with the alliance we have also made with Mrs. Eleanor Gimbel and the Citizens Action Committees—which you know are nonpartisan and are spread all over this town, just to make citizens take an interest in their community—I don't see why next year we can't take Town Hall twice a month, have our weekly broadcasts and reach about 10,000,000 people. And we can, and I think we will. [Applause.]

Now, we are going to keep our name and our autonomy and carry on just the same. And we are going to have our subscription membership. You belong to the forum, you don't belong to the Independent Artists and Scientists and Professional Men. You can belong to them, if you are entitled to. We don't bother with that at all. We have our forum membership, and they will all belong to the forum, we hope, at 10 bucks a year. But we are not so sure about you all belonging to them, because you may not all be artists and scientists.

I think we can go places with that very definitely.

Now, the first thing they asked us to do—I would like to get your reaction to this—they said if we hooked up right away we might perhaps have 4 more forums this year, this winter, instead of just 2 more, which we are able to afford at the moment. If you boys and girls here would bring in 10 people we could afford to hold 4 more on our own. So be sure, all of you, that you sign up and belong to this. You get not only the forum but you get our literature. It means we have your name, and if we are having a party you will get the announcement in the mail, if you belong to the forum.

Now, we were going to have, as our next subject, the Punishment of War Criminals. But Jo Davison and Marc Connelly and Mr. March and his charming wife are pretty well excited about something else, and they said they thought the war prisoners could wait. They were excited about the problem of censorship in New York City. I think it is a darn hot subject, because, as a little tip to you, all our "mossy boss-ies" or "bossy Moss-ies"—whichever way you want to put it—if they get away with one thing, it is rumored they are going after the Voice of the Turtle. It is true. You laugh because it is utterly ridiculous. Remember, every 5 or 10 years you have to get up and swat that kind of idiotic censorship on the head.

I would like to go ahead with that forum, and we can get all the literary guys in the world. And if you approve, that will be your next one. [Applause.]

Now, we have seats on April 4 for the Glass Menagerie, which is opening with Eddie Dowling, Laurette Taylor, and Julie Haydon, and we have seats of our own to sell for that. I think everybody who is here surely wants to see that play. This is one way of raising money, and we've got a lot of bills to pay.

That is my little say for the evening and I hope you will approve and give me a hand on this cooperation with the Citizens Committee and Mrs. Gimbel's. The latter doesn't mean money or a real affiliation, but means they will get our literature, and I hope they will come in a great body and will listen to us. On the other hand, we will have a close affiliation with what I call the Jo Davison committee. [Applause.]

Now, is there any urgent question that has come out of the round table?

QUESTIONER. Nothing has been said about VANDENBERG. Where does he stand? He said he wouldn't represent the Republican Party at San Francisco, but something should be said to clarify it?

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Mr. Chariman, he has not refused.

QUESTIONER. He took a very definite stand on Dumbarton Oaks. Where does he stand?

Congressman BENNET. What has that to do with San Francisco?

QUESTIONER. Where does he stand on Dumbarton Oaks?

Congressman BENNET. I don't want to say where Senator VANDENBERG stands. I think he should say that for himself. I think the speech he made went a pretty long way toward confirming Dumbarton Oaks.

I want to say that Senator VANDENBERG is a keyman in the United States Senate at the present time. He controls the thinking, I think, of quite a few Senators there, and I am very hopeful that he will not only participate in the San Francisco Conference, but the results will be such that he will go back enthusiastic about them. You have to look facts in the face; he is a very influential Member of the United States Senate, and we need him. [Applause.]

QUESTIONER. What is Congressman BENNET's ideas in connection with the opposition by the American Bankers Association to the stabilization proposal of Bretton Woods?

Congressman BENNET. I have a big pamphlet in my pocket that I brought along to read on the train. I was a little sleepy and I didn't do so very well with it. I know they are in favor of half of the plan. They are in favor of the part for the International Bank, which is to be organized along the lines conservative bankers approve of. I know they are opposed to the rest of the plan, because they think we are putting all the real money into it, and the others are putting in mostly obligation, which they owe us. The only cold cash they say is going to be put up by Uncle Sam in the form of gold, because we have almost all the gold there is.

I have this feeling about it, although I am not an expert in international finance. They are probably too conservative in their outlook. They are really intelligent people. They have something in their objection. No plan that is proposed of that sort is likely to be perfect. Maybe some of their ideas will be put into practice. I think they should recede somewhat from their viewpoint, and others should recede somewhat, in order to establish something which will help these governments reestablish themselves.

Maybe the proposal of Bretton Woods is not the right thing, but I think it is in the right direction. If any safeguards are needed, I think they can be supplied.

Chairman BARLOW. I would say the bankers have darn near sabotaged Bretton Woods, and they weren't out for little adjustments, as far as I can see. But I may be quite wrong.

QUESTIONER. Miss Lillian Hellman, who just returned from a 4 months' stay in Russia, had an interesting statement to make, in which she said she considered it one of the tragedies of our time that so much misinformation exists about Russia among our people. I think that is an interesting statement in relation to the forum tonight about the problems of United Nations unity. Both Mrs. Harriman and you, Mr. BENNET, said that we needed an informed people, and it is not only among isolationists that this misinformation exists.

Don't you think it is a duty of the Congress or of our Government to inform our people and remove this, what you would call, the tragedy of our time?

Congressman BENNET. It certainly is not the duty of Congress to do that under any stretch of the imagination. That is not the function of Congress. It might be the function of the Government. But in the last analysis I think it is the function of the various boards of education. I think provision should be made for it in the school curriculum—but don't get me started on that. [Applause.] Anybody will agree we don't know enough about any of these countries, not just Russia. We don't know much about many others.

I would like to just say this, since I got a chance to say something here that I really feel strongly about, and I am awfully glad you brought it up. On the teaching of American history in my day—I am not going to criticize present day teachers—when I went to school a very poor job was done. My impression of the British, for example, was that they all wore red uniforms, and that they were called Hessians, or something of the sort, and that they came over here with big armies and tried to collect a tax on tea, or something of the sort. That was the general impression I got.

Now, that doesn't make approaching these international problems any easier. I think we should have the teaching of history as nearly as possible on a true basis and not show nothing but American victories. We ought to know a good many of the American defeats. Somebody ought to show why we got licked. We don't get enough of that.

As for Russia, that's another field about which we know even less. We can come a lot closer home. What do we know about Mexico? What do we know about a lot of places we have to do business with? South America has been mentioned. We know less about that place than we do about Russia. That's an awfully big field.

Chairman BARLOW. It is a field, I may add, if you open it up. It is a good many years ago since Mr. Hitler crept into the crack. That crack of ignorance is the thing that he has worked on more than anything else. He is the one who sows the seeds of anti-Russianism, and that kind of discrimination, and that is one of the main things in the German far-flung technique of stirring up people against their allies and making trouble. And it has been used most beautifully by the Chicago Tribune. And it is just that point of education that has been the loophole into which Hitler's propaganda has crawled.

Mrs. ELEANOR GIMBEL. I would just like to say to the gentleman who asked the question, that I don't think it is Congress who

should educate the people, I think it is the people who should educate Congress. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. That is what this forum is about, and though we are fortunate to have an educated Congress, greater education is needed.

Problems Confronting the Clothing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on April 11, 1945, before the Woolen Wholesalers National Association, Inc., in New York City. The address dealt with the problems arising from War Production Order M-338, and the proposed maximum average price plan of the Office of Price Administration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have come here to discuss with you informally some of the problems confronting the clothing industry, our Government, and the consuming public which arise from War Production Board Order M-388 and the proposed maximum average price plan of the Office of Price Administration.

As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have received a great flood of telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and visitors to my office seeking our aid in bringing about a reasonable adjustment between the demands of the military, the Government control agencies, the consuming public, and the clothing industry. I have gladly devoted a great deal of my all-too-limited time to this important task. The Senate Small Business Committee intends to continue its vigorous program to insure fair and equitable treatment to independent and small business in these difficult war days and in the reconversion period which now, thanks to our good fortunes on the battlefields, lies just ahead.

As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am particularly interested in the effect of this order on the very small business concerns. These small businesses are dependent wholly on the jobbers for their supplies of materials. It will readily be seen that any order which would adversely affect the jobber would also directly affect the small manufacturer, tailor, and retailer. Therefore, these very small businesses stand to be destroyed by this order unless it can be so formulated as to protect and preserve the small business of the country and their sources of supply. The Senate committee would therefore feel compelled to take the most drastic steps to prevent an order of this kind to be put into effect if it appears it would adversely affect these small business interests.

The last word has not been said on M-388 or M. A. P. My own remarks this evening must be considered in this light for minor modifications of the order have already been made and more are under consideration at the moment. The changing conditions of the war and weaknesses which will undoubtedly be brought about by the administration of the order will require further changes. Nor do I wish to be cast in the role of an expert concerning the interpretations of the administrative purposes and probable effects of this long and involved Order M-388. I am told that many a man who has spent a lifetime in the textile industry and knows it in all its ramifications is not crystal clear concerning the purposes and effects of this order.

I have long been a believer in the necessity of establishing the closest and most harmonious relationship between industry and Government control agencies during this war period when the demands on all of us are so great. Consequently, it was quite disturbing to me to find that M-388 was apparently promulgated without sufficient prior consultation or negotiations with the members of industry. The record shows that only in the last week of January was there a meeting called by the War Production Board at which some 700 representatives of the more than 150 industrial groups affected by the order were present. This mass meeting was hardly the kind of a gathering which could work out the details of such a complicated order. It is small wonder that when it was officially announced some 3 weeks later, on February 19, 1945, many parts of the industry were taken by surprise, and the order failed to take into account the specific problems of many branches of industry. This is not my idea of close cooperation and I have so informed those who are responsible for it.

But in justification of their action, the W. P. B. contends that the acute situation and shortage of time made impractical any thoroughgoing consultation with the more than 150 different textile groups.

As we look forward to the close of the war and reconversion which follows, I am even more certain that we must make very sure that Government agencies, industry, and the general public work in the closest possible cooperation if we are to bring about a transition to peace without great hardship and suffering.

It is my understanding of M-388 that the order was made necessary by the sudden and greatly increased military demands on American textiles and textile products. It seeks to channel a substantial proportion of the limited civilian supply into the most essential items of wearing apparel. Mr. Kenneth W. Marriner, Director of the Textile Clothing and Leather Bureau of the War Production Board, justifies the order on the ground that it is in keeping with W. P. B. orders and practices of the past several years, under which a priority system is set up whereby manufacturers and processors who agree to produce essential civilian goods will be given assistance based upon their past production records in obtaining priorities for goods from the limited supply available. I hesitate to do more than highlight the order because of its complicated and involved nature and because of modifications contemplated.

My understanding is that at the retail level M-388 has the effect of channeling essential apparel items onto retailers' shelves other than the highest-price merchandise. I am informed that in men's clothing, for example, retailers will be deprived almost entirely of suits wholesaling above $32.25. The retailer is further affected by the application of M. A. P., which I am informed may provide merchandise at the average maximum price to be fixed by the base period, resulting in rollbacks that may well affect a substantial proportion of all woven garments.

At the mill level, I am informed that the spinning of worsted for civilian supply has been frozen until June and that what may happen thereafter depends entirely upon military needs and activities. I am informed that W. P. B. directives issued on woolens cut off about 50 percent of the civilian supply, including certain special programs for such items as mackinaws, snow suits, and legging sets. When the most gloomy view is taken of this mill situation on woolens, it would appear that the substantial part of the yardage available for civilian uses will go to fill highest priority orders. The amount available for free goods will consequently be insignificant.

The M-388 order appears to affect the manufacturer of garments in several ways. The order provides AA-4 priority ratings to those manufacturers of essential products so that they may receive piece goods. It would work out so that in men's suits priority assistance would be given to cover 50 percent of the quantity of suits produced in each quarter of the base period, 1943, at prices, however, not above $32.25 wholesale. For students' suits, priority assistance would reach 80 percent of the base period of production and a maximum wholesale price of $17.50. On ladies' suits, however, the priority assistance covers only 20 percent of base period production and reaches a maximum wholesale price of $22.75. I believe some substantial relief is being considered on this item. I am further informed that the AA-4 rating does not guarantee manufacturers that they will get such percentages of piece goods. Rather, this priority has been called by some a hunting license. The order also lists certain essential articles which do not require priority ratings but can be made from free wool goods such as separate trousers, overcoats, etc. But, I have been led to believe that the amount of free goods which will be available at the woolen mills may be very small indeed.

So much for the highlighting effects of Order M-388. What can be done about this situation? The first serious charge leveled at the order is that it contains features and provisions which make it unworkable. It fails to take into account adequately certain inventory provisions essential in the industry. It has been written in terms of calendar quarters whereas the industry is of a seasonal character. The time intervals for manufacture seem to have been insufficiently considered and problems of geographical demands likewise have been slighted.

These particular unworkable features have been brought to the attention of W. P. B. and I am pleased to inform you that some important amendments are in preparation to better these conditions.

I am certain that the Senate Small Business Committee, and I, as its chairman, will make every effort to see that further examination of these essential details results in reasonable modifications of the order.

This order is made necessary, let me repeat, because of the sudden and drastic revision of military requirements for cloth and textile products. I am told that these requirements are unusually high and sustained in considerable part through the third and fourth quarters of the calendar year 1945.

I am one among those Members of the United States Senate who has given fullest support to the Army leaders in their attempts to provide the matériel needed to wage a successful war and bring it to its earliest possible conclusion. We civilians in Government, industry, and private life will make any and every sacrifice to insure that the Army does not arrive too late with too little. But this does not mean that the civilian branches of Government must abdicate to our military leaders. My colleague, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, the junior Senator from Oregon, speaking in the Senate on April 2, 1945, said, in part:

"I will pay as strong a tribute, and with as much sincerity, as any Member of the Senate to the magnificent job our military and naval forces and their great leaders have done on the fields of battle to keep Americans free men. Mr. President, let us be frank * * * by training, by responsibility, by point of view, on the whole those in charge of the military and the Navy are men of action. They are men who want immediate results. * * * Mr. President, the argu-

ments of the Army and the Navy in regard to the problem of civilian production carry very little weight with me because, having observed them function in the field of civilian production for 2 years, I much prefer to leave the problem of civilian production in the hands of free employers and free labor in this country unrestricted by the type of dictatorship that the military and naval officials, at least, shall we say, unconsciously are seeking to impose upon us."

This statement was made in reference to the manpower bill, but it so clearly indicates the need of a limitation on military leadership in civilian matters that I consider it particularly apt with reference to M-388. I would deplore any suspicion that that order has been dictated by the military leaders. It is my firm conviction that the W. P. B. in reaching its judgments to be expressed in M-388, should take into account and weigh carefully all of the demands, both military and civilian, upon the productive machinery of this great Nation.

I am wondering whether the Army has determined its greatly increased demand for textiles, including the outfitting of a new French Army and the provision of essential items in the first 6 months of liberation for war-torn areas, in the light of what Dr. W. Y. Elliott, Chief of the Civilian Requirements Section of the War Production Board has reported concerning, for example, conditions in France. He suggests that the French textile industry could go far toward supplying the present needs of the American and French Armies. It could also supply the numerous uniforms that have to be made up for the special forces attached to our armies, in connection with the occupation of Germany. We have the raw materials; our warehouses are bulging with cotton and wool; yet, we are seeking to provide these foreign demands with American-furnished goods at the expense of the depleted wardrobe of our own civilian workers.

Yes; I am aware of the probable answers which the Army chiefs may give concerning the tight shipping conditions, break-down in fuel supply in France, etc. But the "on the ground" survey recently made by Mr. Elliott concludes that these are by no means as final and determinative as Army leaders would have us believe.

I have said before and must repeat again, that it is the obligation of the War Production Board to so adjust military and civilian requirements, taking into account every possible source of supply so that we can be absolutely certain that the demands made upon American civilians are just and necessary. The changing character of military decisions in the immediate past, not sufficiently well explained by the course of military events, have resulted in sudden cutbacks and equally sudden step-ups in requirements of a wide range of items. Such a course cannot be accepted as a normal pattern upon which to base any reasonably sound program of action. This becomes even more pointed as victory in Europe becomes almost a matter of days.

I am not prepared at this time to discuss the nature and effect of the proposed M. A. P. order because that order has not yet been finally promulgated by the Office of Price Administration. It is my sincere conviction, a conviction which I am sure you share, that the principles of sound price control are imperative if we are to avoid unstable price fluctuation and probable inflation. I believe, because I have discussed this matter with the leaders in the textile industry, that you too are committed to such a program of price control—that this industry in no wise seeks to be exempted from the administration of proper price-control measures.

It may be that the ultimate solution of the difficulties which the textile clothing industry faces, because of M-388, will be found in the early approach of VE-day. I do not subscribe to the theory that this Government's production and purchasing policies must be predicated on the theory that the European war will continue indefinitely. I am, however, in full sympathy with the need of this Government and our allies to supply the essential repair and replacing equipment so that these countries at the earliest moment can put their own manpower at work to provide the food, clothing, shelter, and other essentials of life which they need.

Mr. James F. Byrnes in his recent report on War Mobilization and Reconversion, indicated a very substantial reduction in the Army supply program in the first quarter following VE-day.

While it is true that he did not refer specifically to textiles and while there may be some increased demands in certain lines, such as cotton fabrics and even in some woolen garments, as our activities increase in the Pacific Theater, competent authorities declare that the Army cannot justify their textile requirements after VE-day. If this is true substantial cut-backs can be expected when Germany falls. I know, for one thing, that the Army expects a sizable reduction in its personnel; these returning men will again become civilians and must be clothed as civilians.

While I believe the end of the war in Europe will offer the first major hope for relief from some of the more serious effects of M-388, I do not by any means wish to imply that that result will automatically follow. What happens when VE-day comes must be written into requirements, orders, policy declarations, and carried out in the administration of the control agencies. We must all adopt a realistic approach to the situation confronting us.

Once again I repeat, in closing, that the armed forces must have everything they need in order to wage a two-front war in such a manner as to bring victory to us at the least possible sacrifice of our sons and brothers and in the quickest space of time. But their demands for textiles and textile products must be subjected to the careful screening of the control agency, the War Production Board, which the Congress has set up to do just this job. The result of that screening must be a program which accomplishes the military purposes, while affecting adversely the civilian economy as little as possible.

As Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am continuing conferences and negotiations on M-388, which were begun at the insistence of the small and independent businesses affected by that order. We intend to protect to the full extent of our ability the legitimate interests of these businesses, and we seek to do so in a cooperative spirit for the benefit of the American people.

These remarks are not intended to be a final statement on this subject—but rather a preface to our deliberations here today and to other meetings and negotiations which must be held in the future.

Tragedy—and a Challenge—Face America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which appeared in the Progressive Magazine of April 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TRAGEDY—AND A CHALLENGE—FACE AMERICA

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

The death of Franklin D. Roosevelt came as a shock to the Nation and the world. It removed from the global stage one of the most dramatic and colorful figures ever to tread those boards. No one could come in contact with him without realizing the great quality for leadership which he possessed to so marked a degree. Handsome, genial, with a flare for the dramatic and an extraordinary feel for timing, he was a man who had a sixth sense in dealing with people as individuals or in the mass. I have never known anyone who had more personal and social charm.

Elected President in the most serious economic crisis this Nation has yet faced, he steadied the ship of state and convinced the people they had nothing to fear but fear. Against the background of the economic crisis he pressed for social and regulatory reforms which will have a lasting influence upon the destiny of the Nation.

Contrary to the general impression, I never found him unwilling to listen to opinions which differed from his own. I never pulled my punches in discussing questions of public policy with him and, so far as I was able to tell, he never harbored any resentment because of my frankness.

Naturally, the sharp, fundamental disagreement over foreign policy lessened our contacts, and with the entry of this country into the war and the terrific additional burdens it entailed upon the President, I saw him infrequently during the last few years.

We are too close to the momentous events of the past 13 years to form any definitive estimate of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his policies. The final historical judgment must be reserved until the consequences flowing from his life and actions are revealed by the passage of time.

The precedents he shattered, the domestic and foreign issues he dealt with, the physical handicap he so gallantly overcame, his ability to win support of the rank and file of people, the fact that he died in office with victory in a global war in sight—all these are factors which will affect any measured appraisal of his virtues and his faults.

But no one questions that he will loom large in the annals of time, or that he has profoundly influenced the course of history and the future of our country and the world. His memory will be cherished by millions of his fellow men.

America's thirty-third President took over the helm a few hours after his captain died. No man in our time has faced a greater challenge than this man who came up from being a haberdashery clerk, to county judge, to United States Senator, to Vice President, and now to the Presidency of the most powerful Nation on earth in the most crucial era of modern times.

A tremendous responsibility has fallen upon President Truman, who assumes the power of the greatest office in the world in the midst of an unfinished war of unprecedented magnitude and with the shape and character of the peace to follow it in the process of formulation. He is confronted with the traditional necessity of carrying on the policies of his predecessor without the freedom of action which would be his had he been elected President. His every move will be watched and his slightest decision will be given an unwarranted significance.

President Truman's personality, however, has won him a host of close friends in Congress as well as in the Executive branch of the Government. His outstanding work as chairman of the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program gives him a background of knowledge concerning the war effort unequaled by any other person not responsible for its conduct.

No man in public life since the Civil War has been on a tougher spot. Yet he already has the good will of his fellow countrymen with their spontaneous and sympathetic appreciation of the enormous difficulties he faces. I know he will give to the utmost the best that is in him. I have great hope that it may meet the occasion.

Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Never-Back-to-the-Ghetto rally, held in Carnegie Hall, New York, April 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we are met here tonight to pay tribute to a gallant band of men and women who 2 years ago fought to the death the common foe whom our victorious armies have at last beaten to his knees. They fought so gallantly, against odds so overwhelming, that what might otherwise have seemed a mere street fight won a place among the world's great battles.

It was a battle in our common war. Lesser battles have won great rewards for warriors. How have the United Nations rewarded the warriors of the battle of the Warsaw ghetto?

How, indeed, have the United Nations rewarded the warriors who were the first of the United Nations? Who were fighting the vicious war monster a full 6 years before Poland became a member of the United Nations by being invaded? Whose casualty rolls surpass the total casualty lists of 90 percent of the United Nations combined?

How are we rewarding those valiant warriors—those who remain of those valiant warriors? We are rewarding them by letting them fight more and more battles of the ghetto—unsupported, unaided, unrecognized.

We welcome to the ranks of the recognized United Nations countries and miserable kinglings who short weeks ago were actual enemies of the United Nations and the cause of the United Nations. We invite them to sit at the council in San Francisco which is purportedly to decide the shape of the peace to come. We lay down the red carpet and we bow them into the council halls. But we don't even open the back door to a man or a woman who will speak for the few survivors of the brave bands of Hebrews who fought and still fight from the Rhine to the Jordan.

I am not speaking of the Jews who are fighting valiantly in the American Army, the Canadian Army, or any of the armies of the United Nations in which they serve with their fellow countrymen of many creeds. They are Americans, and Canadians, and Dutchmen, and so on; and they are acquitting themselves nobly, upholding the tradition of their ancient heritage under the banner of the country to which they have willingly given their allegiance.

No it is not because of their efforts that their Hebrew kinsmen in Europe and Palestine seek the recognition that is their due. The brave Hebrew soldiers, for the most part fighting underground, have earned their own right to recognition. And it is this acknowledgment that they demand: That they shall be recognized as a nation, and as a full ally of the United Nations, and as a full participant in the councils of the United Nations.

There is no question of humanitarianism here any longer—although one would think that on humanitarian grounds alone, a decade of persistent persecution, torture, and death would have earned the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine the right at last to life, honor, and national dignity. No it is a question of practical justice and practical foresight. At San Francisco next week will meet delegates of forty-odd national sovereignties. They will endeavor to shape the course of the peace that we hope will endure for all eternity. May God grant them success in their endeavors. All the sovereign peoples of the world will sit there who have earned the right to sit there. All but one. The Hebrew people—a sovereign people, owing allegiance to no nation but the Hebrew nation—will not sit there because no one invited them to sit there.

Because they didn't earn the right to sit there? We know better. We have seen how they have earned that right—a hundred times over.

Then the sovereign peoples who have earned the right to sit there will make some provision for bringing in those peoples who didn't earn the right to sit there, because they stood by and preserved a questionable neutrality while the Axis beast sought to ravage the world. And still the Hebrew people will not be invited.

Why? I do not know why. There is no reason, there is no logic, there is no justice in it. Therefore I, who make some pretense to being a reasonable, a logical, a just man, cannot say why. No one can say why. So no one says anything.

The subject is ignored. Perhaps it is ignored in the hope that if no one pays any attention to it, the problem will disappear. This line of reasoning has some cogency. The problem has more than two-thirds disappeared already—because more than two-thirds of the people involved in the problem have disappeared—disappeared through the gas-chambers, the slaughter camps, and the extermination points. Two-thirds of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine have been exterminated. The remainder are rapidly joining the ranks of the slaughtered.

Is this the solution the statesmen of the United Nations are waiting for? Is this the sort of solution to the world's problem for which we are spending our blood and our youth? I say it is not. And I say we must let our leaders know that it is not. I say we must let the leaders of our British allies know it is not. I say we must tell our leaders and the leaders of Great Britain that we have fought this bitter war to restore the dignity of man, not to drive it deeper down.

We must tell them that the Hebrew people have earned the right to national dignity, to national honor, to national restoration. They must have that national dignity, that national honor, that national restoration while some still remain alive to enjoy it.

You, who tonight enjoy the rights of free men, must exercise those rights so that all men everywhere may enjoy them. You must fight and fight and fight to make the San Francisco Conference what the common people everywhere demand that it shall be—the greatest successful effort for peace that ever took place in the history of the world.

Address by Former Senator F. Ryan Duffy at Memorial Services for the Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our former colleague, Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, now United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, at a memorial service for the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After years of struggle, sacrifices, and heartaches due to the great World War, our people were cheered in recent months because they thought they could detect the dawn of a new day. Victory in Europe seemed near at hand. The bravery of young Americans was bringing defeat after defeat to the unspeakable Japs; the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, with its fine hopes for the future, had been held; our great President had returned from Yalta; the San Francisco Conference had been called. Our people knew that a program for enduring peace was closest of all to the heart of our President. His international stature was great; his influence among the leaders of the Allied Nations was tremendous. And then, like a bolt of lightning from the blue sky, came the unbelievably shocking and paralyzing news of the sudden death of this great world figure. Our citizens in all walks of life were dazed. It was news they could scarcely believe. Its import they could not comprehend. To most of our people there was a sense of personal loss, just like the passing on of a member of the immediate family. A nation paused and bowed its head in sincere and intense grief. And today the mortal remains of Franklin Delano Roosevelt were committed to the earth at his beloved family home at Hyde Park on the shores of the Hudson River.

What manner of man was this who was held in such high esteem by so many of the people of the world? How come that so many of even the humblest of our citizens knew deep down in their heart that this man was their friend?

He was a man of splendid personality, and had great personal charm—the most magnetic man I have ever met. He inspired confidence in all with whom he came in contact. Whether it was Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain, or Premier Stalin of Russia, or Chiang Kai-shek of China, they all respected him for his high ideals and for his integrity of purpose.

The people of the world soon realized that he believed in deep fundamental principles for the betterment of mankind. He proclaimed the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech and of religion and freedom from want and fear—as fundamental to perpetual harmony among the nations of the world. When tyranny and persecution reared their ugly heads, he vigorously denounced them. He despised intolerance in any form. His heart beat in sympathy for the underprivileged and the less fortunate. He was the champion of the oppressed and the downtrodden. Yes, the "little people" all over the

world loved him and had great reverence for him.

Mr. Roosevelt first entered public life in 1910 when he was elected a State Senator from Dutchess County, N. Y. His independence and his disdain for a powerful political boss early brought him to public attention. Limitation of time prevents more than the mere mention of Mr. Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and as Governor of New York. When he was elected President in 1932, our Nation was in the throes of a devastating and paralyzing depression. Thirteen to fourteen million of our citizens were unemployed. Despair was in every heart. Under his guidance and program of humane legislation recovery was rapid. But even as our Nation emerged from the depression, President Roosevelt detected disturbing rumblings from across the seas.

I recall on Washington's birthday in 1935, when Mr. H. W. Story of this city and I had a conference with the President in his study in the White House, we were his only visitors that day. While the subject we were to discuss was unemployment insurance, yet the President spent considerable time telling of his grave apprehension of the Hitler movement and how he feared it might bring the horrors of war to Germany's neighbors and perhaps to other nations of this world. And shortly after that Mr. Roosevelt began to insist more and more upon increased appropriations for our Navy and for our Army. I know how sincere his interest was because it happened I was a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and was entrusted with the duty of assisting in the endeavor to get some of the increased defense appropriations through the Senate. I state frankly to you here that if it had not been for the powerful influence of the President, many of the increased appropriations would never have been passed. He was driven to the expedient of diverting P. W. A. funds from ordinary construction projects to build much needed battleships, cruisers, and destroyers.

It was at the President's insistence, before we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, that the Selective Service and Training Act was passed which provided for a peacetime army, which proved to be of tremendous value in stemming the tide of the aggressors when war was forced upon us. Who here can deny but that the entire Allied cause might have been lost had it not been for Franklin Roosevelt's vision and insistence that this country be adequately prepared for any eventuality? If we had waited until after Pearl Harbor, it might easily have been too late.

While most Americans realize the heroic efforts which our President made to provide a program of adequate defense for our country, many have forgotten the desperate effort he made on the evening of September 28, 1938, to avoid a world conflagration. It was that night that he made his direct appeal to Adolf Hitler.

You will recall that in March of that year Germany had taken over Austria. Everything that Hitler had said seemed to point to his determination to bring the armed might of Germany crashing down upon helpless and poorly defended neighboring nations. The war clouds over Europe became blacker and blacker. From frightened humanity the anguished cry went up, "Is there no other way than war?" President Roosevelt at first addressed a communication to Chancelor Hitler, and to the Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain. Hitler made a reply which indicated his mind harbored no thoughts of peace and his blueprints for the future were war maps. Almost in desperation the President of the United States then addressed a message direct to Hitler, in which among other things he said, "The world asks of us who at this moment are heads of nations, the supreme capacity to achieve the destinies of nations, without forcing upon them as a price the mutilation and the death of millions of citizens." The President was expressing the opinion of the great majority of our people when he continued, "The conscience and the impelling desire of the people of my country demand that the voice of their Government be raised again and yet again to avert and to avoid war."

While the appeal of our President fell upon the ears of a madman deafened to any appeal for peace, and who apparently had long before September 1938 determined to advance his personal ambitions at the expense of the life and blood of so many millions of human beings, yet this personal appeal to him emphasizes that always the great concern of President Roosevelt was to try to prevent sorrow, heartaches, and destruction among the peoples of the world.

Yes; the President of this great Nation was willing to go hat in hand and humbly beg the war-mad dictator to change his course if, by so doing, peace on earth might be preserved. How great was his love for his fellow men.

The day before he died President Roosevelt prepared a brief address which he expected to deliver to the American people on last Friday night. It was not delivered. The grim reaper intervened. But listen to these last words:

"We as Americans do not choose to deny our responsibility.

"Nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our children and our children's children, there will not be a third world war.

"We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars; yes; an end to this brutal, inhuman, and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments."

Yes; his voice is now stilled, but his spirit lives on. May that spirit guide a confused and bewildered world to a lasting and enduring peace.

His death was a tragedy to the peace-loving people of the earth. His superb leadership and his inspiring vision will be missed. But the American people have it in their power to erect a living memorial to our departed President. Let them unite behind our new President who seeks to carry out the Roosevelt program of bringing lasting peace to the nations of the world.

If that time comes when war, with all its misery, is no longer the instrument of settling disputes among nations, due in part at least to the foundation laid by Franklin Roosevelt, how the peoples of the world will bless him. And we can imagine that we hear a voice from the heavens saying, "You have run a good race; you have fought a good fight; you died in the service of your country. 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant,'" to which the grateful people of the world give answer, "Amen."

Address of W. Kingsland Macy, Chairman, Suffolk County Republican Committee, Great River, Long Island, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. SHARP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. W. Kingsland Macy, regent of the State of New York, former chairman of the New York State Republican Committee, and chairman of the Suffolk County Republican Committee, made following his election as president of the National Republican Club, and at a meeting held in the clubhouse, 54 West Fortieth Street, New York City, Tuesday evening, April 24. Mr. Macy, a member of National Republican Club for 25 years, and chairman of its executive committee for the last year, succeeds as president, Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of Westchester County:

Officers and members of the National Republican Club, tonight you have honored me by election as your president of this club. You have given me opportunity to fill a very important post—a post which has been filled with such distinction by so many able executives and leaders. I pledge to you that I will strive to meet the responsibilities you have given me with every bit of energy and ability I may have.

This club has a long and honorable history. It is steeped in tradition and genuine accomplishment. Often it has been a rock of strength amid tumultuous political seas. And, it might be added that not infrequently it has absorbed as little fiscal nourishment from being a lone sentinel among such seas as a rock generally absorbs.

The National Republican Club has been host to many great men. Its walls have resounded with the thunder of the voices of great orators. Its halls have echoed with the spontaneous applause of many thousands—thousands who have derived enjoyment and inspiration from the Republican doctrines enunciated by those who addressed us. Our foyers have been graced by leading citizens, leaders of our party, men from all walks of life, visiting us to enjoy our warm hospitality, and avail themselves of the club's accommodations, so graciously offered. Political history has been made here; great administrative problems have been discussed here; solutions of national questions have here been reached.

Why, then, you ask, as many ask, does the club, on occasion, run upon the rocks of financial coast lines? Well, a few of the answers might be found in the following:

The Republican Party has lost the last three national elections. That's not news, but defeats do have an effect upon party organizations. The club, though in nowise intended as a closely organized vehicle of the Republican Party, is nevertheless a valued one. And it does no good to say to those who, in past years, have left the active service of the party, "Oh, ye of little faith." Human nature being what it is will not be changed particularly by platitudes in stained-glass attitudes. But party reverses do not make for party prosperity, and until the advent of Governor Dewey, Republicans of the State had not elected a Governor in over 20 years. Further, Republicans of the city have not enjoyed the prestige that they rightfully earned in their fight in the good cause of anti-Tammany government.

I think that the club in latter years has lost in prestige through laissez faire and failure to stand out boldly for high principle, and I say this in no spirit of criticism. After all, any institution, any cause, any candidate, any industrial product is only as good as its consumer acceptance, and consumer acceptance can only be gained widely through merchandising and figurative window displays of "sales leaders." Retail merchants declaim, "Bring the public into the stores, and we'll sell 'em."

I think the potentialities of the club as a city, State, and national unifying force of and for republicanism has escaped men high in Republican councils, and this potential has not been brought home with sufficient force to those who might well join, but who have not.

I think, too, that perhaps insufficient importance and public notice have been given the work of club committees, and to their reports in particular. This can easily be remedied.

I am inclined to think that city, State, and national Republican committees may have been prone to regard the efforts of the club as possible threats to their own organizations, rather than as a perfectly logical and useful supplement and help to these all-important groups.

In the foregoing connection, it could be added that the fact that the club itself, as an entity, wants nothing in the way of material political advantage may well have been overlooked by those at the head of our party in city, State, and Nation.

While insisting that this club should not and cannot be a ladder placed outside the walls of county, State, or national organizations, placed there for the purpose of the ambitious gaining entrance to lofty vantage points through the second-story window, I do think that the club would profit, as would the party, if greater recognition were given the club and its members when useful constructive thought accrued to the party from the club. That is in no way contradictory to anything I have said previously.

It is my further view, that if a greater degree of solidarity were developed among members, the club would profit, and the individuals would gain.

I think the club may have erred in past years, by placing an inadequate accent on youth; perhaps it is that our appeal to youth has been incomplete. But, youth is fighting this war; the men who return will run this Nation of ours—one day—perhaps not too far distant. So, in our future planning let us put more emphasis on youth—seek to make the club more attractive to youth, albeit retaining the best features of decorum and inherent dignity. But this is an age of youth which has come into its own during our generation. Who would protest this? Definitely not your new president.

Finally, we can hardly do better than to revert and adhere to what was so succinctly and effectively set forth in the National Republican Club's original charter adopted in June of 1887, namely: "To promote the cause of good government throughout the United States; to advocate, promote, proclaim, and maintain the principles of the Republican Party; to promote an active interest in politics among all citizens of the United States." That was the conception of the club's objectives held by Col. Andrew B. Humphrey, who was the last of the club's original founders when he passed away recently in his ninety-fifth year. Colonel Humphrey was one who never wavered in his republicanism. He was disappointed when the club seemed to stray from the precepts he revered, but before his death his enjoyment in the club's activities was again revived in that he felt that the club's course had been directed once more in what he firmly believed to be the right and proper direction to fulfill its predestined purpose.

The stunning death of President Roosevelt caused abandonment of the particular type of address I had in mind. Frankly, with the Nation still rocking from the impact of the death of their courageous war leader, it is too early to outline any specific plan of action. More important, it is vital that no political group, or political party, launch mortar fire at President Truman while he is valiantly striving to pick up the reins of Government.

The Republican Party, for 12 long years, disagreed with many of the philosophies of Mr. Roosevelt. Thinking citizens were not infrequently appalled at the vast power he had taken into his own hands. They wondered, as you and I often wondered, what would happen to the Nation in crucial war days if the Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom, called home his valiant soul? We feared the catastrophe that might well follow. I know that I was so moved by this very probable peril, that I wrote to the New York Herald Tribune about it in a communication published in that newspaper in full on June 25, 1944.

Conditions leading up to the last Presidential contest were not unknown. Well-informed people had a perfect awareness of what was taking place. The lack of surprise on their part, which attended the fateful news that finally came, attests to this. It is a tribute to the sportsmanship for which the American people are noted—in which sportsmanship newspapermen are entitled to full measure—that so little emphasis was made publicly of the precarious condition of our late President's health. However, it is not without significance that the nomination for Vice President was so much to the fore at the Democratic convention in Chicago last summer.

It is an interesting matter of record that President Truman, of the seven Vice Presidents of the United States, including himself, who have succeeded to the higher office, is not the one with the longest remaining term in view. President Tyler had all but 1 month of the full 4 years following President Harrison's death, while President Johnson only a fortnight less, after President Lincoln's assassination. President Truman, of course, lacks almost 3 months of the 4-year term. Theodore Roosevelt, when he succeeded to the Presidency at the age of 42, the youngest President of the United States, had not quite 3½ years remaining after the assassination of President McKinley, and President Arthur only a few days less after President Garfield's assassination. President Fillmore had 2¾ years following the death of President Taylor, and President Coolidge had only a little over a year and 7 months remaining to him of President Harding's term at the latter's death.

But, even with the passing of our war leader, our democracy is built upon such solid rock of tradition and common sense, that while the Nation's structure trembled for 48 hours, it did not crack, nor were its firm foundations impaired. Vice President Harry S. Truman rose to the occasion; with swift, certain, and reassuring actions and words he calmed a troubled people and a troubled world. God grant that he may be able to perform the crushing tasks before him, and that from out this welter of blood and battle, a lasting peace may come. God grant that tryants—alive or still unborn—will perish from the earth before their sinister philosophies may again plunge the world in war.

Further, let us be thankful for the strength drawn by the American people from their way of life—from their Nation. Thank God for American courage and stamina. Thank God for our valleys, our plains, our mountains, our foothills—our snows and rains and fogs and brilliant sunshine—all contributing component parts to that magnificent manhood and womanhood that is so peculiarly, so convincingly, and so beautifully American. Thank God for the courageous European strains that have been brought here; for the pioneering spirit of our ancestors in our own land who spanned this continent by covered wagon, ox cart, mule back, plodding horses, and on foot. Thank God for that American spirit which shouted to the high heavens—which sent its clarion call to God—"Onward, ever onward, with you my Lord, at our side."

Yes; America met the devastating emergency which came like a lethal blow out of the Georgia blue. Harry Truman, prayers on his lips, picked up the fallen standard of Government, and made it clear he needed the help of the American people and their Congress. And the apparent restoration to Congress of its powers, after long last, cannot help but be an excellent thing for the Nation and the world. Such restoration will make for legislative and administrative stability. Such restoration will insure that should death strike again—and God forbid that this should happen—the Congress and the people would have a clearer conception of the vast problems before them, the Nation, and the world.

With such all-embracing problems awaiting solution—not the least of which is the opening tomorrow of the San Francisco Security Conference, held in the Golden Gate City, any far-reaching suggested political program of mine would appear to be completely lost—and rightfully so—against the gigantic backdrop of the world-crisis scene. However, I think I can say the following:

The strength of Franklin D. Roosevelt in political contests and in many of the policies he promulgated had its genesis in his interest in and affection for the so-called little people, forever being pushed around. And this despite the fact that by birth, wealth, and social position Franklin D. Roosevelt was remote from the underprivileged, the oft-mentioned "one-third of a Nation." Yet, despite all this, Mr. Roosevelt was a keen student of social justice, and a firm foe of religious and racial discrimination and intolerance.

Now the Republican Party, long since, proved its interest in the underprivileged, and both National and State records of the Republican Party disclose this beyond a shadow of any argumentative doubt. And in this State, Republicans everywhere have applauded the strong stand taken by Governor Dewey in matters covering liberal, social, and humanitarian laws which he has caused to be enacted since he became the State's Chief Executive.

I know, and I am sure you do too, that the Republican credo in this State has been on the side of social laws, and this has been emphasized so many times in the last decade by the Republican-controlled State legislature. But one thing stands out, and that is, even conceding the magnificent intent and purposes of the Ives and antibias job bill enacted into law upon the recommendation of Governor Dewey at this year's legislative session, the fact remains that the need for the passage of this law clearly demonstrated that the State and the people of the 62 counties had failed to inculcate into all the people the real purpose and meaning of American democracy. But the various creeds and racial groups and the different organizations representing all minorities must aid too, and very probably can do so more efficiently by tying in their efforts with those of the State and the Governor.

I urge upon you that, in our future political deliberations we lend what support we can to the aims and aspirations of the distaff side in securing equal rights. Let us, during our deliberations, give wholehearted support to the Nation-wide drive to write into the Constitution the just proposal calling for equal rights for women.

Recall, if you will, that on March 24, last, both Houses of the State legislature unanimously memorialized Congress to adopt and send to the several States the equal-rights amendment, now pending before Congress. Surely women for their work in war, if for no other reason— and there are many other reasons—merit equal rights, equal opportunity, equal protection, equal treatment. What intelligent man or woman can say them nay?

I do think, however, that we may all subscribe to the thought that our corresponding secretary, Mr. Edward Rager, has so cogently set forth in the current club bulletin which he edits so ably and carefully to such advantage in keeping our widespread membership informed. It is suggested that some limitation be placed upon taxation so that the people generally may have a little advance notice as to how to budget their taxes as with other expenses in a somewhat orderly

fashion. Further, that Government regulation of everything be pruned as extensively as possible, allowing, of course, for the maintenance of fair trade practices and the prevention of monopolies by capital or labor. Thus free enterprise, for which I assume we all stand, should be afforded the widest opportunity.

So much for a few generalized but important subjects meriting our attention, and then back again to the club itself.

Fundamentally, I think well of that epigram of the Reverend Father Gannon, who said in a recent speech: "When carrying a torch for a cause or an ideal, do not run so fast as to extinguish it." I think there is much truth to what the learned father said. Therefore, I will not jettison my complete cargo of recommendations or thoughts all at one fell swoop. However, a few additional statements would not go amiss.

As a stanch believer in the two-party system and having faith in the responsible leaders elected thereunder in each party, it has always been stimulating to me to find that those well grounded in party affairs as well as in history accorded great importance to the processes of party machinery and the responsible elected party membership.

If I recall aright it was President Coolidge who spoke in such complimentary vein about members of the county committee in the one-hundred-thousand-odd election districts of the country when he said that while we have faithful committee members we are additionally assured of worthy public officials; and he went so far as to say again, if my memory serves me correctly, that without such committee members popular government might almost fail of success. And one of our opposite political faith, a noted authority on government and history, Woodrow Wilson, spoke of the extraordinary development of party authority in the United States and how outside the Government itself there had been so elaborate and effective an organization of parties. He said that there was no interior organization to hold the various independent units of Government in harmony and cooperation and that, therefore, an exterior organization had evolved, which exterior organization he contended was the political party.

Obviously we will get more members in proportion as we do those things, stand for those principles that make appeal constructively. I have always felt, and I still strongly believe, that our party has made its greatest strides when sincerely and diligently it has sought to be an instrumentality for good government. And, in this connection, I would emphasize that we are not as much interested in making Republican policy in city, State, or Nation as we are in stimulating thought leading to more far-reaching Republican policies as arrived at by local, State, and National units of the party.

Again, the club could well become the means of further corralling to its membership and recruiting for the Republican Party many more substantial citizens, not now active in political affairs and apparently not available for recruitment in district organizations.

Not only that, but I would like to see returned to active membership in the club a considerable number of the party's elder statesmen who have resigned, or if still members, who have drifted away from active participation. The Republican Party and this club need all the brains they can muster if party success in the future is to be achieved. If we continue to be aloof from those who have served the party so well in past years, then we are closing our doors upon experience, ideas, and proved working capacity. It is also my earnest hope and wish that our club may attract to its membership all those national leaders and State leaders and others prominent in our party's affairs throughout the length and breadth of our land, who are not already included on our roster.

As I proceed with my new task of serving you faithfully, I shall frequently place before you additional recommendations, additional thoughts on club development, club management, and political issues. In the interval I want to pay my personal tribute to my two immediate predecessors, with whom I have had the fortunate opportunity of working very closely, and the other outgoing officers for their splendid service and their many sacrifices of time, energy, and money in behalf of our great organization. I speak more particularly, of course, of RALPH GWINN, who has but latterly entered upon an illustrious career in the House of Representatives, and Thomas J. Curran, who carried the party banner for United States Senator in the last Presidential election, and who then and is now so ably conducting the important office of secretary of state in this State.

Then, later, when my term of service has been completed, I will be happy if you find I have done well. Such commendation, unspoken or articulated, will be my prized possession, and I say to you again, I will leave no stone upturned to prove to you that you have not misplaced your confidence.

Thank you very much.

Moonbeams That Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Charleston (S. C.) News-Courier of January 12, 1945, in reference to a speech made by the former distinguished Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Hon. James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOONBEAMS THAT UNITE

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and now chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, in an address to the National Foreign Trade Convention last October, quoted this from an address of Miss Ellen Wilkinson, member of the British Parliament and chairman of the British Labor Party:

"This war has produced many surprises but none, I think, more important for the future than the discovery that modern empires do not disintegrate under the shock of war. The British Empire, which, according to Ribbentrop, is united only by moonbeams, has proved that these, after all, natural phenomena, are stronger than Fascist truncheons."

It is indisputable. The British Empire has endured and does endure. The "moonbeams" that unite the New Zealanders, the Australians, the Canadians, with their mother country are stronger than the truncheons of Prussia that attached the Bavarians, the Austrians, and other Germans to Berlin.

In South Carolina, by the way, is no "labor party," but in no party, not even the party of the "Regulars," is a member who has uttered a sentence of the beauty and strength of this one from the woman of the Labor Party in Britain.

Columbia Valley Cooperative Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H. R. 2923 which proposes to set up a Columbia Valley Cooperative Authority. It is the intent of the bill to place this authority as close as possible to the resident population of the area. One feature of the bill is qualification affecting the commissioners to be appointed by the President of the United States. The bill would require that four of the five commissioners be appointed from lists of residents from the four States involved. This is very definitely a limitation of the appointive power of the interests of Government by the people and it is my pleasure to include in the extension of my remarks some of the precedents which make this proposal constitutional.

MEMORANDUM AS TO POWER OF CONGRESS TO SPECIFY LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENTS TO FEDERAL OFFICES

Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution provides, in part, that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

It may be stated as a general principle that, by reason of this provision of the Constitution, Congress may not designate the person to fill a Federal office, and may not provide for the making of appointments except by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by the President alone, by courts of law, or by heads of departments.

It also follows that Congress may not restrict the field of choice of the appointing authority in a manner which will be equivalent to making the choice or designation of the person who is to be appointed. However, there are statutory precedents for imposing certain restrictions upon the field of choice of the appointing authority.

Among these are the following:

In section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 50 War App., sec. 310) there appears the following provision:

"Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President, from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials."

The act of July 18, 1918, as amended by Public Law No. 125, Sixty-ninth Congress, provides as follows:

"That a commission is hereby created, to be known as the Commission for the Standardization of Screw Threads, hereinafter referred to as the commission, which shall be composed of nine commissioners * * * four to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, two of whom shall be chosen from nominations made by the American Society

of Mechanical Engineers, and two from nominations made by the Society of Automotive Engineers."

Another precedent which is of interest is contained in the Railroad Labor Act. I quote the provision relating to the Adjustment Board, as it appears in title 45, section 153 of the United States Code:

"(a) That the said Adjustment Board shall consist of 36 members, 18 of whom shall be selected by the carriers and 18 by such labor organizations of the employees, national in scope, as have been or may be organized in accordance with the provisions of section 152 of this title."

It seems difficult to reconcile this provision of the Railway Labor Act with the general principle above stated, but so far as I know its validity has not been questioned.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I request to add my humble tribute, which I am sure expresses the sentiments of my constituents, to that great American—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He was a man of world stature—Franklin Roosevelt—the greatest figure of our time, who leaves an indelible imprint on history and whose influence will help to shape the course of the world for centuries.

Peoples all over the world mourn his death, with the excellent reason that they know he was urging, for all of them, a better and more prosperous life. But the most poignant grief comes from those whose lot he bettered from his first days in office—the plain, ordinary, untitled people of the United States.

Thousands, millions of these people wept unashamedly at the news of his death. They were not selfish tears, but tears shed for one they had come to love as a great benefactor of the common man.

These oceans of tears, more than anything else, may stand as his memorial, for they may be said to embrace the dozens of Rooseveltian measures by which he sought to lighten the load of the Nation's weary workers.

President Roosevelt came on the scene, assumed his office, in the darkest hour of our economic history, when there were millions of unemployed tramping the land, seeking to earn enough to provide even the barest necessities for themselves and their families.

There were bankruptcies and bank failures by the thousands, costing the poor their life savings, accumulated through toil and denial to themselves of what the more fortunate would have called necessities of life.

Into that picture of approaching national chaos came the man we mourn. Moving with supreme courage, he made a series of quick decisions, which not only restored the confidence of the people but began the building of a firm foundation for our economic life.

None who remember those eventful days will forget the depths into which the Nation had been plunged, nor the almost immediate pick-up in morale, discernible in every face one passed in the street, as the bank holiday halted the downward slide.

This change was both actual and psychological.

And then followed the series of measures enacted over the period of a decade, which will stamp that decade as the most progressive in American history, when legislation for the people was placed ahead of all other considerations.

There was enacted old-age-pension legislation, to bring some cheer into the lives of those who had been unable to save in early years because of adversities; unemployment insurance, the Nation's guaranty of freedom from want for those who, through no fault of their own, could not find employment, and freedom from fear for these same people who, previously, never were free from the dread of unemployment; the minimum wage law, which corrected some pitiful cases of mere subsistence living and brought to thousands 100 percent and more increase in incomes, removing fear of hunger.

These and many more Roosevelt-inspired measures followed in rapid succession. It is perhaps symbolic that he also championed the cause of rural electrification, for it was characteristic of him that he sought always to bring us from economic darkness into light.

President Roosevelt left us when we were able to see the light, not only with a plan of full employment and economic stability, but when we can also see on the world horizon, largely through his efforts, a world organization and pattern to preserve the peace, that all peoples of the world can emerge from living by the law of the jungle—survival of the fittest—to a system of Christian procedure which recognizes we are our brother's keeper.

Through his whole career his every effort was directed toward bringing "peace on earth and good will to men."

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no President of the United States has ever come into office with a more united people behind him than has been true in the case of President Truman. He has been acclaimed by the press, the radio, and the people generally of this Nation. Many have been the editorials written about him. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two such editorials, one from the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 17, 1945, and another from the National Tribune of April 26, 1945:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 17, 1945]

TRUMAN RINGS TRUE

President Truman's first speech rang true. It was irreproachable in taste and in content. He spoke as the inheritor of Roosevelt's mantle. He gave every assurance of intending to hew to the line which had been marked down by his predecessor. With unaffected simplicity, he besought the aid of Congress and his countrymen for the performance of his monumental task.

Of necessity, he gave major emphasis to the war and the peace. He could not have been more reassuring in defining his attitude on that score. The policies which have brought us so close to victory and which have gone so far toward the erection of hopeful machinery for durable peace will be adhered to. Our military and naval leaders will not be interfered with. Unconditional surrender is still a sine qua non. There will be no relaxation in the drive for total defeat of the enemy. Mr. Truman is not interested in a partial triumph. He insists on the same complete crushing of the foe for which Mr. Roosevelt stood.

By the same token, Mr. Truman insists on the consummation of Mr. Roosevelt's peace program. He is a believer in the possibility of eliminating war. He does not hold with the doctrine that as things have been they are bound to remain. He is on the side of those who hope, those who have faith, that the good will and ingenuity of civilized men can contrive to shape a system of justice, fair play, and law which will reduce aggression as a threat to the rights and happiness of mankind.

Mr. Truman is a realist, and he recognizes the large part which must be played by the great powers in the molding of such machinery. It is their strength which must be relied upon to clinch the enterprise of peace which is to receive fresh momentum at San Francisco. It is their strength, used to serve, not to dominate lesser nations, which will determine whether the world is to face other futile and devastating resorts to arms in international affairs. That is why the continued cooperation of the Big Three is an unspeakably precious desideratum.

The President had relatively little to say about domestic matters. But he made it clear that here, as in the foreign field, he is keeping before him the outlook and desire of the fallen captain. He spoke as a thorough progressive. We must look forward, we must move forward, he said. This does not sound like the talk of a man intent on marking time. The social gains which have been won must be preserved, and that large-mindedness does not apply to Americans alone. We must work for the revival of other peoples. We must trade with them, deal with them, not merely for our own sake, but for the sake of those whom we would be helping. Mr. Truman gave no comfort to our nationalists, or to any other supporters of a conception of our country as a curmudgeon among the nations.

It was a capital speech, with the President's sincerity and honesty running through it like a golden thread. Time alone can tell what the pressures to which the White House is subject will make of Mr. Truman. But in his address to Congress he was a very earnest man, admitting his awareness of staggering problems, by no means sure that he can measure up to his great responsibility, but doggedly resolved to live up to it, if a dedication of heart and soul can make him equal to the challenge. This is a President without a trace of pretense, without dramatic fire, but a good man in the old-fashioned sense, and a competent man to the extent of his experience.

His speech was in effect an appeal for support from all quarters, on the basis of toler-

ance, on the basis of commonly accepted goals, on the basis of human decency among the children of men. We have nothing to fear under the leadership of a President so ingenuously devoted to the simple, heartfelt things, unashamed to display "an humble and a contrite heart," ready to pray with Kipling:

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful Hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

[From the National Tribune of April 26, 1945]

"CAPTAIN HARRY"

Just after Pearl Harbor, a bespectacled United States Senator called on Army Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall to offer his services in uniform. It is reported that the general listened patiently and then said laughingly, "We don't want any old goats like you." In answer, if this story which is making the rounds in Washington is correct, the Senator replied, "I'm not as old as you are," and the retort followed, "No, but I'm a general and you would be only a colonel." The general is still directing the war effort, but Senator Harry S. Truman is now President of the United States and the "old goat" is also General Marshall's boss and Commander in Chief of all of the armed forces.

We pass the story along to our readers because the President's offer of his services is typical of the man who has succeeded to one of the most exacting positions any person has ever been called upon to fill. This newspaper commented very briefly last week on Mr. Truman's succession to the Presidency. Following, as he does, a Chief Executive who had served longer than any of his predecessors, a leader who had captured the imagination of the world and one whose demonstrated popularity with the people of the country was unparalleled in history, we commented principally upon the fact that Harry Truman was the first war veteran to enter the White House in 36 years. We sketched in bare outline the enormous task facing him, warned against harsh and premature judgment of his capabilities and bespoke for him the united support of the Nation's veterans and of all of our people to the end that victory over our enemies might soon be assured.

That was to have been the extent of our comment at this time, but since we expressed these few thoughts things have happened that warrant further expression. It could have been expected that the public would be confused by the unexpected death of a man who had been directing the country and its war effort with such tireless energy, but Mr. Truman at once went about his new and exacting duties with a surprising dispatch that indicated an unexpected discernment of the problems at hand. He at once addressed the Congress in person and talked by radio to the armed forces and, through both of them, to the world. He showed an astonishing knowledge of conditions both at home and abroad, and the minds of the people were at once eased by the assurance that this new Chief Executive is one of them and likes them, that he is capable and physically able to command, and that he is not by any manner or means just a bystander.

With direct simplicity, he so sought the bipartisan cooperation of the Congress and the public that congressional leaders have pledged their united support of every proper endeavor. His avoidance of the dramatic and his proved understanding of the needs of the average man have brought to him unsolicited resolutions of confidence by the legislatures of many of the States. An even temperament, lack of impulsiveness, and a God-fearing approach to the conduct of his office has further appealed to those who must be the President's followers, and an open and receptive mind and an amiable nature tend to emphasize an ability that may well lead the way to that national unity and directness of purpose so necessary in these days of trial.

Although the commanders of the country's organized veterans were among the first to assure President Truman of their allegiance and personal good will, they could be expected to watch as critically as any the spoken words of the first comrade to assume the Presidency since Theodore Roosevelt was retired in 1909. They were attracted first to Mr. Truman's message to the Congress, because, while he stated quite simply and humbly his hopes and his ideals, he also recognized in that first public utterance that "our debt to the heroic men and valiant women in the service of our country can never be repaid. They have earned our undying gratitude. America will never forget their sacrifices." Those were the words of a soldier who knew a soldier's life and understood the cost of his service to his flag. The hearts of our veterans were lightened.

Again Comrade Truman spoke plainly the language of a thoughtful veteran when he talked by radio to the armed forces last week. We are printing the full text of that address in this issue. It voices eloquently the thoughts of this man who had waived his own disabilities in order to don his country's uniform 28 years ago and who had tried once more to be admitted to active service in World War No. 2. As he said, "I have seen death on the battlefield * * * I know the strain, the mud, the misery, the * * * weariness of the soldier in the field. * * * I know too his courage, his stamina and his faith," we saw here a man who would not forget his love of comrade, one who would remember the needs of such men and one with the power to excite a lagging interest of citizens who are wont to forget after the shooting is over.

With Mr. Truman's rise to the Nation's leadership, the GI's of his day are vying with one another in repeating anecdotes of their service under him in France in 1918. He exacted from them the loyalty and the discipline expected from men of any command in time of war, but he defied anybody who would do them injustice. As a captain of artillery he proved to be so fair a taskmaster that he became known and remembered only as Captain Harry, and he is still Captain Harry as he continues to attend annual reunions of his old outfit. Veterans like that. They like the cut of the jib of a man who remembers not to forget.

They like the prayer this man made last week on the rostrum of the House of Representatives when he asked his God to keep him in his faith and his good works. They like the forthrightness with which he instructed that veterans be represented at the San Francisco Conference where will be laid the groundwork looking to the permanent peace and security of our country. And they rejoice in the sentiments expressed by their President last week when he described "my hope for the future" and quoted the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln "let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphans."

America's veterans recognize such language. They have faith that the Captain Harry who led so well in 1917–18 has the fortitude to continue to be Captain Harry while conducting the Nation's business. Courage was present in abundance during the days that have gone; it will be needed abundantly in the days that lie ahead. We are convinced the "old goat" has what it takes.

A Good Soldier Goes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an excellent editorial recently appearing in the Vineland (N. J.) Times-Journal, concerning our late President, and entitled "A Good Soldier Goes Home":

A GOOD SOLDIER GOES HOME

Now that Franklin D. Roosevelt has joined the immortals, we can reflect on his letter, written to Democratic Chairman Robert E. Hannegan prior to the 1944 national convention:

"All that is within me cries out to go back to my home on the Hudson River, to avoid public responsibilities, and to avoid also the publicity which in our democracy follows every footstep of the Nation's Chief Executive.

"Such would be my choice. But we of this generation chance to live in a day and hour when our Nation has been attacked, and when its future existence and the future existence of our chosen method of government are at stake.

"To win this war wholeheartedly, unequivocally and as quickly as we can is our task of the first importance. To win this war in such a way that there be no further world wars in the foreseeable future is our second objective. To provide occupations, and to provide a decent standard of living for our men in the armed forces after the war, and for all Americans, are the final objectives.

"Therefore, reluctantly, but as a good soldier * * * I will accept and serve in this office, if I am so ordered by the commander in chief of us all—the sovereign people of the United States."

He was so ordered, and good soldier that he was, he fought the good fight down to the final few hours of his earthly existence.

At the very threshold of a new day, with victory in sight, this good soldier has gone home. As surely as the most humble soldier in the ranks, he laid down his life for his country—indeed, for all humanity. His gallant spirit bids the living to justify the great sacrifices which have been made in this terrible conflict. He marked the path of an enduring peace, for his was a heart of compassion, charity, and justice.

MAX LEUCHTER.

Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on House Joint Resolution 99, before the House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Wednesday, April 11:

Nineteen hundred and forty-five is the year of decision, undoubtedly the most tremendous military decision in the world will be made in Europe soon. That military decision will signalize the extirpation of fascism not only in Europe but everywhere in the world and will strengthen the fight in these United States to destroy the forces of domestic fascism. February 1945 marked the announcement of the most far-reaching political decisions in the history of mankind. The decisions at the Crimea Conference constitute implementation on a world-wide basis of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Atlantic Charter. Lasting and democratic peace are dependent entirely upon the grand coalition cemented at Crimea and to be further reinforced at San Francisco. The immediate success of this war is dependent upon the success of the grand coalition composed of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Only the other day we saw living proof of this when the Soviet Union delivered a hammer blow against Japan in announcing the abrogation of the neutrality pact. I do not want to see that coalition impaired under any circumstances. It is in the interest of the world of today and tomorrow that all questions be subordinated to the problems of the preservation and strengthening of this coalition. In making my plea for Italy I do so in the hope that her problem will be solved within the structure of the coalition. In making my plea for Italy I do so with the full realization that Italy's cause, the cause of all nations, can be saved only as a result of the success of the coalition, as a result of the success of its decisions, and as a result of the further strengthening of the coalition. The chances for a democratic Italy, a democratic Greece, a democratic world is dependent entirely on the success of the coalition of these three great nations and the fruition of the decisions made at Yalta by the leaders of the people of these great nations. If San Francisco fails, if the coalition is disrupted, Italy's cause, the cause of all other nations, the cause of the world will fail. Therefore, I again say that in pleading Italy's cause I do so not in contradiction of the great decision at Yalta but with the full understanding that the cause of a democratic Italy is an integral part of the living flesh and blood of the Teheran agreements, of the agreements of Yalta, of Dumbarton Oaks, and of the great meeting which will take place at San Francisco. For this reason alone Italy cannot be left out of the meeting at San Francisco.

Fascism was imposed on the Italian people from the outside, with foreign guns and foreign funds. For 21 years the Italian people had to live with a bayonet at their throats. The traitor Mussolini supplemented the tyranny of Italian fascism with that of the might of the Nazi Wehrmacht. By 1939 the Fascist peninsula had become a Nazi concentration camp. Italy no longer had sovereignty, no longer freedom of action. Its traitor, Il Duce, had surrendered the people of Italy to Adolf Hitler. Thus, in 1940, when the Italian Fascists entered this war it was not any choice on the part of the people, it was a mere declaration on the part of the Nazi warden, Benito Mussolini. An imprisoned nation could have no choice. Time and events have demonstrated that it had none, except to revolt. The Italian people did revolt. They used the only method that was possible for them and that was voluntary surrender of hundreds of thousands of its soldiers. The Italian people are not cowards. The history of Garibaldi and his legions will always remain glorious pages in the history of world heroism. Men and women of Italian origin of these United States—over 1,000,000 of them in the armed forces—their exploits and their achievements in this war will always give the lie to anyone who snidely charges cowardice to be an Italian characteristic. The 300,000 Italian partisans now engaged against the common enemy have been described by General Alexander: "The resistance movement in Italy has been more effective in fighting the Germans than any other resistance movement in Europe." Up to date more than 250,000 Italians have lost their lives in that resistance movement. No; the surrender of hundreds of thousands of Italian soldiers was not an act of cowardice, it was an act of revolt, revolt against Fascist-Nazi tyranny. It was the only form of revolt that a people with a bayonet at its throat could undertake. Italian soldiers can fight for liberty and freedom. History has demonstrated it. Italian soldiers refused to fight for tyranny and slavery. Events of only yesterday have demonstrated it. All that Italy seeks now is that she be permitted to fight against the common enemy as an ally. I can say with full confidence that Italy is ready to declare war against Japan just as she declared war against Germany. All she asks is that the fetters of the armistice which deprive her of the right to declare and make war be removed. That the dignity of her people be restored by recognizing as allies these people who are now actually fighting on our side, whose patriots are actually fighting and dying on our side, whose navy is actually engaged in warfare on our side. All she asks is to be permitted to mobilize her forces, to be assisted in doing so, by removing the shackles of the armistice and granting to her the status of what she actually is and what her people have always been, allies, and to grant her the right to participate in the building of a world security organization for democratic and lasting peace at the San Francisco Conference

Italy has earned this right with the blood of her men, the famine of her children, and the suffering of her women. To continue Italy to be humiliated by refusing her the recognition of an ally, by barring the doors of San Francisco to her, while at the same time her people are fighting against fascism at home and abroad, restricted by the impossible terms of an unrealistic armistice, is not in keeping with the spirit of the agreements at Teheran and Yalta.

Italy's contribution to Allied victory began long before the armistice. It was not only the blows of our military might that brought about the overthrow of Mussolini, but it was also the act of revolt, the surrender of Italian soldiers at the front, the sabotage of Fascist military efforts by the Italian people at home.

In a report to Congress on the subject of the progress of the war made on September 17, 1943, the President stated: "Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender the Italian fleet has come over to our side and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people." It must be remembered that when we invaded Italy we at all times stated to the Italian people that we were entering Italy as liberators and not as conquerors. This was said truthfully as we recognized that the people of Italy would have no truck with a Fascist-Nazi war. In a radio address to the Nation on July 29, 1943, following Mussolini's overthrow the President promised: "Eventually Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality. In the meantime, the United Nations will not follow the pattern set by Mussolini and Hitler and the Japanese for the treatment of occupied countries—the pattern of pillage and starvation." And again on September 11, 1943, immediately following the armistice in a joint statement, both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill said to the people of Italy: "Take every chance you can, strike hard and strike home. Have faith in your future. All will come well. March forward with your American and British friends in the great world movement toward freedom, justice, and peace."

I sincerely believe that all of these messages and promises were made in good faith and it is my firm belief that the President will do his utmost to see to it that these promises made to the Italian people are kept. It is my firm belief that the overwhelming majority of people in America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union do not desire a status of conqueror and conquered between them and the Italian people but of liberator and liberated.

It is with regret that I must state that the events subsequent to the armistice in Italy have not conformed to the spirit, honor, and letter of the pledges made. The armistice itself restricted Italy's army to 11,000, and now that the restriction has been slightly lifted to allow Italy an army of a little better than 50,000, Italy's 300,000 partisans are fighting the enemy behind the lines. Her soldiers are at the front and her Navy is doing a good job. Although it is extremely doubtful whether under the terms of the armistice Italy will be permitted to declare war against Japan and pool what she has into the war in the Pacific, for Italy cannot under the armistice declare war without permission of the Allied Commission, I am confident that Italy will make war against Japan if permitted and will do an effective job if material assistance is given to her. I am not going to discuss the economic terms of the armistice except that they place on a country impoverished by the rapacious forces of the Nazis a burden that no nation can ever carry. I do not care to give a recital of the indignities imposed on the Italian people by the Allied Commission as it would serve no purpose at this time. I will simply give you those instances which will apprise you of the nature of the conqueror role that the Allied Commission has played in Italy: One, with the exception of the slight increase from 11,000 to some fifty-odd-thousand in the armed forces, the Allied Commission has consistently denied the appeal of the Italian Government to permit her to raise an effective fighting army. Two, even on the matter of relief the Allied Commission for months refused to carry out the President's order to increase the daily bread ration from 200 grams to 300 grams. The President issued this order some time in October. It was finally put into effect on March 1, 1945. Three, when a national government composed of all anti-Fascist political parties was established in June of 1944, the Soviet Union sought to extend diplomatic recognition of that government, the Allied Commission in an arrogant letter to Prime Minister Bonomi informed the Italian Government that it could not enter into diplomatic relations with any government, including an ally.

It is not necessary for me to recite the conditions of famine and disease now rampant in Italy. These are well known, and as for those who do place the blame on the Italian people, may I remind them that the retreating Nazis took along with them all the cattle they could seize, all the grain, all the food, clothing, bedding, and other household furniture. What they could not take they destroyed. In many towns the Italian people were left without food and shelter and yet these people still refused to have truck with the Nazi-Fascist war lords and welcomed those who came as liberators. Disillusionment followed soon, caused not by our soldiers, nor by the people of the three great nations, but caused by an Allied Commission

which sought to play the role of Caesar rather than that of a Lincoln.

We all welcome the news of the easing of some of the restrictions. Italy now is permitted to govern most of the liberated territory although its national liberation committee is still denied jurisdiction in areas that are now being liberated. The people are being allowed a greater degree of self-government and Italy today may enter into diplomatic relations with other nations. In fact Italy today is in diplomatic relations de facto and de jure with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. There is an Italian Ambassador in Washington and an American Ambassador in Rome; and yet we have the incongruous situation of having diplomatic relations with a nation, with that nation and its people suffering and at war with the common enemy, and still refused recognition as an ally and representation in the family of the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference.

How will this situation affect us here at home? Will it contribute to that post-war stability which is so necessary to carry out our program for 60,000,000 jobs and a healthy agriculture? Let us bear in mind that no nation can gain for itself prosperity over another nation, particularly one fighting on our side, which is prostrated and gradually forced to the brink of political chaos and complete economic disintegration. Unless we aid Italy the pressure on the present democratic government of Italy will be so great that it may bring about its overthrow, that it may be supplanted by a government of reaction composed of former Fascist forces. Italy, so governed by these elements would be another hindrance before that democratic world for which decisions were made at Teheran, Yalta, and Dumbarton Oaks, and for which nations are meeting at San Francisco. Shall we force upon Italy another Fascist regime without black shirt, but nevertheless Fascist in character? Shall the war criminals in Italy be permitted to become the masters once again of the Italian people? The answer to that question lies in the determination of the question whether or not we in America will lead the way toward recognition of Italy as an ally, toward having her represented at the San Francisco Conference.

Spring will soon come to the unliberated regions of Italy. The rivers will overflow. The floods will add to the untold hardships of the winter that has just passed. The destruction of those valleys will not make for post-war economic stability. Unless we aid Italy now by extending lend-lease aid to her as an ally, to assist her in reconstruction, to help her to prevent further damage, to help her mobilize her forces fully so that they can join with us in defeating fascism, Italy will be a liability and a serious drag in the post-war world. Is it not sound economics as well as justice that Italy be permitted and enabled to assist in the full dignity of a member in building the post-war democratic world? The answer to this question too lies in the determination of Italy's status, conquered country or liberated country: a co-belligerent or an ally: an outlaw nation or partner at the San Francisco Conference. It is my considered judgment, my earnest conviction that to recognize Italy now, to extend to her lend-lease aid now and to invite her to participate at the San Francisco Conference will be in the interests of American agriculture, American labor, in the interests of 60,000,000 jobs, in the interest of a healthy, free Europe, in the interests of domestic and world stability and in the interests of a democratic world. These interests are our interests, the interests of the American people. They are in the interests of an America that is on the march on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, in the interests of a great America of today and of a greater America of tomorrow.

Don't Fence New England Out!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the prosperity of this Nation in the post-war period depends upon a concerted and united policy to develop to greatest usefulness all the natural facilities for business and commerce throughout the country.

Such a policy must recognize no frontiers except our actual boundaries.

The greatest possible utilization of our facilities for the enjoyment of our share of the world trade of the future requires that every section of the Union be permitted to contribute to the national welfare by making the most of the natural advantages of that section, geographically, economically or otherwise.

Unfortunately, evidences multiply that Washington authorities intend that New England shall be a neglected corner.

The prosperity of New England and the capabilities of New England to contribute to national prosperity depend upon the development of the port of Boston and the extension of facilities for handling an increased air traffic. The recent order of the Civil Aeronautics Board canceling the scheduled opening May 1 of air service out of Boston to the West is a blow to the program to make Boston what it ought to be, an international airport.

I have written the Civil Aeronautics Board protesting the recent ruling and urging that it be reconsidered and reversed. Do not fence New England out.

I append an editorial from the Boston Herald of April 24, which admirably states the case:

DUBIOUS C. A. B. RULING

The United Air Lines and the Transcontinental and Western have virtually completed preparations for new direct service to the West from Boston starting May 1. They have mobilized their staffs for a total of five round trips a day between here and Chicago. The chamber of commerce has announced aviation week to usher in the new service. But over the week end the Civil Aeronautics Board suddenly said "No!" There is some reason to question the soundness of this ruling.

The C. A. B. points to the terrific congestion on the transcontinental lines. A civilian is said to have only one chance in 84 of completing a coast-to-coast trip. The board has, therefore, declared that the planes and pilots scheduled for the Boston-Chicago run must be diverted to relieving the transcontinental bottleneck.

There are two objections to this, however. In the first place, as United has pointed out, cancelation of the Boston service does not assure an equivalent additional mileage on the New York trips to the West. This is because of the efficient use of pilot-hours on the trips from here.

In the second place, as the Chamber of Commerce points out, movement of military personnel from Boston to the West is very great and becoming greater. This is now one of the largest ports of debarkation in the country.

If service personnel landing at Boston en route to the west coast must fly by way of New York, efficiency is not served, and the congestion at the latter city is increased. The movement from Europe to the Pacific will grow rapidly, and to channel the great bulk of it through New York does not seem sensible. There is nothing in the C. A. B. explanation to indicate that it took these factors into consideration.

The disposition in Washington to slight Boston's justifiable aspirations a an international airport must be corrected. In this instance we have a perfect demonstration of the correlation of three factors—a busy seaport, geographical convenience for travel from Europe to the West, and freedom from New York's congestion—which ought to mean a speedy inauguration of the Boston-Chicago service rather than postponement.

America Must Not Forget—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer of April 24, 1945:

AMERICA MUST NOT FORGET—AGAIN!

In all the tragic history of human suffering there is nothing to compare with the wholesale barbarities perpetrated by the fiendish Nazis.

Such frightfulness must never again be tolerated on this earth.

Millions of men, women, and children murdered in cold blood; millions tortured; millions starved; millions wantonly and brutally mistreated—every day new evidence of Germany's appalling wartime crimes is being uncovered as the avenging armies of the Allies march to victory over Hitler.

These shocking accounts of the horrors at Buchenwald, Dachau, Oswiecim, and other prison and concentration camps are not propaganda tales concocted for the gullible. They are facts, borne out by photographs, affidavits, and official records.

But will they be remembered 5 or 10 years from now?

The human mind has an amazing faculty of adapting itself to changing conditions. It can quickly forget pain and sorrow. In particular, the American people are all too prone to forget the hardships, difficulties, and mistakes of the past.

Will we ever learn from history? Twenty-five years ago some cynical Americans were saying that the stories of German brutality in Belgium were chiefly propaganda directed, before April 6, 1917, at getting the United States into the European war.

Today there are those among us who not only take no stock in the certified records of German bestiality in World War No. 1 but who scoff at the evidence of unspeakable German atrocities in World War No. 2 as propaganda.

But our soldiers know. Our boys who have been prisoners in German camps know. The British and the Russians know. They know that not a fraction of the full story of Nazi barbarism has as yet been made public.

General Eisenhower knows the truth. That's why he proposed that delegations of Congressmen and editors and publishers

speed to the scenes of the Nazi outrages to see the evidence for themselves.

That is as it should be, so far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. Every member of the United States House of Representatives; every Member of the Senate; every publisher and every editor who wants to see with his own eyes the exhibits of German brutishness should have opportunity to do so. Surely ways can be found to permit a thousand American civilians, lawmakers, and publicists to visit the German crime spots.

We regard as thoroughly sound the suggestion of Representatives BROOKS, GOSSETT, and FLOOD that a full-time agency be set up to keep a permanent record of German atrocities. But more than that is needed to maintain in the public mind a realization of German criminality in this war.

There should be established in Washington a museum to preserve, so long as such a reminder is necessary, factual, authentic documents, photographs, and other displays to keep the American people from forgetting the horrors committted by the Germans in the name of nazi-ism and the vile Hitler.

Twice in one generation the people of the United States have been called to help put down mad-dog Germany and save Europe from itself. Twice is enough. There must be no further call for America to join in this task, at a cost of thousands of our sons.

German-instigated wars must be stopped for all time. When this war is over German militarism must be destroyed and the Reich policed. The nations must organize for enduring peace and security. But beyond all this:

Nazi Germany's crimes must be kept blazoned on the consciousnes of the world. We must not forget—again!

A Nodding Bouquet for the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include here an editorial on the Office of Price Administration from the California Grange News of March 5, 1945.

A NODDING BOUQUET FOR THE O. P. A.

We have on occasion indulged in the popular national pastime of ribbing that much discussed and cussed Government agency, the O. P. A.

We are glad to compliment the Office of Price Administration for their recent publication, Extent of O. P. A. Responsibility in Wartime Programs Affecting the American Farmer.

We hasten to explain that the above is not the pamphlet itself but the title thereof, and yet, in spite of its periphrastic and circumlocutory titling, every granger will welcome this booklet as a time and temper saver.

It tells you where to go to get information so clearly that the farmer will feel less inclined to tell the O. P. A. where to go.

In modern quiz fashion it gives the farmer facts he should know about agency responsibility in such simple language that the reader does not have to be a Joel Kupperman to figure it out.

It is a right smart piece, and will take the steam out of many a kick aimed at the shins of Chester Bowles and Co.

Get yourself a copy and see for yourself.

The Republican Party Makes Important Constructive Suggestions to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that yesterday the Republican membership of the House of Representatives held a conference, in which it took very significant action. The action of the Republican conference is, generally speaking, the action of the Republican Party as far as the matter under consideration at that time is concerned. At the conference held yesterday the Republicans adopted a resolution which took into consideration the deplorable food situation and which in effect calls upon the President to take immediate action to relieve the situation which has now become a little short of desperate and which is fast becoming worse.

About 2 years ago the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives appointed a special committee known as the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. The purpose of this committee was to investigate thoroughly all phases of food activities. The committee did me the honor to select me to act as its chairman. That committee is made up of membership from all geographical sections of the country and from all walks of life and representing all food activities from the producer to the consumer.

That committee in its report to the Republican membership recommended that a conference of the full membership be called. This was done on yesterday and that conference adopted the following resolution:

Resolved by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, That the President be urgently requested to take immediate and positive steps to relieve the present deplorable food situation particularly with a view to preventing further and more serious consequences which are fast developing; and be it further

Resolved, That in an earnest desire to be of assistance to the President in finding the right solution to this problem, we suggest to him:

First. That as authority and responsibility, in the various aspects of food production, processing, allocation and distribution, price and rationing, are now divided among at least six agencies of Government—thereby generating conflicts of authority, confusion in administration, and uncertainty of results—that the President immediately vest in one single agency full authority and responsibility for the production, distribution, and export, including price and rationing, of all food available to the United States.

Second. We suggest further that the President classify food production as an essential war industry and immediately instruct those Federal agencies concerned with manpower, transportation, storage, farm machinery, and fertilizer to so direct the activities of their respective agencies as to give special assistance to the production, processing, storage, and distribution of foods.

The conference by the adoption of the resolution attempts to be constructive. The conference appreciated the deplorable conditions of the food situation of the country and decided that immediate and firm action by the Chief Executive is absolutely necessary if the situation is to be relieved and if future serious consequences are to be averted.

I am sure that it is the sense of the Republican food study committee that the President should act immediately and if he feels that he does not have full authority, this committee will cooperate in the fullest toward the passing of whatever legislation is necessary to give to the President full authority to act.

Under the direction of the Republican food study committee I introduced a bill in the last session of Congress. I have reintroduced the same bill in this session of Congress. That bill would give to the President all the authority he needs to relieve this situation. The late Representative Hampton Fulmer, who was then chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, introduced a bill in the last session of Congress which would have provided the President with ample authority to act to relieve this serious food situation. That bill was sponsored by the Republican food study committee and it was recommended for passage by the Committee on Agriculture. That bill was not reached by the Congress in its consideration. I feel sure it would have been approved by Congress if it had been considered. I have reintroduced the Fulmer bill in this session of Congress. That bill is slightly different from my original bill, but either of these bills will furnish the President with ample authority. Personally, it is my hope that the President will act immediately because the interests of the people demand such action. There is plenty of food in the country if the same is properly distributed. And with proper encouragement the production of food could be greatly increased so that by the coming of next winter we would have sufficient to carry us through in good shape if the same was properly distributed.

Price Increases for the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Granite City (Ill.) Press-Record:

STEEL INDUSTRY IN SERIOUS POSITION UNLESS PRICE INCREASES GRANTED

For the past 4 years steel industry profits have been declining steadily in spite of the fact that its production has been at record levels. This arises from the fact that the industry has been squeezed between substantially increased costs and fixed price ceilings at levels which have been in effect since 1939. Currently more than 70 percent of the carbon

steel products made by the industry are being sold at a loss. The effect on the small semi- and non-integrated steel companies has been most severe and is approaching a point where the financial stability of these companies is in jeopardy. These small companies have been unable to offset losses on carbon steel products with the profits on war products or shipbuilding which have sustained the larger steel companies.

Thus, in spite of record operations, the small steel companies are either in the red at the present time or fast approaching that condition.

Typical of the semi-integrated companies is the Granite City Steel Co., which has been the mainstay of this community for 50 years. For the past 4 years its production and pay rolls have steadily increased, but the results of its balance sheet have shown a downward trend. O. P. A. has been furnished with complete cost and profit data and yet has delayed for months the price increases the steel industry needs to continue operating. Special price relief which O. P. A. previously granted the smaller companies can no longer be counted upon. With the imminence of VE-day and reconversion to civilian steels, no company receiving special price relief could hope to get its share of the business.

The steel industry has made an outstanding contribution to the war effort. It can do the same in peacetime only if its price structure is restored to a sound basis. It can continue steady employment only if its problems are given fair treatment.

It should be remembered that the steel industry has not only had to absorb substantial cost increases over the past 5 years without price adjustment, but the retroactive wage increases granted last December have further severely aggravated the situation.

The administration's goal of 60,000,000 peacetime jobs must take cognizance of the jobs its deflationary price policies are threatening in the steel industry. Only prompt and adequate price action by O. P. A. on an industry-wide basis can help prevent a serious tailspin following VE-day.

We Must Do Better by the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article appearing in the April issue of Harper's magazine, written by Charles G. Bolté, chairman of the American Veterans Committee.

The American Veterans Committee is a group of veterans of the present war whose primary objective is the making of a lasting peace as the only reward worthy of the sacrifice of the veterans of this war. This organization has other objectives as well, similar to those of other veteran organizations. But it is laying primary stress upon this one main objective.

I found the article which follows extremely challenging to my own thinking. I sincerely believe that it is the duty of Congress to examine all the legislation affecting veterans with a view to improving its functioning and its administration, and especially with a view to simplifying and improving the contacts which the individual veterans must make with agencies of the Government in the process of making their readjustment to civilian life.

The article follows:

THE VETERANS' RUNAROUND

(By Charles G. Bolté)

(Mr. Bolté, who lost a leg at El Alamein, is now one of the organizers of the American Veterans Committee.)

The veterans are getting the runaround. More than a million and a half men have already been discharged from the United States armed forces; if their average experience thus far is any criterion of what is ahead, the 12,000,000 yet to be discharged are in for hard times, confusion, and bitter disillusionment.

Comparatively few veterans and servicemen feel that the country owes them a living; most of them, like most civilians, do feel that they should be restored to the status in life they would have held if they had not gone to war. In many cases that restoration to civilian status is not being carried out, despite the loud, unanimous assertions of politicians, bureaucrats, community leaders, social workers, industrialists, and labor chieftains that "nothing's too good for our boys." The loud assertions, the fanfare over the G. I. Bill of Rights, the endless and much-publicized seminars on rehabilitation have all held out a tremendous promise to the returning soldier. But the gap between promise and performance is very wide. And in 12,000,000 veterans who are disillusioned with the promise of democracy there lies a grave potential danger for America.

To a returned serviceman seeking assistance in his readjustment to civilian life, America today looks like the land of good intentions. Everybody wants to help him, but few are capable of giving him what he needs capably, quickly, and without chasing him around from one agency to another. The Veterans' Administration, already looming as the post-war colossus of Government agencies, recognizes no less than 62 separate organizations which deal with the problems of the veteran. He applies at one place for a job, another place for legal advice, another for medical services, another for financial aid. The armed forces, the Federal Government, many communities, the service organizations, industry, the labor unions, and the veterans' organizations are all out to rehabilitate him.

The inevitable result is confusion, overlapping jurisdiction, duplication of effort, and what is in effect competition among these myriad aid societies to see which can do the most good for the veteran—and incidentally reap the most credit for itself. The resultant feeling in many veterans is just as inevitable; they are coming to regard themselves as footballs being kicked around in an exceptionally disorderly game from which the referee has withdrawn.

If the situation is not corrected soon, it is unlikely ever to be corrected—except by overcorrection. In the past we have been able as a nation to appease the war veterans and our own consciences by belated bonuses, pensions, allotments, and grants of a truly astonishing variety. They have always been too little, too late, and too unfairly distributed. This time we may not be allowed the luxury of such an easy out. Placed in an unjust position, a large proportion of our new 12,000,000 veterans may demand their own version of justice. Unless we devise now a democratically planned and ordered method of restoring the veteran to civilian status, we face the real threat of some native demagogue arising with a glib cure-all designed to bring order out of confusion the Fascist way.

II

The simplified organization chart showing the agencies which deal with the veteran's rights and benefits consists of 38 separate boxes, interconnected by a maze of solid and broken lines. A 28-page pamphlet issued by the O. W. I. on the topic had to be checked and cleared by the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Veterans' Administration, the Veterans' Placement Service Board, the Selective Service System, the United States Employment Service, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the American Red Cross. At the top of this agglomeration of bureaus is the Retaining and Reemployment Administration, a branch of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, chief of the huge Veterans' Administration and Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, was appointed chief of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration by the President.

The test of an organization lies not in the simplicity of its administrative chart nor in the degree to which power is concentrated in the hands of a single administrator. It lies in how well its job is done; and for testimony on this, only the men for whom the job is being done are qualified to speak.

They tell tales of red tape, of inadequate counseling, and of insufficient medical care in all parts of the country.

After listening to many such stories, the American Veterans Committee, a new organization comprising both veterans and servicemen of this war, decided to send its veteran members a questionnaire asking what happened to them when they got out of the service. One member expressed the average feeling when he returned his with a note saying, "Sort of painful filling out another questionnaire. You know that's about all a vet gets thrown at him—reams of questions, but who the hell is around to answer a few of Joe's questions about jobs, education, my dough, these-buzzing-ears-of-mine, and how-now-little-man?"

Once dropped by the armed forces, the veteran needs above all else a single information and service center in his home community, where he can find the answers to most of his questions. Although these have been set up in many communities, and talked about in more, they are not yet widely established or widely publicized—several men didn't know whether such a center existed in their home towns. Where none existed, the men usually went to the local Veterans' Administration office. A majority—discharged with the war still on, with jobs easy to find, and knowing what they wanted—got it: advice on education, conversion of life insurance, a job, a disability rating. Others were not so lucky: they were chased from one agency to another, found the Veterans' Administration taking weeks to answer letters, and experienced what one of them described briefly thus: "Information was so confusing that I had to rely on my own inadequate judgment."

Most of these men didn't have jobs to go back to—no problem these days, but what of after the war? (Selective Service estimates that only 25 percent of the men now in service qualify under the rehiring provisions of the Selective Service Act—the other 75 percent came from temporary defense jobs, school or college, or their own enterprises.) Of those who did hold permanent jobs before entering the service, most were restored; some had trouble with their employers on the grounds that they were disabled. Some received advice or assistance from their unions, notably members of the United Automobile Workers-C. I. O.; but most had little help—which is something for the unions, who have had such a bad press

during the war, to ponder over. Those looking for new jobs applied primarily to the United States Employment Service; and although a majority found it helpful, one summed up the minority opinion by saying: "There is too much emphasis put on just getting a job. What about wages, or the kind of job one wants, or—more important—doesn't want? General attitude is that the vet should be glad to get any old job, never minding what the wages, conditions, or anything else are."

The most serious complaints in the field of jobs came from middle-class veterans—professional men, white-collar workers, and the like—the same class which has been hardest hit by a war demanding welders and ship fitters. The United States Employment Service "had absolutely no leads on newspaper jobs," wrote one veteran. "They have nothing in Los Angeles, Washington, or New York for legal or personnel men," wrote another who had tried hard. Lawyers who maintained offices of their own came home to find their practices gone and their offices occupied; doctors and dentists met the same situation. This group faces one of the most difficult readjustment problems; in a situation involving seemingly insuperable legislative questions, they must depend on the loyalty of their clients and the helpfulness of their professional associations for a solution.

III

The Veterans' Administration, currently the most promising bureau for civil servants seeking permanent berths, comes in for the most thorough excoriation by the newly returned servicemen. A majority of veterans responding to the questionnaire were dissatisfied with this organization, mostly because of the red tape which marks all of its activities. One man reported a 7-week silence from the Administration after the Army had submitted his application for a disability compensation. Another went to a veterans' facility—as V. A. hospitals are called, in businesslike fashion—and reported, "If I'd been sick enough I'd have died before they took care of me."

Several were refused admittance to already crowded hospitals. Construction of new veterans' facilities is evidently not keeping up with the increase in the number of disabled veterans, despite large appropriations from Congress for that specific purpose; and instances of over-crowding have been reported from several facilities. The hospitals themselves are often located far from the centers of population. "Hospital too distant from my residence" is a common complaint.

The isolation of V. A. hospitals has more serious consequences than merely making veterans travel inordinate distances for treatment. A prominent physician was recently quoted as saying: "The Veterans' Administration hospitals are in the back-waters of American medicine, where doctors stagnate and where patients who deserve the best must often be satisfied with second-rate treatment." Civilian doctors who have studied the V. A. say that the isolation of the veterans' hospitals from medical schools and research centers cuts them off from the invigorating influence of doctors fresh from the study of new techniques; that research is discouraged; that improvements in medical science are generally introduced late and reluctantly; that the doctors are hampered in the performance of their chief duty—the healing of the sick—by the necessity of filling out forms and pension claims for the very men they are trying to heal; and that the present method of granting disability allowances to psychoneurotic veterans "consists essentially of paying men to remain ill."

These are serious charges, not lightly to be raised at a time when the peace of mind of so many servicemen and their families depends on their faith in the medical services that a grateful Government will provide for the physically and mentally disabled. Yet it is precisely because that faith must be justified that it is necessary to let light and air into the functionings of the Veterans' Administration. A letter recently received by the American Veterans Committee may be in point:

"For nearly 7 years I have been a physician in the Veterans' Administration. * * * Of course we have some physicians here who are capable, progressive, and diligent and who despite the many obstacles give their patients excellent care. * * * By and large the Veterans' Administration is staffed with many lazy, reactionary duds; it is cluttered with paper work which robs too many valuable hours of physicians' and nurses' time from clinical and scientific work; it features a pension business which too often takes precedence over therapeutic considerations; it really hasn't grasped the enormous problems of rehabilitation.

"* * * Blame can be spread everywhere, but many of us feel that the veterans' service organizations are largely at fault. In my 7 years' service with the Veterans' Administration I have often heard the veterans' organizations clamor for more monetary benefits and I have seen them maneuver for special privilege, but I never saw them exert themselves to raise the Veterans' Administration's standards of medical treatment. How come? They surely have no objections to good treatment of their members.

"The service organizations acquire their power from large memberships; they recruit power from large memberships through offers of greater monetary benefits and special privileges. Locally the organizations are constantly appealing cases for higher ratings and trying to force into the hospital their members and prospects. The typical sales talk runs like this: 'We've got the finest doctors in the country in the Veterans' Administration. You come with me and I'll get you in there.'

"Now what has this to do with the standards of medical treatment in the Veterans' Administration? Mainly this: veterans' organizations have most use for docile physicians and executives. Such men have been rewarded with the leading positions in many but not all instances. Many good men have resigned in disgust."

General Hines is a man of irreproachable character, distinguished by his honesty, integrity, and administrative efficiency. The red tape which slows the wheels of the V. A. is an unhappy byproduct of the careful checks on graft and dishonesty he instituted when he took over the Administration after the last war from the scandalous and ineffable Colonel Forbes, who went to Leavenworth for his sins. But honesty, business efficiency and saving the taxpayers' money by penny-wise-pound-foolish methods may not be sufficient where the future well-being of a large segment of the American people is concerned.

IV

How well do the men most directly concerned feel that the return of veterans to civilian life is being handled? A majority of those answering the A. V. C. questionnaire thought it was only fair.

The rehabilitation machinery is set up to do work on a quantitative, not a qualitative basis; as usual, the things needed are coming later than they might have come with wiser planning. There seems little imaginative understanding of the tremendous task that lies ahead; rather there is a widespread willingness to wait and see how things turn out, then adopt stopgap measures. Without a comprehensive community-government program, more public education, more enlightened personnel in the Veterans' Administration, and more emphasis on guidance for the veterans themselves, the situation cannot be materially improved.

Many servicemen and new veterans are sure that a strong new veterans' organization could do much in the way of bringing about these improvements. "Put the vets themselves in charge of their rehabilitation," one wrote. "Not World War I vets." (The feeling is widespread that this war's veterans can handle their own problems better than the last war's veterans, who now appear settled in life; the young men, as usual, would rather be left free to make their own mistakes.) They want more attention paid to the individual veteran and his problems; having freshly escaped from the highly institutionalized armed forces, they are not eager to be steered through still further institutional channels. Finally, they want less delay in the whole process.

The shortage of trained vocational and educational advisers, of guidance experts, and especially of psychiatric social workers is acute—and not much is being done about it. Result: Too much general advice and not enough individual counseling, which could develop the potentialities of men who have lost their self-confidence and sense of direction. The veteran who knows where he's going doesn't need much help; the veteran who comes home more or less disabled, physically or mentally, the veteran who has been in service so long that he feels out of contact with civilian life—these need help. Too often they are not getting it; or, more likely, they are getting the wrong kind.

These things are not going to be settled by the G. I. bill of rights, nor by any other omnibus legislation. As far as the G. I. bill goes, the honeymoon is over; "our boys" in whose name Congress congratulated itself after passing the bill, are finding out that it is not the key to their brave new world. Under its provisions the veteran can resume his education, if he can live on $50 a month; can get the Government to guarantee up to $2,000 of a loan at 4 percent interest to buy a house or a farm or to go into business, if the lending agency thinks he is a good risk; can get up to $20 per week unemployment compensation for up to 52 weeks, if he is unemployed through no fault of his own within 2 years after his discharge or after the end of the war, whichever is later. But the bill was oversold as much more than this. It was presented to the world by Congress, by the American Legion (which wrote it), and by many banks (with an eye on the loan business) in a fanfare of public relations, like a new breakfast food. Consumer reaction has taken a nose dive in proportion as the build-up was gaudy. In actuality, the bill is carelessly worded and, although businesslike, certainly not overgenerous in its provisions. The point is that by building false hopes we store up an inevitable reckoning of disillusionment and bitterness that will prove deeply damaging; whereas if we simply presented the facts of legislation and the rehabilitation program, the servicemen would know what to expect and would be correspondingly strengthened by preparedness.

V

The real needs of the 12,000,000 will be met neither by catch-all legislation nor by the present uncoordinated and disorganized measures taken in the name of rehabilitation. The veteran needs a coherent program which relates national legislation, State legislation, and community action together in a cooperative entity. It will take a congressional investigation to determine the true efficacy of the Veterans' Administration, to eliminate its weaknesses, and to reinforce its strong points. It will take another congressional committee, a Herculean one, to codify the existing Federal laws relating to veterans, which fill an 800-page book. It will take a greatly expanded public education program to inform American civilians as to what their sons and lovers have been through and what

they will need when they come out. The aim of such a program must be to mobilize the resources of each community to the end of making the serviceman's transformation from uniform to civilian clothes as quick and painless as possible.

In the final analysis, only community action will do the job. A rehabilitation program, like a legislative program, is no better than the individuals who administer it; and on the community level are to be found the men and women most intimate with the individual veteran, with his wants for a job, for education, for training, and for personal readjustment.

Bridgeport, Conn., has come closer to a solution than any town I know of. Its community advisory service center is a pleasant house on a hill just above Main Street, which deals not only with veterans but with displaced war workers and occupational migrants—in itself a healthy sign, indicating to the veteran that he is not being fenced off from the rest of society. Seven towns in the Bridgeport area pay all expenses of the center through the United Community and War Fund; its trained professional staff is headed by Dr. Randall B. Hamrick, a member of the Personnel Training Committee of Connecticut's unique and far-sighted Reemployment Commission, which has guided and trained thousands of individuals into useful, skilled jobs.

There are no well-intentioned dogooders in the center; you have to know the language of the trade when a veteran comes in with a problem, and there are 90 subjects—by actual count—on which you might be asked questions. A receptionist routes the veteran or war worker to an educational consultant, an employment consultant, a regional representative of the Veterans' Administration, a representative of Selective Service, a Connecticut reemployment commission man, a Veterans' Administration doctor, or a Veterans' Administration vocational training officer, depending on his needs. If a man must be referred elsewhere, as to the United States Employment Service, for instance, he is referred directly to an individual, not simply to the agency; an appointment is made by telephone while he is sitting there; and the case—which is never referred to as "a case"—is followed up to see that the proper adjustment is made.

Much of the actual adjusting is done by the 26 committees which cooperate with the center—committees of bankers, insurance brokers, manufacturers, social-work agencies, veterans' organizations, and so on. "We're only a coordinator," Dr. Hamrick says. "We're interested in putting other people to work." Their work lies in providing the proper jobs, the proper help on financial matters, the follow through which does most to restore veterans to a useful and productive place in the community. The best testimonial to their success is that the majority of the men who come to the center say they've come because a friend, another veteran, told them to; they are treated neither as charity cases nor as convicts out on parole, but as individuals and normal human beings.

"You can't fence the veteran off in one field," soneone at the center said. "A member of the family laid off his job creates a new problem for the veteran. They're all human beings, and you can't have one-half of the community adjusted and the other half not adjusted."

In essence, this is the true "veterans' problem." There are many individual veterans' problems, but the one overriding veterans' problem is identical with the overriding national problem: How to create a more democratic and prosperous America in a world organized against war. No peace for the Nation means no peace for the veteran who fought to restore peace. Mass unemployment for the Nation means mass unemployment for the veteran who fought for the right to work. Intolerance, discrimination against minorities, inflation, farm foreclosures, factories turning over at half-speed in the Nation—all these plant at home the seeds of that same fascism which the veteran defeated abroad. The number of servicemen and veterans who know these things would astonish the advertising boys who write of mom and blueberry pie. Most of them do not seek a Government handout, nor retirement in an old soldiers' home. They seek the door back to productive civilian life, in a democracy which fulfills its promises, and in which they can make their own futures.

Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, April 15, 1945, commenting on the proposal that Congress arrange its work so that Members may return to their districts periodically to discuss important issues with their constitutents. This proposal was made before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress by our able and distinguished colleague from the Fifth Congressional District of Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS.

As one who in the trying days of the Seventy-seventh Congress was unable to return to my district for this or any other purpose because of the congressional schedule, and as one who in this Seventy-ninth Congress took advantage of the recent brief recess to go to my home district, I say BROOKS HAYS' proposal is sound.

My visit was strenuous. I met and talked with many people, visited many groups and received many delegations. I answered many questions and asked them. But, I returned refreshed in spirit and with the satisfaction that I had provoked study and thought and discussion of the grave problems confronting us.

A well-informed people is the bulwark of our democracy, and a well informed people will usually reach the proper conclusion.

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE

We are glad to learn that Representative BROOKS HAYS' recent appeal to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to give attention to the relations of Congress to the electorate has had its effect. The committee has now undertaken to include this phase of legislative duty in the scope of its study, which is good.

The Arkansas Congressman pointed out in his testimony that the war had kept most of the Members in Washington so much of the time that their opportunities to learn what the folks back home are thinking have been greatly reduced. Such long absences, he contended, might lead to misunderstandings and loss of confidence by constituents in their Representatives.

To offset developments of this sort, he suggests that Congress arrange its work so that Members can make definite plans to visit their districts to answer questions, discuss policies, and revitalize their contacts with their electorates.

This looks like practical democracy of the sort the United States needs. The essence of the title "Representative" is that the individual so selected shall stem from and maintain a continuing contact with the people he represents.

As the Washington Post points out:

"There is much complaint about the influence of special interests, but not much about the contacts between Congressmen and their constituents. The power of the lobbies is likely to be weakened as the influence of the people is increased. Nor can we forget the great responsibility of Congressmen to educate their constituents as to the value of national policies that may not be properly understood in areas distant from Washington."

Mr. HAYS has made a real point. Congress should be streamlined in its representative relations as well as in its internal rules and procedures.

Reemployment of Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, citizens of ward 7 of the Twentieth District in Cleveland, fully cognizant of the sacrifices and hardships endured by the members of the armed forces, have determined to lend every assistance possible to place their returning veterans in suitable employment. This same spirit of helpfulness might well be copied by citizens of other wards and districts throughout the country, who, I am sure, would be willing to assist their returning servicemen during the reconversion period. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following clipping from the Cleveland Press of April 21:

WARD 7 JOB GROUP HOLDS FIRST PARLEY

The more than 300 servicemen registered with Draft Board 7 today have a neighborhood organization which is going to help them get jobs when they return home.

Elected officers of the neighborhood committee, which represents the area within Ward 7, are James Kmiecek, Cleveland Trust Co. foreign-exchange agent, chairman; John T. Bilinski, assistant police prosecutor, vice chairman; and Mrs. Catherine L. Dempsey, chief clerk of Board 7, secretary.

The first meeting of the community group was called last night at Merrick House, 2531 West Eleventh Street, by Thomas F. Latta, chairman of Board 7's reemployment committee. B. C. Seiple, U. S. E. S. director; Commander C. D. Finn, draft official; and Dr. Frank E. August, director of the Veterans' Information Center, addressed the group. The organization of the jobs committee is believed one of the first of its kind in the Nation.

Mr. Justice Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Federal Loan Administrator, now Director of War Mobilization, at a testimonial dinner honoring Hon. Hugo Black, Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, April 3, 1945:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Justice Black, ladies and gentlemen, "Our object was to maintain the will of the majority * * * and of the people themselves. We believed that man was a rational animal endowed by nature with rights, and with an innate sense of justice; and that he could be restrained from wrong and protected in right, by moderate powers, confided to persons of his own choice and held to their duties by dependence on his will. * * * We believed that men, enjoying in ease and security, the full fruits of their own industry, enlisted by all their interests on the side of law and order, habituated to think for themselves, and to follow their reason as their guide, would be more easily and safely governed than with their minds nourished in error * * * vitiated and debased * * * by indigence, ignorance, and oppression. The cherishment of the people then was our principle."

These words, written by Thomas Jefferson to Mr. Justice Johnson in 1823, comprise the philosophical core of Mr. Justice Black's life. "The cherishment of the people" is the principle which has consistently animated and conformed his conduct in public life.

It is fitting and proper that this band of Americans, gathered from every avenue of our national life, should gather to pay tribute to his public services. As legislator and jurist he has been a preeminent tribune of the common man. I am glad to add my voice to this chorus of admiration and gratitude.

Often it seems that public plaudits are reserved for those who court the passing fancy of the hour. Frequently those who simply labor in the vineyards of democracy are left to plow the lonely furrows of public service. They receive too late their just desserts of recognition and gratitude. Then they cannot derive that lift of inspiration which even the most disinterested public servant must necessarily breathe from the appreciation of those for whom he has fought the good fight. Therefore I am especially happy that those of us who have followed the pioneering footsteps of Hugo L. Black have banded together to acclaim his achievements while he can drink from that cup of inspiration.

For some men, yes, even, for some judges, praise might act as an unhealthy opiate. Recently, another distinguished American retired from the public service after several years of especially arduous and thankless devotion in the war effort; and, his retirement was the occasion of much laudatory comment. A friend asked him how he felt about the acclaim. "Oh, praise is all right," was the reply, "so long as you don't inhale it."

Mr. Justice Black's career has been stamped with an inability to inhale either praise or unjust criticism. Without regard to these twin irrelevancies of political life, he has kept resolutely to the course of principle.

This fixed resolution that principle must come first, the disregard of the counsels of expediency, has been one of the outstanding hallmarks of Hugo Black's public life.

Expediency would have counseled him, as a struggling young lawyer, to court the favor of those interests which can offer so many rewards to the talented advocate. Instead, he devoted his growing gifts to the service of the humble.

Expediency would have counseled him, as a young and newly elected Senator, to take at face value the accepted economic and political shibboleths of the twenties, accepting the then prevalent counsels of those who held that all was well in this best of all possible words. Instead, he chose to challenge those shibboleths, and to raise his voice in protest against the injustices and inequalities which rode rampant over our national economy.

Experiency would have counseled him, as a new-robed judge, to take refuge in the dignified anonymity which a lesser man might seek to find on the bench. Instead, he straightway challenged in unequivocal tones many of the widely accepted juristic canons of the day.

No one can contend that Mr. Justice Black has ever feared to own the cause in which his loyalties were enlisted. I recall hearing a friend say of a Kentucky political figure that his contracts ran only for the current fiscal year. But Mr. Justice Black's enlistments have always been for the duration of the war.

If courage and adherence to principle have been the woof of Mr. Justice Black's career, a fierce and undeviating devotion to the common man has been its very warp. As a Senator he was the tribune of the common man, in and out of season. On the bench he has been preeminently the guardian and protector of the basic freedoms of the common man.

Perhaps it may be felt that this devotion is quite natural and logical. Mr. Justice Black himself sprang from the common people. To him, the common man is no mere abstraction—no mere creation of a philosopher's imagination. The daily struggles of the common man—the needs of humble men and women—the aspirations of simple folks—are all a part and parcel of his own experience.

And yet how often have we seen the self-made man who feels that his own success is but a bench mark of individual superiority and vindication of the essential rightness of the process by which he has surpassed his fellow man. With Hugo Black it has been otherwise. His own struggle against adversity, his rise to a position of eminence, was to him but a vindication of his faith in the capacities of the common man. It served constantly to revitalize his dedication to the gospel of equal opportunity.

When Hugo Black first came upon the scene of national affairs, champions of the common man were few and far between. Many of our most respected and prominent leaders, in politics, in business and finance, were convinced that, under the guidance of the so-called best minds, America had entered upon a new era of perpetual prosperity. It was not felt necessary to make legislative provision for the general welfare of the common man. His natural resources were, in many instances, bartered away to private monopoly.

Senator Black did not accept part and parcel the established order of things. He insisted on looking beneath the surface to the underlying realities. He demanded that the people's heritage of natural resources be preserved as a public trust, to be developed in the common interest. This insistence bore fruit in T. V. A. He relentlessly exposed the efforts to pervert the processes of popular government; and this exposure assisted in the passage of corrective legislation. He insisted that no prosperity which did not extend to the very soil itself could long endure; and demanded a greater measure of justice for the man on the farm. He participated in the agricultural legislation of 1933 and the years which followed. At a time when collective bargaining was regarded by many as inconsistent with the American way of life, he insisted upon legislative protection for the rights of men in factory and mine, to associate themselves together for mutual aid and defense of their economic interests. This insistence bore fruit in the labor legislation which is now accepted as the foundation rock of national labor policy. At a time when the abolition of the sweatshop was regarded by many as unconstitutional, Senator Black pioneered in the preparation and introduction of legislation to protect the common man against wages, hours, and working conditions inconsistent with the basic premises of economic democracy. This work bore fruit, in the Fair Labor Standards Act, which bears his name, and which alone would have earned for him the grateful remembrance of all humble folk who live by toil and sweat.

There is a Chinese proverb that he who lights a candle is better than he who curses the darkness. In all his public life Hugo Black has never contented himself with cursing the darkness of social injustice, economic inequalities, special privileges, or deviations from the essence of democracy. Rather, he has struggled always to light the candle of constructive action, casting the light of correction into the dark corners of our national life.

It is the unfortunate fate of most of us to have the range of our interests and the boundaries of our capacities fixed in early manhood. Experience and time may add unto us skill and judgment, but for most of us the range of possible achievement is determined in the earlier years. With a few fortunate men, this is not so. With them there seems to persist a dynamic quality, a faculty for growth which consists not merely in realizing the promise of youth but in developing newer and wider horizons. Such a man was Lincoln, whose earlier years held little of the promise so richly realized in the hour of supreme national crisis. Such a man was George W. Norris, who recreated so much of the essence of Lincoln's mind and spirit. At 80 years of age, when most men may with justice and honor live in the triumphs of the past, George Norris was blazing thoroughfares.

Such a man is Mr. Justice Black. As a legislator he constantly widened his horizons. And yet, at a time when most men begin to think of resting on the laurels of past achievement, he took on the burdens of a wholly new task, bringing to high judicial office the same intense devotions and the same capacity for unremitting labor which had distinguished his legislative career.

Only a few terms of Court were necessary to bring to the bar the realization that here was an authentic talent—a lucid intellect and a disciplined craftsmanship harnessed to the purposes of creative judicial democracy. Within the limitations of the judicial process—and none is more scrupulous to observe those limitations than Mr. Justice Black—his craftsmanship and intellect were propelled by the same democratic purposes which motivated his senatorial career. For him the Constitution, statutes, and common law are all charters of dynamic freedom for the common man, are all organic testaments of a democratic ideal.

And so tonight we honor him as one who has in two careers distinguished himself as a witness and a warrior for the democracy of the common man.

It is especially appropriate that these ceremonies should take place under the auspices

of a Southern Conference for Human Welfare. A passion for human welfare is woven like a thread through Hugo Black's entire life.

Likewise, he has been a preeminent southerner. Every man is the product of his environment, and even those of us who live somewhat closer to the Mason and Dixon's line like to believe that the South cannot fail to leave her imprint on any of her sons. Least of all has it failed to leave its imprint on Hugo Black. He has ever been conscious of his South—of her special social and economic problems, of her peculiar political traditions, of her sensitive and self-conscious pride.

And yet he has never been provincial. He has realized and led in helping his fellow-southerners to realize that the South cannot fulfill her destiny in isolation or in withdrawal from the destiny of the Nation. Rather, he has struggled to obtain for the South a fuller participation in the benefits of the American heritage and a fuller opportunity to contribute to the enlargement and enrichment of that heritage.

Thus, he has transcended the limitations of sectionalism and established himself as an unmistakably southern but genuinely national statesman.

Those, then, are the fixed stars in Mr. Justice Black's intellectual and moral firmament—a resolute and inflexible adherence to principle; an undeviating devotion to the welfare of man as the hub of the democratic universe; a constant widening of interests, sympathies, and horizons; and a realization that democracy, if she is to thrive, must transcend the provincial boundaries of State or section—or indeed any boundaries less wide than those of humanity itself.

Such are the qualities out of which has been compounded the amalgam of an already distinguished career.

Tonight we bear witness, by our presence here, that Mr. Justice Black is already a cherished asset in the heritage of freedom. He is an asset with many years ahead in which to increase his value. And as we offer him our acclaim and our encouragement to persevere in the course he has set for himself, we draw from him inspiration for the challenging tasks of the future, a future which we shall win only if we highly resolve, as Mr. Justice Black has always highly resolved "to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Polish Deadlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Star of April 24, entitled "Polish Deadlock":

POLISH DEADLOCK

It is regrettable that the San Francisco Conference—barring a last-minute reconciliation of views—should have to open under the cloud of what seems to be a deadlock in the Polish negotiations.

The extent of the unsettling influence which will result from the disagreement among the three great powers on the Polish issue remains to be determined. It should not and probably will not cause a breakdown of the security discussions. But at a time when there is need for the greatest confidence and unity, it cannot fail to be a disturbing factor—a continuing source of concern to those men who are striving earnestly toward the goal of lasting peace and a ready-made foundation upon which the obstructionists can build.

It has been said, and it is perfectly true, that the essential condition of international security in the post-war world will consist of the ability of the United States, Russia, and Britain to work together. There will be differences among them, of course, but if these nations can establish a working relationship based upon mutual confidence and a close identity of interest the outlook for a long period of stable peace will be good. On the other hand, if this relationship cannot be established among the Big Three, it is hardly conceivable that any agrement made at San Francisco can contribute much to the peace of the world.

This is why the Polish question assumes so much importance. It provides the first real test of the capacity of the Big Three to agree on a controversial matter, and it also tests their willingness to abide by the letter and the spirit of an agreement once it has been made. For these reasons it is to be hoped that the Polish discussions will be renewed at San Francisco, as the White House forecasts, and that a settlement will be reached. Otherwise, the area of disagreement is almost certain to grow, regardless of anything that the delegates of the United Nations may put down on paper in the next few weeks.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—with authority to cut tariff rates—no doubt will soon be before the House for consideration, I believe it desirable that we have the benefit of the opinion of responsible persons from every section of this country.

Today, I submit an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, one of the great papers of the Middle West, published in Wheeling, W. Va., and edited by Thomas O'B Flynn. You will find his editorial very interesting:

IF A LOWER TARIFF IS GOOD, WHY ISN'T NO TARIFF BETTER?

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with authority to cut tariff rates another 50 percent, "would give the rest of the world a tangible proof that we mean what we say about joining with other nations in working toward a more prosperous and more secure world," Secretary Stettinius told the House Ways and Means Committee the other day.

Now, it seems to us that if we are going to give examples we should make them full-bodied, striking examples. If it's a good example to cut our tariff in half again, why wouldn't it be a much better example to wipe the tariff out altogether?

If it's a matter of proving our good faith and showing an example, let's do it right. Let's scrap all this burdensome machinery of trade trading, of lopping the tariff here and there piecemeal. Let's say boldly that on and after June 30 next, there will be no tariff at all, no trade restriction of any kind imposed by the United States. Every country will be free to send as much of whatever it has to sell to this country, enter it duty-free, and take its chances of disposing of it on the American market.

Why not?

If the argument the administration and the lay supporters of its trade policy make about increasing prosperity and good will through the less obstructed flow of trade is sound, why isn't it ideal to remove all obstructions and make the flow completely unrestricted? And why, if it is up to us to set an example, and if we would be, as argued, the chief beneficiaries of such a policy, don't we make it, as above suggested, a real example?

Which brings us to a curious and significant political fact.

Not a single one of the foreign-trade enthusiasts of the New Deal era, not a single critic of the Republican protective-tariff policy, ever yet has proposed free trade.

Why not?

It is reasonable to conclude that if they haven't proposed free trade they don't believe in free trade.

If they don't believe in free trade they must believe in protection. For there can be no other reason for a tariff. They must believe that the United States cannot safely open up its market to unrestricted competition with products from abroad.

If this be true—and we submit the evidence in support of this premise is overwhelming—their whole case falls to the ground.

It is no longer an argument between the rival economic theories of protection and free trade.

It becomes merely a question of how much protection.

Which brings us back to this newspaper's basic position:

That we need no cumbersome machinery for the negotiation of trade agreements; that all we need is a simple tariff policy of imposing flexible duties as changing conditions suggest, designed to equalize selling costs on the American market between every domestic product and its imported counterpart, whatever its origin. Where there is no competition, no tariff. Where there is competition, an equalizing duty, no more, no less.

It's as simple as that.

Joint Army-Navy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, last December two boys out of a family of five boys in the service from Johnsonburg, Pa., my district, were killed in action, within a week. I took this matter up with the War Department relative to placing the remaining boys of the family in noncombatant service feeling that where two boys in any one family were killed in action was a great sacrifice.

The War Department, Maj. Gen. Stephen G. Henry and Secretary of War Stimson, advised me they had certain

definite policies on matters of this nature, however, they would take it under consideration.

I want to advise the Members of the House that this policy has now been changed and I am inserting in the RECORD a news release of the War Department for the information of the Members.

I am gratified that the Secretary of War has seen fit to change the War Department policies on a matter of this kind.

JOINT ARMY-NAVY STATEMENT

The War and Navy Departments have long recognized the sacrifice entailed when a family suffers the loss of successive members as war casualties. To lessen the risk of additional sacrifice by such families, a policy has been adopted to assign remaining members who are in the armed forces, to nonhazardous duty. It is estimated that approximately 10,000 individuals in both services will be affected. This is an extension of the previous "sole surviving son" policy.

Specifically the policy will apply when it is established that two or more members of an immediate family group while serving in the armed forces in this war have been killed, died as a result of wounds, accident, or disease, or been reported as missing in action or as prisoners of war.

The remaining members of such a family who are in the armed forces will be assigned to nonhazardous duty upon request of the serviceman concerned or a member of his immediate family. This may mean duty in the rear area of an active theater, duty in an inactive theater, or duty in the United States. A remaining member who is the sole surviving child or sole surviving son will in every case be retained in or returned to the United States for permanent assignment.

Cases under this policy must be brought to the attention of the Army or Navy by a member of the immediate family or the serviceman concerned.

Cases which have been previously submitted and denied under the "sole surviving son" policy should be resubmitted if consideration is desired under the new and broader policy.

Requests under this policy should be submitted to The Adjutant General, Washington, D. C., for those persons in the Army of the United States and to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, and Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Washington, D. C., as appropriate, for those persons in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The person making the application should furnish the name and relationship to the writer of all persons in the immediate family. For those members in the armed forces the grade, serial number, organization, and station assignment should be included. For those members lost in the present war the grade, serial number, last organization, and station and available information as to death, capture, or missing status is necessary. Full and complete information will be of great assistance to the departments in taking necessary action and no action can be taken unless a request is started by a member of the family concerned or the serviceman himself.

A Nonpolitical Appraisal of Our Postwar Trade Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the "bloodless verdict of the market place" is usually a sound yardstick for measuring political ballyhoo. A market place appraisal of postwar trade prospects is found in Barron's National Financial Weekly for April 23.

The contrast between this nonpartisan report and the rainbow painting of Bretton Woods and tariff-cutting advocates is enlightening.

America will serve her own people and the word best if the people of America understand honestly the problems we are facing. Here is Barron's forecast:

FOREIGN TRADE

The administration continues its drive for tariff-cut powers designed to stimulate postwar foreign trade, apparently with no consideration of the fact that there will be little real trade to stimulate. For years to come, normal exchange of goods and services will be practically impossible except with the Latin-American countries and—within the limitations set by the imperial preference system—with the British Dominions. Exports to other areas will be largely at the cost of a further rise in our national debt. Those areas will, by and large, purchase from us with the help of whatever credits we decide to grant. A few nations will be able to use their gold to buy essential food and machinery.

Wherever Germany's industrial capacity has not been turned to rubble, Allied control of her war potential will eliminate the enterprises on which she used to depend for most of her exports.

Russian use of German labor will have tremendous social and economic implications, not least of which will be destruction of that labor's ability to buy abroad. Most of Continental Europe has been so drained of machines and materials and faces such political turmoil that large-scale mutual trade with us is hard to envisage. For that matter, the whole Eurasian Continent presents the same cheerless prospect.

China's poverty is well known and Japan will be in the same case as Germany, if not worse. India's frozen sterling balances in London will force her to buy from the United Kingdom. As for Russia, her post-war industrialization program will leave little for exports. What she does buy from us will have to be paid for in gold of the proceeds of long-term credits.

Great Britain will also take relatively little from us except on credit, at least in the initial stages of her reconstruction. Subsequently, to help pay her debts and regain some of her world commercial position, she will have to become a keen competitor for what export trade is available.

Two Questionnaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two questionnaires, one coming from the O. P. A. office in Baltimore, Form No. 653–40, which was evidently sent out with the idea that the small businessmen of this country have nothing to do except to fill in questionnaires.

Many of the questions in this form are absurd and ridiculous, and I venture the opinion that the answers will never be classified or used for any useful purpose.

The second questionnaire is from the Department of the Interior, and is an insult to the small businessmen of our Nation, threatening them with criminal prosecution, fine, and imprisonment. If I had the power, I would fire whoever prepared this questionnaire before sundown.

It is just too bad that the small businessmen of our country, with either no, or more inefficient, labor, should be compelled to spend so much time answering these useless, annoying questionnaires, which can be of no assistance to anyone. I include the questionnaires in question, as follows:

O. P. A. Form 653-40 (Rev. 1-45)

Budget Bureau No. 08-R610.3
Approval expires September 30, 1945

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

DETERMINATION OF MAXIMUM PRICES FOR SOLID FUELS SOLD BY DEALERS

This form must be filed each time maximum prices are determined or redetermined under rule 1 of section 1340.254 of Revised Maximum Price Regulation Number 122.

Name of company

Address—Number and street

City, postal zone number, State

TO BE MAILED TO YOUR DISTRICT OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS

Column 1: Define by type of customer and method of sales, i. e., "Domestic delivered to bin," "Commercial delivered," "Industrial delivered," etc. Your discounts for yard sales, if any, should be reported as item 4 on page 2.

Column 2: Give the name under which the coal was sold to you, for example, "Pocahontas egg," "East Kentucky lump," "Penn anthracite stove and nut," "Byproduct coke," etc.

Columns 3, 4, 5, and 6: These items will be found on the invoice from your supplier. For column 3, specify the size group number or the screen size dimensions.

Column 7: Enter for each kind and size of solid fuel the highest cost to you during December 1941 before discounts, allowances, or service or treatment charges, and excluding freight costs. Do not include any oil or chemical treatment charge. If no such solid fuels were purchased in December 1941, use the first preceding month in which the solid fuel was purchased.

Column 8: Enter your supplier's present maximum price before discounts, allowances, or service or treatment charges. Supplier means the person from whom you purchase your coal.

Column 9: State the freight rate per net ton (2,000 pounds) followed by "R" if the coal is obtained via railroad, "T" if via truck, "V" if via vessel, or "B" if via barge.

Column 10: Enter your highest selling price in December 1941 for this type of sale before discounts, allowances, or service or treatment charges.

Column 11: Enter present maximum selling price for this type of sale before discounts, allowances, or service or treatment charges.

	Type of sale (1)	Name and kind of solid fuel (2)	Size and origin of coal: Size (3)	Size and origin of coal: Name of producer or distributor (4)	Size and origin of coal: Producing district number (5)	Size and origin of coal: Mine index number (6)	F. o. b. supplier's shipping point: Highest purchase cost December 1941 (7)	F. o. b. supplier's shipping point: Supplier's current maximum price (8)	Present freight rate per net ton (2,000 pounds) (9)	Dealer's highest selling price per ton: December 1941 (10)	Dealer's highest selling price per ton: New maximum selling price (11)
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											

If more space is necessary attach additional sheets using the above column headings

Enter in the appropriate spaces below the charges and discounts made in December 1941, if any were made. Indicate by reference to line number to which of the sales described on the other side of this form these discounts and charges apply. If all, so indicate. (If these have been modified since the base period by O. P. A. order, enter only your present charges and discounts and state the O. P. A. order number in the space labeled "additional information.")

1 a Are the prices listed on the other side of the report based on one-ton sales? Yes ☐ No ☐

b If "No," state on what size sale they are based

Line No. (page 1)	Size of sale (i. e., 3, 5, etc., tons, load lots, carload lots)

2 a Indicate how prices for sales in fractions of a ton are computed (i. e., one-half-ton price equals one-half the ton price plus 25 cents). If the standard unit is more than one ton, indicate how prices for sales in quantities of less than the standard unit are computed.

Line No. (page 1)	One-fourth ton	One-half ton	Other (specify)

b List prices for coal sold by the pound in bulk or bagged

BULK

Line No. (page 1)	Per Lbs.	Per Lbs.

BAGGED (specify weight of bag)

Line No. (page 1)	Yard price to consumer	Yard price to reseller	Delivered price to reseller

3 Specify discounts per ton for sales in larger quantities than the standard unit

Line No. (page 1)	Discount per ton (specify size of sale)

4 Discounts per ton for yard sales to:

Domestic consumers	Resellers

5 Specify the cash discounts per ton allowed

Line No. (page 1)	Time of payment	Discount

6 Charges for special services (if charges are made on hourly basis, specify rates per hour)

Service	Per ton	Other quantities
Carrying from curb to bin		
Carrying up or down stairs		
Wheeling from curb to bin		
Trimming		
Other		

7 Other special charges

Oil or chemical treatment

Extra long haul (if you have a regular schedule of hauling charges for deliveries to other localities, attach a copy to this form)

Other (specify)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

I certify that the information contained herein is true and correct.

Sign here _____
(Name of company official)

_____
(Title) (Date)

STABLE WARTIME PRICES PROTECT YOU AND YOUR CUSTOMER

O. P. A. Form 653-40 (Rev. 1-45) back.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington.

TITLE 30, MINERAL RESOURCES—CHAPTER VI, SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR—PART 602, GENERAL ORDERS AND DIRECTIVES

AMENDMENT 1 TO S. F. A. W. REVISED REGULATION NO. 5

To correlate the provisions of S. F. A. W. revised regulation No. 5 with the provisions of S. F. A. W. regulations No. 26 and No. 28, it is necessary to amend it as follows:

1. Paragraphs (d) and (e) of section 602.81 are amended to read as follows:

"(d) 'Wholesaler' means any producer to the extent that he ships, distributes, or sells anthracite to retail dealers or over-the-road truckers, and any person to the extent that he receives or purchases anthracite for shipment, distribution, or resale to retail dealers or over-the-road tuckers.

"(e) 'Retail dealer' means any person (including the retail outlet, branch, or department of one who is also a producer, wholesaler, or lake or tidewater dock operator) to the extent that he distributes anthracite in any transaction, except a transaction between a wholesaler and an over-the-road trucker involving the disposal of anthracite physically handled in a truck, wagon, or other less-than-carload facility, without regard to quantity or frequency of delivery."

2. Wherever the year "1944" appears in paragraph (a) of section 602.83, it is amended to read "1945." Wherever the year "1945" appears in said paragraph (a), it is amended to read "1946."

3. The date "April 1, 1944" appearing in paragraph (b) of section 602.83 is amended to read "April 1, 1945."

4. The words "90 days' supply" appearing in section 602.84 are amended to read "60 days' supply."

5. In appendix A, "Bureau of the Budget No. 42-R706" is amended to read "Bureau of the Budget No. 42-R706.1." "Approval expires April 30, 1945" is amended to read "Approval expires April 30, 1946." Wherever the year "1944" appears in appendix A, it is amended to read "1945" and wherever the year "1945" appears in said appendix A, it is amended to read "1946."

6. Appendix B is amended to read as follows:

APPENDIX B TO SFAW REVISED REGULATION NO. 5

Bureau of the Budget No. 42-R705.1
Approval Expires April 30, 1946.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR
WASHINGTON

Date _____

Name of dealer _____

Address _____ City _____ State _____

TONNAGE OF ANTHRACITE DELIVERED FOR USE ONLY IN POULTRY BROODERS AND HATCHERIES

Apr. 1, 1942, to Mar. 31, 1943		Apr. 1, 1943, to Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 1, 1945, to date of filing		Producer or wholesaler who supplied such tonnage
Nut	*Pea*	*Nut*	*Pea*	*Nut*	*Pea*	

Did you file a Form S. F. A. No. 29 setting forth tonnages of excluded deliveries made during the base period and commitments to be excluded during the period April 1, 1943 to March 31, 1944? _____
(Yes or No)

I certify to SFAW that the statements contained herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I make this certification with knowledge that if I make any false statement or representation herein I am subject to criminal prosecution under the laws of the United States and that I may be prohibited from receiving any further shipments or deliveries of solid fuels.

_____
(Signature)

_____
(Title)

PENALTIES FOR MISREPRESENTATION

Any person making a false statement or representation on this form is subject to criminal prosecution and upon conviction is subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or 10 years' imprisonment, or both.

This amendment shall take effect 12:01 a. m. on April 1, 1945.

(E. O. 9332, 8 F. R. 5355; E. O. 9125, 7 F. R. 2719; sec. 2 (c) 54 Stat. 676, as amended by 55 Stat. 236, 56 Stat. 176 and 58 Stat. 872.)

Issued this 2nd day of April 1945.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Solid Fuels Administrator for War.

Military Service by 18-Year-Old Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me recently to the Under Secretary of War:

APRIL 24, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There is no disposition on my part to control the conduct of the war. I am not even suggesting any material deviation from policies already in effect. Nevertheless, I have had justifiable complaints from my district regarding the policy of putting 18-year-old men into the battle lines without adequate mental or physical preparation.

Under date of December 8, 1944, the War Times carried the announcement reported from your press conference that under no circumstances would a man be sent into an active overseas sector without a period of 8 months intervening between his induction and going into combat.

Some instances have come to my attention where this policy has been violated. I have in mind a specific case from my State where an 18-year-old boy was informed, while still in basic training, that he would go overseas immediately upon the completion of his 15 weeks' basic course. While the boy was in fine physical condition, he did not believe that he had received adequate training and accordingly discussed this point with his father. The latter, being fully informed of your press conference and the December news release, assured his son that he would not be sent into combat without 8 months' training because the War Department could be depended upon to abide by its publicly expressed policy.

However, this boy was immediately sent overseas and was but 2 weeks in a replacement pool in France before being sent into combat. Within a week from the time of going into the front line outfit he was killed. It seems to me that there is no excuse for sending these men into combat without the training that had been promised, and especially is there no excuse for not frankly telling them what they are facing.

I respectfully request that the policy of the War Department be adjusted to conform to the December announcement. Many boys at 18 have just finished their high-school course and are not physically nor mentally equipped to enter into the rigors of active warfare without a more adequate preparation than some of them have received.

Respectfully,

JAMES I. DOLLIVER.

Constitution as a Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as the opening day of the great San Francisco Conference is at hand the people of America are deeply concerned with the objectives which bring together this cosmopolitan mixture of citizens from all over the world. It is a great effort in a new direction. The task will not be easy, but it is tangible evidence of intellectual minds trying to find a way to stop wars. We must, under all circumstances, as we think of this gathering, bear in mind that delegates

here assembled represent the bloodstreams of many continents, and should they not in this preliminary event fit together all of the phases essential to a well-organized family of nations of the globe, let us have the beginning here and let time play its part in the days that follow.

I ask for unanimous consent to include herewith an editorial so ably expressing this phase of the Conference taken from the Bismarck Tribune under date of April 18, the author of which is Kenneth W. Simons:

CONSTITUTION AS A MODEL

Nearly 30 years after the Constitution of the United States was written and submitted to the States, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the Ark of the Covenant—too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human."

That reverence which Jefferson noted has grown through the years. Today we are inclined to be forgetful of the Constitution's early history and of the amendments which we have seen fit to make in it. Because the Constitution is great and impregnable today, we sometimes talk as if it had been conceived in harmony and born in triumphant strength and full-blown perfection.

So we should be vigilant against demanding the same impossible perfection of the document that will issue from the San Francisco Conference. And perhaps it will increase that vigilance if we review a little further some of the circumstances of the Constitution's birth.

The structure of free representative government explicit in its final form was the fruit of expediency as well as idealism. Smaller States, bucking control by New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the Big Three—and how modern that sounds—won such compromise victories as proportional representation in the House and the popular vote for presidential electors by threatening to walk out of the convention.

The Constitution was presented to the people with considerable fear. Some of the delegates went home before the job was done. Three who remained refused to sign the document. Others were reluctant. Ellbridge Gerry thought it would provoke a civil war. Jefferson, in Europe, was astonished that it contained no guaranty of basic human rights.

At first the Constitution found its support among the rich, and its opposition from the poor and a handful of rich, "visionary" champions of democracy. The series of Federalist papers by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay helped greatly in swinging popular opinion. But even so, Rhode Island, which had refused to send delegates to the Convention, waited 3 years before ratifying the Constitution.

The point is that the Constitution has grown more democratic, stronger, and more effective with the passing years. Today, thanks to the Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments, it stands before the world as a paragon of political right and wisdom, however short we may fall of fulfilling its letter and spirit.

The moral of this short refresher course is obvious. The San Francisco Conference, also sailing an uncharted course, is bound to produce an imperfect plan. By refusing it we should have nothing to take its place. By accepting and amending and improving it we can look with confidence toward a world in which men may live out their lives in peace.

Postal Clerks Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 21, 1945:

POSTAL CLERKS NEED HELP

According to the information furnished us there has been no increase in the pay of postal clerks for 20 years. They are now getting the benefit of an emergency subsidy of $300 per year, but the base pay remains the same. A bill sponsored by THOMAS G. BURCH, chairman of the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, provides that every regular post-office clerk and every special clerk will receive on July 1, 1945, an increase of $400 in base pay.

There are more than a dozen other provisions in the bill designed to benefit the clerks. Congress may have the notion that the bill goes beyond reason in some particulars. It would take time to figure out the propriety of awarding all that the clerks ask, but certainly there can be no objection to an increase of $300 in the base pay. Let the other provisions be threshed out in committee, but let justice be done to those faithful and hard-working employees.

Postal jobs require skill and intelligence. Money orders, stamp sales, air mail, parcel post, handling of star and rural routes, and the dispatch of the mail to have all the time possible require good judgment and expert handling. These jobs are several grades above that of manual labor. They involve much responsibility. This kind of help will not be available if it be underpaid. There are other drafts on the salaries for which allowance should be made. One of these is the 5-percent deduction for retirement.

There is a great difference between the earnings status of a postal employee now and what it was 20 years ago. There is the increased cost of living due to the war. There are deductions for war taxes. There are War bonds to buy and insurance to keep up. Everything is up from where it was two decades ago.

The Burch bill, No. 2071, deserves immediate action by Congress. Something must be done for the clerks and carriers before this service so valuable to the public breaks down through a serious help shortage.

Guts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story which was in the New York Sun of April 18, 1945, under The Sun Dial by Mr. H. I. Phillips. This story was brought to my attention by Mr. Charles J. Tobin, counselor at law, of Albany, N. Y., in the interest of a boy whom his family knows quite well. Mr. Tobin feels that the story should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of some of those who complain about Government regulations.

GUTS

To home fronters, all too easily disturbed by trifles and too ready to kick, the following letter is recommended. It is from Lt. Bob Hardart, son of Gus Hardart, of the Horn & Hardart Co., from a hospital in France:

"DEAR DAD: First of all, I want you to know that I am cheerful and looking forward to getting home and learning to lead a new kind of life.

"Now, I'll tell you what happened to me, so kind of brace yourself:

"My legs were badly wounded, but in time will be as good as new. I lost my right arm just below the elbow. Just now I can't see. But the eye doctor says there is a slight chance they can make me see in time.

"However, I am not counting on that too much because I have a feeling I will remain this way.

"Well, there's the story. I hated to tell you, but I know you would want to know. For gosh sakes, don't feel sorry for me. If you could see me here in the hospital with all the fun I am having, kidding with the nurses and talking with the swell visitors we have, you would say, 'There is nothing wrong with that guy. Send him back to duty.'

"I've got a heck of a lot to live for, plus my faith.

"Say, I'm running overtime, so I'm sending all my love. You can believe me when I say I am happy and contented and have great faith and hope in my future.

"Lovingly,

"BOB."

Security Delegate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing on April 18, 1945, in the Washington Post. This editorial raises the problem of the authority to be given our delegate to an international peace agency and points out dangers which my bill, House Joint Resolution 131, would eliminate.

SECURITY DELEGATE

For the present we think that the duties of the American delegate to the proposed Security Council are less important than creation of the Council. With the San Francisco Conference still before us, first attention must necessarily be given to the structure and operation of the international peace agency itself. Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has again raised the problem of the American delegate, however, and it may properly be considered along with the larger issue.

Senator CONNALLY is undoubtedly right in saying that our delegate to the Council must

be given "power to act in all cases of emergency." The voting arrangement in the council agreed upon at Yalta has removed the only serious objection to the use of police forces through executive action. Military's sanctions will be applied only when there is unanimous agreement among the big powers and acquiescence by two smaller powers represented on the Council. In our opinion routine policing of this type can be entrusted to the President and the delegate without fear of encroaching upon the power of Congress to declare war.

Senator CONNALLY'S talk last week raises one question, however, that will bear much discussion. While speaking of the broad powers to be granted our delegate, he said that he would not object to a provision in the statute to create that position requiring the delegate to consult with the President before voting on any question involving the use of force. This seems to imply that he would make the delegate independent of the President—that the delegate could consult with the Chief Executive and then vote in the Council as he chose. We can think of no more dangerous diffusion of power.

Of course, the power to make these decisions as to the use of our forces to keep the peace must remain in the President himself. The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief and only the Commander in Chief can order American forces into action. Consultation there should be. But it should be in the nature of the delegate getting instructions from the President, not advice that he would be free to accept or reject. Otherwise, we should create a two-headed system that could lead only to chaos.

The most difficult problem, we think, is in providing for consultation between the President and Congress on these problems. Even though responsibility for control of our peace forces will be in the hands of the President, he will want to ascertain the views of Congress to avoid misunderstanding and unnecessary friction. Representative KOPPLEMANN has introduced a bill providing that our delegate could pledge the United States to the use of armed forces through the Security Council after such consultation as may be practicable with the President, the Secretary of State and the chairmen of the Senate and House committees dealing with foreign affairs.

If Congress were properly organized, such discussions would naturally center in a legislative cabinet or council. If no centralization of legislative power is achieved by the present move to reorganize Congress, it may be necessary to create a special council of legislators to consult with the President on foreign policy. Certainly some mechanism to keep the two branches working together in this field is desirable. In our opinion, the efforts of Congress should be directed toward this objective and not toward setting up a delegate to the council who would be independent of presidential control.

Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit an original poem written by a well-known citizen of Iowa, Mr. John S. Stamps, prominent farmer, educator and poet of southern Iowa. He has defined money in a few short verses and gives his conception of the evils of manipulating the flow of currency. The poem is as follows:

MONEY

Money? The "root of all evil"
Not only that but the tool
Used to deceive wise men
As well as to fleece the poor fool!

Money? A "measure of value"
That changers shrink or expand
As suits their pleasure or profit
And makes wealth theirs to command!

Money? The blood stream of business
That freely must flow for good health
But is so controlled and diverted
That mostly a few get the wealth!

Money? The pea of the shell game
That "slickers" shuffle so well
You bet them your farm you can find it
And find you have only the shell!

Money? The Dillinger's loot sack
That you with your chattels must fill
His machine gun, a mortgage, points at you
You know it will riddle and kill!

Money? That trust so sacred
By the fathers on Congress laid
But by them given over to bankers
Leaving the people betrayed!

Money? The base for a "racket"
The greatest the world ever saw
By which the people are plundered
By "changers" protected by law!

Money? The devil's own magic
That devils on earth here employ
To wreck and ruin and ravish
To damn and deceive and destroy!

—*J. S. Stamps.*

SEYMOUR, IOWA.

Truman Takes Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Hon. Robert L. Kern which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on Tuesday, April 17, 1945.

Mr. Kern is an astute political observer. The son of the late Hon. Fred J. Kern, a former Member of this House, he has followed in his distinguished father's footsteps as one of the most prominent publishers in the State of Illinois.

The editorial follows:

TRUMAN TAKES OVER

It is not without significance that President Harry S. Truman's first formal pronouncement on public policy was made in the form of an address to Congress.

Neither is it without significance that the reception accorded him by that body upon his appearance was an ovation every bit as great as any given other Presidents on similar occasions.

It is also worth noting that on President Truman's very first day in office he visited the Capitol and conferred with the leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives.

His address yesterday consisted in the main of his expressed determination, with the support of Congress and the American people, to continue waging the war relentlessly until the enemy submits to unconditional surrender and those guilty of the conflict and its atrocities are hunted down and brought to justice.

He inferred, with no mistaking his meaning, that no neutral nation would be permitted to give the guilty ones a refuge.

Our new President made it plain that he was not one of those who hold that wars from time to time are inevitable, but rather that he entertains the firm belief that a lasting peace can be had through the medium of a United Nations organization.

"The duty of the great states," he said, "is to serve and not to dominate the world. We have learned to fight with other nations and now we must learn to live with other nations."

Any hopes that Germany and Japan may have had that America would fall out of step, if only for a little while, during the change in leadership was most certainly dispelled in yesterday's speech.

Mr. Truman promised there would be no change in our military policy or military leadership.

He reiterated the earlier statement that he would largely retain Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet and would do his utmost to carry on the Government as his predecessor would have wished.

Following his opening sentences, a touching eulogy on the fallen President, he said: "He [Mr. Roosevelt] looked forward and moved forward; that is what America will do."

This is in accord with the Nation's tradition.

As far back as 1865, Andrew Johnson took over Lincoln's Cabinet and Lincoln's policies.

Theodore Roosevelt did the same thing when McKinley was assassinated, and Coolidge adhered to the rule when Harding died.

In ordinary times and with ordinary Presidents such a transition causes no marked difficulty.

There was no disturbance of the even tenor of our prosperity when Theodore Roosevelt succeeded McKinley.

Mr. Coolidge easily gave us the same sort of normalcy which Mr. Harding had promised.

But in extraordinary times and with the passing of an extraordinary President, a change is not such a routine affair.

Both in 1865 and today a President of unknown quantity steps into the picture.

As their first acts both Andrew Johnson and Harry Truman pledged themselves to carry out the policies of their dead leaders.

Both men were sincere and possessed the best intentions, but let us hope the parallel stops there.

On the day of Lincoln's death, when the Nation was prostrate with grief, little men in Washington got together and started scheming how they could undo Lincoln's program.

For years Congress and northern business interests had been restive under the wartime powers of President Lincoln, and now was their chance to do to Johnson what they had not dared to do to Old Abe.

To their surprise they found that Johnson was an honest man who meant what he said about carrying out Lincoln's policies.

There are still Copperheads in Congress, industry, and journalism today, and they, too, will discover that Harry Truman is also honest and sincere in what he says.

There is little doubt but that they, like their counterparts of Johnson's day, will try to gang up to ruin him and the Roosevelt program.

They made Johnson's name a thing for ridicule, and lost the peace Lincoln had fought to win.

The Nation still bears the scars of that reconstruction period.

Let us hope for our sake, and the world's sake, that Harry Truman is given the chance

denied Andrew Johnson by power-hungry Congress and profit-hungry industry and a hate-inoculated press.

These are extraordinary times and Franklin Roosevelt was an extraordinary President.

It is clear, therefore, that the change in the White House will put a strain on our public machinery and a strain on all of us.

There is no reason, however, to be discouraged.

It is well to look facts in the face and take account of all the unhappy potentialities which the situation holds.

But it is also well to recall that the Presidency has a way of lifting men and expanding their minds and their powers.

Even Mr. Roosevelt was a much bigger man at his death than he had been in 1932 when first elected.

Like most of our recent Vice Presidents, Mr. Truman is more or less an unknown quantity, but he did effective work as a Senator and he has shown qualities of mind and character which encourage the hope that he will not fail his country in this trying time.

Let us also hope that the American people will not fail the new President in the endeavors he has pledged himself to carry through.

Oldsters Are Forgotten Men!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Army Times of April 21, 1945, concerning a demobilization plan for men in the service who have celebrated their thirty-fifth birthdays:

OLDSTERS ARE FORGOTTEN MEN

In an organization the size of the United States Army there always are a few forgotten men. In the Army it is the few thousands who have celebrated their thirty-fifth birthdays.

These oldsters are the victims of circumstances. Their draft numbers were low. They were eligible when the Selective Service System occasionally reached into their age brackets. They were able to meet the minimum physical standards. If it hadn't been for these circumstances they would still be in tweeds, virtually immune from the draft.

The Army, by lowering the age for induction to those under 30, has admitted that it needs and wants only young men. This is no insult to the oldsters. They try valiantly to be good soldiers, and many succeed, but age has slowed most of them down. They just can't keep up with the younger fellows.

The oldsters face a serious problem in the post-war period. If forced to compete against the youngsters in a heavy labor market they probably will have extreme difficulty finding jobs. Many industries in pre-war years would not hire men in their age groups. Others in their upper thirties have found that Army life and training have drained their strength and given them odd mental complexes—taking orders from "youngsters" has been tough. These men realize that the problems of the readjustment period promise to be much more acute than those faced by the younger men, and they are worried.

The overage group receives no special consideration in the demobilization plan. It is just as well. The oldsters should not have to wait for VE-day to be discharged—they should be given that white paper now.

Setting up a demobilization plan for that small group would be comparatively simple. There are not enough of them to cause any great confusion or change in strategy. Each man 35 or over should be given the opportunity to apply for a discharge. If he wants to stay in service let him stay. If he wants to get out let him out at the earliest possible moment. If he holds a key job find him a replacement and then let him out. Above all, get the job done before the mass demobilization, with all its considerations, gets under way.

What Are Our Pacific War Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

WHAT ARE OUR PACIFIC WAR AIMS?

It has been said that war is a continuation of politics. It is also true that politics is a continuation of war.

We saw the first of these truths illustrated when World War No. 2 broke out in September, 1939, as a result of peacetime political stresses and strains in Europe. It was illustrated again when we went to war against Japan as a result of Pacific and Asiatic power politics.

Peacetime politics—boundary revisions, reparations schedules, etc.—will be the outgrowth of what happens in the war, and will be roughly determined on the basis of where the armies stand when the shooting stops.

The future of Europe after the war is already pretty well outlined in the minds of the Allied peoples. Germany is to be torn up and hammered down. Russia is to be the dominant land power as regards at least the eastern half of Europe, and maybe the whole Continent. The rest of Europe is to return pretty much to the status quo ante.

But as far as the Pacific war is concerned, nothing definite about Allied war aims and objectives has been decided upon—or if anything definite has been worked out, the Allied peoples have not been told of it.

A SUBJECT FOR FRISCO

The San Francisco Conference opens day after tomorrow. At that Conference, this question of Allied war aims in the Pacific should be thoroughly discussed. The time is ripe for such discussion, in view of the facts that the German war is to all appearances in its last stages and that the United States effort in the Pacific war is often described these days as being ahead of schedule.

The most pressing phase of the question from the American point of view is how much of the total Pacific war burden the United States is to carry from here on.

We have done 95 percent of the work of booting the Japs northward from the Solomons and westward from the Marshalls, of cutting their navy down by perhaps 66 percent, of blasting their cities, of cutting their sea routes to Indochina, Malaya, Burma, and the East Indies.

We have now won most of our war with Japan, so far as our primary interests go. We shall have won it entirely when MacArthur has finished cleaning the Japs out of the Philippines, and our naval and land forces have nailed down a few more Pacific islands which we can use as sea and air bases to contain Japan as long as we keep those bases up to par.

What happens then?

DO WE DO IT ALL?

Do we go on to throw the Japs out of the Dutch East Indies, Malaya, Burma, French Indochina, Hong Kong, Shanghai, and even China itself? After that rather hefty task is done, do we hand those places back to their former owners—the Dutch, British, French, and Chinese—free of charge, and guarantee their quiet and peaceable possession of those places forever after?

Or do we ask that the British especially, and the Dutch, French, and Chinese according to their ability, do the land fighting to get those places back, while our Navy cooperates to the best of its ability?

Then, too, how about Russia? Russia is understood to want to get Manchuria from the Japs, if no more. Manchuria, under the name of Manchukuo, is a nice prize, with 500,000 square miles, some 40,000,000 people, extremely fertile soil, and large iron, gold, coal, and oil shale deposits. But it will require a bit of taking. The Japs have manned it with a lot of their best troops, and presumably have spotted fortifications here and there of the kind our boys have run into on Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and elsewhere.

Do our boys take Manchuria away from the Japs and give it to Russia free of charge, as a graceful addition to the $9,000,000,000 worth of United States war material we have already given Russia free of charge?

If these are the plans for the Pacific war, we can expect to be fighting in the Pacific for a number of years to come, and to lose quite a few of our boys. Japan still has some 5,000,000 soldiers, most of whom are tough fighting men.

Or is it our plan to concern ourselves mainly from now on with our own Pacific safety—to invite the Philippines to join us as our 49th State, and to make the Philippines the key bastion in a network of defenses for the continental United States? Do we let our allies do most of their own fighting to get their Far East empires back?

Our leaders have told us nothing definite—except that military men have been saying lately that after Germany is beaten a lot of our best European-war troops must be sent at once to the Pacific.

These matters should be talked over at San Francisco. Then they should be passed on by the Congress of the United States.

Resolution Adopted by the Young Men's Republican Club of Waterbury, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following resolution adopted by the Young Men's Republican Club of Waterbury, Conn.,

on April 17, 1945, extending the sympathy of the club to Mrs. Roosevelt:

YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN
CLUB OF WATERBURY,
Waterbury, Conn., April 18, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH E. TALEOT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting held last evening the following resolution was adopted:

"Be it resolved, That the Young Men's Republican Club of Waterbury, Conn., in assembly held on April 17, 1945, does hereby go on record to publicly extend its deepest sympathy to the wife of our late and beloved Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Also, it was requested that you incorporate the above resolution in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you for your attention, we remain,

Sincerely yours,
YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN
CLUB OF WATERBURY,
SAMUEL CERVERO, *President,*
HENRY A. CORDEN, *Secretary.*

A Square Deal for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the April 21, 1945, edition of the Boston (Mass.) Evening Record:

A SQUARE DEAL FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Many weeks have passed since the Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives concluded public hearings on a measure giving postal workers their first actual increase in pay in 20 years.

But, as C. W. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers points out in a letter printed elsewhere on this page, there is still no assurance that the measure will be approved.

It has not even been reported out of committee as yet, although there was no effective opposition to the measure in the public hearings and indeed an almost complete lack of any opposition.

Until the committee reports, the measure cannot be acted upon by the House of Representatives and the necessary approval of the Senate cannot be obtained.

Consequently, this important measure is as securely blocked as if the prevailing opinion in Congress opposed it—whereas, nearly the entire membership of Congress has expressed vigorous and seemingly sincere approval of it.

Apparently something is needed to stir Congress out of its apathetic mind about this matter.

If this session of Congress fails to act upon the matter of raising the salary standards of postal workers, as so many sessions have done before it, there is more involved than an injustice—although that should be sufficiently persuasive.

The stark reality confronting the postal workers of the Nation, if this measure fails again, is that they are not only going to be denied an increase in pay, but are actually going to suffer a drastic reduction.

They have been working during the past year under the temporary benefit of a sop tossed to them by Congress in the form of a $300 bonus.

This will expire at the end of June.

Then the postal workers will be compelled to exist on the basic wage scales established 20 years ago—the annual salary of $2,100, from which the withholding tax and retirement contributions are deducted, leaving a scant $1,500 as cash in hand.

As Mr. Doherty bluntly warns, the postal workers cannot exist decently on this inadequate wage and they are not going to try it much longer.

They are weary of 20 years of promises by Congress.

They are fed up with public expressions by sympathy.

In short, if this last appeal for justice is futile, many of them are going to seek the chance to live decently in other fields.

And if they do that, as Mr. Doherty emphasizes, the whole vital structure of Postal Service—already impaired by the war—is going to suffer.

This is inevitable.

The issue is no longer the simple one of whether or not justice is to be done for the postal workers.

It is whether or not the United States mails are going to be moved expeditiously according to the high traditions of the Postal Service, or even be moved at all—of whether or not there is going to be any postal service adequate for the needs of the country.

If Congress is not to be persuaded by considerations of justice to the postal workers in this matter, at least it can be persuaded by prospect of a disastrous failure of the Postal System itself.

It is up to the American people to perform the duties of persuasion in this latter respect.

Though they have tried honorably and conscientiously, the postal workers have apparently failed in their efforts to be persuasive in the former respect.

Every American citizen conscious and resentful of the protracted injustice against the postal workers—and if not of that, of the imminent collapse of the whole Postal System—should write his Congressman, and demand that the people performing such vital service to the Nation be allowed to live and support their families—according to American standards—and no longer according to the condition of near-serfdom they have so long endured.

Roosevelt Called Most Brilliant of the Nation's War Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by one of the outstanding analytical experts on this war, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, appearing April 14, 1945, in the New York Herald Tribune. Major Eliot's inspiring article on our late beloved President Roosevelt enshrines him in the hearts of men as not only our gifted leader in peacetime but our brilliant strategist in wartime who led the world from a path of enslavement to liberty.

ROOSEVELT CALLED MOST BRILLIANT OF THE NATION'S WAR PRESIDENTS—MORE THAN ANYONE ELSE, HE ASSURED DEFEAT OF AXIS AIMS—HIS FORESIGHT AND UNDERSTANDING OF BASIC STRATEGY PAVED WAY FOR VICTORY

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

The death of Franklin D. Roosevelt has taken from this Nation a great President and a great war leader—perhaps the ablest wartime Commander in Chief in our history. No President since Washington—with the possible exception of Theodore Roosevelt—has so well understood the basic strategical needs and interests of this Nation. No President before him has led the Nation in war with such competence, indeed, such brilliance, as Franklin Roosevelt.

During his term of office there arose the most terrible danger to the cause of freedom, to the concept of individual human rights and dignity which free peoples of the world have had to face since the Dark Ages. The basic principle upon which this Republic was founded, that the state exists to serve and to protect the individual in the exercise of his inalienable rights, was directly assailed by powerful forces which were dedicated to the view that the individual exists only to be the slave of the state. From the very beginning President Roosevelt saw the real nature of this threat, recognized it as a threat not only to Britain and France and China but to ourselves and to freedom everywhere, and opposed it with all his energies. The venomous attacks upon him by our German and Japanese enemies show clearly that they recognized in him the arch foe of their evil designs. More than any other human being, Franklin Roosevelt has brought about the defeat and downfall of those designs.

WON REVISION OF NEUTRALITY

When Hitler launched his legions across the Polish frontier and began his attempted conquest of Europe, President Roosevelt saw further than the ruins of Warsaw. He knew that in very truth our frontiers were on the Rhine; that is, he knew that the security of the North Atlantic was essential to the security of the United States, and he knew that if Britain and France and the Low Countries went down, the Atlantic approaches to our eastern seaboard would be in the hands of our enemies. Therefore, he secured revision of the neutrality laws so that we could supply Britain and France, and at the same time he pressed for a greatly accelerated naval-building program, the so-called two-ocean Navy.

In these measures, and in the policy which they implied, the country was far from united behind the President. During the spring of 1940, dissension increased, but the fall of France in the summer of that year shocked most of us into some understanding of our real danger. The President acted swiftly to take advantage of this change in public sentiment. Having, on his own responsibility, sent all the available small arms and field artillery in the country to arm the British people against possible invasion, he sponsored and drove through Congress the selective-service act—the first peace-time conscription law in our history. That measure gave us months of advantage when war came to us.

Still keeping a watchful eye on the Atlantic sea lanes, where German U-boats were cutting sharply into our shipments to Great Britain, the President engineered the famous destroyer deal by which 50 American destroyers were transferred to the British Navy in return for a number of Atlantic bases which would give us far better security should disaster come to Britain. Anxious also about political dissension at home, the President took the remarkably foresighted and courageous step of appointing two lead-

ing Republicans—Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox—as Secretaries of War and of the Navy, respectively, appointments which the country had no subsequent reason to regret.

INCREASED NAVAL PROTECTION

Early in 1941 the Lend-Lease Act increased our power to aid Britain and other nations fighting Germany. Again there was bitter opposition from those who could not see the reality of the danger. Again the President prevailed. There followed increases in our naval protection to the North Atlantic sea lanes, with American bases in Greenland and Iceland. In July, Japanese aggression in French Indo-China brought the cutting off of oil supplies to Japan. In August the dramatic mid-Atlantic meeting between the President and Prime Minister Churchill electrified the world and brought new hope to millions of hearts.

The actual coming of war—with the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—found this Nation better prepared than for any other war in our history. We were not, of course, fully prepared, or even well prepared. But comparison with the past shows how much had been accomplished by the foresight and determination of the President.

As Commander in Chief the President was immediately confronted by the necessity for a fundamental decision: Should the power of this country be thrown first against Germany, or against Japan? Obviously we could not divide our forces, or we risked defeat everywhere by trying to be strong everywhere. This basic military principle, we may thank God, the President understood. He chose Germany as the most dangerous and the nearest enemy, and events have proved that he chose rightly.

At the same time it was necessary to coordinate our efforts with those of our British Commonwealth allies, and for this purpose there was created—largely at the President's instigation—the most successful agency for the higher conduct of an Allied war that military history records: The combined chiefs of staff which, from then on, almost without friction or disagreement, has directed the employment all over the world of all the resources and power of the American and British nations as though they were one. Unity of purpose and effort, implemented by unity of command, is the key to victory in war. That lesson, too, the President understood and applied.

CHOSE WAR LEADERS WELL

He chose his military leaders well, and he supported them with unswerving loyalty. Never in our history have our armies and fleets been so ably commanded from the very outset of war. Never have we had such an unbroken record of victory piled upon victory as we have in this war, after our first dismal set-backs in the Pacific. That the President was wholly the author of these victories he would be the last to wish that anyone should assert, but he made them possible by his wise choice of leaders, by his clear understanding of the basic principles of strategy, and by his ability to mobilize behind the fighting forces the full resources of the American Nation.

Now, in the very hour of victory over his most dangerous foe, in the bright promise of victory in the Pacific as well, our great war President is taken from us. The God who has watched over the destinies of this Republic from its earliest days has, in His infinite wisdom, thought best to call His servant home to rest. But the Republic lives on. It lives because it is, and always has been, greater than any single man. It survived the loss of Abraham Lincoln in another hour of victory and trial. It will survive the loss of Franklin Roosevelt in this strangely similar hour. Lincoln gave his life that the Union might be preserved; he died before he knew that, from the wreck of war, a stronger and more enduring Union would arise. Franklin Roosevelt gave his life that a greater Union—a Union of all peace-loving peoples to achieve peace and guard the hard-won heritage of freedom—might rise from the desolation of a more terrible war than Lincoln ever imagined. He, too, died before he saw the fulfillment of his vision. To us who remain behind he left the heritage and the responsibility of that vision, that bright hope from which his purpose never turned aside.

He gave us victory. We shall not fail to harvest the fruits of victory—the just and enduring peace which shall forever be his shining monument in the hearts and memories of freemen throughout this world.

The Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute to the late President Roosevelt by a Negro pastor of Festus, Mo., published in the Tri-City Independent, of Festus, Mo., Thursday, April 19, 1945:

NEGRO PASTOR PAYS TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

"I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes; but thou shalt not go over thither." Deuteronomy 34: 4.

There comes a time in the lives of men when, as a unit, they are prone to question the wisdom of God; that time comes at a moment when the will of God, executed, seems to strike a hurting blow to our own will, and we are left bewildered amid the wreckage of our own plans. When we have appraised ourselves of the power of God as the Supreme Being and Divine Intellect, and through a close scrutiny of the works of all nature we are made to understand that He Himself has set the course of the history of mankind; and as surely as the succession of the seasons or the fixed course of the celestial bodies of the universe, the course of mankind's history is inevitable and the plans of God immutable.

It is said that history moves in a cycle. If we are to use the Holy Scriptures as a proof, then we are assured that history has once again completed a cycle, and we find ourselves where the children of Israel were on that memorable morning, when they stood silent and grief-stricken on the plain of Moab in mute farewell to a leader whom they had come to love and depend upon during their quest for a God-promised land of tranquillity and contentment. Though Israel may have questioned the wisdom of God, who had called away their great leader, they could never, so long as they remained mortal, have realized the ecstasy and joy which must have overcome him there at the top of Mount Pisgah, as he enjoyed the special privilege of seeing with his own eyes that which had heretofore been only a 40-year dream. Surely he must have felt the glory of God as he heard the voice speaking to him, saying, "I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

Yes; mankind stands in grief for the loss of a great leader who has led the way over 12 years through the wilderness of disillusion and chaos, holding high a torch for the hopeless to see, and assuring the low in spirit that God had prepared a land of promise for those who have the courage to press onward.

The land of promise, as visualized by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a new world, not unlike the One World of the immortal Wendell Willkie; a new world wrought of drastic social, economic, and moral changes which would make for peace.

His was a new world wherein the most important cog was the common man—the underdog, the down-trodden—whose race, color, or creed played absolutely no part in the final determination of his status. His was a promised land wherein the right to life, liberty, and happiness became more than an expression of eloquence, and wherein the strong would stand as a protecting wall to secure the integrity and God-given rights of the weak.

All mankind has lost a great leader, but the Negro and the colored peoples of the world have lost what seems to have been our best friend—one of the greatest friends that a minority people of any era of history could have ever had. Lincoln gave to us freedom, but it was F. D. R. who, when the odds were all against us, gave us the courage to fight for our rightful place in the society of men.

We are tempted to question the wisdom of God, who gave and has taken away this great friend, but we know that God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. If God has promised a new world, and had sent Franklin Roosevelt to lead us on the journey, then that new world is just over the hill; though we may not understand, even as the children of Israel failed to understand, God shall provide for us to come into that place.

Truly we are bowed in sorrow and stricken with tears, but somewhere in the lofty heights of moral achievements, beyond the calculations of man, Franklin Roosevelt stood last Thursday, amidst the clouds of glory—honored by God, yes, glorified by God—and beheld the world of promise. Out from the echoes of good reports from our armed forces on the far-flung battlefields, he must have heard the voice of God as he lay in unconsciousness, saying, "I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither." He must have flashed that friendly smile to us who stand in the valley below, and with his eyes wet from the mist of unshed tears, he must have stepped into formation—our Commander in Chief at attention in the ranks of the immortal: Moses, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

As a minority people, he has left on record words of encouragement, which ought to give us new hope in the years to come: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Rev. F. LEMOYNE WHITLOCK.

Missouri River Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the board of directors of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce, of Sioux City, Iowa, in opposition to

S. 555, known as the Murray Missouri Valley Authority bill:

Whereas the United States Army engineers have had under their jurisdiction the control of projects concerned with the development of the Missouri River; and

Whereas the United States Army engineers and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation have a broad knowledge of the Missouri River, gained through practical experience over a period of many years; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has adopted, and the President has signed, legislation for the complete development of the Missouri River under the coordinated Pick-Sloan plans; and

Whereas certain interests are seeking to impose an authority over the entire Missouri Basin patterned after the T. V. A., which would ignore all of the plans and work already accomplished by the United States Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce, being especially concerned with the progress of this project with the least possible preliminary delay; and

Whereas the substitution of an M. V. A. plan would unduly delay the furtherance of said project and would otherwise be inimical to the best interests of the entire valley: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Board of Directors of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce, commend the Congress of the United States for their action in authorizing the United States Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation to proceed to completion, their proposed projects for Missouri River development: Be it further

Resolved, That we commit ourselves to being opposed to the establishment of the Missouri Valley Authority as outlined in S. 555, known as the Murray-Missouri Valley Authority bill, and respectfully urge our congressional delegates to use their influence in the interest of defeating the above proposed legislation at such time as it may be placed before Congress for consideration.

(The Sioux City Real Estate Board of Sioux City, Iowa, unanimously adopted a similar resolution under date of April 11, 1945.)

Salvage Ace in Toughest Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Lawrence R. Goldberg, which appeared in the Sunday Boston Post April 1, 1945.

SALVAGE ACE IN TOUGHEST TASK—BAY STATE WIZARD FAST OVERCOMING ALL SORTS OF DIFFICULTIES IN CLEARING HARBOR OF MANILA

(By Lawrence R. Goldberg)

For salvaging wizardy, under the most difficult and dangerous wartime conditions, 50-year-old, rugged and fabulous Commodore William A. Sullivan, of Lawrence and Winchester, takes top honors.

Three years after supervising the raising of the 83,423-ton, 981-foot *Normandie*—in the face of moanings that it couldn't be done—this Andover and M. I. T. schooled and trained United States naval officer, has been chosen for the impossible task of clearing up Manila Harbor, recognized as the greatest salvage job in history.

The harbor and bay must be cleared—within a specified time—of more than 300 hulks, either scuttled by the Japs as blockships, sunk by American bombs, or destroyed by Admiral George Dewey's fleet in 1898.

SAME EFFICIENCY

This is Sullivan's assignment and he has promised the Navy Department that it will be done with the same efficiency and dispatch that marked his carrying out of the assignments he received while in the European theater of war to clear the harbors of Naples, Cherbourg, Granville, St. Malo, Le Havre, Boulogne, Calais, Marseille, Casablanca, and Port Lejautey.

Operating under his direction—and by his side on the ocean's bottom amidst specially devised booby traps arranged among and attached to the hulks and blocks that must be moved—will be a crack team of Army and Navy divers, second to none in the world. At their special disposal will be a flock of blueprints and lessons gathered and improved upon by the commodore as a result of the Pearl Harbor disaster, the *Normandie* experiment, and his clearing of European ports during the past 4 years.

A human dynamo of energy and drive—indefatigable and at his best when the going is toughest—Sullivan (born at 524 Andover Street, Lawrence, and making his home with his sister Margaret on Lebanon Street, Winchester, when the war started) is a happy mixture of sparkling intelligence and good nature when the hour and conditions permit him to relax. On such occasions all those who come in contact with him feel his personal magnetism.

POUNDING AWAY

At work, however, he is dogged and determined every second—pounding away incessantly—literally wearing down whatever obstacles may be in the way—never recognizing any such complaint that the task at hand is impossible.

As an example of what his assignment of supervising the raising of the *Normandie* involved, the following facts are cited:

Portholes closed, 356; 5,447 square feet of deck openings patched; 6,000 tons of debris and scrap removed; 5,000 tons of superstructure removed; 8,000 pounds of broken glass cleared; 10,000 cubic yards of mud moved; 240,500 board feet of lumber placed by divers as shoring and bulkheads; 4,500 wedges, plugs, and small patches placed by divers; weight of patches, 150 tons; 1,685 tons of concrete added to ship; 40 ten-inch, 28 six-inch, and 25 three-inch salvage pumps put into action aboard, pumping 40,000 tons of water per hour; 700 men employed on wreck; 70 divers; cost of salvage, $3,750,000.

And the *Normandie* was floated on schedule.

MANY DIFFICULTIES

So that the reader may get a better idea of just what Commodore Sullivan faces in his new assignment, the following facts—established by proper and efficient reconnaissance above and below the waterline—are cited in connection with conditions in Manila waters:

Submerged or partly submerged there are 62 large vessels, each in excess of 2,000 tons; 68 small craft in the northern half of the harbor; 50 small craft in a half-mile of the Pasig River up to Jones Bridge; 21 vessels chained bow to stern and sunk across a 10,000-yard stretch from the yacht basin to the main breakwater; 6 ships blocking the channel entrance through the breakwater to the deep-sea piers; and 3 ships lying alongside piers 7 and 5.

In addition, a hundred or more craft of various sizes, including the 20,000-ton Dewey drydock towed out there in 1904, scattered over the bay bottom.

At this writing Sullivan's men have already patched and hauled one of the 3,000-ton blockships from the mouth of the Pasig and opened the river to traffic. They expect to blow a second one from the channel soon.

HARDEST AREA

The most difficult area is the narrow entrance through the typhoon breakwater, where the Japanese cleverly sank six large ships in the 38-foot main channel. The bow of a big tanker sticks out from the channel ledge and divers will tackle that first.

Inside the breakwater other large craft block the anchorage, sheltered from the typhoons that sweep in from the South China Sea.

On the north side of pier 7, Manila's longest, a 4,000-ton ship is submerged on its beam-ends. At the south side of the same pier a 10,000-ton freighter with two torpedo holes presents the commodore with his main problem.

On top of that ship the Japanese sank three of what Sullivan calls "Sugar Charleys." These are 500-ton wooden coastal craft, a dozen of which Sullivan's men have already raised in the harbor.

"SUGAR CHARLEYS"

"They're all over the place," is the way the Bay State salvaging wizard has described the situation in his preliminary report to the Navy Department. "One contained a cargo of children's marbles and a Chinaman has been carting them away by the sackloads."

On the same side of pier 7, according to his report, lies a 2,000-ton interisland steamboat and a half a dozen more "Sugar Charleys" and tugboats. Sullivan says he will also have to deal with a double-decker, a Philippine steamboat, that ran on top of a Spanish-American War wreck 8 years ago.

Three enemy warships, including a light cruiser, also were sunk near the mainland and two destroyers are lying off Cavite, the commodore reports.

Each vessel, he reveals, poses a different problem.

"But it's like building a bridge; you assemble all the facts first and the job solves itself," he says—to lead you to believe it is just as simple and easy.

USES BLUEPRINTS

In tackling hulks in the past Sullivan has obtained as many blueprints of them as are available from merchant marine sources. From these he studies the ship's deck and hull plan. Then he sends down his diver—or goes down himself—to locate and patch holes and attach air pumps.

Blueprints are not always available and hulks don't always turn out to be what they looked like at first, however, and then the commodore and his crews run into the unexpected and into plenty of trouble.

One help—for example—that Sullivan has been tackling at the breakwater of Manila, has proved particularly pesky. It isn't going to slow up the commodore or cause him to be late in clearing Manila. But this is what he has to say about that one single obstacle:

"We keep on plugging holes and finding so many new ones that I suppose we'll have to drive in toothpicks."

In the face of the terrific salvaging task ahead, however, Commodore Sullivan wants his friends and acquaintances back home in Lawrence and Winchester, especially, to know that not only will the job be finished on time, but that some of the enemy freighters sunk to block the harbor would sail again, and shortly, under the Yankee flag.

H. R. 2071

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief which was submitted to the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee by the New York State Federation of Post Office Clerks urging approval of H. R. 2071:

You are hereby advised that the New York State Federation of Post Office Clerks, which represents the large majority of these employees in this State, favors the enactment of the Post Office Reclassification bill, H. R. 2071. We also favor the amendments suggested by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, as well as any other changes which would grant additional consideration to postal employees.

The justification of such legislation was recognized by many Members of Congress during the past session and resulted in the enactment of a temporary bonus bill. The War Labor Board has adopted what is known as the Little Steel formula, which was based upon the increase in living costs between January 1941 and May 1942, and as a result employees in private industry have received increases in wages of 15 percent since that time.

Postal employees, however, have not received any increase in their compensation since 1925, and we feel that it is unfair to apply the same formula to their basic compensation that was used in the consideration of salary adjustments of private industries employees, whose wages had been advancing on numerous occasions prior to 1941.

It might also be noted that since the adoption of the Little Steel formula the cost of living has greatly increased and, while there is a variance between the statistics of the Department of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, conservative estimates show an increase of well over 30 percent.

It has been long and universally recognized that postal employees are highly efficient and skillfully trained and underpaid in comparison to wages paid for similar knowledge and duties in other industries.

Over 35,000 of these employees are serving in the armed forces of our Nation. As a result a huge additional burden has been thrown upon the remaining employees. The manner in which this greatly reduced force has handled the greatly increased volume of mail during the past few years is a high tribute to the loyalty of these employees. Their hours of labor have been lengthened and their production greatly increased.

The general procedure in all occupations coming under the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board has been to grant employees time and one-half for overtime service. This includes all work in excess of 40 hours per week. Postal employees, however, receive straight pay for overtime, and that rate is not computed on the basis of a 5-day, a 40-hour week, but is based upon a 48-hour work week established in 1925—20 years ago.

We urge that this be corrected and time and one-half be paid for all work in excess of 40 hours per week, and that same be computed on a 253-day-per year basis. We also request that some consideration be granted employees who have performed long and faithful service in the form of longevity payments. It is also suggested that this feature be made retroactive to a degree at least so as to adequately compensate employees who have rendered many years of service, and many of whom may never advance to the top grade if the bill should be enacted in its present form.

It might be well to add that the salaries of these employees have lagged considerably behind prevailing rates of pay. Also that the service rendered by them produces revenue from which they are paid. These revenues are higher than they have been in the history of our Government and they likewise represent the great burden of work performed by the faithful employees of the Post Office Department.

However, we are vitally interested in securing the enactment of H. R. 2071, along with the amendments suggested by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, as well as those mentioned herein and any others of a beneficial nature now being considered by the committee, at the earliest possible date.

Reorganizing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the April 21, 1945, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Post:

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

As evidence of the need for reorganization of the legislative branches of our National Government there are at least 20 different bills before the Congress seeking in one reform or another to streamline the procedures and create a more efficient deliberative assembly.

It is a good thing generally for the Nation that the House and Senate have been reluctant to revise their parliamentary procedure, to scuttle the absurd cloture rule in the Senate and get a firmer grasp upon current problems which require swifter action in the Congress than is now possible.

One of the chief complaints and arguments of the wing of public opinion whose tendency is to shun world cooperation in military measures to control and punish aggressors is that Congress must not yield any of its present powers to declare war.

The obvious remedy is a revamping of Congress to permit swifter action in emergencies and the power of review of such emergency action by later amendment. The whole constitutional provision for repeal of amendments to the Constitution is now cumbersome and ineffective, yet any suggestion that this be altered would arouse a tempest of disapproval.

But even the most stalwart champions of the rights and privileges of Members of the Congress now admit that Congress has just passed through the most critical years of its life, when its influence diminished steadily and the legislative functions were swallowed up by Executive orders. It is doing the late President Roosevelt no disservice to say that the Congress resented this intrusion upon its domains, but it must also be said the Congress did very little about it.

It is evident that many congressional leaders perceive at the present time, when peace is at hand in Europe, and victory mounts in the Far East, that the country will undergo another change, the reconversion to peace. They understand that it will be far easier in these dynamic times to alter their procedure and reform and streamline the Congress than it would be in the settled, prosy times when there are no wars, no rumors of wars, and the lethargy of peace settles upon the Nation.

That Congress needs considerable dusting off and refurbishing cannot be denied. It is fortunate that President Truman has worked and taken part in the deliberations of Congress and understands the problems.

The public must be alert, however, as they were not alert in the tempestuous days of 1932 to 1936, to prevent an abridgment of legislative power by the executive power or vice versa, for the checks and balances of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government are as delicately poised as a great weight on the point of a needle. Once the balance is destroyed the whole precious structure of democracy may crash.

Total Victory—Durable Peace—We Must Not Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today the most important conference in the history of human experience begins in San Francisco.

We look back to the signing of the Magna Carta as an outstanding historical accomplishment breathing life into an instrument advancing the cause of humanity.

We look back to the formation and the adoption of our own Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States as the second great accomplishment advancing the cause of the common people and again breathing freedom and democracy into the lives of all of our people.

As we have again experienced the horrors and tragedies of war—as we have sacrificed our blood and treasure, to loosen the bonds of suffering humanity and to prevent the enslavement of the peoples throughout the world—yes, and to maintain the freedoms and liberties that we have maintained by the goodness and mercy of God, certainly we have realized the tremendous importance and the dire necessity of world security.

So today, Mr. Speaker, begins a conference of the peace-loving and freedom-loving nations of the world, who are determined to accept the grave responsibilities of bringing about another living document for the advancement of

humanity, the cause of the common people, and to establish peace and security in an effort to prevent a third world war.

It was truly said by our beloved and lamented President that "We see peace in enduring peace. More than an end to war we want an end to the beginning of all wars." Never was there a greater challenge to a people, and never have we been more determined to accept this challenge and heed the responsibilities of accomplishing our most worthy objectives.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the result of the San Francisco Conference to be of such importance as to determine if the "limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today."

Just as we have been determined to win the war, and victory is rapidly approaching throughout the world, so shall we determine that our sacrifices shall not be in vain. Unconditional surrender is the only way to end barbarism, to have total and complete victory, which we will have; it cannot be anything less.

We are committed to the destruction of militarism in Germany and Japan and all they possess for the production of weapons of war. We must not permit such desperate enemies to again be armed and again disturb the peace of the world.

We are also determined that the enemy must make reparation for the destruction, terror, and devastation they have brought upon innocent people by unholy aggression. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to see that those guilty of the terrible atrocities, of the inhuman and beastly acts, must suffer the penalty for their terrible deeds. These war criminals must be sought and run down to the ends of the earth, if necessary, brought to justice and severely punished for their crimes. They must be exterminated and completely and permanently removed from society.

The accomplishment of these objectives, however, will never be realized until we establish the means of insuring a peaceful settlement of differences between nations.

We must not make the mistakes that were made following the last World War, thereby laying the foundation for another world war that will completely destroy our civilization.

The Conference at San Francisco will decide our future. It will determine if the nations can agree on an international security organization that will give to the world a just and durable peace, an organization that will establish the faith and confidence of all nations and permit us to live and survive and work together in a peaceful world.

Our brave and gallant men fighting throughout the world are conquering our enemies, they are bringing us victory, but this is only a part of the great task that lies before us. We must finish the job and insure our victorious armies that the final objective, peace, lasting peace, will be realized.

We must not fail—we will not fail—to complete the task of final victory and lasting peace.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the convocation exercises of the University of Richmond, April 20, 1945:

Dean Holtzclaw, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to participate in your convocation exercises today. It is always a pleasure for me to return to this campus which I love so dearly, and it is a privilege to be permitted to pay tribute in this assemblage to our former President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who has passed on to take his place among the immortal benefactors of mankind.

There is little that we can say, however, that will add to the expressions of grief and sorrow which have come from all parts of the world. The spontaneous reactions to the announcement of his death evidenced the greatness of the man and the high place he occupied in the hearts of the people. The radio industry, at tremendous financial sacrifice, immediately canceled all commercial programs and for 3 days paid him homage; places of amusement closed; gaiety ceased; a hush fell upon the land; and people of every creed, class, and faction, in all walks of life, mourned his passing. Such a tribute of love, admiration, and respect has never before been so lavished upon anyone.

Although this demonstration was unprecedented, it is not difficult to understand when we consider the outstanding role President Roosevelt played in national and international affairs during the past 12 years. He guided the destiny of the Nation through some of the most critical years of its history and led us successfully through crisis after crisis when men of lesser mold faltered and despaired.

Mr. Roosevelt first entered upon the national scene as Assistant Secretary of the Navy in 1913 at the age of 31. Then a young man of excellent physique, exceptional intellect, outstanding capabilities and winning personality, his possibilities were quickly recognized; he made many friends and established a brilliant record during World War No. 1.

After an unsuccessful campaign as the Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1920, he was stricken with paralysis, a malady which threatened an abrupt end to his political career. But he was not to be denied; he was not the type to permit difficulties to thwart his plans, and with tremendous courage and indomitable will he set about to overcome the great handicap which the disease had placed upon him. In 1928, just as he was begining to take his first steps following his illness, as the Democratic candidate, he was elected Governor of the great State of New York, although the national Democratic ticket, headed by the popular New Yorker, Alfred E. Smith, trailed him by several hundred thousand votes and failed to carry the State. In 1930 he was reelected to that high office.

Two years later, when the Nation was passing through its worst depression and our people had lost confidence in those who directed the affairs of our Government, they began to search for a new leader. The overwhelming choice fell upon Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and he was elected President of the United States. On March 4, 1933, when he assumed the duties of his office, banks in 38 States were closed; millions were jobless; despair gripped the country. Declaring in his inaugural address, "We are at war with the depression," in confident tones he assured the people, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

He had a definite philosophy of government and he immediately put it to work. He subsequently summarized that philosophy in one of his messages to Congress in the following words:

"We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race, or creed. Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

"The right to a good education."

The application of these doctrines brought numerous innovations into the Federal Government, many of which were severely criticized and bitterly opposed. Gradually, however, the faith of men in their Government, in the system of free enterprise, and in the fundamental soundness of democracy itself was restored. Banks were stabilized, industries were refinanced and strengthened, and the interests of the individual received special attention in the passage of labor, social security, and other laws for his benefit. Mr. Roosevelt soon became the recognized champion of the underprivileged and oppressed. "Democracy can thrive," he declared to the Nation in 1940, "only when it enlists the devotion of those whom Lincoln called the common people. Democracy can hold that devotion only when it adequately respects their dignity by so ordering society as to assure to the masses of men and women reasonable security and hope for themselves and for their children."

In 1936, when he was reelected for a second term, the people gave the most emphatic approval in history to his record. Forty-six of the forty-eight States of the Union registered their satisfaction with overwhelming majorities in his favor. As he continued, during this term, his social program notably for housing and wages and hours legislation, there came the first rumblings of war. President Roosevelt was one of the first to recognize the threat to freedom when greedy dictators commenced their aggressions and began their conquests for world domination. For a long time his was almost a lone voice in America crying for preparation to meet their challenge. Finally, after his election to the Presidency of the United States for an unprecedented third term, the enemy struck, and we were at war.

His leadership in war was as vigorous and as effective as it had been in peace, and to him more than to any one individual is due credit for the fact that the dictators, in the recent words of their own propagandist, now "have sunk very low." The strenuous duties of waging a successful war and plan-

ning a durable peace, when added to the normal activities of his office, proved too much of a strain upon his tired and weakened physique, and shortly after entering upon his fourth term as President, he passed on to his final reward. His fellow countrymen will ever regret that he was not spared to behold the full fruits of the victory for which he sacrificed his life.

I personally have always been tremendously intrigued by the paradoxes which characterized Mr. Roosevelt's life. Born into a wealthy family and nurtured in the lap of luxury, he was a stanch friend to the common man. He was reared in conservative surroundings and educated in conservative institutions, and yet he became one of the great liberals of his day. He hated war, and yet he became a great leader in war. It has even been suggested by responsible sources that when the story of the war can be freely told it will reveal him as one of the great military strategists of history. Crippled to the point that he moved with difficulty, he became a world traveler. Although he prosecuted the war with a fury surpassing all previous conflicts, the entire world looked to him for leadership in the establishment of peace.

One of the paramount questions in the minds of the people of the world today is the effect that Mr. Roosevelt's death will have on the prosecution of the war, and the attainment of a durable peace. So far as American participation is concerned, Mr. Roosevelt left the war effort in competent hands. He selected able leaders for our armed forces on land, on the sea and in the air. He did not limit or restrain their activities but to the contrary he gave them the fullest latitude in the execution of their commands. His faith in them has been justified. They have demonstrated their fitness. The armies of the Reich have commenced to disintegrate and the glad tidings of new victories which are daily coming from the Atlantic and the Pacific give evidence of the fact that it will not be long before the martial tread of Allied troops will resound in both Berlin and Tokyo. President Truman has assured the world that there will be no change in our war policy or leadership. We may, therefore, look forward with confidence to early and complete victory.

The task of perfecting the peace has just commenced. The presence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt at future peace conferences will be sorely missed, but his influence will still be surely felt. He has already contributed much to the laying of solid foundations upon which a satisfactory superstructure of peace may be erected, and President Truman has proclaimed to the world that he will continue to build upon those foundations. I am convinced, however, that the kind of peace we eventually attain will depend to a large extent upon the desires and the efforts of the citizens of the United States. President Roosevelt's program, which I believe has the wholehearted support of the vast majority of the people of this country, was outlined by him in 1944 when he said:

"We must, and I hope we will, continue to be united with our allies in a powerful world organization which is ready and able to keep the peace, if necessary by force. To provide that assurance of international security is the policy, the effort and the obligation of this administration. We owe it to our posterity, we owe it to our heritage of freedom, we owe it to our God, to devote the rest of our lives and all of our capabilities to the building of a solid, durable structure of world peace."

The foundations for such a structure have been laid at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Yalta, but already the isolationists are at work seeking their destruction, and their tactics bear striking resemblance to those which defeated the League of Nations 25 years ago. There has been little criticism of the political agreements reached at Dumbarton Oaks, but there can be no complete international accord without economic understandings. The international stabilization of currency and the regulation of international trade are technical subjects beyond the understanding of the average man. For this reason the greatest experts of the world were assembled in conference at Bretton Woods for a scientific study and consideration of these subjects. The conference agreed upon the creation of an international bank and a stabilization fund as necessary steps for the solution of our economic problems. We are told by those who would defeat the plan that the bank is sound but that it will be a fatal mistake for the United States of America to enter into any agreement looking toward the stabilization of the currency of other countries.

Frankly, I am not an expert in the field of banking and currency. I do, however, have several well-defined views with reference to the peace program. In the first place, I do not agree wtih those who contend that the United States alone is entitled to dictate the terms of the peace. I am not unmindful of the fact that without our help the war probably could not have been won by our allies. I am, however, mindful of the fact that in the dark days following the surrender of France, England stood alone against the might of Germany. Few believed at that time that she could endure more than a fortnight and, yet, with, characteristic courage and determination, she continued to fight on and made an inestimable contribution to final victory. I am also mindful of the magnificent achievements of the Russions, and the contribution of China to the cause of victory. They have richly earned a right to participate in the solution of the problems of peace. Moreover, the smaller nations who must cooperate in the maintenance of peace, if it is to be effective, must have a voice in the peace councils. I am convinced that a durable peace cannot be secured at the dictation of any nation, but that it must come about through compromises and voluntary agreements.

We in America should not be averse to compromises when we realize that our own Government was established only after months of wrangling between the several States, and the problem then was not dissimilar to the problem now. It revolved largely around the question of voting strength in the new organization. The larger and more populous States refused to enter an organization unless they had a larger vote than the smaller States. The smaller and less populous States refused to enter the new organization unless they had equal representation. Finally, as a compromise, two bodies were created, the United States Senate, in which the States have equal representation, and the House of Representatives, in which representation is proportioned on the basis of population. Unless we can enter the San Francisco Conference, and those which are to follow, in a spirit of give and take, our efforts to establish a permanent peace will be in vain.

I am also convinced that however harmoniously, patiently, and long we may labor, we can never design a perfect international organization. Let us again consider the history of our own country. Although I have always marveled at the wisdom, the judgment, and the skill of those who framed our Federal Constitution, we must admit that it was not a perfect instrument and our own State refused to ratify it without certain amendments upon which our representatives insisted. Those amendments were adopted immediately after ratification, and many others have been necessary during the ensuing years to meet new and changing conditions. If we now insist upon perfection in the proposed international organization, again our labors will be in vain. Let us, therefore, content ourselves at this time with the laying of solid foundations upon which we may continue to build until permanent peace becomes a reality.

The last words penned by our departed leader were written the night before his death and published while his body was on its journey to its last resting place. They constituted a speech which he had prepared for delivery on the anniversary of the birth of another great and liberal American—Thomas Jefferson. In the concluding sentence he wrote, "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strength and active faith." God grant that we may dispel our doubts and move forward to the realization of that coveted goal of "peace on earth among men of good will" for which men have striven since the proclamation of the angels on the hills of Judea. No more appropriate monument could be erected to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

False Economy in Interior Appropriation Bill Will Dwarf Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House of Representatives, I congratulate the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on the recognition it gives the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the war food production program. The subcommittee, beginning on page 15 of its report, paid a well-deserved tribute to the crops produced on the reclamation acreage in 1944, which were valued at approximately $400,000,000. I also note that the committee recognized the tremendous value of the power activities of the Bureau of Reclamation through its statement that the power revenues in 1944 amounted to $13,530,000. It should be noted that the power installations of the Bureau of Reclamation made equally great contributions to the war through providing power for war industries in the West.

But, Mr. Speaker, the committee has overlooked the opportunity that the Bureau of Reclamation offers to serve the country in the post-war period as effectively as it has during the war.

This oversight threatens to hamper seriously the Bureau of Reclamation in its preparations for providing employment through permanent public works that will conserve and utilize western water and land resources and provide settlement opportunities for returning servicemen when Germany and Japan are vanquished.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the reductions in estimates for operation and maintenance of projects which have been constructed with Federal funds. It seems to me that the Congress owes it to the taxpayers of this

country to see that the project facilities in which Federal funds are invested are operated and maintained efficiently. I have confidence that the Bureau of Reclamation under Commissioner Bashore has requested only those funds which are necessary to effect economical and efficient maintenance of these Federal facilities. Every dollar expended for operating these projects is repaid by the water users on the projects and by the sale of electric energy.

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is now engaged in hearings on H. R. 520, a bill designed to facilitate the settlement of veterans of World War No. 2 on reclamation projects in the West. This bill gives 90-day preference to returning servicemen in the settlement of irrigated lands on reclamation projects where the heroes of this war can become self-sustaining, support their families and make lasting contributions to the welfare of the country.

The Bureau of Reclamation, if provided with funds, will be in a position not only to provide employment on the construction of reclamation projects, but will also be able to provide irrigated farms for more than 100,000 returning servicemen within a few years. Under the Reclamation Act and other laws passed by this Congress, the Bureau has been authorized to complete projects now under construction and to begin the construction of new projects which will assure more than 100,000 irrigated farms in the 17 Western States. In addition, other projects are under study which would increase the number of farms to nearly 200,000.

In order to assure this employment and the speedy construction of the projects authorized to provide the farms, the Bureau of Reclamation must be provided with funds to complete field investigations and to prepare designs and specifications so that contracts may be let as soon as manpower is available. This necessity was recognized by the late President Roosevelt when he transmitted the Bureau of the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1946 for the Bureau of Reclamation.

I direct particular attention to the Budget estimate of $5,500,000 under the heading of general investigations. This amount was to be payable from the reclamation fund. Approximately half of this amount was to be spent for the completion of field investigations and the remainder for the preparation of designs and specifications on projects which the Congress authorizes.

The reduction of this $5,500,000 item to $1,485,000 will seriously hamper the Bureau of Reclamation in preparing for a post-war program. I call this reduction to the attention of the House at this time, feeling sure that the committee unintentionally has failed to grasp the significance and importance of adequate preparation for post-war construction work so that returning servicemen may be able to earn a livelihood by doing useful construction work. In this connection I also call attention to the reduction from $500,000 to $400,000 of the amount for general investigations from the Colorado River development fund. This fund is made up of receipts from the sale of power at Boulder Dam and like the appropriations from the reclamation fund it does not come out of the General Treasury. The Bureau of Reclamation is now engaged in completing a comprehensive report on the uses of the waters of the Colorado River Basin, in which seven Western States are concerned. The Colorado River development fund can be used for no other purpose than the development of the Colorado River Basin and all of it should be so used.

Another major item in connection with H. R. 3024 to which I direct the attention of the House is the elimination of the provision for continuation of the predevelopment program on the desert mesa lands of the Gila project in Arizona and the All-American Canal project in southern California. The work on the Gila project has been authorized by the War Production Board and has been endorsed by the War Food Administration as an essential activity contributing to the prosecution of the war through increased production of alfalfa. The long-time benefit from this predevelopment work has been recognized as desirable in order that future settlers on both the Gila project and the All-American Canal may know the kind of crops that are best adapted to these areas where returning servicemen can be settled. I have received many inquiries from veterans of the Second World War concerning opportunities in this favored area.

Like all western Members of Congress I favor the development of any section of this country. I have followed with interest the discussions regarding the program for the development of the Missouri River Basin. I was pleased last winter to see that the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers of the War Department had agreed on a coordinated plan for this development. This coordinated plan was subsequently approved by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and construction to the extent of $200,000,000 by each of these agencies was authorized.

The authorization of the Bureau of Reclamation extended to some 30 irrigation and multiple-purpose projects on the tributaries of the Missouri. The Corps of Engineers was authorized to construct some 6 or 8 large dams principally on the main stem of the Missouri.

The late President Roosevelt transmitted to the Congress a Budget estimate of $4,480,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies of the Department of the Interior to complete field investigations and studies and prepare plans for the developments which the Department of the Interior was authorized to carry on. It was with great regret that I noticed that the estimate for the Bureau of Reclamation was reduced to $1,440,000 or about one-third of the Budget recommendation. The amount for the Bureau of Reclamation itself was cut about in half.

The explanation of the Appropriations Committee for this reduction does not recognize the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation and other Interior agencies are concerned not only with the construction of dams but must also plan irrigation systems, transmission lines, land-use developments, and study the water resources of the Missouri Basin. On the other hand, the committee cut the amount for the Bureau of Reclamation to the same figure of $1,440,000 named in the War Department Civil Functions Act for advanced planning by the Corps of Engineers.

I feel sure that this action by the committee was taken without full recognition of the importance and significance of the work to be done by the Bureau of Reclamation as well as the cooperative work by other agencies of the Department of the Interior. The work outlined under the estimate of $4,480,000 is absolutely necessary if the irrigation and other projects in the Missouri Basin are to be ready for construction in the postwar period to assure opportunities for employment and for settlement on irrigated land for returning servicemen.

I shall not take time to discuss other individual items where the Budget estimates were reduced, but I suggest to the western Members that they review the items listed in the tabulations on page 17 where the reductions are set forth. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Appropriations Committee to take full cognizance of the responsibilities of the Congress for providing the Bureau of Reclamation with funds to carry forward its preconstruction and other work essential to preparations for construction that will provide employment and settlement opportunities on irrigated land for veterans of World War No. 2.

Following the War Between the States we had an era of transcontinental railroad building which furnished employment and opportunity for the creative energies of our people. Following the First World War we had a great impetus in automotive transportation, which called for the building not only of automobiles but of many thousands of miles of concrete highways. This furnished employment and constructive opportunity for the energies of our people. What logical and needed new avenues of construction comparable to the others may be offered our people following this war? It is my conviction that reclamation offers such an outlet for energy in wealth-creating effort. It is a solemn responsibility resting upon Congress to avail the Nation of this opportunity in the immediate post-war future. Let us not muff this opportunity.

Radio Address of President Truman Opening San Francisco Security Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in his radio address opening the United Na-

tions Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, President Truman presented clearly the reasons and necessities for action being taken to outlaw war. It was a powerful speech, convincing in every respect, which the delegates at the conference for the national interests of their own countries, as well as the future welfare of decent mankind, cannot ignore. It was an appeal to apply sound reason to the conditions that exist in the world of today and of tomorrow. It was a speech of recognition of the influence and the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The world is watching hopefully the Conference that is now under way. If successful it will go down in history as one of the great turning points in the history of mankind. It will take its place among the foremost events of history.

As President Truman well said:

You members of this Conference are to be the architects of the better world. In your hands rests our future.

The opportunity and responsibility is theirs. Let us hope and pray that they will rise to the occasion.

Following is the text of President Truman's radio address of last evening:

Delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, the world has experienced a revival of an old faith in the everlasting moral force of justice. At no time in history has there been a more important conference, nor a more necessary meeting, than this one in San Francisco, which you are opening today.

On behalf of the American people, I extend to you a most hearty welcome.

ROOSEVELT NAMED ABLE DELEGATION

President Roosevelt appointed an able delegation to represent the United States. I have complete confidence in its chairman, Secretary of State Stettinius, and in his distinguished colleagues, former Secretary Cordell Hull, Senator Connally, Senator Vandenberg, Representative Bloom and Representative Eaton, Governor Stassen, and Dean Gildersleeve.

They have my confidence. They have my support.

In the name of a great humanitarian—one who surely is with us today in spirit—I earnestly appeal to each and every one of you to rise above personal interests, and adhere to those lofty principles which benefit all mankind.

Franklin D. Roosevelt gave his life while trying to perpetuate these high ideals. This Conference owes its existence, in a large part, to the vision and foresight and determination of Franklin Roosevelt.

Each of you can remember other courageous champions, who also made the supreme sacrifice, serving under your flag. They gave their lives so that others might live in security. They died to insure justice. We must work and live to guarantee justice—for all.

You members of this Conference are to be the architects of the better world. In your hands rests our future. By your labors at this Conference, we shall know if suffering humanity is to achieve a just and lasting peace.

WORTHY PEACE TO BE GOAL OF CONFERENCE

Let us labor to achieve a peace which is really worthy of their great sacrifice. We must make certain, by your work here, that another war will be impossible.

We, who have lived through the torture and the tragedy of two world conflicts, must realize the magnitude of the problem before us. We do not need farsighted vision to understand the trend in recent history. Its significance is all too clear.

With ever-increasing brutality and destruction, modern warfare, if unchecked, would ultimately crush all civilization. We still have a choice between the alternatives: The continuation of international chaos or the establishment of a world organization for the enforcement of peace.

It is not the purpose of this Conference to draft a treaty of peace in the old sense of that term. It is not our assignment to settle specific questions of territories, boundaries, citizenship, and reparations.

This Conference will devote its energies and its labors exclusively to the single problem of setting up the essential organization to keep the peace. You are to write the fundamental charter.

TO CREATE STRUCTURE OF PEACE LEAGUE

Our sole objective, at this decisive gathering, is to create the structure. We must provide the machinery which will make future peace not only possible but certain.

The construction of this delicate machine is far more complicated than drawing boundary lines on a map, or estimating fair reparations, or placing reasonable limits upon armaments. Your task must be completed first.

We represent the overwhelming majority of all mankind. We speak for people who have endured the most savage and devastating war ever inflicted upon innocent men, women, and children.

We hold a powerful mandate from our people. They believe we will fulfill this obligation. We must prevent—if human mind, heart, and hope can prevent it—the repetition of the disaster from which the entire world will suffer for years to come.

If we should pay merely lip service to inspiring ideals, and later do violence to simple justice, we would draw down upon us the bitter wrath of generations yet unborn.

JUSTICE REMAINS GREATEST POWER

We must not continue to sacrifice the flower of our youth merely to check madmen, those who in every age plan world domination. The sacrifices of our youth today must lead, through your efforts, to the building for tomorrow of a mighty combination of nations founded upon justice for peace.

Justice remains the greatest power on earth.

To that tremendous power alone, will we submit.

Nine days ago I told the Congress of the United States, and I now repeat it to you:

"Nothing is more essential to the future peace of the world than continued cooperation of the nations, which had to muster the force necessary to defeat the conspiracy of the Axis Powers to dominate the world.

"While these great states have a special responsibility to enforce the peace, their responsibility is based upon the obligations resting upon all states, large and small, not to use force in international relations, except in the defense of law. The responsibility of the great states is to serve, and not dominate, the peoples of the world."

None of us doubt that with divine guidance, friendly cooperation, and hard work, we shall find an adequate answer to the problem history has put before us.

A MIGHTY UNITED EFFORT IS REQUIRED

Realizing the scope of our task and the imperative need for success, we proceed with humility and determination.

By harmonious cooperation, the United Nations repelled the onslaught of the greatest aggregation of military force that was ever assembled in the long history of aggression. Every nation now fighting for freedom is giving according to its ability and opportunity.

We fully realize today that victory in war requires a mighty united effort. Certainly, victory in peace calls for, and must receive an equal effort.

Man has learned, long ago, that it is impossible to live unto himself. This same basic principle applies today to nations. We were not isolated during the war. We dare not become isolated in peace.

All will concede that in order to have good neighbors we must also be good neighbors. That applies in every field of human endeavor.

For lasting security men of good will must unite and organize. Moreover, if our friendly policies should ever be considered by belligeren leaders, as merely evidence of weakness, the organization we establish must be adequately prepared to meet any challenge.

SOME DISAGREEMENTS MAY BE WHOLESOME

Differences between men and between nations will always remain. In fact, if held within reasonable limits, such disagreements are actually wholesome. All progress begins with differences of opinion and moves onward as the differences are adjusted through reason and mutual understanding.

In recent years, our enemies have clearly demonstrated the disaster which follows when freedom of thought is no longer tolerated. Honest minds cannot long be regimented without protest.

The essence of our problem here is to provide sensible machinery for the settlement of disputes among nations. Without this, peace cannot exist. We can no longer permit any nation, or group of nations, to attempt to settle their arguments with bombs and bayonets.

If we continue to abide by such decisions, we will be forced to accept the fundamental philosophy of our enemies, namely, that "might makes right." To deny this premise, and we most certainly do, we are obliged to provide the necessary means to refute it. Words are not enough.

WE MUST PROVE RIGHT HAS MIGHT

We must, once and for all, reverse the order, and prove by our acts conclusively that right has might.

If we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace.

With firm faith in our hearts to sustain us along the hard road to victory, we will find our way to a secure peace, for the ultimate benefit of all humanity.

We must build a new world—a far better world—one in which the eternal dignity of man is respected.

As we are about to undertake our heavy duties, we beseech Almighty God to guide us in building a permanent monument to those who gave their lives that this moment might come.

May He lead our steps in His own righteous path of peace.

We Have an Obligation to Our Gallant Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal:

"WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO OUR GALLANT FIGHTERS

"First Lt. John S. Knight, Jr., O439199, distinguished himself by heroic and meritorious service in action while serving in the Army of the United States against an enemy of the United States. On January 21, 1945, First

Lieutenant Knight with a small reconnaissance patrol cleared the enemy from Hautbellain, Belgium. In the face of a numerically superior force, the patrol, under the aggressive leadership of First Lieutenant Knight, skillfully carried out its attack completely routing the enemy. The actions of First Lieutenant Knight were in accordance with the highest standards of military service.

"W. M. MILEY,
"Major General U. S. A., Commanding
"Seventeenth Airborne Division."

"MUENSTER, GERMANY, April 2.—First Lt. John S. Knight, Jr., son of the publisher of the Beacon Journal, was killed on March 29 near Haltern while leading a small reconnaissance party on the right flank of the Seventeenth Airborne Division's drive on the Westphalian capital of Muenster.

"The 22-year-old Knight, who won the Bronze Star for gallantry beyond the call of duty in the Seventeenth's bitter fight on the Ardennes bulge, was reconnoitering the road leading from Haltern to the small village of Hullern when he and his party of four enlisted men were ambushed by a relatively strong force of well dug-in, carefully camouflaged Germans on Hullern's western approaches."

Johnny is gone. The lovable, kindly kid who never had a vicious thought in his life is sleeping in Germany because of the mad, senseless ambitions of a demented paranoiac; because in the last 20 years the statesmen of Europe have repeatedly sacrificed principle on the altar of power politics; because those of us in all lands who fought the last time failed to insure a lasting peace; because as his friend and fellow paratrooper, First Lt. Denis Jones of Landisburg, Pa., expressed it, "Johnny was killed just the same way he lived, doing just a little more than anyone asked him to do—giving more than he was required to give. That is one thing nobody will ever forget about him—no matter what he was asked to do, he always threw in a little extra."

As we strive to fight back the tears, there are memories of his childhood, his blond curly hair, his sensitive mouth, his contagious chuckle, his affectionate hugs.

Like every other normal American boy, he had the desire to excel in athletics, became a crack boxer and cross-country star. Never a good student, he tackled the roughest work in a lumber yard during summer vacations with real zest and characteristic energy.

Johnny was never intended to be a fighter; he loved people too much. I have seen him apologize to men he could have knocked flat with a single blow. He knew his physical strength and feared it.

War to him was not a glamorous adventure but a job to be done so that he and millions of other American boys could live normal lives when it was finished.

Yet he took all the tough jobs in stride as paratrooper, liaison pilot, and combat patrol leader.

That was Johnny's way.

There are moments of comfort when we are told of the esteem in which Johnny was held by commanding officer and enlisted men alike.

Lt. Col. Lyle McAllister, of Seattle, Wash., writes that "your son was one of the finest officers in the division and consistently entrusted with the most dangerous and difficult missions."

Pvt. (1st Cl.) Earl Holcomb, of Fola, W. Va., pays this tribute: "He never told us to go where he wouldn't go himself. When you went out on a job with Lieutenant Knight, you knew that he would lead and you would follow. He was the kind of officer who really led."

But then, the tears come faster.

Johnny is gone.

Try as we may, it is difficult not to become embittered. All of the kindly, sympathetic words we have spoken to others now taste like ashes in our own mouths.

Perhaps it is always that way.

The great tragedy of the Johnnys, the Sams, the Petes, the Joes, and all the hundreds of thousands of other fine young men who have died for us is that few of them ever had a real chance at life.

There were so few years, so little time for them to have achieved but the smallest part of their hopes and aspirations.

It was intended by divine providence that the young should have their day in which to rectify the errors of their elders; to press boldly forward without fear or inhibitions in a world which has somehow managed to survive the sins and greediness of countless generations.

This chance has been denied them—forever.

Actually, they wanted so little.

A good home, children, a job, and a future bursting with opportunity.

Now it will never be theirs to know. They have given their lives so that our country might live, that you and I can continue living in security and freedom from fear.

They never had a chance.

We hear the war is practically over in Germany, that losses are light. But every second of every hour it continues, some fine young American boy is being slaughtered by a maniacal foe indoctrinated with cruelty and hate.

Nearly 300,000 Johnnys are gone.

We must make an appointment with those gallant boys and give them a solemn pledge that we shall never again shirk the task of achieving a peaceful world, free from the bestialities and carnage that have made a mockery of civilization through the ages.

We must guarantee them further that their returning comrades will be given the chance at life which was denied to them, that no one of them shall ever suffer through our selfishness and greed, that our high-sounding promises will never reecho as a hollow mockery of words.

Above all, we must work unceasingly for a rebirth of spiritual values and the strengthening of our national character.

Here at home we have undergone no such test as that faced hourly by our youngsters on the fighting fronts. Sometimes I think it would have been better if we had.

But the test will come when the parades are over and bands stop playing.

We have an obligation to those who have made the brave and gallant fight, a covenant with the dead.

To the Johnnys who are gone and the millions of Johnnys to come, let it at least be proved by our acts that we sought redemption and endeavored to make atonement for the sins of a shallow, self-indulgent, and greedy generation.

Through tear-dimmed eyes, I offer a silent and humble prayer.

May his noble soul rest in peace.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

What Shall Be Done With Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, recently See magazine conducted a prize contest and asked for the views of contestants on the question "What Shall Be Done With Germany?" The first prize was awarded to George M. Halliburton, 14 Pond Street, Boston, Mass. I ask that his brief and concise article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The United Nations should form a joint occupation government.
2. Convicted war criminals publicly executed.
3. Military courts for postwar criminals.
4. Supervision of education, and suppression of dangerous organized propaganda.
5. Minimum period of occupation 15 years, Germans to work as hard rebuilding Europe as they did to destroy it, with standard of living their own wartime standard.
6. Reparations based principally on value of 15 years' estimated industrial, mining, and agricultural production above living requirements (total perhaps $350,000,000,000); occupation beyond 15 years if production program not met.
7. Industrial relocation: (a) For several years Germany to produce, at full capacity, machinery, steel, etc., to build industry of European non-Germanic countries. (b) During next few years German heavy industry, including chemical plants, to be moved to non-Germanic countries; German railroads reduced to requirements of agriculture, mining, prescribed light industry; remaining railroads between Oder River and Rhine changed to narrow gage. (c) During remainder of occupation displaced German labor to be channeled into agriculture, and neighboring countries, industries protected from German domination.
8. Germany to be divided thus: (a) East of Oder River, to Poland. (b) Saar Basin, to France. (c) Rhineland, including industrial Westphalia, to be an internationalized state. (d) New Germany to be balance of prewar Germany.
9. Throughout occupation, separate civil administrations for Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, etc., fostering local ties, and democratic, rather than totalitarian, ideals.
10. Continued restrictions on Germany: (a) No airplanes. (b) Army limited to border-protection militia. (c) Imports limited to requirements of new Germany economy. (d) No loans, except with United Nations' approval, after full publicity.

Postwar Policy on Synthetic Ammonia Plants

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, while the reciprocal trade agreement is being considered by committees of the House and Senate, I was amazed to learn of a press release issued by the Department of State under date of April 3, and being No. 293 which revealed a pledge made to the Government of Chile that the United States would retain in stand-by condition the synthetic ammonia plants which it owns during the postwar period. Mr. Speaker, in Lake Charles, in my district

we have a large operator of a Government anhydrous ammonia plant, who has been interested in obtaining an additional sodium nitrate plant in order that the ammonia can be turned into nitrate fertilizer for the postwar period, and since I have one of the largest and most important agricultural districts in the United States, in my opinion, such fertilizer operations would not only be of great value to the Government, but also to my district, State, and the territory surrounding.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement which I refer to is with one country and covers one commodity, synthetic nitrogen, and brings to your attention the danger involved.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

During the course of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City, discussions were held between the United States and Chilean delegations regarding the operation and disposal of synthetic-nitrogen plants owned by the Government of the United States.

As a result of those discussions the Secretary of State informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile that it was not the intention of the Government of the United States that the production by the Government of synthetic nitrogen in plants owned by it and constructed for war purposes, should be continued beyond the period necessitated by the conditions or consequences of the war, except as might be necessary in order to maintain the plants in efficient operating condition for national security from the point of view not only of physical condition but also for the purpose of continuing scientific research and technological progress. The Chilean Minister of Foreign Affairs was also informed that should it be necessary for the Government of the United States to modify this position, there would be consultation with the Government of Chile before any action was taken.

The Secretary of State also informed the Foreign Minister of the intention of the Government of the United States to consult with the Government of Chile with respect to such Government plants for the production of synthetic nitrogen, constructed for war purposes, as might not be dismantled, or converted to uses other than the production of synthetic nitrogen, or maintained for national security, if the terms or conditions of cession, sale, or lease of such plants to private interests might create serious problems affecting the production or exportation of Chilean nitrates. Such consultation would be for the purpose of reaching such accord with respect to those problems as would, while protecting the interests of the United States Government, give due consideration to the effects upon Chile, particularly from the point of view of the competitive situation created by the terms or conditions of the cession, sale, or lease of those plants.

Speed?—Take the Air Ferry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative article, "Speed?—Take the Air Ferry," written by W. Clifford Harvey, appearing in the April 7, 1945, issue of the weekly magazine sections of the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, Mass., of the outstanding 4 years' record of the officers and enlisted men of the Air Transport Command under the able and courageous leadership of Maj. Gen. Harold L. George.

The fine work of the officers and men of this command, with very slight public recognition, has played an important part in the successful progress of the war.

The article follows:

SPEED?—TAKE THE AIR FERRY

(By W. Clifford Harvey)

During the half-hour it takes the average suburbanite to get into the office each morning, and every half-hour thereafter on a round-the-clock schedule, two airplanes complete a crossing of the Atlantic Ocean. Every 51 minutes other planes are landing somewhere after hopping the Pacific Ocean.

From transoceanic supply bases direct to the war zones, these planes are carrying 50,000 tons of high priority cargo and passengers every 30 days. And 4,000 wounded soldiers are flown from the battle fronts to America by this greatest of all air-line ferries every month.

Little wonder, then, that the Air Transport Command of the United States Army will look back over 4 years of sparkling achievements on its fourth anniversary, May 29, with the proud observation that in those 4 years of war it has linked together the complete framework of a potential, postwar pattern of international passenger and freight air service.

In the year just ended the ATC, headed by Maj. Gen. Harold L. George, formerly Chief of the War Plans Division of the Air Staff, piloted 1,250,000 war-important passengers, most of them to locations overseas. Passenger and freight tonnage for the year equaled 580,000 tons, including 3,500,000,000 "pulls" of GI mail. Which adds up to a combined total of 600,000,000 miles of flying, or 25,000 times around the world at the Equator in a single year.

Yet, back on May 29, 1941, this now vast, coordinated system of scheduled air services, flying 2,000,000 miles every day, consisted of only two officers, four enlisted men, a map of the world, and the vision of a meritorious job to do.

Drama, pathos, humor, suspense, and all the range of human emotions are loosed in the tales of those who have flown with the ATC. It has a long list of notable performances, including a nonstop flight from London to Washington in less than 18 hours, and a direct flight from Washington to Paris with General Marshall aboard. Its longest overland supply route (from Central Africa to China) has just completed its first full year of operation without a single fatality. It carried a party of United States Senators on a 38,000-mile trip around the world, including a 3,200-mile, nonstop flight from Ceylon to Carnarvon, Australia.

The story behind the splendid record of the Central African Division is basically the story of the Command itself, of persevering men thousands of miles from their homes, of typical American ingenuity working day and night to maintain plane schedules, and to keep vital parts for planes, tanks, guns, and trucks moving to the battle fronts. Preface for the complete story is the arduous training of pilots and crews, who must undergo refresher courses every 90 days to keep abreast of the fast-moving panorama of aviation progress.

Flying time from Accra on the African Gold Coast to Karachi, India, is about 33 hours, or twice the flying time across the United States. Flying conditions involve excessive heat, with only meager reports of weather conditions which are snapped wide open with little warning by windstorms. But, despite these obstacles, the Command flies on over jungles, deserts, and treacherous mountain ranges, operating around the clock, and only waiting proudly for the day when its facilities can be turned to routine schedules carrying peacetime freight and passengers.

Indicative of the air traffic over the North Atlantic these days is the announcement by the Air Command that in one single month it furnished sleeping quarters to nearly 150,000 persons, served 350,000 meals, putting up another 54,000 meals in transit. Transient accommodations were provided at ATC bases for 15,000 people in Alaska, 26,000 in the Caribbean, 26,000 in central Africa, 21,000 in Europe, 44,000 in Indo-China, 110,000 in north Africa, 75,000 in the Pacific area, and 27,000 in the South Atlantic region.

This largest of all hotel chains spreads out over 160,000 miles of air lines and provides the foundation and basic experience that will be required for rapid conversion to routine air-line travel after the war. In a single year the Command, through its 9 foreign divisions, served as transient quarters to more than 5,000,000 persons.

They are not all the luxury types of hotels. "Hotel de Gink" is the popular name for billeting accommodations at many bases. Some are Nissen huts, or wooden barracks, deep in the jungles. Others are just plain tents on remote islands, or brick buildings in the middle of thriving cities. But they are all comfortable, and they enjoy the distinction of paving the way for the great air-line hotels of the peacetime period to come.

Trade and travel on an air-line transportation service of this type necessarily must have its banking and foreign exchange set-up. This the ATC has on a world-wide basis, with banking facilities at nearly 100 separate stations from Greenland to Alaska to Australia, dealing in the currencies of 36 nations.

The Air Transport Command was the result of a directive by President Roosevelt to the Secretary of War, on May 28, 1941, to assume full responsibility for the deliveries of aircraft to the United Kingdom. This function was shortly broadened to include deliveries to other countries receiving lend-lease aid after the United States entered the war. A day after the President's directive, the Army assumed its responsibility under the leadership of the late Maj. Gen. Robert Olds. It was originally known as the Ferrying Command.

The Command developed rapidly, being divided into two wings, domestic and foreign, and on July 1, 1942, shortly after General George took over, the ferrying, transport, and cargo operations were consolidated under a single command. By the end of 1943, the Command had a personnel strength of more than 85,000 officers and men. Today its strength totals more than 160,000 officers and men.

When the war is over and the victory is appraised in terms of operational contributions, the Air Command will stand high on the list of historic achievements paving the way to a higher civilization. An army cannot move without supplies keeping up with the front lines. And these supplies depend upon the importation into defense plants of materials from all over the world. Hog bristles for making gun brushes, feathers and down for flying suits and sleeping bags, tungsten for armor, tools and filament for radio-radar, industrial diamonds for machine tools, and tin for tin plate came in on the wings of the Transport Command for the American "blitz" abroad.

When the War Production Board informed the ATC that there was not enough talc on hand to keep up production of radio-radar for another 10 days in June 1944, the Command diverted three cargo planes from regular runs in its Central African Division to bring talc from India only 4 days later. Tube production was not delayed a minute.

It was the India-China Division of the ATC that kept China's lifeline open with the outside nations on the most hazardous airway in the world, namely, "over the Himalayan hump" between India and China. During a 6-day period, recently, transports took off for China from India every 4 minutes.

When Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the Generalissimo of China, came to New York, it was the ATC that brought her in 27 flying hours. It is the ATC that is bringing the battle with mosquitoes, wild animals, heat, thirst, and high altitudes to a successful conclusion on world-wide fronts. Weather and communication stations set up in lonely outposts of other worlds, serviced by the ATC, enabled American troops to construct airfields right under the noses of the Japanese. Dog teams directed by the Command rescued the crew of a B–17 lost on the Greenland icecap.

One thing that General George and his staff are not talking about is the process of reconverting their gigantic air-line set-up to immediate civilian and peacetime cargo transportation after the war. They are out to win the war first, leaving the performances of the ATC to speak for themselves in glowing terms of what can be done in a short time to lift freight and passengers into the air lanes.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified to notice the increase in understanding and approval of the work of the Office of Price Administration on the part of the vast majority of American people. This war agency probably has the most unpopular duty of any of the home front organizations. In spite of the difficulty of its task, it has done a magnificent job. The inevitable mistakes have become fewer in number and less important.

A large share of the credit for the successful achievements of OPA has been due to its present Administrator, the Honorable Chester Bowles. It seems to me most appropriate that as the time draws near for the renewal of the Price Control Act we give to Mr. Bowles credit for his achievements.

As part of my remarks, I should like to include a radio talk given by him over the Blue Network on April 19, 1945:

Hello everybody. For many weeks now, I've been meeting with you in these radio talks. Often we have had guests * * * to bring out special points about our rationing, rent and price control—points which I felt you would be most interested in.

But today I have no guests. I'm going to talk to you alone. I'm going to talk to you—directly and frankly on a subject of utmost importance to you and your children, and to all the boys in our armed forces now fighting in all parts of the world to bring this terrible war to a victorious conclusion.

Just a few days ago the news of Mr. Roosevelt's death came to us over our radios and through the headlines of our newspapers. It was a shock to every citizen of the United States regardless of his political belief. Likewise it came as a shock to all the people of England, Canada, Russia, China, and all other parts of the world, looking to America for strength, help, and democratic leadership.

As we slowly recover from the shock, we all realize more than ever, the desperately difficult period in which we are now living. In my opinion—and in the opinion of most of us here in Washington—the next 12 months may well be the most critical year in all American history.

Although the war is going well on all fronts, it remains a tough war. It remains a costly war—a war that must be fought vigorously to a victorious end.

Ahead of us lie the problems of working out a permanent peace that will assure all of us and our children, and all the rest of the world, against future wars of devastation.

Finally and of almost equal importance: This year will also decide whether or not this war will be followed—as the last one was followed—by a period of skyrocketing prices, and then the inevitable collapse.

This coming year will decide whether or not we can keep our economy on a sound and a solid basis—on which to build a future of full employment and full production, and prosperity for all of us.

So far, for the first time in any war, the forces of inflation have been kept under control. We have seen, for the first time, in any war, how you and your neighbors working with your Government, can keep prices on a relatively even basis.

For 2 years now, although there have been some slight price rises here and there we have held the line on rents, on food, and on most of our other essentials.

But now I come to the $64 question! The question it's up to you to answer. The question that every one of us—every one of our neighbors, of our farmers, our Government, must answer—not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of all the boys in your town, and in all our other towns, who are away fighting this war.

Will we have the courage and good sense to keep inflation in check during the months that lie ahead?

This coming year is the test, for in this year, the inflationary pressures will be greatest.

This year is the test, because during the coming months, the lobbyists and pressure groups, who sometimes seem willing to risk our whole future security in their efforts to gain some benefits for themselves, will be on the attack.

Now while OPA is responsible for maintaining control over prices, rents * * * let me make this point emphatically clear. OPA cannot do this job without your vigorous help * * * without your continued support and backing.

Let me repeat that fact. This job—of keeping prices in line—of fighting inflation * * * is your job. It's up to you and your neighbors * * * it's up to our farmers * * * our businessmen * * * our factory workers * * * to all of us—as well as to our Government.

On all sides, the lobbyists and pressure groups are exerting their power. They are trying to tear down the structure which we have built up in this war to protect you against higher—and still higher—prices.

In 1918, after the end of the last World War, similar selfish forces managed to set off a disastrous inflationary spiral.

If we are to avoid the mistakes of the past—we must understand those mistakes—and see that we do not repeat them. Let's recall, for a minute, what happened after the armistice was declared in 1918.

War industries, of course, closed down * * * throwing thousands out of work.

Yet prices—which had soared during the war—continued to rise * * * even faster after the shooting stopped.

What few controls we had had—were dropped as soon as the war was over. As a result—with nothing to stop them—prices went their way unhampered. By May 1920, they had reached their peak. Everything was sky high. Clothing prices, for example, were three times what they had been before the war. A suit of clothes that sold for $25 before the war—then had a price tag of nearer $75. Food prices more than doubled. Rents were up sharply. Rents were half again as high as before the war.

Then the crash came. It came fast. In a little more than a year, factory workers' pay dropped 25 percent. Then more workers were laid off and factory pay rolls dropped 44 percent. Millions of people—innocent victims of a war inflation—walked the streets * * * looking for jobs. More than a hundred thousand businesses—most of them small businesses—failed in a 5-year period. Soldiers back from France were unable to find jobs. Many were reduced to panhandling in the streets.

Nor was it only city people who suffered. Nearly a half a million farmers lost their farms in those same years.

I remind you of what happened after the last war, because that's what we face again today—only on a far larger scale—if we fail to keep prices down, if we fail in our fight against inflation.

That's the decision we must make. That's the $64 question we must answer. Are we going to let inflation beat us again—or are we going to beat inflation? That's the question that is squarely up to us, and there's no dodging it.

I think you understand that. I think most reasonable people do. But there are powerful minorities in business and industry, and let me emphasize that they are minorities, who do not understand this.

They are so absorbed in their own interests—they fail to see the picture as a whole. They don't stop to think that a price increase for them, will not stop with them. They overlook the fact that it only takes one price rise here, and another one there, to set off the whole inflationary spiral, where nobody is the winner, and everybody is the loser.

Most of these men have made good money during the war. Naturally they want to continue doing so. But what they fail to realize is—that neither they nor any of the rest of us can make any money—if higher and higher prices drive us into inflation—and its inevitable result, collapse. They don't see what they themselves stand to lose.

In their determination to put their own interests first—these pressure groups don't stop to consider any of those facts. They go on straight ahead—intent on gaining the price increases they want for themselves. They come to Washington in force, hundreds of them. They crowd the lobbies of Washington hotels. They have big expense accounts, provided by the groups they represent.

Now right here, I want to make one point perfectly plain. When I speak of pressure groups I am not speaking of business generally. By and large, business is solidly behind wartime price control, because they know it's good business. OPA is helped constantly by the advice, cooperation, and leadership of business. Many of the strongest supporters, advocates of price control, are from the ranks of business—both large and small.

Likewise, when I speak of pressure groups I do not refer to businessmen with just grievances, who come to Washington to show us with their records that wartime price controls are causing them real hardship.

The position of OPA has always been very clear. We stand ready to give relief to any industry suffering hardship because of price controls.

But we stand equally firm against all purely selfish and unwarranted demands for higher prices. We will continue to resist those—who to further their own personal interest—try to break down the price controls set up to safeguard our national country's business economy in wartime.

I repeat, we stand staunchly against any selfish groups, which render lip service to the idea of wartime price control but actually do everything they can to sabotage it.

Today we stand at the crossroads. We have our choice of two paths to take.

One road leads to inflation and economic disaster. Knowingly or unknowingly this is the road that the pressure groups are trying to make us travel. They will use every means at their command. They will play on our fears and our emotions. They will ask again and again for selfish concessions. As the Price Control Act comes up for renewal in Congress during the coming weeks, they will try to break its protection by tacking on weakening amendments. If we submit to this pressure—prices will begin to rise. Rents will rise. All this will happen slowly at first. Then as it gains momentum—there will be no stopping it. Prices will go up and up * * * faster and faster.

You'll find your rent—your grocery bill—and all your other bills—getting bigger and bigger. You'll rightly demand higher wages—so you can pay your ever-mounting bills. Wages will start up—but more slowly * * * lagging behind, as they always do. But then they, too, will start upward.

The whole merry-go-round of higher prices—higher wages—will start spinning its dizzy whirl * * * faster and faster carrying us straight into another wartime inflation.

In the face of ever-rising prices—merchants will outbid each other in their rush to build up their stocks—paying any price so long as they can charge more. Prices will reach such heights—that once again—people will not be able to pay them. Then crash! The bottom will fall out of everything * * * plunging us again into the depths of depression.

Merchants will not be able to get a fraction of what they paid for their stocks. Businesses will go bankrupt. Factories will shut down. Farm mortgages will be foreclosed. Millions will again walk the streets * * * in the hopeless search for jobs that aren't there. Breadlines will form in every city. Our returning soldiers—who have won their victory on the battlefront—will find that we have lost our battle on the home front. What a hollow victory * * * to win the war—and lose the peace.

Yes, that is where the first road leads all of us—the road to inflation, to disaster, and ruin. This is the road down which pressure groups and lobbyists would—knowingly or unknowingly—lead us.

But now let's look ahead on the other road. This road is difficult and inconvenient. But it leads to a sound postwar economy—security and full employment for all. We have a good start along it already.

But the going is sometimes rough and steep. Some of us stumble and would turn back. Especially now, when all of us are weary of war, tired of all its restrictions and inconveniences.

But we cannot falter. We must go on. Even though the war news gets better every day we must push on—just as our fighting men are doggedly pushing on. In the postwar world this road means protection for our savings—good wages for our workers, good profits, and far-reaching markets for our businessmen—continued high income for our farmers.

In order to follow this road we must follow the signposts of OPA price and rent control. We must stick to our OPA ceiling prices and other wartime rules. Weary as we are of all of them, they have served us well through difficulties. And the sooner we get safely to the end of the road the sooner we can get rid of them.

Whatever the difficulties, this is the road we have marked for ourselves, this is the road we are determined to follow. Nothing can divert us. For we know that if that happens we are lost.

Let me pledge the full, vigorous efforts of our OPA organization, and all the people in it here in Washington, in our regional and district offices, in our local war price and rationing boards, to lead the fight against lobbyists and pressure groups, against higher prices and rents, against the forces of inflation.

Your letters and your messages prove that we are all in this fight together.

We have our decision—130,000,000 of us. We have the courage to carry it through. Under the leadership of President Truman we'll continue our march. We'll keep on pushing ahead against our enemies abroad, against inflationary forces here at home. We'll march straight on, 130,000,000 strong, up our road to victory.

Prejudice: Our Postwar Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, with the war in Europe against the Nazis drawing so close to final victorious conclusion, with the end of the Nazi's nightmare of race superiority so near, I think it is appropriate and necessary that we in this country give serious thought to the problem of racial antagonisms here in our own country.

We all know of the prejudices and intolerance that mark the pattern of behavior here in many sections and communities with regard to our minority groups. Some of us are trying to pave the way to eradicate these evils through the passage of a bill making it illegal to discriminate against persons because of their race, color, creed, or national origin in the matter of employment.

I would like to obtain permission to insert in the RECORD a very fine article appearing in the May 1 issue of the national magazine, Look, which presents this whole problem of intolerance and prejudice and makes some very sound suggestions as to how to combat it.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from Look magazine:

PREJUDICE: OUR POSTWAR BATTLE—WHEN THE OVERSEAS CONFLICT ENDS WE FACE AN INTERNAL WAR UNLESS RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS TENSIONS ARE REMOVED

The architects of peace, gathering in San Francisco this month to blueprint a better world, probably have never heard the story of the Negro girl who was asked by her teacher to name a suitable punishment for Hitler. "Paint him black," was her bitter suggestion, "and bring him to America."

This has been a war of liberation for oppressed peoples all over the globe. Yet within the borders of our own Nation one-third of the people—the minorities who constitute our second-class citizens—are still behind the barbed-wire fence of prejudice.

Hatred and suspicion divide America. On one side, generally, is the white, Protestant majority. On the other are the 17,000,000 "sub-Americans" of different races and colors—Negroes, Mexicans, American Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos—plus the 23,000,000 Catholics and 4,500,000 Jews who, because of religion, are sometimes shut out from main currents of national life.

The powder keg of prejudice awaits the spark that may detonate conflict. When restraints of war are off and demobilization, reconversion, and lay-offs disrupt the Nation, trouble is expected. Minorities will not easily accept "discriminatory discharges." Merchants of hate will exploit friction.

Can the United States, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, ward off postwar catastrophe? An important, timely book—One Nation, by Wallace Stegner and the editors of Look, to be published this fall by Houghton Mifflin—astutely analyzes the state of our prejudices. In the pages that follow, based mainly on One Nation, Look diagnoses this insidious illness which afflicts all America and suggests some possible cures.

Underlying our prejudices, whether racial, religious, or cultural, is fear—the fear of being overrun, changed or diluted, done out of our jobs or social positions. Thus prejudice is a defense of our particular status quo, our "pure" race, our "right" faith. Too many Americans who should know better shy away from people who appear to be "different" and deliberately or unconsciously wall them off.

SEGREGATION—SHAME OF DEMOCRACY

Probably the most common symptom of our malady is segregation. The South's Jim Crow caste system, at odds with all democratic principles, separates the Negro on trains and busses, excludes him from parks, hotels, restaurants, beaches and schools frequented by whites, seats him in a "nigger heaven" balcony at the theater. Even in our armed forces, Negro enlisted men are often kept apart.

To a lesser extent, Filipinos and Mexicans on the west coast are barred from "white" restaurants, segregated in theaters. Chinese are apt to be confined to "Chinatowns."

Advertisements for resorts or for the sale or rent of property often stipulate "protestant only" or "white only" or "gentile only". Restrictive clauses in property deeds, agreements among neighborhood associations and real-estate agents set up the equivalent of a "no dogs allowed" ban against the unaccepted. Even wartime-housing projects are likely to discriminate. In northern cities, colored ghettos have become worse, rather than better.

BYPRODUCTS: DISEASE, POVERTY, CRIME

One effect of physical segregation in slums and "shacktowns" is overcrowding, which in turn produces poverty, squalor, disease, crime and ignorance. Here, even such elementary needs as garbage disposal and fire prevention are generally inadequate.

Illness of almost every kind is pronounced in the black belts of virtually every city where Negroes have settled. Pneumonia and scarlet fever, for instance, hit their highest peak there. Infant mortality among Negroes in Chicago is twice as high as it is in the rest of the city. Among the Hispanos (Spanish-Americans) of New Mexico, the tuberculosis death rate is about three times the national rate; in San Francisco's Chinatown, it is three times the city's average.

In supporting segregation, as One Nation points out, America is subsidizing social evils,

When diseases in slums break away and become epidemic, when anti-social behavior created by slum living turns into a crime wave, or when race tensions explode into riots and bloodshed, the entire population pays the bill.

WANTED: EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

Reinforcing the fencing-in process, economic discrimination resists the efforts of our sub-citizens to rise out of their class. A number of business firms will not employ Catholics or Jews. The South recognizes "white men's jobs" and "nigger jobs," the latter being the servile, the low-paid, and the unpleasant. Thirty-two labor unions either exclude Negroes or shunt them into Jim Crow locals. Hate strikes have broken out against hiring and upgrading of Negroes, in the North as well as the South.

Highly trained Chinese and Japanese have been forced into menial jobs. Mexicans and Filipinos generally have been confined to back-breaking migrant labor. Although the manpower shortage and the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee have recently tended to even up work opportunities, widespread discrimination persists.

SCHOOLS ARE HAND-ME-DOWNS

As with jobs and homes, education is offered to some minority groups only on inferior or separate terms. Certain colleges and professional schools have "quotas" for Jews and the colored races. The system of separate schools for colored children, prevalent in the South, shows signs of spreading to the North. Southern schools for Negroes are crowded, inadequately equipped; colored teachers draw salaries lower than those of white teachers. Mexicans in Los Angeles and other Southwest communities have similar educational hand-me-downs.

THE LAW, TOO, IS PREJUDICED

Inevitably, legal discrimination has become part of the pattern of keeping the sub-American "in his place." Police protection for minorities is frequently a farce. "Law and order" too often is applied according to the ruling caste, class, color, and faith. When hoodlums attack a minority group, victims rather than aggressors are jailed—"for protection." Voting procedures like the poll tax in seven Southern States, or direct intimidation at balloting or registration places, rob Negroes and others of their franchise.

The ultimate stage of the sickness known as prejudice is violence. It may take the form of hoodlumism, vigilante action, or terror. Recent incidents directed at Negroes, Jews, Japanese, Mexicans, and Filipinos have a clear relationship with the Nazi philosophy of hate; the difference is only in degree.

HATE MONGERS USE NAZI METHODS

Feeding these fires of discord is the slimy propaganda shoveled out by the demagogues who spread their lies via whispers, chain-letters, mass meetings, pamphlets and periodicals. Their poison infects all sorts of people. A decent, well-meaning American is likely to swallow the most whiskered myths and generalizations—canards about Catholic "opposition to scientific progress," Jewish "monopoly," Negro and Mexican "shiftlessness," the Filipino "threat to young American womanhood," unfair Chinese "competition with white labor."

The task of checking group tensions, before they break out into a postwar battle, is America's challenge. How can we meet it?

At no time in recent history have the American people been so conscious of racial and religious prejudice as they are today. Under the impact of war and its democratic aims, more has been done to combat discrimination in the past few years than in decades before. Over 200 inter-racial committees, created by public or private agencies, are tackling local issues. But the outcome of our civil war against intolerance must eventually rest with you, as a voting citizen, and with your community.

You can help bulwark your democracy against the enemy within. Here are some specific things you can do about it:

FACTS REFUTE THE MYTHS

1. Nail the lies. Refute the moth-eaten labels, libels and worn-out club-car jokes about members of minority groups. Generalizations about any racial or religious group are absurd. The Negro's achievements in the arts and science, in industry and on the fighting front, blast the myth that he "can't do skilled work," that he is "a child, with a child's emotional equipment and dependence." If the Catholic Church in politics scares some people, you can point out that Catholics in America are of virtually every political persuasion.

THERE IS NO COMPOSITE CHARACTER

The Jews are neither a race nor a nation; they are so mixed that generalizing about them is impossible. There is a higher percentage of Jews in the armed services than in the general population. Election statistics prove the Jew is not a Communist. Nor does a study of bank directorates indicate that he is an international banker. The composite Negro or Catholic or Jew does not exist.

2. Support legislation, both local and national, outlawing the evils of intolerance. Legislative firmness not only can curb prejudice; it can help break down that prejudice by making people learn that the thing they have feared is no more than an inflated bogey.

New York State has just enacted a law designed to prevent discrimination in employment. There is need for a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practices Committee, a Federal anti-lynching law, repeal of poll-tax statutes, a ban on discrimination in our armed forces, schools, trade unions, housing projects, medical care.

GIVE THE MINORITIES A CHANCE

3. Help open up equal employment opportunity, in private industry and Government. This can be a real contribution to economic security of minorities and to better harmony.

During this war, our second-class citizens have demonstrated their ability to handle any and all jobs, skilled or unskilled, if they are only given the chance of training and experience. If you're an employer, give them the same kind of chance in peacetime, too.

4. Participate, wherever possible, in educational campaigns to combat prejudice. Through our schools and churches, young and old must be made to see prejudice not as white versus black, or Protestant versus Jew and Catholic, but as democracy versus fascism.

Schools should become a social pilot plant for the understanding of races, cultures, heredity. In most young people, merely going to school together breaks down the worst prejudices, unless they are subjected outside to propaganda fomenting district, snobbery, and hatred.

NEEDED: MORE SPRINGFIELD PLANS

Schools can actively educate for racial and religious democracy. An outstanding example is the Springfield (Mass.) plan. A few years ago, this city found that soon its schools would be attended mostly by children of foreign stock, rather than by Yankees. In a decade, these "across-the-tracks" children, grown up, would run Springfield. Rather than look down on the minorities, Springfield decided to make them full and equal Americans. So the school board revised the curriculum, launched an experimental program to meet the problem.

Under the plan, students are given practical experience in working together. Pride in their backgrounds is encouraged. The Negro, Jewish, or Polish child gets a chance to learn, write, and talk about the contributions his group have made to America. Parents get the same chance through forums and adult classes. The many kinds of people in Springfield have been welded into a community.

Other cities are studying and copying the Springfield plan. You should try to interest your town in adopting it.

THEY, TOO, ARE FELLOW AMERICANS

5. Know your neighbor. Nobody knows so little about a minority group as the average American who has lived near it for years. Since prejudice feeds on ignorance, any sort of contact, any break-down of the segregation wall tends to weaken or destroy it. Take part in church, school, and community center get-togethers with people of varied cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds.

6. Help marshal public opinion against intolerance. Get behind one of the many interfaith and interracial organizations, support your mayor's or Governor's committee planning and promoting internal harmony.

PREJUDICE ENDANGERS YOUR OWN WELFARE

You have a personal stake in a working democracy. . Prejudice, through the evils it creates, undermines public health, public safety, religion, the home, business.

There is no magic formula to end intolerance in America. We can start with education, better jobs, better housing, more social freedom, more political freedom. Progress in one field advances others. But our basic, important mission is to guide the potential good will of Americans into channels of working and living together as a nation united.

International Office of Education

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word for House Resolution 215, which would establish an international office of education. Such an office should ultimately be included as one of the agencies responsible to the Economic and Social Council which is a part of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to be acted upon at San Francisco. I hope that committee hearings on this resolution may begin promptly.

A group of outstanding educators have forcibly reminded us that "the peace of the world cannot be maintained by police power or economic or social arrangements alone. For the success of a world security organization, there must be developed a climate of world opinion which not only wants such institutions and arrangements but also wants them to succeed."

Among the immediate needs will be the rebuilding of the educational system of large sections of Europe, Asia, and the Philippines. Famous universities, libraries, and museums with age-old treasures have been laid waste, while the teachers and leaders of thought have been liquidated in order to uproot the culture of those lands. Not only money, but every type of technical cooperation will be needed to restore some measure of the heritage of these peoples and prevent

their slipping back into the illiterate state to which the Axis had doomed them.

Second, should come the regeneration of Axis youth. Granted that large numbers of these will be immune to new influences, a job must be done with the present school children. Already distinguished Americans have helped liberal Italian educators revise school texts, the "delousing" of young minds as this process has been called. Some years back I collected a set of colorful Fascist texts and every page showed the perversion of education for the purpose of creating obedient Fascists. The German system was an even harsher innoculation with Nazi viruses. The most enlightened thought is needed to reverse this process. With the systematic liquidation of liberal educators in the Axis nations, moreover, help from outside will be needed to promote this work.

Third, work should be done to adjust both the outlook and the skills of the physically handicapped. A pooling of experience and techniques could salvage thousands of otherwise wrecked lives and release their energies for useful purposes. To these who have sacrified most heavily in our common effort, the world owes help.

Among the permanent objectives would be the opportunities for better international understanding through conferences of educators, exchange of students, and, in general, the encouragement of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups.

German Horror Camp

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I desire to read a letter received from a boy who has just been released from one of these horror camps in Germany:

Mrs. GEO. W. PHILIPS,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MOTHER: I am now at a large camp near —— France, where the Army is building my body back into condition to make a trip home. I know of a thousand things to say and I know that you have a thousand things to ask.

We were liberated on April 2, and I was flown out of Germany in a C-47 on April 7. I am now in a large camp near —— France. We are getting equipped, paid, etc., here.

I am getting the best of treatment. I am back in the hands of the U. S. A. and it's the most wonderful thing that ever happened to me. I brushed my teeth for the first time since December 19, 1944. I changed clothing yesterday for the first time in 103 days. Yesterday I had the first fresh fruit or real food of any kind that I had eaten in nearly 5 months.

The Germans gave us nothing; no toilet articles, no clothing, no diversions—nothing.

We slept on 3-tiered wooden bunks, with a burlap bag filled with straw for a mattress. Our diet was unchanged from day to day. We were given a week tea, with no sugar, for breakfast; one liter of a tasteless potato soup at noon; for supper, on every day except Saturdays and Wednesdays, a slice of black bread, 250 grams. On Saturdays and Wednesdays we received 210 grams of bread. To augment the supper, we had an occasional 30 grams of marmalade. To flavor the bread, we were given 20 grams of margarine, which is about the size of a pat of butter.

The lice were intolerable. Many of the men have ghastly sores from the bites they scratched. I was more fortunate in that I didn't scratch the bites.

It is like being reinstated to life in heaven after being confined to an inferno, to be back in the hands of Uncle Sam. (Will continue on next sheet of V-mail.)

I am completely at ease now; am being given everything I desire to eat, but I have to eat in very small quantities because otherwise my stomach becomes extremely nauseated and I have to toss the food up. I am in a hospital with plenty of nurses and doctors around to see that I do not hurt myself.

Oh, mother, it is all so beautiful, so wonderful, to be free and clean and not hungry again. I can only choke up and stop talking when I try to tell the nurses how grateful I am.

Don't write to me at the present address, because I will not be at this place very long. All that matters is that I'm free and that I'm coming home for a furlough just as soon as I'm in condition. My heart is bursting with thanksgiving every day. I have been given an opportunity to live again in the most glorious land in the world—to go back to the family I love more than life itself; to share my future with my brothers and sisters; to consult a loving, understanding mother and dad when I am in trouble. And I can feel my soul singing inside me over the magnificence of it all.

Your loving son,

GEORGE.

Illinois Legislature for Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the house on March 28, 1945, and concurred in by the senate on April 5, 1945, Sixty-fourth General Assembly, State of Illinois:

House Joint Resolution 28

Whereas the postal employees of the United States have not received an increase in base pay for over 20 years; and

Whereas during the present emergency they are receiving a $300 a year bonus (said bonus expires on June 30 of this year); and

Whereas these loyal employees of the Postal Service must have an increase in wages if they are to maintain a normal standard of living: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we go on record in favor of H. R. 2071, now before the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the United States House of Representatives, which provides for a reclassification of salaries for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to the Honorable Senators LUCAS and BROOKS, to the Illinois Members of the United States House of Representatives, and to the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Adopted by the House March 28, 1945.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the Senate April 5, 1945.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is a national problem. It is a challenge to every parent and community. This problem may not be eliminated but it can be reduced by all forces in the community working together.

The chief causes of juvenile delinquency can be classed as economic, educational, emotional, and those growing out of faulty home training. We find that the offenders, in most instances often play truant, are antagonistic to their teachers and are violators of the rules of the school. Experts tell us that these delinquents have had very little religious or moral training. Most of them rank two or three grades lower than the normal student. However, many experts in the field of juvenile delinquency are stating that the big problem is adult delinquency rather than juvenile delinquency.

For a good many years, our liberal thinkers, both in the fields of education and religion, as well as political, have been dealing in many social experiments that have been unwise and unfounded. We have been taught during the last 12 years to rely upon social planners and good-doers to guide our children instead of training them in the home. We are not giving them the interest and discipline that our fathers and mothers gave their children.

From the statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation we learn that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. It is said that the increase is about 50 percent among girls and about 10 percent among boys. The chief offenses among girls seem to be ungovernability. For the boys it seems to be in the field of larceny and particularly the stealing of automobiles. In the State of Indiana, in the first 2 months of 1945, juveniles were involved in more than 83 percent of the car thefts.

If we study the early history of our Nation and study the criminal careers of the notorious criminals we would find that the outstanding examples of adult crime started in acts of juvenile delinquency.

The crime wave in America cost our people billions of dollars. We can save billions if we solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. It will be necessary to spend more money on education, vocational guidance, physical fitness programs and youth centers to take care of the youth of our communities. The time has come to invest in these programs because they are fundamental to the safety, security, productiveness and welfare of the Nation.

The time has come to pass an act to assist in making adequate provisions, through the public schools, for physical education and vocational guidance among and with the States insofar as the grants-in-aid to the States herein authorized will permit, without the exercise of Federal control over educational policies of States and localities. Each congressional district in the United States shall receive annually $92,000 from the Government to hire physical education and vocational guidance instructors and purchase the necessary materials to carry on the work. An act of this kind will promote national preparedness and the national welfare. It will be a step in the right direction toward eliminating juvenile delinquency. This program is more vital than compulsory military training.

Every child is entitled to the fullest education that he is capable of assimilating, taught by a competent, sympathetic teacher and learning under a curriculum that is broad and flexible enough to meet the scholastic and vocational needs of every student.

Vocational guidance is very important to the young people of America. The schools of America should be responsible for personal adjustments, as well as for the mastery of book learning. Vocational guidance can be made effective with qualified instructors and up-to-date material and equipment.

A complete physical fitness program will provide a system that will bring to the youth of America the opportunity to guard against their health to develop their bodies so they will be able to take their proper place in society.

We need more youth centers to give us means of bettering our community recreational opportunities. These centers must not merely become a place for jitterbuggers but a place that will offer a program to meet the recreational needs of the community.

The teen-agers do not want just a place of recreation but they like to feel that they are a part of the community and its activities. They want a chance to prove their abilities, especially their leadership which will help them to be the builders of their own community and be prosperous citizens of tomorrow.

Lack of health and physical fitness prevails among the youth of our land because our Nation has failed to recognize the importance of these things. America needs a constructive program of action. No one group can change the condition by itself. It will take an all-out concerted effort of all those concerned.

The future of America depends upon the youth of our land. Our youth must be militant, alert, and aggressive. What are you, as an American citizen, going to do about helping our youth get a start in life? What can you do in your community to improve conditions?

Outlook for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, president of the Studebaker Corporation, before the Chamber of Commerce, April 4, 1945, Hammond, Ind.:

We are meeting here tonight in the wake of a succession of military and naval victories of momentous proportions. There can no longer be any vestige of doubt as to ultimate victory over Germany and Japan. When victory will come, no one knows, and we should not forget for one moment that much terribly tough fighting still lies ahead. If we are ever tempted to relax for even a moment in the carrying out of our war assignments, let us remind ourselves that on the last day of the First World War there were 26,000 casualties. We must continue to give unquestioned priority to the war effort, because otherwise precious time might be lost in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion. Nevertheless, somehow or other we must find time to help set the stage for the winning of the peace.

That phrase—winning the peace—conveys varied meanings, but I am confident that whatever else it may mean to us Americans, it also means the maintenance of a free society with the accent on individual freedom. It is only our deep intuitive knowledge that we are fighting for freedom which reconciles us to our vast outpouring of blood and treasure in this war.

As we plan for the future, let us accept freedom in its broad sense as our most priceless heritage and let us determine to give it new and deeper significance. That is the great challenge. If we accept it, let us recognize the responsibilities it imposes on all of us. It is not enough that our Government be so organized as to safeguard and advance individual freedom. Our homes, our schools, our churches, our businesses, and our labor organizations are in a certain sense governments. Each one must contribute toward the strengthening of our freedoms. Each one must provide conditions which encourage the development of the individual. Only by action on all fronts can we push forward the frontiers of freedom. It is a task not for the few, but for the many. It is a task to which you and I must devote ourselves.

Our free society may face a great crisis during the transition from a war to a peacetime economy. If we should be confronted with either mass unemployment or the mass employment of millions by the Government on "made work," the situation would be pregnant with danger. In the first place, the millions out of work suffer a partial loss of freedom as we have defined freedom. That in itself would be a major disaster because our goal must be more and more freedom for more and more people. In the second place, too much unemployent for too long might open the door for the passage of legislative measures calling for unwise expansion of Government controls over business. Government has, of course, the responsibility of exercising whatever supervision is necessary to protect the general public welfare, but if there are too many controls, and the controls are of the wrong character, the exercise of them might lead to a creeping paralysis of our free economy. If our free economy should wither and die and be replaced by State operation, it would not be long before civil rights would be abrogated and religious freedoms put in jeopardly. That was the sequence of events in Italy and Germany, and there is no reason to believe that it would not be followed here.

How many jobs will be needed to provide abundant employment? No one knows exactly; however, there seems to be general agreement among economists and statisticians that an employment level in the immediate postwar period of between fifty-three and fifty-six million civilian jobs, not counting those in the armed services, will be satisfactory. Involved in the reaching of this goal is the creation of from seven to ten million more peacetime jobs than were available in 1940, our last peacetime year.

When will these seven to ten million new jobs be needed? That depends entirely on when we achieve final victory over Japan as well as Germany. However, our plans for providing this greatly expanded employment should be ready to put into action the minute Germany collapes, because the period of greatest crisis may well be that between the fall of Germany and that of Japan. On the day Germany gives up, our domestic economy will be confronted with a high percentage of the problems that total peace will bring. Cutbacks in war production will throw millions of men out of employment and the probabilities are that the armed services will begin releasing men. If we don't have plans ready to get these men back into civilian jobs as quickly as possible, if we are not prepared to deal with the problems of peace when Germany falls, partial peace may bring a partial paralysis of our economy. That would be disastrous, not only from the standpoint of winning the peace but also that of finishing the war with Japan in the shortest possible space of time. Confusion and chaos on the home front would delay the day of ultimate victory; high and sustained civilian morale, based on confidence in the future, will hasten it.

Where will those jobs be found? Employment is found in only two fields—private and public enterprise. In 1940, of the 46,000,000 jobs then available, approximately 43,000,000 were in the field of private enterprise—in commerce, agriculture, manufacturing, the professions, trades, and services. The balance of 3,000,000 was in the field of public enterprise—in regular Government establishments at the Federal, State, and local levels. There will doubtlessly be in the postwar period some expansion above the prewar level of employment in regular governmental services. Useful public works would also supply some of the new jobs needed, but there is unanimous agreement that it is highly desirable that the great bulk of those jobs be found in the field of private employment. Conversely, every businessman will agree that nothing would be more disastrous than to rely on government alone for the expansion in employment which is necessary.

Nothing I have said should be interpreted as opposition to having available jobs on public works. It is unfortunate that we haven't ready now a much larger shelf of projects blueprinted and with financial arrangements made. Too much of the planning for postwar public works is still in the dream stage.

How are jobs created? It is easier to tell how jobs are not created than how they are created. They are not created by speeches about full employment, nor are jobs created in any real sense by adding names to public or private pay rolls. Actually, useful jobs stem only from the production and distribu-

tion of goods and services. Therefore, to get more jobs born we must expand consumption and production.

Involved in an expansion of production—an expansion of private enterprise—are many complex factors, ranging from hard cash to daring imagination. Before output can be increased sufficiently to provide one new job, someone has to have an idea, a plan, capital, the willingness to risk that capital, plus the necessary skill in production or distribution, or both, to translate that plan into a program of action. To create the 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 new peacetime jobs we'll need in the postwar period will require hundreds of thousands of ideas, billions of risk capital, and a vast amount of courage, because these new jobs can be created through an increase in our national output of goods and services to a level 30 percent to 45 percent above that of 1940. Stated in terms of 1943 prices, it means we must achieve a gross output of from $155,000,000,000 to $170,000,000,000.

It is the studied opinion of the Research Committee of the Committee for Economic Development that this goal can be reached—and perhaps exceeded—in the first post-war decade, provided:

1. That America's 2,000,000 employers are ready, when the green light is given for civilian production, with bold, smart plans.

2. That the economic climate is favorable not only to the expansion of present businesses, but also to the starting of a vast number of new businesses quickly. We must attract at least a million new enterprisers who will shift from job-holding to job-giving. One fact we should recognize is that most of these new enterprisers, in fact, most of the expansion of our present enterprisers, must come in the field of distribution. It is the trades and services which hold much of the promise for the attainment of new levels of employment.

3. That we have peace rather than war on the industrial front.

Business, labor, and agriculture each have the right—in fact, the responsibility—to make suggestions and recommendations as to the changes in laws and policies which they believe necessary. Our committee, in considering how it might engage in a constructive activity looking toward the creation of a better economic climate, reached certain conclusions. First of all, we recognized that the only sound approach in the appraisal of policies should be from the standpoint of the general public welfare. We did not subscribe to the idea that what helps business helps you, but rather what helps you and every other American helps business. Our primary concern is over the maintenance of a free dynamic society in the postwar period. If such a society prevails, business and labor both can be assured of their essential freedoms.

Civil war on the home front may nullify the victories won for us by our men on fighting fronts throughout the world. We who are managers of enterprise must go far beyond mere cooperation in trying to work out a harmonious relationship with labor. We must fight for peace. Just within the last few days Mr. Eric Johnston, Philip Murray, and William Green joined in proposing a seven-point charter to govern the successful relationships between management and labor. The charter asserts that (1) increased prosperity involves high production and adequate wages; (2) the rights of private property and free choice of action must continue; (3) the inherent right of management to manage shall be recognized; (4) the fundamental rights of labor to organize and engage in collective bargaining shall be recognized and preserved; (5) the independence and dignity of the individual and the enjoyment of his democratic rights are inherent in the American society; (6) an expanding economy at home will be stimulated by increased foreign trade; and (7) an enduring peace must be secured. In my opinion, this agreement represents a most significant step forward toward a sounder labor-management situation. I suggest that it merits the enthusiastic support of all of us.

Let me summarize, if I may, what I have been saying. First, I have suggested that our most priceless heritage is freedom. I have affirmed that we the people—you and I—have the specific and personal responsibility of contributing as best we can to creating conditions in our homes, our schools, our churches, and our businesses, which will promote freedom. I have defined the condition of freedom as a dynamic one that promotes the growth of the individual physically, intellectually, and spiritually. I have stressed the dangers that might assail our freedoms in the event of mass unemployment and suggested, therefore, the great urgency of maximizing the contribution of business to the achievement of a high level of postwar employment. Again I say that by business I mean all of us—you and me. I have sounded a battle cry for industrial peace. I have urged that in addition to our war effort we must help set the stage for the winning of the peace. Please note that phrase, "Set the stage for the winning of the peace." It is our task to win and hold a beachhead. In the actual battle for the winning of the peace we are going to have the tremendous advantage of having with us as allies the millions of young men who are now engaged in fighting to protect our freedoms. They will supply so much daring, resourcefulness, and inventiveness that I have every confidence that with their help their world can be a better one than we have ever known.

Washington Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a part of an article written by Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Philadelphia Record on Tuesday, April 24. I wish to call attention to the account of the dinner given at the Hotel Statler last week by the National Homebuilders' Association, at which a number of Members of Congress were present, and to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] on his prompt and courageous denunciation of the indefensible attack on our late beloved President and his wife. I believe the entire membership of the House will join with me in commending his action. The article follows:

LOAN LOBBYISTS

About 35 Congressmen got roped in on an off-the-record dinner at the Hotel Statler last week. They came to have fun, but some of them went away boiling mad.

Their hosts were the National Homebuilders' Association, recently active in lobbying among Congressmen to keep the Government out of the postwar housing picture. Despite failure to provide adequate low-cost housing in the past, many finance companies specializing in home loans are doing their best to block Government operation.

No speeches were scheduled for the Statler dinner, but Senators and Representatives were asked to take a bow. GOP Representative FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, took this occasion to tell how his own banking business planned to issue home loans to veterans, while GOP Representative REID MURRAY, of Wisconsin, urged more bathrooms for farm houses. He said farmers were able to pump water into bathrooms because of Rural Electrification Administration.

Then came the big event of the evening. After all the solons had taken their bows and everyone was in relaxed mood, Lobbyist Daniel A. Loftus, of the National Homebuilders, was introduced as the association's "forensic star." Then only 5 days after Franklin Roosevelt had breathed his last, Loftus launched into a bitter attack on the late President and Mrs. Roosevelt.

"Roosevelt," denounced Loftus, "was a great dreamer who started to socialize things, aided and abetted by his wife, who rushed around with her rubber boots and her little blue roadster—which was a Cadillac."

He followed with a tirade about the "socialistic schemes" of the New Deal and the Communist influence upon the White House. Direct object of his attack, of course, was the National Housing Act.

The good will earlier generated by the lobbyists disappeared. A dozen Congressmen got up and walked out while Loftus was speaking, the attack especially arousing young WALTER HUBER, promising freshman Democratic Congressman from Akron, Ohio.

HUBER got to his feet as soon as Loftus finished and declared:

"It comes with ill grace 2 days after the burial of our great President to make a personal attack upon him and his bereaved widow."

The room became hushed. Nearly everyone present, including Republicans, nodded agreement with HUBER.

"As a neophyte Member of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee," continued HUBER, "I don't claim to know all there is to know about housing—public or private. But I've heard mention this evening of dreaming and of bathrooms in farm houses.

"As I look about me, I see here many who recently opposed the confirmation of one of the ablest Administrators we have ever had as head of the REA—Aubrey Williams. I'd simply like to point out that without the vision and the dreaming that created REA and a number of other Federal projects since 1932 you gentlemen wouldn't even have the home to build so that you can put bathrooms into them."

The housing-loan lobbyists will have a hard time staging another dinner in the future.

Tribute to Late President by Bishop Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following memorial address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, over radio stations WIND and WBBM on April 14, 1945:

The great friend of the common man is gone.

The defender and protector of the "little people" is dead. He who knew their thoughts and their aspirations, who voiced their hopes and dreams, has laid down his burden and gone to rest. Across his record can be written in lines of burnished gold: "Died in the line of duty."

"For greater love than this hath no man: That he should lay down his life for a friend." And he laid it down with a will, fully conscious of the fact that he had carried forward a little farther mankind's eternal quest for freedom.

"Freedom is not to limit—but to share,
And freedom here—means freedom everywhere."

But his memory shall live on. His brave words and braver deeds will become as shining beacons beckoning onward a tired and flagging humanity. There can never be rest for those of us who hold dear his memory. As he did, so must we do.

We must spend lavishly our coin of life to purchase for our fellowman those ideals he fought and died for. We must pour out, with generous measure, the very breath of existence in an unceasing struggle for the dreams he dreamed, but did not live to see accomplished.

Yes; his memory shall live on. It will spring into being in the smile of a little child yet unborn, who will know a richer, fuller life because he lived.

It will shine in the face of a tired, benumbed laborer, crouched in front of a mammoth machine, overwhelmed by the mechanics of industry, yet conscious of his dignity as a human being because of the goal President Roosevelt had pointed out.

It will burn in the hungry breast of a war-weary European peasant who will again know of hope and faith and charity because these were gifts of which he gave freely.

It will blaze as an unquenchable fire in the minds and hearts of all men, everywhere, who yearn for freedom.

It will gleam in the dark nights of human despair, and men will warm themselves in its glow and return renewed and revitalized to the struggle for human rights.

His memory will stand as a mightly bulwark, an impregnable fortress against those enemies of democracy who would encompass and destroy it. And his name alone will be sufficient to rally freemen to the standard of humanity.

Dry your tears.

Lift up your hearts.

Let not the hours be wasted in unavailing grief.

His work remains to be finished and it needs the willing hands of all those who marched beneath his banner.

He cannot rest in peace while one human being wears the chains of slavery.

He cannot rest if one mouth goes unfed, one body unclothed.

He will not rest if the fires of victory turn into the dead ashes of forgotten promises, broken pledges, and battered hopes.

But he shall rest, aye, and endlessly * * * if the dreams he dreamed become the reality of a bright tomorrow.

He shall rest, and his gallant spirit will at last go winging home if mankind can find in the unity of grief over his death that unity of life to which he dedicated his entire being.

The stage is empty.

The great, brave voice is stilled.

And from the wings the soft-murmured lamentations, eddy and swell.

The people are taking him to his last resting place.

"The long journey" is over.

The tired and strained ship has anchored in the harbor.

And on the shore the watchers stand mute, each man alone.

The people are taking him to his last resting place.

To deep solitudes and quiet moments.

To silent hours and noise-hushed thoughts.

To that small castle in which few may enter.

The people are taking him to his final resting place.

Beat softly drums.

Blow gently bugles.

This moment is sacred.

The people are enshrining him in their hearts.

"Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord:
"And may perpetual light shine upon him."

Address of Hon. Hugh De Lacy, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and effective radio speech made over Station WJW, of Cleveland, by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] on April 25, 1945, on a program sponsored by the employees of the Fisher body plant, of Cleveland, Ohio:

Today, April 25, 1945, the peoples of the world, through their chosen representatives, sit down in San Francisco to build a living monument to Franklin Roosevelt.

And fittingly so, for the fervent prayers and ceaseless labors of this great American, conquering death, are still moving mountains of prejudice, bringing all peoples closer together, and guaranteeing to them and their children forever, without distinction of race, nationality, geography, or creed, freedom from age-old oppression, freedom from the horrors of war, freedom to think and speak, freedom to work and live and die in accordance with the teachings of their own consciences and the laws and customs of their own countries.

Labor has strong cause to cherish the memory of our country's greatest President. Taking office in a troubled time, with millions in distress and despair, President Roosevelt, backed by the people's representatives in Congress, wrote into law that working men and women could never again be denied the right to organize into unions of their own choice, provided that the jobless must not starve, began a vast slum clearance and low-rent-housing program, set a limit below which wages may not fall, and established 40 hours of labor as the maximum for a week without payment of overtime rates.

Each time after a terrific fight, President Roosevelt inaugurated a system of social security and old-age pensions, guaranteed the little man's savings, protected his widow against unscrupulous stock manipulators, and changed the outlook of the Supreme Court from the last voice of reaction to a powerful bulwark of the people's liberties and trenchant defender of the right of Congress to pass laws providing greater security and justice and opportunity for the common man.

By these and other fundamental measures, which pass unchallenged today, Roosevelt strengthened the economy and the Government of this country. Giving back to the hearts of millions their faith that democracy can and does work for the people was President Roosevelt's first great blow against the Fascist and Nazi Powers that were then fooling and terrorizing so much of the world.

You men and women who are listening in tonight, builders of bombers and fighters and tanks, makers of the indispensable tools of modern war, fathers and mothers and dear friends of the brave young men who are killing and routing and breaking our enemies in far away lands and seas—you here today have a right to take deep pride in the great part your united strength, marshaled behind President Roosevelt, has played in stiffening freedom's forces here and throughout the world. You have a right to take pride in the skill of your hands and in the magnificent contribution you have made through your unbroken observance and your recent overwhelming reaffirmation of labor's voluntary no-strike pledge.

If on this historic day we pause in our thoughts and hopes of the future to remember the great man who brought us so far forward upon this path, it is because Roosevelt towered high above the spokesmen of division and prejudice and appeasement, because he warned us all against the Nazi menace when Litvinov, of Soviet Russia, was the only other strong voice urging united world action against aggression. We honor our fallen leader today because on the Atlantic, at Casablanca, Quebec, Teheran, and Yalta, more than any other national or world leader, he fought for and won the basic agreement, the unshatterable unity of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, which is the source of the devastating military power now crushing our enemies and the foundation for the new world organization which the San Francisco delegations are starting this day to build.

We remember and give thanks for Roosevelt today because the great work he wrought so well he also left in safe, sure, devoted hands. In President Harry S. Truman the people will find another devoted champion; the Nation, another unswerving leader, and the world, another strong American spokesman for liberty, justice, security, and peace.

During his 12 years in the United States Senate Truman supported President Roosevelt's program every step of the way. His legislative record is second to none, whether the measuring stick is labor legislation, social security, the outstanding accomplishments of the Truman committee, pronouncements on foreign policy, appropriations for war, or his courageous vote twice to close debate on the anti-poll-tax bill.

Asked in his first press conference where he stood on the Missouri Valley Authority, public power, and the creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, President Truman impatiently replied, "I stand where Senator Harry S. Truman stood in his speeches of last year on the Senate floor."

Only 11 short days ago on the floor of the Congress, addressing a joint session, his first Presidential message, Harry Truman, raised up from a farm in Missouri, solemnly declared—

"Almighty God has seen fit to take from us a great man who loved and was beloved by all humanity. * * * The world knows it has lost a heroic champion of justice and freedom. * * *

"So much blood has already been shed for the ideals which we cherish and for which Franklin Delano Roosevelt lived and died, that we dare not permit even a momentary pause in the hard fight for victory. * * *

"I call upon all Americans to help me keep our Nation united in defense of those ideals. * * *

"I want, in turn, to assure my fellow Americans and all those who love peace and liberty throughout the world that I will

support and defend those ideals with all my strength and with all my heart. That is my duty, and I will not shirk it."

Reiterating America's demand for unconditional surrender, President Truman said, "Having to pay such a heavy price to make complete victory certain, America will never become a party to any plan for partial victory. * * * We will not traffic with the breakers of the peace on the terms of the peace."

"We will face the problems of peace," President Truman said, "with the same courage that we have faced and mastered the problems of war. In the memory of our fallen President, we shall not fail."

"The peace-loving nations," he continued, "must be united in their determination to keep the peace under law. * * * Nothing is more essential to the future peace of the world than continued cooperation of the nations which had to muster the force necessary to defeat the conspiracy of the Fascist powers to dominate the world."

Appealing again to every American, "regardless of party, race, creed, or color," to support the building of a United Nations' organization for world peace, the President said to Congress, "Surely you know how I feel. Only with your help can I hope to complete one of the greatest tasks ever assigned to a public servant. With divine guidance and your help, we will find the new passage to a far better world, a kindly and friendly world, with just and lasting peace."

"Here in America," President Truman reminded Congress, "we have labored long and hard to achieve a social order worthy our great heritage. In our time tremendous progress has been made toward a really democratic way of life. Let me assure the forward-looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people. * * *

"On the battlefields we have frequently faced overwhelming odds—and won. At home, Americans will not be less resolute."

Friends, our most fitting salute to the historic labors begun this day at San Francisco is to serve notice on our enemies that this great Nation stands united as never before, behind the work and ideals which Franklin Roosevelt has left for completion to the strong and devoted hands of President Truman.

Under his leadership and with the help and unwavering support of all of us, America will go forward. We will crush the military power of Japan and Germany forever. We will take our rightful part in the organized councils of world peace. Adopting the reciprocal trade and Bretton Woods' agreements, as requested by President Truman, we will find markets abroad for otherwise excess plant capacity to the lasting benefit of ourselves and of the peoples of other lands.

We will fight and win the battle of jobs for all—for war workers and veterans, for black and white, for men and women, without discrimination. Standing together, we will win the fight to bring the best medical care within the reach of everyone, to set up a uniform system of federally guaranteed unemployment compensation and increased old-age benefits. Standing together, we can ensure a high and steady volume of purchasing power in America's vast home market by guaranteeing a minimum annual return to every worker and farmer.

Standing together against tyranny, standing together for peace and democratic progress, standing together as Roosevelt taught the peoples and the nations of the earth to stand, thousands gathered here today and millions throughout America and the world turn toward San Francisco, knowing what we want and confident that this time no power is left on earth strong enough to stop our forward march.

The Polish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 26, 1945:

FIRM AND FRIENDLY

Discussion of the Polish problem has been transferred to San Francisco, where the British, Russian and American Foreign Secretaries are still seeking agreement. Current indications are, however, that the deadlock can be broken only in Moscow. President Truman did not yield to the appeal of the Soviet Foreign Commissar, V. M. Molotov, for representation of the existing made-in-Moscow Polish Government when the two met at the White House. He stood firm on the American-British policy of refusing to invite a Polish delegation to the United Nations Conference until the Government at Warsaw has been revamped into a genuine government of national unity.

The White House announcement about the conference between the President and Foreign Commissar Molotov was very brief. It made clear that conversations would continue at San Francisco after Mr. Molotov has had an opportunity "to consult with his Government." That is a pretty clear indication that President Truman was putting it up to the Russians to comply with the Yalta Agreement. We think that he was right in doing so. Undoubtedly, his continued rejection of the Russian appeal was friendly and expressed with the greatest good will, but also with commendable firmness. That is an attitude which the Russians will both understand and respect.

Our Government is in a specially advantageous position to stand firm in this matter because our troops in Germany are holding to the lines of occupation agreed upon by the Big Three. They could have moved into Berlin. They have refrained from doing so in deference to our understanding with the Russians. Similar compliance with the Yalta formula as to Poland can now be required in the spirit of reciprocal respect for international commitments. Every effort to reach an agreement within the principles laid down at Yalta will doubtless be made. But the abandonment of those principles would not be in the interest of Poland or of good international relations. We think that the people of the United States will overwhelmingly uphold the President in standing firm on this vital issue.

Will the Order Closing the Gold Mines Be Lifted on VE-Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, for almost 3 years the gold mines of this country have been closed down as nonessential to the war effort, while the mines in other countries, some of them desperately involved in this war, have continued full blast.

No industry in this country has suffered under a similar order to that inflicted upon the gold-mining industry. Other industries closed down by the war have been able to translate their capital and equipment into other lines of production, but no such steps have been possible for the gold miners. As a consequence, the gold mining operators have had to stand idly by and watch their mines fill up with water, the tunnels cave in, and many gold-mining properties representing lifetimes of investment and work of these people have been totally sacrificed and lost to them. Others have spent thousands and thousands of dollars trying to keep their mines timbered up and trying to keep the water out of their mines in order to save their lifetime investments against the day when they would be permitted to again operate. All of this—the payment of maintenance, taxes, and other expenses—has been borne by the miners alone without Government assistance, but the mortality rate among the gold-mining operations has been heavy.

We have therefore looked forward with extreme anxiety to the day when gold mining could be resumed. When reconversion was first talked of last summer and fall, the WPB was contacted in regard to the resumption of gold mining and we were given a definite assurance by Mr. Krug that the WPB planned the lifting of the ban on gold mining at the end of the hostilities in Europe.

Recently a committee has been set up known as the Committee on Period One, for the purpose of determining which orders should be lifted on VE-day. Among these—and there are 300 or 400 altogether—is Order L-208, closing the gold mines. The list is currently being circulated among the various Government departments for their comment. I understand that the WPB and the War Manpower Commission have both recommended against lifting the order closing the gold mines.

This adverse recommendation is based upon the proposition that there is a critical need of lead, copper, and zinc for war production and it is claimed that permitting the resumption of gold mining may draw men out of the lead mines, in particular in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah. My information is that this is not true and that the lead operators in those four States themselves have stated that they will not lose any manpower by reason of a lifting of the gold-mining ban.

There is a limit to the sacrifice which the gold-mining people should be requested to make on one pretext or another by the WPB and other agencies. No industry has suffered such extensive loss as the gold-mining industry and simple justice demands that this outrageous order, which was never justified in the first place, should be repealed. I call this matter to the attention of my colleagues in the House—those representing gold-producing areas and those in particular of the four States of Arizona,

Colorado, Idaho, and Utah—and ask that you all join in in demanding immediate justice for the gold-mining industry of this country.

The Principles and a Pattern for the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by the Honorable Robert G. Simmons, chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska, on the principles and a pattern for the peace.

The Honorable Robert G. Simmons served as a Member of this House for a number of terms.

Mr. Speaker, the article by the chief justice of Nebraska was written several months ago but it points out very clearly some of the roads we must travel if we are to forge the instruments or even draw the blueprints which will establish a permanent and durable peace:

[From the American Bar Association Journal of April 1945]

THE PRINCIPLES AND A PATTERN FOR THE PEACE

(By Hon. Robert G. Simmons, chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska)

Now and then judges, in deciding cases, become wearied by the effort to distinguish the differences in the details of legal opinions. Occasionally, and perhaps too seldom, they turn to fundamental proven principles of the law and on that foundation build a sure and just decision. Why not do that on the problems of the peace?

The American people are now confronted with the question of whether liberty and world peace can be assured under law. In our own country we have witnessed the settlement of disputes by an established system of justice according to law. These disputes go the full way from family quarrels to controversies between States and even with the National Government itself. They go to liberty, to property, and to all the rights of men, including their right to think, to speak, to live, and to worship. Trial by battle has been outlawed long since and only resorted to in diminishing cases, where the use of arms is necessary to enforce the judgment of our organized society. We have proved, as indeed have all civilized nations, that within our own borders it is not necessary to go to war to settle disputes.

It is obvious that some organization to attempt to insure peace will be set up after the close of this war. We are generally agreed on the objective. We seek the principles and the pattern by which such a system may be established among nations. Those in high places, who speak for us, are now working on that problem, and have suggested the principles and lately a method.

In World War No. 1 we had President Wilson's Fourteen Points. The historians and the statesmen still debate their meaning. This war, so far as our Nation is concerned, was preceded by the historic meeting of our President and England's Prime Minister, from which came the Atlantic Charter. There have followed the President's "four freedoms," the declaration of the United Nations, the declaration issued from the Moscow Conference and Tehran, and others. We now have the result of the labors at Dumbarton Oaks.

Disagreement, confusion, and debate, too often of detail, have followed each of these pronouncements.

Any peace that is to be permanent and any organization that is to be acceptable must be founded on moral and spiritual principles that are understood by and acceptable to the peoples of the world. It must be a workable plan. It is to be remembered that, while officials of government may propose, the effective result will depend upon the final willingness of the peoples affected to make the sustained sacrifices and give the support that will insure vitality and power to such an organization.

PRINCIPLES FOUND IN THE AGE-OLD SPIRITUAL FAITH

Let us then go to proven principles and a known, tried pattern—principles that are age-old, a pattern that has proved successful in this Republic.

The principles upon which this Republic is based are three. They are stated in our declaration. They bear repeating. Men have unalienable rights which governments must respect and protect—these rights are stated in the bill of rights of our Constitution. Men are created equal. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Those principles have a spiritual foundation. Their source is in the belief of men in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men. If you seek proof of this, study the influence of the churches, of churchmen as pastors, teachers, and public leaders during that time. Study also the dominant place of the schools conducted by the churches in the then educational system. That belief and that alone was the unifying faith that brought and held the colonists together. We built this great Nation, and based our entire system of jurisprudence upon that faith and those principles. For over a century and a half in America we, as a free people, have moved in accord with them. Admittedly we, as humans are wont to do, have failed to achieve the full realization of those ideals, but we have built upon that foundation, and we have had those ideals to inspire and to guide.

We in America do not have a monopoly upon that faith. The people of the Allied Nations do not have a monopoly upon that faith. Multiplied millions of peoples now ruled by the Axis Powers have that faith also. It is the one fundamental ideal common to the peoples of every race and every nation.

But it may be said that we in America have succeeded in building and maintaining a Government based upon those principles because we are a united people. Let's examine the situation that existed when we adopted our constitutional system and started it in operation. For it is to that then, not to the now, that we must go to make the comparison.

THE PATTERN IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM

We were then 13, largely independent States, but recently colonies of England. We had 13 separate and in some respects conflicting systems of government. We were a people of many racial ancestries, but recently removed from the mother countries. There were among us colonies of men and women from practically every nation and race of the Old World, with different group spredominating in some of the States. These peoples collectively and individually had a pride in their race, their cultures, their old-country methods and traditions. We were of many races, not one race, at that time. Whatever merging into a people of one race then taking place was toward a State loyalty and a State citizenship. The national conception was not then predominant.

We were also a people of many creeds with different religious organizations dominant in certain of the States. For instance, there was the Church of England in Virginia, the Catholic Church in Maryland, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Congregationalists and Puritans in the New England and Northern States. We, as a people, worshiped at many altars.

The States were not of equal strength and population. There were the powerful States of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York, and others so sparsely populated that at least four of them did not have any city with a population of 5,000 within their borders.

Some of the States had spent large sums in the prosecution of the war and were in serious financial difficulties—others had not and were not.

Some of the States had as their only industry a primitive agriculture. Others had become commercial centers, had developed some manufacturing, and a not inconsiderable maritime business.

Physically close together, they, because of slow communications and means of travel, were far removed from each other. Other differences need not now be mentioned.

The weak States feared the strong, the strong were not too willing to undertake to carry the burdens of those less favorably situated. There were jealousies and antagonisms between States. They were tired when the Revolution ended, just as the people of this and other nations will be tired when this World War comes to a close. But they had their ideals, the three mentioned, that were common to all. They realized that something had to be done to assure peace, liberty, the well-being of all. The thirteen States sat down together, reconciled their differences, gave and took, drafted our constitutional system and builded our Government.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT WAS RESULT OF WORK, EFFORT, AND SACRIFICE

Three further facts are to be remembered in comparing our then with the world's now. The Colonies first attempted to tie themselves together by the Articles of Confederation. They did not confer a power to enforce decisions. Congress became a debating society. The system fell apart as the result of its own infirmities. Second: There was a waiting period between the close of the war and the drafting and adopting of the Constitution, during which men reasoned together. Third: Constitutional Government did not become an established fact when that instrument was adopted by the States. It came only as the result of years of work, effort, and sacrifice guided by a faith and a will to make it succeed. But it came.

If 13 States could do it then, why cannot 13 nations, or 26, or 50, do it now? Superimpose the problems of the nations now upon the problems of the States then, and we find many that were common and few that were different. Our perplexities are no more difficult to us now than theirs were to them then. They solved them by building around a common spiritual faith.

Should not this Nation frankly and simply declare that we fight that the unalienable rights of men will be preserved, protected and respected by governments on this earth; that the truth of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man will control in man's relation with his government and his fellows; and that for all peoples there will be established governments that exist by the consent of the governed? Should we not declare that these truths will become the fabric of the treaty and will control in the writing of the peace? Should we not pledge our Government honestly and courageously to advance these ideals among governments when the readjustments and the rebuildings come that will follow this war? Should we not declare that they will be maintained in the years ahead? We will then be declaring purposes that express the ideals and hopes

of men of every race and creed—ideals that they understand and will support. If that is done, we may look forward to a lasting peace and real progress in self-government among men.

Should we not, can we not, now go to those same basic principles of the rights of men and of governments and, on our constitutional pattern, build the organization that will give the world the blessings that our system has given to us? It is a method that has been tried and proved. It is founded on the solid rock of the religious faith of men. Our ancestors, coming from many nations, made it succeed. Cannot their descendants in the many nations do likewise? I submit it is worthy of a trial.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Baltimore, Md., April 21, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: The board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, at its meeting on April 19, unanimously adopted a resolution recording its deep sorrow at the untimely death on April 12 of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and pledging its wholehearted support and cooperation to President Harry S. Truman in the vital and difficult tasks which lie before him.

I am pleased to transmit to you herewith for your information copy of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

W. G. EWALD, *Secretary.*

Resolution by the Board of Directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, April 19, 1945

On behalf of the business and industrial community of Baltimore, the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce records its deep sorrow at the untimely death on April 12, 1945, of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and wishes to convey this expression to the family of the President and to his associates in government.

Throughout a lifetime devoted to the common good, Franklin Delano Roosevelt labored unceasingly for the welfare of his country and of the entire world. In a time of crisis and despair his was the vision and faith to lead us not only to victory but beyond to lay the foundation for a just and lasting peace based on good will and a better understanding among men and nations. Only future generations who profit by his labors will realize his true stature.

To the new President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, we wholeheartedly pledge the support and cooperation of Baltimore business in the vital and difficult tasks which lie before him. As he assumes the heavy responsibilities of his office, the managements of the commercial and industrial establishments of this community desire him to know they are ready to meet whatever calls may be made upon them in the attainment of final victory and in the solution of the grave peacetime problems which will follow.

Exemplary Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post commenting on the debate held last Monday between Mr. LAFOLLETTE and Mr. HAYS.

I think this comment is timely and of much interest.

EXEMPLARY DEBATE

In their debate Monday on the proposed Fair Employment Practice Commission, Congressmen LAFOLLETTE and HAYS did credit to the best traditions of the House of Representatives. More important still, they demostrated to the House that even this emotion-charged issue can be debated with temperance, dignity, and a mutual acknowledgment of good faith. It is a pity that during much of the debate less than a quorum of the House was in attendance.

The procedure was unusual in that the two men dealt with a piece of legislation on which a rule governing debate has not yet been granted by the Rules Committee. The debate was, therefore, in a sense entirely unofficial. Mr. LAFOLLETTE, one of the sponsors of a permanent FEPC, and Mr. HAYS, a declared opponent of the proposal, simply agreed with one another to present arguments on the issue, pro and con, and secured from their colleagues two special orders to proceed. They divided their time with careful equity, each affording the other an opportunity for rebuttal. By way of sticking to the central issue, both gentlemen sensibly declined to yield for interruptions which might have stirred up the acrimony customarily associated with this particular issue.

"The points on which we agree," observed Representative HAYS, "are as important as those on which we differ. We both believe in the democratic process and we have taken this means of presenting our views with the feeling that perhaps it might tend to clarify the issues. We both believe that we must do everything that men in positions of political responsibility can do to preserve the democratic means of settling differences between groups, not only between races, but between groups of different religious views." The spirit of this approach, which Mr. LAFOLLETTE manifested equally, is certainly much more conducive to a fruitful settlement than abuse of the motives of opponents. Let us hope that Congress as a whole will follow the good example.

Photograph of Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, I wrote to the President and the Secretary of the Navy, calling upon them to take whatever steps might be necessary to acquire in the name of the United States Government all proprietary rights in the famous photograph which depicted raising the American flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, by the United States marines. This recommendation was based upon a complaint from a constituent against being required to pay a fee for the use of the photograph in connection with the forthcoming War bond drive. On yesterday, I received a letter from Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, together with copies of certain correspondence which discloses that all proceeds derived from the sale of copies of this photograph or reproduction rights are to be donated by the Associated Press to the Navy Relief Society on behalf of the Marine Corps.

Such action by the Associated Press is most highly commendable and entirely in keeping with the fine traditions of that organization, and I take this opportunity to compliment them for it. With the belief that Members of the Congress and the public are interested in learning of this fact, I am assuming the liberty of including in my remarks copies of the correspondence which I have received, even though the Associated Press made no effort to capitalize upon this indication of its fine public spirit:

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
New York, N. Y., April 24, 1945.

The Honorable W. STERLING COLE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: In a quotation of your statement to Congress that I have read you apparently, but I hope unintentionally, reflected the idea that the Associated Press has been selling the Suribachi flag picture for profit.

I enclose a copy of a letter that I wrote on April 12 to Secretary Forrestal, a copy of his reply dated April 14, and a copy of his acknowledgement of the first check.

I have been so anxious for the Associated Press not to appear to seek acclaim for this action that I would never have thought of giving any statement out about it except for your statement in Congress. I felt I had to refute the insinuation.

Under the circumstances, perhaps you'll want to make a statement by way of correction, with this correspondence before you.

Sincerely yours,

K. C.

APRIL 12, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are acquainted with the remarkable photograph that Joe Rosenthal, a staff photographer of the Associated Press, took on Mount Suribachi. I was gratified at your commendation respecting it.

As would be expected, the photograph has had unusually wide publication. As a result, requests for copies of the picture and the rights to reproduce it were received from every part of the United States. These requests came from the mothers of boys in the service, historical, civic, educational, and business organizations. Among them was one from the Treasury Department, which desired to use the picture in connection with the forthcoming Seventh War Loan drive.

Recognizing the value of the picture for morale, the Associated Press has made it available to all those who agreed to make

proper and fitting use of it, but not for advertising. The charges made have been nominal, and the Associated Press has borne the expenses of reproduction. This has been with the idea that whatever income is received by the Associated Press in connection with the photograph will be donated to the Navy Relief Society on behalf of the Marine Corps. The gross amount received will be sent, the Associated Press witholding nothing because of the cost of reproduction and mailing. The Marine Corps is mentioned because all of the men but one in the picture are marines, and that one was a Navy corpsman.

I write to you first to ask whether you will accept the fund for the purpose indicated, and second, that upon General Vandegrift's return to the country you will acquaint him with this correspondence.

Perhaps, too, I should assure you that the Associated Press has no intention of making any public announcement about this in order to seek acclaim for itself. It is just that I want to be sure that I am proceeding in the right manner by addressing you.

Awaiting your further advice, I am

Sincerely yours,

KENT COOPER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 14, 1945.

Mr. KENT COOPER,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. COOPER: As Secretary of the Navy and honorary vice president of the Navy Relief Society, I shall be pleased to accept for the society the donation tendered by the Associated Press, in your letter of April 12, on behalf of the Marine Corps.

The Navy Relief Society renders aid in time of need to officers and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps and their dependents, without regard to rank or rating. I shall inform General Vandegrift with respect to this correspondence.

I am requested by the board of managers of the society to express its appreciation of this generosity of the Associated Press.

May I also add my personal thanks for your thoughtfulness.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 20, 1945.

KENT COOPER, Esq.,
Executive Director,
The Associated Press,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. COOPER: Thank you, on behalf of the families helped by the Navy Relief, for your check covering the receipts from sales of Joe Rosenthal's picture. I look forward to receiving the two lithographs but I appreciate even more the reason that you give for sending them.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a vital matter that I wish to discuss with you today; a matter that is very much your business and your concern. I sincerely hope, therefore, that we may have 10 or 12 minutes of your time to consider the welfare of a large group of our citizens who daily serve us.

Specifically, I want to tell you about your postmen and all those allied with them in their work. I want you to know more about the services they are performing in these difficult times and the compensation they are receiving for their work.

Those of us who have loved ones far away, or who anxiously await business decisions, know well the thrill of pleasure when the postman brings the mail. We also know something of the vast network of rail, air, and motor transports that move the mail from place to place and the thousands of persons who must sort and handle the mail so that it will reach you swiftly and surely.

The miracle of our Postal Service has been taken for granted for a century. Perhaps most of us have even been thoughtless of its efficiency as we drop a letter or deposit a large package destined to go thousands of miles at a cost so moderate that it is not considered. But it all does not just happen after you drop your letter in the slot. Decades of scientific planning, years and years of training and experience, and thousands of inventions all blend together to give you the certain confidence that your message will reach the designated person wherever in the world he may be. Whether there be blizzards, rain, desert heat, city sidewalks, muddy roads, or pleasant weather your letter moves until it reaches waiting hands.

If the Postal Service broke down for 1 week—yes; even for 1 day—almost every adult and most of our older children would cry or complain. The Postal Service is such an integral part of our business and our family life, it means so much to separated loved ones, to the maintenance of friendships, and the dissemination of knowledge, that without it life in these United States would simply not be the same.

Therefore, I am most anxious that you consider with me today the welfare of your employees who make this miraculous service possible. I say your employees correctly, because you and I as citizens of this country are the employers of everyone connected with the post offices and the Postal Service from the postmaster of the great New York office to the substitute carrier in "Crossroads," Nev. Through our Representatives in Congress we fix their salaries, pensions, vacations, and working conditions. They cannot secure a general raise or reclassification without an act of Congress, and Congress cannot act permanently and decisively without the support of public opinion.

Now what are the hard financial facts about our Postal Service and the compensation of our postal employees? As you listen to these facts you are apt to be quite amazed and perhaps a bit ashamed.

To begin with there has been no basic pay raise, reclassification, or regrading of postal employees for 20 long years. Since 1925 through the boom years, the depression, and the war inflation postal salaries and the possibility of promotion have remained frozen except for a 27 percent economy cut during the depth of the depression and a makeshift flat temporary raise after our entrance into World War No. 2.

Please note this specific situation. If one of our returning veterans enters the Postal Service as a clerk at the age of 19 he will earn $1,700 a year. Each year thereafter that he serves meritoriously he can secure a raise of $100 per year until he reaches the maximum of $2,100 per year. Then he will be 24 years of age with no hope of further advancement unless he can get into some other classification. That is a typical, not an exceptional, example.

But before we deal with other specific points let us look at the general picture some more. Your Post Office Department employed 275,000 persons in 1935; today it employs 375,000. This is a 10-year increase of only 36 percent. In 1935 approximately twenty-two and one-third billion pieces of mail were handled in contrast to the estimated 37,000,000,000 pieces in 1945—an increase of 65 percent.

In 1935 postal revenues totaled $631,000,000; in 1945 they will total $1,300,000,000 for an increase of 100 percent. In 1935 the Post Office Department showed its usual annual deficit. That year it was $70,000,000. This year, believe it or not, the estimated surplus will be $117,500,000, and that leaves out of consideration $137,400,000 worth of free mail and $91,300,000 worth of military mail. The Post Office Department has definitely come out of the red. And all of this increased business has been handled with customary efficiency despite the absence on military leave of 50,000 postal employees.

Here are some other interesting facts, some minor, some major. Annuity deductions have been increased from 3 percent to 5 percent. Recent rate raises did not benefit the postal employees in any way.

Letter carriers are paid from postal receipts, not from general taxes. Postal employees are not exempt from any taxes. The Government does not furnish the mailman a uniform. The Post Office Department only sanctions overtime in the event of emergencies. Postal employees receive 18 cents an hour less for overtime than for regular time.

Obviously all of this adds up to a bad situation. We cannot hope to keep our postal service efficient on this basis. It is amazing that the workers' morale has stood the shock of rising costs of living as well as it has. It is not surprising, however, that capable men are not being attracted to the Service and that well-trained employees are slipping away. The long-deferred hope that their good efforts would be recognized and rewarded has kept most of the postal employees loyal and persevering, but the hope cannot be longer deferred without long-time serious consequences.

What should be done about it? Again the answer is obvious. The basic pay of

all postal employees should be promptly raised. Existing inequalities and injustices should be removed in every possible instance. And the longevity principle of better pay for better continuous service should be more generously applied.

The House Post Office Committee is fully cognizant of the need and desirability of such a speedy remedy. The committee has concluded hearings and has reported out with unanimous approval H. R. 3035, introduced by its chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]. This bill in general does everything that the situation demands. It, of course, does not correct all inequalities, and it does not go far enough to suit all groups of employees.

Many amendments will be considered, and some may be adopted, but in the main the bill does provide the basic raise, the reclassification, and the broadening of the longevity principle which has been awaited for 20 years by anxious employees and their families.

I urge you, therefore, to put your active support behind the bill. Let your congressional Representative and Senators know that you favor adequate compensation for your postal employees. Let them know that you want your good Postal Service to continue to improve.

Let them know that postal employees should not have to suffer a decreasing standard of living just because they cannot utilize the means available to other working groups. There are several groups in our economic life who have been abused and neglected, but few, if any, have been more forgotten than the postal employees.

Personally, I want to go on record as pledging my vote to the passage of H. R. 3035 and as a member of the Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives I will support every reasonable amendment designed to properly compensate as fine a group of employees as we have in our public service. And I urge everyone do the same. Talk to your neighbor on the bus, or street car, or in your automobile pool about this bill. You and they as the users and employers of the postal employees should take a positive stand for or against H. R. 3035. If you are against pay raises and merit promotions for postal employees, they should know it and your Representatives in Congress should know it. If you are for the bill, you should tell everyone concerned how you stand.

I am confident when you weigh the facts and figures and when you remember that the cost of this bill can be largely or wholly paid for out of surplus earnings, that you will be glad to help correct an injustice that has been allowed, in my judgment, to exist too long. If you and I really get behind this bill with enthusiasm and vigor, it will be passed on time and when we next greet our mailman at the door or the clerk at the post-office window, we can greet him with an honest, wholehearted smile. We will have done our part to reward our loyal servants for a job well done.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of Congress are eager to remedy any legislative difficulties involved in the administration of the so-called G. I. bill of rights in order that veterans may readily obtain the benefits Congress intended they should receive. With this thought in mind, I am glad to call to the attention of the Congress the following resolution of the Fort Wayne Board of Realtors which calls for study and amendment of the G. I. bill so as to insure our veterans receiving the benefits Congress provided:

Whereas the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the G. I. bill of rights, contains certain provisions for loans guaranteed by the United States for the purpose of purchasing, building, or repairing homes; the purchasing of land, buildings, farm equipment, and livestock; the purchasing of business, land, buildings, machinery, and tools, the guaranty not to exceed $2,000; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has final determination as to the probability of success and the loan risk; and

Whereas it has become apparent that the method of handling loan applications is complicated and the processing of loans involved in red tape which renders processing very slow; and

Whereas it is apparently becoming quite evident from actual experiences of many banks and other lending agencies that the act and its regulations as written do not permit the full accomplishment of its intended purposes by any organization or agency; and

Whereas the returning veteran applicants for loans are inclined to charge responsibility for denial of loans to the bank through which applications are made even though responsibility for denial rests upon the regulations contained in the act and upon Government agencies and not upon the banks; and

Whereas the banks of Fort Wayne, and the Fort Wayne Board of Realtors desire to render every available service to returning veterans in order that they may be assured the rights which the Congress intended they should enjoy as a reward for a very distinguished and sacrificial service to their country in the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fort Wayne Board of Realtors of Fort Wayne, Ind.:

1. That the United States Veterans' Administration establish a plan of passing upon applications for veterans' loans shorn of red tape and complicated procedure in order that qualified veterans may qualify for loans promptly and with as simple procedure as can be evolved.

2. That when a loan is denied by the Veterans' Administration or on appraisal of the Federal Housing Administration or any other governmental agency, the agency denying such loan be required to certify its denial directly to the veteran making the application and to state its reason for such denial, rather than to leave the impression with the veteran applicant that the bank is responsible for denial of such loan.

3. That every necessary procedure be taken to make the loan features of the G. I. bill practical and workable consistent with reasonable protection for the returning veteran by every Government agency chargeable with administration of the provisions of the law and that the bill itself and its regulations be carefully studied and so amended as to make it genuinely workable and beneficial; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators from Indiana, Congressman GILLIE, the Realtors' Washington Committee, and the press in Fort Wayne.

Legs Don't Make the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the course of this war thousands of our men will be maimed. Thousands will return home minus a limb or limbs. The rehabilitation of these men, the instilling of hope, courage, and the will to carry on is undoubtedly going to be one of the most difficult tasks in the post-war era.

Our late President better than any man in modern times demonstrated that a man can conquer his affliction and render great public service in the highest office of the land, and serve with higher than average distinction.

The exploits of the English flyer, Wing Commander Douglas Bader, who lost both of his legs in a flying accident, have come to public attention when he was released recently from a German prison camp. The record of this resourceful and distinguished aviator should serve as encouragement to men similarly situated. His example of courage, tenacity, and performance should be emulated not only by men who may have suffered loss of limb but by all.

The following is tribute paid to Wing Commander Bader by the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial appearing April 20, 1945, entitled "Legs Don't Make the Man":

LEGS DON'T MAKE THE MAN

All those strong words of the heart—mettle, pluck, courage, fortitude—come rushing to the mind as one reads the epic story of Wing Commander Douglas Bader of the R. A. F. Now that this extraordinary figure, a fighter pilot without legs, has been freed by the Americans in Germany, one is tempted to cheer.

Douglas Bader lost his legs in a flying accident in 1931. But that didn't stop him. When the war broke out, he pestered the military authorities until they gave him his chance—and he justified their judgment by becoming an ace, with 22 enemy planes to his credit before he was shot down in 1941. His coolness in unstrapping one leg by which he was trapped and bailing out must have been admired by even his German captors. They dropped a message to the British about Bader's need, and the British dropped him

another leg. Four times Bader escaped from prison camp—until the Germans finally separated him from his legs at night.

If Bader could fly without legs and keep on running away from prison, a lot of fellows who have had encounters with land mines and artillery can certainly learn to do thousands of simpler jobs. The heroic example of this dauntless, legless ace is of uncommon value at this time.

The British Navy has a word for Bader—in fact, it named a battleship for him years ago: Indomitable.

Praise Is Rare for G. I. Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Lester Allen, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Post of April 22, 1945:

PRAISE IS RARE FOR G. I. HEROES—BUT, DECORATED OR NOT, GENERALS AND ADMIRALS KNOW IT IS THESE MEN WHO ARE MAKING HISTORY

(By Lester Allen)

Every fighting man in the ranks dreams at some time of performing some heroic deed and thereupon having admirals or generals crowd around to offer personal praise and commendation.

But, the reality is altogether different from the dream, and, although thousands of decorations have been handed out since we went to war, it is rarely that a general or admiral gets around to extending his personal slap on the back to a man under his command.

In fact, it seems that the admirals and generals receive most of the high honors and promotions, while the kids who are in there doing the pitching flash only for an instant from the anonymity of the mass of men, and then sink back into obscurity again.

FLASH FOR INSTANT

The names of Eisenhower, MacArthur, Nimitz, Halsey, Spruance, Mitscher, Patton, Hodges, Bradley, Patch, and a dozen other top commanders on land and sea and in the air are household words—and their deeds are too well known to require a review, but the millions of lesser fighting men, who have flashed out of the mass in one blazing moment of supreme courage, never seem to become more than a momentary sensation.

No group of men is more concerned about this fact than the top commanders themselves. They fret about this fact constantly and do everything they can to get across to the men under them that they, more than anyone else, appreciate what the obscure man has done.

The soldier, sailor, or marine may grouse that his blood and his courage are expended to make a great name and a great reputation for his top commander, who may never have to take one-tenth the risk that he takes.

And, basically, this is so, but there is very little the top commander can do about it because of the way modern warfare is organized. Generals and admirals do not go into battle waving swords and cheering their men on, except in rare exceptions.

It is the exceptions that demonstrate how the top commanders feel about this vital matter. General Patton swims a river to show his men it can be done. Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, commander of a crack tank division, is killed after being captured by a German patrol while up among the forward elements of his division.

No one knows better than the generals that if all the men who were entitled to decorations actually received them our fighting forces would be spangled like a jeweler's window. They know, too, that a large percentage of the deeds of valor are never rewarded, never reported, for the deed is performed without eyewitnesses, alone, unaided, and with death following to seal the lips of the valorous.

GENE BUCK EXPLAINS

Gene Buck, producer, song writer, and raconteur, was telling a story in Washington the other day to illustrate how the top commanders feel about their inability to do exactly what men in the ranks sometimes dream about.

He was at a social function in the home of a friend to which Admiral William Halsey was invited. Admiral Halsey is a man's man, rough, tough, sassy, and very fond of the men who fight under his command.

As Buck tells the story: "A young fellow in a navy lieutenant's uniform arrived late at the party. He was a slim, nice-looking lad and I didn't recall ever having seen him before. I introduced myself, and he told me his name was Gay.

"'How'd you like to meet Admiral Halsey?' I asked him.

"'I'd consider it a great honor,' he said. 'But perhaps I had better not. He's got an awful lot of rank, you know. I'm just a lieutenant.'

"'Stop talking like that,' I told him. 'Come on in the next room. He will be delighted to meet you.'

"Remember I didn't know this Gay from a cord of wood, but I took him by the arm and dragged him in to meet Halsey. 'Admiral,' I said, 'this is Lieutenant Gay.'

"'Sir,' said this kid, 'this will always be remembered as one of the great days of my life. I have always wanted to meet you since I got into the Navy.'

"The old boy drew down those shaggy eyebrows and frowned at me. 'Do you know this man?' he asked, nodding at Gay.

"I said that I just met him a minute or two before.

"'Let me tell you something about him,' said Halsey. 'I bet you never heard of Torpedo 10. Well, on June 4, 1942, Torpedo 10 went out after the Jap fleet at Midway—15 planes. The Japs had turned away from Midway and started to retreat. Torpedo 10 went in against overwhelming odds, kept boring in. There were 30 officers and men against all the mighty Jap Navy. And none of them came back except this man right here. He was shot down after he put a torpedo into a Jap carrier, and he sat out there in the middle of the Pacific and saw the whole Jap fleet go scurrying past him, high-tailing for home."

BIG DAY FOR ADMIRAL

"'Lieutenant, you make me feel very humble. This is a red-letter day in my life, because at last I have a chance to tell you what I think about it. It's men like you who make men like me. I would have done it long ago if it had been possible. But now all I can say is that I will always be grateful for what you have done. Mr. Buck, this man is Lt. G. H. Gay, Jr., the only survivor of Torpedo 10, and I am proud that I have been privileged to meet him.'"

Except for chance meetings of this kind men high in command seldom have a chance to express personally their thanks to the men who have carried out the orders they have issued which have brought about victories. The higher the rank, the more remote the commander is from those men.

Because of the stilted and formal language of citations, the words read to the man by some officer when the decoration is pinned on are in no way adequate to get across the sense of obligation the commanders feel for their men.

At present the services are revising their policy of wording citations and are employing men trained in writing to put into words a more graphic description of the deeds of heroism. But even the written citations ccuched in the best style, do not measure up to what the top commanders feel.

They are intensely aware that their very best planning is only as good as the most humble man in the ranks, and they all declare over and over again that Americans have emerged from the war as the most intelligent, skillful, and courageous of all men in a world at war.

When the Bastogne break-through by the Germans caused heavy losses, which had to be immediately plugged by replacements, the top commanders in Europe experienced agonies of spirit over the sacrifices the men were making.

GREEN MEN SENT IN

A high-ranking general told this writer not long ago: "The replacements came up from the rear areas, new to combat, bewildered by the complexity of war. Often they went into position at night, right up into the teeth of the enemy. They couldn't see the man on their right or the man on their left. God knows what they thought and felt as they hung on. And some of them were dead before daylight without ever having known the men of the outfit to which they were assigned. They died alone in the dark. It had to be that way, for the need was great. But I shall never forget them, and if prayer helps, I pray for them every night."

The organization of command in wartime does not permit any great degree of fraternization between the high command and the lower ranks. But it will not always be that way. When the war is ended and peace comes the comradeship the humblest soldier, sailor, or marine knows with the men of his own outfit extends upward to the very highest commanders.

Few American generals or admirals of flag rank of the First World War failed the men who fought under them. As long as they lived no sacrifice was too great, no man who ever served under their command too humble for inclusion in a vast comradeship tested in war and cemented in peace.

This is something that is typically American. High-ranking officers of other nations seldom unbend, even with the veterans of their own campaigns and commands. But the democratic American spirit rejects such austerity. The commanders prize the esteem of the men who fought under them, and demonstrate it in a thousand ways when peace comes.

Warfare brings to all men a change in outlook, a subtle difference in character. They have learned to rely upon one another, have tested their worth in blood and battle—and they never forget that. The veterans' organizations of America's wars—the vanishing G. A. R., the Spanish War veterans, the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2—are eloquent testimony to the leveling effect of peace. Rank ceases to be of importance when peace comes. To these veterans it is only important that they fought together for a common cause no matter how humble the rank.

The holders of decorations for heroism and service will be the first to admit that they know of others who have never been given such recognition who richly deserve citations. And virtually all the commanders are certain of the loyalty and affection of their men, those whose deeds have been recognized as well as the countless majority who have never been decorated. The pride that Patton's men have in him is matched by the pride millions of men have in their own commanders who have proved themselves in battle.

Morale, which was slow to develop in the armed services, except in famous outfits like the First Division, is now a reality through-

out the services, each fighting man convinced that his outfit, and his commander, is the greatest extant.

And the men who place the highest value on this feeling their men have for them are the generals and the admirals, for they know they owe all men under them a debt they never can repay. Without the men, and their devotion to duty, the generals and admirals would be nonentities. And they wish, more than anything else, that they could tell each man so face to face, man to man.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a tribute upon the death of the late President Roosevelt given by Elizabeth Glaser, a sophomore at Seton Hill College, of Greensburg, Pa., during commemoration hour for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, late President of the United States. This was conducted on Thursday, April 19, at the college:

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." So, 300 years ago, John Donne spoke of death and of its impact upon those who knew and loved the dead. In these days since April 12, we too, as a nation, have known death—the death of a giant leader whose passing diminishes us all more than we like to think upon.

In the death of a friend we experience an uneven struggle—between sorrow for him who lies waxen in his coffin, and sorrow for ourselves on being deprived of a source of personal happiness and security. The struggle is uneven because our selfish interests continually vie with our interest in another. Thus when we saw the newspapers splattered with the headline, Nation Mourns Death of F. D. R., did we think of the loss of security to our own little world? Or did we remember the man, and his courageous fight against the infirmity of his body? Did we remember the helper of the laboring man, the advocate of social welfare, the statesman who was a strategist keen to circumvent or escape the snares of international intrigue. I think once again the balance was uneven; but surely it tipped in the direction of him who lay waxen in his coffin.

We had admired him. Even though we joked about his 12 years in the White House, we admired the dominating personality and strong character that had put and held him there. This man was truly our captain—not only of the ship of politics but of the barque of Christian culture which is our ideal. We were proud that he was, in the highest sense, a gentleman.

Journalists, commentators, political opponents, even his severest critic, the common man, forgot that they had disagreed with many of his policies. They forgot that, listening to his now immortalized "fireside chats," they had tried to fathom what undivulged thoughts and events underlay them. They forgot their petty censure and their not too polite jokes about his family. They paid tribute to what the man had really been and done, and erased the irrelevant details. They even ignored a fear that this our loss might raise the morale of the enemy. There was no need for this fear: the demonstration spanning our Nation, mourning the death of the President, sign of our unity, of our faith in and devotion to our leader—this could have but a demoralizing effect on the enemy. Despite his untimely passing, Roosevelt still stands as the dominating figure of our age.

All this has been said before and many times. So widespread a tribute as has been paid to our late President leaves no room for originality; but there is yet space for sincerity. The house of the United States, the house of the world, now bears a gold-starred service flag for the thirty-second President of this Nation—one who lived and fought and died for his country.

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." The death of President Roosevelt diminishes us all, because we are, with him, America.

Social-Security Protection for Employees of Public Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, which states that—

The Social Security Board believes that coverage should include all public employment by Federal, State, and local governments in such a way that the Federal insurance system would afford a basic protection on which would be superimposed the protection available through special retirement systems.

In my opinion, every Federal, State, and local government employee should have protection just as employees who are under social security.

I sincerely hope the Congress will approve some plan beneficial to these groups.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I am replying to your letter of April 12 with which was transmitted a marked page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Appendix concerning coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for employees of State and local governments.

The question of extending social-insurance protection to employees of public agencies is one to which the Social Security Board has given considerable attention and study. The Social Security Board believes that coverage should include all public employment by Federal, State, and local governments in such a way that the Federal insurance system would afford a basic protection on which would be superimposed the protection available through special retirement systems. It is hoped that this matter will receive consideration in connection with any hearings on social-security amendments.

As you requested, I am returning your enclosure.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER, *Chairman.*

Draft of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Senate Joint Resolution 42

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the War Mobilization Director, and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, to reconsider the proposed plans to draft all skilled farm help and skilled workers processing dairy products for the military service

Whereas the President, the War Mobilization Director, and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey have recently requested that approximately one-half of the 364,000 deferred farm workers of the country between the ages of 18 and 28 be inducted into the military service by July 1 in spite of the provisions of the Tydings amendment of October 1942; and

Whereas it is realized that in the present critical war situation people in agriculture and skilled workers processing dairy products are not exempt from military service; and

Whereas it must be urged that there must be a selection and reexamination of those who may be escaping their wartime duty and a deferment of those who are truly essential to agricultural production and to the processing of dairy products; and

Whereas it is further deemed essential and desirable that operation, function and selection under the Tydings amendment be continued so that the local boards will be given the power to determine the standards for essentiality on a farm or in a dairy processing plant rather than apply an arbitrary standard of deferment with inelastic and consequent hardships under the proposed program of conscription; and

Whereas with an intelligent understanding of the agricultural problem, the necessity of supplying an adequate labor pool, the avoidance of a food famine, the farmers of this State and of the country will toil with their brothers in arms to make this country safe for democracy in the American and cooperative way of life; and

Whereas the farmers and skilled workers processing dairy products in Wisconsin have performed magnificent miracles of production with less help and farm machinery and only with the inspired aid of grandfather and the womenfolk and children; and

Whereas Wisconsin is the leading dairy State and holds top rank in many foods desired by the Quartermaster Corps, and a substantial number of the deferred farm cases are located within the State, the present critical labor shortage is intensified to one of existence or departure from the farm, with an aggravation of present food shortages; and

Whereas the dairyman must have experienced, skilled year-round labor, and other labor available at the right time for harvesting or processing and cannot depend alone on the aged and physically unfit, but must have an adequate reserve of farm help in order to insure an adequate production of food that will win the war and write the peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the President, the War Mobilization Director, Maj. Gen. Lewis

B. Hershey, and the Congress of the United States, to reconsider the calling and inducting of about half of the agricultural workers and skilled workers processing dairy products in the country by July 1, and to urge the continued application of the Tydings amendment that places the power in the local board to grant individual farm and dairy processing plant deferments; in order to save the agricultural and dairy industry of this State, and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the War Mobilization Director, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, the War Food Administration, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

OSCAR REUMBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Air Transportation Faces Problems; Airport and Other Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following enlightening address by C. Bedell Monro, president of Pennsylvania Air Lines, before the Advertising Club of Washington, on Tuesday, April 24, 1945:

Less than 20 years ago, all of the United States domestic air lines carried in 1 year a combined total of about 5,800 passengers. Eighteen years ago, in 1927, the date of P. C. A.'s start in life, the combined total was 8,861. This month, only 18 years later, P. C. A. is alone transporting in 4 days as many as the entire industry carried in a year in 1927.

In 1941, the last year of normal operations, over 4,000,000 persons availed themselves of the benefits of air travel. As aircraft were drafted for military duty, the passenger totals in 1942 and 1943 fell below that figure, but in 1944 the total was again over 4,000,000. This year, on its routes now authorized, including new service into New York, P. C. A. expects to carry in excess of 700,000 passengers—and our company is only 1 of 16 domestic air lines, and is fifth largest from the point of view of passengers carried.

As an indication of the rapidity with which air transport is maturing, in 1930 the number of landings and take-offs at the old Washington Airport averaged less than 500 per month. True, this airport was but little more than a cow pasture, but for years it was the air terminal of the Nation's Capital. At the new Washington National Airport, acknowledged to be the finest in the country, last month there were 13,000 landings and take-offs, or 1 every 3½ minutes.

* * * * *

In reappraising aviation's problems, we must first consider the matter of airports. They represent a National, State, and civic problem requiring foresighted policy and reappraisal, not only from year to year but more frequently, to anticipate technological, traffic, and other developments which are controlling as to airport size, location, and facilities.

The importance of this cannot be exaggerated, as is exemplified by the fact that LaGuardia Field in New York, where operations started in 1939, is now not only inadequate but in every respect is obsolete. This metropolitan airport cannot be expanded or improved to take care of the volume or to meet technological developments of the future, such as instrument approaches and instrument landings.

Possibly within a year, New York will have a new air terminal at Idlewild, which is planned for the future in such a way that reappraisal will only mean adding to, and not replacing or destroying, what has been done.

Interesting features of this new air terminal include the fact that it will comprise 6 square miles, with the terminal area in the center, an area equivalent to the distance from Pennsylvania Station in New York to Radio City. It will have six runways at first, and ultimately 12, each of which will extend from 6,000 to 10,000 feet. It will be equipped to take care of up to 360 aircraft movements per hour, or 6 per minute, in all types of weather. There will be 70 loading positions and 10,500 feet of gate space to adequately handle its patrons.

Let us take a look now at our own airport—the Washington National Air Terminal. Although it has been in operation only a little over 3 years, it is already inadequate in many of its facilities—and is becoming more so. It is not, however, obsolete as there is some room for further improvement and expansion. The terminal building is inadequate, needing more loading positions, more operations offices, more ticket counters, and added facilities. More hangars are needed, as well as other buildings for shop space, storage, and offices. The runway system is satisfactory, but is restricted by the proximity to Bolling Field and Anacostia. The problem in Washington is not one so much of airport landing space but air space, so concentrated are flight operations in this area.

Plans for the correction of inadequacies are currently being made, and great credit in this regard is due the C. A. A. and the airport management. But at an early date the whole airport situation in Washington must be reappraised to anticipate future requirements, for Washington already is one of the few great terminals of the world for domestic as well as international operations. It is not a prediction, but a simple fact, that this city is destined to be he world's most important air capital, the hub of a vast network of international and domestic routes, of which we see today only the beginning. Reappraisal, then, is doubly necessary in Washington in order that this city will anticipate and be prepared for the inevitable ascension of the importance of air transportation here.

There is now a national airport program under way, with legislation currently being considered by Congress. This legislation is most constructive and vital to the continued development of every phase of aviation. It is equally vital to the national defense.

A word of warning, however, is appropriate in consideration of airports on a national scale. The possibility of wastage in funds is enormous, for without fitting the airport to the city, there could easily arise a succession of "super-colossal Hollywood epics." Each airport should be planned and developed in accordance with the specific local problem and local needs, and planned so that with each new development in our industry, another stage can be added. New York's problem is not that of Washington, or Chicago, or Knoxville.

Another problem in air transportation requiring constant reappraisal is that of air traffic control, including methods of making instrument approaches to airports in conditions of low ceilings and limited visibility. This problem is linked closely with airport features such as runway patterns, size, and similar factors. The functions of airway traffic control are the determination and constant checking over the entire Government airways system of the spacing, both as to altitude and horizontal distance, of all operating aircraft, to avoid the possibility of collision. It also concerns the clearing for final approaches into airports of such aircraft desiring to land. Following the clearance, the local airport tower control takes over for landing guidance in accordance with field traffic. Anticollision is the primary purpose of air traffic control.

In good weather, this is all very simple. But in bad weather, the problem grows more complicated, particularly at airports such as Washington, Chicago, New York, and other large centers, where there is a large volume of converging traffic.

The present system of air traffic control has been in effect about 10 years, and is as completely inadequate and as obsolete as a pair of high-buttoned shoes.

Although constant studies have been made, changes and improvements have largely been prevented through the lack of availability in wartime of new and improved radio facilities. Both the air lines and the Government should bear a measure of blame for the delay in reaching even a tentative conclusion for this long overdue change. For on the solution of air traffic control depends the increased safety of air-line operations, and the development of real air-line efficiency. Although the air lines complete over 90 percent of their scheduled flights, this is not enough, for the general acceptance of air travel cannot be realized until it can be counted upon 100 percent of the time.

Examples of flights that were canceled, or that were required to hold an approach pattern over an airport under adverse weather conditions, are too numerous to mention, but they are too widely known in and out of the industry for dependable, all-weather flight efficiency.

The question of what airplanes, and what type of airplanes, will use airports in the future, is itself a lengthy subject. Let me say without qualification that the C. A. B. has done a masterly job in securing the release of aircraft to the air lines for conversion to commercial use. There are more air liner seats now available than at the 1941 peak, due in part to the greater utilization of aircraft by the air lines.

The question of aircraft for commercial use, however, is only a part of the entire question. More fundamental is the lesson we have learned from the war, which is recognition of the importance of air power. I hope we shall never again become so dulled by propaganda, so lulled into security by fatness and well-being and softness, so misled by false prophets, that we shall forget the vital need for supremacy in the air, for both military and economic protection. This means that we must make certain that our aircraft manufacturing does not decline as it did after the last war.

Few people realize what we did after World War No. 1, having built by the end of the war a great, new industry capable of great production. We dumped used aircraft on the country and on our foreign markets. Almost a decade was required before manufacturers could develop either interest or a market for new and better planes. We actually scrapped an industry by immediate abandonment and by the attrition of dumping. We actually sabotaged America's air power and its military power.

This must not happen again. Every nation in the world, friendly or unfriendly, now realizes that in any future war of aggression the United States must be attacked first, rendered impotent, or destroyed, because our vast production potential will turn the scales as it has in the last two wars.

Any attack upon us will certainly be through some form of air assault. This means that we must maintain a strong

manufacturing industry, capable of instant quantity production of aircraft, engines, radio, and other accessories, better than those of any other nation. This means scrapping utterly obsolete military and commercial type aircraft as soon as practicable, which is whenever newer types are proven and are available. This also means maintaining in high gear at all times aeronautical research and engineering, which is the very heart of aviation progress. The Government must encourage such research. It must aid research through subsidy, if necessary. This aid will be the highest type of national peace insurance, purchased at the lowest cost in premiums.

The cause of the manufacturers is the cause of all aviation, of military advancement, of commercial advancement. It is the cause of government and of the private citizen—your cause and my cause. Nothing in our national life requires more intelligent handling and constant reappraisal on the part of all of us.

The late President Roosevelt stated just a little over 6 years ago, in a statement on the Civil Aeronautics Act, that "underlying this statute is the principle that the country's welfare in time of peace and its safety in time of war rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air-transportation system, both domestic and overseas."

* * * * *

In addition to the problems of airports, air traffic control, rates and fares, there is, over the industry, an umbrella—one that could fall to pieces and expose air transportation to an unrestrained and destructive downpour, or one that could fold in on us and actually prevent us from taking another forward step. This air umbrella is legislation.

Air transportation has been exceptionally fortunate in growing up under laws that have fostered its development in the public interest and in the interest of national defense. Great credit for much of existing legislation is due to certain Members of Congress, the C. A. B., and our industry for the foresight and constructive thinking, directed toward modernizing legislation for a modern industry.

Here, however, as in everything in our business, there is necessity for constant reappraisal. It is vital that no legislation be enacted, either National or State, which will be stultifying to the rapid progress of aviation. That stultification might be accomplished by the States, through the establishment of controls and agencies duplicating in each State the C. A. B.'s jurisdiction over interstate commerce, which can prove to be a real barrier to air progress; or nationally, through enactment of legislation which would set up any air transport monopoly either in domestic or international operation or any basis which would be inflexible or incapable of simple and quick change.

Should the mistake be made of sanctioning the creation of a gigantic air transport monopoly, be it called the "chosen instrument," or the "community company," or any new name with the same old meaning, and should the Government attempt to correct this mistake, the corrective processes will be interminable if not impossible. Only with the greatest difficulty could such a Frankenstein be disassembled.

Let us not do anything with air transport's "air umbrella" to prevent or to slow the necessary reappraisal of our fast-changing and constantly changing requirements.

To list but some of the problems confronting aviation today, one need mention only manpower shortages; union jurisdictional campaigns and disputes; multiple taxation; new and increased State gasoline taxes; restrictive State legislation; higher airport rates and rentals; increased requirements for real-estate purchase and building construction; new route expansion and development; increased competitive aspects of air transportation; revision of ground facilities and procedures for handling of larger aircraft; efforts of surface carriers to control or participate in our field under the guise of integration; improvement in service despite equipment, manpower, and supply shortages; increased activities of oil companies to secure exclusive fuel franchises at airports under a monopoly arrangement and at a dictated price structure; extent of further activity in the development of air express and air cargo; and an intelligent program for securing additional capital, through borrowing or equity financing, for post-war development.

Nor are we alone in the obligation to reappraise our policies—for our problems are shared, to whatever degree may be proportionate, by those in Government. The Chief Executive, Congress, the Cabinet, the many agencies—all of those who have anything to do with any phase of aviation, as well as those in every other business which aviation touches, must share with us the complexity of problems that lie ahead, still unsolved.

Democracy Takes Its Inspiration From the Gospel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by Most Rev. Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, on the occasion of the installation of Most Rev. Eugene J. McGuinness, coadjutor bishop of Oklahoma, in Our Lady's Cathedral, on January 10:

DEMOCRACY TAKES ITS INSPIRATION FROM THE GOSPEL, SAYS ARCHBISHOP STRITCH

Our thoughts this morning center on the office of a bishop. We are here to congratulate good Bishop Kelley who has received from the Holy See the extraordinary favor of having had given him as his coadjutor a bishop with whom he worked for long years in his apostolate for our home missions, whom he knows and esteems, with whom he has shared his great zeal for souls. We are here to express our good wishes to Bishop McGuinness, whose worth we know and whose achievements are the safe guaranty of his success in this new field of labor. But here this morning our thoughts turn to the office of a bishop. We try to catch its meaning and find ourselves dwelling now on one phase of it and now on another. In fact, we confess to ourselves that our poor minds cannot do more than consider a single phase of the office of a bishop at a time. May I, therefore, express to you my thoughts on a phase of the office of a bishop which in these tragic times seem to me of utmost importance? For a few minutes I am going to ask you to think with me on the bishop as a peacemaker in society.

WHAT DEMOCRACY HOLDS

As we look out on this war-torn world and see a hard-earned victory for our arms on the horizon, we wonder how out of the chaos of the after-war period men can bring order and that tranquillity of order which is peace. One thing seems very certain to us and that is that peace will come with the realization of the ideal of true democracy everywhere in the world. True, there are those who say that democracy has seen its day and is worn out and inept. They would substitute for it other systems of political absolutism in one form or another. Events have given the lie to this assertion and men everywhere in their hearts are longing for the happiness in the enjoyment of the common good which only a genuine democracy can achieve. In his Christmas message Pope Pius XII says:

"If, then, we consider the extent and nature of the sacrifices demanded of all the citizens, especially in our day when the activity of the state is so vast and decisive, the democratic form of government appears to many as a postulate of nature imposed by reason itself."

We are among the many to whom the Holy Father refers. We are convinced that in the modern state, which exercises such wide authority in the social relations of the citizens, there can be no genuine peace and happiness where the ideals of democracy do not obtain. It is in the very war aims of our country to base the peace on democratic ideals and principles.

But in the confused thinking of the times, it is well for us to stop and take thought with ourselves on the nature of a true democracy and the truths from which it comes. Basic in democratic institutions is the recognition of the person in every man and his human dignity. Man is a rational free being, responsible for his behavior and compelled by his very reason to seek the development and perfection of his innate powers. This man in his very nature is endowed with rights which are sacred and inviolable. Now rights are rooted in law. In what law are these inalienable rights of man rooted? Can the pragmatist or the materialist answer this question? Rightly we say in the law of nature, that is, in that law which is written in human reason. But law demands an author, a legislator, and a judge and sanctions. There is nothing real in the law of nature unless we acknowledge God as its author and its judge and unless we recognize that it has sanctions from God. If you talk about human freedoms, human rights, you must logically talk about God. Within me there is the command: Do right; avoid evil. There can be no real democracy without the fact of God and fact of moral obligations. These truths seem so clear to us in whose democratic traditions they are the constant, the absolute. Now while a truth may be a thing of reason and knowable to man in the light of reason, it is a fact that many such truths are clearer to us if the light of revelation, God's greatest manifestation of Himself to man was Christ Jesus, the Saviour. The Saviour underscored all His teaching with the truth of the moral accountability of man to God.

On the cross He died for man the sinner. As we kneel before that cross how clear to us is the natural truth of innate human rights or freedoms! And when I recall that there on the cross He is the propitiation for my sins, how well I realize my human dignity! It is plain fact of history that the Christian Gospel ministers to man the very basic truths on which democracy rests, the fact of human freedoms rooted in the natural law of God, strengthened and ennobled by the Saviour.

SEEKS THE COMMON GOOD

But before we finish with the origins of democratic ideals there is another fact or series of facts which we must recall to mind. This man, endowed with rights and obligations under the moral law, by a very necessity of his nature, is social, that is, he must provide for his necessities and realize his perfection in social life with his fellow man. He is not a hermit, he is not an all-contained individual. The very moral law in which his

freedoms are rooted governs his relations in society with his fellow man. Under the stress of a natural urge man lives in political society. Therefore he must seek with his fellow man the common good. Full well he knows that this common good is identified with his enjoyment of the free exercise of his innate rights and full well he knows that the moral law imposes on him obligations in political society or the state. Let us look again at the cross. There the Saviour hangs with arms outstretched wide for the salvation of all men. He taught that "greater love than this no man hath that he give up his life for his friend." On the cross we see how in Christian truth justice and charity demand that we not only accord to our fellow men the enjoyment of their rights but that also we go beyond justice in devoting ourselves to helping them in social life to achieve happiness and peace. Again let me say that democratic ideals become potent social concepts when men kneel at the foot of the cross!

Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII recently said the characteristics which should distinguish citizens in a democracy are: The right to express his own views of the duties and sacrifices imposed on him by political authority, and the right to be heard before being compelled to obey. Succinctly here we have stated that rational intelligent participation of the citizen in government is at the very core of our democratic traditions. In a democracy there is organic, organizing unity. Every citizen senses his civic responsibility and seeks to make his contribution to the good of the whole. This freedom is not conducive to chaos because it is constitutive of unity. We know full well that there must be an authority and after we have expressed our views we are ready to obey that authority when it acts within its own acknowledged competence. We choose by a free ballot our civil authorities and recognize in them the authority which our constitutions and laws give them. But we hold to our right to express ourselves on public affairs and we consider it our duty to make the fullest possible individual contribution to the common good.

PEOPLE VERSUS MASSES

Now in our times there has been revived in new garbs political systems which are the very antithesis of a democracy. Leaders by violence or deceit secure political control. They by propaganda and force impose their wills on the masses and sometimes seek to give the world the species of a democracy. But there is a difference between the masses in these countries and the people in a genuine democracy. These leaders recognize no innate human rights in the masses and reduce them to the status of a mere machine. Political life is not energized by the united action of the citizenry but the masses are moved by the dictator leadership. Under stress the masses fall into hysteria and frenzy and, when deftly used by the dictator, are a mere tool in his hands. In a democracy we speak of the people and in a dictatorship they talk of the masses. This system or theory comes from the philosophy of materialism and it significantly persecutes the Christian who even in the catacombs defended human rights against the Caesar on the Aventine.

And how am I going to connect this thought with the office of the bishop? The bishop is the witness of Christ among men. "You will be witnesses to Me," said the Saviour to the first bishops. In witnessing Christ the bishop keeps alive among men the truths on which democracy must rest. Today he looks with tear-stained eyes at the enslavement of the masses on many lands, at the suffering which godless dictatorships have inflicted on the world, at the dangers which imperil the establishment of a lasting peace when victory comes to our arms. He has no fear of genuine democracy; in fact, he is convinced that in the modern world it is the sole political form which can establish a good peace. He knows that democracy takes its inspiration from the gospel of Christ and he realizes the weight of responsibility which his office, as a teacher of that gospel, imposes on him. He is a peacemaker and today he knows that peace is inseparably connected with the establishment of genuine democracy where it does not obtain and with its preservation and development in countries which long have been its strongholds.

TRIBUTE TO TWO BISHOPS

Perhaps these thoughts came to me today when I reflected on how through many years there has sounded from this city through the Nation a pleading, eloquent, courageous voice, begging that men withdraw themselves from satanic chant of the siren of materialism and see on the cross of Calvary, their blood-stained, thorn-crowned King and Saviour, Christ Jesus our Lord, Bishop Kelley through the years has used his rare gift of eloquence, his pen, and his energy in witnessing the Saviour. Who can say what he has contributed to church and country? Today Bishop McGuinness, full of strength and vigor and the desire to do here what he has done so very well in North Carolina, takes up his work among you. He is a peacemaker among you, the servant of Him who promised to men the peace which the world cannot give. In his work of serving his church he will strengthen the foundations of true democracy among us and give of his strength and talents that genuine democracy based on immutable Christian truth, in the nations, and in international relations, may bring to men peace in justice and charity. Ad multos annos!

Increase of Compensation for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I favor H. R. 2071. I hope the leadership of the House will bring this bill up for immediate consideration and passage.

One of the last acts of our State legislature, which adjourned in early April, was the passing of a resolution supporting an increase in the compensation for postal employees. I enclose the resolution as part of my remarks:

Senate Memorial 8

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 2071, which provides for an increase in the compensation of certain postal employees, and also provides for other beneficial employment features of said employees; and

Whereas said employees have received no increase in compensation for many years, with the exception of a small war bonus; and

Whereas the Post Office Department has long been recognized as one of the most efficient and reliable of the Federal agencies, and the employees thereof should be rewarded for their capable and faithful service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the thirty-fifth general assembly, That the Senators and Representatives from Colorado in the Congress of the United States are hereby urged to support and vote for the passage of H. R. 2071; and be it further

Resolved, That this memorial be spread upon the journal of the senate, and a copy hereof sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

WILLIAM E. HIGBY,
President of the Senate.
W. C. BLAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.

Let America Insure Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by the Honorable K. E. Steinmetz, an able member of the Knoxville, Tenn., bar:

In thinking about the terms of arrangement and framework of the machinery for preserving the world peace after the Axis has been whipped, it seems to me there are some fundamental elements which must of necessity be considered.

While their recognition makes the task of formulating a postwar set-up more difficult for whoever will be the negotiators, ignoring them will simply produce future further disaster.

It is probably true that most of our kind of folks, and perhaps most of the human race, know that war is horrible, wasteful, and really silly. There are, however, some races of people who do think differently, and one curse of humanity is that the civilized races have in the past glorified war in fiction, music, and so-called history. There are even some learned men who can give you good arguments that war is a biological phenomenon and a necessity.

The main disturbing element is that ethnological factors, chiefly racial characteristics, prevent world unanimity in any conception of the relations between the individual and the State. Thus, for instance, the Celts devised the clan, the Latins the empire, the Slavs the communistic idea. Others devised the tribal system, and still others the various types of feudal systems, royalties, monarchies, and what-have-you. These various racial characteristics are just as fixed and so much a part of their nature as their differences in language, taste in foods, and genius or talent in music, art, literature, invention, commerce, or industry.

The greater part of the world today still conceives the state as resting in some individual such as an hereditary monarch, or a shiek, fuehrer, duce, dictator, son of heaven, Maharajah, chief, and so on, almost endlessly.

With these the citizens are subjects, and dependent in varying degrees on the Government, and without freedom of choice of vocation, and often of religion, movement, place of residence, or station in life. These, to us, erroneous concepts, have persisted through the ages, and it was only yesterday, in the history of mankind, that the concept arose that there ought to be no government without the consent of the people, that the people were the state, and that the Government operating through its legislative, judicial, and executive departments, was the servant and not the master of the people. The pity is that even in America, the recent generation or so of school children have not learned this fundamental truth and a great many of our politicians and so-called statesmen and bureaucrats at Washington apparently do not know it yet.

To escape the evil of depending on rulers or the governing class, America was settled and colonized, and here was established a government of, by, and for the people under a charter made by the citizens, called a Constitution. If we can keep it.

Many other races and nationalities are ethnologically, historically, and educationally incapable of understanding and functioning under such a form. Ideal constitutions adopted by Latin-American countries have been consistently and historically ignored, because of inherent racial psychological inability to really understand and function under them. They seem to prefer the "strong man" or some sort of empire or junta, even though they operate under the name of republics.

But the United States was organized, in the light of the experience of mankind through the ages, noting the weakness and failure of other systems with their crushing of freedom, individual initiative, speech, worship, ambition, endeavor, and hope of reward, and here was discarded the idea of excessive governmental supervision and suppression, and dependence on the rules of the Government. And here was discovered and recorded the modern truth that the people are the sovereign and not the subject, and that the governmental agencies, bureaus, and administrators, executives, legislators, and courts, are employees only, and are the servants of the sovereign people, and not their bosses or rulers. Recently there has been a tendency to ignore or evade these fundamental truths by an avalanche of bureaucratic, European "pushing the folks around," and an illicit hankering after some foreign, un-American concepts and practices, which the draftsmen of our Constitution knew had been tried and worn threadbare by race after race, nation after nation, in the ages past, since mankind first tried to organize itself into a working society.

We do not need or want any social revolution" in the United States, to un-Americanize the American Nation, or its way of life. It is more plausible that we need a revolution to throw out the insidious weakening foreign idealogists, bureaucrats, and fellow travelers, and restore America to the Americans and come back home to the Constitution by cutting out our philandering with foreign political paramours and bureaucrats and give posterity in America some incentive to try to make an honest living, with at least a gambler's chance of reaping reward for skill, energy, talent, industry, and initiative.

Among a lot of other fundamental factors inherent in this, our American way of life, is the spirit of competition and cooperation. This is really the reason the United States, as a so-called decadent democracy, can spot the Axis a touchdown or two and come from behind and win the game, or, after having been slugged while asleep, recover from the daze and proceed to give unholy hell to the would-be assassin. Incidentally, I believe our great interest and ccomplishment in team sports, like baseball and football, has a meaning. Not only the player, but the public spectator absorbs and realizes the necessity of the two essentials—vigorous competition and absolute team work. No lying down, sulking, or going soft, and no starring or grandstanding by any pet of the coach. Fight hard and cooperate. This is second nature to Americans now.

These considerations seem to make it apparent that any postwar set-up of a supergovernment, predicated on the theory that the other nations can, to a limited degree assumed necessary for the purpose, surrender sufficient of their sovereignty to let the joint agency, thus established under whatever name, enforce disarmament and keep the peace, is insufficient.

It is unfortunate, but manifest, that too many of them are simply inherently handicapped by their racial and ethnological psychology to feel and understand the problem. Little Yugoslavia, an artificial ideal "state," created after World War No. 1, with three or four different races or "nationalities" within its boundaries, is a recent example of the fallacy of such an assumption. And the constitutional inability of the French people at this, of all times, to "get together" is still a more recent one. Ideal plan and formal signed agreement are not enough. Plan and agreement was once almost too risky for even the United States, with its constitution of a group of States more nearly alike in thought and temperament than can be found anywhere in the world. These component states surrendered more of their sovereignty to form the strongest, closest knit "league of nations" in the world under their great constitution than any nation would ever agree to surrender to a postwar superagency, but what would have happened when brother disagreed with brother in the horror called the War Between the States, if it had been, by the accident of history, the faction in the northern area which had announced its intention to secede from the Union and establish its capital at Chicago? The side that had the most effective force prevailed in the end. If the South had had that force, then what about the Constitution, the ideal league? And Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo are nearer to New York today than Atlanta was to Washington in 1861.

War is evil, hideous, and insanely unwise from an economic standpoint, or it is good, pleasant, and economically wise. We are either right and the Axis Powers wrong, or vice versa. On the economic point alone, how few days' cost of the present war would pay for what it would have taken to pay the entire expense, from Versailles to Munich, to have kept us constantly the most effectively prepared nation, with the preventative power sufficient to definitely deter the outbreak of any maniac fuehrer, duce, or descendant of the "Son of Heaven"?

The world knows we have no tendency or disposition toward territorial aggression. There is the case of the Philippines. Our humanitarian disposition is so well known we are by many nations regarded as soft and suckers. And it takes so long and costs so much in lives, bodies, and the money of ourselves and posterity to come from behind every now and then.

Why shouldn't Britain, with the United States, or the United States alone, if necessary, after our enemies have been thoroughly beaten and their capitals invaded and their peoples made to see and feel some of the hell of war they have been inflicting on their victims, their criminal leaders captured and belittled and made ridiculous before their own people, and then finally and permanently punished, disarm these bandit states with their own will and force, and keep them disarmed forever?

Not so incidentally, perhaps, this belittling and ridicule of upstart Napoleons, is rather important. Has it not been another curse of civilization that the tyrant war lord, in the past, when finally conquered, was, no matter how despicable and culpable, tendered the honors of war and merely imprisoned or exiled, to be later excused, then extolled and often nearly cannonized by sobsister historians? Or glorified and glamorized by poets, musicians, and critics? Then a generation or so later some Schicklegruber somewhere figures that he is smarter than the Kaiser and can avoid the Kaiser's mistakes, and conquer where the Kaiser failed. During the effort, all these Napoleons, Caesars, Mussolinis, and Schicklegrubers strut and parade, fume and storm, preen and perform in their vanity and self-assumed might, importance, and glory, feeling secure that if they ultimately fail, all that happens is heroic exile and pseudo martyrdom in a life of comparative ease and comfort of the erroneous but vanquished hero. Doorn or St. Helena were not so bad after all.

Why repeat the mistake? Why not experiment with the possible deterrent effect on future up-starts of showing the world, and especially his former subjects, what a small assinine and ridiculous figure their former boss is, after all? Show him to every citizen of his country, garbed in humiliating raiment, displayed in a Yankee circus cage, and let little children of his oppressed ravished victims, taunt and defile him, time and again, while a sound picture is made of his humiliation for future reference and to keep the record straight.

Colossal vanity, strutting and egotism are the principal stock in trade of such maniacs, and maybe a lot of future would-be-world conquerors would never start, if they knew such would be the consequences of their failure.

They do not need any armament. We are not going to assault them. They know it. But by past performances we know they will assault us, if we let them have what it takes to do it with. And are we not suckers if we depend solely on some postwar contract, treaty, or league with other nations, and do not keep ourselves ready and able to do alone, what it takes to enforce the peace, when the other parties to the treaty welch out on us, secede, or find themselves unable to cooperate for reasons of national self interest?

Salaries of County Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, county agents and employees of the Extension Service constitute a group which has had much to do with the winning of the war. Without fail our county agents and our home demonstration agents are called on to participate in and usually to take the lead in all governmental programs having to do with rural people. It is my opinion they have not been rewarded for their good work as they should have been for they have received no appreciable raise in their pay for many years. They deserve a raise in their salaries.

I sincerely hope the Congress and the various State Governments will lose no time in doing something of a helpful nature for this group.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a letter I have received from Hon. Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 20, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: We have your letter of March 27 asking us to state what we feel can be done to provide a pay raise for county agents.

Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics is carried on by this Department in cooperation with the land-grant colleges of the States in accordance with the act of May 8, 1914, and the State colleges determine the salaries paid to State and county extension workers.

The salaries of county agents are usually paid from Federal, State, and county funds, due to the cooperative nature of the extension program.

There is no uniformity in the salaries received by county agents in the various States. The records show that the average salary paid to county agents in Texas in 1944 was about $2,680, while the average salary paid to county agents in California was $3,995, and the average salary for the United States was $2,880. The salaries paid county agents in many States are lower than the salaries paid to persons holding comparable positions and Director M. L. Wilson of the Extension Service has urged the State extension directors in those States to raise salaries as soon as the financial situation will make this possible. Several States have provided wartime bonuses for their county agents and we have been informed that some legislation has been proposed in the Texas Legislature which, if enacted, will help relieve the situation in that State.

I assure you that we will continue to urge State extension directors to do everything they can to raise the salaries of county agents where such salaries are lower than salaries paid for comparable positions.

Sincerely,

MARVIN JONES, *Administrator.*

More Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, Here is some more bungling of the OPA. This bungling is not limited to the OPA. The WPB has bungled the lumber situation even more. This is the price we pay for permitting government by bureaucracy—by permitting one-man-made laws.

The truth is that we are no longer governed by laws, nor even by bureaucracy, but by deception and make-believe. We are governed by Alice in Wonderland, with a lot of little fellows sitting around pushing pencils, issuing edicts, rules, and regulations. This until we are beginning to feel a real food shortage right here in Washington.

The OPA with its rules and regulations, restrictions and manpower consumption—manpower waste—has not only produced a shortage of butter and meat, but will produce a general shortage of food within a very few months unless Congress wakes up and takes some steps to kick this bureaucracy off of the producers' backs.

Here is a letter I have just received from the North Dakota State Dairy Commissioner, together with a resolution passed by the State Legislature of North Dakota.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, April 18, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a copy of Resolution 2, introduced in the North Dakota House of Representatives by the ways and means committee, and passed both the house and senate without a dissenting vote.

This resolution was introduced as a protest to the policy being pursued by the district OPA office in Fargo in prosecuting our North Dakota creameries for alleged upgrading of butter. The Fargo office of the OPA seemed to have assumed the attitude that all of our creamery operators are law violators, and that, as such, they are all guilty of violating OPA regulations.

Out of the 105 creameries we have in our State, over half of them have already either paid a fine to the OPA, or have been served with a summons to appear in Fargo to defend themselves against these charges. It would appear from a check-up of the action taken by the OPA that they are determined to find something wrong in every plant inspected. If you have had any occasion to check on regulations issued by the OPA you will realize that it is almost impossible at the present time to operate a business and comply fully with all the regulations that they have issued.

In the first place, it would be necessary for a businessman to spend a good share of his time studying the regulations, and then it would be necessary for him to request an interpretation of many points which are definitely not clear in the regulations. After getting the interpretation from the OPA office he would then have to, in most cases, hire an attorney to try to clarify the interpretation. This program of the district OPA is causing irreparable harm to the dairy industry of our State and is resulting in a lower price being paid to our farmers for butterfat.

It appears to me that our sense of American justice, as we were taught to understand it, whereby a party charged with illegal action, was considered innocent until proven guilty has been completely reversed, so that now under the OPA policy, a businessman is considered guilty unless he can produce documentary proof that his is innocent.

I believe that Congress should take some definite action to curb the officials of the OPA in this attitude, and that all unnecessary and unjustified prosecutions be stopped immediately. The dairy industry of North Dakota is soliciting your help on this question.

Very truly yours,

WM. J. MURPHY,
Dairy Commissioner.

House Concurrent Resolution Z

Concurrent Resolution Memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to permit the sale of North Dakota butter within ceiling prices on the basis of its true commercial value, and to cease unjust discrimination against butter made in the State of North Dakota

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That, whereas the creamery industry contributes materially to the aggregate economy of the State of North Dakota, and is the only branch of agriculture in which practically all the processing of the products are carried out within the borders of the State; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has adopted a policy in dealing with our North Dakota creameries based on the erroneous conclusion that top quality butter cannot be produced in North Dakota, and pursuant to said policy has classified North Dakota as a B grade butter State; and

Whereas this action is doing irreparable harm to our dairy industry as a whole and particularly to the producer, as any action that compels creameries to market butter on the theory that Government grades are the sole and only basis of its commercial value will automatically reduce the price the creamery can pay to the producer in this State for butterfat; and

Whereas if damage actions by the Office of Price Administration succeed as against creameries which have bought and paid for butterfat, to the producer on the theory that such butterfat could be and was processed into butter that could be lawfully sold for a price actually based on its real commercial value, within ceiling-price limitations, and judgments for damages against said creameries are obtained, then and in that event, as to cooperative creameries, the damages will be collected from the pockets of the farmer producer, and as to independent creameries, the judgments will have to be collected out of the working capital, as in truth and in fact the prices that were paid to the farmer were based on the prices the creameries have received for the butter, and in truth and in fact, no damage has accrued to the consumer; and if the present program of the OPA is carried out, no benefit can or will accrue to the consumer. The North Dakota producer will be materially damaged and the ultimate consumer will receive no benefit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of the OPA in connection with the matters hereinbefore referred to, and to urge Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to issue such regulations as may be required to permit North Dakota creameries to sell North Dakota butter within ceiling prices on the basis of its true commercial value, and that the present program of the OPA, based on alleged upgrading, be forthwith terminated: It is further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Chester Bowles, Administrator, and to each of the North Dakota Members of Congress.

(NOTE.—The above concurrent resolution was passed by the house of representatives and the senate without any opposition by voice vote.)

A Letter From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have received from one of my constituents, namely, Mr. Arthur B. Dargan, 4609 Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 17, 1945.*

The Honorable WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently a lady told me that if an international bank is formed, she will promptly cash in all her War bonds. I replied that, in that case, I shall immediately buy another bond to counteract, in some measure, her action.

I think that all peace-loving people should work for the programs outlined at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks.

I heard our President on the radio yesterday. I think the forward-looking people of America should unite to give him maximum support in order that the program laid out by our late beloved President may be developed.

At the present time, the following lines written by a patriot and statesman keep

running through my mind. It is my belief that no man can read them without profit.

"Man's dearest possession is life;
And as it is given him to live but once,
He must live so as to feel no torturing regrets for years without purpose;
So live as not to be seared by the shame of a cowardly and trivial life;
So live that, dying, he may say:
'All my life and all my strength I gave to the finest cause in the world: The liberation of mankind.'"

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR B. DARGAN.

Lt. Lois I. Jernberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I feel especially privileged to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the awarding of the Bronze Star Medal to Lt. Lois I. Jernberg, of Butte, Mont.

Lieutenant Jernberg is the first Montana woman to be honored by military decoration for service at the battle front. This award was made for gallantry in the performance of her duty as an Army nurse.

While my respect for our nurses has always been high my regard for them and my appreciation of their job has increased since I have come into close contact with these gallant girls in India, Burma, China, and other parts of the world. No matter where they are or what their job is, they can be depended upon to live up to the highest ideals of their country and their profession.

To all of them and to my fellow Montanan, Lieutenant Jernberg, I can only say "We're proud of you."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an article from the Daily Post of Butte, Mont., dated April 10, 1945, covering the outstanding work of Lt. Lois I. Jernberg, Nurse Corps, Army of the United States:

LIEUTENANT JERNBERG WINS UNITED STATES BRONZE STAR

Lt. Lois I. Jernberg, of Butte, Montana's first woman honored by military decoration for service at the battle front, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal by Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., for gallantry in the performance of duty as an Army nurse.

The 25-year-old Butte girl is currently serving at an evacuation hospital in Germany. A "shock nurse," she administers initial care to men evacuated directly from the field of battle, giving them plasma and preparing them for entrance into the hospital from the shock camp.

In company with 12 other members of the Army Nurse Corps, Lieutenant Jernberg, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Jernberg, of 704 West Park, received the Bronze Star and personal congratulations from General Patton at a formal ceremony at Third Army field headquarters on the western front.

Before a military police guard of honor and headquarters band, the 13 cited nurse officers heard the general read the citation: "The Bronze Star Medal is awarded for meritorious service in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States in France and Luxemburg to the following members of the Army Nurse Corps."

General Patton then pinned the medal upon the blouse of each nurse officer, shook her hand, and commended her on the excellent performance of her stringent duties. When the general had completed the presentations, his chief of staff, Brig. Gen. Hobart S. Gay, and the chief of the Third Army nurses, Maj. Bernice J. Sinclair, congratulated each of the decorated nurses.

Lieutenant Jernberg has been overseas a year last January. She entered service 2 years ago. A graduate of Butte High School, she completed initial nurse training at Tacoma General Hospital, Washington, and later graduated from a public health nursing course at the University of Washington in Seattle. For a time before her enlistment she was a member of the Murray Hospital nursing staff in Butte.

Price of Crude Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 I introduced H. R. 2940 which relates to the price of crude petroleum. I desire at this time to call further attention to the bill and the general subject involved.

The bill as introduced is identical with the Disney bill H. R. 2887, which passed the House on December 13, 1943, but was never acted on by the Senate. The principles of the bill were then offered as an amendment to the Price Control Act and this amendment was tentatively passed by the House on June 10, 1944, which action was reversed and the amendment defeated on June 14, 1944. There, the matter ended so far as action by the Seventy-eighth Congress was concerned.

That, however, was not the end of an economic and industrial injustice that has existed since price control began in 1941.

The bill which I have introduced has been commended by many Members of the House. It has been criticized by others for the same reason that the Disney bill was, namely, that the Congress should not attempt to fix specific prices of a commodity. This, of course, it does not do; it offers a standard by which the fairness of crude oil prices may be measured. We have legislated heretofore along this line with respect to some other commodities.

Like the attempts made previously to act legislatively on the oil price question, I offered this bill to seek correction of an outstanding injustice that has been perpetrated and maintained by the agency to which control of prices has been entrusted. This agency has not been guided by the intent of Congress in this matter, but has substituted for that intent a philosophy of its own whose origin I cannot attempt to explain except to say that it grew in part out of the incompetency of the men who were given authority over the matter of oil prices. They have never gone much further than to look at the earnings statements of the largest oil companies and conclude that all the oil companies are doing very well and that the thousands who produce crude oil exclusively are to be judged by the same standards as those who make profits from the operation of pipe lines, refineries, and marketing facilities.

The State of Oklahoma has imposed new and additional taxes on its people in the session of the legislature just closed. Under a decent price for crude oil it probably would not have had to do so, as there is a 5-percent tax on the gross value of crude oil. The legislature of Oklahoma knew that the need for additional revenue could not be met by the oil producers. The price of oil is little more than in 1941, and the State's production fell about 30,000,000 barrels in 1944 under the 1941 total. Meantime, the producers' costs went up 30 percent and more.

The bill I introduced provides a parity formula for fixing the ceilings on crude oil prices. The price of crude oil today, nationally, is 62 percent of parity with respect to all commodities.

The producers of oil have cried out for 4 years for recognition of the simple, basic economics of their situation. They have not relaxed their efforts to meet the ever-increasing demand for their product. There have been no strikes, no shutdowns. They are Americans, and they have done their utmost to serve America. From time to time during this period they have suffered casualties. There have been many sales of producing properties to the companies whose profits come from the manufacture and sale of products, and who have sought to safeguard their future supply of raw material by such purchases. Many wells have been abandoned. In my district there is one field which in 1943 produced 3,800,000 barrels. The wells generally produce considerable water with the oil and the cost of producing is greater because of the volume of fluid that must be pumped to get the oil. In 1944 the operators began giving up the wells, and they abandoned 59 of them. Production in 1944 was about 1,100,000 barrels less than in 1943—more than 1,000,000 barrels of badly needed oil that a higher price would have brought to the surface. It will never be recovered, for only an extremely high price for oil would enable anyone to redrill the field. More wells in this field are being sold to the salvage dealers, and with a continuance of present conditions it will disappear completely. The subsidy on oil production which is being paid on some classes of small wells does not apply to this field, for the average per well daily production is higher than the upper limits that were set.

This is one example. We can find many more. No industry can continue to operate properties whose costs exceed income.

When the war began the oil industry had a substantial capacity to produce which was in excess of the demand for oil. This has been used up and conservation principles are being violated right and left to get the oil out quickly and

meet the war needs, at the expense of the final total recovery from fields now wastefully produced.

We would have lost this war without a supply of oil adequate to the military needs of ourselves and our allies. That supply came from this country, and for a long period it was nowhere else available.

National security demands that we replenish our ability to produce oil. It demands that we provide conditions which will enable the oil industry to operate, not abandon, present reserves. It is a blind, ignorantly conceived policy that is being followed. There is not a barrel of crude oil produced today that is not being sold at less than the cost of replacement through discovery of new fields.

And simple justice demands that the large army of oil producers who have served this Nation so capably in the past be encouraged to continue their service, not driven from their lifetime occupation.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the officers of the St. Louis locals of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, in tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This resolution also pledges cooperation to President Truman and calls for redoubled efforts in winning the war and establishing a lasting peace:

In the deep sorrow we all feel for a truly great man who was our friend, we ask the members of the UE to do honor to his memory not in mere words, but in deeds. We must rededicate ourselves to the great principles for which he stood, and do our full, unstinting part to make a reality of his aim of lasting peace and security for the peoples of the whole world.

During his entire 12 years in office, working people have known that Franklin D. Roosevelt was their friend. They have come to realize that he was also one of the few really great men of history, a peerless world leader for freedom and democracy, for the abolition of Fascist tyranny and aggression. In our sorrow at his death we are one with the whole freedom-loving people of all lands.

In honor and gratitude to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we must redouble our contributions to the war effort—in loyal effort on the production line in support of our victorious fighting fronts, to the final victory over Germany and Japan—and carrying out labor's responsibility to help unite the American people and the United Nations for Victory and Peace.

Upon Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, has fallen the mantle of President Roosevelt. He is our President, our Commander in Chief, our member of the United Nations Big Three. We know that he will fill that role worthily and effectively with full devotion to the principles and leadership of his dead chief.

Harry Truman needs the full support of all Americans in carrying out that program. He assumes office at a critical period in history, when the final and decisive battles are being fought against German and Japanese fascism, when decisions must be made which will affect the future of our country and the world, the peace and well-being of the people, for generations to come. Taking over the duties of President Roosevelt after his leadership of 12 years is a tremendous responsibility for any man.

It is our duty as working people to close our own ranks and help units the whole Nation in uncompromising unity behind President Truman. Let us not tolerate the enemies of unity, nor the carping critics and the loose-tongued whose careless talk would undermine the leadership of our new President. Let us go on with full confidence in his high office and his leadership.

Behind President Truman we shall work with greater determination than ever to see this fight through—the fight to complete victory in the war and unity with our allies in the councils of the United Nations, for a world of freedom, democracy, and prosperity.

In the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we carry on.

William Sentner, general vice president; Robert B. Logsdon, international representative; Eustus Brendle, president, Local 1102; James Click, business agent, Local 1102; J. W. McConnell, president, Local 825; Archie Wayne, recording secretary, Local 825; Orville Munzer, vice president, Local 825; Frank Lenhardt, president, Local 1108; Ray Mertens, president, Local 1104; Louis Wagner, vice president, Local 1104; Lowell Waldron, secretary-treasurer, Local 1104; R. J. Bergman, president, Local 816; Clarence Bingaman, president, Local 810.

In the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wellsburg Herald, Wellsburg, Iowa:

IN THE AIR

More and more are men in industry and agriculture voicing a fear that the stage is being set for total Government domination of basic production activity in the United States.

The farmer senses it just as he senses changes in the weather. The industrialist senses it, banking senses it, the electric industry has definitely felt it, transportation sees it growing in various branches of that industry, and many lines of business are aware of pressure that makes private operation constantly more difficult.

When bureaucratic demands are finally made that industry cannot comply with, those who would have Government become all powerful, will say: "Private enterprise has failed, Government must take over."

No one has more to lose before the onward march of all-powerful Government than the workman. Wherever Government dominates the individual becomes a slave to an official aristocracy. He finally loses his liberty when a benevolent despotism feeds him with a gilded spoon for which he has to pay.

Peace With Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

THE MARYLAND CITIZENS
COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY,
Baltimore, Md., April 23, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: We are sending the enclosed editorial to you because we thought you would like to have the opportunity to read Gerald Johnson's personal tribute to President Roosevelt. We think it is very beautiful and expresses so well what is in the hearts of so many of us.

We would appreciate it if you would have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HOLT DOWNS
(Mrs. James R. Downs),
Corresponding Secretary.

PEACE WITH HONOR

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

"The great old chief is safe at last—he sleeps well;
Treason has done his worst; nor steel nor poison,
Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing
Can touch him further."

To those of us who have followed him faithfully down all the thundering years there is grim comfort in the thought. Never before has it been true. From that moment in 1933 when he returned from a brief vacation to take up the burden of the Presidency, only to find at Miami a lunatic lurking in the dark with a pistol, he has been the target of every sort of sniper.

The rage of the common enemy is understandable. But it's the "malice domestic" that is beyond belief. Friday night, when they were bringing his body up from Georgia while a weeping Nation stood by, I found in my mail a pamphlet—written by a person, thank God, to me unknown. It was snarling, vicious, mean beyond the limit that one likes to attribute to humanity. It ended, "The Roosevelts seem to be having so much fun. And the world is drenched with blood and tears."

From now on, however, Roosevelt is safe from the assaults of enemies, foreign or domestic. Only the measured judgment of historians will be worthy of respect henceforth, and what their verdict on his career will be it is far too soon to know. You can measure the height of a molehill in a minute, but to determine the true altitude of a mountain requires long and careful calculation.

Yet already certain things about him are easy enough to see. One is that his is among the most dramatic lives in all human history. In part, this was the result of circumstance. It was fate, not his own choice, that brought Roosevelt to power within the same 24 hours

that saw Hitler's elevation. Roosevelt was inaugurated for the first time on March 4, 1933, and on March 5, 1933, the German Reichstag passed the enabling act that gave Chancelor Hitler complete control of the nation.

Each man headed a nation in the depths of despair. Germany and the United States alike were economically prostrate. Germany and the United States alike faced a huge problem of unemployment. Germany and the United States alike saw the whole social system in danger of disintegration. Germany and the United States alike looked to a new leader to devise new methods of dealing with an ancient evil.

Each man attacked the problem according to his own character. Hitler chose the autocratic method, Roosevelt the democratic. Hitler tried to frighten his people into action, Roosevelt tried to encourage his. Hitler raised a thousand bugaboos—Jews, Russians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, labor unions, books, churches, Freemasons—and warned the Germans to beware of them. Roosevelt said, "All we have to fear is fear itself." Hitler relied upon the spur of hate. Roosevelt relied upon the spirit of the good neighbor.

So the long duel began, the contest that was to last for a dozen years. At that time Churchill was not even in the picture, and Stalin was too busy in Russia to pay much attention to what went on outside. For years the leaders of the two divisions of mankind were Roosevelt and Hitler, and at every turn their policies were diametrically opposed.

John Bunyan wrote it centuries ago in the Pilgrim's Progress. It was the age-old contest between Christian and Apollyon, between the man and the demon. At first the demon was spectacularly successful, and the issue was long in doubt. The man, indeed, was wounded unto death, but in the end the demon was chained for a thousand years. Who doubts that it will be so again? Our champion lies dead, but every breeze from Europe brings fresh assurance that the covenant with death shall be disannulled, and the compact with hell shall not stand.

Yet while this dramatic contest will enchain the imagination of future generations, we who were upon the scene should be able to understand simpler, human things. This man, himself disabled, who risked his own fortune to bring help to the afflicted when he bought the Warm Springs property and dedicated it to the service of victims of infantile paralysis; this cripple who traveled tens of thousands of miles, by land, by sea, by air, for a great part of the way in danger of a resolute and ferocious enemy, and every mile of the way suffering fatigue, discomfort, and strain to which no cripple should be subjected, in order that you and I might be safer; this man, who dared walk arm in arm with death as others walked with an old friend, was a hero in the great tradition.

Therefore those of us who followed him can walk today with heads erect, apologizing to no man. We may not be much ourselves, but at least we have what it takes to know a great man when we see one. When we chose a leader we did not pick any waverer, any faint heart, any sunshine soldier. From the moment his first call sounded we knew "it is Richard, it is Raymond, it is Godfrey at the gate," and from that time until the black day last week when taps wailed over the gun carriage that bore his body, we had no reason to change our minds.

We are men of the twentieth century, in some ways the most terrible, the bloodiest, the fiercest in history. The follies of the twentieth century have been colossal, its crimes titanic, and to some extent all of us are implicated in them. Yet in some ways the greatness of that century has been proportionate to its evil. Even to us small men, helpless to shape the gigantic events happening around us, the century has presented the opportunity to choose whom we would serve. Not every generation is allowed the chance to follow two of the mightiest heroes of the realm of the mind and the spirit. In some ways it is a misfortune to have been born into the twentieth century; but the century has allowed to us the honor and pride of having followed first Woodrow Wilson and then Franklin Roosevelt.

The great old chief is safe at last, and although his going has left us desolate, it was not really mournful. For it was with him as it was with Mr. Valiant-for-Truth, when he stood at the brink of the River of Death; so let John Bunyan have the last word:

"My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles who now will be my rewarder . . . so he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

Address of William B. Ziff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following address made by Mr. William B. Ziff, noted author and publisher. This speech was delivered at Carnegie Hall in New York City on April 19, 1945, at a meeting sponsored by the American League for a Free Palestine on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto. Mr. Ziff's strong contention that Hebrew Palestine should be represented at San Francisco, just as the mandated territories of Syria and Lebanon are represented, and that the solution of the age-old Hebrew problem has a vital bearing on the stability of Europe and the Middle and Near East, must be given serious consideration. The text of Mr. Ziff's address follows:

The battle of the Warsaw Ghetto, in which 40,000 Jews—consisting almost altogether of starved little tradesmen who had never even held rifles before in their hands—died, will rank as one of the epic battles of this war. With smuggled small-arms, these men and women heroically fought for every street and every house and did not yield until the last survivor finally died. It was necessary for the Germans to use against this embattled group of fighters a total machinery of war, including tanks, airplanes, and flamethrowers. The engagement cost them several thousand men and the use of a great deal of ammunition and other war material. It was the first organized revolt against Hitler. This tremendous effort on the part of a doomed people received scant recognition everywhere, but will rank in history as one of the great events of the war.

It is a tragic fact that almost all of the five million who died could have been saved, if nations had prepared a sanctuary in the mandated Palestine. There was room for six million there, as is attested by the fact that the 750,000 Hebrews who live there live on about 3 percent of the land. The thing which stood in the way was the opopsition of a small group of Colonial Office functionaries who were determined that no western people capable of building factories should inhabit this part of the world. The result was a continuous effort of sabotage on behalf of a group of Arab tribes—none of whom have been pro-United Nations during this war or the previous war, with the exception of the small group that was with Lawrence.

In the present war, Arabia actually was on the enemy side. It was the British Army and a small group of Hebrew guerillas who saved the Mosul refineries from falling into the hands of the German officers who were working with the Iraqian troops. Hebrew Palestine gave the allies in the most critical moment not only an arsenal of factories, but also 30,000 men who made up a large part of Montgomery's army. The Arabs were either apathetic or hostile to the United Nations. Thus Hebrew Palestine was the only ally the United Nations had in this part of the world.

Only when it was clear that the Germans were already beaten did the Arab kings jump on the United Nations bandwagon. At the present time the Arab kings, under the stimulation of Colonial Office functionaries, are talking in grandiose terms of a great pan-Arabia. Such a pan-Arabia can never exist except in the minds of imperialistic politicians. The Arab kings themselves are dictators, the very tyrants we are fighting against. The tyrant Ibn Saud represents everything the soldiers of the United Nations are fighting against. He is a one-man tyrant whose people have no rights whatsoever, and in his country Christians and Jews cannot even live. Yet it is this man and other Arab kings who have been invited to sit with us in San Francisco as full partners, even though they are anti-Christian and wish to solve the problem in Palestine by the murder of all the Hebrews there. Ibn Saud's prime minister lauded Hitler's methods of dealing with the Hebrews.

Yet it is these men who are now getting lease-lent arms from the United States.

This would be one of the most tragic occurrences, to give the Arab kings lease-lent arms, even from the viewpoint of democratic Arabs who are seeking to overthrow them.

Even today the question of the unfortunate Hebrews of Europe cannot be solved independently of Palestine. They must be allowed to reconstitute themselves there as one of the recognized nationalities. They cannot return to Europe, which has been thoroughly infected with the Nazi doctrine. This is true even of France.

The great opposition to the return of Hebrews to Palestine comes not from the Arabs, but from Colonial Office functionaries. It is they who have instituted a set of anti-Hebrew laws, seeking to prevent the Hebrew from coming in, to prevent him from owning land, and to keep his colonization from being effective.

It will be necessary for the San Francisco Conference to consider this entire problem, and to get independent reports on it, either by the Mandates Commission of the old League of Nations, or by a newly appointed commission. Colonial office functionaries cannot be allowed to sit in judgment of their own crimes.

Hebrew Palestine is a national entity which has fought valiantly on the side of the United Nations in this war. It should be represented in San Francisco. The fact that it is mandated territory would not prevent this. Lebanon, and Syria, and other mandated territories which did nothing on our side during this war, will be represented at San Francisco, but the Hebrew people is refused representation.

No part of the world problem can be solved until justice is done to these first of the victims of Hitler's fury, the homeless Hebrew people of Europe. This is not a problem which can be disposed of at will by English colonial office functionaries. It is a world question which relates directly to the stability of Europe and the Middle and Near East, and must be considered in this light.

Oregon Troops Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we from the State of Oregon are proud of the record made by Oregon troops and also servicemen who received their training in the State of Oregon. They have made an outstanding contribution toward the winning of the war. An editorial appeared in the Portland Oregonian in its issue of April 23, 1945, commenting upon this record. I include the editorial as a part of my remarks, as follows:

OREGON TROOPS OVERSEAS

He who writes the history of this war will have to use many chapters for troops recruited or trained in Oregon. Press dispatches revealing that the Ninty-sixth Infantry Division is on the front line at Okinawa, the One Hundred and Fourth in Halle, and the Ninety-first in Bologna round out the record of Oregon troops on major fronts throughout the world—and a proud record it is.

The Ninety-sixth, commanded by Maj. Gen. J. L. (Smiling Jim) Bradley, was activated at Camp Adair in August 1942, was trained additionally at Camp White, and participated in the Oregon maneuvers of 1943. It went overseas in time to storm the beaches of Leyte on October 20, 1944, where it killed 7,677 Japanese soldiers and was commended by General MacArthur. The story of its fight on Okinawa has not been told, for the decisive battle has yet to be fought.

Those who know General Bradley and the training he gave his selectees from all over the Nation—training so tough that more than 3,000 men failed to make the grade—know that the Ninety-sixth will more than hold up its end in the dark days of battle ahead. The division which did not have time to nickname itself may find a name by popular acclaim on the field of battle.

Oregon's own Forty-first Division, the hardest fighting unit in the Pacific, is secure in its grimly won laurels, after more than 3 years of jungle fighting and seven major assault invasions, from New Guinea to Mindanao and Palawan. But the Forty-first's glorious record does not dim the honors which have been won by Oregon's adopted divisions, the Ninety-sixth, the Seventieth, the One Hundred and Fourth, and the Ninety-first.

Oregon took the Seventieth Division, trained at Camp Adair under the colorful Maj. Gen. John E. Dahlquist (now commanding the Thirty-sixth on the European front), to its heart when it was activated as the Trailblazers in June 1943. The Seventieth went overseas in the fall of 1944, and several units fought with the task force which captured Wingen from Nazi S. S. (Elite Guard) troops in a bitter 3-day struggle in January. Late in February the Trailblazers went into action as a division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Allison J. Barnett, for the first time. They helped wrest the industrial Saar from the Germans, and now, presumably, are driving into Bavaria with other units of Lt. Gen. Alexander M. Patch's Seventh Army.

The One Hundred and Fourth Division, activated at Camp Adair in September 1942, and with many Northwest men in its ranks, landed in France 2 years later, fought first with the Canadian First Army, then joined the American First. The Timber Wolves were commended by the corps commander for seizing the great industrial area, Eschweiler-Weisweiler-Stolberg, and termed "one of the finest assault divisions we ever had in this corps." Led by Maj. Gen. Terry Allen, the One Hundred and Fourth in February plunged through the Roer River defenses in the great Allied drive onto the Cologne Plain. Piling aboard tanks, the Timber Wolves surged into the heart of Cologne on March 5.

Now the Timber Wolves have taken Halle in a terrific drive by Lt. Gen. Courtney H. Hodges' First Army on the Nazis' central front after the initial surrender terms of Count Felix von Luckner, the "sea devil" of the last war and No. 1 citizen of that city, had been rejected by "Terrible Terry" Allen.

The hearts of a lot of World War No. 1 veterans beat faster when the famed Ninety-first (Wild West) Division of St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and Ypres-Lys fame was reactivated at Camp White in August 1942. Official dispatches from overseas on the progress of the far West's most famous division of the last war have been few, but in late summer, 1944, the Three Hundred and Sixty-third Infantry Regiment of the Ninety-first was among the first units to drive into the northern Italian cities of Livorno and Pisa under the command of Col. W. Fulton Magill, of Portland. Now the division has occupied Bologna.

And the story would not be complete without the record of the Forty-sixth General Hospital in France, organized at University of Oregon Medical School with a staff of Oregon doctors and nurses in July 1942, and veteran of north Africa. The unit was awarded the meritorious service plaque in January. The highest praise was given it and its chief, Col. J. Guy Strohm, of Portland, by ex-Ambassador William C. Bullitt, in a letter to Life magazine.

We think no other State has contributed a greater proportionate share in victory than the fighting sons and daughters, native and adopted, or Oregon.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent poem by Mr. Henry Gillen which appeared recently in the Boston (Mass.) Post:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Henry Gillen)

He who has known the wonder and the woe
Of depths and mountaintops in men's affairs,
He who has raised the poor and felled the foe,
And borne the endless burden of our cares,
Unsparing and unceasing in the quest
That night be starlit and the fearsome day
Be calmer, kinder, gentler, nobler, lest
Man and his monuments shall pass away,
Now at the zenith finds a sweet surcease
While battles rage and youths as splendid die,
Turning away from strife, he comes to peace
That God assures and fiends cannot belie,
Leaving the heritage as he departs,
Of goals to gain with courage in our hearts.

Jefferson Day Address of Hon. Albert M. Rains, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable ALBERT M. RAINS, at the Jefferson Day dinner in Montgomery, Ala., on April 13, 1945:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very grateful for that generous, though undeserved introduction. I am grateful, too, for the high honor and pleasant privilege you have accorded me with your invitation to be your speaker on this auspicious occasion. I am proud also, for the opportunity to get away from Washington for a stay, that is all too brief, with my friends at home.

Here, tonight, my friends, in the historic and beautiful capital city of my beloved native State, on this the birthday of the immortal Thomas Jefferson, it is altogether fitting and proper that we, as Democrats meet to review, in brief, the glorious record of our party; to renew our faith in the proud principles of Democracy, and to rededicate our efforts to the cause and call of Jefferson.

In June and July of 1776, in Philadelphia, a lean, lanky, freckled-faced man, wearing ill-fitting clothes, sat in a cheaply furnished rented room, busied himself day and night writing a paper entitled "A Declaration." John Adams said that he was chosen for this momentous task because, as a Member of the Continental Congress, he had earned "a reputation for literature, science, and a happy talent for composition." Out of his magnificent mind and memory, filled with words of wisdom gained and gleaned in years of study and reflection, the document later to be acclaimed by all mankind as the greatest declaration of human rights since the Magna Charta came into being.

It is this dramatic scene out of the history of a people struggling for independence, by which Jefferson won the admiration of all the liberty-loving people of the world.

Perhaps this masterpiece, setting out in burning eloquence the right of men to be free, and declaring the self-evident truth that "all men are born free and equal," and are "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights" is the crowning glory of Jefferson's life.

A few weeks ago I was privileged to visit the home of Jefferson at Monticello. While there, I saw the plain, white shaft that marks the last resting place of all that was mortal of this immortal man. On the modest marble stone was engraved the epitaph by which the great Democrat wanted to be remembered: "Here lies the body of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom and the founder of the University of Virginia."

There was not a word to tell of the prestige that was his; no line to commemorate his long life of political achievement; no mention of the high offices to which he was elevated by the people. As I stood there and recalled that he was President of the United States, Vice President, Secretary of State, Governor of Virginia, and Ambassador to France; that the people who loved him gave him every honor to which he could aspire, I was deeply moved by this simple, but meaningful self-written epitaph. Jefferson, the

great Democrat, preferred that posterity should remember him not for the personal attainments which were his, but for the unselfish service rendered to mankind in the authorship of the great document of human liberties, in the writing of the statute of religious freedom, and in the founding and fostering of a great university for the education of the youth of the land.

There are those who will portray him as the idealistic, the unrealistic dreamer of dreams; others erroneously point to him, and to certain of his printed and uttered statements in support of their animosity toward liberal, progressive government; still others, out of the wealth of their own wishful thinking, exalt him as the champion of unchanging status quo. Some, because of deliberate, inborn reaction, see in his speeches and writings the anathema of all present day, liberal trends in American thought and Government. Jefferson was never a defender, either in his own country or abroad, of an imperfect or unjust state of being, but always believed in the necessity of change as the circumstances warranted and justified. As examples of his liberal faith, and as positive proof of his eternal belief in the sovereign will of the people, he wrote shortly before his election to the Presidency, the famous and oft quoted words, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

All men agree today that Jefferson was our most eloquent and outstanding apostle of democracy. It is true that he always desired a mild and inoffensive type of revolutionary change, insisting that custom and precedent be broken only to permit a new and better order for the greater freedom of the people. None of us can doubt that we live in a revolutionary era today. Living as we are in a changing world, it is essential and necessary that the processes of government change to meet the needs, desires, and ambitions of a democratic people. It is unjust to the memory of Jefferson to attribute to him the authorship of any idea that government should be weak, or should revert from the purpose which Jefferson stated as the end sought. "The freedom and happiness of man—are the sole objects of legitimate government."

So, today, my friends, as we honor Jefferson, we honor the democratic concept upon which this Nation was born, and we honor the great political party which was founded on his faith in the right of the people to rule, and in his eternal belief that all men should be free and untrammeled.

To review and recall the record of the Democratic Party is to restate the history of our country. It is an accepted historical truth that in every great national emergency, the people have turned for leadership to the Democratic Party. It is to the everlasting credit and glory of our party, and to its leaders down through all the years, that we have never failed to give to the Nation and the people, the leadership that the occasion demands.

A nation founded in the democratic, freedom-loving principles of Jefferson, found itself threatened by greed, graft, corruption, and special privilege, in the administration of another great Democrat—the hero of Horseshoe Bend and of New Orleans—Andrew Jackson. It was the strong iron will of Jackson, his brave and courageous heart, his everlasting determination to preserve the Nation for the people, that enabled him to save it in one of its darkest days.

Touching, as I must, only the high spots in the brilliant history of our party, we see next the "schoolmaster of Princeton" as he assumes the duties of President. Born, bred, and schooled in the principles and precepts of democracy, with a firm belief in the ability of the people to rule; recognizing also that changing times and circumstances demanded that the Government provide more protection and service to the people, Wilson's administration enacted into the law of our land some far reaching, and at that time considered radical an revolutionary legislation. The Federal Reserve bank for the stabilization of our currency, and for the elimination of the evils of the money system that had plagued our people over all the years. The Adamson 8-hour-day law, the first major gain for the men who toil in our great industries, and on our railroads. The Federal Land Bank System for loans for farmers, the beginning of the system of farm loans, the continuation of which has meant so much to Southern farmers and to those of the Nation.

And then finally, and much against his will, Wilson was forced to lead his Nation into war. A war in which many of you, here tonight, participated; a war which was to "make the world safe for democracy." Under his proud leadership as Commander in Chief, and as President of the Nation, the gallant men of America, the fathers of the soldier, sailors, and marines who fight today, gave to the world an epic lesson in gallantry all the way from Chateau Thierry to the Argonne Forest. Armed with the holy cause of free men; backed and supported by a nation whose destiny was at stake, these "doughboys" of another day, broke the back of German militarism, and then came Versailles.

To that conference went Woodrow Wilson, tired and sick of the horrors of war, convinced in mind and heart that humanity's only hope for a peaceful world was an international peace organization. For weeks and months he labored with the statesmen of Europe of that day, as they played their power politics around the peace table, and finally, by the sheer force of his will, the might of his intellect, he was able to bring back to America a plan for the perpetuation of world peace.

The Nation was weary of war, and in the hearts of the American people was the ever-present desire to return to "normalcy" again. All over America discord, dissatisfaction, and disapproval of the League of Nations, gained headway. We, as a people, were already, within a few short months, forgetting the price we had paid in blood and treasure in "the war to end wars."

Wilson was being termed as an idealist, a visionary, a dreamer. Recognizing the opposition that was abroad to the League of Nations, he assumed his last major role as a great statesman. Broken in health, and against the advice of friends and physicians, he made a nationwide speaking tour, in a last-ditch fight to preserve for America and the world its chance to live in peace. From coast to coast he carried the message to the Nation of the hope and opportunity for world peace.

Finally, one afternoon at a stop made by his special train at a little town in Arizona, he stood on the platform and made a speech to the people gathered. Among other things, he said, "We have just come through a great world war. Unless America, with the rest of the world, is willing to enter into an international agreement for the preservation of the peace of the world, the little boys now in the arms of their mothers here in this audience, 25 years from now will be bearing the brunt of bloody conflict on battlefields all over the world. Humanity has been able to survive this war, terrible and costly though it has been, but it will be difficult for humanity to survive another." This was his last speech. He returned to the White House a disillusioned and disappointed man. Soon Wilson's arch opponents, amid the plaudits of the multitude, buried the League of Nations, and thus paved the way for the bloody holocaust in which we are now engaged.

To my mind, my friends, Wilson was the peerless leader, the pure Democrat, the man of vision, and the prophet that was "not without honor, save in his own country."

And then, after that sorry interlude in American history, we passed into the "normalcy" of Harding and Coolidge, and then into the panic of Hoover.

Once again the Democratic Party was called upon to furnish the leadership, and to find a way out for a nation in distress.

There are those who are anxious that the people of America forget the black night of depression brought upon this country by Republican misrule, greed, graft, and mismanagement. I shudder as I recall the plight of the people, not only in Alabama, but in the Nation; farms were being sold under the auctioneer's hammer, schools were closed because there was no money with which to pay the teachers, banks were failing with monotonous regularity, the smokestacks of industry were filled with cobwebs, long lines of eager, anxious workmen were in the bread lines, with empty stomachs and fear-filled faces. The black hand of dry rot was clutching the throat of the Nation. And then, to power came the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the man of faith, hope, and courage. To millions today, and certainly to the generations of the future, looking back across the pages of history, he will be known as a man of destiny.

As he assumed office, the people in desperation were approaching revolt. Under his leadership, and with the help of the farsighted statesmen of the Democratic Party, a new day was ushered in for America. Mistakes were made, of course, but it was no time to falter, and certainly not time to fail. Assistance was given to the farmers whereby they could save their farms from mortgages; markets for their crops at reasonable prices were provided; workmen were given jobs in industries whereby they could feed and school and clothe their families; industry reaped reasonable profits; deposits in banks were guaranteed; social-security legislation was enacted.

But there is no need for me to recount for you the legislation that has been enacted during the years of the Roosevelt administration, it is contemporary history to you. It is sufficient to say that the progressive, liberal legislation promulgated by this administration has won the support of the masses of the people of America, and the record made by this administration has run the gauntlet of a national election on four given occasions.

My friends, we can hardly pause to consider the past because of the awful impact of the present, and because of our anxiety and hope for the future.

There were those in the despicable land of Hirohito, and those in Hitler's Germany, and the little tin-horn Mussolini, who referred to "the decadent democracies," and to us in particular, as being too soft to wage war even in our own defense. None of us can ever forget that Sunday afternoon, December 7, 1941, nor the days and months that followed. How the wrath and might of a great nation rose in a mighty torrent! How the young men of America, answering the call of their country, tripped off to battle with a smile on their face, and a song in their heart! How the men and women in industry and labor and on the farms of America, bent in ceaseless toil to the task of building the greatest navy and the greatest army on the face of the earth!

As I contemplate and reflect on the gallantry of the American men who bear arms in this the greatest of all conflicts for human freedom, the grateful words of Winston Churchill as he spoke of the young men of the Royal Air Force who had just won the battle of the blitz over London, come to mind,

"Never in the history of the world, have so many owed so much to so few."

On a hundred battlefields all over the world the valor of American men and the might of American arms, has carried, and is carrying the Stars and Stripes to victory. Mussolini has been toppled; the cruel and inhuman reign of Hitler is practically at an end; the blazing guns of American war ships and the fire of American bombs is burning down the cities of the empire of the Rising Sun; victory is near at hand. A victory out of which we want nothing but peace. Other nations may fight for territorial gains; other nations may fight for positions of world influence in international trade; but America, thank God, fights not for selfish gain.

Surely this time, my friends, we will benefit by the mistakes of the past; surely this time our feet will be guided by the lamp of experience; surely we will remember the admonition given to America by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress on March 1, "There can be no middle ground—we shall have to take the responsibility for world collaboration, or we shall have to bear the responsibility for another world conflict." And so, another great Democratic President pleads with America to assume its rightful role, as a leader among the nations of the earth, for the perpetuation of world peace, and for the elimination of cruel, murderous war. We owe it to the war weary people of the world, to the starving millions of Europe and of Asia, to the fathers and mothers of America, and most of all to the gallant men and women who have fought and died in this war to see that this never happens again.

Across my desk come many letters from men in uniform; men fighting for the cause of freedom and for peace. From a young lieutenant, who has since been killed in action, came this statement, "The only thing that I want after this war is over is to see that these G. I. kids get the breaks they deserve. They are the best in all the world, and we all know that they are fighting for the best country in the world. I have seen them in battle," he wrote, "I have seen them die, and if ever a man has seen courage, I have. I want to be assured that when this war is over our country will take its rightful place in preserving the peace that we are going to win. I want to be sure that all the people back home are going to join us in seeing that this never happens again."

There is today pending before the Congress of the United States the first of a series of legislative measures providing for the participation of the United States in an international peace organization. The House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the honor to be a member, has for many weeks been considering legislation known as the Bretton Woods proposals, which has for its purpose the elimination of economic warfare between and among the nations.

By and large, it appears that the vast majority of the people of our country favor the adoption of Bretton Woods proposals. However, there are some who are steeped in isolationism, who oppose this bill and all measures of world collaboration—setting up as the basis of their opposition the fact the danger that the United States will lose its investment in the stabilization fund and in the international bank, which would amount to eight and three-quarter billion dollars. While it appears that the investment itself will be sound from an economic standpoint, it certainly seems foolish to me to oppose entry of the United States into this program for world collaboration and for the perpetuation of the peace, when the war in which we are now engaged is costing us approximately a half billion per day. If we are to fail in our efforts at world peace, it is of little consequence as to whether we have prosperity or depression, whether we have a balanced budget or an unbalanced budget; whether we are a creditor nation or a debtor nation; since another world war, fought as it would be with the new and ingenious devices of death and destruction, would mean the complete destruction of our Nation, the obliteration of the world, and a total blackout for civilization. There are those who say that our plans for world peace, Bretton Woods proposals, the Dumbarton Oaks agreements, and the agreement which will come out of the San Francisco Conference, will not succeed. I can only think of the awful and terrifying alternative. I can only see what will happen if our efforts at world peace do not succeed. It does not take a prophet or visionary to foretell what the fate of the world would be, and thus to every American who remembers the sacrifices in the war in which we are now engaged is given the positive compulsion to see that the peace of the world is perpetuated.

All of us agree that the peace this time should be a just and equitable peace—the people's peace. Too often heretofore the people have fought the wars and won the victories, made the sacrifices in blood and tears, while around the peace table at the peace conferences the politicians of the world have frittered away the chance of the peace-loving men and women of the earth to end war. It must not happen again. This is our chance, and our last chance, and so every Democrat, every American, every man, woman, and child should urge upon the Congress of the United States—upon all in authority—the compelling necessity for positive action now.

And, my friends, if we, the people of America, fail to do our duty in this crucial hour within the next 25 years, we may be looking into a television set, we may see the President of the United States, probably a man now fighting in some far-off battle, a man who knows war in all its horror, and filled with eternal and everlasting hatred for its brutality and killing, but because of his official position called upon now to speak to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in joint session. He recounts and recalls recent events that have transpired in international relations; with a sad face and aching heart, he comes to the conclusion of his speech with the fateful words, "I call upon the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to declare that a state of war exists * * *." And then the President may say, as was once said, "God help us, we can do no other." And I say to you, my friends, God help us and the future generations of America if we fail to act now for the preservation of world peace in the future.

Fair Employment Practice Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to place on the desk a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of H. R. 2232. This is no new procedure for me as chairman of the House Labor Committee. The Rules Committee has continually since 1937, when I made my first request to that body as chairman of the Labor Committee, refused to grant rules to bring constructive labor legislation to the floor of the House.

H. R. 2232 is a bill which is strictly nonpartisan since it is sponsored by an equal number of Republicans and Democrats and the members of both parties are strongly in favor of immediate action. Since it is impossible to get action from the Rules Committee, I am asking all the Members of the House to sign this petition now, today, so that the issue may be discussed freely on the floor of the House and disposed of.

In simple language the bill prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry. With the opening of the San Francisco Conference yesterday, we have the greatest opportunity to prove our sincerity to the world by adopting this bill. If we in America do not believe in this doctrine, our position at the San Francisco Conference would be impossible to explain. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some necessary information concerning the bill. There has been so much misinformation about H. R. 2232 that we hope the Members will read this very clear explanation of exactly what this bill will do and will not do. I regret the necessity of placing a petition on the desk to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill but we consider it to be very important to get the bill before the House without further delay. More than 2 months have elapsed since the Labor Committee requested a rule.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT H. R. 2232, THE PERMANENT F. E. P. C. BILL

1. Question. What does the bill provide?

Answer. It forbids discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, and creates a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent such discrimination.

2. Question. What groups are forbidden to discriminate by the bill?

Answer. Agencies of the Federal Government;

Employers of six or more persons whose operations affect interstate or foreign commerce;

Federal contractors and subcontractors who employ six or more persons;

Labor unions whose practices affect interstate commerce.

3. Question. What types of discrimination are forbidden by the bill?

Answer. Only discrimination in employment or union membership, i. e., hiring, discharge, wages, seniority, transfers, demotions, upgrading, union auxiliaries, etc. The bill does not apply to discrimination in education, transportation, recreation, voting, or places of public accommodation.

4. What principal minority groups are protected by the bill?

Answer. Thirteen million Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 20,000,000 Catholics, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican or Hispanic origin, 11,000,000 persons of foreign birth.

5. Question. How will the F. E. P. C. be constituted?

Answer. It will be a permanent salaried Commission of five members, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 5-year terms. The size of its staff will depend upon the amount of money Congress appropriates for it.

6. Question. How will F. E. P. C. determine whether an employer or union has discriminated?

Answer. By careful and thorough investigation of the complainant's charge, the employer's or union's explanation, and the surrounding circumstances. The burden of proof will be on the complainant, not the

party accused. If F. E. P. C. believes the charge has merit, it will seek to adjust it by informal and voluntary methods. Where settlement is not possible, F. E. P. C. will conduct a full and fair hearing in which the party charged has the right by counsel to present his version of the facts and to cross-examine witnesses. After the hearing, F. E. P. C. will issue a decision and order, but court approval is necessary before the order can be enforced. Its administrative procedure is like I. C. C., F. T. C., S. E. C., F. P. C., F. C. C., and other administrative agencies.

7. Question. How can discrimination be proved?

Answer. The acts or statements of a party charged are used to prove discrimination. In many cases discrimination is flagrant and revealed by union contracts, newspaper advertisements, discriminatory orders to U. S. E. S., or pay-roll records. In other cases, an employer's pattern of rejections or statements made by personnel officers often indicate discrimination. Weak complaints will be dismissed by the F. E. P. C. without even the necessity of a hearing.

8. Question. What penalties are provided for violators?

Answer. No criminal or civil penalties. F. E. P. C. may merely petition a Federal court to compel obedience to its orders. Violation of a court decree is punishable as a contempt of court. F. E. P. C. will not be able to enforce its orders without court approval. Government contracts may also be withheld from violators. Willful interference with Commission agents is, however, made a crime.

9. Question. What is the penalty when a Government official or agency discriminates?

Answer. The F. E. P. C. may request the President to compel obedience to its orders and he may discharge any willful violator.

10. Question. Does the bill require an employer to hire Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, or other minorities?

Answer. No. An employer may hire or reject anyone he pleases, on any basis and for any reason, so long as a needed and qualified person is not rejected because of his race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

11. Question. Does the bill require an employer to hire a particular percentage or quota of Negroes or of any other minority group?

Answer. Definitely not. The bill provides only that employees shall be selected on the basis of their qualifications. A quota plan makes hiring dependent upon race and is, therefore, itself discriminatory.

12. Question. Will the courts be able to review the decisions of the F. E. P. C.?

Answer. An employer or union aggrieved by an F. E. P. C. order may appeal to the courts. A court will review all questions of law. On questions of fact, the findings of the F. E. P. C. will have to be supported by substantial evidence. This is the customary procedure for judicial review of administrative agencies and has been approved by the Supreme Court. Orders against Federal agencies are not subject to review.

13. Question. Does the bill apply the State or municipal employees?

Answer. No; nor does it apply to any State agency.

14. Question. Does the bill apply to retail stores or domestic servants?

Answer. No. It applies only to those employers who are engaged in interstate commerce or operations affecting such commerce and who employ six or more persons.

15. Question. Are religious associations subject to the bill?

Answer. No, because the bill applies only to employers engaged in interstate commerce.

16. Question. Will the bill make possible racketeering, blackmail, or groundless suits?

Answer. No; because the F. E. P. C. will dismiss all groundless charges on its own initiative, without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the accused employer. The present F. E. P. C. has dismissed two-thirds of all the complaints filed with it. F. E. P. C. thus serves as a necessary safey valve for people who fancy they were discriminated against.

17. Question. What guaranties are there that the F. E. P. C. will not itself be biased and unfair?

Answer. The members of the F. E. P. C. will be appointed by the President of the United States and will have to be approved by the United States Senate. That is the best guaranty of a fair-minded Commission. In addition, the orders of the Commission need court approval before they can be enforced by the F. E. P. C. The Supreme Court requires a "fair hearing" before an administrative agency.

18. Question. What supervision will Congress exercise over the F. E. P. C.?

Answer. Congress will pass upon its annual request for an appropriation. Congress also may, by concurrent resolution, amend or cancel any regulation of the Commission. Congress can at any time investigate the conduct of an administrative agency.

19. Question. Why should we outlaw discrimination in employment?

Answer. It is un-American. It results in low income for minority groups, thus limiting the market for goods and employment opportunities generally. It leads to interracial conflict. It creates a supply of strike breakers. It forces minority groups into substandard conditions of living, detrimental to the community. It depresses wage levels. It decreases the Nation's capacities for war of defense. It injures our standing with the United Nations.

20. Question. Is there enough discrimination in employment to justify a Federal bill?

Answer. The present F. E. P. C. has received almost 7,000 complaints since it was created in July 1943, and it has jurisdiction only over war industries or Government agencies. Many of these complaints involve thousands of workers or an entire industry. In the last 4 months 50 different bills have been introduced in 20 States proposing the elimination of discrimination. This indicates how widespread the problem is. Only one-quarter of F. E. P. C.'s cases originated in the South.

21. Question. Is this a new idea in Federal legislation?

Answer. No. The United States Constitution forbids discrimination by the Government; this bill extends the principle to employers and trade-unions. In the last 10 years Congress has enacted 23 laws which forbid discrimination in their enforcement.

22. Question. Is the bill constitutional?

Answer. Certainly. The United States Supreme Court has repeatedly condemned discriminatory employment practices. A New York law forbidding discrimination by trade-unions was recently upheld as constitutional.

23. Question. Does the bill prohibit prejudice?

Answer. No. Prejudice is a state of mind. The bill prevents discrimination which affects pay envelopes. Discrimination can be eliminated or at least greatly reduced by a firm national policy. An F. E. P. C. will protect those who do not discriminate.

24. Question. Can the bill be enforced effectively?

Answer. No law ever receives 100 percent obedience, but the great majority of employers and trade-unions are law abiding. The small minority will have to conform. Even the present F. E. P. C. without sanctions and with a small staff have been able to stop a great deal of discrimination.

25. Question. Does the bill confer special privileges on minorities?

Answer. No. It merely assures equality of opportunity and equality of treatment. It requires that persons shall be hired on the basis of their qualifications and not rejected because of the immaterial fact of their color, or religion, or place of birth.

26. Question. Why can't the existing F. E. P. C. handle the problem?

Answer. It is a wartime agency without power to enforce its decisions and will terminate as soon as the war is over. Today more than 500 cases, one-fourth of the F. E. P. C.'s case load, are unadjustable at the regional level. People will obey a statute who disregard an Executive order. F. E. P. C.'s accomplishments were possible only because of manpower shortages and wartime appeals to patriotism.

27. Question. What happens to the present Committee on Fair Employment Practice if the bill becomes a law?

Answer. The Committee will cease to exist, but its papers, funds, and employees will be transferred to the new Commission. The new Commission could discharge any employee it did not want.

28. Question. Does this bill impair or conflict with existing State laws?

Answer. There are no State laws which require or permit discrimination in employment. Hence the bill does not affect existing State laws nor does it invade States' rights.

29. Question. Can't this problem be handled by the States themselves?

Answer. Only two States, New York and New Jersey, have comprehensive laws forbidding discrimination in employment. Nor is it likely that such State laws will be passed throughout the country. In any event, Federal action is more effective since most large employers or trade-unions have plants or locals scattered throughout the country in every State. Finally, Federal employees can be protected only by a Federal F. E. P. C. The Federal Government can most effectively enforce the Federal Constitution.

30. Question. Does this bill promote "social equality?"

Answer. The bill has nothing to do with personal or social relationships. It is concerned only with equality of job opportunity.

31. Question. Will such a law cause riots or bloodshed?

Answer. On the contrary, it will lessen the danger of such violence because orderly governmental procedure will be substituted for mob action. Immediately after the last war there were 26 major race riots. We want to avoid a repetition of such disorder.

32. Question. Can't this problem be handled by education alone?

Answer. No. Education is desirable, but as a supplement, not an alternative, to Federal legislation. There are always a few employers or unions who cannot be relied upon for voluntary cooperation. Legislation itself is a most effective form of education. The problem is so urgent it requires immediate action, without waiting for the slow, uncertain processes of education. Education alone in the last 80 years has not proved effective.

33. Question. Isn't the recent Supreme Court decision in the Negro fireman's case adequate to eliminate discrimination?

Answer. The decision in *Steele* v. *Louisville Railroad*, decided December 18, 1944, applies only to discrimination arising from a contract between an employer and a labor union. It leaves untouched all the varying forms of discrimination engaged in by employers acting alone or by trade unions acting alone. There are no Federal statutes today which forbid racial or religious discrimination in employment.

34. Question. Why shouldn't the Federal courts handle this problem instead of a new administrative agency?

Answer. An administrative agency is necessary—

(a) To prevent the flooding of courts and the clogging of their calendars to the detriment of their other work;

(b) To screen out worthless complaints which otherwise would harass innocent employers or unions. A respondent has to defend every suit filed in court, but most administrative agencies dismiss from two-thirds to three-fourths of all charges submitted;

(c) To protect the rights of employees without compelling them to hire their own lawyers;

(d) To insure speedy action and avoid delays and excessive costs in the courts;

(e) To insure uniformity by having one agency interpret the bill instead of 94 Federal district courts;

(f) To permit a commission of experts to devote full time to the problem;

(g) To avoid the necessity of criminal penalties which juries hesitate to impose.

35. Question. Why doesn't the bill allow an accused party a jury trial?

Answer. The bill imposes no criminal or civil penalties, nor should it in this type of legislation. The only sanction the bill provides is a cease-and-desist order issued by the F. E. P. C., carrying no penalties. A jury trial (used in criminal cases or private suits to settle private differences) is inapplicable. Society has a stake in eliminating discrimination and should therefore assume the responsibility and costs of such enforcement, rather than leave it to private parties to hire their own lawyers and enforce the national policy. Such enforcement by private suit is haphazard-and means long-drawn, complicated, expensive litigation.

36. Question. Does this bill repeal or impair the veterans' laws?

Answer. No. The bill does not supersede or conflict with veterans' preference laws. The bill forbids discrimination only because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. It does not forbid discrimination because of war service.

37. Question. Who introduced the bill?

Answer. H. R. 2232 was introduced by Mrs. NORTON, Democrat, New Jersey, chairman of the House Labor Committee, at the request of that committee. The bill is a composite of 13 different F. E. P. C. bills sponsored by the following six Republican and six Democratic Representatives:

Republicans: BALDWIN, New York; BENDER, Ohio; CLASON, Massachusetts; DIRKSEN, Illinois; LAFOLLETTE, Indiana; VORYS, Ohio.

Democrats: DAWSON, Illinois; DOUGLAS, California; BOYLE, California; HOOK, Michigan; NORTON, New Jersey; POWELL, New York.

38. Question. Is there a permanent F. E. P. C. bill pending in the Senate?

A. Answer. A similar bill was introduced by the following seven Senators: CHAVEZ, Democrat, New Mexico; WAGNER, Democrat, New York; MURRAY, Democrat, Montana; DOWNEY, Democrat, California; AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; LANGER, Republican, North Dakota; and CAPPER, Republican, Kansas. That bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor of which Senator MURRAY is chairman.

39. Question. What groups have appeared against the bill?

Answer. Not a single person or agency testified against a similar bill at the hearings held last session by the House Labor Committee.

40. Question. What national groups are supporting the bill?

Answer. The following is an incomplete list:

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.
American Association of University Women.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Unitarian Association.
American Unitarian Youth.
B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Interracial Council.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Common Council for American Unity.
Congregational Christian Churches (Council for Social Action).
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Evangelical and Reformed Church, General Synod.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America.
Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World.
International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (A. F. of L.)
International Ladies Garment Workers Union of America (A. F. of L.)
Iota Phi Lambda Sorority.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans of the United States.
League of United Latin-American Citizens.
March on Washington Movement.
Methodist Church, General Conference.
Methodist Ministers' Union.
Military Workers, Joint Board (A. F. of L.)
National Alliance of Postal Employees.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.
National Bar Association.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Student Christian Associations.
National Council for a Permanent F. E. P. C.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.
National League of Women Shoppers.
National Negro Insurance Association.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Negro Newspaper Publishers Association.
Post-war World Council.
Presbyterian General Assembly.
Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Southern Tenant Farmers Union.
Study Conference on Just and Durable Peace.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Union for Democratic Action.
United Council of Church Women.
Upholsterers International Union of North America (A. F. L.)
Women's Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church.
Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Workers Defense League.
Young Men's Christian Association, National Board.
Young Women's Christian Association, National Board.

41. Question. What is the present status of the bill?

Answer. It has been reported out favorably by the House Labor Committee by a vote of 12 to 2. It needs a rule from the Rules Committee before the House can consider it. Without such permission, it requires a petition signed by 218 Representatives to bring it up for a vote.

APRIL 26, 1945.

Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as an expression of the appreciation generally felt by the people of Hawaii for the splendid service being rendered by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding general, United States Army, Pacific Ocean Areas, with headquarters in Honolulu. I wish to include in addition the address of General Richardson to a joint session of the legislature held in commemorating Army Day on April 6, 1945, in which the general very eloquently expresses his response to this action.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

Whereas Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding general, United States Army, Pacific Ocean areas, has shown himself to be imbued with the principles of democracy and has with rare good judgment administered the office of Internal Security in the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii recognize the good fortune that is theirs in having, in these troublesome times, an officer and a gentleman of General Richardson's unusual qualities as commanding general of the United States Army in the Pacific Ocean areas with headquarters in the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the said legislature take this means of recording its appreciation of Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., and of the manner in which he has discharged all the duties of his office and especially of the understanding manner in which he has handled matters directly affecting the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of these resolutions be delivered to Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding general, United States Army, Pacific Ocean areas.

The address of General Richardson to the joint session of the legislature on April 6, follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature of Hawaii, it is with profound gratitude that I accept the joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii expressing appreciation of the manner in which I have discharged the duties of my office, with particular reference to my relationships with the civilian population of the Territory.

Probably never before in our history has our Army been so intimately associated with the civilian community for so long a period during which difficult problems affecting both Army and civilians had to be faced. One man alone could not solve them. But with the help of many able officers and enlisted men, and with the wise counsel of many citizens of the islands, solutions were found, always in an atmosphere of the most friendly cooperation.

For my part, I have always regarded the Army as a trustee of the people, to the protection of whose lives and property the Army is dedicated. It is by its very nature our most democratic institution, as it is a mosaic of our thoughts, our manners, and our customs. The aim of its leaders is to maintain this democratic outlook and to regard as sacred the civil liberties of our people, always on guard to maintain them by a faithful performance of duty, by the highest standards of integrity, and by a burning devotion to the defense of our country.

The great compliment which you have paid me I accept as symbolizing your confidence in the Army forces which I command. It makes me feel quite humble but it will ever serve as an unfailing inspiration to merit your continued esteem.

What Is the Matter With U. N. R. R. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

"In all this confusion it was inevitable that in some cases the critically ill among the freed laborers and (Allied) war prisoners could not be attended to; that there were some deaths; that in the first days some failed to get food and aid they needed from their liberators; that thousands should never make contact at all with the authorities and simply start down the road on their own; and that other thousands should range freely through the towns, looting and pilfering at will." (New York Herald Tribune, April 9.)

This is another confirmation of tragedy. German war prisoners—yes, Germans, meaning torturers, looters, and murderers—get food, care, and motor transportation before adequate care is given to our liberated friends and Allies.

This is the logical realization of a failure which many people, including this writer, have seen coming since November 1943 when U. N. R. R. A. was established at Atlantic City.

Ex-Governor Herbert Lehman's intentions are above reproach Perhaps it is not entirely his fault that at Atlantic City, the American, British, and French Governments ganged up to put power and responsibility in the hands of the Allied armies; or that the delegates of governments able to pay for what they require showed no enthusiasm about letting a genuine international organization administer relief in their respective countries. The fact remains, the Governor has given no outward sign of fighting for his organization.

Many feel that the Governor has been remiss about organizing his staff, about getting his people overseas, and about estimating the size of the job with which he is charged.

This writer has taken some pains to look into the situation asking explanations both of the War Department and of U. N. R. R. A. officials. This is what he learned:

Both the Department and the U. N. R. R. A. people claim to be entirely aware of the magnitude of the problem of looking after displaced Allies in Germany. The original idea was the Army would do the job while the fighting was still in progress and then turn it over to U. N. R. R. A.

This first plan was based on the supposition that the transition from war to peace would be relatively abrupt. What was not foreseen was a gradual invasion of Germany or gradual liberation of displaced persons while fighting was actually continuing, and a corresponding necessity of simultaneously fighting and looking after our friends.

When the Germans failed to surrender last fall, everything had to be changed. Accordingly, last November a treaty was signed between Army Civil Affairs (G5) and U. N. R. R. A. As this document is marked "restricted" for "security reasons" (believe it or not), only the gist can be given here. Responsibility for looking after displaced persons while the fighting was going on and for an undetermined period thereafter remained with the Army. U. N. R. R. A. agreed to cooperate in a sort of subordinate position.

Meanwhile, the increased transportation demands made upon the fighting forces by the German failure to quit prevented the stockpiling of food for the displaced. It also caused the Army demigods to decide that U. N. R. R. A. teams for dealing with these people should not be brought to Europe until required. These teams are 40-percent Americans and British, 60-percent Continental Europeans. In fact, G5 requirements loomed so small in the Army priorities book that a school for French AMG's, set up in northern France to train French officers to cooperate with American AMG's in Germany, had to be disbanded because the Army refused to allocate the necessary food.

The rest was inevitable. Our armies began liberating increasing numbers of Allied prisoners and slave workers. Army Civil Affairs lacked the sufficient personnel for looking after them all. Where was U. N. R. R. A.? Mostly back in the United States where it had been kept by the Army demigods—or still unrecruited.

Now, as fast as they can be sent over and recruited, U. N. R. R. A. teams of 13 persons are going into action. When they all arrive, our liberated allies will be adequately looked after—unless they have already moved on into other regions, or died of malnutrition.

The fault—if any? Figure it out yourself. This writer believes that U. N. R. R. A.'s performance will be unfavorably compared with the performance of Herbert Hoover and a volunteer American organization after the last war. America's prestige in Europe will fall precisely at a moment when we most need it to be high.

Black Hills Suited for World Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader:

BLACK HILLS SUITED FOR WORLD CAPITAL

It was recently suggested in a statement from Washington by Congressman KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, that the Black Hills would be a suitable and attractive site for the headquarters of the post-war world organization.

Now comes Gov. M. Q. Sharpe with an emphatic endorsement of the proposal coupled with a desire to see that the proposal is adequately presented at San Francisco. In his campaign he will undertake to obtain the assistance of South Dakota's Washington delegation and others.

At first thought, the suggestion may seem presumptuous. But why? What do other places have that we don't have? And what do we have that they don't?

There is no reason why the site must be in some historical place. Certainly it need not be in Europe.

In truth, the Black Hills are as well suited as any place with some definite advantages over many. They possess a rugged beauty matched in few sections of the world. The climate is ideal with no period during the summer when it becomes uncomfortably warm. The mountains soften the winter winds. The average elevations in the hills are above the mosquito line.

Situated in the Black Hills also is the world's most remarkable memorial to the independence of man—the Rushmore memorial.

Distance isn't of particular importance any more with the airplane assuring fast transportation throughout the world.

In the Black Hills a new peace city can be erected—a city dedicated to the business of world government and the maintenance of world harmony with these objectives as its exclusive function.

Dedication of Fifth Marine Division Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following which appeared in the Living Church of April 15, 1945:

IWO JIMA

One of the most impressive services I have ever seen was the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division cemetery on Iwo Jima. Here, at the edge of the airfield for which they fought and died, lie the bodies of brave young Americans—young men in their teens, for the most part—who died on this inhospitable foreign soil to keep our country free. The dedication was conducted by chaplains of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, and was followed later in the day by separate memorial services. At the combined dedication, the following address was given by the division's Jewish chaplain, Roland B. Gittelsohn:

"This is perhaps the grimmest, and surely the holiest task we have faced since D-day. Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the side with us as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us. Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet, to find the way, perhaps, for all to live in plenty, with poverty and hardship for none. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

"It is not easy to do so. Some of us have buried our closest friends here. We saw

these men killed before our very eyes. Any one of us might have died in their places. Indeed, some of us are alive and breathing at this very moment only because men who lie here beneath us had the courage and strength to give their lives for ours. To speak in memory of such men as these is not easy. Of them too can it be said with utter truth, 'The world will little note nor long remember what we say here. It can never forget what they did here.'

"No, our poor power of speech can add nothing to what these men and the other dead of our division who are not here have already done. All that we even hope to do is follow their example. To show the same selfless courage in peace that they did in war. To swear that by the grace of God and the stubborn strength and power of human will, their sons and ours shall never suffer these pains again. These men have done their job well. They have paid the ghastly price of freedom. If that freedom be once again lost, as it was after the last war, the unforgivable blame will be ours, not theirs. So it is we, the living, who are here to be dedicated and consecrated.

"We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way they fought and are buried in this war. Here lie men who loved America because their ancestors generations ago helped in her founding, and other men who loved her with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor—together. Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination. No prejudices. No hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

"Any man among us, the living, who fails to understand that will thereby betray those who lie here dead. Whoever of us lifts his hand in hate against a brother, or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery. To this, then, as our solemn, sacred duty, do we, the living, now dedicate ourselves; to the right of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, of white men and Negroes alike, to enjoy the democracy for which all of them have here paid the price.

"To one thing more do we consecrate ourselves in memory of those who sleep beneath these crosses and stars. We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last battle has been won, there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our backs in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity, and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here: We will not do that! We will join hands with Britain, China, Russia—in peace, even as we have in war, to build the kind of world for which you died.

"When the last shot has been fired, there will still be those whose eyes are turned backward, not forward, who will be satisfied with those wide extremes of poverty and wealth in which the seeds of another war can breed. We promise you, our departed comrades: this, too, we will not permit. This war has been fought by the common man; its fruits of peace must be enjoyed by the common man. We promise, by all that is sacred and holy, that your sons—the sons of miners and millers, the sons of farmers and workers, will inherit from your death the right to a living that is decent and secure.

"When the final cross has been placed in the last cemetery, once again there will be those to whom profit is more important than peace, who will insist with the voice of sweet reasonableness and appeasement that it is better to trade with the enemies of mankind than, by crushing them, to lose their profit. To you who sleep here silently, we give our promise: we will not listen. We will not forget that some of you were burnt with oil that came from American wells, that many of you were killed by shells fashioned from American steel. We promise that when once again men seek profit at your expense, we shall remember how you looked when we placed you reverently, lovingly, in the ground.

"Thus do we memorialize those who, having ceased living with us, now live within us. Thus do we consecrate ourselves, the living, to carry on the struggle they began. Too much blood has gone into this soil for us to let it lie barren. Too much pain and heartache have fertilized the earth on which we stand. We here solemnly swear: This shall not be in vain. Out of this, and from the suffering and sorrow of those who mourn this, will come—we promise—the birth of a new freedom for the sons of men everywhere. Amen."

CLIFFORD P. MOREHOUSE.

The Pacific Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu:

Whereas the islands in the Pacific Ocean north of the Equator formerly mandated to Japan by the League of Nations were declared by Japan in the year 1936, upon her withdrawal from the League of Nations, to be the sole property of Japan, and she announced that she would hold the islands against the world as an integral part of the Japanese Empire; and

Whereas these islands were thereafter so held by Japan and were incorporated into the Japanese Empire as an integral part thereof and were fortified and armed in such manner and to such an extent as to make the same a continued threat to peace and security in the Pacific Ocean area and specifically a threat to the peace and security of the United States of America; and

Whereas the League of Nations was wholly without power to prevent Japan from taking, owning, holding for itself, and fortifying said islands as an integral part of the Japanese Empire and from using said islands as so fortified and armed in connection with acts of unwarranted aggression against the United States of America and as bases from which to conduct war in the Pacific Ocean area and specifically from which to conduct war against the United States of America; and

Whereas in order to protect itself and to bring to a victorious end the war commenced by the unwarranted aggression of Japan against the United States, the United States of America has of necessity seized and captured certain of these islands and of necessity will seize and capture the rest of said islands, all necessitating great loss of the lives of and of grievous injuries to thousands of loyal citizens of the United States; and

Whereas in order to insure peace in the Pacific Ocean area and specifically in order to insure peace to the United States in the Pacific Ocean area, the United States of America is the proper nation to acquire, own, hold, and use said islands as possessions or otherwise as it in its sovereign right may hereafter determine from time to time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu respectfully request that the United States of America declare that the Marshall Islands, the east Caroline Islands, the west Caroline Islands, the Palau (Pelew) Islands, Yap Islands, Marianas Islands, Volcano Islands, Bonin Islands, Marcus Island, and any and all other islands, reefs, or places formerly mandated to Japan north of the Equator are by right of conquest irrevocably the property of the United States of America, and that the United States of America establish its sovereignty over the Japanese mandated islands and other reefs or places in the Pacific north of the Equator originally included in said mandate; and that the strategic bases for defense in the Pacific Ocean area there existing, and the natural resources thereof may be developed, used, held, and enjoyed under civil administration for the purpose of the protection of the United States and of keeping peace in the Pacific area, for the benefit of the native inhabitants of the islands, and for the benefit of the people of the United States as a whole; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and also that a copy be presented at the San Francisco Conference on April 25, 1945, and to the various chambers of commerce on the west coast of the United States.

Cripples Can Make Good When Given a Fair Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a column from PM of April 9, 1945, by Mr. Albert Deutsch entitled "Cripples Can Make Good When Given a Fair Break."

The examples of men and women who have risen above their handicaps and attained successful lives and made contributions of great value to society are an inspiration to all who are burdened with handicaps and to those of us who are more fortunate as well. I am sure they encourage all of us to strive to create and maintain in this country an opportunity for the "fair break" for our disabled veterans, our injured war workers, our handicapped children, and for

every man and woman in the Nation who suffers misfortune too great to be borne alone:

CRIPPLES CAN MAKE GOOD WHEN GIVEN A FAIR BREAK

(By Albert Deutsch)

One welcome byproduct of World War No. 2 is the break it gave to the physically handicapped. The manpower shortage brought large numbers of them into gainful jobs for the first time, and the great majority have made good. Employers are almost unanimous in their high praise of the working capacity of "cripples" who formerly were regarded as unemployable and were widely discriminated against in industry.

A recent Nation-wide survey indicated that there are some 25,000,000 handicapped people in the United States of America, about a tenth of them with handicaps serious enough to raise a job problem. The battle casualities of this war will add considerably to this army of the physically handicapped.

Will the prejudice against employing handicapped people be revived after the war? A tragic situation of large dimensions would ensue if the scores of thousands who have finally found some contentment in having their usefulness recognized should again be sentenced to enforced and unhappy idleness.

Many great men and women have come from the ranks of the handicapped. Consider this partial list:

Julius Caesar was an epileptic. Beethoven was deaf. So was Thomas A. Edison. The inventive genius of electricity, Charles P. Steinmetz, was a hunchback.

Among the great poets of the ages, John Milton was blind, Lord Byron had a clubfoot, and Heinrich Heine was misshapen with a curved spine. Helen Keller licked the twin handicaps of deaf-mutism and blindness. One-armed Admiral Nelson won the great naval victory of Trafalgar.

President Roosevelt is probably the outstanding example among contemporary cripples who made good. The screen star, Herbert Marshall, wears an artificial limb in place of the leg he lost in World War No. 1. The phenomenal Negro tap dancer, "Peg Leg" Bates, is likewise an amputee. The late Chick Webb first-rank band drummer, was a hunchback.

In the world of sports there is one-armed Pete Gray, of the St. Louis Browns. (The first one-armed major leaguer, Hugh Daily, of Chicago, struck out 10 men in a 9-inning game back in the 1880's.) Ferdinand Barkovich, captain of the Pennsylvania University wrestling team and an A. A. U. champ, has won 83 wrestling bouts and lost only 5, despite the fact that he's been almost totally blind since high-school days.

Gonzalo Romero, soccer star who lost his right arm in a cement-mixer accident 3 years ago, made a brilliant comeback and has just been re-signed up by the Brooklyn Hispanos, of the American Soccer League pro circuit. The late Harry Greb, once world's middleweight champ, was blind in one eye during the last 5 years of his boxing career. Ernest Jones became a star golf pro after losing his leg in World War No. 1. Arthur Kidder, of the National Ski Patrol, skis on his one leg with the best of them. Nancy Merki, stricken with infantile paralysis at the age of eight, became a star swimmer.

The disabled can make good, if given the chance. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, operating under the terms of the Barden-La Follette Act, cooperates with State agencies in providing that chance to the physically and mentally handicapped. The Veterans' Administration conducts a rehabilitation program for disabled veterans. Both Federal activities deserve fullest public support, especially on the part of employing groups.

San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 25, 1945:

SAN FRANCISCO

When Germany was poised on the edge of the Channel, ready to strike and overwhelm the British Isles, England did not despair. Against the greatest military machine ever forged, England, through Prime Minister Churchill, applying his doctrines of blood, sweat and tears, shouting defiantly that he would fight on in the hills and in the hedgerows, never gave up.

When Germany suddenly poured her might over the Russian borders, sweeping ahead of her the vaunted armies of the Soviets, overcoming cities and towns as the hurricane mows down the forest, Russia, through Premier Stalin, retreating, yet not surrendering, applying the scorched earth policy to the ancient glories of the czars and the new monuments of the people's regime, never lost faith in the ultimate outcome.

When the red Sunday came in turn to America, as the Japs battered Pearl Harbor and sank our capital fighters in a galling, treacherous attack, Americans did not hesitate. Even as the bombs were falling, fighting ships in that famed harbor which had escaped hurt, sped out to sea and began the long hunt which finds our forces today poised on Okinawa, heading up for the greatest battle of all.

Individually and then jointly, as one fighting unit and allies, we, the Big Three, never for a moment faltered, never lost hope, never were dejected or downcast. We were sure, fighters as well as civilians, that eventually, though the way would be long and the cost would be great, we would win the final victory. Today, in proof of our confidence, Berlin burns and Tokyo burns.

But we were close to defeat. It seems a long time ago when England was contemplating moving its government to Canada. It seems a long time ago when Russia's hopes of survival hung for a week in the precarious balance at Stalingrad. It seems a long time ago when our western shore lacked protection and the Japs, if they had been bolder, might have landed in the United States itself. But we never, individually or collectively, gave up.

Today, as the Conference which marks another mighty milestone in mankind's long, bitter march to the kind of peace that will outlaw war forever begins, have we the same spirit, the spirit that this, the greatest of all the war objectives, can and will be achieved? Have we the same confidence, the same determination, the same courage, the same faith and the same unquestioning belief that out of this, the greatest parliament of man, is certain to be evolved the machinery for outmoding war and making it abhorrent for all time to come?

Or is there another spirit abroad, a spirit of hope, prayer, and brave fervor for success, which is nevertheless underlined in the minds of some who never doubted the martial victory, with foreboding, a touch of fear, a shadow of doubt and a feeling that it is asking too much for all peace-loving nations to put aside their self-interests and combine to keep the world from plunging at a later date into a third World War which will positively wreck civilization?

Whoever has such a spirit let him put it out of his mind and heart. Let us look forward to San Francisco today with confidence and surety. Let us look and listen, and withhold our judgments. Let us not, we who waited long, dark years for victory on the battlefield, expect it at the peace Conference overnight. Three big nations, working with one objective, won the war. Some 46 nations, with varying problems, are laying the groundwork for peace. Let us be patient, let us be hopeful and let us be confident that the common goal can be reached now or in time, because it must be reached and will be reached.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to my home city of Kokomo, Ind., I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting there with representatives of the American Legion and educational and financial institutions in the interest of the veterans of this war. This group gave particular thought to the problem of effecting improvements in Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, and in the administration of this act, popularly known as the G. I. bill of rights.

These very earnest and able gentlemen who met on this occasion to study the particular educational and financial problems of returning service men and women are themselves veterans of the First World War, with a wealth of experience in veterans' affairs and a deep sincerity of interest in veterans' welfare.

The conclusions reached by this group are based upon actual experience in the brief period since the enactment of Public Law 346, and are, I believe, entirely sound and practicable. I offer the reports and recommendations of this meeting as a part of these remarks, and strongly urge my colleagues to study them carefully. I ask the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make this material a part of its records, and to consider these recommendations carefully as additional legislation is formulated:

KOKOMO, IND., *April 3, 1945.*

The following is a narrative statement of the proceedings and comments made at the meeting of representatives of the American Legion, educational units, and banking and loan associations of the State of Indiana at the American Legion home, Tuesday, April 3, beginning at 10 a. m.

Present: Oscar R. Brown, State service officer, American Legion, Indianapolis; F. B. Bourland, special representative, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, Washington, D. C. (Chicago); Ivan E. Cooprider, secretary, Savings & Loan League of Indiana, 716 Union Title Building, Indianapolis; Fred T. Green, president, Federal Home Loan Bank, Indianapolis; George E. Hayes, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Marion;

Glen R. Hillis, Kokomo; John P. Hochhalter, Building & Loan Association, Logansport; H. R. Holdern, service officer, George H. Hocken Post, No. 127, Anderson; Robert M. Horn, assistant to dean of men, Purdue University; A. H. (Art) Kdlros, Anderson; Curtis McCain, secretary, Building & Loan Association, Delphi; Frank McCarty, First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Kokomo; Claude W. McCoy, adjutant, American Legion Post, No. 6, Kokomo; E. M. Matthews, Union Bank & Trust Co., Kokomo; B. D. Mitchell, president, Union Bank & Trust Co., Kokomo; W. P. Parse, Farm Loan Advisory Committee, Kokomo; Harold D. Powell, Veterans' Administration Hospital, 539 West First Street, Marion; O. L. Tharp, Peoples Bank, Portland, Ind.; Maurice Tull, Kokomo Tribune, Kokomo; William W. Workman, service officer, American Legion Post, No. 6, Kokomo.

William W. Workman, service officer, American Legion Post, No. 6, Kokomo, presided, and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the two sections of the law regarding education and loans and to reach conclusions as to recommendations which were to be sent to Hon. FOREST E. HARNESS, Congressman from the Fifth District, for such changes and amendments in the law that would make it more readable, understandable, and workable; that now is the time to correct whatever mistakes are in the bill so that our returning veterans may be able to get full benefit of its provisions.

Mr. Workman stated that Dr. Wright, of Indiana University, was unable to be present but had sent his recommendations and ideas as to what he thinks is wrong with the bill and the changes he would recommend.

Mr. Robert Horne was present from Purdue University. Mr. Workman asked him to explain the workings of the bill as far as it concerned Purdue University and the contact he had with it.

The Veterans' Administration has cooperated with Purdue in regard to the educational provisions of the bill. However, some States lack over-all unity as far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned. There should be some clarification of the provisions of the bill and interpretation by the different States. Example: one boy may have a service-connected disability but with less than 90 days' service. The G. I. bill provides that no man may receive the educational benefits unless he was in service in the armed forces at least 90 days, and, secondly, that his education must have been interrupted by his service or otherwise interfered with, and thirdly, that he not be over 25 years of age.

Another thing is the subsistence pay of $50 or $75; that is not equitable. And there is so much red tape required to be unwound that a man might starve to death while he is waiting for it to unwind. It takes too long to reach him.

Mr. Horne, as representative of Purdue University—

1. Acts as contact between the veteran and the Veterans' Administration.

2. Acts as contact between the university and the Veterans' Administration.

3. Acts as contact between the State and the university.

Mr. Horne stated that Public Law 16 requires that a man must have a service-connected disability for which pension is payable of more than 10 percent for admittance to educational benefits, that his education must have been interrupted or interfered with, and that he is vocationally handicapped.

Mr. Horne stated that the need is for better clarification of the provisions of the bill, so far as vocation is concerned. Example: A man who was a die maker may be certified for education as vocationally handicapped because he had three fingers cut off, but a school teacher who lost a leg would not be considered vocationally handicapped. The men don't always get the proper advice as to their benefits under this act.

Mr. Horne stated that there is another class of men who are coming back from service; men who never graduated from a high school and could not qualify under the university standards; also men 25–30–35 years of age. They won't want to go back to high school and finish.

Mr. Horne stated that they started a classification at Purdue called unclassified students; that nine men have gone through the whole term; that these men had an average of 2¼ years in high school and lacked many subjects—algebra, English, etc. Tests at the beginning on these men ranged from 0 to 46. (The over-all average is 50.) These men at the end of the first term had an average of 4.51, whereas men from the university proper averaged 3.69. Compare that with the average of the men who had less educational qualifications of 4.51. Purdue is the only school in the United States having this class of students and permitting them to take university training. The bill should be amended to permit the men to take apprentice training, war training, and extension work.

Mr. Powell suggested that the older men might be given the opportunity of attending high-school classes at night, using the same facilities, without feeling the difference in their ages in not attending with the regular students.

Mr. Horne stated that this system is being carried out in some high schools in the State.

QUESTION. A man who is not physically handicapped when he comes back must be under 25 years of age to get the benefit of the law?

Mr. HORNE. Yes; up to 1 year's education, plus the length of his service.

QUESTION. A man who has been in the Army is entitled to 1 year's college education, plus the time he was in the Army?

Mr. HORNE. Yes; if he is under 25 years of age.

QUESTION. How about a man who was 20 when he went in, but will be 26 when he comes out?

Mr. HORNE. He will get a year.

QUESTION. A man has been in the Army 5 years; he lacked just 12 hours of graduating; he is now 26 years of age. The bill will permit him to complete his education?

Mr. HORNE. He will get a year to complete it.

QUESTION. Is that construed to mean one calendar year or one school year.

ANSWER. One calendar year.

QUESTION. The Veterans' Administration has construed it to mean 36 weeks for a school year. The average school year is 9 months.

Mr. HORNE. In peacetime Purdue has two terms of 4½ months each; we have been running three terms of 4 months each. I don't know how we will do later on.

QUESTION. Do you think it advisable that these men be compelled to go the full 12 months at one time after the strain they have been under for such a long time. Dr. Knight of Purdue University had made the statement that 60 percent of the casualties now returning are shattered nerves and other mental disorders that will take time to overcome. This type of man should have a longer time. The Veterans' Administration should make a ruling that they may take 9 months of their schooling 1 year and 3 months the next, in order to get the benefit of the full year's education.

Mr. Brown suggested that Congress should write the regulation covering the administration of the bill and not permit the Veterans' Administration to write them.

Mr. Workman read a letter from Mr. Leo R. Dowling, assistant to Dean Wendell W. Wright, of Indiana University, stating his opinions as to changes and recommendations to be made regarding the educational provisions of the G. I. bill.

Mr. Workman stated that according to his interpretation of Mr. Dowling's letter, red tape is the stumbling block together with the low maintenance allowance.

Mr. Brown stated that he believed the administrators in the educational field should issue the regulations rather than the Veterans' Administration. That the educators know what they are doing and should administer the regulations, thus eliminating a lot of the red tape.

The question was asked how long a man had after he is discharged from the service to make up his mind to enter the university training and Mr. Horne stated that it was 2 years.

Mr. Brown again stated that he thought the university should administer the regulations rather than the Veterans' Administration.

The meeting was recessed for lunch and convened again at 12:30 o'clock, at which time the loan section of the bill was taken up for discussion.

Mr. George E. Hayes introduced Mr. F. R. Bourland, special representative of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration of Washington, who discussed in detail the mechanics of issuing loans under the loan provisions of the bill, explaining the various steps and processes to be taken. He suggested that ways should and would probably be found to overcome some of the delays experienced in procuring the loans; that if all papers are made out corrected when sent in together with all the necessary enclosures, it should not take more than a maximum of 2 weeks to secure the authorization of the guaranty. That the delay in most cases was caused by failure to send in the proper forms, properly executed including the certified copy of the honorable discharge of the veteran making the application. That the average time is 8 or 9 days. That the time limit for making application is 2 years after discharge or after the end of the war which is the latest, not to exceed 5 years.

Mr. Workman asked if the time should not be extended so that the men now in hospitals, or who will be in hospitals for some time, might take up some kind of business or line of work when released, and could procure the benefit of this loan so as to have an assured income.

Mr. Bourland stated that the men have plenty of time now, as they have 2 years after being discharged or 2 years after war's end, whichever is the longest, but not longer than 5 years after the war's end. Mr. Bourland stated that the veteran must show an ability to repay the loan before he can qualify for the loan regardless of whether or not he ever held a job.

Mr. Hayes stated he believed the recommendation should be made that the time limit be extended, or eliminated.

Mr. B. D. Mitchell, of the Union Bank & Trust Co., Kokomo, suggested that if the time limit is eliminated it would permit the veteran to get adjusted to civilian life before jumping into any project requiring a loan; Mr. Mitchell suggested that a waiting period after discharge be required before a loan could be applied for, and gave several examples of poor judgment on the part of the veteran regarding investments; that the veterans are good prey for wolves with a selling market.

Mr. McCain, of Delphi, asked regarding farm loans where it would take about a year before any returns could be made on the investment.

Mr. Bourland stated that if he is a tenant farmer, he would have to be in the same class as all other tenant farmers; that the credit investigation would take into consideration the time element.

Mr. Parse, of Kokomo, stated that he was a member of a four-man committee called the Farm Loan Advisory Committee for this area; that it is the job of this committee when a veteran wants to buy or rent a farm, to interview him as well as the proposition he pro-

poses to take over, as to the soundness of the investment.

Mr. Green stated that he thought if the time limit is eliminated it would prevent inflationary buying of real estate and other unsound investments.

Mr. Hayes read a letter from Mr. Horace Russell, general counsel of the United States Savings and Loan League, regarding H. R. 2627, regarding property loans, etc., and making suggestions regarding the applications for loans.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., March 28, 1945.

Mr. GEORGE E. HAYES,
President, First Federal Savings and Loan Association,
Marion, Ind.

DEAR MR. HAYES: I have your letter of March 26 and have just returned from Washington where I have discussed the veterans' loan program very fully with representatives of the Administration.

I enclose a copy of H. R. 2627 by Congressman RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, and there is an identical bill, S. 738, by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado pending in the Senate. You will see from these bills that if enacted the effect would be to permit loans to be guaranteed up to the reasonable normal value of the property without regard to the sale price of the property, and in my opinion, this would greatly simplify the program. At present the chief difficulty arises from minor differences of opinion as to value. If this were enacted, a veteran could buy any property he wanted to but he could not get a loan guaranty for more than its properly appraised value.

The other provisions of this bill primarily relate to business loans and farm loans and would include within the purposes for which such loans can be made, livestock and supplies and merchandise and supplies. Also, with respect to non-real-estate farm and business loans for not over 5 years, the lender could get a 1½-percent service charge which would doubtless encourage more banks to participate in these supply and equipment loans. It does not appear to me that we are substantially interested in these questions because our institutions will not make such loans. The positions of the introducers of these bills indicate that the questions are going to have serious consideration.

In addition, it would be helpful if the Veterans' Administration would eliminate the inquiry as to eligibility and process this question on the application and concurrently with consideration of the loan application. This, however, could be done without any change of the law.

Personally, I feel that the Veterans' Administration is entitled to credit for its best efforts to operate under the statute and that the program has an excellent prospect for success. I do not think too many objections ought to be made at this early stage. After all, it takes considerable time to get such a program under way and sometimes more harm can result from constant changes than the good which may be accomplished by such changes in such a large program.

Very truly yours,
HORACE RUSSELL,
General Counsel.

In reply to a question by Mr. Matthews regarding the eligibility of a veteran who is a minor in executing a valid note and mortgage, he was advised that such eligibility has been established.

There was general discussion of the matters presented, and the meeting adjourned. The committee then met and arrived at the conclusions to be presented to Mr. Harness.

CONCLUSIONS REACHED BY COMMITTEE AT MEETING HELD APRIL 3, 1945, AT KOKOMO, IND.

EDUCATIONAL SECTION

1. That the administration of the program and procedure shall be left to the educational unit concerned.

2. That the age at enlistment date be considered as the basis for qualification for educational benefits rather than the age at time of discharge and that the 25-year age be eliminated.

3. That the subsistence allowance for married men with dependents be increased from $75 to $100 per month.

4. That a Nation-wide clarification of the interpretation of the time limit be made as being one complete calendar year.

5. That standard procedure be put into practice immediately relating to certification forms, letters of entitlement, and billing procedures.

LOAN SECTION

1. That the time limit should be extended to 10 years.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., March 27, 1945.

DEAR DEAN WRIGHT: In answer to the letter of Mr. William W. Workman of the American Legion at Kokomo, Ind., we could point out that, in our opinion, there are three features of the educational section of the G. I. bill of rights that could be improved.

(1) The $50 a month allowance to veterans in training is not sufficient to keep a trainee in college. Veterans will either have to have educational funds of their own or will be required to do part-time work in order to maintain themselves. The $50 allowance covers the average expenses of room and board for a student on the Bloomington campus of Indiana University.

(2) It would seem very desirable to set up a loan fund for trainees of Public Law No. 346 similar to that of trainees under Public Law No. 16. After a veteran has been approved for and enters training in an educational institution he must maintain himself for a period of time until he begins receiving his subsistence allowance of $50. Our experience at Indiana University indicates that the minimum expectancy, for example, the shortest amount of time in which a man can expect to receive his first check, is 4 to 5 weeks. The average is 6 to 8 weeks and we have had a number of cases go 3 and 4 months without payment. If a veteran could borrow $100 from Veterans' Administration upon beginning training, his situation would be considerably relieved. A stipulated amount could then be deducted from the monthly checks as issued by Veterans' Administration, until the loan has been paid back.

(3) The age rule of Public Law No. 346 doesn't make much sense. It penalizes the man who was over 25 and although the reasoning of Congress on this point is generally known, we believe it to be unfair.

(4) In issuing a letter of entitlement to a Public Law No. 346 trainee Veterans' Administration should make it clear to the veteran that if he plans to attend a school outside the area of that regional office he should request immediate transfer of his case folder to the regional office of Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction over the area in which that school is located.

Trainees have not been notified of this fact and as a result those who enter schools outside the jurisdiction of the regional office which issues the letter of entitlement must endure long delays in receiving maintenance allowance.

Respectfully yours,
LEO R. DOWLING.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., March 31, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM W. WORKMAN,
Fifth District Service Officer,
Kokomo, Ind.

DEAR MR. WORKMAN: It is impossible for me to be in Kokomo on Tuesday, April 3, at 10 a. m., simply because I have another engagement at that hour which I made a long time ago to talk on the educational implications of the G. I. bill.

I have asked my assistant, Mr. Dowling, to indicate any thoughts that we may have here in relation to the operation of the G. I. bill of rights from the educational point of view. His letter contains those points which I would also mention, therefore, I simply send it along to you. Some of these are matters of law and some of them concern administration of the law.

If there is any other way in which I can be of help to you, feel free to call upon me. I would like very much to attend the meeting, but it is impossible.

Very truly yours,
WENDELL W. WRIGHT,
Director, Office of Veterans' Affairs.

Military Service for 18-Year-Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to forbid combat service for 18-year-old soldiers until they have had at least 6 months' training is a very good one. But it comes late and it does not go far enough.

No man, regardless of age, should be put into combat until he is adequately trained, except in periods of dire national emergency. We are not in such a period, and since the very early months of the war we have not been in one.

The step from civilian life to military combat is a long one. Many military men believe that a year of training is needed in preparation for the complex problems of modern warfare. It is little enough to ask that a man be given 6 months' preparation. Manpower in this country is ample to permit proper training before any man is asked to place his life in jeopardy.

Unfortunately there are cases—many of them—where 18-year-olds have died in combat less than 6 months from the day they were inducted. It is difficult to find justification or excuse for this. Certainly it cannot be said that we are so short of men that we have nothing but boys to use as sources of replacement for combat units.

There are still nearly 3,000,000 soldiers within the United States. I am reluctant to believe that our armed forces are so organized that none of these three millions are available for combat service. I am reluctant to believe that it is necessary to retain such a number to man the camps and supply depots here at home.

No, the answer appears to be that 18-year-olds make good soldiers. They train easily and quickly. They respond well to discipline. They are rugged and healthy. So they have been made to bear the brunt of war. So they are being sent overseas with 15 weeks' training.

This is a short-sighted policy. It is burning out many youths who have not had sufficient training, and who are not sufficiently mature for the tough job of killing. It should be corrected. It should be corrected now.

World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, as the World Security Conference in San Francisco begins its deliberations, it is urgently important for us all to remember that hopefully as we may look to the Conference, the results of its deliberations alone cannot guarantee a post-war world of security, prosperity, and peace. As individuals we all have heavy responsibilities to fulfill when peace comes once again if security is to become a reality. I believe the following challenging statement deserves serious consideration at this time because of its constructive thoughts on at least one of our post-war problems, the maintenance of a sound economy:

FOREWORD

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Today, the delegates to the World Security Conference are in session at San Francisco, in an attempt to secure peace in our time. But no matter what decisions or agreements they may make among themselves, actual world security will be determined by factors beyond their control; factors which are in the hands of the American people alone. Every American owes it to himself to read the following statement.

ROBERT M. BOWES,
President, Bowes Seal Fast Corporation.

If the delegates to the World Security Conference read America's free press this morning, they must have been handed some surprises.

The war is going well on all fronts—except the American home front, where the war's whole outcome hangs in the balance.

Management, blinded by being sought after to supply things, is day-dreaming about post-war.

Deliberate and shocking strikes, stoppages, and slow-downs have brought into sharp focus the fallacy of the manpower shortage.

The promise of 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is shaping up as the political campaign slogan it is.

American business and industry are in the nutcracker between labor and management, with Government applying the pressure.

Delegates, please realize, here and now, that world peace and security will not be won—in our time or in any other time—unless American business and industry can squirm out of the vise and go to work.

Insurgent labor versus stubborn management, with Government applying the pressure. Is that all there is to the 60,000,000 peacetime jobs the politicians are talking about?

Not by a long shot. Under the American system neither labor, nor management, nor Government itself could get anywhere, be anything, without the ingredient that makes every job in America possible—selling.

If American business and industry are allowed to go to work and sell, we'll pull the world out of the woods—into the sunshine and the clearing.

If American business and industry do not or cannot sell, a world-wide catastrophe is in the making.

WORLD SECURITY DELEGATES PLEASE COPY

Unless American national income is maintained at unprecedented peacetime levels by unprecedented peacetime selling, America will go broke—and we will drag the rest of the world down with us.

That's how important selling is in the coming post-war world.

It is fondly claimed—not only by Washington but by certain highly placed business executives who ought to know better—that post-war selling is going to be a lead-pipe cinch.

Well, look, they say: The public now needs everything. The public has soaked away one hundred billions in War bonds and other savings. Therefore, the public will rush out automatically, without any urging, and spend these billions in one grand shopping spree, as soon as post-war comes and management and labor can make the goods. Returning servicemen? Unemployment relief? Oh, sure. But only temporarily. With all those needs, and all that spending, 60,000,000 jobs will come as easily as rolling off a log.

Common sense indicates that this kind of fuzzy thinking is likely to be fatal.

In the first place, it is people's wants—not their needs—that must be met and satisfied. And wants are created only by selling.

In the second place, read this quotation from a United States Chamber of Commerce bulletin:

"We will have 19,000,000 unemployed persons by 1946, if the war is over and if we achieve a level of business activity no higher than in 1940. To provide relief at only $2 per day for this number of unemployed persons would involve a public cost of $14,000,000,000 a year—or twice our pre-war national Budget for all Federal governmental activities, including relief. To provide work relief might cost twice that figure, or twenty-five to thirty billion dollars a year. Obviously, there is no substitute for employment in private industry."

Read that last sentence again: "Obviously, there is no substitute for employment in private industry."

In others words, relief and boondoggling will only put us further in the red.

What about those 60,000,000 jobs now?

How can 60,000,000 jobs be created except by private industry?

Can they be created by the Government? The Government has not a dollar of its own.

The Government gets all its money from taxes paid by the people—who in turn get their money from jobs in business and industry.

To rebuild this war-torn world, to develop new trade routes, new markets, to turn into money the discoveries which float from our laboratories, American business and industry must go back to work—making goods and selling them.

And the selling must be given new life, new snap, new get-up-and-go, by a million or so ex-servicemen who come home looking for some of those 60,000,000 jobs that were promised them in Washington.

During the war, selling got soft and flabby in the underbelly.

Overstuffed pay envelopes, unsatisfied wants, and critical shortages have debased our pre-war selling game to an order-taking routine.

Therefore, the challenge of full employment in private industry—of creating those 60,000,000 peacetime jobs with a minimum of Government relief—demands (1) a let-up in Government pressure on business and industry; (2) a thorough overhauling of American selling methods.

This means trained men. Scientific sales engineering, instead of wasteful hit-or-miss peddling. More orders per selling man-hour.

It means hard-hitting, two-fisted salesmen, who can sell at a fair profit—to get a fair price with which to pay fair wages and salaries to labor and management, and taxes to Government—which is another way of saying that we don't sell goods because we have national income; we have national income because we sell goods.

This is the basic answer to the whole world-security riddle.

Following World War No. 1 my company devised a plan to train ex-servicemen of that war for peacetime selling jobs.

They took to it like ducks to water. No wonder. They were eager, anxious—with the burning desire to do things.

Through the years we added vast improvements to our plan. We incorporated in it the best thinking from other sources. Today we have a sales training method which works better than any other method we know of. It gives sure, practical results.

We are now devoting this method to ex-servicemen of World War No. 2, who are looking for some of this 60,000,000 jobs.

But eventually we want to place this vastly improved sales training method at the disposal of every employer, every labor or service organization, every individual in America who has the future of our country at heart.

In making such an offer now, we believe we will be giving the World Security delegates something to write home about—a better understanding of what makes America tick, and what they must help America do, so that America can help the world get back on its feet.

So, with the world security delegates looking, so to speak, over our shoulder, here is our offer to every American who reads this advertisement:

1. If you are an employer: Write us, and we will tell you about our sales-training formula, so you can put it to use in your own business.

2. If you are the mother, father, or friend of a serviceman: Write me where I can reach him, and I will send him full information on how to qualify for a sales job when he returns to civilian life.

3. If you are a leader in business or industry: Send for reprints of this advertisement and post them on your bulletin boards where everyone in your organization can see them. Mail them to your friends and business associates. Help me to give the widest possible circulation to this great truth: That peace and security in our times cannot come until and unless America goes to work and sells.

A FINAL WORD TO THE WORLD-SECURITY DELEGATES

Today, in San Francisco, you are dealing with the men who are trying to run this country. You are not dealing directly with the American public.

But never forget this: American public opinion is still the strongest force in the world today. Stronger than our Congress, stronger than our statesmen or our elected officials. No matter what you decide at your meetings—we the American people will still have a direct voice in world affairs.

We intend to see that American business and industry are allowed to build reemployment to an unprecedented peak. Only the selling of goods and services, to your people and to our own people, can possibly do the job.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by John E. Otterson, chairman, American Maritime Council, appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 23, 1945, in comment on an article which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly for April 1945 entitled "What Shall We Do With the Ships?" written by Lewis W. Douglas, former Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration. This is in line with articles which appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, April 19, 1945, inserted by the gentleman from California, Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, consisting of an article which appeared in the Army and Navy Journal and also an extension made by me on April 23, 1945, consisting of a statement of the Maritime Commission. Inadvertently my insertion refers to an article appearing in the Atlantic Weekly. This should have been Atlantic Monthly. The article by Mr. Otterson follows:

OTTERSON HITS SUBSIDY FIGURES AND HIS DATA ON FOREIGN COMMERCE

(By John E. Otterson, chairman, American Maritime Council)

In the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly Lewis W. Douglas proposes that we should limit our merchant fleet to its pre-war size in order to minimize subsidies to shipping to be paid out of the public treasury and in order to afford other martime nations an opportunity to carry a larger percentage of the foreign trade of the world, to the end that they may develop foreign exchange with which to buy American products.

Because of his wide experience in Congress, as Director of the Budget, as Deputy War Shipping Administrator and as a business executive, Mr. Douglas is in a position to exert a considerable influence on public opinion. His article is entitled to most careful consideration.

SUBSIDY FIGURES WRONG

The author states that if, for example, there is to be an American merchant fleet of 20,000,000 tons—that is, a fleet only twice the size of our pre-war fleet—the cost to the country in operating subsidies alone will range between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 each year, depending on the way the subsidy is calculated and the form it takes.

If, as Mr. Douglas states, he is referring to operating subsidies alone, his figures are about 10 times what the actual figures will be, that is, between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000 a year. If, on the other hand, he intends to refer to total operating and construction subsidies, then his figures are about four times the actual subsidies which should be between $50,000,000 and $70,000,000 a year.

Mr. Douglas' second objection to our maintaining a large merchant fleet is that by so doing we would prevent the other maritime nations from deriving income in American dollars for carrying American goods in foreign ships.

CASE OF NORWAY

The total value of our exports to the United Kingdom in 1938 was $513,954,000 and our total imports from that region were $118,366,000. Assuming that England had carried in British ships all of this trade, this would have given her an additional revenue of $20,000,000 to apply against a total merchandise account of $395,000,000—or about 5 percent of that account. Twenty million dollars per annum is obviously not significant enough to influence Britain's broad national policy governing her purchases from the United States. The withdrawal of all competition by the American merchant marine would undoubtedly result in a rise in freight and passenger rates that would make this gesture on our part an expensive luxury.

In the case of Norway, our imports from that country exceed our imports to it so that Norway already has a favorable trade balance in her merchandising account with us, from which she can buy more from us if she is so disposed. We can have no assurance that Norway or any country will use its income derived from ship operation to buy goods in this country.

A similar situation exists as regards Holland, which is already receiving from us in trade more American dollars than she pays out, so that her purchases from us do not depend on her ability to acquire American dollar exchange.

BRITISH SUBSIDY AIDS

Mr. Douglas is also apparently impressed with British arguments against this country's granting subsidies to its merchant marine. I commend to him a study of British practices in this respect over a period of 500 years.

History shows that the British merchant marine has received the following forms of direct and indirect subsidy aid during this period; construction subsidy, operating subsidy, mail contracts, admiralty payments, or subventions to vessels suitable as naval auxiliaries, Government loans to shipping companies and shipbuilders, monopoly to British shipbuilders for building British-flag ships, Government loans for reconversion and modernization of vessels, Government protection of foreign traders against loss, foreign loans made by the British Government on condition that credit be used for purchase of British goods, gifts of vessels by the Crown in trading ventures, Government grants of lands to trading companies, routing of goods to Great Britain for export, discriminating duties in favor of British goods shipped in British bottoms, Imperial preferences granting reduced tariffs for goods shipped in British bottoms, deductions of overland freight on British railroads from dutiable value of articles imported into the Empire, establishment of rates through shipping conferences and extension of deferred rebates favorable to British shipping, use of Navy to promote, extend, and protect foreign commercial interests, and use of British economic and political position in world affairs to promote, extend, and protect foreign commercial interests.

FOREIGN TRADE SHOULD GOVERN

Shipping is merely one American industry. If we are to freeze all of our industries at their pre-war size and refuse to expand them commensurately with the expansion of our national income, because to do so might restrict the expansion of the industries of some foreign country, then I am sure that under such an economic theory we would face "depressed prices, shrinking production, and permanent unemployment."

Any analytical or economic study should be directed toward our foreign trade rather than the size of our merchant marine. Our foreign trade should bear a definite relationship to our national economy and it is generally accepted that our foreign trade should be about equal to 10 percent of our national income. When, in 1938, we had a national income of $64,000,000,000 and a foreign trade of about $5,000,000,000 we had 10,000,000 unemployed.

A national economy based on plenty contemplates national income of $140,000,000,000 a year. To support such a national income would require foreign trade of $14,000,000,000 a year and to carry on foreign trade of $14,000,000,000 a year we shall require a merchant fleet of about 20,000,000 tons, on the assumption that we shall carry 50 percent of our foreign commerce in American bottoms.

ORGANIZATION NEEDED

While ships are merely a facility and an incident in relationship to our foreign trade, yet the organization throughout the world necessary to the maintenance of a strong merchant marine is likewise the organization necessary for the creation and development of our foreign trade; the two are linked together but the objective which makes necessary the maintenance of a strong American merchant marine is the necessity of increasing our foreign trade to have this country prosper and to avoid unemployment.

Furthermore, the increase in foreign trade of this country is the means by which we shall put American dollars into world circulation and make our national credit available to other nations so sorely in need of it. If we limit and inhibit our merchant marine and our foreign trade, we shall surely deny to other nations the opportunity to progress industrially and economically and, in the words of Mr. Douglas, we shall fail to discharge our "responsibility and play our part in fashioning the world."

Mr. Douglas' article in itself does not stand up. When you correct the inaccurate statements in his article, his whole argument fails. However, if his theory is a straw that indicates a rising political breeze which contemplates a complete destruction of our nationalism and the adoption of some altruistic internationalism under which we shall abandon our birthright to other nations and seek to solve their economic problems by abandoning the means by which we shall solve our own, then I should say that we have cause for concern. Mr. Douglas has undoubtedly been exposed to propaganda or spoken of other maritime nations who would limit American foreign trade and shipping as a means to expand their own, but the astonishing thing is that a man of Mr. Douglas' business and political sagacity should have yielded to such blandishment.

Pay Increase for "White Collar" Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Civil Service, April 25, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am happy to appear before you and urge favorable action on the legislation before your committee for increased pay for the white-collar workers.

Our late and beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his annual budget message and the Civil Service Commission, I understand, are in favor of this bill.

I am sympathetic and wholeheartedly in support of the white-collar workers' demands. In order to equalize wages for Federal employees, I urge your committee to bear in mind:

First. A basic wage increase of 25 percent.

Second. Full time and one-half for overtime.

Third. Pay differential for night work.

Fourth. More frequent in-grade raises.

This legislation will alleviate the inequities in compensation affecting this class of workers, who, during this war, have suffered great hardships due to the high cost of living. I wish to give my support toward obtaining a better deal for these forgotten people.

I therefore respectfully urge that your committee take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I have been one of those intensely interested in surplus property disposal, and when the war surplus disposal bill was under consideration offered an amendment to the bill providing that the war industries be continued in the various locations where established in the United States, and that where the Government was unable to dispose of same to be operated where established that the various governing authorities be given an opportunity to purchase same by issuing long-term, low-interest-bearing certificates or other evidence of indebtedness. The main purpose was to prevent the loss of these industries to the communities where established, as the same would not only have been an asset to the community and the country as a whole, but would have been the means of providing employment in the post-war era to our returning service men and women and others. The amendment was not agreed to, but I have been, and I am still of the opinion that my proposal was sound. These industries should not be abandoned or dismantled or moved to some other country or sacrificed to speculators, for in addition to the economic value, they would insure to our country the availability and supply of many critical materials at all times for the future. Mr. Speaker, in the third annual report of the Attorney General of the United States, I am pleased to learn that this high Government official agrees with me in the general idea, as appears from the editorial report from the Washington Post, and which I requested be included in my remarks.

The editorial referred to follows:

SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Attorney General's third report on surplus-property disposal emphasizes the importance of timing. For instance, plans should be made now to insure expeditious utilization of machine tools in connection with industrial equipment as the war program is cut back. That calls for centralized inventories of the Government's huge machine-tool holdings as well as other pertinent information. Since most of the best machine-tool equipment is owned by the Government, it is first of all essential for the Army and Navy to reach decisions as to what tools are needed for stand-by purposes.

In respect to plant disposal, the Attorney General also stresses the necessity of prompt planning. Considerable time will inevitably elapse between the release of property from war use and the time when peace production can begin. More time will be lost if the prospective purchaser has to assemble economic and engineering data before making a bid on properties offered for sale. Hence the Attorney General strongly recommends an immediate economic and engineering survey of war plants which have been or may be declared surplus. Since it is the purpose of disposal legislation to provide maximum employment and to open up new economic opportunities, especially to small businesses, sales to the highest bidder obviously will not always be considered the best policy.

Both the Government and private industry need time for experimentation and for testing novel uses of industrial equipment. To reconcile this necessity for delay in reaching final decisions with the need for haste in getting peacetime activities started, Attorney General Biddle suggests that in many cases, perhaps in most cases, the wiser policy would be to lease rather than to sell larger plants, for a period of years. Such leases might contain options for purchase at prices based on earnings or fixed by arbitration. In any event, the lessee should be required to state the uses to which the plant is to be put and the leases should contain safeguards designed to insure such utilization.

The general objectives of disposal legislation are fairly well defined and the Department of Justice recommendations are of a character to assist their attainment, provided prompt action is taken. For planning must be done now if jobs are to be ready with a minimum of delay when wartime production ceases, and if industry is to resume peacetime operations under conditions satisfactory to our lawmakers.

Wage Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the city council, Chicago, Ill.:

DECLARATION IN FAVOR OF WAGE ADJUSTMENTS TO MEET INCREASED LIVING COSTS

Whereas wage earners engaged in the production of front-line war material have petitioned the National War Labor Board for an increase in wages in order to meet the increased cost of living in our city; and

Whereas these wage earners have, through personal sacrifice and by strict adherence to the no-strike policy, achieved unprecedented records in production for our armed forces in the interests of a United Nations victory; and

Whereas without a wage-rate adjustment, the reduced buying power of these wage earners brought about by increased commodity prices will affect their personal welfare and the welfare of their families as well; and

Whereas numerous office workers and others not directly engaged in actual war industry should also be given consideration in order that their wages may be adjusted to meet adequately the present cost of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Chicago record itself as favoring wage adjustments to meet increased living costs; and be it further

Resolved, That the aforementioned views of this council shall be transmitted to the Members of Congress representing the city of Chicago.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resclution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago on the 16th day of April A. D. 1945.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 25th day of April A. D. 1945.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

"While He Walked With Kings He Never Lost the Common Touch"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, with a sense of pride, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by Mr. Justice Jackson and Attorney General Francis Biddle at the memorial service for Franklin D. Roosevelt in the great hall of the Department of Justice on April 13 last:

REMARKS OF MR. JUSTICE JACKSON

Mr. Attorney General and friends in the Department of Justice: I am touched, that in this hour you remember me as one who has shared with you the privilege of serving under President Roosevelt, and as one who would share your grief in his sudden death. No other event could bow so many human heads in a common sorrow and a sense of personal loss. Throughout the land, by countless humble firesides people feel less secure today because he is gone; for, while he walked with kings, they knew that he never lost the common touch; that he was their friend and advocate; that while he lived there would be no forgotten man. Neither sea nor land stretched far enough to get out of range of his sympathy and understanding. During these recent years I, like the rest of you, have watched with growing anxiety as he spent himself so freely in the cause in which he believed. But he brushed aside all warnings, all of his caution was bestowed upon others and he thought of no human being but himself as expendable.

This is not the time to dwell upon his place as one of the most commanding figures of world history. No Alexander, or Caesar, or Hannibal, or Napoleon, or Hitler, ever commanded such an aggregation of physical force. But power was never an end to him, it was a means, a means to a better world where men might live their chosen lives, rear their families in decency and security, safely think and speak their thoughts, and better their material conditions. His office was the symbol of the greatest of organized physical forces. But it was the moral forces and spiritual aspirations of mankind which he really typified and they never were so passionately concentrated around a single per-

son. As history will look back on our time, above the other men who made up its scenes, the figure of Roosevelt will stand "like a sharply cut rock in the midst of a shapeless sea."

President Roosevelt had an interest in this Department second only perhaps to that in the Navy, to which we often jokingly referred as "the President's branch of the service." As a lawyer he often was critical of our profession, of its backward-looking tendencies, its preoccupation at times with red tape to the injury of what he thought were more vital interests. He threw upon this Department from time to time constantly expanding responsibilities, which sometimes were more welcome as evidence of his confidence than for the duties they carried. But he was deeply interested in all of its problems. He wanted us, as attorneys for the Government, to live up to the best tradition of our profession, to shun shoddy work, and to do equal justice under the law.

Before me are many men of whose work either in general or in particular cases I had occasion to talk with the President, and many whom he knew by name—usually by the first name. We cannot avoid a somewhat personal note. Toward us in the Department he never was an exacting or critical overlord. I have had, on more than one occasion, to try to explain to him why things went the way they did, instead of the way I had told him they would go. Peals of hearty laughter would smother my embarrassment. His patience with blundering was sometimes past understanding—but it was mighty comforting when the blunder was your own. How he found time to pen in his own hand the innumerable little chits, telling, or asking, or commenting about this and that, I do not know. No father could be more solicitous of the personal and family welfare of those in his circle. No one worked harder—no one made you so feel like working hard yourself—and no one knew better the proper proportions in which relaxation and laughter must be mixed with all well-balanced work. He loved the simple things; he could make either a king or a countryman feel at ease in his presence. His personality, his serene self-confidence, his gentle firmness were gifts of the gods.

I think President Roosevelt would be pleased that we have paused today in his memory. This is not because he would have wanted a personal tribute. But he would have seen it as a sign of our dedication to the things he stood for and that would gladden him, and not the least of his great services to our times was to inspire us all with his personal courage in the presence of handicaps of life and the mysteries of death. Despair or defeatism among men or nations vanished at his touch. He would want no disheartening note now. After we have paused and renewed our courage through each other's counsel, he would expect us to pick up the burden and carry on.

All of us will agree that for the interests of all that we have and are President Roosevelt's death is untimely. How much his passing affects the destinies of mankind, we can never estimate. Certainly, when the New World meets the Old in council, this hemisphere can no longer send a personality so appealing, a mind so richly endowed and informed, a heart so warm and understanding, a spirit so unconquerable.

But we cannot say that death dealt unkindly with him. In many ways his sudden passing comes as a fitting climax to life. We are glad that he lived the high moments when he could see that his efforts have led our country to the very threshold of victory, both in Europe and in the Orient. It is as though the President had sent his best-loved friend, General Watson, to prepare the way, and now he has followed to the peace which shall have no end.

REMARKS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL FRANCIS BIDDLE

It is fitting that we should meet together this afternoon to share and to express our sense of tragic loneliness and deep sorrow over the loss of our President. The Nation, the world itself, is overwhelmed today by the news that the great leader is gone, the man who expressed in his words, but even more in his life, the mute aspirations of men and women everywhere.

Franklin Roosevelt many years ago achieved a mastery over the threat of his own affliction and had come to serenity within his own spirit before he became our President in the dark days of the depression.

And now in this long hour of our sorrow, we draw strength from what he said then—that we have nothing to fear but fear itself.

For the President's courage was unconquerable, and his strength was measured by a faith in the people which could not be shaken. Today democracy is triumphant on the battlefield and across the seas. The President's death came when our armies and navies were bringing the war against Germany and Japan to a victorious conclusion. In a true sense he gave his life to achieve this ultimate victory. In the words of the psalmist, he wrestled "against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

His dream of the peace to come, the peace for the little people of the world who loved the President, for the oppressed, the minorities, the plain people whom Lincoln loved, must now be made a reality by all of us who followed him.

As we stand here in sorrow, mourning our tragic loss, we must look to the future if we are to achieve that reality.

Let us, therefore, the members of the Department of Justice, who have worked together under the patient and humane administration of Franklin Roosevelt, renew among ourselves the cause of true justice, and here in our particular part of the structure of our democratic government, continue to build on the ideals which he so vitally lived.

And let us, together with our men and women everywhere, our youth, and with the proud memory of our fighting men who have fallen in battle, pledge our loyalty to the achievement of peace for the world under the leadership of our new President.

May God help America, suddenly made lonely in her hour of need.

And may God bless and give His strength to Harry Truman, the new President of our people.

Italian Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio statement made by me yesterday:

Italian patriots operating behind the German lines north of the Po are giving valiant support to Allied forces which have now crossed the river at many points in a threat to the entire German position in Italy.

It is thanks to the help of the patriots that we are advancing so rapidly, as indicated by our victories at Bologna, at Spezia, and at Parras.

We learn that the partisans have occupied Novara and Varese, and have again captured Domodossola. According to the reports, they control the entire Italian front area from Simplon to Brissago.

This all-out collaboration of these courageous men with our armed forces at this crucial time follows 2 years of patriot fighting under the most difficult conditions. It follows weeks of strikes by Italian workers in industries of northern Italy, so essential to the German war machine.

The most outstanding feature of patriots' warfare and workers' strikes has been the complete discipline of all action. The Committee of National Liberation has led and coordinated all factions and has teamed with the Allied command. As a result, Italian patriots have functioned virtually as a behind-the-lines part of the Allied armies. To them goes credit in no small measure for our successful military operations in Italy. The Committee of National Liberation of North Italy has established an underground democratic system under the most trying circumstances. It has reduced the Fascists to a despised minority and rallied the largest part of the population to fight fascism and nazi-ism.

Italian patriots are partnered with us in the great Allied victories in Germany.

First Lady of Murfreesboro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, our hearts and minds have been turned toward the liberation of Manila and the progress of General MacArthur's march toward Tokyo.

A figure no less colorful than her husband is the General's Lady, who is known and loved throughout the world as the First Lady of Murfreesboro. I should like to include the following article which so graphically portrays the Jean Marie whom my wife and I have known and loved since childhood:

FIRST LADY OF MURFREESBORO—IT'S HER TOWN AND JEAN MARIE M'ARTHUR DREAMS OF THE DAY WHEN SHE, HER GENERAL AND THEIR SON WILL MAKE THEIR HOME THERE

(By Mary Nelle Morris)

To the rest of the world she's "The General's Lady," a gallant and fearless woman who shared with her famous husband the perils of the historic and dramatic dash from Corregidor to Australia; a brave and loyal wife who has remained, insofar as possible, at her husband's side through some of his—and the Nation's—blackest hours.

But to the 9,495 citizens of a little town in Tennessee called Murfreesboro, Jean Marie MacArthur, wife of the five-star general, is "Miss Jean," a petite brown-eyed darling, who "they're positive hasn't change a bit" since she left their aristocratic little Southern town to live adventure such as few women have known. And her letters indicate that is so.

Jean Marie MacArthur, who was Jean Marie Faircloth, the belle of Murfreesboro, before her marriage writes frequently to her girlhood friends and neighbors—letters which are passed around until they're nearly worn out—and the tenor of all her latest ones is the same:

"I am so anxious for the war to be ended * * * to come back to Murfreesboro; for you all to know the general and little Arthur and for them to know and love you as I do."

Mrs. MacArthur's sentiments are shared no less enthusiastically by her townsfolk. They, too, can't wait until the war is ended—to see their "Miss Jean" again and to meet her husband and her son. For, strangely, even though the MacArthurs have been married for 8 years and little Arthur is now 7 years old, the good citizens of Murfreesboro have never met the general. Jean Marie met and was married to him in New York City while she was on an extended world tour.

Murfreesboroans chuckle, however, when their "Miss Jean" writes almost shyly, "I think you'd like the general and I know he'd like you," as she did in one of her letters. Talk about understatement! "Like him!" Why they adore him already. And what a reception there will be when the MacArthurs finally end their long journey home and come to take up residence in the old Colonial mansion that has been the Faircloth home for generations!

It will be a homecoming to remember. And not only because "Miss Jean's" husband is such a famous personage, but because Murfreesboro's "first lady" is so greatly beloved in her own right. "Kind, thoughtful, considerate" are just a few of the adjectives in the whole gamut which Murfreesboroans use to describe her. And they love to talk of her simple, wholesome interests. Her enthusiam over the bi-monthly Luncheon Club, to which she always brings fudge cake—"the best fudge cake ever made;" her love of baseball, football, and the "ham" softball games which her hometown used to stage in prewar days. They still remember that she "just loves" tuna fish sandwiches; that she practically always wears orchid or other varying shades of purple.

They'll tell you how, at Christmas time, no matter how far away, she remembers even old, retired servants with presents, and how disturbed she has been during the past couple of years because circumstances have prevented her from sending the things she would have liked. But "Miss Jean" came through, anyway—by giving magazine subscriptions through the Murfreesboro drug store and to some, like old "Cricket," a former servant, gifts of money. To "Cricket" she wrote:

"Dear Cricket: Another year has rolled by and again I am sending you some money which I hope you will enjoy. Buy something that you need.

"We are very well. My little boy is growing so fast. I hope you are all right and well. In every way, I send good wishes to you, Cricket.

"Yours sincerely,

"MISS JEAN"

All of Mrs. MacArthur's letters are newsy and Murfreesboroans have had first-hand glimpses into South Pacific goings-on which have been denied to others. She tells the neighbors all about her home life; her activities in Brisbane, Australia, which has been her home for nearly 3 years; the baby's life; his kindergarten hours; the quiet strolls in the park; little Arthur's precocious love of music; his war-consciousness; just faint indications of her husband's weighty problems, when she writes: "The general keeps very busy." And, sometimes, humanly, she writes of certain anxieties—like her anxiety over the priceless and precious family heirlooms which she had to leave in her Manila penthouse apartment at the time of the breath-taking flight to Australia. Jean had furnished this lovely place with fine old books, silver, magnificent antiques which had been in the Faircloth family for generations.

She hungers for news of her townsfolk and makes it a point to look up boys from her section of the country. A long time ago she posted a bulletin board notice at an Australian U. S. O.:

"If there is anyone here from Murfreesboro or Rutherford County or Tennessee, please get in touch with me.

"MRS. MACARTHUR."

And all the boys who've taken the "General's Lady" up on her invitation have reported that she's genuinely overjoyed to see them. No wonder Murfreesboroans love her, call her "the most loyal friend in the world," and are preparing to welcome her as no one has ever been welcomed before. They've got a big surprise for her, too. The whole town has been compiling a huge scrapbook—pictures and clippings from all over the United States—which will be handsomely bound as a gift for "Miss Jean" and her "general"—to pore over when the MacArthurs have settled down as Murfreesboro's first citizens.

Wallace and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Hendershot from the New York World-Telegram of April 24, 1945:

WALLACE AND JOBS—POST-WAR EXPORTS OF $10,000,000,000 WOULD PROVIDE SMALL PAY FOR 5,000,000

(By Ralph Hendershot)

In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday Henry A. Wallace is quoted in dispatches from Washington as saying that he foresees exports from the United States post-war of $10,000,000,000 or more. And, he said, if this goal is reached along with a substantial increase in imports, we can count on about 5,000,000 additional jobs in this country.

Those of us who are inclined to get the old pencil out whenever big figures are brought into play may be excused for asking whether Mr. Wallace merely picked these totals out of the air or whether they have been carefully calculated.

If the entire $10,000,000,000 received from Mr. Wallace's anticipated exports are paid directly to the 5,000,000 wage earners he mentions each would receive an annual salary of $2,000, or approximately $40 a week. Many of our current wage earners would consider that a rather low income.

RAW MATERIALS COST SOMETHING

Obviously, of course, not all of this money will be paid directly to wage earners. The raw materials which went into the manufacture of these exports cost something, and it is presumed a small part of the total, at least, would represent profit. Then, too, unless we carried the goods in our own ships, something would have to be deducted for freight.

It should be pointed out, too, that in 1938, which probably could be regarded as a normal prewar year, we exported a little more than $3,000,000,000 of goods. We would be obliged to deduct that amount from the anticipated $10,000,000,000 before we figured on the new jobs to be added. We presume Mr. Wallace was talking about new jobs.

Then, too, if we take for granted that exports make jobs, we also should take for granted that imports take jobs away. If, for instance, Americans wear shoes made outside the country, it follows that shoemakers here will not be able to make and sell as many.

SALARIES WOULD BE SMALL

We will not attempt to add up or analyze the deductions in terms of jobs which should be taken into consideration with respect to that $10,000,000,000, but we have a notion that if 5,000,000 people were to be asked by Mr. Wallace to accept the net proceeds he would be looking for the next train back to his farm. Certainly he would no longer be called a friend of the worker.

It is pretty certain that in the first few years after the war our exports will reach tremendous proportions. In fact, probably the only limit on shipments will be our ability to produce the desired goods and our willingness to give them away or extend credits for their purchase. Whether we can maintain such large exports after the world has returned to normal again is quite another matter. We doubt it very much.

Hail and Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of April 30, 1945:

HAIL AND FAREWELL

Now he is great through all eternity.

So long as time lasts and any man lives, he will be remembered and revered.

Into the Valhalla of the heroic and the immortal, Washington and Lincoln receive him today—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—who truly died that his country might live and that the free people of earth might survive—died as he wished, leading mankind's march to a better day.

His death shocks the Nation. His death shakes the world.

He goes in the hour when his leadership and his wisdom, his courage and experience, his ideals and his dreams of a finer, freer world for men to live in, was needed.

Although he departs on the eve of the achievement of one of his greatest aims—the defeat of the Germanic foeman in his tottering European stronghold—he could be illy spared.

Although he goes as another foe, as bitter and difficult, slides down the long, sure road to eventual destruction, propelled to his doom by the forces which Franklin Delano Roosevelt raised against him, his loss is no less.

For now, as the darkness flees and the lights go on again, as the enslaved climb out of the dungeons and the free batter down the brutal bastions, as the red fields of the world turn green with the splendor of spring and the joyous songs of liberty mingle with the happy melodies of the homecoming birds, he was coming into his greatest time.

He had known great times, difficult times, times that tested him longer and more fully than any other President. From his inauguration in the time of the depression until his last breath there were no moments not beset, there was no hour when he was free of man's tribulations—domestic and foreign. Yet, this man, who understood the suffering of others because of the long years he bravely suffered himself, never flinched nor faltered.

This was to be his greatest hour. As he led in peace and war, forthright and foursquare, resolute and unswerving, in the long, uphill struggle to the mountain top, just as the dawn was breaking he was called away, leaving to others the fulfillment of his hope, our hope, and the hope of all free men, for peace, everlasting peace.

Yet, we who have lived these long years with greatness and now have lost him, cannot, must not and will not despair.

The banner that fell never touched earth. Even at the moment when God beckoned him to the reward and rest so richly deserved, eager and faithful hands caught it up, the hands of the American people, on the battle-line and the home front, to hold it aloft and carry it forward until his dream is consummated.

Into his place, to lead in the time ahead, steps a man of his own choosing, a simple, firm, able American who will gather to him the President's advisers on great affairs—one of humble beginnings, who, in the American tradition, has filled the high places with honor and outstanding distinction.

On his shoulders now falls the great burden.

Yet, he will carry it, as the President carried it, courageously and capably with the help of the American people, with the confidence of our allies.

Through him, in his actions and accomplishments, Franklin Delano Roosevelt will carry on—

Franklin Delano Roosevelt who lived and died for his country, who gave his life for mankind.

Our Daily Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include with my remarks a brief statement on the subject, Our Daily Bread, written by Clarence Woodbury in Common Sense and condensed in Reader's Digest:

When I was growing up, Saturday always seemed the best day of the week to me. Not just because there was no school, but because it was baking day.

All during the morning a tantalizing, mouth-watering fragrance crept through the house and, by midafternoon, we would all be half crazed with hunger. Then, at about 3 o'clock, all the children would rush to the kitchen to watch my mother draw six fat, shiny loaves of bread and a big pan of rolls from the oven of the coal range. No food on earth was ever any better than that fresh warm bread.

The six crusty, succulent loaves would usually last until the next Saturday; but now and then, because of unexpected guests, we would have to eke out our supply with store bread. Mother was always deeply embarrassed on these occasions. Store bread, in her opinion, wasn't fit to eat.

All this happened a good many years ago, but store bread as turned out by our big commercial bakeries is no better eating nowadays. Instead of rich, crunchy, satisfying crust, it has a thin, tasteless flabby coating. True, the stuff is now wrapped in wax paper. It comes ready sliced and "enriched" with synthetic vitamins—which costs little and makes good ballyhoo.

Millions of dollars are spent in shrieking its alleged virtues over the radio, plastering the landscape with billboard advertising. It is, undoubtedly, pure, sanitary, wholesome, nutritious, clean, white, and beautiful—but it is utterly tasteless. It's a far cry from the bread my mother used to make, or the bread of any other land under the sun.

This is not just my opinion. There is a good deal of evidence to show that the general public doesn't like the big bakers' product either. We buy it—but our national taste has not become so debased that we have grown fond of the quilt stuffing foisted upon us as the staff of life.

I travel around the United States a good deal and very seldom do I meet anyone who will eat store bread if he can get anything else. Restaurant keepers from coast to coast have told me that, if given a choice, their patrons will invariably eat biscuits, rolls, corn pone, soup crackers, bread sticks or foreign bread of any description in preference.

The sad fact is that the great majority of Americans fill their bellies with store bread, not because they like it, but because it is difficult for them to get anything else.

In many communities it is still possible to obtain real bread by taking a little trouble. On side streets there are little bakeries—French, Italian, Jewish, German, Hungarian—which consistently produce delicious hard-crust white bread, honest black pumpernickel, tangy salt-rising bread, and magnificent sour rye. Any one of these loaves is a meal which will renew a hungry man in both body and spirit.

But most housewives find it simpler to buy the advertised pap of the big bakers than to shop for really tasty bread or treat their families to ambrosial homemade loaves.

At the end of the last war 50 percent of the bread sold in this country was baked by the small independents. Today they are being squeezed out of business and produce only 10 percent of it. The rest is manufactured by about 80 wholesale producers and chain-store companies. Indeed, the 10 largest of these companies make more than 30 percent of all the bread we consume.

Why, you may wonder, don't the big companies bake real bread? Can it be that they don't know how? They employ hordes of engineers, electricians, chemists, advertising sharks, and throaty radio orators, but practically no skilled bakers who could, unaided by assembly-line gadgetry, go into a kitchen and mix and bake a loaf of bread like mother used to.

The big companies simply find it easier to persuade us by advertising that their product is delicious than to make it so. They are not primarily concerned with gratifying your palate. They are intent upon producing loaves which are precisely uniform in size, shape, and texture, and which will remain fresh—meaning soft—for an unnaturally long time. Uniformity makes it cheap to handle, slice, and wrap mechanically, of course, and the fresh-keeping quality makes it possible to distribute over large marketing areas.

To produce bread that will stay soft the bakers, first of all, rule out the type of flour which makes the best bread in the world—flour milled from soft or high-gluten wheat such as is used in making French and Italian bread. In the second place, they do not bake the bread as thoroughly as it should be baked to taste best, and thirdly, they package it in moistureproof wrappers.

From a sanitary point of view such wrappers are entirely unnecessary. Bacteriologists have assured me that we should be just as safe from germs if our bread was brought home in a paper sack. After all, pies, cakes, and cookies—surely better germ catchers than bread—aren't sealed up so elaborately, and nobody is scared to eat them. Nevertheless millions of housewives have been led to believe that bread must be thus wrapped for health protection.

The formulas which the big bakers employ to keep their bread soft account, to a large extent, for its tasteless quality and for the fact that in warm weather it may turn repulsively green and moldy in your bread box instead of drying out slowly as decent bread does. Without question, though, these practices produce an efficient article of commerce for blitzing small competitors.

One method the big baker employs to swamp markets far from his plant and to induce the retailer to handle his bread exclusively, or give it the best display, is so-called consignment selling. Through this practice, which has been temporarily prohibited by the War Food Administration, the wholesale baker overstocks the shelve of retailers to provide mass sales appeal, and takes back bread as it becomes stale at no loss to the retailer. The stale bread is sold as livestock feed or burned in the bakery furnaces. When consignment selling was suspended some grocery stores were returning as "stales" from 30 to 50 percent of the bread they received, and the practice was costing the Nation every day enough bread to feed 2,000,000 people.

There is no sound economic reason why bread should be produced in large quantities in a few big central plants and then delivered to consumers who live hundreds of miles away. Mass production has not cut the cost of the Nation's bread. The average consumer paid 9.27 cents for a 1-pound loaf in 1942, as compared to 8.55 cents in 1922, although the wheat-grower's income from that same loaf dropped from 1.14 cents to 1.03 cents during the 20-year period. It is a shocking fact that 23.56 cents out of every dollar spent in producing bread goes for distribution.

There are signs that the American people are eager to buy real bread and will pay a good price for it. A few years ago, a Connecticut housewife, Mrs. Margaret Rudkin, started baking eight loaves a day in her own kitchen and selling them to neighbors. It was good, honest bread, and its fame soon spread. Today Mrs. Rudkin sells her Pepperidge farm loaves by mail all over the United States and at a fancy price. A considerable portion of the public eagerly pays her a premium to get away from the cotton batting put out by the big companies.

I know a man who has put his two daughters through college on the earnings of his little bake shop in New York. When he calls on friends he always brings a loaf of his fresh, crusty bread. A short time ago he dropped in on an old acquaintance who was staying at a hotel with his 9-year-old son. The boy got hold of the loaf and ate it all, without butter. The youngster was not starving. He had simply never tasted real bread before.

There are, I fear, millions of other children in the United States like that. Young and old alike, we have never known or have almost forgotten how delicious bread can be. Nobody expects the average housewife to bake bread, as her grandmother did. What she can do, however, and should do in justice to herself and her household, is to insist on getting real bread for her money.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, some of the opponents of Bretton Woods are endeavoring to confuse the people of this country by insisting that the International Monetary Fund agreement is too complicated for them to understand. These opponents engage in a mumbo-jumbo of technical economic phraseology and hope in this manner to convince the American people that the Bretton Woods

agreements are against their best interests.

Actually there is nothing very complicated about either the International Bank or the International Monetary Fund as proposed in the Bretton Woods agreements. One of the best down-to-earth discussions I have seen is contained in a radio broadcast made for the independent voters of Illinois by "Studs" Terkel. I think anyone who reads this broadcast will have a clear understanding of the great value of Bretton Woods:

In a message to Congress on Lincoln's birthday F. D. R. referred to Bretton Woods as the twin cornerstone to Dumbarton Oaks. That is to say, collaboration between nations must be economic as well as political—it's one world from any angle. Just as our democracy depends on the spread of democracy throughout the world, so does our prosperity depend on the spread of prosperity throughout the world. Poverty in Czechoslovakia may foreshadow a bread line in Illinois. For certainly if America is to have full employment, a job for every man and woman ready and willing and able to work, our foreign trade can't be on the downbeat.

Our Treasury Department reports that under full employment our exports to foreign countries would provide 3,000,000 jobs in industry and 1,000,000 in agriculture; that a loss of foreign markets, due to lack of economic teamwork, would force American farmers to retire 16 out of every 100 acres. Shades of '32.

WHAT IS BRETTON WOODS, ANYWAY?

Back in July last year delegates of 44 United Nations got together in New Hampshire and for 3 weeks threshed things out.

Finally these top-fight bankers, economists, and figure jugglers got a plan down on paper, not a perfect plan but a workable one, a practical one, worked out by successful financiers. Here was the most convincing international agreement we've had yet, to 44 different nations, everything on paper, all open and above board.

Now, here's the pay-off: These same weeping Willies who've been hollering murder about secret agreements, about the betrayal of small nations, are now fighting Bretton Woods because it has too much representation. They say it won't work. Then, suddenly it hits you: The opponents of political teamwork are the opponents of economic teamwork. The opponents of one cornerstone wish to tear down the other cornerstone. And the man who opposes Wallace and full employment aims for a perfect cipher in opposing Bretton Woods and full employment.

Sure, the proposals of Bretton Woods are novel. They've never been tried. before. Never has the world been this small before.

The proposition is twofold: An international bank to help in the reconstruction of devastated countries and development of backward nations, and an international monetary fund to promote exchange stability and to facilitate the balanced growth of international trade.

There isn't must opposition to the bank. Even the most nearsighted of politicians knows what's happened to railway systems and factories and harbors of once-occupied countries, and that long-term loans must be granted to peoples eager to rebuild their lands, to dig in with bulldozer and derrick, to get those chimneys puffing away once again, so that they may export as well as import.

And here is the rub, here's where the backward steppers take a stand.

We know that early in the postwar period the imports of a devastated country—like Norway—will exceed its exports. In the long run, a country pays for the goods it receives with the goods it ships out. But there are times when the scales won't balance.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE? DO WE STOP TRADING WITH NORWAY?

Do we say nix, you haven't come through with enough paper, and herring, and cod-liver oil, and you can't pay in the currency of your kingdom without depreciating it, so we won't send you any cotton or automobiles?

And so a customer goes down the hatch; and men who worked the auto assembly line up in Detroit spend some days at home twiddling their thumbs because we've lost a lot of customers like Norway. This will be the case if Congress refuses to O. K. point No. 2 of the Bretton Woods plan—the Currency Stabilization Fund.

This fund is a pool, a kitty, into which each of the 44 countries contributes a lump sum of its currency equivalent to a given amount of American dollars, depending on the nation's size and commerce. You might call it an emergency fund. If Norway, for instance, needs to pay for a shipload of Diesel engines—and hasn't acquired enough American dollars by its exports of sardines and lumber—it may borrow from the fund a limited amount of American dollars.

This loan gives Norway time to get its second wind, more time in which to achieve its long-run trade balance. As a result of this new technique international trade can continue uninterrupted, every man will be at every machine in America as in other countries, and the currency of the nations will be kept stable. The people of Norway can have confidence in their kroner, the people of France will know that a franc is worth as much in 1960 as in 1948; the folks in Italy will know that a lira is worth as much on Wednesday as on Tuesday; and with confidence in the coin of the realm sustained, the peoples' governments of these countries will be more firmly established.

We know what monetary difficulties can do to a nation. The nation which cannot meet its obligations is tempted to start the presses of inflation. We know what happened to the German mark after the last war: How it sunk till a barrel of marks was the price of a can of beans, how the mark became a pretty cheap brand of wallpaper, and with this nightmarish inflation, this lack of confidence and bewilderment, the way was opened for A. Hitler's rise to power.

The International Monetary Fund will be a careful guarded, supervised institution. No country may borrow in any one year more than 25 percent of its contribution, and the United States, the No. 1 participant will have the No. 1 voice in administration of the fund.

Yet, the American Bankers' Association beats out the blues. It won't work, is the mournful chant. But, there are far more financial experts who say it will work, men like Edward Eagle Brown, president of the Chicago First National, and 16 out of 18 past presidents of the American Economic Association. Why then does the ABA say, "No soap!"?

"Too flexible," say the conservatives. "It might bring inflation in this country. We might lose the money." And we might, there's always a chance for trouble; but, we might not. If it helps to prevent another war, like this one, we might save a hundred times as much in money, besides the lives of some of our best young men. For Bretton Woods is a milestone of economic understanding amongst nations. Here is true international banking at its best, for the good and welfare of the peoples of those nations.

Memorial to Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Earl Godwin made the suggestion in his broadcast on last Saturday that the island where the famous and beloved Ernie Pyle was killed be named the Ernie Pyle Island. I believe that this suggestion will have a strong appeal for millions of people who appreciated the day-by-day account from the front by the modest but brilliant newsman who faced the dangers of battle with our men and bore all of their hardships with them. I have today introduced a resolution to embody Mr. Godwin's suggestion and I trust that the proposal will receive favorable consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It would be a fitting memorial to a great American.

Recently I introduced a resolution to provide for a change in the name of the island known as Iwo Jima to the Marines Island in recognition of the heroism displayed by the marines in the battle for its possession, and I respectfully suggest that the committee consider these resolutions together.

I should like to point out that these changes would not affect in the slightest degree the question to be considered in peace conferences relating to the control of said islands following the war, but it would enable the Nation through its official documents and maps to adopt a forceful and appropriate way of honoring some of its heroes.

Dangers of Postwar Deflation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] touched upon a question that is bound to have the attention of the American Congress for the next few years—the prospect of postwar inflation, which also includes the question of postwar deflation.

If we are going to permit the Federal Reserve System to contract the currency, as it did after the last war, we are going to be driven into a depression that, in all probability, will result in the repudiation of the national debt and bring about such

chaos and confusion that it might result in a disastrous revolution.

After the last war, at the peak of high prices, we had $5,698,214,612 in circulation. Today we have, or at least on the 28th of February, 1945, we had $25,751,-204,220 in circulation. Of that amount $22,749,848,165 is Federal Reserve notes that can be withdrawn from circulation and retired without the consent of Congress.

If we are going to maintain our form of government, preserve its integrity, and at the same time meet our national debt without repudiation, we are going to have to do something to stabilize the amount of currency in circulation, and not permit a bunch of financial high-binders to throw the country into a depression, as they did in 1920 and as they did in 1929.

Congress can protect this country from such a disaster by taking back the power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof, and stabilizing the currency as it stands the day the war closes in such a way to prevent runaway inflation, and at the same time protect the country from the disaster that would undoubtedly result from a drastic deflation.

At this point I am inserting the circulation statement of United States money of February 28, 1945, which I hope every Member will study carefully. For, as I said, this is one of the most important issues with which we are going to have to deal in the postwar period.

The matter referred to follows:

Circulation statement of United States money, Feb. 28, 1945

Kind of money	Total amount	Money held in the Treasury					Money outside of the Treasury				Population of continental United States (estimated)
		Total	Amount held as security against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Held for Federal Reserve banks and agents	All other money	Total	Held by Federal Reserve banks and agents	In circulation [1]		
									Amount	Per capita	
Gold	[2] $20,505,997,581	$20,505,997,581	$18,398,312,924	$156,039,431		[3] $1,951,645,226					
Gold certificates	[4] 18,398,312,924	[4] 15,530,230,065			[4] [5] $15,530,230,065		$2,868,082,859	$2,815,444,500	$52,638,359	$0.38	
Standard silver dollars	494,021,125	373,995,443	275,760,837			98,234,606	120,025,682	1,720,241	118,305,441	.85	
Silver bullion	1,520,133,653	1,520,133,653	1,520,133,653								
Silver certificates	[4] 1,794,742,668						1,794,742,668	211,282,870	1,583,459,798	11.38	
Treasury notes of 1890	[4] 1,151,822						1,151,822		1,151,822	.01	
Subsidiary silver	787,296,258	13,962,964				13,962,964	773,333,294	16,415,979	756,917,315	5.44	
Minor coin	294,872,276	6,932,905				6,932,905	287,939,371	5,162,272	282,777,099	2.03	
United States notes	346,681,016	2,518,251				2,518,251	344,162,765	24,067,604	320,095,161	2.30	
Federal Reserve notes	22,749,848,165	124,881,557				124,881,557	22,624,966,608	661,401,045	21,963,565,563	157.92	
Federal Reserve bank notes	555,924,888	356,251				356,251	555,568,637	5,289,600	550,279,037	3.96	
National bank notes	123,030,952	581,527				581,527	122,449,425	434,800	122,014,625	.88	
Total Feb. 28, 1945	47,377,805,914	22,549,360,132	20,194,207,414	156,039,431	[4] 15,530,230,065	[6] 2,199,113,287	[7] 29,492,423,131	3,741,218,911	25,751,204,220	185.15	139,083,000
Comparative totals:											
Jan. 31, 1945	47,139,505,138	22,587,535,914	20,216,513,939	156,039,431	15,557,808,540	2,214,982,544	29,210,674,623	3,920,464,762	25,290,209,861	181.95	138,998,000
Feb. 29, 1944	43,621,961,342	23,724,466,154	21,268,720,665	156,039,431	16,720,773,205	2,199,706,058	24,545,442,648	3,721,857,116	20,823,585,532	[8] 151.43	[8] 137,511,000
Oct. 31, 1920	8,479,620,824	2,436,864,530	718,674,378	152,979,026	1,212,360,791	352,850,336	6,761,430,672	1,063,216,060	5,698,214,612	53.21	107,096,000
Mar. 31, 1917	5,396,596,677	2,952,020,313	2,681,691,072	152,979,026		117,350,216	5,126,267,436	953,321,522	4,172,945,914	40.23	103,716,000
June 30, 1914	3,797,825,099	1,845,569,804	1,507,178,879	150,000,000		188,390,925	3,459,434,174		3,459,434,174	24.93	99,027,000
Jan. 1, 1879	1,007,084,483	212,420,402	21,602,640	100,000,000		90,817,762	816,266,721		816,266,721	16.92	48,231,000

[1] The money in circulation includes any paper currency held outside the continental limits of the United States.

[2] Does not include gold other than that held by the Treasury.

[3] Includes $1,800,000,000 exchange stabilization fund and $143,955,464 balance of increment resulting from reduction in weight of the gold dollar.

[4] These amounts are not included in the total, since the gold or silver held as security against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 is included under gold, standard silver dollars, and silver bullion, respectively.

[5] This total includes credits with the Treasurer of the United States payable in gold certificates in (1) the gold certificate fund, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, in the amount of $14,909,421,182, and (2) the redemption fund for Federal Reserve notes in the amount of $620,808,883.

[6] Includes $123,000,000 lawful money deposited as a reserve for postal-savings deposits.

[7] The amount of gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 should be deducted from this amount before combining with total money held in the Treasury to arrive at the total amount of money in the United States.

[8] Revised figures.

NOTE.—There is maintained in the Treasury (i) as a reserve for United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890—$156,039,431 in gold bullion; (ii) as security for Treasury notes of 1890—an equal dollar amount in standard silver dollars (these notes are being canceled and retired on receipt); (iii) as security for outstanding silver certificates—silver in bullion and standard silver dollars of a monetary value equal to the face amount of such silver certificates; and (iv) as security for gold certificates—gold bullion of a value at the legal standard equal to the face amount of such gold certificates. Federal Reserve notes are obligations of the United States and a first lien on all the assets of the issuing Federal Reserve bank. Federal Reserve notes are secured by the deposit with Federal Reserve agents of a like amount of gold certificates or of gold certificates and such discounted or purchased paper as is eligible under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act, or, until June 30, 1945, of direct obligations of the United States if so authorized by a majority vote of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Federal Reserve banks must maintain a reserve in gold certificates of at least 40 percent, including the redemption fund which must be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. "Gold certificates" as herein used includes credits with the Treasurer of the United States payable in gold certificates. Federal Reserve bank notes and national bank notes are in process of retirement.

Salary Claims of Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the traditional power of the purse and the right of Congress to refuse to provide salaries for persons on the Government pay roll who were deemed to have engaged in subversive activities was defended today in a brief filed in the Court of Claims.

Asserting that Congress "has the power to appropriate for or to withhold appropriations from individuals by class or name," the brief asks the court to dismiss the salary claims of three Federal employees whom Congress specifically eliminated from the public pay roll in a special section of the Urgency Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943.

The brief was filed by John C. Gall, Washington attorney, acting as special counsel for Congress after Attorney General Biddle had advised Congress that he could not advocate its views with conviction. Both the Senate and House concurred in the court action to compel the executive branch of the Government to recognize the powers of Congress.

Denying a claim of unjust discrimination brought by Robert Morss Lovett, formerly executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and by Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., employees of the Federal Communications Commission, the brief filed by Mr. Gall declares that the action of Congress was "clearly an exercise of the power over appropriations and not an attempted exercise of the power of removal."

Congress and the administration came in conflict over the three Government employees on the historic constitutional issue 2 years ago, and the brief filed today is unusual in that it is submitted

under special resolution of Congress by private counsel instead of by the Attorney General.

According to the congressional brief, the brief that was filed in the case by Attorney General Biddle is devoted entirely to propositions also urged by counsel for the plaintiffs.

Replying to an allegation in Mr. Biddle's brief that the hearings before the Kerr subcommittee of the House "denied several of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the accused in all criminal prosecutions," the congressional brief comments:

> If supported by the facts agreed to in the stitpulations, such charges by the plaintiffs in aid of their suits against the United States would be understandable. Coming from the Attorney General in a brief filed in defense of a suit against the United States they are little short of amazing.

The brief for Congress stated that Attorney General Biddle is breaking a precedent in the Attorney-General's office by appearing "as counsel for the United States, and, at the same time, in aid of a claim against the United States."

Seldom have more far-reaching constitutional issues been raised over more insignificant financial claims.

Accused of subversive activities, all three were invited by Congress to "have their say" before the special congressional Kerr subcommittee.

Their statements failing to satisfy the Members of Congress, that body subsequently passed the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act in July, 1943, with the specific provision that after November 16, 1943, no funds be used to pay their salaries unless they received Presidential appointments confirmed by the Senate.

No such appointments being made by President Roosevelt, the Department of the Interior and the Federal Communications Commission ceased to pay their salaries after November 16.

The brief of Congress points out that—

> The problem with which Congress was dealing was that of subversive activities among Federal civil-service employees. * * *
>
> Two courses were open. The Congress could have proceeded along broad general lines and provided that no part of appropriated funds should be used to pay any part of the compensation of any executive employee who was a member of any of the organizations which the Attorney General had held to be within the scope of Public Law No. 135 (for example, American League for Peace and Democracy). But the circumstances were such that a general proscription would have been arbitrary and extremely unfair to many people who had innocently joined such Communist-front organizations. The Attorney General himself had so warned Congress. (Lovett Ex. 18, pp. 1–5.)
>
> A far less objectionable course was the one Congress adopted. It proceeded to investigate individual cases, and to withhold appropriations in those instances only where it appeared that the employee complained of was not merely a member of one such organization, but many, and where, in addition to his membership in such organizations, his speeches, writings, and general activities were such as to make it, in the opinion of Congress, inconsistent with the public welfare to continue to appropriate public funds to him.

Summarizing the constitutional issue between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, Mr. Gall's brief states:

> It is alleged that the act does not represent a true or legitimate exercise of the congressional power over appropriations, but that the exercise of the power over appropriations was a mere cloak for a more sinister purpose—that of invading the Executive prerogative and effecting a removal from executive employment. We may concede at once that many Members of Congress desired that plaintiffs should be removed from office. The fact is, however, that the statute as finally adopted did not remove the plaintiffs, or either of them, from office, nor did it require the Executive to do so. What it did was to say to the disbursing officers of the Government: "You may not draw from the Treasury any public funds to pay as salaries to the plaintiffs after November 15, 1943, unless prior to that date plaintiffs have been appointed and confirmed as herein provided." The act did not require the Executive to do any act of any kind, by November 15, or any other date, or at all. What it did was merely to make unavailable any public funds for payment of salaries for any services after that date, unless the President exercised the option of making the appointment. Whether the President made the appointment or did not do so, no compulsion was placed upon him and no invasion of his prerogatives was involved.
>
> The act was clearly an exercise of the power over appropriations and not an attempted exercise of a power of removal.

Reviewing the challenge to Congress' historic "power of the purse," the brief continues:

> The plaintiffs and the Attorney General have joined in urging that the present exercise of control over appropriations be stricken down because if the power of Congress to withhold appropriations on the conditions laid down in section 304 be sustained the power may be abused. * * *
>
> The precise question presented here has never before been adjudicated in our courts. It may well be supposed that the existence of the power of Congress in its absolute discretion to withhold funds is so clear that heretofore no one has thought to challenge the exercise of the power. * * *
>
> The framers of the Constitution were not content to grant to Congress the power to tax and to spend. They went a step further and provided that except in pursuance of an appropriation by Congress no money could be drawn from the Treasury. This provision—operating on all persons and all agencies, executive and judicial alike—clearly vests in Congress complete discretion as to whether it will authorize money to be withdrawn from the Treasury for any particular purpose; and its decision not to authorize the withdrawal is conclusive upon all. Such a refusal creates no private rights—certainly no private rights cognizable by the judiciary. * * *
>
> The importance of the present case is attested by the fact that never in the history of the United States have the courts invalidated an act of Congress directing the withholding of public funds, either absolutely or conditionally. The implications of a decision against the Government in this case are obvious, for Congress has, since the beginning of our Government, exercised the right to withhold funds, in its complete discretion. * * *
>
> We are dealing here with exceptions to lump-sum appropriations. * * *
>
> To hold that Congress may not make such exceptions to a lump-sum appropriation as it sees fit, under conditions which now prevail would produce the very practical difficulties which the lump-sum method was designed to overcome. The only alternative open to Congress would then be to resort to specific appropriations for individuals by name or to relinquish to the executive branch of the Government a part of its constitutional power over appropriations. * * *
>
> The fundamental issue here involved antedates the formation of the United States Government itself, yet today the plenary legislative power to control the expenditure of the taxpayers' money is being challenged. The very definition of an appropriation, the act of setting apart or assigning to a particular use or person in exclusion of all others, sustains the power of Congress to enact the provision challenged in these suits.

In asking the Court to dismiss the suits, the brief of Congress points out that a judgment for the plaintiffs could not be paid except by another congressional appropriation for that purpose.

> The Congress has already stated unequivocally, through section 304, that it is unwilling to make such appropriation. The control of the public purse is lodged exclusively in Congress. Congress is directed by the Constitution to make appropriations only for the general welfare. Its action in adopting section 304 is equivalent to a finding on its part that an appropriation to plaintiffs would not be for the public welfare.
>
> Even if the courts should conclude that they have jurisdiction of these claims, it still follows that the determination of the Congress not to permit the withdrawal of public funds from the Public Treasury should be respected.

In the Deficiency Appropriations Act of 1943 Congress inserted a provision that no part of the funds appropriated by that or other acts should be used to pay any part of the compensation of three named individuals—Lovett, Watson, and Dodd—after November 15, 1943, unless, prior to that date, they were nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Neither of them was so nominated and confirmed.

On November 15, 1943, the executive superiors of these three men, in one instance the Federal Communications Commission, and in the other the Department of the Interior, made arrangements whereby the men were allowed to continue at their desks for a limited period in order that they might lay the basis for suits for salaries against the United States Government. These suits were duly filed, the plaintiffs claiming that the act of Congress was unconstitutional and void.

At the time the Deficiency Appropriation Act was passed, Attorney General Biddle took the position that the provision with respect to these three employees was unconstitutional. Congress therefore decided to employ its own counsel to defend these three suits. It selected John C. Gall, of Washington, D. C., to defend the suits.

Briefs have been filed in the Court of Claims on behalf of the plaintiffs and the Attorney General. The brief on behalf of Congress, filed today by Mr. Gall, is in answer to briefs previously filed.

The plaintiffs and the Attorney General attack the statute on several grounds. First, that it is an unconstitutional invasion of the prerogatives of the President with respect to removal of executive employees from office. Second, that it constitutes a bill of attainder. Third, that the procedures of the Kerr subcommittee of the House of Representatives, which investigated these employees, were highly irregular and de-

prived the employees of various constitutional rights as to procedure.

The brief filed on behalf of Congress answers all these charges. It points out that the statute did not remove any of these employees from office, but that in fact they continued in office, and one of them—Dodd—is still carried on the rolls of the Federal Communications Commission as an employee on leave of absence without pay. The brief on behalf of Congress points out that since the founding of this Government the Congress has frequently adopted appropriation acts with limitations which direct the manner of expenditure of the funds or limit the expenditure in such a way as to prevent the money so appropriated from being expended except for the objects and purposes specified by Congress. The brief points out that the courts have never set aside an act of Congress putting limitations on an appropriation measure, and that if this were done in the present case it would call into question the constitutionality of various measures which have been on the statute books for many years.

The brief also points out that the Congress, in controlling the public purse, may withhold funds whenever in its judgment it would not be for the public welfare to permit the expenditure. It emphasizes that the holding of office or employment in the executive branch of the Government, and the receipt of compensation, are two separate and distinct things; and that it is not a necessary incident of employment that the employee shall receive compensation. Whether Federal employees will be paid, and if so, the amounts they will be paid, the Constitution leaves entirely to the Congress. This is illustrated by the fact that as of January 1945 there were in the employ of the executive branch of the Government 311,000 persons who either received no compensation or received $1 per year. It also pointed out that there is no general law which requires the payment of compensation as a condition of holding Federal office or employment. The arrangement by which certain people are paid $1 per year is not one required by law.

The congressional brief also takes issue with the Attorney General in his charges that the congressional committee which examined the plaintiffs, denied them any rights which are ordinarily accorded in legislative or other proceedings. The brief lists the charges made by the Attorney General and answers them fully, also showing that they are not supported by the stipulated facts to which the Attorney General's office subscribed.

The brief also deals with the contention made by the plaintiffs and the Attorney General that the only method open to Congress under the Constitution for the removal of executive employees is the process of impeachment. The brief points out that since Congress did not undertake the removal of these employees, but merely provided that they should not receive compensation unless they were appointed in a certain way, obviously the procedure of impeachment would have been improper and inappropriate. The brief reviews all of the impeachment proceedings in the history of the United States showing that such proceedings are appropriate only in the case of high officials of the Government and not in the case of any one of the three and one-half million Federal civil-service employees.

The brief reviews legislative precedents, not only in the history of the United States, but in parliamentary history prior to the adoption of the United States Constitution.

The case is now pending in the United States Court of Claims where it is expected that it will be reached for argument in the near future.

The congressional subcommittee which later recommended legislation, was headed by Representative JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina. The other members were Representatives ANDERSON of New Mexico; GORE, of Tennessee; KEEFE, of Wisconsin; and POWERS, of New Jersey.

Fifth Column Against United States in Mexico Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stanley Johnson, from the Washington Times-Herald of April 28, 1945:

FIFTH COLUMN AGAINST UNITED STATES IN MEXICO REVEALED

(By Stanley Johnston)

The presence in Mexico of a fifth column that is inciting hostility against the United States by reviving old resentments and making subversive capital of wartime exigencies has been brought into the open by Ezequiel Padilla, Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

In a recent address, Padilla, who is head of Mexico's delegation at the San Francisco Conference, disclosed that the anti-United States sentiment, though not representing a majority opinion in Mexico, had attained such proportions that he felt impelled to defend his country's foreign policy, particularly his close collaboration with this Nation.

DOESN'T MENTION NAMES

While Padilla did not mention names, it was believed his criticism was directed at jealous politicians, ambitious business interests, and army men with divergient views, as well as the representatives of foreign governments.

He observed that "the people must realize this is a fifth column machination when they consider that the undermining campaign is only carried out within the country," and noted that though many of the plotters are foreigners fulfilling their subversive mission, "unfortunately there are also Mexicans who, in their campaign to discredit the country, forget they are Mexicans."

In the early days of the war when Mexican ships were being sunk these persons suggested, Padilla recalled, that the ships had been attacked by United States submarines. When there was a shortage of corn, wheat, lard, or gasoline, they whispered it was "because everything is shipped to the United States." A recent subject of our Mexican detractors' efforts to arouse suspicions has been Argentina's delicate relations with the other Pan-American countries.

The imminence of a final war victory for the Allied nations having narrowed that field, the inciters are now reverting to the past. They are insidiously stirring historical resentment concerning the United States' annexation of Mexican territory and other incidents in which they accuse this country of having belittled Mexicans.

DEFENSE POLICY DEFINED

Padilla, who frankly defined the purpose of his address as a defense of Mexican foreign policy against the destructive machinations, said:

"The people must be aware of the existence of a constant and renewed onslaught against our foreign policy. That onslaught consists in designating the policy of Mexico as entreguismo, that is, turning one's country over to a foreign power."

He cynically observed that to his slanderers "our attitude would have been brave had we joined the Axis powers, had we turned Mexico over to the opprobrious dictatorships." Instead, Mevican foreign policy clearly advocated pan-Americanism.

Warning that, just as Mexico has individuals who hate their big northern neighbor, so does the United States "have a powerful sector with imperialistic tendencies," Padilla said:

Those who for spite, for their unconfessed Nazi-fascism, or for envy, stir up animosity against our friends, the people of the United States, thereby encourage that imperialistic sector and thus weaken, before the public opinion of that country, the good neighbor policy so evident on the part of the great majority of the American people."

Send German Prisoners Back to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, no confirmation of General Eisenhower's reports of German atrocities in Europe was necessary. Nevertheless, the actual eyewitness accounts of hundreds of Americans, including Senators and Representatives, military officials, and newspaper reporters reveal vividly the depths to which Germany has sunk under Nazi leadership. It must be obvious to every American who has a boy in a German prison camp that the provisions of the Geneva Convention have been flagrantly violated. Some of these emaciated, starving prisoners may never recover their full health.

To continue the policy of maintaining German prisoners in American camps here in the United States on a level of American conceptions of decency in the face of the German record is to defeat one of the purposes for which this war is being fought. The thousands of German prisoners who are being well fed, clothed, and housed in our country will go back to Germany with contempt for our American "softness" rather than respect for our American "decency."

Our War Department must be realistic on this subject. There is plenty of work to be done in Europe. Many of the German prisoners in our own country don't like to work. I say that the time

has come when they should be sent back to Europe to rebuild under Polish and Russian and Czech and French and Belgian and Dutch and Yugoslav authority the lands they have devastated. This procedure would not violate the principles of international law and it would remove from idleness a group of dangerous, arrogant men who might otherwise one day form the nucleus of a new menace to the world. Sending these prisoners back to the soil that they have devastated would be an act of justice.

I call upon the War Department with all speed to prepare plans for the removal of all German prisoners in our territories to Europe. The same boats which transport those prisoners to Europe could bring back the American soldiers who are to be released from service as well as American prisoners freed from the hell of German prison camps. The German prisoners in our country have little to do here. There is plenty for them to do in Europe.

The GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on April 26 last to introduce Gen. Frank T. Hines to a group of the National Office Management Association, which met in this city. General Hines delivered an address on the GI bill of rights and its effect on office management. I ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a certain paper that goes with it.

There being no objection, the address and the accompanying tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful for this invitation to be here and address your meeting on the subject of the GI bill of rights and its effect on office management. This subject embraces our joint responsibility in building a sound structure for the transition from war to peace for returning veterans.

During World War No. 1 plans were devised principally for those persons who suffered a war disability. When the armistice was declared, uncontrollable events took their course. The results of that unpreparedness are too well known to detail here, but they have served as a warning for the erection now of a firm foundation for a stronger democracy when peace is a reality.

The problem of the present is magnified, not only by the greater number of persons serving in the armed forces but also by reason of the fact that there has been extensive mobilization on the home front. The men in service will return from far-flung battle fronts to home communities which may seem strange by reason of the changes which have taken place during their absence. It is, therefore, necessary that a concerted effort be made to meet as many as possible of the problems of this readjustment period.

The terms of the GI bill of rights outline a plan for the readjustment of the returning veteran which has many phases and which contemplates the cooperation of business and Government.

The subject assigned to me by you recognizes your intention to join hands with the Government in assuring the success of this program.

There is no doubt but that one of the most valuable phases of the present plan is that which provides for the education and refresher or retraining courses for all persons now in service, without regard to the age of the men when they entered service, or the permanent disability which may have resulted from such service.

The educational process has been proceeding for the majority of men from the time they entered service. Many were trained in colleges and universities in accelerated courses designed to equip the men as integral parts of the mechanized forces. Others were trained in industry to make them efficient units on jobs requiring particular skills. They have had intensified training in disciplined and dangerous experience. Upon their return they will have this opportunity under the GI bill of rights for further education or training to equip them as useful citizens in the business world.

Each of you recognizes the value of specialized training and of the necessity for proper placement of personnel. The Veterans' Administration has established a vocational guidance program which is required for the program of rehabilitation for the man disabled in service and which is also available for all other veterans who wish to avail themselves of the advantages of further education or training under the GI bill of rights. The guidance process takes into consideration his education; previous vocational training; present skills; aptitudes; and his interests and personal desires, the object being adjustment in an occupation which will be suitable to his needs and interests.

The War Manpower Commission has prepared and made available to the Veterans' Administration a manual which is arranged for ready reference to the type of work assigned in the armed forces with a cross-reference to related civilian occupations calling for similar abilities. The tabulations show the additional training required, the physical activities, and working conditions.

The application of these scientific methods of vocational guidance and training will assure that these men will make profitable units in business, so it is not surprising that they are being welcomed in employment.

The outlook for the disabled veteran is heartening. It is the general opinion of management in 300 surveyed establishments employing 53,000 persons that impaired workers were just as efficient as the unimpaired doing similar work, and the 8 percent reported as more efficient outweighed the 5 percent reported as less efficient. In respect to absenteeism, injury frequency, and labor turnover, the physically impaired were rated as superior to the unimpaired. The vocational training will equip him to make the most efficient use of his capabilities. Management is considering these factors in establishing employment programs having the objective of placing disabled veterans in positions which will assure speedy and satisfactory return to civilian life.

In the armed services high morale has been sustained by the intensive training for a particular job and by having each man feel that he was an essential part of the unit of the armed forces in which he served. In the transition to business life, he will need close association with the training officer or manager so that he will quickly feel at home as part of the agency unit. He will need encouragement and direction in the work sequence of the organization, an opportunity to contribute his particular skill or training to the advancement of the organization and to his promotion in it.

You will find it advantageous to give these men your personal attention and continuing interest when possible, or in the larger organization it may be wise to assign a returned veteran, well trained in your organization, as adviser and contact man to assure their intensive training and adaptation in the organization.

You will come more and more to realize that the employment of these men is not a patriotic duty or a problem, but that the majority of cases will afford you a privilege and opportunity. They definitely have something to contribute. If there should come to your attention any cases in which you feel that the man needs vocational guidance and training, it is suggested that you tell the men of the training program of the Veterans' Administration or refer him for interview by an employee of this department. Even though he may have taken some training after discharge, it may be that he needs and is entitled to further training before satisfactory placement may be accomplished. We must join in a sincere effort to assure that a man who has advanced in the Service gets the job he feels he can best fill, if this can be accomplished.

I recently attended a meeting of the War Advertising Council whose interest is to stimulate the public interest, the interest of the employer and of everyone concerned in the employment and reemployment of the veteran. Some of the advertising that they are going to undertake, paid for by industries in their budget for advertising, will undoubtedly present this matter to the public and our people in a way that we could not present it. In other words, they are pointing out just what I have mentioned to you, the fact that these men have advanced, have been trained, and should be given an opportunity.

I recall one group of pictures and statements they had worked out, stating that this man had developed and he was capable of undertaking the building of roads, railroads, bridges, and all that, that he was a capable engineer. Others had had training in mechanics in the Air Forces. Throughout our whole effort in the field these men have been trained to the point that certainly, if we do our job right, we should capitalize upon that training to their advantage.

It is true that we can become very enthusiastic along that line and probably find some disappointments, but I am one who believes in aiming at least as high as we can. If we fall short, we have at least endeavored to help the man get what he thought he could do best.

Undoubtedly in certain lines we will have more people to be employed than industry in that particular line can absorb, and therein comes the problem of retraining. Vocational rehabilitation for these men disabled, carried on by the Veterans' Administration at this time, has already rehabilitated some men, and others are training on the job and will undoubtedly train into good positions.

Probably the most hazardous part of the GI bill falls in that section of making guaranties on loans to veterans to go into business. When we realize that 50 percent of those who do enter business generally discontinue operations within 2 or 3 years we can well understand what the casualties may be in that particular section, but we believe that we have set up machinery through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Counseling Service of the United States Employment Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Veterans' Administration (which carries the responsibility for the result) whereby we can help those men. Undoubtedly there will be many opportunities, and the only hope I have is that the advice given to these men paints both sides of the picture before they undertake to go into business. A few failures will be disappointing. However, if we can keep that number to a minimum, it may do a great deal of good.

Many of these men will wish to purchase a home by the guaranty of a loan under the

GI bill. This will not come under your direct duties as a manager, in most instances, but your interest in the welfare and prompt readjustment of these men will lead you to give them the advantage of your advice and experience in real-estate transactions. Few of them will know how best to budget their incomes or the advantage of establishing and maintaining a healthy credit standing. The law requires that the cost of the home must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses, and that it does not exceed the reasonable, normal value of the property or construction involved. The Veterans' Administration has endeavored to place proper safeguards, but each of these men will need your counsel in these matters.

The good health of the returning veteran is assured by hospitalization in modern, scientific hospitals where the highest type of medical care is afforded. If a person about to be discharged from the service needs further treatment, he is transformed by the Army or Navy to a veterans' hospital for continuation of treatment. He is also entitled to hospitalization at any time during his life without regard to the service origin of his disability, should hospital care be needed.

Veterans suffering from a service disability may also receive treatment therefor in outpatient clinics. If the veteran was disabled in service by a condition that requires medical care at intervals, you will wish to have a definite leave policy so he will know the effect upon his employment status when such absences from duty are required. A knowledge of this medical program and of the veteran's rights thereto may be of advantage to you in getting prompt attention for veterans whose health may become impaired in the future and who may not have adequate means for proper attention.

There come to me each day in increasing numbers reports showing that business organizations, large and small, have faced the fact that the war will not have been won until readjustment of returning veterans to peaceful pursuits is on the high road. An armistice must not again leave them to shift for themselves. At a similar period in our past history our President, Woodrow Wilson, warned that we have no more solemn obligation than restoring these men to civil life and opportunity. In conclusion, he said: "* * * The cooperation and interest of our citizens is essential to this program of duty, justice, and humanity. It is not a charity. It is merely the payment of a draft of honor which the United States of America accepted when it selected these men, and took them in their health and strength to fight the battles of the Nation. They have fought the good fight; they have kept the faith; and they have won. Now we keep faith with them, and every citizen is endorser on the general obligation * * *." So said our President following World War No. 1. It is equally true today.

The community interest in the veteran and his interest in his home community will go far in the problem of readjustment and future happiness of the veteran and his family.

Loan guaranty operations

	Home	Farm	Business	Total
Number of eligibility certificates issued	18,519	1,338	2,632	22,489
Number of loan guaranties issued	4,300	74	197	4,571
Number of loan guaranties rejected	803	13	18	834
Total amount of guaranties issued to Apr. 21, 1945	$7,150,789.07	$86,305.25	$225,147.71	$7,462,242.03

National service life insurance

Total number of applications received to Apr. 25, 1945	17,351,500
Estimated amount of insurance represented by applications received	$133,602,552,000.00
Average amount approved to Apr. 25, 1945:	
By policy	$7,679.17
By life	$9,197.50

		Contract insurance	Gratuitous insurance	Grand total
Total number of claims received	281,026	10,612		291,638
Total number of claims allowed	254,613	6,496		261,109
Total number of claims disallowed	2,471	3,180		5,651
Total number of claims otherwise disposed of	181	0		181
Total number of claims pending	23,761	936		24,697
Total amount of insurance awarded	-------	-------	$1,671,779,520	

Tariffs and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I tender to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of March 26, 1945, concerning an address made by Mr. Farley before the Foreign Commerce Club at their annual port of New York night banquet on March 20:

TARIFFS AND PROSPERITY

Possibly as head of a big export corporation James A. Farley views tariff problems more clearly than he did when he was a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet. At any rate, he is on firm ground in emphasizing the importance of foreign trade as a factor in postwar prosperity. Equally valid is his conclusion that if the United States is to increase its exports it must be prepared to take more imports.

The act on reciprocal trade agreements, now up for renewal, has an import bearing on this Nation's prosperity after victory. In spite of the need to satisfy pent-up domestic demands for industrial products, we must have export markets if the wheels of our factories are kept turning over a long period. And there must be foreign sales of our crop surpluses. If we expect other nations to take our exports, we will, in the long run, have to take an equal amount of their products, except for what our tourists spend in foreign travel.

Tariff reductions more drastic than those of the reciprocal trade agreements may be needed, but renewal of this process should be the first step in strengthening our hand in postwar trade. This means of negotiation assures us of getting concessions from other countries in return for those we give. Opponents of tariff reduction claim it would hurt employment here; the truth is that it is necessary, in connection with obtaining similar reductions by other countries, to assure the continuance of full employment here.

The Problem of Relief for Postwar Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two publications relating to postwar conditions. Both are aimed at the theory that a new world cannot be built on cold and hunger. The first one is an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, April 28, and the second one a news item from the New York Post of April 26, 1945. The news item from the Post should be considered as based on figures up to March 31, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial and news item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1945]

THE HARD DAYS OF PEACE

If anyone has the idea that a short time after the war is won the world will be as it was before, he should read, or read again, the joint statement issued in Washington by the three principal members of the Combined Production and Resources Board of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, on the staggering problems involved in restoring even a semblance of normal life to devastated Europe and Asia. And restore it we must, they point out, if we are to have any hopes at all for a secure peace. We cannot build a new world on cold and hunger.

Leaving out entirely the question of food, which is not within the province of the Board, the members point out that there are three other great shortages—clothing and heat and transportation—which must get worse before they can get better, and which can be cured only by increased production. In cloth, J. A. Krug, the United States member, says there will be a foreseeable shortage of 1,250,000,000 yards, or 4 percent of yearly prewar consumption. This shortage comes at a time when much of the world is trying to cover its nakedness with wardrobes that are at the lowest point in modern history. In coal and transportation the situation is even worse. Liberation of some of the coal-bearing regions of Europe, such as those in the Ruhr and the Saar and around Aachen, give some hope of relief, but that is months in the future. All of their initial output, unless the war in Europe is ended quickly, must go for military needs. The crisis in transportation is even worse. In the liberated areas of Europe there is left only one-third of prewar truck capacity.

The main source of the world's basic needs must for sometime be the Western Hemisphere, the only major area of the world untouched by the war, and that means largely from the United States. No one in or out of authority in this country wants to make almoners of the other peoples of the world. That would be as unpalatable to them as it would be to us. But before they can help themselves they need help. Not help in money, but food to keep them from starving, clothes to cover their backs, fuel to warm their homes in winter, and the means to take all three from where they are or where they can be landed to where they are needed.

As Mr. Krug points out, there is no quick and easy solution to these problems. They

are hard problems that will require hard work and thought and patience to solve. But if they are properly understood and wholeheartedly accepted, they can be solved. It is just as important that they be solved as it is to win the war.

[From the New York Post of April 26, 1945]

U. N. R. R. A. GOT 1 PERCENT OF FOOD UNITED STATES PLEDGED

WASHINGTON, April 26.—The United States has contributed only a third of the money it has pledged to U. N. R. R. A., and only 1½ percent of its quota of food and other relief supplies, officials of Food for Freedom, Inc., revealed today.

These figures from official sources, revealed for the first time how little the United States has gone toward meeting the burden of relief in war-ravaged countries, spokesmen for the organization said.

FORTY-FOUR NATIONS PLEDGED

When U. N. R. R. A. was organized, 44 nations pledged 1 percent of their 1943 national income to it. Great Britain and Canada have appropriated their full quotas. The United States quota was $1,350,000,000 and Congress approved this figure.

Actually, however, only a third of this amount, $450,000,000, has been appropriated. Congress authorized the transfer of $350,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies to U. N. R. R. A. in an emergency, but this transfer has not been made.

SUPPLIES UNAVAILABLE

U. N. R. R. A. has been able to buy only $20,000,000 worth of supplies available for immediate shipment in this country, Food for Freedom said, whereas Canada with a much lower quota has provided more than $12,000,000 worth.

"Canada has given 16 percent of its quota, but we have given only 1½ percent of ours," the organization said.

While an improvement is expected because of the release of ships after VE-day, the organization said, the immediate question before Americans is whether we will eat up most of our food or share it with the starving in Europe.

Roosevelt Tribute From Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have in Birmingham, Ala., a very capable speaker and editor, who is beloved by all who know him and admired by all who read or hear him. He is McClellan Van der Veer, of the Birmingham News, popularly known as the South's greatest newspaper.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, there follows an address delivered by Mr. Van der Veer on the Blue Network April 14, 1945. It is a tribute to our late departed President:

Not many months ago a visitor from Birmingham spoke a few words of greeting to the President following a Washington press conference. The visitor, knowing well the great urgencies upon Mr. Roosevelt, would have hurried on. But the President would not have it so. He wanted to know all about Birmingham. He spoke with amazing knowledge of wartime conditions in this city. He had a genuine interest in, and feeling for Birmingham.

This city in turn has realized as much through the years, having a deep responsive feeling for the President, the great friend.

Today, in this large industrial district, the essential work goes on, but all else pauses. In everything, work or meditation, thoughts are of the departed leader who, in such a vivid sense, is still with us. Many places of business are closed. Special church services are being held. The quiet of Sunday is all about us—even in the noise of necessary work. The mood of prayer is upon all.

These lines from a Birmingham Age-Herald editorial strive to convey the feeling among our people:

"Something, at least, of the stupendous measure and meaning of Franklin D. Roosevelt is to be found in the profound sense of void.

"Something incalculably great has gone out of the life of the Nation, out of the life of all the world * * *.

"The challenge from Franklin Roosevelt never came more clearly than now.

"It is the challenge that we rise to all the great tasks that remain to the victorious and full performance of those enterprises for which he gave his life.

"All our sacrifices—crowned now by the President's giving of his own life pledge us, forever, without limit, to the fulfillment of the high destiny that summons us."

Adjournment Order in Respect for the Memory of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following adjournment order of the Supreme Court of Florida:

IN THP SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA, JANUARY TERM, A. D. 1945, FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1945—ADJOURNMENT ORDER, IN RESPECT FOR THE MEMORY OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Late yesterday afternoon, April 12, 1945, shortly after the court had recessed for the day, the news by radio of the death, at 4:35 p. m., of President Roosevelt, at Warm Springs, Ga., shocked and saddened the people of Florida and of every other State in the Union, and, indeed, all the freedom-loving peoples of the world as well. For the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt had long since become the symbol of liberty and hope to the cruelly oppressed and suffering peoples of all the many countries that, without provocation, had been assaulted, conquered, looted, and devastated by Germany and Japan. Even before our country had entered this most momentous of all wars, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had become a great world figure, hated above all others by the diabolical leaders of the Axis Nations, and loved and respected above all others by the decent and liberty-loving peoples of the earth.

But to us here in America President Roosevelt was more than a great world leader. He was our President. He was close to us. We knew him well. He had talked to us frequently in his "fire-side chats." We had heard or read his able, eloquent, and inspiring addresses on domestic and world problems. We recognized the greatness and magnetism of his personality. Even those of us who sharply differed with him at times on domestic problems admired his ability and courage and conceded that he was doing what he considered best for the people of our country. A fine gentleman and a great and beloved President has passed from among us, but his influence and example live on. The victory which he did so much to assure and the organization of the nations to preserve the peace of the world, which he so earnestly championed, are near at hand.

Out of our deep respect for the memory of our late President, and in sympathy for the members of his bereaved family, the court will now adjourn until Monday, April 16, 1945, and that the flag on the Supreme Court Building be displayed at half-mast for a period of 30 days, and that copies hereof be forwarded to the bereaved family and to Florida's Representatives in Congress.

ROY H. CHAPMAN,
Chief Justice.
GLENN TERRELL,
ARMSTEAD BROWN,
RIVERS BUFORD,
EDWIN THOMAS,
A. H. ADAMS,
H. L. SEBRING,
Justices.

A true copy.
Test:
[SEAL]
GUY C. MCCORD,
Clerk, Supreme Court.

Jewish Commonwealth of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit this morning a concurrent resolution adopted by the general court in New Hampshire, urging that appropriate action be taken to open Palestine to free immigration as intended in the Balfour Declaration. The people of New Hampshire through their representatives have by this resolution indicated their sympathy for the Jewish people, and express the hope that their ancestral homeland may again be made available for their free and peaceful occupation:

Concurrent resolution relative to a Jewish commonwealth of Palestine

Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem there; and

Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the Mandate for Palestine and had undertaken "to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine," an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations including the United States; and

Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their national conventions of 1944, adopted platforms in favor of the re-

establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be "in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of the State of New Hampshire express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization as intended in the Balfour Declaration so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this State.

Justice to Post Office Employees Demands Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to have set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Press-Telegram and Long Beach Sun, dated April 10, 1945, entitled "Justice for Postal Employees."

I believe this editorial is not only significant, it is representative of the expression, hope, and expectation of the taxpayers of our Nation. I am sure on the basis of the Post Office Department being one of public service that the people of this Nation do not expect it to operate at a net profit of $47,000,000—the reported profit for last year. Certainly, it is not fundamentally sound, economically or socially, to build up operating profits of a Federal department, such as the Post Office Department, when most, if not all, of its employees have not had a respectable increase in salary since 1925.

As bill H. R. 2071 comes to the floor of this great legislative body, I emphatically bespeak unanimously favorable approval to the desirable and necessary end that the postal employees and families of our Nation shall also have just treatment at the hands of this Congress. Such just treatment merely consists in us making certain that these hundreds of thousands of post office employees shall also be enabled to live at a level and standard of life which contributes to our national income, pride and security, instead of the reverse.

This powerfully and sincerely written editorial by one of my own home-town neighbors is as follows:

JUSTICE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

This Congress has a chance to rectify an unfortunate error made by the preceding Congress.

Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress, now in session, can and should act without delay on the bill granting postal employees the very modest pay increase of $1.30 a week over what they now are receiving, and they now are poorly paid by any normal standard of compensation.

But that is not the whole story: Unless this Congress acts, the men who carry the mail will actually have to take a pay cut of $6 a week—$6 subtracted from their already meager salaries. Six dollars taken from their pay are $6 taken from the postman's family budgets for necessities of decent living.

The $6 is a war bonus granted by Congress nearly 2 years ago, the first increase for postal employees since 1925, but this temporary, emergency allowance will expire next June, so that mail carriers and other post-office employees will drop back to the 1925 pay scale, with wartime prices to pay for all they buy, unless the bill for a permanent increase is passed by Congress.

Last year the House of Representatives passed the permanent pay increase for postal employees with only one dissenting vote. Near the close of the session the bill was beaten on a technicality in the Senate, and the hopes of the postmen and their families for some relief from their financial difficulties were dashed.

The mails are delivered in all seasons, in good weather and bad. The mails always go through. The American public is sure of service by the Post Office Department—a service more than ever important to the public in wartime. And last year the Post Office Department made a profit of $47,000,000. It is a good job the postmen are doing, and they are entitled to decent pay.

The postmen are looking to Congress for justice, and the public is watching Congress to make certain that this time there is no slip in this matter.

Raising of Fur-Bearing Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact into law H. R. 5295, relating to the domestic raising of certain fur-bearing animals.

Whereas fur farming is an important and valuable industry within Minnesota; and

Whereas the raising of pen-bred fox, mink, persian lamb, karakul, and chincilla is, in reality, an agricultural pursuit and the products of such fur farms are livestock, notwithstanding the fact that the Minnesota Legislature, for purposes of expedient administration and regulation, defines such animals as wild animals and polices the industry through the personnel of the division of game and fish; and

Whereas it is the belief of this legislature that great benefits can accrue to this valuable pursuit if the Federal agency concerned with the promotion of fur farming be designated as the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That Congress be urged to take such steps as are necessary to enact into law H. R. 2115, which provides that the breeding, raising, producing, or marketing of the animals herein referred to shall be deemed an agricultural pursuit under the jurisdiction of the Federal Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

C. ELMER JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE W. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 9th day of April in the year of our Lord 1945.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 13th day of April in the year of our Lord 1945.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved April 17, 1945.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Hero of Nazi Prison Camp Proves War Department Test of Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I include in the RECORD a news story from Federated Press correspondent Herbert A. Klein who is with the Seventh Army in Germany. This story is only one among hundreds which tells of the brutal and inhuman treatment of American prisoners of war by the most brutal of all systems, National Socialism in Germany.

Yet this story tells something more. It relates how an American private who has devoted most of his adult life to fighting tyranny and preserving democracy, became a hero among all this Nazi brutality. This soldier of democracy, Pvt. (1st cl.) John H. Dunn, Jr., is credited with keeping the morale of his fellow prisoners from crumbling. Armed by the power of his own enlightened belief in democracy, he held off the full terror of the Nazi brutality.

I call attention to this story because John Dunn was the chief editor of Federated Press, the only daily labor press service in this country, and as such was one of the leaders in labor journalism in the United States before he entered the Army. Before that he was a labor organizer.

Because of his devotion to labor and his positions of leadership in the labor movement, Private Dunn fell within that great body of patriotic and intelligent Americans termed "subversive" by the former Dies committee and others of small minds who are quick to place that brand upon those who advocate progress for the American working man and woman.

Had his opinions been used as the guide rather than his loyalty; had the War Department adopted the "tests" of the Dies committee instead of its own common-sense standards, John Dunn might never have had the opportunity of doing the tremendous service he did his fellow prisoners of war.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and because of the great service Private Dunn has rendered his fellow American prisoners, I include the following Federated Press news story in the RECORD:

FEDERATED PRESS NEWS EDITOR HERO AMONG YANKS LIBERATED FROM NAZI PRISON CAMP

(By Herbert A. Klein)

WITH THE SEVENTH ARMY AT BAD ORB, GERMANY.—The story of how thousands of American prisoners of war, living amid indescribable conditions of filth and starvation, were saved from plunging into complete mental apathy by the efforts of one of the prisoners—Pvt. (1st cl.) John H. Dunn, Jr., news editor of Federated Press on leave—was revealed with the liberation of Stalag 9–B, Nazi prison camp near here.

War correspondents who arrived at the camp the day of its liberation by onrushing American forces were told by his fellow prisoners that Dunn, older than most of them, was chiefly responsible for keeping up their morale and helping them through the horrible 4 months of their imprisonment.

Dunn, who has been in the Infantry for 2 years, was one of several thousand American soldiers captured by the Nazis in the Ardennes offensive in December on the Belgian and Luxemburg fronts.

GIVEN STARVATION DIET

The Bad Orb prison camp, a 400-foot-square barbed-wire enclosure, housed 6,500 Allied soldiers, including 3,200 Americans. They were billeted in 18 flimsy, rotting wooden buildings, one of which was occupied by 160 men The daily diet was less than 260 calories—below the starvation level. It consisted of watery soup, ersatz bread, indigestible cheese, and a vile coffee substitute all served in microscopic portions.

Brought to the camp after a gruelling 2-week journey in a boxcar jammed with Yank prisoners, Dunn looked over his surroundings and announced: "I'm not going to just rot here." A former American Newspaper Guild organizer, Dunn set about organizing recreational and educational activities for his colleagues.

TELLS HISTORY FROM MEMORY

First he started a weekly forum in which he delivered from memory 31 lectures on American history, attended by 50 to 100 P. O. W.'s in an ice-cold hall. In order to heat the place endurably, P. O. W.'s from each barrack contributed 2 sticks of firewood from their scanty stores.

Dunn then branched out and established a forum program attended by as many as a thousands of the prisoners. Deep in Naziland the half-starved men discussed such issues as the postwar world and the GI bill of rights. A quiz program was arranged with the winner getting two cigarets, worth 200 francs or $4 each at Bad Orb rates. The winner was Pvt. Kachedar Aredizian, of Pawtucket, R. I., who exchanged both cigarets for one slice of sawdusty black bread.

Dunn also set up an English reading corner in which the only 13 English books in the entire camp were carefully guarded and rationed out so that all the Yanks could get a chance at them.

ISSUES OWN NEWSPAPER

Together with two others newspapermen, Ed Uzmak of the Chicago Times and Dennis Murray of the Chicago Tribune, Dunn got out a wall newspaper written in pencil with hand-drawn maps. They got their news from a radio smuggled into the camp by British prisoners piece by piece and successfully concealed from the Nazi guards.

Howard Byrne, Stars and Stripes reporter and a member of the Newspaper Guild of New York, devoted a big part of his report on the Bad Orb camp to praising Dunn, who he said had lost a good deal of weight and looked like Lincoln. Other correspondents who inspected the camp agreed that it was one of the worst hell holes the Nazis devised for Allied prisoners.

FOUR HUNDRED DIE

Four hundred of the Bad Orb inmates died before the camp was liberated. Among them were 36 Americans. Those who survived were virtually skin and bones, clad in rags, many of them too weak to walk. There were only 2 American doctors to care for them with hopelessly inadequate medical facilities. Sanitation facilities in the building which housed 160 prisoners consisted of 1 rusty water tap. The toilet was a hole in the floor. There were no soap and towels.

Dunn, a charter member of the Guild, worked on every important daily paper in northern Ohio and was responsible for organizing many of the papers there. He became an international representative of the A. N. G. in 1938 and in the early part of 1939 became assistant editor of the Guild Reporter. He joined the Federated Press staff in April 1942.

Father Pleads for Lasting Peace To Justify Soldier Son's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a message written by Mr. and Mrs. H. McKenna, of Kirkland, Wash., following the recent death of their son, Jack, in Germany. It is a thought-provoking message, and I request that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The article is as follows:

We sincerely thank the many friends whose thoughtful kindness has been of so much help since the telegram came telling of Jack's death in action.

We have been comforted by many letters of sympathy and almost everyone expressed the wish that the writer could do something tangible to help us.

We are taking this means of thanking you and of telling you that you can help us.

You can help not only us, but also the families of the five other boys from Kirkland who gave up their precious lives in action the same week.

Not only those, but also the families of the 100,000 American men struck down by the hand of war in the same month and the thousands who died or were mutilated before that month and those who will be in the months ahead.

We want more than anything else to feel that their young lives were expended not only in defense of our great land but that they were part of the necessary price for a better world, a world in which the sons of other parents can live out their normal lives constructively, free from the toll of war.

Jack believed with firm conviction in the possibility of such a world, a world under universal law.

Millions of the men of our generation died to win such a world, but we who lived on, by our apathy failed to secure it.

So we watch our sons go out to die.

Once again the ransom has been paid, in blood.

Once again history, with more tolerance than we deserve, holds out to us the opportunity to so organize universal cooperation that men everywhere may live in peace and friendship.

Let us not again by indifference and complacency, let the opportunity pass by.

We common people must insist, in season and out, that our leaders truly lead.

We must insist that the first priority on their gifts and talents shall be the abolition of war as a means of settling issues between nations.

The living men of Lincoln's day did indeed proceed, though with many a faltering step, with the task which "those who died so nobly advanced" and they gave us national unity under law:.

We must do no less, else once again we be traitors to our loved ones who die, and to the little children, the men and women of tomorrow.

Let us start by writing the members of the American delegation to San Francisco, strengthening them with our support and insisting that they give their all to the solemn task before them. They are: Dean Virginia Crocheron Gildersleeve, Barnard College, New York City; Senator Vandenberg, Washington, D. C.; Secretary of State Stettinius, Washington, D. C.; Senator Tom Connally, Washington, D. C.; Congressman Sol Bloom, Washington, D. C.; Congressman Charles Eaton, Washington, D. C.; and Mr. Cordell Hull, Washington, D. C.

A Soldier's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of an essay written by Pvt. Martin A. Watkins, of Nashville, Tenn. This essay on the subject, What to Do With Japan, recently was awarded first place in a theater-wide contest, and Private Watkins was awarded a $500 War bond.

The essay follows:

Our actions toward Japan must be founded upon a determination to insure to the peoples of the Pacific, and consequently to the peoples of the world, freedom from war. To that end, a three-point program shall be instituted as our forces occupy Japan.

First, in order to destroy the roots of the Japanese disease of conquest, the war guilty shall be quickly tried and punished. The Japanese Fleet, Air Force, and Army shall be denuded of all power. Militaristic, nationalistic, and Fascist organizations shall be suppressed and their assets turned over to democratic forces within Japan. By granting as rapidly as possible full freedom to the Filipinos, the Koreans, and to the other subjected peoples of the Pacific, and by dealing with them on a plane of equality, we shall give the lie to the Japanese pan-Asiatic propaganda that this is a war between the yellow race and the white race.

Second, to prevent the development of her war power, Japan shall be deprived of her colonies, from which she obtains the raw

materials necessary to wage war. In addition, a system of control shall be established over strategic industries within Japan. Adequate measures of force to remedy violations will be made available.

Third, we will institute a system of education designed to teach the Japanese to think and act independently, unemotionally, and judiciously. They shall be taught to live and let live; to settle differences democratically, around a conference table, or in courts of justice, and not in the field of battle. By intercourse with the peace-loving nations which surround her—China, Korea, the Philippines, Russia, Canada, the United States, and Latin America—the education of the Japanese people will be continuous.

When they have realized that the treachery of Pearl Harbor, the attack upon China, the enslavement of the peoples of the Pacific, and the alliance with the Nazi-Fascist Axis were acts of national disgrace, then—and not until then—will the Japanese people be considered eligible for self-government and for membership in the world council of peace-loving nations.

American Legion Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on the 8th day of April 1945, at Iola, Kans., the Second Kansas District, American Legion assembled in convention.

One of the resolutions adopted at that convention was in protest against the War Department's policy of commissioning Communists in the United States Army. That resolution is as follows:

Whereas it is the firm belief and conviction of the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, that the Communist Party and similar groups believe in and teach principles contrary to the Constitution of the United States and in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, is further convinced that only those who can without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States should be commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, is further convinced that those who believe in the principles of the Communist Party and similar groups cannot without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Second District American Legions, Department of Kansas, That it is contrary to our form of government that those who are known to belong to the Communist Party or similar groups be commissioned as officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Kansas, be earnestly urged to adopt a similar resolution to be sent to the national convention at its 1945 convention, containing a request to the proper authorities prohibiting the commissioning of those known to be members of the Communist Party or similar groups as commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator CLYDE M. REED, and Representative ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

Among other resolutions which so well express the thoughts of these Kansas Legionnaires are the following:

Defeat of Germany and Japan will no more secure the peace than did defeat of the Kaiser 25 years ago, unless we are willing to pay the price of a sound and continuing peace set in a framework of world order in which other races, other systems of government, and other philosophies of life must have their part. In order to attain this purpose, we believe our interests can be best served by the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented by whatever force may be necessary to preserve world peace.

We believe that the security and peace of this Nation, after victory, depends upon the maintenance of a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, with an adequate Reserve force.

We again endorse the principle of universal military training and urge the Congress to enact suitable legislation in furtherance of same.

We again demand that the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese leaders responsible for this terrible war be brought to justice and punished for their terrible deeds, just as would be any other criminal.

We well realize that this country has become and remained great due to our system of free enterprise and the rights of the individual under law. We must remain a government of laws and not of men. We, therefore, reaffirm our faith in the American system of government and the American way of life.

We again urge upon the people of the United States that strikes be reduced to a minimum in order that our war efforts be not impeded in any way whatsoever.

That all aliens now residing in or hereinafter entering the United States be required to take out citizenship papers in a period of years subsequently to be determined by the Congress and on failure so to do to be deported.

Mr. Speaker, these resolutions for the most part are not new or strange, but embody the thoughts of the American Legion for a quarter of a century, and are parts of a program that, had the American Legion suggestion been followed, might have avoided our entrance into this war and eliminated many of the un-American conditions which have sprung up in our midst.

At Last—For Billy Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on April 27, 1945, entitled "At Last—For Billy Mitchell":

AT LAST—FOR BILLY MITCHELL

Twenty years too late, Billy Mitchell, who lies buried in Milwaukee's Forest Home Cemetery, is apparently going to get the honor and promotion he deserved in 1925.

It is plain enough to everyone now, including those high officers of the Army who fought Billy Mitchell at every turn—that air power is an absolute essential of any adequate national defense. So it is well enough to do the only thing that can be done at this late date—try to erase the injustice that was done to a most courageous and patriotic American.

Congress ought to admit publicly by bestowing on Mitchell the Congressional Medal of Honor and the rank of major general, that a costly mistake was made in turning a deaf ear to this air leader's warnings. The honors are due, even though Mitchell did, in his frustration and deep conviction, overstep the bounds of military propriety.

There is more here than simply vindicating General Mitchell. At the end of the last war, most Americans, including military men who had helped to win it, went to sleep on questions of defense development. Mitchell, awake and alert, irritated them no end. We paid an awful price, barely escaping defeat this time, and in the end we had to do what Billy Mitchell said must be done.

As we correct our error and right a wrong, let's not forget the lesson.

Springfield, Mass., Republican Discusses Criticisms of Bretton Woods Agreements by Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, editorially the Springfield (Mass.) Republican has discussed some of the criticisms of the Bretton Woods agreement, and with unanimous consent, I am reproducing herewith two of these very informative editorials:

ONLY A START

The St. Louis banker who attacked the Bretton Woods proposals for an international stabilization fund, at a congressional committee hearing * * * saw a managed currency and, therefore, totalitarianism in it. Britain, the United States, and France maintained a currency stabilization fund for some years before the war began, in a period when the British were off the gold standard and operating on a managed currency basis. If the British do not desire to return to a rigid gold standard, they are acting at least on the basis of an experience which does not suggest to them anything resembling totalitarianism.

But at Bretton Woods the British delegation did yield much ground to the United States on the issue of the gold standard, while insisting successfully on retaining for themselves a degree of flexibility in currency valuation. Even so, what is there so terrible about that? The British can be depended upon, if any people can be, to be dead against international currency warfare and chaos.

Moreover, control of the value of a currency has been regarded in the past as an attribute of sovereignty. The American dollar was devalued in terms of gold, some 10 years ago, in accordance with the constitutional provision empowering Congress "to coin money, regulate the value thereof." It would have been hopeless at Bretton Woods to try to induce the 44 sovereign governments represented there to surrender wholly the control and regulation of the value of their own currencies.

The Bretton Woods program "only partially attacks the job of ending economic warfare," as was charged in his testimony at Washington by the critical W. Randolph Burgess, the New York banker. But the Bretton Woods proposals cannot be expected reasonably to do more than make a start. That is about all anyone expects the coming San Francisco Conference to accomplish toward the establishment of a world security organization in the political field.

Banker Burgess assumes the role of a perfectionist, therefore, in the following criticism:

"The Bretton Woods program only partially attacks the job of ending economic warfare between nations. It deals with currency depreciation and exchange controls, but no other powerful weapons of economic warfare are forbidden. Tariffs can be raised or lowered, quotas, embargoes, subsidies on production, export bounties, preferences, and bilateral agreements (outside the fund) can all be used. The fund provides only a start in dealing with economic warfare which could be made more effectively through the bank."

This criticism might be perfectly valid if the 44 sovereign nations would agree to let the proposed central international bank dictate to them, as borrowers, what their domestic economic policies and legislation should be.

It is impractical, however, to attempt any such dictation. There are numerous powerful countries like the United States and Britain that would not surrender control of their tariff legislation to an international credit institution, or the making of their own budgets of expenditures, or the payment of subsidies, or the imposition of embargoes.

The bankers whom Mr. Burgess represents would like to be able to tell a government asking for credit for any purpose to go balance its budget and cut its expenditures, first of all. But the times are not ripe, evidently, for such banker control of the domestic policies of the greater powers even if it were feasible—as it has been sometimes in the past—to force small impoverished and improvident governments to accept it for the sake of a loan.

The design lurking in the background of the banker criticism of Bretton Woods reveals, it appears, the extravagance of their real demands. These sovereign nations cannot be treated like hard-up individuals asking for a loan at the bank. That is a reason for the virtual compromise in the Bretton Woods proposals on the old gold standard and the freedom allowed within a certain range, for managed currencies such as the British demand. It is also a reason for not attempting to establish a system ranging far beyond currency depreciation and exchange controls and invading sovereign jurisdiction in domestic economies.

The best point yet suggested in favor of the Bretton Woods proposals may well be that they are "only a start in dealing with economic warfare."

BRETTON WOODS AND CONGRESS

The Bretton Woods financial agreements have withstood criticism better than might have been expected. * * *

The preparations for the Bretton Woods Conference last summer were most carefully made. For several months previously British monetary experts led by Lord Keynes had conferred at Washington with United States Treasury experts in order to find common ground for an agreement. At Bretton Woods delegates from over 40 nations assembled and threshed out the international currency problem from every point of view. Our own delegation included both Republicans and Democrats representing the Senate and House. After weeks of discussion and adjustment of contrary views, the nations at Bretton Woods compromised their differences and signed up. To reject or much modify the Bretton Woods agreement by structural amendments might imperil the whole undertaking, inasmuch as the changes would now have to be submitted to the other nations, 40 or more, for their acquiescence.

It is a structural amendment which a committee of the American Bankers Association has pressed with much insistence; and this, it may be added, embodies the most serious criticism of the Bretton Woods plan for financial reconstruction. While the bankers' committee has approved the proposed international bank with a capital of $9,100,000,000 to make loans for economic reconstruction, it has condemned as unnecessary the proposed international monetary fund of $8,800,000,000, designed especially to stabilize national currencies in relation to each other in world commerce. The bankers' committee would have the proposed bank take over the currency stabilization functions of the proposed fund.

On the merits of this highly technical issue we may observe that an impressive body of opinion among professional economists and qualified financiers is at variance with the opinion of the bankers' committee. Sixteeen out of eighteen former presidents of the American Economic Association have endorsed the Bretton Woods agreements unchanged. Of 250 American economists of recognized standing, who answered a questionnaire, 224 have taken the same position in a statement climaxed by the assertion: "It is very doubtful whether another agreement could be reached."

The highly reputable Committee on Economic Development, including both bankers and businessmen, has taken middle ground in its recent proposal to Congress. It would not abolish the international fund, preserving it for ordinary operations in currency stabilization. But it would permit the international bank also to make long-term currency stabilization loans, leaving the fund for strictly currency transactions to cover temporary shortages and tide over temporary emegencies. This proposal of the Committee on Economic Development accepts the currency stabilization fund in principle, certainly, while allowing the bank greater scope in its credit transactions.

The weight of expert American opinion obviously favors the Bretton Woods agreements unchanged, now that the bankers' committee has failed to command the unqualified support of the Committee on Economic Development. On this basis alone Congress may well approve the Bretton Woods bills as now drafted. In view of the opposition expressed in certain circles in Britain, which dislike the concession to the gold standard embodied in the agreements, Congress can hardly afford not to.

The disfavor for flexible managed currencies felt by monetary conservatives in this country explains much of the American criticism of the Bretton Woods proposals. Yet at Bretton Woods the British and other foreign delegations, which now favor managed currencies, agreed to recognize gold as a standard and to define their currencies in terms of it. That was important to the United States, which has a stock of gold valued at $22,000,000,000. The Bretton Woods plan, consequently, has a gold basis, even if it does not revive the old automatic gold standard with its rigid currency valuations in terms of gold.

What Is a Liberal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of April 25, 1945:

SOCIALIST ASKS: WHAT IS A LIBERAL ANYHOW?

(By Charles Yale Harrison)

All jokes aside, what is a liberal?

You come away from Beard and Parrington with a pretty clear idea of liberalism and the kind of people who used to call themselves liberals. But maybe that was before your time. Well, William Lloyd Garrison was a liberal; the lynching mob that ran him through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck were ignorant reactionaries. Lincoln was a liberal; Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun weren't. Clarence Darrow was a liberal, one of the best, and so was his friend, Governor Altgeld, of Illinois. You get the idea.

But when you case the current liberal lineup, things aren't so clear. You ask yourself, after putting down PM with a feeling of disgust, how liberals in the Government can bring themselves to ballyhoo for the May-Bailey labor-conscription bill. Or how a liberal like Archibald MacLeish can take to the air to justify the partition of Poland. Or how liberal editors can find it in their hearts to play footy with east-of-the-Vistula totalitarianism.

So back you go to the source books for a refresher course. And you come up with something simple like this: A liberal is one who stands for human freedom as opposed to tyranny. (Whenever you go back to first principles you always run into simple things like that.) A liberal is not bound by stuffed-shirt political, economic, or social tenets.

He is for greater, not less, personal and political freedom. He's agin' all forms of authoritarian government, no matter how adroitly its burgeoning power is masked with "progressive" smokescreens.

He is opposed to the concentration of power. He favors—and fights for—social and industrial democracy for Negroes; he is opposed to racial segregation, especially in the armed services of his country.

He is for labor, and together with Lincoln he believes that "the strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds."

By this definition, in this year of grace, you will agree that there are few liberals in America. Traditional American liberalism is a sad, emasculated thing these days, done in by totalitarian hatchmen during the past 15 years.

American Legion Protests War Department Directive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution recently adopted by a unanimous vote by Tom Schwinn Post, No. 90, the American Legion, Wellington, Kans.:

Whereas there has been issued a certain directive, identified as being verbal orders transmitted over the telephone from some spot in Government higher than the Secretary of War, creating a new policy in our armed forces, which permits a person who is loyal 49 percent to an alien power and 51 percent loyal to the United States, to become a commissioned officer; and

Whereas these so-called 51-percent loyal American officers would be entrusted with the lives of our American boys while in battle on the land, on the sea, and in the air; and

Whereas the American Legion is diligently endeavoring to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism in the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That Tom Schwinn Post, No. 90, the American Legion, Wellington, Kans., bitterly protests this un-American directive and demands that it be rescinded at once; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and to each of our Senators and Representatives from Kansas to the Congress of the United States.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a news item appearing in the Belleville (Ill.) Daily Advocate on April 25, 1945, dealing with the postal reclassification bill now before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads:

MAIL PATRONS REQUEST BOOST IN POSTAL EMPLOYEES' SALARIES

Mail patrons of Belleville are joining others throughout the Nation in requesting their Congressmen and Senators to act favorably upon a bill which would increase the salaries of postal employees.

Postal employees who have not had an increase in salary in 20 years and who during the depression years suffered a 27-percent decrease are being paid a temporary bonus of $5.76 a week during the present emergency, but the bonus arrangement expires June 30.

Their request, which is contained in the bill before both branches of the National Legislature, is for a pay increase of $7.69 a week to replace the bonus, an actual boost of only $1.93 a week over the present bonus.

Postal employees in the past decade have given faithful and efficient cooperation toward the success of the N. R. A., the soldiers' bonus bonds distribution, the unemployment census, alien registration, War bond drivers, and other projects, all without extra pay.

Despite inadequate earning power and with hundreds of fellow employees in the armed services, they still cheerfully strive to serve the public satisfactorily by bringing prompt delivery of V-mail, business and personal mail.

Many patrons of the post office are unaware that there are men working in the Postal Service whose annual base pay is only $1,200, that 5 percent of their salary is deducted to pay toward their retirement, that postal receipts have increased $200,000,000 since 1941, but that the huge boost did not mean a raise in pay for them; that they are paid entirely from receipts and not from general taxes; that they are not exempt from Federal income taxes, contrary to belief of many people; and that they receive less per hour for overtime than for regular work.

People of Belleville and the local area can help their postal employees obtain a better standard of salaries by writing to their Congressmen and Senators, urging them to vote favorably upon the bill.

A Detroiter Who Made Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD with devotion to an old friend, Alvin R. Meissner, an interesting news article from the Washington Sunday Star of April 29 by James Waldo Fawcett:

Alvin R. Meissner, head designer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, will retire tomorrow.

This announcement, released for publication last night, signifies the end of a professional career of great importance to philately.

Mr. Meissner was the artist responsible for a long list of stamps.

Born on April 3, 1875, he received his education and training in the public schools. Melchor's Drawing School, and Paulis and Giles' Art School in Detroit. The practical experience he required was gained in the plants of the Detroit Lithographic Co. and the Calvert Lithographing Co., both famous establishments.

Mr. Meissner came to Washington to serve as a designer and engraver in the Geological Survey in 1905. He went to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing as assistant to C. A. Huston, head designer, in 1925, and succeeded his chief in 1933.

The first postage stamp on which Mr. Meissner worked was the 10-cent Lindbergh air mail of 1927. His drawing was perfected under Mr. Huston's watchful eye, but it was distinctively his own achievement and should be listed as one of his productions.

Next in order and the first of Mr. Meissner's independent compositions was the 5-cent Sherman Hill beacon air mail of 1928. He then assisted Mr. Huston in designing the beautiful 2-cent and 5-cent International Aeronautic Conference labels of 1928 and the scarce 65-cent, $1.30, and $2.60 *Graf Zeppelin* adhesives of 1930.

Meanwhile, Mr. Meissner alone produced the design for the 2-cent Edison lamp stamp, 1929, and, although it not commonly is credited to him, the 2-cent Ohio Canal commemorative, 1929.

All the postage-due stamps of 1930, from one-half cent to $5, likewise were Mr. Meissner's exclusively. So were the 5-cent winged globe air mail of 1930, the 8-cent edition of the same design in 1932, the 6-cent edition in 1934, and the 30-cent edition in 1939.

The commemoratives for which Mr. Meissner was responsible include: 2-cent Braddock's Field and 2-cent Von Steuben, 1930; 2-cent Pulaski and 2-cent Red Cross, 1931; 1-, 4-, 5-, and 10-cent Washington Bicentennial, 2-cent ski jumper, Olympic Games, and 2-cent Arbor Day, 1932; 3-cent Newburgh, 1933; 3-cent Maryland, 1934; 3-cent San Diego, 3-cent Michigan, and 25-cent China Clipper, 1935; 3-cent Alamo, 3-cent Arkansas, 3-cent Oregon Territory, and 3-cent Rhode Island, 1936; 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-cent Navy, 1936–37; 3-cent Constitution Sesquicentenary, and 3-cent Hawaii, 1937; 3-cent Delaware and 3-cent Iowa, 1938; 3-cent Washington's Inaugural Sesquicentenary, and 3-cent Northwest States, 1939; 3-cent Wyoming, 1940, and 3-cent Vermont, 1941.

Other productions, for which Mr. Meissner is recorded in the annals of the Bureau were many internal-revenue issues, including the green, red, and blue liquor stamps and the District of Columbia liquor stamps—all denominations. He was associated with Mr. Houston in designing the 1928 series of bank notes from $1 to $10,000. It also is understood that he worked on the United States Savings bonds, series E and F, from $10 to $10,000; many Philippine bonds and stamps, and many other Government securities, commissions, citations, and diplomas.

Mr. Meissner is a member of the Washington Philatelic Society, the Collectors Club of Washington, the Washington Numismatic Society, and the Masonic Trowel Club of Washington. He has been treasurer of the Michigan State Society for a long time. In retirement, he says he intends to play, draw, do some oil painting, and in other ways keep consistently busy. His home is at 3507 Center Street NW.

Junction of Governments in San Francisco for World Security and Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, again I have pride in including as part of my remarks an editorial written by a neighbor of mine in my home city of Long Beach, which appeared in the Press-Telegram and Long Beach Sun under date of April 24, 1945.

The other day when the news of the junction of the American and Russian Armies in Germany was announced on the floor of this House, there was very appropriately expressed pride and satisfaction. In the presence of that great significant event there was no middle isle in this great legislative body separating the majority and the minority political parties. With one accord we burst forth in unanimous encore and approval. But that junction in Germany of the might of our armies with that of Russia's was not only significant in a military sense, it was also symbolic in signifying a purpose and cooperation between great peoples of the world, in terms of world solidarity for the purpose of peace. Wars must cease! The purpose of mankind is not blunder but peace. America has planted her feet firmly on the pathway to peace for many years. Other nations have likewise placed their national footsteps on the same pathway to enduring peace.

The San Francisco Conference is the essence of the determination of mankind for the purpose of getting together and living together, instead of staying apart and destroying one another. The nations of the world have no choice in this regard. It is either learn to live together as neighbors, or live separately and selfishly and to eventually leap at one another's throats again with the might of armies and for the purpose of destruction.

This editorial is a sincere expression of the same thought which I have here extemporaneously enunciated and represents the high thinking of the people of my city.

JUNCTION ALSO IN SAN FRANCISCO

Junction of American and Russian Armies in Germany has been eagerly awaited as an event of high drama symbolical of the defeat of Hitler's Third Reich.

As Soviet troops moving from the east meet United States troops moving from the west, their juncture means completion of Germany's conquest, except for Berlin, the so-called Nazi redoubt in the Bavarian Alps and other isolated centers of German resistance.

Junction of the allies from the west and the Russians from the east has a much greater meaning than its strictly military significance. It is the sign nd dramatization of the unity of the Big Three of the United Nations which has produced victory over the Axis—victory that is nearly accomplished in Europe and well on its way in Asia.

There is no answer to the question as to whether Russia, Britain, or the United States was the decisive force in breaking Nazi Germany, except that no one of them is to be so credited. The combination did it. Victory could not have been won if the British people, standing alone as Winston Churchill says, had not carried on after Dunkerque and through the aerial blitz; it could not have been won if the Russians had not withstood the wehrmacht at Moscow and Stalingrad; it could not have been won if the United States had not thrown its matchless resources of manpower and materials into the scales on the side of freedom.

The junction means even more than all of this. It signifies the unity of purpose and the will to cooperate, in spite of some unavoidable differences, which are essential to establishing the peace. It is a happy augury that the soldiers of the United Nations are coming together as comrades on the field of victory as the architects and artisans of a world peace structure assemble at San Francisco for their fateful sessions. The assignment at the Golden Gate is to effect a junction of constructive purposes.

Surpluses: Rubber's Approaching Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by P. W. Litchfield, chairman of the board, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.:

SURPLUSES: RUBBER'S APPROACHING PROBLEM

After years of close association with the business, I am constantly impressed by two outstanding attributes of rubber:

1. It is one of America's greatest necessities and most comforting boons.

2. It is a continuous and unfailing source of highly perplexing problems.

The greatest problem it has ever brought to us arose out of the seizure of areas producing 90 percent of our supply. Through outstanding effort America solved that problem by creating the existing synthetic-rubber industry, thereby averting the threat of a military and economic collapse.

Having solved the problem of no rubber, we thereby created a future problem of too much rubber. The latter is not to become acute until after the rubber growing areas of Malaya and the East Indies are liberated but, sooner or later, inevitably it will be upon us.

Already the British and Dutch, who will regain control of these rubber-growing areas, are giving this impending problem of surplus very earnest consideration. Certainly it is not too early for America, dominant in its control of synthetic supply, to do some thinking in that direction; vital American interests are involved.

It appears that this approaching post-war problem will naturally divide itself into two distinct phases:

1. The situation during the first year or two after liberation of the rubber growing areas;

2. The situation thereafter when supply and demand approach a more normal balance in their relationship.

The following world figures, based upon informed estimates, illuminate both of these phases:

After liberation of rubber-growing areas

[Long tons]

	First year	Second year	Third year
Natural rubber available	350,000	900,000	1,400,000
Capacity of synthetic plants	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Total potential supply	1,650,000	2,200,000	2,700,000
World capacity of manufacturing facilities for the processing of this supply	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000

Thus, whereas our synthetic industry now gives us the high hand in the matter of supply, the balance will change to the point where the supply of natural rubber will be equal to or in excess of our capacity for the production of synthetic.

Based upon the present knowledge, the natural rubber tire is superior to an all-synthetic tire. It appears, however, that when natural and synthetic rubber are used 50–50 the resultant average tire compares favorably with the best we have ever produced.

It is highly important to America, therefore, that we be allotted a fair share of the available natural rubber in those first 2 years. (If the British should elect to keep that available supply for their own uses, or if we should elect to restrict the use of natural rubber through a desire to protect our synthetic industry, we would be at a distinct disadvantage in the quality of some of the tires and other rubber products offered by the American rubber industry. No one seriously believes either Nation would be so short-sighted.)

We can see from the above figures, however, that there will not be sufficient natural rubber for a 50–50 use until the end of the second year. Meanwhile, the pent-up demand for rubber products will require capacity production on the part of our rubber products manufacturing facilities and a large percentage of the output of our synthetic plants.

International agreements, based upon fairness to all concerned, are certainly going to be in order during this first phase of the post-war rubber problem.

* * * * *

Discussions preliminary to such agreements inevitably will introduce the second phase problems, that is, the relationship between synthetic and natural rubber after the potential supply of natural becomes fully available.

At this point, the two most important considerations for America to keep in mind are these:

1. The need to preserve sufficient facilities for the production of synthetic rubber so that we will never again be at the complete mercy of other nations in the matter of rubber supply.

2. The need to provide maximum service and value to the American consumer of rubber goods.

The first of these main considerations is fixed. It means that a high percentage of our synthetic plants must be kept in condition, operating to the extent that their output can be economically utilized but always ready to produce in great quantity should the need arise.

The second point must wait for its final basis until the big question as between synthetic and natural rubber is answered by proven price and performance of post-war tires and other rubber products.

Other considerations of less gravity than the first two, but still of high importance in the American viewpoint might be listed as follows:

Price stability for the American rubber industry. (In the past, with the market price of our basic commodity fluctuating between $1.25 per pound and 3 cents per pound in a matter of 7 years, a highly unstable and hazardous condition was created.)

Avoidance, so far as possible, of a serious impairment of the foundations of the economy of the rubber-growing areas of the east.

Protection for the principles of free competitive enterprise in world trade, with Government controls and cartel restrictions held to a minimum.

Encouragement for the nations of tropical America now interested in developing sources of natural rubber as a part of their own expanding economy.

* * * * *

Obviously there is some fundamental conflict among these considerations, so let us explore some of the possibilities for adjusting them. And please bear in mind that what follows is primarily for the purpose of suggestion rather than the expression of fixed convictions.

In certain respects the problems within the separate fields of synthetic and natural rubber are somewhat similar.

Each competes with the other.

In the field of natural rubber, high cost and low-yield plantations compete with high yield and low-cost plantations.

In the field of synthetic rubber, high-cost plants which utilize the grain-alcohol base, compete with lower-cost plants using the petroleum base.

Small privately operated native farms compete with large corporate plantations.

In the interest of the greatest value for the ultimate consumer of tires and other rubber products, the possibility of eliminating both the high-cost plantations and the high-cost synthetic plants, with an attendant reduction of the surplus of supply, naturally suggests itself.

It has been estimated that as much as 25 percent of our excess capacity for the production of synthetic rubber can be converted over ultimately to the production of materials which will be required in the expanding field of plastics. Thus, it would be removed from competition with natural rubber and with synthetic rubber.

It is certain that some part of the existing synthetic industry will be required for products in the field of oil and acid-resistance—a field in which natural rubber cannot compete with synthetic.

With an expanding world economy, with a pronounced trend toward new uses for rubber, we may confidently look forward to a steadily increasing world demand for rubber in the first decade after the war. (It is well to remember that in the quarter century from 1914 to 1939, world consumption of rubber increased from 119,643 tons to 1,107,818 tons.)

As I have pointed out in previous notes on America's rubber industry, the presence of large supplies of rubber at stable prices will, in and of itself, stimulate our natural inventiveness to find more uses for that supply.

Belief in the advisability of continuing the development of natural rubber in tropical America may seem inconsistent with the facts of a great world surplus of supply. It is not likely that natural rubber produced in the Western Hemisphere can compete pricewise with that grown most economically in the Far East. However, the comparatively higher wage levels in this hemisphere may be partially off-set by the development of high yielding stocks—more rubber per tree with less labor involved in its production. Furthermore, its production should be encouraged as a part of private farming operations affording the farmer supplementary cash for his part-time effort. In this way, the farmers need not be bound so closely by cost-accounting practices found necessary in large commercial operations. Success of such a program would expand trade between the United States and the nations of tropical America with a consequent benefit to their economy.

In this connection it is well to remember that synthetic rubber in many rubber products requires blending with natural rubber to obtain best results. The natural rubber we have been able to obtain from Ceylon and other uncaptured sources, has tided us over the emergency this time, but even Ceylon could be closed to us in some future war in the Far East.

In the foregoing I have undertaken to outline as simply as possible some of the salient facts of the international rubber situation. There are many ramifications of a technical, economic, and political nature which have not been touched upon here but will call for consideration in the international conferences to come.

Some of the most important factors involved can be treated only in principle since their settlement in detail must await the processes of time and experience.

But be that as it may, the rubber problem is rapidly approaching and we should prepare. It is heavily vested with conflicting international interests. It needs to be approached in a spirit of good will and sympathetic understanding by all parties concerned. There should be a wholesome willingness to strive for improvement of the quality and value of both natural and synthetic to the end that the products and services of rubber may be made available to more people and that the consuming public be given consistently higher standards of living. On that basis, the broadest and most enduring interests will be served in the end.

We are in a strong bargaining position with our control of the synthetic industry. But much of our hope for permanent world peace will depend upon the economic health and cooperation of all non-aggressive nations. We should shape our course in the matter of rubber to that end.

Resolution of St. Louis Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the St. Louis Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies:

This is to certify that the St. Louis Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, representing 87 parish branches with a membership of over 20,000, at its regular quarterly meeting on March 20, 1945, held at St. Matthew's Parish Hall, did unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas without the recognition and guidance of Almighty God there can be no just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas the sacrifices of our Nation shall have been in vain unless the moral law govern human relationship, the rights of the individual be assured, oppressed people be protected, the rights of minorities be secured, an international organization be created to maintain peace with justice, international economic cooperation be fostered, and a just social order based on these principles be organized within each state: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the representatives of the Holy Name Societies of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Union, urge the representatives of our country to advocate the recognition and adherence to these principles at all conferences for the establishment of peace and a just world order; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization and a copy be transmitted to the President of the United States, the representatives of this Nation to the San Francisco Conference, to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Missouri, and to the national office of the National Conference of Catholic Men."

ST. LOUIS ARCHDIOCESAN
UNION HOLY NAME SOCIETIES,
By E. M. RUDDY, *President*.

Attest:

JOSEPH H. SIEVERS, *Secretary*.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial to the late President Roosevelt:

The Akron Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., in regular session assembled on April 13, 1945, passed the following memorial in memory of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

"The Akron Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., on behalf of all the local unions represented on the council, publicly expresses its profound grief over the death of our friend and President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"The untimely death of Franklin Roosevelt constitutes an irreparable loss not only to the people of the United States but to the people of the world.

"Franklin Roosevelt was a man of destiny. His ideals, vision, and principles pointed toward a better world. Although all of the people of the United States are indebted to him for what he has done, labor owes a particular debt of gratitude to his memory. Through the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, legislation was enacted for the first time in history guaranteeing labor's right to organize and bargain collectively, prescribing maximum hours of work and minimum rates of pay, providing for unemployment compensation, social security, and many other beneficial principles of law.

"The leadership, the charity, the vision, and the personality of Franklin Roosevelt have been enshrined upon the hearts of men. He demonstrated his interest in the betterment of the common man.

"In the midst of world conflict, Franklin Roosevelt had drawn the blueprint for a world organization to prevent aggression and to preserve world peace. An obligation rests upon organized labor to perpetuate the ideals for which President Roosevelt struggled and died. An obligation likewise rests upon organized labor to carry out the plans which he had made to insure a lasting and just peace in the world."

TO PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Sleep, soldier, sleep! A selfish world,
That oft its cruel venom hurled,
Shall hurt no more. A gentler voice,
A warmer hand, bids you rejoice.
The Master to his faithful son,
Welcomes with "Enter!" and "Well done!"
E'en as to you, did they to me,
We suffered for humanity!"
Sleep, soldier, sleep!

Rest, comrade, rest! The muffled bells,
The furrowed brow our anguish tells.
On anxious face a void is shown,
In upward glance and stifled moan;
While eager eyes the future scans,
To seek the Destiny that's Man's,
Far from you comes that challenge clear,
"You've naught but Fear itself to fear!"
Rest, comrade, rest!

Pause, dreamer, pause! The fight you fought,
The battles won, the goals you sought,
Fresh courage brings to those who seek
And succor gives to faint and weak;
The Light you shed down untrod ways
Undaunted faith to all displays;
More freely breathes your native land,
Because you tried to understand.
Pause, dreamer, pause!

Crusader, rise! The veil is drawn!
Before you lies the visioned dawn!
The Night of hate and fear and wrong,
Has vanished with the victors song!
For Right has triumphed over Might!
The spirit freed in joy's delight!
And Love, that bled and ceaseless gave,
Rolls back the stone, from futile grave!
"Crusader! Rise!"

—*Nicholas J. Richards.*

Continuance of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Ways and Means is now having extensive hearings on legislation authorizing the continuance of our reciprocal trade agreements.

This is one of the most important measures pending in Congress, and it would be tragic if it should be defeated.

A very thoughtful and enlightening editorial appeared in the Dallas News on April 20 upon this subject, and under leave granted, it is submitted herewith:

TARIFF ISSUE AGAIN

Most of the muddled thinking of the world comes from our practice of calling things by their concrete manifestations and overlooking the real objects. This was a weakness of the medical profession through many ages. They doctored the symptoms instead of the disease; and they made little progress until scientific research got them past this technique. Because our political and economic

problems are less tangible than human disease we are going to have more difficulty in getting past the symptoms in our thinking about cures.

The issue of isolation is a good example. Fortunately a large majority is now opposed to isolation, but unfortunately there are evidences that a large part of this majority does not know what isolation means. In their minds the sheep are separated from the goats on the issue of whether we should join in armed conflict to save democracy for the world. That is good as far as it goes, but it is skin-deep thinking.

The beginning of isolation is the erection of obstructions to international trade. The ending is war. There is no consistency in being a cooperationist in war and an isolationist in peace. Yet leaders of the Republican Party met with President Truman a few days ago to express their willingness to go along with him in the great task of guiding this country through the international efforts to obtain permanent peace, and at the same time other members of the party were letting the House Ways and Means Committee know that they were unalterably opposed to tariff reductions. They do not even want a continuation of the reciprocal trade treaties that were partly effective in lowering tariff duties during Secretary of State Hull's tenure of office.

It is difficult to understand why the Republican Party continues to stand by this policy. There was a time when it was good shortsighted policy, even if bad in the long run. But it is not ever good shortsighted policy any more. Whatever national profit is derived from a high tariff policy must come while our own tariffs are high and the other nations' are low. It builds up what used to be called a favorable trade balance. But before the outbreak of the war we were no longer exceptional in our tariff policy. Even traditionally free-trade Britain had been forced to adopt it in part, and the dictator countries were running riot with their tariffs, embargoes, export subsidies, and other forms of trade interference. Now we learn that even the Latin-American countries are adopting tariff policies. If the pre-war trend continues in the post-war period, it will be a completely tariffized world, which will mean that it will be a world of completely isolationist national policies.

The nation with the greatest opportunity to reverse this trend is the United States. Both the material and psychological effects would be impressive if the United States should in the future stand consistently by a free trade policy. It is true that our present tariffs cannot be eliminated abruptly. But the renewal of the reciprocal trade treaties would permit a continuation of a reform that has already made some progress. Any other action will have world-wide disastrous effects.

Humanity Mourns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an editorial under the caption "Humanity mourns." This editorial was published in the Nashville Tennesseean on April 13, following the death of President Roosevelt.

Written by Mr. Jennings Perry in the first few hours after the death flash went over the wires, this editorial has been reprinted and widely distributed in answer to many requests.

The editorial follows:

HUMANITY MOURNS

As to all it must death has come to Franklin D. Roosevelt, beloved President of the United State, one of humanity's great leaders, the first spirit of the world of his times.

His own countrymen were fortunate in him. The peoples looked to him from the ends of the earth. He is wept wherever there are firesides. He is honored wherever men have aspired to lift the common lot. He was to the lowly a pillar, to the mighty a peer. He saw with the vision of all who have loved and respected their fellowmen, his purpose was to turn human genius to the broadest realization of human hopes; his courage and strength—God send—abide in the hearts of the generation with whom he shared them to the end.

The shock of this great man's death is upon all circumstances and men and numbs the processes of thought. It does not lessen the actual impact that indications as well as probabilities have prepared the event. The increasing labors, of increasing scope, to which the President had given himself as our Nation, and all the world, struggled to the climax of its war against war wrote in the lines of his familiar face for all to see. His last appearance in the well of Congress, to account to the people for his acts as their spokesman and servant in the councils of the United Nations and to bespeak the understanding and support of the representatives, revealed the extent time and care had worn, not indeed upon his mind or spirit, but upon his crippled body.

The President may or may not have slipped away to rest with some surmise that it might be his last at his favorite retreat in the South. So well furnished a mind would have faced long ago the fact of mortality. Yet to a man so habitually virile, of so philosophical a cheerfulness, so resilient and eager, the prospect of a termination would have had to stand on its proof.

He came to Warm Springs keenly conscious of the march of the liberating armies of which he was Commander in Chief upon the ultimate goal of their arms; of the near approach of that convocation in his own cherished land of the peace-loving peoples of the earth to agree upon the means of keeping the peace hereafter; of the confidence of the peoples in the plan for security in whose formulation he himself had had so guiding a part.

Thus, as he came to the river, his own bright satisfactions were companioned by the hopes and the will of mankind. He could see after the long and arduous journey the Promised Land. More was not vouchsafed to Moses.

Those who will may debate whether it was the virtue of our form of government or the divinity that shapes all ends that brought Franklin Roosevelt to the presidency of the United States in the epoch when the idea and the ideals of democracy were buffeted by the storms of totalitarian revolution. In our own Nation a crisis had come about. Stark want stalked suddenly among a people whose faith in their social system never before had been so shaken. Angry voices preaching the failure of popular government in far countries had begun to find echoes in our own cities and on our own farms, where amazement had given way to confusion and rising resentment.

In those days, it is well remembered, one personality emerged with the self-assurance that always before had been typical of the American people, one voice spoke in accents of untrammeled courage, called to all faint-hearts to repair their faith, to a great Nation to be mindful of its greatness—and to fight.

The resurgence of this country from its darkest depression is history. Roosevelt's call to action, to self-salvation, stirred the wheels of a people's government to cope with the urgent, immediate needs of the people. Few of us who sustained the fears of that period could or would care to forget the spiritual metamorphosis that occurred. A heavy load was pushed from the imagination of the man in the street. An anticipation of security, of well-being spread everywhere. Thin streams of smoke began to emerge from the paralyzed factories and soon merged in a comforting cloud. The dispirited artisan took stock of his tools, the countryman went again into his fields with prideful eyes.

Here was a man, chosen to lead, who frankly declared his capacity to err—but his determination to try. Here was a man who, in this emergency given the leadership of the Republic, unhesitatingly threw all the powers of government to the rescue of a tottering economy, made work and provided bread and meat, created cheer with his cheer, faith with his faith, courage with his courage. He would experiment—the public welfare was the aim. He would dare—when had America prospered by burying its talents in a sterile field?

Out of it came a regeneration of the people, a return to the first principles of their social compact. The people were sovereign; government was theirs, to be used for their succor and security. It was, at the hearty instance of the new President, so used.

And because, with the unerring appreciation of a people knowing its weal from its woe, the Nation judged Franklin Roosevelt to be on the right track they preferred him again and again and again.

The champion of dynamic democracy in the most productive nation of the world, a defender of the democratic thesis against the presumptions of all other social forms, it was as natural as it was fated that Franklin Roosevelt should symbolize liberty and freedom to wistful peoples beyond our shores already suffering the imprecations and intimidations of dictatorial regimes. His comprehension of the impasse into which the world was drifting, his efforts to avert the debacle and, that failing, to prepare his countrymen and his country against it, are matters of record and grateful memory. He could not quarantine aggressors; he did uncover their names and the ambition of their schemes.

In the alliances to have been effected, in the military determinations that have been made, in the equipment and disposition of our own forces to wage war in both hemispheres, the President demonstrated a diplomatic virtuosity and a generalship whose merits are best attested by the nearness of victory in Europe and the dire straits of the enemy in Asia.

In the reversal of our relations with the nations of Hispano-America over the years of his administration, from cold and suspicious acquaintance to genuine friendship; in his unflagging efforts, from the Atlantic Charter to the San Francisco Conference now at hand, to promote international amity and base a lasting peace on mutual and collective undertakings for peace; in his constant insistence upon the community of the world, he led his own country out of the fool's paradise of isolationism (in the air age) and laid the foundation of the reciprocal trust among all countries which can be the only life insurance of the population of our shriveled planet.

How to explain Franklin Roosevelt, the now historic figure?

It is not enough to say of him that he was the product of chance and the times. The circumstances of his life are known to all. Born to the manor, he became the advocate and the leader of the masses. As able as any of his contemporaries to pass his days in ease, he devoted his fully mature years to pro-

digious work, spared himself no responsibility, entered vigorously into every popular interest and effort of one of the most stirring decades of the century.

Perhaps the loss of his own physical freedom in early manhood accounted for his inclination to—and relish of—the strenuous contests of the political arena and the strenuous services of his public career. Certainly his sympathy for all unfortunates, his concern that others should enjoy a better standard of living, his insistence upon human rights were deeply sincere, and it is noteworthy that these traits he manifested before his own affliction. By some he was called an "intellectual democrat." If this were true, his convictions were indistinguishable from congenital dispositions in this direction. In the White House and out of it he moved with an easy informality and eschewed pomp and circumstance to a degree that scandalized the doctors of protocol.

He was cordially hated in his time—in the good company of Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, and every other popular leader who trampled on the toes of privilege. And he was loved as no other occupant of the Presidential office has been since, perhaps, Jackson. The tilt of his head and the inverted half moon of his sometimes mischievous, sometimes malicious smile—especially of the campaign days—is indelibly imprinted in the recollection of millions of his fellow citizens.

He was always popular with youth, and because youth makes up so much of the armed forces his death will be specially mourned wherever the Army camps or the Navy flag is lowered to the half of the mast.

The President was called hard names. His own political placement was "a little left of center." He brought America a little left of center—or centered America again on its cardinal concept of the general welfare, from which it seemed to have strayed. This it true: That at his death, after more than a dozen years of his administration, every essential freedom of which Americans ever were possessed visibly is unimpaired; private property still is private property; the elective power is as secure as ever before in the hands of the people who, in 1932, chose Roosevelt when they could have chosen another.

Actually democracy is more firmly at home in the United States than at any time since the present political parties were formed; and the American example is more widely respected throughout the world.

There have been those who sincerely felt that Franklin Roosevelt's long tenure of office would depreciate the system and discourage the aspiration of other candidates for the high position. The discouragement has not been palpable. Other candidates regularly have been forthcoming and no doubt will continue to do so. On more than one occasion as President and candidate, Mr. Roosevelt felt it desirable to point out that as long as the suffrage was free the Presidential office never could be seized. The fact that a majority of his countrymen willed Mr. Roosevelt into the White House in four successive national elections could not reasonably be taken to indicate either a hypnotic persuasion in the man himself or a faulty perception on the part of the people. There was no indication save that, with the right of choice, the people believed Mr. Roosevelt best able to serve them.

For this reason, this newspaper gave its support to Mr. Roosevelt in all his candidacies. The people of Tennessee were of the same mind. In the last election beyond question—and in 1940 to every appearance—the parlous world situation greatly influenced an anxious people to place the reins of government in the hands of the man whose grasp of the meaning of the conflict had been so early and clear and whose path in the conduct of the war, once Pearl Harbor precipitated us into it, had been masterful.

We declare freely that other considerations—the personal warmth of the man, his consistent humanitarianism, the great and and good works of his administration, and the character of the opposition to him—drew us to his side.

In the last election, Mr. Roosevelt accepted the nomination as a duty—in the sense that a true soldier accepts the order of authority. His conscience bound him to a heavy task that, as an American, as a statesman aware of his own capacities and of the trust imposed in him, he could not refuse to carry on, though even then the chances had far lengthened that he would not survive the trials.

This is not a one-man Nation, nor has Mr. Roosevelt borne its burden of government alone. Though we mourn him today, we would do him no honor to be appalled, at his passing. He would be amused, cheerily, and remind us that a nation is as strong, not as its leaders, but as its people.

And its purposes. He would notice, undoubtedly, that the American people have not flinched in war; that their national unity has been recemented by a common danger; and that their deep-rooted desire for peace has been reflected, up to now, in their expressed pledges to unite with other peoples in preventing a recurrence of those aggressions, economic and military, that have brought calamity twice in a quarter of a century.

Given an adamant rsolution behind those purposes, the leadership to their achievement will be found. Indeed the leadership exists in the election of the people themselves to enter the type of world union, long sought and long appreciated as the only workable system, which postulates peace on law and law on the police power of the world community.

Evidently the death of the American President whose personal friendship with the foremost men of the nations allied with us in the war and in the peace undertaking has been a weighty factor in creating the conditions for accord at the coming world meeting is a sore loss at this culminative hour. Evidently a personal prestige that counted so much with many smaller nations that have looked hopefully to this meeting will no longer exert its suasion.

But that prestige long ago merged with the standing of the Nation itself: Roosevelt the good neighbor and Uncle Sam the good neighbor are not two different persons. And the interpretations of American thought made by Mr. Roosevelt to our allies, rather than the President's own preferences, are the substance upon which the entente must depend.

It is vain and fruitness to measure preeminence, for the verdict of history is rendered in far retrospect.

This much, however, is certain: No American leader in the exercise of his leadership has so exerted an immediate influence upon the course of human history as did Franklin Roosevelt.

The faded hope of a military conquest of mankind, the spent momentum of the pagan worship of force, all these are ruins instead of monuments because of the clarity of his foresight, the strength of his soul, and the courage of his conviction.

However much the interest of humanity transcends the sentimental, it is not amiss to be gratified that the individual to whom the present triumph of free government owes most was permitted to see with his mortal eyes the victorious conclusion of the epic struggle.

Franklin Roosevelt, if he recognized approaching death, must have praised a beneficent Providence that he had been allowed to witness the destruction of his country's foes and the assured success of the forces of freedom.

For this he lived; in this good knowledge he ceased his earthly turn. Humanity mourns him; his countrymen will set up stones for him.

On these Franklin Roosevelt, the modern apostle of democracy, might like it better that after his name be inscribed, rather than "first citizen," the heartfelt tribute "friend of the people."

And his countrymen of this America, if troubles rise suddenly upon them again, might always to their profit and comfort hear a voice, clear and friendly as of old, saying, calmly:

"There is nothing to fear but fear."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we will have the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—with authority to cut tariffs—before the House for consideration in the near future, I believe it desirable that the Members have the benefit of the opinions of responsible persons in all walks of life and from all sections of the country.

Today, I am pleased to submit an editorial from the Parkersburg News, one of the great dailies of West Virginia, published in Parkersburg and edited by Mr. Herman E. Gieske. His editorial is timely and interesting:

MR. HULL'S TARIFF POLICY FAILED WHEN IT WAS PUT INTO EFFECT

Elsewhere on this page appears a letter, dealing with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, written by Hon. Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State of the United States, which is reproduced in order that our readers may have both sides of the question, even though this newspaper is in utter disagreement with Mr. Hull's tariff theories.

It is difficult to understand why the venerable Mr. Hull clings to this exploded tariff theory, for such it is, demolished by the harsh facts of history. It was all very well for him to proclaim in 1932, as he and others of the New Dealers did, that high tariffs contributed to the depression; but what he and others of that persuasion failed to say was that within Europe was the place to begin the reduction, for even the tiniest of the succession states devised by the Versailles settlement had built sky-high tariffs, higher proportionately than those of the United States. But the fundamental error of the Versailles settlements was that they destroyed the hitherto integrated economic set-up of the European Continent. Of course, Mr. Hull and his associates were then looking for a political scapegoat, and they accordingly fastened upon the Smoot-Hawley tariff and blamed it for the depression that began in 1929. This misapprehension was surely one of the greatest political hoaxes ever perpetrated in the history of the Nation.

If Mr. Hull's tariff theory was correct, why, then, didn't prosperity begin to zoom to the predicted heights when Mr. Hull and his associates began hewing and hacking away at the tariff which hitherto had protected American jobs?

Mr. Hull had also forecast that his tariff theories would tend to prevent wars, and as will be noted from the estimable gentleman's letter, he still clings to that theory. But here is the record:

1934: Mr. Hull's tariff-reduction-by-treaty program was put into effect.

1935: Mr. Hull's tariff policies still in effect.

1936: Mr. Hull's tariff policies continued to reduce the American tariff wall.

1937: Mr. Hull's tariff policies still in effect.

1938: Mr. Hull's tariff policies still reduced the American protective tariff.

1939: Mr. Hull's tariff policies, instead of preventing war are crowned by the greatest war of all time. Instead of promoting American prosperity, when the war broke out in 1939, there were still over 10,000,000 of unemployed in the United States, and only the shadows of war hovering over the entire world served to quicken the economic structure of the United States into action. Except for the prodigious spending of billions of dollars by Mr. Hull and his associates, the level of temporary activity might have been even lower.

Such is the sorry record of Mr. Hull's exploded theory. Though it was tried for 6 years it failed either to produce prosperity in the United States or to prevent war.

Why, then should not people who have jobs, and others who will be in quest of jobs, turn away from this theory as one which has been tried and found wanting? And Henry Wallace goes so far as to say that if we do not still further reduce the tariffs we shall be inviting World War No. 3. They must think the American workers mighty gullible if they expect them to swallow this one. It was different in 1932. The people were in desperate straits, looking for messiahs. Nearly 20 years had gone by since the fiasco of the tariff slashes put into effect by Woodrow Wilson's administration.

As it is now, under Mr. Hull's policies more than 1,200 reductions have been made in the American tariff. And now it is proposed to grant the power to cut them another 50 percent.

Persons who have jobs and expect to retain them will be wise if they look into this matter. All that the average worker has to do is to ask his employer how the latter stands on the subject. His reply usually will be, "If you want someone in Europe or Asia to take your job, then vote against the protective tariff."

We have every respect for a great many of Mr. Hull's achievements, but are convinced that if the American domestic market is permitted to be further hewed and hacked to pieces, we shall have a depression that will make the former one seem like a picnic.

Rededication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include the following excellent editorial from the April 19, 1945, edition of the New World, which through the years in Seattle, Wash., has continually been a voice of democracy in that community:

"IT IS RATHER FOR US TO BE DEDICATED TO THE GREAT TASK REMAINING BEFORE US"

—Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863.

These words from another immortal wartime President of our beloved country carries a message which is even more vital to Americans today than to those who first heard them during the closing years of the bloody Civil War.

Their resounding call to action must cut through the grief of a world deprived of a "heroic champion of justice and freedom" as Franklin Delano Roosevelt was so aptly described by President Harry S. Truman in his stirring message to Congress and to all of us last Monday.

Only determined action by a united people to carry out the program of our fallen Commander in Chief—only the realization of those burning ideals which President Truman declared he will support and defend "with all my strength and with all my heart"—only by dedicating ourselves to this great task can we fill the void created by the tragic death of our fallen leader.

Tears of grief must not blind us—the hypocritical wailing of the pro-Axis press and the bitter-end isolationists must not beguile us—from following the course to victory, lasting peace, and a prosperous world which Franklin D. Roosevelt so clearly charted.

What is the program which President Truman vows to support and defend "with all my strength and with all my heart"?

Clearly it is to prosecute the war to a sweeping victory and at the same time to finish the structure of the world organization of the United Nations so ably designed by President Roosevelt's leadership at the Conference of Cairo, Moscow, Casablanca, Tehran, Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Yalta.

In a few short days, on April 25, representatives of the United Nations will meet at San Francisco to draw up a charter—a plan of world organization—which was projected at Dumbarton Oaks and upon which President Roosevelt was laboring when death struck him down.

This Conference must succeed. We must answer the call of President Truman, who said that "I appeal to every American, regardless of party, race, creed, or color, to support our efforts to build a strong and lasting United Nations Organization."

On March 1 President Roosevelt submitted to Congress his proposals for a World Monetary Fund and a World Bank as projected at Bretton Woods. Congress has not yet voted on these vital measures.

The finest tribute Congress can pay to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt is to act promptly and favorably on the Bretton Woods proposals. Their defeat would be a repudiation of the program of F. D. R. We must insist that Congress enact these measures (H. R. 2211 and S. 540).

It is clear that the death of Mr. Roosevelt places an even greater responsibility on the broad, patriotic, nonpartisan coalition which resulted in victory at the polls November 7. This coalition can and must be strengthened. The issues before the people are not the property of the Democratic or the Republican Party. They are the heritage of all people of good will from a man whose memory is enshrined in the hearts of millions in all parts of the world.

Certainly labor's responsibility has increased. It must push forward to complete the formation of a new world labor organization along the lines laid down at the London Conference. The great and powerful A. F. L. must take its rightful place in the leadership of an international labor movement so that the workers of all lands can do their full duty in building a better world of tomorrow.

It is the equal responsibility of both management and labor to bring into reality the high principles of the "prosperity charter" recently signed by Philip Murray, Eric Johnston, and William Green and endorsed only last week by the C. I. O. international executive board.

Above all, the people must be alert to smoke out and smash those individuals and groups who will attempt to sabotage the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt under the hypocritical pretext of honoring his memory.

We know what that program is. In President Truman we have a great and devoted American who has accepted the standard from our fallen Commander in Chief.

We must strengthen his hand and his heart. We must make democracy live and flourish by a more vigorous participation of all of us toward the realization of the Roosevelt program under under the leadership of his chosen successor—Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America.

Only in this way can we erect a monument to that great and heroic spirit whom we mourn—Franklin Delano Roosevelt, friend of mankind, architect of a lasting peace, and symbol of that upward reach that is in the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley and two editorial comments:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORPORATION, AT THE ANNUAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD DINNER OF THE MILWAUKEE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SCHROEDER HOTEL, THURSDAY EVENING, APRIL 19, 1945

I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss Americanism. In time of great stress we need a constant restatement of values—a reiteration of principles which we, as Americans, hold dear. Americanism is an impelling subject, doubly so today because we are fighting the greatest war in history.

War is a devastating experience. Not only does it cost us our youth and our loved ones, but it tends to shake the faith of the people in our institutions. Fear of today breeds fear of tomorrow. War eats at the very soul of a nation. It is the most dreaded of all diseases.

This Nation has known six great wars, including a revolution and a war between the States, and out of the latter we grew into a stronger and more united nation. That we have never experienced defeat is a statement of fact now possible to no other major Nation. To account for this it is easy to point to our vast resources—our great ports, our enormous industrial plants, our mines, our water power, our unsurpassed farm lands. But surely there must be a deeper reason for this unequaled record, some underlying cause for our triumphs, some all-encompassing factor that transcends these material wonders which we possess.

I have traveled the length and breadth of this country scores of times. I have been in every State in the Union, not once, but often. I know hundreds of people in every State. My correspondence down through the years has been enormous. And I think that out of that vast accumulation of contacts with fellow Americans I can qualify as a witness on Americanism. I believe it has been my privilege to have sensed the spirit which makes this land great.

There are more than 130,000,000 Americans, and I would guess that there were approximately 130,000,000 definitions of Americanism. But if we could summon every one of those definitions before us now we would find one word common to them all. That word is "freedom."

Freedom is the very breath of America, its very life. It is the underlying force, the

inner power, the spirit which is singular to our Nation. To me freedom and Americanism are synonymous. I want to talk today about freedom in terms of what the future holds for us and what we can do about the future. But first let us examine this remarkable force called freedom, this singular American spirit.

I think all of us cherish freedom far more than we realize; we cherish it instinctively, we cherish it by tradition. It is a common error of the rest of the world to regard us as a young people. The, say we are only a century and a half old. Frankly, I think they have made a substantial miscalculation. We are older than they think.

Our freedom, under which five generations of our people have leaped through stages of progress to achieve standards that have astonished the world, does not owe its orgin to decaying governments of the old world. Our form of government, which has given us our freedom, was a new light enkindled in a world dark with monarchy. Not since the cave man found fire has mankind received anything more warming than the protection of a government dedicated to his development with a minimum of hampering laws and a maximum of individual spiritual strength.

Under this freedom, which I insist was not patterned on any in history, we paced the world materially and spiritually. From the earth, out of the depths of the seas and into the skies we have plucked resources. Our men of science have led their world brethren in transmitting these to new uses. Our manufacturers have produced for the uses at amazing rates. Our men of religion, teachers, philosophers, authors, and poets have breathed upon our better natures to inspire us to even greater efforts. Truly, ours has been a fruitful and even happy blend of labor, management, and genius for are we not supplying the whole world with money, food, and manufactured materials.

There are those who will tell you our progress is due to our natural resources. These forget South America, Russia, India, and Africa have as great if not greater shares of the world's goods. There are others who will tell you that our progress is due to our national characteristics. These forget that we have come comparatively recently from all the nations in the world, which are the reservoirs of these characteristics. I say to you as solemnly and sincerely as I know how that the roots of our phenomenal growth is due to the freedom upon which our forefathers built this Government—our freedom, which, under God, all Americans must cherish jealously if we are to continue the growth that has been ours through the years and if we are to enjoy the blessings of peace.

Freedom or Americanism, whichever we choose to call it, is a dynamic liberating force. One need walk no farther than the nearest playground or college athletic field to discover why we are winning this war. Beyond question we are the greatest competitors in the world. I do not advance that as American boast, but rather as a manifestation of the liberating force of freedom.

The American knows no limit of achievement because no limit exists in America. Our children sense it at an early age because freedom is inborn in them. Our youth think only in terms of winning whatever they attempt. Victory is the image before them; defeat is almost impossible for them to conjure. Considered alone we call it the competitive spirit; actually it is a chief product of freedom. It, more than anything else, accounts for American ingenuity in the field of production, and victory on the field of battle No American is ever too old to win. His age may be that of a Marshall, a King, an Eisenhower, or a MacArthur, or his youth may be that of a Bulkley, a Kelly, a Levin, a Bong, or a Basilone, but his competitive spirit is unquenchable.

Countless manifestations of freedom surround us. There is tolerance for each others thoughts, for each others religion, for each others race. There is the demand for justice, for equal treatment under law. There is the conviction that opportunity is unlimited for everyone.

The list is endless, but there is one manifestation of freedom that is often overlooked. Despite our highly developed will to win, Americans love to see the underdog triumph. Paradoxical as that may seem it is one of the deepest roots of Americanism.

What American has not experienced the thrill of seeing some highly touted competitor overcome by some little fellow who was not given a chance to win? It sets American crowds on fire with enthusiasm and it explains a great deal more than we think. It explains why we have never conceived might to be right; why we have never worshipped might as an end in itself; why the superman has never appealed to American instincts.

Imagine if you can an America in which there was only one political party—and it won all the time. Imagine if you can an America with all enterprise owned by the State. Imagine if you can an America with only one press—the Government's. To Americans those things are might, but to Americans these things will never represent right.

It is little wonder that Hitler underestimated America, that he was contemptuous of our democratic ways. To the totalitarian mind the benefits of the free spirit are incomprehensible. The totalitarian thinks only in materialistic terms. He cannot grasp the fundamental fact that human beings cannot be turned into robots. A robot will fight an orderly and relentless battle, but a free man will inevitably triumph. If two great wars have not taught the world that, then nothing will.

As we near total victory in the present conflict, straight thinking on the home front is needed more than ever. For almost 4 years now we have been living under a wartime Government, a Government which has deliberately—and with our approval—made temporary encroachments upon our democratic way of life. That is something we all know and we have accepted it for the single purpose of achieving victory. It is not an invention of this administration. It is a necessity born out of military requirements and employed by every wartime administration since the Nation was founded.

In borrowing totalitarian ways for the prosecution of the war it was our aim to rid ourselves of them at the earliest possible moment. I am certain that the Government had no other end in mind, and I am convinced that the Congress, once this war is over, will take the lead in the speediest restoration of all the democratic processes.

In every war there are those who say that since the authoritarian hand of government worked so well in waging war it should be employed to promote prosperity in peace. During the last World War there were those who counseled President Wilson to take such a course. For the record, I would like to read you what he said in reply. It was contained in his 1918 message on the state of the Union delivered just a few weeks after the end of the last war:

"So far as our domestic affairs are concerned the problem of our return to peace is a problem of economic and industrial readjustment. That problem is less serious for us than it may turn out to be for the nations which have suffered the disarrangements and the losses of war longer than we. Our people, moreover, do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose, and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly tangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All that we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there, and elsewhere as we may. I have heard much counsel as to the plans that should be formed and personally conducted to a happy consummation, but from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of reconstruction emerge which I thought it likely we could force our spirited businessmen and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience."

We could demonstrate no greater attachment to Americanism than to lend our support to that Wilsonian doctrine at the conclusion of this war. That does not mean that every wartime control should be dropped when the final gun is fired. Our economic system has been too greatly dislocated for that. But it does mean that relaxation of controls should be rapid and clean-cut, and labor, agriculture, and management should join, as they are now doing, in preparing for the peacetime readjustment ahead.

As for those who wish for a continuance of authoritarian government in time of peace because it worked so well in war, they are only putting the cart before the horse; in fact they are urging that we do without the horse altogether. Let them remember that it has been our freedom in peace that has been our strength in war. Let them recall that we have fought wars and are fighting this one only to preserve freedom. We have all given up great measures of freedom to achieve victory. We should let no one forget for a minute that we want those freedoms back and that we intend to have them.

Next week at San Francisco the United Nations meet to draft a charter of peace. There is not a person in this room today who does not fervently hope for its success. And I know that many of us wish we could contribute more to that goal.

Personally I think that all of us have a contribution to make and we should unhesitatingly make it. The San Francisco charter when completed will be only as strong as the public respect which it commands. The delegates may arrive at a perfect peace structure, but I doubt it. There will be flaws and weaknesses. That is where we come in, we the public. We should not expect perfection.

I am a firm believer in public opinion. Examined over any reasonable period of time public opinion is wise opinion. But its wisdom is in direct ratio to the wisdom of the people who contribute to it.

The most hopeful sign on the horizon is the increasing interest that Americans from coast to coast are taking in foreign affairs. We have truly come of age. We have taken our place in the family of nations. There is scarcely an American left who does not fully comprehend that the wonders of modern transportation and communication have shrunk the oceans to mere rivers in terms of distance. We lunch in Milwaukee today and eat breakfast in London tomorrow. We pick up a phone and talk to Melbourne in a few minutes. The word "neighbor" has taken on vast new meanings.

Let no one mistake me; I do not hold that we are losing our national identity, that we are giving up this very Americanism which we are discussing today. Far from it. But we have assumed a new role and we must fully recognize that fact. We must learn to weigh our duties as citizens of the world much as we weigh our allegiance to political parties. I am a Democrat, but first I am an American. We must be citizens of the world—that is imperative. But first we must be Americans.

It will likely become clear at San Francisco that the peace for years to come may depend on American decision. What can we as plain citizens do?

First, we must realize that old divisions of opinion among us have all but disappeared. I say it is time to eliminate the words "isolationist," "interventionist," "nationalists," and "internationalist" from our vocabularies. I am not sure that anybody knows what they mean. And if anyone does know what they mean, I am not sure that anyone is sufficiently wise to place you, or to place me, in such categories.

It is easy to unite in war. When survival is the common thought of all of us, we are one, whether we speak of nations or of individuals. But the making of peace is far more difficult. The fear of tomorrow drives men and nations to unwise decisions. The history of their shortsightedness at the peace table is the history of succeeding wars.

What we need today, and will need in the months to come, is wisdom, not extravagance of thought. Extremists—those who would sacrifice America to some global superstate, or those who would sacrifice the future peace of the world on the altar of blind patriotism—should be ignored. They are not wise counselors; they are special pleaders who have lost sight of the common good. They shout the loudest but they do not always say the most.

There is an uncommon amount of common sense in America and we should not hesitate to tap it. Wisdom is the product of straight thinking applied to knowledge. Our job is to keep informed and clear-headed. While the extremists wring their hands because they are not getting what they want, and I can assure you they won't get it, the American people could perform no greater service than to maintain a reasoned judgment. Out of such thinking will come the curatives necessary to make the San Francisco charter a workable document.

The test of our Americanism in the interim is going to be twofold. First, we must realize that until the last Jap is driven from his cave of fanaticism, we on the home front cannot relax for a single minute. Second, we must simultaneously prepare ourselves for a return to a peacetime economy. Nor can we relax on that job for a minute.

You and I know that when our servicemen return they will be in no mood to accept excuses. They will have seen totalitarianism at its worst; they will want to find Americanism at its best. Yes, they are going to want jobs and we shall provide them, but there is something dearer to the American serviceman. That is America itself, as he knew it and as he left it. In securing the first we must, therefore, not compromise the second. We must stay within the framework of democracy and its basic principles of liberty, justice and equality for all. They are the cornerstones of America, and we can choose no better cornerstones for the peace, both at home and abroad.

[From the Boston Sunday Post of April 22, 1945]

A TIMELY WARNING

The speech of former Postmaster General James A. Farley in Milwaukee declaring that wartime controls over civilian life must be relaxed fully and quickly at the war's end gives a warning that should reach every true American. He points to the great measure of freedom willingly given up to carry on a successful war, but also declares we want that freedom back and intend to have them. Totalitarian methods, he admits, have been necessary to reach full victory, but declares Congress must see that the old-time democratic processes are restored at the earliest possible moment.

[From the Hartford Courant of April 21, 1945]

WHAT AMERICANISM IS

In these days of much loose thinking, political, economic, sociological, and otherwise, it is refreshing to read the down-to-earth address that James A. Farley delivered before the Milwaukee Junior Chamber of Commerce last Thursday evening. His theme was Americanism, and he ventered to assert that having traveled the length and breadth of this country scores of times and having made the acquaintance of hundreds of people in all walks of life in every State, he felt himself fully qualified to speak with some authority on the subject.

Many have undertaken to define Americanism; in fact, Mr. Farley said it would be his guess that since there are approximately 130,000,000 Americans there would be about 130,000,000 definitions of the term. But even so, he thought that one word would be common to all these definitions, namely, "freedom." That word he described as the "underlying force, the inner power, the very life of America—something that we cherish far more than most of us realize."

And this freedom, whence does it spring? Mr. Farley had no hesitation in saying that it springs from our form of government, which is dedicated to the development of freedom "with a maximum of hampering laws and a maximum of individual spritual strength."

We may be a young people in point of time, but actually our Government, established under the Federal Constitution 158 years ago, has existed longer, unshaken in its foundations than has any government of any other modern people. We may think of the Government of Great Britain as being very much older, but we are prone to forget that it was virtually reconstituted by the Reform Bill of 1832. All the governments of Europe have suffered violent change since that date, and today not a few of them are practically nonexistent. It is the spirit of freedom upon which our forefathers built the American structure of government that has given it the strength to meet every situation.

As we near total victory in the world-wide conflict that now engages us, Mr. Farley warned that straight thinking on the home front is needed more than ever. He did not have to remind us that for nearly 4 years we have been living under a wartime government almost totalitarian in its pattern, a government that has necesarily made encroachments on our democratic way of life. We have accepted these encroachments for the single purpose of achieving victory. But since the authoritarian hand of Government has worked so well in waging war, there are those among us, and not an inconsiderable number, who think it should be employed to promote prosperity and peace.

Noting this, Mr. Farley recalled what President Wilson said in his message to the Congress just a few weeks after the end of the last war, at which time a similar argument was made on behalf of the Government's exercising a continued control over the economic life of the country.

"Our people do not want to be coached and led," said Woodrow Wilson. "They know their own busines, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly entangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All that we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there, and everywhere as we may. * * * But from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of 'reconstruction' emerge which I thought if likely we could force our spirited businessmen and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliance and obedience."

Subscribing fully as he does to that philosophy based on an understanding of the principles of American freedom, Mr. Farley said that those who desire a continuance of authoritarian government in time of peace because it worked so well in war "are only putting the cart before the horse; in fact, they are urging that we do without the horse altogether." Let all such remember, he added, that it has been "our freedom in peace that has been our strength in war." Let them recall that we are fighting this war only to preserve freedom, and "We should let no one forget for a minute that we want those freedoms back and intend to have them."

Mr. Farley did not mean to imply that every wartime control should be instantly dropped when the last gun is fired; our economic system has been too greatly dislocated for that. He only meant that "relaxation of controls should be rapid and clean cut in order that we may stay within the framework of democracy and the basic principles of liberty."

International Office for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NOVEMBER 18, 1944.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to take this means of conveying to the State Department our support of official efforts to bring about the establishment of an International Office for Education.

We have long been impressed with the need for the advancement of world-wide education. We believe that to be an important, even a basic, element of a sound program for the maintenance of peace. Because we are pledged to support of the development of a satisfactory international machinery for the peaceful settlement of differences and for resistance to aggression, we are concerned that forces—such as education—basic to the maintenance of international harmony and understanding be given official responsibility for the advancement of education on all levels and for the cultivation of an understanding among peoples as indispensable to the world security in which our Nation has so vital an interest.

We have been supporting the efforts of the State Department in its encouragement of a policy of international cooperation for educational reconstruction. We welcomed the statement of policy issued by the Department on March 31, and were gratified at the naming of a commission headed by Congressman J. W. FULBRIGHT to participate with others of the United Nations in a conference on the subject of educational reconstruction. At the same time, we wish to record our concern that such action towards international cooperation for education be not limited to the tasks of reconstruction and rehabilitation only. Those efforts have their proper place; but they can at best lead to a return to a condition which was not adequate to develop the educational forces and relationships which can contribute to a basic desire for world peace.

We, therefore, wish to inform you of our earnest interest that the State Department assume leadership in extending the range of consultations by the United Nations in the field of education beyond problems of reconstruction and into the establishment of a permanent international office for education.

As an organized group of American farmers we have been deeply impressed with the constant correlation throughout the world between higher economic standards and a more highly developed level of educational opportunity. The American farmer is per-

suaded that as educational development extends in all parts of the world, standards of living, the purchase of goods, the consumption of the products of farm and factory increase. The interest of the American farmers is therefore closely linked with the development of higher educational levels throughout the world. Moreover, our national interest is sustained by any and every action which tends to increase understanding among peoples and further their harmonious and peaceful relationships.

We, therefore, submit this to you, Mr. Secretary, as an expression of the views of this organization representative of a large section of the farm element of our country. We record our support of the proposal for the early establishment of an international office for education.

We shall appreciate hearing from you, and will especially appreciate being kept informed as to any actions undertaken by our Government.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 18, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. PATTON: I am happy to acknowledge your letter of November 18, 1944, to Mr. Hull presenting the reaction of the National Farmers Union concerning participation by this Government in international activities in the educational and cultural field.

It is reassuring to have this expression of approval and support of the Department's actions to date. I am particularly interested in the emphasis you placed in your communication on the great significance of education in the development of the understandings and attitudes requisite for peaceful cooperation among nations. You are doubtless already familiar with the plan of international organization developed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the provision made for dealing with economic, social, and other humanitarian problems, under the Economic and Social Council. In addition, provision has been made for the establishment of cooperative relationships with the various specialized organizations. You will note on the enclosed chart, recently issued by the Department, that an educational and cultural organization has been suggested.

The Department is already working in cooperation with other governments in its consideration of the desirable nature of international organization in the educational and cultural field. Hence, your communication is very timely and I appreciate having this expression of the thinking of your organization.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State:

BRYN J. HOVDE,
Chief, Division of Cultural Cooperation.

Proposal To End Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my address at the Dumbarton Oaks rally, Bushnell Memorial, Hartford, Conn., on April 29, 1945, I offer the following in which I state my reasons for the inclusion of specific powers to our representatives at the World Security Organization, and authority to jointly use our armed forces or any part of them to stop a threat of war or an aggressor without the necessity of waiting for a vote of the Congress. This authority shall be given as contained in my bill, House Joint Resolution 131:

Between August 14 and October 7, 1944, an historic event occurred at the Dumbarton Oaks mansion in Washington. The experts of the United States, Britain, Russia, and China, were there The failure of the old League to provide peace was on their minds. They resolved to form an international organization, ready to use force. A plan was drawn up which is now before the San Francisco Conference.

Briefly, the structure of this organization would provide: A general assembly of all nations; a security council of 11 which would have the primary responsibility to keep the peace, by imposing economic and military sanctions; an international court of justice to settle disputes; a military staff committee consisting of the Chiefs of Staff of the Big Five; international armed force contingents to be held on call for each member for joint action against an aggressor and an international air force.

It requires no great amount of analysis to realize that the future success of such an organization lies in its ability to prevent an aggressor nation from resorting to war, either by use of economic sanctions or of armed force. It is in the latter vital aspect that the new organization will differ so radically from the League of Nations. That League had neither an armed force nor a military staff committee, and it was therefore powerless to enforce its decisions completely. The new organization provides means of supplying certain types and quantities of armed forces to back up the decisions of the security council with a military staff to utilize these resources.

However, the success of the use of the military will depend entirely upon the speed with which it may be put into action against an aggressor nation, or one which threatens peace. In this technological age, speed is the vital factor at a time when aggressor nations have learned to strike swiftly, treacherously, and without warning to their victims. France, Holland, Belgium, and Norway were taken with a swiftness that left us stunned. Unless the armed might of an international organization can be instantly mobilized against an aggressor, preventing war would be completely nullified. Unless this is provided for, I say to you that the difference between the old League of Nations and Dumbarton Oaks is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum.

It is with this basic though in mind that on March 19, 1945, I introduced into the Congress of the United States a bill known as House Joint Resolution 131. It provides in substance:

That the representatives of the United States on the council of whatever international security organization is established during or after this war, shall have authority, after such consultation with the President, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, as may be practicable under the circumstances, to pledge the use of the armed forces of the United States, or any part of such forces as shall be required, to enforce jointly the decisions of the international security organization, relative to the prevention or suppression of threats to the peace or breaches of the peace between nations. This shall be implemented immediately by the proper authorities. This resolution shall not be regarded as in any way abrogating or altering the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to declare war.

Note that under this bill, the United States acts only in conjunction with the armed forces of other nations, and not by itself. Of course this implies that all other representatives on the security council shall have powers similar to those of our representatives.

I have the statements of such students of world affairs as Sumner Welles, Francis Sayre, Raymond Swing, Max Lerner, Richard Eaton, and many other outstanding men and women as well as organizations, enthusiastically endorsing the principles of this bill.

You will note that this bill provides for consultation. But it does eliminate the interminable delays and endless debates which would result from reference to the Congress of the United States for approval. While Rome burns, the aggressor nation could be devastating its victim before the Congress would vote.

The failure of the League of Nations because of its inability to act quickly and effectively to put down any threat to peace stands clearly before us and is recognized by every thinking person. The failure of economic sanctions to prevent war is only too tragically illustrated by the events of the past 15 years. These failures of the past strongly emphasize the need for prompt use of force to prevent war. When we stop the aggressor, we stop the threat of war; and if the aggressor knows that there exists an effective mechanism for dealing with him, he will be deterred. In other words, a well-organized international police force will act as a preventative of war, just as the existence of a strong police force is the best method of preventing crime.

I am firmly convinced that the mere existence of such a police force with the power to act immediately would discourage war. We all know and have been repeatedly informed by officials for law enforcement that compulsion is necessary to support all types of legislation. This is not due to the fact that people in general break the law but rather because there is always a certain percentage of the population which will disobey regulations if it can. There are also nations who will always be aggressive and will try to oppress other peoples until an effective method of dealing with them is evolved.

The overwhelming majority of the American people recognize the fact that agreements and laws between nations must be backed up by force. You must unite in throwing your weight and support behind these proposals lest world security organization be sabotaged.

If we do not have this provision for using force quickly, then the entire world organization becomes impotent and the world security council without this provision would be a delusion to those who expect an end of wars. And so I say to you, it would be better to abandon all consideration of any type of international organization, if this proposal is not accepted.

Already there are forces working in opposition to an international organization. I hold here a copy of Gerald L. K. Smith's publication of April 1945, in which he devotes the most important part of that issue to an attack on Dumbarton Oaks. He quotes Senator BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota, in opposition to the principles of my bill, who threatens to introduce a measure in the United States Senate specifically prohibiting such authority to our representative. Over his statement, Gerald Smith waxes enthusiastic. As is to be expected, the opposition consists of the crackpots and isolationists who constitute such a vociferous minority.

If the world organization fails to include a provision for the quick use of force, then the United States will be compelled to do it on its own for our security. But if we do, then the other nations of the world will start

such preparations for war as have never been dreamed of. There will be one unified control at a nominal cost or a multitude of individual nation controls at a staggering cost to us and to the world.

I bring you what may have been one of the last messages ever delivered by our late beloved President Roosevelt on this subject. Shortly after introducing this bill, I contacted the White House to discuss the bill with President Roosevelt. The next day Mr. Hassett, secretary to the President, informed me that the President was leaving for Warm Springs, but asked me to keep this in confidence. Then he said: "Go ahead with your bill. Interest the people in it—the more discussion, the better."

The grave importance of such a provision was vividly and realistically understood by our late President. In a speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City on October 21, 1944, he voiced his concept of the procedure by which the United States should share in the decisions of the International Security Council as follows:

"Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and when there is available power to enforce it.

"The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace, by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

"If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the town council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another world war. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace."

What Do We Learn From the Pictures of Nazi Camps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of April 30, 1945:

WHAT DO WE LEARN FROM THE PICTURES OF NAZI CAMPS?

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Sunday.—Representative MARY NORTON, of New Jersey, is making a magnificent fight for the passage of the fair employment practices bill. This bill would give us a permanent group in the Government whose function it would be to see that, as far as employment goes throughout this country, there is complete equality of opportunity and treatment for all.

Many people have come to think of this bill as being of value only to certain minority groups. I think it is important for the public in general to understand clearly that the bill, while it may be of value to these groups, is equally vital to each and every one of us who are citizens of the United States. If we do not see that equal opportunity, equal justice, and equal treatment are meted out to every citizen, the very basis on which this country can hope to survive with liberty and justice for all will be wiped away.

Are we learning nothing from the horrible pictures of the concentration camps which have been appearing in our papers day after day? Are our memories so short that we do not recall how in Germany this unparalleled barbarism started by discrimination directed against the Jewish people? It has ended in brutality and cruelty meted out to all people, even to our boys who have been taken prisoners. This bestiality could not exist if the Germans had not allowed themselves to believe in a master race which could do anything it wished to all other human beings not of their particular racial strain.

There is nothing, given certain kinds of leadership, which could prevent our falling a prey to this same kind of insanity, much as it shocks us now. The idea of superiority of one race over another must not continue within our own country, nor must it grow up in our dealings with the rest of the world. It is self-evident that there are people in certain parts of the world who, because of different opportunities and environment, have not progressed as far as other people in what we call civilization. That does not mean, however, that they will forever be inferior in our type of civilization. Given the same kind of opportunities, they may do better than we have done.

Looking at the war-torn world of today, we cannot say that our civilization has been perfect. We can only say that we have created greater material comfort for human beings and that we are struggling to find a way of living together peacefully and cooperatively in the future.

That is a great step forward, and we are taking it internationally; but we must also take it within our own borders. We cannot complain that the Germans starved and maltreated our boys if we at home do not take every step—both through our Government and as individuals—to see not only that fairness exists in all employment practices, but that throughout our Nation all people are equal citizens. Where the theory of a master race is accepted, there is danger to all progress in civilization.

Help Them Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the April 30, 1945, edition of the Boston (Mass.) Daily Record:

HELP THEM NOW!

The Jewish people of Europe, or such of them as have survived the long ordeal of persecution, torture, and slaughter conducted by Nazi Germany in Central Europe, are now in the last act of their tragic experience, as the challenging letter printed in this column asserts.

The challenge now confronting the civilized world, writes Mr. Johan J. Smertenko, executive vice chairman of the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, is "to save the surviving Hebrews in Europe from the last mad act of the Germans."

There has been a program of alleviative action, drawn up by the committee and representing the definite and practical things which can still be done in behalf of these unhappy people, before the Congress in Washington for many weeks.

There have been many expressions of sympathy for their cause, and of approval of the proposed program.

But there has not been any action.

And the precious little time remaining is running out.

Something should surely be done, as Mr. Smertenko writes in obvious desperation, to "stimulate sufficient sentiment to produce action in Washington."

Plainly, the American people must provide that stimulation.

The American people have recently become acutely conscious of the bestial practices indulged in the concentration camps of Central Europe.

The Jews of Europe have been the principal victims of this bestiality.

Millions of them have died, and the pitiful few of them remaining are dying.

Why are the things left undone which might save these few?

Every minute of delay spells the doom of more of them.

They expect no mercy from their Nazi tormentors, and will receive none.

But they do expect the civilized peoples of the world, particularly the sympathetic and tolerant and humane American people, to follow their merciful instincts in their behalf down to the last fatal minute of this tragic time.

The lateness of the time must not stay the hands of mercy in this challenging cause.

The grave difficulty of the task, or even its seeming futility, must not prevent the making of a supreme effort to salvage the little that remains of oppressed European Jewry.

Let us not abandon these people to their doom.

Whatever we can do, even the little that seems to remain in our power to do, should be done now in order that the Jewish people of Europe who have suffered so much and so far survived so much will not be utterly destroyed in "the last mad act" which now confronts them.

If Congress needs stimulation for this, let the American people provide it—and be urged on by the solemn warning of Mr. Smertenko that "the greatest danger at this time lies in delay."

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
McCloud, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. HEARST: I am enclosing copies of letters sent by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation and the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe to the President and to Secretary Stettinius, respectively. These constitute part of our effort to save the surviving Hebrews in Europe from the last mad act of the Germans.

Every effort has also been extended to Congress. Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, has just informed me that within the next few days he will introduce a resolution recommending an official statement on the part of our Government in accordance with the statement outlined to the President by Mr. Bergson. A similar resolution will be introduced in the House.

You have been so sympathetic and helpful in the past that I take the liberty of communicating these facts to you now in the hope that you will support these moves by an expression of editorial opinion. My colleagues and I are certain that in calling this situation to the attention of the American public you will stimulate sufficient sentiment to produce action in Washington. We trust that you will be able to do so as soon as possible for the greatest danger at this time lies in delay.

Sincerely yours,

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO,
Executive Vice Chairman, Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, through a resolution adopted by its board of directors on April 24, after due and deliberate consideration, express their opposition to the proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority.

In asking for the defeat of this proposal, the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation advances four reasons for such defeat. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong.) which authorizes improvements for the control of flood waters, for the benefit of navigation, irrigation, and for other purposes, within the Missouri River Basin in accordance with the joint recommendations of the United States Army Engineer Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas the provisions of this law, unquestionably, are adequate for the proper development of flood control, irrigation, and other matters of public welfare; and

Whereas there have been introduced in the United States Congress two bills (S. 555 and H. R. 1824) that would create a Federal authority having the power to control the social and economic welfare of the people within the Missouri River Basin, and to provide for water control, development of resources and other purposes, under what is known as the proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation oppose the proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority now being considered in Congress, and other similar proposals, because such proposal would:

(a) Create a Federal corporation clothed with unprecedented powers freed of all the legal restraints which experience has demonstrated are necessary and desirable;

(b) Make the States within the Missouri River Basin subservient to a superstate so far as the control and development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin are concerned;

(c) Stifle agricultural development, industrial growth, and individual enterprise as the proposed Federal corporation would control basic economic resources;

(d) Establish a precedent for the creation of a similar authority in the Mississippi River Basin, which would be detrimental to the best interests of the State of Minnesota and the Nation at large; be it further

Resolved, That the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation respectfully and sincerely urge the Congress of the United States to defeat said Missouri Valley Authority proposal, and similar proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each of the Members of Congress from Minnesota.

What Is Your Answer?

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to obtain the facts and not desiring to be influenced by so much fiction I asked for the information as to the relationship between the 90 percent parity floor, price of agricultural products and the price of imported agricultural products plus the duties as provided in H. R. 2652. I ask unanimous consent to include this table at this time.

The table referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin is as follows:

Agricultural prices: Actual and parity for January 1945 for selected commodities and indicated parities under pending bills compared with foreign prices and United States import duties

Commodity	Unit	Parity prices			Actual prices			Import duty rate	
					United States		Foreign [1]		
		Present formula	Pace bill, H. R. 754	Thomas bill, S. 507	Farm	Market [2]	Market	Present [3]	H. R. 2652 [4]
*Wheat	Bushel	$1.52	$1.99	$1.84	$1.46	$1.63	$1.02	[5] $0.42	$0.21
*Corn	Bushel	1.10	1.44	1.24	1.07	1.15	.63	.25	.12½
*Oats	Bushel	.69	.90	.66	.72	.73	.30	.08	.04
*Barley	Bushel	1.06	1.39	.96	1.02	1.11	.40	.15	.07½
*Rye	Bushel	1.24	1.62	1.32	1.09	1.23	.60	.12	.05
*Flaxseed	Bushel	2.91	3.80	3.25	2.91	3.12	1.57	.32½	.16¼
Rice (rough)	Bushel	1.40	1.83	1.75	1.75		1.60	.56	.28
Soybeans	Bushel	[6] 1.65	[6] 2.16	3.03	2.03	2.19		1.20	.60
Beans	Hundredweight	5.80	7.58	8.02	6.23	6.85	4.25	3.00	1.50
*Cotton	Pound	.21	.28	.30	.20	.22	.14	[7] .03½	.01¼
Cottonseed	Ton	38.80	50.70	50.30	52.88			6.67	3.33⅓
*Peanuts	Pound	.08	.11	.08	.08	.14	.04	.04¼	.02⅛
*Hay	Ton	20.40	26.70	18.80	17.10	45.00	16.36	2.50	1.25
*Potatoes	Bushel	1.25	1.56	1.56	1.58	1.80	1.25	[8] .37½	.18¼
Sweetpotatoes	Bushel	1.51	1.98	1.86	1.90	2.50		[9] 50%	[9] 25%
*Apples	Bushel	1.65	2.16	2.03	2.46	3.32	2.25	.15	.07½
*Oranges, on tree	Box	[6] 2.03	3.18	3.18	1.98	4.74	.90	.70	.35
*Grapefruit, on tree	Box	[6] .91	1.74	1.74	1.35	3.75	3.20	.48	.24
*Hogs	Hundredweight	12.50	16.40	13.60	13.80	14.66	11.90	1.00	.50
*Beef cattle	Hundredweight	9.32	12.20	9.98	11.70	14.71	11.00	[5] 1.50	.75
*Veal calves	Hundredweight	11.60	15.20	12.30	13.20	15.00	13.00	1.50	.75
*Lambs	Hundredweight	10.10	13.20	15.50	13.00	15.18	12.60	[10] 1.50	.75
Butterfat	Pound	[11] .47	[11] .57	[11] .59	.51	.42	.35	.14	.07
*Milk, wholesale	Hundredweight	[11] 2.91	[11] 3.40	[11] 3.32	3.25	3.70	2.25	[5] .38	.19
*Chickens (live)	Pound	.20	.26	.29	.24	.28	.24	.04	.02
*Eggs	Dozen	[11] .48	[11] .48	[11] .46	.41	.44	.35	.05	.02½
*Wool	Pound	.32	.41	.47	.40	.47	.19	[12] .13	.06½
Tobacco:									
Flue-cured	Pound	.33	.45	.33	.45		.30	.30	.15
Burley	Pound	.32	.44	.31	.45		.23	.30	.15
Fire-cured	Pound	.15	.19	.19	.24		.16	.30	.15

* Commodities on an import price basis, i. e., United States price exceeds foreign price plus duty.

[1] Prices in country of origin—mostly Canada, Argentina, or Brazil.

[2] Representative commercial markets.

[3] Specific rates adjusted to unit shown when not expressed in the same unit, unless otherwise indicated.

NOTE.—Cuba has preferential rate of 20 percent. This is not shown except for grapefruit.

[4] Possible rate is 50 percent of current rate.

[5] Quantitative import quotas are in effect for part or all of the import classification.

[6] Comparable price.

[7] Basic rate is 7 cents. The reduced trade agreement rate applies to cotton 1⅛-inch staple and longer from Egypt and Peru.

[8] White or Irish potatoes entered during the period Mar. 1 to Nov. 30—full duty 75 cents.

[9] Ad valorem rate.

[10] Per head.

[11] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

[12] In the grease, 16 cents scoured.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

This table combines 3 sets of data: (1) The farm parity price position for selected agricultural products as computed under the present formula and as indicated under H. R. 754 and S. 507; (2) actual prices as reported on farms and in specified markets in the United States compared with market prices (converted to United States money) in foreign countries of surplus and (3) the United States import duty rate currently in force and the possible rate under H. R. 2652.

It will be noted that practically all of the prices, either current or under the proposed parity legislation, exceed the prices of similar products in foreign countries by more than the amount of the prevailing import duty. Commodities on such an indicated import price basis are marked with an asterisk.

After studying the table, will you not agree that it will be possible to scuttle the whole domestic agricultural program if H. R. 2652 is passed?

If 90 percent parity guaranteed price for wool during the war and 2 years after the war is 90 percent of 32 cents, or 28.8 cents per pound, and the world price is 19 cents per pound, and the duty is 6½ cents per pound, or a total of 25.5 cents per pound, just how many warehouses will be needed to store the imports of wool?

If 90 percent of parity for rye is 90 percent of $1.24, or $1.11 per bushel, for 2 years after the war, how many elevators will it take to store the imported rye that has a foreign price of 60 cents per bushel and pays a duty of 6 cents per bushel?

If, as in 1939, over 6,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese were imported when the United States price of Cheddar cheese was only 12 cents per pound and the duty was 4 cents per pound, just exactly how many millions of pounds of Cheddar cheese do you think would be imported if there was a 20-cent-per-pound guaranteed floor price and the duty was reduced to 2 cents per pound? If, as in 1939 when the United States produced 42,000,000 pounds of Swiss cheese that brought 17 cents per pound, over 10,000,000 pounds of the Swiss cheese was imported and paid a duty of 5 cents per pound, just exactly how many millions of pounds of this Swiss cheese would be imported if he had a 90-percent parity guaranteed floor price of at least 22 cents per pound and a duty of only 2½ cents per pound?

If, as in 1939, we imported $526,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products, when many of our farm prices were 45 to 60 percent of parity, how many millions or billions of dollars' worth will be imported if we have a 90-percent parity floor price supposed to be the low during the war and 2 years after the war?

I have still to meet anyone anywhere that can use facts to show where the foreign agricultural program of the present administration has been beneficial to the agriculture of the Nation.

The administration in seeking the passage of H. R. 2652 wishes to allow a doubling of the inequalities of the present tariff ratio, and, I might add, to also double the gross injustices and inequities of the present tariff set-up.

O. D. T. Travel Order Restricting Religious Gatherings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I received a letter from a Johnson City clergyman. Now this is nothing unusual because ministers, priests, and rabbis are continually writing me seeking help for families in their parishes and congregations and especially for servicemen they attended before they went away to fight. Then, too, they often write me to express themselves about current affairs.

So it is quite ordinary for the good churchmen from my district to write me. Let me say further that I am glad to have their confidence and to hear from them as often as they see fit to write me.

But the particular letter I had in mind was one the contents of which shocked me as much as the clergyman who wrote it.

He pointed out that he and several of his colleagues had appealed to the Office of Defense Transportation in Washington recently and asked the Director of O. D. T. not to place a ban on religious gatherings and not to force persons who wish to attend such gatherings to obtain permission to travel from O. D. T.

The clergyman continued and I quote from his letter:

We are doing our bit to promote the war effort, and we are willing to do whatever we believe it necessary. However, we know it is unconstitutional and contrary to the spirit of America, for the state to attempt to arbitrarily regulate the religious life of our country. I am joining the hosts of others across this country who will shortly arise to protest this attempt to break down the separation between the church and state.

I continue reading his letter:

I am in receipt of a letter from the recording secretary of the American Council of Christian Churches. In this letter he writes: "We called on the Director of O. D. T. and pleaded with him not to attempt to restrict religion, and to exempt the church from such restrictions. We had quite a stormy session because we stood our ground. We finally told him that if he insisted or attempted to curb the church, we would resist and hold our meetings anyway. You can imagine how he reacted. He hit the ceiling."

Further on in the secretary's letter he writes this word: "The O. D. T. does not want its orders discussed in Congress. They realize that once Congressmen are aware as to what is involved that Congress will compel them to rescind such un-American orders."

The Johnson City churchman concludes his letter to me with the following:

Now because I know of your fearlessness (and I thank him for that) I should like to request that you take this matter up with your congressional colleagues and that something be done about it. I feel certain that if the democratic process of requesting the churches to hold their meetings to a minimum, in the light of the present emergency be followed, there will not be a religious group in this country but will be happy to respond as best they can.

However, when a bureaucrat seeks to pronounce what the church shall do in this country, where the separation of church and state has always been safeguarded by the Constitution, it will be an unnecessary promotion of strife and division, should this order be allowed to stand.

In response to this most reasonable plea of the clergyman, I have introduced in the House the resolution which I now read:

Concurrent resolution to protect churches and religious groups against the encroachment of the state through bureaucratic decrees

Whereas it is recognized that during wartime there should be little if any curtailment of the gracious influence of our churches and religious institutions; and

Whereas it is recognized that conventions and gatherings of churches and religious groups extend their benevolent work and greatly increase morale of all our people in these dark hours; and

Whereas this Nation cannot afford any cessation or lessening of the glorious work by the spiritual sources which instill religion and strong faith in God in the hearts of our people; and

Whereas the Office of Defense Transportation has recently refused to spare any church, synagogue, or religious body from its drastic order banning travel to public gatherings and conventions of more than 50 people; and

Whereas such an attempt to restrict religion on the part of a Government agency is utterly unconstitutional and positively contrary to the spirit of free America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the desire and the will of the Congress of the United States that conventions and gatherings of a religious nature should not be included in the order of the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation which prohibits travel to conventions of more than 50 persons; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the Senate condemn the action of the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation in including churches and religious groups in this order.

Quantitative Import Quotas of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I intended to insert the same table in the RECORD that has just been inserted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. I also intended to insert a statement showing the present quantitative quotas in effect. These quotas are as follows:

Quantitative import quotas now in force are as follows:

Wheat: Eight hundred thousand bushels plus 4,000,000 pounds of flour, which is equivalent to 94,000 bushels, or 20,408 barrels.

Cotton: Three-fourths- to 1⅛-inch staple length, 14,516,882 pounds, which is equivalent to 30,370 bales; 1⅛ but less than 1 11/16 inches, 45,656,420 pounds, which is equivalent to 95,516 bales—478 pounds to bale.

Cattle: Less than 200 pounds, 100,000 head; over 700 pounds, not more than 60,000 head during any one quarter, or 225,000 head during year.

Potatoes: One million bushels per year beginning September 1, except when do-

mestic production falls under 350,000,000 bushels per year, quota increased.

Milk: Three million gallons of whole milk annually.

Distribution of Dental Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER J. RESA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call attention to a discussion by a leader of the dental profession of one of the many problems involved in the task we must accomplish in order to strengthen and preserve our democracy so that future generations, which will have to pay the cost of saving it, may enjoy its blessings:

DISTRIBUTION OF DENTAL STUDENTS[1]

(By Willard C. Fleming, D.D.S., dean, College of Dentistry, University of California)

"Secretary Horner sat in a corner
Asking wherefore and why.
This subject's a tangle;
It's too hot to handle,
So he will let someone else try."

The Council on Dental Education considers the racial and geographic distribution of dental students of sufficient importance to call it to the attention of the profession. The reason given for considering it important may be found in a statement appearing toward the end of the report: "If the dental profession is to be truly representative of our citizenry as a whole, then it would seem that serious consideration should be given to the growing geographical and racial imbalance already marked in the enrollment in the dental schools."

Before accepting this statement, let us first give serious consideration to these two items in relation to the distribution of dental students:

1. To what extent is it necessary that the dental profession be "representative of the citizenry as a whole"?

2. Is it necessary to the welfare of the dental profession that a strict geographical and racial balance be maintained?

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

Statistically, we have two facts before us. First, that for some reason the residents of certain States have been stimulated and found qualified to study dentistry in greater numbers per population than of other States. In New York, for example, 1 out of every 7,000 citizens is studying dentistry; in California 1 out of 14,000; in Ohio, 1 out of 18,000, etc. Other States show a ratio as low as 1 to 22,000, thus indicating an imbalance between States. The second fact that comes to light in our analysis is that for some reason, 4 out of every 5 students come from metropolitan areas, with only 1 out of 5 from rural districts. It will be agreed that these 2 facts do require consideration.

If an unusual number of residents of New York State have been stimulated and found qualified to study dentistry, we might well ask, "What does New York have that other States have not?" Applying this same thought to the matter of 4 out of 5 dental students coming from metropolitan areas, one wonders what there is about city life that stimulates the young people to think of dentistry as a career. This leads us into a land of speculation with one person's guess as good as another's.

The answer to these two questions might be found in a study of the backgrounds and environment of the majority of dental students. One does not have to sit in on an admissions committee in a dental school very long to realize that the majority of applicants come from much the same social and economic environment. Rarely do we interview students from impoverished families, and even more rarely from families of wealth and social position. The fathers of our students are mechanics, teachers, salesmen, clerks, etc. One can visualize the family discussions revolving around problems of meeting payments on the car, life insurance, savings, and the difficulty in general of keeping up with the Joneses.

The professions offer both economic and social betterment to the children of these families. In dentistry the recent graduate is in a better position than graduates in other professions immediately to pay dividends on the cost of education. This is an important item in the case of families who have had to pinch and save, and even borrow, to launch their son or daughter on the road to attain the things denied the parents.

The differences between the various social and economic levels are more sharply defined in the cities than in the country. This may be the most important point in explaining a preponderance of applicants from the metropolitan areas.

Another item relating to the problem is the appeal of the professions to young people seeking a life free from regimentation, a boss, and the time clock. The desire to be the "captain of my ship" is great in many of us. The young man in a rural environment sees a number of such careers; the farm itself, the small store, the garage offer opportunity. However, in the complicated social structure of the city, professions are about the last stand for the rugged individualist.

Regardless of the reasons why the majority of students come from metropolitan areas, the fact still remains that they do. This, coupled with the results of other surveys showing a serious shortage of dentists in rural districts, leads one to believe that the dental profession should be "representative (geographically) of the citizenry as a whole" in order—

1. To assure sufficient numbers of applicants from which to select students; and

2. To supply adequate dental service to all areas of the country.

It is the responsibility of the dental profession and dental educators to encourage young dentists to practice in these areas, and to stimulate interest in dentistry as a career among young people in the rural districts where the need for increased dental service is apparent.

RACIAL DISTRIBUTION

It is stated in the report that "a large percentage of the students resident in New York and Chicago and their environs are of foreign-born or near foreign-born parentage and are largely restricted to two racial[2] groups."

What has been mentioned before about the professions offering an opportunity to better one's social and economic status would certainly hold true with our foreign-born and children of foreign-born population. However, the matter of the unusual concentration of certain racial groups in the profession is not entirely accounted for with this explanation. One wonders if the groups mentioned are groups who have not been assimilated and find the doors closed, or at least difficult to open, to careers in other fields. In other words, their choice of fields is so limited that they concentrate on the few which are open to them.

The writer will always remember a conversation with a Japanese student who had been notified of his dismissal because of scholastic deficiency. He said, "Denied this opportunity, the only thing left for me to do is to become a gardener."

No evidence has been revealed in this report, and the writer knows of none, which would allow one to assume that a direct ratio should be maintained between the racial groups within the citizenry and the profession, and it is not demonstrable that such a ratio would contribute to the welfare of either.

Regardless of our American tradition, racial discrimination is practiced, but it would seem that the very last place it should occur is in the field of science and the health profession. The only discrimination that can be allowed in the selection of students is that of their qualifications to study and practice dentistry, and this selection must be applied regardless of race or color.

If this racial imbalance in dentistry has resulted from a press of applications and the admission of students incapable of practicing the profession merely because of the need for dental students, then our educational system is in need of a vigorous overhauling. Furthermore, if dentistry is practiced by these groups more as a business than as a profession, and is attracting the business-minded student rather than the professionally inclined student, then the profession is to be indicted.

In brief, the point is made to place the admission of students not on the basis of race or color but on the possession of intelligence, integrity, honesty, willingness to work, interest and digital skill—the qualities and abilities we need in our young students, if they are to be capable of developing as members of our profession. There is no evidence to lead one to believe these qualities are the sole property of one race or group. Lacking these qualities, Dr. Smith on Main Street is just as poor a dentist as Dr. Cohen on Broadway, or Dr. Milovsky, wherever he may be.

[1] Portion of a forum conducted by Harlan H. Horner, Pd. D., LL. D., in the Journal American College of Dentists, December 1944, vol. 11, No. 4. Dr. Horner presented facts and trends relative to the growing geographical and so-called racial imbalance in dental-school enrollments, and asked Deans Willard C. Fleming, William H. Crawford, of Indiana University, and Gerald D. Timmons, of Temple University to join the forum in a discussion of the implications of the facts and trends. Herewith is presented Dean Fleming's discussion. The report mentioned by Dr. Fleming refers to Dr. Horner's statements presented for discussion in this forum, and is not the report submitted to the Committee on Education of the U. S. House of Representatives on September 21, 1944, which received Nationwide publicity last month.

[2] If one of the groups referred to is the Jewish, the word "racial" is inaccurate. It would have been helpful if the "racial" groups had been identified.

International Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, if a people know the truth, they usually make a

wise decision when called upon. To know the truth they must be able to assimilate facts; to be able to comprehend facts. To be able to comprehend facts they must understand the background, education or lack of education, and emotional reflexes of those producing the facts.

We are either entering into a period of world-wide cooperation with other nations to keep the peace with all our hearts, or we are not going into it. To merely stick our feet into the door of the organization is worse than making no effort at all. If we go in, and I think we must, then I favor going in with a will to make the organization work. To do that we must understand each other, and to understand each other we must have a basis for education. I commend my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for making this wholesome start, and I hope H. R. 215 passes without a dissenting vote.

Whittier Narrows Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding achievements of both the Congress and the Government generally in recent years has been the flood-control program. This program has had my consistent support and I had the honor to serve on the Flood Control Committee for a period of years.

There are, however, various ways in which effective flood control can be achieved and it should be carried out with a view not only of controlling floods, but also of accomplishing this purpose in such a way as to disrupt to the least possible extent the normal functioning of the various communities of our country.

This speech has to do with a feature of the flood-control program in Los Angeles County which, if carried out in accordance with present plans, would do great damage to thriving communities and as to which, therefore, it is my most earnest conviction that there should be an alteration in the plans now projected.

I refer to the proposed construction of the Whittier Narrows Dam on the San Gabriel River in Los Angeles County.

The Whittier Narrows Dam is being vigorously opposed by the citizens of a very wide area centering in the city of El Monte, which is one of the major communities in the congressional district which I represent.

The Whittier Narrows Dam would be a structure approximately 2 miles long, running between two ranges of hills in an approximately east and west direction. It is planned at present to constitute a retarding basin to take care of flood waters of the San Gabriel River after they have passed down from the Santa Fe Dam already virtually complete, about 6 to 8 miles upstream. The Santa Fe Dam is an extremely large structure many miles in length, and constitutes a semicircular arc around the entire discharge cone of the San Gabriel River as it discharges from San Gabriel Canyon in the Sierra Madre Mountains.

It has been vigorously proposed by those in opposition to the Whittier Narrows Dam that with the Santa Fe Dam in operation entirely adequate flood protection from possible floods on the San Gabriel could be afforded by channel improvements—thus eliminating the necessity of constructing Whittier Narrows Dam.

A very considerable area, approximately 3½ miles long and more than 2 miles wide would have to be abandoned if Whittier Narrows Dam is constructed. This area consists of rich farm lands and residential areas and hardly any of it, in contrast to the basin enclosed by the Santa Fe Dam, consists of unproductive or waste lands. On the contrary, the area which would have to be abandoned if Whittier Narrows Dam is constructed is very highly developed, including the homes of thousands of people, improved roads, schools, industrial plants, valuable farm establishments and everything else that goes to make a thriving community. The expense of condemning all this property will be very great indeed. And since it is a dam and reservoir that is involved, that expense will have to be borne by the Federal Government under the law. Furthermore, the development of this area has continued at a very rapid rate since the Corps of Engineers first proposed the construction of Whittier Narrows Dam. At the time it was first proposed the problem of clearing the area was a comparatively simple one to what it would be today, or what it will be after the war when there is any practical possibility of proceeding with this structure.

Within this area there has taken place a tremendous increase in population. Between 1930 and 1940 this general area increased in population by 397 percent, according to official figures. Since 1940 this increase has continued at an accelerated rate. Extensive brand new groups of homes have been built which are presently occupied in large part by persons working in industrial plants in some portion of Los Angeles County.

The plan for Whittier Narrows Dam, which was originally advanced by the Corps of Engineers, would have required the abandonment of approximately 4,700 acres. However, in recent months a revised plan has been advanced which moves the dam farther downstream and will require the abandonment of a smaller area. This change in plan seems to me to be indicative of the fact that the Corps of Engineers itself recognizes the serious problems involved. Under the new plan the area to be abandoned will require the abandonment of some 2,700 acres.

To give some idea of the very rapid increase in population in this general area, I would point out that a somewhat larger section composing the southern portion of the unincorporated section of El Monte increased from 2,298 population in 1930 to 11,443 in 1940. This development has continued at an accelerated rate since 1940 and there is no telling what the population will be by the time it would be possible after the war to actually begin construction.

The major north-south highway in all the eastern portion of Los Angeles County, namely, Rosemead Boulevard, runs almost through the middle of the area to be periodically flooded if the dam is constructed.

Durfee Avenue, another extremely important trunk highway, traverses the section which would have to be abandoned if the dam is constructed for more than a mile.

A plant of the Bodger Seed Co., a large number of highly important dairy plants, and a number of other facilities of similar sort are included in this area. In addition, of course, there are thousands of homes, dozens of miles of improved road and highways—most of it paved—and much other valuable property, all of which will have to be abandoned and presumably compensated for if the Whittier Narrows Dam is built.

In addition to this, there are three school districts which will be seriously affected. All three of these school districts now have so many children attending school that they are compelled to have half the children come one half day and the other half come the other half day in order to accommodate all their enrollment. In the case of one of these schools, namely the Temple School, the school building itself lies in the area to be abandoned and the bulk of the child population now served by that school also lies within that area. In the case of the Potrero School, the dam would cut off about half of the population now served by the school. The Mountain View School and the El Monte Union High School district would be most seriously affected, also.

In all three instances the question arises as to what would be done about the outstanding bonded indebtedness of these school districts. Presumably, the bondholders would still expect to get paid their money, but there would be no possible means of accomplishing this purpose unless the Federal Government were to assume the indebtedness itself, or some similar plan worked out.

EFFECT ON SURROUNDING AREAS

This problem cannot be comprehended if we limit our consideration to the area which will have to be abandoned if the dam is built That area is an integral part of a larger area which centers around the town of El Monte. This area is generally occupied by people in the medium income and low income group. There are comparatively few wealthy people in this area, which is an additional reason why I am deeply concerned about its welfare.

The construction of the dam would have a very serious, if not a devastating effect upon the business life of this whole section, affecting thereby the future prosperity of surrounding communities as well. To mention only one feature of this, the El Monte Union High School plant was completed only a few years ago. It is an excellent plant, serving not only the city of El Monte but all of the area which would be abandoned if the dam is built, as well as other surrounding regions. This whole high-school district

would be up against an insurmountable financial problem if all of the lands to be abandoned under the proposed plan were taken out of its taxing district.

Another problem already serious, but which would be no doubt made worse by the construction of Whittier Narrows Dam is the problem of ground water. In this whole area during the rainy season, the water table sometimes rises so as to fill with water the basements of many of the buildings in this region. Obviously that situation would be aggravated by the construction of Whittier Narrows Dam, whereas it would be relieved by channel improvements in the river.

I shall not attempt to analyze in detail the alternative proposal to the Whittier Narrows Dam. Very briefly, it is to construct channel improvements on the San Gabriel River below the Santa Fe Dam which would be adequate to take care of any flood problem which would reasonably be expected to affect the area.

It has been contended in the past that the cost of such a general improvement program would be $15,000,000 more than the Whittier Narrows Dam program. I have two comments to make upon this contention. The first is that the cost of channel improvements depends in large part upon whether or not care is exercised in making such improvements to leave out of the channel properties of substantial value. I am informed, for example, that there are certain oil properties which either might or might not be included within the confines of an improved San Gabriel River channel. If they were to be included, of course, the cost would be much higher than would be the case otherwise. But I am personally convinced that there is no necessity of including them.

In the second place, whatever the estimates may have been in the past about the cost of the Whittier Narrows Dam program, it would obviously be necessary to revise those estimates sharply upward under present circumstances, due to the increasing value of the property which would have to be abandoned and the continuous increase in the development of the area. Competent engineers very close to the whole flood-control program of Los Angeles County have informed me in recent months that in their judgment there were many new factors involved in the situation which ought to receive a new and detailed study before Whittier Narrows Dam is constructed, if indeed it ever is.

J. G. White Engineering Corporation Report on St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a report was submitted by the J. G. White Engineering Corporation dealing with the physical resources of the State of Minnesota. This report no doubt has some very excellent ideas, but it entirely overlooked the possibilities of economic, agricultural, and industrial development of Minnesota, as well as the Midwest, which would come about with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

We had hoped that more publicity would be given to the J. G. White report. Of course, the Minnesota Resources Commission has a pamphlet on that subject, but nothing to say about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

It is therefore fortunate that we have a publication, the Duluth Publicity, of which Frieda J. Monger is editor and publisher. The editor considered the problem of sufficient importance to report at some length a discussion which took place recently at a club meeting in Duluth, Minn., and should be commended by every person interested in the St. Lawrence project for giving publicity to this J. G. White report.

At that meeting, according to the editor of the Duluth Publicity, Thomas W. Wahl, Duluth member of the Minnesota Tidewater Commission, took exception to the J. G. White report. Mr. Wahl's devotion to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is too well known among his friends and neighbors to require any comment. He rendered a fine public service in discussing the J. G. White report. The editorial which appeared in Duluth Publicity under date of Saturday, April 28, 1945, and which tells its own story, reads as follows:

MINNESOTA'S BIGGEST PROJECT SLIGHTED

At an open forum meeting sponsored by the Republican Women's Club of Duluth last Thursday evening in the chamber of commerce, the J. G. White Engineering Corporation's report on the physical resources of Minnesota was the subject for discussion. After a talk by James W. Clark, executive secretary of the Minnesota Resources Commission, which sponsored the White survey, the meeting was thrown open for discussion.

Thomas W. Wahl, Duluth member of the Minnesota Tidewater Commission, and for 30 years a staunch advocate of the Duluth-St. Lawrence seaway, took the floor. Mr. Wahl called attention to the fact that exactly 100 years ago 1 man, 1 horse, and a wagon handled all the freight around the Sault Ste. Marie Falls, and that in 1944 the tonnage handled on the Great Lakes amounted to 159,000,000 tons.

Mr. Wahl had with him a copy of the original White report, which consists of four large volumes. He voiced objection to the fact that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway was not mentioned except to say that if the lake channels were deepened there "might" be more tonnage.

Mr. Clark called attention to the fact that Minnesota farmers were at a disadvantage because of cost of hauling their products to market. Mr. Wahl pointed out that the only way this can be overcome is through the seaway, as it costs nine times as much to haul freight by rail as it does by deep-water transportation. He stated that Henry Tarring, Jr., and Joseph J. Kuchar, representatives of the White Engineering Co., called upon him in June 1944 and that he spent over 2 hours with them, going over his private St. Lawrence seaway library which he has accumulated during the past 30 years. Mr. Wahl stated further that he had introduced Tarring and Kuchar to Julius H. Barnes, whom he considers the best-posted man in the Nation on Great Lakes transportation, and that Mr. Barnes, Mr. Kuchar, and Mr. Wahl then spent over 2 hours going over the project. Later on Mr. Barnes and Rollo F. Hunt, Duluth attorney and chairman of the Minnesota Tidewater Association, went to St. Paul by appointment with the J. G. White officials for a third conference on the seaway.

Mr. Wahl insisted that after he, Mr. Barnes, and Mr. Hunt gave the White officials all of this information on a subject so vital to the State of Minnesota, they should have said something more than: "The development of the St. Lawrence waterway to sufficient depth might have a far-reaching effect on bulk lake traffic by bringing ocean ships to the Great Lakes and to Duluth-Superior. The lake carriage of goods has offered lower rail-lake and rail-lake-rail rates than all-rail rates for like shipments. This factor has been beneficial to Minnesota."

After casually examining the original White report we would say it is not as optimistic about Minnesota's future as conditions warrant. Instead of hiring someone from a long distance, officials who sent a couple of men here for a few months, it might have been better to have engaged someone who knows the Midwest or those who have lived in our State for many years and know its advantages and disadvantages. One thing is certain: a report costing some $175,000, of which Duluthians contributed $25,000, should have devoted more space to the biggest project in Minnesota's future—the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Speaker, evidently the J. G. White Engineering Corporation was so busy looking at the forest that it failed to see any of the trees. This must be true because people interested in developing Minnesota and the Northwest have consistently pointed out the advantage of water transportation rates in the Great Lakes area. The Midwest is a landlocked empire and the 27-foot channel in the St. Lawrence River would make the various cities on the Great Lakes virtually ocean ports. Commerce has never done any damage to New York, Boston, and other eastern seaboard cities. Measured by their standards of commercial activity, the Great Lakes ports would become beehives of activity upon completion of the seaway project.

Money must be plentiful and people must like to waste it, if the State spent $175,000 for a report which entirely overlooked the unlimited possibilities of the St. Lawrence development, so far as progress in Minnesota and other adjacent States is concerned.

Of course, there is always a reason, like grapenuts, for some things that happen. I am under the impression that one of the suburbs of Duluth, about 178 miles away, had some industrialists who "engineered" this engineering report. They evidently saw to it that the report was tailor-made and must have felt that Duluth was an orphan or a stepchild, and did not "fit in" with the purposes they had in mind in getting this report.

The Sovietizing of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the sovietizing of Finland:

Since September 20, 1944, when Finland was forced to submit to Russia's crushing armistice terms, there has begun the liquidation of Finland's independence, once held up as a model for the democracies of the world. News from Finland has been scarce, but what little has trickled through the present tight censorship raises grave questions as to Finland's hope for continuance as a free and independent people.

Reporting as a representative of the Federal Council of Churches, Dr. A. L. Warnshuis, who recently visited Europe, stated, "I have brought a special appeal from Finland where the harsh armistice and internal conditions mean the sovietizing of that country." (The Church Situation in Europe, News Bulletin of the National Lutheran Council, January 26, 1945.)

Oscar Jacobi, who visited Finland recently, obviously made an understatement when he said in Collier's (January 20, 1945) that some of the text in the next chapters of Finland's history "is going to be contributed by Moscow." In Finland's recent parliamentary elections, the truly significant factor was not that the elections were outwardly "free" but that there was present fear and psychological intimidation. The Russian newspaper Pravda made clear to the Finnish people that parliamentary elections in Finland were "not to be considered an internal affair of the Finns." To this she added the righteous-sounding assertion that Allied Nations' public opinion was closely watching Finland's election to see whether there would be a "complete victor for the principles adopted at the Crimean Conference." Taken together with her claim that the Young Communist Party is the second largest among the Finnish parties today, this statement clearly implied that only a decisive vote for the Communists would be considered in accord with the principles adopted at Yalta. Contrast this with the observation of Newsweek, on March 19, 1945, that the "Finnish electoral campaign is being watched closely in Washington and London for indications of Russia's attitude toward popular elections in countries under its control."

Thus, while the Soviet Government has publicly announced its policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries brought under the orbit of her control, Pravda indicated to the Finns in no uncertain terms how they must vote. Russia's attitude, revealed in her government-dominated press, is vastly more significant for Finland's future than the freedom claimed for the recent elections. Equally significant and even more ominous is the fact that the Russian newspapers, once the election was over, have taken to accusing the Finnish authorities of being too lenient and formalistic in bringing to trial so-called war criminals. It is not difficult to see the directions which further pressure and intervention will take.

FINLAND'S STORY

In 1940 American sympathy for Finland, to use the words of William Henry Chamberlain, was "warm, instinctive, and practically universal." President Roosevelt called it "axiomatic."

During the past 2 years the mists of war propaganda have clouded Finland's case and Americans have been unable to hear her story. Finland's voice has been largely silenced in this country. Do Americans realize that for almost 2 years prior to the throwing out of the Finnish Minister the Legation in Washington was not permitted to present Finland's side? The Minister and his staff stood with hands tied while their enemies were permitted to hit at them as they chose. The floodgates of Russian propaganda were opened, and there was utmost freedom for one-sided Communist and anti-Finnish statements and misstatements. This is surely a curious logic when a people considered the most literate in the world, a people who maintain free assemblies and meet with honor their obligations, are discounted and suppressed while the spokesmen for a totalitarian power, "a dictatorship as absolute as any other," are free to speak.

Today strong voices are being raised in protest over the sacrifice of Poland on the altar of expediency and power politics. It is inevitable that Americans will compare the achievements and decisions of the great powers with their expressed war aims. The only real hope for Finland, Poland, the Baltic countries, and other small democracies, will lie in an enlightened and vocal public opinion guided by the principles of justice and fairness. Security and peace plans are now in the making. The great majority of Americans are sincere in their desire to cooperate for world security and a lasting peace. We are equally sincere in asking that reason, justice, and fair play will be brought to work on the peace.

The tremendous responsibility of the leading powers is clearly set forth in an editorial of the New York Times in these words, "Under the Crimea Charter, the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia assumed joint responsibility for developments in Europe, and pledged themselves in particular to see to it that the liberated people of Europe, including the former Axis satellites, have a chance to attain liberty and self-government, through the democratic process of free elections under conditions of internal peace." (March 11, 1945.)

Finland was never an Axis satellite. She was not an ally of Germany and had no commitments to her. Throughout the war she maintained consistently that her defensive struggle against Russia was wholly independent of the major conflict. In fairness to Finland and to our own long-standing friendship and sympathy for her we should consider carefully the record of events in the successive phases of her effort to retain independence.

RUSSIA ATTACKS FINLAND

In October 1939, when it was already plain that Russia intended to invade Finland after the same manner in which she took over the Baltic democracies, President Roosevelt made an effort to stay hostilities and sent an urgent personal note to President Mikhail Kalinin of the U. S. S. R. expressing the earnest hope that the Soviet Union would make no demands on Finland which are inconsistent with the maintenance and development of amicable and peaceful relations between the two countries and the independence of each (New York Times, October 14, 1939). In his note the President referred to the long-standing and deep friendship which exists between the United States and Finland.

In his reply of October 16, 1939, President Kalinin reminded President Roosevelt that Russia in 1917 recognized Finland's independence, and expressly stated that the sole aim of the negotiations (with Finland) is the * * * strengthening of friendly cooperation between both countries in the cause of guaranteeing the security of the Soviet Union and Finland (New York Times, October 18, 1939).

Thus at the very moment when Russia was making plans to attack Finland she sought to deceive the world in regard to her real intentions.

A survey of events since the first Finnish-Russian war which began with Russia's aggression against Finland in 1939 shows that Finland was from the very beginning concerned with only one aim, the preservation of her own independence and territorial integrity. She was not an ally of Germany, she had no commitments to Germany, she was not out for conquest, nor did she have any grandiose ambitions of destroying communism in Russia. She was fighting for her own very existence, and that is all.

In 1939 Finland was attacked by Russia. What happened then was an open story to the entire world. Finland's struggle was hailed as a defense of liberty and justice. A great flood of sympathy was released particularly in America over this wholly unwarranted and ruthless aggression by a neighbor fifty times stronger. The League of Nations unanimously expelled Soviet Russia from membership because of her attack on Finland. President Roosevelt, in an address before the American Youth Congress (New York Times, February 11, 1940), summed up the feelings of the American people in these telling words:

"Here is a small republic in northern Europe. A republic which, without any question whatever, wishes solely to maintain its own territorial and governmental integrity. Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland had any ulterior designs on the integrity or the safety of the Soviet Union.

"The American sympathy is 93 percent with the Finns in their effort to stave oq invasion of their own soil. That American sympathy by now is axiomatic.

"The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, as everybody knows who has got the courage to face the fact, the practical fact known to you and known to all the world, is run by a dictatorship, a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

"It has allied itself with another dictatorship and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union, a small nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy and a liberal forward-looking democracy at that."

Finland's courageous and skillful defense has not been forgotten. The odds, however, were too great, and America's refusal to allow her to purchase arms probably was a decisive factor in her collapse. When the Russians broke through the Mannerheim Line on the Karelian Isthmus and reached Viipuri, Finland was compelled to submit to a peace which deprived her of approximately a tenth of her territory, including the historic city of Viipuri, the naval base of Hanko, the shore of Lake Ladoga, and other territory in the north of Finland. Almost a half million Finns "in one of the most impressive informal plebiscites of modern history * * * moved voluntarily and en masse into the shrunken part of Finland. Practically none chose to remain under Soviet rule." (American Mercury, July 1944, p. 11.) The Treaty of Moscow deprived Finland not only of a substantial section of territory but also of approximately 15 percent of her productive capacity. This was Finland's reward for defending herself against unprovoked aggression.

STRIVING TO MAINTAIN THE PEACE

The interval of peace following the treaty of March 1940 was a trying one for Finland. She scrupulously observed the details of this treaty, but the Soviet Government lost no time in exerting pressure of various sorts in order to gain a stronger hold. The Soviet diplomatic and consular corps was more than doubled in size (in Helsinki alone there were 31 in the diplomatic corps and 120 assist-

ants), and efforts to develop a fifth column among the Finns were none too subtle. Constant espionage was carried on by these nominal consular officials, for whom permission to travel in restricted areas, with freedom from any control by Finnish authorities, was insistently demanded by Moscow.

The words of a British publication, all the more striking because Great Britain was formally at war with Finland, portray clearly the difficulties Finland had with Russia during this period. This magazine, The Nineteenth Century and Afterwards, said in its March 1944 issue:

"Although Russia had declared herself satisfied with the treaty, she profited by the helplessness to which Finland had been reduced to impinge upon Finnish domestic affairs and Finnish foreign policy. For example, Finland attempted to promote a defensive association of the Nordic countries, which, had it come into existence, would have drawn Finland, Norway, and Sweden together against Germany. Under Russian pressure Finland was obliged to desist. The personnel in the Russian Legation at Helsinki and in the Russian consulates throughout the country was numerous far beyond normal needs, and there was constant interference in Finnish internal affairs. Demands which had not been made in the peace negotiations were made when Finland was unable to resist them. Amongst these demands were the demilitarization of the Aaland Islands under Russian control, a preponderant Russian share in the management of the Petsamo nickel mines, the surrender of rolling stock beyond the amount stipulated in the treaty, compensation for goods removed from the ceded areas, the cession of the Vallenkoski Rapids (which were entirely on the Finnish side of the frontier). All Finnish attempts to promote trade with Russia and to promote a better understanding in the realms of science and of letters were rebuffed. When Mr. Molotov was in Berlin during the month of November 1940 he demanded that Russia have a free hand in Finland. The demand was refused by the German Government. It is not surprising that the Finns, who have little sympathy with the Germans—and still less for national socialism—should have felt some relief." (Quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1944, p. 3887.)

Among other demands not included in the Moscow Treaty was the request of the Soviet Union that Finland permit Russia to run its own trains to and from Hanko through southern Finland. The trains were used for the transportation of Russian troops and munitions. Finland objected strenuously to this request but was finally compelled to consent in July 1940. At this time Russia and Germany were in close collaboration against the allies. With the precedent established by Russia, Germany was able to secure the consent of Finland to the transit of German troops to and from Norway through the wilderness of Lapland. Thus the German movement of troops was through northern Finland, the Russian movement through the vital areas of southern Finland. Interestingly enough, the Soviet Union did not protest the permission given the Germans (in September 1940), and when she attacked Finland a second time, no reference was made to the German transit. Russia didn't even use it as a pretext.

It has been found to be excellent anti-Finnish propaganda to cite the presence of German troops in Finland. And it is, if one omits to mention why?

RUSSIA ATTACKS AGAIN

Finland did not enter war against Russia a second time because of Nazi sympathies. Russia was the aggressor again in June 1941. This was the eventful month when Germany invaded Russia. While Russian propaganda has attempted to make out that Finland used the opportunity to regain lost territory, the facts speak otherwise. Note carefully the following:

Our own State Department's press release, dated December 18, 1941, giving the official chronology of events in 1941, has these cryptic and tragic words concerning what happened on June 22, 1941:

"Germany invades the Soviet Union; the latter raids Finland; Hitler's speech and Ribbentrop's statement on declaration of war against the Soviet Union." (New York Times, June 23, 1941, pp. 1: 8, 4: 2.)

On the very day, June 22, 1941, when the Russian-German war started, Russia resumed active hostilities against Finland. On that same day the Russians bombed the Aaland Islands and attempted to bomb two Finnish warships. On the 23d, Abo (Turku) was bombed by 24 Russian airplanes. The open city of Willmanstrand was bombed on the same day—so was the Malm airdrome near Helsinki. The Russian Government was asked for an explanation, but no answer came.

Finland herself had refrained from any military action. On the 24th, the Finnish minister in London assured Mr. Eden that Finland would remain on the defensive. But by the 26th more than 10 Finnish towns had been bombed by the Russians and had suffered heavy casualties. On that day, President Risto Ryti broadcast a declaration that Finland would fight in self-defense. "There was a unanimous vote of support for the government when it reluctantly, and after some days of delay, entered the war against Russia for the second time, in June 1941. This unanimous vote was for the same reason as the unanimous vote of the American Congress after Japan had bombed Pearl Harbor. It was in response to days of one-sided bombing of Finnish cities by Soviet airplanes." ("The Tragic Case of Finland," American Mercury, July 1944).

So it was not until after Russia had repeatedly attacked Finland and after there was no longer the slightest question of her intentions that the Finnish Parliament approved military resistance, and only after Russia had refused to answer repeated Finnish requests for explanations of the attacks.

The Finns had been utterly exhausted by the previous war with Russia. But it was clear that their last chance of survival as an independent nation was disappearing. They fought in self-defense for a second time. Their army regained the territory wrested from Finland in March 1940, and pushed only into Soviet Karelia where they established a natural defensive position. For 2 years there was little more than patrol activity on this front. In fact, it became known as a "sit-down war." It is an unsubstantiated Soviet canard that Finnish guns took part in the bombardment of Leningrad which because of its closeness they could have easily bombarded at any time had they so decided. They took no part in the German offensive against that city.

Not only did the Finns refrain from joining in offensive action against Leningrad, but at the very time the Russian resistance at that city was described as most desperate the Finnish Army was only about 28 miles from Murmansk Junction and could have cut that important Russian supply road if she had wanted to. The Finns did not push this great military advantage, and it is impossible to believe that the reason was aught else than their trust in us. If the Russian defensive position was as desperate as has been described it may well be that this fact was a decisive factor.

HARSH PEACE TERMS

Finland was not dominated by Nazi Germany, for if she had been she could not even have begun to discuss armistice or peace terms with Russia, as she did in February 1944. William Henry Chamberlain has pointed out that Finland's taking the initiative in opening peace negotiations is convincing proof that she was not a puppet in the hands of Germany. (The Tragic Case of Finland—the American Mercury, July 1944, p. 13.)

Time and again Russia's first peace terms for Finland were referred to as "reasonable." It is little wonder if some Americans were misled into thinking the Finns to be stubborn, stupid, and perhaps indeed Nazi-dominated in failing to jump at the chance of getting out of the war.

Even a superficial study of the terms should make it clear that they were anything but reasonable. Russia's first set of terms, given through representatives in Stockholm, demanded the breaking off of relations with Germany, internment of German troops in Finland, the restoration of the frontier enforced by the Moscow Treaty in 1940, postponement of reparations discussions, demobilization of the army, and the disposition of Finland's port on the Arctic Ocean, Petsamo, for later negotiations.

In spite of the harshness of these terms, the Finnish Government decided to continue negotiations and was supported in its attitude by the Parliament. After some exchanges of notes Finland sent Paasikivi and Enckell to Moscow to discuss the terms. Near the end of March the Soviet Government gave new armistice terms and, through clever propaganda, gave the world to understand that Finland was to receive more lenient and moderate conditions.

The terms, however, laying down six conditions, were more specific than before and far more harsh:

Finland was to sever relations with Germany, intern German troops, and withdraw Finnish troops to the 1940 border all during the month of April. Soviet war prisoners and civilians were to be returned to Russia immediately; only if the armistice became a peace treaty, exchange of prisoners would be reciprocal. Half of the Finnish army was to be demobilized during May and the entire Finnish army returned to peacetime strength during June and July. In addition, Russia demanded that Finland pay an indemnity of $600,000,000 American dollars in goods within 5 years' time. Petsamo and the Petsamo area were to be ceded to the Soviet Union.

These terms fixed a time limit on internment of German troops physically impossible to fulfill. According to American press reports, there were approximately a hundred thousand German troops in northern Finland, and these could very easily get reinforcements from Norway. Either Finland would have become engaged in a two-front war, or, being compelled to accept Russian aid and admit Russian troops, would have sacrificed everything for which she had fought since 1939. The withdrawal of Finnish troops to the 1940 border would also have been next to impossible within the time limit demanded, and it was complicated by the further problem of moving the entire population of 300,000 people with all their goods from the Karelian area to other parts of Finland. Not one of these people would have voluntarily remained in Karelia. With the cession of her second largest city, Viipuri, and the extensive system of natural waterways and railways in eastern Finland, and with the loss of 15 percent of her yearly exports, the economic unity of Finland would have been broken completely.

In the light of the above and of the fact that Finland had lost much of her productive capacity through the loss of manpower and other factors of war, the demand for an indemnity of $600,000,000, to be paid in the brief time of 5 years, was the most crushing term of all.

In the first place, Finland was not the aggressor, and hence the staggering indemnity was contrary to all principles of justice and decency. In the second place, the indemnity

amount, perhaps seemingly small to Americans now accustomed to speaking easily in billions, was more than the total national income of Finland during the peak years prior to the war. Its payment would have absorbed all Finnish exports; moreover, payment was to be made in goods with prices not determined in advance, enabling Russia arbitrarily to set her own prices. For America in a similar position an equivalent sum would be roughly $120,000,000,000.

Acceptance of the terms would have brought Finland to economic starvation and servitude in an impossible attempt to pay an impossible indemnity. Failure to have paid to the full would have only given Russia a pretext for finally seizing Finland and accomplishing her announced aim of exterminating the Finns "from the face of the earth." (Fravda, June 23, 1941.)

The Finnish Parliament rejected the Soviet terms unanimously. The Finnish people themselves knew them to be unjust and impossible of fulfillment. Acceptance would have been disastrous to the very existence of the nation. The Russian terms were an ultimatum, and Finland was given no opportunity to present counterproposals. It was a take-it-or-leave-it proposition.

RUSSIAN PRESSURE BRINGS ABOUT DIPLOMATIC BREAK

On June 15, 1944, Finland paid its debt installment of $148,000, which it theretofore had been paying regularly and promptly for years. On the following day Finland's minister to the United States, Mr. Procopé, was ordered to leave the country on account of activities described as "inimical" to the United States. A few days later diplomatic relations with Finland were severed.

In the meantime, Russia marked the opening of the second front in Europe (on the part of the Anglo-American forces) by launching a large-scale attack, not at once against Germany but against Finland. While for the gigantic Russian Army this was a relatively minor undertaking, "yet the fact remains that on Moscow's list of political priorities the defeat of Finland has been given precedence over that of Germany." See Human Events, June 21, 1944. Puny Finnish defenses were no match for the Soviet powerhouse, strengthened immeasurably since the winter war of 1939 by American planes and tanks. The Mannerheim Line on the Karelian Isthmus was soon breached.

Under constant pressure from Russia, our State Department had warned the Finns to "get out of the war" or to take the consequences. To the little nation of some 3,000,000 souls who had desperately tried to keep out, this phrase must have had a callous ring. Aside from the fact that Finland was not the aggressor either in 1941 or 1939, it appears obvious that such warnings could have no practical meaning as long as the United States and Great Britain could offer her no honorable way out or assure her that surrendering did not mean loss of independence. In the words of William Henry Chamberlain, "Had the American Government, with Soviet consent and authorization, been able to offer Finland at any time a peace settlement based on restoration of the 1939 frontier, backed up by some international guaranty, the Finnish Government could have been rightly accused of obstinacy and bad judgment in refusing to accept such a settlement." (American Mercury, July 1944, p. 13.) The fact is that no such offer was ever made.

To the overwhelming majority of Americans and especially Americans of Finnish extraction, now heartsick over the fate of the country of their forebears, the reference to "inimical activities" on the part of Finland's Minister and the repeated suggestion that Finland was pro-Nazi simply did not make sense. Minister Procopé was recognized as an outstanding diplomat in Washington, in spirit thoroughly American. His dismissal made it possible for American Communists to hint that the last "Axis listening post" had been removed from Washington, a suggestion which was rank injustice to a man who had served as President of the Council of the League of Nations and who was regarded in Washington and throughout Europe as a man of unimpeachable integrity. The senior Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, paid this tribute to Procopé a few days later: "I cannot find it in my heart to believe that Hjalmar Procopé, a gallant Finnish patriot, is guilty of anything which does not stem from distraught anxiety for his beleaguered homeland and from complete devotion to the harassed life blood of the magnificent Finnish democracy. It leaves me morally certain, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that he has never harbored so much as one vagrant thought that was consciously hostile to our own United States." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 19, 1944, p. 6142.)

In that same address Senator VANDENBERG, whose statesmanship has made him an outstanding delegate to the World Security Conference, made this significant statement: "Only 24 hours before his recall, this Minister once more paid Finland's debt instaliment, inherited from World War No. 1, still uniquely faithful to her undefiled word even in the midst of new and desperate travail. This is not the act of an enemy. For the sake of history, and perhaps, for the sake of belated justice in the post-war world to come, I cannot forget these things, amid the bewildering contradictions of this crashing conflict."

A CRUSHING ARMISTICE

"The armistice terms which Russia and Britain have imposed on Finland are so severe that she may not survive as an independent nation. If the purpose is to make her a puppet of Russia, a good start has been made. If the intent is to build a free, healthy, and peaceful Europe, then the allies began with a failure. * * * The idea that such a tiny state can be a menace to Russia, the mightiest land power in the world, is fantastic claptrap." (Editorial in New York World-Telegram, September 22, 1944.)

On the diplomatic front Russia had now gained what she wanted. She could put the pressure on Finland without concern for possible interference from her allies.

The power of Russia's armies was more than Finland could withstand. On September 20, 1944, she was compelled to accept the armistice terms demanded by the Soviet Union, terms no less devastating than those offered earlier.

Petsamo, in the north, was ceded to the Soviet Union. In place of Hanko, Russia demanded and received on a 50-year-lease basis the even more strategic Porkkala Peninsula, on the south coast of Finland. The frontier established by the Moscow treaty in 1940 was restored. Finland undertook to withdraw her troops at once beyond the line of this frontier and to transfer her army to a peacetime basis within 2½ months.

German land, naval, and air forces remaining in the country were to be disarmed and turned over to the Soviet. The attempt to fulfill this clause has proved to be, as was to be expected, a bloody business, involving the exhausted Finnish Army in a prolonged and bitter struggle in the north, where the Germans have systematically destroyed Finnish towns and homes in a slow retreat into Norway. Oscar Jacobi, writing in Colliers (January 20, 1945), says he had a good look at the fighting in the north, where "men died or suffered all the hardships of a major-scale war." Thousands of Finns, torn from their homes in the northernmost areas, have now had to move southward through the new devastation, complicating the already desperate housing and food situation.

In regard to the reparations clause forced on the Finns, Jacobi writes:

"The Moscow armistice agreement was worded so as to give the Russians wide latitude in interpretation—something about which the Finns felt—and still feel—very uneasy. In the reparations clause they got their first bitter taste of this loose wording. The $600,000,000 originally asked for by the Russians was reduced in the treaty to $300,000,000, which pleased the Finns no end. But there was a catch to it.

"Reparations are to be paid not in cash but in kind, and the Russians have decided they will credit Finnish deliveries against reparations only at prices obtaining in 1938. Since these are vastly lower than today's, Moscow's dictum means in reality that the Finns will have to deliver products worth $700,000,000 at today's prices." (Colliers, January 20, 1945, p. 69.)

For America, in a similar position, an equivalent sum would be roughly $140,000,000,000. Some sum for a nation with a population no larger than the city of Brooklyn. A terrific price for resisting unprovoked aggression.

War criminals: Among the articles of the armistice was also the agreement to collaborate with the Soviet "in the task of the detention of persons accused of war crimes, and the trials of such persons." This follows the invariable Russian pattern.

Genuine war criminals should not go unpunished. Finland's only "crime," however, was in defending herself against unprovoked aggression, in 1941 as in 1939, and in choosing to stand up for her rights and to fight for her freedom against the forces of vicious despotism. Finland's leaders were motivated by their concern for Finland's future. They were pro-Finnish and not pro-Nazi. In a note to Great Britain on October 6, 1941, the Finnish Government said: "Finland wages her defensive war free from all political obligations, but grateful that she need not this time fight alone."

That the concern of Finland's people and her leaders at the time they chose to defend themselves against impossible odds was not without ground is now plain from reports that come from Europe. "What has already happened in the Baltic Nations is a fearful story," writes Dr. A. L. Warnhuis. "I was told that 600,000 of these people * * * have fled before the advancing Russian armies. * * * It is Russia as a nation state and its imperialism that is feared. * * * The fear persists, and we ought to be concerned about this great issue and do everything that is right and possible in reenforcing the Soviet promise of noninterference in domestic affairs." (News Bulletin, National Lutheran Council, January 26, 1945.)

The armistice has also made it possible for Russia to extend her grip on Finland in various ways without making her interference in domestic affairs appear too obvious and yet in time permitting her hold to become ever stronger. Finland has been compelled to disband all patriotic organizations and at the same time to release from prison all Communists and any others who had been confined for treason. These are the ones who are making the loudest cry over war criminals and the need for people's tribunals to try them. It is they who are and will provide the link between Finnish Communists and Moscow and who, to prove that their hearts are in the right place, are serving as willing errand boys to create the proper possibilities for further Russian interference. Seeking to cooperate with the Soviet in the matter of trials by taking them up through the orderly procedure of her democratic courts, Finland has now been accused by the Russian news agency Tass of investigating crimes in a formalistic manner. (New York Times, March 21, 1945.) With the strong backing of Russia, the extreme leftists will keep clamoring for the establishment of people's tribunals empowered to deal out summary justice in the true Soviet manner. The Soviet's record in bringing such justice into the Baltic countries and

Poland promises to make Finland's ordeal of peace even more fearful than her ordeal of war.

Some may still ask, "Is not Russia our ally?" We may well ask in turn, "Does this justify her as an aggressor against a democratic neutral nation which has always been our friend?" Moscow does not conceal her objective of absorbing Finland into the Soviet Union. "Nor is this a new ambition," comments Human Events (June 21, 1944). "As far back as January 1940, Mr. Herbert B. Elliston, a former British national, who is now chief editorial writer for the Washington Post, reported from Helsinki: 'There is no doubt that the price asked of the British for a Russian pact included acquiescence in the extinguishment of Finnish independence. The Finns are grateful to the British for refusing to be accessory to the crime, a word, incidentally, which sounds like a Sunday school picnic to one who witnessed the bombing of Helsinki.'"

The great statesman and diplomat, Andrew D. White, who was United States Minister to Russia in 1892–94, wrote in regard to Russia's traditional policy and attitude toward Finland: "To say nothing of the policy of Russia in Poland and elsewhere, her dealings with Finland thus far form one of the blackest spots on the history of the empire." (Autobiography of Andrew D. White, Century Co., 1917, p. 70.)

IS FINLAND WORTH SAVING?

The aims for which we have been fighting this bloodiest of wars persist in intruding on our consciences even while the heat of battle is at its fiercest, and their demands for attention will mount as the making of the peace approaches.

If ever, it is now that Americans should steep themselves in the philosophy of our ideals clearly expressed in the statements of our statesmen and leaders.

A great interpreter of the American spirit, President Woodrow Wilson, has voiced the reasons why we are constantly concerned with the liberty and welfare of other countries:

"Why is it that all nations turn to us with the instinctive feeling that if anything touches humanity it touches us? Because it knows that ever since we were born as a nation we have undertaken to be the champions of humanity and of the rights of men. Without that ideal there would be nothing that would distinguish America from her predecessors in the history of Nations." (The New Democracy, II, p. 44.)

And America's spiritual heritage and destiny are set forth in these immortal words:

"America has never seen its destiny with the physical eye. * * * The destiny of America is an ideal destiny. * * * It is her incumbent privilege to declare and stand for the rights of men. Nothing less is worth fighting for, nothing less is worth sacrificing for." (The New Democracy, II, p. 68.)

The small nations whose future is now being determined for a long time to come cherish dearly those very rights for which we ourselves have been willing to go to war. The great English historian and statesman, Viscount Bryce, author of The American Commonwealth, the classic work on American government and institutions, has stated the case of the small nation in these words:

"The small states, whose absorption is now threatened, have been potent and useful—perhaps the most potent and useful—factors in the advance of civilization. It is in them and by them that most of what is precious in religion, in philosophy, in literature, in science, and in art has been produced.

"We may be able to arrest the forces which seem to be making for that extinction, but we certainly ought not to strengthen them. Rather we ought to maintain and defend the smaller states." (Essays and Addresses in War Time, 1918, pp. 12, 14.)

The principle of self-determination for nations is a fundamental American doctrine. This is evident from the following declaration of President Wilson:

"National aspirations must be respected: peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their consent. * * * Peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game. * * * The day of conquest and aggrandizement has gone by."

The saving of Finland and the other democracies from the disaster which has overtaken them is, therefore, more than a matter of sentimental feeling for America. The principles and ideals for which we have always stood are involved. When President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill wrote the Atlantic Charter, they restated in simple and clear terms those same ideals of self-determination and freedom which are part and parcel of America's heritage—ideals stated first in our Declaration of Independence.

Whatever may have been said later in the interests of expediency concerning the Atlantic Charter, its promises that the victors would not "seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise"; that "There shall be no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned"; that the peace should "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; that "sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them," are in perfect accord with the ideals of our American heritage. In his recent message to Congress, President Roosevelt asserted that "we shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure so far as is humanly possible the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter."

Our traditional policy of friendliness and help toward small democracies, which is entailed in our own undying love of freedom, will not permit us to stand by and to watch a helpless people be deliberately destroyed without our exerting every possible influence "to arrest the forces which seem to be making for that extinction." Especially must this be true in the present conflict in which the liberation of countries which have felt the iron heel of the dictator is one of our declared aims. We were once a small Nation ourselves. We have fought for justice and self-determination. Every corpuscle in our body rebels against the philosophy that "might is right." To allow anything less than full freedom and governmental and territorial integrity to Finland or to the other threatened countries would be virtually to repudiate the principles for which we have always stood and for which we have again gone to war.

A voice from America's past arises even today to remind us of our tremendous responsibility. In an address in New York City on December 15, 1916, that great American Secretary of State, Elihu Root, expressed thoughts which are applicable to Finland. If the word "Finland" were substituted for "Belgium," one would think that he were speaking of Finland today. We commend his thoughts to every American for consideration:

"Poor Belgium, peaceful, industrious, God-fearing, law-abiding Belgium, she had no quarrel with anyone; she sought no nation's territory, she coveted no neighbor's goods; she threatened no one's security, but she stood in the way of a mightier nation's purpose and she was stricken to the earth. [This is exactly Finland's present tragic situation.]

"What we have to do is not merely to protest in the name of humanity it is to assert a right, it is to call upon the world to assert a right, a right under the law of nations for the protection of humanity and of civilization. This is our concern."

Even if Finland were a backward and uncivilized country, she would be entitled to America's support. It happens, however, that Finland, to quote Cecil Gray, an English writer, in his book on Sibelius, is "one of the most—if not, indeed, as is very probable, quite the most—advanced and progressive country in Europe today."

Her political constitution, adds Gray, "is the last word in enlightened democracy." In fact, her constitution is largely modeled after our own. Representative government, free speech, a free press, and other cherished liberties of freemen are to be found in Finland the same as in America. According to an editorial in the New York Times, March 1, 1940, "Finland, in the last 20 years, has been a projection of American democratic institutions in the Old World. Her guiding principles have been ours, her democracy is as genuine as our own."

Everyone knows how under the compulsions of war there is tremendous pressure to suspend at least temporarily many of the democratic traditions and processes of a nation. The following dispatch, sent by Jack Fleischer, United Press correspondent, as late as March 20, 1944, tells its own remarkable story of the staying power of Finland's democracy even under the burdens of war and the pressures exerted by Germany:

"The Finns still possess the right of free speech and exercise it greatly. Foreign broadcasts are not forbidden, and huge numbers listen to the London radio regularly.

"Anti-Jewish legislation, which the Nazis wanted, never made headway in Finland and, according to information from leading Jews of the country, 2,000 Jews are able to live with the same rights as other Finns and are aiding in the war effort." (New York Times, March 21, 1944.)

It is facts like this which give concrete significance to Finland's assurance that she was waging her defensive war "free from all political obligations."

We know of no more fitting conclusion to our discussion of Finland's case than two eloquent tributes paid her during the winter war, one by a Briton, the other by an American.

Winston Churchill, the great British leader, stated in a world-wide radio broadcast:

"Only Finland—superb, nay sublime, in the jaws of peril—Finland shows what free men can do. The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent. We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left of civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death by the full brutish force of overwhelming numbers. If the light of freedom which still burns so brightly in the frozen North should finally be quenched, it might well herald a return to the Dark Ages, when every vestige of human progress during 2,000 years would be engulfed."

No technical step of conventional unfriendliness which war exigencies may require, writes William Henry Chamberlain, can erase from the memory of Americans this splendid tribute, and he adds, "It would be a bitter irony for Finland, for Great Britain, and for the world if Winston Churchill should find himself compelled by circumstances to contribute to the realization of the prediction so forcefully expressed in these last two sentences."

We feel that the final tribute to Finland should come from an American. The following is from the Christian Science Monitor:

"If you were to name the greatest nation in the world, would it be the richest; would it be the one whose possessions are the most wide-flung; would it be the most populous or that which boasted of the most destructive guns and the most powerful army? Perhaps it would be that nation which paid its debts, which, courageous as the Greeks at Thermopylae, fights a barbarian horde, which faces annihilation rather than compromise its liberty—whose men today die

on the battlefield and whose women and babies starve and freeze behind the lines. If this is the nation you would seek, there stands Finland."

Is Finland worth saving? Are we in this war to save Europe from Hitler and hand it over to Stalin?

Facts and material furnished by Save Finland Committee, O. J. Larson, chairman, 406 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, before the Northampton Rotary Club, Northampton, Mass., Monday evening, March 26, 1945:

We have heard a great deal in these past few years about the American way of life. I certainly have no quarrel with those who have so ably and eloquently discussed that subject. But I have wondered sometimes if, in our glorification of the American way of life, we have not forgotten that a way of life is, in the last analysis, the product of human beings. It is not a social or a political philosophy that some one has thought out and handed to other people as a guide for their activities. It is, rather, a name that we give to the habits and methods and characteristics of men acting in their relation to other men. In short, the American way of life is the product of a human being which we call an American.

Today, I would like to consider for a moment that average American who has created the American way of life; who, in doing so, has built a great nation, and, in the name of that nation, is impressing his character upon a wide and distracted world.

It took a good many things to create the average American. In the first place, he was the product of a problem that may be with us as long as men live upon this earth. He was the product of a continent called Europe, which has suffered for centuries from the fact that it could produce more people than it could feed. In these days, as we get into the habit of looking at the map of the world, we see in true perspective exactly what Europe is. It is a peninsula thrust out to the west and the south of a great continent. In many places its land is poor and its capacity for the production of food is low. Its natural resources are, and have always been, scarce and of doubtful value. For the most part, its coast line, especially in the north, is forbidding, and, in many months of the year, almost inaccessible. Its rivers, in spite of the exalted songs and stories that have been written about them, are not great rivers. Its mountains, with a few exceptions, are not supremely great mountains. But its population has, at least in modern times, been excessively great. That population has been stricken time and again with indescribable calamities. It has been ravaged by disease; it has been beset by hunger. And because of these factors of inadequate resources and superabundant population, it has been cursed with the most bloody and continuous wars that have marked the history of the earth.

Those who made America, were the product of that background. They left that barren and unfruitful continent for many reasons; some because they were hungry; some because they sought religious consolation; some because they disagreed with the political life of Europe; others because they sought adventure; and others because for many reasons they were persecuted and injured at home. They came to America at various times, in various ways, and for various purposes. Here they found the answer to the bitter necessities that they had experienced in Europe. They found that while there were hardships in the wilderness, those hardships were nevertheless capable of being surmounted by courage and hard work and fortitude and patience. Unlike those of Europe, our hardships in America were not man-made. Nature in America, while it exacted a price, was an honest merchant because when men invested their labor and their courage, nature paid them a fair and ample wage. This was all early Americans asked for, and this they were able to get. They brought with them the elements of culture, and constitutional government, and the instinct of workmanship, and technical skills, for in spite of its limitations, Europe at least provided that much for its children.

But Americans found it possible, because they were in the land of promise, to build upon these beginnings and to build better than they had known before. The culture that they imported expanded in America. Constitutional government found new ways of enabling men and women to live together. They multiplied their technical skills because they found ample resources to which they might apply that skill. And in the long years after they had founded a civilization upon the narrow ledge of this continent, they discovered that whenever the curse of overcrowding impeded their movements, they could move farther into the continent and find freedom all over again. And so the growth of America for four centuries was a process of endless new discovery. They went west because the West eternally satisfied their necessities.

It is out of great experience that great men are born, and it is out of great enterprise that a great people is born. As the boundless vistas of American opportunity opened and the population grew and prospered, so did each individual expand in his own views. For, in the last analysis, America was built upon individual men and women. They found in the beginning, as they struggled for self-determination and independence, that in spite of the fact that they had sought refuge from the jealousies and conflicts of Europe, that the source of those jealousies and conflicts had, like evil angels, preceded them to this continent. They found, even before national independence was created, that greedy empires had sought through military power to preempt the great American domain, and that on the south and the west and the north, and in the great sea at the east, they were surrounded by the encircling armies of European imperialism.

One of the most heartening things that we can recall, as in this war we are beset by aggression on the east and aggression on the west, is that when we were, so far as population is concerned, only a fraction of what we are now, we were beset by the same dangers. In spite of our precarious position, we fought and won a war for independence. We established ourselves as a nation, 13 States, in total area only a fraction of what we are now, by uniting in a desire to be free. By the courage of our men and women, by our enterprise, by our power to expand, by purchase, by diplomacy, and when all else failed, by war, we set about the task of freeing this country of the threat of foreign dangers. From the Thirteen Colonies, Americans moved to the West and created new States out of the wilderness. They skillfully played the ambitions of the French, the Spanish, and the English in such a manner as to acquire a vast territory beyond the Mississippi. And as they acquired territory, unlike the practice of imperial Rome, they made each acquisition of territory truly their own by settlement and development. These were not men who made compromises with forces that threatened them. They were men who destroyed those threats by their own indomitable strength and courage.

If the American Nation has, in its resources, in its political institutions, and in its culture preeminence in the world today, it is because strong men found three circumstances that favored the growth of a great nation.

The first of these circumstances was the great area of the country and the richness of its resources. No nation, truly great in every way, can be created without natural circumstances that favor its growth. There have been nations great in a spiritual sense which have grown in a small area and with a small population, but from time to time they have been the prey of physically stronger neighbors. The United States avoided that eternal threat of danger by the happy circumstance of its own position and size.

The second circumstance that favored our growth was the wise policy, inherent in the pioneers who settled this country, of creating, as they grew, political institutions that preserve individual freedom while they offer the broadest protection from selfish influences. They created a constitution sufficiently flexible to afford for all generations to come the possibility of change and growth.

The third circumstance that favored the growth of a great civilization was the fact that America was a meeting place of many cultures, many ideals, and many diversified points of view. It has been the genius of Americans to accept immigrants of many sorts, to permit them to make their contribution to our common life, and at the same time to assimilate them and their descendants in a truly unified American tradition. We have stretched out our hands to the unhappy people of Europe. We have offered them opportunity for a better life than they had at home, and all we have asked is that they have strong hands and loyal hearts.

In the course of our growth we have, in general, avoided interference in the affairs of other countries. We have not been anxious to make others as we are. We have generously contributed whenever we could to permit other countries to live their own lives, to be free of oppression, and to grow as God and nature intended that they should. But we have not sought to impress our own culture upon others. We have learned this hard lesson from our own experience, because as we grew as a nation, we asked no help from others; we merely wanted the privilege of freedom to grow as we could.

A few years after the establishment of this Nation as an independent republic, our statesmen conceived that our duty, in fact, that our safety, demanded that we, as the strongest nation in the Americas, should assert leadership in the two Americas in permitting other small republics to grow as we had grown. Out of this arose the most specific American statement of foreign policy that we have ever created—the Monroe Doctrine. The development of this policy with reference to the Western Hemisphere required, on our part, not only great strength but great forbearance, for we did not conceive it to be the destiny of the United States to create an empire in the Western Hemisphere. The wisdom of our policy of living at peace with our neighbors, while at the same time we offer them the broad protection of our power, is witnessed by the fact that

in this war, we have the friendship and solid support of almost all those countries.

But all of this national greatness comes back fundamentally to the American as an individual. Only sound men can make a sound nation. It has been the habit of pessimistic people to speak of the disintegration of American character. When at times we have seen evidence here and there that wealth and security have made people careless and pleasure loving, there have been those who have claimed that the fiber of America has become soft and that the inner integrity of our people has been destroyed. But these evidences of weakness were, after all, superficial and passing. Fundamentally, the American remains as he has always been. In this war we have the proof of this inherent soundness. It is not alone that Americans in uniform have upheld in every corner of the world the finest traditions of courage and skill. It is also a fact that on the home front Americans have maintained order, have willingly accepted supervision, and have turned with incredible industry and skill to the task of production.

There have been nations, like Germany and Japan, that exalted their efficiency. But the test of 1943 and 1944 has shown that efficiency is not created by the mere proclamation of an intention to be efficient. Efficiency rises from the strength of free people. In spite of many unfortunate failures of foresight, our American industrial life is adding glories to its achievements. American women in the homes, on the farms, in the factories, in the hospitals, and in the armed forces themselves are proving themselves to be the worthy successors of those women who stood loyally beside their kin in Washington's Army. American States and cities are making their contribution to the national effort. Everywhere we find a spirit of cooperation and of loyalty to the cause of victory.

Our task, as we look to the future beyond this war, will be, in spite of the suggestions of those who have formulas for security and happiness, to bear in mind that the United States was not built upon formulas; it was built upon the individual. We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American. The door of opportunity must be kept open. The American boy must be taught from experience that whatever he attains depends upon his own inner integrity. We have won the past by hard work and honesty and self-reliance. There is no better formula through which we can win the future. The greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured if no man-made shadows blur the road. It is for us to preserve for our posterity what our forefathers created for us, a Nation of free people, ever helpful to others, but always selfish for the continuance, within our own domain, of the American way of life.

Despite our errors of omission and commission we remain steadfast in our Americanism. This is a great country. The greatness of our people today indicates the greatness we can attain in the future if we keep our feet on the ground and our eyes straight ahead toward the victory that is inevitable and the harvest it must produce. That our armed forces may achieve the heights the sooner is our earnest desire. That this accomplishment may come to pass with a minimum of suffering is our hope. We are all united toward a single end. Our thoughts today are concerned with the responsibility of completing the terrific task immediately ahead. We rightly interrupt our worries to utter an earnest prayer for the well being of our comrades in the ranks, their officers and their Commander in Chief, that wisdom may guide their effort and out of the sacrifices they so willingly make, this terrible struggle may the more quickly end in the ways of peace.

Comptroller Asks Wholesale Cuts in United States Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star:

COMPTROLLER ASKS WHOLESALE CUTS IN UNITED STATES AGENCIES—USE OF BUSH AX OR MEAT CLEAVER URGED BY WARREN

Wholesale amputation of Government agencies with a bush ax or a meat cleaver was recommended today by Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren.

Testifying before a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee in favor of a bill to bring all Government corporations under the financial control of Congress, Mr. Warren said:

"If the present trend of creating Government corporations continues or is not curbed, we will soon have a government by Government corporations."

ONE HUNDRED AND ONE GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Asserting there now are 101 Government corporations, Mr. Warren said:

"They are largely independent of congressional control and free from accountability to the Executive. This thing we call government has reached gargantuan proportions and is sprawled all over the lot.

"It has become greater than Congress, its creator, and at times arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress.

"The most necessary thing I know of today along governmental lines is a thoroughgoing reorganization of the executive branch of Government. It should be done scientifically.

"But once the decision is made, then a bush ax or a meat cleaver should be used."

SEES YELPS AND SNARLS

"The only way to reorganize is to reorganize," Mr. Warren said with emphasis. It calls for great courage. Duplication and overlapping are widely prevalent. Untold millions could be saved and efficiency created to a high degree."

"Of course," he added, "there would be loud yelps and snarls—that is always true when powers are curbed, consolidations made, or appropriations reduced or discontinued."

San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several newspaper articles.

Mr. Speaker, Drew Pearson has written three important articles on the San Francisco Conference which should be read widely. However, the press of the Nation has seen fit to suppress the last of these articles—one telling of the dealing by American banks with the Nazis after Pearl Harbor. I am informed that this article was suppressed at the insistence of J. P. Morgan & Co. and the Chase Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution must not be trampled upon by private interests.

The statements contained in these articles, if substantiated, are of central importance to the thinking of our country. Friendly relations between the great and small powers is a matter of concern to all of us—our future is involved. It must not be jeopardized by the suppression of facts in our press.

The articles follow:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

(Wednesday, April 25, 1945)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The eyes of about 12,000,000 servicemen will be watching the Conference that opens here today. So will their mothers. So will their wives, who wonder whether the children they bear in this war must be reared to fight another. So will the eyes of all the hungry, weary peoples of war-torn Europe, still hoping with a hope that flickers but never quite dies that finally we can construct a machinery for lasting peace.

And it is no exaggeration to say that the seeds of the next war will be nourished or rooted up at San Francisco. The events happening at this Conference, in its backstage lobbies, and in the chanceries of Europe right now, can spell the difference between peace and war 20 years later.

SEEDS FOR WORLD WAR NO. 3 ALREADY PLANTED

Actually the seeds have already been planted but the roots are not deep and they can be torn up.

The seeds have been planted by groups in England, the United States and Russia who already have begun playing the type of power politics which can only end in eventual war between the two strongest nations emerging from the present conflict—the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Already certain groups inside the State Department and the British Foreign Office have begun jockeying to build up Germany after the war as a bulwark against Russia. Already United States admirals have focused the attention of the entire world on the island bases we are taking from Japan, so that Russia is becoming suspicious they will be aimed against her.

So no matter how high geared and beautifully perfected the machinery for peace devised at San Francisco, it cannot succeed unless it rests on a foundation of good will and mutual trust.

There will be a lot of argument here about 3 votes for Russia, 6 votes for Britain, and 20 indirect Latin-American votes for the United States. But the real fact is that the question of votes becomes pure theory if one big nation doesn't want to cooperate.

If the tremendous armed forces of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics get fidgety and looking for something to do; if the admirals and generals try to become statesmen; if the State Department career boys begin playing balance-of-power politics, then all the votes and all the peace machinery arranged at San Francisco won't help.

The tragic fact is that already there is evidence that the brass hats in at least two

ccuntries, plus certain diplomats, are getting nervous trigger fingers.

Already there is a strong suspicion that Stalin can't control his own generals. Already there is more than a suspicion that Roosevelt could not control his admirals.

"TRUSTEESHIP" A HOT POTATO

One such case concerns the Pacific island bases taken from Japan. For more than 2 years, the late President argued that all islands taken by the United States of America should be held by us, but under the United Nations trusteeship, whereby other nations were given airplane and shipping privileges on these islands—provided they give us reciprocal rights on their islands.

At Yalta something along that line was agreed to by Roosevelt personally. And when he returned, a directive to that effect was sent to the State, War, and Navy Departments, plus the Interior Department, which administers insular possessions. But when the representatives of these four Departments sat down to work out the details for carrying out the President's directive, two Departments—the Army and Navy—kicked over the traces. The third, the State Department, went along reluctantly, leaving only the Interior Department to obey the directive wholeheartedly.

Finally, Admiral Ernest King, commander of the fleet, took things into his own hands and made a public statement against the President's policy regarding Pacific islands. In other words, he went over the head of his Commander in Chief. Although this was a most serious thing to do, even domestically, its international repercussions were even more serious.

The Russians, whose intelligence is the best in the world, already knew that Admiral King is the man who has wanted to build up a big Navy now as protection against Russia later. They also know that Admiral King has opposed Russia coming into the war against Japan, and wants the United States to do the job alone.

The Russians also know that a certain number of professional United States military and naval brass hats side with King. (This is not true of General Marshall or General Eisenhower and the more responsible commanders in the United States Army.)

And the unfortunate fact is that this probably has played into the hands of the Russian generals who are needling Stalin.

RUSSIAN HISTORY MAY REPEAT

Information as to what goes on inside Russia is always difficult, but there has been increasing suspicion of late that Stalin does not control his own generals. This is what has happened repeatedly in Russian history. When the generals built themselves up in wartime, they dominated the Czar.

And today, the men who once were strong in the Soviet have much less to say. Ex-Foreign Minister Molotov, a great believer in international cooperation, is now completely out of the picture. Foreign Minister Molotov has less authority.

The generals, in turn, are considered responsible for the previous policy of having a messenger-boy Ambassador whom they could easily control at San Francisco. Also, it is strongly suspected that they inspired Stalin's demands that the United States Ninth Army retire from the Berlin suburbs on April 13 so the Red Army could enter first.

Tragedy is that some United States war chiefs, by going over the White House heads, are strengthening the Red general's hand. The Russians are a suspicious people anyway. They have been made more so by being shut up by us in the diplomatic closet. When we refuse to recognize a nation as a member of international society, naturally that nation does not forget the rebuff easily.

And meanwhile, the State Department, together with the old Cliveden set in England which wanted to bleed both England and Russia white, have already quietly gone about plans to rebuild Germany as a bulwark against Russia. Thus the seeds for future peace or war are being planted before this war is ended.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—There will be another column on backstage factors at San Francisco showing how the State Department, 3 days after the President died, reversed President Roosevelt's policy of a tough peace for Germany.

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

(Thursday, April 26, 1945)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Last fall it leaked out that there was a drastic difference of opinion between the State Department and the Treasury over a soft peace for Germany, and after several weeks of discussion, President Roosevelt definitely threw his weight with the Treasury in favor of a hard peace.

Top War Department officials, influenced by the atrocities committeed against American and Allied prisoners, finally agreed with the President, and even the State Department reluctantly swung into line.

For a long time it has been no secret that a group inside the State Department favored a soft peace for Germany with a view to making her a bulwark against Russia after the war. But as long as Roosevelt was in the White House, the State Department appeasers kept quiet.

However, on the day after his body was buried, a meeting of the German Reparations Committee was held in the office of Assistant Secretary Will Clayton at which both the State and War Departments suddenly reversed Roosevelt's policy of a hard peace.

Specifically, they argued against the removal of Nazi factories, machine tools, plant equipment, or goods out of Germany. The Russians have proposed the removal of German war plants to help build up the hundreds of Russian factories destroyed by Germany. But the State and War Departments maintained that no such German equipment could be removed from Germany without the unanimous consent of the Reparations Commission. Naturally, this means that either the United States or Great Britain could block such removal since both sit on the Commission.

At this meeting Assistant Secretary of State Clayton argued that American policy should favor leaving factory equipment and machinery in Germany so she can get back on a sound economic basis. He even mentioned the fact that Germany would need to import cotton to manufacture clothes and should be permitted to have enough exports to pay for the imported cotton. (Clayton is the biggest cotton exporter in the world and did a heavy business with the Nazis before the war.)

RUSSIANS REMEMBER

Unfortunately, the Russians are all too familiar with the attitude of the State and War Departments toward them. Unfortunately also, some observers believe this distrust of the United States State Department is one reason why the Russians demand a strong, all-Communist Poland.

However, no matter how efficient the peace machinery devised at San Francisco, it will not work if the two strongest powers supposed to keep the peace already have begun jockeying against each other.

The Russians cannot forget, among other things, the strategy of the Cliveden set in England (with which Churchill was once sympathetic) to stir up war between Germany and Russia while England sat on the sidelines. The Russians also know all too well the type of anti-Russian conversation that goes on at the home of Mrs. Evelyn Walsh (Hope Diamond) McLean, when she entertains the elite of Washington society at her famous dinners at what is sometimes called the headquarters of the American Cliveden set.

The Russians knew in advance, for instance, that the Douglas Aircraft Co. had sold the plans for its DC-4 to Japan for $1,000,000 before Pearl Harbor.

And they have been especially interested in the War Department's survey of the damage done to German war plants by United States planes, a survey to be undertaken by a group of bankers and top insurance executives, including Henry C. Alexander, vice president of J. P. Morgan; Fred Searles, Jr., president of several J. P. Morgan mine companies; Franklin D'Olier, president of the Prudential Life Insurance Co.; and Robert P. Russell, president of Standard Oil Development Co.

Considering the manner in which Standard Oil of New Jersey collaborated with Hitler's cartels even after the war broke in Europe, and considering how the J. P. Morgan branch bank in Paris collaborated with the Nazis even after Pearl Harbor, you can't blame the Russians for wondering whether this survey actually isn't for the purpose of getting a line on German industry and building it up after the war.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY WANTS IN

Already, the State Department is being bombarded by American industrialists who owned factories in Germany before the war and want to get back to start operating them. Among the leading pressure boys is Graeme Howard, vice president of General Motors in charge of operations in Europe (and Germany). Howard helped organize Franco's truck transport service during the Spanish Civil War, has a personal interest in the Opel Auto Works in Germany, and has been busy as a hound dog around the State Department wanting to get back to Germany.

Naturally they can't have a hard peace if they are to build up Germany, so they don't want German factories and machine tools carted off to Russia.

Another factor making the Russians suspicious is the British demand that food which the Russian Army finds in Germany be used to feed the German people rather than to feed starving Poles and Russian slave laborers. Shortly before he left London, both Foreign Minister Eden and Sir James Grigg, British War Minister, took the position, in secret talks with United States officials, that food found in Germany must be used to feed the German, not Polish and Russian civilians. The British argument is that if German food is diverted to the Poles and Russians, the Allies will have to import more to feed the Germans.

SUSPECT O. S. S.

Finally, the Russians are probably most suspicious of the mysterious United States espionage organization called O. S. S. The O. S. S. or Office of Strategic Services, has, strangely, distributed some of the most powerful bankers' representatives in the United States of America at key points where they can influence United States policy in occupied Germany.

The roster of O. S. S. men who have been or are operating in Europe reads like a blue-stocking list of the first 60 families. It includes: Paul Mellon, son of Andrew Mellon; Junius and Henry Morgan of the house of Morgan; Alfred du Pont; Lester Armour of the Chicago Armours; Gordon Auchincloss; John Auchincloss; Warwick Potter; Harold Coolidge; William Van Allen of the Astor family; and Allan Dulles, attorney for various international bankers with previous connections in Germany.

Some of these may not deserve the suspicion focused upon them. But others more than make up for it. And anyone listening for 30 minutes to their conversation about the next war and building up Germany as a partner in that war, can understand why the Russians wrongly accused us of a deal

to permit the American Army to enter Berlin first.

This is the kind of underlying suspicion which must be killed immediately and permanently if the machinery of San Francisco is to bring about permanent peace.

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

(Friday, April 27, 1945)

SAN FRANCISCO.—When the American Army swept into Germany it was fortunate enough to capture an interesting figure in Dr. H. J. Caesar, the counterpart of our Alien Property Custodian who had charge of all American banks and alien property seized in France.

Dr. Caesar was cross-examined at length. From him came highly enlightening and hitherto secret information about the manner in which certain British and American branch banks in Paris collaborated with the Germans after the fall of France. His testimony high-lights the main issue underlying the problem of future peace—namely, whether, despite all the plans worked out at San Francisco, certain Allied business firms together with their friends in the State Department, the Army, and the British Foreign Office are going to maneuver behind the scenes to strengthen Germany once again as a bulwark against Russia.

This largely lies at the root of the ticklish Polish question. Russia wants a Poland which will cooperate with her and be a buffer against another German invasion. If there were no fear of future Germany, there might be less insistence on a puppet Poland.

Ex-Justice Jimmy Byrnes described this graphically to Senators upon his return from Yalta. Telling how Stalin got excited on the question of Poland, Byrnes quoted Stalin as saying: "You speak of English honor, Mr. Prime Minister, and your desire to protect the safety of Russia. But twice in 25 years German armies have marched across Poland to attack Russia. If that happens again will the English armies come to our defense?"

Before Poland was invaded last time it will be remembered that British business interests were quite willing, even apparently anxious, to have the Sudetenland taken away from Czechoslovakia. President Benes complained bitterly regarding Lord Runciman's attitude on this, but the British appeasers' policy was to strengthen Germany at the expense of Russia's friend and buffer ally, Czechoslovakia.

Finally, it was American and British banks which poured money into Germany for years before the war and then maneuvered to have reparations and war debts canceled in order to protect their own loans. The Chase National Bank was one of the worst offenders. That is why a lot of people in Washington, Moscow, and the world at large are watching to see whether history will repeat. That is why the evidence unearthed from the secret files of German Alien Property Custodian Caesar is so significant. It indicates that even during the present war, the Paris branches of Chase and J. P. Morgan were quite willing and anxious to do business with the Germans—though British banks were more so.

Dr. Caesar testified that "the protection afforded to Chase was justified on the ground that it had been active on behalf of Germany before the war in such matters as the German "stand still" credit negotiations.

"The British banks," he said, "were even more preferred by the Germans than the branches of Chase and Morgans. The German occupying authorities decreed that British and Canadian banks in the occupied zone of France 'shall no longer be considered as enemy banks.' These branches provided long-term credits to assist the German war machine. They supplied the Germans with general economic information obtained through their offices in unoccupied France, and they were particularly useful as depositories to the German authorities."

But especially significant were some of the letters found in Dr. Caesar's files. One indicated that the J. P. Morgan Co. had gone out of its way to curry favor with the Nazis by showing that the Morgans had nothing to do with Jews. One memo sent to German Banking Czar Caesar by Mr. Lecestre, a high official of the Morgan firm read: "On the attached sheet there is represented some information relative to the predecessors of Mr. J. P. Morgan, actual head of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., New York. Following the tradition of his father, Mr. Morgan never admitted Jews as associates of fellow workers.

"The Morgan House has been frequently found in its business in opposition to the great Jewish banking houses in the United States, such as Kuhn, Loeb & Co. As to Morgan & Co., Paris, the personnel, since the foundation of the bank in 1868, has never included a Jew."

The memo is dated January 15, 1943, more than a year after Germany declared war on the United States. Another memo found in the files of the German Alien Property Custodian, dated May 6, 1941, is signed by Berenberg-Gosler, Paris representative of the Reichskreditgesselschaft. It reads in part: "Subject: Morgan & Cie.

"During a dinner to which I was invited by the French partner of this firm, Mr. Pesson-Didion, Mr. P. D. again spoke indignantly about the clique in America which continually attempts to draw the United States into an unjustifiable as well as ridiculous war. He told me that I would know from my stay in New York and Boston, the views of the partners of his firm and also how they hate Roosevelt—that Roosevelt is driving America toward a catastrophe by his economic and foreign policies. The development over the last 30 years represents a policy of racial favoritism, insofar as the old established Anglo-Saxon, Swedish, and German element had to relinquish its power to the Polish, Czech, and Jewish elements which immigrated since 1900. For the New York and Boston circles this development is terrible. He hopes that one of these days the increased immigration of Jews will unleash such anti-Semitism that a sudden turn-about will follow. Mr. P. D. compares Roosevelt with Leon Blum and his actions with the blessing of the Front Populaire, for which France paid dearly.

"He expressed the hope that the inter-European and particularly the intercontinental business will, after settlement of the present German-British conflict, take such an upswing that his firm will be in a position to take an active part in the developments through the granting of reparation credits.

"With respect to England, Mr. P. D. hopes that the Conservative Party under Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Londonderry will get the upper hand over the Churchill clique one of these days, and that the worse may still be avoided for England. The principal culprit in this war is Roosevelt, who by vague promises instigated by the criminal clique surrounding him, had driven England as well as France into this war, against their will.

"These remarks were made to me by Mr. P. D. privately, since in the States the Morgans are very friendly toward a firm for which I worked, namely Kidder, Peabody and Co., and they also know one of my distant relatives in Boston. Mr. P. D.'s remarks may well be taken to reflect the opinion of this international Aryan banking firm."

This is one sample of the big business maneuvering which went on behind the scenes during and before this war, and which can lay the seeds for World War No. 3. Unless stamped out it may undo all the peace machinery to be erected at San Francisco.

God Sustain Our Arms Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD a war hymn entitled "God Sustain Our Arms Today," which was composed by Col. Julian G. Hearne, Jr., of Wheeling, who is an eminent member of a distinguished West Virginia family. Colonel Hearne is at present commanding the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment in the Pacific area. The hymn is as follows:

GOD SUSTAIN OUR ARMS TODAY

(The war hymn of the United Nations)

(Words and music by Col. Julian G. Hearne, Jr.)

God sustain our arms today;
Bless our country's cause we pray;
Bless our boys where'er they go.
In the Tropics and in snow.
Grant them courage, strength, and skill;
May they ever serve Thy will.
God sustain our arms today,
And bring a righteous peace, we pray.

A National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 1, 1945:

A NATIONAL NECESSITY

Our future foreign policy will be determined in no small measure by the fate of House Joint Resolution 60 on which debate will begin today. That resolution proposes a constitutional amendment for abolition of the two-thirds rule in the making of treaties. In a preliminary speech to the House yesterday, Congressman MERROW rightly said that "the Seventy-ninth Congress will not be required to pass judgment on any issue of greater significance. * * *"

In one respect it is unfortunate that this historic debate is overshadowed by the approaching end of the war in Europe and the United Nations Conference. Nevertheless, it comes at an appropriate moment. For the unfinished business to which our troops are attending in Germany and our statesmen in San Francisco may never be appropriately finished unless Congress does its duty by voting to abolish minority control over treaty-making.

John Quincy Adams once said that the Constitution was "extorted from the grinding necessity of a reluctant nation." To this Mr. MERROW added that "the grinding necessity of a world in chaos is demanding the proposed amendment." The making of a lasting peace is uppermost in virtually every

mind. The means through which peace can be made is the treaty power. To leave that power in the control of 33 men, a minority of the Senate and a small fraction of the entire Congress, would be, under present circumstances, a bid for national suicide.

The hearings before the House Judiciary Committee brought out the fact that whatever reason existed for adoption of the two-thirds rule in the first place has long since disappeared. Dr. Charles Warren, historian of the Supreme Court, is authority for the statement that "you will search in vain to find any political theory on which that two-thirds clause was founded." It represented only an arrangement of convenience because the Southern States feared loss of their navigation rights on the Mississippi, then controlled by Spain, and the New England States feared encroachment upon their fishery rights. At one time the convention adopted without dissent a resolution by Madison to exclude treaties of peace from the operation of the two-thirds rule. The final agreement requiring a two-thirds vote for validation of all treaties represented a deviation from sound principle for the sake of minimizing opposition to the national charter.

Now the tragic aftermath of that compromise must be dealt with. Treaty-making has become as vital to stability and peace in our world as was national legislation in those days to the interests of the liberated States. We must not withhold from the majority elected to shape our national policies control over our relations to the world of which we are a part. Of course, the matter will not be determined in the House. The real fight will come in the Senate. But if the House adds an overwhelming demand for democratization of our foreign policy to demands already coming from the people, we suspect that senatorial resistance to this imperative change will begin to crack.

Pacific Bases Declared Vital to United States Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star:

PACIFIC BASES DECLARED VITAL TO UNITED STATES SECURITY—RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN DEMANDS FOR TERRITORIES COMPARED

(By David Lawrence)

Is the security of the United States any less important to the American people than the security of Russia is to the Russian people?

One would think that question was easily answered, and yet there are in the Government here persons who argue that Russia may annex almost a third of the territory of Poland, an ally, but that the United States shall not be permitted to obtain a tiny area of ground from the enemy less than 30 miles square for future strategic bases in the Pacific.

It seems that what Russia got out of the Yalta Conference by way of additional territory is not a violation of the Atlantic Charter or, if it is, it doesn't matter, but the moment spokesmen for the Army and Navy of the United States ask for possession of Iwo Jima and the Bonin Islands, as well as the islands formerly held by Japan north of the Equator, they are criticized for wanting to violate the Atlantic Charter's provision forbidding "territorial aggrandizement."

"WHY?" IS NOT CLEAR

Just why it is all right for Russia to take territory from an ally but not all right for America to keep a small group of islands wrested from the Japanese at a heavy cost of American lives is not clear, but the fact is that such conversations go on behind closed doors in some of the conferences which are being held to determine future American policy.

There is a distinct difference between strategic areas such as would give us bases in the Pacific and territories that are annexed as in the case of Poland. In the former there are no large groups of people who have had their independence and no economic resources to exploit. All that is wanted by our Army, Navy, and Air Forces are bases for airplanes and carrier task forces so there can never be another Pearl Harbor.

The late President Roosevelt assured the Army and Navy that they would have complete control of the bases, but he suggested that title be vested in some kind of trusteeship. The question was never finally settled because the Army and Navy folks were debating it.

All that has been settled is that the specific areas to be put under trusteeships will not be brought up at San Francisco. That agreement was reached at Yalta, but pressure has come lately to upset it, and the American delegation was importuned to discuss the whole trusteeship problem. Only the formula of trusteeships and machinery of administration in the abstract will be discussed.

This correspondent did not voice approval of the Yalta settlement, but it is a decision made by the late President and the heads of the British and Russian Governments, and the United States Government is apparently bound by it. By that Yalta Conference one-third of Poland was to be awarded to Russia and the so-called Curzon Line was stanchly defended by its supporters as one way to give Russia the security she wanted. Advocates of the settlement were not in the slightest degree disturbed by the outcry that the annexation violated the Atlantic Charter. But some of them today are arguing that a "trusteeship" which gives America outright possession of vital bases is a quibble and a subterfuge.

SURPRISING MATTER

It is surprising that where the safety of the United States is concerned the matter becomes a quibble, but when the safety of Russia is concerned there is approval on the ground that Russia must have her security.

It may be argued that two wrongs do not make a right, and there is logic in such a criticism. But if the Soviet Government would be willing to rectify the Yalta arrangement and agree to a trusteeship over one-third of Poland, instead of outright annexation, it might be that Americans would be free to consider the same kind of trusteeship for the islands in the Pacific north of the Equator. Certainly there is no reason to be less generous to the United States than the Yalta Conference has already been to Russia.

There are many complicated problems of annexation of territory, but there is a difference between land-grabbing for economic reasons or for exaggerated ideas of what constitutes the spoils of war—something which the Atlantic Charter really described in its prohibition against aggrandizement—and the plea for security bases involving tiny islands that have no political, ethnological, or economic problems and can be used solely for defense against attacks from the sea or air against the American people.

The Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Frank Carl Smith:

THE QUESTION

(By Frank Carl Smith)

(Dedicated to peace with justice)

Is this a fight to free man's mind
From tyranny and sham—
To revive the hopes of human kind
For a better future plan?

What good are battles fought, tho' victory won,
If seething hates more power brew,
And in the years to come
Revive the lust for greed anew?

Are humans to be but shells of men,
Of starving, roaming, homeless tribes?
Is right o'er might soon to begin
Bringing hope that man survives?

Can man afford so much wealth destroy?
Will debt piled on cities lain in ashes deep
Build a better tomorrow, that we might employ
Our God-given skills and society keep?

How long will man stand silent
And see his brothers maimed,
And all his earthly wares are spent
With countless millions dead—unnamed?

Who are these guardians of death,
Whose fancy words betray
The cause of human freedom
And thoughtless masses sway?

Will man e'er learn to live
In tolerance, and number quarrels few,
And, thus, in living, learn to give,
That men be brethren, shall come true?

How can we let our future rest,
When blood-stained hands of every race
Revive the force that we suppress
And bring our triumph to disgrace?

Must we underwrite the spoils of war?
Will our conscience then be free—
Knowing that all men of truth deplore
Vengeance to honor in victory?

Is human greed so strong, and mind so frail,
That peace with justice cannot reign?
Does not the victor's fruits entail
His own past be searched again?

If we allow a lust for power
As empire's tribute to the ages carve,
We betray our God this very hour,
For hate will thrive and liberty starve.

Malice Toward None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting and timely

editorial comment from the Flint (Mich.) Journal of April 22, 1945. I commend it to you because it reflects the broad tolerance and generosity of one of the finest citizens in America. It is at the same time a tribute to James A. Farley.

MALICE TOWARD NONE

President Truman, in his speech to the armed forces, chose a famous paragraph from Lincoln's second inaugural address "to indicate my sentiments, and to describe my hope for the future"—

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up our Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphans—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

It is both heartening and significant that the new President has turned to the example of Lincoln. "To bind up our Nation's wounds" has more than war meaning. War is the greatest of unifying forces, but peace lies ahead. Interests that were divergent before the war must be helped to find common ground. Lincoln's achievements as a politician of highest type, a master of compromise, show the way.

James A. Farley, in a notable Lincoln Day address, said:

"I do not know that Lincoln's principal significance is as a politician, but that was certainly one of his great contributions, and it is worth thinking about a little in these times.

"It is not easy for us today to believe that Lincoln was pictured in his lifetime as a weak man. It was said that he did not follow a clear line of policy; that he wavered, and that he was dominated by stronger men around him. * * *

"Being a first-class political leader, Lincoln had the wisdom to call in and consult all sorts and kinds of men. Again, with fine political instinct, he frequently allowed his visitors to believe that they were really initiating the policy of the country. * * * Only later, as the whole truth comes out, have we discovered that it was Mr. Lincoln who made the policy, though he was humble enough and adroit enough to allow lesser men to believe that they were running the Government.

"Somewhat the same thing was true of his alleged indecision. We know today that he was constantly calculating the political support needed to bring the Union together. He was constantly trying to bridge the wide gap between all sorts of groups. Each one of these groups thought they had the method of saving the country; yet Mr. Lincoln knew that if the country was to be saved, he needed to get them all working together."

Despite his strong antislavery feeling, Lincoln, in his 1860 campaign, "was careful to emphasize those elements which would hold the country together, rather than those which would split it in two," Mr. Farley said. If Lincoln had not had to wait until March 1861 to take office, he believes the war might have been avoided. In the months between Lincoln's election and inauguration, the extremists had their way over the moderates who, on both sides, probably were in the majority. Lincoln had no chance to use political methods for a solution.

"Perhaps we—all of us—will be a little more humble and a little better advised if we take the lesson to ourselves," Mr. Farley continued. "Bitter feelings are not unknown in politics today. We do not have to go back to the Civil War to find people who feel strongly about national affairs, indulge in personalities, and very sincerely believe evil of men without reason. * * * All of us in time may learn to feel that the men who are trying for a common agreement are usually safer guides than the men who are trying to make divisions and stir up hostility."

As true now as in Lincoln's time is his doctrine "that democracy would be impossible if nobody ever agreed," Mr. Farley said.

"Consequently I know that if issues are not discussed on their merits, but on personality; if any political group tries to stir up hatred, and, of course, thereby provokes hatred on the other side, or if resort is had to the tactics of abuse, it becomes increasingly difficult for these groups ever to agree again."

Although, as Mr. Farley added, "even in our wildest political conflicts today we do usually remember that there is something to be said for the other fellow's point of view," there have been many times in the recent past when some have at least come close to forgetting. As we face the difficult adjustment to peace, all groups and interests can best serve their country by proceeding "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

Secretary of State Stettinius' Address at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the address of Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., at the second meeting of the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco:

Fellow Delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, 3 years ago the forces of tyranny and aggression seemed on the very point of conquering the world. Today, on every front, they are face to fact with defeat—utter and complete defeat.

It has taken years of toil and sacrifice to bring us to this moment. But the doom of the aggressor nations was sealed long ago. It was sealed in Washington on January 1, 1942, when the United Nations Declaration was signed.

Our enemies could conquer only by keeping us divided. Instead we confronted them with a free and voluntary association of nations united in purpose and without equal in human and material resources. This unity neither force nor subterfuge has broken. Against the common will and the common strength of the United Nations, our enemies have hurled their propaganda and their armed might in vain.

For centuries to come, men will point to the United Nations as history's most convincing proof of what miracles can be accomplished by nations joined together in a righteous cause. It is a unity achieved in spite of differences of language and custom, of cultural tradition, and of economic structure. It is a unity which proves that no differences of race, color, creed, history, or geography can divide peoples united in a higher community of interest and purpose.

Our first objective has been the defeat of our enemies. But from the beginning the United Nations have pursued another objective—one which is equally necessary to each one of us. It is the objective which gives ultimate meaning to all the sacrifice and suffering of these tragic years. We are united not only for survival, not only for military victory. We are united above all in the necessity to assure a just and an enduring peace in which the peoples of the world can work together to achieve at last freedom from fear and from want.

We have made a better beginning toward the fulfillment of this purpose than nations have ever made before.

For this purpose the responsible leaders of our nations and their representatives have met in Moscow and in Teheran, in Cairo, in Quebec, at Dumbarton Oaks, and in the Crimea.

Because of our common understanding that economic security goes hand in hand with security from war, United Nations conferences were held in Atlantic City, Hot Springs, and Bretton Woods on cooperative measures for relief, to meet common problems in food and agriculture and to prepare the financial basis for economic reconstruction and an expanding world economy in the post-war world.

At Mexico City the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace strengthened the ties between the republics of the Western Hemisphere and prepared the way for a close integration of the inter-American system with the world organization.

Yes; the United Nations have long been at work together on many preparations required in building the structure of lasting peace.

Here at San Francisco we have come to the decisive point in these preparations. The purpose of this Conference is to prepare the charter of an international organization to maintain peace with justice in a free world of free men.

I believe that it was a wise, indeed a necessary, decision to limit the work of this Conference to that great task.

It was a wise decision because writing the constitution of a world organization to maintain peace in the future is a task wholly separate from the punishment of the international gangsters who started this war.

It was a necessary decision because establishment of the world organization must be kept above and apart from the peace settlements if the organization is to be able to deal freely and justly with future threats to the peace that may arise from any cause, including these settlements.

Preparation of the charter of the world organization should not, therefore, be entangled with the many and complex political and economic issues involved in the defeat of Germany and Japan. And the imminent collapse of organized German resistance makes it all the more important that the world organization be established at the earliest possible moment.

To deal with these other issues there will have to be many other conferences and many other decisions, both national and international. We have no time to lose.

Success at this Conference will not of itself assure enduring peace. The whole structure will take years to build. But without agreement on a charter of the world organization, the structure of peace cannot be built at all.

A house cannot be built without a plan or without a foundation. Here at San Francisco the United Nations must draw the plan and lay the foundation.

Upon this foundation and in accordance with this plan the framework of the structure will be erected when the United Nations have ratified the charter by their respective constitutional processes and brought the world organization into being. It is only around this framework that we can complete the structure of peace with all the other agreements on political, economic, and social problems which we must reach together.

At this Conference we have, therefore, undertaken a responsibility on which all else depends. We have undertaken to draw up the charter of an international organization strong enough to prevent war and flexible

enough to allow for peaceful development and change.

The outlines of such a charter are contained in the proposals formulated at Dumbarton Oaks last fall by the representatives of the Republic of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

These proposals were formulated after years of preliminary study. They represent in their essentials the highest common denominator of thought among the four sponsoring nations. They are being presented to this conference as affording the basis of the charter of an international organization.

The proposals were submitted months ago to the most searching examination by the Governments and peoples of all the United Nations. Since then many constructive suggestions have been made toward their improvement. Some of these suggestions—and others which may emerge from our discussions here—will undoubtedly be reflected in the final draft of the charter. And the charter itself should be open to whatever later amendment experience may dictate as wise.

We must always bear in mind, however, that there are at least two conditions essential to the establishment of a world organization which can successfully maintain peace.

One of these conditions is that those peace-loving nations which have the military and industrial strength required to prevent or suppress aggression must agree and act together against aggression. If they do not agree and act together, aggression cannot be prevented or suppressed without a major war. This fact has certainly been spelled out by our experience in this war.

That is why the first step toward establishment of the world organization was to prepare proposals on which the nations sponsoring this Conference could agree. That is why, in the structure and powers of the security council of the world organization proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks plan, provision was made for this essential agreement and unit of action by the major nations. Without this we cannot hope to build a world organization which will provide security to all nations, large and small. Without this we cannot hope to develop enduring institutions in which all free nations may participate on a basis of sovereign equality and in which justice and respect for law will apply to the powerful as well as to the weak.

The second essential condition of success in our endeavor is the voluntary cooperation of all peaceful nations, large and small, acting with full respect for the equal sovereignty of each, to promote justice among nations, to foster respect for basic human rights, and to solve those common problems upon which the security and the economic and social advancement of their peoples so largely depend. There can be no end to the tyranny of fear and want unless the proposed world organization commends the allegiance of both the mind and the conscience of mankind.

The International Court, the Assembly, and the Economic and Social Council and its related agencies are the institutions proposed at Dumbarton Oaks which would have the major responsibility in these fields. They are of the utmost importance. Widespread economic insecurity and poverty, ignorance and oppression, breed conflict and give aggressors their chance. Measures for security against aggression, no matter how effectively contrived, will not alone provide the assurance of lasting peace. We have also to work effectively in close cooperation together toward rising standards of living and greater freedom and opportunity for all peoples, of every race and creed and color.

In the preparations for this conference we have sought from the beginning to build with vision and with justice, but to build always upon the realities and upon hard-won experience.

To build upon a millenial idealism, however fine in theory, would be to build upon quicksand. To build only on the collaboration and interests of the major nations would be to deny the community of interests of all nations.

We have sought instead to assure that the strength of the major nations will be used both justly and effectively for the common welfare—under the law of a world charter in which all peaceful nations are joined together.

We began by seeking common understanding among the sponsoring nations on basic objectives and on the essential machinery for action. These are the nations which have united their strength against the aggressors so successfully in this war. We proceed now by seeking agreement among all the nations, large and small, which have been united against the common enemy.

This is a conference of United Nations, the nations that loved peace and freedom enough to fight for them. The international organization we seek to build is one that is based upon this inescapable fact of our time—that peace and security will be the right of those nations which are willing to share in the responsibilty for keeping them. Tyranny and barbarism have never recognized neutrality. They never will. We do not intend to build a world organization that will overlook this cardinal fact. We do propose that, after it is established, the organization be open to membership of all other nations which have demonstrated their willingness and ability to fulfill their obligations under the charter.

I have reviewed briefly the preparations for this Conference and our thinking on some of the major problems that we must meet here.

We cannot expect at this Conference to produce a charter which will answer all the questions or resolve all the problems. No charter, no constitution, no basic document was ever drafted that was not open to improvement.

We Americans have a convincing proof of that in our own history. Our Constitution under which this Republic has grown and prospered for a hundred and fifty years, was by no means satisfactory to all the citizens when it issued from the Constitutional Convention of Philadelphia in 1787—or even satisfactory to all the delegates to that Convention. It lacked many provisions which numerous Americans of that day believed to be essential. Yet it was adopted by the requisite number of States in 1789. Only 4 years after the Constitution was written the first 10 amendments went into effect, and 11 other amendments have been made since then.

What was true of the Thirteen States which joined to form the United States is true also of the nations which have met in this Conference to consider the proposed organization of the world for security and peace. Let us construct the charter of the world organization as soundly as we can. But let us not sacrifice approval to perfection.

Let us act now in the sure knowledge that our work can be improved upon with time, but that if we fail to act we are likely to lose altogether the opportunity which has been given us to prevent another world war.

Fellow delegates, as we enter upon our great task we cannot forget the millions of men of our armed forces who have given their lives to this cause, nor the other millions of men, women, and children who have suffered the cruel agonies of starvation, torture, and death. We cannot forget the untold destruction that has been wrought. Nor can we forget how close our whole civilization has come to utter ruin.

It is our supreme responsibility, at this Conference and afterward, to see to it that this calamity never again falls upon the world.

Vision we must have to see clearly that without peace and security for all nations, there will be no peace and security for any one of us.

Courage we must have to carry us through trying delays and temporary misunderstandings and lesser differences to the fulfillment of our common purpose.

Faith we must have in the ability of mankind to make peace with the same resolute devotion that the United Nations peoples have given to fighting this war.

That vision, that courage, that faith, inspired the great American leader whose life was given to the cause for which we have here met—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is only with such vision, courage, and faith—expressed in a thousand different ways—that the United Nations have been able to travel so far along the hard road to final victory. It is only with this vision, courage, and faith that we shall make peace secure for ourselves—and for succeeding generations.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, April 24, 1945.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING VETERANS' HOUSING

The regents of the University of Minnesota, on April 13, 1945, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the termination of the war will release from service large numbers of veterans who will wish to return to or enter upon college and university courses; and

"Whereas the provisions of the Public Laws 16 and 346 will stimulate many of them to pursue a higher education; and

"Whereas this post-war increase in enrollment above the normal will result in serious problems of housing veterans for the colleges and universities, whose facilities even now are generally limited; and

"Whereas unless the veterans are adequately housed they will not be able to take advantage of the educational programs which will prepare them for resuming their place in civilian life: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the regents of the University of Minnesota, in cooperation with other State and publicly supported institutions of higher education, urge upon the Congress the enactment of legislation to provide funds on a matching basis for the construction of housing for veterans at such institutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the proper administrative officers of the University of Minnesota are authorized to take such steps in cooperation with other publicly supported institutions, and looking toward the construction of adequate housing for veterans, as may be deemed desirable to indicate to the Congress the need and the desirability for legislation."

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, May 1, 1945, by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, prepared and presented in behalf of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture, and the Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ways and Means Committee, this is either the third or fourth time I have appeared before this committee in regard to trade agreements and the effect of tariffs. My testimony in previous hearings has been based on the record of the United States in the past.

In previous testimony I have pointed out that our raw material income and especially our farm income is the governing factor in our economy. This basic fact has not changed, even though conditions have.

Since my last appearance before this committee, I have carried on a detailed study of our economy and the correlation which exists between the various segments such as agriculture, employment, mining, manufacturing, transportation, trade, etc. The gross farm income in the United States is the foundation from which all the others ratio out, with almost mathematical precision.

The Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia, after checking the analysis, the various graphs and tabulations, published an article in regard to our research work in the December issue of the Country Gentleman.

The article was entitled "The Key to Prosperity" and in it they accepted the basic laws of exchange and ratios that we found in analyzing the past record of the Nation. The ratio is quite simple, namely, that in the United States each dollar of farm income creates a dollar for factory pay rolls and $7 of national income.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, in their report on agricultural income in April 1944, also pointed out the quite constant ratio of $1 of farm income to $7 of national income that apparently exists.

No one has been able to refute this ratio which we first presented to a subcommittee of the United States Senate in Sioux City, Iowa, at a farm hearing in 1937. The ratio has not changed since that time even with a war economy, but there are those who ask, "Well, how do you know the farm income comes first?" To a man with a practical nature the very fact that a man must eat before he can work should be proof enough. For the benefit of the committee, I want to point out briefly why in our capital form of economy the farm income is the governing factor.

In our Nation we have roughly 9,000,000 business units, of which approximately 3,000,000 are nonagricultural. The other 6,000,000 business units are our 6,000,000 farms. Each of these farms is a business unit producing and processing products for trade and commerce, and the capital investment in each on the average is as large as the average capital investment in the 3,000,000 which are nonagricultural. Therefore, it ought to be self-evident that with agriculture having two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise in the United States, any rise or fall in farm income automatically creates a rise or fall in the income of the Nation as a whole.

With this ratio of income in existence, this committee can have a quite accurate yardstick to gage the results of any action which it may take in regard to tariffs or post-war taxes.

Any legislation which tends to reduce our farm income, either through curtailment of production or lower prices to the extent of a billion dollars will automatically force the wiping out of a billion dollars of factory pay rolls and $7,000,000,000 of national income. Greater reductions pyramid according to the ratio.

The loss of such income is automatically reflected in less tax collections and a loss in employment because of the reduction in consumer buying power throughout the Nation. Our loss in foreign trade will also ratio to our loss in farm income. For example, in 1938 our imports dropped to $1,960,000,000 from a total of $3,083,000,000 in 1937. The trade agreements were in operation and the drop cannot be blamed on tariffs which in my estimation are a barrier to trade only when they are above or below the American parity price level and even then to only a limited extent.

The real barrier to trade in the United States and the rest of the world is the price of raw materials and the resulting loss of purchasing power when farm prices drop. The loss in imports was the result of a drop in farm prices. In 1938 our gross farm income dropped over $1,000,000,000 and our national income dropped over $7,000,000,000 or in ratio to the formula I have given you.

A similar happening took place from 1929 to 1932. With a drop of over $6,000,000,000 in farm income from 1929 to 1932 our national income dropped approximately $45,000,000,000. This loss in farm income caused the wiping out of almost all our domestic and foreign trade with the exception of the necessities of life such as food and clothing and transportation.

The facts which I have pointed out to you are not theory but the record of what took place.

Instead of correcting the price of agricultural products we brought forth the trade agreements and various other measures as a cure. The only real measure of success which we had in the period from 1930 to 1940 was to increase the national debt.

The trade agreements were brought forth to increase the exports of farm products. The facts were that no power on earth could have restored our exports of farm products because our agricultural economy has been deficient ever since 1922.

It is true that in the case of cotton and wheat we had a surplus of about $400,000,000, but in spite of this our net imports of farm products from 1934 to 1941 ran about $600,000,000 per year. In 1941 with consumer buying power restored in the United States our net imports of farm products were over a billion dollars.

Since 1910–14 our exports of farm products, using that period as a yardstick of 100, dropped progressively to 49.4 percent in 1940 while on the other hand our imports increased progressively to 209.8 percent.

This record is positive proof that our agricultural tariffs since 1922 have not been a barrier to imports of farm products.

In the period 1910–14 up to 1940 our farm production increased 32.5 percent while our population growth was 38.9 percent. In spite of all this we passed and are asking for extension of the trade agreements to dispose of surplus farm products. Since 1940 our increase in population, on the basis of our American income level, is a greater market than all our export trade in 1940. In addition an increase of $80 per year in the wages of our 55,000,000 workers is equivalent to all exports in 1940.

The simple facts are, gentlemen, that our foreign trade depends on the production of American products and the price we maintain on them. Our foreign trade is merely a byproduct of our American economy.

I think I can prove this to better advantage by pointing out that of the 9,000,000 business units, nonagricultural and agricultural, all of them put together exported products equal to less than 5 percent of our national income during the 1933–40 period. I would like to point out in addition that of the 3,000,000 nonagricultural units, 96 percent of them employ 19 men or less. I have pointed out that the two-thirds of our capital industry agriculture had net imports of its products. With 96 percent of the nonagricultural units employing less than 19 men and many of them domestic trade and service units, it should be quite apparent that the only group who receive any benefit from the trade agreements are the large industrial groups, sometimes called the "economic royalists. They hire the best economists and that may give the committee the reason why a large percentage of our economists are for the trade agreements.

The depression of 1929 was completely misinterpreted by our economists. It was not due to lack of foreign trade because our Nation has had more than its share of world trade. With only 6 percent of the world's population we have been having, good times and bad, about 15 percent of the world trade. We might ask ourselves just how much are we entitled to? It appears that if we reach out for a greater percentage than we now have we may get into quarrels with other nations.

We have had tariffs ever since the first session of the first Congress. During all that period of over 150 years we have outstripped all the rest of the world with both a higher living standard and a much greater increase in our own productive capacity.

This being true let us also ask ourselves the question, why all the effort to obtain foreign trade when we can produce everything with the exception of 5 percent in the United States. Any attempt to increase our foreign trade will force us to reduce our own production and therefore be against our own interests and the world as a whole.

Our position in the world of tomorrow should be that of a referee and not that of a commercial power. To put us in a position of exporting manufactured goods in exchange for raw materials will be a direct repudiation of the Atlantic Charter. In the Atlantic Charter we proclaimed that we were going to make raw materials available for all the world. With only 6 percent of the world's population we have 25 percent of the available war material supplies and we cannot live up to the Atlantic Charter and import raw materials which other nations should have.

The real cause for the depression in 1929 was not tariffs but a complete break-down in the world's monetary system. Devaluation of foreign currencies had the indirect effect of wiping out most of our tariffs before the trade agreements program was put into operation. The result of this break-down in world price levels forced our price level to follow because we did not adjust our tariffs to offset the currency devaluation.

The break-down in our price level in the 1930–41 period forced the United States to suffer a loss of approximately sixty-seven and five-tenths billion dollars of farm income in the 12-year period, and in turn a loss of $473,000,000,000 of national income. Of this loss approximately $25,000,000,000 was our loss in export trade that we could and should have had with proper tariff protection.

If through the trade agreements, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and other announced polices we permit our price level to be reduced to the 1939 level, our Nation will take a loss of $75,000,000,000 per year. I therefore urge this committee to tread slowly on unknown waters.

In order to give the members of the committee an idea of the loss which their own States will suffer, I will give a few examples.

My own State of Iowa, by being forced to produce and sell at the 1939 level, will lose a billion dollars. New York State, which has often been a promoter of high tariffs for industry and low tariffs for raw materials because of its investments in industry, will lose over $8,000,000,000, or more than all the foreign trade that we can hope to gain under a program of W. P. A. loans to the rest of the world.

The State of Virginia will lose a billion dollars, Michigan will lose $3,000,000,000, and incidentally, a market for about 3,000,000 cars; Illinois, five billion; Ohio, four billion; and California, five billion.

Our total farm income will drop off $10,000,000,000, our factory pay rolls will be reduced $10,000,000,000, retail sales will be off $45,000,000,000 from our present potential, and we will have 20,000,000 unemployed.

I am here merely to warn you of what can and will happen if some of the announced policies and plans are carried out. I am for all the foreign trade which our economy will permit, and I am for the restoration of a sound world monetary system as a foundation for world peace. It cannot be done, however, by bankrupting the United States.

I have followed the meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, the meeting in Mexico, and have read of how the trade-agreement program is the cornerstone of them all. The program which is being proposed and planned in behind the scenes will force our price level back to the 1939 level and will bring about the results I have mentioned.

We are seemingly throwing all caution and leadership to the four winds and placing the resources of the United States in the hands of the rest of the world to use and price as they see fit. With our production and resources priced at the world level, we are a bankrupt Nation.

I don't think that this committee wants that to happen and we don't have to permit it to happen. To prevent it, however, we must present a program to the rest of the world which will permit a solvent United States. Instead of a program which would have us join world poverty we must have one in which the rest of the world can join us in prosperity. Such a program can be offered.

Let us analyze briefly foreign trade and commerce. The ability to buy depends on one of two things, income obtained through credit by the buyer or a price for the production of each nation so that they can earn the income for exchange.

The world economy of the past has been based primarily on loans. Because of an exploitive price level which prevented the repayment of loans the world banker, England, landed in bankruptcy. Now we are being asked through the Bretton Woods agreement to underwrite world trade and through the extension of the trade agreements maintain a low price level which in turn will mean that the loans will never be repaid.

And what have we to gain? A few weeks ago I attended a meeting addressed by Mr. Clayton and one of the points he made in favor of the whole program which we are being asked to rather blindly accept was that it would employ about 6 percent of our labor force in export trade. He forgot to mention that if we were to be paid for the exports with imports, we would also import at least the same labor equivalent. The simple facts are that foreign trade paid for with goods will not increase our employment. Of course, if we wish to make loans to buy our own goods, then we can gain employment for the time being. But even then at a very high cost. At present levels it costs roughly a sum of $3,000,000,000 to create a million jobs. Or, stated in another way, 50,000,000 workers at $3,000 per year create the buying power for the Nation as represented by $150,000,000,000 of national income.

There may be some doubt in the committee's mind that present plans will bring about 1939 price levels. I would like to give you my reasons for that conclusion.

In the first place, approximately 60 percent of the world's population is earning 20 cents a day or less. They have no great buying power, and if our raw-material producers are forced to compete at that level even our efficiency cannot meet their ability to buy.

As examples of these imports, I want to give you a few samples as given in the plans of the National Planning Association, 800 Twenty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C., in regard to future world trade.

They expect to bring in, for example, 2,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils which, of course, will compete with cottonseed oil, butter, lard, and other oils; 1,000,000,000 pounds of meats; 1,000,000,000 pounds of burlap; 1,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum; 600,000,000 pounds of copper; 1,000,000,000 pounds of zinc; and practically all our needs of manganese. The prices listed are such that if the program is put into operation, it will close our mines, force down the price and production of agricultural products and the resulting loss in income I mentioned.

The names listed in this planning association are very close to and in accord with the sponsors of present plans for peace and trade. The world cannot recover without a solvent United States, and to me the plan means chaos. Smaller nations, of course, had no choice and accepted what was offered.

If a program had been worked out to give nations a proper price for their product, they would have, in my opinion, accepted even more readily. With a proper price for their products to earn exchange they wouldn't have to borrow money.

The Bretton Woods agreement, in my estimation, practically threw gold and silver to the four winds as monetary metals. In theory they have evidently decided that scraps of paper are just as good. It is my frank opinion that the two-thirds of the world which does not have a banking system as we have, will want coinage or hard money. If that is the case, which I think it is, why not be realistic and have metal coinage as a foundation for world exchange.

Gold can be set up at its present value at $35 per ounce, a price to which the world has become accustomed; silver can be brought to parity with gold, using as an example the price ratio that existed between the two metals in 1910–14.

Commodity prices could then be stabilized at our parity level, the price we need for national solvency, and we would have world parity and a chance for the world to have prosperity instead of poverty as a foundation for world peace. If we are going to agree to something, then let us use arithmetic and agree to something that doesn't put the skids under our own Nation.

With such a world program this committee could safely remove all tariffs even for the protection of the steel barons. We should be realistic, however, and realize that in much the same way that we as a nation grew to our level through tariffs, other nations who wish to establish industry will need them to get under way.

With world prices stabilized at the American price level, world trade could be quadrupled in a few years.

You have a right to ask whether such a program would be acceptable to other nations. I think I can safely say that it would.

At the recent Mexican Conference our State Department presented a blueprint for world free trade. The South American countries didn't want it. Mexico wants to protect its growing steel industry and Brazil desires to protect industries she has started during the war. I feel that they should be given that right.

The final result of the meeting was a very important section, namely, subsection (b) of resolution 15.

"That a fair and equitable relationship should be sought between the prices of agricultural and mineral products and those of manufactured articles and that all prices should be fair to producers and consumers alike."

That in essence is parity prices for raw materials and can be implemented with gold and silver at parity as I have outlined above. With the matter of parity agreed to by all the nations at the Mexican Conference the question is at what level?

To maintain a solvent United States we must maintain our price level as it now exists. Therefore, we have only one choice, and that is to protect our price level with tariffs at the parity level until such time as world parity, with our parity level as the yardstick, is properly implemented with a reorganization of the world monetary system and with basic commodities stabilized at parity with the exchange medium.

The program outlined is not theoretical but based on the factual dislocation of money and commodity prices in the period following 1910–14. In fact, our parity price level was the world level in both the 1910–14 and 1925–29 periods. Our price level of today as given by the Bureau of Labor Index for all commodities is 105 percent of the 1926 level. The only thing which will prevent our parity level from becoming the yardstick for world price levels is the leadership on our part to bring it about.

The citizens of the United States are relying on this committee to be one of the first to protect our Nation. Sometime in the future you are going to be asked to make proper tax levies with which to refund the national debt, and it is only natural that you should wish to maintain the income of the United States.

There are two parts to economy. One is production, and the other is price. Nature gave us the raw-material resources to produce, the Constitution of the United States gave Congress the right to regulate the value of the American dollar, which, in turn, is the price of our production. Failure to properly protect the value of our dollar either through the price of commodities or other measures such as tariffs is to fail to protect the welfare of the American people and our form of government.

The time has come when we must make a decision. To join the world economy by reducing our price level to world levels will mean a return to the economy of the seventeenth century and going back to an economy that our forefathers ran away from.

To restore world economy on the basis of our American economy means that we would give to the world the kind of economy which time has proved as the one which gave the people in the United States the highest standard of living in the world and at the same time the lowest food cost on the basis of per capita income of any nation in the world.

My advice to the committee is make haste slowly. If you don't feel that this measure before you can be amended to require that no trade agreements can be made for imports below the American parity level, you can at least merely extend the law for 1 year in order that we may know how the cards are stacked.

As I have pointed out, we have $75,000,000,000 per year at stake, and it is no time to play "blind pitch."

In closing, I wish to point out:

1. That the trade-agreements program did not increase the export of farm products but instead increased imports of farm products which in turn prevented the recovery of our normal condition of parity prices for farm products.

2. That the trade agreements, when deductions are made for loans and foreign travel, did not increase our exports of all products.

3. That our dollar value of foreign trade is determined by the governing factor of our own economy, our farm income.

4. That the physical imports will ratio to the percentage of farm parity.

5. That a reduction of our price level to the world level will mean national bankruptcy and the continuation of world poverty.

6. That the course which we should follow is to maintain our parity price level and with it as a yardstick, to help reorganize the world monetary system and commodity price level, thus protecting the solvency of the United States and at the same time give the world an opportunity to have prosperity through production rather than loans at our expense.

Officials Keep People Confused So Inflation Continues Unchecked—Financial Authority Gives Clear Picture of Our Inflation Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, after the war ends, if not before, it is almost certain that deficit spending by the Government will be recognized as America's most critical problem.

To the man on the street this problem becomes real as his money loses more and more of its buying power. Thus far the steady inflation and expansion of our currency and bank credits has been kept obscured—so effectively, perhaps, that even we in Congress have become caloused to this danger. But continued self-deception on this danger can result in a financial disaster that may hit with a sudden fury and national destructiveness far surpassing the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. I discussed this danger of an economic Pearl Harbor in this House 2 years ago. I deeply believe that I have no duty in Congress more vital than to continue to endeavor to focus attention on this insidious danger.

The painful symptoms of inflation are rising prices. They have been concealed by the economic drugs or anesthesia known as the O. P. A., subsidies, rationing, and so forth.

Nevertheless, as actual inflation, deficit spending, has gained momentum, several economic developments have become quite distressing. The acute meat shortage and the black markets are examples. Unfortunately historical data indicates these conditions are self-accelerating, unless genuine corrective measures are adopted.

Surely we in Congress can serve America best by facing this problem realistically. A. A. Mol, now of New York, was in business in Holland during the currency chaos that followed World War No. 1. His experience with inflation, deflation, and devaluation in surrounding European countries at that time, plus continued study of currency problems since, qualifies him in my judgment as one of America's few experts on inflation.

The following is a partial statement of his views:

It is difficult to talk about inflation because various people mean various things by the word "inflation." Therefore, people often discuss this subject without understanding each other.

To the man in the street, "inflation" is a word to indicate rapidly rising cost of living, and deflation means a rapid decrease in the cost of living. In this sense the word indicates the final symptom of the phenomenon.

The economist goes a step further back and thinks of inflation and deflation as the economic causes for changes in cost of living. He differentiates between types of causes for such changes. There are two main types.

The first type is called business inflation and deflation. This form of change in the cost of living is by its nature self-limiting in extent and gives rise to the fluctuations in cost of living and in business activity which we know under the name of business cycle. It is possible to look for the causes of the business cycle one step further back than the economist does. They lie in the nature of living matter. This does not concern our subject.

The second form of inflation may, after its cause, be called government inflation. It is the result of continued large government deficits and leads over a period of time to increasingly rapid rise in the cost of living in terms of currency. Government inflation is not self-limiting in extent; it strongly tends to be self-accelerating. Its end is not deflation; it is stabilization. An angle of government inflation which temporarily is obscured and eliminated under war conditions, is that it leads to a rise in the cost of living in proportion to average wages paid and, consequently, to a decrease in tonnage buying power on the part of the population.

In the case of government inflation it also is possible to go one step further back in looking for the cause than the economist does. In doing that, one discovers that the cause of government inflation lies in the attitude of mind of the majority of the population. Consequently, if one wishes to forecast and understand conditions of post-war government inflation in various nations, one is obliged to study the attitude of the populations.

When we find that—

The people of a nation are willing to pull in their belts and to sacrifice the comforts of today and tomorrow in order to build a better future next year.

The people of a nation insist on caring for their unemployed within their own families and indignantly refuse government contributions.

Business managements after the war offer to work off stocks of raw materials and work in process on government orders in the most economical manner, as far as is possible in their normal business, and charge to the government only actual losses taken, instead of tossing the baby into the lap of the government.

Candidates for office present to the electorate basic thoughts about what they believe to be good and right, and are willing to stand or fall on the judgment the voters render on the merit of their thoughts, instead of spending their efforts on grass-root listening and vote catching.

Top executives in business lie awake at night thinking up a dollar or a pound, or a guilder, extra profit for stockholders and, in doing so, create millions of jobs.

Industry prefers improving the value of its product over continuing to plug the old product with dubious claims.

Returning soldiers make a full 8-hour workday out of finding or originating a job.

The people encourage the Government to continue high taxation, reasonably divided over all classes of the population, including their own.

Parliaments pass tax laws which divide the load of government in proportion to the capacity to pay and to the benefit which each group of citizens derives from law and order, without looking at the ballot box.

Hundreds of similar signs appear.

Then we shall know that such a nation is sound in mind and in heart. Then, until the next world war demands another interruption, it shall have a period of sound finance and of prosperity. Then we need not worry over the details of its future, because then we know that it shall have the strength to meet them as they come along. Man is able to build up and to tear down his physical surroundings with amazing speed, and it is the will that lives in him which causes it to be done.

If, however, the people of a nation are pleasure loving to an exaggerated degree, and if they are shortsighted and willing to sell next year's happiness for tomorrow's creature comfort, then we know that that nation shall have major inflation with all its attendant major horrors, no matter what the economists may say about the economic stage setting within the individual nation and no matter what control measures are taken. Then also it is useless to worry about the details of the inevitable, because it is the spirit of the people within the nation which creates the major trend and so long as that spirit does not change, there is no escape from the trend.

This is not just theory. The deciding influence of the attitude of the people was demonstrated in dozens of countries after the end of the First World War. The war caused economic exhaustion all over Europe. The economic settings in different countries were similar, although not identical. Out of these similar settings there came galloping inflation in Austria, in Germany, in Hungary, in Poland, there came major inflation in France, Italy, and Belgium which destroyed about 90 percent of the buying power of the money unit in 25 years, and there came deliberately created deflation and return to the gold standard in England and in Holland. The difference in the economic results came forth out of the difference in the spirit of the people. That spirit will also determine the financial future of nations after the Second World War.

FORECAST OF PRACTICALLY WORLD-WIDE MAJOR GOVERNMENT INFLATION

We can gauge the spirit at this time in the various nations of the world by the criteria I have put down and by dozens of others which each observer can think up himself. These criteria form the basis for judgment regarding the future of the various national money units of the world.

Probably the spirit in the United States at this time is better than in any other nation which has actively participated in the war. There is less cause for suppressed desire because there has been no violent suffering in the home territory. Notwithstanding this relatively favorable position, if we go down the list of the various criteria, the judgment about the mental attitude of our own population, in each and every case straight down the line, must at this time be unfavorable.

Unless the voting majority of the American Nation is re-educated by brilliant leaders, or unless the population changes its mind through the hard lessons of suffering, we must conclude that the population will vote

in one Congress after another with the instruction to spend and to sell out the future for tomorrow. Congress has the duty to reflect the will of the population. That means the prospect of progressive currency depreciation in terms of buying power. It does not mean that there could not be one, or even more, setbacks in the cost of living. It means, however, that, if and when setbacks occur in the cost of living and when, consequently, business pulls in its horns frightened by falling commodity prices, the sluice gates of spending will be opened wide. The result of temporary setbacks in the cost of living, if they should occur, will be further acceleration of the process of inflation, although inflation will go also on without them.

Mr. Speaker, the warning contained in Mr. Mol's analysis of our inflation problem must not be ignored. Nor has this problem been made easier by clever propaganda which has confused the people of America by making them think that the O. P. A. or other devices can enable us to avoid a day of reckoning from the many years of deficit spending.

The responsibility for this strain and peril to the public credit rests on the New Deal administration. However, as these difficulties eventually become critical, it is probable that clever efforts will be made to shift responsibility for this financial Frankenstein away from the New Deal that nursed it to its present terrifying proportions. With the propaganda machinery already in the hands of the Government, plus the dominated radio and movie, it is possible such an attempt to evade and shift responsibility could be effectively made. It behooves all lovers of liberty to be watching for its appearance. The administration borrowed and spent the money. Those acts created the existing concealed inflation, and in the final outcome the administration must be held accountable by the American people.

Undoubtedly, our new President, Harry S. Truman, is aware of this dangerous situation. In any and all constructive efforts that he makes to solve it, he should have the energetic support of Congress, regardless of party. There are, of course, only two genuinely constructive methods for correcting this evil—increased governmental revenues and/or decreased governmental expenditures. More controls in the Gestapo fashion are not constructive, and only intensify the universal trend toward ruthless regimentation of the people.

Although the Republican minority has, with few exceptions, opposed the reckless spending of the Administration, both before and during the war, it must put its shoulder to the wheel in getting the Nation back to a balanced budget.

When the President attacks this job courageously, it will be everybody's job to help him. Regardless of the guilt attached to the Democratic Party because of their reckless waste, all of us must help end it. The people must never allow those who have held full power from 1933 on to evade their responsibility for this inflation, but we of the minority must help unstintedly when this problem is honestly reckoned with. A balanced Budget is the all-American goal, and the future of America depends upon it.

International Office for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by the presidents and chancelors of 500 American universities and colleges, calling for the establishment of an International Office for Education, which declaration was forwarded to the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference. A House resolution by Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, covers the suggestion of an International Office for Education.

The declaration is as follows:

Widespread discussion of the proposals for an international security organization to maintain the peace following the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is an encouraging indication of the maturing of America's thinking on its foreign and international policies. Educators are, naturally, particularly interested in the formation of public opinion on our foreign policy and our place in an interdependent world.

It is of the utmost importance to remember that the peace of the world cannot be maintained by police power or economic or social arrangements alone. For the success of a world security organization there must be developed a climate of world opinion which not only wants such institutions and arrangements but also wants them to succeed. This requires the establishment of some means by which the nations and peoples of the world can attain to a higher standard of education and a better understanding of one another.

There can be no realism in international covenants which are not founded upon moral aims and a desire of peoples to understand others as well as to be understood by them. We believe that any international organization which ignores this fundamental principle will prove to be unrealistic and will speedily dissolve into power struggles and imperialist competition.

In a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to James Madison on December 20, 1787, the author of the American Declaration of Independence gave his views on the dependence of peace upon the spread of education:

"And say, finally, whether peace is best preserved by giving energy to the government or information to the people. This last is the most certain and the most legitimate engine of government. Educate and inform the whole mass of the people. Enable them to see that it is their interest to preserve peace and order, and they will preserve them. And it requires no very high degree of education to convince them of this. They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

That sure reliance can be made world-wide. A world opinion which wants peace and which organizes and educates for understanding among nations and peoples is the only sure foundation for a secure peace structure.

The great fear in every heart is that there may be a new war, a third world war, in which D-day may become doomsday. Everyone is aware of the economic dislocations which have resulted from this war. But culture and cultural institutions and personnel have suffered even more grievously. What is left of these institutions should now be enlisted to heal the torn world and to turn men's minds and emotions to the creation of a common well-being. This is a positive approach to a field in which cultural values have too long and too effectively been exploited for destructive purposes through propaganda and psychological warfare.

In furtherance of a climate of world opinion which wants peace and understanding between nations and peoples and in aid of the development of such understanding, we deem it necessary that there be created an International Office for Education. International interest in education must now include not only the instruction offered by universities and furthered by meetings of scientists and scholars, but also elementary, secondary, and adult education of a more informal character.

We therefore urge that the proposals for the creation of an International Office for Education to further educational and cultural relations be given prompt consideration and that action to this end be taken by our Government in collaboration with the other governments of the world.

The Healthful Midlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald:

THE HEALTHFUL MIDLANDS

Representative KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) arose in the House the other day to chortle a bit about the fact that his State is the healthiest place in America as shown by the lowest mortality and longevity statistics.

The Dakotas, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma have the lowest mortality rate in the Nation. It is a fact that isn't trumpeted nearly as much as it should be.

We are cussed for our climate and we have become almost self-conscious about its extremes. We know it is alternately darned hot and darned cold, that it sometimes rains when it shouldn't, and often doesn't rain when it should.

All in all, however, such contrary weather seems to breed a hardy race. We not only put up with the jibes of those bareheaded, short-pantied Floridans and Californians, but we live longer and have a good time doing it.

The "Four Freedoms" After V-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Four Freedoms After V-Day" by Carter Davidson, president, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.:

I am making my remarks today in the form of an appeal to President Harry Truman which I feel represents the sentiment of millions of American citizens today.

We realize, Mr. President, that you have been placed suddenly in a spot of great responsibility and difficulty at one of the most dangerous and trying times in the history of the world. We hope that you are going to be strengthened to meet these new responsibilities by a realization that you are backed by the opinions of 140,000,000 Americans. We have hopes that you will succeed, because in the first place you have come from a farm in Missouri and know what the opinions of the Middle West really are and what heart beats of this great Mississippi Valley can be. In the second place, we are hopeful, because you have been a judge and a Senator. As the first, you must have gained a concept of justice and equity. As a Senator you must have learned what is feasible in American Government. And finally, we are hopeful because of the symbolism in your name. If you live up to it and tell the American people the truth about problems which you and they face together, your career as President is going to be a success.

Before long we will be celebrating V-day. At the moment the V will stand for victory, but there will be those who will urge you to change its meaning at once to violence and vengeance. We ask you to remember when this times comes that in America V also has stood for the virtues and the values of a democratic system. After V-day there will be many forces pushing us this way and that, but we ask you, Mr. President, to think chiefly of the foundations upon which our country rests. During the war it has been quite suitable for us to think of the four freedoms as freedom from want and from fear, freedom of speech and of worship, but after V-day we hope these freedoms can be expanded into the four freedoms which have been America's gift to the world and which we want to see restored.

First and foremost of these is our political freedom, a democratic society under a republican form of government. We have been told that the democratic method is too slow for the use in time of war, and we have willingly made concessions, but when the war is over we want to get back to that form of government in which all opinions are truly represented, and a democratic method is used. We agree that Hitler's nazi-ism was quicker, and perhaps Russia's communism is more efficient, but when the price for speed and efficiency is our freedom, the cost is too high.

You will be told by many people that the form of government which we worked out in 1789 is no longer applicable to the problems of 1945, and therefore we must change our Government into a form of socialism in which the main control resides in the Federal Government. Let me remind you, however, that the system of government established in the Constitution of 1789 is the great American contribution to political thought and world society. It has proven its value through more than 150 years of trial, so that we feel justified in asking that the problems which face America today be solved in accord with the principles of the Constitution rather than change our form of government to find an easy solution to our current difficulties. I find it hard to picture Franklin and Hamilton and Washington getting together in the summer of 1787 in Philadelphia to figure out ways in which they could secure old-age pensions, a minimum daily wage, and a Federal bonus for themselves. Their thoughts were centered upon the same problem where your thoughts must be turning, How can we best preserve the freedom of the individual in our social organization? There will be those among your advisers who will point to the article in the Constitution giving Congress power to legislate for the general welfare, and they will tell you that the clause clears the way for you to do anything that you would like with the Government. But let me remind you. Mr. Truman, that even in 1789 there were those who were frightened by threat of these implied powers to our freedoms, and therefore they immediately passed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, of all American freemen, and the tenth amendment was put in specifically to limit these powers. It states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." We trust that you are going to try to return our political freedom to us, Mr. President, by reserving these powers to the States and to the people.

The second freedom which we would like to see given back after the war is freedom of individual enterprise. Millions of people came to America because in their homelands they had to work in the places and at the tasks and for the wages which the government or the local landowners had established by law. In America they could work if and when they wanted, at the tasks, in the places, and on the terms which they set for themselves. That freedom is what has made American production the greatest in the world. Today it is threatened from three directions. On one side the great corporations, achieving almost a complete monopoly of the means of production, are fighting to crush the individual who wants to set up in business for himself. The impersonality of the great corporation is a menace not only to the workers and the consumers but also the corporation itself. Our corporations must be given back their individual personality and feeling of responsibility. Attacking the individual from another direction is the labor organization which insists that only these individuals whom it approves shall be allowed to work, and they shall be permitted to do only a certain amount of work at a definitely fixed wage; membership in some unions shall be very difficult to secure because of the apprentice system, and in others membership shall be compulsory under the closed shop. All of us are deeply appreciative of what the labor unions have done for the conditions and laborers in America, and we admit the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. Nevertheless, we feel that the freedom of the individual requires that the union should achieve a greater sense of responsibility and should become guardians of freedom rather than of regimentation. In the quarrels between labor and capital, the Federal Government should be the arbiter, making decisions in the light of our principle of free enterprise, of free labor in a free industry. In recent years, however, the Federal Government has itself become a business corporation and has served in many cases to crush individual initiative. We ask, Mr. Truman, that you give serious consideration to ways in which American system of free enterprise can be restored to America.

When our pilgrim forefathers came to America for freedom of religion they were not interested in providing a haven for irreligious lethargy, nor would they have been satisfied with the trappings of an efficient church organization. They were interested not merely in freedom from certain tyrannical restrictions, but were interested also in freedom for truly religious living. In asking for freedom of religion, therefore, we do not ask that America pay no attention to what goes on religiously, but rather that Americans be encouraged to build a civilization which is based upon morality and virtue strengthened by the convictions which religion can give. We do not ask for a state church, for that would be the end of religious freedom, but we do hope for an America in which religion will be a guiding force.

And finally, Mr. President, I would not be doing justice to my task as president of an independent college if I did not say a word about the fourth freedom, freedom of education. In the rest of the world only those who were born into the right class of society, or who had unusual mental gifts, were given the opportunity of education. The American idea has been that our democracy could not function without citizens educated up to the limit of their capacities. There was no mention made in the Constitution of Federal control of education. This was not an error, but an intentional omission on the part of the framers of that document; they believed, as we should believe today, that education is so individual a matter that it must be kept close to the grass roots, and its control must rest in the hands of the parents, the local school boards, and the independent boards of trustees. In education the authority must go from Galesburg and the country schoolhouse to Washington, and not in the other direction. Therefore, Mr. Truman, we view with alarm recent bills in Congress which would imply that the Federal Government is now going to take over our educational system. I know that these bills are entitled "Federal Aid" bills. If I remember my Latin from the study of Virgil, there was a line in the Aeneid in which one of the Trojans, looking at the famous wooden horse used by the Greeks to conquer Troy, made the remark: "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." The literal translation is: "I fear the Greeks even when they are bringing gifts." To bring this quotation up-to-date in our present situation I would translate it: "I am afraid of Federal control of education, even though it is called assistance."

These "four freedoms" of political democracy, industrial enterprise, religion and education will stand or fall together. If one of them is destroyed the others disappear also. Hitler realized this fact, and therefore took over the German educational system as soon as he came to power. The destruction of educational freedom by the Nazis spelled the doom of all other freedoms in Germany, therefore, all four of these freedoms, Mr. President, must be vigorously defended in America.

To you, Mr. Truman, has been given a great responsibility. Along with it, however, there goes a wonderful opportunity. If you can restore these "four freedoms"—political, industrial, religious, and educational—to Americans, then it will be a country which will inspire not only our soldiers and sailors to fight and die for it, but also all citizens to work and live for it in the centuries ahead.

Excerpts From Address of Herbert C. Pell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following address made by the former United States Representative on the War Crimes Commission, Mr. Herbert C. Pell. This speech was delivered at Carnegie Hall in New York City on April 19, 1945, at a meeting sponsored by the American

League for a Free Palestine on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto. Mr. Pell's defiant fight for punishment of atrocities committed against the Hebrew people of Europe by the Germans, and his very eloquent plea for justice for the remaining Hebrew people of Europe by giving them recognition as one of the United Nations is most worthy of our attention.

The text of Mr. Pell's address follows:

We are gathered here tonight to honor those valiant fighters of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto who, 2 years ago, in a moment of sublime heroism, took up arms in a proportion of one against a thousand and have demonstrated before the whole world that they prefer rather to die fighting than to live on as slaves, without dignity of man. They did this after they were convinced that the German atrocities, the unspeakable policy of extermination, the horrifying tortures and the death of hundreds of thousands did not arouse the sense of humanity, of compassion, and of justice of decent people in the civilized world. They undertook the lost Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto after democratic governments failed to take up Hitler's challenge. They decided to choose the path of certain death after more than a million of their kin had been exterminated before the very eyes of all of us without arousing even a stern warning on behalf of our Government.

I am making this statement as a private citizen with no official position, but I firmly believe that everything that is done by us who are not in the armed forces will be ultimately judged by one standard only—have we contributed toward preventing a third world war which would end civilization? Nothing less means anything in comparison to this.

Now, I am sure that if the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto will pass into oblivion, and the torture and death of the millions of Jews in eastern Europe will be forgotten and relegated to the unpleasant incidents of the past, with no moral drawn as to our present policy, I am afraid that we will never bar the road to another war. For the conviction and punishment of those responsible for the suffering of this war is not a matter of revenge, but of justice. The persecution of minorities is an easy and from ancient times regularly used means of establishing tyrannical governments which inevitably become belligerent sooner or later. Every such government must canalize discontent and transmute the hostility provoked by its own methods at home into hatreds of foreign countries.

Persecution of a minority will tend at first to consolidate the gang and will cow the opposition of all citizens, even those not belonging to the persecuted minority. Let us suppose a shopkeeper in Berlin sees a Jewish shop next to his raided and wrecked. It is manifest that such a man will hesitate before opposing the Nazi organizations.

It is because we did not move when the first Jewish shop was raided and wrecked that we are paying now so dearly in blood, in tears, and in superhuman efforts.

Now the things that have happened in the last 4 years will live for a long time in the memory of people, and so will the policy of the victors.

We are told to forgive those who have injured us and to turn the other cheek, but it must be remembered that we have not been told to forgive injustice to others or to turn the cheek of somebody else. We cannot forgive the Germans what they have done to the Jews, and we cannot ask the Jewish survivors to start experimenting their policy of turning the other cheek all over again. They did it for too long and have paid for it too dearly.

Therefore, I believe that from this turmoil and from this turbulent ocean of suffering two main trends of policy should be made efficacious lest we resign ourselves to further catastrophes. The first is the punishment of the Germans for their crimes. It will not do merely to make a handful of martyrs. The Gestapo, which is a volunteer organization which nobody is forced to join, should be punished. All those in any way guilty of outrages should be punished so that in the future anyone in any country tempted to join such an organization will feel that he is putting a rope around his neck. The fear of punishment will not prevent men from taking the position of leaders. There will always be people ready to swap life for glory, but it may make their recruiting more difficult.

If this course involves some or many cases of personal injustice, it must involve them. It is better that half a dozen innocent German subjects should hang today than that millions of equally innocent people should suffer in 25 years.

For a year, I have supported these views in the War Crimes Commission. I honestly do not think that anyone could have upheld them more vigorously or have been more successful in inducing his associates on the Commission to accept them.

The second policy of action of the United Nations, but first of all of our own great and glorious Nation, is the restoration of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine to life, dignity, and political status. We must give the Jewish survivors a choice, we have to grant them the right to self-determination and to decide whether they want to go back to the ghettoes, whether they want to go back to Germany, and Austria, and Poland, and Hungary, and Rumania, all those countries where they have been treated, not only in the last 5, 10, or 15 years but for generations and centuries, in the most ignoble manner, where they have been persecuted and always subject to pogroms, or whether they want to take up a new life as a distinct national unit and to go back to that country on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean which they, for thousands of years, considered their national territory. As a first step in this direction, they have to be granted at least the privilege of being invited into the War Crimes Commission as full-fledged and honorable members, then their participation in other councils of the United Nations will follow.

I am primarily interested in the country in which my son will live and which I shall not see. I want the United States to be much greater, nobler, stronger than this country is today. The judgment of our descendants in 40 years is more important than political expediency. We owe peace to our children and on this debt we dare not default, and I solemnly declare now that I am thinking of my son and I am thinking of all those unborn children in America and I will see myself damned in the most literal and theological sense of the word before I will leave a stone unturned that might save them from a third world war.

Lilienthal and T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 2, 1945:

LILIENTHAL AND T. V. A.

We hope it's true, as reported, that President Truman has decided to name Director David Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for another 9-year term, in spite of the strong opposition registered at the White House yesterday by Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee.

No governmental undertaking has been more successful than T. V. A., and the reason is largely Mr. Lilienthal's management.

As head of that great project he has applied a definite philosophy. He has insisted on decentralization, on unified authority and responsibility, on making T. V. A. acceptable to and popular with the immediate region where it operates as well as the taxpayers of the Nation. And to accomplish this he has insisted on keeping T. V. A. free from politics. That freedom from politics is what got Senator MCKELLAR sore.

T. V. A.'s record shines, not only as it relates to electric power, but to flood control, navigation, soil conservation, reforestation, and the providing of cheap fertilizer. For Mr. Lilienthal to be bounced because he has resisted pressure that would make T. V. A. a feather bed for political appointees would be a grave injustice—a simple case of executing a man for making good.

Instead, if other such projects are to be authorized—M. V. A. and the like—we'd like to see Mr. Lilienthal supervise them and apply his T. V. A. principles, so that the multimillions spent on them won't be thrown to the political birdies.

Senator MCKELLAR, as President pro tempore of the Senate since Franklin D. Roosevelt's death, is in a powerful and responsible position. President Truman has honored him highly by asking him to sit in on meetings of the Cabinet. Under the circumstances, we do not believe the Senator will choose to make any very determined fight if Mr. Truman recognizes and rewards splendid service by renominating Director Lilienthal. Or that Mr. MCKELLAR's colleagues will give him much support if he does undertake to carry a Tennessee political feud to the floor of the Senate.

The Black Hills as World Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE BLACK HILLS AS WORLD HEADQUARTERS

Some persons may have concluded hastily that the endeavor to establish the headquarters of the United Nations in the Black Hills is just a publicity stunt.

Actually, it is much more than that and the primary sponsors of the idea have reason to believe that their suggestion will command a respectful hearing.

Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, very properly, is interesting himself seriously in the undertaking and is assembling facts and comments that will be of value in advancing the case for the Black Hills.

A summary he just prepared points out significantly the reasons why the headquarters should be in the United States and also why the Black Hills are exceptionally well suited for the site. The Governor's summary, which deserves study, follows:

"1. Our country was the first to declare as a national policy, and ever after to carry it out, an idea which was really the first basic step upward to an eventual world organization for permanent peace: All men are created free and equal.

"2. The history of our country shows without exception that all races, creeds, colors, nationalities are here accorded equality of rights under the law and equality of opportunity in economic and social affairs. So thoroughly have we been influenced by that idea that we have fought various wars to maintain it at home and abroad. Therefore, the United Nations would find here an environment where all believe in and practice an idea that must be one of the basic foundation stones of an organization for permanent world peace.

"3. Our country and especially our State of South Dakota has always maintained the policy of complete separation of church and state and complete freedom of religion for all. Therefore, the Christians, the Buddhists, the Mohammedans, and all other great religious movements of the world would find here an environment in which they can build their churches, temples, mosques, and practice their religion as they desire without interference by the State or objection by the people.

"4. South Dakota is located around the geographic center of the North American Continent. It is about equidistant from both the Occident and the Orient. Delegates and visitors from Europe, Asia, and Africa could meet here free from the local influences and past history and with a feeling of freedom from the advantages of location to one or the other. It is the most convenient to all and the most impartial location available for all for a world capital.

"5. In the Black Hills of South Dakota exist areas of impressive grandeur, majestic mountain peaks, beautiful rolling hill country covered with stately ponderosa pine and ornamental timber in profusion, interesting geological flora and fauna conditions of all kinds, mountain streams and lakes having no superiors anywhere for pure water supply, and an equable, energizing climate with never an extreme of heat or cold, wind or rain, all of them suitable and appropriate for a world capital.

"6. In this same Black Hills area are numerous spacious sites for establishment of a world city which will be an international area not blanketed by the proximity of any other large city and where the world may construct from the virgin, primitive conditions existing, its own city in its own time, in its own way, and with its own name. Ample transportation and communication opportunities of all kinds exist."

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Wynnefield Community Committee for Memorial Meeting of Philadelphia, I desire to call the attention of the House to a movement which had its inception in Wynnefield, a residential section of my constituency in Philadelphia, and the section in which I live. The implications and purposes of this movement appear to be of national significance. I can safely state that it represents the temper and desires of most of the people in my entire district. And being such, I wish to pass it on to all Members of Congress.

A number of citizens in Wynnefield recently met to discuss the appalling sacrifices of the 13,000,000 American families who have been directly affected by this war. They were impelled to give vocal and public expression to the desire that "our boys shall not have died in vain." So they called a preliminary meeting of some public-spirited members of my community, as well as representatives of the churches, synagogues, public schools, and other groups of the community. They discussed the subject of a memorial meeting by the entire community, in which every organization and individual of the section is to participate, to honor those who have already made the supreme sacrifice.

This organization meeting took place at the hall of the Jewish War Veterans, Fifty-fourth Street and Overbrook Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., Tuesday, April 3, 1945. Representative members of a number of our local institutions were present, including members of the Republican and Democratic executive ward committees. The suggestion of a memorial meeting was enthusiastically and unanimously endorsed.

It was the sense of this meeting that the entire community of Wynnefield be dedicated to the purposes for which our boys are fighting, and it was decided to hold a memorial meeting the last week in May at the Mann Public School. Many suggestions were offered, subcommittees were appointed, and long discussions ensued before the assembly decided to arrange the memorial meeting the last week in May at the Mann Public School, a central point. The principal of the Mann Public School, J. Wesley Foote, who was present at the meeting, offered his assistance in every way. There were further meetings at the Jewish War Veterans' post, at St. Barbara's Church, and at the homes of the individuals who were interested. After conferences with businessmen, labor leaders, judges of our courts, and with other prominent citizens, the various ideas and suggestions finally crystallized into the following program:

First. To hold a memorial meeting on May 28 at the Mann Public School.

The meeting to be presided over by one of the common pleas judges of the community.

The principal speaker to be the Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS, United States Senator.

A minister, rabbi, and priest to deliver invocations.

Three short essays on world peace, selected as the result of contests amongst school pupils, to be read by pupils of the community.

The war veterans, boy scouts, and Red Cross to take part in the ceremonies.

Second. Resolutions be adopted by the sponsors of the meeting in favor of a world organization for peace, a broadened social security base, and remunerative employment for all.

Third. To pledge the community to such resolutions and to send copies of the resolutions to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference, and to me, the Congressman of the district.

Fourth. To organize a nonpartisan community council which shall be thoroughly representative of the community, and of its inhabitants.

I am advised that the prevailing view of these organizers is that it shall become a permanent representative body of the community, with the ultimate aim of establishing a permanent memorial for our departed warriors and their and our beloved chief, the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I believe the Wynnefield Council will make its opinion known to this body, and to all other legislative assemblies and agencies which will deal with the winning of the war and the peace; which deal with the welfare of our returning veterans, and with the elimination of bigotry and prejudice. It will endeavor to explain various problems to the entire community in open meetings, and to help frame policies to maintain amity among nations and among individuals, as a responsible community should under our democratic form of government.

Now I subscribe to these purposes. I know that men in public office often give lip service to these ideals; and that in practice some of these flaunt the spirit of our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and its Bill of Rights, because of their short-sightedness. I intend to be present at the memorial meeting on May 28 at the Mann Public School, and to watch closely the work and resolutions of the Wynnefield Council which will be formed after this memorial meeting.

I hope this work of the citizens in Wynnefield will be an inspiration to other communities all over our country, and so that all of us in Congress may have the benefit of first-hand information regarding the desires and the temper of the people we represent. I look upon such an organization as a healthy sign, that the citizens of our land are deeply interested in the complex problems which face them and us in our victorious post-war world.

Mr. Speaker, I also desire to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions that I received from this committee, as follows:

Whereas the freedom and liberty of the entire world was threatened; and

Whereas all freedom-loving people sent forth their brave men and women in defense of their institutions that were threatened with destruction; and

Whereas our men and women in the armed forces have made the supreme sacrifice in order that we and generations to come may live in a secure, peaceful, and happy world; and

Whereas on April 12, 1945, the American people and the entire freedom-loving people of the world suffered another casualty in the loss of our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas all these whose memories we cherish sacrificed their lives for those ideals and objectives that will assure freedom, security, and a lasting peace for us in fraternity with the nations of the world; and

Whereas it is our determination that those who passed into eternity shall not have died in vain:

Now, therefore, we, the citizens of Wynnefield community in the city of Philadelphia, do hereby promise and pledge our wholehearted support to our new President, Harry S. Truman, the members of his Cabinet, and to our delegates at the San Francisco Conference who are engaged in the construction of a world peace organization in everlasting combination and cooperation with the United Nations, and we have further resolved to take, and do take, this solemn pledge: We solemnly pledge to consecrate ourselves to the memory of those who sleep beneath the crosses and the stars. We do hereby further rededicate ourselves and offer our resources and energy to the men and women in our armed forces. We promise that it is and shall remain our sacred obligation to help build the kind of world for which they fought and died. It shall be our sacred task to rally our entire community in united support for freedom, security, and equality of opportunity to all. We shall not rest until bigotry and fear are forever abolished from our great land, and until security and enduring peace are established throughout the world.

Cleveland Postal Employees Support Seventh War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Cleveland, beneficiaries of the very effective services rendered by the willing and efficient employees in the Cleveland postal area, are very proud, and rightly so, of the patriotic response and contribution to the war effort made by these employees.

Under the inspiring leadership of Mr. Joseph P. Nolan, post-office inspector in charge, these patriotic men and women are achieving a record which is well worth bringing to the attention of the Members of the Congress, and to the people of the Nation.

Incident to the Seventh War Loan drive, and utilizing the voluntary payroll-savings plan, it appears evident that the personnel of the Cleveland, Ohio, post office is doing its full duty. The first unit completely canvassed—the supervisory force—subscribed to the extent of 99.2 percent, and the second unit—the Claims and Inquiry Section—92 percent. Following the energetic leadership of their respective local presidents, it is a foregone conclusion that the clerks, carriers, motor-vehicle employees, mail handlers, messengers, and custodial service men will make an equally favorable showing.

The personnel of the Cleveland post office leads all industrial and other large groups, locally, and claims national leadership among postal establishments throughout the United States, in this important respect.

The post office contribution to the 1945 campaign for the war chest exceeded all previous records.

Lions Club Honors Memory of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, our great departed leader was a member of Lions International. Various Lions clubs throughout the United States have joined in paying tribute to his memory. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by a standing vote, with heads bowed, by the Chattanooga Lions Club on April 25, 1945. The resolution was signed by officers of the club—Ben Duggan, J. A. Sherrill, and Lee Allen.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas God in His infinite wisdom has called to his reward our President, Commander in Chief, and fellow Lion, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the United States and the world has lost a great leader and humanitarian; and

Whereas President Roosevelt was an active member of Lions International, and his life and work exemplified the ideals and principles of Lionism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Chattanooga does hereby join with Americans and with the peoples of all nations in recognition of the great loss to our country and to the world in the untimely passing of a great and beloved leader whose vision was pointed toward a universal peace and brotherhood of men; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the club and that copies be furnished to the press of the city of Chattanooga.

Unconditional Surrender of German Forces in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my joy over the great news announced today by President Truman—the unconditional surrender of all German forces in Italy.

I especially want to pay tribute to the brave men through whose efforts and gallantry this glorious result has been achieved.

For many months, Mr. Speaker, ever since our troops hit the beaches in Normandy, the Allied forces in Italy have considered themselves to be on the forgotten front. This was because, quite naturally, a major share of the headlines in the Nation's newspapers was devoted to happenings in France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany. But that did not mean there was no longer war in Italy. There Allied soldiers still were fighting, where they had been fighting for months before D-day in France. And Allied soldiers were still dying there, in the cause of freedom.

I believe that today we should pause to pay special tribute to the soldiers of the American Fifth Army and their commander, Gen. Mark Clark, and to their comrades of the British Eighth Army, who chased the Fascists out of Africa, and who conquered Sicily and Italy.

And I want to add my personal tribute, in which I know I will be joined by millions of other Americans, to the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division, which has been the spearhead of the Fifth Army through most of the fighting in Italy.

The Thirty-fourth, or Red Bull Division, as it is known from its shoulder patch, originally was made up of National Guard men from my home State of Minnesota, and its sister States, Iowa, North and South Dakota, once commanded by Ellard A. Walsh, of St. Paul, now Minnesota's adjutant general.

The units comprising this division left their home stations early in 1941. One of its regiments, the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry which traces its traditions to the Civil War in which it served as the First Minnesota Infantry, provided the first troops to land in Europe in this war. Within 3 months of the attack on Pearl Harbor the regiment disembarked at a North Ireland port.

Two other of its regiments, the One Hundred and Fifty-first Artillery from Minnesota and the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry from Iowa, also carry on their standard and colors, battle streamers won in France in 1917 and 1918 when they were part of the famed Forty-second, or Rainbow, Division.

The Thirty-fourth provided many of the men for the first American Ranger units, men who took part in the Dieppe raid. It made the landing in north Africa in November 1942. It fought at Kasserine Pass and through Tunisia to the Fascist surrender at Bizerte. It was in the thick of things at Anzio, Salerno, and Cassino, through all the major fighting in Italy. Seldom have its units been out of action since the north Africa landing.

The division is now recognized as the most decorated in the Army, in addition to having more combat days than any other. Here, for example, are some recent figures on decorations received by members of the division:

More than 15,000 Purple Hearts, 9 Medals of Honor, 98 Distinguished Service Crosses, 116 Legion of Merit Medals, 1,052 Silver Star Medals, 51 Soldier's Medals, 1,713 Bronze Star Medals, 3 Presidential Unit Citations, 7 British awards, 7 French awards, 6 Italian awards, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 1 Distinguished Flying Cross, 34 Air Medals with 52 Oak Leaf Clusters, 525 divisional citations, 6 War Department meritorious service unit plaques, and 15 Army commendations of the unit.

As may be guessed from the more than 15,000 Purple Hearts awarded in the division, all its members no longer are from Minnesota, Iowa, and the Dakotas. Replacements from every other State in the Union were required to keep the di-

vision at strength, and these all made gallant contributions to its record. The people of Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota, however, may take special pride on this great day in the knowledge of what their gallant sons have contributed to America's brilliant military history.

England Mourns President Roosevelt's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the sorrow of the American people at the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is well known but it is interesting to know that this sorrow is not confined to this country but is worldwide.

A letter from Mr. J. E. Evans-Jackson, a prominent lawyer of London, England, whom I know personally, has just been received by Mr. C. P. Carter, of Washington, which doubtless expresses the feelings of the English people upon the tragic loss of President Roosevelt, and upon leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

DEAR CHAUNCEY CARTER: We all received the news of President Roosevelt's death with great sorrow and express to you our deep sympathy in the loss the United States has sustained, a loss in which this country shares.

The people of this country held the late President in deep affection and had the greatest admiration for his courage, honesty, strength of purpose, and not least, for his farsightedness and wisdom.

It is sad that he should not have lived to see the final victories over Germany and Japan and the way of life for which these two countries stand; victory to which he contributed so largely. It is also a tragedy for the world that it is deprived of his wisdom in shaping the peace and settling the many difficult problems which will face the nations in the next few years.

We shall never forget, at the time the British Empire stood alone against the Axis Powers, the words of hope and friendship which President Roosevelt broadcast. They were as water to men parched in the desert.

Yours very sincerely,
J. E. EVANS-JACKSON.

A Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Industrial Relations Review for April 1945:

A TIME FOR ACTION

A few weeks ago, and within a few days of each other, two men—one an Englishman and the other an American—made important statements which carry with them a solemn warning which all United States citizens should take to heart. One statement comes from Prime Minister Winston Churchill, in an address to his Conservative Party in London. The other, unusual as it may seem, was made by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, in an address before the Rotary Club of New York. The statements of these two men follow:

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of England: "Let there be no mistake about it. It is no easy cheap-jack utopia of airy phrases that lies before us.

"There is no time for windy platitudes. The Conservative Party had far better go down telling the truth and acting in accordance with the verities of our position than gain a span of shabbily bought office by easy and fickle froth and chatter.

"Woe betide those public men who seek to slide into power down the slippery slope of vain and profligate undertakings. This is no time for humbug and blandishment, but for grim and stark facts and figures, and action to meet immediate needs.

"It would be very easy for us all to promise or even to give each other presents, bonuses, and gratuities in the most enthusiastic manner but if we woke up in the morning and found that the pound sterling ($4) bought only 5 shillings ($1) worth of goods or services, we should have committed the crime of cheating the soldiers and workers of the country.

"You hear all this talk by the stay-at-home left-wing intelligentsia that the soldiers will hold us guilty if we do not have a new world waiting for them on their return. The brave new world is to be already waiting for them when they disembark. * * *

"But that is not what the fighting men are looking forward to.

"They are not looking forward to a new world constructed behind their backs by politicians who seek their votes. Most of them have lived long enough in uncomfortable proximity to another world to be thinking of that. * * *

"They do not regard themselves as a slumbred serf population chased into battle from a land of misery and want. They love their country and the scenes of their youth and manhood and they have shown themselves ready to die not only in defense of their material satisfactions but for its honor.

"When they are home and settled down and their country is again a going concern, paying its way and standing on its own in the post-war world, then will be the time for them to settle what form and shape our society should assume. * * *

"No restriction upon well-established British liberties that is not proved indispensable to the prosecution of the war and the transition from war to peace can be tolerated.

"Control for control's sake is senseless. Controls under the pretext of war or its aftermath which are in fact designed to favor the accomplishment of totalitarian systems, however innocently designed, whatever guise they take, whatever slogans they mouth, are a fraud which should be mercilessly exposed to the British public.

"At the head of our mainmast we fly the flag of free enterprise. We are determined that native genius and the spirit of adventure and of risk taking, in peace as in war, shall bear our fortunes forward, finding profitable work and trade for our people, and that good, thrifty housekeeping, both national and private, shall sustain our economy."

MATTHEW WOLL, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE A. F. OF L.

"The struggle will be long and bitter if any group in the United States attempts to make the American people a nation of fuehrer worshippers, goose-stepping totalitarian robots.

"Today, despite the allegiance of the overwhelming percentage of the American people to the democratic way of living, there is evidence of a trend to totalitarianism in small but influential groups. The growing reliance of the Executive on directives and government by decree is but one evidence of this impatience with our traditional, representative method of doing things.

"Another evidence of this trend is the gullibility with which some respectable sections of the community have accepted the brand of political and economic eyewash sold by the American Communists.

"Admiration of communism before the war was confined largely to a handful of party members and its lunatic fringe of intellectuals. Today the penetration of communism has reached alarming proportions.

"Labor unions, church organizations, cultural bodies have adopted the ever-changing party line. But most disquieting is the Communist penertation of conservative business groups. Interests close to some of our largest banking institutions have become fellow travelers, strange as it may sound.

"American communism can thrive best in a totalitarian atmosphere. Every move to concentrate greater power in the hands of Government meets with a chorus of American Communist approval, and since it is generally agreed that big government is the enemy of economic voluntarism or free enterprise, and since communism in America today is completely behind the growing tendency toward total control over the Nation's industrial enterprise, those in business who soft-pedal communism are, in effect, digging their own graves.

"Today there is a shrinking of democratic processes and a continual enlargement of the role of the Government as a final arbiter. Before it is too late, it is time we all demanded a priority on initiative; a priority on freedom, and the willingness to think things through, without the help of some ghost writer in one of the countless Government bureaus.

"Newspapers and radios which permit the skillful penetration of pro-Communist columnists and commentators are unwittingly preparing the day when their properties will be completely controlled, if not owned, by the growing, ruthless bureaucratic elite whose ultimate goal is nothing short of total control.

"Unless we think clearly and plan intelligently now, while the war is on, we may find ourselves with military victory on our heads but unwittingly encumbered by the enemy's social philosophy."

No one single action that can be taken by our citizens will so effectively rid our country of the dangers of the "left-wing intelligentsia," "communism," "totalitarian systems," and "government by decree," or do more to give us a "priority on freedom and initiative" and enable us to fly from our mainmast "the flag of free enterprise" than the repeal of the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act.

Never was there a more propitious time than now to start this long deferred move. It can be repealed. The way to do it is simple. Write your Congressman and both your Senators to repeal the Wagner Act. Tell all whom you see to write their Congressmen: "Repeal the Wagner Act." Make those words your slogan. Soon throughout the Nation "repeal the Wagner Act" will rise to such a crescendo that Congressmen will take heed, will introduce the bill in Congress, and will repeal the Wagner Act.

Then we shall have done more, in a shorter space of time, for the preservation of our American way of life that we could have done by any other single act. Repeal the Wagner Act—now is the time to get the movement under way. To start this movement we have just mailed a marked copy of this issue to

each Member of the Senate and House, and to President Truman.

P. S.—Lest we be accused of "labor baiting" in starting this movement, listen to what Thomas E. Flynn, executive assistant to Dan Tobin, president of the teamsters' union, and another vice president (along with Matthew Woll) of the A. F. of L., said at the recent southern conference of the teamsters' union held in New Orleans: "I am thoroughly disgusted with the National Labor Relations Board. I can say that speaking for the entire international union. We have nothing to hope for from the N. L. R. B. Therefore, our only recourse appears to be to ask Congress to repeal the Wagner Act and wipe out the N. L. R. B. which has become nothing more than a standing committee for the C. I. O."

Making Jobs by Closing American Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morgan County (Ohio) Herald, concerning the effect in my district of Ohio of lowering the tariff on the importations of pottery and chinaware.

The editorial is as follows:

MAKING JOBS BY CLOSING AMERICAN FACTORIES

Readers of the Zanesville papers, no doubt noted the page ad carried by the southeastern Ohio pottery manufacturers a few days since, asking that all interested parties write their Congressmen in protest against any tariff reduction on pottery. They stated their case fully and frankly—they cannot pay wages upon which labor can exist at the American standard and compete with the pottery makers in Czechoslovakia, Japan, and other low wage standard countries. They directed attention to what the pottery industry means, in particular to towns such as Roseville and Crooksville. If their factories are forced out of existence by the importation of a flood of earthenware, fabricated by cheap labor abroad, they will be compelled to close their doors, with consequences which cannot be other than economically disastrous to those communities.

We do not believe the potters are exaggerating the situation in their industry. In the typical pre-war year of 1937, imports of household china were 44 times that of domestic production. Chinaware that was made in Japan comprised a large part of prewar importation. For instance, a 104-piece earthenware dinner set which sold at $38.50 could scarcely compete with a Japanese china set, after it had been transported 7,000 miles across the ocean with a 70 percent duty paid at the American port of entry. And, as everyone knows, china is more costly than earthen dinnerware, being thinner, harder, and more brittle.

Much has been said about 60,000,000 jobs after the war. At the same time we are being told at Washington by free traders that if we are going to have peace we must have trade agreements and economic as well as political comity. We wish our exponents of free trade would tell us how the potter, for instance, is going to exist when with a 70-percent protective tariff he could not compete with imports before the war? Since the war the potter's wages and costs, which include almost confiscatory income taxes, have doubled his cost of production. Lower the tariff and what does he do—what can he do but close his doors? When his plant is closed, men are thrown out of employment and places such as Crooksville and Roseville become ghost towns. How are you going to create jobs by destroying productive industry which employs labor and which is the lifeblood of the Nation?

Vote Bretton Woods Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on April 30, 1945, entitled "Vote Bretton Woods Now":

VOTE BRETTON WOODS NOW

Congress has under consideration in committee the Bretton Woods plan for a World Reconstruction and Development Bank and an International Currency Stabilization Fund.

This plan is designed to make exchange of goods and services between nations easier. So great a step cannot be taken without difference of opinion. Everyone agrees the purpose is desirable. But some business associations, notably the American Bankers' Association, oppose the second part of the program—that is, the International Fund.

With due respect to the bankers, one may recall that under their leadership—or lack of it—we never got anywhere about reforming our currency. They did not support the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, though a few years later they were loud in its praise. The leadership, if anything is to be done, must be elsewhere.

Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, spoke for a party truce in Congress, lest expression of strong feelings endanger the work of the San Francisco Conference. Senator PEPPER, of Florida, speaking on the same program, was more to the point when he declared that favorable action now on Bretton Woods would give great impetus to the San Francisco meeting.

No one supposes the Bretton Woods plan is perfect. But it would be a beginning. If the nations take some risk in setting up a fund, the risk to this country is no more than a month of this war is costing.

Speaking at a regional meeting of the Catholic Association for International Peace, held at Marquette University, the Reverend Thomas F. Divine, dean of the school of business administration, made the point that needs to be made concerning the stabilization fund:

"In spite of all the objections raised against the fund, we consider its advantages to outweigh its disadvantages. As no satisfactory alternative has been offered, the choice is between accepting the fund and doing nothing in the way of international cooperation for exchange stabilization."

It is the old choice—the choice we made in adopting the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and at many a lesser crossroads of our history. We have succeeded when we did something; our regrets are for times when we failed to act. Let Congress, by adopting the Bretton Woods plan now, send word to San Francisco that the United States is in earnest about cooperation—that we are not going back to isolationism in any respect.

Chattanooga's Experiences With T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent address by S. R. Finley, general superintendent, Electric Power Board of Chattanooga. The address was delivered at a meeting of the Arkansas Valley Association, Muskogee, Okla., on April 12, 1945.

Mr. Finley is one of the most capable and best-informed municipal electrical superintendents of the Nation.

The address follows:

I want to make it abundantly clear in the discussion of Chattanooga's experiences with T. V. A. that I am not employed by the T. V. A. and never have been. Nobody in the T. V. A. has asked me to come out here, nor do I know any one of them who has any knowledge of what I am going to say about our experiences in Chattanooga with the T. V. A. project. I went to Chattanooga in 1937, upon the invitation of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, to become its chief engineer and direct their efforts in connection with their desire to acquire an electrict distribution system. The people of Chattanooga had decided about 2 years previously, by a referendum vote on the ratio of 19,000 to 8,000, to acquire for themselves an electric distribution system.

At that time I had never heard of any preconceived plan to take over the destinies of the region, nor have I since. So far as I know, there is not now in existence any definite thing called a T. V. A. plan. From my knowledge of the T. V. A.'s program, and observation of it, and experiences with it, I would define the Tennessee Valley Authority as a regional authority carrying out a mandate from the Congress in connection with certain things which the Congress of the United States deemed necessary in that area. If there has ever been a preconceived plan to completely do over the area, or to revise the ways and lives of the people there, then I have never heard of it, nor has there been any effort made to force such a thing upon our section. The only people I know of that have to do anything which the T. V. A. says are the employees of the T. V. A., and that, of course, holds good in most any kind of a well-run business. Certainly the few thousand permanent employees of the Authority are among the minority in the millions of people where the T. V. A. project is in operation.

* * * * *

Chattanooga is the only large city, aside from Knoxville, located directly upon the Tennessee River, Nashville being upon the Cumberland River and not even in the river's drainage area, and Memphis being located upon the Mississippi River. For generations, until the advent of the T. V. A. project, the principal physical parts of which are now almost complete, the Tennessee River and its tributaries have been an unmanageable stream. Its tributaries rise in the mountains of North Carolina, southwestern Virginia, and northern Georgia and the main

stream is formed just below Knoxville and flows southward across the State to Chattanooga, and thence southeastward and westward across Tennessee and northern Alabama and turning north again at the northeastern tip of Mississippi, recrosses the State of Tennessee and portions of Kentucky, emptying into the Ohio River just below Paducah. Its length from Paducah to Knoxville is about 650 miles and in this distance it has a fall of about 500 feet. The tributaries are fed by the snows and heavy rains which fall in the mountains where the tributaries form, and until the advent of the T. V. A., the river annually overran its banks, destroying much valuable land and property, and was always generally a flood menace, particularly in the upper portions of the main stream. Our own city of Chattanooga has had the name of a "flood city" and much of the area within the city limits was known to be subject to annual floods.

In discussing our experiences with T. V. A. during these past 12 years, I think I can say that we think many of the original purposes of it have been brought to a full and satisfactory completion, and that we are very happy with the results, and because of them we have prospered a great deal. The same is true for many other sections in the valley, throughout the entire 41,000 square miles in the drainage basin of the river. We have come to look upon the T. V. A. to be exactly what it was originally intended to be. It is true that it is a Government corporation, clothed with the authority of Congress, and its three directors are appointed by the President. However, it is vastly different from most functions of government in that it has the flexibility and opportunity for initiative and enterprise, in its field, that has usually been enjoyed only by private corporations. It has taken us some time in Chattanooga to have this feeling about T. V. A., and there are those among us yet who are unable to distinguish it from the normal governmental bureau. They are, however, gradually diminishing in number, as they observe more and more the operations of the T. V. A., become acquainted with it, and realize the benefits that have come to Chattanooga, that could only come from this type of a Government function. Even though our public power operation, the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, is only connected with the T. V. A. by our wholesale power contract, some citizens even yet after nearly 6 years of operation, refer to us as the T. V. A.

The reason for this is that many people look upon the T. V. A., on account of its widespread controversial past, as only a giant electric enterprise. The facts are, that the electrical part of it is only one of its several important parts. It is true that the T. V. A.'s income from the sale of electricity at wholesale to its municipal and industrial customers is now providing enough money to pay its expenses of operation, depreciation, tax replacements, and the operating expenses of its other programs. T. V. A. reports of its financial operations will show that its income from its sale of electricity to the 130 municipal contractors, rural electric cooperatives, industrial customers, and private utilities, after paying the expenses of electrical operation, is enough to repay the Federal Government over a period of years the money advanced for that part of the project which has been deemed as allocated to the power part. For this reason, we do not consider ourselves a recipient of special gifts from the Federal Treasury at the expense of other taxpayers in the Nation. Instead, with our own money, secured from our customers by the sale of electricity at retail, we are paying to the T. V. A. for electricity at wholesale, enough money to cover the electrical expenses of the project, with enough over to repay the Federal Government, or to pay the T. V. A.'s other operating expenses of agricultural research and demonstration, recreation, and use of public lands, fertilizer development, flood control, and navigation. Let me say again, that with our own money, we are paying for this something that is being used to the advantage and development of our section.

One of the great beneficial experiences which has come to Chattanooga from the T. V. A. project has been that of flood protection. It may be true that we will need some additional local flood protection works, to absolutely protect ourselves from any future flood damage, but without the protection given to our city by the T. V. A. system of flood control on the main stream, then no system of local flood protection works would have been financially feasible or available. As late as January 1943, at least a million dollars in damages was saved us by the reduction of a flood crest and there have been other instances where operation of the T. V. A. system of dams has saved us from additional flood ravaging. I want to say here and now, that the T. V. A. dams do generate electric power. Of course they do, and they were built with that as one of their purposes. However, these dams are also flood control and navigation dams, and these nine dams upon the main river channel, eight of which were constructed by T. V. A., and one purchased in the power company deal, along with the tributary reservoirs, provide much head water and main stream storage, and all operated together as a unit are capable of providing flood protection to flood danger points upon the Tennessee River, one of which has always been Chattanooga. No one can say that we will never have another flood in Chattanooga, but the chances are that we won't, and certainly the constantly recurring minor floods that have been our annual experiences in the past have been eliminated. A number of industries in our city who have suffered from floods in the past have a feeling of security in the future, and there are available new industrial sites for developments and large areas of land we hope in the future to put to use. Certainly a fine measure of flood protection provided to Chattanooga has been one of our most beneficial experiences with the T. V. A.

It is hard to discuss flood control without relating it to navigation. The Tennessee River is really not exactly a great river anymore. It is a moderately flowing body of water subdivided into 9 great lakes. Each lake is at a different level from the one below and above it, and there is throughout the length, or soon will be, a 9-foot navigation channel from Knoxville to the mouth of the river. The use of this channel for transportation of freight by water has been increasing by leaps and bounds. Chattanooga now receives a large amount of grain, petroleum products, sand and gravel and other bulk products by water, and, when materials and equipment are available for expansion of barge lines following the war, a great deal more freight traffic will move in and out of Chattanooga by barges. We have not lost sight of the fact that this 9-foot navigation channel places us with direct access by water with the upper and lower Mississippi waterways system, including the Ohio. Our modest river terminal in Chattanooga, built by the T. V. A., even though having been in operation only a short time, is already paying its operating expenses from our constantly growing river freight. Steel barges are of course the future vehicles of river transportation. The large ones will hold up to 3,000 tons of freight, as much as 75 railroad boxcars and a tow boat can push a couple of dozen of them. An oil barge carries 9,000 barrels of oil compared to 240 in a tank car, and a coal barge will carry 2,000 tons, equivalent to 50 carloads. This matter of heavy material transportation to and from Chattanooga, as Chattanooga is essentially an industrial city, with its industry dominated by its iron and steel industries, textiles, food products, chemical and wood products, is going to be one of our great benefits in the future. In years to come this river channel will be the basis for creation of much additional industrial wealth. Its use requires no regulation as to rates, for it is simply a natural economic resource of the people being put to use by the people for the benefit of the people. I can say frankly that you won't find our railroads promoting the use of river transportation. Wha they really object to is the complete development of the Mississippi River and its branches as a waterways transportation system, for they know that this is a method of transportation that can be used without the permission of Wall Street or the financial interests that dominate the railroad systems. In the South the differential freight-rate procedure in use upon the railroads has been a brake upon our industrial progress. River traffic on the Tennessee River, and this would apply to Chattanooga, has increased to nearly 6 times in volume since the advent of the T. V. A. development. Our brief experiences in the past convince us that the future in river transportation, brought on by the T. V. A. development, is going to be of immense value. We have uses for phosphates, limestone, tobacco, cotton, ores, grain, iron and steel, and petroleum and many other heavy materials upon which, as one of our benefits, there will be great saving in existing freight charges.

I am the administrative head of a public power system which purchases its electrical energy from the T. V. A., and it would be unnatural if I did not comment upon that phase of the benefits which our city has enjoyed from the program. The people of Chattanooga put themselves into the public power business in 1935 as I have previously stated by a referendum vote of 19,000 to 8,000. They did that after a heated campaign which nearly wrecked the hithertofore peaceful composure of the community. Let me say that it does not take very much to start an argument in east Tennessee. The original settlers there were pushed over into that area just after colonial times by the growth of the seaboard States. Apparently the experience made them a little objectionable to being pushed around so they just turned in and pushed the Indians out and the bears back into the caves in the mountains. Even now when there is nobody else to fight with, we just naturally start an argument among ourselves and the public power campaign in Chattanooga preceding the election in 1935 was really a big top performance. I wasn't there when it happened, but the echoes were still reverberating when I came in 1937, and even at that late date, all of the split families, broken business partnerships, disrupted church congregations and neighborhoods, and what not had not gotten back together again. After a good healthy start, however, toward building for themselves an electric power distribution system, a deal was finally consumated in August of 1939 in which the T. V. A., Chattanooga and 27 other municipalities and electric cooperatives acquired the entire property of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. (save their street car systems) for $78,000,000. Chattanooga's share of this purchase price was $10,850,000 and many have been kind enough to say that it was the best investment that Chattanooga ever made. The purchase price paid permitted the power company to pay off in full all of its bondholders, its preferred stockholders, and even left a good many million dollars for the common stock which was of rather doubtful value. Practically all of the existing employees of the company who desired to remain in the services of the T. V. A. and the municipalities were retained. Many of them immediately began receiving higher salaries than they had been paid, and today are still important members of our organization in Chattanooga, the T. V. A., and other contractors.

I think Chattanooga recognizes that in our nearly 6 years of operation, our public power

system has benefited us a great deal. During that time, based on the average rates charged in 1938, the last full year of operation by the private company, electricity users served by the Chattanooga system have saved over $13,000,000 in their cost of electricity. These savings have extended to all classes of customers and exceed the purchase price of $10,850,000 paid for the system. The rates being charged by the private power company at the time of purchase were not abnormally high, as rates go among private power companies, but the savings made were so apparent, so real and noticeable, that they could not help but be noticed by the users of electricity. Naturally they look upon this as one of the benefits that have come from the T. V. A. project.

Each year our publicly owned system has paid as tax equivalents amounts representing taxes formerly paid upon the private company's property which we acquired, and in 1944 our power board readjusted our principle of tax payments so as to include payments at the going rate, upon 75 percent of the net additions and extensions made to the property. As a result of this, for 1944 the city of Chattanooga received 40 percent more in ad valorem taxes from our board than it did from the privately owned company in 1938. Likewise, the city has annually had a cash saving of over $50,000 in its cost of electricity for such city uses as street lighting, school lighting, public-building lighting, etc. I might add that the city is billed the same as any other customer for its use of electricity, within that class of service which its use represents, and they pay these bills to our board just like any other customer. We do not furnish the city free street lighting or free public-building lighting, and our board's relation with them is upon a regular commercial basis. In turn, our payments of tax equivalents come to them just as do property owners who pay taxes.

* * * * *

The philosophy of our board, and we know this reflects the views of those whom we serve, with reference to the use of the income of the system, is that this income should not be diverted to pay other governmental expenses of the city, nor to be used as a support for those functions of government such as public schools, fire, and police, that are normally supported by taxes. As I previously stated, our board pays a tax equivalent to the city government in a most liberal manner. The city in turn pays its bill for its electricity uses just the same as do the board's other 47,000 customers. Our operation is one belonging to the people of Chattanooga, serving themselves and the surrounding area electric service at cost, and recognizing that the cost of this electric service cannot be a true cost, if that cost is loaded down with the cost of other things not a part of their electric service. This is the real objective of publicly owned electricity in that it is sold at the lowest possible cost for the social and economic benefits of the people in the community. If its cost is loaded down with expenses other than those belonging to the operation, then there can be no cheap electric power, and instead of this great servant of mankind being made a blessing to any community, its inevitable high cost will act as a brake upon the community's development, both socially and economically.

That our cheap cost of electric power has been a tremendous benefit to our community, aside from the savings made in its cost, is amply borne out by the fact that many of those already using electricity have greatly expanded and enlarged their uses of it providing more industrial expansion and development. A number of old steam engines and privately owned plants formerly used by industry have been shut down and discarded. The cheap rates have promoted much use of air conditioning, additional home uses, and new industrial processes have been installed involving electro-chemical applications, electric heating, and other commercial uses.

Almost solely as a result of the low rates for electricity and likewise on account of the assured availability of a large volume of water, a nationally known corporation has purchased land in Chattanooga and after the war will establish a large nylon plant, employing approximately 800 people initially with plans to expand this to over 3,000 later. It's not hard to see that 3,000 additional jobs in our city at the liberal wage scale which the Du Pont Corporation pays will be of great benefit.

The privately owned power company previously sold electrical appliances in competition with local dealers and did a pretty good job of it. Our board immediately discontinued this practice when we purchased the company and began an energetic sales-promotion program to encourage the sale of electrical appliances by private dealers. In the first 2 years following the purchase of the system by our board and the inaugurating of the low rates which we placed into effect, the sale of electrical appliances by private dealers in Chattanooga was phenomenal, greatly exceeding those being previously made by the private power company and those dealers who had previously sold them. Many new dealers went into the business and those already in greatly expanded their sales program. Compared to 1938, a year in which the power company and dealers sold approximately a million dollars worth of appliances, in 1941 the dealers by themselves sold over $3,000,000 worth. Our board services electrical appliances with repairs. At the present time we have a staff of over 36 repairmen. We do this work upon a basis of charges which reflect the cost of doing it and to keep the large volume of electrical appliances in use upon our lines in repairs is no small job, as anyone in the business can tell you.

In Chattanooga we believe that there is a great use in the future to be made of electrical appliances by many people, particularly in the low-income group, who now do not have the appliances already in common use. To these will be added many new appliances for the use of electricity as a result of the technical developments made in the use of electricity for war purposes. Our household use in Chattanooga now ranks among the highest in any similar size city in the Nation and we believe that in the 5 years following the end of the war that this already high average will double itself.

I have perhaps devoted more time than I should to the benefits we have derived from the electrical phase of our experiences with T. V. A., but they have been so wholeheartedly recognized that I thought they should be mentioned. So far Chattanooga has found as a result of this experience that it can operate its own electricity system upon a business basis, keep it free from politics as they are usually recognized, and realize from it for themselves large savings in cost of service. Instead of putting private businesses out of commission, possibilities for additional privately owned businesses have been established. In the 2 years preceding the war I know our newspapers regarded highly the large increase in electrical-appliance advertising that came to them from the dealers and our board as a result of the widespread electrical-appliance business estimated by our board's low retail rates.

* * * * *

We folks in Tennessee, like people everywhere, like to have opportunities for recreation and fun. A great benefit accrues to those who have these opportunities and the T. V. A. lakes have opened up a whole new field of pleasure. After all, the whole Tennessee River is now nothing but a chain of nine large lakes. Around Chattanooga there is now much boating, fishing, outdoor water sports, and additional recreational opportunities that make our section a mecca for those who enjoy outdoor life. Very definitely one of the great benefits we have received as a result of our experiences so far with T. V. A. has been the development of a greatly enlarged outdoor recreation life for our citizens.

Chattanooga is an industrial city. We are not a great distributing center, but we are fortunate in having extensive railroad connections. Our city is not in particular a clean city, for there is some smoke and soot. Likewise, we have a population, many of whom have been in the low-income group and not always been able to obtain the most desirable living quarters. This condition is likewise true in practically every large city. We have approximately 40,000 Negroes in our city and we know we have a very high TB rate, and the same as other cities, have some undesirable health conditions. For its employees, and in connection with its health and sanitation program in its reservoirs, malaria control, and other kindred activities, T. V. A. has had a rather comprehensive health and sanitation department whose headquarters are in our city. The very presence of this has acted as a stimulant to many of us to work toward improved health conditions in the community. Gradually we are improving these, as are other cities, and in the program the experiences and cooperation of T. V. A. have been most helpful.

We have in Chattanooga the headquarters of the Department of Electrical Operations of the T. V. A., which is the paying partner in the program. They are in their own building adjoining which our Board has built a new building. In their Electrical Department are many trained and experienced electric-utility men, all of whom live in our city, are customers of our Board, and whose experiences are available to us any time we care to consider them. We run our own power operation independent of them, and they do not in any sense dominate or control our operations nor tell us how to run our business. We differ with them sometimes in our common problems, but quite often we find they can be very helpful and we have had a fine relationship. In fact, our only connection with the T. V. A. directly is our wholesale power contract, under which we purchase our electricity requirements. The rates which we charge are a matter of agreement between ourselves and the T. V. A. and likewise in the contract we agree to dispose of our revenues only in a certain specified manner. * * *

In concluding this discussion about our experiences with the T. V. A. and the way it has been carried out, I want to make mention of something I think is important, and something that we should not lose sight of. The T. V. A. headquarters and its officials are right in the area where the work is being done. All of the discussions with reference to it, and consultations between it and local groups, can be held literally right on the spot, and decisions made there about them. This is in pleasing contrast to the gradually growing centralization of authority and decisions that have to be made in Washington. If the T. V. A. had been run from Washington, as are most governmental projects which comprise even one, or more of the programs which T. V. A. administers in our valley, I am frank to say that I do not believe it would have been carried on nearly as well, nor such splendid results obtained. Visitors from other Government projects that carry out one or more of the programs of T. V. A., have told me that they would give almost anything, if their area had the same set-up as the T. V. A. project has. The administration of it, of course, by its board of three directors, has had a great deal to do with it and those of us who know the T. V. A. program best and its results, are quite frank in paying the highest tribute to David Lilienthal, the chairman of its board, and its other two directors. We think so

much of the method used in the Tennessee Valley and the mechanics for doing it, that we want the T. V. A. law left alone in Congress, with no crippling legislation to retard its progress and destroy its effectiveness. Sometimes we have had to quarrel with our own Tennessee Representatives in Congress about this, for they have thought otherwise. There have been some minor mistakes made in the program in our area, which is but natural, but anyone who has visited the area and seen the results first hand, can understand that the benefits have greatly overshadowed any minor mistakes. I am quite frank to say that if it had to be done all over again, I would want it done in our area, by the same type of regional authority that has accomplished the splendid benefits so far to the area, in many of which our city of Chattanooga has been a recipient.

And now, in closing, let me state that no discussion of T. V. A., nor our experiences with it, would be complete without expressing the thought, that through it, we in Chattanooga and Tennessee and throughout the valley, have had a very great opportunity to expand our contribution to the war effort. Long known as the Volunteer State, the resources of our section have had an opportunity, through the T. V. A. program, to go to war along with the manpower of our section. There is no question that this contribution of materials and resources would have been much less, had we not had a T. V. A. program, and as some of them were so very vital to the war effort, the very progress of the war might have been affected.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the News-Press of Santa Barbara, Calif.:

TRIBUTE WRITTEN TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

It is but natural that a typically great American should become the first-accepted citizen of the world in this modern machine age. It is also natural that this man should be one who was tempered in the fires of personal pain, politics, and wealth. Yes; this man of faith was our late beloved and immortal President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He has left not only his indelible tracks around the world, that spelled out in deeds: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." But he also left the seeds planted in his tracks that will sprout and grow and flower into that better world for all.

He and many thousands of others have given their life's blood to nourish this yet unsprouted plant; and feed and protect it to maturity from being smothered by fowl weeds and ill winds.

It is inevitable, even though this may be a century plant, that enough people of good will and forcefulness will now spring to the propagation of this potential plant of world freedom, of which our late President will ever be the symbol.

Some of the planted seeds could well be named "Bretton Woods"; and the San Francisco Peace Conference can become the "April showers" that sprout the seed and push the young and tender plants through the earth's crust into the sunlight.

Yes; "Having served his own generation by the will of God, he fell on sleep." But the spirit of this first citizen of the modern world is an indestructible crusading spirit that will permeate many souls of many lands of many future generations. It is this cause of world freedom I wish to serve, that I, too, may become worthy, in the eyes of my Creator, to humble world citizenship.

ODIN G. BUELL.

BULLETIN.

Social Security Accounts of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following enrolled copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 63, adopted by the 1945 session of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide wage credits on the social-security accounts of members of the armed forces during their period of service:

Assembly Joint Resolution 63

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to provide wage credits on the social-security accounts of members of the armed forces during their period of service.

Whereas by the end of the war there will be approximately 15,000,000 men and women in the armed forces of the United States and Wisconsin's share will be approximately 300,000; and

Whereas most of these men and women will have lost from 1 to 4 years or even longer from the accumulation of benefits provided by the social-security law; and

Whereas this will effect a real loss in the benefits to be received at the time of retirement inasmuch as such benefits are dependent upon contributions by both employee and employer; and

Whereas the social-security law is wholly a Federal program; and

Whereas it is the sense of the people of Wisconsin manifested in their respective representatives in the legislature that the returning veteran justly deserves and is entitled to fair and generous treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress to enact with all convenient speed appropriate legislation providing that men and women in the armed forces shall receive appropriate wage credits on their social-security accounts for their period of military service; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and to the clerk of each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Lithuania's Freedom Cause in Connection With the International Security Conference at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following resolution adopted by Waterbury Lithuanian-American Council, Waterbury, Conn., regarding Lithuania's freedom cause in connection with the International Security Conference at San Francisco:

Whereas the Moscow Conference in October 1943, proclaimed that it recognizes the necessity of establishing as soon as possible a general organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations, and open to membership to all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security; and

Whereas the Government of the United States as far back as March 22, 1944, proclaimed that the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation upon which the future international organization will be constructed, and further, that each sovereign nation, large or small, is according to law the equal of every other nation; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania during 3 years of Nazi occupation continued to fight the Nazi occupant by every means, thus contributing to the final defeat of Nazi Germany; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania has always been a peace-loving nation, and to this day continues to be a member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America recognizes the Republic of Lithuania as a sovereign state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American delegates to the International Security Conference at San Francisco insist on the application of the principle of justice and sovereign equality for all nations, large and small, thus upholding the democratic structure of the whole post-war security organization, as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Declaration, the statement of the Secretary of State of March 22, 1944, and countless other solemn proclamations; be it further

Resolved, That a duly accredited representative of the Republic of Lithuania be admitted to the forthcoming deliberations in San Francisco as a conference member; be it finally

Resolved, That the military occupation of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania be placed under the supervision of the inter-allied control body, that the Lithuanian people be given the right to organize their own government and proceed with uncoerced democratic elections. The United Lithuanian Organizations of Waterbury, Conn., call attention to the fact that while the U. S. S. R. continues to repeat praise-worthy sentences about democracy and humanitarian principles, the reign of terror inaugurated by the N. K. G. E. against the entire population in eastern Europe continues unabated on the eve of the International Security Conference.

PETER VILEISIS, *Chairman.*
ANTHONY LAZDAUSKAS,
Secretary.

Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew's Address Concerning the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the address delivered by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, at the Washington Cathedral Service of Prayer for the United Nations Conference on International Organization on Sunday, April 29, 1945:

Throughout the ages, one of the basic aspirations of mankind has been the attainment of security: Physical security against the elements, the ravages of disease and the depradations of fellowmen; economic security against poverty and hunger; spiritual security and the peace that passeth understanding.

Similarly, nations have sought security, both economic and strategic, from disruptive forces within and from aggressive forces beyond their borders.

Yet time and again ambitious leaders have used unprovoked aggression as a means of enhancing their power and prestige.

Time and again the civilized world has been plunged into havoc by an Alexander, a Genghis Khan, a kaiser, a duce, a fuehrer, or a Japanese military clique whose megalomania knew no bounds.

Under this constant threat, peaceful men have searched for some way out of the tragic dilemma of war—some device for preventing violence and brigandage through mutual agreement, justice, and common defense.

The Greeks tried it in the fifth century before Christ. Their Delian League was a federation of sovereign city states. Its purpose was to suppress piracy and build a common defense against the aggressive Persians.

The Romans made a world-wide experiment in peace by domination—but like all such attempts since then, it fell eventually, undermined by its own progressive decadence.

In more recent times, men we now know were true prophets of peace offered the world blueprints so far in advance of their own day that they were never tried. William Penn, in 1693, and Immanuel Kant, just a hundred years later, propounded remarkably modern schemes for federal union under systems of international law. Kant boldly proposed a world federation of free and democratic peoples. But theirs were voices crying in the wilderness.

Even after the bitter lessons of revolution and Napeoleonic conquests, the best that the Congress of Vienna could offer Europe was an uneasy alliance based on shifting force. And this alliance in its turn collapsed.

In the late nineteenth century the world knew a period of armed peace, but it was not until the eve of the twentieth century that the nations of the earth came together at the Hague to make a concerted attack on the causes of war.

The foundations of the structure of modern peace were laid at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. The structure itself, alas, was delayed and neglected as the storms of war gathered and descended upon an incredibly unsuspecting world.

There has been a tendency in recent years to belittle the League of Nations, as regards both its concept and its achievements. Those who would write off the League as a poor attempt at peace building are, it seems to me, evading the plain fact that its provisions were never faithfully carried out in times of crisis. The League machinery, imperfect though it was, failed not through use but through disuse, and Woodrow Wilson's prophecy has come to pass:

"I look for the time," he said on Memorial Day, 1919, "when every man who puts his counsel against the united service of mankind in the League of Nations will be just as ashamed of it as if he now regretted the Union of the States."

Today, as we survey the holocaust of two world wars within a quarter century, as we count the cost in death and disaster, in torture and starvation, in ruined lands and blackened cities—above all, in the loss of our youngest and best—we are determined as never before to find the way to a peace that will endure. And at long last we are willing to face the ultimate stubborn realities, to make the sacrifices and give the service necessary to attain that great objective.

Reluctantly we have come to the realization that there is no certain security in strategic frontiers, great oceans, or vast distances that never again can we or any other people find security in isolation.

We know beyond peradventure that another war, coming upon an intensive development in military, electrical, and chemical science could wipe great masses of civilians off the face of the earth in a matter of very brief time. With that certain knowledge, can any effort, any sacrifice be considered too high a price for preventing future tidal waves of militarism, and for permitting mankind to live and progress in confidence, security, and peace?

We human beings may not change much through the ages, but at least we do learn from grim experience. The seeds of conflict are buried deep in human nature; they cannot be destroyed merely by the signing of a pact. What can be done, what must and will be done, is to create conditions, month by month and year by year, under which those seeds cannot germinate.

That, as I see it, is the fundamental task that lies before us today.

The San Francisco Conference has begun. We may describe it, without fear of overstatement, as one of the most momentous gatherings of history. We may approach it with sober confidence and high hope.

What justification, you may ask, exists for this confidence and hope?

By what new alchemy do we propose, now, miraculously to snatch success out of the failures of the past?

I believe we shall succeed, not through any miracle, but through a combination of hard work and faith.

We and our allies have been slowly and painstakingly hammering out—by a combination of hard work and faith—the shape of a new kind of peace: Not a Roman or Teutonic peace by domination; not a reactionary peace designed to freeze an antiquated social and economic order; not a peace of rival blocs but a flexible, dynamic, progressive peace by cooperation and mutual accommodation. A peace which shall hold out the promise of better conditions of life for so many people of this earth that they will be drawn into its orbit through enlightened self-interest.

The proposals before the San Francisco Conference, while neither perfect nor complete, do, however, provide a realistic basis for developing such a peace.

They contain, in the proposal for the Security Council, machinery for the adjustment of grievances and the settlement of disputes by all the methods that have been evolved and effectively used by peaceful nations.

They also contain provisions for the immediate use of overwhelming force to restrain or punish any member or outsider who may breach the peace of the international community. It is hoped, of course, that the very existence of this force and the clear intention to use it will make it unnecessary to use it.

But it is in the Assembly of the United Nations that the great constructive work for peace will, we hope, be planned and undertaken. It is there that the genius of all nations, large and small, will make its full contribution to the solution of problems which have defied man's best efforts for centuries.

Through the Economic and Social Council and the other specialized bodies which will come under its general supervision, the Assembly will direct the attack on hunger, poverty, and disease. It will be concerned with the progressive disarmament of nations, as conditions of security permit. With the help of the International Court of Justice, it will undertake the building of a code of international law to serve the needs of a modern world community.

The Assembly can become a true parliament of man. It can cultivate the seeds of peace by creating the soil and the climate congenial to their growth.

Leadership in such an enterprise will spring from national character and genius, as it does in any civilized society from which force has been outlawed.

We come, then, to what is, for us, the paramount question: What part can we, the American people, most usefully play in this bold enterprise?

I think I am faithfully interpreting our innermost desires and convictions when I say that, as a great democracy, we come to the council table of the United Nations not to dominate but to serve humanity—to serve not only through leadership but through example.

"Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all."

The opportunity to serve a stricken humanity will come to us only if, at the height of our power, we can be humble. Our character as a people has never faced a harder test.

Alone among the great powers, we shall emerge from this most destructive of all wars with our cities unscathed, our fertile fields and natural resources untouched by the devastation of war.

The average level of our standard of living has, if anything, been raised by the necessity for unprecedented employment in war production.

In becoming the arsenal of democracy, we have demonstrated a productive capacity undreamed of before the war, and we intend to use that capacity to satisfy the peacetime wants of all Americans and many in need abroad.

On the day of final victory we shall awake to find ourselves possessed of the greatest military power in all history.

We have proved that our democratic system can withstand the imposition of wartime controls, and indeed draw added strength from the fact that they were self-imposed.

These are thoughts that might induce complacency. If that should happen we should be lost, and our victory would be empty. But we can be confident that it will not happen, because this generation of young Americans has grown up in a period of leadership which understood the uses of power and accepted its responsibilities. When the challenge to our freedom came, Franklin Roosevelt knew whence the power of the American people would come, and with vision and great courage he drew it forth.

"Our strength is measured not only in terms of the might of our armaments," he said. "It is measured not only in terms of the horsepower of our machines.

"The true measure of our strength lies deeply imbedded in the social and economic justice of the system in which we live.

"For you can build ships and tanks and planes and guns galore; but they will not be enough. You must place behind them an invincible faith in the institutions which they have been built to defend."

That was said in 1940, in the darkest hour of the war, when one great democracy, France, lay prostrate, and another, Britain, had been shaken by the blows of the Luftwaffe.

Yet we and they, and our great allies in Russia and China and elsewhere, together proved that faith was invincible, and we shall keep on proving it until all the world believes.

The other day, one of our Air Force officers was interviewing a young Nazi prisoner, dazed but obviously impressed by the weight of the military colossus that had descended upon him.

"We are beaten," he said bitterly, "beaten by your American assembly line." He knew only the half truth that is more dangerous than falsehood. That he shall understand the power of our faith is one of the conditions of a lasting peace.

For he was beaten—and he and his kind must learn it—by the aroused and wrathful conscience of the Allied people. He was beaten by peaceful citizens of the United Nations, men who left their homes and families to learn the unfamiliar and uncongenial business of waging war.

Because they loved freedom and justice, they fought with a fury that no tyranny can withstand. Because they and their families love peace and decency, we and the other peoples of the world can look forward confidently to a better and happier future for mankind.

But love of freedom and justice and belief in certain victory are not in themselves enough. We and the other peace-loving nations must have faith in Almighty God as the ultimate ruling force in our lives and theirs.

It was faith that brought our forefathers to this land of ours, that inspired the founding of our Nation, and that has been the underlying force in our progress and our development throughout our history.

The very religious freedom which is a fountainhead of our democracy would have been swept away along with our other freedoms had the dictators had their way. And now, as peace approaches, having fought the good fight, we must realize that only through this spiritual dynamic can our individual and national freedom be preserved. Our faith in God must be alive and vibrant in our daily lives if we are to gain the full rewards of victory. Only at our peril can we neglect that faith in the coming days of peace.

If only our faith, which the churches have helped to build and preserve, is robust; if only that faith is an active and not merely a passive factor in our daily lives, then can we draw with confident assurance from the great reservoir of spiritual strength and guidance which is ever at our disposal if we but seek it.

Many have prayed in moments of darkness and discouragement; our fighting men have prayed in crisis and peril, and we at home have prayed for them and for the world's deliverance from war. In the times of tranquillity to come, that spiritual faith in our individual and collective lives must be the cornerstone upon which we shall build the enduring security and peace to which we are dedicated.

For man cannot build a lasting peace by material means alone. But, if he has faith and draws on the spiritual help from God which has been promised to those who believe, man can do what to the unbeliever is impossible.

Let us therefore pray, in our churches and in our homes, today and in the days to come, for our representatives and for the representatives of many peoples as they embark at San Francisco upon the great undertaking which can, with God's help, deliver mankind from the scourge of war. And as we pray let us be of good courage and high hope, remembering Christ's words:

"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

"For everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."

Parley Faces Peril, Historian Declares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address made by William B. Ziff, as reported by the North American Newspaper Alliance in the Miami Daily News, April 15, 1945, on the conference now being held in San Francisco to promote a world peace organization:

PARLEY FACES PERIL, HISTORIAN DECLARES

(By William B. Ziff)

NEW YORK, April 14.—It is evident that, whatever the accomplishments of men in the fields of science and technological advancement, the world is still today in the horse-and-buggy stage internationally.

The question of world organization is no longer some pleasant academic affair which can be retained or rejected at some later time, after we have seen how it has worked out. Its aspect instead is relentlessly realistic and immediate.

This time we will have to guess right—or else.

I address myself to this question because I am afraid that we are taking the wrong road. I am afraid that we have found ourselves on a detour full of easy and facile expediencies, which will end finally in disillusion, and in the mire of the international fear, distrust, and war.

We must make certain today that what we achieve is the reality of freedom and security—not its shadow.

I refer, of course, to the present effort to create a new League of Nations, which is now being brought to the attention of the American public.

TRADE AND ECONOMICS INVOLVED

I am not suggesting that we withdraw from the rest of the world.

It is a question of whether the present archaic political structures which act like so many watertight compartments to keep men separated from each other can be broken down, and whether they can be consolidated along rational lines to meet the needs of this century. It is a question of trade, of economics, of manufacture, of military defense and of those cultural and social adjustments which must apply in a machine age.

Above all, the question certainly is not one of charters or politics alone.

Those who support a world league would like to effect an international security organization based not on the common law which applies to individuals everywhere, but on a series of pacts and arrangements between the various nations as they now exist.

Those nations which break the convenant are to have their heads bashed in by the use of force and sanctions in the hands of the more pious states.

Though such a league may appear to be a step in the right direction, it is a commitment to chaos.

When one compares the background of the Concert of Europe created in 1815 at the Congress of Vienna with that of the Dumbarton Oaks league, it is amazing to notice the similarities. The leading powers of the time were determined to create a condition of permanent balance among themselves. Assurances were exchanged, and an article written into the compact which bound the great powers of the time to meet at fixed intervals and to arrive at a peaceful settlement of all problems. This arrangement looked forward to the final disarmament of the Continent, to the establishment of a permanent international court, and to the rule of international justice.

Instead of being reduced by these measures, militarism gained rapidly. The concert of Europe ended in the usual clash of interests.

AMERICA HAS SPURNED TREATIES

The cause for these failures is not hard to find. It involves the nature of the sovereign state itself.

The need for military security, for markets, for raw materials, for seaports, river routes, or new settlement areas, will determine the course of the sovereign state without relation to any pacts, treaties, or guarantees which might exist.

Even the United States, presumably as moral as any nation in history, has not hesitated to disregard treaty obligations and arrangements where it deemed it necessary to do so.

Indeed, the agreement at Chapultepec by which trade preference is to be given the Latin-American republics must have the effect of fracturing the entire spirit of the San Francisco Conference. To deal thus with Latin America, no matter how laudable the purpose, means the creation of bilateral or favored-nation agreements.

Our present approach toward some type of sane international order is in the wrong direction. Every historic experience has proved it to be false and unsound. You will not make it more sound by trying it over again.

The old Wilsonian League started out with quite as high ideals and, if anything, with an even nobler purpose. It failed to function because it could not reconcile two utterly antagonistic ideas—the rule of international law, and the sovereign independence of the individual state. As long as a state is sovereign, it is its own judge as to its need and it relationship to the world. It cannot be ruled by law—it can only be coerced by superior military power in the hands of other states.

As far as the old League was concerned, it had almost all the superstructure which is now under other terms proposed for the new league.

How, if the relatively easy method of economic quarantine failed because the member nations themselves would not adhere to the pledge for unified action, can we expect nations to permit the use of their armed forces against a threatened aggression?

RULE OF FORCE NOT LAW

Now aggression is a matter of definition. Hitler declared that Poland had been the aggressor in the present war. Japan called Korea and China aggressors.

Further, the rule of force is at no point connected with law. Force in the case of a sovereign state means coercive military power. It certainly is not the police power which it is so glibly described.

Harry Hopkins, in the American magazine, asserted recently that the "earth is not civilized enough to make world-wide disarmament practical for peace-loving nations." General Arnold also has pointed out that the United States by virtue of its riches will be the "first target" of the next world aggressor.

All of this, mind you, is said with the knowledge that we intend to enter a new world league.

This is a confession of failure in advance. It is a confession on the part of high officers of the administration that the best we can hope for is a new armaments race, a new contest for power within the League itself.

I submit that this is a mistaken concept of world security, and that it does not bear the slightest relations to those real issues which must be determined and settled if the world is to be at peace.

Permanent peace can come only when the fundamental imbalances which now give weight to the business of power politics, are removed. These imbalances rest on the present unequal distribution of opportunity, power, and natural wealth among the nations.

Markets, manufacturers, and military operations today are all on a hemispheric scale. They cannot successfully be conducted otherwise. The existence of a great many minor nationalisms throws a sabot into the whole machinery of international operation, and is an invitation to world disunity and anarchy.

In the old days a country like Bulgaria, which produced stalwart men and fine horses, could create a cavalry quite equal to that of any state. Today, only a great nation can produce that mechanized cavalry called a tank corps, or those cavalrymen of the air called the air corps.

Possession of such hardening agents as vanadium, chrome, and beryllium alone can be of major consequence in a military struggle. The lack of certain tropic materials may be a decisive handicap.

The new world of mechanical mastery demands new approaches to the existing problems. It suggests not the setting up of international police forces, which themselves would become immediately an object of intrigue and conspiracy in a new global contest for power, but great regional amalgamations capable of fulfilling the needs of this age.

I proposed now that we take the first step—that step toward which the whole history of this hemisphere has pointed from the beginning and which the revolutionary changes in our social order now makes mandatory—the physical union of the Western Hemisphere.

Such an amalgamation of the West, it appears to me, is the terminal conclusion of all plans for tomorrow's security, as well as for the proper exploitation of the wealth of this hemisphere for the benefit of all its citizens. If, in their broad aspects, national policies rest on military, economic, and geographic considerations, we are violating every precept of sound judgment if we do not bend our energies toward the political consolidation of the American nations, both on this and our sister continent to the south.

If such a power system were to have every advantage an ultimate extension of its borders would provide, it should embrace also the British Isles and the great bulk of islands in the Pacific, as units molded into a common framework of government and of cooperative action.

EXAMPLE FOR REST OF WORLD

The presumption is that these units would be more or less equal in power and resources; that each would possess a balanced table of physical resources and opportunity, so as not to have any important section of its economy at the mercy of others, and that to this degree the reasons for war would diminish.

The rest of the world will not be far behind once we have set the example. Perhaps, indeed, the example already has been set for us by the actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Such an arrangement could easily take place within the superstructure provided by Dumbarton Oaks. It would make of what must otherwise prove to be an unsound and illusory project, a workable framework for world collaboration. Such collaboration can be effective between a small number of giant units, all more or less equal to each other in physical power and attributes. The pretense that it will work with the present set-up, which presumes that little Latvia or Bulgaria is coequal to the United States and the Soviet Union in the affairs of the world, is a dangerous piece of thinking which comes under the head of folly.

If a common union existed, our military installations in the Caribbean, over the North Polar routes, or in the dangerously exposed eastern hump of South America, could be erected as a result of long-range planning. They would not need suddenly to be improvised at some last insecure moment when immediate danger threatened.

By the consolidation of the Americas and the great bulk of the islands in the Pacific, together with the British Isles, there would be created a modern military fortress which could be breached from no side without the gravest risk to the aggressor.

Here, too, would be new frontiers, new vistas, and new opportunities by which the economic level of the peoples of our respective areas could go forward toward a new West of exploitation and development. This entire vast expanse, together with its approaches in the two oceans, would constitute a self-contained consuming area which, like the Soviet Union, need not seek markets elsewhere to exist.

ISOLATION THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

This would open up for Great Britain, as well as the United States, extensive new frontiers which would be a stimulus to the spiritual side of our nature as well as to its industrial and mercantile side. The effect would be to create new enthusiasms in a civilization which otherwise will be in danger of constriction through the failure of its own powers.

The alternative to this enlightened course is, of course, continued isolation. The possibilities are not pleasant to survey. The loss of Britain, Canada, or the island empire of the South Seas would be unfortunate in the extreme. Latin America could easily be our heel of Achilles. If Europe should come under one totalitarian rule, or Asia industrialize its teeming millions and unite against us, the question of our survival would be determined by the status and sympathies of the Latin south.

Latin-Americans judge us now not altogether as friends but as potential competitors, as people who wish to hold them under our thumb and to give them nothing in the way of equality.

When hostilities cease the sellers' market, which now makes South America prosperous, will come to an abrupt end.

We will begin perhaps to buy tin from the British in Malaya, and will be once more in open competition with Brazilian cotton and Argentine meats and hides for world markets. It is estimated that, within 3 years after the liberation of eastern Asia, there will be a world surplus of some 1,300,000 tons of rubber a year. The price of rubber will tumble, as will that of other important commodities.

LATIN AMERICA'S VIEW OF THE UNITED STATES

It is at this point that the economy on which Latin America rests may find itself in the most extreme jeopardy. These states will be in agitation and perhaps in revolutionary ferment as a result.

If they cannot turn to us as friends who will receive them in our community of states, they will turn against us and will seek some other answer to their problems.

We will then find ourselves quarreling not only with Latin America, but with England and other states, over many questions. We will find ourselves apprehensive and contentious over details of commercial advantage, and will survey with unconcealed fear the gigantic growth which will have made the Soviet Union the most powerful nation the world has yet seen.

As far as differences of cultural and national interests are concerned, we need only point out the existence of exactly such divergencies among the people of the Soviet Union, or Switzerland, or even in little Belgium, which is made up of two distinct peoples. Or for that matter, our own neighbor, Canada.

Brazil has large German-speaking communities, as has Chile. Paraguay is mostly Indian, speaking the Guarani language. The great majority of Bolivia's 3,500,000 inhabitants are Indians who speak Aymara and Quechua, not Spanish.

All of these peoples would operate in the full freedom of their own autonomous development, and would fit without difficulty into the grand over-all plan of union. Although remaining autonomous, as is the citizen of Quebec, in Canada, they would, nevertheless, have a common political destiny, a common defense, a common industrial economy, and their collective areas would constitute a common market for the products of their skill and labor.

The difficulties of bringing such a result about may be great, but they are not insuperable. Even the American Union itself was for a period of 6 years a league of independent, quarreling States.

SENTIMENT STRONG FOR UNION

In Australia and New Zealand I am convinced that a plan of union enunciated by us, would find strong support. This may be less true of Canada, but I believe that that Dominion can be won to the idea. As far as Britain is concerned, it is not to be forgotten that Churchill once flew to France, when all seemed lost, and offered the French, not collaboration within a league, but unity under the roof of a single parliament. The incident proves that a potential acceptance exists in Britain, too, for just this type of Federation.

The entire tradition of Latin America is not for separation but for union. That greatest of all Latin-American leaders, Simón Bolívar, spoke not for separatism. His principles and his design for the future, unqualifiedly were for union.

At the height of his career Bolívar wrote: "Why should South America not stand under a single government? The bloody spectacle of Europe should be a warning to us."

It is my belief that the hour is at hand, and that the great clock of destiny is striking.

We Americans, as citizens of the most powerful, the richest and most influential of the free States of the West, have only to speak our minds and set the pattern. The rest will be a matter of normal evolution in response to the quickening spirit of freemen everywhere in our hemisphere and in the islands of the two oceans which are conjoined with it.

Justitia Fiat, Coelum Ruat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me on Sunday, April 29, 1945, in a radio broadcast of the Washington story over the Blue Network, on the question, Shall retaliation in kind be made for the atrocities committed by the Nazis?

The statement follows:

The first human reaction of every decent civilized person to the atrocities practiced by the Nazis is horror, revulsion, and indignation.

No punishment could be too brutal, no torture too cruel, to inflict upon the Nazi beasts in retaliation for the abuse of those helpless victims whose ashes and bones and twisted bodies cry out for vengeance. These are the natural human reactions.

But we are living in a civilized society. We have attained that high standard of civilization through centuries of struggle. Law and order and justice have been the tools by which we have molded it.

The civilized nations at this very moment are striving earnestly to build a peaceful world by peaceful means. Law and order and justice must be the foundation upon which it rests.

In isolated cases, in our own communities, atrocities have been perpetrated by the lawless, terrible crimes of violence and bestiality have been committed by psychopaths, but we do not mete out justice by retaliating in barbarous fashion. Cruel and unusual punishment is not the way of civilized society.

The Nazis have sought to destroy our civilization.

In their lust for power, they have ignored the dignity of the human being, made to the image and likeness of his Creator. They have descended to the lowest depths of degradation.

The criminals must be punished. The punishment must fit the crime. It must be certain and swift. The determination that justice be done must move us. Calm reason should fix the penalty.

Sympathy for the guilty does not dictate this course. We are simply unwilling to brutalize and degrade ourselves by adopting the methods of the Nazis. We are unwilling to abandon law and order and justice for the sake of vengeance.

The way of a just man is often hard. The way of just nations, too, is often hard.

Justitia fiat, coelum ruat. Let justice be done even though the heavens fall.

Historical Society Gets 1793 Book on Shorthand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., Wednesday, May 2, 1945:

HISTORICAL SOCIETY GETS 1793 BOOK ON SHORTHAND—GIFT OF MISS MARY BRINGHURST SHOWS CONGRESSMEN AND OTHER LEADERS 152 YEARS AGO FOUND ITS STUDY PROFITABLE

Would-be stenographers and embryonic business executives weren't the only ones who were struggling with the complexities of shorthand in 1793.

In a book of shorthand, recently given to the Delaware Historical Society by Miss Mary Bringhurst, is a list of Congressmen and leaders of the country who endorsed and purchased the book published by H. & P. Rice, Philadelphia, in 1793. Among the subscribers was Joseph Bringhurst, Jr., an ancestor of the well-known Wilmington family.

Thomas Jefferson, Peter Caverly, and George Booth were others who found the study of shorthand profitable.

The book, now on display at Old Town Hall, is entitled "The System of Shorthand Practiced by Mr. Thomas Lloyd in Taking the Debates of Congress." In the preface, the superiority of this system of shorthand over all other systems is eloquently stated. The author modestly said that more complicated systems were to his simplified one as the Chinese alphabet is to the English alphabet. "The Chinese have unhappily succeeded in an attempt to express every word by a different character," the preface states.

Miss Bringhurst, who donated this curious piece of Delawareana, is the sister of the late Edward Bringhurst 5th, who died December 8, 1939.

She lives at Rockwood, the family home, where her brother lived all his life.

Republic of Poland Submits Memorandum to the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a memorandum on some aspects of a world security organization submitted by the Government of the Republic of Poland to the Conference of the United Nations in session at San Francisco in April 1945:

The Polish Government considers that its omission in the invitations extended to the governments of all the other United Nations to attend the Conference opening on April 25, 1945, in San Francisco, does not release the Polish Government from its primary duty, as the only legal representative of the Polish Nation, to submit constructive suggestions on behalf of Poland to the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference with a view of contributing in a spirit of international collaboration to the establishment of a world-security organization. These objectives are no less dear to the Polish Nation than to other freedom-loving nations.

Throughout this war, and from its very outset the Polish Government and the Polish people have given constant proof of their attachment to the ideals and aims in the name of which the United Nations are waging this war in defense of human freedom and of the independence of nations.

Poland was the first to oppose armed resistance to German aggression. Ever since the Polish armed forces, in Poland and abroad, under the direction of the Polish Government continue actively to fight against the common enemy on land, on sea, and in the air. The Polish Nation has not had a single Quisling.

Conscious of its responsibility to the Polish Nation, which is deeply attached to its traditions of Allied loyalty, of love of peace, and ever faithful to its secular policy of constructive international collaboration—the Polish Government submits to the United Nations in conference at San Francisco the following considerations and suggestions:

I. CONSIDERATIONS

A. At the close of this unprecedented total war the entire Polish Nation and undoubtedly every man and woman the world over sincerely crave for a just and secure peace settlement founded on the permanent harmonious functioning of a world security organization led and guaranteed by the big powers in full and willing collaboration with the smaller ones.

B. For more than 5 years, freedom-loving peoples have all been fighting relentlessly, the weak and the strong, the military and the civilians, to make possible the establishment of a better world founded upon the principles of freedom and justice, free from wars of conquest, from oppression of the weak by the strong; a world in which power would be used only as a last resort to maintain and defend the rights and liberties of man, but never to suppress them.

C. In civilized countries all citizens are equal before the law. In a civilized world all nations, as groups of individuals, must be equal before the law and juridically equal amongst themselves, regardless of their size, importance, or power.

D. The inequality which exists between the big and small powers should not be measured in terms of power supremacy but only in terms of power responsibility. The big powers cannot escape responsibility for the maintenance and the defense of a just peace settlement, even by force, if the necessity should arise.

However, to be just and durable, a security system should be operated on the firm basis of the collaboration of all nations concerned, the big and the small, as their joint responsibility, in direct proportion to their respective possibilities.

E. Peaceful international collaboration is essential to the creation of international confidence without which real security could not be established. Therefore, the initiative which led to the holding of the Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conferences, as well as their timing, certainly deserves wholehearted approval.

F. However, in wartime responsible statesmen are mainly absorbed by military problems in which the power of armed force necessarily plays a dominant part as the chief element of victory. Wartime thinking tends temporarily to relegate to secondary importance fundamental principles, moral and cultural forces, and spiritual ideals, so indispensable to the establishment of a world security organization for the maintenance of a just and durable peace.

G. Consequently, it may be inadvisable for the United Nations to attempt to complete the erection of a rigid structure of a world security system while hostilities are still in progress, as such finality might lead to a dangerous freezing of a world status imposed by war conditions, and inconsistent with the common program of purpose and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, to which the United Nations subscribed in the declaration signed by them on January 1, 1942.

H. This war has definitely proved that in modern times war can only be waged by a big power endowed with a great industrial potential and vast territory over which it can distribute and effectively defend its war industries. On the other hand, no smaller power can prepare or wage war unless it becomes the satellite of a big aggressor power.

Hence, apart from the basic reasons of justice and of the right to self-determination of peoples, a sound security organization requires that the real independence of smaller states be preserved and scrupulously maintained.

If a world security system is to be established under the joint guaranty of the big powers in willing, permanent collaboration with the smaller states, it would be unjust, illogical and superfluous for any one of the big powers to seek additional insurance of its own security by means of territorial aggrandizement at the cost of neighboring states or by tending to reduce their independence and sovereign rights.

I. In the light of this reasoning, the veto formula agreed upon at the Crimea Conference should be revised by the United Nations, as, in its present form, it could secure the world only against aggression by a

small state, while it would be inapplicable in the case of aggression by a big power.

II. SUGGESTIONS

1. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are a first step on the way to a formulation of the statute of a World Security Organization. The welcome result of the constructive criticism provoked by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is most effectively proved by the fact that a few months later another greatly improved document of international collaboration for security, known as the Act of Chapultepec, issued from the conference recently held in Mexico City.

The Act of Chapultepec differs substantially and advantageously from the Dumbarton Oak proposals. It established explicitly international relations on the basis of justice, law, the respect of treaties, the equality of states, good-neighbor policy, noninterference in internal and external affairs of states, the nonrecognition of territorial acquisitions by force; and on the recognition of the principle that every state is equally entitled to political independence and to respect of its territorial integrity.

From the general standpoint of the high aim of establishing an indivisible peace in an united and indivisible world, it appears both indispensable and logical to apply the same civilized norms of justice to international relations in both hemispheres.

The Polish Government suggests that these noble principles of justice and democracy, adopted by the free nations of the Western Hemisphere and reaffirmed by them in the Act of Chapultepec, be adopted in their entirety by the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference and embodied in the text of the charter of the World Security Organization.

2. The necessity for the introduction of the principles of the Act of Chapultepec in the charter of the World Security Organization additionally arises from the very text of the Act of Chapultepec. Namely, part III of the Act of Chapultepec stipulates that it shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the World Security Organization. Consequently, failure to coordinate the principles of the charter of the World Security Organization with those of the Act of Chapultepec would result in rendering the Act of Chapultepec inoperative.

The importance of this suggestion should be weighed in the light of the second paragraph of chapter VIII of section C of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which foresees that no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the security council. If the voting formula suggested by the Crimea Conference were to be adopted, such authorization of the security council should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members. In fact, any one of the permanent members of the security council, even when a party to the dispute, could delay or even prevent the operation of the security stipulations of the Act of Chapultepec. Assuming, for example, that a non-American power were preparing an act of aggression against an American power, such a non-American power would have the possibility of rendering inoperative the security agreement signed by 20 nations of the Western Hemisphere.

In the light of all the above-enumerated considerations and of the observations relating to the functioning of specific regional arrangements:

The Polish Government suggests that the voting procedure of the Security Council be amended to provide that all decisions of the Security Council be taken by simple majority vote of all its members including those of the states permanently represented on the Council. Furthermore, that a state which is a party to a dispute should not be entitled to cast its vote on any question relating to the dispute, and that a state should not be entitled to cast its vote when its failure to act in accordance with the provisions of the charter is under consideration.

3. The General Assembly, according to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, is not granted the attributes of a policy-making body in international problems of the greatest importance, namely, in those of permanent security and the maintenance of peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals tend further to reduce the importance of the General Assembly by stipulating that its right to make recommendations should not include any subjects being dealt with by the Security Council. This limitation would considerably reduce the value of the General Assembly not only as a consultative body but even as a debating forum. It should be remembered that the General Assembly is the only body of the World Security Organization in which all the signatory nations will be represented and should have the opoprtunity of expressing their views. It is therefore a forum of special value for the smaller States, and particularly for those not represented on the Security Council. Any curtailment of the rights and privileges normally enjoyed by member states on such an international Assembly would seriously limit those States in their effective participation in the task of maintaining security and peace.

The way in which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals tend to deprive the General Assembly—the only body on which all the United Nations are to be represented—of equality with the Council, and to limit even its freedom of discussion, is difficult to reconcile with the declared principle of "the sovereign equality of the peace-loving nations."

The Polish Government suggests that the General Assembly of the World Security Organization be given the right of unrestricted discussion of and initiative in, all questions pertaining to problems of world security and peace.

4. The experience of the League of Nations shows that one of the main difficulties of maintaining peace was due to the divergence of views and interpretations regarding the definition of aggression. It may be useful to remind the United Nations at this stage that the most comprehensive and clear definition was supplied on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by Foreign Commissar Maxim M. Litvinov and was embodied in the Convention for the definition of aggression concluded between the representatives of Soviet Russia, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Iran, Turkey, and Afghanistan, and later adhered to by Finland. In the preamble of this agreement, signed in London on July 3, 1933, it was stated that the signatories, "Mindful of the fact that the Briand-Kellogg Pact, * * * prohibits all aggression," have agreed in article 2 that: "The aggressor in an international conflict shall * * * be considered to be that state which is the first to commit any of the following actions:

"1. Declaration of war upon another state;

"2. Invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state;

"3. Attack by its land, naval, or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels, or aircraft of another state;

"4. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state;

"5. Provision of support to armed bands formed in its territory which have invaded the territory of another state, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded state, to take, in its own territory, all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection."

Article 3 goes on to say: "No political, military, economic or other considerations may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to."

In a special annex to article 3 of this convention for the definition of aggression, the high contracting parties, signatories of the convention, further stated:

"Desiring, subject to the express reservation that the absolute validity of the rule laid down in article 3 of that convention shall be in no way restricted to furnish certain indications for determining the aggressor,

"Declare that no act of aggression within the meaning article 2 of that convention can be justified on either of the following grounds, among others:

"(a) The internal condition of a state:

"E. g., its political, economic, or social structure; alleged defects in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counterrevolutions, or civil war.

"(b) The international conduct of a state:

"E. g., the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign state or its nationals; the rupture of diplomatic or economic relations; economic or financial boycotts; disputes relating to economic, financial, or other obligations toward foreign states; frontier incidents not forming any of the cases of aggression specified in article 2.

"The high contracting parties further agree to recognize that the present convention can never legitimate any violations of international law that may be implied in the circumstances comprised in the above list."

This Convention for the Definition of Aggression was freely entered into in 1933 by a big power, with seven lessor states. It is to be hoped that this important, realistic instrument of international law will be taken into account by the United Nations in working out the future world security system.

The Polish Government suggests that a clear and comprehensive definition of aggression, on the lines of the definition quoted above, be embodied in the charter of the World Security Organization.

LONDON, *April 1945.*

How To Avoid Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1945

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, this statement by the Educational Policies Commission is the most complete analysis that I have ever seen on the important subject How To Avoid Federal Control of Education. The statement follows:

THE THREAT OF FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

For more than a quarter of a century, education in the United States has drifted toward Federal domination. This drift has continued at an accelerated rate during the war. Present indications are that, unless this movement is sharply checked by an alert citizenry, it will continue even more rapidly after the war.

Following 1929 a mounting number of school systems, especially those in the poorer sections of the Nation, found themselves in a serious financial situation. The Federal Government responded through a series of indirect measures. Under the Works Progress Administration, funds were made available to

help keep schools open. Other relief funds were used to establish and operate nursery schools and other educational services.

More recently, through the "Lanham Act" the Federal Government is distributing hundreds of millions of dollars for educational purposes in communities where war industries and training centers have been established. Again, meticulous Federal controls accompany these allocations. The "G. I. bill of rights" bypasses State educational authorities almost completely.

Continuance of recent and current trends in Federal-State relations in education will, within a short period of time, result in the transfer of responsibility for the control of education in the United States from State and local communities to the National Government. If our education becomes federalized, it will not be because the people desire it. In fact, the federalization of education is inconsistent with the best American traditions and the best interests of our future American life.

If national control of schools becomes a reality, it will come by a process of accretion and infiltration. It will result from responses to many small emergencies and from the pressures of many special interests. It will not come as the fulfillment of a policy consciously adopted after mature deliberation by the majority of the American people; it will happen by default, resulting from failure to give this important matter the attention it deserves. No one Presidential directive or piece of legislation will be decisive in itself.

Although new factors in our contemporary civilization require closer organization and increased centralization of some of the areas of our life, a central control in other areas is a definite threat to our American plan of social organization. The fact that the national government must be the predominant authority in waging warfare and in determining the routes of transcontinental highways does not mean that it should similarly dominate such areas as the distribution of news and the education of the young. Education should be placed high on the list of services to be continued under State and local control. The ability to make distinctions as to what should be and what should not be centralized permits some nations to preserve their liberty. Those who cannot so distinguish may succumb to totalitarianism.

SOUND FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

Federalization of education in the United States can be prevented by application of the following principles:

1. The Nation as a whole, as well as the States and localities, has a stake in education, and the Federal Government should continue to exercise, within properly defined limits, educational functions demanded by changing national conditions and needs.

Citizens are citizens of the Nation as well as of States and localities and thus the outcomes of education have their effects, both good and bad, upon the Nation as a whole. Accordingly, the Nation should exercise educational responsibilities which are essential to its welfare. Requisite Federal action, however, can and should be limited to functions which supplement and assist, rather than displace, States and localities in the conduct of education.

2. In its relations to education in the States the Federal Government should limit its action to two broad functions: (a) financial assistance, and (b) leadership of a stimulating, but noncoercive character.

Four factors now largely determine whether a child is offered adequate or meager school facilities. These are economic status of the family, fiscal competence of the community, place of residence, and race. Education should be a major force in eliminating class distinctions and in equalizing the social conditions under which men live. However, as it operates in some parts of our country, education accentuates class difference, creates and perpetuates disparities in the conditions of men, and thus imperils the very foundations of the American way of life.

Federal financial assistance to education in the States is absolutely necessary if educational opportunity is to be provided throughout the Nation. This fact has been clearly established by a series of fiscal investigations. That such aid can be extended by methods which do not invalidate State and local control of education has also been demonstrated.

The requirements accompanying Federal grants to the States should be limited to minimum items, such as post-audit and the publication of reports to assure the use of these funds for the purposes for which they are granted.

By the Federal leadership function is meant all activities such as research and investigation, conferences, the encouragement of interstate communication, and cooperation, the preparation of reports and recommendations for educational development, and all other similar methods which lead to educational progress on the basis of understanding and consent, as opposed to coercion and compulsion.

3. The Federal Government should limit such direct control and administration of education as it exercises to certain special enterprises.

This proposition recognizes that there are certain educational undertakings which the Federal Government should directly control and administer, such as the academies at West Point and Annapolis. The number and scope of Federal educational enterprises and functions, however, should be kept within restricted limits. There is justification for the direct administration of an educational activity by a Federal agency when this activity is an integral part of some recognized function of the Federal Government and does not duplicate activities nor involve the administration of education in the States.

4. The Federal Government in its relation to education should recognize that this is a service of primary importance, which makes its greatest contribution to the general welfare as a well organized, integrated enterprise designed to develop well-balanced citizens for democracy, rather than as a means of advancing unrelated aims or special interests.

This proposition holds that education is a matter of primary concern; that youth can be best prepared for democratic citizenship when their activities are guided by the mature experience of qualified teachers; that the curriculum should not be a patchwork of poorly related activities dictated by passing enthusiasms, ephemeral needs, and pressure groups; that the educational systems must be well organized, both as to their general control and administrative direction, eliminating competition between Federal and State governments.

5. The decentralized pattern of public educational organization developed in the United States during a period of more than a century and a half, involving basic control and administration of education by the States and localities, is sound policy and should be continued.

The inherent merits of decentralized control derive from the necessity of keeping education attuned to the evolving demands of a dynamic industrial nation; from the desire to permit educational diversity; from the wish to keep education close to the people; and from the fear that, if education became centralized in the Federal Government, it might more readily be captured for political or other improper purposes. Educational progress in this country is due in substantial degree to the experimentation and adaptation which go on continuously in the State and local school systems.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

The mistake is often made of assuming that financial aid for education is synonymous with control of its program and administration. This is not the case. The presence or absence of control, as a by-product of financing, depends upon the terms of the legislation. Federal funds for education should be allocated to the States in terms of the following six policies:

1. General grants are preferable to special grants: A grant of so many dollars per pupil in attendance, available for the financing of all phases of education, or a grant to aid States in establishing an acceptable minimum of financial support in all districts, is a general grant. A specific grant is one specified for use in developing a particular school subject or type of service at some particular educational level or for a limited age group of children or youths. General grants permit the development of balanced educational programs with the needs of children and of society as a whole in mind. Special grants tend to direct attention unduly to particular phases of education.

2. The proportion of a Federal grant for education going to each State should be determined on the basis of objective factors: Objective factors would be, for example, the number of children attending school, or the number of youth of a certain age in the school district, or the fiscal capacity of the district. An objective basis of allocation is one that two competent persons can use independently and get the same result as to the amount due each State.

3. The granting of Federal funds for special educational purposes, accompanied with the requirement that similar sums be appropriated from State or local revenues, is undesirable. The two most serious objections to such matching requirements are: (a) the richest States or localities tend to receive the largest amounts of Federal money since they can most readily match Federal appropriations, and (b) subsidies so granted result in unbalanced educational programs.

4. State plans for the use of Federal educational funds should be prepared prior to their distribution and these plans should be worked out jointly between the agents of the States and the Federal Government. The role of Federal officials in this process should be limited to advisory functions.

5. Each Federal act to aid the financing of education should provide that the State legislature must formally accept the provisions of the act and designate the State office to administer it.

6. Federal funds granted to a State should be available for use in schools which the State itself recognizes as eligible to be supported from public funds.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

The National Government will be unable to organize properly its relations to education until it establishes an adequate Federal educational office. The present inadequacy of the United States Office of Education results neither from lack of competence nor from lack of effort on the part of its leadership and staff. Rather, it stems from its lack of status and financial support, and from the willingness of Congress to authorize or permit noneducational Federal agencies to develop their own elaborate, and often expensive and overlapping agencies for dealing with education in the States, and even for the direct control and administration of major educational functions.

An essential step in correcting this situation would be the establishment of an adequate Federal educational agency as an independent office of the Federal Government. This agency must not be a subordinate bureau of some powerful department or independent agency of Government. It must have sufficient rank to deal directly with

Congress and the President so that the voice of education will be heard in Washington.

Until such time as Congress takes fundamental action to establish an appropriate Federal educational office, the existing Office of Education should be granted more adequate funds. The President in his latest budget message recommended more funds for a far-reaching improvement of the Office of Education. Such funds are necessary if the Office is to undertake the services which should be provided by such an agency. These funds would be a small fraction of the appropriations now made annually by Congress for a variety of educational activities.

The functions of the reorganized Federal educational office should not be mainly administrative, so far as the conduct of education in the States is concerned. Some of the principal duties of the new office would be: To serve as the agency of the Federal Government for dealing with education in the States; to administer all Federal educational undertakings except those which, for peculiar and valid reasons, are exercised by some other department of the Federal Government; to serve as an agency through which the Federal Government transmits funds appropriated for education in States; to conduct over-all national investigations and researches; to organize temporary demonstrations of promising new educational undertakings; to collect and disseminate useful information concerning education.

Our democratic technical society requires an abundance of good education. In the long run, the best way to provide that education is under a decentralized pattern of educational organization which keeps the schools close to the people and responsive to their needs and wishes.

Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an article by Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling, entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training."

Colonel Conkling is eminently qualified to write on this subject. In World War No. 1 he was the organizer and first director of the draft in New York City. In that war he also served as a lieutenant colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Department, and was one of General Crowder's executive officers at national draft headquarters. He is a former deputy attorney general of the State of New York. He was recommissioned major and later lieutenant colonel, in July 1942, to become a member of the Presidential Appeal Board. He served in that capacity at the National Selective Service headquarters in Washington, D. C., until January 25, 1945, when he returned to inactive status at his own request.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE REGULAR ARMY AND NAVY URGES IT

The proponents of peacetime compulsory military training among high officers of the Regular Army and Navy are unquestionably well-meaning and loyal Americans. But the human trait of self-interest permeating their advocacy of the project cannot be gainsaid; consequently the value of their advice is decreased, its importance diluted. The greater the number of soldiers and sailors, the greater the number of officers; and with the increase in officer personnel the higher soars the rank of the regular officer with its increased pay and importance. With the expansion of our Army to 10,000,000, or thereabout, regular captains and lieutenants have been promoted to brigadier generals; majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels to major generals, lieutenant generals, and generals. Reduce that army to 1,000,000 or less and, with exceptions here and there, generals again become colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors. Their pay is decreased, their authority contracted, and their social positions receive a jolting set-back. Is it any wonder that with the ending of hostilities and the demobilization of our armed forces to relatively small peacetime limitations these presently high-ranging regular officers should avidly grasp at any plan which would continue their high pay and place, or at least demote them as slightly as possible? The reduction of base pay, together with longevity accumulations and incidentals, aggregating six, eight, ten, twelve, or more thousand dollars annually, to base pay of $333 a month for a colonel, $300 for a lieutenant colonel, $250 for a major, and correspondingly reduced "incidentals," cannot be thrust out of mind, however conscientious the effort. The demotion of naval officers likewise takes place, although perhaps not quite so severely, with the reduction of the naval arm from war to peacetime strength. Consequently, the urging of the Regular Establishments of the Army and Navy for compulsory peacetime military training should be viewed in the light of their officers' self-interest when the country is weighing this tremendous project so novel to America. It would, indeed, be wise if Regular Army and Navy officers refrained entirely or were prohibited from joining in any way in the promotion of this general proposition, except upon request of Congress. Certainly all efforts in which they are now directly and indirectly indulging to effect legislation favoring it should cease at once. They cannot possibly forget their self-interest, for subconscious of it they must be, however sincere their desire for the Nation's welfare.

TEN MILLION SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' LIPS ARE SEALED

Recently revised Army Regulations provide that "except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active service of the United States * * * to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army * * * are forbidden."

In other words, if the Army, which today is in truth the War Department, will permit it, a commissioned or noncommissioned officer or a private may speak out publicly in opposition to peacetime compulsory military training. If it will not authorize free discussion, the lips of every man and woman of the 10,000,000 or more comprising the United States armed forces are sealed. Yet the Secretaries of War and Navy and their assistants, members of the General Staff, and other high ranking officers are free to promote and propagandize at will, often at Government expense, for the enactment of this proposed law. And it is a peacetime not wartime measure affecting, after their demobilization, perhaps disastrously for many years to come, the lives and living as well as the purses of our citizen soldiery now held incommunicado, their children, and kin; while most of those, themselves so vocal but enforcing the silence of their opposition, will be the enriched beneficiaries of the legislation they so desperately sponsor. There can be little doubt as to the War Department's attitude if authorization to oppose is sought by any serviceman. As a matter of fact this writer, through channels, sought of his commanding general, in writing, not approval or indorsement of his opposition to compulsory military training, but merely his superior's formal expression that he had no objection to such being publicly set forth. It is known that his application was received and discussed with other staff officers, but it was not forwarded to the War Department for its authorization and probably found its way into the wastebasket—for nothing has been heard of it since.

If American doctrine and tradition are not to be completely destroyed, we should continue to keep the military out of the lawmaking which orders our peacetime living.[1] Such has been our way since the founding of the Republic and such has been demonstrated to be the way to keep the United States of America the leading, most beloved nation on earth; and this notwithstanding when forced into war, but only then, it becomes the most feared. When called upon, its hosts of civilian soldiery sweep their enemies before them, establish peace, and at once return to their peacetime pursuits, despising war and warmaking.

WHY RESERVE AND SPECIALIST OFFICERS APPROVE IT

At first signs of gathering war clouds over America the War and Navy Departments began their hurried enlargement of administrative personnel, and thousands of civilians have been commissioned. These officers have been so rapidly promoted, often almost automatically every 6 months, that throughout all the service commands and especially within the military district of Washington, we now have a mighty host of generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors; naval captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants. Many never see front-line or even field-training service at home, although some spend a few weeks taking an indoctrination course which is usually more or less a useless procedure, for upon its completion they promptly return to their desks in the Navy Department and in such sections of the Army as the Quartermaster's, Finance, Adjutant General's, Air Force, Provost Marshal General's, Judge Advocate General's, Selective Service (National and State), etc. They make up the greater part of the officers seen in uniform-weary centers such as our large cities and especially in Washington itself. And, incidentally, observing the unusually large number of newly made administrative Army and Navy officers appearing on the streets of the Nation's Capital, and elsewhere, one wonders why so many of this multitude holding commissioned rank and performing office duties are and have been from the beginning of their service well within the younger brackets of the draft ages. Certainly a great majority, when first commissioned, were and probably are now between the ages of 21 and 31, or 35 at most, while not so fortunate men between 35 and 45 with dependent families and settled and

[1] President Wilson on July 8, 1918, at the beginning of the great American offensive of World War No. 1 at Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry, sharply reminded the American people: "A very fundamental principle of our institutions is that the military power is subordinate to the civil"; that the armed forces of the country must be instruments of the civilian authority which determines the Nation's policies and that this was the idea of the framers of the Constitution he sought to perpetuate.

important home-community interests have been inducted into the armed services in droves.

Great numbers of these young men hold ordinary office jobs, mostly of a clerical nature, and have been recruited from every vocation and from every section of the country: real estate agents and insurance men, salesmen and customer's men from stock and bond houses, bank clerks, haberdashery, textile, footwear and other salesmen, lawyers and government clerks. Numerous indeed are young Federal employees from the various Government departments who were on the ground when draft agitation began in Congress and knew the ropes as to the securing of commissions, or how to locate and get the desirable assignments for the duration if they had already, since the last war, been endowed with the status of reserve officers.

For these Army and Navy officers, the armed services are indeed glamorous and lucrative. It is probably true that the majority of them receive a far greater net income than their civilian jobs ever afforded in fact or in contemplation. Coupled with this is the exhilaration of receiving a military salute from every private, non-commissioned and lower-ranking officer of all arms of the services they happen to pass on the highway, constantly reminding them and confirming their satisfaction at knowing they are labeled and recognized as superior by so many of their fellow men. Of course they live in comfort; far from the dreaded battlefields. That is militarism; one side of it; the easy side. And it is among this grouping of our unarmed forces that the prospect of universal military service is so attractive and so worth insisting upon for the good of the Nation, and, incidentally, for the possibility that they themselves will be retained in a new military structure and avoid going back home, minus the striking and labeling uniform, to work at the prosaic old job where superiority must be demonstrated by merit and in free fields open to all competitors.

The desk officers of the Army and Navy, regular, specialist, and reserve, know full well compulsory universal military training will necessitate a huge personnel of high rank to maintain a peacetime Army and Navy of a million or more boys, added to the enlarged Army and Navy we shall undoubtedly maintain for many years after this war. And therein lies their chance of retention in their present high pay and place jobs or, at worst, possibly a mild demotion.

ARMY AND NAVY PROPONENTS TAKING ADVANTAGE OF WAR FERVOR

Probably the unfairest aspect of the effort to force compulsory military training upon us is the strategy of its proponents—somehow to get legislation for it quickly passed while we are in the midst of war enthusiasm—or hysteria; when everyone is working hard for victory and countless numbers are worrying about their loved ones or suffering from the bereavements of war. They know that at the conclusion of hostilities the millions of actual fighting men won't want to listen to agitation for more soldiering. Their first thought will be to forget their harrowing experiences and be freemen again, not uniformed robots to be told where and when and what, 24 hours a day. That questionably will be the attitude of those who come back to us whole in body and sound of mind. Of the others—"Well, always thinking or talking about it will do no good. That was yesterday, last month, last year. Thank God it's over." Those of us who experienced the aftermath of World War No. 1 are entirely familiar with that point of view of returning fighting men. War stories will be rejected without demur by book and periodical publishers. Motion pictures with war plots or even short war scenes will become taboo. Consequently, after the hysteria of actual warfare has subsided compulsory peacetime military training legislation can receive Nation-wide and thoughtful consideration by our civilian population with both sides of the proposition fully developed. Informed and free opponents of it will be available who can testify from knowledge and experience as to the horrors and uselessness of peacetime and fanatical youth militarization among our enemies, from which we may judge its inevitable results if forced upon the boyhood of the United States. At least we shall not be rushed pell-mell into this monstrous de-Americanizing project by the one-sided, opposition-crushing, and self-interested campaigning of a comparatively few high rankers of the Army and Navy, aided by well-financed civilian groups such as those who profit fabulously by the sale of military products; uniforms and other prescribed wearing apparel, quartermaster's supplies, constantly obsolescing air, sea, and ground vehicles, armaments, etc.; and aided also by that hidden and ruthless alien movement—call it what you will—the leadership of which has not yet been identified, but which is spreading its tentacles throughout the land and seeks to strangle our tried and revered American ways and manner of free, peaceful, and prosperous living.

America fights, how well our enemies twice within a quarter of a century and to their sorrow have learned, when it has to, or is dragged into war. But it is not a warrior nation and certainly, in its normal life, frowns dourly upon grandiose militaristic activity. Yet its doctrines and traditions have proved the most successful of all the nations of history.

THE SELF-INTERESTED PROPAGANDA AGENCIES EARLY AT WORK

It would be interesting to know how many heads or groups in various sections of the War and Navy Departments, with or without the sanction or encouragement of the Secretaries or their assistants, with or without the support of certain members of the General Staff or, indeed, with or without the nod of the President, himself, have long been busily engaged in developing plans and propaganda for the introduction of legislation now; for a law requiring a year or more of compulsory military training of American boys between 18, 19, and 20 years old, to be begun as demobilization of our returning fighting forces gets under way.

Publicity was not only discouraged but darkly frowned upon within one Washington military department while several nonfighting colonels, naval captains and commanders who, although charged with urgent duties pertaining to the daily progress of this war, spent most of their time during a recent period conferring, discussing, and drafting legislation for compulsory military training. And by no process of reasoning could this activity be regarded as within their jurisdiction or line of duty. The project actually had been under consideration since May 1943; perhaps even before then. These Regular, Specialist, and Reserve Army and Navy officers worked diligently during July and August of 1944 in order to have something definite and in print to submit to one of the Army's most publicized nonfighting major generals upon his return from a tour of the country during which he sponsored, cautiously, in public speeches the compulsory military training idea. Whether this was by direction of his superiors or on his own initiative is not known. But, previous to his departure, he had quietly charged this selected few of his staff with the preparation of a bill to be made ready for quick presentation to Congress. Incidentally, this "law-making" body undoubtedly entertained no other idea in their completed proposals than that this major general should be named the Director of Universal Military Training. And the most enthusiastic of his legally unauthorized bill-drafting coterie were no doubt convinced that they would continue with him indefinitely in supervising the compulsory military training of our youngsters long after World War No. 2's armies had been disbanded and their components were back at their jobs making a living—and figuring out how to pay the taxes staring at them from the future, in addition to paying a tremendous price for the militarizing of their teen-aged sons. The estimate of annual cost for the training of these youngsters arrived at by the major general's "planners" was from one to one and one-half billion dollars per million trainees; about $1,000 to $1,500 "a head."

Who directs this attempted transportation of old world peacetime military servitude to free America; this revival and modernization of medievalism? It undoubtedly does not spring from the minds and hearts of even a substantial number of our national legislators. While at least two bills pertaining to it were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, they were permitted to slumber undisturbed for months. The subject was "too hot at the moment" is reported to have been observed by some Congressmen before the November elections. Shortly after the election recess a special committee of the House was appointed and announced it would begin hearings on compulsory military training within a few days. A flood of church, labor, and other opposition appeared. The militarists' demand for haste was somewhat offset temporarily and the House committee chairman, the day after Thanksgiving, decided that the committee would be unable to complete hearings in 1944; that the measure would have to go over for consideration by the new Congress convening in January 1945. Representative WADSWORTH and a few others, when not urging complete regimentation of all Americans via national service legislation, discourse in patriotic banalities on the "mental, physical, and civic" value of the militarization of our youth. But the legislators of the outgoing Congress generally appeared to be occupied with more important items having to do with the welfare of the Nation at war, not peacetime militarization of its boyhood.

A poll by Fortune magazine last July purported to indicate public favor for peacetime drafting of boys as they become 18 years of age. Who inspired this poll at that time or how much thoughtful opinion is involved is, of course, problematical. Concurrently with the issue of Fortune the Director of Selective Service, before the Commerce and Industry Association in New York City, adroitly turning to the importance of "conditioning and training youth for the future national defense" following a discussion of the rejection of registrants in draft operations in this and World War No. 1, remarked that so long as "Selective Service has custody of the greatest inventory of manpower America has ever made" it must collaborate in every possible way to insure that "by training and rehabilitation more men can assume the entire burden of citizenship." A dainty morsel tossed out to test its palatability.

A few weeks later Colonel McDermott, director of selective service for New York City, appeared before the microphone and urged adoption of military peacetime training in a public radio debate. A prominent minister of one of the city's churches opposed him. This draft official's stereotyped theme was "national security, national health and welfare" and inculcation of the democratic spirit by "its powerful influence in breaking down and eliminating racial, religious, and class barriers and prejudices." His exhortations followed the usual pattern which seems to have been designed especially for the proponents of youth training in their stealthy

but ever bolder advocacy of militarizing the Nation. Then, in a heroic effort to tell us why we should at once undertake this form of un-Americanism, he delivered himself of this novel and profound thought: "History and the frailties of human nature have taught us that war may come again."

Following this broadcast debate by the director of selective service for New York City, the New York Herald Tribune published a Washington correspondent's story telling us that "selective-service officials, planning for any post-war compulsory military training system which might result from pending legislation, were disclosed to favor administration of such a program by a joint Army-Navy board * * * and if Congress does choose to give control of universal service to such a board, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the draft Director, and some of his present staff 'might' want to stay on, selective-service officials said."

The gently persuasive emanations of high-ranking selective-service officers, however, made no noticeable impression upon the country at large; bolder urging became necessary. On September 26 the Director of Selective Service abandoned his dulcet and generalized approvals of the measure and boldly told the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce he was "heartily in favor of peacetime military training," and dangling the scarecrow "defense" before his audience, warned:

"Today's warfare has changed in a manner that the risk of unpreparedness is tantamount to courting disaster. Our national growth requires manpower and armament in adequate numbers and quality to protect it from sudden aggression. * * * Relief from this training should be permitted only in cases where extreme physical or mental conditions exists."

In other words every American boy who can walk without crutches or is not a congenital imbecile, must leave his job or school and go to military training camp for a year or more when he becomes 18 or 19 years old; irrespective of whether he is the sole or partial support and comfort of a widowed mother or a physically or mentally incapacitated father, or necessary to aid in feeding and clothing younger brothers and sisters and thus help keep intact an American family unit; irrespective of whether he is needed on the typically American little farm which produces our food and which his father and mother have worked drudging years to develop; irrespective of breaking into the required hours of apprenticeship he's been building to become a journeyman machinist, plumber, carpenter, tinsmith, or other tradesman; irrespective of interfering with his preparation for law, medicine, engineering, dentistry—and this not in war but in peacetime. Thus the Director of Selective Service put officially and squarely before his Buffalo listeners the idealistic proposals of the militarist minded of America who are urging to the utmost Universal Compulsory Military Training—for the good of America? or in their own personal interest!

Equal Rights for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a resolution introduced by Senator Brees, which has been passed by the Legislature of the State of New York. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the resolution, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, March 24, 1945.

Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

Whereas this Nation was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex; and

Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood and is a source of irritation and annoyance to many thousands of others who recognize in this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to adopt and submit to the several States the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment is now pending before the Congress; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 24, 1945, concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

Labor Problems in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of the Honorable CHARLES R. SAVAGE before the Senate Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises on April 10, 1945; a letter dated April 12, 1945, from Mr. I. W. Wilson, vice president of the Aluminum Co. of America, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the aforementioned committee; and the subsequent statement of Congressman SAVAGE to Senator MURRAY, on April 20, 1945:

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE BEFORE THE SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES ON APRIL 10, 1945

I would like to comment very briefly on certain labor problems in the production of aluminum in the Pacific Northwest. These problems have evidently been handled not very effectively by either the Federal war agencies concerned or by the Aluminum Co. of America. The result has been the false charge of labor shortage given as a reason for curtailment of aluminum production in Oregon and Washington during part of 1944 and for difficulties now in reopening potlines at the Troutdale aluminum plant. The weak handling of the labor situation has been partly responsible for the alleged need to buy more Canadian aluminum under the new Shipshaw contract. There is no sign now that proper measures will be taken to correct the aluminum labor situation in the Northwest. I make these comments in the hope that this committee will lend its efforts toward securing appropriate action.

My conception of the fallacious labor policy of Alcoa is based on my several years' experience on local, State and international committees, negotiating on labor-management problems in the Northwest and from serving on an appeals board for the War Manpower Commission since the freeze of manpower in the timber and nonferrous metals industries. My tracks, in fact, often used to cross those of the eminent gentleman from Oregon, WAYNE L. MORSE, now Senator from that State, though in a much lesser capacity I assure you.

Today, the War Production Board contends that it is difficult to obtain 250 workers to reopen half of the Troutdale, Oreg., aluminum plant. This difficulty of course plays into the hands of those who are more interested in buying metal from the Aluminum Co. of Canada than in using our own economical Northwest aluminum plants. The labor difficulties are very easily explained. They could have been overcome; but there was no real intention among the Federal war agencies concerned to overcome them.

The problem today is no different from that 1 year ago, when exactly the same situation existed at all the Northwest aluminum plants. Today shipyard workers are gradually being released in the Portland area, but they are refusing to go to the aluminum plants. The War Manpower director for Oregon has indicated to some Federal officials that he expects a few tens of thousands of shipyard workers to be released in the Portland area this summer, but there is no reason to believe that the aluminum plants will get the few hundred they need. There are too many other jobs available paying better wages and offering better working conditions. That is the heart of the difficulty. The blame for this situation must fall initially upon the Aluminum Co. of America for its conservative policy in holding back until too late the necessary wage increases and then not granting large enough increases. And the blame must also fall upon the same officials of the Federal war agencies who protest that they want to get the Northwest aluminum plants into full operation but will not lift a finger to request necessary wage action from the War Labor Board.

If the committee will look into this matter, it will find that wage rates in the Northwest shipyards have been more attractive than aluminum-plant wages ever since April 23, 1941—4 years ago—when Henry Kaiser entered an agreement on the Pacific coast with the American Federation of Labor's metal-trades department. At that time common shipyard labor could get 95 cents an hour for day-shift work, 10 percent more for late-afternoon-shift work, and 15 percent more for night shift. But in the aluminum plants during 1942 the basic hourly rate was 75

cents. A man could earn at the shipyards in 48 hours nearly $50 per week but only $39 at the aluminum plants.

This entire situation was looked into by a public committee called the Oregon Industrial Area Labor Supply Committee representing various Federal agencies and private business groups. In July 1942 that committee submitted a report on the troubles of Alcoa in hiring men. Among the explanations for Alcoa's troubles, in the opinion of the committee, were the low wage rates compared with other plants. Also, there was a lack of confidence between management and the workers because of the company policy of requiring that decisions on labor problems be settled in Pittsburgh, 3,000 miles away. Finally, working and social conditions in the aluminum plant were not attractive.

To show this Senate committee the utter lack of understanding by officials concerned over what had to be done, I want to compare Alcoa's failure in securing labor with the success of many other plants in the Portland-Vancouver area. I will cite figures from the War Manpower Commission which I have examined.

In January 1942 the Alcoa plant at Vancouver, Wash., employed 1,000 workers. In July 1943 the plant was operating with a labor shortage and was threatened with partial shut-down. It has lost in one year and a half 156 workers. But, in the same year and a half, 9 shipyards in the Portland-Vancouver area put on 104,000 new workers, and 3 aircraft-part plants put on over 2,000 workers.

In that same year and a half, the Government aluminum plant at Troutdale had delays in opening aluminum potlines which Alcoa blamed on a labor shortage. The plants needed only 100 to 150 men for each pot line, and only a few hundred men altogether. And yet it could not obtain these men during a period when other plants in the same area were putting on 106,000 new workers.

This is one of the most amazing stories of ineptitude and blundering by a private company and Federal war-agency officials. Aluminum was critical in 1942 and 1943; the Troutdale plant was vitally needed; yet there were months of delay in opening portions of the plant, and Alcoa actually slowed down construction of part of the plant because it claimed it could not get workers to operate the pot lines. Of course, it could not get them with its lower wage rates and its unattractive working conditions and its continuous labor troubles with the local unions. But here was a company charged with the highest responsibility of producing aluminum needed for our war plane program, failing to live up to its responsibility because it chose to follow labor policies that were out of line with conditions in the Pacific Northwest.

If the committee will look into this matter, it will find that Alcoa did try certain steps. The company recruited men in the South and the Middle West. It offered to pay transportation of men to the Northwest. It offered rewards of War bonds to its own employees who brought in other workers. It advertised extensively in the newspapers. It went through motions of vigorously seeking labor. But it failed to adopt the only measures that would have held the men it needed—large wage-rate increases and better working arrangements with labor.

In April 1944, 1 year ago, the War Production Board was considering further cut-backs of production in American aluminum plants. In view of the fuel shortage it decided to reduce production at the eastern plants that got their electric energy from coal and to keep in production the plants in the Northwest that use hydroelectric power. But at Troutdale, labor was leaving faster than new men were coming in. The plant was threatened with partial if not entire shut-down. The War Production Board took the official position that it wanted Troutdale to continue to operate if it could obtain the manpower, but the W. P. B. would not lift a finger to change the conditions necessary to get that manpower. Many conferences were held between representatives of the Department of the Interior, Bonneville Power Administration, Congressmen from the Northwest, and officials of the War Manpower Commission and War Production Board. Recommendations were made to certify to the War Labor Board that conditions required wage increases. But the W. P. B. refused to grant that certification, assuring everyone of course, that it really wanted to see Troutdale continue in operation, but that it couldn't ask for wage increases because aluminum was not sufficiently critical. Well, on May 11, 1944, one fourth of Troutdale shut down and for a few months it was nip and tuck to prevent the entire plant from shutting down. Why should labor stay in a plant to produce aluminum that the W. P. B. did not think was sufficiently important. That was the common reaction of the workers. It is shown in the amazing figures of labor turnover for the 10 months from March 1, 1943, to January 1, 1944. In those months, Alcoa complained it could not get labor. Yet in the 5 Northwest aluminum plants, 3 of which Alcoa operated, 5,367 workers were hired but only 1,000 remained. These figures are from the War Manpower Commission. They show conclusively that there never was a labor shortage for the Northwest aluminum plants. Instead, there was an ineffective, fumbling policy by Alcoa and Government officials that prevented the aluminum plants from holding on to the abundant supplies of labor that poured through those plants like a sieve.

Today, the situation is no better. Wage rates are still higher in the shipyards although the difference has been reduced by slow, inadequate increases made by the Aluminum company. Workers all know that it is hot and unpleasant in an aluminum plant compared with the shipyards and the forests of the Northwest. They do not intend to accept the 95 cents an hour starting wage for a pot-room worker when they can get higher wages elsewhere for doing unskilled work, like $1 an hour for warehouse work in the teamster's union.

Today we are buying Canadian aluminum from friends of the Aluminum Co. of America because Alcoa, aided by the indifference or neglect of Federal officials, has failed to adopt labor policies that would get out production in the Northwest plants. This country has relied upon one company for most of its aluminum production and has permitted that company to determine when and how much aluminum we got, and when we should go to Canada to buy aluminum, all because we have permitted that company to run affairs its own way.

I urge this committee to examine this story and to go back and find out the months of delay that occurred in opening aluminum pot lines in other plants operated by Alcoa. Certainly we admit that what Alcoa produced was eventually the aluminum that is winning this war. But this committee will find, I'm sure, that we got less aluminum and more expensive aluminum by relying on Alcoa for determining such vital matters as its own labor policies. We paid for this in the extra costs of Canadian aluminum—nearly 19 cents per pound compared to 12 cents in the Northwest plants. We paid for this in the delays in producing aluminum during 1942. We paid for this in other ways, as the Truman committee has pointed out in citing the delays in launching our aluminum program because Federal officials relied upon Alcoa for advice in 1940 and 1941. And we will pay for this in the shut-down of Northwest plants and maybe even in their abandonment and loss of jobs to workers unless we do something about it.

I think that this committee should lend its full efforts to see that the Government plants are put into new competitive hands so that never again will this country have to rely on one company for a crucial war material like aluminum. Never again should we have another Shipshaw scandal. Meanwhile, I hope this committee will see what can be done to get the Federal agencies and the Aluminum Co. to secure proper wage increases in the Northwest aluminum plants and keep those plants running until new competitors will take them over.

ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1945.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This morning at the hearing before the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, Senator WHERRY referred to a statement filed by Congressman DE LACY at the previous day's hearing on behalf of Congressman SAVAGE. I have examined that statement as it appears in the transcript of the hearing on April 11, 1945, and would respectfully ask that in the interest of placing the facts as to the wage situation in the Northwest before your committee, you permit this letter to become a part of the record as was suggested by Senator WHERRY.

Congressman SAVAGE has apparently been misinformed regarding wages and labor turn-over in the aluminum industry and the number of available workers in the Pacific Northwest. Wage scales in the Pacific Northwest are said to be the highest or among the highest in the United States and Alcoa has met or bettered the prevailing rates for similar work in that community, as in every other community in which it has operations. Nor has Alcoa failed to keep pace with wartime rising wage scales. For example, during the period between early 1941 and the present, the wage rate of potmen, the least skilled of the aluminum plant operating labor, in the Vancouver Alcoa plant has increased 46 percent and other classification rates have increased in like proportion. Of the total percentage increase, 41 percent or by far the greater portion was negotiated during the period when the company was free to make wage increases without War Labor Board approval. The remaining 5 percent of the total was awarded after the stabilization date when wage increases became subject to War Labor Board approval. The most recent application to the War Labor Board made jointly by the company and the union in June 1944, for a further general increase, was denied by the War Labor Board. From 1941 to the present, the average weekly take home pay of all hourly rated workers in the Vancouver plant has more than doubled due to wage increases and longer workweeks. At the present time many base rated potmen are earning more than $100 a week, including overtime earnings.

Labor turnover in the Vancouver Alcoa plant has been exceptionally low in comparison with other war industries in this area. We point with pride to the fact that whereas the Vancouver plant only began operations in 1940, nearly 60 percent of our employees in that plant have been with us more than 2 years and nearly 25 percent more than 4 years. All of the Alcoa plants have given considerable numbers of men to the armed services. In the Northwest region designated by the War Manpower Commission as an area of acute labor shortage, replacements for these men have sometimes been difficult to find and periods of serious manpower shortage have been experienced. However, through the loyalty of our workmen who have worked long hours, our production schedules have always been met.

Our plants are new and modern, with every engineering feature for comfortable working conditions.

Congressman SAVAGE's statement will undoubtedly further complicate the efforts of Alcoa and the War Manpower Commission to recruit men for the aluminum plants in the Northwest, the output of which is so badly needed for the war effort. It certainly will not encorage workmen to seek employment in these plants.

I wish to take this opportunity to express to you and the committee our appreciation for the opportunities which have been given us to supply information to the committee and to assure you of our earnest desire to cooperate in every way with you.

Very truly yours,

ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA,
I. W. WILSON, *Vice President.*

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. SAVAGE TO SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS, ON APRIL 20, 1945

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In reply to your letter of April 16, 1945, I am very pleased to comment on the letter of Mr. I. W. Wilson, of the Aluminum Co. of America dealing with my statement before the Small Business Committee on April 11, 1945.

The essential points raised by Mr. Wilson seem to be:

"1. Wage scales in the Pacific Northwest are said to be the highest or among the highest in the United States and Alcoa has met or bettered the prevailing wage rates rates for similar work in that community. * * *

"2. Labor turn-over at the Vancouver Alcoa plant has been exceptionally low in comparison with other war industries in this area.

"3. In the Northwest region designated by the War Manpower Commission as an area of acute labor shortage, replacements for these men have sometimes been difficult to find and periods of serious manpower shortage have been experienced. However, through the loyalty of our workmen, who have worked long hours, our production schedules have always been met."

My statement before your committee was to the effect that with respect to reopening half of the Troutdale plant, owned by the Government and leased by Alcoa:

1. It is doubtful that the needed workers can be obtained because "there are too many other jobs available paying better wages and offering better working conditions. That is the heart of the difficulty. The blame for this situation must fall initially upon the Aluminum Co. of America for its conservative policy of holding back until too late the necessary wage increases and then not granting large enough increases. And the blame must fall upon the same officials of the Federal war agencies who protest that they want to get the Northwest aluminum plants into full operation but will not lift a finger to request necessary wage action from the War Labor Board.

"If the committee will look into this matter, it will find that wage rates in the Northwest shipyards have been more attractive than aluminum plant wages ever since April 23, 1941. * * *"

2. During a year and a half, 1942–43, the Alcoa plant at Vancouver lost 156 workers and the Alcoa managed plant at Troutdale had delays in opening pot lines which Alcoa blamed on a labor shortage while 9 shipyards and 3 aircraft-part plants in the Portland-Vancouver area put on over 106,000 net workers. Alcoa could not get the few hundred workers it needed because of "its lower wage rates and its unattractive working conditions and its continuous labor troubles with the local unions."

3. In April 1944 at the Troutdale plant labor was leaving faster than it came in. Figures on labor turn-over in the Northwest aluminum plants during 1943, show there were ample workers placed in the plants but most of them left. Consequently, there never was a true labor shortage. Labor poured through the aluminum plants like a sieve, going to other more attractive and better paid employment.

4. Alcoa's wage policy coupled with ineffective action by interested Federal agencies was responsible for failure to produce as much aluminum as was possible in the Northwest and naturally contributed to the need for the United States to buy Canadian aluminum.

Mr. Wilson's reply in no way answers these contentions. To his first point, I have no difference at all. It is true that wage scales in the Northwest are among the highest in the country and it is also true that Alcoa has met or bettered the prevailing rates for similar work in that community. That is Mr. Wilson's contention. It simply has no bearing on the problem. The difficulty was that the shipyards and aircraft plants offered higher wage rates and more attractive working conditions than the Alcoa aluminum plants and therefore labor was difficult for Alcoa to hold. It is beside the point to argue that Alcoa paid wage rates equal or better to those for similar work. The work with which Alcoa competed for jobs was a different kind of work for which unskilled workers could qualify just as well as in an aluminum plant. Alcoa failed to compete for the supply of workers in the Portland area as is shown by the delays in opening Troutdale pot lines and by the forced shutdown of one line in May 1944. Alcoa should have set its wage rates with respect to the shipyard rates if it truly wanted to meet production schedules at Troutdale. It did not do so.

On June 3, 1942, Mr. C. S. Thayer, general manager of the Alcoa Vancouver plant, appeared before the Oregon Industrial Area Committee and the minutes of that meeting include the following: "Mr. Thayer stated that the existing problem of Alcoa is to keep their plant running; their difficulty is keeping their men on the job. They have had a turn-over of 500 men in the 900 normally employed at the plant within the last 3 months. Alcoa is unable to pay their employees comparable wages offered in the shipyards and the company is unable to raise wages until officials of the company, now in Washington, D. C., advise of the decisions made in the conferences being held there with the War Labor Board. Until that time the Vancouver plant is unable to offer their men any prospect of salary increase attractive enough to prevent their men from leaving."

This statement supports my contention. Mr. Wilson stresses the fact that Alcoa did raise wages considerably before it had to have War Labor Board approval. The record shows that when it had freedom of action, it did not raise wages sufficiently. If it had, Mr. Thayer would not have gone before the Oregon Industrial Area Committee.

In his second point, Mr. Wilson states that turn-over at the Vancouver plant has been exceptionally low in comparison with other war industries in the area. I have examined turn-over statistics from the Department of Labor which show for the country as a whole that in the aluminum-production plants, turn-over rates were higher than in aircraft and shipyard plants. War Manpower Commission figures show that at Vancouver, Wash., Alcoa's turn-over rate was relatively low. From March 1, 1943 to January 1, 1944, the average turn-over was 5 workers for every 100 employed. But at Troutdale, which Alcoa operates, and about which Mr. Wilson made no statement, the turn-over rate for the same period was 15 workers for every 100 employed. And the War Manpower Commission figures show that turn-over in the Government plants operated by Alcoa averaged 3½ times greater than in the plants owned by the company. This is not unusual when we consider that workers looked at Alcoa's own plants as offering permanent employment. But that problem should have spurred Alcoa, as trustee for the Government charged with high responsibility, to take adequate measures to secure and hold labor in the Government plants. It did not do so. It never opened one-third of the reduction plant at Riverbank, Calif., and two-fifths of the plant at Los Angeles, Calif., because of difficulties in obtaining and holding men. Alcoa failed to produce all the aluminum it was scheduled to produce. That is an unassailable fact.

Mr. Wilson, in his third point, argues that Alcoa's production schedules have always been met. In reply I cite this record:

a. At Los Angeles, pot lines 4 and 5 were originally scheduled for operation in October and December, 1942, respectively. They were completed after delays and never put in operation. These pot lines would have produced 3,000,000 pounds per month. From December 1942 to April 1945, Alcoa failed to produce at these lines 96,000,000 pounds of metal.

b. At Riverbank, Calif., pot line 3 was originally scheduled for operation in April 1943. It was completed after delays and never put into operation. From April 1943 until April 1945, Alcoa failed to produce at this line 72,000,000 pounds of metal.

c. At Troutdale, Oreg., the record shows the following delays for each pot line:

	Scheduled date for service	Date operation began	Months lost
No. 1	Apr. 1, 1942	May 15, 1942	1½
No. 2	June 19, 1942	Oct. 15, 1942	4
No. 3	July 19, 1942	Aug. 10, 1943	12
No. 4	Feb. 1, 1944	Sept. 5, 1943	7

During the lost time of 24½ months, Alcoa failed to produce 73,000,000 pounds of metal.

On May 11, 1944, one Troutdale pot line was shut down because Alcoa could not hold the labor. From May 11, 1944, to April 11, 1945, Alcoa failed to produce at this line 33,000,000 pounds of metal.

d. All of the foregoing failures to produce metal add up to 274,000,000 pounds of metal. These failures may be fairly attributed to Alcoa's labor policies and the ineffective measures adopted by the Federal war agencies concerned. And these failures exceed the 250,000,000 pounds of aluminum which the Metals Reserve Company contracted in March 1945, to buy from the Canadian Aluminum Co.

The committee will be interested to learn, I am sure, that currently the Troutdale plant, operated by Alcoa, and the labor union of that plant, are requesting a wage increase from the War Labor Board amounting to about 7 cents an hour on the basic wage. This proposed action was being discussed during the week April 16–22. I think it speaks eloquently for itself in reply to any claim that wage rates at Troutdale have been sufficient to hold labor in the past.

In concluding, I think it only fair to make one observation. In the Northwest, Alcoa found itself up against a very high wage level established in the shipyards. This level was out of line with prewar wage rates and may have seemed to Alcoa as out of line for the postwar period. Alcoa operates plants throughout the country, and may have been concerned with the effects, on its other plants, of establishing very high wages in the Northwest. But Alcoa did find a similar problem when it came to buying electric

power. In the eastern plants it operated for the Government, it had to pay electric rates that were normally uneconomic. But it paid those high rates in order to produce aluminum.

It even arranged with the Defense Plant Corporation to obtain a refund from the D. P. C. for power costing more than 3 mills per kilowatt-hour in all the Government plants. If it made that kind of arrangement with D. P. C., why did it not try to make a similar arrangement if it felt that it should not be asked to permanently pay very high wage rates in the Northwest. Why should Alcoa have distinguished between rates for electricity and rates for human labor? In either case, it should have been prepared to pay the rates necessary to get out the aluminum. The record shows that it did not.

I therefore repeat my observation that while Alcoa is largely responsible for the metal we are using to win this war, Alcoa's policies have not always been in the national interest. It is too dangerous to rely upon one company for so vital a war material. Government policy should correct this situation now that we have the opportunity through the disposal of the Government-owned plants.

In support of my statements I am attaching two pieces of evidence. The first is a press release issued by Mr. P. R. Schermerhowe, president of Local 338, United Steel Workers of America; the second, a letter written by Mr. Howard E. Endicott, of Vancouver, Wash., a former employee at the Alcoa Vancouver plant.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. SAVAGE.

Liquor Imports and Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, there are millions of persons in this country who feel that there is something virtuous, highly moral, and spiritually satisfying in the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. It has been heralded as a political Sermon on the Mount.

The pious platitudes in support of the trade-treaty program, printed at Government expense and widely distributed throughout the Nation to women's clubs, are noteworthy for what is suppressed rather than for what the documents contain. Not one word appears in all this propaganda, sent out to the good Christian men and women who are opposed to flooding this country with hard liquor from abroad, with reference to the reduction in tariffs on liquor.

The Congress, representing the sentiment of the temperate citizens, has from time to time placed a high duty on whisky, rum, gin, brandy, cordials, bitters, champagne, and other liquors. These high rates of duty on liquors, enacted by Congress, kept the flow of foreign whisky, gin, and other liquors from flooding the United States.

The petitions from the people protesting against the evil, especially against permitting the liquor traffic in and around our military camps, have been presented to the Congress by the thousands.

Instead of respecting public opinion on this question, as Congress had done by enacting high rates of duty to keep foreign liquor out of this country, the administration ignored public opinion and secretly entered into trade treaties with foreign countries reducing the duty on liquors, as follows:

Articles	Rate changed	Modified rate
	Per proof gallon	*Per proof gallon*
Whisky of all types	$5	$2.50
Rum:		
Cuban	4	2.50
Other than Cuban	5	2.50
Gin	5	2.50
Brandy	5	2.50
Cordials, etc	5	2.50
Bitters containing spirits	5	2.50
	Per gallon	*Per gallon*
Champagne	$6	$3.00

This lowered the floodgates for liquors, and even with the shortage of ships to fight the war, there seems to be space in some of them to import booze.

The average annual importation of liquors during the period 1931 to 1935 was 8,590,000 gallons. This was before the Trade Treaty Act. Under the Trade Treaty Act, the average yearly importation has amounted to 17,907,000 gallons. For the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive, under the New Deal trade-treaty program, a total of 89,537,000 gallons of liquor were imported.

Was this lowering of duties on whisky, gin, and other liquors done in the open? Not at all. Did any one of the millions of persons, urging Congress to suppress the traffic in and around military camps rather than increase it, have an opportunity to be heard? They did not. Did foreigners sit in on this secret conclave when the revenue was being bartered away and the liquor barrier was being lowered? Yes, the representatives from 26 foreign countries sat in this liquor huddle, but millions of American citizens and their elected representatives were denied a voice in the formulation or consummation of these trade treaties. I say that such a procedure is un-American; it invites the practice of deception, intrigue, and fraud.

What I have said with reference to the star-chamber methods of procedure in reference to liquor applies to the vital interests of agriculture, industry, and labor.

The Cotton South and the Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cotton South is deeply interested in the action which Congress will take on the Bretton Woods agreement as outlined in H. R. 2211. The future of our Cotton Belt is closely interwoven with what we do to carry into effect the proposed Bretton Woods agreement, which will also be considered at the San Francisco Conference. A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Memphis Cotton Exchange was set out in a letter from the secretary of that organization to me, which, under leave granted, I am filing herewith as part of my remarks:

MEMPHIS COTTON EXCHANGE,
MEMPHIS, TENN., *April 23, 1945.*

Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZIMMERMAN: At the last regular meeting of the board of directors of the Memphis Cotton Exchange the subject of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, as outlined in H. R. 2211, was discussed at length, after which the following statement, outlining the position of the Memphis spot cotton trade, was unanimous adopted:

"We, the officers and directors of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, recognizing that the early passage by Congress of H. R. 2211 is of vital importance to the essential expansion of world trade, and to the accomplishment of lasting peace—do unanimously approve the Bretton Woods proposals and call upon our Senators and Congressmen to lend their most vigorous support to their adoption.

"Ours is the largest spot cotton market in the world. As cotton is the major export commodity of the United States, we believe that experience qualifies us to say that if the Bretton Woods proposals are not speedily accepted by our Government all plans and aspirations for creating a stable, lasting peace will be frustrated.

"Experience and reason both prove that no body politic can long remain healthy and vigorous without the fundamental support of adequate, free-flowing trade, which in turn depends upon a sound and reliable monetary system."

We consider this bill of major importance and your valued assistance and most vigorous support toward its adoption is respectfully urged.

Yours very truly,

A. H. BOWERS,
Executive Vice President and Secretary.

Ray McLain Draws Praise From Newsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Daily Oklahoman reprinting a tribute paid to Oklahoma's fighting civilian soldier, Maj. Gen. Ray McLain. General McLain has distinguished himself on every front in the European theater of war, and his rise to the command of the Nineteenth Army Corps undoubtedly places him as one of the outstanding civilian soldiers of World War No. 2.

The noted war correspondent for the AP, Wes Gallagher, has recognized this

distinguished record as shown by the following article:

RAY M'LAIN DRAWS PRAISE FROM NEWSMAN

The Associated Press wires last week carried a tribute to Maj. Gen. Ray McLain, banker-soldier who heads the Nineteenth Army Corps.

A story by Wes Gallagher from the western front, said:

"A small, business-like banker has established himself as one of the top-flight American generals in the United States Ninth Army's dash from Rhine to the Elbe.

"He is Maj. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, in peacetime an Oklahoma City banker and the only National Guard general in the American Army to reach the rank of corps commander.

"McLain * * * was given the dual task of meeting the First Army to close the Ruhr pocket and at the same time push at top speed for the Elbe. He had to go in two directions at once.

"At one time advance spearheads of his two wings were fighting more than 125 miles apart. Both his flanks were exposed when he reached the Elbe because the corps on each flank had not been able to keep pace with the Nineteenth.

"The Nineteenth Corps, with the Second Armored and Thirtieth and Eighty-third Infantry Divisions, reached the river days before other American or British forces.

"Genial and seldom perturbed, McLain * * * spends more hours in a jeep than any other general on the front. Every hour during daylight he travels about the front from division to division seeing for himself. At night he conducts staff work."

Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the National Republican Club Bulletin dated March 27, 1945, concerning Yalta as it relates to Poland and its relation to Russia:

YALTA

We are very happy to note that some Republicans in Congress have had the courage to take a definite stand on our foreign policy and world cooperation. The statements of Senator VANDENBERG on world cooperation and on the Yalta agreement have justly merited the attention and approval of many of our citizens.

Much good has been accomplished at Yalta, and some of the decisions made are a step in the right direction. However, we hope that the Yalta agreement will be followed by one in which not only the Big Three but also the smaller nations participate as equals and that no small nation is treated unjustly. Only in this manner can we justify the heroic sacrifices made by American boys on the battle fronts of the world.

Among the nations whose sons and daughters have given their lives for the cause of freedom is Poland.

In September 1939, when most of us in this country were living in normalcy and in the spirit of happy isolation, when the American Communists paraded in Times Square and chanted "The Yanks are not coming," when some of the nations of Europe surrendered to Hitler with little or no fight, there was one brave nation who staked and sacrificed all for the cause of freedom. Just as in the Middle Ages, when the hordes of mongols overran eastern and most of central Europe, when the Russian princes paid homage and tribute to the Tartar lords, and civilization was saved by the brave Polish nation; just as in 1683, when the Turks and the Tartars were about to destroy the western civilization at Vienna and the brave Polish soldiers lifted the siege, defeated the barbarians, and saved Europe again, so in 1939, Poland, without adequate weapons, defied and fought Hitler.

Poland was encouraged to fight by the promise of Britain and France that they would fight for her independence and the inviolability of her boundaries. After weeks of bitter fighting, during which Polish cities and villages were devastated, hundreds of thousands of Poles killed, Poland went down in defeat and then the massacre in German-occupied Poland continued systematically.

Although in each country occupied by Hitler, a collaborationist regime was established, Hitler could not find in Poland a Petain, a Laval, a Degrelle, or a Quisling, and no Polish collaborationist regime was established. However, thousands of Poles succeeded in escaping from Poland and under the leadership of the Polish Government, which fled from Warsaw to London, they established valiant armies that bled and fought courageously on the sands of Libya, at Cassino, at Bastogne, and many other places. When Britain's Air Force was still in the process of development, the Polish eagles of the air were often spoken of gratefully by Mr. Churchill and other British leaders.

When Hitler invaded Russia, it is our recollection that Russia promised to guarantee Poland's independence. The Russian people have rendered a great service to humanity. Without their valiant fight, the Rhine would not yet have been crossed, without them, Hitler might have won—without them, and their victory, there probably would be no Poland at all. No doubt some adjustments in Poland's eastern boundary are justifiable, but we cannot see the justice in making a decision as to Poland's future and boundaries without the participation of the Polish Government in London, which is the only one that has been recognized by us. We hope that the Russian people can be persuaded to be magnanimous and help to the best of their ability to give to the Poles, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians, whom their heroic armies liberated from Nazi oppression, a new birth of true freedom.

MacArthur Came Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the successful and heroic recapture of the Philippines by Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the armed forces of the United States has prompted Miss Mattie Richards Tyler, a Washington poet, of 3945 Connecticut Avenue NW., to write a poem entitled "MacArthur Came Through."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including Miss Tyler's poem, as follows:

MAC ARTHUR CAME THROUGH

Just a night and a host of stars,
Men imprisoned behind walls and bars,
Women and children far from home,
Captives, exiles, with thoughts that roam
To food for the body, food for the soul,
Clothes to cover (clean and whole),
Loved ones, fireside, comfortable bed,
Music to solace, books to be read!

Just a night and a host of stars,
Filth and hunger and prison bars!
What was the promise MacArthur gave?
That he would come back one day and save
Those of us who were left behind.
MacArthur will come; he is just that kind.
We must have faith, be unafraid;
MacArthur has promised to come with aid.

Three long years since the Philippines fell
And we were plunged into darkest hell;
Three long years since the Death March rang
A challenge above war's din and clang;
Three long years since MacArthur bowed
To superior orders, but solemnly vowed;
"I came through, and I shall return!"
For 3 long years those words were to burn
In the gallant heart of him who spoke—
A man of purpose who inspired and awoke
Those who obeyed his every command,
Knowing the strength of his mind and hand.

Just a night, another dark night,
And 3 long years since that last grim fight!
Some have died, the rest have grown gaunt,
Men and women and children in want!
What is that pounding against the prison?
Have the dead awakened? have they arisen?
Oh, to break down these prison bars!
Dear God, what is that illumined by stars?
I am mad, I have cracked; it cannot be true,
I'm losing my mind, I'm finished, I'm through!
Then out of the darkness, clear as a bell:
"It's the Yanks! It's the Yanks! We are here. All is well!"

Just a night and a host of stars,
The Yanks have crashed through the prison bars;
From cell to cell they fight their way,
As the Japs fall back and right holds sway.
The Yanks have come, Oh, God is good!
MacArthur came through! We knew he would.
Just a night, but our hearts soar high
As the Stars and Stripes salute the sky;
And when morning comes the world will learn
That MacArthur meant: "I shall return!"

—*Mattie Richards Tyler.*

The Needs of the Republican River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the time I have been a member of this Congress, I have on frequent occasions called attention to the needs of the Republican River Valley.

In 1935 a terrible flood occurred, taking the lives of 110 people in the district which I now have the honor to serve. To this day, not one bit of construction has actually started. We need not only flood protection, but we need to save our soil and we must have supplemental water. A program of flood control and irriga-

tion will bring about the saving of our soil.

The people of the Republican River V .lley are intelligent, hard-working, and thrifty individuals. They need a program of water conservation to stabilize their economy and make them prosperous. This will repay the Government manyfold.

The statistics show that in addition to the fact that the farmers who use the water pay for the project, that on Federal irrigation projects the annual taxes collecetd amount to approximately 5 percent of the cost of the project. Farm land without sufficient water does not produce income sufficient for any great amount of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks a petition signed by members of the fifty-eighth session of the Nebraska State Legislature. The petition is as follows:

To Senators BUTLER and WHERRY and Congressmen CURTIS, STEFAN, BUFFETT, and MILLER:

We, the undersigned, members of the fifty-eighth session of the Nebraska State Legislature, commend the United States Army engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Agriculture, and all other Federal agencies for the over-all plan for development of the Republican River drainage basin; that we express our confidence in the ability of the Federal Government and its present agencies to develop this plan; and that we urge construction in accordance with the plans as drafted by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as approved by the Congress of the United States. Time will prove whether an authority is necessary for its operation.

Ed Hoyt, Arthur Carmody, Daniel Garber, H. L. Pizer, Fay Wood, Carl P. Jeffords, Lester H. Anderson, Earl J. Lee, Don E. Hanna, Edwin Schultz, William A. Crossland, William Hern, James A. Ryan, Harry F. Burnham, John F. Doyle, Ernest C. Raasch, Sidney J. Cullingham, Walter R. Raecke, Fred Seaton, C. Petrus Peterson, Tom Dooley, Sam Klaver, Thomas H. Adams, Lloyd Kain, C. N. Ogden, D. H. Cronin, Joseph C. Reavis, Ladd J. Hubka, D. W. Burney, Charles F. Tvrdik, A. J. Brodahl, H. P. Heiliger, J. E. Conklin, John E. Mekota, R. A. Babcock, Frank Sorrell, Harry A. Foster, James H. Anderson.

Well Played

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the House to the recent editorial from the Daily Oklahoman on the death of State Senator Fidler.

Senator Fidler was one of the outstanding members of the State legislature for 16 years and served with distinction with several Members of the present United States Congress, including Representatives ROSS RIZLEY, PAUL STEWART, JED JOHNSON, and BILL STIGLER.

His passing is a distinct and profound loss to the State of Oklahoma.

WELL PLAYED

Rarely does a State possess so much civic strength and official talent that it can lose as good a man as Senator Fidler without suffering a real loss. Men who served with Fidler in the Oklahoma Senate and men who were acquainted with his official activities count him among the most efficient and faithful public servants the State has ever known. His 16 years in the senate covered some of the best years and some of the most sordid in the State's official history, and he retired from office with the profound respect of everyone who was acquainted with his career. He was a faithful servant of his district and his State, and in the hour of his passing there will be a unanimous verdict of commendation.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Justice for Poland" by our colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this, the one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, it is fitting that we pay tribute to Poland's contribution to the cause of humanity, and that we recognize the justness of the claims of her people for true representation at the San Francisco Conference.

At the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in 1939, brave Poland, after concluding an alliance with Great Britain, offered the first resistance to the then overwhelming strength of Hitler and his Nazi war machine. The epic struggle of Poland, shut off as she was from any real assistance by other powers, will live forever. The heroism of Poland inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world and brought home to them the Axis threat to civilization. By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack by Hitler on France and England, who were unprepared. Had Poland compromised, instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed. Instead of the present anticipated total military victory in Europe for the United Nations, the war might have been won by Hitler long before now.

After Poland was overrun by the enemy, her forces rallied in the defense of France. Polish units served with valor in north Africa, while the Polish Air Force added strength to the R. A. F. over Europe.

It is our solemn duty to befriend the nation which has done so much for us and for humanity. The people of Poland were the first to bear arms. Certainly, their government should be truly representative of the people who fought the brave fight and made the sacrifices.

The prospect for a just and lasting peace depends not only upon mutual understanding and good faith as between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, but, equally important, it is necessary that all nations, great and small, be given the consideration which they merit to the end that they shall have confidence in the justness of the framework upon which the peace is to be built. That framework is now being laid at San Francisco. If the people of Poland are satisfied that those who speak for them in establishing the framework are truly their representatives in a Polish provisional government of national unity as envisioned by the pledge of the Yalta declaration, we will have gone far in attaining our objectives.

Government Need of Private Brain Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by me entitled "Government Needs Its Private Brain Power," which was published in the May issue of Forbes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT NEEDS ITS PRIVATE BRAIN POWER

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

One of the most refreshing influences on Government during this war has been the influx of dollar-a-year men and other captains and lieutenants of industry, labor, and agriculture. These men have spearheaded much-needed minor revolutions in many emergency and old-line Federal agencies. Into the ponderous maze of bureaucracy they have brought crisp, efficient, hard-hitting brain power. Accustomed to the most modern management techniques of private enterprise, to streamlined organizations, direct and terse communications, clear-cut personnel policies, etc., they have made short shrift of many of the archaic traditions of Government departments.

For a long time they had been on the receiving end of voluminous questionnaires, discourteous orders, arbitrary restrictions, tardy instructions, and incomprehensible counsel from Government. So it was only natural that they would reform their authority-mad bureaucratic underlings.

BUSINESS VERSUS BUREAUCRACY

They had kept their own enterprises in the black, met pay rolls, paid out stiff individual and corporate taxes. So it was only natural that they would sound a loud note of economy in the symphony of Federal extravagance.

They had beaten private production dead lines, ended bottlenecks, constantly improved product standards and specifications. So it was only natural that they would do expert trouble shooting and efficiently improvise against the ever-changing needs of the military situation.

They had perfected salesmanship, refined merchandising, polished public relations. So it was only natural that they would enlist in the war effort the wholehearted aid of the press, the radio, and the motion pictures, and would help to keep the general public as a gracious and willing customer for war appeals.

They had risen in their own corporations, unions and associations, by dint of perspiration and inspiration, foresight, hindsight,

and insight. So it was only natural that they would recruit staffs of Federal officials of similar competence and shelve the old fuddy-duds who had risen to high government position through mere seniority.

Of course, some of these good will and good work ambassadors from private enterprise could not "take to" the Federal Government, and sooner or later resigned. Of course, most of them did not receive a free hand, but were hamstrung at every turn in their enlightened efforts toward public service. Of course, they were often abused by the synthetic thinkers of the Left through smear accusations of alleged complicity with their former concerns.

But, luckily for the Nation, a large number of these cracker-jack executives stuck it out in the Federal service. They bore the taunts, the ridicule, and the lack of thanks for their financial and other sacrifices.

The living testimonial to the work to which they have so ably contributed is the niagara of food, ships, planes, and other matériel which has flooded out to the far-flung battle fronts. Now, however, with the war in Europe happily approaching a close, many of these men are yielding to their natural desire to resume their former connections. Already, many have returned to their former posts.

They are, of course, receiving little encouragement from the Government, as a whole, to do otherwise. Yet the tremendous production needs of the war in the Pacific still requires their wizardry. And even after victory in the Far East there will be important domestic battles which will require their services in government.

These men will be needed as never before in the war for prosperity. They will be needed to cooperate with their fellows in industry, labor, and agriculture to insure the conditions essential to prosperity, such as speedy reconversion, the progressive relaxation of Federal controls, assistance in community planning, streamlined reduction of Federal bureaucracy, maintenance of demand at high levels, etc.

NEEDED NOW

Moreover, they will be needed for the impact they may bring to bear toward basic beneficial changes in Federal policy. Such changes would include: The return to the States and localities of powers properly within their jurisdiction and the revision of the current widespread notion that government exists to support the people, rather than that government should be supported by the people.

Now, therefore, is the time to encourage these executives to stand by their economic battle stations until the afore-mentioned battles are won. The welfare of the Nation—that of its 12,000,000 service men and women, its millions of demobilized war workers, and everyone else—demands that these men be permitted and stimulated to continue their grand job. Let government retain within the public service its gold mine of private brain power.

Palestine's Place in the New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I as unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Palestine's Place in the New World," delivered by Louis Bromfield at a dinner sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America, in New York City, March 18, 1945, to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the creation of the Jewish Legion in World War No. 1.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE'S PLACE IN THE NEW WORLD

I am glad to be here tonight on the occasion honoring Colonel Patterson, so valiant a fighter for so many years in behalf of the cause of the Jewish people and that of a Free Jewish Palestine. By comparison my own interest and activity is recent, although I believe it to be no less sincere.

The cause of Palestine, like that of India, is one which is not too well understood by the average American. It is not simply a Jewish question, or one which concerns Great Britain and Palestine alone. It is the responsibility of the whole of a world which has shrunk, in the generation immediately past, to a fifth or less of its present size. Whether we wish it or not, the American people are involved today in what happens in the most remote regions of the earth. It is no longer merely a question of being involved through aloof moral principle or abstract reasoning. What happens in the Balkans, in Indochina, in the Near East, affects immediately our interests in the world and even our economy at home.

DECLINE OF IMPERIALISM

Tonight I would like to speak concerning the place of a Free Jewish Palestine in the new world—that shrunken world which makes neighbors of all of us, that world in which there is no longer a place for great scattered empires exploited by three or four small nations. In this new world, the power, the dominance, political, economic, and military, will belong inevitably to those nations which occupy huge, self-contained areas of the earth's surface, with enormous natural resources and immense supplies of manpower for military, industrial, and agricultural purposes. It is those nations with which will lie the responsibility for prosperity, order, and peace. In that new world a solution must be found for India, for Palestine, for the remote islands and colonies of the Dutch and French empires. Who can believe that after this war the people of the British Commonwealth, the people of Russia, and the people of this Nation will be content to allow such problems as those of India and of Palestine to drag along, compromised and befuddled and exploited in the interests of a small nation, or even a small class, thousands of miles away? Who can believe that England, France, or Holland will return upon the same terms to the colonies of the East, swarming with people who by now no longer look upon the white man as either infallible or unconquerable.

It may be that I am stating all this too bluntly. If so, it is because, out of long experience at first hand with political and economic conditions in many parts of the earth, I am inclined to be a realist. I believe that perhaps the worst enemies of world peace and world government are those perfectionists and Utopians who expect a paradise on earth to emerge overnight in this confused and tortured world. No such thing will happen. If and when the paradise arrives, none of us will be living. Mankind has never progressed by utopian plans which an individual or a group sought to impose upon the rest of the world, but always slowly and painfully. It might almost be said that man's progress is only through necessity, the hard way. It might be said that this is the natural and immutable law.

In this new world before us, there lies an absolute necessity for realism. In this new world certain problems cry out for a solution upon sound and practical terms. Certain questions must be answered before we can hope for lasting peace or orderly government.

RUSSIAN REALISM

Russia and Stalin have shown by far the greatest understanding of what this new world is to be. They had laid and are laying their future plans along realistic lines based upon economic union among nations large and small over a vast area of the earth's surface. The policy of Great Britain is one dictated to her by the circumstances of history. It is always well to remember that Great Britain is not a single nation. She is three things—the British Isles, the Commonwealth of Nations, and the Colonies which comprise the Empire. Save by a return to the world as it was before 1939, the curious world institution known as Great Britain can no longer exist as a great united national force. Churchill, John Simon, Samuel Hoare and other imperialists would prefer a return to the world of before 1914, but this even the Tory recognizes as impossible.

BRITAIN'S "BURDEN"

It would be absurd to belittle the great courage, the great wisdom, the great leadership of Mr. Churchill in the time of England's crisis, but it would be equally absurd to overlook the fact, already forgotten by some, that Mr. Churchill has always been England's most stubborn Tory, its principal advocate of imperialism and the long-exploded Kipling philosophy of the white man's burden. Mr. Churchill was the most bitter opponent of the Irish settlement and of the Indian constitution. Today when he betrays Great Britain's promises to Palestine—when he prevents any settlement of the India question, when he intervenes in Greece, in Italy, in Belgium, he is not fighting in the interests of humanity or the establishment of a new and better world in which a lasting peace may be established—he is fighting with his back to the wall, to restore an old imperialist world which cannot be restored, a world in which the great advantages belonged not simply to the people of the British Isles but to a comparatively small class of that people.

AMERICA'S "ABSTENTION"

As for ourselves, our record, as determined by our Government in Washington, has been no better than that of Great Britain, perhaps worse, for it has been until now largely one of indirection and confusion, of compromise and bargaining, without any apparent direction. While making high-sounding declarations concerning freedom and democracy, we have compromised with Spain, with Vichy, even with Great Britain in utter contradiction to our proper ideals of democracy and government. Nowhere at any time can it be said that we have exerted the full weight of our enormous power and prestige to bring order, justice, and liberty into the creation of a better world. At times it has seemed indeed that our Government was more occupied with playing a game of intrigue in which the object of the opponents was to outsmart each other than with the establishment of sound principles and the foundations of a more decent world. In all history there is no greater example of aimlessness than the doctrine of abstention enunciated by our Secretary of State only to be denied and repudiated the next day.

NO ROOM FOR NONPRODUCTIVE POPULATIONS

How does all this affect the Palestine question? It affects it directly. Who in this room can doubt that if there had been firm and honest insistence from Washington that Palestine be opened to the pitiful hordes of mid-European and Balkan Jewish refugees, it would not have been done? We need to say now with complete honesty, "There is no such thing as Moslem unity. It is no

more than a shabby excuse to keep control of Palestine." I know personally many Indian Moslem leaders and their contempt is unbounded toward the greater part of the Moslem population of north Africa and parts of Arabia for the degraded practices which are loosely called Islamic. We need to say now, "If this crowded world is to advance, there can be no place in it for shiftless, nonproductive, half-bandit populations. Is it not better for the world that Palestine should belong outright to the Jews whose historic home it is, who have turned it from a desert into a blossoming and prosperous garden, than to a people who had reduced it over the centuries to a state of wretched poverty and banditry?" Have we not the right to ask why General Spears, an expert in devious ways, remains in the Near East, sent there to intrigue against the French and the Palestinian Jews who are the Allies of the British and ourselves? Who can doubt that but for oil and the proximity of the Near East to trade routes, the Arabs would long ago have been given the shrift?

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

In the new world—if it is what we hope it will be—if we are to have peace—there can be small place for old-fashioned imperialism. Our course as Americans is clear enough. Stalin has no doubts as to the course of Russia. Churchill's course is determined for him. We alone have the power and the opportunity to exert immense pressure toward the righting of many imperialistic wrongs. We cannot do it by "abstention." We cannot do it playing a game of old-fashioned political intrigue, and we cannot do it by issuing periodically political statements telling the Jews and the Christians affiliated with them that they are nice people and that some day somebody will do something about Palestine. The people of the United States deserve recognition in the world and in our own Government of their power of leadership as the most disinterested of all those nations working toward the goal of peace and decency in the world.

INDEPENDENCE PROTECTED BY FORCE

If the nations of the world accomplish nothing more than a vague structure, without power, without respect, imposed upon a world without regard for the facts and the fundamental rights of all nations, they will succeed no better than they succeeded at Versailles or at Geneva. We shall have once more only a world structure which becomes no more than a center of international intrigues and a center to foster imperialism and trample upon the rights of small nations and peoples. Self-determination coupled with wholesale freedom is not enough. Those of us who knew Europe well between the two wars know well the iniquities of such a doctrine. The rights and independence of small peoples must be guaranteed and protected by force if necessary.

In the establishment of a proper and effective structure of world government, the leadership lies naturally with the United States, the most powerful and what is more important, the most disinterested of nations. Until now we have failed to take that leadership. We have failed to insist that we do not return through a patchwork of compromise and intrigue to the tragic world before 1939, but to step forward and upward.

MANDATE SYSTEM VERSUS PEACE

In such an advance, justice and the rights of small nations like Palestine play a large role. There will be no peace so long as small nations are mandated to great nations whose fate is dependent upon the imperialistic exploitation of other peoples. Palestine is not the problem of any one nation. It is the problem of all nations, of all people, everywhere—interested in freedom, justice, and opportunity. In the new world there will be no place for backward, unproductive peoples artificially protected by imperialist nations. There will be a place only for peaceful, productive nations, contributing materially to the welfare of the world as a whole. In that category, Palestine has certainly earned a place. Indeed Palestine might well serve as a model. For that reason if for no other she merits the respect and protection of all those who sincerely seek the establishment of a decent world.

The U. S. S. "Oregon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Restore the Old *Oregon* as Patriotic Symbol" from the Argonaut of April 6, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTORE THE OLD "OREGON" AS PATRIOTIC SYMBOL

The *Oregon* of Spanish-American War fame had been fitted out as a national symbol by the pennies of school children. Following Pearl Harbor, someone in an excess of zeal for the collection of scrap iron, condemned the gallant ship, and after long behind the scenes debate it was towed out as junk to serve as a breakwater off the Hawaiian Islands. The scheme was as impractical as it was short-sighted and hysterical, and the splendid old hull, that the Spaniards could not sink, floats uselessly, but not forgotten. It should be returned in good condition to the children of Oregon State who paid to have it preserved as a national monument.

"The *Oregon*," writes Admiral H. E. Yarnell, "is one of our great historic ships. She was built in San Francisco by the Union Iron Works (now Bethlehem Steel), and no ship was ever better built. All of the ships built by that company were superbly constructed. * * *

"I think every naval officer has a deep affection for the ships on which he served, especially in his younger days. I joined the ship on June 19, 1897, at Esquimalt and was detached in March 1899 at Manila."

The following officers who served on the *Oregon* during her cruise from San Francisco to Cuba in 1898 are still living: Admiral J. M. Reeves, Rear Admiral Frank Lyon, Capt. R. Z. Johnston, Capt. C. R. Miller, Fleet Admiral W. D. Leahy, Vice Admiral C. S. Kempff, Admiral H. E. Yarnell. These are honorable names and they should be honored in their ship. They rolled around Cape Horn on a perilous voyage, 17,000 sea miles in 81 days, demonstrating in the suspenseful nation the need for the Panama Canal for the protection of two coasts, 3,500 miles apart.

On March 6, 1898, the battleship *Oregon*, commanded by Charles E. Clark, was ordered to leave Seattle, sail around Cape Horn, and join the Atlantic Fleet. While off the Chilean coast, on April 30, Captain Clark was notified that a state of war existed between the United States and Spain, and he was ordered to make all possible speed to the Cuban shores, on forced draft. On May 25, after the completion of this remarkable voyage, that famous ship the *Oregon* steamed in the lead of all the Atlantic Fleet, fighting the Battle of Santiago, preventing the escape of the *Vizcaya* and the *Cristobal Colon*, in the action which decided the Spanish-American War.

That is history.

National spirit depends on the preservation of historical appreciation. What children see and visit, they remember. To glory in their country's flag, they should view it not as the symbol of a vague abstraction, but as a banner of honor which has floated in hours of peril over buildings and forts and ships. Children should know that the story of their country began long before they were born, and that a price in courage was paid for all that they enjoy.

We believe that as a matter of national honor the *Oregon* should be restored. The rusting of the *Oregon* indicates a decadence in our patriotic perspective. If the *Oregon* does not matter, there are a lot of other values, of which she is a symbol, which will too soon be of slight popular concern.

In restoring the *Oregon* the Navy Department, supported by the Congress, shall have the opportunity of demonstrating to the heroes of this generation that it is not the American way to forget them in the next.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two matters relating to the San Francisco Conference, and in connection with them, and as introductory thereto, I should like to read two or three paragraphs from an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, containing a quotation from Alexis de Tocqueville, published in 1835, as follows:

OUR LINK WITH RUSSIA

When Alexis de Tocqueville in 1835 published the first volume of his monumental study, Democracy in America, he ended the book with the following amazingly prophetic words:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. * * *

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

This must have seemed a wild statement at that time, and for many years thereafter. When the French political scientist wrote, America was a youthful Republic, its President the frontiersman and fighter, Andrew Jackson. Russia was ruled by Czar Nicholas I, an absolute monarch who gave his people few if any liberties.

Today the prophecy of 110 years ago is being brilliantly fulfilled. The two great nations have proved not only to tend toward the same end, but to be well on the way to achieving it. Their progress toward that

end—the smashing of Nazi power and the creation of enduring peace—has been recorded in the headlines for months past. Momentarily the tangible symbol of that epochal cooperation is expected in the joining of their military forces in the heart of Hitler's empire.

I ask that following that there be printed an editorial entitled "Pandora's Box at U. N. C. I. O.," from the Washington Post of May 1, 1945, and the column Today and Tomorrow, by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANDORA'S BOX AT U. N. C. I. O.

(The following editorial was wired before the afternoon (Washington time: evening) plenary session at which Argentina was formally admitted to the Conference after Molotov's press and public protests.)

SAN FRANCISCO, Monday.—Intrigue of the most egregious variety seems to have been going on at San Francisco at the hands of the bush-league diplomats of the State Department headed by Secretary Stettinius. The intrigue has centered on Argentina. Under the Yalta agreement, as generally understood, Farrell's Argentina hasn't even the shadow of a pretext for asking a ticket of admission to this Conference. The understanding was that invitees should comprise the United Nations plus a specified list of associated powers, provided they declared war by March 1. Argentina wasn't on the specified list. Argentina didn't declare war until March 27. Yet the State Department, which has been insisting rightly upon the integrity of the Yalta agreements and invoking the memory of President Roosevelt to sanctify those agreements, has actually jimmied the Conference open so that Farrell's Argentines, who are supposed to be waiting at Los Angeles for the expected call, can be admitted. In the meantime the State Department has been sedulously spreading the rumor that the agitation arose among the Latins and that they could not restrain it.

The intrigue would be disgraceful even if conducted by master hands. At the hands of the amateurs of the State Department, this kind of blundering is worse than criminal, for the consequences may be grievous. First, as one delegate put it, any tampering with the Yalta understandings undermines the very structure of the San Francisco Conference. A moral blow has been administered to this Conference, in other words, which cannot yet be assessed. Already the cynical comment is being heard, "It will be Franco's turn next." Secondly, what has happened about Argentina has prejudiced our relations at this Conference with Soviet Russia.

It is understood that Molotov is honestly amazed at the inexpertness and disingenuousness of the week-end play as pulled upon the Russians. On Saturday their proposal for seats for the Ukraine and White Russia was submitted to the steering committee. It was accepted, except that at the seemingly formal suggestion of Colombia the names were referred to the inner executive committee for preparation of proper official invitations. Argentina wasn't mentioned. The steering committee, testifying to an accomplished fact, actually went on to confer on Molotov's further request that the Ukraine and White Russia should be given chairmanships on the subcommittees of the working commissions. Over the week end Argentina popped out of the shadows. And this morning Argentina was brought up alongside White Russia and the Ukraine which Molotov thought had been admitted.

It was a crude device and it aroused Molotov's ire in hair-raising fashion. During the storm Molotov referred to the week-end intrigue, protested against the bracketing of the war-making Ukraine and White Russia with the Fascist Farrelites among the peace-loving nations, and threw huge anti-Argentine chunks of Mr. Hull's and President Roosevelt's speeches and notes at the heads of the little Machiavellis of our State Department.

Molotov cannot think of this week-end's offensive work as anything but stupidity. He must know that at this crucial period of world history we consider that nothing is more precious after the maintenance of our principles than the preservation of the wartime community of interest between Moscow and Washington. All he can conclude is that incompetence has taken hold of our foreign relations. However, Molotov is not averse to playing poker with men who compared with him, didn't even know the rudiments of the game. Some sharp trading must now be expected along with constitution making, and, let warning be pondered, today's proceedings have given the Russians a mountain of chips.

On Saturday the head of the American delegation was told that the high purposes of this great convention might be tarnished by a riot of speculation on deals over tickets of admission. He must have known the damage that was being done by the "monkey business." If he didn't, his eyes have been opened and his ears have been reddened by today's proceedings.

Another "victory" of this sort and we may have to call for the undertaker. It is time for the President to call a halt to this foolishness and return the American delegation to its job, which is to frame a constitution for the world of peace-loving nations, lest Mr. Stettinius seek to follow up his "victory" by trying to score another in behalf of Franco. The idea of allowing Argentina to come between us and the Russians could not have been entertained if statesmanship had not taken a week-end holiday at San Francisco.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

MONDAY'S SHOWDOWN

SAN FRANCISCO.—When Mr. Stettinius mounted the rostrum and demanded an immediate vote on the admission of Argentina, he adopted a line of conduct which, if it becomes our regular line, will have the most dangerous consequences. M. Molotov had asked for more time in which to seek a diplomatic settlement. The question before the plenary session was whether to grant this request. It was not whether Argentina is a Fascist state and, therefore, more or less eligible to membership than the unreconstructed Warsaw Government, or than the Ukrainian and White Russians Republics. The question was whether these issues about which the Allies disagree should continue to be dealt with by diplomacy which aims at agreement or should be settled abruptly by an open test of political power in the form of a showdown vote.

On this question Mr. Stettinius, to the astonishment and dismay of every experienced observer I have talked with, took the position that his diplomacy was exhausted and that there must be a show-down. He got the show-down and he won. But when he examines the result, he will wish he had paused long enough to realize what he was doing.

The debate itself was a clear warning not to force a show-down that afternoon. After M. Molotov had asked for more time, there were five speeches. One was by M. Spaak, of Belgium, who supported the plea for time to seek a diplomatic settlement. The other four were by Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and the United States. All four demanded an immediate show-down by vote. Thus the only countries which demanded a show-down were in the Western Hemisphere. No European country, no British Empire country, no Asiatic country argued for the American demand. That should have been enough to make Mr. Stettinius pause.

The first vote, which was the crucial one because it dealt with the question of diplomacy or a show-down vote, was carried by a majority composed of the American and British Nations. Of the Big Five who are to be permanent members of the security council, only Britain supported the United States. France and China did not support us. And the Soviet Union, of course, was opposed. Moreover, with the exception of the Netherlands, not one single liberated country of Europe supported us. Mr. Stettinius carried the vote by a large majority, because the British Empire Nations, except New Zealand, alined themselves with the American Republics. The combination had a lot of votes, but, unhappily, the nations which did not support us were the very ones with whom, through whom, and by whom peace, when it is made, will have to be maintained.

The United States, it is said, was compelled to force the issue, because the Latin-American Republics insisted upon the admission of Argentina as the price of their agreeing to the Yalta decision to admit the Ukraine and White Russia. They had the votes, nearly half the votes in the Conference, and they exercised their political power.

If this is what happened, the American republics were badly advised. For in using their voting strength at the outset in order to force liberated Europe and the Soviet Union to accept a country with so bad a war record as Argentina, they have called attention dramatically to the fact that the voting power of the Americas is out of all proportion to their political weight in the world and to their contributions to security in fighting this war or in preventing another.

The vote in the Conference on Tuesday was a preview of where power will reside in the general assembly. Let us not have any illusions that the Soviet Union, that France, or the other important continental countries which are near to Germany, will vest in such an assembly any real authority in matters affecting their vital interests. The assembly may be based on the sovereign equality of states but, as the events of Tuesday demonstrated, it will be dominated by the American Republics with the help of British votes whenever the United States draws upon its political credit in the British countries.

Moreover, the event will diminish the authority of the whole organization. For what Mr. Stettinius demonstrated, quite unintentionally no doubt, was that the mechanism of this organization can be used to short-circuit diplomatic agreement among the leading powers, that in the hands of men who lack experience and wisdom and are impatient and not objective, it may not reinforce diplomacy but destroy diplomacy. As a result the powers will be more than ever determined to keep the things that really matter most to them away from the organization. For matters of great moment must be handled not by show-down, roll calls, "victories"—God save the mark—but by diplomacy which is based, as Field Marshal Smuts put it so sagely in his address, on the intention to make the right of unanimity, to operate as "a duty to unanimity."

The first week of the Conference has shown that the United Nations are not yet ready to dispense with the kind of authoritative guidance which Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin supplied. Their unity still depends on the heads of states; it cannot yet be left to subordinate officials, even such high ones as foreign ministers, who so quickly tend to become enmeshed with controversies their departments specialize in, and to lose sight of the forest for the trees.

When M. Molotov leaves, as he will shortly, the Prime Minister and the President will

need to talk seriously with Marshal Stalin so that together they may find ways to steady and guide the very uncertain management of this Conference.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution authorizing an investigation of the Office of Price Administration to determine whether or not the actual operation of the price-control and rationing program has been fair, impartial, and equitable in its administration and enforcement, and whether or not the regulations governing price control and rationing were fair and equitable as written.

In the past few days two reports have been issued showing the necessity for curtailment of available civilian supplies of food in the United States—one by Judge Rosenman, and the other by Leo T. Crowley, as Chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee on Foreign Shipments. Both of these reports indicate that a further curtailment of civilian supplies will be necessary in the year 1945, and thereafter in order to assist in fulfilling the requirements of the Army and some foreign needs.

We cannot conscientiously ask the people of the United States to accept a further curtailment in civilian commodities unless we can definitely assure them that the regulations under which they are operating are fairly, impartially, and equitably written and administered.

It has been fairly well established by testimony before the House Food Investigating Committee that the regulations upon meat have not been fairly and equitably written, and also that the enforcement and administration of the regulations have not been equitable nor impartial in practical application.

On March 1, 1945, I entered into the RECORD a statement outlining the inequitable administration and enforcement proceedings in the handling of institutional users' allotments in the Cincinnati district, and I now find that I have evidence of further abuse in this respect in the same district and which in some cases reaches into the regional office of OPA at Cleveland, Ohio. In the city of Dayton, which is administered by the Cincinnati district and the Cleveland regional office, we have a case where an intermediary meat distributor who was charged on six counts, with a maximum possible penalty of $15,000 and 3 years, was actually fined $500 and no civil action for the recovery of the alleged overcharge was ever taken by the OPA.

Another meat case in Dayton, Ohio, which resulted in an indictment before a grand jury on 12 counts, with a possible penalty of a $60,000 fine and 12 years' imprisonment, ended with a $500 fine to the principal involved and a $1,000 fine to the agent, and no civil action has ever been taken to recover the overcharges involved. The investigation of this case was extensive and exhaustive, and the prosecution was furnished with invoices and checks showing the overcharge.

In a banana case handled in the Cincinnati district the investigation covered 5 weeks and involved an operation which handled over 1,000,000 pounds annually; it resulted in an overcharge showing of over $23,000. The complete investigation was reported to the Cincinnati office November 1, 1944, and on April 1, 1945, this case was sent back to Dayton for reinvestigation.

Rumors are current that a rent-control case against a Dayton hotel and a rent-control case against a Columbus hotel have not been pushed to hearings because the Cleveland office had requested that no action be taken.

A newspaper ad tie-in with soap sales was completely investigated in Springfield in December 1943 and reported to Cincinnati at that time, but no action was taken.

These items indicate the need for explanation regarding the lack of prompt enforcement measures on relatively big cases. On small cases the Cincinnati district will send out notices to alleged violators ordering them to send their checks for $50 in to Cincinnati despite the fact that the man charged with the violation had no opportunity to meet his accuser nor defend himself.

In matters of price control I find evidence that a canning plant which produced tomato puree in the reason of 1944 is up to this time without an authorized ceiling price, and the commodity is in storage awaiting final determination of the proper price. This plant is a small plant; and in all cases where large plants are involved there is evidence that the price allotted is higher than the one which is in negotiation for this small plant.

The limits upon personal investigation are such as to prohibit full and complete documentary evidence upon charges of this kind, and the only way in which the matter can be thoroughly examined and the facts brought to the surface is by a complete and thorough examination of the files of the Office of Price Administration. It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution asking that such investigation be authorized.

The recent statement by the President of the United States, to wit: "Irresponsible criticism should not be permitted to break down the confidence of the people in an essential wartime program and hard-working wartime agency," has my sincere approval. I hope that nothing will interfere with the continued operation of price control and rationing of scarce commodities. However, any such program which is not completely fair and equitable is contrary to the concept of American government, and the only way that we can determine whether or not the criticisms are irresponsible is to obtain testimony under oath regarding the alleged inequitable and unfair regulations or administration and enforcement of such regultaions.

The resolution is offered for the purpose of determining:

First. Whether or not the acts of the Price Control Division have been fair and equitable in application upon all persons engaged in similar enterprises.

Second. Whether the rationing program developed by the Rationing Division has been fair equitable to all persons, business enterprises, or others engaged in business in the United States.

Third. Whether the rent control regulations have been fair and equitable to renters and owners of property.

Fourth. Whether the Legal Division and the Enforcement Division administered such regulations of price, rent, and rationing in a fair and equitable manner.

Fifth. Whether the Administrative, Management, and Planning Divisions have operated in a fair and equitable manner toward the citizens of the United States.

Sixth. Whether the Field Administration Division, through its regional and district offices, has handled the various price, rent, and rationing regulations in a fair and equitable manner.

Seventh. Whether the War Price and Rationing boards in the local communities have administered the various price, rent, and rationing regulations in a fair and equitable manner.

Eighth. Where the individual responsibility rests for any unfairness or inequity in such administration.

The resolution is directed to the administration and division of the available civilian supplies within the United States and the control of prices thereon. It does not concern itself with the allocation of commodities among the Army, our allies, liberated countries, and the civilians within the United States. The resolution is concerned simply with determining whether or not the effect of the regulations, as administered and enforced, has been fair and equitable in all respects.

Pay Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today in favor of a raise for our good and faithful Federal employees, who have done such a magnificent job during the past years and have received such little recognition for their services. We all know the cost of living has advanced very materially, and yet we find that the postal employees have received no basic pay increase for 20 years. They get the same pay they did in 1925, except for a $300 annual cost-of-living bonus, which has been paid for only 2 years. Under existing law, even this bonus cannot be paid after June 30, 1945.

Nobody outside the armed services has done a better job during this war than these same postal employees. The Postal

Service has moved an ever-increasing volume of mail. They have found time to sell War bonds and stamps. They delivered the ration books, helped register aliens, and a host of other wartime services. The Postal Service is not exempt from the draft and has contributed a great percentage of its members to the fighting forces, now scattered over the many fronts. Their big job has been done by a short-handed staff.

In a voluntary appearance before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a few weeks ago, I stated very frankly that I think these worthy postal groups should be given increases in pay and other proper recognition. These are long overdue. I have also appeared before the representatives of most of the postal groups in the Pittsburgh area and have pledged them my vote and whatever influence I may have for the passage of H. R. 2071 (reported as H. R. 3035). I now repeat this pledge and will support any reasonable amendments designed to adequately compensate these faithful public servants. This bill does not correct all inequalities but in the main it does provide the basic raise, and the reclassification which has been awaited by anxious employees and their families for many years.

In my maiden speech I pointed out to Congress and to the various Government departments that members of the armed forces feel that it is not too much to ask a Government employee to do a full day's work for a full day's pay. When we do see a group of employees giving that full day's measure of work and more without complaint, and efficiently operating their department of the Government at a profit, we should recognize such full day's work by giving them proper increases to make the full day's pay to which they are rightfully entitled.

Flood Threat and the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 18, 1945:

FLOOD THREAT AND THE ANSWER

Again the spring floods are threatening as they threatened last year and for many other springs through the decades of the past. The floods aren't so widespread, now, but this is only April. The big difference this year is the definite hope for the future.

The flood-control bill passed last December included the Army engineers' complete plan for harnessing the Missouri floodwaters. The series of great dams on the Missouri River and its tributaries, the long-awaited flood walls and levees are now in the accepted program of the United States Government. The Army engineers are already at work on the details. Vast basin-wide construction can start as soon as the war emergency ends. It won't help us this spring. There can't be much help by next spring. But it is good to feel that the tinkering years are over. The Federal Government has said complete flood protection is just a question of time to finish the war and then build. It is ready to start.

There is only one "if" in the picture. At the very time of another flood threat, the United States Senate is holding hearings on the Murray bill to repeal the part of the Flood Control Act that applies to the Missouri Basin. It would wipe out the plans the Army engineers have developed through years of study. It would stop all construction for another 2 years. It would set up a board of three men called the Missouri Valley Authority and let those men start over—from scratch. They could completely revise the Army engineer plan or throw it away.

Other issues aside, it strikes us this is a poor time for the sudden urge to an MVA. Through all the years the people of the valley were trying to get real flood control from Congress nothing was heard from the MVA advocates. Six or eight years ago they might have made good their claim for the method to cut through red tape and get action. But these groups, largely outside the Missouri valley, didn't seem to know of the existence of the river.

The people of the valley urged Congress, kicked, needled, and sat in congressional waiting rooms. They received a little here and a little there, but the great vision for the river was held back year after year. Nothing heard from the people who are now screaming for an MVA. Not a word.

Finally a Congress showed interest in action. A river plan big enough to conquer the floods came out of committee and was on its way to passage. The years of struggle approached their reward. Then, suddenly, out of the silence came the Political Action Committee and other groups from outside the valley shouting "Wait, wait! Hold everything. We have dreamed up something better, the one and only MVA. Let's start over."

But Congress did pass the flood-control bill. The United States accepted the challenge of the floods. The Government has a plan that is ready to start as soon as the war ends. A battle of several decades finally has been rewarded. It strikes us the MVA advocates are asking a lot when they suddenly suggest scrapping everything in favor of their vague theories. The way to stop the floods is to build against them.

Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Take Cognizance of the Inherent Right of the People of Poland, as Well as the People of Other Small Nations, To Determine the Form and Kind of Their Own Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a concurrent resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature April 24, 1945, memorializing Congress to take whatever action it shall deem necessary in its deliberations to restore unto the people of all small nations all of their just rights and privileges:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government

Whereas the circumstances surrounding the disposition and placement of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, and of other small European nations, as well as the manner in which the people of these small nations shall be permitted to determine the kind and form of their own government, give rise to serious concern as to whether the inherent rights of these peoples shall be safeguarded; and

Whereas all peoples throughout the entire world are fundamentally entitled to self-determination of the manner in which they shall be governed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That we look with concern upon conditions in Europe which presently are determining the location of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, as well as those of other small nations, and, therefore, respectfully urge and petition the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the fact that the matter of terriorial boundary lines is of universal concern and a proper subject for determination as a result of conferences between the United Nations as a whole rather than as the result of the decision of a single member thereof and, further, that the matter of the form and kind of government to be enjoyed by any group of people is a matter for self-determination rather than by arbitrary decision of another government; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and petition the Congress of the United States to take whatever action it shall deem necessary in its deliberations to restore unto the people of all small nations all of their just rights and privileges; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this State.

Charleston, W. Va., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, there is included in H. R. 2603 an appropriation of $2,750,000 for the completion of an airport belonging to Kanawha County, W. Va., located near the city of Charleston, W. Va. This was inserted in the bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee for the following reasons:

In 1942, Rubber Reserve Corporation let a contract to Carbon Carbide Chemical Corporation for the erection and operation of a rubber plant. Carbon Carbide Chemical Corporation desired to erect the plant adjoining an existing plant of theirs in Charleston, W. Va., by reason of the fact that by so doing they could eliminate the need for a laboratory and could use their own laboratory personnel in the operation of the Federal plant. Mr. Jesse Jones, then Secretary of Commerce and head of the Rubber Reserve Corporation, quite rightly felt the proposal of this com-

pany was correct and would entail a large saving to the Government. The site on which they desired to erect the plant was part of the then Charleston, W. Va., airport and which was then in operation. Mr. Jones told the Charleston Chamber of Commerce and representatives in Congress that if they would let the airport be used for this purpose, he would guarantee the Government would build them another airport. At the time, he made this statement he, as Secretary of Commerce, was in charge of CAA and contemplated using WPA funds coupled with CAA allocations. After the airport had been rendered useless for flying, all funds for airfields were put under the control of the Army. The Army agreed that this was a strategic location but not suitable for a combat field and under their ruling the grading would take longer than the 1 year in which they must complete a field. Therefore, they declined to go ahead with it.

Kanawha County, W. Va., thereupon bonded themselves for $3,000,000; purchased a site which was the only suitable site to be obtained after losing the other one and started the construction of an airport. Under a promise from the Army that when they had it in condition so that 1 year's work would complete it, they would take it over if conditions in Europe had not changed. Thereupon, the county secured a contract at an extremely low figure for the grading, to wit, 47 cents a yard as again $1 a yard estimated by CAA, and started to work. If the funds in this appropriation are made available, it will save both the county and the Federal Government a considerable amount of money due to this extremely favorable contract. It will cause the Government to carry out the promise made by Mr. Jones when Secretary of Commerce and which was the consideration for surrendering of the Charleston airport, and it falls within the general rule of merging funds which is contemplated in the new appropriation for the construction of airports after the war in that Charleston will have been paying more than one-half contemplated in the other bill. In other words, $3 for every $2.75 furnished by the Government, and it will enable the entire southern half of the State to have an air service of which they have been deprived by reason of the using of the only available airport for the erection of a rubber plant.

Comments on Speech by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently an important speech was delivered before the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Like all Mr. Farley's speeches and comments it attracted wide attention.

I append herewith an editorial from the Jersey Observer of Hoboken, N. J., of April 21, 1945, containing interesting comments upon Mr. Farley's speech. The editorial follows:

"BORROWED TOTALITARIAN WAYS" SURE TO GO, DECLARES FARLEY

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley is certain to find widespread agreement to his proposal for "rapid and clean-cut relaxation of Government controls after the war." In a speech before the Milwaukee Junior Chamber of Commerce, he asserted that while we have all given up great measures of freedom to achieve victory, "we should let no one forget for a minute that we want those freedoms back, and that we intend to have them."

Nor was he speaking from the standpoint of one long and prominently connected with politics, but as one now identified with one of the largest business corporations of the Nation. "In borrowing totalitarian ways for the prosecution of the war, it was our aim to rid ourselves of them at the earliest possible moment," he declared, adding that it is his conviction that "once this war is over, Congress will take the lead in the speediest restoration of all the democratic processes."

Having achieved political eminence through his ability to sense popular sentiment, James A. Farley obviously retains this facility notwithstanding the transition from public office to private enterprise.

The Pony Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Indian Affairs has favorably acted upon H. R. 378, a bill to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928, known to the Sioux Indians as the pony claims. The bill has been reported to the House with certain amendments recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and is No. 85 on the Consent Calendar.

At the time the bill was considered by the committee, the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior were presented orally by representatives of the Office of Indian Affairs, his formal letter not having completed clearance. Consequently, the formal recommendations were not available to embody in the committee's report.

Subsequently, however, the Secretary's letter recommending enactment of the bill was received by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and that it may be available for the information of the Members, I place it in the RECORD at this time by permission of the House.

It will be noted that the letter has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1945.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JACKSON: Reference is made to the request of your committee for a report on H. R. 378, "A bill authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes."

I recommend enactment of the bill if amended as hereinafter suggested.

The act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), authorized the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and determine the claims of individual Indians enrolled at the various Sioux agencies for the loss of personal property and failure to receive allotments of land to which they were entitled; to adjust any such claims found to be meritorious if possible under existing law, and in the absence of authority therefor to report such claims to Congress with appropriate recommendations.

All of the claims filed under the act of May 3, 1928, resulting from the failure to receive allotments have been adjudicated and settled heretofore by the allowance of 1,046 such claims aggregating the sum of $160,578.49, and the authorizing and making of appropriations for their payment. (See S. Rept. 347, 74th Cong., 1st sess., and the acts of June 14, 1935, 49 Stat. 340, and June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1757, 1764; see also H. Rept. 933, 75th Cong., 1st sess., and the acts of June 29, 1937, 50 Stat. 441, and August 25, 1937, 50 Stat. 755, 763).

The Sioux Indians began asserting claims for personal property losses in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and prior to the passage of the act of May 3, 1928, the Congress appropriated the aggregate sum of $416,260 in settlement of such claims. (See the acts of Mar. 2, 1889, 25 Stat. 833, 899; Jan. 19, 1891, 26 Stat. 720; Mar. 3, 1891, 26 Stat. 989, 1002; Mar. 3, 1903, 32 Stat. 1031, 1074; June 21, 1906, 34 Stat. 325, 374). The acts of March 2, 1889, and January 19, 1891, required the Indians to accept the payments made thereunder in full satisfaction for all personal property losses suffered by them, and in pursuance of this requirement the Indians expressly released all further claims or demands against the United States for such property losses. Despite these appropriations and the releases mentioned, the Indians continued to complain that they had not been fully compensated for property losses. (See S. Rept. No. 449, 62d Cong., 2d sess.) Their complaints led to the passage of the act of May 3, 1928, authorizing a general investigation of the losses.

Early in 1932 the claims for personal-property losses filed under the act of May 3, 1928, were adjudicated. Only an inconsiderable number were allowed, the balance of the claims being disallowed. A report thereon was made to the Congress on December 13, 1932 (S. Doc. No. 152, 72d Cong., 2d sess.), with the recommendation that $19,357 be appropriated to pay the claims allowed. This appropriation was authorized by the act of February 16, 1933 (47 Stat. 818), and made by the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1602, 1609).

The attorneys for the claimants promptly filed objections to the disallowance of the claims by this Department and continued to object to the alleged injustice of the adjudication until on March 14, 1939, in a letter to Hon. FRANCIS CASE, House of Representatives, this Department agreed to a reexamination of the claims for personal-property losses. Over a period of almost 5 years a thorough and exhaustive study of all available information and evidence gleaned from all available sources was made in connection with the reexamination of these claims. The reexamination was completed and submitted to me by the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs on September 1, 1944, and the conclusions and findings were approved on November 4, 1944. It was found that an additional sum of $101,630 should be awarded the claimants. As the report of the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which is enclosed and made a part of this report, contains a detailed history of the claims, including the reasons for the reexamination thereof and the evidence bearing on the allowance

or disallowance of such claims, a restatement of the findings and recommendations is not needed here.

H. R. 378, which authorizes the appropriation of $101,630 for the payment of the awards referred to in the preceding paragraph, would, in my opinion, serve adequately the purpose intended if amended as hereinafter suggested. In lines 1 and 2 on page 2 the words "eliminate or modify awards where overlappings or duplications exist" should be substituted for the words "eliminate awards or such other modifications as he may deem necessary." Without this substitution the proviso beginning at line 11 on page 1 of the bill would authorize the Secretary to eliminate or modify any award. It is desired only to authorize the elimination or modification of such awards as may be found upon further examination in connection with the identification of claimants, or the determination of the heirs or devisees of deceased claimants, to be claims which previously have been satisfied in whole or in part.

There should be added to section 2 of the bill the following: "For this purpose an additional $10,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended." The losses for which awards are to be made occurred some 60 or more years ago. The claimants were adults at that time and the overwhelming majority of them are now deceased. It will be necessary, therefore, that the heirs or devisees of such deceased claimants be determined in order that payment can be made. This will be a task of such magnitude that it will be impossible for the regular staff of employees engaged in probating the estates of deceased Indians to cope with the situation and maintain their existing assignments. If the awards are promptly to reach the persons entitled to payment, it will be necessary to provide for the salary and expenses of an employee or employees whose efforts will be devoted exclusively to this task. It is estimated that $10,000 would be adequate for this purpose.

There should be added to the bill another section as follows:

"SEC. 3. Every claim or demand for payment of the individual awards made pursuant to said act of May 3, 1928, shall be forever barred unless such claim or demand shall be filed with the Office of Indian Affairs within 10 years after the date of the approval of this act. The Secretary of the Interior shall cause diligent investigation and inquiry to be made for the purpose of identifying all persons entitled to share in the distribution of any such award, including the heirs or devisees of deceased claimants. As soon as possible after the termination of the time allowed by this section, the Secretary shall certify to the Department of the Treasury the amounts of the individual awards made pursuant to said act of May 3, 1928, which remain unpaid by reason of no claim or demand having been filed, or by reason of the death of the claimant intestate and without heirs, or by reason of inability to identify any person entitled to receive distribution of the award. All amounts so certified shall revert to the United States and be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury."

The inclusion in the bill of the foregoing provisions is deemed necessary in order to accord a degree of finality to all claims arising under the act of May 3, 1928. The records of this Department show that at the present time there remain unpaid and unclaimed balances of prior awards made under the act of May 3, 1928, in instances where a claimant or his heirs cannot be determined or identified. The evidence strongly indicates that such balances never will be claimed or paid. In view of the number of claimants to whom awards have been made and the fact that the overwhelming majority of such claimants are now deceased, it seems inconceivable that there will not be a number of instances in which the claimant died intestate without heirs or in which his heirs cannot now be identified. A period of 10 years would be sufficient time to ascertain if all persons or their heirs having an interest in the awards made can be determined or identified and the funds disbursed to them. The suggested amendment would permit the unpaid balance of all awards made under the act of May 3, 1928, which have been or may be found impossible of disbursement, to be returned to the United States Treasury, and would bring about the much-to-be-desired result of making completely final the adjudication and payment of all claims filed under the act of May 3, 1928.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ABE FORTAS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Discussion of the Problem of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith in the RECORD the news release of the Cooperative League of the United States for April 6, 1945, in which is included an account of a forum discussion between Judge Thurman Arnold, Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, and myself before the Co-op Forum of the District of Columbia:

ARNOLD, VOORHIS, AND KREPS URGE CO-OPS TO MOBILIZE FOR ATTACK ON MONOPOLY—CO-OPS ESSENTIAL TO BLOCK MONOPOLIES AND CARTELS, ARNOLD TELLS NEW FORUM

(By John Carson, Washington representative, the Cooperative League)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Judge Thurman Arnold, Congressman Jerry Voorhis, and Theodore J. Kreps, director of the Temporary National Economic Committee, joined this week in inaugurating the Co-op Forum of the District of Columbia and in challenging cooperative organizations and their member-owners throughout the United States to mobilize for an effective attack on monopoly.

Kreps, now associated with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and generally recognized in Government circles as the ablest authority on monopolies, presented a program to the cooperatives for an attack on monopoly. But he called immediate attention to the patent monopolies and to the Voorhis antimonopoly patent bill, which is now before the House Committee on Judiciary. He described the bill as a "statesmanlike attack on one of the gravest evils in the monopoly system" and urged interest in the measure.

"We have an undeserved reputation in this country, probably because of our antitrust laws, that we are opposed to cartels and monopoly," said Kreps. "On the contrary, we favor cartels and monopoly more than does Great Britain. We should awaken to the realization that we cannot continue to accept monopoly and cartels without accepting the totalitarian state and without going the road that Germany traveled."

Arnold said that constant repetition is necessary to make the American people appreciate the menace to freedom that exists in monopoly. He referred to the downward spirals of the economy we have experienced, of the limitations on production, and of consequent unemployment. He also urged support for Voorhis bill.

"America cannot live without cooperatives," he said. "The cooperative movement is the answer to an age which demands decentralization."

VOORHIS explained that his bill was not a "drastic bill, at all." He said he merely provided that where a patent was used to violate the law, as part of a conspiracy or to aid monopoly, the Government should cancel the right of exclusive ownership of the patent and it would become available to anyone who might want to make use of it.

"I am not even providing that they cannot continue to use the patent," said VOORHIS. "I am just depriving them of their monopoly ownership of the patent. But they are fighting the proposal, nevertheless."

Kreps said that any sound attack on monopoly must provide for "a stable currency"; for a "free flow of capital into the undeveloped areas of the world"; for "reduction of trade barriers of all kinds"; for the placement of a "floor for standards of living." He told of how monopoly extorted $243 a pound for a metal which cost only $9 a pound, how the rubber cartel exploited labor and never "passed on a dollar to the native workers"; how the tin monopolists of Bolivia were not interested in any proposal to assist labor employed in the mines.

"We must develop consumer cooperatives, we must make every possible use of the antitrust laws, and we must develop the direct action method the Government has in the Tennessee Valley Authority," said Kreps. "There is no possibility of compromise on this issue of monopoly and cartels. Our cooperative organizations must become zealously interested in helping our people to understand that where monopoly and cartels exist there can be no freedom."

Arnold described how "obsolete investments" in business were protected through regulations which destroyed consuming power and referred particularly to the rate agreements of railroad companies, and now to the rate agreements of aviation companies. He insisted that those who declare for "free enterprise" and "the competitive system" could not consistently declare for protection of the obsolete investments in railroad properties.

"We are moving toward a free market and nothing can be done to stop it," said Arnold. "The cooperatives are leading the way to the free market. The technological developments are compelling decentralization and the cooperatives are the answer to an age which must compel decentralization."

VOORHIS explained how the United States Supreme Court had ruled recently that the Hartford Empire Co. had used more than 600 patents to create a monopoly over glassware production and how the consumer paid the bill. Despite that the Court agreed the company had violated the law and had used these "patent grants from the public" to injure the public, the Court declared nothing could be done to prevent the company from continuing to use the patents.

"Now and then we are hearing people talk about good cartels," said VOORHIS. "There is no such thing. You might as well talk about a benevolent despotism."

VOORHIS, who has been campaigning for 10 years to compel changes in the monetary system, agreed with Dr. Kreps that a stable currency must be had to prevent exploitation of the people by the money monopolists. He urged support for the Bretton Woods agreement although he opposed the proposal to tie currencies of all kinds to gold instead of to goods.

FEPC Bill Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star on Sunday, April 29, 1945. The editorial is not only pertinent with reference to the situation of the present bill for a permanent FEPC, but also calls attention to the antidemocratic, potentially Fascist methods adopted by many so-called liberals in the Congress of the United States, which action makes it so difficult to sell progressive and liberal proposals to people of good will who are resentful of the tactics used by too many people who wear the badge of liberalism on their shirts to cover up the antidemocratic authoritarian philosophy which exists in their breasts.

FEPC BILL STYMIED

In presenting her petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the fair-employment-practice bill, Representative NORTON is influenced by a perfectly legitimate desire to bring that controversial measure to a vote in the House.

This is by no means the first time that a congressional committee has sought—often with success—to kill a distasteful bill by the simple process of burying it. And the so-called liberals are just as ready to offend in this respect as the reactionaries. On several occasions, for example, the House has passed bills which were not to the liking of professional labor leaders and their friends in Congress. When these bills reached the Senate, they were sent to the Committee on Education and Labor, and there they died a quiet death in a convenient pigeonhole. This was the work of the liberals, who were afraid to let the bills come to a vote in the Senate. If they were aware of anything sinister and undemocratic in that technique, they were able to refrain from voicing a protect.

But now the shoe is on the other foot. The liberals are among the champions of the FEPC bill, and they are articulately resentful of the tactics which have been employed in the Rules Committee to prevent the measure from reaching the floor. In this they are inconsistent, of course. But, as it happens in this instance, they are also right.

The function of Congress is to face these controversial issues and vote on them. The Members ought not to shirk their responsibility by permitting a strategically placed committee to sidetrack a bill in which there is an extensive and legitimate public interest. The FEPC bill, if passed, would empower a governmental agency to forbid discrimination in employment. Many sincere opponents of economic discrimination have grave doubts as to the wisdom of this approach to the problem, and no such bill should be passed without the fullest consideration of all its implications and potentialities. But the FEPC bill cannot receive this consideration by the Members of Congress if it is to lie in a committee pigeonhole. It ought to be brought to the floor, where it can be opened to amendment, debated, and voted on.

Government Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Creston (Iowa) News Advertiser, one of the best small dailies in the State of Iowa, long has advocated cutting governmental expenditures and being realistic about the financial situation of the country. In a timely editorial it applauds the Comptroller General's recent recommendation that the number of Federal corporations be drastically reduced and placed under the financial control of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the editorial "Clean them all out," which appeared in the Creston News Advertiser of April 26, 1945:

CLEAN THEM ALL OUT

Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, recently appeared before the senatorial Committee on Banking and Currency, and he had some things to say about our Federal corporations that will give some of the Washington bureaucrats the cold shivers. As one writer expressed it: What he said was in effect "give 'em the ax." He recommended that a brush ax or a meat cleaver be used to chop off the 101 Government corporations which now exist.

He was testifying in favor of the passage of a bill now before Congress which would bring all Government corporations under the financial control of Congress. He expressed the fear that "unless the present trend of creating Federal corporations is not checked, we will soon have a government by Government corporations." It amounts to asking that all the financial affairs of the Nation shall again be placed under the control of Congress. He would end this right to "spend as you see fit." He would end the authority of all subdivisions of Government to issue and sell bonds, and he would make all of them accountable for every dime they spent. In short, Mr. Warren would have the Nation return to a government by democracy.

Today, there are 101 Government corporations, which are largely independent of the authority of Congress, and can do pretty much as they please without having to render an account to anyone. Many of those corporations are overlapping; most of them handle large sums of money, and the Comptroller believes that "untold millions of dollars could be saved by cutting out most of these organizations." "Undoubtedly there would be," he said, "loud yelps and snarls as office-holders were forced off Uncle Sam's pay rolls, but the resulting saving would be enormous."

All newspaper readers will remember that time and again it has been announced impossible to give the exact amount of the public debt, because so many of these corporations could create debts on their own account and were not required to submit an accounting. The amount of Federal bonds sold to the public has at times been very indefinite because some of these Federal corporations were empowered to issue and sell bonds of their own, and no one who could tell, would announce the amount of business done.

Under Warren's plan of "giving these corporations the ax" and returning all financial authority to Congress—where it belongs—there would never be any uncertainty as to what the Nation had or what it owed. It would put a padlock on the Federal money drawer, and beyond all doubt he is right in saying it would save the taxpayers untold millions of dollars. Further, until this is done and the people again have control of the public money through their Representatives in Congress, we are not operating under a democratic form of government.

Prayer for the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following prayer for the San Francisco Conference, written by Gregory Lynch, an eighth-grade pupil at St. Francis Xavier School, Waterbury, Conn.:

PRAYER FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

I

O Lord, your attention! We beg if You please,
Never have times been as trying as these.
Our world is a turmoil of stress and of strife,
Never so low was the value on life.
Countless the souls that have gone home to Thee,
That You will reward them is our earnest plea.
Comfort their loved ones, teach them to know
In Your blessed home there is freedom from woe.

II

They're meeting, dear Lord, the men at the helm,
They're planning of peace to prevail o'er their realm.
O God, you can guide them as no mortal can,
Your foresight can penetrate far beyond man.
Make them heed Your direction, Your guidance so sure
And plan for a peace that will always endure.

Farm Draft Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks under the above caption I do not do so for the purpose of defending my position, for I have been one of those who has consistently called to the attention of this Congress the importance and necessity of food production, not only for our armed forces but for the civilian population of our country and for the relief of the starving

peoples of Europe who are looking to America, and I have consequently, time and again, called to your attention the fact that Selective Service was putting pressure on all of the draft boards throughout the country to induct necessary and essential farm and dairy workers, notwithstanding the protest of the Members of Congress and the Senate, but in contravention of and in flagrant violation of the terms of the Tydings amendment enacted by the Congress in the year 1942.

Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues of the minority who voted to sustain the veto of the President on the bill under discussion here today, the inconsistencies of their position, many of which have been covered in the remarks of those who were in favor of overriding the veto, and which it is not necessary for me to reiterate here.

One of the most unconvincing arguments made against the veto was that we were selecting one special group to favor, and it was made to appear by implication that deferments under the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act were sought to be extended to only a select group of registrants engaged in necessary and essential occupations connected with agriculture, which also includes dairying. Everyone who understands the law, and anyone who has observed the deferments of registrants under Selective Service, certainly know better.

As a matter of fact, the special committees appointed by this House to investigate the situation has brought to the attention of the House the deferments under Selective Service, and for those who are not informed, the reports of those committees are available, and I call particular attention to the reports of the committee headed by former Representative Costello which deals principally with employees engaged in governmental and Army and naval work.

In addition, the releases, although multifarious and confusing and contradictory, issued by Selective Service should also be available to those not informed. As an example, for the information of those who have charged that the agricultural workers under the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, is in a select group, I include hereunder an article from the Associated Press released today by War Manpower Commissioner McNutt to the effect that 5,500 more key workers have been given draft deferments between the ages of 18 through 29 years of age. The published release is as follows, and is from the Washington Evening Star:

FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MORE KEY WORKERS GIVEN DRAFT DEFERMENTS

War Manpower Commissioner McNutt announced today that certifications have been issued for draft deferment of 5,500 more key workers 18 through 29 years of age.

This brings the total to about 353,000, or approximately 50 percent of the industrial workers in that age span.

The certifications were distributed as follows:

Agricultural Department, 1,000 deferments to take care of small employers engaged in food processing; Petroleum Administration for War, 2,000, and the Office of Defense Transportation, 2,500.

The authorizations were granted by the Government's Inter-Agency Committee, which announced it had rejected ODT's request for a blanket deferment of all transportation workers. Deferment for a high percentage of these workers had been approved previously.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on to expose the fallacy of some of the pleas made to gain support not to override this veto, but I respect the opinions of my colleagues on any question, and only take exception to some of the statements that I think are irrelevant to the issue, and reflect on the patriotism of our boys on the farms who are working day and night to produce the food so necessary to the successful prosecution of the war and to feed the citizens and our allies. Mr. Speaker, coming from a predominantly agricultural district, I know that this statement is unfair, for as a matter of fact, most of our young men from the farms have long since enlisted in the armed forces, and the few remaining would rather be on the front lines fighting, than remain on the farms, and it is only through remonstrance and necessity that all of them do not leave the farms unattended.

Mr. Speaker, I also take exception to the pleas of some of those who tried to make the issue Back up the Commander in Chief. This is a slogan of those who do not have any argument to substantiate their appeals, and it was brought out in this discussion that the present Commander in Chief—the President—while a Member of the Senate of the United States had been recorded as voting in favor of this question.

The only reason that I can ascribe to the change of attitude by the President is that he is trying to back up the departments, and I am disappointed to note that the President has likewise thrown his support to another agency, the Office of Price Administration, notwithstanding the flagrant maladministration and befuddling, high-handed, discriminatory and discourteous manner in which the same has been operated.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are holding their elected representatives responsible for the conduct of the Government, and at this time when there is a critical food shortage in this country, it is up to us to use our judgment to do what is necessary to correct many programs which are being administered in a most unsatisfactory manner, and resulting in unnecessary confusion and suffering on the part of our citizens, and I for one, expect to do all in my power to bring about such changes as are necessary to correct the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that no exception, in my opinion, should be taken by the President to this majority vote on this veto, for he was in favor of the bill when the same was presented to the Senate when he was a Member.

From the Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Nashville Banner.

FROM THE SHOULDER

(By James G. Stahlman)

If somebody wants to throw a monkey wrench into the Truman machinery, which has started off so smoothly, the surest way to do that is to revive agitation for the passage of a bill setting up a permanent FEPC.

That would not just slow down the machinery; it would wreck it. Cogs and gears would fly, pistons would bend, cylinders would crack; the whole blooming thing would go plumb to pot so fast that Harry Truman wouldn't know what had happened until they started picking up the pieces.

The present FEPC has already caused enough trouble. A permanent one would be the last blow to national unity. I can't imagine anybody but a troublemaker who would want to disrupt the national spirit now so solidly unified behind the plain man from Missouri.

The President knows what a fight would be precipitated in the Senate alone. He knows the southern bloc isn't going to take another FEPC lying down. He knows the bitterness that would be engendered in another debate on the subject. He knows, as does anybody who cares to think about it, that racial discrimination can't be corrected by Federal statute, Federal snoopers, Federal police, Federal anything. Legislation and governmental browbeating will not cure that vexing problem.

There isn't any doubt but that there has been racial discrimination. Some of it has been malicious, some of it very deliberate, all of it very short-sighted. But no FEPC will rectify a situation that can be corrected only through enlightened opinion. An appreciation of the rights of the other fellow, a willingness to work together, and the desire and determination on the part of peoples of good will, regardless of creed or color, to live together in peace and concord. They are attitudes of the mind and heart that cannot be forced into human make-up by statute or by bayonet. Compulsion from any source propelled into the racial question means trouble and disaster.

The racial problem, so far as the South is concerned, will never be settled by somebody, especially somebody from the outside, trying to cram something down our gullets. We just won't take it that way. The South has its opinions on the question, some admittedly prejudiced, some highly unsound, some definitely un-American. But Federal statute isn't going to change any of that.

A permanent FEPC would irritate and aggravate. God knows, we neither need nor want any more irrigation or aggravation.

The racial problem will be solved when the leaders on both sides sit down and canvass the situation from top to bottom, looking at it as it is, not as zealots on either side think it should and will be. A spade should be a spade, and no tomfoolery about it.

The whole thing must and will be worked out in time, if those on both sides who want the problem solved are willing to bury intol-

erance, forget recklessly claimed privilege impossible of attainment, recognize the legitimate rights of others, and work in a spirit of compromise toward the elimination of those discriminatory irritants that have been and will continue to be detrimental to our national life and unity, until equitably adjusted in accordance with God's laws, not man-made statute.

So far the FEPC has not proved itself an agency of the Almighty. In permanent form it could easily become the agency of the devil. And there'd be hell to pay! No foolin'.

Common Justice Long Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Union Postal Clerk:

SALARY ADJUSTMENT JUSTIFIED

More than 100 Members of Congress appeared before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on March 27, 1945, to urge early, favorable action by that committee on legislation to give postal employees a well-earned and much-needed increase in their basic pay schedules. These representatives of the people of every section of the country were voicing the sentiments of their constituents as deduced from personal conversations and correspondence.

Most of those who appeared expressed their personal views, as well as the opinions of the public generally in their respective districts, and paid high tributes to the efficiency and dependability of Postal Service, made possible only by the loyal service of experienced and skilled workers who have been working under extremely difficult and trying conditions. Numerous comparisons were made between the conditions of workers in private industry who have secured increases in basic compensation rates, premium payments for overtime services, and numerous other concessions, through their exercise of organization collective bargaining and those of postal employees whose hope for adjustment of economic conditions to meet ever-changing standards rests with the Congress, through legislation.

Postal employees are grateful for the many public acknowledgments of their efficient and loyal service. They are heartened and encouraged by recognition of the effectiveness of their efforts. Their pride in the service they render and in the important part they play in the public welfare, especially their essential place in maintaining the morale of millions of members of the fighting forces and their families, is greatly increased.

However, postal employees do not enjoy exemption from the vicissitudes that beset other workers, increased costs of everything necessary to the maintenance of health and physical efficiency, increased taxes, additional taxes, and the proper participation in all fund drives for public purposes, including the purchase of War bonds. Words of encomium do not make a satisfactory substitute for equitable adjustment in pay.

No upward adjustment in the basic pay rates of post-office clerks have been made since January 1, 1925. In the meantime, during the depression years of the early 1930's, postal employees were not exempt from the effects and suffered reductions in pay and the loss of other benefits that amounted to as high as 28 percent for post-office clerks.

Since 1935 the cost of living and wages and salaries in private industry have climbed steadily, while postal wages have remained stationary. Official Government agencies have recognized the necessity of increasing wages by 15 percent over the rates in January 1941; rates that had been steadily climbing since 1935. The increase provided by the bill now before the House Post Office Committee (H. R. 2071), therefore, falls far short of the general increases in wages and salaries that have been given approval by official Government sanction.

The Congress authorized a temporary War bonus of $300 per year, effective May 1, 1943, and expiring June 30, 1945. H. R. 2071 provides, therefore, an increase of only $100 per year, for post-office clerks, for the succeeding fiscal year, an exceedingly modest increase in view of the fact that the Post Office Department realized the largest surplus in its history in the current fiscal year and an even larger surplus is estimated for the next fiscal year.

With over 50,000 postal employees now in the armed services, the regular employees have maintained regular and dependable service only through extra efforts and long hours of work, buoyed up by the pride of service and patriotic zeal that is inherent in postal employees. Relief from the hardships of greatly reduced purchasing power is common justice long delayed. It is also a necessity if the service efficiency is to be maintained. Prompt and favorable action by the Congress on H. R. 2071 is a measure of justice that should not be denied.

Gov. Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey, recently signed a memorial of the New Jersey Senate urging Congress to take early favorable action on this legislation. The resolution was introduced by Senator Herbert J. Pascoe, of Elizabeth, N. J. Governor Edge, then a United States Senator, introduced in the Senate a companion bill to the Kelly bill of the House and served as chairman of the joint committee that steered through the Congress the classification law of 1925.

Similar resolutions have been adopted by State legislative bodies in Arkansas, California, Colorado, and Michigan.

Belt-Tightening Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the report of Samuel I. Rosenman, special adviser and legal counsel to the late President Roosevelt, as it was submitted to President Truman on Monday, April 30. The report dealt with the civilian food supply situation. It stated simply that the people of the United States would have to pull their belts tighter so that the hungry and war-ridden people of liberated areas in northwestern Europe could eat.

Perhaps Mr. Rosenman's report is true. But, I believe, the American people will object to his statements. They do not believe that belt-tightening is the right answer to the problem. They are sympathetic toward the people of the world who face starvation. They want to help feed them. But they disagree with the reasoning that the people of this Nation must be denied food so that the world can be fed. This feeling is particularly true among the farmers in Indiana and the Midwest. They sternly disagree with the philosophy of scarcity. If administration spokesmen would stop talking about making the American people do with less, and provide the farmers and processors with a freer hand in food production, there would be no need of continually harping on the theory that America must go hungry so that the world can be fed.

The farmers in the Indiana district which I have the honor to represent, along with other midwesterners, would welcome a change in administrative policy in this respect. If the statement was made, that we need more food and must have it, and we will see to it that the farmer, dairyman, stockman, and processor gets the stuff to work with without tying his hands in endless red tape and restrictions, the food would be raised. From the standpoint of the producer as well as the consumer, the food and meat situation is in a mess. But if the philosophy of plenty was substituted for crop curtailment there would be no need of shortages. Give the farmer a chance. Get him more tractors and plows. Recalling a speech that Prime Minister Churchill made at the beginning of the war: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job," we can aptly apply it to our farmers here at home. See that the WPB permits sufficient steel to be diverted into farm equipment manufacturing. But, of course, not to the degree that it might impair the war effort. Although now in view of current information from the European war fronts, some broader diversion could be effected without interfering with production of supplies for the Pacific battles.

The farmer has gone along throughout the war years with no new equipment to speak of. He has been short of help. His 8-hour day has been 8 hours in the morning and 8 hours in the afternoon and evening. But he has not complained; he patriotically figured he was doing his bit along with the rest of the Americans. He has sown his grain with tractors and equipment bound together with bailing wire. His crop-harvesting machinery has been in the same broken-down and worn-out condition. Corn has rotted in the fields because last year and this spring there were not enough corn pickers or farm labor to do the job.

The fact that millions of dollars in surplus trucks and mechanical equipment are now being offered for sale through the RFC indicates that the production of some types of heavy machinery can be halted and the material used for it channeled into production to alleviate the farmers' shortages. It is not too late to get some of this machinery ready for this year's crops. But it will require action now. Poultry raisers and livestock producers also need encouragement and the assurance that the feed supply for their chicks and animals will be available.

Last year Congress voted a large appropriation to assure an adequate seed supply for this year's crops. But the farmer is not going to plant seed for harvest unless he feels sure that he can do the job. We all know this.

President Truman on May 2 terminated the duties and Office of Civilian Defense. Why not terminate or change some of the duties of those agencies affecting our food shortages, Mr. President, by the same action? Let's cut out or revise the regulations of the AAA, the OPA, and the WFA that furnish the red tape and overlapping restrictions on production and distribution which only perplex and interfere with the raising of an adequate food supply.

The Republican conference of the House of Representatives in a special session on food called by House Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, has drafted and adopted a resolution seeking to correct the evils of the prevailing administration-controlled situation. The resolution is based upon a report of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, which for 2 years conducted an independent analysis of the food situation.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, That the President be urgently requested to take immediate and positive steps to relieve the present deplorable food situation, particularly with a view to preventing further and more serious consequences which are fast developing; be it further

Resolved, That in an earnest desire to be of assistance to the President in finding the right solution to this problem, we suggest to him:

First. That as authority and responsibility in the various aspects of food production, processing, allocation and distribution, price and rationing, are now divided among at least six agencies of Government—thereby generating conflicts of authority, confusion in administration, and uncertainty of results—the President immediately vest in one single agency full authority and responsibility for the production, distribution, and export, including price and rationing, of all food available to the United States.

Second. We suggest further that the President classify food production as an essential war industry and immediately instruct those Federal agencies concerned with manpower, transportation, storage, farm machinery, and fertilizer to so direct the activities of their respective agencies as to give special assistance to the production, processing, storage, and distribution of foods."

A bill has already been introduced in this session, similar to that introduced 2 years ago at the suggestion of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, which was reported favorably by the House Agriculture Committee of which I am a member, giving the President authority to create such a unified food administration.

Furthermore, the House Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages has issued its report and recommendations which are as follows:

1. The Committee recommends that immediate steps be taken to give first priority to food production and that all possible measures be taken without delay to increase the production and supplies of those food items now in short supply, and that policies be initiated to provide adequate manpower and machinery for the farm.

2. The Committee respectfully recommends that the President immediately consider the problem of needed coordination of the entire food program. By that the Committee means the coordination of production, distribution, rationing, and pricing of food. Certainly such coordination of effort is the least the American people can ask or expect in the light of the stupendous requirements for food at home and abroad.

There must be action now. The price line is weakening. It must be held. Time is working on the side of scarcity, and if time is wasted and coordination not achieved, black markets will have cracked price control irreparably.

3. Fair and equitable margins should be established in every operation of the production, processing, and distribution of meat with special incentives for feeders of cattle to produce better and heavier beef, due consideration being given to the over-all feed situation.

4. The support prices on hogs should be increased to $13.50 per hundred on drove weight. In view of the fact that hogs have been selling at ceiling prices for many months, this should not cost the public a single dollar but should give needed confidence and encouragement to the hog producer.

5. Special inducements should be given to poultry and egg producers to increase their supplies of poultry and eggs, and to the fishing industry to increase the supply of fish as quick sources of protein food to supplement dwindling meat supplies.

6. In view of a tighter sugar market, special inducements should be given to sugar producers in this country and its Territories materially to increase their acreage immediately.

7. Storage facilities should be increased to keep pace with increased production.

8. Issue separate ration points for meat.

9. Rigid black-market controls must be applied, particularly at the source.

The farmer will raise the food and the processor will get it to the people of the world, if they get the green light. The United States has shown what it can do in supplying the mechanical weapons of war for the world—even under the myriad and confusing governmental regulations. The farmers, poultry raisers, dairymen, and livestock men will do an equally good job on the food supply, if they get the things they need to work with—seed, fertilizer, equipment, and manpower.

We must raise more food in the future if we are to feed the world. It is our biggest safeguard for a lasting peace. But the farmer cannot do the job with his hands tied.

The Treaty-Making Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 3, 1945:

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER

When President Truman visited the House of Representatives on Monday he found it debating the proposed constitutional amendment offered by its Judiciary Committee to vest the power of approving or rejecting treaties in a simple majority of both the Senate and House instead of in a two-thirds majority of the Senate alone. This proposal is so important that it is disturbing to learn that soon after the debate began, there were only about seventy Members on the floor and not more than twenty when it ended.

Perhaps one reason for this apparent indifference is the feeling that regardless of what the House does in the matter the Senate will never consent to share its treaty powers. It is true that under our method of constitutional amendment it will be practically impossible to make the proposed change unless the Senate itself is willing to have it made. But passage of such a proposal by the House would serve definite notice that the House wishes to share in this power; and certainly, many Senators, regardless of their personal wishes or opinions, would not like to stand in the way of submitting the proposal to the people, which is all that an affirmative vote on their part need mean.

The historical reasons for adopting the present constitutional system of treaty approval have long ceased to exist. The present provision for treaty approval is both undemocratic and illogical. It is undemocratic because it permits a minority to block a majority in the making of peace. It is illogical because it permits a simple majority of the House and Senate to make war, while it requires two-thirds of the Senate to make peace. So far as the Senate is concerned, it is harder to make peace than to make war.

The arrangement is illogical also, moreover, in excluding the House from participation in treaty making. The House declares war chiefly for the purpose of achieving eventually a certain sort of peace; yet when the war has been won, the House has no say regarding the kind of peace made as a result of it. The situation is even more illogical than this. A treaty supersedes any existing domestic law that happens to be contrary to it. But this means that the Senate can by its own action repeal a domestic law regardless of the wishes of the House.

Finally, as Representative SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, points out: "This House, which has the initial power of appropriating money, is continually being called upon to exercise that function to implement treaties on which it has had no decision. It seems sound to me that we here, who have to appropriate the money, should have a voice in passing, in the first place, on the soundness or unsoundness of the agreement for which the money is asked." This means that it is not only unfair to exclude the House from participation in treaty approval but also unwise; for the House is likely to be much more willing to carry out a treaty which is has helped to approve than one in which it has had no voice.

The Recognition of Palestine as a Free and Democratic Jewish Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include herein a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held in Union City, N. J., on Monday, April 23 last.

The object of the meeting was to urge that the doors of Palestine be opened to Jewish refugees in Europe and that Palestine be recognized as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Many eminent speakers including clergymen of several denominations addressed the large and enthusiastic meeting.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Conference of the United Nations is to assemble in San Francisco, Calif., April 25, 1945, to lay the foundations for a lasting peace and the reconstruction of civilization in war-ravaged and devastated lands.

We, the people of the several municipalities of North Hudson and Hoboken, N. J., assembled at a mass meeting of nearly 2,500 persons in the presence of notable guests and speakers do hereby resolve and pray:

1. That the Conference of the United Nations be blessed with tranquillity and order amidst good tidings;

2. That the spirit of truth and justice prevail amongst all their deliberations;

3. That amongst the patterns for a just and lasting peace, they embody in the preamble of the new charter of human freedom, an international bill of rights as contained in the American Bill of Rights and the unwritten customs and traditions of the best in every cultured, democratic society;

4. That full civil and political rights in Europe and elsewhere be restored to every individual and people and that all discriminatory laws and practices be abrogated;

5. That all property confiscated by the Germans from the Jews and other peoples be returned to the original owners;

6. That all people be helped as speedily as possible to be resettled and rehabilitated in their homes and lands;

7. That the doors of Palestine be opened at once to the hundreds of thousands of Jewish homeless, stateless and wanderers and that they aided to get there as speedily as possible, and

8. That the mandate for Palestine agreed to by the 52 nations of the world after the last war be reincorporated into a new mandates commission of any new international conference or league expressly and unequivocally, declaring and guaranteeing the immediate reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth and facilitating the immediate establishment of a Jewish majority justly and legally with full respect to other minority rights as expressed in the Balfour declaration.

9. That full and complete retribution be according to war criminals and full and complete justice be done to all the victims of nazi-ism and fascism.

A Gentleman and Aristocrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by L. B. Skeffington of the Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, N. Y., under date of April 14, 1945:

A GENTLEMAN AND ARISTOCRAT

(By L. B. Skeffington)

My closest contact with Franklin D. Roosevelt was some years ago when he seized my arm in a vise-like grip while he got his stance to make a speech. It was while he was Governor of New York and the place was Cayuga Lake State Park. He was making what he called his "annual inspection" in a trip across the State, accompanied by high State officials. The Governor traveled part of the way and made his headquarters on a canal yacht. Most of the other members of his party traveled by motorcar.

I was one of a number of newspaper reporters covering the tour. At the park pavilion the Governor was greeted with cheers. He walked forward slowly with the aid of a cane and leaning on a State trooper. The Governor backed against the edge of a platform, held my arm with his right hand for support while he waved with his left hand. Someone slid a chair forward. He turned it around in front of him and not until he was in a position to lean on its back did he release his powerful grip on me.

The one thing that impressed me most was the tremendous strength of his grip. Later I watched him, cane in left hand, right hand on rail, literally drag himself up a low ramp into the hotel of Seneca Falls. Most of the crowd watched his face and smile. I was fascinated as he dragged first one foot, then the other, and then advanced his hand along the rail. Years later I was to remember this when Mrs. Roosevelt told a small group at Cornell University that sheer willpower had carried the President through. She recalled that when he was stricken with infantile paralysis he would lie on a couch and massage his legs hour after hour. One day he shouted and she hurried in, thinking perhaps he had fallen off the couch.

"I got a wiggle out of one toe," he greeted her.

That night at Seneca Falls the toastmaster asked the Governor to introduce his fellow officials. He did. Then he paused. "Now my friends," he said, "I want to introduce you to my very good friend, the man who takes such good care of your Governor. Sergeant, stand up." A blushing, blond State policeman stood up. Later I asked the trooper if that was an act to win the plaudits of the crowd. "No, I don't think so," he replied. "He always is very kind and thoughtful toward the people who are close to him. Perhaps it is partly because he is dependent upon them, but I think it is because he instinctively is a gentleman and an aristocrat with a sense of noblesse oblige or something of that sort."

On one of his tours the Governor was to stay overnight at a home in the Finger Lakes region. Arriving and being greeted, he inquired about arrangements for housing his two troopers. Being told no arrangements had been made, he sat in his car until their comfort was provided for. Another time party bigwigs gave him a dinner at Geneva. The Governor inquired about his trooper aides and found they were left standing in front of the hotel. He went out into the lobby, called for them and escorted them into the dining room.

As Governor, F. D. R. was close to the farmers. Under the State government set-up then, the department of agriculture and markets, the council picked the State council of agriculture and markets. The council picked the commissioner and the department was outside of the Governor's realm. The council was Republican and there were those who said it had degenerated into a strictly partisan affair. Roosevelt created the Governor's agricultural advisory commission. To membership he invited heads of State farm organizations and others who apparently held more of the confidence of agriculture than the council.

For a number of years the governor's commission was an important body until finally the council was abolished and the commissioner of the department was appointed by and responsible to the governor.

His associates of those days recall that Roosevelt was a "driver." He asked a Cornell official to undertake a certain job and the latter pleaded ill health. The Governor came back: "What's the matter with you; look at me!"

About 30 years ago Farmer Roosevelt joined Chapel Corner's Grange in Dutchess County. Nearly 25 years later he reminded Louis J. Taber, then master of the National Grange, that he was about due for a Grange silver star, the 25-year emblem. There were visions of an elaborate ceremony of presentation at the White House, but F. D. R. chose to receive it at his home Grange hall, among his neighbors and fellow members.

It has been remarked that the President found it hard to say "no" to his friends. Previous to the last election he may have sensed that the sands of time might be running out for him. He must have faced the possibility that the next Vice President might have to take over. At best Henry Wallace was a controversial figure. The President apparently made a deal for the Vice Presidency, but he went all out for Wallace for Secretary of Commerce. Likewise under pressure of wartime needs, he stripped the Secretary of Agriculture of all power, but he did not have the heart to throw Claude Wickard out of the Cabinet.

Our Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inserting in the RECORD with my remarks the following poem written by George Franklin Rinehart, of Glendora, Calif., regarding our late President:

OUR GOOD NEIGHBOR

(By George F. Rinehart)

The Captain of our Ship of State, in dying,
Left all the nations of the world in grief.
And when he passed, the caustic tongues of critics
And lying foes were stilled with guilty shame.
His extraordinary career, his rare accomplishments,
His courage in the face of adversity, his vision,
His indomitable spirit, his mental and moral strength,
His towering eminence, his unlimited resource—
All had won for him the admiration of mankind.

Compared with his superior merit, eulogy is empty,
Encomiums are futile and praise superfluous.
He was the one man who defied tradition and won.
He was one man who shattered precedent because
He had secured the confidence and love of those
That he had made secure in every human right.
His premature removal at this mometous time
Was somber tragedy, a said catastrophe—
One of the overwhelming calamities of war.

No man in all the world ever held more secure
The sublime affection, the loyalty and devotion
Of those he served with such distinction. Born
To a life of luxury and ease, he much preferred
To spend his life in service of the common man.
He chose the activities of the strenuous life,
Enduring the calumnies, indifference to slander,
Fighting gloriously for the rights of all mankind.

The high distinction of world leadership was his,
But with it all he never lost the common touch.
Amid the overwhelming burdens of his career
He dispensed most lavishly to friend and foe
His friendly handclasp, cheerful smile and charm.
He visioned new horizons and gave the homeland
The sheer enjoyment of the democratic life.
The vastness of his influence reached all lands,
Wherein his memory is cherished and revered.

His contribution to world security and peace
Was the grand climax to his unparalleled career—
The high distinction won by his supreme leadership
In the affairs of a turbulent and distracted world.
Wearied by his labors, he lay down to endless sleep—
The rest his splendid life and labor so deserved.
Our much beloved good neighbor left us as a legacy
A record that mankind is proud to laud and emulate.

Two-thirds Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 3, 1945:

TWO-THIRDS RULE

Hitler rendered one final disservice to the American people when his death was announced on the first day of a great debate in the House of Representatives. It is a pity that excitement over this event and the windup of the war in Europe overshadowed what Members of the House had to say, for they are grappling with a problem that has a direct bearing upon the feasibility of maintaining the peace that our armies are winning. Indeed, they are inaugurating the first essential change in our governmental machinery to make it possible for the United States to carry out its postwar obligations.

The total effect of the debate, both Tuesday and yesterday, was to build up a powerful case against retention of the two-thirds rule in treaty-making. The most effective summary, we think, was made by Representative GOSSETT in these words:

"The two-thirds rule was an historical accident written into the Constitution as a matter of political expediency.

"The two-thirds rule is unworkable, undemocratic, and denies the majority of the American people any real voice in foreign affairs.

"The two-thirds rule shackles this Nation in foreign affairs, and is a menace to world peace."

More sweeping and powerful, however, was the plea of Representative SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who was speaking in behalf of his own resolution. His first inclination, he said, was to oppose amendment of the constitutional provision on treaty making. Study of the situation brought him to a different view for two reasons: (1) The House of Representatives ought to be participating in the great decisions on international policy that will so vitally affect the future of the American people. (2) The two-thirds rule is now out of harmony with the type of government we are trying to operate.

"We have reached the point," Mr. SUMNERS said, "where the necessity of the world has fixed it * * * that some sort of authoritative government is going to project itself * * * into that realm that lies between the governments of the world." We have no choice in the matter. A terrible new responsibility has come to the United States by reason of the times in which we live. We must meet that responsibility through the treaty-making power, and the decisions thus to be made are "not a thing to be left to one-third of the Senate plus one."

We do not see how the House, or the Senate, for that matter, can escape the logic of this conclusion. Opponents have stressed the great importance of treaty making—a field in which the Government operates virtually without constitutional restraints. But surely that only emphasizes the necessity of giving the House a voice in this sphere of policy making. The greatest danger to the Nation nowadays seems to arise, moreover, not from inept treaties but from a failure to exercise this vast power constructively in the cause of world peace. The inescapable fact is that the United States will not be able to take its rightful place in the organization to keep the peace now being set up at San Francisco unless it can exercise the treaty power free from a minority veto.

"Laws and institutions," said Jefferson, "must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind." The House will be asked to do nothing more, when it votes today, than to recognize and act upon this simple, common-sense truth for the sake of preventing World War No. 3.

San Francisco and Beyond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Clarence K. Streit in New York City on April 13, 1945:

A dictatorship can secretly prepare alternative plans in the field of foreign policy, and swiftly swing over from white to black. A democratic government, however, cannot fall back on any alternative plan, however sound, that does not have public opinion behind it. In a democracy, such planning must originate among the citizens themselves. We need to take this responsibility more seriously than ever now, if our democracy is to survive in this hair-trigger age.

We need, too, some basic truth to guide us in our search for peace in the confusions of these days—a compass to tell us whether we are really heading toward peace. Federal Union is here to supply the compass, the alternative, and the basic truth we need.

HOW EVERY NATION HAS MADE A LASTING PEACE

Some say there is no possibility of peace—that with human nature what it is we are bound to have conflict, fighting, war. I agree we are bound to have conflict and fighting; but I don't agree we are bound to have war.

Certainly, if anything is inherent in human nature, conflict is. It breaks out in the best circumstances. Boy meets girl, they fall in love, they marry, but even that does not keep them from fighting. Between friends, between businessmen, between employers and workers, between labor unions, between and within churches, there is any amount of conflict. This city is shot through with conflict and fighting, so is this State and this whole country—and yet we have peace within the United States.

If all the rest of the world were to sink, and only the United States remained, there would then be world peace. But that would also be true if all nations should be obliterated except England, or France, or Russia, or any one nation. Peace is not only possible; it is so possible that every nation on earth has proved capable of establishing enduring peace within a territory where before there was intermittent war.

How did they do it? Always and only by doing one simple thing—by changing the unit of society within that area from sovereign bodies politic, such as tribes, city states, principalities, to individual persons—by reducing the unit of human conflict from a mass-to-mass fight down to the conflict easiest to govern, a man-to-man affair.

For war is not a conflict between two men, it is a fight between sovereign states composed of masses of men. When you melt men together to form this body politic and that body politic, you do not eliminate the danger of conflict inherent in the nature of every individual man in them. You merely make it worse by putting it on a nation-to-nation basis. So long as your world is composed of sovereign states, as its predominant units, there is bound to be war, no matter how peace-loving they are at the start, or how strongly they are leagued together.

EVEN UNITED STATES LEAGUE FAILED

Common sense tells us this, and experience backs it up. Among all the 60 regions of the earth today in which enduring peace has been established, there is none where this was done by joining sovereign states together in a league as we are trying to do on a world scale at San Francisco.

Attempt after attempt has been made to secure peace by organizing sovereign states instead of men as units, and always the result has been failure. This method was tried by the little city republics of ancient Greece more than 2,000 years ago. Their leagues were stronger and more advanced than the one planned at San Francisco. Yet, they failed to secure peace even on that little peninsula.

If this method could work, it surely should have worked among our original States. They tried it under the most advantageous circumstances. The League of Friendship they set up under our Articles of Confederation during the war of independence was more advanced than the League of Nations. It had the improvements that many believe could suffice to make the United Nations league succeed.

In this early American league, each State had its own army, its own currency, its own tariffs, but the 13 States allowed the League of Friendship an international force—the Continental Army. Each State had an equal vote in the league, but the league could act by a majority of 9 States in many things,

and the larger States had no special veto. This league was limited to only 13 States, whose people all spoke the same language, had the same Christian religion, the same economic system. All were democratic republics.

Yet, despite all these advantages, even this league failed. During its brief career there rose 11 territorial disputes among the 13 States, several of which threatened war. There were trade wars, boycotts. The league proved helpless and led to hard times, revolts, and dangers of war from outside. If a league could not work among these 13 peace-loving States, how can any reasonable person expect to gain peace merely by extending the same system to all the divergent nations of the world?

THE ESSENTIAL TRUTH OF FEDERAL UNION

The essential truth is plain: Insofar as the world is organized predominantly with sovereign bodies politic as the unit—whether they are called nations, states, city republics, tribes—the world is organized for war. So long as it is organized on this unit, so long as we seek to establish law in terms of states instead of persons, aggressor states, guilty nations, peace-loving nations, sovereign states—we cannot possibly eliminate either small wars or world wars, any more than we can eliminate theft, murder, or riots by organizing law with the individual person as unit. But where we do thus reduce inevitable human conflict to this individual unit, we do eliminate war. Insofar as we organize the world predominantly with the individual citizen as the unit, we shall get peace. There is the compass that Federal Union gives to guide you in these troubled days, the basic truth for which it stands.

HOW TO APPLY IT

How shall we transform the existing nation-to-nation relationship of war into the man-to-man relationship of peace?

It must be done either by force or by agreement. History tells us that nearly all the eras of peace we have in the world were formed by force—the stronger cave family conquering the others and building the tribe, the strong tribe conquering the others and building the city, state, or pretty kingdom, and so on up to the nations of today. The anarchy of sovereign bodies politic usually has been abolished by a conqueror—just as Hitler tried to abolish it—and we can be certain that if we fail to work this transformation by agreement, we shall soon be facing some new Hitler.

The outlook would be grim if there were no exception to the rule of force. But there are a few, and the most promising of all lies in our own history. When the league system failed the 13 States, they did not wait for war to engulf them. They sent their delegates to meet in convention in 1787. After long and arduous debates, they agreed on a constitution that shifted the basis of their organization from the 13 sovereign States to the sovereign citizens.

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION POINTS WAY

It provided that the new United States Government should operate directly on the citizen unit, instead of on his State as a whole. It provided that the operations of this new Government should be determined and governed by the representatives of the citizens, chosen roughly on a basis of one citizen, one vote, instead of by the delegates of the State government, acting as a unit on the principle of one State, one vote. It provided, too, that the whole purpose of this new Government should be to secure the freedom and sovereignty and security of the citizens themselves, rather than the freedom and sovereignty of their State governments. You see, the Founding Fathers wrought an all-around transformation from the State to the person as unit.

To do this they had to solve two major problems that had hitherto baffled mankind, and seem to be baffling the nations today. One was the big State—little State problem. The big States feared the little States would dominate them if each State had an equal vote. The little States feared the more populous States would dominate them if representation were apportioned by population. The founding fathers solved it by giving the people of each State, small and large, equal representation in the Senate, and every citizen equal representation in the House.

The other problem rose from twin fears that the State governments might remain so powerful as to continue anarchy, and that the new inter-State government might be so strong as to be tyrannous. The founding fathers solved it by dividing the powers of government between the State governments on the one hand and the United States Government on the other. Where they all agreed the citizen would gain more by having the Union Government handle the job, they transferred that power from the States to it. Where they agreed the State could do the work better, they guaranteed that right to each State. In the end they shifted only 5 major powers from the States to the Union. But in so doing they abolished those 13 separate armies, currencies, and tariffs, set up 1 army, 1 currency, and 1 great free trading area under the Union, and gave the citizen of every State an additional citizenship, the one we all prize the most now, citizenship in the Union.

There in a nutshell is the Federal Union way to transform the relations between the people of sovereign nations from the State-to-State basis of war to the man-to-man basis of peace. Here in the United States we first proved that this difficult transformation could be wrought in peace, and that the Federal Union solution works.

WHAT OF SAN FRANCISCO?

How can we begin this transformation now between nations? It is only too clear that we cannot hope to begin it with all the United Nations at San Francisco. The plan that the great powers have already agreed to support there is based entirely on the state as unit. It does not transform, in the slightest degree, international relations from the nation-to-nation basis of war to the man-to-man basis that peace requires. It provides merely for another league of nations.

It is evident that only another league can come out of San Francisco. The basic problem there is to keep all the United Nations together. The larger the number and the more divergent the nations to be organized, the lower the common denominator must be. But this is no reason to reject this league as useless, or despair. We Federal Unionists hold that no matter how weak a league is organized at San Francisco, it should be supported, for any league is better than a return to isolationist diplomacy. Though it cannot possibly suffice to secure peace, it can help, and it can do much good.

We Federal Unionists have never believed the transformation from State to citizen that peace requires, could possibly begin among nations as divergent as the Big Three, let alone all the United Nations. We have always believed that it could begin only among a few nations, selected on the basis of common principle rather than of great armed power. Clearly the only governments that can be expected to consent freely to base their mutual relations on the citizen as unit are those in which the citizen already has the greatest power, those which not only operate down on the citizen but operate up from the citizen for his greater individual freedom, which aim to give him more power over government, and government less power over him—the nations, in short, that are most democratic in their principles and practice.

Federal Unionists have always recognized that the union of citizens which peace requires must first come up from the citizens themselves in those advanced democracies where they already are free enough to work for this, and in position to change the government's policy by changing the minds of the majority of their fellow citizens.

UNION WITHIN A LEAGUE

Consequently we Federal Unionists favor the common-sense, two-basket, practical policy of combining league and union, organizing a union where we can and a league where we can't, uniting some of the democracies within the league of United Nations in a nuclear union that can grow gradually into a world federal democracy.

We Federal Unionists warmly support the efforts of the United States Government to organize all the United Nations in a new league. We deem it particularly important that this league should include such great countries as Soviet Russia and China, with whom we hope thereby to improve our present friendly relations. We are ready to bow to the practical necessity of weakening the league machinery in order to keep all the United Nations together in it.

But the more the new league is weakened the more we must insist on the need of supplementing and strengthening it, and providing an alternative for the unhappy event that the league should quickly fail.

By uniting the democracies within it in a federal union we do not only definitely begin the change-over from the nation-to-nation basis of war to the man-to-man basis that peace requires, but we vastly improve the possibility of keeping the world at peace during the transition period needed for the nuclear union to grow to universal union.

Experience in the Western Hemisphere has shown that peace can be preserved fairly well even in a weak league if that league includes a colossal federal democracy. And luckily it happens that a few of the democracies can, by union now, make democracy the same colossal power for peace in the world league that it is already in the inter-American league.

WHAT THE CITIZEN CAN AND CANNOT DO

None of us private citizens can hope to get any of the foreign governments at San Francisco to accept the stronger league we want. We must leave that to our delegation there, and remember that the only way it can get all those governments to agree on any league at all is by weakening rather than by strengthening it.

But any citizen can help strengthen that league by working to supplement it with an international union of citizens that does not require the consent of all those governments—that requires only the consent of the majority of citizens in a few of the democracies where the citizen is freest, and first of all the consent of our fellow citizens here in the United States.

To work for peace in this way would seem to be the major duty of the citizen, especially in the present interlude while he waits for the results of San Francisco to reach the Senate.

That is the duty that the citizens who form our association, Federal Union, Inc., are trying to do. For our association aims to educate people in these basic principles of peace, and have an alternative plan prepared that is founded on truth.

We answer your question, "To what does enrollment in Federal Union really commit me?" by saying: "Only to the purpose for which this Federal Union was incorporated as a nonprofit membership association, namely, to promote education in the basic

principles of Federal Union as exemplified in the Constitution of the United States with a view to attaining world order by a Federal union of democratic peoples."

The sky is the limit to what you can do in the association, but by enrolling you are committed at bottom only to registering your name behind those principles and contributing at least $2 in dues to spread knowledge of them.

FEDERAL UNION PIONEERING

We realize that such educational work does not seem exciting to some people. They think it remote; they want something as immediate as the front page. They haven't time to ring their neighbor's doorbell—especially if they live in an apartment house—or send their old friends a book or pamphlet. They want the excitement of the final stages of a fight, the excitement of the band wagon.

But before they can climb aboard the band wagon some other people have got to provide the band wagon. There seems to be only one person in a hundred to whom this foundation work, this creative work, this pioneering work appeals more than does bandwagoneering. But there are such persons, and they are the ones we are seeking tonight, and every day.

Those who serve the truth of Federal Union must be prepared to serve it as did the men and women who got mankind to see every great truth that is common knowledge now. How can one expect to isolate and cure the germ of war except by the process by which the germ theory itself was established?

Surely everyone who knows in his heart a thing is true has the responsibility of helping spread that truth. Every one of us is benefited personally every day of our life by any number of truths that have come to our aid through men who first saw them boldly declaring them, and spreading them and staking even their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor—as Jefferson put it—to give these truths to the rest of us. What manner of man is he who will take all this truth from strangers, from men long since dead, and do nothing in his time to spread any truth to others, even to save his living friends and his own children?

There is no special virtue that I see in discovering a great truth by oneself—if that can really be—instead of from one's fellowmen. What good does it do for any man to discover any truth by himself if he cannot spread it to others? His truth lies dormant, until men who can spread knowledge and acceptance of it take it from him. There is as much merit in those who spread the truth, who make it known to the most of men, as in those who first stumble on it.

WHERE THE LIGHTS ARE STILL GOING OUT

In Federal Union you have in its early stage one of those great, world-changing truths whose rise forms the glory of our species. It is greater than the truth that germs invisible to the naked eye can cause disease—greater in this sense, at least: That it cures the worst of diseases, the one that the germ theory fails to reach, the one that makes men themselves the destroyers of men, turns man himself into a virus more hideous than any spirochete. This disease twice in 20 years has seized the whole species in its pestilential grip.

True, the lights are going on again all over Europe, but all over America now, in family after family, in heart after heart, the light is going out. They have already lost what was dearest to them in this war. And millions wait tonight in dread lest this fate be theirs, too. Let us remember that the joyful hour we dream of, when our boys come marching back victorious, will be the saddest of days for our brothers and our sisters whose boys will not return.

They need comfort, and surely the best comfort they can get is reason to hope that out of their sacrifice comes great and lasting good. On us, the living, rest the responsibility, whether the new chance these dead have given us shall be used to create something as great and enduring as the Americans of Jefferson's generation created, or whether our own dead shall have died merely to let us fritter and fumble and fool ourselves into a worse world war.

YOUR PRIVILEGE

You have the privilege of helping conquer this dread disease of war by enrolling behind this truth, the great truth of Federal Union.

Peace cannot possibly be had on a state-to-state basis; it can only be had by changing over to the free man-to-man basis that characterizes the American Federal Union. The sooner we each recognize this ourselves and get the majority to agree to begin this transformation, the sooner we shall have peace.

If you are not sure that this is true, you should study it more, and we have plenty of literature to help you. But there must be some of you who know in your heart that this is the truth. So long as you do not even acknowledge this truth by enrolling behind it, you are yourself holding back the spread of truth, blocking what your own conscience tells you is the road to peace.

If everyone listening to me, here in this hall and in the radio audience, who knows in his heart that this is the truth, would but act upon it now, would but sign his name to what he holds to be self-evident, would but tell the world by telling us, "I believe in the Federal Union principle and I will help spread its truth," how much more rapidly that truth would spread than if you stayed passive.

How easy it would be if only I could speak to you with the clarity of Thomas Jefferson, the logic of Alexander Hamilton, the authority of Abraham Lincoln.

If only I had the imagination of Dante to portray to you the hell toward which humanity is heading; the imagination of Shakespeare to bring before your eyes the unbelievably happy and abundant world we could enjoy through Federal Union. If only I had, just for tonight, the eloquence of the great Hebrew prophets to burn into your hearts this truth:

Beyond San Francisco lies chaos, slavery and war if you fail to work incessantly to supplement its league with Federal Union of the Free. But if you do achieve this there lies beyond San Francisco freedom, abundance, and peace such as man has never known.

If you can accept and act on that simple truth without needing a Jefferson to convince you, or a Hamilton, Lincoln, Dante, Shakespeare or Isaiah, well, then you have in your something better than the stuff that dreams are made on. You have in you the stuff that can turn dreams into reality.

Gap in Our German Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very much concerned about the problem of properly dealing with those responsible for the hideous atrocities committed by the Nazis. Unfortunately, we seem to have taken a step backward in this connection when Herbert Pell was dismissed from the Government service. In the judgment of many Americans, Mr. Pell was ideally qualified for his position on the War Crimes Commission and the reasons for his dismissal do not seem to be clear. As part of my extension of remarks, I would like to include the following admirable editorial by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post of May 2, 1945:

GAP IN OUR GERMAN POLICY

(By Marquis Childs)

The accusation brought against the State Department by Herbert Claiborne Pell deserves more consideration than it has received.

Part of the blame for the German atrocities that have so shocked the world Pell puts on the State Department. Coming from a former member of the War Crimes Commission, that is no mere shot in the dark.

Pell, a man of position and prestige, has a long European experience, including two important diplomatic posts. He speaks out of sober knowledge and a realization of the dangers inherent in a policy of drift.

As the American member of the War Crimes Commission, Pell worked with representatives of our allies to define war crimes and to fix adequate punishment. The Commission in London did a thorough job. Aware of the awful threat to millions of human beings at the mercy of the Nazis, the group provided penalties ranging from imprisonment up to death for a series of crimes.

The Commission itself, of course, did not have the power to put out this international criminal code in behalf of the nations represented on the Commission. What it could and did do was to recommend that the various foreign offices take over at this point and inform the world that war criminals would be punished in terms of a code agreed upon by the Allies.

But nothing happened. The Foreign Office in London and the State Department in Washington sat on the recommendations.

Pell returned to America in an effort to get action. It was already very late, since clearly the Germans would become more brutal as they became more fearful of their position in Europe. A tottering dictatorship is always more cruel than one that is securely entrenched.

From the late President Roosevelt, Pell received every assurance of support. In the face of this assurance, he was told at the State Department that he was to be dropped from the Commission because Congress would not appropriate $30,000 for its work.

At about the same time the British member of the Commission, Sir Cecil Hurst, resigned. He had no more success than Pell in persuading the Foreign Office to accept the Commission's recommendations.

So nothing was done. Notice was not served on the enemy that the guilty would be punished.

Of course, this would not have prevented the holocaust of brutality that has swept Germany. But Pell says, and with good reason, that many individuals might have been deterred from acts of mass savagery if they had been informed that it meant certain death. As it was, the Nazis knew that the individual governments had failed to act on the recommendations of the War Crimes Commission.

This failure leaves a serious gap in our German policy. There is an embarrassing zone of doubt at the moment when our military commanders should proceed under agreed-upon rules.

It might be necessary to pass sentence on a half million or more men, possibly all of the Gestapo, together with the S. S. But how much better to be able to fix the guilt and assess the punishment: That would make the approach to the jungle of Germany today so much simpler.

Pell points to the contrast with Russia. The Russians, never so naive as to talk about a hard or soft peace, have acted on a clearly defined code which has already brought many German criminals to trial and punishment. Having established the Free German Committee and drawn the line between criminals and noncriminals, they are going ahead on a policy that makes sense.

Naturally that impresses the people of liberated countries. If Soviet retribution is swift and sure while we continue to waver, then, as Pell points out, tortured Europeans will chalk up another score for Russian realism.

Is it any wonder that German soldiers and civilians came flocking to our lines to try to surrender? Quite apart from Goebbels' propaganda against Russia, the Nazis have never heard anything from us about punishment.

Flood Wall at Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I made reference to the flood condition in the Ohio Valley and to the protection afforded by the flood wall which protected my home town of Huntington, W. Va., from any damage whatsoever.

Today, I wish to inform the House about two thriving communities just west of Huntington at the confluence of the Ohio and Big Sandy Rivers. Here is located Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va., two progressive communities important in the manufacture of cement, glass, lumber products, and as a railroad center. These communities are served by the great Ohio River, the C. & O. Railway, the Norfolk & Western Railway, and the B. &. O. Railway, and more coal passes this point annually than any other place in the world.

These communities were also safe and dry under the protection of a flood wall constructed through the efforts of an industrious people, and I think you will find that the flood wall at Ceredo and Kenova was constructed at a greater per capita cost than other walls in this section of the country.

During the recent flood crisis no manhours were lost, no property was damaged, and all trains proceeded on regular schedule.

Broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Wednesday, May 2, 1945:

In Congress the Special Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives, headed by Representative CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, made public its first report on the meat crisis of the Nation, and I have been reading congressional committee reports for upward of 25 years, but this one is without question, I think, the best job I have ever seen done. For simplicity, for the complete and over-all and thoroughly competent grasp that this committee has achieved on this tremendously complicated situation, it is a masterpiece. It goes to the very heart of the whole problem. It analyzes and explains in everyday nontechnical language exactly what has been wrong and why and how the black markets have developed, and then it offers 10 simple suggestions by way of a cure.

If you want a complete and perfect picture of what has happened to the meat supplies of the Nation, and what has been the cause, and how it has happened, and if you want it told in language that a child can understand (it's beautifully written by the way) by all means get this report. It's only 17 pages long. There's no charge for it. Simply write to the office of Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and ask for the report on the meat investigation. It will be sent to you at Government expense.

This report is unanimous. It is signed by all seven members of the investigating committee—Chairman ANDERSON, Representatives STEPHEN PACE of Georgia, EARLE CLEMENTS of Kentucky, MARTIN GORSKI of Illinois, AUGUST ANDRESEN of Minnesota, CHRISTIAN HERTER of Massachusetts, and HAL HOLMES of Washington. The only disagreement of any kind is in one of the recommendations. That recommendation was as follows:

The committee respectfully recommends that the President immediately consider the problem of needed coordination of the entire food program, and by that the committee means the coordination of production, distribution, rationing, and pricing of food. Certainly such coordination of effort is the least the American people can ask or expect, in the light of the stupendous requirements for food at home and abroad.

There must be action now. The price line is weakening. It must be held. Time is working on the side of scarcity, and if time is wasted and coordination not achieved, black markets will have cracked price control irreparably.

The only disagreement was that the three Republican members wanted to add to that the specific recommendation:

"In order to secure such coordination and cooperation, we respectfully suggest that the President place a single authority in charge of all phases of the food program."

The Democrats would not subscribe to that, and perhaps it makes no difference because the results are what are important. This morning at the White House this entire committee consulted at great length with the President, laying their findings before him. Members who were present told me the President was deeply impressed and that he gave the clear indication that he will act according to the recommendations. He indicated, however, that this is one job in which he personally intends to take a hand and do the coordinating, and if that is the case, that's all that's necessary to bring an end to the conflicts and the cross purposes and the lack of cooperation between the various agencies involved in the food picture, which has been one of the greatest contributing factors in the present difficulties.

This report not only tells what has happened to produce the meat crisis and the mistakes that have been made, but it goes into fundamentals and explains that there are two parts of the problem. One is the rationing and price control over the meat we have on hand. The other is producing more meat to come closer to securing the demand. It's the shortage of supply as compared with public demand for the product that produces black markets and the more you can reduce that gap between the two the more you weaken the forces that make the black market. The report says, as you may have heard before, if beef is to be produced in greater quantities for the relief of the present shortage it must be made profitable to fattened cattle in the feed lots because that is where beef is made. In the opinion of the committee, it is not profitable to do so now.

Now, I'm sorry it's impossible to read it to you but as I say you can get a complete copy absolutely free by writing to Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Simply ask for the meat-investigation report. It's very easy and interesting reading. Not long and one of the best jobs any investigation committee of Congress has ever done.

Farm Machinery

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that we are making real progress in working out a program that will actually get surplus machinery that can be used on the farm back to the farmers.

I want to congratulate Secretary Wallace on the way he has cooperated since entering the picture. I know the interest of the farmers is now in safe hands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from N. E. Dodd, Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, dated May 1, 1945; copy of Surplus Property Board Regulation No. 3; letter from Mr. Dodd of May 2, 1945; and statement on the operation of the surplus truck disposal program as it would affect the farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: Attached is a copy of Surplus Property Board Regulation 3, Dispositions of Surplus Property in Rural Areas and to Farmers. This regulation has been approved by the Administrator of the Surplus Property Board, the War Food Administrator, and me.

Regulation 3 is broad enough to accomplish the objectives of section 17 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944. There are two points which are not given specific consideration in the regulation, but which this

Agency believes are necessary to the successful operation of any disposal program on surplus trucks. The first point is that of establishing a fixed price on each truck offered for sale by the disposal agency; the second point is that of establishing O. P. A. ceiling prices which will reflect actual services rendered by the dealer, plus a reasonable margin of profit.

With reference to the first point, the Department of Commerce states it does not have sufficient information or personnel at this time to do a satisfactory job on establishing fixed selling prices. Both the Department of Commerce and the Surplus Property Board have stated that as soon as the required information and personnel are available, steps will be taken toward establishment of fixed prices on all trucks to be sold. With reference to the second point, the Surplus Property Board and the Department of Commerce have advised this Agency that they will do everything possible to assist in working out with O. P. A. satisfactory ceiling prices on surplus trucks. This Agency has recommended to O. P. A. that ceiling prices on surplus trucks be determined in a manner similar to that contained in MPR-133 for farm machinery.

I will endeavor to keep you advised from time to time on the operation of the surplus disposal programs directly affecting agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD, *Chief.*

TITLE 32—NATIONAL DEFENSE

CHAPTER XXIII—SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

[S. P. B. Regulation 3]

Part 8303. *Dispositions of surplus property in rural areas and to farmers*

SEC. 8303.1. Definitions: (a) "Board" means the Surplus Property Board.

(b) "Farmer" means an individual, firm, or corporation chiefly engaged in farming or tillage of the soil, in dairy farming, or in the production of poultry, livestock, or poultry or livestock products in their unmanufactured state.

(c) "Farmers' cooperative association" means any association in which farmers act together in processing, preparing for market, handling, or marketing farm products, and any association in which farmers act together in purchasing, testing, grading, processing, distributing, or furnishing farm supplies; provided, however, that any such association is operated for the mutual benefit of the members thereof as such producers or purchasers.

(d) "Surplus property" means any property which has been determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the owning agency in accordance with the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

(e) "War Food Administrator" means the War Food Administrator or his successor.

SEC. 8303.2. Limitation of application: This regulation shall apply only to disposals of surplus personal property made by disposal agencies within the continental United States, its territories and possessions.

SEC. 8303.3. Diversion of surplus property into rural areas. (a) General duty of disposal agencies: Disposal agencies shall adopt all reasonable measures to cause appropriate quantities of surplus property to be sold or channeled into rural areas so that farmers and farmers' cooperative associations will be accorded opportunity to purchase which is equal to that accorded buyers having no priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944. In discharging this duty disposal agencies shall consult with the War Food Administrator.

(b) Allocation and disposal of surplus property having general farm use. In carrying out the foregoing policy disposal agencies shall, after satisfying all priorities as provided in the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and regulations of the Board thereunder, sell in rural areas or for distribution in rural areas such quantities of the types of property listed in exhibit A as may under the circumstances appear reasonably necessary or appropriate to assure the utilization of the agricultural resources of such areas. Periodically, but at intervals of not to exceed 60 days, commencing with the effective date of this regulation, each disposal agency shall advise the War Food Administrator of the quantities on hand of the types of property listed in exhibit A, and the States or regions in which such property is located. The War Food Administrator will from time to time advise the disposal agencies of the quantities of such property which he finds should be channeled to rural areas to assure the utilization of the agricultural resources of such areas, and the disposal agencies shall be guided accordingly. If the efforts of the disposal agency demonstrate that the quantities thus assigned for rural areas will not be so absorbed, such quantities may be disposed of in any other manner authorized under the act.

(c) Methods of disposal. The appropriate quantities to be channeled into rural areas under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section shall be disposed of as follows:

(1) To distributors, dealers, wholesalers, farmers' cooperative associations, or retailers who customarily distribute in rural areas and certify that the surpluses being purchased will be so distributed, or

(2) Through community auctions which are certified by the War Food Administrator as serving rural areas, or

(3) By a combination of the methods stated in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph, or

(4) By any other method or methods, reasonably calculated to effectuate disposal in rural areas, as may be agreed upon by the disposal agency and the War Food Administrator and approved by the Board.

Disposal agencies may, notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, distribute new trucks and new farm machinery directly to farmers if they shall find that it is in the public interest to make such disposal.

SEC. 8303.4. Surplus trucks, machinery, and equipment needed to prevent impairment or threatened impairment of farm production. (a) Duty of disposal agencies: Reasonable quantities of surplus trucks, machinery, and equipment shall be made available for disposal in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations whenever a shortage of such items impairs or threatens to impair farm production. Such reasonable quantities shall be determined by the Board from time to time as provided in paragraph (b) of this section. Upon such determination the disposal agencies shall promptly take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to make such property immediately available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

(b) Allocation orders; certificates of War Food Administrator: If the War Food Administrator shall find that farm production is impaired or is threatened to be impaired in any area by a shortage of trucks, machinery or equipment, he shall submit a certificate to the Board stating that he finds such impairment or threatened impairment of farm production to exist in a specifically named area by a shortage of specifically described types of trucks, machinery, or equipment and setting forth the quantities of each type of such property which constitute a reasonable portion of the existing total surplus supply thereof to be made available in such area to aid in relieving such impairment or threatened impairment of farm production. In order to assist the War Food Administrator in the preparation of such certificates, disposal agencies shall promptly on his request advise him of the total surplus supply of such trucks, machinery, and equipment as he may specify and the States or regions where they are located. Upon receipt of any such certificate of the War Food Administrator the Board will determine the types and quantities of such property to be made available as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, taking into consideration such certificate and any other pertinent evidence, and will publish its determination by an order under this regulation.

(c) Methods of disposal: The types and quantities of property designated in such orders under this regulation shall be disposed of:

(1) To regular retail dealers and farmers' cooperative associations which are dealers, provided that they represent and agree that they will sell the property purchased only to farmers or farmers' cooperative associations located in the areas specified in such orders, and that, in the case of trucks, the property will be sold only to farmers or farmers' cooperative associations located in such areas that hold certificates issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency; or

(2) By any other method or methods, reasonably calculated to effectuate disposal in rural areas, as may be agreed upon by the disposal agency and the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and approved by the Board.

Disposal agencies may, notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, distribute new trucks and new farm machinery directly to farmers if they shall find that it is in the public interest to make such disposal.

SEC. 8303.5. Violations by dealers: Any person who shall make a false representation or who shall be found to have defaulted on any undertaking or promise required by this regulation, shall thereupon be disqualified to acquire any surplus property disposed of under this regulation.

SEC. 8303.6. Regulations and reports to be filed with the Board: Copies of all regulations, orders, agreements, and instructions of general applicability issued by any agency in furtherance of this regulation shall be filed by such agency with the Board. Within 60 days after the effective date of this regulation and thereafter at intervals of not more than 60 days, each disposal agency shall file with the Board a report of sales made pursuant to section 8303.3 hereof. Reports of sales made pursuant to section 8303.4 and any order issued thereunder shall be filed with the Board by each disposal agency within 60 days after the promulgation of such order and thereafter at intervals of not more than 30 days until the repeal of such order; final reports shall be filed with the Board within 60 days after such repeal.

SEC. 8303.7. Regulations of other agencies: All disposals under this regulation shall be subject to applicable regulations of the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation.

SEC. 8303.8. Amendment or repeal: This regulation and any order under it shall be subject to amendment or repeal by the Board by any regulation or order of the Board duly published in the Federal Register.

This regulation shall become effective June 1, 1945.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD,
A. E. HOWSE, *Administrator.*
April 25, 1945.

Approved and concurred in,

MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator.
April 30, 1945.

NORRIS E. DODD,
Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency.
April 28, 1945.

EXHIBIT A TO SPB REGULATION NO. 3

TYPES OF PROPERTY TO BE CHANNELED INTO RURAL AREAS

1. Farm construction materials: Lumber and lumber substitutes, shingles and other roofing materials, lath, paint, varnish.

2. Merchant trade products: Barbed and twisted wire, drawn wire, wire bale ties, wire nails and staples, woven and welded wire

fence, pipe (cashing, line, standard, etc.), reinforced mesh and wire netting, formed roofing and siding, fence posts.

3. Hand tools.

A. Farm and garden tools: Forks, hoes, mattocks, picks, post hole diggers, rakes, scrapers, shovels.

B. Mechanic hand-tools: Wrenches (all types), pliers, vises, belt cutters, pipe stocks and dies.

C. Carpenters and edge tools: Axes, adzes, hammers, wrecking bars, saws, chisels.

4. Cordage: Rope, binder twine, tobacco twine, wool twine.

5. Electrical equipment: Motors adaptable for farm use, electric wiring and supplies.

6. Miscellaneous supplies: Harness and harness hardware, chains.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: This morning, while in your office, we agreed to furnish you with a statement on the operation of the surplus truck disposal program as it would affect farmers and farmers' cooperatives. We are attaching a copy of such a statement, and have also included in the statement the operational procedure that will be followed in disposing of surplus farm machinery and equipment, and all other farm supplies.

If we can furnish you with any further information, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD, *Chief.*

STATEMENT ON OPERATION OF SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROGRAMS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD REGULATION 3

BASIS OF THE REGULATION: SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944, SECTION 17

The Surplus Property Board Regulation 3, effective June 1, 1945, and signed by Mr. A. E. Howse, Administrator, Surplus Property Board, and approved and concurred in by Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and Mr. Norris E. Dodd, Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, sets forth provisions under which surplus trucks will be made available to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

The War Food Administrator determines the areas where shortages of trucks cause impairment or threatened impairment of farm production. After such a determination is made, it will be reported to the Surplus Property Board, which will determine the portion of available trucks to be sold to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations in the reported areas. The Surplus Property Board will then issue an order requiring the Department of Commerce to make the specified number of trucks immediately available, ahead of all other priority buyers, for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

Trucks so set aside will be sold to those regular retail dealers who agree that they will sell the trucks purchased only to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations located in areas specified in the order, and that the trucks will be sold only to those farmers and farmers' cooperative associations who hold certificates issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. After a dealer purchases trucks he will notify the proper county A. A. A. committee of the number and description of the trucks he has for sale to holders of A. A. A. certificates. The dealer will then be advised of the farmers and farmers' cooperative associations holding A. A. A. certificates. Reports giving the name and address of each purchaser will be procured from the dealers.

The above procedure also applies to farm machinery and equipment, except that A. A. A. certificates will not be issued to the user. However, as in the case of trucks, dealers purchasing farm machinery and equipment set aside by order of the Surplus Property Board for agricultural use must agree to sell only to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

Regulation 3 also contains provisions which will cause appropriate quantities of all surplus properties to be sold or channeled into rural areas, so that farmers and farmers' cooperative associations will be accorded an opportunity to purchase which is equal to that accorded buyers having no priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Disposal agencies are directed to consult with the War Food Administrator in carrying out this part of the regulation.

Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last year I presented to the Members of Congress a summary of the great contribution to the agricultural effort of the United States in wartime by farmers living in Hampden and Hampshire Counties of Massachusetts. I have now had brought to my attention a summary furnished to me by S. R. Parker, administrative officer of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, to whom I wrote asking for information.

At a time when the food shortage in the United States is becoming critical and when distribution problems have become even more critical, it is interesting to note to what extent the farmers in the various congressional districts of the United States are endeavoring to meet the food problems of the people living in the area where their farms are located. Since the percentage of increase or decrease in the production of livestock, fruits, and vegetables is based upon averages obtained from a large number of representative farmers, the figures do not accurately show the total number of livestock and the total acres of crops in the State or in the respective counties. The importance of the summary is, however, that it shows a substantial increase in the raising of food products in Massachusetts in 1945 as compared with the actual production for 1944. The total harvest will, of course, depend upon weather and other factors over which the farmers have no control. But it is most encouraging to note that they intend to plant more acres, produce more hens and eggs, and otherwise contribute to the relief of the food shortage so prevalent throughout the country at this time. It will be interesting to note how the summary for Massachusetts and the two counties of Hampshire and Hampden compare with the production scheduled in other counties of the United States.

I wish to express my own personal appreciation for the splendid work of our farmers at a period when they are faced with shortages of manpower, machinery, tools, and feed. They certainly are contributing fully to the success of our men on the battle fronts. The summary is as follows:

Summary of the 1945 production intentions taken from the 1945 enrollment blanks prepared between Dec. 1, 1944, and Mar. 15, 1945 [1]

[Number of schedules, 8,604]

	1944	Intended, 1945	Percent 1945 is of 1944	
			State goals	Intended
	Numbers	*Numbers*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Sows to farrow:				
Spring	8,744	8,028	88	92.0
Fall	4,302	4,589	100	107.0
All cattle and calves	151,615	154,125	100	102.0
Dairy cows and heifers of milking age	111,276	115,350	100	104.0
Hens and pullets kept for laying	2,317,169	2,356,026	93	102.0
Turkeys raised	143,520	214,918	110	150.0
	Acres	*Acres*		
Corn	34,025	36,778	100	108.0
Other small grains	9,697	10,263	100	106.0
Vegetables	23,319	23,356	100	100.2
Tobacco	4,093	4,364	105	107.0
Potatoes	13,758	14,335	100	104.0
New seedings	22,883	27,732	101	121.0

[1] No schedules received from farms out of production. Previous years have shown that crop acreages planted usually are somewhat less than March intentions. Reports indicate production to the limit of labor available.

HAMPDEN COUNTY

1945 production intentions taken from the 1945 enrollment blanks

[Number of schedules, 712]

	1944	Intended, 1945	Percent 1945 is of 1944
	Numbers	*Numbers*	
Sows to farrow:			
Spring	722	661	−8.0
Fall	269	304	+13.0
All cattle and calves	10,544	10,655	+1.0
Dairy cows and heifers of milking age	7,300	7,522	+3.0
Hens and pullets kept for laying	140,325	167,547	+19.0
Turkeys raised	28,983	36,247	+25.0
	Acres	*Acres*	
Corn	2,798	3,008	+8.0
Other small grains	704	809	+15.0
Vegetables	2,443	2,551	+4.0
Tobacco	375	444	+18.0
Potatoes	1,391	1,527	+10.0
New seedings	1,835	2,386	+30.0
Bearing orchards	1,230	1,223	−.6
Small fruits	120	129	+7.0
Permanent pasture	2,978	3,006	+1.0

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY

1945 production intentions taken from the 1945 enrollment blanks

[Number of schedules, 938]

	1944	Intended, 1945	Percent 1945 is of 1944
	Numbers	*Numbers*	
Sows to farrow:			
Spring	483	401	−17.0
Fall	195	175	−10.0
All cattle and calves	15,498	15,459	−.3
Dairy cows and heifers of milking age	10,718	11,081	+3.0
Hens and pullets kept for laying	143,566	153,132	+7.0
Turkeys raised	7,634	13,973	+83.0
	Acres	*Acres*	
Corn	4,818	4,994	+4.0
Other small grains	770	779	+1.0
Vegetables	2,562	2,445	−5.0
Tobacco	2,371	2,436	+3.0
Potatoes	3,741	3,725	−.4
New seedings	2,210	2,734	+26.0
Bearing orchards	1,735	1,691	−3.0
Small fruits	45	22	−50.0
Permanent pasture	20,625	20,679	+.3

Clara Barton Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Concurrent resolution officially recognizing the story, life, and achievements of Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross; setting aside the second Thursday of October of each year as Clara Barton Day; requesting Congress of the United States to establish a Clara Barton Day

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the Senate concurring), That we hereby officially recognize and do declare: That there is no surviving American of either sex, the story of whose life and achievements is more thrilling and fascinating than that of Clara Barton; that her achievements in the evening of her life, are greater than the conquests of nations or the inventions of genius; that she left to the world a legacy of accomplishment, which with every passing year has matured, and throughout the future, will mature and expand into wider and more fruitful field of beneficence; that she met the opposition and hardship of a pioneer, but her industry and zeal were as unflagging as her sympathies were universal, her labors never ceasing until her idea of organized relief had thrust its roots deep in the soul of America and that great instrument of mercy, the American Red Cross, had been engrafted into the body of this Republic; that as we witness the terrible catastrophies of the nations that now confront us, the memory of the gentle ministrations of her who won the name of "Angel of the Battlefield" cannot but be a mighty stimulant to the hopes of sorrowing and war ridden peoples everywhere; that she went in person upon the battlefields of three wars: the Civil War in the United States; the Franco-Prussian War; and the Spanish-American War, and there, unblinded by smoke and carnage, free from hysteria, with perfect self-control, she showed mankind the way out and proved that civilization was not dead; that the crown of this leadership of humanity was the foundation and beginning of that world-wide movement of relief that not only upon the stricken fields of war, but in the calamities of peace has immeasurably reduced the sum of human misery; that as long as the American Red Cross endures or its name is remembered, the memory of its founder will be cherished; be it further

Resolved, That the Second Thursday of October of each successive year hereafter be, and the same hereby is, set apart and designated as Clara Barton Day throughout the State of Florida; that the Governor at the appropriate time before said day of each year may call attention to said day, and call upon the people of Florida, the schools, churches, and other organizations to observe Clara Barton Day by appropriate activities and exercises that fittingly do homage to her great name; be it further

Resolved, That we recommend to the Congress of the United States that by appropriate action it establish and designate a Clara Barton Day for the entire Nation, to the end that the civilized world may know that the soul of America is alive and responsive to the gratitude it owes to those whose lives and characters embody and symbolize the spirit and heart of this great Democracy; and be it further

Resolved, That when Clara Barton Day has become national, the State of Florida will cease to observe the day herein named and will thereafter observe the national Clara Barton Day; that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Florida delegation in the National Congress, and the officials of the American Red Cross.

Approved by the Governor May 2, 1945.

Rehabilitation of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Post of April 27, 1945, concerning the employment of wounded servicemen by Collector Denis W. Delaney, Internal Revenue Service, Boston. Collector Delaney was a wounded veteran of World War No. 1, and out of approximately 459 male employees, 116 are veterans.

The article follows:

PROVE WOUNDED VETS COME BACK—NINE MEN, MAIMED OR DISABLED IN WAR, NOW FULLY REHABILITATED IN REVENUE COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

(By Grace Davidson)

Rehabilitation of servicemen is an imposing and long-sounding phrase. To most of us, it has very little reality until we see men who lost legs, arms, and hands at Gafsa, Salerno, Anzio, and in Normandy working at highly skilled jobs along with others who were more fortunate. Yesterday Denis W. Delaney, collector of internal revenue and himself a disabled veteran of World War No. 1, invited a group of disabled veterans of this war, now profitably and usefully employed in his department, to illustrate what rehabilitation is like when it advances beyond the theorizing and talking stages.

For Mr. Delaney's Government department is one of the very first in the country that began giving preference in jobs to disabled veterans returning from the war. Nothing was permitted to be said about the work until wounded men were completely and successfully assimilated in their jobs and the program was proved a definite achievement in public service. * * *

N. Joseph D'Antuona, a Dorchester man, who had his right leg blown off at Gafsa in Tunisia when a land mine exploded, said: "I thought I was done for forever, would never be able to work again and would be a tragedy for my family every time they looked at me. That was how I first felt, but not now." He stood erect, a tall, fine-looking young man dressed in tweeds. He now walks on his artificial leg without the use of a cane.

"One day a man walked into my ward where I lay at the Walter Reed Hospital," said D'Antuona. "He said that I would soon be walking around like him and working at a better job than I ever had. It didn't make sense until he pulled up his trousers and showed me that he had two artificial legs. He was badly wounded in the last war. Then I began to see hundreds like him, who had conquered in the toughest of battles—the wounded man's battle in the hospital."

DETERMINED TO WALK

D'Antuona said he made up his mind that he would walk erect without a cane. After 13 months in the hospital, he walked out under his own power without a crutch or cane. He took a civil-service examination and in May 1944 was appointed deputy collector at 141 Milk Street.

Mr. Delaney interposed, "You see, I was a veteran of the last war and was gassed in the stomach. When I came home I learned that 2 years in France was no asset in getting a job. And I, for one, did what I could to see that it would not happen in my department."

The collector said he regretted that larger plans for returning veterans were not formulated immediately after Pearl Harbor Day. He said he did not like to see men discharged too soon from hospitals, before they were physically and mentally ready for civilian life. And for those men who must remain for long periods in convalescent places, he thought it would be a good idea if civilian hotels were set aside for their use. This thought was prompted when Richard P. Collins, of 42 Millwood Street, Dorchester, remarked that it was unfortunate many of his buddies would not stay long enough in hospitals for complete physical rehabilitation. Collins lost his left hand at Salerno.

DEVELOP HIGHER I. Q.

"I don't think the Government ought to let them out until they are ready. The fellows are too impatient to get out and after they are out a while, they regret that they did not stay longer for treatment," said Collins, who was appointed to a clerical job on his discharge in the collector's office.

Mr. Delaney said at this point that records prove the disabled men, many of them, had developed higher I. Q.'s during their military service. Men who never before in civilian life could have passed the tests are now employed in jobs requiring high mental capacities. Solomon Hammelburg, a discharged disabled veteran, was before the war a taxi driver.

"During the service I got to thinking a lot," said Hammelburg, "and I decided I would like to work with my head when I came out. I didn't want to drive the taxi any longer. I took the civil-service test, passed, and was appointed to a clerical job. And I enjoy every minute of my work. I hope to get promoted one day."

Mr. Delaney assured the group that as fast as they earned promotion, they would be promoted. He said, "If you continue to give to your jobs what you gave to the military service, each one of you will be promoted. The reports on your work are splendid so far." He commented that the disabled serviceman makes an admirable worker. He is anxious to prove he can do as much and more than the man who has not been wounded in battle.

WANT TO CHEER WOUNDED

Several of the men expressed the wish to be invited to visit the wounded men in the hospitals. They said they knew they could help others lying despondently in their ward cots if they could see how they got over the hurdles in spite of their disabilities. The group included Harold J. Hooper, who suffered a broken neck when he was caught in the machinery in the engine room during his naval service; Frank E. Rose, brain concussion and malaria in the New Hebrides; James W. Wallace, wounded in the head, back, left leg and face at Bougainville; Arthur V. Mogan, permanent bone fusion in spine from a shot in magazine of ship; Walter P. Perry, spinal trouble from accident in Air Corps, and Coleman B. Connelly, broken neck from proving ground accident.

Mr. Delaney explained that this group of nine men were picked at random to give their stories of how they were rehabilitated and

found employment. He said that more and more the recent appointments which have been made include disabilities such as loss of legs, arms, hands, with others trussed in steel frames.

Shipshaw Aluminum Deal Proves Need of Light Metals Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill which I introduced today to create a Light Metals Administration, to bring some unified control out of the chaos in light-metals procurement, operation of Government-owned light-metals facilities, and eventual disposal of those facilities, I include the testimony which I gave April 11, 1945, before the Senate Small Business Committee:

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee and to comment on the latest contract of the Metals Reserve Company to purchase Canadian aluminum.

This contract will unquestionably injure the post-war disposal of the Government aluminum plants. It is the fittest instrument that could be legally devised to keep new competition out of the aluminum industry.

Consider its terms: The United States must accept a minimum of 100,000,000 pounds of metal. If Metals Reserve wishes to cancel the contract, it must give 65 days notice. In that interval the Canadian company may deliver 90,275,000 pounds of metal. Altogether this country could be required to accept 190,275,000 pounds. None of this metal is to be delivered before July 1st of this year. I understand that considerable cut-backs in aluminum needs are planned by the Army and Navy if the German War is liquidated soon.

NO REAL CANCELATION CLAUSE

I understand that in requesting the Metals Reserve Company to undertake this purchase contract, the War Production Board expected that aluminum requirements would fall off and asked that the contract contain appropriate cancelation opportunities. The contract does no such thing. It actually saddles this country with the obligation to keep on taking Canadian aluminum even if it is no longer needed this year.

Last year, because of the earlier Shipshaw contracts to buy Canadian metal, the Metals Reserve Company had 444,000,000 pounds stock-piled in Canada. Because of this surplus, the War Production Board shut down American aluminum plants and cut back production in even the best plants that will be most attractive to new operators after the war. Those plants include the Pacific Northwest plants at Troutdale, Oreg., and Spokane, Wash.

SQUEEZE ON NORTHWEST AHEAD

Today Troutdale is operating at half capacity although it is supposed to open the remaining half. Spokane will be back to full capacity. But if we permit Canadian aluminum to pile up again in this country later this year, the squeeze will undoubtedly be put on as it was before. This time, the Federal agencies will probably want to shut down the Spokane and Troutdale plants completely. How can this committee and the Surplus Property Board expect new operators to be interested in shut-down aluminum plants?

Testimony already presented before this committee shows that there will be many difficult problems for new producers in obtaining bauxite, alumina, and in building up markets for metal. In addition to these problems, the policy of buying aluminum from the Canadian front of the American Trust can easily mean that new operators would have to take over cold plants, look around for labor, hire and train new supervisory personnel, and spend considerable sums of money in putting the plants into operating condition.

HARD ON FUTURE OPERATORS

An aluminum plant can't be opened by pressing a button. You have to get the men; you must clean out the aluminum cells and reline them with carbon. Why should a new operator be saddled with all these expenses if he is willing to try to help the Government put its aluminum plants to use and is willing to risk his own working capital in competition with Alcoa and Reynolds?

I don't know whether the agent for the Aluminum Co of Canada was aware of the effects upon American aluminum production when it requested the inflexible cancelation terms. I don't know whether the Alcoa officials who also own controlling stock in the Canadian company also were aware of the consequences of those terms. But I don't see how any competent person in the aluminum business could fail to understand what they meant.

OTHER OBJECTIONABLE FEATURES

There are other objectionable features about this contract that others will go into. These include, I am told, the need to use American coal to produce Canadian alumina when this country has Government plants that can produce the alumina with natural gas, saving 200,000 tons of coal.

Also, I understand there is a serious problem of getting ships to carry the bauxite from South America to Canada. Whereas in this country just outside the Government-owned alumina plant there already stands a pile of bauxite more than enough for the aluminum we are to buy from Canada.

Others will comment on these features. But I want to conclude my remarks by pointing to the need for doing something to correct the situation that permits all the Government agencies concerned with aluminum to act in such an uncoordinated, irresponsible way, so detrimental to the national interest.

TOO MANY AGENCIES

Previous witnesses before the committee have mentioned the many agencies that deal with aluminum in such a way that the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing, or doesn't seem to care. How else can one explain the first Shipshaw contracts to build a big power project in Canada and build the Canadian aluminum industry, at the expense of American power projects and the investment in American aluminum plants?

The Metals Reserve Company signed the Shipshaw contracts that promise to destroy some of the investment in Government plants owned by the Defense Plants Corporation. Metals Reserve and Defense Plants Corporation were both agencies of the Federal Loan Administration, and the Administrator at the time all these arrangements were made was Jesse Jones. He personally knew about all these contracts. He knew about the initial Shipshaw contract signed May 2, 1941, and a few weeks later he was engaged in planning to finance the investment of nearly $700,000,000 in American aluminum plants that would be hurt by the Shipshaw deal.

And besides Mr. Jones, there was Mr. Batt who had been told in 1940 about power waiting to be used at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams in the Pacific Northwest, but who turned in Canada in 1941 to help build a private power project.

NO UNIFICATION TODAY

This latest scandalous contract with Canada's Alcoa is one more evidence that there is no more control over a unified policy in aluminum for the true interests of this country than there was back in 1940 and 1941.

If nothing is done to change the situation in the various Government agencies so as to produce cooperation for the disposal of Government plants according to the Surplus Property Act, the best possible administrators of that act will be helpless to salvage any portions of the millions we have sunk into Defense Plants Corporation aluminum plants in this country.

Here is what will happen unless this committee recommends remedial action. The Army and Navy Munitions Board has recommended a stockpile of metal and bauxite, but that stockpile is not to be built up in any part by purchases from Government plant operators. No other agency today is concerned with this question. That means that the Government-owned plants will close, no matter how low their costs are. Congress must unify policy on stockpile acquisition with plant disposal. Otherwise there will be no outlet for the aluminum produced in the Government plants, and they cannot be kept in operating condition until disposed of.

MAZE OF CONTROL

Again, the War Production Board is only interested in getting aluminum for the needs of the Army and Navy and other war requirements. When war requirements fall off, the War Production Board will tell the Defense Plants Corporation that it can shut down the Government aluminum plants. But Surplus Property Board later is supposed to sell these plants, and the best way to help sell them is to keep them in at least partial operating condition. But there is nothing now to prevent the Defense Plants Corporation from closing down the plants when the War Production Board says so, and then the Surplus Property Board wringing its hands later because nobody will want to buy them.

That is the predicament this country is in because of the lack of unity among the Government agencies interested in aluminum. Only Congress can impose that unity, and I urge that this committee consider this problem. Perhaps the solution may be as one witness already recommended—the establishment of an aluminum commission. Actually, a commission is apt to be divided and weak. I would recommend that an aluminum administrator be authorized by Congress for a temporary period until the Government plants are finally disposed of.

CANCEL SHIPSHAW CONTRACT

And preliminary to everything else, to introduce flexibility into the wartime procurement of aluminum, to safeguard the immense interests the Government has acquired in aluminum plants, and to preserve the basis for the introduction of post-war competition into aluminum production, the committee should recommend the immediate cancelation of the latest Shipshaw contract and begin legislative action now that will result in the speediest possible transfer of existing D. P. C. plants to operating companies that give reasonable grounds for the expectation that they will acquire the facilities and operate them in competition to Alcoa.

This committee has an excellent opportunity to safeguard millions invested in DPC plants, correct a mishandled war supply problem, and insure practical opportunity for free enterprise in a vital field of production that is now monopolized by the Aluminum Co. of America and its sister monopoly in Canada, both owned by the same stockholders and jointly dominated by 11 persons. On behalf of the people of Seattle and the Northwest, I wish to thank Senator MURRAY, Senator MCMAHON, and the members of this able committee for their interest in and work upon this vital problem. Through your efforts our people will gain a great opportunity for future jobs and prosperity.

Florida Will Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an editorial from my hometown newspaper, the De Land Sun-News, which I think is very pertinent. This editorial points out charges made by the State chamber of commerce against Federal bureaus and departments in exposing certain undesirable actions carried on in the State of Florida, which actions received great publicity throughout the Nation. I recall distinctly that there was publicity in every Washington newspaper, and at least one magazine ran a feature article on Miami, Fla., which was very disparaging. I have been in Miami during the war and I saw nothing going on there that was not going on in New York City and Washington. The fact of the matter is that I believe that some of the things that were criticized by this magazine in Miami would pale into insignificance when compared to some of the things going on in other cities in the Nation. If anyone cares to investigate Washington and New York or any other large city they will see for themselves.

It is true that Miami publicized the city as a resort, inviting tourists to come to the city. It is also true that anyone with an ounce of intelligence must realize that during the war people must have some relaxation and they are going to the best place to get it. This may be the subtle reasoning for the publicity against Miami and Florida. There is no better place in the Nation for people to get relaxation of the kind they should have. It is also evident to an intelligent person that there are many people who are wealthy and who are contributing nothing to the war effort who would go to Miami, Washington, New York, Atlantic City, or anywhere else where they can get excitement and enjoyment. If it is a sin for Miami and Florida to advertise their climate and their advantages to those who are seeking relaxation and a vacation, then I have a mistaken impression. I notice that big concerns all over the Nation whose production has been almost entirely taken for the war effort run full-page advertisements in newspapers as though they were still selling goods to the public. To this I have no objection. I think it is perfectly proper for them to advertise their goods to the public so that when the war is over the public will know that these concerns are still in existence. On the other hand, is there any reason why the State of Florida, and Miami, should not continue to publicize their benefits?

As I have said, I have been to Miami during this war, and I have seen the armed forces, those who have enough money, doing the same things that the civilians were doing, and while I do not approve of all that either the armed forces or the civilians were doing, yet it may be well that there is some spot where people can forget the war for a little while. I am proud of the part that my State has played in the war effort. There is no State in the Union that can show a proportionately greater cooperation and contribution than the State of Florida.

The editorial referred to follows:

FLORIDA WILL FIGHT

The Florida State Chamber of Commerce makes rather startling charges against what may be designated "various Federal bureaus in Washington." When summed up, the charges are that these bureaus take keen delight in exposing Florida and give it unfavorable publicity for things that could as well have as a locale, almost any other place in the United States. If Florida is being made the goat, as is implied, it is time that the matter be exposed. Only by a determined fight on unfair publicity of this kind can Florida occupy its rightful position as a really patriotic State that has not only met the demands of the war upon it but has exceeded them.

That there is sufficient ground for suspecting discrimination may be taken for granted from the very fact that former Gov. Spessard Holland has consented to be the chairman of the committee on State relations to battle for Florida with facts and figures. This committee will fight for Florida's good name.

Remember the recent so-called Miami exposé? The Treasury Department decided to clamp down on pleasure seekers who are also tax evaders. The Department's agents invaded Miami, rounded up a few tax evaders, and received reams of publicity.

The Treasury Department charged that Miami was impeding the war effort by encouraging tourists—that she was even advertising her resorts in the northern newspapers and magazines. Matter of fact, so were New York, Los Angeles, Mexico, Cuba, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Virginia, and many other States and cities. These are examples, says the State chamber, of unfavorable publicity of the caliber that Florida has been subjected to which could have originated in virtually any city of any size in any State in the Nation.

Has Florida been backward in war effort? Here are some facts:

Florida has contributed 300,000 men and women to the Nation's armed forces; she has built thousands of ships, airplanes, ordinance, and miscellaneous war items and maintained war contracts at a level of $725,000,000; she produced 5,000,000 tons of food for human and animal consumption during 1943 and 1944; she contributed, tax free, 538 hotels to the armed forces; her citizens purchased $1,161,000,368 worth of War bonds.

In some of these categories, Florida was close to top, proportionate to its population, in war suport. It will be well for the Nation to know that.

Who Really Owns My Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. H. Martindale:

WHO REALLY OWNS MY BUSINESS?

(By E. H. Martindale)

Two gentlemen from the Ordnance Division of the United States War Department were in my office recently in connection with forward pricing which is superseding renegotiation.

During the course of our conversation I remarked that although we had been in business over 30 years, I had never been able to draw out enough from the business to pay the inheritance tax when my share is passed along to my two sons. One of the gentlemen said, "Why should you? They didn't earn it."

This remark bothered me because it sounded logical but it raised the question of why should an inheritance be a liability instead of an asset?

I am a little past the age of 60 and if I should die at the present time my sons, one of whom is with a company of combat engineers with the American First Army on the western front, would have to sell their War bonds, borrow the limit on their life-insurance policies, raise money wherever possible, and still would probably fall far short of raising enough cash to pay the inheritance tax.

As we are a closed corporation with 92 percent of the stock owned by members of two families, no bank will accept the stock as collateral for a loan, and it would be difficult to find an outside buyer to purchase part of the stock at a reasonable price, even if my sons were willing to give up control of the business by disposing of part of their stock.

Then for the next several years my sons would have to skimp and scrape to pay off the debts incurred by the inheritance.

This problem revolved in the back of my head until there came back the answer that my business is not really wealth to me and the question "Who really owns my business?"

It was started back in 1913 by another man and myself as a partnership with a total investment of $260 and, with the addition of a few other stockholders, was incorporated in 1917.

Year after year most of the profits, after taxes, have been plowed back into the business but two periods of unusual expansion required additional cash investments of $17,200 and from these cash investments and plowed-back earnings we are now giving employment to 88 men and women.

Our books disclose that our present factory machinery and equipment cost $89,703.76 with another $10,726.92 for typewriters, desks, and other office equipment, making an investment of $1,141.25 for each of our 88 employees. These are their tools of trade which we have supplied to them and without which they would have no employment.

Then they must have a place in which to work and real estate and buildings represent an investment of another $45,043.27 or $511.85 each.

Next, they must have raw materials from which to manufacture the finished goods and the latter must be held until a buyer is found. These two items take another $196,025.31 or $2,227.50 each.

Our customers, consisting mostly of other industrial plants, are not in the habit of paying cash on delivery and accounts receivable take another $73,816.30 or $838.82 for each employee.

Next, bank balance and petty cash take $32,524.44 or $369.59 each. Other miscellaneous items require $1,859.02 or $21.13 each.

These all total up to a frozen investment of $449,699.02 or $5,110.14 for each employee. It seems safe to say that our employees have never given this any thought and do not realize that without this investment on their behalf, they would not have their present jobs.

This does not represent wealth to me because I cannot exchange it for goods; I cannot spend it for a vacation or for amusement. Our employees look upon me as wealthy because I control this business, but I deprive myself of many luxuries and pleasures in my efforts to accumulate sufficient liquid assets to pay the inheritance tax—wealth that I should feel free to spend if I worked for a salary and owned no stock in the corporation.

I am merely the custodian of the business which seems to really belong to others. First, I am custodian for our employees; they have first claim on our income for their pay in addition to which we pay 1 percent of the amount of their wages or salaries for Social Security to provide them with a pension at some future date, and another 3 percent for possible future unemployment.

Next I am custodian for my city, county, and State. They demand an annual dividend of 2.87 percent of the assessed value of our real estate and buildings, machinery, furniture and fixtures, raw materials, and finished merchandise, even if we make no profit, with a smaller dividend from us on accounts receivable and one from our bank on our bank balance. The State also demands a domestic franchise tax annually of one-tenth of 1 percent of our net worth.

Then comes the Federal Government. To make sure that it gets something, regardless of profits, the Government first assesses the capital stock tax of one-eighth of 1 percent of what we think the business is worth. Then if we make a profit, the Government collects a fat share, and if we pay the profits out in dividends the Government comes back for another large share.

So I submit that I am only the custodian of this business; first, for the benefit of our employees, then for the city of Lakewood (a suburb of Cleveland), the county of Cuyahoga, the State of Ohio, and the Government of the United States of America, and that when I die I shall be passing along mainly this custodianship rather than real wealth to my sons.

Why should my sons be penalized for accepting this custodianship? Should not the inheritance tax laws be revised in some way to permit more liberal treatment when frozen productive wealth that furnishes employment to others, is passed along to the heirs?

Such revision might allow a reasonable exemption based on the average number of employees or average annual pay roll for the preceding 3 to 5 years.

For a firm in the small-business class the present burden frequently makes it necessary to discontinue all expansion, reduce selling and advertising expenses, and otherwise retrench for a period of several years in order to withdraw sufficient cash from the business to pay the inheritance taxes.

This necessary retrenchment may come at such a critical time in the life of a small business that its growth is permanently stunted, or it may even be started on the downward path toward bankruptcy and liquidation.

Senator La Follette's Analysis of Congressional Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose an article written by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., which appeared in the Progressive magazine April 16, 1945. In the article entitled "What's the Matter With Congress?" Senator LA FOLLETTE, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee to Modernize Congress, sets forth his well-considered ideas of the things that should be done to strengthen the Federal Legislature.

The article is as follows:

Vital problems affecting the future welfare of every American citizen confront Congress. Never before in its history has Congress been faced with national and international issues of such great magnitude and complexity.

The determination of policies of our Government rests with Congress under the Constitution. The tendency to increase the power of the executive branch of Government manifest before the war has been greatly accelerated during the conduct of a global struggle. After the war this trend must be reversed, and Congress must recover its power to make the policies of government if representative government is to survive the impact of the problems we face in the postwar period.

Reconversion of our economy from war to peace. Full employment for those ready, willing, and able to work. Adequate social security on a broad base. Improved medical and hospital service. Equality of educational opportunity. An increasing standard of living for agriculture and the preservation of the family-type farm. These are a few of the great domestic problems which confront Congress.

COMMITTEES NEED OVERHAULING

In the field of international relations the Congress will be called on to pass on issues as diverse and complex as those involved in Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, tariff, foreign credits, commodity agreements on oil, rubber, tin, cotton, and wheat and many other like problems.

But Congress today is neither organized nor equipped to understand and approve such policies or to supervise and review their execution. It lacks adequate staff facilities for its committees as well as for the individual members. Its internal structure is antiquated and overlapping. Its contact with the Executive is irregular and spasmodic. Its supervision of executive performance is superficial. Much of its time is consumed by petty local and private matters. These are formidable obstacles to legislative understanding, determination, acceptance, and oversight of postwar policies and programs.

In order to overcome these obstacles, Congress should have its own Research Service to furnish it unbiased information essential to an understanding of complex public problems and programs. The legislative and supervisory committees of Congress should have their own, independent, qualified experts in whom they can have confidence.

I have long believed that Congress must reorganize its committee system by abolishing the inactive committees, consolidating those with overlapping jurisdictions, and providing the remaining committees with adequate and able staffs. Thus the committee systems of both chambers would correspond with each other and be correlated with the major functional divisions of the executive branch.

GUARDIAN OF OUR LIBERTY

We must strive for the greatest possible continuity of post-war policy if a just peace and full employment are to be attained. Continuity of policy and unity of governmental action would be advanced if Congress would create a responsible mechanism for liaison between the Congress and the Executive by setting up a legislative-executive council.

Such a council could be composed of party leaders in Congress and members of the President's Cabinet. It would promote better teamwork between the two branches, achieve legislative scrutiny to assure the administration of post-war measures in harmony with the intent of Congress, and assist in preserving coherence and continuity of high governmental policy.

Congress needs to strengthen and develop methods for implementing its scrutiny of Executive performance. It has been suggested that this might be done by strengthening the staffs of the appropriations committees; giving the General Accounting Office audit power over all Federal agencies, departments, and corporations; creating a Joint Congressional Committee on Public Accounts and a Joint Committee on the Budget; and experimenting with a question period at which executive officials would appear on the floor of Congress and answer questions.

Congress will fail unless it seriously sets to work to put its own house in order, equip itsef with the necessary expert staff, and streamline its committee organization so that a working and clearly defined liaison can be established between Congress and the President on broad phases of national policy.

In foreign as well as in domestic fields it has been demonstrated conclusively that policy is often determined not by the passage of laws, but rather by the day-to-day administration of those laws. In dealing with complex questions of this kind it is impossible to legislate in advance for every conceivable contingency. Discretion must be granted the President and his agents to meet developments as they arise, and the way that discretion is exercised in crucial situations, the slant it is given, frequently goes farther in determining policy through the actual shaping of events than the formal legislative process of framing and passing a bill.

This is a fundamental fact that completely upsets the traditional separation of powers theory, which is based upon the assumption that policy can be determined completely by the passage of laws, that the Chief Executive can clearly be held responsible to such policy since his only function is to execute the law.

The growth of administrative law, the law of executive regulations, orders, and directives, is a profound change in the American system of government.

If, then, Congress is to regain its intended position as the policy-making branch of the Federal Government, it must necessarily equip itself to exercise a high-policy supervisory function over the administration of the laws it passes. It must develop ways and means of working with the Executive

in a cooperative way, continuously, on all major phases of national policy.

It cannot pass a law and then let go of the problem until the Executive comes back for an appropriation or for confirmation of some official to administer it. Those controls are only negative checks on the Executive. They are not the instrumentalities of constructive leadership by Congress.

Finally, it is widely believed that Congress must divest itself of less essential duties like private claims and acting as a common council for the District of Columbia, which divert its attention from national policy-making, and which it ought not to have to consider.

Adoption of these or similar reforms would go far, I believe, toward restoring the effectiveness of Congress as a coordinate branch of our National Government, simplifying its operations and improving its relationships with the Executive, and preventing political frustration of policies involving postwar peace and prosperity.

Representative government is the heart of the democratic faith, and the chief protector of our political liberties. Upon a stronger and more effective Congress may well depend the preservation of democracy in the United States.

Helping Everybody But Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter received this morning. It is typical of the thoughts of some who believe we should continue to aid all other people, all other nations, but who overlook the fact that we have a duty to our own people, to our own country.

The letter and my reply are as follows:

DOWAGIAC, MICH., *April 28, 1945.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am writing to you regarding the bill providing for the United States participation in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank. I understand the bill H. R. 2211 is now in committee.

I have watched closely the progress of public opinion in international affairs in the last few years. We, the people, are beginning to think; we are beginning to use our reasoning powers. That is a very encouraging sign. It means that more people will recognize the issues and problems facing our country and the world. Also important, they will make decisions and judgments by the use of facts and reasoning, rather than by superstitions, ignorance, and fear.

Coming back to the bill, we know that after 2 or more years, tiring years, of negotiations, experts from 44 nations, including our own, have agreed on this fund and bank. We know, if "crippling" amendments are added, the whole agreement must be referred back to the 40 nations, which delay would seriously hinder recovery. We know that the amount of money this fund and bank would need from our country would run a world at war only a few hours; but it opens a way for cooperative planning among nations for prosperity and peace, instead of cutthroat competition of world trade and finance. We know what that leads to. We also realize that, if Congress fails to pass this bill, the United States will again be withdrawing from international responsibility—we know how disastrous to international organization this would be.

As I see it, there are about five stands a Congressman may take:

1. Active stand against, and a "no" vote.
2. No stand and a "no" vote.
3. Lip service and a "no" vote.
4. No stand and a "yes" vote.
5. Active stand and a "yes" vote.

The eyes of your constituents are on you, Congress and individual Congressmen. We expect an active stand and some mighty sound reasons, or a better plan, if your vote is "no."

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) FERN E. NAHIKIAN.

MAY 4, 1945.

Mrs. FERN E. NAHIKIAN,
Dowagiac, Mich.

MY DEAR MRS. NAHIKIAN: Your letter of April 28 came in this morning. In it you ask that I vote for the bill providing for the United States participation in the international monetary fund and the international bank.

Your further statement that the people "will make decisions and judgments by the use of facts and reasoning, rather than by superstitions, ignorance, and fear," carries the implication that they have not in the past followed that course.

It is true that, by the use of propaganda, through Government agencies, over the radio, and through the press, the people have at times been led to believe that by the adoption of certain legislation we could create a utopia, banish work, insure social security, prosperity, happiness for all and an enduring, universal peace—all worth-while objectives.

However, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan are far too sensible to be overlong swayed by propaganda of that nature and, although I have lived in southwestern Michigan for more than 40 years, I have never known them to base their decisions on either superstition, ignorance, or fear. Perhaps you wrote thoughtlessly or are not well acquainted with an overwhelming majority of the people of the district.

You call attention to the fact that the representatives of some 44 nations have agreed to the establishment of this fund and bank. To it, the United States, although it could not control loans or expenditures, would be required to contribute somewhere near $6,000,000,000 at the outset; to be exact, $3,175,000,000 to the bank, which is more than one-third of the total contributions; $675,000,000 more than the combined contributions of Britain and Russia, and within $250,000,000 of what all the rest of the nations, other than Russia and Great Britain, will contribute. To the fund it would contribtue $2,750,000,000, which is more than one-fourth of the total contributions; $250,000,000 more than the combined contributions of Great Britain and Russia; wthin $800,000,000 of what all other nations, other than Great Britain and Russia, will contribute.

The expenditure of the money would be beyond our control, inasmuch as ours would be but a minor representation on the Board of International Directors, and we would be outvoted.

You then conclude your letter with this statement:

"The eyes of your constituents are on you, Congress and individual Congressmen! We expect an active stand and some mighty sound reasons or a better plan if your vote is 'no'!"

That there may be no misunderstanding, let me write that my vote will be "no" and I have what I consider sound reasons for it. In voting "no" on this proposition, I am but following the course pursued so vigorously by Stalin and Churchill, each of whom, from the day when Hitler invaded Poland, has on every occasion acted for and in what he conceived to be the best interests of his own country.

I know of no reason why, if it is so laudable for Stalin to think and act first for Russia; Churchill to have in mind always the interests of the British Empire; I, an average American, should not think and act for what I conceive to be the best interests of my country. That I propose to do.

The garageman's wrecker is of little use to the motorist whose car has been smashed on the highway, unless it has tires, gasoline, a good motor, and is properly equipped for its task. Nor will the United States be able to render effective aid to anyone unless it conserves its ability.

In this war, to save the British Empire, to give Russia the means of defending herself when she was invaded, the United States of America contributed billions of dollars of national resources and of manufactured munitions of war.

While Churchill told us that, if we would furnish the tools, they would furnish the men, our young men have sustained more than a million casualties; more than 500,000 of them have given their lives. More than 4,500,000 men are on foreign soil on the western front. Do you want more sent? Hundreds of thousands of others have died in the Pacific and, if the international politicians have their way, that war may continue until we have retaken all the lost possessions of the British Empire, of the Netherlands, whose queen, with millions at her command, now enjoys a comfortable home here. How long, and to what extent, do you want us to continue the war in the Pacific? How many islands do you think we should retake, at the expense of the lives of American boys, and then give them to either the British or the Netherlands?

No, Mrs. Nahikian, with all the respect which I have for your judgment and for that of those who agree with you, I do not propose, while this country is so short of so many things which are necessary if we are to help not only others but ourselves, to vote $6,000,000,000 or any other like sum to enable the politicians of other lands to gamble in world trade.

I know that a humanitarian impulse causes you to write me and that many others feel the same way. Not a day passes that I do not receive here in Washington letters from parents, brothers or sisters, wives or children, of those who have either been killed in the war or who are still abroad doing the fighting. Many of those letters disclose want, suffering, pitable situations, dire need. There must be some of those cases in your vicinity.

May I most respectfully suggest that, instead of asking me to increase our national debt, which, after this war, will require an annual interest charge of more than $6,000,000,000, by adding another $6,000,000,000 to that debt, you and those who feel as you do start an organized effort to aid those whose sons, brothers, husbands, or fathers have either volunteered or been drafted into the armed service.

You and yours are living in Dowagiac, a beautiful city. I am sure that you and yours get three good meals a day; that you sleep in comfortable beds; that your home is heated in the wintertime; that it has a good roof over it, and that you yourself are a participant in many pleasant social activities.

Wouldn't it be more to the point if we all, instead of looking so far afield for someone to help, turned to our neighbors? Wouldn't it be better if here, in the land to which so many from other countries have come as a place of refuge; where so many from other lands have found and availed themselves of the opportunity for prosperity, for religious freedom, for educational advantages, we preserved—instead of dissipated—our resources?

I am quite sure that you and your husband think first of the family of Nahikian; then of your city, your county, your State, and your Nation. I have followed that same course and expect to follow it as long as I remain here as the Representative of the district.

If we preserve our own economic structure, our own liberty and freedom, we will, as the centuries roll on, be able to help others. If we wreck ourselves by destroying our constitutional processes, by giving away our natural resources, by sending out of the country millions of those who should be the fathers of coming generations, bringing in German war prisoners and refugees to take their places, we shall be not only unable to help others, but we shall be unable to preserve our own existence.

Thanks again for writing me.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

P. S.—If you want the name of a distressed wife or of the mother of some serviceman who is serving abroad and who needs help, will be glad to send on one or two so that you may encourage her, relieve some of her anxiety and suffering, in any way you find convenient. C. E. H.

Poland Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the heroic people of Poland are in our hearts and prayers on the one-hundred-and-fifty-fourth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

It is a sad commentary on world affairs to realize that as the United Nations look hopefully to the establishment of peace among all nations courageous Poland is forgotten and allowed to be partitioned and its entity as a free republic destroyed.

The gallant Polish Nation was the first to feel the cruel lash of the oppressor as he swept through its land on his diabolical itinerary for world conquest. Larger nations applauded the Poles as they fought the invading forces with relentless fury and a national spirit that will prove an inspiration to freedom-loving nations from generation to generation.

Unable to cope with a modern war machine said to be at that time incapable of defeat, the brave Polish people were crushed under the streamlined methods of warfare unleased by the forces of evil and destruction. But Poland's proud head was "bloody but unbowed," and her courageous people continued their efforts to resist by aiding the Allied Powers in various ways and in an effective manner.

It is said that nearly 1,000,000 Polish soldiers have made the supreme sacrifice since Hitler invaded their nation, and that in occupied Poland nearly 4,000,000 lives have been sacrificed through cruel executions, or as a result of barbarous treatment in concentration camps.

Surely the clarion call "Poland must be saved" cannot be forgotten. It was the battle cry of the United Nations as they joined each other in declaring war on the Hitler government to avenge the ruthless subjugation of peaceful Poland.

It is a coincidence that the San Francisco Conference should be in session on the one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the Polish Constitution and that the memories of Poland's mighty contribution to the restoration of peace are apparent in the fervent appeals that "Poland must be saved." God grant that the world leaders conferring in San Francisco will find inspiration in the heroic struggle of the valiant Polish people and that they will take appropriate action to restore that war-torn nation to its rightful place in the family of nations by restoring it to the stature of a free and independent nation.

National Marine Corps Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Forty-third Street Rifle Club of New York, that proposes the designating of a certain day to annually pay tribute to the marines.

I want to congratulate this organization for this timely suggestion, as I think it has great merit and is worthy of consideration.

None of us would want to say anything, or do anything that would detract from the glory and fighting ability of the other services, but we who have had the opportunity to serve with the United States marines take great pride in having served with that organization. We know the history and tradition of the Corps, and know of its long service to this Nation. From its first expedition in the Bahamas on March 3, 1776, the marines have carried the flag and fought our country's battles on land, sea, and in the air.

It was at Iwo Jima that it reached the height of its glorious fighting history. The marines who fought and died there justified its past traditions and added new luster to its name and its motto "Semper Fidelis."

The resolution follows:

Whereas the American people have long been proud of the United States Marine Corps as a fighting force of unmatched ability and courage; and

Whereas the glorious traditions of the Marine Corps are being magnificently sustained in successive brilliant operations in the Pacific theater of war; and

Whereas the grim determination of the marines to accomplish every assigned task, no matter how difficult or costly, has inspired their countrymen with new zeal to prosecute the war more vigorously; and

Whereas we feel that a day set apart to honor the Marine Corps would crystallize public sentiment and make manifest to the Corps the gratitude and pride in our hearts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Forty-third Street Rifle Club, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate November 10, the day the corps was founded, as a fitting day on which to pay annual tribute to our marines; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the National Rifle Association.

Staff Sgt. FRANK J. ECKES,
President.

HERBERT FOX,
Vice President.

HARALD B. CALLAHAN,
JOSEPH DRAIN,
HAROLD LEIDY,
Committee.

APRIL 17, 1945.

Capt. Apollo Soucek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, all of the people of my State were justly filled with pride when it became known that one of Oklahoma's native sons, Capt. Apollo Soucek, had been appointed to command the Nation's latest and greatest aircraft carrier, the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, launched last Sunday in New York.

The people of my congressional district are particularly pleased with the Navy's selection of the commanding officer for this new carrier, because this energetic son of humble parentage, was born and reared at Medford, Okla., in the Eighth Congressional District.

He graduated from the Medford High School, attended the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.; and as a naval flier a decade ago, established numerous world altitude records. Captain Soucek, then with the rank of commander, served as executive officer of the carrier *Hornet*, when Doolittle's raiders took off from the ship in the first bombing of Tokyo. He was awarded a naval citation for outstanding ability during the last hour that the *Hornet* was afloat and in its final sinking, after the ship had been mortally wounded by enemy action in the Battle of Santa Cruz Island, October 26, 1942. He has lately been in command of the naval base at Pensacola, Fla.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Enid (Okla.) Morning News of May 2, an eloquent tribute to Capt. Apollo Soucek:

CAPT. APOLLO SOUCEK

All northwest Oklahoma, but especially Grant County, where he was born and reared, will cheer the appointment of Capt. Apollo Soucek, of Medford, to command the Nation's latest and greatest aircraft carrier * * * the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, launched Sunday in New York. It will applaud not only the honor which has come to this still young man who not so long ago was "just another kid" around Medford, but also the manner of this boy's rise to fame and leadership in the Navy, a typical American success story.

Apollo Soucek was the son of a pioneer Medford blacksmith, a boy of humble beginnings but with proud, progressive, hard-working, and ambitious parents who gave him a background of energy, thrift, and ambition. Securing an appointment to Annapolis after passing the stiff examination with an extraordinarily high grade, he distinguished himself as a naval student. Upon graduation he had a tour of sea duty, after which he went into the naval aviation service, and, in 1929, astounded the world by flying a naval land-type craft to the then unprecedented altitude of 39,140 feet, only to achieve another record a short time later when he pushed a clumsy naval seaplane to a new world altitude record for such craft of 38,550 feet.

From then on, Captain Soucek's progress was rapid and he contributed much as a fearless test pilot to the building up of the technique of naval aviation. Ultimately, he became the executive officer on the famous American aircraft carrier *Hornet* which carried Doolittle's famous raiders to within bombing distance of the Japs for the raid which only a few months after the opening of the war showed the Nips what might be expected in the way of American retaliation for the treacherous sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

Hard work, continuous study, personal courage, and strict attention to duty have carried this former Grant County boy to the captain's bridge of the mighty new 45,000-ton carrier, an example of the typical American story of success for those who prove themselves worthy. It is a story which the youngsters of this region with naval, or any other ambitions well might study with benefit; and the News, which for years has followed with recurring news reports the upward climb of this Medford blacksmith's son, joins in congratulating him for a deserved promotion, and predicts new glory for him when his ship is commissioned and joins in the coming all-out assault on our Pacific enemy.

The Canol Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item:

VAST CANOL PROJECT TO BE AUCTIONED?

The Canol project, the Army's $134,000,000 white elephant which the Corps of Engineers proudly has claimed second only to the Panama Canal in magnitude, will go on the auction block if Canada does not want to buy it.

The project, defended by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell against all comers is soon to be listed as surplus Army property.

Canada, by virtue of arrangements with the United States, which bore entire cost of the project, will get first crack at the huge outlay of oil wells, refinery, tanks, and pipe line, which was started in 1942 to supply gas for defense of Alaska and the Northwest.

Canol ceased functioning April 30, less than a year after it was finished. Army said it was no longer needed.

Though General Somervell justified the great outlay of money and manpower to build Canol under the most difficult and hazardous conditions in the far northwest as needed when Japs were sinking transports in the Pacific, the Truman investigating committee called the project a "white elephant" and seriously questioned need for its original construction or pursuance of the project after the danger passed.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial written by the publisher of the Darien Review, Darien, Conn., on April 19, 1945. The Honorable Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., is a former colleague and my good friend. His editorial is an outstanding tribute to our late beloved President. It follows:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, 1882–1945

It would require more than modest gifts in the field of journalism possessed by anyone connected with this newspaper even to attempt correctly to appraise the many contributions to the life and traditions of the United States of America which were made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. So great were his talents, so varied were his interests, so warm were his human sympathies and understandings, that, like viewing the many facets on a finely cut diamond, one is forced now to pay tribute to but at most a very few of the many achievements of Mr. Roosevelt as our President. Only time, that great leveler, will presently develop a true perspective of Mr. Roosevelt's life and accomplishments as a whole.

Therefore at this moment, in bidding Mr. Roosevelt—this great American—a last and respectful farewell, we will devote ourselves solely to the consideration of one outstanding contribution which Mr. Roosevelt has made to us, his bereaved countrymen, as well as to all mankind everywhere. In our opinion it is this: He—he alone in the final analysis—saved for the world, ourselves included, a continued opportunity to live in that favored condition of freedom, religion, and democracy which Americans have for so long taken for granted as their natural right. He—he alone in the final analysis—constructed that machinery which has or will soon encompass the final downfall of Nazi-Fascist-Axis dictatorship and barbarism—that horror of violence, terror, torture, and slavery, which, if it persisted, would have set the progress of civilization back for possibly thousands of years.

We state this because we are more than ever convinced of this as we now look back at those vacillating, blindly pacifist, pre-war days, that Hitler's Axis' definite design was to encompass our isolated downfall, after piece-meal destroying the last other possible sources of opposition in our pre-war world, namely Britain and Russia. Thereafter, as we see it, Hitler's plan was an infiltration of South and Central America, followed by military control of them and then invasion of the huge but then militarily unprepared and helpless United States of America, which at that time presented an open road and an easy conquest. Have we, any of us, forgotten the awful, futile sense of unprepared helplessness we all justly felt when France fell—when we realized it "could happen here"?

But Mr. Roosevelt, early sensing and correctly appraising this true world situation, promptly acted with aid to Britain and to Russia, and maintained, too, a steady leadership of the American people along the hard upward road of military and naval preparedness (which, also, he had long been influencing through Congress). He did this initially before most of the American people realized and awakened to the true state of world affairs.

Thus, in bolstering up Britain and in aiding Russia to keep on fighting, and in fostering our military preparedness until we three could effectively smite the satanic Axis, Mr. Roosevelt staved off the evil day of democracy's defeat until this defeat was no longer possible. If at times in our pre-war days he seemed somewhat to soften from his purpose, we think that Mr. Roosevelt never really deviated, but rather remembered Plato's admonition, "Woe be to that leader who leads the people faster than they are able to follow."

This, we feel, is Mr. Roosevelt's greatest contribution to America and to mankind. Nor do we feel that we should ever forget this fact, and because of this, our great debt to him and to his memory. We are free today, our people not miserable slaves in Axis factories or rice paddies, only because of what Mr. Roosevelt perceived and did.

Too, if a postwar permanent structure to preserve world peace is built, we can thank Mr. Roosevelt for this, as having labored mightily as the architect of the plans of such a needed organization of the world's nations. Apart from his other weighty accomplishments, these we believe are the outstanding ones in Mr. Roosevelt's enduring claim to fame and to our never-ending gratitude.

In that spirit we believe we must approach the forthcoming San Francisco Conference. With this spirit actuating us, let us make sure that this conference succeeds in advancing the new world organization for peace, the guiding torch above which Mr. Roosevelt has passed to us from his inspired but tired, failing grasp. Let us carry that torch ahead not only for the welfare of our sons and daughters and their children and children's children yet unborn, but also as the most proper tribute to our departed leader who has thus preserved for us the American way of life. May we thus fittingly remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt—a great man—a great American.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by the master of the Washington State Grange, which appeared in the April 21, 1945, issue of the Grange News:

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROOSEVELT

In final tribute to our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt let it be said of him, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." We believe no other man of his generation has stimulated so greatly the ideals of democracy, the good-neighbor policy, the brotherhood of man.

Many are the legacies he has left us from the pattern of his life—courage, cheerfulness, a desire to carry on his fight against

poverty and disease, as well as strength and hope to the afflicted that they can rise again. It is hard to evaluate his leadership in this new era of unity, as we are living too close to the time of his life. It can better be appraised by generations to come. Now it is up to us, the living, to carry on his unfinished work, to study the problems of a lasting peace. God grant us wisdom, for we know that Franklin Delano Roosevelt in that brief moment with death found that permanent and lasting peace for which he sought a solution at Teheran and Yalta.

Two-Thirds Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by Mark Sullivan from the proposed constitutional amendment in the matter of the ratification of treaties:

TWO-THIRDS AMENDMENT
(By Mark Sullivan)
FERVOR HAS DIMINISHED

The House this week debated the proposal to amend the Constitution so that treaties may be ratified by a simple majority vote of the two branches of Congress instead of requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone, as the Constitution now provides. The debate has been able and thorough on both sides. But it is unlikely that the proposal will come to early success in both branches of Congress.

For this, the reason is a change in psychology. While the amendment, if adopted, would of course be binding as to all future treaties, the motive and impetus behind it had to do with one treaty—the expected one to embody the United Nations organization for preventing war, as tentatively written at Dumbarton Oaks, and now under discussion at the San Francisco Conference. Of all the arguments for the proposed change in method of ratification, the one most often stated, whether with complete accuracy or not, runs thus: "The League of Nations 25 years ago was defeated by failure to get a two-thirds majority in the Senate; let us see to it that the United Nations proposal does not suffer the same fate."

What has taken place since the proposed constitutional amendment first emerged, last November, is a change in mental attitude toward the United Nations organization. It is by no means a reversal, the wish to have an international organization for preventing war is as strong as ever. The change is rather one from a spirit of headlongness to a mood of deliberation, a desire to be surefooted.

Last November, fervor for the international organization to prevent war was at high pitch. The tentative plan for it had recently been concluded at Dumbarton Oaks. Without popular familiarity with its details, it commanded strong emotional support as an ideal, an aspiration. It was assumed that the plan would carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter, as put out by Roosevelt and Churchill 3 years before, including: "No aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

The fervor for preventing war, by some good plan or any good plan, was the stronger last November because we were enduring a special anxiety from the present war—the Germans had made their last desperate bid for victory by formidable attack upon our forces on the western front.

For the mood of hurry about adopting a constitutional amendment to facilitate ratification of the proposed United Nations organization, there was a special condition. In nearly all the 48 States, sessions of the legislatures would be held during the winter. It was hoped to get the proposed amendment through Congress quickly, so that it could be laid before the State legislatures in time to get final adoption by spring.

The first pause in the mood of hurry came when it was disclosed that the Atlantic Charter had been seriously impaired; that the fate of Poland was to be fixed, at the demand of Russia, in ways that violated several principles of the chapter. The ensuing dismay was increased when President Roosevelt, speaking offhand at a press conference, seemed to condone the departure from the Atlantic Charter. The whole incident, as Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, put it, "jarred America to its very hearthstones."

Subsequently in February President Roosevelt, at his Yalta Conference with Stalin and Churchill, tried valiantly to restore the sanctity of the Atlantic Charter. In part he succeeded. He got from Stalin an agreement that the new government of Poland would be set up in recognition of the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. But Roosevelt was obliged to concede Stalin's demand for part of Poland's territory, in violation of the Atlantic Charter.

The present mood of Congress and of the administration is one of sustained determination to have an organization for preventing war, but with watchfulness that each step be sound and planned with care.

Italian Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution requesting that the appropriate committee of the House investigate immediately the existing military and political situation between the United States and Italy, with a view to facilitating the prompt return of Italian prisoners of war to their homeland.

With the signing of the unconditional surrender of the German troops fighting in northern Italy, it appears that the last legitimate reason for retaining these prisoners of war in the United States has been removed.

Furthermore, as the hostilities in Europe come close to an end, it is apparent that keeping these prisoners in America for labor purposes will soon be depriving American workmen of job opportunities. In addition to the foregoing reasons for their prompt return, there is the more significant fact that an armistice was signed with the Italian Government, September 3, 1943, over 18 months ago, terminating hostilities. Furthermore, it is apparent that in the near future ships will be going to Italy to bring our boys back. It seems practical that these same ships could be carrying these Italian prisoners to Italy at the time when these transports are going to Italy to get our men.

Prompt and efficient action on this problem would be welcomed by the American people and the world as well.

I trust that this resolution will receive prompt, careful, and appropriate consideration.

The Role of Capital in the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, so much is now being said by Government officials about how our acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreement and Dumbarton Oaks proposals will help raise the standard of living of people. It would appear that our Federal Government has never before propagandized so aggressively on any issue as it is now pushing Congress and the people on these two proposals.

Citizens of the United States with vast funds they could now invest in the expansion of presently established and new industries are fearful of future Federal Government policies as to taxes, tariffs, international agreements, and arbitrary controls by WPB, OPA, SEC, and other agencies which will no doubt be created.

If the administration is sincere in ts efforts to encourage private industry and enterprise, let it make clear to our people that Government will establish and maintain a friendly attitude toward the individual investor.

The remarks of Mr. Cassel are constructive and helpful at this time. They follow:

The rise of the workers to a higher standard of life is in general dependent on a more abundant supply of real capital, and it is vital for them that this supply should be constantly maintained at the highest possible level. One might suppose that these facts were so obvious that nobody would contradict them. In reality we find, however, that the relation between capital and labor is commonly represented as something intrinsically hostile. The workers are apt to imagine that progress can be attained only by appropriating a large share of the proceeds, after a successful fight with capital. This idea is, of course, connected with the fact that at each separate agreement the interests of labor and capital come into conflict; but this conflict is merely temporary. If a rational agreement is concluded on each occasion, the conditions of labor will in the long run be improved, in about the same degree that the workers are provided with a more abundant equipment of real capital.

The peoples who have reached the greatest prosperity are precisely those peoples who

have been most abundantly supplied with capital. Prosperity has in fact risen at those times when the supply of capital was abundant. This is a truth which is applicable also in a comparison between the most advanced civilized nations. The high level of the American national income can only be explained by the relatively abundant supply of capital in the United States. Immediately before the present war the American worker was approximately twice as amply provided with means of production as the British workman and had therefore risen to a standard of living approximately twice as high. In Germany the supply of capital was, no doubt, considerably better than in England, but England had the advantage in her large income from foreign countries and in her importation of cheap foodstuffs. The standard of life was much the same in the two countries.

The Economist, in the autumn of 1944, has taken up this whole problem for close consideration in a series of articles—A Policy for Wealth—and has arrived at results which are very remarkable. The most noteworthy of these results is the very scanty supply of capital which British industry had to content itself with during the pre-war decades. Out of a national income of £4,604,000,000 sterling in 1938, only about £20,000,000 went to the equipment of private industries with plant and machinery. The Economist itself designates this sum as quite shockingly small. Very considerable sums were, of course, invested in public works and especially in housing, but on the whole, the supply of capital for productive investment was utterly insufficient for normal progress.

Why has Britain's supply of capital lagged so sadly behind? The obvious answer is that savings have been inadequate—in fact, savings have been merely a fraction of the amount required for normal progress. The Economist contends that savings would have been quite sufficient if only they had been effectively utilized for productive purposes. So far as concerns the total volume of savings, this view is quite wrong. But it is a fact that industrial production has by no means found use for the relatively small savings which have been available.

There must be some explanation of this. There must be factors which have deterred British industries from equipping themselves with as much capital as would have been required in order to keep pace with development in more progressive countries.

Chief among these factors we note the heavy incidence of taxation. The Economist asserts that a high rate of income tax cannot in itself have a deterrent effect on investors. This is a mistake. If investment involves some risk of loss as well as prospects of large profits, it will be economically impossible under a greatly progressive system of taxation, even if it might be very remunerative at an invariable rate of income tax. In Sweden it has often been alleged that, as shown by England's example, investors need not be discouraged by a high rate of taxation. The utter futility of this contention has now emerged into clear relief. The Economist, however, believes that much could be gained by a particularly lenient taxation of such income as is used for investment in industrial enterprises.

Another factor which has conduced to discourage investments of capital is monopolism which in England is very widespread. When a branch of industry is dominated by cartels and trusts, which oppose new enterprises or the expansion of existing enterprises at the cost of others, the supply of fresh real capital to that branch of industry will, of course, be greatly restricted. Similar results will ensue from a monopoly of labor, as manifested in a restrictive trade-union policy with tendencies to oppose any increase in the productivity of labor that might conduce to weaken the position of labor in competition.

In the past decade, economic thinking in the world has been largely dominated by a critical attitude toward saving. According to this view, saving, generally speaking, is larger than is necessary for providing production with capital. Some part of the savings therefore remains unused, with the consequence that the total spending power is reduced, so that it does not suffice even for buying all that is produced. Under such conditions, economic depression must naturally become a normal phenomenon in industrial life. It is not a coincidence that this theory has its origin in England. Since savings in that country have been far smaller than necessary and as those savings have not even been fully utilized for industrial enterprise, it is evident that the exponents of the said theory have been unduly impressed by British conditions. Under this theory, progress is not conceived as a normal aspect of the future national economy. It is implied that technical development is finished.

In contrast with the views prevailing before the war, people are now demanding rapid progress. Interest in raising the standard of life is being extended beyond the individual country; it is being demanded that backward countries should be provided with modern equipment of real capital in order to increase their productive power.

The extraordinary progress of Russia under her new policy, with its distinct capitalistic tendency, has contributed to this general change of attitude and has greatly impressed the rest of the world. Never before has a people imposed upon themselves such severe restrictions in order to accumulate savings to be converted into real capital. It has not been clearly realized that this immense display of power is based on an abundant supply of capital created by an abnormal reduction in current consumption. Everywhere, however, people are demanding an economic policy which will lead to a progress similar to that of Russia.

If we begin to consider what these demands involve, saving will undoubtedly be brought into credit again. Elementary economic theory must again be based on a clear view of uniform progress. It is precisely such progress that must be aimed at in times when full employment, without crises, is a leading item in the social program. It will then become evident that saving and the accumulation of capital must increase at the same pace as progress in general.

In order that this shall be possible without dictatorship it is, however, necessary firstly that thrift shall be encouraged by such favorable conditions as to result in savings which will suffice for normal economic progress, and secondly, that enterprise shall not be deterred, by unfavorable treatment, from investments which will completely utilize these savings. These demands must not be set up as being in the particular interest of certain classes. They represent the necessary conditions for a national economy in which the immense possibilities of progress in the future will be tolerably well utilized.

Representation of Veterans at Peace Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following concurrent resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature, asking that the Congress provide for representation of the veterans of this war at all future world peace conferences:

Concurrent resolution relating to the participation by representatives of members of the armed forces at meetings of the government of the United Nations

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that peace of the United Nations be a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the casualties of this global war have thus far exceeded those of any war in which our Nation has ever been involved, and our fighting forces have won the admiration of our country for their courage and valor; and

Whereas in every war it is the youth who give their blood and lives and make the greatest sacrifices; and

Whereas the men who have gone through the horrors of battle should have a voice in making the peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we ask our Congressmen and Senators in Washington to do all in their power to see that representatives of the veterans of this war including officers and enlisted men who have had combat service and some of whom were less than 30 years of age when chosen as delegates, be at all future conferences for world peace; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen and Senators in Washington and to the President of the United States.

APRIL 24, 1945.

Indoctrination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the War Department document entitled "Three Ways To Spot United States Fascists," which was supplied to discussion leaders in Army camps, is now attracting attention not only in the Congress but throughout the land. The wisdom of such propaganda on the part of the Army is being questioned.

Today I submit to you an editorial from the Point Pleasant Daily Register, published in Point Pleasant, W. Va., which you will find timely and interesting:

INDOCTRINATION

The War Department has provided discussion leaders in Army camps with Three Ways To Spot United States Fascists. It says that a person who does any of these things is in "a mental state that lends itself to the acceptance of Fascist aims":

1. Believes in a master race; is antagonistic toward any particular race or religion, toward labor or the foreign born.

2. Is intolerant of the brotherhood of man; opposes international cooperation; spreads propaganda against the British, Soviet, French, or United Nations.

3. Indiscriminately applies the label "red" to persons and ideas he dislikes.

Any person given to such practices is, of course, ignorant, vicious, antisocial, antidemocratic, a menace to the national and international communities. But is he a Fascist, actual or potential?

A Fascist is an adherent to the philosophy of the Fascisti, a gang of thugs organized by one Benito Mussolini (remember him?) for the ostensible purpose of rescuing Italy from communism but for the actual purpose of serving the ambitions of Mussolini and his associates.

So far as we remember the Fascisti never argued the theory of a master race, or raised a religious issue, or persecuted Jews or Negroes as such. Far from being antilabor as we use that term in the United States their program contained a liberal dash of syndicalism, which aims, by strikes and violence, at giving workers' organizations control over production.

It was Hitler and his Nazis who expounded the master race thesis, and blamed Jewry for all the world's ills and persecuted Jews with a sadism that has horrified every civilized person.

We hate communism. We hate fascism. We hate nazism. We hate Japanism—and all totalitarianism. Nevertheless, we claim the right of any man, woman, or child who disagrees with us to accept and propagandize his fallacies to his heart's content, so long as he does it peaceably and out of conviction, and not at the behest or for the benefit of any alien government.

The Army betrays ignorance of what fascism is. But even if it had correctly spotlighted Fascism it would still be wrong. It is the duty of the Army to defeat our enemies—which it is doing to perfection—and not to use its vast authority to hint that certain beliefs, detestable as they are, come within the purview of our armed forces.

TVA Chairmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for May 4, 1945:

TVA CHAIRMANSHIP

The harnessing of the Tennessee River to the uses of those who live within its valley has been one of the great and heartening stories of our time. It is a story in which David E. Lilienthal, as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has played a major role. He conceived of the river and the soil surrounding it and the people who lived upon it, to use his own phrase, "as a unity." He understood the desirability of making balance a concomitant of growth—of promoting power development, navigation, soil conservation, and flood control synchronously in accordance with a rounded, integrated plan. He saw that to carry out this plan, the TVA had to operate free from political spoilsmanship.

Mr. Lilienthal's insistence on keeping politics out of TVA has earned him some formidable opposition in the Senate—where his name must go for confirmation now that President Truman has nominated him for reappointment. The President of the Senate, Mr. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, in particular, has avowed bitter enmity toward him and has manifested it on many an occasion in efforts to shackle the TVA and subject it to political control. It would be most unfortunate if Senator MCKELLAR's bitterness were to prevail. A reprisal upon Mr. Lilienthal would be more than an injury to an able public servant. It would be at once an injury to the agency he serves and to the whole merit system in public life. It would be a triumph for the spoils philosophy. We congratulate President Truman on his renomination of Mr. Lilienthal and trust that he will back it up with his full support in any contest that may be waged over confirmation.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of April 23, 1945:

POSTAL PAY RAISE

When life runs along in a smooth, uninterrupted manner and our daily routines seem almost as natural as the course of the time itself, we are prone to take a good many things for granted, little realizing that some of the most commonplace, familiar services are the products of active brains and sure hands.

There was a short story in the Commercial Appeal last Saturday relating how a former Memphian, now on a battle front, won a $100 bet by demonstrating to his buddies that postal employees in his home town would deliver a letter even if it were addressed phonetically. To prove his point, he mailed a message to D. Canale & Co., but addressed it to Deacon Alley.

Promptly the letter went to the wholesale grocery company, was acknowledged, the soldier collected his wager, and the scoffers were silenced. The mail had gone through again.

But back of that little story is the amazing efficiency of the men who handle the United States mails, your letters and mine. It would have been quite easy for some clerk to mark "Unknown here" on the envelope and return it to the sender, but postal people are proud of their tradition of getting the mail to its proper destination, in the shortest possible time.

Many other examples, more serious ones, of the sort could be cited. Men and women who handle the mail get it through, even when addresses are obscure or difficult to decipher. They even trace addressees to the four corners, many times beyond the strictest call of duty. They're proud that they can.

To your mail carrier, and to the clerks and sorters who work behind the scenes, you are indebted for the promptness and accuracy that bring to you so much that is vital to your way of life. Tidings of birth and death, the ebb and flow of mail that keeps the Nation's business moving, the tender billets doux of sweet young romance, even those heartbreaking letters in official envelopes these sad days, letters commencing "The Secretary of War regrets to inform you * * *."

And yet, for 20 long years, postal employees have had no wage adjustment, no raise, to compensate for rising living costs, to acknowledge the vastly increased work they have had to perform, even during the harrowing war years.

True, they received the temporary war bonus in 1943, a miserly $300 a year, and this in the face of a $47,000,000 surplus turned into the Treasury by the Post Office Department.

These men and women have done, and are doing today, a magnificent job. They have been, and are, victims of our attitude of taking mail service for granted. Pending now in the Congress is the Mead-O'Brien proposal to grant to postal employees wage increases compatible with the ever-expanding services they render, increases more nearly adequate to provide reasonable living standards for these men and their families.

Here is one activity vitally affecting every American. Congress should grant wage increases to postal employees now. There is more than ample reason why every citizen should tell Congress to do the just and decent thing. To deprive, for another day, these faithful public servants of what they have earned the hard way is dishonest. The American way demands an immediate adjustment, upward, of postal employees' salaries.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, prepared by Charles J. Farrington, Jr., a 16-year-old student in the junior class at Fishburn Military School:

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The late afternoon hours of Thursday, April 12, 1945, passed quietly in America, but took with them the life of a man who was the strength of that Nation; for it was then that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-second President of the United States and greatest of twentieth century Americans, died in the service of the Nation whose survival in the war and progress in the peace was uppermost in his heart.

For 12 years Franklin Roosevelt guided America through grim days of depression, jubilant days of prosperity, and trying days of toilsome, bloody war. It was he who, because his country needed him, broke all precedents in accepting a third, and then a fourth term to that highest of Government offices for which his fellow countrymen considered him so capable. It was he who, more than any other man, knew how to deal in international affairs with the leaders of the other great nations of the world. It was he who, because of democracy, was given a chance to be active and progressive in spite of his physical affliction. From the experiences of his own life, Franklin Roosevelt knew the great truth and meaning of those immortal words of the Declaration of Independence "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It was out of his deep appreciation for all the advantages granted him under the American system of government and a sincere reverence for Almighty God, that he willingly gave his time, his finest efforts, and, finally, his life, to the cause which he considered most worthy of the attentions of mankind, the cause of peace and freedom for all.

In the pensive hours which followed Franklin Roosevelt's departure from our midst to eternal life, there was not an American alive who was not shocked and grieved at the realization of the great tragedy which had come to our Nation. The death of the President at such a decisive hour as this seems unfair, but perhaps it was in the wise planning of God to take away this champion of

democracy in order that fresher hands might have their chance to lead America to the inevitable victory over its totalitarian enemies, and, with the united cooperation of all its people, to bind up its battle wounds and to establish a just and lasting peace with all nations. These are the goals we must all labor to achieve. These are the things for which Franklin Delano Roosevelt lived and died. Our finest tribute to him, who was the defender of our democratic institutions in war and in peace, shall be a complete victory and the reaffirmation of the loyalty of Americans all over the world to the ideals of unconquerable peace and endless prosperity for all.

To the White House, a crowded convention hall, Warm Springs, Yalta, the Chamber of the House of Representatives, Teheran, Hyde Park—Franklin D. Roosevelt will go no more, but everywhere he will be remembered as a symbol of the dedication of a free nation to the cause of creating a world united for peace and progress. We Americans have lost a great and loyal friend; however, we find a consoling message in his last prepared speech. In his farewell message he made a final request when he said:

"I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straightedge of your own confidence and resolve. To all Americans who dedicate themselves to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

" 'The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.' "

May God reward the great work of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the safety of the United States of America, by bringing about a speedy climax to the war on all fronts, and by giving us, the living, his indomitable courage to go forward in peace and freedom once more.

CHARLES J. FARRINGTON, Jr.

Retirement Plan for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial appearing recently in the Thompsonville Press of Thompsonville, Conn. Mr. Philip Sullivan, the editor, believes in a retirement plan for Congressmen.

The editorial follows:

SIMPLE JUSTICE

The death of Senator Francis T. Maloney, stricken at the height of his powers, and near the peak of his usefulness, was a sad event to all of us in Connecticut. The Senator's death has proved one thing. Namely, that the Federal legislators have not been just to themselves, and have not had the courage to be just to themselves. It is only a matter, we believe, of some 2 years or so ago that it was proposed that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Government have created for them a pension system. Now this was simple elementary justice, because many of these men gave big hunks of their lives in their services as legislators.

However, a hue and a cry went up, and the Congress was accused of political self-pocketing, and of a sort of personal nepotism. This was unfair and unjust, but as a result of the turmoil which occurred, the Congress dropped the project. We claim to know whereof we speak when we assert that serious legislators, whether in the State or Federal Government, works hard, indeed. The work of leading legislators is just as arduous and difficult as the work of a judge of the superior court or the United States district court.

In Connecticut, superior court judges and common pleas judges receive retirement pay upon the conclusion of their careers. For our State employees, we have a State retirement plan. But, for the Congress of the United States, there is no provision of any consequence for these men when they retire by political accident or event, and such retirement is the fate of most of them as time goes on.

Having in mind the sudden and tragic death of Senator Maloney, as he worked for his country, we seriously urge Connecticut legislators in the National Congress to think over the justice of such a retirement plan. We have the fancy that a legislative move in this direction in the future, or near future, could be made better understood to the country, when all the facts are told.

Letter of Dr. Edward A. McDowell to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of a letter which appeared in the Baptist Courier, May 3, addressed to President Truman by Dr. Edward A. McDowell. Dr. McDowell was a schoolmate of mine at Furman University, Greenville, S. C. He is now a distinguished professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. It seems to me Dr. McDowell's letter is most appropriate and I take pleasure in presenting it, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your simple request, "Pray for me," has aroused in God-fearing Americans everywhere a confidence in you that nothing else you might have said could have aroused in this trying hour in our Nation's history. It gives us confidence to know that you are a man of simple faith in God, unashamed to make such a request.

In one of my classes I learned from one of the students from Missouri that you are a member of a little Baptist church in your home State. We who are Baptists will pray that you will discover in your early spiritual experience and in your Baptist heritage sources of power and inspiration for the epochal and trying days that lie ahead of you. Ours is a great heritage, Mr. President—a heritage of simple faith in God and in His Son, Jesus Christ; a heritage of love of freedom, of the dignity of the individual, of human rights, of spiritual and political democracy. It is our prayer that this heritage may be real and vital to you as you face the stupendous responsibilities of the future. If you rest upon this heritage, you need have no fear—you will become a great President and a worthy successor to Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

You may be assured, Mr. President, that you have the prayers of the faculty and students of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and that the more than 5,000,000 Southern Baptists, to whom you belong, will respond with pride to every evidence of your success and of your fidelity to our heritage.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWARD A. MCDOWELL.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, April 29, 1945, to commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like our Declaration of Independence, and to pay homage to creators of liberty and equality for the Polish nation 154 years ago.

Further, we, as Americans of Polish descent, adhering to the principles set forth by our founding fathers who, in the Declaration of Independence, proclaimed that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their power from the consent of the governed, which principles have never been violated by our Nation—strongly disapprove of the decision reached at Yalta which refers to the so-called small nations, Poland and Baltic states included, for they deprive these peoples of their God-given right of self-determination substituting it with external coercion, in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Bill of Rights, and any other concept of democratic ways of life and thinking.

Whereas the only legitimate government of Poland, now in London, has been excluded from any and all participation in the selection of even a temporary administration of their martyred land, and that the great masses of the Polish people, who have survived the terrible and long Nazi occupation, could not and have not been consulted in any way.

Whereas the tragedy of the Yalta Conference lies in the fact that a green light was given to the forces of oppression, as exemplified in the puppet regime, created first in Lublin and then moved to the ruins of heroic Warsaw. For at this time, from both sides of the Atlantic, from the lips of the British Foreign Secretary in London, as well as from those of a United States Senator in Washington—has come confirmation of arrests, mass executions, deportations, and other acts of violence now being committed by the Soviet-sponsored Lublin regime officiating in Warsaw.

Whereas it is to be deplored that our gallant allies, the Poles, who spilled so much blood on the battlegrounds of Poland, Norway, Africa, France, Italy, Belgium, and Holland, in defense of our common war aims, were denied the elementary right of representation at the San Francisco Conference, where the fate of Poland will also be discussed. At San Francisco, as at Yalta, the aggressor will again sit in judgment upon its own acts of aggression, while the victim, Poland, who opposed the Germans even when

the Russians collaborated with them in the first 22 months of the war—will not be accorded the formality of a hearing granted even to the worst criminals in all courts of justice. This is repugnant to our American sense of honesty, decency, and fair play.

We therefore appeal to the conscience of every free thinking man and woman in our country, to our fellow citizens of these United States of ours, to all Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States to petition and prevail on our representatives at the San Francisco Conference from which Poland and the Baltic States have been excluded and will have no voice, to join us in support of our great Christian, democratic, and civilized movement for the preservation of decency in international relations, of right over might, of justice over injustice and violence—in the defense of Poland, the Baltic States, and all other downtrodden and helpless peoples.

Furthermore, we here assembled declare that by supporting Stalin's dictatorial decisions is the perfect way of inviting disaster for the world. That this war and sacrifices of four boys on the world battle fronts, and our sacrifices here at home shall have been in vain, thus bringing distrust and condemnation from all people loving freedom, liberty, and independence as the aggressive plans in Poland by Soviet Russia has constituted a dangerous situation toward the security of the world and also of our United States of America, making the San Francisco Conference and all other post-war conferences a mockery for any future lasting peace or stoppage of future wars.

CHARLES L. PARUSZENSKI,
Chairman.
VINCENT J. TOWALENSKI,
Secretary.

Hitlerism Is Dead, Even if Hitler Is Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a timely editorial from the Spartanburg Herald of May 3, 1945:

HITLERISM DEAD, EVEN IF HITLER ISN'T

Nazi reports of Hitler's death have been received with some skepticism throughout the world.

The British Foreign Office believes the reports of his death are true while doubting the accuracy of the German claim that he died in battle.

In Russia the Hitler death reports were described as a Nazi trick, and Moscow will not accept them as true until independent supporting evidence is available. With their armies now smashing at the last remnants of German resistance in Berlin, the Russians probably will soon be in a position to confirm or refute the German report.

In the United States the news seemed too good to be true, and the people are taking it with a grain of salt. Official Washington has adopted a "wait and see" policy until more substantial evidence than the Hamburg radio announcement is at hand.

Whether the physical body of Adolf Hitler is dead or alive is something we all would like to know.

That does not matter so much, however, as does the question of whether or not the evil influence he has held in world affairs is dead.

From all the evidence, we can be reasonably sure that Hitler has come to the end of his career as head of the German Reich and as the guiding spirit of a political philosophy that all but wrecked the world. Whether the end came by death or in cowardly flight doesn't matter much.

As he threatened months ago, Hitler has pulled down Germany, and much of Europe in ruin with him, as he fell.

With her cities smashed into shambles and rubble and the wehrmacht hopelessly split up, Germany is at the end of her rope. The Hitler death report, the surrender of the German armies in Italy and the disappearance of the more important Nazis from places of power in the Government all point to the conclusion that powerful forces for making peace are at work inside Germany.

Regardless of what fate has fallen Hitler, it is safe to say that Hitlerism is in its dying agony. It is up to us to see that no monster like it will be allowed to arise in the future to scourge the world.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an enrolled copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 27, adopted by the 1945 session of the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing Congress to abolish the poll tax:

Assembly Joint Resolution 27

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to abolish the poll tax

Whereas 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are presently deprived of their gift of free suffrage by poll-tax laws in eight States which impose upon the exercise of the elective franchise limitations neither contemplated nor condoned by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, taking advantage of the inability of these 10,000,000 citizens, both Negro and white, to express themselves politically by participating in the choice of their representatives in government, both State and Federal, a few have been able to perpetuate themselves in office and, heedless of the needs and wishes of the people in their districts, have refused to recognize the grave perils that endanger our country and seek to disrupt the unity of our country and the mobilization of all our forces for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas at a time when the morale and strength of the people of this Nation are needed increasingly if it is to survive, it is a dangerous inconsistency to continue to deprive any section of them of their democratic rights, to preserve which this war is being fought; but rather it is necessary to draw all men and women, no matter what their race, creed, color, or economic position, into full participation in the struggle for victory; and

Whereas the continuation of the poll tax in free America furnishes propaganda for the Axis to the great mass of colonial people who are fighting with us in this war for their freedom; and

Whereas the abolition of the poll tax will enable these 10,000,000 citizens to enter fully into their rights and duties as American citizens, and will, at the same time, weaken those forces who place petty self-interest and personal power above the need for complete mobilization for victory and will strengthen national unity and morale: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Statement of J. P. Morgan & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD dated May 1, 1945, the gentlewoman from California, Mrs.. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, received unanimous consent to insert three articles by the columnist, Drew Pearson, all of which she described as "three important articles on the San Francisco Conference which should be read widely." One of these articles dated Friday, April 27, 1945, quoted from what was purported to be a statement made by the Nazi administrator in occupied France, who in turn claimed to quote a French partner of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co.

The gentlewoman from California further stated that this article was suppressed at the insistence of J. P. Morgan & Co. I quote from the statement issued by J. P. Morgan & Co., given to the Bell Syndicate, which handles articles written by this notorious columnist, as follows:

The column of Drew Pearson released for April 27 contains references to Morgan and Cie Paris, to a French partner of that firm, and to J. P. Morgan & Co., that are cruel, wholly false, and libelous. Certain of them purport to have been made by the Nazi administrator in occupied France—a strange source for the emanation of reliable information. The fact is that Morgan and Cie refused to do business with the Germans during the war. The French partner is a loyal Frenchman and now serving in the French army. The position of J. P. Morgan & Co. during this war and the last is too well known to need defense from these charges.

The gentlewoman, in the extension of her remarks, expresses the opinion that the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech are guaranteed under the Constitution and should not be abridged. We can all agree with this philosophy,

but freedom of the press does not mean license to spread falsehoods and malicious rumors. I think Members of Congress should be extremely careful in verifying any statements that are placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and not lend themselves as unconscious agents of the spreading of false and libelous statements.

John R. Flynn and the Dashnags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

JOHN T. FLYNN AND THE DASHNAGS

Frantically trying to sabotage the sedition trial and smear witnesses, the McCormick-Patterson press axis has now resorted to the use of lies lifted direct from Fascist files. Writing in the Washington Times-Herald, John T. Flynn, ex-America Firster, has attacked John Roy Carlson, Armenian-born author of Under Cover, and prospective Government witness in the sedition trial. Flynn seems to have based his article almost exclusively on the time-worn web of lies concocted by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, also known as Dashnag, with headquarters in Boston. This revolutionary gang with a long record of terrorist-fascist activity, is negligible in number but well organized. It is thoroughly discredited in the eyes of Americans of Armenian origin, the overwhelming majority of whom are loyal and law-abiding citizens grateful to the United States of America.

Flynn's masterpiece of distortion is proving popular with native Fascists. It is being circulated widely in Chicago at meetings of We, the Mothers Mobilize and other defeatist groups identified with the Bund, Silver Shirt, and Coughlinite mentality. Flynn's smearpiece has been picked up by Gerald L. K. Smith, boosted in the Chicago Tribune and the Brooklyn Tablet in a futile attempt to offset the searing effects of Under Cover. And the bulk of Flynn's "facts"—flimsy, picayune, irrelevant half-truths, distortions, and outright lies—have been inspired by Armenian Fascist circles in Boston.

In accepting the usual trash from the Dashnag kitchens of journalistic rot, Flynn has insulted all American Armenians (except the criminally minded Dashnag) and committed the sacrilege of terming their martyred Prelate a "Communist agent." Flynn has whitewashed the sordid Dashnag record and called it "patriotic." Dashnags' Nazi sympathies are clearly shown in this sample quotation from the September 17, 1936, issue of their Armenian-language organ, Hairenik, edited daily by propaganda chief, Reuben Darbinian:

"Italy has not only become regenerated by fascism, but has become an empire nation, and today is reckoned as a military power in international politics. Germany has not only become regenerated by Hitlerism, but has turned her face to the east, and displays her fist to Moscow. * * * Hitlerism and fascism, which are the stepsons of bolshevism, and begotten by it, are its gift to mankind, know where they are going. Germany has found her element, Russia has lost it (translation)."

In order to understand the role of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), it is necessary briefly to review Armenian history, for ARF misdeeds in America are rooted in the ideologies it fostered in the stormy, feud-infested underworld of the Near East.

DASHNAGS AS REVOLUTIONISTS

The Dashnags are a secret political society of self-styled socialist-revolutionists, founded in 1890 in the Caucasus in order to liberate Armenians from Turkish oppression. Its form was (and is) oligarchic and its members subject to strict militaristic discipline. Instead of resorting to the ballot or constitutional methods, the ARF determined to "achieve political and economic freedom by means of rebellion," and "terrorize Government officials, betrayers, and all sorts of oppressors." According to official Dashnag publications (from which these excerpts have faithfully been made, it proceeded to "form fighting bands" and "use every means to arm the people." Droshag, official ARF organ, reporting on a party congress at Geneva, summed it up as follows:

"Expressions of revolutionary tactics—general rebellion, armed resistance to the forces of government, wide political terrorism, projects of revolutionary demonstrations, armed popular self-defense, political and economic strikes, peasant and labor movements—all of these, cultivated and unified in their minutest details, shall constitute the totality of the system of a modus operandi by which the party is to achieve its program in life (translation)."

DASHNAGS AS POLITICAL TERRORISTS

"Should we continue terrorism or not?" party leaders asked in an official booklet, and answered the query: "After a few successful operations, thanks to the terroristic disposition of the leading elements, the party eventually completely adopted terrorism." Terror and intimidation were used in instruments indispensable to political warfare precisely as later used by Nazi brownshirts. Terrorism was directed mainly against Armenians, and few who opposed the ARF were spared, whether laymen or holy priests. Dashnags—as did Russian nihilists of the time—lived in a world of total hate and revenge.

I. Jamharian was a wealthy Armenian who refused to contribute. He "fell under the blows of a dagger * * * in broad daylight in the courtyard of the Armenian church, in the presence of a great throng," wrote M. Varandyan, Dashnag historian. Death sentences were decreed by the central committee and were detailed to the "terroristic body of the ARF experts in political murder regionally located. A dagger (Dashnag, which is the abbreviation for the Armenian word federation, itself means dagger) was the most frequent instrument used. Droshag widely publicized acts of terrorism and triumphantly ended its reports with "The terrorists are at large." In one instance a killer was caught and executed; Droshag lamented the death of "that noble soul." In September 16, 1933, Hairenik, Dashnag mouthpiece of Boston, reaffirmed the traditional policy of terror:

"Another effected practice was the intimidation of prominent men in order to obtain financial support. Those who refused were 'put on the spot.' In fact, it was very similar to the underground methods of modern racketeering, except that its goal was noble."

By a curious twist of diplomacy the ARF became rulers for about 2 years (1918–20) of the territory now comprising Soviet Armenia. Being used to revolutionary methods, however, they failed as administrators. They engaged in a series of expansionist wars which ended disastrously. Torn by dissension, famished, decimated, and also threatened by Turkey, the populace welcomed Bolshevist rule, which promised bread and peace. After purloining the national treasury Dashnag leaders were ousted from power.

TERRORISM IN AMERICA

Armenians in America, while not gratified with Soviet rule, are content to see age-long massacres ended and Turkey, the dread Mohammedan enemy, held at bay. A degree of religious tolerance has been granted to the Holy See of the Armenian Church in St. Etchmiadzin in the shadow of Mt. Ararat, enabling it to hold elections, appoint bishops and keep alive the flame of Christianity "in the hope," as expressed by Bishop Mazloumian of Greece, "that tomorrow may have something better in store for us."

Since their ousting, exiled Dashnag leaders have entered into a web of intrigue with any power which promised to place them in the saddle again. In 1933 Hitler lavishly promised everything to everybody, and looked with particular favor on any disgruntled clique which could pave the way for his drang nach osten policy of reaching the Caucasian oil fields. Early in 1933 Dashnags suddenly revived their cult of the tricolor—its red, orange, and blue party flag. In mass revivalist meetings, marked with wild religious frenzy, they worshipped the defunct flag of a defunct regime.

On July 1, 1933, Archbishop Leon Tourian, Primate of the Armenian Church in North and South America, refused to speak at Armenian Day at the Chicago Fair unless the Dashnag tricolor was removed. He demanded that only the American flag appear; the audience voted overwhelmingly in his favor. From then on the infuriated ARF press denounced the archbishop as a traitor and a Soviet agent.

At an outing in August 1933, he was attacked by seven Dashnag hoodlums while blessing parishioners of the Worcester Church of Our Saviour. Hairenik began to print letters threatening his life. Four samples follow. "Archbishop Tourian will be punished sooner or later. The day of reckoning will come." * * * "He is going to be sorry for it, and very sorry." * * * "He will get his share, I am sure." * * * "Until Tourian is punished ruthlessly, the bones of our marytrs will not rest in their places." Hairenik stepped up its tempo by printing a letter which offered a reward: "I will gladly give $100 if something is done to teach Tourian a lesson." When the Archbishop asked for police protection Hairenik denounced him for seeking the protection of "alien (American) police."

In December 1933 while celebrating Christmass mass in the Holy Cross Church in New York, the Archbishop was murdered by a gang of Dashnag assassins in the favorite Dashnag manner; a butcher knife plunged deep into his groin. Two ARF officials were convicted of first-degree murder, seven other Dashnags were convicted of first-degree manslaughter. The convictions were sustained in successive courts while the ARF press (under Darbinian's complete charge) spoke of "ignorant jurymen," "false witnesses" and slurred the American judiciary. It referred to its nine cutthroats as "our blameless comrades." On March 26, 1935, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, now Governor of New York, who had been engaged by Armenian democratic forces in the United States to help prepare the case against the Dashnag, wrote to the Honorable Herbert Lehman, then Governor:

"For many years a very small group of fanatic zealots among the American people have perpetrated murders and assaults upon the duly constituted authorities, in a campaign of terrorism * * * for the purpose of imposing the will of the few, upon the many. I believe it is correct to say that this group, the Dashnags, does not constitute more than 5 percent of the Armenian population. Nine murders of those in high authority are attributed to this group within

the past 10 years and the murder of Archbishop Leon Tourian * * * is the most shocking of these crimes and the first conspicuous invasion by this group into the field of terroristic murder in the United States."

WHO WAS ARCHBISHOP TOURIAN?

He was descendant of a distinguished family of clerics, scholars, and statesmen. The former patriarch of Jerusalem was his cousin. He was a linguist, author of four books, including a translation of the beautiful Armenian liturgy into English. He served as bishop of Bulgaria, primate of Smyrna, vice patriarch of Constantinople and Armenian archbishop of England. He was a friend of Right Rev. William J. Manning Episcopal Bishop of New York, who participated in the burial services in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine and recited a special prayer for the martyred prelate. A tall, stately figure, the prelate gave hope to and glorified the democratic aspirations of Americans of Armenian origin. By obeying the dictum of the Holy See to keep partisan and political strife out of the church, he gained the undying enmity of the Dashnag gang.

Preceding the trial, the ARF had called the archbishop a "Soviet agent." Then they changed their tune and called his murder a "Bolshevik plot." Dashnag attorneys failed completely to produce a shred of evidence to support these Nazi inspired charges.

DASHNAGS AS PRO-NAZIS

Following the murder, the Dashnag press showed marked Nazi leanings. Here are sample excerpts from the September 17, 1936, issue:

"The former Germany, defeated in the Great War, lacking popular unity, conducted an uncertain, confused, day-by-day policy which got her nowhere * * * And came Adolf Hitler, after Herculean struggles. He spoke to the racial heart string of the German, opened the fountain of his national genius, struck down the spirit of defeatism.

"Now, there is a Germany, strong, united, aggressive, proud, and self-reliant. She has torn and given to the winds the principal restrictions of the Versailles Treaty, and is now a national power, equal to, if not higher, than the great at the green tables of Europe and the world. Internally organized, externally impressive, the German people have come to occupy the place which was theirs before the war. * * *

"At no period since the World War had Berlin conducted so realistic, well-organized, and planned policy as now, since Hitler's assumption of power. At no time the German thought had been so explicit, clear, and rich as now. * * * And whatever outsiders may think concerning Hitlerism and fascism, as a system of government, it is proved that they have revitalized and regenerated the two states, Germany and Italy."

DASHNAGS AND ANTISEMITES

Flynn's "patriots" have published some notorious anti-Jewish lines. A series of three lengthy front-page articles written by a Dashnag just returned from Germany, were published in the August 19, 20, 21, 1936, issues of Hairenik, extolling the Nazi regime, the myth of Aryan culture, and whitewashing Nazi persecution:

"Jews of all people being the most fanatical nationalists and race worshippers, wherever they go they are compelled to create an atmosphere and the rites and customs of internationalism and world citizenship in order to preserve their race exalation pure. * * * As the British use battleships to occupy lands and to protect their fatherland, in this same way the Jew uses internationalism or communism as a weapon. * * *

"Sometimes it is difficult to eradicate these poisonous elements when they have already struck deep root like a chronic disease. And when it becomes necessary for a people to eradicate them in an uncommon method, these attempts and methods are regarded revolutionary. During a surgical operation the flow of blood is a natural thing. * * * Under such conditions dictatorship seems to have the role of a savior" (translation).

Hairenik Weekly is the English language organ of the Dashnag, edited in Boston by James Mandalian. The Weekly voiced the political sentiments of the mother publication but exercised greater restraint. The August 9, 1935, issue started off with a reference to the Jewish controlled film industry, then ascribed Armenian massacres to the Turkish Jews of Salonika because of the Jewish love of gain. The May 10, 1935, issue quoted the vice mayor of Bucharest as saying: "The Armenians [meaning Dashnags only] have helped us Rumanians not to become slaves of the Jewish elements." An article in the September 25, 1936, issue of the Weekly denounced Zionist aims, and adopting a strong Arab nationalist view concluded with:

"And the type of Jew who is imported to Palestine is not anything to be proud about. Their loose morals, and other vices which were unknown to the Arabs prior to the Balfour Declaration, on top of all communistic activities, were the cause of most of the Arab criticism."

DASHNAGS AS ANTI-CHRISTIAN

Flynn's patriots also have a record of anti-Christian utterance. The archbishop's heinous murder had its roots in Dashnag disrespect for church and clergy. It was common practice for ARF chiefs to burst into a church, fling open the doors and using the altar and chancel as platform hold political meetings. In at least two instances Armenians who tried to protect the Church of Smyrna from being desecrated were shot on the spot by Flynn's patriots. Dashnag leaders have always tried to seize political control of the church and reduce it to an instrument of Dashnag ideology.

They carried their cancerous feud even to America, but thanks to the devotion of a flock loyal to a historic church founded in 301 A. D., the ARF plan has failed. Hairenik Weekly evidently tried to poison the American-born Dashnag generation with a dose of anti-Christian hate and published two astonishing letters (March 29, 1935), headlined "Better off without Christianity." Excerpts follow:

"I. By accepting Christianity as our national religion we lost more than we gained as a people. There is nothing we as a people should thank Christianity for * * * and plenty we should regret on account of it.

"II. The Armenian cause suffered by the adoption of Christianity. The new venture was not particularly beneficial nor reassuring. * * * We lost much of our virility as a militant race. Before Christianity Armenia was a powerful state capable of more than holding her own. * * * We possessed national unity, solidarity, and virility."

DASHNAGS AS RACE WORSHIPPERS

Just as the myth of an Aryan superrace was conceived by the Nazis to rekindle hope among the defeatist and frustrated German masses, Flynn's friends added race worship to the cult of flag worship. A few months before the murder, Hairenik (September 27, 1933) published an article on racial religionism explaining the need for "racial convulsions" in order to achieve "racial awakening":

"The racial-religious believes in his racial blood as a deity. Race above everything and before everything. Race comes first. Everything for the race. * * * We hear the racial religious orders have their own general creed, their leadership, and political emblem. They are also going to have their own uniforms, their own hymn, their rites, their holidays (translation)."

The organizer of the Racial Religious Orders was military hack named Gen. K. Nejdeh. "Today Germany and Italy are strong," he croaked, "because as a nation they live and breathe in the terms of race" (Weekly, April 10, 1936). Adapting the slogan "Youth, heart, and iron," Nejdeh generally modeled Dashnag youth upon the Hitler youth pattern. At first called racial patriots, later they become known as Tzeghagrons—composed of two words: tzegh (race) and gron (religion): race worshippers.

From this point on the dope of decadent race worship, dead-hero worship and defunct-flag worship was injected into young Tzeghagron minds. Whipped into strict discipline, urged never to marry non-Armenians lest it "pollute" the "purity of the Armenian race," Dashnag leaders pursued the nationalist credo that Armenianism and Armenian race-nationalism be retained at all costs. Otherwise, they cried out in alarm, its youth would "disintegrate into the melting pot and be lost to Armenia." It urged political activity as a means of keeping the new generation anchored to its race. Listen to the drivel drilled into American-born Tzeghagrons (Hairenik Weekly, January 11, 1935) by Mandalian, Darbinian, Nejdeh & Co.:

"I am preaching to you the Tzeghagron creed, worship of the race. * * * To me the highest act of individualism and of freedom is to follow the voice of my race. I am a Tzeghagron. That means: I know my race. I believe in my race. I worship my race. I know that my race is great; that my race has given more to humanity than it has received from it. I am a believer in my race and, behold, I worship another deity, the blood of my race, in whose unspotted purity lies the future of our people. * * * The deification of the will of the race—that is what the Tzeghagron is fighting for."

DASHNAGS AND NAZI GERMANY

The question arises: were Flynn's friends subsidized by the Nazis or, as in the case of countless American Fascists, did Dashnags themselves bear all carrying charges? This issue of Propaganda Battlefront presents only the documented evidence and will draw no conclusions. But it is significant that in its editorial of November 1, 1936, Hairenik observed:

"Who can guarantee that Germany and Italy with their Polish and Hungarian and other allies, or independent of them, would not try to infiltrate beyond Transcaucasia as the Germans did in 1918. Therefore, instead of binding our fate to the 'undefeatable' army of the Soviet Union, isn't it wiser for the Armenian to think also of the day when that army is crushed, deserts our motherland, and leaves defenseless our people of the homeland (translation)."

Equally significant is an item in News Week of November 12, 1941, entitled "Armenian Puppet State:"

"As the Near East crisis develops, look for evidence of Nazi fifth-column activity by Armenians in Turkey and Syria. The Nazis have picked out the Armenian Revolutionary Federation or 'Dashnag' party to do the fifth-column work. This intensely nationalist organization has recently moved its headquarters from Switzerland to Paris in Berlin. * * * The Nazis have promised the Dashnags an autonomous state similar to Croatia in return for their cooperation."

Pages of Hairenik Weekly contained references to intercourse with Nazi Germany. The November 29, 1935, issue recorded that Frau H. Winkler was shipping to Tzeghagrons 200 copies of her book entitled "In the World of the Dragons." Formation of a Tzeghagron chapter in Berlin received repeated mention. The May 3, 1935, issue carried a letter from Hellmut Lange, a Nazi at Chemnitz, Germany, answering the query of a Tzeghagron on the Reich's attitude toward ARF aims:

"We Germans stand for the principles of self-determination not only for our German countrymen living under foreign oppression but also in favor of any other nation suffering in the same way. * * * National socialism is the mainstay of the national idea and the determined opponent of thraldom.

* * * We Germans cannot but recognize your claims as thorcughly legitimate. * * * Your aim is and must be Armenian rebirth to Armenian liberty in the Armenian spirit. We Germans want to have our countrymen free from foreign yoke. You as an Armenian patriot want to have Armenia free again. Can we both have a finer aim than this?

DASHNAGS AS COMMUNISTS

With the turning of the Nazi tide and the triumph of Soviet Armies, Dashnag policy in the past 6 months has completely reversed itself. The Dashnags have now seemingly turned Communist. The Mandalian-Darbinian enterprises regularly reprint from Lraper, Armenian organ they once denounced as Communist, from Sovetakan Hayastan, official organ of Soviet Armenia, and the Weekly (Mar. 29, 1944) published a panegyric on Soviet Armenia and the Patriotic War issued by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Dashnags have already made subtle overtures to leftist Armenian elements. On May 19, 1944, a Weekly editorial (translated from the Hairenik) ignored its defamation of the Soviet regime and adulation of Nazi theory, and begged anti-ARF factions to forget the past and effect a merger, explaining:

"The attitude of the Federation toward the Soviet Government in relation to the practical Armenian national policy is no different from theirs. Like them the Federation too looks to the Soviet Government * * * and is willing to make all possible sacrifices for the realization of that national aim. The Federation, too, like them, admits that Soviet Ar-Armenia is the rightful political trustee of the Armenian cause."

DASHNAGS AS POLITICAL CHAMELEONS

Flynn's pals began as Socialists and Socialist-Revolutionists, turned into Nazi sympathizers and are now seeking favor with Soviet interests, while also courting Brother Flynn's brand of America First politicians. The fact is that a corrupt, self-seeking Dashnag leadership has always followed an opportunistic policy, becoming all things to all men—whatever was most lucrative for the moment.

But it's had business now to write pro-Nazi columns, and it's bad business to peddle anti-Jew hate. Hence Simon Vratzian, member of the Dashnag central committee in Boston, shed crocodile tears (Weekly, September 22, 1943) in an article entitled "The Jewish Tragedy." In hypocritical contrast to previous ARF sentiments, Vratzian bemoaned the "terrible fate" of Jewry and called Jews the "allies of civilization." Reversing its former anti-Zionist and pro-Arab nationalist views, the Weekly (March 22, 1944) devoted an editorial to the jubilee birthday of Rabbi Stephen Wise, chief exponent of Zionism, referred to him as one of Jewry's "noblest sons" and wished him the attainment of Zionist aims. But although the Dashnags have professed internationalist views on world collaboration, they are currently serving as informants for the ultra-isolationist, nationalistic McCormick-Patterson interests.

Dashnag leaders have tried to be everything to anybody—whether Communist, Nazi, Social-Democrat, Socialist, isolationist, or native Fascist. In order to survive they must be nourished by outside sources for they are shunned by those who know the truth about them.

But John T. Flynn insists on calling them "patriots." Dashnags have hoodwinked many with their wily chameleon politics, perverted patriotism, hypocritical professions of faith, employment of defrocked priests, glib flattery and bribery of the gullible and naive. But the prize catch in the ARF suckers' net has been John T. Flynn who, in the absence of any evidence against the author of Under Cover, has swallowed as truth the sewer-spawned lies of a disreputable Armenian terrorist-fascist gang completely unrepresentative of Americans of Armenian origin and ostracized by them.

As to John T. Flynn, what are his qualifications for posing as an expert in the machinations of wily Old World politicians now plying their trade in America? What are Flynn's motives in becoming involved in the nationalist-isolationist politicos of the Washington Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune? Has Mr. Flynn always been a member of their camp and only now bared his apparent affiliation?

Source Material Which Shows FEPC To Be a Concentration Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a permanent FEPC, which is proposed in certain legislation now pending in Congress, would create a concentration camp for all Americans. It is my purpose to discuss that question in the House today.

In order that everyone may read the source material upon which I am to base my argument on that question, I am including in this extension of remarks three documents, as follows:

Exhibit 1: A copy of H. R. 2232, which is the bill referred to;

Exhibit 2: A copy of portions of a little booklet entitled "FEPC—How It Operates"; and

Exhibit 3: A copy of the proceedings before the temporary FEPC in Case No. 65 against the United States Cartridge Co., of St. Louis, Mo.

These exhibits are as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

H. R. 2232

A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Fair Employment Practice Act.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds—

(1) that the practice of discriminating in the matter of employment, and in matters relating thereto, against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry leads to domestic and industrial strife and unrest and forces large segments of the population permanently into substandard conditions of living, thereby creating a drain upon the resources of the Nation and a constant threat to the maintenance of industrial peace and of the standard of living necessary to the health, efficiency, and well-being of workers; and

(2) that the existence of such practices in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce causes the means and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such conditions throughout the several States and causes diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair and disrupt the market for goods in commerce, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

(b) Individuals shall have the right to work without discrimination against them because of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to protect such right and to eliminate all such discriminations to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, receiver, or any organized group of persons, and includes any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person having in his employ six or more individuals, or any other person acting in the interest of such an employer, directly or indirectly.

(c) The term "labor union" means any organization, having six or more members, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, or terms or conditions of employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(f) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission created by section 6.

RIGHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 4. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any employer—

(1) to refuse to hire any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any individual from employment because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any individual in the matter of compensation with respect to, or in other terms or conditions of, employment because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of individuals for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against individuals because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any labor union—

(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to expel from membership any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, employee, or individual seeking

employment because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any employer or labor union to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because such person has opposed any practice which constitutes an unfair employment practice under this act or has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of securing enforcement of the foregoing rights and preventing unfair employment practices, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in its employ or under its supervision, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such further reports on the cause of, and means of alleviating discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(f) When three members of the Commission have qualified and taken office, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 21, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said Committee shall then be transferred to and become employees of the Commission, and all records, papers, and property of the Committee shall then pass into the possession of the Commission.

(g) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

(h) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder; and

(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

PREVENTION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as provided in this section—

(1) to prevent unfair employment practices by employers affecting commerce;

(2) to prevent unfair employment practices by employers who are parties to contracts with the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, or with any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, and by employers performing, pursuant to subcontract or otherwise, any work required for the performance of any such contract;

(3) to prevent unfair employment practices by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and of the Territories and possessions thereof; and

(4) to prevent unfair employment practices by labor unions affecting commerce.

(b) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint.

(c) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(d) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state in its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. Except as provided in section 12 (relating to the enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies), orders of the Commission shall be subject to judicial enforcement and judicial review in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same provisions of law, as in the case of orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof.

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 10. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue such regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to amend or rescind, from time to time, any such regulation whenever it deems such amendment or rescission necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. If, within sixty days after the issuance of any such regulation or of an amendment to any such regulation, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that Congress disapproves such regulation or amendment, as the case may be, such regulation or amendment, as the case may be, shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution; and after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution, no regulation or amendment having the same effect as that concerning which the concurrent resolution was passed shall be issued by the Commission.

Regulations issued under this section shall include the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

INCLUSION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION CLAUSE IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 11. (a) Every contract to which the United States, or any Territory or possession thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, is a party (except such classes of contracts as the Commission may by regulation issued under section 10 exempt

from the scope of this section) shall contain a provision under which—

(1) the contractor agrees that during the period required for the performance of the contract he will not engage in any unfair employment practices; and

(2) the contractor agrees that he will include a provision in each subcontract made by him for the performance of any work required for the performance of his contract a provision under which the subcontractor agrees—

(A) that during the period required for the performance of the subcontract, the subcontractor will not engage in any unfair employment practices; and

(B) that the subcontractor will include in each subcontract made by him provisions corresponding to those required in subparagraph (A) and this subparagraph.

(b) Unless the Commission shall otherwise direct, no contract shall be made by the United States, or any Territory or possession thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, with any person found pursuant to this act to have engaged in any unfair employment practice, or with any corporation, partnership, association, or other organization, in which such person owns a controlling interest, for a period (to be fixed by the Commission) not to exceed one year from the date on which such practice was so found to have been engaged in. The Commission may, by subsequent order, for good cause shown reduce any period so fixed. The Comptroller General of the United States shall distribute to all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and to the appropriate officials in the Territories and possessions of the United States, lists containing the names of such persons, corporations, partnerships, associations, and organizations.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 12. The provisions of section 8 (providing for judicial enforcement and judicial review of orders of the Commission) shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof. In the case of any such order, the Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to secure compliance with such order which may include the summary discharge of any officer or employee of any such agency or instrumentality who, in the opinion of the President or such person as the President may designate, has willfully failed to comply with such order.

WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 13. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

EXHIBIT II

COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE—HOW IT OPERATES

BEGINNING AND GROWTH

Early in the defense program it became evident that full mobilization of American manpower was going to be a major problem. It was also obvious that since minority groups number some 30,000,000 persons in the United States, an important aspect of the over-all manpower picture concerned their integration into the war effort. In July 1940 there began a series of measures to prevent discrimination in essential industry.

* * * * *

DUTIES AND JURISDICTION

Responsibility for fair employment practice rests, actually, with the individual employer, union, or Government agency. In interpreting and administering Executive Order 9346 the Committee, which is an administrative agency, first must determine how, when, and by whom discrimination is practiced, and second, must take appropriate steps to eliminate such discrimination.

Definition of complaints and complainants

FEPC has jurisdiction over complaints of discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin or ancestry. The category of noncitizens was not included in Executive Order 8802, nor in the more recent order. A statement by the President in January 1942 brought aliens within the scope of the Committee's jurisdiction, but the Committee is now seeking clarification of its responsibilities in regard to this group.

Whether because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, discrimination may take many different forms. It may be direct by the employer against an employee, as in the case of refusal to hire. A member of a minority group may be employed and later subjected to inferior working conditions. Failure to utilize minority workers at their highest skill level, early and unwarranted dismissal and unequal pay for equal work are additional types of direct discrimination.

Less direct discrimination in employment may be practiced by unions, training institutions, and employment agencies. Most of the complaints against unions charge refusal to accept for membership, to issue work permits or to handle grievances, including disputes over seniority and upgrading. There also may be segregation into local auxiliaries in which the Negro worker is denied the right to vote, to bargain collectively, or to participate equally in business negotiations. Complete denial of training and, in addition, unequal facilities where segregated schools exist and where an equal supply of Negro labor is available for training are the chief charges against training institutions. Discriminatory want ads and job specifications sent to employment agencies frequently prevent nonwhite, Jewish, and alien complainants from obtaining war jobs.

Basis of the Committee's authority

The functions performed by the Committee are carried out for and in the name of the President. The authority delegated to the Committee stems from two Presidential powers: First, the constitutional authority of the President, as administrative head of the executive branch of the Government, to direct the operation and administration of all Federal agencies in this branch of the Government; and second, his power as Commander in Chief to take all administrative action necessary to assure adequate supplies for the armed forces of the United States. Pursuant to his authority under the former, the President has empowered the Committee to investigate discrimination on the part of Government agencies, Government-sponsored training programs, and private industries involved in the performance of Government contracts. The President's power as Commander in Chief underlies his delegation of authority to the Committee to investigate discrimination in all essential war industries.

Agencies within the jurisdiction of the Committee

Thus the jurisdiction of the Committee under Executive Order 9346 extends to three categories of complaints alleging discriminatory employment practices:

1. Complaints against all agencies of the Federal Government;

2. Complaints against all employers, and the unions of their employees, having contractual relations with the Federal Government which expressly or by implication contain a nondiscrimination clause regardless of whether such contracts pertain to the war effort; and

3. Complaints against all employers, and the unions of their employees, engaged in industries essential to the war effort, whether or not they have contractual relations with the Government.

The Committee's jurisdiction over complaints against Federal agencies has never been challenged. But questions have been raised regarding the kinds of Government contracts contemplated by the order and whether or not the inclusion of the order's nondiscrimination clause in such contracts is mandatory. The latter question has been answered in the affirmative by the President. In defining the kinds of Government contracts contemplated by the order, the Committee has ruled that the nondiscrimination clause must be included in all contracts made, amended, or modified which call for the employment of persons. Such inclusion does not depend upon the amount of money involved and is required even though the contract does not concern war activity.

Jurisdiction over war industries where no contract is involved has been challenged in several cases. The Committee has issued no comprehensive definition of what it regards as war industries. It accepts as a general guide the War Manpower Commission's list of essential war industries, but it reserves to itself the right to determine in each case whether the party charged is an essential war industry within the meaning of the order. It has been ruled that steamship lines, railroads, telephone and telegraph companies, and local street-railway systems in vital industrial areas are essential war industries.

The Committee also has ruled that its jurisdiction extends to all war-training programs financed with Federal funds, even though operated by private educational institutions.

Agencies not within the jurisdiction of the Committee

Contrary to popular belief, the Committee does not have jurisdiction in a case merely because the party charged is engaged in interstate activities. FEPC has no power to deal with privately owned and operated plants which do not hold Government contracts or subcontracts and which are not engaged in activities essential to the war effort, even though they may be engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. Also excluded from the Committee's jurisdiction are retail stores and local enterprises such as beauty parlors, law offices, specialty shops, etc., which do not hold Government contracts and which are not engaged in services essential to the war effort.

The Committee has no jurisdiction over the armed forces.

PROCEDURE

A case requiring investigation by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice is—

(a) a signed complaint

(b) against a named employer, union, or Government agency

(c) alleging discrimination

(d) relating to employment, placement, or training

(e) because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

When it comes to his attention, a staff member may act upon information pertaining to discriminatory advertisements, placement orders, or application forms. In addition, evidence of violation of Executive Order 9346 referred to the Committee by another Government agency may constitute a case.

Method of investigation: Customary steps

All cases are filed in the regional office of the area in which the alleged discrimination has occurred. Investigation begins as soon as it is decided that the complaint comes within the Committee's jurisdiction. The first steps are to obtain from the complainant whatever additional information may be necessary and to check with other sources for material in regard to the union, employer, or Government agency charged. After this, if the fair practice examiner is satisfied that the case has some merit, contact is made with the party charged. If an employer or union official thus reminded of his responsibilities under Executive Order 9346 complies with the recommendations of the examiner and the regional director, the case is closed. In many of these cases negotiations between regional representatives and employers, union officials, or Government officials are required. Most of the cases satisfactorily adjusted in the 11-month period from July 1, 1943, to May 31, 1944, represent disposition at the regional level.

If a case cannot be adjusted by the usual steps taken at the regional level, the regional office can refer it to the Director of Field Operations in Washington. At both the regional and national levels there is frequent negotiation with the War Manpower Commission or with the contracting agencies of the Government. In some troublesome situations a fair practice examiner is sent from the Washington office to effect a satisfactory disposition of the case. The Committee holds but few public hearings each year, and only in exceptional cases is there referral to the full committee and the scheduling of a public hearing. This occurs only after all other methods of settlement have been employed unsuccessfully.

Hearings

The decision to hold a hearing is not automatic. It is made only after the members of the Committee have agreed upon such action. The purpose of public hearings is to determine the existence of discrimination, the duties of employers, and the rights of employees under Executive Order 9346.

Hearings conducted by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice are informal, fact-finding proceedings. They are not limited by the legal rules of evidence and procedure. The full Committee, sitting as an impartial body, may hear the case or may authorize its Chairman to appoint a hearing commissioner for the purpose of conducting the hearing. In other instances a panel of Committee members may be designated. In the case of full Committee hearings a number of concerns from the same industry or local area may be investigated at one set of hearings. This practice is followed in part for reasons of economy. Moreover, where several firms in the same industry and/or local area show discrimination in their employment policies, it would be unjust to hold public hearings on some one company.

Ample notice of the hearing and of the specific charges is given to the party charged. Parties may appear in person or be represented by counsel and may examine and cross-examine the witnesses. The Committee may request the party charged to present material, but it has no power to subpena witnesses or records.

The full Committee reviews the stenographic record of the proceedings before rendering its final decision and entering its findings. At this time it takes corrective measures, which may include recommendations and directives to the parties charged and recommendations to Federal agencies and to the President of the United States to eliminate whatever discriminatory practices have been revealed.

The elimination of discrimination

In most instances FEPC staff members are able to bring about the adjustment of specific complaints without formal reference to the Committee. Frequently the employer or the union has no idea of how to go about the elimination of discrimination. In these cases FEPC staff members can offer expert advice and counsel on techniques for overcoming employee resistance. Satisfactory disposition is achieved when the party charged complies with the requests of FEPC representatives that it take certain positive steps to correct present discriminatory practices or to guard against their future occurrence. Beyond the settlement of the immediate grievance, such implementation usually consists of written notices and instructions to personnel officers, placement agencies, training institutions, and labor unions that the party charged will employ and utilize persons solely on the basis of their qualifications and without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Committee's directives usually advise the parties charged to issue formal instructions to their own personnel officers and employment agencies that the recruitment, training, and placement of workers will be carried on without discrimination.

In addition, the Committee has at times directed companies to hire persons who have been discriminated against or to reinstate workers who have been dismissed for discriminatory reasons. One such instance occurred in December 1942, following a hearing which involved charges brought by seven members of Jehovah's Witnesses. The Committee directed that "the company take immediate steps to offer reinstatement to the seven complainants and to offer them reemployment with full seniority rights they would have enjoyed had they been continuously employed."

The Committee consistently has expressed its conclusions regarding methods of carrying out the purposes of the Executive orders by means of the well-known administrative procedure of issuing directives. Power to issue directives is implied in Executive Orders 8802 and 9346. Under Executive Order 8802 the Committee "shall take appropriate steps to redress grievances." The corresponding clause in Executive Order 9346 authorizes it to "take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of * * * discrimination." The Committee's authority to issue directives springs from these phrases.

Should the Committee's directives be defied, such violation can be referred to the proper contracting agency, including the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission. Ultimately noncompliance is certified to the President of the United States.

The Committee can also bring such cases of noncompliance to the attention of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. A formal agreement executed by the two agencies in August 1943, defines the respective responsibilities of FEPC and WMC in enforcing the Government's nondiscrimination policies concerning the training, placement, and utilization of manpower.

The War Manpower Commission in carrying out its employment stabilization program may penalize violators of the program's clause prohibiting discriminatory hiring and referral practices. War Manpower Commission through the United States Employment Service may refuse to service noncomplying employers or may issue certificates of availability to workers against whom discriminatory policies have been practiced. It may refuse the employer clearance for the recruitment of workers outside of his labor market if he imposes discriminatory hiring specifications. It may issue certificates of availability to the workers of a noncomplying employer. Also, in accordance with WMC policy, employees who quit in protest over the employment of minority workers may be denied certificates of availability to other employment. The above steps may be taken at either the regional or national level.

Ultimately the President may act under his authority as administrative head of the executive branch of the Government or as Commander in Chief of the armed forces to enforce Committee directives.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

Complaints received and investigated

As of July 1, 1943, FEPC had pending 1,016 cases. During the 11 months' period between that date and May 31, 1944, 3,806 new cases were docketed. During the same period 2,648 cases were closed, leaving the Committee's June 1 case load at 2,188. Nearly 39 percent of the cases closed represented satisfactory adjustments. Dismissal because of lack of jurisdiction over the complaint or because of insufficient evidence accounted for approximately 20 percent of the closings. In addition, 28 percent of the cases were closed on merits, nearly 10 percent were withdrawn by the complainant, and not quite 4 percent were dismissed for other reasons. The 1,642 cases in these last 4 categories represent allegations of discrimination which would have remained as continuing disputes had they not been subjected to a careful examination by a third party.

As of June 1, 1944, FEPC public hearings numbered only 11. Six of these were held under the auspices of the old Committee, before the issuance of Executive Order 9346. A number of companies and unions were involved, and compliance has been largely good. Certain companies have been especially cooperative. The new Committee has conducted 5 public hearings; 2 were based upon charges of discrimination because of creed and involved the Dow Chemical Co. in Midland, Mich., and the Northwest Mining & Exchange Co. in Du Boise, Pa. The railroad hearings in Washington, D. C., the boilermaker hearings in Portland, Oreg., and Los Angeles, Calif., and the case of the Philadelphia Transportation Co., in Philadelphia, Pa., involved charges of racial discrimination.

Distribution of complaints by race, creed, color, national origin, alienage

Race and color.—Discrimination on account of race comprised 81 percent of the complaints docketed from July 1, 1943 to May 31, 1944. Practically all of these involved Negroes. For the most part Negro labor in the United States has been disproportionately concentrated in unskilled, domestic, and agricultural occupations. According to the 1940 census Negro men comprised 60.2 percent of all males in domestic service and Negro women constituted 46.6 percent of all women employed in this field. Colored men formed 21 percent of the males employed as laborers; colored women composed 26.9 percent of such female workers. (Farms and mines are not included.) Negro men were 21 percent of all farm laborers and foremen. It can be seen how disproportionately the Negro was concentrated in the lower work brackets in 1940 when it is considered that Negro males constituted 10.3 percent of the total male working population, and that colored women formed 18.9 percent of the total female working population.

During World War No. 1 and for a decade thereafter Negroes made significant occupational gains in such industries as iron, steel, meat packing, shipbuilding, and automobile manufacturing. The depression seriously hampered these gains, and in 1940 Negroes constituted a small, proportion of the workers in mining, manufacturing, transportation, and communication than they had in 1910. A survey by the Bureau of Employment security of the Social Security Board, issued in September 1941, revealed that Negroes would not be considered by industry for 51 percent of 282,245 job openings expected to occur by February 1942.

The Tolan committee, in 1941, found that nine AFL unions still had constitutional provisions barring Negroes from membership, along with seven unaffiliated organizations. In addition, numerous unions continued to discriminate against Negro workers, excluding them by tacit consent and constitutional ritual and by segregating them into auxiliaries.

Since 1941 the Negro has made considerable advances in the field of industrial employment. In January 1944, according to the War Manpower Commission, nonwhite workers constituted 7.2 percent of the total 15,000,000 war workers in firms reporting to the United States Employment Service. This shows a good trend. In the beginning of 1942 it was estimated that nonwhite workers constituted only 3 percent of the employees in war industries. By September 1942 the figure was 5.7 percent; in January 1943, 6.4 percent, and in March 1943, 6.7 percent. Negroes have secured significant employment opportunities in shipbuilding, aircraft, blast furnaces, steel works, rolling mills, tanks, communication equipment, explosives, and ammunition.

No reliable data is available on the utilization of nonwhite workers in skilled and semiskilled occupations. Most observers agree that Negroes are being both placed and upgraded to skilled and semiskilled operations in many plants at a startling rate. The WMC has revealed that for the last quarter of 1943, 14.8 percent of nonwhite placements were in other than unskilled occupations. The number of Negroes in operations other than unskilled in industry is perhaps much higher than this figure would indicate since the usual tendency is to upgrade Negroes from unskilled jobs, rather than to take newcomers from the outside at the high levels of employment.

Negroes have also made considerable gains in the Federal Civil Service. A 1938 report by L. J. W. Hayes showed that Negroes composed 8.4 percent of Federal employees in Washington, and that 90 percent were in custodial jobs. In contrast, a study by the Division of Review and Analysis of FEPC, involving a sample which covered 1,957,858 Government employees, showed that as of July 31, 1943, 12.5 percent of these workers were colored. According to this study Negroes composed 18 percent of the total personnel in the departmental service. A large number, 50 percent or more in some agencies, were employed in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal category, although in the field service most Negroes were still in custodial classifications.

In general, however, good utilization of Negro labor is spotty and is concentrated in certain industries, in certain areas, and even, in some cases, is limited to specific corporations. There are many industries where the full utilization of nonwhite workers is of critical importance to the war production effort. Among these are the local transit industry, the air frame industry, the cotton textile industry in the South, the jute-spinning industry, the rayon fiber and rayon textile industry, the antifriction bearing industry, and the shipbuilding industry where colored workers are already highly utilized.

The practices of organized labor have not kept pace with the increased employment of the Negro. Today 13 national or international unions exclude Negroes by constitutional provision, 4 exclude by tacit consent, 9 afford only segregated auxiliary status to Negroes, and 1 excludes by ritual. A number of the large industrial locals of the latter interpret the ritual reference to white persons to mean white of character and thereby admit Negroes. With regard to most situations involving the highest-grade mechanics, the ritual is still effective in achieving exclusion.

Creed: Charges of discrimination because of creed comprised about 9 percent of the complaints received by the Committee during the July 1943–June 1944 period. Most of them came from Jews. Members of this group frequently have been barred from employment through discriminatory want ads or specifications to employment agencies. Application forms on which religion must be designated further such discrimination. In many cases training schools have refused to admit Jews because of past difficulties in placing these graduates.

Discrimination against Jews has been widespread in several fields of employment. Prior to the war it was difficult for persons of Jewish origin to obtain white-collar positions through employment agencies, for a large proportion of these did not refer Jewish applicants to Christian employers, even when the latter placed no discriminatory specifications. Signs with legends such as "No Jewish applicants until further notice" were mentioned in a report by the American Jewish Congress, and even the application forms of some State employment agencies required persons seeking jobs to state their religion. Employment by public utilities, banks, chain stores, and industrial concerns was also denied to large number of Jews, although in certain industries they were well represented.

Complaints filed with the Committee from Jews are concentrated in the northeast section of the country. There are few cases involving discrimination on the part of unions or Government agencies. Most Jewish complaints involve refusal to hire, discriminatory application blanks, and discriminatory advertisements. Those charging discriminatory working conditions usually involve attitudes on the part of fellow workers rather than more direct discrimination on the job.

Orthodox Jews, Seventh-day Adventists, and others who regard Saturday as their Sabbath constitute a problem because of the working schedules to which most industries geared to the demands of war production now adhere. Absenteeism related to such practices often has led to dismissal, although many plants and agencies have managed to work out satisfactory arrangements for Sabbatarians. John W. Martyn, administrative assistant to the Secretary of War; the late Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox; and Harry B. Mitchell, president of the Civil Service Commission, in separate statements, have expressed the willingness of their departments to attempt to provide systems whereby their employees can observe religious holidays. These statements have been implemented by departmental instructions.

National origin and alienage: Discrimination because of national origin alone accounted for slightly more than 6 percent of the complaints docketed by the Committee between July 1, 1943, and May 31, 1944. Some foreign-born citizens are denied employment simply because an employer doubts their loyalty. On the other hand, certain groups, largely Spanish-American in origin, have to contend with discrimination of the same type which faces American Negroes. This is especially true in sections of the far West and Southwest.

The problem of placing noncitizens in war jobs is a troublesome one. During the 11 months' period mentioned above, discriminatory acts against aliens constituted approximately 5 percent of FEPC's docketed cases. Most discrimination of this kind arises from delay on the part of employers engaged in war production to process the necessary clearance. Sections in two acts of Congress, passed in 1923 and 1940, forbade the employment of aliens in the performance of aeronautical, secret, restricted, or confidential contracts without the written consent of the secretary of the department concerned. Although the latter act has expired and the 1926 act covers only aeronautical contracts, the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission continue to require written consent for the employment of aliens on such classified contracts.

The number of complaints received by the former Committee from aliens proved the existence of confusion among employers and applicants alike. In March 1943, discrimination against aliens still comprised FEPC's second largest group of complaints. A series of steps has served to alleviate the situation. On July 11, 1942, President Roosevelt issued a clarifying statement, setting forth the official position on the employment of noncitizens and outlining procedures to be followed in hiring them. This was reaffirmed on June 7, 1943, in a joint statement by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

According to section 205 of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, approved June 26, 1943, aliens who are nationals of any of the United Nations may now be employed by the Government agencies whose appropriations are provided by this act.

In recent months the paper work and the time needed for clearance of applications have served as the chief obstacles to the employment of aliens. At this time the Provost Marshal General has brought about decentralization of the investigation and clearance of alien applications. This process should reduce considerably the time required for clearance.

As a war agency the Committee on Fair Employment Practice is concerned with bringing about the fullest utilization of all available manpower for the fight against the Axis. Its functions are the direct expression of Government policy and are aimed at eliminating discriminatory practices, which in the present emergency tend seriously to impair workers' morale and national unity. The current need for labor does not allow for the continuance of habits which bar qualified workers from employment and prolong the day of victory.

EXHIBIT III

CASE NO. 65—IN THE MATTER OF UNITED STATES CARTRIDGE CO., RESPONDENT

Before the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice: Malcolm Ross, chairman; John Brophy, Charles H. Houston, Boris Shishkin, Sara Southall, Milton P. Webster, members.

Appearances: Ernest G. Trimble, for the Committee; R. H. Sullivan, assistant general manager, United States Cartridge Co., for the respondent; Emanuel H. Bloch, of counsel to the Committee.

DECISION—STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Upon complaints duly filed, and after preliminary investigation thereof, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice (herein called the committee) issued its statement of charges, dated July 18, 1944, against the United States Cartridge Co., of St. Louis, Mo. (herein called the respondent), alleging that the respondent had engaged in and is engaging in discriminatory employment practices in violation of Executive Order 8802, as amended by Executive Order 9346, promulgated by the President of the United States on June 25, 1941, and May 27, 1943, respectively.

With respect to the discriminatory employment practices, the statement of charges alleged in substance that the respondent at its St. Louis plant (1) discharged Negro employees while retaining in its employ white employees of less seniority and denied reinstatement to Negro employees while reinstating white employees of less seniority, because of the race or color of such Negro employees; (2) refused employment to the complainants Irene Johnson and Beatrice Marshall on September 13, 1943, because they were Negroes; (3) discharged complainant Bertha Brown on December 11, 1943, Margie Foster on December 7 1943, John W. Joiner, Jr., on December 4, 1943, and Ollie M. Haynes and Emilie T. Lee on December 6, 1943, because they were Negroes.

Pursuant to notice, a hearing was held at St. Louis, Mo., on August 2, 1944, before the

Committee. The Committee was represented by counsel and the respondent by a lay representative; all participated in the hearing. Full opportunity to be heard, to examine and cross examine witnesses and to introduce evidence bearing upon the issues was afforded all parties.

During the hearing, on the motion of counsel for the Committee, the complaints of Ollie M. Haynes and Emilie T. Lee were withdrawn.

Upon the entire record in the case, the Committee makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The respondent

The U. S. Cartridge Co., a corporation, respondent herein, manufactures ammunition and other essential war material for sale to and use by the United States War Department and Department of the Navy under contract with said Departments. It maintains and operates eight buildings in St. Louis, Mo., which are owned by the United States of America. Its contracts with the War and Navy Departments contain nondiscrimination clauses, required by Executive Order 9346, which forbid discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of their race, creed, color, or national origin.

We find that the respondent is a war industry within the meaning of Executive Order 9346 and that its employment policies and practices are subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee.

2. The respondent's racial employment policy

We find that in seven of the eight buildings operated by the respondent, production work is performed exclusively by white employees, and in the eighth building, known as Building 202, only Negroes are employed. Separation of the white and Negro workers is maintained strictly, although white and Negro workers perform similar duties and are listed under identical occupational code classifications.

In defense of the respondent's policy, Mr. Sullivan, respondent's assistant general manager, testified that when its war production began there was very little skilled labor available in St. Louis, thereby necessitating the training of new employees. The respondent then determined, he explained, to follow the population ratio and to employ 90 percent white operators and 10 percent Negro. Before this was accomplished, the respondent explored the problem with Negro and civic organizations of St. Louis.

Mr. Sullivan testified further that the same type of training was afforded Negro and white employees and that Negroes in Building 202 have advanced to high supervisory positions. Finally, he admitted that had Negroes been fully integrated on a nonsegregated basis by the respondent at the time its operations commenced in St. Louis, it would have been easier to solve the problem of cut-backs, but "The customs community-wide are influential on what we have to do in industry."

The respondent's defense, in essence, therefore, is a contention that its quota system of hiring Negroes, being based on the existing Negro-white ratio in St. Louis, is fair and not in violation of the Executive order.

But, we find, that the actual operation of this system demonstrates that a person's chances of being hired will not be based solely upon his occupational qualifications, but on the irrelevant factor of his race or color. As we stated in *Matter of McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Company*, Case No. 64, decided December 16, 1944:

"Validation of a race 'quota' system of employment would be inconsistent with the individual protection against discrimination 'by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin' to 'any person in war industries and Government' afforded by Executive Order 9346. It is apparent that qualified 'available and needed' workers can be denied employment under the operation of a quota system when the share allotted to their race or group has been filled.

"Consequently, such a system works to the disadvantage of individuals in both minority and majority groups by providing that consideration of race rather than qualifications and availability shall operate as the criterion for hiring an employee. We cannot permit the rationale of the Executive order to be so subverted."

We concede respondent's argument that building 202 was not intended as a device to discriminate against Negroes but to broaden the opportunities for their training and to serve as a demonstration unit of Negro technical capacity. But we find that this laudable purpose could have been accomplished without denying Negroes the opportunity of working on other buildings of the plant, when the respondent needed workers in such buildings.

While the respondent is entitled to commendation for its efforts to take the first steps to eliminate descrimination against Negro workers by employing Negroes in large numbers and a variety of skills, we find that the result of its racial quota system has been to thwart fulfillment of its original praiseworthy purpose.

3. Discriminatory lay-offs

We find that the United Electrical and Machine Workers of America, CIO, Local 825 (herein called the union), is the recognized and contractual bargaining representative of the employees of the St. Louis plant of the respondent. On September 22, 1943, the respondent and the union entered into a written contract. Article IV of said contract, entitled "Seniority," provides:

"SEC. 1. Seniority shall be a determining factor in matters affecting lay-off and reemployment, transfers, demotions, and promotions, only if factors of ability and aptitude are equal. Seniority shall be applied on an occupational group basis."

Article V thereof, entitled "Discrimination," provides:

"No employee or person seeking employment shall be discriminated against because of race, color, creed, or sex."

We find that during the month of December 1943 a mass lay-off of respondent's employees was effected. In selecting employees for lay-off the respondent admittedly used two seniority systems, one of which was applied to building 202, and the other applied to the seven other buildings. In other words, seniority was either "Negro seniority" or "white seniority."

From figures furnished by the respondent it appears, and we find, that 412 Negroes were laid off in December 1943 who would not have been terminated had the same seniority standards been followed in selecting Negro workers for lay-off as were used in selecting white workers.

We find that in March 1944 and in June 1944, further mass lay-offs took place. The respondent offered testimony to show, and we find, that during these lay-offs Negro workers benefited from the operation of its dual seniority system so that 26 Negroes were retained in March 1944 and 517 in June 1944, who would have been terminated had the same basis of calculating seniority been applied to white and Negro workers.

In January 1944, some of the employees previously laid off were rehired. Again, the "Negro" and "white" seniority system was used by the respondent in determining who should be rehired. Mr. Sullivan admitted that "some people may have been reinstated with less seniority than some that were laid off." We find that some white workers were reinstated, while Negro workers with greater seniority and in the same occupational code classifications were not rehired.

Theodore E. Brown, the St. Louis field examiner of the committee, testified that following the December 1943 lay-offs, he conferred with the respondent's executives to determine why Negro workers had been laid off contrary to the seniority clause in respondent's contract with the union. He testified, and we find, that respondent's executives told him that the respondent had determined to maintain a ratio between white and Negro workers based upon "the ratio of the Negro population to the total population in the city of St. Louis," which ratio, concerning to testimony of Mr. Sullivan, was 10 percent.

We find, according to the respondent's figures, that in November 1943, before the first mass lay-off, Negroes constituted 12.5 percent of the respondent's employees at its St. Louis plant; and that after the third mass lay-off in June 1944, they constituted only 10.5 percent.

William Sentner, general vice president of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, testified, and we find, that following the December, 1943 lay-off the union protested the violation of the seniority clause in its contract insofar as it affected Negro workers in building 202, and demanded, pursuant to formal resolution of the union, that the respondent give effect to said seniority clause and cease discriminating against Negro workers. The union also announced that if the respondent failed to do so, it desired to submit the issue to arbitration, as provided in its contract. A similar protest was made following the January 1944 lay-off.

Mr. Senter also testified, and we find, that when the respondent began to reemploy move men in the seven white buildings, Negro move men were not rehired, although the white list of move men was exhausted. Finally, he stated that it was impossible to apply the principle of seniority when there were segregated units within a plant.[1]

We find that a racial quota system is equally as mischievous when used to select employees for lay-off as when applied with regard to their hire. Executive Order 9346 does not provide that Negroes or other minority groups shall be hired or retained in employment in accordance with population ratios. The order, on the contrary, forbids the use of extraneous considerations of race, creed, color, or national origin in hiring or in laying-off employees. It is no defense to argue, as the respondent has done, that its quota system on certain occasions operated to the advantage of Negro employees and to the prejudice of white workers. The Executive order forbids discrimination against white as well as against colored employees.

As a result of the racial quota system, Negroes suffered in the December 1943 lay-offs. As a result of the same system, Negroes enjoyed a preference in the March and June 1944 lay-offs. How they will fare in subsequent lay-offs, no one can predict. The

[1] Mr. Senter testified that in July 1942 the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce distributed a report to war production plant operators in that city in which it suggested complete segregation of Negroes in special buildings or floors in order to overcome the resistance of white employees. He contended that from 1933 until the issuance of the report there had been no segregation of Negro workers in St. Louis plants except in one establishment, although factory employment of Negroes was confined to material handling, porter work, and common labor. Herbert R. Ramel, a member of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce and former chairman of the Labor Supply and Labor Training Committee, pursuant to permission granted by the committee, filed a statement after the close of the hearing which is hereby made part of the record. Mr. Ramel denied that the 1942 report of the chamber was responsible for the development of an employment pattern in St. Louis or that the statement in such report represented the policy of the chamber. The committee finds it unnecessary to resolve this conflict in testimony.

rights of employees under the Executive order cannot thus be made a matter of chance, nor can an employer's duties under the order be avoided by an exhibition of factors such as segregation, which make their discharge inconvenient or difficult.

This case demonstrates the difficulty, if not impossibility, of affording equal job opportunity to all workers while confining one minority group to jobs exclusively in one portion of a plant.

4. The individual complaints of discrimination

Beatrice Marshall, a Negro, testified, and we find that on September 12, 1943, a help-wanted advertisement was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch over the respondent's name, reading: "Two thousand needed. Wanted to help make cartridges for our fighting men. No experience needed in training period. Immediate employment." She testified, and we find, that in response to that advertisement she visited the respondent's plant and applied for employment. She was told that Negroes worked only in building 202 and that the respondent was not then hiring any persons for work in that building.

Irene Johnson did not testify, and we find there is insufficient evidence to sustain her complaint.

We find that Bertha Brown, a Negro employee, was laid off because of a "reduction in forces" during the mass lay-off of December 1943 and that she had been working for the respondent for 6 months.

Margie Foster, a Negro, testified, and we find, that she had worked as an inspector in building 202 and had been laid off on December 7, during the December mass lay-off.

John W. Joiner, Jr., a Negro, testified, and we find, that he had been employed as a welder in building 202 and was laid off on December 1 or 2, 1943. He testified that he had more seniority than white welders who were not laid off during that month.

Mr. Sullivan, respondent's assistant general manager, testified, and we find, that Bertha Brown and Margie Foster would have been retained had the respondent not had "Negro" and "white" seniority systems, but that John W. Joiner, Jr., would have been laid off even if plant-wide seniority had been applied.

Upon the basis of the above findings of fact and upon the entire record in the case, the committee makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS

1. United States Cartridge Co., is a war industry within the meaning of Executive Order 9346, and its employment policies and practices are subject to the jurisdiction of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

2. By refusing to hire Negro workers solely because quotas or ratios imposed by respondent for hire of such workers had been filled, the respondent has engaged in employment practices forbidden by Executive Order 9346.

3. By laying off Negro employees on a seniority basis predicated upon their race or color in an effort to maintain a Negro quota or ratio, the respondent has engaged in employment practices forbidden by Executive Order 9346.

4. By refusing to hire Beatrice Marshall and by discharging Bertha Brown and Margie Foster because of their race or color, respondent has engaged in employment practices forbidden by Executive Order 9346.

5. The respondent has not engaged in any practices forbidden by Executive Order 9346 with respect to John W. Joiner, Jr., Ollie M. Haynes, Emilie T. Lee, and Irene Johnson.

DIRECTIVES

Upon the basis of the above findings of fact and conclusions, and pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9346 to take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of discrimination forbidden by such order, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice directs that the respondent, United States Cartridge Co., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns shall:

1. Cease and desist from—

(a) Refusing employment to Negroes because of their race or color, for available positions for which they are qualified;

(b) Laying off or discharging Negroes through the operation of any seniority system which is not equally applicable to Negro and white workers;

(c) Maintaining any racial quota or other system, such as segregation, by which the race or color of an employee or applicant for employment becomes a factor in any decision with respect to his hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment; and

(d) In any other manner discriminating against employees or applicants for employment with respect to their hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment because of their race, creed, color, or national origin.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the committee finds will effectuate the policies of Executive Order 9346:

(a) Offer immediate employment to Beatrice Marshall in any position for which she is qualified and if employment for her is not immediately available, place her upon a preferential hiring list and offer employment to her as a vacancy develops in any position for which she is qualified;

(b) Offer to Bertha Brown and Margie Foster immediate and full reinstatement to their former or substantially equivalent positions without prejudice to their seniority or other rights and privileges;

(c) Issue written instructions to all of its officers or employeers having authority to recruit, hire, place, transfer, promote, lay off, or discharge employees to perform their duties without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

(d) Issue written notices to all employment or recruitment agencies, public or private, including the United States Employment Service, through which the respondent recruits employees or trainees that it will accept and hire employees or trainees, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin;

(e) Issue written notices to all labor unions with which it has contracts that it will comply fully with the provisions of Executive Order 9346, and with these directives, and that it will not discriminate against any employees or applicants for employment with respect to their hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, because of their race, creed, color, or national origin;

(f) Submit to the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice copies of each of the above instructions and notices;

(g) Report in writing to the committee within 30 days of the receipt of this decision what steps it has taken to comply therewith.

3. And it is further directed that the complaints of Irene Johnson, John W. Joiner, Jr., Ollie M. Haynes, and Emilie T. Lee be, and the same are, hereby dismissed.

Issued at Washington, D. C., on December 23, 1944, by order of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

MALCOLM ROSS,
Chairman.

Service Ribbons for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution:

Whereas the Japanese armed forces waged provoked and undeclared war on the peaceful people of China beginning with the incident at the Marco Polo Bridge in 1937; and

Whereas the United States of America maintained land and sea forces in the eastern Asia war zone during this period for the protection of American lives and property; and

Whereas the China Service Ribbon was awarded to the members of the United States Navy who served in this war zone in 1937 and 1938: Be it therefore

Resolved, That realizing the desirability of giving equal recognition to all our armed forces who endured the dangers of this conflict, San Francisco Post No. 15, Regular Veterans Association, unanimously favors extending the privileges of similar recognition to the members of the United States Army. This twenty-fourth day of January, 1945.

ALFRED BARRATH,
San Francisco Post 15, California.

Repeal Unfair Use Tax on Automobiles and Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this use tax of $5 on automobiles and boats has served its purpose. Such a measure violates the principle that a tax should be proportionate to the wealth or income of the payer and his ability to pay, and being more or less of a nuisance tax should be repealed.

The Atlanta Journal of Atlanta, Ga., in an editorial of April 11, 1945, refers to this tax as follows:

The most indefensible tax levied on the American people since the evening of the Boston Tea Party.

Such a tax places a burden on car owners irrespective of the value of the car and whether the car or boat may be used little or those who use them everyday. Certainly the earmarks of a nuisance tax.

I include in my remarks the following editorial from the Palm Beach Post of West Palm Beach, Fla., under date of May 2, 1945, one of the leading, outstanding, and most influential newspapers of the State of Florida:

ROGERS KEEPS A PROMISE

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS has fulfilled one of his campaign promises by introducing a bill to repeal the annual $5 Federal use tax on motor vehicles and boats.

Mr. ROGERS correctly described this impost as a nuisance tax. It is also an unfair tax because so many automobile and boat owners avoid paying it.

Collecting the tax from those who do not voluntarily go to the post office and buy stamps imposes a heavy burden upon the internal revenue department and one that is growing more onerous each year.

The Florida Legislature has gone on record in favor of its repeal, the general public wants it repealed, and the Federal Treasury would scarcely miss the revenue received from it.

Congress will make no mistake by passing the Rogers bill.

Address of Paul A. Strachan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and also my address, both delivered before Lodge No. 2, AFPH, Washington, D. C., April 18, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, this, I know, is a solemn occasion for all of us, as, since we last met, our President and friend—the most eminent physically handicapped in all the world—has died.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead, but his spirit goes marching on. His words, and his works, will live forever and be an inspiration to not only those now living, but, to generations as yet unborn.

I have here a resolution adopted this past Saturday night by our Lodge 1. It says, "We believe that the immortal words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, at his first inaugural, 'The only thing we have to fear is fear, itself!' is applicable to, and should be adopted as the motto of every physically handicapped person."

That is unquestionably true. The only thing we have to fear is fear itself. Now let us see how that applies to every handicapped. We all know when the dread realization of our disability first shocked and stunned us that our first reaction was, fear. We feared that we could not carry on, because of our lacking some physical facility. We feared that our friends would pity us. We feared to pit our wits and remaining faculties against the economic scheme, because, in the vernacular, we knew "we didn't have all our marbles," and we were, therefore, operating under a double handicap. These and other fears, prevented or deterred the vast majority of us from calmly acknowledging and evaluating our physical handicap, and then developing other talents, as an offset. Therefore, we know that, in order to again pick up the threads of life the first thing we had to conquer was, that fear.

I shall call upon every AFPH Lodge to adopt the resolution sponsored by Lodge 1, and make it the motto of our federation.

While we are holding this brief memorial service to our departed President, I believe it fitting that we read, again, his inspirational message, sent to our last convention in August 1944, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 21, 1944.*

PAUL A. STRACHAN,

President, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., Washington, D. C.:

The value of the undertaking which you and your organization have started on behalf of the physically handicapped of our Nation can be very great. In this period of crisis in the world's history, when men have been forced to apply their intellects to the tragic science of human destruction, it is heartening to find a group like yours facing the future with determination to repair the ravages of that destruction.

In addition to the war injured and to the greatly increased number of workers injured in industry because of the vast war production effort, there are undoubtedly countless others in this critical period.

It is well that thoughtful people dedicate themselves to the purpose of transforming those handicaps as far as possible into means of returning the handicapped to useful and creative employment. I wish the federation the success which its noble purpose merits.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

But, while we feel an irreparable sense of loss in the passing of humanity's friend, I believe we have a duty, also, as well as high privilege, to not only support President Harry S. Truman, but to wish for him a continuance of the program which made this administration the most humanitarian administration that this country has ever seen.

I know that I have studied the history of the laws for handicapped very carefully. I know that, as people, we weren't recognized until some twenty-odd years ago, but I reflect the greatest movement ever known to have been made in this Nation, to recognize and deal with the problems and needs of handicapped people, unquestionably has been during the past 12 years, and yet we have only started on that program.

We believe and we hope that the President today will carry on, and I am going to ask that all of us stand for just a moment and give him a silent pledge that we shall do our part to unite behind him and make his administration the great success it deserves to be. I ask you to rise for one moment. [A pause.]

Thank you.

As we resume the business of this evening I want to say that I am very proud, in many ways, that we have made friends in high places. Not so much because the individuals themselves were in high places, but because in them I found, first, human beings who were sensitive to our needs and who wanted to help us. I have found as a rule that the higher you go the more accessible you find the individual. That may sound paradoxical, but it applies to many of the most eminent Members of Congress and officials with whom we have to deal. I have also found that the greater the man the greater his simplicity. They do not lose the common touch; they remain close to the source from which they derive their real power—the people; they do not become "up-stage" but remain real human beings. I am always happy to become acquainted with these people.

About 8 years ago a gentleman came out of the far West, arrived in Washington, and took his seat in Congress.

I became acquainted with him. I found that he had many varied experiences in life. He had seen both the seamy side and also had been a member of the so-called upper crust. He had fought and worked his way to success and had established a splendid business which operated successfully for many years, but which he disposed of upon being elected to Congress.

But with all the hallmarks of success, underneath he still remained a "roughneck." I say that with the intent to fill the word with the very finest implications, because I have maintained and shall always maintain that "roughnecks" are the salt of the earth, and I'm going to stand on that. They never forget their experiences with the under dogs, and that gives them an asset which many people lack—human understanding.

I found that he was a "definite type." I also found that he is far more prolific in use of the word "No", than "Yes", but, you can depend upon it, he means what he says, in using either of them.

I know that he has made a fine name for himself in Congress. He worked. He was on the job. A few years ago, they named him chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, whereupon he immediately began waving his Merlin's magic wand. It is a matter of record that, under his leadership, the House passed a bill which, up to that hour, was the largest appropriations bill for Navy ever passed in all the history of the world—25-plus billion dollars, I may be off, a billion or so, but, such a sum is beyond my conception.

I wanted to borrow his magic wand, but, he won't loan it to me, so, I have to continue, as one of the Sons of Martha, to work for whatever I may get out of Congress.

I know he is going still higher, unless I am a very poor judge of politics and policies, and I would be happy to see him a United States Senator, because, even if he is "tough", he has a very, very soft spot in his heart for the afflicted, and for the old folks, and for those two things, alone, I would forgive him his sins.

I hope that this is just the beginning of a fine friendship for you, with him, because, when he goes back home to that beautiful California, I have got him committed to make an address before our Los Angeles lodge, and I believe what he says then may well be heard around the entire country.

We owe him, in fact, a great deal, because he was the first man in Congress to actually do something about the handicapped program. He published the first digest of that program which, subsequently, became the fundamentals of the AFPH program, and he has backed that up, ever since.

It is with pleasure I introduce our real friend, the Honorable HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California. Mr. SHEPPARD.

ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. President and friends, knowing my friend, Paul Stracham, for quite some period of time, and having an extremely high regard for his tenacity and his ability to be pugnacious, I am not particularly surprised at the manner of his introduction. But, I believe that kind of language deserves to be replied to, in kind, so, despite the fact that I had a prepared speech ready tonight, I am going to lay that aside and talk to you as I would any other group of friends.

Your federation is engaged in a campaign which, in my opinion, is one of the most important activities being carried on by any organization. "Restoration of our physically handicapped citizens is an economic necessity," and I speak, not as a visionary, but as a practical businessman who has had hundreds of employees and who had to "meet a pay roll."

It is decidedly bad business to permit continuance of an existing condition wherein many, in need of assistance in rehabilitation, are denied this benefit, despite the fact that many improvements in laws and methods dealing with this subject have been made since the present war started. But those of us who have gone into the situation know full well that in the past, and even at the present time, the door has been closed against many applicants, for one reason or another. In my judgment, our people are entitled to the assistance which Congress intended for them to have, when the present rehabilitation laws and agencies were established. No person should be denied the means to enable him, or her, to be restored to such condition, physically or otherwise, as may be needed to afford an opportunity to earn a living.

We see today on world-wide battle fronts men striving in death agonies, to preserve the right to freedom from human bondage Of what avail will their efforts be if we on the home front fail to protect and conserve our own resources. And there is no greater resource than that of our own men, women, and children.

Even the least of these, those sorely afflicted by physical ailments or disabilities, are entitled to their chance in life, and we must see to it that a means is afforded to provide that for them.

There are those who, apparently, prefer to look upon the gloomy side of life. They croak an endless dirge of hard times; of worse days yet to come, and they bemoan the fact that, from their point of view, our people are "wastrels" because, instead of

being content with poverty and its concomitant miseries, they demand the best in life.

I do not share their pessimism. It is my conviction that this Nation, the greatest nation on earth, is fully capable of developing an economy that will provide jobs for all citizens who want to work. Indeed, I fully agree with a recent assertion made in London by one of our greatest elder statesmen, Bernard Baruch, when he said: "The years following this war will see the greatest boom this country has ever known."

Why not? We have the natural resources; the productive capacity; the tools, and best of all, we have the men and women who are forward-looking, and who will absorb our agricultural and industrial products, right up to the hilt, and then, ask for more.

Thank God, the American people are not pikers. We are willing to pay the price of winning this war in blood, grief, and sacrifice. But we are doing it in the belief that there is a better world for us all, beyond the present days of trial and tribulation, when the roar and thunder of death and destruction ceases. We shall then insist upon full exercise of our rights—the rights so eloquently expounded by Tom Paine, Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Ben Franklin, and other architects of our present governmental structure, and we shall fully exemplify "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

Surely, our millions of handicapped people are also entitled to their dreams of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They should not be—they must not be—condemned to continue to live in the half world, the world of pain, lack of even common necessities, and, worse than all, idleness. Once, a disabled man said to me, "Harry, the saddest thing in any man's life is to know that he is not wanted." I have come to understand that, more and more, as I grow older.

The happiest people, I have found, are those who are workers, who throw themselves, body and soul, into whatever pursuit they may be following. I have noted that many handicapped people are superior to nonhandicapped as workers, because they have developed their faculties to such extent as to have enabled them to more than make up for any lack, physically or otherwise. I have noted, too, that handicapped at work at suitable employment are uniformly cheerful and pay close attention to their tasks. Indeed, in many respects they are among our very best workers.

Now the question arises, "What is needed so that we may restore to usefulness millions of men and women who, through no fault of their own, have become disabled by injury or disease?" We have seen for many years the pronouncements of our able Surgeon-General of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Thomas Parran, who for several years prior to this war warned us that we must adopt both preventive and rehabilitative measures to conserve our human resources, and he made many fine presentations to Congress looking to development of national planning for better health of all our people.

Sad to relate, we paid very little attention to his pleas, or to those of others who had likewise given study to the problems and saw the great danger imminent in piling up a human scrap heap every year of men and women born physically defected or having become so in later life through illness or injury.

When your national president, Paul A. Strachan, came to me, in 1941, and presented the results of his own long studies in this field, it amazed me to note that for several years preceding that time there had been an average of 800,000 persons permanently disabled in some degree, each year, and of those, only 30,000 had been rehabilitated. What an appalling waste of manpower! And, we paid a terrific price for our negligence when, at the beginning of this war, Selective Service turned down approximately 1 out of 4 of all men examined because of physical unfitness.

We must not continue this saturnalia of human waste. We must erect an edifice of rehabilitation, adequate to the needs of today and tomorrow, and based upon sound principles of good public policy. In this instance, I am convinced that it must be the position of the Federal Government to lead the way in this field.

Until our House Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, of which my friend and colleague, the able gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, is chairman, has completed its work, I am not prepared to lay down specific recommendations in this matter but, I can say, now, that from results of investigations already made by that committee it is clear that there must be better coordination of existing agencies, both Federal and State, and far greater facilities and personnel provided, to deal with this enormous problem.

It stands to reason that, with some 34 Federal agencies each having a part of this work, many of which activities are in wholly unrelated establishments, there is a splendid opportunity for Congress to bring order out of the present chaotic condition, by demanding a complete overhaul and, very likely, bring about a combine of some of these agencies, in order to afford better and quicker service to the public. I am confident, when the Kelley committee makes its recommendations, they will be the basis of a thoroughly comprehensive and adequate program for all physically handicapped.

Four years ago I pledged my support to development of such a program, and in all ways open to me I have kept that pledge, and will continue to do so.

Again, I wish to commend your federation for the splendid job it has done in pioneering in this field, awakening the Congress, industry, and the public, to the necessity of dealing adequately with the problems of the handicapped, and I congratulate you upon the several victories you have already won, beneficial to your people.

I warn you, however, that your work has just begun. You have been told, on many occasions, that it is your function and duty to carry on this fight. You cannot expect to gain adherents to your cause unless you sell them the idea. You cannot expect the Congress, busy as it is with matters of great moment, to hunt you up, and ask for your opinions. To the contrary, you must see to it that the Members of Congress are informed, and thoroughly informed, by you.

Moreover, you must carry your battle into the field. You must educate the public, and the handicapped, on the need and value of such a program as that you are sponsoring, and arouse their enthusiastic support. I must confess, as a Member of Congress, that I consider the views of my own constituents of paramount importance and, so it is, with every other Member. For example, I know, out in my State of California, your lodges are building up good will, understanding, and public interest, on behalf of the handicapped, and your officers, Messrs. Perry E. Seely, Preston Barr, Toivo Lindholm, and Joseph Morehouse, and the Mmes. Alice T. Terry and Edythe Kennedy, are sincerely devoted to advancing the great cause for which you are laboring. I am pleased to learn that the Messrs. Allan Selznick and Charles McMillan are organizing a lodge, now, in San Bernardino, which is the principal city in my own district. But, you must see to it that similar campaigning is done, in every State in the Union.

I am glad, Mr. President, to have had this opportunity of meeting with my friends, and I assure you it will be a pleasure to cooperate with your federation in every way possible, to develop to the fullest extent a means of regeneration and restoring to usefulness, our physically handicapped people.

I thank you.

Basic Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News, May 2, 1945, on the subject of basic pay increase for officers and employees of the Post Office Department:

PAY THE POSTMAN MORE

At this late date the case for an upward adjustment of postal salaries, as provided in a bill before each House of Congress, needs hardly to be argued. It has only to be stated.

Postal employees have been more than 20 years without a raise in base pay, which remains between $32 and $40 weekly—a reproach to the Government and by reflection to ourselves for perpetuating an injustice to as loyal and conscientious a body as any in the public hire.

Action at this point by Congress is particularly urgent because in another 60 days the legislative grant of a war bonus of $6 a week will have expired. If Congress neglects to take favorable action, the postal employee's check will be $6 less after June 30. If it acts favorably, he will receive $1.90 a week over what he now receives.

It is little enough for the caliber of personnel the Department attracts—we are inclined to think too little.

The security the Service offers in depressed times hardly compensates for the struggle to make ends meet on such money in times like these, times in which incidentally the postal employee works harder than ever before.

Congress cannot in good conscience do less than act without delay to correct a long-standing imposition on faithful servants. A similar bill in the final stages of passage died with the last Congress. Only procrastination keeps it from being the law.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on May 1, 1945, entitled "Only a Few Oppose Waterway":

ONLY A FEW OPPOSE WATERWAY

Senator AIKEN (Republican, Vermont), has charged that "not more than 1,000 people in the whole country" are blocking the St. Lawrence waterway. If so, that opposition ought

to be swept aside. The war has shown that the waterway is vital in wartime as a protected area for the building of ships, to say nothing of the peacetime needs of commerce.

The Great Lakes obviously are among the greatest of the world's sheltered, inland water bearing facilities. To a measurable degree they can be protected in wartime. And to a great degree they can bring the world's water borne commerce almost into the heart of a Nation in peacetime. It is within the power of the Congress to smother the opposition to this improvement by power interests, some inland shipping interests, and a few others.

The St. Lawrence seaway ought to be among the first of the big postwar projects undertaken by the Nation.

Suckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent for the extension of my remarks and inclusion of a newspaper article, I submit the following:

ARGENTINA TO GET TIRES UNDER UNITED STATES AGREEMENT

BUENOS AIRES, May 3.—Argentina will receive a sufficient supply of automobile tires, tubes, and synthetic rubber to satisfy the country's essential economic needs during the war period under terms of an agreement with the United States and Brazil, the Foreign Office announced today.

The agreement, designed to promote Argentina's war effort, to the mutual advantage of all the United Nations, requires that Argentina limit the use of rubber and rubber products to essential needs and prevent sales at excessive prices.

Argentina agreed to halt all contraband in rubber between this and other American republics.

Kansas Farm Bureau Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas Farm Bureau on April 19, 1945.

The resolution reads as follows:

While recognizing the need of price controls to avoid inflation, it is our belief that such controls should be rescinded as soon after the termination of the war as possible; and in no event should Congress extend such controls for a period of more than 1 year at a time. Also a continuation of the provision that OPA regulations shall not be used to limit profits.

Jewish Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on April 29, 1945, at a mass rally for Jewish Rights, held under the Joint Auspices of the American Jewish Conference and the American Zionist Emergency Council, at the Lewisohn Stadium, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

My friends, we meet in an hour of great decisions. On the battlefields of the world, we are winning liberty by the sword. In the assemblies of San Francisco, we are working toward security by international organization.

The unconditional surrender of the Nazi enemy, yesterday reported by rumor will very soon in God's appointed hour be reported as fact. The moment is about to arrive—the moment for which endless tears have been shed and unnumbered prayers have been uttered. The long, dark night is about over.

For the victory which is now in sight mankind has paid a stupendous price—in the lives of countless heroes, and the tortured bodies of Hitler's victims.

Our own Franklin D. Roosevelt gave his life so that out of the victory so dearly won may grow universal tranquillity and international justice—justice for all the peoples of the globe, the mighty and the weak, of every color and race and creed.

Justice for the monsters who started this war means retribution, stern and swift. Justice for the innocent sufferers of this war means restitution to the limit of human possibility.

In all the four corners of the world, men and women are urgently looking for a sign—a sign which will indicate whether this great hope of justice will be realized—a sign to make certain that never again shall we experience bitter disillusionment, cynicism, selfishness, and ghastly war.

Because Palestine is so small among the nations, because it has no power except the appeal to conscience, little Palestine is the sign and symbol of that hope, the touchstone of the world's integrity.

Twenty-five years ago, almost to the day, the Palestine mandate was allotted to Great Britain. In 1920, when that historic event happened, we expected that we would assemble in 1945 to celebrate a grand international achievement. Instead, we meet today to protest its nonfulfillment.

What I shall say today is well known to everyone here. My real purpose is to address an audience beyond the sea—the brave people of Britain who are fighting this war against slavery and brutality, shoulder to shoulder with our own boys. I want to speak to the people of England because I have faith in their honor, in their sense of fair play. And I shall speak as one speaks to a friend: bluntly.

In this spirit, I say to our British friends and allies: "You have not fulfilled your obligation in Palestine. You are in default. The American people believe it is high time that you redeem your pledge."

Great Britain made at least three promises.

It promised to use its best endeavors to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.

It promised to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine.

It promised to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land in Palestine.

It made these promises in writing, solemnly, in the name of His Brittanic Majesty. In return for these promises, Britain received much. From the Allied Powers and the United States, it received the mandate to govern Palestine. From the Jews, it received a vast sacrifice of sweat and treasure which have converted that neglected wasteland into a paradise. From the Jews, also, Britain received on a per capita basis an unexcelled outpouring of blood in this war, as Palestine became the eastern bastion for the defense of Britain's life line.

But Britain has taken without giving in return. It has not facilitated Jewish immigration into Palestine. On the contrary, it has restricted and prevented immigration, even by the hunted refugees from the terror of Hitlerism. It has not encouraged Jewish settlement on the land. On the contrary, it has stripped Palestine of half its territory; and in the remainder has placed every conceivable obstacle in the way of land purchased by Jews. It has not used its best efforts to establish a national home for the Jewish people. On the contrary, it has frustrated that holy aspiration of the Jews.

I do not need to pronounce judgment on this record. Mr. Churchill called it a breach of faith.

There is no defense to this indictment. Great Britain has at all times kept, and still keeps, the benefits she received from the Palestine Mandate. These benefits have multiplied. She has had previously the power to perform her promise. She never had that power more adequately than today.

The officials who today keep the doors of Palestine locked are British officials. The laws which obstruct Jewish land purchases are British laws. The power which is preventing the development of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine is British power.

We do not believe that England lacks the strength to perform its obligations. We do believe that its Palestinian policies are a tragic revival of the disease of appeasement.

Appeasement starts with little things, just as an avalanche starts with a faint, crackling noise. But those who do not hear that faint, forewarning, those whose conscience is not quick to act at the first sign, are heedless of history since 1933. No one expects big aggressions shortly after this war. The world is too exhausted for that But it is the world's reaction to smaller aggressions, upon the rights and liberties of small minorities, which will determine whether we can avoid permanently big aggressions when the world recuperates.

That is why I say that the Palestine question is transcendently important—an importance overlooked by short-sighted persons who count the number of Jews with faces turned toward Palestine, as against the total population of the world. The people of the Sudetan also did not count for much—in numbers.

If I am critical of our allies across the Atlantic, let me remind them and others that I have never hesitated to protest against injustice here in my own country. If I did not feel that my record at home was clear, I would not point a finger at others. Let me make it equally clear that, while the primary responsibility for the treatment of Palestine is a British responsibility, I have never forgotten that America has a responsibility as well. The whole concept of world organization is founded upon the proposition

that no great nation can resign totally from responsibility for fundamental questions of justice and right anywhere in the world.

I have always insisted that America should make known to the world its position on the Palestine question, in unmistakable terms. In Congress I have fought for a resolution expressing the sense of the American people that Jewish entry into Palestine should be unrestricted, and that Palestine should be brought into the association of free democratic nations. If the decision had been mine Palestine would now be represented at San Francisco. My influence will ever be exerted in the direction of my beliefs. If I held higher office I would exercise the influence of that higher office in the same direction.

As an American who holds these views I believe in my right and my solemn duty to say to our allies in arms and our prospective treaty partners: The time is ripe to do justice to the Jews. No group of people has suffered longer, or more intensely, from the bestial brutality which Hitler has let loose upon civilization. Most of the Jews of Europe have been annihilated. Only a remnant remains—a brand saved from the flames.

Are the Jews alone to find no solace in the destruction of Hitlerism? Are they alone to be denied a haven where they can rekindle their will to live and contribute to the progress of mankind?

The time is short.

The hour is urgent.

Let all the nations now put their hand to their neglected task of constituting a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. When intelligence of that great deed is broadcast, then the lowliest and humblest of men everywhere will know that at last justice and liberty have been proclaimed throughout the world.

Pay the Postmen More Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the Detroit News:

PAY THE POSTMEN MORE

At this late date the case for an upward adjustment of postal salaries, as provided in a bill before each House of Congress, needs hardly to be argued. It has only to be stated.

Postal employees have been more than 20 years without a raise in base pay, which remains between $32 and $40 weekly—a reproach to the Government and by reflection to ourselves for perpetuating an injustice to as loyal and conscientious a body as any in the public hire.

Action at this point by Congress is particularly urgent because in another 60 days the legislative grant of a war bonus of $6 a week will have expired. If Congress neglects to take favorable action, the postal employee's check will be $6 less after June 30. If it acts favorably, he will receive $1.90 a week over what he now receives.

It is little enough for the caliber of personnel the Department attracts—we are inclined to think too little.

The security the service offers in depressed times hardly compensates for the struggle to make ends meet on such money in times like these, times in which incidentally the postal employee works harder than ever before.

Congress cannot in good conscience do less than act without delay to correct a long-standing imposition on faithful servants. A similar bill in the final stages of passage died with the last Congress. Only procrastination keeps it from being the law.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Some American high officials say it is regrettable that neither the late President Roosevelt nor Prime Minister Churchill insisted sufficiently that the flags of the three major nations should be flown side by side in all the conquered and liberated capitals of Europe. This would have given the peoples of Europe a more tangible visual proof of the cooperation and good understanding among the Big Three than the many officially spoken words which were heard all over the western democracies but reached them only casually.

The matter is said to have been lightly touched on at some of the private meetings of the heads of the American, British, and Russian Governments but was not pressed when it was apparent that the suggestion failed to strike a responsive chord with Premier Stalin.

Today, the Red flag flies over the remaining official buildings in Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, Warsaw, and Bucharest and soon will be hoisted over the imperial palace in Prague.

Neither the Stars and Stripes nor the Union Jack is flown alongside the Red flag with the hammer and the sickle.

The British flag has been hoisted over the large Hanseatic ports of Bremen and Hamburg and will be shown in the near future at Luebeck, while the American flag has been confined to more modest corners in southern Germany. Today, it flies over the ancient town hall of Munich and the Bierkeller, where the Nazi Party was born.

The partition of Germany into three military zones was decided at Teheran in 1943. The actual details as to how far each zone should extend were worked out and settled at Yalta. In order to avoid frictions resulting from a junction of the armies of the western nations and those of Russia, it was agreed that the zone taken over by the Red armies must be well separated from the British and American lines.

The junction of the victorious armies was announced with the usual fanfare. The occasion was made a festive affair which lasted several hours when specially designated detachments fraternized with each other. But as soon as this was over they went back to their positions and there was nothing but a token and official intercourse between them. American officers and men are not expected to leave the tightly drawn lines. Neither are the Russians allowed to cross into the American zones.

There are a few Russian observers with the Eisenhower forces and one official military correspondent at his headquarters. But there are no American observers or newspaper correspondents along the Russian battle front.

There is a reluctance on the part of the Soviet high command to allow "snoopers"—even if they represent the Allies—to wander around Russian lines. And there is a similar reluctance to permit more than a temporary fraternization as a "token celebration" between the GI Joes and the Ivans.

But the question of hoisting together the flags of those nations which have brought the Nazis to their knees is an entirely different matter with a real political significance.

The American and British Governments are striving to show to the people of the conquered and liberated countries that they owe their fate to the common effort of the Allies. There are no American and British forces in any of these countries, with the exception of Greece and Italy. Hence the mass of Slavs, Magyars, Poles, Austrians, and Germans east of the Rhine see only Russian liberating troops and the Russian national emblem. They have no idea that the United States and Great Britain, while too far away to help them with armed forces, have also contributed vastly to their freedom—or defeat, as in the case of the Germans.

From the military point of view alone, this is of little consequence, but from a political point of view it is of the highest importance.

America and Britain originated the designation "United Nations." It is in the interest of the peace of the world to inform the people of Europe, and particularly those east of the Elbe River, that this denomination means what it says and is not a mere sophistry. Since it is not possible for British and American forces to be physically represented in those territories, the flags of Russia's allies flying side by side with the Red flag, would be a visual proof to the liberated and defeated people that victory was achieved by the efforts of the three major powers and that in the same manner they must look to these powerful nations in the future for a lasting peace.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times of May 5, 1945:

BY A MAJORITY

A brilliant debate was held in the House of Representatives this week on a proposed constitutional amendment to have a majority of both branches of Congress ratify treaties, instead of a two-thirds majority of the Senate. Representatives PRIEST and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee made compelling arguments in favor of the resolution.

Mr. PRIEST argued that the situation on treaty ratification has changed since the Constitution was adopted.

Under the original document, Senators were to be chosen by the State legislatures and hence were to be regarded more or less as delegates to the central Government from the sovereign States. Now Senators, like Representatives, are chosen by the people.

When the Constitution was adopted, the least populous State, Delaware, had 8 percent as many inhabitants as the most populous, Virginia (Census of 1790). Now the least populous State, Nevada, has only ⅘ of one percent as many inhabitants as the most populous, New York (Census of 1940).

Representative MERROW, Republican of New Hampshire, pointed out in the House on Tuesday that under the system of ratification by two-thirds of the Senate the two Senators from Nevada, representing 110,000 persons, have as much power over treaties as the four Senators from New York and Pennsylvania, representing 23,379,000 persons. A treaty could be defeated by Senators from the 17 smallest States, containing only 7½ percent of the entire population.

A strong argument for ratification by a majority of both Houses is that this present destructive war probably would have been averted if that rule had been in effect after World War No. 1. The League Covenant would certainly have been adopted by a majority of both Houses of Congress.

Oregon: State's Future Linked With Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest stand of virgin timber in the United States lies within the States of Oregon and Washington. The forestry industry is one of the major industries of the Northwest and entitled to most careful consideration in plans for the postwar development. Much of the wastes of the forests which are not being utilized could be salvaged under advanced, scientific methods. A most interesting discussion of the future of this great industry is contained in the article by Dean Johnson, president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian on April 29, 1945.

The article is as follows:

STATE'S FUTURE LINKED WITH FORESTS—"LOG 'EM AND LEAVE 'EM" NO LONGER THEME SONG OF WOODSMEN OF WEST

(By Dean Johnson, president, West Coast Lumbermen's Association)

Paul Bunyan and his blue ox are gone forever from the woods of Oregon and other parts of the Pacific Northwest. They epitomize the pioneer courage, vision, and strength of the lumber industry as an enterprise that turned the big timber of the virgin forests into wood products for the markets of all the world.

For the most part, those were "lumberyard forests," with the trees at their prime or past it and so simply standing on the land as timber in storage—timber that would die and decay if left unused by man.

In the west coast region today vast areas of the remaining virgin forest harbor decadent trees. Other vast areas have been cut over by the ribe of Paul Bunyan, whose main business in life was to get old-growth timber off the land and manufacture it into lumber, shingles, plywood, and pulp.

Production in the age of Paul Bunyan meant only the production of logs and log products.

Now, in the new day of the west coast forest, industrial production also means the production of trees from the land.

Those two short paragraphs represent what in fact is a definite turn-about of the west-coast lumber industry from the things of the past and a forward march into a forest future of giant hope and glittering promise.

PRODUCTS DEVELOPED IN WAR OPEN NEW MARKETS

The hope and the promise are substantial. On the one hand they are rooted in the forest soil itself. Lumberman have learned that it pays to grow trees—to produce trees as well as to produce logs and lumber. And so lumbermen who are responsible for the majority of west-coast production are committed to "the continous growing of timber crops" within the west coast tree farms program.

On the other hand, the hope and promise of the west-coast forest future are rooted in research and in the new wonders of wood that have proved their value in recent years, particularly in the war. They greatly broaden the market for forest products, they offer increasing utilization of forest material now unmarketable, and they make greater use of the small second-growth log.

Forest defeatism is folly. Close-downs of ancient saw mills mean nothing but progress—the giving way of the old for the new. The greatest days of trees and men together in this region are ahead of us. Let us look a few facts in the face.

West of the Cascades—from Canadian border to California line—are 29,000,000 acres of forest land, covering 82.6 percent of all of our land area. Federal forest surveys show that 25.9 million acres of this land is in valuable commercial forests.

Today this area supplies our Nation with 30 percent of all lumber used, 90 percent of the wood shingles, and 23 percent of the pulpwood. Last year, 1944, we cut a little less than 8,000,000,000 feet of lumber. Federal surveys show that in the Douglas fir belt alone we have 451,000,000,000 feet of unreserved saw timber—old-growth timber. This saw timber comprises several species, all valuable commercially—Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, west coast helmlock, western red cedar, Balsam firs, and some hardwoods.

On the basis of these figures, which are unquestioned, assuming that we would continue to cut old-growth timber at the rate of 8,000,000,000 feet annually from the region west of the Cascades, the old growth timber in Oregon and Washington would disappear after another half a century. The worst pessimists expect it to last another 30 years.

But back of this stand of old-growth timber is a tremendous reserve of young timber, young growing trees, capable of making from 500 to 1,500 board feet per acre per year of wood. More than 8,000,000 acres is in second growth of less than saw timber size and another 1.5 million acres are in recent cut-overs, while 2.2 million acres are less than 10 percent restocked.

Oregon State Forester Nelson S. Rogers, who has spent a lifetime working in and studying forestry, logging, timber management, and forest land management, estimates that Oregon alone can produce on her 24.5 million acres of forest lands (this figure includes eastern Oregon pine) something in excess of 7,000,000,000 board feet of lumber perpetually—measuring each year only trees of sawlog sizes, 60 or more years old. Think of it—7,000,000,000 board feet of sawlogs produced each year—more than we are cutting today at the peak of our harvest of old-growth crops. The forestry survey says that today in the Douglas fir region—the west coast of Oregon and Washington—we are growing only 2.4 billion feet, but that our potential in this region is 8.2 billion, once the old stuff is taken off the land and it can be turned to the production of trees.

The main reason we are not producing to the full capacity of our forest lands today is because so much of our land serves only as a storehouse for stagnant timber. Another reason is that we have too many acres of forest land that are not in forest crops, which has either been poorly cropped so that trees had no chance to reproduce to renew themselves or because the land was burned clean of seed sources. Then, too, we have millions of acres of forest land in old growth (dead timber), now being harvested. These lands are not putting on growth, in most cases, actually are showing a loss of board feet measure per acre every year, due to disease, decay, wind damage, fire and old-age deterioration.

If we are to get maximum production of forest products from our vast areas of forest lands, then sound forestry must be practiced everywhere so that lands now being harvested will reseed naturally. Even now both public and private timber land owners are planting some of the burned or nonstocked lands. This will require costly hand planting, but under fair conditions it can prove to be good business. In any event, the public welfare requires it.

What is the new lumber industry doing to provide perpetual crops of forest products? In western Oregon and Washington more than 2,000,000 acres of privately owned timberland have been certified as tree farms. This means that owners of 51 separate tracts from small holdings to half-million acre estates have agreed to practice intensive forestry so that these lands will produce the maximum of forest products.

LEADERS RECOGNIZE NEED OF NEW ATTITUDE

Many more owners of timberland have installed expensive fire-protection systems; are leaving seed sources so that newly logged areas will reseed naturally; are practicing better logging so that small trees, not yet mature, are left; are carrying on extensive research to find ways and means of using more of the tree now left in the forests, because it now costs too much to cut and haul out as conventional sawlogs; and are planting at heavy expense several million seedling trees grown at the industry's own nursery at Nisqually, Wash., every year.

Granted, we have a long way to go yet before all of the industry can proudly hold up its head and say, "We are doing the best job of forestry possible to do." The important thing is that industry leaders recognize there is a real job to do; that the industry in a large way has considerable responsibility to the people who live in the forest-supported communities of the West; that only by adopting sound principles of sustained production—sustained yield—harvesting only as much as we can grow on our lands, can we hope to perpetuate an industry which will forever be the backlog of our economy, the source of over half our region's jobs, over three-fourths of our freight, a large share of the tax load.

There is going to be some economic adjustment necessary in this region as we shift from a mining to a cropping policy in our timber, from a harvesting of wilderness forests to managed forestry. This adjustment is already going on. It may often be an economic dislocation instead of an adjustment. In some areas a slow-down in amount of timber that can be cut must be undertaken. It will require from 25 to 50 years before we can apply the sound program of sustained yield to all of our lands, before we can work out the very difficult problems of allotment of public-owned timber to operators in various regions.

There will be bad news for some areas when sawmills close during the period between cutting of last old growth and maturity of the new crops. Fortunately, in many regions,

an intelligent approach to the problem of sustained-yield management is being undertaken early enough so that little or no lag will be felt in most of our well-established communities, depending upon forest-products industries.

If we grant that acceptance by industry of sound principles of forest-land management is good news for the West, which will serve to perpetuate jobs and pay-roll industries far into the future, then we will say, I am certain, that another achievement of industry, aimed at producing even more jobs, is front-page banner-head news.

I refer to results of research into the field of utilizing waste from sawmills and forests. Today we are forced by the strict law of economics to leave much of the wood in the forests, finding it profitable to take out only good grade sawlogs or pulp logs. At the mill other wastes occur in many of our plants as we dispose of sawdust and slabs in uneconomic, nonproducing fires, using only a small percentage of our total sawmill wastes for fuel for nearby communities or power to turn our saws and machines.

Tomorrow we know that most of this waste will be channeled into profitable products for the use of humanity. The forest industries shall do their part to create many thousands of new jobs, permanent jobs, in the making of products which will utilize our woods and sawmill wastes.

Plastics, ethyl alcohol, ships stores, oils, lignins, feeding yeasts, high-protein fertilizers, charcoal, dry ice are just a few of the thousands of products which can be profitably made from our cellulose and lignins—the two principal components of trees.

WASTE CAN BE REDUCED BY NEW PROCESS

At Springfield, Oreg., a $2,500,000 plant is being erected for the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co., which will manufacture ethyl alcohol (potable 190 proof) from wood waste—mostly sawdust and log fuel from nearby sawmills—which has been going up in smoke in burners. There are innumerable other byproducts possible from this plant, including feeding yeast for cattle, a good fertilizer for worn-out Willamette Valley farm lands, even dry ice from one of the by-products gases after ethyl alcohol is made.

In Portland experiments have been sucessfully carried on for over a year now in manufacture of charcoal (used in large quantities by our Northwest chemical industry) from log-fuel waste, and now produced in commercial quantities. Laboratories at Oregon State College, Longview, Portland, Bend, and Seattle are tirelessly at work on other projects in research, all aimed at creating new products from wood waste.

Some Oregon and Washington sawmills have developed the treating of lumber to a point where it can be offered to the public as proofed against wear and fire. Termite protection has been afforded for some time. The trend within the industry is toward a more refined product from our sawmills—not just rough, green boards.

More jobs will be created in our industry in the future not only from new byproduct industries, but from our further processing of lumber. Better grading, trimming, packaging will suit the customer. So will certain types of prefabricating, which has been developed by several of our firms to a high state during the war, and which will see complete bridges, houses, small buildings, trusses, beams, boats completely framed and manufactured at the mill or in specialty plants in this region.

Developments in new products have been so numerous during the war that even those of us inside the industry do not yet know all the story. Hemlock bark tannin, cork from Douglas fir bark, compreg wood (resinous injected and heat pressurized wood as strong as steel), plastics from bark, impreg wood, new glues which will not deteriorate under heat, frost, water, or weather are just a few of the new magics in use of wood which come to my mind.

We are truly living in the new age of wood. If some of the great scientific developments in wood use are hidden to our eyes for national security reasons, our boys in the Army and Navy know about them. They know the job wood has done since it was first inducted and called upon to house 12,000,000 men and women. They know how it alone was obtainable in sufficient quantities to help build fleets of airplanes, flotillas of ships, pontoon bridges and P. T. boats, huts, hospitals, hangars, docks, shipyards, how it has safely carried million of tons of food, ammunition, and medicines to every fighting front. These jobs wood did—and proudly.

When the war is over, wood will take its place here in the Pacific Northwest, here in the greatest timber-growing area in the world, west of the Cascades, as the raw material from which prosperity will be fashioned. The economy of this region will be a forest economy, for most of the land is good for little but timber growing. For the growing of timber, considering climate and tree species, our land is the Nation's best.

German Atrocities

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall insert in the RECORD, so that it will be a part of the permanent RECORD a statement that came out of Paris of the American editors who are over there now investigating the German brutalities. This is evidence for future consideration. The statement is important evidence in connection with the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

Not only must those responsible and those who participated actively or passively in these mass murders be prosecuted, but the spirit that animated such atrocities, the influence that brought it about, the origin of such inhuman brutality must be destroyed for all time. The "Prussian spirit" and what it stands for cannot be permitted to exist after this war is over, even in an underground manner.

After the war in Europe is completely won and when Japan is defeated in the Pacific, the war criminals of that country should be vigorously prosecuted and severely punished. After the terrific pain and suffering of this period, with millions of persons killed, with millions injured, with the untold destruction of property, with the set-back to the normal, healthy progress of mankind which the vicious enemies of decent civilization have brought about, we cannot permit those responsible as war criminals to go unpunished.

There is one thing we must do for the benefit of mankind in the future, and that is to see that the war criminals of Nazi Germany and of vicious, destructive Japan are promptly prosecuted and severely punished.

The report heretofore referred to follows:

EDITORS' REPORT SAYS BRUTAL MASTER PLAN GOVERNED NAZI CAMPS

This statement is issued by the editors who came to the European theater of operations through the personal invitation of General Eisenhower to see for themselves conditions in the German prison camps overrun by the Allies.

This delegation of newspaper and magazine editors was brought to Europe at the suggestion of General Eisenhower to investigate reports of German atrocities.

TWO CAMPS INSPECTED

We have visited and spent considerable time investigating the prison camps at Buchenwald and Dachau. We have interviewed recently freed political prisoners, slave laborers, and civilians of many nationalities. We have studied a great mass of documents covering the German occupation of France which contained photographic evidence and testimony taken in many places and painstakingly authenticated with the sworn statements of witnesses and victims.

The conclusion is inescapable that the Nazis had a master plan for their political prison camps. That plan was based upon a policy of calculated and organized brutality. The evidence we have seen is not a mere assembling of local or unassociated incidents. It is convincing proof that brutality was the basic Nazi system and method.

This brutality took different froms in different places and with different groups. The basic pattern varied little.

MURDER COMMONPLACE

Actual Nazi methods ran the gamut from deliberate starvation and routine beatings to sadistict tortures too horrible and too perverted to be publicly described. Murder was a commonplace.

Prisoners whose only crime was that they disagreed or were suspected of disagreeing with the Nazi philosophy were treated with uniform cruelty. When death came, as to multiplied thousands of them it did, it must have been a relief from worse than death.

By these tortures most of the Jews in prison camps had already been destroyed. After the Jews, the most cruelly treated victims were the Russians and the Poles.

To the basic policy of brutality toward political prisoners there were, however, no significant exceptions.

This, we believe, is the inexorable consequence of the whole Nazi-Germany philosophy. By this philosophy and the cunning and persistence with which it was propagated the German mind became contaminated and diseased.

PEOPLE TO BLAME

For these crimes the German people cannot be allowed to escape their share of the responsibility. Just punishment must be meted out to the outstanding party leaders, and the German general staff, to party office holders, to all members of the Gestapo, all members of the S. S. Simple justice, and the future peace of the world require that all these, by virtue of their position, be indicted as war criminals.

In punishing these crimes the historic principle of individual and personal responsibility must be preserved and all those responsible for these atrocities must be punished in accord with the accepted laws of civilized nations.

We strongly urge that United Nations policy in regard to war criminals be speedily agreed to and the War Crimes Commission speedily empowered to put those policies into action.

As we witness the collapse of the Nazis' experiment in ruthlessness and totalitarianism, we are more than ever convinced that there can be no peace on earth until the right of the earth's peoples to life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness is recognized and protected under law.

Julius Ochs Adler, New York Times; Malcolm Bingay, Detroit Free Press; Amon Carter, Fort Worth Star-Telegram; Norman Chandler, Los Angeles Times; William L. Chenery, Collier's; E. Z. Dimitman, Chicago Sun; John Randolph Hearst, Hearst Newspapers; Ben Hibbs, Saturday Evening Post; Stanley High, Reader's Digest; Ben McKelway, Washington Evening Star; William I. Nichols. This Week magazine; L. K. Nicholson, New Orleans Times-Picayune; Joseph Pulitzer, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Gideon Seymour, Minneapolis Star-Journal; Duke Shoop, Kansas City Star; Beverly W. Smith, American Magazine; Walker Stone, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance; M. E. Walter, Houston Chronicle.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of the city of Topeka, Kans., concerning the proposed Missouri Valley Authority:

Whereas there are proposals before Congress for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas the Army with the cooperation of the city has a flood protection project nearing completion for the city of Topeka; and

Whereas the Topeka project is under the direction of competent Army engineers and without political consideration; and

Whereas the city prefers to maintain and operate locally these flood protection works: Be it

Resolved by the board of city commissioners, That the board of city commissioners hereby protest the formation of a Missouri Valley Authority and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Kansas Senators and Congressmen in Washington.

Adopted by the board of commissioners, May 1, 1945.

Approved May 1, 1945.

W. A. LAWSON,
President of Commission.

Attest:

LOUISE HANLIN,
Deputy City Clerk.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Matthew Woll, president, American Wage Earners' Protective Conference—tariff group of the American Federation of Labor—also president, Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my appearance and presentation at this time is in opposition to the extension of the trade-treaty program submitted to your committee for its consideration and to urge that a limitation be imposed providing that competitive imports of workers in foreign countries be denied entry in American markets at total landed costs, tariff duties paid, which are less than American costs of production and wholesale ceiling price of products of American workers when such competitive products of American workers are commercially available.

In contemplating the extension of the trade-treaty program at this time two principal considerations should guide us. One is that war conditions have disrupted completely all normal trade between nations. We should therefore keep in mind the abnormality of current conditions. The other is that we should keep before use the oncoming days of peace and the reestablishment of a peacetime economy.

While still operating under restrictions and artificial conditions of war, we must not lose sight of the situation which the cessation of hostilities will bring nor of the economic forces which will become operative when peace is established.

So long as the war continues, the necessities of war will, of course, continue to shape our foreign trade no less than our domestic production. Import duties under such conditions are of minor importance. Wartime needs and the availability of essential products and of shipping determine the course of imports and exports. The primary concern in considering the extension of the trade-treaty authorization is therefore with post-war-trade policies.

Undoubtedly many changes will have occurred before the war ends, setting off the postwar from the prewar world. For several years abnormal conditions will prevail. There will be a shift in the countries in the order of their importance in our trade, and this will represent a change in the international competitive conditions.

The experience of the war and of the prewar years naturally suggests a reexamination of our position as well as of the principles which we have followed in the past. It is important that we avoid errors that can only lead to disastrous consequences. We should examine very closely certain ideas and doctrines that have gained currency during the war. We must take care that in seeking to build for peace we do not permit our eagerness and our natural desires to help the rest of the world to lead us into false actions which, however idealistic and seemingly conducive to peace, will end not only by not helping others but by injuring ourselves immeasurably.

TRADE NO GUARANTY OF PEACE

It is obvious that we have a trade treaty program on the one hand and a world at war in a number of sectors on the other. Let us overlook or disregard the contention that the trade-treaty program arrived on the scene too late to prevent the outbreak of hostilities or to draw us into the present world conflict, based on economic struggles of long standing, even though the program had been in effect long enough to produce the alleged gains in trade claimed for it. Since the later claim is erroneous, we may agree that nothing occurred which would have produced any appreciable effect upon the economic difficulties which presumably underlay the war.

It is said international trade leads to intradependence. This, according to the theory, would lead to international pacification. Yet at the same time it appears that international rivalry grows, to some extent, at least, out of competition for control of raw materials.

Now, too, international interdependence based on trade produces international vulnerability to economic distribution. Should the war come to an end tomorrow, we cannot escape the depressing consequences of a general demoralization, military and industrial, and the ensuing unemployment. Now, this is not set forth as a counsel of isolationism, as some would have you believe. but to deflate the fallacy that international intradependence is a guarantee of peace.

We need look back only a few years to the days when trade treaties were proposed as instrumentalities of world peace. We have embarked on the one hand upon a course which is calculated to increase the standard of living in this country by establishing minimum wages and shorter hours. We undertook on the other to lower our tariff rates, thereby exposing our relatively higher wage structure to the competition of low-wage products of workers in other countries.

This action would not have been inconsistent if we had restricted our tariff-rate reduction to those considerations which did not come into either direct or indirect competition with the products of our own factories, farms, and mines. Although the negotiators of the trade treaties profess to have taken care that only those tariff rates on products that did not compete too seriously with the domestic output should be reduced, this avowed care was quite ineffective because, among other things, of our adherence to the unconditional most-favored-nations clause.

TRADE TREATIES ILLEGAL

In considering the proposal of further extending both the time as well as discretionary authority enhanced in the trade-treaty program, it is well that we first consider the question of legality. In our judgment, these trade treaties are contrary to the Constitution of the United States. They are contrary to the express policy of every Democratic Party controlled Congress from 1882 to 1932. They are contrary to, and virtually set aside and nullify, the protection of jobs and standards of living which American workers receive through the Asiatic exclusion law, restrictive immigration law, and the fair labor standards law.

Former Secretary of State Hull, in serving as Congressman and Senator, bitterly opposed the granting of taxing and treaty-making power to any appointed officers of our Government.

Every leader of the Democratic Party, prior to 1933, has publicly opposed this type of legislation.

Then, too, we hold that the taxing power of our Federal Government, under our Constitution, is vested solely and exclusively in the Congress of the United States, and that Congress is without authority to delegate this taxing power to the executive branch of the Government.

Under our Constitution all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. This power to originate revenue measures cannot be delegated to any other agency of Government. Indeed, the Senate cannot act on measures affecting revenue without the House of Representatives having first considered such measures. The House of Representatives have sole and exclusive authority of dealing originally with any and all measures pertaining to or involving revenue.

That the trade-treaty program is a revenue measure is well evidenced by the fact that the present proposal finds its origin in the House of Representatives. Had the Senate attempted to set aside or disregard this constitutional provision, we are confident the House of Representatives would have clearly and unmistakably revolted against such a new procedure.

Then, again, we find further evidence in support of this contention in the well-known and historical policy of the Democratic Party that tariff rates can only be justified and be used solely for revenue-producing purposes. It is, therefore, our contention that the attempt to continue and to enlarge the discretionary authority of the State Department to decrease the revenue at will is wholly without constitutional sanction and is unwarrantably delegating authority from one branch of Government to that of another.

Aside from the legal and constitutional questions involved, there is to be considered the danger of depriving the citizens of our land of the opportunity of petitioning their Government through its legislature in matters which vitally affect their property, persons, and their livelihood, whether as proprietors of industry or of labor. Then, too, there is involved in this proposal, the development of a bureaucracy, a development wholly at variance with our American concept of a free and democratic people, and our republican form of government.

Then, too, if we are ultimately to forsake our original moorings and venture in permanent international arrangements through covenants instead of treaties, we must, at least, insist that such covenants be openly arrived at and not be negotiated in secrecy, and that all parties affected either in their properties and persons shall be given the opportunity of presenting their point of view honorably and fairly for consideration, not by listening posts, but by those who are actually entrusted with and do the negotiating of such trade treaties.

AMERICAN PLANTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

In the development of an extension or enhancement of international trade there enters the question of methods of production, costs of materials, wage structure, and terms and conditions of employment prevailing in the countries at interest.

It is a well-known fact that the wage levels of the various foreign countries differ widely, the lowest levels, in general, being found in the Far East countries.

The 10-year annual real income per worker from 1925 to 1934, inclusive, in various countries has been estimated as follows:

China	$110
Italy	343
Japan	353
Germany	646
France	685
Great Britain	1,069
United States	1,381

This mean that when we import goods to the value equal to those that we export, we actually import more man-hours of work than we export. Therefore, the exports by which we balance imports do not represent the amount of employment that is lost through importation of competitive goods that could be produced in America, and, which would provide some of the 60,000,000 jobs which will be needed for America's workers after the close of the present World War.

It is true that in quite a number of instances we have had the benefit of modern automatic machinery, mass production, with volume sales and mass distribution, resulting in a greater productivity per worker and at lesser unit cost. It is equally true that the postwar years will witness the installation and use of modern automatic machinery—both of American and European production—as well as mass production in many of the industrial plants in competitive foreign countries. Indeed, among our principal trade-treaty advocates, we find those who are interested not only in furnishing the prostrate countries of Europe with our modern production machinery, but, likewise those who would invest American earnings and savings in capital investment abroad in the hope, in later years, of closing down American factories and supplying the American market with products produced in their foreign plants.

By these processes what may seem an immediate advantage, will become gradually of lesser value here, and will ultimately place the competitive products of American wage earners and of our smaller consumer-goods manufacturers at an ever-increasing disadvantage. As evidence of the validity of the foregoing, we would point out that industrialization of Latin-American countries, and, of the Far East has proceeded at a remarkable pace. India has become an industrial nation of secondary rank, as well as a creditor nation. East Europe has been made a second Ruhr industrial district by the Nazis, and, we understand that a substantial part of industrial capacity has been transferred to what is now southeast Poland, Upper Silesia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary. Coal production in Upper Silesia, with developed coal fields slightly greater than those of the Ruhr, now compare with the former Ruhr production.

Turkey, the Belgian Congo, South Africa, Argentina, and Brazil, as well as other countries formerly buyers of America's industrial machinery and other products, have increased their industrial productivity. Brazil once a buyer of American cotton, now supplies those who formerly purchased our cotton, as well as most of the manufactured cottons sold in Latin-American countries. Incidentally, England today, and in the future, purchases our cotton only to fill out the void left by the present inability of India and Brazil to fill her needs for cotton.

England, with the consent of important factions of English organized labor, has also arranged to install pilot plants, equipped with modern automatic machinery and the elimination of restrictions on the number of machines which one person may man, which restrictions have existed for years, in order to permit of a substantial increase in the export of competitive products. All these are merely indications of trends and developments in the making, and which cannot and must not be overlooked if we are to conserve American interests, maintain our American standards of life and work, and enable us as a people and as a Nation to render the much needed help required by the depressed nations of Europe and Asia. Incidentally, at this time we direct your specific attention to a situation in the present tariff act which should be corrected. Under the provisions of section 526, an American manufacturer with plants located in foreign countries with lower production costs protected by American patent and trade-mark registration, has the sole authority to market in American markets such products of foreign workers, subject only to his paying the inadequate tariff rates which are now in force.

PROGRESS PENALIZED

It is well known that in recent years the industrialization of a number of countries that previously shipped principally raw materials or the product of home or household industries, has proceeded rapidly. The specialization in given lines of goods that was characteristic of the past has given way to a wider line of industrial products. It has, therefore, become difficult to single out a few products of particular countries for tariff rate reductions without bringing in the same products from other countries, and thus exposing American producers to competition of the lower labor costs products of workers in other countries.

The theory was that certain undisclosed specific industries could be sacrificed for the supposed greater general benefit that would be enjoyed all around, but, no one has ever shown how this can be done. Another theory was that domestic manufacturers were enjoying excessive profits and that lowering this profit was a good deed in itself, quite regardless of other consequences. What was either not understood, or, if understood, not acted upon, was that in a world of unequal standards of living, the inevitable result of an unimpeded flow of trade would be the reduction of all standards of living to the same level in all parts of the world. The standard of living in the United States, being the highest in the world, would be reduced more than any other. This represents a strange way of fostering progress. It is difficult to understand what class of justice requires that progressive people should be penalized for being progressive. To reward industrial and mechanical progress by depriving it of its fruits is not in keeping with common sense.

We have within the United States itself an incompletely exploited market. An increase in wages, in the lower wage areas, would expand a potentially rich sales territory without exposing ourselves to unfair competition of competitive products of much lower paid labor. On the contrary, unfair competition in the domestic field would be eliminated.

The same principle holds in our economic relationship with other countries. If they wish to sell more to us, they should make it possible for us to sell more to them. As long as their population cannot purchase more extensively because of the low wages paid, the market for our goods in these countries remains relatively small. It is not intelligent to place the burden of expanding international trade upon us. Too long and too often we have been reproached for retarding and discouraging international trade. Actually, when our imports equal our exports in dollar values we import the product of more man-hours of labor than we export.

It has not been the United States that has hampered international trade. The most that can be said is that we have refused to jeopardize the job opportunities of millions of America's industrial workers and the price level of our farmers to the competition of the lower wage and lower cost products of workers and farmers in other countries. Those who say that we should do that advocate a lower standard of living for the workers in our factories and our mines and those on our farms, and, therefore, a shrunken economy.

It is actually the low-wage countries that retard foreign trade, for it is against low-cost, and, therefore, low-wage competition that tariff duties are generally aimed, not only in the United States, but in other countries. It is the differentials in wage levels and costs of production that constitute the stumbling block in international trade. No sane nation is willing to see its own industries driven out or closed down by the competition of the products of low-wage-paid workers of other countries.

TRADE TREATIES HAVE FAILED

It is said that in order to export more we must import more. That is to say, that if we wish to dispose of our farm surpluses abroad and wish to add to our factory employment, we must reduce tariff rates in order that foreign-produced goods may come in to our markets in greater volume. To which is now added the plea that if our Nation ever hopes for a repayment of loans made or to be made in foreign countries, we must open wide our doors to imports. It is quite obvious that increased factory employment attributable to increased exports represents a net loss in employment compared with what employment might be obtainable if we manufactured at home the competitive articles which we import.

Failure of foreign countries to increase their purchasing of American products or commodities may not be attributable to any failure of the United States to increase its imports. Indeed, we face ultimate danger in planning for surplus product economy. It is all very well to say we must gear up American industry at this time far beyond our own abilities to consume in order to provide employment for our workers and look to foreign markets to dispose of our surpluses. How-

ever, we must not overlook ultimate reckoning. Within a few years foreign industries will have been rehabilitated with modern automatic machinery and American methods of production and distribution. We will then find we have founded our national economy on a false and insecure basis. Indeed, we have had a surplus production in cotton, in manufactured tobacco, in wheat, and in lard. What do the trade treaties show as to the benefits we have conferred on those who depend on such products for their means of a livelihood?

In order to market cotton and tobacco we are now paying an export subsidy. Assistant Secretary of State Clayton has told this committee that the paying of an export subsidy was economic warfare. Secretary Wallace told your committee, or, in previous addresses has stated, that export subsidies constituted international price cutting and unfair competition.

We are now emerging from a disastrous world war. We are told that this was due, in part, to economic conditions. We are told by some of the proponents that the continuation of the trade-treaty program, and further reductions of 50 percent in our tariff rates is necessary to purchase, although they did not use such plain language, the good will of those countries which we have saved from the domination of the aggressors.

With increased productivity and dependence on foreign countries, we will find that even during the present world war, 1939–44, countries dependent on importations of foods and industrial products turned to domestic production of these articles and commodities.

FAULTY PROPAGANDA

One of the innumerable pieces of propaganda which has literally flooded the homes of America's workers, advocating the further reduction of tariff rates, through our entry into trade treaties, is a graph issued by the Graphic Associates of Public Affairs Committee. This graph is allegedly based on figures contained in the statistical abstract of the United States. This graph lists the average weekly wages paid in the United States, 1939, for "protected" domestic and export industries, citing certain industries as illustrative.

The text which accompanies these graphs conveys the impression that workers in export industries receive higher wages because "trade is a two-way street" and due to the fact that we import certain raw materials.

The average wages cited are:

Protected industries:	
Cotton goods	$14.26
Silk and rayon	15.78
Pottery	22.75
Carpets and rugs	23.25
Export industries:	
Agricultural implements	29.61
Automobiles	32.90
Rubber tires	33.36
Machine tools	34.25

For from being an argument against protecting the job opportunities of America's workers in these protected industries, these tables show that the wages that can be paid in American industries are limited in their wage ceilings by competition in American markets with competitive law-wage products of workers of foreign countries. American industries that compete with low wage, and thus low-priced products of wokers of foreign countries, have their wage ceilings limited by the entry into American markets of such products of foreign workers. These American industries may not have the margin available for payment of wages that indutries of an export basis have. The disparity may, therefore, be well attributed not to tariff protection, but to the inadequacy of tariff rates now in force.

No reference is made in these graphs or in this propaganda to the fact that these so-called export industries are those which are highly mechanized and which have a labor cost which represents a small portion of the cost of production.

In addition it is worth while noting that all of these so-called export industries are dependent for some 90 percent or more of their sales in the great American market.

The low labor cost of these export industries is due primarily to the great volume of sales available to them in the American market due to the higher-living standards made possible by the much greater purchasing power and capacity of America's workers, miners and farmers.

Those who advocate a higher living standard for all Americans, and, who are willing to help promote higher living standards in other nations seemingly overlook the fact that our present tariff system places an unfair handicap on the products of those countries which have higher living standards prevailing, and, which countries are our best customers. Higher living standards mean higher wages, and, in most cases, higher labor costs. Our present tariff system, with ad valorem rates based on foreign valuation, makes it possible for the competitive products of the lower wage and lower living standard countries to enter into American markets at a lower tax than is paid for comparable products of the higher living standard countries.

The time has arrived when the right of high living standard countries to protect themselves should be recognized. It should no longer be necessary for a country that maintains a relatively high wage level to apologize to the low living standard countries. Indeed, the apology should come from the reverse direction. Why should we be ashamed of our higher standards of living? If the products of the low-wage-standard countries compete with our own in our own American markets because of the lower prices resulting from the lower wages paid in those countries, we are certainly under no moral or economic obligation to import such products. The moral and economic obligation, if any, rests on the low-wage countries not to disrupt our wage standards.

FORCED LABOR IMPORTS?

In this regard it is well we consider the sort of competition we may anticipate from some of the countries abroad. We hear much of the effort being made by some of the Allied Nations in having German labor indentured, conscripted, or forced to labor in other countries as a means of reparations in kind. This raises the serious question of whether section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is to be enforced.

Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930, in substance, prohibits the importation into American markets of the products of forced or indentured labor. Naturally, indentured slave or forced labor, through the use of which certain of our allies hope to rebuild their country and their industries, comes within the scope of such prohibition.

Will this law on our statute books, designed to protect American labor against the products of involuntary labor, be properly enforced by our Treasury Department or will it be virtually set aside with the Treasury Department refusing to enforce the law as in the case of imports of Sumatra tobacco and Russian wood pulp, products of forced or indentured labor?

This raises the question, are we a government of laws and shall our laws be enforced impartially and not be set aside for the benefit of anyone—Government or otherwise?

ANALYSIS OF TRADE TREATIES' EFFECTS

The Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted by Congress in order to prevent, within our own country, exactly such unfair competition as will confront American labor unless protected by Congress against the competition of low-labor-cost products of foreign production. There is no difference in the injurious effects produced by unfair competition from low-wage areas merely because these areas lie beyond our national boundaries.

Actually, the trade-treaty program was ineffective in the accomplishment of the hopes claimed for it. This is a story in itself.

Five years of operation did little or nothing to provide jobs for the millions then unable to find jobs or, later, as promised, to prevent the outbreak of the most terrible war in history, although it was claimed, by its proponents, that it would provide jobs and would pacify the world.

The export statstics for 1934 through 1938 (the last normal prewar year) show conclusively that the trade treaties also did not promote exports, as it was boldly claimed and proclaimed that they would. This can be and has been shown conclusive.

For example, the exports from the United States to Norway and to Sweden during the 4-year period of 1935 to 1938 ran a very close parallel in upward trends, year by year, These are adjacent countries. We had a trade treaty with one and not with the other. Yet, from an examination of our exports to them it would be impossible to say which was which. In the case of Argentina and Brazil, our exports to Argentina grew more rapidly than our exports to Brazil in 1937 and 1938. Yet, we had a trade treaty with Brazil and none with Argentina. These, also, are adjoining countries.

In the case of Colombia and Venezuela, two more adjacent countries, the result was the same. Our exports to Venezuela, a non-trade-treaty country, rose much more sharply than our exports to Colombia, with which country we did have a trade treaty.

We find also that our exports to Denmark increased sharply in 1938 while those to Holland increased only slightly in the same year. Our exports to France and Germany, adjacent countries, as in the case of Norway and Sweden, ran a very close parallel in trends from 1935 through 1938, year by year. Yet we had a trade treaty with France and none with Germany. A similar result was obtained in our exports to Finland, a trade-treaty country, on the one hand, and Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, non-trade-treaty and adjacent countries, on the other.

Imports, on their part, also failed to respond to trade treaties. Of seven countries with which we entered into trade treaties the trade, which could be compared with similar non-trade-treaty countries, only two countries increased their sales to the United States in a higher ratio than the non-trade-treaty countries, or are producers of similar products. Comparison was made as follows:

Sweden with Norway.
Brazil with Argentina.
Holland with Denmark.
France with Germany.
Canada with Mexico.
Colombia with Venezuela.
Cuba with the Philippine Islands. (Imports from these two trade-treaty countries increased more sharply than imports from Venezuela and the Philippines, respectively. In all of the other cases imports from the non-trade-treaty countries increased more than from the trade-treaty countries during the years the trade treaties were in effct, through 1938.)

Further light is thrown on the ineffectiveness of the trade-treaty program by an analysis of the trend in the exports from 1932 to 1935, and from 1935 through 1937.

By 1935, the first year in which any appreciable effects of the trade treaties could be expected to be felt, exports from the United States had already increased 41.6 percent in value, compared with 1932, the low point of our trade since the First World War.

Our exports during this period increased 53.8 percent. This latter increase took place when our average tariff on dutiable goods (ad valorem equivalent) amounted to 57.8

percent. A very interesting fact moreover, came to the fore. Imports of dutiable goods increased 89.5 percent while imports of goods on the free list increased only 36.1 percent, the average total increase of the combined being 57.8 percent as stated above.

HIGHER RATES—FREE LIST INCREASED IMPORTS

In 1936 10 trade treaties went into effect and 2 more became effective in 1937. Imports of dutiable goods should therefore, according to the theory, have responded more favorably. Total imports did increase by $586,000,000, but 65 percent of the increase came in goods on the free list.

In other words, after duties had been reduced, the increase in imports came principally in goods on the free list, whereas before the reductions had been made the increase in imports had come predominantly in dutiable goods.

By 1937 the average tariff on dutiable goods had dropped to 37.4 percent compared with 57.8 percent in 1932 (in part due to rising price levels). Clearly, the trend during these two periods was the exact reverse of what the theory of free trade would lead us to expect. In other words, while the duty burden was the highest, imports of goods on the free list should have shown the greatest increase, whereas, when the duty burden declined, imports of dutiable goods should have increased more than those on the free list. The opposite took place, as just shown.

The fact of the matter is that we regularly import (in normal years) an important list of products that are on the free list. Most important of these items are: Newsprint, pulpwood and wood pulp, coffee, rubber, bananas, fertilizer, jute, copper ore, tin, tea, raw silk, coco beans, palm oil, copra, tapioca, tung oil, and carpet wool. Free-list imports increased from $886,000,000 in 1932 to $1,765,000,000 in 1937, or almost exactly 100 percent. This was in keeping with our increased domestic business activity. The upshot is that a prosperous United States automatically becomes a better market for foreign exporters. It is, therefore, in the interest of other countries, so far as their trade with us is concerned, that this country maintain a strong purchasing power. It is our industries that are the heavy buyers of foreign products and our workers offer the principal market for the products of our industries. Depress our workers' wage income and the foreign exporters to this country destroy their own market.

Obviously, the trade-treaty program failed utterly on all important counts. It is time that those who advocate the extension of this unconstitutional authority whereby administrative agencies of the Government are enabled to enter into trade treaties involving the question of taxation eliminate potential assumptions and estimates and look at what has really happened.

Why the Congress and the American people should be asked to pump life into an undertaking so thoroughly discredited by a fair study of the real facts is hard to understand. For years an effort has been made to place a halo around the trade-treaty program so that anyone questioning their sanctity was somehow suspected of being unclean. Nothing but this sanctification can explain the tenacity with which they have clung to a program that by all valid tests is so complete a failure. Against this apparent impregnable dogma, facts seem to mean nothing.

We go before the world hanging our heads in shame for having built a prosperous country; for having achieved a standard of living attained in no other country; and for raising a partial protective barrier against the products of those with a lower standard of living prevailing in other countries. This is a strange attitude, indeed, not duplicated elsewhere in the world.

LABOR SEEKS EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

American labor, the products of which compete in American markets with products of workers in other countries, seek equality of opportunity for the sale of the products of their labor in American markets. Does such a request call for high tariffs?

The proposal is now made to empower our negotiators to enter into trade treaties and to reduce our present tariff rates an additional 50 percent. Nothing is said about comparable costs of production at home and abroad. The principle that differences in cost of production should be equalized so that equal competitive conditions should prevail, is cast aside. The fact that we need an unusually high level of production and an equally high level of income to cope with the tremendous public debt, is lost sight of. The deflationary effect of ruinous foreign competition, arising from a tariff level of rates not high enough to compensate for the differences in costs of production, is definitely overlooked. The fact that by far the highest tax burden in history cannot be met unless a high rate of employment and wages are sustained and unless industry and agriculture are assured a market in the United States, is brushed aside. We are asked to continue our inconsistent program of adhering to minimum wages, social security, unemployment compensation, and similar props to our living standards and income levels on the one hand and, at the same time, open the door to their destruction. We are asked further to nullify the beneficial effects of our Fair Labor Standards Act, or Asiatic exclusion and our restrictive immigration policies.

This inconsistency comes from a misconceived idealism that proceeds on the assumption that our assets are inexhaustible and that our power to help others is unlimited and capable of standing endless economic contradiction. In part, it also comes from those who would be delighted to see our present economic system collapse beyond repair.

The alternative is not a destruction of our foreign trade. The history of our trade during the last 25 years bears out no such conclusion. A brief review will show quite the opposite.

During the last war the Underwood tariff of 1913 was in effect. This was superseded by the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. These last two legislative enactments were adopted in an effort to pull our country out of the depression of 1921 and 1922. The average duty collected in 1921 was 29.5 percent (ad-valorem equivalent). The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act increased the tariff rates to 38.1 percent (ad valorem equivalent).

HIGH TARIFF RATES—DUTIABLE IMPORTS INCREASED

Did our foreign trade decline, as it should have, according to certain economic theorists? No. Instead exports rose to 36.8 percent in the succeeding 6 or 7 years, while imports rose yet more, or 41.2 percent. These increases were not reflections of increased price levels, for it is well known that during that whole period the general price level was remarkably stable. The increase in imports took place even though in 1929 the average duty paid had risen to 40.1 percent. Why? We have already given the answer. Industry in the United States was prosperous and bought heavily in foreign markets. Wages were comparatively good and purchasing power was relatively high. The United States offered a good market for products from other countries. Tariff rates were, however, not so low that products of workers in foreign countries could drive the products of American workers out of our own markets.

In 1930 the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was enacted and by 1931 the average duty on dutiable goods had risen to 50.8 percent. In part due to the low level of prices and the increased ad valorem rates on those goods which are taxed on the basis of a specific duty.) In 1932, as a result of the still further drop in price levels the average duty rose to 57.8 percent.

Nevertheless, our trade began to increase after 1932 and by 1935 (at which time only a few trade treaties had been negotiated with countries which furnished only 8 percent of our imports) our exports had increased 41.6 percent in value and our imports 53.8 percent in value.

We have already seen that during the next few years, after 1935, the increase in imports shifted predominantly to items on the free list, precisely after we began reducing our tariff rates under the trade treaty program.

From a high average duty of 57.8 percent, in 1932, the average duty declined to an average of 37.4 percent in 1937. But, whereas trade increased, as already noted, after 1932, it declined sharply in 1938. Imports shrank a good one-third from the 1937 high. Exports also fell off. This was in keeping with the reduced business activity in this country in 1938, referred to, at the time, as the "recession."

Thus, the record of the last 25 years completely shatters the theory on which the theory of the trade treaties are based. We should not, however, reach the conclusion that tariff rates are of no importance. As soon as they become insufficient to cover the difference in costs of production between the domestic and foreign-made articles or commodities they begin to affect adversely the employment opportunities of America's workers. The gravity of the threat, therefore, depends on the margin of advantage offered to the foreign producers and the extent of his competitive potentials. It is for this reason that a yet further reduction in our tariff rates, a reduction in the rates already lowered, is a dangerous venture.

The sense of all the foregoing does not point to self-sufficiency as a national policy, although self-sufficiency, could it be had for the asking, by all nations, would exert a profound pacifying influence upon the world. As the natural resources of the various nations differ widely, some with actual output and reserves far beyond their needs, and, others with deficiencies in the same resources but with surpluses in others—with such a condition prevailing and likely to continue for many years, a natural and beneficial basis for trading will remain. However, we should rid ourselves of the view that competitive trade is a pacifying element in international relations. Actually it is the opposite.

There are those among the advocates of trade treaties who recognize the force and soundness of what has been said above. They recognize the complete absurdity of enacting and enforcing minimum wage legislation and restrictive immigration legislation on the one hand, and, then on the other, to the opening of our industries and our jobs to the competiton of low-wage produced products of foreign countries.

SUBSIDIES MEANS SUBSERVIENCY

As a means of overcoming the disastrous consequences that they foresee, they advocate a subsidy to the industries, injured or jeopardized by the entry of the competitive products of workers in foreign countries at delivered costs which are less than our costs of production. However, it will be noted that they have prepared no legislation to provide such a subsidy nor have they shown how the subsidy could be determined and distributed. They have also failed to point out that the grant of subsidies would bring

with it, as a necessary instrument of administration, a measure of Government control. Our experience with the O. P. A., as a necessary war measure, has not whetter the appetite of the American people for governmental controls over the details of foreign trade and domestic production. We conclude that the subsidy proposed is not advanced seriously, but, rather as a sleeping pill to lull the opposition to the pending legislation.

It is true, as legislative history will show, that a 100-percent subsidy, tariff protection in reality, has been found necessary to sustain an essential American industry, namely, the American commercial shipbuilding industry. The Maritime Commission, in order to build up a merchant marine, allows a construction differential of 50 percent of the American cost of building merchant ships. In other words, it is the official finding of the Maritime Commission, that there is a difference of 100 percent in the cost of building such ships. Thus, we have a precedent set that a duty of 100 percent—100 percent of the foreign costs of building ships—are necessary to permit of our continuation of a merchant-marine industry, to equalize the difference in costs of production, American shipyards as compared with foreign yards.

This is only one industry. For the economic welfare of our country, in peacetime, there are numerous essential industries. A subsidy of this level is much greater than the present ad valorem equivalent of those rates levied on dutiable imports. Moreover, the subsidy would not be paid out as wages. It would go to the employers, who, because of the foreign goods admitted into competition in the American market, could not guarantee the maintenance of employment at necessary levels.

We feel that the tariff is the simplest method of protecting the job opportunities of our workers, and, therefore, the high level of employment that is conceded to be indispensable if we are to meet our tax burden and our public debt.

We have consistently opposed the delegation of the taxing power of the Congress to administrative agencies as an unconstitutional shift of responsibility. Such a shift of responsibility may well be the forerunner of the making of our general tax laws by the administrative agencies of government.

We are particularly opposed to the further extension of this legislation, and, especially the authorization of further reductions in tariff rates. We find nothing in the American standard of living to apologize for to the rest of the world. On the contrary, we recommend that other countries follow our lead in establishing higher wages and shorter hours for their workers. We also point out that it is to the interest of foreign countries and not to their detriment that the prosperity of the United States be sustained rather than torn down.

A prosperous United States, with tariff rates which will equalize the difference in costs of production affords a better market for foreign goods than a depressed United States with tariff rates which permit the entry of competitive goods at less than our costs of production.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Vickery, and a summary from the Maritime Commission showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program up to May 1, 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C. May 4, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: There is enclosed a tabulation which I believe will be of interest to you, showing monthly tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program up to May 1, 1945.

During the month of April, United States merchant shipyards delivered 103 ships of 1,004,073 tons deadweight. The ships delivered into service between Pearl Harbor and the end of last month totaled 4,802, with an aggregate tonnage of approximately 48,600,000, not counting harbor tugs, wooden vessels and other miscellaneous craft.

As you know, several months ago the Commission awarded contracts for a program of some 226 ships, including 60 tankers, to meet anticipated military requirements as determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Pursuant to the subsequent direction of the latter, the Commission on April 20, 1945, canceled 30 of the 60 tankers. Five of the tankers canceled, however, probably would not have been completed until 1946, with the result that the over-all 1945 merchant shipbuilding program of some 12,000,000 tons has been reduced about 3½ percent.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January	----------	20,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,226,481	1,372,864	1,300,340
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	1,294,432
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	1,004,073
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	----------
June	31,524	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	----------
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,433	----------
August	33,756	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	----------
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	----------
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	----------
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	----------
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	----------
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	----------
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	1,677	----------

Only Way to Insure Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., on last Saturday, May 5, carried an excellent editorial strongly supporting the Sumners resolution for the abolition of the two-thirds rule. In my opinion this House could not take a more important step toward world peace than to initiate this most badly needed reform in our Constitution.

I commend the following editorial to the careful attention of all Members:

ONLY WAY TO INSURE PEACE

On next Tuesday the House of Representatives will resume consideration of the proposal to put an end to the provision in the Constitution by which the vote of two-thirds of the Senate is required to ratify a treaty. It is proposed in a resolution approved by the Judiciary Committee that in the future treaties should be ratified by the majority vote of both Houses of Congress. Long hearings were held last fall and the testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of the change.

As it takes the vote of both Houses to declare war, a like procedure should be utilized to garner the peace. The power of one-third of the Senators was the dagger that denied peace after World War No. 1 and is in part responsible for the death and destruction in World War No. 2. If the United States had taken its seat at Geneva, the League would have functioned to undergird the world peace which the men in arms won in 1917–18, and if there had been no veto power in one-third of the Senate, the United States could and would have led in such measures and adjustments as would have prevented the present holocaust, now happily coming to an end, which has cost so much in blood and treasure.

North Carolina is proud to have been first in guaranteeing the incorporation of the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution and in other democratic advances. This was the first State to declare for the change from minority rule to majority rule in preserving good foreign relations by calling for an end of the undemocratic and archaic two-thirds requirement of the Senate for the ratification of treaties. At the State Democratic convention held in May 1944 the following declaration was unanimously adopted and made an integral part of the platform:

"The provision in the Federal Constitution requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senators present for the ratification of treaties has enabled a minority of the Senators to thwart the will of a great majority of their colleagues, to disregard the considered opinion of the American people, and to defeat the best interests of the United States.

"We strongly approve and urge an amendment to the Federal Constitution that will make the process of ratification more democratic in its nature."

At the recent session of the general assembly that body passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and

"Whereas this constitutional provision disqualifies the more representative House of Representatives from any participation in treaty making and has led in the past to obstruction by determined minorities in the Senate; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the National Government shall be able to effectuate any international agreement

upon which the President and a majority of the Senators and a majority of the Representatives agree: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose, either to the legislatures of the several States or to conventions in the several States, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reading substantially as follows:

"'The President shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall consent thereto.'

"SEC. 2. That a duly certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one copy of the same sent to each of the North Carolina Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification."

It was introduced by Senator Brandon P. Hodges, of Buncombe, representing the same county formerly represented by Representative ZEBULON VANCE WEAVER, long a leader in the National House of Representatives. In Washington Mr. WEAVER'S high position on the Judiciary Committee gives him influence and the respect of his fellow Members, and he presided over some of the hearings on the abolition of the two-thirds rule. There seems the eternal fitness of things that Buncombe County, the home of the illustrious Vance, should take the lead in this long-needed reform. The resolution in the Democratic State convention was drawn by the chairman of the resolutions committe, D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, editor of the Asheville Citizen, who presented it to the Democratic State Convention. The resolution in favor of the amendment to the Constitution was introduced and advocated in the general assembly by Senator Brandon Hodges, of Buncombe, and one of its ablest champions in Congress is Representative ZEBULON VANCE WEAVER, of Buncombe County.

North Carolina, true to its devotion to majority rule, is committed to this change which is the only way to guarantee peace and wise foreign relations, and it is gratifying that it was the first State to instruct its Senators and Representatives in Congress to lead in carrying out the mandate of the people.

International Office for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Owen D. Young, published in the bulletin of the International Office for Education:

Now that modern communications and transport have compressed the world into one neighborhood, it becomes important in connection with the peace to establish an International Office for Education. At the root of international concord is clear understanding between the peoples of the different nations. Nothing will contribute more to that than knowledge of the way in which the different peoples are educated.

I, therefore, endorse heartily the proposal for an International Office for Education not only because it will provide a clearing house for the interchange of educational procedures and techniques, but because it will be an expression of confidence in the constructive spirit of the postwar world.

Woodrow Wilson's Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 6, 1945:

WOODROW WILSON'S SPIRIT

There has been little public allusion to Woodrow Wilson in the first sessions of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. Our first of World-War Presidents was not formally mentioned until, on April 29, Jan Massaryk, foreign minister of Czechoslovakia, paid tribute to him. Later, Prime Minister Smuts, who helped Wilson frame the Covenant of the League of Nations, reminded the delegates of the debt which they and the free world owe to the memory of that greatest of peace pioneers of a quarter century ago.

But doubt not that the spirit of that man who died for his dream of a warless world was present at the Conference, and will be till the end, speaking to the minds and the hearts of all there assembled, counseling each in his own language, voicing the yearning of all mankind in all lands for a world set free from an ancient and dreadful curse.

Woodrow Wilson, the man, is gone from the scene. But not the vision that sent him across the sea to Versailles and led him afterward on a futile crusade among his own people. That vision lives on. It inspired another of our war Presidents to take up the cause from the fallen leader's hand and advance it farther, till he, in his turn, fell. And it inspired the Conference at the Golden Gate today. Wilson, and Roosevelt beside him, are profound realities at that meeting.

And a great host of Woodrow Wilson's Americans are there in their thoughts and hopes. They followed him gladly in his time. They saw his dream shattered, his plan rejected by his countrymen, yet they believed. They are not a minority now, for world events have shown, far more vividly than 25 years ago, the ghastly danger ahead for civilization. These Americans are there in spirit, a cloud of witnesses. They gather not to exult in the possible triumph, long delayed, of a world-saving idea, but to pray that this time, before it is too late, the idea may take form and become the foundation of a decent and orderly world—a world where never again the human right to liberty and happiness may be challenged.

They are not alone, these Americans. In their prayer they are joined by millions of people of every kindred, every tribe on this troubled planet.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador to the United States, at the commemoration of the One hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, under the auspices of the United American and Polish Societies in Baltimore, Md., Sunday, May 6, 1945:

No American commemoration of an event in Polish history has a symbolic meaning as deep as that of Poland's Constitution Day. By commemorating the founding of the liberal Polish Constitution, unanimously introduced by the Polish Nation on May 3, 1791, the great-hearted American people show their deep understanding of the real fundamental closeness existing between our two nations. In the latter part of the eighteenth century the civilized nations of both hemispheres founded their constitutions upon what was then considered the novel trend of liberalism and what later led to the modern conception of democracy.

This has forged a special link between them.

The yearly manifestations of the American people all over this great United States on Poland's Constitution Day, the numerous speeches in the United States Congress, the press comments and, last but not least, such splendid celebrations as the one we are privileged to attend today are the living proofs of the intensity, the sincerity, and the depth of American-Polish friendship, founded upon a community of ideals and aims.

This year's anniversary of the Polish Constitution takes on an exceptional meaning, for, after many years of bitter fighting and of the greatest sacrifices, the victory of the United Nations over the forces of German totalitarian imperialism has been finally achieved. The defeat of Hitler's Japanese ally can be regarded as not-too-distant foregone conclusion.

Hence, the time has come for all freedom-loving nations in both hemispheres to start readjusting their thoughts, so tensely concentrated on war problems and war requirements, to the great task of winning a peace which will open a new era of freedom, justice, and democracy, a peace worthy of the sacrifices of the millions of lives of our best men and women, worthy of the toil and suffering of innocent peoples and, above all, worthy of our Christian civilization; a peace which will unite the world by inspiring all human beings with mutual confidence, with faith in principles of morality, justice, and decency, and will reassure them that henceforth laws and treaties will be respected and security will become a reality.

In this unprecedented total war Poland was the first actively to resist German invasion. Though defeated in the initial campaign by Hitler's overwhelming forces, supported by a Soviet invasion of Poland in September 1939, the Polish Nation remained unconquered. Poland never ceased actively to fight throughout this war by means of her underground home army in Poland and the Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force abroad. These forces have fought valiantly, shoulder to shoulder with Poland's allies. They fought in France, in Norway, in the Battle of Britain,

in north Africa, in Italy, in Normandy, in Belgium, in Holland, inside Germany as well as on sea and in the air.

When Hitler attacked Soviet Russia in June 1941, the Polish underground, acting on orders of the Polish Government in London, gave its fullest active support to the Russian forces by means of increased guerilla warfare, sabotage of German communications and transports, and later, when the Russian offensive through Poland started in 1944, the regular underground army of Poland came out into the open and greatly helped the Russian forces in their advance on the entire territory of Poland.

Throughout this war, Poland, alone among the European countries overrun by Germany, never produced a Quisling.

Poland's war record is clear and blameless.

I am not enumerating these facts in order to blow Poland's trumpet. In acting as she did, Poland fulfilled her duty to her own people and to the common cause of freedom which she had always defended in the past. I mention these facts because, unfortunately, it appears to be necessary to restate them in view of the spread of a propaganda campaign hostile to Poland which attempts to vilify the Polish Nation and its legal Government by so grossly misrepresenting facts and issues, that the true picture of prewar Poland, of her war effort, and of her conduct in this war is being deliberately distorted and falsified.

The Polish Nation is too sincerely attached to its traditions to allow such misrepresentation of its character and aims to go unchallenged. The Polish Government and people have been exceptionally patient and long suffering, being sincerely desirious of preserving allied unity, so essential in war time. However, at this crucial moment, when allied unity should be reaffirmed in relation to the constructive principles of justice, which alone can become the sound basis of collaboration in a world-security organization, it is urgent to rectify misconceptions endangering the establishment of a just and durable peace.

Contrary to allegations of hostile propaganda, Poland is not a feudal oligarchy where opulent and arrogant aristocrats subjected and exploited the poor. Nor is she a country of great landed estates and of miserably small peasant holdings. This is proved by official comparative international statistics on agricultural holdings in various countries.

In Poland 76.3 percent of the total area of farm land was broken up into farms of less than 100 acres. Only 23.7 percent constituted farming estates of 100 acres and upward, while in England large farming estates over 100 acres represent 50.9 percent of the total farm land, in Czechoslovakia 43.4 percent, and in France 29.2 percent.

Social legislation in Poland, the care of working women and child welfare were considerably more advanced than in France or England. They comprised compulsory social insurance, paid vacations, medical assistance, and old-age pensions. This labor legislation and educational facilities extended not only to industrial labor, but to farm labor and domestic servants as well, and was efficiently applied.

It is therefore a gross injustice to attempt to misrepresent Poland as a socially backward country.

Since the restoration of Poland's independence after the First World War, Polish Governments have never been composed of large landowners and aristocrats. The land reform was quite effectively carried out and was increasing the number of small holdings at the cost of the larger estates. Nor were the so-called wealthy classes really rich in the American sense of the word. Our country, unfortunately situated in a most precarious geographical position between two mighty empires which had thrice partitioned it, was forced to maintain a considerable military establishment for its defense. This cost the nation 43 percent of its budget and weighed heavily on the Polish taxpayer.

And yet, after regaining our independence, in the short 20 years during which it lasted, Poland had become a semiprosperous country, hard working and almost self-supporting, increasing its industrialization, the number of its schools, developing its road and railway systems, its air transport, and gradually reoccupying its place among the civilized nations of Europe, after having been partitioned under foreign domination for one and a quarter century.

All the hard work of rehabilitation accomplished after the First World War in that short time of independence has now been ruthlessly destroyed by German invasion, war, looting, and wanton destruction. No nation has suffered such oppression, humiliation, persecution, and methodical extermination. Our population of 35,000,000 people has lost in this war about eight and one-half million people—in fact, nearly one-fourth of its total. And yet the spirit of the nation remains undaunted, its national consciousness and patriotism have survived. It has never sought to alleviate its sufferings by any compromise with German totalitarianism which for over 5 years has done its utmost to enslave and destroy it.

And now, after what that nation has gone through, after all its sacrifices in its effort to do its part for the common cause of humanity and to preserve its soul, the restoration of Poland's independence appears once again to be placed in doubt. And because it would be impossible, after this unprecedented war fought by the United Nations against totalitarian oppression and enslavement, to justify the denial of freedom and independence to the Poles—a campaign of villification has been launched in an attempt to prove what can never be proved, namely, that the Polish people, who so relentlessly fought fascism, are themselves Fascists; that Poland, who never ceased to fight the Germans, is pro-German, undemocratic, and disloyal, although her outstanding Allied loyalty is unquestionable.

One of the methods of this propaganda campaign consists in spreading the impression that there is no Polish-Soviet problem, but that internal differences and political strife between rival Polish factions stand in the way of an understanding. This is untrue, intentionally misleading, and obviously calculated to turn the attention of public opinion from the complex problems now existing between Soviet Russia and Poland. These Soviet-Polish issues call for direct contact and frank discussions between the Polish and the Soviet Governments in an atmosphere of peace and mutual good will. Hitherto the Polish Government has met with no encouragement on the part of Poland's eastern neighbor in its endeavors to discuss these matters directly.

Poland's constitutional Government is accused of being unfriendly to Russia. That is entirely untrue. Although Russia stabbed Poland in the back on that fateful 17th of September 1939, when Poland was fighting the German aggressor on her territory, and partitioned Poland with Germany for the fourth time in history—as soon as Hitler had double-crossed Russia and attacked her in June 1941, the Polish Government resumed diplomatic relations with her eastern neighbor and pledged itself actively to support the Russian war effort against the common enemy.

It is noteworthy that in 1941, when it took Germany only a few days to drive Russia out of eastern Poland, the Soviets did not accuse the Polish Government, with whom they concluded an agreement on July 30, 1941, of being unrepresentative of Poland or unfriendly to the Soviet Union. On December 4, 1941, the Polish-Soviet agreement was further strengthened during the Moscow visit paid by the Polish Prime Minister, General Sikorski, to Marshal Stalin, which resulted in a declaration of friendship and mutual assistance between the two countries signed by General Sikorski and Marshal Stalin in person. During this visit details for the formation of a Polish Army to be recruited from Poles deported to Russia during the Soviet invasion of Poland, were agreed upon between the two statesmen. Later the Soviet Government accused Poland of having withdrawn this army when Russia needed it most. The truth is that Marshal Stalin decreed that this army was to leave Russia, saying that he could neither feed nor equip it. This army was later trained and equipped in the Middle East with the aid of Poland's ally Britain and, under General Anders, it has proved most useful in the Allied campaign in Italy.

Nor is it true that the Polish Government became unfriendly to Russia after the death of General Sikorski. His successor, the prominent Polish Peasant Party leader, Premier Mikolajczyk, made every effort and undertook two journeys to Moscow to work out an understanding and to conclude a treaty with Soviet Russia. His efforts failed because he was asked to sign away 43 percent of Poland's territory before any agreement could be discussed, and other conditions incompatible with Poland's independence and sovereignty were placed regarding the composition of a Polish Government.

Nor is the present Polish Government presided by his successor, Mr. Arciszewski, the venerable leader of the Polish Socialist Party, unfriendly to Russia. Mr. Arciszewski did not spend his time in this war outside Poland. For 5 years he was one of the most active leaders of the Polish underground state inside Poland and one of the party chiefs in the Polish underground parliament. He risked his life daily alongside of the other underground fighters and was finally brought out of German-occupied Poland at the special request of the President of the Polish Republic to take part in the Polish Government. During his work in the underground he was one of those leaders who carried out the determination of the Polish people to fight the Germans and to help Russia. Even now, regardless of rebuffs and villification, of being called a Fascist and reactionary, this venerable Socialist Party leader has repeatedly issued statements on behalf of the Polish Government expressing his readiness to open direct negotiations with the Soviet Government and has declared that the Polish Government will accept any one of the methods foreseen by international law for the just and fair solution of the controversy with the participation of both parties concerned.

How then should one interpret the term "friendly government": A Soviet-sponsored committee formed in Moscow, without consultation with the people of Poland and in which former Comintern agents, some of whom were until recently Soviet citizens, occupy the key positions, has been imposed upon the Polish Nation and recognized by Soviet Russia as the provisional Polish Government. Are we to conclude that a friendly government of an independent Poland must be constituted in Moscow and mainly composed of Communists? In what way is such a government representative of the Polish people, as deeply attached to their constitutional rights of choosing their own governments as any other democracy? How can such a government be representative of a people, among whom communism constitutes at most 1½ to 2 percent of the population? How is this method of creating governments compatible with the repeatedly declared formula of Marshal Stalin that he is determined that Poland shall be strong and independent?

As regards the accusation that the legal Polish Government in London is unrepresentative of the Polish people—the following irrefutable facts suffice to disprove this accusation.

From the very outset and up to this day the Polish nation has never questioned the constitutional legality or the authority of that government. No rival government has been formed in Poland by the Polish people. On the contrary, the Polish underground state organized in the closest understanding with the Polish Government, has always followed all its directives. The Polish Army, Navy, and air force abroad, as well as the Polish home army of underground Poland, have fought under its direct command.

Most recently 12 representatives of the Polish political parties in Poland and 4 ministers of the legal Polish Government, resident there, in understanding with the Polish Government undertook to enter into direct negotiations with the Soviet authorities. These 16 Polish leaders who throughout this war have headed Poland's underground state in its active resistance to the German aggressor, established contact with the Soviet high command in the latter part of March. They were promised their personal safety by the Soviet authorities and facilities for going to London in order to consult with their government prior to further negotiations in view of concluding an agreement. Notwithstanding these promises, the intrepid leaders of Polish democracy disappeared and the Soviet government refused to give any explanation regarding their fate.

The press has just carried the news that the Soviet government has now informed the British and American Governments that these delegates have been arrested by the Soviet authorities under the ludicrous accusation that they were responsible for a plot which allegedly resulted in the death of "more than a 100 Red Army officer and enlisted men."

I must leave it to the sound good sense of American public opinion to form its own judgment regarding this violation of international law and procedure in the case of a delegation of leading officials and political representatives who have in good faith sought to open negotiations on behalf of Poland in the sincere hope of reaching an understanding with Soviet Russia.

Reliable information from Poland conclusively proves that a rapid process of political, economic, and social communization is being carried out in Poland against the will of the people. Contrary to democratic practice, legal chaos and irresponsible economic experiments are being arbitrarily introduced. The heroic fighters of the Polish Home Army, the same who did their utmost at the cost of untold sacrifices to help the Russian forces in their fight against the common German enemy, are being arrested, deported, and executed. They are accused of being traitors and, most ironically, of being German collaborationists and fascists.

These are the grim facts of Poland's "liberation" from Nazi tyranny. There is no enmity in Poland against the Russian nation. But the Polish people are determined to regain their freedom and to remain free. They are determined to regain real independence, which they consider to be their birthright as it is that of other less precariously situated nations.

Throughout its history the Polish people have always fought for freedom. They will never give up that fight.

The Allied countries liberated by the British and American forces are being turned over to their legal governments as soon as this is feasible. Most of these governments have by now been reinstalled and reconstructed. A different pattern is followed in the countries now liberated from German occupation by Soviet Russia. In the case of Poland, not only is the legal government prevented from returning to that country and placing itself at the disposal of the Polish people, who alone have the right to decide what government they want to have, but Poland has been entirely barred from any free contact with the outside world, and neither Britain nor the United States have as yet been able to send any military missions or observers of any kind to Poland.

The Polish Nation is deprived of the means of free expression. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press have been abolished. For 8 months now the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has been unsuccessful in obtaining the necessary visas from Soviet Russia for its mission to proceed on its samaritan work to Poland.

In these circumstances, it is permissible to have serious apprehensions regarding the situation inside Poland under Soviet occupation.

Painful as it is to have to state these facts at this time when our common victory over Nazi tyranny and the rule of right over might has finally been achieved—it is necessary to do so, not with any intention of disrupting Allied unity or of endangering the all-important task of establishing security and peace. On the contrary, it is necessary to realize the existence of such situations and to face them boldly while there may still be a chance of using persuasion to rectify them with a view of creating an atmosphere of harmony necessary for the successful work of establishing a secure peace.

Victory has been achieved by united force. In war, power is the dominant factor. However, power alone cannot be the foundation of peace. Without justice, no peace can endure. And a just peace is what the world is yearning for and has a right to expect.

In a civilized world, all nations must be equal before the law and juridically equal amongst themselves, regardless of size, importance, or power.

The inequality which exists between the big and small powers should not be measured in terms of power supremacy, but only in terms of power responsibility. The big powers cannot escape responsibility for the maintenance and the defense of a just peace settlement, even by force, if the necessity should arise.

However, to be just and durable, a security system should be operated on the firm basis of the collaboration of all nations concerned, the big and the small, as their joint responsibility, in direct proportion to their respective possibilities.

Wartime thinking tends temporarily to relegate to secondary importance fundamental principles, moral and cultural forces, and spiritual ideals, so indispensable to the establishment of a just and durable peace.

In erecting the structure of a peace settlement on a world scale it is indispensable boldly to turn our minds to the principles and human ideals without which mankind, profoundly disturbed by war, cannot be restored to normal ways of thinking and democratic living. How can one establish unity in a world if one hemisphere is to enjoy the rule of justice and individual freedom, while the other is to be partly free and partly oppressed and enslaved?

Much is being said at present about realism as opposed to idealism. We are frequently told not to attempt to strive after perfectionism. Recently we have even been told that one cannot sacrifice agreement to ideals.

The gallant soldiers who fought and fell for these ideals which alone are considered by true democrats as worthy of a fighting total war in the twentieth century of our enlightened civilization, would not accept such cynical slogans. Have these heroic fighters sacrificed their lives in the cause of freedom and the ideals of justice to allow the world they have saved, once more to revert to the tyrannical power-political concepts of the Congress of Vienna, or rather to help establish in the post-war world the noble principles of the Atlantic Charter, which inspired them to fight?

It is time that the statesmen who were wise enough and bold enough to lead the freedom-loving nations to victory, should realize that no just and honorable system of security can be established by the United Nations on any compromise with democratic principles. It is time to admit that peace can never be based on appeasement and that one can never appease justice. In a modern world there can be no realism which does not take the human element and its rights into account. Hence, there can be no settlement which disregards the self-determination of peoples. There cannot be durable peace based on injustice. There can be no justice if nations are not treated as equal before the law. There can never be real peace if power-political concepts, allowing some powers to extend their domination over others are permitted.

To establish an indivisible peace in a united and indivisible world it is both indispensable and logical to apply the same civilized norms of justice to international relations in both hemispheres.

All freedom-loving nations yearn for American leadership in establishing a just world peace. This mighty democracy has preserved and maintained the principles of true democratic ways of living. It is both powerful and disinterested. It has learned by experience gained in two World Wars that in modern times its own security in indissolubly bound to that of all other nations. It has grown to a unique position as a world peace. Its responsibility has grown in direct proportion.

The greatest opportunity in human history is now given by Providence to the American people: The unique chance of using their powerful influence to restore security, just peace and happiness to suffering humanity.

God bless America and help her in this her greatest mission.

Oregon Participates in the International Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply interested in the work of the San Francisco Conference now in session. Now that Germany has surrendered and V-day is actually with us on the European front, we are all deeply concerned and praying that an international organization may be effected at the San Francisco Conference in which the nations of the world will join together in an organization that will make another world catastrophe of global war impossible and will insure a just and lasting peace so far as it is humanly possible.

Many of us from Oregon are glad to note that a number of citizens from our State are taking an active part in the conference at San Francisco. I include as a part of these remarks a recent news release giving the names and the duties of these Oregon citizens:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 1.—Seven natives of Oregon are participating in the historic San Francisco Conference for International Organization, which got under way in this city last week.

These Oregonians are attached both to the International Secretariat, which manages the entire Conference, and to the delegation that is representing the United States.

C. Easton Rothwell, of Portland, former professor at Reed College, is executive secretary of the International Secretariat, and one of the assistants to Alger Hiss, secretary general of the Conference.

John Halderman, of Astoria, is one of the legal advisers to the American delegation.

Carlton Savage, of Salem, is special assistant to Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman of the American delegation and United States Secretary of State. Savage, who works closely with the congressional members of the delegation, is a cousin of the late Senator Charles L. McNary.

Harley Notter, of Eugene, is an adviser to the American delegation.

George Verne Blue, of Ashland, is correspondence officer of the American delegation.

Mrs. Virginia Hartley, the former Virginia Fox, of Portland, is executive secretary of the American delegation and in charge of the delegation's operating arrangements.

Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, of Portland, who formerly served with the Army engineers in Alaska, is an aide on the staff of Secretary of State Stettinius, chairman of the American delegation.

The bulk of the Oregon people assigned to the Conference are regular members of the State Department staff. They arrived in San Francisco last week and are expected to be here for the duration of the Conference.

Wage Increases for Postal and Federal Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great many interesting developments which directly affect people who are in the employment of the United States Government. One of these situation is called the increased cost of living. Of course, prices should have been frozen when wages were frozen, but the politicians in charge of these matters did not do that and we do have an increased cost in living.

Then the tax increases came along and Federal employees who have not had an increase in pay have been confronted with the withholding tax which, of course, reduces the cash income.

These conditions, together with other factors, have been well known to the different administration leaders, and they are the ones who shape our legislative programs. They have been too busy, however, to do anything about the situation.

Of course, there are some lopsided individuals who have a partial paralysis over their thinking apparatus but still have a tremendous amount of energy left. They devote all of their time "doing good for others." They are what is known as do-gooders. They just simply want to do good all the time, provided the money can be spent in foreign countries. They overlook all domestic problems, the wholly inadequate small relief payments made to aged and destitute citizens, and numberless other domestic problems. Yet, they are the ones who are consulted when money is to be spent and they always see to it that it is spent in foreign countries.

WAGE INCREASES FOR POSTAL WORKERS

These good folks have entirely overlooked the employees in the United States Post Office Department. Some of these employees have not had an increase in basic pay rates in more than 19 years. They have always been loyal, have done their work in a competent manner, and no other group of people have more friends among the American people. In the Seventy-eighth Congress we joined with others in efforts to increase the amount of their pay, and you all know the legislation was defeated by parliamentary subterfuge. It is time that the administration quit fooling these folks. I have just received a letter which expresses in a fine way the fairness of the request of our postal workers, and I quote from a portion of the letter:

I wish to petition your continued active support for the bill to reclassify the salaries of postal employees.

To know that these men have been working overtime at a lower rate of pay than that which they receive for regular time was hard for me to believe, especially when private industry is ordered to do so by the same powers that be. To me that is as preposterous as some of the other things we have had to put up with.

You certainly will help to right a great wrong and injustice to these men if you actively support and vote for this legislation.

I expect to continue my support for legislation which will be of benefit to employees of the Post Office Department. It is, I believe, the only Government agency that brings in an enormous revenue to the Government. The efficiency and high standards of service of the Post Office Department are a real tribute to the loyal employees in this branch of service, and they deserve support for this legislation.

WAGE INCREASE FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Legislation is also pending for the benefit of Federal Government employees. This will take into account the fact that there has been an increased cost in living and that there has been a large increase in the amount of taxes which people have to pay. These other Federal Government employees are entitled to the pay-increase proposals contained in pending legislation. This group of employees is sometimes referred to as white-collar workers. Large numbers of them entered Federal service when the Government appealed for workers in connection with various Government bureaus and departments having to do with our war effort. Everything I have said about problems of the postal workers apply to the difficulties faced by these Federal Government employees.

I have talked to a large number of these people, and I am familiar with the way they are situated. They ought to have relief.

The following is a quotation from a letter which I received sometime ago and is directly in point:

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: The following figures are an example of a Federal employee's income in the lower salary bracket during 1944.

This girl receives base pay of $1,440 per year with overtime of $302, total $1,742. From this amount there is deducted $72 for retirement, $245 for taxes, and 10 percent for War bonds, $174. The total deductions, $491, reduces her cash income to roughly $105 per month. Since the dollar of today is valued at but 65 cents in comparison to the dollar earned in 1940, we find that this girl has actually less than $70 per month as of 1940.

In a situation of this kind she has but one recourse, and after office hours we find her in restaurants, drug stores, and shops trying to earn enough that she may live decently. She is the girl that is expected to report at her Government job well dressed, well groomed, and well rested.

It is more than 20 years since there has been an increase in the base pay of such employees. Congress should immediately legislate to fairly compensate an employee of the Government, and the foundation of salary increase should be in base pay.

Yours very truly,

_____.

I am calling attention at this time to these problems because this legislation is long past due. It should have been enacted a long time ago. If administration leaders will give us an opportunity to act on this legislation, I shall support it and work for its enactment.

"No Special Favors"—Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 4, 1945:

"NO SPECIAL FAVORS"—TRUMAN

President Truman did a national service in vetoing the bill to give outright exemption to farm workers. And it is reassuring that there were enough Congressmen who understood this service to sustain him.

In the interests of a nation still at war, the President said what needed to be said. He reminded Congress of its own declared policy that no groups should be placed in a favored position by the selective-service law; that deferments should be on the basis of the merits of each individual case. He referred pointedly to draft deferment scandals of the last war, "particularly in the shipyards." There have been abuses in this war, too.

It couldn't be denied that there also have been some gross inequities in the administration of the draft law. At one time it appeared that the patriotic willingness with which farm boys were enlisting, and the eagerness with which they were transferring to higher paid war jobs in the city, might spell disastrous reduction in food supplies. That was the basis for the Tydings amendment and there was some reason for action then. But what was done was abused.

There may still be some need for the protection of farm workers but Congress, by no means overlooking the opportunity to appear

in the role of champion of the farmers, prescribed a cure that was worse than the disease. This special draft exemption for agricultural employment would have, in the words of the President, singled out farm work as "more important than industrial occupation or military service. It would have been an injustice to millions already inducted * * * and those yet to be inducted."

It would certainly have put every farmer or farm worker of draft age under a cloud of suspicion that he was dodging military service under this rigid exemption.

Farmers and farm workers engaged in vitally important food production deserve every possible consideration. But the Nation should know, and the individual should know, that he is being deferred, as any other American is deferred, because his draft board is convinced that he is contributing more in his present occupation than he could in the armed services. There is the means now to defer him if he is essential.

President Truman laid down a great principle when he said that no American should be placed "in a favored position." Special favors—that has been the curse of this country.

Repeal of Land-Grant Transportation Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, if the bill the House passed last week discontinuing the land-grant rates for transportation of Government traffic, which means freight as well as personnel, becomes a law the taxpayers of this country will be required to pay the land-grant railroads of the United States something around $400,000,000 a year. This at a time when the railroads are making more money than at any period in their history and at a time the Government is increasing the national debt daily. Several years ago I assisted in defeating such a bill. In the last Congress, while we failed to defeat a similar bill, fortunately it died in the Senate.

At the present time, due to a decision of the courts, supplemented by an act of Congress, Government traffic is subject to a 50 percent rate over land-grant roads. Starting in 1850, the Government granted land for the construction of railroads. In all, over 125,000,000 acres were donated to those railroads. The land was not only sufficient for a right-of-way but extended on both sides of the road bed; there were no strings tied to the grant. The railroads in time disposed of a great deal of this acreage and, statistics show, received in return nearly a billion dollars.

Pressure groups have been at work, members have been contacted by constituents directly and indirectly interested in the railroads. Some businessmen have been sold the idea the repeal of this law means a reduction in freight rates. Such will not be the case. Those favoring the bill refused to agree to a provision making the repeal effective several years after the termination of the war.

Mr. Speaker, had illness not prevented me from being present I would have opposed the passage of this bill by voice and vote.

It is opposed by the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, Interior Department, as well as those handling lend lease.

President's Veto Does Not Change Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's surprise veto of Congress' latest attempt to make clear the right of individual agricultural workers to exemption from military service, when necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort so long as he could not be replaced, may lead many local and appeal boards and State selective service officials into the same error they made when they followed General Hershey's January 3, 1945, State Director Advice No. 288, and inducted agricultural workers who were entitled to deferment.

After local and appeal boards, relying upon General Hershey's directive, began to disregard the Tydings amendment and to induct agricultural workers who were entitled to deferment, the Congress took action to correct the error by passing, on April 23, the so-called Flannagan resolution, which amplified and explained and gave directions for the interpretation and application of the Tydings amendment.

Then President Truman, on May 3, sent to Congress a message vetoing the Flannagan resolution. The House, by a vote of 195 to 168, refused to sustain the veto by burying it in a committee. Then, when the issue came squarely before the House, 185 voted to override the veto, while 177 voted to sustain it. Thus, the veto, which required a two-third vote to override, was sustained by a minority vote.

TYDINGS AMENDMENT STILL THE LAW

This action of the President does not change the law. It tends to again confuse local and appeal boards, for the Tydings amendment is still the law of the land and an agricultural worker who comes within its terms is entitled, as a matter of law, to deferment from military service.

The President's statement that "I do not believe that it was the real intent of Congress that agricultural workers should be given blanket deferment as a group," is quite true, but it was the intent of Congress that individuals regularly engaged in essential agricultural occupations, who could not be replaced, should be deferred.

That, as shown by the debate, was the sole purpose of the Tydings amendment, which had Hershey's approval and was adopted in the Senate with but six dissenting votes. The House adopted it; President Roosevelt affixed his signature. It is today the law of the land and, from the time when it became law until the 3d day of January 1945, it was interpreted and administered in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Then General Hershey, apparently due to the "Belgian bulge" and some other undisclosed reasons, changed his mind, and instructions went out to draft agricultural workers. They were drafted, notwithstanding the exemption given by the Tydings amendment.

Now it is said that agricultural workers are favored above all others. That just is not true. All men are not subject to draft. There are many exemptions. The Selective Service Act of September 1940 is just what its name implies—an authorization to select certain men out of the whole. It exempts State and Federal officials, ministers, theological and certain other students, conscientious objectors.

Everyone knows that hundreds of thousands of industrial workers, thousands of whom have at times gone on strike and hindered the war effort, have been deferred from military service. As a matter of fact, some few farmers, seeking exemption from service, went into industrial plants and obtained deferment.

Then when, in 1942, Congress learned that the effectiveness of our war effort was being impaired by the drafting of too many men who were engaged in the production of food, it lifted right out of the Selective Service Act all those individuals who met the Tydings classification, and no Presidential order or directive can put them back in as long as the right of Congress to make the laws is recognized. President Truman's veto did not repeal the Tydings amendment.

Local boards, appeal boards, every officer charged with the interpretation and administration of the selective-service law, should remember that today, notwithstanding the veto, the Tydings amendment is still the law of the land; all should obey it and agricultural workers entitled to deferment under it should be deferred.

Retail and Small Business in California in Post-war

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about the important subject of conditions and elements entering into retail trade and small business in my native State of California, as peace returns. Strange as it may seem, several people from the east coast have

come to my congressional office and asked about opportunities and conditions in California, with reference to going into small business when peace returns. Also, I receive written inquiries and communications on the same subject. I specifically have in mind that my study of this problem may be beneficial to other Congressmen in my own State, and possibly other States, and likewise beneficial to some G. I. boys or their families in their planning.

First, the need of making an adequate living and making it honorably and promptly, always exists. Where will the jobs be in California? Shall I go into retail sales? Shall I engage in small business in California when peace comes? These questions indicate some of the lines of the discussion that will briefly follow.

Fundamentally, if there is no reasonable opportunity for small business or retail business to succeed, then I doubt if free enterprise as such can succeed. Also, the retail trade is the outlet for wholesalers, distributors, and manufacturers. If there is no demand for goods through retail and small business, there is no need for the manufacturers turning out products for home consumption. In using the term "retail trade" or "small business" I refer to that business engaged in selling direct to the consumer those items of personal property which men, women, and children want and must have to keep happy, healthy, well-fed, and contented citizens. This simple definition applies to retail trade wherever found; it does not apply exclusively to California.

It is estimated that about 500,000 people will be engaged in retail trades in California by the end of the first year after demobilization of the armed forces. Naturally some of these will enter business as proprietors and some will necessarily go on pay rolls of other employers in retail trade and small business. It is estimated that approximately 50,000 retail outlets which did not exist at Christmastime 1944 in California will come into being by demobilization day. Retailers will be busy selling to Californians most of the things denied Californians and all Americans during this period of global war. Retail stores in California and all over the Nation are still jammed with customers, even though many items of necessity are not obtainable.

Population movements have made a difference in California cities, towns, industries, retail merchandising, and rural and agricultural districts. This probably means a difference of outlook for retail business as peace comes. People from inland towns took jobs in metropolitan areas and purchases of War bonds and stamps used up millions of dollars of consumers' money which would have otherwise gone into retail purchasing. California towns and communities grew up almost overnight; thousands of new retail purchasers moved in. They had plenty of money in their purses; some spent for only the actual necessities of life, and some spent lavishly because they either did not know the value of the dollar or because it was the first time they had had any money to spend.

In the collision of events, demands, and purposes thousands of retail businesses vanished entirely. There were about 200,000 retail trade outlets when the war broke; about one-sixteenth of them have closed, so that it is reported that in midsummer of 1943, California had fewer retail outlets than anytime in the 10 years previous. Nevertheless the total sales of the remaining retail businesses jumped up almost 20 percent. In other words, from $4,087,000,000 in 1941 to $4,812,000,000 in 1943; the total sales jump from 1940 to 1943 was even greater, to wit: 43 percent. The above jump in retail sales, in spite of the sharp decrease in the number of retail outlets, is significant if you take it in the light of the great increase in population and income in California during the same period. This population increase jumped up over 20 percent between 1940 and 1944. It is also significant that the average current income a Californian had in 1943, as compared with 1940, was more by over 80 percent. Yet, retail outlets in California sold only about 30 percent more of the retail trade in 1943 than in 1940. During the same period prices in California rose about 25 percent.

Of course, retail sales to nonresidents or temporary residents of my great native State were always and are always a substantial factor in terms of income or sales by retail merchants.

I am including in my remarks some brief tables of findings of fact, with reference to retail sales in California and to retail outlets in California. These tables show that the greatest per capita increases were in restaurants, bars, and to sellers of nonessentials, to wit: luxuries. Californians expended about twice as much on food and liquor and all sorts of jewelry during 1943 as was spent in 1941. During the same time the loss in per capita sales hit the automobile agencies, farmers, dairy supplies, plumbing, heating, and similar retail merchants.

The figures in these tables, which tables are quoted from California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, Pamphlet No. 7, seem to clearly indicate that over a period of the last 15 years, the average income for residents of California was about 40 percent more than the average national income. But this does not mean that there can safely be an immediate rush or influx of people into my native State of California, with assurance of either making a living in small business or at retail sales, or, to promptly obtain employment. Nor does it mean that California must necessarily be concluded to be a State in which it is absolutely safe to invest capital. I include "character" capital as well as "cash" capital. I respectfully suggest that California having been a good place for the retailers of the necessities of life, for many years, it should correspondingly be a good place for jobs. But the other day when some easterner came to my congressional office and asked me about jobs and told me they had no reserve capital to go on, I advised that they better think twice about leaving the jobs they already had. Any person from any other State who expects to land in California and find it a haven of rest and a guaranty of success in financial investment, or, guarantees a job, even though it may have the most wonderful climate in the world and the most wonderful oranges, citrus fruits, grapes, prunes, vegetables and dairy products and all other things—excuse my boasting, please—this does not mean that immediately upon peace coming to this world, that it will be safe or sound reasoning for folks to flock to my native State if they have no financial reserve behind them. Nor will it be safe for Californians to flock to any other State without financial reserves behind them.

It does look as though retail stores and small businesses, such as grocers, restaurants, automobile sales agencies, garages, and service stations, and so forth, all selling the necessities of life—yes, and the luxuries of life—should be mighty busy. Consumer goods, as such, will increasingly be in demand all over the Nation.

Before closing, I want to briefly urge to your attention information which is applicable to my native State of California, as well as every other State. The Department of Commerce lists that almost 85 percent of small businesses are in the retail trade, and that about 90 percent of retail businesses and over 95 percent of all service businesses have a gross annual take of less than $50,000; with about 60 percent of these having an annual gross receipt of less than $10,000. Mark you, these figures are gross, not net profit. All expenses have to come out of the gross receipts before there is a net profit. A Dun & Bradstreet booklet relates more than 13,000 retailers in the United States in 1939 only averaged 2½ cents net profit out of each dollar gross take. These figures indicate that a retail store must be located where there are plenty of people to permanently do well; and that there should not be too many retail stores trying to sell the same thing to the same people. Someone must take a loss, and that means small business insolvency. It appears undeniable that, at least, 30 percent of small business proves a failure by the end of the first year, and about 15 percent dies a natural death by the end of the second year. Dun & Bradstreet also related that during 1939, out of a check-up of about 13,000 average retailers of small businesses, the analysis showed that the owners of these retail outlets received less than $200 per month; that about one-third of them actually made no net profit. I am informed these figures are taken from the entire Nation survey.

In reading Trends recently, it was noted that the morale division of the Army Service Forces reports that about 480,000 GI boys anticipated going into business for themselves in pursuits not pertaining to agriculture. They, of course, plan to do this in connection with the GI bill of rights. I am happy to see this expression of determination of independence on the part of these fine lads. The above number does not include Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard boys. California can expect to have a larger percentage of these boys than

most any other State by virtue of past experience.

I think it significant that many inquiries come as to whether or not an individual has a reasonable chance of success as peace comes in a "small business." I am frequently asked whether or not an ambitious, observing, trustworthy veteran can make an investment of $1,000 or $2,000 in groceries or service station and expect to succeed. Space does not permit me to elaborate on this question, but such questions quicken my thinking as to whether or not there is now and will be a reasonable economic freedom for such individuals in competition; in other words will the mighty important human incentive of competition have reasonable opportunity in our postwar economy, or will there be reasonable industrial, agricultural, and small business freedom for an ambitious, observing veteran and others to make, manufacture, grow, and dispose of their merchandise and goods through an uncontrolled small business or retail outlet or market? I do not pretend to now know the answer to this question. But it seems fundamental to me that if we are to perpetuate the American way of life so far as free enterprise is concerned, then it must more and more be the fact that American men, women, and children must have reasonable opportunity to put up their abilities, earnings, and chances as against the same assets of other Americans—to win or lose, based on the merit of their merchandise and marketing methods. I think California is no exception to the statement that a small businessman there has his increasing problems to survive. For many years I have read that the economy of opportunity is the dominant ideal of American industry, trade, and manufacture. However, if that ideal is to perpetuate our American way of life as peace comes, then there cannot safely be increasing concentration of power over all business in the hands and control of a relative few. There must be free enterprise for the small businessman, for the retail merchant, for the small wholesale merchant, for the small distributor, if there is to be free enterprise anywhere in our economic system. Therefore, neither the GI boys nor their families should rush to California, thinking that economic conditions there are such as will guarantee that either cash or other assets are sure to make a net profit. California is not off by itself in these important particulars than in any other manner.

California, naturally, will help these boys to get favorably located. They simply must not be taken advantage of in any way either by haste or dishonesty by any person who deals with them. The fact that increasingly banks have felt the necessity of being more and more strict with reference to character loans makes it difficult for small businessmen to get capital loans. It is too bad that character seems less and less a capital asset, so far as private loans are concerned. Yet deposit records show that bank vaults are bursting with money. Likewise the pockets of private parties are bulging with savings which ought to be in the investment field, instead of being held in private vaults, jars, and hiding places.

What is the way to enable the G. I. boys and other young men wanting to go into small business to get "character" loans? Is there any way? Yet, it is essential to the security of our bigger business that there be small business. Free enterprise cannot endure unless there is opportunity to freely compete. California is no place for anyone to go, anymore than any other State is, as peace comes, for the person who there expects to borrow money without collateral. I am afraid that our present economic set-up and system is not conducive to small business or the retail stores starting on the basis of free enterprise or individual initiative or ambition as the major elements. Cash or bank credit must be had or on hand more than ever.

At luncheon, May 7, in the congressional restaurant, I sat with a distinguished Congressman from another State. In speaking of the problem of civilians taking advantage of the returning veterans, he related he was shocked already with the reports of some civilians in a certain district in his State taking advantage in business and trade transactions, rent charges, and so forth. This conversation with him emphasized my determination to say in these remarks that the spirit and mind of all civilians in every State in this great Nation must be that no returning veteran shall be imposed upon or taken advantage of by scheming, designing, dishonest, or snide dealing persons. I urge the people of my native State of California to raise their levels of dealing with all GI's and veterans to the highest possible level of ethical dealings and transactions and trade. Let no veteran or man either in uniform or otherwise have just cause to criticize or condemn any civilian in these matters.

A perusal of the following figures will, no doubt, be helpful in giving an understanding of retail and small business sales, and purchases, averaged in my native State of California:

Taxable retail sales in California, 1941–43

Commodity classification	Per capita taxable sales, showing the percentage of change	Average taxable sales per outlet, showing the percentage of change
Food and drink:		
Confectionery and soft drinks	+42.7	+62.1
Grocery stores	31.2	+66.8
Other food stores	+21.0	+61.7
Restaurants and bars	+74.2	+134.0
Packaged liquor stores	+82.2	+105.8
Personal supplies:		
Clothing	+67.5	+97.3
Tobacco products	+53.2	+89.2
Drugs	+49.1	+71.6
Shoes and shoe repair	+46.0	+69.2
General merchandise	+30.2	+59.9
Personal service supplies	−6.7	+15.2
Medical and health supplies	+36.5	+45.6
Variety stores	+26.5	+34.4
Luxuries:		
Sporting goods, amusements	−8.9	+57.6
Art, gifts, novelties	+71.6	+112.7
Luggage and leather goods	+83.6	+93.1
Jewelry	+72.6	+90.7
Photographic supplies	+72.3	+74.3
Books and periodicals	+45.2	+48.2
Florists and nurseries	+17.2	+110.3
Home furnishings:		
Radios and musical equipment	−25.3	+5.3
Home furnishings	−15.4	+8.3
Building supplies:		
Plumbing, heating, air conditioning	−29.1	0−.2
Lumber and building materials	−21.2	+6.7
Hardware and light tools	−4.2	+36.0
Commercial and farm supplies:		
Farm and dairy supplies	−30.8	−17.7
Feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock	+.3	+24.8
Office, school, and store supplies	−23.7	−3.3
Printing and stationery supplies	−1.8	+19.0
Autos and equipment:		
Motor vehicles	−63.0	−54.4
Service stations, auto supplies	−14.9	+16.4
Miscellaneous:		
Fuel and ice	+22.8	+50.7
Second-hand stores	+19.8	+48.7
Mortuary, cemetery supplies	+17.7	+36.4
Industrial supplies	+1.7	+4.9
Unclassified	+18.8	+312.6
Total	+9.6	+36.5

Retail stores and retail sales in California and the United States, 1939

Type of business	Per capita retail sales		Average sales per store	
	California	United States	California	United States
Food	$115	$78	$27,577	$18,134
General stores	60	49	128,527	71,984
Clothing	34	25	29,967	30,468
Furniture, radios, etc.	23	13	34,776	32,810
Automotive	66	42	102,196	92,275
Filling stations	36	22	15,914	11,670
Lumber and building materials	33	21	40,839	34,483
Eating and drinking places	44	27	13,040	11,527
Drug stores	17	12	34,726	26,985
Other stores	40	32	15,006	19,588
Total	468	321	28,354	23,748

These figures are based on Census of Business, Retail Trade, 1939, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Significance of VE–Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, historic November 11, 1918, brought forth a wild, spontaneous and victorious celebration throughout our Nation. Every town and hamlet, every home, ceased its labors to join in impromptu revelry. We won a victory? No; only a temporary military victory, when we thought it was the victory that was going to prevent all future wars.

VE–day—Victory in Europe Day—should inspire us all to renewed efforts to bring about VP–day—Victory in the Pacific. Let us build and work unceasingly for that glorious, victorious day. When that day comes, it is my prayer that all nations of the world will unite in a determined effort to live in Christian

brotherhood, and to the end that no more will the youth of the world be driven to slaughter.

Unless we create a permanent world peace, the next war will destroy all civilization. Again we have crossed the terrible abyss of war and we have lost multitudes of the flower of youth in its deep unfathomed chasm of despair.

I have every hope and faith that we can, we must, unite to prevent another recurrence of this unspeakable slaughter and suffering. The nations of the world can and, I pray, will, bridge the chasm of war.

I close with a poem that seems to me very fitting at this very particular hour of our national history, by Will Allen Dromgoole:

THE BRIDGE BUILDER

An old man going on a lone highway
Came at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm vast and wide and steep,
With waters rolling cold and deep.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream had no fears for him;
But he turned when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here.
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way.
You've crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at eventide?"

The builder lifted his old gray head,
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
The chasm that was as nought to me
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim—
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as the time approaches for the consideration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—with further tariff reduction proposals—we are deeply impressed by the growing alarm expressed by labor and industry throughout the Nation.

Today I bring to your attention the protest of the glass and pottery industry of West Virginia, supported by sound argument.

West Virginia, perhaps, produces more pottery and glass than any other State in the Nation, and we have some of the Nation's largest plants. Our first duty is to our own labor and industry.

This statement is signed by the following factories which employ 1,300 men and women with an annual pay roll of $2,000,000: The Viking Glass Co., New Martinsville, W. Va.; the Paden City Glass Manufacturing Co. and the Paden City Pottery Co., both of Paden City, W. Va.:

A DUTY FOR EVERY CITIZEN OF WEST VIRGINIA INTERESTED IN THE POTTERY, CHINA, AND GLASS INDUSTRY

Fanciful dreams of the Utopia-like post-war world may turn into a fitful nightmare, for many Tyler and Wetzel County citizens unless we do our part to stop the vague planning of many theorists who are advancing plans to be incorporated into legislation, well-meaning though those plans may be.

While it may be the duty of the United States to aid the down-trodden nations to regain their position in the world economy, it is certainly not our duty to do so at the expense of our own workers who have for generations put their effort into the building of this Nation.

One of the dreams of the post-war planners is to lower, and in some cases, abolish, tariff barriers so that merchandise may be imported duty free in some instances and at greatly reduced rates on others.

For practical reasons best known to those who are directly concerned, this will have an adverse economic effect which will make itself felt in the life of every citizen of Tyler and Wetzel Counties, W. Va.

The danger to Tyler and Wetzel Counties from this angle is very real and concrete and should stir every citizen in this community to action before it is too late. This danger must be recognized now, and dealt with before it gets beyond the influence of the people most greatly concerned.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, Democrat, of North Carolina, on March 16, introduced a bill known as H. R. 2652, which would extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1945. This bill authorizes tariff reductions of 50 percent below the January 1, 1945, level on duties already lowered by 50 percent under the Trade Agreements Act. A 50 percent reduction would mean a 75 percent cut from the rates established in the Tariff Act of 1930.

This is a serious threat to American industry, especially manufacturers of glass tableware, china, pottery, and earthenware.

West Virginia is the center of the American pottery and glass industry and it perhaps produces more pottery and glass than any other State in the Union. Here in West Virginia are located some of the largest pottery and glass plants in this country.

The radical tariff reductions proposed by the bill introduced by Congressman DOUGHTON mean fewer employment opportunities for the American potter and glass worker and smaller pay checks. When we import low-wage goods, we export jobs. American pottery and glass manufacturers can not compete with the low wages paid in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Belgium, England and Portugal. The threat of foreign competition is greater today than it has ever been. Innumerable potters and glass workers from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Germany have infiltrated into South America and Mexico. Many new plants have been started. The labor rates paid in South America and in Mexico are so low that even the existing tariffs do not provide adequate protection for the American manufacturer.

The disastrous effect of tariff reductions upon the American pottery and glass industry can readily be discerned through the effects of the Czechoslovakian trade agreements, the effective date of which was April 16, 1938.

Every citizen of West Virginia should oppose the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

Many of the employees of the pottery and glass industry own their own homes, have established their roots here and intend to remain here. But, if their means of livelihood is taken from them because tariff barriers are removed, they will be forced to market their skills elsewhere, or enter the labor market at a lower figure. This will not be good for our counties.

It is inconceivable that any citizen of West Virginia would want to see this situation come to pass, and that they would fail to exert the small amount of effort required to do their part in protecting this industry and themselves.

Dedication and Opening of the New Woodrow Wilson House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels on the occasion of the opening and dedication of the new Woodrow Wilson House, 45 East Sixty-fifth Street, New York City, on April 17, 1945, and also a statement by Mr. Arthur Sweetser, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, on the same occasion.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. ARTHUR SWEETSER, PRESIDENT OF THE WOODROW WILSON FOUNDATION

Today, as we meet for what was to have been the simple and informal opening of the new Woodrow Wilson House, we stand in the shadow of an immense tragedy.

A second great President of the United States has just given his life that the governments and peoples of the world may live in peace and order.

As history takes on perspective, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt seem destined to be ever more closely linked. Both were elected to the highest office in the gift of the American people. Both led their Nation to victory in a world war. Both became mankind's leading proponent of a world association for peace and justice. Both sacrificed their lives that war may pass from civilized society.

It seems strangely symbolic that this permanent Woodrow Wilson House should have been scheduled for dedication just at the moment of Franklin Roosevelt's passing.

It also seems profoundly appropriate.

Woodrow Wilson was the first man in history to convert the world's yearning for peace from mere aspiration and hope to an actual, juridical association embracing at its zenith 59 of the nations of the world.

It was not his responsibility, nor the responsibility of the mechanism he helped construct, that a second world war came upon mankind. He had laid the broad lines well and truly, he had provided the ways and means; but the governments and peoples of the world were not yet sufficiently alert to give them the necessary vitality. It is essential to the future to understand this basic fact.

President Roosevelt took up the heritage amidst a second world war. He built strongly and wisely on the experience of his former leader and on his own instinctive judgment. The foundation he put in place at Dumbarton Oaks seems certain to be embodied in international acceptance at San Francisco.

The lives and the ideals of these two great leaders seem curiously interlocked and intertwined. President Wilson made Mr. Roosevelt his Assistant Secretary of the Navy and gave him the opportunity for the experience which served him so well in his own Presidency. When President Wilson was exhausted by his efforts at Paris and at home to secure acceptance of the League of Nations, Mr. Roosevelt became a candidate for Vice President on a platform centering on the League, and later largely organized and became first president of the foundation bearing his former chief's name. The first representative of the United States to be accredited to the League of Nations reached Geneva on the very day of Woodrow Wilson's death, just as this permanent Woodrow Wilson House is being dedicated amidst the emotion of President Roosevelt's death and on the same day that the first special train is leaving Washington for San Francisco to complete, along the lines laid down by President Roosevelt, the conception of world organization proposed by President Wilson. And it is symbolic, too, that as the Presidency passed from President Roosevelt's hands, the new President should have taken the oath of office immediately under a portrait of Woodrow Wilson.

Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt have left us a great heritage and a great challenge. To our country has fallen the supreme honor of having produced the two statesmen who, at the end of two world wars, led the world's battle for peace. We faltered last time and slipped helplessly into a second world war. It is our heavy responsibility this time to complete what they have so well designed and to give the world some reasonable hope for peace.

Victory is possible on one stern condition. The pigmies will come out of hiding again when the war danger is past, as they did before, and attempt to disintegrate these high ideals through prejudice, partisanship, distrust of our allies, and small-mindedness, appealing to our fatigue, our impatience, and any other corroding emotion they can discover. The fight may be rough.

Let us this time be forewarned and vigilant. Criticism and constructive suggestions are desirable, have indeed been urged by the Government. Let us, however, keep our perspective and ruthlessly resist anything which will make us fritter away the fruits of our victory in this war as we did those of the last war.

God has given us a second chance, even those of us who were crushed last time. We owe it to the joint memory of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt to take the solemn obligation never to relax till we fulfill the chance. Day in and day out, almost every hour of the day, we can each of us add our bit to complete the work to which these two greatest of our countrymen gave their lives.

This would, I am sure, be their deepest hope, and for us of the Foundation, it is a command. I hold in my hand a letter from President Roosevelt which says:

"I am delighted to learn of the splendid progress the Woodrow Wilson Foundation is making. This is just the time to renew its activities."

Let that, indeed, be our legacy from the late President of the United States and the first president of the foundation spontaneously created by over 200,000 American citizens in honor of a previous President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson.

And now I have both the honor and the pleasure to introduce to you the men who more nearly than anyone in the world is a link between these two great men—the only surviving member of President Wilson's original Cabinet, who served him as Secretary of the Navy for 8 years, and who was in turn served by Franklin Delano Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and later appointed by President Roosevelt as his Ambassador to Mexico—the Honorable Josephus Daniels.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Man proposes. God disposes. This occasion was planned as a joyous celebration of the formal opening of the Woodrow Wilson Shrine dedicated to advancing universal peace. In the providence of God, it has also been converted into a solemn memorial to the noblest champion of the outlawry of war whose vision and courage and masterly strategy have highly advanced the nations toward a permanent pact of peace.

At the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it is but truth to say that all the peoples of the earth who loved liberty are today "like Niobe, all tears." Wherever there are men and women, particularly those who have not enjoyed a fair share of their toil and been blessed with full equality, the feeling is universal in the voiced expression coming up from hill and plain: "We have lost our best friend." In their hearts, they echo Walt Whitman's immortal lines:

"O Captain, my Captain, our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weathered every rack, the prize we sought is won,
The port is near, the bells I hear, the peoples all exalting,
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring,
But O heart, heart, heart! O the bleeding drops of red
Where on the deck my Captain lies, fallen cold and dead.
O Captain, my Captain! rise up and hear the bells!
Rise up. For you the flag is flung, for you the bugle trills."

In devotion to bringing about a warless world, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt are linked for all time as the Elijah and Elisha of this century. In the fullness of time, after years of disillusionment, if the younger man had been asked his heart's desire, Franklin Roosevelt would have said to his chieftain of World War I: "I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me." In the months when Roosevelt was drawing up the blueprints of the first fruits of victory, the peace-hungry men and women of the universe have said of him, as sons of the prophets aforetime said: "The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha."

In this hour of universal mourning, coupled with consecration to the cause they incarnated, the similarity of their objective of international brotherhood in the lives and aspirations of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt is well nigh perfect. Unlike in background and in their approach to their high duties and the methods of attainment, their master passion for peace was identical.

Both loved peace and hated war and warmongers. It is history that until the Kaiser's laying off the lanes of the sea, denying our fundamental devotion to freedom of the seas, and murdering Americans traveling on lawful missions, Wilson left no stone unturned to keep his country out of war. In like manner until the day of infamy at Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt exhausted every effort to prevent the spread of the flames. He pointed out to Hitler and Mussolini the fate of men who sought by force to destroy the sovereignty of other nations and despoil their people. He never desisted in seeking to avoid the holocaust that came to curse the world until Americans were dastardly murdered without any declaration of war and the Axis Powers set out on a policy of world domination. And then in 1941, as in 1917, this peace-loving country could do no otherwise than join with all free peoples to repel the enemies of democracy.

In the years of disillusionment that followed the rejection of the League of Nations, Franklin Roosevelt as president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, was mindful of Wilson's spirit of prophecy as he said in 1919:

"I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations do not concert the methods by which to prevent it.

"I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terrors of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face the next time. What the Germans used were toys compared with what would be used in the next war."

We did not concert to prevent the next war, and it fell to Franklin Roosevelt as Commander in Chief to direct the greater war successfullly against the incomparably greater terror than that of 1917–1919.

On the day of infamy, which brought the United States in this war, Roosevelt must have recalled and been influenced by what Wilson said in 1919:

"If Germany should ever attempt that (world conquest) again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not propose to stand off and see murder done. We do not propose to be champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes."

Animated by a like high resolve, Roosevelt summoned America to arms as the champion of liberty and by masterly strategy made certain that liberty could not be destroyed.

The parallel between Wilson and Roosevelt and their faith continued until the end. Not long before the close of his life, broken in body but not in spirit, seeking to remove doubts of an old friend, Wilson said:

"Do not trouble about the things we fought for. They are sure to prevail. They are only delayed."

And with that quaintness which gave charm to all his sayings, he added:

"And I will make this concession to Providence. It may come in a better way than we proposed."

There breathed the same confidence and wisdom (was it divine illumination?) in Roosevelt's last written speech which, alas, he did not live to deliver. He wrote:

"Let me assure you that my hand is the steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move more firmly into the task, knowing that you—millions and millions of you—are joined with me in the resolve to make this work endure.

"The work, my friends, is peace, more than an end of this war—an end to the beginnings of all wars; yes, an end, forever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the difference between governments by the mass killing of peoples.

"Today as we move against the terrible scourge of war, as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world, the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straightedge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

These were the last words touching the master passion of his life. He hoped with his steadier hand he could direct the immortal document that would make an end to the terrible scourge of war. It was not to be. The strain of responsibility heavier than ever weighed on a world leader had taken its toll. The brain that had been overtaxed was worn out. His steadier hand will not sign the covenant of peace. But his spirit will direct the counsels and guide the text as others complete the unfinished task. It is for

us, the living, to consecrate ourselves to the achievement of the goal to which he gave the last full measure of devotion.

There are other parallels that will make Wilson and Roosevelt go down the ages as the foremost apostles of peace. As Wilson entered World War No. 1, he declared: "There is no hate in our heart for the German people." Two days after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt said: "We are in the midst of a war not for vengeance."

No hate cankered the soul of these greatest leaders even in the conflict of the wars they directed.

It was my privilege to be comrade and shipmate with and to work with and under these two apostles of liberty and peace. Their names are inseparably enshrined as the prophets of a world when all battle flags will be furled. It is my profound conviction that no two men have lived and been called to world leadership with such confident faith that war is an anachronism and could be avoided. May their holy faith light the world to the realization of the goal of the Prince of Peace.

THE KEY PRESENTED

Presenting the key to the Woodrow Wilson house to Mrs. Wilson, Mr. Daniels said:

"As a disciple of your distinguished husband, I am honored in the name of the foundation to present you the key to the house where the ideals of Woodrow Wilson are enshrined.

"I bring you the assurance that all Wilsonians hold you in affection and admiration because they know you shared the faith of your beloved husband, because you were his full partner in all things and keep alive in your heart and in your devotion the light that we all believe will soon illumine the whole world. He knew, and you know, and we know, that 'God's fruit of justice ripens slow' and that 'we must wait.'

"If it be given to those who have gone before to know what transpires on this sphere, we know his spirit hovers over us, gladdened by the near approach of the full realization of his great dream."

River Basin Authorities and the New Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "River Basin Authorities and the New Community," delivered by Hon. Leland Olds, Vice Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, before the Washington Academy of Sciences, at Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1945.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate on the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $182.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I am going to talk about our river basins and how their planned development can contribute to the growth of a well-balanced rural-industrial civilization, a mosaic of regional cultures which will enrich the entire national being and prove the enormous material and spiritual potentialities of democracy.

And I would like very humbly to dedicate what I have to say to one of the great leaders of all times who has just passed from our midst, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His spirit will always live in the modern cooperative river-basin communities which will increasingly give form to the common life of the people, not only in this country but in many lands. From the day when he first took the oath of office as Governor of New York State, such river-basin programs as that which he saw come to fruition in the Tennessee Valley were an important element in his conception of the new world which he was building.

In order to approach the question with the right perspective, I want to combine the thought of a congressional leader who has played an important part in river-basin legislation with that of an Irish poet whose book, The National Being, expresses more fully than any that I know the basic philosophy which must guide these programs.

On May 8, 1944, Representative WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Flood-Control Committee, reported that year's flood-control bill to the House. His speech reviewed the long vistas of history in which great civilizations of the past in China, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere have controlled floods and harnessed rivers to make them among the most important servants of man. He said:

"Rivers are among nature's best contributions to the progress of man. But man must supplement nature. Impediments to navigation must be removed. Canals must be constructed, channels must be deepened, harbors must be kept open, and barriers must be removed. Transportation by water is the cheapest form of transportation, and the denser the population the greater the need for cheap transportation.

"Rivers have always contributed to the advancement of mankind. The lack of navigable rivers has hindered the development of many countries. Cities in ancient and modern times located along great rivers have grown and prospered.

"Rivers have served man in the past. They have molded peoples, and they have contributed to progress. In the future, as in the past, rivers will make nations great.

"Rivers interest me. They fascinate me. They have always influenced the course of civilization. They have a character of their own. They flow through the years and through the lands, they flow across civilization. They make history. They bring life, and they bring destruction. They are friends or they may be enemies of man. Man himself makes the final choice."

The Irish poet, George Russell, whose pen name was Æ, conceived of each people as engaged in the great task of building a civilization. He understood that a great civilization must rest on a spiritual base, on national ideals, and that democracy requires that all the people join in the discussion and creation of those ideals.

Æ saw that the building of a great civilization must be related to the divine order of the universe, and that this involves two things: freedom of the individual and cooperation with one's fellow men—the developing of a sense of identity of interest, of common purposes, of interdependence and solidarity. These combined, he saw as constituting real democracy.

Looking over the great reaches of history, he saw that absorption of life in great cities is the danger that threatens the modern state, that a civilization not rooted in healthy rural life, dies. And then, looking ahead to the building of a civilization as a task like the slow rearing of a medieval cathedral, he said:

"The creation of a rural civilization is the greatest need of our time. It may not come in our day, but we can lay the foundations of it, preparing the way for the true prophet when he will come. The fight now is not to bring the people back to the land, but to keep those who are on the land contented, happy, and prosperous. And we must begin by organizing them to defend what is left to them; to take back, industry by industry, what was stolen from them."

Æ saw in cooperation a vast turning heavenward in which men would become habituated to the thought of common action for the common good. He saw it as the cure for the conflict of interests which destroys the unity of nations, as creating that sense of identity of interest which is the basis of citizenship. He goes on:

"Our great nation-states have grown so large, so myriad are their populations, so complicated are their interests, that most of them really feel no sense of brotherhood with each other. We have yet to create within our great nation-states social and economic organizations which will make this identity of interest real and evident and not seem merely a metaphor, as it does to most people today."

The challenge of the river basin authority movement today comes to us in this setting and in these terms. It offers the generations now alive their counterpart of the work of the generations of pioneers who built the foundations of our America and passed on. For the building of such a civilization as can be achieved through this new instrumentality of democracy is not only the noblest but also the most adventurous of undertakings. And let me add that it was the warp and woof of the vision of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

For it is the valley authority idea that is important. It is the comprehensive development of the resources of a river basin—control of floods, storage of water, irrigation of land, conservation of soil, improvement of navigation, generation of power, etc.—under the leadership of a single agency which stimulates the people of the valley to cooperate in the use of those resources to promot the general good. It is the flowering of that idea which holds promise for the future. And I am convinced that the quality of our culture and civilization will depend in great measure upon our attitude toward the resources of our valleys—upon whether our approach is one of cooperatoin or exploitation.

Let us look for a moment at the Tennessee Valley Authority as the prototype of the river basin authorities of the future. Let us look at it as a new instrument of democracy which may enable us to solve some of the pressing economic and social problems of our modern technological age, problems which, if they go unsolved, will wreck our civilization.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is essentially a regional, not a national agency. Its management is located in and has identified itself with the region which it serves. It is vested with appropriate powers and the flexible corporate type of organization necessary to enable it to assist the people of the region in marshalling their resources. In the language of its 1941 report:

"On the watershed the Authority is enabling the people to reclaim and revitalize many thousands of acres of their forest and agricultural lands. In the laboratory, intensive research is uncovering new opportunities for taking advantage of native resources in the everyday business of earning a living. Working with the people and through their institutions, the T. V. A. is perfecting new cooperative techniques for solving region-wide problems that overrun established political boundaries."

In short, although the Nation provided the capital for starting the T. V. A., and incidentally has already been well repaid in the tremendous contribution which it has made

to the war effort, the enterprise belongs essentially to the people of the region. It is their agency for coordinated planning of the use of their resources. It is enabling them to lift their economic life to new levels which will assure higher standards of living for farmers and wage earners, sustained prosperity for local business institutions, and an ever-widening opportunity for the oncoming youth of the valley.

And here I want to amplify somewhat the essential characteristics of such a regional authority as a new instrument of democracy. For we must distinguish it carefully, on the one hand, from mere coordination of the water resource development functions of several great Federal agencies and, on the other hand, from the administrator type of organization representing a single great Federal department.

When Congress creates an authority on the T. V. A. model, it actually sets up a regional development corporation with a wholly public purpose, which goes to work subject only to the annual check-up of its owners, the American people, through their Representatives in Congress. The directors of the corporation, men in the field, are given the power of decision, and provision is made for the active participation of the people of the region through their local institutions. Thus the public corporation is a device for regional management in terms of broad national conservation policies. It reflects the unity of nature in a great river basin. It has roots in the valley and its success depends upon stimulating the activity and sense of responsibility of the people of the valley for their own economic and social well-being. In short, the unified development of the resources of the valley becomes a common purpose in which men cooperate. Thus it strengthens rather than weakens democracy.

To reiterate, such a river-basin authority is located wholly in the valley which it serves; it is autonomous; it has full responsibility for the valley program; it is free from entanglement with Government activities extraneous to the valley; it combines the necessary powers of Government with the effectiveness of a self-financing corporation; it works, not through enlargement of its own organization, but through the cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies, farm organizations, agricultural colleges, experiment stations, labor organizations, chambers of commerce, private business and cooperatives, and it is concerned with fuller and better-balanced development of the resources of the region in order to promote the economic and social well-being of the people who inhabit it.

Thus the whole tendency of this approach to river-basin development is in the direction of economic and social as well as political decentralization. In other words, it offers a way to preserve our traditional democracy by reversing the powerful trend of the past generation toward centralized control of the country's economic life by an all powerful corporate bureaucracy. This trend has been steadily substituting great monopolies for the thousands of small community business units which were truly characteristic of American free enterprise. And here I would like to quote briefly from the report, dated January 18, 1943, of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business, of which Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana is chairman. According to this report:

"The resolution establishing this committee was passed before war struck America. It was born of the realization that for several decades we had been facing a national trend toward centralization of American business and industry. Business and industrial institutions engaging in Nation-wide operations had vastly increased, and the smaller concerns with home-town control and management were disappearing through consolidation or inability to meet the monopolistic pressure and financial power of these larger institutions.

"Prior to the present war this trend caused serious alarm, and studies and efforts had been under way to stop the trend and encourage decentralization of business. It has become generally recognized in this country that small business is fundamental to our system of free competitive enterprise and that the trend we had been following would eventually lead our country to a complete abandonment of free enterprise and the building in its place of a totalitarian system like that in Germany."

It may be noted in passing that a solution of the problem which the committee is facing is of primary importance to the very life of the civilization which we are building. For the development of huge monopolistic corporations, under centralized financial control, has reversed the natural order which should govern the conduct of business enterprise—that men produce to meet their needs as consumers. The country's business is no longer seeking a just return for serving the consumer needs of the people, but is seeking maximum profits through exploitation of those needs.

This reversal of the natural balance between production and consumption has introduced the economic instability which is the greatest threat to our way of life. If our civilization is to survive, we must find a way to restore that balance, so that our young men and women, as they come out of school, can look forward to continuity of employment in the useful work of transforming the country's wealth of resources into a full life for all. And I am convinced that restoration of the balance, of the natural order of business, must begin on a local and regional basis.

We must progress from a balanced community to a balanced regional economy, and from a balanced regional economy to a balanced national economy. So, finally, we may progress to a balanced world economy in which all peoples can really cooperate to maintain peace.

This means that we must reverse the trend toward economic colonialism which has characterized the period in which our great corporations have concentrated the economic power of the country in their hands. For the small business enterprises which people are seeking to preserve are not small corporations competing in a national market but regional and local business, producing for and distributing to their neighbors, employing their neighbors and the children of their neighbors, taking their places among the country's premier small businesses, the individually operated farms, as a part of an integrated regional economy.

The economic problems which I am discussing are perhaps best set forth in a comprehensive report of the T. V. A. on regional freight rates. Although this report is concerned primarily with freight rate differentials and their effects, it reveals the nature of the economic colonialism which the river basin authority program may well bring to an end.

The report shows that, as a result of retardation of the growth of manufacturing, the South and West are far above the country-wide average in percentage of workers employed in extractive industries and corresponding below in manufacturing and trade. Needless to say, the Northeast is well above the average in manufacturing, trade, and services. In our industrial era this spells over centralization in the country's economic life.

The report shows further that the average value per ton of freight originated in the northeast was more than a fourth again as high as that of freight originated in the South and West due (1) to the fact that manufactured goods, the specialty of the northeast, are more valuable generically than nonmanufactured goods and (2) to the fact that, among the goods classified as manufactured, those originated in the northeast have an average value of $109 per ton as against $71 a ton for those originated in the South and West. The report points out that goods gain in value with each step in the progress from raw material to finished product and that manufacturing activity generates a further large fraction of the national income by creating service opportunities of many kinds—advertising, selling, financing, and insuring, as well as supplying the needs of the industrial employees.

Each step in the development of value which takes place within an area adds to the ability of the area to support population, directly through industrial employment, indirectly through the trade involved in supplying the industrial employees. Thus, where economic centralization gets started, it tends to breed more centralization which, in turn, reaches out to exploit the areas thereby relegated to the task of supplying raw materials and semimanufactured products. The T. V. A. report sees development of indigenous industry in the South and West as the solution. It says:

"For reasons to be brought out in the subsequent discussion, this solution is best designed to preserve local and regional initiative. * * * This solution will minimize disruption, promote more economical use of resources and distribution of national population; provide economic stability and occupational diversity; and, perhaps above all else, will most greatly promote the conservation of priceless resources."

Insofar as the South and West are concerned, the only alternative to the development of indigenous manufacture, with the concomitant trade and services, appears to be migration of surplus population. Such migration, the report says, cannot be accepted "unless it is proposed, without openly saying it, that the South and West be used primarily as feeders of manpower and materials to far-away industries and in their colonial function be kept much poorer than the imperial region."

To put the matter another way, dependence on raw-material production on an area or regional basis is typically associated with low per-capita income and vice versa. Thus a chart showing the 48 States, located by coordinates, representing per capita income and percentage of population engaged in the production of raw material, i. e., in agriculture, forestry, and mining reveals the colonial structure of our economy. Broadly speaking, this chart shows a concentration of manufacturing and high per capita income in the Northwestern States, with California and Washington also in the group. On the other hand, almost without exception, the States of the Southeast and of the great region extending from the Mississippi River to and including the Rocky Mountains, show an above-average dependence on agriculture, forestry, and mining, coupled with low per capita income. As Chairman David E. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, said in his address before the Business Conference on Transportation at the University of Texas in 1941:

"No one in these days can longer doubt that the community or the region that depends predominantly on the production of raw materials is a community or region of a lower standard of economic prosperity than is the community or region that is more extensively engaged in the processing and manufacturing into finished goods of these raw materials that grow in the fields or forest or are mined from within the earth. This close relation between low income and raw-material production, between high income and manufacturing, is a fact of fundamental importance that we of these disadvantaged regions must understand thoroughly, a fact upon the basis of which we must weigh our plans and fight our battles."

For rectifying of this situation, for reversing the trend toward economic centraliza-

tion and colonialism, for promoting the creation throughout all parts of our land of a well-balanced rural-industrial civilization, the development of our river basins through the instrumentality of authorities can provide a tremendous impetus. In the States where average rainfall is low, the storage of waters for irrigation will be a very important element in these programs. But, as a means of more general distribution of the benefits of modern technology, low-cost electricity as a contribution of river-basin development may well provide the key.

Such a program begins by controlling floods and conserving stream flow through reforestation and construction of dams. It raises the standards of agriculture through scientific farming with its contour plowing, use of fertilizer, cover crops, diversification, and rural electrification. It goes on to promote local and regional storage as well as processing of farm products in order to keep more of the economic value at home. It improves navigation, to create slack-water transportation of bulk commodities in and out at low rates, and assists in the development of river port facilities to serve the several areas. It promotes the development of new devices, adapted to the valley's use, and attracts private enterprise to produce these products. It offers abundance of low-cost electricity to other industries which can utilize valley resources to manufacture for the larger market. It helps to develop model communities, not only in connection with its construction activities, but also through accepting the responsibility for relocating families and reestablishing communities displaced by the construction of reservoirs.

In fact, it carries out President Roosevelt's philosophy of government which he said could be found in a quotation from another great American—Abraham Lincoln. Said Lincoln:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for the community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

The harnessing of the waters of a great river basin, the application of a unifying principle to the utilization of its resources, leadership in cooperative use of those resources to promote the highest economic and social well-being of its inhabitants are today beyond the ability of the community of people to do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. So they become the object of government acting through an agency designed to meet the need with the greatest possible dependence on the separate and individual capacities. So they become the object of government acting through an agency designed to meet the need with the greatest possible dependence on the separate and individual capacities of the people of the valley.

Let me call your attention to two or three quotations from recent Tennessee Valley Authority reports. They reflect a cooperative method involving all economic interests in the valley, which I believe must be carried much further and untimately extended to other valleys, throughout the country. Thus, I read that:

"In order to carry out a valley-wide program in private as well as public land, the T. V. A. has enlisted the cooperation of thousands of individual farmers together with that of the State institutions serving their varied needs. The farmers, selected by their neighbors, test T. V. A. fertilizers under actual farming conditions, under the technical guidance of their agricultural extension services. The tests involved making adjustments toward sustained productivity in crops, livestock, and other farm enterprises."

And again:

"In many communities neighboring test-demonstrations farm operators combine their farms into area demonstrations. In this way farmers on small watershed act together in planning readjustments otherwise not practical in respect to land use and cropping systems, livestock, and other factors."

And again:

"To encourage farm practices that will contribute directly to better living and higher income, farm implements particularly suited to this region are being devised; improved methods of processing and preserving fruits, vegetables, meats, and other marketable farm products have been developed. Through demonstrations, trade journals, and other appropriate channels, the results of these investigations are passed on to private enterprise under conditions that insure wide distribution of new wealth and new opportunity."

And finally:

"It is believed to be apparent that the problems and opportunities confronting the Authority cannot be dealt with separately by the individual efforts of the Authority or any other public or private agency. They can be dealt with successfully only if the efforts of Federal, State, and local agencies on the one hand, and those of private citizens and land owners, on the other, can be joined through a single administrative and cooperative technique. The Authority a flexible corporate body, is in a position to provide the element of unity and leadership through which separate and often times ineffectual efforts are brought together, strengthened, and employed to the best advantage of the region as a whole."

If time permitted, I could call the role of this country's rivers and suggest for each river what the multipurpose approach might be expected to offer the people of the region through which it flows to the sea. Scanning the country from the top of the Washington Monument, our swing around the compass would take in the Potomac, the Rappahannock and the Roanoke, the Yadkin-Peedee, the Santee-Congaree, the Savannah, the Altamaha, the Chattahoochee, the Alabama-Coosa, and the Tombigbee-Warrior, all serving our great Southeast; the Missouri, the White, the Arkansas, the Red, and Ouachita in the region between the Mississippi and the mountains; the Colorado and its tributaries; the rivers of the great central valley of California; the Columbia of the Northwest; the Niagara and the St. Lawrence draining the Great Lakes; the rivers of New England and the Susquehanna; the Ohio tributaries, including the Cumberland, all offer tremendous possibilities that are still untapped.

Conservation of soil, erosion control, reforestation, flood control and conservation storage, navigation, swamp drainage, irrigation, pollution control, recreation, all these values can be developed; and, in connection with them, hydroelectric power to the extent of seventy-five to one hundred million kilowatts of capacity, capable of generating from four hundred to five hundred billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy a year.

Furthermore, our greatest concentration of potential hydroelectric power is in the northwest where other energy resources like coal, oil, and natural gas are almost nonexistent. In other regions the hydro is well adapted to meeting peak-load requirements in integrated systems in which steam plant burning coal, oil, or natural gas will carry the base loads. In fact, regions in which natural gas abounds today may well find that this fuel is too valuable a chemical resource to be used even under power boilers, rendering their available hydroelectric power even more welcome.

Reduced to round figures, our river basin programs are dealing with an estimated annual loss of 3,000,000,000 tons of invaluable soil, representing nearly half a billion dollars of annual agricultural productivity; with flood damage, which in 1936 totaled half a billion dollars; with over 20,000,000 acres of fertile land that could produce crops if irrigated; with thousands of miles of waterways that could be improved for modern river transportation; and with potential hydroelectric energy equivalent to nearly twice the total electric energy today used for every purpose throughout the land. And all of these values can be realized by reversing the cycle of destruction which has resulted from approaching our river basin resources on the principle of exploitation in the interest of quick profits, the cycle which has been characterized by the slashing of forests without provision for their reproduction, by the mining of soil leading to erosion, by increasingly disastrous floods and the concomitant waste of water, by the centralization of population in great urban centers, by a rootless population wandering over the land in search of jobs which periodically vanish.

I sometimes think of the programs of control and use of our great rivers as symbolic of what we must do to restore stability to our whole economic life. For the flow of our ecnomic life swings between torrential activity of flood proportions and periods of economic drought when the grinding of wheels of industry run slow. Why? Because, just as our exploitation of forest and soil has removed many of the controls which constitute Nature's balance, so has the reversal of the natural order of business, in which enterprise serves the consumers' needs, removed the controls which stabilize our economic life.

This natural economic balance was a function of communities in which men worked together to meet their needs as consumers. It was destroyed by the exploitation of modern technology to serve the ends of those concerned only with commercial profits. The old communities were disrupted and destroyed; they ceased to have any sound economic function and so ceased also to have any social or spiritual significance. As a result, people have theorized about the possibility of new communities of national, continental, or world dimensions. But this new community of world dimensions will remain but a technological dream, without substance, unless it is composed of smaller communities in which men cooperate as neighbors.

That is where the river-basin authorities will play their part. For, by bringing technology back to a closer relationship with the soil, so that raw materials can be locally processed for local use, regionally processed for regional use, and ultimately those for which regions show unique adaptability exchanged on a national or world basis, they will restore communities. In the process of working with people of the regions to control and utilize the resources of their rivers to stabilize regional economic life at high levels, they will be restoring the natural controls which assure the harmonious working of national and regional economies.

And I might conclude with the keynote of the report of the Mississippi Valley Committee, the first great study of our river basins. On October 1, 1934, under the inspired leadership of Morris L. Cooke, the committee said:

"Planning for the use and control of water is planning for most of the basic functions of the life of the Nation. We cannot plan for water unless we also consider the relevant problems of land. We cannot plan for water and land unless we plan for the whole people. It is of little use to control rivers unless we also master conditions which make for the security and freedom of human life. * * * The need for planning arises out of the needs and desires of the people. Under the proven system of democracy no plan can be imposed upon the people. Government may inform, educate, and guide. It may mobilize resources for a common task. It cannot dictate. What must be sought is effective means of carrying out the common purpose, not only in the interest of the living generation but for the protection and enhancement of the lives of all the generations to

come. * * * We are tenants and transients on the earth. Let us hand down our heritage not only unimpaired but enriched to those who come after us."

Tonight I have tried to give you, not a technical discussion of the engineering and economic activities of river-basin authorities, but a glimpse of the possibilities of this new institution in a world of changing institutions. And, in truth, it is not altogether new, but rather a natural outgrowth or offspring of our traditional institutions, able to help us adapt our entire life to the requirements of modern technology and so to pass on, to succeeding generations in a new world, a great civilization. Such a civilization will grow ever richer in the spiritual values without which a civilization is doomed to the decay which finally destroyed every culture that ignored the harmonies of nature and so lost the vitality which comes only from the sense of oneness in the knowledge of God.

And so I want to come back to Will Whittington's concept of the river as one of the greatest factors in human life, as a great unifier, drawing men together for common use, symbolizing man's journey through this world and through eternity. I have always been impressed by the inspired words of a great Greek poet who wrote: "Full of Zeus is the city; full of Zeus is the harbor; full of Zeus are all the ways of men." If he had not been more familiar with Aegean ports than with life-giving rivers, I am sure he would have added: "Full of Zeus are the river basins." For the great cycle of replenishment, through which water falls in rain and snow on the hillsides, seeps down through the soil, forms little rivulets which join into creeks, and so into rivers, bearing fertility, carrying commerce, providing everlasting energy, finally to be lifted up to the heaven by the sun, to fall again as rain, is certainly one of the great manifestations of creative mind, of spirit.

So I urge that we adopt institutions through which we, and our children, and our children's children, may become a part of our river basins, adapting our civilization and our culture to their natural rhythms, working with them in the harmony and balance of nature itself. If we do, I feel we will rediscover freedom, the freedom which can come only through cooperative effort in accordance with the moral law.

Perhaps if more people, if all of the people, could know their rivers as personal factors in their lives, as friends; could move on their surfaces mirroring the blue sky of day or the star-spangled heavens of night; could feel the rhythms of their curves, of their flanking meadows and hills and bluffs, of their villages and cities, of their forests and fields, we would find the solution of the problems which burden the world today.

The Education of Dentists in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Education of Dentists in Wartime," published in the last issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATION OF DENTISTS IN WARTIME

The handling of dental education by the armed forces during this war has not been a happier experiment than it was in the last. The awkward blunders of the administration of the Students' Army Training Corps in World War No. 1 have been repeated in large part during World War No. 2. This possibility was foreseen as early as May 1943 by the Journal, which then pointed out the dangers.

"It seems unbelievable, but it is the sober fact, that Army and Navy officials would lay out plans for taking over dental education, reorganize and greatly modify the predental requirements and set the stage for regimentation of the dental schools without even recognizing the existence of the two agencies principally responsible for the present conduct and status of dental education.

"After all this military machinery does its work, it will transpire, we predict, that there was really no occasion or necessity for doing anything. What more do the Army and Navy want than a steady flow of well-trained dentists to meet their replacement needs? * * * Allowed to carry on their work undisturbed, the schools would have continued to enroll new classes on the present basis of admission and number with completely accelerated schedules and, with the assurance that the reasonable and tremendously important needs of the civilian population and the literal demands of the Army and the Navy would be met. All the Government needed to do was to establish a sensible working scheme for the deferment of enough bona fide high school and liberal arts college students to sustain the present enrollment in dental schools."

Government evaded this simple solution, however, to work out the more complex plan represented by the Army specialized training program and the V–12 program of the Navy. The former displayed little durability and was precipitously abandoned by its sponsors, who permitted the discharge into civilian life of approximately 250 young dentists who had been trained and maintained at Government expense. Althought a majority of these men ultimately found their way into uniform, this spectacle did not amuse the thousands of older dentists who had left established homes, families, and practices to serve their country in a time of need. The cry of the time was for younger men of combat age; yet this arbitrary program of Army officials worked directly to frustrate that need.

The Navy V–12 program, which takes in a lesser number of students, has fared better and has displayed less of the characteristic military tendency to improvise in situations that are better served by intelligent, long-range planning.

Today there are still many dental students who have had some of their training subsidized by Government and who wish to enter the armed forces. They are prevented from doing so in many instances by Army and Navy regulations governing the number of officers in the Dental Corps. It is exceedingly difficult to understand why these younger men should not be permitted to enter the armed services to replace older men on a basis of (1) length of service, (2) health, (3) age, and (4) dependents. Such simple justice can be the part of any military program even in time of war.

With all of this fancy tightrope walking through the wartime problems of dental education, there is still no program for keeping a sufficient number of young men in the dental schools of the country to provide for future needs. Under the present program, for which Selective Service must bear its share of responsibility, there will be a critical shortage of dentists after 1948, simply because the existing capacity of the country's dental schools cannot be used.

Senator ELLENDER has recognized this potential crisis and has introduced into the Senate a bill (S. 637) to defer or release from active service not more than 3,500 predental students and not more than 1,750 dental students for each year of the training course. The objectives of this bill were endorsed as early as 1943 by the American Association of Dental Schools and by the Council on Dental Education and the ad interim committee of the board of trustees of the American Dental Association.

The Ellender bill also has similar provisions for premedical and medical students. It is to be hoped that with the support of both professions, the basic provisions of this bill will soon be enacted into legislation. Dental societies and dental schools should do everything in their power to urge its passage, in order to prevent a critical shortage of health profession personnel in the years immediately to follow.

Obligation of a Home-Front Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Benjamin E. Neal, president of the "I Am an American" Foundation, a statement in which he calls my attention to the program, "My Obligation as a Home-Front Soldier," supported by all members of that organization. I ask unanimous consent to have the obligation printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TILL THE LAST SHOT IS FIRED!"—MY OBLIGATION AS A HOME-FRONT SOLDIER

I am in the army of home-front soldiers: a grand army of 100,000,000, engaged in supplying the sinews for victory—on farms, in workshops, offices, stores, schools, churches and homes of America.

My first enlistment (in the war effort) will expire only when the last remnant of military opposition has been wiped from the face of the earth; my second enlistment (in the struggle for prosperity and permanent peace) is for life-time service.

I realize that absolute victory, to be won at the earliest possible moment, depends on me as well as upon our loved ones who are still sacrificing their lives for God and country.

I want to live each day so that in future years I may look back at my service record and find that I did my best to help prevent the needless loss of a single American life, right up to the very hour of unconditional surrender on the last battle front.

I hear America calling; calling me to duty until the last short is fired; calling me to join with men and women of good will wherever they may be found, in the never-ceasing struggle to banish war, increase prosperity and enshrine the Golden Rule.

I will answer the call: I will carry my full share of the load in the Nation-wide crusade

to speed the coming of the day of enduring peace on earth.

My heart is in America and America is in my heart! I am an American home-front soldier!

Bread, Not Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bread, Not Stone" published in the Stars and Stripes of April 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAD, NOT STONE

We hear about a few GI's sitting at the peace conference as advisers. Instead of such window dressing why not give something real, namely, the vote, to all GI's and all Americans between 18 and 21?

If a man's old enough to fight, he's old enough to vote. If we're serious about a lasting peace, let's let those whose lives are at stake help elect the people to write it.

Some 7,000,000 young Americans between 18 and 21 are now voteless. They are old enough to drive a car, an airplane, or a tank. They are old enough to go into business or farming or a war plant. They are old enough to marry and raise a family. They have had the benefits of the best education the best nation in the world can provide. Surely they are old enough to vote.

Let each State, therefore, and the United States—do as Georgia has already done—reduce the voting age to 18. Let's give our youth the ballot, not bunting. Bread, not a stone.

CAPT. HENRY H. COLLINS, JR.,
French Truck Group.

They Shall Not March Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "They Shall Not March Alone: The Spirit of the American Chaplain," written by Rev. Grover C. Schwartz, grand historian of the Societé des Quarante Hommes et Huit Chevaux, Grand Voiture of Mississippi, published in the Mississippi Veteran of March 1945. Reverend Schwartz, by the way, was a chaplain in World War No. 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY SHALL NOT MARCH ALONE—THE SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN CHAPLAIN

(By Chaplain Schwartz)

When this vast global war broke like a dangerous and devastating tropical storm upon the American people and our Government began to mobilize its millions of fighting men to meet this grave crisis, the churches of America began to mobilize their young men also and during the present war our American churches have sent the cream of their clergy to minister to the men in national service.

The clergymen enrolled have been young men, strong men, men of attractive personality, men who were ready to serve or to die, men who thoroughly knew their trade and who could bring the maximum of comfort, consolation, and courage to those in any area of service. The cry of the church was—"They shall not march alone," and you will realize that the church has kept its word when I tell you that there are now 10,243 chaplains in the Army and Navy and this does not include hundreds of other clergymen who have already served and have been discharged because of bodily ailments or service-acquired disabilities.

Our brave chaplains, who have served and are now serving, possessed in abundance that qualification which is the mark of the good soldier in every land and age, and that is, they were not afraid or unwilling to die for their country and their cause, and among the thousands of brave young men, who have died during the present war, have been several score of clergymen, who wore the khaki and esteemed it an honor to lay down their young lives that out of their sacrifice might come a glorious daybreak for those who dwelt in darkness.

Out of the many high moments of heroism and devotion of the present war this incident comes to bless and inspire. In February 1943, the S. S. *Dorchester* was torpedoed off Greenland and it carried a large number of American personnel and troops. When the vessel was struck and those on board knew that they must go over the side there was momentary panic on the ship, but the four Army chaplains present went among the men—comforting and encouraging them and calming their fears. The last duty that these brave clergymen performed was to give out lifebelts to the troops. When all the lifebelts had been distributed and still men were unprovided with these safety devices—these four chaplains took off their own life belts and gave them to men not prepared to meet death. And when the boat went down the survivors caught a vision of the four standing with linked arms as they went into the presence of their God.

Strangely enough these four chaplains represented the three great religious bodies in America—Chaplain Clark V. Poling, of New York State, and Chaplain George L. Fox, of Massachusetts, were Protestants; Chaplain John P. Washington, of New Jersey, was a Catholic; while Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, of Washington, D. C., was Jewish. When the waters closed over their heads I can imagine Father Neptune and his royal court standing at salute as they received these heroic men as honored guests into that mystic kingdom.

Yes, American chaplains are dying for our country on many fronts, others are receiving painful wounds at their post of duty, some are missing in action, while others languish in the prison camps of our enemies. To those who have fallen we give a farewell salute of honor—to those who survive we offer the consolation of our prayers to God for their recovery and deliverance.

The table which I now insert contains the latest, official information from our War and Navy Departments regarding the service, the sacrifices, and the honors which like priceless jewels adorn their service record:

Our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps chaplains

	Army	Navy	Total
Chaplains in service	7,800	2,443	10,243
Died in service	88	16	104
Wounded in action	105	22	127
In hands of the enemy	38	5	43
Missing in action	1	1	2
Decorations, Army: 384 chaplains have received these decorations	459		459
Decorations, Navy:			
Chaplains decorated		43	43
Chaplains who have received eloquent letters of praise and commendation from their superior officers		8	8

Surely this is another instance where figures speak more eloquently than words.

On July 29 of last year the United States Army celebrated the one hundred and sixty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the chaplaincy in our armed forces, for it was on July 29, 1775, that Congress made the first formal recognition of a legal status for chaplains in the armed forces. For over 169 years men of loyalty and devotion have poured out their lives in service to our troops at home and in the field. The church in every generation has kept its pledged word—they shall not march alone. When it was necessary for a body of men to march through the valley of death the church has sent its holy men to march with them. When men have writhed in their wounds and pain, some chaplain has blessed them by his ministrations. The chaplain's gentle voice has committed their soul to God and their body to the earth. Often the chaplain has shared their captivity among their enemies and when peace came the chaplain has accompanied them home and by his example and precept has inspired them to build a new civilization upon the ruins of the one that has fallen.

All honor to the American chaplain; we uncover before him and our hearts beat out a symphony of homage in his name.

Control and Treatment of Infantile Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the control and treatment of infantile paralysis delivered by Sister Kenny before the Illinois State Legislature.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the onset I would like to convey to you my grateful thanks for the honor conferred upon me by this invitation to address you this 1st day of May 1945.

In order to dispel the idea that I emerged from the Australian bushland with some unknown and untried idea about a disease that

had baffled medical science from the time of the Pharaohs down to the present day, I will give a brief outline of the incentive of my visit to the United States. In a July, 1939, number of the Journal of the American Medical Association there appeared a statement presented by Dr. Kristian Hansson, Hospital for Ruptured and Crippled, New York, reading: "Nowhere in the world is there any known treatment for the disease infantile paralysis in the acute stage of the disease." Dr. Louis Schwartz, of Paris, sent me this information to the city of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, drawing my attention to the fact that I had treated his own daughter, Betty, in the acute stage with outstanding satisfactory results in the year 1938. At this time I was granted the privilege of treating cases of infantile paralysis in the acute stage of the disease in the Brisbane General Hospital. In November 1939, the medical observers who were called in to pass judgment made the following statement:

"Sister Kenny has evolved a satisfactory and commendable treatment for the disease infantile paralysis which holds out more hope for recovery than any other method known anywhere.

"Signed: Dr. Alan Fletcher, M. D., M. S., F. R. C. S. (Eng.), Sydney, New South Wales; Dr. Norman Little, M. D., F. R. C. S. (Eng.), Consultant Orthopedic Surgeon, Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, New South Wales; Dr. Allan Fletcher Roberts, M. S., F. R. C. S., Orthopedic Surgeon, Newcastle, New South Wales; and supported by Prof. H. J. Wilkinson, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia."

It was at this stage I was advised to come to the United States, owing to the fact that the disease is more prevalent in this country than any other. A group of medical men wrote to Dr. Melvin Henderson concerning this visit and, also, interviewed the Government and myself, and being aware of the international reputation of the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, sought the good offices of the above-mentioned member (Dr. Henderson) of the Institute to introduce me to the medical world of the United States. It was also thought wise that my visit should be an official one; consequently, arrangements were made, and the premier of my State, the Honorable W. Forgan Smith, M. L. A., upon the advice of the United States Consul wrote to Mr. Basil O'Connor, bringing before his notice the following items: First, explaining that I did not seek personal gain, and that in Australia I had given my services entirely voluntarily and, I quote, "has neither sought nor accepted any monetary reward from the Government or from patients." It was then further explained to Mr. O'Connor, I quote: "New cases which have occurred since she has had access to patients in public hospitals have been treated in the acute stage by her system with outstanding results. She has also had outstanding results in her treatment of cases in the convalescent stage, of which a large number have been treated by her system. Her results have been particularly outstanding in early convalescent cases." In further quoting, the last two paragraphs of this letter read:

"Miss Kenny's mission to the United States of America is to obtain scientific assistance to complete her research and in the compilation of a book, which she has been urged to publish, setting out by description and illustration the Kenny system of treating the disease in the acuate stage. She does not seek personal gain. Her mission is being undertaken on the advice of a group of medical men. The Government has associated itself with her mission by providing transport for her and an attendant to America and for their subsequent return to Australia.

"My Government has been much impressed with the results of the Kenny system, particularly with the success of the system in the treatment of the disease in the acute stage. This success opens up the prospect that much greater improvement can be made in treating the disease than has previously been accomplished. Miss Kenny has, in the opinion of the Queensland Government and that of many medical men, made a notable contribution to the cause of humanity. Accordingly, I commend Miss Kenny to the good offices of the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis."

I would consider that this official introduction to your country from the Premier of my State and the statements contained therein should be sufficient evidence to let you know that any previous evidence submitted by any doctor or group of doctors was submitted in ignorance of the fact that there was in deed and truth a treatment in the acute stage which was worthy and satisfactory. However, for some unexplainable reason, Mr. O'Connor advised me that no one was anxious to investigate and that I had better return to Australia.

I was en route to Australia when Dr. Henderson, Mayo Clinic, introduced me to Drs. Wallace Cole and George Williamson, of St. Paul, and in the course of time I met Drs. Miland Knapp and John Pohl, Minneapolis. All of these gentlemen asked advice about patients whom they informed me had had the best treatment the United States could offer and were, as they expressed it, "getting no better fast." This was several months from the onset. Deformities were corrected and function restored in certain muscle groups. Thus it was through this last chance being given before I boarded the boat for my return to Australia and the honest purpose of four medical men that the United States was saved from a national disaster in the years 1943–44.

I have given you a brief outline of my arrival in the United States and of my reception. It is now necessary to see what happens in the years that followed on. For 30 years I had seen the words I have spoken, twisted and misconstrued. I have seen my life's work again and again broken. I have gathered the threads together and fanned the dying flame. As already explained, I have taken what was supposed irremediable deformities and lifeless muscles and straightened the one and strengthened the other and have seen the light of happiness replace the look of despair in the eyes of the youth and maiden of the United States. I have seen parents weep for joy. I have felt and known the prayers of the people.

These questions may be asked—What was this gift? Was it a new type of therapy? A treatment? Or something deeper still unknown to science? These questions may best be answered by the reports of unbiased medical men and the findings of science. The one you will find in the many presentations where an opportunity was given for demonstration before the dread disease had done its damage. The other you may find in the book, entitled "The Importance of Research." The first American report was presented by Dr. Wallace Cole, professor of orthopedic surgery, University of Minnesota; and Dr. Miland Knapp, professor of physical therapy, University of Minnesota. This report states, amongst other things, that pain was overcome in a few days and the patient was much more comfortable than ever before. However, the most important of all the statements was the statement that treatment was given for symptoms and conditions previously unrecognized which were just the opposite to those generally accepted throughout the world. As a matter of fact, that part of the human anatomy previously thought normal was the part to receive special attention and banish pain. In this presentation I will omit the series of reports sent in by medical men whose associations were either negligible or nonexistent.

The next important report came from the city of Winnipeg, Canada, and states, amongst other things, that this revolutionary treatment demanded that the disease be given reassessment, and stated further that the Kenny method had proven good, indeed, better than good, the best of which they had ever experienced, and added: "We (doctors) and our patients owe Miss Kenny a great debt. We gladly acknowledge it." It was also admitted that deformities had been combated in every case by the newer method for the newer concept.

The White Memorial Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif., presents its experience, which is coincident with Winnipeg.

The Los Angeles Children's Hospital asks the following question: "Do you know that before the adoption by hospitals of the Sister Kenny treatment for infantile paralysis, 85 percent of the victims of this dread disease never recovered? Under the Sister Kenny treatment, only 15 percent of the cases are incurable. Do you realize the 70 percent who were previously doomed to the life of a cripple can now look forward to normal life?"

The president of the hospital in Seattle, amongst other things, states: "Through the use of the Kenny treatment all 87 infantile paralysis patients treated in the year 1944 walked out of the hospital. The length of hospital treatment here now averages less than 3 months, whereas previously it was a year or more."

We shall now take the reports on this disease prior to my arrival and up to date. It was acknowledged by Dr. Philip Wilson, medical superintendent, Hospital for Ruptured and Crippled, in the year 1940, that one-third of the crippling of childhood was caused through the disease infantile paralysis (New York Times, May 1940). This referred to all seven types of crippling, including accident. It was acknowledged in the Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery that a higher percentage of cases suffering from the after-effects of this disease presented themselves at the Shriners' Hospital, St. Louis, October 1941, for treatment than that of any other malady.

Dr. Frank R. Ober, former president of the American Orthopedic Association, assistant dean in charge of courses for graduates, Harvard Medical School, stated in lecture No. 6 given at Vanderbilt University in 1941 under the auspices of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and published in the book entitled Infantile Paralysis, 1941, printed by the Waverly Press, Baltimore, Md: "Poliomyelitis, more popularly known as infantile paralysis, leaves more handicapped individuals than all other acute diseases combined." Dr. Ober also stated in the foreword of the book, entitled "The Kenny Concept of Infantile Paralysis and Its Treatment," that I have put great emphasis on the condition of muscles in this disease, and adds that this is not found in textbooks but admits that there is no doubt it is present and is a great factor in the production of early deformities. It is agreed by all that deformities prevent normal function and produce paralysis. In this statement Dr. Ober agrees with the scientific findings quoted later.

It was also acknowledged in the Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery that with the different types of orthodox treatment the highest percentage of recoveries was 15 percent and deformities developed during treatment. It was also acknowledged that without any form of physical therapy the recoveries were 19 percent. It is acknowledged in the same journal that pain lasts up to four months. This is supported in the Public Health Bulletin, No. 242.

We shall next consider the question, What does scientific investigation have to say? In

reply we will consider the book published by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and entitled "The Importance of Research." If you turn to pages 22 and 23, you will see the following statement:

"Physicians had always been taught that infantile paralysis was really paralysis. Kenny claimed that infantile paralysis was rarely paralysis, but was really spasm of muscles. This was an exactly opposite concept. Physicians used a method of treatment which consisted of immobilization by casts or splints. Kenny contended that these were all wrong for they merely increased the spasm and led to contractures and permanent deformities."

Scientific research was instituted by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and it is stated in this book that this research proved I was treating a condition which actually did exist; and, furthermore, when this condition was treated the Kenny way, it recovered. When they were left untreated, which was the orthodox way, they were still sick, useless muscles after long weeks. It also proved that all previous treatment had been for conditions that did not exist. This is the answer why 70 percent more patients are restored to normal than previously experienced. It was further stated in this book, "This was the first real proof that Kenny was treating a condition that did in truth exist."

You will also see in a statement made by Mr. O'Connor and published on pages 9 and 10 of the book, entitled, "The Kenny Concept of Infantile Paralysis and Its Treatment": "Those who work in the laboratories with problems on histopathology, anatomy, and physiology claim that the major concept is reasonable and rational," and admits further, "This forward step is not a new treatment for the disease as previously conceived, but presents an entirely new concept and a satisfactory treatment for this concept," and expresses his thanks that much that once was accepted as necessary deformity can be overcome and handicapping physical defects be eliminated. Despite this admission on the part of Mr. O'Connor, the book (containing description of how to overcome these handicapping defects) sent to the medical director of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis was returned to the publisher; and the book that allowed these defects occur was translated into other languages and generally distributed.

The next question to be asked is, What use has the medical world made of this forward step and discovery? Alas, it is my painful duty to state that this knowledge has been suppressed and hidden away. For instance, when seven medical men whom Dr. Fishbein refers to in the Chicago Daily News as "top notch" men in the medical world, teachers in medical schools, admitted that they were ignorant of any such conditions and symptoms, both the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and Dr. Fishbein were cruelly silent. They were also silent when these gentlemen accused me of introducing a work to the United States which could be damaging to children in the acute stage. We shall now inquire into this matter.

If you examine the report of one of their number which appeared in the Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, you will see that 160 acute cases were treated according to orthodox procedures before my arrival. They were treated by immobilization until pain subsided which was a period of 3 or 4 months. They were then given the best physiotherapy obtainable in the United States, and it is admitted that the results were very disappointing, and deformities developed in 50 percent of the cases with trunk involvement during treatment. How different the story you will see in the documentary film where pain lasted 3 or 4 days with Kenny treatment—this is supported by all reports up to date—and 80 percent of the cases had recovered and gone home inside the 4 months' space. It is also interesting to note that the disagreeable complications which Mr. O'Connor states previously were thought inevitable are entirely banished by this newer science for the newer concept.

We shall now inquire, What are these disagreeable complications and deformities? In reply it is necessary to state that immobilization has produced kidney stone, inflammation of the kidney, inflammation of the bladder, bleeding heels, and suppurating pressure sores. Also, the attendant deformities through nontreatment of the symptoms discovered by me are hideous spinal deformities, leg deformities, arm deformities, foot deformities, and hand deformities—all of which you will see on the film and all of which have been banished by the introduction of my work—along with dwarfed and stunted limbs. Seventy more cases out of every hundred are restored to normal, and up to date all adults have been restored to useful citizenship, and no child has had to attend the crippled children's school. Before the introduction of my work in Minneapolis the average enrollment at the local crippled children's school was approximately 100, and maintained this number by a yearly enrollment between 20 and 30 cases. Since the introduction of my work in 1940 the enrollment has been nil.

However, for some unknown reason there seems to be an organized boycott on the part of the officers of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and Dr. Fishbein. Of my charity I would say that they may be ignorant of the true picture. This is partly true, for they have denied the facilities for research into the further presentation I have to make of which they are entirely ignorant. However, this does not excuse their cruel silence when teachers in medicine acknowledge their ignorance of the result of scientific research, already proved, nor does it excuse them from their cruel attempts of preventing the work from being introduced into other countries, nor their callous behavior in the distribution of a book written by Miss Jessie Stevenson describing a treatment which Mr. O'Connor admits allowing damaging conditions occur which were thought inevitable.

What shall be the feelings of the mothers of other countries when they know their children suffered unnecessary, excruciating pain, and see their bodies warped, twisted, and deformed, and know, as they will know in the years to come, that the United States had this great gift and held back—and, if I may use the simile, when they asked for bread, gave them a stone? The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis put forth every effort to prevent the work from being sent out in its entirety. Students were sent for 9 weeks to unlearn one idea and absorb the opposite; and when I protested, I was called cantankerous and difficult to get along with. I wish to give a gift worthy of a great people and give it in its entirety, and I wish every child on earth to be relieved of suffering and deformity. I would consider any person that stands in silence and allows these things to happen when they can be prevented is guilty of a crime as great as that committed in any concentration camp—to condemn a child to 4 months' pain when it could be reduced to 4 days.

Dr. Fishbein states that the advisory board of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, of which he is a member, was within their rights to deny the institute the funds for research, stating that the building was not suitable for either clinical or scientific research. Does Dr. Fishbein know what sort of a building yielded the evidence that revolutionized the concept of this disease and eventually gave to the United States a gift which Mr. O'Connor admits saved the country from a national disaster? I will tell him. It was a small log hut with a bark roof and a dirt floor and wooden shutters for windows. What was discovered in this humble dwelling puts 85 percent of the American children back instead of 15 percent and leaves the remaining 15 percent in a much better shape than ever before. With strange incongruity, Dr. Fishbein complains, "Sister Kenny states she has a method of early diagnosis. If she has, why does she not come out with it? Why does she hide it away?" And yet admits facilities were denied to do what he complains about me holding back. For 2 years I have been pleading with Dr. Fishbein and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis to come and see and institute research. Dr. Fishbein's own statement that they were justifiable in refusing is the answer. Neither financial or scientific help was forthcoming. I am trying to do it alone.

For 3 years I have been requested by medical members of the armed forces of the United States to record by documentary film my findings and procedures. I had notified all concerned of this request and no notice was taken. However, through the generosity of Miss Rosalind Russell, I was able to present part of my work by sound film—that is, the concept, early diagnosis, and how to prevent deformities. The members of the armed forces who have seen it have not hesitated to state that they think it of great educational value. As a matter of fact, I have had an appeal from Fort McClellan to see if they could rent a copy. This camp is now in quarantine for this disease. At my own personal expense I sent a copy of the film, for which I have no desire to receive rent. Neither the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis nor the American Medical Association take any interest in this film. However, the public-health officers are interested, and I had another copy made and shown to the public-health officers of New York. I have their statement that they consider it the best presentation of my work that either I or anyone else has given in writing and is, in their opinion, of great educational value.

Furthermore, I would consider a gift of healing to other lands would go a long way to bind the wounds of a war-weary world and kindle the flame of friendship. We will now consider what help has been granted in this objective. In the year 1941, Dr. Chown was advised not to come to Minneapolis from Canada by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. However, this was forgivable for the true worth of my work was not then known. However, the same thing happened in 1943, when Mr. O'Connor knew that I had an important appointment with the medical association and the Minister of Health in the State of Ontario, and I was in New York. He informed me that he desired to see me in Dr. Diehl's office in Minneapolis on the same date. He refused to see me in New York.

A South American neighbor appealed for help the same year. The appeal was at first refused. However, when it was known that I desired to give the help and would send my ward with another technician, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis came forward with a proposition. My ward and an American technician was sent along on contract. An appeal was made at the expiration of this contract to the foundation from Argentina to extend the term. No notice was taken of this appeal, and the appeal was then sent to me by the Ambassador and the authorities in Buenos Aires which was supported by the technicians themselves. With this appeal I received the following wire from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis:

"For your information have just wired Mary Kenny 'After most careful consideration of the request that you and Miss Gardner be permitted to remain an additional 2 months in Buenos Aires and after conferring with those in whose judgment as to such matters we have reason to have confidence we are convinced that the interests of those

in Argentina afflicted with infantile paralysis will be best served by your returning immediately to this country pursuant to the plans under which you were sent to Argentina by the National Foundation. The Foundation, however, has no right and no desire to dictate to you in any sense what you as individuals should or should not do. If, however, you elect to remain in Argentina we are certain that you would be the first to wish to relieve the National Foundation of any responsibility in connection with your continued sojourn or your safe return to the United States and in such case the National Foundation would consider itself so relieved.'

"DON W. GUDAKUNST, M. D.,
"Medical Director."

Simultaneously with this wire I was informed by Dr. Diehl that he had been instructed by both Mr. O'Connor and Dr. Gudakunst not to issue any checks in favor of Mary Stewart Kenny. I may here state that the foundation had not honored its financial obligation to Mary Stewart Kenny entered into by contract. However, the Republic of Argentina supplied the necessary funds and presented Mary Stewart Kenny with an honorarium and a gold medal and saw that she returned safely to the United States. The financial status of the American technician was not molested. She received her fees according to contract. However, both my ward and I were well aware of the fact that these procedures would not have the approval of the good American people whom we wished to serve. Nor would the activities of Dr. Fishbein have the approval of the 400 good American doctors who wrote, I quote: "You have presented to us a new concept of this disease and led us along a new pathway of treatment. We hope you will live to see the day of its adoption throughout the world."

Dr. Fishbein states in the lay press that I object to any improvements being introduced into the treatment. This is altogether incorrect. I would gladly welcome any improvement, but quite understand that before improvement can be introduced it is necessary to understand the symptoms of the disease. Dr. Fishbein refers to the committee of seven orthopedists as the "top notch" men in their profession. It is from these gentlemen that improvement could come. They admitted that they were ignorant of the condition that I had observed clinically and which scientific research had proved correct in which the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and Dr. Fishbein had maintained silence. With this attitude and lack of knowledge of the results of scientific research, it is logical to understand the impossibility to present any improvement.

Also Dr. Fishbein in the lay press refers to Prof. Stanley Cobb and states that this gentleman had referred to my presentation as "physiological nonsense," and added that all neuromuscular professors were of the same opinion. This statement appeared in January 1944 in the Journal of the American Medical Association. However, in the May number of the same year it is announced that my presentation is a "scientific fact." Of this latter statement Dr. Fishbein and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis were again cruelly silent. Also Dr. Fishbein had an opportunity to distribute and publish the findings of research, proving Dr. Cobb and his colleagues wrong in this article, and again failed.

In October 1944 number of the Foundation News, a paper is presented by Miss Worthingham, technical director. A statement appeared in this paper to the effect that a Kenny technician could not give the necessary after-care to a patient suffering from the disease infantile paralysis. It is evident from this statement that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has lost sight of the fact that I had taken cases upon my arrival in Minneapolis that had failed to respond to the best physical therapy for months, and deformities had developed. Function was restored and deformities corrected with the application of the newer sciences of dermo-neuro-muscular therapy applied by me. It is admitted in the Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery that the results of physical therapy was most disappointing. This is supported by the Canadian reports Canada also states, "We were astounded to see Miss Kenny restore to normal muscles we had accepted as flaccoid or paralyzed." The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis intends to donate over one million dollars to the teaching of the useless method and refuses any assistance to the teaching of the newer science. Dr. Fishbein states that it is their endeavor to save the American people from exploitation. The documentary film prevents the failure of the best physical therapy to produce satisfactory results for months and the success of the Kenny method by the newer science in the same patient. This is indisputable evidence to the lay person. May I ask who is doing the exploiting?

Furthermore, I take keen exception to the published statement that I was annoyed because I was denied funds from the Foundation. I, personally, have never made any request for funds. The medical committee and the Board of Directors of the Elizabeth Kenny Institute had requested funds and were refused. I have stated that owing to this refusal it will be necessary for me to present my further findings to research in some other country. This does not mean I disassociate myself from the work at the Elizabeth Kenny Institute at Minneapolis. It is in order to place all my findings on a full scientific basis that would impel me to take this step. The medical men to whom I have presented these findings have unhesitatingly stated that they demand scientific investigation.

The fully trained staff of the institute is familiar with the presentation and the satisfactory treatment for the conditions. However, all other centers are not so fortunately situated, and I am most anxious that they should be in order that the results at other institutions may compare favorably with those obtained at the institute. It is acknowledged by all visiting medical practitioners that the results at the institute excel those obtained elsewhere. I have been frequently asked the reason why. The seven professors whom Dr. Fishbein refers to as top notch men made the following remark in the presence of witnesses, "Your results are excellent. No one could deny that." Major Stone and Major Erickson of the United States Army asked me in the presence of Dr. Todd of Washington in rather an accusing manner to please explain why the results were so much better at the institute than anywhere else in the United States. My reply is that the staff is more fully trained and understands the concept.

The foundation has refused any further assistance. That is quite immaterial to me. It also refused to take part upon my arrival, and both Mr. O'Connor and Dr. Gudakunst advised me to return to Australia. However, St. Paul and Minneapolis responded to the request of my government and a group of medical men, and I presented part of my clinical findings the first year and informed all concerned that it would take 2 years to present the full 30 years' clinical investigation. It is admitted by the foundation that scientific investigation had proved these findings correct and the newer type of treatment evolved for these findings had saved the United States from a national disaster. In this admission, it is acknowledged by the foundation that if I had taken their advice in 1940, the good people of the United States would have experienced this disaster. It may be that when some other country investigates my further clinical findings, the full conquest of the disease may be centuries nearer. However, it is necessary for the world to know what has already been accomplished.

It is most evident in the presentation of this evidence that those who have undertaken the supervision of the work and its expansion have failed the people. I am sure the gentlemen referred to as "top notch" members of the honorable profession of medicine would never have made the statements they did if they had known that scientific research had proved that in all of the years that had passed, the part of the human anatomy they had accepted as nonaffected by the disease and normal was the part severely affected and requiring all possible skill to prevent the development of all the gross and humiliating conditions which it was admitted was impossible to correct. Science has proven my presentation, which was the opposite to all previous concepts known to the medical world, to be correct.

The evidence produced here, which is not my own but evidence produced by scientific research, proves the economic and humane side of my work. The economic value can be measured by millions of dollars, but the humane value cannot be measured. Because of this gift, many young Americans can walk again, can play again, and the heart of motherhood made glad throughout the land. As explained by my country, I ask no personal gain, but I humbly ask the assistance of the people of the United States of America to give this message of healing to other lands and see that the wives and children of the men who gave their lives for my country and saved my people from slavery shall receive this gift in its entirety; and thus I shall feel I have in some way recompensed them for their gift of freedom to Australia.

Finally, it may have been noticed I have made no reference to a report presenting the activities of the Elizabeth Kenny Institute other than certain statements made in the presence of witnesses. Personally, I think the manager of this institute, Frank E. Harrington, M. D., should request the medical supervisor to furnish this report to be published in the medical journals. The medical supervisor, John F. Pohl, M. D., has had wide experience in this disease, before and since my arrival, and with his associations with the Harvard Crippled Children's Commission of the United States of America, and Harry Pratt, M. D., Manchester, England, and supervisor of the local crippled-children's school and various other activities. Furthermore, there has been a certain amount of publicity given to the dismissal of spastic patients from the institute by order of medical authorities. I wish it to be known I was not experimenting with these children. The reports of my work with this very sad disease are, to a degree, most encouraging. For instance, a report is contained in the book, entitled, "Report on the Elizabeth Kenny Clinic, Townsland, Queensland," compiled by the Queensland Government and contains the following statement, presented by Dr. James Vivian Guinane, M. D., F. R. C. S. (England). This gentleman was detailed to inquire into the end results of treatment in England and the continent, then becoming associated with the work in the clinic for 4 months, watching procedures, gathering evidence, and comparing results. In this report you will see, quote:

"SPASTIC CASES

"The results in this type of cases have been excellent. No other method I know of can approach it."

I have a written statement from the president of the American Congress of Physical Therapy, Miland Knapp, M. D., quote:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to confirm my verbal statement that I would appreciate being shown a method of treatment that is effective in cerebral spastic paralysis.

* * * * *

"MILAND E. KNAPP, M. D."

This evidence states that physical therapy has nothing to offer. However, dermo-neuro-physical therapy has something.

Therefore, it is imperative that legislation should recognize this newer science and protect the technicians by law and the people from exploitation. If this protection were given, it would induce young medical men to become interested in physical therapy of the more advanced type and explain to young orthopedic surgeons how to deal with the bodily mechanics to avoid operations and keep the body straight.

I am sure that neither the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis nor Dr. Fishbein was aware of the enormity of the action of placing a stumbling block in the way of the propagation of this newer science. Both had individual interests very near their own hearts. Mr. O'Connor, president of National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, did not hesitate to tell me to always remember that he was president and treasurer of the institution known as Georgia Warm Springs, and Irvine McQuarrie, M. D., professor of pediatrics at the University of Minnesota, informed me that if I had the letters "M. D." after my name, all would be well.

Therefore, I would say that both the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and Dr. Fishbein were defending individual rights and not the common cause. If I neglected to present this to you, I would be breaking faith with the good people of the United States of America, and more especially with the men who died for my country.

Congressional Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., has commented on an expense allowance for Congressmen. I believe the viewpoint of the Evening Star is in line with the thinking and wishes of many fair-minded people throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein an editorial from the Evening Star, dated Saturday, May 5, 1945:

CONGRESSIONAL INCOME

Members of Congress will do well to vote themselves the $2,500 tax-free expense allowance recommended by a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. In view of wartime wage controls, such a move might be criticized in uninformed quarters, but it would be nonetheless justified, and no fair-minded American would challenge it.

As matters stand today, Congressmen, unlike executives in the Federal agencies, must pay out of their own pocket for many facilities and services needed to conduct their official business. More than that, they are burdened with legitimate political and social expenses that cannot be avoided if they are to do their job well. Far more than any other group in the Government, they find that performance of duty imposes a heavy drain on personal finances—so much so that they stand a good chance of going into the red unless they have an independent income over and above their present $10,000-a-year salary.

The proposed expense account would offer a substantial measure of much-needed relief. Tax-free, because it would cover outlays directly incidental to office, it would have the effect of ridding many Congressmen of the sense of economic insecurity they feel now. It should be voted into being, and after that is done Congress should give serious consideration to an outright salary increase. The present $10,000 figure was fixed in 1924. Since then, particularly in these war years, living costs have risen so drastically (not to mention the expanded volume of work in the Senate and House) that fairness obviously demands some upward adjustment.

But it is not only for reasons of fairness that congressional compensation should be increased. For the good of the Nation as a whole, the legislative branch of our Government needs to be made more efficient, and men of outstanding ability ought to find it worth while, financially, to seek membership in it. To this end, impartial organizations like the National Planning Association recommended a salary of $25,000 a year. Perhaps this would be on the excessive side—particularly if a special expense allowance is made available—but no one aware of the facts will doubt that the present $10,000 is grossly inadequate. It is high time that Congress acted upon the matter.

Salary Increase for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication which I have received from John B. Glenn, president of the New York Board of Trade, recommending an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. Since I have received so few communications of this sort, I should like to have it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 25, 1945.

Hon. JAMES N. TUNNELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TUNNELL: The directors of the New York Board of Trade unanimously favor an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. The following resolution is an excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of the directors which was held on April 3, 1945.

"*Be it resolved*, That the New York Board of Trade supports in principle bills currently before the Congress designed to increase the salaries of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this opinion be presented to the President of the United States, and the Members of the Congress."

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. GLENN,
President.

A Scheme to Scuttle the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article prepared by Arthur M. Tode, honorary president, Propeller Club of the United States, appearing in the Marine Journal, April 1945, and discussing an article by Lewis W. Douglas, which appeared in the April 1945 issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

A SCHEME TO SCUTTLE THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—LEWIS W. DOUGLAS, FORMER DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION, PROPOSES TO REDUCE OUR POST-WAR MERCHANT FLEET TO TEN MILLION TONS, LEASE THE REST OF OUR TONNAGE TO OUR MARITIME ALLIES AS A GESTURE OF ABNEGATION TO AID WORLD PEACE

(By Arthur M. Tode, honorary president, Propeller Club of the United States)

In the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly there was published an article by Lewis W. Douglas, formerly deputy administrator of the War Shipping Administration, entitled: "What Shall We Do With the Ships?" In this extraordinary defeatist argument against American sea power, it is seriously proposed that the American Merchant Marine, now the greatest in the world, which has cost the taxpayers more than $17,000,000,000, and which aggregates approximately 50,000,000 tons, be reduced in size to 10,000,000 tons; the balance, without distinction as to quality in speed or design, to be distributed on easy time payments or "irrevocable" leases, to our maritime allies that have suffered tonnage losses due to the war.

Specifically mentioned as beneficiaries of this scheme to give the merchant marine away are: "Great Britain, Norway, Holland, and other friendly countries that have been the traditional transporters of the products of the world."

Having thus disposed of more than four-fifths of our national tonnage on easy terms or by outright gift, Mr. Douglas seems to feel that we should also destroy our future capacity to ever rebuild our sea power, for he suggests that we might select one or two of our shipbuilding concerns "not for the purpose of building a large tonnage, but merely to determine how designs can be improved, operations reduced in cost, and construction itself accelerated," this scientific information, presumably, to be made available for the benefit of the foreign nations that will henceforth monopolize the ocean transport of the world while we will retire from maritime competition for which Mr. Douglas does not believe we are fitted, and devote ourselves to producing products which the ships we have given away can carry at a profit in American transport dollars to keep our allies satisfied and happy and prevent them from becoming angry with us as they might be if they thought we harbored any large-scale maritime aspirations.

This fantastic scheme to scuttle the American merchant marine is put forward by Mr. Douglas in all seriousness as a plan to assure future world peace "by reestablishing the market places of the world and a stable

medium of international exchange * * * which to endure, must have an international environment in which it can nourish itself, grow, and become the accepted order of mankind."

The very thought of this country having any nationalistic thoughts of maintaining the basis of vast sea power such as the ocean-going tonnage we now have would assure, is anathema to Mr. Douglas who declares that "The monopolistic practices that have been established under the administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and enjoyed by certain overseas operators should be eliminated."

Who is this Mr. Douglas? What background has he that would justify him to arrive at such extraordinary conclusions as to the disposal of American sea power in this period of world crisis? Let us see.

He served four terms in Congress as a Representative from the State of Arizona. He was Director of the Budget in the early days of the Roosevelt administration. He served two years as deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration. He was Chancellor of McGill University in Canada. All that one finds in this record is 2 years of governmental executive activity connected with shipping. Yet, Mr. Douglas suddenly appears upon the international scene as a shipping expert * * * a pundit descending with graven tablets of maritime wisdom from a Trojan horse * * * the same horse from which anti-American shipping propaganda has been distributed throughout the United States for the past several decades when it became apparent to foreign shipping interests that we intended to reestablish ourselves as a maritime power in the world.

All of these fantastic ideas about giving away the sea power of this country are not intended for some future date but right now. Mr. Douglas wants the United States off the seas at once. Just as poor Mr. Chamberlain took his umbrella and went to Munich to appease Hitler when a world war seemed imminent, so does Mr. Douglas demand that we here in America give away our ships to keep the maritime peace with the shipping nations abroad because, as he puts it: "Shipping touches the Allied maritime nations on their most sensitive spots, for it is the nerve center of their national life."

He says in this article in the Atlantic Monthly that we cannot hope to compete with the traditional maritime nations abroad because they can operate ships more cheaply that we can, and that we must make up the differential by subsidies which are a heavy drain on the public purse. But the figures he concocts to bolster his argument against subsidies are as misleading and fantastic as the rest of his article and quite in the manner of Alice in Wonderland.

In order that his subsidy calculations be as impressive as possible, Mr. Douglas magnanimously increases the total tonnage he actually wants us to have from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons. In this connection, he says: "If, for example, there is to be an American merchant fleet of 20,000,000 tons * * * the cost to the country in operating subsidies alone will range between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 each year, depending on the way the subsidy is calculated and the form it takes."

Recognized experts in the shipping industry are unable to follow the devious and serpentine calculations used by Mr. Douglas in arriving at these subsidy costs.

Mr. Stanley Ferguson, writing in the Journal of Commerce of April 9, puts it this way:

"During the 5-year period between the middle of 1937, when temporary subsidies began, and the middle of 1942, when they were suspended, total operating differential payments amounted to approximately $51,000,000, of which some $30,000,000 will be recaptured by the Government. The ultimate total cost for this period will thus be around $21,000,000 for 5 years, or a little more than $4,000,000 annually. Even if the shipping lines had not earned enough to justify any recapture, the cost would not have greatly exceeded $10,000,000 annually."

There is no intention nor has there ever been a desire on the part of this country to monopolize the sea carrying trade of the world. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 modestly proposes that we carry in our own ships a substantial proportion of the trade originating in the United States or imported here from foreign countries serviced by American flag ships.

The ship-sales bill, upon which hearings were recently held in Washington, leans heavily in the direction of placing as few obstacles as possible in the way of acquisition by our maritime allies of such tonnage as they may require to make up the losses sustained through the war effort. The terms of sale to our allies are liberal in the extreme and our surplus tonnage can be acquired by them on generous terms. What more does Mr. Douglas want?

It is quite apparent from his article that he wants this country to eliminate itself entirely from the overseas trade and to leave this source of potential national revenue to our allies, who can in this way secure foreign exchange with which to buy our American products.

But how does this suggestion of Mr. Douglas square with the assurances from official governmental quarters that we must maintain an expanded national economy after the war to provide employment and avoid deflation? What will the maritime unions think of his demand that we whittle our American fleet to a paltry 10,000,000 tons?

In a brochure just published by the C. I. O. Maritime Committee the post-war program of the following marine labor organizations is briefly and effectively presented: National Maritime Union of America, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Marine Cooks and Stewards Association, Inland Boatmen's Union of the Pacific, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, American Communications Association.

These maritime unions represent many thousands of workers who derive their livelihood directly or indirectly from the successful operation of an American merchant marine. If Mr. Douglas has his way, most of them will be permanently on the beach. What do these men want from the maritime industry? They want adequate wages to keep themselves and their families living decently. They want an annual guaranteed income. Unemployment insurance. Medical care and education for merchant-marine veterans. Opportunities for advancement. Labor-management cooperation. A voice for labor. And these same unions concede that to gain these advantages American shipowners must make money out of the operation of ships. Shipowners want profits just as the maritime workers expect decent wages. Therefore, according to these maritime unions, "What the American people want * * * is a strong merchant marine. A fleet of merchant ships sufficiently large to carry a large part of our water-borne domestic and foreign commerce in peacetime, and to serve as an auxiliary to our Navy in wartime. * * * They want a sound program that will keep the merchant marine on a thriving basis all the time in peace as well as in war." Obviously, these maritime unions, and doubtless all other labor organizations connected with the sea not listed above, have endorsed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

What will these maritime workers think of Mr. Douglas and his scheme to give away the American merchant marine? If he has his way, there will be no work * * * no wages * * * no opportunities, and no voice for labor. It will be interesting to hear what officials of these maritime unions have to say about the defeatist observations of Mr. Lewis W. Douglas.

Mr. Douglas has done a disservice to the sea power of the United States in signing his name to this Atlantic Monthly article. There are no "special interests and superpatriots" involved in opposition to his defeatist views, as the once powerful advocate of American shipping * * * the New York Herald-Tribune * * * recently stated in an editorial. The only interests dangerously affected are those of the United States, the maritime industry which has built a great fleet of ships to save the Allied cause and has operated them efficiently with loyal union seamen thousands of whom paid the supreme sacrifice to keep the ships sailing through hostile waters.

But Mr. Douglas has not one word of praise for this modern miracle of maritime achievement. In the name of peace he would destroy the maritime industry that saved the Allied cause from certain defeat. In the name of peace he would repay the valiant seamen who went through hell to deliver supplies to the battle fronts by destroying their means of making a living. In the name of peace he would have this country give up its rightful place as a great maritime nation and return to a condition of impotency, leaving the sea carrying trade to those who are our Allies today during the war emergency but who may conceivably become our rivals and perhaps even our enemies tomorrow.

Address by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing at National Rally of the United Americans for United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the National Rally of the United Americans for United Nations, at New York City on April 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One week ago last Saturday I stood in the East Room of the White House. There before me was the flag-draped bier of one of the immortals. Franklin Roosevelt belonged to the ages.

Representatives of every nation—except two—had come to pay their last respects. A delegation from Congress, the Supreme Court, military and naval leaders, high Government officials, were all there. In addition, the hearts of millions of Americans and of other people throughout the civilized world were with us in that room that day. But nothing could adequately express what all of us felt.

Those of us who knew Mr. Roosevelt in life, realized how deeply we would miss this gay warrior. Those of us who want to see government used to bring the most happiness to the most people, knew we had lost a gallant leader. He had been the champion of the down-trodden, the defender of the

weak. He had used all the powers of government to prevent the exploitation of labor, of farmers and low-income groups. He had tried to improve the lot of each. He passionately hated racial and religious intolerance. He believed in the dignity of every individual, whatever his race, creed, or color. He was the champion of the exploited, the unfortunates, the victims of discrimination. He was their friend—and they knew it.

Mr. Roosevelt had qualities of heart and mind that few men have possessed. Combined with these, he had another quality that made him one of the great men of all time—the quality of political leadership which enabled him to translate into practical governmental action the sympathy and understanding that he had of the yearnings of his fellow men.

Socrates described politics as the greatest of all sciences. It is the art of government. Through it the ideals in which we believe are translated into accomplished facts. Politics in the proper sense calls for talents of the highest order. A political leader must attract a following that can win elections. The motives of the various members of that following will include every human impulse, from the basest selfishness and greed to the noblest qualities of idealism and service. The leader cannot change the nature of these men but he can direct their action to the achievement of his ends.

Being a Democrat, Mr. Roosevelt used the Democratic Party as the instrumentality for the accomplishment of his ideals. He recognized that party machinery could be used as a great constructive force for the causes in which he believed—and the Democratic Party organization responded to his thrilling leadership to an amazing extent. In addition, Mr. Roosevelt was able to gather together many of the scattered political forces of our Nation, to reconcile their essential contradictions and, out of the sorry confusion, to create a political army that, notwithstanding the loss of an occasional skirmish—went from victory to victory in the struggle for a better social and economic order. This same political following gave enthusiastic support to Mr. Roosevelt's every effort to achieve military victory and a lasting peace. Seldom, if ever, has nature so combined heart and mind with political genius.

Mr. Roosevelt died at the height of his career. The social gains for which he fought had been advanced to new horizons. The military victory to which he contributed so much was definitely in sight. The fundamental structure of the peace organization that was to prevent future wars was clearly envisioned. He went back to lie on the bosom of his beloved Dutchess County with an unparalleled record of achievement. It is for us to finish his work.

At the funeral in the White House that afternoon there sat the man on whom Mr. Roosevelt's mantle had fallen. Harry Truman had not sought the nomination for Vice President. He had gone to the Chicago Convention last summer with a prepared speech nominating someone else. As the movement to nominate him gained momentum, he implored some of us who were urging his selection to desist. When, however, the convention spoke, he answered the call.

The new President assumed his duties with deep humility. To the newspaper correspondents he said: "Boys, if you ever pray, pray for me now." In his first speech to the Congress and the world, he closed with the words: "I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people."

Yet there was no hesitation or indecision. Within an hour he announced that the San Francisco Conference would be held as scheduled. This was followed by a succession of decisive acts. There was no interruption of the public business. There was a specific pledge to continue President Roosevelt's policies.

Naturally, people wonder what manner of man our new President it. This is particularly true of millions who have a deep sense of insecurity in our modern civilization and who feel forlorn and hopeless without Mr. Roosevelt. To all of these, I can say: Be of good cheer.

President Truman has a record that speaks eloquently. In 1940, he said: "I believe in the brotherhood of man; not merely the brotherhood of white men, but the brotherhood of all men before the law. * * * I believe that in giving Negroes the rights that are theirs, we are acting in accord with our ideals of a true democracy." When the bill to abolish the poll-tax was before the Senate and its opponents were talking it to death, Senator Truman joined in an effort to shut off debate so that a vote might be taken. He voted against every effort to hamper the Tennessee Valley Authority and he tried to prevent the destruction of the National Youth Administration. The enlightened Murray-Kilgore bill to provide machinery for post-war employment has had Mr. Truman's wholehearted support and he opposed the removal of three employees from the Federal pay roll that the Dies committee had branded as Communists. Perhaps more important, is the fact that Senator Truman was primarily responsible for the Burton-Ball-Hatch-Hill resolution, a resolution intended to commit the Senate to a world organization for peace. Senator Truman arranged the dinner of the dozen Senators who planned the resolution and he picked the four who signed it. One of the first pronouncements of the new President showed his deep concern for the returning veteran. This is a record that no liberal, no victim of exploitation or discrimination, need fear. It holds every promise of a forward-looking future.

Never, in all our history, has a President needed the united support of this Nation as does President Truman. The crucial days for making the peace and creating a world organization to keep the peace are just ahead of us. Up to now, the United Nations have been held together by the danger of a common enemy. The defeat of Germany and Japan will remove this cohesive force. If, instead of making for a world peace organization, the selfish interests of each nation should become controlling, then World War No. 3 is as certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun. The most important contribution that the American people can make toward an enduring peace is to unite solidly behind their new President. If we do this, President Truman can accomplish the utmost possible in his dealings with foreign nations. If we fail him, if the feeling gets abroad that America is divided, then we have weakened our country's influence at the conference table. For our own sakes, for the sake of our children and our children's children let us uphold President Truman in his determination to carry out Mr. Roosevelt's ideas for a world peace organization. Let us help the President build a monument to Mr. Roosevelt more lasting than bronze or marble—one that can endure for generations to come.

A Square Deal for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Square Deal for Postal Workers," together with a letter from William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, published in the Boston Daily Record of April 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SQUARE DEAL FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Many weeks have passed since the Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives concluded public hearings on a measure giving postal workers their first actual increase in pay in 20 years.

But, as Mr. W. C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, points out in a letter printed elsewhere on this page, there is still no assurance that the measure will be approved.

It has not even been reported out of committee as yet, although there was no effective opposition to the measure in the public hearings and indeed an almost complete lack of any opposition.

Until the committee reports, the measure cannot be acted upon by the House of Representatives and the necessary approval of the Senate cannot be obtained.

Consequently, this important measure is as securely blocked as if the prevailing opinion in Congress opposed it—whereas, nearly the entire membership of Congress has expressed vigorous and seemingly sincere approval of it.

Apparently something is needed to stir Congress out of its apathetic mind about this matter.

If this session of Congress fails to act upon the matter of raising the salary standards of postal workers, as so many sessions have done before it, there is more involved than an injustice—although that should be sufficiently persuasive.

The stark reality confronting the postal workers of the Nation, if this measure fails again, is that they are not only going to be denied an increase in pay, but are actually going to suffer a drastic reduction.

They have been working during the past year under the temporary benefit of a "sop" tossed to them by Congress in the form of a $300 bonus.

This will expire at the end of June.

Then the postal workers will be compelled to exist on the basic wage scales established 20 years ago—the annual salary of $2,100, from which the withholding tax and retirement contributions are deducted, leaving a scant $1,500 as cash in hand.

As Mr. Doherty bluntly warns, the postal workers cannot exist decently on this inadequate wage and they are not going to try it much longer.

They are weary of 20 years of promises by Congress.

They are fed up with public expressions of sympathy.

In short, if this last appeal for justice is futile, many of them are going to seek the chance to live decently in other fields.

And if they do that, as Mr. Doherty emphasizes, the whole vital structure of postal service—already impaired by the war—is going to suffer.

This is inevitable.

The issue is no longer the simple one of whether or not justice is to be done for the postal workers.

It is whether or not the United States mails are going to be moved expeditiously according to the high traditions of the Postal Service, or even be moved at all—of whether or not there is going to be any postal service adequate for the needs of the country.

If Congress is not to be persuaded by considerations of justice to the postal workers in this matter, at least it can be persuaded by prospect of a disastrous failure of the postal system itself.

It is up to the American people to perform the duties of persuasion in this latter respect.

Though they have tried honorably and conscientiously, the postal workers have apparently failed in their efforts to be persuasive in the former respect.

Every American citizen conscious and resentful of the protracted injustice against the postal workers—and if not of that, of the imminent collapse of the whole postal system—should write his Congressman, and demand that the people performing such vital service to the Nation be allowed to live and support their families according to American standards—and no longer according to the condition of near-serfdom they have so long endured.

POST OFFICE PAY BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
San Simeon, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEARST: On behalf of 63,000 members of this association, and an additional 15,000 letter carriers in the armed services of our country, I desire to express my deep appreciation for your personal interest in their welfare. The numerous feature articles and special editorials appearing in the Hearst newspapers have had a wholesome effect in focusing public attention to the plight of the Nation's postal workers.

The House Post Office Committee concluded public hearing on H. R. 2071, the postal reclassification bill, on March 27. On that date many Congressmen appeared before the committee pledging support of the measure when it reaches the floor of the House. Each and every Representative expressed words of high praise for the excellent work being performed by letter carriers and other postal employees throughout the war emergency. Encomiums liken to a litany permeated the atmosphere in the committee hearing room.

Prior to the present series of 3-day recesses, there was no indication to when the Post Office Committee would report H. R. 2071. Nor was there any way to foretell when the House of Representatives would vote on the measure, which will authorize a $400 permanent salary increase, true time and one-half overtime, and other benefits long overdue.

Slightly less than 3 months remain before the present $300 temporary increase law expires. Unless the seventy-ninth session of Congress moves to bring about speedy enactment of the reclassification measure, the so-called temporary bonus will be taken away from letter carriers and other postal workers. They will be compelled to exist on the basic pay scales established 20 years ago. If that comes to pass their $2,100 annual salary will actually amount to exactly $1,575 after 20 percent withholding tax and 5 percent retirement contributions have been deducted.

Manpower shortages within the postal service are already acute. Management is finding it practically impossible to recruit needed personnel on the present outmoded pay schedules. Existing critical conditions are no longer a matter affecting letter carriers and postal employees alone. It is definitely in the public interest that H. R. 2071 be enacted into law without further delay.

The expeditious handling of the United States mails is essential in either peace or war times. V-mail, business letters, and other mailings simply must go through. The people of this great country can decide the issue through the process of making known their desires to the Members of Congress. Let it be said that the very future of the postal service and the fate of its personnel now rest with the Seventy-ninth Congress.

You are to be highly commended for your personal interest in the welfare of the postal worker and the service he renders to the American public. The crusade conducted by your newspapers stand out like a beacon light. Every citizen should be grateful for the magnificent manner in which you have sounded the warning. There still exists a grave danger—the development of an inferior postal system.

Again expressing profound thanks and with every good wish for your continued success, I remain,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

Light Metals Industry in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, hydroelectric power developed in the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest has made a great contribution to the winning of the war. Over one-third of the aluminum needed in this great struggle was produced in this area alone. Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, before the Governors' Conference at Reno recently, made a most interesting address on the light metals industry, setting forth many of the basic factors and problems involved in this most important industry. The address is worthy of consideration by all of us concerned with these problems and postwar development, and is as follows:

THE LIGHT METALS INDUSTRY IN THE WEST

These are very busy days in the office of Governor in any State. The presence at this conference of nearly all of the Governors of the 11 Western States is indicative of their appraisal of the importance of this gathering and of their interest in the questions and problems to be considered.

One of these questions is the future light metals industry in the West. I was assigned that topic. It seemed that the extra time necessary to prepare even this brief discussion simply was not available. Yet, I realized that the great importance of this industry to the future development of the West suggested the burning of a little more midnight oil on the part of all of us. It has a particular application to my own State of Oregon.

A unanimity in thought and action is necessary on the part of the Western Governors in connection with some of these problems if we are to obtain the results desired. Hence, the primary purpose of this conference.

And so, for the purpose of our discussion, I submit these few thoughts for consideration and subsequent action.

It seems to me that in any discussion of industrial development there are certain fundamental questions that must receive early consideration. Indeed, the retention and further development of the light metals industry in the West is no exception.

Three of the more important questions which come to mind and which I would list for early exploration and analysis are these: Raw materials, cost of manufacture, markets.

Magnesium

In discussing the light metals industry, aluminum properly occupies the spotlight position, but the impotrance and utility of magnesium is not to be minimized. Even though lighter than aluminum, the tensile strength of its alloys is practically the same as that of the best steels. Apparently its most practical use and is greatest commercial value are derived from being alloyed with other metals, principally aluminum.

The ore or raw material for magnesium is found in each and all of the 11 Western States. However, there was no production whatever of light metals here prior to the war. Now, several large plants are operating in a number of our Western States producing a major portion of the Nation's magnesium capacity. The use of magnesium may be expanded considerably in the postwar period.

Beryllium

Beryllium is another light metal, but its total use is very small.

Aluminum

In the manufacture of aluminum during this war emergency period, the West has established records which are the envy of the entire Nation. Our case has been proved. However, the retention and continued operation of these plants is a question not quite that simple in its solution.

In my approach to the question I shall follow the steps previously outlined; namely, raw materials, cost of manufacture, and markets.

Raw materials

Bauxite is the accepted raw material for aluminum manufacture. From bauxite comes alumina. Alumina is then processed with electric power into aluminum.

The known supply of high-grade bauxite ore in this country is very limited. The greatest reserve of bauxite, known and potential, lies in the State of Arkansas. There are scattered deposits in some of the other Southern States, but the supply is either very small or the quality deficient. Large quantities of bauxite ore have been imported from Dutch Guiana.

The question of costs will be discussed a bit later, but I think it is timely at this point to mention that the manager of one of the Northwest aluminum plants recently made the statement that the costs of manufacture of aluminum at this particular western plant were so low that the raw material could be shipped to the West from Arkansas, processed here, and the finished product shipped across the continent again to the East, all at a cost less than the like aluminum product could be processed in the East. However, the need for a bauxite or alumina plant in the West is obvious. According to Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the War Shipping Administration, transportation savings from such an installation would total about $13 per ton of aluminum.

Materials other than bauxite from which alumina may be extracted offer promise here in the West.

Alunite is found in some of our Western States and large deposits of alumina-clay have been discovered in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

An alunite reduction plant is located in Utah, and through the facilities of the Defense Plant Corporation, the Columbia Metals Corporation, and the Chemical Construction Corporation are constructing and will operate in Salem, Oreg., a four and one-half million dollar alumina-from-clay reduction plant. The economic success of this process has not yet been determined, but if successful, it should open the door to a great development. An experimental plant also has been located at Laramie, Wyo., where large anorthosite deposits appear.

Recently extensive deposits of iron-bauxite have been discovered in Oregon. Some of the tests show the alumina content to be nearly 50 percent. It is estimated to average about 35 percent and the iron content 25 percent. Eastern officials are now making additional tests. This discovery is cause for much optimism and encouragement.

Cost of manufacture

Electric power represents a big item and major classification of cost in the operation of a light metals industry. The West has the biggest block of cheap electric power to be found any place in the Nation.

The 11 Western States possess 66.7 percent of the potential water power of the United States. Washington, Oregon, and California alone have over 50 percent.

The ultimate rated capacities of the bigger hydro installations are as follows:

	Kilowatts
Grand Coulee Dam (Washington)	1,620,000
Boulder Dam (Arizona and Nevada)	1,322,000
Umatilla Dam (authorized) (Oregon and Washington)	690,000
Bonneville Dam (Oregon and Washington)	518,000
Shasta Dam (California)	375,000
A grand total of	4,525,000

To be added to these figures are the capacity ratings of the plants of the private utilities, both hydro and steam as well as many smaller hydro installations under public ownership. And, there yet remains in the West a tremendous amount of undeveloped water power, a great never-ending source of cheap electrical energy.

Likewise is the West rich in the expendable items which are used for power development, for fuel and for industrial production—coal, wood, gas, and oil. Coal is found in all of the 11 Western States, the chief producers being Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Montana, and New Mexico. Gas and oil are found in California, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Substantial drilling operations are now under way in Oregon and I understand in some of the other States as well.

Twenty-three million tons of coal annually are produced in the West, as well as 25 percent of the crude petroleum supply of the Nation.

Three-fifths of all wood produced in the United States comes from the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States.

Labor

Another item to be considered under the general heading of "Costs of manufacture" is labor. The availability of a stable and dependable labor supply is important to the success of any industry. In the West we have just that. The western spirit prevails. On the whole, labor relations in the West have been very satisfactory. The men—and women, too—have been cooperative and understanding. They are definitely interested in the development of new industries in the West and can be counted on to cooperate and assist to the fullest extent.

I take pride in pointing to the fact that during this emergency, labor relations in Oregon have been outstanding in the Nation.

At this point it should be mentioned that the most favorable and desirable climatic conditions prevail in the Western States. Such is an asset of great advantage when measured in terms of costs.

Taxes

The next subhead I would include is that of "Taxes." The Western States have adopted the usual and accepted forms and methods of levying and collecting taxes.

Partly because of our limited population, no doubt, we find that the average per capita tax in the 11 Western States is $48.57, as against a national average of $42.58. The per capita tax runs from a low of $34.95 in Wyoming to a high of $75.74 in the State of Washington. The per capita income, however, of residents of the 11 Western States totals $1,069, as against a national average of $1,031.

Several of the Western States are now undertaking thorough studies of their tax structures with a view to improving the systems and providing greater incentive to prospective industrial development.

One item of great importance and one that gives rise to considerable concern is the large block of federally owned lands in the 11 Western States. The Federal Government now owns nearly 50 percent of the total area of lands in these Western States—47 percent to be exact.

Such Federal ownership runs from a low figure of 26 percent in Washington to a high of 78 percent in Nevada. Obviously those lands are not on the tax rolls.

There is a bill now pending in Congress which is designed to remedy this situation as far as the question of taxation is involved. The proposed law would provide that the States be reimbursed by the Federal Government in amounts equal or nearly equal to the loss in taxes sustained by the States on account of such Federal ownership. Such a law would be very beneficial in further distribution of the tax load in these Western States and would, in effect, broaden the tax base to a considerable degree.

Recent reports indicate that passage of this proposed law this year is quite likely. We western governors should give unanimous support to the measure.

Transportation

The Western States have access to all modern forms of transportation—rail, water, highway, and air. Barges, ships, and tugs operate on the inland waters and streams while oceangoing vessels ply from the ports of the coastal States. Transcontinental railroads and truck operations serve practically all of the main cities of the 11 Western States. Thus is assured dependable transportation at low cost. The States likewise are served by transcontinental air lines, which service is to be extended and improved in the postwar period.

Markets

The subject of markets and foreign trade undoubtedly will be discussed extensively at another period during this conference. However, I wish at this time to call attention to a few items which I deem pertinent and which have particular application to this subject of light metals.

Looking out over the broad Pacific toward the Orient—China—Russia, we can visualize a postwar potential market in the light metals field of tremendous proportion. Then, too, we can anticipate a vast amount of business from the Americas alone—21 nations with a population of 250,000,000 people.

Let us for a moment, however, give consideration to the possibilities of our own western division and to the Nation as a whole. In our 11 Western States we have a population of 15,000,000 people. Inclusion of the western territories and possessions adds another seventeen million for a grand total of over thirty million and, in my opinion, the West is on the eve of a great growth and development. However, with our very low cost of manufacture in the light-metals field, together with the advantage of excellent transportation facilities, we are placed in a favorable competitive position in the markets of the East.

The low production costs of aluminum here in the West give rise to the likelihood of greatly expanded use of this light metal. Consideration is now being given to its use in the building of trains, trucks, busses, boats, various building materials, irrigation pipe, and an endless number of appliances, utensils, and gadgets. Here lies opportunity for the development of untold numbers of small business concerns. Include also the necessary numbers of small plants, shops, and foundries turning out castings, forgings, and the like.

With proper development there is real opportunity in this western light-metals field to provide for the economic rehabilitation of large numbers of our returning veterans.

Aside from a considerable use of aluminum by the aircraft industry, a big potential field for expanded use of the product rests with the automotive industry. It has been predicted that if and when the cost of aluminum is lowered and there ceases to be virtually a monopoly of the product, there then would develop a wide-scale use of this light metal in automotive equipment. Lighter-weight equipment obviously means longer life for our highways.

Last month the circuit court of New York handed down its Alcoa antitrust decision, which may have far-reaching effect in the disposal of the Government aluminum plants and the future of the industry in the West. In discussing the question of plant disposition, the court said that the disposal agency "may well believe that it cannot do so without some plan or design for the industry as a whole, some comprehensive model which shall, so far as practicable, reestablish free, independent, private enterprise, discourage monopoly, strengthen small competitors, foster independents, and not foster monopoly or restraint of trade."

The Western States have an unusual interest in the program of disposition that will be adopted by the Surplus Property Board.

Another policy of Government of vital interest and concern to the future of the industry in the West, and to the industry as a whole, for that matter, is the one having to do with the American subsidized Shipshaw aluminum plant in Canada.

In 1941 the United States Government loaned without interest to the Canadian Aluminum Co. $68,500,000. This money was used in the construction of the power dam at Shipshaw and the adjacent aluminum ingot plant. Not only was the money loaned without interest, but the obligation was to be repaid by the sale of aluminum to the United States Government. Furthermore, the price at which it was sold is higher than the price paid for aluminum to firms in the United States.

The amount of aluminum involved in the Canadian deal totals 1,370,000,000 pounds, with 245,000,000 pounds to be delivered in 1945.

There is just cause for all of us who are interested in the postwar development of the light metals industry in the West to view this entire transaction with considerable alarm and much concern.

Conclusion

In developing this discussion I have attempted to point out the great possibilities for future development of the light-metals industry in the Western States and yet at the same time to focus attention on the obstacles to be met and those things that need action now and in the future.

Briefly, then, may I summarize with the following statements and suggestions:

1. The 11 Western States should become actively interested in the development of a plan for the disposition of aluminum plants by the Surplus Property Board that gives promise of a long-range, systematized program of development of the light-metals industry in the West.

2. The future success of the industry strongly suggests a suspension or settlement of the Shipshaw Canadian aluminum contract.

3. A bauxite or alumina plant, properly located, should be constructed in the West.

4. The Government should render assistance in making available to the West low-cost raw materials, particularly from foreign countries at least until local sources and methods have been proved.

5. It seems highly desirable for the Government to create emergency stock piles of aluminum as well as exercise care in the disposal of surpluses, if any, following the war.

6. The Western States should conduct surveys for future markets both here and abroad, as well as surveys looking to the location of light-metal plants, shops, and factories.

2. Through the medium of advertising and through the facilities of appropriate agencies, both public and private, we should "tell the Nation" of the great manufacturing advantages of the West.

8. Some of our educational institutions should establish courses in the light metal fields and promote research in new uses and processes.

9. The Western States should review and analyze their tax structures with a view of offering every possible inducement to future growth and development. Immediate support should be given to the bill providing for payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands.

10. This conference, by resolution, should provide for the creation of a select and qualified committee, appointed by the Governors of these 11 Western States, to pursue actively all phases of this question so important to the future welfare and development of the West. In unity there is strength. The time for action is now.

Justice for the Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justice for the Postman," published in the New York Daily Mirror of Saturday, April 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the New York Daily Mirror of April 28, 1945)

JUSTICE FOR THE POSTMAN

This should be the year the postman gets a break. If it is, it will be the first year in the last 20.

Your postman hasn't had a raise since 1925. His wages were substandard long before anyone ever heard of the Little Steel formula.

He has held his family together, and maintained his dignity as one of our best citizens and highest types of public servant, only by dint of the most stringent personal economy.

Now the Burch bill, sponsored by Representative THOMAS G. BURCH, of Virginia, has been reported out with the unanimous approval of the House Post Offices and Post Roads Committee.

The Burch bill would immediately raise postal base pay from $2,100 to $2,500, grant time and one-half overtime based on a 40-hour week, and give an opportunity for workers in large cities to be upgraded to $3,000 a year—$2,700 in smaller cities—over a long period of years.

These benefits, adding up to nothing more than plain and simple justice, would cost the Government annually only about one-third of the present year's $100,000,000 postal profits.

If the bill does not pass by June 30, the date when the present annual emergency bonus of $300 expires, the average postman will have exactly $1,575 left to live on after taxes and retirement fees.

No more good men would go into the service; thousands would leave it; the general public would suffer. This must not happen. Congress and President Truman should quickly approve the Burch bill, against which no voice can be raised.

Bretton Woods Proposals Essential to United States Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following series of five articles on the Bretton Woods monetary agreements for economic security, soon to be presented to this body for ratification, which I wrote for the Seattle Star and which were published serially on April 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, 1945, in that fine Pacific Northwest newspaper:

[From the Seattle Star of April 24, 1945]

"ADOPTION OF BRETTON WOODS PLAN WILL MEAN PROSPERITY FOR SEATTLE"—HUGH DE LACY

(By HUGH DE LACY, Congressman, First District)

WASHINGTON.—As representatives of the United Nations gather today in San Francisco to forge the political bonds of world peace, many of them will be casting anxious eyes toward the Nation's Capitol.

For here in Washington, Congress will be making the same choice as that confronting the delegates 3,000 miles away, but in another field.

Here, in hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee and later on the floor of Congress, we will decide between international collaboration in the economic field and the age-old system of economic isolation in which each Nation, weak or strong, is plunged into ruthless competition with every other nation in a dog-eat-dog fight for international markets.

That is the question posed by Bretton Woods—Once only the name of a little resort in the New Hampshire hills, but now designating agreements reached by 44 United Nations for economic cooperation toward world peace and prosperity.

The main issue before Congress, of course, is peace or war, international cooperation, or economic isolation.

But to us in Seattle it means that and much more. It means the difference between prosperity and depression, between the opening of a Pacific era of trade and development and the closing of our gateways to the Far East and the Soviet Union—the difference between 100,000 jobs and 100,000 unemployed.

Why?

Because Seattle's postwar prosperity is largely dependent upon trade across the Pacific, and because the Bretton Woods proposals are the means of bringing that trade to our shores more quickly. The point about the Bretton Woods proposed international monetary fund and the international bank is that they will speed up the time interval between the ending of the war and our reaching the ten billion foreign trade level we need.

Some idea of the importance of foreign trade to our Nation's prosperity can be gained from the fact that last year alone we sent over fourteen billions in lend-lease goods across the seas. Last year Government purchases for the war, including lend-lease, amounted to ninety billions, or half the national income.

That means that if we are to keep employment at last year's high level, we need a domestic market for seventy-six billions of goods beyond what was consumed here at home in 1944, and foreign trade of at least fourteen billions.

Because of the vast pent-up need for consumers' goods after the war, economists look for an eight billion home market after final V-day. That means we must have—and can have—a $10,000,000,000 foreign market. Such a market, the United States Treasury Department says, means 3,000,000 industrial jobs and 1,000,000 farm jobs.

In the Puget Sound area, where we had 466,488 jobs as of last June, and where we have a 500,000 share of the 60,000,000 job program, nearly every fifth job depends directly upon foreign trade. That means 100,000 jobs.

That is our stake in foreign trade, and in the passage by Congress of the Bretton Woods agreements.

[From the Seattle Star of April 25, 1945]

BILLION DOLLAR TRADE WITH CHINA IS SEEN IF BRETTON WOODS PROPOSALS ADOPTED

(By HUGH DE LACY, Congressman, First District)

WASHINGTON—More than $1,000,000,000 a year in foreign trade with China alone is within the grasp of the Pacific coast after final V-day. And, according to the United States Treasury, you can figure $1,000,000,000 in trade as equal to nearly a half million jobs.

China's postwar plans, realization of which mean ever-increasing millions in trade to us, are great. Here are but a few: A 100,000 miles of railroads, calling for 20,000,000 tons of steel; a 1,000,000 miles of highway; power plants capable of producing 20,000,000 kilowatts; 80,000,000 telephones; 1,000,000 new homes a year; 32,000 cotton looms; 16,000 woolen looms; 94,000 silk looms; thousands of river and canal boats, and eventually 10,000,000 of oceangoing shipping.

And Seattle's share in it is great—not alone in shipping.

Our new light metals industry, for which the Washington congressional delegation has been fighting, can provide thousands of miles of aluminum wire. Our shipyards can easily produce the thousands of river boats China needs. And we can share in her needed 10,000,000 tons of oceangoing vessels. Our prefabricated homes can be built and shipped to China cheaper than from anywhere else in the world.

Assistant Secretary of Treasury Harry D. White, who went over the Pacific picture with me, told the woeful story of prewar trade with China.

In 1928, he said, Chinese imports amounted to $859,000,000. But by 1937, they had dropped to $167,000,000. The devastating effect on our Northwest lumber industry, he summed up:

"In 1929 imports of lumber alone amounted to $13,000,000, while paper and paper products accounted for $23,000,000. In 1938 lumber exports had been reduced to $6,000,000, and paper to $13,000,000."

Approximately 40 percent of all China's lumber came from the United States and this drop came because:

"The principal difficulty," White said, "is that, prior to the war, China was not able to obtain the foreign exchange needed to purchase more supplies in the United States."

Thus, our billion-dollar trade picture, has an "if." I'm precluding some other "ifs"—winning the war, establishing a solid security organization for world peace, and stabilizing the internal political situation in China. Those preconditions for stable trade must be realized, too, but on these, at least, a good beginning has been made.

The answer to the biggest "if"—obtaining of foreign exchange—is contained in the Bretton Woods agreements, signed by 44 United Nations, and now before Congress here for ratification.

That's the job of the proposed international monetary fund, the first half of the Bretton Woods agreements. That fund's particular value to any community as de-

pendent on foreign trade as Seattle is that it will require member nations—all 44 of them—to fix their currency at a definite and single value in relation to the United States dollar.

Try to think of yourself selling lumber or ships or aluminum or prefabricated houses to China if you discovered that the Chinese dollar was worth 10 cents less one day than it was another. You'd say, "Now, look here, friend, I want to be paid in United States dollars." And if China had no dollars, you'd lose the business and China would lose the goods.

The idea of the fund is simply that any nation which becomes a member, under the safeguards and conditions laid down for membership, may put its own money into the international pot—called the fund—and take out dollars or pounds or rubles or francs or kronen to pay the business of whatever country it is doing business with.

Now, if China had sold some antimony to the United States, it would have some unused dollar credits. Then, of course, there would be no need of going to the fund. But, the day when she was caught short without dollar credits, the fund would be there. China's obligation—and that of all nations—would be to hold her money at the agreed-upon rate of exchange and to keep in the fund her original quota deposit.

It is so simple you wonder why the world went on for years, with each country rigging its currency, depreciating it, and international bankers playing all kinds of tricks with exchange rates, and each nation out to beat every other nation in what became an economic struggle for survival and ended in shot and shell and dive bombers and death.

But, of course, that was back when we were isolationists in everything. Down in San Francisco today and back here in Washington, we hope to write finis to that chapter of world history.

[From the Seattle Star of April 26, 1945]

"ADOPTION OF BRETTON WOODS PLAN WOULD OPEN UP TRADE WITH RUSSIA," DE LACY SAYS

(By HUGH DE LACY, Congressman, First District)

WASHINGTON.—Across the Pacific—2,000 miles closer to Seattle than any other large United States port—the Soviet Union today is seeking to buy $10,000,000,000 in United States goods when the war ends.

Marshal Stalin told Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, that his nation could use $10,000,000,000 in American credit to rebuild and develop the Soviet economy. Johnston said he thought all the United States could loan Russia was $2,500,000,000.

But the desire for $10,000,000,000 in business is there. That means unprecedented trade through the port of Seattle, tremendous orders which can be filled in the Pacific Northwest, and thousands of jobs for workers and new profits for new industry.

Seattle is the natural port through which much of the ten billion will flow. From San Francisco to Hawaii to Midway to Wake to Tokyo is 6,920 miles. From Seattle via Dutch Harbor the distance is only 4,800 miles. All distances to China, Japan, for eastern Russia and even to European Russia shrink when you follow this great circle route across the top of the world.

Much of the $10,000,000,000 will be put into the Russian Far East—our closest Pacific neighbor. When Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace discussed our Pacific future in relation to Bretton Woods with me, he pointed to his speech in Seattle last July after his return from the Soviet Union and China. He said then:

"Soviet Asia during the past 15 years has more than doubled its population. Russia, as a result of her experience with this war, will certainly shift much of her industry east of the Urals. Most of the people who moved to Siberia with their factories will stay there."

Into this developing section will go much Northwest goods. Assistant Secretary of Treasury Harry M. White told me he expects tremendous orders from Russia for our aircraft. Northwest aluminum, produced with low-cost public power more cheaply than anywhere in the United States, will be in demand. Steel, too, including high grade stainless steel, which can be made in Seattle's electric furnaces. Machine tools from our prospective tool industry. And an entire fleet of fishing vessels, which could come from our shipyards.

But Stalin asked for credits—long-term loans. For, with the tremendous reconstruction and industrialization job ahead of the Soviets, they simply haven't the cash to buy what they need.

That is the exact function of the international bank, the second half of the Bretton Woods agreements and counterpart of the international fund which I discussed yesterday.

The purpose of the bank is to safeguard and encourage "international investment for the development of the productive resources of members, thereby assisting in raising productivity, the standards of living, and conditions of labor in their territories."

This is done simply.

If Russia needs money to buy a million pounds of Pacific Northwest aluminum, its representatives go to a private banker. They both go to the international bank. The bank investigates. If the proposal is sound for the entire Siberian development, the bank says to the private lender, "Go ahead, we'll guarantee the loan."

Many a Seattle homeowner knows how that works. For it was the Government which guaranteed to private banks the F. H. A. loan on his home.

The bank also can lend money of its own—up to 20 percent of its capital. This is largely reserved for loans too big for private investors, or loans which the private bankers don't want even under the guaranty.

Without the bank not only Russia but every Pacific country—torn by war, needing reconstruction and developments, urgently requiring American goods, American industry, and American know-how—would find it harder to get credit and dollars to buy what they need and what we need to sell.

The bank helps erect a bridge of international cooperation into what can be a great, prosperous Pacific era.

[From the Seattle Star of April 27, 1945]

HARD PEACE TERMS BASED ON BRETTON WOODS PACT WOULD AID SEATTLE, NORTHWEST INDUSTRY

(By HUGH DE LACY, Congressman, First District)

WASHINGTON.—Revelations of cruelties and barbarism carried out by Japan and Germany have brought the realization in Congress that these nations must be deprived of the power to war. The tools of warfare must be stripped from their grasp. Production of electric-toughened steel for tanks and armor plate and tank-piercing shells and of light metals for air warfare must be taken from them. Without these metals no nation can wage modern warfare.

Under a system of import quotas to guard against stock piling of these vital metals for another war, Japan and Germany could obtain stainless steel, aluminum, and magnesium for her peacetime economy from the United States, turning the great wartime arsenal which we have built for the United Nations into a guaranty that the peace will be kept.

In the Pacific Northwest we have invested more than seventy million in aluminum plants alone. In Seattle we have two electric-furnace steel plants. New magnesium plants are also war created.

From these plants should flow much of the alloy steel and light metals which the defeated Axis Powers must not be permitted to make—at least until they have demonstrated an abiding will to peace and freedom.

Its prospects increased by a tough peace and its path cleared by adoption of the Bretton Woods agreements, Seattle's foreign trade can be like a great snowball, rolling ever larger. For as China and India and the Soviet Far East expand their internal economy and become more and more industrialized, this industrialization itself creates even greater markets.

You can't build even a $500 house for a Chinese whose income will not total that in his lifetime. You can't provide him a telephone or electric light. You can't sell him an American stove or a pair of pants.

But raise the living standard of China and India—of the millions who can't buy—and you have founded a new market.

As Donald M. Nelson, who as personal representative of the late President Roosevelt went to both China and the Soviet Union to help with plans for industrialization, told me:

"A sound international plan which contributes to China's financial stability would be an excellent thing for us, as well as China. As China develops, our trade with her is bound to benefit, just as our trade with Canada and Mexico has grown with the progress of these countries."

Nelson spoke knowingly of Canada. For as Canada's industry grew from 1900 to 1929 our exports to her also grew. During these years her national income increased 4.5 times and her manufacturing facilities 8.1 times. Her imports jumped 7.8 times.

Charting national income and imports of every nation shows that imports jump as national income jumps and falls when income falls.

Bretton Woods provides the means for our Pacific neighbors to buy from us now the equipment and tools and machines they need to expand their economy. That means immediate trade, and as their economies do expand, the snowball grows.

The framework of commercial interchange and investment provided by the Bretton Woods agreements can mean billions in trade for Seattle, growing trade, new industry, shipping, jobs, and greater prosperity.

[From the Seattle Star of April 28, 1945]

SEATTLE'S BANKING LEADERS HAVE URGED BRETTON WOODS RATIFICATION, DE LACY SAYS

(By HUGH DE LACY, Congressman, First District)

WASHINGTON.—Many Seattle business and banking leaders join dozens of civic organizations, clubs, and most Seattle labor organizations in urging Congress to ratify the Bretton Woods agreements for international cooperation in the economic field.

When I first began a study of Bretton Woods, nearly 2 months ago, I sought the advice of bankers and businessmen. I found opposition, of course. But the opinion of the American Bankers' Association, representing largely the view of large international bankers in the East who have long controlled foreign trade and foreign exchange, is not shared by many local financial and business figures.

The Seattle Star, through its columnist, Samuel Grafton, and its own editorials, has added greatly to the clarity of Pacific Northwest thinking on Bretton Woods.

Three main reasons are offered in support of the agreements reached by 44 United Nations which Congress is now asked to approve:

1. Even if the agreements are not all we would like, they represent the effort of 43

other nations and the United States, and if we believe in international cooperation, we must demonstrate it now.

2. To amend Bretton Woods in Congress, is to destroy it, since it means calling together again all 44 nations and saying: "We will take nothing but this." Such is the pathway of "reservations" which wrecked the last peace.

3. Expanded international trade, promised more quickly under Bretton Woods, means more jobs and greater Northwest industry.

On the last point, W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, said:

"Here in the Pacific Northwest, we are all anxious to resume trade with China as soon as possible, both to restore old outlets for west-coast lumber, pulp, and other products, and to build up future economic relations that should be of benefit to both countries.

"But it is impossible almost to start in this direction until some commercial stability is placed over Chinese exchange. Even if it remains terribly depreciated, there must be at least some bottom ratio between Chinese and American dollars on which trade can be conducted before trade will get on any but a wildly speculative basis."

It is this function of the Bretton Woods international monetary fund which Greeley approves, although he points to its imperfections, adding: "I assume imperfections will appear in any plan for financial stabilization of the world that is now offered; that amendments and revisions will be necessary from time to time; that the nations will have to work out ways and means by trial and error * * *. But certainly we should make a start; we should not fail to try."

Recalling ancient oppositions to other important steps in banking, Jay G. Larson, vice president of the Seattle First National Bank, joined many other officers of that bank in approval of Bretton Woods.

"I am mindful of the fact that much of the progressive legislation affecting banks, domestic and international finance, has met opposition from bankers and certain economists; the Federal Reserve Bank, the R. F. C., the F. D. I. C., etc., yet they have all worked, in my opinion, beneficially," he said.

"Certainly we are a part of the world," he added. "We shall be engaged in world commerce and trade. Without it our position would be extremely precarious. If we can contribute to the stabilization of currencies, it certainly will facilitate such trade and minimize the risks involved * * *. Certainly we have spent much more than this for the purpose of stabilizing the world politically and socially, and have sacrificed the lives of many men for this purpose. The cost in dollars is small compared to that."

E. I. Wallberg, assistant manager of the Bank of California in Seattle, speaking personally, summed up many local banking views:

"1. The fund, as proposed, was devised by technicians of 30 different countries, and has been approved by representatives of 44. The present plan, therefore, is already a compromise plan.

"2. It is a constructive step forward, but if a plan so overwhelmingly approved by the Conference is further modified or rejected, international distrust will arise, and the well-intentioned results of world collaboration will be irretrievably lost.

"3. Without the fund, the postwar world will return to the chaos of depreciated and manipulated currencies, thus setting the stage for renewed social, political, and trade dislocations on an international scale."

Ira W. Bedle, vice president of the National Bank of Commerce, said he was inclined to agree with Edward E. Brown, chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago, when Mr. Brown said: "The plans are not perfect * * * but represent * * * years of study by different national interests to bring about the result which all the united and allied nations desire."

Such views are not universal but a majority of Seattle business and banking leaders seem to agree. And agreeing with them are the vast number of men and women of labor. Two examples sum up labor's views:

Hope Lodge, 79, International Association of Machinists: "The Bretton Woods proposals, organized into an institution for universal accord, can win the peace and keep it."

Painters' district council No. 5: "The Bretton Woods proposals are necessary to world economic stabilization and postwar reconstruction."

Most of us in the Puget Sound area look to the better days ahead under Bretton Woods.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over station WEAF of the National Broadcasting Co. Saturday afternoon, May 5, 1945:

Is universal military service feasible in the United States? Is it needed? Is it democratic? My answer is an emphatic, unequivocal no to these questions.

I view with apprehension—with justified apprehension—the proposals to introduce into the United States a system of universal military training in peacetime. I admit I am shocked by the loose thinking that has characterized the proposals to date. We are told that it will be a blessing, an enrichment in education and in health. Let us examine these statements more closely. A year's military training is not education in the accepted sense of the term. Quite frankly, it is sheer, unabashed indoctrination for military purposes. No broad cultural base in education is provided, as I understand it; only knowledge that will have a direct bearing on the brutal business of fighting is to be included in the curriculum. I can't be confused on that point because the War Department in a recently distributed circular states, "There will be no place in a sound universal military training program for activities that are nonessential to the task of preparing our young men for combat." Beyond peradventure of a doubt, it will be education for military purposes.

Military training is uniquely remote from education in its cultural and humanistic implications. As proposed by the War Department, it is not even vocational education or training. The type of mechanical proficiency required to repair a howitzer does not necessarily qualify a man to repair an automobile. Assembling and dissembling a Garand rifle will not enhance one's knowledge of the intricacies of a radio set. Knowledge as to the operation of a 150-millimeter gun—its artillery range, its fire control, its damage potentiality—is useless except in defensive or offensive action in a war.

It is further stated that when this year of military training has been completed the training is ended. Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a recognized military authority, told the House Military Affairs Committee recently that 2 years of service would be absolutely the minimum in order to train the modern soldier. No one of equal or higher authority has arisen to contradict him; at least, not to my knowledge. Major Eliot's statement is completely understandable in the light of the high degree of specialization required in our Army today. Judging by the rapidity with which destructive mechanical devices are being planned and perfected, such a brief and limited period of training could not be effective. I would be mandatory to retain men to use the new weapons.

As the educators of our country know well, a year's interruption in the normal progress of study—assuming only a year will be required—must result in a marked decrease in future attendance at higher institutions of learning. Take a lad away from his school for 1 year at the age suggested and mark then his reluctance to return. He is confronted with a sudden and drastic change in his living habits and aside from that, a diversion is created which may color his mental attitudes for years to come. What will he learn under this suggested program that a vocational or professional school could not teach him more quickly and more thoroughly—other than the dubious usages attendant upon war? We have seen evidence a plenty of the military system in the depravity of the Hitler youths of tender age. Their insensitivity to their brutal occupation casts a chill over one's heart and one hopes and prays that it "won't happen here." It is stated that "Graduate trainees would then be free to continue their further education." And, I say, "yes," they might be free, but would they continue their education? It is the answer to this question that should engage the very serious attention of every thoughful citizen.

The talk about the increased health of our youth is just as hollow. Let's remember that only the physically fit will be selected for training. It has been ascertained that only 830,000 out of 1,250,000 who reach the age of 18 are mentally and physically fit for service. The unfit are not acceptable in the Army and therefore do not receive the innoculations and the cures nor are they the beneficiaries of the elaborate health programs inaugurated for those who do make the grade. Moreover, it is a pretty sad commentary on the state of this Nation when we appear to choose the Army as an instrument to cure our social ills. Let's admit frankly that our public health services need mending badly—many children of 5 as well as adults of 50 should receive remedial care. Why only lads of 17 and 18?

It is that angle of it which disturbs me—this tendency to shy away from essentials and giving us instead so much eyewash about health and education.

It is stated that the military security of the Nation must be placed first and not last, and that all conjectural fears should not be permitted to obscure the issue. I object to the phrase, "conjectural fears." If we as the most powerful country in the world desire to start a race among the nations of the world for bigger and better armies, for feverish expansion in the instruments of war, then by all means let's have universal military peacetime training. But let us also keep in mind the possible outcome if we embark upon such a course. Undoubtedly we will cultivate an atmosphere of distrust among our militarily weaker neighbors to the south of us and inspire them to rivalries and jealousies among themselves. The axiom developed in the past 25 years is that modern technical warfare has made stronger nations stronger and weaker nations weaker. If this is what we want, then by all means let's have peacetime militarism. And if we desire to make absolutely certain that all proposals for the establishment of an international organization for peace will fail, then let's pass the military training bill now. Let's not wait until the deliberations at San Francisco are concluded. Let's not wait until "Johnny

comes marching home" with millions of his buddies.

The structure of a durable peace can only stand firm, and this is neither naïveté nor wishful thinking—when the people—all people everywhere—believe and trust and hope and pray it will stand firm. Encourage a tentative approach—vacillation in any of its forms—an indolent view of practicable international harmony—then, upon the slightest disagreement—poof! down it comes, smashed into irretrievable atoms. You cannot build a huge machinery of war—involving men and machines—and then not search, consciously or unconsciously—for some way in which to use it. As the military monster is swollen and perfected, the temptation likewise becomes more enticing. "Preparedness" is a paradox. We prepare for combat—in order to keep the peace—which ultimately develops into war.

You may cultivate the constructive attitude that a durable, reasonable, sane peace is possible, that an organization for peace is something that can be mad to work—or you may cultivate the dubious attitude, loaded with distrust and suspicion. Then the game begins again—all over the world. "Oh, you don't trust me, eh?" "Well, I don't trust you." The well-worn chip is adjusted on the shoulder and some other nation, anxious to throw its weight around in a contest, will somehow manage to find a way to knock it off. We can always find an enemy, if we concentrate.

I should like to ask the proponents of this legislation this question. Against whom are we arming? Peacetime conscription brings with it the full panoply of war, including now, I assume, the robot projectiles. Will these implements of complete devastation be aimed at our present allies? Does it mean that we will shake hands with them but have a bodyguard hovering in the background? We have decisively defeated Germany, and when we defeat Japan will we start out after them again? The Big Three agreed at Yalta that the Reich must be disarmed, demilitarized, and dismembered, and that the United States, Russia, England, and France would occupy Germany indefinitely. Is the Crimea agreement a mere scrap of paper so soon? If so, why are we going through the motions required to set up international machinery for an organization to keep the peace? If such a reversal of policy is possible at this stage of the proceedings, then let the delegates return to their homes. We are dedicated to the proposition of abolishing war in our time. War must not be accepted as inevitable, as the cynics say. Dr. Margaret Mead, a noted anthropologist, stated: "So long as we believe that war is a part of human behavior, we only tackle it sentimentally. We didn't get rid of the buggy until we had the automobile. War is an invention. We must substitute another."

If we are going to embrace the incredible and inhuman concept that war is inevitable and we must, therefore, bow to the inevitable, I can't see the effectiveness of universal peacetime training. When will this third war for which we will be training our youth break out? In 5 years, in 10, 15, or 20? Assuming any period of time to be a logical one, in view of the swiftly changing techniques of war you won't be able to use the boys whose training took place 5 years ago, 10 years ago, 15 years ago, 20 years ago. Those who have been trained will be too old, in many instances, and if their age is not held against them they will have to be retrained. Immediate use could only be made of the men then in training when the newer holocaust breaks out and they will be in the 17- and 18-year-old brackets, hardly sufficient in number for a fighting army. For manpower, we will have to use the identical process of our present Selective Service System—and retrain.

We are warned that the safety of the United States should never again be imperiled by defenses extemporized in the shadow of imminent danger. I presume the imminent danger is that which culminates in the so-called sneak or sudden attack. Of all the misnomers in military history, the sudden attack stands supreme. The technique of modern war requires years of preparation, the conversion of peacetime manufacture, and the diversion of raw materials for war purposes; it all takes time.

Our American resources were so great the conversion was comparatively rapid, and we had a foot hold as a result of the lend-lease program. Both Germany and Japan gave the powers that be ample notice of their intent. Hitler did not sneak up on France, Britain, and Russia. He gave full warning, as evidenced by the set-up of the Reich factories. The whole world knew about his attempts to establish ersatz rubber for military purposes, and it was no secret that Messerschmitts and Dorniers were rolling off the assembly lines. We heard about the conversion of automobile factories to the manufacture of tanks and the change-over from fertilizers to explosives.

Intelligent appraisals of the exports and imports of a suspect nation and of its manufactured products will reveal any inimical plans. A war can be stopped in the making—before the deaths on the battlefields—if we have the international peace structure dedicated to that purpose, alert and aware, that in this era, war does not come overnight. War is one coming event that casts its shadow before. This one lesson we have dearly bought.

If we must keep our youth in everlasting training, why not our farmers, our manufacturers, and our shipbuilders, etc. In order to fight successfully, our men will need the weapons of war. Must they stand around and wait while the industries are activated to a war emergency? If we have universal military training, the inescapable conclusion is that forever and a day, our economy must be geared to war.

Proponents of this legislation dismiss as the lightest straw in the bundle of arguments presented against the proposal the suggestion that there is a danger of the establishment of a military dynasty, or a professional hierarchy. Have they forgotten, even before this horrible war ends, the Junkers of Germany and their satellite military cliques or the military caste that holds the Japanese people enthralled? I am opposed to compulsory military training because it is duck soup for the hereditary military caste. It makes the professional soldier top dog, career colonels, who demand blind obedience—not thoughtful acquiescence. I prefer volunteers first, with suitable inducements of pay, living quarters, and rank, supplemented by scholarships, and, if necessary bonuses. If the proposals at San Francisco prevail, we will need our Regular Army and as well, an international army for police purposes, to which we would have to make our contribution of manpower. If volunteer methods fail to fill our quota, then we will have to conscript. We would have no choice. It will be the price we will have to pay for domestic and international security. But, for goodness sake, let us not glamorize any idea of military conscription.

Military conscription is hardly a new idea. It has been utilized by a number of countries after Machiavelli first proposed it in his famous work, The Prince. It was used by French revolutionists to preserve the benefits of the revolution but Napoleon seized upon it to advance his imperial dreams. Said he, "I can afford to expend 30,000 men a month." Such utter disregard for the sanctity of human life is the very antithesis of democracy. Avoidance of onerous military service was one of the primary causes motivating millions of immigrants who streamed to the United States from Europe. Prussia under Bismarck, Germany under the Kaiser and under Hitler, used conscription for the entrenchment of militarism and to achieve the so-called Lebensraum. The czars used it in Russia despotically. Hirohito and Franco find it a useful tool. The dead, degraded Mussolini ruled Italy with this device. The Argentinians, under Farrell and Peron, feel the impact of its heel. England and the United States, without conscription, were the victors in World War No. 1 and are clearly destined for victory in World War No. 2.

The Negroes fear the democracy of compulsory military service. They know it will spread Jim Crowism. Visit any camp or replacement center and notice how the Negroes are segregated and socially ostracized. It has been charged that even in the European theater of combat operations and in certain points in the Pacific, Negro soldiers are segregated. We believe we are fighting the theory inculcated by Hitler that he and his ilk are the Herrenvolk, the master race, and that we are resisting his efforts to overcome the Sklavenvolk, his version of the inferior races. Let us remember that Jim Crowism is nazism—just another twist to the Hitler depravity.

And remember this. Peacetime conscription must lead to the surrender of much of the liberty for which we have fought and sacrificed. Our democracy is founded on the principle that the State serves the people and this fundamental must not be perverted to any concept that the people serve the State. Military peacetime training is a distortion of this basic principle of our government. It will insist upon the dedication of 1 year or more of the lives of our youths for no useful purpose, as far as I can see. A constant stream of malleable minds will be placed under the tutelage and discipline of professional officers who necessarily bear the military cast of mind. With them, it is a business. The habit of wearing a uniform. Physically, easily develops the habit of wearing one, mentally.

To my mind, the question before the American people today is this:

Does universal military training involve perpetual conscription?

Taking all of the factors into consideration, the logical answer seems to be in the affirmative. I strongly doubt that the American people desire to endorse a potential menace and such an obvious delusion. We would gain mighty little and lose much—too much.

Principles of the Turners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Pearl Harbor forced America to suddenly call its youth to arms only to find that millions were physically unfit for military service. This disclosure of the physical unfitness of our youth was shocking to the American public. As a step of correction and in protection of the future youth of America, I introduced H. R. 2044 for the promotion of physical fitness.

The American Turnerbund seeks this same goal, and as part of my remarks I am happy to include the Principles of the Turners:

PRINCIPLES OF THE TURNERS

The American Turnerbund is a federation of Turner societies in the United States of

America, organized to promote physical education and disseminate rational ideas, in order to advance the health, happiness, prosperity, and progress of mankind.

It is the principal duty of our societies to provide courses in physical training for youth and adults, and also to promote their intellectual growth and moral character through special schools, instructive lectures, and stimulating debates.

Believing in the United States as a democracy in a republic, established upon the principles of freedom and equality, dedicated to justice and humanity, we recognize in the harmonious education of body and mind the most important factor to preserve and perfect such a democracy. Therefore, we seek to train the citizen for the efficient discharge of all his duties toward the community, also showing him how to live his own life in a wholesome and rational way, with happiness as its proper goal.

Man's highest function is to think, and his noblest service to proclaim the truth as he sees the truth. Conduct should be based on reason and knowledge, and these can be attained only through liberty, the first of all human rights, not to be denied by bigots nor abridged by censors. We hold, therefore, that the state has the paramount duty of protecting the individual in the exercise of those fundamental rights guaranteed by every liberal constitution—the right of free speech, free press, and free assembly. Conversely, we hold that the state has no right, either by constitutions or laws, by multiplied prohibitions and magnified police powers, to impair any human right that does not diminish or destroy any rights of other human beings.

In matters of religion and conscience, especially, striving for the dissemination of a philosophy based on the ever-growing knowledge of natural forces, we demand freedom and tolerance in the broadest sense. Believing in the well-established American principle that state and church should be kept separate, we oppose any interference by sectarian bodies in political affairs. Attempts to debar the people from national amusement and recreation on Sundays, the employment of religious functionaries paid out of public moneys, the exemption of church property from taxation, and all similar tendencies to impose upon the state the support or recognition of any creed or denomination, we protest against with solemn and sincere concern.

As we oppose coercion in religious matters, so also we demand for every human being the right to use whatever language he prefers. All languages should be free to all people, and to make any language obligatory or to interdict any language is an invasion of human rights as would be the compulsion to accept or adjure any special religion. We recognize particulrly in the German language a social heritage of priceless value, worth cultivating and preserving.

Matters like these are implicit in the guaranty of mental liberty underlying the entire fabric of our civilization. Such liberty is the lubricant and dynamic of our material prosperity, to guard which is the primordial sphere of government. The state, with all its institutions and laws, defining rights and duties, is but a phase in the continuous evolution of society.

When economic conditions are such as to produce, by privilege and monopoly granted to special groups, extremes like the millionaire and the pauper, the centralization of political power in certain classes becomes inevitable. For these reasons we approve all measures to keep open the avenues to economic equality. Opportunity must be afforded every human being to secure, by his mental and physical labor, a decent and comfortable livelihood in accordance with the prevailing standards of civilization, and likewise to share in the opulent heritage of past centuries.

We favor social institutions and legal enactments that will secure to every worker the fruits of his toil and safeguard his life. Such legislation, putting human rights above private profit, is merely the practical modern application of the ancient commandments, "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not kill."

In the full application of this principle we recognize a new extension of the doctrine of eminent domain, subordinating individual and corporate privilege to the general good. We hold that all natural resources, such as coal, oil, gas, ores, forest reserves, and water power, are primarily the property of all the people, and cannot be monopolized without injury to all the people. Wherever such monopolies through their exploitations, become unbearable, the Government should adopt measures of regulation and taxation to restore such property to its original and rightful owners, to all the people. We hold further that all public utilities—such as railways, interstate or municipal, steam or electric, and telegraphs, telephone, and radio—being in their ultimate development essentially monopolies like the mail service, ought to be and are subject to the same power of regulation and taxation, so that, whenever the exactions of such monopolies become intolerable, such property may be gradually escheated to its ultimate and rightful owners, to all the people.

To this end we favor direct participation by the people in affairs of government, through the establishment of the most far-reaching democratic agencies for political control.

The greater and more extensive the people's rights, and the more use they make of those rights, the greater will be the importance of clearly understanding cause and effect in relation to social and economic needs. We hold, therefore, that the State, representing the whole people, has the duty of furthering the intellectual enlightment of all by perfecting our school system, supporting scientific research, and vindicating the freedom of teaching against all gag laws.

As history reveals the gradual ascendancy of right over might among individuals, so it should prevail among nations and races. For this reason we favor the removal of all barriers to trade and travel between one country and another, as well as the abrogation of all inhuman immigration laws. And we favor the settlement of international disputes by judicial procedure. We hold that every war, except defense against invasion, is a crime against the law of nations, and should be outlawed by every nation; that overgrown military and naval establishments are a menace to our own liberties and the peace of the world; and that the power of conscription is a dangerous device of tyranny. Therefore we favor progressive disarmament, international arbitration treaties, and tribunals, the abandonment of all selfish discriminations and historic hatreds, leading to the ultimate fraternal federation of the world.

These Turner principles, briefly summarized, are as follows: Liberty, against all oppression; tolerance against all fanaticism; reason, against all superstition; justice, against all exploitation. Free speech, free press, free assembly for the discussion of all questions, so that men and women may think unfettered and order their lives by the dictates of conscience—such is our ideal, which we strive to attain through a sound mind in a sound body.

We are not a political party, obligating its members to any definite demands, but we urge upon them the supreme duty of independent thought and action—always to live as men and always to vote as citizens in harmony with the philosophy whose fundamental principles are here set forth.

Plans of War Department for Redeployment of Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the War Department, published in the New York Times yesterday:

PLANS OF WAR DEPARTMENT FOR REDEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS

(The text of the War Department's announcement on its troop redeployment plan was as follows:)

As the end of the war in Europe approaches, public interest is turning to the problems involved in defeating Japan and the size of the army required to accomplish this job. Yesterday members of the War Department General Staff appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee to discuss our plans in executive session fully and frankly.

The information presented has appeared in the press in partial and garbled form, therefore as it is of the most intense interest to every soldier and to our citizens generally, the following statement is released. The War Department desired to delay making any public statement in this matter until after several basic factors had been cleared with overseas commanders and the plan presented to the entire Congress by Admiral King and General Marshall.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, after consultation with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz, have made a preliminary estimate of the troops and equipment needed to crush Japan in the shortest possible time and with the smallest cost in American lives. Similar calculations were made for the forces provided General Eisenhower.

Their estimate of the needs in Europe and Africa was quite accurate, the last division to arrive in Europe having gone into action on April 1.

ASK REDUCTION TO 6,968,000 MEN

Our Army is now 8,300,000 strong. Under the approved plan we are now engaged in working toward an Army strength of 6,968,000 a year from now. That will give us all the strength we believe we can deploy effectively against Japan and will also enable us to meet our occupation responsibilities in Europe and to maintain the necessary training and supply force in the United States.

Although we were able to hold to the plan we made for the war against Germany, developments in war are a matter which cannot be mathematically predicted with accuracy. Our best judgment is that we can defeat Japan quickly and completely with an army which a year from now will be 6,968,000. This figure is given to the American people with the assurance that they will be told later on of any changes that the progress of the war makes possible or necessary.

The Japanese have a military force of more than 4,000,000 men and many millions more men that can be utilized for service forces or for combat, if need be. The numbers we can deploy in the Pacific, with the limitation of shipping and base facilities, would not appear on the face of it sufficient to insure that preponderance which brings victory swiftly and with low casualties.

But the Japanese forces are divided. Some are in the home islands; some in China;

some in Manchuria. They have remnants of garrisons in many parts of the Pacific and the East Indies. Our control of the sea and the air makes it possible for us to keep these forces apart and to choose the time and place of our attacks. We have opportunity to strike with overwhelming power as soon as we get our bases established and our armies deployed.

SAYS MEN IN EUROPE MUST AID

It is our aim, together with our allies, to give the men under General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz all the help we can give them just as rapidly as we can move it into the Pacific.

We can meet only part of the needs of this Pacific war from men still in this country. Many of the troops now in Europe must also go to the Pacific to take their places beside those who have driven the Japanese back from the threshold of Australia to the inner zone of their own defenses.

Every physically fit soldier in the United States who has not yet served overseas will be assigned to foreign duty when he completes his training or, if he is performing an essential administrative or service function, as soon as he can be replaced by a returning veteran. The War Department has been making a systematic and successful effort since the start of the war to get all qualified men overseas. There have for several months been no combat divisions left in this country and few smaller tactical units of any character.

Moving our forces from Europe to the Pacific involves the greatest transportation problem that has ever been undertaken in war. The distances are tremendous. From Europe to Manila by way of Panama is 14,000 miles. From San Francisco to Manila is 6,771 miles. And speed is essential, for it is vitally important that we do not give the enemy time either to rest or reorganize his defenses.

Consequently many troops will go straight from Europe to the war against Japan. As many as can be taken through the United States without reducing our pressure on the enemy will be brought through this country and given furloughs en route. Some must be given retraining after their furloughs, for fighting the Japanese is different from fighting Germans.

HALF THROUGH UNITED STATES

The need is particularly great for service troops to build the communications, harbors, bases, and airfields essential to sharply expanded combat operations. Many of the service troops will have to go direct to the Pacific to prepare the way for the full application of our ground and air strength.

More than half of the men to go to the Pacific will go by way of the United States. The proportion will be substantially lower than this among service units attached to air and ground operations, and higher among combat units. The great bulk of the combat units will be staged through the United States.

Still others of the troops now in Europe will have to remain there for occupation duty to make certain that the menace of Nazi aggression is permanently eradicated and that the seeds of a new war do not take root before this one is ended. The number assigned to this duty and the length of time they will be needed will depend on the situation in Europe and the nature of our international commitments. For a considerable period of time the actual number of our soldiers in Europe will exceed the requirements, due to limitations in shipping.

We are mindful of the desire in the heart of every soldier and every citizen to have as many of our soldiers as can be spared without diminishing the force of our blows against Japan to return to civilian life as soon as possible. The War Department fully shares this desire. The Department strongly urged the Congress to provide in the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 that no one should be retained in the armed forces after he was no longer needed for the prosecution of the war. This requirement is now the law of the land, and the War Department will live up to it in every respect.

DRAFT CALLS AFTER VE-DAY

The reduction in the size of the Army from 8,300,000 to 6,968,000 represents a drop of a little over 1,300,000 in total strength. This will not be sufficient to permit the early discharge of all the men we consider should be returned to civil life as a result of their extended oversea and combat service.

Consequently, it is planned to hold Selective Service calls after VE-day at a level above that necessary to replace men lost through battle and normal attrition and thus make it possible to release more men with a record of long and arduous service. This procedure of releasing the maximum of veterans and their return to civil life will permit the call into service of those men who have heretofore been deferred for one reason or another.

We will at the same time continue to release men because of sickness, wounds, age, and such other factors which prevent their effective use in the service. During the last 12 months discharges from all these causes totaled about 450,000. It is expected that discharges of this kind, in addition to those made of men with long oversea and combat service, will result in the release from the Army during the next year of about 2,000,000 men.

With the exception of the men to be released for specific disabilities, those who will leave the Army in the next year will be selected from all parts of the world, the Pacific as well as in Europe, on the basis of impartial standards recommended by the enlisted men themselves.

The whole aim of the system that has been developed is to insure that those men who have been oversea longest and have fought hardest and those who have children, get first consideration in demobilization. That is the way our soldiers believe it should be and that is the way it will be, subject only to the continuing necessity of keeping in service until adequate replacements can be found those men needed to defeat Japan.

SHIPPING DECLARED A FACTOR

A preliminary survey made by the War Department on the basis of a one-sixth demobilization of the Army indicates that all but 2 percent of the men to be released will be men who have served overseas and that these 2 percent will be fathers who have been in the Army a long time.

About half of the 1,300,000 men who will be eligible for release from the Army due to extended and arduous service are now in Europe and about one-third are in the Pacific. Most of the others are now in this country, having been returned under rotation after serving full tours of duty overseas.

How soon the men to be demobilized can be brought home will depend on the availability of shipping and air transport after the requirements of the war against Japan are met. The transportation of those eligible for discharge must be considered in connection with the whole transportation problem. In the last war it took a year to bring back the 2,000,000 men in the A. E. F., with no problem to meet in the Pacific save for a small force in Siberia. Today we have the problem of moving out of Europe almost double that force, a large number of whom must be transported over 14,000 miles of ocean to the far reaches of the Pacific.

We must transport to the Pacific vast stores of equipment and supplies both from the continental United States and from Europe so that our forthcoming operations may be carried out in accordance with our standard practice of using ammunition, air power, and material to the utmost to save lives. The soldiers who fight Japan will have all the superiority in fire power and equipment we can provide, but it will impose a heavy strain on shipping to give it to them. The supply lines to the Orient are so long that it takes three cargo ships to do the work one was able to do in supplying our troops in Europe.

SEVENTY DIVISIONS IN EUROPE

We have about 70 combat divisions in Europe at the present time, exclusive of hundreds of thousands of combat troops assigned to corps and armies and a huge force of supply and service troops. It takes 15 Liberty ships to move the equipment of a single armored division. It takes 75 trains to move it to the port. That gives you some idea of the transportation problem we are up against.

First priority must be given to the troops and equipment going to the Pacific if we are to win that war in the shortest time and with the smallest cost in casualties. Otherwise, we must slow down the pace of our offensives and run the risk that the enemy will have an opportunity to reorganize for renewed resistance. We will not ask any American soldier to lay down his life in order that another American soldier may return home a few days sooner.

However, it is not the intention of the War Department to push demobilization to one side during the many months it will take to transfer our main strength from Europe to the Pacific. Demobilization will proceed at the same time as redeployment, although it will be necessarily secondary in terms of urgency. We will do everything that can be done consistent with the effective prosecution of the Japanese war to see that men eligible for discharge do get back home in the shortest possible time.

Every ship that can be pressed into service from any quarter will be used. Arrangements have already been completed for returning soldiers with long European service in converted cargo and grain ships. It is estimated that nearly half a million men can be brought home in such ships by the end of the year. Regular passenger ships and troop transports, including the famed British *Queen Elizabeth*, *Queen Mary*, and the *Aquitania*, will also be operating on a gigantic shuttle system.

There will be 800 transport planes assigned to this task. Fifty thousand men a month will be brought back to this country by air. To the maximum possible extent, these planes will bring men from combat troops in the very heart of Germany—men with the longest periods of combat service and most remote from the ports. This process will begin promptly after Germany is defeated.

It is our expectation that, by ship and plane, we shall be able to bring home from Europe all men to be discharged in about a year's time.

BUILD SURPLUS IN PACIFIC

Equal attention is being given to the problem of bringing veteran troops back from the Pacific at the same time that the mass movement of additional forces into that theater is under way. The War Department is now shipping to the Pacific every replacement for whom shipping space can be found. By this means a surplus of replacements is being built up there so that men of long service can be sent home. Naval ships are being used wherever possible to assist in the return of men from this theater. Unfortunately, while the fighting goes on, the rate of return of men from the Japanese war will be governed by the extent to which we can bring in troops above actual battle replacement needs. No man can be released until another man is available to take his place.

The main facts of the redeployment as far as it concerns manpower are that:

We believe that a program which gives us an Army of 6,968,000 in 12 months from now will provide an adequate force to defeat Japan.

About 2,000,000 men will be returned to civilian life during the next 12 months.

About two-thirds of the combat units will come through the United States and have furloughs.

The larger proportion of service troops urgently needed in the Pacific will go there directly.

Transportation shortages, even with the 800 transport planes being used, will not get the last of the men who are to be discharged back to the United States before 12 months.

The problems involved in transferring our strength to the Pacific and bringing home those men who are no longer needed are more complicated than any we have experienced before. We cannot expect every phase of our plans to work to perfection. We count heavily upon the American people to continue to meet with courage and understanding the tests that lie ahead, as they have worked, prayed and suffered for the great victories in Europe.

For some the end of the war in Europe will mean joycus reunion, but for many more it will mean a new period of sacrifice and anxiety. None of us can afford to relax our efforts until that anxiety is terminated for every American at home and abroad.

Our great mission today is to mass against our enemy in the Pacific the largest force that can be effectively employed with every resource and power we can put at its disposal. That process has already begun. It will not stop until we rid the world permanently of this menace.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that has been outstanding in its support of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Democratic organization of this district—Berks County, Pa.—attended services in St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa., when the pastor, the Reverend Dr. W. R. Siegart, delivered a very appropriate sermon, which I desire to include in my remarks:

On April 12, close to the anniversary of the tragic death of another American President, Abraham Lincoln, the entire world was shocked and bowed with grief at the death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. While many knew the state of his health and did not expect him to live through his fourth term as President, none realized that the end of his earthly labors was so nigh. With victory in Europe so near he was not permitted to see that goal achieved while he remained on earth.

Now a story can be told. It is more or less established that President Roosevelt did not want to run for a third term. Several people visited him and tried to talk him into being a candidate for that high office for the third term. He is said to have told them that he did not believe he would live through a third term, and that he would like to retire to his home in Hyde Park. One of the group, I believe from Pennsylvania, said, "Mr. President, others are called upon to sacrifice their lives for our country." After that remark silence fell upon the group. In a little while the President left without another word being spoken, but he was in deep thought. The next day he announced that he would be a candidate. Nor did he want to run for a fourth term, and had he considered himself alone he would not have done so. Truly, it may be said that he laid down his life for our country; but in a larger sense it may be said that he laid down his life for the world, for peace, amity, and good neighborliness among all the children of God everywhere.

* * * * *

The very principle enunciated in the Declaration of Independence upon which all our democracy, liberty, and freedom is based, "that all men are created equal," gets its start and power from the fact that there is one God who is the Father of all men, and that all men are children of God. So in keeping with our divine heritage, and in the spirit of our fathers through whose faith and sacrifice we are the heirs of such liberty and freedom, we meet for worship in the house of God, that from this worship we may thank and praise God, offer our prayers to Him, and receive strength, power, and courage to face the responsibilities which are ours, and faithfully to discharge them.

* * * * *

Born in the lap of luxury, he scorned the ease which such luxury would bring. All his life he never sought the easy way. Early he became a crusader and a fighter for the equal right and opportunity of all men. It is well said that he was a great humanitarian. He was more interested in people than in things. Is this not a basic teaching of our religion? Are we not taught that God is a Spirit, and that man is created in the image of God? Are we not taught the value of the soul? Are we not taught that man is of great value in the sight of God? Is it not true that things in themselves have no value except as they minister to the good of people? Thus this teaching seemed to animate his desire for men to the end that man, even the humblest citizen, might enjoy happiness in life as God intended.

From this belief which so permeated his being came the urge to have enacted social legislation of several types and kinds. I know from my own experience in mills and factories how necessary much of this legislation had become. When greed gains the ascendancy over sympathy and understanding, cruelty reigns. Much legislation is necessary to protect man from himself. When evil spirits gain the upper hand in a man's life results in agreement therewith follow. True it is that we argue the point concerning state and governmental oversight, but true it is also that we see that the state is the servant of the people, and not the master. For our Government is, as Lincoln so well put it, one "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Roosevelt's interest was in people, in men and women and little children, and the social legislation he advocated was the fruitage of his faith in man.

In looking at the life of Franklin Roosevelt we see that it was filled with drama. The play and interplay of forces, experiences, suffering, and joy make drama. But in peace and in war he was a man of action and a fighter.

One of the great crises of his life came when he was stricken with infantile paralysis. Truly here was an affliction to bow the strongest soul. But the spirit of action and the will to fight went a long way toward keeping him from becoming a permanent invalid. So well did he overcome this affliction, and so well did he enter normal life, that few thought of him as a victim of infantile paralysis. His interest in others who were suffering and afflicted was enhanced by his own experience. While we tell stories of others who have overcome handicaps of many kinds, let us not forget the struggle of a man of faith who rose to the highest office in our land from the depths of physical affliction. His fight against infantile paralysis explains much concerning his courage and willingness to face handicaps and opposition. There was a moral responsibility, a spiritual faith, and an intellectual vigor which would not permit him to remain idle and at ease, but which seemed to urge him on to greater endeavor.

True it is that after his overwhelming defeat as the Vice Presidential candidate, to which was added the physical affliction, Mr. Roosevelt rose to his greatest heights. It was after these crushing blows, either of which would have been enough to end the active career of any man, that he did his finest, noblest, and greatest work. Crisis after crisis seemed to mark his life, and he came to the office of President in a time of crisis; all through the years in that office one crisis seemed to follow another.

Immediately facing him as the Nation's Chief Executive was the economic crisis which had brought fear into the hearts of men. And when fear runs wild chaos rules. Then the Nation saw the man who had come from the depths of fear and suffering and who had risen to face life anew and to tackle the tasks with confidence, faith, hope, and action. From those days came that now famous statement of his, "We have nothing to fear but fear." The Nation rallied around him with new confidence, faith, and hope.

It is not our purpose, place, or function to analyze and evaluate all the legislative and executive acts of his career. Time and history will do that. Recovery, relief, reform, war, and peace all had their place upon the stage as the drama of his last 12 years was unfolded. But through it all democracy appeared in all its beauty, strength, and power.

Time will not permit us to go into all the outstanding characteristics of his life, but there are two more things about his life to which we should give time and attention. One of these is his desire for world peace, and the other is his faith in God; but must be considered together, for they cannot be separated.

Let me introduce the first by reading some of President Roosevelt's own words. On the 13th, the day after he died, he was to have delivered an address on the radio to the Jefferson celebration. That address, though written, was never delivered. Let me read to you about two-thirds of that address, the latter two-thirds:

"Today we have learned in the agony of war that great power involves great responsibility. Today we can no more escape the consequence of German and Japanese aggression than could we avoid the consequences of attacks by the Barbary corsairs a century and a half before.

"We as Americans do not choose to deny our responsibility.

"Nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our children and our children's children, there will not be a third world war.

"We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars—yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman, and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments.

"The once powerful malignant Nazi state is crumbling; the Japanese war lords are receiving, in their own homeland, the retribution for which they asked when they attacked Pearl Harbor.

"But the mere conquest of our enemies is not enough.

"We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance, and the greed, which made this horror possible.

"Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of the 'brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe.'

"Today science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another.

"Today we are face with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all peoples of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world at peace.

"Let me assure you that my hand is the steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move firmly into the task, knowing that you—millions and millions of you—are joined with me in the resolve to make this work endure.

"The work, my friends, is peace; more than an end of this war—an end to the beginnings of all wars; yes, an end, forever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killing of peoples. Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war, as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace—I ask you to keep your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

"The work, my friends, is peace." That may well be said to be the President's last words to us. Certainly if we fail this time to do everything within our power to make and keep peace upon the earth, we can expect chaos. Here is one part of his great desire which should grip every American to the very fiber of his being and the depths of his soul, to strive mightily for peace on earth.

To this end we ought, every one of us, to pray God to lead, guide, and direct the Conference now being held in the city of San Francisco, to empower the representatives with His spirit, and to bring from that conference the blessings of world peace.

From a purely selfish purpose it becomes necessary for us to work for peace on earth. Here, for example, are the comparative costs of killing a soldier from the time of Julius Caesar until now:

In Julius Caesar's time	$.85
Napoleonic Wars	3,750.00
American Civil War	6,250.00
World War No. 1	26,250.00
World War No. 2	62,500.00

When we take the cost of the present war and see what could be done with it we are so startled that we wonder at the ways of men. For each of the 400,000 groups of 5,000 people throughout the world—and that means all the world without exception—the cost of the present war could build a school for $275,000, a church for $150,000, a hospital for $100,000, a home for the destitute for $50,000, a library for $50,000 and a park for $25,000. If the money then left over were put into an endownment fund the annual interest would perpetually pay the salaries for each of these groups of 20 teachers, 10 nurses, 2 physicians, 2 clergymen, 2 librarians, and 2 superintendents for the park and home.

The cost of the First World War would have bought the entire United States, lock, stock, and barrel, in 1885; and at the present time this cost would purchase all the United States west of the Mississippi River.

There are moral considerations involved also and these weighed heavily upon Mr. Roosevelt. Was he not a champion of good neighborliness? Was he not a champion of the rights of man? Listen again to those words which were almost his last:

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world at peace."

Yes; among other things he was called a dreamer and a visionary. But sustaining and upholding him was a faith in God which was real. Listen again to the last words of his last address: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Not the faith of mere intellectual assent, but the faith that moves souls and governs life. Faith beset by doubt dies aborning. Faith by which men live and move and have their being, and which keeps God within the soul as an ever-present help, is real and true faith.

Do you believe in God? Do you believe in God's will and way? Then we recall our Lord's words, "Wherefore dost thou doubt?" We recall the words of God spoken to Moses, "Speak to the children of Israel that they go forward." The promised land of world peace lies before us. Are we able to go in and to possess it?

We cannot move forward along the ways of peace, justice, and righteousness without a living, moving, and ever-present faith in God. Our United States needs a solemn rededication to the God and Father of us all. It is not less religion we need, but more. Indifference kills. Recall the words of Holy Scripture: "Because thou art neither hot nor cold I will spew thee out of my mouth." We all need a high and holy rededication to our religion and our God. "Let us move forward with a strong and active faith." That means a responsibility which is laid upon each one of us to put faith into action and to live and labor as empowered by that faith.

We cannot have world peace without world consecration to God and the power and strength of the spiritual. This responsibility rests upon each of us. The strength of democracy is the strength of the people within a democracy. It recalls to our minds the words of another great President, Abraham Lincoln, "That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. * * * And that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain. * * * It is for us, the living, rather to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt now rests with his fathers, and his soul has returned to God who gave it. The causes to which he gave his life have not all seen the blossom develop into fruit. Responsibility has been passed to us. It is for us the goal for which men have sought, about which prophets dreamed, for which men have laid down their lives, and the desire of the God and Father of us all—that men should live on earth as brethren, at peace one with another. We cannot reach the goal alone. We must journey onward in full faith, hope, and confidence, with the presence, strength, and power of God, to accomplish His holy will on earth.

The unfinished task is ours; may God grant that we be faithful to Him in the discharge of the responsibility He has placed upon us.

Give the People a Chance in Ratifying Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful editorial of the Nashville Tennesseean of May 5, 1945. This editorial is typical of several other editorials of the Tennesseean setting forth in persuasive terms the reasons the House of Representatives should have a part in treaty ratification. The editorial under the title "Assert for the People," follows:

ASSERT FOR THE PEOPLE

If there ever was good reason to amend the Constitution to authorize ratification of treaties by a majority of both Houses of Congress—and we believe that history and common sense argue eloquently for such an amendment—nothing has happened or is about to happen which can lessen the wisdom and the urgency of such a step.

On next Tuesday the House will once again vote on the proposed amendment and should and probably will give it a decisive vote of approval. Because the measure has been intimately associated with the names of two Tennessee Congressmen—first with the name of Representative PERCY PRIEST, who pioneered it in the House, and now with that of Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, who has given unstinted effort toward making it law—the people of this State have an added interest in its fate.

Despite the treaty provisions of the Constitution, the House is bearing a larger and larger responsibility in our foreign policy. Bretton Woods must come before both Houses. The decision on our membership in the United Nations food and agriculture organization has already won the House endorsement (295–25). Reciprocity agreements, which are in effect economic treaties, depend on House legislation. So do lend-lease, U. N. N. R. A. agreements, and every appropriation for foreign activities.

Members of the House served on the American delegation to the Chapultepec Conference and others are now at San Francisco. If it is the course of wisdom to have these popular Representatives at conferences out of which treaties grow, then it is equally wise that they should have a voice in ratifying the treaties.

Since the days of James Madison, who himself pointed out the inconsistency in our organic law which gave the House a share in declaring war but no voice in ending it, writers have insisted that the cause of democracy would be served better if the almost unworkable Senate ratification provision were altered. On more than one occasion House action has been required when the ratification machinery broke down. Texas was brought into the Union by a House sponsored joint resolution. When the Senate refused to make peace with Germany in 1919, the war had to be called off 2 years later through the same device.

In the beginning of our Union, Senators were chosen by the legislators and were in a sense official delegates of their once independent States to the central governments. Hence it was considered logical that the 26 officials should sit as a sort of advisory council to assist the President in forming treaties that would be agreeable both to the Union and to their own States. The arrangement never worked as intended, and it has remained illogical, cumbersome, and largely unworkable since the day George Washington retired rebuffed and angry from the Senate Chamber.

Objectors point out that House approval would be useless now since the Senate Judiciary Committee has announced that it will not approve any amendment to the Constitution during the war. Others insist that ratification could not be effected in time for action on forthcoming peace treaties. The ratification can be obtained in time to give the House a share in treaty making. The people are white hot for such a step. Their gravest fears attach to the possible action of the Senate minority when the treaties come

up for approval. A number of State legislatures are already in session. The others can be called without loss of time.

As to the Senate blocking the amendment, there would be an accounting day for the obstructionists. It was once argued that direct election of Senators could never be achieved because the Senate was obdurate against the measure. In the end they bowed to the will of the people—as bow they will some day on the matter of 33 men, one-sixteenth of Congress, being able to throw a roadblock in front of the hopes and dreams and welfare of the mightiest nation on earth.

Not in some distant future when the welfare of the people does not turn on the ratification of an instrument of peace, but now when the matter is uppermost in the minds of the citizens the issue should be pressed. The Tennessean urges that the House do its duty as justice and reason dictate and let the chips fall where they may.

Profits and the Pacific War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

PROFITS AND THE PACIFIC WAR

It is using language rather loosely—and we've been guilty of it along with others—to talk about American fighting men retaking Malaya, Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, Borneo, Hong Kong, and Shanghai from the Japs and then giving them back to the British, Dutch, and French Governments.

True, political control of those places will go back to those Governments if such a plan is carried through. So will control of those places' defensive installations and various other things of a non-profit-making character—post offices, roads, schools, and so on.

But how about the tropical products of most of those places, the things out of which money can be made? There is a varied lot of this stuff over there—or was when the Japs came in, and they can hardly have carted it all away to Japan.

PRODUCTS AND THEIR OWNERS

In normal years before the war, the Dutch East Indies, Borneo, and southeastern Asia produced about 90 percent of the world's supply of rubber, 85 percent of its pepper, 65 percent of its tin, 30 percent of its copra (dried coconut kernels), and 17 percent of its petroleum.

The British, French, and Dutch Governments didn't own these profitable products or the farms, plantations, mines and wells from which they came. They were owned by private capital.

Royal Dutch Shell, for example, a British-Dutch oil company, was the chief peacetime oil operator in the South Pacific. Standard Oil of New Jersey also had big interests down there.

Tin ores from the Dutch East Indies were smelted for the most part at a big plant at Arnhem, Holland—a town much in the war news a couple of months ago. Private enterprise ran that smelter.

Far East rubber was controlled mainly by British and Dutch rubber monopolies—private enterprise again—which kept output low enough to keep Americans, their principal customers, paying plenty for rubber.

So if our boys take those places back from the Japs and restore them to their former owners, they will be doing the job chiefly for the benefit of the stockholders of the numerous private businesses that flourished in those richly productive areas before the Japs took them.

It may be all right and the best thing all around for our boys to do just that. We're not trying to pass judgment on the morality of it.

HELPING OUR COMPETITORS

The countries concerned—the United States, Great Britain, Holland, France—are all capitalistic countries up to this writing, though France appears to be moving rapidly leftward and Britain somewhat less rapidly in the same direction. In capitalistic countries, the government owns little or no profit-making property, and private business exploits such property to make profits for its stockholders and to help lift general living standards.

But if it is planned for our boys to do this big and bloody job primarily for the benefit of Royal Dutch Shell and others, we should all know explicitly that that is the plan. The former administration was highly secretive on the subject. It is to be hoped that there will be less secrecy about it from now on. It is a subject which needs to be thoroughly aired and widely discussed.

Another aspect of it which calls for discussion is the fact that by reviving British, Dutch, and French businesses in those Far East areas our boys would be bringing back to life some husky competition for some of our own industries.

We have built a big synthetic rubber industry under stress of war necessity—about $750,000,000 worth of same. Far East natural rubber in British-Dutch hands will be a competitior for our synthetic—unless, as seriously suggested by no less an economic thinker than Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace, we should cut down our synthetic rubber industry to pilot plant size and take to paying through the nose again for Far East rubber.

The American people should be frankly informed on our ultimate aims in the Pacific war. The American people are paying by far the biggest part of the bill for that war; paying with their boys as well as with their money.

As for the strategic islands, with little or no economic value, which our boys have been taking at such cost in blocd, there should be no postwar cloud on the ownership of them. Iwo Jima, Saipan, Tinian, Peleliu, and any other of such places that we need to base our future far-Pacific defenses on—we should keep them as absolute owners, without any monkey business about international trusteeship. They are an economic burden to whoever owns them; but strategically they are indispensable to our future defense against aggression from the Orient.

A Just and Lasting Peace—Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," the congressional resolution for a just and lasting peace, Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks, all signify, we trust and believe, a fervent hope and a sincere purpose to have the nations of the world cooperate in bringing about such an understanding among the people of all nations as will make unlikely, if not impossible, another such war as what we call World War No. 2. Instead of conflicts we would have helpful cooperation; instead of differences, mutual helpfulness; instead of divisions, accord; instead of war, peace.

In blood, sweat, and tears, this war has been dreadful. We are really staggered at contemplation of its results. Loss, destruction and death, with anguish and pain and tears, have followed in its wake. The tears and pain and anguish cannot be repaired. The suffering can be ameliorated only by our feeling, when we shall have done our best, that such a tragedy, through our wise and righteous planning, will not occur again.

One of the plans offered us for acceptance and adoption is a method for economic stability and peace, with a means provided for reconstruction and development. This is Bretton Woods. This is the establishing of an International Monetary Fund, and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These are to make and keep peace in economic affairs and give every nation a chance for reconstruction and development, so that peace may prevail. It is true that man cannot live by bread alone, but in that very statement it is recognized that bread is essential to life. We cannot expect hungry people to continue to be peaceful. With bread there must go freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear.

I am, at the time, addressing myself to Bretton Woods or the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for that I conceive this to be one of the cornerstones necessary in the building of a structure of a just and lasting peace. Let us remember that economic warfare will inevitably lead to political warfare, resulting in actual war. I cannot imagine that Dumbarton Oaks can survive without Bretton Woods. It has been said that "Necessity is the mother of invention"; and that "Experience is a dear school, but fools will learn in no other." The latter I would change by suggesting that experience is a dear school, but few learn in any other. In my opinion, the Bretton Woods agreements prove the soundness of both statements. Our sad experience has caused us to learn that economic warfare among nations, instead of accord and cooperation, leads to one end—loss to all and final disaster.

The necessity we found resulted in the plans we now have for adoption, not the least important of which is provision for reconstruction and development and international economic cooperation. The declared purposes of these are—as to the fund: First, to promote international monetary cooperation with machinery for consultation and collaboration on international monetary problems; second, to facilitate the expansion and balance growth of international trade and thereby to contribute to higher levels of employment and real income for all members of the fund; third, to promote exchange stability and to avoid competitive exchange depreciation; fourth, to as-

sist in the establishment of a multilateral system of payments, eliminating foreign exchange restrictions, which hamper the growth of world trade; fifth, to give confidence to members by making the fund's resources available to them, under adequate safeguards, eliminating resort to measures destructive of national or international prosperity; sixth, in accordance with the above, to shorten the duration and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in international balances of payments of members. The fund shall be guided in all its decisions by the purposes set forth.

There is no involvement, uncertainty, or unreasonable undertaking in these purposes. I know of no one who does not approve the purposes or objectives of the fund. Surely exchange stability and orderly exchange arrangements, avoiding competitive exchange depreciation, are to be desired. Indeed, the purposes, being for order, collaboration, and accord, provide a business way of doing business, instead of resorting to destructive methods, calculated to produce economic and political discord, with promise of no more than temporary advantage to one people, maybe, but inviting retaliation from others, resulting in disaster to all.

There seems, after all and in reality, no objection to the fund, except that some would insist that the fund be merged in the bank. With great respect, I must say that I am convinced that the two arrangements, as contemplated by the Bretton Woods agreement, are sounder and more to be desired than a single institution. The International Bank is for reconstruction and development, as the name definitely implies. The purposes of the bank are:

First. To assist in the reconstruction and development of territories of members, by facilitating the investment of capital for productive purposes, including the restoration of economies destroyed or disrupted by war, and to aid countries of low productive capacity.

Second. To promote private foreign investment by means of guaranties or participation in loans made by private investors. In the bank, as in the fund, the several nations subscribe to the capital required. Everyone, in both, is interested in successful operation of the fund and of the bank. One is one thing; the other is another.

Third. The third objective of the bank is to promote balanced growth of international trade, encouraging international investment for the development of the productive resources of members, thereby assisting in raising productivity, the standard of living and conditions of labor in their territories. This is international cooperation and collaboration, participated in by all member countries. We may be assured that we cannot long enjoy what to so many are the luxuries of life, while other nations sleep on beds of straw, go half fed and illy clothed, with little hope for the future. It certainly must be understood and appreciated that the higher the living standards of other countries—their people—the more they shall require of our own goods, and the greater degree of prosperity we, ourselves, shall enjoy.

Fourth. The fourth objective is one of practical consideration: To arrange the loans made or guaranteed by the bank in relation to loans through other channels, so that the more urgent and useful project may be dealt with first.

Fifth. The fifth stated objective is that the bank shall conduct its operations with due regard to the effect of international investment on business conditions in the territories of members and, in immediate postwar years, to assist in bringing about a smooth transition from wartime to a peacetime economy. This is the recognition of the need for regard to the effect of international investment on business conditions and the requirements of orderly transition from wartime to peacetime economy.

Membership in the fund is wisely provided for those who were represented at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, whose governments accept membership; and membership shall be open to the governments of other countries at such times and with such terms as may be prescribed by the fund.

In schedule A is set forth the subscriptions and quotas of the several nations; and these are the exemplification of the good faith and cooperation of all these nations, 43 or 44 in number, with their several quotas set forth.

Members of high standing in the American Bankers Association testified, without exception, that they and the association approve the purposes and objectives of the fund as set forth in article I of the agreement. The framework, with the provisions and stipulations of the fund, are marvelous, when one considers with what care the objectives of the fund are set forth and protected.

In article III, section 2, it is required that the fund shall, at intervals of 5 years, review and, if it deems it appropriate, propose an adjustment of the quotas of the members. It may also, if it thinks fit, consider at any other time the adjustment of any particular quota, at the request of the member concerned. The need of adjustment may well appear as time goes on. It is well that the fund shall have the authority and be chargeable with the duty to review the quotas of the members. The section concludes with the statement that a four-fifths majority of the total voting power shall be required for any change in quotas and no quota shall be changed without consent of the member concerned.

Safeguards are at every point. Some people are very fearful. Some are moved by doubts and suspicions at every turn. I have heard the suggestion made that the United States may be required to become a Santa Claus and increase its quota to the fund, and possibly this related to the bank. It cannot be done. If we must give place to conjured fears and imaginative suspicions we shall hardly get anywhere in providing peace and security in the world. There is quite a difference between justified caution and trumped-up fears. The framers of our Constitution had a hard time on account of the fearful and doubting. There were objections here and objections there, and success was finally despaired of, and so completely that Benjamin Franklin said: "Let us stop right here. We seem incapable of the task. Let us seek divine guidance. Let us pray." Then we had a Constitution one of which I think every American is proud. It is true that later there were amendments, but there was first a Constitution. There are ample means for amendments in operation of the fund and the bank, as experience and review may justify. The truth is, the constitution of the fund and the bank is a marvelous accomplishment.

The par value of a country's currency may be changed, but only to correct a disequilibrium, and with the fund's approval. The signers agree to this.

TRANSACTIONS WITH THE FUND

These are provided for with all reasonable safeguards. Full and ample provision is made for protection of the fund. All signers are concerned for the successs of both the fund and the bank, just as a stockholder in a bank is concerned for that bank's success. There are 20 articles in the instrument creating the fund, and all of these relate themselves faithfully to article I, which declares the purposes of the fund. Consider, for instance, article XII of the fund agreement, organization, and management. The fund shall have a board of governors, executive directors, a managing director, and a staff. All power shall be vested in the board of governors, but the board may delegate to the executive directors any of its powers, except the following:

Admit new members, approve a revision of quotas, approve a uniform change in the par value of the quotas of all members, arrange for cooperation with other international organizations, determine the distribution of the net income of the fund, require a member to withdraw, decide to liquidate the fund, decide appeals from directors. These enumerated exceptions are for the personal action of the board of governors; and ought to be.

Each member of the board of govern shall have 250 votes plus 1 additional vote for each part of its quota equivalent to 100,000 United States dollars.

These provisions are adverted to to point out what care and caution are used in the management of the fund. In the agreement for the fund and for the bank there is stipulation for not rivalry, not competitive attitude, but collaboration and cooperation. The fund is for one function, the bank another, but each complements the other.

The fund is primarily designed to stabilize and to prevent disastrous and unmoral economic competitions, themselves disrupting in their influence on trade and capable of bringing on economic warfare, with its inevitable results—political warfare and final resort to arms to take by force what could not be gotten by tricks in trade.

The fund agreement does not involve a member country in an absolute guaranty of financial resources. The quota allotted a member country is not a checking account. The fund and the bank retain always the right and power to inquire and ascertain the purposes for

which borrowings or purchases are sought. Reliance by members on their own resources is impressed in the fund proposal.

The two new international financial institutions have functions of different purpose and different service. They may and will be helpful one to another, but the merger of the two is to take away a measure of efficiency from both. They are companion institutions, but each within itself important, both definitely recognizing and preparing a place for private enterprise in the plans set forth.

The two proposals are of vital importance. They lay the foundation for confidence, for world trade, for orderly procedure, for stability in financial transactions, for reconversion and development, and economic peace. Isolationism is nine-tenths of the opposition to these structures for world peace. The other tenth is made up of selfishness and ignorance.

There is no way to amend the Bretton Woods agreement, except amendments by the institutions themselves, after trial and review may suggest amendments. That authority is provided in the agreement, and to suggest amendments by Congress is a left-handed attempt to scuttle the plan and sink the ship.

This is the final step, so far as Congress is concerned, in an attempt actually to provide against another world war. If this agreement for the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, so reasonably and sensibly arrived at, is not ratified by the Congress, such failure will have the effect of making nugatory any understands arrived at at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, or San Francisco. This is not to say that financial considerations are above moral questions—they are not—but it is to realize that if we have not the faith and the willingness to take the steps, designated, designed, and well calculated to furnish one of the cornerstones in the structure of a just and lasting peace, we cannot hope for anything or expect anything except to fight it out on fields of battle, to which service, deplorably, we who are at fault do not have to devote ourselves, but call upon the young men of America to suffer and die in the name of freedom and love of country for our lack of faith, our suspicion and fear and silly spirit of isolationism and personal and national selfishness.

This is our hour of responsibility. We must act. On us may well depend the question of maintaining a just and lasting peace.

May we have faith in our cause, faith in our fellows, and dispel the doubts and suspicious which can have no end except disruptions, failures, and other wars. The Bretton Woods agreement is an intelligent effort to hereafter avoid the suffering, the tears, the horrors we have so recently endured and which, indeed, we continue in; but with the hope that through faith and confidence we may escape them hereafter. For my part, I shall not be chargeable with doubts, fear, lack of faith resulting in other such experiences.

World Power Concepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "World Power Concepts Unfolding at Parley," written by David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD POWER CONCEPTS UNFOLDING AT PARLEY—GAP BETWEEN RUSSIA AND UNITED STATES MUST BE CLOSED, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

SAN FRANCISCO, April 30.—This is the story of what is going on behind the scenes of the United Nations Conference. It is not a story of the phrases of a charter yet to be written nor a story about tedious meetings or conflicting procedure. It is a story nevertheless realistic and in some respects sensational. For it is the story of the conclusions being earnestly reached by men of major importance in the various governments represented here.

It is, in brief, a warning that if the prevention of World War No. 3 is the greatest task that confronts mankind, then a means must be found whereby Russia and the United States shall learn to trust each other, to understand one another, to know one another.

There's no use mincing words. All the nations gathered here, large and small, are lining up, consciously or unconsciously, behind either the United States or Russia. Whether it be Great Britain or France or Brazil or China which look more than ever now to the United States as their mighty protector or whether it be Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and a new array of smaller nations which have decided they must cast their lot with Russia, the fact remains that two different concepts of world power are unfolding. They ought never to be permitted to clash—they ought to be required by world opinion to adjust themselves to each other.

AGREEMENTS UNFILLED

There's no use camouflaging the truth or suppressing facts. The Yalta Conference brought forth a communique of hopeful phrases, but Russia has not fulfilled the agreements made at Tehran in 1943. The British, the Americans, the European governments directly concerned are all baffled, puzzled, confused.

Why has Russia found it difficult to cooperate with Britain and America in establishing a new government in Poland as called for in the Yalta agreement? What are Russia's problems, her handicaps, her internal pressures? Nobody on our side knows; Russia keeps these things from us. She allows, for instance, a Russian ambassador to open an embassy in Czechoslovakia but refuses permission to Britain and the United States to send in their ambassadors. Yet the Yalta agreement specifically called for inter-Allied action and no unilateral steps in the liberated areas. Numerous instances of barriers to officials of Britain and United States could be cited as existing in other areas also under the Russian military command.

What then can be done? The American Government and the British Government are frank and outspoken now about these matters. There is no need, of course, for swashbuckling talk or displays of temper but there is a great need for candor, for temperate criticism and for open discussion in the press.

The first thing to be done is to be practical on the economic side. American economic aid should not be frittered away as if it had nothing to do with other issues or the fulfillment of other agreements. There is no reason for arbitrary decisions or prejudgment of Russian motives or proposals. Her method of bargaining is hard, often inept from our point of view and even irritating, but it must be learned, and she must endeavor to learn our ways of thinking and the importance of what we term "ideals." We may not be able to gain acceptance immediately for our ideals but this is no reason to disparage or abandon them as our goal.

ON PIECEMEAL BASIS

A charter will be written here that Russia will accept. What is more important is the fulfilment of such a charter's provisions and the execution of agreements yet to be made with reference to Germany and Japan. For there is to be no peace conference or peace treaty in the 1919 sense. Special problems will be handled in special conferences over a period of years. Peacemaking is to be on a piecemeal basis until each problem is satisfactorily adjusted.

Meanwhile thoughtful Americans have a solemn duty. The tragedy of differing languages has been revealed here. Mr. Molotov does not speak English. None of the principles on our side speaks Russian. How can we ever begin to appeal to each other's minds and consciences? American universities and colleges should start at once courses in the study of the Russian language. The next American Ambassador to Russia should know the language of Russia. Our State Department should establish a division of Russian affairs with capable men and women on its staff.

The pride of Mr. Molotov in being able to preside over the plenary session and speak Russian from the platform was mentioned by him. Russia is having a rebirth of patriotism. She is feeling a new sense of power and this must inevitably bring a new sense of responsibility. But if ultimate war between Russia and the western world is to be prevented, no time must be lost in beginning the interchange of missions of officials, of businessmen, of labor leaders, or newspapermen, and of the best exponents of the spiritual and cultural life of the two countries.

The gap that already separates Russia and the United States must be closed at the earliest possible moment or there inevitably will be chaos in Europe and ultimately another war of devastating proportions.

Only Way To Insure Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Raleigh (N. C.) News-Observer of Saturday, May 5, 1945:

ONLY WAY TO INSURE PEACE

On next Tuesday the House of Representatives will resume consideration of the pro-

posal to put an end to the provision in the Constitution by which the vote of two-thirds of the Senate is required to ratify a treaty. It is proposed in a resolution approved by the Judiciary Committee that in the future treaties should be ratified by the majority vote of both Houses of Congress. Long hearings were held last fall and the testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of the change.

As it takes the vote of both Houses to declare war, a like procedure should be utilized to garner the peace. The power of one-third of the Senators was the dagger that denied peace after World War No. 1 and is in part responsible for the death and destruction in World War No. 2. If the United States had taken its seat at Geneva, the League would have functioned to undergird the world peace which the men in arms won in 1917–18, and if there had been no veto power in one-third of the Senate, the United States could and would have led in such measures and adjustments as would have prevented the present holocaust, now happily coming to an end, which has cost so much in blood and treasure.

North Carolina is proud to have been first in guaranteeing the incorporation of the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution and in other democratic advances. This was the first State to declare for the change from minority rule to majority rule in preserving good foreign relations by calling for an end of the undemocratic and archaic two-thirds requirement of the Senate for the ratification of treaties. At the State democratic convention held in May 1944 the following declaration was unanimously adopted and made an integral part of the platform:

"The provision in the Federal Constitution requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senators present for the ratification of treaties has enabled a minority of the Senators to thwart the will of a great majority of their colleagues, to disregard the considered opinion of the American people, and to defeat the best interests of the United States.

"We strongly approve and urge an amendment to the Federal Constitution that will make the process of ratification more democratic in its nature."

At the recent session of the general assembly that body passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and

"Whereas this constitutional provision disqualifies the more representative House of Representatives from any participation in treaty making and has led in the past to obstruction by determined minorities in the Senate; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the National Government shall be able to effectuate any international agreement upon which the President and a majority of the Senators and a majority of the Representatives agree: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose either to the legislatures of the several States, or to conventions in the several States, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reading substantially as follows:

" 'The President shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall consent thereto.' "

"SEC. 2. That a duly certified copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one copy of the same sent to each of the North Carolina Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification."

It was introduced by Senator Brandon P. Hodges, of Buncombe, representing the same county formerly represented by Representative ZEBULON VANCE WEAVER, long a leader in the National House of Representatives. In Washington Mr. WEAVER's high position on the Judiciary Committee gives him influence and the respect of his fellow Members, and he presided over some of the hearings on the abolition of the two-thirds rule. There seems the eternal fitness of things that Buncombe County, the home of the illustrious VANCE, should take the lead in this long-needed reform. The resolution in the Democratic State Convention was drawn by the chairman of the resolutions committee, D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, editor of the Asheville Citizen, who presented it to the Democratic State Convention. The resolution in favor of the amendment to the constitution was introduced and advocated in the general assembly by Senator Brandon Hodges, of Buncombe, and one of its ablest champions in Congress is Representative ZEBULON VANCE WEAVER, of Buncombs County.

North Carolinians, true to its devotion to majority rule, is committed to this change, which is the only way to guarantee peace and wise foreign relations, and it is gratifying that it was the first State to instruct its Senators and Representatives in Congress to lead in carrying out the mandate of the people.

New Postal Pay Bill Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3035—formerly known as H. R. 2071—was introduced in the House on April 25 by my colleague, Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH, chairman of the House Post Offices and Post Roads Committee.

This bill is the result of hearings and study on H. R. 2071, and bears the new number rather than H. R. 2071 because it was thought advisable to introduce a new bill containing all of the changes, rather than to have H. R. 2071 continue through the legislative process.

Note that this is not an appropriation measure to offset wartime increases of living costs. Postal employees have not received a salary increase since 1925 and they receive less pay for overtime than they do for regular time.

There is at present a $300 bonus, but this expires on June 30. And even with due consideration of this bonus, 20 years is entirely too long a time to wait for adjustment of salaries to meet the advances in living costs which have come in those 2 decades.

H. R. 3035 proposes to give rural, city, and village carriers a graduated increase in pay based upon the number of years in the Postal Service. There is also provision for an 8-hour day, compensatory time for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays; overtime pay in emergencies requiring more than an 8-hour workday; a 10-percent differential for night work; and a 15-day vacation with pay.

Political Policy in the Pacific Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, last December I had the privilege of making a naval bases inspection tour in the Pacific with certain members of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

The information gained during the course of this trip was the source of various opinions expressed in an interview published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on April 22, 1945.

It is my firm belief that the United States of America should immediately develop and announce a definite and strong political policy in the Pacific.

In the hope that Members of this House will take the time to read these opinions, I am asking unanimous consent to extend this article in the RECORD:

LACK OF UNITED STATES POLITICAL POLICY IN PACIFIC PERILS FRISCO PARLEY, PLOESER SAYS

(An interview with Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER—member of the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee)

The absence of an American political policy in the Pacific is not only an active threat to military morale, but seriously jeopardizes the success of the San Francisco Conference, Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER, member of the House Naval Appropriations Subcommittee who recently returned from a 25,000-mile inspection trip of Pacific bases, told the Globe-Democrat yesterday.

"No matter where we went in the Pacific, there was one dominant question asked by everybody from GI's to admirals—'What is the political policy of the United States in the Pacific?' " PLOESER said in an interview. "We had no answer to that question because, so far as we and the Nation know, our Government has no political policy for the Pacific.

"Regardless of what anyone in Washington says, it is important for the fighting man on Iwo Jima and the Philippines to know his Nation's objectives to know his Nation's objectives over and above just defeating the enemy," PLOESER asserted. "They want to know why we're taking those islands at such a terrible cost in blood and money, and they have a right to know what plans our Government has for the future of this vast area they are conquering at such a great sacrifice."

FACTOR IN MORALE

Only the break-down of the rotation system because of inadequate shipping facilities occupies an equal status as a morale factor in the Pacific, he declared.

"Even the term 'unconditional surrender' has never been properly defined in this battle zone," the Congressman, who interviewed ranking military and naval commanders as well as enlisted men in the Southwest Pacific, asserted:

"It can mean many things in the Pacific that it doesn't mean in Europe, because this is a different kind of war. If it means merely seizure of lost possessions of our own and our

Allied Nations, that is one thing. If it means capture of the enemy's homeland and possessions, that is another. If it means complete domination of the enemy by ending all resistance, that is still another because that involves virtual extermination of the enitre Japanese population."

American delegates to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco this week will find themselves badly handicapped by the absence of a Pacific policy, with the resultant lack of plans for future Navy maintenance, PLOESER predicted. Other nations already have long-range plans and objectives well defined and outlined for both theaters of war, but the United States, which has been the most important factor in winning the Pacific battle, will have no policy to guide her delegation, he declared.

ALL-AMERICAN SHOW

"Our men in the Pacific are wondering if we have saved the Pacific empires of the French, the British, and the Dutch, only to withdraw against to our own shores without making secure our future safety from aggression in the East," the Missouri Representative reported. "Remember, this Pacific affair is about 99 percent an all-American show, even most of the supplies of our allies in that theater have come through us.

"I feel, and our fighting men there feel that we should develop a political policy of our own for the Far East and not depend on other nations to do that for us. The main reason for this is that the United States is the only nation with sufficient naval power to enforce peace in the Pacific, plus the fact that we, unlike the purely European powers, have a coastline to defend on the Pacific."

PLOESER praised highly the naval government officials responsible for regulating the reconquered islands. He pointed out that American Samoa and Guam, where self-government among the natives is fostered by a naval governor, are outstanding examples of colonial administration in the entire Pacific Ocean area. Progress under this system in education, in living conditions, and in general economic betterment for residents of these islands is unapproached by any other power in control of islands in the Pacific, he pointed out.

TYPES OF ISLANDS

There are three different types of islands which American forces are occupying, the Congresman asserted. The first are those former American possessions which are being recaptured, such as Guam and the Philippines. The second are islands which were either possessions or mandates of our allies, such as New Caledonia and the Admiralty Islands. The third, and most difficult, are Nipponese possessions or Japanese-mandated islands, such as Iwo Jima and Saipan.

The complexities arising from the military conquest of these vastly dissimilar territories give added emphasis to the need for an American political plan for the Pacific, PLOESER averred.

"The fighting up to now, costly and terrible as it has been, was just a preliminary to the real battle which is ahead when we seek to occupy the Japanese mainland and drive the Japanese out of China," PLOESER declared. "We are battling a crazed foe, whose women and children will kill themselves rather than be captured by Americans. The knowledge that there is a concerted, long-range plan in the Pacific will add immeasurably to the confidence and assurance of our fighting men who are daily performing miracles of military achievement and supply."

The nations of the Orient long have been distrustful of the United States because of its lack of a consistent foreign policy in the Far East, he pointed out. This distrust will continue to grow and may even turn into fear or enmity if our armed forces conquer the Pacific while our Government remains silent on its plans there, according to PLOESER.

CHAIN OF BASES

Reporting his conclusions for the first time since returning from the Southwest Pacific last December, the Congressman affirmed that a chain of American bastions extending from Pearl Harbor and American Samoa all the way to the Aleutians and Alaska are indispensable for the preservation of peace in the Pacific.

"We cannot risk the possibility of another Pearl Harbor attack which would cut our communication and supply lines to the Philippines and bases in the South Pacific," he said. "We must take definite steps now to assure for all time security in this immense region as a contribution to the safety of this Nation and the future peace of the world."

Specifically, the Congressman advocated establishment of United States bases in the Admiralty Islands, Palau, or some other strategic island in the western Caroline group, Guam, Saipan, and Tinian, on Iwo Jima or similar important ones of the Bonin Islands, New Caledonia, and American Samoa, as well as in the Philippines. Roughly describing a great arc from east of Australia, swinging west to the doorstep of the Japanese home islands, and north to anchor on the Aleutians and Alaska, the series of American outposts would command the entire Pacific including all the major water routes to the United States coast.

SYSTEM OF DEFENSE

Supplementing this chain of fortified bases, PLOESER recommended holding certain other smaller islands necessary for the smooth logistic operation in order to provide alternate routes to the major bases. He asserted that the main points of the system of defense already are in American hands and that semipermanent harbors, airfields, and highways are either constructed or nearing completion.

Other Japanese islands could be placed under United Nations mandate with specific restriction as to their use in order to prevent unauthorized fortification of strategic areas, he said.

"The development of such an interrelated plan is essential to the future wellbeing of our Navy, which today is entirely in the dark as to what will happen to it when the war ends," PLOESER asserted. "I am not in favor of scrapping a single United States fighting vessel, but propose instead a process of conservation of ships which would keep us at all times in a state of preparedness."

SHIPS IN RESERVE

PLOESER'S proposal would inactivate most of the Navy's 15,000 fighting ships of the line after the war in such a manner as to keep the machinery and hulls in proper working condition. "This would not increase the expense of Navy maintenance appreciably, yet would prevent the need for a gigantic naval rebuilding program in some possible future emergency," he asserted, "as it is always cheaper to recondition and modernize ships than to build new ones."

"The first thing that a bomber group does before a mission is to brief its crews with all the information contained in the plan of attack," he declared. "Then, when the planes are over the target and in the thick of the raid, each man knows not only his role in the fighting, but also his importance in relation to the entire mission. Today our fighting forces in the Pacific are over the target, in the bloody midst of the attack, and our Government has not yet briefed them as to the total objectives of the fight. This must be done immediately, and any further delay in announcing a Pacific political policy may threaten the whole future of the peace for which our war is waged."

Buchenwald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first 10 American Congressmen and civilians to view the Nazi horror camps in Germany. I did so at the request of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, supreme Allied commander. On my trip to Europe in April I also spent considerable time making an independent study of the English system of veterans' benefits and hospitalization. A report on these findings is now being prepared for the War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member. My trip took me to Canada, Newfoundland, Labrador, Iceland, Scotland, Ireland, England, France, Luxembourg, and Germany. In these places I made a serious effort to talk to as many people as possible to find out the problems in which we have a mutual interest and to find out what our men and women overseas are doing now and thinking and planning for the future. The trip was most educational, and, I feel, will greatly increase my usefulness to the people I have the honor to represent in Congress, and to my country generally. I wish all Members of Congress could have similar experiences. To talk to the people of other nations; to fly twice across the Atlantic Ocean, to meet the officials of the British Government, to see them in action on the floor of the House of Commons, to hear them plead for "union now," to witness the destruction caused by the blitz, the V-1 buzz-bomb and the V-2 rocket, to see men die from treatment by enemies of our Nation, to see our own GI's in the battle areas, to see the utter devastation of many cities—the starving, the displaced people, the homeless, the sick, the wreckage of war and its horror, to live on cold army field rations, to see Communists winning elections in France; all of these and many other things help to clarify the thinking and increase the concern of any man who has been selected to help lead our Nation through the difficulties of war and the backwash of it.

At a future time I may have opportunity to comment in more detail upon these things. Now, because of the fall of Germany, I want to confine my remarks to a situation I saw in that nation which points up a great problem we must solve if we are to avoid another war. I refer to the most unpleasant and gruesome experience of my life—my visit to the German concentration camp at Buchenwald, near Weimar, Germany. Flown in an Army plane to this spot, deep in the heart of Germany, close to Berlin and right at the front lines, I saw scenes no Christian can imagine or fully

understand. With a German camera which I "liberated" with the help of Capt. Paul Morton, of Springfield, Mo., a medic doing a grand service at the front, I secured pictures to document scenes which will be forever in my mind. Time does not make it possible here to record all of these things in detail. Some of them have already been reported. Others will be reported by the dozen Congressmen who visited the camps after I did and by the able editors and newspaper reporters with them. It was my privilege to see the situation before it was cleaned up. Pictures and the printed word will not do justice to it. You have to smell a human slaughter pen to get its full impact. The English language does not contain adequate adjectives to describe what I saw. I will simply recount some of these things for your own prayerful consideration.

Weimar, Germany, is the birthplace of the German republic which Hitler destroyed after he had been elected to office by the people. Weimar was the home of such great men as Schiller, Liszt, Bachs, and Goethe who contributed much to civilization and human happiness. Martin Luther preached there. But all that was before one-party government, one-man personal government and military domination wrecked the German nation and destroyed its soul. Weimar now is a city of the dead. Three thousand Germans were killed there by just one of our numerous air raids. Fifty-one thousand people died of starvation and torture at Buchenwald on the outskirts of the city. This notorious camp was for political prisoners from the area where the Nazis held sway. There were Germans in the camp. There were also Poles, Russians, Dutch, Belgians, Frenchmen, and so forth. All were paying the penalty imposed by the Nazis upon those who would not accept the new order and who criticized those in power. These unfortunate people were used as slave labor in nearby war industries. They were given insufficient food. Every 24 hours prisoners received a small piece of heavy brown bread, a little margarine and one scant portion of stew. That is all. As soon as they became too weak to work they either were killed, were permitted to commit suicide or fell victims to the filth, disease, and brutality rampant in the camp which at one time contained 120,000 souls and had 21,000 there when General Patton's forces overran it. Over the entrance to the camp is the inscription, "Recht oder unrecht—mein Vaterland." My country right or wrong. The camp is surrounded by a high barbed-wire fence—electrified. The camp is typical of a dozen others.

I personally saw scores of bodies piled 8 and 10 layers deep, like cordwood. I saw some of their burned remains in 6 great ovens built solely for cremation of the dead. I saw a great pile of human bones and ashes taken from this place to be used as fertilizer. I saw lampshades and cigarette cases with human-skin covers. I saw bodies of men and women beaten to death, lying in pools of blood where they fell. I saw the bunks where 6 men had to sleep so close together they could not turn over. I saw the lack of sanitary facilities. I saw men frozen to death because of lack of clothing in the camp. I saw little buildings formerly used as stables and which were turned into charnel houses each containing 2,300 men. I saw the brothel where slave women were kept. I saw the jars containing specimens of human organs taken by German doctors who killed patients at various stages of disease and removed their organs for study. I saw 850 children, ages 6 to 13, but with faces and shrunken bodies of old men. They are children who remember nothing but life in a concentration camp to which they were taken because their parents did not like Hitler. I saw and talked with men whose legs were no bigger around than my arm and who were too weak from malnutrition to raise their heads. They were educated men who spoke good English and who were covered with the sores of old beatings and the festering bites of vermin. These men are still dying at the rate of 35 per day because they are so far gone adequate medical care and food can do them no good now. They are the living dead. A few of them may recover—to be harassed the rest of their short lives by tuberculosis and other diseases. I saw the walls of a laboratory in the camp decorated with death masks of the "more interesting" prisoners, many with features of remarkable nobility and refinement. I saw sterilized prisoners, usually Jews. I saw men and women with their prison numbers tatooed in blue on their left forearms. I saw the beautiful barracks in which the brutal young S. S. guards lived who operated the camp. I brought back to America with me some of their whips and instruments of torture that I might show them to my friends. I saw tens of thousands of displaced persons, many of them Germans as well as former prisoners in concentration camps, all fleeing through the American lines away from the Nazis and away from the Russians. I saw these and many other things. I was driven through this area in a jeep operated by Pvt. (1st cl.) Lee R. Davis, of Montevallo, in Vernon County, Mo., in my Sixth Congressional District. I was in this area several days and had plenty of time to see and study the things mentioned here.

What do the German people think about it? The German civilians deny any knowledge of what has happened to political prisoners in these camps. They know now. They are digging graves in which to bury them. They have been forced to go through the nearby camps and see for themselves what has been done. I saw some of the older German men and women weeping at these sights. I saw one faint. I read in Stars and Stripes the next day that one man and wife went home and committed suicide rather than to live in Germany which had been responsible for these crimes. I saw some of the younger Germans with cold and stony expressions as they looked at the piles of bodies. I saw some of the younger girls smirking. In the historic city of Jena, which was still on fire from the effects of our bombardment and with the odor of burning flesh still in the air, I saw German civilians wandering about the streets attending to their business as if nothing had happened, showing and speaking neither remorse nor regret. They did not seem hostile toward me as an American. They have the attitude of a beaten bully who wants, very much wants, to be nice. I saw them looking eagerly at a box of K rations protruding from my coat pocket. They are fat and well dressed now with the loot of Europe. But, they fear that starvation and cold will be their own lot before long. I saw them lined up to receive rations under the orders of our efficient military government forces. I saw their beautiful countryside, their sturdy houses with tile and slate roofs, their rich fields. In the bright April sunlight, past the cool green forests, past the geometric fields arranged on gentle slopes, past corpses of men, of horses, of tanks, past the great and never ending throng of displaced people lining the green landscaped verges of the superhighway, the autobahn, a four-lane concrete military road Hitler built, past these things and around bomb craters I went and I marveled at the natural resources of the country and of its beauty which war could not completely destroy. I wondered at all of these conflicting things and asked myself, What can we do about this awful mess?

Many men are giving serious thought to that question. Some of them are now at San Francisco, specially commissioned to study such questions. I hope that they will evolve an answer—if one can be found. In my work in the Congress I will be guided by certain ideas which are a result of my own experience. Germany must never again be allowed any heavy industry. Germany must be made self-supporting as possible but without the means of making the machines of war. She must have no army, no air force, no navy. We must have big ones. Her generation of Nazis must make reparations in kind and must repair the damage done to other lands as nearly as possible. Germany's own cities must be left heaps of rubble as monuments to her folly and reminders that crime does not pay. My first reaction after seeing the horrors of Buchenwald and other places was that we just ought to kill off all the Germans. It was more than bad leadership which had done this thing to Germany and the world. The ignorance, apathy, and greed of the German people supported it. But you cannot kill a nation of over 70,000,000 people—and even if you could, you should not. This kind of swelling anger we must guard against. It is a treacherous thing. It is not the method of civilization to license killers. The method of civilization is the method of law, and that must be ours. This means that the guilty must be convicted of specific crimes, on satisfactory evidence, and with due opportunity for presenting their defense, if any. The Nazis have been fighting not only Poles, Russians, Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, and others, but they have been fighting civilization, too. In punishing

them for their crimes, according to law, we are defending civilization. And we must still beware the most evil of the Nazi secret weapons, which is to tempt us down to their level. It is good to be an American. It is good to have representative government. It is good to be able to criticize an administration and change it when we do not like it, because we have a choice between two great political parties. It is good to live in a country with a tradition of justice and political liberty, where there is a free press and habeas corpus. We take these things for granted. But in an age of trans-Atlantic flights, rocket bombs, revolution, ideologies which parade under different banners but mean the same as nazism to the common man—in such an age we would do well to keep alive the memory of Buchenwald and to remember that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

The Press Appraises Franco Fascist Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have been an aggressive critic of Franco Fascist Spain from the inception of its totalitarian government.

Most Americans were apathetic to the ominous dangers inherent in the continued existence of that set-up. For the long time, I have advocated that the United States sever diplomatic relations with the outstanding example of fascism now existing in the world among so-called neutral countries.

There is overwhelming support among the American people for this proposal. Our efforts are not helped, however, by the diplomatic recognition recently accorded the Argentine Republic by the United States, after a considerable period during which the diplomatic relations had been severed; nor are the plain peoples of the world encouraged by the sorry spectacle of the San Francisco Conference inviting the Argentine Government to participate officially in the Conference's deliberations.

The Argentine is a shadowy camp follower of Franco, who is an abject sycophant of Hitler and the late Mussolini. Newspaper editorials are growing increasingly indignant at the disgusting display of so-called neutrals, who have been following the party line of fascism, and are now suddenly drawing their skirts aside in factitious horror at further close association with their erstwhile bed partners. They are now declaring war on their former fascist pals or breaking diplomatic relations. These are phony gestures, indulged in for no other purpose than to beguile and hoodwink the gullible diplomats of credulous nations.

The following editorials are representative of the overwhelming majority of American press with respect to Franco Fascist Spain:

[From Pawtucket, (R. I.) Times of April 17, 1945.]

FRANCO CHANGES FRONT

Perhaps you have had some doubts regarding the early ending of the war in Europe. Perhaps you have thought it may yet be long drawn out—that is, for months to come, despite the long succession of victories in the East and West. But no such doubt should persist now, after the news from Madrid, Spain has broken relations with Japan.

It can, of course, mean only one thing: That Francisco Franco, the Spanish dictator, sees the defeat of Germany as imminent and does not care to be a sponsor of Germany's partner in the days to come. It really makes no difference what attitude Franco shows toward Germany now but when he lashes out at Hitler's partner he indicates clearly enough that he wants no further truck with the leader of nazism.

Friendship with Hitler has ceased to pay; he and his gang have become liabilities to be quickly disposed of by people engaged in the business of running a government. The supreme repudiation, of course, would be Japan's desertion of Berlin, and Japan certainly would do that if it promised to do any good. It would not; Japan is also a beaten nation in a war provoked by her mad statesmen, and it would not help her in the slightest to turn against Hitler today.

Franco, however, sees the advantage of getting from under the disaster that is about to fall on Nazi Germany. He does it by delivering an oblique blow, by repudiating Germany's partner, who is far enough away to be unable to hit back at this critical time in world history.

And the cause as given? Well, it is solely a diplomatic fiction. The Japs in the Philippines are charged by Franco with murdering Spaniards, and no doubt the charge is true. They murdered Americans, why not Spainards? But Franco has only now found out that it was a crime. So he becomes indignant and breaks off relations with the Japanese.

If the Japs murdered Spaniards in the Philippines—and we do not doubt it—the murders probably began early in December, 1941, when the legions of the Mikado invaded the islands. That was when the Japs were winning, when our Army on Luzon was being wiped out by the invader. That was the time, if Franco really meant it, for Spain to get mad at Japan, but Spain didn't.

Franco waited until Japan was in trouble, until Germany was staggering toward defeat, punch-drunk and out on her feet. Then Franco delivered his defiance to Tokyo, Germany's partner.

It is not a very gallant performance.

[From St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 20, 1945]

FRANCO'S NEW COOPERATION

Spain continues shamelessly to climb ever higher on the Allied victory bandwagon by progressively shedding ties with the Axis. Now that the Luftwaffe has been driven out of the air, Franco forbids all German planes to land in Spanish territory. And last week Spain severed diplomatic relations with Japan.

Actually, however, all this is not entirely a band-wagon performance; it is partly internal pressure forcing Franco to move with the will of the people, even though possibly from selfish motives. For Spaniards have long recognized that if the nation's reconstruction coincides, as it should, with that of France and Italy, a nonrevolutionary government must go in. The World War began in Spain, and it may end in Spain unless she can convince the allies by her present conduct that they should take a benevolent hand in helping set her political house in order. Should the World War cease suddenly with internal factionalism still at white heat, another civil war could well follow which would finish Spain.

Although the vast majority wants a peaceful transition, it seems clear that Francoism by that name must fall, whether by democratic processes or force. The question is whether it will reappear as the same dog with another collar—a government based on the military clique which supported Franco. A military government would appear to be foredoomed to the usual corruption and ultimate anarchy. The only alternatives are a return to monarchy—a system which likewise would require backing of the generals—and another republic.

The latter doubtless will be the people's choice, but they will insist on a different sort of republic than the fumbling republic of 1931, one which will bring together all factions into a new national spirit for reconstruction. And it is to satisfy that demand in the hope of retaining an under-cover semblace of his dictatorship that Franco apparently is donning a new garb of antitotalitarianism and temporarily following by political necessity a course popular with most Spaniards.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Times of April 18, 1945]

SPAIN'S BREAK WITH JAPAN

Gertrude Stein, whose utterances often defy analysis, once let fall an observation which expresses the reaction of all of us to the news that Generalissimo Franco's Spain has severed diplomatic relations with its Axis associate, Japan. "It is remarkable," she said, "how uninterested I am." This comment is a departure from the Stein tradition in the respect that it is easy to understand.

We view the obvious efforts of the Franco regime to escape from a sinking ship with cold indifference. Spain is and has been an enemy nation, one whose position is all the more reprehensible because it has been clothed in the pretense of neutrality. Spain has applauded every Hitler aggression, every victory. It has sent Spanish soldiers to fight on the eastern front, maintained a constant flow of vital supplies to the Reich. Its ships have been sunk while trying to run the blockade of French ports still held by the Nazis.

Americans cannot soon forget the effusion of the official Falangist paper, Arriba, after Pearl Harbor and the fall of Manila. "The ancient and renowned culture of the magnificent oriental empire, and its exceptional human qualities," it said, "are shown in the important victories of the first days—victories that have won for Japan the admiration of the world."

But Spain's support of Japan in the Philippines was not limited to words. Falangist agents had been planted in the islands long before the attack. They helped to sabotage civilian defense organizations, provided the invaders with lists of "dangerous Americans" who, according to charges made in the House by Representative COFFEE, of Washington, were put to death. In return, these emissaries of Franco were decorated by the Japanese Government.

Spain's cupidity and treachery must not be forgotten when the day of settlement comes. Spain is an enemy nation and must be treated as such.

[From the Tennesseean, Nashville, Tenn., of April 22, 1945]

FRANTIC ANTICS OF FRANCO

The "conversion" of El Caudillo proceeds apace. The latest news from Madrid is that Francisco (El Butcher) Franco is to abolish the Falange salute and change the Falange flag.

The Falange salute was borrowed in toto from Mussolini's cohorts during the Nazi-

Italian-Moorish conquest of republican Spain and is given by raising the arm with palm outward.

Maybe that will fix things with the United Nations, for who could think of breaking relations with El Butcher now that he has frowned fiercely on the Japs and announced the elimination of the Fascist salute? But if some hard-hearted Americans and English still insist that it should be done, perhaps Franco will oblige with some more proofs of "conversion." He could change the name of the Falange itself after all (an assassin organization can be just as effective under another name) or even ship the now useless German Ambassador out.

The frantic antics of Franco would be humorous if one could forget only for an instant his bloody record or if one could only be sure that no official responsible for foreign policies in western Europe would be stupid enough to accept Franco's crude window dressing for a change of heart. Some in our own State Department have worn kid gloves in dealing with this open and avowed collaborator with Hitler. It is past time to deal with this enemy of democracy as he deserves.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Archibald G. Thacher National Co-Chairman, Citizens Committee for Universal Military Training of Young Men:

The citizens committee urges the present adoption of a Federal system of Nation-wide military training for one continuous year, of all young men found physically fit. Such training should begin in early manhood, preferably in the 18th year and upon completion of grade school, high school, or preparatory school, and before about 12 to 15 percent of such youths go on to higher education or the others enter employment.

Such training should be military only not C. C. C. camps, and should not include any plan for national youth education.

The controlling reason for the establishment of such a system is to assure the future security of the United States, as so positively stated by Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, and Chief of Staff Marshall.

There will be other valuable byproducts such as health examinations and benefits, improvement of coordination (mental and physical), development of qualities of leadership, learning mechanical skills useful for trades and other employment. Such training will bring together young men from different parts of the country, of every race, creed, and color, united in one objective—democratic military training for the safety of the country that gives them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Without national security these great privileges cannot exist. Nor can a liberal system of education flourish where a condition of safety does not prevail. Young men who have had such training will be better and more law-abiding citizens; will learn to respect each other's points of view and rights and ways of life, because they have worked together.

They will gain in self-reliance and will learn qualities of leadership. These lessons will point toward the main objective—the security of the United States.

The only alternative, as General Marshall has pointed out, is a large standing army, maintainable only at much greater expense and obtainable only by real peacetime conscription. Our history shows that, even in time of war, sufficient numbers of men do not volunteer for armed service.

Nation-wide military training for 1 continuous year, required by the law of the land, is not "peacetime conscription for service" no matter how many times that untrue assertion may be made, ignorantly or from conscious prejudice.

Conscription, whether in peace or war, means the compulsory recruitment of men for the Regular Army or Navy, for a definite period of active military service in the national forces.

Young trainees, under the system advocated by the Citizens Committee, would not be in the Army or Navy. They could not be used for garrison duty or active service either at home or overseas.

Upon termination of their 1 continuous year of training, trainees would be entirely free to enter employment, carry on their civilian education or, voluntarily, continue military instruction either in the Army, Navy, National Guard, or Naval Militia.

They could not be called back for further training periods, except in war or in a national emergency declared by Congress, and then only if they, at that time, came within age limits and other requirements prescribed by Congress. Many such trainees would quickly qualify as junior commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, or warrant officers in the National Guard, Naval Militia, or R. O. T. C., if they volunteered for such training.

The United States would then have, for the first time in its history, the substance of Washington's plan for a peace establishment, consisting of a large citizen reservoir of trained manpower and a valuable citizen corps of officer personnel, drawn from the people and not a military caste. This would permit timely reduction in the Regular Army, would avoid conscription for service on the European model, and would greatly reduce the cost of regular establishments.

All young men headed for the military schools, including West Point and Annapolis, must first take their 1 continuous year of training with all other young Americans.

The Citizens Committee, largely composed of men who by experience as trainees, citizen instructors in military training camps and in combat service overseas in World Wars I and II, is qualified to express useful opinions, not as theorists but as practitioners of what they preach.

Some organized the Plattsburg Training Camps of 1915 and 1916, under Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood; worked for Nation-wide military training in 1916 and 1920 and cooperated in suggesting to the Government in May 1940 (18 months before Pearl Harbor) and obtaining the adoption of Selective Service, without which we would have been completely unprepared.

The considered judgment of the Citizens Committee is against granting to prospective trainees any of the following options:

1. To permit such year of training to be broken up into two or three periods over several years. This would interfere seriously with the sequence of progressive training, planned by experienced officers of the Army and Navy during the 52 weeks required for proper training. Under pressure of war-necessity, men may be sent into the ranks after 4 to 5 months of intensive training, but such partly trained are slaughtered in battle. Peacetime training should be thorough, in order to be valuable.

2. To permit an age range of years (say, 17½ to 21) within which young men might select their 1 year to train, would unwisely widen the ages for training. Young men of approximately the same age (preferably 18) should be trained together.

Moerover, such right to choose could be misused to create a "block" or objection (when the chosen training time arrived) against interruption of education or employment. It is far better for all concerned that 1 continuous year of training shall have been finished before 19 years of age.

3. To permit anyone (son of high government official or son of humble worker) to escape such training would be a grave mistake. Therefore, any suggestion that a young man going to an institution of learning where a Reserve Officers' training course is given, might, if he agreed to take and complete such course, escape one continuous year of training with other young Americans before he went to college, would be a most undemocratic silk-stocking exception, and should be firmly refused.

4. To permit any more exemptions than are absolutely necessary would be unwise and undemocratic. It will be most beneficial that all young men, intending to become teachers and educators, should train for 1 continuous year. It may be quite proper for teachers and educators of military age to be exempted from war service, but these young men will be better teachers and wiser eductors if required to give, with all others, their 1 year of military training. Nor would it be wise or right to exeempt from such training, young men aiming to be chemists, physicists, engineers, scientists, etc. Later, if war comes, let wise and necessary exemptions be granted, but, in early youth, all young men should be required to take such training. There are now too many exemptions in war—do not let us make a similar mistake in peacetime military training. If the claims of all pressure groups were granted there would soon be more exemptees than trainees, a most undemocratic result.

We are arming against no nations, but we shall give adequate military training to our young men for the security of the United States and against our reckless tendency to sleep and luxuriate in a false sense of security. It is time we awoke to the grave dangers so narrowly averted. If we are again caught defenseless, we shall not deserve to survive.

The Late President Roosevelt Loved the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Richard L. Neuberger is one of the brilliant and rising young man of the Pacific coast. He has distinguished himself in the field of journalism, in politics, as a member of the Oregon State Legislature, as a writer of books and magazine articles, and more recently in his military service with the United States Army. He has recently written an article for the Oregonian, one of the leading daily newspapers of the United States, in which he discussed our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in direct relationship to the Pacific Northwest. We, of that area, had more than a political devotion to F. D. R. We had a pronounced personal affection for him which his death has not canceled. We sensed

that Roosevelt loved the wide open spaces and the rugged majesty of Nature's wonderland. We knew he responded to the appeal of the alfresco grandeur of God's country.

The article I am inserting hereinbelow is an appraisal of Roosevelt's love for and understanding of the incomparable Pacific Northwest region, from the Daily Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., April 22, 1945:

F. D. R. AND THE FAR WEST

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

"Our President, Please Go Slow" read the sign held up by a little girl in the dusty town on the Oregon frontier. F. D. R. went slow. He did better than that. He stopped his car. Someone lifted up the little girl. She and the President talked for a moment. Cowpunchers, Indians, ranchers, and lumber jacks clustered about the tonneau. They gossiped with Mr. Roosevelt for 4 or 5 minutes. Then the cavalcade moved on. It was the first time any of these people ever had seen a President of their country.

No President in American history figured more in the development of the far West than Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He visited lonely places in the backwoods. He loved the soil of America, its trees and mountains and streams. One afternoon in the lava gorge of the Columbia River, as the shadow of the world's greatest dam advanced in the waning sunlight, the President declared, "Seventy-five or eighty years ago an editor in New York said: 'Go West, young man, go West.' Horace Greeley is supposed to be out of date today, but Americans shall still have the opportunity of going West."

Mr. Roosevelt did more than any other President to make this possible. The dam at Grand Coulee is now completed. It will reclaim 40,000 farms from the upland desert. Returning soldiers will have the first chance to settle these 1,500,000 acres. This project is Mr. Roosevelt's monument as surely as if it were named for him and cast in his image.

As early as 1915 men and women in the West began urging the construction of Grand Coulee. They got scant hearing in high places. Then in 1920 there rode down the Columbia a young New York politician running for Vice President. At the little Washington town of Pasca he said:

"Coming through today on the train has made me think pretty deeply. When you cross the Mountain States and that portion of the Coast States that lies well back from the Ocean, you are impressed by those great stretches of physical territory now practically unused but destined some day to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like us; a territory to be developed by the Nation and for the Nation. As we were coming down the river today, I could not help thinking, as everyone does of all that water running down unchecked to the sea."

When these words had been uttered, the West knew it had found a champion. For more than a decade people along the sundown side of the continent followed the career of Franklin D. Roosevelt, waiting for a chance to help send him to the White House. He never failed the West, and the West never failed him. In four consecutive national elections, he carried the 11 States which stretch westward from the Continental Divide 41 out of a possible 44 times. No record in American political history ever compared with this.

California, Idaho, and Oregon, traditionally Republican States, became overwhelmingly Democratic in their Presidential sympathies upon the appearance of Franklin D. Roosevelt. California and Oregon turned down beloved favorite sons to endorse him. Nevada, Utah, and Arizona gave him majorities which compared with those in the solid South. The late Senator Borah, an opponent of the New Deal on many issues, told his people in Boise that Mr. Roosevelt was our great President.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the far West's favorite President. Even while he lived, Westerners ranked him with Jefferson, who sent Lewis and Clark to the Pacific. The West is notoriously fickle. It is a maverick region. It flirts with new political trends and movements. Yet it never wavered from F. D. R. To him it gave allegiance never accorded to any other figure in American political history.

Why was this? The President loved the American outdoors. Unable to walk himself, he nevertheless felt a kinship with the men who felled trees, tilled the soil, cruised the forests, and patroled the frontier. At Bonneville Dam he munched a ham sandwich and talked concrete mix with a greasy crane operator. On the wooded heights of the Mt. Hood National Forest, he chatted about seedlings, sustained yield, and Ponderosa pines with a glen-clad forest ranger.

Mr. Roosevelt knew the West, and the people of the West knew that he knew it. There was nothing phoney or synthetic about his interest in firs, hemlocks, granite crags, and mountain rivers. He could talk about dams with Col. Hugh Cooper, who built Dnieperstroy and advocated Grand Coulee. He could argue the worth of different grasses with a group of Wyoming ranchers. He could tell Lyle Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, where to plant a pine grove. At Mt. Hood some newspapermen were not sure of the elevation of the glittering white summit. F. D. R. turned around. "Eleven thousand, two hundred and twenty-five feet," said he. That was right—exactly.

Mr. Roosevelt is dead now. To the little girl with the sign and to Senator Borah he was our President. That is the way he always will be remembered out West. Our President he was, and our President he will remain. I camped one night with my friend, Forest Ranger Grady Miller, at Memaloose Ranger Station in the Wallowa National Forest. F. D. R. has always been Grady's hero. The ranger looked across the black chasm of the Snake River, deepest canyon on the continent, to a lofty pinnacle on the Idaho wall. "That mountain's nameless," he said. "Know who I'd like to see it named for?"

Grady's oldest son has since died at Guadalcanal, but he still feels the same way. He wants the big peak named for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

American Forum of the Air—Theodore Granik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter written by our distinguished President on February 26, then Vice President of the United States:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, February 26, 1945.

We know that we speak the sentiments of most of our colleagues in congratulating Theodore Granik on the seventeenth anniversary of his radio program, the American Forum of the Air. Mr. Granik's program, the oldest forum on the air, has been outstanding in its field; week in and week out it has presented to the American people discussions of vital concern to them in the finest American tradition of freedom of speech.

For his splendid public service in conducting these programs without compensation for 17 years, the American people and the many Members of Congress who have participated on the forum owe Mr. Granik a debt of gratitude. The radio industry can be proud of this pioneer in the field of public service programs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been taking freedom of speech too much for granted. So many of us make use of that freedom every day of the year that we sometimes forget the comparatively few people who work so hard year in and year out that that freedom shall continue to exist.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that it does take work to keep freedom—any freedom—alive. Not only work—but, for the past 3½ years, those freedoms of which freedom of speech is the keystone, has cost blood and sacrifice to maintain.

I believe the recent release of American citizens from the prison camps of our barbarous enemies of Japan and Germany has brought home to us the shocking contrast between the freedoms we here take for granted and the dark misery and ignorance of those unfortunate prisoners. Because it is the policy of our infamous foes to keep their own people, as well as war prisoners, from learning the truth, those Americans knew nothing of events during the past 3 years or more. As far as knowledge of the outside world is concerned, those people were "blacked out."

Their homecoming, therefore, has been a mental jolt to us, a jolt which should remind us that we have been taking our blessings of freedom too much for granted.

America was founded on freedom of speech. We all know the early settlers of this country met together in open forums to thrash out their problems. We all know how, as settlements grew into towns and cities, this country gradually adopted the representative form of government, nothing more than the people's representatives meeting to decide what steps to take for the betterment of the larger community.

But do we know how the development of the forum discussion has kept pace with representative government?

We who are elected to represent our people try and try truly to carry out their wishes, but except for those who call or write to us or come to sit in the galleries, the great majority often do not know what we are thinking and saying. Newspaper accounts, by the time they get back home, are often abbreviated in the pressure of events. Taking into account all the great services performed by the newspapers and periodicals of America, they still do not bring home to the people how the members of this great American forum, the United States Senate, or our sister forum, the House, really talk and sound in discussion of the people's best interests.

But there is one medium which conveys the true atmosphere of the deliberations of this body to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the American Forum of the Air, founded and presided over by Theodore Granik, and heard every Tuesday evening from coast to coast over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

I believe Mr. Granik is a disciple of free speech in America, and I am proud to count him as my friend. I have known him since his boyhood, watched him go through law school, and I believe no one in America has worked as hard at keeping the torch of liberty of expression alive—all without compensation to himself.

I said I was proud to count Mr. Granik as my friend. I am also proud of the fact that his forum is in its eighteenth year on the air, and that I appeared on Mr. Granik's first forum more than 17 years ago.

In that time Mr. Granik has become an authority on radio forum discussion. As director and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, he brings to the American people every Tuesday night one of the most vital issues of the week. To discuss these issues he brings before the microphone the prominent authorities of the Senate and of the House, distinguished persons from every walk of life, business, education, law and labor, and high-ranking Government officials, including members of the Cabinet.

No work is spared to obtain the best living authority on the issues to be discussed and every precaution is taken to present all the points of view involved.

Thus, Mr. Granik has developed radio forum discussion to the point where once again the deliberations of this body can be brought home to the American people just like the forum discussions of the early settlers. He brings to millions of listeners throughout the Nation the true attitudes, the true thinking of the people's representatives. He brings to these millions the very voices and thoughts of their duly elected representatives. Yes, and further, he provides the one impartial method—far above and beyond any partisan criticism—of informing our servicemen overseas with the course of events at home. I am told that these programs are recorded and rebroadcast extensively by the War Department and that they attract the keen attention of our news-hungry sailors, soldiers, and marines on the fighting fronts all over the world.

About Theodore Granik, the man, I need say very little. It has been said here before by our distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator CAPPER—speech by Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, March 27, 1941—how he has given freely of his time, talents, and energy to become one of the foremost exponents of free speech and the winner of the coveted Peabody award is all in the RECORD.

That he has received recognition as a distinguished member of the bar is known to many of us. We may take note of the citation awarded to Mr. Granik by St. John's University School of Law on the occasion of conferring upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation awarded to him recited that Mr. Granik had been an "outstanding student at St. John's University School of Law from 1926 to 1929"; while still a student, organized the forum served from 1934 to 1937 as assistant district attorney of New York; counsel for the United States Housing Authority from 1937 to 1941; helped write the law creating the much-needed Smaller War Plants Corporation; the first alumnus of the school of law to win a place in the current edition of Who's Who in America. "The board of trustees of St. John's University," the citation concluded, "taking cognizance of the remarkable achievements of a loyal son, devoted father, and distinguished public servant, is happy to confer the honorary degree of doctor of laws."

The services he performs as moderator of the American Forum of the Air are worthy of note, however. The forum has become such an established feature of American life and has attained such stature as a sounding board for public opinion that Mr. Granik has been called in as an unbiased adviser on legislative and policy problems during these difficult years by various war agencies and committees of the Senate and the House.

As a result of discussion on the forum, for example, Mr. Granik was appointed special counsel to the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency to devise legislation to convert small-business enterprises to war production. The result was the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

He served as special adviser to Mr. Donald Nelson of the War Production Board.

He served as civilian aide to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service. As a result of many letters addressed to Mr. Granik as moderator of the forum, General Hershey adopted a new method of announcing draft quotas and induction regulations at a time when lack of adequate channels of public information had caused considerable hardship and anxiety to American homes. When the Senate War Investigating Committee began deliberations on the problem of manpower Mr. Granik placed the committee right on the air with expert witnesses on both sides so that the public would grasp the problem.

These services are typical of the many Mr. Granik has been able to perform and are a great tribute to his personal ability and integrity.

The significant point of this account is, however, that the American Forum of the Air is established as a definite link between the legislators and executives of Government and the people back home. Grown up before us over a period of 17 years is a national institution as free to the Members of this body as it is to the American people to provide a place to talk things out, to hew out the answers to the problems of the day in close touch with the people themselves.

The American Forum of the Air is a living monument to the man who founded it and the living, dynamic spirit of the principles of free government which has carried this Nation on to its present greatness.

Following is a list of titles and speakers of American Forum of the Air programs for the past year; they are typical of the far-reaching subjects discussed each week:

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR—SUBJECT AND PARTICIPANTS

1944

April 4: The 1944 campaign. Representative Warren Magnuson, Washington; Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York; Dr. Frank Kingdon, radio commentator and author; Representative Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota.

April 11: The wage policy. William H. Davis, Chairman, National War Labor Board; George K. Batt, industry member of the National War Labor Board; Lee Pressman, general counsel, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, professor of political science, Harvard University; Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor.

April 18: The political periscope. Ernest K. Lindley, syndicated columnist and chief, Washington bureau, Newsweek; Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington bureau, Christian Science Monitor; Phelps H. Adams, chief, Washington bureau, New York Sun; Marquis Childs, United Features Syndicate columnist; Ray Tucker, McClure Syndicate columnist; Charles Van Devander, chief, Washington bureau, New York Post.

April 25: Our foreign policy. Representative Albert Gore, Democrat, of Tennessee; Representative Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Republican, of Pennsylvania; Representative Herman P. Eberharter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Representative Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota.

May 2: The poll-tax issue. Senator Samuel D. Jackson, Indiana; Senator James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Representative George H. Bender, Ohio; Representative John S. Gibson, Georgia.

May 9: Inter-American development. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; Eric Johnston, president, United States Chamber of Commerce; Eduardo Villasenor, Mexican banker; Valentim Boucas, Brazilian industrialist; Gen. Henry H. Arnold, United States Army Air Forces.

May 16: Government seizure of business. Representative Charles S. Dewey, Republican, of Illinois; Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of New York; Representative Forest A. Harness, Republican, of Indiana; Representative James A. Wright, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

May 23: The fourth term. Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat, of West Virginia; Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Republican, of Nebraska; Representative George E. Outland, Democrat, of California; Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire.

May 30: Should the House have a voice in treaty making? Representative J. Percy Priest, of Tennessee; Senator Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas; Senator Hugh A. Butler, of Nebraska.

June 6: Canceled—D-day.

June 13: Financing postwar public improvements. Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Gov. Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia.

June 20: Army-Navy merger. Representative Melvin J. Maas, of Minnesota; Representative James W. Mott, of Oregon; Capt. Lowell Limpus, syndicated military analyst and author of How Army Fights; Glen Perry, military writer, New York Sun.

June 27: Republican convention. No program.

July 4: What kind of world organization does youth want? Elisabeth Stadulis, graduate of the High School of Music and Art, New York; Steve Benedict, sophomore, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; Eugene Gendlin, freshman, Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.; Tom Hughes, sophomore, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; guest chairman, Capt.

Arnaud C. Marts, United States Coast Guard Reserve and president of Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

July 11: How much regulation of business after the war? Robert E. Freer, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of directors of the Timken-Detroit Axle Co.; Robert R. Nathan, former chairman of planning for the War Production Board and author of Mobilizing for Abundance; John Airey, president of the King-Seeley Corporation and director of the National Association of Manufacturers, vice chairman of its committee on war control terminations.

July 18: The campaign issues. Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual Network's Washington reporter; Leon Henderson, former Chief of the O. P. A., now a Blue Network commentator; Ray Tucker, syndicated columnist of the McClure Syndicate; Ernest K. Lindley, chief of the Washington bureau of Newsweek magazine, syndicated columnist, and Blue Network commentator; Leo Cherne, executive secretary, the Research Institute of America, and Mutual Network analyst; Walter Trohan, White House correspondent of the Chicago Tribune; Robert E. Hannegan—Greetings—Chairman, Democratic National Committee.

July 25: Jobs for disabled veterans. Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and of retraining and reemployment; Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York; Robert M. Gaylord, president, National Association of Manufacturers; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, C. I. O.; Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans; Ray Murphy, general counsel, Association of Casualty and Surety Executives.

August 1: What should be done now about reconversion? Dr. William Y. Elliott, vice chairman for civilian requirements, War Production Board; Judge Charles M. Hay, Executive Director, War Manpower Commission; Frank M. Fenton, director of organization, American Federation of Labor; A. M. Wibel, vice president, Nash-Kelvinator Corporation.

August 8: What do the people back home think? Senator Homer Ferguson, Republican, of Michigan; Representative Robert Ramspeck, Democrat, of Georgia; Representative Leonard W. Hall, Republican, of New York; Representative John W. Murphy, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

August 15: Political periscope No. 2. Ernest K. Lindley, chief, Washington bureau, Newsweek; James A. Wechsler, chief, Washington bureau, PM; Walter Trohan, White House correspondent, Chicago Tribune; Charles Van Devander, chief, Washington bureau, New York Post; Ray Tucker, McClure Syndicate columnist.

August 22: The meaning of Bretton Woods. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury; Harry D. White, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury; Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State; Senator Charles W. Tobey, New Hampshire, ranking Republican member, Senate Banking and Currency Committee; E. E. Brown, president, First National Bank of Chicago, and president of the Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System.

August 29: Labor in politics. Representative Clarence J. Brown, Republican, of Ohio; Representative Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington; Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

September 5: What are the major issues of the campaign. Representative James A. Wright, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Representative Charles A. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana; Representative J. Percy Priest, Democrat, of Tennessee; Representative Walter C. Ploeser, Republican, of Missouri.

September 12: Should we have universal military training in peacetime? Representative James W. Wadsworth, New York; Warren H. Atherton, national commander, the American Legion; Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for President; Dr. Broadus Mitchell, chairman, Committee Against Postwar Conscription of the Postwar World, acting chairman Postwar World Council.

September 19: What should be done with Germany? Miss Sigrid Schultz, author of Germany Will Try Again and former Berlin correspondent of the Mutual Network and the Chicago Tribune; Dr. Paul Hagen, member of the Council for a Democratic Germany and author of Germany After Hitler; Dr. L. M. Birkhead, national director of the Friends of Democracy, Inc.; J. King Gordon, managing editor of the Nation.

September 26: Business and the election. Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Democrat, of Wyoming; J. Louis Reynolds, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co. and chairman of the advisory council of Businessman for Roosevelt, Inc.; Senator Owen Brewster, Republican, of Maine; Malcolm Muir, president and publisher of Newsweek magazine.

October 3: Woman's stake in the election. Miss Fannie Hurst, novelist; Miss Marian E. Martin, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee; Mrs. Emma Guffee Miller, Democratic National Committeewoman from Pennsylvania; Dr. Ruth Alexander, economist, lecturer, and editorial columnist on the New York Mirror.

October 10: The World Security Organization drafted at Dumbarton Oaks. Senator Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota; Representative Hamilton Fish, of New York.

October 17: The P. A. C. and its effect on the election. Dr. Frank Kingdon, educator, author, and commentator; Senator James M. Tunnell, Democrat, of Delaware; Mr. Louis Bromfield, author and farmer; Representative Fred A. Hartley, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.

October 24: What to do with Germany. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister, Community Church of New York, and chairman of the Civil Liberties Union; Henry J. Taylor, news commentator and correspondent, who was the last American in and out of Germany before Pearl Harbor, and author of Man in Motion; Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, New York, and author of the recently published Germany—A Short History; Louis Nizer, attorney and author of the best seller What To Do With Germany; guest chairman Sydney Moseley.

October 31: Political periscope No. 3. Ernest K. Lindley, chief, Washington bureau, Newsweek; Gladstone Williams, Washington correspondent of the Atlanta Constitution and of the McClatchy newspapers of California; Emil Hurja, publisher of Pathfinder; Ned Brooks, Washington correspondent of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance; Milton Murray, Washington bureau of PM.

November 7: Election day—no program.

November 14: What should be our tax program after the war. Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy Co.; chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; John L. Connolly, secretary and general counsel of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and member of the advisory committee for the development of the Twin Cities tax plan; William Benton, vice president of the University of Chicago and vice chairman of the committee for economic development; Harold Ruttenberg, research director, United Steelworkers of America.

November 21: What's holding back India's freedom? Sir Frederick Puckle, adviser on Indian affairs to the British Embassy; Norman Thomas, Socialist leader; S. M. Ahmed, economist and India trade consultant; Congressman Emanuel Celler, New York.

November 28: Should we have compulsory military training in peacetime? Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Representative James W. Wadsworth, of New York; Capt. Lowell Limpus, military analyst of the New York Daily News; Alonzo F. Myers, professor of New York University and chairman of the N. E. A. Committee for Defense of Democracy Through Education.

December 5: Should we freeze the social security tax? Representative Harold Knutson, Minnesota; Representative Walter Lynch, New York; Representative Charles Dewey, Illinois; Representative Herman Eberharter, Pennsylvania.

December 12: Is world-wide freedom of news essential to future world peace? William Ziff, editor and publisher; Henry J. Taylor, news commentator and correspondent; Eugene Lyons, editor, Pageant; Richard Eaton, publisher, News Digest magazine.

December 19: Should the House of Representatives have a voice in making treaties? Representative Francis Walter, Pennsylvania, chairman, Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee; Representative Edward Gossett, Texas; Senator Raymond Willis, Indiana; Prof. Herbert Wright, professor of international law, Catholic University.

December 26: No program.

1945

January 2: How adequate is the GI bill of rights? Senator Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona; one of the coauthors and cosponsors of the GI bill of rights; Willard Waller, author of the best seller, the Veteran Comes Back; Dr. Lawrence S. Kubie, leading psychiatrist and member of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene; Lee Garling, World War No. 2 veteran who has benefited from the GI bill; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System, guest chairman.

January 9: Do present methods of education fill the needs of returning veterans? Stringfellow Barr, president, St. John's College; Dixon Ryan Fox, president, Union College; Oliver C. Carmichael, president, Vanderbilt University; Kenneth I. Brown, president, Dennison University; Francis P. Gaines, president, Washington and Lee University, guest chairman.

January 16: What is America's present manpower problem? Brig. Gen. William C. Rose, Chief of Executive Services, War Manpower Commission; J. D. Small, Executive Officer, War Production Board; Senator Owen Brewster, Maine; A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor; Representative Frank Hook, Michigan; Senator James M. Mead, New York, guest chairman.

January 23: How can we dispose of war surplus materials? Senator Harley Kilgore, of West Virginia; Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Gov. Robert Hurley, member, Surplus War Property Board; Mason Britton, Administrator, Surplus War Property Board; Albert H. Hall, Director, National Institute of Governmental Purchases; Walter Morrow, president, American Retail Federation; David L. Podell, General Counsel, Smaller War Plants Corporation.

January 30: Do we need work-or-fight legislation? Representative Andrew J. May, of Kentucky; Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri; Representative John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Chet Holifield, of California.

February 6: How large a merchant-marine fleet should we maintain after the war? Almon E. Roth, president, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.; John F. Geham, president, the Propeller Club of America, vice president, American Export Lines; Dr. John Lee Coulter, consulting economist, American Tariff League; Harvey Klemmer, executive secretary, postwar planning committee, United States Maritime Commission.

February 13: Should we have more freedome or control in our international trade?

Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming; Anton deHaas, professor of international relationships, Harvard University; Redvers Opie, Esq., economic adviser to the British Embassy.

February 20: Should the legal voting age be reduced to 18 years? Representative Augustus W. Bennet, New York; David Fund, senior, Wooster (Ohio) High School; Betsy Ancker, senior, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Walter Crosby Eells, executive secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges; Robert E. Mertz, freshman, Lehigh University; Janie Peipel, senior, Adamson High School, Dallas, Tex.

February 27: Will adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks program give us permanent peace? Senator Claude Pepper, Florida; Senator Elbert D. Thomas; Senator William Langer, North Dakota; Mr. William B. Ziff, Editor and Publisher.

March 6: Will the Polish agreement best serve peace? Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, California; Congressman George E. Outland, California; Congresswoman Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Congressman Alvin C. O'Konski, Wisconsin.

March 13: What should be America's international commercial air policy? Senator Owen Brewster, Maine; Senator Pat McCarran, Nevada; Representative Harry R. Sheppard, California; Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington.

March 20: Should we adopt the Bretton Woods plan? Senator Charles W. Tobey, New Hampshire; W. L. Gregory, president, Independent Bankers Association; Senator Robert A. Taft, Ohio; U. V. Wilcox, Washington representative, American Banker.

March 27: Was the cause of lasting peace advanced at Yalta? Senator Joseph H. Ball, Minnesota; Senator Owen Brewster, Maine; Senator Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart, California.

April 3: What shall we do with territory taken from the Japanese—trusteeship or annexation? Dr. A. N. Holcombe, professor of government, Harvard University, on leave; Chairman, Appeals Board, War Production Board; Representative Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts, former chairman, Boston Foreign Policy Association; Representative F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Representative Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland.

April 10: What is the food situation? Senator W. Lee O'Daniel, Texas; Representative A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Lt. Col. Ralph W. Olmstead, Director of Supply, Commodity Credit Corporation, Deputy Director, War Food Administration; Representative John Murphy, Pennsylvania.

April 17: Should we renew reciprocal trade agreements? Representative Frank Carlson, Kansas; Representative Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Representative Walter A. Lynch, New York; Representative A. Willis Robertson, Virginia.

Men Without Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted me to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid article written by Edward T. Leech entitled "Men Without Medals" appearing in the magazine section of the Washington Star of May 6, 1945, a deserved tribute to the members of the 6,500 local draft boards, and their related agents and agencies. It follows:

MEN WITHOUT MEDALS

(By Edward T. Leech)

They're the members of the local draft boards, who've shown how democracy works.

They've never seen action, and never will, yet the war couldn't be won without these 10 American divisions.

They have served for four and a half years, without furlough or relief. And it has been hard service, trying, tiresome, and frequently sorrowful—performed without pay, without acclaim, without decorations, with almost no public recognition.

These 10 divisions consist of about 150,000 men who comprise the nation's 6,500 draft boards and their related agents and agencies—appeals boards, appeals agents, legal advisers to registrants, examining physicians, medical advisers, and reemployment committeemen.

They are the human element of Selective Service—the machinery that put the major part of 12,000,000 men into uniform without disrupting the home front.

They've been on the job since late in 1940, when America's first peacetime draft began functioning with the drawing of blue capsules from a gigantic bowl in Washington. Remember when No. 158 came out first? They were working then.

Today, as victory approaches, they are still feeding men into the war; but increasingly, their work now is with men returning from war to seek jobs back home. For Selective Service has the double duty of putting men into uniform and getting them back into jobs when those uniforms are put aside.

The men who make up Selective Service are your neighbors. For the basis of Selective Service is local control. Washington fixes general policies; State headquarters administer them; but the local draft board applies them and determines who shall go and who shall stay. And the local board is a neighborhood group, living with those whom it must judge.

On your board you will find men who are the backbone of your community. Not only the judge, the banker, the merchant, and the teacher, but the man around the corner, that civic-minded citizen who has given up the time in which he used to putter around the house, play with his kids, and who has volunteered, instead, for this important war job at home.

The draft board has more power than any group of unpaid volunteers in our history. Yet for all its troubles, for all the conflicts and complexities of the manpower question, it has worked with efficiency and freedom from major scandal, accusation, or politics.

There have been faults of course; but no such scandals as marked Civil War drafting and some World War No. 1 instances.

It was inevitable that in creating a mass citizen army for all-out war there would be confusion of regulations, frequent shifting of policies, border-line interpretations, and all the other uncertainties of constantly changing situations both at the front and at home. Plagued by those conditions and by all the questions they created among registrants and their families, the local draft boards had to carry on the most delicate of assignments.

Working usually in small and uninviting quarters in a schoolhouse or fire station or borough or township hall or some available public room, with a modest assortment of old furniture and makeshift equipment, these groups of neighbors have decided the fate of their home town and home street young men.

Draft headquarters is seldom much to look at. Some patriotic posters, mimeographed notices and newspaper clippings on the wall; a few desks and uncomfortable chairs; groups of boys and their fathers and mothers and employers waiting outside. This is where some little group of men has given many hours daily and several nights a week for over 4 years to unpaid public service. Only the clerical help receives pay.

Often the work has been agonizing. It has involved the lives of the sons of neighbors and friends, the disruption of homes, all the deep domestic dislocations and griefs of war. The draft board members must rule—and then continue to live with the neighbors so vitally affected.

They've been able to go on living among their neighbors because they've done a hard job honestly. They must tell others to fight; they deal in lists, files, and folders—the cold stuff of paper and steel cabinets. Yet they also work with flesh and blood, out of which has come an armed force battling without reprieve to finish the war and gain the goal of peace.

After victory, when our aim once again will be happy living, these men—whose only badge is "local board member, Selective Service"—can feel real satisfaction.. They've shown the world that democracy can act—quickly and effectively.

Postal Workers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (S. C.) News:

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

There can be little question but that the American people generally look with favor upon the present move in Congress to place the employees of the United States Postal Service upon a more satisfactory basis of compensation.

The men who handle our mails have earned only moderate salaries, and they have had no pay increase since 1925, except for a temporary cost-of-living-increase bonus of $300 a year, which expires under existing law on next June 30.

The time is ripe, we think it will be generally agreed, for more definite and more comprehensive action by Congress to establish a more nearly adequate plan of compensation.

Out of the many bills to this end, one of which was passed by the House at the last session, a comprehensive measure has been worked out in a conference of the Post Office Department, representatives of the employees and members of the House Post Office Committee. Offered by Representative BURCH, chairman of the House committee, it is generally known as the Burch bill, and would upgrade all classifications of postal workers, and in addition make more systematic and more satisfactory provisions with respect to overtime payment and longevity increases. The New York Journal describes this bill as one that would not only give postal workers better pay from the lowest to the highest brackets, but would also substitute an orderly general law for what has become a mass of piecemeal measures because of frequent amendments to the 1925 law. It regards this bill as the best legislation proposed in behalf of the postal workers since 1925.

The Nation's postal employees, it is safe to say, have the sympathetic approval of the people of the country in their effort to secure the enactment of such a measure now.

Radio Address at Portland, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on May 5, 1945:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, the 2 weeks since I last broadcast have seen some of the most eventful days that have ever occurred on our planet. The victory has come in Europe. There may be more shooting. Some of our boys may still perish at German hands. But there is no longer a German army or a German state. The whole loathsome apparatus has fallen to pieces. The last few days have shown us how loathsome it was. All the stories that seemed incredible were true. The newspapers have revealed some of the horrors to the world. The movies will show them unmistakably to people the world over, above all to the German people. Look at these pictures and reflect that but for the grace of God your body might be hanging on a nail in a Nazi dungeon or shoved into a Nazi oven.

Those are the moral standards of nazidom that we rejected. Is there anybody who still thinks that we could have temporized with them or conciliated or appeased them?

This has been the last act of the great tragedy. The wheel has come full circle. The famous jaw that jutted out over the Piazza Venezia in Rome was laid in the dust of the Piazza Loretta in Milan. Benito Mussolini crying, "No, no," to the firing squad is the symbol of a man who has denied all the values of the human spirit. Hitler is dead, also, says the Hamburg radio. If it is not true today, it should be tomorrow. Sic semper tyrannis. So let it be with all bloodthirsty guttersnipes; whatever shirts they wear, whatever tongues they speak, whatever lands are darkened by their shadows.

This is a glorious hour, but a solemn hour. It is no time for cheap rejoicing. Too many brave men are dead. Too many must still die in the struggles to come in the Pacific. All Americans will wish simply to give thanks for their blessings and go on to the consummation of their European victory by triumph over Japan and triumph at San Francisco over the forces that cause wars.

San Francisco, bear in mind, is not a peace conference. It is a constitutional convention to form the framework of a new world society. I shall not comment upon it at any length tonight. It is too early to speak either of its successes, or if its failures. Our ideal is a world society with at least some rudimentary fabric of law and ethics to which we can commit the future. An alliance of powerful states is not a free world society but it can help a true world society come into existence. If it does not, it will go hard with us. The Russians have some uncomfortable ideas. They have not our conception of civil rights and they have played a lone hand in eastern Europe. No doubt many Russians distrust the genuineness of Anglo-American friendship. On that point they should receive every reassurance. I hope they in turn can reassure us that they want genuine collective security and not selfish spheres of influence. Real collective security will have military force at its disposal and it will be able to exercise control over the fabrication of munitions and armaments.

Two weeks ago I made some remarks about the war in the Pacific. I want to make some more tonight. At Cairo on December 1, 1943, we announced our aims in the war against Japan. We said, "The three great allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion. It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed. The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

Just lately a new Japanese Cabinet has been formed. There are only two generals in it and one of the old war lords. Its most striking feature is the predominance of admirals and specialists in Soviet affairs. The admirals are of the pre-Tojo group. Some of them are said to come as near to being friendly to us as it is possible to find in Japan. Undoubtedly the new Japanese Government wants to keep Russia out of the war and induce us to accept a negotiated peace. Admiral Baron Suzuki has begun his career as Premier by eating dirt in public, which is never easy for a political leader and is particularly hard for a Japanese political leader. Suzuki has expressed—I quote him—"deepest humiliation and regret at the development of a situation which has allowed the enemy to take possession of an integral portion of our empire. The very basis of the empire will be threatened if the situation is allowed to go along as it has been going." This is not the old swagger of Admiral Tojo. It is the voice of a very worried man.

And he has good cause for worry. The Jap Navy is done as a fighting force. It is capable of a demonstration, of sinking some of our ships, but it is no longer a formidable fighting force. Neither is the Japanese air force. The Japanese leaders know they have no friends in the world. They know that the corpse of Mussolini is spat upon by the populace of Milan. They know that the mighty of Germany are fallen and that Hitler, if he still lives, is hiding either in the rubble of his former capital or in the recesses of the Alps.

There may be some Japanese who don't know what our superfortresses flying now in comparatively short hops, our bombs and our incendiaries can do to their cities, and their people. But they will realize more clearly with each succeeding day.

It seems to me that we should stop talking about unconditional surrender and repeat what we said at Cairo, our war aims in the struggle against Japan. I think it possible that Japan might now accept our terms. In no sense do I advocate a negotiated peace. We could take this course with no sacrifice of principle or weakening of our moral or military position. I very seriously urge that this possibility be explored before we commit other thousands of Americans to die on beaches in China or on Formosa or the main islands of Japan.

In the last fortnight the House of Representatives has worked principally on routine appropriation bills. The most important exception has been the resolution to amend the Constitution by doing away with the provision that requires a treaty to be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate and providing in lieu thereof that treaties must be ratified by a simple majority of the Senate and the House. I approve of such a constitutional amendment and spoke for it on the floor of the House. The present constitutional right of one-third of those present in the Senate to block the ratification of a treaty is an obstacle and almost an insuperable obstacle to the whole conduct of our foreign affairs. In 1844 the Senate refused to ratify a treaty which admitted Texas to the Union. In 1897 they refused to act at all on a treaty for the admission of Hawaii. In 1919 they denied ratification to the Treaty of Versailles and this set in motion the great deteriorative forces that have led us along the bloody trails that the world has traveled in the last 6 years. There is no reason why the House as the more popular branch of the Federal Legislature should not share in the treaty-making power and there is no reason for not following here as elsewhere in our democratic Government the principle of majority rule. I see no reason for saying that the requirement of a two-thirds majority on treaties affords any necessary protection to the minority. In the debate on the resolution proposing the amendment no opponent of the amendment was able to show a single instance in which an undesirable treaty was defeated by the vote of less than a majority but more than a third.

John Hay, probably as able a man as ever headed our State Department, once exclaimed in exasperation: "A treaty in our Senate has no more chance than a bull in the arena."

The debate on the proposed amendment was conducted on a high plane. At the time of preparing this broadcast the vote has not been taken. A two-thirds vote in both branches is necessary to adopt the resolution.

Everyone is standing by now for good news in Europe. In my next broadcast there are certain to be many new developments to discuss. But for now, good night.

What Is the American Way of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in the June issue of Reader's Scope there appears a symposium, consisting of three articles, on the subject, What is the American Way of Life? The first article is by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; the second by Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia; and the third by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?

(A symposium)

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

The American way of life is the fulfillment of the ideals set forth by our forefathers; a life enjoyed by men created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is a way actually experienced by our people with freedom and justice for all. That all have not yet shared altogether alike only serves to inspire greater effort to reach the goal which has been in the hearts and souls of Americans from our earliest days.

As dear to us as the air we breathe is our conception of a land where the individual has No. 1 priority; where government is the servant, not the master of its citizens. Above all, we are determined that the United States

shall be a good place in which to live; where every man can earn his daily bread and have a good home. We are not satisfied unless our average citizen has a chance to get ahead and to raise his children so that they can have opportunity to be just a little better off than their parents.

For the deepest emotion which moves us all—faith based upon the worship of our Lord—comes our conviction that our homes are the very center of the American way of life. Only in a good home can be developed personal virtues on which the strength of our Nation depends: courage, initiative, self-reliance, willingness to assume risks and responsibility, eagerness to share in the work of making our country a better and better land.

Good government begins at home. It is from the home that the spirit of team-play and understanding spreads to the community, to the State, and to the Nation. Our people themselves are, indeed, our way of life, one big family, composed of many races and faiths, but united in brotherly love and determined that right shall ever be master over might.

ELLIS ARNALL, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

The American way of life can be summarized in a single word: Freedom. There are not 4 freedoms, nor 10 freedoms, but only 1 freedom: The right of the individual to lead his own life in his own way, free of the threat of interference so long as he interferes with no other man's freedom. Freedom of the individual has many aspects. Political freedom includes both the right to participate in government through democratic processes and those civil liberties guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. Economic freedom implies the right to earn a livelihood and the opportunity to do so. But these aspects of freedom are not the whole of man's unalienable heritage. He has the right to the pursuit of an ever-fugitive happiness, which may elude him or may disappoint him, but which remains for every man the true measure of his liberty.

Freedom is not to be found where men are deprived of opportunity through exploitation, nor where they are deprived of individuality in a dull monotony of regimentation. It is to be found only where the free man's freedom is limited only by his inescapable obligation as an individual to maintain, as dearly as his own, the right of other men to be free.

Material prosperity has been an incidental of the American way of life, which brought men across uncharted seas to forest wildernesses that they might build a New World in which freedom, which had been rejected in the Old World, should be the cornerstone.

ALEXANDER WILEY, SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

The American way of life is the trail which was blazed by our pioneers and which grew into a high road of happiness for the great mass of our people for these 160 years. This high road is lined with the living trees of liberty, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the other historic documents and words of our great statesmen and humble citizens. And these trees of liberty, in turn, have borne the sweet fruit, the abundant fruit, which have made the American way the abundant way of life.

This life abounds in blessings, spiritual and material. It is a life as overflowing with opportunities as an American harvestland, as filled with inspiring challenges as a big city skyline, as neighborly as a country fair or a barn dance, or a community sing, and as peaceful as Main Street on Sunday morning when the town is at prayer meeting. It is a life with the time-saving efficiency of a Detroit assembly line, and the time enjoying leisureliness of puttering in the family garden.

It is a life where there is competitive sportsmanship in business like an intercepted forward pass on the football field, but a life in which the selfsame business by mass production and brilliant promotion puts a radio in four out of every five American homes. It is a good life made constantly better by better working hours, better working conditions, wages, nutrition, health, recreation, schooling, and home-making. It is a meaningful life of abundant progress and abundant evolution, individual and national. It is a robust life in which every man, regardless of his race, creed, color, national origin, or station of origin, may rise to his fullest dignity, realize his fullest potentiality, reap his fullest reward by the sweat of his brow and the toil of his brain. It is an independent life where a man has the privacy of his own home, the choice of his own ballot marking, the selection of his own church, his own trade, his own risks. It is a life in which the citizen is informed and active in the affairs of his community, his Nation, and his world. It is a life in which the personal virtues of thrift, integrity, ingenuity, diligence, and cooperation are the intended virtues of the Nation. It is a life in which Government is a wise and helpful servant, in which the individual enjoys a Bill of Rights and at the same time recognizes his "bill of obligations" for the common welfare.

The Gentleman From Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a personality sketch of the junior Senator from Idaho, the Honorable GLEN H. TAYLOR, which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Progressive. This article, written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, one of the outstanding authorities on the Northwest, Canada, and Alaska, gives a close-up view of the new and friendly Senator from Idaho.

Senator TAYLOR will, I know, make his mark in the Senate of the United States because, on the basis of what he has done to date, he has shown an ability to express himself clearly and to handle matters affecting his State and his country in a very efficient and capable manner.

It is a real pleasure for me to bring this article to the attention of the House because the membership here will come to know and admire Senator TAYLOR the longer he is with us. His kindness, friendliness, and courtesy typifies the real spirit of the West and we may rest assured that the magnificent start he has already made is only an indication of the great things which we may expect of him in the future.

The article follows:

FROM "SINGING COWBOY" TO UNITED STATES SENATOR

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger)

When GLEN H. TAYLOR, junior Senator from the State of Idaho, arrived in the National Capital, he and his wife and their two children, like a lot of other new arrivals, couldn't find a place to live. The Senator sat on the steps of the majestic Capitol Building and strummed a ditty on his banjo:

"O, give me a home near the Capitol dome,
With a yard where the children can play.
Just one room or two, any old thing will do,
Oh, we can't find a place to stay."

This confirmed most advance opinions of Idaho's new Senator. "Just another singing cowboy," everyone said. People knew that TAYLOR had sung Clementine, Oh Susanna, Home on the Range, and Wagon Wheels during his campaign. They braced themselves for buffoonery and court-jesting. They have been sadly fooled.

GLEN TAYLOR has proved one of the outstanding liberals to arrive in Washington in recent years. John Chamberlain, covering the Senate for Life, was told that "MORSE, of Oregon, and TAYLOR, of Idaho, were two newcomers to watch closely." And Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, the majority leader, informed a newspaper reporter that TAYLOR was sure to make his mark in the Senate.

Two of the most effective speeches for the confirmation of Henry Wallace and Aubrey Williams were delivered by TAYLOR. In addition, the Senators gave a careful hearing to his description of his own work in a war plant when he rose to oppose the manpower conscription bill. And at a Young Democratic Convention in New York recently, TAYLOR delivered a fighting address that was a high light of the occasion.

TAYLOR'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Many newspapermen on Capitol Hill have been told that TAYLOR may eventually be considered one of the foremost progressives in Congress. "Watch TAYLOR" is a common comment. This doesn't add up to the presession picture of a wild-eyed singing cowpuncher with chaps, lariat, and 10-gallon hat. Just what sort of fellow is GLEN H. TAYLOR, 41-year-old junior Senator from Idaho, who was elected last autumn in one of the big upsets of the 1944 campaign?

He is a slight, wiry fellow with many enthusiasms. He first became interested in politics a few years ago, when he decided he could do as well as many of the men in public life. Thus far in the Senate TAYLOR has been definitely on the liberal side of most issues. He fought for the confirmation of Henry Wallace and Aubrey Williams. He opposed passage of the manpower bill. One of his greatest enthusiasms was the late President of the United States. TAYLOR ran for Senator as a Roosevelt Democrat. He said that there had been two notable Presidents in history who paid particular attention to the far West—Thomas Jefferson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TAYLOR'S philosophy is best epitomized by a statement which he recently made to Young Democrats meeting in New York City:

"Jefferson was an advocate of private enterprise, but he also believed in public intervention, if necessary, to secure protection from dangerous concentrations of economic power. The long-established practice of passing on estates to the eldest son was a cherished institution, and when it became evident that its opponents were to win the battle, a compromise was offered suggesting that at least the eldest son should be allowed a double portion. Jefferson responded that he would favor that only when the eldest son could eat twice as much as each of his brothers.

SHOW BUSINESS AND DEPRESSION

"I think we must keep this thought in mind in our postwar world. Everyone should have equal opportunity and equal rights. We must give more attention to the individual. We have been so engulfed with our rapidly expanding industrial system that sometimes

we have lost sight of the individual. Frankly, the one solution I see is to bolster wage standards and guarantee the people sufficient purchasing power to buy everything that can be produced in the way of services and goods.

"It was our failure to face the truth that brought economic collapse before. It was that collapse which left people hungry while resources and machines stood idle. It was that collapse which prepared the soil for Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco. It led us directly into World War No. 2. Unless we face these economic problems in a realistic manner, everything that may be done by the diplomats at San Francisco will be of little avail and the peoples of the world will continue their violent quest in search of economic security."

This progressive outlook on world affairs stems from a unique background in the Far West. GLEN TAYLOR was born in Portland, Oreg., in April of 1904. His father, Pleasant John Taylor, a nomadic preacher was holding a prayer meeting there. Pleasant John preached in camps and outposts all over Idaho, Oregon, Colorado, and Utah. The frontiersmen would not pay for their religion, however, so the Taylor family put on concerts to finance the trips.

The whole family was musical. This propensity still continues. Several of Glen's brothers now manage a chain of theaters extending from the Idaho uplands to the eastern edge of Montana. Another brother, Ferris Taylor, is in the movies. As a boy, Glen acted in his father's shows. "I usually was killed in the third act," he recalls, "but we were short of actors, so I came back as the sheriff in the fourth act to arrest the man who had killed me!"

After Glen was married he and his wife started their own company. They called it the Glendora Players, combining both their first names. They had made a good beginning when the depression came along. They suffered with the rest of the Nation, traveling from town to town, often broke and hungry. "The want and misery I saw during those years," the Senator now recollects, "made me do some serious thinking. I saw people hungry and ill-clothed and out of work, when I realized that our factories could still produce if the people just had enough money to buy the products. I started reading economics and political science and decided I could do better than the lawmakers and leaders who had let things get into such a terrible mess."

In 1937 GLEN and Dora TAYLOR moved to the Idaho town of Pocatello. She played the piano, he played the banjo, and they broadcast cowboy and ranch tunes over the radio. In 1938 he ran for Congress, using a hill-billy band in the campaign, and finished fourth in a field of 9. In 1940 Glen was nominated for the United States Senate on the Democratic ticket, but was defeated in the general election by 14,000 votes. His conqueror was JOHN THOMAS, 71-year-old present senior Senator from Idaho.

TAYLOR ran for the Senate again in 1942, losing by only 4,000 votes. He rode a horse in the campaign, and his wife and their 7-year-old son helped entertain the voters with music. TAYLOR moved to California to work in a war plant. As a prominent political figure, he could have had an executive job but worked at a bench for 2 years as a sheet-metal mechanic. He went back to Idaho for the 1944 campaign and edged out Senator D. Worth Clark by a slender margin in the Democratic primaries. The final election was between TAYLOR and Gov. C. A. Bottolfson, a conservative Republican. Betting was on Bottolfson, but TAYLOR talked about Roosevelt. Bottolfson talked about Dewey. Idaho went for F. D. R.—and GLEN TAYLOR. His most cherished message of congratulations was a letter from the war plant where he had been an employee, signed by all his fellow workers.

Franklin D. Roosevelt changed the trend of politics in Idaho. A Republican State for years, this mountain commonwealth voted four times consecutively for F. D. R. Now he is gone. GLEN TAYLOR, a 41-year-old singing cowboy and war-plant worker, inherits the New Deal mantle in the State. TAYLOR is liberal and progressive. His memory bears the scars of the depression, when he and his wife played to meager audiences and had to count their pennies. He remembers when they could not pay the grocery bill. His liberalism is practical rather than theoretical. He is sure to be a political figure for many years to come. He is young and aggressive. His Senate term runs until 1950 at least. Idaho's senior Senator is past 70. The Nation will probably hear more of the young man who a year ago was hammering out sheet-metal strips in a machine shop.

Universal Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest M. Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING—PREPAREDNESS TO DISCOURAGE ALL FUTURE WARS IS URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In consideration of the debate about the desirability for universal military training too little attention, it seems to me, is given to the essential fairness of the proposal. Whatever the temporary inconvenience or minor sacrifice in the individual case or the necessity for readjustments upon us collectively, it is far more just that some responsibility for the maintenance of free institutions should be laid successively upon each generation for a brief time than that periodically every few decades the tragedy of war should be imposed for half decades or more upon generations contemporaneous with the respective emergencies.

I do not assume that permanent immunity from war can be made completely certain whatever we do. On the basis, however, of some continuing contacts with sentiment abroad through the years since World War No. 1. I am fully persuaded that a well-devised and intelligently established system of universal military training would be in very large degree insurance against the frequency of war and might be more. I cannot think of any proposition that I should not consider imperative that decreased in the slightest degree the hazard of war or even increased the span of time between one war and another.

WARS LESS LIKELY

I want a system of universal military training established in the United States because I believe it would make wars less likely. For the second time in little over two decades I watch day by day the mounting list of Dartmouth's dead. Other colleges and universities have like lists. And beyond these are the thousands upon thousands of attractive lads of other associations and other backgrounds who all together were to constitute the warp and the woof of the pattern of our citizenship in years to come, pattern that now can never be what it might have been.

It is not an experience that can be borne except in grief to receive the daily items announcing the deaths of boys over whom one has watched with affection and with keen anticipation of what they might have become, or to realize the sorrow imposed upon their suffering families. It does not make for poise and calm and philosophical rationalization about the minutiae of daily living. Rather it makes for anguished query whether as a people we must always be subjected to the cost of our lack of realism.

RESISTANCE AT RIGHT TIME

It has been estimated by military authorities that nazi-ism could have been stopped at the time of the invasion of the Rhineland at a cost of a few hundred casualties at the most, and at the boundaries of Austria at a cost of a few thousand, had organization and will existed among peace-loving nations to have undertaken resistance then. I once asked a distinguished American in the Government whether any resistance on those occasions had been considered. "With what?" he replied. "Neither the United States nor England had trained men, matériel or convictions in those years."

It isn't reassuring to reflect what would be our situation at the present time if any one of numberless things hadn't occurred, particularly England's dogged and exhausting defense while we slowly came to understanding of what the war was all about; or Russia's entry into the war and her valor in it while we slowly got under way. If we in opulence, inertia, and self-righteousness withhold from preparedness for a possible World War No. 3, we will invite it.

MEASURE OF DEFENSE

But someone says, "Possibly so, but what does that prove about universal military training?" "Everything," in my belief. The circumstances of modern life demand elimination of any time lag as a factor in preparedness. The measure of our defense will be the extent not only of our provision for war but also of our readiness for it for long time to come, except for agreement more binding than anything now in sight.

Public sentiment in Europe as I saw it in the two decades following World War No. 1 offering many warnings of onrushing tragedy. Increasingly year by year subsequent to our refusal to enter the League of Nations the insistent belief cumulatively developed among the peoples of the Continent that the United States not only would not take any responsibility to support the peace-loving nations of the world, but that on the contrary we were so confident of our immunity from attack that we believed we could safely accept the hazard of doing nothing to defend ourselves against possible aggression.

German university men, students and graduates, stated frankly that the Reich was about ready to take over supremacy in Europe, and Italian Fascist officers boasted of what they were going to do in making the Mediterranean Sea their own exclusive lake. Again and again I asked whether there was no concern at all among them about public sentiment in England and America. With no single exception that I can remember was the question answered with anything except amused tolerance among those most friendly or derisive comments among others as to the lack of public spirit and of virility in the soft and effete democracies.

The most revealing experience of all to me as to what our attitude was doing to jeopardize our own safety eventually as well as to invite disaster to the rest of the world came in France early in 1935. In conversation with the spokesman of a brilliant group of young physicians, himself a distinguished veteran of World War No. 1, and neither rightist nor leftist in sympathies but inclined to lean toward the Popular Front, he

said nevertheless that the common sentiment held that France had been deserted and betrayed since Versailles by both England and America, that she was defenseless against Germany, and that many believed there was no hope for her except in an alliance with Russia or Germany. Personally he was inclined to think Germany the safer choice. He read me letters to the same effect. Many of the letters bespoke not only distrust of but antagonism toward the United States and England. "The United States," he said, "if in the League could with England have assured peace in Europe and given France safety. We were led to rely on that. As it is, our only hope of security is not to offend Germany." Then sadly came the conclusion of the whole affair as far as he and his friends were concerned. "Public sentiment being what it is, if some one on a white horse were to ride through the gates of Paris tomorrow, the world would be astonished at the following that would turn out to accept leadership from him." He begged me to make these facts clear to my friends at home.

WORDS NOT ENOUGH

Again I seem to hear the comment, "But what does all this have to do with universal military training?" Again I answer, "Everything." Any disposition in America toward preparedness would have given Germany and Italy pause and France reassurance. I would at this point, listening to the arguments of those who oppose universal military training, freely grant, as I have stated before, that wars may still be a possibility after a post-war organization for the maintenance of peace is set up. Words will not necessarily preclude war. An organization in which the great powers sit together in continuous session to smooth out differences and to try to maintain peace will be a long step toward eliminating some of the hazards that lead to war. As such it is imperative, but it can never in itself be a complete barrier. This is the answer to be made, it seems to me, to those who argue that because San Francisco is designed to lead the mind of the world toward peace, we should forego any organization internally that would make force available to us to protect ourselves.

IDEALISM INEFFECTIVE

Regarding the arguments of those who say that universal military training will jeopardize the efforts toward setting up a peace organization, let us not ignore the fact that the idealists have had their day—that the League of Nations, the Disarmament Conference and other such movements were all patterned on the premise that the world had reached a sufficient stage of civilization so that in the future wars would be outlawed. Subsequent events have proved how false that assumption was. Therefore, until such time as the whole world has been educated to the belief and is ready to accept the ideal of enduring peace, it is going to be the responsibility of the peace-loving nations to maintain the peace by at least the threat of force, if not by actual force.

People ask me as a college officer if universal training would not disorganize college procedures. The answer of course is, yes. However, the problems of reorganizing life in the college, the home or the community do not interest me in the slightest degree beside the possibility that a system of universal military training might save our youth from suffering and dying in war a quarter of a century from now.

ARMY ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The proposal for universal military training is a proposition purely and simply to enhance the military security of our people. Its alternative is a huge standing army for years to come. Protection in one way or another must be given against the necessity of becoming involved in wars engendered by those who may in the future believe, as has been believed twice in our time, that our unpreparedness made it safe to violate every principle in which we believe. Moreover, the proposal to my mind is valueless except as it envisages military training exclusively. Valuable byproducts doubtless would accrue to the individual and to society from establishment of the proposition, but military security for the American people in the enhanced possibility of escaping future wars must be the one all-inclusive purpose of such a project.

Finally, for those who fear the effect of the proposal upon the spirit of democracy, the plan seems to me to embody the very essence of democracy in imposing alike upon all equal responsibility for the maintenance of the democratic state and the freedoms they derive from this. Moreover, there unquestionably would be some inconvenience and some disappointments involved in the readjustments of such a plan. I grant it. But my eye turns to the pages of fine print in the Times by my chair—the headings are "Dead," "Wounded," "Missing." After this I am not interested in the inconveniences to be met by institutions or individuals. I do not care how great the problems of readjustments may be in the fields of learning, labor, or management. I am not even concerned over possible changes in our form of Government if freedom be safeguarded, or whether our taxes be greater or less. The only thing that seems to me of the slightest consequence in the world is that boys like these shall not again have to walk this Gethsemane, that these pages of fine print shall never again have to be published. A Nation-wide prepardeness to such extent as universal military training would provide might make such possibilities into probabilities. I pray it may be tried.

ERNEST M. HOPKINS.

HANOVER, N. H., May 1, 1945.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the memorial sermon in memory of President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered at the Gardena Baptist Church by Rev. W. Floyd Alexander, Sunday, April 15, 1945:

When news came concerning the death of the President, we were all momentarily stunned. Then sorrow encompassed us. Our hearts felt heavy. We felt as though a close member of our household had been taken. We ask why? We are reminded that great statesmen, even Presidents, have died before. They have shocked us with their death, but we never felt a personal loss such as we felt when we received news of the death of President Roosevelt.

Yesterday our mayor called together clergymen of this community to plan a memorial service for our beloved President. Mayor Rush, clergymen, and other leaders of the community planned to have this service next Sunday at the high school. Plans could not be carried through for a proper community-wide memorial service immediately. Almost all churches are going to have as the main feature of their service a reference to the President. But for our own church we planned this memorial service. I personally felt we could not do otherwise. No one in our congregation was interested in anything else. In our plans the choir met last night, Saturday night, and practiced favorite hymns of the President, and we have sung almost all of them this morning.

I feel as you do this morning—an irreparable loss. There are reasons why we feel this. First, the President for years has been a member of our respective families. It is true that he was never present physically in our homes, but he was very real to us all through his voice which for years has been a guiding voice in our households. We depended upon him for political guidance. We did not feel the weight of political responsibility because we knew he was taking care of our Nation internally, and in international relations. Our entire life has been for some 12 years remolded, modified, and patterned after an economy developed by the President.

We trusted his judgment in international affairs. Many criticized him for his policies. He listened to criticism, as every God-fearing man must do, then he proceeded to do that which he knew was right, even at the risk of losing powerful political support. He put duty and service to God and man above political favor and popularity. He felt within him a spirit that dominated his life and compelled him to press forward. The apostle Paul felt the same spirit when he wrote to the Corinthians: "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel." No one will ever know, for instance, the number of lives of innocent people that were actually saved by the policy of lend-lease. When this was inaugurated it was not popular. Insight, forethought, and an abundance of common sense enable the President to have a total picture of the world situation.

Further evidence of his closeness to our homes was the reaction his death caused upon the children. No death has so universally affected the lives of so many children and young people. A young man, one of our soloists, was prepared to sing The Lord's Prayer as a part of this memorial service. He found that it was impossible to sing because his sense of personal loss was so great that he would be forced to weep during the singing. This is only one index of how deeply children and young people felt the tragic loss. Other Presidents have died, but children and young people of past generations did not feel a deep sense of personal loss as they felt when the President passed on. This was due to many things. His fireside chats, his speeches, were delivered in such a manner that children and young people could understand them and enjoy them. Other great personages have spoken, and do speak, but their manner makes it hard for children and young people to understand them. As far back as most children and young people can remember, the voice of the President has been coming into their homes. He was the interpreter in political matters at home for both children and adults.

He was great, too, because he was used as a servant through whom many innovations were to come. He knew that he could not bring into existence a Utopia. He knew the difficulties and problems arising out of an attempt to establish a lasting peace. What he wanted to do, and did do, was to lay the foundation for a lasting peace. What he wanted to do in our social life was to make changes that would lighten the load of the common man and give him an opportunity to lift himself higher in the social scale. Great changes came through his proposals. We associate him with these changes.

Then, too, he was the champion of the weak, helpless, crippled, and the maimed. His resolve and fight to overcome his handicap

gave an example and courage to every handicapped person in this country and throughout the world. His example helped them to take an objective view and press forward with greater courage and hope.

Last November he offered a humble prayer that was an expression of a great Christian spirit. He said:

"Almighty God, of whose righteous will all things are and were created, Thou hast gathered our people out of many lands and races into a great Nation. We commend to Thy overruling Providence the men and women of our forces by sea, by land, and in the air; beseeching Thee to take into Thine own hands both them and the cause they serve. Be Thou their strength when they are set in the midst of so many and great dangers. And grant that, whether by life or by death, they may win for the whole world the fruits of their sacrifice and a just peace. Guide, we beseech Thee, the nations of the world, into Thy way of justice and truth, and establish among them that peace which is the reward of righteousness. Make the whole people of this land equal to our high trust, reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, generous in the protection of weakness. Enable us to guard for the least among us the freedom we covet for ourselves; make us ill content with the inequalities of opportunity which still prevail among us. Preserve our Union against all our divisions of race and class which threaten it. And now may the blessing of God Almighty rest upon this whole land; may He give us light to guide us, courage to support us, charity to unite us, now and forever more. Amen."

We remember how he appealed for a revival of religion in our country. We have sung some of the best hymns of the Christian church this morning: God of Our Fathers, Goin' Home, Faith of Our Fathers, Crossing the Bar, Our God, Our Help, Abide With Me, and Nearer My God to Thee. I have heard that some of these were his favorites. I imagine he was like some of us. They all were his favorites, and it was hard to choose which one was his real favorite. I am also reminded that Eternal Father, Strong to Save, was his special favorite. Certainly it does embody some of the Christian philosophy of this great man:

"Eternal Father, strong to save,
Whose arm hath bound the restless wave,
Who bidd'st the mighty ocean deep
Its own appointed limits keep:
O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

"O Christ, whose voice the waters heard,
And hushed their raging at Thy word,
Who walkedst on the foaming deep,
And calm amid the storm didst sleep:
O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

"O Holy Spirit, who didst brood
Upon the waters dark and rude,
And bid their angry tumult cease,
And give, for wild confusion, peace;
O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

"O Trinity of love and power,
Our brethren shield in danger's hour;
From rock and tempest, fire and foe,
Protect them wheresoe'er they go:
Thus evermore shall rise to Thee
Glad hymns of praise from land and sea.
Amen."

You have come here this morning somewhat frustrated, as to what will happen to our Ship of State. We can be well assured that it has been left in good hands. In all probability our President had a premonition that he could not carry his ever-increasing responsibilities for another term. He realized that if he should be called from this earthly life someone should assume the responsibilities of state who could carry forth where he left off. He chose out of his knowledge of many personalities Senator Harry Truman for Vice President, and his successor in the event that he could not carry on. Senator Truman is going to assume his obligations and fill the vacancy left by the President in such a manner that we are all going to be greatly surprised in his ability. Senator Truman will do a good job and do it well. The affairs of state have not been left in a mass of confusion. They are in good hands.

There is no parallel in history to compare to our President. No life analogous to his either in secular or religious history. If I should point out to you the state of confusion in which the early disciples found themselves after the death of Jesus, I will necessarily have to modify the parallel in many respects. We find ourselves in many ways in the same attitude of mind that they were in. The early disciples felt hopeless and downcast when Jesus was taken away. They felt that nothing was ahead but a lost cause. But on second thought they realized that the only alternative was to go forward. They rose to meet the occasion. God helped them to meet the future that was before them. We, too, may fully trust in His omnipotent hand. We can say as did the psalmist:

"God is our refuge and strength, a well-proved help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear though the earth totter and the mountains topple into the heart of the sea. The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved: He uttered His voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations He hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; He burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still, and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." (From the American translation by Smith and Goodspeed, Psalm 46.)

The question comes to many minds today wondering why our beloved President was not spared to see the fruits of his labor literally come to pass. Why didn't he live to see the promised land of peace and plenty. He worked, lived, and died to see this come to pass. In an address before Congress a few months ago he pronounced his doctrine of the "four freedoms." He said in part:

"We look forward for a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want, and the fourth is freedom from fear."

We cannot answer in full the question of why he was not spared to see the machinery actually set up to help establish these basic concepts of life. We can only repeat in verse, in song such penetrating words as these:

"Not now, but in the coming years,
It may be in the better land,
We'll read the meaning of our tears,
And there sometime, we'll understand.

"We'll know why clouds instead of sun
Were over many a cherished plan,
Why song has ceased when scarce begun;
'Tis there some time, we'll understand.

"Then trust in God through all the days;
Fear not, for He doth hold thy hand;
Though dark the way, still sing and praise;
Some time, some time, we'll understand."

—*Oswald Smith.*

Or as the Apostle Paul has reminded us concerning our limited human understanding "For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known."

We might ask why so many great heroes and champions for the common man did not live to see the full fruition of their labor Why did Moses die before he reached the promised land? His youth was spent in Egypt, preparing to bring the children of Israel out. For 40 years they followed him through the wilderness. He fights enemies without, and puts down dissension within his ranks. He gives to his people unity, law, morality, faith in God, and great hopes for the future. He is their deliverer, prophet, and lawgiver. He makes a nation out of a mob of discouraged and despondent people. But death takes him just before he was ready to enter the promised land with them. Suddenly there came the news:

"My servant Moses is dead; proceed, then, to cross the Jordan here, you and all this people, into the land which I am giving them. Every place on which the sole of your foot treads I have given you, as I promised Moses. * * * No one shall be able to hold his own against you as long as you live, in that I will be with you, as I was with Moses, never failing you nor forsaking you. Be strong and brave; for you shall put this people in possession of the land which I swore to their fathers to give them. Only be very strong and resolute to be careful to do just as my servant Moses commanded you, swerving therefrom neither to the right nor to the left, so that you may succeed in everything that you undertake. Do not be frightened nor dismayed; for the Lord your God is with you in whatever you undertake" (Joshua 1: 2-9).

Moses is not alone. Many of the great leaders of the children of God never saw the actual fruition of their labors. We have a record recited in the Book of Hebrews of how so many could only reach or see their promised land by faith:

"Faith led Noah, when he was warned by God of things no one then saw, in obedience to the warning to build an ark in which to save his family, and by such faith he condemned the world, and came to possess that uprightness which faith produces. Faith enabled Abraham to obey when God summoned him to leave his home for a region which he was to have for his own, and to leave home without knowing where he was going. Faith led him to make a temporary home as a stranger in the land he had been promised, and to live there in his tents, with Isaac and Jacob, who shared the promise with him. For he was looking forward to that city with the sure foundations, designed and built by God.

"All these people lived all their lives in faith, and died without receiving what had been promised; they only saw it far ahead and welcomed the light of it, recognizing that they themselves were only foreigners and strangers here on earth.

"Time fails me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel, and the prophets. They all gained approval by their faith, but none of them received what he had been promised, for God had resolved upon something still better for us, that they might not reach the fulfillment of their hopes except with us" (Hebrews 11).

The key or secret to this passage is that they reach their fulfillment through us. "For herein is the saying true, one soweth and another reapeth. I sent you to reap that whereon ye have not labored; others have labored, and ye are entered into their labor" (John 4: 37-38). The hopes, objectives, and plans of the President will be realized and brought to pass through us.

Our beloved President has met and through the spirit of our Living God has conquered the last enemy—death.

"In all of these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life,

nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:37-39).

He has fought a good fight, he has finished his course, he has kept the faith, and there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give him. He has heard:

"Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of the Lord" (Matthew 25: 21).

Unity After VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, everywhere the peoples who love liberty and fought for it are rejoicing today. Europe is freed from the German slave master. The gates of his starvation pens and his murder camps are forced open. Those he made sick are cared for. Those he kept hungry are fed. Those he made homeless are returned to their homes, and the dead and the living dead are raised up to judge over him.

We turn now to our enemy in the Pacific. We turn now the whole power of our Nation and its allies to breaking the arrogant Japanese Empire and freeing the boundless waters of the Pacific and the vast stretches of Asia.

We turn now to our part in rebuilding shattered lands and shattered peoples, to administering justice in the lands and over the population of our late enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I have received an eloquent letter from my friend, Chief Warrant Officer Ben Paskoff, who writes of his observations of the people of Germany and of the fear that is in the mind of some of our fighting men that we at home will not gather the full fruits of this costly victory. He writes:

My experiences in Germany, what I have seen and done there so far, have aroused mixed feelings in me. The people here disgust me. They lack the basic dignity of a democratic people in trouble. Most of them fall into two major categories from the point of view of the impression they leave with the American soldier. Most of them are servile, subservient, toothy smiling, anxious to please, and you know all the time that you can't trust them to the extent of turning your back on them. The others, distinctly a minority, are arrogant and sullen. But even the veneer of their arrogance cracks when they see our apparently endless convoys of troops and matériel roaring through the narrow streets of their quaint, travel-folder towns, shaking the walls, raising the dust, and cracking the pavements; or when they gape open-mouthed at the powerful fleets of planes filling the skies.

I don't think there's very much of the destructive element in my make-up. Nothing used to delight me so much as to see shapeless and detached pieces of wood grow into carpenterial entities under Hugh's skilled hands, but a certain thrill passes through me when I see the destruction that has been brought to the sacred soil of the Reich. There's a powerful element of justice in the fact that the war has been brought back to its source, to its home grounds, that at last the people's will is being done. I can't help feeling a great deal of satisfaction that Guernica, Amsterdam, Stalingrad, Coventry, and the countless French towns and villages I saw razed to the ground, are being avenged. And to see the destruction and rooting out of the obvious signs of Nazi domination is in a sense the culmination of what I have thought and taught for a good many years. Do I sound smug? I don't feel smug. I have a feeling there hasn't been enough of such destruction in Germany yet.

I don't know where we used to get the information that there was great scarcity and near famine in Germany, but what parts of the country I've seen certainly belie that impression. Of course, my excursions have been confined to the southern parts but there, at least, no one seemed to have been suffering from a lack of food or clothes. Our common practice, when we enter a town and plan to stay for a night or more, is to inform the occupants of the houses we will need that they have a specified amount of time in which to gather together some basic necessities and get out. As a result, in the process of making our usual check through the house, including attic and cellar, for booby traps, time bombs, and s"chlike contraptions, we have been able to get a pretty well undoctored picture of the status of the family. Clothes closets have been full of clothes in good shape, and a great deal of it certainly not ersatz. And frequently hidden beneath plentiful potato, coal, or wood piles we have found bounteous stores of canned foods, preserved fruits, and vegetables, flour, etc. Also wine—much of it of excellent quality. There is no doubt that much of it came as plunder from the conquered countries—cheeses with the mark of Holland, French wines, etc.—but whatever the source, these b———s have the stuff.

If I sound bitter, it's because I am. You have to have seen the results of their work, spoken to Russian, French, Polish, Greek slave laborers—"displaced persons" the Army calls them—4 and 5 years in brutal bondage to these barbarians, or to some of our own boys who were German prisoners for varying periods of time, to begin to realize the measure of punishment that these people rate. And what worries me and a lot of other soldiers I've spoken to, is that some of the people back home are going to be so relieved and happy that the war in Europe is over that they're going to be willing to see the spirit of justice tempered by an utterly undeserved mercy.

The Army's policy with regard to German civilians is one of strict nonfraternization. And to the credit of the American soldier, be it said that so far it seems to have been one of the best obeyed military orders ever issued. The order will undoubtedly be more difficult to enforce when certain bodies of troops are settled down as occupation troops, but right now there appears to be a pretty complete understanding among the men of the reasons for the order. I, as well as the others, miss the social contact with a friendly civilian population that we found so pleasant in France, but the thought of friendly contact with these swine is revolting to me.

Mr. Paskoff was a college teacher of history before entering the service. He is a trained observer and a qualified interpreter. I hope that his remarks will help guide us as we face the serious problems of maintaining a unity of purpose among the United Nations, to win serious war yet ahead against Japan and to win and keep the peace.

Military Training—If

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because it contains one of the most thrilling stories of heroic sacrifice which only the spirit of do or die in our country's cause could inspire, a thrilling portrayal of a World War No. 1 incident which contains a hard-learned lesson which might well guide us in the shaping of our national defense policies of the immediate future, under unanimous consent, I spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the able pen of Col. G. W. Stuart, United States Army, retired, which first appeared in the Carmel (Calif.) Pinecone-Cymbal of Friday, April 6, 1945, under the significant title of "Military Training—If."

The article, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred is the following:

MILITARY TRAINING—IF

(By Col. G. W. Stuart, U. S. Army, retired)

Military training. What a mauling that expression has taken at the hand of controversialists! The words have been twisted and torn, colored and odorized to serve the purposes of argument, without respect for real meaning. Years ago it was the same with,—"Preparedness for war."

Well, perhaps it is one of the inalienable freedoms of democracy to indulge in unending and fruitless debate. This debate has been going on for many years without any beneficial result.

Suppose instead of asking, "shall we have military training?" we put the same question in another way, thus, "If we are going to continue sending our selected boys out to fight our wars for us, do you want them to have to go into battle, without knowing anything about it?" Only a demented person would answer, "Yes, that's what I want." The alternative is obvious and yet we have never done anything about it.

One of America's otherwise great men propagated the oratorical euphemism that in case we were attacked a million men would spring to arms overnight, implying that we needed no other preparation for national defense. Honest and informed people knew that the patriotism of our men was unchallengeable, but they also knew there were no arms for them to spring to overnight. The art of waging war requires more than a willingness to spring.

Perhaps a little tale of an actual event will speak more convincingly.

It was my first battle. My 3,000 soldiers were out in the trenches, in the dense darkness of the night, drenched by the drizzling rain. They could not even light a cigarette; absolute silence reigned; they were quiet, waiting, waiting for my order that would certainly send some of them to their death. Can you imagine the abhorrence of such a thought and such a duty for a commander? I loved my soldiers.

They had done well every job given them. Our present job was to make the enemy stop fighting. Our Government wanted a decent peace and was learning the age-old lesson all over again—that we had to pay the price—there was no other way. Only in fairy stories are desires fulfilled by wishing. Victory in this battle would be another step forward.

A great prayer welled up from my soul for wisdom to drive a sharp bargain with death for victory at the lowest possible price.

In a small flimsy, abandoned, first-aid shelter in the front-line trench, by the flickering light of a well-shaded candle, I was studying last minute orders and my map for the hundredth time. A heavy barrage from our own artillery and massed machine guns was hurtling overhead with deafening racket. Enemy guns replied and flashes of signal rockets illuminated the ghostly tangle of old wire in front of our trench.

A young boy crowded into our already packed shelter. "Who are you and what are you doing here?" he was asked. "Oh, I am the bugler of E Company. I just came in to get out of the rain." "Well get out and get back to your company. You can't get any wetter," he was told. As he slowly moved out, we could hear his trembling voice, reproaching us in the tone of an abused child. "That's no way to treat me when I'm just about to go over the top." He was just a scared little boy, afraid in the dark, and yearning for companionship, but there was no hesitation or doubt about his going over the top. We were both sorry for and proud of him. We were all scared, each in his own way. Much good it did legs to tremble and hearts to beat faster in that gang of the bugler boy of Company E.

Zero hour struck. All up and down the line leaders shouted above the din and roar, "Let's go." The battle was on. We climbed over and through the barbed wire, tearing the skirts of raincoats to shreds. The early light of dawn disclosed what the map had told me. There was a hill before us with woods to right and left. We advanced up the hill (Bean Hill—possibly named by Roman armies centuries before). Going up the hill the woods, filled with a dense undergrowth, difficult to traverse, converged but did not join. A gateway gap led a field road over the crest of the hill. I followed the road and there in the gap I found him. A fine specimen of American manhood—just right for tackle on an All-American team. There he was, lying on the ground in one of those attitudes that only death knows how to assume—Our first partial payment for the victory. Doubtless there would be others today—how many?

And then the idea came to me—I will study the terrain and reconstruct the circumstances leading up to the tragic end in each case, with a view of learning how to drive a better bargain next time.

As we moved up the hill, I had noted that my soldiers were doing just as, most likely, you would have done. They were not moving straight forward through the woods but were drifting out and massing in the more easily traversed open. I sent an order for them to scatter but probably some did not get it while others, untrained to unquestioning obedience most likely said, "Oh, the 'Old Man' don't know what he is talking about," and proceeded on their easier way with the crowd. Any trained soldier would have known that an enemy just recently pushed back from that terrain would have set up a pair of machine guns to pour a stream of cross fire on anyone following them through the gap. They anticipated that "those cocky undisciplined Americans will gang up and come over the hill in a massed group and we will get a pot shot at a covey." Something like that had happened, except that the itchy fingers of the enemy fired too soon at the first and smallest group. The rest scattered, obeying the command of enemy bullets much better than my orders to scatter. They were learning the art of war the hard way. We were fortunate in losing only one man. This was our first victim on the altar of ignorance, ignorance of how the tragic game of war is played.

The next victim I found out in a beautiful meadow. Standing by him I could reconstruct the picture of what had taken place only a few minutes earlier. He had been advancing on an irregular line with his buddies to right and left. A copse of woods a few hundred yards ahead had concealed the enemy. A burst of fire had forced him to lie down. Bullets and shrapnel were passing overhead or striking the ground around him. He was "pinned to the ground" and there was no place to go. To his right and left his buddies were rushing forward in short bounds and dropping down to fire at the enemy. But he was falling behind—that must not happen—had not the sergeant, back there in his 2 weeks training camp in the States, always been yelling at him to "keep up on line"? And so he plunged forward to his death—an unnecessary death—instead of waiting until his buddies, who were not pinned to the ground, could clear the way for him with their fire.

And so I visited every spot where a soldier of mine has been killed and made note of the circumstances.

By noon of the first day my blessed soldiers had swept back the enemy and advanced to a line on the ground which higher headquarters had marked as "Second Day's Objective." They had captured about fifty officers, hundreds of enemy soldiers, about one hundred pieces of artillery of all categories, several warehouses filled with valuable military supplies, a small railroad with engines and cars and, more important, had struck a mortal blow to the vaunted superiority of the boastful enemy.

What price had we paid? Apprehensively I checked up all the reports. We had 20 men killed out of our 3,000. Some war reporters might have called that "insignificant losses." They were not insignificant to me. Every individual loss was filled with significance. Could it have been avoided? I studied each case. Most of them had been with insufficient training. (In fact, there appears to be some foundation to the military legend that "Old soldiers never die.")

We could not expect to win such a victory without any losses. In fact you could hardly expect 3,000 men to go to a county fair without some casualties. We were ready to pay any reasonable price, but revolted at the idea of paying any excess, avoidable cost.

A careful study revealed that 30 percent of our 20 killed was due to ignorance—they did not know what to do in the situation. Applied to all our losses in that war, 30 percent of the number killed amounts to 20,000. That means we left buried in foreign soil 20,000 who should have returned to their homes, families, friends. (30 percent at Tarawa is 1,300—30 percent at Iwo is another 1,300 and so on.)

Out of the mass of suffering accumulating in the present global war, there is arising an irresistible demand for correction of one of our worst national sins—neglect. The parents of sons and the sons themselves are demanding that before we send them out in fight battles our Government shall be compelled to teach them enough about the game so that they will have every possible chance to accomplish mission and return alive.

If, then, we are to have some kind of military training, shall we first indulge in one of our peacetime pastimes and talk it to death? Shall we devitalize any law proposed, with the bane of all laws—"provisos"? Shall we be deaf to the demands of all those thousands whose death in battle could have been avoided? Shall we continue to deny the moral obligation we owe our living sons? Shall we engage in petty contentions, inspired by self-interest, as to the curriculum and who shall be charged with the job of teaching and end up with ineffective half-measure compromises?

As to a proper curriculum, this is no place for a gratuitous detailed prescription unsupported by authority but it is perfectly proper to express the opinion that, to be satisfactory, any plan adopted should be designed to produce in our boys and girls—(1) a correction of physical defects and weaknesses, (2) a sternly disciplined soul well harmonized with their God-given sense of fun and sparkling humor; (3) skill in manipulating the simplest tools of a soldier; (4) practice in the unchanging basic principles of the art of war. Training in the more technical implements rapidly becomes obsolete with new inventions.

As to the proper agency to conduct military training, I express no preference but am definitely opposed to unloading such a responsibility upon the already overloaded and underpaid teachers of our school system.

Some confuse "education" and "training," or consider the terms synonymous. I believe that a marked distinction should be made between education and military training. To my mind education should teach us how to live a full life and survive the battles of peacetime, while military training should teach us how to win victories in war at the lowest cost. John Milton combined both these purposes in his definition, "I call therefore a complete and generous education, that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public of peace and war." This may seem a pretty big job for one centralized group of teachers, but Milton's definition of a "complete and generous education" for citizenship in our democratic society cannot be successfully challenged.

Military training is above all a most practical subject. The successful teacher must have much more than an understanding of textbooks. Failure of any pupil to pass the final test in battle means a death that might have been avoided.

I would not be so wholly sold on peacetime military training if I were not firmly convinced that the best soldier makes the best citizen and the best citizen makes the best soldier.

Request for Removal of Certain Obstructions to Navigation From Calumet River

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago on April 23, 1945, entitled "Request for Removal of Certain Obstructions to Navigation From Calumet River":

Whereas tug operators complain of the hazards to navigation in the Calumet River between Lake Michigan and Lake Calumet caused by the obstruction to free passage created by the Calumet Western and Nickel Plate Railroad bridges; and

Whereas these obstructions prevent the use of the river by larger lake vessels and are a detriment to the development of the city's proposed barge-to-rail-to-lake interchange terminal in Lake Calumet because no experienced terminal operator will consider the Lake Calumet operation unless these obstructions to navigation are removed; and

Whereas the city and the Federal Government stand to lose much of the investment already made in Lake Calumet, and the great potential possibilities of this vast inland water-front industrial area: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago, That the Chief of Engineers of the

United States Army and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby petitioned to take such steps as may be necessary to cause the removal of the said hazards and obstructions to the full and free navigation of the Calumet River between Lake Michigan and Lake Calumet; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded promptly to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and to the Members of Congress representing the Chicago area.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held on the 23d day of April A. D. 1945.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 3d day of May A. D. 1945.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Philo Norton McGiffin, Sailor of Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, few Americans are aware of the warm international friendship which has characterized Chinese-American relationships down through the years, and fewer still have a clear understanding of the long series of events upon which this friendship is founded.

No doubt the historically informed would point to the open-door policy, the refusal of the United States to accept its share of the indemnities which a weak and defenseless China had been coerced into agreeing to pay, the American philanthropies which are reflected in the splendid medical colleges, finishing schools, and universities as the basis of the kindly feeling that has so long existed between the peoples of these two great continental nations.

Important though these considerations are, proper emphasis has never been placed upon the heroic sacrifices of American nationals while in the service of the Chinese people, the amazing exploits of such American soldiers of fortune as Lt. Gen. Homer Lee and the thrilling adventures of such valorous sailors of fortune as Capt. Philo Norton McGiffin, an Annapolis graduate, the designer and builder of the first Chinese Navy, successful commander of a Chinese Fleet in the first naval engagement in which modern dreadnoughts were engaged. As a compelling factor, personalities such as these cannot be ignored.

It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the story of Capt. Philo Norton McGiffin, packed, as it is, with thrilling incidents of gripping interest, should have inspired a fellow townsman, one of great literary ability, to take up his pen to write again of this most remarkable fighting man's exploits of more than a half century ago.

Mr. Earle R. Forrest, of Washington, Pa., has done just that in a most appropriate style and manner. So well does he tell this story of Chinese-American cooperation that I am constrained to ask unanimous consent that that which he has written so entertainingly may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The retelling of this story during these days when China is again "at grips" with her ancient enemy, the Japanese, will inspire the people of our two great Republics to a closer cooperation in the accomplishment of our joint task of driving all forms of tyranny from the face of the earth. Ours in indeed a great undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I have referred is the following:

PHILO NORTON M'GIFFIN FOUGHT JAPANESE IN BATTLES OF 1894—WASHINGTON COUNTIAN WAS FATHER OF NAVY OF CHINA

(By Earle R. Forrest)

Since the war between the United States and Japan opened at Pearl Harbor, the name of Philo Norton McGiffin, undoubtedly the first man from Washington County to fight against the Japanese, is coming more and more to the front. Not only was he the first from this section of Pennsylvania, but he was one of the first Americans to fight against the Japs. This was in the war between China and Japan in 1894. There were not many Americans fighting for China in that war because we did not give a hoot which side won—but that was in 1894.

Norton McGiffin, as he was known here, has been mentioned frequently in the Reporter during th last few years, just to bring to the minds of the generations of Washingtonians who have come along since he died 46 years ago, that he was a man whose name was known over the whole world in the middle of the 1890's, and a Washington man who made world history.

His name is brought to mind in the present case by a story that appeared in the column of Wally Boren in a Washington, D. C., newspaper of recent date. Endorsement is given Mr. Boren's suggestion that after we capture Japan we rename the biggest Jap town "McGiffinville."

Here is the story from the Washington, D. C., newspaper:

"Did you ever hear of Philo Norton McGiffin? Well, neither did I until a few nights ago. He was a real guy—I didn't just go make him up in my mind.

"There's a Chinese restaurant down the street and the proprietor, Mr. Wing Teh, likes my brand of chili, an' I like his chop suey. So every once in a while we trade a little patronage.

"The other night I enjoyed a dish of his barbecued duck—which goes by the name of 'Sin Ap'—when Wing brings me out a magazine dated 1894.

"'Americans long time fight Japan,' he says. 'Give look see what I find in ol' paper.'

"Well, it's a piece about Philo Norton McGiffin. He was a soldier of fortune—except for being a sailor instead. Ol' Philo was, by 1894, second in command of a Chinese battleship that outsmarted the Japs in the battle of the Yalu River, way back 49 years ago.

"Seems ol' Philo had to take over when the ship's captain got the jitters. They was short of ammunition, the ship got hit and set afire eight different times. Philo was wounded an' burned practically crisp, but somehow he came out alive an' not only saved his own ship, but also another Chinese battleship.

"Well, Wing knew, even if I didn't, that the Chinese lost that war of 1894 to the Japs because they didn't have enough stuff to fight with.

"Now, I ain't one to go makin' suggestions to the military authorities, but me and Wing think it would be quite fittin' if, the first time we capture a real part of Japan, on account of having enough men an' ammunition this time, we should rename the biggest Jap town 'McGiffinville.'"

Here is another thing about Philo Norton McGiffin that Mr. Boren does not know. He was the father of the Chinese Navy, and he was the first American or European to command a modern war vessel in battle, for the Battle of the Yalu River was the first combat between modern warships.

Neither was Norton second in command. He was commander of the *Chen Yuen* from the beginning, and when the Admiral was killed in the battle he became commander of the entire Chinese Fleet. And had not McGiffin been so terribly wounded when that big Jap gun went off, there might have been a far different story to tell of the Battle of Yalu River.

Mr. Boren is right when he calls Philo Norton McGiffin a soldier of fortune. He loved adventure; he loved the sea, and he loved to roam over the world. He came by that disposition honestly.

His great-grandfather, Nathaniel McGiffin, a Scotchman, came to America by way of Ireland. As far as we know today, his reason for coming to this land was to fight for liberty. At any rate he enlisted in the Continental Army at the outbreak of the Revolution. He fought with Washington at Brandywine and Trenton and spent the winter at Valley Forge.

Later he served under Lafayette when the young French patriot was the youngest major general the United States Army has ever known. At the end of the war young McGiffin received an honorable discharge. He came to Washington County and settled on Ten Mile Creek, in Amwell Township, where he was engaged in fighting Indians until peace finally came to the western border.

When the Mexican War broke out in 1846, Norton McGiffin, grandson of the Revolutionary War veteran and Indian fighter, enlisted in the old DuQuesne, of Pittsburgh, which was mustered into the service as Company K, First Pennsylvania Volunteers.

He marched with General Scott (Old Fuss and Feathers) from Vera Cruz to Mexico City. He was at the siege and capture of Puebla, October 12, 1847, where a comrade, James Phillips, Washington County, was killed. He fought at Churubusco, where Lt. Joseph F. Irons, also of Washington, was mortally wounded, August 20, 1847, dying in Mexico City August 26. He marched into Mexico City with the American Army and was at the storming of the Castle Chapultepec.

And when he returned to Washington County he brought a Mexican boy, Antonio Morales, with him. Antonio fought in the Civil War and spent the remainder of his life in Washington, a respected citizen.

When the Civil War broke out Norton McGiffin marched away as captain of Company E, Twelfth Pennsylvania Volunteers, on April 20, 1861. This was the first company to leave Washington, and it was in answer to President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers to put down the rebellion.

When its term of service, 3 months, was over, Norton McGiffin returned as lieutenant colonel of the regiment. But the old war horse would not stay at home. He had smelled powder in Mexico, and he wanted to smell more. During the 3 months' service his regiment had been used to guard a railroad, and he had not heard the sound of a gun.

After the 3 months' service was over he enlisted immediately in the Eighty-fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers and was commissioned lieutenant colonel of that regiment.

It was disease that got this old warrior. During the Peninsular Campaign, under General McClellan, Colonel McGiffin was stricken with a malady which forced him to resign, a mere skeleton of his former self and made almost an invalid for the remainder of his life. In fact, many another man of less determination would have gone to bed and remained there. He lived to see his son become internationally famous and then die at the early age of 36. The old veteran of two wars died in Washington July 20, 1905.

With such a family background and such a father, it is little wonder that young Philo Norton McGiffin became a world wanderer and soldier of fortune.

He was born in Washington December 13, 1860 (some accounts say in 1863, but this is not correct), and at the age of 18 he entered the United States Naval Academy, graduating in 1882.

One of his little known, early adventures is a story told by some of the old-timers. During the great railroad strike in Pittsburgh in 1877, according to this old tale, young McGiffin was with the troops surrounded by the strikers in the roundhouse. They needed help and needed it badly, but the commanding officer of the troops was not aware of their predicament. How to get that help was a problem.

"If someone will show me how to start and stop an engine I'll get out of here and send help back," young McGiffin told the captain. There was an engineer among those militiamen, and he quickly showed the volunteer how to start and stop. Getting up a full head of steam, McGiffin climbed on board.

The roundhouse doors suddenly swung open and before the astonished strikers could recover from their surprise a big engine seemed fairly to leap at them from the open door, and they scattered away from its deadly path like a flock of frightened sheep before a pack of wolves. McGiffin got through and sent help back.

After cruising some in the Atlantic and South American waters, during which he contracted typhoid fever, young McGiffin, after his graduation was assigned to duty on the China Station. The people of that country appealed to him and he became so interested in them that when France declared war against China in 1883 as a result of the Chinese operations in Tonkin, the 23-year-old American, who had only been in the naval service 1 year, asked for and received his country's release from service and its consent to enter the service of China.

This was the beginning of the Chinese Navy and it was probably the real beginning of friendly relations between the United States and China. These relations were undoubtedly greatly enhanced by McGiffin during the years he spent in the service of the Chinese. And the Chinese, on their part, have long memories; they do not forget with the passing of years and the name of Philo Norton McGiffin is held sacred by them to this day.

During the war with France young McGiffin quickly showed his naval ability by capturing the only gunboat lost by the French in the Battle of the Yungtse River. After hostilities ceased by an equitable treaty in 1885, McGiffin was sent by the Imperial Government of China to England to superintend the construction of several gunboats for China—and he was just 25.

These were modern battleships, possibly not modern when compared with the fighters of 1843, but they were the beginning of modern battleships nevertheless.

One of these ships was the *Chen Yuen*, which was to become famous in world history 9 years later as the flagship of the Chinese Fleet in the Chinese-Japanese War of 1894–95.

The years passed and Captain McGiffin continued to build the Chinese Navy as best he could with the material allowed him. If he had had his way and received the full financial support of the Emperor there would undoubtedly have been a different ending to that war. At least Japan would not have felt that the "sons of heaven" were not invincible and the world in general would have had a different opinion of the China of 50 years ago.

In that war Captain McGiffin became world famous as the commander of the battleship *Chen Yuen* in the Battle of the Yalu River on September 11, 1894. He was in full command of the vessel from the start, not second in command as Mr. EOREN states. And it was the admiral of the fleet who was killed, after which McGiffin took command of the fleet; but by that time McGiffin himself was suffering from terrible wounds.

As a matter of world history, this Battle of the Yalu River was the first combat between modern warships, and Philo Norton McGiffin was the first American or European to command a modern war vessel in battle.

The defeat of the Chinese Fleet was undoubtedly due to the terrible wounds sustained by Commander McGiffin early in the battle. In trying to work the *Chen Yuen* to a point of vantage he was severly wounded. The story of what happened later is one of the most thrilling of that of any officer in all the history of naval warfare.

Just as he recovered consciousness while lying on the deck of the *Chen Yuen* he looked up to see a great Japanese gun directly above him swinging into position to fire. He knew that he would be blasted out of existence by the discharge, and, making a desparate effort, he managed to roll over and fall to a lower deck, but not in time to escape part of the blast.

His body was literally filled with splinters of iron and steel, all the hair was singed from his body, his clothing was blown off and both ear drums were broken by the concussion. Prior to that he had been shot in the back of the head and thigh, and his eyesight was so badly affected that he could never see clearly again.

If ever there was a man of iron it was McGiffin, for, in spite of his many wounds, he kept on, vainly trying to direct his ship It is estimated that the *Chen Yuen* was hit 400 times, 120 times by large shot and shell. Every part of the vessel was struck.

The courage of the Chinese was clearly demonstrated in this battle, for they resolutely stuck to their posts. Their wounded commander encouraged them to fight on, and he alone of all the Chinese commanders kept his ship in its proper position, thus protecting the flagship and saving the fleet from total destruction.

In was the custom at that time for Chinese commanders to commit suicide when defeated, but Captain McGiffin refused and fell somewhat in disfavor with the Imperial Government. He could not secure the medical attention necessary for his wounds, and returned to the United States.

On his way back he met the late James S. Stocking, Washington, in Europe, and to him he related his terrible experiences. Even after reaching this country he could obtain little relief from the pieces of steel scattered through his body. A friend of his told how he had seen McGiffin rub his abdomen until he located a steel splinter and then deliberately cut it out with a sharp knife. He never recovered and while in a New York City hospital lost his mind from his sufferings and killed himself February 11, 1897, at the age of 36.

He is buried in Washington Cemetery, and today we may see his grave in the old section. The inscription on the granite monument tells the tragic story of one of our most noted sons:

"Philo Norton McGiffin. December 13, 1860–February 11, 1897. Commander of the Chinese battleship *Chen Yuen* at the Battle of the Yalu, September 17, 1894.

"'A broken and a contrite heart,
"'Oh, God, Thou wilt not despise.'

"This tablet is erected in tender memory of a brave man, who loved his own, but gave his life for an alien flag."

Such is the tragic and brilliant story of Philo Norton McGiffin.

In the collection of the Washington County Historical Society on the third floor of the courthouse is a large painting of this native son whose life story reads like the wildest romance of fiiction. The portrait is of a man of kindly face, very attractive, with winning, likable eyes.

In the historical society room are a number of relics that he brought back from the Far East.

Miss Ida V. Steen, 143 South College Street, who was well acquainted with McGiffin and other members of his family, is also in possession of a number of beautiful and interesting relics brought back by him from China and presented to her by members of his family after his death.

The Pacific Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

LET'S KEEP OUR BLOOD-BOUGHT PACIFIC BASES

Because this question is so vital to the protection of the United States and to the prevention of World War No. 3, you are urged to give immediate and vigorous support to the action proposed in the following resolution.

WM. S. GRANT,
President, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, Long Beach, Calif.

"Whereas at the close of World War No. 1 all islands in the Pacific Ocean lying north of the equator and owned by Germany were mandated to Japan under the Versailles Peace Treaty; and

"Whereas many of said islands were further colonized with people of Japanese nationality and converted into bases for the use of the Japanese Nation; and

"Whereas many of those islands have been taken possession of by the United States after loss of many American boys and the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars; and

"Whereas it has been frequently stated since the beginning of World War No. 2 by many of our Government leaders in control of foreign policy that the United States did not seek in this war and would not accept a single foot of territory belonging to any other nation; and

"Whereas so far as is known by the American public, the leaders of the Allied Nations have not been informed of any policy to the contrary by those officials in charge of the foreign policy of the United States; and

"Whereas it is most important to the prevention of a third world war that many of these islands in the Pacific that have been taken from the Japanese and others that will be hereafter taken before the end of World War No. 2 must be held by the United

States and maintained as military bases in the Pacific; and

"Whereas Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King in a recent speech made in the city of New York stated: 'Failure to maintain these bases essential for our defense raises the fundamental question: How long can the United States afford to continue a cycle of fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give again? Rich as we are, we do not have the human or physical resources to dissipate our patrimony, generation after generation, in this manner'; and

"Whereas a conference of the Allied Nations of the world is to be held in the city of San Francisco, Calif., beginning April 25, 1945; and

"Whereas it is important that the Allied Nations of the world be informed before the end of World War No. 2 that the United States intends to hold and maintain those bases in the Pacific that this Nation considers necessary for its future defense; and

"Whereas there has recently been introduced in the Congress of the United States by the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, Representative from the State of Texas, a resolution for the purpose of having the Congress express at this time a policy advising the other nations of the world that after World War No. 2 is won by the United Nations, the United States will continue to hold permanently any and all islands in the Pacific formerly owned by or mandated to Japan considered by the Chiefs of Staff of the United States as necessary for the maintenance of world peace, and that the United States will also hold those islands in the Pacific liberated by it which belonged to friendly nations until the original owners thereof can reoccupy them or until their mutual occupation can be arranged by the United Nations: Now, therefore, it is hereby

"Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Long Beach, Calif.:

"That all islands in the Pacific Ocean formerly owned by Japan or mandated to Japan at the close of World War No. 1 and designated by the Chiefs of Staff of the United States as necessary for the maintenance of world peace, be permanently held by the United States; and

"That all islands in the Pacific Ocean that formerly belonged prior to World War No. 2 to friendly nations, be held by the United States until they can be reoccupied and maintained by the original owners thereof, or until their mutual occupation can be arranged by the United Nations; and it is further

"Resolved, That this policy be made known to the United Nations of the world in their Conference at San Francisco, Calif., beginning on April 25, 1945, so that when the peace terms are agreed upon at the close of World War No. 2, there will be absolutely no question about consenting to the United States holding and maintaining bases in the Pacific Ocean on islands held by Japan prior to December 7, 1941; and it is further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States; Senator CONNALLY, of Texas; Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Representative BLOOM, of New York; Representative EATON, of New Jersey; Secretary of State Stettinius; Senator JOHNSON, of California; Senator DOWNEY, of California; Representative DOYLE, of California; and Representative MAHON, of Texas; accompanied by a letter from this chamber of commerce signed by the president thereof, urging prompt and favorable consideration of this resolution, followed by immediate action pursuant to the provisions thereof."

Unanimously adopted by the directors of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, April 12, 1945.

American Relief for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, while our eyes are turned to the victory of Allied arms in Europe and to the suffering among the liberated peoples there, we should not forget the war-caused suffering of the Far East.

In India the war has caused the death by starvation of more than 1,000,000 civilians—more than the total casualties of our armed forces to date. The famine has passed in India, but its aftermath of destitution, epidemics, and malnutrition is still very serious. Millions of her people are in need of medical supplies that are readily available in the United States. Yet India is not now receiving help from the American Red Cross and no aid has yet been forthcoming from U. N. R. R. A.

Fortunately, some American help has been and is being sent through the American Friends Service Committee. Vitamins, sulfa drugs, atabrine, and dietary supplements are being shipped. They are distributed by all competent agencies in Bengal, Orissa, Bikar, and south India. Moslems, Hindus, Christians, and British Government bureaus cooperate in getting the supplies to the people in need.

This work started last year under the auspices of the National War Fund which has withdrawn its support in order to concentrate on liberated areas.

A group of American citizens under the leadership of such men as Henry Grady of California, Ambassador William Phillips, J. Edgar Rhoads, of Delaware, Guy Emerson, Henry Luce, John Haynes Holmes, and George Medalie of New York, Frank Aydelotte of New Jersey, and Sumner Welles of Maryland has set out to raise funds to maintain this work of mercy. They have organized under the name of American Relief for India, Inc.

As one of its sponsors, I want to call it to the attention of the House, and to introduce into the RECORD a challenging statement by Mr. William Phillips on this subject. It is a statement which he made in New York on the occasion of the first public announcement of American Relief for India, Inc.

I am pleased to add the following speech by Hon. William Phillips of the State Department at a luncheon of the board of directors of American Relief for India, Inc., April 17, 1945:

Americans in the past have thought of India as a land of violent contrasts, of lofty capped mountains, and endless arid plains, of dazzling wealth and abject poverty, of great culture and pitiful ignorance, and yet so remote that to many it seemed to be principally a land of mystery and of fairy tales.

What changes of thought and contact has this war produced.

Never before have cities and towns in India been so disturbed as they are now by the roar of American trucks and armored vehicles or by the confusion of hustling American soldiers. And never before in this country has there been such an interest in India due to the presence there of thousands of young Americans. For India has been for nearly 3 years a base for our operations against the Japanese in Burma and in China.

Our forces have been obliged, owing to military necessity, to make themselves at home in this foreign land and often, I fear, without fully appreciating and respecting the habits and customs of the people. And Indians, on their part, have undoubtedly felt concern as the numbers of our forces increased, since to them the Japanese enemy seems remote in faraway Burma and China and therefore of no immediate danger to their own country.

But the recent terrible famine in many parts of the country and the pestilences which have followed in its wake are to a considerable extent attributable to this distant warfare. And then, too, the very presence of increased Allied forces, including our own, has contributed in raising the prices of India's food supply and has added to its scarcity.

In these circumstances it is natural that the people of India should look to this country for sympathy and help, and the governor of Bengal, in whose province is to be found the most acute suffering, has joined the appeal for American aid.

Friendship between nations, as between individuals, is won by sympathy and understanding in times of need. India is in need now.

American relief for India does not presume to be an answer to India's suffering millions but it can be the channel through which America may extend a sympathetic and helping hand to an allied people whose tragic condition and suffering springs in large measure from the effects of the war.

India looks to America. Shall we respond or shall we turn a deaf ear? Of course we shall respond, and gladly, for we have an obligation to the Indian people as a result of this war, and we count upon India's friendship in the years to come.

I submit four important letters concerning American relief for India:

THE VICEROY'S HOUSE,
New Delhi, February 19, 1945.

Since 1942, the Friends' Ambulance Unit has been doing very valuable work in relieving distress in India. Its main activities have been in Bengal, but supplies have been sent also to Bihar, Orissa, the Malabar District of Madras, and the states of Travancore and Cochin. The unit has received generous aid from America, and I should like all those in America who have helped with money or goods to know how much their practical sympathy has been appreciated. I am glad to say that the food situation in India is better than it was in 1943, but there is great scope still for the unit's work, and I hope it will continue to receive the same generous support.

WAVELL,
Viceroy and Governor General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Calcutta, December 22, 1944.

The splendid services rendered by the American Friends in Bengal during the past 12 months have earned the gratitude of all sections of the public in this province. In distributing large quantities of milk, vitamins, and medical supplies they have taken the utmost trouble to insure that they reach those who need them most, and in this way a

great deal of genuine suffering and distress has been alleviated.

Bengal is making every possible effort to help herself, but at the same time she is most grateful for the help that has been forthcoming from friends outside India, all of which has been and will continue to be of the greatest value.

I wish the American Friends all success in their great humanitarian task.

R. H. CASEY,
Governor of Bengal.

GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL,
Calcutta, December 22, 1944.

F. W. JOHNSON, Esq.,
American Friends Service Committee,
Calcutta.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I understand that you are shortly returning to America to work in the head office of the American Friends Service Committee.

I should like, if I may, to take this opportunity of asking you to convey to your committee the sincere thanks and appreciation of the Bengal Government for the magnificent work which has been done by the American Friends during and after the famine. There is hardly an affected part of the Province where your drugs, vitamins, and milk have not penetrated and your noble motives become known.

At the same time, I hope it will be possible for the A. F. S. C. not only to continue but to expand its efforts. Many of the poor cultivators and artisans of Bengal are always on the border line of starvation, and the floods and other natural disasters to which the province is prone may at any time push them over the edge. In wartime, however, earnest the efforts of government, the strain on transport and on food supplies makes relief doubly difficult. The work of the A. F. S. C. and F. A. U. transcending the barriers of community, race, and politics, is a vital complement to the work of government; and as long as war conditions prevail in India, I hope that those efforts will continue.

Yours very sincerely,
TARAKNATH MUKERJEE,
Minister in Charge of Relief.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION,
Belur Math, Howrah, December 23, 1944.

ERIC W. JOHNSON, Esq.,
American Friends Service
Committee, Calcutta.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: The other day you inquired of us about the conditions in Bengal and the need of continuing relief in the Province. So far as foodstuffs are concerned, the condition has somewhat improved as compared with last year at this time. But from reports received from our relief centers we find that the situation is again getting worse. The price of rice, which came down to Rs. 12/- and Rs. 10/-, has again gone up to Rs. 18/- in some places.

Even if the need of foodstuffs be not so acute, the need for medical relief is very pressing. Though foodstuffs are not so rare as in the last year, yet in consequence of last year's famine, which left the whole Province famished and physically weak, we are having epidemics like malaria, smallpox, cholera, dropsy, pneumonia, and general debility. These epidemics are taking a heavy toll of life. There is no possibility of their being brought under control in 1945, because the general health of the people has to be improved first. Meanwhile medical help has to be continued, and suitable diet given to the sick.

The need for antimalarial drugs is most acute. In spite of Government arrangements for the supply of antimalarial and other drugs, it is not quite adequate, and so many nonofficial bodies are also working in the field supplementing Government aid or cooperating with them in fighting these epidemics. Your organization has done much to meet this demand, and your antimalarial drugs, as also the vitamins and sulfa drugs, have been of the greatest help. So also has been the supply of powdered and condensed milk for the sick, nursing mothers, and children.

We, therefore, request you to continue your help to India throughout 1945.

Please convey to your countrymen India's gratefulness for the timely help and sympathy they have meted out to a sister nation in distress.

Thanking you for all your kind help and cooperation, and wishing you a bon voyage,

Yours sincerely,
SWAMI MANHANANDA,
Secretary.

Schools—Bulwark of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the schools of America are the bulwark of democracy. Through education we can encourage correct thinking and formulate public opinion that will forever kindle the light of freedom, justice, and brotherhood, without which democracy cannot survive.

Most of us may not have realized the heavy toll this war has taken in our educational institutions. Registrations in colleges have decreased as much as 60 percent. Important as our educational system is to the future success of this Nation, it is almost unbelievable that we have permitted the school teachers to become the forgotten men and women of America. Unless we produce incentive so that more young high-school students will be persuaded to adopt teaching as a career, in too short a time we will find our school rooms intolerably crowded. The armed forces, of course, were a heavy drain on our supply of instructors. Yet we must admit that the inducement of better pay, shorter hours, better social conditions in other fields of endeavor were a factor in withdrawing so many teachers from the profession in the past 4 years that the National Education Association estimates at least 10,000 vacancies for which teachers were being sought last fall. Alarming indeed. Already classrooms that customarily held 25 children must accommodate 45, a situation which makes proper teaching almost impossible.

The various States are bestirring themselves to find remedies. Some are raising salaries, thus tackling the most serious phase of the problem. I sincerely regret to state that a Republican senate majority in my own State of Pennsylvania was responsible for the failure to pass an adequate pay proposal advocated by Democratic legislators in Pennsylvania. In a profession as important as any other to today's world—with democratic ideals on trial—it is shocking to learn that 3 out of every 100 teachers are paid less than $600 a year. According to a survey made by Allegheny County, Pa., educators it was discovered that 45 out of 58 county school districts pay the average elementary school teacher less than the average school janitor. Single salary schedules are coming into favor, however, a plan which will pay equally for equal talents regardless of sex or of the grade taught.

I urge this Congress to grant adequate Federal aid to every State unable to pay its teachers decent salary standards. This can be accomplished through the passage of H. R. 1296. Liberal pay increments will be an inducement to the many who have left the teaching profession to return and will also induce students to pursue a teaching career.

Let us hope that present aid and reforms will prove neither too little nor too later. The times force an acknowledgement of the importance of the teaching profession to the welfare of the world. Young people should be encouraged to become educators if they have aptitude in that direction.

The objective of the present Conference at San Francisco fully justifies us in appropriating an adequate sum to strengthen the foundation of democracy—the schools of America.

The Strawberry in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of May 6, 1945:

THE STRAWBERRY IN ARKANSAS

The Greater Little Rock Chamber of Commerce could not have served a fruit more appropriate than strawberries at its luncheon honoring White County, for the large annual crops of strawberries distinguish this part of Arkansas.

When the South was struggling to reestablish its economy after the Civil War progressive leaders began to consider seriously the growing of fruits for the commercial market. In De Bow's Review of October 1866, Dr. J. A. Dibrell of Crawford County; C. Langtree of Little Rock, who had made a map of Arkansas, and Liberty Bartlett, judge of the fifth Arkansas judicial circuit, discussed the State's resources, and they listed strawberries among the fruits which thrived here. In 1872 James P. Henry, in his "Resources of the State of Arkansas," stressed the cultivating of fruits, including strawberries. He predicted a great fruit business would be created, with the railroads giving access to many markets. By 1900 farmers were planting strawberries for the commercial market, but the industry had its greatest expansion after World War No. 1. The cultivation of the strawberry has become one of the major crops in northern and central Arkansas counties. For the 1933–42 period the State averaged 16,200 acres of strawberries harvested, a total production of 841,000 crates, and a yield of 52 crates per acre. Arkansas's 1942 crop of 1,785,000 crates gave the State first place in strawberry production.

Arkansas has gained prominence not only in yield but in the type of plants cultivated here. Strawberry growers in Florida obtain the Missionary variety of plants from eastern

Maryland and an area near Judsonia, Ark. We are told that comparative tests made by the Florida Experiment Station showed that the Arkansas plants produced more fruit.

The cultivation of strawberries has been an important factor in developing White and other counties. It has stimulated the crate and other industries. Strawberries are the State's most widely marketed fruit.

German Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1945, during the course of the usual evening hour broadcast given over to America's brillian and popular commentator, Richard Eaton, radio station WOL, Washington, I delivered a short speech on German atrocities and the necessity of having a permanent commission to record and preserve the record. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein this talk:

Since Pearl Harbor nothing has shocked the American people as much as the recent stories of the atrocities perpetrated by the Germans against those who are their prisoners. From time to time we have been told of the inhuman treatment being given prisoners in German camps, but as a people we have been somewhat loath to believe that anyone could be so barbaric as to be guilty of such shocking outrages. Now the German battle lines have been broken at many points under the weight of our attacks and those of our allies. We have freed large portions of Axis countries, and with this we have freed many Nazi prison camps. The true story of treatment of our prisoners comes forth in all of its sordid and ghastly light.

Never in all history have acts of such barbarity been visited upon captive peoples. At some camps thousands upon thousands of civilians along with our own troops have been literally starved to death. At other camps we are informed that our men were given a daily ration, three times each day, of only carrot soup, or turnip soup. They were slowly starved to death. They have been killed in cold blood by infuriated Nazi leaders and their bodies have been permitted to fill the compounds and the enclosures by the thousands alongside of those who yet lived. A total absence of medical treatment at times has prevailed, and unspeakable indignities have been visited upon these poor, defenseless peoples.

It is therefore small wonder that Gen. George S. Patton ordered, as a punishment, that hundreds of local German civilians in the captured areas be forced to view these scenes of horror in one of the camps. They turned their heads and shielded their eyes in horror as they looked upon these ghastly sights. We are not surprised when we learn that the British Parliament last week visited some of these horror camps so as to make a formal report on them to the British Empire. And now our Congress has appointed a special committee of Senators and Congressmen to visit these atrocities. And further, so that there be no uncertainty in the minds of anyone, a group of 12 editors have been chosen to make the same visit to the German camps, and to then report directly to our people as to exactly what they saw.

These reports, for the moment will be sufficient to convince any doubting Thomas, if such there be, of the truthfulness of the vicious cruelty and utter disregard of the laws of humanity by the Nazis. If the experiences of the First World War are repeated, the moral saboteurs will not be heard from further until the war is over, and then we may expect to hear some say, "Oh, that's just a lot of 'baloney.' It is just propaganda."

Because of this, many of us down on Capitol Hill feel that a permanent commission should be set up to record and tabulate these countless acts of bestial inhumanity. We think they should be put in permanent form; and should constitute an all-time black record of atrocities. This record should cover not only the Germans but should cover the Japs also. While it is the German acts which now shock us I am sorry to say that the Japs have been guilty of acts of savagery already which will be a constant shame to many peoples of the Orient for a thousand years to come.

These records, properly compiled and catalogued, should be permanently bound. They should be available this year and next year. They should be available 10,000 years hence as a naked plea of Axis guilt through all ages to come. They should be available to the War Crimes Commission which meets in London and will have charge of the prosecutions of the leaders after the war. The records should be available after the war to those who rewrite the articles of the Geneva Convention and work to place penalties in it to prevent a reoccurrence of these acts of utter vandalism and cruelty.

I think the work of making a permanent record of these things is very important and I am making an effort that we create a permanent War Atrocities Commission.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the memory of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt should be perpetuated.

His accomplishments and his record as a leader and a great humanitarian is evidenced in every section of our country, but it would be well for us to have one day in each year set aside as Franklin D. Roosevelt Day to remind us forcefully once each year of this great man who has been called to his reward.

I heartily subscribe to the suggestion advanced by division 618 of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, in my State, and I offer for the RECORD the resolution, which follows:

Resolution to declare by law a national holiday, January 30, birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt

Whereas our Heavenly Father in His infinite wisdom has seen fit to call from this earthly pilgrimage our beloved leader the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas our grief is great, beyond the ability of mere words to express, because he by work and act prior to and during his 12 years and 4 months as the Chief Executive of the Nation proved himself to be the greatest friend that the working men and women of America ever had. He struck the shackles of industrial impediment and servitude from their physical and mental desire for opportunity to elevate their standards of living and provide security against the day when they are no longer physically able to produce. He was the man who led the Nation and brought it through the greatest crisis in our history since the Civil War. He was a master planner of war strategy, and the architect of world's peace, the symbol of hope that peace-loving people the world over have had, for a lasting world security from the sweat, blood, and tears of war. History will record him the greatest of them all as President and humanitarian of this or any other era: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the members of Division 618 Street Carmen and Bus Operators Union Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America in special meeting assembled in the Eagles Hall, April 16, 1945. We do hereby petition our Representatives in Congress, Washington, D. C., individually and collectively to move and work for the enactment of legislation making January 30 of each year, the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, thirty-first President of the United States, a national holiday in order to perpetuate his memory for all time; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Senators THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and PETER G. GERRY and the Honorable Representatives JOHN E. FOGARTY and AIME J. FORAND, and be entered as part of the minutes of Division 618.

The Communists Are at It in Slovakia, Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Dreyfus case of the nations; the political football of the mighty; the victim of Magyar chauvinism; the battlefield of foreign wars; the victim of Czechoslovakia; the victim of Nazi aggression; the country liberated by the Red armies; just another country taken over by the Communists.

That in short is the story of Slovakia. It is a story of the sacrifices, tribulations, and thraldom of a nation that has never been the aggressor. It is the history of a nation that has shed its blood many times over in the cause of justice and freedom of other nations, but the fruits of which it was never fortunate enough to enjoy.

In World War No. 1, the Slovaks were instrumental in destroying the tyranny of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and establishing the Czechoslovak Republic under the leadership of Thomas G. Masaryk, Milan R. Stefanik, and Dr. Edward Beneš. Masaryk pledged himself that in the newly founded republic, Slovakia would have "her own administration, her own assembly, and her own courts." But neither Masaryk nor his successor, Dr. Edward Beneš, ever made good on that promise.

What about Slovakia today and in the postwar world?

It seems to me that the watchword of the provisional government of Czechoslovakia, headed by Dr. Edward Beneš, and the Slovak National Council, just about the whole of which is made up of Communists, is, Slovakia must not be heard. The case of Slovakia must never come up before any United Nations conferences.

Much has been said and written against the absorption of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in an alien system of government without their free consent. Volumes of words have been said and written about the events that have transpired in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Finland, Greece, and Italy. The case of emaciated and persecuted Poland stands out glaringly before the eyes of the civilized world. Even Czechoslovakia, into which the Slovaks were duped and in which they never gained the recognition of their national existence, occupies the minds of diplomats and writers.

Do not the events that have transpired or are transpiring in the above-mentioned countries flout the very principles for which this dreadful war is being fought—the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"?

But what has been said or written about Slovakia?

Practically nothing. And, it seems to me, the powers that be simply take it for granted that the Slovaks are perfectly satisfied with the trend of events in their country. The world knows practically all that Dr. Beneš and his propaganda machine have said or written about Slovakia, but the Slovaks themselves have not been heard from. No one seems to note the fact that that unfortunate country is not even represented at the Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco. And no one seems to care.

Nevertheless, the case of Slovakia should interest all countries and all governments that are sincerely striving to attain a just and lasting peace for the world. In the light of the events taking place in Slovakia, Christians the world over may rightfully fear that we are not tending in the direction of a better postwar world, in the direction of a just and permanent peace. What has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia is being reenacted in Slovakia, which is predominantly a Catholic country.

Reports coming out of liberated Slovakia would have us believe that the Slovaks have just about all their desires fulfilled, that the millennium is at hand. Slovakia, the Slovak National Council proclaims, will actually be free within the framework of Czechoslovakia; she will have the autonomy she demanded in vain in the years when the satisfaction of her claims undoubtedly would have strengthened the Czechoslovak Republic, and the Masaryk and Beneš regimes as well.

All such reports are made to order; they are not for home consumption, but rather for the consumption of the truly democratic countries. Their purpose is deception.

The fact still remains that the vast majority of the inhabitants of Slovakia, the Catholics, have no proportionate representation either in the Provisional Czechoslovak Government or in the Slovak National Council.

Slovak Americans strongly suspect that Communistic tactics are being applied in Slovakia in the same measure that they were applied in other countries "liberated" by the Soviet armies. The composition of the Czechoslovak Government and the Slovak National Council tells us plainly that the Communists are definitely taking advantage of the situation in Slovakia and forcefully seizing control of local and national government.

The Slovak Communist press of America, true to type, told us of the joy of the inhabitants of Slovakia on being "liberated." It hailed the return of Bishop Carsky to Kosice. "See, the Communists are not such a bad lot after all!" editorials of the Communistic press exclaimed. That happened the latter part of March, but Bishop Carsky still has not been heard from!

Slovakia has been "liberated," but we still have to get reports from our own war correspondents. The reports that have come to us originate in Moscow and in the press bureau of the Slovak National Council or the "Czechoslovak Press Bureau," which are subservient to Moscow. It is the same old story that has been repeated so often about other "liberated" countries. Foreign correspondents and neutral observers are not allowed to enter for a time, which usually means: until the "purge" is completed and the "right persons" are entrenched in the local and national government.

The eminent Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing in the New York Times of April 21, said among other things:

> But at Kosice the Slovak National Council has now been reorganized under the presidency of Dr. Letterich, a former agrarian, and Carol Smidka, a Communist. The administration is in the hands of trustees consisting of four Communists, two Social Democrats, and six Democrats and Nationalists.

It is plainly evident that even Miss McCormick could not have first-hand information. She does not mention the names of said trustees and says nothing at all whether the administrative body is representative of Slovakia or not. The reader is apt to believe that four political parties share in the administration of Slovakia. That is not so. If the parties in question were investigated, it would not surprise us to find them all headed by Communists. The latter have announced quite some time ago that all Socialist parties joined with the Communist Party and now bear its name, the other parties, however, forming one joint "Democratic Party."

The Slovak People's Party, commonly referred to as Hlinka's Party or the Catholic Party in Slovakia, has been dissolved by the Slovak national council. It is generally assumed that no former member of the Hlinka Party can be a member of the council or the "provisional Czechoslovak Government." It was the largest organized political group in Slovakia prior to 1938. One of its claims was that it helped to elect Dr. Eduard Beneš in 1937 on the promise of achieving autonomy for Slovakia within a year. Under the present set-up in Slovakia, the Catholics, representing the vast majority of inhabitants, are simply out. The whole governmental apparatus is definitely communistic. It has been forced on the populace, according to the general axiom of aggressors: Might makes right. The Hlinka Party, the Catholics of Slovakia, really are in for a cleaning.

The Czechoslovak delegation to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations consists of 11 members, according to the report of the Czchoslovak Press Bureau. It is headed by Ján Masaryk, former London playboy and present foreign minister of Dr. Beneš' government, who once answered the query "What are you fighting for?" as follows:

> I want to read Heine. I don't want to live if I can't. I don't give a d—— what kind of economic system there is as long as I am free to indulge in the virtues and vices that do not interfere with the smooth running of the program and order.

This is the type of man that heads the Czechoslovak delegation to the San Francisco Conference. The others are definitely members of Dr. Beneš' official family—the old political clique, pawns of Beneš, who denied the Slovak Nation the inherent and God-given right to its own national existence. Is it any wonder then that Slovak Americans are asking why Slovakia is not represented as a nation at San Francisco?

No true American, no real lover of democracy, no sincere Christian will ever force the Slovaks to return to the old Czechoslovak order or believe that they want to return to that order of their own free will. And Slovakia should not and must not be forced to accept an alien system of government without the free and unfettered consent of its inhabitants.

Christian Slovakia, Catholic Slovakia, has been exploited by the Magyar chauvinism, Czech nazism, and German nazism. Today she is being overwhelmed by Red fascism—communism. Is that what the United Nations are fighting for? Is that the way to prepare for a just and lasting peace in the postwar world? No Christian, no freeman, will believe it!

For the sake of a just and permanent peace, in the name of everything that stands for justice and truth, decency and fair play, the case of Slovakia must at long last be reviewed by the United Nations. Slovakia has a natural right to freedom and its own national existence. Whosoever denies the Slovak Nation that right is not consistent with the aims and ideals of a world organization, of a world court; of him it may be truly said that he is not interested in a just and permanent peace, in the principles of democracy and justice, in the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and expressed by the "four freedoms."

Slovak-Americans like to indulge in repeating the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's belief: "We believe that any nationality, not matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood." Slovakia must not be an exception. She must not be forced into any political alliance; she must not be absorbed in any alien system of government without her free consent.

In the name of the ideals for which millions of young men and women, the flower of the United Nations, are fighting—for free nations in a free world, for the cause of Christianity and a just and permanent peace—for God's sake, review the case of Slovakia!

The Late Col. William Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an enrolled copy of Joint Resolution No. 57–A adopted by the 1945 session of the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to adopt and approve a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as major general:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to adopt and approve a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as major general

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, Senate Joint Resolution 34, authorizing the posthumous award to the late Col. William Mitchell of a commission as major general; and

Whereas it is a fitting tribute to the memory of William Mitchell that this award be made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorialize Congress to expedite the adoption of Senate Resolution 34, and the President to approve the adoption of said resolution; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

OSCAR RENNEBOHN,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Ernie Pyle

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we were shocked at the news of the death of Ernie Pyle on the battlefield.

I shall not take the time of the House to make an additional eulogy to Ernie Pyle. His accomplishments are well known, both to those serving in our armed forces and to the general public, and his writings will always remain a sweet memory.

Ernie Pyle's home was in Dana, Ind., which is in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. This community is made up of many of the finest, most loyal, and patriotic citizens of our Nation. They are true Americans.

Ernie Pyle came from one of these fine families, and it was through his early training and his sterling character that he was able to accomplish so much and to reach such a high place in the esteem of the people.

I want to take a few minutes to announce that the citizens of Dana and vicinity have formed an organization known as the Ernie Pyle Memorial Library. It has selected Ernie's father, Mr. William C. Pyle, as honorary president, and his aunt, Mrs. Mary Bales, as honorary director.

The following have been selected as officers of the organization: Mr. John Dussing, president; Mr. Edrick Cordes, vice president; Mr. John N. Allison, secretary; Mr. Franklin R. Southard, treasurer; Mr. James Elder, Mr. Glen Randall, and Mr. H. R. Scott, directors, all of whom are highly respected citizens of the community.

It is the purpose of this organization to establish, erect, and equip, by public contributions, a memorial library at Dana, Ind., as a national shrine in honor of this great American who was loved and honored by all who knew him or read his column, that his great name and work might live on as an inspiration to future generations.

Every contributor's name will be placed on record and this record will be kept in the library when completed. I have every confidence that the millions of people who feel they have suffered a personal loss in the untimely death of Ernie Pyle will be happy to have the opportunity to participate in the construction and equipping of this memorial library and thereby have a part in perpetuating his memory and accomplishments.

This is a most worth-while undertaking, and the citizens of this community are to be congratulated.

This memorial library will be constructed and equipped as quickly as the necessary funds are received.

Keep the Pacific Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, following World War No. 1 the United States made many mistakes. The lessons we have learned from those mistakes must never be repeated.

Not the least of these mistakes was the mandating of Pacific islands to Japan which made possible the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor engulfing us in a war that has cost thousands of lives of the flower of American manhood. Such a condition must never again be permitted to exist. If the peace of the world in the Pacific is to be maintained the United States must retain sovereignty over the islands which Japan fortified. It must never again become possible for any nation or group of nations to make an attack on the United States from these bases.

High naval authority has already asserted that these Japanese islands, bought with the blood of American soldiers, sailors, and marines, are essential to our national defense. Those responsible for making the peace when we shall have secured the unconditional surrender of Japan must recognize this necessity of national defense and not barter or give them away to become a future menace to our safety.

Mr. Speaker, my own sentiments in this regard are so admirably stated in a recent editorial appearing in the San Francisco Examiner that I include it herewith under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

KEEP THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

When the United States marines planted the American flag on Iwo Jima and an alert photographer made a picture of the event that is already as well known and will probable be as long remembered as the famous Minute Man of Concord, they thought they were putting it there to stay.

All of the American people, in fact, have been taking it for granted that all of the Pacific islands we are taking away from the Japanese are automatically and indisputably becoming American islands.

The only possible exceptions which the American people might be in a mood to consider would be those Pacific islands over which Allied Nations had sovereignty before the war and lost it to the Japanese in the early part of the war—such as Tarawa, which was recovered from the Japanese by the American marines, but over which the British flag was subsequently restored.

But in the case of Pacific islands of Japanese ownership or mandate—the Marshalls, the Carolines, the Marianas, the Volcano group, the Ryuku chain, etc.—there should surely be no more question about permanent American occupancy than there will be about total American conquest.

This is not because the United States aspires to territorial aggrandizement from the Pacific war.

The United States would not be greatly enriched by possession of any of these islands.

Economically, most of them will be liabilities.

It is for our permanent security that permanent American possession of them is desirable.

These islands were the air and naval bases from which Japan launched its attack upon the United States.

They were armed and fortified by the Japanese.

They made possible the Japanese war against us.

They were responsible for our loss of the Philippines and of Guam and Wake.

They were the springboard for the assault on Pearl Harbor.

They supplied and supported the Japanese conquest of the entire Southwest Pacific, up to the very shores of Australia.

The only way we can ever remove this menace is to possess the islands which have constituted so grave a menace to us.

We should make them American naval and air bases, for the permanent protection of America.

Of course, we are not going to allow them to revert to Japanese ownership.

But that is not the only danger they pose.

While official quarters in Washington are strangely and ominously silent about the future control of these Pacific islands, other quarters are neither silent nor inactive.

The internationalists in Washington are already talking about international trusteeships for them, and are openly suggesting that the United Nations Conference in San Francisco should set up the structure for their control.

If ever there was warrant for unilateral action, the United States has such warrant in the Pacific islands.

This is not the business of any other nation.

It is no part of the business of the San Francisco Conference.

The United States should raise the American flag over all the former Japanese islands in the Pacific, as the Marines did at Iwo Jima, and keep it over them.

Tomorrow's Trains Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to direct attention to an event now going on right here in Washington that I believe is a most inspiring example of how American industry is preparing to carry out its responsibilities in the future. I refer specifically to the exposition, Tomorrow's Trains Today, now on public display in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, under the official auspices of that Department.

Here is an unusual demonstration of American ingenuity and planning. Presented with most colorful and convincing completeness, it must remove all doubt from those who wonder about America's ability to forge ahead after the cessation of hostilities. It is the precursor of one of those eagerly awaited bridges with which we will successfully span the gap in our period of reconversion and readjustment. While depicting some of the future wares and plans of only one company—those of the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co.—it effectively typifies all of the splendid foresight and conscientious endeavor that so many of our other better known industrial concerns are displaying in their preparations to provide for the human and economic needs of tomorrow.

Considered only from the angle of what they mean in the modernization of railroad service in the years ahead, Pullman-Standard postwar plans are almost beyond the imagination of the traveler, the commuter, all those other millions who depend so much on satisfactory transportation in their everyday lives. As radical as they may seem, compared to past standards, these plans are not visionary pipe dreams. Anyone who inspects the exposition will testify they are practical developments, based on sound and extensive research. Most important they can be placed on the rails of the country as actual realities only a few months after the company receives Goverment authorization to resume passenger-car construction.

In my opinion, however, there is a far deeper significance to this presentation at the Commerce Building than all that it means in more luxurious, cheaper, faster and safer service for the railroad passenger. I am thinking of what it implies in such matters as the stimulation of trade and industry; employment in the years ahead for our present workers and for our returning servicemen; business for small industries after they have completed their war jobs; the solution of many of the other economic and social problems that must be solved if the peace we are now winning at so great a price is to be worth its cost.

It would be an imposition on my listeners to recount here today how much transportation, particularly railed transportation, has meant in America's development and progress. Where the rails have led, prosperity, culture, all that have given us our leadership in world affairs have generally followed. And yet transportation must be in the years ahead an even greater factor in our economy.

If trade and industry are to forge ahead, they must have steady and rapid flows of raw materials as well as equally fast and widespread distribution of their finished wares. Contacts between towns and cities, between States—yes; and between nations—must be maintained on a basis never before known. I am thinking of such things as the great hemispheral network of roads and rails they are talking of for a better linking of the two Americas. Not only must there be free opportunity for men to travel but there must be the modernized means for shipping the output of man's varied lines of handiwork.

That foresighted companies like Pullman-Standard and the great railroads that use its products are practically ready now to furnish some of the means to bind our civilization as closely together as world affairs now in the making will permit, must be a source of gratification to all who are concerned with our national and international planning.

I stated that industrial developments like those under discussion will have far-reaching effects upon the maintenance of continued employment of the American worker. I repeat that statement. I know from the very district I represent, with its hundreds of busy factories, its great steel mills, its many nationally operating railroads—yes; and its big railroad car-building plants—what it all means.

Federal census figures show that just prior to Pearl Harbor 1 out of every 40 gainfully employed wage earners was on the pay rolls of the railroads, with thousands of others receiving their livelihood from those concerns which build our cars and other railroad equipment.

Think what the modernization of our vast railroad network will mean to all these. Think what it must mean in new jobs and other opportunities for so many countless others. American history shows that whenever we have brought forth better products more jobs have followed. Pullman-Standard, right here in Washington, this week is pointing the way in a manner that must influence the futures of millions of us.

This is no one-industry matter. Thousands of companies—companies that are so frequently termed the small businessman type of venture—have an equal interest. To construct only one railroad passenger car there must be available the wares of hundreds of apparently unrelated companies. All of these companies have pay rolls. The glass blower who makes the car windows, the steel puddler who helps supply the steel car walls, the upholsterer who finishes the seats, the paint mixer whose gay colors adorn interiors and exteriors—all these are affected.

It has been stated that to put our railroads back into first-class shape after the wear and tear they have experienced in doing such a remarkable war job thousands of new passenger cars and freight cars must be available. It will take years to catch up on the program.

It seems fitting, therefore, that this first actual demonstration in Washington of what is being done now to clear the industrial track into the post-war era should come from a company that has contributed so much to our national progress in the past.

Pullman-Standard helped make America's railroads the model for the world. Combining its years of knowing what the American traveling public wanted with its own engineering genius it gave us our first lightweight streamliner. And for the past 4 years, its busy plants have won one governmental commendation after another for their outstanding work in producing armament for the Army, ships for the Navy, aircraft parts for our flyers, and transportation equipment vital to the maintenance of our lines both at home and behind the fighting fronts. Now it comes forth here, right next to the very Halls of Congress, with another proof of what it and our other better-managed industries are ready to do in another pinch.

Gentlemen, I suggest that all of you visit the Commerce Building exposition. If we are to insure that America is going to go somewhere in the future, we cannot afford to miss the train now.

Victory for Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Edson:

VICTORY FOR WOODROW WILSON

(By Peter Edson)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 8.—Woodrow Wilson died with the understanding that it was right for the United States to stay out of the old League of Nations, in 1920. And the day before his death he prophesied this country would join a new League of Nations and that it would succeed, his daughter, Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, has just revealed, breaking a family secret closely held for 21 years.

Mrs. McAdoo is in San Francisco in connection with her war-bond work and as a radio correspondent covering the United Nations Conference.

This story of her father's death, making an important new footnote to history and today's big war news, has never been told before. Eleanor Wilson consents to its being told today because this seems the right moment to bridge the gap between the end of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2; between the old League of Nations, which her father helped create, and the new United Nations organization being created at San Francisco. Had Woodrow Wilson died as Franklin Delano Roosevelt did, at the height of his victories, the end of the League of Nations story might have been different.

The day before Woodrow Wilson died, February 3, 1924, he lay on his bed in the house on Washington's S Street, where the family had moved after they left the White House in March 1921.

In the room with him, watching him, was his daughter Margaret, Eleanor's sister. The ex-President's eyes were closed. He spoke quietly:

"It was right that the United States did not join the League of Nations."

Startled, Margaret caught her breath, came to his bedside.

Woodrow Wilson opened his eyes and smiled. Again he spoke:

"You think I'm raving, don't you? I'm not.

"But I've been thinking about this for a long time."

Her father had had much time to think, says Eleanor Wilson today. In Paris he had contracted flu. Asthma had developed from that, and with it came broken sleep. The ability to sleep, to relax completely for 5 minutes or an hour, had been one of Woodrow Wilson's greatest sources of strength. From a nap, or a full night's sleep, he could wake refreshed and able to cope with any new task. But now, with one arm paralyzed and one foot dragging when he could walk, in the long days and the longer nights of wakefulness, Woodrow Wilson had done much thinking.

There was nothing the matter with his brain. Eleanor Wilson declares, and he was anything but the broken-hearted man he has been so commonly and so wrongly portrayed.

"If we had joined the League when I asked for it," he said, "it would have been a great personal victory. But it would not have worked, because deep down in their hearts the American people didn't really believe in it."

Margaret Wilson rose then and bent over her father's bed.

"The time will come when this country will join such a league, because it will know that it has to be. And then and then only will it work."

He laughed a little.

"He was really a gay soul," Eleanor Wilson recalls today. "To us he was never the cold, austere professor so many people have tried to make him. And he was never an egotist."

He was sincere, and he was a philosopher, and he was reverent at all times. But he had the grandest sense of humor, and that revealed itself in his last hours and his last words with Margaret on the League of Nations.

We Will Soon Have 80,000,000 Germans on Our Doorstep—It Is Time We Are Making Up Our Minds What We Are Going To Do With and to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because the questions are so timely, raised on the eve of VE-day, I include, as a part of my remarks, a public-service advertisement of Time, the weekly news magazine, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that we are caught on this long anticipated day of victory in Europe without any plans? Is it not high time for the captains on our diplomatic front to take the American people into their confidence?

But the shortcomings of the State Department, whatever they may be, do not relieve the American people, citizens in a great democracy, of the responsibilities which are theirs. It is well that they contemplate the questions which Time poses.

The public-service advertisement to which I have just referred is the following:

You'll soon have 80,000,000 Germans on your doorstep.

What's to be done with them?

When the Big Three met at Yalta they did what they could to blueprint the reformatory in which the German people will live after the war.

But a blueprint will house no Germans. The reformatory itself is yet to be built; and meanwhile thinking on what constitutes the "right" peace for Germany will swing back and forth across a wide arc.

Some will wonder if a "tough" peace isn't just what the Nazis want—to drive the German people back to their arms again.

Others will ask if a peace as hard as Germany richly deserves can ever be enforced—will suggest that a milder, enforceable peace may be a wiser choice.

Still others will say: "Germany is rubble. She is devastated as no nation has ever been devastated; she knows now what it means to lose a modern war. Let us not be vindictive."

In any case, it will take more than just our leaders to write the peace and the punishment. It will take millions of men—and you are one of them. You have a great stake in this peace-to-come—and you will have a greater voice in its making than the citizens of any other nation.

Now, during the San Francisco Conference, you have the duty as well as the right to make your opinion known—provided you have earned that right, kept yourself informed, nourished your thinking on the raw material of the news—so your opinion will make the greatest long-term enlightened sense.

Of course, nobody has the complete answers yet—not even the experts. But perhaps these are the big questions you ought to be chewing on so you can be better prepared to "sit in" when the first decisions are submitted to you.

The Big Three said at Yalta:

"We are determined to bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment."

But who are the war criminals? Those who can be convicted of actual crimes? Or the whole Nazi leadership, SS and Gestapo, those legions especially trained for torture and brutality? And under what international laws (if any) can they be tried?

"We are determined to break up for all time the German General Staff."

But Napoleon thought he had uprooted these professional warmakers forever; Wilson, Clemenceau, and Lloyd George thought so. But the Junkers outsmarted them all. You can't get older men like these—who have practiced war all their lives—to begin to think like peaceful lawyers, doctors, tradesmen overnight. What can be done?

"We will eliminate or control all German industry that can be used for military production."

After the First World War we forbade Germany to manufacture arms—set up the best control system we could think of to enforce the ban. For years the midget German Army drilled with wooden tanks, dummy guns. But off came the mask in 1935—and we found Germany had been making arms right under our noses all along. * * * How did we fail in 1918? How can we succeed today?

"In reparation for the damage caused by Germany, Germany will be obliged to make compensation in kind, to the greatest possible extent."

But how? Do we agree with the Russians that the best way is to force masses of the German people into labor battalions to rebuild the cities they destroyed? Or can greater reparation be made with money earned by Germans working in Germany?

And what of the idea to split up Germany into two or three small, separate, individual states?

Has partition of a defeated nation ever been a real peace-keeping success? Would it make more sense to turn Germany into an international area under the management of the new world organization?

Time believes America's greatest need, now and in the coming years, is for the sovereign people to nourish their minds and speak them out on these pressing problems of our time.

To do so, citizens must keep themselves informed. So in advertisements like this Time is seeking to encourage reading, questioning, argument, and straight, hard thinking

For Time's own future is unalterably linked to a United States citizenry deeply concerned about public affairs—to a nation insistent upon seeking the truth and learning from recorded experience.

Toll-Free Bridge—Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Minnesota and northern Wisconsin, and particularly

those living in the city of Superior and the city of Duluth, are interested in the construction of a toll-free bridge between these two cities. For many, many years people have paid tribute to Caesar, and this has happened, not in the Middle Ages, but in this modern world of ours, in the twentieth century, and it has happened every time anyone had occasion to travel between the cities of Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis. When the present bridge was constructed it was generally understood that it would be a toll-free bridge, but that understanding has been dissolved in thin air many, many years ago.

In order to remedy this situation, before World War No. 2 commenced, I was the author of a bill, H. R. 6475, which became Public Law No. 333, Seventy-sixth Congress, and which authorized the construction of a toll-free bridge between these two cities. This bill was approved August 7, 1939, and subsequently amended so far as the time in which construction could be commenced. However, World War developments forced delay and plans were discontinued because it was not possible to get materials or labor while World War No. 2 was in progress.

Now that VE-day is a reality, I think it proper that we again give vigorous attention to the construction of this toll-free bridge. Public Law No. 333 was enacted after careful consideration by the governing bodies in the city of Duluth and in the city of Superior. It carefully safeguards the interests of the public, and under the terms of that law we will actually get a toll-free bridge after the expenses of construction have been paid from revenue realized from the collection of toll charges for the purpose of building and maintaining said bridge, and for no other purposes. It should be noted that this legislation imposes no burden on the taxpayers of either Duluth or Superior, or on the people of either Wisconsin or Minnesota. The project is a self-liquidating project.

In order to revive and reenact this legislation, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the construction of a toll-free bridge in accordance with the terms, conditions, and provisions of Public Law No. 333, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1939. The enactment of this law and the construction of this bridge will furnish employment, and I think everyone will agree that this is a proper and worth-while post-war project.

The W. F. A., the O. P. A., and the Shortage of Poultry and Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, today the House has under debate the report of food shortages made by the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages. This committee has made constructive suggestions. Recently it has been necessary for the Governor of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts to make use of extraordinary war powers by seizing truckloads of poultry for distribution to the hospitals throughout the State. Many factors, all bad, have created a deplorable situation. Failure to furnish feed at reasonable prices or at any price in some instances has led to a sharp reduction in available poultry for table use. Many farmers in New England have been forced to curtail the production of poultry and poultry products as the manpower problem on the farms became more critical month by month.

In some instances the farmers have actually gone out of business at a time when the need for more farm production is being stressed by Government officials. The War Food Administration has failed to solve the farmers' problems. At times it has seemed to some of the egg producers in western Massachusetts that the O. P. A. is endeavoring to put them out of business. For example, the O. P. A. has allowed only 1 cent per dozen more for processed eggs than for eggs in their natural state. This allowance is made in the face of a known cost of 3 cents per dozen in order to carry on the processing operation. In addition, the processing plant has to provide for shipping and other costs. Since there is a ready market for eggs the shortsightedness of the O. P. A. in this regard is likely to result in the closing down of processing plants. Since it is reported that the Army and the Navy are not receiving enough of the processed eggs, this situation marks one more case in which Government administration is not successful. To these troubles of the farmers black-market operations have arisen as a further serious menace.

The situation in Massachusetts concerning poultry has been so bad that Gov. Maurice Tobin actually called upon our State legislature to furnish him with such powers as might be necessary to protect the patients in the hospitals of Massachusetts. A resolution was passed by the General Court of Massachusetts, which is outstanding evidence of administrative failure on the part of the Office of Price Administration in New England. In addition, I have received many complaints and protests from individual constituents about the ineffective and unfair handling of the meat problems of the people of western Massachusetts. Inquiries which I have made show that New England for many weeks past has been receiving less than its share or quota of meats as compared with other sections of the United States. I regret that the latest information indicates that we must expect a further decrease in our meat supply at a time when feed for poultry, hogs, and cattle exists and could be made available to livestock producers.

I believe that the resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts on March 28, 1945, set forth one of the sharpest indictments of the inefficiency of the Office of Price Administration known to the public. The shortage of poultry in Massachusetts is said to be due to a combination of factors all of which are within or should be within the control of the Federal Government. They include unfair egg price ceilings, a serious black market in poultry, and inefficient administration of available supplies of other meats throughout the country. This break-down in Federal activities by the O. P. A. caused the General Court of Massachusetts to pass a law at the suggestion of Gov. Maurice Tobin which permitted him to secure a sufficient supply of poultry to meet the needs of hospitals in the care and treatment of their patients. It is difficult for Americans to believe that it is necessary for the Governor of a great State to cause police officials to halt trucks carrying poultry and to confiscate the poultry in order to furnish supplies for our hospitals. Yet, this happened on several occasions in different parts of Massachusetts during recent weeks. The resolutions also call attention to the need to stop unlawful practices in the sale and distribution of poultry. The outstanding feature of the resolutions, however, was the clause in the preamble of the resolutions in which the State Legislature, the General Court of Massachusetts, acting at the request of Governor Tobin, stated that it was the belief of the members of the General Court that the fundamental cause of the existing emergency was the failure of the Office of Price Administration to recognize the peculiar condition under which the New England poultry industry is forced to operate. Six weeks after these resolutions were adopted, conditions in the poultry and egg business of Massachusetts remain unsatisfactory.

Congress is now investigating the failures of the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. in connection with the critical meat shortage in the United States. I hope that these congressional committees will give consideration to the difficulties now prevalent in the poultry and egg industries. In any event, I urge the officials of the Office of Price Administration to take the steps necessary to reestablish the poultry and egg businesses on a stable basis which will bring these most essential food products within the reach of the millions of American families who rely upon them in large part for proper food. Our industrial workers require meats and eggs in their diet if they are to remain efficient at their war work. This problem is directly connected with the success of our war effort. It deserves better and more efficient administration at the hands of Government officials. May our farmers secure the cooperation from the Government agencies which they certainly have earned. I hope that special inducements shall be given to poultry producers to increase their supplies of poultry and eggs, as recommended by the special committee.

Wood Pulp Waste Converted Into Alcohol, Acetone, and Fuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, an important discovery of chemical processes

for the utilization of sulphite liquor that is a waste product from wood-pulp manufacture has recently been made. It no doubt will have a most important bearing on the utilization of wood waste in our forestry industry. I include an article by Robert A. Barr which appeared in the April 28, 1945, issue of the Timber Operator describing this process.

The article is as follows:

WOOD PULP WASTE CONVERTED INTO ALCOHOL, ACETONE, AND FUEL

(By Robert A. Barr)

Climaxing more than 2 years of scientific research, two Seattle men announced the discovery of one of the most important chemical processes in the history of forest industries—commercially feasible means of complete utilization of the sulphite liquor that is a "waste" product in the making of wood pulp.

Experts said the discovery may be one of the greatest boons in Northwest history.

The men are Dr. Bror L. Grondal, professor of forest products at the University of Washington for nearly 30 years, and Maj. Henry W. Berger, gray-haired research chemist and expert fermentologist.

Under the process, developed through painstaking experimentation and study, Grondal said they have evolved a method of producing butyl alcohol from sulphite liquor, as well as other products, all in the course of the research.

The process evolved by the university men should not be confused with that employed by the new Bellingham, Wash., plant of the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., which manufactures ethyl alcohol, as contrasted to butyl alcohol, from wood pulp byproducts.

To the casual ear perhaps what the men had to say would not mean much, but to the plastics industry, the paint and lacquer manufacturer, the fuel dealer, the pulp manufacturer, the dairy farmer, and the synthetic rubber industry, its commercial aspects would be too great for contemplation at one sitting.

For the Washington pulp manufacturer here was a way to eliminate wastage of 50 percent of every log cut in the forests for his pulp mill.

Here was the answer to a dream as old as the pulp industry.

For the pulp man, too, was an answer to one of the biggest headaches which ever harassed a major industry—pollution of Puget Sound and other water by the dumping of sulphite liquor which had precipitated bitter battles, carried against the pulp men by the fisheries interests into the courts and the State legislature. The pulp man has dug down in his pockets to the tune of $300,000 to find something to do with the sulphite.

For the plastics industry, the synthetic rubber industry, here was a brand new, cheap source of butyl alcohol from sulphite liquor, which by test tube and beaker has been changed from a major nuisance to virtual liquid gold. Formerly these industries had relied almost solely on production of the alcohol from molasses.

NEW KIND OF FUEL

For the fuel dealer, here was a completely new kind of fuel, extracted from the sulphite liquor in the form of a heavy, insoluble "fuel precipitate," with the heating qualities of wood and the appearance of finely cracked coal. This now is wasted in huge quantities.

The new fuel, Berger explained, can be ground from its original form of granules, about the size of a split pea, into powder for blowing into furnaces, or can be pressed into any size lump or log.

The substance, which burns in a manner similar to coal, contains about 6,000 British thermal units for each pound as against about 12,000 B. t. u.'s in average quality coal, or from 5,000 to 8,000 B. t. u.'s in wood, the men explained. In its original form, it would be suitable for use in stokers.

"The recovery of the substance from the liquor is so great," Berger said, "that it comprises at least 75 percent of the fuel used in the production of the pulp from which the liquor is cooked."

BOON TO DAIRY FARMERS

For the dairy farmer it will mean a new source of yeast fodder which is produced in large quantities necessary for and in the course of the production of the butyl alcohol. The yeast, high in nutritional value and vitamin content, is chemically pure and can even be used in the home for baking and by the commercial baker, it was explained.

Recovery from the liquor of the substances, Grondal said, is accomplished by comparatively simple, inexpensive, progressive processes of precipitation, fermentation, and distillation, with a sufficiently high yield of the materials to make it highly advantageous to the industrialist from an economic standpoint.

The liquor, containing about 2 percent of available sugar, which in itself would support commercially feasible operation, also is about 12 percent fuel precipitate by weight, it was pointed out.

Grondal explained that for want of practical use of the liquor, it is being dumped into Puget Sound from mills in this area at a rate of 1,700 tons a day.

MUCH FUEL LOST

This would mean that usable fuel is being discarded at a rate of 192 tons a day in this area—which has a serious fuel shortage.

Although the new-type fuel gives off a somewhat sulfurous odor when it burns, it was pointed out that its use in industrial plants, where the smoke and fumes could be treated at low expense, would release other types of fuel for residential consumers.

MUCH ALCOHOL PRODUCED

From 100 pounds of the recoverable sugar, the process produces 22 to 23 pounds of butyl alcohol; 10 to 12 pounds of acetone (used in paints, solvents, thinners, etc); and about 3 pounds of ethyl alcohol.

Grondal, who 2 years ago began the research work after retaining Berger, and who has been working constantly with Berger since, said the process now is "available to any and all who want to use it."

Grondal's praise for Berger was high. Berger, a veteran of the First World War, is a graduate of the University of Michigan, and studied fermentology extensively in Europe. Returning to this country, he became a fermentologist in the United States Bureau of Chemistry.

Berger later went into consultant work, and before his work here operated several mines in Arizona. In his office the 65-year-old chemist leaned back in his chair and chuckled, and then summed up his 2 years of work as though it had taken only 2 days.

MATTER OF DIET

"It was just a matter of diet for the bacillus that does all the work," Berger explained. "Sometimes they call it the Weissman bacillus, developed by Dr. Weissman, of London, before the last war for production of butyl alcohol from molasses.

"Another name for it is the clostridium acetobutylicum. It's a microscopic, rod-shaped bacillus that divides itself in the middle under normal development. Sulphide liquor was a pretty tough diet for it. He couldn't survive or develop normally and ferment the liquor for distillation.

"We had to add certain chemicals directly to the raw liquor, which would leave the available sugar behind, and then our problem was to get rid of the inhibiting materials which hampered normal growth of the bacillus, which in turn prevented his conversion of sugar to alcohol and acetone.

"It took a lot of work and a lot of experimenting, but we found it at last."

The research work has been under the sponsorship of the Washington State Planning Council.

Scientific Suicide Faces America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement by Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, director of Monsanto Chemical Co.'s central research laboratories at Dayton, Ohio.

Adapted from an address which he delivered March 27 at the annual stockholders' meeting of this company, the statement sets forth his belief that "scientific suicide" will result from this country's failure to train replacements for technical men called into the armed services.

As information, Dr. Thomas has been head of Monsanto's central research organization since 1936. He is a graduate of Transylvania College and of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a director of the American Chemical Society:

Scientific suicide faces America unless immediate and adequate steps are taken to train replacements for technical men going into the armed services.

American college graduating classes have been reduced to 10 percent of their former level. Our Selective Service System has not only virtually eliminated the training of young scientists, but also has made it very difficult for industries and universities to retain young men already trained.

There are thousands of scientists in the Army and Navy doing work of a nonscientific character. Several thousand young scientists in uniform can do no more than several thousand other soldiers on the battlefield, but in the laboratories these young scientists may be able to create new things to hasten military victory and to assure jobs for millions of returning soldiers.

Our situation in America is all the more serious when compared with that of other countries, which are encouraging the training of scientific students. England is not making the same mistake she made in the last war, when she drafted and lost many of her brightest scientific students and young technical men. A case in point is young Henry Mosely, who, in 1913, at the age of 25, had given to the world the first direct experimental evidence for allocation of atomic numbers to the elements. He was killed in action in 1915.

Today, Cambridge and Oxford Colleges are enjoying their highest enrollments in history. England's scientific and technical schools are crowded. No scientist who is 21 years or older is permitted to engage in any work in England, military or civilian, which does not utilize his training, and ample provisions have been made to keep the young scientist in training until he is 25.

A similar attitude toward technical men exists in Russia. No less an authority than Sergi Ogoltsov, Commissar for higher education in the U. S. S. R., stated a year ago that Russia awarded 75,000 technical degrees in 1942 and that the number would be greater

in 1943 and 1944. In peacetime, America awards about 35,000 technical degrees a year.

England and Russia will emerge from this war more strongly equipped with scientists and technicians than at any previous time in history. If the war were over tomorrow, the United States would need until 1955 before our colleges would be able to make up the deficit of trained scientific men in this country.

We approach the post-war era with a pent-up demand for scientific progress and industrial applications of our science by industry, but we are making no provision for supplying scientists whom we must have in order to meet this demand.

Instead of accelerating their training, as we should in order to assure increased scientific accomplishment, we have retarded it. Unless something is done immediately, our country faces scientific bankruptcy. I believe the people of this country should be cognizant of this tragic situation.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the minutes of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit at Richmond, Virginia, Friday, April 13, 1945, on the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT, AT RICHMOND, VA., FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1945

The court convened at 9:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present: Hon. John J. Parker, circuit judge; Hon. Morris A. Soper, circuit judge; Hon. Armistead M. Dobie, circuit judge; Hon. Elliott Northcott, circuit judge.

Proclamation is made and the court is opened.

Senior Circuit Judge Parker, upon the opening of the court, made the following announcement:

"Since the court adjourned on yesterday, we have heard with great distress of the death of the President of the United States; and we take this occasion to give expression to our deep sense of the loss that the Republic sustains in his passing.

"In one of the most trying periods in the history of the country, he has furnished leadership which has been an inspiration to the American people. He has guided the country in the greatest war effort in which any nation has ever engaged. He has preserved unity with our allies amid the most trying circumstances. He has laid the foundations upon which we may build a world order based on law and righteousness.

"It is a tragedy that death should have come to him just as the plans for which he had labored so mightily were coming to successful fruition; but he has left the country the heritage of a great dream and a noble purpose as well as a record of great work splendidly done. He will rank as one of the very great Presidents of the United States and one of the greatest figures ever contributed by any nation to world statesmanship.

"It is not fitting that a United States circuit court of appeals should hold public sessions when the Nation is so deeply grieved by his recent passing. The court will accordingly adjourn as a token of its respect. Any matters demanding immediate attention will be considered by the judges in chambers."

A true copy.

Teste:

——, *Clerk.*

The Sovietizing of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, when we entered World War No. 2, we were told that we were fighting this war for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Supposedly for this reason, 1,000,000 of our boys have already paid with their lives. We have spent more than $400,000,000,000 for this purpose.

However, as developments occur, we find that the people of America have been fooled again. Recent developments clearly point out that all we have accomplished in this war so far is to save Europe from Hitler and hand it over to Stalin, which is just as bad. We have crushed Brown fascism but we are getting in its place Red faseism, which is just as bad, if not worse.

Present developments indicate that all of the freedom-loving people of Finland, Poland, Jugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and others are going to be swallowed up by Red fascism. More than 250,000,000 people of Europe will never see the light of freedom again if Red fascism is permitted to swallow up these countries and butcher the freedom-loving people in these countries.

No matter what small country we turn to in Europe we find the killing hand of Red fascism taking over just as Hitler tried to do. Unless America raises its voice we are going to find a complete communization of all Europe. Did we fight this war to hand 250,000,000 European people to slavery under Red fascism? Did we fight this war to take away the liberties and the boundaries of these freedom-loving countries? Unless the people of the world wake up that is exactly what will happen.

I wish to deal particularly today with the country of Finland to show how the killing hand of Red fascism is crushing those freedom-loving people. I might add that no nation in the world can compare in integrity, honesty, and love of America than the people of Finland. Yet we are silent while the crushing hand of Red fascism is butchering that nation.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.—National Labor Relations Board

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a deplorable example of the undemocratic way in which the National Labor Relations Act is being administered has recently come to my attention. From the information which I now have, it is my firm conviction that an investigation of the policies and practices of the National Labor Relations Board as now constituted is not only immediately necessary but long overdue.

Out in the capital city of my State, in the main plant of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., one of the largest firms in St. Paul, the N. L. R. B. recently conducted an election between a C. I. O. union and an independent union. For the past 10 years the employees of this plant have bargained with their employer through their own representatives. On many occasions during this long period these employees have rejected the attempts of outside unions to become their bargaining representative.

Why? Because this company is one of the most progressive and fair-minded employers in the country in its treatment of its employees. Among its policies are liberal pension and bonus plans, employee profit-sharing, paid vacations, and wage rates which compare favorably with the best plants in the area. Under these circumstances, the employees have preferred to bargain directly with their employer because outside unions had very little to offer them.

Then came the war. More than 1,300 of these employees have entered the armed forces. The plant has greatly expanded to meet the needs of war production. Many new employees have been added to the pay rolls. Many have been added to replace those who are in the service of our country.

The C. I. O. takes this occasion of the war to put on a new drive to organize the plant. An election is eventually called, in which the employees in the armed forces are denied the right to vote. I need not remind you that these employees retain their seniority and the right to return to their former jobs when the war is over. If anyone is entitled to vote in a collective-bargaining election, it is the employees who left their jobs to enter the service in time of war. Certainly these employees have a vital interest in who will represent them when they return.

But in spite of all appeals to the N. L. R. B. the servicemen are not allowed to vote. Finally the election is conducted under the supervision of the N. L. R. B. The employees vote by secret ballot, and the independent wins by a close ma-

jority. Had the servicemen been permitted to vote, no doubt the C. I. O. would have been overwhelmingly defeated.

Then what happens? The C. I. O. trumps up a set of ridiculous charges to prevent certification of the independent. After 7 months of investigation and delay, while employee problems and grievances remain unsettled due to the lack of a certified bargaining agent, the N. L. R. B., on April 23 of this year, outlaws the election and orders a new one.

And on what grounds? Solely because two officers of the independent union tried to adjust a grievance of a returned veteran. There were no other reasons—no findings of unfair labor practice—no charges whatsoever of company domination. There was only one isolated incident where two employees tried to help out a returned serviceman. The N. L. R. B. ruled that this may have created the impression that the company favored the independent union. And thus the election won by the independent is thrown out, and the C. I. O. is given another chance.

These are the methods used by the N. L. R. B. to prevent certification of independent unions. Elections are thrown out on the slightest pretext and servicemen are denied the right to vote. This case and many others reek with partisanship in favor of the C. I. O. Can it be that the political contributions which might be forthcoming through a C. I. O. victory might have some bearing on these decisions? As free Americans we rebel against such undemocratic practices.

Let me say to you the National Labor Relations Act was enacted to protect the right of workers to choose their representatives—whether they be A. F. of L., C. I. O., or independent—or to bargain for themselves if they so desire. The biased administration of this act contravenes the right of American workers to represent themselves, and the act itself is twisted by the N. L. R. B. into a convenient tool for herding employees into the C. I. O. against their will.

The majority of workers in this plant have freely expressed their preference for an independent union by secret ballot. In refusing to certify this union as the bargaining agent, the N. L. R. B. has flagrantly disregarded the expressed purpose of the act it is charged to administer.

Fellow Americans, it is high time that the National Labor Relations Board, an agency of Government in this free land, discovers that this act of Congress it purports to administer must and shall protect the right of all American workers to bargain through representatives of their own choosing, with equal protection for the rights of those who choose to maintain their independence from the C. I. O. or any other labor group. Partisanship such as this, so clearly evident in this case, can only lead to discrediting the agencies of Government in the hearts and minds of the people. I call upon Congress to correct this evil, and to remove all vestiges of fascism in our American institutions.

Leon Fraser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago many people in America and other countries were shocked by the sudden death of Leon Fraser.

Fraser was a self-made man. He lost his mother at the time of his birth. He was brought up by foster parents on a farm in New York. Nevertheless he was to achieve outstanding success in everything to which he turned his hand.

Born in 1889, he was a lecturer and instructor in public law at Columbia University at the age of 25. He made good as a newspaper man. He was successful as a lawyer both at home and abroad. Entering World War No. 1 as a private, he emerged a major, being awarded the Distinguished Service Medal in recognition of his services. After the war he served as executive officer and Acting Director of the Veterans' Administration in Washington. Subsequently at the age of 35 he began to play a major part in the settlement of the difficult post-war problems in Europe.

In 1924 he served as legal adviser to the American delegation to the London Prime Minister's Conference. From 1924 to 1927 he acted as general counsel and Paris representative of the organizations set up under the Dawes plan. In 1929 he attended the Paris Conference of Financial Experts, which drafted the Young plan. In 1933 he served as a member of the committee of experts at the London Monetary and Economic Conference. From 1930 to 1933 he served as vice president of the Bank for International Settlements at Basel, Switzerland, and from 1933 to 1935 as its president.

On his return to this country he became vice president in 1935 and president in 1937 of the First National Bank of New York, being sometimes referred to as "the bank president who had never worked in a bank."

He served also on the Federal Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System, as a trustee of Columbia University and other educational institutions, and as director of several of the most powerful manufacturing concerns in the Nation. He was the holder of five degrees and, in addition to the Distinguished Service Medal from his own country, was awarded decorations for his services abroad by the Governments of Belgium, France, Italy, and Yugoslavia.

It was my privilege to work closely with him for 3 years in Europe at a time when he was general counsel and Paris representative for the Dawes plan under the late Hon. S. Parker Gilbert, then Agent General for Reparation Payments, and, as such, the representative of some 12 allied nations, including America, creditors of Germany as a result of World War No. 1. I knew him intimately. I knew his brilliancy.

Fraser spoke three languages fluently. He knew and commanded the respect and confidence of the leaders in Europe.

He had the ability to reduce the most difficult problem to its simplest terms. He was tactful and resourceful in harmonizing conflicting viewpoints. He could speak effectively to a court, to a jury, or to the public.

He always approached a subject dispassionately and courageously seeking a solution which, in his judgment, would accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

Only recently he appeared before a group of Senators in reference to the Bretton Woods proposals. A veteran Member of the Senate told me after the meeting that Fraser was the most powerful witness he had listened to in years.

He could have been an able Secretary of the Treasury. He could have been an able Secretary of State. He could have filled any position in public life in America with ability and distinction. He was, in my judgment, one of the ablest Americans of his time.

His death at the age of 56 is a tragedy. He could have contributed immeasurably to the solution of problems which we must inevitably face in the days and years ahead.

I include as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, two editorials, the first appearing in the New York Times of April 10, the second appearing in the Washington Post of April 10, both of which speak eloquently of the man and his career:

[From the New York Times]

LEON FRASER

The tragic death of Leon Fraser removes one of the leading financial figures of this country and of the world. Though he was president of one of the most conservative banks in the country, the First National of New York, he was, except perhaps in external appearance, far from the conventional conception of a prominent banker. That was chiefly because he was so much more than a banker. Few men have had such a wide range of experience; few have shown their capacity to succeed in so many different careers.

At college he thought of making a career in literature, edited The Columbia Monthly, and became a newspaper reporter. He swung for a time into political science, won a Ph. D. degree at Columbia, studied law, taught it, carried on pacifist activities, then enlisted as a private in the First World War and ended as a major with the Distinguished Service Medal. After the war he became a public official here in the Veterans' Bureau. He practiced international law in Paris, helped first on the Dawes plan and then on the Young plan for German reparations, attended several international conferences and finally became president of the Bank for International Settlements at Basel.

In all the assignments that came to him he showed both extraordinary aptitude and an extraordinary capacity for work. He was distinguished as a banker for the liberalism of his outlook and for the outspoken courage with which he stated his opinions. But behind the efficient and successful banker that strangers saw, there was a deeply sensitive human being. He remained to the end of his life a student as well as a man of affairs. He never lost that wide-ranging curiosity which

he had shown as a reporter. Those who came to know him found in him a rare warmth and friendliness.

He was a city man, apparently, from sense of duty and not by preference. Always his thoughts must have turned to the farm at North Granville, in the foothills of the Adirondacks, where he had been brought up; and when his melancholia, which he concealed so successfully from the outward world, at last became so intense that he decided to take his own life, it was there, amid the scenes of his boyhood and his dearest memories, that he decided to spend his last day.

[From the Washington Post]

LEON FRASER

Leon Fraser, whose death by suicide has shocked a host of friends in many countries, shone at everything he did, and he did many things in what, in his farewell message to his country neighbors, he called a "crowded and busy life." He had a brilliant career at Columbia, where he became instructor at the average student's age. Then he won his spurs as a newspaper reporter. In his spare time he studied law and was admitted to the bar before the United States entered the last war. Enlisting as a private, he soon became known for his legal gifts, and he ended his military service as a judge advocate. As a lawyer he served in the Reparations Commission, quickly came to the notice of the top officials, and from then on worked as an administrator of German reparations. He wound up his experience in this field as president of the World Bank at Basel, a central bank for central banks. Here he started a banking career which eventually led him to the presidency of the bankers' bank, the First National of New York.

It was, in literal truth, a meteoric career, won not so much by burning the midnight oil, as his contemporary, S. Parker Gilbert, did, but by a rich talent coupled with a compelling personality. No man could excel Fraser in lucid exposition. Whatever problem arose in the interminable arguments concerning the sum of German reparations, which filled up so much of the history between wars, Fraser could reduce it to its essentials and win the respect and admiration of his listeners by his logic and articulateness. He was an ideal choice for the World Bank. Central banking is altogether different from commercial banking, being an art, not a business, and it calls for the imagination and skill in promoting a meeting of minds that Fraser brought to it. Much the same gifts were required at the First National, which caters to banker and big-money depositors, and it seems scarcely credible that beneath his buoyancy and energy there lay a melancholia which induced him, 2 years after the loss of his wife, to take his life. His almost boyish bonhomie seemed to spring from an integrated personality and an untroubled psyche. When he died he was a statesman in the American banking fraternity, and his tragic passing will be mourned far and wide.

Mandates—Trusteeship—Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, I was authoritatively informed I need not worry about Britain slamming the doors of Palestine against the Jews seeking to escape from the Nazi clutches. I was told that the infamous MacDonald white paper would be bypassed. Those words to me were balm. Apparently these words have evaporated into nothingness.

Recently, Lord Devonshire, Under Secretary for Colonial Affairs, announced in the House of Lords that the colonial office had rejected a demand by the Jewish agency for extra immigration certificates in addition to those available under the Palestine white paper. Lord Devonshire offered as an excuse what he termed "information" that a great many Jewish refugees did not want to proceed to Palestine. That statement is as ghastly as a laugh in hell. The Swiss Government recently received several thousand children and adults from various concentration camps in Nazi and satellite countries on condition that these refugees would be subsequently removed to make way for others. Now that the colonial office has refused to issue immigration certificates to Palestine, these refugees will be forced to make the trek out of Switzerland to an U. N. R. R. A. camp for refugees in Algiers. At first, when extra certificates were requested, the excuse offered was lack of ships. Now that there are ships, the British Government assumes the Marie Antoinette attitude of "Let them eat cake."

As usual, Lord Devonshire accompanied his frigid refusal with words of sympathy for the plight of the Jews and trusted that the refusal must not be taken as an indication of a lack of feeling for Jews and that certainly he acted with all good intentions. I remind Lord Devonshire that the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

Sympathy and all the pious utterances in the world did not save the 4,000,000 dead Jews. Words of pity did not save the victims of the steamships *Patria* and *Struma* who were drowned off the shores of Palestine. Phrases of compassion will not restore to the wandering dispersed Jews of Europe the sense of belonging. Common sense tells us that in those areas where when antisemitism flourished and still flourishes in Germany, in Roumania, in Hungary, for example, such antisemitism will not evaporate with military victory. Will the non-Jewish populations welcome them back? Will they find room for them in shattered economies? What should be a matter of course in the restoration of stolen property is being all knotted up by dilatory legal practices. The uprooted Jews seek a place where they can live with national dignity with the freedom and liberty which is the right of man.

To me the greatest pity of it all is the blind spot in the eyes of the leaders of the Anglo-Saxon world. The whole Anglo-Saxon world, least of all our British friends, cannot afford to overlook what a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would mean, not only to the Jews, but to themselves and to the rest of western civilization. To those trained in world affairs, it is obvious that a Jewish Commonwealth, a democratic Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine would be the one solid bastion of western civilization in the East. The Jews with their genetic and religious background based upon the Orient are the best equipped to create the bridge between the East and the West. Yet they are a people who speak the languages of the West, whose cultural pattern has been shaped by western civilization and whose loyalties belong to what is best in occidental heritage. The Arabian world is a jungle of intrigues, of warring interests, of undercurrents of malice. Arabia is the one unknown quantity in the equation we seek to establish of one world. Remember, Arabia has always sold to the highest bidder. In this war, we ultimately proved that we, the Allies, were the highest bidder. As auctioneers of international commodities—I mean oil—they play and will continue to play a cunning game. We pay high now; the next time an aggressor nation or combination of nations will pay higher. Would it not serve Britain and the United States well to know that solidly planted in the midst of this area is a commonwealth dedicated to the interests of western civilization. You might ponder this for a while.

Let us admit, frankly, that we are facing a crisis in the whole situation of the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews. The United Nations are at this very moment meeting at San Francisco. The Jews are not represented as such. Palestine is not represented. Pan-Arabia is well represented. But there is one question that is on the agenda that concerns us both as members of the allied nations and as Jews and that is the question of mandates. Because the whole problem is so intimately related to the problem of Palestine, I believe that tonight we must dwell on the subject for a few moments.

The war has taught us a number of lessons. Heretofore dependent or "orphaned" lands were held under a so-called stewardship by one country. Let us take for an example, the Mariana Islands, the Caroline and Marshall Islands mandated to Japan. They were to be held by Japan in trust for the League of Nations. Contrary to the letter and spirit of the mandate, Japan fortified these islands. She garrisoned and controlled them with uttermost secrecy. Our ships and those of other nations were actually precluded from entering the harbors of these islands. The tragic results for all allied nations of such selfishness on the part of the mandated power are well known.

Before I continue on the question of mandates, permit me to direct your attention to the basic thought expressed in article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. It reads: "To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of

this trust should be embodied in this Covenant."

Palestine and Iraq were mandated to Great Britain, Lebanon and Syria to France. Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria were endowed with independence; they are now sovereign nations. The only class A mandate (so designated by the League of Nations) not granted independence is Palestine.

Keep in mind that the only purpose of the class A mandate was to permit the mandate power to watch over the territory as a mother would over an adopted child. It was never intended for the trustee country to act as though she owned the mandated land and could, therefore, treat it as a colony or subjugated territory.

How Great Britain has failed in her trusteeship you well know. The injunctions of the mandate given in pursuance of the Balfour Declaration were and are ignored. "Unquestionably, the primary purpose of the mandate as expressed in its preamble and its articles is to promote the establishment of the Jewish national home." This unequivocal, this flat and direct statement was not made, as might be supposed, by some fervent espouser of Zionism. It was made by the Palestine Royal Commission, an official body of the British Government, appointed to investigate the administration of Palestine in 1937.

"Unquestionably," the Commission said; yet, today, it remains very much the question.

To all other mandates of the A class was given independence and national sovereignty; to the Jews was given the fatal white paper—is given continual denial of relief.

I say that the system of sole trusteeship of mandates in the interests of international good will and the shaping of a durable peace must give way to a system of international trusteeship. If, for example, three nations were to set up a cotrusteeship with an administrative staff culled from the register of an international civil service, no one nation could act for her own selfish interests. Two nations instead of three might be sufficient. In either case, such a set-up would be a deterrent to rapacious and self-serving patterns of colonial administration. Any covenant covering the terms of a mandate must include the right of inspection by a mandates international commission, and the right of redress of wrongful administration by direct petition to such commission by the inhabitants of the mandated territory. Heretofore there existed no such right of inspection and petitions for redress could only be submitted through the colonial administrator. We can safely say that had the original mandate system, which is said to have been conceived in generosity but born in sin, been so organized, the abuse of power with such dire results would not have taken place. We would not now be faced with the fatal possibility of Palestine becoming an Arab state with a Jewish ghetto attached thereto.

I know that the question is now arising in your mind concerning the possible claims of the United States to islands in the Pacific that will be wrested from Japan. I know that you question the statements made by Admiral King to the effect that we must maintain large postwar army contingents in these islands as protection against possible aggressor nations. I know you are concerned with statements in our Congress demanding immediate action on legislation to annex key Pacific bases, such as the Marshall and Caroline Islands, Iwo Jima, Saipan, and Okinawa.

These are not the views of those of us who look for a strong international organization to build and maintain the peace. We ask ourselves whether we intend to hold bases in the Philippines. Would that be consistent with Philippine independence? The United States now holds bases in New Georgia and New Britain, in Guadalcanal, and the Gilbert Islands. The first two are the possessions of Australia and the latter two of Great Britain. We hold a base in Dutch New Guinea, possessions of the Netherlands. Do we intend to argue that we must take these possessions away from the possessing country because they are necessary to our national defense? If so, we must applaud the annexation of Rumania and Poland by Russia and of Belgium and Holland by Great Britain. Certainly, they too can argue such possession is necessary for their self-defense. Australia is already putting forth her demands. Australia, as Mr. Evatt, her Minister of State for External Affairs, says: "Will naturally regard the arc of islands lying to the north and northeast of our continent" as "of crucial importance." She is "vitally concerned" about "who shall live in, develop, and control these areas so vital to her security from aggression." So with covetous eyes France gazes upon the river Rhine and the Rhineland and the Ruhr; so Britain with the Low Countries; and so Soviet Russia with the borderland with Germany and with access to the sea through the Baltic, the Black Sea, and the Persian Gulf. Are we to permit the wild scramble to begin again? Under the Atlantic Charter we are pledged "to seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or otherwise." Would not outright ownership or even sole trusteeship which has been translated by deed into outright ownership be a contravention of this basic principle recited in the Atlantic Charter? What dismal seeds of danger are we sowing thereby? We the United States, and freemen everywhere, must see to it that the Atlantic Charter shall now become a "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." Roosevelt could not rest in his grave with such vile hands tearing asunder his Atlantic Charter. Incidentally in the Panama Canal Zone, where sovereignty lies in Panama, our interests of defense have been well served.

The answer lies not in sole possession or sole trusteeship, but in international cotrusteeship with special accommodations for the needs of the country whose area is most vitally affected. The rights of visitation must be accorded all members of the United Nations. Some compromise could be worked out as to Pacific bases where the United States might have unfettered control in military matters but we would have to respond to our cotrustees in all nonmilitary matters.

I would like to ask this question. Against whom are we so busy protecting ourselves? I mean not only the United States, but Great Britain, France, and Russia as well. Against each other? Are we starting a world peace conference in an atmosphere of mutual distrust? Are we putting our faith in international organization or into weapons of war, island bases for war, and cordons sanitaire?

To go back specifically now to Palestine, which is so intimately tied up with this problem of mandates. A cotrusteeship for Palestine, save for an immediate establishment of a Jewish democratic commonwealth, is a must.

Without fear of contradiction I say that Britain has betrayed her trust in violation of all moral and legal precepts. She violated the Balfour Declaration, the terms of the Mandate signed by 52 nations, the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. She ignored the condemnation of the white paper by the Permanent Mandates Commission. She ignored the weight of evidence of the suffering of the Jewish people. Unlike the war of 1914, this time Britain did not have to woo the Jewish people to cast in their lot with hers. They were on her side, anyway. So, instead, she appeased the Arab world, an appeasement that bore no good fruits for her as is in the case of all appeasement. If I am harsh, I am also just.

I know you will be interested in the picture that the United States presents with reference to the Jewish problem. With the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there has gone from us a loyal friend, a true believer in the dignity of man, be he Jew or Gentile. He fervently hearkened unto the Voice of Leviticus: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

He exemplified rare courage and the understanding heart when he devised the War Refugee Board which was an independent agency with no authorization from Congress. It has rendered and will continue to render unequalled service to the Jews fleeing from Festung Europa into free and liberated lands.

It was Roosevelt who, despite caustic comment and virulent opposition, set up the Free Port at Oswego, N. Y. There over a thousand who escaped the Hitler scourge are comfortably housed and protected.

It was he who set up with no aid from Congress the Fair Employment Practice Committee. He did this in the spirit of the vision of Micah: "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid."

It was he who in 1938, realizing that thousands upon thousands who would be rendered homeless and helpless by Nazi terrorism needed all possible outside help, issued the call for delegates to come to a conference at Evian, France. Thirty-two nations responded. The work of that conference was continued at Bermuda.

The hand that never faltered was Roosevelt's.

Now he is gone to the Valley of the Shadow. The burning torch is handed to Harry S. Truman.

Naturally we wonder what manner of man is he. Certainly we must remember that the problem of the Jews, together with its political implications, its historical associations rich in story, the 2,000-year-old trek of the Jew wandering from land to land, all these may be like a new book to him, read but not studied. Frankly I believe he will study that book and study it carefully. We take note that on a number of occasions President Truman showed his sympathy with the work of the Jewish people. He has more than once defended the Jews against those who would slander and defame them. In October 1943 he appeared at the St. Louis B'nai B'rith centennial meeting and denounced the slurs which had been made on the Jewish part in the war effort. During his term as Grand Master of the Masons in Missouri Truman appointed a rabbi as lodge chaplain.

After his inauguration as Vice President at Chicago, on March 17, 1945, President Truman made a strong plea for religious tolerance. He said:

> Bigotry and intolerance are the munitions of our enemies. Evil doctrine of discrimination frequently imported from gangster nations plague certain areas in America. Racial and religious intolerance is being preached here by agents of our enemies as well as by innocent victims of their propaganda.

These exemplary sentiments were highlighted and emphasized in his statement before the joint session of Congress on the Monday following the death of Franklin Roosevelt. The new President said:

> Our forefathers came to our rugged shores in search of religious tolerance, political freedom, and economic opportunity. For these fundamental rights they risked their lives. We well know today that such rights can be preserved only by constant vigilance, the eternal price of liberty.

However, we must mark that when Truman was asked his opinion on the then pending Palestine resolution in the Seventy-eighth Congress in the fall of last year, his published reply, while containing a degree of sympathy for the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews, did seem somewhat uncertain because of an apparent fear of muddling in diplomatic waters at that time. He did, however, embrace the Palestine plank in the Democratic Party platform.

This leads me to this important observation. Truman, beyond doubt, has a deep and warm sympathy for the Jewish cause, but he needs much nurturing and guidance on the question of Palestine. It is incumbent upon the friends of Palestine to win his ear and pour therein the tearful prayer that he give us aid and comfort.

There is little room for complacency. There will be those who do not see eye to eye with us. They will seek to tug and pull Truman in other directions. We must be pragmatic; we shall take nothing for granted. Those of us, therefore, who are in Washington have our work mapped out for us.

But—and this I wish to emphasize and underscore—the time is past when we placed our reliance upon personalities and friendships. We have depended too much in the past upon Chaim Weizman's friendship with high-ranking officials in the British Government, upon friendships such as that of Stephen Wise for President Roosevelt. It was almost like the politician's "personal contacts" that we hear so much about. We placed too heavy a burden on the "top layers." I do not say this in criticism of these exemplary gentlemen. They are my esteemed friends. They have rendered yeoman service. I only inveigh against the system we allowed to grow up. It's time for us to translate the need for Palestine into democratic action. This means that the people, the good people of Canada, of Great Britain, of France, of the United States, must act themselves through their legislatures, through bills passed in their Congresses and Parliaments, through expression of public opinion on radio networks and forums, in newspapers not only Zionist bulletins, via editorial expression, through magazines and publications of wider scope. Enough hush-hush and enough, "Let George do it." It is a movement of the people; let it be such.

Let me go back for a moment to mandated territories. It is to be noted that there is free and open discussion on all mandated territories except in the case of Palestine. As to it, world officialdom assumes an ominous silence. Let us talk about Palestine; let us write about Palestine; let us force the discussion of Palestine into the open. Let us ask of officialdom: "What have you to say?" "What is being done?" "What shall be done?"

If the United Nations are to prove that not power will prevail, but moral law and order, then the Palestine pledge must be redeemed. By so doing, it would thereby reject for all time the noisome ideology of nazism. Smaller nations would find therein a reason for rejoicing and a basis for trust. We will know thereby that the shaping of a better world has really begun.

Should Palestine remain in the clutches of imperialism, then even the dispassionate in temperament and the judicious in mind, could he but peer into history, would quail before the verdict of posterity. Twenty-five years hence, when the record of our dark age is read, posterity will find it incomprehensible that a people should have been permitted to continue in travail when the possibility of rescue was at hand. What decent answer can be given? The small intrigues and cheap expedience in which the Palestine issue is being drawn before our eyes shall be a source of burning shame in days to come.

Almost Unbelievable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the representatives of the Polish underground government revealed themselves to the Soviet military authorities in the following circumstances:

During the first days of March the delegate of the underground government received an oral invitation to participate in a conference with the representatives of the headquarters of the first White Russian front.

On March 11, the delegate of the Government and a few other members of the underground received identical written invitations, signed by Colonel Pimienow of the N. K. W. D., stationed in Pruszkow, near Warsaw, acting in the name and on order from the commander of the first White Russian front, General Colonel Iwanow, with whom the Poles were to meet.

In his invitation Colonel Pimienow stressed the urgent necessity and the importance of this meeting and guaranteed with the word of an officer of the Red Army the personal safety of all persons of the Polish underground government who will accept the invitation.

Vice Prime Minister Jankowski dispatched an emissary to Colonel Pimienow to check the authenticity of the invitation. The emissary returned with confirmation of the previous negotiations and with additional information that: (a) The conversations with General Colonel Iwanow are in regard to the coming out of the political parties in Poland; (b) general clearing of the atmosphere; (c) inclusion of the underground political parties in the common current of the democratic forces of independent Poland.

The conference with General Colonel Iwanow was to be preceded by initial talks with Colonel Pimienow.

On March 17, Mr. Jankowski had a conference with Colonel Pimienow and informed him that:

(a) The Polish underground army has been definitely dissolved.

(b) The underground political parties would be willing to begin open activities, but the existing circumstances—which he described in detail—do not permit them to come out.

(c) It is entirely up to the Soviet authorities to create an atmosphere permitting open political activities and to assure freedom of action for all citizens.

In addition, Mr. Jankowski requested that General Iwanow elucidate on the following questions:

First. The scope of competence of the Lublin government and the N. K. W. D. and the political rights of the command of the front.

Second. Why the command of the first front and not the command of the Soviet forces is seeking contact with the Polish underground government.

Third. Is the command acting with the knowledge and approval of the Big Three commission or Mr. Molotov's?

Finally Mr. Jankowski stated that he will demand facilities for sending a delegation to London in order to consult with the Polish Government and political authorities.

On March 20 Mr. Jankowski received a note from Colonel Pimienow that, first, General Iwanow is authorized by the Soviet headquarters, of which he is a member with personal approval of Mr. Stalin, to conduct the talks; second,

Moscow is eager to settle this problem as soon as possible; third, a plane will be placed at the disposal of Mr. Jankowski to take his delegation to London; fourth, General Iwanow is willing to come to the meeting in the nearest future.

Separate talks were held by Colonel Pimienow with the representatives of the Peasant Party, the Labor Party, and the National Party. During these conversations he stated that "the Lublin government will have to agree with the decisions of the command of the front which are official."

On March 27, 1945, the following persons went to Pruszkow for conversations with General Iwanow:

Delegate and Vice Prime Minister of the Polish Government, Jankowski, Labor Party.

President of National Unity Council—the parliament of the underground—Puzak, Polish Socialist Party.

Colonel Okulicki, former commander of the underground army.

All three did not return to the meeting of the National Council which was to be held that day in the afternoon.

On March 28, the following went to Pruszkow for a meeting with General Iwanow:

Assistant delegate of the government, Adam Bien Walkowicz, Peasant Party.

Minister Jesinkowicz Opolski, National Party.

Attorney Pajda Traugutt, Polish Socialist Party.

Kazimierz Baginski, secretary of the Peasant Party.

St. Mierzwa, member of the executive committee of the Peasant Party.

Stypulkowski and Kobylanski, from the National Party.

Chacinski and Urbanski, from the Labor Party.

Czernik and Michalowski, from the Democratic Party.

Debski Jan, as an interpreter.

None of them returned; the "higher authorities" of the underground supposed that they were taken to the east in automobiles.

On March 30, three unknown civilians and one Russian officer arrived in a car in Wierzchoslawice, residence of Wincenty Witos, former prime minister and president of the Peasant Party, and took him to an unknown destination.

Undoubtedly the disappearance of the 16 leaders of the underground quickly spread throughout Poland.

The authorities sent a radio message to the Polish Government in London with a request that the British Foreign Office inquire as to the whereabouts and the fate of these leaders.

On April 25, this question was discussed in the House of Commons in London, where Minister of State R. Law said that the Foreign Office sent an inquiry to Moscow, and that this matter is occupying the earnest attention of the British Government, but he did not enter into a discussion.

On April 28, the Polish Government sent a cable to Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Eden in the United States with a request for clarification of this matter during the stay of Mr. Molotov in San Francisco.

Whether a reply was received, and if there was a reply, what was its contents—is not known.

What Goes on in Poland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out how Russia treats Poland.

January 1, 1945, Lwow: At the beginning of January over 6,000 Poles were arrested in Lwow within 1 week, among them 20 professors of the university, also priests, students, employees of the gas and electric companies, and so forth.

The usual pretext for arrests is—collaboration with the Germans. The belongings of the arrested persons were stolen.

January 19, 1945, Krakow: Krakow is entirely under the control of the Soviet Army. The soldiers are looting Polish stores and warehouses and even private homes. We ask for your intervention with the Allies.

The Soviet authorities posted notices calling for the registration of all men between the ages of 16 and 65. All typewriters and mimeographs are to be registered, while arms and radio sets are to be relinquished to the Soviets.

The provisional Lublin government is the only authority for announcing mobilization. All activities of other organizations are regarded as espionage for the benefit of Germany.

January 22, 1945, Krakow: The population shows no enthusiasm toward the soldiers of the Berling army and a feeling of deep depression prevails.

The arrests have begun among the civilians for the time being.

January 24, 1945, Krakow: The Soviet armies entering our territories are plundering and looting towns and villages, every soldier is on his own. Simultaneously strong propaganda is active and mass meetings are organized.

There is news of executions of the members of the underground in Miechowa and Slomniki. Radziwill has been arrested in Balice. In the county of Miechow the Soviets arrested 40 farmers and peasants for participation or collaboration with the underground.

The Soviet offensive surprised the nation. The population's stand is very patriotic. The temporary joy over the expulsion of the Germans is combined with general distrust toward the Soviets.

In most of the cities the Communists have coordinated organizations and in localities where they were active before their action is very weak.

There is general disorganization and complete lack of administrative apparatus. The supply situation is out of control.

The N. K. V. D. began its terror with arresting all judiciaries. There is a lack of discipline within the Red army, which is looting the country and drinking heavily. The population is oppressed by steady demands of quarters for the army.

A discreet anti-British propaganda has been observed within the ranks of the Soviet Army.

January 25, 1945, Krakow: Small units from the Berling army are arriving in the city. Command posts are being installed with strong escort of the N. K. V. D. Draft to the units is expected. These units lack officers, and there are hurried courses preparing officers for duty. There is a strong propaganda among the soldiers, but nevertheless 70 percent of them are for the Polish Government in London, according to one of their officers.

January 26, 1945, Krakow: The Soviet armies have engulfed Poland. The masses of men, left without supplies, are stripping the country of all its stores of food as well as livestock. The Soviet military authorities have no regard at all for the Lublin government; they act independently. Unfriendly and hostile attitude toward the Poles is apparent.

One aspect of the propaganda is to prepare the armies for a march past Berlin—even on to London.

The Lublin government is a group of fanatics and Russian servants, without a plan, without an ability and will to govern, and without men to conduct the work. Their attitude towards Russia is servile.

The statements of the ministers delivered at the meetings in Krakow promising full sovereignty, coordinated economic system and private ownership to the Poles—are only empty phrases without the support of their masters. The Government silently agrees to the fact that a visa from the Soviet Ambassador and a permit from the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs is necessary for a trip to Lwow.

Yesterday, Zaruk, sent from Lublin under the name of Michalski, has been made the mayor of the city. A supposed Socialist, Wolas, and a Democrat, Tor, were appointed as his assistants. The city council is not completely organized and is composed of the members of the Democratic Party and unknown Socialists and members of the People's Party. The authorities for the province are similarly organized; Mr. Mitera has been named as the Governor. The new authorities had not as yet begun to function.

The stores are closed, there is no electricity and gas, there is no bread and other supplies, all means of communication are at a standstill.

The soldiers are looting homes and raping women in the streets. No one is safe.

The arrests began with judiciaries in cities and with farmers in the villages. This group of people is to be eliminated altogether as a caste.

There is a planned destruction of the underground army.

Prolongation of this state of affairs may result in a spontaneous armed revolt.

January 27, 1945, Krakow: The Soviet Army is frightfully plundering and robbing the civilian population in towns, in villages, in homes, and on the streets. They are taking food, watches, and jewelry. Women are raped by officers as well as by soldiers, who say they have a right to the Polish women for freeing Poland and shedding their blood.

Please intervene with the Allied governments because we are afraid of an armed resistance by the population.

January 30, 1945, the general headquarters: Terror against the underground army and civilian authorities is increasing. Sixteen officers of the underground have been arrested in Miechow. A number of officials were arrested in Piotrkow. Chaos is reigning everywhere without a hope for improvement. The supply and fuel situation is awful. There is a lack of communication.

The attitude of hostility toward the Red Army and the Lublin committee is increasing.

There is evidence of anti-British propaganda conducted by the Soviets and the Lublin government. During a parade staged by one of the Lublin men in Czestochowa on January 25, a banner with the words "Down with England" was carried.

January 31, 1945, Krakow: Minister Skrzeszewski expressed his thanks to the professors of the Jagiellonian University and the underground school authorities for continuing their educating program during the war.

All rights of the university will be respected, however; presidents and deans of universities will not be elected but appointed.

All teachers of secondary schools must register with the school board and must state what they did during the war. The secret classes are to be continued until February 10.

January 31, 1945, order of the commander of the underground army:

Soldiers of the underground army, I am giving you my last order. Continue your work and activities in the spirit of regaining the full independence of the Polish state and the defense of the Polish people against destruction.

Strive to be the leaders of the nation and to realize the independence of Poland. Each of you must be his own commander in this action.

In the belief that you will obey this order and that you will always be faithful to Poland and to facilitate your future work, I am dissolving the underground army with the permission of the President of Poland and releasing you from your oath.

In the name of service, I thank you for your devotion in your work. I deeply believe that our holy cause will win and that we shall meet again in a real, free, and unoccupied Poland.

Long live free, independent, and a happy Poland.

February 1, 1945, Bialystok: Between November 8 and 15, 1944, 143 boxcars filled with men were sent out from Bialystok and Grodno, that is about 8,000 men were deported to the east of Russia. The deportations of Poles continue. The soldiers of the underground are mistreated in prisons.

Enforced drafting to the Berling Army continues. Raids are conducted. Information from Wilno and Nowogrodek is just as appalling. N. K. V. D. stages bloody orgies.

The population under the leadership of the underground army resists heroically and believes in an early help from the legal Polish Government.

February 1, 1945, Lodz and Piotrkow: The Soviet soldiers are robbing the population of food, watches, money, clothing, and shoes. Wild requisitions are conducted in the villages, the peasants are tired of this practice.

Leaflets of the Lublin government and the Soviet officers announce the destruction of the underground army and the national armed forces, whom they call Fascists.

February 1, 1945, Krakow: Many farmers are being arrested in the vicinity of Krakow. The soldiers are looting the villages. Peasants are beaten, while women and girls are raped. In town the soldiers force their way into private homes, demanding quarters, food, and liquor under threat of guns. There is no difference between the action of the officers and soldiers.

The Russian soldiers have a permission to send 16-pound food packages to Russia from territories west of the Vistula River.

The Soviet quartermaster does not supply the army with food, leaving the soldiers a free hand in requisitioning, which turns out to be plain robbery.

February 5, 1945, eastern Poland: On February 5, Poles in higher posts, such as professors, doctors, and so forth, were being forced into signing a memorandum denouncing in insulting words the Polish Government and the underground, debasing it and calling them bandits and slaves of Hitler, and expressing tribute and support without reservations to the Lublin group.

This document, prepared by the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow, is presented for signature after mass arrests and deportations, which create an atmosphere of depression; further arrests follow after.

February 6, 1945, Lodz: The food situation in Lodz is very difficult. N. K. V. D. has begun the arrests of former members of the underground. Two of the officers have been already arrested.

February 6, 1945, Piotrkow: N. K. V. D. began its activities. All food supplies have been requisitioned. Famine will come in a few weeks. Arrests of the members of the underground are increasing. All Polish life is directed and controlled by the N. K. V. D.

February 7, 1945, Czestochowa: There are at present 192 English soldiers from P. O. W. camps; among them are 2 officers, 2 noncommissioned officers, 7 sergeants, and 180 others. They are all afraid to go to Russia and ask for intervention of the British authorities, for a safe conduct to England. They are not treated as well as soldiers of other nationalities, who come from the German camps. Their food, quarters, and sanitary conditions are very poor. They are forbidden to contact the Poles, who are helping them as best they can.

I am giving the names of a few of them: Flight Lt. Hammet Patrick, R. A. A. F., Flying Officer Symington Fonn Wilson, R. A. F., Sgt. O'Dwyer Ernest, Royal Tank Regiment, Stalag 344, Sapper Orr, New Zealand Engineers, Stalag VIII–B.

March 7, 1945, Lublin: The Union of Mutual Peasants' Aid is a totalitarian organization of social and economic character. A circle is organized in every rural community and the farmers have a moral obligation to belong to it. Where the People's Party did not enter, the Polish Workers Party has control. The officers of the Warsaw province were nominated by the board of the convention from the Polish Workers Party. The government has a second set of people in case something goes wrong. The first is secret.

The department of security is directed by Radecki who is responsible to the N. K. V. D. and not to the government. Militia operates discreetly in the villages. All commanders are Russians. The administration is undecided, chaos and bureaucracy reign. Hostility toward Lublin government and the Soviets increases everywhere. The Polish Workers Party is under the control of the N. K. V. D. and is used for political intelligence service. The Soviet contingents of food are much higher than the German were. There is danger of hunger. The system of prices and wages is so corrupt that bribery is flowering.

February 8, 1945, Krakow: The impotency of the administration, the unpopular tendencies of sovietization of Poland increase the will of resistance. The population counts on the intervention of the Allies.

The general opinion may be summed up in this statement: "We were able to endure 5 years of German occupation—and we will endure these few months of liberation."

February 9, 1945, Krakow: The Lublin armed forces are of the belief that there will be a war between Russia and the western Allies—they are hoping for a junction of all armed forces of Poland under the command of the London government.

The Soviet officers who are in command of all units from a battalion up and of special units, guard the line of thought of the soldiers.

February 11, 1945, Krakow: Registration of officers is being carried on in Krakow. According to unconfirmed reports about 2,000 officers have been registered.

February 12, 1945, Krakow: A mass return of Poles from Germany has begun, most of them are completely exhausted and wretchedly poor.

A pressure through the diplomatic channels upon the Soviet Union and the Lublin committee is needed so that speedy aid is organized for those returning and those still remaining near the fronts in Germany. Clothing, food, and medical supplies are urgently needed and should be supplied by international agencies.

February 13, 1945, Krakow: Enormous migration is under way. The inhabitants of the eastern provinces taken by Russia are walking to the western regions. Many are returning from forced labor in Germany, also those freed from the concentration camps. There is a consider-

able number of Germans from labor and military camps and a large number of Hungarian Jews.

The incompetent Lublin administration cannot give sufficient aid to those exhausted and ill masses. The social agencies are also helpless because they have no money or food supplies. Aid of foreign agencies is urgently needed.

The situation of the population in Krakow is catastrophic. The prices are rising, there is no employment. Factories are either not yet opened or their production is insufficient. The ration of bread has been cut.

The Soviet army of occupation has Lublin money printed in Moscow. It is said that the soldiers received about 5 milliards of such money. Despite promises of measures for deflation, the country is at the height of inflation. Mass murders are occurring in the eastern provinces of Poland, especially in the oil region.

February 13, 1945, Radom: One of the units of the underground army, which participated in a battle with the Germans in the region of Mniszek, where about 200 Germans were killed, was surrounded and fired upon by the Soviet units, after the battle; finally it broke through, losing 30 percent of its men.

The Russians are destroying the underground from the first day of occupation. Hundreds of underground members have been arrested and accused of activities for Britain. The Russians are untiring in their efforts to find the staffs of the various units of the underground. They endeavor to find and to seize all arms, to register all commanders who will then be jailed, and to mobilize all men from the years 1911 to 1924.

The realization of this plan is giving speedy results through the use of disguised Soviet officers, who are placed within the ranks of the underground army and the enforced registration of all officers and noncommissioned officers. All officers who do not agree with the Russian proposals disappear completely. In the Sandomierz region the Soviets have arrested more Poles during the few months of occupation than the Germans during 5 years.

Officers from the Berling army are warning the men of underground not to admit their association with it, because they're doomed to destruction.

There are mass arrests of judiciaries and public prosecutors.

The press and the speakers at meetings are officially hostile toward the London Government and the underground army, whom they promise to destroy as traitors.

The various government offices are being constantly reorganized as incompetent and unable to cope with the situation. In Kielce there have already been four governors and six mayors.

The attitude of the population toward the new government is hostile. There prevails a strong attachment to the London Government and Polish forces fighting outside of Poland.

The members of the underground are depressed because their work did not bring such results as they anticipated and they themselves must now hide as criminals.

Address of Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, at Launching of the U. S. S. "Franklin D. Roosevelt"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal at the christening of the U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* Sunday, April 29, 1945, New York Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.:

You were invited here today to witness the launching of a new aircraft carrier, one of the newest and largest carriers in the United States Navy, exceeding by many thousands of tons of weight, and by a substantial differential in defensive armor and antiaircraft fire power, any American carrier now sailing the seas. When your invitations were sent to you, this vessel was to be named the *Coral Sea*. With the approval of President Truman, the Navy has changed the name of this vessel and you are attending the launching of the new supercarrier, the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*.

It is a matter of deep regret to President Truman that he is unable to be with us today. When I asked him whether his engagements would permit his attendance he responded in language which he has permitted me to quote:

"Nothing in the world would please me more than to be present at the christening of that vessel. It is with the deepest regret that I deny myself that pleasure; I do so only because I deem it of paramount importance at this juncture to be constantly available at my desk in Washington."

It is appropriate that the Navy, which the late President loved and served so well, should make this ceremony one of reverent recollection of his memory.

It is appropriate that this vessel should bear the name of our dead Commander in Chief, because he was greatly interested in the design of its type, as he was in the design and building of all combatant vessels. The freshness of mind and the sweep of imagination which he brought to every naval problem, whether of construction or of logistics or of strategy, arising out of the great conflict in which we are still engaged, bore testimony to the universality of his intellect.

For example, I recall the instant approval he gave to the expanded aircraft carrier program early in 1942 when we began the building of the great fleet which has reduced Japanese sea power to a point where it is impotent even in its inland seas.

The President had great belief in the effectiveness of air power and particularly in the value of naval aviation when integrated with sea power. His quick and imaginative grasp of the possibilities of the small escort carriers played a large part in the launching of the program for their construction and later in the substantial enlargement of that program. Again his faith was justified—the baby flat-top, that mighty midget which has been so effective in the war against German submarines and some of which, like David against Goliath, survived the gunfire of heavy Japanese surface craft in the Battle for Leyte Gulf, is today a factor in practically all of our vast operations in the Pacific.

In these, as in many other matters of naval architecture and of war at sea, President Roosevelt showed a readiness to accept new ideas and an accommodation to the swiftly changing pattern of modern war which were an inspiration to the leaders of our Army and Navy.

The *Franklin D. Roosevelt* will take the sea against our Japanese enemies with a displacement of substantially over 45,000 tons; carriers of this class will be capable of housing and launching from their decks a greater number of planes than any other carriers of ours or any other nation. Their characteristics in terms of speed, fire power, and defensive armor will reflect the carefully evaluated experience of this war.

This supercarrier is a far cry from the first experiments in the use of combat airplanes from the decks of ships; experiments carried on by the Anglo-American Navies, who were responsible for the development of the carrier concept. The first flights from the deck of a ship were made from the United States cruiser *Birmingham* in 1910 while the first major ship to be converted to the carrying of planes in substantial number was His Majesty's ship *Furious*.

To the American Navy went the distinction of greatly increasing the scope and scale of this new naval weapon. That we were able to do so was due unquestionably to the fact that the United States Navy was able to develop the uses of air power as an integral part of its strength, and the British will be among the first to admit that the loss of control by His Majesty's Navy over its air power was a most serious and dangerous mistake. I think it is well to remind the Nation that the tremendous power which we now possess in the United States Navy was developed because the Navy was free to exploit sea and air power according to its own experience and traditions. Before we attempt to merge this highly individual service into a single conglomerate I believe we should take deep and serious thought.

This carrier is a symbol of our determination to prosecute the war against Japan to complete victory. In contemplating this new giant of the sea I am reminded of Woodrow Wilson's address on the day we declared war on the Central Powers: "Germany has once more said that force and force alone shall decide whether justice and peace shall reign. * * * There is, therefore, but one response possible from us: Force, force to the uttermost, force without stint or limit."

The Japs, like the Germans in 1917 and again in 1941, did not comprehend the extent of the force that we could bring to bear against them, nor did they realize how rapidly we could bring it to bear. The contrast of what we had in the Pacific in the midwinter of 1942 and what is available now may therefore be of interest to Premier Suzuki and Admiral Mitsumasa Yonai, Minister of the Japanese Navy.

In February 1942 we had in the Pacific Ocean four carriers—and by October of that same year the number was reduced to one. That was typical of the thinness of the line by which we held our long-extended communications in the Pacific and it was typical of the slender margin by which we held that pivotal point in the Pacific war, the Island of Guadalcanal.

Today we have in the United States Navy a total of 26 carriers. We have in addition to those a total of 65 escort carriers.

In early 1942, we had 16 battleships on hand as against 23 today; 38 cruisers of all types as against 67 now; 173 destroyers then and 386 now; no destroyer escorts against 368 at present; and 112 submarines compared with 240 today.

This tremendous accretion to our naval power occurred between the tense and tragic days of early 1942 and the present, a span of a little over 3 years. I doubt if we ourselves had any comprehension in those days

of the tremendous pace at which we would be able to build our military power. I am sure the Japanese did not have such knowledge.

I am equally sure the Japanese now realize that this accumulation of power and our ability to deploy it against their homeland almost at will spells the doom of their great dreams of 4 years ago, although they may fight as the Germans have fought, a desperate war of suicide and self-extinction.

For us it suffices to remember what our late President said in the enunciation of his war policy and what was repeated by his successor, President Truman, in his simple and effective opening speech before the Congress on April 16: "Our demand has been, and it remains—unconditional surrender."

In closing I am constrained to take advantage of this, as I do every other opportunity, to point out that we must keep the ability for swift and effective application of force if the peace bought at a bitter price is to be maintained.

The retention of force by the United States does not conflict with the aspirations which are taking shape at San Francisco. On the contrary, that force in our hands and in the hands of our allies in this war is essential if the events at San Francisco and the events that take place at similar meetings afterward are to have any meaning.

The Navy dedicates this vessel to the aims of the man whose name it bears: winning the war and keeping the peace.

A National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, communications received by me from veterans' organizations and other residents of this area, requesting the establishment of a national memorial cemetery in or near Troy, indicate great enthusiasm for such a project.

I am in entire accord with such a movement, and will be happy to lend it my support. The heroic deeds of men and women of this community, both in civic and military endeavor in all the wars in which this Nation has been engaged, are recognized almost universally.

The recent unusual distinction of awarding two Congressional Medals of Honor in this community serves to magnify the glorious services rendered by the fighting forces of this area, and in my opinion is of sufficient merit to make indisputable the claim that a national memorial cemetery should be established here.

Resolved, That Trojan Post, No. 469, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in regular meeting assembled in Troy, N. Y., on the fourth Tuesday in the month of April, in the year 1945, be recorded as in favor of the establishment in this area of a national cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this post, individually and collectively, work untiringly to promote and advance the interests of this community in order that such a shrine to commemorate the sacrifices of those who, in combat with the enemy, gave their lives on the altar of service to this Nation from this vicinity, be perpetuated; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to Representative DEAN P. TAYLOR, Thirty-third Congressional District, New York, with the request that he use his good office to effect and promote the creation of such national cemetery in these parts.

In witness hereof, we the undersigned have affixed our signatures and the seal of our organization this 30th day of April 1945.

[SEAL] THOMAS L. MCGOVERN,
Commander.
FREDERICK J. DOUGLAS,
Adjutant.

Poland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell what goes on in Poland today.

APPRAISAL OF THE SITUATION IN POLAND

February 12, 1945, Warsaw:

First. The population is very exhausted and economically poor. At the beginning there was joy upon the expulsion of the German occupant—but the new one brought disappointment.

The sight of the Soviet soldiers, who are often in rags, their Mongolian faces, their behavior, creates the impression of having Asiatic hordes in our towns and villages. They seem infinitely below our standards and people wonder how such an army could have defeated the Germans. Plunder of stores, homes, livestock, and other supplies, and heavy drinking of the Soviet soldiers create a hostile attitude of the population.

Second. The initial activities of the Lublin government are marked by total incompetency in taking hold of the situation. There is chaos and a complete lack of plans. Even the organization of city governments meets with failure. In addition the financial state is chaotic due to the fact that the exchange of old money for new was limited to 500 zlotys per person, because sufficient amounts have not been printed. This brought a complete economic stagnation in many localities. Stores are closed, people are unwilling to work, because wages and prices are not stabilized. The Lublin government lacks men with organizational abilities, it is ignored by the Red army and totally dependent upon the N. K. V. D. A permit issued by the Red army commander is necessary to see the members of the Lublin government.

Third. The attitude of the population toward the armies of General Zymierski is marked by curiosity and pity. The soldiers are emaciated and poorly dressed, often in torn shoes. The officers, from major up, are Russians. This army is under the command of Generals Zawadzki, in charge of political education, and Korkuyc, the chief of staff. Both supposedly are members of the N. K. V. D.

These are Polish soldiers, but not a Polish army. We have information that very few men will be drafted into this army because the Soviet Government does not wish to have large Polish forces.

Fourth. The peasants, as well as the city people, are greatly disappointed. One can often hear that the Russians are worse than the Germans in some instances.

February 21, 1945, Eastern Poland: During January 3 to 15 there were mass arrests—60 percent Poles, the remainder Volksdeutsche. Among the Poles, the Russians arrested 21 professors, priests, professional men, and others. The jails are full; conditions are appalling; the prisoners are beaten and hungry. Numerous executions of various nationalities are carried out, about which no details may be obtained. Among those arrested in August 1944 and January 1945, two trainloads, about 2,000 people, were sent to labor camps in Voroshilowgrad. Postal stamps with the image of Hitler, German newspapers, or books were used as evidence against those arrested.

February 22, 1945, Bialystok: The N. K. V. D. is conducting the arrests of members of the underground with fury. The investigations are marked by bestiality, the prisoners are beaten with barbed wire, pins are stuck behind their nails, ribs are broken; all prisoners are deported to Russia. Up to January 1 the N. K. V. D. deported 5,000 men from Grodno, 10,000 from Bialystok; all were sent to the east to an unknown destination.

The Polish national committee of liberation is cooperating with the N. K. V. D. The contingents are three times as high as previously. The forests are being cut down completely. Soviet soldiers are looting and murdering the population and raping women. Soviet military propaganda announced the liberation of France by the Soviet forces and is preparing the army for a war with Turkey, Japan, and England. They are afraid of America. The drafting to the army has been called off from March 1; only volunteers will be taken.

The population trusts and supports the London Government. The commanders and soldiers of the underground remain on their posts.

Behind the Curzon line the N. K. V. D. is gathering Poles, many of whom are murdered on the spot. Those who are healthy and strong are sent to labor camps or the army. Polish families are forcibly deported to the west of the Curzon line. The White Russian population is organizing partisan units against the Russians. They want to be in Poland.

February 25, 1945, Lublin area, Radom: In Lubartow, near Lublin, the Russians opened a camp for the officers of the underground and officers from General Zymierski's army who were accused of belonging to the underground or of other political "crimes." There are 6,000 officers in the camp, which is guarded and controlled by the N. K. V. D. Sanitary conditions, food, and treatment of the prisoners are terrible. Groups of prisoners are being taken into unknown destination every few days. Most of the of-

ficers taken away are exhausted and tortured.

In the Radom region all jails are filled with soldiers of the underground; arrests continue.

We feel that after individual arrests, mass arrests will follow after the organization of our army is revealed.

Lieutenant governor of the Kielce Province, Andrzejewski, and a few other members of the London government, have been arrested at the beginning of February.

The Crimean decisions saddened the population greatly, but, regardless, the attitude toward the provisional government and the Soviet Union continues to be hostile. The people have a faith that our cause will be justly settled and that the legal Polish Government will not permit the partition of Poland and to subordinate the nation to Russia.

March 1, 1945, Lódz: The feeling toward Russia among the forces of General Zymierski, stationed in the region of Lódz, are not very friendly. Many of the White Russians voluntarily claim to be Polish.

The N. K. V. D. arrested 23 officers of the underground in the last 10 days. The majority of the population regards the entrance of the Soviet armies as Bolshevist occupation of the country. The people are waiting; no enthusiasm is shown for the forces of General Cymierski. Attitude toward the Lublin group is decidedly unfriendly. The population is exasperated, hungry, and resentful toward the chaotic administration of the Lublin government. The Russians are plundering the country.

March 1, 1945, Bialystok region: The region of Bialystok supports the legal Polish Government, the Poles as well as the White Russians; there is no question of minority. The population is following its leaders. Concessions bring bad results; the enemy is impressed by courage. Every sign of weakness results in a new wave of arrests and deportations to Russia. The population resents the decision of fifth partition of Poland.

A statement by radio of the Polish Government to the effect that the eastern provinces are still a part of Poland would lift the morale of the people. The people are different now; they suffer and fight and do not recognize weakness.

The N. K. V. D. continues mass arrests of the members of the underground. Most of them are deported to Russia. A total of 370 boxcars filled with men were deported to Russia in February from the regions of Bialystok and Grodno. If this continues no Poles will be left behind the Curzon Line within 2 months.

The prisoners are held in basements, antiaircraft dugouts, sheds—in darkness and without any bedding. During examinations and questioning the prisoners are beaten and tortured, or kept without food and clothing in the cold. They are accused of espionage for England and the Polish Government in London and collaboration with Germany. Death rate is very high. The commanders of the underground are deported to the interior of Russia or are completely lost.

Posts of the N. K. V. D. have been organized in towns and cities for the purpose of destroying the underground. The liberation committee is cooperating and aiding the N. K. V. D. in arrests. Please intervene with the Allied Governments.

March 16, 1945, Lódz: Numerous arrests of men and women by the N. K. V. D., who seek staffs of the underground units. We cannot endure very long in such conditions. The local N. K. V. D. is under the control of Raknimow. There are very few military units, only posts of the N. K. V. D.

March 16, 1945, Warsaw: Seven men and mayor of the underground administration were shot by the security department in Mniszek Mazowiecki during the night of March 2. The bodies were left in the street. Arrests continue. During examination the prisoners are beaten, kicked, and tortured.

March 8, 1945, Lwow: Unorganized draft to the Army. Evictions, plunders, contingents enforced for the third time. Many transports of forcibly evicted population.

March 10, 1945, Lwow: The Big Three conference did not change anything. Arrests and mass deportations continue. One thousand people were sent out on March 3 from Lwow, additional thousands from the villages. Ages 14 to 70 years, 20 percent are women.

The conditions of the evacuees are horrible. Many die on the way. In Russia they are represented as Germans or collaborationists and the treatment of the Russian population will speed their destruction.

If nothing can be done to stop these arrests and deportation please intervene for more humane methods.

People are completely depressed, all are willing to leave and travel behind the San River, peasants and workers as well.

We beg you to save us from destruction.

February 25, 1945, eastern Poland, belated information: The present terror surpasses all we went through and the German occupation seems mild. The prevailing conditions will result in complete liquidation of all Poles in eastern Poland.

Captured Nazi Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have just received today from Lt. J. C. Petrone, Jr., of Marshalltown, Iowa, a captured Nazi flag. Only recently this emblem of tyranny and horror was floating over the ramparts of our enemy; now because of the skill and courage of men like Joe Petrone, Jr., it has been torn from its standard and those who carried it are bowed down in humiliation and defeat.

Lieutenant Petrone was appointed to the Military Academy from the Third District of Iowa. While there he made an excellent record and he has been a great credit to the State and Nation. It is men like he who made possible the VE-day which we now celebrate.

The Home Guard—Prepared Address of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman was scheduled to address the graduating exercises of the twenty-eighth session of the National Police Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation here in Washington on Saturday, April 14, but owing to the untimely death of President Roosevelt the exercises were called off.

Mr. Truman had his address prepared and has authorized its release. It is such a splendid contribution on the subject of law enforcement that I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

It reads as follows:

It is a special privilege to be present at the graduation of you guardians of the home front. It would be more than tragic if, while fighting a world-wide war to preserve our democratic ideals, we would neglect the constant battle against evil forces at home.

Fortunately, the specialized training provided here at the National Police Academy, under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, assures America that we will continue to have well equipped specialists to maintain peace and order within our borders.

Please permit me to pay special tribute to the man, who, in addition to founding the National Police Academy, has played such an important part in improving law enforcement throughout the United States I refer to your distinguished leader, the moving spirit behind the Federal Bureau of Investigation, my good friend, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

You men have been especially fortunate in being selected for intensive training at the greatest crime clinic in the world. Here you have learned the wonders of modern scientific methods. You have acquired skill in using the latest weapons available. Even more important, here you have been taught the all-essential need of quick cooperation with all law enforcement agencies, local, county, State, and Federal. If we hope to make progress for the benefit of all society, we must carry on a well-coordinated, all-out attack on crime.

You officers have had the opportunity to study the most modern methods of crime prevention and crime detection. Your intense training here at this most efficient center, should pay you and society great dividends in the years to come. You learned not merely the use of scientific methods in combating the enemies of society, but also the urgent need of effective cooperation with all the other useful agencies. Only by a Nation-wide, coordinated campaign by all law-enforcement agents can we achieve the highest degree of efficiency, which in itself will be one of the most effective means of preventing antisocial acts. Certainty of

criminal apprehension is the most powerful check on crime.

Tremendous progress has been made in criminology during the last century. In the past the criminal was punished in a spirit of revenge, without proper consideration of the many factors which gave rise to this problem of social maladjustment. Criminals are not born such. They are usually the unfortunate product of their environment, experience, and social background.

In view of the many economic and health factors, which frequently give rise to criminal tendencies, there remains a tremendous job for society to accomplish. Our statesmen must eliminate most of the outstanding inequities in our social structure, providing greater individual security, improved health, and a better economic opportunity for all our people. Then a most important step will be taken in removing some of the main reasons for crime.

The war has greatly complicated the problems of law-enforcement agencies. In the first place, there remains the constant danger of saboteurs, spies, and enemy agents, all anxious to undermine our military power and the public morale. Fortunately, the splendid work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the able direction of Mr. Hoover, has made these enemy efforts of little value. However, constant, vigilance is still necessary for the preservation of life and property at home.

Another factor which hit agencies charged with the maintenance of law and order has been the call to arms of many of our most active officers. Yet, despite all handicaps, utilization of modern scientific methods have made possible the record achieved. As in all matters mortal, there still remains room for improvement.

The most distressing aspect of the current criminal record in America is the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. Youngsters still in their teen age constitute one of the major groups of our criminal offenders. For the average layman, it is difficult to realize that the most frequent arrests in any male age group is 17, 18, and 19 years, respectively.

In a review of the 1944 figures it is especially shocking to learn that in a democracy where the voting privilege is denied until the age of 21 our youth under 21 years committed 35 percent of all robberies, 52 percent of burglary, 35 percent of larceny and 63 percent of auto thefts. Of 110,000 crimes committed against property, fully 40 percent of the offenders were less than 21 years old. What a sad commentary upon the training of the youth of America.

As officers charged with the duty to protect society from crime, you have a most serious responsibility. You will require the active cooperation of all law-abiding citizens. For the most effective discharge of your duty, you need the help of every social agency created to improve living conditions in your community.

It is far better and cheaper to prevent crime than to pursue the criminal and, after detention, try to rehabilitate him. For example, to direct the excess energy of youth to the gymnasium of a boys' club may prevent his joining a juvenile gang.

The future of America depends upon the character and quality of our youth. The primary problem is one of home training, general education, and character building. However, as leaders in the cause of a progressive order, you should actively promote and help coordinate all welfare and social agencies which can be utilized to ease your burden.

Present social conditions naturally reflect the great dislocations caused by the war. Mothers with patriotic purposes work in war plants, while their neglected children become social problems. The strong guidance of fathers in service is missing in many homes. Children, who should be in school, are working long hours and, though helping the war effort, sometimes associate with the wrong kind of people. Many spend their salaries seeking release from wartime emotions.

Americans dare not wait until juvenile delinquency becomes more critical before combating the causes. We must act now to protect the welfare and future of our youth.

The total number of selected law-enforcement officers from every State of the Union, as well as leading foreign-police agencies, who have graduated from the National Police Academy, now total 1,049 men. These officials all know the methods taught here. They are all disciples of modern crime detection. These officers can and will be of great assistance in the fight for a decent social order.

Real peace and order cannot be obtained by vast armies of policemen merely trying to use force and arms to crush crime by old-fashioned methods. Today, more than ever before, we need quality, not just quantity, in our law-enforcing agencies. Small, but efficient groups, operating carefully and intelligently, can accomplish far more than a large untrained force. You are being sent forth to assist your community by applying the latest scientific methods placed at your disposal by this specialized training. You will guide others to appreciate the great benefits of modern techniques and efficient Nation-wide cooperation in combating crime.

Today, millions of our young men are fighting throughout the world for the preservation of democratic decency. It would be tragic indeed if they came back to find that the home front had fallen down on the job. Our veterans have the right to expect us to safeguard their homes and their relatives, despite all wartime difficulties.

In this sacred trust, the home guard will not fail.

At home here we still have a tremendous task ahead of us. The dislocation of families by war work in distant plants, the growing threat of juvenile delinquency, and the psychological reactions of individuals exposed to the emotional hardships of war, all present problems of the first magnitude. If we intend to insure the proper social climate which will permit orderly progress in keeping with our ideals, all of us must face these new problems frankly and act effectively.

The modern law-enforcement official needs far more than a nightstick and a gun to maintain peace and order. The efficient officer must know the nature and extent of local social problems. He must use scientific tests, as well as psychology. As a progressive leader he should effectively mobilize all available agencies in his locality and throughout the country for the prevention as well as the detection of crime. This is a large order, but the times call for men of large stature.

As bigger social problems are presented, America needs better trained men to solve them. You are indeed fortunate in having the opportunity of association with the best and receiving the finest training available in your specialized profession. By your conduct and character you can make your profession one of the most progressive and useful in our national life.

In a few months the National Police Academy will celebrate its tenth anniversary. During this decade tremendous things have been accomplished by its graduates. If we had time it could be shown how much money society was saved by the special training of these graduates. We could list also the arrests made, convictions obtained, and pardons recommended by these officers.

No set of statistics, however, can adequately convey the heartache averted, nor the deep-felt gratitude for crimes prevented, for lives saved, for missing people recovered, and for the countless worthy services rendered. Even the most comprehensive reporting system cannot reveal these things. For all such essential services, society is indeed grateful to the law-enforcement officers, especially to the graduates of this splendid academy.

Our fighting men on all fronts are today going through a most strenuous ordeal. They are bravely offering their lives so that we may live our democratic way. The heroes on the battlefront surely deserve all praise and credit for their noble fight.

The general public, unfortunately, does not fully appreciate the fact that right here at home other heroes are waging a relentless war against another deadly foe—the modern criminal. This public enemy is resourceful, crafty, and efficient. His attacks are frequently powerful and against the weak. Your bitter conflict against crime is endless.

To check the constant ravages of crime requires character of the highest order. As well expressed in the motto of the National Police Academy, to win your war you need "knowledge, courage, integrity." The omission of any one part of this trinity of virtues makes the other two practically useless. Like the three-legged stool, it simply cannot stand on two.

The world would be a much better place if more people possessed these great virtues—knowledge, courage, and integrity. I am confident that, after your practical experience and intensive training, you will continue to be the strong champions of law and order. With your essential character and tested ability, you will render a lasting service to your community and to your country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article which appeared in the Catholic magazine America under date of April 28, 1945. The author of the article is Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., one of the foremost Catholic intellectuals of the country and presently a member of the faculty of Georgetown University. It not infrequently occurs that those who teach principles and theories do not recognize their practical application. Father Parsons, as author, editor, educator, and lecturer, not only taught the principles which he has set forth in his article, but is realistic enough to recognize those principles though cloaked in the wrappings of the New Deal. The article follows:

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: A LOOK AT THE RECORD

During the first Roosevelt campaign in 1932 there was considerable discussion at Democratic headquarters in New York over what should be done about the so-called Catholic vote. Mr. Roosevelt himself was firmly convinced that there was no such thing, but he did allow that there might be much disaffection among the followers of Al Smith, and he was willing to take that into consideration. He had no anti-Catholic feeling himself; in fact he was fond of pointing out that 16 of the 17 on his immediate staff at Albany were Catholics. On the other

hand, it would be manifestly absurd to tell the Catholics how much he loved them.

A POPE SHOWS THE WAY

In August of that year this writer was asked by him to come to Albany to talk it over. I told him that the best way to attract Catholics was to talk like a Catholic in social-economic matters. With the quick uptake that was characteristic of him, he said with a laugh: "You mean that Encyclical of the Pope last year? That's much too radical to talk in a political campaign." The net result was that I was to send the "brain trust" what I considered a typical passage from Quadragesimo Anno which he could use in one of his speeches. I chose the passage in which the Pope shows the results of unrestrained competition:

"It is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, which they administer at their good pleasure.

"This domination becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood to the whole economic body, and grasping in their hands, as it were, the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will.

"This accumulation of resources and power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition, which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience.

"This concentration has in turn led to a threefold struggle. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles. Finally, the clash between states themselves."

CHARTING THE COURSE

It is, of course, the passage which Henry Wallace read in New York recently and dared the press to identify. It was spotted immediately, but nobody remembered that Roosevelt had already used it. He quoted it in his Sunday afternoon talk at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, and again on a Sunday in Detroit, along with similar passages from Protestant and Jewish sources. It is that Commonwealth Club speech which writers are fond of citing as containing the original blueprint of the Roosevelt New Deal. On the radio, the night of Roosevelt's death, I heard a half dozen speakers say that it marked the end of an era. They were wrong. Roosevelt's life and death together marked the beginning of an era. The end of an era came at the precise moment of that first inaugural when, with the world crashing around our ears, and sick with fear, we heard his vibrant and confident voice proclaim: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

It was often called, especially in its early days, "the Roosevelt revolution." It was a shocking thing for those who tried to make themselves believe that we are not an integral part of the world and who closed their eyes to the fact that still more drastic revolutions were taking place in most countries of that world.

SIGHTS ON CENTER

Roosevelt was commonly accused of two contradictory things: he listened to people and took their advice; and he was headstrong and followed his own will. Both statements are true. He was probably the most indefatigable listener of his time. He listened to every shade of opinion. Then he saw an opening somewhere to the right or left of center (to use his own quarterback metaphor) and he shot everything through that. But he always had a good idea in his mind of where was the center. He was accused of being deflationary and inflationary at the same time. He was. And with characteristic skill he managed to keep us from going to either extreme.

I think that here lies the key to his conduct. I have never known a New Dealer—and I have known my share of them—who was not furiously angry at him at one time or another. And, of course, those who had had their way for several generations and their dupes—along the lines of the Pope's words above—were permanently angry at him. The New Dealers were more often pleased with him than the right wingers, naturally; which means that he more often shot through left of center than right. But he still never lost sight of center. The other countries of the world were not so lucky.

PERMANENT REFORMS

The result was that he left a permanent structure in the country's Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—which succeeding administrations will perhaps amend and perfect but will not abolish. He left the capitalistic system intact, though hedged around with restrictions, at which it has chafed because it had never had them, but which it has come to accept. Evidence for this is that the last two Republican platforms and candidates have substantially endorsed them.

The fundamental principle behind many of these restrictions was, for a Catholic, that impressive statement of Leo XIII, repeated 40 years later by Pius XI, on social welfare legislation:

"The function of the rulers of the state," said Pius XI, "is to watch over the community and its parts, but, in protecting private individuals in their rights, chief consideration ought to be given to the weak and the poor." And then, quoting Leo XIII, "For the richer population is guarded by its own defenses and is in less need of governmental protection, whereas the needy multitude, without the means to protect itself, relies especially on the protection of the state. Hence, since wage workers are numbered among the great mass of the needy, the state must embrace them under its special care and foresight."

The National Labor Relations Board, safeguarding the workers' right of collective bargaining; the Social Security Board, caring for the widow, the orphan, the aged, the unemployed, the disabled, the blind; the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, protecting the workers' equity in their homes; the Farm Security Administration, which has to date turned over 36,000 tenants into farm owners; the Fair Labor Standards Act, which guarantees a minimum wage, safety, and health in factories, and decent hours, and abolishes child labor in interstate industries; the Federal Housing Administration, to aid the States in clearing slums and building decent homes; the Fair Employment Practice Committee, to protect the Negro, the Jew, the Mexican, and all racial and religious minorities in their employment; these are the permanent welfare agencies which will always be connected in the memory of the American people with the name of Roosevelt.

If you asked him, he would have told you that these were and are the New Deal. But for him, they would not be in existence now. For Catholics, they are the concrete realization of American society's corporate obligation to practice the seven corporal works of mercy. I think they were such for Roosevelt, too. Both Willkie and Dewey endorsed them in their campaigns, and if Eric Johnston or Harold Stassen is the next Republican candidate, they will also endorse them. Barring upsets, these achievements of the New Deal are permanent.

On the broader economic field, there were other far-reaching reforms: the Securities and Exchange Commission, which put an end once for all to the bad old practice of using people's savings for gambling purposes; the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which guards the welfare of the food producers in an industrial civilization; the reciprocal trade agreements, which attempt to alleviate some of the more obvious absurdities of our high-tariff policy; the withdrawal of monetary gold from private manipulation, a long-overdue reform; these, too, are New Deal, but perhaps not so permanent as the others, for the finance-capital forces whom they curb have declared war on them, and they may triumph. For all his influence, Roosevelt never did succeed in breaking the "immense power and despotic economic domination * * * concentrated in the hands of a few" of which Pius XI spoke. If anything, the war has, unfortunately, made for the strengthening of that concentration and control.

TEMPORARY CHANGES

Besides these fundamental changes in our governmental structure, there is also a multitude of smaller, overlapping agencies, which are mostly transitory in nature and which, but for the war, would have been abolished or merged with others, whose functions they largely usurp. It is these agencies (I am not speaking of the strictly war agencies, whose lives are all limited by law) which have largely given a pretext for ridicule and attack on so-called bureaucracy, as a sprawling and proliferating growth. For these Roosevelt must bear the blame along with Congress. They never were very strong and, frankly, they existed only for the purpose of affording jobs for politicians' friends. They were the price that was paid for the fundamental agencies. That is the reason I have not listed them (there are dozens and dozens of them) in this attempt to assay what is likely to be regarded as permanent in Roosevelt's policy.

IS THE NEW DEAL DEAD?

What will happen now that Harry S. Truman is President?

Nothing is more common at this present writing than to say that the New Deal is dead. But what is the New Deal? To the professional politicians, and to the newspapers and columnists that are beholden to them, it means Hopkins, Rosenman, Baruch, Niles, Frankfurter, Pepper, O'Mahoney, Wagner, Biddle, Douglas, Black—in other words, a new, mostly non-political group, who asked for and got the jobs. There will, naturally, be another set who will get the patronage and the Senate will be happier. (Much of the so-called coalition of southern conservatives and Republicans has to do with patronage. In the face of that, mere legislation is often only a plaything). In his later years, Roosevelt was mostly indifferent to patronage.

TWO NEW DEALS

To brooding conservatives, the New Deal was largely a sinister Communist plot, an essential change in our Constitution. Apart from the fact that the essential New Deal legislation I have listed above was declared constitutional, and that it was Chief Justice Hughes, no radical in his later years, who led the way in that, I think that few people have ever realized how Roosevelt, consummate politician that he was, used the Communists. There was no known Communists in his Government (or even any party-liners in any responsible position), but there always was an uncontradicted impression that Communists were all over the place. I believe that this was deliberate. If he was to get anywhere, it was necessary that there be established a force to the left of him, for legislation is always the result of compromise.

With nothing to the left to give him bargaining power, he never would have been able to reach the center.

That is why, in 1939, in a re-issue of the "Bishops' Program" of 1919, Archbishop Mooney was able to say, in his foreword, that 10 of the 11 concrete proposals made in it had been wholly or partially realized in legislation—since 1933. Of course, it also explains why the essential New Deal legislation has been accepted by every political party. The fact is there is no Communist, or Socialist, law on our statute books.

There is, however, another New Deal that must be taken into account. That is the New Deal that exists in the inflamed imaginations of some conservatives. It is the New Deal they were persuaded would come into existence if things went on as they had. This state of mind was no accident, either. It also was a Roosevelt asset, and can be, and most probably will be, discarded by President Truman. He will have the advantage of pressure from C. I. O. and P. A. C., and if he really wants to pursue a middle course also, he can always point a silent finger in their direction. So this imaginary New Deal, the one that never existed but was always feared and spoken of as if it did exist, can be said to be dead. It is doubtful if President Truman has the inclination, even if he had the skill, to use this bogey as Roosevelt did.

CREDITS AND DEBITS

Roosevelt's three terms were a turbulent time. He himself was a formidable fighter, his enemies said even a dirty fighter. It is true that he was supremely self-confident—it was his greatest fault, and led him into the worst of his mistakes, for it often turned into arrogance. He is not known to have pardoned an offense to him as a public official, and he had a long memory. This was the other side of a character which also had a deep and almost fierce feeling for the unfortunate and the underprivileged. It was this combination of aggressiveness and tenderness that drove him to the long series of legislative enactments which, as leader of his party, he had Congress adopt. Most of what was important in the work will survive. It has become a part of America.

Truman Seen Prodding Japan To Quit While Quitting Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, naturally every American was happy when VE-day arrived. To know definitely that the shooting has stopped in Europe and that the Allied armies have conquered the barbarous Nazis of Germany is sufficient to bring about a day of rejoicing. On the other hand, we must realize, too, that much remains to be done before we can have complete rejoicing. Many families are sad today knowing that their sons will never return to their homes again, and many more of our youths will be sacrificed before defeating the forces of Japan. Our President put it well when he said there is work and more work ahead. There are some who feel that the planners are afraid Japan may fold too quickly and cause industrial confusion. Such ideas cannot prevail; our youth cannot be sacrificed just to provide jobs. I am sure the American people would be only too glad to tolerate industrial confusion and unemployment for a little while, if that is the price they would have to pay to save the slaughter of any more of their sons. I believe the following article by Mark Sullivan bears on this very point and is worthy of reading:

TRUMAN SEEN PRODDING JAPAN TO QUIT WHILE QUITTING IS GOOD—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS PRESIDENT SOUGHT TO EMPLOY VE-DAY TO HELP LAST ENEMY POWER REALIZE SIZE OF FORCES ABOUT TO DESCEND ON IT

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—To radio listeners President Truman's VE-day speech and proclamation may have seemed largely ritualistic, the sentiments called for by the occasion. To a great extent this impression was correct. The expressions of rejoicing over peace, the allusions to the debt we owed the dead, and the expressions of gratitude to God—in President Truman's case five times repeated—were what might color any utterance by any head of state on such an occasion.

But newsmen who had been present at a preview press conference got an additional impression, strongly. A half hour before the radio address to the public Mr. Truman, to some 200 newsmen in his office, had partly read and partly summarized his speech and procalamation and the accompanying documents; and as he spoke, had interjected comment. From his comments and from the emphasis he put on portions of his speech at this informal reading one could grasp some things that obviously were much on his mind.

PREOCCUPIED WITH TALK AHEAD

Broadly he seemed less preoccupied with the accomplished past than with what remains to be done. One would say his chief concern was that the people should hold their faces to the task ahead; over and over he repeated the word "work," and once told the newsmen that this was the point to be emphasized. The strongest impression this writer got was that Mr. Truman would feel concern if America, at this half-way point in the war, permits rejoicing over present triumph to prevail over dedication to the last half of victory. What he regards as most to be borne in mind on VE-day is that we are only half way through.

In the same spirit of looking to the future it was obvious to newsmen that he wished to use the occasion to speak to Japan. More accurately, he wished the occasion of itself to speak to Japan rather than his words. He wished Japan to take warning of the concentration of military might—the greatest ever assembled in history, Mr. Truman told the newsmen—now about to descend upon it. In this there was implicit invitation to surrender, but it was implicit only. There was no spirit of threat or bluff. He merely told the Japanese and left the inference to them.

What he said we would do was an exact statement of what we are actually in course of doing, no more, no less. Mr. Truman is a factual person; in his communications he is austerely concrete.

One other impression stood out. In his radio address was a phrase, "a peace rooted in justice and in law." That was as far as Mr. Truman went in his public address, but to newsmen he emphasized and expanded upon the words. To Mr. Truman, a peace based upon law and justice is not a mere phrase; it has a specific meaning to him, differentiated in his mind from other conceptions of the coming peace, and it expresses what he wants the San Francisco Conference to produce.

In any utterance or action the substance is inseparable from the manner, and the manner is a reflection of the personality of the principal.

PRESIDENT FREE FROM STRAIN

The public, now forming its impression of a new President, got opportunity from his radio address. The newsmen, in his direct presence at the press conference, got more. It was what would have been to many men an occasion for strain. Within a few minutes, just as soon as the press conference should be over, he was to go on the radio with an address of world-wide importance. But neither the shortness of the time for what he had to say to the newsmen nor the imminence of his radio address led to any tension on Mr. Truman's part.

To most persons the mere imminence of going before the microphone, even for an ordinary address, might have been occasion for jittery anxiety. In Mr. Truman's case, not at all. In compressing what he felt he should say to the newsmen into a strictly limited 20 minutes or so, he was brisk but not hurried. In his conduct of the press conference he made an impression of businesslike command of the situation and of its details. When, a few minutes before 9, one of his aides spoke up to remind him that the time was getting close, he took the reminder in with his brain rather than with his nerves. Quickly yet carefully, and preserving complete clarity, he epitomized what he had to say to the newsmen into the necessary time. Then, again with briskness but without hurry, he, with his aides, left the office to go to the White House room in which the radio apparatus had been set up.

The Forgotten People of India Need Your Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by American Relief for India, Inc.:

1. INDIA, VICTIM OF BOTH FAMINE AND THE WAR

India, which holds more than one-sixth of the world's population, is the forgotten nation of the world. Her impoverished millions, who even in normal times were able to eke out only a bare existence, have suffered pitifully during the past 3 years, ravaged by a combination of famine and war.

The great famine that raged through Bengal and other provinces from the middle of 1943 to February 1944 caused at least 1,000,000 deaths and left a tragic legacy. For every person who died from starvation a dozen survived. Undernourished and lacking the food to restore their health they are easy prey to diseases which daily claim victims. Malaria, amoebic, and bacillary dysentery, cholera, skin diseases, night blindness, pneumonia, and bronchial infections are the foes which old and young, their bodies wasted by hunger, are ill-prepared to fight.

Those who suffer most are the women and children. In Bengal alone the famine left 100,000 orphans, and tens of thousands of women in the ravaged areas were left destitute. They subsist principally on rice or a native variety of sweetpotato. Fish, meat, eggs, fresh vegetables, and fruit, vital to rebuilding undernourished bodies, are beyond the reach of the meager funds of these people. Many thousands of the men in rural populations, due to the war's dislocations, are without means of earning a livelihood.

India's tragic plight, moreover, has been greatly accentuated by the war. The Government, through fear of an invasion by the Japanese, put 2,000,000 natives into uniform. In addition, India was a base for concentration of tens of thousands of American and British troops. On top of all this the war cut off much rice-growing territory, upset an already frail transportation system, paralyzed the fishing industry in the mouths of the Ganges, and created countless other hardships.

Other highlights of this war-created situation are: The country's transportation system, always inadequate, is virtually monopolized by the military. Deteriorated rolling stock, depleted by shipments to the Middle East to meet the Axis threat there, moves troops and military supplies. The same is true of India's roads. Normally bad, there now is no labor, materials, or money to keep them in repair. There are too few trucks for civilian supplies. The inevitable result of this situation on railroads and highways is that movement of desperately needed food and medical supplies to stricken areas is curtailed and sometimes stymied. In one area, East Bengal, where the network of the Ganges River makes life virtually amphibious, the people are without boats because the Government requisitioned them early in the war when a Japanese invasion seemed imminent. Today the vast majority of those boats have been lost, destroyed or else have rotted into disuse. Thus there is both a complete break-down of transportation in this area and the people are deprived of the fish which formerly provided them with much of their food.

Food prices, stimulated by vast purchases by the military, have skyrocketed from three to seven times pre-war levels. Wages have lagged and an Indian laborer who earns from 8 to 20 cents day, can afford only rice or other foods deficient in vitamins. Meat, fish, fruit, and vegetables are beyond his purse. The Japanese occupation of Burma cut off one of the principal sources of India's rice supply and shipments from other countries for civilian needs have been drastically reduced as a military necessity. Thousands of war refugees who fled from Burma and other countries settled in Bengal and neighboring areas, bringing new diseases and imposing an additional strain on meager food supplies. The British and Indian Governments, in the face of the war and political tension, have found it impossible to cope effectively with the situation. India lies almost prostrate, half starving and wracked by disease.

2. AMERICANS RESPONDED TO INDIA'S S O S

The cry of the dying and starving in India was answered in 1944. On January 13, 1944, the President's War Relief Control Board was informed by the American mission in New Delhi (diplomatic representation of the United States of America in India):

1. That the relief needs of the civilian population are abnormal, due to the famine;

2. That there is extreme distress in the areas where great numbers of American forces are concentrated;

3. That it is important to demonstrate to the Indian people that America is not indifferent;

4. That supplies should be sent rather than money; and

5. That the American Red Cross or the American Friends' Service Committee (Quaker) should, with the aid of some American personnel, organize distribution of relief supplies in India.

The President's Board asked the American Friends' Service Committee to organize a relief effort in Bengal and other distressed Indian areas. The Quakers accepted this call to service with the full approval of the American Government, the Viceroy of India, the Governor of Bengal, and Indian leaders of every group.

The National War Fund promised financial support and contributed more than $540,000 up to September 1944 through the British Relief Society. When its support ceased financial aid from two other sources enabled the Quakers to carry on. The A. F. of L. and C. I. O. earmarked $200,000 of their contributions to the war fund for India relief. Governor Casey, of Bengal, one time Australian minister to the United States, gave the Quakers a substantial sum from the Bengal civil relief fund.

American Relief for India, Inc., is a citizens' committee organized late in 1944 to mobilize the necessary support to assure the continuation of the American relief program in India.

Its board of directors comprises Rufus M. Jones, honorary chairman; Henry F. Grady, chairman; J. Edgar Rhoads, president; William Phillips, vice president; Guy Emerson, treasurer; Frank Aydelotte, William Green, David Hinshaw, John Haynes Holmes, M. Albert Linton, Henry R. Luce, George Medalie, Philip Murray, Victor F. Ridder, and Sumner Welles.

3. WHAT AMERICANS HAVE DONE FOR INDIA

When the Quakers reached India to begin work they found that the famine had been halted by vigorous action in which the British Government, the Government of India, and the Provincial Governments, had collaborated. Grain, shipped from Canada and Australia, had been distributed; food rationing and price control had been instituted; canteens and medical stations established and a campaign undertaken to cultivate an additional 12,000,000 acres. The British and Indian businessmen had rallied with financial support. Essential medical supplies were lacking and were available only in the United States.

At the start the American relief workers established an organizational "blue print" and principles that contributed immeasurably to the success of their work. Few in number, even when augmented by British Quakers, the Friends Service Committee workers devoted themselves to showing the people of India how they could help themselves. Local agencies were used to distribute supplies and these outlets included such diverse groups as only India offers—Hindu, Moslem, Baptist, Red Cross—200 agencies in all maintaining 4,500 different centers. Included were 88 Christian missions, Protestant and Catholic. It was decided that supplies would be distributed without distinction as to religion, caste, or politics. The people were told that the aid had come from Americans.

American aid, administered by Americans, has brought to India's suffering humanity the food to build wasted bodies, drugs to fight disease, and funds and counsel to aid in their rehabilitation. Milk, vitamins, and sulfa drugs share with the relief workers the credit for the success so far attained. More than 150,000 daily attend canteens set up in many villages, for children and mothers, nursing and expectant. Evaporated milk sent from the United States, and some from other countries, too, is distributed by the India Red Cross under Quaker supervision.

Multivitamin tablets—30,000,000 of them from the United States—have been distributed by local committees through a distribution that is systematic and controlled. The reputation of the "little black pills" previously unknown to the natives has spread. To them it is "magic" as it builds vitality to fight disease that menaces them and combats night blindness and skin afflictions from which many suffer.

Two million sulfa tablets have served as a spectacular aid to the medical men's battle to combat streptococcal infections, dysentery, cholera, sores, and venereal disease. Other basic medicines, such as atabrine to fight malaria, have been supplied from America to supplement the Government's meager supplies.

Rehabilitation has been aided through establishment of training centers where weaving, cane making, pottery, sewing, and embroidery are taught. Widows and children eagerly attend. With small loans destitute fishermen, cane workers, carpenters, and weavers are aided to buy nets, boats, cane, tools, and thread to again become self-supporting.

4. FUNDS ARE VITAL TO SUSTAIN RELIEF PROGRAM

Approximately $100,000 monthly is needed to enable the Quakers to carry on this practical and effective humanitarian work of mercy in the name of America.

American Relief for India is making a direct appeal to the American people to contribute $1,200,000 to sustain the relief work during 1945.

This direct appeal is made necessary by the decision of the National War Fund which rejected the request of American Relief for India to allocate a share of the money contributed by American citizens for this work. The War Fund expressed the hope that "your important program may be financed adequately in some other way" but that the War Fund "must of necessity concentrate its resources on liberated areas."

The President's War Relief Control Board recognized the relief work in India as a war relief measure in authorizing American Relief for India to undertake an independent appeal for financial support. The board itself recommended the relief program to the community chests of the Nation in an unprecedented endorsement. It set forth the following reasons for approving the independent appeal:

1. The program proposed by American Relief for India must be construed as a war-relief measure.

2. Increasing importance of military operations in the China-Burma-India theater and continued presence of American forces in India make it desirable to express American interest in conditions in the areas where the American soldiers are stationed.

3. The program serves a significant humanitarian objective in addition to being important to the war effort.

4. The British and Indian authorities have expressed their approval and the American Minister in New Delhi vigorously urges continuation of the relief program.

In addition, the American Relief for India Committee's program has the endorsement of the United States State Department, the President's War Relief Control Board, the British Ambassador in the United States of America, the Indian Agent General in the United States of America, the Labor League for Human Rights (A. F. L.), the National C. I. O. War Relief Committee, the Foreign Missions Conference, and the field department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The committee, responding to these requests, and in recognition of the tragic need, will make a direct appeal for funds to the American people and community chests to support this work. Solicitation will begin April 17.

Relief From Stringent Naturalization Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of

H. R. 511, which is similar to the bills that I introduced in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and Seventy-eighth Congresses. This legislation is needed more now than ever before. It would take care of the forgotten people who came to this great America in the 1890's, young, honest, industrious people who never really had the time or the opportunity to learn how to read and write. They married, had large families, and have given their best years in honest labor. Many are property owners and taxpayers. Many had sons and daughters who served our great country in World War No. 1 and are today giving their lives in the great battle in which we are now engaged for the preservation of our free institutions. The sons and daughters of others are today in the vanguard of America's progress. Yet, these same clean-living people of America cannot become citizens unless they pass an examination that would probably flunk a high-school graduate or perhaps a college graduate. If the only requirements for citizenship were contributions to national wealth through honest labor and love for democracy, almost all of our noncitizens could easily become citizens.

There are thousands of people in the United States who have made application for their first and second papers, but who failed to pass the examination. In making application they renounced allegiance to their native countries, and yet they are not citizens of the United States. They love America, they belong to America, they are willing to fight to defend America and keep it democratic and free, so why deny them citizenship?

I might add that the House took favorable action on similar bills in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses and that this legislation is needed more now than ever before. What is needed as well as tanks and planes is a united people. I wish to state that I am heartily in favor of this legislation which was reported by the Rules Committee and urge the Members of the House to act favorably on it.

The bill, H. R. 511, follows:

A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 304 thereof, a new section to be numbered 304A and reading as follows:

"SEC. 304A. An alien, if eligible to naturalization, 50 years of age or over, who has resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924, and who, on or prior to the effective date of this section, has made a declaration of intention to become a citizen which is not more than 7 years old, or who, within 2 years from the effective date of this section, shall make a declaration of intention, may thereafter file petition for naturalization and be admitted to citizenship upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, except that he shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his declaration or petition in his own handwriting, or meet other educational requirements: *Provided*, That this section shall apply only to petitions for naturalization filed within 4 years after the date of the enactment of this act."

SEC. 2. Section 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1150; 8 U. S. C. 726), is hereby amended by adding a new subsection, to be known as subsection (e) and reading as follows:

"(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any alien whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 3. The Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 331 thereof, a new section to be numbered 331A and reading as follows:

"SEC. 331A. A declaration of intention to become a citizen shall not be required of any alien whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war."

Surplus to Shortage—Where's All Our Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Malcolm Logan, entitled "Surplus to Shortage—Where's All Our Food?" which appeared in the New York Post under date of April 9, 1945. This is the first of a series of six articles written by Mr. Logan, and which I believe are of vital interest to the people of the country. We know that within 12 months the surplus of food which the people of this country enjoyed has today dwindled to a dangerous scarcity. Most people know the fact of this food stringency; few, however, know the cause. Mr. Logan knows the cause and states it in his six articles, the first of which is as follows:

SURPLUS TO SHORTAGE—WHERE'S ALL OUR FOOD?

Less than a year ago there was so much food in this country warehouses were bulging and nearly all meats and canned vegetables were taken off rationing.

Today that abundance is gone.

Col. Ralph W. Olmstead, Deputy War Food Administrator, told Senate investigators last week, "Serious shortages are rapidly developing for meats, dry eggs, sugar, and rice."

The situation, he said, is so bad that minimum lend-lease and relief needs cannot be met without a further cut in civilian rations.

Now housewives of New York are informed that things are going to get much worse.

But they were not told by Colonel Olmstead why in less than 2 months we passed from food surpluses to food shortages. They were not told how much of the blame for that situation rests upon Food Administrator Marvin Jones, Colonel Olmstead himself, and other officials responsible for W. F. A. policy.

These articles will tell that story for the first time.

PRODUCTION SOARED, AND THEN—

When we entered the war, American farmers raised food production to record heights. In 1942 we produced 24 percent more than the 1935–39 average; in 1943, 29 percent more; in 1944, 33 percent more.

But 1945 will be another story.

The goals for this year set by the Agriculture Department are roughly the same as those of 1944. Latest reports on actual plantings, however, indicate that except for oats, flaxseed, rice, and sugar beets this year's acreage will be less than last year's.

For the first time since we went to war, then, we face a decline instead of an increase in food production—and at the very time when Europe is looking to us to keep our promises and provide the food it needs until it can produce its own food again.

"COULD BE STEPPED UP"

The War Food Administration is pretty proud of our food-production record. But James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, asserts:

"Total farm production could be stepped up 25 percent by efficient use of farm labor and aid to small and medium farmers."

Patton's position was supported by a special Food Advisory Committee headed by E. W. Gaumnitz of the Office of Economic Warfare in the report on Fundamentals of a Wartime Food Program sent to Agriculture Secretary Wickard on July 31, 1943.

This report was extremely critical of the Government's food program and proposed radical changes to convert agriculture to war production, as industry had already been converted.

REPUDIATED BY WICKARD

It was so critical that its very existence was kept a secret until the New York Times on August 15 published a summary of its contents. Then Wickard charged that the committee had gone far beyond its assignment and repudiated its action in proposing a thorough revision of the food program.

"The greatest opportunity for more efficient production in American agriculture," the report said, "is the small and medium-sized farm whose resources are partially wasted for lack of credit and good management.

"The potentialities of this group of farms were graphically demonstrated in 1942 by the 464,000 families who received credit and technical assistance from the Federal Government. * * *

"These families have less than 8 percent of the Nation's farms; yet their increased production in 1942 accounted for 38 percent of the Nation's increase in milk production; 5 percent of the increase for pork; 10 percent of the increase for peanuts, and 17 percent of the increase for dry beans."

TARGET OF FARM BLOC

The principal Government agency through which these farmers receive credit and technical aid is the Farm Security Administration. But the congressional farm bloc, spokesman for the big farmers, has been steadily attacking the F. S. A. ever since it was established.

The Guamnitz report urged drastic changes in the kind of farm products raised during the rest of the war years, with great increases in foods most urgently needed here and in Europe and slashes in other production, particularly short staple cotton. This was never done.

All this indicates that we could have raised more food crops than we did if Congress and the administration had gone all-out for a maximum wartime food program.

So far as meat production is concerned, we have had first a great surplus and now a severe shortage.

Frightened by surpluses, particularly by the record slaughter of hogs in the winter of 1943–44, the W. F. A. cut down its support prices sharply. Breeding of pigs and other animals fell even lower than the revised quotas.

But when last spring it became apparent that incentives had been reduced too much, the W. F. A. still refused to raise them. So on January 1 of this year the number of hogs on farms had fallen in 12 months from 83,852 to 60,660, the largest decrease in our history.

Lower incentives in 1943 and higher ones last year might have evened out production of pork, chickens, eggs, and beef. But the W. F. A. did not use its powers that way. It created a 1944 surplus and a 1945 shortage.

These food-production policies have contributed very greatly to our present troubles. But they are only the beginning of the story.

The United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Raymond Moley:

I should like to underline the fact that I am not making this broadcast from San Francisco. There are good reasons for commentators to be in San Francisco, and there are many excellent commentators there. But it seemed to me that something could be gained in perspective from New York—3,000 miles away.

The point I make is well illustrated by the excitement last night over the premature report of a German surrender, when thousands of people celebrated the supposed news. The hunt for news at a large conference is highly competitive. There is limited game and many hunters—a thousand reporters for every bit of news.

In San Francisco a Senator apparently talked too much last night, which is not unusual for a Senator. But it is also clear that there was hasty and clumsy handling of the Senator's comment by the press.

President Truman's handling of the report was superb. He didn't handle it through a press representative. He didn't laugh it off. He didn't blame the press. He was direct and to the point. Yes; he heard it. Yes; he called Eisenhower. It is not true. That is all. That is a magnificent example of prompt and clear dealing with the public. His stature as President continues to grow.

In the excited atmosphere of a conference, trifles light as air become confirmations strong as Holy Writ. A small argument in a little room sounds louder than a big battle in the open. When news is scarce, it must be multiplied like the loaves and fishes in the desert.

Let's keep this in mind when we hear things about differences between the United States and Russia in San Francisco.

Those reported disagreements, heard from this spot between the Golden Gate and the Elbe River in Germany, seemed pretty small this week. To the west, in San Francisco, excited overaged men were quarreling about seats in an unborn league of nations. But in the other direction, on the Elbe River, boys from Russia and America were finishing a job without which there could be no league of nations.

Look once more, Americans, at the pictures of those boys in your Saturday and Sunday papers. There is the hope of the world. What do Tovarich Joe and his buddy Ivan care about who presides on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday in San Francisco? They know that on last Wednesday they met some great guys on the Elbe—clean, strapping fellows who had licked the greatest army on earth all the way from Stalingrad and all the way from Normandy. In heaven's name, Americans, let's listen to those boys and, meanwhile, take our diplomats with a grain of salt.

Now, let's have a little quiet common sense about Russia. In some quarters in this country questions have been raised about the good faith of our ally. In turn, let us examine the reliability of some American Russia-haters who have been writing and talking about Russia over the past few years.

In 1939 I heard these gentlemen say that Russia would join Hitler in an attack upon western civilization. Instead of that, Russia and Germany went to war.

In 1940 I heard an otherwise important critic of Russia say that Germany could conquer Russia with 10 divisions. Russia has destroyed almost 200 German divisions.

In 1941, after Germany attacked Russia, we were told in print over and over that Russia could not last 2 months.

In 1942 our Russia-haters said Stalin would make a separate peace with Germany. Tell that to German fugitives.

In 1943 we were told that Russia would stop at the Russian borders. Tell that to the boys on the Elbe.

In 1944 we were told that Russia would stop at Warsaw. That's another one.

In 1945—3 weeks ago—we were told that Russia would stop at the Oder and make us shed our blood at Berlin.

A few days later we were told that Russia wouldn't let us take Berlin. She wanted that glory for herself.

Now these two stories are contradictory. But they both must sound strange to Americans whose sons might have died in Berlin, and to Russians, whose sons did die in Berlin.

We were also told that Russia would permit no fraternizing with Americans at the Elbe. Look at those pictures again.

They tell us now that Russia will not help us beat Japan. Wait a while and see.

All of these charges prove a case, not against Russia, but against the Russia-haters.

Now let's try to see Russia's position in this peace-making business.

Russian suspicion of the western powers is very real and very deep. She remembers that twice, in 3 years, there was created in eastern Europe a series of small states whose bitter anti-Russian sentiments were counted on to shut Russia permanently out of European affairs. Germany did this in 1917 in the enforced peace of Brest Litovsk. Germany, in that so-called peace, severed from Russia, as Churchill said, "by a great saber stroke from the Baltic to the Caspean Sea," all that Russia had acquired in 300 years. A dozen German-controlled nations were set up to wall in forever the remains of the Russian Nation.

After Germany's defeat in 1918, the process of walling in Russia began again—this time by Clemenceau and Lloyd George with the tacit consent of the United States. We participated with our allies, including Japan, in an attempted invasion of Russia, hoping by intervention to change her form of government. Some of the new states that we set up celebrated their freedom by attacks on Russia, shearing off still more of her legitimate territory. And the United States capped it all by refusing to recognize Russia for more than 15 years. This is a record that we would all like to forget.

Russia is determined never again to have a cordon sanitaire of unfriendly nations on her western borders. In their simple, realistic way, Russians believe that the alternative to a cordon of unfriendly nations is a cordon of friendly nations. Would we enjoy a concerted move by foreign powers to set up governments unfriendly to us in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba? President Monroe answered that.

In Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary the alternative is not democratic versus undemocratic governments. Those countries have never had real democratic governments. For the time being, it is either governments that hate Russia or governments that do not hate Russia, and Russia is determined that her neighbors shall not hate her.

On the other hand, truly democratic Czechoslovakia has welcomed a treaty with Russia. This is a test by a highly civilized government on the spot. The Czechs were sold down the river at Munich. This time they voluntarily choose to trust Russia instead.

The test of Russia cannot and must not be on the special case of Poland alone. The test will be what Russia does with Germany and what Russia has already done in Austria.

We have the answer in Austria today, and it is a good answer. Moscow has announced that a new Austrian Government has been set up in Vienna. The head of that government is Dr. Karl Renner, a former prime minister of the Republic of Austria, a leader of the social-democratic party, and a man favorably known in all freedom-loving circles of Europe. He is positively not a Communist.

The second man in the new Austrian Government is a Christian socialist, a fellow member of the Catholic party with Dollfuss and Schuschnigg. Hitler killed Dollfuss and sent Schuschnigg to a concentration camp. His death was reported recently.

The third man in the new Austrian Government is a Communist.

This is a representative government. It is not Communist. And it is not a puppet government. Dr. Renner has never been a puppet for anyone.

This indication of Russian intentions is wholly reassuring. We could not have done better ourselves.

Now, in the name of common sense, is there any evidence that Russia wants to make trouble for us? In the first place, the Russian Bear needs time to lick her wounds which are deep and painful. In this most costly of all our wars, Russia a year ago admitted four and a half million military deaths. There must be hundreds of thousands more now. If we add to that, civilian casualties of all sorts, we see that her loss has been from ten to twelve million.

In the next place, Russia needs money and credit from us for years to come. Her problem of reconstruction is immense. It will take 10 years to complete that. Whatever we contribute will not only profit us but cement a lasting friendship. Russia likes our stuff, from our jeeps to our refrigerators. She admires our industry and those who direct it.

Finally, there is a basis of friendship between us and Russia, not only in history but in geography. Of all the nations in the world, Russia and the United States have the least reason to attack each other for reasons of national gain. We are a sea power. Russia is a land power. Our spheres of influence are nowhere in conflict. We both have oil, coal, iron, gold, and wheat.

These are the basic and material grounds of friendship. Our cultural and political bonds will grow with the years.

I certainly have never, in all my life, had any preference for communism. I have opposed even the slightest subversive Communist propaganda here with everything that I could muster. But as an American I believe that Russian preference for communism is her business. Constitutional democracy is our business. But world security is everybody's business. And that is

the business at hand. Let's get on with it and stop looking under the bed.

Tonight Europe is face to face with the stupendous fact of German defeat. Legal surrender will merely signalize the practical fact. Our own reception of this fact is tempered by our awareness of our unfinished job in Japan. But to most of Europe, this is the end. And Europe, like a man emerging from long darkness, is only slowly comprehending the light. Words fail them. Their emotions choke their speech. Their hearts outrun their minds.

Think and feel, Americans, what this means to Europe. Sixty-eight bitter months ago it heard the screaming voice of Hitler announce the entrance of the heathen gods of murder, terror, and slavery. The thunder of armies shook the continent. Small nations were trampled underfoot. As months mounted into years, it seemed that no human life could endure. It seemed as if some voice from heaven had said that all truth was a myth, that all good was bad, that all the mind had learned must be forgotten, that God was not God but a magician's trick to serve the devil's purpose, and that fire, hunger, pestilence, and pain were truly the destiny of men.

It will take many years to understand that, somehow, terror has been blasted. Churchill told his people that without victory there could be no survival. But blood, toil, tears, and sweat have won at last.

We Americans still have dangers and labor ahead. We must finish Japan and, after that, prepare for our future and for that of our children.

The spectacle of a terribly beaten Germany must be clear, even to a Japanese mind. Let's tell Japan over and over what has happened in Europe. We can tell them more, besides, and in the telling strengthen our own spirit. Japan is now alone.

Our job is not over, but we have labored to the eleventh hour. We rejoice for Europe, but "we have promises to keep, and miles to go before we sleep."

"We Beg You To Save Us From Destruction," Poles Cry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr Speaker, yesterday was VE-day. Some people celebrated, but there is no reason for such celebration. Just what is there to celebrate? The "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter have become a farce. The 800,000 of our boys who became casualties did so in vain.

We hear a lot about German atrocities. But bad as they were, the atrocities of today under Red fascism in Europe are worse. That seems to be the chief accomplishment of this war in Europe.

The 16 Polish patriots who were lured to Russia and arrested is a blot to all decency. These men went there after being approved by the United States of America and Britain. They are probably executed by now. But this going on is mild. Daily appeals for help from complete destruction are reaching the United States of America and Britain, but all in vain.

Reports from former leaders of the Polish underground have reached our State Department. They detail convincingly the atrocities committed by the Red army which has engulfed Poland. Facts and figures, names, dates, and places are cited, but omitted in the following excerpts:

Red army men are stripping the country of all its stores of food and livestock. Soviet military authorities treat the Poles with contempt, disregarding even the Lublin puppet regime, acting independently. The attitude of the Lublin Communists toward Russia is servile.

The stores in most cities are closed; there is no electricity or gas; all means of transport and communication are at a standstill. Looting and rape are rampant. The Polish people are starving. Soviet soldiers have permission to send 16-pound packages of food to their families in Russia. They have a free hand in "requisitioning," which turns out to be plain robbery.

A state of planned terror prevails. The underground army is being systematically destroyed by wholesale arrests, deportations, executions. Chaos reigns. The population is oppressed by mounting demands for quarters for soldiers in homes not destroyed.

There is danger of a revolt, which would only lead to murderous reprisals, following the Nazi pattern.

There is evidence of anti-British propaganda conducted by the Soviets. During a victory parade in Czestochowa on January 25, a banner read, "Down with British imperialism."

Poles in high posts, including doctors, professors, political leaders, are forced to sign statements denouncing the Polish Government in exile and the underground army as Fascists and bandits, and agents of Hitler, and supporting the Lublin regime now in Warsaw. The alternative is deportation or death. The documents are prepared by the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow.

All Polish life is directed and controlled by the N. K. V. D.

There are 192 British solders at Czestochowa who are forbidden to contact the Poles; their food and quarters are very poor, and they are terrorized. Among them are Flight Lt. Hammet Patrick, R. A. F.; Flying Officer Symington Fen Wilson, R. A. F.; Sgt. Ernest O'Dwyer, Royal Tank Regiment, Stalag 344; Sapper Orr, New Zealand Engineers, Stalag VIII-B.

The Union of Mutual Peasants Aid is a totalitarian organization which peasants are forced to join.

The mass return of Poles from German forced-labor camps has begun. They are all utterly exhausted and wretched and add to the difficulties we face. Speedy aid alone can save the lives of hundreds of thousands. The Lublin regime, which is powerless and incompetent, cannot meet our desperate needs. The situation is catastrophic—far worse than under Nazi occupation. Lublin money printed in Moscow adds to inflation.

The Soviets has arrested more Poles during a few months than the Nazis did during 5 years of occupation.

In Warsaw the joy that arose with liberation has given place to deep despair. The conduct of the Red army soldiers has created hostility. There is economic stagnation. Trainloads of Poles are being sent to Russian labor camps. Members of the underground who fought Germans for over 5 years have again gone into hiding underground. Our only hope is intervention by Britain and America, in whom we still have faith.

Please intervene with the western democracies in our behalf. We cannot endure very much longer. We beg you to save us from destruction.

These reports come separately from Warsaw, Lwow, Krakow, Bialystok, Lodz, Piotrkow, Czestochowa, Lublin, and Radom, but all tell the same tragic story. May their voices be heard in San Francisco.

Hail the new order of slavery in Europe. To think 800,000 of our boys gave their lives for this. It is ironical that at the funeral of our late President Roosevelt the West Point Band played the Polish Funeral March, by Chopin, from the depot to the grave.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, adopted by the St. Paul, Minn., Trades and Labor Assembly, a delegate body representing the American Federation of Labor local unions in that city:

LABOR'S GRATEFUL TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE NATION'S FOREMOST STATESMAN AND HUMANITARIAN

A PEERLESS LEADER DIES

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt, while serving his fourth term as President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the mightiest military forces of all time, was stricken by the remorseless hand of death, at a time when the world most needs his wise leadership.

A CHAMPION FOR THE RIGHT

President Roosevelt's sympathetic understanding, his keen sense of justice, and his boundless courage qualified him to meet with vigor and success the many difficult situations that confronted him during his long official career. From his advent as President to the closing day of his life, he was beset by critical problems which taxed the vital forces of mind and body, and like a loyal soldier fighting for a great cause, he sacrificed his life in the service of mankind.

When President Roosevelt assumed the re ns of the Federal Government in 1933, he beheld a prostrate Nation. Its industrial and financia' institutions were on the brink of bankruptcy with leaders in business and Government bewildered and terrified at the appalling situation. Millions of workers were unemployed and destitute. Homes, farms, and businesses were being seized by merciless creditors. The entire structure of government and society was menaced by desperate and disappointed citizens, whose faith in their leaders was blasted, and they were filled with resentment.

VISION, UNDERSTANDING, AND COURAGE

President Roosevelt showed vision, understanding, and courage in meeting and solving the problems of industry and government; problems that baffled the master minds of public affairs. Under his guidance and inspiration, our Nation began the long journey out of despair and depression. With a happy combination of idealism and realism, President Roosevelt charted the practical course that brought prosperity to business, employment to labor, and good prices to the farmer, and hope and happiness to all.

To prevent a recurrence of the evil days that almost wrecked the Nation, President Roosevelt sponsored laws that curbed the

speculators and money manipulators, and gave protection to the independent businessman, to the farmer and the wage worker. Social security to the aged and hour-and-wage protection to the helpless, and independence to the organized worker. Gigantic public works like the T. V. A. were brought to full fruition and success, thereby laying the foundation for permanent prosperity for all the people.

A TRUSTED FRIEND OF THE PEOPLE

President Roosevelt's steadfast attitude and progressive principles and actions shocked and alienated the greedy and reactionary; but opposition and criticism never daunted him nor diverted him from the chosen course of public service. Born to wealth, position, and culture, he never was blinded by the glamor of his own place and power so he could not see and understand the plight of the vast majority of his fellow Americans. He showed by his constant planning and proposals that he recognized the obligation of government to safeguard the right of every citizen to an opportunity to earn a livelihood and enjoy the full fruits of his labors.

FORESIGHT AND EXECUTIVE ABILITY

When President Roosevelt was nearing the consummation of his program of improvement for the Nation, the peace and security of the United States and the world was menaced by the Axis Powers' war of conquest. He was the first to appreciate the far-reaching significance of the growing military conflict in Europe. He warned and virtually compelled the United States to prepare for the impending clash, in the face of bitter criticism and opposition. Mr. Roosevelt's wise foresight of the danger and magnitude of the struggle saved America and the civilized world from universal subjugation and servitude to the conquering hosts of Nazi tyrants.

ALWAYS PLANNING FOR PEACE AND PLENTY

Although bearing the burden and responsibility of the armed forces of our own Nation and of the world, the President never forgot his obligation to safeguard the welfare of the people of the United States and the world. He was preparing to bring to full realization the ideals and principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter of human rights. He had expressed definite ideas on a practical program to provide opportunity and recompense for every citizen of the Nation.

A FAITHFUL SOLDIER MUSTERED OUT

At the most vital stage of his gigantic endeavors—political, military, and diplomatic—to establish freedom and prosperity for all mankind, this tireless and unselfish soldier of the common good, before he could finish the battle in which he had fought so long and valiantly, was mustered out by the Supreme Commander for a well-earned rest and reward.

To the millions of devoted friends and followers of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the United States and the world over his words and his deeds shall ever serve as a guide and an inspiration to them to strive faithfully and persistently to achieve the purposes and principles of their departed leader. This course of action will serve as the most enduring monument of gratitude and devotion to the memory of a great humanitarian and statesman.

Be it known that the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, in expressing these views of labor on this heartfelt subject, does hereby declare that the death of President Roosevelt is the most tragic event in these crucial times in human affairs; and bespeaks the sorrowful sentiments of a bereaved humanity, whose welfare was always foremost in the thoughts and actions of our beloved benefactor.

Submitted by the legislative committee to the trades and labor assembly for adoption and incorporation in the official records of the organization as a permanent memorial.

Open Letter to Producers and Distributors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Motion Picture Herald of April 21, 1945:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRODUCERS AND DISTRIBUTORS

In the interests of mutual prosperity—which you have been enjoying with increasing abundance and which we are able to share in less and less—we, the members of the North Central Allied Independent Theatre Owners of Minnesota, feel impelled to put before you several urgent questions.

1. Do you, or do you not, believe in free enterprise?

2. Are you, or are you not, in favor of the system of business competition which has made this Nation great?

We believe you do not and are not. For if you did, the independent theater owners would not have their backs to the wall as they now have. This is the direct result of your policies which appear deliberately designed to force us out of business so that the field may be yours completely.

First-run theaters in major cities are lavishing in unprecedented prosperity, while neighborhood houses have suffered a loss in attendance of at least 25 percent. This is a paradox but nevertheless the hard truth. Pictures are kept in downtown houses for unprecedented runs and are completely "milked" by the time they are permitted to reach the suburban theaters. In spite of this loss of business by the independent exhibitor, you have enacted a confiscatory policy of high percentage and high flat film rentals.

It should hardly be necessary to call to your attention the fact that the operating costs of theaters have skyrocketed. Despite all the obstacles imposed on the exhibitors, the producers have seen fit to increase the cost of films to independent exhibitors to such a point that it is impossible for the exhibitors to make a profit. The independents have been put in a spot where the only profits in their theaters come now from the sale of peanuts and popcorn. We refuse to be reduced to the status of candy hawkers. Our business is the showing of motion pictures. The pictures we show should hardly be a sideline to the candy stand.

Many small towns have lost a large segment of their population, because of the shift to war jobs in larger communities and because of the draft. What justice is there, what equity is there, in the demand of producers that the small independent pay such high flat film rentals and percentages that you producers are now exacting? The policy you are following represents confiscation. And that, an impartial public will agree, is not America's way.

The unusually large grosses gathered at the first-run theaters in major cities apparently have intoxicated the distributors to the point where you have lost all sense of proportion and value. Certain pictures formerly rating only bottom bracket rental now are placed in the top bracket when offered to the independent exhibitor. There is no price control code in our industry as yet—but, in the name of all that's decent, isn't there a code of morals for big guys to follow in their dealings with little guys?

Gentlemen, the situation is serious. This is not crying "wolf." The facts are apparent to everyone in the industry. The independent exhibitors, as a matter of self-preservation, demand an immediate readjustment of the distributor's sales policy toward independent exhibitors. This is something of a family matter, and naturally we would prefer to settle it within the privacy of our own industry. But unless we are able to get satisfaction quickly and fully through the medium of open discussion, we intend to carry our fight to the theater-going public and enlist the support of the Nation behind our cause.

We are prepared to press the issue. If necessary, we will go to the daily press and the radio. We will enlist the aid of our various Representatives in Congress and of the appropriate Government agencies. We will, if need be, place trailers on our screens to go directly to the theater patron for his understanding and support. We have given our lifetime toward building up our business and we are not going to stand idly by watching distributors take our business away from us—which you are trying to do. We mean to stay in business and we mean to have you see the light.

We believe in free enterprise. We believe in competition. We believe in the American way. We do not believe in the octopus-like operations you are using to choke us. We pledge ourselves to use every means at our command to eradicate this evil.

Now, let's be reasonable. When do you want to start talking shop?

NORTH CENTRAL ALLIED INDEPENDENT THEATRE OWNERS, INC., OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure I am able to offer for publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Birmingham News of Alabama on last Sunday. It is an excellent statement of the case as to Joint Resolution No. 60 and in favor of its passage:

OPENING OF A GOOD FIGHT

Congress is at last coming to grips with a proposal to amend the Constitution for the purpose of making the House co-equal with the Senate in the process of treaty-making. The Lower Chamber spent several days last week in a debate on the subject. The Kefauver bill which would deprive the Senate of its exclusive authority under the Constitution and which would make approval or rejection of a treaty a matter of majority vote is now up for action.

The House is not considering this change merely to serve its own prestige. HATTON SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, made that clear. He said that the Chamber which is called upon for appropriations to implement treaties should have some voice in passing on the soundness or unsoundness of international agreements. This is a good point, and it does not lose its force when we realize that the House is feeling its oats and has grown weary of senatorial assumptions of superiority.

Yet it is undeniable that in moving toward equal power in the field of foreign affairs,

the House is expressing the growing public desire for some such alteration. Americans are now fully aware of the dangers which inhere in the exclusive authority which the Constitution gives the Senate. As a consequence, the Senate has come to be the graveyard of treaties which a minority of Senators objected to.

Now that our country is emerging as a full-fledged participant in world affairs, the people of the United States have become uneasy about the possibilities of obstructionism and frustration in the constitutional situation as it stands.

One of the strong arguments justifying an amendment to eliminate this sort of thing is that the constitutional provision under fire was written in to meet an emergency which the Nation has not had to face since the 1780's. It is common knowledge among historians that this provision was designed to "meet problems of the time which threatened approval of the Constitution by the original States." Since then it has been used for an entirely different purpose—all too frequently to hamper the State Department and the President in conducting foreign relations for the best interests of the Nation.

Amending the Federal Constitution is a slow process at best. It is likely to be particularly gradual in this instance, unless the Senate undergoes a great change of heart. If the House approves the Kefauver bill, it will be only the beginning of a long fight, the end of which cannot come until public opinion will have driven the Senate to agree to give up its special privilege. Conceivably, if the Senate outrages the country by acting up in connection with a security organization, that demand will crystallize swiftly. But otherwise the change will be the result of an unavoidably long-drawn-out campaign of popular education.

O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Grinnell (Iowa) Herald-Register recently discussed the dilemma of local merchants attempting to comply with complicated O. P. A. directives, and urged that some effort be made to simplify these orders and make it possible for honest businessmen to comply with them without being overburdened with paperwork, thought up by O. P. A. officials who have never tried to run a business themselves, particularly in wartime.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a news story and an editorial, both from the Grinnell Herald-Register, of April 30, 1945:

MERCHANTS PROTEST O. P. A. REQUIREMENTS—DECLARE COMPLIANCE WITH NEW PRICE REQUIREMENT A NIGHTMARE

For some time past Grinnell merchants who deal in men's clothing, women's wear, or furniture have been burning the midnight oil in an effort to comply with the provisions of O. P. A. Price Regulation Order 580. The merchants have been provided with a 40-page leaflet which they are required to read and digest. Then they must check through every item in the store and make a report by May 4 "or else," which, being interpreted, means that no sales of the affected merchandise can be made unless the report is filed.

HERE'S THE REGULATION

Regulation 580 applies to all those who sell at retail men's, women's, children's, or infants' wearing apparel, apparel accessories, or shoes, or household textile items like blankets, towels, or sheets, furniture, floor coverings, lamps, or bedding, and other specified articles. It requires preparation of a "base date pricing chart." This chart consists of a list of costs and prices for the items covered by the regulation which were being sold on the base date.

After May 4, 1945, merchants may not sell this merchandise unless they have filed a chart and received an acknowledgment of it.

Sounds simple so far. But wait until the merchants have waded through 40 pages like the following paragraphs taken at random which refer to the long list of articles covered by this regulation. "These articles are grouped into 'categories' and each category is given a category number. For example, men's and boys' underwear and nightwear constitute category 116."

HERE'S A CATEGORY

Let's see what category 116 is: "This is a 'general' category, including all underwear and nightwear garments, made of either knitted or woven fabrics, except that it does not include men's shorts subject to MPR 547 or men's or boys' shorts or pajamas subject to MPR 578."

Here is another enlightening paragraph:

"Category 602: All other cotton yard goods. "This is a 'general' category, except that it does not include any cotton white goods covered by category 601, and pile fabrics, covered by category 605, and lace, net, or fancy goods covered by category 606, or any sheeting, pillow tubing, toweling, tablecloth material, or curtain, blanketing, drapery, or upholstery fabrics, covered by categories 501–504 or 507. It includes all finished fabrics, woven or knitted, of yarn containing 75 percent or more by weight of cotton or cotton waste."

And so on for 40 pages.

BUSINESS AND THE O. P. A.

Like everybody else we recognize the importance of regulated prices in times like these and consequently we recognize the inevitability of the O. P. A. and O. P. A. regulations.

We recognize also the difficulty of the task which O. P. A. is called upon to perform and we have found the O. P. A. representatives with whom we have come in contact earnest and sincere gentlemen, doing their best to handle a hard job.

We feel it only right to make this statement as a preamble and to add that to the best of our ability we have been trying to hold up the hands of the O. P. A. by giving space in this paper to some of their more important directives.

However, we have wondered and have been wondering for some time if the O. P. A. wouldn't get along a whole lot easier if it were possible to streamline and simplify some of its directives for the benefit of the hard-working businessmen who are trying to comply with them. Elsewhere in this paper appears a case in point, to wit, the recent O. P. A. order affecting dealers in men's and women's clothing and household equipment. This article, taken from another paper but applicable in every community, gives some of the reasons why it is extremely difficult for businessmen to comply with the terms of this directive.

In the first place, it is wordy. In the second place, its legal phraseology is confusing. In the third place, many businessmen are not prepared to furnish offhand the detailed information required in this report. In the fourth place, every single store that we know anything about is desperately short of help and most of the proprietors are already burdened with more detail than they can take care of without this added load.

Granting the sincerity of the O. P. A. we feel that it can be said that a large percent of the men who framed this directive have never tried to run a business themselves, particularly in wartime, and have no appreciation of the burdens which, with the best intentions in the world, they are heaping upon the already overburdened shoulders of businessmen.

There is another thing which we might mention while we are on the subject. We fail to see why businessmen who, with no intent to offend, are found a cent or so over the ceiling on maybe five or six items out of several thousand in stock, should be fined for their failure. Punishment of willful offenders is all right, but it seems to us that penalizing an honest businessman who is doing his very best to keep up with the constant flood of directives and changes is not cricket. It seems to us like abuse of power rather than exercise of power.

This is written with all the good will in the world and in a desire to be helpful rather than unduly critical. It seems to us that something ought to be said to interpret the average businessmen to those who for the present exert so great an influence over his destinies.

VE-Day Program for Postwar Construction Includes St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives took official notice of VE-day in Europe. For a long time there has been talk about postwar planning and postwar construction projects which would furnish employment not only for soldiers who have been discharged from Army service, but for men in this country who will soon be out of jobs when the war factories close down. The time for talk has past.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress they used the argument that we should not undertake the St. Lawrence project while the war was in progress.

When the opponents of the St. Lawrence project were forced back to a last ditch stand in their opposition, they always fell back on that stone wall, "This project will hinder the progress of the war, because it will take many men from our war industries and from the Army, and because it will take steel and other needed materials which the Army and the Navy must have." There was a lot more talk—and I think it was just talk—along these same lines. The announcement yesterday of unconditional surrender of Germany puts an end to this argument that we must delay the project on account of the war.

I believe that we should have postwar planning and that it should include worth-while projects, those that will create wealth and improve the welfare of

the American people, and remain a permanent asset to the national defense of this country. For that reason, within 24 hours after the House convened on January 4, 1945, I introduced H. R. 671, a bill to confirm the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, and to authorize postwar construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I do not here argue the merits of this proposal. In fact, aside from objections by powerful and selfish interests, who think more of monopoly privileges than they do of the unemployed and the bread lines and other difficulties that come inevitably in the wake of war, there are no sound reasons why this project should not be undertaken.

We do not want another depression and unemployment, and other economic disasters such as followed World War No. 1. The way to prevent such conditions is to provide worth-while employment so that American labor will have an income from useful work. This can and will be spent for the products of factories and the farm so as to create and maintain a high level of production and income.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is ready to go now. It has been approved by the Departments of War, Navy, Commerce, and every other department which has anything to do with this development. It has been approved after public hearings by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House. Moreover, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, which has made such a magnificent record in this war, has prepared plans and specifications now available for use. The seaway project has already been completed over 90 percent of the distance from Duluth to the open sea. This is not a new project. Let us take action now to finish this job as the No. 1 postwar project on the North American Continent.

Something About the Man Who Represents the United States on the Reparations Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Star, of May 8, 1945. This is a column written by Mr. Lowell Mellett and is called Something About the Man Who Represents the United States of America on Reparations Commission. I, for one, am delighted to know more about the career of Mr. Pauley, and think that President Truman is to be commended for having appointed him to this most difficult assignment. I am sure that he will serve his country with credit to it and to himself.

The article follows:

SOMETHING ABOUT MAN WHO REPRESENTS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON REPARATIONS COMMISSION

(By Lowell Mellett)

Now, to pick up the pieces of a devastated continent and to try to put them together again.

Being a member of the Allied Reparations Commission isn't a job that anybody would ask for if he were merely seeking an honor. It's a job of hard, disagreeable work for which a man is unlikely to receive any recognition, whether he does it well or otherwise. So Ed Pauley has taken the job, and has the dubious pleasure of reading that his appointment is a political pay-off by President Truman. It may be timely, therefore, to tell the story of the man the President has delegated to handle this country's part in adjusting Germany's shattered economy to the needs of the rest of the world.

He was a Hoosier the first 6 weeks of his life, an Alabaman the next 16 years, but is now a Californian, having lived out there for 26 years. He is 42 years old.

WORKED IN OIL FIELDS

He worked his way through Occidental College and the University of California, partly by selling encyclopedias, whose contents he is said to have mastered, more or less, in the interest of good salesmanship, and partly by laboring in the oil fields. Beginning as a "mucker," he was promoted to be a "roughneck," and he didn't stop there. They made him a derrickman, then a driller, a crude gager, a buyer, and a refinery evaluator. By which time he knew the oil business. Then his neck and his back and 32 assorted bones were broken in an airplane accident.

He was in the hospital 1 year, spending the time reading and thinking—thinking mostly about how to pay the doctors' bills, $9,000 worth. Out of any salary it would take a long time. He decided to go into business. Persuading some others to join him, he leased an oil refinery. Out of this grew the Petrol Corporation of California, engaged in producing as well as refining, and Pauley's present fortune of several millions.

In the hospital Pauley had been inspired by the story of a New York politician who had overcome an accident even more crushing than his own. He became a Roosevelt man. He did what he could in the 1932 campaign and those that followed. In 1940 he collected the party's funds for the 11 Western States and in 1944 was notably successful as the party's national treasurer.

In 1938 Pauley was made a regent of the University of California. His special interest was the department of economics, but the university's special interest in him may have been something else. He was made chairman of the Committee on Endowments. University of California now has an endowment fund second only to that of Harvard.

Came the war and the problem of supplies. Britain needed gasoline desperately. Pauley wired the President that 100 tankers carrying gasoline for domestic use could be released to serve Britain if our rail shipments were properly routed. (His postgraduate thesis at the university had been on the subject of transportation.) The President asked him to report at the White House the next day. Pauley arrived and laid down a plan that would enable the railroads to do more of their job than they had been doing.

SENT TO ENGLAND

The plan worked. He promoted then the creation of the War Petroleum Administration, with Harold Ickes heading it. That also worked.

Drawn into the operation of lease-lend, he was sent to England. There he enccuntered Sir Arthur Salter, who will represent Great Britain on the Reparations Commission. He persuaded Salter, top British shipping man, to revise the wasteful routing of that country's own tankers.

There also he met Ambassador Maisky, who will represent Russia on the Reparations Commission. Russia had asked for a considerable amount of 100-octane gas. Pauley had a better idea. By the adoption of certain new processes Russia could obtain the needed high octane gas from her own refineries. Maisky was cold.

"Do we get the 100-octane gas?" he repeated.

"No," said Pauley.

That was the beginning of a perfect understanding between Pauley and Maisky. The new refining processes were installed by the Russians and the result was what Pauley had promised.

This is the man, not the political hack he has been pictured, whom the President has entrusted with America's part in the reparations negotiations. On his record he seems likely to do well.

The Veterans' Administration's Program for the Counseling of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Dr. Ira D. Scott, Chief, Vocational Advisement Division, Vocational Rehabilitation Service, United States Veterans' Administration, before Lodge 2, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., April 18, 1945:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and friends, I am appreciative of this opportunity to come before your federation, realizing as I do, after more than 25 years' intensive study and practice in the rehabilitation field, how important the work you are doing is and how well you have battled for all physically handicapped people.

I have been directly connected with the Veterans' Administration ever since World War No. 1, and my views regarding the counseling, training, and employment of handicapped persons is based upon many years' experience in working with the problems with which all types of disabled persons are confronted. My observations convince me that the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped manifests most admirable group intelligence by having as its national president Paul A. Strachan, a man whose ability, earnest zeal, and achievements in promoting the interests of the handicapped distinguish him as a most outstanding constructive leader in this great field, where great leadership is so much to be appreciated.

The Veterans' Administration is responsible for providing a counseling service, not only to disabled veterans who are eligible for vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, but also to all veterans who are entitled to and request guidance in connection with their education or training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress (GI bill). A large number of returning veterans, both men and

women, will be eligible for such services under the provisions of these two statutes.

While "educational and vocational guidance" is the term used in Public Law 346 to designate this service, the Veterans' Administration has developed its counseling program with most careful regard to the fact that veterans will have greater assurance of achieving their educational objectives or occupational goals when mental conflicts, emotional maladjustments, and other types of personal problems are alleviated prior to, or parallel with, counseling and training. The plans and procedures of the Veterans' Administration, therefore, are aimed at providing such thorough and complete counseling to each veteran claimant that he may be assisted in making the adjustments necessary for a useful life as a citizen in a community of his choice. For this counseling service it is most important that competent professionally trained and otherwise well-qualified persons be employed.

For many veterans, guidance in the selection of an occupation or of an educational objective may be all that will be required. Other veterans may need assistance in handling personal problems, in resolving mental conflicts, in attaining emotional stability, or in learning how to secure and hold employment. The Veterans' Administration plans to furnish all types of counseling service which may be required in the case of an individual veteran. He will also be guided in making intelligent use of other clinical and professional services available to him through the Veterans' Administration and other agencies, for the purpose of assisting him in making and maintaining the mental, emotional, and social adjustment essential to the attainment of his objectives. Each veteran is counseled as a person, in accordance with his needs, and educational and vocational guidance are not given without reference to the consideration of the other problems which affect the life of the individual.

In such a complete counseling procedure the well-trained counselor will first explore fully the facts related to the individual, as a person, observing his attitudes and whether there may be need of any special personal adjustment counseling. In case the interview reveals evidence of tension, stress, or strain of the personality, the counseling procedure is to be conducted in such way as to effect a satisfactory adjustment, if possible. In some cases the counselor may solve some minor personal problems in the course of the interview; in other cases the problems may deal with worries connected with family relationships, financial difficulties, or other troubles which may require the assistance of some case-work agency; while the more severe cases of mental conflict or of emotional instability may require referral for conferences with specialists in psychotherapy or with psychiatrists. The Veterans' Administration counseling procedure provides for discovering all these different types of problems and for counseling each veteran according to his individual needs.

In addition to special types of counseling service to meet personal problems, there remains the essential guidance service to assist the veteran in selecting educational or employment objectives and training courses designed to lead him to an appropriate occupational adjustment. This includes ascertaining through recognized counseling techniques the veteran's interests, aptitudes, attainments, and personality traits which have the greatest significance in determining the occupational fields and educational pursuits in which he may have the greatest possibility of success, considering also the limitations imposed by physical or mental disability. The counseling techniques include interviewing, the review of records of school training, and of military or naval service, the survey of work history, and the use of objective tests. When the counselor has carefully evaluated the data concerning the veteran which have been made available through the counseling techniques mentioned, and has considered his assets and liabilities in relation to various kinds of work, he again confers with the veteran describing the occupational fields wherein his strongest abilities may be utilized. During such a conference the counselor and the veteran will usually be able to make a tentative selection of an occupational goal and of education or training courses to reach it.

When the procedure is considered with reference to meeting the outstanding purposes of the legislation, it will be observed that the Veterans' Administration procedure focuses attention upon encouraging the veteran to consider fully and carefully the factors which relate to accomplishing his occupational adjustment. This emphasis is desirable since nearly all veterans who will be counseled under the provisions of either enactment will be adults or will be regarded as adults and should generally be directed toward occupational adjustment because, for the typical veteran, this is the most important aspect of any satisfactory adjustment as a useful member of society.

In the counseling of disabled veterans with reference to vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, it is especially to be noted that the obligation rests upon the Veterans' Administration to do everything possible to see that the veteran's employability is restored. The Veterans' Administration must, therefore, insist upon the use of modern methods and techniques in vocational advisement so that the results of the counseling will meet present-day conditions so well that the disabled veteran will not be disappointed when, having completed his training, he seeks employment.

The Veterans' Administration plans to make the services of qualified counselors available to veterans throughout the Nation. The program, which was started in 1943 by placing vocational advisers in the 53 regional offices in the different States and which was developed by increasing the number of such counselors in these offices as the number of veteran claimants grew, is now being expanded to include Veterans' Administration guidance centers in a number of cooperating colleges, universities, and other educational institutions which have personnel qualified to render counseling services. This plan for establishing guidance centers in educational institutions will make the counseling service accessible to veterans at points near their homes; it provides for the participation in this counseling service of a number of well-qualified people in colleges and universities who would not wish to sever their relationship with their educational institutions, but who are able to contribute highly valuable service in the counseling of veterans; it will afford veterans thorough and complete counseling in a suitable setting, and it will enable the Veterans' Administration to make arrangements, in advance, with educational institutions which, because they are going concerns, will be able to start counseling service to veterans on comparatively short notice when an increase in the number of claimants makes it desirable to have a larger number of guidance centers in any regional territory.

The fact that a veteran is requested to report for counseling at a Veterans' Administration guidance center located at any particular educational institution places no obligation upon him to take educational or training courses at that institution. Each Veterans' Administration guidance center will provide counseling service to any eligible veteran who may apply if he resides within the area to be served by the guidance center, and any veteran may take his training wherever he can secure courses appropriate to the attainment of the educational or occupational objectives he has selected. For example, it would be possible for a veteran to be counseled at a guidance center in New York and to take his training in an approved educational institution or industrial establishment in California if that seemed to be the best way to secure the education or training which he needs and desires. In most cases he will select a training institution or establishment near his home, but the location of the Veterans' Administration guidance center at which he receives counseling service should in no way limit or influence his selection of an educational or training course or of a place of training.

One of the most important advantages of the plan for establishing guidance centers in educational institutions is the way it provides for a continuing supply of trained counselors, so that when the time comes to expand the service still further and to extend it from the nuclear points at the colleges and universities to the communities more remote from these, it may be possible to make this expansion without reducing in any way the quality of the counseling service to be provided. Considering the probability that before long it may be necessary to provide counseling service at some 400 guidance centers at educational institutions and then to prepare to expand the service still more by supplying trained counseling personnel for 500 or more branch offices, it becomes apparent how important it is to make provision for a practical program of counselor training.

In preparing to furnish such a thorough and complete counseling service to so large a number of people as the group of veterans who are, or will be, entitled to such services, the Veterans' Administration has found it necessary to look beyond the immediate needs and to envisage the probable number of claimants who will seek counseling when the peak of demobilization may be reached. By providing counseling service to veterans now, through guidance centers in cooperating educational institutions, the present is being used as a time of preparation. During the time when the number of veterans to be referred to a guidance center remains comparatively small, the college personnel will not only have time to learn thoroughly the procedure for counseling effectively all types of veterans with their widely varying problems, but they will also have time to teach others counseling principles, techniques, and procedures so that they may be prepared to do effective counseling when the number of veterans to be counseled increases.

For this purpose the guidance center plan which locates the practical work of counseling in the educational institutions which provide counselor training is, in many ways, ideal. The colleges and universities are able to train counselors not only through their usual classroom instruction, but they are in position to combine with this instruction observation of actual counseling, and as the new counselors develop, they can be given closely supervised practice in all of the counseling techniques. Thus the established guidance centers not only provide veterans with the services of well-qualified and experienced counselors, but they also make it possible to increase the number of trained counseling personnel in geometric ratio. This plan will make counselor training easily accessible to qualified persons in different parts of the country, and at the same time it will make it possible to maintain the counseling service at the highest possible level as the demand for it increases, so that every type of counseling that may be needed will be available to each counselee at each counseling center.

The guidance-center plan has been developed because, in considering any other plan for providing a counseling service to veterans, certain undesirable alternatives were presented. In order to provide personnel who are qualified and adequately trained to do effective counseling it would be necessary to secure the release of a large number of such personnel from colleges and universi-

ties or other agencies and to place such qualified people in the counseling centers in the different communities, or to delay the establishment of counseling service until extensive counselor training courses could be given to an adequate number of people. The only other alternative would be, to staff such centers for the most part, by people, who are either untrained or inadequately trained to render an effective counseling service. The first of these alternatives, if the difficulties in getting the personnel to accept full-time employment as counselors could be overcome, would probably be successful in providing adequate counselor services for veterans at the present time, but it would not be desirable because the loss of such personnel would destroy or greatly impair the ability of the colleges and universities to continue to train counselors to meet the future demands of such service. The second alternative is not practical because it is desirable to provide adequate counseling service without delay to veterans who apply for it now. The third alternative might result in setting up a great number of makeshift counseling centers readily accessible to veterans, but unable to meet the real needs of veterans because most of their personnel would lack the thorough preparation which is essential to becoming effective counselors.

The plan for providing complete and thorough counseling service to veterans by establishing guidance centers in cooperating colleges and universities utilizes the services of qualified counselors and thus gives to veterans the best service the country has to offer now; it enables these counselors to improve their techniques through practical service; it offers them an unusually practical setting for training other counselors; and it furnishes the personnel in institutions of higher learning an exceptional opportunity to come to know and understand the feelings, the aspirations, and the everyday problems of the returning veterans. This should result in more effective future service by such institutions, not only to veterans but to other students and to other citizens who may be interested in the permanent improvement of adult counseling services in their own communities.

In deciding to decentralize the counseling service to veterans by utilizing qualified personnel in colleges and universities, the Veterans' Administration has adhered to the point of view that the counseling of veterans should be on the highest professional level and should utilize the most competent, well-trained, and highly qualified persons available. It was felt that colleges and universities were the best source of potential advisers, since among their faculty members could be found many persons with graduate training in the fundamental fields of psychology, business, and industrial personnel administration, public personnel administration, labor problems, labor market analysis, tests and measurements, social work and community organization, education, rehabilitation of the handicapped, vocational psychology, mental hygiene and psychiatry. In addition, a number of the persons so trained have had practical experience in counseling students and adults in the community. It was believed that such persons would be most adaptable and could be trained in the shortest period of time in the use of compendia of occupational information and in other specific counseling equipment and techniques to be prescribed by the Veterans' Administration for counseling veterans.

It is hoped that this policy will pay dividends in high quality of the service to be rendered veterans. No doubt there could have been found able persons, well-intentioned, highly motivated, and eager to be of service in helping the veterans, and some of them might have been trained in a relatively short period to do the work. In the long run, however, they could not be depended upon to render the complete professional counseling service, with all of its ramifications. The emergency has required a lowering of standards in many areas, but the Veterans' Administration is hopeful of maintaining professional qualifications for the people who are to perform the complex function of dealing with the human relationships of the men whose lives and plans have been so sorely upset by our wartime society. Even the most highly qualified professional counselors will find the job a challenge for their technical skills, personal abilities, and most ingenious efforts.

I thank you.

Treaty of Versailles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the "willful minority" that prevented ratification of the Treaty of Versailles with the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Congressional Library has furnished me, at my request, with a record of the votes taken in the Senate on this matter.

Following are the roll-call votes referred to:

TREATY OF VERSAILLES [1]—VOTES ON RATIFICATION IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

I. November 19, 1919: Vote on the treaty with 14 reservations:

FOR RATIFICATION

Democrats, 4: Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma; John K. Shields, Tennessee; Hoke Smith, Georgia; David I. Walsh, Massachusetts.

Republicans, 35: L. Heisler Ball, Delaware; William M. Calder, New York; Arthur Capper, Kansas; LeBaron B. Colt, Rhode Island; Albert B. Cummins, Iowa; Charles Curtis, Kansas; William P. Dillingham, Vermont; Walter E. Edge, New Jersey; Davis Elkins, West Virginia; Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; Frederick Hale, Maine; Warren G. Harding, Ohio; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; Frank B. Kellogg, Minnesota; William S. Kenyon, Iowa; Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire; Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts; Porter J. McCumber, North Dakota; George P. McLean, Connecticut; Charles L. McNary, Oregon; Knute Nelson, Minnesota; Harry S. New, Indiana; Truman H. Newberry, Michigan; Carroll S. Page, Vermont; Boies Penrose, Pennsylvania; Lawrence C. Phipps, Colorado; Reed Smoot, Utah; Selden P. Spencer, Missouri; Thomas Sterling, South Dakota; Howard Sutherland, West Virginia; Charles E. Townsend, Michigan; James W. Wadsworth, Jr., New York; Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; James E. Watson, Indiana.

AGAINST RATIFICATION

Democrats, 42: Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; J. C. W. Beckham, Kentucky; George E. Chamberlain, Oregon; Charles A. Culberson, Texas; Nathaniel B. Dial, South Carolina; Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida Edward J. Gay, Louisiana; Peter G. Gerry, Rhode Island; William J. Harris, Georgia; Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Charles B. Henderson, Nevada; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, Nebraska; Edwin S. Johnson, South Dakota; Andrieus A. Jones, New Mexico; John B. Kendrick, Wyoming; William H. King, Utah; William F. Kirby, Arkansas; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Henry L. Myers, Montana; John F. Nugent, Idaho; Lee S. Overman, North Carolina; Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma; James D. Phelan, California; Key Pittman, Nevada; Atlee Pomerene, Ohio; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; James A. Reed, Missouri; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Morris Sheppard, Texas; Furnifold M. Simmons, North Carolina; Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina; John Walter Smith, Maryland; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona; A. Owsley Stanley, Kentucky; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Charles S. Thomas, Colorado; Park Trammell, Florida; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Thomas J. Walsh, Montana; John Sharp Williams, Mississippi; Josiah O. Wolcott, Delaware.

Republicans, 13: William E. Borah, Idaho; Frank B. Brandegee, Connecticut; Bert M. Fernald, Maine; Joseph I. France, Maryland; Asle J. Gronna, North Dakota; Philander C. Knox, Pennsylvania; Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin; Medill McCormick, Illinois; George H. Moses, New Hampshire; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Miles Poindexter, Washington; Lawrence Y. Sherman, Illinois; Hiram W. Johnson, California (Republican and Progressive).

NOT VOTING

Democrats, none.

Republicans, 1: Albert B. Fall, New Mexico.

Vacancies, 1.

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 58, pt. 9, p. 8786; Congressional Directory, 66th Cong., 1st sess., July 1919.)

II. November 19, 1919: Vote on the treaty without reservations:

FOR RATIFICATION

Democrats, 37: Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; J. C. W. Beckham, Kentucky; George E. Chamberlain, Oregon; Nathaniel B. Dial, South Carolina; Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida; Edward J. Gay, Louisiana; Peter G. Gerry, Rhode Island; William J. Harris, Georgia; Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Charles B. Henderson, Nevada; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, Nebraska; Edwin S. Johnson, South Dakota; Andrieus A. Jones, New Mexico; William H. King, Utah; William F. Kirby, Arkansas; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Henry L. Myers, Montana; John F. Nugent, Idaho; Lee S. Overman, North Carolina; Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma; James D. Phelan, California; Key Pittman, Nevada; Atlee Pomerene, Ohio; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Morris Sheppard, Texas; Furnifold M. Simmons, North Carolina; Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina; John Walter Smith, Maryland; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona; A. Owsley Stanley, Kentucky; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Thomas J. Walsh, Montana; John Sharp Williams, Mississippi; Josiah O. Wolcott, Delaware.

Republican, 1: Porter J. McCumber, North Dakota.

AGAINST RATIFICATION

Democrats, 7: Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma; James A. Reed, Missouri; John K. Shields, Tennessee; Hoke Smith, Georgia; Charles S. Thomas, Colorado; Park Trammell, Florida; David I. Walsh, Massachusetts.

Republicans, 46: L. Heisler Ball, Delaware; William E. Borah, Idaho; Frank B. Brandegee, Connecticut; William M. Calder, New York; Arthur Capper, Kansas; LeBaron B. Colt, Rhode Island; Albert B. Cummins, Iowa; Charles Curtis, Kansas; William P. Dillingham, Vermont; Walter E. Edge, New Jersey; Davis Elkins, West Virginia; Bert M. Fernald, Maine; Joseph I. France, Maryland; Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; Asle J. Gronna, North Dakota; Frederick Hale, Maine; Warren G. Harding, Ohio; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; Frank B. Kellogg, Minnesota; William S. Kenyon, Iowa; Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire; Philander C. Knox, Pennsylvania; Robert M. LaFollette, Wisconsin;

[1] The Covenant of the League of Nations was included as part of the Treaty of Versailles. In fact, it was to the Covenant that most of the Senate debate on the treaty was directed.

Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts; Medill McCormick, Illinois; George P. McLean, Connecticut; Charles L. McNary, Oregon; George H. Moses, New Hampshire; Harry S. New, Indiana; Truman H. Newberry, Michigan; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Carroll S. Page, Vermont; Boies Penrose, Pennsylvania; Lawrence C. Phipps, Colorado; Miles Poindexter, Washington; Lawrence Y. Sherman, Illinois; Reed Smoot, Utah; Selden P. Spencer, Missouri; Thomas Sterling, South Dakota; Howard Sutherland, West Virginia; Charles E. Townsend, Michigan; James W. Wadsworth, Jr., New York; Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; James E. Watson, Indiana; Hiram W. Johnson, California (Republican and Progressive).

NOT VOTING

Democrats, 2: Charles A. Culberson, Texas; John B. Kendrick, Wyoming.

Republicans, 2: Albert B. Fall, New Mexico; Knute Nelson, Minnesota.

Vacancy, 1.

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 58, pt. 9, p. 8803; Congressional Directory, 66th Cong., 1st sess., July 1919.)

III. March 19, 1920: Final vote on the treaty with 15 reservations:

FOR RATIFICATION

Democrats, 21: Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; J. C. W. Beckham, Kentucky; George E. Chamberlain, Oregon; Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida; Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma; Charles B. Henderson, Nevada; John B. Kendrick, Wyoming; William H. King, Utah; Henry L. Myers, Montana; John F. Nugent, Idaho; Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma; James D. Phelan, California; Key Pittman, Nevada; Atlee Pomerene, Ohio; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; Hoke Smith, Georgia; John Walter Smith, Maryland; Park Trammell, Florida; David I. Walsh, Massachusetts; Thomas J. Walsh, Montana; Josiah O. Wolcott, Delaware.

Republicans, 28: L. Heisler Ball, Delaware; William M. Calder, New York; Arthur Capper, Kansas; LeBaron B. Colt, Rhode Island; Charles Curtis, Kansas; William P. Dillingham, Vermont; Walter E. Edge, New Jersey; Davis Elkins, West Virginia; Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; Frederick Hale, Maine; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; Frank B. Kellogg, Minnesota; William S. Kenyon, Iowa; Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire; Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts; George P. McLean, Connecticut; Charles L. McNary, Oregon; Harry S. New, Indiana; Carroll S. Page, Vermont; Lawrence C. Phipps, Colorado; Reed Smoot, Utah; Selden P. Spencer, Missouri; Thomas Sterling, South Dakota; Howard Sutherland, West Virginia; James W. Wadsworth, Jr., New York; Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; James E. Watson, Indiana.

AGAINST RATIFICATION

Democrats, 23: Braxton B. Comer, Alabama; Charles A. Culberson, Texas; Nathaniel B. Dial, South Carolina; Edward J. Gay, Louisiana; Carter Glass, Virginia; William J. Harris, Georgia; Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, Nebraska; Edwin S. Johnson, South Dakota; William F. Kirby, Arkansas; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Lee S. Overman, North Carolina; James A. Reed, Missouri; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Morris Sheppard, Texas; John K. Shields, Tennessee; Furnifold M. Simmons, North Carolina; Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina; A. Owsley Stanley, Kentucky; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Charles S. Thomas, Colorado; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; John Sharp Williams, Mississippi.

Republicans, 12: William E. Borah, Idaho; Frank B. Brandegee, Connecticut; Bert M. Fernald, Maine; Joseph I. France, Maryland; Asle J. Gronna, North Dakota; Philander C. Knox, Pennsylvania; Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin; Medill McCormick, Illinois; George H. Moses, New Hampshire; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Lawrence Y. Sherman, Illinois; Hiram W. Johnson, California (Republican and Progressive).

NOT VOTING

Democrats, 3: Peter G. Gerry, Rhode Island; Andrieus A. Jones, New Mexico; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Republicans, 9: Albert B. Cummins, Iowa; Albert B. Fall, New Mexico; Warren G. Harding, Ohio; Porter J. McCumber, North Dakota; Knute Nelson, Minnesota; Truman H. Newberry, Michigan; Boies Penrose, Pennsylvania; Miles Poindexter, Washington; Charles E. Townsend, Michigan.

Vacancies, none.

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 59, pt. 5, p. 4559; Congressional Directory, 66th Cong., 2d sess., May 1920.)

Mr. Speaker, examination of these votes will disclose that on the first call of the roll there were only 39 votes, less than a majority, for ratification with 14 reservations and 55 votes against such ratification.

On the second vote, a vote on ratification without any reservations, there were 38 votes in favor, not a majority, and 53 votes against ratification.

On the final vote a bare majority of the whole Senate favored the treaty with 15 reservations, the vote being 49 votes for ratification and 35 votes opposed. As 84 votes were cast ratification would have required 56 favorable votes and only 28 votes opposed. It is interesting to note that on the final vote the opposition to ratification was composed of 23 Democrats and 12 Republicans.

A Bad Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 7, 1945:

A BAD EXAMPLE

A government which for the last 12 years has never ceased to impress upon private employers their obligations to their employees has been guilty of shameful neglect of one of its oldest, most loyal, and hardest-working groups of Government employees.

It is now more than 20 years since the postal workers have had any increase in their basic pay. In those two decades the wages and salaries of most other workers, both public and private, have soared, in most instances keeping pace with, if not pacing, the rise in the cost of living.

Two years ago, while still refusing to face the real issue in this case, Congress did grant the postal workers a temporary annual bonus of $300. This was supposed to make up for the increased living costs and the vast increase in the amount of work performed in the war period. Actually, it did neither. Furthermore, this bonus will die a natural death in June, unless Congress takes further action and the postal workers will be forced to go back to their 1925 wages.

Your mailman, who has done so much to maintain public morale in these dark months, is not asking for a renewal of the bonus. He is asking for the passage of the Burch bill, now pending in Congress, which will grant a permanent increase of $400 a year in the basic pay of the postal workers, reclassify the service for the first time in two decades, provide an incentive for remaining in the service by granting annual increases over a limited term of service, and provide regular time and a half pay for overtime.

Congress should pass this bill as an act of simple justice. The Government should practice what it preaches.

The Dregs of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article written by Mr. Sam Tucker, a Washington newspaper correspondent representing several large Illinois daily newspapers, and which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on April 26, 1945.

I have been well acquainted with Mr. Tucker for more than 15 years. He is one of the leading journalists in Illinois. In 1933 he broadened his scope of writing experiences by coming to Washington as representative for both the East St. Louis Journal and the Decatur (Ill.) Herald-Review. His work is well known throughout Illinois, and he is considered by thousands of readers as an interesting interpreter of national news.

The following article is particularly typical of Mr. Tucker's accurate interpretation of situations:

THE DREGS OF A NATION

(By Sam Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Never before in all the long, generally sordid, record of human history has there been any other episode so hideous as that of the Nazi regime in Germany. No other ruling caste has ever murdered so many human beings, inflicted so much torture and suffering.

In comparison, all the Christian martyrs tortured to death in the Roman arena numbered only a few hundreds. If the legend of St. Ursula's 11,000 virgins is true, the sacrifice amounted to less than a week's toll in a single Nazi concentration camp—one among many. The nearest parallel, perhaps, was in the ancient Aztec empire. The Spanish soldiers under Hernando Cortes were not squeamish and not unaccustomed to the sight of death, but their stomachs were turned and they were moved to fury when they saw the blood-crusted temples of the Aztecs.

LACKED SCIENCE

At that, the Aztec ceremonial slaughter was performed by a small group of the priesthood and with hand weapons. They lacked the German scientific equipment, the machine guns and gas chambers. Although they claimed to have sacrificed 10,000 victims on occasion, for the glory of their god, probably they were bragging. Human arms, operating only with stone knives, would have been sooner exhausted.

The murders by the Nazis total millions. Americans have seen the evidence of it only in the last week, and are horrified. It is so nearly unbelievable that Eisenhower has de-

manded witnesses, German witnesses, and American Congressmen. What they will see is nothing new. It is something that was begun the very day Hitler came into power and has been continued every year since. For every corpse found by American troops in Buchtenwald and Belsen, for every act of bestiality committed in these torture camps now opened to world inspection there were several others in Warsaw, in Czechoslovakia, and in Austria.

President Roosevelt knew about this, and so did many other well-informed people. It was one of the reasons for the conclusion, while Americans still clung to the hope of keeping out of war, that the Nazi system and the American system could not both continue to exist in the same world.

A WARNING

The magnitude of the horror is so great that civilized indignation now will be tempted to fall unconsciously into the Nazi error—the theory that human beings can be judged by their race, and that certain races are inherently evil. Upon this theory the German race would have to be held the most barbaric and evil in all human experience. We must avoid the temptation to that easy verdict.

What happened in Germany was that the dregs of the nation, the criminals crawling out of the cellars and sewers, managed to get possession of the Government. After terrorizing their own people they attempted to take possession of the world. There are thousands of Nazi criminals to be dealt with, but they must be dealt with as individuals for personal crimes. To judge them because they picked Germans as parents would be to repeat the Nazi fallacy.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on the 13th day of April in the Washington Post. It gives expression to the thoughts and feelings of millions of people throughout the world in much better fashion than I could do it.

The successful conclusion of the war in Europe brings to our minds the irony that the man who had carried the burden of it so long was not here to witness its conclusion. The time is propitious for us to review his talents, and to reevaluate his stature among the great.

The editorial follows:

MR. ROOSEVELT

All the politics of the moment are stilled by the overwhelming news from Warm Springs. F. D. R. is dead. The flash came over one's desk stark and simple. It recorded the end of the life cycle of a single individual. But, as one looked at it, the three words seemed to grow bigger and bigger, and one groped to clothe them with meaning. The groping will go on for many a day. For the news comes like a bolt from Jove, and the thunder is still echoing and reechoing through the diameter of our planet. The shock is felt with a poignant sense of personal loss by men and women of every race and color. It is as if a presence has been removed from the daily lives of all nations. A minute before the stabbing news came through the ether and over the wires, the busy world had been lost in its work and its wars. Then there was this silence, this solitude, while men everywhere looked at each other bewildered. The sepulcher of this man who has died is, indeed, the whole earth.

At this time the general performance of the President is in all our minds. Franklin Delano Roosevelt has put a stamp upon history which may well be unique in recorded time. Four times elected President of his country, he has a place all his own in our American annals. He dies as his country stands at a dizzy height of puissance. No nation, not even ancient Rome, has ever attained such eminence, and the entire world looks to the United States for guidance in bringing the war in both oceans to a victorious end, and for aid in putting the world in the way of recovery from its awful travail. Franklin D. Roosevelt was the leader of this arbiter of the world's destinies. To many millions of people he personified the United States. The record puts Mr. Roosevelt in the company of the very greatest back to Pericles.

A man who has made such an imprint on the pages of history is never easy to assess. Franklin Delano Roosevelt is no exception. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that a man is this, and not that; but Mr. Roosevelt was this-and-that, and you could find every human quality and trait in his character. Perhaps all great men are unanalyzable, unfathomable. At any rate, there is no biographer of Mr. Roosevelt who has ever been able to sum up the manifold personality of our late President.

"Give me a place to stand!" said Archimedes. One can almost hear Mr. Roosevelt saying, "Give me a place to stand" after he had emancipated himself at 28 from the life of the idle rich which he inherited. It was at that age that he made two discoveries. One was that his career belonged to politics, the other that the object of government is the welfare of the people. He followed these stars unswervingly. They led him to the conviction that he must give to humanity what he was giving in all fullness and with amazing versatility to the United States.

So he grew to the Titan role which he filled at the day of his death. He will be written of in years to come as the war's greatest casualty. For he died in war's service, and to Mrs. Roosevelt in this hour of her grief will go the sympathy of men and women from the farthermost corners of the earth. May it be her consolation that countless hearts are bowed down over her bereavement. She deserves great honor today, for it was she who organized her husband's life for the tasks that she felt, in spite of the affliction which cut him down 20 years ago, were marked out for him by Providence. In death he will reinforce the unity among nations which he strove to achieve in his lifetime.

O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, every phase of that instrumentality known as the O. P. A., whose job it was to hold the line against inflation, is under bitter attack. Particularly does it face universal disapproval because of the manner in which it has handled food, particularly beef and pork.

The effort of the W. P. B. in M-388, issued in collaboration with O. P. A., which deals specifically with fabrics and has for its purpose the channeling of goods into garments to satisfy the cheaper buyers, is meeting with some difficulty.

I quote here a statement from one of the New York papers, as follows:

Just as the New York fashion designers became resigned to the worst shortage of fabric they've ever known (because such immense quantities of rayon, cotton, and woolen yardage have been sent to France, England, and the rest of Europe on lend-lease), they are visited by French salesmen representing textile firms in Lyons, France, bearing fat sample books of wonderful and varied fabrics all ready for prompt delivery. Who's looney now?

My Choice for American Hero No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. Leslie Witt entitled "My Choice for American Hero No. 1," appearing in the February 2 issue of the War Production Sentinel, a publication of various war plants in Houston. Mr. Witt is connected with the Emsco Derrick & Equipment Co., Houston.

The article is as follows:

MY CHOICE FOR AMERICAN HERO NO. 1

(By J. Leslie Witt)

Webster's definition of a hero is: "A person of distinguished valor in danger, or of fortitude in suffering." I prefer to place the latter interpretation upon the word.

Our front pages are filled with the names of men who by long training and brilliant ability have been able to effect remarkable achievements in the face of emergencies, when they no doubt had no other choice except to do what they did. On a momentary impulse of fanatic patriotism, men have challenged Fate, and heroic deeds have been done that brought glory and renown to the hero. All of this is grand and commendable, and is the background of most of our heroes.

But I think that the real test of true heroism is measured by the spirit that inspires the deed, the courage and fortitude required to perform the deed, and the good that is accomplished by it.

I visualize a mother who sends her son into the service of her country at war. The memory of his warm baby breath upon her breast; the emotions of her long years of tender care throughout his childhood; and the proud realization that now he is a grown man, the reincarnation of her own self, the culmination of her life's dream—all of these memories crowd into her mind and heart as she hears the call for him to go away to war, to privation and suffering, and perhaps to death. And yet, with full knowledge of these consequences, she sends her boy away with a kiss and a smile, leaving all the love in her body pushed up into her throat.

She makes the supreme sacrifice of flesh of her flesh, heart of her heart, and soul of her soul, with no thought of glory for herself, but with the one desire that in years to

come other mothers might be spared the agony of such a sacrifice.

My choice for American hero No. 1 is an American mother of a boy in service.

Address of Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on May 8, the four major radio networks of this country presented, among many other outstanding features, special remarks addressed to the Nation and the armed forces overseas by the chiefs of the armed services, headed by Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, the senior military officer of the United States on active duty. The address by Admiral Leahy, who is chief of staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, was a summary of what we are all thinking and feeling today. Coming from a leader who has served with supreme distinction in both military and civilian capacities—as Governor of Puerto Rico and Ambassador to France—and from one whose views on the war have been heard only rarely, it will be of especial interest to the entire country.

Incidentally, in my humble judgment, Fleet Admiral Leahy is not often enough given the exalted credit due him for his brilliant but modest chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Supreme High Command of the United States armed forces.

Admiral Leahy's address follows:

We cannot help being overawed by the great event in which we share today. We have seen now all but the final act of the stupendous drama of the past decade. That decade witnessed an attempt by the remorseless forces of barbarism to overrun and enslave the peace-loving peoples of the earth. The attempt almost succeeded, but finally it has failed. We record today the unconditional surrender of the barbarians of the west.

Our ability to comprehend this in its true proportions is small. We can feel but we cannot yet understand. The perspective of time is needed to evaluate it in its full grandeur. Roughly we know what has happened. The giant of German militarism, arrayed in revolutionary armor, arrogant in its power and contemptuous of the values of civilization and democracy, lies destroyed before us. We and our allies have destroyed it. Millions of our men and women, although hating war, found the strength and skill to wage war more successfully than those brutal belligerents who worshipped war. In the vast Atlantic theater, we are now unconditionally victorious, and we move on, with all our might and power, to confront the still strong but already doomed enemy in the Pacific.

In this historic struggle, in which every nation on the earth was involved in some degree, the United States has played a major role. Each Allied nation has lent itself, without stint or measure, to the common struggle and the final victory. Never in the world's military history has there been such a successful demonstration of coalition war. The list of heroic achievements of our allies is long. For our part, we may recognize the eminent achievements of our own arms and of our own Nation. Our armies, our naval fleets, and air forces have dealt crushing and fatal blows to the enemy in Europe, while at the same time hammering their way across the Pacific to the gates of Japan. While we mobilized, we sustained our allies with food and the materials of war, and continued to supply them, even while our vast forces struck and struck again at the enemy.

But it is certain that the one circumstance without which victory would have been impossible was the combined strength of the Allied coalition. In that Allied unity we take our greatest pride. Without that unity, without the coalition of all our forces, our Nation today would stand in dreadful peril.

Today it is fitting that we pay reverent tribute to the master architect of that unity, as he was also the master architect of our own military accomplishments, our late beloved Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That great spirit understood the world's peril long before it took the open form of war. He prepared his Nation for it, within the limits of feasibility, and early threw our moral and material weight into the scales. At that moment, the forces of aggression were doomed, even while they were winning victories. When the Axis Powers in their anguish for conquest, threw caution to the winds and launched what they thought would be the final assault, our brave Commander in Chief addressed words of courage to the Congress—words which emboldened and refreshed all the world's forces of resistance—"With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounded determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God." That brave pledge is now fulfilled in part. With victory over Japan, it will be wholly accomplished.

I may say today that President Roosevelt's wisdom and amazing grasp of world geography and military capacities played an all-important part in leading the forces of the coalition, and our own, to victory. We who were privileged to serve under him in high staff and command posts, today salute this brave soldier who fell in battle, in the same sense that we salute those millions of others, of our own and of other lands, who died that this Nation, and its neighbors across the seas might fulfill their destinies in peace, freedom, and friendship.

The millions of men in the ranks who fought this war have earned our undying gratitude. Their deeds speak for themselves much better than I can speak for them. We are proud as well as grateful for their sacrifices, their endurance under unspeakable conditions, their courage and their valourous maintenance of all the highest traditions of this Nation. And for those who died, there are no words at all. We grieve for them, and in our sorrow we are more firmly resolved to achieve in full the purposes for which they died.

Victory in this war was won, not by navies and armies alone. The war has been waged and won by entire peoples. We must acknowledge in our own land the contribution of those millions at home who converted our factories, farms, and workshops into an arsenal of unprecedented productivity. From that arsenal we supplied our own forces and those of our allies. Labor and management share fully in today's victory.

For the military waging of this war, it became necessary to provide an effective coordination of the various arms and branches of the services. For amphibious warfare, and for coordinated air, sea, and land attacks on many far-flung fronts it was imperative to bring about an intimate association of the forces of the Army, of the Navy, and of the air. This was achieved not without difficulty, but it was achieved. Today on the fighting fronts, there is no distinction, except in function, among the personnel of the different services. Operational command has been unified. There has been a complete alliance of our own arms, and for this, high credit is due to my three colleagues of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Gen. George C. Marshall, Admiral Ernest J. King, and Gen. Henry H. Arnold.

Now, with the hosts of evil and barbarism vanquished in Europe, we must turn our full attention to the Far East. There we still have a powerful enemy, who boasts that he is willing and ready to fight on for 100 years if necessary. We assure him it will not take that long. Still he has powerful legions of troops in his home islands and on the coast of China, perhaps 7,000,000 of them. Although the vast circumference of his Empire has been shrunk by our assaults, his naval power destroyed, and his air forces crippled, we have a long road to travel before victory.

Japan must be beaten into defeat, into unconditional surrender. The reconquest of the Philippines was a step in that direction. The remaining steps must and will be taken. We have no intention of relaxing until the eastern barbarian share the fate of his partner. We have not forgotten Pearl Harbor. We know that the American people, with equal devotion and sacrifice, will support their sons and brothers, who will be fighting our savage enemies in the far Pacific until the final victory is won.

Increase of Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the immediate adoption of a plan to increase the salaries of postal carriers and clerks of Massachusetts in particular, and the Nation in general:

Resolution that Congress be memorialized in favor of the immediate adoption of the plan to increase the salaries of postal carriers and clerks of Massachusetts in particular and the Nation in general

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, foremost in the enacting of legislation beneficial to working and living conditions of its citizens, and anxious to start a parade of States petitioning Congress to take immediate action in rectifying the substandard working conditions and wages of the postal clerks and postal carriers, hereby urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the plan of the National Postal Employees Association and provide funds necessary in carrying out this great humanitarian piece of legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress,

and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 26, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, May 2, 1945.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:
[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

There Is Some Sense to It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Post of this morning comes the following editorial, the first three paragraphs of which contain some constructive thought:

NOW JAPAN

The impact on Japan of the unconditional surrender of Germany will be considerable. In following up the blow, political warfare should now be employed to the fullest extent. Specifically, Japan should be told her fate immediately so that she may be encouraged to throw in the sponge. Up till now all she knows is what she hears from such fire-eaters as Admiral Halsey and Mr. McNutt. The extermination ideas of men like these two have doubtless been spread through Japan by the Japanese themselves in order to ginger up a last-ditch fight. Better to die fighting than surrender to be destroyed.

What we are suggesting, to be sure, is conditional surrender. What of it? Unconditional surrender was never an ideal formula. It was absolutely essential in the case of Germany because unconditional surrender was the only common denominator of inter-Allied agreement. Even now we have many points of difference with the Russians on the occupation of Germany. How, then, could you ever have got agreement on inter-Allied terms on conditional surrender from Germany while the war was going on?

No such problem among the Allies is involved in the case of Japan. The war in the Pacific is an Anglo-American affair, with the Americans doing the lion's share. It would not be difficult to get agreement on terms for Japan; in fact, agreement could be got overnight, so that the Japanese could be told without delay.

We urge, therefore, that the task of compiling the terms for Japan and informing the Japanese of them should not be delayed. Already both Britain and America must have an understanding that Japan should be pared down to its volcanic core. But, of course, it is not enough to say that. We must expand upon the Cairo agreement, which is the nucleus of peace with Japan, and spell out what we require of Japan as the condition of surrender.

The Cairo agreement would return Japan to the condition prior to 1895; that is to say, before Japan launched war on China and took Formosa as a prize. This means that Japan would be pretty well stripped of her conquests. Beyond that, there must be more demands before we can be satisfied that the possibility of a resurgent militarism in Japan has been ended. It is not a hard peace that we are interested in. It is an effective peace. In our view this means a Japan where, at the end of the road, we shall not find utter chaos, as we are finding in Germany, but a going concern with a native administration still in operation within Japan.

VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following very excellent editorial on VE-day which appeared in the May 8, 1945, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Daily Record:

VE-DAY

VE-day, the long-awaited capitulation and unconditional surrender of the Axis in Europe, has come at last.

We are tempted to rejoice and release our pent-up emotions in the traditional manner of war-weary people.

But we cannot.

The victory has been too costly in the blood of our loved ones, too dissipative of the progress of the past, too destructive of the hopes and promises of the future.

We are glad for the lives that have been spared by the cessation of hostilities in and about Germany.

But we cannot forget the lives that have been lost.

Nor can we lose sight of the grim truth that the war is not over for us.

We still must meet and defeat Japan.

We still must overcome and overwhelm the worst menace to our western civilization.

What has really happened in consequence of the collapse of Germany and the extinction of the Nazi tyranny is that we are finally enabled to turn our whole attention as a nation and as individuals to our war.

The battles of Europe had to be fought and won.

But no American fails to remember how we got into that conflict.

Whatever the Germans or the Italians might eventually have done to compel us to go to war with them, it was the Japanese who stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor.

It was the Japanese who shattered our peace on that December morning nearly 4 years ago, and despoiled our soil and desecrated our flag.

Because we had to fight Germany and Italy, too, we could not fight back at the Japanese effectively.

In fact, we very nearly lost the war with Japan as a result of our electing to fight and crush the Germans and the Italians first.

The decision was a dangerous gamble, as military authorities knew and acknowledged.

Fortunately, it succeeded.

But, in the meantime, the Japanese had swiftly overrun the Pacific basin and had conquered the Philippines and Guam and Wake Island, and were strongly based in the Aleutians, and were only barely stopped at the shores of Australia.

Slowly and painfully and bloodily we pushed the Japanese out of the advanced parts of their stolen empire.

Finally we drove them out of the Philippines and Guam and the Aleutians.

And now we are steadily reducing the inner fortress of Japan itself.

But all this we have done—and have been forced to do—with what could be spared from the bitter conflict in Europe.

As long as such a situation prevailed we could not hope utterly to defeat and destroy Japan.

Which is what we can and will and must do now.

And until it is done our war is not over.

Our American boys are not coming home in great numbers until it is done.

They are going on fighting and dying until it is done.

This is a triumphant day and a memorable day. But it is also a stern and solemn day.

Only a part of our job is done.

The biggest, hardest, worst part still remains.

Japan is the enemy of all the world and particularly the enemy of the United States now more than ever.

Only the United States stood between Japan and her master plan for conquest.

Only the United States possesses the determination and the strength and the weapons completely to subdue her.

Let us therefore get on with the bitter struggle against Japan.

Let us put all our resources and energy into it and win it.

Then, and then only, will America "end the war victoriously, make the peace permanently, and bring our boys home promptly," which are the things for which we are fighting.

There Is Still Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, as I have said repeatedly on this floor, the war workers of this Nation have no equal in their devotion to victory. Even as the historic announcement of VE-day yesterday was in the making, the men and women who build the giant B–29 Superfortresses in Seattle were seriously thinking of the meaning of that day to them.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include with my remarks an editorial from the April 26, 1945, edition of the Aero Mechanic. This is the official newspaper of the Aero Mechanics Lodge 751 of the International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., representing every worker of Boeing, builders of bombers.

The editorial, written by Richard H. Powell, executive vice president of the union, expresses the determination of these workers to continue at their benches and beside their machines until VE-day has become final victory day. His eloquent message follows:

With General Patton's tanks thundering up the hills of Hitler's Berchtesgaden hideout, and Russian troops fighting through the ruins of Berlin, the German conflict might end momentarily.

But that does not mean the war will be over.

The yellow hordes of Japanese military might must be snuffed out for all time. The Pacific war is still far from victory, and all

of our efforts, and all of our thoughts must be concentrated on smothering Japan effectively and decisively.

As Aero Mechanic members, we have been building the main weapon for assault against Japan—the mighty B–29 Superfortress. Termination of hostilities in Europe should not be a cause or reason for us to celebrate; rather, it should be an added incentive for all of us to renew our determination to stay on the job and get our phase of this nightmarish war over as quickly as possible.

There have been fears expressed by government officials that war workers will rush from their workbenches and production machine when word is flashed in war plants that Hitler's regime has been crushed. I do not believe that Aero Mechanic members will do this.

Our members are extremely aware of the important part they have in prosecution of the Pacific war. Nearly all of our members have a relative, a close member of their family and of their heart, in the armed forces, and many of these fighting GI's are aiming their guns at the heart of Nippon. It is for them that we must stay on the job, and for ourselves and the millions of other peace-loving persons of the world who are determined to stamp out aggression.

Excellent Article by John Griffin, of Boston Sunday Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. John Griffin which appeared in the May 6, 1945, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post:

AIR POWER WAS RESPONSIBLE IN LARGE MEASURE FOR ALLIED VICTORY OVER NAZI ARMIES—VON RUNDSTEDT VERSION OF DEFEAT GIVES EMPHASIS TO CLAIMS OF THOSE WHO INSISTED ON VALUE OF BOMBING

(By John Griffin)

A couple of years ago there was a great dispute as to the value of air power in the present war. The advocates of air power insisted that their branch would win the war, and the generals on the ground scorned the idea. The latter believed that the Infantry only could win the war because only the infantry could take enemy territory and hold it.

The argument was rather futile, for it was obvious even then that the war could only be won by the best use of all branches of the service. One could not win without the other, but the argument will probably go on forever.

The airmen now have their chance to crow as a result of the remarkable summary made by the German Field Marshal von Rundstedt, as reported in an interview with Associated Press writer Louis P. Lochner.

THE PRIME FACTOR

Marshal von Rundstedt, explaining the defeat of the German armies, said that air power was the prime factor, and what he said coincided with the claims made by Allied airmen long ago. They held that Germany's industrial potential could be destroyed by air power, and that her communications could be ruined.

That is just what Von Rundstedt said after he had been taken, and his statements appeared to reflect the considered judgment of the military man speaking of military things as a scientific problem.

Bridges had been destroyed by allied air power, railroads ruined, and it was impossible during the critical periods for the Germans to move any of their men and equipment by day. Bombardments of industrial plants and oil centers made it difficult, if not impossible, for the panzer divisions to function properly.

This was of the greatest importance at the time of the German counter offensive in Belgium last winter. Marshal von Rundstedt said that he thought he had a chance at that time of holding in the west, but all his reinforcements had to be brought up on foot because aerial bombardment had destroyed the mobolity of the mechanized groups.

At the same time General Patton and other American generals had full opportunity of moving around rapidly on wheels and could get to the critical points in plenty of time to put an end to the German advances.

OVERWHELMING EXCELLENCE

"The unheard of superiority of your air forces," Von Rundstedt said, was the really important factor in the allied victory. This made daytime movement impossible. Second in importance was the lack of motor fuel for the panzer divisions, which can also be traced to allied air offensive. Third was the systematic destruction of all railway communications, also a result of air bombardment.

Thus comes early corroboration of the claims of the airman, made 3 years ago, and incorporated by the Allied general staff, that Germany could be beaten down from the air.

That didn't mean, as many people believed it did, that surrender could be forced upon the Germans simply by aerial bombardments and without an invasion by land armies. It meant that full and efficient use of air power would make the Germans relatively soft for invading forces.

The German armies were composed of professionals, generals who have been planning for many years and soldiers who had been well trained, who had in fact been brought up from childhood with the idea that they would make war for Germany.

They were not soft pickings, by any means, for the Allied armies that did land on the continent. But they were at full efficiency at no time after the landing in Normandy, because the Allied air power had robbed them of their strength and had deprived them of the necessary equipment.

VALUABLE RAIDS

Remember the air raid on Schweinfurt that cost the lives of many American airmen? These men were told at the time that if their raid was successful, the war would be shortened by several months. Apparently that statement was correct, and those gallant fliers did not die in vain.

For that great raid, one of the outstanding exploits of the war, cut down the production of vital materials for the German air force. The all-important items needed by the luftwaffe were not forthcoming, and the German air arm was rendered almost helpless.

And the big raids on the Ploesti oil fields, raids in which American Flying Fortresses dropped their bombs from only several hundred feet and had to fly directly into a rain of antiaircraft shells? What about those?

Well, Von Rundstedt offers as one of the chief reasons for Germany's defeat the loss of materials from Rumania. This was one of the greatest oil-producing areas the Nazis had, and when it was badly damaged, Nazi panzer outfits hundreds of miles to the west came to a halt.

When they halted, and when the luftwaffe was grounded through lack of equipment and fuel, and when the bridges went down under Allied bombs and the railroads were helpless, the great Allied armies landed in Normandy as the first step on the road to the heart of Germany.

TRIBUTE TO GENERALS

It was through the eyes of a man in the position of Von Rundstedt that Americans may gain an even more impressive idea of the wonderful work their armies and air fleets and navy have done. Von Rundstedt speaks of the terrible bombardment of the American and British Navies at the time of Normandy, which indicates the great cooperation between all the Allied branches.

And then, finally, the German marshal talks about American generals, and he is "amazed." He can hardly understand how we could have so many able military leaders. "It is terrific," he said. "Your mobility, your ability to detect and exploit the enemy weaknesses is as modern as were our operations in France in 1940."

One wonders if men like Von Rundstedt will ever realize what suckers they are to pick a fight with the United States and to fight a war of mechanized might. That is our strength, as Germany has learned, and Japan is learning.

One wonders if they will ever get a true appreciation of the fighting qualities of a free people who will fight with more determination and more spirit for the very fact that they are free.

Our success and our ability, as testified to by Von Rundstedt, ought to be a great example to the peoples of the world who are still oppressed, who still long for freedom, and also to those nations who think that only dictatorships can produce great spirit.

The War in the Pacific Is Not Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the morning press comes the following:

THERE'S A WAR OFF, BUT NOT ON OKINAWA

(The following dispatch, by Gordon Cobbledick, war correspondent for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, tells of Okinawa on VE-day.)

OKINAWA, May 8 (via Navy radio).—We stood in the rain this morning and heard the voice from San Francisco, only half believing. There had been so many false reports. But this seemed to be the McCoy.

"Confirmed by General Eisenhower's headquarters," the voice was saying. "Prime Minister Churchill proclaimed May 8 as VE-day."

Artillery thundered and the planes roared low overhead and we couldn't hear all that the voice was saying:

"President Truman—Marshal Stalin announced—the Canadian government at Ottawa — unauthorized announcement—American new agency—"

So this was VE-day. It was VE-day in the United States and Great Britain and Russia but on Okinawa the ambulances skidded through the sticky red mud and bounced over rutted rocky coral roads. Some of the men who rode them gritted their teeth behind bloodless lips and let no cry escape them. Some stared into space through eyes that were dull with the look of men to whom nothing mattered greatly. Some screamed with pain that the morphine couldn't still. And some lay very quiet under ponchos that covered their faces.

It was VE-day all over the world but on Okinawa. Two doughboys lay flat behind a jagged rock and one said, "I know where the bastard is and I'm going to get him."

He raised his head and looked and then he stood, half crouched, and brought his Garand into position.

When he tumbled backward the rifle clattered on the rocks. The boy looked up and smiled sheepishly and said, "I hurt my arm when I fell," and the blood gushed from his mouth and ran in a quick torrent over the stubble of beard on his young face, and he was dead.

It was VE-day at home, but on Okinawa men shivered in fox holes half filled with water and waited for the command to move forward across the little green valley that was raked from both ends by machine gun fire.

It was VE-day, but on Okinawa a staff officer sat looking dully at the damp earthen floor of his tent. A young lieutenant, his green field uniform plastered with mud, stood awkwardly beside him.

"I was with him, sir," the lieutenant said. "It was a machine-gun bullet, sir. He never knew what hit him." He paused. "He was a good marine, sir."

The staff officer said, "He was the only son we had."

It may be you had a son in the war.

Wisconsin Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Establish Enviable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with great pride, I call attention to the enviable record made in this war, thus far, by the fighting men of Wisconsin. True to the traditions established by the famous Iron Brigade in the Civil War, and the Thirty-second Division in the last war, our sons and daughters are carrying on to final victory over Japan.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I insert herein an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

WISCONSIN NAMES HIGH ON HONOR ROLL OF HEROES—STATE HAS SENT MAN TO EVERY THEATER OF WAR; SOME HAVE RECEIVED HIGH DECORATIONS

From the moment the first explosives dropped from the sun-bathed Hawaiian skies upon the runways of Hickam Field and the nearby naval installations of Pearl Harbor, Wisconsin men and women in uniform have added new luster to the State's military record.

Wisconsin soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardmen—some 300,000 of them—have fought in the jungles of New Guinea and Burma, among the hedge rows of Normandy, on Tarawa, in Italy. They have flown tons of destruction against the enemy and sailed the world's oceans with Allied supplies.

Some Wisconsin heroes have been awarded the Nation's highest military honors; others, unnamed and unsung, have uncomplainingly endured the fox holes and hardships and braved death a thousand times.

There were Wisconsin men on Wake, in the Philippines, in Iceland, and other far-off bases on December 7, 1941. The Wisconsin National Guard was on maneuvers in Louisiana; it had been reactivated as the Thirty-second Division of World War No. 1 fame and soon sailed to the South Pacific against the Japanese.

RUSH OF VOLUNTEERS

When the word came that we were at war, thousands of young men and many young women rushed to the recruiting stations, and the draft machinery set up a year before hurried new men day after day to the Milwaukee induction station. In some of those earlier months, Wisconsin enlistments topped the Nation, on a per capita basis.

Casualty reports trickled in at first, a few from Pearl Harbor, a few from the Philippines. Then came the Buna-Gona campaign, with the Thirty-second Division spearheading our first offensive against the enemy, and the lists of the killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners were more frequent.

At times, some Wisconsin communities were harder hit than others as the news was received that units drawn from certain cities or villages were bearing the brunt of front-line fighting.

JANESVILLE MEN FIRST

The first American killed in the Japanese attack on the Philippines was Ensign Robert G. Tills, of Manitowoc, pilot of a PBY bomber in the famous Patwing 10. He was killed when his plane was sunk in the Gulf of Davao by Jap dive bombers. A Navy escort ship has been named in his honor.

At the very outset of the war, a Janesville tank company which had been detached from the Thiry-second Division and sent to the Philippines was plunged into action. There were 106 Janesville men in the company, which played a heroic role in the defense of the Bataan peninsula. Some will never return to their Janesville homes, while the rest have been prisoners of the Japanese for almost 3 long years.

And there is no more heroic Wisconsin chapter in the war than that written by Company K from Milwaukee's south side in the jungles of New Guinea. This unit, composed almost entirely of men of Polish ancestry, battled the Japanese under almost incredible conditions for days until, when these men from the south side were taken out of the front lines, there were scarcely a dozen able to walk.

New names were added to the list of the State's military heroes from the very outset of the war.

Capt. Franklin Van Valkenburgh, of Milwaukee, was officially named by the late Secretary of the Navy Knox as "the outstanding hero at Pearl Harbor." Commander of the *Arizona*, Captain Van Valkenburgh was fatally wounded but refused to be carried to safety and directed the fire of the doomed battleship. He was posthumously awarded the Nation's highest honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, and a destroyer now bears his name.

CITY CLAIMS MAC ARTHUR

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose name became known to every American for his defense of the Philippines and later as commander in chief of all land forces in the Pacific, is a Milwaukeean. Under his planning and leadership American forces first stopped the Australia-bound Japs and then carried the battle to the enemy.

In the Philippines was Joseph Bangust, son of Mrs. Betty Ann Massouras, 922 W. Clybourn Street, who died a hero's death with the Navy's famous *Patwing 10*. Bangust, a waist gunner on a plane, was seriously wounded but continued to fire upon Japanese Zero fighters until enemy bullets killed him at his post.

Maj. Jack L. Jerstad, of Racine, and Capt. Cassin Young, of Milwaukee, were both awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Jerstad helped lay the plans for the first low-level bombing attack on Rumania's Ploesti oil fields and then volunteered to lead the way. He never returned. Captain Young, commander of the famous cruiser *San Francisco*, was killed in a furious night naval battle in the Solomon Islands.

Other Congressional Medal of Honor winners were Sgt. Elmer J. Burr, of Menasha, and Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, of Helenville, who both died on Christmas Eve, 1942, near Buna in New Guinea. Sergeant Burr smothered a hand grenade with his body, saving the lives of his commanding officer and other soldiers, and Sergeant Gruennert in daring fashion led an attack on two Jap pillboxes.

The list of Wisconsin winners of the Congressional Medal also included General MacArthur himself; Corp. Eric G. Gibson, Rice Lake; Lt. Beryl R. Newman, Baraboo; Maj. Richard I. Bong, Poplar; Sgt. Truman C. Olson, Cambridge; and S. Sgt. Gerald L. Endl, Janesville.

Major Bong was the first American ace to break Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's World War No. 1 record of 26 enemy planes shot down in combat. His total finally reached 40 Jap planes knocked down in the Southwest Pacific. He was then reassigned to duty in the United States.

The first enlisted man to win the Distinguished Service Cross in the north Africa campaign was a Milwaukeean—Corp. Sanford (Sandy) Forbes, son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Forbes, of 205 North Thirty-fourth Street. Corporal Forbes was later killed.

Other Wisconsin men who have distinguished themselves in the war include Vice Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, of Hillsboro, under whose leadership Task Force 58 scourged the Japanese throughout the far reaches of the Pacific; T. Sgt. Robert L. Holliday, of Milwaukee, and Lt. Comdr. Louis J. (Bullet Lou) Kirn, of Milwaukee, both veterans of air combat, and Lt. Willis A. Carpenter, of Milwaukee, who died storming the beaches of Tarawa.

Many other Milwaukee and Wisconsin names appeared from day to day in stories detailing the exploits of our men in the front lines and in the less heroic but equally important supply jobs behind the lines.

And then that host again of unnamed heroes—the foot sloughing doughboys who took the best that the Germans and Japs could offer and then punched back with devastating effect; the intrepid paratroopers, the sailors who braved the elements and enemy action, the merchant seamen, and the airmen, the tank crews, and the artillerymen, the WAVES, the WAC's, the women marines, and the SPARS.

Fighting men and women, every last one of them.

Expedite Payment of Claims by Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging that the necessary steps be taken

to expedite payment of compensation claims by the Veterans' Administration:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to provide for expediting the payment of claims by the Veterans' Administration

Whereas great inconvenience, and in some cases severe hardship, is being caused by the unreasonable delay in the payment by the Veterans' Administration of claims for compensation, particularly the claims of the dependents of those who had died while serving in the armed forces and the claims of disabled veterans; and

Whereas persons entitled to such compensation are in many instances deprived of their sole means of subsistence and are forced to rely upon public welfare assistance for their support; and

Whereas immediate action should be taken to remedy the deplorable condition to which persons entitled to the benefits above-mentioned are unjustly and unfairly subjected: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to immediately take such action as may be necessary in order to expedite the payment of compensation claims by the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, April 26, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, May 2, 1945.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] F. W. COX,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Cleveland (Ohio) News and an article from the National Women's Trade Union League of America:

SATURDAY TOWN MEETING—EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN?

(By Grace B. Doering, member, legislative committee, Business and Professional Women's Club)

Will Rogers said, "We're all ignorant, only on different subjects." Don't women have equal rights with men now that they have the right to vote? No; that is the only right which is guaranteed to them under the Constitution of the United States. Amazing?

Aren't women guaranteed the equal protection of the law (meaning the protection of equal laws) under the fourteenth amendment, because it forbids States to discriminate against citizens and persons? No; women are not really "persons," "citizens," or "people." Following a principle laid down in its early decisions, the United States Supreme Court (*Smith* v. *Alabama* (124 U. S. 465)) has so interpreted such provisions that women are guaranteed under the Constitution only such rights as the English women enjoyed in 1789 because "its provisions are framed in the language of the English common law."

Those rights are described by Blackstone in his Commentaries (1765). A married woman could not contract for the spending of her own money, even though it had been given to her by her own parents or earned by her own labor. She owned no personal property, not even the clothes she wore, nor the jewels her husband gave her. She could not sue in the courts for injury to her person. She could not make a will. Her husband could chastise her or restrain her of her liberty. In short, she was her husband's lovely slave, dependent upon his whims, without appeal to any court—and penniless. She could, however, be punished for her crimes.

STATE LEGISLATION IS INADEQUATE

Why don't the women, with their vote since 1920, get these discriminating laws removed? It is a slow process. Only about 150 have been eliminated in those 25 years. It would take 150 years at that rate. Moreover, what one legislature rights, the next can undo, unless there is one supreme law of the land. Had "sex" been included along with "race, etc.," in the fifteenth amendment adopted after the Civil War, American women would have been granted 50 years sooner the right to vote which came with World War No. 1.

The movement for the freedom of women is a serious one. It is gathering momentum with the passion for democracy which is sweeping the world. Women are overcoming personal whims and past stands and are uniting in an effort to obtain passage of the equal-rights amendment now, while they work at forge and under battle fire for freedom for others. It is indorsed by 31 national women's organizations with a membership running into millions. Governors of at least 25 States have approved wholeheartedly. Mary Pickford, Pearl Buck, Gladys Swarthout, Katharine Hepburn, presidents of universities both women and men economists, historians—the list of active supporters grows hourly.

ALIMONY WORKS BOTH WAYS

The opposition worries, too, that the "age of consent" would have to be made the same for man and woman. We have done that in Ohio without detriment. Each State would set its own age.

Husbands and wives would be treated equally with respect to their responsibilities for the support of the other spouse and children. Already in 13 States either husband or wife may be allowed alimony at the discretion of the court.

And what of the mothers' pension? Social security laws call it aid to dependent children; and the children of a widower, as well as those of a widow, or orphans, are benefited. And maternity legislation? Such laws apply to a limited number of women over a short period of time and are no more discriminatory than medical care for war veterans. All men are not veterans.

Protection against long hours never did apply to mother and houseworkers; nor does protection against night work apply to nurses, war workers, and office cleaners. The first of such discriminatory laws (1836) was recommended partly because women were a competitive menace to men. Here in Cleveland it has been discovered that such laws protect the woman against the better job, and in times of scarce employment, against any job. She is protected from working the extra hour or hours required of an executive and protected from time-and-a-half pay for emergency rush jobs.

DEMOCRACY MEANS EQUALITY

Once (in 1923), *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital* (261 U. S. 525) our United States Supreme Court said, "We cannot accept the doctrine that women of mature age, sui juris, require or may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men under similar circumstances," but the next year (1924) the old doctrine was reverted to. The Justices, too, could change their minds; there was no equal-rights amendment.

And what is meant by rights under the law? The word "right" is used frequently in the first 10 amendments, commonly known as the Bill of Rights. It has a distinct meaning to all liberty-loving Americans.

The principle that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex is vital. It is a matter of natural justice and equity which should require no argument for its approval. America cannot honestly be a vigorous democracy while full equality is withheld from one-half of its citizens.

(By Mrs. Charles Bang, president, Ohio League of Women Voters)

"Certainly I believe in equal rights for women," you say. But wait a minute. Let's look a little closer at the fancy label of this package which is being so temptingly offered to American women. The advertising slogans sound wonderful—but do they really mean what they say?

The League of Women Voters believes that "equality of rights" are mischievous words to put into the Constitution because they are abstractions. Do they refer to both rights and duties? What does "equal" mean? Each of us may have a very clear idea of what we mean by "equal" and "rights," but our concept is probably not a legal one.

Once a part of the Constitution, these vague words become the law of the land, likely to cause infinite trouble for years to come. Not only are these words more vague than any now in the Constitution, but they cover a greater variety of fields of law.

All laws treating men and women differently would be in question until, through endless litigation, the Supreme Court had finally arrived at the interpretation of what "equal rights" or "equality of rights" under the law means.

The amendment would not substitute new legislation for the laws that are now in force. The State legislatures would have to do this, just as they are free to do now and are doing. This is recognized in some literature prepared by the Woman's Party which points out that under the amendment 5 years is given to the States after the final adoption of the amendment to make their laws conform to it.

LAWS ARE SUBJECT TO CHALLENGE

The trouble is that even after the States changed their laws each new one would be subject to challenge in the court until meaning has been given to the amendment through court decision.

Granted that we want to remove any discrimination against women that remains in the laws of the various States and that we want women to have equality of opportunity, the argument is not over the objective but over the method.

Will the so-called equal-rights amendment eliminate all discrimination which handicaps women in industry, the professions, in civil life? Definitely not. These discriminations (not getting equal pay for equal work, lack of opportunity in certain professions, difficulties married women have had in getting jobs) are not legal but traditional and emotional. Education and legislation can eradicate them, but a constitutional amendment cannot guarantee jobs to women if employers want to replace them with men.

As a matter of fact, in several States laws have already been passed forcing employers to grant equal pay for equal work. The proposed amendment does not make the passage of such laws by the States mandatory. It is not necessary for their future enactment by other States.

LEGAL STATUS WILL REMAIN

Will the amendment wipe out all the differences in the legal status of men and women arising from marriage and family responsibility? Definitely not.

For example, in the average American home the husband is the wage earner and the wife the homemaker. In the society in which we live it is taken for granted that it is the man's legal obligation to be responsible for the support of his wife and family. Under the equal-rights amendment, to which status would the word "equality" occur? Would women be required to support their husbands? What would happen to the thousands of women who are deserted by husbands? Would the man have no financial responsibility in these cases?

We know that a few parasites have used alimony to further their own selfish ends but what would happen to the many who need this protection—the middle-aged whose husbands leave them and who are not able to support themselves. In instances such as these the application of the equal rights amendment would scarcely be equality.

Actually it could eliminate the right of married women to be supported by their husbands, a right we can ill afford to abandon so long as the family is the basic unit of our society.

LAWS RECOGNIZE DIFFERENCE

Those legal discriminations which are unreasonable and obsolete should be removed by legislation in the States, and through testing in our courts. To attempt to remove them by constitutional amendment would make unconstitutional every labor law that does not apply equally to men and women. It would leave nothing in their place.

These laws recognize certain facts which mark the essential difference between man and woman—woman's child-bearing function, her dual job as homemaker and worker, her lesser strength, her greater susceptibility to fatigue. The amendment would set the clock back 100 years from the point of view of progressive social legislation. It would actually prohibit the enactment of any legislation for the safeguarding of women alone.

The league and many other women's organizations believe we should not add specific prohibitions which would violate the integrity of the Constitution. This is an attempt to get something we are equipped as citizens to achieve through the orderly development of legislation.

Careful analysis of the amendment has convinced us that it is a delusion and a snare—a veritable Pandora's box for the unsuspecting purchaser.

WHY TAKE OFF YOUR HEAD TO CURE A HEADACHE

This is what we are being asked to do. A so-called equal rights amendment has been before the Senate and the House for over 20 years. It has been and still is opposed by most of the large women's organizations and by the trade-union movement of the country. Yet its proponents hysterically cry "Pass the equal rights amendment; wipe out all differences in law between the sexes and women will be made free and equal."

Indeed, while some of the discriminatory laws against women may thus be cured, we would kill at the very same time, through the proposed drastic equal rights amendment, the very laws that are enabling women to progress and advance to real equality Yes; the equal rights amendment treatment is akin to curing your headache by taking off your head.

WHAT IS THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT?

It is a misnamed proposal to amend the United States Constitution as follows:

House Joint Resolution 1: Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

"Senate Joint Resolution 25 (as revised by Senate Judiciary Committee): Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 5 years after the date of ratification."

WOULD THIS AMENDMENT GIVE WAGE-EARNING WOMEN EQUALITY?

This amendment gives nothing to anyone. It will not give women equal pay for equal work. It will not give women greater opportunity for work according to their individual abilities. It will not increase their opportunity for education. It will not remove a single disadvantage now in existence. On the contrary, it takes away from women their hard-earned industrial gains which have given them a better standard of living.

WHAT IS THE REAL PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT?

The real purpose of this amendment is to make it impossible for the State or Federal Governments to ever pass a law that applies to women alone regardless of how necessary and desirable such a law might be.

WHAT IS BASICALLY WRONG WITH THE AMENDMENT?

The amendment fails to take into account that there are physical and functional differences between men and women. These differences require special consideration (such as laws prohibiting the employment of women in mines and quarries).

WHAT WILL BE THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF PASSED?

It would wipe out completely all the good laws that have been enacted to improve the working conditions of women. It would also make forever impossible the passage of any law bettering the employment conditions of women alone.

WHAT NECESSARY LEGISLATION FOR WAGE-EARNING WOMEN WOULD BE THROWN OUT BY THIS AMENDMENT?

1. Minimum wage laws for women: 26 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, have minimum-wage laws. Four million women in hotels, restaurants, laundries, and other service industries are now assured through minimum-wage laws that they must be paid a wage which will, at least, give them a decent standard of living.

2. Maximum-hour laws: 43 States have laws that limit the number of hours that a woman may be required to work daily and weekly. Many working women have responsibility of home and family. This is especially true today. If these hour laws for women are destroyed, women would again have to work long hours in order to keep their jobs.

3. Other regulations concerning women have to do with providing proper sanitary facilities and other conditions of employment to safeguard their health. These regulations are especially necessary for the well-being of the woman worker.

HOW DO PROPONENTS OF THE AMENDMENT ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE ARGUMENTS THAT THE AMENDMENT WOULD DESTROY THE LABOR LAWS FOR WOMEN?

1. Proponents argue that by invalidating the special labor legislation for women we will succeed thereby in somehow getting these laws for both men and women alike.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THEIR ANSWER?

At present there is nothing to prevent a State from making its minimum-wage law or other legislation pertain to men as well as women. But the fact is no State has done it as yet—and the proposed amendment is now 20 years old.

To believe that this amendment will mysteriously inspire State legislatures to make all their labor legislation affecting women apply to men alike may be satisfying to the woman of leisure, but to the woman who works in a laundry or restaurant or hotel there is small comfort in this nonsensical illusion.

Of course, it would be desirable to have some of these laws made applicable to men, but until we can succeed in passing such laws for men, why should we destroy the legislative gains which women have achieved thus far?

2. Some proponents further argue that the labor laws for women, instead of helping them, restrict their chances for employment. Is this argument true? No.

It is completely false. Figures compiled by the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, clearly show that the number of women employed in industry has increased steadily during the past 25 years, the time during which these laws were enacted. Not only have greater numbers of women been working during these years but because of these very labor laws women are working under better conditions of employment. Their health and efficiency to continue working is being safeguarded and they are earning better wages.

ARE THOSE OPPOSED TO THIS AMENDMENT AGAINST REAL EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN?

Of course not. We have always favored and worked for legislation that will secure full civil and political equality for women and men. However, we believe that the Nation and the States must have power to make allowances for the physical and functional differences existing between the sexes. Only by recognizing and providing for such differences can real equality be established between men and women.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the National City Bank of New York has made some pertinent observations in its May 1945 report relating to Bretton Woods. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the report on Bretton Woods and the American Bankers Association:

THE AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION AND BRETTON WOODS

"Why is the American Bankers' Association opposing the Bretton Woods program?"

From the number of times this question is asked and the variety of answers given by critics of the A. B. A. position, it is evident that, despite all the talking and writing on the subject, there is still very little real understanding of what the argument is about.

With Treasury officials and other Bretton Woods advocates constantly preaching in public addresses, through the press, and over the radio that the Bretton Woods plan is indispensable to post-war currency stability

and abandonment of discriminatory exchange practices, it is small wonder that people ask, "Why are the bankers opposed?"

The answer is that the bankers are not opposed, in the sense of being against what Bretton Woods stood for. They are just as much in favor of currency stability and elimination of discriminatory exchange practices as the Treasury or the delegates to the Conference. But being in favor of objectives is not enough. There must be a practicable plan. Too often in their zeal to sell the American people, the Bretton Woods enthusiasts have talked as though their particular plan offered practically a guaranty of post-war currency stability and freedom from exchange controls. Actually, of course, it does no such thing. No plan could; and certainly it needs but a casual glance through the extended and complicated provisions for changing exchange rates and maintaining exchange controls to see that Bretton Woods is no exception.

Yet such has been the force of propaganda that a large section of public opinion takes criticism having to do wholly with matters of method and technique as evidence of lack of sympathy with objectives. Not to go along with the official program in every particular has been to invite charges of ulterior motives, isolationism, and being a reactionary.

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST INTERNATIONAL BANKERS

There is, for example, the charge that bankers are opposing Bretton Woods because they want to make profits out of unstable exchanges. This follows an old familiar formula, based on appeal to popular prejudice and the fact that it is always possible to impress some people by attacking the bankers, especially the "international bankers of Wall Street."

Curiously enough, at the same time that bankers are being attacked by one group of critics for wanting to perpetuate unstable exchanges for selfish reasons, they are being accused by another group of seeking to drag an unwilling world back prematurely to the gold standard and rigid exchanges. Obviously one of these accusations must be wrong, and it so happens that both are.

No group in the community has stood more consistently—even obstinately—for stable and orderly exchanges than the bankers. Bankers, almost to a man, opposed the departure from gold in 1933, and have overwhelmingly favored every approach to gold ever since. They were among the strongest advocates of repeal of the President's power to devalue the dollar. The fault, if any, in their attitude is that they have been too orthodox in their advocacy of the gold standard and fixed exchanges, which accounts for some of the criticism mentioned above, although anyone taking the trouble to read the American Bankers Association report on Bretton Woods should be aware that the association neither proposes nor expects any general return to the gold standard in the near future. To charge now that bankers suddenly have become obstructionists to stabilization proposals for the sake of profits is to totally ignore this traditional viewpoint.

The fact is that bankers have very good and selfish reasons for not wanting fluctuating exchanges. The profits that can be made out of unstable exchanges are risky and speculative, and are quite as likely to turn out to be losses. Where banks make their surest and most money in exchange is in financing a large volume of foreign trade—a condition that thrives best under stable currencies. Mr. Edward E. Brown, president of the First National Bank of Chicago, member of the American delegation to Bretton Woods and a warm supporter of the proposed international monetary fund, dealt effectively with the charge that banks want unstable exchange for profit when, in appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee recently, he said:

"It is to the advantage of our bank to have exchanges that are stabilized, because the profits of our foreign-exchange department are based on the interest and exchanges that we get on handling foreign-exchange transactions, and stable exchange promotes foreign trade and the more foreign trade there is, why, the more money we make. We do not make any speculative profit on our exchange position."

NATURE OF THE ISSUES

In attempting to define the real issues posed by Bretton Woods it might be useful to begin by stressing, for a change, the large area in which there is already agreement.

In the first place, there is—as stated above—already agreement upon objectives. The association wants free and stable exchanges, and an international monetary organization to help achieve these conditions. Its record in this respect is clear and consistent. More than a year and a half ago, when the first Keynes and White currency stabilization proposals were under discussion, it said in a report by its economic policy commission:

"Some international institution is desirable: To help nations in stabilizing their currencies; to provide a meeting place for the discussion of monetary questions; to collect information which is a necessary basis for sound decisions; and to make arrangements for stabilization credits in cases where they are justified."

That the association is still in favor of these objectives is shown in its report on the Bretton Woods proposals issued on February 1 last, and in statements by association representatives in hearings on the Bretton Woods Agreement Act before the House Banking and Currency Committee in March.

Secondly, the association favors an important part of the particular machinery proposed at Bretton Woods for accomplishing these objectives. It endorses the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as sound and desirable, and recommends its adoption with few changes.

Thus we come to the International Monetary Fund as embodying the main points of disagreement between the A. B. A. and the Treasury. What the A. B. A. wants primarily is more assurance that the fund will be operated as a stabilization fund should be—that is, concerned only with short-term credits required to iron out temporary irregularities in exchange fluctuations. It fears that the fund, as proposed, is too elaborate and complicated, and by its system of quotas in an international money pool, managed by an international board, would make credit granting too easy and automatic, leading to bad loans, overborrowing, and postponement in countries experiencing exchange difficulties of those corrective internal measures necessary to insure real currency stability.

For such reasons the Bankers Association does not favor a separate international monetary fund, but recommends that certain proposed functions of the fund be merged with the international bank to be set up as soon as possible. Such an institution would be equipped to supply the kind of credit most needed in the reconstruction period, and such credits would be made selectively and after proper investigation. The United States in the case of the bank would have a veto power over loans floated in dollars, just as other countries would have such power in respect to loans in their currencies.

The bank, in the opinion of the A. B. A., could readily serve as the center for consultation and agreements between countries on currency matters, and provide stabilization credits where necessary and under proper safeguards. The association believes that arrangements of this kind go as far as is practicable now in getting countries to really commit themselves as to currency policies and practices during the reconstruction period, and would be simpler, less costly, and more workable than the proposed monetary fund.

TREASURY OPPOSITION TO A. B. A. PROPOSALS

Treasury opposition to these proposals has been mainly on three counts:

1. That the Bretton Woods agreement, having been adopted by 44 countries, cannot be changed without calling another conference.

2. That adequate safeguards against the misuse of the fund feared by the A. B. A. are already embodied in the articles of agreement. Thus, Treasury officials point out that, apart from quantitative limitations restricting (except upon special permission by the fund) a member's net borrowing to a maximum of 100 percent of its quota, with no more than 25 percent in any one year, the fund has authority both to postpone inauguration of exchange transactions with any member whose circumstances are such as might be considered likely to lead to improper use of the fund, and to suspend exchange dealings at any time with a member deemed to be making improper use of the fund. It is contended that these provisions refute the charge of easy and "automatic" lending, and were inserted with the purpose of insuring the same high standards of careful lending and liquidity emphasized in the A. B. A. proposals.

3. That merging the fund with the bank, in the manner proposed by the A. B. A., would "wreck the entire program" by doing away with the elaborately-worked-out formulas for dealing with changes in exchange rates and discriminatory exchange controls. As Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, recently put the argument:

"The heart of the Bretton Woods proposal is that there must be some action to get the nations to agree to abandon methods of economic warfare—such methods as competitive exchange depreciation, multiple currencies, and exchange controls.

"If you can't get countries to abandon these practices, it does no good to make stabilization loans."

Of these three objections, point No. 2—Is the lending sound?—must surely be considered of paramount importance. For without sound lending everything else goes by the board, regardless of how many nations may have signed or how solemn or sweeping their promises on currency policies and practices may be. Not only will the money of the lenders be frozen, but no favor will be done the borrowers who, instead of taking the basic steps necessary to correct their balance of payments, will be encouraged to go on borrowing and getting deeper and deeper in debt.

This suggests one of the several fallacies in the argument that because we spend hundreds of billions for war we can afford to risk two and three-fourths billion dollars (United States subscription to the fund) for peace. It all depends upon the plan. While two and three-fourths billion dollars might not be too much to pay for a good plan for international monetary stability, it would be a high price to pay for a bad plan.

If, as the Treasury insists, there is really agreement with the banking community on fundamental principles of how the fund should operate, it ought not to be too difficult to find a means to express that agreement in ways that both parties can subscribe to, and which will be acceptable abroad as well. As now drawn the articles of agreement contain so many obscurities and ambiguities of language on critical points that it is hard to tell what they really mean. Since the task of administering a fund of this kind will be a most formidable one at best, the management will have need of the clearest possible mandate as to what principles should govern.

A SUGGESTION BY THE C. E. D.

As a move in the direction of greater clarity may be cited the recent suggestion by the

Committee for Economic Development that the proposed international bank be given express authority to make stabilization and general-purpose loans in cases where they are justified. Foreseeing the same danger envisioned by the A. B. A., viz, that the fund—particularly in the post-war transition period—may become involved in loans which are of essentially long-term stabilization character, the committee has proposed that the phrase in the provision of the bank agreement that "loans made or guaranteed by the bank shall (except in special circumstances) be for specific projects of reconstruction and development" be interpreted as definitely authorizing loans of the character just indicated. While it is true that the bank managers might so construe the present language, if they chose to do so, the suggestion of the C. E. D. has the merit of making the language perfectly clear and removing all possible doubt as to what the powers may be.

The fact that the Treasury has indicated a receptive attitude toward the C. E. D.'s suggestion is encouraging evidence of recognition that the Bretton Woods document can still be changed to advantage, notwithstanding the much-harped-on "agreement by 44 nations." The suggestion itself is good so far as it goes, but does not go far enough. While it opens up the bank for a type of stabilization loan that belongs there rather than in the fund, it does not at the same time necessarily imply a tightening up of the operations of the fund. There is still serious question as to the adequacy of safeguards provided to assure proper discrimination in granting fund credits.

WILL OTHER COUNTRIES ACCEPT CHANGES?

The question of the willingness of other countries to accept changes in the articles of agreement is, of course, pertinent and deserves comment.

The first thing to be said is a reminder that the Bretton Woods plan has not been agreed upon by 44 nations, as so often loosely stated, but represents merely a set of proposals which the Bretton Woods delegations agreed to submit to their respective governments for consideration. The delegations did not even recommend the adoption of the proposals; and, in addition to this general reservation, there were specific reservations on a number of points by several delegations. The governments themselves remain entirely uncommitted.

The second point that needs bringing out is the evidence from comments abroad that other countries are going to take a good long look, including all the fine print, before signing on the dotted line. While the bank has found general acceptance abroad, the fund has met with a good deal of criticism and demand for clarification.

The British Chancelor of the Exchequer has characterized it as "a difficult document, inevitably long and technical." "There are," he said, "some obscurities of language in it which have led to misunderstanding and must be clarified."

Two leading British trade organizations—the London Chamber of Commerce and the National Union of Manufacturers—have issued statements severely critical of the fund, while the Federation of British Industries, though approving the "broad objectives and principles" of the plan, calls attention to various "defects" and asks for interpretation of certain obscurities (for example, the term "fundamental disequilibrium"). The Federation further proposes an interim trial period of perhaps 4 years before the Government definitely commits itself to a universal multilateral system.

The London Economist, one of Britian's leading financial weeklies, observes in its issue of December 2, "The bank is less controversial than the fund and more urgently needed. In the final act the two are tied together, but if the bank could be untied and set up separately, great advantage would result."

The following is from an editorial in the London Times of September 25:

"Legitimate anxiety has been expressed over the possibility of a divergence of interpretation and of consequent misunderstanding on what may be a matter of vital concern to this country; and, whether arrangements of the kind described are contemplated in the immediate future or not, Parliament will rightly desire to be assured that other prospective parties to the draft scheme share without reservation the view of its effect taken by the Chancelor of the Exchequer and Lord Keynes. * * *

"This country is most anxious to cooperate loyally in any international arrangement, but it can hardly afford to face the alternative of either appearing as a defaulter or running into insoluble difficulties and failing to counter mass unemployment caused by the development of a slump elsewhere. The credit facilities provided by the fund are, as one correspondent showed, a wholly inadequate safeguard against this contingency; for any sudden depression in the United States—such as occurred in 1929 and, with even greater rapidity, in 1937—would almost instantaneously lead to exhaustion of Britain's credit with the fund. It would seem difficult for any government which has accepted the prime responsibility of maintaining a high and stable level of employment in the future to ratify the Bretton Woods agreement without further clarification of this issue."

The London Times comment raises a key question which has bothered a good many people, namely, whether there has been any real meeting of the minds between British and Americans on post-war currency policies, or whether we have been using language to create an impression of agreement without the substance. The British want a plan which leaves them plenty of room for flexibility in dealing with their post-war currency problems; we want a plan which puts more emphasis upon stability and firmer commitments. In an attempt to reconcile these differing viewpoints there has been produced a document which has been taken to mean one thing on this side of the Atlantic and another thing on the other side.

Thus we hear the plan spoken of in this country as giving us something of the assurance of stability usually associated with the gold standard; while in England Lord Keynes has spoken of it as "the opposite of the gold standard." The impression that is left is of a kind of double talk which, however well intended, may be hurtful of real international understanding in the end.

WHY NOT ANOTHER CONFERENCE?

It is, of course, desirable to arrive at an understanding with other countries on monetary problems, if we can, without calling another conference. But why—if we have to have it—should we dread another conference? We are having two conferences to deal with security proposals—Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco; and maybe more. In the economic area, other conferences must be held and will be useful in learning each other's point of view. One such conference is essential before long to consider trade arrangements, because trade quotas, tariffs, export bounties, bilateral agreements and the like could completely defeat any program for monetary stabilization. As Assistant Secretary of State W. L. Clayton recently told the Congress, in testifying on the reciprocal trade agreements program, the Bretton Woods monetary agreement and other plans won't make sense without action in the tariff field. Trade policies and monetary policies should logically be considered together.

While we want to do all possible to capitalize and build on the progress of international monetary cooperation already begun, a program as important and complicated as this calls for much more than mere formal inspection and approval by the Congress. We need to give it the same careful study that other countries are going to give it, to the end that we reach an agreement that appeals to public opinion in this and other countries as both fair and practicable and to which people can give their continuing support.

A True Majority Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Schwabe amendment is an important contribution to the resolution before us. Instead of proposing ratification of treaties by a simple majority vote of the Members present in each body, House and Senate, it requires a majority of the membership of each body to vote affirmatively on a treaty. That moves in the direction of the two-third rules, and in some respects is better.

As has been pointed out, under this method we would not have joined the League of Nations as originally proposed, but we would have joined it with the Pepper reservations, assuming the House voted as did the Senate. We would have proclaimed adherence to the World Court, a step that was recommended by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and such Secretaries of State as Henry Stimson, Elihu Root, and former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes.

The Schwabe plan has been spoken of as a compromise between the simple majority and the two-thirds rule. To see how accurate this is we might apply it to the most recent two-thirds question in the House, the vote on overriding the President's veto on the draft bill. The motion to override received 185 votes, with 177 against, getting a majority of those voting, but not two-thirds of those present, which would have been 242. A majority vote of the House membership would have been 219, which is 60 percent of the 362 who were present and voting on that question.

There is much to be said for participation by the House of Representatives in the making of treaties. Consideration in the House committees and debate on the floor of the House, with the attendant publicity and study throughout the Nation, will afford some replacement for the safeguards offered by the present two-thirds rule in the Senate. Not enough, I have thought, to warrant the change to a simple majority of a quorum in each body. But enough, I believe, to warrant the change if an actual majority of total membership in each body is required as contemplated by the Schwabe amendment.

We are living in a different world than did the framers of the Constitution. Communication is faster. Transportation is faster. There are more newspapers and magazines to inform the people. And we have radio. There is reason to think that these things will insure a better understanding of questions involved in treaties.

And whether we wish or not, the United States is living in a world where it cannot escape decisions on world questions. To ignore them is not to escape them. It seems to me important that we strive for more flexibility in our handling of international questions—the establishment of a more positive approach without loss of the wisdom that thorough consideration should give.

Our present rule of a two-thirds vote in the Senate provides a negative safeguard against precipitate action, but leaves something to be desired when affirmative action is wanted by the Nation that is so much more completely represented in the House.

The amended resolution seems to be the best proposal to accomplish the double purpose of thorough consideration with opportunity for action either affirmatively or negatively, and my vote is cast accordingly.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Orlando Morning Sentinel of May 7, 1945:

FLORIDA LEADS TREATY FIGHT

(By Allen Morris)

TALLAHASSEE.—It well may be Florida has—as United States Senator CLAUDE PEPPER says—done something historic. At least the State has started rolling a ball which could change the Constitution of the United States.

Congress will get soon a resolution by which the Florida Legislature applies for a convention to allow ratification of treaties by a majority of both Houses, instead of two-thirds of the Senate alone.

Since the Senate was unlikely ever to submit to the States an amendment to take away its veto power, the reverse procedure is being tried with Florida taking the lead in the Nation.

Drafters of the Constitution provided two channels for its amendment; one in which the Congress sends proposed amendments to the States for ratification, and the other in which the States required Congress to call a convention.

If 31 other States join Florida in the adoption of a resolution "applying"—that's the constitutional word—for a convention to phrase the amendment, Congress has no alternative but to do so.

Senator PEPPER, who urged the Florida Legislature to take its action, explained the two-thirds rule gave as few as 17 Senators the power to defeat any treaty, and 33 Senators could do so at any time.

"At present," said Senator PEPPER, "the House of Representatives, the body in the Congress closest to the people, is necessary to a declaration of war. But it has no part in making a treaty of peace or in our joining an international organization to keep the peace. Only the Senate has anything to say about that.

"But even the Senate cannot agree to a treaty or to any organization like the United Nations unless two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present when such a matter is considered agree to such proposal.

"That provision defeated the League of Nations and contributed to the present awful war. For there is no doubt that a majority of the Senate and the House of Representatives would have agreed to the League of Nations as recommended by President Wilson if they had had the power to do so."

Declaring the time had come to modernize the country's peace-making machinery, Senator PEPPER argued:

"Both Houses of Congress represent the people; both Houses declare war; both Houses have to pass legislation which is usually necessary to carry out any treaty we make; both Houses have to make any appropriations necessary to carry out any treaty.

"Both Houses, therefore, should speak for the people in making agreements with other nations, not just two-thirds of the Senate, whose Members are not answerable to the people except every 6 years."

H. R. 2652

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Norris E. Phillips, chairman, Tile Council of America, before Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, re H. R. 2652:

My name is Norris E. Phillips. My full-time job is that of vice president of the Olean Tile Co., Olean, N. Y. I am appearing today as chairman of the Tile Council of America, an organization of 18 floor- and wall-tile-manufacturing companies representing more than three-quarters of the total volume of the industry. Several of the other members of the industry are also here with me.

We are seriously concerned about the impact of lowered tariffs for tile upon our industry. We appreciate this opportunity of presenting to you the reasons for our concern. We hope that you will be mindful of them in your deliberations on this proposed legislation.

At the outset I should like to say that we do not purport to be economic experts. We don't pretend to be familiar with the intricacies of international trade and commerce.

We are well aware that there are several large volumes, running to millions upon millions of words, of testimony given before this committee in the past several years. We know that there are libraries packed with learned treatises on foreign trade.

It is impossible to scan the testimony of hearings held before your committee without a profound respect for the time and study you gentlemen have devoted to this complicated question. We cannot attempt to match that knowledge.

We come before you simply as American tile manufacturers. We are small-business men. We have come to our conclusions with honesty and sincerity. After examining the facts relating to our industry, we find no other conclusions possible.

We are businessmen. But we are, first and most important, Americans. We have an abiding faith in our country. America's future is our future.

More than anything else we want a world in which we and our children and their children can live at peace. We are conscious of the fact that wars have their roots deep in economic disturbances, and that the seeds of this war grew and matured in the fertile fields of poverty and discontent throughout the world.

Our overriding consideration, therefore, in asking you to hear us, is the preservation of future peace. With any national policy devoted to that end, we are in entire accord.

We know that in debating and passing upon laws affecting the lives and hopes of all Americans, you gentlemen have a difficult and often thankless task. We take it for granted that your first goal is the welfare of the entire Nation. We know you are trying to achieve this with due consideration for the impact of national policy upon the groups and segments making up the total economy.

We are convinced that America cannot long be economically healthy and militarily secure in an impoverished world—a world ripe for every dictator and demagogue that comes along.

We believe that America can make a very great contribution to the progress of the world by setting an example of working peacefully together among ourselves, with a constantly better standard of living for our people, and with hope and confidence in the future.

That is why we have left our businesses to come to Washington and set forth our views for your consideration. The American tile industry has made outstanding contributions to higher living standards for the people of this Nation—contributions out of all proportion to the size of the industry itself. We do not believe it will be in the natural interest to sacrifice this industry through a policy of further lowering tariffs to the point where we are driven out of business.

As I have said, we are small business. How small is best shown by facts set forth in an exceptionally able study of our industry made by Mr. Ray T. Watkins, Mr. Carl J. Whelan, and other members of the staff of the United States Tariff Commission. This study is known as Earthen Floor & Wall Tiles, Report No. 141, second series, and was published by the Tariff Commission in 1941.

A table on page 38 shows that, according to the United States Bureau of the Census, there were in 1936 57 manufacturing establishments, producing 55,551,463 square feet of floor and wall tile, valued at $13,748,332. By 1939, the last year for which any figures are available, the industry presented the picture described on page 2—some 55 plants operated by about 50 companies, with capital ranging from a few thousand dollars to over a million dollars per company—a total industry capitalization of from twenty to twenty-five million dollars. The industry's production was valued at $17,200,000, and employment stood at somewhere over 6,000 people, ranging from 10 to 500 per plant.

Thus the average company in the floor- and wall-tile industry employed 120 people and did a volume of $344,000.

Our plants are located mostly in New York, New Jersey, Pennsyvania, Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, and California.

According to the best available estimates, our products are distributed through some 3,500 tile contractors and wholesalers and are installed by 10,000 tile setters and 10,000 tile helpers throughout the country. The entire industry thus provides employment for about 30,000 people.

The ramifications of our supply system are such that anything that affects our sales is

directly reflected in other industries in a great many States. Our various manufacturers by raw materials—clays, silicas, feldspars, refractory materials, stains and glazes, natural and propane gas, lumber and other supplies—from companies in Kentucky, Tennessee, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, California, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Virginia, North Dakota, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Maryland, Delaware, Oklahoma, and Texas.

We realize that we constitute a very small segment of American industry. But we have been assured that no action will be taken by our Government that will injure any American industry. We submit that ours is one of the industries that will be seriously injured by a reduction in tariffs.

Moreover, it will serve no national interest to adopt such a policy for the tile industry. If there had been no domestic tile industry during the years 1924 to 1939 and the amount of tile manufactured in the United States during that period had been imported, it would have increased total United States imports by only three-fifths of 1 percent.

Not only that, but the American people would not have had the advantages of better quality and greater values.

One of the obvious measures of a people's standard of living is their homes and their public buildings, and we are proud of the contributions we have made to the beauty, the cleanliness, and the colorfulness of America's homes and buildings. It is our tile that has helped to make possible finer schools and hotels, more hygienic hospitals, moisture-proof subways and tunnels, durable factory floors, attractive swimming pools, beautiful bathrooms, kitchens, and sunrooms.

We want to continue to make these contributions to better living standards in the future. But, more than most other American industries, ours is a hand craft industry. Labor comprises a large part of our product's value. We cannot compete with foreign labor paid as little as one-twelfth of American rates.

Our labor costs run three to four times as much as the average labor cost for all United States manufacturing industry of 16 percent in 1935. The manufacture of tile is not mechanized in the degres that many American industries are mechanized. This is largely due to the nature of the product. The greater portion of the tiles made must, under present methods of production, be individually handled several times in the course of manufacture, inspection, packing, and shipping.

Although no Government figures for the past 10 years are available, our individual members state that their labor costs today are running somewhere between 55 and 65 percent, and on some items as high as 75 percent. But whatever the percentage, the fact is that our American labor is in direct competition with foreign labor paid at greatly lower wage rates. For example, here are figures on wages paid in the ceramics industries of several countries in 1938 and 1939, as shown in a Tariff Commission study of the pottery industry, which the Commission has told us are comparable.

Year	Country	Weekly wage	Hours per week	Hourly rate
				Cents
1939	United States	$22.46	36.6	61.4
1938	Great Britain	8.78	46.0	19.1
1938	Germany:			
	Men	10.20	48.0	21.2
	Women	6.20	48.0	12.9
1938	Japan	3.00	60.0	5.0

We want to pay our own people as much as we can possibly afford to pay them. We want to do everything possible to enable them to enjoy more and more of the goods and services that life in the United States makes possible. But to do that we are dependent upon our ability to sell our products—and our ability to sell depends upon adequate tariff protection against cheaply made foreign products.

To put the problem even more specifically, one of our companies has figured that the average unit value of floor and wall tile sold by the company during 1937 was 32.8 cents per square foot, yielding to the company on its normal operation a net profit of 4 percent on sales before Federal income taxes. During this year, considerable floor and wall tile was imported from Japan, the average unit value of which was 10.2 cents per square foot. Even with the 1930 tariff which required duties of 70 percent, the total price in the United States of Japanese tile was only 17.3 cents a square foot, giving the Japanese manufacturers an advantage of 15.5 cents per square foot. Thus the price of American-made tile in 1937 had to exceed the price, including duty, of that imported from Japan by 90 percent. On the basis of the present tariff, this differential would be 138 percent.

Another example: Before the war, Japanese declarations on tile coming into this country showed a cost of ¾-inch tile of 5 cents a foot in Japan. Under the tariff law, this came under the minimum cost in the United States and called for a 70 percent ad valorem. Therefore, the Japanese paid a duty of 3½ cents which, plus freight, brought the price to 9 cents a square foot delivered in New York City. This valuation was about equal to the cost of our raw materials before they were even put into the kilns to be burned.

If we are to remain in business and provide our fair share of the postwar employment that Americans must have, we cannot be subject to this vicious competition. Because of the highly specialized character of the manufacturing operations, our tile factories cannot be converted to other types of goods when the market for tile goes bad. This is why we, in our industry, have suffered so materially from depressions and the war.

The Tariff Commission study, page 59, sets forth our operating profits to net sales, and I cite this as an indication of the lack of flexibility with which we are faced. During the 15-year period from 1921 to 1935 (figures since 1935 are not available), the industry operated 9 years from 1921 to 1929 with a simple average net profit of 15.7 percent of net sales. The other 6 years, from 1930 to 1935, it operated with a simple average net loss of 25.5 percent of net sales.

In spite of this we have continuously improved the quality of our products. Research and development work has improved the product itself, reduced manufacturing costs, improved installation methods, reduced installation costs, and developed new designs, shapes, and colors. Subjection to low-cost foreign competition will reduce and likely eliminate such work, the prime objective of which is to give the American consumer a better product for less money.

The price structure of the tile industry is such that low-price foreign imports can quickly wreck the domestic market. If this happens, it will throw out of work thousands of American workmen who depend upon the domestic industry for their livelihood. It will deprive millions of Americans of their ability to get the quality and the quantity of the various kinds of tile they will want, to improve and beautify their homes and buildings.

Competition from foreign imports is felt primarily in the New York and California markets, which together constitute nearly half of the total tile sales of the Nation. Anything that depresses this market quickly causes depression in markets throughout the country.

This is why even a relatively small volume of imports, priced so low as to break the New York and California markets, constitutes a definite threat to the continued existence of our domestic industry.

Another fact that might be considered is that foreign tile producers analyze the American market for volume items—the "bread and butter" types of tile—which they then concentrate on sending in. It is these same items that new American plants would have to produce to start in business. Therefore, if foreign tile of this type is allowed to flood the American markets, it will effectively bar the establishment of any new American tile businesses.

The fact that you gentlemen take time from your many broad and important duties to take note of the problems of one small industry like the tile industry is bound to be reassuring to the other small businesses of the Nation. For the postwar period, it must be the national policy to give every encouragement to small businesses, such as those comprising the tile industry, who must become a major source of employment for millions of Americans. These businesses, like those of the tile industry, stand ready to begin postwar expansion to meet anticipated postwar demands—but they cannot go forward with those plans without favorable consideration from the Congress.

In summary, I should like to make these points:

1. We are one of America's small industries that will be materially affected by lower tariff rates on foreign products with which we must compete. On behalf of the thousands of people whose working lives have been devoted to this industry, and on behalf of the millions of American consumers who will benefit from our products in the future, we ask that we be given the protection of tariff rates sufficient to equalize competition between foreign-made and domestic tile. We do not seek to prevent all imports; we do seek to equalize competition so that American factories can pay ever-increasing wages, and finance the cost of the socially desirable services that all of us regard as an essential part of the American standard of living.

2. We are seriously concerned with any establishment of tariff rates which permit sales of foreign tile at prices with which we cannot possibly compete—concerned lest a policy set now become part of the Nation's tariff policy and eventually prove ruinous to our industry.

3. We should like to point out that the reciprocal agreements are not reciprocal so far as tile is concerned. For example, on December 23, 1942, the United States signed a trade agreement with Mexico which cut the tariff on floor and wall tile by 50 percent. The cut is shown by the following tables:

Tariff Act of 1930		Trade Agreement No. 50797, Mexico	
Value bracket (cents per square foot)	Rate of duty	Value bracket (cents per square foot)[1]	Rate of duty
Not over 14.3 cents	70 percent ad valorem	Not over 14.3 cents	35 percent ad valorem.
Over 14.3 but not over 20 cents	10 cents per square foot	Over 14.3 but not over 20 cents	5 cents per square foot.
Over 20 but not over 40 cents	50 percent ad valorem	Over 20 but not over 40 cents	25 percent ad valorem.
Over 40 cents	60 percent ad valorem	Over 40 cents	30 percent ad valorem.

[1] Does not include ceramic mosaic tiles and quarries or quarry tiles.

On the other hand, a decree of the Mexican Government, published in the Official News of March 27, 1943, to take effect 30 days later, raised the duty on floor and wall tile as shown by the following table:

Item	Duty (gross kilogram)		
	Old duty	New duty	Percent increase
Wall tile:	*Centavos*	*Centavos*	
White, weight up to 140 grams	8	35	337½
White, weight over 250 grams	8	30	275
Colored, weight up to 250 grams	8	42	425
Colored, weight over 250 grams	8	37	362½
Inserts, up to 250 grams	8	80	900
	Duty (per square foot)		
Wall tile:	*Cents*	*Cents*	
White	3	13	337½
Colored	3	15½	425

Thus the Mexican Government, through use of the trade agreement, has severely handicapped United States products, while securing extremely favorable conditions for sales into this country. Now we understand that Mexico has imported considerable tile-manufacturing machinery and has expanded her facilities. With cheap Mexican labor, they will be able to produce tile at costs which constitute a definite threat to our domestic industry.

4. We face the fact that war has increased our manufacturing costs while it will probably decrease costs for foreign manufacturers. During the last war most of the tile manufacturing plants of Belgium and France were destroyed. After the war, they were rebuilt with the most modern machinery and equipment, which, of course, lowered their production costs. There is every reason to believe that the same pattern will be repeated after this war. With new and more efficient facilities, and with wage rates drastically below ours, these plants will constitute an even more serious threat to our domestic plants and to the thousands who are dependent upon them for their livelihood.

5. We are agreeable to an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for not more than 1 year, but we protest the granting of authority to make further reductions in the tariffs on tile which are already too low.

At the end of 1 year, when world events are in clearer focus, we suggest that the Congress reconsider this whole question. We feel that this is no time to change policy and that this Nation has much to gain and nothing to lose by waiting another 12 months to put into effect new and untried lowered tariff policies.

Expense Allowance for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the reason for my voting against the provision in H. R. 3109, which would allow the sum of $2,500 to Members of Congress to assist in defraying expenses relating to his official duties.

I am in sympathy with the need for increasing the remuneration of Members of Congress either by way of a salary increase or by way of an expense allowance, but there has been a long-established policy in Wisconsin against increasing the compensation of any person elected to public office during his terms of office. In fact the constitution of the State of Wisconsin provides in part that the compensation of any public officer shall not be increased during his terms of office. I do not, Mr. Speaker, feel justified in acting contrary to that policy.

I would be one of the first to vote for the allowance contained in this bill, provided the increase were to become effective for Members of the Eightieth Congress, who will be elected in November 1946. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not, as a new Member of Congress from Wisconsin, feel justified in voting myself this increase.

There is also another factor to which I must give consideration. Before my election to the House of Representatives I served 4 years as a member of the Wisconsin State Senate. Members of the Wisconsin Legislature receive $100 per month. I know how inadequate that amount is. The Wisconsin Legislature within the last few weeks refused to make a very modest allowance for expenses of the members in attending legislative sessions. I have great confidence in the men and women serving in the State legislature of my State. If they cannot see their way clear to increase the very nominal amount which they receive for their services and expenses, I certainly cannot justify voting for an expense allowance for myself at this time.

Goering—War Criminal

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with no reflection upon the brave and heroic officers and men of our armed forces who effectuated the capture, I protest with all the force at my command the treatment and recognition of the Nazi Goering as a prisoner of war and demand that he be classed and treated as one of the arch criminals of this war.

I was incensed with the Alphonse-Gaston act that the Associated Press reported resulted from the surrender of this vile member of the unholy three of Nazidom.

Still pompous, strutting, and arrogant, this obscenely obese buffoon and charlatan demanded and was granted the privilege of a bath and a change to one of his grotesque musical comedy uniforms before he would condescend to have his picture taken by his captors.

I protest this fantastic mockery of justice; I protest in the name of the 100,000 peaceful citizens and the destroyed city of Rotterdam wiped out in 20 minutes from 12 noon to 12:20 by this evil bird of prey. Goering and his Luftwaffe—this was cold-blooded murder by order of this fat friend after the brave Dutch had capitulated—a horror warning of things to come from Goering the Goon. I protest in the name of the dead of Warsaw—the city and its brave Polish men, women, and children—dominated by the orders of this airminded devil from the hell that was Potsdam. I protest in the name of a long list of peoples, cities, and nations done to death by his "schweinehunds" and his evil crew.

Instead of being wined and dined as a privileged character, this overstuffed museum piece should have been shot on sight as any other mad dog.

The only thing Hitler ever did that I agreed with was to order the immediate execution of successor-designate to Hitler, marshal of greater Germany, supreme war-economic authority, president of the Reichstag, chairman of the Council for the Defense of the Reich, commissioner in control of transportation, chairman of the wartime ministerial council, Governor of Prussia, chief of the Prussian secret police, infantry general of the Reichswehr, minister of forests, minister of aviation, Premier of Prussia, minister without portfolio, member of the secret cabinet council, director of state theaters and operas, and field marshal general. He also rejoiced in the positions of hunting master of Germany and chief forester of Germany.

This very day the joint committee of Congress sent to view the atrocity camps in Germany returned to the United States and in statements to the press emphasized the revolting horrors of the Germans and demanded punishment for war criminals.

Blithely ignoring these facts so recently revealed to the world, Goering the Evil demanded food and drink, to quote him, "because I am hungry and want to eat." Shades of the millions of starved and starving slave laborers of Europe—victims of this foul and unregenerate rascal.

As a warning to the world at large, as assurance to the people of liberated nations, as a guaranty to the armed forces of the United Nations, and out of respect for the memory of the legion of the dead by his vile hand, the swashbuckling Goering, he of the Grand Cross of the Knights Cross of the Iron Cross, with crossed swords of diamonds and brilliants, chief of the double-cross, should receive a court martial without further delay.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following questions and answers on reciprocal trade agreements:

TRADE AGREEMENTS QUIZ—FIFTEEN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Expiration on June 12 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act brings up for public review and congressional action a tested American policy just when representatives of the peace-loving nations of the world are convening at San Francisco to write the charter for a new world organization.

We have learned through bitter experience that the road to enduring peace is a three-lane road and that all three lanes must be kept in good repair. One handles the political relations among nations; another cares for the international flow of development financing, and the middle lane carries the main traffic of trade which makes for economic stability. Whatever nation places, for whatever purpose, roadblocks in this middle lane will cause dislocations and congestion that will spread into the other two and throw nations apart instead of pulling them more closely together.

It is with this perspective that we Americans must re-appraise the trade-agreements program which implements a policy initiated in 1934. We must remember that this policy has been in force and has been at least tacitly accepted as a continuing force in the progression of international understandings which began with the Atlantic Charter and now culminates at San Francisco. And we must therefore weigh our action as to the future of the Trade Agreements Act in the balance of our hopes for Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco.

Originally adopted in 1934, the present act has been extended in 1937, 1940, and 1943, the last time by a definitely bi-partisan vote in both House and Senate. Hence, the basic questions of constitutionality, delegation of authority, protection of business interests and the like have been thoroughly examined and approved. Further, the performance record under the act from 1934 to 1939, when war interrupted the normal flow of international trade, has shown substantial benefits well spread across our Nation.

Now the Doughton bill (H. R. 2652) has been introduced to extend the act for another 3 years and in so doing to resharpen it as an essential tool for post-war commerce. The House Ways and Means Committee started hearings on the bill on April 18, and the testimony being given by Government and private witnesses indicates the importance attached to this measure.

As the American people have gone deeper and deeper into World War No. 2 and now finally see light ahead, they have shown an ever stronger grasp of the key position which an expanding volume of trade has in the structure of stable relations among nations. The bipartisan vote by which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended in 1943 is a significant milestone in that trend. As we now approach the next milestone in the further extension and modernization of the act, we are confident that the American people will expect Congress again to give it broad support.

The following questions and answers are offered as an aid to those who may have lost contact with the trade-agreements program.

CLARK H. MINOR,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
The Committee on International
Economic Policy, United States
Chamber of Commerce.

NEW YORK, *May 1, 1945.*

WHAT IS THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS POLICY?

It is a grant by Congress to the Executive of power within certain prescribed limits and for a specific period of time to overcome the rigidity of tariff walls by reciprocally adjusting the duties on specific products of both the United States and other countries to the mutual benefit of each. The reciprocal adjustments are made through bilateral agreements under our traditional most-favored-nation policy; they are extended to all nations which do not discriminate against United States goods, thus serving to protect American exports against discrimination in foreign markets.

GOOD WILL OR GOOD BUSINESS?

The trade-agreements policy is both, and therefore is a valuable, two-edged tool. Trade agreements have created good will by demonstrating our willingness to buy foreign goods so that other nations can buy from us, thus promoting world economic cooperation. Trade agreements are good business because they have increased the markets for the products of our farms and factories by aiding in doubling our export trade from its low point of $1,611,000,000 in 1932 to $3,177,000,000 in 1939. In fact, this policy has proved to be the No. 1 tool in expanding our foreign commerce.

HOW DO TRADE AGREEMENTS TIE INTO THE PEACE STRUCTURE?

The charter for an international peace organization is to be written and agreed upon by United Nations representatives in session at the San Francisco Conference. This charter is to serve as a guide to world political and economic order as against chaos and warfare. International economic chaos results when the various nations, each acting wholly on its own, erect more and ever higher barriers against each other's commerce. The trade-agreements policy helps to bring about international cooperation through the reciprocal reduction of existing barriers to peaceful trade and the discouragement of new tariffs, quotas, and other impediments. The policy is therefore seen as a vital forerunner of, and effective aid to, the charter of peace being developed at San Francisco.

WHY BRING TRADE AGREEMENTS UP NOW?

The trade-agreements program will expire automatically on June 12 unless renewed by Congress prior to that date. Consequently, the Doughton bill, now before Congress, is of immediate concern to all those who are writing in San Francisco the charter for a new world organization.

WHAT DOES THE DOUGHTON BILL PROVIDE?

The Doughton bill (H. R. 2652) provides for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements policy, and for the power to reduce within the limit of 50 percent any specific duties in effect January 1, 1945, which can be reduced without impairment to efficient American production and with benefit to our over-all trade. In this way the Doughton bill revitalizes our 11-year-old trade policy and resharpens a tool for effective use under current world conditions.

WHY THE NEED FOR RESHARPENING THIS USEFUL TOOL?

The tools of peace must be as up to date as the tools of war. We are not winning this war with tanks and planes of Pearl Harbor vintage, and we can't construct the economic basis of the peace with an instrument forged in 1934 and blunted in the essential work it has accomplished since then. Resharpening this tool will make it possible, for one thing, to bargain with Great Britain and Canada—our two largest markets—for a further modification of the trade barriers which favor British over United States goods in British Empire markets. As the trade-agreements program now stands, we have used up most of our bargaining power with Great Britain and Canada, as well as with some other countries.

DOES THE DOUGHTON BILL SLASH ALL DUTIES BY 75 PERCENT?

No. The bill does not provide for an automatic reduction in tariffs nor for a wholesale reduction in tariffs. The Doughton bill permits greater latitude of action in meeting certain specific situations. It permits a maximum reduction of 50 percent in any duty which was in effect January 1, 1945. Some of these rates do reflect up to 50 percent reductions from the original 1930 tariff schedule, but it is estimated that the categories in which the full permissive 50-percent reductions had been made prior to the beginning of this year constitute less than half (42 percent) of our total pre-war dutiable imports. They represent 373,000,000 in dollar value, or less than 2 percent of our national production.

In considering this matter of tariff reduction it should be remembered that it is being made from the highest schedule of duties in the history of the United States, that of 1930. The epidemic of tariff and trade barriers which swept the world in the decade before World War No. 2 was detrimental to the United States and to the world at large.

It should also be remembered that duty reductions are made only where found feasible, and selectively, product by product, rather than in one horizontal cut. Thus, a reduction of 5 percent in the duty on one item may result in the stimulation of trade, whereas a reduction of as much as 50 percent on some other item may have a negligible effect on commerce. United States duties are reduced only when negotiation with a foreign country results in concessions important to us.

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS BENEFIT UNITED STATES INDUSTRY?

Yes. Countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements have lowered trade barriers on almost 50 percent of all the manufactured products they buy from us. Nonagricultural United States exports in 1937–38 were $935,000,000 above the 1934–35 volume. Nonagricultural United States imports in 1937–38 were $356,942,000 above the 1934–35 volume.

To help provide full employment after the war, many of our largest and most important industries must expand their foreign markets. Here are some pre-war figures on the importance of export trade to United States industry:

Industry:	*Percent of output sold abroad*
Automobiles	14
Agricultural implements and machinery	17
Tractors	28
Power-driven, metal-working machinery	20
Printing and bookbinding machinery	18
Sulfur	36

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS BENEFIT UNITED STATES FARMERS?

Yes. Trade-agreement countries have granted vital concessions on almost 75 percent of all the farm products they buy from us; consequently, United States farmers are able to sell much more abroad. We have, however, made duty reductions on less than 25 percent of our agricultural imports under the program.

Millions of United States farmers—for example, the cotton, apple, and tobacco growers—have a vital stake in expanding our export markets through the reduction of world-trade barriers. Furthermore, the benefits from increased exports of our manufactured products are also shared by our farmers through the sustained purchasing power of the factory workers who buy more and better foodstuffs.

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS BENEFIT UNITED STATES LABOR?

Yes. In 1937, after 3 years of the program, United States manufacturers were employing 8,569,231 wage earners. This topped 1929 and represented an increase of 2,000,000 jobs over the depression period. An expanding foreign trade makes jobs, particularly in the high-wage, efficient, export industries. As the accompanying chart shows, United States industries with important foreign markets pay

the highest average wages in the country; whereas protected industries tend to pay lower wages.

Average weekly wages, 1939

PROTECTED INDUSTRIES

Cotton goods	$14.26
Silk and rayon	15.78
Pottery	22.75
Carpets and rugs	23.25

DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES

Dyeing, cleaning	$21.70
Building	30.34
Street railway and busses	33.13
Printing newspapers, periodicals	37.58

EXPORT INDUSTRIES

Agricultural implements	$29.61
Automobiles	32.90
Rubber tires	33.33
Machine tools	34.25

Based on statistical abstract of the United States.

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS BENEFIT UNITED STATES CONSUMERS?

Yes. They help to make available to United States consumers a wider variety of goods, thus enriching our standard of living.

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS HELP TO MAINTAIN OUR MERCHANT MARINE?

Yes. The expansion of two-way trade through reciprocal trade agreements will provide cargoes for the United States merchant marine.

DO TRADE AGREEMENTS HELP TO CONSERVE VITAL UNITED STATES RESOURCES?

Yes. By stimulating the import of vital raw materials into this country, trade agreements help to protect our own supplies from being completely exhausted. Many of our essential raw-material resources have already reached a dangerous low, as the following table indicates:

Raw material:	*United States supply, in years*
Copper	34
Zinc	19
Petroleum (based on proven reserves only)	18
Cadmium	16
Lead	12
Bauxite	9
Vanadium	7
Antimony, mercury, and asbestos	3
Manganese	2

IS THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS POLICY PARTISAN?

By no means. It was renewed by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote in both the House and the Senate in 1943. And it was endorsed by the last two Republican candidates for President—the late Wendell Willkie in 1940, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in 1944.

WHAT DOTH IT PROFIT?

The bitter history of the last 25 years proves unmistakably that high tariffs, economic warfare, and isolationism lead to war. We may well ask ourselves the question posed by the News of Greensboro, N. C., "What doth it profit us to protect some privileged industries or producers, only to lose our dear ones, our way of living, and our civilization?" The late President Roosevelt summed up the alternatives for us in one of his last messages to Congress:

"The coming total defeat of our enemies and of the philosophy of conflict and aggression which they have represented gives us a new chance and a better chance than we have ever had to bring about conditions under which the nations of the world substitute cooperation and sound business principles for warfare in economic relations * * * The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live."

BENEFITS SHARED WIDELY

The over-all benefits from the stimulation of our foreign commerce by the trade agreements program have flowed back to every State in the Union, according to a statistical analysis filed with the House Ways and Means Committee at the request of one of its members. This analysis cites the substantial gains in export sales of major products of each State; in addition, many States produce parts and other materials which find their way into foreign trade through assembly in automobiles, machine tools, office equipment, food, and a wide range of additional products exported from other States.

Direct participation in important categories of foreign trade is herewith shown for typical States in various sections of the Nation:

Typical States	Example of stake	To—	United States sales before and after agreements			
			Year	Amount	Year	Amount
Connecticut	Textiles	Canada	1935	$6,476,450	1938	$9,272,715
	Electrical apparatus	do	1935	4,823,740	1938	7,121,273
California	Wood, paper	do	1935	8,259,663	1938	14,208,740
New Jersey	Paint, varnish, pigments	Cuba	1933	15,000	1938	257,000
Missouri	Hog lard	do	1933	536,000	1938	3,969,000
Minnesota	Wheat flour	do	1933	2,935,000	1938	5,565,219
	Agricultural machinery	Brazil	1935	543,000	1938	1,533,000
Massachusetts	Refrigerator apparatus	do	1935	906,000	1938	1,238,000
	Cotton and cotton manufactures	Canada	1935	2,709,000	1938	4,154,000
Louisiana	Rice	Cuba	1933	114,000	1938	5,175,000
	Petroleum and petroleum products	Canada	1935	5,065,368	1938	10,729,739
Kansas	Wheat	The Netherlands	1934	1,124,000	1938	10,408,000
Michigan	Automobile parts	Belgium	1934	2,713,000	1938	7,895,000

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the flag—our flag—which our fighting men raised victoriously over Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima, flies solemnly and gloriously today over the Capitol of the United States.

Every red-blooded American thrills at the sight of our grand old flag. Never before have I experienced such a feeling of pride and thanksgiving, because like every American I can proudly say, "That is my flag"—the symbol of everything big and fine and good, the ideals of true Americanism.

But as we gaze with pride at that flag, with tear-filled eyes, we remember the great sacrifices, the blood and the tears of American men and women on the fighting fronts, and many on the home front, too, who have made possible our many blessings.

From the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock we have had a succession of historical events by which our Nation under God has gone forward to greater accomplishments. To the brave men who raised that flag on Iwo Jima, and to all their buddies, alive and dead in this war, and all previous wars in which our Nation has participated, we pledge to you with grateful hearts to keep the faith always.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read a good and timely editorial by Stanley Norris, editor of the Stanton Zephyr, of Stanton, Iowa, which to me describes so well in written words our thoughts as we look heavenward today and see that flag—our flag—waving in all its beautiful glory over the Capitol of our free land. God help us to be worthy of everything for which it stands.

The editorial follows:

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S PROGRESS

We doubt if anyone has missed that classic picture of American Marines raising the Stars and Stripes over Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. What a gripping picture it is! What a thrilling story it tells! Brave men, struggling to take to the most God-forsaken places on earth the beautiful and refreshing symbol of freedom, justice, liberty, and social progress. We swelled with the kind of pride that only an American can experience when we first saw that picture. We saw with it many another classical scene which predicated it in our great country's colorful and proud past. We could see The Spirit of '76, Washington at Valley Forge, and we could vision the great but humble Lincoln as he delivered his mighty speech at Gettysburg. Then imagination hastily took us through the comparatively few but eventful years in which the land of the free has become not only the melting pot of the world but the guiding light of the world. We could see Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the Liberty Bell with its historic crack. There were the Colonial garbed founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others, affixing their signatures to our immortal basic documents. We could see Robert Fulton's little steamboat braving it way up the Hudson River. James Watt's locomotive which resembled an overgrown teakettle on wheels. We could hear the light-hearted colored folks singing in the cotton fields of Dixie, we saw the begrimed Iowa farm lad emerging from a cloud of dust on his roaring tractor as he tilled the fertile ground between the two great rivers. We saw the twinkling of miners' lamps, the reddened skies from Gary's blast furnaces, and the smoking stacks of River Rouge. We heard the cry of coyotes of our great plains country and thrilled at the majestic beauty of Mt. Rainier. There were ox-drawn prairie schooners headed westward and great river packets riding the crests of our waterways. We saw the Wright brothers take off from the sand dunes of Kitty Hawk, and actually fly in an overgrown box kite, drawn from the earth in a vacuum produced with a crude propeller driven by a gasoline engine. There was Samuel F. B. Morse tapping out "What hath God wrought" on a simple telegraphic instrument over wire he had patiently gathered ahead of fashionable ladies who had hoped to have it for their hooped skirts. We heard the ringing of the woodman's ax and

witnessed Henry Ford demonstrating his horseless carriage with Barney Oldfield blowing into the gasoline tank in order to keep its engine running. We saw Thomas Edison at Menlo Park, working on the incandescent electric light and heard recorded music from his phonograph. We stood with the crowd and stretched in the seventh, just after Babe Ruth had poled out a home run, and cheered lustily as Joe Louis put away another white opponent. We bought chances on a quilt at a Catholic church bazaar and were fitted with a new suit of clothes by a knowing Jew. A Greek made hot-dog sandwiches for us and an Italian barber cut our hair. We hunted and fished in the northern wilds, assisted by Indian guides. Yes, in that great picture we could see and hear a pageant—a pulsating, impatient, and impulsive pageant if you please. It lived as a great and living reminder of all the truly great things for which America is fighting today. Lt. Bob Malmberg was there to witness that stirring sight. So was Capt. Don Beck and perhaps others who are near and dear to people living right here in Stanton community. The raising of the flag there was witnessed by many a brave young man who will never be able to tell his children the thrilling story—a story which will be decisive in our march to Tokyo. We think it most fitting that the Treasury Department has decided to use this powerful picture as its principal theme for the forthcoming Seventh War bond campaign.

Governor Dewey's Second Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including hereafter the second radio report to the people of the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, delivered on May 4, 1945.

I have included this second report of the Governor of the State of New York because it includes an excellent statement of the history, philosophy, purposes, and anticipated operation of the recently enacted State legislation creating a Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The report follows:

Since last week, when I made the first half of my annual report on the progress of your State government, mighty events are culminating in the triumph of freemen over the Nazi forces of slavery and darkness. The complete collapse of the Nazi armies indicates more clearly than any formal announcement can do that victory in Europe is substantially complete.

I earnestly hope that the people of our State will signalize victory in Europe when it is formally announced by prayers of thanksgiving to Almighty God, prayers for our noble dead, for swift victory over our Japanese enemies, and for the safe return of our ghting men. I hope and have asked that there shall be no interruption of production for victory or of the ceaseless efforts of everyone in our total war effort.

POSTWAR PROBLEMS PRESSING

With the ever-hastening end of hostilities our postwar problems come closer to us. Millions of New York workers will be displaced in the change-over period from war to peace, and 1,500,000 New Yorkers will come home from the armed services.

I discussed with you last week our great veterans program, the building of our essential surplus and the projected highway and mental hospital construction. In addition, the State Postwar Public Works Planning Commission has a broad program ready. It has approved some $14,500,000 of work on State educational institutions and has allocated money for plans for necessary projects in 399 communities of our State, estimated to cost over $200,000,000.

Also in progress is the program to combat the continuing erosion of our shore line by the Atlantic Ocean. Our 200 miles of ocean front is a region of homes, bathing beaches, and summer cottages, as well as of industry and fisheries. This whole shore line has been endangered by storms and wearing away by the action of the sea. So $1,000,000 of State funds have been appropriated to match a similar amount to be put up by the communities, to stop this destruction of our Atlantic coast line and to insure the lives, property, and continuous enjoyment of our people of that great section of the State.

CONCERNING THE ANTIBIAS LAW

One of the laws enacted at this session of the legislature made history not only for the State but for the Nation. That was the antidiscrimination bill, which has probably aroused more misunderstanding than any law passed in our time.

It has been criticized bitterly by persons it will not affect at all. There are those who believe the antidiscrimination bill is designed to fix by law the tastes, the habits, the associations, or the special lives of people. Others believe it is a law to tell you who you may have in your home as domestic help or guests or roomers, or that it will tell employers who they may hire and who they may not hire, or that it is designed to discriminate in favor of one group against another. Of course it is none of these things.

The bill establishes by law the simple principle that in business and industrial employment there shall be no discrimination on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin. It translates into law what is inherent in our Constitution, and is the very essence of our free society.

SAYS NAZIS LIVED ON HATRED

We are, you know, a nation of minorities. If we allow discrimination against one group, we open the door to discrimination against others until the whole Nation is poisoned by dissensions and hatred. The dying Nazi movement rose to power and lived on hatred and prejudice against all religion and all minorities. It is the ultimate example of the self-destruction of its hateful creed. Discrimination against any minority is, in truth, a threat to the freedom of all.

So a bill was introduced in the closing days of the session last year, in an attempt to meet the problem. However, the bill was clumsily drawn, and introduced so late that no action was then possible. Had it passed, its defects would have destroyed the great objectives we were seeking.

The legislature, therefore at my suggestion, created the temporary State commission against discrimination, under the distinguished leadership of Assemblyman Irving Ives, the majority leader of the assembly. The commission labored successfully and well for almost a year, taking the utmost pains. They held many hearings and heard the opinions of civic, religious, and business groups all over the State.

NEW BILL IS BETTER, HE SAYS

As a result, the commission bill was introduced this year. It was well drawn and designed to meet every sound objection. After some rather bitter opposition, the bill was passed and I was happy and proud to sign it as an act which gives living reality to the great principles upon which our country was founded.

Look at the casualty lists you see printed in the newspapers, the lists of those Americans who gave their lives for our freedom. You will notice that their names stem from England, from Russia, Ireland, Poland, from Italy, and almost every other nation in the world.

They are Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. They are white and Negro. But they did not fight and die as Irish or Poles or Italians, as white or Negro, or as Catholic or Jew or Protestant. They fought as Americans. They died as Americans. They were fighting for freedom, for the dignity of the individual, for equality before the law and for equality of opportunity. Those who come home have a right to expect that they will find here the everliving reality of the principles for which they have fought abroad.

The antidiscrimination bill is a simple and practical measure to make good that expectation for all our people—to make good the sacred guarantees of our Constitution. The new commission has a broad educational job to do.

In addition, if business or industrial employment be denied to an applicant and it is clearly established that this is not because of his incompetenece or on good grounds, but on grounds of prejudice, we have set up a forum, a place to go where both parties can work out the problem by the orderly processes of a civilized society.

Already most large employers in our State have broken down the bars of prejudice in plants and factories, in offices and shops. I have visited factories and shops, all over the State, where people of every race and religion worked happily together.

We want to keep this successful habit of working together. In the end it will bring a better understanding between our people, and I am sure that every one of our citizens will be happy to live in a State which has proudly proclaimed that no man shall be deprived of the right to earn his bread by reason of his race, his religion, or his national origin.

CHANGES IN DELINQUENCY TREATMENT

Major improvements have been made this year in our treatment of delinquency and parole. Years ago as a district attorney I made the decision that some day, if I ever had the opportunity, I was going to do something definite about the tragic spectacle of these youngsters who are put through our criminal courts by a process they do not understand and sent to prison, often to be made worse rather than better.

As a result, some 2 years ago I asked a group of the members of my cabinet whose work was closest to that field to form an interdepartmental committee on delinquency and parole to study the entire problem. Their report, which was filed this year in two parts, is, I believe, one of the most intelligent and progressive studies of the whole field of delinquency and parole ever prepared.

The first step was the creation for the first time of a State Youth Commission to bring together and concentrate on this problem the efforts of all our great volunteer social agencies, of our police departments, schools, and of other agencies of our cities, counties, towns, and villages. Our first task is to find the child before he gets into trouble and get him in the hands of trained people who will solve his problems before they overwhelm him.

In addition, there is a broad program to find the right kind of treatment for boys and

girls who have run afoul of the law, before they are sent to institutions where, all too often, neither the kind of treatment available nor the associations will do them anything but harm. In other words, this is a broad attempt not to fit the punishment to the crime but to fit the treatment to the child, to give him new hope, a new future.

STATE AID FOR EDUCATION

In the fields of State aid for the blind, for epileptics and others of the mentally and physically handicapped, broad new liberal provision was made this year. We are, I believe, at last giving a real future to those who, through no fault of their own, are deprived of the natural opportunity or equipment to grow up as useful, well-adjusted citizens.

So also was great progress made in the field of education by cooperative action of the State and the localities. New York provides the greatest support for its public school system of any State in the Union. Nevertheless, we must not only maintain New York's high standing, but all of us want to take the lead in making sure that our children have the best of all possible opportunities to grow up to be good and useful citizens.

So, after extensive study, we adopted this year a new formula, for distribution of the State's share of the cost of education. It will result in something over $18,000,000 more of State money going annually to our school districts. This is a very large increase and it is my earnest hope that these additional funds will be used in the interest of ever better education for the children of our State.

All these and many other advances in the better service by the State to its people were achieved, I am happy to say, without increased taxation. We were able to continue the 25-percent reduction in State income taxes, resulting this year in a saving of $44,000,000 to our income taxpayers. Local real estate taxpayers and home owners were helped through distributing the State utility tax and $5,000,000 of State aid for snow removal.

In our social services, in the continuing fight to bring equality of opportunity to all our people, in aid to business and agriculture, this has been, I believe, a memorable year in the history of our State. It will be many years before we will harvest the rich fruit of the sound and forward-looking program achieved at this session of the legislature.

I know I speak for all the people of the State when I express my warm gratitude to the members of both houses of the legislature and their leaders for their high-minded approach to the difficult problems we have faced and their great diligence in the public service. In this critical and, we hope, last year of total war we have built broadly for the future—for a better future for all our people.

Expense Allowance for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule on H. R. 3109, since I am opposed to the $2,500 expense grant to Members of Congress.

I believe Congressmen are underpaid, and that at the proper time their salaries should be increased. This is not the proper time, however, because of the insistence of the Congress and the administration that wage and salary levels be held within the limitations of the Little Steel formula. This $2,500 is a "fringe" salary increase, and I oppose fringe increases because they accomplish by indirection that which has been frowned upon by direction.

There should, in my opinion, be a positive enactment which would make allowable as income-tax deductions the reasonable expense of a Congressman incidental to the fulfillment of his duties. The legitimate expenses of every businessman, inclusive of living expense away from home, are tax-deductible without question. There is no reason why Members of Congress should suffer discrimination in this particular.

Let us attack congressional remuneration directly, not indirectly.

Needed—A Department of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I call attention to the following editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of April 21, 1945:

TWO DEPARTMENTS FOR WAR BUT NOT ONE FOR PEACE

Jan Christiaan Smuts, grand old warrior and peacemaker of the Union of South Africa, believes the world is ripe for a change of heart. On his way to San Francisco, he envisages a world weary of war, ready to break with its past and begin a new epoch in history.

With him in this latest quest will go the hopes of us all.

Yet, in overdramatizing the San Francisco Conference there is danger of expecting too much. San Francisco is not a peace conference. The most that can be hoped for there is that the United Nations will set up a mechanism for settlement of future disputes without resort to force.

But no machinery is sufficient in itself. In 1928 the nations of the world solemnly renounced war as an instrument of national policy. Eleven years later the most brutal and widespread of all wars began.

The Pact of Paris failed because it was negative. One doesn't find happiness by saying there shall be no unhappiness. Neither has the world been able to find peace by outlawing war. For peace is a positive, not a negative, condition.

The simplest way to attain peace is to make peace, not by treaties, although they are important and necesary, but by a cementing of peoples themselves.

We have a Department of War and a Navy Department; why not a department of peace?

But it will be protested: What is the State Department for? That one is easy. The Department of State, like the foreign ministries of every nation, conducts the relations of our Government with the governments of other peoples.

Nominally, all such ministries are agencies for peace, but actually their duty is to attempt to make national policies prevail by diplomatic means. That is to say, they are traders and schemers, for that is the way of diplomacy.

Their failure as agencies for peace is written in the tragic pages of all history.

And the reason is that they deal between governments, not between peoples. Again and again peoples have wanted peace but could not have it.

A department of peace could bring peoples together. We have consuls in nearly every foreign city of consequence to maintain commercial contacts. Representatives of a department of peace in every city are just as important.

Such representatives would not be agents of Government but of the people. They would have no national policy to carry out, save the most important one of explaining America, its manner of life, its ideals, its ways of solving its problems, the elements in its population, and how they work together for the common good.

If we want peace, we shall have to work for it positively. A department of peace could channel all such efforts.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that this morning the House Committee on Foreign Affairs began hearings on H. R. 215, which is a bill I introduced for the purpose of establishing an international office of education. Hearings will be continued next Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock. Such an office would in reality serve to fulfill the functions of a department of peace.

The Plight of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 1945, Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO made an eloquent address in the House of Representatives. He told us of the atrocities which were inflicted upon his people by the Japanese.

On the night of Sunday, April 29, 1945, the National Broadcasting Co. presented the Pacific Story, which was written and produced by Arnold Marquis. A Filipino member of the Philippines Commission assisted the National Broadcasting Co. in presenting the Pacific Story.

It was a most interesting story and contained factual information which I feel every Member of Congress should know. As a member of the House Committee on Territories, I am very glad to insert a part of the radio script abovementioned. It is as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. and its affiliated stations present—the Pacific Story.

This is the story of the Pacific and the millions of people who live around this greatest sea * * * the drama of the peoples whose destiny is at stake in the Pacific war. This is the background to the war in the Pacific, and its meaning to us and to the generations to come.

Tonight's Pacific Story—The Philippines Come of Age, comes to you from Hollywood

and Washington, D. C., as another public service with drama of the past and present, and commentary by the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Senator of the State of Maryland and Chairman of the Philippine Rehabilitation Commission.

NARRATOR. A lone Filipino stands at dawn among the shattered and blackened ruins of Manila. A solitary silhouette against the tangled destruction.

JUAN. Out of this will rise a new nation.

NARRATOR. The Filipino people, still bleeding and still suffering, stand on the threshold of independence. But with the realization of this long-sought independence comes a welter of problems.

JUAN. We have waited more than 300 years for our independence. The Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 promised independence on July 4, 1945. And in 1944 the American Congress promised independence before 1946.

VOICE 1. The President of the United States is hereby authorized, after the normal functions of government have been restored, and after consultation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, to advance the date of the independence of the Philippine Islands by proclaiming their independence as a separate and self-governing nation prior to July 4, 1946.

NARRATOR. Today as the battles go on to redeem the Philippines, and the day approaches when the Filipinos will take over their own government, the problems of this new nation are coming more sharply into focus.

OBSERVER. The United States Government stands in the difficult position today of being obliged to keep its word to grant the Filipinos their independence, and at the same time morally to be responsible for the welfare of the Filipinos until they are on their feet.

VOICE 2. If assistance is withdrawn from the Philippines as soon as the Japanese are thrown out, chaos would sweep the islands.

VOICE 3. Yes. Not only is the country devastated, but its economy has been upset. And what about defending itself from aggression?

NARRATOR. Filipino Rehabilitation Commission was appointed to deal with these very problems.

VOICE 1. The Commission shall investigate all matters affecting post-war economy, trade, finance, economic stability, and rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, including the matter of damages to public and private property and to persons occasioned by enemy attack and occupation.

NARRATOR. That's the wording of the resolution creating the commission which is composed of nine representatives of the Government of the United States, and nine representatives appointed by the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

OBSERVER. It must be realized that among the population of 17,000,000 Filipinos there are a number of different types of people. There are, for example, the Negritos who were in the islands before the Malays came. And there are Indonesians and Chinese, and all these intermixed in the passing years.

VOICE 2. But that's what happened in the United States, too, isn't it? The Filipinos must be able to control their own internal affairs.

OBSERVER. It must be remembered that the Filipinos were held down by the Spaniard for centuries. Only in the last half century have they been given the opportunity to emerge. Some of the Filipinos, before the war, lived on an aristocratic scale. A somewhat larger group made up the middle class, but the vast majority—the group called the taos—lived on big estates, and were more or less at the economic mercy of landowners like feudal lords.

NARRATOR. While the Filipinos are rebuilding their war-torn land, they must still eat. At the same time, they must take their place, along with the other nations of the world, outside the tariff wall of the United States. For years the products of the Philippines were inside the American tariff wall. As a result, the Philippines were dependent on the American market. Before the war, 75 of the Filipino exports went into the United States tariff free. Under the law, tariff taxes must be paid on these exports after the Philippines get their independence.

OBSERVER. During one 3-year period before the war the Philippines sold to the people of the United States some $520,000,000 worth of goods—cane sugar, coconut oil, hemp, and so on. Nearly all of this was sold without the payment of any tax whatever. The tax on these goods amounted to some $440,000,000. If this tax had been paid, the Filipino producers and the Filipino laborers would have received only $80,000,000 for these products, or a loss of $440,000,000. Now, unless some special arrangement is made, after the Philippines get their independence, they will have to pay these taxes the same as any other independent nation.

NARRATOR. The Philippines were to have had a 6-year transitional period to prepare gradually to pay such taxes.

VOICE 3. Starting in 1941, the Filipinos were to pay 5 percent of the regular tax on goods sold in the United States. In 1942, they were to pay 10 percent. In 1943, 15 percent, and so on—5 percent more each year until it reached 25 percent in 1946. Then in 1947, after the Philippines had been given their independence under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, they were to pay the same export tax as any other nation.

NARRATOR. That was the plan. But the war in the Pacific changed all that. There was no transitional period.

OBSERVER. That means that, under the law as it now stands, the Philippines will have to pay full export taxes on goods sold in the United States almost as soon as they get their independence.

VOICE 2. Will the Philippines be able to pay this right off the bat? I mean, at the same time their country is being rehabilitated?

OBSERVER. That's a grave question. The only way they could pay it would be to lower the cost of production.

VOICE 2. Could that be done?

OBSERVER. Not without lowering wages and living standards. And, if anything, wages and living standards must be raised in the Philippines.

NARRATOR. Before the war the Philippines sold nearly all of their products to the United States tax free.

VOICE 1. Ninety-nine percent of the Philippine sugar was sold to the United States.

VOICE 3. Ninety-four percent of the coconut oil.

VOICE 4. Ninety-nine percent of the embroideries.

VOICE 1. One hundred percent of the canned pineapple.

VOICE 3. One hundred percent of the desiccated coconut.

VOICE 4. One hundred percent of the pearl buttons.

OBSERVER. To put it another way—of the $128,000,000 worth of goods exported annually by the Philippines to all countries, $100,000,000 worth of it was exported to the United States. And after the Philippines get their independence they will have to pay taxes on every dollar's worth that comes into this country.

NARRATOR. As a result of this some of the Philippine industries would cease to exist so far as selling to the United States is concerned. In addition to facing the problems that will arise with the ending of free trade between the Philippines and the United States, Juan, the average Filipino, faces the problems of internal policies. For years the Philippines virtually had a one-party monopoly. He actually had little say in the affairs of his government. When his country gets its independence he will, in all likelihood, have more of a say. But until this comes about he will not have the same opportunities as many in the classes above him, especially the professional politicians.

VOICE 3. The average Filipino will have to take a more active part in the affairs of his government if he is to benefit by having his country get its independence. But is he able to do this?

OBSERVER. It must be remembered that the Philippines have been influenced by many peoples and many cultures. They were influenced by the early oriental empires, long before the first white man arrived. Then they were controlled by Spain for more than three centuries while Portugal and the Netherlands and England tried to gain a foothold in the islands. Since 1898 they have been occupied by Americans. It must be recognized that the Filipinos have been a dependent people for about 500 years. The average Filipino has had little opportunity to put his natural skill into practice. This will come.

NARRATOR. But before the body politic of the Philippines as a whole becomes operative, the enormous problem of a new statehood must be faced.

VOICE 4. Are the Philippines going to be able to defend themselves?

VOICE 2. How much responsibility is the United States going to assume for the defense of the Philippines?

VOICE 4. With the economic conditions they face, how can the Filipinos afford a strong military?

NARRATOR. These questions, long in the consciousness of leading Filipinos, will come sharply into focus when the Philippines become a sovereign nation.

FILIPINO 1. It will not be an immediate problem.

NARRATOR. So say the Filipino leaders.

FILIPINO 1. When the war in the Pacific is over, the Japanese will not be an aggressive threat for many years to come.

VOICE 1. But ultimately, the Philippines must be in a position to defend themselves.

FILIPINO 1. With at least a generation of peace, we shall be able to defend ourselves as well as any small nation is able to defend itself. We have shown in this war that we are able to take military responsibility, and our men have fighting qualities equal to those of men of any other nationality. Besides, there is the over-all matter of peace in the Pacific.

VOICE 1. You mean that the United States and Britain will keep peace in the Pacific?

FILIPINO 1. Yes, if a small nation, such as the Philippines, is in danger, then the largest nations on earth are in danger. We learned that in this war. For the preservation of world peace, the big powers cannot stand by and permit small nations to be swallowed up by aggressors.

VOICE 1. It should be remembered, that when the American flag is lowered over the Philippines, and the Filipino flag goes up, that the responsibility for defense of the islands must be assumed by the Philippines.

FILIPINO 1. That is true. But in the larger sense, all the nations of the Pacific represented on the Pacific Council, must be committed to keeping the peace. For many years to come, it will be necessary for the United States and the other nations of the United Nations to maintain strong land and air and sea bases throughout the Pacific. Some of these bases will be in the Philippines. This does not mean that the United States will take over the defense of the Philippines. It means that we are cooperating against aggression. For we shall have an army to put into the field as large, proportionate to our population, as other nations.

VOICE 4. The United States bases in the Philippines could imply that we are, actually, assuming responsibility for your defense.

FILIPINO 1. No; not any more than the American bases in Trinidad and Bermuda and Dutch Guiana imply the same thing for those places. What it means is that, in the

interest of peace, nations are beginning a new era of cooperation. And, even more than that, it means that in the Philippines the United States has a loyal friend in the Far East, and this will go a long way toward the protection of American interests in this part of the world.

OBSERVER. In the broad sense, the coming independence of the Philippines will usher in a different kind of cooperation between the two nations. Each must be responsible for its own defense, but each, for mutual protection, must help the other.

NARRATOR. The question of American bases in the Philippines is covered in the Tydings-McDuffie law.

VOICE 1. The President of the United States is authorized to enter into negotiations with the government of the Philippines not later than 2 years after the independence of the islands to settle all questions relating to United States naval reservations and fueling stations in the islands.

OBSERVER. So, exactly what bases the United States will have in the Philippines will be settled within 2 years after the islands get their independence.

NARRATOR. The Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines has asked that the complete independence of the Philippines be proclaimed on August 13, 1945 * * * the first anniversary of the landing of American troops on Leyte. To help make this transition, the Philippine Rehabilitation Commission is studying the great, complex problem, and gathering all possible data. But before it loom vital questions.

VOICE 2. How can they tell the extent of the damage or the amount of relief that will be needed until the Philippines are completely conquered?

VOICE 3. How are they going to handle the matter of money, with much of the pre-war money destroyed, the islands flooded with Japanese pesos, and newly printed American currency now being used?

VOICE 2. How long a transitional period will be set up, and what kind of provisions will be made to facilitate the transition, and how will it be integrated with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration?

FILIPINO 1. We will establish an office here in the Philippines.

NARRATOR. This is a Filipino member of the Philippines Commission who has already returned to his home islands.

FILIPINO 1. We are now in the process of organizing a complete staff of clerical and legal experts. This staff will carry out the work of the nine Filipino members of the Commission.

NARRATOR. A similar office will be established in the United States.

OBSERVER. The American members of the Commission, for the most part, will operate in the United States. And the two offices will report to the Governments of the Philippines and the United States.

VOICE 4. Just what powers will this Commission have?

OBSERVER. Its job will be to investigate and recommend. It may recommend, for example, that a preferential trade agreement running over a period of, say, some 20 years, be enacted to help the Filipinos get on their feet. Such a trade agreement, of course, would have to be enacted by the Congress of the United States. Or, it may recommend that rehabilitation to a certain extent, agreeable to both the Philipino members and the American members, be undertaken.

VOICE 4. There's a possibility of conflict within the Commission about problems of that kind, isn't there?

OBSERVER. Yes. There will be differing political views among the members, and, besides that the Commission may be in conflict even with the agencies of the Commonwealth Government and the Government of the United States. But whatever the difficulties, they will have to be resolved. For the Philippines stand as the first nation voluntarily to be freed, and as such stands as a symbol of hope for all the oppressed peoples of the world.

NARRATOR. A lone Filipino stands at dawn among the shattered and blackened ruins of Manila * * * a solitary silhouette against the tangled destruction. This is Juan who, at last, stands on the threshold of freedom.

JUAN. Out of this will rise our new nation.

Resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that there has been a mistaken opinion that the people of Wisconsin are isolationist and opposed to the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods agreements. Actually there has never been any basis for this mistaken belief. Concrete evidence to the contrary was shown recently by the introduction of Joint Resolution 68S in the Wisconsin Legislature by Senators Laird (Republican), Tehan (Democrat), and Risser (Progressive). Both the State senate and the assembly passed this resolution unanimously. It reads as follows:

Resolution extending cordial greetings to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco and pledging support to the objectives of the Conference

Whereas the United Nations are gathering in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to build a world organization for security and lasting peace on the basis of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; and

Whereas the unity of the Allies and the United Nations which insured us victory in this people's war over Fascist barbarism must be continued and strengthened to prevent future wars; and

Whereas the hopes of all freedom-loving peoples are centered around the San Francisco Conference where the United Nations organization will be established for the cooperation of all peace-loving nations in a world of peace and order; and

Whereas the American people resolved upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt that the success of the San Francisco Conference must be assured as a living monument to his memory; and

Whereas the Bretton Woods agreement constitutes an important part of the plan for world cooperation and lays an economic basis for increased foreign trade, full production, full employment, and better world-wide living conditions, all of which are essential to the establishment of a lasting peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature extends a most cordial greeting to the delegates to the United Nations San Francisco Conference, expresses its best wishes for the success of the Conference, and pledges its support to the objective of the Conference, namely, to establish a world security organization, based upon the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods proposals, to prevent aggression and build a peaceful and prosperous world: Be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of the United Nations San Francisco Conference and to each member of the United States delegation to said Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the views expressed by the people of the great State of Wisconsin will prevail and that we will soon have before us a report from the Committee on Banking and Currency for passage of the pending legislation on the Bretton Woods agreements and that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals now under consideration at the San Francisco Conference will be before the Senate before very many more weeks go by. Certainly if we are to build a peaceful and prosperous world both of these measures should pass the Congress with expedition.

Experience of a Red Cross Worker Seeking Reemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, the attached article which appeared in This Week, March 11, 1945, setting out the experience of a Red Cross worker seeking employment, was handed to me by a young naval officer who has been seriously injured as a result of 2 years' of service on mine sweepers in the Pacific.

I am introducing this article into the RECORD as a startling example of the thing that we do not want to happen in America as this war enters its final stage nor after its conclusion:

BACK TALK

Best letter of the week is this one from a Red Cross girl. We were so impressed that we are giving it all our Back Talk space:

"DEAR SIR: After 18 months in Asia with the American Red Cross, I recently returned to the United States on a medical recommendation. I could not go overseas again for at least 4 months, since it takes one a little time to get over malaria. And so it occurred to me that I should get a desk job while waiting.

"Yesterday I started looking for a job similar to the one I had before going overseas. My first call was on one of New York's leading employment agencies. I walked into a luxurious room entirely empty of applicants and was immediately granted an interview with a smartly-clad female executive. She handed me the usual questionnaire.

"(I wrote: College graduate, business course, 1 year studying advertising copy and layout, 5 years' experience in the advertising department of a leading national publication.) She asked where I had been for the last 2 years. I told her.

"You will find this hard to believe, but it's true. She twirled her novelty wrist watch, looked out of the window and said, 'You must realize that while you've been overseas, the girls at home have been getting experience which makes them much more qualified for the salary you ask. I suggest you take a cut in salary, since your business value has slipped. In a year you may work up to where you were before.'

"I thought. 'This is actually happening! The soldiers in Burma and India and China said it could, and they worried about it. We

discussed the soldier's future employment status, his ability to take up where he had left off—or, for the younger ones, to start out against experienced workers.

"So I wondered if this was a typical reception and if it was awaiting all those boys. 'Your value has slipped.'

"GOOD REASON TO BE MAD

"I looked at the employment executive's half-inch nails and smug face and was mad. Of what use those hands in making a fire from the rot of the jungle! Washing a thousand coffee cups each day in chlorinated water! Tucking in the mosquito netting of a sick soldier. My business value had slipped doing that!

"And so when she consolingly said, 'Don't be discouraged,' my reply was, 'I am discouraged—but not with myself. It's with you and those like you who have something very important, very delicate to handle. Is this what awaits our returning servicemen? "Your value has slipped." If they get this reception now, when employment is booming, what are you going to say to them later on, when it isn't?'

"The lady had no answer, and I left her office. A cold wind was blowing outside—and I still feel cold.

"Today they are the men of the First Army and the Third Army and the Fourteenth Air Force. Remember, they're fighting with grim determination now, and you like to hear that on the radio. Tomorrow they will be ex-soldiers looking for a job, and they won't lose that grim determination in fighting—not for a while. And America had better be prepared.

"M. J.

"NEW YORK, N. Y."

The Arkansas Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we are very anxious that the people throughout the Nation know all about Arkansas—our development, our progress, and our opportunities.

The Governor of our State, the Honorable Ben Laney, is giving a most excellent account of the facts regarding Arkansas today in Chicago. He gave this story to a large audience in New York last week. As it is so expressive of the heritage, courage, and determination of the people of our State, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein this excellent presentation of Governor Laney on the Arkansas story.

I invite the attention of every Member of the House and the people throughout the Nation to it:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, you have extended me an opportunity, here, to tell you the Arkansas story. For this I personally am grateful. And I can express to you also the gratitude of all of my people in Arkansas.

There are 2,000,000 of us. We feel we have a story to tell. It is not the old "down in Arkansas" story which you may have heard so often in the past.

No; this one is altogether different.

The old story never was any too factual. This new story has been documented.

In the beginning, I should like to apologize and ask your indulgence of my use of the personal pronoun in a few personal references which I think are pertinent to the first part of this story.

Something is happening in Arkansas. No one man has brought it about. No one man, be he Governor or magician, is going to see it through, single handed, to its ultimate fulfillment. The success of the movement rests preponderantly in the hands and on the shoulders and in the minds of the people of Arkansas, our John Doe's and the Mr. John Q. Public's. The sons and daughters of those great men and women who started with nothing at the end of the Civil War. The men and women who endured poverty and oppression without losing their spirit and determination to build a great State. They have given to us a rich heritage and the people of Arkansas today are proving themselves worthy of that heritage.

Last summer I campaigned for the office of Governor of Arkansas. I was a businessman. I still am. It wasn't an easy matter to leave my personal affairs in other hands for months and put all of my thought and energy into such a campaign. My decision to do just that had been reached only after several years of close observation of the operation of our State government.

As a businessman, as a taxpayer, and as the father of three sons, I had finally become alarmed at what I saw.

But there didn't seem to be any remedy. Talking to my business associates and contemporaries; viewing with alarm; going up to the capitol at Little Rock and registering a personal squawk—these measures accomplished absolutely nothing.

Every year or two, this tax, or that tax, would be boosted. Every year, the operating budget of our State government increased. Year by year, new commissions, new agencies, appeared. And the State government pay roll climbed like Jack's fantastic bean stalk, up and up and up.

In all these things Arkansas was by no means setting a precedent. I think you all can agree with me on that. The trend in Arkansas, and I must say elsewhere, was toward higher taxes, mounting cost of government, pyramiding departments and commissions; and despite the ever-mounting pay roll, there was noticeable to me upon close observation, a very definite deterioration of efficiency in the necessary functions and services of government.

So I took the big step. I announced my candidacy for governor. In my campaign I went to the people and reminded them that everybody had always talked about how wonderful it would be to have a businessman in the governor's office—just once. I promised the people of Arkansas to do two very simple things: Improve the efficiency and lower the cost of government.

Not a single political observer considered my candidacy seriously.

But on election day last July the people of Arkansas gave my simple two-plank platform such an overwhelming endorsement that my election was assured.

From that day until my inauguration 6 months later, I studied.

After arranging my personal business affairs, I put every moment into a study of all phases of the job I was to undertake and also a study of the State which I was to serve as chief executive. To assist me in these studies, and in drafting the subsequent plans of my administration, I summoned a group of business and professional men whom I considered to have two attributes in common: a willingness to render a public service; and a distaste for receiving money or political favors for that service.

Yes, we have many men in Arkansas in that category, as you shall see.

We selected as our first subject for study, the actual government of the State—forgetting for the moment the broader aspects of the job.

Well, we were in debt, but our State income was high—higher than in history—and we had accumulated treasury balances, in cash and securities, totaling $44,000,000.

Yet some of our State operated institutions and services were suffering for money. The tax revenues earmarked for their use had dwindled at the source.

Other funds were as rich as a Midas could have made them—far exceeding the normal need of the services maintained by them.

Our State government as a whole was indulging in prosperity spending.

We found the State pay roll to be staggering under the oppressive weight of approximately 6,000 jobs. We found in existence, 10 commissions numbering some 65 members assigned to handle the State's fiscal affairs. We found 7 separate agencies of government engaged in a confusing, overlapping, and inefficient effort to develop Arkansas' natural resources.

We discovered two costly regulatory agencies with not enough work to keep both of their large staffs busy, and with their fields of work closely allied. These were our corporation commission and our department of public utilities, both studded with high-priced personnel.

We found the system for tax revenue allocation and distribution to have the amazing total of approximately 100 separate funds. This was a patchwork, hydra-headed system which had been built up through 50 years of changing ideas and tugs-of-war between the special-interest groups. It had finally become a burden on every single function and service of government, a millstone around the necks of the long-suffering taxpayers.

I believe you will join with me when I say again that this situation which we found in my State is not peculiar to Arkansas. In my study of the record at home and of the records of many other States, I didn't find all of the remedies. Some we had to originate ourselves.

There wasn't anything we could do with our highway indebtedness except to make it more secure. But there was something that could be done with our other seven and one-half million-dollar bonded debt. We could get the money ready to pay that. And that is what we did in the Arkansas General Assembly last January and February.

We couldn't use the accumulated $44,000,000 cash and securities in the special accounts in the treasury. But we could certainly set it aside as a protective interest-drawing backlog. We did that.

The flow of money into this backlog of special accounts we cut off entirely, and we directed it into a single fund which eliminated all of the one hundred-odd funds—the overlapping, complex, archaic allocation machinery which was choking up our State functions and services.

That was a pretty drastic innovation, I'll tell you. But when once understood, it drew the support of everybody. This was one of the remedies we had to originate. The act was called the revenue stabilization law.

Simply stated, the act rearranges the allocation and distribution of State funds so that no function or service of our Government is dependent upon any one certain tax source; with the exception, of course, of our highway debt service, which is maintained by the State tax on gasoline and motor vehicle license fees; and self-supporting agencies.

The act earmarks a yearly minimum of $1,500,000 and a maximum of $3,600,000, depending on the level of tax revenue, for retirement of our nonhighway bonded debt. This will be accomplished in from 3 to 4 years.

And when this debt has been liquidated, the tax revenue previously earmarked for it will not be needed. So why not then begin a program of tax reduction. Well, such a

tax reduction program is an automatic feature of the bill.

In order that the legislators and the public could have a simplified exposition of the revenue stabilization plan, we drew up an explanatory folder. Some are available for those of you who would like to have one.

Before we even introduced this stabilization bill in the general assembly, we consolidated 10 commissions dealing with the State's fiscal affairs, creating one new agency, the State board of fiscal control. The Governor is chairman of the board, with a vote only in case of ties. Eight other top State officials make up the board.

Some of the functions are to: determine the amount of ad valorem taxes necessary, and to certify the State rate to the respective counties for collection; to set the amount of surety bonds of all officers and employees of the State and counties; to supervise the depositing of all public funds of the State of Arkansas; to make all investments of State treasury funds, and of the reserve fund created to secure the payment of our highway bonds; to prosecute the plan to retire our nonhighway bonded debt in advance of maturity; to handle all refunding and other matters affecting the bonded debt of the State; to pass upon all petitions of departments, agencies, and institutions of the State, for funds to be used for emergencies; to sit as a quasi-judicial body for hearing all claims against the State of Arkansas, over which it has exclusive jurisdiction; and to handle many other important matters of a fiscal nature.

Legislation was enacted to merge the corporation commission and the department of public utilities into one agency, the public service commission. In this a substantial savings was effected. For example, the consolidation eliminated three commissioners in the high salary bracket and a number of employees. And the combined docket of the new agency is current. No person having business with either of the old agencies has been delayed or inconvenienced. As a matter of fact, all the functions are being carried on more efficiently.

I gave a great deal of study to our development and conservation agencies—seven of them—and I studied the plans of a great many other States. What we did, finally, was to consolidate the seven development and conservation agencies into one, the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission.

The new commission absorbed the geological department, the parks commission, the forestry commission, the flood-control commission, the soil-conservation services, the agricultural and industrial commission, and the planning board. A substantial savings was effected here, too. And an improved efficiency is already being manifested. We now have 15 commissioners, where we used to have 54.

In addition, we eliminated other unnecessary agencies. We completely overhauled two of our most important departments—the comptroller's office and the revenue department. As a matter of fact, we went through the entire set-up of administrative and functional machinery and tightened up, pruned, and abolished.

I find it quite satisfying to tell you that just before leaving my office I had a report from my comptroller which revealed that 543 jobs had been abolished during the first 3½ months of my administration—jobs ranging from the lowest to the highest brackets.

I also find it quite satisfying to tell you that we already have reduced taxes in Arkansas. Two of the last bills I proposed to the legislature—after our consolidations and eliminations had indicated their soundness—were tax-reduction measures.

First, an act to eliminate the State tax of $9 on the second $1,000 of valuation on all homesteads. The savings to taxpayers of Arkansas won't be tremendous in the aggregate, but the satisfaction in this act comes from the reversal of the trend of ever-mounting taxes.

Second, an act which, in effect, eliminated the State inheritance tax.

Very likely you are all familiar with the fact that the Federal Government allows a credit for State inheritance taxes paid in an amount not exceeding 80 percent of the basic Federal estate tax. Under Arkansas law, our inheritance tax is an amount equivalent to 80 percent of the basic Federal tax insofar as the estate of a deceased resident is concerned. As to nonresidents, the State collects an amount equivalent to that proportion of the Federal estate-tax credit that the value of the real and tangible personal property having a situs in Arkansas bears to the total value of the estate of such deceased nonresident. Or, stated in another way, the total death taxes, both State and Federal, which would be levied upon the estate of either a resident of the State of Arkansas or a nonresident having real and tangible personal property situated in Arkansas would be no more than such estate would be required to pay in Federal estate taxes alone if the deceased were a resident of a State which imposed no death tax whatever.

The larger, long-range tax-reduction program incorporated in our revenue stabilization law will finally eliminate all State tax on real and personal property. I'm one of those local government advocates. I believe that all units of government should stand on their own feet in every sense of the word. It is my opinion that in Arkansas the ad valorem or property tax field should be left to counties, municipalities, and school districts. On the other hand, I believe the income and inheritance tax fields should be left entirely to the Federal Government. I want to see our State income tax eliminated, and I believe that this hope can be realized within a few years if our goal for industrial development and a higher per capita income for all of our citizens is attained.

This concluded my legislative program for changes which, you might say, were under the dome of the capitol building. My other field of study, which I mentioned at the beginning, was the State of Arkansas, as distinguished from the government.

I already had considerable knowledge of this subject. In fact, I had worked with some of our basic natural resources all my adult life. My farms had made money in food and feedstuffs; from other parcels of my land I had brought in petroleum; I had maintained paying beef cattle herds on my pastures; and I had in a business way handled many other resources. For years I had been a member of civic committees, both State and local.

And I had always had a great pride in my native State.

Here is what my study of the State of Arkansas showed:

One of the great agricultural States—third in production of cotton; second in yield per acre; third in rice; third in spinach; sixth in soybeans; fourth in snap beans; fifth in peaches; in fact, high in most of the products of the soil. I found that Arkansas had soil that would grow anything produced in the United States.

One of the great timber States—third in the South in production of timber, ninth in the Nation. We have 20,000,000 acres of timber, and this resource now is perpetual. Arkansas has more forest land under growth-and-cutting management than any State in the Nation, not excepting even Washington and Oregon. In fact, Arkansas pioneered the growing of timber as a crop.

One of the great mineral States—with the greatest array of mineral wealth anywhere on earth. We have all of the fuel minerals. In petroleum we rank high in the midcontinent area; our natural-gas reservoirs are vast beyond description; we have almost 2,000,000,000 tons of bituminous and semi-anthracite coal which sells at premium prices throughout the Midwest; and we have lignite in great quantities.

The story of our metal minerals is amazing. We supply 97 percent of the Nation's production of aluminum ore; we have been contributing substantial quantities of the Nation's production of mercury, manganese, titanium, zinc, and lead. Among our nonmetallics are barite, gypsum, limestone, mica, novaculite (incidentally, the only novaculite in the Nation), quartz crystals for radio oscillators, slate, chalk, glass sand, tripoli, phosphate rock, marble, asphalt sands, and some 40 others of less economic importance.

One of the great water resources States—for navigation, for irrigation, for hydroelectric power. Our nine highland streams, including the great White; the Arkansas which traverses the middle of our State; the Ouachita; the Red; and the Mississippi which forms our eastern border—these streams constitute one of the richest water resources in the Nation. We have only to further develop their potentials.

One of the great recreational States—with 2 magnificent mountain ranges, with the highest peaks between the Appalachians and the Rockies, 2 of the greatest of America's national forests, the oldest and finest national park in America, 8 State parks, and 500 private resort establishments scattered throughout our Ouachitas and Ozarks. We had 4,000,000 visitors in Arkansas in 1940, the last normal year for tourists and vacationists.

One of the great arsenal States of our Nation at war—with five tremendous arsenal establishments including the largest rocket plant on earth and the Army's No. 1 firebomb plant.

I found that Arkansas wasn't altogether an agricultural State. One of our aluminum plants, for instance, was producing twice as much of the silvery metal as the entire Nation used in the last pre-war year. And I found, incidentally, that the cost of unit production in this plant was lower than in any other similar operation in the Nation. We have 1,600 timber processing and woodworking plants including furniture manufacturers known throughout the country; our ceramics and pottery industries have national markets; Arkansas cheese made by Kraft and Cudahy and others is as fine as ever came out of any State.

Other things manufactured in Arkansas are too numerous to catalog here, but a few are: Baseball bats of a recognized brand name; handles for all kinds of implements; textiles, such as work clothes material and broadcloth of the finest quality; garments, shoes, hose, shirts, ties; boxes and crates and toys; bows and arrows for archery; canned vegetables and fruits; and a thousand and one other things.

The greatest need in the State of Arkansas, as I saw it in my preinauguration studies, was for the mobilization of a force for the further development of our natural resources and the exploitation of our many unusual attractions. It was obvious that we needed to increase our income from manufacturing and thereby obtain a more desirable balance in our agriculture-industry economy.

As the spearhead for this job, the logical agency was the new resources and development commission. I appointed one of Arkansas' most successful businessmen to the nonsalaried job of chairman of the commission, and as his advisory board, I selected 14 additional outstanding businessmen, mainly on the basis of their specialized knowledge and experience with the various categories of our resources.

I intended that this commission be a working commission, not the usual window dressing. Not only has it functioned as a working commission for 2 months; it has fulfilled

my most cherished hope. For this Arkansas Resources and Development Commission has now mobilized a large segment of our human resources into a movement which has been called aptly Arkansas Business Men in Action.

This is the "something" of which I spoke in the beginning. The working nucleus of the movement is 1,000 business and professional men. Groups of them are organized in every county in the State, in virtually every community. They are all members of the State economical council—chamber of commerce. Surrounding them in their respective communities are other hundreds, so that this civic agency ultimately may mobilize the whole human resources of Arkansas.

Every single one of its activities is tied tightly to our government agency, the resources and development commission. Among its membership are the officials of all of the State's leading industries, and many of these industries have research laboratories which now will be coordinated with the overall development program; also we have established a research bureau in our university whose findings will furnish us with new ideas in processing, manufacturing, and utilizing our raw materials.

Last month, in Little Rock, these Business Men in Action met and pledged to me, as Governor, and the resources and development commission, as their spearheading agency, the full resources of their organization.

Our plan for the further development of Arkansas' resources is directed into two fields. We are endeavoring to attract big industry to Arkansas, and we shall certainly try to obtain the conversion of a half dozen big war production plants.

But the emphasis in Arkansas is on the small manufacturing and processing plant with from 25 to 250 employees. We are going to sectionalize the State and catalog the raw materials in each section. Then we are going to prepare engineering studies or prospectuses on 15 or 20 different small-plant possibilities in each section, utilizing the raw materials at hand. Our business colleagues in the various sections of the State are going to do a local selling job and investing on their own, so that these small manufacturing projects will have a closer than usual tie to their communities.

The plan is already working. A few weeks ago a new shoe factory began operating in Jonesboro, Ark. This is in the heart of our livestock and cotton area. The major share of the capital was supplied by the St. Louis concern whose brand name will be on the shoes, but a substantial part of the capital was subscribed by Jonesboro people.

Arkansas laws are, we think, an asset to the movement toward industrialization which we have begun. Our workmen's compensation law is one of the best in the Nation. The Governor and our new resources and development commission are empowered to waive State property taxes up to 10 years for new industries or additions to existing industries.

One of our greatest assets in the industrialization plans is the availability of good, dependable labor. Arkansas war industries alone represent factory capacity of nearly a billion dollars investment. Most of this production required skilled labor. Arkansas furnished virtually all of this labor. Our men and women were found to be unusually adaptable. Another advantage has been the history of harmony between our labor and management, and between competing labor organizations in Arkansas. There have been practically no strikes in the past 4 years.

The dexterity of 150,000 pairs of hands developed in Arkansas by 4 years of such meticulous tasks as loading fuses, detonators, shells, and bombs offer a rich reward for industrialists who locate in our State.

Yes; there is great promise in the new movement for development in Arkansas. I think the promise is brighter than usual, mainly because, for the first time in my memory, business and Government are working as a team, with full confidence and trust in, and yes, admiration for, each other.

That promise and the facts behind it which I have related constitute the Arkansas story.

There have been many old moss-backed stories circulated throughout the Nation which we in Arkansas have not liked. There once grew an opinion among the uninformed that Arkansas was a backwoods State.

Actually, we spend more of our State tax dollar on education than many richer States; actually a larger percentage of our children go to school than the percentage in 22 other States. And we stand at the top of the South in the literacy of our citizens, leading 11 other States.

The native of no State on earth has greater cause for pride than has the man from Arkansas. The last portion of my inaugural address was devoted to this subject—State Pride. In it, I urged my people to implement their State pride with knowledge about their State, and then manifest it everywhere they went and in every way they could devise. That is the way we can best combat the old Down in Arkansas story.

Indulge me one admonition in closing, and I present it with all due respect: The time for selling Arkansas short has long since passed. While a vast section of our country has been bled of its natural, God-given wealth, Arkansas has been busy discovering her's.

While the North and Northeast have built an economy largely on importation of raw materials, Arkansas has been getting wise. The inventory of our raw materials is now complete. And we have begun to apply the wisdom gained.

If you want to get rich and live a happy, healthy, tranquil life, you might well consider Arkansas. For besides being one of the richest in resources, Arkansas is the healthiest State in the entire Nation. Number one for health. And the documentation for this may be found in the latest statistics of the United States Bureau of the Census.

That is the story of Arkansas, a story of progress under extreme handicaps and difficulties, progress in times of depression or prosperity, progress in times of peace, progress under the stress of war, progress initiated, developed, and achieved by determined, courageous, God-fearing native Arkansans.

On behalf of 2,000,000 industrious, intelligent, healthy, and proud Americans in Arkansas, I thank you again for this opportunity.

The Illusion of Subsidies—Farm Business Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks two very worth-while editorials from the St. Johnsbury (Vt.) Caledonian of Tuesday, May 8, 1945, the first entitled "The Illusion of Subsidies" and the other "Farm Business Prospects," as follows:

THE ILLUSION OF SUBSIDIES

According to figures released by the War Food Administration, a total of $3,314,170 was paid to 26,342 New England dairymen in the form of milk subsidies in November and December 1944. Vermont dairymen received almost half of the New England total payments, or about $1,250,000.

Notwithstanding this beneficence of the Federal Government, leaders of agriculture in New England are aware of the fact that subsidies are the great American illusion. Not more than 2 months ago, Dr. H. P. Young, manager of the Northern Farms Cooperative, wrote to a correspondent: "We have emphasized time and again to our members who favor subsidies that we thought it was a bad program for milk producers for the principal reason that we never know when it will be cut out from under us."

This practical viewpoint of the unsoundness of subsidies may be amplified on a broader economic basis. Consumers are now paying only a part of the cost of living. The rest is paid by the United States Government, whose source of income for subsidy payments is taxes collected from all the people and money borrowed from them. The practical result is that food costs are not based upon ability to pay. The rich and well-to-do who are amply able to meet the real costs of living, pay no more than the less-fortunate possessors of wordly goods.

Federal contributions to consumer living costs have now reached huge sums. Estimate for subsidy payments to producers of milk throughout the Nation now reach the staggering total of $350,000,000. More than 20 commodity programs have resulted in Government losses. Subsidies create only an illusion of saving. They will be discontinued when the full burden of war costs is felt by the people.

With such a result inevitable, agricultural leaders will do well to plan effective measures to cushion the shock of discontinuance of subsidy payments. Dr. Young of the Northern Farms has the right idea—to secure the adoption of an amendment to the Federal order "that will equal the present returns to producers, including the present subsidy."

Such a program would have the effect of substituting straight pricing for subsidies. It affords the logical way out of an unsound economic means to support agriculture. A price level sufficient to cover the entire cost of producing fluid milk plus a reasonable profit is not disproportionate to the buying power of consumers under present conditions immediately to be foreseen. If a price level covering costs and profit should prove too high in the post-war era, far better a reduction on a straight pricing basis than entanglement with Santa Claus subsidies which may be discontinued on short notice.

FARM BUSINESS PROSPECTS

A recent review of Vermont farm business prospects compiled by Dr. R. S. Beck, extension economist, summarizes matters of vital interest to the agriculturalist.

Dr. Beck believes that this is still a good time to produce milk and predicts a favorable continuance of the milk-feed ratio throughout the year. Significant is the statement that a part of the 3 percent increase in milk production in Vermont in 1944 was the result of better care and heavier grain feeding. Yet a word of caution is given with regard to dairy stock. The extension economist expresses the opinion that prices of dairy cows hit a peak in August of 1943 and suggests that "only good dairy heifers should be raised, as calves started this year are likely to be worth less when they become cows than cows of the same quality are worth now."

No easing of the farm labor situation is predicted for the current year. It is believed that for seasonal help, farmers must continue to rely upon high school students, volunteers from the cities, and older men and women. Still higher farm wages are indicated. To save labor, there must be more

skillful planning on the farm and a greater use of labor-saving devices.

Reference charts compiled by Dr. Beck show a striking contrast in prices received by Vermont farmers during the past decade. In 1933, milk in the 200-mile zone of the Boston milkshed brought $1.50 per hundredweight. Including subsidy, the price received in 1944 was $3.95. Cows sold at $47 per head in 1933 and at $137 in 1944. Eggs per dozen rose from 23 to 39 cents; potatoes from 81 cents to $1.72 per bushel and apples from 94 cents to $2.53 per bushel during the same period.

But prices alone do not tell the whole story. It is the adjustment of prices to farm costs that counts and upon this adjustment depends the true prosperity of agriculture. From 1930 to 1941, farm prices were low, relative to costs. Since 1941, farm prices have regained a favorable balance in relation to costs. The task in post-war days will be to maintain this favorable balance.

Only through high consumption, high production and high employment throughout the country will this favorable balance be maintained. If a great volume of jobs can be provided for the industrial workers by free private enterprise, the farmers will remain prosperous. If the initiative and skillful planning used in wartime fail to carry over into the days of peace, nothing can prevent drastic price declines for the farmer.

Reconversion will present problems challenging the best minds of the country. In the accomplishment of the tasks that lie ahead, agriculture must play a full part. It has the men to do the job—men who must now study their own particular problems and make immediate plans for the adoption of measures necessary to insure a continued prosperity for the farmer.

Post-war Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a soldier from my State, Thaddeus W. Hunt, to the editor of the Stars and Stripes, on the subject of post-war compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENDER SPOT

DEAR EDITOR: In Mail Call of February 9 issue of the Stars and Stripes, J. R. Halcac stuck his pen in my tenderest spot, and I'm forced to protest.

As he is wholeheartedly in favor of post-war universal compulsory military training, I'm against it.

Every day in the life of an individual or a nation can be considered an emergency. All those prone to cry "wolf" and those who have lost faith in America's ability to cope with emergencies need a refresher course in freedom from fear.

Professional, trained, and experienced armies start wars and may win a battle, but they have never won a final victory or a lasting peace. Twice in my life the civilian youths of America have been called on to save the world from the avaricious ambitions of professional armies. Twice they have defeated the greatest professional armies of Europe, with no thought of conquest or military grandeur. They did it to live in peace as civilians and not under a militant regimentation.

Caesar wasn't satisfied with defeating his enemies in Italy. Napoleon wasn't content with restoring peace after the French Revolution. And Hitler's ambitions were obvious. Should an unscrupulous leader in America find himself in possession of a great army, we may see ourselves walking in the footsteps of those conquerors who only brought disaster and destruction to their nations. Military might from within is as hazardous as military might from without. Germany is a dying example.

Universal conscription in time of peace is un-American. It's an invitation and a challenge for other nations to remain militant. No man trained today will be familiar with the deadly, modern, currently invented weapons of tomorrow's war. And by the time the world has recuperated sufficiently from this war to try another one, our Nation will have been bled dry by military might in idleness.

We will survive longer in peace than in war, and great armies don't make for a peaceful world.

T–5 THADDEUS W. HUNT, T. D.

Proposed United Nations Charter Preamble and an Appeal for Support by the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a good example of constructive thought and vigorous support of the cause of international peace, justice, and security is found in the recent action of the Committee on World Order of the Unitarian Laymen's League.

They have proposed a preamble to the United Nations' new world charter, and by this time have no doubt presented it for consideration by the proper committee of the San Francisco Conference. It seeks to proclaim objectives for which the United Nations are struggling and which will deserve widespread support after the war.

The preamble so proposed, and the appeal currently being made to the general public by this committee urging universal vigorous support of a program to maintain international peace, justice, and security, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREAMBLE FOR UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

We the people of the United Nations, in order to secure for ourselves and for our children the blessings of liberty and peace, do solemnly affirm our faith in the rule of law as the only adequate basis for justice among men, expressed through governments of free and independent nations united in common endeavor to advance the welfare of all mankind; and we do solemnly promise to maintain the institutions created for this purpose with an unalterable and loyal determination, pledging to one another, to the sacred dead, and to the generations yet to come our last full measure of devotion for the achievement of a united world, with liberty and justice for all.

WORLD SECURITY IS UP TO YOU

While 11,000,000 young Americans are carrying this war into the heart of Germany and to the streets of Tokyo, several other million Americans, not so young, are remembering the battle that went against us in the days after 1918. In simple words, we lost the peace.

It is the memory of that final battle that has steeled the wills of a whole generation of middle-aged Americans, many of them veterans of World War No. 1. They are determined that this time the peace shall be won as well as the war.

This means one thing today: The establishing of a world security organization as planned at Dumbarton Oaks, and a structure to insure economic stability as planned at Bretton Woods.

While it is true that Republicans and Democrats, Catholics, and Protestants, and Jews are supporting the plans for a world security structure, it is by no means safe to assume that the job undertaken at San Francisco is already done. This hope of mankind for an effective organization can be sabotaged, and by men who say they are for it, but who may intend to defeat it by reservations, amendments, and the fatigue of good men.

The committee on world order of the Unitarian Laymen's League believes that the proposals drafted at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods demand your full support. The plans in their totality are not too ambitious. They can easily be compromised to death through timidity and the fearful attitude of playing safe.

Courage and the spirit of adventure have marked all advances in recorded history. They brought Columbus to his New World. They will as surely bring us to ours—if we will let them strengthen our hearts and our hands.

The whole edifice of world organization and of lasting peace must rise upon foundations of popular support. You, a citizen of one of the contracting nations, can give—or withhold—such support. By your vigorous action—or by your apathy—the fateful balance may be turned. It is important that during the weeks through which the great conference deliberates at San Francisco, those sitting around the council tables shall directly or indirectly hear from you. We urge all Americans to make their support known today to President Truman, to the Senators and Representatives, to the American delegates at San Francisco. They want and need your help. They never needed it more. You can offer it in many ways. This is a period in history when even writing a series of letters can be as effective as the capture of an enemy gun emplacement, or the precision bombing of a rail center. Let us fight this battle together.

It all adds up to this: Whether there is to be a World War No. 3 is up to you.

The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at my request Col. Lewis Sanders, of the United States Army, has prepared a review of

the pamphlet written by Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training." I ask that the review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no object, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF THE CASE AGAINST COMPULSORY PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

(By Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling—Review by Col. Lewis Sanders, F. A.)

The author stresses as a major argument the self-interest of the officers of the Regular Services in promoting compulsory military training. He uses adjectives as hand grenades to throw at the opposition rather than as descriptive words to clarify his meaning. For example, he writes of the high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy that they "desperately sponsor" this legislation, but he cites no actions justifying such a description. Those familiar with the matter know that such a description is completely misrepresentative of the War Department atmosphere in the matter.

In a foreword to the pamphlet Dr. Alonzo F. Myers describes Lieutenant Colonel Conkling as "eminently qualified to write on this subject." Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's record as stated by Dr. Myers, however, does not indicate any experience that would specially qualify him. The record does not indicate that he has ever had any contact with military training, either in receiving it or in giving it to others. It is true that he served with the draft boards and with national headquarters of the draft in World War 1, and at national headquarters of Selective Service in World War 2. Neither of these activities has any contact with military training; they are concerned solely with determining the liability of citizens to serve in the armed forces. This reviewer can speak of this from his own knowledge, having received military training prior to the United States entering that war, been an instructor to both officer candidates and troops, an officer with combat service in World War 1, a Reserve officer between wars both giving and receiving instruction, and terminated 3 years of duty at national headquarters of Selective Service during World War 2 in October 1944.

The technique of the pamphlet is to create a hostile or prejudiced atmosphere for the consideration of the subject of military training rather than to discuss it on its merits. The War and Navy Departments are charged with muzzling officers opposed to peacetime military training, and the author cites his own experience in being unable to obtain permission to publicly oppose it. He treats this as a unique and undemocratic attitude on the part of these organizations.

Of course, the War Department will not allow an officer to publicly oppose a policy of the Department, but neither will any civilian branch of the Government permit subordinates to publicly oppose departmental policies, nor will any other organized group permit such activities. No business will retain in its employ a man who goes about campaigning against its policies; no church will retain a minister or priest who preaches against its dogmas. The offender is tried for heresy and expelled. A college does not permit a member of the faculty to carry on a public campaign contrary to its philosophy. A college fraternity has recently expelled a woman member for writing a magazine article critical of fraternities.

He urges that consideration of the subject of military training should be postponed until the 10,000,000 men in the armed forces are free to talk, intimating that they are against it, but he refuses to accept the favorable attitude expressed by the veterans of World War No. 1, who are perfectly free to talk. He dismisses their opinion with:

"The Legionnaires present, having had their military training, albeit a quarter of a century ago, promptly obeyed and recommended the legislation." Apparently the opinions of soldiers are weighty if Lieutenant Colonel Conkling thinks they may join him in opposing peacetime military training but should be disregarded if they are favorable to it. As a matter of fact a poll taken among the troops in this war shows them to be as overwhelmingly in favor of it as are the veterans of the last war.

Obviously the opinions of the veterans of World War No. 1 should constitute our best-informed public opinion. They have seen the results of our being twice involved in major wars when unprepared due to our following the advice of the same groups still opposing military training. They have personally experienced what it is to go into battle for an unprepared nation, and they have sons repeating their experience in a second war. They now bring to evaluating their experiences a mature judgment and they have shown themselves overwhelmingly in favor of a permanent military-training system.

Lieutenant Colonel Conkling repeatedly mentions plans to train 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 youths of 18 years of age annually and makes all his computations on the basis of 1,500,000 trained annually. But our population does not contain 1,500,000 youths becoming 18 years of age each year—only 1,200.000. Also, Army and Navy plans have never contemplated training even 1,000,000 youths annually. Too many of the statements in this paper do not accord with known facts. Motives and intents are imputed to proponents of universal military training that rest on nothing stronger than unsupported assertions.

In an attempt to show that history proves that we do not need military training it is stated:

"When called upon its hosts of civilian soldiery sweep their enemies before them, establish peace, and at once return to their peacetime pursuits." And again:

"Isn't the complete answer to the proponents of universal military service that America's five major foreign wars have been decisively won without it, the greatest of which were against nations prepared by years of the most exacting compulsory military training of their youths?" Let us examine these statements against the historic facts. Our five major foreign wars have been, the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, World War No. 1, and World War No. 2. During the Revolution the Colonies used a total of 395,853 men, at one time or another, against a British force of 62,196 men. It required 7 years and the assistance of the French to secure our independence from a Nation whose people had so little heart in conquering their own kinsfolk that their government had to complete their forces with hired alien troops.

In the War of 1812 we used a total of 527,654 men passing through our forces to face a force of 81,502 British. During 4 years we lost every battle fought on land, except one, and many of them under disgraceful circumstances. Only at sea did we distinguish ourselves and there we fought with trained men.

In spite of the large number of men we used during the Revolution and the War of 1812 we were never able to keep more than small poorly trained forces in the field at any one time due to lack of a sound military policy.

The Mexican War was not against a military power and we were the aggressor.

In World War No. 1 our civilian soldiers did not rush out and sweep the enemy before them, as stated. When drawn into that war we were unable to fight at all, even with a token force. It was more than a year before we could place even a small force in battle and some 18 months before we could mount an offensive. During all that time we were sheltered by the armies of our allies. When we did finally go into battle it was to take over a portion of a line the major part of which was still manned by our allied troops. Had any such situation existed as Lieutenant Colonel Conkling pictures the result would have been a complete military disaster and it would have been the American Army that would have been swept away, not the enemy army.

World War No. 2 is a repetition of World War No. 1. Pearl Harbor found us unprepared and if the Japanese had not been attempting to conquer China and take the British and Dutch colonies in the Far East, all at the same time, they could have taken Hawaii and invaded our Pacific Coast. We were unable to do any serious fighting for more than a year and again prepared for war under the protection of allied armies.

History shows that not only is their no foundation in fact for Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's statement but that, on the contrary, four times in 150 years we have escaped destruction, because of our unpreparedness, by little short of a miracle.

The author also states:

"For modern warfare relies more and more upon mechanical instrumentalities and less and less upon great masses of men." This statement is wide of the facts. Although mechanization in this war is far more complete than in World War No. 1, it has also required far greater masses of men, not less, as Lieutenant Colonel Conkling implies. To anyone familiar with military matters it is obvious that the greater the use of mechanical equipment the greater the number of men that will be used. The reason is simple; war entails a maximum effort on the part of the nations engaged. Mass-production methods have permitted the equipment and supply of much larger bodies of troops than ever before and armies promptly increased to the largest size made possible by the new production facilities.

When mass production permitted the constuction of large numbers of cannon and the production of huge quantities of ammunition the amount of artillery on the battlefield and the quantity of artillery fire leaped to unheard-of heights because neither side could afford to let the other outmatch it. But this did not decrease the need for infantry.

The mechanization of the battlefield itself, particularly in transportation and communications, still further increases the number of troops who can be supplied and controlled and therefore forces the use of still larger numbers of men, not less as stated.

The airplane has still further increased the need for military manpower. While it is impossible to win a war without an adequate air force neither the war nor even a battle can be won by air power alone; that still has to be done by the ground troops. The air force has, therefore, become mainly an addition to the size of the armed forces rather than a substitution for other troops. Our Army Air Force alone, in World War No. 2, exceeds in number of men the entire American forces in France in World War No. 1. The same holds true in the Navy. In spite of a large and efficient naval air force the Navy has required more regular naval craft and men than ever before.

In short, in World War No. 2, although we have increased the use of machines in battle some 300 or 400 percent over World War No. 1, we have also had to call three times as many men to serve in the Army and Navy as we did in that war. According to Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's thesis, we should have used fewer men.

The argument is advanced that we will not need to train any men for several years after this war because its veterans will be available to be called back to service in the event of an emergency. There is neither democracy or equity in the suggestion that the youth of the Nation be exempted from taking

military training at the expense of the men who already have carried the burden of a major war. All of the objections which Lieutenant Colonel Conkling raises to training the youth of the Nation apply with far greater force to calling the veterans of this war back to service.

Inconsistently with his argument for calling back the veterans he states that universal military training would be of little value as the men would lose all their training within 2 years and it is, therefore, wasted effort to train men in advance of a war. If such were the case it would be an added argument in favor of universal military training as it would be the only way in which we could always have a body of suitably trained men ready to defend the country.

Actually men will not lose the value of their military training for a considerable period, probably 5 to 8 years. (This is based on the reviewer's personal observations after World War No. 1.) While it is true that the art of war constantly changes in its technique, it changes little in basic principles. The individual soldier in World War No. 2 is, as to probably 75 percent of his activities, doing the same things that he would have done if a soldier in World War No. 1. He is doing them better because we have been able to give him more thorough instruction before he goes into battle. The veteran of World War No. 1, if still physically fit, could have been retrained for the new techniques of World War No. 2 in a fraction of the time it took to train green men. In the matter of physical fitness, a man who has once been conditioned can be reconditioned much more quickly than a man of the same age can be conditioned for the first time.

The balance of the paper creates a prejudiced atmosphere in which to consider the subject of universal military training. Aspersions are cast upon the honesty of purpose of all Army and Navy officers favoring the proposition. Without shadow of proof, it is repeatedly charged that when these officers had said one thing they have meant something different and the "something different" is put into their minds. He repeatedly challenges the right of the Army and Navy to advocate or be listened to on national-defense policy because they are tainted with self-interest. He says nothing about their competency to advise the Nation on its defense requirements or their legal and moral responsibility for so doing. Neither does he indicate where we can obtain other competent advice.

Of course the officers of the Army and the Navy have a personal interest in our post-war military establishment but their situation is no different from that of most experts upon whom the public must call for guidance. The physician is affected by a self-interest in public-health problems; the engineer has a self-interest in flood control, highways, and other public works; the lawyer has a self-interest in laws dealing with many subjects; yet our State and national legislative bodies contain many lawyers.

Intelligent and competent people are able to make effective use of the advice of experts even when affected with a self-interest because they follow the arguments and facts set forth and make allowance for any conclusions that are not properly supported. If Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's reasoning were followed to its logical conclusion and our professional soldiers and naval men thrown out of court because of their personal interest in the outcome we would have to exclude from consideration also the views of all men of military age and their close relatives since they are tainted with an even greater self-interest through being subject to the military training.

Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's knowledge of the proposals for universal military training appear to be confined to what has appeared in the press since his paper shows no knowledge of War Department studies or policy on the subject.

Typical of Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's approach to this subject is the following statement:

"And, incidentally, observing the unusually large number of newly made 'administrative' Army and Navy officers appearing on the streets of the Nation's Capital, and elsewhere, one wonders why so many of this multitude holding commissioned rank and performing office duties are and have been from the beginning of their service well within the younger brackets of the draft ages. Certainly a great majority, when first commissioned, were and probably are now between the ages of 21 and 31, or 35 at most, while not so fortunate men between 35 and 45 with dependent families and settled and important home community interests have been inducted into the armed services in droves."

The above, with several other statements which it is unnecessary to quote, create the impression that through favoritism large numbers of young men succeeded in securing unearned commissions for which their principal qualification was influence. He also infers that a military autocracy needlessly snatched away from dependent families and important jobs large numbers of men between 35 and 45 years of age.

When examined against the records the statements and implications fall to the ground. First consider the men over 35 years of age inducted into the service since Lieutenant Colonel Conkling, through his service at National Headquarters of Selective Service, is charged with some personal knowledge of this subject. The Army and Navy are without power to induct a single man through their own selection. Such selections are not made by officers of the armed services or even by commissioned civilians in the Selective Service System. Every man inducted has been selected, as is perfectly well known to all, by a board of civilians who are his neighbors. Men with dependents were not called until after the Congress had passed legislation providing financial assistance for dependents and even then, until we faced a tight manpower situation, such men were called last in their groups. Men engaged in important activities were deferred until they could be replaced. The Army, before Pearl Harbor, released about 100,000 men over 28 years of age, most of these being recalled after we were attacked. At a later date the War Department permitted men over 38 years of age, who could show that they had a war job awaiting them and whose commands could spare them, to return to civil life. Something over 200,000 men were released under this policy.

Lastly, the number of men over 35 years of age inducted into the armed forces was determined by the requirements of the war and the manpower situation and not by the choice of the Army and Navy since the services do not want men of this age. The population does not contain a sufficient number of suitable younger men to meet the military manpower demands of this war.

As to officers commissioned, one would assume from Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's statement that a major part were commissioned direct from civil life through either favoritism or being on the ground and knowing the ropes. The facts are that only 10 percent of the officers were commissioned directly from civil life. Of this 10 percent 54.8 percent were commissioned in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Sanitary Corps, Medical Administrative Corps, Veterinary Corps, and Chaplains. That is professional men commissioned in their own specialty and for which there is no other means of obtaining the required officers. An additional 18.8 percent were commissioned in the Transportation Corps, Chemical Warfare Service, Corps of Engineers, Ordnance Department, Signal Corps, and Judge Advocate General's Department. Commissioning in these departments is based on technical training or business experience or both and much better qualified officers can be obtained for these departments direct from the comparable civilian occupations than can be obtained by a training course in the short time available. Or 73.6 percent of the 10 percent were commissioned because their civilian technical training or experience fitted them for the jobs and there was no other comparable source for procuring such officers.

There is left then only 26.4 percent of the 10 percent or 2.6 percent of all commissioned officers who might have been commissioned for other reasons than that they were from the logical and best source for obtaining such officers. But it has been a prerequisite to issuing any commission to a man directly from civil life that he be shown to have specific qualifications for the assignment for which he is intended. Anyone familiar with the issuing of such commissions in this war knows that about the only part friendships have played is where those in administrative posts knew men specially qualified to handle jobs to which it was necessary to assign an officer and have recommended the man. This is the way most men are secured for executive jobs in civil life and no one has yet found a more efficient way. While some men may have secured commissions through favoritism or influence this writer is sure that those familiar with the issuing of commissions will agree that in this war they have been kept as near zero as is humanly possible.

The Army obtained the majority of its officers from the following sources: Regular Army 2 percent, National Guard 2.3 percent, Officers' Reserve Corps 25.3 percent, former officers recommissioned 2.5 percent, enlisted men commissioned after passing through an officers training school or directly from the ranks 51.6 percent.

The picture presented by this pamphlet does not stand up when tested by the facts.

Parties, Politics, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an admirable article entitled "Parties, Politics, and Peace," written by Christopher Dawson, and published in the February 1945 issue of the Sword of the Spirit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIES, POLITICS, AND PEACE

(By Christopher Dawson)

Recent events in Greece and elsewhere have shown us that victory alone is not enough to restore peace to Europe. The sufferings that the occupied countries have endured have weakened the whole tradition of civilized order and have accustomed men's minds to violence and lawlessness. Moreover social conflicts and ideological differences have been deliberately fostered by those tactics of disintegration which are the most diabolical weapons of totalitarian warfare. How is it possible to restore parliamentary democracy when any party struggle is apt to degenerate into a display of totalitarian

thuggery? And if we do not do so, how can we honor our pledges under the Atlantic Charter? This is our present dilemma, and in order to solve it we shall need more clear thinking as well as firm action.

PARTIES AND IDEOLOGIES

In the first place there is a certain confusion of public opinion with regard to the real nature of the war. Is it a struggle for world power between rival states, or is it a conflict between two rival ideologies or political theories, named democracy and fascism? The answer is that this is not a true dilemma, since from the beginning it has been the policy of Hitler to use the ideology of national socialism as a weapon of power politics and consequently our resistance to his international aggression inevitably involves a resistance to his ideology and a defense of our own political ideals. It is impossible to fight this war as though it were a straightforward national conflict of the old style. It is essentially an ideological war, but since we are not a totalitarian state and consequently do not possess an official state-imposed uniform political doctrine, we are at a disadvantage as compared both with our Fascist enemies and our Communist allies. When, therefore, we say that we are fighting for democracy, we do not mean that we are fighting to impose a watertight system of political ideas on the rest of the world, but merely that we are defending our political and social freedom against the mass tyranny which is seeking to destroy it.

DEMOCRACY AND THE PARTY SYSTEM

Now, political freedom, according to our tradition, involves the existence of political parties. The party system, which has been evolved in Britain and America, is an elaborate and delicate mechanism which makes it possible to change the government without the necessity of revolution. It is like a balance that allows the weight of public opinion to determine the position of political power. A single party system, such as is characteristic of all the totalitarian states, removes one arm of the balance and essentially changes the nature of the mechanism. The single party is in fact no longer part of a balance; it is a sheer weight which concentrates the whole power of the state in one direction, so that public opinion does not influence the government but is influenced and formed by it. The strength of such a system depends entirely on the efficiency of the ruling group and their servants. It has the strength and weakness of a despotism irrespective of the size of the dominant party. It can claim to be democratic, because it can, theoretically at any rate, force everybody and anybody into its ranks, but it can never be democratic in the same sense in which we in the West understand the term.

PSEUDO-DEMOCRATIC PARTY SYSTEMS

At the same time we must recognize that our conception of party is not the only one. Our conception involves of necessity a limited measure of cooperation between the parties and the recognition of a superpolitical basis of agreement and loyalty on which the state stands. But there is another type of party which is essentially noncooperative and exclusive and which refuses to admit the right of other parties to exist. The victory of such a party is usually followed by the proscription or liquidation of its opponents, so that every election becomes a potential civil war. This has been the tradition of the revolutionary parties in the past, and in some cases, as with the French Jacobins, it produces a party dictatorship like that of the totalitarian states. But at other times this revolutionary tradition has been combined with the other Anglo-Saxon tradition of alternating parties, with surprising results, as we see in nineteenth century Spain, where Progressives and Moderates staged alternate coups d'etat and an eminent liberal could declare on his deathbed that he had no enemies to forgive since he had killed them all!

DEFINING OUR TERMS

Hence it is clear that it is not enough to talk about democracy and fascism unless we define our meaning pretty clearly. If by fascism we understand that particular form of mass tyranny which has arisen on the Continent between the two wars, and if by democracy we mean a constitutional regime of political and personal liberty, then it is correct to say that the defense of democracy against fascism is our essential war aim. But we must remember that there is an alternative sense to both these terms and that many people will not accept our definitions.

THE RIGHT AND LEFT FALLACY

Thus, many people today use the terms "fascism" and "democracy" as equivalent to what are known as the right and the left, so that any political ideas or social elements which are regarded as conservative or reactionary or capitalist or monarchist are described as Fascist, while anything that is regarded as revolutionary or progressive or socialist is spoken of as democratic. The result of this division is to obliterate the distinction between constitutional and totalitarian parties, and to force every shade of political opinion into alliance with some extremist totalitarian party which inevitably tends to become the predominant partner. And this is no remote imaginary danger. It is a real situation which has been exploited again and again to the advantage of the totalitarian powers in the course of the present struggle. Wherever this division between left and right has been carried to its logical conclusion, it has led to the weakening or collapse of the society concerned; while the survival of Great Britain in 1940 was due above all to our rejection of this left-right ideology, and to the cooperation of all the constitutional parties in defense of their common national existence and freedom.

CAN DEMOCRACY SURVIVE?

Where parties are incapable of doing this, parties cannot exist, and some form of authoritarian or totalitarian state is bound to take over control. Now it may be argued with some plausibility that this is what is happening in the world today, and that the Anglo-American system of constitutional liberty is incapable of surviving in a world of mechanized mass powers. But if so, this means that democracy, as we have understood it, is finished, and that we have been fighting for a lost cause. This is not a conclusion that we can readily accept, since our political system has stood up to the strain of total war more successfully than any of our critics expected. But the making of peace may prove an even more difficult test than war, since it brings western democracy face to face not only with the problems of a Europe that has been disintegrated by years of Fascist exploitation, but also with the massive power of our Soviet allies which represents the most complete and far-reaching single-party system in existence. It is clear that no stable peace can be reached unless it is possible to find some modus vivendi between Anglo-American democracy and Russian communism, and in order to do so it is not sufficient to gloss over their essential differences by an equivocal use of the term "democracy." It is an immensely difficult task and one which demands exceptional qualities of statesmanship and moderation. But though it is difficult, it is not impossible, and since the peace of the world and the survival of civilization depend upon it, it is in the interests of both parties that it should be solved. That must be the basic aim of Allied statesmanship and the more fully public opinion in the various countries realizes the true issues the better are the chances of reaching this goal.

Communications for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Communications for Peace," delivered by Hon. Paul A. Porter, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at a dinner by the Baltimore chapter of the Morse Telegraph Club of America, at Baltimore, Md., on April 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was brought up to believe that America is the land of opportunity, and I'm delighted to see that there are opportunities open even for you ex-Morse telegraphers. Victims of technological unemployment in your chosen trade, like the lamplighters and hostlers of another generation, you nevertheless seem to be eking out an existence as railroad presidents, steel corporation vice presidents, or at whatever other similar job turns up.

I wish that I could hold out hope that the future might restore you to your old jobs. I wish I could assure you that the Federal Communications Commission was in a position to order the junking of these newfangled gadgets, the telephones and tickers and automatic transmission devices of all kinds, so that you old Morse telegraphers could leave your present jobs and return to your chosen profession—getting the message through—though the calluses sprout.

But that is not the burden of my talk tonight. On the contrary, I am here to emphasize what you all know anyway, that still further communications progress lies ahead. For it is an essential feature of our kind of society that it cannot stand still. Some decades hence I hope I may be invited to talk to a reminiscent get-together of today's young radar specialists, their heads turned bald or greying, as they think back to the good old days when radar was being used, and was even considered quite up to date.

What are these newer technological developments which already loom on the postwar communications horizon? Those of you who have turned from Morse telegraphy to broadcasting know about FM, television, and facsimile broadcasting, which will bring into our homes programs for the ear and for the eye. Those of you who have taken to working on the railroads know that FM and facsimile are being increasingly tested in your rail communications systems. The reliance of aviation on radio communications is little short of its reliance on wings and propellers.

But tonight, meeting as we do at a time when the thoughts of the world are centered on San Francisco, I want to talk chiefly about international communications. For if our country has learned one lesson from the war in which we are engaged, it must be that America can never again live by itself. We are a nation among other nations, and our domestic tranquillity is dependent upon the peace of the whole world. International communications—direct, fast, safe, cheap communications—are one cornerstone upon which a structure of world peace and world cooperation can be built.

It is not enough that sitting at your desks in Baltimore you can pick up your phone and talk to Athens, Ga., or Paris, Ill., or

Moscow, Idaho, or that you can send a telegram to any of those points. Until communications are fast, inexpensive, and efficient with Athens, Greece, Paris, France, and Moscow, Russia, the contribution which communications can make to world order will not be complete. Our newspapers must have rapid, economical means of gathering news in unprecedented volume throughout the world, and newspapers abroad must have ready access to a continuous flow of news from the United States. Businessmen here and abroad should have no more difficulty in communicating with one another than businessmen in Baltimore and New York. International broadcasting which has proven itself so potent an instrument of psychological warfare, can effectively be used for the purposes of peace.

The oldest means of rapid international communication, the cable, still carries the bulk of the traffic along such heavily burdened routes as that from New York to London. Challenging its leadership is the radiotelegraph and radiotelephone. In our own homes, we listen to the overseas broadcasts of the B. B. C., while the English hear the best that our broadcasters have to offer. And radio fascimile, which enables this afternoon's newspapers to carry pictures of this morning's happenings on the other side of the earth, is already a significant factor. These are the available techniques; will we have the social inventiveness to harness them to the purposes of world news, world trade, and world peace?

Some weeks ago, when our late President reported to the Congress on his visit to Yalta, he called attention to the significance of such techniques. He said:

"Far away as I was, I was kept constantly informed of affairs in the United States. The modern miracle of rapid communications has made the world very small; we must always bear in mind that fact when we speak or think of international relations."

In discussing international communications tonight, I want first to enter a plea of confession and avoidance. As a newcomer to this field, I make no pretense to that sort of expertise which sometimes lends authority and on other occasions breeds dogmatism. Nor do I subscribe to the conclusion that a person must have been a classmate of Marconi to have an opinion about the subject. With these reservations, I repeat the observation of President Roosevelt that we must bear in mind the fact of communications when we speak or think about international relations and to it I add a question as to whether the United States is prepared to assume its proper post-war role in this field.

The Congress and the several agencies of Government concerned with the question of international communications have over the years given detailed consideration to the problem of a more effective system and, as you know, have as yet reached no final agreement upon policy. Hearings are now in progress before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

As one who followed the problem casually prior to having some official responsibility with the policies, I had assumed, and I think the public generally must have assumed, that here is a field of enterprise offering great advantages to those who operate it. Because of the public familiarity with the great names of the carriers involved, most of us had presumed that a vast financial empire was involved. Here were interests and investments which captains of industry were striving to protect and maintain and develop. I presumed this until I looked at the books and accounts of the competing carriers.

What are the facts? The total remaining investments involved are less than the cost of a single battleship. According to our data, the principal carriers in the international field have aggregate net investments of $57,000,000. Of course, I do not deprecate this as an insignificant sum even in these days of multi-billion-dollar appropriations. But, as I shall undertake to show in a moment, the financial stake involved even from the standpoint of existing investments or prospective revenues is greatly outweighed by considerations of national interest in effectuating an efficient system of world-wide communications.

Then, you may ask, Why have Congress and the interested agencies of Government become so concerned about this relatively small segment of our economic system? Here are six companies with remaining investments of less than your major department stores in Baltimore. Yet weeks of hearings and much effort and energy are now being expended in seeking a solution to the problem. The answer is found, I think, in the words of President Roosevelt, that we must always bear in mind the fact of communications when we speak or think of international relations.

That our present or post-war system is inadequate is evidenced by the fact that leading executives of the international communications companies are seeking a coordinated national policy, and although differences of opinion exist, it is obvious that those who operate our present systems are not satisfied that this Nation can assume its proper leadership under the policies and practices that existed prior to the war.

Moreover, it is readily apparent that if the hopes and aspirations of humanity are realized at San Francisco—and they must be—we must completely revise our thinking about international communications. No longer can we be content with merely satisfactory service to centers of heavy traffic. A vast expansion in facilities, in volume and in techniques, must be developed. The only relevant issue is how can this best be accomplished.

The evidence of the inadequacy of our existing system is abundant. About a year ago the distinguished commentator, William L. Shirer, observed:

"If there is to be any order or sense or cooperation or understanding or peace in our post-war world, something has got to be done about international communications, which, though few Americans know it, are at present in a rather lamentable state."

Mr. Shirer further concluded:

"It will be news to most citizens, I think that despite our undoubted achievements in science and technology and industrial organization, despite our alleged Yankee push we have been positively bashful and backward in playing our proper role in the international communications business."

I do not propose tonight to dwell upon the factors which warrant the conclusion reached by Mr. Shirer. Those who are engaged in international communications are completely aware of the shortcomings of the existing system—the wasteful allocation of frequencies and duplication of circuits, the irrational pattern of rates, the need for a unified policy in dealing with foreign companies and foreign administrations at the other end of the circuit. I wish to emphasize that this problem must be approached from the standpoint of what policies will give the American people an effective system of world-wide communications that will best foster and promote our democratic ideals and serve as the instrument of free exchange of news and ideas, and as an alert handmaiden to our commerce and trade. Obviously the interests of those who presently operate this business are subordinate to those they seek to serve. To my mind, there should be erected no philosophic barriers which will prevent the United States from having the greatest communications system that it is possible to devise.

In a field which is inherently monopolistic in character, and which is affected with such a broad public interest, I can see no violation of our traditional democratic concepts if we take realistic measures to develop this great utility to its maximum usefulness. If such a result calls for a consolidation of all of our international communications resources, and I believe it does, we should not hesitate to adopt such a plan.

There are, of course, debatable questions in any field of public policy. But I would summarize my own views with the observation that it is preferable to have a strong and profitable monopoly, with appropriate safeguards to protect the public interest, than to continue with a relatively small number of weaker companies at the sacrifice of efficiency and service.

The more I study the problem, I am convinced that if the present companies were operating exclusively in the international communications field, without collateral and supporting interests, the processes of competition would result in insolvency for some of them. If, as we hope, the art of communications is going to bring the light of democracy in many dark corners of the world, I do not believe the Nation should assume the risk that may be inherent in divided effort by the existing companies.

We recall that, particularly in the field of radiotelegraphy, the principal carrier began as an organization exclusively interested in international communications. Limited competition and a relatively small volume of traffic caused it to exert its energy and talents in other and more profitable fields. Others in the field, including cable companies, had domestic interests that were more profitable and were developing to a greater extent. The result is that today we have the pattern in which the important function of international communications is only a side line of the principal business of those who control these companies.

A few figures may be enlightening. The principal American carriers engaged in international telegraph service are controlled, as I have said, by companies engaged in other activities. The three principal companies have assets, after deducting reserves, of about $900,000,000. Their American subsidiaries handling international traffic have net investments in cables and radio-transmitting equipment of about $30,000,000, or about 3⅓ percent. The net income of these three companies approximates $70,000,000 annually before Federal taxes, and their American operating subsidiaries have net income from international communications of $8,100,000, or about 11½ percent.

Of course, I do not assert that international communications are a kind of a hobby of the large institutions which have developed it. What I do urge is that the time has now come when international communications should stand on their own feet as the principal and exclusive business of those who operate them, and that the only way in which that can successfully be accomplished is through an appropriate consolidation of existing facilities.

I do not know how long those presently engaged in the business will want to continue upon the basis of the division of relatively small profits; I have no way of predicting how long the incentives of prestige, as distinguished from competition, will provide the impulse to further lower rates and improve service. But I do suggest that were it not for the fact that our existing international carriers have strong and beneficent parents, failure to consolidate might ultimately result in the necessity for Government operation.

I am, therefore, hopeful that from all of the discussion that has been under way upon this problem there shall emerge a program which will give to the people of America a strong, aggressive international communications carrier, exclusively engaged in this important function, that will be able to hold its own throughout the world, and cooperating with other governments and

foreign correspondents give to America the eminence in this field which its leadership in world affairs and its responsibilities for the world of tomorrow so amply justify.

In developing such a program there are four important considerations:

1. International communications must be cheap and uniform.
2. They must be rapid.
3. They must be available to and from even the remotest points.
4. They must travel by direct routes, unrelayed, wherever possible.

I place low cost first, because by and large the volume of news and intelligence is dependent upon cost. No one except the newspaper itself cares particularly whether the 500-word dispatch from its correspondent at S. H. A. E. F. this morning cost $10 or $1,000; but every newspaper reader is vitally concerned that he get that full 500 words instead of merely 50 words or 10. Only by lowering rates and then lowering them again and again can we be sure that full reports rather than mere hints of what has happened will reach us.

Businessmen, too, must have low rates if world trade is to flourish. Some of you may recall the New York partner in a business enterprise who had not had a letter from his partner in Brazil for many days. Eventually he decided to cable; but after considering the costs, he cut his message to just one word: "Well?"

The partner in Brazil received that query, and composed a copious answer. Exchange rates, his message said, somewhat complicated closing the transaction he had under way. There was also the question of credit. And the articles in question would have to be sized on the metric scale rather than in inches.

Then the partner in Brazil thought of the cost, and began to cut his message down. He left out the exchange rates. He eliminated the reference to credit. The metric measurement point he dropped. What he finally cabled in reply was also just one word: "Well?"

When the New York-London cable first opened in 1867, the rate was set at $10 a word. And newspaper readers found few 500-word dispatches in their morning papers.

Today the cost of a full-rate message between New York and London is 20 cents a word, and the press rate under certain circumstances is only 3 cents a word. But to Russia the full-rate from New York is now 30 cents, to Montevideo 45 cents, to Australia 60 cents, to China 88 cents, and to Borneo $1.05 a word.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has proposed a post-war New York-London telephone rate of $12 for 3 minutes, which means that a business man could pick up his phone and talk to London for the present cost of a 30-word cable plus a 30-word reply. Under this same company proposal, a 3-minute conversation in which 300 words or more can be readily spoken would not cost more than $15 to any point on earth. You could talk to French Indochina, for example, at less than the present telegraph rate for a 3-word name, a 3-word address, the 1-word message, "Well?" and a 2-word signature, plus a similar reply. The international airmail, too, will have a profound effect in increasing the volume of international messages and in keeping telecommunications rates in line.

In the past, rates between different parts of the world have grown up largely on the basis of the costs of cable operations, and the resulting pattern has been one in which distance has determined the relative amount of the rates. In the world of tomorrow, we must recognize that the barriers which have existed between nations, because of distance, must disappear. I strongly feel that the uniformity of international communications rates to all corners of the globe would go a long way toward removing these barriers. This principle has been in effect with respect to mail rates for the past three-quarters of a century and has proved its worth. Fortunately, we have in radio the means by which this goal can be attained, for the economies of radio are reflected in the relatively insignificant differences in costs of operation as between a circuit to London, a circuit to Moscow, or a circuit to Chungking. And important strides toward this end are being made. On May 1, present rates from New York to all countries in continental Europe and to all countries in South America will be reduced to a uniform 20-cent full rate. Other classes of messages to these points will be lower and similarly uniform. This means that not only will a substantial measure of uniformity of international rates be achieved, but that sizable reductions will be made. Thus, the present 30-cent rate to Moscow and the present 45-cent rate to Montevideo will come down to the level of the present rates to London.

We cannot, of course, regard these rate changes as the ultimate in our efforts. Much remains to be done by way of extending the idea of uniformity to other areas of the world and making the uniform rate even lower, if it is possible.

In addition to being cheap, international communications must, of course, be rapid—and that means consistently and reliably rapid. Back in 1919, when the last peace conference was sitting in Paris, Walter S. Rogers—President Wilson's adviser on communications—wrote to Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels:

"One of the tragedies of the present peace conference lies in the fact that great sections of the world have no chance to learn what is going on there. For instance, it now takes from 8 to 14 days for a message to reach the Far East, and the rates are virtually prohibitive. This means that that great section of the world is cut off from contact with the great events taking place."

Tonight at San Francisco, special facilities have been organized by which the representatives of the United and friendly nations can immediately communicate with their governments. President Truman in opening the conference said that "man has learned long ago that it is impossible to live unto himself. This same basic principle applies today to nations. We were not isolated during war. We dare not become isolated in peace."

And it is through the modern miracle of communications that isolation is bridged in fact as well as in spirit.

The third specification for a sound post-war telecommunications structure is that it must afford fast, cheap service between any two points—not just on the major routes like that from New York to London. The importance of communications to and from such out-of-the-way places as Teheran, Okinawa, and Arnhem should be obvious to a generation which has seen the spotlight of world attention move so rapidly from continent to continent and from island to island.

By means of radio, any point can be as closely linked to the United States as London and Paris are now linked, if the equipment is available at the far end of the circuit. One of our major concerns, accordingly, must be to devise means whereby improved communications equipment will be readily available to the remotest parts of the world.

Communication is a two-way matter; and it profits little to have the finest communications equipment here in the United States if the other ends of the circuits with which we communicate are still tapping out their messages by hand or have no transmitters at all. It is to our benefit, accordingly, to encourage other countries to use equipment as good as our own and to arrange for the purchase of American made apparatus at the earliest practicable date.

Finally, let me suggest that to the fullest extent possible, post-war international communications should be direct, rather than relayed through a few communications bottlenecks where the possibilities of delay, interruption, or favoritism are ever present. The Federal Communications Commission, and I think also the Congress, has been concerned with the need for direct communications routes to every part of the world, and some progress in this direction has already been made.

In recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, I have urged that the prompt merger of the many companies which now render international cable and radio service would do much to ensuring the United States a cheap, rapid, efficient, and direct communications service to and from all parts of the world. This is a basic question of national policy which must be wisely—and promptly—decided if the United States is to emerge from the war ready to play its part in the world order now being framed in San Francisco, and in the world trade which will follow. A single American international communications organization, pledged to build without delay the kind of worldwide communications structure which our role in world affairs required, appears to me to be a prerequisite if other plans for a peaceful, prosperous world order are fully to materialize.

Democracy in Decline?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Democracy in Decline?" by Rev. James M. Gillis, which appeared in the May issue of Washington News Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEMOCRACY IN DECLINE? [1]

(By Rev. James M. Gillis)

One friendly critic has upbraided me for saying that democracy is now at its lowest ebb in the United States.

Another has gently jibed at me for holding to the belief that democracy can still survive.

A third tells me that I may as well admit that the American Republic as such is already gone.

It reminds me once again of a favorite passage in G. K. C.'s Orthodoxy concerning critics of the church and the clergy.

Christianity, they say, is pacifist; Christianity has deluged the world with blood; the pope is a shrewd politician; the pope knows nothing about affairs of state; the clergy live in an ivory tower; the clergy are too much in public; preachers remain aloft in a metaphysical cloud; preachers foolishly attempt to apply the gospel to politics, diplomacy, business.

In somewhat similar fashion critics of these editorial comments say "you are too pessimistic about democracy"; "you are too optimistic"; and "why be either optimistic or pessimistic, why not be realistic?"

[1] This article is part of an editorial from the Catholic World by the editor, a famous Paulist Father and one of America's greatest orators.

Since the subject seems to interest at least some readers, will others be indulgent while I briefly renew my profession of political faith, and then I promise we shall go on to something more important than personal opinion.

I have not abandoned belief in democracy. On the contrary, the more I see of dictatorship, the more I love democracy.

As for being realistic and admitting that the Republic is dead—to me that would be a kind of apostasy. I do not, of course, believe that the Republic is invulnerable and immortal. It may die or it may undergo such a metamorphosis as to be no longer recognizable for what it used to be.

But it hasn't perished yet. Please God it will not perish. Ours would be a sad and tragic world with no forms of government remaining but empires, dictatorships and a few moribund monarchies. I should not like to be like Charles Maurras and Léon Daudet, interested in the resurrection of the monarchy that used to be.

As for the new type of monarchy, "the rule of one," that is to say a dictator, such an alternative to democracy is so revolting that I am horrified to see my own country slipping into any similarity with it. Yet the most obvious temptation of Americans at the present time is to think that we have something to learn from at least one form of dictatorship—the Russian—and that we had better trim our sails to catch the wind of the new ideology.

The idea seems to be growing that the amazing military prowess of the Soviets is proof positive that there must be some virtue in their political system. There is no truth in that notion.

History shows that when martial power develops, political purity declines. While Pompey and Crassus and Caesar and Antony piled up victories and annexed kingdom after kingdom, the republic was slipping and the end of all that was good in the Roman system was approaching.

If military success were the measure of political merit, we should have to hold that the barbarians who conquered Rome had a better political system than that of Rome; that Alaric, Attila, Genseric were greater statesmen than Marcus Aurelius, Trajan, Augustus, Cicero, Cato; that Alexander meant more to civilization than Aristotle; and that the supreme political geniuses of all time were Genghis Khan and Tamerlane.

Speaking of those savage conquerors, I wonder how much of the military genius of the present-day Russians is due to the inheritance of Mongol and Tartar blood. Let's dodge that question for fear of wounding the feelings of our valiant but sensitive Soviet ally.

But I hope that those who think there must be something superior in the Russian political system because it produces admirable results on the field of battle, will see to what a mad conclusion their argument leads.

Obviously we have dropped the unimportant consideration of my views about the status of democracy in the United States, and we have reached the most crucial of all political questions now confronting the American people. That question—a double one—is, have we been gravitating away from democracy toward collectivism and is it well that we do so?

It may be superfluous to explain that "German thought and German practice" of which Dr. Frederick A. Hayek writes, in The Road to Serfdom, is essentially the same as Russian thought and Russian practice.

Marxian Socialism was made in Germany in the 1880's, exported into Russia in 1917 and returned to Germany in 1933.

Communism, as Lenin insisted, is pure Marxism, and Stalin has sworn upon the corpse of Lenin that he would be faithful in carrying on what the master handed down.

Hitler likewise has repeatedly declared that nazism is socialism. The Russian brand and the German brand are at least as much alike as the American and English brand of democracy.

To say "at least" is to be too conservative. Russian communism and German nazism are in aim and method, in theory and practice, identical.

Hayek is alarmed at the infiltration of nazism; Americans will do well to be alarmed at the infiltration of communism. The danger is the same—call it nazism or communism or fascism, it all adds up to statism.

We are not yet Communists; still less are we Nazis or Fascists. But we have become to an alarming degree "Statists."

Further than that, we have made considerable advance toward lodging the power of the state in the hands of one man. That danger has always been present in our system.

It is notorious that the American President, in peace and in war, within or without the framework of the Constitution, has such powers as are possessed by no other leader in the world of democracy.

In the last generation, and particularly in the last decade, that power has developed abnormally. For this reason alone, I have deplored the present tendency to surrender political power into the permanent keeping of one party and to concentrate more and more authority in the hands of one man.

I believe in the axiom of Lord Acton: "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

My own conviction against concentration of power is based upon psychology, rather than upon history. No man is good enough, wise enough, modest and humble enough, no man in the natural order is sufficiently self-effacing to be immune against the temptation of too much power.

It is for that reason that democracy wisely distributes power, breaks it up, interrupts it by insisting on rotation in office. Democracy encourages home rule, States' rights, local self-government. Democracy functions best when every State and every city, town, village, hamlet, takes care of the greater part of the job of governing itself.

The Confederate States were not all wrong. They "had something." It's a pity they sold it for a mess of patronage. Insistence upon States' rights is indispensable to the continued existence of the Union.

Let Us Not Ask Too Much of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Not Ask Too Much of San Francisco," delivered by my friend and former colleague, Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, at United Nations Forum, Princeton, N. J., on April 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is grave danger that we shall lose the peace through the mistakes of those who most desire to win it. One of the most serious threats to the evolution of a new basis of international collaboration is the sincere but uncompromising perfectionist who is playing directly into the hands of the isolationist. Indeed the isolationist is picking up the perfectionist's arguments and repeating on every favorable occasion the charge of the perfectionist that our allies are playing dirty power politics and that America must keep away from the whole sorry mess. The isolationist would not attempt anything; the perfectionist demands too much. If the Nation accepts either viewpoint we shall fail. The effect on public opinion of both is the same, viz, a defeatist attitude toward the possible because the impossible cannot be achieved.

Americans have great faith in the power of legislatures and constitutional conventions to change things. This faith imputed to other nations blinds us to the historic obstacles to international federation and makes us intolerant of their unwillingness to entrust their security to an international government. In our haste we forget that social institutions like government cannot be created overnight, for they all root in the past, in habit, consent, and custom; in emotions as well as in will. We recall the origin of our own Federal Constitution and we are often unable to understand why other peoples hesitate to apply this example to relations between nations as we did between the Thirteen Colonies. We too often fail to dig deep enough to learn that the analogy of our Federal Constitution is no analogy at all and that it is, therefore, false and misleading.

Let us fix our eyes on the possible; let us refuse to be divided or diverted by intolerant insistence on the impossible.

To be more specific, let us be realistic about force in international affairs. Let us not exaggerate unrealistically the present possibilities of an international police force as an agency on which to rely to keep the peace. Too many good people are doing so, forgetful that this is beginning at the wrong end as the long evolution of law and government proves. Let us realize that any supra-national organization must begin modestly. Let us not insist on a supra-government so all-embracing and unfamiliar that nations would not be prepared emotionally to participate. Let us concentrate on an international organization limited in scope and simple in operation, directed to those areas in which world interdependence is strongest and in which international friction is most easily generated. This much I think is possible if we keep our eyes on a limited objective and refuse to be severed from it. Let us remember the terrible consequences if we fail through expecting and demanding too much.

Thoughtful people are much worried about American public opinion after the war. After the last war we endorsed the League of Nations until its opponents started to work in the Senate. But let us understand that the League failed largely because its members were at no stage willing to trust in it for security. It is important also that we understand how short was the step taken at Dumbarton Oaks, and how unwilling the world is today to abandon time-honored methods for achieving security. Dumbarton Oaks is not an implementation of the Atlantic Charter by any means. I sincerely wish it were and I deplore all efforts of our statesmen to make it appear that it is. Efforts to over-sell it today will bring harmful repercussions later, because it promises to be all we shall have to build on. Let us be sure to exploit its possibilities to the utmost.

Let us not be dismayed by examples of power politics such as we have witnessed in Poland. Historically considered there are equities on both sides of this particular issue. Let us be reconciled to the fact that the nations which will manage the immediate post-war world are the ones which have

the dominant force. They are the only powers that can keep the peace in that period, and keeping the peace for even another 25 years is going to be very important of itself if international collaboration is to have a chance to develop. Let us not despair if the terms of the peace contain the familiar concepts of buffer states, naval and air bases, trade routes and spheres of influence. It is obvious from the course of recent events that nations are not yet willing to entrust their future security to an overall world organization with its own police power. They are further along than they were after World War No. 1, but there is still a long distance to go. It is highly important to the future development of a world organization that the nations be able to enjoy after the war a sense of security which the Versailles Treaty did not afford. Without this feeling of security no world organization of any importance can be built and put to work. Not even the sketchiest would have a chance to function. Unless we get a settlement that will in itself be more trusted and stable than the one after the last war there will be no environment in which to develop and experiment with any significant agencies of international collaboration.

It is true that Dumbarton Oaks provides little more than an organization for discussion between states. But such an organization is fundamental. We must have this much; on that we cannot compromise. Without it we shall certainly have lost the peace. The Food Conference a Hot Springs, the Financial Conference at Bretton Woods, the Air Conference at Chicago are modest examples of subjects which can become matters of discussion and agreement when a continuing international organization is set up. I regret that they were not originally made parts of a single international organization, but from this seed there can grow in time a more comprehensive organization to establish the reign of law among states. An organization for discussion in a climate favorable to collaboration is at this moment more important than all the debates over the Security Council. Failing this, another great war is inevitable. Let us all compose our differences and unite on this platform, despite our disappointments and criticisms as to the limited scope of the new international agencies now evolving. Let us understand that the attainment of the reign of law among nations will be a long process and that we cannot depend upon any statesmen performing a miracle to achieve it in a world of starved, broken, and cynical people. Over and over again, nature demonstrates to the doubter that giant oaks from little acorns grow.

A Missouri Soldier's Attitude Toward Furloughs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief letter addressed to me by a Missouri soldier, in which he states his attitude toward furloughs and sending the boys home, and suggests that the War Department be allowed to proceed in its regular course.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: Corp. Thomas C. Cauley. Public Relations Office, Sixth Army Headquarters, A. P. O. 442, Postmaster, San Francisco.

DEAR SENATOR: The letter written by my family concerning a furlough for me was done without my knowledge or consent. Naturally, when I learned about it I was both angry and embarrassed.

I know that you must receive many letters of this kind from the well-meaning folks at home. They have what we call "localitis." They believe that their son or husband is the only one fighting the war. The other ten million are just along for the ride.

The fact is, I have been one of the more fortunate soldiers over here. Although I have been with a combat-engineer unit in four campaigns, I have never been sick or wounded. My present assignment requires that I interview soldiers in both combat and service units. After talking to wounded veterans of 40 months' service overseas, I feel like a combination U. S. O. Commando and male WAC.

I have written my family to stop bothering you with letters concerning my welfare. I know you have more important things to do. I want to assure you that I neither want nor expect any special favors.

Sincerely yours,

Corp. THOMAS C. CAULEY.

The Late President Roosevelt and President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement signed by a number of distinguished sons of Missouri relative to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT IN DEEDS

STATEMENT BY OFFICERS OF ST. LOUIS LOCALS, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, C. I. O., APRIL 13, 1945

In the deep sorrow we all feel for a truly great man who was our friend, we ask the members of the U. E. to do honor to his memory not in mere words, but in deeds. We must rededicate ourselves to the great principles for which he stood, and do our full, unstinting part to make a reality of his aim of lasting peace and security for the peoples of the whole world.

During his entire 12 years in office, working people have known that Franklin D. Roosevelt was their friend. They have come to realize that he was also one of the few really great men of history, a peerless world leader for freedom and democracy, for the abolition of Fascist tyranny and aggression. In our sorrow at his death we are one with the whole freedom-loving people of all lands.

In honor and gratitude to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we must redouble our contributions to the war effort—in loyal effort on the production line in support of our victorious fighting fronts, to the final victory over Germany and Japan—and carrying out labor's responsibility to help unite the American people and the United Nations for victory and peace.

Upon Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, has fallen the mantle of President Roosevelt. He is our President, our Commander in Chief, our member of the United Nations Big Three. We know that he will fill that role worthily and effectively with full devotion to the principles and leadership of his dead Chief.

Harry Truman needs the full support of all Americans in carrying out that program. He assumes office at a critical period in history, when the final and decisive battles are being fought against German and Japanese fascism, when decisions must be made which will affect the future of our country and the world, the peace and well-being of the people, for generations to come. Taking over the duties of President Roosevelt after his leadership of 12 years is a tremendous responsibility for any man.

It is our duty as working people to close our own ranks and help unite the whole Nation in uncompromising unity behind President Truman. Let us not tolerate the enemies of unity, nor the carping critics and the loose-tongued whose careless talk would undermine the leadership of our new President. Let us go on with full confidence in his high office and his leadership.

Behind President Truman we shall work with greater determination than ever to see this fight through—the fight to complete victory in the war and unity with our allies in the councils of the United Nations for a world of freedom, democracy, and prosperity.

In the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt we carry on.

Signed: William Sentner, general vice president; Robert B. Logsdon, international representative; Eustius Brendle, president, Local 1102; James Click, business agent, Local 1102; J. W. McConnell, president, Local 825; Archie Wayne, recording secretary, Local 825; Orville Munzer, vice president, Local 825; Frank Lenhardt, president, Local 1108; Ray Mertens, president, Local 1104; Louis Wagner, vice president, Local 1104; Lowell Waldron, secretary-treasurer, Local 1104; R. J. Bergman, president, Local 816; Clarence Bingaman, president, Local 810.

Willow Run Bomber Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent the Michigan congressional district in which the Ford Willow Run bomber plant is located. It is in this plant that the B–24 Liberator bombers are manufactured. It is the apparent purpose of the War Department to cease the manufacture of these Liberators in this plant on or about August 1. This is to be one of the first major reconversion war projects in the

country. Not only the present employees of the plant and the feeder plants, but the local community, are vitally interested in what disposition is to be made of this Government-owned project when in the opinion of the War Department it is no longer needed in war activities. It is fundamentally to the interest of both employees and community that an early and definite decision be made by Government agencies as to final disposition.

Army-Navy E award ceremonies were held at the Ford Willow Run plant on May 4, 1945. Addresses were made by Henry Ford II and by Col. Nelson A. S. Talbot. These addresses were also broadcast over a national hook-up, and because of the national interest I include these addresses in my remarks. They are as follows:

ADDRESS OF HENRY FORD II

Colonel Talbot, Captain Velz, fellow workers, it is certainly with mixed emotions that we meet here today. We are proud that you men and women of the Willow Run bomber plant have won for yourselves the coveted "E" award for excellence in war production. We are proud of the job you have done in manufacturing these B–24 bombers which have played an important part in bringing one phase of this global war to an end and in helping to terminate more quickly the Pacific phase.

To the representatives of the War and Navy Departments here today I wish to express the sincere appreciation of my grandfather and the rest of us for this award, and to the men and women who have earned this award I offer my sincere congratulations on this recognition of your spirit of cooperation, patriotism, and skill.

Four years ago this spring there was no Willow Run. This land, 1,800 acres of it, covered today by a gigantic monument to industrial might, was producing agricultural products. But war was upon the world and our country's participation was nearing. It was decided by the Army Air Forces to bring the Ford Motor Co. into the heavy bomber production plan. Mass production of the B–24 Liberator bomber, then the largest, fastest, and hardest-hitting of them all, was handed to us as our job. Our engineers and production men were masters of the art of making automobiles flow from the assembly lines. But they had no experience in the airplane business and much criticism was heaped upon the Ford idea of trying to build huge bombers as we had built automobiles. But I think the record speaks for itself.

In March 1941 the Ford Motor Co. was awarded its first educational contract for B–24 parts. On March 28 the initial job of clearing the land for the plant began. On April 18 of that same year ground-breaking and excavation was begun, and then just 4 years ago this week, my father announced plans for the enlargement of Willow Run on only the verbal assurance from Army Air Force officials that we would be allowed to build completed bombers as well as subassemblies.

On May 15, 1942, the first Ford-assembled B–24 bomber put together at Willow Run was delivered for flight tests at the plant. Since then the climb in production has been steady and we are proud of the record—for 20 consecutive months Willow Run has been ahead of schedule, and we have made the schedule we set long ago of a bomber an hour.

The credit for the record of Willow Run belongs not only to the people of our organization but to many others. It belongs to General of the Army Henry H. Arnold, who stood with us during the storms of controversy. It also belongs to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. When the obstacles seemed insurmountable, when the vicious criticism was piling high about us, when our actual problems were many, Mr. Truman, then head of the Senate War Investigating Committee, made a special trip to Willow Run with members of his gorup on February 19, 1943. They had been swamped with accusations about the inefficiency of Willow Run. They were determined to learn the truth and to get the actual facts. Mr. Truman and the comembers of his committee placed investigators in the plant to work alongside other employees—to make careful notes of actual conditions. After checking and rechecking their findings, the then Senator Truman gave a clean bill of health for Willow Run. Willow Run was completely absolved by this Government agency. We firmly believe that the lift it gave employee morale and the halt it placed on further meddling in the plant's operations, formed the turning point in the production battle at Willow Run.

A great deal of the early accusations concerning Willow Run centered around the social problems created by a new plant of this size and location. The management of the Ford Motor Co. was perfectly aware that such a plant could not be built and operated without encountering such problems. We took the stand that this was a war plant, constructed to meet a war need, just as a carrier, a battleship, or a bomber. Actually, if this plant has hastened the end of the war, it is as expendable as a battleship—and no more expensive, either.

We are not in the least reluctant to see this plant or any plant discontinue making implements of warfare—once the war need ceases. On the other hand, we feel we have a definite responsibility to our Willow Run employees. Naturally, we have been intensively planning in whatever spare time we had for our postwar operations. We want to employ in our various plants in peacetime production as many people as we possibly can.

We expect to be able to offer to you people of Willow Run jobs somewhere in the Detroit area just as soon as we receive the necessary go-ahead from the Government. There will be many problems, but I am confident they can be solved. We do not intend to solicit additional war work for Willow Run. However, if the Government of its own volition places war work here, we'll handle it as we have before.

We have no plans for the future use of Willow Run. The Army Air Force in conjunction with the Defense Plant Corporation, owners of the plant, have decided that the wartime utility of the plant has been fulfilled. We have not disputed that decision because we believe that they, not we, are the best judges of what use should be made of Willow Run.

We also agree that to extend the operation of such a gigantic plant as this any at all beyond the actual need of it for the pursuit of the war is an unnecessary waste of plant, personnel and the taxpayers' money. Since all of us are taxpayers, it would seem to be worth while to take this viewpoint.

Just as all champion teams must face the day of dissolution and the teammates must go their different ways, Willow Run's production team must be dispersed when the job is done and the work at hand has been finished. You can be absolutely assured that we will use all reasonable means at our disposal to disperse this team in such a way as to create another championship team—a peacetime champion.

The pride in being able to fashion such a team, such a plant and such a system of production, will last long after we are all at work elsewhere. It is just another proof that in America we can do the impossible, and that the impossible always proves the nemesis of those enemies of peace and progress who attempt every so often to upset our relentless struggle upward toward a better world for all men everywhere.

In closing, I know that you men and women who have created the record that this plant has made can take great pleasure in seeing the fruits of your efforts used to help terminate this war; and again I offer you my sincere congratulations.

ADDRESS OF COL. NELSON S. TALBOTT

Men and women of the Ford Motor Co., Willow Run bomber plant: Today you are gathered here at this ceremony to receive your country's highest award for production—the Army-Navy E award for excellence. As a representative of the Army Air Forces and the Under Secretary of War, it is a great honor to be present when you raise the E pennant over this world-famous bomber plant. You have earned it—every one of you—and we are just as proud of each of you as we are of our boys overseas.

I think the greatest tribute we can pay you is to give you an idea of the terrific job your product, the B–24 Liberator bomber, is doing in the combat zone. One example, which is one of General Arnold's favorites, illustrates how the B–24 holds up. This is what happened over Iwo Jima to a B–24 named the *Chambermaid* by its enthusiastic crew:

Coming in low over Iwo Jima, the bombs were released on the designated target. In quick succession, flak hit the nose compartment and knocked out the hydraulic lines; a 20-mm shell from a Jap fighter plane hit behind the copilot and wounded him; the throttle controls were shot off the two left engines and they ran wild; another engine began throwing oil; a shot blew off the top turret and wounded the gunner in it; the plastic dome flew off and tore a hole in the rudder; another shell ripped a hole in the top of the left wing gas tank; the navigator and observer were wounded, and all the way home the pilot had to fight a tropical storm.

Then, coming in over their base, thinking themselves safely home, they found that only the right landing gear would crank down. Jap fire had severed the cable of the other. The loss of the hydraulic system left them without brakes. The crew, however, threw out two parachutes to serve as brakes, and they came in on one wheel only to hit a trailer and a revetment. When the *Chambermaid* came to rest, they found a hole 2 feet wide in the fuselage and the tail section so bent that it made an oblique angle with the rest of the plane.

That gives you an idea of the quality of the great bomber you have been building here. It is tough, it is rugged, and because of these characteristics, it is serving in 15 of our air forces. Throughout the world, the B–24 has become a trade-mark of United States production.

Another reason this bomber is known in every country of the world is because you have not only built them well, but by the thousands. Four years ago, when the Government said: "We want a place to build bombers," the land we stand on here was soybean field and woodlands. Through the ingenuity of both management and labor, this was converted into the mightiest bomber plant in the world. This 67-acre building was constructed, land was cleared and concrete laid for this airport, and thousands of inexperienced workers were trained. Finally, in the fall of 1942, the first of the all-Ford bombers began coming off the 5,400-foot assembly lines.

Early in 1943, the bombers really started rolling—in the first quarter 200, the next quarter 600, until in the final quarter the mark of 1,000 had been attained. When 1944 came around, Willow Run hit its stride. During the first half, you turned out over 1,800—doubling your previous production. At your peak, you were producing approximately 1 every hour, or about 100 every week. That is some record.

On March 13 of this year, you completed your eight thousandth Liberator which you aptly dubbed "Ford's V-8,000." In short, you have turned out more four-engine bombers than any other aircraft plant, and besides, have built the equivalent of more than 1,000 B-24's in spare parts. For 15 months you consistently exceeded your monthly production quotas. That is a production record to be proud of and I'm sure you are.

And then, a month later, came a blow which struck everyone of you. You were told, "Willow Run's job is done. It has won its campaign ribbons and is ready for an honorable discharge." That was hard to take, I know, for when you have thrown your heart and soul into a job like this one, and done it well, it is not easy to be told that your services are no longer needed.

But let's not look at it that way. We are not grieved when we are told a brother or a husband is getting his discharge from the Army. We rejoice with him that his part in the war is over and that he can come home. So should all of us have cause to rejoice that the war is reaching the stage when we no longer need so many weapons of war, and that some of us at least, can return to peaceful pursuits.

That, however, does not mean that all of us may. For, just as many of our boys must carry on the war in the Pacific, so will many of you have to carry it on here, in Detroit, in the great industries that are still forging these weapons.

Remembering then, that the war is still upon us, let us raise this proud E award pennant today as a tribute to the service you of Ford Willow Run have rendered your country for the last 2½ years. Let it fly there as a symbol of America's vast and mighty production which is making victory in Europe possible and is bringing victory in Japan constantly nearer.

Greetings to the Delegates at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a resolution which was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan greeting the delegates attending the United Nations Conference on International Organization now meeting in San Francisco.

House Concurrent Resolution 40

Concurrent resolution greeting the delegates from all nations attending the San Francisco Conference

Whereas the people of all lands for centuries have been faced with wars and the threat of war; and

Whereas gathered at San Francisco are delegates from all of the United Nations for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace; and

Whereas President Truman has asked for the support of all the American people in the promoting of peace efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we greet the delegates from all nations attending this historic San Francisco Conference and wish them well in their deliberation; and be it further

Resolved, That one copy of this resolution be sent by telegram to the delegates assembled at the San Francisco Conference, and copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives April 25, 1945.

Adopted by the senate April 25, 1945.

NORMAN E. PHILLCO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the unconditional surrender and humiliating defeat of Germany is a great victory for righteousness, yet we celebrate but solemnly. It is a heart-rending hour for the 1,000,000 families whose sons and daughters are casualties of this tragic war. The hard, rugged road that lies ahead before we attain final victory against the ruthless forces of barbarism prohibits extreme joy over VE-day. We stand at a solemn hour in world history. In thanks for VE-day, let us rededicate ourselves to God for His guiding hand and His great mercy. We thank God for this victory and we pray for divine guidance and protection to complete the great task which remains before us on the perilous road to Tokyo and VJ-day. Daily prayers will pave the way.

As part of my remarks, I am happy to include the victory VE-day prayer prepared by the Reverend Dr. Joseph D. Piper, pastor of the First Methodist Church, McKeesport, Pa., which was used in all McKeesport public schools:

VICTORY DAY PRAYER

Almighty and everlasting God, who maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth, we praise and magnify Thy great mercy, which has brought us to this hour. We bless Thy holy name that earth, sea, and sky are safe again in Europe; that the guns are silent; and that Thou has brought us to this long expected hour. By Thy grace keep us humble in victory; forbid that we should harbor hatred or revenge and guide us for Thy name's sake.

Almighty God, who in former times didst lead our fathers; give Thy grace, we humbly beseech Thee, to us, their children, that we may always approve ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land, defend our liberties, preserve our unity. We dedicate to Thee our country, to a purer life, an unselfish patriotism, a deeper loyalty to Thy kingdom.

Eternal God, grant to the President of the United States and to all in authority wisdom, strength, and guidance. Send forth Thy spirit, we beseech Thee, into all the world, that all leaders of men everywhere may be instructed in the ways of peace, kept clean of evil ambitions, and so guided that they may make Thy ways known upon the earth, Thy saving health among all nations.

Gracious God, we pray Thee to join us in mind and heart with all those who have endured battle for our cause. In Thy great love bless our victorious forces in Europe and our armed forces in the Pacific. May peace speedily come there also. Grant that we at home may not shrink from the fellowship of suffering with those who yet carry our destiny into battle.

We remember before Thee the dead, the wounded, the saddened hearts, the weary minds. We commend all to Thy loving care. We pray that we shall not lightly accept our blood-bought heritage.

We pray for our native land and what we pray for her we pray for all nations. May the time come when "men shall brothers be," when men "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Amen.

Put the Likeness of the Diamond of Democracy on Every Dime: Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to briefly speak and to include in my remarks a copy of a letter I received from the Director of the Mint, Nellie Tayloe Ross, dated May 1, 1945; also a copy of my letter to the Director of the Mint, dated May 3, and also copy of my letter dated May 10 on the same subject.

It is entirely appropriate and in keeping with national policy and with the use and purpose of our currency that the likeness of our late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, be placed on one side of the dime. This would make the American people very happy and proud. My estimate is it will actually increase the use and circulation of that popular coin by millions of dollars a year. As my letter to the Director of the Mint, May 3, shows, the likenesses of other great American Presidents were promptly placed on American coins following the demise of each. I am aware that the list of Presidents whose likenesses are on coins and currency of our great Nation is not complete, in my letter of May 3; but it is nevertheless proof of my statement that it can be done and is in line with established national policy.

I have had nothing but favorable response to this suggestion from all sources. I think my letters sufficiently set out the purpose and program suggested. I call particular attention to the suggested desirability, by me, of a national and even international recognition and observation of this appropriate use and development of this popular American coin the dime. I believe there could be appropriately conducted a special or additional March of Dimes in connection with this, and

which would bring many millions of dollars into the treasury of the infantile paralysis program. If inadvisable to have an additional observation, it could be as it now is in observation of his birthday and also tied in to the placement of his likeness on the dime. Such dual observation would, undoubtedly, be a very popular observation not only in our own Nation but throughout the world. I respectfully submit copies of the correspondence:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 2, 1945.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: In reference to your telephone call to this office, you are advised that during the past 10 calendar years, 1935 through 1944, the United States mints have produced domestic coin as follows:

Denomination:	*Pieces*
50 cents	323,532,776
25 cents	745,753,475
10 cents	1,771,859,648
5 cents	1,787,201,167
1 cent	7,762,131,385

The mints and Federal Reserve banks do not maintain large inventories of coins and the deliveries of coins are approximately equal to the amount produced.

Very truly yours,
NELLIE TAYLOE ROSS,
Director of the Mint.

MAY 3, 1945.

Re: To have the likeness of our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt placed on the dime.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: A few days ago I received from you in compliance with my request the listing of the relative place in our currency circulation of the first three coins. I note the time is No. 3. Thank you for this information.

As we stated in asking you therefor, I had in mind that it would be proper to have the likeness of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, placed on the dime. I say "proper" for the following reasons, amongst others: First. The dime was made famous over the world because of the triumph by our great beloved President of great spirit, heart, mind, and soul over physical infirmities and handicaps. Second. It was made famous over the world because of the March of Dimes which was sponsored by him in order that the terrible disease of infantile paralysis might be eliminated in the experience of all mankind. The millions of dollars received has actually achieved a great deal in this worthy objective. Third. Other coins of our great Nation have had the likenesses of our great Presidents and citizens placed upon them. Fourth. The circulation of the dime, while No. 3 now in our Nation, is so rapidly increasing that it has become almost the most popular coin in business. Fifth. The dime has become a piece of money for which the average American has real affection because of the identity thereof with the March of Dimes.

The other most commonly used coins each have the head of a great American past President, to wit: The penny, Abraham Lincoln; the nickel, Thomas Jefferson; the quarter, George Washington. It would be very appropriate to have the replica of this great American on one side of the dime and the replica of the Goddess of Liberty on the other side.

I do not purpose to offer a bill on the floor of the House in this regard, because I anticipate that a simpler and more efficient process of doing this timely act would be by your Department deciding so to do. If I am in error in this important thought, I shall appreciate your advising in the premise.

I will say, from the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent, there come frequent and very large numbers of requests that this development in honor of this great American take place as promptly as possible.

If there is any reason why this cannot be done by you, kindly call my attention thereto by reply mail.

I have the honor to be,
Sincerely yours,
CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

MAY 10, 1945.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

Put a diamond on every dime.

MY DEAR FRIEND: You were good enough on May 1 to answer my inquiry of a few days before with reference to the circulation of the dime and other American coins. Thank you for the information.

On May 3 I briefly wrote you on the subject of my earlier phone communication to you. I see in my letter of May 3 that I did not there include a sixth item, which I had intended to do. So I do it now, and urge this sixth point to your attention as to why the dime should have placed on one side thereof, the likeness of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is as follows:

Sixth. A diamond on every dime. If this statement seems at all odd at first glance, I hope that upon reflection it will occur to you that it is most significant and indicative of the fact that the American people, by and large, thought of him in his lifetime and always will, as a genuine diamond. Genuine diamonds being what they are in fact and in the minds of people, I submit the phrase I am using as psychological strength and reason for putting into effect this suggestion.

Shortly after the death of our great leader, I had intended to file a bill to effectuate the purpose of my suggestion to you, but feeling it was a matter which should logically be put into effect by our agreements between the proper Government officials, rather than by congressional legislation; and that it should be put into effect long before congressional action might be concluded, I am going to make remarks and put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the next day or two.

Another suggestion I have is that if you do put the likeness of this diamond of democracy on the dime, then there should be nationwide—yes, worldwide recognition of your doing so. It might be that an extra March of Dimes campaign be conducted to raise additional money for the infantile-paralysis program, or conduct other or additional appropriate national and even world recognition thereof.

I have the honor to be
Respectfully yours,
CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Taps for a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a poem written by Charlotte Levin, of Des Moines, Iowa, who is now a sergeant in the WAC, stationed in New Guinea:

TAPS FOR A PRESIDENT

Sad is this hour, torn every tear
  Loose from its hiding.
Saddened the Nation. Darkened night
  In death abiding.

Magnificent imprint etching
  Clearly heart's vision
Deep in the souls of all mankind.
  Courage, decision.

Leading a people through storm's stress,
  Safeguarding freedom,
Lighting a way through valleyed dark
  To commoner's kingdom.

Stature towering, aiming, reaching,
  Wind-swept head held high,
Unscathed by elements beating,
  Greatness none could deny.

By death alone was vanquished.
  Indelible hand
Writing, "Never forgotten
  His name shall stand.

Serving in death to live, inspire
  Those who must man lead,
Guiding their footsteps through darkened hours,
  Cherishing liberty's creed."

Sound the taps, half mast the colors' glory.
Sad is our hour, dynamic its story.
—*C. C. Levin.*

APRIL 13, 1945.

Studies and Reports To Be Made on Columbia River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in Civil Engineering, written by Col. Ralph A. Tudor, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, who is district engineer in the Portland, Oreg., office. This article contains much valuable information concerning various studies being conducted by Government agencies for the development of the Columbia River that should be available, in my judgment, through the pages of the RECORD. It reads as follows:

SEVENTEEN-POINT STUDY OF COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT UNDERTAKEN

(By Ralph A. Tudor, A. M. A. S. C. E., Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Portland District Engineer, Portland, Oreg.)

(An engineer's plan to take care of navigation, irrigation, flood control, power, and related benefits is the objective of the investigation of the Columbia River system by the Corps of Engineers. Potentially the greatest river system of the United States, the Columbia offers at least 25,000,000 kilowatts of cheap power yet to be developed. That such development is to be orderly and well planned, the Senate specified when it authorized this study. Several United States Government agencies are cooperating with

the Corps of Engineers, and Canada has agreed to join in the study and investigate waters north of the boundary. Because of the multiplicity of data to be collected, Colonel Tudor states, the report will not be completed until 1948.)

The Columbia River was one of the great attractions that drew explorers and settlers to the Pacific Northwest, and for more than a century it has served them and their children after them well. Although it remains relatively undeveloped today, it is known to be one of the most valuable natural resources of the North American Continent. It possesses latent ability to irrigate several million acres of otherwise desert land, to support a system of inland waterways for navigation, to generate vast quantities of cheap power, and otherwise to benefit the extensive frontier of the Pacific Northwest. Some development has already been realized, but the potentialities have only been touched. In fact, the full possibilities can only be estimated at this time.

Many studies and reports have been made and the most comprehensive are the "308" reports of the Corps of Engineers. These cover the main stem of the Columbia River below the Canadian border and portions of several of the principal United States tributaries. There remain, however, virtually the entire Canadian portion of the river system and many tributary sections in the United States which have not been studied in coordination with the rest of the system. With the relatively meager actual development that has so far been accomplished, no harm has come and no loss has been suffered, but with the more intense activity projected for the future, it is essential that the existing reports be extended and revised. Only thus will it be possible to obtain the greatest value for this water system at the least cost and at the earliest time compatible with proper development.

The need for such additional planning has been apparent for some time and has been the subject of much thought and discussion. The first positive action to this end was taken on September 24, 1943, when the Senate Commerce Committee adopted a resolution that directed the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to proceed forthwith to extend and revise the "308" reports and to prepare a plan for the development and use of the water resources of the Columbia River system. The second important step was accomplished when, by an exchange of notes between the Canadian and the United States Governments, the international aspects of the problem were referred to the International Joint Commission on March 3, 1944. In this manner, one of the most important and intensly interesting engineering investigations yet undertaken in this country has been started, and after approximately 1 year, it is well under way.

The importance of the study and the magnitude of the work involved can be comprehended only from a brief description of the Columbia River system. It is one of the great river systems of the world, exceeded in this country only by the Mississippi. In fact, the Columbia surpasses the Mississippi insofar as potential power development and irrigation are concerned. The principal tributaries are the Kootenai, Clark Fork, Okanogan, Wenatchee, Spokane, Yakima, Snake, Deschutes, Klickitat, Williamette, Lewis, and Cowlitz. The drainage area includes some 259,000 square miles, of which 39,000 are in Canada. In the United States, waters from Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Washington, and Oregon flow to the sea by this route.

Most of the tributaries have their origin in the high Rockies and tumble through several thousand feet, the largest part of this fall being concentrated in the headwaters. Sufficient fall, however, remains below Spokane, Wash. (elevation 1,870), Lewiston, Idaho (elevation 738), Pasco, Wash. (elevation 388), and other downstream points to permit the development of large blocks of power and to create significant navigation problems.

Rainfall and runoff characteristics of the area are unusual. Storms moving in from the Pacific Ocean, principally from November to April inclusive, are forced to drop most of their moisture when they cross the coast and Cascade ranges. West of The Dalles, the annual rainfall varies from 30 to 100 inches. Between the Cascades and the Rockies is a vast semi-arid plateau with a rainfall generally of less than 14 inches Finally, the Rockies gather in from 15 to 50 inches of precipitation per year.

That this last is almost wholly snow and melts in the summer is attested by the fact that the city of Portland has two high-water periods each year. In midwinter, the Willamette reaches its high stage, while in midsummer, peak flow in the Columbia backs water up the Willamette to produce a higher stage at Portland. The maximum flow of the Columbia near its mouth reaches about 1,250,000 cubic feet per second, while the minimum uncontrolled flow is 55,000 cubic feet per second. Each year, an average of 189,000,000 acre-feet flows to the Pacific via the Columbia.

The region drained by this vast river system is rich in resources. In a few areas some of these gifts of nature are developed quite extensively, but on the whole the potentialities remain for the future. The reclamation of irrigable land has advanced perhaps the fastest, and today, out of some 16,000,000 acres under cultivation in the United States portion of the basin, approximately 4,120,000 acres are irrigated. From surveys at hand, it appears that at least another 4,000,000 could be successfully irrigated. The value of this potential acreage to the Nation is illustrated by a typical development of the Bureau of Reclamation in southern Idaho, where land once desert yields crops valued at $75 per acre.

Deep-water navigation is provided from the Pacific Ocean to Portland and Vancouver (35 feet), and is authorized, but not yet dredged, to The Dalles (27 feet). Barges can be moved to Albany on the Willamette and to Pasco on the Columbia; and in recent years traffic on these waterways has been increasing rapidly. However, even in these up-river stretches serious obstacles to economic operation remain. In the Columbia there are several sections of fast rapids, and except at Bonneville Dam all locks are antiquated. In addition to vast improvement of the channels now available, future navigation will undoubtedly require new extensions up the Snake to Lewiston, further up the Columbia at least to Priest Rapids, to Corvallis on the Willamette, and possibly elsewhere.

The development of industry and of agriculture in the basin has already created the need for extensive flood protection in many areas. Some areas have already been made free from hazard. A great many more have been or are being investigated, and the comprehensive study will doubtless disclose others.

Development of hydroelectric power is still in its infancy, and future possibilities have not been determined. In fact, a great amount of investigation and planning is yet to be done in this field. An inventory of power plants shows that 67 of more than 500 kilowatts are now operating, with a total generating capacity of 2,022,600 kilowatts. Except for Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, built and operated by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, respectively, the existing plants are not large, having an average capacity of only 10,860 kilowatts. At the present time, it is not possible to do more than estimate the amount of power that the Columbia River system can economically generate. However, it is believed that at least 25,000,000 kilowatts of cheap power is to be had as the need is created. By comparison, all the hydroelectric power now generated in the United States, including the great plants Boulder, Shasta, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and in the T. V. A. system, totals approximately 25,000,000 kilowatts.

METHOD OF STUDY

An investigation of the Columbia River system is so large in scope that it requires very careful and thoughtful planning, as well as the cooperation and advice of all interested parties. While it must be pursued vigorously and diligently, it should not be carelessly rushed to furnish a premature report. Preliminary discussions have shown that the study must be progressive in nature and that it must move successively from one problem to another. This will be more clearly understood from a statement of the various problems into which the study has been divided.

Furthermore, it was recognized that if the comprehensive plan is to meet with ultimate success, it must be generally acceptable to the several States involved. This is a difficult assignment, as the rights of the individual States are a matter of real concern to them. They are properly fearful of any general statements, but they have repeatedly concurred in the belief that a sound engineering plan can be worked out that will be mutually beneficial, without depriving any of them of their individual rights.

It is evident that nothing less than a good and complete job must be done in full cooperation with the States. For all these reasons, it was determined that 5 years should be devoted to the work, and a completion date of July 1, 1948, was established. In the meantime, development of the area will not be delayed, since enough projects have already been reported on and are ready for prosecution, if Congress desires, to bridge the gap.

SEVENTEEN SEPARATE PROBLEMS

In planning the study, it seemed best to divide the work into a number of separate problems. Each of these is to be the subject of a partial report, and all are later to be combined into a single comprehensive report. Many of the problems cannot be started until others are at least partially completed, and this is provided for by proper scheduling. A brief résumé of each of the problems follows:

Problem 1. Inventory of projects and investigations: Much development, already accomplished or planned in the area, has been inventoried in detail. The inventory includes both public and private projects for irrigation, flood control, power generation, navigation, and other purposes in the United States. This was completed on July 1, 1944.

Problem 2. Stream flow, hydrological and meteorological data: A great volume of stream flow, flood, storm, snow survey, and meteorological records has been accumulated, and an inventory of these was completed on September 1, 1944. A study of these records indicates the need for additional data, and these that can be accumulated during the preparation of the report are being obtained.

Problem 3. Mapping: Many areas have been mapped by various agencies, and a complete inventory of this work has been made. It has now been determined that rather extensive additional areas must be surveyed and mapped to permit a proper engineering study of the area. It is intended to map only the necessary streams, not the entire basin. During the past summer, aerial photographs were completed. Ground control and maps will be expedited, but the task is so great that it is not expected to be completed until January 1, 1948.

Problem 4. Natural resources: Innumerable surveys have heretofore been made of the natural resources of the basin. These data will be combined to produce a comprehensive

picture. This is scheduled for completion on January 1, 1945. It may develop that certain additional surveys should be made to complete the information.

Problem 5. Power market: A study of the existing and probable future uses of electric energy will be made. This will cover load centers, rapidity of development, power demands, and load-curve characteristics. Completion of a preliminary report is scheduled for July 1, 1945, and that of the final report for January 1, 1948.

Problem 6. Economic studies: It is intended that the plan finally developed will be economically sound and above reproach. Many general rules for measuring the economic propriety of projects have been established by Congress and by the several Federal agencies. However, it is possible that, because of the interdependence of projects and the interstate and international aspects of the basin, some changes or additions to these rules would be advisable. A report on this is scheduled for completion on July 1, 1945.

Problem 7. Irrigation: It is recognized that the West must have adequate water for irrigation. To insure this, the first step in planning the use of the waters of the Columbia Basin will be to determine all areas that can ultimately be irrigated, the amount of water needed, and the source of this water. This report is scheduled for completion on July 1, 1945.

Problem 8. Navigation: This study will include potential water-borne commerce and the probable character and dimensions of barges and tugs so that it may be possible to determine the proper channel depths and widths and the stretches of the rivers that should be improved. This report is also scheduled for completion on July 1, 1945.

Problem 9. Flood control: Many areas in the basin are still subject to destructive floods. It will be necessary to determine which of these should be protected and the proper means for so doing. September 1, 1947, has been fixed as the date for this report.

Problem 10. Power generation: While subject to the rights of irrigation and navigation, and to the needs for flood control, power generation is one of the most difficult as well as one of the most important problems to be studied. Answers to the preceding problems will very largely control the solution of this problem. However, so many possible solutions still remain that it will be necessary to resort to a certain amount of cut-and-try to produce a proper plan. This will be one of the last studies completed and is scheduled for January 1, 1948.

Problem 11. Recreational development: In many instances, it will be possible and advisable to provide recreational facilities in conjunction with reservoirs or other projects. These possibilities will be investigated concurrently with other work and reported on January 1, 1948.

Problem 12. Power distribution: The physical difficulties and the cost of distributing electric power from river plants to points of consumption will be direct factors in the development of the river system. A report on this problem is scheduled for July 1, 1947.

Problem 13. Fish life: It is essential that all feasible means be provided for the protection and perpetuation of fish life, which is unusually important in the Northwest. A study will be made of facilities for enabling fish to pass dams, of the possible reservation of certain streams, and of other means to accomplish this end. A report is scheduled for January 1, 1946.

Problem 14. Miscellaneous: Domestic water supply, stream pollution, little reservoirs for range stock, and other miscellaneous problems will be the subject of a report due January 1, 1948.

Problem 15. Cooperation with Canada: Since a large share of the headwaters of the Columbia lie in Canada, it is essential that coordination be accomplished between the studies made by the two governments.

Problem 16. Legal problems: The area concerned involves five States and two nations, and each of these has laws of its own relative to the use of waters. An inventory is to be made of these laws so that they may be studied and, insofar as possible, coordinated. It may be advisable to note the need for certain changes to permit proper and agreeable development of the river system. This report is scheduled for January 1, 1947.

Problem 17. Priority of construction: In the light of current and anticipated needs for irrigation, navigation, flood control, and power, and giving due consideration to economic feasibility and to balanced development of the area, a tentative priority of construction will be proposed. This will be undertaken at the conclusion of other studies.

COOPERATION WITH OTHERS

Many agencies other than the Corps of Engineers have a proper interest in and responsibility for one or more of the problems that have been outlined. For this reason, their advice and cooperation are being sought. In some instances these agencies are preparing parts of the report, while in others they are furnishing information and advice. Not all such arrangements have been completed as yet, owing to the progressive nature of the work. Principal among the Federal agencies concerned are the following:

Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Agriculture, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, United States Geological Survey, United States Weather Bureau, United States Bureau of Mines, United States Indian Service, United States Forest Service, National Park Service, and Public Roads Administration.

Of the foregoing, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture (Land Use Coordinator) are, together with the Corps of Engineers, parties to the Inter-Agency River Basin Committee. The report will be finally reviewed by this committee, in keeping with its agreement, to assure proper coordination.

The States of Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon are all vitally concerned in this matter, and the success of any plan will be largely measured by its acceptability to them. They are, therefore, being kept fully informed of progress, and their advice and assistance are sought whenever their respective interests are involved.

Since a large proportion of the Columbia River system lies in Canada, coordination with that country is likewise essential. As already indicated, this is being accomplished through the medium of the International Joint Commission, which has been charged with reporting to the two countries on all matters of joint interest. The Commission made a very extensive field trip through the basin during the past summer. It has set up a technical committee to assist in coordination, and the machinery is now functioning. Canada proposes to study her portion of the river system in a manner very similar to that being pursued by the Corps of Engineers in the United States. She has much work to do, but it appears that her studies will meet the proposed completion date of July 1, 1948.

It should be borne in mind that the investigations which have been discussed are for the purpose of making a plan for the economical and balanced development of the Columbia River system. This plan will be the conclusion of the report to be submitted to Congress. It is then anticipated that, whether future projects are built by private or by public agencies, they will be in accordance with the blueprint thus established. In this manner, a proper and orderly development of the vast and invaluable Columbia River system will be realized.

National Rehabilitation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a proclamation by the President of the United States calling for observance of national rehabilitation week. The date has been set to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the passage of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920.

Vocational rehabilitation is a sound and wise activity of this Government, and I am glad that the Congress extended its usefulnes. by enacting the Barden-La Follette Act in 1943. We are learning new things about it in the work of rehabilitating our war disabled, and I look forward to the time when every disabled man and woman in the country will have an opportunity to be trained and refitted for useful and productive lives.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION 2650—NATIONAL REHABILITATION WEEK

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

With the attention of the Nation rightly focused on the welfare of men and women returning from service in the armed forces and the emphasis placed on benefits provided for them through congressional action, we must not let our interest flag in discharging our obligations to the increasing thousands among our civilian population who through accident, disease, or congential conditions are unable to hold a place in the ranks of the American working force. Even in the midst of war their condition calls to us for renewed effort to bring about their restoration that they, too, may maintain their self-respect through self-supporting work.

On June 2, our Nation-wide program for the vocational rehabilitation of such disabled men and women will have been in operation a quarter of a century. Less than 2 years ago, the Congress expanded this program by amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. The new law—the Barden-La Follette Act, passed in 1943—makes it possible for the Federal and State governments, working as a team, to bring to the mentally disabled and the blind and all other groups of the disabled, the many services necessary to make them employable, including physical restoration, vocational training and placement in suitable employment.

Over the past 25 years it has been demonstrated that this program for the restoration of disabled men and women is paying dividends not only in humanitarian terms but in dollars and cents. Thousands of men and women annually apply to the rehabilitation service for help. Because of disabilities they are able to contribute little to the national income. Many of them are forced to accept public aid. Refitted for work, they begin to pay their own way. No longer then are they tax consumers; they are taxpayers.

That we may not fail to discharge our obligation to help every man and woman who needs vocational rehabilitation services in order to become self-supporting, it appears appropriate at this time that I should urge the able-bodied citizenry of the United

States to unite in a concerted effort to bring about wider knowledge and use of the services for physical and mental restoration of the handicapped provided under the Barden-La Follette Act, which applies to all civilians disabled. Now, therefore,

I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby declare the week beginning June 2, 1945, as National Rehabilitation Week.

And I urge all churches, educational institutions, health and welfare services, civic organizations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, industry, labor, public-spirited citizens, and the radio and press throughout the United States to observe National Rehabilitation Week, to the end that handicapped men and women throughout our Nation may be located and advised of the benefits to which they may be entitled.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 5th day of May in the year of our Lord [SEAL] 1945, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-ninth.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State.

Food Almost Gone, United States Locks Pantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include an article by Malcolm Logan, which appeared in the New York Post on April 10, 1945. The article is entitled "Food Almost Gone, United States Locks Pantry," and is the second of a series of six articles which have been written by him on the food situation and which have been published in the New York Post.

As against a food stock pile to take care of the possible wants of the American people or the fear of a post-war food surplus, which might have hurt the farmers, it is evident that the authorities succumbed to the fear of the surplus. The result is the scarcity of food for the people in the consuming areas. The article follows:

FOOD ALMOST GONE, UNITED STATES LOCKS PANTRY

(By Malcolm Logan)

Throughout 1944 a long and bitter fight went on in Washington over the question of food stock-piling.

One of the contending groups did not want to save up our excess food supplies because it feared a post-war food surplus which would hurt the industry and farmers.

The other group wanted stock piles so that there would be plenty of food when it was needed for our armed forces, our civilians, our fighting allies, and the people of Europe who were to be liberated from the Axis.

In the group that was afraid of surpluses were the powerful American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, most of the farm-bloc Congressmen, the food trades and top officials of the War Food Administration.

Against them stood the labor unions, the National Farmers Union representing the smaller farmers, and some consumer and religious groups working through an organization called Food for Freedom, Inc., and some officials of W. F. A. and other departments concerned with food supplies.

On July 31, 1943, a special food advisory committee of Government experts headed by E. W. Gaumnitz, of the Office of Economic Warfare, said in a report (which was made public only after it had leaked out to a newspaper) that creation of a food stock pile was imperative.

"A thorough food program requires creation of a single contingency reserve to cover unusual and unpredictable demands for the United States armed forces, United States civilians, and foreign claimants," the report said.

That recommendation was never adopted. Instead the W. F. A. made a determined and successful effort last year to cut down food reserves.

The W. F. A. not only refused to create its own stock piles but would not let U. N. R. R. A. and Allied Governments, whose requests for food allocations had to have W. F. A. approval, build up their own reserves.

W. F. A. officials were able to create fears of post-war surpluses because the amount of Army food reserves were a military secret. The public was never given a true and complete picture of our food situation because of this great unknown quantity.

Last February 15 Lt. Col. Ralph W. Olmstead, Deputy War Food Administrator, testified before a House Appropriations subcommittee that "the stocks accumulated for military reserves" would be used to help feed Europe.

ARMY HAS VAST SURPLUSES

In answer to a question by Representative CANNON (Democrat, of Missouri), he agreed that there were vast surpluses on hand in the Army warehouses and pipelines.

At this hearing Olmstead also made the extraordinary statement, "I have never been permitted to see what the military inventories show."

Last week another spokesman for the F. W. A. told this reporter that the F. W. A. had been constantly kept informed as to the amount of Army food reserves. It was pointed out that since the W. F. A. is responsible for allocating our food supplies, it could not do its job without this information. Yet Olmstead said he did not know how much food the Army had on hand.

NO STOCK PILE, BUT—

The carefully cultivated reports of great Army stock piles were finally denied by Assistant War Secretary Patterson last March 23.

"We have no stock pile in the Army, as the word is commonly used," he said.

Last week in a more explicit statement he revealed for the first time just how much food the Army has. A year ago, he said, it had a 90-day supply for troops in this country, a 68-day supply here at depots and ports for troops overseas and a 108-day supply at overseas ports and depots. These levels have since been reduced, he said, to 75 days, 60 days and 70 days.

The entire reserve, he said, is so low that if it were all suddenly released it would not be enough to feed our civilian population for a week.

But by the time the veil of military secrecy was lifted, the battle for stock piling had been lost, and Olmstead had admitted to Senate food investigators that serious shortages were rapidly developing in meat, fats, and oils, sugar, dairy products, and other foods.

O. P. A. FOUGHT FOR RATIONING

Last July, in order to preserve our dwindling supplies, the O. P. A. began a fight to restore to rationing the canned goods and meats taken off points in the spring.

But the W. F. A. convinced War Mobilizer Byrnes that it wasn't necessary, and apparently Byrnes, like many other high officials, thought the war in Europe was almost won last summer.

On September 9 he forecast removal of virtually all food rationing in the first 6 months of this year and helped along the surplus scare by saying that a surplus was in sight. The Government, he predicted, would have to buy excess foods to prevent a collapse of prices.

Even when it became apparent later in the year that our optimism about the military outlook was unfounded, the W. F. A. did nothing to conserve stocks of food.

DEMANDED AN ABOUT-FACE

On October 3 Food for Freedom sent War Food Administrator Jones a memorandum asking an immediate about-face in policy. He ignored it.

On November 30 Howard Tolley, head of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, disclosed that we were unable to supply Europe's essential relief needs in four of six major food categories—meat, fats and oils, sugar, and milk. Still nothing was done.

Finally, Food for Freedom and 22 allied organizations took their fight to the White House on December 22. Two days later, canned vegetables and nearly all meats were put back on points, and because supplies were so low, millions of red and blue stamps were canceled.

We had at last locked our pantry door. But by that time, thanks to W. F. A., there was not enough food left to go around.

Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the victory edition of the May 7, 1945, Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

VICTORY

It is here at last, the day of victory. It is a day of spontaneous, heartfelt rejoicing, of deliverance and profound thankfulness. It is also a day of questioning and of stock taking. The celebration will pass and be forgotten. The deliverance will soon be taken for granted. But the answers to the questioning and the result of the stock taking are still to be determined.

What has been accomplished? Europe has gained liberation and peace. America has come halfway, perhaps the hardest half, in its fight for survival as a free and decent nation in a free and decent world. The paralyzing grip of nazism has been broken. Greater Lynn has played a glorious part in that achievement.

It has taken 5 years of struggle in the greatest, most terrible war ever known to

achieve this victory. They have been 5 bitter years of blood, toil, tears, and sweat. Their cost has been staggering, counted today in the millions of combatants and civilians who died for the victory we celebrate today. For years to come we shall count a further cost in broken lives, families, property, and fortunes. Some of these can be rebuilt, others are gone forever, like the monuments of earlier and prouder cultures than ours which have vanished in the wake of battle and vandalism.

And for what has this price been paid? To curb the murderous ambitions of one man, a criminal paranoiac permitted by a myopic world to hypnotize his country into a frenzy approaching his own.

Never in history was a man more personally responsible for a great war than Adolf Hitler. And never in history was one so unworthy of the sacrifices that he exacted. Yet these sacrifices have surpassed their cause in countless examples of transcendent heroism which have now reached a triumphant climax.

The victory is certainly a triumph of American strength and courage, American production and strategy and leadership. Without them there could have been no victory. But without the equal strength and courage of Dunkirk and Stalingrad and Alamein, without the hope and spirit of the patriots of all the occupied lands and of Britain in the desperate days of the blitz, Europe would not have survived to receive the American contribution that turned the tide.

America has learned through her sacrifices that she can live in harmony with herself and in mutual friendliness and understanding with other nations when the goal demands the effort. That effort must be continued and increased toward the military victory still to be won over an enemy as cruel and ruthless as the one now fallen.

But are the goals of freedom and prosperity and lasting peace any less desirable and demanding than the goal of victory in war? Do military victories mean that we may now forget their lessons and return to selfishness, suspicion, disunity, and hatred at home and abroad?

We were given the answer to that question 26 years ago, and we did not heed it. If we and the other great powers again fail to heed, then we shall be no better than Adolf Hitler, who said death of millions in this war was "merely an episode."

Sacrifices of the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, May 8, 1945, was VE-day, but it was accepted in our Nation as a challenge, and not with a spirit of celebration. We must look ahead to the terrific task of total victory and we cannot stop now with any intent of victorious celebrations.

I am certain that all Members of Congress, as do I as Representative from the Seventeenth Ohio District, receive many letters from parents who have known human sacrifice in the casualties of sons and daughters in World War No. 2. I am particularly impressed with the comments sent me by a father in Ohio when he received word of the death of his son in the European theater of war. It is with tribute to the sacrifices of the American home that I pass on to the Members of Congress my constituent's statements:

Regardless of the fact that war is far-searching in its effects to nations and individuals, and casualties of various kinds are to be expected, when a loved one gives his life, a person no longer doubts General Sherman's definition of war.

After receipt of that dreaded wire from the War Department, we, like a great many others, experienced that feeling of heartbreak and despair. The sorrow will be of long duration, but courage is stronger than despair, as we realize that our struggle with life must continue.

In facing today's chaos, the majority of us humans are completely helpless. We realize that the Nazi creed offers a new conception of civilization—it embraces all the wrong things with terrific zeal; then, if honesty is in evidence, we must realize that here in America we embrace all the right things—with minute enthusiasm and no action.

It is difficult to realize that more than 300,000 American boys are sleeping in foreign lands at this moment, solely due to the weakness of goodness in man. Because of this status, man has failed to shoulder his obligation as a citizen—man has, likewise, been blind to the fact that freedom is much more spiritual than political.

We are prayerful that supreme sacrifices will not have been in vain. World War No. 3 is in the making, and if it is to be averted a closer approach to right thinking is imperative. Humanity must learn to live—and help others to live.

Officials Fear Land of Plenty, Spread Gospel of Eat-It-All-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the question of food for the home front is one of the greatest problems of the day. In a series of six articles which were published in the New York Post, Malcolm Logan gives the causes of the food shortage. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the third of these articles, which appeared in the New York Post on April 11, 1945, under the title "Officials Fear Land of Plenty, Spread Gospel of Eat-It-All-Up" and which reads as follows:

OFFICIALS FEAR LAND OF PLENTY, SPREAD GOSPEL OF EAT-IT-ALL-UP

(By Malcolm Logan)

The War Food Administration was created to do two things:

To raise food production as high as possible and to distribute it in such a way that we could feed our armed forces and civilians, our fighting allies, and the hungry people freed from Nazi and Japanese conquest.

Yet when we had a record production of pork, eggs, lard, and other foods last year, top W. F. A. officials did not rejoice. They were frightened to death.

They did not try to save as much of that food as possible for the day when our own supplies might be short and we would be called upon to help the starving people of Europe. They deliberately encouraged our civilians to eat it up as fast as they could.

THE W. F. A. ASSURANCES

That can be proved by the acts and the words of high W. F. A. officials.

Lee Marshall, W. F. A. Director of Distribution, repeatedly assured the food trade last year that it was W. F. A. policy to keep food reserves to a minimum so there would be no post-war surplus.

In a speech in Cincinnati, May 4, he said: "From here on out we must exercise the greatest possible care with regard to food procurement in order that we may come out as even as possible at the end of the war."

The W. F. A. carried out the "bare shelf" policy announced by Marshall by taking lard off rationing on March 3, 1944, putting eight canned vegetables on the point-free list at the end of April, and ending rationing on all meats except steaks and beef roasts on May 3.

It is the W. F. A. which decides how our food supplies are divided among the armed forces, civilians, and our allies. It is also the W. F. A.—not the O. P. A.—which decides what foods shall be rationed or taken off rationing.

AND THE MEAT PILED UP

The official explanation of the removal of nearly all meat from rationing was that the record run of hogs and other animals, combined with a drought and a decline in Army and lease-lend demands, had jammed slaughterhouses and cold-storage warehouses with meat.

At that time the Army was using every available ship to rush to England the weapons needed for the invasion of France. Army and lease-lend food was piling up in storage plants here at the very time that meat, lard, and eggs were being marketed in record quantities.

In March 1944 the Nation's freezer warehouses in which meat, fowl, and butter are stored at zero temperatures were filled to about 92 percent of their capacity, which is just about the top limit.

But when meat was taken off rationing in May freezer occupancy had dropped to around 85 percent. It rose slowly after that until September, when it was again near the March peak. Since then it has been dropping steadily, and on March 1 of this year stood at 69 percent.

BUT EAT MORE WAS THE WORD

Every drop of 1 percent represents roughly a million feet of available space. If meat rationing had been resumed last summer, or even last fall, when meat began to get scarce again, we could have stored a tremendous quantity of meat in those millions of empty cubic feet.

Instead of doing that the W. F. A. encouraged us to eat more meat than we had ever eaten before.

Lard was taken off rationing months before a combination of a huge lard surplus, resulting from the record hog slaughter of 1943–44, and a glut of eggs filled cooler warehouses to their highest practical occupancy level of about 85 percent in July 1944.

Not only was lard taken off rationing but soap manufacturers were allowed to buy all they wanted, and so were other industrial users.

The W. F. A., through its Commodity Credit Corporation, did buy 336,000,000 pounds of lard during the year and stored it, with a preservative, in steel drums. But it continued to hand out lard to all comers

after cooler space became vacant last summer.

AS FATS AND OILS DWINDLED

Last fall it became apparent to Government experts that we were running into a shortage of fats and oils. Yet until November 13 soap manufacturers were allowed to continue buying lard, and lard rationing was not resumed until last January 22. Point values have risen twice since then.

Moreover, last January, 2 months after purchase of lard for soap had been prohibited, the C. C. C. sold 20,000,000 pounds of lard to the Army, which promptly turned it over to five soap companies. The reason given was that the lard had turned rancid.

However, when it was last inspected, it was in such condition that 98 percent of it could have been recovered for use as food. Both the food trade and U. N. R. R. A. offered to buy it, but it was turned into soap.

Disclosing this deal on the floor of the House last March 12, Representative HOOK (Democrat; Michigan) charged that the soap manufacturers demanded this lard as their price for filling military requirements for cheap yellow bar soap, which is far less profitable than perfumed toilet soaps which are still in abundant supply here.

Even now, with the fats and oil supply steadily decreasing, no attempt has been made to restrict the amount of expensive soaps sold to the public and increase supplies of cheap laundry soap.

Many Government experts believe we could get much more lard if the W. F. A. would order packers to trim pork more closely, so that the fat would go into lard instead of pork chops. At the big packing plants, which are under constant Federal inspection, enforcement of such an order would be easy.

It is reported that such an order was actually drawn up some time ago, but it has never been issued.

THE SUMMER OF OUR OVERCONFIDENCE

Beginning in July, the O. P. A. began demanding that the F. W. A. resume meat and lard rationing. But that was the summer of overconfidence. Many of our highest officials believed that VE-day was almost at hand.

The W. F. A., more concerned about possible surpluses of food than possible shortages, stubbornly refused to resume rationing. Our accumulated stocks melted away, and when rationing was put into effect again last December, there was so little food left that we must now go in slimmer rations if we are to keep our promises to feed hungry Europe.

San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of Wednesday, May 9, 1945:

TODAY AT SAN FRANCISCO

(By David Lawrence)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 9—This is a strange place to be writing about VE-day, but perhaps, after all, it is the most significant location in the whole world from which to express one's dissent from the prevailing concept of VE-day.

As encouragement for the future, as satisfaction over what has already been achieved, as an opportunity for prayer and thanksgiving that a big milestone has been reached—as President Truman has so eloquently proclaimed—there is reason for applause. But what real reason is there for rejoicing, for shouting, for carousing, for stopping work?

Will rejoicing bring back the hundreds of thousands who have been killed? Will it restore the limbs of the maimed, or heal the wounds of the sick? Will it stop the fighting against Japan? Will it help to prevent the next world war?

These are the questions that one asks today as the celebrations all around us seem so drab and artificial. But it is precisely because we camouflage truth on VE-days that we have such things as wars. We like to sweep along with so-called popular tides and let emotion appear as the substitute for reason. And that's why we keep on ignoring the facts that lead to wars.

Today, as I write this in a high building which overlooks for miles around the entire bay of San Francisco, I see so many ships moving slowly out to sea, so many kinds of ships, so many loaded down and so many coming back to be reloaded, that I can think only of the war out there in the Pacific—10,000 miles away from our shores. We have won a war 3,500 miles away in Europe, but to win a war nearly three times as far away in the Pacific means an unsung yet unprecedented operation of supply and transportation so colossal that it is really indescribable.

Here in San Francisco, too, the United Nations Conference is going on. Millions of words are being written about its phrases and its maneuverings. Again, emotion prevails—and a limitation on truth-telling. It is popular, of course, to speak of the conference here as one that is to make a "lasting peace." It is considered desirable to emphasize such progress as is being made and to avoid telling the people the unpleasant truth, which is that the charter being written here is weaker by far and endeavors, at least on paper, to do much less to restrain the evil passions of would-be aggressors and selfish powers than the document drawn up 26 years ago in Paris.

To those who make such observations about the charter is flung back the misleading retort that they are "perfectionists." They are told that the old league "tried to do too much" and hence failed. Excuses and more excuses, alibis and more alibis, and still not the whole truth.

What is the truth? It is that men with pride and devilish passion, with selfishness and greed, with an exaggerated sense of what military might can do to make peace and a scorn for the power of moral force and spiritual understanding, still rule this world and run its conference.

Timidity such as men on the battlefield never show, hesitancy and even fear are the characteristics in and about the United Nations Conference. Realism, which requires that the facts of international intercourse be fully published, is met with the same old-fashioned cautions of diplomacy, namely that the press must remain polite and conform to the official line and that critics must not speak lest someone somewhere be offended. This is the reactionary type of thinking which creates, in time, the festering situations that eventually bring on wars.

One had hoped that here at San Francisco, after all the sacrifices of heroic men, there would be a new spirit, that the swashbuckling attitudes of power would be abandoned and that governments would sit down together in all humbleness and examine their own consciences before they asked for political or economic terms of special advantage to themselves. But they boldly proclaim here that might makes right, that the weak have less voice because their armament is less, and that the strong must be trusted to be benevolent even when actuated by self-interest.

Here they proclaim that human rights are to be granted on paper, but to be brushed aside if they conflict with the internal policies of any nation. Here they state the same old doctrine that "internal" affairs are sacrosanct, which means that another Hitler and another Nazi party can arise, suppress freedom of speech and freedom of worship and mislead millions of people into war. Must the charter of a conference of nations ignore all this as purely an "internal" and hence a forbidden question for world-wide inquiry and condemnation?

Some day the truth may force its way through. It must first make a shambles of this edifice of pretense called diplomacy and this mechanism of camouflage called expediency which permits quibble and equivocation. Then it will be revealed clearly that because powerful nations, like individuals, often wish to become a law unto themselves, there has been no universal peace. We shall have peace only when peoples—the ones who shed their blood—are permitted to have complete access to each other through freedom of the press and speech, and when the right to insist on the truth is not impaired by the coercive hand of totalitarian governments or dictatorships anywhere in the world. Peoples can make peace and keep the peace if they will make governments their servants and not their masters.

Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Dr. James H. Cotter, published recently in the Irish World:

THOUGHTS

(Specially written for the Irish World by Rev. Dr. James H. Cotter, LL. D., Litt. D.)

I turned from my radio, on the evening of the twenty-sixth, stunned by the San Francisco proceedings that never mentioned the name of God. God, whose hands have shed blessings, dear and numberless, on this land, blessings that have made America for the world, a land of promise. Secretary Stettinius began his introductory speech by devoting 1 minute to solemn meditation. Strange substitute this for prayer and un-American to a marked degree, for since its struggling infancy America has opened its every session of Congress, its every national convention with prayer. What was the solemn meditation about? If, on God, why did the chairman not say so? Was it but a cowardly and hypocritical shift for prayer, done out of consideration for Russia that ignores God?—a course that politicians would call diplomatic. This last gained credence, as his speech proceeded, for it showed the omission of God's name was formal, deliberate, and by design. In enumerating realties, he ignored the greatest, the supremely powerful reality—God, and immediately focused thought on faith in man. Faith in man! How he could have that, in contradistinction to faith in God, was hard to understand for man gives man, right now, a horrible picture, rivers of blood and hills of slain, the while God's command pronounces solemnly, "thou shalt not kill"; and Christ, in kindly solicitude, gives mankind the precept, "love thy neighbor as thyself."

The omission of all recognition of and dependence on the Almighty was an insult to Catholic, Protestant, and Jew alike, and woefully out of tune with the popular song, God Bless America. In no way was it fashioned to reach the high purpose for which men have yearned as the goal of the Conference. Our brave boys, bleeding and dying above the clouds and in the depths of the sea, in foxholes and jungles, are not resting their faith in man but in the God whom nations and warlords have forgotten or defied.

Chili's representative, too, in his zestful politeness, praising, honoring, and giving thanks to the dead President, forgot the Divine from whom all blessings flow.

England's delegate, Secretary Eden, omitted all mention of God and yet dared to express his confidence in the Conference, that it would conduct itself "with courage, modesty and dispatch." To reach this he gave no formula. Like the geographers of old was he who declared that Atlas supported the world but were unable to tell us on what the giant Atlas stood.

The redeeming feature of the preliminary opening of the Conference was President Truman's address in which he invoked divine guidance and was thus happily in touch with the great fathers of our country who unashamedly believed that without religion there is no morality and without morality there is anarchy.

And now a word to the American delegates, appointed by President Roosevelt. The unabridged dictionary will be no help to you at the Conference, as the Russian dictionary is based on a new diplomacy that would have words, manners, and morals strangers in the world by destroying with communistic glamour the hallowed use of words with which time has endowed them. Liberty and democracy and their derivatives have strange meanings in the mouth of Russia. Be not deceived, then, by the sophistry deduced therefrom. Stand firmly for America and American ideals, remembering "there are no tricks in plain and simple truth."

General Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of Thursday, May 10, 1945:

GENERAL EISENHOWER

To President Roosevelt and to General Marshall, with the full concurrence of Winston Churchill, must go the praise for having selected General Eisenhower for the assignment which he has now so brilliantly carried out. It took more than normal insight into human nature to discern in this modest brigadier the array of qualities necessary for the organization and carrying out of the most difficult military campaign in history.

But it is to General Eisenhower himself that tribute must be paid today. No military man in the history of our country has shown more indomitability. None has ever so successfully guided disparate forces and achieved with them an overpowering resultant. None has solved better than he the difficult personal questions which incessantly arise when high-spirited men, representing not merely differing points of view but, in some instances, differing national aspirations, are brought together and bidden to work as a team with a single objective. If all that General Eisenhower had done was to coach this team and imbue it with a unanimity of purpose, he would deserve all the encomiums which are now being heaped upon him.

He did much more than this. He took the raw human material which was lifted from the farms, the factories, the mines, the offices, and even the schoolhouses of this country and the British Empire and, by meticulous training, welded it into a great fighting machine capable of withstanding the heaviest blows of the supposedly invincible German Wehrmacht without losing courage or discipline. To that same human machine he gave something even greater. He gave it the urge to go ahead against obstacles, in the face of prepared death, and to stop at no obstacle, however lethal. This building of an army, too, must be credited to General Eisenhower. And it adds to his achievement to recall that, in large part, his army was trained on British soil, a long way from home and the solace of friends and family.

While this training was going on, General Eisenhower had to devise and plan for the execution of an amphibious operation across the English Channel, most treacherous of waters. For almost a thousand years the channel had been the impregnable bastion of Britain. There was an ingrained conviction in the minds of millions of Americans and Europeans that carrying an army across it and landing it on a defended beach was something no general could hope to do.

Quietly and methodically, against the pressure of prejudice and fear, General Eisenhower planned this operation. When it became known that he contemplated it, only the ignorant cheered. The prudent felt a chill of apprehension, and these apprehensions were voiced in high places. But General Eisenhower, using the best brains the Anglo-Saxon world commanded, went ahead with his planning, neither hurrying at the pressures of the ignorant nor faltering before the fears of the prudent. It was a job that had to be done, and he was determined that it be done efficiently, which in the Army means at the least cost in blood. We all know how well it was done despite the additional handicap of unprecedented storms.

From then on we could watch another aspect of the Eisenhower genius. We saw the development of the plan for the conquest of Normandy, with Montgomery at the northern hinge and the almost legendary Patton assigned to follow the break-through at St. Lo with that rush across France. The liberation of Paris was but an incident in this great maneuver, as it should be. The objective was to pursue and destroy as much of the fleeing enemy's army as possible. Only the west wall stopped this unprecedented movement.

We also saw the methodical mind of Eisenhower working at the business of cracking that impregnable defense, hardly slackening even when in a last spasmodic plunge the Germans hit back in the battle of the Belgian bulge. We saw the approach to the Rhine, the cool decision merely to develop at slight cost the fortuitous Remagen bridgehead rather than alter the greater plan to fit this development. We saw the envelopment of the Ruhr and the continuing pursuit of the Germans beyond it, the shattering of the mythical Bavarian redoubt and the final plunge to the North Sea, the Elbe and the Danube.

We saw all these far-reaching maneuvers completed with almost uncanny precision. We saw the complexities of the meeting with the Russian onrush smoothed out and passed over with no ripple; and we saw, finally, the grand climax of unconditional surrender, a denouement in which, characteristically, the main actor was not on the stage. His role, in fact, was but to speak the few concluding lines which rang the curtain down. But his presence brooded over that historic scene as it had brooded over every single incident in the long drama.

The strength of General Eisenhower is baffling when the effort is made to put it into words. His appearance is likewise baffling, for in his features and in his men there is little of that jutting cragginess which we have come to expect in great leaders. The adjective kindly more nearly describes the effect he makes upon men than any more melodramatic term. Gentleness and a kind of poetic sensibility are there, surely. But whatever the words used, the impression of greatness persists. In her hour of need, the country once more found the right man.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Alfred C. Gaunt at the reciprocal trade agreements hearing before the Ways and Means Committee:

My name is Alfred C. Gaunt, of Methuen, Mass. I am an owner of a small worsted mill. I was the first president of the N. E. Smaller Business Association and chairman of the National Advisory Council of Independent Small Business. I come as a private citizen interested in the promotion and preservation of small independent business in America.

You gentlemen of the committee possibly have not had presented to you the particular angle of the so-called reciprocity program as it affects small business, and I should like to lay before you some facts that may help you in arriving at a sound decision.

You may be interested to note that the remonstrants against lowered tariffs are almost without exception from industries which are not monopolistic, but primarily made up of small owner-operated units, and among whom exists full, free, and fair competition.

Some of them are the following:

	Concerns	Employees
Surgical instrument manufacturers	541	14,339
Hothouse vegetable growers	2,000	50,000
Toys and athletic goods manufacturers	821	36,797
Lumber manufacturers	11,520	360,613
Cutlery, tools, and hardware manufacturers	1,196	73,664
Hat manufacturers	254	23,369
Glass cutters	213	67,000
Lace manufacturers	63	7,254
Paper and allied products	3,279	264,716
Cotton mills	1,248	409,317
Clock and watch manufacturers	116	20,287
Woolen mills	583	190,000
Chemicals	9,203	287,136
Potteries	290	33,105

If to these are added such of the owner-operated farms and farm-products processors and the shoe manufacturers and miners and others, not on this list, who ask or need protection, it is unquestionably fair to say that tens of thousands of small business concerns and the jobs of several millions of their employees will be adversely affected by any reduction of tariff which permits increased imports of lower labor-cost products from abroad to undercut them. The long period of depression followed by tariff cuts had already put multitudes of small industries out of business, and many others, like

myself, were hanging on the ropes when we were saved by the cessation of imports when war came.

To demonstrate to you that these industries are genuinely small business, may I give you the break-down of the business I know the best, the woolen business, which I think is largely typical of these small businesses listed. In the woolen business there were in 1937—

Plants employing from 1 to 100 persons	241
Plants employing from 101 to 500 persons	293
Plants employing from 500 to 2,500 persons	43
Plants employing over 2,500 persons	6
Total	583

There are no restrictive practices or patent or price agreements among the woolen mills. The largest single concern in the business by no means dominates, having less than 10 percent of the looms of the industry. There exists full, free, and fair competition and free enterprise in its true sense. The units are generally located in small communities of which they are the chief support. They are over 95 percent resident-owner operated.

Cotton textile mills also belong in the same category. The potteries, the lumber manufacturers, the hat and shoe and lace manufacturers and others, and their employees are likewise all of the type and geographical distribution that are essential to the healthy economic and social life of America as a whole.

The point which I would like to make, which I feel sure has not occurred to you is that the sufferers from lowered tariffs will not be aluminum or steel or General Electric, or automobile big business.

WOLVES

It will be the little fellows and their employees who will be thrown to the wolves. It is the existence of innumerable small businesses that is now threatened by the advent of peace.

Congress has universally and uniformly been friendly to small business. Congress passed by a unanimous vote of both Houses the bill creating Smaller War Plants Corporation. Most of the gentlemen on this committee are on record as being for the promotion and preservation of independent small business.

SACRIFICE

The glib answer of those who espouse lower tariff, that "it may be necessary to sacrifice one industry to promote another" overlooks entirely the importance to the Nation of the small industries they propose to sacrifice.

Most small businesses and farms cannot be moved. It would be uneconomic and antisocial to move them to Detroit, even if Detroit is booming with export orders. Moreover, not all small businessmen and their workers wish to uproot themselves and their families from their small communities.

Wool growing, for instance, is an occupation in almost every State, and the most important occupation of 11 States, which have a rural population and small towns.

To increase the activity and congestion and concentration in big centers, while small communities go on W. P. A., is certainly a condition we, all of us, wish to avoid.

So also the policy of snuffing out what some may call an inefficient industry is at direct variance with that of President Woodrow Wilson when he said, "We were absolutely at the mercy of the world on chemicals. We are not going to get caught that way again." A wise tariff policy launched shortly thereafter turned what many thought was an inefficient industry—chemicals and dyestuffs—into one that now leads the world. Without this industry our country would have been placed in a disastrous position for rubber and ammunition. Without the textile industry—also erroneously characterized by some as inefficient—our boys would have gone cold and short of shelter.

Any definition of "inefficient industry which should be sacrificed" as being "one which pays low wages" ought to be examined, especially if it is an industry marked for extinction. The textile industry would almost immediately qualify under this definition as inefficient unless one gets the whole story. If we say, for instance, that the automobile industry is efficient because it pays an average of $1.25 an hour then the textile industry is inefficient as its average is $0.81 an hour.

But here is the fallacy. In the automobile industry there is normally one worker in each family—the man. The variety and lightness of work in the textile industry makes it possible for not only the man to work but perhaps several of his unmarried daughters. I know of one typical family where the mother holds out her apron, and the husband and daughters and a crippled son toss in over $200 every weekly pay day. The average family income in textile communities is as great or greater than the average family income in the automobile industry or the mining industry or others where the rates per hour are apparently higher.

Condemnation or sacrifice of any such industry is a disservice to our plans for full employment.

The problem of survival of small business because of war conditions has been over 500,000. Big business meanwhile has thrived and grown greater.

You gentlemen of the committee are naturally turning your eyes to the post-war period in your study of this trade agreement bill.

HISTORY

After the Napoleonic wars with the low protective duties then existing in our country, England sent shipload after shipload of products into the United States and nearly ruined what little industry we had at that time. We were saved by erecting tariff barriers, as the Hollanders have been saved from the sea by raising their dikes.

You perhaps remember the period after the last war. The replacement of destroyed material kept all industries booming, until the tumble that came about 18 months after Armistice Day. We were at that time operating under the low tariff Underwood bill of 1913. A tremendous flood of foreign goods started to overwhelm this country. We pulled out of that slump by raising the tariff. The Underwood low tariff was replaced with an antidumping bill and an emergency tariff in 1921, followed by the Fordney-McCumber tariff in 1922.

While the world-wide destruction of goods will keep productive facilities going at top speed for a period after the war, we know that the world's productive capacities will soon overtake the demand. It is time right now to put our tariff house in order.

The British Board of Trade already has sent scouts and "research men" to this market. They have appropriated substantial sums of money to place agents here who have already canvassed the users of fine woolens and worsted goods.

These British propaganda missionaries are earnestly working to revive the old idea that something imported from abroad is better than can be made in this country, notwithstanding the fact that it has been demonstrated now over many years that the American craftsmen and workmen are as skilled as any that exist anywhere. They used to tell us that only from Germany could be had such wonderful dyestuffs. Today our laboratories produce products which surpass any thing that Germany ever did. It used to be that if a man wanted a fine automobile he went after a foreign make. Today our automobiles lead the world in beauty and value and serviceability. Certain interests still promote the propaganda that imported woolens are superior to American woolens. They even go so far as putting a tag on certain fine American woolens and stamp them "imported." I have seen where this very thing had been done on products of our own mill by some unscrupulous person. Today American ingenuity and skill and good taste produce woolens as fine or finer than those made anywhere in the world, and in sufficient volume to serve this greatest luxury market in the world.

Headlines in British papers frankly state they are looking to the "rich American market." In the pre-war year 1939, the first year Britain got the benefit of reduced tariff on woolens, she jumped her shipments to us over 350 percent. Only the war prevented further distress to our woolen mills, most of which are owner-operated small, independent businesses. Britain already is "squared away" to jump in at the advent of peace, even under the present 50-percent concession. She needs no further 50 percent. She should get less than 50 percent. This drive of hers is going to hit most especially the smaller mills like my own. You see the finer goods requiring higher skills are mostly made in the smaller units; and inasmuch as the finer cloths have the greater labor content, Britain with her much lower standard of living for workers is in a preferred position on finer goods to knock out our smaller mills. Our wage scale is more than double that of Britain. Czechoslovak and Italian and Japanese wage rates are still lower, and they all have the same modern machinery that we have.

The tariff rates as now in effect under the Reciprocity Act on the products of these small mills are today lower than those which prevailed at the time the Underwood Act was in force, and when the 1920 post-war flood of foreign goods submerged us.

VETERANS

Under no circumstances should the power of making still further reductions be granted, unless you wish to kill off more small independent businesses. Hopeful as we are that the return of the veteran will open up many new small businesses, we must be concerned with seeing that he gets a fair start and fair show. In Sunday's New York Times is an ad of a returned veteran seeking to buy a small woolen mill. What a tragedy if we hand him one that must stand idle while Britain's mills run night and day.

The small businessman does not ask subsidies. He does not fear fair competition from big business neighbor or from abroad, but you note I say fair competition. As labor has protection from unfair labor practices, so must small business have protection from unfair business practices. The foreigner has no 40-hour week. He does not pay time and a half. He pays his labor low wages. Small business has a right to expect from its elected representatives laws that will shield it from this unfair competition. You may remember that as between North and South N. R. A. said that it was unfair competition for industry to make profits out of lower wage rates. Exactly the same sort of fair parity as that directed between North and South should be established as between foreign producers and domestic producers. What the small businessman asks is a parity tariff—one that takes care of the cost differential (principally labor) and other artificial or unfair advantages that foreigners employ.

The farmer has a formula for agricultural parity, but we do not have any accepted standard of practice or policy of establishing a parity tariff for industry.

The reciprocal trade agreement law gives no practicable rule or standard by which changes in any tariff rates can be determined. They are left to the uncontrolled direction of the President—the only present limit being that he may not increase or decrease any duty by more than 50 percent. Although we have numerous studies of costs here and abroad and information on comparative labor rates, we make no use of these figures

in arriving at changes. I know of no study that has ever been made, however, of the relative impact of so-called reciprocity reductions on Small Business versus Big or Monopoly Businesses.

If you say "Well, why does not small business develop its export trade?"—you have the answer when you note that the principal manufactured exports that interest foreign buyers are our mass production products; and small business does not and cannot make mass-production items. Moreover small business is not organized with export branches as is big business. The natural markets for small businesses are the nearby or home markets to which it should have access on at least as fair a basis as any foreigner. Big exporting business would in effect be given a further subsidy of tariff favors with further lowering as proposed.

PEACE AND WAR AND TARIFF

The absurdity of some arguments for a reduced tariff have doubtless already impressed you. For instance, the statement to the effect that anyone against continued or further reduced tariffs contemplated in this bill "is advocating another war." In fact when one examines the record, he is impressed by the regularity of war following a decreased tariff. In the 1890's we had the Cleveland low tariff bill followed by the Spanish War. In 1914 World War No. 1 followed the tariff cuts of the Underwood bill. In 1934 to 1937 came the so-called reciprocity reductions followed by World War No. 2.

Does it not lie nearer to the truth for us to conclude that friction and irritation and disruptions and wars are more often caused by violent or radical shifts or changes in tariff policies and levels? Was not the reversal of Britain's free trade policy and establishment of protection and Empire preference a restriction of world trade and a source of world irritation? And did not Britain attribute that change of her policy to our American "weather vane" policy?

RECIPROCITY

As to foreign trade, of course, we want foreign trade. But it should be true reciprocity on the basis of our buying from the other fellow what we can use without detriment to ourselves; and selling to the other fellow what he wants to buy. This can be done either in direct trade or in the so-called three-way trade. Rubber or tin or coffee or a certain amount of Australian wool imported do not displace American labor, and such imports promote prosperity in the countries of the exporters. In return we sell them what they want—machinery, automobiles, gadgets. That produces prosperity and employment in our country. That is true reciprocity.

Then as they raise their standard of living and the labor differential is narrowed we gradually, not violently, reduce our tariffs, keeping them at a level where there is a basis for them to enter our market in fair competition, not with an overwhelming flood such as hit and prostrated us in 1921.

The tariff should not be a football of politics or diplomats. A policy having been laid down, it should be consistent, based on scientific determination; and subject to supervision not by the State Department or bureaucrats far removed from public control, but by our Senators and Congress, who are the elected representatives of the interests and workers affected.

DECREE

You gentlemen, the duly elected representatives of the people themselves, are in a far superior position to know what is good for your constituents than are any bureaucrats or State Department officials trading behind closed doors. Opposition to referring back for ratification to you or the Senate is either a reflection on you or the assumption of a very great superiority on their part. If they fear to submit their agreements to you, they should not make them. If they are for the good of the country and its small independent businesses, they will be ratified. If they are not, they should not be ratified. No one man should have the power to decree the death of any industry and the unemployment of its workers; and no few big exporting industries should be artificially giantized by killing off small businesses which supply our domestic market and do not need to export.

The State Department is open to severe criticism because of the method used in negotiating these treaties. Interested parties of small business or agriculture were not invited to attend preliminary mapping out of concessions to be discussed. Formal negotiations on the last British agreement began 3 weeks before the public hearings opened. The hearings given were so perfunctory and apparently so boring to our officials that everyone in attendance felt that the stage was already set. Announcement of the final agreements only confirmed our worst fears. The small businesses and small farmers had been made the sacrificial goats. And we had no forum of our elected representatives to whom we could appeal.

It is, of course, the hope of some that the lowering of tariff on imports will afford markets for increased American production, but the lowering should not be haphazard. It is little consolation to a small-business industry and its employees that is crippled or destroyed by foreign competition, that some big industry in some other section of the country is profiting.

I feel sure that this committee and the State Department have not fully appreciated the fact that the use of the authority to reduce tariff protection has been highly discriminatory and has been unwittingly applied to the detriment of small, independent, competitive business. Not only should there be no further cut of another 50 percent of existing rates, but a policy of protection of small business having been established, let there be a reappraisal of all rates to the end that reciprocity like charity shall begin at home, with fair play and fair trade first of all to our own small industries and their employees.

If shortness of time and expediency indicate temporary measures, may I suggest that renewal be for but 1 year; and with rates frozen right where they are against any further reduction that will harm any independent competitive small business. Then during this ensuing year let a survey be made and recommendations be brought in for a parity tariff that will not discriminate against American independent competitive small businesses and their employees.

The Mothers of America

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising is to pay a tribute to the American mothers during this war. They have given much and they have contributed much to the final victory in Europe. They will continue to make their outstanding contribution to the end that this war with Japan will soon be over, and the happiest day of a lifetime will be ours, and then our fighting forces will come home again.

In Decatur County, which is located in the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, there is reason for the people of that community to be proud of the contributions made to victory in this war. Every community is proud of their achievements in this emergency, and justly so. I wish especially to speak today of the fine record of this one county, in the district which I have the honor to represent, which has a population of some 18,000 people, and which county has furnished more than 1,800 men and women for our fighting forces for this war. There are some very outstanding contributions recorded in that county, and I wish to mention them here for the record.

One mother, Mrs. Alvie G. Pratt, has given six of her children for the service in this war. Four mothers, Mrs. Irvin Wells, Mrs. Emma Harmon, Mrs. Wallace DeMoss, and Mrs. Cort Barnes, each have five in the service. Fifteen mothers, Mrs. Grover Smith, Mrs. Hugh D. Wickens, Mrs. Hester M. Porter, Mrs. Fred Klene, Mrs. Olin Gommel, Mrs. Clyde E. Holtzlider, Mrs. Lillian McGinn, Mrs. George Gray, Mrs. Melvin Cox, Mrs. Mabel McCullough, Mrs. Adelade Welage, Mrs. Mamie Croddy, Mrs. Lena Nesbitt, Mrs. Anna Wynkoop, and Mrs. Bertha Schoeff each have four in the service.

Four of these are Gold Star Mothers. These mothers have contributed ensigns, seamen, lieutenant commanders, privates, and all grades of commissioned officers to and including major in the Army. The 20 mothers to whom I have referred have given 86 boys and girls to our Army and Navy, and they are serving in every branch of the service and on every battlefront throughout the world.

Decatur County, Ind., has an outstanding war record. That county, in addition to contributing more than 10 percent of her entire population for military or naval service, she has oversubscribed every war loan drive and every drive for funds for our armed forces; that was true in World War No. 1 just as it is true in World War No. 2. Fifty-one of the brave lads of that community have made the supreme sacrifice in this war.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach Mother's Day this year, I can visualize the happiness of every mother who has a son or daughter in the service to realize that the war is over in Europe; every mother who has made a contribution to our victory, including the 20 mothers herein mentioned, will offer their prayers to the Prince of Peace for the final victory and the unconditional surrender in Europe. That one phase of this cruel and terrible war is over. We have the unfinished task in the Pacific, and they will offer their prayers—as the people of this Nation will likewise pray—that the final victory may soon come, and that this war will be over; that the sons and daughters of our Nation may come home again safe from the ravages of war.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of these great contributions made throughout our Nation, on Mother's Day our prayers will be heard pleading for guidance into the paths of a lasting and a permanent peace when this war ends. Ours is a peace-loving nation. We want peace, not war; we want happiness, not confusion; we

want to engage in useful occupations, not in the destruction of war. This Mother's Day will truly be one of prayer—prayer for the early termination of this cruel war and for a lasting and a permanent peace thereafter—and I know that every prayer will ask the richest blessings to rest upon those who have given all to our country, and upon those who have suffered the disabilities of war, and, too, may the blessings of God ever rest upon every mother, everywhere.

The Importance of the Cheese Industry in the United States and in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the making of cheese is an art and a profession. When milk is converted into the various types of cheese, one of the great foods of all time have been produced. There are many types and kinds of cheeses. These types have been developed in the various countries such as the Italian in Italy, the Roquefort in France, the Cheddars in Britain, and the special cheeses of Holland and other countries.

Many of these cheeses have long been known as the poor man's meat. Many cows give 12,000 pounds of milk in a year. This milk can be converted into nearly 1,200 pounds of cheese. This 1,200 pounds of cheese may equal the weight of the cow. The cow, then, is a machine that is capable of producing her own weight in food each year for many years. Since this dairy cow will make four times as much human food from 100 pounds of feed as some farm animals and twice as much as any other farm animal, it is apparent why the dairy cow is of such importance in the production of food for war.

The total cheese production of all kinds in the United States has reached a total of approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds. It may not appear so important when we compare this source of animal protein with the twenty to twenty-five billion pounds of meat produced. However, cheese is practically all edible, while the meat poundage also includes the bone and waste.

There has been, and is now, and apparently going to be, an increasing demand for this great food. It is doubtful if any country can produce any type of cheese that excels the product made by the cheesemakers of America.

Table No. 1 shows the United States and Wisconsin production of various types of cheese. Table No. 2 shows the imports of the various types of cheese. Table No. 3 shows the import duties on Cheddar and Swiss types of cheese. Table No. 4 shows the average price of Swiss and Cheddar types of cheese:

Among the facts shown in these tables are:

TABLE I.—*Production of cheese by types, Wisconsin and United States, 1936–44*

Year	Wisconsin Cheddar cheese	United States Cheddar cheese	All Italian varieties		Münster		Brick cheese		Swiss	
			Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
1936	270,193,421	487,576,000	5,906	11,361	7,455	7,645	28,008	30,436	27,993	40,078
1937	243,002,647	492,041,000	5,811	13,520	7,014	7,450	25,441	28,193	27,676	41,504
1938	281,645,547	560,542,000	7,238	16,461	8,065	8,928	23,365	26,067	29,377	43,084
1939	284,034,983	537,298,000	9,261	20,509	6,575	7,032	24,791	27,937	28,881	42,631
1940	314,867,164	602,790,000	12,450	25,002	7,752	8,362	23,073	25,966	32,304	48,659
1941	371,611,352	753,122,000	17,822	34,363	7,068	7,426	22,836	24,640	37,570	55,962
1942	417,413,554	916,850,000	17,139	33,259	8,608	9,210	16,989	19,588	33,379	51,240
1943	383,349,931	770,610,000	22,220	43,003	8,503	8,946	16,987	19,032	29,643	45,626
1944 [1]	367,004,000	799,780,000	18,556	39,925	10,575	11,150	14,324	16,001	28,795	44,897

Year	Limburger		Cream cheese		Blue cheese		All other types [2]	
	Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States	Wisconsin	United States
	Thousand pounds	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
1936	8,792	11,982	8,359	40,448	[3]	[3]	761	7,234
1937	5,350	8,165	9,278	43,987	[3]	[3]	763	9,171
1938	6,288	9,307	8,308	44,056	[3]	[3]	597	11,055
1939	6,152	8,971	9,850	47,961	[3]	[3]	885	11,941
1940	5,453	8,198	9,705	51,183	[3]	[3]	1,299	11,440
1941	5,292	8,088	9,710	49,449	[3]	[3]	4,515	18,409
1942	4,923	8,441	10,110	47,554	[3]	[3]	5,831	19,435
1943	3,866	6,653	18,458	[4] 70,451	6,458	8,036	6,575	21,788
1944 [1]	3,904	7,523	{7,559 {8,679	{[5] 39,240 {[6] 20,391	4,012	6,616	5,904	19,629

[1] Preliminary estimates.
[2] Does not include American Cheddar and cottage cheese.
[3] Included in "All other types."
[4] Cream and Neufchatel.
[5] Cream.
[6] Neufchatel.

First. The rapid increase in the domestic production of Italian cheese. You can compare the United States production of Italian cheese as shown in the above table I with the imports of the Italian types—Pecorino, Provoloni, Parmesan—as shown in table II.

Second. The Münster and brick types are produced largely in Wisconsin.

Third. About one-half the Limburger and about one-half of the Cheddar cheese of the Nation is produced in Wisconsin.

Fourth. That about two-thirds of the Swiss cheese of the Nation and about three-fourths of the Bleu cheese of the Nation is produced in Wisconsin.

Fifth. That the imports of all cheese in 1926 represented as much as 20 percent of the United States production of all cheeses.

Sixth. That the domestic production of Bleu cheese—American comparable to French Roquefort—has shown an increased production, and that the United States production of this cheese now equals about the same amount as the former imports of Roquefort plus the former imports of Bleu cheese.

Seventh. The Cheddar-cheese production of the Nation has shown a rapid increase. Wisconsin has shown an increase in the production of Cheddar as well. Much of this type of cheese has gone to lend-lease. The consumers of America should be able to absorb all this increase in production. The improvement in quality will increase the per capita domestic consumption of this great food.

You can readily note that the Cheddar-cheese production overshadows the amounts of all the other types of cheese produced in the United States. This is also evident in the Wisconsin production of cheeses as well.

Eighth. The Roquefort made from goat's milk, and the Bleu cheese made from cow's milk are similar. The American Bleu has received an evident appreciation by the consumers of America. The consumers may prefer the domestic Bleu, which is being manufactured in splendid sanitary plants, to the imported Roquefort.

You will note that the domestic production of American Bleu has already exceeded the pre-war imports of Roquefort and the imported Bleu combined. You will also note that Wisconsin produces about three-fourths of the American Bleu produced in the United States. The acceptance of this American Bleu by the consumers should indicate that a rapid expansion in its domestic production can be expected.

Ninth. In looking over these tables you will note that a few years ago nearly all the Italian type of cheese consumed in the United States was imported. You will note that the domestic production of this variety has increased from 11,000,000 pounds in 1936 to 43,000,000 pounds in 1943. In 1936 about twice as much Italian cheese was imported as was produced in the United States. The war has contributed to increased domestic production very materially. The domestic Italian cheese is made under favorable scientific and sanitary conditions and it is not difficult to visualize a further expansion in the domestic production of this type of cheese. Wisconsin produces one-half the Italian cheese of the Nation.

The table showing the imports is as follows:

TABLE II.—*Cheese: United States imports for consumption, by types, 1920–43* [1]

[In thousands of pounds]

Year	Emmenthaler or Swiss	Romano or Pecorino	Provolette or Provoloni	Reggiano or Parmesan	Cheddar cheese whether or not in original loaves but not including any cheese processed otherwise than by division into pieces	Roquefort in original loaves	Blue-mold cheese in original loaves	Edam and Gouda	Gruyère process cheese	Sbrinz in original loaves	Goya in original loaves	Other cheese	Total all cheese imported
1920	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	14,592
1921	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	25,917
1922	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	46,577
1923	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	61,113
1924	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	59,820
1925	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	62,632
1926	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(2)	75,883
1927	[3] 6,675	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	[3] 74,133	80,808
1928	18,584	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	61,369	79,953
1929	18,684	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	57,666	76,350
1930:													
Jan. 1 to June 17	8,355	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	33,313	41,668
June 18 to Dec. 31	9,309	5,002	3,857	673	(4)	874	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	7,575	27,290
Total	17,664	5,002	3,857	673		874						40,888	68,958
1931	15,675	16,570	8,508	2,708	(4)	3,145	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	14,201	60,807
1932	11,707	16,705	6,507	2,184	(4)	3,203	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	13,333	53,639
1933	10,728	13,414	6,465	1,616	(4)	2,298	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	14,975	49,496
1934	6,819	14,426	6,952	2,167	(4)	2,578	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	14,591	47,533
1935	6,259	15,817	6,319	2,679	(4)	1,999	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	15,859	48,932
1936	6,287	15,437	5,175	2,386	10,845	2,147	[5] 1,818	[6] 4,168	[7] 1,742	(8)	(8)	9,843	59,848
1937	10,332	15,394	5,575	1,763	4,719	2,401	3,660	5,483	2,815	(8)	(8)	8,530	60,672
1938	9,904	15,516	5,110	1,567	1,815	2,394	3,377	4,162	3,414	(8)	(8)	7,170	54,429
1939	10,559	16,056	3,292	2,436	6,352	2,974	3,265	2,815	3,583	(8)	(8)	7,740	59,072
1940	4,195	11,708	1,310	1,714	635	1,584	1,650	1,118	1,600	(8)	(8)	7,107	32,621
1941	479	6,876	107	865	332		1,695	712	626	[8] 669	[8] 33	7,615	20,011

[1] Includes products of Cuba (duty less 20 percent). Excludes negligible imports entered free under special provisions of the tariff act.
[2] Not separately classified prior to July 8, 1927.
[3] Not separately classified, formerly included in all other cheese prior to the 1930 Tariff Act.
[4] Classified as Cheddar cheese in original loaves in trade agreement with Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936, formerly included in all other cheese. Cheddar cheese, not processed, separately classified in 1939, included with cheese, not specifically provided for, prior to that date. Cheddar cheese, in original loaves and not processed, combined in 1940 and subsequent years.
[5] Not separately classified prior to trade agreement with France, effective June 15, 1936, formerly included in all other cheese.
[6] Not separately classified prior to trade agreement with Netherlands, effective Feb. 1, 1936, formerly included in all other cheese.
[7] Not separately classified prior to trade agreement with Switzerland, effective Feb. 15, 1936, formerly included in all other cheese.
[8] Not separately classified prior to trade agreement with Argentina, effective Nov. 15, 1941, formerly included in all other cheese.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

There have been at least four tariff setups in effect during the 20-year period.

The exports of cheese have been insignificant in amount since World War No. 1. Since 1930 it has been less than 2,000,000 pounds a year up until 1940 when it has been exported in large amounts for war purposes and under lease-lend.

The following table shows some of the duty changes on Swiss and Cheddar cheese:

TABLE No. III.—*Tariff duty on cheese*

1920: 20 percent ad valorem, all cheese.

1921 to 1926: 23 percent ad valorem, all cheese.

1927 to 1929: July 8, 1927, 7½ cents per pound, but not less than 37½ percent ad valorem, all cheese.

1930 to 1935: Tariff Act of 1930, 7 cents but not less than 35 percent ad valorem, all cheese.

1936 to 1941: Swiss cheese duty: Modified 1936, 7 cents per pound but not less than 20 percent ad valorem. November 2, 1936, Trade agreement with Finland, 5 cents per pound but not less than 20 percent ad valorem. Cheddar cheese duty: January 1, 1936, trade agreement with Canada, 5 cents per pound but not less than 25 percent ad valorem; 1937–41, superseded with trade agreement with Canada January 1939, 4 cents but not less than 25 percent ad valorem.

Duties provided in H. R. 2652 can be 2 cents per pound for Cheddar cheese and 2½ cents per pound for Swiss cheese.

The following table shows the average annual price of Cheddar and Swiss cheese:

TABLE IV

	Cheddar cheese, annual Plymouth price	Swiss cheese, annual Wisconsin price
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*
1920	26.2	31.0
1921	18.8	28.7
1922	19.7	21.9
1923	22.5	30.0
1924	18.8	23.1
1925	21.8	25.8
1926	20.2	26.3
1927	22.7	28.0
1928	22.1	28.7
1929	20.1	28.9
1930	16.4	25.7
1931	[1] 12.5	21.2
1932	10.0	16.0
1933	10.2	17.5
1934	11.7	16.6
1935	14.3	19.6
1936	15.3	20.5
1937	15.9	20.3
1938	12.6	17.5
1939	12.8	17.7
1940	14.3	20.2

[1] P. 496, Agricultural Statistics, 1942.

You may note that Cheddar cheese averaged more than 20 cents per pound from 1920 to 1930 and only 13 cents per pound from 1930 to 1940. You will note that Swiss cheese averaged 27.2 cents per pound from 1920 to 1930 and only 19.6 cents per pound from 1930 to 1940.

The cheese industry of America is all set for the production of a higher and a higher quality of cheese. The agricultural colleges and the experiment stations and the industry itself are continuously improving methods to provide a still better finished product. The apparent demand for domestic blue cheese should result in a rapid expansion in the production of this type of cheese. Certain situations have developed during the war to this industry, but these situations will be erased once the war is over. The American people can look forward to the day they can secure even greater amounts of this great food with its blended animal fat and animal protein. The producer most assuredly can look forward to a further expansion of the industry if additional obstacles are not imposed on the industry.

We have been on an import basis as far as dairy products are concerned for many years. We have not produced sufficient amounts for our domestic consumption.

Two questions then are to be answered if H. R. 2652, the bill to cut duties by an additional 50 percent, is passed, as proposed by the present administration.

One is, if as in 1939, when Cheddar cheese was 2 cents per pound, and there was a duty of 4 cents per pound, over 6,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese was imported, how many millions of pounds of Cheddar cheese will be imported if the duty is reduced to 2 cents per pound and there is a floor price of 20 cents per pound for 2 years after the war?

The second question is, If, as in 1939, over 10,000,000 pounds of Swiss cheese

were imported and 42,000,000 pounds was the United States production—when the duty was 5 cents per pound and the price was 17 cents per pound, how many million pounds of Swiss cheese will be imported if the duty is reduced to 2½ cents per pound and there is a guaranteed floor price of 22 cents or 23 cents per pound?

Cheese of many varieties have had many problems to face as a result of a nonequitable reduction in the duty on the product in the past.

Protect American Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Congress to a significant line which appeared in a news release by Mr. Elmer Davis, of O. W. I., which announced the ban on American newspapers, magazines, and books from Germany. This news release, issued yesterday, contained the words "the ban will apply to foreign businesses in Germany."

Does that mean that great American plants established in Germany, such as the American Cyanimide Co., General Motors, International Harvester Co., and others will be prohibited from resuming operation?

What will become of such plants? What is to become of the American money that has been invested in those plants? What of the return to the United States Treasury on the earnings on those investments?

Who is Elmer Davis who, with one short stroke of the pen, blandly wipes out the investments of the American people? Where is his authority? What does he know about foreign investments? What pay roll has he ever met?

Administration spokesmen talk about reducing individual taxes but in thus wiping out this American capital and the return therefrom they are, in effect, increasing individual taxes.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis' announcement has all the earmarks of being the usual clever New Deal method of highlighting the ban on free press in Germany while concealing a move that will cost the American people hundreds of millions of dollars. This thing can be so far-reaching that it threatens the future of the white-collar class and its entire investment in annuities and life savings policies, because all insurance companies have investments in foreign countries.

This Congress owes a duty to the people of the United States to learn the full reason for Mr. Davis' action. The people are entitled to know every detail of the plan afoot. An immediate investigation is called for.

Bad Judgment in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard considerable about mice and men and about "fraidy cat" Congressmen.

Developments of the day really showed who were the "fraidy cats," since the bill was passed without the inconvenience of a roll call.

The following editorial from one of Washington's leading newspapers, the Washington Daily News, is in today's issue:

BAD JUDGMENT IN THE HOUSE

Because we so much want to see Congress deserve public respect, we regret that the House of Representatives yesterday voted a $2,500-a-year tax-free salary increase for each of its Members, in the guise of an expense allowance.

Our objection is not to better pay for Congressmen. Most of them need, and many of them deserve, more money. We think there would be almost no criticism of a salary increase adopted without subterfuge at a proper time under proper circumstances. At a time, we mean, when the Government is not holding down the wages of ordinary citizens and when public attention is not absorbed in world-shaking events. And by an honest record vote, so that constituents can know how each Congressman voted. And in conjunction with a genuine plan to bring the machinery of Congress up to date and make it more efficient.

Unless the Senate shows better judgment, this badly timed, sneakingly voted pay grab will become law—then Congressman will start crying because citizens say what they think.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Truman gives this bill the proper attention and veto it is entitled to. Will he? If he does not put the silencer on this $2,500, he might as well forget all about the Little Steel formula and he might just as well scrap the O. P. A.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, before the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, May 2, 1945:

The wool textile industry is opposed to H. R. 2652 and opposed to the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements amendment in any form.

This committee has listened to me a number of times on this subject, and I shall not impose upon you to the extent of presenting any compilation of previously expressed views.

I wish, however, to draw your attention to certain aspects of this program which can be seen in clearer perspective today than in 1934 when the program was first presented.

The advantages which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are alleged to possess have always been many, and as conditions change, it appears that the sponsors of the legislation have found new virtues in the program.

In 1934 the Trade Agreements Act was heralded as "assisting in the * * * emergency in restoring the American standard of living."

In 1937 the theme was "world peace through world trade."

In 1940 the two themes were combined in the phrase "economic progress, sustained prosperity, and enduring peace for our Nation and for the world."

In 1943 the program was represented as a means whereby we could better assist in postwar, world-wide economic reconstruction, and the amendment became an instrument of "economic nonaggression" which would "be regarded throughout the world as an acid test of our future intentions" in the economic sphere.

Now, in 1945, our "economic nonaggression" seems to have given way to a new idea of promoting an export trade of ten billions or more annually, which most certainly is economic aggression on a colossal scale.

If our present objective is ten billions of exports—some even talk in terms of sixteen billion—we had better drop all talk of economic peace. Any such quantity of exports will bring us head-on into conflict with Great Britain and with other nations whose markets we must invade if we are to attain that volume. If we insist on exporting a volume even approaching that figure in terms of present-day dollars, we will invite a trade coalition against this country. Mr. Clayton in testifying for this bill spoke of the necessity of preventing "a resurgence of economic warfare." A minute later he praised the reciprocal trade-agreements program as a means of disposing of our surplus products overseas. There is no better way of promoting economic warfare than trying to dump our surpluses abroad and launching a campaign for a huge export trade in competition with other producing countries. Mr. Clayton seems a little uncertain as to whether this program is a grandiose philanthropic endeavor to assist other countries in achieving economic security of their own, or a project backed by the might of all of our so-called exporting industries to grab the lion's share of international trade.

I believe Mr. Clayton is wrong on both counts. The present concept of foreign trade as a means of getting rid of our surplus products is not a help in promoting peace but a step toward economic warfare. And if the program should result in a vast expansion of exports, we will sooner or later discover that we will not be paid for them for the simple reason that we do not require imports in a volume comparable with the volume of exports which the backers of this bill advocate.

The State Department is seeking to acquire and retain power which rightfully belongs to the Congress, for the express purpose of using that power in a manner of which the Congress itself would not approve. The obvious purpose of the State Department is to emasculate our tariff and completely revise it without regard to the original

purpose for which import duties were imposed nor to the effects of their abandonment.

I can see no present excuse for giving to the State Department the authority it seeks and many reasons why it is dangerous in the extreme to do so. When the proposal was first put forward in 1934, we were in the midst of a serious depression and in the mood to try anything. I think it was a mistake, but the amendment was passed. Since that time, all sorts of arguments, to which I have already referred, have been put forward by the State Department in an endeavor to retain their right to bargain away our established tariffs. In 1943 when the amendment was last extended, it was done so more or less as a personal tribute to Mr. Hull. The Congress realized that no substantial use of the State Department's powers was possible during the war and perhaps felt that at that stage any change in our set-up might be misinterpreted abroad.

The world faces very serious economic readjustments. No one knows what lies ahead, but it is likely that we will find it necessary to make substantial changes in our tariff structure. Certain fundamental decisions should first be made—decisions which should not be left to any administrative agency of the Government.

There is absolutely no warrant for leaving a matter of such prime importance to the State Department and allowing it to set tariff rates by a series of "bargains" with foreign countries. The matter of this bargaining should be considered objectively. Our tariffs are not for revenue, but rather for the purpose of channeling imports—to discourage the importation of certain items, and to facilitate the import of others. In the light of that fact, let us consider the mechanics of a bargain with Great Britain. Great Britain is asked to make a reduction in the tariff rate on something she does not want to import in return for a reduction here on an item which we have decided we want to produce ourselves rather than buy abroad. Does anyone who knows the business acumen displayed by Great Britain actually believe that any reduction in the rates which she makes will be a "valuable concession" to us? Does anyone who has followed the "buy British" campaign believe that the British actually will scrap that policy and rely on "bargains" from our State Department? And why—and for what end—should we insist on selling Great Britain products which she has decided she prefers to make herself. Or why should the British insist we should buy from England products which we can perfectly well make for ourselves. Certainly that is not the road to economic peace.

We should not bargain away our tariff and set rates by making international deals behind closed doors. Our tariffs were designed for certain purposes; they should not be abandoned unless we have first determined that the purpose for which they were established is no longer valid. For example, we should first decide whether or not we want a wool-textile industry in the United States. If we do not, we can forget the tariff on wool products altogether. If we do want the industry, however, the tariff rate should not be left to chance trading. We cannot reduce the rates by bargaining or otherwise and expect them to achieve their original purpose. It is not strictly correct to say that our rates have been left to chance trading. It would be more accurate to say that they have been made responsive to the desires of foreign negotiators. In the treaty with Great Britain, which reduced many of the rates in the wool schedule, the greatest reduction was made in the item where protection was needed most. This was not because that made sense, but because the British negotiators demanded it. There was no attempt whatever to be consistent, despite the fact that the State Department has claimed that this was the best way to establish a scientific tariff. The State Department has never suggested any increases in rates, which, it would seem, would have been necessary in at least a few instances if the object actually had been to establish a scientific and well-balanced tariff structure. It is abundantly evident that the State Department is interested only in completely emasculating the tariff and in doing so as rapidly as possible. This is too fundamental a matter to be left to an administrative agency.

State Department officials are completely inconsistent in their statements concerning the mechanics of this program. They claim that great care has been and will be used not to injure any American industry. They also point out that our industries are so efficiently organized that we need not fear foreign competition even if we have a lessened degree of tariff protection. If either of these statements mean anything, they mean that tariff reductions already made or in prospect will not substantially increase imports. But the State Department's avowed purpose is to increase imports so as to provide foreign countries with American dollars. Either they are confused or I am. They say that their object is to increase imports, but insist that they won't cut the rates enough so that this will actually happen, and add that we are so efficient that we can easily undersell the foreign competitors, anyway. Based on this extraordinarily illogical presentation, the State Department asks the Congress to delegate to it the authority to completely alter our tariff structure.

The request for authority to cut rates 50 percent below those prevailing on January 1, 1945, is a true index of the State Department's intentions. For a rate which has already been cut 50 percent from the 1930 established figure, this means a reduction of 75 percent. To justify any such action, one would have to show that the rates in the Hawley-Smoot tariff were four times as high as they should have been. To grant this request for additional cuts means complete abandonment of the policy of protecting American producers against low-paid foreign labor when such protection is needed.

The United States of America is not in the position of having to bargain for the privilege of carrying on international trade. Our productive capacity is extensive enough and diversified enough to permit us to direct it into channels of our own choosing; the matter should not hinge upon the results of a so-called trade agreement with Iran, Italy, Latvia, or some other nation. Our productive plant must undergo a very considerable reorganization after the war. That reorganization should be based upon a study of our own needs and a realistic appraisal of what products we should try to produce for other countries. We must decide what industries we want to keep in this country and determine the products which we plan to secure from other countries. Those are the key decisions. Those are the decisions which determine which industries should have tariff protection and how much. The matter should not hinge upon the willingness or unwillingness of Great Britain to cut her tariff on our automobiles or the promise of Italy to increase her import quota for American radios.

The necessary revision of tariff rates calls for most careful and detailed study. In the postwar period some rates already reduced by trade agreements will be found to be much too low; others may perhaps be higher than necessary. We should wait until the shape of the postwar world is more clearly discernible and then revise the tariff and do it properly. The spade work should be done by an enlarged tariff commission, working with industrial groups in gathering information and data to be submitted, with a carefully formulated plan, to the Congress. Most differences of opinion should be resolved before the recommendations reach the Congress. It should be the responsibility of Congress to determine whether or not the resulting recommendations are in the public interest and calculated to effectuate certain basic decisions on economic policy previously arrived at.

Meanwhile, we should not tinker further with our tariff. This idea of outsmarting ourselves by cutting existing tariff rates should be laid on the shelf for all time. Many industries such as our own—the wool-textile industry—are greatly disturbed over the cuts already made. Certain items in the wool schedule were cut on January 1, 1939, by a treaty with Great Britain. The war has prevented any real evaluation of the effect of those reductions. We are doubtful of our ability to meet British competition after the war under these rates. We are, however, content to wait and see what happens when peace returns. If it then develops that the rates are inadequate, we want to ask for changes presumably justified by a decision that we desire to continue to make woolens in the United States, and the decision as to what constitutes an adequate rate should be based upon a study of relative costs and not left to international horse trading.

In 1909 the ad valorem rate was set at 55 percent by the Payne-Aldrich Act.

In 1913 the Underwood-Simons Act cut the rate to 35 percent. The cut in the value of the pound sterling, especially in 1920 and 1921, had the effect of reducing the degree of protection considerably below that intended at the time the Underwood-Simons Act was drafted.

In 1922 the rate was increased to 50 percent, pursuant to the Fordney-McCumber Act. Exchange rates did not fluctuate greatly during the time this act was in force.

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in 1930 set the rate at 60 percent. However, the action of Great Britain in abandoning the gold standard in September 1931 and the accompanying drop in sterling to approximately $3.50 made the actual assessment of duty in 1931 and 1932 lower than it was before the Hawley-Smoot Act was passed. On January 3, 1934, the United States devalued the dollar. This had the effect of increasing the duty. As the chart shows, the devaluation of the dollar in 1934 increased the amount of duty assessments to a greater extent than did the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff in 1930.

The trade agreement with Great Britain became effective on January 1, 1939, cutting the stated ad valorem rates to 35 percent. By reason of the ratio of the pound sterling to the dollar, the effective rate has averaged considerably lower, being below 30 percent during most of the time the agreement with Great Britain has been in effect.

Of primary importance is the fact that these ad valorem rates are percentages not of the value in this country but of the value in the country of origin. The English value is not over one-half the value in this country. Thus, the 35 percent in the agreement with Great Britain amounts to approximately 17½ percent of the American value. Adjusted to the present official exchange rate of $4.03½, this figures less than 15 percent of the American value.

And now because "much of our original authority under the act has been used up" and "we do not have enough to offer these (foreign) countries to serve as a basis for the further concessions we want from them" we have this demand for authority to cut this rate in two.

Can anyone seriously maintain that the wool textile industry in the United States can continue to pay an average hourly wage of 85 cents an hour and compete against English mills paying the equivalent of 30 cents an hour, if we are protected by a tariff amounting to 7 percent of the American value?

Ours is by no means an isolated case. The State Department has made many reductions in rates which might have had the most serious consequences if the World War

had not intervened to prevent foreign countries from underselling us in our own market. The tariff was designed for a specific purpose. The State Department does not agree with that purpose. This is too vital a matter to be delegated to any executive agency of the Government. This bill should be defeated. If the economic theory under which we have achieved the highest prosperity of any nation in the world is no longer sound, the Congress should consider the matter and devise whatever substitute seems most promising. If the theory is sound, we should stick to it. In no event should Congress delegate power to jeopardize our economic status to an agency which has in effect said that it wants authority to do that which it knows Congress would not itself approve if the opinion of Congress on individual agreements under this act were sought. The bill should not be passed. Congress should not abdicate its function in the critical postwar period.

Editor of Eagle Magazine Pays Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I am reprinting a tribute from the Eagle magazine, published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, to the late President Roosevelt, written by Editor Robert W. Hansen. The President was a long-time member of that fraternal organization, and during his political career sponsored many humanitarian social measures supported by its membership. The editorial follows:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT: A VALIANT EAGLE

(By Robert W. Hansen)

As Americans, with the Nation and the world, we mourn the passing of President Roosevelt. As Eagles, we mourn the passing of our most illustrious member, the man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, powerful champion of the rights of the common man, the poor, the sick, the oppressed; the little people to whom the fraternity has dedicated its services over nearly half a century. In him, the little people found a human, understanding friend, a valiant champion—valiant despite physical handicaps that would have beaten a man less great in heart and spirit. In him the Eagles found a true, warmhearted friend and fellow member whose loyalty and leadership were tested in the crucible of our greatest crusade—the fight for Nationwide social security for the common man.

As Americans, with the Nation and the world, we pay homage to his indomitable spirit and his great leadership. As Eagles, we shall treasure forever the memory of the man who was one with us in common brotherhood. As it is true that no other public figure of the last quarter-century was so closely linked with the history of our fraternity, so is it true that his death ends one of the proudest chapters in the annals of Eagledom.

The chapter opened in 1930, when he was Governor of the State of New York. That year, on July 22, he became a member of Buffalo Aerie, No. 46, where the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was more than a symbol and a name on the roster. After the initiatory ceremonies, he said:

"I am very happy to be privileged to join such a wonderful organization—an order truly American in principle, one that is doing and intends to do the best possible thing for the many who need aid." Later that evening, upon receiving a solid gold life-membership card, he added: "I sincerely thank the members of Buffalo aerie for this life membership. I shall always prize it, and carry it as something worthy of respect by all men."

Prophetic words, these—and but the first of the many tributes that he was to bestow, as the years passed, upon the order for which he so often demonstrated his affection and admiration. Thus, too, was forged the bond that was, until his death, to unite this man of world vision with the fraternity whose principles so staunchly echoed his own ideals.

He was a fighter. Had he not fought—and conquered—a dread foe, infantile paralysis? Yes, he was a fighter. Maybe that is one reason why he loved the Eagles, the "fighting fraternity." The weeks, the months, the years ahead were to prove the strength of his fighting spirit.

As New York's Governor, he led the vigorous campaign for the security of the needy aged in his State. It was not smooth sailing—the proposal was meeting with powerful opposition. But he won that fight, just as he was later to win the fight on a broader front. On April 10, 1930, he signed the bill making mandatory the payment of old-age pensions in New York. As he affixed his signature, generously he declared:

"Most of the credit for showing the needs of old-age pensions is due, and will be given to the F. O. E. They started this Nation-wide movement and it is because of their continued efforts that the idea has been brought to the attention of the people in the various States."

Thus had Roosevelt kept the faith with our order * * * a faith that sprang from the early declaration made to his brother Eagles: "I hope in my humble way I may be of help to the members of this aerie and this fraternity in bringing about the enactment of this and similar humanitarian measures that may be advanced by this order." He was as good as his word. At many gatherings, his voice was heard in advocacy of old-age pensions * * * security for the dependent aged. And at the Governor's conference in Salt Lake City that year, he devoted his powerful address to unemployment and old-age pensions.

The page turns. The chapter continues. Franklin D. Roosevelt has become President of the United States. A national Social Security Act is the next goal.

The Social Security Act is regarded by many contemporaries as the outstanding piece of legislation bearing President Roosevelt's signature. Certainly, it represented the realization of an ideal he long cherished and for which our order long had labored. But first must come the molding of public opinion toward the need and the justice of security for the aged, the sick, the young, and helpless. He raised his voice in molding that opinion. Vigorously, with determination, he championed the cause of the needy aged. As all Eagles know, he was not alone. He won his fight. The national social-security bill was passed.

When he signed that history-making document on August 14, 1935, again, with characteristic thoughtfulness and generosity toward others, he expressed his appreciation for what the Eagles had done. In giving to our order a pen with which he signed the measure, he wrote:

"I have long observed with satisfaction the sponsorship by the F. O. E. of social-justice legislation, both in the States and in the Nation. The records for more than a quarter of a century bear witness to the campaigns of education conducted, the literature distributed, and the addresses delivered by your socially minded order. These efforts have borne, and are bearing, gratifying results. Our countrymen owe the Eagles much good will for their unselfish services.

"The pen I am presenting the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your 600,000 [now 940,000] members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people."

Proud words, these—words to be engraved on the brightest page of our fraternity's archives. Eagles took hope, too, from other words spoken by the President on that historic occasion. The security of many of America's little people was assured. But ahead lay another battle front, for the dark days of the depression were upon us. And so, while expressing his satisfaction over the victory gained, he again sounded the new battle cry, which found echo in every Eagle heart:

"Today," the President said, "a hope of many years' standing is in large part fulfilled. The civilization of the last hundred years, with its startling industrial changes, has tended more and more to make life insecure. Young people have come to wonder what would be their lot when they came to old age. The man with a job has wondered how long the job would last.

"This social-security measure gives at least some protection to 30,000,000 of our people and has provided an economic structure of vastly greater soundness."

As Americans, we had felt the pinch of the depression. As Eagles, we had determined to do something about it, with the help of a national leader completely in accord with the Eagle thought and plans.

More than a year before, in his message to Congress on June 8, 1934, the President had outlined his program for economic and social reforms to insure a living wage and security for the workingman. These were his three objectives: Security of the home; security of jobs; security in old age. In November of that year the President called upon two Eagles to serve on an advisory council to aid in planning social legislation to be presented to Congress. The F. O. E. was the only fraternal group so honored.

Two years later, the common cause the late President made with the F. O. E. during the critical depression days was expressed in his message to the 1936 Grand Aerie convention. "I feel that our order has special cause for jubilation this year," the President stated. "With the return of better days we can feel a sense of satisfaction in the knowledge that during the dark days of the depression, we as a fraternity did our part. We did not lessen but rather increased our humanitarian and philanthropic work, ever mindful of our obligations to our less fortunate neighbors."

There were other evidences, too, of President Roosevelt's close kinship with the order. His own humanitarian causes and principles were part of the Eagles' creed, and he was quick to associate us with him in advancing his objectives. He followed Eagle events, too, with great interest, despite the demands of his high office. Never too busy to take note of our programs, he was with us in our fraternal gatherings through his warm, friendly messages. Typical of his annual greetings to fellow Eagles is the message to the Dayton convention, in session during the signing of the Social Security Act:

"I feel particularly interested in this meeting of the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles because the members of the order have so fully demonstrated their sympathy with social legislation of the type to which so much sincere attention is being given in Washington.

"I recall with pleasure, for example, the helpful spirit shown by your members in New York when we placed the State old-age

pension law on the statute books. I am proud to be a member of an order whose interest and activities are being directed along such worthy lines.

"I trust and believe that the Dayton convention will serve to increase your enthusiasm for well-ordered social improvement, and I am sure the delegates will return to their respective aeries with added enthusiasm for the humanitarian efforts to which the order has devoted so much attention.

"With sincere good wishes for your continued success, and as a brother member of the order, I greet you."

Now that chapter in Eagle history has been closed by death. As we have relived the past in which Franklin D. Roosevelt so truly proved his brotherhood with us, we wonder what other bright pages might have been written had he lived to press onward. But this we know; no man in the history of our Nation did more to make life a little more secure for the ordinary folks of our land, a little easier for the weak and the helpless. Eagles were proud to serve in this crusade under a strong national leader, a humanitarian whom we revere as brother.

As the poet said of those of our Nation's honored dead who sleep at Arlington, to him reverently we say, as one who has fallen in the fight:

"Sleep well, soldier. You are not forgotten."

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Louis J. Kehoe, of Washington, Iowa. Mr. Kehoe has written many articles on outstanding national and international issues during recent years and his discussions have always been worthy of thoughtful reading by everyone interested in our national and international situation. It is a pleasure to make his article available to the Members of Congress. It follows:

The quest of peace might well be described as the paramount concern of mankind at this time. All nations, almost without exception, and all people except only a few scattered madmen, are honestly yearning for respite from the turmoil and tragedy of war. Civilized mankind with all the gains of generations of effort and struggle has been shaken by this war to its very foundations.

It is not to be wondered at then, that as the prospect for cessation of hostilities in the near future appears quite certain, leaders of the world have shown increased activity in laying the groundwork for a peace that all of us hope will endure.

Worthy as this activity is, and conceding for the most part the good faith of all the nations and people concerned, yet in a matter of this long range importance, much caution must be exercised, particularly on the part of America or we may find curselves, while making an all-out effort for perpetual peace, losing many of our most cherished rights and privileges as a free people and a nation blessed by the Almighty with more than average natural treasure and a heritage entrusted to us by the valiant and costly efforts of our forefathers.

Even in our quest for peace, we must not betray that trust and must not barter away any of that sacred heritage for the generations of our American children, in exchange for some visionary guaranty of peace.

World peace is important and we must do our full share to make its realization possible in the future, yet it is not so important that we will pay any price. There are other things equally or more important to us Americans, to our brave men and women in service and to our children of the future. Yes, there is a price that is too great to pay for the peace of the world, even if that could be guaranteed and it cannot. Not while there still remains in human nature the spirit of greed that is common to all mankind, and there does not seem to be any immediate prospect that this human trait is going to be eliminated. If anything, it is getting worse as time goes on. Experience of past generations has demonstrated that this element of greed in human nature has been harnessed and controlled more by the moral teaching and practices of the Christian religion over the world than by any other agency. It is also quite apparent to anyone taking the trouble to look about him, that greed is on the increase in human behavior, whenever any political organization is substituted for such influence or set up and undertakes to regulate and control human behavior.

Granting that world peace is a most admirable goal, yet we cannot focus our eyes on that to the exclusion of many other very worth-while considerations. We must not become so preoccupied in our quest for perpetual world peace that we will stumble into some of the many pitfalls that lie between us and that utopia. What are some of these pitfalls that exist and must be shunned and avoided by America if we are to go forward as a great nation and continue as a free people blessed with most of the good things of this world?

1. There is little, if anything, possessed by other nations of the world that is generally coveted or sought after by the people of America. The nations of the world need have little fear of American aggression. America has much that is coveted and sought after by most other nations of the world. Lack of vigilance could cause us to lost great and priceless advantages we have.

2. Intruding ourselves and our ideas into the intimate affairs of other nations invites like activity by other nations in our intimate and entirely national affairs.

3. Too intimate a relationship between nations, just as between individuals, breeds contempt and leads to trouble. An example of that is Europe. It may be effectively argued that Europe's interminable troubles are due to a great extent to the close association of these nations with one another because of their geographical locations. Nations of Europe, because of this intimacy, easily get entangled in each other's affairs and trouble develops. It is not only possible but very probable that strong international influence and activity adds to rather than eliminates the causes of war. Instead of more international interference aiding in the prospect of peace, less intrusion of nations in each other's affairs is a much better prospect.

4. Our leaders and delegates to these international conferences had best keep in mind that we in America, for the most part, except a few adventurous political busybodies, are pretty well satisfied with our type of government and way of life here and do not welcome the prospect of it being interfered with by any nation or combination of nations having different notions.

We must never lose sight of the fact that our men are not fighting all over the world so that they and their loved ones can share in the Russian way of life or even the British way of life, even though we may admire them as a people and applaud their record in this war. Neither are they interested in exchanging our way of life for that of any other European or Asiatic people. They are fighting to perpetuate and preserve the American way of life they know and love. Our leaders and delegates to these various international meetings will do well to remember this at all times. Our fighting men and our people generally, will never sanction the sacrifice of or the bartering away of any of these American rights, or sacrificing any of our sovereignty as a Nation in return for some phony international guarantee of security or peace. Neither do our people or fighting men expect any other nation to surrender any of their sovereignty. Such ideas are impractical and fantastic and thrive only in the minds of zealots and international extremists. We must hold ourselves ready and willing to cooperate with other nations to curb aggressors and encourage peace, but this must be done as a dignified and entirely independent Nation acting with other nations of like kind. We must remain free of all international restraint beyond this cooperation. We cannot tolerate having other nations with other designs of government with the strange ideologies of other people of the world, superimposed on our American way, by the action of some supergovernment of the world, created to suit the fantastic whims of international adventurers either here or abroad.

The best way for an individual to retain the respect of his neighbors, is to be cooperative on matters that jointly concern them, deal fairly with them and then attend to his own business and not intrude in the private affairs of his neighbors. This, and keeping himself in such a position that he can resist any imposition on him or interference with his rights and dignity, is the best guarantee of future good relations in his neighborhood. This is just as true in the family of nations. This formula is best for the future tranquillity of the world.

Preliminary to American participation in any proposed international organization to be set up along the lines contemplated at the so-called Dumbarton Oaks meeting, and designed to regulate the behavior of the nations of the world following the conclusion of the war, serious consideration should be given to the realities involved in such an arrangement.

Our representatives should recognize the obvious truth, that any agreement completed between the nations establishing such an international set-up is nothing more than a multilateral treaty between the nations involved covering their future behavior in relation to matters affecting the interest of the member nations, and the sanctity or effect of such a treaty or charter is limited to the moral responsibility of the nations involved and their continued sympathetic adherence to its principles and aspirations. World experience in the not too distant past is not calculated to impress us as to the enduring nature of international agreements. Experience has shown these international agreements having but transitory effectiveness, and they are broken or renounced with abandon in many instances whenever they interfere with expediencies affecting interested nations.

Because of the past demonstrated instability of such commitments, it is well for us to go slow before determining to make extended sacrifices of our American rights or sovereignty for the benefit of any world organization or to further its uncertain hopes in any international venture.

To that end the writer submits the following suggestions as to the scope and purpose of any international organization, as well as the extent we are willing to share in or to provide the force necessary to insure the effectiveness of its precepts and principles.

A condition precedent to our having any part of such an organization is unquestioned recognition of the following basic rights of people anywhere and everywhere in the world:

1. The right of self-determination by the affected people of any nation to choose for themselves any type or form of government they see fit, and to adopt, without any outside interference, such laws as they consider best for themselves and provide for themselves such guaranties for individual personal rights as they consider proper. The sole limitations on this right of any nation or people, to be that they in the exercise of that right do not interfere or prevent the exercise of similar rights to all other nations and peoples.

2. National pride and veneration by the people for their history and traditions and faithfulness and loyalty to same, are conceded to all nations and all people, and even recommended as a stimulant to progress and civilized advancement. This to be denied or restricted only to nations such as Germany and Japan, during the period these countries require to eradicate the aggressive military policy that has predominated in these countries in the past, and this restriction shall continue only so long as it takes these countries to uproot the forces of military aggression that has characterized their conduct as a nation in the past, and when Germany or Japan shall be able to convincingly show the membership of such international organization that they no longer harbor ambitions to dominate the world or other peoples, and are content to follow with other nations a policy of peaceful relationship with all nations of the world, then they to be admitted on equal terms with other nations in this international organization and conceded the same rights for self-determination and management of its internal affairs as all other nations.

3. The scope and purpose of this international organization to be strictly limited to a program to curb and restrain aggressive activity of any nation or nations against any other nation or nations, and to the use of such force as shall be required to effect that result. For the purposes of this organization aggression shall be held to include military activity and also the intrusion of nationals of one country into the affairs of other nations, and particularly aiding, abetting, or having any part directly or indirectly in any political organization or any activity designed to, by the action of such group, change, alter, or modify, or influence any such activity toward the existing form of government or order in that nation.

4. The force necessary to curb aggressor countries and implement the provisions of such international organization to be provided by the member nations in accordance with treaty commitments covering that subject. Such commitment to specify the volume of military and naval forces to be provided by each nation, same to be made available only on the order of the government furnishing such forces; such forces to remain under the command of its own leaders, and its use and activity limited to restraining nations attempting aggressive action against other nations.

5. Additional incentives for the compliance with regulations prohibiting aggression may be provided by trade sanctions or boycotts to discourage violations of this restriction against national aggressiveness.

6. The territorial integrity of all member nations shall be respected and protected from all activity of aggressor nations. Any future territorial acquisitions to any nation shall be the result of purchase and not of conquest.

7. Each nation to be conceded the absolute right to choose for itself economic standards it desires, and maintain same and support same by such laws and regulation as its people may consider proper and best calculated to better their interests. This reservation of right to include the privilege of imposing any export or import regulation or duty as such nation may consider proper or expedient.

8. The international organization to have no power to abridge the right of any member nation to enter into any trade program or practice it desires with any other nation or nations under any treaty that might be arranged by interested nations.

9. The sphere of action of such international organization should be divided into two classes: (a) Its authority to forcefully prevent aggression and intrusion into the domestic affairs by one nation against another. (b) Further activity of the organization to be limited to making recommendations on subjects its membership may consider to be of constructive value in contributing to the cause of world peace, and the good of people of the nation receiving such advice or recommendation. Each nation having conceded to it the right to accept or reject such advice or recommendation as it shall choose, and in so doing not to subject that nation or its people to any penalty whatsoever.

10. Each nation to be conceded the right to retain and maintain such military, naval, and air establishment as such nation may consider proper or advisable without interference by such international organization except the limitation as to its aggressive use.

Every fair-minded person will hope for the success of the San Francisco meeting, and all right-thinking people share in the hope of future peace. However, America must take every precaution to preserve the future of our national welfare.

Of late it has been a common practice by some of the over-the-deep-end-internationalists to recklessly label any person, who had the temerity to even question the wisdom of some plans involving the almost complete integration of this Government into some international super government, as isolationists. America has never been an isolationist Nation. As evidence of that fact, if American leadership and American proposals had been recognized and supported, Japan's venture into Manchuria would never have succeeded. If America's attitude had received sympathetic response from many of the nations who now profess such interest in the world peace and fair treatment of all people, the Italian venture into Ethiopia would have been prevented at that time. It is apparent, then, to anyone who makes any effort to face the facts, that these attempts to label America as an isolationist Nation in the past or to attribute the most of the world's present ills to that isolationism, has no real basis and is nothing more than a mischievous effort to saddle America with responsibility that does not rightfully belong to this Nation and to encourage America participating in some visionary world scheme that will not be conducive to the future good of the American people.

Such practice has served to deter many right-thinking people from giving adequate examination or criticism to some of the more extreme of these international proposals. It is to be hoped that fear of such reckless labeling of this country as isolationist, or such well-meaning people as isolationists, will not deter our delegates and later our Congress from taking all possible precautions to prevent our being inveigled into some plan of international government that will endanger our sovereignty as a Nation, our way of life as a people, and increase rather than diminish the prospect of future wars and future domestic dissensions.

While the purpose of these proposed international involvements may be lofty beyond question, yet it is a radical innovation and experiment. Perhaps a worthy experiment, but none the less an experiment and a very dangerous experiment.

Sacrifice, the Essence of a Mother's Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article, "The Good Mother," by the Rev. Godfrey Kaspar, S. J., which appeared in the St. Aloysius (Wash.) Bulletin of May 1945.

Father Kaspar is an old friend of mine who is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination to the holy priesthood next month. In my opinion, he personifies the great spirit of the Jesuit Order of which he is a member and I shall always cherish our friendship.

In the following article, Father Kaspar sets forth the criteria of the good mother. As he says, "a good mother is the greatest need in the world today." Because on Sunday, May 13, we honor the mothers of the world, who have loved, suffered, and sacrificed so much, I feel that his words are particularly fitting:

THE GOOD MOTHER

Mother! 'Tis the sweetest word in the language. 'Tis the first that springs from the heart and the first uttered by the tiny babe. It possesses charm that never grows old. Man may forget everything this world holds near and dear, but he cannot forget the word mother; her image remains within his breast amidst the greatest ruin. Even when mother is gone, we fancy we see her rise up before us—one whose memory grows more entrancing as the years stretch out between us.

A mother is the noblest personification of love. She is at once the ideal of the most lovable dignity and power, wielding the most irresistible and fruitful influence.

Dignity designates the rank that one being holds among other beings. In the human order nothing is higher, nothing nobler than the dignity of a mother. She cooperates with God in the creation and training of His masterpiece upon earth—man. Not only does she bring forth and nourish man, but she rears and fashions him; she gives him the finishing touch and makes him all that he is to be. It is at the mother's knee, in her arms, under the touch of her caress, by her tears and sacrifices that the heart of the child is fashioned. "Here is the sublimest mission," Cardinal Gibbons says in the Ambassador of Christ, "poverty and old age do not degrade a mother; only her character, her soul may ennoble or degrade her."

Every dignity imposes a duty. No man is greater than his mother; therefore the duty of this uncrowned queen of the home should be to cultivate the virtues of the home. Her radiance adorns the home; her labor beautifies it; her love makes it holy; her faith puts heaven into it. Should a mother think her life narrow and obscure? From her relative obscurity the mother's dignity sheds a great influence. Like all latent forces, the mother's influence, though hidden, is the more powerful; it is like the blood that circulates through the body bestowing life in a divine silence.

A good mother is the greatest need in the world today. Give the Nation good mothers and you give it safety, for its safety is better kept by domestic goodness than by trained armies. Give the Nation good mothers and you give it good laws, for the character of its

laws reaches back to the mother. Give the Nation good mothers and you give it greatness. If we would make the Nation glorious we must make the home good. A nation does not rise above its homes. The people of our country can never be greater than the cradles of our nurseries. The surest way to lift the country is to lift the home. If we take care of the home the Nation will take care of itself.

The origin of the mother's influence and power lies entirely in her love. It is her love that changes the poorest cottage into a paradise; and the lack of it changes the grandest mansion into a tomb. Love's shrine is the heart. Love is the mother's duty and happiness is the outcome. She lives for the child for her womb and loves it. The child that dwelt near its mother's heart is attracted by a secret, sympathetic but always conscious love. A mother loves more than anyone else and surely she has a right to be loved more than anyone else. It is nevertheless true that she loves more than she is loved; children receive more than they know how to give. The object of a mother's love is her child; therefore, she fashions its mind and heart; she teaches her child to know and love God. Her loving influence permeates the entire home; it is carried beyond the walls of the home in her sons and daughters armed with respect, purity, obedience, cheerfulness and affection. It continues through generations long after the mother's death.

A mother's influence is shown in sacrifice, for sacrifice is the most precious jewel in the crown of love. It is the duty of every mother to model herself on the divine Victim of Calvary. Sacrifice is the law of salvation; it governs individuals and society; it is the essence of Christianity it is the essence of the home. It finds its highest realization in the mother's heart. In sacrifice lies a mother's greatness, strength, beauty, and joy. She gives her life for her children. Like the Sacrifice of Christ, hers is personal. She never considers herself; never seeks herself, but always thinks of others and forgets herself for them. Like Christ, a mother sacrifices herself for all—for father and for all her children.

A mother's sacrifice too is perpetual. Christ immolates Himself today, tomorrow, every day and at all times. The life of a mother is a sacrifice that has no end. She never thinks herself too much a mother; she never feels that she has suffered enough for the happiness of her children. She often stands on Calvary and watches her children dying and passing into eternity.

Courage, mothers! Draw the secret of immolation and love from Christ. In the bitter hours of life, when the cross weighs heavily upon you and your heart is about to break, go up to Calvary and behold Mary bringing forth, in union with her Son, in the greatest anguish, that most sweet fruit, the world's redemption, the eternal salvation of mankind.

Such is your task, mothers, bringing forth God's children into the world and unto salvation. You may have seen mothers fail—ah, good mothers can never fail.

GODFREY KASPAR, S. J.

Statement of the American Tariff League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement for the American Tariff League before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by H. Wickliffe Rose, member of the tariff league's executive committee:

The American Tariff League is over 60 years old. In its constitution the object of the league is declared as follows:

"The object of this league shall be to carry on continuous research into all the facts and forces brought into play in trade between the nations, and to make these facts available in an educational effort designed to provide a better understanding of the effect of these forces on the prosperity of American labor, agriculture, and industry."

In pursuance of this objective a statement of principles and recommended program was made in January of this year and a copy is submitted herewith.

Membership of the Tariff League includes not only those who produce for the domestic market but those who export and import as well. Thus the league is interested in both the domestic and foreign markets and in the proper relative proportion. Membership of the league includes 82 different industries and divisions of agriculture.

The league is actively interested in the broad objectives of enduring peace, increasing standards of living in this and in other nations, and economically sound international trade and the postwar achievement of maximum employment in the United States.

H. R. 2652 is offered in the guise of an extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as several times extended. The Trade Agreements Act (sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930), at least, had the virtue of staying within the limits of allowable change as provided in the act of 1930. H. R. 2652 does not even have this merit. It is therefore not a mere renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. To the contrary, it would authorize changes in tariff rates much greater than authorized by Congress, either in the tariff law of 1930 or in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The Tariff League has always been opposed to the Trade Agreements Act, not only as being unconstitutional, but because it is wrong in principle. H. R. 2652 makes the defects in the original law even worse, and the league is, therefore, opposed to its enactment.

There is a fundamental point at stake in H. R. 2652 in the trend from constitutional toward autocratic government. The method of autocracy in the Axis governments is the very enemy against which we are fighting, and yet this resolution asks not only that Congress extend further, after 11 years, its temporary grant of authority but still further to abdicate its responsibility by increasing that grant of authority to the executive branch of the Government.

If the extension of the Trade Agreements Act were necessary as a temporary war measure, that would be quite a different consideration. But the present proposal contained in H. R. 2652 is offered as a part of planning for the future. It is thus offered to forestall some future emergency under conditions which are impossible to predict.

We respectfully submit that the economic system of the United States, the welfare of its citizens, the international trade of the world, and the prospects for a durable peace are subjects of greater importance and complexity than can be well served by the present proposal. It is time to give up expedients and to prepare for fundamental solutions.

The formula in support of the drive for reduced United States tariffs is familiar to everyone:

1. We must have maximum employment—referred to by some as 60,000,000 jobs.

2. That calls for production as great as, or greater than, the present abnormal rate.

3. This country cannot absorb such production, and so the surplus, greater than ever before in normal times, must be shipped abroad.

4. The foreign buyers must be able to pay us by shipping goods here in return in much greater quantities than ever before in history.

5. Tariffs must be reduced in order to admit such unprecedented quantities of goods.

There the formula ends; but why? What of maximum employment when all that imported goods reaches our domestic market? Can we provide maximum employment in jobs that will be noncompetitive or that will compete successfully in our domestic market against exploited labor and low wages in all the rest of the world? The formula is never carried through this final step to complete the circle because the viciousness of that circle becomes only too apparent.

This resolution is offered on the theory that United States tariffs must be lowered to permit imports of competitive goods on an unprecedented scale so that exaggerated exports might be paid for. It is generally agreed that exports can best be paid for through imports of goods and services, but if such a volume of foreign competitive goods should come in there would be serious interference with our goal of maximum employment.

If we lead other nations to believe that we can and will accept such a volume of imports, we are dangerously misleading them and such a course is not conducive to peace and friendship. (See Postwar Fiscal Problems and Policies published by the Committee of Americans, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.)

While an exaggerated number of jobs is held up as the goal in the United States, H. R. 2652 would strike down many lines of production in which there is the possibility of providing much of the maximum employment we need.

I want to make it entirely clear that the American Tariff League is not opposed to tariff changes per se, provided the need for change and the permissible amount of change shall both be determined by an economic yardstick provided by the Congress, which shall be used to achieve definite objectives also provided by the Congress and of which maximum employment in the United States would be a most important one.

In his message to Congress on March 26, the President emphasized the fact that most of the authority to reduce United States tariffs had been used up under the existing Trade Agreements Act. What was not emphasized was the fact that, despite all the reductions already made by the United States, there is comparatively little real mitigation in the trade barriers of foreign nations. Another drastic cut in United States tariffs, as here proposed, again would secure little by comparison in the way of foreign reductions, even though the result to our own economy could be disastrous.

Also, in the message of March 26, some figures were given to show that under the agreements there had been in both exports and imports an increase with the agreement nations almost twice that with the nonagreement nations. This misleading deduction was reached, however, by including in the nonagreement nations those which were at war in the later period. If those nations are excluded from the calculation, then the increases in our trade with agreement and nonagreement nations were almost identical. This is to be expected when we consider that all concessions made under an agreement by the United States went to all the world, Germany excepted.

Furthermore, between 1934 and 1939, while total United States exports did increase in physical volume, as did those of all principal nations, they reached only 80 percent of the peak volume of 1928–29. The total of the physical volume of imports increased to the peak of 1929, but the increase in agri-

cultural products was greater than in manufactured goods, and the drought of 1934, 1935, and 1936 partly accounted for that increase. Since the net result of our foreign trade during this period of lowering our tariffs was an increase of imports much greater than that of exports, it becomes obvious that the trade agreements did nothing to aid employment in this country.

Furthermore, and this is not often acknowledged, many other nations either will not or cannot follow our lead in tariff reduction. In the first place, most nations, unlike the United States, derive a great part of their national revenue through tariffs. (See our study, Customs Duties or Tariffs as a Source of Revenue for Central and National Governments, copies of which are provided herewith.) For them substantially to reduce tariffs would mean finding a replacement of the lost revenue. Besides, many nations are planning new or increased protection to new productive enterprise, as was brought out at the recent Mexico City Conference.

The concisely stated objectives of the tariff act of 1930—the protection of labor and the encouragement of productive enterprise—are just as important today as when written. If we in the United States are to be of real help in reconstructing a torn world, it is imperative that we maintain the only possible basis for such help, which is maximum prosperity within the United States.

We offer here in outline form, and in more detail in our written brief, the framework of a program which we believe can place this country in position to trade with foreign nations on a businesslike basis and thereby to take steps toward our mutual goal of busy, prosperous, and peaceful lives.

The American Tariff League believes that in any legislation intended to further international economic cooperation through tariff changes, certain important principles should govern United States action.

Changes in United States tariff rates should not be made except in connection with stability in foreign exchange rates. Assuming stability of exchange, no reductions in United States tariffs should be made that will result in undue injury to an efficiently conducted American productive enterprise.

The principle of flexibility in United States tariff rates to meet unforeseen changes in the conditions of world competition should be restored to full operation.

In determining what is a proper rate of United States tariff, a well-defined economic yardstick should be used, including the differences in wages in this and competing countries as such are reflected in unit cost of production.

Our specific recommendations are that Congress should—

1. Reassume its constitutional duty to regulate commerce with foreign nations and to lay and collect duties.

2. Restore the flexible principle in the tariff act in such form as will provide for changes in rates up or down as such may be found necessary because of changing economic conditions.

3. Define the economic yardstick by which the necessity or the reasonableness of a change is to be decided. In section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, differences in cost of production are used as the measurement. This is reasonable in the case of competitive goods if these factors are taken into account: (a) Whether United States production is efficiently conducted; (b) the effect on the cost of a unit of production of differences in wages, taxes, or other such factors which are beyond the power of technical efficiency to overcome.

4. Provide that changes in United States tariff rates be made in accordance with the yardstick of measurement provided by the Congress.

5. Restore the constitutional right of United States producers to be heard and secure action where injury is claimed as a result of change in tariff rate.

6. Provide for mandatory action under the antidumping law of 1921 and under sections 337 and 338 of the tariff law of 1930, dealing with unfair practices and discriminatory treatment;

7. Provide for mandatory adjustments to equalize fluctuating exchange rates in the future, or exchange rates which are substantially different now from what they were when existing trade agreements were made.

We recommend further that Congress reorganize the United States Tariff Commission so that it again will be an independent agency operating under well-defined purposes and rules laid down by the Congress. If in addition, it were made a quasi-judicial body, it could make findings of fact and decisions based thereon; it could decide on rate changes which, if not disapproved within a certain time by Congress, would be proclaimed by the President.

We disagree with the theory voiced in support of H. R. 2652 that an industry is inefficient which needs tariff to enable it to compete fairly with foreign production. In automobiles, there is not the same percentage of skilled labor in the cost per unit of production as in pottery, for instance. The higher the percentage of labor, the more jobs will be lost by forcing an industry out of the country. Similar machines produce at the same rate in foreign countries as here, their labor is equally skilled abroad, and only because they are paid less can they produce goods cheaper. Our automobile industry, highly mechanized and considered superior in efficiency, enjoys a tremendous domestic market which makes high mechanization possible. Reduce that market and the same industry will become less efficient, for its labor per unit produced will become higher, as will its costs.

Our textile industry, for example, is dependent on tariff. It is pointed out by proponents of this resolution that the average wage in the textile industry is below that in the automotive industry. That is true, and it is so because, even with tariffs, our textile workers are competing with those of the rest of the world, which are paid much lower wages. We cannot afford to drive important industries and pay rolls out of our country without sacrificing employment, and yet, discouraged by this act and the policy motivating it, the prospects of building new plants here after the war not only are diminishing, but a number which otherwise would be here, are actually being planned and built abroad at the present time.

We only lose job opportunities by importing goods in which labor cost is high in order to export goods in which labor cost is low.

More than twice as many jobs are provided in cotton manufactures in producing $1,250,000,000 worth of goods than are provided by motor vehicles in producing $3,000,000,000 worth of goods. (See Statistical Abstracts of United States, 1940). Since the principal argument by proponents of this resolution is to provide dollars here for imports to pay for our excess in exports, it must not be overlooked that by sacrificing industries protected by tariff, we would lose more employment than we would gain, and thus defeat our major objective.

We need to raise the standard of living of our marginal and low-income groups and thereby create a greater market in the United States, in addition to what we do to increase sound foreign business. Industrialization in the South is offered as a logical solution of the cotton problem, but that solution is not practical so long as our policy is to drive the means of production abroad.

For this same reason, foreign countries will insist on protecting their industries. As we have the policy of helping them raise their standards of living, it will be inconsistent for us to ship them the means of production, and then to trade them out of the tariff necessary to produce. The Latin-American countries made this very clear to us at the recent Chapultepec Conference. As a result of their position taken at that Conference, Brazil, the following week, raised their tariff on several articles 105 percent.

And yet, advocates of this resolution say that there is no time like the present to lower tariffs, that while whole industries are patriotically working on war materials under all the various difficulties involved, now is the time to make it impossible for those industries to reconvert or ever again to produce profitably their normal goods. If any such deep injustice were done, it could result in the very reactionary wave of isolationism which all of us interested in enduring peace are working to prevent.

Are most of our imports subject to tariff? The general impression given is that they are. In the early days of the Republic that was the case, but an increasing percentage has been placed on the free list, until in recent years about 65 percent of all imports entered the United States duty free.

Are United States tariffs high? The general impression is that they are. Two studies, one in 1942 and another completed only in February 1945, show the contrary to be the case, most nations having higher tariffs than the United States. The second of these studies is more complete than the first and makes an entirely different approach, yet both are in agreement on the principal conclusion. (You received copies of the earlier study 2 years ago, but we are providing an additional copy herewith. Of the second study, we are providing copies for all members of the committee.)

It should be realized that the other barriers to trade, such as quotas, prohibitions, exchange restrictions, preferences, etc., are far more restrictive than tariffs, and yet if all these were removed, other nations would still have tariffs higher than those in the United States.

One of the barriers in our own tariff lies in the fact that we discriminate against the higher wage countries in favor of the lower wage countries. While two of the principles of our foreign policy are to give equal access to our market and to raise standards of living abroad, on the basis of foreign valuation we actually collect less duty from the low-cost country and thus increase the advantage already gained and actually encourage the exploitation of labor. The Trade Agreements Act does not take this into account and, therefore, any legislation to replace that act should include a provision to base all duties on domestic valuation.

The American Tariff League advocates as the basic principle of tariff that a domestic producer in an efficient industry and plant, should be in position to compete in the domestic market on an equitable basis with a similar foreign product. This does not mean high tariff. It does not mean low tariff. It means an equitable tariff.

An equitable tariff is not a barrier. It has the effect of stimulating trade. We all agree that fair competition is stimulating to business, and it is no less true when an equitable tariff is employed to make competition fair between domestic and foreign producers.

Of still more importance, and a point that is seldom discussed, tariff has a profound influence on the flow of the means of production in and out of a country. This act has the purpose of stimulating the flow of products, but not much has been published about the effect of tariff on the flow of the means of production in or out of this country. Our economy is based on pay rolls of production. Trade and services are important, but they depend on production. If tariffs are lowered beyond the level of equity, and the means of production are forced out of the country in order to employ cheap labor, then our economy suffers accordingly.

On the other hand, the presence of an equitable tariff causes a flow of the means of production into this country and fosters the growth of industry, employment, and pay rolls. For example, because there was a tariff, the entire rayon industry in the United States originally came from Europe, including patents, technology, know-how, some employees, and in many cases, capital. For 35 years those pay rolls have been pouring into our communities. Without the tariff, the European producers would have been content to ship the product here, until the war, when, like silk, the supply needed in the war would have ceased. Another example is our organic chemical industry, built here after the last war. Where would we be in this war without that industry, which has been dependent on a tariff? Is it isolationism to foster the very industries which are necessary for our national defense? We believe not.

This leads to what we consider to be one of the basic questions involved in the Trade Agreements Act. Should changes in our tariff be made piecemeal in an atmosphere of international political trading, when many other considerations than the exchange of goods become involved? We believe not, and so offer these recommendations in order to keep the complex subject of tariff in its true proportion to the other factors, and on a business-like, continuous, and up-to-date basis.

Finally, we recommend that, instead of H. R. 2652, legislation be prepared as soon as it is practically possible to replace the Trade Agreements Act, that all rates remain unchanged meanwhile, and that after the enactment of the legislation recommended, a review be made of all rates, whether or not they were established under a trade agreement.

We wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear before you, and we wish to call your attention to our written brief submitted herewith.

Foreign Trade and Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith two editorials, one from the New York Times and one from the Washington Post of May 10, 1945, with reference to the recently released sixth report of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning on the subject of foreign trade and shipping.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times of May 10, 1945]

TO REDUCE TRADE CURBS

The special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning has issued a report which makes recommendations on so many leading economic questions that it could hardly expect agreement with every one of them. But the report produced by the committee is, on the whole, an admirable document, one of the most carefully thought out and balanced sets of recommendations, indeed, to come out of any congressional committee in recent years.

The recommendation of the committee that has attracted most immediate attention is that an international conference should be called as soon as practicable to establish a general policy of reducing barriers to world trade. This is wholly desirable. But two steps should obviously precede it. The first is for Congress to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which is due to expire in a few weeks. This law in itself provides, so to speak, for a series of international conferences, country by country, to make mutual reductions of tariff rates. The second step is for Congress and the administration to make up their own minds, and perhaps even to state clearly in advance what concessions they are ready to offer to other countries if they can obtain similar concessions in return. For unless we are willing ourselves to make substantial concessions of this sort, there would be no hope for the success of a world conference to universalize such concessions.

Once these two steps are taken, it is clear that there is much that such an international conference could achieve. For high tariff rates are not the only barriers that can stand in the way of international trade. Even more disrupting controls, as the special House committee recognizes, were developed during the thirties—import quotas, export subsidies, blocked currencies, exchange controls, bilateral trade pacts, and all the rest. World agreements could be made restricting or abolishing such devices. Agreements could be made, also, either prohibiting cartels or compelling public registration of international cartel agreements. If such world agreements were reached, an atmosphere could be created in which any international bank or fund would have a far better chance to work successfully.

These are some of the ends we could reach by a world conference against trade restrictions, once we have ourselves recognized that we have nothing to gain from such restrictions.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The Colmer committee has outlined a foreign economic program for the United States, the aim of which is "to establish the economic foundations of a durable peace and to assist in providing high and expanding levels of income at home and abroad." Specifically, the committee favors continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with increased authority to reduce tariff rates, and recommends speedy calling of an international conference to consider reduction or elimination of all sorts of trade restrictions, such as tariffs, import quotas, export subsidies, and exchange controls. The Post has frequently suggested such a conference.

While refraining from outright endorsement of the detailed provisions of the Bretton Woods agreements, the committee evidently approves the essential features of the program for establishing a world bank and an International Monetary Fund. Its advocacy of intergovernmental commodity pacts and opposition to restrictive private cartel practices are in general accord with the views expressed by various spokesmen for the Department of State and the Department of Justice. While the committee realizes that we shall need a much larger post-war merchant fleet than we had before the war, it concludes that the volume of subsidized merchant shipping should be limited to the tonnage necessary for national security. The question of size and type of vessels required for defense purposes should be determined, it suggests, by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission.

Most of the recommendations contained in the report are in conformity with administration proposals for reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade. No new ground is broken and no original contributions have been made to solution of the post-war foreign trade problems that confront this country. Nevertheless, the report is a highly valuable document. It explains clearly why an expansion of our foreign commerce after the war would contribute to the peace and prosperity of the world. And it shows why the achievement of a balanced trade expansion is dependent upon a many-sided program of action.

For example, foreign loans and investments by the United States will be needed to rehabilitate the industries of war-devastated countries and to build up the industries of undeveloped areas. The international monetary system will also have to be reconstructed after the war to prevent resort to restrictive systems of exchange control and competitive currency devaluation such as throttled trade during the thirties. Commercial policy—of which tariff policy is only one aspect—is likewise an integral part of the foreign economic program, but the committee does not elevate it to a position of supreme or even chief importance. Instead, the report emphasizes the fact that the success of a program to reduce trade barriers is "to a large extent dependent upon preventing serious depressions and upon establishing a workable international monetary system." As a result, our post-war commercial policy will necessarily be closely connected with our domestic employment policy and our monetary lending policies.

Not all the committee's recommendations will meet with approval outside Government circles. But advocates and dissenters alike will profit by reading the report because of its clear exposition of the basic principles underlying foreign trade and its penetrating analysis of the relation between our import trade and world prosperity.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, few people realize the importance of industry, especially small industry, to the very existence of New England. That importance is not simply to the prosperity of New England communities, but to their very survival. Neither New England, nor the community life which has grown up around so many little industries throughout the countryside, could continue to exist unless small industry continues to provide the livelihood upon which the worker and his family depends. This applies not only to all of the New England States but to New Hampshire in particular.

There are few people who realize, even in New England, that a greater proportion of the number of people who work for a living in New Hampshire work in small industries than in any other State in the Union. In a sense, New Hampshire is the most highly industrialized State in the country. Questions that bear upon the prosperity and survival of small business are, therefore, of the utmost importance to New Hampshire people. The problems of small business are New Hampshire problems. Questions involving the taxation, geographical distribution, the maintenance of a free market, and countless other questions affecting small industry are of importance, not only to workers, communities, towns,

counties, but to the State as a going, progressive enterprise.

The importance of the consideration which we give these questions is indicated in a resolution adopted by the Northeastern States Development Agencies Conference which, under leave granted me to insert, follows:

Representatives of the development agencies of the Northeastern States, including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, having conferred on matters of mutual concern and interest at a meeting held in New York City on May 3 and 4, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The Northeastern States were the cradle of liberty and economic progress and are the heart of the commercial and industrial life of the Nation.

These States are the homes and workshops of nearly one-third of the people of the Nation, and therefore America's greatest consumer market. At the same time they stand as the chief gateway for the exchange of goods between this country and the rest of the world.

We combine a rich experience in industrial skills, business judgment, and advanced labor relations with a wealth of youthful ideas and energy, and shall continue to expand our contributions to the benefit of the entire country.

We are continuing, as ever, to lead the way in progressive government and business measures for the benefit of all peoples, everywhere. Our histories have demonstrated that economic and political freedom are not merely compatible but complementary.

It is the sense of this meeting that the post-war prosperity of the Nation, particularly the reemployment of our returning service men and women, is the first order of business of the development agencies of the Northeastern States. To achieve this high objective the Nation requires the mature experience and skilled workmanship of the people of the Northeastern States.

In peace as in war, we take pride in the industrial development and prosperity of our entire Nation, and shall continue to give our best efforts and know-how to the end that all States will profit from the contributions of each, so that economic expansion can be general.

We shall continue to resist any effort to destroy the national free market, the birthright of every American, or to erect artificial trade and industrial barriers between States or regions, or to grant any special privileges to any sections of the country at the expense of the others. Opportunity for growth is unlimited throughout America, and we shall all prosper as we expand together.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, prepared and presented in behalf of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture and the Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ways and Means Committee, this is either the third or fourth time I have appeared before this committee in regard to trade agreements and the effect of tariffs. My testimony in previous hearings has been based on the record of the United States in the past.

In previous testimony I have pointed out that our raw-material income and especially our farm income is the governing factor in our economy. This basic fact has not changed even though conditions have.

Since my last appearance before this committee, I have carried on a detailed study of our economy and the correlation which exists between the various segments such as agriculture, employment, mining, manufacturing, transportation, trade, etc. The gross farm income in the United States is the foundation from which all the others ratio out, with almost mathematical precision.

The Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia, after checking the analysis, the various graphs and tabulations, published an article in regard to our research work in the December issue of the Country Gentleman.

The article was entitled "The Key to Prosperity" and in it they accepted the basic laws of exchange and ratios that we found in analyzing the past record of the Nation. The ratio is quite simple, namely, that in the United States each dollar of farm income creates a dollar for factory pay rolls and $7 of national income.

The United States Chamber of Commerce in their report on agricultural income in April 1944 also pointed out the quite constant ratio of $1 of farm income to $7 of national income that apparently exists.

No one has been able to refute this ratio, which we first presented to a subcommittee of the United States Senate in Sioux City, Iowa, at a farm hearing in 1937. The ratio has not changed since that time, even with a war economy, but there are those who ask, "Well, how do you know the farm income comes first?" To a man with a practical nature, the very fact that a man must eat before he can work should be proof enough. For the benefit of the committee, I want to point out briefly why in our capital form of economy the farm income is the governing factor.

In our Nation we have, roughly, 9,000,000 business units, of which approximately 3,000,000 are nonagricultural. The other 6,000,000 business units are our 6,000,000 farms. Each of these farms is a business unit producing and processing products for trade and commerce, and the capital investment in each on the average is as large as the average capital investment in the 3,000,000 which are nonagricultural. Therefore, it ought to be self-evident that with agriculture having two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise in the United States any rise or fall in farm income automatically creates a rise or fall in the income of the Nation as a whole.

With this ratio of income in existence, this committee can have a quite accurate yardstick to gage the results of any action which it may take in regard to tariffs or post-war taxes.

Any legislation which tends to reduce our farm income, either through curtailment of production or lower prices to the extent of a billion dollars, will automatically force the wiping out of a billion dollars of factory pay rolls and $7,000,000,000 of national income. Greater reductions pyramid according to the ratio.

The loss of such income is automatically reflected in less tax collections and a loss in employment because of the reduction in consumer buying power throughout the Nation. Our loss in foreign trade will also ratio to our loss in farm income. For example, in 1938 our imports dropped to $1,960,000,000 from a total of $3,083,000,000 in 1937. The trade agreements were in operation, and the drop cannot be blamed on tariffs, which, in my estimation, are a barrier to trade only when they are above or below the American parity price level, and even then to only a limited extent.

The real barrier to trade in the United States and the rest of the world is the price of raw materials and the resulting loss of purchasing power when farm prices drop. The loss in imports was the result of a drop in farm prices. In 1938 our gross farm income dropped over $1,000,000,000 and our national income dropped over $7,000,000,000, or in ratio to the formula I have given you.

A similar happening took place from 1929 to 1932. With a drop of over $6,000,000,000 in farm income from 1929 to 1932, our national income dropped approximately $45,000,000,000. This loss in farm income caused the wiping out of almost all our domestic and foreign trade with the exception of the necessities of life such as food and clothing and transportation.

The facts which I have pointed out to you are not theory, but the record of what took place.

Instead of correcting the price of agricultural products, we brought forth the trade agreements and various other measures as a cure. The only real measure of success which we had in the period from 1930 to 1940 was to increase the national debt.

The trade agreements were brought forth to increase the exports of farm products. The facts were that no power on earth could have restored our exports of farm products because our agricultural economy has been deficient ever since 1922.

It is true that in the case of cotton and wheat we had a surplus of about $400,000,000, but in spite of this our net imports of farm products from 1934 to 1941 ran about $600,000,000 per year. In 1941, with consumer buying power restored in the United States, our net imports of farm products were over a billion dollars.

Since 1910–14 our exports of farm products using that period as a yardstick of 100 dropped progressively to 49.4 percent in 1940, while on the other hand our imports increased progressively to 209.8 percent.

This record is positive proof that our agricultural tariffs since 1922 have not been a barrier to imports of farm products.

In the period 1910–14 up to 1940 our farm production increased 32.5 percent while our population growth was 38.9 percent. In spite of all this we passed and are asking for extension of the trade agreements to dispose of surplus farm products. Since 1940 our increase in population, on the basis of our American income level, is a greater market than all our export trade in 1940. In addition an increase of $80 per year in the wages of our 55,000,000 workers is equivalent to all exports in 1940.

The simple facts are, gentlemen, that our foreign trade depends on the production of American products and the price we maintain on them. Our foreign trade is merely a byproduct of our American economy.

I think I can prove this to better advantage by pointing out that of the 9,000,000 business units, nonagricultural and agricultural, all of them put together exported products equal to less than 5 percent of our national income during the 1933–40 period. I would like to point out in addition that of the 3,000,000 nonagricultural units, 96 percent of them employ 19 men or less. I have pointed out that the two-thirds of our capital industry agriculture had net imports of its products. With 96 percent of the nonagricultural units employing less than 19 men and many of them domestic trade and service units, it should be quite apparent that the only group who receive any benefit from the trade agreements are the large industrial groups, sometimes called

the "economic royalists." They hire the best economists and that may give the committee the reason why a large percentage of our economists are for the trade agreements.

The depression of 1929 was completely misinterpreted by our economists. It was not due to lack of foreign trade because our Nation has had more than its share of world trade. With only 6 percent of the world's population we have been having, good times and bad, about 15 percent of the world trade. We might ask ourselves just how much are we entitled to? It appears that if we reach out for a greater percentage than we now have we may get into quarrels with other nations.

We have had tariffs ever since the first session of the first Congress. During all that period of over 150 years we have outstripped all the rest of the world with both a higher living standard and a much greater increase in our own productive capacity.

This being true let us also ask ourselves the question, Why all the effort to obtain foreign trade when we can produce everything with the exception of 5 percent in the United States. Any attempt to increase our foreign trade will force us to reduce our own production and therefore be against our own interests and the world as a whole.

Our position in the world of tomorrow should be that of a referee and not that of a commercial power. To put us in a position of exporting manufactured goods in exchange for raw materials will be a direct repudiation of the Atlantic Charter. In the Atlantic Charter we proclaimed that we were going to make raw materials available for all the world. With only 6 percent of the world's population we have 25 percent of the available war material supplies and we cannot live up to the Atlantic Charter and import raw materials which other nations should have.

The real cause for the depression in 1929 was not tariffs but a complete break-down in the world's monetary system. Devaluation of foreign currencies had the indirect effect of wiping out most of our tariffs before the trade agreements program was put into operation. The result of this break-down in world price levels forced our price level to follow because we did not adjust our tariffs to offset the currency devaluation.

The break-down in our price level in the 1930–41 period forced the United States to suffer a loss of approximately $67,500,000,000 of farm income in the 12-year period and in turn a loss of $473,000,000,000 of national income. Of this loss approximately $25,000,000,000 was our loss in export trade that we could and should have had with proper tariff protection.

If through the trade agreements, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks and other announced policies we permit our price level to be reduced to the 1939 level, our Nation will take a loss of $75,000,000,000 per year. I therefore urge this committee to tread slowly on unknown waters.

In order to give the members of the committee an idea of the loss which their own States will suffer, I will give a few examples.

My own State of Iowa, by being forced to produce and sell at the 1939 level, will lose a billion dollars. New York State, which has often been a promoter of high tariffs for industry and low tariffs for raw materials, because of its investments in industry, will lose over $8,000,000,000, or more than all the foreign trade that we can hope to gain under a program of W. P. A. loans to the rest of the world.

The State of Virginia will lose a billion dollars; Michigan will lose $3,000,000,000 and incidentally a market for about 3,000,000 cars; Illinois, five billion; Ohio, four billion; and California, five billion.

Our total farm income will drop off $10,000,000,000, our factory pay rolls will be reduced $10,000,000,000, retail sales will be off $45,000,000,000 from our present potential, and we will have 20,000,000 unemployed.

I am here merely to warn you of what can and will happen if some of the announced policies and plans are carried out. I am for all the foreign trade which our economy will permit, and I am for the restoration of a sound world monetary system as a foundation for world peace. It cannot be done, however, by bankrupting the United States.

I have followed the meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, the meeting in Mexico, and have read of how the trade-agreement program is the cornerstone of them all. The program which is being proposed and planned in behind the scenes will force our price level back to the 1939 level and will bring about the results I have mentioned.

We are seemingly throwing all caution and leadership to the four winds and placing the resources of the United States in the hands of the rest of the world to use and price as they see fit. With our production and resources priced at the world level, we are a bankrupt Nation.

I don't think that this committee wants that to happen and we don't have to permit it to happen. To prevent it, however, we must present a program to the rest of the world which will permit a solvent United States. Instead of a program which would have us join world poverty we must have one in which the rest of the world can join us in prosperity. Such a program can be offered.

Let us analyze briefly foreign trade and commerce. The ability to buy depends on one of two things, income obtained through credit by the buyer or a price for the production of each nation so that they can earn the income for exchange.

The world economy of the past has been based primarily on loans. Because of an exploitive price level which prevented the repayment of loans the world banker, England landed in bankruptcy. Now we are being asked, through the Bretton Woods agreement, to underwrite world trade and through the extension of the trade agreements maintain a low price level which in turn will mean that the loans will never be repaid.

And what have we to gain? A few weeks ago I attended a meeting addressed by Mr. Clayton, and one of the points he made in favor of the whole program which we are being asked to rather blindly accept was that it would employ about 6 percent of our labor force in export trade. He forgot to mention that if we were to be paid for the exports with imports we would also import at least the same labor equivalent. The simple facts are that foreign trade paid for with goods will not increase our employment. Of course, if we wish to make loans to buy our own goods, then we can gain employment for the time being. But even then at a very high cost. At present levels it costs roughly a sum of $3,000,000,000 to create a million jobs. Or, stated in another way, 50,000,000 workers at $3,000 per year create the buying power for the Nation as represented by $150,000,000,000 of national income.

There may be some doubt in the committees' mind that present plans will bring about 1939 price levels. I would like to give you my reasons for that conclusion.

In the first place, approximately 60 percent of the world's population is earning 20 cents a day or less. They have no great buying power, and if our raw-material producers are forced to compete at that level even our efficiency cannot meet their ability to buy.

As examples of these imports, I want to give you a few samples as given in the plans of the National Planning Association, 800 Twenty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C., in regard to future world trade.

They expect to bring in, for example, 2,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils which, of course, will compete with cottonseed oil, butter, lard, and other oils, 1,000,000,000 pounds of meats, 1,000,000,000 pounds of burlap, 1,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum, 600,000,000 pounds of copper, 1,000,000,000 pounds of zinc, and practically all our needs of manganese. The prices listed are such that if the program is put into operation it will close our mines, force down the price and production of agricultural products, and the resulting loss in income I mentioned.

The names listed in this planning association are very close to and in accord with the sponsors of present plans for peace and trade. The world cannot recover without a solvent United States, and to me the plan means chaos. Smaller nations, of course, had no choice and accepted what was offered.

If a program had been worked out to give nations a proper price for their product they would have, in my opinion, accepted even more readily. With a proper price for their products to earn exchange they wouldn't have to borrow money.

The Bretton Woods agreement, in my estimation, practically threw gold and silver to the four winds as monetary metals. In theory they have evidently decided that scraps of paper are just as good. It is my frank opinion that the two-thirds of the world which does not have a banking system such as we have will want coinage or hard money. If that is the case, which I think it is, why not be realistic and have metal coinage as a foundation for world exchange?

Gold can be set up at its present value of $35 per ounce, a price to which the world has become accustomed; silver can be brought to parity with gold, using as an example the price ratio that existed between the two metals in 1910–14.

Commodity prices could then be stabilized at our parity level, the price we need for national solvency, and we would have world parity and a chance for the world to have prosperity instead of poverty as a foundation for world peace. If we are going to agree to something then let us use arithmetic and agree to something that doesn't put the skids under our own Nation.

With such a world program this committee could safely remove all tariffs even for the protection of the steel barons. We should be realistic, however, and realize that in much the same way that we as a nation grew to our level through tariffs, other nations who wish to establish industry will need them to get under way.

With world prices stabilized at the American price level, world trade could be quadrupled in a few years.

You have a right to ask whether such a program would be acceptable to other nations. I think I can safely say that it would.

At the recent Mexican Conference our State Department Presented a blueprint for world free trade. The South American countries didn't want it. Mexico wants to protect its growing steel industry and Brazil desires to protect industries she has started during the war. I feel that they should be given that right.

The final result of the meeting was a very important section namely, subsection (b) of resolution 15:

"That a fair and equitable relationship should be sought between the prices of agricultural and mineral products and those of manufactured articles and that all prices should be fair to producers and consumers alike."

That in essence is parity prices for raw materials and can be implemented with gold and silver at parity as I have outlined above. With the matter of parity agreed to by all the Nations at the Mexican Conference the question is at what level?

To maintain a solvent United States we must maintain our price level as it now exists. Therefore we have only one choice and that is to protect our price level with tariffs at the parity level until such time as world parity,

with our parity level as the yardstick is properly implemented with a reorganization of the world monetary system and with basic commodities stabilized at parity with the exchange medium.

The program outline is not theoretical but based on the factual dislocation of money and commodity prices in the period following 1910–1914. In fact our parity price level was the world level in both the 1910–1914 and 1925–1929 periods. Our price level of today as given by the Bureau of Labor Index for all commodities is 105 percent of the 1926 level. The only thing which will prevent our parity level from becoming the yardstick for world price levels is the leadership on our part to bring it about.

The citizens of the United States are relying on this committee to be one of the first to protect our Nation. Sometime in the future you are going to be asked to make proper tax levies with which to refund the national debt and it is only natural that you should wish to maintain the income of the United States.

There are two parts to economy. One is production and the other is price. Nature gave us the raw material resources to produce, the Constitution of the United States gave Congress the right to regulate the value of the American dollar which in turn is the price of our production. Failure to properly protect the value of our dollar either through the price of commodities or other measures such as tariffs is to fail to protect the welfare of the American people and our form of government.

The time has come when we must make a decision. To join the world economy by reducing our price level to world levels will mean a return to the economy of the seventeenth century and going back to an economy that our forefathers ran away from.

To restore world economy on the basis of our American economy, means that we would give to the world the kind of economy which time has proved as the one which gave the people in the United States the highest standard of living in the world and at the same time the lowest food cost on the basis of per capita income of any nation in the world.

My advice to the committee is—make haste slowly. If you don't feel that this measure before you can be amended to require that no trade agreements can be made for imports below the American parity level, you can at least merely extend the law for 1 year in order that we may know how the cards are stacked.

As I have pointed out, we have $75,000,000,000 per year at stake and it is no time to play blind pitch.

In closing I wish to point out:

1. That the trade-agreements program did not increase the export of farm products but instead increased imports of farm products, which in turn prevented the recovery of our normal condition of parity prices for farm products.

2. That the trade agreements when deductions are made for loans and foreign travel did not increase our exports of all products.

3. That our dollar value of foreign trade is determined by the governing factor of our own economy, our farm income.

4. That the physical imports will ratio to the percentage of farm parity.

5. That a reduction of our price level to the world level will mean national bankruptcy, and the continuation of world poverty.

6. That the course which we should follow is to maintain our parity price level and with it as a yardstick, to help reorganize the world monetary system and commodity price level, thus protecting the solvency of the United States and at the same time give the world an opportunity to have prosperity through production rather than loans at our expense.

No Easy Road Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the medical profession has frequently called attention to the fact that there are certain fundamental rules relating to health. The doctors of the country have constantly warned of the disillusionment that is bound to follow if we take the easy road suggested by self-seeking quacks and fakers. The same thing is true in regard to engineering or farming or business generally.

It is difficult, however, to convince some people that there are also certain sound principles of government which may not be violated with impunity. Nevertheless, the bitter experience of many people in many times points to the conclusion that the duty of any government is to seek out these fundamentals and apply them. For example, our Constitution sets out certain great principles relating to social and individual conduct. These principles are not true simply because they are in the Constitution; they are in the Constitution because they are true.

Now we are hearing a lot about 60,000,000 jobs to be furnished for us by Government planning. The burden of this song is that the individual should look to his Government, follow blindly its orders, and comfort and security will come to him. It ignores the obvious fact that if we call upon the Government to plan our way, that Government must also have the authority to make us walk the way it has planned. History points out that the highest standard of living has always been in those countries where exists the fullest measure of individual liberty.

In accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include an editorial in the April 26 issue of the New Hampton Economist, a sturdy exponent of Americanism published by the Babcock Bros. at New Hampton, Iowa:

NO EASY ROAD BACK

There is so much loose talk in political circles about the "right to a job" that it has become almost meaningless. "Rights" have become confused with "opportunities."

The United States Constitution and Bill of Rights guarantee every citizen fundamental rights that make him a free man to enjoy the opportunity to go as far as he can, based on his ability, ambition, and energy. Beyond that, Government owes a free man nothing, except if he is destitute or mentally deficient, or handicapped in ways beyond his control. Government should then provide satisfactory means for his care and comfort—that is what government is for. But to try to fool the people with the idea that the Government owes a man a living can create and maintain countless millions of jobs, without destroying a free country, is rank hypocrisy.

Vote-seeking politicians are trying to make millions of war workers think a benign government can take over all their troubles after the war. Within reason, a government can widen the opportunities whereby men can have jobs, recreation, and high wages. The extent to which one takes advantage of opportunities, depends upon the will and purpose of the individual. As government or anyone else can expand opportunities, the chances for advancement in living standards are greater, but in no sense are such benefits rights to which anyone is entitled, without respect to his own effort to obtain them.

History has shown that when the people of any nation depend on government to do their thinking and providing for them, it is only a short time before they lose their ambition, their initiative, and their freedom. There will be no easy road to full employment and prosperity, after this destructive war. Only a people who work and save and do not look to government for hand-outs, will survive and retain their personal liberties.

H. R. 3109

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the portion of H. R. 3109 having to do with allowing $2,500 to Members of Congress for expenses is ill-advised at this time. It is not so much a question of need—as that is very apparent—but it is a matter of holding the line against inflation. That line is not being too strongly held at this time, and I am fearful that this particular legislation may open the floodgates to widespread demands for wage increases and thus bring about an inflationary situation which we might not be able to control. On that basis I was one of 124 who voted against the rule reporting H. R. 3109 to the House, was one of those who voted to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee, and then, when that failed of passage, was one of 83 who voted against final passage of the measure.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador of Poland to the United States, over Station WCBM in Baltimore, Md., on Sunday, May 6, 1945:

I am deeply grateful to the United American and Polish Societies of Baltimore and to Station WCBM for the opportunity of addressing this distinguished American radio

audience on this one hundred and fifty-fourth anniversary of Poland's liberal constitution.

Poland's past history is the record of a nation fervent in its Christian faith, tolerant and liberal, deeply attached to individual and national freedom. Two hundred years before England passed the Habeas Corpus Act, Poland guaranteed the liberty of the individual by the Neminem Captivabimus Act of 1430. In 1573 she established freedom of conscience and worship, when religious persecution was rife in most other countries.

The liberal constitution of May 3, 1791, was therefore but a natural development of Poland's gradual trend toward democracy. It is the basic ideological link between the Polish and the American Nations.

Poland has been true to her traditions throughout this war. She was the first unhesitatingly to put up fierce armed resistance against German aggression in September 1939. Ever since, although her armies were defeated inside Poland by overwhelming forces, her underground army in Poland and her army, navy, and air force abroad, under the leadership of her legal Government-in-exile, have never ceased to fight for the common cause of freedom and justice.

She has a clear record of Allied loyalty and has never produced a Quisling.

Freedom, justice, and peace are Poland's aims in this war, in accordance with the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter and embodied in the Declaration of the United Nations of which Poland was one of the original signatories on January 1, 1942.

The Polish people will certainly regard as symbolic that the United Nations victory in Europe coincides with the anniversary of their liberal constitution. They will see in this fact a promise that the fundamental principles of democracy and the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" and the rule of right over might will now effectively become the rule for the world.

If this promise is to be fulfilled, and peace, justice, and human freedom are to become a living reality after this victory of freedom-loving peoples over the evil forces of the pagan Hitlerite doctrines of enslavement, it is urgent to realize the necessity of reestablishing democracy not only within countries but of applying its rules to international relations as well. In a civilized world all nations must be equal before the law, regardless of their size or power. That is the essence of equality as applied to nations and to their mutual relations.

The inequality which exists between big powers and smaller states should be measured not in terms of power domination, but in terms of power responsibility alone.

In this war, the people of Poland have been subjected to greater cruelty, barbaric oppression and extermination than any other nation overrun by Hitler.

The Polish Nation yearns for freedom and for collaboration with other free nations in the work of establishing and maintaining a just and durable peace. It would be unthinkable if Poland were not given her rightful chance to do her part in this great task and further to develop her peaceful instincts and her constructive and cultural capacities.

Her precarious geographical position between two powerful neighbors, has been reflected throughout her history in the course of which she was repeatedly partitioned and subjected to foreign domination. President Woodrow Wilson declared this to be one of the greatest crimes in history and clearly stated that the restoration of Poland's freedom was an essential necessity for the establishment of a just peace.

The men and women of the United Nations who have so gallantly fought in this war, the millions of them who have sacrificed their lives in the cause of justice, have proved through their sacrifice that these noble principles of humanity continue to prevail. Our common victory proves that ideals still play a dominant part in realism.

In this Western Hemisphere the nations of the Americas enjoy the blessings of good-neighbor policy which above all is the basis of security and peace. It is time that this American concept, so indispensable to international confidence, be made available to the Eastern Hemisphere as well.

Experience has taught all of us that peace can only be maintained if it becomes indivisible the world over. It has taught us that no nation, however powerful, is secure from attack in our modern times of scientific achievement which has so greatly reduced distance and abolished the effectiveness of natural or created defenses. It has therefore become impossible separately to plan a western peace and an eastern peace. It is impossible to allow totalitarianism to hold sway in one part of the world, while democracy prevails in another. For then, the ideological cleavage between nations would divide the world into potential rival camps and inevitably lead to future wars.

It is time to be realistic. Not in the cynical sense of power-political concepts unworthy of our enlightened times, but to be sufficiently bold and realistic to face facts. Instead of launching ever new slogans about world unity, it is necessary to create that unity on the firm basis of principles which all free human beings understand and demand. In fact, it is time to realize the greatness of American concepts and to apply them to the world in establishing security and peace. At the time of their proclamation the world may not have been ripe for them. At the end of this terrible war all mankind is ripe for justice.

It is time to understand that the problems left by this war, which has shaken the world in its very foundations and destroyed practically everything tangible and solid except the fundamental qualities of humanity, cannot be solved by petty compromises or short-lived power-political agreements. To solve them, we must start from the foundations, by applying sound, human, and solid principles with simplicity and courage, urged by firm determination to build a new and better world for its duration, and not merely to set up a precarious structure of antiquated concepts of balance of power on the quicksands of temporary appeasements and of wishful thinking.

Humanity has gone through too much to accept anything but real peace, founded on real freedom and on real justice.

It is time to simplify, not to complicate, problems. The solution of really great problems calls for boldness of statesmanship and simplicity. The time has come to adopt and to apply to the world the proposal announced by President Woodrow Wilson in his magnificent address to the Senate on January 22, 1917, when he suggested "that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world: that no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful."

Memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced into the House of Representatives a resolution to create a memorial to our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The resolution has been referred to the Committee on the Library of which I am the chairman.

It is my purpose in the near future to begin hearings on this measure. I intend to bear in mind the suggestion of Mrs. Roosevelt that a living memorial be erected in honor of her husband. It is not necessary for me to inform this House that that which was dearest to the President's heart was the care of the unfortunate victims of infantile paralysis. Through his untiring efforts and personal interest, the Nation was made conscious of this dreadful plague. He, more than anyone else, was responsible for the great sums that were collected to study and combat this disease.

Knowing this, I feel that the best memorial that could be erected in his honor would be a national institution here in Washington for the study and treatment of polio and similar muscular and nerve diseases. With that in mind, it is my intention within the next few days to invite here to Washington to appear before my committee Sister Elizabeth Kenny, Dr. Morris Fishbein, and other leading figures in the medical world. Through their testimony we will be able to get expert guidance on the polio situation. We will have an opportunity to find out the advanced treatments and approved therapy with which to combat the disease. The hearings in themselves will serve as a clinic where these experts can settle the disputes that are now existing in the medical profession and at the same time can agree as to the size, scope, treatment, and study that will be used in the suggested memorial. It is my intention from time to time to acquaint the Members of the House with the proceedings of the committee.

Congress Wisely Provided for Air-Mail Pick-up Service; Great Progress Noted During First 6 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the rapid development of aviation is noteworthy during the emergency of war. Air power is recognized as having shortened, perhaps by years, the defeat of Germany. Its fury is now being loosed against Japan.

We look ahead to the use of the airplane for the purposes of peace. It is in this connection that I call to the attention of my colleagues and the country one unique and successful phase of aviation as it assists our people to speedier communication and transportation.

It was 6 years ago tomorrow that the air pick-up service was begun. The anniversary of the Nation's unusual air-line operation, established as an experiment

authorized by Congress in an effort to find a practical way to extend air-mail service to communities off the main air-transport system, brings comment from Halsey R. Bazley, president of All-American Aviation, as to the adaptation of the pick-up equipment for military purposes, and disclosed plans for the future.

All-American, the operating carrier, has grown from 2 experimental routes 1,040 miles long which served 56 communities, to a system of 5 routes extending 1,568 miles and serving 118 communities on schedules requiring 5,068 miles of daily flying.

The air pick-up planes in the past year flew 1,296,472 revenue miles making the 6-year total 5,166,434 miles to which should be added another million miles flown by the company's military cargo aircraft before the service was terminated. During the year 70,488 pick-ups and deliveries were made for a grand total of 295,609. Mail transported amounted to 954,000 pounds; air express 181,000 pounds.

The mail volume, Mr. Bazley reports, represents an increase of 71 percent over the previous year. Air express traffic jumped 11 percent. This increase would have been greater if mail loads had not precluded development of the traffic.

The air pick-up service—

Says Mr. Bazley—

is not costing the Government a cent. We emerged from the subsidy class 3 years ago, and the Post Office Department is now making a substantial profit on the service. Air mail dispatched via air pick-up last year produced estimated postal revenues of $1,915,000 as compared with $534,000 mail pay received by the company. In 6 years the postal revenues from mail dispatched by air pick-up have amounted to $3,875,245, while our mail pay for the same period was $2,416,069. The postal revenues have been computed only on mail which has been actually dispatched over All-American's lines by the communities which they serve. The figures do not include postal revenues from mail dispatched to these points from our terminals—Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, and Harrisburg. They were purposely left out in order to make a bedrock appraisal of the economy of the service from the Government's standpoint.

The Army Air Forces lifted recently the secrecy on how the air pick-up has been used effectively in Europe and Burma in launching gliders, carrying troops and supplies, in evacuating battle casualties by gliders, and in retrieving gliders stranded in isolated places, and in picking up human beings. I am advised that except they are larger, the military pick-up units are identical with those in air mail pick-up operations.

All-American has on file with the Civil Aeronautics Board applications which, if approved, would create an integrated system of 69 air pick-up routes covering 20,064 miles and serving 1,321 cities and towns in 24 States east of the Mississippi River. Present lines extend through 6 States—Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Delaware, and New York and the District of Columbia. I recall the work preparatory to the first operation when Dr. L. S. Adams, pick-up device inventor, demonstrated and perfected the operation with work in West Virginia.

Expansion of the air pick-up system abroad seems imminent. All-American is completing the organization of its own Brazilian company. In recent months government representatives and others from France, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain, Australia, Canada, and several South American countries have displayed interest.

Combination passenger-pick-up service is planned over some of the new routes.

The company likewise is studying the feasibility of commercial glider operations.

Mr. Bazley believes that:

From the first All-American has envisioned the adaptation of the air pick-up to passenger planes which would be operated over short routes to many intermediate points making stops only where necessary to load or deplane passengers and providing service to other places by the pick-up and delivery method as it is operated today. Technically, this operation is entirely feasible. Pick-up planes have carried many Government officials, members of the press, and others as passengers on regular trips and without exception these passengers have afterward expressed the belief that a combination pick-up and passenger service would be both practical and safe. Such an operation would provide passenger service to many more places on local and short-haul routes than would be possible if a landing were necessary at each station.

All-American has on file with the Civil Aeronautics Board applications to carry passengers on pick-up routes. Although some of the airports on the proposed passenger-pick-up routes may not be suitable for passenger operations, they probably could be improved for this purpose without prohibitive expense. In considering the traffic potential the thought has been expressed that psychological resistance on the part of air passengers to riding in planes engaged in pick-up operations would make it unprofitable. No such feeling has been expressed by the persons who have flown as passengers over the present air pick-up routes and it is not anticipated that this factor will seriously retard the development of combination pick-up and passenger service.

Serious thought also is being given to the possibility of using gliders in future short-haul transportation. The spectacular achievements of gliders in warfare in the transportation of troops and supplies give the promise that they can be employed for the transportation of passengers and cargo in commercial operations.

The economic feasibility of short-haul air transportation as it has been conducted by conventional methods is still speculative but there can be no speculation about the economic and operating feasibility of air pick-up service which represents the intensive development of short-haul and local transportation.

By air pick-up the Government almost overnight could extend the benefits of direct air mail and air express service to every nook and corner of the country. This expansion could be accomplished at no great cost to the Post Office Department and would involve no expense to the Government for additional airports or aids to navigation. It also would afford postwar employment for thousands and a substantial market for new equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks by stating that West Virginia, now served by the air-mail pick-up in 34 communities, has been a valuable proving ground because of the rugged terrain and difficult flying conditions. At my home town of Elkins the system dispatched 13,659 pieces of mail during the first year of service. In 1944, 221,614 pieces were dispatched. The same phenomenal growth has been found at other points, including Morgantown where the increase in the first and most recent year jumped from 25,043 to 365,385 pieces. This city also dispatches air mail over the facilities of Pennsylvania-Central Airlines. I desire to also state that Morgantown was the base of operations for Dr. Adams during the pioneering period prior to the beginning of regular pick-up service.

Resolution of Development Agencies of the Northeastern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the development agencies of the Northeastern States, including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, having conferred on matters of mutual concern and interest at a meeting held in New York City on May 3 and 4, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The Northeastern States were the cradle of liberty and economic progress and are the heart of the commercial and industrial life of the Nation. These States are the homes and workshops of nearly one-third of the people of the Nation, and therefore America's greatest consumer market. At the same time, they stand as the chief gateway for the exchange of goods between this country and the rest of the world.

We combine a rich experience in industrial skills, business judgment, and advanced labor relations with a wealth of youthful ideas and energy, and shall continue to expand our contributions to the benefit of the entire country.

We are continuing, as ever, to lead the way in progressive government and business measures for the benefit of all peoples everywhere. Our histories have demonstrated that economic and political freedom are not merely compatible but complementary.

It is the sense of this meeting that the postwar prosperity of the Nation, particularly the reemployment of our returning service men and women, is the first order of business of the development agencies of the Northeastern States. To achieve this high objective, the Nation requires the mature experience and skilled workmanship of the people of the Northeastern States.

In peace as in war, we take pride in the industrial development and prosperity of our entire Nation, and shall continue to give our best efforts and "know how," to the end that all States will profit from the contributions of each, so that economic expansion can be general.

We shall continue to resist any effort to destroy the national free market, the birthright of every American, or to erect artificial trade and industrial barriers between States or regions, or to grant any special privileges to any sections of the country at the expense of the others. Opportunity for growth is unlimited throughout America, and we shall all prosper as we expand together.

VE-Day Emotion Questioned by Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is herewith printed David Lawrence's column datelined at San Francisco on May 9:

VE-DAY EMOTION QUESTIONED BY WRITER—CAMOUFLAGING OF TRUTH TO BRING ON OTHER WARS, SAYS LAWRENCE

(By David Lawrence)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 9.—This is a strange place to be writing about VE-day, but perhaps, after all, it is the most significant location in the whole world from which to express one's dissent from the prevailing concept of VE-day.

As encouragement for the future, as satisfaction over what has already been achieved, as an opportunity for prayer and thanksgiving that a big milestone has been reached—as President Truman has so eloquently proclaimed—there is reason for applause. But what real reason is there for rejoicing, for shouting, for carousing, for stopping work?

Will rejoicing bring back the hundreds of thousands who have been killed? Will it restore the limbs of the maimed, or heal the wounds of the sick? Will it stop the fighting against Japan? Will it help to prevent the next world war?

These are the questions that one asks today as the celebrations all around us seem so drab and artificial. But it is precisely because we camouflage truth on VE-days that we have such things as wars. We like to sweep along with so-called popular tides and let emotion appear as the substitute for reason. And that's why we keep on ignoring the facts that lead to wars.

OUT THERE IN THE PACIFIC

Today, as I write this in a high building which overlooks for miles around the entire bay of San Francisco, I see so many ships moving slowly out to sea, so many kinds of ships, so many loaded down and so many coming back to be reloaded, that I can think only of the war out there in the Pacific—10,000 miles away from our shores. We have won a war 3,500 miles away in Europe, but to win a war nearly three times as far away in the Pacific means an unsung, yet unprecedented, operation of supply and transportation so colossal that it is really indescribable.

Here in San Francisco, too, the United Nations Conference is going on. Millions of words are being written about its phrases and its maneuvers. Again, emotion prevails—and a limitation on truth-telling. It is popular, of course, to speak of the Conference here as one that is to make a lasting peace. It is considered desirable to emphasize such progress as is being made and to avoid telling the people the unpleasant truth, which is that the charter being written here is weaker by far and endeavors, at least on paper, to do much less to restrain the evil passions of would-be aggressors and selfish powers than the document drawn up 26 years ago in Paris.

To those who make such observations about the charter is flung back the misleading retort that they are perfectionists. They are told that the old league tried to do too much and hence failed. Excuses and more excuses, alibis and more alibis, and still not the whole truth.

What is the truth? It is that men with pride and devilish passion, with selfishness and greed, with an exaggerated sense of what military might can do to make peace and a scorn for the power of moral force and spiritual understanding, still rule this world and run its conferences. Timidity, such as men on the battlefield never show, hesitancy, and even fear, are the characteristics in and about the United Nations Conference.

OLD DOCTRINES STATED

One had hoped that here at San Francisco, after all the sacrifices of heroic men, there would be a new spirit; that the swashbuckling attitudes of power would be abandoned; and that governments would sit down together in all humbleness and examine their own consciences before they asked for political or economic terms of special advantage to themselves. But they boldly proclaim here that might makes right, that the weak have less voice because their armament is less, and that the strong must be trusted to be benevolent even when actuated by self-interest.

Here they proclaim that human rights are to be granted on paper but to be brushed aside if they conict with the internal policies of any nation. Here they state the same old doctrine that "internal" affairs are sacrosanct, which means that another Hitler and another Nazi party can arise, suppress freedom of speech and freedom of worship, and mislead millions of people into war. Must the charter of a conference of nations ignore all this as purely an "internal" and hence a forbidden question for world-wide inquiry and condemnation?

Some day the truth may force its way through. It must first make a shambles of this edifice of pretense called diplomacy and this mechanism of camouflage called expediency which permits quibble and equivocation. Then it will be revealed clearly that because powerful nations, like individuals, often wish to become a law unto themselves, there has been no universal peace.

We shall have peace only when peoples—the ones who shed their blood—are permitted to have complete access to each other through freedom of the press and speech and when the right to insist on the truth is not impaired by the coercive hand of totalitarian governments or dictatorships anywhere in the world.

Peoples can make peace and keep the peace if they will make governments their servants and not their masters.

Stop It Before It Starts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa Tribune of May 8, 1945:

STOP IT BEFORE IT STARTS

Never in our history, until now, have the American people been kept in the dark about the fate of American sons who have survived a war and who have rendered their highest duty in destroying the enemies who tried to rob us of our liberties and our rights.

Germany set out to destroy the United States of America. Germany set out to destroy, no less, England, France, Russia, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland. We fought to save these countries while we fought to save ourselves. And we destroyed that common foe. Now that job is done. We have carried a great deal of the war load. Now let our allies, two of them especially, carry the police load principally.

It is a very strange thing that the American people are not allowed to know what the late President Roosevelt said and did at Yalta that might commandeer our sons to stay in soldiers' service for an indefinite term of years.

If there is such a commitment, as has been at least implied, Mr. Roosevelt violated all the principles and practices of our liberties and repudiated all the traditions of our national life. We have a right to know.

Our sons enlisted for a period lasting 6 months after the duration of the war. They did not enlist for 25 years after the war. But it appears that agreements were made at Yalta for a half-million American soldiers to remain for 25 years in a section of Germany, and the least good section at that, to live the lives of policemen to patrol those mad people.

That is Europe's job. We have a war to win against Japan. It will need many of our men now in Europe. Congress should rise as one man to protest, and to stop any effort to pledge 25 years of the lives of half a million American men to any such service as is alleged to have been pledged at Yalta.

For our Government to take half a million men and commandeer a quarter of a century of their lives is a cruel conviction that is wholly without warrant and without justice.

Let's have the facts on this Yalta business. And if any such diabolical business as this was part of Mr. Roosevelt's pledge, Congress and the President should stop it before it starts.

Army Demobilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the New York Times of today by Maj. Gen. William F. Tompkins:

The standards that will control priority of separation from the Army will apply equally to soldiers all over the world and they embody the desires of the soldiers themselves, as expressed in polls taken by the War Department among thousands of enlisted men in this country and overseas. More than 90 percent of the men interviewed said they believed the men to be released first should be those who have been overseas and in combat longest and those with children.

Accordingly, the program to be followed provides for the issuance to each enlisted man and woman of an adjusted service rating card. Separate point totals will be entered on this card covering each of the following four factors:

1. Service credits: One point for each month of Army service since September 16, 1940. This is the same as 12 points per year.

2. Overseas credits: One point for each month served overseas since September 16, 1940. This too, is the same as 12 points per year.

RULES ON COMBAT CREDIT

3. Combat credit: 5 points for the first and each additional award of the following for service performed since September 16, 1940:

A. Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying

Cross, Soldiers Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Bronze Service Stars (battle participation stars).

B. Credit will also be given for the following decorations awarded by the Navy Department: Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Silver Star Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, and Purple Heart Medal.

C. Credit will be given for those awards and decorations of a foreign country which may be accepted and won under the War Department regulations in effect when the readjustment regulations are placed in operation.

4. Parenthood credit: 12 points for each child under 18 years up to a limit of 3 children.

HOW POINT SYSTEM WORKS

To illustrate how the point system works, let us suppose that a soldier has been in the Army 36 months, has served overseas for 18 months, has won the Silver Star and Purple Heart and participated in three major campaigns and is the father of a child under 18. He would receive 36 points in service credit, 18 points in overseas credit, 25 points in combat credit, and 12 points in parenthood credit. His total score would be 91 points.

The men with the highest point totals will become eligible for release from the Army, except where considerations of military necessity make it impossible to let them go until qualified replacements can be obtained. This exception applies particularly to men possessing special skills required in the war against Japan and to men in units that will have to move into the Pacific so swiftly that no opportunity is provided for replacing men with high scores until they reach the new theater.

The Army wants to be absolutely certain, however, that any such cases which arise represent true military necessity and not military convenience. Therefore, the theater commanders have been instructed to establish a reviewing authority at an appropriate level to consist of selected mature officers who will pass on every case where an individual with a score equal to or above the critical score is to be retained by reason of military necessity.

SYSTEM WILL HELP FATHERS

I know many of you are wondering how we know whether the point credits we intend to use will actually achieve the desired effect of permitting those soldiers who have seen the longest and most arduous service away from home and those with children to leave the Army first.

A preliminary survey made by the War Department on the basis of a one-sixth demobilization of the Army indicates that all but 2 percent of the men to be released will be men who have served overseas and that these 2 percent will be fathers who have been in the Army a long time.

The significance of this figure becomes clear when you consider that 68 men out of every 100 now serving in the Army have served overseas, whereas 98 out of every 100 to be returned to civilian life will be overseas veterans.

How well will the system succeed in providing preferential treatment for men with combat experience? Men who have been in combat constitute 35 percent of the Army, but 73 percent of the men who will get out are men from this group. Put another way, men with combat experience make up a little over one-third of the Army, but constitute nearly three-quarters of the number to be released.

Fathers represent 19 percent of the Army and 26 percent of the group returning to civilian life. In other words, one soldier out of five is a father, but one man in every four to be sent home will be a father. Since we did not begin drafting fathers until the war was well advanced, it is apparent that our system is operating heavily in their favor.

MOST DESERVING TO BE FIRST

I think these statistics make it clear that the point system carries out the desire expressed by our soldiers in the polls and gives first consideration to those most entitled to receive it.

After the adjusted-service rating cards have been filled out, the number of soldiers with each point total in every theater will be reported to The Adjutant General's office here in Washington and a certain point total will be established as the critical score. This critical score will represent the minimum number of points with which an enlisted man or woman can be released from the Army. There will be one critical score for all enlisted men in the Army Ground Forces and the Army Service Forces and another for all men in the Army Air Forces. A third critical score will be calculated for members of the Women's Army Corps. The three critical scores are designed to effect equality of treatment for enlisted personnel in all branches of the service.

It will take about 6 weeks before these critical scores can be computed and announced. However, the War Department has no intention of delaying releases until this computation is finished. An interim score of 85 points has been established for Army Ground, Air, and Service Forces enlisted personnel. All soldiers who have this many points or more will be considered as eligible for release in accordance with the plan, and men will start moving to separation centers for discharge early next week. For members of the WAC, an interim score of 44 points has been set up.

MEN ALLOWED TO STAY IN ARMY

Only points scored as of Saturday, May 12, 1945, will be taken into consideration in determining eligibility for release. The only credits which will be given after that date will be for decorations and battle participation stars earned prior thereto. Likewise additional credit will be given for children born on or before May 12, but whose birth was not known to the father at the time the scores were prepared.

Enlisted personnel who desire to remain in the service and have a satisfactory record will be retained.

Because of the requirements of the war against Japan, the strength of the Army Service Forces and the Army Air Forces will be reduced much less than the strength of the Army Ground Forces. As a result, the initial rate of release will be more rapid among ground troops than among those assigned to air forces or service forces. However, through transfers of some low-score men from the ground forces and new trainees, a proportionate share of men will be released from all three forces as rapidly as practicable.

ARMY TO AVOID UNFAIRNESS

In this whole program the Army has put the emphasis on the individual because we felt that was the only fair way in which to carry out demobilization. From the operating viewpoint it would have been much simpler to bring surplus units home for demobilization and release their personnel intact without worrying about whether all the men in them were entitled to priority of separation from the Army.

Such a method, however, would operate with great unfairness to many individuals who have had long and arduous service but are not assigned to one of the units declared surplus. If only units in Europe were considered, this method would work unfairly to units long in the Pacific or at outpost bases in the American theater. It would operate unfairly to men who have seen extended combat service both in Europe and the Pacific and have been returned to this country for reassignment. It would release men only recently assigned as replacements to units long in combat and would discriminate against veterans of many campaigns in units not selected for return.

Consequently, it was determined that the fairest method to effect partial demobilization would be through the selection of men as individuals, rather than by units, with the selection governed by thoroughly impartial standards.

The carrying out of this program will not affect the continued release of enlisted men over 42 years of age, which was started recently. Discharge of these men, upon application, will continue without regard to other factors.

Holders of the Medal of Honor will also be eligible for release upon their own request.

In addition, married members of the WAC will be released, at their own request, if their husbands have been separated from the armed forces and returned to civilian life.

STRICTER PLAN FOR OFFICERS

Now, I would like to explain the method we will use in releasing officers. It is tougher than the plan for enlisted personnel primarily because officers have received additional training, have heavier responsibilities, and have developed specialized skills and leadership capacity. They must be handled more on an individual than a group basis. Therefore, although officers will have an adjusted-service rating score based on the same multiples as for enlisted personnel, this factor will be secondary to the prime requirement of military necessity.

The expression "military necessity," as applied to officers, means consideration must be given on an individual basis to the relative utility of an officer, need for his specialty, and the availability of assignments which will make the best use of his capabilities. Officers with lengthy overseas service and long and hazardous service in combat will receive special consideration for release. An officer's desire to remain in the service at this time will be another factor to get consideration.

The return of officers to the United States will be controlled by theater commanders, who will use the foregoing principles in making their decisions. However, I wish to emphasize that the determination of whether or not an officer is to be released from the Army, as opposed to simply being returned to the United States, will be made by the commanding generals of the Army ground, air, and service forces acting under the general supervision of the War Department.

SYSTEM IS SET FOR CENTERS

In other words, if an officer is declared surplus by his theater commander, he may still be retained if he is needed by any unit of the A. A. F., A. G. F., or A. S. F.

When individuals who are surplus to overseas theaters arrive in this country, they will proceed from ports to a reception station close to their home area. Twenty-two of these reception stations will be placed about the country in order that the Army may bring individuals as close to their homes as possible. Seventeen of them are already in operation and the remainder will begin operations during June. Here in the reception station those individuals with scores equal to or above the critical score will be screened once more to determine whether they are essential to the Army as a whole or are nonessential and can therefore be returned to civilian life.

Again let me emphasize that an enlisted man whose score entitles him to release will be held in the Army as essential only if his skill is so important to the Army and so scarce that he cannot be spared. Individuals of this type who do have to be held will be replaced as rapidly as the Army can train and

make available replacements with the proper skills.

An individual who is found nonessential at the reception station is immediately transferred to a separation center, located at the same post, for processing for release from the Army. The complete process in a separation center will take about 48 hours, after which the individual is on his way to his home as a civilian. As you know, at the separation center, every possible assistance is given to prepare the soldier for his return to civilian life. We want those who are separated from the Army to know that their services are deeply appreciated.

HARD TASK IS SEEN AHEAD

We are certain, too, that they will prove themselves to be as good citizens as they have been soldiers, and as soldiers they have shown themselves to be unexcelled. The many citizen soldiers who must remain in the service have a tough job ahead. Their accomplishments so far indicate that they will more than measure up to that task. They may be assured that when the job is done procedures will be ready to insure their prompt return to civilian life.

Through the same reception stations, which I have just mentioned, pass the individuals returned to this country in units which will be required for continued service against the Japanese. These individuals will have in almost every case scores below the critical score. They will be brought from the ports to these reception stations in order to get them close to their home areas. Here they receive travel time to and from their homes, plus up to 30 days' furlough for rest and recuperation. After that they report to the designated point where their unit is to be reformed for continued active service.

Postwar Jobs in Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Republic of February 28, 1944:

POSTWAR JOBS IN AIRCRAFT

Statisticians like to say that war employment in the aircraft industry has not expanded—it has exploded. Substantially they are correct. In 1939 about 50,000 men and women made up the total working force of the American aircraft industry. Today nearly 2,000,000 are at work in aircraft plants over the Nation. In addition at least 200,000 members of the armed forces are former aircraft workers with legal right to available jobs in that industry. Two out of every 17 workers now employed by American industry are aircraft workers.

What do these workers have to look forward to on the morning after the victory of the United Nations over the Axis? Will the explosive expansion of aircraft employment during the war be matched by an even sharper deflationary detonation once the demand for planes to smash the Axis has been met?

To look now for an answer to these questions is, in my opinion, a very direct and immediate part of the Nation's war effort. For workers in the aircraft industry know and fear the specter of postwar unemployment. The men and women who trekked to southern California or Detroit in search of a war job 2 years ago, are beginning now to look around for other jobs—jobs that will carry through into peacetime employment. Increasingly when the worker has freedom of choice among a number of jobs, his choice is for one in "permanent" industry rather than in the aircraft plants or shipyards.

Fear of the future—the conviction that regular paychecks are purely wartime phenomena—has bitterly intensified worker resentment against the inequitable application of Government "stabilization" policies. The rigidities of the Little Steel formula seem doubly onerous to the worker who sees both his present and his future standard of living slashed by high prices. Inevitably, therefore, the Nation is paying a price in terms of depleted production morale for failure to give the aircraft worker at least a fighting chance for future security.

Such a fighting chance for the aircraft worker has not been within the vision of those Government experts who have been charting, graphing, and forecasting the future. A very pleasant statistical gentleman from the United States Department of Labor recently gave me and my fellow officers of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. his picture of what lay in store for us following victory over the Axis. His charts showed aircraft employment curving upward with all the verve of a skyrocket from 1940 on through 1943 and 1944. But then at 194— came the end of the war, and with it there was a fall in aircraft employment like the side of the Grand Canyon.

The best we could expect was to find employment for about 300,000 workers in the aircraft industry. Maximum annual production would be a little bit less than 2 weeks' output at the industry's present rate. One aircraft worker out of 15 might find a job in the industry. The rest would choose between unemployment and "withdrawal from the labor force."

I am convinced that those figures are accurate only if we do nothing to prevent them from being verified by reality. I do not believe that we must accept any assumption that the hundreds of thousands of workers, the Negroes, the women, the older workers—who are doing so magnificent a job on the assembly lines—must be rewarded by bread lines and continuing insecurity. Such an assumption of renewed unemployment for millions in the postwar world is an assumption of national defeat and chaos which I shall never be prepared to make.

Certainly some curtailment of aircraft production is inevitable. No presently conceivable peacetime economy could justify devoting 2,000,000 workers and $12,000,000,000 a year to the production of aircrart. No worker wants to continue a situation in which the Nation's life and liberty hangs on the production of 100,000 warplanes a year. I am confident, nevertheless, that our postwar aircraft industry can provide employment for well over a million workers—and become a mainspring of economic and social progress.

My own prediction is based, like those of the statisticians, upon certain assumptions. I am assuming:

1. That the United Nations carry through to a complete and unconditional victory over the Axis, and establish thereby the bedrock foundation to a peaceful and democratic world.

2. That political and economic cooperation among the United Nations continues to develop for winning the peace and assuring the democratic development of a world economy.

3. That the American people rally in this year's elections to defeat the rightist reaction at home which would snatch away from us the victory over fascism.

4. That American labor, industry and farm groups press for an economy of full production and employment, with gross national product running at levels of close to $200,000,000,000 a year.

Not a single one of these assumptions represents any historic inevitability. But they are the fighting objectives of hundreds of millions of common people throughout the world today. With certain important limitations, they are the objectives of industry groups who are learning in the war that world organization along Fascist lines can lead only to their own destruction. We in the labor movement feel that we have a right to make these assumptions in our planning because we are fighting for their realization in the war factories today—and will vote, along with millions of our fellow citizens, for their realization in the elections next fall.

If the American people as a whole enjoy decent income and a rising standard of living, if the channels of international trade are fully opened up, if the system of autarchal self-sufficiency which characterized the early preparations of Fascist powers for world domination is fully rooted out, then we can talk of 1,000,000 jobs in the postwar aircraft industry in terms of solid and practical reality. Otherwise what we must talk about will not be jobs in the aircraft industry of peace, but jobs in the manufacture of weapons for a Third World War. In the planning of such an economy I suspect that organized labor, together with readers of The New Republic, will be permited very little to say.

What are steps necessary to the development of the aircraft industry in a democratic world?

First of all it is necessary, in my opinion, to work out measures to protect aircraft workers and their families in the period of conversion that will follow almost inevitably upon the cutting off of the monster load of war orders upon which the industry is now working. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, together with increased State unemployment insurance, can do part of that vital job in protecting the health and economic welfare of those who built the planes for victory.

In addition, the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has brought before industry and government proposals for the accumulation of funds out of war profits from which severance and layoff bonuses may be paid out to workers at the end of the war. This obviously noninflationary measure is one which cries out for adoption by war agencies dealing with labor and wage policies. Retraining and educational projects for aircraft workers who do not plan to return to the industry should be initiated during the conversion period under Government auspices.

A second and companion imperative is to shorten as much as possible this period of conversion and of tooling up for new production in aircraft plants. For this purpose I believe that an industry planning committee, with representatives of manufacturers, government, and labor, should be established immediately. The extremely complex problems of plant disposal, of inventories, of determining which plants are to stand by ready for production of military planes, of where orders are to be concentrated as war demand tapers off—all these things can be decided in the interest of the Nation only if labor is assured its rightful voice in the making of such basic decisions.

Public moneys to the value of nearly $4,000,000,000 have gone into the construction and equipping of aircraft plants throughout the country. What use is made of that tremendous investment (about 40 times the industry's own investment from 1935 to 1939) is a matter of crucial public concern.

Investigation should be immediately undertaken by such a tripartite committee to determine possible uses for postwar aircraft plants whose productive capacity will not be required in the predictable future.

Most aircraft-parts plants are readily convertible to the output of various types of consumers' durable goods. The aircraft-engine plants, with their batteries of basic machine tools, likewise are available for any

and all types of metal fabrication. Final-assembly plants present a more difficult problem. Their jigs and fixtures are adapted for the most part to the production of only one plane model. Their tools are generally light and are not suited to a wide range of production. At a minimum, these plants represent a tremendous asset in available floor space in modern plants for the manufacture of anything from four-motor bombers to prefabricated houses or widgets.

For the conversion period and as long as unemployment exists, a 30-hour week should prevail in the industry—with the guarantee of a decent annual wage.

TECHNOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Assuming the emergence of steady mass purchasing power, postwar aviation can become a mass industry like the automobile industry, provided only that certain technical problems are solved. So far the complexity, uncertainty and danger, even, of light-plane operation has kept it the monopoly of sportsmen or enthusiastic amateurs.

None of these problems is basic. Concerted research work should open the way to the production of a light plane that you or I can operate with the same certainty and with substantially less risk than the present family jalopy. Assuming that only one automobile owner out of five is willing to go on the market for such a plane, that demand should be sufficient to maintain an annual output of about 1,000,000 light planes.

A pooling of research facilities and personnel through Government support for such a project would be out of the normal channel of technological development in American corporate enterprise. But it would bring results. Only through such joint effort could immediate research work be undertaken on an adequate scale without interference with the essential war research and development which are now the primary responsibility of the industry and the Government.

AIR PASSENGER AND CARGO TRANSPORT

Civilian air travel today is the almost exclusive privilege of the socially, politically, or economically elect. In the postwar world this situation can continue only as a direct result of planned sabotage to air travel. Naturally the same forces which were charged before the Kilgore committee with choking of the manufacture of streamlined trains in order to keep obsolescent Pullman cars in operation will be hostile toward large-scale, cheap air transport for the average American.

This resistance must be broken down. It is the only barrier to air travel in postwar America for the common man and his family. It can be broken down if pressure from the American people and their elected representatives is brought to bear against the monopoly groups which are responsible for this sabotage of progress. It is by no means visionary to predict that the average American in the future will be able to vacation in California, in Europe, or the islands of the Pacific. For improved travel facilities means not less travel but more—a lesson which even the profit accounts of the transport monopolies should verify.

The same principles apply to air cargo transportation. Here international trade will be decisive. Full interchange of goods and services among all nations will provide a giant stimulus to the expansion of aircraft. Clearly, present rates per ton-mile for air freight have been artificially maintained. Sharp reductions in costs, together with control of corporate price policy, should put air transport within the range of any shipper to whom speedy delivery is a major consideration.

Obviously, likewise, international air transport cannot be advanced on any program of Lucean air imperialism or on arrogant demands for American air bases to girdle the world. The future of international air transport hangs on the future of peaceful and cooperative relations among all nations of the earth.

LABOR RELATIONS

Emerging as a new force in American industry, the aircraft industry should and must create for itself a new pattern of labor relations. An opportunity exists to develop cooperative relationships which can lead to new levels of joint accomplishment. The pattern of corporate hostility to unionism which still scars the automobile industry must not be duplicated in aircraft.

Our union can report already that substantial progress is being made toward this end in wartime. Whether such will continue to be the case when the wartime pressure for manpower and production is lifted, I cannot presume to say. That question of policy will be determined by the powers of the industry.

My frank advice to them, however, is to remember that the entire future of their industry is linked to the force of democratic progress in this country and throughout the world. If they are to profit by such developments they must at the same time give recognition to democracy where it most directly counts—in the plants where the planes are made.

RICHARD T. FRANKENSTEEN.

The European Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, stark hunger is stalking Europe in the wake of the war. With the crying urgency of feeding the hungry of Europe, it seems to me that the House Agriculture Committee has an important mission to perform in seeing that the food needs of Europe are met efficiently and effectively without jeopardizing the situation on the home front.

Former President Hoover, who contributed one of the greatest jobs to humanity with his distribution and care of the food problem after the last war has spoken out for immediate action to save hundreds of thousands of children from starvation in Europe. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, our great military leader, also has indicated the importance of the job of feeding the peoples of Europe.

While we have one governmental agency, the U. N. R. R. A., functioning for relief purposes, it seems to me that to objectively plan a program, and to see that the proper goals and food supply are achieved to meet the needs which confront us, that the Agriculture Committee of the House outline a survey and study of the conditions by making a personal inspection and investigation of conditions in Europe. With this first-hand information, we would be in a position to report and make suitable recommendations to see that we fulfill our obligations to the deserving peoples of Europe while sizing up the demands of the home front. This would enable us to shape adequate plans for food production and give us complete knowledge of conditions and potential demands from agriculture.

As I have stated before, food is one of the most important factors in winning the peace of the world. Well-fed persons are happy. If we can help keep the hungry fed, we can help avoid future wars.

On Increased Congressional Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the rule on H. R. 3109 for the reason that I am opposed to that provision in this bill providing for an expense allowance for Representatives in Congress, and I voted against the bill, when it came before this body on a motion to recommit.

In my opinion there has been no material change in the status of Members of Congress since the last election to justify this action by Congress. Therefore, with no material change in the status of the expenses incidental to the office, I am of the opinion that this is not the time for us to make provision for increased living expenses and other incidental expenses attached to the office.

The congressional committees appointed for the purpose of making recommendations relative to the streamlining and modernizing Congress are at this time conducting hearings on this matter. Many suggestions have been made by economic experts pertaining to the matter of streamlining Congress. These committees have not as yet made their report nor have they made their recommendations to Congress on these matters. Until they have made their report and submitted their recommendations to Congress, I do not feel this is the proper time to pass legislation on this matter in a piecemeal fashion, without the benefit of the facts from the investigations now being made by the congressional committees which have been appointed for that very purpose.

Crossroads Town or Superfactory—United States Builds on Firm Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Christian Science Monitor by Mr. R. H. Markham, who is one of the outstanding magazine writers. Mr. Markham

states that this article is inspired by a recent visit to the Midwest, where he saw both main phases of modern existence—industry and agriculture. He calls attention to his visit through one of the greatest manufacturing plants ever built that turns out "one of the mightiest, most intricate, and most beautiful machines ever produced—the B–29 Superfortress." Mr. Markham speaks of his trip over the Kansas prairies and his visit to towns and villages, and describes a typical town whose name is legion because of its former beloved citizen, William Allen White.

I commend the reading of this article to you:

Although there is much inequality, a good deal of lawlessness, and not a little unjust discrimination in the United States, there is far more good will, brotherliness, freedom, and justice.

I have just had a special occasion to observe some of these good things, and found them very inspiring. They have strengthened my conviction that the United States has enabled masses of common men and women to live in a far more prosperous, enlightened, neighborly, and independent manner than was ever the case before. There is much to be reformed, but the United States has laid the best basis that has ever existed for good life on the part of common people.

These remarks are inspired by a recent visit to the Midwest, where I saw both main phases of modern existence—industry and agriculture. I had an opportunity to visit one of the greatest manufacturing plants ever built, the Boeing airplane factory at Wichita, Kans., and to wander through the labyrinth of its amazing production lines.

TEAMWORK ON SUPER SCALE

The vast building is as clean and light and convenient as a modern university. It turns out one of the mightiest, most intricate, and most beautiful machines ever produced—the B–29 Superfortress. Perfect engineering, flawless construction, unerring precision are required. Never have bulk and minutiae been more intimately combined. Inspecting it one wonders if the production of any other single machine anywhere at any time has called upon so many men and women so completely to adapt themselves to teamwork and so unreservedly to follow directions.

The production line of that factory, with all its tributaries, resembles a great river system, emerging as a tiny spring and eventually flowing as a mighty flood into the sea.

A B–29 starts as nothing, or rather, as a plan in the corner of a factory, then gathers wires, rivets, metal sheets, motors, body, immense wings, and finally emerges, all in a single shift, as the mightiest bird that ever soared into the air. A score of thousands of men and women, white and Negro, strewn along the lines, upstairs and down, with hammers and brushes and screw drivers, with delicate pincers, and with power cranes that could lift railroad cars, all work in unison as a champion rowing crew.

STEADY PACE WITHOUT TENSION

When the broad factory doors swing open at regular intervals, day and night, to let an American eagle fly into the air, the throng of workers might well applaud its silvery flight as a team victory.

The lines move almost unceasingly, but with little appearance of strain or tension. The pace is steady and humane; each task is measured.

Men and women work side by side and get equal pay. White and Negro work at the same task for the same reward. They gather in the some lounging rooms, listen to the same radios, eat at the same places, sit together on the same benches.

Relationships are friendly and dignified. The toilers are neatly dressed. They seem to have as much self-respect and assurance as a lawyer in his office or a teacher in his classroom. And they are far better paid than most high-school teachers.

HOUSING FACILITIES ARE GOOD

Although this is an emergency project, carried on by workers who flocked into the area in multitudes, they are well housed in clean marginal settlements that are equipped with modern conveniences, served by good stores and shops, and provided with excellent schools, good playgrounds, and suitable places of worship.

In this factory also the bosses are closely associated with the workers, and the big chief's old Chevrolet is daily parked on the factory lot near the workers' cars of the same type. There has been no work stoppage because of labor trouble. All the producers, from the chief through the engineers and technicians to the floor sweepers, have cooperated with confidence and a sense of devotion to a common task.

In that extremely intricate plant, where utter exactitude in timing and production is required, one might expect the workers to become robots and the bosses tyrants, but that is in no sense the case. What you see there are mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors, proud of their place in American life, jealous of individual freedom, and determined several times each day and night to send a gigantic silver bird to their young men fighting for America at the ends of the earth. They work well, are paid well, live well, and are consciously trying to help one another make a better America.

ITS NAME IS LEGION

And if we go from this splendid factory, typifying our machine civilization, out over the Kansas prairies and vist towns and villages, we see still more pleasing scenes. Let us take a typical town of 10,000 inhabitants. I shall not mention its name, because, though I have a special town in mind, its name is Legion.

It has wide, clean, well-paved streets, beneath graceful, overarching trees. A central park adds to the impression of spaciousness and liberty of freedom from constraint and compulsion. Two peripheral parks serve as picnic grounds and are well patronized. There are several sport fields.

Two modest, well-housed colleges of denominational origin vie in a friendly way for sport trophies and academic honors. There is a fine high school and an appropriate number of good primary schools.

Large, well-built, and pretty-well-attended churches adorn the central city blocks, and posters in the windows of the business houses show that the pastors are busy in common, useful projects. You find a Y. W. C. A. and a Y. M. C. A.

The local daily paper is an honor to America's free press. I am not intimating that every American town of 10,000 has a William Allen White, but many small-town dailies are of a higher standard than not a few big-city dailies. They show integrity, competence, a balanced news sense, and moral responsibility.

Relations between the town's bankers and the farmers or businessmen are not those of Shylocks with desperate debtors; most of the bankers seem more like neighborly promoters. Not a few of them point with pride to many young fellows whom they helped get a start.

INEQUALITIES ARE AMELIORATED

The houses in town are much alike; so are the furnishings. Naturally, there are better streets and poorer ones, newer buildings and older ones, but no slums.

The Negro problem—or the white problem in relation to Negroes—is not solved, but inequalities are ameliorated. Negro boys and girls sit beside white classmates. No other racial or class problem seriously violates democratic ideals there. Homes are often left unlocked.

The high-school principal and milkman call each other by their first names; the Lutheran pastor and the Greek restaurant keeper sit side by side in the grandstand and cheer their Hans and Nick as they charge the line together in the college football game.

NEIGHBORLY BUT NOT PROVINCIAL

Yet with this neighborliness there is no comic provincialism. The girls and women dress stylishly as their sisters in Washington or Boston, the coeds one degree less sloppily than their fellow students in the famous girls' schools of the East.

Prominent lecturers make frequent visits, and the people are well informed on world affairs. They are also as familiar with fast automobiles, splendid roads, crack trains, and silver planes as any community on earth.

Some impatient, impetuous, rebellious reformers are inclined to laugh with scorn at such a picture of good America. But it is a true picture, and anyone with eyes may see it for himself. These facts stand solidly for all the world to behold. One may soberly say that America has made the dreams of ages come true. Some of the dreams. Others still remain to be realized. Building must be continued. But it would be well to build on the present foundation and not tear it down in fanatical devotion to foreign models.

Significance of VE-Day to the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement entitled "Significance of VE-day to the Veteran":

"The capitulation of Germany serves as a forceful and immediate reminder that the United States is woefuly unprepared to assume its just responsibility to the millions of fighting men who, it is hoped, will be returning to civilian life at an early date," declared Jean A. Brunner, Forest Hills, N. Y., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in a statement issued on VE-day.

While hailing the great victory over Germany, Brunner pointed out that "the men who made VE-day possible, and who are carrying the cause of liberty into Japan's own backyard, now more than ever demand that adequate consideration be given to that date in the not too distant future when they will be coming home.

"While we humbly give thanks that the evil German forces of oppression have been conquered without greater loss of American life, we must stop to recall that the war is far from won. Yet, at this time, it is fitting to take inventory of the Nation into which some of our boys will be setting foot again soon.

"We find that the men returning from the battle fronts will encounter an understaffed

and overloaded veteran's agency; that they will experience difficulty in obtaining a job—unless they return to their former place of work—or opening a new business, or securing education and vocational training, and that they will discover no concrete plan for avoiding another world conflict.

"And let us not forget those who will be kept overseas until final victory is won. The V. F. W. has consistently sought 30 days furlough in the United States for each fighting man after 18 months' overseas service, and we are gratified that General Marshall has seen fit to base forthcoming home leave on length of service. We sincerely trust that the forgotten men with 3 and 4 years' service in the Pacific for whom we have tried time and again to obtain furloughs on the rotation plan will be given equal consideration with the triumphant troops in Europe."

Brunner, speaking for 900,000 war veterans, including over 500,000 now fighting in combat theaters overseas, called upon the Nation's leaders to prepare for the discharge of millions of servicemen now scheduled by the War Department by taking immediate action on the following program of the V. F. W.:

1. Thirty-day furloughs in the United States for all men after 18 months of foreign service, with preference given to those with extended periods of combat duty, 3 and 4 years, in the Pacific as well as in the European theater of operations.

2. Demobilization procedure, based solely on length and type of service, which will give discharge preference in the following order: (1) Combat disabled veterans; (2) those with longest periods of combat service; (3) those with longest periods of foreign service; (4) those with the longest periods of home service.

3. An adequately staffed and equipped, efficiently operated Veterans' Administration, capable of serving 15,000,000 war veterans with elimination of delay and red tape in adjudication of claims to veterans and dependents.

4. Complete and adequate hospital facilities for free medical treatment of honorably discharged veterans.

5. Full opportunity for employment of returning servicemen, including recognition of military service in computing job seniority for the purpose of both securing and retaining jobs in industries where employment is based on seniority—placing the veteran on an equal footing with the worker who obtained a job in a war plant since Pearl Harbor.

6. Relaxation of rationing, priority, and surplus property sale restrictions to enable the veteran to enter business and to take advantage of loan provisions of the G. I. bill of rights.

7. Liberalization and prompt and efficient administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to remove barriers impeding practical application of loan and educational provisions.

8. Insulation against another world war through immediate adoption of a compulsory peacetime training program, maintenance of large and well-equipped land, air, and naval forces, inclusion of representatives of combat veterans in peace conferences concluding the present war and participation of the United States in a world association to maintain peace, by force when necessary.

9. The ultimate postwar goal of the V. F. W.—a stake in the future for the veteran, commensurate with the financial advantage accrued by the war worker, consisting of adjusted service pay for World War No. 2 veterans through a credit of $3 a day for home service and $4 a day for overseas service, with a maximum of $3,500 for home service and $4,500 for overseas service, exclusive of $500 extra credit to those wounded in active service in line of duty.

A. F. of L. Supports Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I include in the RECORD the following excellent article by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, endorsing the Bretton Woods agreements, which was published in the May issue of the American Federationist:

WE BACK BRETTON WOODS

(By William Green)

The American Federation of Labor, in accordance with its stated policy of supporting a world organization to aid in resolving differences between nations and in bringing about a lasting peace, recommends that Congress accept the Bretton Woods agreements with necessary clarifications and safeguards, as of vital importance in implementing the functions of such a world organization. We take this position because we experienced after the First World War the alternatives to cooperative action in this field, and we know they would bring even more direful consequences now.

Labor realizes that exchange controls and loans are only one key to resumption of world trade and rehabilitation of economies destroyed or damaged by the war. We need also economic agencies for reconstruction.

MUST ALSO ACT IN OTHER FIELDS

It will be necessary to take action in other important fields, such as food, cartels, surplus commodities, aviation, and others, and it is not to be expected that the Bretton Woods agreements alone will suffice to prevent post-war chaos in international trade. We do believe, however, that these agreements can make a substantial contribution toward solving immediate and long-term problems of exchange and international investment.

The A. F. of L.'s main reasons for urging acceptance are as follows:

"While we believe that the chief source of prosperity in this country lies in maximum productive employment which would support greatly enlarged markets for our home use, we also believe that an additional source lies in expanding international trade.

"It is particularly important for a small country to have an opportunity to satisfy its economic needs through international agencies, instead of being forced to resort to bilateral agreements with a dominant power. These bilateral economic agreements might well bring the small country within the political orbit of the dominant power, thus jeopardizing its national integrity and independence.

"Experience with international investments in the period between the two wars has demonstrated the need for international understanding and cooperation instead of blind competition. In the long run, investment must be repaid with goods. But during that period international investments were often devoted to developments which were not productive of goods, such as balancing of accounts, housing projects, etc. There was an additional handicap to repayment because of high rates of interest. The result was repudiation of debts or depreciation of currency, with loss to the investor. Under the Bretton Woods agreements the investor is insured against loss both by the bank and the country of the borrower, after the bank has assured itself that the loans are to be used for productive purposes. One great cause of potential ill feeling or ill-advised action is eliminated by making the debtor country responsible to the bank rather than directly to the loaning country. An additional safeguard is provided in that each government is authorized to prevent its currency from being loaned if it regards the loan as insecure. All losses are shared, thus reducing the loss to any one country.

"The policy followed between the wars of national self-interest in competitive currency depreciation, fostered depressions, discriminatory control of foreign exchange; bilateral agreements for barter, high tariffs, controlled reduction of imports, dumping, and similar forms of economic warfare did in some cases aid temporarily in solving domestic problems for individual countries, but in the long run contracted international trade and lowered the standard of living in all countries and strengthened trends toward isolation. The proposed fund provides a plan for the elimination of such practices and the gradual restoration of the orderly and stable exchange relationships essential to expanding international trade. It has been recognized that equitable exchange rates cannot be determined immediately because of the present disruption of international trade. Provision for flexibility has therefore been made in the agreements, permitting gradual relaxation of wartime exchange and currency controls, as well as limited currency devaluation. The fund should aid nations in relaxing these controls.

"It is to the advantage of workers that the currency of their country be stabilized, that inflation or deflation be avoided, and that their savings and their earnings should not be destroyed by violent fluctuations. In the past there have been such losses to the workers and their families because of the inability of their countries to borrow on a short-term basis in bad years to pay for the imports which in good years would balance their exports. Their governments, without an international fund from which to borrow, where forced to resort to such poverty-creating expedients as limiting imports, fostering a depression, or devaluating their currency.

"If the United States does not ratify these agreements we may be accused of bad faith by the people of the world who are relying on us for aid in their prostration and misery. On the other hand, our acceptance of these agreements may engender good will which will be a strong force in the mutual settlement of other international problems."

ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

The American Federation of Labor believes that it is both a matter of human decency and a matter of enlightened self-interest on the part of the United States to share through the bank in restoring the prewar economic status of our allies. They need aid on a self-respecting basis in restoring their general productive capacity and in stabilizing their currencies during the period of restoration. Some of our allies are practically bankrupt as a result of war devastation and of their need to liquidate all available assets. Until their productive capacity is restored and increased, they cannot engage in extensive international trade, nor can they pay with exports for their imports. Restoration will mean greater productive employment and higher standards of living in all countries, including our own. To achieve these purposes would constitute a constructive investment even if the loans were not repaid.

Authorization should be given to the bank to make either short-term or long-term loans to countries needing them for general economic stabilization in addition to loans for specific projects of reconstruction and development, under safeguarding guaranties

as provided elsewhere in the agreement. In the articles of agreement, international bank for reconstruction and development, article III, section 4 (vii), reads as follows: "Loans made or guaranteed by the bank shall, except in special circumstances, be for the purpose of specific projects of reconstruction and development." At the recent hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee, one of our delegates to the Bretton Woods Conference testified that the phrase "except in special circumstances" was intended to cover such general restoration and stabilization loans. The authority of the bank to make these loans should be clarified. We recommend, therefore, that this provision "except in special circumstances" be expanded to include specific authorization to the bank to make these general restoration and stabilization loans.

We realize that the Bretton Woods proposals to stabilize rates must be supplemented by efforts to expand and stabilize the economy and the domestic financial system of each country, followed by efficient marketing of products at home and abroad, and constantly increasing consumer purchasing power with greater production.

High levels of productive employment cannot be maintained by individual countries without cooperation between countries to sustain the efforts of all countries and to promote progressively higher standards of living for the people of all countries.

When efforts are made to eliminate obstacles to trade between nations, workers must be assured that lower tariffs do not mean lower labor standards.

The one special organization which labor helped to create and to which we have entrusted the protection and advancement of labor standards and welfare is the International Labor Organization. This organization must be continued and authorized to protect our interests in connection with operations of the bank and the fund and coordinate economic progress. The International Labor Organization must be preserved with its present independence and with its present capacity for service. We urge that Congress provide policy on the bank and fund directing our representatives to insist that consultation with the International Labor Organization be made a base administrative procedure before deciding upon policies and use of funds.

We also urge that our Government's representatives should be instructed to insist that the bank, in considering loans for reconstruction and development projects, should include in any contract standard labor provisions requiring that the recipient of the loan must give minimum guaranties of welfare on the work, including observance of the labor laws and requirements of the country, prevailing wages and hours, safety and health standards, and, in general, the labor standards recommended by the International Labor Organization.

Fair labor standards guarantee the welfare of workers and therefore increase productivity, promote justice, economic stability, and prosperity. These purposes are an implementation of the expressed objectives of the Bretton Woods proposals.

The functioning of the bank and fund will be no better than the men administering them. Wisdom, foresight, good judgment, and broad experience as a basis of cooperation will be needed if these international institutions are to perform their part in an expanding world prosperity and peace.

We urge that the selection of our representatives be made without regard to politics, and in consultation with representatives of the main functional organizations of our economy which are vitally concerned.

Guard for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Guard for Liberty" by Daniel M. Kidney, which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

GUARD FOR LIBERTY

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Hitler and Mussolini rose to power by denouncing political parties and "corrupt politicians," Ambassador Claude G. Bowers maintains.

The former Ambassador to republican Spain, who now represents the United States in Chile, outlined his views in the Virginia Quarterly Review under In Defense of Politicians.

As a historian, Mr. Bowers maintains that the greatest Presidents were the best politicians—except Woodrow Wilson—and warns against the trend to discredit politics and politicians as being Fascist.

"I have observed, close hand, that invariably the preliminary campaign (toward dictatorship) has taken the form of a denunciation of political parties and corrupt politicians," he wrote.

"The assumption of the Goebbels propagandists was that a political party not dominated by the state is a faction, and that all politicians are incompetent and corrupt.

"There certainly are some corrupt politicians, just as there are corrupt financiers, corrupt merchants, corrupt industrialists, and corrupt preachers, but no one is so unfair as to draw a sweeping indictment against these sectors of society because they contain, here and there, a corrupt man.

"Only in the case of politicans is the charge made general, and that, of course, is a fantastic falsehood. When we reflect that in the case of men engaged politically in the public service the spotlight is constantly thrown upon them and the microscope used in eager search of evidence of wrongdoing, we tremble to think what might be the result if all the other elements of society were subjected to the same constant and intensive scrutiny.

"And nothing could be more amusing than the notion that with the elimination of politicians, which would mean the extermination of democracy, corruption would disappear from government.

"It is common knowledge that leaders of fascism in Italy and Germany accumulated vast fortunes through the ungentle art of stealing by force; and in the stealing of the property of the citizens, these nabobs of tyranny also deprived them of their natural rights, liberties, and human dignity.

"This astounding pillaging of the state and of individuals, by the totalitarian dignitaries, would be quite impossible where the people can pass on such crimes through legal and political action. * * *

"The dictator must suppress political parties because he must impose silence. With but one party, and that an organ of the government, the rulers can keep the people in ignorance of the fact that their pockets are being picked and their liberties are being taken away.

"Party government means ballots; Fascist government means surrender or bullets."

Psychological Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following two articles entitled "Psychological Nonsense," an editorial in today's Washington Daily News, and "Capitol Stuff" by John O'Donnell, which appeared in today's Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 11, 1945]

PSYCHOLOGICAL NONSENSE

This newspaper isn't seeking subscribers among the beaten Germans. So it's no skin off our personal nose that the Office of War Information has joined in an agreement to bar from Germany, during the initial period of occupation, all privately published American, British, and other newspapers and magazines. The story was an exclusive in this newspaper yesterday.

We think, however, that the agreement is silly. And so is O. W. I. Director Elmer Davis' explanation of why it was made. He gave the explanation following publication of our story. We report it today on page 16.

"For 12 years," says Mr. Davis, "the Germans have been getting out of the habit of understanding what a free press means." For some time, he goes on, it won't be safe to let them read private publications from free-press countries, which might give them "too much of an impression of divided policies." Instead, they will be confined to publications "conducted" by American, British and, doubtless, Russian officials.

This, according to Mr. Davis, is the decision of the Psychological Warfare Command, composed of American and British military men and civilians. Only last week President Truman said, in cutting O. W. I.'s budget, that events then culminating were expected to make possible the end of psychological warfare in the European theater. But our psychological warriors seem determined to become psychological peace wagers, at the taxpayers' expense. We can only wonder at their brand of psychology.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 11, 1945]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Distinguished members of the medical profession have pointed out that one of the occupational hazards of the practice of psychology is that a doctor at times becomes as screwy as the patient.

As a case in point, we call attention to the latest proposal of the Office of War Information and its uniformed stooge, the War Department's Division of Psychological Warfare, for the immediate treatment of Germany's psychological ills brought on by the Hitler regime.

In substance it is this: Germany, under Hitler, had a controlled press and all-powerful propaganda set-up—almost as 100 percent airtight as that imposed by the dictators of Russia on the citizens of the Soviet.

So the psychological experts of O. W. I. announced yesterday that the triumphant forces of liberty in Germany, by way of giving practical application to the somewhat moth-eaten principles of the "four freedoms," will

go Hitler one better in the way of iron-clad censorship and all-out propaganda.

In the first place, no United States newspaper, magazine, or book will be permitted to get into the hands of a resident of occupied Germany; also barred from Germany, Director of O. W. I. Elmer Davis said yesterday afternoon, will be the publications of all foreign countries—Swiss, Swedish, etc.

To fill this vacuum in the consciousness of German readers, O. W. I. is using up some newsprint in its London office turning out what it hopes will be a best seller among the German populace.

This first effort will be a booklet, profusely illustrated, depicting the horrors of the German concentration camps.

Later, O. W. I. will run the entire German newspaper publishing business. Under 250 O. W. I. editorial directors, now in Europe, and some 750 uniformed members of the Division of Psychological Warfare, publication of newspapers will start in the chief German cities—first as weeklies, later as dailies. The proposal is to use German printing equipment and mechanical labor, and publish in German, world news as prepared in the O. W. I. headquarters in London.

Very frankly, Davis told Washington reporters that if you let Germans read American newspapers, the conquered nation would get too much of an impression of divided policies.

The idea that you could keep facts of world importance—unpalatable as they might be to O. W. I.—from reaching the consciousness of a mass of 70,000,000 persons, is something that would never occur to anyone but those self-appointed experts in the psychology of news.

And the decision to bar the free press of the United States and Great Britain from the victims of Hitler censorship on the grounds that the news in our papers would be bad for them is one of the most bizarre flip-flops of logic that the ever-resourceful do-gooders and world-savers have yet produced at Government expense.

The expense won't be so much, Director Davis thought. A few more millions, perhaps.

Incidentally, it was just a week ago that President Truman recommended that O. W. I.'s present budget request of $54,100,000 be slashed twelve million on the grounds that "war developments in the European theater are expected to make possible an end of psychological warfare in that area and a curtailment of information and broadcast materials in neutral and Allied countries."

There is a matter of newsprint so desperately needed in the United States which enters into the question, but this Davis does not think will be serious. O. W. I. has a store in Great Britain and France.

More has been recovered in German cities by our troops. And within a few weeks it is hoped that the Scandinavian supply can be tapped for the psychological publications in the occupied Reich.

Authority to put all these new O. W. I. overseas schemes into operation stems solely from the military power of the occupying forces. The O. W. I. concurred in the decisions reached by the military and the O. K. was put on the plan by S. H. A. E. F. and the British Foreign Office.

A good hunch is that the regular military men first heard of the plan after it had been cooked up by Director Davis, Assistant Secretary of State and Poet Laureate Archibald MacLeish, Philip C. Hamblet, European Chief of O. W. I., and former White House assistant and New Deal publicist, Lowell Mellett.

Davis, while he made it clear that he didn't trust all American papers in the hands of the German reading public, came out with the hope that American reporters would be permitted to circulate freely within Germany. This point was raised in connection with the prohibition, simultaneously announced, against American businessmen entering the occupied zones.

German bureaus of American newspapers, wire services, and news periodicals will not come under the ban, Davis declared. However, an American corporation which had manufacturing equipment in Germany will not be permitted to resume operations.

Davis pointed out that all these decisions to bar American and other newspapers from Germany and set up an O. W. I. psychological publishing monopoly there was only for the initial or military period of the occupation and would be relaxed as time went on.

Important point is that it gave O. W. I. another chance to prolong its legal life, ask more dough from Congress, and keep the faithful on fat Treasury salary checks with a lush allowance for subsistence and expenses while abroad. In other words, the boys don't get off the gravy train until they're kicked off.

Meat Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much alarmed over the growing shortages of meat in the coal-mining areas of West Virginia.

I have received several protests and desire to read a letter for inclusion in the RECORD from Mr. C. F. Davis, president district No. 31, United Mine Workers of America which he is joined by G. S. Brackett, president, of the Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Fairmont, W. Va. There is also a letter from Local Union No. 442, Pursglove, W. Va., United Mine Workers of America which I also desire to include in the RECORD:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Fairmont, W. Va., May 9, 1945.

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Sometime ago Mr. George S. Brackett and myself addressed a joint letter to you relative to the meat shortage in the coal-mining areas of northern West Virginia. We have received replies which would lead one to believe that the situation was improving.

The facts are, however, the situation is gradually growing worse. Local unions of the United Mine Workers of America have been asking that something be done about this.

The enclosed photostatic copy of letter received at our office is a sample of coal miners' thinking.

Again I suggest that something be done about this matter.

Very truly yours,

C. F. DAVIS,
President, District No. 31, U. M. W. of A.

LOCAL UNION 4427,
DISTRICT NO. 31, U. M. W. A.,
Pursglove, W. Va., May 7, 1945.

C. F. DAVIS,
President, District No. 31, U. M. W. A.,
Fairmount, W. Va.

Mr. DAVIS: By instructions of my local, I have been instructed to write you as to the general meat shortage in this area.

The members are becoming bored with these meatless work days and hence want you and your office to contact the O. P. A. as to the granting of more meat to the hard-working and energy-using coal miner. There has been, and is, the rumor of "no meat, no work." I assume you realize the significance of that expression at this vital stage of the times.

Knowing that you all will give this letter proper attention, we remain,

Fraternally yours,

PETE CHIKIS,
Secretary.

House Committee on Foreign Affairs Opens Hearings on Resolution Proposing an International Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the House Committee on Foreign Affairs opened hearings on House Resolution 215 which I introduced on April 9 for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of an International Office of Education. Hearings on this resolution will be continued next Tuesday morning, starting at 10 o'clock.

Because the newspaper report on the hearings as it appears in the Christian Science Monitor for Thursday, May 10, provides a clear but cogent review of many of the purposes of House Resolution 215, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point for the information of the Members of the Senate and the House:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OFFICE URGED TO UNITE WORLD PEOPLES

WASHINGTON, May 10.—On the theory that the man you don't like is the man you don't know, Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, has proposed that the peoples of the world get acquainted with each other through the medium of an international office of education.

His proposal is in the form of a resolution—House Resolution 215—which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and which Mr. MUNDT outlined to the committee today.

The resolution does not establish an international office of education, but merely provides the means by which Congress can express its support of such a project and so advise the San Francisco Conference and the world.

The purposes of the office were announced by Representative MUNDT as follows:

1. To function in a purely consultative and advisory capacity so as to bring together scholars and educators throughout the world for an exchange of ideas and ideals.

2. To encourage the wide exchange of students so that people of different nations may become acquainted with each other and with living conditions in other parts of the world.

3. To elevate world educational standards and educational opportunities throughout the world.

4. To work with other national and international agencies to speed up the rehabilitation of school systems which have been dislocated and destroyed by the war.

5. To advise and consult with the occupying authorities representing the United Nations on appropriate methods for aiding in the reestablishment of educational opportunities in enemy countries and freeing these systems from the poisonous doctrines which they promoted before the war.

6. To establish commissions and conduct studies to prepare curricula material which will help to spread abroad a correct conception of different peoples of the world.

7. To eventually evolve a code of international good behavior which will help everyone to appreciate the virtues of good citizenship and proper international relations.

It was emphasized that the resolution does not propose to set up an international educational system. Also it does not represent any effort to promote political indoctrination or to interfere in any way with local school systems.

Opium—Hidden Wartime Cargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 11, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Opium—Hidden Wartime Cargo" from Hearst's International-Cosmopolitan magazine from April 1945:

OPIUM—HIDDEN WARTIME CARGO

(By Phillips J. Peck)

Out of the logistics of World War No. 2 today grows the threat of a flourishing peacetime revival in the United States of illicit narcotic traffic and the ugly menace of drug addiction.

Military men use the term "logistics" when they talk of the job of supplying armies. The world's supply lanes now are revealed as two-way thoroughfares unloading destruction at both ends.

The story is one of amazing simplicity—a mere case of two and two adding up to four. It promises to have a grim post-war aftermath, however, barring extreme vigilance and prompt counteraction by this country.

The story is one of ships—ships voyaging out from United States ports by the thousands laden with war materials and returning for more supplies—to provide a possible bridge between the opium marts of the east and the fantastic prices offered by the underworld drug rings here.

Pang Jong Hock, 31-year-old English-speaking Chinese merchant seaman, could explain in more detail how the traffic operates. Not so long ago the Chinese seaman was a member of the crew of a freighter which put into port at Baltimore—almost in the shadow of the Nation's Capital. Pang Jong Hock carried a rich cargo of 63 pounds of opium purchased in India.

Drug smugglers frequently make mistakes, but not often are they as careless as Pang Jong Hock. He foolishly asked the Navy gun crew aboard the vessel to assist him in bringing his prize ashore. Treasury officials were notified and agents of Narcotics Commissioner H. J. Anslinger nabbed the Chinaman as he prepared to board a train for the headquarters of the United States underground drug network in New York City.

In this case an inept smuggler was caught. Stringent enforcement work of the Treasury's Bureau of Customs and Bureau of Narcotics blocks a great part of such efforts, but undoubtedly in some cases the traffickers succeed. The traffic in opium is lucrative enough to justify great risk, from the standpoint of the smuggler. Pang Jong Hock's 63 pounds of the drug were purchased for roughly $1,000. In the United States the contraband would have brought $50,000.

Ironically, the ever-widening arc of United States conquest, each foot of Jap-held territory liberated, has intensified the problem. The presence of thousands of American soldiers, sailors, and civilians and the merchant seamen of other Allied Powers in India and Iran has made the British and Persian opium monopolies our concern.

Before the war the smuggling of Indian opium into the United States was nonexistent. The traffic developed with the war. United States officials fought the opium menace around the world but were inclined to recognize the Indian opium monopoly as India's own problem. Now, in Bombay, Karachi, and Calcutta, World War No. 2 has placed our troops in close association with the habits of the East.

Westward go United States ships to the great new port of Basra to unload war materials, soldiers, and civilian technicians in Iran, where both raw and prepared opium can be bought as readily as cigarettes in the United States.

United States military authorities have declared opium shops out of bounds in Iran. In India they apparently are too numerous for such a simple expedient to be really effective. The Defense of India Rules provide punishment, however, for the sale of drugs to soldiers.

A War Department spokesman minimized the danger. He said the problem was dealt with by commanders in the field, adding that the drug threat in India and Iran apparently had not become serious enough to warrant referral to Washington.

"The opium shops and dens have been declared out of bounds by the Army commanders," he said. "There are limits to where you can go in the Army. And don't forget you are in the Army and under its control 24 hours a day."

In the minds of other United States authorities, however, the problem is not so easily dismissed. They believe great danger exists in uncontrolled, immeasurable illicit traffic which is acknowledged by the Indian Government.

Despite a 35-year fight by the United States to liberate several million people from the slavery of drug addiction, the world still produces an estimated 5,200,000 pounds of opium annually—more than five times its medicinal and scientific needs—and Iran and India are the second and third largest producers, respectively. The age-old British monopoly in the latter country continues to operate through some 22,000 State stores, and 17,000 licensed cultivators of the opium poppy. The traffic nets enormous revenue.

India, whose Mohandas K. Gandhi has constantly decried the drug evil, affords one of the most conspicuous examples of opium monopolies. In India opium is eaten, not smoked. It is consumed by countless inhabitants to cure a cough, for pure pleasure, in treating children for diarrhea and dysentery, or to keep babies from crying. It possesses a monopoly of great revenue-producing qualities. In 1940, according to a League of Nations document, 16 provincial governments alone—out of 570 states—collected $3,989,000 in opium excise duties and licensing fees.

The 22,000 opium shops in India are estimated to sell upwards of 500 tons of opium annually. In India the cultivator must first obtain a license from the government stating the number of acres to be planted with poppies. When the crop is ripe, it must be sold to the government, which converts it into opium for export and for domestic consumption in India. In 1940, the government factories at Ghazipur and Neemuch bought 71,355 and 30,928 kilograms of opium, respectively. In the same year 21,991 acres of poppies were planted in British India, although the acreage once ran as high as half a million. The shopkeeper pays a small fee for his license to sell and buys the opium from the government. It is sold at a fixed price and in specified quantities. In addition to opium, many of the licensed shops also sell marijuana—preparations of Indian hemp known as bhang, charas, and ganja.

Other notable figures: in the Netherlands East Indies, 2 percent of the entire revenue was derived from smoking opium; in British Burma, 5 percent; in the British Federated Malay States, 6 percent; in British North Borneo, 10 percent; in British Sarawak, 11 percent; in the British unfederated Malay States, 12 percent; in the British Straits Settlements, 20 percent.

United States drug addicts—estimated at 1 in each 3,000 of the country's population—had tough sledding before the war. It used to be that the average addict could keep himself well satisfied for $2 a day. Then our campaign to wipe out the narcotic evil, given force by the enactment of the Harrison law 30 years ago, gradually bore fruit. Over a period of years the price went up as the supply of drugs slumped. By the time World War No. 2 made its appearance, the long arm of the Government had blotted out many of the traditional sources of supply and the dope fiend found that it cost him $10 a day to satisfy his craving. From 1 in 400 before the last war the number of United States drug addicts dropped to the present-day ratio of 1 to 3,000 population. Another conflict now threatens to undo these gains.

India and Iran are, according to the Narcotics Chief, the sore spots—"the cancer of narcotics infection." Indicative of the sinister trend here at home is the disclosure that seizures by United States narcotic agents of opium from Iran and the Indian state of Gwalior doubled last year. The raw opium bore the labels, "Iranian Government Opium Monopoly" and "Gwalior Government Opium Godown."

Whether or not the United States, as the price of Pacific victory, will reap the harvest of a full-scale outbreak of drug addiction, smuggling, and crime in the years ahead depends not only on its vigilance here at home but also upon the success of its efforts to cleanse the rest of the world of this age-old evil.

"We have no illusions about breaking up permanently the United States drug rings," Anslinger explained. "Our best bet is to destroy the sources of opium—dry up the supply before it reaches this country."

The United States policy against the illicit traffic in and nonmedicinal consumption of opium has been reinforced by the so-called Judd resolution, which requested President Roosevelt to urge upon all opium-producing countries immediate steps to limit growth of the opium poppy and the production of opium and its derivatives.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, voiced the fears in the minds of United States narcotics officials when he told the House that conditions in India and Iran constitute a real threat to the health and welfare of Americans.

The situation, JUDD believes, is most conducive to the development of addiction among curious or lonely or discouraged boys. Others succumb to the temptation to pay 50 cents for a small package of opium which they can sell illicitly for as much as $50 in America. High officials of the merchant marine, JUDD reported, have expressed concern at the increasing number of such small packages found on returning vessels.

So far, however, the evidence indicates that the bulk of the smuggling is carried on by foreign crews, largely Chinese. The total seizures or raw opium practically doubled last year and nearly two-thirds of it came originally from Persian Gulf ports and

was carried by Chinese crew members of British and Netherlands vessels. Large quantities of Iranian stick opium were seized in Atlantic-coast ports by customs officers from Chinese seamen on British tankers coming from Liverpool and other British ports. Investigation revealed that, because of war conditions, there is a considerable Chinese colony in Liverpool and that opium is being trafficked freely.

The wartime impetus given to opium smuggling, Anslinger fears, will mount after the peace, with extensive world-wide shipping to continue but without the current strict military surveillance. Smugglers will have built up backlogs of drugs here and there throughout the world, and the demand and fantastic prices of the United States underworld market will persist. The inevitable law of supply and demand will continue in force.

United States officials view the opium problem in two phases:

The Far East: The area embracing Java, Sumatra, the Malay States, and other British and Dutch colonial regions, now Jap-held, where real progress is being made—plans to stamp out the drug evil after liberation.

India and Iran: Where progress is not so apparent.

In the first-named populous regions, the United States' long fight against opium is about to be crowned with success. The Governments of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, after pursuing for many years a policy of gradual suppression of the use of smoking opium, have announced that upon regaining control of the Japanese-dominated territories they will not reestablish the opium monopolies. Moreover, all American expeditionary forces, immediately upon the occupation of a part or the whole of any of the Jap-occupied countries, will seize all narcotic drugs intended for other than medicinal and scientific purposes and close existing opium monopolies, opium shops, and dens.

The State Department reports that the Judd resolution has been transmitted to the Governments of Great Britain, Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Russia, Yugoslavia, and China. The Department hopes it will prove the forerunner of a postwar agreement among the opium-producing countries to fix rigid production quotas essential to medicinal and scientific needs.

Will India and Iran be the prime targets of postwar efforts by our Government to obliterate the opium evil?

Fraternalism's Job in the Days Up Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, District of Columbia Lodge, on May 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight, we gather to celebrate the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, which came into being in England on April 26, 1819.

In these fast-moving times, it is difficult for us to turn our glance backward through the din and roar of a world which is filled with war and the problems of the coming peace, and the world's need for the solution thereof. However, with a brief glance backward to 1819, we see this Nation, now the greatest on earth, then just reaching westward beyond the eastern seacoast. This was before the invention of the steamboat, steam engine, telephone, telegraph, threshing machine, the radio, the automobile, and all the modern inventions.

In the brief period of this order's life, this country has crossed the continent, fought in two world wars, and advanced, as we stated, to leadership among the nations of earth. As we face the future, this order and other fraternal organizations, are met with this question: Will we be adequate in the challenging days up ahead? Has fraternalism a place?

We know that in the Fascist lands, such orders as this one were considered obnoxious to the state. Why? That brings us head-on to the subject of this talk: Fraternalism's Job in the Days Up Ahead.

There comes to my mind a poem:

"I gave a beggar from my little store of well-earned gold,
He spent the shining ore,
And came again, and yet again,
Still cold and hungry as before.

"I gave a thought, and though that thought was mine,
He found himself a man, supreme, divine,
Bold, clothed, and crowned with blessings, manifold,
And now he begs no more."

In this little verse is found a mint of wisdom. We know that our job in Europe, during its reconstruction, is to do just what is set out in these inspiring words. Of course, we have to help to feed and clothe, but our main job is to reconstruct men so that they will be able to help themselves. This calls for understanding, kindness, and having patience with human failures; for being generous and large in deed and thought. It calls for doing unto others as we would be done by; for bestowing charity that enables the receiver to be reborn.

This is meeting the world's need. But we also need the same kind of action on the home front.

The other night I talked with a group of Gideons who told me that they had distributed some eight million New Testaments and Psalms to the men in the services. This exemplifies businessmen in action, men who realize that right ideas mean right action. I heard one businessman say that he had no trouble with his group of workmen. He called them together when they wanted to organize and told them that was agreeable to him. All he asked was that when they had any problems, they would meet around the table, put the Bible between them, and agree to settle their problems on the basis of what was contained in that book. Here was a man who was motivated by the spirit of love, good will, and justice.

What would happen if we could convince the peoples of this earth that greed and selfishness would get no one anywhere; that in good will and understanding will be found the solution to all problems—economic, social, and political. You and I know that if this solvent became an actuality, that all problems would be on their way to a solution.

On this continent, since this great order was founded, we have in a slight measure applied this solution. In our political field, we have had to fight a civil war to test whether this Nation was one or divisible. While we have had a great many misunderstandings between labor and management because this solvent was not present on both sides of the table, by and large, as the statistics show, a great percentage of employers and employees do possess this gift from on high.

Up ahead on the world's stage, when the mechanism comes out of San Francisco, we are hoping that the peoples of earth will work together as brothers, bound together in the rebirth of the desire for the utilization of this solvent. Without it, there will be no advance step taken toward the solution of this problem of war.

Everywhere the individual is asking how he can make an effective and enduring contribution to this great end.

I know I am speaking to men and women who are leaders. By that I mean folks who constructively influence others in their daily contacts. My answer to this question is this: In your own conduct apply the rule of doing good. It is an old injunction which has rung down through the centuries. You remember the Master said: "Do good to them that hate you." There is plenty of opportunity everywhere for the application of that rule. We find such opportunities in our own community, in our own homes, and in our own businesses. The job of this organization is to revitalize the leadership, which is inherent here, to invest its great teachings, the fine thoughts, and physical energy of its membership, in doing that which will add to the grand total of the good which is done in the world.

It is easy to talk this way, but if it is put into practice, it becomes easy to act this way. When discouragement approaches, we will have to shut that devil out. You remember the story related that the devil held an auction and sold off all his goods. The next day someone came to his store and said: "Well, now you are out of business. The world will be at peace." And the devil replied: "No; I still have one tool. It is over there in the corner," and the observer noticed an old rusty tool and inquired what it was. The devil said: "That remains with me, and tomorrow I will have a brand new stock of merchandise. That tool is called discouragement."

The war is over in Europe. Some of us will remember VE-day for the rest of our lives. Here in Washington it was in great contrast to the Armistice Day of 1918. But apparently in Europe—war-torn, wrecked Europe—the relief was so great that again they lived through a great day of celebration. All this was brought to our ears over the magic of the radio. I heard reports from around the world: President Truman, Churchill, Eisenhower, MacArthur, the King of England, and countless others. And there was abundant wonderful music adding to the splendor of the day.

There are occasions in individual and national experiences when the limited view gives way to the far expanse; the provincial becomes worldwide. We are living in such a period now, and the VE-day experience gave us the broader view. Because of man's invention, his extended physical and mental powers, the world has become shrunken, and the era calls for the wider view. The individual, if he does not sense this, is like the man who lives by the side of the road and sees the rest of the world go by.

Man was born for growth, development, unfoldment. The race is called now to meet the challenge which has obtained all through the preceding centuries—the challenge of peace or war. The fact that the preceding centuries have failed should put us more on our toes and not cause us to feel inadequate. This age, of which we are a part, is a great age. It is great to be alive. It is great to know that we can go places—places where other generations have failed.

There lived in this city some 80 years ago a man whose spirit I am sure is at the helm guiding this Nation. He had a philosophy which each individual in this age should get a hold of. It was this:

(a) He believed in the utilization and practicality of a sense of humor.

(b) He had a great faith—a faith in the omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of God.

(c) He had a great love—a love of America and its Constitution.

This man was, of course, Abraham Lincoln.

If we could follow in his footsteps, there would be no question about the adequacy of this day and generation. We would sell a true and worthy bill of goods to the world. We would get rid of the fears which exist between the nations.

And on the home front, by our actions (which speak louder than words), we would demonstrate to the world that there is only one class in America—the American. As in this war, we have all played ball together, so in the peace we should collaborate, cooperate, and live in harmony together, producing such a volume of material wealth and such a force of spiritual harmony, that our light would so shine that all the world would see the wisdom of following in our footsteps.

I have spoken of a great hope, a great job, for each of us.

In the lodge meetings of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, there must be reborn the spirit (not the letter) of friendship, love, and truth, in order that the vitality of these great principles can effectively operate in the minds of men. We have been told, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

"Perfect love casteth out fear." Only through international friendship can suspicion and hate be dissolved. You remember the story of Tolstoy. He was walking down the street of Warsaw one day and a palsied beggar asked him for alms. Tolstoy had given away his wealth, but he approached the beggar, took him by the hand, and said, "My friend," and then he whispered in his ear a great idea. That afternoon the beggar stood erect, not palsied, and with gleaming eyes he repeated, "He called me friend."

I have refrained from applying these thoughts to the specific problems of reconversion, reemploying 56,000,000 Americans, balancing the Budget, eradicating supergovernment influence and bureaucracy. That is the job for each of us. I make only one exception—because there is so much synthetic thinking, so much opportunism.

What is that exception? It is this: In our pursuit of the better life for America and the world and the solution of our problems—social, economic, and political—proving ourselves and the Nation adequate, let us ever bear in mind the words of the prophet: "Open Thou our eyes that we may see." This means that we must never again become so obsessed with an idea of false security which would result in America becoming endangered because of such obsession.

A good Odd Fellow is alert—on his toes—as to what is going on and is fully cognizant of the rights and obligations of being an American.

A Plea for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an eloquent address delivered by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, entitled "A Plea for Poland." This address was delivered at a religious ceremony at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, at Boston, Mass., on May 6, 1945, attended by several thousand people of Polish descent.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

While freedom is being won and city after city is being liberated throughout the world it is sad to note that those who first suffered the impact of the invader, and who have never given up the struggle, appear destined to be mercilessly crushed in their attempt to regain freedom. I speak of the heroic people of Poland.

As soon as the Polish opposition to the Nazi invasion had been crushed the people of Poland's western provinces were torn from their homes and lands and the systematic destruction of a great people began. While staggering from the first attack, another enemy crossed her borders to deliver the blow of death. To Germany and Russia went helpless Poland. When these two countries were at war poor Poland fell to the one, then to the other, and the wholesale destruction of a Nation ensued.

There is no need to retell the sad story of devastation, exile, and slaughter. It is probable that no nation in all history ever suffered so greatly and so bitterly in such a short period of time. But while the fury of war crushed the bodies of men, it cannot destroy the spirit of a nation.

Against seeming insurmountable difficulties and in the face of almost certain defeat, with few if any signs of hope, the Poles fought on. They never despaired. Almost 1,000,000 of their soldiers gave their lives on every battle front of Europe. In Poland itself the losses are said to be approximately 5,700,000. Of this number 3,500,000 are reported to have been executed, murdered, or to have died in concentration camps, in prisons, or in gas chambers. Two hundred thousand are said to be in prison camps and the remaining 2,000,000 are listed as deported, to forced labor in foreign lands. When one compares the population of Great Britain, the United States and Poland, the significance of Poland's contribution is astounding and appalling. Her losses exceed 18 percent of her prewar population. England's Prime Minister has said that Poland contributed immeasurably to save Great Britain. Our late President once called Poland the "inspiration of nations." We are hopeful that those who owe Poland a debt of gratitude will demand justice for her.

Today Russia claims that she must have at least half of the country for her own security. According to prewar statistics Russia is 54 times the size of Poland, twice the size of all the rest of Europe, about 3 times the size of continental United States. She has one-sixth of the land area of the globe. Poland had one-third of 1 percent of the earth with 35,000,000 people while Russia counted 170,467,000 people. Since the war Russia has taken over much more territory and millions more in population. It is hard for me to follow the reasoning that Russia needs a goodly part of Poland for her security. This problem came before the three great victorious powers in the Crimean Conference. Their solution was a disappointment to all who had built their hopes on the Atlantic Charter.

Poland, which stood against the Nazi aggressor from the very beginning of the war; Poland, which has suffered more than any other nation in the war; Poland, which has fought and is fighting with our armies on every European front, has been forced by her allies to surrender a very large part of her territory. In apparent exchange, it was guaranteed at Yalta that in the reconstructed world there will be a strong, Independent Poland, with a government chosen in a free election by its own people. Pending the action of the people of Poland in a free election, agreements were made to set up a provisional regime which will be recognized by the Three Great Powers. This provisional government must not be the creation of a single foreign power, but the choice of all parties to the Yalta engagements. Our President is pledged to see that in the choice of a permanent Polish Government the people of Poland be guaranteed in their right of free secret ballot. No foreign power must be permitted to influence this election in a way which will determine its results. The peace of the world demands a free, independent, democratic Poland. It must not be that Poland become a puppet state under the domination and control of any foreign power. If Poland is secured in its rights of freedom and independence, it will make great sacrifices and do its full part in the international community. If it is enslaved and its leadership forced into exile or inhumanly liquidated, the love of freedom will not be crushed in Polish hearts, but the seeds of war will have been sown.

The cause of Poland must not die, for her cause is the cause of Europe and the cause of the world. As her rights are guaranteed, so will the rights of other countries be guaranteed. The tragedy of Poland is inseparable from the fate of a dozen of nations between Germany and Russia which, after having escaped the Nazi conquest, are now forced into the Russian orbit. This war began for Poland's independence and security. Her restoration was the prime technical purpose of the war. Without the guaranteed independence and freedom of Poland, the outcome of this war is destined to be questioned, both morally and politically. Morally, because the just aims of the war would be questioned. Politically, because it will be said that ideals are utilized in order to prosecute wars but not to organize peace. Poland is a test case. We ask, therefore, that the same justice be given to Poland as we expect will be accorded to every other country, large or small, that has been our ally in this war. To punish or abandon an ally to whom we solemnly promised to restore all rights, privileges, and liberties taken from him by a brutal, bloody, and wicked enemy is something without precedent in American history. Self-respect and the debt we owe to our men who have died in Europe for a really free world in which Poland also might be free make it impossible for any authority to still the imperishable demand that complete justice be done Poland.

We pray, therefore, today that justice may be done to Poland so that a great nation, an ancient member of Christendom, a faithful defender through the ages of its faith and culture, may once again be free. Justice to her cannot be disregarded in building a just and enduring peace.

Reply to Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able radio address delivered by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman of New York State, on May 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Dewey has made his report to the people. As chairman of the Democratic

Party in New York State, it is my responsibility to call to the attention of the people certain misrepresentations. I shall do so frankly in the interest of good government and fair play. I shall do so from the record.

Mr. Dewey's record must be judged by what he failed to accomplish as well as by what he claims credit for, and incidentally, it is important to remember that much of what he claims credit for, was forced upon him and the Republican Party. Public opinion was far ahead of him, and he caught up with it only as a matter of political expediency.

He dwelt at great length upon the antidiscrimination bill which was passed at the last session of the legislature. Now, how did it come about that this law for which he claims credit was written into the statute books?

Was it his leadership that brought about its passage, or did he actually try to run away from it? The facts give the answer.

In 1943, a nonpartisan commission was appointed to deal with unfair labor practices in industrial employment. The war effort was being hampered because of such discrimination and the commission operated under the State war council. This commission, composed of public-spirited citizens unanimously made its report to Mr. Dewey, and submitted a proposed bill embodying their recommendations. It was then introduced in the Senate by a Republican. The bill had the support of divergent groups and was considered a nonpartisan measure. Now, anybody who knows how the Republican Party of this State works, understands that the introduction of this bill was O. K.'d by Mr. Dewey. He gave it his support because he considered it a politically expedient bill—that is, until he remembered that he was a candidate for the Presidential nomination and he might lose delegates in the convention.

What did he do? He ran away from the bill, using the all-too-familiar technique of appointing another commission to study a subject which had already been studied at length by his own appointees. Eight outstanding members of the original commission resigned in disgust. Mr. Dewey now claims that last year's bill "was clumsily drawn, and introduced so late that no action was then possible." A year's delay resulted. You, the people of the State, will pass judgment on this lame excuse.

In the last session of the legislature the members of the Governor's own party sought to avoid consideration of the bill. It was planned to send it to the scrap heap until vigorous public opinion and a forceful Democratic minority in the legislature compelled the Governor to take a stand. Despite a clear Republican majority in each house of the legislature, it would not have passed without the support of the Democratic Party. The people of the State of New York will resent the effort of Mr. Dewey to claim credit for a bill which had the unanimous support of the Democratic Party. They will resent the failure of the members of his own party to give support to the bill. The antidiscrimination bill was not political in nature and should have no place in politics. The law will attain its objective only if wisely administered. We will watch the character of the Governor's appointees and will be vigilant in following their official acts. Upon them, will depend the success or failure of the law

A similar technique was employed by Mr. Dewey in connection with the rent-control bill. Certainly the memory of the people of this State is not so short that they have forgotten the facts which led to the passage of the present rent-control bill. Here, too, Mr. Dewey seeks credit for legislation which was forced upon him. In 1944, as a result of the critical shortage of loft, office, and business space in the city of New York and the rent-gouging activities engaged in by unpatriotic landlords, a legislative commission was appointed. Nineteen hundred and forty-four, as Mr. Dewey may remember, was the presidential year and again the commission delayed action for a full year for political reasons while landlords made extortionist demands for increase in rents upon their tenants. The commission failed to take any action, an acute situation arose, and demands were made for a special session of the legislature. The mayor of the city of New York and many nonpartisan organizations urged some action upon Mr. Dewey but the pleas fell on deaf ears. It will be remembered that the Democrats introduced bills in the 1944 sesison for rent control which the Republican Party defeated. Finally, in December 1944 the situation became so aggravated that the Republican Party could no longer ignore the needs of the situation. Under persistent pressure from the Democratic Party, Mr. Dewey finally recommended legislation freezing rents on loft buildings, but he continued to ignore the equally serious need for similar limits on office and store rents.

In his report to the people, Mr. Dewey, in discussing another subject speaks "of those hired lobbyists who swarm down on Albany * * * mispresenting both the nature of the problem and the various bills before the legislature." Could it be that the Governor also had in mind the lobbyists composed of close friends and advisers who swarmed down on the legislature and succeeded, at least for a time, in preventing passage of a rent-control bill for office and business space? Again, public opinion was too strong to be resisted and finally the people triumphed, not because of Mr. Dewey or the members of the Republican Party, but in spite of them.

Mr. Dewey's general policy has been one of token support of such bills as he believes to be expedient politically. He represents a negative type of leadership where such action as he takes is the result of pressure of public opinion. He has not exerted a dynamic and aggressive leadership such as marked the administration of three previous Democratic governors.

Let us take another example of this negative leadership. Every civic and nonpartisan organization interested in housing had urged upon the legislature the full authorization of the balance of $115,000,000 and an increase of the subsidy necessary to carry the annual loan amount to the extent of $4,000,000. The Governor controlled the activity of the various civil bureaus interested in sound housing and radically cut these figures, thereby limiting the scope of this program. This is an example of the policy embarked upon from the beginning of his administration to scuttle the housing program. He gives it just little enough support so that it can not be said he has killed the program entirely. Let us not forget that Mr. Dewey and his Republican legislature "forgot" in 1943 to pass necessary legislation, and in so doing delayed the steady advance of the housing program.

The State with its unlimited resources and taxing powers has accumulated a large surplus. Everyone knows this is due to abnormal times resulting from war conditions. Our municipalities have been stripped with rising costs and limited revenues. Mr. Dewey shut his eyes to their needs. As a result, the operating plants of our municipalities have slowly disintegrated and the efficient operations of municipal services have been seriously impaired. Employees of the municipalities, faced with rising cost of living, find that their real wages have been considerably reduced. Mr. Dewey ignored their plight. The Democratic Party consistently hammered home the fact that the municipalities were in need of additional financial relief from the State. Mr. Dewey has once more shown he is very adept at talking big and accomplishing little. All we get from him is the creation of a commission to study the problem and after they submit their reports, he sets up other committees and commissions. These he dominates and controls by appointing members who will do his bidding—members of his own party or immediate cabinet.

Mr. Dewey takes a bow on the fact that out of the postwar fund approximately $210,000,000 has been appropriated for a highway construction to employ the returning veteran. Our boys have had their fill of digging foxholes and living in mud and mire without having to come back and be given the so-called generous opportunity to work with a pick and shovel on the highway. They are not looking for a dole or a hand-out.

The existing method of allocating State aid for education is antiquated and it is inadequate for our present-day needs. The Democratic Party has recognized this principle for many years and has agitated for a change in the Friedsam formula which is the method governing the distribution of State aid for education. Mr. Dewey has continued to ignore this self-evident fact. It was due only to the persistent prodding of the Democratic Party that any action was taken.

A joint legislative committee created to study educational problems, and which had received aprpopriations of approximately one-half million dollars, was authorized to make a study of the Friedsam formula with a view to making changes in keeping with present-day needs. Fearful that the findings of this legislative committee would run counter of his views, Mr. Dewey by-passed this committee and instead appointed members of his own administration—the "yes-men." This group, hastily created and without an opportunity to study this very complex and vital problem, prepared a revision of the Friedsam formula favorable to some districts at the expense of others for reasons of political expediency.

Let me conclude by saying that in the problem year ahead Governor Dewey may depend on the fullest cooperation of the Democratic Party toward solving the pressing problems of the times but we shall expect full credit for this patriotic assistance. Whenever the Governor endeavors to deny us this credit for political enhancement of his aims, we shall feel free to correct the record. We aim to play fair and expect fair play in return.

Getting Along With the Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Getting Along With the Government Agencies," delivered by Mr. Gilbert H. Montague, and I also ask that the request for printing prepared by the Senator from New Jersey be incorporated in the RECORD preceding the address.

There being no objection, the request and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Gilbert H. Montague under the title "Getting Along With the Government Agencies."

Mr. Montague delivered this speech before the Forum of Administrative Law of the Essex County Bar Association, in Newark, N. J., April 9, 1945.

Great interest has been shown by the businessmen and members of the bar in this speech of Mr. Montague's.

Your committee has asked me to talk as personally and intimately as possible, out of my 30 years' experience practicing in matters before Government agencies.

Illustrative of the Government agencies to which I shall refer are the Antitrust Division and the War Division of the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the National War Labor Board, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, the War Manpower Commission, the Alien Property Custodian, the Wage and Hour Division and the Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor, the Office of Price Administration, and other prosecuting agencies and departments of the Government.

KEEPING OUT OF TROUBLE

Trials and court arguments are the drama in a lawyer's life, but most companies and trade associations want to keep as far away from litigation as possible.

Now that Government agencies are everywhere, a prime part of a lawyer's job consists in advising companies and trade associations so as to keep them out of trouble with the Government agencies.

I shall talk, therefore, as your committee has requested, as personally and intimately as possible, about ways and means for accomplishing these objectives.

WHAT IS UNLAWFUL?

When a company or a trade association asks, "Is what we are doing unlawful?" what it really wants to know is usually something quite different, namely, "Is it likely that the Government agency that enforces this law will prosecute us in the belief that what we are doing is unlawful?"

Companies and trade associations have bought and paid for reams of legal opinions dealing with the former question, when what they really wanted was usually something they never got, namely a legal opinion dealing with the latter question.

Before there is any investigation or prosecution, a company or a trade association is seldom interested in the question "How is the Supreme Court likely to rule on what we are doing?" What it then usually wants to know is, "Is it likely that some Government agency will prosecute us?"

Not until after investigation or prosecution is begun, is a company or trade association often really interested in the former question.

BEFORE THERE IS ANY INVESTIGATION

To counsel whose day-to-day practice is in many matters and many industries which Government agencies are investigating and prosecuting, there are many premonitory signs as to when and where an investigation and prosecution may be likely.

That likelihood will have been sensed by such counsel long before any prosecution, or even any investigation, is actually begun, if he is active and experienced in this field, and knows the operations of the company or the trade association he is advising.

The company or the trade association can then weigh unhurriedly that likelihood, and also the pros and cons of whatever changes of methods and policies may become necessary, if it seems worthwhile as a business proposition to try to avert the likelihood of investigation and prosecution.

Companies and trade associations thus served have shown over the years a remarkable absence of prosecutions and even investigations, and a notable record of effective growth, as compared with companies and trade associations that have continued methods and policies which they have later had to change with loss of prestige, or under pressure of investigations and prosecutions that have been harassing and costly in lawyers' fees and executives' time.

Equally important is assurance to a company or a trade association when there is no likelihood of an investigation and prosecution.

This assurance can sometimes be given by counsel when the officers and general counsel of the company or trade association are mistakenly apprehensive.

WHEN AN INVESTIGATION BEGINS

The sign that an investigation is actually begun is sometimes first discoverable in a questionnaire or inquiry coming from some nonprosecuting branch of a prosecuting agency, such as a research, economic, administrative, or policy division of the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission or the Office of Price Aministration, or from some wholly different agency which itself does little or no prosecuting, such as the Departments of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Labor and Commerce, the War Production Board, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Foreign Economic Administration, and innumerable other nonprosecuting Government agencies.

So abundantly do the prosecuting agencies now avail of data obtained by questionnaires and inquiries from the nonprosecuting agencies that many companies are finding it worth while to insist on a routine screening by counsel of all questionnaires and inquiries coming in from any Government agency whatsoever, and all responses thereto which the company makes.

TELLING YOUR STORY FIRST

Should a company or a trade association always keep away from a prosecuting agency until after the agency has called on it?

Usually, yes. But if its story is one that can be more persuasive and convincing if the agency hears it before listening to too many of its enemies, and if its counsel knows the agency well enough to be able to gage the probabilities, it is sometimes good tactics to tell its story to the agency's top officials before they hear it from the agency's staff, or before there is any sign that an investigation is actually begun, or even before there is any prosecution in prospect.

When companies and trade associations served by such counsel have thus told their story in advance to an agency, my experience has been that in most instances there has been a prompt settlement and sometimes no prosecution.

Where investigation and prosecution have not been averted, the good impression created by the first approach to the agency has usually sufficed to curtail greatly the scope of the investigation and to aid greatly the negotiation of a satisfactory settlement without a trial.

UTILIZING THE INVESTIGATION PERIOD TO AVERT PROSECUTION

During an investigation a counsel who is active and experienced and knows the agency will have many opportunities for well-planned efforts to avert prosecution.

He and his staff in contact with the agency's staff will be able to sense the direction of the investigation and the probability and extent of the possible prosecution.

If he knows the agency well enough, such a counsel can, without offense to the agency's top officials or staff, develop opportunities for raising before the agency's top officials questions of law on which he can submit informal legal memos and make informal legal arguments.

Companies served by such counsel have in this way averted many prosecutions involving highly controversial legal, economic, scientific, and medical questions which, if not averted, would have been exceedingly protracted and expensive.

Even where prosecution has not been averted, the narrowing of the issues achieved by informal legal memos submitted and informal legal arguments made on these questions of law before the agency's top officials has usually curtailed greatly the scope of the investigation and greatly aided the negotiation of a satisfactory settlement without a trial.

CONCERNING COUNSEL

Trial lawyers and litigating law firms are sometimes better at litigating than in interesting a Government agency's top officials in questions of law that may terminate an investigation without prosecution, or negotiating a settlement without a trial.

Trial lawyers are trained to compete against adversary counsel and to persuade, convince, and win agreement from a judge or a presiding officer.

In a Government agency matter, in the initial stages before a prosecution is begun, the counsel's task is to persuade, convince, and win agreement, not from a judge or a presiding officer, but from his adversary counsel.

This calls for a high order of advocacy, quite different from the advocacy requisite to persuade, convince, and win agreement from a judge or a presiding officer.

Speaking personally, as your committee has asked me to do, it has been my experience that a lawyer practicing before a Government agency will find it helpful, if his record with the agency is that while he has litigated or settled many cases coming to him after investigation or prosecution has begun, no individual or company or trade association while acting upon his advice has ever been prosecuted by the agency.

HIGH COST OF TROUBLE

Government agencies today have plenty of teeth.

A recovery or a settlement for violating a directive or a regulation of the Office of Price Administration can sometimes cost a company hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Back pay awarded to employees because of discrimination in violation of the National Labor Relations Act has in one case exceeded a million dollars.

A recovery or a settlement for wages that are not in compliance with a directive or a regulation under the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Stabilization Act will sometimes cost a company thousands of dollars.

Fines collected by the Attorney General in criminal prosecutions and settlements under the antitrust laws now amount to several million dollars annually.

More formidable than money damages and fines are some of the provisions that courts are now inserting in antitrust decrees.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR A TRADE ASSOCIATION

Because a trade association had violated the antitrust laws a lower court in 1942 required drastic changes in its methods of operation, but permitted it to continue. But in January 1945 the Supreme Court held that the lower court had been too lenient, and ordered that the trade association be disbanded and enjoined the defendant companies from having any trade association for 5 years.

"The association has undoubtedly been an important instrument of restraint and monopoly," said the Supreme Court.

"It may be made such again, and detection and prevention and punishment for such resumption of violations of law may be difficult if not impossible.

"In the light of the record, we think it better to order its dissolution, and to provide that the corporate defendants be restrained for a period of 5 years from forming or joining any such trade association, and that thereafter they may apply for leave to do so.

and have such leave on showing to the court that the purposes and activities of the proposed body will not be violative of law."

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR FAIR TRADE RIGHTS?

Price structures in many lines of business are today based on resale prices specified in contracts executed under State Fair Trade Acts and the Miller-Tydings Act.

Because it had violated the antitrust laws, a company in 1942 was enjoined for 6 months from making Fair Trade contracts with its trade.

This 6 months' limitation disappointed the Government, and on appeal it asked the Supreme Court to make the injunction permanent.

In April 1944 the Supreme Court declined to do this. But it is an interesting speculation whether the Supreme Court would have cut this injunction down to 6 months, if the court below had made this injunction permanent in the first place.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR PATENT RIGHTS?

With the forcible persuasion of criminal indictments, the Attorney General in recent years has been procuring consent decrees, in which patent owners violating the antitrust laws have been required, permanently or for limited periods, to license, royalty free to all applicants, patent rights involved in this violation.

In a contested case in January 1945, the Supreme Court in a 4-to-2 decision, refused to follow this course. But the Attorney General has not desisted, and in several suits begun since that date he is still continuing to ask for decrees containing this provision.

Apparently he hopes that the Supreme Court, in some future case in which all of the nine Justices can participate, may recede from its January 1945 decision, and may hold that where patent rights have been used in violation of the antitrust laws, patent owners may be required, permanently or for limited periods, to license, royalty free to all applicants, all the patent rights involved in this violation.

Several times in recent years the Attorney General has moved to intervene in suits by patent owners for infringement, so as to litigate in those suits the question of whether the patent owner is violating the antitrust laws.

By this practice the Attorney General may transform any patent infringement suit into an antitrust suit against the patent owner.

The Attorney General has recently begun two suits to cancel patents on the ground of fraud. It is 60 years since any Attorney General has instituted any suits of this character. Sixty years ago the Government lost.

LOSING COMPETITIVE RIGHTS

For an industry to be prevented for 5 years from having any trade association may be a serious handicap in meeting the competition of other industries.

For a company to be mulcted in huge money damages or fines because of violations of the Emergency Price Control Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Stabilization Act, the antitrust laws, or any other law administered by a Government agency may be financial ruin.

For a company to be enjoined from exercising its patent rights or from making Fair Trade contracts with its trade, while its competitors are still free to do these things, may spell disaster in a highly competitive field.

LITIGATING WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Litigation of any kind is a nuisance to a businessman, but litigating with the Government is most wasteful of all in lawyers' fees and executives' time.

As a litigant, the Government has advantages of unique prestige, unrivaled powers of publicity, specially trained legal talent, and inexhaustible resources.

Such Government agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the National Labor Relations Board have also the advantage that in all their prosecutions they are both prosecutor and judge, and are empowered by statute to make decisions in their own favor, even though such decisions be contrary to the weight of evidence.

Sometimes prosecution cannot be averted. Its challenge sometimes has to be met in order to back up the management of the company or the trade association or to save their standing with the trade or the public.

But the door should always be kept open to the possibility of negotiating with the agency's top officials looking toward a settlement of the prosecution and the reestablishment of pacific relations with the Government.

RESPONSIBILITY AND RESOURCEFULNESS

Advising a company or a trade association in its relations with the Government agencies calls for a high degree of responsibility and resourcefulness.

Like other institutions, a company or a trade association can be crippled or wrecked a great deal faster than it can be built up.

Mistakes of law with respect to Government agencies are a swift way to cripple or wreck a company or a trade association.

These casualties are more frequent than they should be, and the tragedy is that most of them are preventable.

With a little more care and a little more resourcefulness, almost any company or trade association can do just about as well within the law as it can do when it heedlessly strays outside the law.

Getting along with the Government agencies requires constant alertness, constant care, and constant resourcefulness; but these are duties that every company and every trade association owes to itself.

Treatment of Hermann Goering After Capture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address dealing with the story of Goering's capture and treatment after capture, delivered by Dr. Frank Kingdon over Station WMCA on May 10.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The story of Goering's capture and treatment is an immediate, clear, and unmistakable call to every American to be on the alert. In all soberness, I say that it is the most dangerous signal for the future since Munich. Official representatives of this Government have shaken hands and sat down to dinner with this monstrous and perverted being who has openly denied the reality of the very meaning of law, spilt human blood as recklessly as clouds drop rain, treacherously unloosed ruthless air power upon undefended cities and people, and denied every humane instinct of mankind. This is the brute who rubbed his hands in such glee when the infamous pact of Munich was signed. For 5 years and more men, women, and children have been dying in horror and torture because of what he planned and executed. He has destroyed homes, desecrated churches, prostituted schools, and burned books. We have captured him. What did we do then? We invited him to dinner. But first he took a bath, as though all the waters of all the seven seas could wash out one single stain from his polluted record. Then he put on his favorite uniform, presumably so that he could carry to the dinner table every memory of savagery and sadism upon which this rotting cloth had looked. Then—God save the mark—he put on his decorations, just to remind himself of the hands of the dictator who first pinned them on him. Thus bedecked in the trappings of his dishonor, he posed for pictures and sat down as the guest of the American Republic.

One reporter wrote of him: "Goering seemed delighted with his captivity." One can almost see his satisfied smile, but one cannot see it. The room is too crowded, the faces of the dead look up from the mounds of the murdered, the fire-scarred skulls of the burned gleam in the dining room, the twisted bodies of a hundred battlefields crowd the chairs. the wounded and the blind are stumbling over the furniture, the tear-streaked faces of a million mothers are looking for their lost sons, the misshapen bodies of starved children haunt the table piled with food, the shrunken eyes of the persecuted are reflected in the polished silver. What madness is there in us that we can pull up a chair for such a one as Goering in the midst of so great a company bereft and tortured by his horror? I warn you, my countrymen, that the cause of justice is threatened, and the folly of forgetting has already begun. I turned this morning to one of our most responsible New York papers and could hardly believe my eyes when I read: "Ridiculous poseur though (Goering) is, one is yet tempted to apply to him such relative terms as the 'brains' and 'balance wheel' of the Nazi regime. That is because of his organizing ability, his general astuteness and his affable wordliness." I can imagine no more humiliating confession of our utter incapacity for moral indignation than to use such words of such a man. Look at them. "Ridiculous poseur"—said of the man upon whose conscience rests the heaviest weight of spilled human blood in all history, Hitler alone excepted. Goering is no poseur. His costumes, his medals, his hunting knives, his infatuation with display are all parts of the man himself, the pride, the scorn of others, the vaunting arrogance, the inflamed megolomania which could not be satisfied unless a thousand airplanes dropped their pyrotechnic death upon terrorized innocence. Goering never was "ridiculous"; he was mad with all the terror of unbridled lust for power, as ugly and degraded as a maniac running wild with a jewelled sword in an unarmed crowd. "Brains and balance wheel"—such words lose meaning when applied to him. His brains were the tool of his paranoiac master, capable of no nobler utterance than to say that he was the first paladin of Hitler. His were the brains that consented to the burning of the books and prophesied that Berlin would never be attacked. And to call him a balance wheel is like calling the black plague glowing health.

This is the man who organized the Gestapo, the prying and probing and threatening instrument of tyranny which upset every balance of government and stable living in Germany from the humblest home to the highest councils of the Nazis. Goering may have the low intelligence of a cunning beast of prey, but he made a prostitute of even that, and in the process unbalanced not only one country but the world. It is that low cunning which probably prompted him to give himself up to the Allies, gambling a few weeks of life against the possibility that he may never be executed for his deeds, and, whatever else may happen, he has already got one good meal out of it. "His organizing ability and general astuteness"—how can such words be

used calmly about this man whose monuments are the Luftwaffe, the Elite Guard, the Reichstag fire, the blood bath of 1944? These are the work of the organizing ability of a wolf-pack and the general astuteness of a plague of locusts settling on a field of corn. This is unreason, not reason. It is destruction for its own sake. It is worship of naked power. In any proper use of words, it is the triumph of organizing disability and of general insanity. But look most closely at the final phrase of this description, "affable worldliness." My mind literally staggers at its use. Goering is fat, rough, cynically patronizing, and able to smile. There is no doubt about his worldliness. He robbed every man and every country he could to provide himself with luxury and wealth—but, affable? Ask the hundreds of thousands thrown into concentration camps for their political beliefs. Inquire of all those driven from their homes and their altars for their faith, from the lowliest Jew to Paster Niemoeller. There is not a city or a hamlet in Germany into which the heartless cruelty of this monster has not penetrated. The earth of a score of countries cries out with the searing wounds of his bombs, London and Stalingrad and Rotterdam and Warsaw carry his signature in their broken walls and roofless houses.

He was the first officer in the army of hate, the essence of evil concentrated into one will. I suppose that, again with the exception of his master, he will be accounted by history as the most degraded individual of our time, and the generations that come after us will never speak his name without cursing it. I am spending all this time on this one description of Goering, not to point a finger at a particular paper, for the one in which this appeared has been among the most enlightened in its treatment of the Nazi peril, but to indicate the danger toward which this kind of thinking leads. If we can be mild about Goering, we can be mild about Germany, and if we are mild about Germany we shall commit again the error of 25 years ago, and bequeath to our children the world war that will finally end civilization. Word comes through today that Goering is to be brought to trial soon. How can he be tried? There is not a code of law in history that defines as crime what he has committed. He is thief, arsonist, and murderer—guilty of crimes which the law recognizes—but he is more than all these put together. He has denied the concept of law itself and acted to destroy humanity. There is no law that can measure the depths of his subhumanity. To call him a criminal is to flatter him. To try such a creature is to rob law of its dignity. He is outside its pale. There is no defense for him. There cannot be for he has denied the existence of truth. He cannot be fitted into orderly processes because he has denied order and served chaos as the ultimate good. We make a mockery of our own best impulses when we consider giving such a man what we call a trial. He has forfeited his day in court by his 12 years in blood. He and those associated with him in the Nazi Party leadership, the members of the Gestapo and the Elite Guard, should be shot, the United Nations taking full responsibility for the moral decision involved in such an action and making their declaration solemnly for the record of history.

We should write once and for all so that all men of the future may read that those who deny humanity and civilization will be destroyed by them. I believe that this is in the profoundest sense, moral. The weakness of our generation has been that it has seen the moral beauty of goodness and kindness, but it has never faced the unrelieved moral ugliness of evil. We have gone on our way saying easily that men will be good if we give them a chance, and refusing to recognize the abysmal capacity of men for evil-doing. Nazism is more than a false political philosophy, more than a derangement of the mind, more than a love of arms. It is evil. It is men depraved by the lust for power which blots out all morality. They are worse than immoral. They mock the whole concept of morality. Racial persecutions, blood purges, starvation and burning of prisoners, ruthless cruelty in all its forms—these are the products of something much more fundamental—the denial of human dignity itself. Unless we see this evil for what it is and deal with it inflexibly, we shall never achieve the good life we desire, for realization of the nature of evil is one prerequisite to achievement of good.

Now What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with organized fighting in Europe at an end, it is time for those representing foreign countries and our own hired men to tell us what they have in mind for the United States. Whether we went into this war to establish the "four freedoms" throughout the world (and that we now know cannot be done), to protect ourselves from a feared invasion by Germany, or whether we went in to preserve the British Empire, is a dead issue.

The European war has cost us $185,000,000,000. That is $1,405.03 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. As of May 4, 1945, 920,472 American men and women are casualties—dead, wounded, or missing; and, for years to come, the crippled, the maimed, and the mentally deranged will be with us.

Our dollars, material, our flesh and blood, saved the British Empire, enabled Russia to successfully defend herself. Our own way of living has been changed. Some who are getting high wages, doing a good business, making exorbitant profits, are joining the internationalists in the demand that we keep a million or two young Americans indefinitely in Europe, to aid in police work, in rebuilding the war-damaged towns and cities and to, if necessary, fight the Russians if they attempt to dominate Europe and threaten the welfare of the British Empire.

Some also ask that we not only feed and clothe the people of the stricken areas but that we supply Russia and all others who ask with the necessary equipment, including machinery of all kinds, to enable those countries to reestablish themselves in postwar world trade.

Now there are many agencies to which those who want to aid other nations and other people can contribute as much as they desire of their own money without any action by Congress.

PATRIOTISM

Is it unpatriotic to suggest that Great Britain, Russia, and France—Germany having been disarmed—now police their own backyards—Europe—and let American boys come home at the earliest possible moment? Is there any reason why, after they have retaken all of the islands of the Pacific which may be necessary for our own national defense, our men should continue to fight and to die to take and then to give to the British or to the Dutch the islands and territory which they lost; which they may want to protect their international trade?

Is it not time for us say to Russia, to Britain, to the Netherlands, "Now that our men have the Japs on the run, if you want more islands, more territory, you get into the war against the Japs; give our men the same aid they gave you when your existence was at stake?"

The war in the Pacific is not over; 1,000,000, 2,000,000 additional Americans will be sent into the fighting there. In view of the fact that three—a fourth only in part—of the most powerful integral parts of the British Empire have never conscripted men for overseas service; that Canada has ceased to induct men, should we not ask those in authority in our own Government to state now, in clear and unmistakable language, our program in the Pacific; just what we intend to do hereafter in Europe?

Our people have demonstrated their willingness to do the right thing and, as the young men and women who have been inducted into the service—not the politicians, statesmen, profiteers, nor we who are safely enjoying life here at home—have been doing the fighting, making the sacrifices, they are entitled to know, and to know now, the full extent of the program which our statesmen, those in authority, the internationalists, are laying out for them.

Nothing is gained by deception or concealment. The man who is asked by his government to give up his home life, to fight, perhaps to die, has the right to know why and for what purpose. Only dictators and tyrants expect men to sacrifice themselves without knowing the reason.

The 80 Commodities Having Imports Valued at $1,000,000 or More Each in 1939 on Which Reduced Trade-Agreement Rates Were in Effect on April 1, 1945, Arranged According to the Percent of Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a table prepared by the Tariff Commission showing tariff reductions in major imports of products under the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The table is unique, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that the products are listed according to the percentage of reductions made under the program and will more clearly show the particular products upon which further reductions may be made in tariff duties.

The table follows:

The 80 commodities having imports valued at $1,000,000 or more each in 1939 on which reduced trade agreement rates were in effect on Apr. 1, 1945, arranged according to the percent of reduction

Tariff paragraph	Commodity, agreement country, and effective date of agreement	Value of imports, 1939 [1]	Equivalent ad valorem rates [2]		Reduction in rate
			Preagreement	Agreement	
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 10 TO 19 PERCENT				
		Thousands	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
389	Nickel and alloys in pigs, ingots, etc. (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939)	$24,914	12	10	17
1109 (a)	Woolens, not elsewhere specified, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, valued over $1.25, not over $2 per pound (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	2,327	88	73	17
1530 (b) (4)	Calf and kip lining leather (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939)	1,854	15	12	17
601	Cigarette leaf tobacco, unstemmed (Turkey, May 5, 1939)	24,247	71	61	14
1109 (a)	Woolens, not elsewhere specified, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, valued over 80 cents, not over $1.25 per pound (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	1,636	98	88	10
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 20 TO 29 PERCENT				
710	Cheese: Romano and Pecorino, in original loaves (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941), imports at ad valorem rate.[3]	4,061	35	25	29
205 (b)	Roman, portland, and other hydraulic cement (Belgium, May 1, 1935)	1,614	25	19	25
374	Aluminum metal and alloys, crude, and scrap (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939)	3,249	34	26	25
717 (a)	Fresh water fish, fresh or frozen: Whitefish, yellow pike, jacks, lake trout, yellow perch, tullibees, lake herring and ciscoes, chubs, mullet, saugers, and blue pike (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939).	4,114	12	8.9	25
1552	Cigarette paper in bobbins (France, June 15, 1936)	3,569	60	45	25
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 30 TO 39 PERCENT				
367 (a)	Watches and watch movements, etc., less than 1.77 inches wide, having 7 to 7 jewels (Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936).	2,510	99	61	39
367 (a)	Watches and watch movements, etc., less than 1.77 inches wide, having 16 or 17 jewels (Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936).	4,308	106	66	38
382 (a)	Aluminum foil, less than six one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness (Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936), imports at reduced rates.	1,250	40	25	37
601	Tobacco leaf for cigar wrappers, unstemmed (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934; Netherlands, Feb. 1, 1936; Cuba, supplement, Dec. 23, 1939, and Jan. 5, 1942).	3,623	134	89	34
1529 (a)	Cotton laces and articles, Levers, 12 point or finer (France, June 15, 1936)	2,558	90	60	33
1109 (a)	Woolens, not elsewhere specified, weighing over 4 ounches per square yard, valued over $2 per pound (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939.)	1,616	80	55	31
1105 (a)	Wool noils, not carbonized (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939)	1,939	60	42	30
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox furs or skins, dressed, or undressed, n. s. p. f. (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939, and Canada supplement, Jan. 1, 1940, and Dec. 20, 1940).	2,468	50	35	30
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 40 TO 49 PERCENT				
202 (d)	Ferromanganese (30 percent or more manganese) containing not less than 4 percent carbon (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939).	1,415	61	32	47
1101 (a)	Wools, Donskoi, Smyrna, and similar, in the grease (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941; Uruguay, Jan. 1, 1943).	1,338	85	46	46
1101 (a)	Wools (other than Donskoi, Smyrna, and similar), not finer than 40s, worsted type, in the grease—dutiable (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941; Uruguay, Jan. 1, 1943).	1,910	90	49	46
1013	Table damask of flax and articles thereof, over 130 threads per square inch (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	1,410	45	25	44
921	Imitation oriental rugs of cotton (Belgium, May 1, 1935)	2,546	35	20	43
1011	Plain woven fabrics of flax, hemp, or rumie, weighing less than 4 ounces per square yard (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	3,239	35	20	43
710	Cheese, Emmenthaler (Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936; Finland, Nov. 2, 1936)	2,606	36	21	41
701	Cattle, weighing less than 200 pounds each (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939; Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	1,600	31	19	40
701	Cattle, weighing 200 pounds or more, but less than 700 pounds each (Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	5,037	80	48	40
804	Still wines from grapes, 14 percent or less alcohol, in containers of 1 gallon or less (France, June 15, 1936; Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941).	1,661	68	41	40
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 50 PERCENT				
38	Quebracho extract (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	5,082	15	7.5	50
92	Vanilla beans (France, June 15, 1936; and Mexico, Jan. 31, 1943)	3,502	8.8	4.4	50
302 (a)	Manganese ore, etc., containing 35 percent and over of manganese (Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936) (not including imports from Cuba, free of duty).	6,719	86	43	50
391	Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes (Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	1,045	35	17	50
393	Zinc ores (except pyrites, not more than 3 percent zinc), dutiable (Canada Jan. 1, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943).	1,304	77	38	50
394	Zinc, in blocks, pigs, etc. (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	1,890	57	29	50
401	Sawed boards, planks, etc.—Spruce, other than Western white (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939)	3,666	16	8.2	50
401	Sawed boards, planks, etc.—Spruce, western white (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939)	2,989	4.6	2.3	50
401	Sawed boards, planks, etc.—Pine, northern white and Norway (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943).	2,736	3.4	1.7	50
401	Sawed boards, planks, etc.—Fir (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939)	1,578	18	8.8	50
501	Cane sugar from Cuba (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934, and Cuba, supplemental, Jan. 5, 1942)	72,772	78	39	50
501	Cane sugar, full duty (Peru, July 29, 1942)	2,243	137	68	50
502	Molasses not used for the extraction of sugar, or for human consumption, from Cuba (Cuba supplemental, Jan. 5, 1942).	5,172	5.3	2.6	50
502	Molasses and sugar sirups, containing 6 percent or less soluble nonsugar solids, from Cuba (Cuba, Jan. 5, 1942).	1,258	40	20	50
503	Maple sugar (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939)	1,524	38	19	50
601	Cigar filler tobacco, stemmed, from Cuba (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934, and Cuba supplemental, Dec. 23, 1939, and Jan. 5, 1942).	5,426	60	30	50
601	Cigar filler tobacco, unstemmed, from Cuba (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934, and Cuba supplemental, Dec. 23, 1939, and Jan. 5, 1942).	1,175	52	26	50
701	Cattle, weighing 700 pounds or more each, other than dairy cows (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943).	13,008	50	25	50
706	Beef, including corned beef, canned (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941, and Uruguay, Jan. 1, 1943), imports at specific rate.	8,571	60	30	50
718 (a)	Tuna fish packed in oil, etc. (Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	1,490	45	22	50
719 (2)	Cod, haddock, etc., pickled or salted, neither skinned nor boned, containing more than 43 percent moisture (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939; United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	1,767	20	10	50
726	Oats (except hulled oats unfit for human consumption) (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939)	1,506	46	23	50
730	Bran, shorts, and other wheat byproduct feeds (Canada, Jan. 1, 1939)	7,853	10	5	50
747	Pineapples in crates, from Cuba (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934)	1,132	38	19	50
753	Tulip bulbs (Netherlands, Feb. 1, 1936)	1,682	40	20	50
757	Brazil nuts: Shelled (Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936)	1,298	33	17	50
757	Brazil nuts: In the shell (Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936)	1,053	33	16	50
762	Flaxseed (Argentina, Nov 15, 1941; Uruguay, Jan. 1, 1943)	18,424	56	28	50
762	Castor beans (Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936; Colombia, May 20, 1936)	2,882	28	14	50
771	White or Irish seed potatoes (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939)	1,293	45	22	50
772	Tomatoes, prepared or preserved (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	2,789	50	25	50

[1] Imports from all countries dutiable or subject to excise tax on importation except those from Germany.
[2] These equivalents are all based on 1939 values regardless of whether the agreement or preagreement rates were in effect during that year.
[3] Imports are of all Romano and Pecorino cheese at the ad valorem rate, whether in original loaves or not. It is believed that all or substantially all of these imports were in original loaves.

The 80 commodities having imports valued at $1,000,000 or more each in 1939 on which reduced trade agreement rates were in effect on Apr. 1, 1945, arranged according to the percent of reduction—Continued

Tariff paragraph	Commodity, agreement country, and effective date of agreement—continued	Value of imports, 1939	Equivalent ad valorem rates		Reduction in rate
			Preagreement	Agreement	
	ITEMS HAVING A REDUCTION IN RATE OF DUTY OF 50 PERCENT	*Thousands*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
783	Raw cotton, staple 1⅛ inch or more in length (Peru, July 27, 1942)	$4,700	48	24	50
802	Whisky, aged in wood at least 4 years (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939; United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939).	41,482	118	59	50
802	Brandy (France, June 15, 1936; Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	3,415	112	56	50
802	Cordials, liqueurs, etc. (France, June 15, 1936; Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	1,509	99	49	50
802	Rum, in containers of 1 gallon or less (Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934; Haiti, June 3, 1935; United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939; and Cuba, supplemental, Dec. 23, 1939).	1,434	100	50	50
803	Champagne and all other sparkling wines (France, June 15, 1936; Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	2,501	134	67	50
804	Vermouth, in containers of 1 gallon or less (France, June 15, 1936; Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941)	1,900	91	45	50
805	Ale, porter, stout, and beer (Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943)	1,372	55	27	50
1001	Flax, not hackled (Belgium, May 1, 1935; United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939; and Peru, July 29, 1942)	1,291	6.2	3.1	50
1001	Flax, hackled including dressed line (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939; and Peru, July 29, 1942)	1,097	7.8	3.9	50
1010	Woven fabrics of flax, hemp, or ramie, n. s. p. f. (Belgium, May 1, 1935; United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939)	5,405	40	20	50
1105 (a)	Wool rags (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939)	2,322	65	33	50
1116 (a)	Oriental, etc. rugs, not made on a power-driven loom (Turkey, May 5, 1939; and Iran, June 28, 1944)	2,568	63	32	50
1410	Bound or unbound books of foreign authorship, except prayer books, tourist literature, and diaries (United Kingdom, Jan. 1, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943).	1,544	15	7.5	50
1530 (a)	Hides and skins of cattle of bovine species, raw or uncured, or dried, salted, or pickled (Argentina, Nov. 15, 1941; and Uruguay, Jan. 1, 1943).	16,820	10	5.0	50
1551	Motion-picture film sensitized but not exposed or developed, 1 inch or more in width (Belgium, May 1, 1935).	$1,200	53	26	50
1733	Crude petroleum (Venezuela, Dec. 16, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943) [4]	19,570	30	15	50
1733	Topped crude oil (Venezuela, Dec. 16, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943) [4]	[5] 3,362	26	13	50
1733	Residual fuel oil (Venezuela, Dec. 16, 1939; and Mexico, Jan. 30, 1943) [4]	1,476	32	16	50
1803 (1)	Sawed boards, planks, etc. (except flooring)—Maple (except Japanese), birch, and beech (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939).[3]	2,295	7.4	3.7	50
1803 (1)	Cedar, siding (Canada, Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939) [3]	2,023	5.0	2.5	50

[4] This item is on the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, but is subject to an excise tax on importation. This tax was reduced by the trade agreements. The quantity of imports admissible at the reduced tax is limited by the terms of the agreement. The imports shown here for 1939, however, would all have obtained the benefit of the reduction in effect on Apr. 1, 1945, had it been effective in 1939.

[5] This item is on the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, but is subject to an excise tax on importation. This tax was reduced by the trade agreement.

NOTE.—"N. s. p. f." means "not specially provided for" in another classification.

The equivalent ad valorem rates have been shown in whole numbers (except in a few cases where very small) in order to avoid decimals without significance, and the "reduction in rate" figures, based on actual rates of duty or total amount of calculated duty, are therefore controlling where a discrepancy appears.

The imports of the 80 items in this table represent 76 percent, based on value, of all imports of duty-reduction items.

Italian Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release relating to an overseas broadcast which I made on April 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, of Delaware, member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who recently completed an inspection trip to Italy and the Mediterranean area, speaking to the Allied armies and liberated nations in an overseas broadcast said today:

"That the tremendous feat of Italian patriots in liberating Milan, Italy's second city, and Genoa, her greatest port, as Allied forces sweep forward toward these cities, is on a par with the great military victories over Germany which are taking place on all fronts."

He further said:

"The perfect timing of the Italian partisans in seizing these important cities in advance of our armies shows their complete coordination with the Allied Military Command. The patriots, organized under the National Committee of Liberation, are now acting as an advance army for us in a big way. Clearly their ability to help is as strong as their will to help in this final drive to clear the hated enemy from northern Italy. The courageous Italian patriots are now waging war on a large scale.

"They are contributing both to the pace of the Allied armies and to the disastrous plight of the German troops in Italy. The Allied seizure of Verona, the gateway to the Brenner Pass, seals off a great part of the forces in northern Italy. We know that the Nazis' loss in men and equipment has been terrific. In these signal achievements the Italian patriots have aided heavily."

Real Uses for Waste Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest natural resource in our Nation is water. Until recently we have taken for granted that this resource was permanent. Recent years have convinced us that we must not only control but conserve the water within the interior of our country. We must not only conserve but make intelligent use of our flood waters. We must harness them for power, store them for irrigation and domestic use, and what is left the navigators can have.

Bearing the above in mind it gives me great pleasure to insert here an article by B. Ashton Keith:

Further waste of public funds for a so-called flood control by backing the provenly outmoded and provenly ineffective plans of the Army engineers merits general denouncement.

Also, from bitter personal experience, we decry further waste of the Nation's water resources despite repeated occurrences of severe drought and grave need for increased production of foods and vast needs for really cheap power.

Studies on the official reports of foreign governments through many years show that at least two great nations have found many ways to utilize nearly all their flood waters in many river basin for the benefit of all the people (pt. 2, pp. 19 and 24), instead of for the enrichment of only a few (pp. 18 and 20). Flood waters may be either a curse or a blessing, depending on how they are managed and by whom.

Careful examination of divers public records reveals that during the past 65 years an astounding great sum-total of cash has been paid out to support the so-called river improvement activities of the Army engineers, but that they have given us countless so-called permanent improvement which the next floods either filled up or washed away.

Their methods were simply to dike, dredge, and sand-bag the streams, as the Germans had done for 200 years, only to cause increased silting, flood damages, and expenses, and which finally led (pp. 20–21), to national disaster. France discarded these methods in 1857 because she, too, had found them increasingly expensive and ineffective. Better methods were adopted, and through almost 80 years have proven to be far superior to the

German methods which were copied (pt. 2, pp. 16 and 18) by our Army engineers.

The main trouble has been in fighting the floods and rushing the excess waters as quickly as possible out to sea, an utter waste. The saving of such waters by up-stream, cheaper dams of medium size, which has proven so successful in India (pt. 2, p. 24), not only prevents flood damages almost completely, but in all our States their use for emergency irrigation in times of drought would alone save many billions of dollars over a period of 30 years.

These statements are proven by our public records and the official reports of other governments. They are not the products of armchair theorizing. It has been found that our Nation's grand total of costs in floods alone already exceeds the cash costs of all our previous wars; and we not only still have flood damages and expenses, but we have them increasing. The set-up as well as the methods are wrong[1] fundamentally.

Widespread retention of nearly all the run-off waters by means of cheaper and smaller reservoirs, mostly situated far up on tributary streams on cheaper or even worthless land have been tested by the engineers of India (2 p. 24) through several decades with steadily increasing success in many ways and with simultaneous solving of flood-control and soil-erosion problems, and wider spread of intensive cultivation of land that formerly was less productive.

The placing of many very large dams on the main streams "with facilities for generation of electric current, the aid of navigation, and for purposes of flood control" is merly a safe method for securing large sums of money by false pretenses, so far as effective flood control is concerned. Dams to aid navigation and for production of power must be kept constantly so full of water that they are of little use and cannot be depended on for flood control.

On the other hand numerous systems of medium-size, up-stream dams in many places have been found cheaper and more effective and rendered a more useful service, with valuable production of additional cheap power, with more abundant supplies of water to farmers for irrigation of crops when needed.

At the same time through a period of more than a century, India's intensive methods of water conservation and improved use, have proven far superior to ours. With very liberal contracts for the farmers and local industries, there long has been[2][3][4][5] high yield of interest on the grand total of expenses for irrigation construction (both productive and nonproductive), and with effective flood prevention made only an incidental matter.

It is a matter of common knowledge that in many areas where terrible famines formerly occurred, due to floods and drouths, intensive conservation of flood waters and widespread promotion of in-soak have brought greatly increased safety and prosperity despite increase in population.

High prices and exploitation of the masses through control of foods by scarcity, largely has been prevented by abundant production.

Permanent covering of more and more of the richer bottom lands by construction of dams on the larger streams is deplored as wasteful and unnecessary.

[1] Read the warning of Ritter Gustav von Wex, Chief Imperial Counselor on Engineering 1873, later verified by readings: Küster on the Oder 58 years; Berghaus on the Rhine 66 years, etc.

[2] Statesmans Year Book (1943) (Congressional Library No. JA51.S7).

[3] New Delhi Report, Bureau of Information (1937) (DS401.I38).

[4] Rept. Com. Cent. Provinces (1929) (TC-904.C3H5).

[5] Buckley, Robt.—Irrigation Works of India (1880) (TC903.B9).

Examination of divers records has revealed the fact of a little-publicized but startling number of failures of very large dams in recent years. Largely these were found to be due to unexpected deterioration of the concrete or to construction plans and methods which obviously need further study. The failure without warning of the great St. Francis Dam[6] in California, drowning nearly 1,500 people, is only one of the many examples. We have a long list.

Too generally, for some reason, the engineers involved have minimized these tragic disasters. We find that of a list of more than 20 large dams which a leading engineer classed as "perfectly safe" only a few years ago, several already have gone down and several others have begun to undergo extensive repairs. It is becoming evident that the talk of large and costly dams lasting for centuries has little basis on facts. Several have been destroyed by natural forces within only a few years, and several more within a few days after completion.

Another serious cause of national and local loss that has not been made sufficiently well-known to the public in general is seen in the very rapid filling of a number of large reservoirs with silt. Instead of lasting for centuries, many already have had their water-storage capacity largely diminished by the washing in of dirt. Valuable soils that should have been held far upstream on the farms already have been permitted to almost completely fill several of our larger reservoirs. That on the Bighorn River near Emory, Wyo., is only one of the several examples.

We know of many farmers with valid water rights who did not get their share of the water or did not get it when it was needed, although others got theirs when needed and not a few got more than they needed. In some instances this was known to be due to the ignorance or indifference of easterners who had been sent out to manage western water business. Specific examples of this, too, can be cited, some of which caused some hard-working farmers to lose their land.

By a called vote by our members in 22 Western and Midwestern States, it is the sense of the League of Western Voters that a more genuine flood control can be and should be made incidental to a truer conservation and better use of the flood waters in nearly all parts of this United States, and certainly in the Midwest and far West.

This can best be done by constructing numerous systems of medium-size, up-stream dams with canals, ditches, and channels for permitting a far wider spread of irrigation, both emergency and regular. There is no better or cheaper way to produce with dependable regularity the increased quantities of grains, meats, and other foods that increasingly will be needed to fill domestic and foreign orders through many years to come. The people of many nations now are getting the American idea of foods in greater variety for all the people.

[6] Eng. News-Rec. May 31, 1928, p. 835; ibid June 1928; Civ. Eng. Apr. 1932; Western Construction News, Nov. 25, 1929; Surveyor, Mar. 31, 1923, etc.

Chavez Leads First Patrol Into Naha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of today appears an article of far more than passing interest to the Members of the Senate. Every story reciting the heroism and courage and resourcefulness and the will to win of the American armed forces elicits our admiration, but this story is especially intriguing because it is centered around Lt. Dennis Chavez, Jr., the son of one of our distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from New Mexico.

Lieutenant Chavez of the marines led the first patrol into the city of Naha which, by the way, is the first Japanese city to be entered by Americans in this war.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this fascinating press release printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it may have the attention of the Members of the Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAVEZ LEADS FIRST PATROL INTO NAHA

(By Homer Bigart)

WITH THE SIXTH MARINE DIVISION OUTSIDE NAHA, May 13.—Lt. Dennis Chavez, Jr., Albuquerque, son of the Senator from New Mexico, led the first patrol to Naha Saturday afternoon.

For more than an hour they explored the northernmost ward of the capital city, separated from the main part of the town by the broad mud flats of the Asato estuary. Then, after drawing only sniper and knee mortar fire, Chavez boldly tried to ford the basin in low tide. Two Marines went along with him while the rest of the patrol covered them with automatic small arms from the northern bank.

They crossed at a point 50 yards below the demolished concrete span of Highway No. 1, which the Japanese had dynamited the day before. They had absolutely no cover and were plainly visible to the Japanese, who undoubtedly watched their every movement from handsome stone government buildings across the river. These buildings appeared to have suffered little from nearly 2 months of naval siege.

PLUNGE THROUGH MUD

Chavez tested the black ooze beside an abandoned yawl. He sank to his knees, but still thought that the estuary could be waded. With Corp. Thomas D. Bryson, Jr., Oakland, Calif., and Pvt. Roy Wheeler, Watertown, Mass., former locomotive fireman on the Boston & Albany Railroad, Chavez plunged through the mud. The stream was about 60 yards wide at ebb tide. Beached on the opposite mud flat was another yawl that looked deserted and would offer some protection if the patrol were caught under sniper fire.

The three men headed for it.

Bryson, in the vanguard, was nearly across when he floundered suddenly in hip-deep mud. "It sucked me down like quicksand," he told this correspondent. "I was going down fast when Wheeler grabbed a mooring rope from the yawl and tossed one end of it to me." The patrol tried to skirt the deep hole, but couldn't and finally retired.

ENEMY FIRE INCREASES

Meanwhile, the four marines on the north bank were drawing increasing small-arms and mortar fire from enemy troops approaching from the military college, a quarter of a mile up the river.

Upstream and just behind the military college was a wooded knoll topped by a Shinto shrine. From wooded prayer grounds around the shrine came the first enemy fire.

A knee mortar shell exploded close to Lieutenant Chavez, who was staggered momentarily by shock but uninjured.

Other mortar shells slammed down on the river bank where Moran and three other marines took positions while Chavez, Bryson, and Wheeler set out across the mud bottom.

JAP SHELTER SMASHED

Friendly outposts on the bluff overlooking the estuary saw Japs sneaking into a three-story frame building at the north end of the bridge. Capt. John P. Lanigan, London, Ohio, immediately placed the building under mortar fire. It collapsed under a rain of 81-millimeter shells.

The Japs made no further attempt to cut off Chavez, but snipers continued to shoot from buildings and woodlots upstream. Their special target was not the Senator's son, but Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold L. Maddocks, Fort Fairfield, Maine. "I was willing to join more than one church down there," Maddocks said.

Chavez's patrol returned without one casualty.

The honor of being the first Americans to enter a Japanese city since the outbreak of the war rested lightly on the marines. Chavez called it "just another patrol."

Should Bureaus Be Substituted for Our Probate Courts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gibson B. Witherspoon, attorney at law, Meridian, Miss., from the March 1944 issue of the Mississippi Law Journal:

SHOULD BUREAUS BE SUESTITUTED FOR OUR PROBATE COURTS?

(By Gibson B. Witherspoon, attorney, Meridian, Miss., member of Mississippi State Bar and American Bar Association)

I. ESTATES OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 1

Estates of veterans of World War No. 1 were administered under the law existing in the State where the veteran was domiciled, subject to the able supervision of the Veterans' Bureau of the various States. The work of the Veterans' Bureau was splendid. They held the court costs, attorneys' fees, and administrative expenses to a minimum and always were alert to see that the result obtained was to the best interest of the veteran's estate. Under the uniform veterans' law,[1] which has been enacted in all the States, copies of petitions were submitted to the Veterans' Bureau before being taken up with the courts. Often objectionable features were eliminated and the best available investments were obtained for the estate. Thus each estate was safeguarded by all the laws of the several States plus the wisdom and experience which the able attorneys of the Veterans' Bureau were able to render. Apparently this was a desirable combination and reached near perfection in protecting the estates of the deceased veterans and preserving the corpus for the time in the minor's life when it was most needed for educational purposes.

[1] Mississippi Code Annotation (1930), ch. 175.

II. THE NEW LAW FOR VETERANS' ESTATES OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended up to July 13, 1943,[2] provided that where payment of any compensation, pension, or insurance was to be made to a minor or to any person under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, the payment might be made to the legally appointed guardian. If the latter were not properly executing his duties, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States Veterans' Administration[3] could appear in the court which had appointed this fiduciary and call the matter to the court's attention. He could also suspend payment, holding the funds in the Treasury to the credit of the beneficiary. But the person normally in charge of the funds was a judicially appointed and controlled guardian.

Not being satisfied with this developed system of handling estates of veterans and wishing to abandon the safeguards established through years of experience, Congress passed, on July 13, 1943, an amendment to this section which demands the closest scrutiny by the bench and bar. The new subsection (4) of section 21 is as follows:

"(4) Any benefit payable or paid by the Veterans' Administration shall be subject to the applicable provisions of sections 454a and 555a of this title, as now or hereafter amended: *Provided*, That in any case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay may be made in the discretion of the Administrator to the wife of such veteran for the use of the veteran and his dependents: *And provided further*, That payment of death benefits to a widow for herself and child or children, if any, may be made directly to such widow, notwithstanding she may be a minor. Section 44 of this title is hereby repealed and any other law in conflict herewith is modified accordingly."[4]

The alleged purposes of the passage of the above amendment, according to testimony before a congressional committee, are:

"1. To provide uniform application of World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, and other provisions of Public Law No. 262.

"2. To afford more flexible administrative actions and centralize the control of all cases under a Washington bureau, regardless of the rights of the several States to safeguard the rights of its incompetent and unfortunate citizens.

"3. The direct payment of all the money to the beneficiaries without the small amounts depleted by:

"(a) Guardians' commission.

"(b) Attorneys' fees, and

"(c) Court costs incident to guardianships, etc."[5]

III. SHOULD ESTABLISHED SAFEGUARDS BE ABANDONED FOR SPECULATIVE BENEFITS?

Under the first alleged purpose for the enactment of this amendment, "to provide uniform application of veterans' estates," it should be remembered that each State has already enacted what is universally called a World War Veterans' Act. Under its provisions, each petition is presented to the Veterans' Administration in each State before being filed and taken up with the court. If there are no objectionable features in the petition, the veterans' chief attorney returns a waiver. On the other hand, if there are objectionable features in the proposed petition, the chief attorney of the State offices of the Veterans' Administration points out the objectionable features to the local attorney handling the matter, and usually the petition is redrafted and the objectionable portion thereof is omitted. In a very few cases the petition is filed regardless of the objection and the reasons therefor. In such cases the chief attorney of the Veterans' Administration files objections and the chancelor or judge of the probate court decides the issues. Thus, it would appear that the laws are uniform in the several States and that all the safeguards as prescribed by the various States should be preserved.

The Veterans' Administration has supervision in all veterans' estates under the old law as administered in veterans' estates of World War No. 1. The oft-heard criticism of bureaus wanting to have more and more power seems applicable in answering the first alleged benefit of the new act. The efficiency which has been effected in the handling of estate cases in the First World War should be utilized instead of abandoned. The experience gained should prove a beacon light to safeguard the estates of veterans of World War No. 2.

The boys in the armed forces are fighting to preserve life as they know it, and not as it might be administered by some bureau. It is safe to say that the insurance premiums which they pay for the support of their wives and children are intended to be subject to the safeguards with which they are familiar—to the administration of a court of competent jurisdiction which will preserve the best interest of their loved ones by preventing the squandering of a lump-sum payment.

Concerning the second alleged purpose for the enactment of this amendment, namely, to afford more flexible administrative action and centralize all the estates of the veterans of this war under the control of a Washington bureau, it is submitted that the various State courts should be utilized and that the States' established safeguards should govern the administration of these estates. That procedure has proved satisfactory in the handling of estates of World War No. 1; so, why should it be changed?

It is admitted that Federal grants can be given to anyone the Government may smile upon, under the Jeremiah Hall case,[6] but there is a serious legal question presented where there is a sacred contract between a soldier of this war and the United States, payable to certain beneficiaries who are under the disability of minority. Can some administrator take a valid release from a minor of tender years or from a widow who is sweet sixteen? At the conclusion of war in 1918, all of our courts held that the Government could be sued on these contracts of insurance. Suppose a minor, after reaching his majority, should sue the Government for his insurance money, on the theory that it was wrongfuly paid to his mother, who was incompetent to handle the estate and who spent the money herself without giving him any of the benefits. Certainly there would be at least some equity in his claim. If this amendment to section 21 were declared invalid by our Supreme Court because it violated the rights of the several States as guaranteed under our sometime forgotten Constitution,[7] would

[2] 49 Stat. 607 (1935), 38 U. S. C. A. § 450 (Supp. 1942).

[3] 46 Stat. 1016 (1930), 38 U. S. C. A. § 11 (Supp. 1943).

[4] 57 Stat. 554 (1943), 38 U. S. C. A. § 450 (Supp. 1943).

[5] Letter of November 5, 1943, from Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, to J. E. RANKIN, Member of Congress and chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

[6] *United States* v. *Hall* (98 U. S. 343, 25 L. Ed. 180 (1879)).

[7] In 1823 Jefferson said, "I ask for no straining words against the Government nor yet against the States. I believe the States can best govern over home concerns and the General Government over foreign ones. I wish therefore to see maintained that wholesome distribution of power established by the Constitution for the limitation of both and never see all offices transferred to Washington." Norton, The Constitution of the United States ((1940) 226).

the Federal Government then be liable for another payment to the proper legal guardian of the minor?

The act containing this amended subsection was originally passed by Congress on July 13, 1943, and provides for "payment of compensation or retirement pay-death benefits to a widow for herself and child or children if any," this notwithstanding the widow might be a minor. The President signed the act a few days later; and with the ink hardly dry, the Veterans' Bureau on July 16, 1943, sent out a form letter to every State office in America advising them not only that the act applied to payment of compensation pensions, retirement pay, and death benefits, as Congress specifically designated in the act, but also that it applied to all insurance of personnel discharged from the military or naval force of the United States. Can it be said fairly that Congress intended to include insurance money in this act? The very fact that it was left out would indicate that Congress wanted to exclude insurance payments.

The third and last reason advanced by the administrator in support of this objectionable new amendment is possibly the underlying purpose for the enactment of this provision into law. Guardians' commissions usually amount to approximately 5 percent of the expenditures. In normal times, when the Government is not lending money, most investments earn more than this commission, and everyone knows that the guardian earns every cent of these small fees, as do the clerks of the courts. So the basic reason for the entire act, I think, is to cut the attorneys of the country out of making any fees at all from veterans' estates arising from this war.[8] Apparently we have another example of the forgotten man—the lawyer—who is completely left out by this new legislation. Yet if the attorney charged too much for his services under the old law, the attorneys for the veterans bureau immediately objected and equitable fees were invariably paid. Thus a most uniform fee schedule for attorneys was actually in force throughout America.

IV. POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS OF THE AMENDMENT

Let us consider some practical applications of this law.[9] Assume some 18-year-old widow, whose soldier-husband was killed in Italy and who is left with one child. The insurance money is paid directly to her; she receives the child's part for its use and benefit. The widow marries again and other children are born to this new couple. The mother spends her money for a home. The soldier's son has his money in the bank, and the mother hopes to educate him in the State university. But the children of the second marriage become ill and must be hospitalized; so the mother from time to time spends the inheritance of the soldier's son, and when he is old enough to go to college, his money has disappeared and he must go to work instead. This wrong could well occur under the statute, under which guardians' commissions and small attorneys' fees were saved to this estate.

Numerous illustrations could be cited. In every State, each surety company, lawyer, and chancery clerk could add some regrettable cases in which the corpus was wasted; but, because of the surety bond, no loss resulted to the infant heirs of the estates.

It is stated that a guardian may be appointed under this new law. This is true, but how many will be appointed if the Federal Government will pay directly to the widow without a guardianship? The attorney for the Government may approach the widow with a check for $10,000. He may say,

"I will pay this over to you now and you may use it as you desire, or you may have a guardian appointed, but you will have to pay the guardian's commissions, pay court costs, bond premiums, and, of course, attorney's fees. Every time you want to spend something, the court will pass on it, etc."

In nearly every case the widow would take the money, and she would become subject to all the hazards which might befall a person incompetent and inexperienced in handling money.[10]

[8] See resolution passed by Mississippi State Bar ((1943) 15 Miss. L. J. 319).

[9] Jesse Stuart, winner of the Thomas Jefferson award for 1943, gives us an example of this in Taps for Private Tussie. When Kim Tussie was killed in action, the Bureau paid his illiterate wife, Vittie, $10,000 insurance money in one lump sum. The author shows the natural sequence of events which normally happened when an illiterate relief family was paid $10,000 cash. The tragedies in this novel will be enacted in real life in hundreds of cases unless our present law is changed.

[10] Joseph W. Henderson, president of the American Bar Association, states, "I am a good deal concerned that we of the American Bar Association and the legal profession do the job which is expected of us, and do it soon and well. The rising tide of criticism of arbitrary administrative action no longer comes chiefly from lawyers or their clients but from the rank and file of folks who now are finding out that arbitrary and unchecked administrative action affects their lives and liberties too. As someone said the other day: 'They are tired of being kicked around.'" ((1943) 29 A. B. A. J. 681.)

Poetic Tribute to the Late President Roosevelt by John Magill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by a farmer of North Dakota named John Magill, of Verona, N. Dak. The poem is entitled "Glorious Leader," and is one of the finest poems I have read in memory of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLORIOUS LEADER

(By John Magill)

"Long live your glorious leader!"
Cried allies overseas;
Alas! that leader slumbers;
'Neath Hyde Park's budding trees.
'Twas in the "line of duty"
The final summons came
To him whose years so painful
Have earned undying fame.

For him no union hours,
For him no 8-hour day;
Like farmer at the harvest,
Or soldier in the fray,
His Atlas mind envisioned
Through anxious days, and long,
Through battles never ending—
For him no friendly gong.

The peace he vainly wished for
With longing, tired sigh,
Has come to him eternal
In Realms of God, on high;
Yet long will live his efforts
For us he loved so well;
Our world will ne'er forget him
Who in the battle fell.

He found our Nation fearful
Of dangers near at hand;
Resurgently his courage
Spread hope throughout the land.
When rising tides of warfare
Sought to engulf us all,
He calmly told our country
To answer every call.

To work or fight, wherever
The talent each possessed
Could render greatest service—
And each to give—his best!
In this our splendid leader
Example set for all,
Since none can strive more greatly
Than labor till he fall!

That voice of silver kindness
Our firesides heard of yore,
Like those of Clay and Webster
Can stir men's hearts no more.
Then take your place, Frank Roosevelt,
Nor hesitate to claim
What you so nobly merit
In history's hall of fame.

The qualities of Washington,
And Lincoln's love of men,
With ideals of a Wilson
Have lived in you again.
In every national crisis
A leader forward came;
America forever
Will bless your honored name.

Patent Medicine Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the May 1945 issue of the magazine, Washington News Digest, contains an interesting and informative article by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

PATENT MEDICINE POLITICS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The pattern of American politics of the immedate future has now become clear. A swarm of collectivist medicine men are going to try to high-pressure our Nation into buying a mess of political patent medicine.

They intend to take advantage of our unsettled times and feelings to sell us a phony political bill of goods. These leftists want to bamboozle us to buy—what?

"The little pink healer. A magic bottle which produces cradle-to-the-grave security and jobs for all. A miraculous formula designed to make a sick nation well and a well nation better. Composed of the following ingredients: One part of deficit financing, one

part centralized Executive power, and miscellaneous items such as political pap, bureaucratic patronage, and public pork."

From the rostrums of Government-controlled unions and front organizations, the snake-oil salesmen will hawk their nostrum. They will use all the time-worn techniques of the medicine man craft—the come-on, the follow-through, and the who'll-be-the-first-to-buy-it finale.

First, they will gush their dripping praise of the common man. Next, they will beat their breasts over the fictitious political and economic grievances and ailments of the common man. Lastly, they will hold up the little pink healer, which will put him out of his misery. Take a bottle, folks. It's all wrapped up in red tape. Yours for the simple price of the great American ballot.

Will our Nation take to this apple sauce? I think not. I think we have learned to beware of these political charlatans. We have enough horse sense to neutralize their hokum. But let's start right now to take their hokum apart and show up its component elements for just what they are—the siren songs of demagogy.

First, the medicine men's initial bit of hokum is their professed love for the common man, the little man, the forgotten man. Inwardly these demagogs must sneer at the common man who "falls for their line," even though it has been long discredited.

It is the little man who will pay through the nose in taxes for the staggering national debt which the collectivist medicine men would even increase. It is the little man who will surrender his liberties just as the big man will lose his in return for the spurious blessings of "the little pink healer."

Secondly, the medicine men's next bit of hokum is their spine-chilling propaganda of fear. They try to panic the public into state socialism or a reasonable facsimile thereof. With their gloomy warnings of post-war depressions and unemployment, of bread lines and soup kitchens, they try to raise America's hair, its blood pressure, and its willingness to do what the political hypnotists tell it.

The demagogs omit all references to the forces which will make for post-war prosperity in the American way. They do not mention the breath-taking backlog of industrial, agricultural, and consumer demands both here and abroad, demands whose fulfillment will enable American production to reach a peacetime peak and to continue humming in high gear.

They ignore America's great infant industries—plastics, electronics, aviation—which are standing only on the threshold of their tremendous peacetime development. They render no account of America's private inventive genius, which, in the period since 1870, produced 15,000,000 new jobs in 15 new industries.

Thirdly, the medicine men proclaim the hokum of the democratic newness of their nostrum. They say their seductively titled full-employment program is the latest thing in democratic public policy. They urge, let's keep up with the English Joneses with their up-to-the-minute Beveridge plan. They know that the public always takes a hankering to neat things wrapped up in a new package.

Actually, however, their program is neither new nor neat nor democratic. Its collectivist poison is the oldest stuff in the world—the stuff of which the ancient institution of slavery was made. In particular, look underneath the bottle and you will see made in Europe—totalitarian Europe.

The ersatz American thinkers, who concocted their devil's brew of spend and spend, elect and elect, borrowed the formula from the economic advisers of Hitler and Mussolini. They took over, as their own, the hocus-pocus economic and political schemes of the very men whose nations we have had to conquer with such costly sacrifice on the battlefield.

Moreover, we ourselves have tried this potion and found it completely wanting. Between 1933 and 1940, we took a long swallow of the very same economic and political firewater which is sold today as something new. Before the war, this firewater bore the trademark, pump priming and other innocent titles.

Under its influence, we indulged in an orgy of extravagant spending. We came very close to scuttling our entire system of economic and political checks and balances. Yet, we were left after 7 years of our intemperance with worse financial headaches and spiritual heartaches than when we started—and with 10,000,000 unemployed.

Fourthly, the medicine men dispense their hokum about Government. Washington, D. C., is, of course, the location of the mineral springs from which "the little pink healer" comes. The Capitol is the Fountain of Youth for our "tired old economy."

If in doubt, turn to Government. If in need, turn to Government (the Federal Government). If suspicious, remember that government works in a mysterious way its wonders to perform. Government does everything better. Government knows best. Government, government, government!

Now, just who was it that built this Nation—the bureaucratic seat-warmers or the grass-roots men in overalls?

Who was it who, between 1940 and 1944, produced 246,000 planes, 56,000 naval vessels, 769,000 trucks, who boosted the Nation's food output by 23 percent while the Nation's farm population dropped by 16 percent?

Was it not the selfsame free enterprise whose independent genius and grit the collectivists despise?

Was not our magnificent production achieved often in spite of the confusing, conflicting, and confounding orders issued pell mell by the authority-mad Washington bureaucrats?

Fifthly, the medicine men spout a lot of hokum about strife on the American scene as a reason and justification for Federal intervention. They picture big business as being at the throat of little business, labor in a death struggle with management, the farmer as perpetually at loggerheads with the consumer.

Of course, these class-conscious medicine men make no mention of the fact that they have gleefully contributed to whatever strife exists. They ignore the fact that the existence of competitive groups in America, peacefully pursuing their individual ends, within the framework of the general welfare, is the very crux of our American system.

These groups are in themselves beneficial checks and balances against one another. Certainly, there are abundant evidences at hand which belie the insinuations of vicious strife between them.

"The new charter of labor and management" agreed to by the presidents of the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and chamber of commerce is a case in point of the most modern American cooperation between supposedly deadly antagonists.

Other evidences of voluntary cooperation are the numerous profit-sharing plans in industry, the widespread pension and insurance plans sponsored by private enterprise for its employees, the innumerable labor-management committees, and the $600,000,000 financial pool for America's small business projected by America's bankers.

All these and more refute the trumped-up charges of American class-warfare and riddle the case for the Federal Government taking everything over in order to enforce peace and harmony.

Finally, the medicine men bait their trap with the hokum of guarantees. What do they not promise to guarantee? They vow to insure jobs, credits, profits, education, security, health, housing—practically the moon on a silver platter for every American.

But they fail to tell us the price, the age-old price of slavery in a planned economy in which wages, hours, and every factor of production are held in the iron fist of despotic government.

They fail to tell us that even after paying that awful price, the so-called guarantees turn out to be pigs in the poke. The little pink healer, itself, merely becomes the first drug to which a nation becomes addicted. Soon that nation finds itself compelled to take the all red healer.

So is it not best to beware of collectivists bearing gifts? The security they would donate is that of the caged bird or of the hog being fattened for slaughter. Why not remember the words of old that "he who would give up liberty for security deserves neither"?

But enough of the patent-medicine palaver.

America should give ear to none of it. Our national economic and political body is sound. Whatever ailments that body does have were brought on by the depression emergency, then by the continuation of the depression (resulting from the taking of quack cures) and then by the war.

Those ailments can all be cured by tried and true American remedies. The only medicine we need take is the sunshine medicine of sincere cooperation.

This natural medicine shows its effects in straight thinking, straight talking, and straight acting on the part of management, labor, agriculture, and government.

Yes, a government of checks and balances, a thrifty government, an efficient government, a courteous government can contribute its vital share to the health and well-being of a free America.

Political patent medicines are patently perilous. America doesn't want them.

Our New President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our New President, Harry S. Truman" delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] over Station WBAL, Baltimore, Md., on April 21 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The momentous transition of the Presidency from Roosevelt to Truman has come at one of the most critical stages in history. It is highly significant that the American people are meeting this change in the office of the Presidency with quiet assurance.

President Truman is confronted with stupendous problems of war and peace, of economic readjustments the significance of which is unprecedented. A new President is necessarily a serious experiment in peacetimes and more so during a war.

People are asking today "Who is Truman and what will he do?" Well, what has Truman been doing? His life may be divided roughly into four periods: First, civilian and minor political activities; second, as a soldier; third, as United States Senator; and

fourth, his exceedingly brief experience as Vice President and as President of the United States.

Truman's record in civilian life and as a public official is creditable. As a soldier he displayed courage, efficiency, and the ability to win the confidence and friendship of his fellow soldiers. Scrutiny of his record as a Member of the United States Senate gives much insight as to his personal characteristics and as to what may be expected of him as President.

President Truman and I were sworn in as Members of the United States Senate on the same day, January 3, 1935, and we soon came into close contact with each other. We agreed on many points. We remembered Senator John Sharp William's description of the United States Senate as a "cave of the winds." Both President Truman and I expressed belief that the value of the making of set speeches in the Senate is grossly exaggerated; that while many speeches are explanatory and persuasive, slogans and catch phrases and especially denunciatory language may attract attention, but seldom are illuminating or convincing, in the Senate or out of it. Again and again he regretted that people do not realize sufficiently that the operations of the Senate are really a vast business enterprise, and that hard work, industry, and clearness of vision are as essential in the United States Senate as in any other place in the world.

President Truman's work in the organization and handling of the Truman committee was really in line with his previous valuable work in the Senate. Everyone admits that the work of the Truman committee was entirely nonpartisan and as constructive as that of any other congressional committee during the past 50 years. President Truman, in handling that committee, ran true to form.

When President Truman in his impressive speech to the joint session of the Congress pled for hearty cooperation, it was almost as if he were talking again, as a Senator, to his former associates in the Senate, urging closer teamwork between the President and the Congress. His informal visit to Congress on April 13, the earliest moment possible, and his radio address a day or so later to the members of the armed forces, again emphasized the necessity of such cooperation.

Another characteristic of Truman is his love for tolerance. When several weeks ago I asked him to come to Baltimore to speak to the Maryland Historical Society, he accepted immediately. So, on March 27, in commemoration of Maryland Day, the then Vice President Truman delivered an address to the Maryland Society, praising Maryland's historic doctrine of toleration, and urging that it be a beacon light to us in these days. His splendid record during his 10 days as the President proclaims the man, and is no surprise to those who know him.

The hundred days at the end of the Napoleonic regime are regarded as unprecedented in the importance of the events which followed each other in rapid succession. The first hundred days of the administration of President Truman will be comparable. Developments in this, the biggest and most tragic of world wars, are taking place with unparalleled rapidity. Organized resistance in Germany is fast disappearing. Since modern warfare requires men, weapons, oil, airplanes, and countless other facilities on a gigantic scale closely coordinated, the effectiveness of disjointed Nazi fighting groups will peter out, however much some fanatics prefer to die fighting in a hopeless cause.

The war in the Pacific moves on with incredible speed. The Japanese now know their ill-gotten gains will fast disappear but the frenzied eagerness of the businessmen in Japan, to try to prevent their basic industries from being destroyed will become more and more apparent and may be a factor of increasing importance as to the duration of the war.

Will the San Francisco Conference adopt the conclusions of Dumbarton Oaks or will material changes be made? The Conference, after controversies and apparent deadlocks, will probably follow substantially the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Only 2 days before the death of President Roosevelt I received a letter from him in which he referred to his plans for attending the San Francisco Conference. Although Truman has stated that he will not participate on the ground in that Conference, he will keep in the closest touch with what is going on there and his influence will be a continuing and powerful one. He shares fully the general opinion that our delegation of six can and will handle the situation satisfactorily. Even though Truman does not take part in San Francisco in the active proceedings of the Conference, he might appear in San Francisco as a host to greet or congratulate and bid farewell to the visiting delegation.

On Friday a very unusual event happened as Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG, our two delegates from the Senate, were about to leave San Francisco. Both made earnest speeches in the Senate outlining generally our aims and purposes. At the conclusion of each speech, the Members of the staid and precedent-observing United States Senate paid the highly unique tribute of breaking into loud applause. This farewell touch was our recognition of the vast importance of the conference, and of our full and complete confidence in our delegates.

History will record more changes during the 100 days beginning April 12 than in any other short period in our existence. History is in the making as never before. The foundations of our future international relations are being laid. An organization will be created, designed to offer security to a world tortured and stricken almost to death. However, the main safeguard of peace will be, not in the language of the instrument adopted, but in the spirit in which it is carried out.

Among the myriad of serious matters to be settled will be the disposition of certain islands in the Pacific which have been in the possession of our enemies. We do not want colonies, but this war has demonstrated that our security demands that we must have air and naval bases in various parts of the world which are always readily available to us. Ought we to own these bases outright or should they be trusteed? No set formula will probably prevail but some of the bases should belong to us outright. Where there is grave uncertainty as to whether they should be owned or held in trust, all doubts should be resolved in favor of our ownership.

I now return to what has been the greatest change in the rapidly moving panorama. The sudden death of the dynamic and epoch-making Roosevelt with a record of real achievement in the international field brings a man to the White House of proven and outstanding ability, but almost untried in diplomacy and international relations. Never in this country has an incoming President received more whole-souled assurances of support. The people of the United States, irrespective of party, have gathered around our new leader in accordance with the best traditions of our American way of life. Both Democrats and Republicans in caucus have passed resolutions pledging the President hearty cooperation and have called at the White House to emphasize such support.

Some cynics say, however, that this is the customary honeymoon of a new administration, and that discord will break out later on. Differences of opinion between the President and some members of Congress may lead in time to some friction. In view, however, of the gravity of our problems, and of the fact that President Truman, while a member of Congress, made friends and no enemies there, and also because he is instinctively cooperative, the probabilities of grave and lasting discord developing are at a minimum.

The American people like a contrast in temperament in their successive chief executives. Soon we will have the opportunity to decide which of the many far-reaching Roosevelt an policies should continue and which should be discarded. Strange as it may seem we may be able to make these decisions better under President Truman since as long as President Roosevelt lived, likes and dislikes of him tended at times to hamper the handling of our policies. We can now approach these matters, less as personalities and more as intrinsic specific facts. Time alone will permit us to evaluate clearly Roosevelt's astonishing record of achievement. President Truman's well-poised and practical mind will function satisfactorily in sharp antithesis to the brilliant one of Roosevelt.

Many people are asking, Is Truman a New Dealer? I do not know how to answer that question, nor, do I imagine, would he. Those who favor and those who oppose the New Deal differ so materially among themselves as to its meaning and desirability of policies, that classifications are not satisfactory. President Truman will judge every important matter on its merits, totally irrespective of whether it has any label or brand as being pro- or anti-New Deal.

Will Truman retain the Roosevelt Cabinet and chief advisers? I doubt if he has very definite opinions on that point just now. Experience has demonstrated, however, that each new President does, as time goes on, make numerous substitutions in the official family which he inherits. Quite likely some such changes will again take place, but of this we can be sure—President Truman will move thoughtfully and will select competent assistants.

We have given convincing evidence to the world of how a change in the head of our Government can avoid disruption and promote unity. By that striking example we urge the world to make governmental changes in a calm and deliberate manner, in the fullest accordance with both the letter and spirit of constitutional processes of government.

President Truman must deal with men who have spent their lives in close international contacts. How will Truman function when he negotiates with Churchill and Stalin? Against Truman's lack of experience in international matters is the fact that he has many able and trained advisers, including Cordell Hull, the soundest man alive in the field of international relations. Even more important is the fact that Truman is naturally clear-headed, cautious, fair-minded, and cooperative. Frequently, during the Presidential campaign of 1944, I said in my speeches that if Truman should ever become the President of the United States he would serve the people well, and he is doing so. He is modest and delights in no illusions of grandeur. He has shown he can be quick to act, and yet act wisely. He is firm in the position he takes and he is his own President.

We have a wise and well-balanced man in the White House who strives to serve the people well, and who will devote himself assiduously and efficiently to the most gigantic job in the world—the Presidency of the United States.

Economic Stability for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Plans 10-Year $4,600,000,000 Campaign to Give Economic Stability to Cotton South," written by William Parker and published in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, May 14. This is a very important announcement to the cotton farmers of the South and to the country generally. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, not that I approve of it, but in order to advise the cotton farmers of the South of the plan of the Department of Agriculture over a period of 10 years, and later I expect to speak on the proposal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PLANS 10-YEAR $4,600,000,000 CAMPAIGN TO GIVE ECONOMIC STABILITY TO COTTON SOUTH—WOULD LET DOMESTIC PRICE OF FIBER SINK TO WORLD LEVEL, CUSHIONED BY SUBSIDIES

(By William Parker)

WASHINGTON.—The Department of Agriculture this week will publicly unveil a $4,600,000,000 plan to restore economic order to the Cotton South.

Covering a 10-year period, the new program is designed to do the following:

1. Allow the domestic price of cotton to sink to the world price.

2. Cushion the shock of this drop through a 5-year system of cotton price adjustment payments, which each year would make up a smaller part of the difference between the world and the parity price of cotton.

3. Make additional Government payments over the entire 10-year period to aid inefficient cotton producers to switch to other types of farming.

4. Industrialize the South.

5. Shift 1,600,000 southern farm workers from farms to industry or service trades.

6. Keep cotton production at about 13,500,000 bales, or at the level which domestic consumption and exports will absorb each year.

7. Restore cotton to a competitive price position with foreign cotton and with synthetic fibers.

8. Increase gross farm income of southern farmers from the pre-war average of $865 to $2,500 a year or better.

9. Get the Government out of the expensive business of artificially supporting the price of cotton year after year while building up large stocks of unwanted cotton.

This new proposal is really a detailed elaboration of the general ideas presented last December to Representative PACE'S Cotton Investigating Committee in the House by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. Though still labeled "preliminary," the document has been sent to Mr. PACE and will doubtless be discussed at the hearings which his committee will hold this week.

To date the Pace committee appears to be more inclined toward the present program of artificially holding up the price of cotton. Backers of the new proposal say that it has been examined and endorsed by representatives of the cotton industry and that they hope to win further support among agricultural officials in cotton States. Through the hoped-for support in the cotton area, the authors of this proposal believe that now skeptical Congressmen can be won over.

In drafting the 10-year cotton program, the agricultural planners started with the following assumptions:

That the war with Japan would be over in 1946 and the new program would start in 1947.

That the parity price of cotton would remain at about 20.5 cents a pound and that the world price would be 15 cents in 1947, 14 cents in 1948, and 13 cents thereafter.

That the United States would be experiencing a period of full employment. The study says that if all of these conditions did not exist the plan might be retarded, but still could be carried out.

CUSHIONED BY SUBSIDIES

Assuming the program was instituted in 1947, the initial step would be to allow the price of cotton to fall to the world price, or to 15 cents a pound if the calculations of the plan are correct. The impact of this drop, the advocates of this plan admit, would be tremendous so they propose a system of cotton price adjustment payments to act as a cushion. Under this system every cotton grower would be allowed during the first year 100 percent of the different between the world price and the parity price. The second year this would be reduced to 80 percent of the difference, the third year to 60 percent, the fourth year to 40 percent, and the fifth year to 20 percent. After the fifth year these payments would be discontinued altogether.

This would serve notice to cotton growers that at the end of 5 years they would have to be producing cotton at the world price or not at all. The efficient producers would be expected to continue and enlarge their cotton crop and the inefficient growers to reduce their cotton acreage or drop out of cotton altogether. This brings up the second phase of the program or the conversion payments. These are payments which would be made to farmers to help them get out of cotton and into some other field of agriculture.

Government grants would be available for such purposes as establishing improved permanent pastures, fencing, terracing, planting soil-building crops and improving farm wood lots. Farmers would be encouraged to go into the production of livestock, dairy and poultry, and truck. Payments to make this change-over would continue for 5 years, but as all farmers probably would not come in at the same time, the conversion payment program would last the full 10 years.

In addition to the conversion payments, there would be available to converting farmers an expanded system of loans, which would enable them to get the money for barns, livestock, and additional land where needed.

INCREASED INDUSTRIALIZATION

Concentrating cotton production on efficient farms and shifting other farms to producing food crops still will not take care of all the farm families in the South. The answer to this surplus population, according to the plan, is increased industrialization, more nonagricultural jobs in the South. This can be done primarily through stimulating the growth of industries to supply the expected increase in the needs of the area and through encouraging expansion or new industries to manufacture the raw materials of the South. An example cited is that expansion in food processing and marketing to handle the expected rise in food requirements in southern States will require 200,000 more workers, or about one-seventh of the 1,500,000 people who will have to find nonagricultural work.

The plan proposes Government aid to displaced workers including training in new jobs, transportation, and subsistance during the training period, all amounting to approximately $200 per worker for an estimated 900,000 people who will need to be helped. Private capital would be expected to finance most of the new enterprises in the region, but where necessary Government loans from such agencies as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be available.

The cost of this program to put cotton back on its economic feet is expected to run $4,600,000,000 over the 10-year period, exclusive of loans to either agriculture or industry. The plan estimates that for the first year the direct cost would be $675,000,000, that it would increase somewhat during the next 2 years, and then steadily decline, averaging less than $160,000,000 yearly during the last 5 years.

This annual average rate of expenditure of $460,000,000 for farm payment would be higher than the $375,000,000 a year spent on cotton programs prior to the war. But according to the advocates of the plan, the new program will work to help get the Government out of the cotton business. They estimate that after the conversion program has been completed, the Government need not make any contributions to cotton agriculture other than normal soil conservation payments which will probably continue to run around $50,000,000 a year.

Post-war Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Friday night, May 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are living in a changing world. We cannot measure the future by the past. When the war is over we are going to have to deal with complex and difficult problems, both in America and throughout the world. When victory comes we shall not be able to return to conditions which existed 20 years ago, or even before the war began. Our economy has undergone a vast change. We have contracted a staggering public debt. We must provide for its payment, make jobs available for our whole population, including our army of returning soldiers, stabilize our national life, and make secure our own future by aiding in stabilizing the other nations of the world.

While the supreme task of America is to win the war—and this shall continue to be our sole aim until final victory comes—yet it is vitally important that we give serious thought to meeting the conditions which will confront us at the close of the war and which must be met without delay if we are to save our country from the tragic conditions which exist today in many nations of the earth.

We hear much about creating 60,000,000 jobs, providing security for all the people from the cradle to the grave, safeguarding the health of the whole population, and otherwise making everybody happy and contented by making available for them all material comforts. This sort of utopia reads well and you could get considerable support for the general proposition, but it is not as easy as all of that. We have always had more or less unemployment, lack of security, scarcity of money, even poverty and want. We cannot abolish all of these evils. The only way to get rid of total unemployment is to have either war or slavery. The demands of war take up the slack in unemployment and the master always provided a job for his slave. Likewise, the slave had security. He was provided with food, shelter, and raiment, but he was a slave.

Sometimes it becomes necessary to choose between security and freedom. The slave had security but not liberty. The man in jail has security. He will not starve, he will not freeze, he will be treated by a doctor when he is sick, but he has lost his freedom and he is paying a high price for his security. It is our problem as a Nation to provide the maximum of employment, security, education, and other desirable facilities for the whole people without sacrificing or imperiling our greater assets of liberty and freedom.

America has had a great record of progress, advancement, and achievement. This has been the land of opportunity. It has been possible for the poorest boy or girl to reach the highest attainments in the field of business, industry, agriculture, or the professions. The tenant of yesterday has become the landlord of today; the mill worker yesterday is the mill owner today; the clerk yesterday, the merchant prince today; the mechanic yesterday, the industrialist today; the family yesterday in poverty and want, today in wealth and affluence; the plow boy becomes president. That's the America of yesterday and today—it must be the America of tomorrow if we shall preserve our individual liberty and freedom.

The Government can and should do much to help its citizens. The first obligation is to maintain liberty and freedom for all of its people; to provide opportunity for work and achievement, to safeguard and protect from monopolistic control and capital or labor dictation; to enable all of its children to have the chance to get an education and be trained and equipped to do some helpful and gainful work; to provide assistance for the old who are unable to work and without sufficient income for support, and help for the dependent children and those who are handicapped by disability. These are proper functions for a government of a free people.

If we would retain our freedom we must guard against regimentation; against state socialism; against a planned economy to the extent of limiting and controlling the initiative and activities of our citizens, or restricting or regulating business or establishing a bar against the power to acquire or possess wealth. There must be an incentive to work and achieve and the profit motive has demonstrated its effectiveness in accomplishing marvelous results in all fields of human endeavor. A planned economy did not produce the Edisons, Fords, Dukes, Reynolds, Cannons or Ervins of the business world, nor could regimentation give us the great scientists, educators, ministers, statesmen, and leaders of thought who have blazed the pathway of human progress throughout our national history.

We have already achieved victory in Europe and are now standing on the threshold of complete victory in the mightiest global conflict of all history. We know the productive power and capacity of America; we know the greatness of her people and the indomitable courage of her young men and the complete dedication in time of war of all the men and women in our land. Yet amid the shouts of triumph of our armed forces and the swelling tide of gratitude in the hearts of fathers, mothers, wives, and sweethearts of our Nation as we confidently look forward to final victory there are many discordant voices and pessimistic prophecies with reference to the post-war period and our ability to get along with other nations and to formulate and establish a tribunal to make a just peace and then to function effectively in settling future controversies between nations and to preserve world peace.

I do not share this pessimism. I believe that a nation capable of achieving the success which has been ours, will be able to meet the conditions and solve the problems of the post-war period and translate the fruits of a great war victory into a great peace victory. We have already made much progress in that direction. Beginning with the Atlantic Charter which heralded a new day for the world and which received the approval of 44 nations or governments, with all of the intervening conferences and proposals now culminating in the San Francisco Conference, we have abundant ground for the basic hope that all peace-loving nations will be able to formulate and agree upon a compact of world peace by which war will be forever outlawed.

There have been two great basic conferences whose proposals furnish the groundwork and the real foundation for stabilizing the world and establishing the peace. They are generally known as the Bretton Woods Plan and the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. The former deals specifically with the material or financial affairs of our own country and the other 43 nations whose representatives have already agreed to its provisions and the latter relates to the organization of a world tribunal to hear, determine, and settle controversies between nations and to preserve and enforce peace. The Yalta Conference supplements Dumbarton Oaks and all of the proposals are being considered and discussed, and it is hoped will be agreed upon at San Francisco.

A big issue following the war will be the stabilization of our own Nation and the nations of the world to the end that full employment may be maintained and America may continue prosperous. The Bretton Woods plan will aid in accomplishing this result. In order for America to have markets for her increased production of farm and factory the other nations must be in a position to buy our excess products. With a view of providing this market for our goods and at the same time to save the world from collapse and revolution, this very practical plan has been devised, which consists of the establishment of an international bank and an international fund.

The international bank would have a capital of $9,100,000,000 subscribed by the 44 nation members. The United States, the richest Nation of the world, would be the largest stockholder, owning $3,175,000,000 of the stock of the bank. The purpose of the bank would be twofold—one to lend money to the nations, or its institutions, upon valid security, and the other to guarantee the loans made under its directions by private banks to the member nations, or its corporations, upon security approved by the bank. The latter would be the largest sphere of activity. These would be generally long-term loans and made for the purpose of enabling the devastated countries to rebuild and reestablish their business and industry and generally to stabilize their whole economy.

The international fund would consist of $8,800,000,000, representing an investment of $2,750,000,000 by the United States and a corresponding amount in proportion to wealth of each of the member nations. The chief purpose of this fund would be to stabilize the currency of all member nations and prevent the depreciation of currency by any nation, to regulate money exchange rates and to facilitate trade between the nations. In order to do this, the fund, in periods of emergency or crisis in any nation, would be authorized to buy a given amount of that nation's currency and otherwise enable the nation to meet its obligations and keep its financial structure from collapsing. The fund would make these advances for temporary uses and would be regarded as short-time loans and made upon security inferior to that required by the bank for long-term loans.

It is of vital importance to America that we keep the other nations from depreciating their currencies. That is why we lost so much of our export trade in cotton, tobacco, wheat, potatoes, textile goods, and so many other products following the other World War and continuing until the beginning of this war. We cannot maintain a trade balance in our favor when other nations are prevented from buying goods in American markets, because it requires double and treble the amount of their currency to equal ours. This would remedy that situation and enable us to expand our industry and agriculture and to find ready markets for our surplus products.

This is but a brief explanation of the functions of the bank and the fund, stripped of all technical terms and stipulations. The headquarters of both would be America, since our Nation would hold 35 percent of the stock in the bank and around 32 percent in the fund. There would be 12 directors from the various nations to manage the affairs of these institutions. There is general approval of the bank, but a committee from the American Bankers Association opposes the fund, largely upon the ground that it is not good banking practice and that the security would not be adequate. Looking at it from a banker's standpoint alone, that is unquestionably true, but the very purpose of the fund is to enable nations in periods of crises to obtain funds without having gild-edged security, and the justification is to save the nation's financial structure and prevent its collapse and the consequent depreciation of its currency, which would result in more detriment to our country than to any other, because we are going to maintain the value of our currency and the American dollar will continue to be the standard of value.

Not all of the great bankers in America oppose this fund, and while I have great respect and admiration for the Committee of the American Bankers Association who think this plan for the international fund is unwise, I recall that a similar committee opposed the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in the United States and regarded that as a dangerous innovation, and later offered strenuous opposition to the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to guarantee bank deposits and voiced the opinion that this would prove adverse to our whole banking system. Now everybody approves both of these institutions and regards their establishment as wise and beneficial legislation. As a result of the latter and the prosperity of our people there is more money on deposit in the banks of America today than at any time since we became a Nation. In view of all of this, I do not feel that we should be unduly alarmed by the opposition offered to the Bretton Woods plan.

The Dumbarton Oaks deals with the spiritual concept of a peaceful world following the winning of this war. It provides the machinery for the establishment of a tribunal to settle controversies between nations, to advance the common interests of all nations, to maintain liberty and freedom in the world and to preserve peace in the long tomorrows. It would establish a general assembly in which every peace-loving nation in the world would have at least 1 member. This assembly would meet once a year, and have power to make recommendations, to present causes, to counsel as to the economic and other interests of the affected nations, and to elect 6 members of the security council, which would be composed of 11 members. Five nations would be permanent members of this council—United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France—and the other 6 members would represent the smaller nations and would serve for 2 years each, with a change of 3 each year. The council would be the supreme authority and would have power to settle controversies short of war, to employ economic restraints to prevent war and ultimately and as a last resort, to use force to make effective its decisions. There would also be an international court to hear and determine legal questions and a secretariat and economic council. All of these agencies

would be properly correlated with the final authority in the security council.

The San Francisco Conference is considering the Dumbarton Oaks and the Yalta proposals, and it is expected that an international agreement will be reached providing a workable plan for preserving the fruits of our forthcoming war victory and to translate it into a victory for permanent peace. We must not expect perfection in this document. We must be prepared to accept all of this as a foundation upon which to build a structure of world peace with the full knowledge that improvements can and will be made. The important thing is that the nations shall have the will for peace and shall make an honest effort to arrive at an agreement by which differences may be composed and controversies heard and determined, without resorting to the sword. Civilization cannot survive a third world war, and the fathers and mothers of the world and the youth of tomorrow must be saved from the devastation and destruction incident to another global war. I believe it will be possible to achieve world peace and it would be criminal to fail to agree to make a supreme and united effort to attain this goal.

I am not pessimistic about our condition now or the future of our country. I believe in the inherent common sense of the American people, of their honesty of purpose and unfailing patriotism. They have always proven their resourcefulness and courage in both peace and war. I look forward confidently to winning the war and just as confidently to winning the peace. I believe our people will display the same daring and courage following the war that they have shown during the long and difficult days of this dreadful world conflict. Even as this Nation has amazed the world by its production during the war, it will surpass its own great record in producing in peace. America and the world will need all that we can produce and if we can succeed in stabilizing the other nations we shall have available abundant markets for all of our excess production. We should enter upon a period of unexampled prosperity.

The peace proposals transcend in importance any of the economic or material aspects of the whole situation. I am happy to say that I find genuine and wholehearted support for the peace treaty on both sides of the aisle in the Senate. It was most reassuring to find that the 16 new Senators elected last November—10 Democrats and 6 Republicans—are unanimous in their support of the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and will give their enthusiastic support to any reasonable plan for world peace. I confidently believe that the Senate will ratify the peace treaty by more than the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution.

With the world assured of a long period of peace and our Nation occupying a position of leadership in cooperation with the big and little nations of the world in economic improvement and development, and in spiritual unity of purpose in establishing and maintaining that long-hoped-for peace—America will stand at the crossroads of world history as the Nation of destiny.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks we have heard and read so many critical remarks regarding the veterans' hospitals, including the one in Minneapolis, that under leave to extend my remarks I am glad to include, along with my reply, a letter from a patient who is eminently satisfied with the care he received at our Minneapolis veterans' hospital.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 2, 1945.*

Mr. C. D. HIBBARD,
Manager, Veterans' Administration,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. HIBBARD: The recent articles in Cosmopolitan magazine have made me so damned mad that I have delayed writing this letter to try and cool off.

The records will show that in the past 11 years I have spent about 2½ years as a patient in the Minneapolis veterans hospital. The medical records will show that when I first came there I was in mighty bad shape.

That I am alive today is, without any question, due to the wonderful care that I received at the hands of the very people who are now called third raters.

I cannot say how the other veterans' hospitals are run. But that first Cosmopolitan article named my own doctor out there. True, he didn't say Dr. Josewich was incompetent; but in the very next paragraph he implied as much. I am intelligent enough and interested enough in my personal physical ailment to have learned a great deal of the record and reputation of the many specialists in the same field as Dr. Josewich. He tops them all. He was doing lung collapse treatment successfully when the writer of that article was in grade school.

Many others rate equally high. I recall Dr. Marclay—now retired—undisputed dean of chest men in the Twin Cities; Dr. Seaberg, now promoted to a higher position at the Minneapolis hospital; Dr. Culligan, who did some surgery for me—recognized as one of the most brilliant surgeons in the Twin Cities; Dr. Dumas, recognized nationally in his special field. These are the men who have taken a bunch of broken down wrecks like me—average age today 52—and put us back on our feet.

But the doctors alone couldn't do it.

"Poor food served cold" that article said. I give you my word of honor that I often got a copy of the mimeographed menu for the week from the dietitian and mailed it home to my folks to show them that I was sure "living the life of Riley." I found that the dietitians, the kitchen help, the orderlies, everyone that had anything to do with the food would break their necks to give a fellow the finest food and served according to the patient's taste even though the patient was many times unreasonable in his wishes.

And the nurses—God bless them. Sick men are apt to complain and squawk about trifles. But those girls did just the right thing at every turn. Why I haven't been in the hospital for 7 years and yet today I could name off no less than 25 by name that I remember for their many kindnesses, and especially that grand character, the Chief Nurse Anne Griffin.

You must excuse the length of this letter but a hospital is made up of a lot of people—I refer to the hard and thankless jobs done by the orderlies. I'll never forget the many times when I was in very serious condition that some orderly would slip into my room quietly to see if there was anything he could do to make things more comfortable for me.

When a fellow got on the mend and time hung heavy on his hands he needed another type of help—mental help.

I am thinking of that fine occupational therapy worker, Miss Macomber and her staff—how she would teach us all manner of things such as needle work, leathercraft, paintings, etc. It took our minds off of our bodies and our worries.

And then along would come the librarian, Miss O'Toole. To think that we actually in that single institution had a library that would be the envy of many a small city. With the current subscriptions to practically every magazine published and, if I recall, about 10,000 books—and a fine and cooperative librarian to bring to your bedside any book or magazine you might fancy.

And the dental clinic—as fine a staff of workers as would be found anywhere. Dr. Koontz happened to be the dentist who worked on me. A fine dentist, a fine man. And to think that every man they work on is actually there for some other reason than his teeth, all sick men. They have to be good, and they sure are.

I must not pass over your own part in the scheme of things. I recall very well that when I first entered the hospital a sick, worried and down-hearted man it was only a day or two and a contact man from the Administration was at my bedside explaining all of my rights under the veterans' laws; assisting whenever needed in adjusting business and family affairs. It happened to be Mr. Madden that took care of things for me. He was fine. Unable to appear or speak for myself, he appeared before various boards and saw that my rights were properly presented. I am grateful to him.

I'm sorry that I have strung this letter out but from my heart I want to say I am mighty grateful and there are so many people who have done so much for me that I could not be brief if I tried.

With the storm of criticism that is being stirred up on the subject I feel that men like myself should speak up. The chronic complainer, though in the minority, is long-winded and loud-voiced. We who know the fine record of the Veterans' Administration should tell the millions of service men and women, their parents, wives, and families that they can feel assured that their loved ones will get the best treatment in the world in the veterans' hospitals.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Dr. JUDD, my Congressman, so that he will know of my experience.

Sincerely,

ROBT. J. BURNS.

MAY 10, 1945.

Mr. ROBERT J. BURNS,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. BURNS: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your letter of May 2 to Mr. Hibbard, regarding medical and other conditions at our Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital.

There can be no denying the fact that in any large bureau which has to be run fairly closely according to rules and regulations, things become mechanical at times and not as personalized as one could wish. On the other hand, I believe the picture drawn in the Cosmopolitan article is out of focus.

I do think that veterans' hospitals ought to be under medical men rather than laymen. There are some other changes which will have to be made in the enormously expanded program, but your point is very well taken that the complainers are usually very vocal while those who are satisfied with the service allow the complaints to go unchallenged or unanswered. Therefore, I am having your letter introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I believe it will be wholesome in getting a little better balance into the picture.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

Right in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Right in the Middle," written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of Railroad Yardmasters, on a subject which is very much in our minds at the moment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE

We are hearing much pro and con on the subject of unionizing foremen in industry. Some labor leaders feel that foremen should be unionized, and most businessmen are of opposite opinion. The National Labor Relations Board has ruled in favor of organizing foremen and just recently handed down a decision in Detroit covering an automobile manufacturer. So now the public is becoming curious and wanting to know just who is right.

This question, to be handled intelligently, must be done in an unbiased manner, without special favor to the parties directly concerned in the controversy. The best answer so far seems to be the one covered in an advertisement of General Motors Corporation. It says: "We think it would be bad for foremen if American industry would be compelled to make a change in its proven type of organization, which would unavoidably reduce the foreman's status, diminish his responsibility, authority, influence, decrease his opportunity for personal advancement."

Some labor leaders believe that unionization would be highly beneficial because it would enhance the membership of unionism and it would give unions inside control over production through union membership of foremen. And right here is where the rub comes in, because it places the foremen of industry right in the middle.

This question is not going to be adequately solved by "beating around the bush" and believe me, this writer does not like bushes to beat around. The title "foreman" means nothing. In fact, titles alone in any occupation mean nothing; the duty of the occupation is what really counts. In other words, you can call them foremen, vice presidents, general managers, or what have you, and it does not amount to much. What really is important is the duty of the occupation. A messenger boy that does nothing more than deliver messages, even though you call him an expediter, is only a messenger.

If a foreman is a worker with no disciplinary authority, he is to my mind just a glorified worker, with a title that means nothing, and I see no reason why he should not be organized. But, if the title of "foreman" means what it actually implies, the right to hire, discharge, and discipline employees for insubordination, then I do not hesitate in saying that a foreman should not be organized. How can a man be honest with himself and honest with his union, if he is forced, through a condition of unionism, to play both ends against the middle. And this is exactly what he must do as a unionized foreman. If he does not discipline insubordinate employees, he can be expelled from the company for his own insubordination; and if he does discipline, as a conscientious foreman, he can be expelled from his own union, which places him right in the middle!

In order for a foreman to function properly in his capacity, he must be respected by all those with whom he comes in contact; and just how can he be respected, or even trusted, when he is in the position of playing two ends against the middle? In the position of serving two masters at one time. Management cannot trust him because he has sworn allegiance to the union, and the union cannot trust him because he has sworn allegiance to management. In this position, it is not very long until no one trusts him, because to hold his position as foreman, he is inclined to become an unprincipled schemer of playing both ends against the middle.

The foreman of any job should be a man highly respected by his subordinates. It is necessary for him to set an example of good, loyal workmanship. He must personify incentive, initiative, and executive leadership. Yes, the foremanship of every department ought to be something that all workers should strive to attain some day. It is definitely a reward for capable and conscientious workers.

Just picture a foreman, who is just an ordinary member of his union, getting into an argument with the president or business agent of his own union in a meeting. I would venture to say that his union status would not be so good, and if it is not good, according to union contract under the closed-shop system, he can be expelled for union insubordination. If he is expelled from the union, he is automatically expelled from the company. A nice system of eliminating the conscientious foreman. The more I think of the situation the more I am inclined to agree with management, that foremen should not be unionized. It would be bad for management because it takes the managerial rights away from where they belong. It would be equally bad for labor because it automatically sets up a condition of disharmony within unionism.

The National Labor Relations Act, or the Wagner Act, as it is commonly referred to, definitely states in section 8 "It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer (1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights guaranteed in section 7; (2) to dominate, interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization, etc." Now in spite of this law, which has been validated by the United States Supreme Court, the National Labor Relations Board in its decision has told the world that employers do have the right to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercising of their rights as workers. This statement is based on the fact that when foremen have the authority to hire and discharge workers, they are employers, part of management, and as such have no right to be mixed up in unionism in any manner whatsoever. It is obvious that as unionists they can be the means of influencing labor one way or the other. When a man becomes a foreman and is unionized, he immediately loses his chances of going further up the ladder, because he becomes estranged from management.

The Labor Act is in unmistakable language, and as long as the National Labor Relations Act stands as the recognized law of the land governing employer-employee relations, in my opinion it is unlawful for foremen to become unionists. And mark you, when I say foremen, I mean those who have disciplinarian authority, the right to hire and discharge workers.

We Americans boast of our system of free enterprise, a system by which the most humble may rise to the pinnacle of industry, through diligent application, and yet the real recipient of this system, the worker himself, through unionizing foremen, is creating a condition that will definitely block careers at the half-way mark. To look at the situation with an open mind is to invariably arrive at the conclusion that to unionize foremen is to put them right in the middle.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

H. R. 1690

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to add my support to H. R. 1690. Two important reasons immediately come to my mind, in backing this measure. First, the important contribution that the 4–H Club program has made in developing the agricultural interests of the boys and girls participating in the program and the resulting high standards of citizenship they have achieved; and, secondly, the farsighted educational advantages which have accrued to the farmers because of the assistance and interest they have received from the agricultural extension program.

One of the most impressive and unforgettable sights in my memory has been to see the more than 1,500 4–H Club members from every State in the Union marching into the amphitheater at the International Livestock Exhibition at the Chicago Union Stockyards, where they were participating in the numerous projects conducted for their benefit. The 4–H program has helped them in many ways, taught them to be better farmers, livestock raisers, and better citizens by teaching them to work with their hearts, hands, and heads for better health and happiness. They have been doing a remarkable piece of work, and the culmination of their efforts has been inspiringly portrayed in the projects and exhibits that I have seen during the quarter of a century that I have been privileged to witness the international exhibition.

In several instances today I have heard on the floor of the House objections to the bill because of complaints registered against the county agents in various districts of the Nation. These complaints have charged the county agents with "playing politics." While this situation may exist in some localities, I find that the county agents and their assistants in my Indiana district are of the highest type. They have remained distinctly out of politics and have devoted their time and energies to their duties of effecting a comprehensive 4–H Club program which will mean a better farm citizenship in the future, while assisting the farmers with their soil, livestock, and agrarian problems to enable the farmers to do a better job of farming.

I believe that it would be unwise for us to jeopardize the widespread benefits of these activities because some county agent unfortunately places his selfish political interest above the high objectives of the agriculture program. There

should be some other method of handling these individuals who stand in the way of constructive, progressive agricultural developments.

I therefore support the bill H. R. 1690.

China and the United States—A Challenge to Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address prepared for broadcasting over the Mutual Broadcasting System May 13 on the Let's Face the Issue program, sponsored by the American Bar Association:

The first objective of a nation's foreign policy must always be its own security. As VE-day brings us security on our eastern border, it is appropriate that we turn our attention to the West, where our historic policy for achieving security has been the so-called "Open Door Policy" in China.

Sometimes one hears Americans say, "Why are we so sentimental about China? Why are we always insisting upon an independent China? What concern is it of ours what happens in Asia? Why don't we keep out of other peoples' affairs, and mind our own business?"

That kind of comment is based on the naive assumption that America's insistence for a half century upon an independent China was the result of some sort of sentimental altruism. But, as a matter of cold fact, it was based on the most realistic and hard-headed concern, not for China, but for the United States of America. It has been clearly recognized by all our real statesmen, that the surest guarantee of America's security in the Pacific was to have there an independent, strong, friendly China. There have been only two nations that could conceivably threaten us in the Pacific—Japan and Russia. Neither of them could move in our direction as long as, in their rear or on their flank, was a strong, independent, friendly China.

Perhaps a case could be made out that we ought to appease Japan, try to avoid trouble by yielding to her demands for the war materials necessary for her cruel assault on China. On the other hand, perhaps a case could be made out for our disarming in the Pacific, thereby saving the taxes that would have been necessary to build a two-ocean Navy and to fortify the Philippines and Guam. But nobody who can add up two and two and get four can possibly make out a case for doing those two things at the same time. If we were going to help Japan destroy China as our bulwark, then we had to have a great Pacific Navy. If we were not going to build that Navy, then we had to have an independent, friendly China. But what did we do? We gave up our Pacific armaments and then helped Japan destroy China, left ourselves almost defenseless. It would be incredible if it were not so tragically true. Thus we got into a two-front war. Our hope of victory depended, in part, on China's ability to hold out against Japan until we could beat Hitler first and then get our full strength into the Pacific. Fortunately for us, China has been able to hold out through unbelievable fortitude. She needs and properly wants the same sort of assistance in war materials and weapons and in men to help train her troops in mechanized warfare as we have given so lavishly to our allies in Europe. It is in our own interest to supply them. The more the Chinese can do of the fighting against Japan on the mainland, the better it is for the Chinese, and for Asia, and for the world, both now and in the future. And certainly it is better for us. It will be costly enough to equip and train China's armies, but if we have to do most of the fighting ourselves, then it will cost us far more in money and materials—and more of our men in addition.

We are needlessly sacrificing American lives and money insofar as we fail to mobilize fully the will and the confidence, as well as the military strength, of so important an ally.

The white man's prestige in Asia has been at its all-time low. To regain respect he must demonstrate power—and he will. But power alone does not command confidence. That comes only as he demonstrates that he intends in the future to use his power in Asia for the freedom and welfare of the people there, not just to restore the white man's special privileges. The Chinese have justifiably been anxious at times, not so much because of what some other nations have said or done regarding their war aims in Asia, as because of what we have not said regarding our aims.

Therefore, it was most reassuring to hear President Truman's ringing declaration that, "The responsibility of the great states is to serve, and not dominate the peoples of the world." That is effective political leadership.

For much as we need China to help win the war, we will need her even more to help establish and maintain a stable peace. We have learned, the hard way, that we can no longer get security by physical separation from the world. The ability of the airplane and the flying bomb to disregard all land and sea boundaries, and the refusal of other nations to ignore us, no matter how much we want to ignore them, have made isolation an impossibility.

On the other hand, we cannot get long-term security just by building up a gigantic Army and Navy air force. We simply do not have enough resources or essential minerals or money or manpower to sustain such a program indefinitely. We should not forget the hard fact that we have only 6 percent of the earth's land and 6½ percent of its population.

The peoples of Asia are on the move. We cannot hold them back. We cannot drive them. We cannot buy them. What, then, can we do? We can join them; yes, we can lead them—if it be on the basis, not of superior and inferior, but of full partnership in working together for the security of all as the true way to promote the security of each. If we fail to exert vigorous leadership in that direction, there are others eager to persuade China to go in other directions.

In short, America, after this war, is going to need friends. We have realized how much China needs us. But, on the whole, we have not appreciated how much we need a friendly China as the strongest nation in Asia once more, the great stabilizing force in the Far East as she was all down through the centuries.

For example, the one thing that, above all else, prevented Japan from making this a world race-war, as she tried so desperately to do, was a great moral decision by Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese people—a decision to fight against their own race, the Japanese, and to fight with us, of an alien race, because they thought this was a war for human freedom, including their freedom, too. This contribution by China to us far outweighs all other considerations. It was one of the truly great decisions of history. And the way to make certain that there will not be a world race-war in the next 10 years, or 100 years, or 300 years, is to make sure that the western democracies and the Chinese, incomparably the largest and strongest of all the nonwhite peoples, are on the same side—the side of freedom and democracy. Is there any more important business in the world than making sure of that?

Heretofore the Chinese have trusted America far above any other country. They never forget our 125 years of missionary work, churches, schools, hospitals, agricultural stations.

They do not forget our inauguration of the open-door policy, which prevented their being split up by the European powers at the end of the last century; or our return of the Boxer indemnity to establish a great modern university in China, and to provide scholarships, enabling almost 5,000 of China's ablest and finest youth to study in our universities here and return to be the new leaders of China, imbued with American ideas and ideals.

They remember gratefully our vigorous rejection of Japan's 21 demands on China in 1915; and Mr. Stimson's firm stand against Japan's seizure of Manchuria in 1931.

They observe that we made the Philippine Islands, not the first colony in a great new empire, but a republic—and trained its people for the independence we promised and will deliver.

Our support of the Cairo declaration, promising complete defeat of Japan and return of Formosa and Manchuria to China, their rightful owner, was worth divisions of American soldiers.

Our repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts and putting the Chinese on the same immigration quota basis as our other allies, thereby starting to treat them as equals now, won their respect and gratitude not because it was a favor but because it was simple justice.

They almost revere General Chennault and those gallant American aviators who have been so heroically fighting for China and flying supplies "over the hump."

Despite some less worthy chapters like our arming of Japan and our relinquishing extraterritoriality only after we no longer had it to give back, such factors as the above have caused the Chinese to continue to believe in us almost pathetically.

We must continue to prove worthy of their faith. The thing that, more than anything else, will bind China to us for the future is for us to demonstrate that at long last we understand the true nature and significance of this struggle in Asia and of the times in which we live, as the Chinese have understood them all these lonely years; that we, too, see the larger vision and are committed to the larger loyalties which alone can give a common hope for the future.

Chiang Kai-shek himself has said it in unequivocal terms: "China has no desire to replace western imperialism in Asia with an oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of anyone else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs, which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or for us."

In dedication to that common cause of real world cooperation let us go forward together confident and unafraid.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clem Walker, a friend of mine and a prominent Nevada miner, very clearly expresses my sentiments, as well as those of many of my constituents, on reciprocal trade and the tariff question. His expressions are worthy of the attention of the Members of this House.

DON'T TRY TO TELL ME A CUT IN THE ZINC TARIFF WON'T HURT THE ZINC MINER

(By Clem Walker)

I am a miner in a Western State. There are lots of miners in this country, both East and West and North and South, but I work in the West.

I mine the ore from which zinc is made.

If I don't mine the ore, then there is so much less zinc.

They tell me zinc is called a critical and strategic metal in wartime. Those are big words but they tell me they mean that without zinc there can't be any brass for ammunition, or dry batteries, or galvanized steel, or zinc die castings, or lots of other important things for the Army and Navy.

They tell me I am just as important in the war work as a lot of other workers you hear more about.

They tell me if we ever get in another jam, we've got to have a lot of zinc where we can get at it quick.

I get all this and it sounds good to me to be a zinc miner, now and after the war.

And then they say that when the war is over we've got to sell a lot of things to foreign countries so the men in the big cities in this country where they make things will have lots of work—important work, I guess, but work I don't know how to do because I'm a zinc miner. Besides, my family and my house are here, near the mine, and not in a city.

However, it sounc d good to me to have the big factories running full time because I figured they would have to use a lot of zinc and that would mean I would have lots of work mining the zinc ore.

But, Mister, I got a jolt when they told me these factories wouldn't need the zinc ore I mine. The hell you say, I said. How can you make a lot of those things you're going to sell to those foreigners if you don't use any zinc?

Well, sir, they said they would use zinc all right but it wouldn't be the zinc I mine, because they would use zinc from those foreign countries, because how could those foreigners pay for the things we sold them if they didn't sell us something; and they could sell our factories over here zinc very cheap because they don't pay such good wages over there in those other countries and they don't pay out much for safety work in the mines, and they don't do a lot of other things for the zinc miners that cost money and the zinc miners work long hours and their zinc costs less. And on top of this they're going to cut the tariff on zinc to almost nothing a pound so that I won't be protected against this cheap foreign zinc, as I ought to be. Thank you very much, but they won't need the zinc I mine. Ain't that something?

They call that bargaining with foreign countries so as to help them buy from us. I call it throwing me out of a job so I can't buy anything from anybody. They use long words like reciprocal trade treaties, but when you get down to the guts of all the fancy talk, it looks like I'm going to get trimmed; all I got to go on is that every time so far that they put zinc into one of those trade treaties, they cut the tariff, and in the long run, I get the worst of it.

Where the hell do I come in, I said. Oh, they said, you don't count because the big manufacturers like the idea of cheap zinc and the workers in the cities like the idea of having lots of work and there are a whole lot of these people and there aren't as many zinc miners. Besides, the boys in Washington who work with figures have got it all figured out. The zinc mines will close down and all the zinc miners will move somewhere else and do something else or go fishing or something.

So I'm just a figure on a piece of paper, am I, I said. Well, that don't sound good to me. Why should I lose my job of mining zinc to help some guy in some foreign country who works longer hours for lower wages so he can sell his zinc cheap over here? Why shouldn't somebody worry about me instead of worrying about some foreign guy and giving away the tariff protection I ought to have.

And if they close down the zinc mines and they fill up with water, and the timbers rot and there isn't any development work to find more zinc to mine and we all lose our jobs, what becomes of this mining town I live in? What happens to all the miners and to all the people who work in stores here and who work at a lot of other things around town? There just wouldn't be any town—and that goes for a lot of towns in this United States of America.

And then, some day, when they want zinc in a rush because there is an emergency, as they call it, where is the mine and the mining town and where am I? Strictly out of sight—gone. And then everybody will rush around and holler for zinc.

Well, why not holler for zinc now, I say, and that's what I'm going to do.

I'm going to holler about losing my job and I'm going to holler so they can hear me in Washington and at my union headquarters and so they can hear me, a living human zinc miner, above the clatter of those adding machines on which I'm just a figure to the boys who work with figures and not with human beings.

How about hollering with me, you zinc miners, and telling those fellows they can't do this to us—they had better put the tariff up instead of down and out.

The Postal Pay Increase Bill

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the postal pay increase bill is to be brought before the House for debate and action tomorrow. For the benefit of the Members of the House in general, I make the following brief synopsis of the provisions of H. R. 3035:

First. The bill provides a $400 per year increase over present base pay to practically every person in the Postal Service, in lieu of the $300 per year temporary bonus which expires June 30, 1945.

Second. It introduces the principle of longevity pay in many of the branches of the Postal Service.

Third. It removes many of the inequalities and injustices that have existed for a long time between various branches of the Postal Service.

Fourth. It provides for time and one-half pay for overtime work.

Fifth. It provides 10 percent extra over the hourly day rate for postal workers, with some exceptions, who are required to work nights.

Sixth. It grants to all postal employees 15 days leave of absence each year with pay, and 10 days of sick leave with pay each year.

Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 4715, the $400 flat salary increase for postal employees, was passed by the House last December, I said in the debate on the bill:

I wish to warn the House that H. R. 4715 is not a panacea that will cure all the ills of our Postal Service. We have many inequalities and injustices that this bill does not touch. In fact, the inequalities and injustices now prevalent in the Postal Service will only be aggravated by the passage of this $400 flat pay increase. It will not remove the restricted and narrow opportunities for promotion, advancement, and pay increases that exist today in the Postal Service.

H. R. 3035 corrects most of those inequalities and injustices; it provides a permanent $400 increase in the yearly basic pay of practically all postal employees; and it also removes the "narrow opportunities for promotion, advancement, and pay increases." It should be passed by a unanimous vote of the Congress.

Norwich University Trained 16 Chinese Generals, All Now in War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, his colleagues in the House of Representatives will not begrudge the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] the gratification and satisfaction he must feel in the knowledge that 16 of the ranking generals now commanding the Chinese armies were educated at Norwich University while he was president of that West Point of New England. No alumni have greater affection for their college than those who have graduated from the small but solidly grounded schools of historic New England. Mr. PLUMLEY can rest in the assurance that those Chinese generals, trained as they were under the hard, conscientious, painstaking tutelage of an able Vermont schoolmaster, now look back with appreciation of the sturdy preparation they had in the grim business of war.

Today Norwich can look at the Chinese command with the knowledge that it

has been strengthened and fortified with the qualities that, since the days of Ethan Allen and Seth Warner, have been indissolubly associated with the hills of Vermont.

In the Burlington Free Press, published at Burlington, Vt., one of the most beautifully located cities in America, appears the following item in its issue of May 3:

SIXTEEN CHINESE GENERALS, FORMER NORWICH MEN, MAKE RECORD IN WAR

NORTHFIELD, May. 2.—News of 16 Chinese generals who were students at Norwich University two decades ago was reported to the alumni office of the military college today by Lt. Col. Edward T. Cowen of the United States Army, Norwich, 1928, graduate now stationed at Chungking.

High in military and governmental affairs in China, 2 of the former Norwich students are major generals and 10 are brigadiers, according to Colonel Cowen, while 2, Ma Chu-an, class of 1925, and Wang Chun, '28, have died, and a third, Brig. Gen. Chen Chung-wu, '28, is insane as the result of injuries received during an air raid. Another, Brig. Gen. Chi Hsueh-chi, '26, is a prisoner of the Japanese.

The two Chinese major generals listed by Colonel Cowen are 1926 Norwich graduates. Maj. Gen. Shuming is generalissimo's representative to the joint Sino-American planning section, and he formerly was military attaché at Washington. Maj. Gen. Ho Hao-jo is head of the foreign affairs bureau at Chungking. Names and positions of other Chinese Norwich graduates follow:

Brig. Gen. Yang Chang-ling, '28, chief of protocol to the generalissimo and director of gas defense; Brig. Gen. Yao Kai, '28, director of the foreign affairs bureau at Kweiyang; Brig. Gen. Wang Chieh, '31, attached to General MacArthur's staff; Brig. Gen. Chao Hen-ching, '28, mayor of Hengyang; Brig. Gen. Sun Fu-lin, '26, guerrilla commander in Honan Province behind the Japanese lines; Brig. Gen. Chang Chin-chung, '25, military spokesman at Chungking; Brig. Gen. Li Chia-chen, '25, a Chinese commander in India.

When Mr. PLUMLEY read this item he stated there are many others too, among them Gen. S. M. Chu, military attaché at the Chinese Embassy right here in Washington. It is noteworthy that any educational institution in America should have graduated 16 boys, all of whom became generals in the army of one of our Allies; but when a small New England military college, tucked away in the hills of Vermont, can boast of such an accomplishment, it is a significant achievement indeed.

In sending those boys to Norwich the Chinese Embassy was impressed not only with the training which Norwich had to offer, but with those in whose hands was entrusted the responsibility of administering that training. That Norwich was selected is a tribute to that sturdy college, but it is in addition a tribute to the man who was her president in those days of preparation. Some day China was to rely upon the training which they were to receive. They needed to be trained well. How wise was China's choice, and how richly has that choice been rewarded.

Norwich University is a small college. Over the years she has labored diligently to train her sons thoroughly, to counsel wisely, and to educate soundly. Her alumni—Gen. Ted Brooks is one of them—testify to her success.

From the founding of the college in 1819 in Norwich, Vt., until it changed its location to Northfield in 1866, Norwich and Dartmouth were separated only by the Connecticut River. Although the colleges were good neighbors, the students, to put it mildly, were not congenial. Since it was desirable that one of the colleges should move, Norwich went to Northfield, later to be further enriched as the birthplace of one who was to become later the president of Norwich. As one born in Vermont and an alumnus of the Hanover college, I know how well Norwich has fulfilled her mission as a military college, and how ably she has met the responsibilities imposed upon her. No tribute of mine is of any moment. Her sons, generals, and other officers of allied armies now reerecting the pillars of freedom are paying that tribute, not only to a small college, firm and resolute in ideals nurtured in the everlasting hills of Vermont, but to a master craftsman, heralded in the history of that college, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY.

Stettinius and the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of May 7, 1945, and also a column by Ernest Lindley published in the Washington Post of May 6, 1945. I am calling these newspaper articles to the attention of the House because they represent the opinion of individuals who are on the job at the San Francisco Conference and who have had a chance to size up the fine work being done there by our Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius.

I think it extremely important that these matters be called to the attention of the House because of the fine response which I have heard on the part of all Members concerning the good job that our Secretary of State is trying to do at San Francisco.

[From the Portland Oregonian of May 7, 1945]

AMERICAN WAY

Attempts by some Washington columnists and a few newspaper editors to discredit Edward R. Stettinius, Secretary of State, by referring to him as "second team" quality, has done them no good and Mr. Stettinius some harm. Criticisms of "Big Ed" seem to be based on the fact that he is not a professional diplomat. This is true. And for this Americans should get down on their knees and thank God most heartily.

The fact that Ed Stettinius is himself as typically American as the ice cream soda (in fact is himself one of America's typical success stories) bodes well for United States victory at San Francisco. The Stettinius story is a story of America. He was board chairman of the United States Steel Corporation at the age of 37. No New Dealer, Ed Stettinius answered the call of his Government when war clouds gathered. Stettinius did an outstanding job as Lend-Lease Administrator and succeeded in making both the Congress and the country understand its practical phases. When Sumner Welles resigned, he was made Under Secretary of State and became Secretary with the retirement of Cordell Hull. Those close to Big Ed say he has no political ambitions, but that he is determined to do a service for his country in winning a few victories on the diplomatic front.

In any event, for the first time in recent history, an American Secretary of State is sitting across from his peers at a world conference and saying "Yes" and "No" in the American way. For the first time in many years foreign diplomats are learning right from the horse's mouth what we want and why we want it. As a result, we have increased hope of getting the things that we need if we are to do a job for ourselves and thus insure a peaceful world.

Stettinius' boss, Harry Truman, the Missouri farm boy who became President of the United States, is American, too—just as American as the corner drug store that he used to hang around in Independence, Mo. Mr. Truman, also, believes in the direct approach, and apparently has no use for the devious turnings and dark paths of Old World diplomacy. Mr. Truman thinks his boy Ed is doing a great job. And so does Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, one of America's ablest elder statesmen.

Of the world powers the Russians were the first to abandon the courtly and devious techniques of world diplomacy—that is, since the United States forgot the school of Ben Franklin and Henry Clay. Now at long last the Americans have at least matched the Russians in the reply direct and because of the simple forthrightness of Ed Stettinius have perhaps gone a step ahead. The Russians have found and the world has found that we propose to hang onto the strategic bases taken over in this war, at the same time cooperating fully with the United Nations in caring for native populations to the satisfaction of all.

There is every reason to believe that whatever the outcome of the San Francisco Conference may be, the true aims and viewpoints of the people of the United States will be presented to the world in simple and unequivocal terms by Secretary Stettinius and such able colleagues as Commander Harold E. Stassen and Senator Vandenberg.

[From the Washington Post of May 6, 1945]

STETTINIUS' TACT WINS DELEGATES

(By Ernest Lindley)

Before and since this conference began, there has been some sniping in the press at Secretary of State Stettinius. It is only accurate and fair to report that so far as one can see or hear, these criticisms are at variance with the overwhelming judgment of the delegates.

The remarkable harmony within the American delegation is due in no small part to his tactful management. At every turn the delegation has given him overwhelming support—unanimous except in one instance, in which a single dissenting vote was cast.

Stettinius and Eden have worked as a team. Eden is more experienced. His help has been very valuable. But he has not been dominant in any sense. Even if you granted that he might dominate Stettinius, if only the two men were to be considered, it would be hard to imagine his dominating Senators Vandenberg or Connally or Commander Stassen.

The delegations from the smaller countries also seem to like and respect Stettinius. This respect and liking really are attached to the United States. But, at least, the chairman of our delegation has not subtracted from them.

Finally, the Russians, as of this moment, seem intent on showing Stettinius that they are really good fellows and haven't minded the rebuffs which he was instrumental in administering to them.

FACTS NOT TOLD

Much of the criticism of our handling of the Russians sprang from ignorance of or a refusal to face the facts about Russia's failure to fulfill the pledges made at the Crimea Conference.

The American Government had been reluctant to put the facts before the public—which may have been an error.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the Russian default cannot possibly be explained by misunderstandings or differing interpretations of the meaning of the Yalta agreement—especially with respect to Poland. The agreement was discussed too extensively before it was reached to admit such a margin of misunderstanding.

When the Russians, with this lamentable record, began to throw their weight around—and especially when they had the brass to request seating of the Communist-dominated Warsaw regime—they asked for the rebuffs which they received. Inevitably their international reputation had suffered and it can be repaired only by the substantial, if belated, performance of their previous promises.

As to Stettinius, the point is that the moves he made with respect to the Russians were considered right and wise not only by the United States delegation and by the British but by nearly all of the smaller nations.

Whether Stettinius has the wisdom to formulate long-range policies and the fortitude to argue and fight for them is a different question.

ROCKEFELLER POPULAR

In certain respects, especially with regard to the treatment of colonial areas, the American program seems poorly prepared. The formula proposed takes care of our needs for naval and military bases, but it takes little account of our economic interests in the colonial areas which are being redeemed by American arms or of our moral position as the champion of self-government.

It appears to be—it is hard to be sure of this because the language is very general—a complete capitulation to the imperial powers which are allied with us.

One doubts that if Roosevelt had lived the American program would have been so weak and so narrow.

Among the diplomats outside the delegation, the man who seems to carry the most weight is Nelson Rockefeller. The solid bloc of Latin-American votes has not created too good an impression outside this hemisphere but it has impressed mightily the practical politicians on the American delegation. It is the surest proof that the good-neighbor policy pays dividends.

It seems odd, in a way, that the two relative amateurs in diplomacy, Stettinius and Rockefeller, should exert so much influence. Both are beneficiaries of long-range policies conceived before they became important officials and of the reaction to recent Russian maneuvers.

But it would not have been hard for them, or anyone, to dissipate these assets. They have conserved them, and so among the delegates—both American and from other nations—enhanced their personal prestige.

General Romulo Makes Eloquent Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States and chairman of the Philippine delegation, delivered a dramatic speech before the fourth plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, April 28 at San Francisco, Calif. Commissioner ROMULO has the distinction of having served as aide to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He is also a writer and a speaker whose knowledge of the political, economic, and social conditions of the Philippines, and other oriental countries has afforded us the key to the understanding of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the Far East.

The substance of his address at the conference has been widely publicized throughout the United States. The San Francisco News, April 30, 1945, summed up his speech in the following article:

ROMULO STIRS U. N. C. I. O. WITH A DRAMATIC PLEA—"WORLD WILL SIGN ITS DEATH WARRANT IF WE FAIL ON THIS FLOOR"

Philippines Chief Delegate Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO in dramatic oratory championed "1,000,000,000 oriental faces turned pleadingly toward us for recognition of their human rights" before the fourth plenary session of U. N. C. I. O. Saturday afternoon.

General ROMULO pulled out all the stops as he gave the session an oratorical exhibition unequaled heretofore at U. N. C. I. O. Accompanied by sweeping dramatic gestures, his tones ranged from whispers to soulful cries which brought frequent applause from his audience.

WARNING TO WORLD

He warned the world that it will sign the death warrant for the future unless it shows a willingness for giving and not grasping, declaring, "We are here to determine whether the human race is going to exist or whether it is to be wiped out in another world holocaust. We are here to fight for our lives. Let us make this floor our last battlefield."

Emphasizing the urgency of each nation contributing its share of effort and yielding, General ROMULO declared, "Men of all nations have shown their ability to sacrifice and die. Now is the time to show our ability to sacrifice and live, for without mutual sacrifice now we will only live to die."

"It is the hope of orientals," he continued, "that the peace which this conference is seeking to secure is one which will not neglect the uplift and development of all socially and economically depressed areas and peoples, but one that will help raise them to a plane of living where they can become not merely bystanders, but effective collaborators in the promotion of human welfare and maintenance of peace. Theirs is the plea that such a peace may not be appropriated for the purpose of freezing the political, economic, and social order in their part of the world."

MUST ANSWER FRANKLY

"Paramount in Asia today," the Filipino leader declared, "is the remembrance of past hopelessness. Sections of our world are festering with resentments that will obstruct the war to peace unless they are brought into the open and cleared away. We must ask what gave birth to these resentments and hatreds. We must ask why they are there. And we must answer these questions frankly before we can wipe away those erosions of distrust."

He likened the struggle of American and Philippine soldiers on Bataan to those of the ancient Greeks at Thermopylae and modern Greeks before the German invaders, declaring that 9,000 Americans and 75,000 Filipinos held off the Japanese forces which might have invaded Australia and destroyed civilization in the Pacific.

Press Comment on Associated Press News Release of Germany's Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a good newspaper friend of mine, the Honorable A. Morton Smith, of Gainesville, Tex., has just sent me a number of observations and press comment relative to the news release of Germany's unconditional surrender by Edward Kennedy. I agree with these newspapermen that censorship is certainly not in keeping with American traditions unless military security is in some way involved. While I am not passing judgment on the actions of Mr. Kennedy, I think it might be well that these various opinions be placed in the RECORD:

UNDATED NATIONAL AND TEXAS COMMENT

(By the Associated Press)

Messages of commendation and congratulations on the news of Germany's unconditional surrender poured into Associated Press offices Monday and today.

Coupled with these were protests against official efforts to withhold the news of final victory in Europe.

Texas editors and publishers, as well as those of other States, took occasion to emphasize the importance of the freedom of information and news, when security is not at stake.

Following are some of the messages received by the Associated Press Bureau at Dallas:

Brownwood Bulletin:

"Congratulations on sustaining the finest traditions of a free press in free world.

"ERNEST JONES,
"Editor."

Big Spring Herald:

"While scoring an outstanding beat, A. P. has struck a blow for free and prompt dissemination of news. We are tremendously proud of both.

"JOE PICKLE,
"Managing Editor."

Waco Times-Herald:

"Congratulations many times over to A. P.

"HARRY PROVENCE,
"Managing Editor."

Times and Record News, Wichita Falls:

"Edward Kennedy's dispatch was clean, straight newspaper beat that efforts of apology, explanation, censorship, and deprecation can only emphasize. Congratulations."

Pampa News:

"The by-line of dependability still stands. We back Ed Kennedy to the hilt in his filing the greatest story of our time.

"J. L. SWINDLE,
"Managing Editor."

Texarkana Gazette and Daily News:

"We could not conceive of complete exclusive on one of the greatest stories in history. I would rather be Ed Kennedy today than President of the United States.

"J. Q. MAHAFFEY,
"Managing Editor."

Laredo Times:

"We are fighting a war for freedom. May the Associated Press always continue to carry the banner of truth and freedom as it has today. Please convey this to our champion of world peace freedom, Kent Cooper.

"WILLIAM PRESCOTT ALLEN,
"Publisher."

Temple Telegram:

"Real congratulations are deserved by the A. P. for fine beat on surrender story, pride for which is shared by all Associated Press members. That A. P. facilities in Europe should be suspended because of Ed Kennedy's vigilance and enterprise is absurd anticlimax to great journalistic achievement.

"WALTER B. HUMPHREY,
"Editor."

Lufkin News:

"The A. P. has turned out a great job and we member papers today should appreciate our membership more than ever.

"W. R. BEAUMIER,
"General Manager."

Daily Register, Gainsville:

"We want you to know we greatly appreciate great beat scored in announcement of Germany's surrender. It was A. P.'s greatest achievement to date."

The editors of the Austin American and Austin Statesman sent President Truman a message protesting delay in announcement of the end of the war in Europe, and pointing out that the Associated Press performed public service of highest value in reporting to the parents of American soldiers authentic news of unquestioned facts. The message also stated:

"We protest political agreements for withholding, delaying, or controlling authentic war news and deplore a nation dedicated to freedoms has been made a party to trampling of the fundamental freedom of the people to know accomplished facts and to political suppression of the freedom of the supreme Allied commander in reporting his great achievement."

Corsicana Daily Sun:

"Congratulations on the greatest news beat in the history of journalism. The Daily Sun carried all Associated Press News of the unconditional surrender of Germany in its Monday afternoon edition. When it is news, the Associated Press gets it and sends it through. Again congratulations.

"L. A. WORTHAM,
"Editor."

Beaumont Journal:

"Your 24-hour beat on World War No. 2 surrender of Germany is perhaps the greatest in news history. We commend you on the story and your courage to use it, thus maintaining the tradition of the public's right to the freedom of news of such vital importance. Also, praise to Edward Kennedy who wrote it.

"W. W. WARD,
"Managing Editor."

Denison Herald:

"Formal announcement by Allied chieftains confirms the greatest scoop in history by the Associated Press. In the thinking of millions of Americans the triumph of the Associated Press was heightened by the fact that the historic flash was forced through a news black-out intended to keep the world for 36 hours in ignorance of the development it had fought, prayed, and died for.

"PAUL O'TOLLEY,
Editor."

Dallas Times-Herald:

"May I congratulate the Associated Press, its executives, and personnel, for securing the greatest news beat in the history of American daily newspapers. With characteristic enterprise and devotion to truth, your splendid organization continues to uphold the finest traditions of the news-gathering craft. Admiringly yours.

"TOM C. GOOCH,
"President."

The Sugar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Republican congressional food-study committee report to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader, House of Representatives, Monday, May 14, 1945:

SUGAR SITUATION

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee submits this report based on an investigation of the sugar situation made by a subcommittee of which Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN is chairman:

The American public faces the most severe sugar shortage of the entire war emergency because the Commodity Credit Corporation has failed to use the authority given it by Congress to encourage production in Puerto Rico and Cuba, where 60 percent of our sugar supply is grown. This shortage has been further accentuated by the failure of the Office of Price Administration to properly regulate rationing of sugar.

The civilian population of the United States, already severely restricted, will be further drastically reduced in its sugar consumption under action of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration, as follows:

1. Consumers will have 25 percent less sugar for table use.

2. Housewives will receive 45 percent less sugar for home canning.

3. Hospitals and other institutional users will receive 17 to 30 percent less sugar.

4. Restaurants, cafeterias, and other public eating places will receive 25 percent less sugar.

5. Industrial users, such as bakers, soft drink, and candy manufacturers, and food canners will be drastically restricted to 45 or 50 percent of pre-war requirements. Their supplies should be materially increased at this time.

While sugar cane is harvested annually the planted crop has a life of from 3 to 6 years, its average being 4 years. Thus it is necessary to plan sugar production over a period of several years, modifying it annually as necessary. In 1943 Cuba could have harvested the equivalent of 5,000,000 tons of sugar. Our Government was the sold buyer. Cuba actually produced only 3,250,000 tons because of the failure of the War Shipping Administration to adequately route returning empty ships on the North Atlantic run to pick up sugar cargoes. Immediately following an address by Congressman JONKMAN in the House of Representatives on March 28, 1944, in which he called attention to the fact that for many months large numbers of ships had been lying idle in American east coast ports, the War Shipping Administration allocated ships to the sugar run.

The shocking failure of food officials to plan for sugar production has created the present serious situation. They failed to take note of the fact that the continental stockpile of sugar in December 1942, was 500,000 tons less than it was in December 1939. Furthermore, to balance crops in the United States, these Government officials had reduced the sugar beet acreage for 1943 by another 500,000 tons. They failed completely to consider the loss of the whole Philippine sugar crop for an indefinite period. Had a long-range sugar program been inaugurated at the outset, there would be an adequate supply of sugar today to meet all needs.

Further accentuating this shortage was the action of the United States Government officials in 1944, when they diverted 900,000 tons of sugar to the manufacture of industrial alcohol at a time when we were harvesting the greatest grain crop in our history. The result now is that we have such a huge surplus of grain without storage facilities that the 1944 fall harvest in some areas is still lying in the fields, while the American housewife and industrial user pay for administration folly.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to use incentive payments to stimulate production in continental United States and Puerto Rico. It purchases all sugar supplied from Cuba, and is authorized to fix the price so that production will be stimulated. Incentive payments must be made known prior to the planting of a crop if they are to be effective. The Commodity Credit Corporation has repeatedly delayed announcement of these incentive payments until too late for them to serve their purpose. Testimony adduced before the Committee on Insular Affairs indicates that these payments should have been resurveyed long ago to provide for future crops. In 1944 the incentive payment for the Puerto Rico crop was not announced until 2 months after the harvest ended; and in 1945 it was not announced until 6 weeks after the harvest had begun. In the case of Cuba, the price for the 1945 crop was not announced until March, when the harvest had been under way almost 2 months.

As a result of this kind of procrastination and delay, Cuba's sugar production this year is more than a million tons less than last year; and the output of sugar in Puerto Rico, while slightly higher than 1944, when a drought reduced production, will be 200,000 tons less than in 1943, and 300,000 tons less than in 1942. Had the Commodity Credit Corporation used its authority for incentive payments as contemplated by the law, authorities in the sugar industry estimate that Puerto Rico would have this year produced about 1,300,000 tons of sugar instead of an estimated 850,000 tons, and that Cuba would have produced almost 6,000,000 tons instead of an estimated 4,200,000 tons. Puerto Rican sugar producers have exhibited their records showing actual losses on their 1944 production.

The method of sugar rationing by the Office of Price Administration was so lax and ineffective in 1944 that 800,000 tons of sugar were not subjected to rationing regulations. The Office of Price Administration has failed to explain this matter. Until it does make full explanation the Office of Price Administration has failed in its responsibility to the people.

Administration officials have been very secretive about the amount of sugar that has been allocated for foreign commitments. There should be an immediate resurvey of allocations, both foreign and domestic, to assure the American people of their fair share of the supply of sugar.

There is nothing further that can be done to increase sugar production for this year in Cuba and Puerto Rico, for these crops were planted last year and are now almost all harvested; but to prevent a more serious situation during the year ahead, constructive

governmental action can be taken. Otherwise there is grave likelihood of an actual sugar famine in 1946 and 1947.

Additional acreage can be planted in sugar cane in both Puerto Rico and Cuba until about June 15, to be harvested 12 months after planting. Reliable sugar authorities estimate that 1946 production can be increased by 1,000,000 tons if the Commodity Credit Corporation takes immediate action. Likewise speedy action would induce sugar beet growers to expand their production for the 1945 fall harvest.

Responsibility now rests on these Federal Government agencies to insure an adequate supply of sugar for 1946 and 1947. If they fail in their duty, then Congress must speedily act to protect the American public.

Respectfully submitted.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE,
By THOMAS A. JENKINS, *Chairman*,
HARRIS ELLSWORTH, *Secretary*.

Permanent Court of International Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

The undersigned Committee on International Organization for World Peace wishes to submit the following resolutions for adoption and promulgation by the Federal Bar Association:

"Resolved, That the Federal Bar Association recommends and urges that the United Nations Conference at San Francisco should establish a permanent international organization for the purpose of maintaining and enforcing peace and the prevention and suppression of war in accordance with Christian and other established religious and moral principles and the pattern of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; and be it further

"Resolved, That the resolutions and report adopted by this council on January 20, 1945, with respect to the Permanent Court of International Justice are hereby reaffirmed, the resolutions being as follows:

"'1. That the Permanent Court of International Justice organized in 1922 at The Hague and known as the World Court, should be continued and should constitute the principal judicial organ of the United Nations Organization.

"'2. That the statute of the Court should be continued in force and should be annexed to, and be a part of, the charter of the United Nations Organization.

"'2. That the statute of the Court should be modified to provide that the Court may be divided into chambers or divisions and that such chambers or divisions may be available to hear and make decisions in international cases expeditiously. In this connection provision should be made for sessions of chambers or divisions of the Court in such capitals of the member nations as may be necessary from time to time. Provisions should also be made for appeals from the decisions of chambers or divisions to the full court.

"'4. That the members of the United Nations Organization should ipso facto be parties to the statute of the Court.

"'5. That the Court should have obligatory jurisdiction in legal disputes'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the foregoing resolutions be presented to officials of the executive and of the legislative branches of the Government charged with the duty and responsibility of formulating and effectuating the Nation's policies in international relations."

JAMES GIBSON EWELL, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM ROY VALLANCE.
MARTIN F. SMITH,
Adopted April 17, 1945.
TOM C. CLARK, *President*.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission, Minneapolis, Minn., April 19, 1945:

The Upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission of Minnesota, established by a joint resolution of the State legislature in 1927, wishes to make the following statement in opposition to the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority or other similar legislation creating regional authorities patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. Unanimously adopted at a meeting of the commission in Minneapolis, Minn., April 19, 1945.

Our commission unanimously agrees that the accomplishments made under democratic principles in the United States under the system of free enterprise has definitely proven that there is no need for the establishment of regional authorities which take away from the people the power of control over management of the resources of the affected area.

The 48 States which make up our Union already have established adequate departments for the management of their resources and the United States Congress has established proper United States agencies which are well staffed to coordinate with the present State agencies' plans for the development and management of these resources.

We further believe that the establishment of authorities with appointed heads who are not directly responsible to the people or the State officials or representatives of the affected areas is basically unsound.

We are of the unanimous opinion and we do support the need for coordination of planning and development of the water resources of some of our major river basins. However, we are sure that the present State and Federal agencies are well qualified to do the necessary job that lies before us.

The recent development of the Upper Mississippi Valley Water Use Council which consists of three delegates from each of the five States bordering the upper Mississippi is a fine example of how State and Federal agencies which have interests in the control of water on a navigable stream can handle the many problems that develop from such control and still give proper representation to the people in the areas affected, and at the same time give recognition to the rights of all interested groups such as navigation, small boating interests, recreation and the management of wildlife.

We are opposed to the establishment of authorities that are granted power by Congress to engage in private business, remove thousands of acres of lands from tax rolls and in general do the economic planning through the control of basic resources of the entire area.

Christening of Coast Guard Helicopter "Congressional Page"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of the christening of the United States Coast Guard helicopter *Congressional Page* held at United States Capitol on April 30, 1945:

Master of ceremonies, Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, President of the Senate. Fellow citizens, we will open the ceremonies here this afternoon with prayer to Almighty God for His blessing which will be delivered by Dr. Harris, the Chaplain of the Senate. Dr. Harris.

Dr. HARRIS. Our Father God, we pause beside this majestic dome of this shrine of each patriot's devotion. We come with humble and reverent hearts to acknowledge Thee as the God who hath made and preserved us a Nation. Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and from prejudice and from all the ugly sins that doth so easily beset us. Lift us we pray Thee above the mud and scum of mere things to the holiness of beauty. Lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. We thank Thee for great national leaders who being dead yet speak. We thank Thee for new leaders who step into the gap, coming from the vital ranks of our democracy. We thank Three for the victory over the powers of darkness, which have threatened the precious things that we hold nearest and dearest to our hearts. And we pray that in this war of test and trial we may give the best that is in us—the last measure of devotion against the wrongs that need resistance and for the right that needs assistance and for the future in the distance and for the goodness we may do. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

Mr. MIDDLESWORTH. Last year we congressional pages desired to do our small bit in this war effort and other affairs which netted over $32,000 worth of bonds. As chairman of last year's drive I would like to thank the many people who helped to make this possible. Out here today you can see what the pages bought with last year's funds and we hope it is only a small token of what we would like to accomplish this year with your kind support. And now I take great pleasure in introducing our distinguished chairman of this year's page bond drive, Mr. John Floyd.

Mr. FLOYD. Friends of the congressional pages serving in the United States Congress in the Senate and in the House and in the Supreme Court, we realize how fortunate we are to be active in the war effort on Capitol Hill under your leadership and guidance. We are indebted to you for an opportunity to express our patriotism in our work as well as in our bond selling. We also appreciate the

generous cooperation of the United States Coast Guard for helping us to provide a setting for the christening of our purchase. We especially invite you to attend our War bond dance this evening at the Shoreham Hotel at 8 o'clock to 12 o'clock. This begins our seventh War bond drive to sell bonds for our Pacific rocket plane armada. We have organized teams to compete for the trophies you will see displayed this afternoon, and final awards will be made at graduation exercises on June 15. We are depending on you and your generosity to put us over the top. It is now my great pleasure and honor to present one of our best friends on Capitol Hill, who will act as master of ceremonies, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR of Tennessee.

Senator MCKELLAR. If you will look on your program you will see the names of the distinguished gentlemen who are now going to address you. The first of these is a member of and belongs to the greatest court that was ever established among men—the Supreme Court of the United States. And I take great pleasure at this time in introducing to you one of the ablest lawyers, one of the best judges, one of the best friends that the pages ever had—Justice Wiley Rutledge, of the Supreme Court of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, Justice Rutledge.

Justice RUTLEDGE. Senator MCKELLAR, my friends the pages, your distinguished guests and friends, I wish I could measure up to the Senator's very kind but I'm afraid not altogether accurate introduction. I do want to express on behalf of the judicial branch of our Government the feeling which all of us have in the very fine contribution which these boys have made as expressions of their citizenship and their future leadership in the affairs of this Nation. They already assume their obligations as citizens. Their action today and their action last year in raising the fund with which this donation has been made show that they too realize what the issues are now confronting this country and the part it plays in the world. And so to them I am honored and proud to have part in expressing our appreciation for what they have done, for what they are to do in the drive to come and in the years ahead when they assume the full leadership of the Nation. Thank you.

Senator MCKELLAR. Ladies and gentlemen, the next business on the program is to show all of you the reward that will come to that group of you who makes the greatest number of sales of War bonds. I am going to show it to you in just a moment. Before doing that I want to say to these pages of the Senate, and I hope that the House and the Supreme Court pages may also be included in the group, that several of us met several days ago for the purpose of working out a plan that we can establish here in Washington within a very short distance of this Capitol a great school for the education and maintenance of the pages of these three bodies. These pages are brought here from all over the United States. They are as fine a lot of boys as could be found anywhere in the world. I don't know but what they are the finest lot of boys in all the world and I think this Government ought to establish a school that will make great men out of them in the future and that's what I will propose later on in the Senate and I hope such a law will pass. Now I will show you the immediate reward for the group selling the largest number of bonds. It is this gold-lined cup that I hold in my hand. I'm merely showing it to you to show you what your reward will be. Ladies and gentlemen, the next on the program is one of my friends in the Senate. Formerly he was mayor of the great city of Cleveland, Ohio. He has been in the Senate quite a number of years. He is one of the ablest men and one of the finest men I know, and without further words I am going to introduce to you the Honorable HAROLD H. BURTON, Senator from the State of Ohio, who will now address you.

Senator BURTON. Senator MCKELLAR, Mr. Justice Rutledge, Members of the Senate and of the House, representatives of the Latin-American republics, the pages in the Senate and House and the Supreme Court, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to join here today with our pages and I'm glad to see the steps of the Capitol so well decorated with the youth of America. It is to the youth of America that we look for the future of America and we believe that that future is in the best of hands. And I am glad to see the pages here today as they go ahead with their bond campaign also look up—look up with the symbol of an airplane, because I believe that aviation is a symbol of this generation. When these pages were born I don't suppose there were more than a few thousand people flying in the planes of America. These days there are millions of people flying in the planes of America every year. And so it is that we look forward. We look to new heights. And these young men serving the Senate and the House and the Supreme Court are destined to lead this Nation to new heights. We wish them well with this bond drive and I happened to receive the other day a copy of a letter which a young man who is flying a plane abroad sent to his father and I want to read a few sentences from it that will bring us a message here that I believe will help us to see the war as he saw it and to see the share that we have in it. He said this:

"MY DEAR DAD: The life that I'm leading now is not nearly so bad as one might imagine. Although our lives are risked on each mission, the odds are pretty much in our favor. More and more I feel that it is all in the hands of the Lord. On each mission I pray that my crew and I will make it, if it is His will. Now I know that the crew will stick by me and I shall certainly do all in my power, with the help of God, to see them through all that lies ahead. Going over a target and seeing and feeling all of the flak that is thrown up is an experience which is indescribable. It really makes one feel awfully humble, because you realize that there is only a certain amount that you can do about it. The rest is entirely in the hands of the Lord. Some people call it luck, but I'm firmly convinced that to an element of luck and a certain amount of skill is added an awful lot which is answerable only to God. I know that every time that I go over the target I am scared to death—yet there is something about it that I wouldn't miss for all the world. At least we do know that we are contributing our share, little as it may be, toward winning this war which shall and must be won."

That message from a man at the front to us here, and I'm glad to see many men here in uniform also, is a message telling us that everyone has a share in the winning of this war and the restoration of our country to prosperity. The buying of a bond is one good way to do it. By buying a bond, you have helped to fight the war, you have helped to preserve the money so that it will be able to bring prosperity to the country when you spend it again in years to come when the bond is paid back to you. So these pages are engaged in helping to win the war and to reestablish prosperity in America in order that there may be peace and security in this world and an opportunity worthy of the sacrifice that is being paid for it around the world. And so I close with one sentence. A sentence that I believe is the most fitting sentence for this time. A sentence that was first spoken right here 80 years ago. A sentence that was spoken by President Abraham Lincoln when he took office at his second inaugural. He said this, and we may well say it today. He said it as he faced the end of a great war and we hope that we shall soon see the end of the great war that we are in today. He said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to build up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Senator MCKELLAR. Ladies and gentlemen, the next on the program is the distinguished Congressman from the State of Oklahoma. He is an able and splendid Representative, and I now take great pleasure in introducing to you the Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Thank you, Senator MCKELLAR. Fellow guests, it's a privilege to be here today with you folks. I wish to congratulate the page boys, the Coast Guard, the mothers, and each and every one of you who participates in this type of work. Only a few weeks ago I went to Europe and, if you could have seen the dead bodies packed for 3 miles like cordwood, as I did, then you can really appreciate the value of these bonds. Today at noon I rose over this Capitol in this Sikorsky helicopter and, as we hovered there above the dome, it made me think that perhaps the Lord was hovering over each and every one of you and over our boys in the service. As you buy these bonds, remember that it purchases machines like this and many others to help our boys in the service. Thank you.

Senator MCKELLAR. Ladies and gentlemen, primarily this is a business affair this afternoon. We all want to sell bonds for the benefit of our Government to keep our boys in the Army, and Navy, and Marine Corps, and Air Corps going while this war is going on. We want to sell these bonds and we want to say that any person here, lady or gentleman, any person who wants a bond and would like to help the pages, or would like to help the Army, or the Navy, or the Marine Corps, or the Air Corps, or the great Government that is ours, we have a booth right around here and a table a little beyond, and you can go there and buy your bonds and have your name inscribed on the tablet that is to be prepared. It is a splendid investment, and I hope that these boys will make even greater sales this time than they made last year. I now have the pleasure of introducing to you another distinguished Senator of the United States who happens to be present with us. I have served on the committee a long time with him. He knows all about money, too. He knows all about many things. I take great pleasure in introducing to you the Senator from Michigan, the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Senator MCKELLAR, honored guests, pages, fellow citizens, it is indeed fitting today that we open this bond drive with the boys christening this helicopter. I look upon this as an instrument of peace—an instrument by means of which those wounded at sea may be rescued and which may be used for many other types of rescue work. We have other airplanes that travel much faster than this, but the fact that this helicopter can be set down in front of the Capitol Building is indeed a marvel, and we are going to hear great things of it in the future. While we expect victory in Europe, we still need the instruments of war to win against Japan. We rejoice that the battle is about over in Europe, but it is up to each and every American citizen to work for complete victory on the other side of the world. Only then will we realize the truth of those words carved over the door of the Supreme Court Building, just back of us, "Equal justice under law."

Senator McKELLAR. I now introduce Congressman GERALD LANDIS, of Indiana, whose heart and soul is in this work. Congressman LANDIS. [Here follows applause while Mr. LANDIS rises to acknowledge this introduction.]

Senator McKELLAR. About a hundred years, more or less, I can't be accurate, of course, about a hundred years ago I served in the House of Representatives, and while I was there I had a very distinguished and able friend. Truthfully, he is young, I admit it, but he is not a great deal younger than I am. He is one of the finest men God ever made. I'm delighted to see him here. He doesn't expect me to do it, but I am going to introduce South Trimble, of Kentucky. [Applause while Mr. Trimble acknowledges introduction by rising.] Mr. McKELLAR continues: I feel that I should applaud my friend because I love him with all my heart. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we'll have a christening participation, and I want to read the names of the participants: Miss Gloria Chavez, maid of honor; Mr. Ernest K. Hall, Senate page; Mr. Joseph L. Bowles, House page; Miss Sylvia Brull, Latin-American girl; and Miss Dorothy Weaver, a naturalized girl.

Miss CHAVEZ. It is customary to christen ships with champagne. But since we want the congressional page air armada to become the sea gulls which will rid the world of the locust plague, we use mineral water. As the Lord has blessed this liquid with many healing elements, may He also bless this and all our ships in the air and on the sea toward the end that they shall quickly rid mankind of the diseases of tyranny and become the healers of the human race. May He also bless the work which our late beloved President Roosevelt undertook by sponsoring the good-neighbor policy on this hemisphere—a policy which we hope shall reach into every corner of the world. May President Truman be guided by Him in his efforts to complete this humanitarian undertaking.

Mr. BOWLES. I christen thee *Congressional Page* so that you shall bring new hope to the united world, to cement the good-neighbor policy of the American hemisphere.

(Here ship is hit four time with bottle.)

Mr. HALL. I christen thee *Congressional Page*, air armada of the Senate, to become the armada of peace and friendship among all peoples on earth.

Miss BRULL. We, the Latin Americans, your neighbors, are happy and proud that you have asked us to join with you in the christening of your *Congressional Page* and hope that the young people of the country will help to increase this armada so that we can bring this war to a quicker end and shall help build an even larger American air force in the post-war world to bring us of the Americas and the world closer together in order to enjoy each other's products and production, given each of our countries by God, and to the labor of man for the enjoyment of all the people of all the world for peace and mutual prosperity.

[Here follows translation of Miss Brull's remarks in Spanish.]

Miss WEAVER. We naturalized Americans who come from every corner of the globe appreciate highly that we can participate in this worthy christening of the *Congressional Page* armada and we pray ardently that these planes shall become after the war ambassadors to teach the world how to live the American way among themselves and with their neighbors so that our children and the yet unborn children of the returning war heroes will not have to die on foreign soil.

Senator McKELLAR. The audience will come to order and we will now have a solo, "God Bless America," by Miss Rita Nicholson.

[Song.]

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Constantine Brown, This Changing World, that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The diplomatic relations between the United States and Great Britain on the one hand and Russia on the other have entered another difficult phase.

According to well-informed diplomats here, President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill received individually on Thursday a reply from Moscow to their observations regarding the Russian leader's failure to live up to the Yalta agreements. Premier Stalin's reply to Mr. Churchill is said to have been couched in stern terms and in unequivocal language.

The "observations" sent from Washington and London are said to have dealt with the question of Poland, Russia's unilateral actions in Romania, Hungary, and Austria, and the failure to hold elections in Yugoslavia.

The confirmation of the reports that 16 Polish underground leaders had been arrested in Moscow caused consternation in London and Washington.

Within 48 hours after Mr. Truman had become President there were definite indications from the American and British Ambassadors in Moscow that at least half of the Polish group would be included in a new Polish government in order to permit Poland to be represented at the San Francisco Conference. Premier Stalin apparently changed his mind, however, by the time Foreign Commissar Molotov arrived in Washington.

President Truman is said to have expected to clear up the entire situation with the Soviet Foreign Commissar when he received him at the White House. He was disappointed when Mr. Molotov informed him he had no instructions to make any "deal" on Poland, but had come to the United States merely as Russia's chief delegate to the San Francisco Conference. President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill then took up the whole question with Premier Stalin directly and in order to make their arguments stronger brought up every one of the points agreed on in February at Yalta which the U. S. S. R. Government had not lived up to.

Among these matters the question of the tripartite occupation of Austria and particularly Vienna is said to have been brought to the fore strongly.

It appears that there had been a definite agreement at Yalta that Austria should be occupied by the forces of the three Allies. Britain was to send troops into southern Austria and take temporary possession of Carinthia and Carniola. The United States was to occupy the Austrian area on the Bavarian border, while Russia was to occupy the rest of the country. Vienna was to share the same fate as Berlin and be divided into three zones shared equally by the American, Russian, and British forces.

Since we had no direct access to Vienna it was agreed later that the American and British token forces were to be brought by air and supplied in the same manner. Two incidents occurred soon after Vienna's liberation. The Russians, in drawing the various occupational lines in the Austrian capital, took over all the airfields, making it impossible for their Allies to use them except with their permission. This meant that every time transport planes arrived they had to receive permission of the Russian authorities to land.

But while negotiations to remedy this situation took place, Russia, without consulting the American and British Governments as provided for in the Yalta agreements, formed an Austrian cabinet under 75-year-old Dr. Karl Renner. Although neither Washington nor London recognized this government and Moscow was duly informed of our decision, the Soviet Government extended its full recognition to the new puppet organization and pointed out that we would have to take up the matter of the presence of the American and British forces in Vienna with the new national government of Austria. Austria became a "sovereign" state once more almost overnight.

This action by Russia was considered in Washington and London as another flagrant breach of the Yalta agreements. All these matters, together with the failure of the Yugoslav Government to hold free elections and the difficulties of our diplomatic and military missions in moving freely in Russian-liberated countries, were summed up and sent to Moscow. In his reply Premier Stalin is reported to have refused to recede from his position.

J. G. White Engineering Corporation Report Ignores St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks about an alleged engineering report—economic engineering—of the J. G. White Engineering Corporation, dealing with the resources and possibilities of the State of Minnesota. My remarks are found in the Appendix, page A2005. Incorporated in those remarks was a very able editorial from Duluth Publicity, under date of Saturday, April 28, 1945, which called attention to the omissions in the J. G. White Engineering Corporation report of the value of the cheap transportation on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes in future development of the resources of the State of Minnesota. In this connection, it is interesting to note an editorial from the Duluth Herald, Duluth, Minn., under date of May 10, 1945, which reads as follows:

PITTENGER ON WHITE REPORT

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix for May 1, appears an extension of remarks by Congressman W. A. PITTENGER, of this district, attacking the White report, which pictures Minnesota pretty nearly flat on its back and helpless in a commercial, industrial, and futuristic way. Mr. PITTENGER devoted his attack from another angle than those from which the press and different organizations of the State plunged their stilettos into the

report and the White Co., its compilers. And there were plenty such attacks.

Mr. PITTENGER took up the negligent attitude of the White report on the St. Lawrence seaway, pointing out the absurdity of virtually ignoring a project that would mean a new era in transportation and a conversion of Duluth, the only port of consequence of the State, into a world terminus. Especially when the White Co. had been hired to uncover commercial and industrial avenues of progress and development for the State.

"Money must be plentiful and people must like to waste it," said the Eighth District Representative, "if the State spent $175,000 for a report which entirely overlooked the unlimited possibilities of the St. Lawrence development, so far as progress in Minnesota and other adjacent States is concerned."

Of course, it should be explained, the hiring of the White Co. was engineered by interests not favorable to Duluth, for a purpose, the purpose being obvious on a reading of the report.

"I am under the impression," continued Mr. PITTENGER, "that one of the suburbs of Duluth, about 178 miles away, had some industrialists who 'engineered' this engineering report. They evidently saw to it that the report was tailor made, and must have felt that Duluth was an orphan or a stepchild, and did not 'fit in' with the purposes they had in mind in getting this report."

We feel the Congressman has made as clear an explanation of the situation as is necessary, and we don't expect to hear a reply.

The able editorial points out much better than I can do the implications contained in this alleged report which the editor calls the White Report. It seems strange that anyone claiming to be an authority on economics and agricultural development would entirely overlook the tremendous importance of water transportation, which, not only in the United States but all over the world, has contributed to the progress of all nations.

If we are dealing in color-scheme effects, I am afraid that the word "white" is the wrong word to use as an adjective applicable to describe the results of the labors of this engineering corporation.

Colorado-Big Thompson Diversion Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, once again it is proven that food is as essential in winning a war as ammunition. Now after the first round and our first enemy has been defeated, food and ammunition for the continuation of the war against the Japanese are just as important and essential as they have been since December 7, 1941.

As our special investigating committees on food continue their efforts to discover the cause of our shortages and offer proper remedies, sugar appears as one of the most scarce of our vital food products.

In the Second Congressional District of Colorado we have 12 beet-sugar manufacturing or processing plants. Under pressure from the War Food Administration we have increased our beet acreage, estimated contracted acreage for 1945, to 171,000 acres. Colorado has the acreage and could produce at a profit beets on more than 240,000 acres. Under the Colorado-Big Thompson diversion project, extra or supplementary irrigation water will be made available for more than 600,000 highly tilled and irrigated acres, with the lakes, irrigation ditches, and headgates already installed to distribute the water over this land.

A very fine article appeared in the Longmont Times-Call in which a word picture is painted of this great project. I enclose it as part of my remarks:

THE MIRACLE TUNNEL THROUGH THE DIVIDE

A short time ago some half a hundred Longmont district men, who are interested in the Colorado-Big Thompson water diversion project, rode deep into the famous Adams tunnel which has been cut 13.03 miles through solid rock under the Continental Divide.

This famous tube, the longest in the world to be driven from two portals, is 9 feet 9 inches in diameter and was holed through last summer. It is now being lined with concrete—concrete so smooth that it appears to be steel plates.

The Longmonters entered the east portal above Estes Park after climbing aboard a three-car train pulled by an electric motor. As the electric train bumped and clattered over its uneven, narrow-gage track, the passengers, who were soundly spanked by wooden-car benches for the entire journey became acutely conscious of a brisk draft and a temperature not much above 40 degrees.

As the train pulled itself deeper into the earth, the passengers became conscious that they were going into a hole of solid granite, schist and gneiss rocks—rocks that were ancient and fused by heat before the earth's crust folded up to make the Rocky Mountains 60,000,000 years ago.

During the first mile inside it is noted that heavy iron ribs support the granite walls which are crumbling and slacking due to exposure to the air. In some areas water seeps through with the force of a summer shower. As the train bumps on, solid granite is reached which needs no support. The change is easily noted because electric lights line the tunnel at distances of 50 feet.

A mile or so before the train reaches the center of the Continental Divide, about 6½ miles in, the iron supports are used again. They are needed because of the huge pressure of the mountain above. At the point where the train stops, the thickness of the ground above is 3,800 feet and the temperature was over 82 degrees. The peak through which the tube goes is 12,183 feet high.

The passengers got off the train and, led by J. M. Dille, secretary-manager of the Northern Colorado Water Conservation District, waded through water past giant concrete machines and fantastic forms to the point where concreting the tube was under way. After the lecture regarding the work, the awed observers scrambled on their wooden train and bumped back to the east entrance. The ride required 50 minutes to go and 45 minutes coming out.

This tunnel, when complete, will divert water pumped into Shadow Mountain Lake through Grand Lake to the Eastern slope, and will generate over 90,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. Seven power plants are provided for. The Green Mountain plant is now in operation, Mary's Lake and Estes Park plants will be built soon after the war, and the others as needed.

The tunnel will make 320,000 acre-feet of water available to bring 615,000 acres of already irrigated land to full production. The water will reach the farms through present irrigation systems, but will put no new lands under irrigation. The water project alone will boost the value of crops in northern Colorado millions of dollars, and will stabilize the income of 175,000 people. The Longmont district will benefit greatly, how greatly only the people who have actually gone through the miracle tunnel can realize.

Food Famine and the Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no secret about the fact that I consider the key officials and the policy-making officials of the Office of Price Administration a first-class failure. I expressed that opinion about them 2 years ago and my remarks appeared on Thursday, July 8, 1943, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. It is not pleasant to be critical. It is always diplomatic and easy to pay tribute and to hand out orange blossoms and sunflowers and red roses to those who do a good job. However, we just can't do that in connection with this particular Government bureau. In this connection, I have no criticism for the various employees in different sections of the country, who carry out the regulations that are mimeographed every hour, with rapid change, and sent to them. They are doing the best they can. However, I cannot say as much for the policy-making boys in this Bureau here at Washington, D. C.

They have done everything they could to create a food shortage. Other bungling and ignorant-minded bureaus may deserve a lot of honorable mention for helping out in the mess, but do not forget we started out with O. P. A. and it had promised to make and carry out regulations which would keep prices down, increase production, and even in wartime make everybody sensitive to the more abundant life.

As I said, I do not like this fault-finding idea, so I take Senator ELMER THOMAS, Democrat, of Oklahoma, as one of the authors of my food bible. I do this so the "braintrusters" and New Dealers will understand that I am trying to be nonpolitical and fortify myself with comment from an impartial observer. Said Senator THOMAS in a newspaper interview in the Washington Post for April 29:

I would be for anything other than what we have.

Senator THOMAS declared—

It is obvious that the meat situation must have some extraordinary attention and it is obvious to me that O. P. A. has failed on the problem to date.

In a speech the other day, our colleague the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN pointed out findings of the House investigating committee of which he is a member indicating that there not only would be a shortage of meat and other vital foods in this country, but that in

the case of some foods there would be none at all.

In view of these startling disclosures, I just want to ask why there is any delay in changing horses in the middle of the stream, or on either side of the bank. We need a food administrator and we need him badly and we need him now.

Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *May 8, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I have been noticing in the press that an action of Congress is pending to confer the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late President.

Such an action would be a clear violation of the law creating the honor. But it would be more than that, it would be a cheapening of the honors that have been bestowed on men who have deserved the high honor and upon whom it has been legally bestowed.

Everything that we have prized seems to have been cheapened. Exalted rank has been bestowed with a lavishness that is only exceeded by the lavishness of our spending of money. But the honors that a proud nation has given to men for their valor on the field of battle, "in action involving actual conflict with an enemy * * * by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty" should never be trifled with or cheapened.

I know that the charge of partisanship will be made against the man who opposes the movement. But every dictate of patriotism requires that this travesty be not allowed. When an act of patriotic appreciation involves a violation of law it is a disgrace and not an honor to him who receives it. If anything in the country should be preserved sacred it is this medal of honor. If it is desired to strike a medal in honor of Roosevelt let the Congress provide for it specially. Let them not shove him as an intruder among these men whom we have honored with the highest honor because of their highest devotion and bravery.

If I were in your place they might shout partisanship forever but I would never consent to this disgraceful action. Suppose the law required that a copy of the recital of the reason for the action should be sent to all living men holding a like honor. Each of them would get out the similar recital of the reason back of his own honor. He would find some gallant and brave, outstanding action, "beyond the call of duty," at the risk of his life, "in actual conflict with an enemy." He would see that he had at that price won the honor according to the rules of the game. He would look in vain for a justification for this last bestowal. Can you imagine Colin Kelly and his fellows meeting Roosevelt on the other shore, all of them wearing their decorations and their citations and comparing notes? At last they come to the last recipient of the honor and they find that his decoration was not given according to law, for gallantry beyond the call of duty, nor in combat with an armed enemy. And they would ask him, How come? I can imagine them again reviewing the citations on all the other breasts and then saying to the newest comer, "Brother, you don't belong."

I cannot imagine a Congress of the United States conferring this highest of our honors on one whom they know not to be entitled to it.

My son was given the Distinguished Service Cross. It was conferred posthumously because of a dangerous mission voluntarily performed by him, in the doing of which he was wounded so severely that he died a few days later. His mother and I were very proud of the decoration and of the citation. But if the Congress or any other authority embarked on the program of conferring like decorations on men who never were on the line of battle, we should be very much inclined to return to the authorities who issued it the decoration they had robbed of all of its honor.

I suppose that technically the President might be supposed to be eligible to the Distinguished Service Medal, but I think that a fair reading of the law makes even that questionable. He is certainly not eligible to receive either of the two higher decorations. For you people to confer it on one man in violation of the strict conditions heretofore by law governing its bestowal, is to cheapen the decoration on the breast of every man living or dead on whom it has been worthily bestowed.

I hope that a movement will take form that will prevent this inroad on custom as it has prevailed for so long and that you may be identified with it. I should hope this even if I knew that it might prove unpopular. But I am satisfied that it will be recognized as a loyal action in behalf of a most sacred tradition and will not be unpopular.

Yours truly,

W. A. PETREE.

We Must Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Enumclaw Courier-Herald of May 3, 1945:

WE MUST WIN THE PEACE

The eyes of the world are upon the sessions of the United Nations meeting in San Francisco. The question upon the lips of everyone is "Will they succeed in establishing the right machinery for a permanent peace?"

It does not seem possible that this organization will fail. It cannot fail, for if it does it will mean the end of our civilization. The next war with its buzz bombs and other devastating methods of warfare would mean practically the extinction of human life on this earth.

With such a threatening cloud hanging overhead, it does not seem possible that we humans can fumble the chance to establish the foundations of permanent peace.

But after all, the leaders of our various world nations are but human beings. They are subject to the frailties of human selfishness, national patriotism, power politics and all of those suspicions that cause disagreements.

Because these leaders are human, we cannot expect a perfect peace but we can expect a machinery that will lay the foundation for a workable peace that will at least keep another world war from engulfing us once again. Let us direct our prayers that the peace will be won, that our leaders will meet with compassion and tolerance in their hearts so that a friendship of strength will be built that will overshadow the suspicions and quarrels that are the cause of wars.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
HARTFORD, *May 11, 1945.*

Hon. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOPPLEMANN: At the request of the Honorable Searls Dearington, clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Honorable John L. Sullivan, clerk of the Senate of the State of Connecticut, there is herewith transmitted a certified copy of House Joint Resolution No. 265, memorializing the Congress to pass universal military training legislation at the present session, adopted by both branches of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL S. GOOGEL,
Deputy Secretary of State.

Resolution memorializing the Congress to pass universal military training legislation at the present session

Whereas twice within the last 25 years the people of these United States have been forced to bear the terrible consequences of their lack of preparedness, in the loss of their sons and in the waste of their wealth; and

Whereas the lack of preparedness of this Nation in 1939 and again in 1941 undoubtedly encouraged the aggressor nations, Germany and Japan, in starting a world conflict; and

Whereas developments in modern warfare make it highly improbable that the United States in a future war will be given the time by a potential aggressor to prepare their defenses; and

Whereas the future peace of the world depends upon the cooperation of these United States in maintaining such peace, and on the conviction of other nations that these United States through their strength mean to preserve such peace; and

Whereas the hand of the President of these United States will be strengthened in future international conferences by the avowed determination of the people of these United States to hereafter maintain a state of preparedness; and

Whereas minority groups, despite the convictions of the majority of the people of these United States and the majority of the members of the armed forces, are already attempting to postpone necessary action to keep these United States strong and prepared; and

Whereas the President of these United States, in his wisdom and in his knowledge, has already stated to the Congress his conviction of the necessity for universal military training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Representatives of the State of Connecticut in the Congress of these United States be respectfully requested to make effort to further the passage of universal military training legislation during the present session of the Congress, so that these United States may never again be forced to face a potential aggressor without adequate preparedness; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each of the Senators and Representatives for Connecticut in the Congress, and to the chairmen of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the House Military Affairs Committee.

Passed house of representatives April 25, 1945.

Passed senate May 2, 1945.

Address by Justice Douglas Opening Indiana Bond Sale Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh War Loan campaign in Indiana opened most auspiciously at Indianapolis last Friday, May 11, with Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, as the orator of the occasion. It was the greatest and probably the most successful War-bond meeting ever held in Indiana, with representatives from every county in the State in attendance. The address delivered by Justice Douglas was so masterful and inspiring that I have asked and obtained unanimous consent of the House to insert it in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be read by people all over the Nation. It was as follows:

Three days ago we celebrated VE-day. In one way, celebration seems an odd word to use for what we all felt when we knew the war in Europe was over. The sirens blew for victory. But at the same time the church bells tolled for the dead.

There will be more dead, and more wounded, before the war with Japan is won. Our dedication to the task of winning that war sobers our celebration of victory in Europe. There is no heart in America which does not feel it.

We have dedicated ourselves to another task, too—as gravely and as fervently as we have to final victory. That is the task of making victory secure and permanent. There must be no more war. To win the war against Japan, to win the war against war—these are the great jobs ahead.

It is easy to say there must be no more war. No one thinks it will be an easy thing to do. It can't be done by governments and security agreements alone. In this country, from its very earliest days, we have known that a government is nothing but the instrument of the people. Today, it is only the determination of the people of the earth to work for peace that can end the threat of war. The democratic processes are the surest guaranty that war will be ended.

We have a right to celebrate the end of the war in Europe—because of the way we won, because of what we fought against. The war in Europe was won by no single nation. We won it, and the Russians won it, and the English and the French and all the peoples who couldn't be conquered by tanks, or torture, or the idea of a master race. The Germans thought that brutality, and terror, and mass education for evil could conquer the human spirit. They were wrong.

It is part of our triumph that they were proven wrong in those ideas. Let us celebrate that.

The Germans thought military might could take the place of civil government and due process of law. They were wrong. Let us celebrate that.

They thought that Gestapo terror could beget through fear greater loyalty and devotion of people to their country than freedom could. They were wrong. Let us celebrate that.

They thought that betrayal was as easily learned as loyalty and as firm a foundation of national strength. They were wrong. The Nazis betrayed their own people. They found Quisling to betray the Norwegians, and Laval to betray the French. But they could not make the human spirit betray its own dignity. Let us celebrate that.

The Nazis could enslave millions and work them to death, starving them even as they put them at work making weapons for their conquerors. They could and did spread cruelty and ruin over Europe. They could and did destroy almost everything they touched. But the one thing they could not and did not destroy was the age-old determination of human beings to live in dignity, and decency, and honor.

It was the Nazis themselves who were destroyed.

And let us celebrate that.

But let us never forget the desolation they have left behind them. The Allies today find themselves the heirs of that desolation. To help Europe remake itself for peace will be very hard. Too much blood has been shed, too many children have starved, too many adults have lived with despair. There will be no easy solution, nor any quick one.

But we must never forget that the blood was shed by the Nazis, the starvation was allowed or enforced by them, the despair created by their will. This is what the Nazis did. This is what they would have done to us. This is what we fought against. And this is what went down to defeat before us.

We beat not only the German Army—we beat the Nazi idea. Let us celebrate that.

We have a right to celebrate it. Our victory is a real victory. Because it is real it imposes some definite obligations upon us.

The Germans are beaten. Their domination of Europe and their threat to the rest of the world is at an end. That was true once before, in 1918, but it did not remain true. The Allies dissipated their victory because they failed to accept the obligations it imposed. Cynicism was easier than responsibility. It is easier now. It will always be easier. And it will always be disastrous.

Victory in Europe will certainly be followed by victory in Asia. To say that we are sure of this is not to belittle the effort necessary for complete victory over Japan.

And when that war is won we shall again find ourselves faced with desolation and despair created by the Japanese. There will have to be an answer to that despair in Asia as in Europe.

Charity to those who suffer is no answer. Food for the hungry, medicine for the sick, clothing for the ragged are only partial answers. What we can give, we will give, and gladly. But material aid alone cannot cure the sickness of this war-torn world or begin to solve its problems. If we expect to buy gratitude with gifts we shall be unfair to those we help. They need more than that. They need their self-respect.

Self-reliance is a good American word. It has become a good European word, too. The peoples who need our help want to and can help themselves. They know the price of national failure in the modern world. Freedom cannot be imposed and peace cannot be bought. Only a people who themselves lack self-respect would try to barter the help that must be given freely, or to buy the friendship that must flow from cooperation between nations.

If we deny the power of moral idealism—if, instead, we idealize mere power—we shall be untrue to the men who died in this war—to our sons, to the countless dead we never knew and whose names are strange to us, and to unborn generations.

If we forget that America is rich because it is free, and that it is respected because it is both, we shall be untrue to the memory of that great leader of America and of the world, for whom we mourn—Franklin Roosevelt. He knew that we cannot buy prosperity for ourselves or peace for the world by loans and exports alone. He and his great coworker, Cordell Hull, fought not only the illusion of political isolation, but the temptation of ceonomic isolation as well.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that we dare not shut ourselves up within our own boundaries, and within our own minds. He knew that we cannot divide the world in two, at once expecting to get on with the rest of the world, and for the rest of the world to leave us alone. We tried that course, and we failed.

Economic break-down in Europe was cause of economic depression in America. Japan's attack on China led inevitably to Japan's attack on the United States. German aggression against Czechoslovakia became a threat to our shores. No words or bribes—no kind of appeasement—could restrain those bent on conquering the whole world.

Governments begin when human beings realize that they have mutual concerns. Our society is now more clearly seen as world-wide. Therefore, we now more clearly see that our concerns are world-wide, too.

We can never again "help China," or "feed Belgium," because we are sorry for the people of those lands. China and Belgium and the United States are together part of something bigger. If we help China we help ourselves, in the simplest and most literal meaning of the word. And there is no other way that we can help any part of the world, except by understanding our concern in each other. There is no other road to world order and to peace.

Mutual concern and mutual trust are founded on mutual respect. There is a strange kind of fear, in some places, over America's ability to command respect. There is, at times, doubt whether we are smart enough to deal successfully with the other powers of the world; doubt over our trading position. Respect for others—nations or individuals—is impossible without self-respect. Our self-respect ultimately turns on our own achievements in peace as well as in war. Our trading position with the rest of the world is just as good as we make life in America.

If we fail in our national task we shall fail in our international task. If our soldiers come home to depression and unemployment, to the kind of blindness and irresponsibility that flourished in the decade after the last war, we will lose our chance to influence the world. Machiavelli himself would not be able to make a good trade for us. Defeat in foreign affairs will simply reflect failure in national affairs.

The people of Europe, like the people of Asia, have seen with their own eyes how great is our strength. They have seen us land in Italy and France and overrun half a continent. They have seen us beaten bitterly in the Philippines, only to come back, help those islands to regain their freedom, and drive on past them to threaten the Japanese homeland. They have seen us build a transportation system across the other end of the world. They have seen us build airports and arsenals overnight in swamps and desolate islands. They know

just how good we can be. They now have good and new standards, American standards, by which to judge America. They will know if we fail to meet the standards we ourselves have set for us and for the world.

The good people of the world pray that we will not fail. More than anything in the world, they want us to succeed. They hopefully believe that their success is tied up with ours. American ideals of freedom and justice under law, American industrial ability and inventive genius, have become most important and precious to people all over the world who have suffered under the aggressor nations.

They have just one question to ask us—can you make your ideals and your wealth work for good in peacetime, too? They are emerging from the war as new people, with unlimited expectations from the new life and opportunity which has been granted them. The peoples who are fighting their way into the peace are thinking more like Americans than many of us realize.

The only sure way for us to keep the respect of the rest of the world, the respect that has been won so impressively during this war by our soldiers overseas and by our workers at home, the only way for us to keep that respect is to be worthy of it.

But America cannot serve either itself or the human family, unless it is as strong economically as it is strong at waging war against aggressors. That brings us to the immediate problem of today.

War bonds are a very important part of our American system. First of all, they are fine investments—investments in dollars, investments in peace. The savings they represent are also an essential check on inflation and run-away spending. There is indeed no occasion to worry about inflation if we continue to put every dollar over rock-bottom expenses into the purchase of War bonds.

But War bonds have a different kind of importance too. They are symbols of the Nation's participation in the war. They are service stripes for the home front.

Every time we buy a bond, we buy a part of a secure peace for ourselves, for our countrymen, and for the rest of the world. Every time we buy a bond, we buy part of a gun, or a tank, or a plane These tools have gone overseas. They have done their job. They have done it through the sweat and the blood and the skill of American fighting men. And what paid for them here was not just money. It was the sweat and the skill of the men on the job who made the tools. The bonds are one way the tools go overseas. They are, indeed, bonds between the people who have won the war on the home front and the people who have won it overseas. They are the living symbols of our unity, of democracy in action. The character of the Nation and ourselves as individuals is indeed judged by great voluntary activities such as sustain the War bond program.

Symbols, like weapons and investments, are things we own and use. America's pool of war savings is important in a way that mere property alone can never be. It is a challenge—a challenge to use our savings, no matter how much or how little, as seed, to put our accumulated wealth to work. For the war savings pool can become an instrument to guarantee for tomorrow both security and opportunity. Security and opportunity must indeed be woven together inseparably into the pattern of our future.

Here at home is not the only place where War bonds are bought. It is not only here that plans are laid for the future we all want. Overseas, our men and women in service are buying bonds, too. The day after Manila fell to us, our boys were buying bonds there. They are still buying them in the fox holes.

The bitter past and the bloody present are not the whole world to our fighting men. It is with War bonds that they get an option on the future—an option on our national unity, our prosperity, and our dignity.

Shall We Give the Air to Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the daily Times-Dispatch of the grand old historic city of Richmond, capital of Virginia, and quondam capital of the Confederacy, is one of the leading liberal and brilliantly edited newspapers of America. Its editorials are widely quoted throughout the United States. It is an ideal example of what newspapers can and should be.

The Daily Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala.; the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C.; the Observer, of Charlotte, N. C.; the Tennesseean, of Nashville, Tenn., are among other splendid newspapers of the Southland.

On April 26 there appeared an editorial of the Times-Dispatch which is well worth the attention of my colleagues and of the country. It is in reference to a statement made by me before the congressional joint committee headed by the Honorable ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, Senator from Wisconsin, in which I urged the enactment of legislation introduced by me, providing for the broadcasting to the country of congressional proceedings.

Some newspapers have made fun of the proposal, indulging in good-natured derision of such a plan. They are, apparently, unaware that broadcasting proceedings of national legislative business is not unprecedented. The experiment has proved very successful in New Zealand since 1935.

Naturally, such an undertaking would be enshrouded with every practical protection to the end that the privilege not be abused and that no one Member would hog the program; also, that only debates of national and international importance would be offered the public.

Considering the character of much of the tripe which appears in soap operas during the day and considering the bilge which commercial announcers spew on the air in phony enthusiastic endorsement of dubious nostrum and quack remedies, I am of the serious opinion that the congressional body contains some of the greatest wits and orators in the United States, who might well compete for public appeal.

Here is the editorial:

PUTTING CONGRESS ON THE AIR

The suggestion by Representative COFFEE, of the State of Washington, that sessions of Congress be broadcast by radio probably will tempt some people to indulge in puns and wisecracks. We can just hear the quipsters saying, "Congress is up in the air all the time, and now it wants to go on the air," and "Instead of putting Congressmen on the air, we should give 'em the air." You know the kinds of things people are prone to say about Congress, always, of course, in a spirit of good, clean fun—or sometimes anyway.

For our part, we have no wish to make any quips. We think the proposal deserves serious consideration. Why not put Congress on the air and let the people hear it tick? It's the people's business they are transacting, and the people should be interested in following the proceedings while they are going on. Of course, the newspapers give accounts of the doings of Congress, and so do the radio news broadcasts. But perhaps something new would be added if the legislative proceedings came to us hot off the congressional griddle.

We have no disposition to spoof the suggestion, but we question one statement made by Mr. COFFEE. "I am convinced that if the people are given a chance to listen to their lawmakers, Congress would soon become the most popular program on the air," he says. "Even housewives would follow their Senators more closely than their soap operas." Congressional broadcasts more popular than soap operas with the housewife audience? Or more popular with the general public than quiz programs and the radio comedians? It's hard to imagine, with all due respect to Congress. Of course, some good, clean funsters would say that there are comedians in Congress, too, or, at any rate, some of the Members are comical. And it might be said also that there no $64 questions on the quiz programs comparable to some of the questions asked in the House and Senate. We leave such jibes to others. But even so, in all seriousness, from long familiarity with the contents of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which some persons profess to find dreary reading, we doubt that broadcasts of the same material would put Congress at the top of the Crossly and Hooper radio ratings.

Mr. COFFEE's proposal is no kidding matter, so far as we are concerned, and we do not intend to make light of it. If Congress can get the networks to give it time on the air, let the broadcasts go on. But we just had a sudden thought—in saying that Congress "would soon become the most popular program on the air," is Mr. COFFEE kidding?

Salary Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter of transmittal and Resolution No. 12, adopted by the honorable Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis, Mo., on May 11:

BOARD OF ALDERMEN,
St. Louis, Mo., May 11, 1945.

Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Eleventh Missouri District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Herewith find copy of Resolution No. 12 which was adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of St. Louis on this date. It is self-explanatory.

Very respectfully,

GEO. W. HARTMAN,
Clerk, Board of Aldermen.

Resolution 12

Whereas H. R. 3035, a bill to reclassify the salaries of postal employees, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes, has been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas this bill would provide an urgently needed upward revision in compensation for these public servants; and

Whereas postal employees have not received a salary increase since January 1, 1925,

except for a temporary increase which expires June 30, 1945; and

Whereas the cost of living has risen approximately 30 percent in recent years, making it imperative that Congress enact legislation to provide an American standard of living for the postal employees and maintain a highly efficient Postal Service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of aldermen of the city of St. Louis urges the enactment of H. R. 3035 by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Representatives in Congress from St. Louis, the United States Senators from Missouri, the Postmaster General, and the President of the United States.

Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I say first that I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before your committee on this tremendous undertaking you have assumed. The Members of Congress, as well as the entire Nation, are deeply indebted to this committee for undertaking the tremendous task of making Congress more efficient in the performance of its proper functions on behalf of the American people.

May I also say, Mr. Chairman, that although in my opinion there are many ways in which Congress may be made more proficient, I am not one of those who believe that our basic and fundamental system should be changed to conform to the system of legislative procedure of some other nation. I believe fundamentally and basically that we have the greatest legislative system established under our Constitution in the world—and I may include—in all history. It is the greatest democratic and representative system in the annals of history, and it is an esteemed privilege and an exceptionally high honor to be a Member of such a great legislative body.

Needless to say to you gentlemen that our Constitution provides the functions of Congress and that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." It is with this particular provision of our Constitution that you are now concerned in that it determines the organization. Every 2 years the Congress meets and reorganizes. In many instances it is merely a formality as the same rules and proceedings are adopted that we used in the previous Congress.

From time to time, however, this or that rule or proceeding has been changed—or more often additions to meet this or that condition have been provided.

It was on April 6, 1789, when enough Members assembled legally to organize the first Congress. We are now in the one hundred and fifty-seventh year and the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is obvious with the progress, growth, and development that we have had and the Congress determining its proceedings every 2 years to meet these new conditions, that it may become top heavy. During the course of these years, we have continuously added to but rarely taken from, regardless of how obsolete a particular rule of proceedings may become.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that the time is long past due that we stop and see just where we are and what has been done and what can be done toward the greatest efficiency in Congress and the performance of its functions in behalf of the people.

One of the things that makes our system the greatest in all history is the flexibility in determining the procedure to meet the condition that exists from time to time. The Seventy-ninth Congress has entirely new and different problems than the first Congresses, and under our Constitution it is our duty—a part of our function in establishing these proceedings and in the reorganization of each Congress to obtain the greatest possible efficiency and in strengthening our congressional machinery. This is what we are concerned with today and it is of tremendous importance to the future welfare of this Nation.

I have a few suggestions, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to make and which occurs to me should be considered in our attempt to obtain the best possible service from this branch of our Government.

1. The primary responsibility of Congress is to legislate. The very first article of our Constitution, section 1, says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." That doesn't mean, in my opinion, that the legislative function belongs to the Executive, or to some agency, or bureau established, whether independently or otherwise.

There has been a tendency gradually developing that the executive department of our Government actually perform the legislative function and for Congress merely to review such proposals after their origin and presentation.

I would not go so far as to say that the Executive should not make legislative proposals, because as a coordinating branch of our Government and in carrying out policies given as a mandate of the people, it is the duty of the Executive to present his program in order that the Congress may properly legislate on these issues of importance to all the people.

Therefore, in meeting this No. 1 problem, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we should organize and equip the Congress with the proper staff for us to actually perform our responsibility of making laws. Instead of doing this in the past, we have been providing the skilled and technical staff for the executive departments, agencies and bureaus for this function. We have the "cart before the horse," and sometimes I am afraid an example of "the tail wagging the dog."

We have an example as to the effectiveness of such a staff, although it is limited, and that is with our joint Committee on Internal Revenue. Of course, that is not a legislative committee, but such technical and professional experts should belong to the proper committee.

Our legislative service is so limited that they cannot properly provide the technical assistance in the many research fields necessary in dealing with the many complicated and tremendous problems in our legislative work. Therefore, it is easily understood why committees in a great many instances depend on the technical advice from the staffs we provide in the various departments. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we reduce to a very great extent such technical staff in the various executive departments, and that Congress provide itself such a staff necessary for good and wise legislating.

2. Speaking about becoming top-heavy, I believe this to be especially true by the establishment of its many committees from time to time. I believe very strongly in the committee system. I believe that it is the best system yet to be devised for orderly procedure. I am fearful that many of our committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction, which causes jealousy, enviousness, confusion, and makes it very difficult in many instances to definitely fix the responsibility for particular legislation.

I therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that for better efficiency that our committees be reorganized, reducing the number to eliminate the overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction and to define definitely and clearly the legislative responsibility of each committee.

I suggest further that each full committee be divided into subcommittees and assigned fixed and definite responsibility in a field under the jurisdiction of that committee.

It is also my opinion that insofar as possible, it would be much better in setting up special committees to make them a part of whatever committee has jurisdiction over the particular subject for which the special committee was established.

I am also inclined to agree with a great many others that the chairman and ranking minority of the full committee should designate the responsibility of the chairmanship of the subcommittees to other members of the committee, and they remain as ex-officio members of all subcommittees and in a supervisory capacity. This is done by many of our committees, but in a great many it is not the practice. It is humanly impossible for any individual to personally attend to all of the important matters that should be within the jurisdiction of one of these great committees.

3. Another thing which seems to me would be highly desirable in consideration of streamlining our Congress would be for Congress to have our own liaison organization.

It is recognized that one of our proper functions is to inspect and review the action of the Executive in the administration of the laws provided by Congress. To have the proper contact in carrying out this responsibility, we should have an organization that is responsible to the Congress. Here, we again have the cart before the horse, in that we provide for the Department to establish these liaison contacts and to obtain the information necessary to efficiently perform this function of review and inspection. It is only natural and without any disparagement toward any individual for the viewpoint to be expressed of those to whom the individual is directly responsible.

To have better efficiency in our work on behalf of our people, I suggest that we have such an organization established in dealing with the executive departments and agencies, who will be directly responsible to us as Members of Congress. We have some very good legislative and liaison people delegated by the various departments to this responsibility. They have worked hard in most instances and I believe have tried to accomplish the objective reposed in them, but it still holds true that we all are human, and it is human to err.

It is not my intention to propose that the Congress encroach on the authority and responsibility of the other branches of government. We must be very careful not to do this and I am fearful that we sometime do overstep our limitations. However, in these more modern times, it has been necessary to delegate unusual, and at times, unlimited authority and to appropriate large and excessive funds. It, therefore, devolves on the Congress as direct representatives of the people to see that that authority so delegated is administered as was intended for the best interest of the people, and that such funds be expended to obtain the greatest benefit. Therefore, it is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I think these three suggestions are

highly important on our internal organization.

There are some other thoughts that occurred to me would be highly desirable that do not relate to the internal organization of Congress, but which I believe to be of vital importance to the people and I think should be considered in this over-all study.

4. This next suggestion that I have had in mind for some time was considered in the House a few days ago, and that was in reference to the making of treaties. I was one of a great many who introduced a resolution providing for the making of treaties by the President with the advice and consent of a majority of both branches of the Congress. The House as you well know passed this resolution overwhelmingly and I trust the Senate will concur, in order that it may be presented to the States for ratification as an amendment to our Constitution. I have a feeling that it would be a more representative procedure and more nearly in accordance with our democratic processes.

5. While we are endeavoring to modernize our congressional machinery, we should not overlook the importance of the relationship between the Members of Congress and their constituents. To properly ascertain the sentiment of the people and to know their feelings, it is going to be absolutely necessary to have more opportunity than we have had in the past few years of being with them.

Also, if we as a part of our duty and responsibility, and being in a position to attain more information, are going to promote a better public understanding of our legislative work, it is going to be necessary that we have the opportunity of personally placing these matters before our people.

I assume following the war, and I believe this study is for post-war consideration, most of the Members of Congress will have more time to be back in their districts. However, if the work continues to be heavy, and I believe it will take many years for readjustment, some systematic plan should be devised in order that this function may be properly performed.

6. Finally, I want to call your attention to what to me is a very serious situation—that is, our absentee problem in Congress. If in carrying out the thought above suggested we can devise some systematic plan, I think we could very definitely improve our absentee problem, which has at times reached staggering proportions. This is in no sense critical, as many Members find it necessary to be back home or other places on official matters as important in many instances as what may be considered in Congress at that particular time.

From my viewpoint, absenteeism is no small matter and certainly retards efficiency. I have been absent a few times myself, not because I wanted to but because it was necessary in the performance of my official duties. I therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if provisions can be made for Members to have an opportunity to take care of these outside duties, that we will materially improve our absentee situation and thereby have greater efficiency in our legislative work.

We must approach these problems, Mr. Chairman, in my viewpoint, in a practical and realistic manner. We must first recognize our handicaps and then courageously make the necessary adjustments that Congress will keep pace with the times and the growing problems that are being heaped upon our shoulders continuously. Many suggestions, and good ones, have been made, I am sure, to the committee and as one Member of Congress I am confident that you will thoroughly explore the many possibilities and make such recommendations that may be effective in consummating the objective sought by this undertaking.

VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I join with all of our people throughout the Nation and our allies everywhere, in rejoicing that VE-day has come. Let us lift up our hearts in humble and grateful thanks for our victory—that at long last the war in Europe is over.

Mussolini is dead. Hitler is reported to be dead. Nazism and fascism in Germany and Italy are prostrate, and their infamous aggression and unholy attempt to conquer and enslave the people of the world has been overcome and gloriously destroyed.

Except in Japan, aggressor nations have loosened their licentious hold on all the countries of the world. Their destruction—root and branch—is certain and sure everywhere in the world.

Yes; only Japan is holding on in a last-ditch struggle of death and destruction. Her day of reckoning is near, too. The end of the war will come only when victory over Japan is final and complete.

Our motto now is, "On to Tokyo!" and let Japan and its fanatical military power take note.

The climax has come, and the end of this horrible and terrible conflict is in sight. It has been no easy task. Freedom and liberty have always been attained and maintained at a heavy cost. Nothing, however, will stop us in achieving total and certain victory, unconditional in the Pacific as in Europe, and complete destruction of the military hordes and war lords, who would disturb the peace of the world and enslave all the people.

As a Member of Congress, that unhappily, though unhesitatingly, was forced to declare war on the ruthless and destructive aggressor nations, I have, with never-failing interest, observed the courage and valor with which our boys have gone to war.

I have also glowed with pride when our gallant men were properly recognized and cited for their valiant deeds of bravery.

My heart has bled with yours in deep and profound sympathy on receiving the shocking news that many loved ones that gave their lives that democracy may live—yes, who gave their lives that we may be spared the horrors and tortures experienced by innocent men, women, and children in the conquered nations of Europe.

I pray to God that you will never have cause to feel your sons have died in vain—that you will never have cause to feel that your sacrifices for freedom and liberty have been forgotten.

God grant this time we may reap the rewards of victory; that nazism, fascism, or any other phalange, may never again rise to threaten the peace and safety of the world. That peace on earth, good will toward men may ever be the beacon light that guides men's souls to bring the "four freedoms" to suffering humanity everywhere.

To achieve these objectives, these aims and ideals, not only victory but lasting peace, let us dedicate the remainder of our lives.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Tom Linder, Georgia commissioner of agriculture, before Ways and Means Committee of the House, on reciprocal trade agreements, May 2, 1945:

Gentlemen of the committee, the most vital test of this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is whether it will get us into war or keep us out of war.

I am convinced that the reenactment of the reciprocal trade agreement law in 1937 was directly responsible for our involvement in this war with Japan.

Let us see what incontrovertible evidence we have that our present war with Japan was caused by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1937.

PEACE AND WAR

On January 2, 1943, the Secretary of State released a booklet or white paper, which was entitled "Peace and War."

Peace and War is a resumé of the United States foreign policy during the decade 1931 to 1941.

On page 1, in the third paragraph, beginning in the second line, we read:

"In 1937 Japan again attacked China."

The records show that after the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1937, and after Japan attacked China the second time our shipments of iron and steel to Japan increased 1,000 percent.

It is evident that we would not have increased shipments of iron and steel 1,000 percent at that particular time unless we had been forced to do so.

In 3 years we shipped enough iron and steel to Japan to build a fleet of warships and to equip an army.

On page 34 of Peace and War, the third paragraph reads as follows:

"In line with the policy enunciated by the President of restricting the export to belligerents of abnormal quantities of war materials, which had been urged by the Government since the beginning of the war between Italy and Ethiopia, a neutrality bill containing such a provision was introduced in Congress in January 1936. Secretary of State Hull, in supporting this proposal before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, emphasized that a neutral should not 'deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war' by delivering essential materials to belligerents, thus helping 'not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely.' This proposal was not adopted by Congress."

In January 1936 the administration realized that we were responsible for encouraging and abetting the war. Yet, after this our exports of iron and steel to Japan increased 1,000 percent. Why? It is evident that not only the President, but the administration

in general, realized that all of the iron and steel we shipped to Japan would be used in a war of aggression.

Why then did we not stop these shipments of iron and steel?

Instead of stopping these shipments of iron and steel in 1936, 1 year later in 1937 we reenacted the reciprocal trade agreements law and increased shipments of iron and steel to Japan 1,000 percent.

On page 44 of Peace and War, in the first two lines of the first paragraph we read:

"On July 7, 1937, a clash occurred between Chinese and Japanese troops near Peiping in north China."

Immediately after this clash between Chinese and Japanese troops we increased our shipment of iron and steel to Japan 1,000 percent.

How can you explain this tremendous increase in shipments in iron and steel to Japan in the face of Japan's unjustifiable attack on China, unless there was a compelling reason why this administration was forced to concede to Japan's demands for this iron and steel?

On page 47 of Peace and War, the next to the last paragraph reads as follows:

"A year later, in a conversation with the Canadian Minister, Secretary Hull said that since August 1937 he had proceeded on the theory that 'Japan definitely contemplates securing domination over as many hundreds of millions of people as possible in Eastern Asia and gradually extending her control through the Pacific Islands to the Dutch East Indies and elsewhere, thereby dominating in practical effect that one-half of the world'."

In other words, the Secretary of State said that he had proceeded on the theory that Japan definitely contemplated a war of aggression. And yet, through those very years when the Secretary of State contemplated a war of aggression by Japan, we stepped up our shipments of iron and steel to Japan 1,000 percent. Is it reasonable to suppose that we would have done this unless Japan held a club over our heads?

On page 49 of Peace and War in the second paragraph we read as follows:

"On October 6, 1937, the assembly of the League of Nations adopted a report stating that the Japanese action in China was a violation of Japan's treaty obligations. On the same day the Department of State issued a statement that the action of Japan in China was inconsistent with the principles which should govern the relations between nations and was contrary to the Nine-Power Treaty of February 6, 1922, regarding the principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China, and contrary to the Kellogg-Briand Pact."

On page 51 of Peace and War, the first paragraph is as follows:

"PANAY INCIDENT

"On December 12, 1937, the Government and people of the United States were deeply shocked by the news of the bombing and destruction by Japanese aircraft of the United States gunboat *Panay* and three United States merchant vessels on the Yangtze River in China. The bombing and machine-gunning of the crews and passengers resulted in loss of life to citizens of the United States. This Government immediately sent a note to the Japanese Government stating that the United States vessels involved were on the Yangtze River by uncontested and incontestible rights, that they were flying the American flag, and that they were engaged in legitimate and appropriate business. The Government of the United States requested and expected of the Japanese Government 'a formally recorded expression of regret, in undertaking to make complete and comprehensive indemnifications; and an assurance that definite and specific steps have been taken which will insure that hereafter American nationals, interests, and property in China will not be subjected to attack by Japanese armed forces or unlawful interference by any Japanese authorities or forces'."

This attack on the *Panay* occurred on December 12, 1937, and yet for several years after that time we continued to ship Japan iron and steel at a rate of 1,000 percent of normal shipments prior to the enactment of the reciprocal trade-agreements law of 1937.

Would you have believed any administration in the United States could have been so deluded as to continue to supply unlimited amounts of iron and steel to Japan after and in the face of this unwarranted attack upon an American vessel?

You know that no administration in the history of this country would have permitted these shipments to go on unhindered unless Japan either had us bluffed or had us in a corner.

On page 113 of Peace and War, the first paragraph reads as follows:

"Secretary Hull discussed Japan's actions in the Far East, on January 15, 1941, at a hearing of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on the lend-lease bill. The Secretary recounted the various steps in Japan's program of expansion, including the conquest of Manchuria, the denunciation of the Naval Treaty of 1922, the intensified construction of military and naval armaments, and the large-scale military operations against China which had begun in July 1937. He said it was clear that 'Japan has been actuated from the start by broad and ambitious plans for establishing herself in a dominant position in the entire region of the Western Pacific'; that Japan's leaders had openly declared their intention to achieve and maintain that position by force of arms and thus to make themselves masters of an area containing almost one-half of the entire population of the world."

Let us see what was the reason that United States permitted an increase of 1,000 percent in shipments of iron and steel to Japan during the very years that the Secretary of State says he knew that Japan was preparing for war of aggression to bring all that portion of the world under Japanese domination.

Turn to page 87 of Peace and War and read the last pargraph:

"As evidence accumulated of the endangering of American lives, the destruction of American property, and the violation of American rights and interests by Japanese authorities or Japanese-sponsored agents in China, and after diplomatic representations had failed to effect a substantial alleviation of the situation, further consideration was given to the possibility of commercial retaliation against Japan. It was felt that the 1911 commercial treaty between the United States and Japan was not affording adequate protection to American commerce either in Japan or in Japanese-occupied portions of China, while at the same time the operations of the most-favored-nation clause of the treaty was a bar to the adoption of retaliatory measures against Japanese commerce. Consequently, in July 1939 this Government gave notice of termination of that treaty at the end of the 6-month period prescribed by the treaty. That termination removed the legal obstacle to an embargo by the United States upon the shipment of materials to Japan."

It is evident from the above paragraph of peace and war that the treaty between the United States and Japan of 1911 was the club which Japan held over our heads.

There was nothing, however, in the treaty of 1911 which committed us to increase shipments of iron and steel to Japan 1,000 percent.

Why then, did the treaty of 1911 with Japan amount to a club over our heads, which made compulsory these shipments of iron and steel to an aggressor nation?

Why in particular did we ship iron and steel to an aggressor nation whose very geographical location made it inevitable that the United States would be involved in any war of aggression on an unlimited scale which might be launched by Japan?

The Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act of 1937 provided among other things that any concession made to any one most-favored-nation would apply equally to any other most-favored-nation.

Our commercial treaty of 1911 with Japan constituted Japan a most-favored-nation.

Under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1937, Japan automatically became the beneficiary of other trade agreements with other most-favored-nations.

The international traders and influences who were profiting because of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements were not willing to forego their profits in international trade in order to avoid the necessity of this country supplying iron and steel to Japan.

An internationalist cannot be a patriot. In the very nature of things, an internationalist must put his own business above the interest and welfare and peace of any one nation.

On page 93 of Peace and War the last four lines are as follows:

"After it was announced in September that the export of iron and steel scrap would be prohibited, Japanese Ambassador Horinouchi protested to Secretary Hull on October 8, 1940, that this might be considered an 'unfriendly act.' "

The record shows that our shipments of 2,000,000 tons per year of iron and steel to Japan continued through October 16, 1940.

These reciprocal trade agreements have forced us to arm our enemy for a world war in one instance. It is only fair to suppose that the reenactment of this law by Congress at this time may well involve us in wars to come.

The meeting in San Francisco and world plans for peace are doomed if this country is committed to a policy of free trade and low prices before we have an opportunity to reduce our national debt and stabilize our money to prevent this wild inflation which is now knocking at our gate.

This country is in just as great danger today from inflation and panic as was the danger of our military unpreparedness on December 7, 1941.

For 4 years we have made a superhuman effort to overcome the danger which we faced in December 1941. For the next 4 years we must make an equal superhuman effort to overcome the danger to our internal economy. This we cannot do with low prices, and we will have low prices if we have low tariffs or free trade.

On April 21, 1945, this Government held gold in the amount of $20,375,011,829.91.

After shipment of some thirty-odd billion dollars in lend-ease to our allies we now owe our allies $6,000,000,000 in gold. This reduced our actual gold assets to $14,000,000,000.

Under the Bretton Woods agreement, it is proposed that we shall donate another $4,000,000,000 in gold to an international fund to stabilize the money of the world.

If we do this, we will be undertaking to do for the world what we are at present utterly incapable of doing for ourselves—that is, to stabilize our money.

If an additional $4,000,000,000 is transferred to an international fund, then our gold assets will be reduced to $10,000,000,000.

In 1932 the total of outstanding money or medium of exchange, including coins, was, in round figures, $6,000,000,000.

At that time the Government was substantially out of debt. At that time $6,000,000,000 in money would have been stable with or without gold reserve because of what then appeared to be the unlimited assets behind our Nation's money.

It is true at that time there was not enough money in circulation. The limited amount of money available was largely responsible for the condition in which we found ourselves during the years 1930, 1931, and 1932. That fact is beside the point at this time. The point was that we had sound money.

In 1944 our circulating medium or money had increased to $27,000,000,000—an increase of almost 500 percent. Our gold reserve behind this money had been reduced to 40 percent in some cases and 35 percent in some cases.

Under Senate bill 510, which is now pending, it is proposed, and actually it is necessary under the circumstances, to reduce this gold reserve to 25 percent, or 25 cents on the dollar on our outstanding medium of exchange or money.

I have never been an advocate of the gold standard. I have never been an advocate of the idea that sound money was necessarily based on gold or any other metal. I have been an advocate of the idea that money was as sound as the Government which issued that money, and I still believe in the soundness of this doctrine.

If our Government today were as free of debt as it was in 1932, if its assets were unencumbered and unspent, then we could sustain a floating medium of exchange of $27,000,000,000 without serious threat of inflation.

However, the picture had entirely changed, and our money today is being based not on the assets of the Government or its ability to pay, but our money is actually being issued on the Government's inability to pay.

It is based on Government bonds which have been issued to the extent, as I understand it, of $300,000,000,000.

We now have in round figures $300,000,000,000 of outstanding bonds and $27,000,000,000 of outstanding money or circulating medium, including coin.

As the gold reserve is reduced and as the bonded debt of the Government increases, our circulating medium is based not on an asset, but on a liability.

As the war comes to an end, as Government spending recedes as it must, regardless of the wishes of Congress, the administration or anyone else, it will be imperative to issue national circulating medium in lieu of billions of dollars of outstanding bonds as well as to carry on necessary Government expenditures.

In view of the above stated facts, it does not require a seer or a Solomon to see that this Nation is now on the brink of the wildest money inflation imaginable.

If through our failure to avert this danger the country is plunged into inflation, we will have broken faith with every bond holder in the United States.

What is worse we will have broken faith with every man who has served in the armed forces in this great conflict, but above all, we will have broken faith with those who died to preserve this country from destruction.

Unless the Congress and the Chief Executive take immediate cognizance of this situation, and unless immediate action is initiated to meet this dire threat, then it will not for long matter what you do with regard to this so-called reciprocal trade agreements bill.

The signs of this condition into which we are now entering can be seen on every hand. There are a great many people who fear inflation, but many of these people have the illogical idea that they, as individuals, can escape the evil influence of inflation if they have their assets in cash. Many people do not realize that cash is the very thing that is most affected by inflation. As a result of this fear of inflation, it is a matter of common knowledge among people who are in position to know, that hundreds of millions of dollars in cash is being tucked away in lock boxes and in secret hiding places.

There are, of course, many persons who imagine that we can carry a three- or four-hundred-billion-dollar debt indefinitely with the payment of a normal price. If such were the case, then indeed the world would be Utopia.

If it were possible for a man or nation to spend all they have and then continue to enjoy it by the payment of a nominal fee we would have found out actually how to have our cake and eat it, too.

This debt cannot be carried indefinitely for the reason that outstanding bonds are short-term bonds generally. It cannot be carried indefinitely for the reason that outstanding bonds are not in the hands of private parties. Outstanding bonds are largely held by the banks of the country.

These bonds in the hands of banks have largely replaced the moneys belonging to the depositors in those banks. These banks have simply substituted Government bonds for their depositors' money.

Under the F. D. I. C., the Government guarantees every dollar of these depositors' money. When these depositors call on the banks for their money the Government must see that the depositors get their money instead of bonds. The only possible way the Government can pay these depositors off is by printing some more money and substituting this inflated money in the bank in place of the Government bonds which the banks now hold.

It should be obvious to any thinking person that this creates a situation which is dangerous in the extreme. It should be clear that our entire national monetary and economic system is "riding on a wing and a prayer."

This special trade treaty which is just a subterfuge and a camouflage for free trade is the match that will set off this powder keg.

For this Nation, at this time, to enter into a program of low prices is just a form of national economic hara-kiri.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

There is but one course of action, to my mind, that would be prudent under conditions which face us today. This course of action has been set out in the program presented to you by the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, which is fully concurred in by the association, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture; that course of action is necessary and imperative if we are to keep the "Old Ship of State" on an even keel and ride out the storm which is before us.

That course of action is not only inconsistent with reduced tariffs and free trade, but it is impossible of attainment under anything approaching free trade conditions.

The only prudent course that we can follow is to maintain high prices in every line. High wages, high salaries, high-priced commodities, high raw products, and high everything.

We must maintain the national income as high in peacetimes, without Government spending, as it has been in wartime, with unprecedented Government spending. If we maintain a national income of $150,000,000,000 outside of Goverment spending and then collect Federal taxes amounting to one-third of this national income we would have a national revenue of $50,000,000,000 per year.

If we assure that the total cost of Government operation, including provisions for our veterans and all other purposes, will amount to $25,000,000,000 per year, then we would have only $25,000,000,000 left with which to pay the interest and principal on the national debt. Remember it must cost many billions per year to maintain our armies in Europe and Asia. Remember this must be continued for a long number of years.

If we assume it would be possible to finance the national debt, including interest, for $5,000,000,000 per year this would leave only the amount of $20,000,000,000 per year to apply on the principal.

If we assume that the national debt will be $400,000,000,000 by the time Japan is defeated our armies disbanded, it does not take a mathematician to figure out that it will be 20 years, with the people paying one-third of their income as Federal taxes, to pay this war debt. And this is on the assumption that the national income will be $150,000,000,000.

Remember also that the taxpayers, after paying one-third their income to the Federal Government, must still support their State, county and municipal governments.

After this war debt is paid off in 20 years, with the people paying one-third of their income to the Federal Government, all of us who are now middle aged and over will be passed on to the Great Beyond before this country can be freed once more.

Recember, too, that the $25,000,000,000 principal allowed for Government spending will not begin to suffice if we are to maintain large standing armies in Europe and Asia during the coming years. That alone will cost $25,000,000,000 to say nothing of other national expenditures.

If, on the other hand, we permit prices to fall, the wage scale to go down, salaries to go down, commodities and farm prices to go down, and economic assistance to an army of unemployed, then our national income instead of being $150,000,000,000 will be seventy-five billion or possibly only fifty billion.

If our national income should fall to $50,000,000,000 it would be necessary to tax the American people 100 percent of their income simply to carry on.

If this so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were entitled: "A bill to provide for a tax on the American working people to the extent of one-half of their income to pay for free American goods to other countries," not a man on this committee would vote for a measure that carried such a title.

If this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were entitled: "An act to provide that every holder of an American obligation shall receive the amount he now holds of American obligations but shall be paid with inflated money," not a member of this committee of Congress would cast a vote in its favor.

If this reciprocal trade agreements bill were entitled: "A bill to require all the working people in America to labor one-half of all their time for the next hundred years without compensation," not a member of this committee of Congress would cast a vote for it.

Not a man in the House or Senate would vote for a bill carrying either of the above captions, and yet, the effect on the American people would be the same in bills carrying such captions as it will be, in the long run, if we persist in following the phantom of world free trade.

In all of the testimony heard by your committee the most vital effect of this kind of legislation has been entirely overlooked insofar as I know.

The most vital effect of legislation of this character is to take away from the American working people, in industry and on the farm, the pay to which they are entitled for their sweat and toil.

Whether or not a few international traders in the United States and foreign countries are able to make money out of these international treaties is entirely beside the point.

Whether or not a few exporters and importers of Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Mexico, and other nations will have a monetary interest in preserving peace with the United States is entirely beside the point.

A peace that must be purchased at the price of slavery of the American working people is bondage.

The Pharaohs of Egypt and the children of Israel lived without open war for 400 years, but the Israelites enjoyed this peace at the price of slavery to the Egyptians.

Undoubtedly each and every member of this committee, and each and every Member of the Senate and House, must know that free trade means low prices. That it means low prices in industry as well as on the farm.

Many leaders of labor, capital, and politics in the industrial sections of the Nation seem to have an idea that they can have low farm prices by free trade through the reciprocal tariff route and still maintain high prices in industry and business.

This is simply wishful thinkng. It cannot be done because of natural laws over which the Congress and Executive have no power. You cannot repeal them nor amend them.

SEVEN-TO-ONE RATIO

In a complete economy, with its complexities of production, transportation, processing, and distribution, when you fix the price of the raw materials—agricultural, mining, forests, etc.—you automatically fix the national income.

If the farmers of the Nation receive $20,000,000,000 in peacetimes, the national income will be $140,000,000,000. If your farmers and miners together receive $28,000,000,000, your national income will be $140,000,000,000.

Seven times the farm income is the national income. Five times the farm income and mine income is your national income.

This is not a theory. It is a business principle which works. It is not a theory by an academic economist whose theories do not have to pan out. It is a fixed practice some of the largest business institutions in America use who have to buy for future sales.

These big business houses place their orders a year ahead for sales based on a national income that is calculated by the amount of money the farmers and miners receive during the preceding 12 months. If the place of purchasing these raw products is moved out of the Continental United States it will not affect the operation of this natural law. If the farmers here in the United States receive $20,000,000,000 your national income will be $140,000,000,000.

If, on the other hand, instead of paying the farmer here in the United States $20,000,000,000, you go to South America, the East Indies, and other countries and buy exactly the same amount of the same farm products for $10,000,000,000, you will have apparently saved $10,000,000,000. But this is only half the story. The sad part of the story is that in your 12 months' cycle this $10,000,000,000 in foreign products will turn into a national income of only $70,000,000,000.

If you pay $20,000,000,000 to the farmer your income will be $140,000,000,000. If you pay $10,000,000,000 to the foreign farmer your national income will be $70,000,000,000.

It is very simple. If a merchant buys a pair of shoes for $5 and makes 25 percent profit he makes $1.25. If, on the other hand, he pays $10 for the pair of shoes and makes 25 percent, he makes $2.50 profit.

The same thing happens to a nation on the farmers' income. If the nation buys a farmer's crop for $10,000,000,000, they make $60,000,000,000 profit on it. If the nation buys the farmers' crop for $20,000,000,000, the nation makes $120,000,000,000 on it.

I note that the War Labor Board has recently been given authority to still further increase industrial wages.

Increasing industrial wages and, at the same time, attempting to lower farm prices and prices in general with trade treaties is inconsistent and must prove fatal to our national economy.

Sic Transit Gloria Mundi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mussolini from the world scene marks, we hope, the end of an era. When we toppled these sawdust Caesars from their papier mâché thrones and isolated them from their gingerbread edifices of statecraft, we have reached a significant milestone on the thorny path of the world's progress.

Well do I recall, Mr. Speaker, during the twenties, the vast number of American tourists who, upon returning from a visit to the Peninsula of Italy, would extoll the virtues of this autohypnotic chest thumper.

It has always seemed to me that one who could view the world with dispassionate eyes could penetrate through the aura assumed by Mussolini. Anybody who gazed upon this incredible creature and noted the manner in which his jaw was thrust out belligerently would know that he was psychopathic personality. Psychiatrists and psychologists readily classify individuals who fall within the well-defined Mussolini categories. There are many paranoiacs in the world.

An editorial in one of the two daily newspapers in my home town of Tacoma, Wash., sums up the situation very well.

This editorial provides one of the most trenchant appraisals of Mussolini and his era I have yet seen. Here it is:

[From the Tacoma News Tribune of May 1, 1945]

MUSSOLINI'S END

"Imperious Caesar, dead and turned to clay, might stop a hole to keep the wind away." So wrote Shakespeare many decades ago describing the death of the ancient Roman dictator. The assassination of the despot who ended the Roman Republic and began the empire, has intrigued historians for more than 2,000 years.

Benito Mussolini, in his days of power, liked to think of himself as a modern prototype of the ancient Caesar. He strutted and grimaced in a fashion that would have shocked the original Julius but he aped the symbols and revived the Caesarian traditions. He called the Mediterranean as did Caesar: Mare noster—"our sea" and tried to recreate the old empire. But his death was even more ignominious than his ancient predecessor.

According to authenticated reports from Milan, Mussolini was fleeing with his young mistress and 17 Fascist leaders to the Swiss border when he was taken prisoner by Italian patriots. He was held in prison overnight and executed the next morning, passing away like the craven coward that he was. The man who had sent thousands of others to execution including his own son-in-law, was not able to die like a man, but screamed: "No, no!" to the firing squad as the bullet that killed him entered the back of his head in the fashion decreed by Italian law for traitors.

Mussolini's favorite device was to leave the bodies of his victims on exhibition in public squares to terrorize his subjects. So the Italians for a day left the corpse of the former dictator hanging in a public exhibition that for sheer barbarity reminds one of the brutalities of the Dark Ages.

It was a horrible and dramatic end for the man whose example inspired Hitler and who started the world on the mad course of events which have resulted in the greatest catastrophe that Eurpoe has ever seen.

Mussolini's fate is symbolic. As one Rome editorial writer commented: "With the death of Mussolini, disappears the most evident incarnation of the evil of the century."

Now that Mussolini has gone, what of Hitler? This neurotic weakling, whom fate permitted to wield unprecedented power, approaches an equally inglorious end in the final hour of his life. Whether he is alive or dead, whether he is hidden in some Bavarian cavern or is suffering in a mental hospital, or has fled, is variously reported. Hitler has always been in fear of his life. He has had doubles trained to talk and act as he does, with physical characteristics so similar that only intimates can tell them apart.

Perhaps Hitler is already dead and one of these doubles takes his place. Perhaps the real fuehrer has gone to some neutral country and the body of his double may be exhibited as proof that he is dead. Whether he dies now by his own hand, which would be the manlier way, or dangles from the gallows as he so richly deserves, Adolf and his gang are finished. In a few more days or weeks they will no longer cumber the earth and the world will be cleansed of their horrors.

The chapter now ending is one of the most incredible passages of human history. For thousands of years civilized men may ponder the mystery of how such low and vicious criminals as Hitler and Mussolini could "so get the start of the majestic world and bear the palm alone."

The President's Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the memory of all mothers, I want to call attention to the editorial from the Washington Evening Star on Mother's Day, 1945, titled "The President's Mother," which follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MOTHER

When Mrs. Martha Truman was a little girl Abraham Lincoln was President. She has lived through an age of wonders since then—the railroads lacing the continent, the coming of the telephone, the invention of the electric light, the debut of the automobile, the development of the radio, the birth of aviation, and any number of other marvels that have revolutionized the life of America and the world. Ninety-two years old, she has seen so much happen in her time that precious little can surprise her now. Yet even she, despite all her rich and eventful years, must find it a truly wonderful thing that today—after her first trip by plane, on her first visit to Washington—she is stopping at the White House as the Nation's most distinguished mother. Pierce was living there when she was born, and after him Buchanan, and then Lincoln, and then Johnson, and then Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, and now her own son Harry. This

is an American story. Nothing quite like it could take place anywhere but in our country. All hail to this remarkable, bright-eyed lady who says "Fiddlesticks!" to people who naturally make a fuss over her.

Political Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint statement made by Representatives of the Legislature of Puerto Rico before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. This statement was unanimously presented by a delegation from the Legislature of Puerto Rico which included representatives from all the island political parties, and was headed by the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, president of the Senate of Puerto Rico. It was made pursuant to a joint resolution of the Puerto Rican Legislature, also unanimously approved, to bring before this Congress a petition of self-determination.

I urge that special consideration and thought be given to this statement, since it represents the expressed desire of the people of Puerto Rico, with regards to political status and to the method of approach to that problem. When the statement was read before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, during the hearings held on May 7, 1945, in connection with S. 227, the chairman, the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS, said:

I think that this is an intelligent presentation from both the Puerto Rican and the American standpoint. It is as fair a statement as any that I have heard during the whole discussion of the independence bill, or any other bill.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN

The undersigned joint commission of the Legislature of Puerto Rico represents all political parties and its conclusions, contained herein, have been unanimously adopted.

We hold that the colonial form of government which now prevails in Puerto Rico is contrary to the democratic rights of our people and to the democratic tradition of the United States.

We therefore believe that a prompt and satisfactory settlement should be made as to the permanent political status of Puerto Rico. Such settlement should be made democratically on the basis of self-determination. Such is our mandate from the people and the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

In pursuance of this end we respectfully request the Congress of the United States that it submit to a referendum of the people of Puerto Rico the different forms of permanent political status that the Congress may be willing to establish in Puerto Rico. We request that such forms of political status be submitted in the detailed form in which the Congress feels that it could establish any of them which should receive the favorable vote of a majority of our people.

In fairness to all sections of opinion in Puerto Rico it is our request that all forms of political status that may have some support among Puerto Ricans be submitted. Broadly speaking, the forms of political status that have support in public opinion are independence, statehood, and a form of dominion government based on full and final political rights.

We submit that under any political status that may be finally established certain minimum economic conditions must be met, if chaos, through a total disintegration of civilized life in the island, is to be averted. We equally recognize that if the legitimate interests of the United States are to be fully protected, military establishments and rights must be permanently enjoyed by the United States in Puerto Rico. The United States Government will, of course, counsel and determine what these military establishments and rights should be.

We hereby express our conclusions as to the minimum economic conditions referred to. They are:

1. Free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States, limited from time to time by bilateral agreement;

2. Exemption of Puerto Rican exports to the United States from internal-revenue taxes provided that Puerto Rico collects export taxes on such products at the same rates that the United States imposes or may at any time impose on such products;

3. Maintenance for a suitable time of conditions for cane farmers now established by United States law; and

4. Temporary continuance of other grants and aids to Puerto Rico, these to be discontinued as productivity and commerce reach certain agreed levels.

If, as we hope, Congress should accede to our people's request that alternatives be submitted to their choice in accordance with the principle of self-determination, the bill now being considered (S. 227) could be one of those alternatives, and as such it could command substantial public support if amended to meet these minimum conditions necessary for survival.

The close relationship of the United States to our island during almost half a century, the development of our economy under American norms and legislation during that time, the responsibility assumed thereby by the United States, fully warrant, in our view, that such minimum economic conditions be recognized under any permanent form of government that the Congress of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico may democratically work out and establish.

Fundamental economic realities in Puerto Rico—small territory, small extent of usable land therein, large population, scarce natural resources—make such conditions for economic subsistence and development an irreducible minimum for the maintenance of modest civilized life and of a stable and orderly government in Puerto Rico.

Luis Muñoz Marín, Ernesto Ramos Antonini, Leopoldo Figueroa, Celestino Iriarte, Ernesto Cádiz, Rafael Arrillaga Torrens, Bolívar Pagán, Samuel R. Quiñones, Antonio Pacheco Padró.

It is signed by the full membership of the Commission, which is myself, Luis Muñoz Marín, Mr. Bolívar Pagán, senator, of the Socialist Party and former Resident Commissioner; Mr. Ernesto Ramos Antonini of the House of Representatives; Dr. Leopoldo Figueroa speaking for the Republican Party; Mr. Ernesto Cádiz, representative for the Liberal Party; Mr. Samuel R. Quiñones, Vice President of the Senate, the Popular Party; Dr. R. Arrillaga Torrens, Member of the House, Popular Party; Mr. Celestino Iriarte, Chairman of the Republican Party and Member of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; and Mr. Pacheco Padró, Member of the House of Representatives, all members of this Joint Legislative Commission.

Green Be Their Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bryan (Ohio) Press, listing these heroes of this great world conflict, shows graphically that our people need no propaganda, no synthetic treatment to make them realize there is a war on:

GREEN BE THEIR MEMORY

In this war Williams County has lost 59 young men killed, 9 missing, 25 prisoners of war, and over 170 wounded out of 2,102 who entered the armed service of their country. In a sense, this is a breathing space in the war, a time of memorial for those who have died. Their survivors must determine to have as unfaltering a resolution in the field, though they may pray that it have a happier issue.

In the words of Thucydides, these men failed not to deprive their country of their valor, but laid it at her feet as the most glorious contribution they could offer. And for this offering of their lives, they, each of them individually, received that renown that never grows old, and, for a sepulcher, not so much that in which their bones have been deposited, but that noblest of all shrines wherein their glory is laid up to be eternally remembered upon every occasion on which deed or story shall call for its commemoration. For heroes have the whole earth for their tomb; and in lands far from their own, where the cross with its epitaph declares it, there is enshrined in every breast a record unwritten, with no tablet to preserve it except that of the heart. For men of spirit who rightly judge happiness to be the fruit of freedom, and freedom of valor, may never decline the dangers of war, but rather invite that unfelt death that strikes them in the midst of their strength and patriotism.

THE LIST OF DEAD

Lloyd Clark, Jr., Montpelier, killed in France, November 22, 1944.

Corp. Charles Butzin, Montpelier, killed in France November 22, 1944.

Lt. Thomas Roberts, Montpelier, died on flight in New Guinea, January 12, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Earl W. Hart, Bridgewater, killed in Germany, December 1, 1944.

Lt. Don Neff, Pioneer, shot down over Bremen, Germany, December 17, 1943.

Andrew Hornyak, fireman, second class, Bryan, drowned on Destroyer *Hoel* in the Battle of the Philippines, October 25, 1944.

First Lt. John W. Ingram, Edon, shot down over Berlin, Germany, May 24, 1944.

First Lt. Stanley Throne, Bryon, killed in England, February 1945.

Pvt. Darwin Hemenway, killed in marine invasion of the Marshall Islands, January 31, 1944.

T-Corp. Jack Yoder, Edgerton, killed in France, February 1945.

Pvt. Monroe "Pete" Shouf, Bryan, died in France, February 1945.

T-5 Warren Custar, Montpelier, killed in Luxembourg, December 31, 1944.

T-5 Rex Rutledge, West Unity, killed in Belgium, January 13, 1945.

James B. Wallace, seamen, third class, Bryan, drowned at sea April 13, 1945.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Arthur Woolf, Montpelier route, killed in Germany, April 15, 1945.

T-5 Albert J. Fenicle, Kunkle, killed on Luzon, January 10, 1945.

Pvt. Lester Zeigler, Blakeslee, killed on Luzon, March 17, 1945.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Arthur Hemenway, Edgerton route two, killed in Belgium, December 7, 1944.

Clyde Ridenour, Jr., Bryan, at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Lemuel Johnson, Edgerton, off Java, February 19, 1942.

Capt. Richard Miller, Montpelier, off Newfoundland, April 1, 1942.

Joe Atis 3d, Bryan, down off Gibraltar, July 1942.

Sgt. Lavere Sharp, Northwest township, New Guinea, December 28, 1942.

Lt. Laverne Tingle, Montpelier, plane crash in New Mexico, January 29, 1943.

Lt. Ervil Eyster, Edon, over Europe, April 4, 1943.

Corp. Maurice Kosier, Kunkle, crashed in India, September 1943.

Carl Welly, Edgerton, died in camp, June 18, 1943.

Sgt. Frank Myers, Bryan, died in Africa, September 9, 1943.

Pvt. (1st Cl.) Raymond Calvin, Bryan Route 3. Tarawa, November 20, 1943.

Technician (5th Gr.) Clinton Wheeler, Pioneer Route I, Italy, February 4, 1944.

Lt. Doyle Zimmerman, Montpelier, crashed in Yugoslavia, March 24, 1944.

Lt. Jack Laws Buda, Edgerton, Hollandia, New Guinea, April 28, 1944.

Pvt. (1st Cl.) Gerald Weber, Melbourn, Italy, May 17, 1944.

Ensign Robert Munk, Pioneer, airplane crash in South Carolina, May 1944.

Lt. James Sanders, Bryan, shot down over Germany May 25, 1944.

Sgt. Orland Mixter, Bryan, Marshall Island campaign, 1944.

Staff Sgt. James Boucher, Bryan, shot down over Germany, April 29, 1944.

Sgt. Richard Gabriel, Montpelier, unreported on flight to Latin America, March 24, 1943.

Master Sgt. Paul D. Zigler, Montpelier, France, June 6, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Maurice Lovejoy, Bryan, Saipan, July 1944.

Pvt. Paul E. Johnson, Montpelier, France, July 4, 1944.

Lt. Richard Breininger, Montpelier, France, July 20, 1944.

Lt. Richard Wilhelm, Bryan, France, July 12, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Kenneth Cunningham, Montpelier, route 3, Saipan, July 12, 1944.

Corp. Jack Phillips, Bryan, Italy, February 11, 1944.

Pvt. Carmon Thorp, North Bridgewater, France, July 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Richard Moore, Montpelier, France, July 12, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl Burkhart, Bryan, France, August 13, 1944.

Pvt. Raymond Coon, Bridgewater Township, France, August 1944.

Hillard Rogers, Pioneer, died at Great Lakes Naval Station, September 1944.

Corp. Burl Knapp, Jr., Edon, France, August 25, 1944.

Lt. Harold McFann, Jr., Montpelier, crashed in California, September 29, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Warren U. Mills, Montpelier, Holland, September 18, 1944.

Lt. Walter Shambarger, Montpelier, shot down over Germany, July 7, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Perry D. Hopkins, Edon, France, September 8, 1944.

Pvt. (1st cl.) John King, Alvordton, Pacific theater, 1944.

Sgt. Daniel Kuszmaul, Bryan, Holland, September 19, 1944.

Sgt. Chares W. Buda, Bryan, route 3, shot down over Germany, October 7, 1944.

Richard Henry Johnston, Bryan, route 3, gunners' mate, third class, November 1944.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the delicate and important problem of Presidential succession was discussed on May 9 at the annual meeting of the Hazleton, (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce by the Honorable James A. Farley. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I need hardly say how glad I am to have an opportunity to see and talk with my friends in Hazleton and in this part of your great State. Every time I visit with you Pennsylvanians I learn more than I impart. Tonight's experience will be the same, I am sure, as I raise with you one or two questions for your consideration.

At the outset we would all want to refer to the fact that we are meeting in the shadow of a great tragedy—in the personal sense, the national sense, and the international sense. Yet the passing of our President and Commander in Chief, deeply as it shook us, gave opportunity for a demonstration of the strength of character of our people and of the solidity of our institutions. The passage of the enormous powers of the Presidency was accomplished without panic, without the issuance of emergency orders, without any of the incidents that such a transition would cause in a less stable nation. We already think of President Truman as our leader who is entitled to call upon us for our utmost in the desperate phases of war still before us. We will give him our best.

And the manner of his coming to office is a sober reminder of the fact that though we may choose a President we cannot know that under the will of divine providence he will be allowed to complete his term. Seven times in our short history the Vice President has succeeded to the highest office because of the death of the man the people had selected as President. It is interesting to note that of six previous successor Presidents four did not at the expiration of the interim term offer themselves for election for a regular term. Two were later elected for a regular term when they ran for President after having served an interim period.

Here is the record, known to all of us:

John Tyler succeeded William Henry Harrison in 1841. He did not become President.

Eight years later Millard Fillmore, of New York, succeeded Zachary Taylor. He did not go on.

Then came the immortal Lincoln, who left his chair to Andrew Johnson. Johnson fought the Congress and was lucky to serve out Lincoln's term.

Now we move to James A. Garfield, who was succeeded by another New Yorker, Chester A. Arthur, after Garfield was assassinated in 1881. Arthur's political career stopped at the end of Garfield's original term.

Thus, we have completed the record of four Vice Presidents who did not go on under their own power.

The third Presidential assassination and fifth succession occurred in 1901. McKinley was shot at Buffalo. Theodore Roosevelt succeeded him and then went on to be elected in his own right in 1904—the first time a Vice President who had succeeded by death had been elected for a regular term.

We come to 1923, when President Harding died and Vice President Coolidge succeeded him. President Coolidge had touched the public imagination, and he was elected, traveling under his own steam, in 1924.

Now what of the history of our Vice Presidents?

Thirty-four times the people have filled the second highest office in the land by election and 15 times that office has become vacant. In addition to the gap left by the 7 Vice Presidential successions to the Presidency, at 8 other times the country has been without a Vice President because 7 Vice Presidents have died in office and 1—John C. Calhoun—resigned to become a Senator from his native State, South Carolina.

This may be an appropriate time to review the grave problems involved in the ever-present possibility that death may strike down a President or a nominee before his election; and my thinking has led me to submit to you a suggestion in which I deeply believe and which I bring forward for your most serious consideration.

Under the Constitution, of course, the Vice President succeeds in the event of removal, death, resignation, or inability to perform Presidential duties. And under the same paragraph of the Constitution the Congress may by law provide for the situation that would be presented if a succeeding Vice President likewise were to be removed, to die, to resign, or become incapacitated. The present statute in this respect was enacted in 1886 and provides that the Secretary of State is next in succession, and after him in series the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy and finally the Secretary of the Interior—in short, for a Cabinet succession based on seniority among the departments.

But this raises a question. Under our present method, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate. In his case, a vacancy caused by his death, resignation, or removal, is filled, as I have stated, by the Secretary of State whom he appoints, subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible short-circuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved.

There are other aspects to the problem of succession which have never been worked out by law. Under the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, commonly known as the Norris amendment, the choosing of a President in the case of the death of both a President-elect and a Vice President-elect before they take office apparently devolves upon the House of Representatives. The same amendment provides that the House meet on January 3 and that the Presidential inauguration occur on January 20, or 17 days later. In this instance we are faced with a real possibility of confusion. If the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should both die before January 20, there is now no provision, either in the Constitution or in the Federal Statutes, which would provide for a successor to the highest office in the land. Presumably the House-elect meeting on January 3 could pass some kind of a law of succession to meet the emergency, but here once more another real possibility arises. If the House-elect should be closely divided in its membership—so closely divided that a deadlock might result—then conceivably the date of January 20 might arrive and pass while the House fought over the question of control. The appalling result would be that from January 20 until such time as the deadlock was broken this country would be with-

out a Chief Executive. There are Members of Congress who are aware of this situation and they have considered a bill in the past which would provide that the Speaker of the House would become President. But, as has been pointed out, this would not remove the possibility—in fact, it might increase it—that a paralyzing deadlock in the organization of the House would occur for such a period as to leave this Nation for a time without a President.

I, therefore, think that a special commission should now be set up, composed of Members of the Senate and of the House and with one or more members appointed by the President and perhaps one Supreme Court Justice selected by the Chief Justice. There might be other groups which should be associated with the work of such a commission. This commission should study and recommend with respect to the whole problem of the succession to the Presidency, including the succession after the Vice President, which now is in the Secretary of State. If a constitutional amendment is called for, it should be initiated. If legislation alone is called for, this body should suggest such legislation. It seems to me common sense and governmental wisdom to study this question now and to act as soon as we wisely can.

I now turn to a topic always of interest in a State with Pennsylvania's vast manufactures and trade. I want to discuss with you for a few minutes what our postwar interests are in this respect. It seems to me that it will be upon the margin represented by foreign trade after the war that national prosperity or depression will depend. And considering the vast necessities that will be present in this country for employment, for goods and for the use of a great industrial plant, our margin of foreign trade, while relatively small, will be the critical balance on which our well-being may well depend.

I am not going to indulge in prophecies about the amount of our foreign trade after the war. There are many such estimates—some modest, some utterly too hopeful. But what we know is that in the business that will follow this war, foreign trade is certain to play a very large part. The important thing is not to indulge ourselves in estimates, but to set to work now to develop the changed national viewpoint which will make a large increase in foreign trade possible. That is a task to which business, labor, and Government can well devote their united strength.

It is a hopeful sign that in both political parties there is developing an increasing interest in foreign trade and, in consequence, a recognition that the modern position of the United States in the world makes it necessary that we reconsider many of the tariff policies of the past. Under the great leadership of Secretary Cordell Hull, this change of attitude has taken form in our reciprocal trade policy. That policy was sound, but in its beginning it was experimental, tentative, and modest. But now that American prejudices in favor of higher tariffs are subsiding before the great facts of American efficiency and necessities, we may more resolutely proceed in the direction of enlarging our imports. A test of opinion on this subject will come within a few weeks when the reciprocal trade agreements are submitted for congressional action. If the above is close, it may mean that the administration will hesitate to move resolutely toward a larger exchange of goods. If the vote is by a wide margin, we may expect sentiment in both parties to move progressively toward a real reconsideration of our tariff policies.

We hear a good deal about increasing our exports, but not so much about the necessity of imports. It is time for a considerable change in this emphasis, if we are to take steps in the direction of making it possible to liquidate our prospective postwar loans.

But in our preparations for postwar responsibilities, we must break off the habit of delay. Too much of our financial machinery consists of an apparatus for putting things off. A great part of our credit system consists of means of postponing payments through notes, mortgages, and the like. The financing of foreign trade seems to be arranged in the same spirit of delay. And in that trade the parties are farther apart. Decisions are postponed, procrastination governs our actions, and all too often we postpone settlements until they can no longer be made without defaults. These delays in the past, which were largely due to the complicated machinery of international finance, resulted in some very serious international problems. The weight of our trade balances became so heavy that collapse finally resulted. Depression swept the world, and war came in its wake. There is nothing new in this deadly cycle. Philip II of Spain long ago decided to have done with all of the financial machinery involved in his foreign borrowings and he simply repudiated, throwing weaker countries into chaos and ruin.

The danger of postponing settlements in foreign trade is similar to the old habit of long delayed reparations after a war. The fact is that the longer actual payments of reparations are deferred the greater the danger is that no reparations will be paid.

We must, as Americans, resolve to walk squarely up to these questions of how we are going to be paid for our exports and face them honestly. Republican Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, gave some sound advice to his party in a speech in January. He said, "If we are going to sell abroad, we must buy abroad." And I would add to this statement of Senator WHERRY that if we are going to lend abroad, we must accept goods from abroad.

We are going to need more from the rest of the world than we have ever needed before. We have scraped to the bottom of the barrel in many of our resources. Some of our resources of which we still have considerable quantities, such as our forests, might well be given a rest in order that they may grow again. We shall have to import more zinc and lead, more iron, petroleum, and timber. The development of our new industries which will follow the war will require much more of materials than we have, in the past, imported in small quantities, such as manganese, nickel, wool, vegetable oils and oil seeds, pulp and paper. The list is extensive and impressive.

There are a few items, such as rubber, of course, in which the process will be reversed, but the trend will be toward large import of raw materials.

We will have to do some importing of things that we shall need for essential defense, such as the elements necessary for steel alloys. Our stock piles should be here and not in Arabia or Central Africa.

There are other offsets to trade—things which have traditionally helped us to balance our accounts. There is foreign travel, for example. There will be more of that. There will be foreign investments which leave money abroad. All these factors will still leave room for greater imports of luxuries and goods of general utility, and our tariffs always must be adjusted to take account of them.

But the greatest necessary adjustment must be in our thinking. The great argument for high tariffs in the past has rested on the fallacious belief that there is just so much work to go around. Our thinking on this subject has looked upon work as a constant and sterile substance which, having been measured and weighed, need not be measured and weighed again. But the amount of work in the world is not a sterile and unchangeable commodity; it is a vital organism capable of growth. We shall have to revise the thinking on the basis of which we have sought shortcuts to limited employment, such as shorter workweeks and other share-the-work plans. We shall have to revise the belief, so widely prevalent in this country, that if somebody else makes any kind of goods which can be made here, then somebody here loses his job.

It is time that we realize that there is no limit to the quantity of the many things we could import and consume in this country, and, on the other hand, that there is no limit to the amount of goods in the production of which we unquestionably excell—goods that are made in accordance with the highest standards of efficiency the world has ever seen.

If we are going to bring about this readjustment of trade, of our laws governing trade and of our past and obsolete thinking which lies behind those laws, the time to do it is when European production is being slowly and gradually resumed. If we take time by the forelock and prepare now for this new era in our economic policies and thought, the amount that we will have to accept will be small at first and increase only gradually. That is because European production must, of necessity, be slow in moving back to its normal capacity. In dealing with our tariff laws we might well learn a lesson from the philosophy of Secretary Hull, which viewed tariff adjustments as a matter for progressive action. The Tariff Act of 1933 provided for five biennial reductions. Such a progressive plan makes it possible for business to anticipate changes, plan ahead and meet slowly increasing imports with new programs of essential production.

Our adjustments to reductions in tariffs may not be as great as we think. Our merchandise imports came pretty close to balancing our merchandise exports from 1922–29. Indeed, if the growth of our foreign trade had continued from 1929 at a steady rate, we would not now be viewing the trebling of our peacetime trade as a distant goal. We would already have attained something like that proportion.

A good deal has been said for the view that a prosperous America is the best single guarantee for a prosperous world. But this statement, however true, needs to be spelled out in terms of what it takes to make a prosperous America. A prosperous America is an America going forward, with investment at home and investment abroad, with confidence in the essential friendliness of its government, with confidence that there may be profit in trade and in international finance, with confidence that obligations, public and private, will be honored.

We talk of how a prosperous America can carry the benefits of its prosperity to other countries. How can we do this best? Should we merely tell them that they ought to raise their wages, or should we enable them to engage in a trade so profitable, through buying their goods, that their wages will increase as a natural consequence?

The grim handwriting is on the wall for everyone to see. Unless we do arrange in some way to obtain payment for our goods, and now is the time to start arranging for that—then we risk having to go through the experience of another great series of defaults. Once more we may have the bitter experience of unpaid debts, of hard feelings between nations, of a paralyzed trade and of the unpredictable results beyond. I have spoken of the danger of another series of defaults. Three of these have already come within the memory of most of us.

The first consisted of those debts to American private investors contracted abroad in the 1920's. Not all of these failed by any

means, but a lot of good American money went down the drain.

The second series of defaults took place in the early 1930's. They were the debts to our Government by other governments, contracted during and after the First World War. This series of defaults led to the passage of the Johnson Act, which was the expression of a country which was sick and tired of all dealings with foreign nations. It was a gesture of isolationism, but to be perfectly frank it was a gesture which rose out of despair, anger, and disillusionment.

The third series consists of lend-lease obligations which we are probably going to forgive in large part, as a portion of the cost of winning the war.

Let us not go beyond this and permit defaults to occur in a fourth series of loans—loans which are proposed in such institutions as those suggested by Bretton Woods. Let me make it clear that I am not objecting to these loans. I am trying to make the point that when we make them we must adjust our economic thinking to a proper means of permitting those loans to be repaid.

Let us face these problems squarely. Let us admit that if we are going to lend abroad, we must buy abroad. Let us put our traffic in such order that we can accept payment in the only way in which payment can be made. Let us make loans to Europe, not necessarily out of our generosity but out of our business sense, because Europe will need loans for her reconstruction. The impoverished countries over there will need, on the physical side, industrial and transportation equipment, building materials, and tools of every kind. A Europe rising from her ruins will be a good customer, and a good supplier of valuable products to us, if we are willing to accept them in payment for what we sell.

In our attitude toward countries which, in the past, have been, in the main, merely suppliers of raw materials, let us encourage them in their efforts to develop an industrial system. Always remember that our greatest volume of trade has always been with nations industrially developed—not with poor and backward countries. The great economic paradox in international affairs is that our greatest benefits come from countries which are our natural competitors.

Once our thinking is adjusted to these principles, we need not spend our time and energy talking of employment first. Employment is a result and not a cause. Employment will come from increased confidence among nations, from a sound maintenance of international credit and, above all, from the promises of a lasting peace.

That, of course, is the theme to which all thoughts return—a lasting peace. We are seeing now at San Francisco the laying of the ground work of an international organization to implement our hopes of a lasting peace. Even as thousands of American men and women pass through the Golden Gate to the battle zones of the Pacific we and the other peace-loving nations are trying to insure that our ports shall not again be clogged with the traffic of war. We Americans have grown experienced in our appraisal of efforts like those being made at San Francisco. We did not expect when San Francisco convened that a perfect system would emerge which would never need to be altered in even a detail. We did expect—and we have seen our hopes justified—that a good start would be made. Having seen the degree of cooperativeness manifested by the United Nations at those great deliberations, we now face the future with hope and we can plan for an international political and economic life that will give mankind some of the things denied it for so long.

Postwar Era Big Challenge to Daily Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able article on the subject Postwar Era Big Challenge to Daily Press, written by Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer for the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTWAR ERA BIG CHALLENGE TO DAILY PRESS

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

To be invited to address the students of this eminent school of journalism is the highest professional recognition my work on the Washington Post has received. I value it the more because my entry into journalism has been unorthodox. I did not become a newspaperwoman because I wanted to, but because time and circumstances compelled me to do so. The social impact of the war effort with its tremendous repercussions on future development of our Nation, was and still is inadequately reported by the daily press.

When the war came, I tried to carry out the admonition of the Missouri School of Journalism "to make righteousness readable." I had no training for this task. Three years ago my experience did not entitle me to be called a reporter. That is why the honor your dean and the faculty are doing me by inviting me to speak here today will always give me an encouragement and a stimulus that I need. I have never filed a story without suffering agonies of doubt, self-distrust, and a sense of inadequacy. Perhaps those inner conflicts will always reappear, but henceforth, in moments of despair, I shall think back to the kind words Dean Mott has spoken with profound gratitude and go about my work with renewed courage and determination.

PEOPLE COUNT

To any loyal American, especially any reporter, life today is a perpetual battle for the survival of the good and for the extension of the good life to all human beings. As President Truman admonished us, in his inspiring proclamation on VE-day, it is work, work, work in the public interest. It became daily more clear to me as I journeyed through our war centers, that we are in the grip of a revolution which I had already seen in Great Britain, a movement of the hitherto inarticulate mass of the people for a new place in the democratic structure.

The gist of that Nation-wide movement lies in the fact that our millions of neglected citizens are beginning to feel that they count. They are determined to escape from the horrible anonymity, the spiritual poverty of slums and neglected rural areas. The education which war workers derived from their migrations, from the training they received and the money they earned in the factories, from working side by side with all sorts of other people, has set a ferment in motion that will not come to rest until the new hopes aroused in many breasts are recognized as legitimate and given the satisfaction which they deserve.

The ultimate question is whether democracy is better fitted than authoritarianism to create broader social patterns that satisfy these yearnings. The victory in Europe is only the first step in that debate. When the war is concluded we shall still have to win the social battle against authoritarianism, and in that struggle no single weapon of democracy is more powerful than the daily press.

For this reason I cannot make you any of those light-hearted speeches considered appropriate for the neophyte about to enter his profession. But surely it is more encouraging to welcome you to hard and unremitting toil whose rewards are greater than they have ever been before, especially to women, if you see the new opportunities that lie before you.

When men return from the front lines to the city room, as they must and will, the newspaper woman's usual ambition to be "as good as a man" won't be good enough. The world being what it is, women reporters will have to let the men have first call on routine work and make themselves a place in new and experimental fields of observation. Now that we are about to enter a crisis in our national history even more hazardous than that of war, there is no greater public service any reported can render than to fight for social justice and human dignity; not dignity in the abstract, but the personal, individual dignity of our neighbors in the social setting of our own environment.

CAN SERVE ANYWHERE

Wherever you may be living and working, you can serve that cause. Have no doubts about the results of work done in that spirit. To study practical social situations and report faithfully your findings always meets with response from honest people and affects their thinking in the most immediate way. The influence of such work, however small it may see to you, will reverberate slowly but surely throughout the whole Nation and travel to the ends of the earth.

There, it seems to me, is the great new field of reporting, especially for women. Surely we women can claim a greater awareness of the terrible threat total war has been to the family and greater sensitiveness to the destruction that war has wrought in the whole fabric of social relations which is the basis of a decent life. At the same time we women have a more immediate interest in social justice and order because they are essential to the well-being of our children and our children's children.

Since I was untrained as a reporter, you may wonder, as many people have, why I undertook such a career late in life. While my children were growing up, I tried to do my duty as a citizen and filled for 18 years a public voluntary job as chairman of my county's recreation commission. There I learned how the wheels of Government go around in a local community, county and State. I learned practically how and why things are done or not done in our democratic structure. I found out, especially during the depression, how remote Washington is from the grass roots and how vitally important to our Nation's progress and welfare are the local independence, initiative, and courage of our people as a whole.

Our institutions and forms of government differ somewhat in different sections of the country, but if you learn your way about thoroughly in your own home town and county, you can walk into any other American community and feel yourself equally at home with its people and problems.

I have been on many stories, in widely different parts of the country, with reporters whose skill is infinitely greater than mine, but I have frequently been able to get a better picture of such trouble spots as Willow

Run, of the problems of the soft coal miners, of the sufferings of war workers in Mobile, only because I know how an American town ticks and where I can get exact information as to the underlying difficulties. As training for any kind of newspaper work that knowledge is useful, but with our country facing perhaps the greatest social upheaval in its history, when veterans return in great numbers and war workers are dismissed, knowledge of our community organization in its strength and its serious weaknesses seems to me essential to anyone who wishes not only to report but to anticipate the turmoil that we are bound to experience.

I should like to emphasize that word anticipate. For on the Washington Post we are not content to report grave social problems and labor tensions when they burst into flame and become "spot" stories, but we try to dig into these situations beforehand in the public interest.

WORRY STARTS WORK

After we went to war, I flew to England to study British administration of the war effort. Having seen how great the burden of total war is upon the people, particularly upon woman and children, I grew apprehensive after my return over the fact that our Federal Government was trying to run social aspects of the production program from Washington. My local experience taught me this could not possibly be done efficiently with centralized control and, out of sheer worry as to what was happening to the migrant war workers and their families, I planned a swing around the country.

My first itinerary of 4 months had to be fixed in advance, with no knowledge of how much work I was facing.

The first stop was Buffalo in February 1943, at the height of the manpower chaos. Before leaving Washington, I followed a technique I used throughout the journey. I wrote to the key people of industry, labor, of the Federal and the local government, asking them to meet a reporter from the Washington Post at 10 a. m. of my first day in Buffalo to discuss their war problems.

BUFFALO RECEPTIVE

I thought two or three of these busy people might show up. To my amazement, word had gone around and there were more people than I had invited. Coming from a Washington paper turned out to be an advantage in every community. People were impatient with the Federal Government and nobody from Washington had as yet asked local citizens to tell their troubles.

Before I left that meeting in Buffalo, to go and see things for myself, I knew I had walked straight into pandemonium. For 4 days I visited factories, talked to workers, labor leaders, social workers of public and private agencies, to youngsters on the loose with money itching in their pockets, to desperate mothers struggling with a job and horrible living conditions, to children wan with fatigue from overwork or homesickness, to racketeers and to patriotically inspired war workers. I knew then for the first time that my story had to be filed before I faced the next chaotic situation. How was I to organize that mass of pulsating material within a few hours?

Indeed, I hammered out my first story of eight columns despairingly, with the conviction I was not equal to the task. What saved me was knowledge that the story was such an indictment of many people that my facts had to be carefully sifted until they were accurate. In fact, I made my figures and descriptions conservative, and I cannot recommend too highly that you never yield to sensationalism when describing sensational material.

Understatement, I have found, is always more effective in the long run. Moreover, it is a sound procedure from the practical point of view.

Only one city, a sink of iniquity near a big camp, attacked my veracity, but the attack was serious because it was made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and signed by the mayor and half a dozen clergymen. If I had not understated the case, I would have had no reserve ammunition. As it was, I could defend myself with additional facts, including the city's venereal-disease rate. That ended the discussion.

CAN REPORT TRUTH

The most important deduction from my experience is that you can report anything that is true, no matter how terrible the truth may be, if you are factual and have no political axe to grind, no "isms" to support, no personal animosities to serve. Your main difficulty when evaluating human conflict will be to dig below the surface claims of interested parties to uncover basic truths.

I visited more than 26 war centers in a year's travel, my primary purpose to get immediate relief from housing and food shortages for war workers; better provisions for the education, health, and general welfare of their children. It never occurred to me then that this reporting might have permanent value. But gradually it became evident that the evils I was portraying were due to our neglect of human welfare before the war began; and that the pressure of the war production effort had simply highlighted the weaknesses that we had long failed to recognize in our social structure. The greatest of our many injustices is the fact that a child born in some parts of our country has every opportunity for self-development—mental, physical, and emotional—while those born in other sections have next to none.

My efforts are now turned toward securing for all children, regardless of race, color, or creed, a chance to grow up to be independent citizens, sound in mind and body, and thus able to bear their share of responsibility in our democratic government. Again I use the reportorial method but instead of the critical studies I made during the war, I am now piecing together the ideal American community by reporting the outstanding experiments for social betterment going on in many parts of our country. These differ in character but have the same objective in every case—to stabilize the American family by stabilizing the local community in order that we may create a stronger and a happier America ready to help the veteran return to civil life and the war worker to a peacetime economy.

FREEDOM, NOT LICENSE

I don't want to leave with you the impression that I am the only one on the Washington Post who is stirring up the citizens to a broader sense of social responsibility. Throughout the staff, of which I am a very humble member, a high degree of social consciousness prevails. A democratic code of principles exists among us that has never been formulated but which has gradually developed out of a free exchange of our very different points of view.

Under my husband's leadership there has sprung up for all members of the Washington Post's staff great freedom of expression. But we do not interpret that freedom as a license to say what we please. It is a freedom to evaluate conflicting interests by the objectives they seek, freedom to select among those objectives what is intrinsically most worth while to the greatest number of people. It is a mandate to maintain freedom of communication between all nations and all kinds and conditions of men. Such freedom of communication is the heart and strength of American life, because it inevitably breaks down the prejudices of economic status, of race, of religion, of all forms of isolationism that estrange human beings from each other.

Used to maintain that freedom of communication, the press becomes one of the most important and one of the most effective tools of social unity and world-wide democracy. To be an instrument for the maintenance of liberty, equality, and justice for all human beings is the highest ambition of the publisher of the Washington Post and his associates.

This responsibility, I honestly believe, you younger members of the press are better trained and better equipped to understand than most of the older members of the profession. The fight for democracy versus authoritarianism will not end with the military victories. It has only just begun. Wholeheartedly I welcome you to the hard battle before us. You are to be envied, for you will live to see the new world whose outlines are already visible just beyond the horizon.

The future can bring you no greater happiness than the knowledge that you have followed the mandate of your great school of journalism and made your own contribution to the ultimate triumph of international good will and human brotherhood.

Labor-Management Agreement on Bonneville Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, relative to a recent labor-management agreement between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Columbia Power Trades Council, together with certain editorial comment in connection therewith.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., May 9, 1945.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The recent signing of an agreement between the Columbia Power Trades Council and the Bonneville Power Administration establishing a labor-management mechanism for treating with problems of mutual concern has been publicly regarded with considerable favor. It occurred to me that you would be interested in reviewing some of the editorial comment which appeared following the signing of this important instrument.

In my belief, it was particularly significant to have arrived at this agreement now, as the importance of maintaining sound labor-management relations cannot be minimized if the return of servicemen and war industry workers to peacetime activities is to be accomplished smoothly and effectively.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVER, *Administrator.*

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Sun, of May 3, 1945]

BONNEVILLE COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENT MARKS MILESTONE

An agreement entered into yesterday by the Bonneville Power Administration and the Columbia Power Trades Council truly marks a milestone in Federal labor-management relations. It is a pact that will work for efficiency in management and delivery of the goods on the part of labor. No Federal agency has taken such an advanced step, and the agreement very likely will become a model in other Federal projects employing a large number of men and women of diversified training and responsibilities.

Now, it is up to those responsible to make the plan work, and judging from the spirit with which all parties have entered the agreement, results would not appear to be in doubt.

According to announcement of Bonneville Administration:

"The agreement will be applicable to all Bonneville hourly employees in the trades and crafts who are not subject to the Classification Act of 1923. By the terms of the agreement conference and consultative machinery and procedures, through the processes of collective bargaining, are set up (1) to provide for joint determination of fair and reasonable rates of pay, hours, and working conditions; (2) to insure the making of appointments and promotions on a merit basis; (3) to promote stability of employment and to establish satisfactory tenure; (4) to provide for improvement and betterment programs designed to aid the employees in achieving their acknowledged and recognized objectives; (5) to promote the highest degree of efficiency and responsibility in the performance of the work and the accomplishment of the public purposes of the Bonneville Power Administration; (6) to adjust promptly all disputes, whether related to matters covered by the agreement or otherwise; (7) to promote systematic labor-management cooperation between the Administration and its employees; and (8) to aid the reestablishment in civilian life of returning veterans.

"The agreement provides for joint cooperative committees which will give consideration to such matters as elimination of waste in construction and production; conservation of materials, supplies, and energy; improvement in quality of workmanship and services; promotion of education and training; correction of conditions making for grievances and misunderstandings; encouragement of courtesy in the relationship of employees with the public; safeguarding of health; prevention of hazards to life and property; betterment of employment conditions; and the strengthening of the morale of the service."

The agreement grows out of long discussions and exchange of ideas in which all conceivable situations are taken into account. The scope is such as to provide for procedure on negotiations relating to hours, compensation, conditions of employment, labor improvement, cooperation, and assistance, adjustment of disputes, etc.

The pact is one that well may be studied by private industry, because here may be found the foundation for industrial peace, a plan for management and labor cooperation in the postwar era, without which the Nation cannot attain the levels of prosperity essential to our national well-being in the immediate years to come.

[From the Oregon Journal of May 5, 1945]

UNION CONTRACT MAKES HISTORY

Federal labor and management took a history-making step Wednesday when representatives of Bonneville Power Administration and the Columbia Power Trades Council signed a collective bargaining agreement affecting various trades and crafts not governed by the Classifications Act of 1923, under which rates of pay and working conditions are fixed by law.

The bargaining machinery was set up to provide for joint determination of fair and reasonable rates of pay, hours and working conditions, to insure promotions and appointments on a merit basis, to promote stability of employment and establish satisfactory tenure, to provide for improvement and betterment programs for employees, to promote efficiency and responsibility, to adjust promptly all disputes, whether related to matters covered by the agreement or otherwise, to promote systematic labor-management cooperation, and to aid the rehabilitatio nof returning veterans.

It calls for the establishment of joint committees to consider such matters, as elimination of waste in construction and production, improvement in quality of workmanship, promotion of education and training, correction of conditions making for grievances and the safeguarding of health and life.

In addition to establishing those fact-finding committees and the machinery for mediation in wage-rate matters, the agreement provides for a joint board of adjustment to act as the final determining body. The pact remains in force until December 31, 1946.

Besides Dr. Paul J. Raver for the administration, and Robert B. Sheets for the trades council, signers of the agreement included:

Allen C. Crowder, teamsters; John O'Neill, iron workers; Harry Ames, steamfitters; Oscar Harbak, electricians; D. L. Marlett, Assistant Administrator; Dan Hallowell, labor relations representative; David Blakeman, personnel director; Claude A. Miller, chief of operations and maintenance; Walter H. Kanzler, chief of engineering and construction; Gilbert Sussman, assistant general counsel; S. E. Schultz, chief engineer; John T. Richardson, assistant controller, and Jeanette C. Hahner, attorney.

German Brutality Described

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, an astonishing eye-witness account of the atrocious mistreatment of prisoners of war by the Germans is told in a letter just received by William L. Batt, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, from his son, Lt. Robert R. Batt. The lieutenant, writing from amid the scenes where these acts of bestiality occurred, calls his letter to his family "my own personal first-hand indictment of Nazi brutality." The letter, which is of entrancing interest and a notable contribution to the literature of the war period is as follows:

APRIL 23, 1944.

DEAREST FAMILY: You all know what a skeptic I am. I'm the original guy from Missouri; I don't believe anything I read if I think the author is trying to sell me a bill of goods. So I want you to be sure to keep this letter. It's my own personal first-hand indictment of Nazi brutality. This won't be table talk exactly, but I saw it and I want to get it on paper for the record.

Gardelegen makes Lidice seem like a garden party. You may have read about it: It has caused quite a stir. Everybody is on the way to investigate it officially now, but it will never be the same as when I saw it. Which was in turn mild as compared to the day before. Soon there will remain nothing but eleven or twelve hundred crude wooden crosses neatly arranged in a green meadow next to a burnt-out barn. The graveyard should be neat and well-kept for years; each grave has been registered and a male resident of nearby Gardelegen assigned the responsibility of caring for it for the rest of his life.

I guess that is necessary. My idea, I am afraid, would outrage convention. But I can't help thinking that a great opportunity has been lost, and that the victims, most of them nameless now anyway, wouldn't mind. I should like to see that barn and the area around it somehow kept exactly as it was discovered. Preserved, frozen, by some process of casting in plaster, for all to behold. That is my idea of what a monument should be. It would speak, eloquently, a million words, in the merest glance.

Gardelegen looks just like any other rural German town. Reasonably prosperous, happy. The people are reported to have admitted they heard the screams of the dying, and many of them have been taken to view the aftermath. Daily a large number of their menfolk are going out to the barn to get on with the grim work. But time works wonders, and the people you see on the streets look quite unselfconscious.

As you leave town to the north, traveling the route that the hundreds of political prisoners were made to travel that day a week ago, you come into an area of broad, fertile fields that bounds the town. The barn stands out prominently, its bricks blackened but intact. There is no other building in sight. Yesterday a friend tells me, there were still bodies along the side of the road. Those were the lucky ones; they were shot on the march from town, but before they ever reached the barn.

There is a great hole, now filled, behind the barn. In it and in other holes the townspeople had already burned some 700 bodies when the first Americans arrived. Most of those bodies have by now been dug up and reburied in the new graveyard. Those I saw were all charred, just as are the remains in the barn.

Four hundred and twenty bodies were found unburied, most of them in the barn in the various attitudes in which death had caught them. The sliding doors, all four of them, were partially open. At each door was a mound of burnt bodies, partly within, partly without the barn. Most of those to the outside had been shot. One had burrowed under a door so that his head and one arm projected outdoors. He was shot in that posture. Several had clawed clear through the brick walls of the barn and were shot with their heads to the apertures.

The fire, caused by drenching the straw on the floor of the barn with gasoline and igniting it with tracers, must have been intense but superficial. The timbers, for example, were scorched but still standing. Here and there, patches of straw showed yellow. Few of the bodies were consumed in the flames.

The bodies of the victims were for the most part unbelievably emaciated empty sacks of bones. Of calves and things there were few. Just a spark of life that must, judging from the signs, have flared up in each to a frantic blaze in those last insanely active moments.

All the clothes I saw—to the extent that clothes remained on their bodies—were striped. Political prisoners. I saw the 6 survivors as they were brought back to the scene today. One of them was a good-looking Polish officer, now wearing a British uniform. I read the testimony of one in Stars and Stripes. He lay for 2 days, he says, under a pile of dead. Once some soldiers came back and asked who needed medical

assistance. One man stirred in answer, and was shot.

I could see no trace of emotion on the faces of the survivors, as they walked among the civilians trying to make identifications.

I was one of hundreds of American soldiers on the pilgrimage to Gardelegen. They react variously. Most are something from sobered to stunned. I saw a medic go virtually berserk, cursing and kicking the civilian burying crews as they hurried by. The soldiers in charge—combat troops all—are near the thin edge.

But the reaction of the civilians working around the barn and graveyard is something to ponder to infinity. Young and old, strong and infirm, they are all working at an hysterical feverish pace to end the nightmare. In teams of four they deposit the bodies, each with a clean, white shroud, and rush back for another. They are forced to run, and to handle the bodies with their bare hands. They are hazed every moment and worked almost until they drop.

I saw a boy of about 14, crying his heart out. Fear, horror, shame, hysteria, exhaustion, all flew like a flag on his face. The older men exhibit the same emotions, all canceled out to an expression of anguished nothingness. Some break. One tried to run and was shot in the leg. The others worked a little harder. One litter squad came by me with the man at the feet doing the work of two. His companion was lagging, exhausted. With part of its support gone, the body began to slip off onto the ground. The poor man was in a dilemma, trying to keep up the run, recover the body, and make his partner catch up, all at the same time. I doubt that he, or any of the others, will ever forget this day.

I understand that the SS officer and his 30 men who carried out this little affair were apprehended recently. They tried to pass themselves off as Wermacht troops, but were recognized.

Love,

BOB.

(Lt. Robert R. Batt, headquarters, 216 Field Artillery Battalion.)

Shall Alien Minds Determine America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the State and Treasury Departments are flooding the country with propaganda designed to influence Members of Congress on pending legislation. The number of letters being received by Members of Congress from members of women's organizations, ministers, and even high-school students clearly indicates the effectiveness of this campaign.

If Government agencies are permitted to continue their propaganda activities, Mr. Speaker, our entire democratic process of intelligent consideration of legislation and the independence of Congress will be destroyed.

The people of America must be informed as to what is going on. I therefore extend my remarks and include portions of a letter published by the National Economic Council, Inc., which came across my desk this week:

SHALL ALIEN MINDS DETERMINE AMERICA'S FUTURE?

Never in our history has it been more important for Americans to think clearly. The question of whether the United States will continue toward national socialism will probably be settled in the next 4 years—possibly in the next 24 months.

The San Francisco Conference in which vitally important decisions can be made is just beginning.

Pending before Congress are such proposals as Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and the several other agreements or treaties negotiated the past year or two by Mr. Roosevelt's administration. Adoption of them without important modification would so enmesh us in the affairs of other nations, every one of them less devoted to genuine freedom than ourselves, that nothing short of an upheaval would ever extricate us. And domestically there is the question whether we are going to retain all existing New Deal measures—and perhaps add others; or to reject the newer proposals "Cradle-to-grave security," "60,000,000 jobs—or else," etc., and modify or eliminate some of the more drastic laws we now have.

It is hard to base a prediction for the future on past history, because a new factor has entered in. The art of modern propaganda has been developed. It has been clever, thorough, ruthless, and often untruthful. Relatively few Americans understand either its source or its extent and potency.

Every day we meet business and professional men of standing in their fields, as well as men and women highly regarded for their generous attitude toward their fellow men, who simply do not know what it is all about. They do not realize that many of the very views they express have been formulated by cunning men and women; and that through New Deal control of radio and New Deal influence among most of the country's writers, these ideas have been implanted in their minds so cleverly that they never doubt they are their own. They fail to note that the minds of the Germans were molded by Hitler in precisely similar ways.

They do not know that, with rare exceptions, many of the country's best writers simply cannot get magazine articles published if they express views contrary to the New Deal. They do not know that, while in 1944 Martin Dies and his friends could not find a publisher courageous enough to print his book telling the truth about the New Deal and its communistic supporters, the counters of our book shops have groaned under the weight of books extolling the New Deal, Russian communism, and pretty much everything Russia has ever done. For fear of Washington retribution, the American people have been denied, in true totalitarian style, the right to know both sides.

One book, Under Cover, written by an Armenian immigrant with a communistic background, and which scurrilously and falsely attacked scores of patriotic Americans for the sole reason they opposed the New Deal and Communist Russia, sold more than 600,000 copies. We listened several times to grave conversations in well-known New York clubs between supposedly intelligent men who had been completely fooled by this book, which was, of course, a mere document in the 1944 political campaign.

This propaganda is alien in origin and conception. It stems directly from eastern and central Europe. It is designed to undermine and destroy America; and it is having that effect.

It follows the best techniques of Hitler and Mussolini. John T. Flynn, in his book, As We Go Marching, has traced the step-by-step development of fascism in Italy and nazism in Germany. In both cases the cornerstone of those edifices was deficit financing. And in tracing the growth of our own totalitarian government in Washington he has shown how closely it has paralleled these two European dictatorships. Austrian-born Friedrich Hayek, in his The Road to Serfdom, has written in the same vein.

The fact that American Communists and their fellow travelers have been supporters of our American fascism need surprise no one. Their hope has been that, following the analogy in Italy and Germany, the next step after American fascism will be American communism.

In passing, it is worth noting that alien-minded persons, whether in public office or outside, are among the leading molders of public opinion in the United States today. Some of them, for reasons best known to themselves, have changed their names. Some are Communists or fellow travelers, and nearly all are more or less tolerant of communism. Many are artists in the technique of smear. Few, if any, give more than lip service to traditional American principles. Their writings are welcomed by publishers and reviewers; they have the freedom of the radio, while many advocates of the American system are refused radio time. * * *

Several aliens, like Sir Bernard Pares, have taken up temporary residence here, apparently for the purpose of indoctrinating our people. John Maynard Keynes is the actual author of our 12-year policy of deficit financing and the principal inspiration of the Bretton Woods agreement. * * *

We question at this time neither the ability nor sincerity of any of these persons. But they are not believers in the American way of life. They and others like-minded, dominate our public opinion. The independent American republic will be destroyed if their domination continues.

Two characteristic current propaganda activities deserve mention. The International Latex Corporation, Abraham N. Spanel, president, has for many months been publishing in many American newspapers quarter-page advertisements urging New Deal policies, national and international. Thus, the New York Herald Tribune of April 21 contained such an advertisement endorsing Bretton Woods. Over the company's name at the end of each advertisement is the legend, "Presented as a public service." The Blue Network carries a news program five nights a week under the sponsorship of the Electronic Corporation, of which Russian-born Samuel Novick is president. The broadcaster is William Gailmor, who changed his name from William Margolies, under which he pleaded guilty to grand larceny and is now out on parole. He has a communistic record.

Considerable inquiry reveals that the business of both the International Latex Corporation and the Electronic Corporation is so modest as to suggest their chief activity may be the propaganda they are carrying on, if, indeed, they were not organized for this purpose.

America has two great needs today.

The first is to return to the American way of life. If we do not return to the American way of life, American liberty will have been lost. "What can it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What can it profit America if it set up a world organization in which its identity and independence are lost or even impaired, with the further result that in order to do our part in such an organization we must continue for the indefinite future to be a regimented people?

Of course, the current propaganda has it that America cannot return to the American way of life. We are told that, having

achieved total employment in wartime (under coercion, of course) we can likewise achieve it in peacetime. We can. But only if the state tells every man where to work, for how long, and for how much; how he may spend his money, and where; only if we Americans permit the state to plan and regulate our lives. We can do this, but only if we continue deficit financing. But in doing it, we will have turned our back on all American experience. We will have deserted the principles that made America great and rendered her able to subsidize her allies and thus win the war. We will have rejected America and will have embraced the very Fascism we say we hate.

Those of our boys overseas who come home will find the America they were told they were fighting for has irretrievably gone.

It is of more importance to the 130,000,000 American people that we return to the liberty we have always known—than it is even to achieve a world organization.

America's second need is to try to build a kind of world organization that will do something to prevent war in the future. But one grave danger of such a world organization is that we shall place too much reliance on it; and another is that, if controlled by Roosevelts, Stalins, or Churchills, it will tend to become a totalitarian superstate, just as the United States has tended the past 12 years to centralize all power in Washington.

We believe the greatest factor for peace is the existence of a strong, independent, law-abiding nation, unwilling to make war against any of its neighbors, and prepared to defend itself against all comers. The example of one such nation (and the United States during much of its history has been such a nation) will be far more potent than treaties or agreements, no matter how high-sounding their phrases. Just one such powerful nation possessed of the complete will for peace can go far in maintaining the peace of the entire world. If the United States, Britain, and Russia all determine upon peace, then there will be peace, unless other nations believe that before reaching that determination one or more of them have first despoiled other countries, which Russia has actually done.

So, it is an open question whether the existence of an elaborate world organization, constantly tempted to mess into all sorts of matters, will not tend to increase rather than decrease the chance of war. We know this thought flies in the face of the propaganda barrage we live under today. But our problem is not to accept highly propagandized ideas, but to think.

Several fallacies of the propagandists are widely and unthinkingly accepted. One of these is the old saw that after the last war the United States "turned her back on Europe"—that if the United States had entered the League of Nations there would have been no more war. But we did not turn our back on Europe. It was the willfulness of President Wilson that prevented our entering the League of Nations. Even Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister, in 1919 expressed the opinion that the reservations asked by the United States Senate were reasonable and should have been approved. No nation in the world did more to preserve the peace of Europe after 1919 than the United States. We scrapped nearly a million tons of our war vessels—though other nations scrapped few, if any; we loaned Europe $6,000,000,000 for rebuilding—little of which was ever repaid; we took part in numerous international conferences; we led in pushing the Kellogg-Briand pacts to outlaw war.

What brought on this war was not our staying out of the League of Nations, but rather the fact that Britain and France refused to lift a finger to stop Hitler when he made his first aggression by moving into the Rhineland in 1936. Though they were, of all parties to the Versailles Treaty, the most vitally concerned, yet, owing to Red pacifist propaganda, they did not have the will to enforce their own treaty.

Another fallacy, constantly reiterated, is that economic inequalities in different parts of the world make for war. There is little in history to back this. If this argument had serious weight, why did not other nations far more powerful militarily than the United States make war on us when we were overtaking and passing them in the standard of living? Is it not possible the idea has its source in the have-not nations who have long had envious eyes on the United States and wish to force us to divide our living with them?

Then there is the one-world argument—the theory that in the future it will be impossible to maintain peace unless all nations are welded together in one organization. The speed of communication, especially by airplane, is assigned as the reason for this. But on analysis this argument also falls down. There has been peace between the United States and Canada for a hundred and thirty years; and the reason is that there has been a will to peace. At least five countries in Europe—Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey (till very recently), and Ireland—have kept out of even this present war; and, similarly, the reason has been the will to keep out.

Lastly, there is the fallacy that we cannot have prosperity in the United States unless all other countries have comparable prosperity. No good reason is given why this should be so, and all human experience indicates it is not so. As a matter of fact, the history of the past hundred years indicates the precise opposite, so far as the United States is concerned, namely, that the rest of the world can become more prosperous if the United States is prosperous. For the United States, by reason of achieving general liberty for its people, released energies of the body, mind, and spirit which have placed us far in the lead of all nations in the manner of our life and living. Practically all the world has sought to imitate us, but most of them have failed because they did not understand that our cornerstone was individual liberty. Testimony before Congress recently showed that we are far ahead of the Russians in the productive power of the individual, and that even in Britain it takes—on the average—the work of two and three-tenths men to produce what one man produces in the United States.

The proper course for the United States is to keep the sovereignty and independence of her Nation and her people. For only so can she continue in the future to be the example that has inspired the whole world in the past. And we can do no better than set an example.

After the war all Europe and Asia will be poverty stricken. American wealth, imagination, and creative ability—provided they are preserved—will alone be able to help those countries. For us to enter into agreements with other nations that will give them the first call on our wealth and a large control over our affairs would, for us Americans, be the height of folly. To adopt the Bretton Woods agreement, for instance, by which, in effect, other countries may vote taxes on the American people by assessments against our resources, would suggest that both our love of independence and our sanity had departed. We would have lied to our fighting men to whom we have promised a better future.

We know we can help the people of other countries, if only we are free to help them. But to get down to their level, and to surrender the freedom of our people, would be practically to insure that our ability to help them in the future would be cramped if not destroyed. We would have sold ourselves and our descendants into bondage to them.

Party Congress Is Held on Eve of Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the world is about to witness a remarkable event—a political party which possesses practically complete power voluntarily setting out to surrender that preferred position, in accordance with pledges made many years ago.

The Chinese Kuomintang Party was established by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. It succeeded in overthrowing the Manchu Empire and, under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership, ended the period of feudal war lords, secured for China tariff autonomy, abolition of the foreign concessions and extraterritoriality, and made almost unbelievable progress between 1932 and 1937 in modernizing China in such fields as education, transportation, industry, public health, and first steps in political democracy. This was the period of political tutelage under the Kuomintang as Dr. Sun had advocated. The period was scheduled to end with the convention called to meet in Nanking on November 12, 1937, to adopt a constitution establishing a true republic. On July 7, 1937, 4 months ahead, Japan struck without warning, and when November 12 came, Japan's armies were threatening Nanking itself, capturing it in December.

Obviously when a nation's very existence hangs by a thread, as China's has all these war years, it is not feasible to effect a drastic change in the whole character of its government. So Chiang postponed the constitutional convention, but announced repeatedly that it would be called within a year after the end of the war—just as Churchill postponed England's election scheduled for almost 5 years ago and has not yet announced when it will be held.

In China's case, however, Chiang agreed to hold the constitutional convention even before the war is over, setting the date for November 12, 1945. The Kuomintang Party is now meeting in Chungking to plan for that convention. It is one more evidence of the steadfast determination of Chiang Kai-shek and most of the Kuomintang leaders to establish a real democracy in China at the earliest practicable moment. It will be a most difficult task but all true friends of China and of America wish them well, because a strong friendly democratic China is our best assurance of security in the Pacific.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a news story from an American paper, the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, of May 4, 1945:

PARTY CONGRESS IS HELD ON EVE OF TRANSITION

(By Charles S. Miner)

CHUNKING.—China's biggest step toward democracy is expected when the Kuomintang convenes Saturday for the first time in 10 years.

The foremost item on the agenda will be the national assembly to ratify China's new constitution, which automatically will change the Kuomintang from the undisputed ruling party to just one of many which will be dependent on public support to stay in power.

APPROVAL EXPECTED

President Chiang Kai-shek's proposal to call a national assembly on November 12 is expected to be approved with enthusiasm. But with it the Kuomintang must tackle the problem of swiftly teaching the people how to exercise the powers the constitution will give them.

Few political parties anywhere have ever adopted with any great degree of enthusiasm a program legislating themselves out of power. The Kuomintang, however, may be about to do just that, although it by no means follows that they will lose power at any time in the near future. At the same time, they are about to substitute power by sufferance for power by monopoly.

With a new form of government in prospect is a result of its own action, the Kuomintang is expected to inaugurate a strong campaign to get closer to the people; to plumb heavily for more equitable land ownership, for a better livelihood for the masses of the people, for more rigid monetary control, and for an end of bureaucracy.

NATIONALISM TO FORE

Nationalism also looms heavily on the program. Steps are expected to be launched to make China's five races into one. The Mongolian, Tibetan, Mohammedan, Manchurian, and Chinese each will be told they're one people living in one country; in effect, in a United States of China.

The election of new central executive and central supervisory committees is expected to touch off the liveliest political skirmish in China's recent history. Observers hold that the political rule of the C. C. clique now is at long last being seriously challenged, and the opponents to the clique have recruited formidable support.

There is, for instance, Minister of War Chen Cheng, with Army backing; Chiang Ching-kuo, with the powerful youth movement behind him; Minister of Education Chu Chia-hua, and his "intellectuals," Gen. Wu Teh-chen, Gen. Chang Chih-cheng, and others. One prospect is the union of all anti-C. C. forces behind Chen Cheng, who will surprise no one if he emerges from the Congress as the second most powerful man in China, outranked only by the Generalissimo himself and wielding more authority than even Dr. T. V. Soong or Dr. H. H. Kung.

Incidentally, the absence of these latter two leaders from the forthcoming congress will be in itself history making. For never in recent years has so important a conclave seen neither Dr. Soong nor Dr. Kung among those present.

POWER TO DICTATE

Few here dispute that the generalissimo could with a wave of his hand dictate the entire proceedings. That he has apparently chosen instead to leave the Congress to its own devices—beyond pointing the way toward democratic reform and constitutional government—is believed by his friends to put an end for all time to charges of dictatorship.

Already a democratic leader, the generalissimo is expected to guide the Kuomintang in its task of developing a democratic country for him to lead. The path is not an easy one. The Communist problem, troubles in Sinkiang, the delicate question of Russian relations, disastrous inflation, commodity shortages, threatened economic chaos, and all the inevitable evils of 8 years of war stand in the way.

The Kuomintang, too, has its own internal problems. In turning over the governmental reins to the nation at large, it must dispose of many former exclusive activities such as youth training, information work, overseas work, political training of troops, and kindred efforts which will be relinquished as fast as conditions permit.

Rumors have been widely circulated, moreover, that personnel switches are in prospect, including a change of several ministers, ambassadors, and key executives, and possibly exceeding the sweeping reorganization of last fall.

We're Getting on With the Job

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we have waited many long months for this day, months that meant sacrifice and sorrow to untold thousands. But now victory in Europe is here. I am happy and humbly proud to join in the spirit of this day of rejoicing and of solemn thanksgiving to Almighty God for the success of our arms. We have come a long way since that black day of Pearl Harbor. We're getting on with the job. Germany and Italy have fallen. Only the Japs remain to be crushed, and their time grows short.

We have been battling a giant conflagration which threatened to consume the world. The flames in Europe have been reduced to embers; but those in the Far East still burn fiercely. But it is all the same fire. We are compelled to stamp out the working of an evil doctrine among men.

World War No. 2 is not over. The job is not done. Our momentum will sweep us on to victory, but there must be no pause or relaxation. If our war effort should be permitted to slow down, we will find it many, many times harder to get under way again. We are facing a foe who is desperate and cornered, but a foe who is dangerous to the last.

The men who fight the Japs have no illusions about the toughness of the job ahead. The men who are behind the barbed wire of Jap prison camps have no illusions about the weary, tortured months which still separate them from their homes and their loved ones.

Japan remains a formidable enemy. Whipped in the air and on the sea, deprived of Germany's aid, driven back to its inner bastions, it still retains as allies great oceans and distances. The bulk of the Japanese armies are intact, their soldiers tough and fanatical fighters. And there are millions of them.

Our fighting men will face the task promptly and unflinchingly. They have learned discipline and they know from battle trials that no one can lay down his arms with a dangerous foe still in the field.

Allied home fronts face a greater challenge to keep unwaveringly mobilized behind the fighters. We must renew our willingness to keep working for the war, to forego still longer not only comforts but many things we once thought were necessities. Hardest of all, we must again send our young men into battle.

We need not and shall not feel driven along this last long mile. There is a high courage granted only to free men in a righteous cause that buoys them over deep waters which the minions of brute force must wallow through.

The inspiration of the great works already accomplished will buoy us in days ahead. The words "VE-day" carry a significance which escapes no person, be he friend or foe.

There are many who wish that our great departed Commander in Chief might have witnessed the triumph of this day. But other great triumphs are his, for his is the triumph of immortality. He led the Nation out of the depths, helped it to find itself, then led it on to those heights which have made it invincible in war and an inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

With full confidence in the right, and our ability to see and do the right, we shall rally behind the man who has been given us to lead our Nation. We shall stand with and support President Truman in the final task of defeating the transgressor nations. And as certain victory comes nearer, we shall also plan for those great tasks which must come with peace, tasks which may be greater even than those of war.

We shall accept without fear or compromise the task of properly readjusting into useful and happy private life the 15,000,000 men and women who will have been sent to fight the Nation's battles and to win its greatest war. We shall attack without hesitancy the terrific responsibility of providing gainful jobs in private industry for the millions who are now engaged in war production, knowing that in gainful jobs lies the surest basis for prosperity. We shall not again allow this Nation to sink again into the misery of depression.

F. E. P. C.: A Challenge to Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "F. E. P. C.: A Challenge to Democracy," by Father Richard J. Roche, published in America, April 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

F. E. P. C.: A CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY

(By Richard J. Roche, O. M. I.)

A steady job which pays wages is a very important thing. Very few people are able to live without using their hands and brains in exchange for money. Without a job, most men may not eat; without a decent job paying relatively decent wages a man cannot live anywhere but in a slum, cannot keep the

ravages of disease from his home, cannot hope to plan for his children any brighter future than the drab, hand-to-mouth existence which is his own.

Most working people, many politicians, and even some businessmen have at last come to the Christian—and Papal—point of view: that since man is bound to lead a good life, and since a decent job with decent pay is at present a practically necessary means to a good life, there is a right to work, to use one's skills for just wages which will support a man, and his family in decent comfort.

Recent years have seen this right extended, at least in theory, to workingmen in general. Yet here in the United States, many of those who have come to recognize the fundamental nature of this right to work are failing—out of a false self-interest—to recognize the fact that this same principle applies to the minority-group working man (notably the Negro) exactly as it applies to all working men, or to working men in general.

It is not necessary to prove that the Negro worker has been the special object of the denial of the right to work. That is known to all of us. It has also become known to us that even a war-induced shortage of white manpower in the face of a most grave international situation could not break down the barriers to any appreciable degree, not only in industry, but also in many branches of government.

QUALIFIED BUT BLACK

As an example in point, there is the case of the large and extremely important Federal agency which, not long after the outbreak of the war, was engaged in most vital war research. The research was impeded by a lack of skilled electrochemists. A young man, a university graduate with specialized knowledge in the very field of research, was sent to the agency by a Federal referral office. The young man was a Negro. But the personnel officer of the agency shook his head sadly when the young man presented himself: "I'm so sorry, but the position has been filled." The Negro chemist left.

He had forgotten, however, to obtain the personnel officer's signature to his admission slip, and discovered that he was not allowed to leave the building. So he went back to get it. The sign on the door read "Enter," so he entered. The personnel officer was talking on the telephone and did not even look up. He was saying: "* * * the best qualifications I have seen in a long, long time. Just what we need. * * * Yes; would have hired him on the spot if he could only erase his color."

Because there was a President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice (F. E. P. C.) the Negro chemist soon obtained the position, and vital war research, halted by a false labor shortage, went forward once more.

There is no doubt that this F. E. P. C. was not set up with the whole-hearted approval of the American people, nor with the united support of the majority (Democratic) party, nor was it even established from an unalloyed sense of justice on the part of the administration. There was a large dose of the pragmatic in its founding: the knowledge that the war effort was being seriously hampered by discrimination plus the effects of pressure brought to bear by interested citizens and civic groups. It was established by an original Executive order (8802) which was not very strong and, in addition, not too clear. Even the amending Executive order (9346) under which the F. E. P. C. now operates is open to interpretation on certain very important points, and still does not give the Committee any powers which are really effective in practice.

If you search the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will discover that last summer, during Senate debate on the F. E. P. C., a Democratic Senator from the South gave vent to some very impassioned phrases in which he characterized the F. E. P. C. as the "most powerful * * * ruthless" of New Deal agencies. Of course this was oratory which would look good to prejudiced voters back in the home State. But was it truth? Examine the Executive orders under which the F. E. P. C. operates. The plain fact of the matter is that the F. E. P. C. cannot seize anything, cannot even stop anything—it can only investigate, judge, attempt to conciliate, and, that failing, finally request the President or some congressionally established agency to do the stopping for it. This is overwhelmingly demonstrated by too many cases to need proof.

But, to put the matter beyond argument, look at what happened to the proven cases of flagrant discrimination involving certain railroads and railway-labor unions. The F. E. P. C., after trying in vain for months to negotiate an adjustment, finally passed the matter on to the President—and the President created the special Stacey committee whose original purpose was to effect a just settlement of the cases. More than a year has passed now since the Stacey committee took over, and some people are beginning to wonder if it is not the intent of the Stacey committee to put the matter on ice forever. That is not good government. Rather than having a "powerful" and "ruthless" F. E. P. C., it seems that we have some business enterprises and some labor unions more powerful than the Federal Government.

F. E. P. C.'S 3-YEAR RECORD

Yet, in the less than 3 years of its effective existence, the F. E. P. C. has, by peaceful negotiation and with the help of some friendly businessmen and some friendly labor unions, adjusted thousands of cases. This has been done in almost all instances without riots, without strikes or publicity.

Most of us agree that "Government by Executive order" is something which is at times necessary, but which is dangerous and can be overdone. We are also agreed that it is the duty of the Congress to pass laws which are just and necessary. Since the right to work, as outlined, is fundamental, and since this right has been flagrantly denied to the Negro (13,000,000 Negroes), it seems that we have here a pressing need for congressional action. In this case a law of Congress would both fulfill a duty of Congress and eliminate the necessity for what has been a very controversial (but much maligned) Executive order.

Shortly before the last national elections the Republican Party announced that it had seen the justice of the minority worker's case and that it had also seen the necessity for speedy and effective congressional action. It pledged itself to such action. Seemingly the administration and its Democratic supporters saw the same facts when the antidiscrimination Executive orders were issued. It is too much to hope, of course, that what is known as the Southern bloc in Congress has also seen the light; but even without the aid of that block it seems that, given forthright good faith on the part of the duly elected representatives of the American people, a very safe majority of Senators and Representatives is committed to the support of just and intelligent legislation designed to insure every worker's right to consideration for employment for which he possesses the skill and qualifications.

NOT JUST A WAR NEED

The present F. E. P. C. is a war agency erected under the war powers of the President. The war was the occasion which necessitated an attempt to give employment opportunity to qualified minority-group workers. But the war was not, is not, and cannot be the basis for the right of the minority worker to decent employment opportunity. War does not change the basic principles of morality and justice. The right of the minority worker existed before the war (although it was not generally recognized), it exists during the war (when it is partially recognized), and it will exist after the war, despite the fact that many may then want to deny it. On the other hand, in the light of all experience with discrimination in employment, it may be said with almost equal certitude that the injustice which existed before the war will flare to even greater intensity after the war—unless the Congress of the United States, which purports to represent all the people and to serve all the people, does something about it now.

There is now before the Congress such legislation. The bill is known officially as S. 101. It aims to establish a permanent F. E. P. C. with rights and obligations outlined in law; actions taken under it will be subject to review by the Federal courts. The bill as it now stands, is a sane, effective, constitutional piece of legislation. If America is to keep faith with the democratic credo it is supposed to have, that bill must pass. If the Congress is to keep faith with its own promises, that bill must pass without important revision or amendment; emaciated substitutes, such as the Taft effort, will not serve to keep congressional honor clean. Support of S. 101 is not action in behalf of minorities alone. It is to the interest of the Nation as a whole.

An Answer to the "Have Nots"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ira L. Wright, general manager, Black Hawk Consolidated Mines Co.:

[From the Industrial News Review of May 1945]

AN ANSWER TO THE "HAVE NOTS"

(By Ira L. Wright, general manager, Black Hawk Consolidated Mines Co.)

(Reprinted from Mining Year Book, of the Inter-Mountain Region, 1945)

Recently I had the opportunity to visit the largest copper refinery of the Southwest. There, both electrolytic and fire-refined metal is produced and in such huge amount that the visitor is lost in wonder at where it all comes from and where it all goes. The answer to the first question is that it comes from mines right here in the Southwest. Those "have not" alarmists who advocate removal of import duties to permit free entry of foreign metal to conserve "our dwindling supply" would find little here to support their views. Part of the answer to the second question was given by Lieutenant General Somervell in an address on the evening of November 11 to visitors to the International Mining Day celebration held in El Paso, November 10 and 11, when he said the Southwest is furnishing 60 percent of the copper needed in the war effort, nearly 50 percent of the zinc, more than 50 percent of the lead, 50 percent of the silver, and a substantial amount of mercury. He could have mentioned the not inconsiderable amounts of iron, manganese, molybdenum, magnesium, and other metals furnished by the Southwest and the very large production of those highly essential nonmetallic minerals from which potash salts are obtained as well as the important output of fluorspar, pumice, and other useful minerals.

But the "have nots" want the country to believe that this huge production for war

purposes is the last spurt of a dying industry. What are the facts? Surely the great copper mines of the Inter-Mountain region will be able to supply our peacetime requirements for many years to come if the metal price is such as to enable our mines to operate under probably higher labor and supply costs. The great production from Morenci alone can for a long time take up any slack caused by the exhaustion of many smaller mines.

MANY YEARS' SUPPLY

We are told that the zinc mines of the great Tri-State district are nearing exhaustion and only a meager production may be expected when premium metal payments are withdrawn. This may be true but to offset this loss we have large districts in the Inter-Mountain area which are just beginning to be developed. I believe production from the States of Idaho, Colorado, and New Mexico added to that from the eastern and southeastern area can supply the needs of the Nation for many years if the price of the metal is maintained at a level that will allow our mines to pay the relative high labor and supply costs that may reasonably be expected. As an example of a district which, though an old producer of zinc ore, has only since the beginning of World War No. 2 reached a production commensurate with its possibilities, the central district in Grant County is cited.

A noted geologist with long experience in the district makes the guess that the district will produce 100,000,000 pounds of metal annually for 30 years from ore averaging 10 percent zinc. Seven large mining and smelting organizations with both foreign and domestic interests are operating in the district. In 1943 New Mexico output of zinc was second only to that of Idaho among the Western States. And 5 years ago hardly anyone thought of New Mexico as having other than secondary importance as a zinc producer. In predicting the early exhaustion of metals or minerals the prophets often overlook a factor that frequently rises up to confound them. That factor is technological advance. This may be in improved methods of finding ore by geological or geophysical methods, our present knowledge of which is admittedly hazy—well, anyway, inexact—or improved metallurgy of the already known ore deposits. Even back as far as the beginning of this century there was worry over the early exhaustion of our rich copper mines. Then Utah copper came along with a production that has since been nothing but embarrassing to those wise and experienced copper producers who were so certain of its failure when it was being promoted. But its success was only a forerunner of a score or more of successful porphyry or low-grade mines with an aggregate production which makes that of the former high-grade mines seem puny. With the advent of World War No. 1 there was great uncertainty of our ability to wage war with a country on which we had depended for a large part of our chemicals, particularly those having a potash base, since the larger part of the salts of potassium came from Germany. Yet in a few years after the end of that war discoveries of large deposits of potash minerals were made in New Mexico and the operations since built up around these discoveries have freed the Nation of any anxiety in regard to a supply of potash for chemicals or fertilizer.

WHAT A DISCOVERY!

Some of us can remember when aluminum metal was barely more than a laboratory curiosity yet the oxide, alumina, is second only to silica in abundance in the earth's crust. Then Hall developed his method of reducing the metal in the electric furnace and so cheapened the production of the metal that it is today a much-feared competitor of the older known and heavier metals. Similarly the production of magnesium has become commonplace where it was formerly shown to students in chemistry as somewhat of a triumph of a chemist who was able to reduce even a small piece from its oxide. And yet magnesia is one of the more abundant minerals in the earth. Not so many years ago some of us can remember when a prospector usually qualified his description of his lead-silver prospect by stating that there was not enough zinc present to carry a very large penalty at the smelter. Large deposits of zinc and lead were known in the West, but the minerals of these two metals were poison to each other at the smelter and no one knew how to separate them. Flotation was known as a method adapted to the concentration of sulfides but it was not known how to float one sulfide mineral and prevent the other floating at the same time. Then it was discovered that alkaline cyanides would hold down zinc sulfide while lead sulfide floated, and then the zinc could be reactivated with copper sulfate and a valuable concentrate of zinc suitable for the zinc smelter obtained. And what a discovery! Mine owners no longer excused the presence of zinc but bragged about the added value of their mines. At once another Tri-State district, perhaps several, were made ready in the West for development and production.

ONE OF BEST MINERALIZED DISTRICTS

In a less spectacular way but of great value to our western economy has been the discovery and development of our nonmetallic minerals and certain rare metal minerals. Fluorspar, that increasingly valuable mineral in various manufacturing and smelting industries, is being developed in many of our Western States. New and successful methods of concentration have been developed to render formerly valueless deposits capable of contributing important supplies of metallurgical or acid grade to industry. Space does not permit the listing of all the valuable minerals produced in this intermountain area but it is difficult to mention one that does not occur here. Recently I had occasion to show a geologist around a portion of our mineralized area here in southwestern New Mexico. He is a scout for a very large mining organization with headquarters in the East and has prospected in many parts of the world. One who spends most of his life in one mining area is prone to underestimate the potentialities in his own backyard and I was therefore both surprised and gratified to hear this gentleman say that this is one of the best mineralized districts he has ever visited. He had been told that the area had been thoroughly prospected but as he pointed out, a few shallow diggings by the old timers does not constitute thorough prospecting.

LOOK TO THE HOME INDUSTRY

There seems to be more concern among some of our statesmen about the welfare of the mining industry in foreign countries than here at home. While we in the mining industry realize that a flourishing home industry requires a prosperous international trade and to maintain such a trade it is necessary to import as well as export, we do not believe the development of our own natural resources should suffer from the effects of tariffs that too cheaply permit the importation of minerals and metals from abroad. We had a great investment in treatment plants before World War No. 2 and during the war it has been tremendously expanded. With some exceptions we believe we can supply the ore to keep these plants busy. And it is going to be necessary to keep these plants working if we are to provide the employment that a domestic prosperity requires. Give us the markets and this intermountain region will supply the mineral. There is still "gold in them thar hills."

The Moral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "The Moral" by John W. Hillman, an outstanding journalist of Indianapolis and chief editorial writer of the Indianapolis Times, is attracting unusual attention. The editorial is a fine contribution to sound thinking in this troubled era. The philosophy contained in this editorial points the way to the highlands of permanent peace and away from the law of the jungle, and I wish everybody could read it. I have asked and have obtained permission of the House to insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

In the wave of horror and revulsion that has followed the publication of pictures and descriptions of the Nazi death camps, perhaps some of us have lost sight of the moral underlying these demonstrations of bestiality.

We are not so far removed, culturally, from the law of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." That is proved anew by the wave of letters proposing that similar punishments be meted out to Nazi criminals—suggestions that they be exhibited as beasts in a cage, or tortured as were their helpless victims.

But such is not the way of civilized people, however outraged. We can not afford to stoop to the level of those we fought or, in defeat, they will have destroyed us as they could not in battle. Rather we should learn from their example. And there is an important lesson for all of us in those heaps of broken bodies, and in the calloused souls of those who, by their cruelty, have shown how little ground humanity has won in its struggle to rise from the slime of the past.

WELL AND CLEARLY STATED

That lesson is well and clearly stated in a thoughtful editorial by Sgt. H. F. Butler in Top Billings, the weekly newspaper published at Billings general hospital.

"If this writer were the praying sort," writes Sergeant Butler in the current issue, "he would pray not merely for the souls of the miserable victims of Nazi concentration camps, not merely also for the hopelessly diseased souls of the criminally insane keepers, but still more for the souls of all humanity. For what the Americans discovered at Belsen and Buchenwald * * * and what the Russians earlier discovered at Maidanek represents the possibilities latent in all people.

"Cruelty is not localized, nor is it a Nazi or Jap monopoly. Popular interest in bloodshed may take various forms, from enthusiasm over bullfighting to enthusiasm over lynchings, from absorption in murder mysteries to the irresistible impulse to gape at the mangled victims of an automobile accident. The religious and moral principles of a well-ordered society impose restraints which keep all but the criminally insane from yielding to obscure impulses to shed blood or inflict suffering.

"'DESTROYED AS MUCH AS THEY COULD'

"But the Nazis destroyed as much as they could of the religious and moral influences that stood in their way. They legalized the hunting down and torturing of their religious and political opponents, and thus

made possible the eventual horrors of Maidanek, Belsen, Buchenwald, and other murder factories.

"Let us not feel too smug and superior. The rest of the world knew, even before the Nazis seized power in 1933, what the doctrines of Mein Kampf would almost certainly produce. Everybody could predict it, but nobody did anything important about it.

"The lesson to be learned from Belsen, Buchenwald, Maidanek is not just the commonplace conclusion that the Nazis are fiends. The lesson is rather that those horrible places represent the logical end of violence and aggressiveness. There is what can happen to any society that throws its restraints overboard. With a multitude of lynchings and bloody labor battles to our past discredit, we Americans must be careful to observe the law and keep the peace in what may turn out to be our most difficult years, the postwar era."

THOSE PICTURES REMIND US

Sergeant Butler is obviously a man who knows what he is fighting for. Just as obviously, he knows what we must fight against—not only now but in the years ahead. And he knows how we must fight. His are words to remember lest we, like the Pharisees, praise God that we are not like others, forgetting that we, too, are clay and that only good will and tolerance and humanity stand between us and the spawn of the jungle. Those pictures of the torture chambers, those shriveled skeletons of living death, those piles of bones, and rotting flesh remind us.

It could not happen here?

Let us not be too sure.

It cannot happen—if we learn well the lesson of Buchenwald and Maidanek and Dachau, if we remember that they are but the last way station on the road of violence and intolerance—the road that leads to destruction.

We must not let it happen here.

The United States Chamber of Commerce Committee on Agriculture Study the Trade Agreements Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Doughton bill to extend the trade agreements law for a period of 3 years with permission to further reduce tariffs by an additional 50 percent may come before the House soon.

The greater part of the agreements already entered into are with nonindustrial countries whose exports consist of agricultural products and raw materials. The relation of exports and imports of agricultural products to American agriculture should be given very careful study.

The United States Chamber of Commerce have what they call a department committee for agriculture. The chairman is Mr. Elmer H. Sexauer. They made a report on May 3, 4, 5, 1945, entitled "Agricultural Imports and Exports in Relation to American Agriculture." This report is a very thorough and comprehensive one. I wish to quote certain excerpts therefrom. Speaking of agriculture they say:

Even if large-scale exports of these products should be possible, the domestic agricultural industry must continue to be largely dependent on the domestic demand resulting from a high level of productivity and employment in other industries. * * * during the course of World War No. 2 the total crop acreage in the United States has been increased from approximately 342,000,000 in 1939 to 364,000,000 acres in 1944, and a further expansion may occur in 1945. The 1944 increase over the 1939 acreage is equivalent to 6½ percent, but the volume of production has increased 32 percent.

Concerning the foreign outlets for our agricultural products this United States Chamber of Commerce committee says:

The possibility of maintaining a large volume of agricultural exports for any considerable period after the war is clouded by conditions both at home and abroad. Abroad there is a pronounced tendency for the production of the major agricultural products to be increased. This is associated with the fact that many countries, which in the past have been economically backward, are rapidly expanding their production both for home consumption and for export. This is being done as a means of increasing the national income and raising the standard of living of the peoples concerned. It is a regrettable fact which may be noted in passing that exports of agricultural products from the United States may compete with exports from these other countries and to some degree hinder their economic developments, which from both humanitarian and economic considerations, may be quite undesirable.

This committee stresses the importance of the American market for the American farmer. They say:

Many persons, both within and without the agricultural industry, are very doubtful that an American standard of living can be maintained among farmers in the United States if price levels for agricultural products decline to levels at which they will be competitive with products produced under conditions existing in foreign countries.

* * * * *

Because of the conditions, both at home and abroad, which have been described, the agricultural industry of the United States is peculiarly interested in the maintenance of all those conditions which will contribute to the largest practicable domestic market for its products.

This committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce concedes the desirability of not disturbing noncompetitive imports, but they make a very careful analysis of the effect upon our whole economy of the competitive imports. I again quote from their report:

The competitive imports are similar to the products of the United States. This class of imports contributes to the economic well-being of the country to the extent that they bring about a better balance of supply and demand. This may occur when the imports supplement an adequate domestic supply. If, however, the imports displace a portion of the domestic supply of any product because the demand does not increase as imports increase, the effects may be far-reaching. The effects to be anticipated from such a displacement are numerous and varied. First, outlets for domestic production will be curtailed. Second, the price of the entire domestic supply will be governed in large measure by the price at which imports are available. Third, the buying power of domestic producers subject to foreign competition will be curtailed to the extent that their incomes are reduced by lower price levels and curtailed outlets. Fourth, the expanded imports will shift buying power from domestic-producers groups to foreign producers in proportion to the volume and price of the competitve imports, while no assurance will be given as to the particular domestic-producer groups which will derive a benefit from this shift in buying power. Fifth, the shifts to foreign sources of supply will lead to displacement of labor and capital of domestic producers until such time as their labor and capital can be utilized in the production of goods acceptable to foreign markets.

Because of the lower price level at which it is presumed that the foreign supply may be obtained, it is obvious that the buying power generated by a given volume of imports will be smaller than that resulting from the purchase of corresponding amounts from domestic sources. Accordingly, the amount of labor and capital in nonagricultural industries required to supply the new foreign demand thus created will not be so large as that formerly required, with the result that, while certain nonagricultural industries may be benefited by lower costs of raw materials, other industries may suffer from the shift in sources of supply and in the volume of demand for their products.

In the agricultural industry from which markets and the resulting buying power have been shifted, there will have to be a shift of workers and capital to other forms of production and quite possibly to nonagricultural industries. Such shifts on the part of the agricultural industry are especially difficult, expensive, and slow.

Furthermore, the very conditions which seem to make an expansion of the export trade desirable, particularly as they relate to the labor supply, will operate to make a migration of labor from agriculture to other industries difficult and uneconomic.

If the farmers of America are to have a standard of living equal to our industrial workers, who are protected by wage and hour laws and other legislation, they must be protected in the American market and they must have every opportunity to find new uses for their products. One of these new uses is the production of synthetic rubber made from alcohol made from grain of this the United States Chamber of Commerce committee on agriculture says:

To produce from grain alone a volume of synthetic rubber equivalent in amount to normal domestic requirements would require about 250,000,000 bushels of wheat, equal to the production of about 22,000,000 acres. Improved alcohol production methods might reduce this somewhat, but, after making due allowance for these factors, the amounts are sufficient to indicate that the production of rubber alone could utilize all the surplus wheat acreage and raise domestic consumption to around a billion bushels a year.

The detailed analysis to which the United States Chamber of Commerce Committee for Agriculture has made in reference to the problems of the farmer is quite revealing. They point out the vast imports into this country of vegetable oils. They have translated this into possible opportunity for the American farmer, and again I quote the report:

The major competition with domestic oils is furnished by coconut and palm oils and to a lesser extent by babassu and palm kernel oils. All are hard oils and all but palm oil are quick lathering, a characteristic which makes them highly desired as constituents

for high quality soaps. In 1938 the imports of these four oils amounted to a billion pounds, of which 470,000,000 were used in soap.

The amount of these four oils used in other products than soap in 1938 was equivalent to the production of about 4,000,000 acres of soybeans. The amount used in soap was equivalent to the fat production of 3,000,000 cattle, and the acreage required for soap alone to 16,850,000 acres. If livestock and meats were produced and consumed in liberal amounts, the supply of domestic animal fats would be adequate to make the substitution.

Linseed oil, tung oil, and perilla oil are the principal drying oils and are chiefly used in paints and varnishes. These three oils were imported to the amount of 430,000,000 pounds in 1938. Linseed oil can be produced in the United States but the flax area in the past has been small in relation to the amount of oil used. In 1938, flax production was a little over 8,000,000 bushels. This rose to 52,000,000 bushels in 1943. This latter amount is sufficient to produce nearly a billion pounds of oil. The 1944 production was 24,000,000 bushels. There is an import duty of 65 cents a bushel on flaxseed, but the large amount of seed imports, chiefly from Argentina, indicates that this tariff is not sufficient to encourage the domestic industry.

* * * * *

The significance of these imports of the three major drying oils is indicated by the fact that they are equivalent in volume to the linseed oil which might be produced from about 3,875,000 acres in the United States.

Imports of cottonseed, peanut, soybean, and corn oil are of particular interest because of the large domestic production.

These imports supplied a portion of the domestic demand and were equivalent to the production of over 800,000 acres.

Obviously these amounts would go far to offset the estimated reduction of 25,000,000 acres which many believe will be necessary after the war. As the acreage of soybeans, peanuts, and flax in 1944 was 10,676,000 acres above the 1938 level it is evident that the producing capacity of the country is ample to supply the needed oils and that if domestic consumption were supplied from domestic sources the additional acreage would utilize practically all and possibly much more than is now devoted to the production of oil seed other than cottonseed.

In reference to animal fats and oils the committee says:

These fats supplement the domestic supply which is a byproduct of the meat industry. The domestic supply is largely determined by the consumption of domestically produced meats. If the beef and pork imported in 1938 had been produced domestically, the supply of animal fats would have been increased by about 61,000,000 pounds and thus would have reduced the needed imports to about 32,000,000 pounds. A more liberal consumption of domestic meats will reduce the need for fat imports, except possibly that of cod oils and cod liver oil.

The United States Chamber of Commerce committee supports the contention of the beef producers by saying:

In comparison with the domestic production of beef cattle, the total number imported is not large, but by reason of the fact that the imported animals compete on the domestic market on a par with animals produced in this country and constitute a part of the total supply, they introduce an adverse price influence on the entire domestic production which would not otherwise be present.

* * * * *

Substantial amounts of fresh beef were received from Canada and New Zealand. Nearly all the imported pork came from Canada and Lithuania. Corned, canned, and cured beef were imported almost entirely from Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay. Cured ham and bacon were imported from 29 countries, nearly 75 percent of this ham and bacon, as well as more than half the salted pork having come from Poland. Sausage casings have come from 37 countries, half of them from Australia, New Zealand, and Morocco. These meat imports are equivalent to a volume of domestic meat which would require about 4,000,000 acres to produce.

As production costs in the domestic livestock industry are largely dependent on wage rates and the amount of capital invested, large reductions are not possible without serious impairment of living standards and the wiping out of capital values in agriculture.

In reference to butter, the agricultural committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce says:

Butter imports were larger than usual in 1938 because of a high price. About two-thirds was from New Zealand. The remainder came from many countries, including those in central and eastern Europe. The amount imported from all sources was equal to the production of about 380,000 acres.

Supply and demand for butter in the United States are generally so nicely balanced that comparatively small imports create very definite depressing effects on prices of the entire domestic supply.

Much of the time the tariff of 14 cents a pound is not fully effective, but it does operate to prevent the domestic price from falling to the level of other countries which could not supply the entire requirements of so large a market as the United States, but which could have a depressing influence on the market price.

In reference to poultry and poultry products, this committee said:

In 1938 the greater part of the commercial imports of turkeys came from Argentina and Uruguay. Chickens and guineas came from a larger number of countries, including Japan, Hungary, Poland, and the United Kingdom.

Birds and poultry, prepared and preserved, came from still more numerous sources, including China, Poland, France, Japan, and 10 other countries. It is possible that in some cases the source named was not the original source.

Most of the eggs and egg products were imported from China. It is quite apparent that with the egg-producing capacity and egg-drying capacity of the United States, there will be no future need for the domestic supply to be supplemented by imports.

It is estimated that about 66,000 acres would be required to produce the equivalent of these imports.

Grain production in the United States in reference to imports was analyzed by this United States Chamber of Commerce committee as follows:

At times the importation of limited amounts of hard wheat may be desirable for mixing with softer domestic wheats in order to improve the quality of flour and there is some deficiency of malting barley. It is possible, however, that the availability of barley malt in Canada, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Belgium, with a duty of only 4 cents a pound may have had something to do with causing barley production in the United States to be insufficient to supply the demand.

Many of the items in this grain group are imported in such small amounts as to suggest that they are odd lots. However, most of these contribute a bit to an oversupply already tending to accumulate from domestic production. In the aggregate they are equivalent to the production from over 500,000 acres of farm land in the United States.

Cotton has for several years been a problem crop. In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee a showing was made that Brazil has become the fourth largest producer. They undersell us in the world market in spite of our export subsidy. If the Doughton bill, as written, is enacted into law and the present embargo on cotton is removed, cotton growers will soon become high-tariff advocates, because Brazil with its new merchant fleet would soon be providing New England textile mills with Brazilian cotton. The United States Chamber of Commerce committee on agriculture makes these observations:

The imports of raw cotton in 1938 were equivalent to 184,000 bales. Of these, about 145,000 bales were under 1⅛-inch staple. Of this amount, about half came from India and China, and most of the remainder from Mexico. The equivalent of about 39,000 bales was imported from Egypt, and 4,500 from Russia.

These imports combined were equivalent to the production of about 370,000 acres of domestic cotton.

Jute is used in the manufacture of coarse bagging where its comparative cheapness enables it to displace cotton. The imports in 1938 were equal to approximately 190,000 bales of cotton, and on the basis of current yields, to the production from 585,000 acres of cotton.

Other vegetable fibers imported include sisal, manila or abaca, kapok, itsle or Tampico, orin vegetal, coir, as well as several others in small quantities. These fibers have distinctive characteristics so that cotton would not in all respects be a satisfactory substitute, but it is of interest to note that a similar weight of cotton would be equivalent to the production of about 1,335,000 acres.

Wool was commented upon by this committee in their report as follows:

The amounts of the competitive type wools which are imported vary widely from year to year. In the 1938–39 year the amount imported was approximately 66,000,000 pounds. Two years earlier it was 181,000,000 pounds. These amounts are equivalent to the average production of 8,000,000 and 22,000,000 sheep, respectively, in the United States.

Starch is imported into the United States in great quantities. The agricultural committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce says:

To produce in the United States an amount of starches equivalent to that imported in 1938 would require about 325,000 acres of corn. It has been estimated that the importation of these products valued at $4,500,000 displaced farm products and opportunities for the employment of capital and labor in transportation and processing industries to the extent of $11,000,000.

Import disadvantages for American agriculture were summarized by the United States Chamber of Commerce committee as follows:

In view of the prevalent demand for higher living standards among agricultural producers it is a question whether production will continue for export at its former volume if export prices are maintained at levels at which foreign producers appear willing to maintain their production.

A second feature is that the export trade does not necessarily or even usually result in a direct exchange of goods between two groups of producers or even two regions. For example, the export of oranges to Canada may be paid for by imports of Canadian beef cattle or Canadian bacon into midwestern or eastern markets where these products come into competition with livestock producers who enjoyed no apparent benefit from the export of the oranges.

Likewise the export of grain to Europe may be paid for by importations of vegetable oils from the Netherlands Indies which compete with beef tallow, lard, and soybeans from the Corn Belt and with cottonseed oil and peanut oil from the South.

Because of these conditions there is an open question as to whether groups producing primarily for the domestic market and in volume approximately sufficient for that market will continue to countenance the competition on the domestic market of the imports resulting from export trade in agricultural products.

Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a series of articles by N. E. A. Washington Correspondent Peter Edson concerning the establishment of our joint committee on the organization of the Congress, in which he stresses the need for improvements to strengthen Congress. The following editorials should be of particular interest to each Member:

CONGRESSIONAL SELF-REFORM

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Seventy-ninth Congress will probably have before it this year no domestic issue of greater importance than its own reform.

The House has approved a proposal by Congressman A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY of Oklahoma, calling for a joint committee of six Senators and six Representatives to study congressional reorganization. Senate confirmation is expected and the new joint committee is expected to organize a staff and make its first report by April 1.

Every one of the more than 500 Congressmen has a few ideas on how Congress could be "streamlined" but that is only the beginning. Books have been written about it and magazine articles by the score. Private organizations like American Political Science Association and National Planning Association have made independent studies.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS

Suggestions range all the way from removing the snuffbox which by Senate rule must be filled daily with fresh sneezes, to removing many of the Congressmen themselves, making the Congress a smaller body, paying the Members more money, giving them pensions to boot, and providing them with more help at higher pay so they can do more work and keep a better check on the rest of the Government. The problem is going to be one of getting any kind of agreement on what, if any, changes should be made, boiling down all the proposed reforms into a program acceptable to practical politicians jealous of their historical prerogatives.

That being the case, many of the suggested alterations simply aren't going to get any place at all. Many of the things which seem the silliest—like the Senate snuffbox and the right to filibuster—are a part of now-traditional rules which will be changed only over some solons' dead bodies. Proof of that is the fact that although several hundred bills and resolutions to change the structure of Congress have been introduced by Congressmen in the last 50 years—there were 50 reform bills offered in the Seventy-eighth Congress—the last reorganization was in 1921.

As Governor Dewey might say, "That's why it's time for a change," but as Governor Dewey found out, there won't be so many changes made.

A straw in the wind is provided by the recent House vote to reconstitute the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, making it a permanent instead of a temporary committee. Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE of Wisconsin introduced a bill to cut down the number of Senate committees so as to streamline and simplify the work of the Members. The need for something of this kind is generally recognized. Yet on Mississippi Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN'S slick move to keep the un-American committee going, the House voted to add one more permanent committee instead of simplifying by subtraction.

MORE POWER URGED

This whole business of congressional reform in its broader aspects is hinged on what you want your Congress to do. That's why you find suggestions for giving Congressmen less to do alongside suggestions that Congress should do more. Part of the agitation in the latter direction comes from Congressmen and others who feel that the executive branch of the Government has usurped many of the legislative functions and that Congress should regain lost powers. Reformers who think this way would therefore build up a big congressional staff, give it police powers over the executive departments and further curb the President himself.

Counter to this is the sounder belief that reforms of Congress should be aimed at taking it further out of the executive business and keeping it what the founding fathers intended to be—a law-making and a policy-making group, leaving administration and execution of its orders to others.

CONGRESS NEEDS MORE HELP

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—There were 8,852 bills dumped in the legislative hopper in the Seventy-eighth Congress, January 1942 to December 1944. That is an average of more than 16 bills per Congressman.

Only about 1 out of 9 of these bills, or 989 of them, became laws. If this average of 1 public and 1 private bill per Congressman in 2 years makes you wonder what the solons do with their spare time, it gives a false impression and doesn't begin to tell the story.

The sheer bulk of proposed measures which must be studied so that Congressmen will know which bills to vote for and which to vote against is staggering in itself, and this brings up one of the major reforms which has been suggested for modernizing Congress—increasing and improving its staff. Congressmen claim they need more and better and better-paid help to do their jobs.

In the closing days of the last session, Congressmen voted themselves an extra clerk to help them take care of the business of their districts and States. This will give each Representative $9,500 a year to hire not more than four clerks. Each Senator may hire up to six clerks or seven if the Senator comes from a State of more than 3,000,000 inhabitants. Pay of these clerks is from $1,500 to $4,500, and averages less than $2,500.

CONGRESS HAS STAFF OF 300

In addition to these personal assistants, the congressional staff consists principally of clerks and counsels assigned to the 81 standing congressional committees. They number about 300 in all—200 for the Senate, 100 for the House, and with few exceptions they are limited to tops of $3,900 in the Senate, $3,300 in the House. Many congressional clerks are relatives, resulting in nepotism, which is considered bad.

To help Congressmen draft laws, there is an office of legislative counsel consisting of four lawyers, one assistant, and two clerks for each Chamber. Total cost for this service is $83,000 a year.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue has a full time professional staff of 15 headed by an $8,000-a-year tax expert, but aside from this the only research staff available to Congressmen is in the 66-employee legislative reference service of the Library of Congress. In all, Congress has less than 2,500 employees including pages, messengers, and janitors whose combined pay is less than $6,000,000 a year.

Compare these figures with the staffing in the executive departments. As Congressman MIKE MONRONEY, leader of the congressional reformers, has pointed out, the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Agriculture alone has 600 employees. Treasury and Federal Reserve Board alone have 30 or 40 banking specialists at $5,000 a year. The entire cost of the legislative arm of the Government, including Congressmen's $10,000-a-year salary, is only fifteen million—less then half of what it costs to run the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

DEPARTMENT STAFF PROPOSED

In short, Congressmen interested in modernizing their honorable Assembly feel that if it has been a bit backward and dumbish at times it may be because it was not properly staffed to do a good job. In a way, this may be Congress's own fault. It appropriates the money for the executive branch, and for itself.

It has also been proposed that Congress build up a permanent staff—removed from any temptation of patronage appointments—to keep constant check on the executive departments of the Government and see that they live up to and within the mandates of Congress.

Against both of these reforms it has been argued that they would merely duplicate work already done by the executive branch of the Government and so would merely add a congressional bureaucracy to that of the administrative agencies.

Before streamlining the staff of Congress it is argued that the entire committee structure of the Congress must be reorganized. This will be considered in the succeeding article.

CONGRESS AND JOHN Q. PUBLIC

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Of all the proposed reforms of Congress, those which would seek to change the relationships between Congress and the people are most controversial.

Basis for the belief that some change is needed is the fact that Congressmen have

to run too many errands and do too many petty chores for their constituents. This is supposed to keep the Congressmen so busy they don't have time to legislate in the national interest. Yet if all these tasks, like helping their people get jobs, pensions, war contracts, or settlement of claims against the Government, were taken away from Congressmen and given to some other agency, there is possible danger that the whole system of representative government would be weakened. After all, Congressmen are elected to represent the people of their district in Washington and look out for their interests. If Congressmen don't look after the interests of their constituents, they don't get reelected. Most of the would-be reformers of Congress forget that.

Yet it is seriously proposed that all routine requests for information sent by voters to their Congressmen be turned over to an Inquiries Service, set up in the Library of Congress. That might ruin one of the Congressman's best contacts with his people.

CLAIMS COMMITTEE SWAMPED

Since the Federal Government can't be sued without its consent, anyone with a claim against the Government must have his Congressman introduce a private bill for his relief. These private bills make up about half the number of acts passed by Congress each session. Some are reintroduced year after year. The Claims Committee, which handles them, is usually swamped. To remedy this situation it is proposed that the Claims Committee be abolished and this work turned over to the Claims Division in the Department of Justice for all claims of under $5,000. For bigger claims, relief could be sought through the United States Court of Claims.

To relieve Representatives of the necessity of running for office so frequently that it amounts to all the time, it has been proposed that their terms of office be lengthened from 2 to 6 years, like Senators. It would take a constitutional amendment to put this over, and the chances are slim. It can be argued that forcing Representatives to run for office every other year makes them watch their step and behave better, keep in closer touch with their districts than if they were cut loose for 6-year terms.

Other ideas for improving the relations between Congress and the people range all the way from having Congress hire a press agent, to doing a much better editing job on the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and putting Congress on the radio.

CONGRESS ON THE AIR

This last is particularly intriguing. To watch visitors come into the galleries, linger a few moments, then leave in disgust gives a faint idea of how fast listeners might spin the dial if they happened to tune in on the congressional frequency. At the other end of the scale, there is the thought of how congressional spellbinders might be tempted to make political speeches for home consumption, if they knew they were on the air and it wasn't costing them anything.

The whole question of improving relations between Congress and the people really boils down to a problem for the electorate, not to a problem for Congress. It is the matter of choosing better Congressmen. It has been proved time and again that most people don't know who their Congressman is. Too few good men want to make public service a career, considering the risks too great.

There are many able men in Congress in spite of this situation, and it is the opinion of some of them that Congress could be made much more efficient, even under its own antiquated rules and procedures, if only the voters would elect better Congressmen. And that puts the responsibility for the primary congressional reform right where it belongs, on the people who cast the ballots.

MODERNIZATION IS NOT EASY

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The 122 standing and special committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives pose one of the toughest problems which must be considered in studying the modernization of Congress.

In 1927 the number of congressional committees was reduced from 55 to 42, principally by merging into 2 committees the 11 which had previously considered expenditures for the executive departments. Since the early nineteenth century, however, the number of committees has grown like twin Topsys. In the last session of Congress there were 47 standing and 8 special committees in the House, 33 standing and 12 special committees in the Senate, 4 joint committees, 18 commissions and boards.

Each of these committees is a little ministry in itself, with powers and privileges duly appreciated by the members thereof, who will see the merging or liquidation of their group effected only over their political dead bodies.

BUT THE REFORMATION MUST COME

Yet, reform of the committee system must come if Congress is to be made into a more efficient organization. So much of the work of Congress has to be done in committees, yet the Congressmen simply haven't the time to attend all the meetings of all the committees of which they are members. No Senator serves on less than five committees, the House average is two, membership on big committees being exclusive.

It has been estimated that of the 122 committees in Congress only 27 are really important—16 in the House and 11 in the Senate. Many of the committees duplicate each other.

Creation of more joint committees has been proposed as a remedy for this. And instead of having one committee in Congress to match every department or activity in the executive departments, it has been suggested that there be created only 9 or 10 policy committees, each to deal with 1 broad field of public affairs.

All such oversimplification might in the end defeat itself. A few big committees might be much more cumbersome than a lot of little ones. And if all the work must be done anyhow, in the end there may be 122 or even more subcommittees carrying on just as usual under a purely paper reorganization.

SENIORITY RULE CALLED VICIOUS

Far more vicious than the committee system itself, perhaps, is the unwritten seniority rule by which a member once assigned to a committee may stay with that committee during his career, advancing in rank in his committee as he is reelected term after term until, being the oldest in point of service he is eligible to become its chairman regardless of his ability.

Modification of congressional custom to permit the election of chairmen is opposed, however, on the ground that it would encourage log rolling and deals among Congressmen for votes on coveted chairmanships. One compromise to meet this objection would be to limit the number of years a Congressman might hold a chairmanship.

Whatever reform of the congressional committee system may be decided upon and recommended to Congress, there is a still further reform suggested by Roland Young, former chief clerk of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to create a legislative cabinet in each House, made up of the chairmen of the major committees. The function of this legislative cabinet would be to work more closely with the President, create a coordinated legislative program in each session of the Congress and then work for the passage of that program. Such a legislative cabinet would replace the present party leadership of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Every idea for reorganizing Congress, regardless of its desirability, meets with some more or less valid objection.

There is in Congress itself considerable sentiment to change the procedure which requires two-thirds Senate approval for any international treaty negotiated by the President. This rule is considered bad for three reasons. First, 33 isolationist Members of the Senate might block a broad international post-war security plan. Second, the House is cut out of any participation. Third, the President is driven to making executive agreements with foreign countries, not requiring congressional approval when it was the intent of the founding fathers that the Senate should participate in making foreign policy and treaties.

Letting the full Congress ratify or reject all international deals by simple majority vote is proposed as a remedy for these evils. Yet students of Congress point out that the House of Representatives is the most unpredictable thing in Government, subject to strange moods and temperamental acts which at times defy reason. Recent action of the House in bringing to life the committee formerly headed by Martin Dies, after everyone thought it was safely dead and buried, is cited as an example of this whimsy. And if foreign relations are to be subjected to such irresponsible actions as this, say the experts in international affairs, the country would be letting itself in on many strange upsets should the Congress be reformed in this manner.

SUFFRAGE FOR D. C. CITIZENS

Another desirable reform of Congress is the proposal that the governing of the District of Columbia be taken away from Congress and given back to the people who are resident in the Capital, along with the right to vote. Granting suffrage to the D. C. inhabitants is a long and involved issue in itself. But the necessity for Congress to turn itself into a city council every so often and worry about local schools, sewers, garbage collection, and such matters is unquestionably a handicap to Congress, besides which it doesn't exactly make Washington the best governed city in the world.

Changing the rules of Congress to remove a few traditional though questionable procedures presents a problem of extreme difficulty, and the investigating committee will be restricted in this effort. However, there are just grounds for criticism of the Senate's rule which permits unlimited debate on any subject and makes it possible for one Senator to hold the floor until he has talked to death a bill to which he alone may be opposed. A strengthened cloture rule of some kind, limiting debate on any one issue, would correct that procedure. Yet it is pointed out that no essential piece of legislation has ever been defeated by a filibuster. And the right to filibuster is held up as a safeguard for the minority's rights in a democracy.

UNDESIRABLE RIDERS

Another procedural trick in which the Senate sometimes indulges, though House rules limit the practice, is the passing of riders to pending legislation. The rider

may incorporate the pet project of some one Senator or one congressional bloc. The rider may have no bearing on the legislation to which it is attached. Yet because the main bill is desirable, the less-desirable rider sometimes gets adopted along with it, the President preferring to save the bad with the good than to let the good die with the bad.

Creating some system of party responsibility which would make individual members of a political party live up to the principles of a party platform has been advanced by some students of government. But again that may lead to a political dictatorship of the most vicious sort, and it involves a limit to freedom of individual thought and action.

Opponents of any kind of congressional reform have their points. The present system has worked for 160 years, giving the American people what they believe is the best government in the world, for all its faults. No change is now proposed in the form of American Government, but limited strengthening of Congress through modification of some of its procedures to meet changing times and conditions may be needed. Radical reform is not.

International Office of Education

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the item I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD today deals with a subject about which we shall soon have legislation to consider.

I have reference to the establishment of a national bureau of education.

It is my contention and the contention of a great many Americans that it does not suffice to feed children and adults with good democratic food for their stomachs if we do not provide some means of getting to them good democratic ideas for their minds. We know what has happened in Europe and the tragedy involved; we also know that many people in this country have come from Europe, including Germans, who through American education, good democratic education, have become oustanding citizens.

I hope when that legislation comes before this House the House will give it serious consideration.

The following is from a report of the committee on education of the New York State Federation of Labor, August 1944:

The interest of labor in the extension of educational opportunity and in the need for education for world understanding and peaceful international relationships has long been expressed. Labor has taken a leading role in every effort to raise the standards of education and to help bring about a genuine understanding among peoples, nations, and races the world over.

At its sixty-third annual convention in October of 1943 the American Federation of Labor expressed itself vigorously in behalf of a world educational agency.

We wholeheartedly support that decision and call upon our constituent bodies to take an active part in securing public awareness of and governmental support for the establishment of an international office for education.

The interests of progressive labor in such a permanent agency are self-evident. There is not only a universal relationship between low standards of education and substandard working conditions, there is also our basic reliance upon the peaceful institutions of world collaboration, of which education for peace and understanding among peoples is the foundation. We recognize the action already taken by our Government in collaboration with others of the United Nations for programs of educational rehabilitation and reconstruction. We regard these steps as of temporary and transient value only, because incapable of themselves in meeting fully the world need for education in which labor has so vital a stake.

Only a permanent agency having the full support of Government and participated in by representatives of all basic groups can attain the necessary objectives.

We recommend that our delegates work with their own members and with other like-minded groups toward the establishment of such an office and in support of congressional action toward that desired end.

The War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the Membership of the House that I was gratified with the statement of Prime Minister Churchill that Japan with all her treachery and greed remains unsubdued. That the injuries she has inflicted against Great Britain, the United States and other countries and her detestable cruelties call for justice and retribution. We must now, he said, devote all our strength and resources to the completion of our task both at home and abroad. This statement from the British Prime Minister indicates to me that the British Empire will go all out with the necessary support to the United States to bring total victory in the South Pacific.

We can now await anxiously the utterances of the Prime Ministers of the British Dominions as to their positions—to determine what policies and support we are to receive from their countries in the South Pacific warfare. This is a great opportunity to create good will to bring closer unity and solidarity on the North American Continent.

We have heard a lot about the "good neighbor" policy and "hands across the border" slogans, but recently we heard loudly proclaimed over the radio that no Canadian troops would be transferred to the South Pacific unless they volunteered for South Pacific service. We also heard that all future inductions will be stopped in Canada. So, it will be interesting to watch the course of future events from our Canadian neighbor to ascertain what help we are to receive in this all-out effort for total victory to erase the Jap menace from the face of the earth. It is time for plain speaking.

Certainly this war in the South Pacific is not just our war. Britain and her dominions have as much at stake, and far more, than we have in oil, rubber, spices, and minerals. And the question is what are we to gain in fighting to recover and return these possessions to our allies?

It would bolster the American morale if our Canadian brothers would loudly proclaim to the world that they expect to see the South Pacific warfare through, with us, to the bitter end. I feel if the great majority of Canadian people had their way, that is exactly what would happen. So we anxiously await a proclamation from the Dominion of Canada as to the support we are going to receive in the South Pacific war effort.

Statement on Behalf of American Paper and Pulp Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made before the Ways and Means Committee:

I am appearing before your committee today as the representative of the American Paper and Pulp Association, the central organization of the United States paper industry, including manufacturers of every grade of paper manufactured in this country.

The United States paper industry will be adversely affected—probably to a greater extent than any other major American industry—by further reduction of rates of duty.

The United States paper industry is peculiarly sensitive to foreign competition, for it is unique among American industries in being forced to compete with foreign nations whose production methods and abilities are identical with ours, but whose wage rates are substantially lower than the wage rates of American workers in comparable jobs.

Broadly speaking, United States paper mills have no advantage by reason of mass production or improved techniques over mills abroad. This is particularly the case in the truly mass grades such as newsprint, book, sulfite writing, kraft, and so forth. This fact may be startling at first blush and its implications difficult to appreciate because of the general conception which nearly everyone has of American industry as being much more geared to straight-line and mass production than that of other countries; but it is a fact, and one which must be thoroughly understood if the economics of paper tariffs are to be properly appraised.

The automobile industry seems to have become in nearly everyone's mind the typical example of all American industry and when contrasted with foreign production of automobiles, the typical example of superior ability of Americans to manufacture. In that industry (in this country) we have straight-

line assembly in great volume with a tremendous number and variety of automatic single and multipurpose tools and a very high production per man per day. In other countries the process of automobile manufacture ranges from hand production of individual machines to what appears to us to be rudimentary assembly-line technique applied to relatively small volume with no tooling at all comparable to ours and the result is that production per man per day is very low. Inevitably in the United States automobiles can be made much cheaper than in any other country even though higher wages are paid in the United States.

This situation may be typical of many or possibly most industries but it emphatically is not at all true of the paper industry.

In the paper industry we find a situation where in Sweden, Norway, Japan, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Chile, Mexico, Canada, Austria, Finland, United States, Great Britain, and anywhere and everywhere else in the world where paper is made, it is made in exactly the same way, of the same materials, with the same kind and quantity of machinery, by the same kind of labor (that is, labor long familiar with paper processes) and in quantities which reflect the savings due to mass production. No country has any manufacturing or "know-how" edge on any other country. This is due to the fact that paper manufacture is inherently a completely straight line, machine-made production proposition. Paper machines require the same number of workers to operate them in any country. With identical machine crews, what makes capacity of the machine and per man per hour production is the width and speed of the machine and the weight of the paper made, not the number of workers. Paper machines in all countries are comparable in size, speed, and weight of product made. Consequently the productivity of workers is identical everywhere. This is nothing new, as in the automobile or aircraft industries, for example, but has existed for over a hundred years. There have been no basic changes in the method of manufacturing anywhere in all of that time for the very simple reason that the process can hardly be improved, since from the first it has been 100-percent mechanized and straight line. What developments there have been are in the nature of refinements and in increasing the capacity of the individual paper machine. This is accomplished by increasing the speed or building wider machines, or both. Any such developments have been equally available to and have been availed of by all manufacturers everywhere.

The result of this situation inevitably is that the only advantage in cost any country can have over another country is in wages—wages in the paper mill, in woods operations, and in the production of other raw materials, in the production of steel and the fabrication of paper-making machinery from steel. The country with the lowest wages and the poorest standard of living is automatically the lowest-cost producer of paper. Every paper-making country in the world is a lower-cost producer of paper than the United States. This is inevitable in any industry where equal machinery and equal know-how are available to all, as they are in paper.

With these facts understood, it is as clear as two plus two equals four that if the United States paper industry is to survive it must either be by means of reduced wages and living standards or by means of such tariff equalization as will permit the continuance of United States standards of wages and living. There can be no other alternative.

Even were raw material and production costs equal, foreign mills could deliver paper to this country at less than American cost to deliver at the same port. Foreign mills, whether by subsidies to shipping, or by lower wages to workers in transportation fields, can deliver paper in this country at a freight cost of less than that involved in a shipment from important United States mill points to New York. An average freight rate from Sweden, for instance, to New York is $5 to $6 per ton. This is lower than the freight from many eastern mills to New York. Typical rates from important production centers are as follows: Printing paper, Ohio and Wisconsin to New York, $8 to $9.80; wrapping paper, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin to New York, $7.40 to $11.20 per ton.

In support of my statements as to the relative cost of producing paper in the United States and foreign countries, I am including with this statement as appendix A a tabulation showing comparable wage rates, job by job, in Norway, Sweden, Canada, and the United States. These figures are for 1939, since which time it has been impossible to secure any comparable data. A survey by the American Paper and Pulp Association, however, shows that average wage rates in paper mills in the United States increased 37 percent between 1939 and January 1945.

The United States paper industry is not a proponent of high tariffs. The record made of the hearings before this committee in 1929 and 1930 demonstrates that it asked no increased rates at that time on any mass production grade, even though the printing-paper duty rate was then only 15 percent as against much higher rates in other countries. The same was true as to other basic paper grades, and when the act of 1930 was passed there was no increase in the rate of duty on any major grade of paper above those in effect under the Act of 1922. At that time, as in 1922, the United States paper industry did not seek a high protective tariff, but asked only that rates be established sufficient to enable its manufacturers to compete in its home market on even terms with comparable foreign papers. It takes the same position today. However, it has no choice except to oppose any measure which would permit drastic reduction of duties already insufficient to equalize foreign and domestic production costs.

The United States experimented with reciprocity in 1911 and the United States newsprint industry in particular, and the entire industry in consequence were the victims of that experiment. When the United States made newsprint duty-free as its part of a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada—an agreement which Canada failed to ratify—the newsprint industry moved to Canada. Since that time American mills have been compelled to abandon that field, while it has had tremendous growth outside the United States, principally in Canada, England, and the Scandinavian countries; in 1944 the United States produced only 22 percent of her consumption when before 1911 she produced between 80 and 100 percent.

Following the irreparable loss of that great industry to the American economic system there were no further efforts to negotiate specific reciprocal trade agreements until the present administration came into power.

The United States paper industry, because of its experience in the newsprint reciprocity deal, and the loss of domestic markts which has followed each of the reciprocal trade agreements negotiated since the present Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was passed, is opposed to such agreements. The paper industry has been forced to give up its own markets to foreign competitors on the unspoken but actual theory that the national economy will be strengthened by allowing the sacrifice of some American industries in the interest of other industries which seek export markets.

The United States ranks as a great industrial Nation, but when this phrase is used people think of its tremendous, highly centralized industries such as steel, automobiles, and chemicals. The paper industry is not sufficiently recognized as one of the Nation's major industries because it is not centralized and but few of its individual units are of tremendous size. Its mills are located in 38 States. Also, its product is of such everyday use that the consumer does not realize its essentiality in his daily life, just as he gives little thought to the air he breathes. Nevertheless, the United States paper industry represents a capital investment of approximately $2,900,000,000.

The United States paper industry is essentially what might be called a "Main Street" or a "home town" industry. It consisted in 1939 of 969 units located largely in smaller manufacturing communities where water power is available. Approximately half of the industry's investment is in towns wholly or largely dependent on the business developed through these mills. Fifty-eight percent of the Nation's mills are in communities with a population of under 10,000, and the largest percentage of the primary industry is in communities estimated to be from 70 to 100 percent dependent on the mills. Appendix B is a comprehensive analysis of the dependency of communities on the paper mills in the various States.

But paper is a great industry even when compared with steel and automobiles. The United States paper industry is the largest paper industry in the world and now, during the war, the United States is making and consuming about 70 percent of the world's entire supply. Its export markets are negligible and always have been largely because its high wage rates do not permit competition with low-wage producers in other countries. The United States should not permit its paper industry to be so hamstrung by tariff concessions to other countries that this Nation will become more and more reliant on foreign mills for its own needs, as has already become the case with newsprint. That the placing of newsprint on the free list has not even yet ceased to have its effect on the American industry is shown by an article in Editor and Publisher, April 7, 1945. This publication said that the profit margin in the manufacture of newsprint has become so slim that many mills are turning to other paper products and added: "This is particularly true in domestic mills, and has been going on for the last dozen years."

Paper manufacturing is an industry which must maintain a high rate of production, roughly 75 percent of capacity, in order to carry its overhead costs. The value of annual output under present conditions is about equal to the capital investment. This ratio is the smallest of any major industry, but prior to 1939 the ratio of sales to capital was much lower. Other great industries produce a sales volume averaging from two to four times the dollar investment. Even a slight reduction of sales volume, such as that caused by foreign importations, has an immediate effect on the paper manufacturer's balance sheet. This is demonstrated by a recent 10-year income survey covering a broad cross-section of the industry. This survey shows the operations were at a loss in 1934 and 1935, and that a peak was reached in 1941 when the profit after taxes was 7.18 percent on the capital investment. In 1943 the profit was 4.58 percent, and in only 2 of the 10 years was profit above 5 percent. The National City Bank of New York in its April 1945 review of economic conditions shows the very low relative earnings position of the paper industry in comparison with other industries. The industrial group, Pulp and

Paper Products, comprising 74 corporations with a total net worth of over $711,000,000 is 39 in a list of 44 groups in which the financial return is shown as a percentage of net worth. The industry's own analysis of earnings in comparison to production shows the losses were in years when production was low, and the peak of profit was when the industry operated at its maximum level in history.

Labor is a controlling factor in the cost of producing paper. The paper industry leads all major industries in the amount of capital invested per worker. The mill pay roll alone amounts to about 25 percent of the total sales value of the finished sheet. This does not include such labor costs as those involved in transportation, pulpwood cutting and delivery, and production of other raw materials.

The importance of labor can be appreciated when we estimate the production of paper on the basis of man-hours involved. An over-all estimate, covering mill employment only, shows that paper is produced at an average rate of 111 tons per man per year. Every ton of paper imported deprives an American paper mill worker of 3 days' employment to say nothing of the loss of employment by subsidiary workers. The number of man-hours required to make a ton of paper varies with the grade produced, from 10 to 14 hours in the coarse grades to 45 hours in writing paper. On the average every ton of paper imported deprives 1 American worker of 3 days' employment, but in the writing-paper mills 1 ton of such paper would represent a full week of work. Any tariff reduction which increases imports thus results in an immediate proportionate idleness of American paper mill employees.

Just as the placing of newsprint on the free list caused an American industry producing a commodity valued at $200,000,000 a year to move to Canada, reductions made by later trade agreements are causing other grades of paper to disappear from the list of American-made products.

The manner in which reciprocity acts as a "one way street" as far as the United States paper industry is concerned is shown by the fact that in agreements which have been concluded with 27 countries, concessions on American paper have been granted by only 8, and these of a minor character. No concessions on paper were granted by the following countries: Belgium, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Holland, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Salvador, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Turkey. Inasmuch as we could not compete with other foreign countries in these markets, concessions to the United States paper industry were unimportant in the eyes of our negotiators, thus demonstrating the manner in which we made sacrifices for the benefit of others.

Argentina granted the United States preferential exchange; Costa Rica cut its rate of duty on paper napkins, Colombia on printed wrapping, and France increased its allowable quotas of imports of vulcanized fiber, cardboard, and printing paper. Uruguay cut its rates of duty on hygienic papers, building boards, and impregnated cardboard. Venezuela reduced its duty rate on writing and toilet paper. Cuba reduced its rates to a comparatively minor extent. In most or all of these cases the items involved were not an important part of the production of these countries, which were therefore willing to reduce duties on goods which they could not make.

A striking example of reciprocity as it is known to the United States paper industry is found in the 1939 agreement with Canada. Paper of all kinds not otherwise provided for, including printing paper, was bound at the former Canadian rate of 22½ percent, but our rate was cut an average of about 40 percent and now is from 9 to 12 percent as against the Canadian rate of 22½ percent, although Canada also has a 10-percent exchange advantage over us. Canada levies a duty on newsprint if valued at over 2¼ cents per pound, but its newsprint comes into the United States duty free. Rate reductions granted by Canada were: Prepared roofings, wallboards, paper and fiber boards, from 25 percent to 22½ percent; electrical insulating pressboard, from 25 percent to 12½ percent; hanging paper, from 32½ percent to 30 percent; electric cable and insulating and condenser paper from 22½ percent to 10 percent; wrapping paper from 30 percent to 25 percent, and manufactures of paper from 30 percent to 27½ percent. Canada made material reductions only on papers which she does not herself manufacture in volume sufficient to supply her own demand. On its part the United States reduced its rates on paper as much as 50 percent, and in addition Canada enjoys under most favored nation treaties the reduced rates on paper granted in other trade agreements.

A tabulation of tariff rates now in effect shows that the rates on many principal grades of paper are not only lower than those in effect under the Tariff Act of 1922, but even below those fixed by the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913. Today's rates on 18 out of 23 grades of paper on which rates have been reduced in various trade agreements are at or below those in the act of 1913, which set the lowest rates in American history. The proposed Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would permit a reduction in tariff rates to as much as 50 percent below those in effect under that act, known as a "tariff for revenue only."

The appended table, appendix C, lists the papers already subjected to rate reductions under the existing reciprocal trade-agreement program with a comparison to the rates in the Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930.

The United Kingdom is one of the nations whose spokesmen have been loudest in criticizing the "high tariff barriers" of the United States. Average British duty rates, however, are 18 percent higher than those of the United States before the war, and have been sharply increased since that time. An appended table, appendix D, gives comparable rates of duty on standard grades of paper in which it is seen that in 10 out of 19 items the British rates are higher than our own.

There is no intent in this discussion to attack Canada or the United Kingdom. We are using figures and illustrations involving these two countries merely because in many grades the effects of reductions of duty rates were not apparent as to any other countries because of the war. It should, however, be emphasized that any concessions made by us would be even more disastrous in the case of the Scandinavian and other European countries through operation of most-favored-nation treaties with those nations.

The problem before American industry is not solely one of specific rates. It is also confronted with other acute problems. Foreign cartels, not subject to American antitrust laws, by fixing prices in their own countries set the values at which the United States authorities, under existing customs laws, must compute duties. Antidumping laws, as they now stand, are not enforced because imposition of any antidumping duty is optional with Government agencies, not mandatory. By means of currency depreciation, foreign countries are able to ship paper into this country at prices not compensated by existing duties. In any form of tariff legislation, including the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, some steps should be taken to correct these abuses.

From the foregoing the position of the United States paper industry should be perfectly clear. It opposes the proposed change in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act permitting a 50-percent reduction in present duty rates. In taking this position, the industry is not forgetting the basic economic premise behind the reciprocal trade-agreement theory; that is, that we must have more international trade if there is to be peace on earth, and that the United States cannot year after year export unless it imports in substantially equal dollar volume, so as to create dollar exchange with which payment can be made for our exports. We have no quarrel with that argument. But the industry does claim that it has contributed its share, and far more than its share, in the acceptance of imports and the creating of dollar exchange available to foreign countries. Imports of paper and pulp into the United States are far larger than the imports of any other commodity. In 1938, for example, importations of paper and pulp amounted to over $185,750,000—approximately 25 percent more than the importations of coffee, the next largest commodity, and still a larger percentage above cane sugar, crude rubber, and raw silk, the three next largest importations, all of which are produced either in very small quantity or not at all in the United States. Paper and pulp imports were over twice as large as those of chemicals, which constitute the second largest importations of manufactured goods produced in substantial quantity in the United States. That last pre-war year is no exception; the facts are the same for the 10-year period 1930–39, inclusive. No other imported commodity came anywhere near equaling paper and pulp. During that same period the net dollar exchange created by the absorption of imported paper and pulp by the paper market of the United States was $1,635,289,759. Total imports in these years were $1,957,438,412 and exports only $321,548,613. In view of these figures, the paper industry feels that it can fairly assert that further tariff reductions on paper should not be considered as a necessary contribution to the furtherance of international trade but must be considered on their own merits. The question of whether or not paper tariffs should further be reduced must, in all fairness, be determined by considering whether or not the United States wishes to become further dependent for one of its prime necessities on foreign countries and whether or not it wishes directly to displace United States workers engaged in the paper and pulp industry. It is the paper industry's contention that this is a specific decision to be made by Congress, not something to be decided indirectly as a part of generally determined policy to foster international trade.

In terms broader than the scope of its own industry, the United States paper industry believes that it is impossible under present conditions to appraise the economic situation which will exist 2 or 3 years from now and after the war is over. To mortgage the future of American industry in advance without any knowledge of what may transpire in that time seems to us to imperil the entire financial structure of our industry, if not the entire country. We believe that the limit to which Congress should now submit the industrial economics of the country is a continuance of the present reciprocal trade-agreement legislation for a year, or perhaps as much as 18 months, which we all hope will mean that both wars will be over, and until known economic developments can permit a consideration of tariff problems on a realistic basis.

APPENDIX A

Comparison of wages in European and American mills

(Average rates per hour on comparable machines)

Position	Norway	Sweden	United States	Canada
Machine tender	$0.41 to $0.44	$0.38½	$1.16 to $1.37	Wage rates in mills average 10 to 12 percent below American wages.
Back tender	$0.31½ to $0.33¼	$0.33½	$0.98 to $1.16	
Third hand	$0.30½ to $0.32	$0.32½	$0.84 to $0.85	
Fourth hand	$0.30 to $0.31	$0.30¾	$0.64 to $0.68	
Oilers	$0.32	$0.31½	$0.54 to $0.66	
Head beaterman	$0.31¼	$0.31½ to $0.38½	$0.68	
Electricians	$0.32¾		$0.60 to $0.77	
Acid maker	$0.36½	$0.35¼	$0.55 to $0.82	
Laborers	$0.31¾	$0.30¾	$0.62½ to $0.70	

Sources: Special committee of American Members of International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers. American Paper & Pulp Association. Averages include mills comparable to foreign mill in size and speeds of operations.

NOTE.—The union committee commenting on the relative cost of living in Scandinavia and the United States states that it takes the worker in Norway and Sweden 100 hours of work to buy what the American worker can purchase with 65 hours of work.

GENERAL NOTE.—The wage rates are those available in January 1940 Since that time American wages have risen materially, but there is no information on the results of the war on Scandinavian rates. No effort has been made to weight the wage rates given to compensate for any depreciations of currency.

APPENDIX C

Duty rates on paper 1913 to 1945

(Grades on which duty rates have been reduced by reciprocal trade agreements)

Grade	1913	1922	1930	Jan. 1, 1945	
				Actual rate	Equivalent to ad valorem computed on latest available statistics of actual importations
	Percent				
Printing	12	¼ cent per pound and 10 percent	¼ cent per pound and 10 percent	⅛ cent per pound and 5 percent	10.8 to 12 percent.
Paperboard:					
Plain	5	10 percent	10 percent	10 percent (bound)	
Processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	$14.50 per ton, not less than 15 percent or more than 30 percent.	
Pulpboard in rolls for use in manufacture of wallboard.	5	10 percent	10 percent	5 percent	
Same, processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Tissue:					
Lightweight [1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 3 cents per pound and 10 percent.	30 percent.
Heavyweight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent.	28.7 percent.
Stereo, carbon, pottery, lightweight. [1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents, 4 cents per pound and 15 percent.	21.5 percent.
Same, heavyweight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents, 4 cents per pound and 10 percent.	17 percent.
India Bible (over 10 pounds)	12	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.6 percent.
Crepe paper	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 7½ percent	32.5 percent.
Simplex decalcomania	35	5 cents per pound	5 cents per pound and 10 percent	2½ cents per pound and 10 percent	22.1 percent.
Drawing paper	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if over 40 cents per pound.	13.7 percent.
Hand-made paper	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at over 50 cents.	12.9 percent.
Bristolboard	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at not over 15 cents.	33.7 percent.
Hanging raw stock	12	10 percent	10 percent	7½ percent	
Filtering	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent, if valued at 75 cents or more.	8.5 percent.
Blotting	30	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Wrapping kraft	25	do	do	20 percent	
Wrapping, other	25	do	do	25 percent	
Vegetable parchment	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	29 percent.
Straw board and paper, less than 12-point, not less than 8-point.	5–25	10–30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Cigarette	50	60 percent	60 percent	45 percent	

[1] Lightweight refers to paper weighing not over 6 pounds per ream of 288,000 square inches. Heavyweight is paper 6 pounds or over, less than 10 pounds.

APPENDIX D

Comparative tariff rates—United States and United Kingdom

Grade	Actual rate	United States rate—equivalent ad valorem based on latest actual available import data	British rate
Printing	⅛ cent per pound and 5 percent	10.8 to 12 percent	20 percent.
Paperboard, plain	10 percent	10 percent	15 to 20 percent.
Same, processed	$14.50 per ton not under 15 percent or over 30 percent.	15 to 30 percent	Do.
Pulpboard in rolls for manufacture of wallboard	5 percent	5 percent	20 percent.
Same, vat-lined	15 percent	15 percent	Do.
Sheathing paper	10 percent	10 percent	Do.
India and Bible	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.6 percent	Do.
Simplex decalcomania	2½ cents per pound and 10 percent	22.1 percent	Do.
Vegetable parchment	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	29 percent	16⅔ percent.
Tissue, lightweight	3 cents per pound and 10 percent	30 percent	Do.
Same, heavy	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent	28.7 percent	20 percent.
Drawing paper, over 40 cents per pound	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.7 percent	Do.
Hand-made paper	do	12.9 percent	Do.
Bristolboard, not over 15 cents	do	33.7 percent	Do.
Wrapping:			
Kraft	20 percent	20 percent	16⅔ percent.
Other	25 percent	25 percent	20 to 25 percent.
Strawboard	15 percent	15 percent	15 to 20 percent.
Blotting paper	do	do	20 percent.
Filtering paper, if 75 cents or more	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent	8.5 percent	Do.

Public Housing and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from one of the largest home builders in the city of Detroit, Mich. His experience reflects that of many other builders and property owners in the Detroit area. His views are those of a loyal American who believes in American principles of freedom and opportunity and our long established American way of life.

MILLER HOMES, INC.,
Detroit, Mich., May 1, 1945.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: There are two matters coming before this Congress that are of vital interest to me and to all people interested in the home-building industry. The first is the subject of the continuance of the Office of Price Administration; and, secondly, the subject of homes built by the Government.

I do not believe any well-thinking American citizen has objected to the purposes of the O. P. A. as set up by Congress. If we had any complaint, it was that Congress had not gone far enough and included everything in price control at the inception of the war. Our "beef," if you wish to call it that, has been due entirely to the administration of the act.

The O. P. A. was captured by left-wingers at the very beginning and, although you have seen fit to change the leadership, the proper job of housecleaning has never been done. Therefore, the O. P. A. has been used continuously to advance the purpose of left-wing planners rather than a fair and honest administration of price control, and nowhere has this been more evident than in rent control. There has been no attempt to be fair and equitable in the administration of this part of the act. My organization has suffered tremendously because of this policy, and I am acquainted with numerous others who have likewise been unfairly dealt with.

I recommend an immediate housecleaning of the O. P. A. and a definite decision by Congress that its will be carried out so that instead of allowing groups, such as the C. I. O. to enforce their wishes, a fair deal be given to everyone alike. It is my opinion that when the truth is actually told, you are going to be very red faced regarding what has gone on in this organization right under your nose.

Concerning the matter of public housing at governmental expense, there is a movement on to further establish public housing as a part of our national economy. This program is entirely out of step with our traditionally American way of life. If you are not very, very careful, you will find that in spite of his very admirable attitude while holding public hearings on housing, Senator TAFT has, apparently been inoculated with the idea that we should have a little bit of pregnancy in the housing field, a matter of about 8 percent, or something like that, of families that private enterprise cannot serve. I had sincerely hoped that Senator TAFT would finally see the fallacy of the public housers' position, but I have now been led to believe this is not the case. The history of housing has clearly demonstrated that private enterprise built much cheaper and better than public housers.

Senator TAFT has failed to explain who these people are in our society who should be made wards of the Government. If these people turned out to be wounded soldiers, mental delinquents, or driftwood of society that was proven incapable of making their own livelihood, certainly it is a public duty to institutionalize these people in some manner. However, society as a whole is made up of one complete economic structure and the people in the low-rent bracket today may be in the middle or high-rent bracket tomorrow, and even be able to own a good home of their own.

Society is not made up of an 8, 20, or 35 percent class, it is not made up of the lower third, the middle third, the upper third, we do not have a caste system in America, and I don't believe we want one. Given the same benefits of low interests rates, long-term amortization, low tax rates, the private builder can do the entire job of building, and do it cheaper and better, and keep out of the hands of the Government the maintenance of these homes, and this will be done not in the spirit of socialism or socialistic democracy or governmental autocracy, and we need not fear anything about communism, fascism, or nazism, it will be done in the simple American way that has proven itself equal to do the best housing job that has ever been done on the face of the earth.

Private home building cannot and will not compete with public housing. I personally asked Dr. Hayek, author of The Road to Serfdom, his opinion of public versus private housing. His first words were these: "The two cannot exist together."

If you men in Congress want to see the job of housing properly done, stop the public housers cold, give them not one cent, but, instead, instruct the governmental agencies that are interested in housing to extend to private enterprise all possible aid in setting up ways and means of reaching every class of our society with suitable homes. I feel positive that this will result in all of the necessary housing being produced as quickly as labor, materials, and proper methods of financing are available for the purpose; and these homes will mark a vast improvement over any other period to date in our American life.

It is worth a note that despite the enormous increases in cost of maintenance and taxes, some as much as 200 to 300 percent, the O. P. A. has not granted one dime of increase in rentals—this during a period of wage increase of 250 percent. This fact alone is positive proof that property owners have been compelled to bear an unfair proportion of the cost of war. This condition must be remedied as soon as possible if properties are to be retained and maintained. The loss is fast becoming unbearable. I personally have homes now rented for 3 years with monthly mortgage obligations of $48, and total income of $50. These homes badly need painting and repairs. Where will the money come from?

It is not my thought in discussing public housing that the Congress should not cooperate with private enterprise, for I feel such cooperation is positively essential to the cause of progress and national well-being. However, this cooperation should be such as has already been exemplified by Congress, in the F. H. A., an institution that has been of great benefit to both the home builder and the home owner and, instead of being operated at national expense, has actually operated at a profit.

Very truly yours,
MILLER HOMES, INC.,
GEO. W. MILLER,
President.

Sheepmen Oppose Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the statement of J. M. Jones, secretary of the National Wool Growers Association, before the House Ways and Means Committee:

The National Wool Growers Association is a voluntary organization with permanent headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah. This organization was founded in 1865; first, in order to secure for the business of wool growing equal encouragement and protection with the other great industrial interests of our country; second, to protect the interests of sheepmen in the framing of a protective tariff on wool.

The history of tariff, as far as the sheep industry is concerned, dates back to 1867, and there has been a continual fight as to where duties should be placed. In 1913, the Underwood Simms Act placed wool on the free list, but following the last war when almost all of our agricultural commodities were in need of some protection, this protection was given under the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921. Just prior to the passage of this Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, imports of meat, wool, butter, and other products were so large that all interests united in the passage of this act.

The present market for domestic wool is the military market. Ordinarily consumption of wool in the United States exceeds production by 25 to 35 percent. Today foreign wools are sold here at Government-fixed prices which are below our own cost of production, and the result is that consumption of wool under the present conditions amounts to approximately 75 percent foreign and 25 percent domestic.

This deprives the American wool grower of practically his entire civilian market, and a large share of the temporary wartime markets. The question, therefore, resolves itself down to the effect that these large importations of foreign wools under the present price schedules will have on the domestic market.

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTS

The membership of the association consists principally of wool growers in Texas and 12 other Western States which have State wool-grower organizations affiliated with the national. Over 70 percent of the sheep industry in the United States is located in this area representing an investment of three-fourths billion dollars and requiring the services of 175,000 operators. These States, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, on January 1, 1945, have 29,335,000 head of stock sheep out of a total of 41,315,000 head in the United States. There has been a decrease of 16 percent in numbers, however, since 1942.

IMPORTANCE OF LIVESTOCK TO THE WEST

Ninety-six percent of the western range lands occupied by this great industry is adapted only to the raising of livestock. Also, a large percentage of the remaining land is used in raising feed for livestock. Except for the livestock industry, this land would be nonproducing and nontaxable, and the whole region would be of little value

for the mineral deposits—and oil—but these resources are expendable and are being expended at a rapid rate—they are not replaceable. Livestock utilizes only the annual resource of this country, and over the years to come will be the principal source of wealth.

In 1943 the cash income received from the principal commodities produced in the 12 Western States and Texas was divided into the following: All minerals amounted to $1,652,000,000. The livestock industry ranked second in importance with a total income of $1,288,766,000, or over three-fourths as much as the income from minerals. Petroleum ranked third with a total cash income of $887,404,000. Fruit crops followed with over $700,000,000; vegetable crops $626,000,000; dairy products over $409,000,000; food grains $334,000,000; poultry $156,000,000; and sugar beets $41,638,000. It is readily recognized from these figures that the financial stability of the West is dependent to a large extent on the livestock industry which will continue to increase in importance as the natural resources are depleted.

ASSOCIATION'S POSITION

The position of the wool growers and their associations has been consistent. The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the eightieth annual convention on January 30, 1945:

"The present administration is committed to the revision of tariff through reductions and replacements by international and reciprocal trade agreements. We oppose this program because the successful contribution of meat and fiber, and of agriculture, industry, and labor has shown that those industries having protective tariffs have been able to make a greater contribution to the war effort than those not having such protection and dependent upon foreign sources of supply."

This association's representatives, on May 1, 1934, gave extended testimony in opposition to the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Concern of the woolgrowers and their representatives was so great that Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, secured from the President of the United States, under date of June 5, 1934, a letter giving assurance that nothing would be done under this act to injure wool prices. This letter from former President Roosevelt follows:

"MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: My concern that agricultural prices should be protected and, where possible, substantially raised ought to be well known by this time. That is why I was surprised that a question should be raised about wool. The new tariff bill has been thought of as one of the emergency measures which would help in the general effort to rehabilitate agriculture and industry together. The wool industry is one of those which needs price protection, and the suggestion that the new tariff bill might be used to lower those prices is one which would not have occurred to me. That is the thought I expressed to you, Senator Costigan, and others on May 9. I have read the statement which you issued, and, as I might expect, it correctly reports the facts.

"I hope you have no further concern for fear that something damaging to the industry may result from the legislation.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

Congressman REED asked Mr. Henry A. Wallace, on March 8, 1934, if he believed that lower tariff would help agriculture. Mr. Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture, replied, "Well, I am to some extent a partisan of agriculture, and I would hold on to all the agricultural tariff I could get; from the national point of view, it seems to me that agriculture is entitled to exactly the same kind of tariff benefit as industry, to that, and no more."

Mr. Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State in 1934, stated: "I can say this, sir, and I am speaking for myself alone, that no blanket tariff revision is contemplated. It is not to my mind a proceeding which will mean a tariff revision. It is a proceeding which will mean finding bargins which will prove to advantage to foreign trade without undue injury to American producers.

"Now those responsible for this program will have the program and a reel problem of finding just how trade can be increased without undue injury to American producers."

The record, of course, shows that Mr. Sayre was wrong in his opinion that no blanket tariff revision would be made because as the record shows, many commodities have been affected by these tariff changes.

In every instance when the interests of the sheep industry were affected, the National Wool Growers Association has submited a brief to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in regard to the various proposed agreements.

The submission of these briefs to this committee has been a formality to conform to the law. So far as anyone can determine, neither the State Department nor the committee gave any consideration to these briefs. The agreements entered into under the act have been made with the utmost secrecy and without regard to opinions of industries affected.

Tariff reductions have been made with countries in which the commodity under consideration was of little importance, but under the "favored nations" agreements, the reductions apply to all of the other countries in that group. The State Department has said that it is the general policy of the United States in negotiating trade agreements with foreign countries to consider concessions only on products of which the other country is the chief or an important source of our imports.

Apparently this is just another policy statement that is not adhered to. For example, in the agreement with Mexico, in 1942, the duty on sheep and lambs was reduced 50 percent, or from $3 to $1.50 per head. The year before the trade agreement, however, Mexico imported into the United States only 4,000 head of live sheep, which is very unimportant when considering the sheep population of the United States of over forty million head.

The country for which the reduced duty was particularly effective was Canada. Up to the middle of November 1944, 93,647 head of lambs were imported from Canada. On the days those imports were received the effect was to lower the market price of domestic lambs. During the time these Canadian lambs were being imported into this country, agencies of our Government were sending large quantities of meat to Great Britain. The question naturally arises as to why Canada did not send this meat to Great Britain instead of shipping the lambs to this country while, at the same time, our Government was shipping large quantities of meat to Great Brtain under lend-lease.

Another point deserving serious consideration is the fact that the Defense Supplies Corporation paid the packers the same subsidy for the imported lamb as was paid on domestic lamb.

REASON FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

When the reciprocal trade agreements bill was being considered in 1934, former Secretary Hull stated repeatedly, and particularly, when important questions were asked of him which were not answered in a direct manner—"the bill frankly proposes an emergency remedy for emergency conditions. Most persons are still passing through a grave economic crisis, it is my judgment that extraordinary conditions call for extraordinary methods of treament. Its support is only urged as an emergency measure to deal with a dangerous and threatening emergency situation. It is an emergency measure, temporary in its nature, to meet emergency conditions. Of course, you know what an awful condition the world is in economically and socially. We have had as high as fourteen and fifteen million unemployed persons in this country who were accustomed to employment and who, with their families, would amount to thirty-five million human souls of our one hundred and twenty million living an utterly hopeless existence, out of employment.

In asking for the extension at this time, the economic situation is reversed, particularly from the standpoint of workers. In fact, as far as the sheep industry is concerned, the threat of future reciprocal trade agreements made in this manner is causing grave concern. It is not impossible that, under the proposed provisions of the extension of this act, more and more farm and livestock people will be forced into cities to constitute a surplus of industrial labor.

SOME REDUCTIONS SINCE 1934

Through trade agreements with the United Kingdom, France, Argentina, and Mexico, duties on wool and lambs, and on wool imported in manufactured form have been reduced.

The duty on wool imported in the form of rags was reduced from 18 to 9 cents per pound. This agreement became provisionally effective on November 17, 1938. In the next 2 years, the imports of rags, chiefly from Great Britain, increased over 200 percent, from the average imports the past 8 years, which of course, displaced the use of that much domestic wool. The increases in imports of two types of cloth and clothing in the same year were 219 percent and 69 percent, making a total of the equivalent of 20,000,000 pounds of wool. Because of the fact that the domestic manufacturer is our only customer, any reduction in the duty of wool in the manufactured form has an effect upon domestic wool, it being impossible to export wool from this country due to our higher costs of production. Consequently, the domestic producer is concerned over the reduction of tariff duties on manufactured products made of wool.

In 1936, an agreement with France reduced duties on yarn, pile, and knit fabrics, thus increasing the imports of foreign wool and decreasing the potential demand for domestic wool by American manufacturers.

On October 14, 1941, an agreement was signed with Argentina which reduced the rate on dutiable wools not finer than 40's from 24 to 13 cents per pound clean content. On wools not finer than 44's, the reduction was from 29 to 17 cents per pound.

An agreement with Mexico, signed December 23, 1942, reduced the duties on sheep and lambs from $3 per head to $1.50 per head.

We also know that negotiations with Australia were under discussion until interrupted by the outbreak of the war, and of course, the war situation makes it impossible to fairly determine the effect of these tariff decreases on the imports of wool, rags, and wastes and the manufacturers of wool. However, Australians recently asked a reduction in the usual duty and suggested that our wool growers be given a subsidy in place of it. As explained above, we have had an example of what effect the reduced duties on sheep and lambs have had on our domestic products.

It is readily seen, therefore, that this reciprocal agreement program is a continuous threat to the domestic sheep industry as long as it is handled in the present manner.

THE EFFECT OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ON AGRICULTURE

The United States Tariff Commission prepared material showing the value of agricultural imports and exports for the years 1934, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. Because of the effect of the war upon foreign trade, only the comparison of the 1934 figures with those of 1939 are shown. Of course, it must be

stated that this study does not include trade with Argentina, Uruguay, or Mexico, since the agreements with those countries were negotiated after 1940. In this report, noncompetitive agricultural imports are not separated from competitive. But inasmuch as noncompetitive imports are practically duty free and have not been affected by trade agreements, it would seem fair to consider that increases in imports were on competitive commodities.

From 1934 to 1939 agricultural imports from trade-agreement countries increased from $512,000,000 to $717,000,000, or 40 percent. Exports during that same pericd to the same countries increased $57,000,000 or 14 percent. The net effect was an additional volume of agricultural imports amou ting to $148,000,000.

We feel that H. R. 2652 should be amended. *"Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to give the President any authority to reduce any existing rate of duty on any agriculture or livestock product on which ceiling prices have been established as a war measure, until such time as the stocks of such material within the United States have been reduced to the quantity on hand at the time ceiling prices were established."

The policy of increasing agricultural imports in order to promote industrial exports will ultimately place the United States in the position of some other countries which have produced chiefly manufactured goods and were dependent for food from other countries.

The war has demonstrated the necessity for domestic production of both food and fiber.

This whole question as far as sheep industry is concerned is, Does our Government want a domestic sheep industry in this country? If the answer is in the affirmative, then assurance must be given the industry that it will receive prices for its products which will cover the cost of production.

The United States Tariff Commission, in its report on costs of production of wool, sheep, and lambs, released January 1945, shows a loss of $1.22 per head of sheep. These losses, brought on largely by Government regulations, coupled with threats of lower tariffs and other adverse factors, are occasioning tremendous liquidation. It is our considered opinion that reduction in breeding stock since 1943 has been 25 percent.

In spite of all of these adverse conditions a remarkable record has been set up by the sheep industry in the supplying of meat and fiber. But using the words of former Secretary Hull, when speaking during the discussion of the reciprocal trade agreements bill, "commodities will not long be produced unless they can be distributed and sold at cost or more. * * *" The sheep industry is exactly in this position. Production is decreasing because costs are not being met.

This present conflict has undoubtedly taught us the need for our ow nproduction of raw materials. Agriculture and labor of the United States have produced for the allies, and without doubt has had much to do with the defeat of our enemies. George Washington said: "If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war." That is the price of peace.

Protection of industries producing raw materials through a protective tariff is very inexpensive insurance. This fact is brought very forcibly to mind by the tremendous expenditure of $600,000,000 to construct a synthetic rubber industry in this country during the present war.

The executive branch of our Government, including the bureaus, are continually grasping for more power, more control. The request for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the bill under consideration is an example of not only increased power, but a continuation of the present unsound delegation of power to the executive branch of the Government.

In the words of Hon. J. C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator from Wyoming, "The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does invade the field of treaties—it does invade the field of revenue legislation—it does invade the field of regulation of commerce."

All that is asked by our people is the return of the Congress of the legislative power given the representatives of the people under our democracy. The request for the adherence by our representatives certainly cannot be construed by foreign nations as a lack of interest in international relations. After all, at least 22 out of the 26 countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements require in some form or another the legislative appraisal of such agreements.

Our people of the West urge that the Congress of the United States assume again its responsibilities by not passing this bill to extend the authority of the President, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The Sugar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ARTHUR R. HURST CO.,
Grands Rapids, Mich., May 9, 1945.

Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BARNEY: I have been interested in reading the reports of your Washington comments on the sugar situation, and just thought I would mention once more the Washington O. P. A. office still refuses to rezone Michigan so that Puerto Rican and Cuban granulated sugar coming into this country through New Orleans, Mobile, and Pensacola cannot be shipped into Michigan, although, as I wrote you recently, there are plenty of these sugars stored by dealers in public warehouses at a point as near as Gary, Ind. We need these sugars badly, even a few thousand bags a month would help.

A letter from our New York connections this morning makes the plain statement: "National Sugar Refining Co. are still tremendously handicapped by the enormous demands made on them by Government agencies, which are taking almost their entire bulk granulated product."

The inconsistency of this program, details of which are not given the public, is brought to light when you consider the Interstate Creameries at Cedar Springs, Mich., are working 100 percent on sweetened condensed milk for W. F. A. and yet they can't get enough sugar to operate consistently, and our friends the W. R. Roach Co., who will have to set aside about half of their pack of peas for Government agencies, can't be sure they will have sugar with which to pack these peas, even though the local O. P. A. gave them the sugar certificates 6 weeks ago. Orders for 3,200 bags were placed with the eastern refinery who is accustomed to supplying Roach's demands, and only one out of the four cars involved has been shipped.

The local O. P. A. rationing office will begin to issue coupons for home-canning sugar on the basis of 15 pounds per person by the end of this week, and there isn't enough sugar in distributors' hands around here to take care of the demand that will come from the "cashing" of these coupons.

You are probably well aware that throughout the South and Central States the home-canning program went into effect some time ago and those fortunate persons were issued canning-sugar coupons on the basis of 20 pounds per person, but, of course, in this fruit and berry raising State the cut from 20 to 15 pounds per person was made prior to the issuance of any canning coupons, so our good citizens are the ones who suffer.

Very truly yours.

A. R. HURST.

Resolution Adopted by Jewish War Veterans of the Department of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted May 6, 1945, in Boston, Mass., at a convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of the Department of Massachusetts:

We, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of the Department of Massachusetts in convention assembled at Boston, on May 6, 1945, are meeting in a time replete with problems staggering to a world bled and bleeding in its effort to overcome tyranny and reestablish civilized processes. We are met at a moment when the second of the three beasts that attacked the civilized nations is gasping its last and when we are assured that the third will soon do likewise. It may be noted here that we are meeting on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of our national organization of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. It is well, therefore, and timely that we give expression to our thoughts, our hopes, our aspirations and reflect, as we plan for the future, on the happenings of the past which brought about the present state of affairs.

We pause as we open our deliberations in solemn reflection upon the memory of our departed President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Deeply do we mourn his loss. A great American; a great humanitarian; beloved of the whole world, he symbolized in human form true Americanism, liberty, and democracy, courage, and perseverance and the adherence to the death to principles which were right. The world will long remember his valiant fight to which he truly gave his last full measure of devotion. Yet, while we mourn his passing, we stand firmly behind Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, who in these short weeks has proven himself a true leader of our great Nation. To him the Jewish War Veterans of the United States pledge their wholehearted support in the great tasks which it has fallen to his lot to further and complete. For this is America; Government of laws and not of men. A Government which knows no dictatorship whether benign or tyrannical; a dictatorship which appoints its successor irrespective of the wishes of the people and without their counsel.

As we emerge from the smoke of horrible battle and approach the dawn of a new era

of peace, we are constrained to think back to recall the things that led up to the conflagration which has envelcped the entire world. Economic want, unjust distribution, greed, ambition for political and economic power; all played their part in the rise of fascism, Hitlerism, and aggression. Then followed persecution of a peaceful people who afforded the aggressors a scapegoat. Propaganda was one of the many means used to deflect attention from the real aims of the aggressors. Scapegoatism, isolationism, and nationalism were nurtured by the aggressors. How very nearly they succeeded is something which should cause the world, as it gropes for a future of peace, to ever keep before it as a constant reminder of how close we came to the brink of the abyss.

One hundred and thirty-eight million Americans were so firmly imbued with the true spirit of Americanism and all that it embodies, so firmly steeped in right that they stood as a solid barrier against all the undermining forces directed against them. For this posterity will be forever grateful.

In the great struggle for freedom the veteran organizations of our country stood side by side harmonious and cooperative for they, above all others, know exactly the path along which America must go. Be it known that the Jewish War Veterans of the United States are grateful to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Spanish-American Veterans, and the rest of the veteran organizations for having stood side by side with us during the very trying periods through which we had gone with the advent of Hitlerism and dictatorship.

At this moment the United Nations are sitting in conference at San Francisco planning for an organization of the powers of the world to make for future world peace. In this planning it is our hope that the principles laid down at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and at the Bretton Woods Conference will be adopted recognizing that in planning world security, economic problems lie at the very foundation. That the solution of economic problems is as important in the maintenance of peace as the use of military power. It is our hope that in the plans for a security organization we afford such an organization necessary and practicable police powers which cannot be nullified by a handful of men from any one or more of the powers. Withal, it is our hope that such an organization may be speedily established even if perfection cannot at once be attained. Once established, like our own Constitution, we may strive for improvement as experience points the way. One thought presents itself in these plans for stopping future aggression; That is, it shall be an act of aggression on the part of any Government which fosters or permits the persecution of any of its minorities because of race, color, or religious preference. It was the first means used by Hitler.

Recalling that 12,000,000 American men and women of all faiths, creeds, and colors will be giving of their all in the armed services of our Nation and of whom all too many will have sacrificed life, limb, and career, we urge upon all Americans the adoption of a program which will establish permanently the security for which they made their sacrifices. Quibbling over benefits to the returning veteran should not be tolerated. Interpretation of the so-called G. I. bill of rights must be liberal. For those who require it, the best in hospital and medical care; financial assistance where needed without embarrassing red tape. It should be constantly borne in mind that veterans benefits are not doles, they are not charity, they are not gifts, they are not even compensation. For, be it remembered that these 12,000,000 men and women were deprived of those years of their lives upon which in civilian life they would have built their entire future.

At the end of this war more than 500,000 men and women of the Jewish faith will be eligible for membership in the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. To them we extend an invitation and an opportunity to join with us in our program of Americanism and service.

Let our memorials to those who made the supreme sacrifice in the wars of our Nation be more than mere monuments of stone. We urge such memorials to be of the nature of permanent reminders of the things for which they fought; beautiful roads in their memory, great forests in their name, camps for needy children, hospitals, homes and humanitarian projects generally.

As our men have fought for freedom let us implement their successes by the universal adoption of fair employment and antidiscrimination and practices acts. We favor the enactment in Massachusetts of legislation patterned after the so-called Ives-Quinn bill of the State of New York.

We favor the immediate bringing to trial and the punishment of the war criminals following the cessation of hostilities.

As a civilized and democratic people, we recognize the humanities of the Geneva Conference with respect of war prisoners but notwithstanding that recognition, we urge the adoption of methods in their treatment which would indicate our awareness of the inhuman treatment suffered by our own men who had the misfortune of being taken prisoner by the Axis powers. Being civilized we cannot invoke the rule of "an eye for an eye," but we can and should stop nonsensical coddling of arrogant whelps mothered by inhuman beasts.

Finally, we urge upon the United Nations the adoption of the proposals by our Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan to effect the permanent and total disarmament of Germany and Japan for the safety of the world and the happiness of our future generations. Be it *resolved*, That the foregoing be adopted by this convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of the Department of Massachusetts at Boston on May 6, 1945, as a statement of policy.

JOSEPH H. CINAMON,
Past Department Commander,
National Vice Commander,
Chairman, Committee on Resolutions.

H. R. 2788

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will soon be able to complete its study of and report out favorably H. R. 2788. Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter which sets forth clearly some of the difficulties under which both business and labor are operating and which this bill would, in part, relieve:

VALENTINE CLARK CORPORATION,
St. Paul, April 27, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of inviting your attention to Representative JOHN H. GWYNNE's bill, H. R. 2788, which would amend the Judicial Code to establish time limitations within which public and private action could be brought, based on Federal law. This is quite important in the light of present conditions.

So long as we in the lumbering industry dealt only with union organizations, we found they did observe their contract obligations after the usual period of negotiation and discussion had resulted in a signed contract. Then along came the wage-and-hour law and the various controls set up by the Manpower Commission, and the evolution of that was that the employer knew that at least once a year his entire procedure would be subject to the routine labor negotiations with the union, and then in due time the matter would be referred to the War Labor Board where they sat on it for months and months, and finally a panel would appear, take up a few more days' time and expense for all concerned, and then the situation would be reviewed again somewhere, and sometimes a year after the discussion started a ruling is handed down which is just filled up with decisions that change the entire understanding under which industry has been working. They always give something in the way of a raise or a ruling that increases the income and they make it retroactive.

It is impossible to set up reserves anticipating these belated decisions, and with just three of our men in the plant here the last year we have already gone back over the records twice to catch up on some retroactive pay, plus overtime, plus Social Security, less withholding tax. Now we have to go over the records back 2 years for the same men, all because the labor panel, in its final conclusions, left out a couple of words that both the union organization and the employers had agreed to for years. It is another one of those cases where people who know nothing about the industry they are dealing with apply the same interpretation they made on a slaughterhouse or peanut factory.

This accumulation of retroactive adjustments is getting to be so complicated that we never know whether we are doing it right or not, and we notice that the workers have gotten to the state of mind where they are completely bewildered and admit that they simply cannot figure out whether they were correctly paid or not.

In view of this it certainly seems reasonable to us that Mr. GWYNNE'S bill is going to be almost necessary if we are going to retain our sanity in trying to operate a business, as there certainly must be a definite period established within which these matters must be disposed of or be outlawed.

May I urge your consideration and interest in support of this measure.

Respectfully yours,

M. H. SPERRY.

Salaries of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Assembly Joint Resolution 42

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to adjust the salaries of its Members

Whereas the salaries of Members of the Congress of the United States have not been changed for several years; and

Whereas a Member of Congress usually must maintain a home in his resident State as well as in Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas living expenses have greatly increased and taxes are very high and will likely remain so for a number of years after the war; and

Whereas the Members of Congress occupy positions of great importance and responsibility, which demand men and women of ability, integrity, industry, honesty, and character: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide, as soon as may be, for the adjustment of the salaries of the Members of Congress so that each Member will receive not less than $12,500 nor more than $15,000 annually; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of recommendations and statement of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HONORABLE LINDSAY C. WARREN, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDED IN HIS STATEMENT BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, MAY 15, 1945

1. Better informed scrutiny by appropriations committees of Budget estimates.

a. More information in Budget as to agency programs.

b. Increased staff for appropriations committees.

c. Increased use of General Accounting Office on particular matters relating to expenditure and application of funds.

d. Closer cooperation between Congress and Bureau of the Budget.

2. Joint committee to receive, act on, and route to other committees reports of Comptroller General on expenditures, economy, and efficiency.

3. Reexamination of statutes exempting administrative agencies from general laws controlling expenditures.

4. Removal of many small statutory restrictions which hamper administration without accomplishing legislative thought.

5. More careful scrutiny of requests by disbursing or certifying officers or sureties for legislative relief from charges raised by General Accounting Office for improper payments.

6. Audit of Government corporations (already enacted).

a. Development of techniques for furnishing Congress increased information, which may prove applicable in some degree to regular departments.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LINDSAY C. WARREN, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, MAY 15, 1945

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the invitation which you have extended to me to appear before you and discuss methods of strengthening congressional control of Federal expenditures, in connection with the studies which your committee is making of various phases of the organization of Congress.

Because of my long service in the legislative branch and continuing close relationship, official and personal, with its Members, I am intensely interested in the whole problem of strengthening the Congress and equipping it with modern machinery to enable it to perform properly its appropriating and other legislative functions. The number of proposals made to this end, both within and without Congress, and the high standing and character of the proponents, shows the importance of the question. And indeed, it is important. At present we have a situation where Congress annually appropriates billions to the executive branch, but treats itself so poorly that it has to go to the executive branch and beg, borrow, or steal personnel to help run its business.

I am generally familiar with the proposals in the field of reorganization and reduction of committees, improving the staffing of Congress and of its committees and members, formalizing the relations of Congress with the executive branch through such measures as the "question period," and increasing the control of Congress over administrative procedures, actions, and expenditures. All of these have their good points and many should be adopted without too much delay. The most constructive step, I think, was the establishment of this committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements. I only regret that your authority does not go further. However, I shall confine my remarks to those matters which concern the relationship of the Congress and the General Accounting Office, and the broader question of legislative control of expenditures.

Control of the purse is one of the most important prerogatives of the legislative branch. It was written into the Constitution as section 9 of article I, providing that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law. Ever since the Congress has sought in many ways and with varying success to give effect to this principle. As early as 1802 the Nicholson committee of the House of Representatives, appointed to inquire and report whether moneys drawn from the Treasury had been faithfully applied to the objects for which they were appropriated and whether they had been legally accounted for, said:

"There are two previous requisites which are necessary to justify the expenditure of public money and without which no legal expenditure can be made: First, that the expenditure for the object to which it is applied should be authorized by law; and, secondly, that an appropriation should have been made to cover that authorized expense."

In its efforts to put teeth into these rules Congress has written countless restrictions and prohibitions into appropriation statutes, but those restrictions sometimes have been evaded, sometimes have been impractical, and sometimes have defeated their own ends. At other times, such as the present, due to war or emergency conditions, Congress has practically given a blank check to the executive branch in the matter of expenditures. I feel that it is not too soon to begin to reexamine these large grants in the light of the progress of the war and to draw back to the Congress the control of expenditures.

For the enforcement of all of its directions as to the expenditure of the public funds Congress has relied upon the accounting officers of the Government. Until 1921 these officers—the comptrollers and auditors of the Treasury—were in one of the executive departments. A principal purpose of the Budget and Accounting Act was to make the Accounting Office of the Government independent of the Executive and responsible to Congress. This intent is shown not only by the language of the act but by its legislative history.

The act created the General Accounting Office as an establishment independent of the executive departments. It gave the Comptroller General and the Assistant Comptroller General a 15-year term and made the Comptroller General ineligible for reappointment and both officers removable only by joint resolution of Congress or by impeachment. It provided that all claims and demands in which the Government was concerned, either as debtor or creditor, should be settled and adjusted in the General Accounting Office, and that the balances certified by the Comptroller General should be final and conclusive upon the executive branch. It directed the Comptroller General to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and to make reports to Congress, either House, and certain committees of either House.

As to the legislative history of the act, during consideration of the bill in the House, Representative Byrns, of Tennessee, ranking minority member of the House Select Committee on the Budget, which had initiated similar legislation in the preceding Congress, and later chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, majority leader, and Speaker of the House, said: "The Comptroller General is the representative of Congress. He does not represent the Executive in any sense of the word, and the whole idea of the Budget Committee was to make him absolutely and completely independent of the Executive. (Sixty-first CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1081.)

A little further on, Mr. Byrns stated with respect to the Comptroller General:

"He acts as the auditor for Congress, to see that the appropriations made have been expended properly and honestly and in accordance with the intent of Congress as expressed in the appropriating act." (Id., p. 1082.) And on page 1857 of the RECORD, Representative Garner, later Speaker of the House and Vice President, one of the House conferees on the bill, said of the Comptroller General, "I wanted him to be absolutely independent."

Thus it is clear that the General Accounting Office is not a part of the executive branch but is the institution of Congress in fiscal matters, under the Comptroller General and the Assistant Comptroller General as the agents of Congress.

Today there is a widespread misconception of the functions and duties of the General Accounting Office, not only among the public, but among Members of Congress itself. There are less than 25 Members of the present Congress who were here when the Budget and Accounting Act was enacted in 1921. This seeming lack of knowledge has undoubtedly been due primarily to the fact that we do not invite interviews or give out releases or propaganda statements. To do so would destroy the effectiveness of the Office.

Within the past year a highly respected Member of the Congress and chairman of an important committee, who was a Member when the Budget and Accounting Act was passed, made the startling statement that the principal duty of the General Accounting Office was to detect fraud. Even recently it was said on the floor of the House that we were merely an auditing and bookkeeping establishment. Of course, the General Accounting Office is doing the biggest auditing job in the world, as an agent of the Congress. But against the comments I have just noted, set this statement made during the debates on the Budget and Accounting Act by Representative Good, chairman of the Select Committee on the Budget, in charge of the bill on the floor of the House:

"It was the intention of the committee that the Comptroller General should be something more than a bookkeeper or accountant; that he should be a real critic, and at all times should come to Congress, no matter what the political complexion of Congress or the Executive might be, and point out inefficiency, if he found that money was being misapplied—which is another term for inefficiency—that he would bring such facts to the notice of the committees having jurisdiction of appropriations." (61 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1090.)

In order to insure the carrying out of this desire the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Act provided in considerable detail as to the investigating and reporting functions of the General Accounting Office. These functions have been carried out by the Office ever since. There has been criticism, some well-founded, of the manner in which it has been done. However, it has been my constant effort since assuming the office of Comptroller General to improve this service to Congress. During the past fiscal year, 233 reports were made by the General Accounting Office to the Congress or to its committees. Besides these reports, a detailed list of which appears in the House hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1946 commencing at page 112, 184 cases of erroneous or extravagant payments were reported to the House Committee on Appropriations. Many of these reports, however, are little used, and it has even been reported to me that some could not be found up here in Congress. I will come back to this in a moment with a specific recommendation.

The investigating and reporting functions of the General Accounting Office are very broad, but little understood. Section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act requires the Comptroller General to investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and to make annual reports to the Congress containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds as he may think advisable. This subsection also requires him to make recommendations, in his regular report or in special reports, looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures.

Section 312 (b) requires the Comptroller General to make investigations and reports ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures, and at the request of any such committee, to direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request. Other provisions of section 312 require still further reports from the Comptroller General to the Congress.

It is under this general authority, as implemented by annual appropriations, that the investigating and reporting functions of the General Accounting Office have been carried on ever since the Office came into existence. However, the function of making investigations and reports ordered by either House or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures—that is, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Finance Committee—has been emphasized by a new provision in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1946 making an appropriation of $67,930 to the General Accounting Office for investigations for, and detail of assistants to, committees of Congress as authorized in section 312 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act.

This appropriation for the purposes of section 312 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act does not affect the general duty of the Comptroller General to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds and to make to Congress reports concerning such matters and recommendations concerning economy or efficiency in public expenditures, as set out in section 312 (a), or other reporting functions covered by the remaining portions of section 312. However, it may result in increased use of the facilities of the General Accounting Office by the committees designated in section 312 (b), especially the Appropriations and Expenditures Committees.

The foregoing statements show the close relationship between the Congress and the General Accounting Office, and the information and assistance being furnished to the Congress by the Office, in addition to the performance of its function as the agent of Congress to settle and adjust all accounts and claims in which the United States is concerned. I believe that analysis of these statements will also show the possibility of Congress obtaining increased help from the Office.

The Budget and Accounting Act set up the machinery for executive compilation and revision of the budget estimates, and for their presentation to the Congress through the Bureau of the Budget and the President. It also set up the machinery for the independent audit and settlement of the public accounts, and the furnishing of reports concerning the receipt, disbursement, and application of such funds, by the Comptroller General as the agent of Congress. However, with all the information the Congress is receiving as to budgetary requirements and expenditures, I have been forced to the conclusion, previously expressed to committees of the House, that Congress has no idea how appropriated funds are spent. Since I first made that statement steps have been taken to strengthen the staffs of the Appropriations Committees, and we are cooperating with the Senate committee by furnishing two men for their staff.

This brings me to my first recommendation concerning measures to strengthen the control of Congress over expenditures; that is, a closer, better-informed scrutiny and analysis by the Congress—the Appropriations Committees—of the budget estimates submitted by Government agencies. This could be done without destroying the concept of the executive budget as contemplated by the Budget and Accounting Act. In fact, to attempt to set up a parallel legislative budget would completely duplicate the work which you have set up the Bureau of the Budget to do. Now it is the job of the Bureau of the Budget, and not of the General Accounting Office, to prepare the budget. I think, however, that if you could have the budget show more of the programs they expected to undertake with the money which you appropriate, that is, state the job to be done in specific terms within the general authority of the agency rather than merely the receipts and expenditures, man-years and salaries, and other information classified according to type of expenditure, you would have a better idea of what that money is really to be spent for.

Then, by increasing the staffs of the Appropriations Committees, perhaps even beyond the limited increase which has already taken place, and by increasing use of the General Accounting Office on particular matters relating to the expenditure and application of funds, the Congress could better inform itself as to how expenditures have been made and as to the soft spots in the organization or activities of the agencies requesting funds. This information would be available for use when the agencies appeared before the Appropriations Committees requesting funds. In other words, the committee would have both sides of the story. While the present manpower situation and the tremendous job the General Accounting Office now has due to war expenditures and the new corporations audit work enjoined upon us by the George Act would make it impossible for the General Accounting Office to undertake the job immediately on a Government-wide basis, this function could be developed gradually and I sincerely believe would in time become a great aid to the Congress and its committees dealing with appropriations and expenditures. I feel, too, that notwithstanding the distinction between the executive and legislative branches here could be closer cooperation between the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget, particularly in regard to information as to the standards applied by the Bureau in reducing or approving particular estimates.

My second recommendation is that a joint committee be set up by Congress to receive and act upon reports submitted by the Comptroller General on expenditures, efficiency, and economy in the executive branch, and to route them to other interested committees such as the Expenditures and Appropriations Committees. Upon receipt of such reports, representatives of the department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office could be called to the Committee on Public Accounts and the whole matter could be threshed out. This would keep our reports from getting lost, or simply being disregarded, and would encourage us to make more and better reports.

A third and a most important step would be the reexamination of the numerous statutes enacted by the Congress granting authority to administrative officials to make expenditures without regard to general laws controlling and safeguarding the use of public funds. Many such statutes are listed in my annual reports for the fiscal years 1941 to 1944, inclusive. While Congress no doubt deemed it necesary in the early days of the war to authorize administrative officials to act without regard to the provisions of many laws otherwise controlling, the present progress of the war makes continued granting of such authority highly questionable if the Congress is to regain its control over the purse. Now is the time to begin to draw in this authority.

Closely related to the suggestion just made is another concerning the restrictions and limitations on the use of public funds. It may be that in some cases, you will find that the reason for exempting so many agencies from a particular restriction is that the restriction has become outmoded or unworkable. In such cases the solution will not be to put the agencies back under the restriction, but to remove the restriction and hold the agency accountable for its actions under its general grant of authority from Congress. It will take careful study to determine just when this should be done, but I can see a fertile field for study in the removal of many small limitations which hamper administation and do not always accomplish the legislative thought.

A fifth improvement would be more careful scrutiny of requests by disbursing or certifying officers for relief from charges on account of illegal or improper payments. These charges are raised by the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress in the settlement of the public accounts. A liberal treatment of such requests for relief tends in the long run to encourage a careless attitude on the part of the spending officers and to discourage the General Accounting Office in its efforts to apply, in the settlement of the accounts, the rules laid down by the Congress to control expenditures.

Another notable step toward increased congressional control of expenditures, long recommended by the General Accounting Office, has already been taken with the enactment of the Government corporation audit

provisions of Public Law 4, approved February 24, 1945—the George Act. That act provides that the financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited each fiscal year by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, beginning with the current fiscal year, and that a report of each such audit shall be made to the Congress not later than the following January 15. The complete program for financial control of Government corporations is set forth in the Byrd-Butler bill, S. 469, and the Case and Whittington bills, H. R. 2051 and H. R. 2177, now pending. This legislation will give the Congress an annual review and report of the financial transactions of all Government corporations. In the meantime, the audit by the General Accounting Office under the George Act will be a laboratory in which we can develop and test the techinques for providing the Congress with better information as to the use of public funds by these corporate agencies—techniques which experience may prove suitable for application in some degree to the regular Government departments and establishments.

With these suggestions for improving the control of Congress over expenditures, I will close my general remarks, gentlemen. I will be glad to answer any questions which you may have on these matters.

Vermont Leads the World With Its 46 Ton-of-Gold Cows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of those who would really like to rate as representatives from dairy States, let me modestly and facetiously offer the advice that they come to Vermont to learn the business. This is said in all kindness and only with an intent to be helpful to those to whom I have had to listen patiently for the last 12 years as they have tried to make me believe they came from a real dairy State.

Now, they should read of the world record made by the Jersey herd owned by their former colleague, the Honorable E. S. Brigham, of St. Albans, Vt., and Montpelier, Vt., and forever after hold their peace; or at least they should acknowledge the correctness of my statements, that when it comes to the dairy business Vermont leads the world, and it takes second place for nobody either as to quality, or as to quantity of cows per capita.

Under permission heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Burlington Free Press of date May 11, 1945, which reads as follows:

BRIGHAM WITH 46 TON-OF-GOLD COWS IN ST. ALBANS HAS MADE WORLD RECORD AMONG BREEDERS—MOREOVER, HE HAS HAD FOR 5 YEARS HERD OF 100 OR MORE PRODUCERS WHICH HAVE UNUSUAL PLACE IN JERSEY ANNALS

New honors have been heaped upon the outstanding Jersey herd of Brigham Farm, owned by E. S. Brigham, St. Albans. He has built up the greatest number of ton-of-gold cows of any breeder in the world—46. And he has had for 5 years the highest producing Jersey herd of 100 cows or more.

"This great producing herd has carved its record into the annals of Jersey history," reported the American Jersey Cattle Club. Brigham shares all credit with his herdsman, Cesaire Lacoste, and his good pasture growing farm manager, E. Dupre. His entire herd of 141 head is by 8 sires, as shown by latest records.

The herd is made up of five yearlings in milk, twenty-seven 2-year-olds, nineteen 3-year-olds, nine 4-year-olds, fifteen 5-year-olds, five animals over 10 years old, and the balance of the herd between 6 and 10.

In 1944, with 141 cows in the herd, 10,171 pounds of 5.11 percent milk, 520 pounds of fat were produced, with records made on a strictly twice-a-day milking basis. In 1943, with 127 cows, 10,058 pounds of 5.26 percent milk, 529 pounds of fat; 1942, with 112 cows, 10,116 pounds of 5.11 percent milk, 517 pounds of fat; in 1941, with 124 cows, 9,734 pounds of 5.26 percent milk, 512 pounds of fat; in 1940, with 118 cows, 9,441 pounds of 5.12 percent milk, 484 pounds of fat; in 1939, with 104 cows, 8,796 pounds of 5.18 percent milk, 455 pounds of fat; in 1938, with 102 cows, 8,398 pounds of 5.21 percent milk, 438 pounds of fat; and in 1937, with 94 cows, 7,617 pounds of 5.06 percent milk, 386 pounds of fat.

HAS OUTSTANDING SIRES

The eight sires and their tested sire averages are in themselves "one of the finest tributes to a breeder's ability to select herd sire that I have had the privilege of ever finding in 20 years of making herd analysis," comments the American Jersey Cattle Club representative. Their records, calculated on the basis of what the cows produced in 305 days a year with twice-a-day milking, follow:

Sy' il Ashburn Baronet Owl 396681, superior sire, 22 daughters who averaged 10,930 pounds of 5.41 percent milk, 591 pounds of fat. His 23 classified daughters average 83.15 percent.

Josephine's Royal King 250214, tested sire, 91 daughters, 10,605 pounds of 5.35 percent milk, 567 pounds of fat.

Floss Duke's Model 369058, tested sire, 37 daughters, 10,248 pounds of 5.36 percent milk, 549 pounds of fat.

Killingly Torono Lass' Lad 291790, tested sire, 47 daughters, 10,175 pounds of 5.02 percent milk, 511 pounds of fat.

Lilac Remus Unrivaled, 409293, three daughters, 10,431 pounds of 5.26 percent milk, 549 pounds of fat.

Lucille's Golden Owl, 251626, tested sire, 47 daughters, 9,150 pounds of 5.3 percent milk, 485 pounds of fat.

Smoky Pure Gold Duke, 356655, tested sire, 10 daughters, 10,471 pounds of 4.95 percent milk, 518 pounds of fat.

K. Torono Lass Lad's Omar, 361613, seven daughters, 10,629 pounds of 4.93 percent milk, 524 pounds of fat.

RECORD IS 10,831 POUNDS

The highest record made for 1944 by Brigham's cows was 10,831 pounds of milk, 683 pounds of fat, credited to the 3-year-old, Sybil Owl Verinda, 1289893. She is the daughter of Sybil Ashburn Baronet Owl, 396681, himself one of the highest ever proved in the Bureau of Daily Industry's sire program and a superior sire son of the great superior sire, Sybil Ashburn Baronet.

The highest of the 46 ton-of-gold cows is K. Torono Lass Lad's Olga, 1026871, credited with 56,885 pounds of milk, 2,553 pounds of fat. She is a daughter of Killingly Torono Lass' Lad and out of the cow Lucille's Golden Owl's Ina, 773938. The greatest dam of ton-of-gold cows, who is herself a ton-of-gold cow, is K. Torono Lass Lad's Nerissa, 1000269, dam of 4 ton-of-gold cows.

The 1944 herd improvement registry certificate issued to Brigham farm shows the following production groups into which all cows milked 270 days or more fell. Actual records only are quoted:

Twelve cows, 600 pounds of fat or more; 41 cows, 500–599 pounds of fat; 37 cows, 400–499 pounds of fat; eight cows, 300–399 pounds of fat; and only 1 cow under 300 pounds of fat.

Views of the Ball Bearings Tariff Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the views of the Ball Bearings Tariff Committee with reference to the Trade Agreement Act:

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

In the matter of the proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act, whatever may be its other aspects, its primary purposes are economic. This fact may be seen in the opening words of the act itself. (See transcript attached.) Time and the war have altered these purposes which may now be stated as: The prevention of a recurrence of economic depression; the provision of sufficient employment for returning veterans and others; and the preservation of peace. These purposes being entirely worthy and of vital importance, the question is whether or not this legislation will achieve its purposes.

II. ACT AS AMENDED BY H. R. 2652 SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED

For the reasons hereinafter stated the committee is opposed to the passage of H. R. 2652. Statistics have shown that in the years before the war and after the conclusion of trade agreements under the act, its avowed purposes were not accomplished. It is believed that the further extension of the policy inherent in the act would result in economic disaster.

III. FURTHER TREATY REDUCTIONS WOULD PAVE THE WAY FOR FLOODING OF THE DOMESTIC MARKET

The State Department, which in the last analysis has and will carry this legislation into effect, has stated its case over the radio and has distributed copies to the press and public. In the March 10 broadcast Mr. MacLeish asked, "If we lower tariffs, wouldn't we be flooded with cheap goods?" To which Mr. Clayton replied, "I don't think so. I'd like to point out that there is an implied contradiction in that phrase 'flooded with cheap goods.' The consumer would like to be flooded with cheap goods that are honestly cheap—that is cheap in price, because other countries can make them more efficiently than we can these are exactly the goods we should import."

It should be noted that, although productive efficiency has little to do with it, with further tariff reductions every nation's goods will be cheap but our own and the consumer will buy them. No good will derive from increased exports, if achieved, if domestic consumption is supplied largely by imports.

IV. FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS WILL CAUSE CONVERSION OF INDUSTRY

At another point in the same broadcast Mr. Clayton said: "After victory most plants will have to convert from war to peace production. They can convert in various ways,

and if they see tariff rates coming down and foreign markets opening up they will convert to the things that offer the best opportunities under those conditions."

There you have the proponents of lower tariffs telling you what is going to happen. United States industries which can only meet foreign competition with the aid of tariffs must convert to something else, if they can, and if they can bear the cost of conversion and find convertible labor.

V. EFFECT ON THE ANTIFRICTION BEARING INDUSTRY

The antifriction bearing industry did not have to convert for war because it is vital to the vast majority of other war industries. Antifriction bearings are essential components in the following combat units: airplanes (a Flying Fortress uses approximately 1,700 ball bearings), aircraft propellers, aircraft engines, gun mounts, instruments (including bomb sights), electric motors, machine tools (on which all other industries are dependent), tanks, and trucks.

The antifriction bearing industry had its start in Europe, and had it not been for tariff protection it would never have been able to develop in this country. Under these circumstances we would have been dependent on others in this war, as we could not have built up the industry without experienced technicians and laborers. In 1939 the industry employed an average of 18,248 workers for a total of 35,481,311 man-hours annually. It now employs approximately 70,000 workers for an estimated 155,000,000 man-hours for this year. As far as America's ability to defend itself in the future is concerned, the further reduction of duties on its products would prove even more disastrous to America than was the bombing of Schweinfurt to Germany.

Under the Tariff Act of 1930 the duty on these items was 45 percent and 10 cents per pound. Under the Swedish trade agreement this was reduced to 35 percent and 8 cents per pound. The duty on balls and rollers only was further reduced to 25 percent and 8 cents per pound under the United Kingdom trade agreement. If H. R. 2652 is passed as written these duties may be reduced to 17½ percent and 4 cents per pound, and 12½ and 4 cents per pound, respectively.

If this is done it is gravely doubted that the American industry can survive. As it is, the industry will be at a distinct disadvantage after the war with labor representing 60 to 70 percent of the cost of its product. In 1938 hourly wages in the various competing countries were United States 80 cents, England 40, France 38½, Germany, 35, Sweden 30, Belgium 24, Italy 16, and Japan 9½. The present average hourly wage in the United States is $1.233. Moreover, while American industry enjoys no technological advantage, foreign industry in some cases enjoys an advantage in raw material costs as well as in the productive rate per hour. These advantages may be further accentuated by the depreciation of foreign currencies in post-war years.

The State Department has branded this industry inefficient and therefore unworthy of protection, but its loss would be an irreparable disaster to our economy, our technical independence, and our safety.

VI. EFFECT OF CONVERSION OF PROTECTED INDUSTRIES

Further along these lines Mr. Clayton said: "If they have to depend on protection it is because they are less efficient. Our export industries are able to pay the highest wages because they are the most efficient industries."

Formerly protected industries then must become more efficient or convert to more efficiently produced products. These industries will then either employ less people for the same value of product or develop exportable surpluses which must produce more imports.

VII. THE QUESTION OF EXPORTS

As to our export industries, we have the automobile industry for example, though it is not mentioned by Mr. Clayton. If all production in the United States were as efficient as the auto industry we would probably have to export 30,000,000,000 annually in order to maintain full employment, and take only money in return. The exports mentioned by Mr. Clayton are cotton, tobacco, grain. Must we reduce the standard of living of everyone in the country to that of the producers of these products?

VIII. RAISING OF FOREIGN LIVING STANDARDS

Dean Acheson gives the answer: "Of course, in the long run and not too long a run either, living standards in other countries must be brought closer to ours * * *. As their standards are raised, and become equalized with those of the United States, they will be less likely to undercut our market by producing goods that are low in price because of sweated labor."

IX. CONCLUSION

When and if that millenium arrives will be time enough to cut tariffs further, but until then we must protect our economy from the results of our unique position. Low wages, longer hours of labor, depreciated currencies, and even technological superiority on the part of the majority of foreign industrialized countries makes it impossible for us to trade with them on a nearly free basis, without suffering ruinous competition and resultant unemployment.

Respectfully submitted.

THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.,
Canton, Ohio.
THE MARLIN-ROCKWELL CORPORATION,
Jamestown, N. Y.
THE FEDERAL BEARING CO.,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
THE FAFNIR BEARING CO.,
New Britain, Conn.
THE NEW DEPARTURE DIVISION OF GENERAL MOTORS,
Bristol, Conn.

Presidential Veto of House Joint Resolution 106

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, very few men, if their names were not mentioned, could be identified by their obituaries. The same is true of the obituary written in the form of a veto message on House Joint Resolution 106. Were it not for the fact that the resolution is mentioned by name in the veto message no one would ever suspect that the President was administering the last rites to the Tydings amendment and House Joint Resolution 106. Instead of quoting from the Tydings amendment and House Joint Resolution 106 in order to establish a premise, whoever penned the message simply set up a straw man and then proceeded to knock him down with a sledge hammer.

Now it is not my purpose to hold a post mortem, because in spite of the veto the policy laid down by Congress in the Tydings amendment is not dead unless we are going to kill food production, and no one, of course, is going to let that happen. My purpose is simply to acquaint the Congress and the country with just what has happened. It is this: The Tydings amendment declared the policy of Congress with respect to farm labor. The policy so declared, after being respected for over 2 years, was annulled by a directive issued by the Selective Service. The Congress then passed House Joint Resolution 106 reaffirming its policy as set forth in the Tydings amendment and directing Selective Service, notwithstanding its directive, to respect that policy. The President vetoed the resolution which, in effect, was equivalent to saying that an act of Congress can be annulled by a directive issued by some governmental agency. There can be no question as to this because the veto killed the resolution thereby reviving the directive. Of course, I do not believe the President intended to do such a thing; nevertheless that is exactly what he has done by his veto.

THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT

Let me first give you the background of this amendment. After the passage of the selective-service law industries essential to the war effort, such as munition factories, and so forth, were classified as critical industries, and provision made to keep those industries supplied with sufficient help, even though young men of draft age working in those industries had to be deferred from military service. This was right, because we all realized that it would be foolish to draft an army unless we supplied the army with the necessary implements of warfare. Strange as it may seem, though everyone recognized that food was just as essential in warfare as guns and tanks, agriculture was never classified as a critical industry, and hence farm boys prior to the Tydings amendment, were drafted into the armed forces regardless of their essentiality to the production of food. Realizing that farm labor, simply because farming had not been classified as a critical war industry, was being drained off in an alarming manner, not only by the draft boards but by industries paying a higher wage, the situation was taken up with the Selective Service by those in Congress interested in seeing that the farmers were given the necessary help to produce the food so essential to our war effort, to see if a solution could be found whereby the farm boys who were found by their local boards to be essential to the war food effort would be left on the farms. And to those who seemingly think the farm representatives were attempting to put something over that would give the farm boys preference, let me state that the Tydings amendment was not only agreed to by the Selective Service but was prepared by the Selective Service.

Now let me quote the text of this much maligned amendment, which when it was up in the Senate for passage, was favored by the author of the veto, who, of course, was then Senator Truman:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the

war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

The amendment had two purposes, namely:

First. To give the local draft board the authority, in the event it found the registrant "necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort," to defer the registrant "so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

Second. To freeze the farm boy to the farm in the event he was found by the local board "to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." This was necessary in order to keep such boys from leaving the farm and going to work for some war industry paying several times the farm wage, and this purpose was accomplished by providing "that should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land and naval forces under this act, his Selective Service local board shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service."

That part of the amendment that House Joint Resolution 106 attempted to preserve from the death knell of the Selective Service directive, and which is dealt with in the Presidential veto, is plain and unambiguous. The Congress, and so did Selective Service until its directive of January 3, 1945, construed the amendment to mean exactly what it said, namely, that if the local draft board found a registrant to be "necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort" the board, having made such determination, was required to defer the registrant "from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until a satisfactory replacement can be found." The only question under the amendment the local draft board was called upon to determine was the essentiality of the farm boy to the war food effort. No question of comparative essentiality between the farm and the armed forces was ever contemplated.

The effect, and the only effect, of the first provision in the amendment, which is the provision dealt with in the veto message, was to classify agriculture as a critical war industry and place the farm boy upon the same footing as boys engaged in critical war industries. Had not this amendment been passed, the local draft boards would have been forced to put all farm boys who passed the physical into the armed forces, which, of course, would have wrecked agriculture. This amendment was not passed until November 1942; and remember that prior to its passage a great deal of essential farm help had been drained off either through the draft boards or by industry paying a wage a great many times higher than the farm wage, and agriculture thereby placed in a precarious condition.

The Tydings amendment was passed in November 1942, and observed by Selective Service until January 3, 1945. On the later date Selective Service issued a directive known as Directive No. 288, which, for all practical purposes annulled the Tydings amendment by requiring the local boards to determine whether or not the registrant was more essential to the war food effort than he was to the armed forces. Moreover, Selective Service did not stop here, but went further and told the local boards that this determination had already been made in favor of the armed forces and if the registrant passed the physical there was nothing left for the board to do but put him in the Army.

There can be no question as to the meaning of the directive. And this meaning is confirmed by the testimony taken by the House Committee on Agriculture, which shows that in many instances Army officers appeared before the local boards and gave this interpretation of the directive. Now, up to January 3, 1945, the Congress had construed the Tydings amendment as placing upon the local boards only one determination, namely, is the registrant "necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." Moreover, the Selective Service had so construed the amendment. Hence, when the directive of January 3, 1945, was issued, stripping the farms of all boys between 18 and 26, a storm of protest came up from all farming sections, and many local draft boards resigned rather than follow the directive which in effect told them to ignore an act of Congress. In answer to this protest, the House Committee on Agriculture asked General Hershey to appear before the committee and explain why he was attempting to annul an act of Congress by a directive. Accordingly, on January 22, 1945, General Hershey appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture, and after engaging in considerable talk—he is a pretty hard man to corner—finally admitted that Selective Service construed the act as it had been construed by Congress, and further agreed to issue a directive correcting the erroneous interpretation of the amendment as set forth in directive No. 288. Thereupon, the House Committee on Agriculture and General Hershey drafted a directive correcting the erroneous interpretation placed upon the amendment by the directive of January 3, 1945—No. 288—which is as follows:

Questions of interpretation of State directors advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors advice No. 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

Everyone was now satisfied, as we thought the matter had been amicably settled. Then what happened? Why this is what happened: In the January issue of a publication gotten out by Selective Service, published subsequent to January 22, 1945, General Hershey inserted a signed editorial in which he wiped out the interpretation he placed upon the Tydings amendment in the corrective directive of January 22, 1945, which was the interpretation Congress had always placed upon the amendment, and which was also the interpretation Selective Service had agreed to January 22, 1945, and reaffirmed the interpretation set forth in directive No. 288 of January 3, 1945. In other words General Hershey went back on everything he told the House Committee on Agriculture on January 22, 1945, and which he confirmed by the directive of that date.

Directive No. 288 of January 3, 1945, and the editorial appear in my remarks to the House on February 7, 1945, and as they are rather lengthy I will not reinsert them.

On February 5, 1945, the House Committee on Agriculture again held a hearing on the matter and examined, among other witnesses, General Hershey. It was at this meeting that General Hershey, after much hedging, finally admitted that he placed upon the Tydings amendment the erroneous construction that I have referred to. Having obtained this admission, there was nothing left to do but introduce House Joint Resolution 106 if we intended to protect the production of food and maintain the integrity of Congress.

The record on this point is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now I just want to get the issues clear. As I understand it, the issue is this: The Congress believes that under the Tydings amendment, the determination for the local board to make is whether or not the boy is essential to the farm. Under your interpretation, it is a question as to the relative needs of the farm and the Army.

General HERSHEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that the local board should determine, when they examine a farm inductee, whether or not he is more essential to the farm than he is to the Army, or whether or not he is more essential to the Army than he is to the farm?

General HERSHEY. Yes.

THE VETO MESSAGE

The veto message is predicated upon the assumption that the Tydings amendment gave a blanket deferment to farm labor. This is clearly shown by the following excerpts from the message:

The indicated purpose of the amendment is to cause the deferment of a large number of registrants engaged in agricultural production.

* * * * *

Congress, when it passed the Selective Training and Service Act in 1940 wisely provided * * * no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups.

* * * * * *

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress that agricultural workers should be given blanket deferment.

* * * * *

In my opinion no group should have any special privileges, and, therefore, I return the joint resolution without my approval.

Now the Tydings amendment does not, as set forth in the veto message, attempt to defer a particular class or some particular group. It only attempted to keep on the farms those boys who were essential to our war-food effort, and these boys, regardless of their essentiality to the farm, were only to remain on the farm until satisfactory replacements could be obtained. The language of the amendment, as I have stated, is "every registrant found by a selective service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

If the farm worker was found essential to the war food effort by the local board he was left on the farm. If, on the other hand, the local board found that the farm worker was not essential to the war food effort he was inducted into the armed forces. The farm worker was dealt with by the local board as an individual. And remember House Joint Resolution 106 was simply a reaffirmation of this amendment. House Joint Resolution 106 did not, in any way, change the Tydings amendment. It only attempted to force Selective Service to respect the amendment. And also remember the Tydings amendment left with the local draft boards to determine, with respect to each individual registrant, the essentiality of such registrant to war food production. There is just as much reason in arguing that we gave blanket or group deferment to men working in some factory producing bombers simply because we deferred men working therein found essential to the successful production of bombers, as it is to argue that we gave blanket or group authority to men on the farm under the Tydings amendment, simply because under said amendment we deferred men working on the farm found essential to the successful production of food. Of course, blanket or group deferment was not given in either case.

But, for the sake of argument, let us assume that Congress under the Tydings amendment gave blanket or group deferment to those working on the farm; and let us admit that the Selective Service Act passed in 1940 contained a provision providing that "no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups." This violent assumption and frank admission does not, in any way, fortify the veto message. Congress is the policy-making body of our Government and, of course, if it has power to establish a policy it has the power to change a policy. The policy of Congress as expressed in the original Selective Service Act of 1940 was that "no deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups." Now assume—of course, it did not—that the Tydings amendment subsequently passed, changed this policy with respect to those engaged in farming as contended in the veto message. Will anyone familiar with our system of Government contend that Congress did not have the power to make this change in policy? The executive branch cannot establish or change a policy of Congress. That power, under the Constitution, is vested in the Congress and in the Congress alone. It can only execute the policies promulgated by Congress. Yet the veto message assumed a power never granted to the executive branch of our Government in that it upheld a directive that absolutely changed a policy laid down by Congress.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 106

Having at last found out that Selective Service intended to wipe out the Tydings amendment by directive, House Joint Resolution 106 was introduced. This resolution directs the Selective Service to carry out the policy of Congress as set forth in the Tydings amendment. It does not in any way change the Tydings amendment. All it does is to wipe out Selective Service Directive No. 288 of January 22, 1945, and direct Selective Service to construe said amendment according to its plain meaning and in accordance with the intent of Congress, and, for that matter, in the same way Selective Service itself had construed the amendment up to January 3, 1945.

The resolution reads:

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification, of said registrant, shall be made by said board: *Provided*, That no registrant who is qualified to serve in the armed forces shall be deprived thereby of the right to volunteer for such service."

The resolution was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee. Hearings were held and General Hershey appeared before the committee in opposition. The Military Affairs Committee, after hearing testimony and carefully considering the resolution, made a favorable report. A rule was asked for in order to speedily bring the resolution before the House. The Rules Committee held a hearing and General Hershey again appeared in opposition. The Rules Committee after a full hearing granted a rule. The resolution then came before the House where after full debate it was passed and sent over to the Senate where it was incorporated in what is known as the work-or-fight bill and passed. The work-or-fight bill having been killed, the resolution was reported out by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. It then came before the Senate, was fully debated, and passed. I give this recitation in order to show that the resolution was thoroughly and carefully considered.

Now permit me to quote a few excerpts from observations made by Senator TYDINGS, the author of the Tydings amendment, on directive No. 288 and the Hershey editorial, upon the floor of the Senate.

On February 8, 1945:

Mr. REED. On January 3 of this year General Hershey addressed to all State directors a letter, the concluding language of which is as follows:

"In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding"—I call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to that particularly—"will consider the President's finding that"—now I read what General Hershey quotes as the President's finding—"further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18- through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

Does the Senator from Maryland find in the language of the Tydings amendment anywhere a direction or authority or permission or requirement of the local draft board to give consideration to the need of the Army for men?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Kansas and all other Senators know that the head of the Selective Service System cannot do anything except in accordance with the acts of Congress. He cannot on his own motion draft anybody for the military service. He can only draft those within age limits and restrictions fixed by the Congress. He has no more authority to draft a man for the military service than I have, unless he is given the authority by law. Therefore my answer to the Senator is that what he has just read, contravening as it does the act of Congress, is worthless, and the fact that a Government official occupies a high position does not make his action any more valid than if he were a mere justice of the peace.

I should like to say for General Hershey—and I have had numerous dealings with him—that I have found him to be a very able man, who, until this recent action, it seemed to me was trying to stay within the acts of Congress and to perform at the same time a very arduous and difficult task, namely to supply men for our armed forces. That is the reason I feel all the more shocked that in this sweeping order, a part of which the Senator from Kansas read, and the remainder of which I shall shortly read, the whole amendment known as the Tydings amendment has been completely brushed aside insofar as what General Hershey said is concerned. Actually the Tydings amendment is just as valid and effective today as it was the day it was signed. No man coming within the provisions of the Tydings amendment can be drafted for any service until Congress changes the policy it adopted at the time it enacted that amendment, and the Tydings amendment provides "that if a man is regularly employed in an essential agricultural endeavor he cannot be taken for any other service unless a replacement for him shall first be found."

* * * * *

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it will be found that the third, the fifth, the seventh, and

the ninth paragraphs, particularly, of the editorial in effect say, "It does not make any difference whether a man is employed on a farm in an essential agricultural endeavor, and whether or not no replacement for him is available; if the draft board wants to draft him I say, 'Go to it.'"

That is exactly what the language means.

Mr. President, I do not believe Congress is going to stand for that sort of interpretation of its clear and express purpose in this matter, not only because of the merits of the legislation itself, inherent, in my opinion, in its wording and in the circumstances which now confront the country, but because the Congress will not be worth its salt unless it shall see to it that its acts are respected by those in executive position who are called upon to administer and enforce them.

* * * * *

Mr. TYDINGS. * * * Now we have a total striking down of that amendment, not by us, not even by the President of the United States, but by the head of the Selective Service System. I know that the pressure on General Hershey to provide men is tremendous and I sympathize with him. The way to obtain a change in anything we may have done so as to accommodate the country to the situation is by a new policy of the Congress; but so long as the policy of the Congress remains unchanged it must be interpreted as it has been interpreted up to now.

When House Joint Resolution 106 came before the Senate for consideration, the RECORD of April 18, 1945, reveals that the following proceedings took place:

Mr. TYDINGS. A number of Members of the Senate, as well as the House, have during the past 6 weeks asked for legislation reaffirming the provisions of the so-called farm deferment or Tydings amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. A measure doing that has passed the House. When it came to the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs has unanimously reported it favorably. The proper place to offer it would, of course, be on the bill which is now before the Senate. However, the Senator from Utah is not anxious to have the bill extending the Selective Training and Service Act go to conference. At the same time, in view of recent practice, I think the farm-deferment amendment ought to be restated and reaffirmed. Inasmuch as I know of no objection to it, with the consent and approval of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 106 be now considered. I do not believe it will provoke any debate. In that way we can avoid the necessity of offering it as an amendment to some other bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the joint resolution in the same language as the amendment which the Senate adopted when it had under consideration the manpower bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is in the original language, with an interpretative sentence at the end, so as to avoid the conflict of opinion which seems to have resulted. There is nothing new in it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When was the joint resolution reported from the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. It was reported on April 11.

Mr. WHITE. And it has been on the calendar since?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. There is no objection from any quarter. I believe it passed the House unanimously. I do not wish to offer it as an amendment to the bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me ask the Senator from Maryland if the joint resolution is in the exact wording indicated in Calendar No. 182?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

(Here follows the text of H. J. Res. 106.)

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

CONCLUSION

First. The Tydings amendment is clear and unambiguous and definitely defines the policy of the Congress with respect to the drafting of essential farm workers.

Second. Whether the policy was right or wrong it could not be changed even by Executive order much less by a directive issued by some governmental agency.

Third. The President's veto should have been overridden because it changed the policy of Congress and substituted therefor an entirely different policy.

Fourth. Moreover, the policy established by Congress with respect to the drafting of essential farm workers is the only policy that will assure us anything like an adequate food supply. If this policy is not established we are going to wake up with an empty bread basket.

Big Business and Government Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune of May 9, 1945:

BIG BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT POLICY

What a contribution to the war effort!

The midnight entertainment curfew and the ban on horse and dog racing were lifted today. Once again transportation facilities will be crowded by pleasure seekers who like to stay out all night or lay a bet on the ponies.

VE-day seems to be the signal for spreading the idea that the Jap war will be a picnic.

Lifting the brown-out made some sense. This is summer and the downtown lights don't go on until late, anyway. Now, if our Government will only do something to make certain that there will be enough coal to keep those lights burning.

They say A-card holders may get a break, too. They deserve it, if anybody does. Most of them won't use their spare gas to go to the races but they could use a little more for shopping trips.

This whole question of the right of Americans to enjoy themselves in wartime once again comes to the fore. Just what is right and what is wrong for the people to do?

Motorists were asked first to save gasoline to save tires. Finally they were asked to save gasoline to save their autos. That makes sense. But a fellow with an airplane can get all the gas he wants. A fellow with a boat, which has no tires, can get very little. It is a crime this year to own a boat and use it for more than an afternoon or two. But you can burn up fuel of one kind or another to see the horses run.

It's all right to go to the resorts if you can get there. It's all right to play golf, tennis, or baseball, or to pay to see these games played. It's all right to let the miners strike even if you do have to burn less in your homes this winter.

The Government conserves on the one hand and wastes on the other. It asks people to be war conscious and makes them play conscious.

Would it have been too much to ask that civilians who must gamble and gallavant around should confine their fun to their own neighborhoods? Would it not have been much better, at the war's outset, if all play centers were completely closed, all pleasures and devices for pleasure put on the shelf for the duration?

Most of us would not answer these questions without prejudice. Most of us would not agree. There is much to be said, of course, for the value of wholesome recreation in wartime, a value which even England retained while under the fire of Nazi bombs. But while conceding that the Government has made many worth-while efforts to bring a balance between the grim business of winning a war and beneficial relaxation, we cannot escape the conviction that big business, rather than moral judgment, has been the determining factor too often in Government decisions.

Horse racing is a big business. The night clubs are big business. Least worthy of any consideration on an economic basis, they are the first to get consideration when VE-day comes.

We don't know how far the Government will go to meet other civilian and business demands for relief, but judging by the Government's action on the racing ban, the boys with the best organized pressure group are getting relief first.

Which makes one wonder why the various bans and prohibitions on pleasurable activities were enacted in the first place.

Reserves of Bauxite in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Bureau of Mines:

Several million tons of bauxite—an aluminum ore vital in the war program—have been marked out by Bureau of Mines engineers

during the past 3 years in an area of about 1,400 square miles in the central Arkansas bauxite belt, Bureau officials have reported to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

The plotting of these additional reserves of bauxite followed extensive geophysical surveys started by the Bureau early in 1942, or just a few months after Pearl Harbor. With sensitive geophysical instruments, the Bureau explored underground formations to weed out unfavorable areas and furnish a blueprint for the drilling program that followed.

On the basis of the geophysical exploration, a total of 1,300,245 feet of holes—more than 246 miles—were drilled by other Bureau crews or contractors in subsequent months, and an estimated 9,307,000 tons of bauxite of a grade suitable for direct use by industry for metals, abrasives, and chemicals were blocked out in Saline and Pulaski Counties. This is equivalent to a 12-year supply of commercial bauxite at the normal peacetime rate of consumption in the United States.

An additional 3,825,000 tons of marginal ore described as usable for metal or chemical purposes were charted, together with several million tons of high-alumina and bauxitic clays that must await further metallurgical developments before it can be used commercially.

A new Bureau of Mines publication just released to the public, Geophysical Survey of Arkansas Bauxite Region, describes in detail the early geophysical work. The drilling program and the estimated tonnages of bauxite are covered in other Bureau manuscript reports, some of which have been issued and some of which have not been published because of wartime security regulations.

Significant is the fact that the geophysical work eliminated many geological formations where there was little likelihood of finding bauxite, according to Bureau officials, resulting in economy and speed in the drilling and discovery program later. Although geophysical surveys were made in seven Arkansas counties, the search narrowed down to two counties—Pulaski and Saline—and it was here that the bulk of the reserves were charted.

At the peak of the drilling activity, there were 20 drill crews in the field in Arkansas, but the project is now nearing completion and there are only 12 crews working. Much bauxite was found at depths supposed to preclude economical exploitation, and the Bureau has undertaken studies to develop new methods of mining the material.

A break-down reveals that since May 1, 1942, the drilling program has blocked out 28,621,000 tons of bauxite and bauxitic clays in Arkansas, and this figure includes the 9,307,000 tons of commercial grade bauxite. Another 29,621,000 tons of bauxite and bauxitic clays are estimated to be present but this has not been completely delineated and proven. In addition, the Bureau crews charted 17,917,000 tons of high-alumina clay, and they place the indicated and inferred clays at about 73,000,000 tons.

As the supply of native high-grade bauxite in the United States is limited and the war has made heavy drains on resources, the Bureau of Mines is building a 50-ton-a-day pilot ore-dressing mill at Bauxite, Ark., to test the commercial feasibility of a Bureau process for concentrating low-grade bauxite for use in existing Bayer Alumina plants. Expected to go into operation this summer, the pilot mill is another step in the Bureau's program of utilizing large reserves of low-grade ores to make the United States as independent as possible of imported strategic minerals and metals. Only by charting accurately and exploiting fully its second-grade bauxite, alunite and alumina clays can the Nation be assured of supplies of aluminum in time of war, Bureau officials maintain.

In the 3 years preceding 1941, more than 70 percent of the bauxite used in the United States was imported, largely from South America, according to the newly published report on the Arkansas geophysical surveys written by J. R. Thoenen, district engineer in Arkansas, M. C. Malamphy, project engineer, and J. L. Valley, mining engineer. Soon after the war began, aluminum consumption increased so rapidly that it became difficult to import enough bauxite under convoy protection to supply the domestic aluminum industry.

To offset this emergency, Congress passed the Second Supplemental National Defense Act of 1941, authorizing the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey to investigate domestic reserves of bauxite and alunite ores and alumina clays. Since Arkansas already produced more than 95 percent of the bauxite mined in the United States and had virtually all of the known reserves, the Bureau drew up an exploration program for that State calling for geophysical surveys of the entire region surrounding the known bauxite deposits and core drilling to check the results of the surveys.

Bauxite is usually found near the earth's surface. The geophysical surveys in Pulaski and Saline Counties showed that the erosion-exposed outcrops where bauxite was concentrated were domes, or a huge, irregular buried mass of rocks, leading Bureau engineers to believe that other similar domes existed below the surface. Core drilling revealed the presence of 10 such domes, but only two protruded through the Midway geological formation and offered possibilities for the occurrence of bauxite.

Incomplete drilling on these two newly discovered domes has disclosed showings of bauxite, and one hole has indicated an ore body of considerable size. However, further drilling will be necessary to block out this and any other bodies of ore which may be present.

A copy of Report of Investigations 3791, Geophysical Survey of Arkansas Bauxite Region, which contains an explanation of the instruments and procedures employed, map illustrations, and logs of holes drilled, may be obtained without charge by applying to the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

Let Us Be Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent of mine, who, as I understand the facts, has been a lifelong Democrat and is a practicing attorney. He is a student of history and political science, is an accountant, and has a good understanding of the science of finance. He is vitally interested in the welfare of his family and of the people of this country. His family has contributed liberally to the present war effort, both in the armed forces and financially.

The letter which this constituent has sent me is thought provoking, and from a historical and prophetic standpoint, challenges our most earnest consideration. I am pleased to quote the following excerpts from the letter of this gentleman:

Now take the proposed peace formula called the Dumbarton Oaks proposal and Yalta Conference which is to be summed up at the San Francisco Peace Conference and let us look at the thing in a realistic manner. In the first place, no peace agreement or plan can amount to anything if it is just a mere paper document. There must be something more behind it; some reason for its existence—a real moral and spiritual backing by the contributing powers.

The fact that we want peace, that England would like to have peace and pursue her dreams of empire undisturbed, and that Russia wants peace does not necessarily imply that peace is to be achieved. Peace must be established upon a sound, moral, natural, geographical, and economic foundation; otherwise, it can never exist except at the point of a gun, and that, in my opinion, is not peace.

It seems to me that a peace to endure must be grounded upon the fundamental promise that there is a reason, naturally, geographically, and economically for the three contributing governmental units to exist. For example, Russia has every reason for a continued and expanding political and economic existence. She has manpower, natural resources, territory, and a working, virile people. France and England are two countries whose manpower and virility are decidedly on the decline. Both of these countries' colonial systems were outmoded 50 years ago and have continued to function only because the United States came to their aid, first in 1917 and now again. In fact, France's colonial empire is at an end now. England's colonial empire will fall also unless we maintain it. If we are to undertake the proposition of maintaining colonial empires for England and France, we have taken on a very large job indeed. When our leaders make the statement that our frontier is on the Rhine we are in fact saying to the world that we intend to maintain the French and British empires in status quo.

It seems to me that the world, if it is ever to achieve any degree of stability and peace, must fall into about three or four political, geographical, and economic spheres of influence.

Russia would dominate a large part of Europe and Asia, China and India dominating the other portion of Asia. The United States would dominate North and South America. Some country, possibly England or France, would dominate a portion of Europe and a portion of north Africa. A peace agreement which does not recognize these political and economic factors is artificial and can only mean another war.

The present peace proposal called the Dumbarton Oaks Proposal, as I see it, is an attempt on the part of England to secure the commitment of the United States to a plan which will protect her against Russia and which will guarantee her colonial position, particularly in India and China. That is a large responsibility for the United States to undertake.

At the risk of being called a midwestern isolationist I say to you that this country never had any business and does not now have any business trying to dominate European politics, unless it is our intention to become an imperialistic world power. If that is to be our future then we must insist on setting up our own controlled satellite European and Asiatic states and not permit Russia or England to establish them and then call on us for aid in maintaining some artificial economic or political unit. We must either stay out of European politics or get in with both feet. We cannot have England and France attempting to dominate European politics on one side and Russia on the other and when a clash comes have one or the other call on us to aid them.

If we are to be continually pushed into European wars and get the country involved

out of trouble, then we must be the one who will dominate the European political situation and say how and when these buffer countries shall be set up and how they shall be maintained; otherwise we waste our manpower and our substance on innumerable wars and accomplish nothing except to support European political units which shall be selected by us from time to time. In the past those selected by our politicians have been England and France.

The Russians and the English as well as the French have adopted very realistic viewpoints on the whole matter. Never at any time have their ever aided our Government in any of our difficulties except if it pleased or suited their then ruling powers. As a matter of fact, England has been against our country for years and even now is attempting to put us under trade disadvantages by the empire-dominated plan.

Sentimentalists have played upon our sympathies saying that France was the country to whom we owed our independence. This is partly true. History does not, however, bear out that unqualified statement. The fact of the business is that France was fighting England at the time and came over here as a means of forwarding her fight against England. England and France had been at war with each other for over a hundred years, prior to 1776. France has since proven herself to be realistically inclined when she sent her governmentally backed Maximillian with his dream of an empire to Mexico and brought about a very unpleasant situation for us. England has always been practical and has wasted no sentiment on us. She has cared little for this country except for what could be extracted by her from our people.

Over a hundred years ago we had the War of 1812. She then aided the Confederacy in its attempt to break up our country. Less than 50 years ago we almost had a break over the Colombian and Venezuelan situation. England sent a number of warships to enforce her demands and we very nearly came to blows. When we built the Panama Canal the Hays-Pauncefote treaty was negotiated with a gun at our head and we got the short end of the trade there. Incidentally this treaty ought to be abrogated and set aside at the San Francisco Conference or whenever the final wind-up of this affair in Europe and Asia is worked out.

This brings to mind another situation. We have been sending our manpower into the Southwest Pacific and we have withstood all of the attacks and all of the war there, have recaptured many islands taken by the Japs and almost before our men got out of battle the British flag was being raised over the islands which we had captured and the British High Commissioners were taking over the functions of running the islands' affairs. This has been done time after time in the Pacific but not a word has been breathed to our people about it.

Mention is being made that we are going to recover Borneo and Java and other areas by our manpower and our conduct of the war, and then hand them back to the Dutch who in turn will hold us up again on tin and rubber as they have been doing in the past in cooperation with their English financiers.

Turning to the western war front we find there our men who have been drafted by the millions, but do we find any men drafted by the British Dominions? Not a one. Australia has never sent a drafted man anywhere outside of Australia. Canada has not drafted a man to fight anywhere outside of Canada. The same is true with South Africa and India. Only a few English or British soldiers have ever appeared on the western front. Less than one army out of all the British Isles and the British Dominions is fighting on the western front while we have millions of men over there fighting in a European War expending our substance and our manpower in an attempt to maintain the English Empire.

We have drafted our men and sent them all the way to Australia and the Southwest Pacific, but never a drafted man has left Australia for any of the battles in the Southwest Pacific. Her country was threatened with invision by the Japs and even then she was not willing to pass a draft law such as we had passed in this country and which has sent our men thousands of miles to fight in foreign lands.

Not a Russian has ever left his country. They have manpower conscription there probably to even a greater extent than we have. Nevertheless, no Russian has ever fought in the Southwest Pacific or left his homeland except to repel actual invasion.

It is time that we in America begin to look at this situation and appraise it as realistically as Churchill and Stalin. We need someone who will be a militant leader and who will be for America, American people, American ideals, American manpower, and American property first, and for English colonies, English colonial aspirations, and Russian aspirations second.

We cannot have another world war sending our fighting men, our materials, and our manpower all over the world as we have in this war, and expect to win. If it is England's intention, and I firmly believe it to be, to use us in the event there is any trouble with the Russians (and that is bound to come because of the conflicting political and economic spheres of influence in Europe) then I doubt that we can win such a war against the Russians because we then will not have superior manpower and natural resources.

We have an opportunity to render a great service to humanity, an opportunity to become the leader among the countries of the world, but we must husband our own property; we must not fritter it away; we must not give it away; there must be an end to this lend-give-away proposition. Possibly it was warranted after we got into the war and had to get out of it some way; but certainly there is no excuse for us to give and give to a Europe which has been wrecked by its own hand and build it up so that it can help wreck civilization again.

Neither must be give away our ships to England or to France or to any other country. We have built these by great sacrifice of our own people and they must be used for our own people. Let us carry our own goods and the goods of the rest of the world. Let us keep our Navy strong so that no aggressor, be it England, Russia, a rehabilitated Germany, a rehabilitated Japan, or anyone will ever again be in a position to dominate the seas. We have that domination and should keep it. We should not share it with any other country.

It seems to me that the natural geographical and economic control of our country and the long-range plans for our foreign diplomacy should be the welding into one economic unit, if not a governmental unit, of Canada, United States, Mexico, Central America, and if possible, South America. Certainly there should be one dominant economic over-all control for all of North America. That should be our aim rather than to try to dominate Europe or Asia or some place that is thousands of miles away, leaving our back door open and unguarded.

In this war the lend-give-away program has reduced the mineral position of the United States to where our previous natural resources self-sufficiency will be at an end in the post-war years. We will be obliged to go forth into the world for a large part of our minerals and oil. Particularly, I refer you to a recent article by Elmer W. Pehrson, Chief Economics and Statistics Branch, United States Bureau of Mines, which appeared in Mining and Metallurgy of April, 1945 at page 204. We will be obliged to rely more and more on the foreign shipment of iron ore, zinc, lead, mercury, silver, copper, tin, and oil. The exhaustion of our commercial reserves in some of these items is almost complete within our continental areas. This only brings more emphasis upon that which I have just stated—that we should bring Canada and Mexico and Central America and at least a large part of South America within our economic and political spheres of influence. With these countries added we would have our reserves immensely supplemented.

If we do not undertake some long range planning of this sort we shall find ourselves out of these important reserves without which no country can exist economically for a period and without which no country can prosecute a successful war, and we will find England or some other country controlling the seas and dominating our country.

Another thing is that our Government is winning the war and should be the one to make the decisions. Instead, it is being pushed into the background. We are told that when Germany is finally conquered that the Russians will control all of northern and eastern Germany. The Briish will control all of the rich Ruhr area containing all the mines and industries; whereas, the Americans will control the mountainous areas and the poor part of Germany. The French will control the rich Rhine province.

In other words, we are being pushed into the position where we will be obliged to support a large part of the German people because the area which is proposed to be assigned to us will be nonsupporting. The area which the British control will be supporting; likewise the Russian and French areas of control. This again simply shows the manner in which American diplomats seem to get whatever nobody else wants and foots the bill for all.

I trust that the above has not been too long, nor too rambling, and that it gives you some of my ideas on the problems sought to be solved by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal and the coming San Francisco Conference.

Farley on Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of May 10, 1945, touching upon statements contained in a speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at Hazleton, Pa., on the important subject of Presidential succession. It is my hope that the subject of this speech will be the basis for legislative action shortly.

The editorial is as follows:

FARLEY ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

James A. Farley, in an address at Hazleton, Pa., yesterday, stressed an important matter which rises above politics to the plane of statesmanship and far-reaching public policy—namely, the defects and dangers in the present provisions for Presidential succession.

Pointing to the existing statute which puts the Secretary of State next in succession after the Vice President, followed by other Cabinet members, Mr. Farley says:

"Under our present method, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate. In his case, a vacancy caused by his

death, resignation, or removal, is filled by the Secretary of State whom he appoints, subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible short-circuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved."

Mr. Farley also notes that in the event of a President-elect and a Vice President-elect both dying before they took office, the choosing of a President would apparently devolve upon the House of Representatives. But if the House should divide and deadlock beyond Inauguration Day, the "appaling result" might be that "until such time as the deadlock was broken this country would be without a Chief Executive."

The time has come, Mr. Farley urges, for a thorough study of this whole question by a special commission composed of Senate and House Members, one or more Members appointed by the President and "perhaps one Supreme Court Justice selected by the Chief Justice." The commission should recommend such constitutional amendment or such legislation, or both, as may be needed.

The Farley suggestion is not political. Neither is it academic. Death is no respecter of democratic processes. There is but duty and common sense in being prepared.

WAC's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me to the WAC's on yesterday, their third birthday:

It is with a deep sense of personal pride that I greet the Women's Army Corps on still another birthday and offer my congratulations on a job well done. Able Colonel Hobby and her WAC's can well be proud of their record.

You are today proven soldiers of the armed forces. You are doing a vital work at home and on foreign shores that was a mighty factor in speeding victory over Germany, and will be even more helpful against the Japanese. Women everywhere in this country of ours could thrill with a new pride when the surrender of Germany came just a few days ago with the knowledge that they have a new and tremendously important status in the affairs of their country. The work of the Army Nurse Corps has been a source of pride to us for many years, but you have written a new and very important chapter in history. More glorious pages will be written before the peace we all pray for can be brought to every corner of the world.

There are no doubters today.

By your work you have made your place in the Army. High-ranking officers continue to testify to your value in their reports of operations abroad and preparations at home. Calls for your services continue to come in. Jobs that were entrusted only to highly trained officers and enlisted men are now yours. And you are doing them as they never were done before. Other jobs never thought of before you have quietly set up and made them function.

As these records of the efficiency of the Women's Army Corps come in day after day—as hard-boiled commanding officers at home and abroad continue to demand more and more be sent—as men who but a short time ago saw no place in the Army for women now rise day after day to sing your praises, you can understand my pride and satisfaction.

Pride and satisfaction—yes. But not surprise. I knew the capabilities of the American woman and I knew that she desired to stand side by side with her menfolk in this, the greatest struggle to preserve civilization the world has ever seen. And I knew, further, that she was capable of any job that the Army demanded of her.

The very fact that your work today is not dramatized now as it was 2 years or even a year ago, is testimony to your own efficiency, your own modesty, and your own ability. The Army and the country have accepted you in the status you asked for, that of soldier on equal terms with your men. You have been so accepted because you have earned it. You have earned it by quietly fitting into the Army routine, by doing your work as soldiers do it, with no thought of self, but of duty. In other words, you have become soldiers—and there is no higher tribute.

There is much ahead for the WAC's. The job is not finished. Even with the close of hostilities in the Pacific, which I pray may be sooner than we now expect, there will be a great need for your services. You have become such a vital part of the Army machinery that you will be demobilized on a point system, just as the male members of the Army. No special privileges or demobilization plans were considered for the WAC's, they were soldiers, and that is all there was to it. That in itself indicates your worth to the war effort and better still, that the Army has accepted you as you wished to be accepted. It is not now the time to speak of the future of the Women's Army Corps, but I can say, without fear of contradiction, that it has well earned a place in the peacetime establishment.

I can visualize for you a greater part in the peace because of your service in the war. Certainly, you will have a greater understanding of the tremendous problems ahead. You must, certainly, have a greater hatred for war than ever before, and will therefore be more effective in the fight to maintain future peace.

You will understand more clearly the problems of rehabilitation of our men. You can have a great and worth-while share in solving that very, very important obligation. Your place in the peacetime world will most certainly be greater, because you will speak from knowledge and the strength of service and suffering and sacrifice. You have earned the right to speak and the right to equality of participation in the future of our country.

On your third birthday, then, members of the Women's Army Corps, I greet you and congratulate you. I speak from the depth of my heart when I say that you have justified, many, many times over, all the efforts that were necessary to give you this opportunity. I am proud of you, each and every one, officer or enlisted personnel—in the eternal routine on the home camps, or in the exciting battle areas abroad—one and all, at home or abroad, you have well merited the accolade of "Good soldiers."

Editors' Report on German Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the congressional committee's report presented to Congress today as a result of their investigation of German atrocities is a splendid document, which presents logically, clearly, and forcefully the facts relating to the brutalities and atrocities which they found in Germany from their recent visit there, as a result of an invitation from General Eisenhower.

Several days ago there was released a report by 18 American editors and publishers, who also investigated the German prison camps at the invitation of General Eisenhower, and this report should also be incorporated in the RECORD, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith.

It will be noted that this report confirms and corroborates that of the congressional committee with reference to the calculated and organized brutality of the Nazis, which makes the blood of civilized people everywhere boil with righteous indignation.

The report follows:

EDITORS CONDEMN NAZIS' BRUTALITY—EIGHTEEN WHO TOURED GERMAN CAMPS CALL FOR PUNISHMENT OF PARTY AND ARMY LEADERS

WASHINGTON, May 5.—Eighteen American editors and publishers who toured German prison camps at the invitation of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower today urged the United States to adopt a strong policy on war criminals and to empower speedily the War Crimes Commission to put such a policy into effect.

The statement, released by the War Department while the newspaper and magazine men were still abroad, said the investigation convinced them that the Nazis pursued a master plan of calculated and organized brutality.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The text of the statement follows:

"This delegation of newspaper and magazine editors was brought to Europe at the suggestion of General Eisenhower to investigate reports of German atrocities.

"We have visited and spent considerable time investigating the prison camps at Buchenwald and Dachau. We have interviewed recently freed political prisoners, slave laborers and civilians of many nationalities. We have studied a great mass of documents covering the German occupation of France which contained photographic evidence and testimony taken in many places and painstakingly authenticated with the sworn statements of witnesses and victims.

"The conclusion is inescapable that the Nazis had a master plan for their political prison camps. That plan was based upon a policy of calculated and organized brutality. The evidence we have seen is not a mere assembling of local or unassociated incidents. It is convincing proof that brutality was the basic Nazi system and method.

"This brutality took different forms in different places and with different groups. The basic pattern varied little.

"Actual Nazi methods ran the gamut from deliberate starvation and routine beatings to sadistic tortures too horrible and too perverted to be publicly described. Murder was a commonplace.

"Prisoners whose only crime was that they disagreed or were suspected of disagreeing with the Nazi philosophy were treated with uniform cruelty. When death came, as to multiplied thousands of them it did, it must have been a relief from worse than death.

"By these tortures most of the Jews in prison camps had already been destroyed. After the Jews, the most cruelly treated victims were the Russians and the Poles.

"To the basic policy of brutality toward political prisoners there were, however, no significant exceptions.

"This, we believe, is the inexorable consequence of the whole Nazi-German philosophy. By this philosophy and the cunning and persistence with which it was propagated the German mind became contaminated and diseased.

"For these crimes the German people cannot be allowed to escape their share of the responsibility. Just punishment must be meted out to the outstanding party leaders and the German general staff, to party officeholders, to all members of the Gestapo, all member of the SS [elite guard]. Simple justice and the future peace of the world require that all these, by virtue of their position, be indicted as war criminals.

"In punishing these crimes the historic principle of individual and personal responsibility must be preserved and all those responsible for these atrocities must be punished in accord with the accepted laws of civilized nations.

"We strongly urge that United Nations policy in regard to war criminals be speedily agreed to and the War Crimes Commission speedily empowered to put those policies into action.

"As we witness the collapse of the Nazis' experiment in ruthlessness and totalitarianism, we are more than ever convinced that there can be no peace on earth until the right of the earth's peoples to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is recognized and protected under law."

Signed by:

Julius Ochs Adler, the New York Times.
Malcolm Bingay, Detroit Free Press.
Amon Carter, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.
Norman Chandler, Los Angeles Times.
William L. Chenery, Collier's.
E. Z. Dimitman, Chicago Sun.
John Randolph Hearst, Hearst newspapers.
Ben Hibbs, Saturday Evening Post.
Stanley High, Reader's Digest.
Ben McKelway, Washington Star.
William I. Nichols, This Week magazine.
L. K. Nicholson, New Orleans Times-Picayune.
Joseph Pulitzer, St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
Gideon Seymour, Minneapolis Star-Journal.
Duke Shoop, Kansas City Star.
Beverly W. Smith, American Magazine.
Walker Stone, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance.
M. E. Walter, Houston Chronicle.

Benefits for Servicemen, Ex-Servicemen, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has several times pointedly come to my attention that benefits intended by Congress for servicemen, ex-servicemen, and their dependents are frequently not received by them, generally, I believe, because of the failure of potential beneficiaries to know what they are entitled to, and under what circumstances.

The technical language as to the many laws pertaining to those serving actively in our Nation's armed forces, or to those who have so served, and to their dependents, is very confusing.

As chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the oldest committee in Congress having jurisdiction over legislation affecting veterans and their dependents, I have been intensely interested in such legislation for many years. It is, nevertheless, very difficult for me to coordinate all such legislation in my mind. Not all of such laws are applicable to all such persons; in fact, most of them are applicable only to certain groups, under certain conditions.

How to bring order out of this chaos so that those in each such groups might be put on notice as to the rights, privileges, preferences, and benefits to which they might be eligible, without requiring them to read too much about other benefits to which they could never be entitled, has been very baffling.

The key to the solution of this maze of material was, I believe, formulated about 2 years ago by my good friend, Millard W. Rice, the national-service director for the Disabled American Veterans, now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the major veteran organizations.

Mr. Rice has recently revised the outline then prepared as to all such benefits, a scanning of which will speedily inform any serviceman, ex-serviceman, or his or her dependent as to what governmental benefits, if any, he or she might be entitled to under the circumstances indicated.

Those who read such outline should be cautioned that more detailed information concerning each such point can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration, or from such other governmental agency as may be concerned with the application of the particular law indicated.

Active servicemen, discharged veterans, and the dependents of veterans have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from the service officers of any of the several congressionally chartered service organizations: The Disabled American Veterans—D. A. V.—which is composed exclusively of those American citizens who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving honorably in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war; the American Legion, composed of honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; the Veterans of Foreign Wars—referred to as the V. F. W.—composed solely of America's campaign-badge war, campaign, and expedition veterans; and the American Red Cross.

Most applicants would be wise to take advantage of the technical knowledge and experience of the service officers of such organizations. The D. A. V., incidentally, has made arrangements with the Veterans' Administration whereby handicapped veterans of World War No. 2, having the necessary educational prerequisites and qualifications, and deeply imbued with a desire to assist their fellow disabled veterans, and their dependents, are being trained, under the provisions of Public Law No. 16, toward the objective of becoming full-time employees of the Disabled American Veterans, as national service officers.

Such vocational training consists of 6 months of academic training at the American University, in Washington, D. C., supplemented by up to 18 months of on-the-job placement training under three different experienced national D. A. V. service officers. Such rehabilitated trainees will then be employed by the D. A. V. as full-time national-service officers, and will be located in the many regional offices and facilities of the Veterans' Administration, and in Army and Navy discharge centers.

During such period of vocational training, these D. A. V. national-service officer trainees have their disability pensions from the Veterans' Administration increased, if not already entitled to more, to $92 per month, plus $11.50 for a wife, and plus $5.75 for each minor child or dependent parent. In addition thereto, because of the high cost of living, the D. A. V. pays them $25 per month while at the University, and thereafter $50 per month, with periodic increases on the basis of their respective increased effectiveness as assistant national service officers.

The first class was started at the American University on October 16, 1944. Additional groups of up to 50 have since then been enrolled each 10 weeks and will, after May 21, 1945, be enrolled each 12 weeks, into such training course, for at least an additional year.

This expansion of its Nation-wide service setup by the D. A. V. is considered essential in order to extend needed advice and assistance to the increasing number of disabled dischargees, as to their varied rights under complicated laws, and as to how factually and technically to establish entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled, and also to assist them in becoming integrated back into useful, self-sustaining, self-respecting civilian living.

Mr. Rice assures me that the outline prepared by him has been carefully checked by members of his staff and by the office of the legislative counsel of the Veterans' Administration to make sure of its accuracy.

I here insert the outline prepared by Mr. Rice, as follows:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I. BENEFITS FOR AND AS TO PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

1. Base pay ranges from $50 to $138 per month for enlisted personnel, from private or apprentice seaman, up through seven grades to master sergeant or chief petty officer. Base pay for commissioned personnel begins with $150 per month for second lieutenants or ensigns. All base pay of enlisted men is increased by 20 percent, and of all officers by 10 percent, while on sea duty or serving outside the continental United States or in Alaska. Active flying duty, including flights in gliders, or active submarine duty, increases the base pay by 50 percent, and active parachutist duty by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Enlisted men of the combat ground forces of the Army who are authorized to wear the expert infantryman badge or combat infantryman badge are entitled respectively to extra pay of $5 and $10 per month. Certain other pay increases are provided for specially skilled or dangerous types of service. Longevity pay is provided by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of active or Reserve service, up to 30 years.

2. Monthly allowances will be granted after June 1, 1942, the dependents of any enlisted

individual, male or female, with certain exceptions, of the first seven grades, upon written application therefor by the service member or by or on behalf of a dependent in class A, class B, or class B–1, $50 for a wife alone, plus $30 for the first child and $20 for each additional child; for a child alone, $42 plus $20 for each additional child; for one dependent parent alone, $50, or $68 for both, plus $11 for each dependent brother or sister.

The monthly pay of the service member will be charged with the amount of $22 per month and an additional amount of $5 per month if the allowance is payable to more that one class of dependents. Class A includes a wife, child, or former wife, divorced; class B includes a parent, brother, or sister dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of his or her support. Class B–1 includes a parent, brother, or sister dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his or her support. In the event of death during active service the next of kin is entitled to a gratuity equal to the monthly pay of the deceased for a period of 6 months.

3. National service life insurance, obtainable without examination during first 120 days of active service and thereafter if found by the Veterans' Administration to be a good insurance risk (with privilege of conversion after 1 year; mandatory conversion before end of fifth policy year), in multiples of $500, from $1,000 to $10,000, for those in active service since October 8, 1940, maturable only by death of the insured, with proviso that premiums may be waived during continuous total disability, which commenced after he was insured, but before he became 60 years of age, which has continued for 6 consecutive months.

4. Mustering-out payments for members of the armed forces, with certain exceptions, discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, in the amount of $100 for those who served less than 60 days, $200 for those who served 60 days or more only within the continental limits of the United States, and $300 for those having performed active service of 60 days or more who served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

5. Certain protection for those in active military or naval service of the United States, and to American citizens, under certain conditions, in the active service of some country allied with it during time of war with reference to private life insurance and property rights and personal indebtedness, when ability to meet obligations is impaired by such service, through judicial process, under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. (All matters affecting real or personal property rights should be referred promptly to competent local attorneys for assistance and advice.)

6. Allowances, in varying amounts, for clothing, subsistence, and quarters made to officers and, under certain conditions, to enlisted men, as well as up to $1,500 of their base pay and mustering-out payments, upon their discharge from service, are excluded from income for tax purposes.

7. Naturalization as an American citizen by the easy petition method as to any alien while serving in the armed forces, as well as for certain war veterans.

II. MONETARY BENEFITS FOR EX-SERVICE PERSONS

1. Compensation or pension for disabilities proven to have been incurred in, or aggravated by reason of, active service in the armed forces of the United States, ranging from $6.90 to $300 per month, depending upon the nature, degree, and permanency of the disability, and the time of incurrence, including the 15-percent increase effective July 1, 1944, in the monthly rates for service-incurred disability exclusive of the special awards or allowances fixed by law, but, if single and without dependents, not more than $20 per month while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency.

2. Retirement benefits at three-fourths of base pay for certain Regular officers with permanent handicapping disabilities, or after a certain period for certain types of service, or/and the attainment of certain ages; and for certain emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers with permanent disabilities of requisite degree, clearly shown to have been acquired in active service, in fact, in line of duty.

3. Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living and/or length of service for——

(1) Civil War veterans in the amount of $75 per month, and Indian wars veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100 if in need of a regular attendant, but not in excess of $50 as to those in a United States National or State soldiers' home on July 13, 1943, but if thereafter furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency, only $20, where the veteran has no dependents.

(2) Veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but not more than $50 monthly as to those in a United States National or State soldiers' home on July 13, 1943, but where the veteran has no dependents, if thereafter furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency, only $20.

4. Pensions of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, World War No. 1, or World War No. 2, with 90 days or more of service and a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable, or where less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct; this rate is increased to $60 per month of rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or when the veteran, suffering from permanent and total disability, attains the age of 65 years, but only $8 per month is paid to men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a governmental agency.

5. Enlisted men of the Regular Army, or of the Philippine Scouts, who have served 20 years or more and who have become permanently incapacitated for active service due to physical disability incurred in line of duty, may be retired at 75 percent of the average monthly pay received for 6 months prior to retirement. This retirement pay, or so much thereof as would equal the amount or pension or compensation to which such person may be entitled, may be waived for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation.

6. Enlisted men of the Regular Navy whose service began after July 1, 1925, may, after 20 years' service, be transferred to the Fleet Reserve at one-half base pay received at time of transfer, and, after the completion of 30 years of service, are transferred to the retired list with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions thereto, plus allowances to which they would be entitled after 30 years' active service. If their service commenced on or prior to July 1, 1925, they may be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon completion of at least 16 years' service, with one-third of base pay, and after 20 years of service or more, one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, plus all permanent additions. This pay is increased by 10 percent for all men credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more shall be not less than 95 percent of the maximum. After 30 years of service they are transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement plus allowances to which they would be entitled after 30 years' active service.

7. Enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, after 30 years of service, are entitled to retirement with monthly pay at 75 percent of their last base pay plus allowances. Members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps may also be retired after 30 years' service, or at the age of 50 years after 20 years' service. Temporary commissioned rank has been provided for members of the Army Nurse Corps and female dietetic personnel of the Medical Department of the Army with adjustment in their retirement pay on the basis of such commissioned service.

8. Statutory award of $10 per month is payable to all medal-of-honor men after age of 65 years.

9. Adjusted-service credit up to $50, payable in cash, or, if more, an adjusted-service certificate based upon adjusted-service credit for active World War No. 1 service in excess of 60 days, computed at the rate of $1 per day for domestic service, and $1.25 per day for oversea service, with maximum limitations, exchangeable for United States bonds bearing interest at 3 percent, redeemable at any time. In the event any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation is hereafter authorized for World War No. 2 veterans, any benefits received by or paid for any such veteran under the so-called G. I. bill of rights will be deducted from any such adjusted compensation.

10. Government life-insurance policies, as to death or total or permanent total disability in multiples of $500 up to $10,000 for insurable veterans of (1) World War No. 1 or (2) World War No. 2 and (3) of peacetime servicemen who applied therefor prior to October 8, 1940, with lien loans permissible up to 94 percent of reserve value, at interest of 5 percent per annum.

11. Incompetent and minor beneficiaries generally receive their monetary benefits, if any, through guardians, whose accountings are periodically inspected by regional attorneys of the Veterans' Administration, but payment may be made to the wife of an incompetent veteran having no guardian or to a minor widow for herself and child or children.

12. All monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration, as well as supplemental pay from an employer-trainer during on-the-job placement training under Public 16, are excluded from income for tax purposes, and are exempt from the claims of private creditors, or of the United States, except as to the indebted beneficiary and except as to overpayments or illegal payments by the Veterans' Administration, and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process either before or after receipt by the beneficiary.

III. MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE FOR VETERANS

1. Hospital treatment, or out-patient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, with institutional training in the use of such appliances, may be furnished certain persons medically determined to be in need therof for service-connected disabilities. Out-patient treatment may also be authorized for any non-service-connected conditions, which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment.

2. Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities under certain conditions may be furnished when needed for any war veteran discharged under

conditions other than dishonorable, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

3. Transportation may be furnished to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

4. Clothing may be furnished at Government expense to beneficiaries receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, when necessary for protection of health or for sanitary reasons and when such beneficiaries are without means and receiving less than $10 per month for their own personal use. Toilet articles, barber service, tobacco, etc., are furnished beneficiaries receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, whose total income is less than $6 per month.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

1. Vocational rehabilitation courses not exceeding 4 years, including placement in suitable gainful employment, furnished by the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabled veterans of World War No. 2, including persons who served in active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who are feasible therefor and in need thereof to overcome a service-incurred handicap, with tuition and books paid for by Veterans' Administration, with training allowance of $92 per month, plus $11.50 for wife, plus $5.75 for each minor child and dependent parent, unless entitled to more on the basis of service-connected disability.

2. Education or training, not to exceed 1 year, at any institution of the veteran's choice, for veterans of World War No. 2, including persons who served in active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' service or more or for disability incurred in service in line of duty, plus 1 month for each month of service, but not to exceed 4 years of education, under certain conditions, with subsistence allowance of $50 per month, or $75 per month if the veteran has dependents; tuition and all other fees and expenses not to exceed $500 per school year, to be paid by the Veterans' Administration.

3. Guaranty by the Veterans' Administration of not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans, the aggregate amount guaranteed not to exceed $2,000 for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. Such loans may bear interest not to exceed 4 percent and are payable in 20 years. This benefit is available to World War No. 2 veterans and persons who served on or after September 16, 1940, with service requirements the same as those for education or training.

4. Readjustment allowances of $20 per week for a period not to exceed 52 weeks for unemployed World War No. 2 veterans, including those persons who served after September 16, 1940, under the same service requirements as for education or training. Self-employed veterans earning less than $100 per month are eligible for readjustment allowances representing the difference between their net earnings and $100 per month.

5. A seeing-eye or guide dog for the aid of blind veterans may be provided blind veterans entitled to disability compensation. Also, there may be provided mechanical and electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness. Blind veterans, as well as other blind individuals, are allowed to deduct $500 from adjusted gross income in determining net income under the Federal income-tax law.

6. Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions and reinstatement of Federal employment are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, war and campaign service veterans, and the unremarried widows of such war and campaign service veterans, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service and Veterans' Employment Service, in every State, for all unemployed veterans, and an effective job counseling and employment placement service so as to provide the maximum opportunity for gainful employment. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor within 90 days after relieved from active duty or service, or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private permanent employment, for a period of 1 year, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by court order if necessary.

7. Credit for all active military or naval service for Federal civil-service retirement, with minor exceptions.

8. Credit for all active war service for railroad retirement purposes.

9. Burial allowance, up to the amount of $100, may be paid as to any war veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability. A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran whose death occurred after discharge from active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment, or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged as to any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who dies while in active service, with the right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and, under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—may be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

10. Various benefits, rights, preferences, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veteran Laws."

V. MONETARY BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS

1. Death compensation or pension, under varying conditions and amounts, to widows, minor and helpless children, and dependent parents of those deceased veterans who have died in service or as a result of their service-connected disabilities.

2. Death pension, in smaller amounts, under certain conditions, to dependent widows and minor and helpless children of deceased veterans of World War. No. 1 and those veterans of World War No. 2 who, at time of death, have some service-connected disability of measurable degree.

3. Death pensions, under certain conditions, to widows and minor and helpless children of deceased Civil War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and Indian war veterans.

VI. BENEFITS FOR SERVICEWOMEN

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, which is no longer in existence, having been superseded by the Women's Army Corps, was an auxiliary component of the Army, and as such was not generally covered by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, but its members are entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration. Members of the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps and Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, which are components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, on the basis of active duty, are eligible for veterans' benefits.

As to rights to hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits, on a parity with war veterans, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the term "active military or naval service" includes active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard. Members of the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard are also eligible for these benefits as members of components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard on the basis of active service in World War No. 2.

Statement on Behalf of American Jeweled Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers' Union, before the Ways and Means Committee April 30, 1945:

Gentlemen, during the last few days I have sat in this hearing room and have tried to project myself mentally into your position. You sit here for hours and patiently listen to prepared briefs, loaded with statistics, and it is small wonder the end of the day does not find you completely confused and exhausted. You should be commended highly for the fine understanding attitude you take in listening to a cross-section of America present its case.

Democratic discussion of this type guarantees America a sound future.

Much has been said here in the last few days regarding the American jeweled-watch industry. It is impossible for any group of men to know all the facts about every industry, and by the exhibits and facts which I will present to you today I trust you will have a clearer picture of the absolute necessity of the American watch industry to the United States, the part that industry plays in time of war and what it can do for the Nation in time of peace. I shall prove to you that the American watch industry is as vital to national defense as are the generals of our Army, the admirals of our Navy, the G. I.'s, chemicals, guns, shells, planes, tanks, and ships.

The Army and the Navy will tell you that it is impossible to conduct any military maneuvers without the mechanical timing mechanisms which the American watch workers produce.

In all the world there are but two sources available for these timing devices—one is the United States and the other is Switzerland.

You are here as the elected representatives of the people and I come before you as the elected representative of over 8,000 Ameri-

can jeweled watch workers. It is not our job to match wits but to solve a problem.

Every one of the 8,000 workers I represent stands here with me today as definitely as though he were physically present in this room. These American watch workers desire that I speak frankly to you on this problem because management cannot or dares not tell the whole story. The sword of Damocles is held over the head of management by the Swiss watch monopoly and trust, for this cartel has under its absolute control the stream of life without which watches cannot be made—the supply of watch jewels. It is sad to note that if it chooses to do so, the Swiss monopoly can by simply placing the same embargo on the export of watch jewels as it has done in the past on watch machinery put the American jeweled watch industry out of business for a while at least.

At this point, I would like to explain to you what the jewels are.

The jewels referred to are not precious stones as the name implies. In the watch industry they are small bearing pieces used to save the wear of metal against metal. These stones are mostly synthetic and I understand are made from aluminum oxide.

The manufacture of these synthetic jewels is a highly specialized business in Switzerland; in America we did not prior to 1941 produce them in quantity. We were dependent on the Swiss monopoly because they had the "know-how" and could produce jewels at lower costs. In 1941, at the start of this war, the Axis shut off completely the use of jewels of over forty-thousandths diameter which were essential for military use. There was no American industry to supply them.

The Defense Supply Corporation, with the War Production Board, enlisted the services of two of our American jeweled-watch manufacturers and they started to produce jewels under the handicap of not having sufficient equipment or skilled workers. We lacked the "know-how" of experience.

With American ingenuity, plus the skill of engineers, the American jeweled-watch industry was able within 2 years to get into production and produce these parts for 80 percent less than the cost of the original lot produced here in 1941; given more time we would have been able to reduce production cost even more. We would not, of course, ever be able to compete with Swiss jewel monopoly because the employees of the Swiss industry receive wages of one-half to two-thirds less than the wages paid to the American watch workers, but at least we would have freed ourselves from the threat to our national security.

However, in October 1944, after the Swiss border had been freed of Axis control, the Defense Supply Corporation canceled almost all of its contracts and we found a thousand persons, members of our union, shifted from jewel production to other production. Thus, the experimentation—the progress that had been made on the production of jewel bearings in this country for 2 years—was scuttled.

I ask you, gentlemen, is it good judgment for an agency of the United States Government which was set up to establish national defense industries in order to guarantee national security by issuing a constant supply of critical material for war purposes to scuttle this industry?

The scuttling of the watch-jewel industry was protested by me to the War Production Board in 1944 and statements were released in the name of the War Production Board denying this cut-back. However, this cut-back did take place and gentlemen I invite you to investigate the record. You will truly find ghost plants in Aurora, Ill.; Lancaster, Pa., and Waltham, Mass., where jewels were once made. These buildings are now used on other production but so far as jewels are concerned they have become a haunted house of the past. Thus, for no conceivable reason, other than the possible influence of those who are a part or represent this Swiss monopoly, we now again find the American jeweled-watch industry dependent upon the supply of Swiss watch jewels.

I present this display of war equipment made at the Waltham Watch Co. by American watch workers. This picture of timing mechanisms for war made at the Elgin Watch Co. by American watch workers. This picture of timing mechanisms made at the Hamilton Watch Co. by American watch workers. This equipment was furnished in great quantities for the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and our allies, because the American watch workers, whom I represent, had the skill and know how to make them. These men and women have skills to work in many other industries, but no other industry can supply the skills or the machine tools necessary for the American jeweled-watch industry. Highly skilled men come into the machine shops of Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, look at the work and often refuse to take jobs because they feel they cannot do the precision work.

Please look at these exhibits and see for yourself, gentlemen, what the American watch worker has done in this war, and remember there are only two sources in the world for this equipment—one, the United States; the other, Switzerland. Kill the American industry and you will have only one source left—Switzerland.

I point out to you that a jeweled-watch factory is not easy to start; it takes from 4 to 5 years to get a plant ready for production; and I submit to you the record that in the past century over 60 watch factories have started in this country—only 3 are left. These are the three remaining companies: Waltham, which is 95 years old; Elgin, which is 80 years old; and Hamilton, which is 53 years old. All the rest are dead—ghost plants of our industry.

By allowing unrestricted importations, by cutting the tariff, by disregarding warnings by competent military men, our State Department has shirked its obligation to the citizens of the United States, and House bill No. 2652 seeks to further this great wrong.

In June 1935, when the State Department was considering our entry into a trade treaty with Switzerland, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and the Secretary of War wrote the State Department and Tariff Commission—and I quote: "The War Department is vitally concerned in keeping the watch and clock industry alive, for the Department is depending on it in an emergency to assemble and regulate the large quantities of antiaircraft and bomb mechanical time fuzes which will be required in an emergency." I submit to you for the record copies of two letters which were written on June 24, 1935, and June 20, 1935, by Douglas MacArthur, then general, Chief of Staff, and George H. Dern, then Secretary of War of the United States.

The emergency arrived in 1941. The American watch and clock industry was understaffed because Swiss competition had thrown out of employment thousands of capable workers. This was due entirely to the fact that tariff reduction had permitted the products of the Swiss Government watch monopoly to take over a large part of the American watch-purchasing market. This same Swiss industry was at that time completely under Axis domination and working in full cooperation with our enemy.

Thousands of dead American heroes lie buried in foreign lands due entirely to the failure of our State Department officials to heed the foresighted warning of General MacArthur and the Secretary of War.

Faced with a terrific handicap the American watch worker and his employers met the challenge, though the delay was costly in loss of lives and dollars. The Axis Powers did not have this handicap for the Swiss industry which was stimulated and built up by our own State Department's action was on its toes ready to help our enemies with the skill and equipment which should have been ours. They were ready to time the blitzkreig.

It is interesting to note that less than 5 percent of the contracts given our industry were cost-plus contracts.

Gentlemen, history repeats itself. The record, as made by General MacArthur and the Secretary of War, and later by the action of our armed forces in taking over the entire production of the three American watch industries shortly after Pearl Harbor, has proven conclusively that the watch and clock industry is as essential to our national defense as any munition or any other product used by our armed forces.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, the Swiss Watch Monopoly supplied the world with navigation watches, chronographs, time and stop watches, elapsed time clocks, and other highly precise timing instruments and timing mechanisms. Following Pearl Harbor and our entry into the World War, all such equipment other than watches for civilian use made by the Swiss Watch Monopoly went exclusively to the Nazis, and most likely to the Japs, to be used to kill and maim our airmen, soldiers, and sailors.

Is it possible that American watch workers are to be deprived of a market for the products of their labor and that market turned over to those who for years aided the Nazis to kill those who went overseas and sacrificed their lives that democracy might be preserved?

No tariff alone can properly protect a vital national defense industry such as the production of watches and other highly precise timing instruments and mechanisms against the competition of a world-wide cartel. When one considers the relations and influence the Germans have in Switzerland as revealed by the Department of Justice reports on cartels, he finds a condition which is a hazard to our national security.

Legislation should be speedily enacted providing that products of foreign countries which are competitive with highly essential national-defense items, such as certified by the Joint Staff of the Army and Navy should be limited entry into American markets to not more than 30 percent of the domestic production of such items, under normal conditions, with not more than 50 percent of such imports of products of any one foreign country.

Surely in view of the experiences which we have had twice in the past 25 years, it is simply good judgment to assure ourselves that those American industries which furnish items highly essential to national defense should at all times be in a strong position.

Gentlemen, members of this committee, I submit to you that American watch workers, all of whom have been awarded the Army and Navy E for producing these essential war timing mechanisms, are in a quandry. On one hand they are told through our Army and Navy Departments they are doing a fine job, while on the other hand a bill (No. 2652) is introduced which, if passed in its present form, will take away their postwar job opportunities.

Congressman CURTIS developed in his examination of Chairman Ryder, of the Tariff Commission, that up to a few months ago all exports of Swiss watches to the American market were shipped through Axis military lines with the help and consent of the Germans. Considering the tactics used by the Nazis, is it possible that these watches were permitted free movement through their lines without the Swiss Watch Monopoly and those representing them contributing to the success of the Axis war effort?

Under questioning by members of this committee, Chairman Ryder admitted that his Tariff Commission had never bothered to check into the comparative cost of producing jeweled watches in this country and

in Switzerland. Without these facts, how can any Commission make intelligent recommendations? Are you going to allow an industry vital to American national defense to be scuttled by a Commission which does not even bother to look up all the facts in the case?

Chairman Ryder may not consider the watch industry important but the 8,000 American watch workers I represent consider it extremely important. The military and naval leaders of the United States know it is vital, and any one who looks at the facts at all will see that House bill No. 2652 will deal a death blow to the American watch industry for all time.

The Chairman of the Tariff Commission admitted as stated in their digest of the concessions granted in the trade treaty with Switzerland: "There is no doubt that smuggled watches have contributed a competitive problem of some importance not only for domestic manufacturers but for legitimate importers."

Incidentally, I submit to you two excerpts from a recent report of the president of the American Watch Assemblers' Association (The Swiss Import Trade Association) which may be of interest to the members of this committee. The first deals with the fact that the Swiss watch monopoly has apparently placed the United States under a quota and notified its distributors here that they will temporarily perhaps have to get along with the supply of five and one-quarter millions of Swiss watches annually. This representative of the Swiss watch importers in his report stated that "Under the general terms and conditions prevailing now total watch imports for 1945 may well drop to five and one-half million units, which is approximately the Swiss export quota for movements and watches to the United States, but as already stated the agreement concluded in Berne changes the aspect of the quota problem—and is expected to permit us to trade under fewer restrictions."

The members of the Ways and Means Committee dealing as you are with the problems of foreign trade may have been advised of the terms of the Berne agreement. I assure you that the American watch worker, vitally affected by imports of Swiss watches, has not been informed of the terms of such agreements made on behalf of the American people by representatives of the State Department. The other excerpt which may have a bearing on the legislation now under consideration by this committee reads as follows: "In my last report I mentioned that a special assessment might be needed. There are certain plans afoot which prompt the directors after a full discussion to recommend the raising of an important contingency fund. We hope you will approve the recommendation." This recommendation was subsequently approved. I submit to you for the record a copy of this speech, which was printed in the April 1945 issue of the National Jeweler. This report after the statement of this so-called contingency fund then goes on and deals almost wholly with the question of the renewal of the trade-treaty program and the legislation now pending before this committee.

Many Swiss watches masquerade as American, and to illustrate this point I would like to present an advertisement of the Gruen Watch Co. We pick up national publications, odd daily newspapers, we listen to the radio, and we find high-pressure, subtle advertising, such as this advertisement which I clipped from the April 1945 issue of the National Jeweler's magazine. This type of advertising disturbs every American watch worker. We find the Army and Navy E awarded this importer, the Gruen Watch Co., for work performed on manufacturing electrical measuring instruments in its assembly plant. All of Gruen's watches or parts are manufactured in a foreign country under the Swiss watch monopoly, yet they pretend through subtle advertising to be dedicating their entire facilities to the production of war materials for the United States.

I believe that this method of supplying misinformation to the American public by Swiss watch importers warrants me to refer to certain reports of Dun & Bradstreet dealing with two of the largest American importers of Swiss watches. A 1944 report on the Gruen Watch Co. states "the fact that the company has been able to continue the progressive trend throughout the period under review despite a general shortage of materials in this line is due to (1) (watch) movements are manufactured in Switzerland by its wholly owned subsidiary shipments of which have been continuous; (2) a reasonably large supply of critical materials used in manufacturing watch cases on hand." This report further states that this company has a large modern plant in Switzerland where the principal manufacturing of movements and movement parts is done and also one plant in Cincinnati, Ohio, where cases are manufactured and watches are assembled and regulated for civilian use, a privilege denied our American companies since our facilities are all devoted to essential production for the Army and the Navy, and our allies.

Friday afternoon one of the leaders of the American Jeweled Watch Industry, Mr. T. Albert Potter, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., appeared before your committee. He also submitted a brief, and among the signatories to that brief was one Bulova Watch Co., Woodside, Long Island, N. Y.

The American watch worker objects to this inclusion of the Bulova Watch Co. in this category of American jeweled watch manufacturers, because less than 10 percent of their production is American.

The Dun & Bradstreet report shows that Bulova owns a plant at Biene, Switzerland, where watch movements and watch parts are manufactured. Further speaking of Bulova it may interest your committee to know that evidence was revealed by the House select committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission and radio activities which showed that several of those who used and operated the facilities of several of the radio stations operated by Bulova were interned as alien enemies shortly after Pearl Harbor by the F. B. I. and the armed forces.

This same report refers to the smuggling of 200,000 watches and shows that the Treasury Department levied a claim against Bulova (p. 4677) for $405,000 for smuggling watches which claim was settled by the payment on the part of Bulova of $38,000.

I seek to show the kind of people who ask to be benefitted by House bill No. 2652. Contrast these, if you will, with the good, honest, hard-working Americans that you and I both represent.

At this point I would like to define the term "American" as applied to the American watch industry. By the term "American" I mean purely, simply, directly American. I do not mean half Swiss, half American. I do not mean one-quarter Swiss, three-quarters American. I do not mean nine-tenths Swiss and one-tenth American, nor do I mean part Jap, part American, or part German or part American. I do mean simply, and directly, and honestly American; really American. As American as the ideal one has in mind when he pledges allegiance to the flag, the kind of stuff immigrants feel in their hearts when they first see the Statue of Liberty. As American as the Star Spangled Banner, as American as the President of the United States.

Many Swiss importers, Bulova, Gruen, Benrus, Longines, and the many others too numerous to mention are deluding the American public day in and day out with their advertising, and there seems to be nothing that we as American watch workers can do but straighten out the record.

Even in this campaign to bring attention to what this bill would do to our industry we have been denied radio time and newspaper advertising in one of the three communities that our industry is located in. In Lancaster, Pa., radio station WGAL refused to allow a radio transcription of a talk which was given on another radio station in Boston on their station, unless they were allowed to delete and to change most of the language which was effective in this speech.

American radio time signals, Bulova watch time, Benrus watch time, etc., are dominated by the Swiss monopoly. These time signals are not available to any American watch manufacturer on any important hours.

The Hamilton watch factory is a vital industry in Lancaster, Pa., and yet the Lancaster newspapers * * * incidentally owned by the group that control radio station WGAL refused to accept a paid advertisement which was carried in the Waltham and Elgin newspapers. I present to you a copy of that advertisement.

Where can the American watch worker seek redress against these wrongs? The only place is here, gentlemen, the legislative halls of Congress. Either this Congress is going to preserve this industry by forbidding the importation of Swiss parts or the American watch worker will lose his job.

Mr. Potter, in his statement, which was signed by not only the American jeweled-watch industry but by the American clock industry, warned "if Congress makes it possible for the clouds of importation that have been hanging over our heads to get too black, a part of the industry may have to transplant itself in order to survive."

Gentlemen, do you need any language plainer than that? The handwriting is on the wall. The Swiss are gaining control of our industry. House bill No. 2652 is designed to deliver the knockout blow to the American watch industry which we have proven essential to our national defense.

I now wish to present to you a petition which we call "the ghost town petition". Thousands of American citizens are petitioning for protection of our industry because it is essential to national defense and because it can create 60,000 new jobs in America. House bill No. 2652 can make "ghost towns" out of any industrial community in this country where labor costs represent more than half the factory costs. Included in this petition are the fathers, mothers, sisters and daughters of those now serving in the armed forces overseas, and other interested Americans.

I wish to present separately and as an indication of the intelligence and interest which those in our armed forces have in what is going on here, a sheet of this "ghost town" petition signed by some of those serving on the U. S. S. *Hermitage*, appealing to this committee to protect their job opportunities while they sacrifice their lives if necessary to preserve democracy.

I ask you, gentlemen, to contrast this petition and this plea for economic protection of jobs for American workers against the plea made last Saturday by the C. I. O. representative. His attitude, his argument, and that of the college professor who is now research director of the C. I. O., Dr. J. Raymond Walsh, who, in debate on Town Meeting of the Air, with Senator Brewster, took the attitude that if American industries could not compete, American workers should be willing to transfer into other industries.

Gentlemen, the fate of America is at the crossroads. House bill No. 2652 will decide whether we are going to have full opportunity for employment, or whether we are to give our markets to foreign lands so that importers may benefit.

The American Watch Worker says you need our industry for national defense. We want to work in this industry, our homes, our lives, our families are tied into these communities where watches are manufactured,

I ask you to save America against the day when we may need this vital industry again.

Gentlemen, I rest my case knowing that it is in the hands of 25 good Americans who have the interest of our Nation at heart and are not going to allow importers, whose only interest is profit-making and whose profits are not subjected to renegotiation, to scuttle our industry.

Thank you.

See the Triple-A Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, a new farm machine—more gas for the tractor—a crop loan—a slaughter permit—the guy who runs the Government's big farm program takes care of all complaints—and runs his farm besides.

Organized programs to further Wisconsin's war-food production have for the most part been conducted by and through the A. A. A. county committees. Wisconsin has 213 elected county committeemen who are all farmers and operate 40,683 acres of land.

Just recently a survey was made into the details of these men's farming activity and volume of production, as they are leaders in the State campaign for increased production of milk, meat, dairy products, and eggs.

It is found that 200 of the 213 county committeemen own their own farms, average length of ownership 23 years. In education 177 of them finished eighth grade, 168 went to high school, and 58 went to college. They average 52.9 years of age.

On the 40,683 acres they operate these Badger farm community leaders in 1944 produced 23,874,000 pounds of milk, 1,012,200 pounds of pork, 3,144,400 eggs, and 8,980 pounds of wool. They milk 3,880 cows on these farms.

In the A. A. A. program three county committeemen are elected to administer the farm program, their term of office is 1 year, they are elected by delegates who in turn are elected by the farmers in the community; one delegate for each community, which in most cases represents a township.

Ben Hermundsen, vice chairman in Buffalo County, has the largest acreage. He owns and operates 774 acres. He has been on the county committee for 11 years and has owned and operated the farm for 38 years. He is now 63 years old.

Fred Schmid, vice chairman of Walworth County, is the largest dairyman with a herd of 80 milk cows. Mr. Schmid has for the last 35 years owned and operated 526 acres. He was one of the largest hemp producers at the Darien plant which was built on land purchased from him. Besides his large dairy herd he has about 30 other cattle, and raises about 200 hogs a year.

Ed Richard, vice chairman in Grant County, is the largest pork producer. He raises an average of 300 hogs per year on his 168-acre farm besides milking 25 cows and keeping 1,000 laying hens. He has operated this farm for the past 21 years, and has been owner for 17 years.

Herman Hanson, chairman of Dunn County, is the largest poultryman. He keeps an average of 1,200 layers on his 392-acre farm which he has operated for the last 28 years and owned for the last 24 years.

Ray O. Staupe in Douglas County is the youngest county committeeman in the State. He now owns a 160-acre farm which he bought a year ago and had previously operated it for 18 years.

Harvey Spriggs, in Racine County, is the oldest county committeeman; at 76 he is still hale and hearty. He has owned his good 449-acre Racine County farm for the past 54 years. In the time Spriggs spent in agriculture he has become connected with about every agricultural move that has developed in the last 50 years. He is a general farmer, milks about 23 cows, feeds over 100 hogs, has 300 laying hens and has about 50 sheep. He has produced hemp for the mill at Union Grove.

Most of the committeemen produce the feed for their stock with the exception of supplements to balance up their rations. Tractors and other modern machines are used on most of their farms.

A tabulation of horsepower on our county committeemen's farms revealed an average of 3.3 horses per farm. Many of the farms had no horses at all and were entirely mechanized as can be seen from the large acreages operated. The 3.3 per farm average for horses could not possibly furnish the power to operate these farms at maximum capacity.

DOUBLE DUTY FOR THEM

In addition to their regular farm management responsibilities, most of the committeemen do regular farm chores in the morning and evening and during the day carry on their responsibilities as administrators of their county A. A. A. program with its many varied and related war activities. The programs for which these committeemen were responsible during the year 1944 are the following:

Lime, superphosphate, aerial mapping, hay-seed harvesting, commodity-loans program, crop-insurance program, regional agricultural credit program, C. C. C. dairy production program, war crop goals program, sugar-beet program, rationing of farm machinery, rationing of milk cans, rationing of gasoline engines, rationing of crawler-type tractors, nonhighway gasoline, conversions on farm implements, certification of vegetable processors, protein 20 percent set-aside order, farm construction order, frozen-food locker plants, wool-purchase program, softwood lumber program, maximum transportation conservation, allocation of new farm trucks, copper-wire program, milkweed-floss program, surplus Government trucks, farm slaughter permits, and public auction of surplus equipment.

To give some idea of the amount of work involved in the conduct of these various individual programs, the county offices made a tabulation of the following specific items which when summarized on a State level give the following approximate figures for the year 1944:

Office calls:	
Farmers	519,616
Others	70,252
Communications:	
Letters written	673,852
Mimeographed letters	1,814,272
Letters received	825,600
Telephone calls:	
Incoming	132,260
Out going	78,780
Meetings:	
Number held	5,532
Number attending	274,992
Field contracts:	
By county committee	216,044
By community committee	614,104

Over one-half million farmers thus made personal calls at their county triple A offices in the State. These calls may have been for information on their regular triple-A program practices, to order limestone, for assistance in obtaining tractor gasoline, or information or assistance under any of the various war programs previously listed. A large amount of traffic to the county offices during the period January through September was in connection with the machinery rationing program which was suspended in September.

Under the triple-A farm program the county committeemen were directly responsible for the participation of 93.3 percent of the total crop acreage in the State. This in itself is a major achievement, and is the result of the conduct of an efficient administration on the county level. The conduct of the various rationing programs, maximum transportation conservation, farm lumber, and the nonhighway gasoline program in particular made necessary the holding of innumerable committee meetings after the evening chores were done. The time, gasoline, and tires for these meetings were for the major part donated by the committeemen.

This gives the major activities of some prominent Wisconsin farmers who in addition to their farm operations are actively administering their own farm program for the benefit of their friends and neighbors, the agricultural industry and the Nation as a whole. Triple A is a farmers' program which it can be truly said is actually run by farmers.

Hats off to the Wisconsin triple-A leaders.

Observations on Present-Day Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following observations on present-day problems. I offer these remarks for the consideration of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

A GROWING WORLD MENACE

The people of Europe and the world are shocked and astonished at the attacks that are now being made upon the

Catholic Church by the Russian press in general and the official Soviet newspaper, Pravda, in particular. The Roman Catholic Church of Austria has been attacked as an obstacle in the Russian attempt "to create a democratic form of government for Austria," and it is urged that both the Catholic Party and the Socialist Party of Austria (the only political parties in Austria) be purged so that a "patriotic front" can be established. Stalin's policies in Poland and Rumania have long since brought disquiet to France and England; but now his proposal to occupy Denmark and also his direct interference in the political affairs of Austria have intensified this disquiet and brought it home to the whole western European world. Of course, Europe and her problems and worries are some 3,000 miles away. However, the same disquiet is being brought home to the people of the Western Hemisphere because Elias Laferte, the president of the Communist Party in Chile, speaking in Mexico City, May 18, 1944, singled out catholicism as the most formidable enemy of communism in America. He even pointed out the methods that communism must employ in the Western Hemisphere to disparage and destroy the religious forces which stand in the way of the advancement of communism in America. The Catholic Church of America is to be congratulated for being singled out as "the most formidable enemy of communism in America." Every Protestant Church should join up with the Catholic Church in a crusade to prevent the Sovietization of the world—Weekly News Letter, May 7, 1945.

THE ONLY SURE FOUNDATION FOR PEACE

In February 1941, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America—a Protestant organization—issued a rather remarkable pronouncement to the world. It stated, in substance, that the only sure foundation for lasting peace are the teachings of Christ as recorded in the Gospels. In a recent pronouncement of the Catholic bishops of America the world has again been told the same thing, in stronger and more specific words. In the bishops' pronouncement the statement is made that we must seek "the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations." The pronouncement suggests that only when this is accomplished can we expect lasting peace. Men of good will of all nations, all races, and all creeds, can take heart today because of the similarity of thought and the unity of spirit that have been expressed in these two great pronouncements, one by the Protestant Churches of America and the other by the leaders of the Catholic Church of America—Weekly News Letter, December 18, 1944.

DUMBARTON OAKS AND SAN FRANCISCO

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference held last summer constructed a skeleton organization for world peace. The San Francisco Conference is expected to put flesh and clothes upon that skeleton in order to make it a living, functioning organization. Every American is in full accord with the objective of world peace and is hoping and praying that the objective will be accomplished. We must not blind ourselves, however, to the fact that the concessions made to Stalin at Yalta and the secret agreements arrived at by the Big Three at Yalta will hamper and handicap the delegates at San Francisco in their efforts to complete the task of building an organization that will insure world peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks peace plan is not a new one. It has been tried twice before in the history of the world and failed both times. First it was tried by the Big Four—Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Austria—in 1815, when they formed the Holy Alliance to keep the peace of Europe after they had defeated Napoleon. The Dumbarton Oaks plan, based upon a Big Three great-power dictatorship to keep the peace of the world, is in all its basic essentials very similar to the Big Four alliance that was created following the Napoleonic wars. The Big Four Holy Alliance became a Big Five in 1818 when it admitted a chastened, penitent Bourbon France. Its life was a short one, however, because in 1823 Great Britain seceded from the alliance and it broke up.

Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was patterned after the Holy Alliance. It was similar in many respects, but was more universal and more idealistic. Wilson's League of Nations was doomed to failure before it began to function. Because Wilson would not accept some protective amendments, his plan for world peace was turned down by the United States Senate. Without the United States as a full-fledged partner the League was doomed to failure. Will the same thing happen again? Will our leaders become so enamoured over the Dumbarton Oaks plan, when it has been made into a living functioning organization for world peace that they will say, as Wilson did, "It cannot be changed; it must not be amended in any respect; it must be accepted as it is"? If so, will the Senate again turn thumbs down on a program for world peace?—Weekly News Letter, April 23, 1945.

SLAVE LABOR AS WAR PUNISHMENT

Should Stalin be permitted to use 2,000,000 German soldiers as slaves for 10 years to rebuild that part of Russia that has been destroyed? Should we agree to such a program? How many of the German soldiers fought of their own free choice, and how many had no choice but to fight when ordered to do so? We are told that Stalin's plan for enslaving 2,000,000 Germans for 10 years had the full approval of Roosevelt, Hopkins, Hillman, and Frankfurter. We know the Romans in the time of Caesar enslaved their war prisoners. But we also know that with the coming of Christianity that brutal degrading custom was abandoned. Is it to be resurrected and given approval by the Big Three? Is Uncle Sam to be a party to forced slavery? We realize that such a barbaric custom of enslaving war prisoners is in line with the Asiatic despotism and the serf traditions of Russia and Stalin. Hitler made slaves of the civilian population of the countries his army overran and conquered. The civilized world condemned his action as inhuman, the act of a madman. Are we now to approve the same act because Stalin desires to retaliate? What becomes of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as ye would have them do unto you"?—Weekly News Letter, April 23, 1945.

POSTWAR IMMIGRATION QUESTIONS

After World War No. 1 this Nation faced a very serious immigration problem. A flood of European immigrants were pouring in through our gates, threatening our economic life. To stem this incoming tide Congress in 1924 passed our quota immigration laws, setting up immigration quotas for the various countries of Europe. These quota laws were both restrictive and selective and have worked wonderfully well during the past 20 years.

Following this war, we will again be faced with a serious immigration problem. Millions of Europeans will be clamoring for admission to the United States. Hundreds of thousands of the people of the subjugated countries of Europe who have been forced to do slave labor by the Germans say they do not want to go back to their own country when released; they want to emigrate to America. What shall our postwar immigration policy be? Shall we retain our quota system as it is? Shall we suspend all quotas for a period of 10 years? Shall we reduce present quotas or increase them? Shall we suspend quotas of enemy countries and increase the quotas of Allied countries? Germany today has a yearly immigration quota of 27,000. Shall we increase the Polish quota so that the 250,000 Polish patriots who have been fighting so bravely with our Allied armies may find a home here? We are told they will not be permitted to return to Poland after the war because they are persona non grata to Stalin. Perhaps these freedom-loving, Christian Poles would make better American citizens than Russian immigrants with their communistic background and their scorn of religion.

The House of Representatives has authorized its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to investigate this whole problem of postwar immigration and make a report to the Congress so that the problems involved can be acted upon intelligently. This is a very important matter. It places a heavy responsibility upon the Immigration and Naturalization Committee of the House. The writer will be serving on that committee and will welcome suggestions from back home—Weekly News Letter, May 14, 1945.

Address of Archbishop Cushing Before Jewish War Veterans' Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Archbishop Cushing before the Newton Post, No. 211, Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans, at the Copley Plaza meeting in Boston, Mass. The address appeared in the May 14, 1945, issue of the Boston Daily Globe:

ARCHBISHOP WARNS JEWS AND CATHOLICS OF DISCRIMINATION—BOTH VICTIMS OF INTOLERANCE—ARE OFTEN SET AGAINST EACH OTHER

When totalitarian states get going, Catholics and Jews are the first victims of discrimination, Archbishop Cushing told members of Newton Ladies' Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans Post at their annual luncheon at the Copley Plaza this afternoon.

He warned his listeners, too, that Catholics and Jews are sometimes mischievously led to think ill of each other.

"Let us be very careful," he said. "There are those who would gladly embarrass both of us.

"As the Archbishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston I officially tell you that it is contrary to the dictates and to the doctrines of the Catholic faith for any Catholic to hate anyone.

"Catholics have many things in common with the people of Israel," began the Archbishop. "We acknowledge as the founder of our religion and as the son of God, Jesus Christ, a Jew. The first followers and apostles of Christ were Jews, men proud of their Jewish race. Today, in the midst of a world that ignores the right of God to speak to men in Divine revelation, both Catholics and Jews respect the revelation of the Almighty in the Old Testament. In the acceptance of this right of God to dictate to men their conduct and of the obligation of mankind to follow these dictates, Jews and Catholics stand on a platform of mutual agreement and concord.

COMMON ENEMIES

"We have a common respect for the voice of God expressed in the Old Testament which we, as Catholics, are bound to hear and which the Jews cannot ignore. Names that are sacred to you are hallowed to us. Names that you are not permitted to forget, we are charged to remember—Moses, Isaiah, David, Daniel are your heroes and ours.

"I might add that our enemies and our critics—we also frequently have in common. Abroad, the Jews and the Catholics are usually the first objects of the nationalist totalitarian's ban. At home, the vested interests which discriminate on one day against our people, discriminate the next against yours, and the next against both of us. I mention this because it is extremely important to be on guard against a serious danger to both our groups, a danger the more mischievous because it sometimes comes in the guise of friendship for one or the other of us. Some of your people are occasionally led to think ill of some of mine; some of my people are similarly victimized with regard to you. Let us each be very careful. There are those who would gladly embarrass both of us.

"We have common enemies and they are hard at work here in this city and elsewhere, trying to divide your people from ours. They have even tried it on occasion in the name of good will and, I regret to say, of democracy.

"But, far more important among the ties that bind us are those which are positive. In an era that is striving to dethrone Almighty God, Catholics and Jews, by reason of our religious belief, feel a need of the God above us. We as Catholics believe in prayer and worship, and we go to heroic extents to manifest this belief.

"The Jews who adhere to the faith of their fathers do the same. Faithful Jews have their days of worship, sacrifice, and self-denial, and they keep them. So do we. Faithful Jews have their schools in which they teach the young the rights of the living God and make sacrifices, financial and otherwise, to have their sons and daughters render their tribute of devotion to the God of nations and of men. So do we.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN

"Faithful Jews recognize the need of the love of God in the midst of a godless world; they warn their adherents against indifference in modern paganism; they recognize the need of placing the light of faith in their window, not just once a week or once a year, but of showing it at all times, without offense to anyone, and without neglect of God. And so do we. Being so sympathetic in matters moral and spiritual, I do not hesitate to speak to you today on a very controversial subject with profound moral and spiritual implications: woman's role in the modern world.

"Women in modern times, like men, can play the game of life on the side of the angels or with the forces of evil. Rallying behind what is best in life you have a twofold contribution to make to a new and better world. You can reintroduce into modern life the lost sense of reverence, and you can help in the reestablishment of the family, the unit of society which must be saved if democracy is to survive * * *.

"A wise man remarked some years ago, when feminism had done its work, 'Women were once our superiors—now they have become our equals.'

"But, equal or not, this is still a man-made and man-run world. The only difference since the feminist movement is that women figuratively, and in some cases literally, have put on trousers to take men's places. Men may be flattered by this imitation—though I doubt it—but the world has profited nothing from it.

"With the miscarriage of the feminist movement and with woman's consequent donning of trousers to take her place as a man in a world of men, the family and home began to suffer a decline. Woman's career as a politician, a professional or business or social worker began to supersede her natural, God-given career as mother and home-builder. Divorce laws, certain economic factors, and, finally, contraceptives completed the ruin of a marriage and threaten to sabotage the social unit which is the family.

"If you think I exaggerate, I ask you to consider with me the fact that there exists in the world today powerful political and social movements which are based on the theoretical and factual promise that the family no longer exists, nor has it any right to exist. These movements are based on the theory that the state is the only legitimate social unit. The family, representing as it does, a social unit, which guarantees the individual certain rights and privileges prior to and independent of the state has no place in the totalitarian state.

"Perhaps you think the family is safe here in our counry? The facts prove the contrary. We have the largest divorce record of any nontotalitarian state in the world—a fact which shakes the family at its source. We are now having about 250,000 divorces a year in this country—1,000,000 dreams of marital bliss ending in disaster in every 4-year period. We may well imagine how the children of these families are being trained. And yet the prime purpose of the home is children—their rearing as well as their procreation. Can we really express surprise at the great number of our delinquents? And the end is not yet. The war has made the family situation worse.

"Truly, only gigantic efforts will accomplish the task of reconstructing our family life.

"My dear Jewish women, from these and other noble women of the Old Testament have come your ideals. Do not sacrifice them for the fictitious heroines or the glamour girls of modern life. If you hold fast to the sacred traditions and types of womanhood in the old law you will make a grand contribution to the rebirth of reverence and to the rebuilding of the family life so vitally needed in the remaking of a world that came very close to annihilating itself with the sword of a war which exploded from the poisonous gases of secularism and immorality."

Prime Minister Churchill's Review of the War and Pledge for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Prime Minister Churchill, as published in the New York Times of May 14, 1945:

It was 5 years ago on Thursday last that His Majesty the King commissioned me to form a national government of all parties to carry on our affairs.

Five years is a long time in human life, especially when there is no remission for good conduct. However, this national government was sustained by Parliament and by the entire British Nation at home and by all our fighting men abroad, and by the unswerving cooperation of the Dominions far across the oceans and of our Empire in every quarter of the globe. After various episodes that occurred, it became clear last week that so far things have worked out pretty well and that the British Commonwealth and Empire stands more united and more effectively powerful than at any time in its long romantic history. Certainly we are in what may well, I think, be admitted by any fair-minded person—certainly we are in a far better state to cope with the problems and perils of the future than we were 5 years ago.

For a while our prime enemy, our mighty enemy—Germany—overran almost all Europe. France, who bore such a frightful strain in the last Great War, was beaten to the ground and took some time to recover. The Low Countries, fighting to the best of their strength, were subjugated. Norway was overrun. Mussolini's Italy stabbed us in the back when we were, as he thought, at our last gasp. But for ourselves, our lot—I mean the British Commonwealth and Empire—we were absolutely alone.

BATTLE OF BRITAIN RECALLED

In July, August, and September, 1940, 40 or 50 squadrons of British fighter aircraft in the Battle of Britain broke the teeth of the German air fleet at odds of 7 or 8 to 1. May I repeat again the words I used at that momentous hour—never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few. The name of Air Chief Marshal Lord Dowding will always be linked with this splendid event. But conjoined with the Royal Air Force lay the Royal Navy, ever ready to tear to pieces the barges, gathered from the canals of Holland and Belgium, in which a German invading army could alone have been transported. I was never one to believe that the invasion of Britain with the tackle that the enemy had at that time was a very easy task to accomplish. With the autumn storms, the immediate danger of invasion in 1940 passed.

Then began the "blitz," when Hitler said he would rub out our cities. That's what he said—rub out our cities. This was borne without a word of complaint or the slightest signs of flinching, while a very large number

of people—honor to them all—proved that London could take it, and so could our other ravaged centers.

But the dawn of 1941 revealed us still in jeopardy. The hostile aircraft could fly across the approaches to our island, where forty-six millions of people had to import half their daily bread and all the materials they needed for peace or war. These hostile aircraft could fly across the approaches from Brest to Norway in a single flight or back again. They could observe all the movements of our shipping in and out of the Clyde and Mersey and could direct upon our convoys the large and increasing numbers of U-boats with which they the enemy bespattered the Atlantic—the survivors or successors of which U-boats are now being collected in British harbors.

The sense of envelopment, which might at any moment turn to strangulation, lay heavy upon us. We had only the northwestern approach between Ulster and Scotland through which to bring in the means of life and to send out the forces of war.

DE VALERA DENOUNCED

Owing to the action of Mr. De Valera, so much at variance with the temper and instinct of thousands of southern Irishmen who hastened to the battle front to prove their ancient valor, the approaches which the southern Irish ports and airfields could so easily have guarded were closed by the hostile aircraft and U-boats. This was indeed a deadly moment in our life and, if it had not been for the loyalty and friendship of northern Ireland, we should have been forced to come to close quarters with Mr. de Valera or perish forever from the earth. However, with a restraint and poise to which, I say, history will find few parallels, his Majesty's Government never laid a violent hand, although at times it would have been quite easy and quite natural, and we left the De Valera government to frolic with the Germans and later with the Japanese representatives to their heart's content.

When I think of these days, I think also of other episodes and certain personalities. I think of Lieutenant Commander Esmonde, V. C.; of Lance Corporal Keneally, V. C.; of Captain Fegen, V. C., and other Irish heroes that I could easily recite. And then I must confess that the bitterness by Britain against the Irish race dies in my heart. I can only pray that in years which I shall not see the shame will be forgotten and the glories will endure, and that the peoples of the British Isles and of the British Commonwealth of Nations will walk together in mutual comprehension and forgiveness.

My friends, when our minds turn to the northwestern approaches, we will not forget the devotion of our merchant seamen and our minesweepers, out every night and so rarely mentioned in the headlines, nor will we forget the vast, inventive, adaptive, all-embracing and, in the end, all-controlling power of the Royal Navy with its ever more potent new ally, the air. These have kept the lifeline open. We were able to breathe; we were able to live; we were able to strike. Dire deeds we had to do. We had to destroy or capture the French Fleet, which, had it ever passed undamaged into German hands, would, together with the Italian Fleet, have perhaps enabled the German Navy to face us on the high seas. This we did. We had to make the dispatch to General Wavell—all round the cape at our darkest hour—of tanks—practically all we had in the island—and this enabled us, as far back as November 1940 to defend Egypt against invasion and hurl back, with the loss of a quarter of a million captives and a heavy slaughter, the Italian armies at whose tail Mussolini had already planned to ride into Cairo or Alexandria.

AMERICAN ANXIETY CITED

Great anxiety was felt by President Roosevelt and, indeed, by thinking men throughout the United States about what would happen to us in the early part of 1941. The President felt to the depths of his being that the destruction of Britain would not only be an event fearful in itself but that it would expose to mortal danger the vast and as yet largely unarmed potentialities and the future destiny of the United States. He feared greatly that we should be invaded in that spring of 1941, and no doubt he had behind him advice as good as any that is known in the world, and he sent his recent Presidential opponent, the late Mr. Wendell Willkie, to me with a letter in which he had written in his own hand the famous lines of Longfellow which I quoted in the House of Commons the other day:

"Sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union strong and great,
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

We were, however, in a fairly tough condition by the early months of 1941, and we felt very much better about ourselves than in those months immediately after the collapse of France. Our Dunkerque army and field force troops in Britain, almost a million strong, were nearly all equipped or re-equipped. We had ferried over the Atlantic a million rifles and a thousand cannon from the United States, with all their ammunition, since the previous June. In our munition works, which were becoming very powerful, men and women had worked at their machines till they dropped senseless from fatigue. Nearly 1,000,000 of men, growing to 2,000,000 at the peak, although working all day, had been formed into the home guard. They were armed at least with rifles and armed also with the spirit "conquer or die."

Later in 1941, when we were still all alone, we sacrificed unwillingly, to some extent unwittingly, our conquest of the winter in Cyrenaica and Libya in order to stand by Greece, and Greece will never forget how much we gave, albeit unavailingly, of the little we had. We repressed the German-instigated rising in Iraq. We defended Palestine. With the assistance of General de Gaulle's indomitable Free French, we cleared Syria and the Lebanon of Vichyites and of German alienators and intriguers. And then in June 1941, another tremendous world event occurred.

You have no doubt noticed in your reading of British history—and I hope you will take pains to read it—it is only from the past that one can judge the future, and it is only from reading the story of the British Nation, of the British Empire, that you can feel a well-grounded sense of pride to dwell in these islands as you have sometimes noticed in your reading of British history that we have had to hold out from time to time all alone, or to be the mainspring of coalitions, against a continental tyrant or dictator, and we have had to hold out for quite a long time—against the Spanish Armada, against the might of Louis XIV, when we led Europe for nearly 25 years under William III and Marlborough, and 150 years ago when Nelson, Pitt, and Wellington broke Napoleon, but not without assistance from the heroic Russians of 1812. In all these world wars our islands kept the lead of Europe or else held out alone.

And if you hold out alone long enough, there always comes a time when the tyrant makes some ghastly mistake which alters the whole balance of the struggle. On June 22, 1941, Hitler, master, as he thought himself, of all Europe, nay indeed soon to be master of the world, so we thought, treacherously, without warning, without the slightest provocation, hurled himself on Russia and came face to face with Marshal Stalin and the numberless millions of the Russian people. And then, at the end of the year, Japan struck her felon blow at the United States at Pearl Harbor. And at the same time attacked us in Malaya and Singapore. Thereupon Hitler and Mussolini declared war on the Republic of the United States.

Years have passed since then—indeed, every year seems to me almost a decade—but never since the United States entered the war have I had the slightest doubt but that we should be saved and that we only had to do our duty in order to win. We have played our part in all this process by which the evil-doers have been overthrown, and I hope I do not speak vain or boastful words, but from Alamein in October 1942, through the Anglo-American invasion of north Africa of Sicily, of Italy, and with the capture of Rome, we marched many miles and never knew defeat.

And then last year, after 2 years' patient preparation and marvelous devices of amphibious warfare—and, mark you, our scientists are not surpassed in any nation in the world, especially when their source of supply is considered—last year, on June 6, we seized a carefully selected little toe of German-occupied France and poured millions in from this island and from across the Atlantic until the Seine, the Somme, and the Rhine all fell behind the advancing Anglo-American spearheads. France was liberated. She produced a fine army of gallant men to aid her own liberation. Germany lay open.

And now, from the other side, the mighty military achievements of the Russian people, always holding many more German troops on their front than we could do, rolled forward to meet us in the heart and center of Germany.

At the same time, in Italy, Field Marshal Alexander's army of so many nations, the largest part of which was British or British Empire, struck their final blow and compelled more than a million enemy troops to surrender. This Fifteenth Army group, as we call it, British and American, joined together in almost equal numbers, are now deep in Austria, joining their right hand with the Russians and their left with the United States armies of General Eisenhower's command.

It happened, as you may remember, but memories are short, that in the space of 3 days we received the news of the unlamented departures of Mussolini and Hitler, and in 3 days also surrenders were made to Field Marshal Alexander and Field Marshal Montgomery of over 2,500,000 soldiers of this terrible warlike German Army.

I shall make it clear at this moment that we have never failed to recognize the immense superiority of the power used by the United States in the rescue of France and the defeat of Germany. For our part, British and Canadians, we have had about one-third as many men over there as the Americans. But we have taken our full share of the fighting, as the scale of our losses shows. Our navy has borne incomparably the heaviest burden in the Atlantic Ocean, in the narrow seas and the Arctic convoys to Russia, while the United States Navy has had to use its immense strength mainly against Japan. We made a fair division of this latter and we can each report that our work is either done or going to be done.

It is right and natural that we should extol the virtues and joyous services of our own most famous commanders, Alexander and Montgomery, neither of whom was ever defeated since they began together at Alamein. Both of them have conducted, in Africa, in Italy, in Normandy, and in Germany, battles of the first magnitude and of decisive consequence.

At the same time we know how great is our debt to the combining and unifying command and high strategic direction of General Eisenhower. And here is the moment when I must pay my personal tribute to the British Chiefs of Staff with whom I have worked in the closest intimacy throughout these heavy, stormy years. There have been very few

changes in this small parcel and capable body of men, who, sinking all service differences and judging the problems of the war as a whole, have worked together in perfect harmony with each other. In Field Marshal Brooke, Admiral Pound, succeeded after his death by Admiral Andrew Cunningham, and in Marshal of the Air Portal, a team was formed who deserve the highest honor in the direction of the whole British war strategy and in its relation with that of our allies.

ALLIES' COOPERATION PRAISED

It may well be said that our strategy was conducted so that the best combinations in closest concert were imparted into the operations by the Combined Staffs of Britain and the United States, with whom, from there onward, the war leaders of Russia were joined. And it may also be said that never have the forces of two nations fought side by side and intermingled in the lines of battle with so much unity, comradeship, and brotherhood as in the great Anglo-American armies.

Some people say: "Well, what would you expect if both nations speak the same language, have the same laws, have a great part of their history in common, and have very much the same outlook upon life with all its hope and glory?" or "Isn't it just the thing that would happen?" And others may say: "It would be an ill day for all the world and for the pair of them if they did not go on working together and marching together and sailing together and flying together whenever something has to be done for the sake of freedom and fair play all over the world." That is the basis of the future.

There was one final danger from which the collapse of Germany has saved us. In London and the southeastern counties we have suffered for a year from various forms of flying bombs—but you heard about this—and rockets and our air force and our ack-ack batteries have done wonders against them. In particular the Air Force, turned on in good time on what then seemed very slight and doubtful evidence, hampered and vastly delayed all German preparations. But it was only when our armies cleaned up the coast and overran all the points of discharge—and when the Americans captured vast stores of rockets of all kinds near Leipzig, which was added to our information only the other day, and when all the preparations being made on the coast of France and Holland could be examined in detail, in scientific detail, that we knew how grave had been the peril, not only from rockets and flying bombs but from multiple long-range artillery, which was being prepared against London.

Only just in time did the Allied armies blast the viper in his nest. Otherwise the autumn of 1944, to say nothing of 1945, might well have seen London as shattered as Berlin. For the same period the Germans had prepared a new U-boat fleet and novel tactics which, though we should have eventually destroyed them, might well have carried anti-U-boat warfare back to the high peak days of 1942.

Therefore we must rejoice and give thanks not only for our preservation when we were all alone but for our timely deliverance from new suffering, new sorrows, new perils not easily to be measured.

WARNS OF TASKS AHEAD

I wish I could tell you tonight that all our toils and troubles were over. Then, indeed, I could end my 5 years' service happily, and, if you thought you had had enough of me and that I ought to be put out to grass, I assure you I would take it with the best of grace. But, on the contrary, I must warn you, as I did when I began this 5 years' task—and no one knew then that it would last so long—that there is still a lot to do and that you must be prepared for further efforts of mind and body and further sacrifices to great causes if you are not to fall back into the rut of inertia, the confusion of aim and the craven fear of being great.

You must not weaken in any way in your alert and vigilant frame of mind. Though a holiday of rejoicing is necessary to the human spirit, yet it must add to the strength and resilience with which every man and woman turns again to the work they have to do and also to the outlook and watch they have to keep on public affairs.

On the continent of Europe we have yet to make sure that the simple and honorable purposes for which we entered the war are not brushed aside or overlooked in the months following our success and that the words "freedom," "democracy," and "liberation" are not distorted from their true meaning as we have understood them. There would be little use in punishing the Hitlerites for their crimes if law and justice did not rule and if totalitarian or police governments were to take the place of the German invaders. We seek nothing for ourselves. But we must make sure that those causes which we fought for find recognition at the peace table in facts as well as words. And, above all, we must labor that the world organization which the United Nations are creating at San Francisco does not become an idle name, does not become a shield for the strong and mockery for the weak. It is the victors who must search their hearts in their glowing hours and be worthy by their nobility of the immense forces that they wield.

We must never forget that beyond all lurks Japan, harassed and failing, but still a people of a hundred million, for whose warriors death has few terrors. I cannot tell you tonight how much time or what exertions will be required to compel the Japanese to make amends for their odious treachery and cruelty. We, like China so long undaunted, we have received horrible injuries from them ourselves, and we are bound by the ties of honor and fraternal loyalty to the United States to fight this great war at the other end of the world at their side without flagging or failing. We must remember that Australia and New Zealand and Canada were and are all directly menaced by this evil power. They came to our aid in our dark times and we must not leave unfinished any task which concerns their safety and their future. I told you hard things at the beginning of these last 5 years; you did not shrink, and I should be unworthy of your confidence and generosity if I did not still cry: "Forward, unflinching, unswerving, indomitable, till the whole task is done and the whole world is safe and clean."

This Subsidy Juggling Is Difficult to Explain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to see how the War Food Administration arrived at the conclusions they come to when they decide on the milk subsidy for the various States. The fact that the milk production has not been increased 10 percent even though millions were spent as milk subsidies indicates that other factors are involved. The amount of the subsidy is not based on the cost of labor nor on the governmental official report showing the hourly returns per hour of labor on typical dairy farms of the various States.

One fact is evident and that is that the amounts of the subsidy are to continue to be juggled as long as the present political agriculturists stay in power.

The following table shows the amounts for each State for the various months of the year up to April 1, 1946:

State	Counties	Rate per hundred weight, milk delivered			
		January through April	May and June	July through September	October through March
		Cts.	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*
Alabama	Baldwin, Mobile	90	55	75	90
	All other counties	70	35	55	70
Arizona	All counties	70	35	55	70
Arkansas	do	70	35	55	70
California	Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Ventura.	80	45	65	80
	All other counties	70	35	55	70
Colorado	All counties	70	35	55	70
Connecticut	do	80	45	65	80
Delaware	do	70	35	55	70
Florida	do	90	55	75	90
Georgia	do	90	55	75	90
Idaho	Benewah, Bonner, Boundry, Clearwater, Kootenai, Latah, Lewis, Nez Perce, Shoshone.	70	35	55	70
	All other counties	60	25	45	60
Illinois	All counties	60	25	45	60
Indiana	do	60	25	45	60
Iowa	do	60	25	45	60
Kansas	do	60	25	45	60
Kentucky	do	60	25	45	60
Louisiana	do	70	35	55	70
Maine	do	70	35	55	70
Maryland	do	70	35	55	70
Massachusetts	do	80	45	65	80
Michigan	do	60	25	45	60
Minnesota	do	60	25	45	60
Mississippi	do	70	35	55	70
Missouri	do	60	25	45	60
Montana	do	60	25	45	60
Nebraska	do	60	25	45	60
Nevada	do	70	35	55	70
New Hampshire	do	70	35	55	70
New Jersey	do	80	45	65	80
New Mexico	do	70	35	55	70
New York	do	70	35	55	70
North Carolina	do	90	55	75	90
North Dakota	do	60	25	45	60
Ohio	All counties	60	25	45	60
Oklahoma	do	70	35	55	70
Oregon	do	70	35	55	70
Pennsylvania	do	70	35	55	70
Rhode Island	do	80	45	65	80
South Carolina	do	90	55	75	90
South Dakota	do	60	25	45	60
Tennessee	Fayette, Shelby	70	35	55	70
	All other counties	60	25	45	60
Texas	All counties	70	35	55	70
Utah	do	70	35	55	70
Vermont	do	70	35	55	70
Virginia	do	70	35	55	70
Washington	do	70	35	55	70
West Virginia	do	70	35	55	70
Wisconsin	do	60	25	45	60
Wyoming	do	60	25	45	60

What Is Behind Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, every mail brings us letters from innocent, propagandized people to vote for this and vote

for that. Too often these people do not even know what they are asking us to vote for. They have been asked to send us these demands. They do not even know the people who are asking them to do this. They do not know that some of these that are propagandizing them represent foreign nations rather than our own.

The time has come for all of us to know what we are doing, and where we are going. All the plans submitted to the American people by high pressure, well financed groups in New York and other large cities, will not bring salvation but destruction.

When this propaganda comes from organizations that think more of other nations than of our own, it is time to read something that originates from people who feel that their first duty is to our own people. It is refreshing to know that there are still a few who have the courage of their conviction and who speak with knowledge and authority on the subject that they discuss. It is for this reason that I submit an article by former Democratic Congressman Charles A. Binderup:

It was President Lincoln who said in substance this: If I should find a piece of wood in Washington neatly carved with curves and notches, and later find another piece in New York City, and again another piece in Bretton Woods, and when placing these together they fit and make a completed something, I have reason to believe back of all was a concerted plan.

So it didn't just happen, as stated in former letter to Congress—(1) That we conscripted all the gold from the people and gave them Federal Reserve notes, not legal tender. (2) And that there was secretly donated to the Federal Reserve banking system, the arm of the international bankers, approximately twenty billions of the conscripted gold. (3) After which they are raising the fiat value of gold certificates 15 percent, again donating to the Federal Reserve banks (strictly private banks) approximately another $4,800,000,000. (4) That sold gold to some 40 nations and taking in return their worthless bonds for free gold in the United States Treasury. (5) So they could qualify and go on the gold standard at Bretton Woods.

Thus was built up and pieced together "the something," the edifice, a throne for the gold standard of the world, the most hideous and hated dictator, money monopoly. A thousand times more cruel and ruthless than any other dictator the world has ever known.

And thus was planned a sneak attack on the children of Uncle Sam—in darkness for 3 years or more, that the people might be kept in ignorance, born in England to be controlled by foreign nations—a plan to steal from our people their representative government and substitute the secret invisible government, the vicious power behind the throne, money monopoly, whose business it is to promote wars and disturb peace. Giving over to the pirates of finance complete control. The same power that has been wrecking us for 170 years with money panics and depressions in the midst of plenty and wars and strife between nations.

On this gold-standard throne, there is to be crowned and decorated with the veil and diadem of the Bretton Woods conspiracy, an international bank with an $8,800,000,000 international monetary fund and a $9,100,000,000 world bank capitalization all in control of foreign nations, and over and around this throne a mighty Frankenstein armed with the weapon we have given it, $20,000,000,000 in pure gold represented by gold certificates and the right to increase this with an added Government fiat of four times its value (25 percent reserve), making the huge sum of $80,000,000,000 outside the bank, a money power almost 10 times stronger than the bank itself.

But that isn't near all. We have added to this by allowing the banking system to issue approximately $75,000,000,000 in check-book money, fountain-pen money, mere ledger entries on the bank's books subject to check.

But we have done much more. We have donated to these international banks approximately $75,000,000,000 in Government bonds. Given these bonds to them, as completely as you ever gave a blind man a penny. While the people paid dollar for dollar to buy their bonds, and, remember, we pay the banking system interest on these gifts.

But we still have done more. We have made everything tax exempt. We have agreed to let labor and the farmer pay, that these might be made tax free.

THE BRETTON WOODS CONSPIRACY

An international bank capitalization	$9,100,000,000
International monetary fund	8,800,000,000
Gold certificates, approximately	20,000,000,000
25-percent reserve	80,000,000,000
Bankers credit money (ledger entries)	93,500,000,000
Government bonds (a donation)	75,000,000,000
All tax free, total (in billions)	286,400,000,000

This financial octopus clothed in absolute power by the Bretton Woods conspiracy will control directly the money of 43 other nations, thereby controlling the money of the world. These international bankers, that have ever been traitors to the peoples' cause, that have usurped the control of our money contrary to the Constitution, that have created no less than 27 money panics, depressions, and recissions in the brief lifetime of our Nation, thereby taking from labor the products of their hands and brains. Friends let me say it religiously: How long, O Lord, how long will the people kiss the hand that wields the whip of economic slavery?

Members of Congress, in whom we have trusted the welfare of our great Government, isn't 170 years enough to prove to you the corruption of these hounds of money monopoly that in the past have ever been traitors to the cause of liberty and justice? Surely there is not one of you who will vote for this Bretton Woods conspiracy. Of course not. There is not a Member of the people's Congress who will thus betray their sacred trust.

Yours truly,

C. G. BINDERUP,
Former Member of Congress from Nebraska.

Reclassifying Salaries in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming sentiment of Congress, as expressed today upon the floor and by more than 200 Members who appeared or presented statements to the committee, is a great tribute to the men and women of our Postal Service.

It is a long-overdue tribute, Mr. Speaker. Not since 1925 has this Congress taken action to recognize the needs and the service of these men and these women who have served us so well and so tirelessly. Not since 1925 has their basic pay been adjusted.

CORRECTING 20 YEARS' INJUSTICE

So today we are correcting 20 years of injustice. It was injustice which became so manifest when wartime living costs crowded in upon these workers' meager incomes that there was hardly a man alive who could not see it and did not recognize it.

I desire to compliment the committee for its deep understanding and concern and for its earnest efforts in developing H. R. 3035. It was not an easy task they had before them, Mr. Speaker. It is most difficult to adjust all inequities, grown up with the years. It is difficult, too, to attempt to bring the salaries of these employees in line with those paid in private industry, under restrictive regulations set by the National War Labor Board. Certainly I know of no group of privately employed workers which has received no advance in basic wages since 1925.

Yet, within the framework afforded them, the able committee did an excellent and praiseworthy job.

I do not desire to belabor the point. We are doing justice today.

TRUE TIME AND ONE HALF

Yet there is one additional point I do desire to make. This bill provides true time and one-half for overtime. This section is long overdue. It has always seemed strange to me that this Congress, through the Fair Labor Standards Act, established the basic 40-hour week and time and one-half overtime pay above 40 hours for industry, and yet neglected to apply this same rule to our own employees. Somehow it reminds me of an employer I once knew. He owned a newspaper. In the columns of his paper he praised the achievements of labor. He advised workers to organize and protect their rights. He talked of shorter hours and higher wages. But when the employees in his own plant began to organize, he opposed them. What he advocated was good for everyone else but himself.

I am glad to see that today we are extending to those whom we employ some of the benefits we have advocated and enacted into law for employees generally. We are not following the course pursued by the employer I mentioned, who, by the way, has belatedly also seen the wisdom of practising what he preached.

NEED TO MAKE PERMANENT

In this connection I would call attention to the fact that the bill has one defect in my eyes. Section 20 of the legislation provides that during the emergency and 6 months thereafter employes shall be paid overtime for services required on Saturdays. This is not in line with true time and one-half overtime pay.

Overtime pay is compensation for overtime no matter what the cause. Perhaps it is true that after the emergency we will not need to ask these employees to put in longer hours by Sat-

urday work. If not, of course, they will receive no overtime pay. Yet, they are entitled to overtime pay for all the overtime they work. There is no other answer. While I know it is not the intent of this legislation to provide other than true time-and-one-half, the temporary wartime character of this particular section might possibly allow for payment of the first 8 hours of overtime on Saturdays at the old rate during emergencies, such as the Christmas rush.

MUST PASS H. R. 3035

I would like to see this section of the bill made a permanent feature, not just a provision for the duration.

However, because over all this legislation is a great step forward, and because during the course of its consideration by the committee I had ample opportunity to confer with members of the committee and to discuss with them the many difficulties they faced and to see the over-all solution which they developed, I do support H. R. 3035 in its present form and I urge its quick passage by both Houses of Congress. Then later, as the few defects which may remain become clearer, I have every confidence that we will correct them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege to support such a measure.

Manganese Producers Association Opposed to Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the statement of J. Carson Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, with reference to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act:

I have been in the manganese industry continuously for more than 30 years. Since the First World War I have constantly worked for the full development of our manganese resources.

Manganese first became strategic mineral No. 1 in 1914 and has always remained at the top of the list of military emergency procurement problems. Manganese is the "starch" in steel. Without manganese, there can be no satisfactory steel product. There is no known substitute for manganese. It stands in a category all its own.

Col. C. T. Harris, Director of the Planning Branch, Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, in testimony before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, February 9, 1937, stated:

"Naturally some of the materials have a higher importance and are more difficult to obtain than others. I place manganese at the top of the list, chromium next, and the minerals more or less at the top of the list. Rubber would have a high priority also. I put manganese and chromium at the top."

* * * * *

"Researches have been made for years and have not been particularly successful in developing materials to supply the shortage. There is no substitute for manganese. Without manganese the steel industry would produce a very inferior quality of steel, and there is no substitute."

The reason for the strategic position of manganese is plain. During the war we consumed over 1,300,000 long tons of high grade manganese ore per year. In prewar years our average consumption was around 800,000 tons. According to the U. S. Bureau of Mines the domestic production of high grade manganese ore containing 35 percent or more manganese in the year 1944, was the largest since 1918, and the second most productive year on record. During 1944, output of high grade manganese ore as measured by shipments from mines is estimated at 243,000 short tons. Domestic shipments of low-grade ore containing 5 to 35 percent manganese in 1944 totaled 1,660,000 short tons. Under normal conditions our major sources of supply of high grade ore are Russia, Africa, India and Brazil, all more than 4,000 miles away.

The tariff covers ore containing 10 percent or more manganese. The main reason for the tariff on manganese, originally granted in 1922, was to stimulate developments in the United States and help remedy this dangerous dependency on foreign ores. Producers have had to face almost unbelievable and at times devastating opposition, both from within and without the United States. The prize being fought for was a major basic industry, including ferromanganese, amounting to approximately $40,000,000 annually in our domestic market, and at the same time making it possible for foreign countries to acquire a stranglehold on the security of this country if we remained wholly dependent on foreign ores. But, in spite of all, the industry is proud to give a good report to this committee today.

The domestic industry produces practically all the low-grade manganese ore needed. Since 1940, with the war in Europe and the beginning of our own stock-piling program, producers in the United States have supplied the war effort 757,432 tons of high-grade manganese ore—35 percent and above manganese—and around 2,000,000 tons of low-grade ore—10 to 35 percent manganese. This ore was produced at a time when the situation was seriously uncertain. This was done during the war years, when the top officials in the war agencies were saying that they were getting not only every ton but every pound of manganese ore available in the world.

Under the treaty of 1902 there is no duty on Cuban ore. The American tariff stimulated developments in Cuba, as well as in the United States.

Since 1940, Cuba produced and shipped into the United States a total of more than 1,000,000 tons of high-grade manganese ore, making a total of more than 1,757,000 tons of high-grade ore from the United States and Cuba combined.

Without this tonnage from United States and Cuban sources during the war years, the situation in manganese would have reached the point of alarming shortage. The greater portion of the production in both the United States and Cuba has come from mine developments, research on processes, and work initiated and carried forward over a period of years, solely through encouragement under the tariff. Without the tariff, the major mine developments in both the United States and Cuba could not have been undertaken during the peacetime years. This alone should serve to emphasize the importance of the tariff on manganese ore to our national security.

It is often said that domestic manganese ores are low grade. During World War No. 1 domestic shipments of high-grade ore contained 40-percent manganese. During peacetime high grade imported ores contained 48 percent manganese. Today, under the stimulation of war demand, United States miners are producing from one plant alone more than 100,000 tons a year of manganese ore running as high as 60 percent metallic manganese, which is higher grade than any ore from any foreign country. This is produced from low-grade ore which as mined runs from 15 to 25 percent manganese, formerly unknown and considered worthless. Some of it is mined at a depth of 2,000 feet below the surface. Additional milling plant facilities have been installed since the start of the war, but such deep-mine developments would never be undertaken after the start of a war. They must be carried forward over a long period of years during peacetime.

It is often stated that we have become a "have-not" nation—that we need to conserve our minerals. This is not true in the case of manganese. We have an abundance of low-grade manganese ore which is now being mined and concentrated into a product higher in grade than foreign ores. Our total known reserves of low-grade manganese ore in 25 States exceeds 200,000,000 tons and further work discloses additional reserves. It simply takes time for development of underground ore bodies.

Assistant Secretary of State W. L. Clayton, testifying before this committee, recently stated:

"Of course, the things that we lacked principally were the metals and minerals, which, of course, we did not have. They were not stored in the earth here and we had to go elsewhere to get them. Principally that is the thing."

Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, before the Small Business Committee of the Senate in 1943, stated:

"We still have here, 15 months after Pearl Harbor, an anomalous situation, in which, on the one hand, there is a serious need for raw materials to feed our war plants, and, on the other hand, there are large numbers of small entrepreneurs—owners and operators of small mining and milling properties—begging for an opportunity to produce for war."

* * * * *

"We are furthermore under a moral obligation to sustain small enterprise if we wish to rebuild and retain the America that we have known, with its concepts of individual freedom and opportunity.

* * * * *

"The Bureau of Mines, by examination of 1,600 ore deposits involving 31 different minerals in 25 States and the Territory of Alaska, has found 28,000,000 tons of iron ore, 10,000,000 tons of manganese ore, 8,000,000 tons of bauxite, 6,000,000 tons of low-grade nickel, 4,000,000 tons of chromite ore, 2,000,000 tons of antimony ore, 1,000,000 tons of tungsten ore, and 1,000,000 tons of mercury ore.

* * * * *

"Only a negligible percentage of the total newly discovered mineral resources has so far been brought into production.

* * * * *

"On manganese: We presented a program for domestic manganese production in the fall of 1941. In January 1942 we had developed the program to the point of providing for the domestic production of all needed manganese, with the exception of the importation of 130,000 tons from Cuba. We proposed to eliminate dependence on risky importations from Russia, India, and Africa, all long hauls requiring convoys. We kept pressing for the adoption of the program that we had worked out. And in the summer of 1942 we thought we were getting somewhere when the War Production Board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation started to take preliminary steps to set up seven or eight projects called for in our program.

"Today most of these projects have fallen into the class of good intentions.

* * * * *

"There has been far too much tendency to resolve all our problems of minerals shortages in favor of importation. This has been

discouraging to our western mining industry, which has properly looked forward to an immediate utilization of the discoveries of the Bureau.

* * * * *

"I see no cause for alarm in any projected rate of depletion of our mineral resources, provided the necessary steps are taken to insure that as a given mineral resource is depleted, other mineral resources are developed which will take its place."

One of the greatest setbacks to the domestic industry was the cut in the duty. The manganese ore tariff was cut 50 percent by the trade agreement with Brazil, a minor supplier. This was done in 1935 without notice or any consideration whatsoever to manganese producers and without regard to national defense.

As a result, the United States has paid a severe penalty. After the cut in the tariff a number of manganese operations in this country were abandoned and the mines allowed to collapse; many new developments which would have proceeded during the years preceding the war were not undertaken; the Government has lost more than $20,000,000 which formerly went into the Treasury through tariffs collected on imported manganese; the Government has spent untold millions in a desperate effort to get manganese throughout the world after the outbreak of war; the large tonnage of manganese now at the bottom of the ocean, the excessive number of manganese ships sunk and the lives of seamen lost in an effort to transport manganese from far-away countries into the United States is a story that will not be told until after the war, but the responsibility, in a large part, rests squarely on the doorstep of the administrators of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Proper foresight and wisdom on the part of the State Department in the precious prewar years, 1935 to 1940, would have dictated a 50-percent increase rather than a 50-percent decrease in the duty on manganese ore. This would have announced to producers that the country encouraged rather than discouraged the further development of manganese deposits in the United States. Instead the officials of the Department, while other nations were preparing for war, pursued their single-minded policy of sacrificing our own national defense to what proved to be a Utopian dream of peace and foreign trade.

Mr. Clayton has already specifically mentioned before this committee the manganese duty as being excessive. This is added evidence of the misinformation which still prevails in the State Department. Our natural conclusion is that, if authority to further cut duties is granted, manganese is destined for a further reduction in tariff.

Considerable new investments have been made and plant facilities installed in the industry during the war period. Some of it was Government money, some private funds. It operates today as an essential asset in the war program but most of it will be lost to the Nation unless tariff protection is provided or a satisfactory market assured for domestic ores.

Congress in the prewar years has repeatedly and in no uncertain terms expressed its will and intent to bring forth development of our own manganese resources.

It is generally recognized that the State Department made a mistake in reducing the duty on manganese and we hope some way will be found to rectify it before the cutbacks after the war.

In order to insure the continued development of domestic manganese deposits in the postwar period producers need to have restored to the industry the full measure of protection contemplated by Congress in the Tariff Act of 1930. We further seek assurance that our destinies henceforth shall not be pawns in the hands of persons wholly unfamiliar with the present status of the domestic industry and its future possibilities as a result of abundant new ore reserves and revolutionary new processes for making available in usable form and at reasonable prices the vast resources of low-grade manganese ores now known to exist in the United States.

I submit for the record a table showing domestic production and imports of manganese ore from 1910 to 1944, inclusive. (Table attached.)

I also submit for the record a brief summary of the domestic manganese industry covering the year 1944 as prepared and released by the United States Bureau of Mines under date of January 16, 1945.

The following figures from United States Bureau of Mines publications may be of interest in studying the strategic position of manganese ore:

Domestic shipments of manganese ore, imports of manganese and ferromanganese, and apparent consumption of manganese metal, 1910–44, in long tons

Year	Manganese ore			Imports of ferromanganese (gross weight)	Apparent consumption of manganese metal
	Domestic shipments		Imports		
	10 to 35 percent manganese	35 percent or more manganese			
1910	---------	2,258	242,348	114,228	--------
1911	2,602	2,457	176,852	80,263	--------
1912	2,782	1,664	300,661	99,137	--------
1913	9,650	4,048	345,090	128,070	217,658
1914	60,484	2,635	283,204	82,997	162,112
1915	64,204	9,558	320,778	55,263	179,266
1916	316,600	31,474	576,321	90,928	283,944
1917	576,608	129,351	629,972	41,969	271,770
1918	818,003	305,869	491,303	27,168	297,303
1919	211,632	54,957	333,344	33,022	162,378
1920	357,279	94,420	599,764	59,254	278,952
1921	8,439	13,531	392,606	9,077	96,104
1922	344,674	13,404	425,000	100,725	211,714
1923	319,666	31,500	419,000	113,833	309,254
1924	286,470	56,515	505,000	56,588	230,264
1925	267,252	98,324	615,000	78,713	280,725
1926	364,312	46,258	738,000	59,710	316,308
1927	148,291	44,741	622,067	45,500	291,206
1928	90,581	46,860	427,708	60,055	320,496
1929	78,191	60,379	664,269	71,211	356,079
1930	77,417	67,035	585,568	55,046	280,130
1931	64,062	39,242	502,518	24,664	166,492
1932	15,635	17,777	110,634	18,470	67,673
1933	12,779	19,146	156,836	39,693	150,370
1934	23,231	26,514	341,339	23,349	--------
1935	93,291	26,428	383,500	27,240	210,784
1936	98,962	32,119	813,362	37,953	310,497
1937	151,955	40,241	911,922	29,559	--------
1938	33,620	25,321	483,588	26,258	217,961
1939	239,544	29,307	627,131	41,227	273,570
1940	320,006	40,123	1,282,079	10,369	397,587
1941	457,287	78,388	1,530,876	6,278	443,626
1942 [1]	268,764	190,748	(2)	(2)	(2)
1943 [1]	471,593	205,173	(2)	(2)	(2)
1944 [1]	(3)	243,000	(3)	(2)	(2)

[1] Short tons.
[2] Figures not available for publication.
[3] Figures not available.

Dairy Interests Opposed to Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Charles W. Holman, representative of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, before Ways and Means Committee of the House, on reciprocal trade agreements:

My name is Charles W. Holman. My address for purposes of this hearing is 1731 Eye Street, Washington, D. C. I am secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. This is a Nation-wide organization in which approximately 350,000 farm families residing in 46 States are banded together into 73 voting membership units. All of these units are cooperative dairymen's associations owned and controlled by producers. About half of our members supply fluid milk and cream to urban milksheds. The remainder are mainly interested in supplying manufactured dairy products made in their own plants. These plants number about 800 and vary from cooling stations to the most highly modernized all-purpose dairy plants in the United States. Within our organization every type of dairy product is manufactured with the possible exception of some products prepared for medicinal purposes. I am asking permission to file, as an appendix to my statement, a list of the member associations with their addresses and the names and addresses of our officers and board of directors.

I am appearing in opposition to H. R. 2652. Dairy farmers of the United States whose products enter into commercial channels number more than 2,500,000. About 1,000,000 sell their product as whole milk and the remainder sell farm separated cream.

These producers constitute America's largest group of agricultural producers relying almost entirely upon the domestic market. In normal years relatively small quantities of evaporated milk are constantly shipped abroad. Some specialty shipments of butter are exported but they are mainly to our dependencies in the Pacific, the Caribbean Sea, and to a few South American countries. Our normal demand for imported dairy products is confined almost entirely to certain types of cheeses such as Emmenthaler Swiss, the Holland Edam, and the Italian types. For all other dairy products, we have abundant capacity to produce every need of the American consumers. This applies particularly to cheddar cheese and to casein, the admission of which into this country has been stimulated by trade agreements with Canada and the Argentine.

Our organization in the winter of 1920–21 became aroused to the need of tariff protection, which then was nonexistent because of spectacular imports of butter and other fats into this country. These imports were having a disastrous effect upon our markets. As a result, the Congress passed the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, which placed a duty of 6 cents a pound on butter and 5 cents a pound on cheese.

During the following year we learned a little about the tariff problem and went before the Congress in connection with the Tariff Act of 1922. Slightly higher rates were then put into effect. These included a rate of 8 cents per pound on butter. Between the passage of that act and the act of 1930, it was found that this rate on butter was insufficient to protect American domestic markets from speculative price fluctuations due both to sporadic and to planned imports. Accordingly, we sought relief through the cost-of-production powers vested in the President and were successful in having started a comparative cost-of-production investigation which was handled by the United States Tariff Commission. The Commission chose Denmark, the one country in the world whose costs would be highest next to ours, and sent to that country a body of investigators. These investigators were to make investigations on the ground, headed by the late Dr. George W. Warren, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics of Cornell, an eminent authority on farm costs.

Similar investigations were made in the United States.

As a result of the report of this body, the Tariff Commission recommended, and the President raised the duty on butter from 8 to 12 cents per pound. However, in our importing months prices of New Zealand butter at London and our 92-score butter at New York continued out of balance, the former often being over 13 cents lower in price.

When the Tariff Act of 1930 was being prepared, our organization laid before the Congress the results of a long investigation and proposed to the Congress the first scientifically coordinated set of duties on dairy products in American history. These duties were based upon the fat relationships in milk and its products, or the skim-milk relationships. With the exception of casein, every recommendation made by us to the Congress was adopted. As to casein, we had recommended 7 cents a pound and succeeded only in obtaining 5½ cents, an inadequate duty in the light of then known costs of production and market practices of Argentine exporters.

With respect to dairy farmers, th Tariff Act of 1930 was a lifesaver. Without it during the depression years we would have been unable to avail ourselves of protection from the outside while we were going through the tortuous conditions of low prices, poor markets and Federal purchases of surpluses to maintain producers and supply some needed nutritious food to those on relief.

We viewed the advent of the trade-agreement program with distrust and we look upon its continuance with trepidation. Dairying is more vulnerable to international competition than are some other agricultural commodities since dairying does not lend itself to any high degree of mechanization. It is true that some 394,000 dairy farmers use milking machines. These machines are generally of the two-cow type, that is to say, two cows can be milked at one time by the same machine. But the milking machine has been with us a long time, and further labor saving through the use of milking machines is likely to be small. Labor and purchased feed continue to be the largest factors in milk-production costs, and dairymen in the United States cannot maintain American standards of living if forced to sell in competition with the surplus products moved to our markets from other countries.

American dairy farmers are faced with constantly rising labor costs, with the prospect in some sections of the country that hired farm help may become unionized and insist upon a 40-hour week. These developments may make themselves quite apparent in the post-war period, and our people are particularly concerned since we do not, especially under Government controls, have the opportunity which manufacturers have to pass our increased costs on to consumers.

Long ago we learned that whatever benefits might flow from tariff are not confined to price stabilization. Domestic market outlet is just as important as price. Often our people can get by with moderate prices on large volume marketing, which they would prefer rather than to being forced into an economy of scarcity which is foreglimpsed in the future operation of the Doughton bill as proposed by the Government authorities.

It should be obvious to all that the new program for trade agreements contemplated by the bill is intended to be one of a four-legged post-war world policy for our Government. The second leg is the world agricultural organization devised by the Hot Springs Conference, to be set up under the United Nations, and which is authorized in the Bloom bill which has passed the House. The third leg is the international financing and currency management arrangement provided for by the Bretton Woods Conference and including legislation enlarging the Export-Import bank. The fourth leg, presumably, will be determined at the San Francisco Conference, and is supposed to provide a means for keeping the world in order—at least for a time.

From testimony offered this committee by proponents of the bill, and from propaganda widespread throughout the country, the credulous and unwary might be led to believe that failure to adopt any part of this four-legged program would result in toppling over the peace table.

We do not believe that a policy of a reasonable economic self-sufficiency for any nation is the cause for war. We do not believe that low tariffs and free trade have ever prevented wars. Despite wishes to the contrary, the Trade Agreement Act of 1934 did not keep us out of war. War results from the pressure of the populations and the struggles for the control of new lands on which to settle bursting populations, or to obtain greater control over raw material resources, or to place imperial mandates over economic and political lives of weaker peoples, and from the clash of ideologies. These are self-evident facts of history. But much of the arguments for this program of low tariffs and free trade have been based upon the psychology that it is "the eye of childhood that fears a painted devil."

OBJECTIONS TO TRADE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1934

1. Section 350 (a) states that the act is "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States * * * by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States * * *."

The committee will note that the objective of the bill is to satisfy the "needs" of American producers not only as to exports but as to imports. A strict administrative construction of this mandate would require the President to eliminate from consideration any American-produced commodity which is produced in quantity sufficient to meet American consumption or which can be, with slight stimulation, brought to achieve this position. It would also automatically erase from consideration commodities produced in sufficient quantities to meet American consumption and to export abroad. The language of the act does not contemplate reduction of import duties or the making of other concessions which will cause foreign commodities to enter the United States and displace in volume domestic outlets for domestic producers. The act contemplates concessions which would meet the export needs of producers, but not injure their internal market outlets or prices. The act further contemplates our making tariff concessions only on commodities produced in America on a deficit basis in return for concessions made by other nations on our commodities which are definitely of a surplus production character.

If this construction of the language of the act is correct, the Executive has not carried out the congressional mandate, but has made reductions and other concessions with respect to agricultural products which are directly or indirectly in competition with the products of American farms and which in many instances can only be produced in sufficient quantities to meet American consumption with the help of tariff protection or some other governmental device.

2. We object to the absence of any congressional rule to guide the Executive in determining modifications of the Tariff Act of 1930. Such a broad delegation of power to the judgment of the Executive is particularly odious with respect to revenue, which is distinctly the province of the Congress under article I of the Constitution. In this act only two fundamental limitations are placed upon the power of the Executive. He is forbidden to transfer articles from the free to the dutiable list or from the dutiable to the free list, and he may not increase or decrease import duties by more than 50 percent. On the other hand, the power to bind an article at a given rate of duty or to bind it on the free list is exercised by the Executive in administering the act.

3. The act removes from application to operations under it those provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 whereby citizens might obtain tariff changes as a result of studies and reports by the Tariff Commission to the Executive on the comparative cost of production and comparative competitive conditions affecting a commodity in this country and the country of principal competition. Abandoning this sound rule to guide the Executive, which, with some modifications had been on the statutes for many years, shuts off any opportunity for an American citizen, producer, or otherwise, to initiate possible changes in existing tariff rates.

4. By specifying that the provisions of section 516 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 "shall not apply to any article with respect to the importation of which in the United States a foreign trade agreement has been concluded pursuant to this act or to any provisions of any such agreement," opportunity of American citizens to obtain court review has been denied. This legal device makes the Trade Agreement Act of June 12, 1934, as extended, the most dictatorial law on the Federal statutes. In addition to denying the constitutional rights of citizens, this device affords opportunities for destruction of whole groups of American producers wholly upon the often untested judgment of persons whose knowledge of commerce is small, whose comprehension of the complicated relationships of one industry to another is limited, and who under pressure for advantage by representatives of foreign governments, show little desire to please any but the foreign diplomats.

5. We object to the "triangular" system of making duty reduction and trade concessions applicable to "articles, the growth, produce, and manufacture of all foreign countries, where imported directly or indirectly * * *."

This provision carries with it a generalization to nontrade agreement countries, without commensurate returns of tariff concessions. It provides a field day for brokers and speculators in foreign countries who can purchase products and trans-ship them from one country to another and still obtain the benefits of the act.

For example, the duty on Emmenthaler process Swiss cheese was reduced in a trade agreement with Switzerland. This type of cheese might be purchased in Finland by a London broker, shipped to England and transshiped to New York. Thus, the London broker would garner whatever benefits might come from the reduction of the duty made to Switzerland. In other instances, Cheddar cheese made in New England or Australia, but reaping the benefit of duty reductions made to Canada, could be dropped off at any American port from a cargo en route to London without extra freight rate being paid. Now I ask, what do we get out of either of these two transactions? The so-called triangular system of world benefits, so ingeniously explained to the committee on other occasions by Dr. Sayre, is plausible but I have never been able to believe that it represented anything but a hope or a dream.

The provision in the act for generalizing tariff concessions to all countries of the world not otherwise prescribed, inevitably washes out any possibility of America's maintaining a favorite balance of trade and automatically reduces our bargaining power.

In a later section of this statement I will refer to the admission of Under Secretary of

State Will L. Clayton that the Trade Agreement Act has already gone bankrupt. Apparently few, if any, other nations have anything more to take from us by this method. So Mr. Clay and his colleagues are seeking through the Doughton bill the opportunity for further reduction of our import duties, thus making of the present legislation a strip-tease act. The logical sequence would be for the administration at the end of another 3 years to seek a further 50 percent cut which would just about put us on the basis of free trade on the greater part of our imports.

I suspect that this program has considerable backing from international manufacturers and bankers who desire to locate factories in foreign countries equipped with American machinery but operated by much cheaper labor, and to then bring the products of those factories back into America on the lower levels of import duties. From the testimony given by administration witnesses there seems to be no other interpretation of the objectives of certain groups of big business in this country. We already have an excellent example in the operation of sugar plantations and sugar mills in Cuba by New York-controlled capital. Reduction of the tariff on sugar and forced reduction of beet sugar and sugar-cane acreage in the United States did not preserve this country's self-sufficiency as to that type of food; but it undoubtedly poured millions into the coffers of the American owners of the Cuban centrals.

6. We object to the language of the act which permits trade agreements to be executed without ratification by the Senate of the United States. We are aware that legislation is pending before the Congress to provide for a constitutional amendment whereby treaties may be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses of the Congress. We are not opposed to this amendment and our people see considerable merit in it. However, the path of any proposed amendment to the Constitution is long and tortuous and until the people settle the question, we are adhering to article II of the Constitution which requires all treaties to be ratified by the Senate.

For many years we have maintained that the trade agreements contained considerable material which is of a treaty character. As an illustration of what I mean by "treaty material," I call to the attention of the committee, and ask to be incorporated in the RECORD as an appendix to my testimony a memorandum. This memorandum shows much similarity of thought, and identity of language, between the standard sanitary provisions embodied in trade agreements and the proposed Argentine "Convention" of 1935 which was negotiated by the State Department and offered to the Senate for ratification. Just what may be the distinction between a treaty and a "convention," I cannot say, except that the dividing line could be measured by a hair.

Members of the committee will recall that in the Tariff Act of 1930, Congress imposed an embargo against the shipment of fresh and frozen beef from the Argentine because of widespread prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease. At least one epidemic costing millions of dollars to livestock producers of the United States was traced to Argentine sources. Despite the act that Argentina had done little or nothing to clean up this disease, a "convention" permitting the admission of these products into the United States was framed by the State Department and submitted to the Senate. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations still has this document in its files.

Members of the committee will note that some of the standardized phrases used in the trade agreements (which now do not have to be approved by any congressional body) are identical with the phrases used in the proposed Argentine "Convention." The question therefore arises: If the State Department recognized that it required Senate ratification to remove the quarantine against the importation of fresh and frozen beef from the Argentine, how can it justify placing in a number of these trade agreements language similar to that "convention"?

To a layman it would appear that a treaty or a "convention" can become a trade agreement at the option of the Secretary of State. The mere existence of these sanitary provisions in the trade agreements has occasioned administrative opposition to any attempts to bring about additional sanitary restrictions on the importation of products from abroad which do not meet sanitary standards required of American producers. This includes failure to apply sanitary restrictions to the importation of such products as unpasteurized butter and unpasteurized cheese in which tubercular germs have been known to live for 6 to 9 months.

This line of reasoning on the part of administration officials is equivalent to saying that any effort on our part to protect the public health is to be interpreted as a "trade barrier." Much evidence exists to show that responsible officials, even in the Department of Agriculture, are prone to interpret even city health ordinances devised by city people to protect their own health, as being "trade barriers."

OBJECTIONS TO PROCEDURE

Chairman Ryder, of the United States Tariff Commission, described to this committee the elaborate mechanism which has been set up for negotiation and effectuation of trade agreements. As an example of coordination, of interdepartmental effort, it leaves nothing to be desired by a foreign country.

Mr. Ryder described how, in most instances, the initiative is taken by the United States. The list of commodities on which we are willing to give concessions and the list on which we are seeking concessions are made public after many conferences with the Government and with representatives of foreign countries. Even the views of American citizens are allowed to be expressed to a portal committee known as the Committee on Reciprocity Information. But few, if any, American citizens have ever succeeded in getting through the "portal." Contrary to the custom of some of the countries with which we have negotiated agreements, few if any American producers of agricultural and industrial products have been called in to advise with regard to policy.

But the machinery of initiating, negotiating, holding hearings, making recommendations, and finally obtaining the signature of the Executive, is in good working condition to accomplish the objectives of those making the policy for the administration of this act. Our experience with a number of agreements in which we had a direct interest has convinced us that the consistent, undeviating policy directing this machine is to use the trade agreement as a mechanism for uniformly and progressively reducing import duties until the closest possible approach to free trade is reached. In furtherance of that program, the present Doughton bill is sought.

This policy naturally percolates downward to each active official in any department connected with the program. It inevitably creates a cast of mind so that, in making a reduction in the duty on any commodity, the bureaucrats shrug away consideration of possible effects on any particular group by saying to themselves "this is but a little matter." Isolated as they are from any real contact with the people who must produce and distribute products, they cannot know the serious effect upon trade practices of their policies.

As to our people, this program disregards trade practices, price interrelations of dairy products, and the consequent effect upon the entire production and price structure of milk. I cannot but recall my own experiences in appearing before the Committee on Reciprocity Information. Never have I testified before a more indifferent, somnolent body of men.

At the beginning of the public hearing procedure, we were not even furnished with a list of the commodities as to which the administration had any intention of reducing duties. Our organization made a Nation-wide campaign against this star-chamber method. Finally, we were furnished lists of commodities. We were also required to furnish written briefs, 8 days in advance, and then were forbidden to present any oral testimony on any matter contained in the brief, a ruling wholly contrary to normal procedure. Once on the witness stand, we found ourselves facing a silent, indifferent body of men. Their only attitude appeared to be "Get rid of this witness as quickly as possible and let us go about our own business of negotiating this agreement." Certainly the public-hearing system as operated in negotiation of trade agreements is a travesty and a farce.

WHY WE OBJECT TO H. R. 2652

1. Even if the act were extended, we object to its extension for more than 1 year under the present condition of world relations. It seems to be unwise for Congress to relinquish, even partially, its control over acts of the Executive with respect to foreign trade when every foreign-trade agreement is now written for a period of 3 years and is subject to automatic renewal unless either of the contracting parties gives 6 months' notice of abrogation.

It has been argued that even then the Congress has the power to denounce these agreements by resolution, but it is hardly likely that the Congress will seek to serve notice of denunciation except in connection with the 6-month advance notice provided for in the agreements. It is also not likely that an executive responsible for negotiating such an agreement would sign such a congressional resolution unless it were so drawn that he would save face.

2. The bill intensifies all of the duty-reduction evils of the original act by empowering the President to go over the list again and reduce any or all duties by another 50 percent of rates in existence on January 1, 1945.

I know of no sadder admission of the futility of the present trade-agreement program and the trend toward total free trade than was made to this committee by Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, when he admitted that our authorities have now practically exhausted the resources of the Trade Agreement Act and must begin all over again a program of reducing duties which have already been reduced, in order to obtain any further trade concessions from the countries with whom we have negotiated trade agreements. Mr. Clayton said:

"The authority under the present act to reduce duties by not more than 50 percent of 1934 rates has been fully exhausted with respect to 42 percent of our total dutiable imports from all countries on the basis of the 1939 import values. The authority has been partially exhausted, and in many cases almost fully exhausted, in respect of an additional 20 percent of our total dutiable imports from all countries. Of the authority which has not been used at all, which applies to 37 percent of our dutiable imports from all countries, a considerable part relates to a type of goods formerly supplied by Axis countries, some of which authority may be unusable because to use it would require negotiation of trade agreements with the Axis countries." (Cf., p. 16, pt. 1, hearings on H. R. 2652, April 18, 1945.)

With whom then can we increase our trade? Mr. Clayton said very frankly that the United Kingdom and Canada constituted our two largest customers. I quote again from his testimony on the same page of the hearings:

"In the case of the United Kingdom, rates of duty have been reduced, under the trade agreement program as a whole, on about 90 percent, by value of our total dutiable imports from that country in 1939. In the case of Canada, the figure is about 92 percent. The United Kingdom and Canada are our two largest customers. These two countries accounted for 30 percent of our total export trade in 1939. In the case of France, Sweden, and Mexico, other important peacetime buyers of American exports, rates of duty have been reduced about 70 percent, 60 percent, and 90 percent, respectively, on our total dutiable imports from those countries.

"The conclusion is clear and is particularly unsatisfactory to me as a businessman. Under the act as it stands today we are unable to negotiate to the extent required, new and mutually advantageous business with our best customers. As a public servant, I would consider the failure to remedy such a situation unwise in the extreme. Only by relating the Trade Agreements Act to our present situation can we make it a fully effective device for the expansion of world trade."

POST-WAR DAIRYING UNDER THE DOUGHTON BILL

Let us look at the Doughton bill as it may affect some 2,500,000 dairy farmers who sell milk and separated cream into commercial channels for consumption.

The dairy price structure is very delicate and complicated. Butter, being the residual depository of any surplus milk, for generations has been the basis of pricing most dairy products. For example, the price of Cheddar cheese at Plymouth, Wis., customarily, is about one-half the price of 92-score butter in Chicago.

The price of cream intended either for fluid consumption or for ice cream depends entirely upon the price of sweet cream butter. Likewise, the price of evaporated milk carries a certain differential above the market price of butter.

Products made out of skim milk have a fairly constant relation to each other. When the price of casein shifts it affects the price of nonfat dry milk solids (dry skim milk); for if the casein market should decline dairy manufacturers would, within a week, shift their production into the nonfat dry milk solids. Similarly, changes in the price of nonfat dry milk solids affect the price of casein.

Even when protected by tariff walls temporary shifts in production or demand upon one product have an instantaneous effect on the others.

Prices of domestic dairy products are also affected by world prices. This is particularly true when tariff protection is very low. In normal years about 1,400,000,000 pounds of butter is in transit across the seas from the producing to the consuming nations and the owners of this butter are not particular as to who buys it. It will seek the best market anywhere. In the twenties, on many occasions, the unexpected or even the anticipated arrival of a shipload of New Zealand butter in New York, or the unloading of that butter and placing it in bond, has been known to shake the price of butterfat downward as much as 5 cents per pound in every community of the United States. In the few years preceding the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930 the disparity between the prices of 92-score butter at New York and New Zealand butter in London ranged from about 2 cents a pound to as high as 21 cents a pound in favor of American butter—the price differentials depending upon the season of the year. It will be recalled that the production season in the Southern Hemisphere is the reverse of ours. When our butter is going into storage, they are in the winter season. As our butter begins coming out of storage, their flush season comes on and their exports increase.

During the depression years the price differential between London and New York narrowed; but in 1937 the differential in favor of American butter ranged from 5.2 cents to as high as 15.5 cents per pound. The year closed with American butter selling in December at 13.7 cents per pound more than New Zealand in London. The years 1938 and 1939 were depression years for dairying, and in our surplus months of 1938 our prices ran lower than London prices. In 1939 the price spread was almost indiscernible due to the continuation of tragically low prices in the United States.

During the 7-month period beginning with July 1, 1938, the Commodity Credit Corporation stabilized the price of butter at 75 percent of parity which gave a wholesale price of approximately 26 to 27 cents per pound. The Dairy Products Marketing Association, operating as the agent of the Commodity Credit Corporation during this period, took off the market 114,000,000 pounds of butter. This butter was not permitted to be returned to commercial channels.

But what has happened in the past may happen again. We still need our 1930 integrated tariff-rate schedule for dairy products.

With our entry into the World War we entered a period of controlled economy. The competitive price of butter at Chicago having reached 46½ cents per pound wholesale was rolled back 5 cents per pound and a subsidy inaugurated in its place. This subsidy is being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Besides the first roll-back subsidy on butter, other subsidies have been paid amounting to 3¾ cents per pound on cheese and varying amounts on fluid milk. In addition to this, dairy production payments are being made in lieu of fair prices and these payments for the next fiscal year have been authorized by Congress not to exceed $568,000,000.

Dairy farmers are today the most completely subsidized of any group in agriculture. Approximately 14 percent of their total national income is derived from subsidies. In some sections the fluid-milk subsidies will run as high as from 20 to 30 percent. The combined subsidy payments in connection with butter and butterfat for the month of April of this year will total 53 percent of the market value of the fat.

Under the stimulation of Government requests, despite rising costs and lessened manpower, dairy farmers last year produced 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk at the farm, exceeded only in 1942 when feed and manpower were more plentiful. But during the war many of their customary domestic markets have been at least temporarily lost to them because of the set-aside policy to care for our military needs and the lend-lease requirements. The set-asides this month (May) are as follows:

	Percent
Cheese	65
Butter	55
Nonfat dry milk solids (spray process)	75

Fluid milk and fresh cream are being allowed to go into civilian consumption at relatively high levels. Production of casein has declined notably because the pricing policy of the Federal Government was intended to divert skim milk from casein to the driers. In consequence, Argentina has redeveloped a great market for casein in this country, aided by the cut of 50 percent in the import duty in the trade agreement made with her.

Dairy leaders are much perturbed over the post-war outlook. Sudden stoppages of Government purchase may bring disastrous price falls. Reeducating the American public to eat butter, persuading American bakers to use adequate quantities of nonfat dry-milk solids in their bread, getting enough fat back into the ice cream, and reeducating the people to eat good cheese are among our serious, unsolved problems.

A low cushion has been provided by the Congress to help tide over a part of the transition period following cessation of hostilities. This is the inclusion of milk and butterfat among the Steagall commodities which are entitled to a 90-percent-of-parity support price. However, a fall from present dairy income returns to a level of 90 percent of parity would mean a drop in the price returns on fluid milk at the farm of 34 percent and on butterfat of 36 percent. Should there be a general decline in the income level of the Nation, the present parity index will also decline, and price returns to dairy farmers will be even less.

Confronted with this outlook, we must now face the possibility of losing what protection has been afforded by the Tariff Act of 1930.

This prospect is fraught with dire consequences to our domestic markets. It is not even necessary to reduce the tariff on butter below 14 cents for the Doughton bill to affect the price of butter. An amendment to the Canadian trade agreement reducing the price of imported Cheddar cheese to 2 cents per pound would immediately throw out of gear the customary price relationship between cheese and butter in the United States. Larger quantities of Cheddar-type cheese would flow into the United States from Canada and other countries. This would cause diversions from butter to cheese manufacture in foreign countries, thereby raising the world price of butter. As the world price of butter rises, opportunity of coming over our tariff wall increases. With the price of butter adversely affected domestically, prices of all other dairy products containing fat will suffer similar declines.

Under such conditions, American prices for dairy products can only be maintained by continuing indefinitely some form of governmental subsidy. Even then dairy farmers will suffer in competition for per volume outlet, a most important factor in preservation of the dairy industry.

Restoration of the duties embodied in the act of 1930 would make it possible for dairy farmers gradually to recover and enlarge commercial channels of distribution and take care of their own affairs. Should surpluses arise, and they were permitted to export, a mechanism similar to the Dairy Products Marketing Association could easily stabilize prices, remove temporary surpluses from the markets, and place them either into foreign channels of trade or into new uses, with the losses on such an operation sustained by the dairy farmers without cost to the Government.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

1. We are opposed to continuation of the act, but if it is the intention of Congress to extend it, it should not be extended beyond June 12, 1946. Changing world conditions within another year will require reappraisal of the trade agreement program.

2. Application of the concessions written into trade agreements should be limited to the nation which is signatory to an agreement. Concessions made by us should be commensurate only with concessions made to us by the other nation. Concessions should be made only to nations which are the principal producers of the commodities covered in any agreement.

3. Trade agreements should be ratified by the Senate of the United States.

4. The right of Court review should be restored.

5. The act should be amended to change the public hearing procedure from a farcical pretension to an important, integral part of the negotiations. The right of witnesses to discuss the subject matter of their briefs should be made statutory. Those actually negotiating trade agreements should be present and conduct the public hearings.

6. A congressional rule to determine modification of import duties and the making of commodity concessions should be inserted into the legislation. We suggest the reincorporation of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as a sound method of testing the

need of tariff changes on any given commodity.

7. The act should prohibit lowering of any duties when landed costs of an imported article, plus the duties, are less than the American wholesale selling price of the article.

The Road to Serfdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed that one of the most stimulating, widely read, and influential books in modern times is the Road to Serfdom, by Friedrich A. Hayek. Equally enlightening is a recent article by the author, in which he warns against using portions of the book's arguments to support certain economic views while ignoring other essential portions of the argument which are not so favorable to those views. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a condensation of his article as it appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of May 13, 1945:

RECEPTION GIVEN "ROAD TO SERFDOM" IN UNITED STATES SURPRISES AUTHOR

(Condensed from an article by Friedrich A. Hayek, author of The Road to Serfdom, in the Chicago Sun)

For an author who never intended to write a popular book a reception like that accorded to The Road to Serfdom is a pleasant surprise but also an embarrassment.

The book was intended mainly for a small circle of people actively struggling with the difficult questions which arise in the field where economics and politics meet, and the chief purpose in writing it was to persuade a few leaders in the current movement of opinion that they were on an extremely dangerous path.

I wrote mainly with the British public and the British progressives in mind. My expectations concerning any effect the book might have in the United States were small.

Yet, that a book which has sprung from a very different background and experience should be felt to have so much immediate application to American problems seems to me a quite remarkable confirmation of my main conclusions.

NO PARTY BOOK

I was at first a little puzzled that a book written in no party spirit should have been so exclusively welcomed by one party, and so thoroughly excoriated by the other.

It seems that not only arguments similar to some of mine had for some years been used by the opponents of recent economic policy, but also that some of the more strenuous advocates of reforms have often employed a phraseology disturbingly similar to that which I have learned to fear in Europe. Yet I still feel that the interpretation of my book as a party document is the result of some misapprehension.

In Britain the movement toward some kind of collectivism had gone on so much longer than in the United States and had so much infected all parties that there is now little organized political opposition against it. On the other hand, as consequences of this movement have become more visible, many thoughtful people had begun to question the underlying philosophy.

Thus, while Britain may in one sense appear to have gone much further and the old opposition has become almost silent, there is noticeable a certain disillusionment and a readiness to reexamine cherished beliefs which I do not yet see in the United States.

My book aimed not merely at restating an old philosophy but at redefining it, redrawing boundaries between legitimate and illegitimate government activities, and providing a set of principles which would help to clear away existing confusion. I derived more help from the liberal philosophers of the nineteenth century than the popular conception of laissez faire suggests.

But much remained to be done, and the main task seemed to be to elaborate principles which would help us to decide in particular instances whether government action was dangerous or unobjectionable.

In Britain the book was, on the whole, received in the spirit in which it was written.

TRADITION STILL ALIVE

The different impact on America is probably a necessary result of the different circumstances. The liberal tradition from which my philosophy stems has never admitted defeat, but is very much alive and kicking in the United States. So much so that it has not yet learned that in order to keep alive it has constantly to rethink its principles and to restate them in the light of what we are learning.

If I had to write the book again with the present America more consciously in mind, I should probably stress even more than I have done the necessity of revising and developing the old liberal philosophy on the ground of Government activities which are required to make competition work effectively and beneficially.

And I should take greater care not to be misunderstood as being against all kinds of Government action which are lumped together under the vague word "planning."

There is a good deal about the positive tasks of Government in my book which, because it does not accord with any of the popular political philosophies, has not received the same attention as the rest. There is some tendency to pick and choose from what I regard as unitary philosophy which must be accepted or rejected as a whole.

There is no justification for taking up my argument against certain kinds of Government intervention in internal affairs and leaving out the equally strong case against tariffs based on the same principles; or to stress solely the necessary restrictions of Government activities which I discuss, and leave out the equally strong argument for the Government's taking steps to curb the power of the various moncpolies, both of capital and labor.

APPLIES TO NATIONS

The argument for freedom and the rule of law applies equally to international affairs. Even as great a country as the United States cannot hope long to preserve them in isolation from the rest of the world. Unless the United States leads the way toward free trade and international cooperation, in creating the necessary institutions for an international order, there will be little hope for the future.

Particularly in the field of monetary organization it will be most important that an international understanding should be arrived at as soon as possible.

Although I don't regard the Bretton Woods agreements as a particularly good compromise, they are probably the best that was possible. And now that they have been agreed upon they are probably the only hope of avoiding a development in the direction of extreme economic nationalism. Thus, though I could wish for something better, I regard it now as fundamentally important that these agreements should come into effect.

My main concern is now that I find far too many people talking about what I am represented to have said rather than about the argument that I have actually used. I certainly do not wish to be held responsible for all the interpretations of my views. If those who want to use part of my argument for special pleading are allowed to get away with it, this is not my fault; there is enough in the book to answer and refute them.

If an argument is true, it does not cease to be so by being used in the service of particular interest; this will always happen, and has always happened to the true philosophy of freedom.

Men Without Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward T. Leech:

MEN WITHOUT MEDALS—THEY'RE THE MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS, WHO'VE SHOWN HOW DEMOCRACY WORKS

(By Edward T. Leech)

They've never seen action, and never will—yet the war couldn't be won without these 10 American divisions.

They have served for 4½ years without a furlough or relief. And it has been hard service, trying, tiresome, and frequently sorrowful—performed without pay, without acclaim, without decorations, with almost no public recognition.

These 10 divisions consist of about 150,000 men who comprise the Nation's 6,500 draft boards and their related agents and agencies—appeals boards, appeals agents, legal advisers to registrants, examining physicians, medical advisers and reemployment committeemen.

They are the human element of selective service—the machinery that put the major part of 12,000,000 men into uniform without disrupting the home front.

They've been on the job since late in 1940, when America's first peacetime draft began functioning with the drawing of blue capsules from a gigantic bowl in Washington. Remember when No. 158 came out first? They were working then.

Today, as victory approaches, they are still feeding men into the war; but increasingly, their work now is with men returning from war to seek jobs back home. For selective service has the double duty of putting men into uniform and getting them back into jobs when those uniforms are put aside.

The men who make up selective service are your neighbors. For the basis of selective service is local control. Washington fixes general policies; State headquarters administer them; but the local draft board applies them and determines who shall go and who shall stay. And the local board is a neighborhood group, living with those whom it must judge.

On your board you will find men who are the backbone of your community. Not only the judge, the banker, the merchant, and the teacher, but the man around the corner, that civic-minded citizen who has given up the time in which he used to putter around the house, play with his kids, and who has volunteered, instead, for this important war job at home.

The draft board has more power than any group of unpaid volunteers in our history. Yet, for all its troubles, for all the conflicts and complexities of the manpower question, it has worked with efficiency and freedom from major scandal, accusation, or politics.

There have been faults, of course; but no such scandals as marked Civil War drafting and some World War No. 1 instances.

It was inevitable that in creating a mass citizen army for all-out war there would be confusion of regulations, frequent shifting of policies, border-line interpretations, and all the other uncertainties of constantly changing situations both at the front and at home. Plagued by those conditions and by all the questions they created among registrants and their families, the local draft boards had to carry on the most delicate of assignments.

Working usually in small and uninviting quarters in a schoolhouse or fire station or borough or township hall or some available public room, with a modest assortment of old furniture and makeshift equipment, these groups of neighbors have decided the fate of their home town and home street young men.

Draft headquarters is seldom much to look at. Some patriotic posters, mimeographed notices and newspaper clippings on the wall; a few desks and uncomfortable chairs; groups of boys and their fathers and mothers and employers waiting outside. This is where some little group of men has given many hours daily and several nights a week for over 4 years to unpaid public service. Only the clerical help receives pay.

Often the work has been agonizing. It has involved the lives of the sons of neighbors and friends, the disruption of homes, all the deep domestic dislocations and griefs of war. The draft board members must rule—and then continue to live with the neighbors so vitally affected.

They have been able to go on living among their neighbors because they have done a hard job honestly. They must tell others to fight; they deal in lists, files and folders—the cold stuff of paper and steel cabinets. Yet they also work with flesh and blood, out of which has come an armed force battling without reprieve to finish the war and gain the goal of peace.

After victory, when our aim once again will be happy living, these men—whose only badge is "local board member, Selective Service"—can feel real satisfaction. They have shown the world that democracy can act—quickly and effectively.

VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by the manner in which the people of my congressional district observed VE-day a week ago. The solemnity of the event was appreciated and throughout the area, which has contributed so much to the war effort, there was a grim determination to carry on and go forward until VJ-day.

The Botany Worsted Mills, located in Passaic, N. J., observed the day in a most fitting manner and I am sure that the House will be interested to hear the program of this enterprising mill, now engaged almost 100 percent on Government orders. Production during the day was continued almost without interruption in accordance with plans made by the mill's vice president and general manager, Mr. Charles F. H. Johnson, Jr., several weeks before.

The company has a radio and loudspeaker system that reaches every nook and cranny of the big mill and when the news dispatch of unconditional surrender was received the word "attention" was heard over the radio by the mill's thousands of workers. The voice was that of Mrs. Genevieve Green, Botany's radio announcer. She went on to say to the expectant workers that news had been received of the cessation of hostilities in Europe and she asked all to join reverently in the Lord's Prayer by Malotte, sung by Nelson Eddy, the record having been held in readiness for this occasion.

Tension was relieved immediately and then all were asked to join in singing the Star-Spangled Banner. Mrs. Green followed with a brief announcement to the effect that, now that the European phase of the war was over, it was everybody's duty to bend every effort toward an early victory in the Pacific, in keeping with the wishes of our national leaders and the heroes who the week before had cautioned against any let-down and had called for increased production on VE-day itself. "Let's all help finish the job now!" urged Mrs. Green and as other appropriate and fitting music was played everyone went back to his or her machine.

"It was a wonderful demonstration of Americanism and the splendid spirit of our workers determined to do their part to the last bit to back our boys fighting the battle for freedom," said Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, president of Botany. "It was thrilling and we are certainly proud of our workers' observance of VE-day. It is this kind of sticking to the war job that is going to spell an early finish for our foes in the Pacific."

Botany's own radio also picked up President Truman's speech, the workers receiving the official news quietly and resuming work immediately after the conclusion of the White House program.

The story of Botany's observance of VE-day will be well received by our fighting men everywhere.

Address of Hon. H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Struve Hensel at the annual dinner of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Hotel Statler, Buffalo, N. Y., May 9, 1945:

I have chosen for tonight a much-discussed and very important subject. It is the advisability of consolidating the existing War and Navy Departments into a single Department of Armed Services. While I realize that final determination of that proposal must be left to the post-war period, there has already been an unusual amount of public attention given to the problem. Some citizens seem to have reached a decision. A full crystallization of public opinion without complete understanding would, however, be most undesirable. Therefore, I should like to present to you some of the considerations which I believe must be fully appreciated and appraised before a final decision can be made.

The merger or continued separation of the two Departments means nothing to me that it does not mean to every other citizen. My sole desire is that we make no mistake. This country must have the most competent armed service or group of armed services which our ingenuity can provide. On that objective, I am sure we are all agreed. Our future security is so important that it cannot be risked in the slightest. The organization of our armed forces must meet the test of effectiveness in peace and in war.

To meet that test, I believe that this country must remain a strong sea power. I agree with Admiral King that sea power consists of seven essential elements—surface ships, submarines, aircraft, merchant ships, naval bases, trained personnel, and the productive capacity to build, equip, operate and fight them. I am, therefore, opposed to all organizational changes which, intentionally or unintenionally, might weaken our sea power. I hope you start from the same premise.

In approaching this organizational problem, one other fact is basic. Our problem is whether an effective group of fighting forces can be made more effective. We are not discussing armed services which have failed. Our present departments have established themselves in this war as successful, going concerns. We and our allies have won the first phase against what was once a military colossus. We are winning the phase against Japan. The Japanese Navy has been driven from the Pacific. Our ground troops are firmly entrenched on the threshold of the Japanese Empire. Failing organizations could not have achieved those victories. We owe it to posterity to be certain of improvement before we discard a victorious combination.

I wish I could lay before you a reasoned conclusion one way or the other. Unfortunately, I have not arrived at any final decision. I cannot present a plan of consolidation. I cannot bring myself to recommend that no change in that direction be made. I see disadvantages and advantages in the present system. It seems to me that there will be an equal number of disadvantages and advantages in a single department.

My main difficulty is that I have not been able to work out the blueprint of an effective single department. I cannot accept a theoretical "general principle of consolidation" in the abstract and trust that the details will later fall in line. Successful organizational forms exist only in the concrete and depend on careful attention to many details. All mergers are not beneficial. Our national experience with corporate mergers is eloquent in that respect. Some mergers produce compact and efficient units. Others result in loose, diffused, and unprofitable concerns, disappointing to the stockholders and the public alike. None of you would approve a merger of two industrial concerns without having a detailed plan presented and studied. I do not mean that you would want to envision where each clerk would sit. You would, however, insist on preparing a reasonably clear forecast as to the effect of the

merger on the important divisions of both companies. You would probably want to study the experience of any other company which might have tried the same type of merger. It is my suggestion that we follow the identical cautious approach in thinking through this defense problem.

Let us start with a quick glance at history—first at the history of our own country. The United States started on its national career in 1789 with a single department for the armed services. The Department of War was given authority over both the land and naval forces. At that time we had no naval vessels. The depredations of the Barbary pirates in 1794 started our naval growth. In 1798, we drifted into an undeclared sea war with France. Ship construction was further increased. Agitation started for a separate Department of the Navy. On March 22, 1798, the Secretary of War himself, as one alternative, proposed the separation of naval affairs from the War Department. The debates in Congress are worth examining. Some of the opponents of separation feared that it would lead to a great Navy. Those favoring a separate Navy urged that important economies would result through closer supervision of naval matters. It was also said that one department could not so spread itself efficiently to administer the business of both the Army and the Navy. After considerable debate and a close vote, our present separate Navy Department was created on April 30, 1798.

Germany and Russia have each experimented with a single department. The German Navy of World War No. 1 was built under a separate admiralty. After 1918, the German Army and Navy were placed under a single ministry of defense. There was at that time no Germany Navy. It had been scuttled at Scapa Flow. By 1936, the German war organization had been split into three separate departments—the army, the navy, and the air force. In 1938, a single supreme military command, which included fairly complete control over the economic life of the nation, was established. Whether it resembled our Joint Chiefs of Staff or a single department, we do not as yet know.

Russia started her first 5-year plan by placing her armed forces under a single committee. Later this committee, or commissariat as it was called, was replaced by a single minister of defense. On December 7, 1937, when the idea of a strong Russian Navy was revived for the first time since 1918, the navy was transferred to a separate naval commissar. Foreign Commissar Molotov then declared that Soviet Russia was determined to have a fleet equal to her great mission.

It may well be that we should draw no final conclusions from such history. I realize that the vitality of institutions depends greatly on environment. I do not feel that we are clear enough about the effect of environment upon our early combined department. We know much less about the environments of the Russian and German experiments. Even so, the need for caution seems considerably emphasized by the fact that on several occasions on this globe a single department was tried and abandoned.

The arguments in favor of a consolidated department are basically simple and are grounded entirely in dissatisfaction with the present situation. Separate departments are charged with three fundamental defects. It is said that separate departments lead to (1) uncoordinated operations in the field, (2) duplicating services and efforts, and (3) competitive interferences accompanied by a waste of manpower, material, and money. Consolidation is presented as the organizational panacea for such defects.

At this point I suggest an examination. At least two questions can well be asked—can these defects be eliminated without consolidating the departments? Will these defects surely be eliminated by consolidation?

For instance, I think it is clear that coordination of command in the field can be accomplished without merger of the departments. In our Joint Chiefs of Staff I think we have created an instrumentality through which unity of military command can be effected. With some exceptions, I think unity of command has been achieved. In such exceptions, furthermore, the fault, if any there be, does not lie in the organizational form but rather in the decisions made. There is no form of organization possible which will prevent all error of judgment. I would retain permanently the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That will require legislation, but in that respect consolidation of the departments is not essential. As a matter of fact, the different backgrounds of the men comprising our Joint Chiefs of Staff may well have contributed to the vitality of their decisions.

I agree that there is considerable duplication of effort between the services. Some of the most widely publicized, however, are not really duplications. As to others, it seems to me that consolidation would not be a cure. For instance, I do not think there is any duplication in the existence of two hospitals in Washington a few miles from each other. I have in mind the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., and the Army Hospital in the District of Columbia. Both hospitals are full. All operating rooms, X-ray rooms, and laboratories are used to capacity. I am told that both hospitals are about as large as a single hospital should be for efficient operation by a single staff.

An example of a possible duplication which would not be cured by consolidation is the existence of two air stations in Washington—the Anacostia Naval Air Station and the Army's Bolling Field—immediately adjacent to each other. It is said that under a single department those fields could be combined with the saving of one control tower, one operations building, and one operating staff.

That claim was first made early last year. Later in the same year single operation of the two fields was tried. It was unsuccessful. The fields are located on a long narrow strip of land bounded on one side by the Anacostia River and on the other by some low hills. Control of both fields from a single tower resulted in delayed take-offs and landings, general confusion, and inefficiency in operation. The truth is that for modern planes the fields are badly located. Once the present location is accepted as a fact, there is no duplication. Combination of the departments would cure nothing.

In 1943 a point was made of the fact that the Army ordnance plants were not being used to peak capacity and yet the Navy was building additional shell-loading facilities. After the German attack in December 1944 the Army suddenly needed all loading capacity available and would have liked more. Then the additional Navy loading capacity seemed farsightedness indeed.

It must also, I think, be recognized that consolidation is not a certain cure for all duplication and overlapping. Duplication almost always exists in large organizations. It might well be termed a byproduct of enormous size as natural in that situation as the thorn is on the rose bush. Overlapping often exists and persists in spite of unity of command. The Navy, a single department, has unity of command in a single Secretary. All of the top military and civilian executives work as a team and are extremely conscious of the need for team work. Yet one of the most difficult problems we face in the Navy is the elimination of duplications within our walls. After years of close attention, we are continually discovering unsuspected duplications. Some are deliberately created for the sake of what we deem to be efficiency. I fear that it will be some time before we discover the organizational secret which will guarantee the elimination of all inappropriate duplications and overlappings.

Unification will not necessarily remedy all the criticized defects. The resulting single department would be so large that existing duplications might possibly become accentuated and more numerous. As organizations expand, executive control becomes more and more tenuous and weakened. There is limit to the direct executive control which can be exercised by any one man. In almost direct proportion to size and decentralization the obstacles in the way of coordination multiply. In industry, mass production has provided savings which have counterbalanced the inefficiencies of diffused executive direction. What the counter-weight in the armed services might be, I do not know.

The War Department provides an excellent clinical study of the operation of a huge organization. Size has, in my opinion, forced Army management to separate and decentralize much more than the Navy. That is not said in criticism. In an organization of the Army's size, I do not think there was any option. Nevertheless, it is inescapable that considerable duplication exists within the War Department.

I have also watched another phenomenon of evolution in the Army which I attribute to size. At the start of this war the Army voluntarily split into three parts—the Army Ground Forces, the Army Air Forces, and a joint Service of Supply, now known as the Army Service Forces. The Air Forces sought and obtained a high degree of autonomy, even in respect of the General Staff. The Air Forces established their own separate Air Judge Advocate, Air Surgeon, Air Inspector General, Air Chaplains Division, and Civil Affairs Division. The Air Forces' procurement organization is now also quite separate from the Army Service Forces. The trend toward complete separation is continuing. As late as September 27, 1944, there was transferred from the Army Service Forces to the Air Forces independent authority over automotive maintenance, repair of real property, operation of utilities, contracts with commercial laundries, and several other nonspecialized operations with respect to Air Forces installations. Duplication in administration was thus deliberately created. It was probably wise.

Personally, I expect to see a continued trend toward separation in the huge War Department. It may well be that complete autonomy of the Air Forces is inevitable. That may be dictated not only by logic but by the natural limitations with respect to size. No one, I fear, knows how large an organization can become before a separation into parts is essential to maintain effective control.

Many urge a merger of the armed services in the interests of economy. As you undoubtedly noted, the same argument was made in 1798 in favor of separation. I doubt whether anyone knows the path to true economy. War is not economical. It is the apotheosis of waste and destruction. Furthermore, it is as yet impossible in respect of this war to estimate the waste in duplication as compared with the waste through haste, changes in strategic plans, and diffused administration inside the two huge Departments.

And let me add that in war we cannot sacrifice effectiveness to economy. That could be the path to defeat.

Quite apart from my worries about the loss of efficiency in organizations of huge size, I do not think the plan of combining the departments, which was publicly proposed last year, involves unification. It is really a plan of separation. You will recall that such plan envisaged a single department headed by one secretary supported in turn by four subordinates—three separate Under Secretaries, one each for the Army, Navy, and Army Air Forces—and then an independent Direc-

tor of Supply on a level somewhat below that of the Under Secretaries. The only signs of unification in that plan lie in the name of the overall department and in the person of the single Secretary. Unity in an organization of that size will, in my opinion, need many more aids. All criticisms of the existing situation will, I think, apply equally well to that type of organization.

It seems to me that the substance of such plan is the further separation of the Army Air Forces and the Service of Supply. Such thought is supported by the position taken by one of its proponents. On April 26, 1944, before the Select Committee of the House on Post-War Military Policy a high-ranking Army Air Forces officer was asked the following questions and made the following answers:

"Question. Then, you think that unity can be brought about by a merging together of the two armed services in their entirety; the Army and the Navy?

"Answer. No, sir; I do not.

"Question. You think the unity can only be brought about by further division?

"Answer. Yes, sir; I do."

Unification through separation may be practicable, but I think we are entitled to a clear demonstration.

If the real purpose of this proposal is to establish the Army Air Forces on a separate and independent basis, I think it should be discussed from that angle and not presented as unification. That separation may well be an appropriate change. I am not sufficiently advised to comment on the wisdom of a separate Army Air Force. I know, however, that it is an entirely different subject from consolidation of the two present departments.

I realize that tonight I have done nothing more than sketch a shadowy outline of an important national problem. You must fill in the details yourself. A real burden is thus cast upon you. You must become informed and you must make your views known. You cannot let this question go by default. Our national security and power cannot be weakened.

If I have seemed tonight to favor the present situation, such impression was not intended. I am still sincerely on the fence. Although I am satisfied that a change in the present victorious combination should not be hastily made, I am anxious that we think this proposal through. If I seemed to deal too emphatically with the disadvantages of size, it was because I fear such dangers are usually glossed over. I have tried simply to emulate the watchman at a dangerous railroad crossing. My whole appeal was intended to be one of caution—a cry of—"Stop, look, and listen."

Treat Captured Nazis as the Criminals They Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, May 11, 1945.

The captured Nazi, whatever his rank, should be treated like any criminal is dealt with when apprehended. The American people should not and will not, in my opinion, tolerate the type of leniency which is being shown, according to newspaper reports, some of these criminals. The time to begin to cease such nonsense is now. It should never have been begun.

The article follows.

THE GERMAN GENERAL STAFF

It is interesting to observe how the German admirals and field marshals act these days. They have been humbled, they have surrendered unconditionally, but they still carry themselves suavely, even arrogantly, dressed up in their smartest uniforms and wearing their flashiest medals.

Some make speeches and some grant interviews and some maintain an ostentatiously haughty silence, but it is clear that all of them—Doenitz, Rundstedt, Kesselring, Jodl, Keitel, to name but a few—are of the same frame of mind. Neither by gesture nor word do they give the slightest indication of feeling sorry for having planned and let loose the Second World War. There is not the faintest admission of guilt, no contrition, no regrets, no apparent feeling of responsibility for a holocaust that has wiped out millions of lives.

Possibly these men experience some inward pangs of conscience, but if they do, the fact is hidden from us by their outward manners—by the cold, prideful manners of the Prussian military aristocrat. Let us note this. Let us remember that in these peacock-like characters we see the German general staff parading before us—the once all-powerful architects of death and destruction on a grand scale, the master minds of the blitz on Poland and of all the other blitzes that followed that, the builders of the U-boat fleet, the Luftwaffe and the Wehrmacht, the high and mighty makers of war without whose ardent support Hitler and the Nazis would never have been able to convulse the world.

Let us note this well. Let us note that these beaten but unbowed titans of battle, when they speak at all, still speak respectfully of the Fuehrer's "genius" and show no compunction whatever for having organized and launched the war. The German general staff has been like that ever since Bismarck's day. The membership now is different, but the viewpoint remains the same—the fixed viewpoint of an old conspiratorial military organization in Germany. Long before the First World War, it plotted for that war, and after losing it began almost immediately plotting again, and it will do the same thing once more if it is but given the chance.

The shattering of the Nazi party does not remove the danger. Prussianism must be shattered as well. The cold, bemonocled stare of the Keitels, the hauteur of the Jodls and the smugness of the Kesselrings are fitting symbols of a mentality traditionally crowded with thoughts of how to wage new wars after old ones are lost. As was agreed at Yalta, the German General Staff must be broken up for all time if Germany is to be permanently cured of its liking for aggression.

Bretton Woods Stabilization Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter received by Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, from Henry R. Hayes, of New York City:

NEW YORK, *April 24, 1945.*

Hon. FREDERICK C. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: With further reference to the Bretton Woods Stabilization Fund (so-called) agreement, I continue to believe, consistently since the summer of 1944, that the most objectionable feature is that proposal about scarce currencies (art. VII).

It would seem to be correct to assume—

(a) That United States dollars are the strongest currency; and

(b) In the post-war years our dollars will be the strongest currency in demand.

ARTICLE VII. SCARCE CURRENCIES

(a) Under this article provision is made for the rationing of a member's currency when such currency is declared to be scarce.

(b) When formally declared scarce, the fund (see sec. 3 (a)) "shall thenceforth apportion its existing and accruing supply of the scarce currency with due regard to the relative needs of members, the general international economic situation, and any other pertinent considerations."

(c) Such a declaration (see sec. 3 (b)) "shall operate as an authorization to any member temporarily to impose limitation on the freedom of exchange operations in the scarce currency."

(d) Here we see, temporarily at least, a restriction in the freedom of exchange operations. That spells instability of exchange—not stabilization.

(e) With the power for borrowing, with no prior stabilization of domestic currencies, and with the United States as a creditor-exporter nation, it is correct to assume that Uncle Sam's dollars would be declared scarce. Then our dollars would be rationed. Thus we would be forced to restrict exchange operations in dollars or lend the fund additional dollars—the limit of amount is indeterminable.

(f) Thus, too, our trade—agricultural, industry, and our services of export and import could readily be seriously affected. Under such conditions the production of wealth would be curtailed. Such an impact on our business and workers could damage our whole domestic economy seriously. The social aspect of such serious conditions need only to be mentioned, I would think.

I cannot conceive of contentment at home with this rationing practice in operation. And so, I believe this authority under this article VII would, if exercised, unduly and adversely influence our economic conditions and our ability to perform for world peace.

We have suffered too much and too often from foreign influences which have adversely affected our domestic economy. The last time was in 1926 when forces outside our borders were set in action to put gold to a premium. Those forces were potent factors, too little known, in bringing about the crash of 1929, at a time when we had a sadly extended credit structure. For detailed studies about that manipulation in the value of gold I refer to the proceedings of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures for the years 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Stabilization of exchange is a highly desirable objective. Our willingness and our ability to perform in this field must not be weakened and otherwise impaired. Our cooperation must not become ineffective.

If we play our part in world peace we must first put our domestic fiscal and monetary operations in strong condition. Then, I have confidence, we can and will be more enlightened than in the 1920's as to importing goods and exporting capital in the interests of improved world trade.

Also, I am convinced such a course is within our power. If followed we can then best serve the post-war interests of the United Nations.

Incidentally these domestic fiscal and monetary policies are truly bi-partisan.

That is because they cut horizontally across the social and economic interests of all our people.

The economic phases of lasting peace to me are every bit as important as those which are currently emphasized under the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and the need to set up military power to enforce peace.

Going beyond this discussion of scarce currencies there are many other features of the Bretton Woods fund agreement which can be criticized. I shall not attempt a detailed study of them, but will pass along some further observation and views as pertinent to my objection to that agreement.

Currencies in the fund would range from those which are good to those which are weak, and those which are poor, or of unknown value.

Under conditions for borrowing, with no requirements for domestic stabilization of currencies, we find debtor countries which are poor or insolvent, to be in the majority. As I see it, then, the power of management of the fund could be with the countries which do the borrowing. That would put the debtor and not the creditor in the saddle—clearly unsound relationship.

Such a condition in the long run is bound to result in a lack of that kind of confidence which is needed at all times.

I do not see how we can now consider general stabilization of exchanges until we change our fiscal and monetary policies and tackle the difficult problem of British-blocked sterling balances.

Also, I do not see how many of these currencies in the fund could be valued reliably until nationals put their own houses in order.

I sense out of this whole scheme just a continuance of paper currency practices for the same temporary political joy rides we have witnessed by politicians who will not solve fiscal and monetary policies.

For me therefore, as I have orally stated to you, we see in this effort of the administration a continuance of the cockeyed practice of wasteful exhaustion of our people's money and credit and an assured weakening of our ability to do our best in the post-war world.

Thus it is I conclude that the Bretton Woods Stabilization Fund agreement would make for unsettled economic conditions in post-war years and thereby would make for an unstable peace.

It is of prime importance that there be a better public understanding of what is involved in this fund agreement. I hope that the hearings will develop just that.

There are very serious jobs ahead on fiscal and monetary problems since they have been unsound for a long time.

Not only must we consider new ways by which we must attain more stability in our monetary yardstick of value, i. e., money, and make it more difficult for men or government to manipulate the value of that yardstick, but we must teach both political parties and the public the true importance and big role which such stability plays in domestic and world-wide peace.

J. M. Keynes (now Lord Keynes) writing The Economic Consequences of the Peace said:

"Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalistic system was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. * * *

"Lenin was certainly right. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose." (Pp. 235, 236, Harcourt, Brace & Howe, Inc., 1920 Ed.)

Sincerely yours,

HENRY R. HAYES.

Opposition to Trade Agreement Extension as Provided in H. R. 2652

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include brief in opposition to H. R. 2652, by Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute:

We wish to present, in the name of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, the following brief in opposition to H. R. 2652.

The Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute is an association of arms and ammunition manufacturers comprising the following companies: E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Federal Cartridge Corporation; Hercules Powder Co., Inc.; Ithaca Gun Co.; the Marlin Firearms Co.; O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc.; Remington Arms Co., Inc.; Savage Arms Corporation; Western Cartridge Co.; Winchester Repeating Arms Co.

While the institute is designated as the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, it should be noted its membership includes all of the small arms and ammunition manufacturers in the United States, with the exception of the pistol manufacturers.

Our membership includes companies which have furnished the nucleus of the skilled help and management that has made it possible to produce the millions of rifles, carbines, and other small arms, as well as the billions of rounds of small-arms ammunition that has been necessary for our armed forces in the current war. Further, this industry has been called upon to supply not only our own troops, but has had to meet the enormous demands, under lend-lease, of our allies.

The industry can point with pride to the fact that at no time has there been a shortage of either small arms or small arms ammunition.

All of our members have in their files letters of commendation from high-ranking Government officials emphasizing the contribution of our industry to the effective prosecution of the war.

This reference to our part in the war effort is not advanced as a plea for some kind of reward—it is put forward solely to emphasize that the continued existence and well-being of our industry is of the greatest importance to the future defense of our Nation.

As hostilities cease, our industry of necessity will return to peacetime proportions. This means a drastic reduction in operations. But no matter how ardently we hope for peace, we dare not neglect the continuance of the nucleus of skilled personnel which could again b expanded should the emergency arise. This can only be done by keeping the industry in a strong and healthy condition, thus enabling it to preserve the largest possible working force.

The United States Government must recognize this situation and should therefore refrain from any acts which would have a contrary effect.

H. R. 2652 if passed in its present form will very definitely injure the industry and further decrease employment.

Following the reductions in duty on guns made in the trade agreement with Belgium in 1935, importations increased five-fold by 1939.

Your committee knows that wages in the United States have materially increased since 1939 and the indicated trend is still strongly upward. No corresponding wage scales exist in Europe; in fact it is reasonable to expect that for some extended period, food, clothing, and shelter will be far more important considerations than wage and living standards.

In the gun industry, practically 80 percent of the cost is represented by labor. It is therefore readily apparent that differences in wage and living standards play a tremendous role in the cost of our product.

A reduction of tariff on the products of the ammunition industry will have the same injurious effect as that already indicated for guns.

The institute has already protested against the cuts in tariff which are now in effect and which were beginning to seriously affect us when the war started. Obviously the full effects of the present tariff have not as yet been felt so that the industry is concerned about the present low duties and is entirely opposed to any further reductions on its products.

To summarize, it is our sincere view that (a) an ability to turn out substantial amounts of small arms and small arms ammunition, on comparatively short notice, is vital to this country's future defense; (b) such ability cannot be present unless we have in peacetime a sound small arms and ammunition industry to provide the nucleus of specialized know-how and skilled labor upon which expanded wartime production can be built; (c) the existence of such a sound peacetime small arms and ammunition industry is already in jeopardy by reason of the low tariff duties presently in effect; and (d) any further tariff reductions would so weaken this industry as to ruin its ability to play an important part in the country's defense if it should ever again be called upon so to do.

We wish again to registe our strong protest against the passage of this bill, and ask that it be reported unfavorably.

Respectfully submitted.

SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION MANUFACTURERS' INSTITUTE,
C. STEWART COMEAM, *Secretary.*

Oil in Three Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Paul H. Giddens, head of the political science department at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., and one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the petroleum industry. This article was published in the Orange Disc for March and April 1945, the magazine of the Gulf companies:

OIL IN THREE WARS

In World War No. 2, with thousands of planes, tanks, jeeps, trucks, tractors, submarines, motor torpedo boats, and other vessels to be fueled and lubricated, we appreciate the way in which oil has revolutionized the conduct of war and is determining the outcome. In thinking of the importance of petroleum in this war, however, we should not overlook the fact that it played a decisive role in two other crises in our history—the Civil War and World War No. 1.

Less familiar to us is the part played by petroleum in our Civil War. In writing about its value to the North, Sir S. Morton

Peto, the English banker, pointed out in 1865 that "it is difficult to find a parallel to such a blessing bestowed upon a nation in the hour of her direst necessity." Of course, it was not used as a fuel or lubricant for mechanized units; it proved to be of utmost importance in other respects. At the Battle of Gettysburg, for example, petroleum was used to treat the wounds of the soldiers. Petroleum's special contribution, however, was the fact that it provided the world with a cheap, safe, and efficient illuminant and lubricant. With the decline of the whaling industry and the inadequacy of lard oil, the shortage of oil became increasingly serious in all parts of the world between 1840 and 1860. At the same time, the invention of new machines, the rapid growth of factories, and the extension of the railroads made heavier demands upon the diminishing supply. Under the circumstances, scientists everywhere made scores of experiments and spent large sums of money trying to find a new lubricant and a new source of artificial light. In 1859 Col. E. L. Drake tapped a vast subterranean deposit of petroleum in the great Oil Creek Basin, demonstrated how petroleum could be secured in abundance, and gave to the world that long-sought-for illuminant and lubricant. This marked the birth of a new industry—the petroleum industry.

Born in the darkest hour in the life of the Union, the petroleum industry was a powerful force in strengthening the economy of the North. At the outset the North was cut off from the turpentine districts of the South, and the small supply on hand, being inadequate for painting and other purposes, brought exorbitant prices. A satisfactory substitute was soon derived, however, from some of the products discovered in refined petroleum. Furthermore, the new industry was a factor in developing the phenomenal wartime prosperity of the North. Thousands of teamsters were employed in hauling oil from Oil Creek to the nearest railroad points. Refineries sprang up all over the oil field.

In Pittsburgh alone there were, in 1865, 58 refineries, valued at $2,533,000, with an annual pay roll of $500,000. Railway lines were hurriedly extended into the oil region and they hauled thousands of passengers and tons of freight; nor was this all. As the petroleum industry developed, it provided a stimulus to all other branches of industry; coopers worked to capacity; the rolling mills found a market for an immense amount of hoop iron; tinners made 5- and 10-gallon cans; chemical laboratories ran to capacity in producing acid and alkali; machinists had more orders for steam engines and boilers than they could handle; and glass manufacturers benefited largely from the trade in manufacturing lamps, globes, and chimneys.

Although in its infancy, the petroleum industry rendered outstanding service in helping to furnish the sinews of war. Under the law of July 1, 1862, and that of June 30, 1864, levying a tax on crude and refined petroleum, the United States collected about $7,000,000. In addition, the Government secured considerable internal revenue from a newly created occupational group—the oilmen—under the income-tax law. The industry assisted in another respect. In 1861 the balance of trade was running strongly against the Union. By 1865 our export trade in petroleum amounted to $15,727,881, and it ranked sixth among our exports. Petroleum, therefore, not only helped to offset the unfavorable balance of trade but it constituted a medium of exchange and enabled us to buy abroad.

These, then, were the ways by which petroleum substantially assisted in the successful prosecution of the Civil War. When President Grant visited the oil region in September 1871, he spoke briefly at a dinner in Franklin, saying that it was a pleasure to visit the oil region—"a pleasure which is enhanced by remembering, not alone how promptly Pennsylvania contributed her war quota during the Rebellion but also the importance of her oil products as an element of national wealth and resource during the same period."

Between the Civil War and 1914 two things occurred to revolutionize the conduct of the war—the introduction of petroleum as a fuel for warships and the development of the internal combustion engine and its application to vehicles for war purposes. Probably no one in naval circles appreciated more the part fuel was destined to play in future naval warfare than Capt. John Fisher, of the British Navy. "You can take it from me," said Fisher in 1882, "that the general adoption of oil instead of coal as fuel for ships would immediately increase the fighting capacity of every fleet by at least 50 percent." His colleagues dismissed the idea as visionary, and, for many years, Fisher was known in the British Navy as the oil maniac. But he continued to pound away at the idea that "oil will absolutely revolutionize naval strategy." In 1912, through the efforts of Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Fisher, now an admiral, the British Government made a momentous decision—to burn oil fuel in the British Navy. They therefore laid the keel of the *Queen Elizabeth*, the first large warship to burn oil exclusively. Within 2 years the British had partially converted its fleet to burn oil. The same was true of the Central Powers. By the end of World War I more than 48 percent of the British fleet was using oil.

After 1900 the United States Navy made rapid strides toward adopting oil as fuel for its warships. By 1910 all new destroyers and submarines were designed to burn oil exclusively, while battleships like the *Delaware* and *North Dakota* were fitted to carry oil as an auxiliary fuel. After 1912 all battleships were to burn oil exclusively. In the spring of 1916 we launched the dreadnaughts *Nevada, Oklahoma,* and *Pennsylvania,* the first of our battleships to burn oil exclusively.

The demand for petroleum to fuel and lubricate ships in the World War I and to power trucks, tanks, submarines, and airplanes—new weapons of war which made their appearance for the first time—was enormous. The British Army alone consumed on an average 23,000 tons of oil per month and the French Army 35,000 tons, or 700,000 tons a year for these two armies alone. Oil had really gone to war in 1914. It was an absolute essential.

So great was the British dependence upon petroleum that a very serious crisis developed during the spring of 1917. German U-boats had sunk so many tankers that the British oil reserves became perilously low. Instead of a reserve of some 5 or 6 months, it was reduced to one of about 8 weeks. In June Lord Northcliffe, head of the British war mission to the United States, informed our Government that, owing to the shortage of oil, the British Fleet had been partially demobilized and that destroyers on patrol had reduced their speed from 26 knots to 18 in order to conserve fuel. The stocks of motor gasoline and aviation gasoline were at such a dangerously low level that, if the Germans had started a major offensive, the Allied forces would not have had sufficient supplies to pull a retreat. The United States immediately responded to the call for help, and by the end of 1917 the British situation had greatly improved.

France's plight was even more precarious than Britain's. On December 15, 1917, Premier Clemenceau frantically appealed to President Wilson, pointing out that the minimum stock of petroleum for the French armies was 44,000 tons; that the monthly consumption was 25,000 tons; that the stocks had dropped to 23,000 tons; and that they threatened to fall to nothing if immediate relief was not forthcoming. "A failure in the supply of petrol," wrote Clemenceau, "would cause the immediate paralysis of our armies and might compel us to a peace unfavorable to the Allies. * * * The safety of the Allied nations is in the balance." The note had the desired effect. The United States soon had a stream of tankers headed for France.

At the end of the war the Interallied Petroleum Council, which had been created in the fall of 1917, was entertained by the British Government at a dinner on November 21, 1918. Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary, presided and spoke. In pointing out the decisive role petroleum had played in bringing about ultimate victory for the Allies he said: "Without oil how could they have procured the mobility of the fleet, the transport of their troops, or the manufacture of several explosives? All products of oil fuel, gas oil, aviation spirit, motor transport spirit, lubricating oil, etc., played an equally important part in the war. In fact, we might say the Allies floated to victory on a wave of oil." He could have added that the United States had furnished about 80 percent of the oil used by the Allies.

The defeat of the Central Powers was due, in a large measure, to an inadequate supply of oil. Germany possessed no petroleum deposits of any consequence. Austria-Hungary owned wells in Galicia, but these were far from adequate to supply the needs of the Central Powers. The shortage of petroleum, therefore, led the Germans to develop the synthetic process of extracting oil from shale and coal. Benzol, extracted from coal tar, served as one of the chief fuel oils for motor vehicles, submarines, and airplanes. Furthermore, the lack of petroleum forced Germany to direct its military operations toward Galicia, Rumania, and the Caucasus because there were rich oil deposits in those places. Thanks to the thoroughness of the British in wrecking the Rumanian oil field, Germany failed to obtain anything like the quantity upon which it had counted. Nor did the conquest of the Caucasus region in the spring of 1918 bring any relief; pipe lines and drilling towers had been to a large extent destroyed during the internal disturbances through which the country had passed.

The failure to secure adequate petroleum supplies was undoubtedly a prime factor in Germany's defeat. During the winter of 1916–17, according to General Ludendorff, "The shortage of oil at home was serious. The country districts did not obtain sufficient for the winter. The peasants had to pass the longer winter evenings in the dark, which was very bad for their morale. It is characteristic of Germany that little was ever said about this great inconvenience. For a time some of our transport difficulties were due to bad lubricants used in locomotives. They froze very easily. Private cars were practically not used at all in Germany. The whole rolling-stock situation was one of the greatest anxiety and called for incessant attention."

With the outbreak of World War No. 2 in 1939, the character of warfare had been completely changed. It is clearly the day of mechanized war. The internal-combustion engine, whose potentialities were only beginning to be understood in 1918 has been perfected and adapted to all kinds of engines of war. Thousands of them are now being used in the fight around the world, and they consume oceans of oil. Furthermore, petroleum requirements for nonmilitary but essential activities are vast. Never has the fate of so many nations depended upon an adequate supply of petroleum.

In 1939 none of the belligerents was self-sufficient in petroleum. The oil resources of the British Empire were small, amounting to only 2.5 percent of the world's production in 1940, but the output of the fields throughout the world upon which it could draw were very much larger. The entry of Russia into the war with 10.6 percent of the world's supply and the United States with 60.8 percent

built up unlimited resources for the Allied side.

Germany's oil resources since 1914 have not increased materially, yet her war machine has been far more powerful, and, at the same time, more dependent upon petroleum. When Hitler came to power in 1933, Germany was producing about one-fourth of its oil requirements. He sought to make the country self-sufficient through the drilling of new wells, economy in consumption, improving the synthetic process, the annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia, and, ultimately, the control of foreign fields. Italy's position was far weaker than its Axis partner, and it depended at the outset almost exclusively upon Rumania for its supply. Japan depended upon other countries for about 65 percent of its annual consumption. Because of the Axis shortage of oil resources in World War No. 2, those countries with a large supply have been the object of every Axis diplomatic and military drive—Rumania, the Caucasus, Iraq, Iran, and the Dutch East Indies.

The Allied military strategy in World War No. 2 has been twofold; the Allies have tried, so far as possible, to keep the Axis countries from capturing those areas where oil is produced in large quantities; and to reduce the Axis oil supply through uninterrupted and systematic bombing of their synthetic oil plants, refineries, and storage depots.

The results of 5 years of bombing 81 major oil targets in Germany is now becoming apparent. As this is written, Allied intelligence reports that all of Germany's crude oil refineries are inoperative, and that only 4 of her synthetic oil plants are producing. The Germans are reported as producing only 103,000 tons of gasoline a month compared with 500,000 a month early last year. A steady improvement of bombing weather from now on may render German industry incapable of producing any but the most insignificant amount of gasoline needed to keep the Wehrmacht and the Luftwaffe in action. So once again, as in 1918, the lack of oil is proving to be "the Achilles heel of Germany's motive power." As the war in the Pacific draws closer to Japan and the line of communications between Japan and the rich oil resources in the Dutch East Indies is severed, the lack of oil will also be a prime factor in Japan's inevitable defeat.

It is now clearer than ever before that what the great French industrialist and wartime oil commissioner, Henry Berenger, prophesied in 1919 has come true. He wrote: "He who owns the oil will own the world, for he will rule the sea by means of the heavy oils, the air by means of the ultra refined oils and the land by means of petrol and illuminating oils."

Estimates of Number of People Who Will Earn Livings From Agriculture at War's Conclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is highly essential to the welfare of our country that there be an abundance of employment when the war ceases. For this to obtain, farms must necessarily employ a good many more people. Particularly do I think that every returning service man or woman should have the opportunity to buy, own, and operate a farm who desires one. I was heartened to learn recently from the Secretary of Agriculture that farms can probably absorb a million and a half additional people in the first 5 years after the conclusion of the war.

I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from Hon. Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Hon. J. C. Capt, Director of the Census. They follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 5, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have fairly satisfactory estimates of the persons and families now living on farms and the number of people employed on farms. According to estimates prepared jointly by the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for April 1944, there were 25,870,000 people living on farms in the United States and there were 6,490,000 farm families. However, 1,500,000 of these households living on farms did not contain a farm operator, being households with a head engaged in nonfarm work, employed as a farm laborer, or not in the labor force. The number of persons working on farms 2 or more days during the week in April 1944 is estimated to have been 9,080,000.

It is more difficult to answer the question on how many additional people farms will absorb after the war. Although the demand for farms after the war cannot be measured accurately, it very likely will be materially greater than the supply of good farms available. This is a normal situation. The farm population has long produced many more children than needed to replace farm operators and other workers on farms. In 1940 only three out of five young men reaching maturity on farms were needed to replace older men in the farm population who died or retired. In spite of the heavy loss of young men from farms because of the war, in 1944 there were still enough young men aged from 15 to 24 on farms to replace all of the older men who would die or retire during the next 10 years.

In addition to farm youth now on farms and returning veterans, some war workers will wish to return to farms after the war. The number of such will depend to a large extent upon whether or not the country maintains full employment; the higher the level of national employment the smaller the number who will return to farms.

It is estimated that around 800,000 to 900,000 farms will become available for new farm operators during the first 5 years or so after the war through death, retirement, and change in occupation of present operators and through development of new farms. In addition to farm boys reaching maturity and an unknown number of returning war workers it has been estimated, based on an Army survey, that about 900,000 veterans will be seeking farms to operate on a full-time basis and possibly 500,000 will be seeking part-time farms.

In addition to opportunities to become farm operators, there will probably be some half to three fourth of a million nonoperator jobs in agriculture available for returning veterans and others. These work opportunities will arise as women, youths, and even children who have worked on farms during the war return to their normal pursuits. Because the work capacity of these temporary workers is generally less than that of young adult males, the number of such workers replaced will be greater than the number replacing them. In many cases the replacement will be made by a returning son; in many other cases a man will be hired to replace a person only temporarily in the labor force during wartime.

In other words, agriculture may be expected to absorb approximately 1,500,000 persons during the first 5 years after the war, but some of these opportunities will be filled by young people now living on farms.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, May 7, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Secretary Wallace has asked me to reply to your letter of April 23, 1945. In answer to your questions, I am sending you our most recent estimates of farm population and agricultural employment which may help you in your analysis of the problem of full employment after the war.

The Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, in cooperation have prepared estimates of the farm population for 1940 and 1944. (See Estimates of Farm Population and Farm Households, April 1944 and April 1940, and Farm Population Changes in 1944, enclosed.) Estimates of agricultural employment are issued each month by the Bureau of the Census, based on the results of a sample survey of 30,000 households. (See Monthly Report on the Labor Force, enclosed.)

The latest date for which the three items you specify have been estimated is April 1944. At that time, there were 25,870,000 persons living on farms and 6,490,000 families or private households. In April 1944, an estimated 7,500,000 persons 14 years of age and over were employed in agriculture. The current farm population is probably at about the same level, while agricultural employment is slightly higher because of the early spring in many areas this year.

In estimating the conditions of full employment in the post-war period, most students of the problem assume that we shall need an agricultural labor force not much, if any, larger than that which we have currently. If full employment obtains, there is no reason to expect that any substantial increase in the farm population would occur, since the number of agricultural workers required to meet the total demand for farm products will be approximately the same as at present.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT, *Director.*

German Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report from the Minneapolis Tribune of May 13, 1945, of a report by its executive editor, Mr. Gideon Seymour, on what he and other editors saw on their recent trip to Germany. He corroborates the conclu-

sions of our own congressional delegation and makes other observations regarding the nature of the Nazi movement which I believe are most significant:

"NAZI POLITICAL PRISONERS TREATED WORST"—SEYMOUR

Necessity for distinguishing between the three main types of German prison camps to get a valid appraisal of German treatment of prisoners was emphasized heavily Saturday by Gideon Seymour, executive editor of the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune, in a public report at Minneapolis auditorium on his visit to the German camps.

Seymour, 1 of 18 American editors and publishers invited by the War Department to view conditions in the German camps, spoke under sponsorship of the Minneapolis Hospital council and Minneapolis Foreign Policy Association.

"American boys who were prisoners of the Germans will come home and say, yes; they were underfed; yes; they were often kicked and slapped and some were treated worse; but they will say they weren't victims of wholesale atrocities," Seymour explained.

POLITICAL PRISONERS HURT

He warned his audience: "Don't assume from this, then, that the so-called atrocity stories were false. For the wholesale atrocities were those committed against political prisoners in the concentration camps, not the war-prisoner camps.

The three types of camps, Seymour said, are those for prisoners of war, those for political prisoners, and others for the so-called "free laborers" recruited from invaded countries.

"All the prisoners of war were kept in special camps," he said. "We did not find a single American, British, or Russian soldier in the concentration camps we visited who were captured in uniform or on the battlefield.

FOOD CLAUSE IGNORED

"Germany had signed the Geneva Convention on war prisoners, which Britain and the United States had also signed, and it apparently made a pretense of living up to the rules of treatment of war prisoners."

The Germans, however, didn't feed our troops who were captured nearly as well as their own, as required of signers of the convention, Seymour added.

"High American officers told me that among the several thousand American troops liberated the average weight was about 100 pounds. Lots of the Americans told me they were slapped, kicked, and spit upon.

"Persons in the free labor camps received pretty good food and life wasn't too bad for them—probably not as bad in many cases as if they had stayed in their own countries."

These facts, Seymour said, may lead some people to question the veracity of the stories of atrocities, as well documented as those stories may be.

YOUNG BOYS HELD

Contrasting sharply with the two camps described, he continued, were the political prisoner camps, first established when the Nazis rose to power in 1933—for those the Germans called "trouble makers," boys of 8 and 10 years old, clergymen, and others of all types and descriptions.

Sifted from the maze of reports, much of it obviously false, and the unconfirmable reports, and combined with his first observations, Seymour said, are the stories every person must know—that and the basis on which the Nazis were able to perpetrate their crimes against humanity.

At Dachau, Seymour recounted, the group found the execution chamber disguised as a shower bath, where prisoners were told they were to go for baths before being given uniforms and assigned to barracks.

No one still alive in the camp when the Americans came ever had bathed there, he was told.

"Outside the execution chamber was a cheery reception room, done in white, with a stack of towels and small bars of soap in a corner—on a table still remained a vase for flowers.

"We went to the crematorium and looked behind it at the two embankments inside high walls where prisoners of high degree were executed in really formal style—by putting them on their knees, blindfolded, against the embankment, and shooting them in the back of the neck."

"TROUBLESOME" KILLED

In the infamous Buchenwald camp was another crematorium, Seymour continued, where prisoners were ordered for execution because of misbehavior or because they were troublesome.

"On a railroad sidetrack beside the Buchenwald camp were 29 open cars, like our railway coal cars, on the floors of which were scattered the bodies of the starved," he said. "Records show the Germans started moving 4,600 prisoners in the path of the advancing Allies and when the prisoners arrived a week later only 2,719 were alive."

In Buchenwald also Seymour and the others found iron hooks on a wall where prisoners were hanged by ropes tied to the back of their wrists.

Among the prisoners there were some 1,600 Polish clergymen and a smaller group of other nationalities.

Because the clergymen could do no work in most cases, Seymour said, they were used for experiments.

"One priest told me he and 177 others had been infected with malaria. Three died and the others were all left with the disease," Seymour related.

Others were starved deliberately to the point where they developed a disease which results from malnutrition, so the Germans could experiment in finding a cure for the disease.

"They never found the cure," Seymour said.

Hundreds of others, he was told authoritatively, were immersed in salt water at sea temperature to see how long they could remain there after various diets. The German said they were trying to find a cure for lesions which develop from the sustained immersion.

In some of the prison camps the Germans employed the worst criminals from regular penal institutions as cell-block leaders.

On one occasion Seyomur reported, a political prisoner was beaten to death by a cell-block leader for no other reason than that the latter wanted to impress the German guard in control of the section.

For the best evaluation on the degree to which the German people are responsible for nazism and what happened in the political prison camps, Seymour referred to the statement made to him and others in the group by General Eisenhower.

ORIGIN IN ARROGANCE

"At the bottom of it is the arrogance of the German people."

"I do not think for a moment," Seymour declared, "that the average German approved of what was going on in Buchenwald, Dachau, and the others.

"I do not think he knew about it. I think he would have been horrified if he had.

"But I do think the average German brought all over again from Hitler the proposition that Germany was the master race, that the German people had a right to push and trample others if they thought they could get way with it, and that Hitler built nazism on that foundation and could not have built it on any other.

"It was the un-Christian principle that one man is better than another because of the color of his skin or his racial origin. It was the un-American principle that all men are not created equal."

"On the Other Hand"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask to include this article written by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Lowell Mellett, as published in the Washington Star, May 14:

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—IF HOOVER WAS GOOD, WRITER ARGUES, JONES-BOWLES TEAM EXCELLENT, INDEED

(By Lowell Mellett)

There are those now engaged in telling the American people what a terrible time we have had during this war; reminding us of how we have suffered, and seeking to convince us that this is all unnecessary, due solely to bad management. It is an easy line to take. The war period has been filled with irritations and discomforts. But—

For those who have not had the agonized suspense that goes with having children overseas in uniform, the awful shock of the news that loved ones have been killed or maimed, this has been a very easy war in most respects. It has been a period of prosperity. Business houses have done well, farmers have paid off mortgages, workers have received high wages, professional men have collected excellent fees.

We haven't had all the new cars or the gasoline we could have used. We haven't had all the meat we could have eaten. We haven't been able to replace worn-out refrigerators and vacuum cleaners. We've had to save more money than we wanted to save.

All this has been irritating, but it doesn't add up to national suffering. Look at the pictures in the papers and in the newsreels of liberated populations dragging themselves back to their homes—homes they may find leveled to the ground when they arrive. Read the official reports of mass starvation in other lands.

It hasn't happened here.

SHOULD BE THANKFUL

Don't listen to those who magnify our discomforts into real suffering. Be thankful for the vision of the man who elected to fight our enemies overseas rather than wait for their appearance on this side of the ocean, thankful that all our homes are intact as a consequence. Be thankful that he found competent men to handle the thankless problems of production, distribution, pricing, and rationing and so enabled us to have something close to normal living during the years when that was true of no other people on earth.

This prayer to the better instincts of the American people is offered after reading a typical appeal to our latent selfishness. The latter appeal is based on the usual text of bungling bureaucracy. President Truman is admonished to get rid of the "cracked machinery" bequeathed to him by President Roosevelt and is offered this interesting advice:

"If he does not know what to do he might take counsel with the man who concededly knows more about the problem of food production, distribution, pricing, and rationing than any other man—Mr. Herbert Hoover. That would be the sensible thing to do."

Suppose we agree that Mr. Hoover demonstrated this ability in the last war. Instead of making us dissatisfied with what has been done in the present war, it will make us positively proud. For we find that, although

relatively few farmers were drafted by the Army in the last war, food production increased only 5 percent from 1914 to 1919, whereas, despite the drafting of some millions of farmers in this war, food production increased 35 percent between 1939 and 1944. As for distribution, pricing, and rationing—well, we've certainly eaten better than we did during World War No. 1.

OBSCURED BY CLAMOR

The truth may be obscured now by the clamor of special interests, who are doing well, but want to do better—the packers, for example, who succeeded in so confusing Congress that they were granted increased subsidies a few weeks ago despite the fact that their average wartime profits, after paying taxes, have been more than double their profits in the comfortable years immediately preceding the war. The truth may be obscured now, but one day it will be understood that Marvin Jones and the farmers have made a proud record in food production and that Chester Bowles and his tens of thousands of unpaid assistants have made a proud record in distribution.

With the war in Europe at an end the pressure is on to wreck that record. The pressure comes from those who put their own profits ahead of the national interest and from those who seem honestly to believe that uncontrolled inflation would do the country no harm.

President Truman has made it clear that he is prepared to resist this pressure. Most of us have pledged ourselves, silently or outspokenly, to support him in his efforts to see the country through the present national crisis. He needs that support now.

Petroleum Administration for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on Tuesday, March 6, 1945, I included a copy of a letter addressed by a constituent, Mr. Ernest C. Bratt, to the Attorney General of the United States under date of March 2, 1945.

The letter was written on behalf of the small oil companies doing business in wartime and finding themselves in an unfavorable position due to the operation of directive 59 and certain orders issued by the Petroleum Administration for War.

Under further leave to extend my remarks and at the request of those for whom Mr. Bratt speaks, I include at this point copies of a letter addressed to Mr. Bratt by the Assistant Attorney General under date of April 23, 1945, and reply by Mr. Bratt under date of April 28, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1945.

Mr. E. C. BRATT,
Sterling Stations, Inc.,
Fitchburg, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of April 17, 1945. Your letter of March 2, 1945, to the Attorney General was brought to the attention of the War Production Board, the Petroleum Administration for War, and the Defense Supplies Corporation.

I understand the position of Defense Supplies Corporation to be that it is required to administer its regulations in a manner consistent with the orders and directives of the Petroleum Administration. The War Production Board desired that your matter be reviewed by the Petroleum Administration for War and this Department. A detailed report has been received from the Petroleum Administration for War on April 11, last, which raises the following points with regard to your complaint.

It appears that during 1941 Sterling received all of its supplies from sources on the east coast, did not import any products from other areas and that its sole marketing activity was the retail sale of gasoline to the public through 26 service stations; that your importations began after the curtailment of supplies due to the shortage of tankers and alternate transportation facilities; that you closed 24 of your stations and became a broker of petroleum products, selling to original suppliers instead of to consumers; and that you would have been able to secure enough gasoline to meet the ration demand of your service stations, had you continued their operation, under the provisions of Petroleum Administrative Order No. 1.

It further appears that of the 12 applications filed by you for permits under PAO 5 between September 1943 and February 1945, seven were granted and five were denied because the areas of destination were adequately supplied; that your importations prior to September 1943 resulted in unscheduled movements of critically needed tank cars which could have been used more efficiently under Directive 59 shipping schedules and had the effect of causing additional supplies to be shipped into areas already equitably supplied; that prior to March 1, 1945, your importations of naphtha and natural gasoline for blending with motor fuel required the use of a considerable number of tank cars which could have been used more efficiently to supply other areas faced with critical shortages; and that PAO 5 was amended to include these blending agents in order to keep a balance of supply and distribution. The report states that you erroneously assume that the recent amendment of PAO 5 will eliminate importations of these blending agents and that permits will be granted in the event P. A. W. finds that your proposed importations meet the tests necessary for the administration of PAO 5. P. A. W. advises that it is unable to consider your applications for permits without your submission of information requested by it and that your application will be reconsidered whenever you supply the requested information.

P. A. W. maintains that its importations and shipping schedules promulgated under Directive 59 and PAO 5 are designed to assure that supplies are available as equitably as possible among all companies in all areas in accordance with current ration demand and so as not to permit a single company to import quantities which will give to it and to the area in which it operates unfair advantages over other companies and other areas.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will advise me further of any facts or information which should be considered in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.

APRIL 28, 1945.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Wendell Berge.)

DEAR MR. BERGE: We are in receipt of your letter of April 23, 1945, in connection with our complaint as contained in our letter to the Attorney General, dated March 2, 1945.

Frankly, we are greatly disappointed. Our letter was an appeal to the Department of Justice asking for relief from practices which we considered to be discriminatory, monopolistic, and detrimental to the war effort. We believed we had a right to expect from the Department of Justice full consideration of the issues we brought to its attention and for the benefit of all businessmen and companies in our own situation, that it would render a decision as to the validity of our charges, and moreover, take remedial action if such charges were sustained.

It appears, however, that the Department of Justice has simply taken the replies of the Petroleum Administration for War and the Defense Supplies Corporation and passed along to us excerpts therefrom as its reply. In this action we are of the opinion our charges have not been considered on their merits, hence, that your letter is not properly either an opinion as to validity of said charges or a denial that grounds for them exist.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge a reconsideration of the complaint and a thorough investigation of the combined operation of directive 59, Defense Supplies Corporation and the activities of Petroleum Administration for War which we charge have had the effect of changing directive 59 from a voluntary agreement to a compulsory order which is monopolistic in its effect on the whole petroleum industry.

We feel it incumbent upon us to make reply to your references to D. S. C. and P. A. W. answers to your queries. These follow:

D. S. C. states in effect that it is required to administer its regulations in a manner consistent with orders and directives of P. A. W. From its inception, until March 1, 1944, when it issued its amendment No. 5, D. S. C. did not consider such bilateral actions necessary.

Full proof of this is in the fact that claims were paid by D. S. C. on imports in direct violation of P. A. W. orders. Its regulation No. 1 was not written to cover this point

What took place to cause this change of procedure on the part of the responsible directors of D. S. C. and what is the documentary evidence to point out that such action is necessary or even premissible under the law which gave birth to Defense Supplies Corporation?

P. A. W. apparently defends its action in our case by stating we are doing business of a different nature than our normal pre-war business. Is such a statement germane to the issues? We are of contrary opinion. No oil company is doing precisely the same kind of business it did before the war. Our appeals to P. A. W. in New York and Washington (copies were furnished to you under dates of March 28 and April 6) clarify our position on this point.

We take exception to the statement that we "sell to original suppliers instead of to consumers." We sell to consumers and resellers of all kinds including such original suppliers as we can accommodate.

P. A. W. states that our rejected applications for permits to import were "denied because the areas of destination were adequately supplied." If there have been adequate supplies of gasoline and heating oils in the areas in which we operate, how can P. A. W. explain the persistent gasoline and heating oil shortages. These shortages exist while materials and the tank cars to transport it are available to us in district 3 but lack of P. A. W. permits prevent imports.

We cannot agree with the charge that tank cars we use can be "used more efficiently under directive 59 shipping schedules." Actually, it takes no longer for a tank car to reach our destinations than it does to reach terminals of original suppliers.

As to P. A. W. statements relative equitable distribution of supplies to all companies:

We reiterate, it seems that P. A. W. is more interested in protecting relative sales positions of original suppliers than in expediting imports to district 1. There is nothing in P. A. W.'s Petroleum Administrative Order No. 1 that guarantees equal distribution to secondaries. The provisions are so ambiguous that it is difficult to find any two suppliers using the same formula for distribution of either gasoline or heating oils.

We sincerely trust that a complete investigation will be made by the Department of Justice and would appreciate a statement to this effect.

Yours very truly,

STERLING STATIONS, INC.,
E. C. BRATT.

Subsidizing Our Competitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, subsidizing seems to be the order of the hour. Subsidizing at home and subsidizing abroad seem to have captured the thinking of some of the leaders in our Government. Many think that subsidizing will ultimately be the downfall of our American system of free enterprise. It is bad enough to subsidize at home. But what about subsidizing our alien and foreign competitors?

Mr. Speaker, I quote the following from an editorial appearing in the Daily Oklahoman, published at Oklahoma City, Okla., a leading Democratic newspaper of the Southwest, under the topic above indicated:

SUBSIDIZING OUR COMPETITORS

Is it the design of our official planners to compel American producers to pay taxes to subsidize foreign competitors to the point where those competitors will be strong enough to put the American producers out of business? Or is the financial help we are extending to foreign production an essential part of all out war and something that will be discontinued just as soon as the war has ended?

Under our foreign loan and rehabilitation program we have financed a steel plant in Brazil to compete effectively with American steel. We have financed the development of Mexican mines, which are outright competitors of our own mining industry. And, by the terms of the Bretton Woods agreement we are pledged to supply several billion dollars for world rehabilitation, a large part of which is intended to be world industrialization.

In the days when the A. A. A. was restricting cotton acreage the production of cotton increased enormously in Brazil. A congressional committee was told recently that cotton can be produced more cheaply in Brazil and Mexico than it can be in the United States. We lost a large part of the world's cotton market by the policies we practiced at home.

Unquestionably, Americans would be deeply disturbed if it should develop that foreign nations were promoting with their own money and resources a program of full industrialization. Of course, the success of such a program would curtail our export trade drastically, cut American employment seriously, and close many an American factory. But, apparently, foreign nations are not going to use their own money. It is to be supplied by the American Government after it has been taken from the American taxpayers. Surely, the Government will not make us pay for the weapons with whic hour alien competitors plan to cut our throats.

This business of helping the world will need a lot of revising as soon as the war has been won.

Old-Age Pensions—Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by me at a public meeting conducted by the Massachusetts Social Security Association, Inc., Sunday, May 13, 1945, at the Symphony Hall, Boston, Mass., on the subject of old-age pensions:

The Scripture says, "I am my brother's keeper." But too many nations and too many men have closed their minds and hearts against their fellow men and the world is paying a terrible price for that denial.

With the coming of the wealth-producing, labor-saving machine age, we thought that economic security would be guaranteed for all. The very reverse took place. We saw fantastic wealth piling up on one side and mass unemployment and destitution on the other. The false prosperity of the 1920's gave way to the want and despair of the 1930's, and all of us wondered why this should be; why millions should have little or no purchasing power in the richest nation the world has ever seen. Our whole economy was out of balance. The machine age had solved the problem of production, but, in turn, had raised the new and vexing problem of adequate distribution.

Our social thinking was lagging behind the development of machines. The new system was leading to a concentration of economic power, and the men who controlled that power had not learned that with power goes responsibility. Their eyes were dazzled by the pyramiding wealth in their hands. They did not care to see that the machines which were making profits for some were taking jobs away from others.

Greed—the one great danger to our material civilization—had taken the bit in its teeth and all of us were on the run-away ride to destruction. Economic tensions led to civil strife and tyranny in many countries. Greed had broken away from spiritual controls and the world was plunged into war—a war that destroyed human and material resources at a rate that threatened us with the complete ruin of our civilization.

As we look back a few years, it is ironic to note that some men in our own country objected strenuously to the proposal that $2,000,000,000 should be appropriated by the Federal Government for old-age pensions. They cried that it would lead to national bankruptcy. They resisted every effort to help our own people. Yet, when we became involved in war—a war which will cost us close to $300,000,000,000 to fight and win—these same men said not a word. Perhaps they now realize that we must protect in old age the men and women who labored to create our national wealth. Economic security in this country and every other country will serve to eliminate the causes of war. The cost for pensions now seems so trifling as compared with the cost of destructive war that we wonder why there remains any opposition to this investment in national well-being.

This is not a special interest that we favor, because the majority of people in our country, even the infants in the cradle, will reach old age, for the life span is ever lengthening. Age is entitled to freedom from want and worry. It is entitled to dividends from the investment of labor and skill which it has made through the years in the building of our Nation.

Private charity cannot do the job, and it must not try to do the job, for charity is repugnant to the dignity of American manhood. We cannot depend upon sons and daughters to support the aged, because youth has its own life to lead and its own homes to establish. Today we must think in terms of the Nation as a whole and in terms of mutual responsibilities. The aged have finished their life work. They deserve the security and serenity of work well done. It is the moral obligation of the Nation to fulfill its part of the implied contract so that the aged may have personal and economic peace in their declining years. To do less is to default on the men and women who have made this country strong, free, and prosperous.

The days of an expanding America are gone. No longer is it possible for a man to carve a home out of the wilderness and there live a self-sufficient, independent life. Furthermore, none of us would like to return to such a hard and primitive way of life. The machine age has brought us higher standards but at a price that we have not yet learned to pay. The price is cooperation. We are all interdependent. The health and wealth and happiness of any community, of any nation, is tied in with the welfare of its humblest citizens. Today we have learned that, in the economic senses, no nation can prosper half slave and half free.

Strangely enough, the United States was one of the last nations to provide security for the aged. In 1934 there were only three large countries which had failed to enact such protection. Those countries were India, China, and the United States. India and China are undeveloped countries while ours has the highest standard of living in the world. In spite of our vaunted progress, we had actually fallen behind the rest of the world in social and economic adjustments. It took the depression of the 1930's to reveal a dangerous weakness in our way of life.

The problem of old age in security has been created by our modern industrial system of mass production with its efficiency experts who try to make man, with his physical limitations, compete with tireless machines. This relentless competition reached such a stage a few years ago that a man over 40 found it difficult to get a job. He was considered burned out and unable to keep pace with the machine.

In this furious race for production and profits we were creating wealth for some and poverty for others. The Government, acting through the elected representatives of the people stepped in to correct these abuses. At first industry and capital fought against this adjustment with every weapon at their command. The basis for a pension system, inadequate though it was, came into being. Belatedly, the corporations began to see the light.

Already, the ghost of a needy old age has been laid for 2,000,000 American workers by the greatest corporate pension rush in history. In 1940 only about 1,000 corporations had pension plans. At present, over 6,000 such plans have been filed for Treasury approval, with more coming almost every day. Private industry may eventually pay aged workers a billion dollars each year. These annual payments are guaranteed either by

insurance company funds or guaranteed trusts.

The average Government payment to old couples ranges between $50 and $60 a month, enough to provide for the bare necessities of life. Additional contributions by employers spell the difference between comfort and misery.

One of the most unusual social security programs, both in scope and liberality, was started not long ago by Schenley Distillers. Schenley's pension plan, provided without cost to the employee, aims at assuring even $1,500-a-year workers a minimum retirement income of $1,200 after 30 years, with proportionate payments to workers with shorter periods of service. A 65-year-old married employee, for example, who has averaged $1,500 a year for 30 years gets $56.50 monthly from Social Security and $47 from the company, a total of $1,242 annually. Equally important, and contrary to most group life-insurance plans, an additional security measure started by this company, the employee who leaves the company can exchange his insurance for any cash which has been accumulated. He also has the choice of obtaining paid-up insurance or an ordinary life policy, or convert his policy into an annuity.

In connection with this the board chairman of the company has said: "What we've done is to concentrate on the actual needs of the lower-salaried worker. We set aside funds for the depreciation of machinery, why shouldn't we take care of the depreciation of men?" Pensions make it possible for workers to experience the full enjoyment of their later years. Pensioners are pursuing hobbies or operating small businesses which interest them. Worker benefits sponsored by employers demonstrate that American business is rapidly awakening to its responsibility, and its opportunity.

Why this wholesome change in the attitude of American business? I believe it was due to the educational activities of such groups as yours and the successful efforts of your representatives in Government to write social legislation into the law of the land.

American business is now cooperating in establishing a strong economic base for our national life but it cannot possibly do the job alone. Many millions of our citizens are not covered by pension plans, either of Government or of industry. Many more became aged before the country was shocked into the realization that provision must be made for them. Our aim today is to make old-age pensions all-embracing in scope and more liberal in allowance.

We believe this should be done not only as a reward for your life's work, not only to provide you with security, but for sound economic reasons as well. Industry and agriculture cannot thrive unless we have a maximum number of consumers to use the products of our fields and factories. Bare subsistence income is not enough. You must have sufficient purchasing power to stimulate our national economy, for the greater good of all. Inadequate distribution of purchasing power continues to be the bottleneck of our economic traffic jam. Enlarge the area of that purchasing power, increase its velocity, and we shall have the full flow of goods and services needed to promote prosperity.

The principle of old-age pensions or deferred wages, is a dignified and natural demand. Those entitled to it have given valuable service to society during their productive years. The Government spends large sums to subsidize business and agriculture. Surely our human resources have the same or better claim for assistance. The care of the aged must become the major responsibility of the Federal Government even before the war is completely won. The youth of our land are in favor of it. The millions of returning veterans will support it. The national welfare demands it in order to cushion the shock of reconversion to a peacetime economy where jobs will not be as plentiful as they are now.

George Washington said it first. During the Revolution he proposed half pay for life to the officers who served under him. Since that time it has become the fixed policy of our Government to pay pensions to the men who fought in our country's wars. We paid a total of $70,000,000 to the veterans of the Revolution; $46,000,000 after the War of 1812; $61,000,000 after the Mexican War; to the Union soldiers of the Civil War we have given nearly $8,000,000,000. We have spent over double this latter figure on veterans of the Spanish War, and World War No. 1. The figure for World War No. 2 will far exceed all of the foregoing put together. Now no one questions the right of veterans to these pensions even though some of these men saw no action, being in uniform for a mere 2 months at most. The point we do raise, however, is that men and women who have given a lifetime of constructive service to the Nation, helping to make her great and strong, are entitled to the same consideration.

The selfish but powerful few in our Nation cry out against old-age pensions. They would have us believe that the people as a whole could not stand the cost. They conveniently forget that the vast majority of people through social security taxes are paying part of the cost for their future old-age insurance. Our immediate problem concerns the minority who are now old and who never had the chance to come within the provisions of old-age insurance during their working days. For them, a straight and adequate pension is the only answer.

The most serious indictments against our civilization are the failures of our economic order to abolish unemployment and to provide an honorable retirement income for the aged.

Some people may point to other defects in our way of life such as its gross materialism; the flagrant disregard of ethical and religious standards and ideals; the appaling increase of crime and of mental disorders; the exploitation of one man by another; the low level of intellectual, cultural, and esthetic aspirations and, last but not least, the unequal and inequitable distribution of the Nation's wealth and the Nation's income.

And yet, in their gravity, in their immediate responsibility for human unhappiness, none of them are as revolting as our failure to abolish poverty, the proverty from which a substantial proportion of our population suffers always even in times of plenty and more acutely in times of economic depression.

Why is this so? There are a number of reasons. First, the lengthening span of life causes more old age; second, the earning period of life has been shortened relatively; third, children are less able to take care of their parents today; fourth, the passing of agriculture causes more dependence; fifth, the growing age of many firms calls attention to their aged employees.

It is estimated that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the expectancy of life at birth in some parts of Europe was not more than from 21 to 26 years. In Massachusetts in 1789 the estimated expectancy was 35 years. No farther back than 1855 the average life span in the United States was about 40 years. By 1924 it had increased to 58 years, or a gain of nearly one-half in 70 years. In 1870, the persons in the United States aged 40 and over numbered 19.9 percent and in 1920 these numbered 26.8 percent of the total population. Thus there is the fact that our population is gradually aging.

This phenomenal increase in the average length of life has not been matched by a proportionate lengthening of the working period; in fact, the working period has been cut off at both ends. The spread of education and the decline of child labor are sending workers into industry at higher ages than in the past. On the other hand, the man over 50 having still a life expectancy of about 23 years, finds it increasingly difficult to make permanent peacetime connections again if he loses his job or to get a satisfactory job at all at decent wages. The modern, more exacting nature of many factory processes places a high premium on endurance and the agility of youth. Higher standards of efficiency established by managers, ever more watchful of costs and competitive advantages, have similar results. Standardization of production inevitably demands a swifter pace which produces greater nervous strain tending to wear out workmen more rapidly. Many friends of labor have recently urged that trade-union organizers stress this phase of the modern setting in order to induce unionization.

Standardization destroys the former premium on experience and skill. Each new invention and the introduction of each new machine diminishes the value of the old mechanic's experience and frequently renders it worthless. Henry Ford, in his autobiography, frequently discounts experience and even goes so far as to say that when a man becomes an expert he is fired and that the Ford car is made with unskilled labor. Of course this does not hold true for foundry work in the same degree. The fact remains that the great majority of jobs at Ford's can be learned in a few hours or a few days. This applies to all other great industries as well. During this war we have seen men and women by the millions go into war plants and shipyards, leaving offices and homes to do mechanical work they had never touched before.

Children are less able to give support today due to the late marriage of their parents compared with the older custom, and the resultant smaller families. These children, marrying late in their turn, may be expected to be in the midst of rearing their own families just at the time when their parents are in need of aid. Furthermore, family ties having largely broken down and many of our city dwellers being forced to live in small and confined apartments or flats, the aged wage earner is no longer a welcome burden even to his own children.

Due to the change from agriculture to urban industrialism, larger numbers of the population are wage earners and renters, while a smaller percentage are farmers, small shopkeepers, and home owners. In the agricultural period the aging farmer was likely to find both a home and a livelihood on the farm which he had acquired and improved. The industrial era has crowded men into the cities where housing problems are acute and the cost of real estate makes home ownership difficult for the average workman. The percentage of those engaged in agricultural pursuits declined from 44.4 percent of the total population gainfully employed in 1880 to 26.3 percent in 1920.

The growing tendency toward celibacy, including the great increase in divorces is leaving an increasing number of people without support in old age.

That society has a duty to care for its needy aged is being less and less questioned. Mr. Epstein, after a careful study of the problem, concludes that "the underlying causes of old-age dependency today lie outside the control of the individual." The true causes he finds to be "industrial superannuation, waning earning power, sickness, industrial accidents, unemployment, inadequate wages, industrial disputes, and business and banking failures." Thus old-age dependency is caused by our social and economic order, and the society which has created that order must protect the aged from its unfortunate consequences.

There are now in existence in the United States two main types of Government old-age pensions—the "privilege" type and the "charity" type. The privilege type is represented by the pensions of certain public em-

ployees—teachers, firemen, policemen; in some States judges; Federal judges, postal clerks, Army officers, veterans and their widows, widows of former Presidents. There is no stigma attached to receipt of these pensions. The larger they are the more honorable they are.

The general old-age pension laws of the States for other than public employees are of the charity type. Timid and sensitive persons who most need aid are prone to suffer privation and hardship rather than ask for it. The system is expensive to administer, requiring a large force to check on applicants and their children.

The appearance of both the privileged and the charity type of pension is a mockery in a democratic nation. The granting of full pay to our high-salaried Federal judges on their retirement after 10 years of service at the age of 70 smacks of the special favors of the disappearing monarchies of Europe. The patronizing gesture of providing a pittance to the proved poor intensifies the general impression of class legislation and class distinctions. It is absurd to assume that the ordinary citizens of the Nation are capable of providing for their old age in comparison with the luxurious old-age pensions provided for these well-paid public servants.

Our real need is not merely a pension for the absolute poor; it is for a minimum of security for all, rich and poor. It is for the cheapest possible old-age insurance, not only for the person who has not a cent saved, or who has lost every penny he had, but also for the person who has a little home and wants to spend the rest of his life in it; yes, even for the person who has today a comfortable income.

To send a monthly check to all over a certain age is much simpler than to investigate need. It is certainly much more democratic, and takes the curse of charity off the gift to those who are in actual need of it.

In the establishment of an old-age security service for all, regardless of present wealth or poverty, we have a precedent in the service which has been set up for youth security. There was a time when schools were private and only those with means could obtain schooling. Then we established a public-school system, primarily for the benefit of those who otherwise could not attend school. But we did not shut the rich out of the public schools. We did not say to them, "If you have as much as $3,000 worth of property you must pay for your child's schooling. To get your child into the public schools, you must give proof of poverty."

There are still private schools for the rich who want to patronize them. But with all these advantages, the rich are not deprived of the opportunity to enjoy with the poor the minimum standards of training provided by the public school which is supported out of public funds.

Accident compensation for workmen is another illustration of equal treatment for rich and poor. An injured employee may be a well-to-do man; he may own a good home. That makes no difference under the workman's compensation laws.

If it is reasonable to establish educational security for all youth, and to establish accident compensation for all workers, in both cases disregarding the financial status of the insured, it is certainly not unreasonable to advocate a system of pensions which will safeguard the old age of every citizen, regardless of his financial status.

The old-age insurance provided by Government should, however, be the same for all. Democratic government should concern itself, not with providing special privileges for the few but with guaranteeing minimum safety and comfort for all.

At the present time we are sending billions of dollars' worth of food, clothing, and the necessities of life to help people all over the world, but we have done little or nothing to broaden the base and increase the payments of pensions to our aged at home.

It strikes me that if the United States is to play her proper role in world affairs she must make certain that she is strong at home before she goes forth to help strangers. Of course, we have a responsibility to the world, but common sense says that our first duty is to our own people. Only if our own social and economic system is strong can we hope to help others.

Many people say that after the war we shall extend the Social Security Act to embrace every person in this country, but I say the time to overhaul our makeshift old-age pension system is now. As soon as the war with Japan is over we shall be faced with a host of domestic problems, and in the ensuing legislative tangle and the clamors for priority the cause of old-age pensions might suffer.

With the coming of peace this Nation will have to start all over again. Youth coming up from the schools will want to find a place in life. Millions of veterans will come back to compete for jobs in the labor market. War workers will have to make adjustments. What is to become of the aged unless we retire them now, and honorably, on a pension that brings security and dignity for the rest of their years.

Out of all the groups on the home front during the agony of this war, the aged have suffered most severely. Their income, small at best, has been further shrinkened by the increase in the cost of living. The price index has gone up 26 percent, while pension rates have remained fixed. Each dollar of pension money can now buy only 74 cents worth of goods and services. The truth of the matter is your pensions have decreased.

I mention this fact to stir you to greater efforts. At this moment we have no guarantee that prices may not go even higher. No pension plan is fair or just that fails to compensate for the increase in the cost of necessities.

This, then, is all the more reason why we must have more generous pensions and without delay—for your right to security and as a cornerstone for economic stability as our Nation goes forward to solve the problems of peace and recovery.

Mr. Vandenberg's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., Tuesday, May 15, 1945:

MR. VANDENBERG'S ROLE

Mr. Roosevelt's decision to make Senator VANDENBERG a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference and Senator VANDENBERG's decision to accept the appointment have already yielded and are continuing to yield large returns to the people of this country.

There were, of course, good political reasons for the selection of the Michigan Senator. Leaving out of account the question of his ability, it was clearly important to have an outstanding Republican Senator on the delegation. On him would fall a large part of the responsibility of winning the necessary Republican votes for an undertaking for which, in the nature of things, a Democratic President could claim a large share of the credit. There was no secret about this aspect of the Vandenberg appointment.

As matters have transpired, Senator VANDENBERG has come to be recognized as one of the strongest and most influential men at the Conference. He has been more than a Republican willing to go along. He has been a positive force in the resolution of the almost innumerable difficulties which the conferees have faced. It is not too much to say that, in addition to raising almost single-handed the moral level of the present undertaking, he has contributed much of the necessary firmness and decision to the American delegation.

His first achievement along this line is well known. He called for and secured the inclusion in the charter's list of objectives the concepts of justice and international law. It is true that these are vague terms, or, if not vague, that they involve varying definitions. What is justice to an American may not be justice to a Russian. But the fact remains that the common effort to define these terms must now be made. Out of this common effort a common principle must finally emerge. The commitment to agree on such a principle has been given.

But Senator VANDENBERG'S effort has gone beyond this insistence upon including guiding principles in the charter. He has displayed remarkable gifts as a tough and resilient negotiator. The most recent example of his skill in this wearing business came to light over the week end in the matter of fitting regional agreements such as the act of Chapultepec into the world-wide organization. There were profound differences of opinion between the British and American delegations and a certain natural suspicion among the representatives of the Latin-American countries. The latter naturally regard the act as their chief bulwark against aggression from within and without and they hesitate to make its application subject to the sanction of an untried and perhaps overburdened council.

The debate raged for days and on more than one occasion tempers were in evidence. The American advisers, especially Mr. John Foster Dulles, finally worked out a formula which seemed to meet the issue. But the negotiators were tired and worn out, and there was a certain tendency to yield where yielding was perhaps not necessary.

It was in this juncture that the toughness and resiliency of Senator VANDENBERG displayed itself. It was he who carried the burden of the argument, he who stood firm when firmness was essential. His attitude gave lift and spirit to all the negotiators, and before the long meeting was over the essence of the proposal as described in the news columns had been generally accepted.

Such achievements as this cannot, naturally, command headlines. The man responsible for them is prevented, by the nature of the undertaking, from boasting about what he has done. Mr. Hull, as Secretary of State, was a master of this kind of negotiation, but because so few had seen the accomplishment or understood the manner in which victory was achieved, it was often impossible to portray to the people of the country precisely what had happened. So it has been with Mr. VANDENBERG in the present instance. Only time and the work of the historians can finally make a fair estimate of his contribution.

But we can now see deeply enough to know that a rugged and determined character lies beneath the jolly affability of this American politician, and that his stature has now increased to the point where the word statesman is not too large for him.

Foreign Trade and Shipping Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article How Trade Can Expand, by Merlo Pusey, on the Sixth Report of the Special House Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, which appeared in the Washington Post of May 15, 1945:

COLMER REPORT

Hope for development of a healthy foreign trade in the decade ahead of us has reached a new peak with the issuance of the Colmer committee's report on post-war foreign economic policy. The report is unanimous. That in itself suggests the approach of the millennium. For this Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning is composed of 10 Democrats and 8 Republicans. It is the first time within my memory that such a forward-looking report on this subject has emerged from Congress with bipartisan support.

Can it be that a new common ground for a progressive foreign economic policy has been found? Certainly our efforts at San Francisco to create a new center of world power calls for a worldwide approach to economic problems. The Nation is now thoroughly committed to the one-world idea. Peace and world order have become the responsibility of all nations acting together. Only one economic policy is consistent with this undertaking and that is a policy of expanding international commerce. We cannot move politically in one direction and economically in another without tangling our objectives and inviting chaos.

The Colmer report is not blunt enough to say so, but it clearly shows that we have not had a sound foreign trade policy since World War No. 1. In the twenties we made foreign loans on a large scale and sharply raised our own tariffs. In the thirties we lowered our tariffs, while withholding foreign loans and making it otherwise difficult for commerce to flourish. Both policies were products of isolationist thinking.

Judged by the results obtained, the policy of the twenties was much more successful than that of the thirties. Take, for example, the 4-year periods at the end of the two decades. Exports from 1926 to 1930 were much greater than from 1936 to 1940 and imports were not far from being twice as great in the earlier period. The clear implication is that the trade agreements in effect in the pre-war years did not offset the other impediments that had gotten in the way of foreign trade.

"The disturbing aspect of our foreign lending," says the Colmer report, "was not so much its magnitude during the twenties as its sudden cessation in 1930." We continued to be a creditor nation. Yet we shipped more goods abroad than we bought abroad. We took capital from other countries at the rate of $500,000,000 a year. We drained away their gold and thus contributed to the world's monetary chaos. "Our record in the thirties," says the committee, "can hardly be described as reflecting anything but a temporary, and in some respects harmful, expedient."

At the same time, we artificially raised agricultural prices, thus making it more difficult to trade with other countries. Superimposed upon our isolationist recovery efforts of the thirties, the reciprocal trade agreements were necessarily disappointing in results. There is as little to be gained from dividing static markets with foreign competitors as there is from dividing existing wealth among citizens. The chief hope of advancing prosperity lies in creation of new markets and new wealth.

This is the approach which the Colmer committee now suggests. It wants to see more foreign lending for the development of industries in other countries. New industries in Brazil, China, Mexico, and India will lift the purchasing power of their people and make them better customers. There may be some lingering fears that industrialization of nations that are backward in this respect may cut off exports from this country. But that is a narrow and discredited theory surviving from the era of exploitation in foreign trade.

That theory is disproved by our own experience. Great Britain fought industrialization of the United States because she could see in it only competition for her own industries. Actually, industrialization here brought the British markets they had never previously dreamed of, because that industrialization made our people prosperous. In the years ahead industrialization can do for the world what it has done for the United States.

We have a great interest in promoting this policy because world prosperity will mean prosperity for us. "As the incomes of other countries are increased by development programs," the Colmer committee says, "our exports to those countries will likewise increase." And that will be true in spite of the tariffs which many countries will find necessary to impose to protect their infant industries.

It is true that foreign lending came to be regarded in the thirties as a way of throwing money away. Some Americans had lost their shirts. But this was largely because many foolish loans had been made for wholly unproductive purposes. As a whole our foreign lending between the two wars appears to have been quite profitable. Indeed, the Department of Commerce estimates the amount Americans invested in other countries during that period at $13,400,000,000 and the amount of income received from those investments at $12,300,000,000. To this latter figure must be added the value of foreign investments in 1940, estimated at nine and eight-tenths billions. In short, we put into foreign investments thirteen and four-tenths billions and got out twenty-two and one-tenth in spite of defaults and depression.

If we intend to go forward with the one-world idea, lending for industrial advancement in other countries will have to be stepped up after the war. We shall have to seek an expanding economy on a world basis. Fit into that picture, the reduction of tariffs becomes a constructive aid to prosperity and not merely a matter of horse trading over increasingly restrictive markets.

Wisconsin's Milk Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table is official evidence of Wisconsin's contribution to the national milk production and the dairy war-food program:

Total milk production

WISCONSIN

[Million pounds]

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January	681	732	780	768	803	849	921	1,027	1,002	1,009
February	666	735	778	773	798	881	903	1,031	1,010	1,070
March	798	909	957	954	989	1,046	1,101	1,263	1,250	1,256
April	908	997	1,027	1,060	1,053	1,144	1,227	1,357	1,336	1,358
May	1,193	1,277	1,280	1,354	1,352	1,364	1,560	1,671	1,613	1,662
June	1,367	1,436	1,433	1,416	1,461	1,485	1,544	1,620	1,719	1,667
July	1,236	1,167	1,225	1,253	1,242	1,310	1,366	1,412	1,486	1,481
August	1,080	965	989	1,102	1,053	1,124	1,198	1,239	1,239	1,253
September	911	957	814	916	906	970	1,033	1,006	1,059	1,050
October	781	964	763	859	831	900	991	929	909	983
November	629	741	641	694	715	758	854	800	803	870
December	671	718	691	713	770	834	927	884	908	973
Total	10,921	11,598	11,378	11,862	11,973	12,665	13,625	14,239	14,334	14,635
United States production	101,205	102,410	101,908	105,807	106,792	109,510	115,498	119,240	118,140	118,952

Wisconsin produces nearly one-eighth of the milk of the Nation. Wisconsin's milk is war milk since a large percentage of its milk is diverted into manufactured dairy products used in the war dairy-food program, and a comparatively small amount of its annual production is consumed as fluid milk. Wisconsin produces over one-half the cheese, nearly one-third of the evaporated milk, and over one-third of the powdered whole milk of the Nation. These are all war foods.

Wisconsin has increased its milk production every year, even when the production in other dairy States was being reduced, and when the national production was being reduced. You will note that of the increase in national milk production of 1944 over 1943 that Wisconsin alone accounted for over one-third of the increase in the Nation.

This miracle of milk production has been performed in spite of all the senseless persecutions and prosecutions by the O. P. A., and in spite of attitudes on the part of the War Food Administration that have harmed the dairy program.

If the dairymen of the United States had increased their milk production the same as Wisconsin dairymen have increased their production, the national milk goal of 120,000,000,000 pounds would have been attained. Wisconsin's milk production would have been further increased in amount by an additional 10 to 20 percent if it had not been for the unwise persecutions, prosecutions, and machinations of the O. P. A. and the silly, senseless rulings of the political W. F. A. At this late hour $1,300,000 is included in the present agriculture bill to hire a few hundred more bureaucrats

to promote the rationing of cream and milk. The products made from milk are war products and have the O. P. A. for master, while the milk and cream boys with a home market have dodged the O. P. A., and at this late hour have come under the wing of the W. F. A. for at least gentle consideration.

Having bureaucrats call our constituents to put pressure on us to keep us from following our honest convictions is not in keeping with constructive legislative processes and should be discontinued.

McIntire Knew Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable talk recently among Members of Congress and others concerning the advisability of requiring candidates for the high office of President of the United States to submit to a rigid physical examination. The views of those with whom I have discussed the subject vary considerably. But there is somewhat of a prevailing opinion that since the President of the United States is ex officio Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and since all Army and Navy personnel are required to undergo examinations periodically, the head of the armed forces should likewise be required to pass satisfactorily some such physical tests. Some argue that the passing of such physical examinations should be a prerequisite qualification for each candidate for President.

As further evidence of the thinking of the people on this subject, I am pleased to quote the following editorial from the Tulsa Daily Tribune of April 30, 1945:

Mr. George Sokolsky is a reporter whose opinions are always respected because he is reliable. Recently he made a very pertinent suggestion that a joint committee of the Congress of the United States and the American Medical Association establish a fixed rule for the official physician attending every President.

In support of this move he suggested that the illness of our late President, Mr. Roosevelt, be studied.

It is a common practice for corporations to require their officers to undergo periodic medical inspection, just as the Army and Navy require regular medical and physical examinations of our officers. We don't want a sick officer to get in the front of battle.

Precisely so with the President of the United States. The people have a right to know the true condition of their President. Above all, they have a right to know the truth, and not be misled by falsehoods, when a President is asking the people to retain him in office.

There never was a political convention in American history like the Democratic Convention in Chicago last summer. The whole concern of that convention was who shall be Vice President? In selecting the Vice President every delegate knew he was selecting the next President.

Although our late President's official physician, Vice Admiral McIntire, assured the delegates and the American people that Mr. Roosevelt was in fine physical condition and fully able to carry the burdens of his high office for another 4-year term, the delegates suspected that Dr. McIntire was not telling the truth. Dr. McIntire was not telling the truth, and now it is completely established that Dr. McIntire knew he was not telling the truth. Dr. McIntire lied to the American people. Not a becoming performance.

Dr. McIntire was a servant of the American people. He was paid by the American people, having taken his oath to be true to the people. Had he been true to his trust, he would have told the people the truth. He knew in midsummer, and in October he knew absolutely, the President could not live more than a matter of weeks after his inauguration.

The American people have a right to know the physical condition of the candidates they are asked to vote for. The suggestion is altogether proper. Congress should provide that a soldier in uniform, acting as the President's physician, must tell the people the truth about the President when he asks the people for another 4 years in office.

McGregor Favors Increase for Postal Employees Under H. R. 3035

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly favor H. R. 3035, a new bill to replace the original measure, H. R. 2071. This legislation grants a permanent increase in pay for postal carriers and clerks and has been long overdue. There is no branch of our Federal Government which has worked harder than this group and additional compensation should be given them by this Congress.

This legislation, in a small way, merely provides tardy recognition for the fine, efficient service rendered by these faithful workers.

I sincerely hope this bill, H. R. 3035, will be speedily enacted into a law.

Food Muddle—How It Grew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

NOTHING CAN BE MORE IMPORTANT TO AMERICA AND TO THE WORLD THAN FOOD—A FEW MONTHS AGO WASHINGTON WAS PROMISING US STUPENDOUS SURPLUSES TO BE—TODAY THE HOUSEWIFE FINDS THE GROCER'S SHELVES ALMOST EMPTY—HERE ARE SOME REASONS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important problem confronting the American people today than the befuddled food situation. We have seen an example of the old adage that "too many cooks spoil the broth." A myriad of governmental agencies, working at cross-purposes and often with more than the usual amount of red tape, have carried us to today's predicament.

The Nation's Business for May carried a very thorough analysis of this situation by that well-known writer, Lawrence Sullivan. His article follows:

FOOD MUDDLE—HOW IT GREW

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

For millions of Americans, 1945 will be a year of belt tightening.

If the weather is favorable, we may have a bumper food crop—the seventh in a row—but even so, there will be barely enough food for our domestic needs, military needs, and relief commitments. Should a severe drought hit the country, a disastrous food shortage could result.

Many basic foods will be short. The supply of most secondary items will be spotty. People will have to take what they can get, and hope their victory gardens will help see them through. Until October we are going to have to accentuate the broccoli.

The consumer recalls that only last summer many foods were taken off the ration list, and point values were reduced on others. Washington anticipated at the time that the war in Europe would be over before Christmas. The air waves crackled with alarms of stupendous food surplusess to be. Congress was asked to set up a price-support revolving fund of $2,000,000,000 to prevent a collapse of farm prices.

That was last summer. The war, of course, did not end before Christmas. This miscalculation is one root of today's food difficulties. O P. A. reports:

"Civilian supplies of meats, sugar, butter, canned fruits and vegetables are at the lowest point since the war began."

As Congress proceeds with its food-shortage inquiry, the consumer finds himself confused by apparently conflicting official figures. So he wants to know, "Is there a food shortage, a food muddle—or a food scandal?" And no wonder.

The Department of Agriculture calculates our food supply for the year as adequate, but does so by a strange statistical device. A missing pound of butter or beef, the Department offsets with a pound of cabbage—and makes the grand totals look encouraging.

"But," the Department's forecasters hasten to point out, "supplies of some of the most popular foods will continue smaller than the average consumption in the pre-war years 1935–39 on a per capita basis."

Those were the lamentable years, Congress notes, when advocates of "the more abundant life" were telling the Nation that one-third of the population was "ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed."

TONS OF POOR NUTRITION

In tonnage (not in nutritional value, understand) the Department's figures show that we will produce 35 percent more food this year than the average for the years 1935-39. Included in this predicted tonnage are tremendous increases in cabbage, kale, carrots, peanuts, and soybeans. This increase in total farm production as compared with the pre-war years thus vindicates, as it were, the Government's various price-support programs. But the same official report tells us:

"Supplies of all meats, chicken, butter, lard, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry beans, some fresh vegetables, deciduous fruits, and sugar probably will be reduced from the 1944 levels."

In butter, for example, civilians will get an estimated 10.5 pounds per capita compared with 16.7 pounds per year in the 5 pre-war years.

Civilian supplies of beef are estimated at 52 pounds per capita this year against a prewar average of 54.8 pounds; total milk, 770 pounds against 801; total fats and oils, including butter, 41.9 pounds against 48; sugar, 78 pounds against 96.5.

The Department of Agriculture knows you cannot substitute peanuts and spinach for beefsteak and butter. So, in its official outlook report, it warns:

"When the quantities of food expected to be available to civilians in 1945 are translated in nutritive value, the number of calories appears to be down about 4 percent from 1944."

Here is one small instance of how guessing wrong about the war's end affected the food situation: In the spring of '44—on the expectation that the fighting in Europe would be over that year—the War Food Administration signaled United States farmers to curtail hog production 20 percent. When the figures were in, it turned out that the reduction was actually about 34 percent, leaving us with plenty of hog feed but not enough hogs.

This illustrates, incidentally, what can happen when price is eliminated as the controller of supply. The parity technicians in Washington may hit the supply-demand squarely on the nose, but cannot persuade the farmers or the hogs to go by slide-rule calculations.

The principal factor in muddling our food problem, however, was not the wrong guess about when the European war would end, but was—and still is—short-sighted management and lack of coordination on the part of the various Federal agencies which are supposed to be responsible for the production and distribution of the Nation's food.

Take a look at the War Food Administration, by way of example. Because of its tremendous inventories, W. F. A. sometimes holds great stores of food until it is unfit for human consumption. In January of this year, Food Administrator Marvin Jones announced the release of 20,000,000 pounds of off-condition prime steam lard. The entire consignment went to soap manufacturers.

This release of spoiled lard was announced January 17. Next day, O. P. A. ordered the resumption of lard rationing at retail, effective January 22. Lard had been removed from the ration list as of March 3, 1944. It was returned to the ration list due to increased military and export commitments. Since January the Government has been virtually commandeering about 60 percent of all lard production, leaving only about 40 percent for civilian needs.

Congress has found it difficult to get at the official truth concerning food stock piles and spoilage. W. F. A. reported, February 25, 1944, that it had on hand only 380,873 pounds of food in storage since 1941, or earlier. But an on-the-spot survey by the Warehouse Inspection Division between January and April 1944 "discovered a total of 28,619,710 pounds of various food products that were packed or entered in storage in 1941"—more than 75 times as much as W. F. A. reported in February.

"This situation," the Mead committee informed the Senate, "indicates, first, that records on food stocks were incomplete and inaccurate; second, that sufficient care was not taken to use older stocks first; third, that more food had been purchased than was needed."

INVENTORIES SLIGHTLY REDUCED

Following this sharp criticism from the Senate, W. F. A. revised its inventory system, reducing total stocks from $852,000,000 in April 1943 to $477,000,000 on December 1, 1944. Of this latter figure, however, the committee found "35 percent, or $168,000,000, represents shell, dried and frozen eggs." This inventory of 504,000,000 dozen was equal to about 48 eggs for every person in the country.

Most of these eggs were acquired in the Government's price-support program. In powdered eggs alone, as of December 1944 the Mead committee reported a supply on hand "sufficient for about 18 months for the Army and for all our allies."

By overpricing eggs in relation to other farm products, the Government is calling out millions of dozens more eggs every month than it can dispose of under lend-lease. At the same time, chickens are underpriced in relation to eggs, and W. F. A. now has commandeered all chicken meat offered, both fresh and canned, to supply basic military requisitions.

Another example: February 17, W. F. A. increased the Goverment set-aside on canned orange juice from 30 percent to 56 percent; but, March 12, another section of W. F. A. offered for sale 11,566 cases of 1943 pack orange juice, "the balance of a larger amount previously offered for sale."

This is a specific instance of Government clearance of 2-year-old surplus food items, to make way for even larger requisitions on the new pack. It shows how faulty management perpetuates food shortages—by carrying them over from year to year as W. F. A. inventory.

Other surplus food items offered for sale by W. F. A. in February and March this year included: 728,850 cases of canned peas from the '42 and '43 packs; 100,000 cases of evaporated milk packed in '42; 46,139 cases of pork and beans from the '42 pack; 10,000,000 pounds of frozen eggs; 400,000 cases of green beans packed in '42; 2,778 cases of fancy-grade tomato juice from the '42 pack; 15,600 cases of canned tomatoes from the '41, '42, and '43 packs; 1,523,797 pounds of shortening.

When Congress demanded an itemized inventory of W. F. A. stocks, it learned that as of December 12, 1944, Government storehouses still held 12,858,339 pounds of canned and dried foods from the '41 crop. The items had been continuously in Government storage for 3 years.

As of the same date, combined Government holdings of '42 packs were 57,000,000 pounds, plus 325,000,000 pounds still on hand from the '43 pack—when the '44 pack already had been completed. The report also disclosed 400,000 cases of evaporated milk purchased in 1941 and still in Government storage, "unfit for human consumption."

On the floor of the House on March 21, Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, pointed out:

"W. F. A. has been trying since last December to dispose of 9,600,000 No. 2 cans of string beans of the '42 and '43 packs. Meanwhile, a No. 2 can of string beans is still rationed at 10 blue points a can. * * * There are some things about this food situation which smell worse than spoiled tomatoes, rancid lard, and carloads of rotten potatoes."

March 12, W. F. A. offered for sale 217,360 pounds of dried whole milk "stored in Philadelphia." The next day, W. F. A. increased the set-aside on spray process dried milk from 50 to 75 percent of production for April and May. Here's surplus milk in Government storage at Philadelphia and a simultaneous shortage in Washington.

Without going further, it is apparent that W. F. A. has made mistakes. Under pressure of wartime, that could happen in any Government agency, and is to be expected.

The trouble is, however, that in the food field we have no real program. There has never been in Washington anyone with authority to map such a program and see it through.

Instead of having one responsible agency with a definite aim—making occasional mistakes as it goes along, and being in a position to correct its mistakes, always keeping in mind the ultimate goal—we have nine agencies working at cross purposes in an attempt to guide our production and distribution of food:

1. The Department of Agriculture still administers basic production aids, through county agents and local crop-adjustment committees.

2. The War Food Administration allocates all basic foods between civilian, military, and lend-lease claims.

3. The Commodity Credit Corporation finances all Government price-support programs, stores surplus holdings, estimates annual requirements.

4. The Defense Supplies Corporation administers distribution subsidies on butter, flour, meats, sugar, and several lesser commodities.

5. The Foreign Economic Administration handles all lend-lease transactions.

LEND-LEASE GROCERY BASKET

In January our lend-lease shipments of food were equivalent to a month's supply at American standards for 6,500,000 persons. January's lend-lease shipments were 597,600,000 pounds compared with 391,000,000 pounds in December 1944.

Some of the major items in the lend-lease food total for January:

	Pounds
Butter and milk products	65,103,955
Meats	185,539,241
Fats and oils	36,577,906
Fruits and vegetables	65,243,350
Grain products	157,601,186
Sugar	55,795,508
Food specialties	24,467,973
Cigarettes	731,124

In addition to lend-lease shipments we also consigned foods abroad through U. N. R. R. A., the American Red Cross, and other relief organizations. Other consignments from W. F. A. stocks went to Alaska, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the British Colony Mission in Washington, the Netherlands Purchasing Commission, Greek War Relief, and the Rubber Reserve Corporation. None of these items is included in the published lend-lease totals.

6. The Office of Price Administration fixes wholesale and retail ceilings but is without authority to hold basic farm prices within its retail ceilings.

7. The War Production Board allocates fertilizers and basic materials for farm machinery, trucks, and equipment, but has no control over the type of production which may be called for with the machinery made available.

8. The War Manpower Commission and Selective Service have full authority over farm manpower, the crux of the production problem.

9. Finally, Rural Resettlement Administration and Rural Electrification Authority are fussing around the fringes of every farm-production problem.

In addition, through special treaty arrangements, the State Department has a voice in fixing our annual supply of sugar and coffee.

When the war came a demand arose for a centralized food administration to bring together all aspects of national food management. A War Food Administration was created by Presidential executive order early in 1942, but that agency has been through reorganization upheavals four times in 3 years.

Never has there been a central agency to say—

"Next year we will need so much food. We shall get it by this production, plus these imports; with this much fertilizer, so much farm machinery, so many trucks, and this much manpower."

In 1944, the Department of Agriculture estimates, 21 percent of our food production was diverted from normal civilian channels. In round numbers, 90 percent of our population got about 79 percent of the food supply. Our military forces got 14 percent, and the remaining 7 percent went to lend-lease and other exports.

This year, military needs are considerably larger, first because we are feeding about 1,000,000 more prisoners of war; second, because food shipments are increasing weekly to provide subsistence diets in the liberated areas; third, because we are building up food stock piles for expanded operations in the Pacific.

In the face of these increasing overseas demands, our food production is smaller this year than last, limited sharply by manpower, farm machinery, and fertilizers. Distribution is restricted by transportation difficulties, a shortage of farm trucks, and maladjustments in O. P. A. ceiling prices.

Facing the most critical planting season of the entire war, United States farmers began 1945 with less labor than at any time since the Department of Agriculture began keeping these records, 21 years ago. Total farm employment in March was reported at 8,400,000, including all family workers—many of them older men and women—about 150,000 fewer than a year earlier, and about 2,000,000 below the pre-war average.

REPAIR PARTS SCARCE AT HOME

Next to manpower, machinery, and fertilizers, trucks are the farmer's biggest headache. Because repair parts are hard to get, a disabled truck may be out of service 4 to 6 weeks. W. P. B. reports that, since auto rationing began, March 9, 1942, only 375,401 trucks have been released for civilian allocation here at home. Farmers, of course, got only a few of these. In the same 3 years, 1942–44, Foreign Economic Administration reported lend-lease shipments of 355,059 trucks to Russia alone. Several hundred thousand additional trucks went to Great Britain, France, Australia, India, China, and Africa.

Moving from the fields of primary production, we encounter a new set of Government-made bottlenecks in food distribution, principally because of artificial price dislocations flowing from conflicting Federal orders.

As compared with August 1939, average food prices to city consumers had advanced 46 percent by February this year. Government price-support programs have hiked all farm prices, while O. P. A. ceilings have sought to hold the 1942 line at the retail outlet. Between these two policies, food processors and distributors have been caught in a vise of steadily diminishing operating margins.

Dairy industry net earnings dropped from 3.5 percent of sales in 1939 to 2.2 percent in 1943. So it went with meat packers, flour millers, canners, bakers, confectioners, coffee roasters, and sugar refiners.

These are the principal reasons the Department of Labor finds basic foods increasingly scarce in the grocery stores and butcher shops. Housewives now must spend hours trudging from store to store to find the particular item needed.

The Labor Department checks once a month on the availability of 24 food staples in 56 cities. As of January 16, it found 34 percent of the stores without beefsteaks and roasts, against 24 percent in December; 56 percent had no veal, compared with 33 percent in December; 36 percent were out of shortening, against 13 percent in December.

For the country as a whole, 18 percent of the stores had no sugar, but in New York 33 percent were without this item. In San Francisco, 83 percent were without bacon, 81 percent without veal, and 65 percent without shortening.

For all cities, 35 percent of the stores were out of butter, but in New York the "no butter today" sign was displayed by 53 percent of the stores, and in Boston by 52 percent.

If you can't find beef, remember all packers now are required to set aside for Government account 70 percent of their utility-grade beef for canning. Prior to February the set-aside requirement on this item was 50 percent.

All beef graded "choice" or "good" must be held by the packing plant until Government buyers make their purchases. The Government serves notice it may buy up to 60 percent of the slaughter in these preferred grades. But in no event may the packer offer such beef for sale until Government procurement agencies have made their bids. This regulation has the effect of withdrawing from the market the entire production of choice and good beef, although 40 percent later may be released to civilian channels.

AMPLE SUPPLY—A SCARCITY

Potatoes went under Government control January 31. War Food Order 120 prohibits shipments of potatoes from the principal production areas except "under permits issued by W. F. A." Only those cars the Government rejects are released to civilians.

By all previous experience, our potato supply was ample. But growing shortages of other food threw an extraordinary demand on the potato market, and this unanticipated consumption was tending "to divert seed potatoes away from planting areas."

Fruit canners now must set aside about 60 percent of their total pack for Government account, and vegetable canners must hold 48 percent for W. F. A. orders. Regulations cover 13 major fruits and 15 major vegetable packs.

In other words, about half the new-pack canned goods is to be withdrawn from the market before the 125,000,000 civilian population gets even a chance to "cash" its ration coupons.

The butter set-aside for April was 40 percent, and for May is 55 percent of total production, against 20 for February and 25 for March.

March 10 W. F. A. increased the set-aside on rice from 60 percent to 100 for the balance of the present crop year.

March 15 an Associated Press dispatch reported Moscow looking forward to the "best spring and summer season of the war."

"The best news in many months," this report continued, "is a second reduction in prices in Russia's commercial food stores, where you can buy unrationed quantities of everything from filet mignon to day-old eggs.

"The finest cut of beef have been reduced by 15 percent, pork 18 percent, mutton 16 percent, and salt pork 14 percent. Bacon and chicken remain the same, but turkey is down 11 percent and goose 9 percent.

"Butter has been reduced 25 percent, cheese is cheaper by about 10 percent, and chocolate—which Russians love so well—is down 18 percent."

Will Congress find out why United States rationed food items are becoming cheaper in Moscow, while still going up at home—when they are to be had at all?

A pinch in food was bound to develop as the war dragged on, but lack of coordination and hit-or-miss controls have made our situation immeasurably worse.

So far as one may judge the present temper of Capitol Hill, the time has come to do something about it.

An Unpaid Account

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Rev. Charles J. Chwalek, delivered over Station WTHT, Hartford, Conn., as a feature of the Knights of Columbus hour, Hartford council, on April 17, 1945:

Fellow Americans, the Polish question is not, as many people imagine, a closed chapter in European history, nor is it a mere subject for sentimental attention of idealists. It happens to be a substantial actuality from which our eyes would hardly be averted if it significance were understood.

It is my intention this evening to lead our listeners to the half-closed casket of murdered Poland, and there in silence meditate over the remains of the innocent victim, who this time was sacrificed by her friends. There as we stand we cannot help bu hear that pitiful, smothered voice calling from amongst the dying, for Poland is not dead, it's only that the mighty of the day are trying to bury her alive. Her land is divided, the starving and suffering children dispersed over the entire universe, but her spirit lives on, much to everybody's surprise, as it was once said, I quote: "It is impossible to kill a people that has the will to live."—Unquote.

COMPLETE DESTRUCTION OF POLAND

Poland today is a cemetery. Look, here's a mound of corpses half covered, the torn limbs protruding are those of innocent Polish women and children. Over there is a cemetery containing the 10,000 bodies of Polish officers murdered in cold blood by the one who today calls himself a friend of the Polish people. From the east to west, west to east, war's bloody scythe mowed and mowed again. Finally today 20,000,000 Polish workmen, women, and children gnaw roots and the bark of trees. They shiver in caves, swamps, and thickets, because the so-called liberator absolutely forbade the Allies to send relief into Poland. To this very day not a single ounce of food, not a stitch of clothing is allowed into Russo-occupied Poland from the abundant resources of the United Nations Relief storehouse, because Russia, the so-called friend of Poland, does not desire it. That is a fact admitted by the United Nations Relief authorities in Washington.

Down on her knees, suppliant Poland raises her voice in the words of the prophet, I quote: "Hear, I pray you, all ye people, and see my sorrow; my virgins and my young men are gone into captivity. I called for my friends but they deceived me." (Lamentations I: 18–19.)

VOICE OF THE DYING

Why is it, she pleads, that the sad pages of my history repeat themselves and only the aggressors change their roles? Asia and Germany, as in the past, play with me the selfsame game. Seven hundred years ago Mongolian Asia marched against me—I was abandoned on the battlefields of Lignica—and then Germany merely stood by to watch my agony. Today, while I bled against Germany, Asiatic Russia stood by and abandoned my brave warriors on the streets of Warsaw. Now I starve, and she refuses to give me a helping hand. Yet before I breathe my last I shall plant my banner deep into the ground and tell the entire world it matter not that I perish, let my banner at least wave victoriously. That banner emblazoned with the unstained feathers of the White Eagle above which dominates the Holy Cross, is fittingly the emblem of Christ the King, and remains unstained except with the blood of my brave children.

From the immense tomb that is my land, the hand of my defenders stretches forth in an oath, "Unto death, for the rights for the temple, for the city, for the nation, and its citizens." (II Mach. XIII:14.) I have fought for Christian principles without ostentation because they are engraved deeply in the hearts of all my children from earliest childhood.

But now the powers that guide the destinies of humanity in this age have scrapped

those principles at the last conference in the Crimea; to them these principles are nonexistent—so now I present another bill, a debt to be paid, a compensation owed to my humanity.

This is what I contributed to the Allied war effort—who is going to repay me? This bill as prepared by the Polish underground reads as follows: First to fight, Poland as a nation has, on the basis of population figures, suffered more terrible losses than any other of the United Nations.

More than 28 percent of the population of Poland, some 10,000,000 persons in a country whose pre-war census showed 35,000,000, have been killed, deported, or have fallen on the field of battle.

Military losses total 1,045,000 casualties. During the September 1939 campaign in Poland, the Polish armed forces suffered 831,000 casualties, including 220,000 killed and wounded, 420,000 prisoners taken to camps in the Reich, 181,000 prisoners taken by the Russians, and the remainder interned in several countries at that time neutral.

Since then, in the Norwegian and French campaigns of 1940, the Libyan campaign of 1941–42, the Italian campaign of 1944, and on the western front, up to December 31, 1944, the Polish Army has lost more than 32,000 men killed, wounded, or missing.

HOME ARMY LOSSES

Casualties of the Polish Home Army that has been recognized by the United States and Great Britain as an integral part of the Polish armed forces with full belligerent status, total more than 180,000 killed, wounded, or missing. This figure includes losses suffered by the Home Army during the 63-day battle of Warsaw in 1944. In that insurrection alone more than 250,000 troops and civilians were casualties.

CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

Of the 9,000,000 civilian casualties suffered by Poland, 5,000,000, that is, 14 percent of the population, were killed, starved, or perished in concentration camps. Approximately 3,000,000 of this number were Jews, exterminated in the notorious German lethal and torture chambers and death camps. The German practice of taking first 5, later 100, Polish hostages for every German victim of the Polish underground accounts in part for these high figures. The 2,000,000 Poles—men, women, and children—met death in mass round-ups or were executed as hostages in concentration camps or prisons, or merely starved to death. Many, too, paid with their lives for participating in the underground or by resisting the Germans in some way or another.

Still others were killed in punitive expeditions staged by the enemy in the guise of retaliatory measures. Such expeditions were carried out against 800 Polish villages, of which 300 had been totally destroyed and all of their occupants murdered.

More than 3,000,000 Poles have been deported to Germany since Poland was occupied in 1939, including able-bodied men, women, and children taken for slave labor, or men forcibly drafted into the Wehrmacht.

Poles deported to Russia total about 1,250,000, of whom some 150,000 men, women, and children have been evacuated after the Polish-Russian pact of July 1941. About 150,000 men were drafted into the Red Army. Some 270,000 perished in the Soviet Union, while another 662,000 Poles taken to Russia are still unaccounted for.

ECONOMIC LOSSES

Polish economic losses have been equally tragic. In order to make room for German colonists and to incorporate various territories into the Reich, the Germans had deported some 1,500,000 Poles from the western provinces into the former Government General, while an additional 200,000 Poles were deported from the vicinities of Lublin and Zamose.

The actual deportation was carried out in the most brutal manner possible. The Poles were not given time to prepare nor were they allowed to take anything with them save a few valueless personal articles.

Besides this, the population of the Government General itself was constantly being shifted about. Almost one-third of the Polish population had to leave their homes at some time or another during this war. In their place the Germans imported some 1,000,000 German colonists.

The basis of German economic policy in Poland from the very moment of occupation was that both Polish state and private property, as well as the entire Polish economy and means of production and manufacture, were at the disposal of the Herrenvolk. The total economic loss suffered by Poland as a result of German occupation is inestimable, running into billions of dollars.

Thus has Poland suffered in contributing her full measure to the Allied war effort. It is imperative that the world realize this so that the greatest sacrifice in her history will not have been made in vain by Poland.

VE-Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered on VE-day by our former colleague, Hon. William L. Nelson, of Missouri, for two decades a Member of Congress and, at the time of his service in the House, a member of the powerful Committee on Rules. This stirring address was delivered on VE-day before the Kiwanis Club of Columbia, Mo.:

We have made the first hurdle on the highway that leads from a Hitler hell to a happier haven. For this we thank the Father in Heaven.

The observance of VE-day is not a time for dancing in the street. Nor is it a time for minimizing the matchless work of our fighting forces. It is a time for dedication, not dissipation; for gladness, not gaiety; happiness, not hilarity.

As we give thanks to the Commander in Chief of all armies and all navies that fight for right, we must not fail to ask His help in the days that lie ahead. The whole war has not been won. There must be no letdown until the last Jap has been rendered impotent, whether this means alive or dead. For Japan, as for Germany, there must be an uncompromising, unconditional end. The last of the gangsters must go.

Only a few years ago—but to some it seems as centuries—Siamese Satans, in Europe, entered upon careers of conquest. The people were taken up on high mountains and shown lands to loot. Coerced or convinced, they became as putty in the hands of the potter. It mattered not that the plan meant mountains of human skulls, oceans of blood, and rivers of tears.

Of course, the people should have known better. It was written in the Book, "Pride goeth before destruction," and "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." But the Book they banned or burned.

Today the whole world knows that nations which specialize in waging wars can no longer win wars. Wars are won by men who hate war, but who dare die so that their loved ones may live.

The house that Hitler built became a house of carnage. Mussolini lay dead in the dust. Joined together in sin and shame and in the untold suffering that they inflicted, these twins of terror—if actually both are dead—may together now be crawling upward, as crawl they must from the depths to which they had descended, to enter the pit of eternal punishment.

Almost on the same date that the fighters for freedom met in the heart of what had been Germany, the swaggering, breast-beating Mussolini met his deserved death. The Allied troops had traveled far and long, traveled a total of 2,300 miles, the Russians from the foothills of the Caucasus, from which they started in 1942, and the Americans and British, journeying since last June, from the flooded beaches of Normandy.

Then came May Day and the report that Hitler, proclaimed by his successor as "one of the greatest heroes of German history," was dead. How appropriate was the date. On every May Day since the beginning of his dictatorship this man, who in his craving for might became a mass murderer, each year had harangued his hordes. On Tempelhof airfield bordering Berlin he each year ordered a million or more of his subjects to assemble and cheer his speeches. It was on this field, with its "faceless sea of faces," that there was born the German mass man, and there the individual died.

Largely as a result of his philosophy Hitler lived to see Germany insolvent, lived to prove that the business of aggression leads to national bankruptcy, leads to the loss of all that is best. In the end he willed more than a Wagnerian holocaust. He saw Germany, "a fabric woven through the centuries and knit together under Bismarck," torn to shreds. Now, for world safety, we know that there must be no return of the ravelings.

Let the man who says "there have always been wars and there will always be wars" learn his lesson from Germany as she came to be under the heel of Hitler.

There was a Germany of great capital wealth, of stalwart men and women, of learning and culture. Great once was the glory of Germany. Today, weak and wrecked in a war of her own making, nobody fears her military might. She invested all in war and lost all. "In every asset that makes for civilization she is insolvent." She gave all not for a mess of pottage but for a post of personal power.

If Germany, once so strong in most that makes for national strength, was able to do no more than prove the futility of waging aggressive wars, surely there is a lesson worthy to be learned by the whole world.

I repeat that today we do not fear the military might of Germany. Complete and crushing has been her defeat.

The Nazi war machine is wrecked, but from the land that Hitler ruled and ruined there comes a threat greater than that of physical force. I refer to what has been described as "the power of an idea conceived in hell and gestated with fiendish genius." It was such a power that caused this most destructive war in all history.

Hitler may be dead. It matters little. His teachings, his philosophy, still live in the minds of millions of misguided German youth whose lives have been shaped in the Hitler mold.

I might compare the Germany of today and our own beloved America, but for purposes of comparison there must be two objects. There

is an America. There was a Germany. So I suggest that we contrast the lives of two Germans, one a musician, the other a busy nobody.

Beethoven lived in Bonn until he was 21. He then went to Vienna. At the same age, but 150 years later, a paper hanger and unsuccessful art student left Vienna in disgust to make a start in Munich. His name was Hitler. History tells that there were bitter movements and angry moments in Beethoven's life, but these were, as a priceless gift to the world, translated into the Ninth Symphony. In the other case there followed, from the nightmare of a madman, not a symphony, but suffering and shame.

All wars are terrible. This one has been especially tough. More tough fighting must come before the Jap serpent that struck at Pearl Harbor has been beheaded. There should follow a tough peace.

If any sympathy is to be shown, let it be not for those who started this war, but for those who are stopping it. This is no time for sniveling softness for the foe; no time for condoning the cruelty suffered by men, women, and children in Nazi prison camps; no time for suggesting that the awful atrocities, the fiendish, brutal, and inhuman treatment as reported and now known to be true represents the exception rather than the rule. Let the truth, the whole truth, be told.

I would be derelict of duty if I did not refer to a class, not "F. F. V.'s," once the proud title of "first families of Virginia," but "F. F.'s," short for faultfinders. We had them after World War No. 1. We will have them after World War No. 2. Even now, with but one part of the war won and with the peace problem yet to be solved, fault is found. After total victory, after there is safety and security—as with the convalescent patient, when the doctor is no longer needed—there will follow a more pronounced peevish period. Criticism of those who risked most and gave most will increase. It will be said of the returning veteran that he expects too much, that he demands more than his just deserts. When you hear an F. F. making such charges ask him what his charge would have been to take the veteran's place in battle. Ask him just that and don't be mealy-mouthed about it.

We owe to the men and women of this war, to them and their loved ones, more than we can ever pay. Mere money for veterans is not enough.

In the present war, as in no other, mine sweepers have played a necessary part in making the seas safe. In the post-war period there will be need, even greater need, for mind sweepers. These the Government cannot supply. So you and I must. With these mind sweepers there must be swept out terrible impressions such as war puts in—the cries and moans of wounded and anguished men, the sight and smell of unburied bodies, the memories of cruel hand-to-hand combat, the indescribable loneliness of a night vigil in some far-away place amid strange surroundings.

Yes; there is a call for mind sweepers right now as we think on VE-day. Some of the men—boys no longer—are coming home. To delay in providing all help, including guidance (they do not want sympathy, in the usual sense) will mean "too little and too late."

On an old sundial near Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore I have paused to read and reflect on these words:

"One hour alone is in thy hands,
The hour on which the shadow stands."

And in the Bible we read, "Lift up now thine eyes from the place where thou art. Lift up now thine eyes." When called, the men in service did not delay. We should not.

In this connection, I digress to congratulate Columbia and Boone County on the commendable movement to provide a veterans' information and service center in our city.

With but one war won—and there are two—many of our best youth have died, and their dreams—dreams of homes of their own, of returning to their loved ones, of living in a better world which they had helped to make—died with them.

Mothers and fathers, particularly those whose sons sleep overseas or whose bodies are buried in the waters of the deep, know much of the cost of war. Their sons walked with death, fought and fell in far strange places that we and their loved ones might live.

"They lived with us, who rest so far from home, and in the dawning they will be close to us."

As we keep the spirit of VE-day we realize that while we may reach the peaks of national joy we cannot plumb the depths of individual sorrow. The great tragedies are not world calamities, but happenings in our own homes. We want wars to end, want to see all battle flags furled in a "parliament of man, a federation of the world," so that our children and our children's children may be safe.

It is with this hope that we look to the Conference now convened in California, on the shores of the Pacific, a name for peace. This Conference has been referred to as "the loom of peace." Of it there has been written, "Here on the loom of God's will and understanding there may be woven a wonderful new world." With this hope in our hearts there is cause for encouragement, but throughout there must be greatness and the presence of God.

Since World War No. 1, we as a people have suffered much and learned much. We know that isolation is dead, gone as is distance. Whether we like it or not, we are neighbors to the whole world. Your address, as is mine, is no longer Main Street, U. S. A. We live at the crossroads of the continents.

We have learned in the school of bitter experience that any effective program calling for enduring peace must be predicated upon both justice and power. As Pascal put it, "Power without justice is tyranny. Justice without power is meaningless."

It is well that the conference in California, called at the time and place suggested by one who gave his life for peace, should be held while the forge of war is hot enough to weld the nations. With the stress and strain of war still on, despite this VE-day, the unity of the purpose of the power of the people has not been lost.

As we thank God for victory in Europe, as we work for victory in the far Pacific, and pray for peace the wide world over, we remember the men and women in uniform. We shall be grateful to them so long as men plow and plant, so long as the passing years blossom roselike from the thorny stem of time, so long as church spires point to the common heaven of the Christian's God, so long as heroism is honored and courage commended, so long as childhood brings cheer and motherhood has meaning, so long as unfailing forces hold the waters of the sea to the shore.

As we, members of the Columbia Kiwanis Club, a body of builders, consider the meaning of VE-day, we firmly resolve that a way must be found to prevent war, all wars. Proudly and with thanksgiving, but with some grief, we read the more than 5,000 names on our Boone County service board, some of them studded with stars and inscribed on the scroll eternal. Then, looking to the Prince of Peace, we pray that there may be built, on the sacrifices of America's sons and daughters, a monument in the form of enduring peace, strong enough to equal their valor.

Such is the meaning of VE-day to you and to me.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered from San Francisco on May 9 by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, dealing with the work of the San Francisco Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am speaking to you tonight from the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Why are we here? We, the representatives of the United Nations, are gathered here in response to anguished cries from every stricken land, from every home from which a gallant son has poured out a hero's blood, from the heart of every mother who has suffered for her loved ones—anguished cries that war shall be banished and security shall be established.

VE-day is here. The wicked power of Nazi Germany has been broken. Victory has rewarded the heroic struggle of the United Nations. The success of the Conference has become even more imperative than before. Our valiant soldiers have purchased with their blood the right to live in a peaceful world. This time we must not fail.

The United Nations are assembled here with high hope and determination to erect an international organization which will be strong enough to outlaw war and to help bring about those conditions in the world necessary for a just and durable peace.

The Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration, the Moscow Declaration in which Secretary Hull participated, and the results of the Conference at Cairo, Tehran, and the Crimea together constitute a magnificent background for the charter we propose to draft here. They express the hopes and aspirations of the United Nations. They reflect the noble purposes and high objectives which we have in mind.

The international organization which is envisaged will include a General Assembly in which the smallest and weakest state will have equal representation with the mightiest and strongest. The Assembly will serve as a democratic world forum and center for the discussion of matters whatever their origin, that may relate to international peace and security.

The Security Council will be endowed with wide authority in the settlement of international disputes. It may employ sanctions, both of an economic and military character, if such action becomes necessary for the maintenance of world peace. However, this is a peace organization and before sanctions can be employed, recommendations shall be made to the parties to settle their differences by negotiation, diplomacy, conciliation, or arbitration; to maintain the processes of peace and not to employ the arbitrary measures of armed force until all other remedies have failed.

Here, in a nutshell, is the essential difference between the old League of Nations and the new organization. At San Francisco we propose to combine might and right by

creating an international organization strong enough to keep the peace. The League of Nations could not go that far. It could recommend, it could propose, it could suggest, but it was not able to take effective action to stamp out aggression.

The organization will also establish a number of commissions which will aid in the solution of international social, economic, cultural, and humanitarian problems and will promote regard for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This work is second in importance only to the task of keeping the peace. For no matter how carefully we build the machinery for the settlement of disputes, that machinery will fail unless the nations of the world also take steps to root out the basic causes of war.

Ample provision will be made for amending the charter or, if the need should arise, for calling a special conference of the signatory powers for a reconsideration of the entire document. Clearly, the charter must be flexible enough to enable the new organization to function smoothly in a rapidly changing world.

The Conference has now been in session 2 weeks. All things considered, a splendid beginning has been made. As a member of the United States delegation, I am glad to advise the people of our country that the Conference has been effectively organized and has already made great progress toward the successful conclusion of its work under the leadership of Secretary of State Stettinius. We are seeking to carry on the policies of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and Secretary Hull. Secretary Stettinius has served with distinction as chairman of the delegation, co-president of the Conference, and chairman of the important steering and executive committees.

The Conference has now reached the point where the commissions and committees have begun their work on the amendments which have been offered to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. We face a tremendous task in considering the hundreds of amendments that have already been proposed. They must receive detailed consideration, first in the committees, then in the commissions, and finally in the plenary sessions.

Members of the United States delegation have been assigned to membership on all four important commissions and on the respective committees of the commissions. It will thus be possible for the delegation to keep in close touch with all developments and to have a voice in the discussion of all proposals advanced at the Conference.

You have probably read in your newspapers reports of disagreements and so-called controversies at San Francisco.

The nations are not yet wholly united on the question of trusteeships; certain points remain to be settled. The vote on the seating of Argentina was not unanimous, but the decision was reached by the democratic method of discussion and a vote which cleared the way for the real work of the Conference. That, to my mind, was what counted most in this matter.

Of course, there have been divergencies of view. That, however, is not a sign of weakness but rather an evidence of strength and of wholehearted effort by the frank exchange of views to reach final agreement upon important questions. When the Constitution of the United States was drafted, there were many disagreements and many different interests that had to be harmonized. Yet there was final agreement upon the great document which has served us so long and so well.

Here at San Francisco the disagreements which have occurred have been far less important and far less numerous than the agreements which have already been reached. From the point of view of the success of the Conference and the long-range security of the United States and unanimous agreement of the four sponsoring powers upon their amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is infinitely more important than all the minor disagreements put together. These amendments go to the heart of a successful world organization and the fact that we could reach agreement upon them in the short space of 2½ days of intensive discussion offers great promise for the success of the Conference.

This concerted action on the part of the sponsoring powers by no means excludes other nations from offering their amendments. Indeed, many such amendments have already been offered, and they will be given equal consideration with those of the sponsoring governments.

One of the most important matters still to be settled is the vital subject of international trusteeship for certain territories. The proposals of our delegation have already been made public and are well known to you.

Suffice it to say, I believe the system proposed by our delegation holds great promise for the development and progress of the peoples of dependent areas. Furthermore, it would afford full protection for American rights and make adequate provision for American security. It must be emphasized, however, that we are here dealing only with the machinery for trusteeship. No consideration will be given at this Conference to specific territories which are to be placed under the system. That will be left for future arrangements. We have already made considerable progress in our discussions with other delegations on this subject.

Let me repeat that the United States delegation is acting as a unit and in complete harmony. This does not mean that there is any suppression within the delegation of individual opinions or of points of view. Questions arising are thoroughly and fully discussed and when the delegation comes to a decision with respect to a particular problem it acts as a unit on it.

We must bear in mind that the Conference is composed of almost 50 nations—nations which speak different languages and have different historical backgrounds. It cannot be expected that instantaneously they would all be of the same mind upon fundamental questions. This Conference is a great assembly. It is among the greatest that has ever assembled on the planet. Its possibilities for good are immeasurable. Its failure would be tragic to the welfare of the world. Here on the anvil of discussion must be hammered out of the final questions which we must decide. Here must be kept in clear perspective the sublime objectives which we have in mind. We must not allow individual preferences or jealousies or any similar considerations to divert us from reaching agreement upon the basic and fundamental things which we seek to achieve.

We must keep in mind the experience of the League of Nations. We recall the tragic failure of the great and lamented Woodrow Wilson to attain his dream of world order through collective security. Though the League in some respects failed, its experience helps to lighten the pathway toward a greater and stronger world organization. Wherever its weaknesses appear we have a warning signal. Wherever its successes are seen we find encouragement. The very fact that it may have failed can only increase our determination to build a world organization that will not fail.

The charter which will be adopted at San Francisco, in order to secure vitality, must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. Our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, realized that senatorial approval was an important constitutional obligation which could not be ignored. He placed upon the United States delegation Members of the Senate and of the House without partisan discrimination or political advantage. This is not a domestic political problem. It is an American problem affecting every citizen under our flag. Every farm, every factory, every business, every home in the land is affected. Its success is more important than that of any political party. It rises above the political fortunes of any individual. It lifts its head among the sublime things that affect human lives and human happiness by bringing peace and security and goodwill.

The necessity to secure Senate ratification is one of the chief concerns of the United States Delegation. The resolution of the Senate adopted in 1943 favoring participation in an international organization for peace was an important step in this direction. We are exerting every effort to reach agreement on a world organization which will meet with Senate approval. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, I am deeply desirous and highly hopeful that the Delegation may be successful in its purpose. Senator VANDENBERG and I shall have a heavy responsibility in carrying back to the Senate an instrument which we can endorse and which we can submit to the Senate with a feeling that it will be approved.

I have endeavored to give you a brief account of the work of the Conference and the activities of the United States delegation. It is devoting earnest and laborious effort to represent the best interests of the United States. It never loses sight of the sublime objective of world peace and security. In approaching that goal it does not neglect our own national rights and interests. It feels that the United States has been singularly blessed by a generous providence. Rich in material resources and possessing tremendous military and naval power, she stands foremost among the nations of the earth. With such a noble heritage we feel that the United States has a great destiny. We feel keenly that our tremendous national power should be employed in the cause of peace rather than in the cause of war. We feel that the United States has a particular duty to civilization to do all within her power to curb aggressors and to crush and overwhelm cruel and savage attacks upon peaceful peoples. Only in peace can nations attain their highest cultural and moral levels. The United States is responding to a clear and urgent call to meet this challenge. We shall answer that challenge for the United States. Rising to her high destiny, the United States will strive to make its contribution to a mighty edifice of peace and security. Let us be the architects of a structure more marvelous than one built of granite and steel. Let us create a temple of law and reason and justice at which the nations of the earth may submit their disputes for peaceful settlement.

We have reached the crossroads. One dark and sinister sign points the way to the old order. Another, bright and shining, directs the traveler to international peace. There is no question which road we must take.

Our Future in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech on the subject Our Future in the Pacific, which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on May 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. I want to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to think with you for a few minutes on a subject of vital importance to you and to me—and to our children and our grandchildren.

That subject is the disposition of the islands which our finest young men are purchasing with their blood in the far reaches of the Pacific. Even as we think on this subject, some American marine, or soldier, or sailor, is dying in battle tonight for islands of which we had never heard before the war.

The subject of our discussion is as close as your son who has gone forth to keep America free; it is as important as his future and the future of millions of other men like him; it is as urgent, in some respects, as the battle he is now fighting.

It is urgent because tonight, in San Francisco, the representatives of our Nation are meeting with the representatives of other nations. Our representatives are helping to determine the future world policy in regard to the islands. We can and should help them to make this policy because they represent us. We can let them know, through letters, through Congress, through editorials, through speeches, that we are supporting them every step of the way, particularly in regard to American possession of these islands.

There is little doubt about what should be our attitude in regard to these islands, I think, although there may be some who wonder whether or not we should keep them. Certainly there is no doubt in the minds of the men who are capturing the islands. They have made it clear that our Nation should keep the islands, if for no other reason than to make sure that other Americans will never die in again attacking the Pacific beachheads which are stained with American blood.

Our future world position, our most immediate concern must be with the control of suitable bases both in the Atlantic Ocean and in the Pacific Ocean. But because our position is more secure in the Atlantic and because the average citizen is more or less familiar with the Atlantic and our needs there, I want to discuss the Pacific area tonight.

We as a nation have suffered much because we had insufficient bases in the Pacific. We have now been fighting for more than 3 years and have not yet reached the mainland of Japan. Had we possessed adequate bases, we would have been able to attack the Japanese on their own mainland long ago—just as we were able to attack Germany using the land of one of our allies as a base.

This war has taught us that the nation with bases is in a powerful position to control the tradeways, the lines of communication, the water routes, and the air routes which course through or about the bases. We have seen that a ring of bases can make an outlying bastion that prevents, or makes costly, the approach of the enemy to the homeland.

These bases are important now, as they will be immediately after the war is over. But in the decades to come they will be far more important, for we are entering the air age. By air Montreal is 300 miles nearer to Liverpool, England, than is New York City. The airplane saves 4,000 miles between Chungking and Washington, D. C. Air travel cuts down distances far beyond what most people think. The enemy may always be near.

Our air lines, which will encircle the globe in peace as in war, will need a strip of land—an atoll, an island, or a coral reef—where they can seek refuge from the storms, repair a broken part, or replenish their depleted fuel.

We need such ports of call everywhere—and especially in the far reaches of the Pacific. More especially do we need them for possible aerial warfare of tomorrow. What we have seen in this war of the work of the deadly bomber is a mild display of military mischief compared to the devastating ruin which may be heaped upon populations in any future war.

If mankind were to be so stupid as to engage in another World War, there would be gigantic bombers that could aim their demolition charges with deadly accuracy to wipe out all the means of a nation's life. Even more terrifying than the battleships of the air may be developments in aerial warfare as characterized by robots and rockets. Robot planes undoubtedly will be developed that can be maneuvered by remote control and be able to strike their target with remarkable precision. Rockets will be so perfected that their power for destruction will be devastating.

The bases to which I am referring, if they were in the hands of an enemy, could be used for giant robot and rocket launching installations to carry demolition charges against us—or any other nation they wish to destroy. We must remember that on these islands could be constructed vast warehouses for supplies, great machine shops for repairs, and extensive military installations of every kind. The nearer these bases are to the country which is to be attacked, the better it is for the attacking power. Therefore, it is essential for us to establish real control over every island territory near our shores.

We usually think of what can be done to our seaboard cities if an enemy with bases nearby should attack us. But now cities do not have to be on the coast to be destroyed. The enemy could point his weapon just as well on inland cities, to our crowded centers and industrial areas. The whole of this continent would be a part of the battle line in any future war.

We have an unwritten pledge to fulfill to those who have suffered and died far from their native land to gain these strategic bits of soil. Shall we forget the 2,000 marines who suffered and bled for Kwajalein? Shall we forget the 3,000 marines who either fell dead or were wounded taking Tarawa? Will we forget the 7,000 Americans who offered their blood for Peleliu? Can we overlook the great sacrifices made for Iwo Jima and Saipan and Okinawa, where the flower of our American youth bled and died that you and I might be free?

All of these islands must be ours. Without any further negotiation except that of the recognition by the other powers, we should become the outright possessors of the Marshalls, the Carolinas, the Palaus, the Marianas, the Bonins and the Ryukyus.

There are those who label such demands as "imperialism." They would have you believe that we are going to keep these islands to exploit the poor natives. Such a thing is not in my mind, as I know it is not in yours. We would not keep these islands because we wish to exploit them. We would not stay there with a whip or a club, but with the honest desire to protect our children's future and to lift the natives to higher standards of life in this rapidly developing world.

Our possession of the Philippines serves as an example of what we would do in all the other islands. We went to the Philippines unwelcomed by the natives and with great misgivings in America. We passed through years of careful administration devoted to the best interests of the peoples of the islands. We suffered indignities, but finally, when we were understood, the great mass of the Philippine population made common cause with us in their own development.

The islands have prospered under our administration. The natives no longer consider themselves subjects of America, as do colonials of other great powers. We have raised them to the dignity of free men—and it was as free men that they fought and died with our soldiers in the long dark years when they were under the heel of the Jap.

Today, there is talk of a trusteeship for the islands we are discussing. What would anyone call our administration of the Philippines? Could any trusteeship have given more to the credit of the trustee than that of the Philippines to its American administration? Yet, we owned the Philippines lock, stock, and barrel. By all the concepts of international law, we had complete title to them and annexed them. They were ours. And yet, there is nothing in colonial history which matches our unselfish stewardship of the interests of the native population.

The cultural, political, and economic advance of the Philippines is what would take place in any territory consigned to our charge. We know it. Every nation knows it.

We have not gone into the Pacific seeking plunder. We have never waged war there as aggressors. We were not animated by love of conquest when we took Guadalcanal and Tarawa and Iwo Jima and Saipan. Our soldiers took those islands as the defenders of humanity. They fought to keep our country on the map of the world and our flag flying.

And we are not seeking to keep the islands to oppress the natives. We are seeking to keep them so that no future aggressor can shackle us and so that we can remain sovereign and free as a nation not for one or two decades, but for all the long years to come. We want to put the shining band of friendship around the globe, so that when our soldiers come back this time, they will know that their comrades did not die in vain.

As momentous as is the present great struggle, just as momentous are the decisions which we must make in the interests of our continued security. I believe we shall not be found wanting in the wisdom which our position and mission in the world demands. Great men in the past secured the heritage we enjoy today. Long ago, we purchased the Louisiana Territory for our southwestern defense. We bought Alaska for the same purpose. We bought the Virgin Islands from Denmark to bolster our defense of the Panama Canal.

We do not envisage conflict with any great people in the Pacific. Our stake in the coming peace is as great as that of any nation. We want to construct a substantial peace organization, but we must protect our own interest in whatever may be the structure of any post-war concert of nations. Our own future demands it.

As the most powerful nation in the world, recognized everywhere as the very central bastion and light of the peace to come, we are entrusted by those who have sacrificed so much, with the inescapable responsibility of safeguarding the future peace by perfecting our strategic position. We have fought for this line of defense and spilled the blood of our best men to secure it. If we abandon it after victory, all history will condemn us as having been unequal to the glorious task of world leadership that is ours today.

Let us think tonight of the men who died for these islands—of those who sleep in unknown graves, whose names are only in the heart of those they loved. And let us resolve that their sacrifice shall not have been in vain.

Milestones on the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Milestones on the Road to Peace," which I delivered on Sunday, May 13, 1945, before the Schley Street Jewish Congregation, of Newark, N. J.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Rabbi Kahan and honored guests, I feel it a very special honor to be your guest speaker here this evening, and I was particularly happy to accept your invitation for two important reasons.

First, I welcome the opportunity for Mrs. Smith and myself to become better acquainted with you all personally. We are happy to meet here with you on this important occasion when you are celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of your synagogue in Newark.

My second reason for wanting to be here is to express to you in person the profound feeling of gratitude I have myself, and I feel all the civilized peoples of the world should have, to the Jewish people who as a race "cradled" the fine spiritual heritage of the world today. At a time when the Roman Empire dominated the world and was teaching the false doctrine of polytheism, your ancestors discovered the profound truth that there was one God—your Jehovah—the same Jehovah who is now the God of all mankind. You gave to the world Moses and the Ten Commandments, but beyond that, you gave to the Christian world the founder of the Christian faith and the Sermon on the Mount.

And now we are all working together here in America as citizens of one great country, demonstrating that government of, by, and for all the people, without regard to race, creed, or color, is able to unite our people, and by that united effort to prevail against the forces of evil which only recently have threatened the destruction of our civilization.

I am profoundly interested—and I know you are—in the post-war world that will emerge after all these present struggles have been brought to a conclusion. I rejoice—as I know you do—in feeling that our great country is going to take its share of responsibility in the organization of the world for the preservation of the future peace.

During the last few years we have seen in the United States the evolution of a national conviction. We have moved from hesitation and doubt as to the wisdom and safety of our cooperation in some form of world program for the preservation of the peace to a deep national conviction that this is very definitely the way ahead for us.

In 1942 I had the privilege of attending the April and December meetings of the Republican National Committee which went on record committing our party to the principle of international cooperation. In September of 1943 there assembled at Mackinac Island, in Michigan, a group of Republican leaders, which included Senators, Members of the House, all of our Republican governors, and certain members of the national committee, of which I had the privilege of being one, which group formally issued the Mackinac declaration.

Here were three steps in the history of our party looking toward a national policy, and shortly afterward there followed the Fulbright resolution in the House of Representatives, and the Connally resolution in the Senate, both passed by overwhelming bipartisan votes.

Almost simultaneously Secretary Hull participated for the United States in the Moscow agreement, which declared the same principle. At both the Republican and Democratic Conventions of 1944 the policy was reaffirmed.

In the fall of 1944 and following the Conventions, the Dumbarton Oaks conferences were held under the leadership of the present Secretary of State, and thereafter followed, as is now well known, the Yalta conference, the Mexican conference at Chapultepec, and now the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

This succession of events must be looked upon as milestones on the road to peace. If we look upon them as milestones on a road that we are traveling, and bear in mind that no one of these milestones is a final destination, we can get the right perspective of the entire movement. This perspective will make us realize that what we are seeking is not final perfection this early in our gropings for a new world, but rather progress. Yalta was a very distinct milestone in this progress with all its limitations and with all its subsequent misunderstandings. There are real difficulties at San Francisco and there will be more, but I predict without fear of contradiction that San Francisco will be another and significant milestone and will take us far along the road. Let us not expect perfection from San Francisco, but let us expect progress and let us rejoice when that progress is made.

In all these discussions I am particularly interested in the way in which the powerful nations of the world will look at the problem of the right relationship of the small, weaker nations to the whole world organization. And within all of the states, both strong and weak, which the organization will seek to protect, it will be vitally important to determine the right approach to the rights of minorities and the ways in which those minorities can be most effectively incorporated in the life of the peoples with whom they live.

We cannot find the answer to this problem of the weak states and the minorities all at once, but we must realize that this problem is also one of evolution—a problem of milestones of progress along the road.

There has been much talk of an international bill of rights being incorporated in the San Francisco agreements. I hope sincerely that there can be a start made in this direction, but here again we must realize that we are dealing with peoples who have been widely separated geographically, by language, by racial traditions, and prejudices and, above all, by diverse ideologies and religions. The minds of western Europe and the Americas function differently from the minds of central Europe, the Near East, central Asia, and the Far East. Because we Anglo-Saxons think that certain standards of conduct are right, it does not necessarily follow that these other minds will have the same conception of right, and it certainly would not be right for us to try and impose our definitions on others.

It does seem to me, however, that we can find a universal common ground if we can think of freedom in its largest sense as the absence of physical control of an individual or group of individuals over the destinies of other individuals or groups; if we can think of the right of those who are governed to select those who are to govern them; and probably above all and underlying all, if we can think of the principle of equality of opportunity as a fundamental right of both individuals and nations.

These simple conceptions of freedom and equality of opportunity seem to give us a new vision of what we mean when we oppose discriminaitons because of race, creed, or color; when we fight all prejudices or persecutions because of race, creed, or color; what we mean when we look forward eagerly to the flowering of an ultimate human brotherhood of understanding and tolerance.

With the bringing to a successful conclusion of the war in Europe, Americans everywhere are doing some new and hard thinking—thinking of each other, thinking of the real causes of the war, thinking of our prospects of avoiding a future war—which, if it does come, may well destroy the civilized world. This problem is yours and mine. It is every American's problem to study with the utmost care the tremendous and magnificent results achieved in this present war by the cooperation between the workers and management in industry, the farmer, Government and business, between all groups regardless of race, creed, or color. When the heart of America was threatened from enemies without, the ramparts were guarded by a spirit of national unity never before achieved in this country. The results of American production that has brought about the destruction of the international gangster, dictator nations and their evil leaders, were achieved because the forces of this country united together in the bond of a common purpose.

It is of that unity that we are talking tonight, because if we lose that unity through carelessness or lack of desire, then the things for which many of our sons have died, are lost to us forever. The grave problems facing us in this post-war period cannot be solved if the American people divide into hostile groups, sections, or classes. Racial and religious hatreds have no place in building the freedom which we hold so dear in America. If they are allowed to come into existence and flourish, then we too in this country will be threatened with the same danger that has destroyed the continent of Europe.

We must not close our eyes to the fact that these hatreds are being constantly nourished from evil sources. To claim that they do not exist is but a way of closing our eyes to their existence. This is not the true American way to treat diseases of this nature. We must recognize these whispering campaigns not only against Jews, but against Catholics and Negroes also. It is our duty to counteract the constant stream of propaganda that would destroy the national unity that placed this Nation in the forefront of the nations of the world.

If the day ever comes in this country when tolerance gives way to internal enmities, persecutions, and discrimination, the end of this glorious Nation will be in sight. It is well to remember right now that the dangers of intolerance must be faced by the Government. If intolerance succeeds, then free government, as we know it in this country, is at an end.

I have noted with keen interest the introduction in certain of our States of legislation such as the F. E. P. C., which is designed to combat intolerance and prejudice. This legislation is a step in the right direction, and a law such as this, properly administered, will be of tremendous aid in bringing enlightenment to our people. We have before us in the Congress at the present time a Federal measure for the creation of a Fair Employment Practice Committee. While I am not one who believes that we can legislate right human relationships, certainly a measure which has for its purpose the elimination of the accumulation of cen-

turies of hatred will be another milestone on the road to peace.

There are many, and I place myself among them, who believe that what we have achieved during the last 5 years in this country in national unity, may be possible of accomplishment on an international scale. We cannot, of course, solve a problem of this size overnight, but just as we are gathered here tonight to give thanks to Almighty God for His aid in this great conflict for the survival of free men, so do we ask His divine guidance in the Conference now being held at San Francisco. From all parts of the world, men of practically all nations have gathered in a sincere endeavor to create some sort of organization that may bring into existence an international unity so that our civilization may survive. In San Francisco today these delegates are gathered to discuss ways and means of solving problems that have caused our unrest and that have resulted in chaos and destruction in so many countries of the world.

And this brings me to a consideration of the situation which I know is very close to the hearts of everyone here. I refer to the tragic plight of the Jewish people brought about by the devastating and shameless persecutions of the Hitler regime in Germany and the Nazi control of the countries of Central Europe. These horrors have shocked the hearts of all of us, and I look upon the problem of the pitiful remnant of the Jewish people who formerly lived in central Europe as the first responsibility of the United Nations after the world organization now being formed in San Francisco is set up.

With the liberation of Europe we all hope and pray that many of these now homeless Jews may be able to return to their former homes in Europe, where they may take their places in the new civilization being brought to life. Where that cannot be done, homes must be found for them, and it is certainly to be hoped that the traditional home of the Jews in Palestine which so many of them ardently hope to return to, may be opened to their further immigration and settlement under the guiding protection of a soundly conceived United Nations trusteeship. This would seem to me to be the immediate approach to the Palestine problem.

In discussion with officials of the War Department recently, I learned of the large number of men of the Jewish faith who are serving in the various branches of our armed forces. Official figures show that approximately 500,000 men are serving at this time and that more than 8,200 have received citations for valor and merit—many of them posthumously. The splendid record also includes over 226 rabbis who are serving as chaplains and 3 have already given their lives that boys of all faiths might have the spiritual strength to carry on.

You may be justly proud of this magnificent contribution to the forces of freedom. It is only natural in reviewing this great contribution of your people that names of Jewish men who have made the supreme sacrifice come quickly to mind—such as General Rose, Lieutenant Berman, of Paterson; Pvt. Bernard Goldberg, of Atlantic City, and your own Pvt. (1st cl.) Louis Schiffler, of Newark, one of the very first to give his life so that we might all gather here tonight as free men. The names of the heroes are endless—all of your faith—how proud you are of these men and justly so. How proud I feel tonight that in this great land of ours, men of all faiths have joined in heart and mind to guard the ramparts so that the cradle of liberty may forever remain the beacon light of freedom to all people everywhere.

We are soberly rejoicing over the news of the victory in Europe. This victory has been achieved by the blood, sweat, and toil of millions of people of all races, religions, and creeds. Our United States, composed of people whose ancestors came from every corner of the earth know now that it can no longer live alone and should no longer live alone. We will emerge from this war the most powerful and influential Nation in the world, but it is vitally important for us to accept that position with humility and consecration. We cannot, if we would, ignore the resposibilities of leadership that will be ours, and I am convinced that we will accept our share of that responsibility.

Let us look forward courageously and with faith to the victory of human freedom throughout the world and to the setting up of a world organization to preserve that freedom. Freedom, the unity of people, and equality of opportunity for all mankind, are the ultimate conditions of lasting peace.

Arthur Weichel Wins National Farm Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Clinton Daily News, of Clinton, Okla., honoring Arthur Weichel of Custer County, Okla., on his winning a national farm honor:

ALL STAFFORD INVITED AS NEIGHBOR WEICHEL WINS NATIONAL FARM HONOR

Unless it rains and the roads mire up, about two-thirds of Stafford community will be in attendance next Saturday morning at a breakfast honoring Arthur Weichel, Custer County farmer chosen for Skelly Oil Co.'s agricultural achievement award for next week.

A good-sized segment of the Stafford population will be there, because when Weichel was informed of the honor and asked to invite his neighbors to the breakfast, he inquired. "All of them?" In Stafford, he explained, one's neighbors are everybody who lives in the school district.

The Weichel well-wishers, with the Weichel family and relatives, will meet at 6:30 a. m. at Harry's Cafe to eat breakfast as guests of Skelly Oil Co., then they will listen to the N. B. C. radio program at 7 that will spotlight Arthur Weichel as top agricultural news.

The way Arthur Weichel makes news, in the opinion of Lloyd Burlingham, Skelly's farm reporter, is by his agricultural production record of the past year, combined with a bit of history for the past 6 or 7 years.

EIGHT HUNDRED ACRES IN 7 YEARS

Weichel began farming in Custer County 11 years ago. With a minimum of livestock and second-hand equipment, he rented a farm, but in 1938, he had scraped together a small down payment and bought three-fourths of a section. In 2 years that 480 acres was paid for. By 1940, by hard work and saving, the Weichels had their present 800 acres paid for, had built a well-furnished new home and new barns, and had accumulated a fine layout of machinery and a Hereford herd of 65 head.

Last year the Weichel farm produced 6,500 bushels of wheat, 300 of oats, 130 tons of grain sorghum, 300 bushels of corn, 5,600 pounds of sweetclover seed, 12,000 pounds of pork, 30,640 pounds of beef, and 1,900 dozen eggs.

This year the Weichel prospects include 300 acres of wheat, 100 acres of oats, 150 cattle, and 100 acres of sweetclover.

Weichel has signed an agreement with the upper Washita soil-conservation district to put into effect a complete soil and moisture conservation program on his 800 acres.

"COMMUNITY MAN"

His farm work is heavy, but Weichel still finds time for community work. He is a member of the Stafford Board of Education, secretary and treasurer of the rural electrification administration board, a triple-A committeeman, a member of the Kiawasha R. E. A. cooperative and active in Red Cross and Lutheran Church work.

These are the factors that the agricultural achievement award committee considered in naming Weichel for next year's honor.

The Weichel family will receive a $100 War bond, an achievement pennant, and a scroll in recognition of their achievement. On hand for the presentation will be Mrs. Weichel and the three children, Oleta, 13; Clifford, 7; and Eloise, 2.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Savannah Evening Press for Thursday, May 10, 1945, commenting upon the suggestion advanced by the Honorable James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General, regarding presidential succession.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be reported in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

A very timely and important suggestion has come from James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman and Postmaster General, and now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. Speaking in Hazleton, Pa., Mr. Farley has directed attention to the Presidential succession and the possibility of grave complications arising under the laws as they now stand.

After presenting statistics showing that seven times in our short history the Vice President has succeeded to the highest office because of the death of the man the people had selected as President and that at eight other times the country has been without a Vice President because seven Vice Presidents had died in office and one, John C. Calhoun, resigned, Mr. Farley thinks it is high time that serious attention be given to the laws governing the succession beyond the Vice Presidency. He also directs attention to the complications that might arise between the election of a President and Vice President and the inauguration should death remove the principals.

With constitutional and congressional authority, it is now provided that should a Vice President who had become President die in the latter office, members of the Cabinet, based on seniority and beginning with the Secretary of State, would succeed to the

Presidency. "But," Mr. Farley points out," this raises a question. Under our present method, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate. In his case, a vacancy caused by his death, resignation, or removal is filled, as I have stated, by the Secretary of State, whom he appoints, subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible short-circuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved."

There are other aspects to the problem of succession that Mr. Farley sees as possible sources of confusion. "If," he points out, "the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should both die before January 20, there is now no provision either in the Constitution or in the Federal statutes which would provide for a successor to the highest office in the land. Presumably, the House-elect meeting on January 3 could pass some kind of law of succession to meet the emergency, but here once more another real possibility arises. If the House-elect should be closely divided in its membership, so closely divided that a deadlock might result, then conceivably the date of January 20 might arrive and pass while the House fought over the question of control."

It is Mr. Farley's idea that a commission should be set up to study the whole problem of the succession to the Presidency, reporting for consideration such legislation as may be necessary. As usual, Mr. Farley's suggestion appears to be sound.

Discharge Petition for Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asking my colleagues to sign a discharge petition, to bring the anti-poll-tax bill onto the floor of the House of Representatives so that it can be voted on. The House Judiciary Committee, it is obvious, will never report this bill out. The House Judiciary Committee is well aware that the House Members approve of this bill. It has had thorough discussion both in committee and in debate before this body. Two similar bills have had overwhelming approval of the House membership.

During the years fewer and fewer people have actively defended the poll tax. Some have been persuaded that it is not consonant with a republic; some, needing its protection, have simply changed their tactics. They no longer defend the indefensible poll tax as a precondition to voting. They claim violation of States' rights; they claim that the educational system of poll-tax States would suffer for lack of this ill-gotten tax.

This year they have chosen another argument under which to operate. They are trying to discredit the method of discharging a committee by petition. Let us examine the boldness of this attempt. The right of petition is an ancient and honorable one, embedded in the Bill of Rights. Petition by majority combines two old American principles—the right of petition and majority rule. When a bill is brought to the floor of the House by the discharge-petition route over half of our Members have signified either their belief in the virtue of the cause or their belief in the wisdom of the majority.

And is this discharge-petition method some new and insidious innovation? No. Our founding fathers thought through and around the problem of how to get good bills before the House for consideration. They thought of two methods: One is consideration by a legislative committee after hearings; the other is that a majority of the Members can ask for the right to vote on a bill by discharge petition. One is as old as the other. The second method was used frequently in the House and Senate in early days. Standing Rules of Senate, section 2, rule XXVI. The use of the motion was discontinued from the Forty-first Congress, 1869 to 1871, through the Forty-seventh Congress. But a real need for such an alternate route to the floor of the House caused it to be reestablished in the Forty-eighth Congress, 1883 to 1885. In 1910, in the Sixty-first Congress, the Committee on Rules reported a rule which was adopted without amendment as section 4 of rule XXVIII. Some changes have been made in the rule since then. It has been considered an essential tool which needed sharpening occasionally. But it is very clear that from 1910 on the discharge petition has been an established legislative procedure. It is not only respectable and correct, it is necessary to keep circulation in the House system. We must not let our arteries harden. We must guard the flexibility of our procedure just as carefully as we guard the purity of majority rule.

If you, my colleagues, are annoyed at having to sign discharge petitions, I can see you being annoyed next at having to vote on bills in subcommittee and in committee—eventually you can become just too annoyed at having to vote at all. Government by decree, without the possibility of popular opinion acting as a pressure, would be so much simpler, would it not?

Imports Subject to Duty, but Admitted Free by Executive Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Imports subject to duty but admitted free of duty by Executive action

[Free entry of "War Materials purchased abroad," under Executive Order 9177 of May 30, 1942, and free entry of "merchandise as an act of international courtesy"]

Commodity	Imports free of duty, 1942			Loss of duty or revenue
	Unit	Quantity	Value	
Foodstuffs and beverages:				
Canned beef, including corned beef	Pounds	14,800,633	$1,818,460	$444,019
Tallow, beef and mutton (edible)	Pounds	2,087,401	133,235	36,530
Tomatoes, canned	Pounds	5,963,330	252,437	63,109
Sunflower oil (edible)	Pounds	15,571,773	1,381,644	488,518
Molasses (blackstrap)	Gallons	45,602,394	8,176,928	42,394
Malt liquors (beer)	Gallons	1,081,961	576,828	540,980
Animal and vegetable products (nonfood):				
Tallow, beef and mutton (inedible)	Pounds	7,958,000	413,787	139,265
Bristles, sorted or prepared	Pounds	62,637	187,796	1,879
Feathers for beds	Pounds	41,337	126,400	25,280
Rubber, crepe sole	Pounds	564,525	137,292	27,458
Rubber tires and tubes for automobiles	Number	10,636	418,046	48,656
Coconut oil	Pounds	13,391,783	793,531	267,836
Rapeseed oil (not denatured)	Gallons	1,462,688	433,869	591,373
	Pounds	11,191,383		
Sunflower oil (denatured)	Pounds	3,789,911	334,452	85,273
Linseed oil	Pounds	14,009,414	1,155,588	630,424
Expressed oil, n. s. p. f.	Pounds	2,258,260	406,198	81,240
Textiles:				
Cotton fabrics with fast edges and cotton articles, n. s. p. f.			485,559	178,484
Jute burlaps and other woven fabrics, not bleached	Pounds	835,164	172,236	8,351
Silk goods, miscellaneous			161,165	104,757
Wool, finer than 56s, worsted type (apparel wool):				
Clean content	Pounds	258,565,609	140,655,258	88,530,932
Actual weight	Pounds	484,540,112		
Wool, carbonized:				
Clean content	Pounds	5,888,847	2,787,288	2,527,284
Actual weight	Pounds	6,533,435		
Wool wearing apparel and manufactures, n. s. p. f.			639,179	362,408
Minerals, nonmetallic:				
Petroleum products:				
Aviation gasoline (100-octane and over)	Barrels	62,302	378,504	65,417
Gas oil and fuel oils	Barrels	3,905,061	3,485,559	410,031
Glass for optical instruments	Pounds	20,688	110,554	55,277
Mica (various grades)	Pounds	7,260,458	4,771,254	1,506,044
Magnesite, dead-burned	Pounds	14,605,931	288,851	73,030
Graphite crystalline	Pounds	14,218,914	514,960	138,826
Metals and manufactures:				
Steel rails	Pounds	12,884,610	205,044	12,884
Tanks or vessels, for holding gas, liquids, etc	Number	660,990	2,130,084	532,521
Iron and steel manufactures, n. s. p. f.			1,694,114	762,351
Brass manufactures, n. s. p. f.			267,510	120,379
Manganese ores (except battery grade) m. c.)	Pounds	394,264,825	7,173,615	1,971,324
Tungsten ore and concentrates (t. c.)	Pounds	13,119,692	15,274,852	6,559,546
Molybdenum ore or concentrates (m. c.)	Pounds	754,868	553,507	264,204
Aluminum:				
Metal and alloys, crude	Pounds	201,218,707	31,309,167	6,033,561
Plates, sheets, bars, rods, etc	Pounds	11,547,909	2,139,122	692,875
Manufactures, n. s. p. f.			1,598,271	719,222
Copper (ore, concentrates, regulus, unrefined, and refined in ingots, plates, or bars) (c. c.)	Short tons	635,877	137,685,595	50,870,207

Imports subject to duty but admitted free of duty by Executive action—Continued

Commodity	Imports free of duty, 1942			Loss of duty or revenue
	Unit	Quantity	Value	
Metals and manufacturers—Continued.				
Copper wires and cables, covered with materials	Pounds	1,582,503	$456,244	$222,985
Lead:				
Ores, flue dust, and mattes (l. c.)	Pounds	98,300,484	2,932,855	147,451
Bullion or base bullion, pigs and bars (l. c.)	Pounds	850,371,582	35,797,159	17,069,396
Zinc:				
Ores (z. c.)	Pounds	454,773,406	8,712,336	5,457,281
Blocks, pigs, or slabs	Pounds	41,024,712	1,686,081	564,090
Quicksilver or mercury	Pounds	2,778,879	6,303,627	694,719
Metal manufactures, n. s. p. f.			682,880	307,296
Machinery and vehicles:				
Radio apparatus and parts			13,578,030	3,399,458
Telegraph and telephone apparatus and parts			1,097,060	325,642
Electrical goods and parts, n. e. s.			3,587,971	896,995
Electrical machinery, such as locomotives, etc.			169,785	42,446
Steam engines, reciprocating			699,021	69,902
Internal-combustion engines	Number	40	775,628	135,735
Metal-working machinery, power driven, and parts			5,232,477	1,569,743
Machinery and parts, n. e. s. (except agricultural)			3,951,991	1,086,798
Automobile trucks, valued $1,000 or more each	Number	20	191,489	47,872
Airplanes and parts:				
Airplanes	Number	5	135,000	40,500
Engines	Number	31	251,657	75,497
Other parts			7,746,240	2,323,872
Carriages and other vehicles (metal chief value)			163,790	73,706
Chemicals and related products:				
Coal-tar products:				
Acetanilide, etc. (not medicinal)	Pounds	112,000	151,049	68,260
Explosives (except smokeless powder)	Pounds	924,100	445,538	265,179
Ethyl alcohol	Gallons	982,291	342,839	147,344
Ammonium nitrate	Pounds	107,345,236	3,292,061	1,073,452
Liquid anhydrous ammonia	Pounds	28,063,950	982,019	701,599
Lime, chlorinated (bleaching powder)	Pounds	13,079,500	243,471	39,239
Aluminum, hydroxide (refined bauxite)	Pounds	43,002,403	1,414,847	215,012
Phosphorus	Pounds	286,075	102,987	22,886
Chemical elements, salts, etc. (no alcohol)			420,790	105,197
Explosives and ammunition:				
Smokeless powder	Pounds	538,000	193,705	116,223
Cartridges and shells, empty			9,389,002	2,816,701
All other, n. e. s.			15,237,664	3,047,533
Miscellaneous war materials:				
Scientific instruments, etc. (optical goods, etc.)			370,515	148,203
Rifles, breech-loading, valued over $50 each	Number	514	106,600	34,645
Guns, parts and accessories			7,250,166	1,570,034
Military equipment and supplies, miscellaneous			4,543,035	908,607
Tapers, fuses, night lights, and chemical signals			117,044	46,818
Equipment and supplies for repairing and outfitting vessels			9,374,841	1,874,96
All commodities, less than $100,000 in value			3,877,119	775,424
Total under Executive Order 9177			414,761,520	164,142,813
Total under international courtesy			109,522,582	50,343,057
Grand total			524,284,102	214,485,870

Source: Compiled from official report of United States imports for 1942, issued by U. S. Department of Commerce.

NOTE.—The items in this table were subject to duty in 1942 but were made free of duty by Executive action as indicated above. Also the table lists only commodities of $100,000 or over in value.

Summary of imports and revenue loss, 1942

[Effect of Executive action in transferring dutiable items to free list]

Dutiable imports that were admitted into United States free of duty under—	Value of imports, 1942	Revenue or duty loss
(a) Executive Order 9177, as war materials purchased abroad	$414,761,520	$164,142,81-
(b) As an act of international courtesy	109,522,582	50,343,057
Total	524,284,102	214,485,870

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute to the memory of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, delivered about 2 hours after his death, in Los Angeles, over radio station KFWB by Judge J. F. T. O'Connor. All of the radio stations in Los Angeles County, upon announcement of the death of our great President, immediately canceled all of their programs and devoted their time to expressions of regret and eulogies of our fallen leader. Judge O'Connor was an intimate friend of the late President, having served as Comptroller of the Currency of the United States from 1933 to 1938; was also a member of the Board of the Federal Reserve, ex officio and vice chairman of the F. D. I. C. Immediately after passage of the F. D. I. C. bill by Congress he organized the Corporation which commenced its activities upon the appointment by the President of the two other members of the board. In 1940 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as United States district judge for the southern district of California.

Judge O'Connor's tribute follows:

The sudden passing of President Roosevelt a few hours ago has shocked the entire world.

We met in Madison Square Garden 21 years ago on opposing sides of a great political controversy. He nominated Alfred Smith for the Presidency, while I seconded the nomination of William G. McAdoo for the same office. Returning from the platform to my seat in my delegation, Roosevelt put his hand out and greeted me, commending my address. The friendship that began at that moment has continued up to the present time. It has been a warm friendship down through the years.

From 1933 to 1938 I served under this great leader as Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, and in this capacity and also as Vice President of the F. D. I. C. and ex officio member of the Federal Reserve in Washington, D. C., I had the opportunity to discuss official matter frequently. During the first year when we were rebuilding the banking structure of the Nation these conferences were rather numerous.

It is difficult to speak of the passing of a great friend when one is still stunned by the blow of his passing. The emotion one experiences retards the process of reasoning—yet I could not forego the invitation to pay tribute to the memory of my departed friend.

While I have many personal memories of the President, time did not permit a search of memory nor an examination of my records to disclose some of the more important incidents while I was in Washington. Let me mention just one or two.

I sat at President Roosevelt's desk one afternoon during the latter part of his second term. I told him the country would demand that he run for a third term. He thought for a moment, lighted his cigarette, and said, with a trace of sadness in his face, "No, Jefty; I want to go to Hyde Park. My library is about finished; I am tired; I want to do some writing and make an occasional speech." President Roosevelt meant that; and if it had been left for him alone to decide, he never would have been a candidate for a third term, and never a candidate for a fourth term.

On another occasion I was discussing with the President plans for celebration of his birthday. I happened to be chairman of one of the committees in Washington, D. C. He was extremely happy over the way the country had been celebrating his birthdays and the relief that had come to crippled children through the contributions made. He said, "I hope if the people find it convenient to remember me on my birthday after I have gone that it will be used for some humanitarian purpose."

It is my opinion that his birthday will always be remembered; and when we have won the battle against the disease of infantile paralysis, then we should continue to stamp out other diseases, such as cancer and tuberculosis, and make this work the greatest monument to his memory. It should be a living, breathing monument, rather than one cast in bronze or cold stone.

Some called him Chief; some called him Skipper; his secretarial staff called him Boss. I recall hearing a speech he made honoring the memory of Woodrow Wilson, under whom he had served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, when he said, "Woodrow Wilson will always be my Chief."

The skipper has gone to sea—his last voyage. I am sure if he could have selected a place to say farewell to the world, it would have been Warm Springs, Ga.—a quiet, peaceful spot, far from the political storms which broke above his head during his long and distinguished career. Warm Springs, a modest place far from official life, among the crippled children whom he loved and helped. "Suffer little children to come unto me" is a message that has come down through the ages—he lived that gospel—not with empty words, but in actual deeds. Amid these quiet surroundings with no officials of the Government near him, the greatest man living in the world silently set sail on his voyage to the distant port from whence no traveler has ever returned. The turbulent seas upon which he has sailed for so many years—at

times through hurricanes which have broken other craft, became instantly calm, and the skipper was at last at peace.

President Harry S. Truman will carry on the work of our great fallen leader. Harry S. Truman is a strong man of wide experience, a fearless man, a man who came out of the very soil of the Middle West. His outstanding work as chairman of the important committee which saved the Government many hundreds of millions of dollars in wasteful war spending, is only one criterion of the work of this great public servant. I count him a warm friend of many years. He needs the help of every citizen to carry this tremendous burden that has fallen upon his shoulders. You will not fail him. If you do you have failed our great leader.

I fully realize how futile, how inadequate, these few extemporaneous remarks are in paying tribute to our late President. Probably at some future time when recovery from the shock affords clearer thinking and emotions are less dominant, a worthier expression on this tragic event will be possible.

For Franklin Delano Roosevelt the troubled years have passed. The critics are silent. The lovers of liberty over the world bow their heads in prayer. The boys in battle witness their Commander in Chief stricken on the very threshold of victory—an irreparable loss. The ages claim him. Honored with his friendship, I can still hear his voice and see the light in his kindly eyes; an inspiration for the years ahead.

Only one comforting thought—God knows best.

Air Power Doomed Reich

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the concluding phases of the war in Europe have turned up many new and terrifyingly convincing demonstrations of the role of air power in modern warfare. Among these, however, is one that especially should be pondered by Americans because it was the carefully assayed opinion of the Nazi's highest land general, the strategist who engineered the break-throughs in 1939–40, Marshal von Rundstedt. Receiving Allied correspondents immediately following his capture, von Rundstedt told them that air power was the most decisive factor in the defeat of Germany. One newspaper headlined this story, "Air power won war for Allies, says von Rundstedt." Another, "Air power doomed Reich."

Therefore, I have asked unanimous consent that the first paragraphs of the news story of May 4 on the von Rundstedt interview be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where they may be studied by the country and preserved as a testament to this terribly potent weapon which in the future shall help keep the peace it has so importantly helped to win.

In view of this most convincing testimony to the efficacy of air power, it also seems appropriate to include a newspaper column by Marquis Childs that appeared a few days later—May 7—paying tribute to our own Gen. H. H. Arnold, commanding general, Army Air Forces. I also ask unanimous consent that this tribute follow the quotation of Marshal von Rundstedt.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1945]

AIR POWER OF ALLIES SEALED REICH'S FATE, VON RUNDSTEDT SAYS—BELIEVES HITLER DEAD BUT NOT BY SUICIDE, CORRESPONDENT TOLD

(By Louis P. Lochner)

WITH UNITED STATES SEVENTH ARMY, May 4.—Field Marshal Karl Gerd von Rundstedt, admitting complete German defeat, said today he regarded air power as the most decisive factor in the Reich's military failure.

Wearing his marshal's uniform with the Knights Cross of the Iron Cross and other decorations, the former German commander in the west received correspondents in a chateau where he is held prisoner.

Marshal von Rundstedt said these were the other factors in Germany's defeat, in order:

1. Lack of fuel, both oil and gasoline.

2. Destruction of the railway system.

3. Germany's loss of raw materials areas such as Romania.

4. Smashing of the home industrial sections such as Silesia and Saxony by air attacks.

Bowing stiffly to the correspondents, Marshal von Rundstedt seated himself on a big sofa and replied to every question put.

He said in his opinion Hitler is dead, but not by suicide. He expressed belief the Fuehrer died in Berlin.

ALLIED GENERALS PRAISED

Nervously puffing at an unlighted cigarette and in crisp Prussian tones, he then said:

1. American generals are surprisingly good, as is Marshal Montgomery of the British Army. They have learned much since the World War.

2. The D-day invasion came as a surprise, both regarding the exact time and locality, although the locality had figured among German calculations.

3. The western Allied armies made as successful a war of movement on Germany as the Reich made on France in 1940.

4. The so-called von Rundstedt counter-offensive in the Ardennes last December was ordered by Hitler with the field marshal the scapegoat. It was Germany's last and only chance to avert disaster. It would have succeeded if supplies and reserves could have been brought up as quickly as General Patton could move up from the south.

5. Germany fights on solely because all utterances, both in the east and west, indicate that it is a fight for existence.

6. Germany would have won in 1940 except for British certainty that the United States would help.

TAKEN PRISONER

After answering the first question regarding Hitler, von Rundstedt commented: "Before I say anything else I must begin with a personal remark. I'm not a prisoner by choice. I was taken by force of arms from a military hospital. I should never have yielded myself up voluntarily. That would have been the most despicable thing an officer could do. I would have resisted, weapon in hand."

Regarding Hitler's death, he said he had not heard the radio for days since the electric current had been cut off at his hospital, but:

"I feel satisfied, however, that the Fuehrer is dead. Either he was wounded and died as a result of these wounds and possibly even fell fighting, or he died under the impact of the pressure of events upon his soul. Never, never will I believe he put an end to his own life. That was not in accordance with his nature."

[From the New York Post of May 7, 1945]

BLASTING OF REICH BY AIR A TESTIMONIAL TO ARNOLD

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In most newspapers, if it got in at all, it was a small item buried on the inside by the sensational news of mass surrender in Europe. Yet it marked the homeward progress of one of the very great heroes of this war—one of the authors of the victory.

The one-paragraph item reported that Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, had stopped in Rio de Janeiro for a visit on his way back from an inspection tour of European air units. In Rio, President Vargas had given him a top Brazilian decoration.

During the past week, German field marshals and industrialists have testified that it was our air power which blasted away their hope of victory before Allied forces invaded the continent. Those of us who have traveled through shattered Europe did not need that testimony. We saw something—inevitably a small fraction—of the destruction wrought from the air.

The author of that destruction was General Arnold. He had the courage to go all out on a program of fighter and bomber construction that, in its inception, seemed fantastic. He bullied that program through. He risked everything on its success.

On Arnold's judgment, billions upon billions of dollars were thrown into the construction of B–17s and fighter bombers. If they had failed, then the blame would have fallen on Arnold. It would have come down on him like a ton of brick.

General Arnold has been perfectly well aware of that. It was one reason why he sometimes seemed to be boastful and brash. That was a defensive reaction.

BATTLED SKEPTICISM

Then, too, he was constantly battling the skepticism and doubt of the ordinary individual, who simply could not take in the meaning of this new weapon. Intelligence reports showed what was happening, but there were few who could credit those reports. Sometimes when we met with him in off-the-record sessions, General Arnold blustered at us.

I can understand that bluster now. We were still back in the preair age. We couldn't believe what this big man with the bellicose look was telling us.

There were times when he himself found it hard to credit the secret reports out of Germany. It didn't seem possible. It was hard to believe that any people could stand up under so much punishment.

Field Marshal von Rundstedt told how his armies lost their mobility. The bridges and rail lines of France were destroyed. That was von Rundstedt's explanation for the German failure to drive the Allies out of Normandy.

The Ardennes offensive succeeded during the first stages, said the old field marshal, with a little show of pride. But massive attacks from the air made it almost impossible for the Germans to move up reserves.

Contribution of Motion Picture Industry to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the ma-

jor contribution to the war effort that the motion-picture industry has made.

Our boys overseas have received a valuable form of entertainment and relaxation in this, America's favorite indoor sport. It has brought home closer to these fighting men, and given them a few hours of escape from the necessary hardships they are undergoing.

On the home front, civilian workers, and families of service people have been brought to understand the nature of this total war and the enemy we fight, through the medium of the screen.

These two points, I believe make up the greatest part of the job done by the motion-picture industry, in the name of the war effort. The other factors it has contributed are many. The members of the acting profession have given of their time most generously; to entertain our troops, to develop pitched enthusiasm on the bond drives and for Army and Navy relief. The other professions represented in this vast industry have also given in whatever manner they could do best. The technicians have left their positions and entered into services where they are most needed; writing, directing, filming, and producing training films for the armed forces.

The motion-picture industry has worked in the proverbial manner of the theatrical world. They have carried on the show for our country in its need.

We owe our thanks to the men and women of this group for proving that it, too, can go all out for war, when called upon to do so. We may certainly be proud of our motion-picture industry.

Salaries of Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the resolutions passed by the State bar of California, the Los Angeles Bar Association, and the Lawyers' Club of Los Angeles urging the passage of H. R. 2181, to increase the salaries of all Federal judges. The bill was introduced by Congressman HOBBS, and I understand is receiving considerable support.

It seems that the time is opportune to make a real examination of the salaries of Federal judges, as well as of other officers of the Federal Government. There appears to be an extremely wide range in judicial salaries. Judges of the highest court in New York are each paid $25,000 a year, and the Chief Justice $25,500. The Intermediate Appellate courts are paid from $17,000 to $27,000 with larger salaries to the presiding judges, while the trial courts' salaries range from $15,000 to $25,000. There is a wide range of salaries in other parts of the country for State judges. In my own State, California, the legislature is considering bills increasing the salaries of members of the Supreme Court from $13,000 to $15,000; the Chief Justice from $14,000 to $16,000 and the appellate courts from $12,000 to $14,000; and increases are being considered by Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and Florida and other States.

The voters are taking a deep interest in this matter. In a recent municipal election in the city of Los Angeles, which is my home city, the voters increased the salary of the mayor by a large majority—from $10,000 to $18,000, and other municipal officers, including members of the city council.

The supervisors of Los Angeles County have endorsed by resolution the increase in salaries of State judges.

Those of us who are members of the legal profession appreciate the need for increased salaries for the Federal Judiciary if we are to attract men of wide experience to these positions. A very careful study and argument for the passage of H. R. 2181 has been prepared by Judge Harold Stephens, of the United States District Court in Washington, D. C. I wish to direct the members' attention to this carefully prepared argument which is on file with the committee considering the matter.

The resolutions referred to follow:

RESOLUTION OF LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas it has come to the attention of the board of trustees of the Los Angeles Bar Association that a measure has been introduced in Congress, H. R. 2181, which is designed to increase the salaries of all Federal judges by $5,000 a year; and

Whereas there has been no increase in the salaries of the Federal judiciary since 1926; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in 1939 upheld a statute enacted by Congress in 1932 imposing income taxes on the salaries of all judge appointed after the enactment of such statute; and

Whereas recently in the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 Congress has provided that the salaries of judges who took office before the passage of the Revenue Act of 1932 should be included in gross income for Federal income-tax purposes; and

Whereas the cost of living has risen very substantially in the last 20 years; and

Whereas the increase in the salaries of all Federal judges by $5,000 a year will only have the effect of approximately restoring to the Federal judges' income the amount taken therefrom by income taxes and the increased cost of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association favors the increase in the salaries of the Federal judges in the amounts provided for in said measure, H. R. 2181, and recommends that said increase be put into effect immediately; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators from the State of California and to each Congressman from districts within Los Angeles County.

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

Resolved, That the State bar approves the increase in salaries of United States judges provided for in H. R. 2181, but favors such increases being put into effect immediately, and not being delayed as in said bill provided; and it was further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to such other persons as may be interested.

RESOLUTION OF THE LAWYERS' CLUB OF LOS ANGELES

"Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives bill H. R. 2181, to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; and

"Whereas said bill, if passed, would increase the salaries of the officers therein named; and

"Whereas bill H. R. 2181 appears to provide for more fair and adequate compensation for Federal judges than is now allowed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Lawyers' Club of Los Angeles*, That the aims and objects of bill H. R. 2181 appear to be in the best public interest, and we therefore approve said bill. We recommend that it be made effective immediately."

The above resolution was passed by the members of the board of governors of the Lawyers' Club of Los Angeles at its meeting held on Tuesday, April 10, 1945, and was passed by a vote of the members at a meeting of the members on Wednesday, April 18, 1945.

IRVING E. READ,
President.

Which Road Shall We Follow in Our Postwar Era?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States officially proclaimed VE-day Tuesday, May 8, he announced an event which the American people have long desired. This date also marks the beginning of a multitude of developments which will claim the attention of the American people. Unless these new situations are solved, then the serious matter of preserving our form of government and our American way of life challenges attention.

When the historian chronicles the story of the present age he will relate how the Nation's Capitol was transformed on December 7, 1941, into a place where the eyes of the world were centered and where domestic and foreign policies were shaped, the effect of which directly concerned all peoples of all parts of the world. That was the date when the Japanese made their attack on Pearl Harbor and which was immediately followed by declarations of war by the United States of America against Axis Nations.

In the march of events from that day until Sunday, May 6, 1945, when Germany signed an unconditional surrender document in favor of the Allied Nations, the Government of the United States occupied a position which it had never before taken throughout its history. It had to undertake preparations for a world war and at the same time change over from a domestic peacetime economy to a wartime economy. In all of

these developments the Congress of the United States was placed in a position of world-wide importance.

Public pronouncement has been made following VE-day that the job is only half done and that there must be no let-down in our war effort until Japan surrenders. We are all in accord with this sentiment expressed by the President of the United States. As your Representative in Congress during these history-making days I have supported the war effort in every way possible. I shall continue to do so.

When World War developments made necessary the building of an Army and a Navy and an Air Force in this country we must not forget that the industrial East was ready and willing to grab all orders for war goods and leave the Midwest stranded with its unemployment problems and other imprints of the depression. Men were out of work. They were leaving home and going elsewhere to seek employment. Members of Congress from the Midwest found it necessary to battle the selfish interests of the eastern seaboard and demanded that the Government and the administration place orders for war contracts and materials in the Midwest and opposed the policy of giving all contracts to the industries located in the East. I joined with my colleagues in this program, and we were eventually successful. As a result of these efforts, industries were developed in Minnesota. At the head of the Lakes shipyards were constructed and boats were built for the United States Government in its war effort, and in this industry employment was furnished to large numbers of men. In one of these shipyards alone, if I remember correctly, a well-informed man told me that $80,000,000 had been paid out during the war period in wages. I call attention to this fact because we will want to keep the record straight.

We are now faced, with the surrender of Germany, with the problem of reconverting from a wartime economy to a domestic economy. Our task of the future will no longer be the manufacture of weapons of destruction. It will be a problem of producing goods and materials needed by a nation at peace with the rest of the world. This means that factories, for example, which have been busy with orders for war materials and war goods will face the necessity of filling orders for manufactured goods which are to be used, not only by the American people but in other countries, if full employment is to be given to American citizens who are working in these factories. Small business and small war plants are vitally concerned in these immediate plans of the future.

In this connection there are already signs that the industrial East, with its factories, its mills, and its other resources, will attempt to keep its industries going, regardless of what happens to the industries of the Midwest. We face the same battle in the Midwest that occupied the attention of the Members of Congress when the country was transformed from a domestic economy to a war economy, and the industrial East was trying to get all the business and let the Midwest suffer and be forgotten. We propose to carry on activities which will give small business and small war plants in our section of the country their share of orders for the manufacture of goods for domestic purposes. This problem is of direct interest to everyone in the Eighth District and I shall welcome your suggestions.

While VE–day brought its full share of rejoicing, it is well to give attention to some of the problems and difficulties that are immediately ahead of us. Before the war is over we may have a national debt of $300,000,000,000. This is a figure so enormous that it staggers the imagination to think about it. Let us hope the amount will be a lot less. In this connection, the Government will be faced with interest payments of probably $7,000,000,000 annually on the public debt; probably $5,000,000,000 annually for veterans' benefits, hospitals, disability payments, and so forth; and probably another $5,000,000,000 for the Army and the Navy and the proposed plan to have the United States police the world; and add to this another five to ten billion dollars which the do-gooders will want for the purpose of reconstructing the rest of the world. Well, do you not think you have something to talk about and to think about? Governments either meet their obligations or they blow up and turn communistic, and this is followed by a dictator, and the people become virtually slaves. You know what happened in Europe in past years where just exactly such procedure took place. We do not want it to happen here.

Hand in hand with this problem of public debt and income with which to pay the expenses of Government goes the subject of taxes. This subject can be interesting, uninteresting, intricate, clear-cut, painless or painful, depending on how you look at it. The Government has to have revenue, despite the philosophy of the pink parlor socialists and counterfeits who have never given concern to the subject of a balanced budget or Government revenue or any other matters which have to have attention if we are going to continue to operate under our constitutional form of government, where freedom exists for the individual. A budget, for example, deals with the question of how much money is required for a given purpose and then with the question of how the revenue is going to be raised. Some of our self-styled economists never have gotten past the stage where a budget has to do with anything except spending yourself into prosperity, which, of course, means bankruptcy and ruin.

Just remember that the enormous war income is very shortly going to be a thing of the past. We are going to have to look to other income, and this means keeping up production on the farm and in our factories so that people have earnings. If they do not have an income, they will not have money to pay taxes. If they do not pay taxes, the Government will not pay interest on the war debt, and if that time ever comes, our life insurance companies and other institutions which have invested in Government bonds will fail to get interest on the bonds and, in plain language, they will all go broke. This, of course, is just what the Communists, and the fellow travelers, and those who preach class hatred and so forth would like to have take place in this country. If they could develop a crisis that would lead, of necessity, to a one-man Government in the interest of the masses. Historically, this would soon be a dictatorship and that is why a recent article in the Reader's Digest calling attention to The Road to Serfdom, has attracted so much attention. Most of us have known for the past 12 years that a lot of people believe in a planned economy, where the Government does everything for you, and winds up by putting you in jail if you do not do everything the Goverment tells you to do.

With this brief background, let me say that I am convinced that our entire tax structure is bad, and needs overhauling. We put up with it under the guise of a war emergency.

Taxes of every kind have been levied and increased to the point where the American citizens do not have the incentive to carry on productive work or business for a profit, because such earnings beyond a small margin are simply taken away by the Government in the form of taxes. The theory is beautiful, but it is not working out. For example, under the present tax structure it is easy and convenient, if you feel like it, to make substantial contributions to various purposes and these amounts are deducted from the tax bill instead of being paid to Uncle Sam. There are numberless examples. There are many other illustrations and reasons for a change in our tax structure.

Of course, our pinks and counterfeit economists who always yell "soak the rich" will give forth weird vocal lamentations at any suggestion that our tax system be changed to again encourage people in productive enterprises, to keep on producing or go back into business, because they can make a profit. This motive, by the way, is characteristic of the American way of life, and has always worked successfully.

With a proper program, people will want to produce things, not only on the farm, but they will want to manufacture articles and they will want to go into business. This sort of development means that there will be jobs in numberless places and numberless ways for the man or woman who wants to work. We are not going to have jobs unless you have your business institutions and your factories operating. You have to make it worth while for them to do this and if you don't make it worth while, you face the possibility of bread lines and unemployment. These people who are opposed to this sort of Government philosophy are going to make a lot of noise when Congress is called on to readjust tax problems and make other concessions to agriculture and industry in order to help these groups meet the reconversion problems and in that way avoid a large-scale unemployment condition. So will there be loud outcries when plans are made to adjust our tax structure so as to encourage individuals to engage in business for a profit. But these things are going to have to be done. When the demagog talks about "big business" and fans the flames of

class hatred, he overlooks the fact that most business organizations are owned by stockholders and that stocks and bonds are recognized as legitimate ways in which to invest money. The Library of Congress told me the other day that figures dealing with some of the principal railroads show approximately 500,000 stockholders, and this is an incomplete list of stockholders. Stockholders of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. number over 650,000 people, and those owning stock in General Motors alone number over 400,000 people. I cannot here add to the list. Now, as a matter of fact, every stockholder is a part owner in the business. He is definitely interested in the tax structure. If the factory is idle, he gets no dividends. Likewise, if the factory is idle the wage earner gets no pay check.

Which road shall we follow? One is the highway of progress and encourages our productive agencies to give us food, to operate factories, and make possible for employees to earn wages. At the same time, those who devote time and energy to this end, are encouraged to do so because they will earn a profit.

The other road is the planned-economy highway, and those who travel it adopt the philosophy that the Government must plan for its individuals; that private enterprise is harmful because it recognizes the profit method, and that this partakes of the element of criminality; that Government alone can give us a grand utopia where each shares in the other people's property and earnings. This is what will happen if the pinks and fellow travelers have their way. It can only be avoided by an alert and serious-minded American public which will study these postwar problems and support such plans and measures that will keep the torch of liberty lighted in this Republic of ours.

How Come?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial indicates the position of a part of the press of the Nation. The Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune is located in a city of about 15,000. The city is strongly organized by labor. One of its large industries is the paper-and-pulp business. Paper from these mills is used in some of our leading magazines.

Large groups of labor have had their wages frozen and cannot be expected to support legislation that provides any additional incomes to public officials. This newspaper is an independent paper and expresses its views as it sees them. The representative of the Seventh District of Wisconsin appeared before the Rules Committee and protested the waiving of all points-of-order rule and voted against the rule. He was subjected to plenty of criticism by those who wanted to get the "dough."

The bill was passed without the inconvenience of a roll call.

The editorial is as follows:

HOW COME?

The House last week voted a tax-free $2,500 "expense account" for Congressmen. This is tantamount to a salary increase of 25 percent. It can also be considered as offsetting a Congressman's share of the Federal income tax. But no matter how one looks at it, the action is in direct contradiction to the "hold the line" and "no raise" policies which Washington would have John Q. Citizen observe. Maybe Congressmen can't live on a measly $10,000 a year. We wouldn't know. But, in the face of gigantic war expenditures and strict controls over the public pocketbook, we think the legislators have acted in poor taste and sincerely hope that the Senate will kill the effort until such time as a legitimate raise can be put through on merit and without subterfuge. Otherwise, throughout the country, the cry will be heard, "We want an expense account, too."

It is hoped that this legislation will be killed; otherwise the O. P. A. might as well fold up and the W. L. B. might as well quit.

The new legislative technique operating at this time here in the House appears to let the Appropriations Committee take over, and continually place legislation in the appropriation bills. The evident objective of the leaders is to put additional thousands on the Federal pay roll. Use your own judgment why these thousands are added to the Federal pay roll at this time. When the war came along many of these peacetime departments made every effort to show where they had a place in the war program, and make the war agencies now appear to be anxious to keep their agencies alive in peacetime.

If Congressmen can be sweetened up with a $2,500 expense account, no doubt he could be expected to be more amenable in providing more and more jobs for more and more unnecessary employees.

If any governmental official, regardless as to his position, says that present taxes should be maintained, he must, to be fair, insist that unnecessary Federal expenditures be immediately curtailed. In other words, an appropriate way to reduce taxes is to curtail unnecessary Federal expenditures and remove a portion of the need for higher taxes.

No one can expect to see taxes reduced as long as appropriations for unnecessary expenditures is constantly continued.

Victory of the Ideal of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Force of an Ideal Proves Stronger Than the Ideal of Force," published in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of May 9, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORCE OF AN IDEAL PROVES STRONGER THAN THE IDEAL OF FORCE

The day of victory spells the day of democracy, of government by the consent of the governed, and the doom of totalitarianism.

This was not only a war waged for conquest and inspired by greed. It was a war begun to destroy the principles of the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the government of the people and for the people throughout the universe. Nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy, shintoism in Japan formed the trinity of creeds which the Axis Powers conspired to put in the place of Christianity, democracy, and self-government. Nothing was sacred to them if it stood in the way of the resolve of the sawdust Caesars bestride the earth and destroy all the advances toward democracy during centuries since Christ incarnated the doctrine of the dignity of the individual, the brotherhood of man, and the right of people everywhere to think, speak, write, worship, and vote in accordance with the dictates of their conscience and their love of liberty, and as the Atlantic Charter promised, "the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live."

In every country controlled by the Axis the totalitarian creed was put into practice. The first things the Axis rulers did were to destroy free speech, free press, free worship, and free government—boons won by freemen by long battles and costly sacrifice. If the victory had gone to the Axis Powers, these inherent blessings enjoyed by the many would have perished from the earth.

The war was a conflict between the two ideas, each contending for the mastery. The emperor worship of Shintoism was not different from the enforced adulation of the Fuehrer and the abasement of Italians to the sawdust Caesar. All three nations believed, or acted on that belief, that some men are born booted and spurred to ride on the backs of others and that force was above human rights. And they practiced it in their domain and forced its acceptance in every land they conquered. To be sure, the conquerors invoked rapine and murder and the appropriation of the goods of all peoples who could not stand up against the weight of their military machine. But it was belief that the ideal of force could destroy the force of an ideal that endangered the world, and, as they understood that the fate of all free people today and tomorrow was at stake, that summoned those who preferred death to slavery to unite to destroy, not peoples, but the creed of force and to prevent the destruction of democracy.

If the Axis Powers had won, there would have fallen upon the earth another era of the Dark Ages, the light of learning would have been extinguished, and the glory of Christianity submerged into the worship of military power. And at one time it seemed that this throw-back to the Dark Ages might succeed. Fear sat in every free government chancery, on every schoolhouse door, on the threshold of every Christian institution. However, in the darkest hour, even in the zero route at Dunkerque and in the robot blasting of London, in the day of infamy at Pearl Harbor—there was high resolve to do and dare and die to preserve the rights of man, the equality and dignity of the common man, and never to yield to the engines that had long been fashioned for the destruction of democracy.

The valor of freemen, guided by providence, has demonstrated that the power of an ideal is greater than the ideal of force.

That is the significance of the day of yesterday's world-wide celebration.

We have won a second time the war to make the world safe for democracy. There are two more victories that will call for both courage and wisdom—to write the victory by soldiers into a lasting covenant of peace and make democracy safe for the world.

Having won the first battle, there is call for full consecration to crown the victory with a pact that will insure a warless world, and guarantee to every individual in the world the right of self-government and the enjoyment of the "four freedoms."

Let us say with Joshua of old: "We are able."

The "Lost Delegation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Mirror of May 7, 1945:

THE "LOST DELEGATION"

Red Russia has given the spider-and-the-fly treatment to a delegation of Polish patriots, and Secretary of State Stettinius and Foreign Secretary Eden, on behalf of their respective governments, are not only diplomatically but openly shocked.

The story of the "lost delegation," which it now develops was never lost at all, but thrown into prison in Moscow, is briefly as follows:

The Yalta agreements, announced in a special Big Three communique, February 11, 1945, provided for the the reorganization of the Lublin (Communist) Government of Poland "on a broader democratic basis, with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

So 16 "democratic leaders from Poland itself" were induced by the British Government and the Polish (London) Government-in-exile to reveal themselves to the Russians so that—they believed—they could participate in the formation of a truly representative Polish Government.

They had been fighting underground since the start of the war, September 1, 1939 at which time Stalin was the virtual ally of Hitler.

On March 27 and 28, of this year, the 16 Polish resistance leaders, assured by both their own and the British Governments, appeared at Pruszkow, on the invitation of Col. Gen. Ivanov of the Red Army, acting for Marshal Zhukov.

Then they dropped from sight.

For more than a month, both the United States and British Governments have been asking Russia for information about the missing Poles. All requests were ignored until Saturday, when Stettinius and Eden announced in San Francisco that they had been officially informed by Foreign Commissar Molotov that the 16 had been arrested for "diversionary activities against the Red army."

Subsequently, the Moscow radio elaborated by saying: "All these persons, or some of them, as investigations may warrant, will be committed for trial."

Red duplicity in this instance is comparable to inviting a friend to one's home, then bashing him with a window-weight as he sits at dinner.

But the imprisonment of the Polish delegation in itself is less an indication of Soviet morality than the concealment of that imprisonment from the other signatories of Yalta—Britain and the United States.

It must be remembered that during the concealment, Mr. Molotov was sitting in Moscow with W. Averell Harriman, American Ambassador, and Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, British Ambassador, to reorganize the Polish Government in accordance with t' ' decisions of Yalta.

It must also be remembered that when this three-man commission literally got nowhere, the Soviets seized upon the failure as an excuse to press their own demand that the Lublin (Communist) government should, alone, represent Poland at San Francisco.

Molotov, only, was aware, even as the commission met to broaden the democratic base of the Polish Government, that the first delegation of democratic Polish leaders had been clapped into prison on apparently trumped-up charges.

Sincere friends of Russia—not Communists, but Americans and Englishmen who earnestly hoped for amity and cooperation between the world's three foremost powers—begin to wonder.

Is Russia determined to give no moral ground upon which she can meet the other nations, but only the shifty sands of violated pledges and diplomacy by dictatorship?

The Meat Shortage and Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the case against the bunglers in the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration who have driven this Nation into a food crisis has already been overwhelmingly documented. But even though more evidence is unnecessary, I hold in my hand a statement which I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House, and which I wish to file with our special committee investigating the food situation.

Here is a simple accounting of the purchase of a single beef animal by an independent packer, and of the sale of the carcass and byproducts. Note that the packer paid $96 for this live animal as it came across his scales, a price strictly in compliance with schedules established by the O. P. A. Now notice that the packer received a total return of $93.30 when his whole transaction on this animal was closed. That includes the proceeds from the sale of every pound of edible meat. It includes the returns from all the byproducts, such as hide, bones, and tallow. It even includes an item of $12.48 paid by the Government as a subsidy.

In short, the packer actually received $2.70 less for the finished animal than he paid for it on the hoof. This statement, understand, does not attempt to show the packer's normal operating cost in processing this particular animal. What he paid for labor, plant facilities, and general overhead in this case is all total loss, and must be added to the $2.70 loss shown on this statement.

This statement is submitted under oath by two responsible citizens of my home community who are in no way connected with this Standard Packing Co., which processed this animal. One of the signers is Hon. Charles V. Orr, the mayor of my home city. The other, A. H. Schwartz, is a prominent and respected businessman there.

If any further explanation were needed to show why honest independent meat packers are going out of business, and the black market gangsters are handling most of America's meat supply, this sort of report ought to supply the answer:

STANDARD PACKING CO.,
Kokomo, Ind., March 30, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that the beef herein described as 1 roan heifer, was weighed on standard scales, and the actual live weight was 640 pounds, at 15 cents, $96 (O. P. A. price on grade A beef, top, $15.70; bottom price, $14.20.)

A. H. SCHWARTZ, *Witness.*

Cost	$96.00
1 Roan heifer, 354 pounds, at 20 cents	70.80
1 Tongue, 1½ pounds, at 24 cents	.36
1 Liver, 7 pounds, at 25 cents	1.75
1 Heart, 2½ pounds, at 15 cents	.38
1 Ox tail	.08
Headmeat, 6 pounds, at 9 cents	.54
Subsidy, 640 pounds, at 1.95 cents	12.48
1 Hide—green hide, 49 pounds, at 12¼ cents	6.00
Bones, 15 pounds, at 1½ cents	.23
Tallow, 15 pounds, at 4½ cents	.63
Total	$93.30
Loss	2.70

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the data herein set out is correct to the best of our knowledge and belief.

A. H. SCHWARTZ,
CHAS. V. ORR, *Mayor.*

County of Howard,
State of Indiana, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of April 1945.

PANSY O'LEARY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires January 11, 1948.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Missouri Valley Authority delivered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] before the first conference of the friends of the Missouri Valley Au-

thority on May 11, 1945, in Jefferson City, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends of the Missouri Valley, I am indeed glad to be with you on the occasion of the first conference of the friends and sponsors of the Missouri Valley Authority.

Conferences have been held on many occasions in the past dealing with problems of the Missouri River. None, however, have been imbued with the spirit of idealism or concern for the welfare of the people of the Missouri Valley than the conference now in session.

Past conferences have failed because their basic approach and proposals were generally influenced by selfish motives and interests.

The people of the valley and the country at large have become aware of this. Due to the tireless and effective efforts of such leading newspapers as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Star-Times of St. Louis, and other newspapers in the Valley, the people of the valley have now become awakened. The people of the valley are demanding new leadership in this cause, and I am confident that from this conference will come the requisite leadership and guidance for the support and final establishment of a truly constructive program.

We must search beneath the hidden motives of the opponents of the Missouri Valley Authority to find the true explanation of their bitter opposition. They, too, claim that they want flood control, irrigation, navigation and power and all the other benefits which can be derived from successful exploitations of the resources of the valley.

Our opponents have had a free hand for decades to bring about a solution of these problems. They have been given hundreds of millions of dollars with which to accomplish results. But what have they to show for such expenditures and efforts? Despite the labors of competent engineers and planners and contractors to do the job the old way, the unruly river is still a liability and a menace.

The floods still rage on from season to season. Droughts continue to parch the earth and ruin our farms. Our natural resources still lie undeveloped. Population continues to dwindle. Industries fail to multiply. Increased opportunities for the youth of the valley fail to materialize.

And while this great empire—the Missouri Valley—continues neglected, the need for new frontiers and new opportunities is growing rapidly. A new frontier in Alaska is now suggested—this is the usual recommendation of dreamers who fail to see the opportunities at hand. They would seek new opportunities beyond the horizon rather than take advantage of the boundless opportunities before their eyes.

My friends, the future of our country in the post-war period as, in fact, the future of the whole world, depends upon the effective resource development and expansion of industry in America. To have world prosperity, we must have a prosperous America. Such expansion and prosperity can be achieved only by going out to the great undeveloped regions of our country. Since coming to the Senate more than 10 years ago, I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the economic trends of the Nation. In recent years, there has been much criticism leveled against the Government because of the centralization of American industry. The regional authority for the development of river valleys is a step in the direction of decentralization and future growth.

If the outstanding and unquestioned accomplishments of the T. V. A. fail to convince our opponents in and out of Congress that the unified grassroots method is better than the antiquated piecemeal method, then there is little that you or I can do to make them change their mind. Their opposition is either due to a deep-rooted prejudice against change—any change, no matter how worthy—or it is the result of motives which resist conviction. Of course, there can be no excuse for anyone to remain ignorant on this subject. For example, only a few weeks ago, the legislature of this great State of Missouri created a commission to study the T. V. A. on the spot. This is the wise way. Instead of listening to the harangues of men sponsored by well-known lobbies which are nothing more than fronts for various vested, monopolistic interests, and then adopting stereotyped resolutions against the M. V. A. plan, it would have been far better if the legislatures of our States had followed the example of Missouri by dispatching commissions to learn at first hand what the T. V. A. has actually done.

The people who live in the lower Missouri Valley, where floods are frequent, and in the valleys of its lower tributaries, also subject to destructive overflows, are much concerned about the proposals of the Army engineers for dams and reservoirs in this State. The Missouri Farmers Association, which has endorsed an M. V. A., has questioned the plans of the Army engineers for large reservoirs on the lower stretches of the Osage, Gasconade, and Grande Rivers. They know that their reservoirs will submerge permanently thousands of fertile acres.

They want flood protection, of course, but they want to know if there isn't a better way to achieve it. They think an M. V. A. will be more likely to find that better way, and M. V. A. will look upstream to the headwaters and more actively promote storage of the rainfall in the land. They believe that an M. V. A. will understand better how to cooperate with the Federal Soil Conservation Service and Missouri's own excellent agencies for conservation and development of the State's wonderful resources in farm lands, forests, rivers, and minerals.

They think that through an M. V. A. will come a better balance in the conservation of these resources. They are right in thinking that the control of the floodwaters, the utilization of stored waters for navigation and electric power production and the coordination of these lower valley facilities will promote the fullest utilization of the upstream waters for irrigation.

Down here in the lower Missouri Valley the people have wisely shown a keen appreciation of the rights of others and the importance of a unified plan for development of the river for the welfare of the people of the entire valley.

My friends, even if the T. V. A. lessons were not available to us, we should feel impelled by past failures to try a new method. Instead of that, we are being pressed by well-staffed lobbyists parading under high-sounding names to continue with the discredited, obsolete methods which have robbed the Nation of hundreds of millions of dollars and produced next to nothing in return.

Of course, there is plenty of pork in the old pork barrel—the piecemeal method. That is why these opposing propaganda associations, which are mere fronts for seekers of special privileges, are giving out loud wails to be heard from one end of the country to the other in opposition to a Missouri Valley Authority. Just as the introduction of my bill on August 18, 1944, brought about a shotgun marriage between two formerly irreconcilable Government bureaus—the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers—so it has likewise brought about shotgun marriages among the squabbling lobbyists. For example, only a few months ago, the Mississippi Valley Association and the powerful National Reclamation Association were stubbornly fighting each other over the question of division of the waters of the Missouri River system. Each was accusing the other of trying to arbitrarily usurp the available water for selfish purposes.

Naturally, they have been driven to surrender their claims and unite their forces because of the growing demand on the part of the people—the plain people—for a workable and just solution of these perplexing problems—the T. V. A. way. Only a few days before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee sat down to take testimony, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce announced the results of the referendum taken among its members. The majority of that chamber voted for a Missouri Valley Authority. Will the opponents have the courage to charge that the leading businessmen of St. Louis who voted for the M. V. A. are advocating socialism, totalitarianism and similar nonsense?

If a similar referendum were held in other cities throughout the valley, and if the people were honestly informed of the issues involved, I am sure that the results would be the same.

The representatives of labor and agriculture spoke in unmistakable terms for an M. V. A. in their testimony before the Commerce subcommittee. They voiced the sentiments of millions of people, the same people who bear the brunt of the floods and the droughts, whose sons and daughters must migrate to other sections of the country in search of economic opportunities denied them in their native States. They want, and we want, the entire river and its related problems considered as one problem, one river, one problem. They want, and we want, the traditional policy of divided jurisdiction and remote control, with all the inefficiency and waste it entails, ended now and forever.

All of us want a unified regional agency, responsible to the Congress of the United States, and to the President, to do the regional job in cooperation with the people of the valley whom it is designed to serve.

This, my friends, is the voice of the people we are hearing, the very people who have elected the Members of the Congress to pass upon such legislation. We in the Congress must not ignore their wishes. We must not betray their confidence.

Incidentally, I might say that the opposition have resorted to the well-known Hitler method in their endeavor to discredit the Missouri Valley Authority bill. Hitler believed, as he so frankly admitted in his book, Mein Kampf, and carried it out in practice, that the bigger the lie and the more often repeated, the more readily will people believe it.

In a letter asking for contributions, sent out April 13, 1945, the so-called Missouri Valley Development Association informed its would-be victims that the proponents of my bill (I quote) "are unusually well financed." Of course, they offered no proof. At the same time, they attached a membership card for their own organization, bearing in italics the following line: "Larger contributions very acceptable." In other words, they were willing to do you a great favor by accepting larger contributions, to help carry on their nefarious work against a Missouri Valley Authority.

It might also interest you to know that of the 10 directors of the so-called Missouri Valley Development Association, 4 are bank presidents; the chairman and treasurer are presidents of banks in Sioux City, Iowa, and Lincoln, Nebr., respectively.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, another one of the opposing groups, under date of April 13, 1945, informed its friends that my bill is backed by (I quote) "powerful interests." That charge, of course, I do concede. The supporters of my measure are powerful, because they represent the will of the majority of the farmers, laborers, small businessmen, and professionals within the valley and throughout the Nation. They seek to overcome our strength by the free use of money and false propaganda.

However, our numbers alone will not be sufficient if we remain unheard. We are well familiar with the technique which the minorities usually employ in order to outshout the majority. Before leaving Washington, I was reliably informed that a New York advertising agency has recruited nine propagandists to be dispatched to the nine Missouri Valley States, where they are to organize a campaign of misrepresentation against the M. V A. bill. Another leading advertising agency in Chicago—note that they are all outside the valley—was engaged some months ago to work for the vested interests against the creation of an M. V. A.

The adverse report of the Senate Commerce Committee should bring no discouragement to the friends of the Missouri Valley Authority project. Upon the introduction of my bill, I protested its reference to the Commerce Committee, because I knew it was opposed to this legislation.

My friends, the millions of people in the Missouri Valley must make themselves heard on this issue. When the opponents of the M. V. A. come to them with unfounded arguments, the people must uncover the motives behind these propagandists; they must make it their business to ascertain the sources of the financial backing of the press agents and advertising agencies. The public-spirited citizens of the Missouri Valley must realize that the improvements which they must have and can have will not come by merely wishing and hoping for them.

Between August 18, 1944, when I first introduced the M. V. A. bill and February 15, 1945, when I introduced S. 555, our great late President Roosevelt voiced on several occasions his support of the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

President Truman, too, has given the project unqualified support. In addressing the most rabid enemies of a regional authority in the Missouri watershed, the Mississippi Valley Association, President Truman said, on October 12, 1944:

"There are many projects of merit which have been given the attention of your Federal Government in recent months. Of these, none exceeds in importance the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. * * *"

President Truman called the M. V. A. project the American way of solving the serious Missouri Valley problems.

He warned:

"Selfish interests must be submerged to the common good."

He justified his endorsement of the M. V. A. in the following statement:

"There is ample evidence in the Tennessee Valley—if the opposition will take the trouble to inquire about it—that free enterprise is still very much alive and, yes, it is thriving and healthy. In fact, both big business and little business in the valley are booming. * * *"

President Truman's renomination of the able chairman of T. V. A. for another 9-year term is conclusive evidence that he stands wholeheartedly with the people and for the regional authority method of administration.

The people of the valley, therefore, should not be discouraged in the least by the unjustified conclusions of the Commerce Committee of the Senate. I am confident my bill will receive fair and friendly treatment when it comes before the other committees having jurisdiction over this legislation, and when it comes before the United States Senate and is freely and fully debated.

The cause in which we are all interested is not the first to be misrepresented and discredited by the enemies of progress. Every step of human achievement is beset with obstacles placed in its way by the kind of people who are today trying to obstruct the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. But if the masses of farmers, workers, businessmen, and professionals will be fully aroused, there is no doubt in my mind that the obstructionists will be defeated.

It is within your reach to provide the leadership which will see the Missouri Valley Authority project translated into reality. The numerous groupings of the people in the valley—the progressive and aggressive organizations of business, labor, agriculture, religion, education, and professionals—will rally to your call and do their full duty to bring opportunity and prosperity to the great Missouri watershed.

Out of Great Tribulation—Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant and inspiring editorial entitled "Out of Great Tribulation—Triumph," by Editor James E. Craig, published in the New York Sun of May 8, 1945, and dealing with VE-day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF GREAT TRIBULATION—TRIUMPH

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord."

It is victory at last in Europe—victory complete and conclusive. After the long dark, dawn. After despair, disaster, and disillusionment, an inevitable decision. First by German radio, then by informal word from Allied headquarters, and today formally and officially from Washington, London, and Moscow, came the electrifying news that the civilized world had come up out of great tribulation into the full light of day.

First of all we give thanks to Him, the great Jehovah, who throughout the ordeal has upheld our hearts and the hearts of our brave allies. We give thanks to indomitable Britain, which for so long held the bridge alone. We give thanks to our kinsmen of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa, who helped sustain the burden. We give thanks to gallant Russia, which first dammed the flood of German conquest, then sent it rolling back until Germany itself was submerged. We give thanks to the faithful French, who first lost then found themselves. We give thanks to the Norwegians, Danes, Netherlanders, Poles, Belgians, Czechs, Yugoslavs, Greeks, Maltese, North Africans, and others who fought underground when they could no longer fight in the open. We give thanks for the support of our loyal friends in Latin America. We give thanks for brave China.

We give thanks for the valor of our American boys from city, farm, and factory, who after a few short months of training met in combat the proudest and best disciplined armies in the world and proved themselves masters. We give thanks to our American girls, who in sacrificial service matched the courage of their brothers. We give thanks to Annapolis and West Point for supplying the nucleus of as capable a personnel of commissioned officers as the world has ever known. We give thanks for our military and naval leadership. We give thanks to American industry and American workers for supplying in unprecedented and unbelievable sufficiency all the essential tools of victory and all the necessary means of subsistence. We give thanks for our merchant seamen, who turned the seven seas into open highways for the transportation of men, supplies, and equipment. We give thanks for the matchless skill of those who fought on land, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea. We give thanks for the steadfastness of our people at home, who in the mass were firm as a rock at the front behind the front. We give thanks for the moral and spiritual qualities handed down to us by our God-fearing, freedom-loving ancestors. But for these—but for any of these—defeat instead of victory might today have been our portion.

"He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored."

But the day of victory must also be a day of judgment. The soft of heart among us will say that now is a time for generosity, not for vindictiveness. Generosity to whom? To the Judases who sold civilization for less than thirty pieces of silver? To those who tore down the Cross of Christ and erected in its place the blood-drenched swastika? To the Gestapo, its chambers of torture and its black death of systematic espionage and cruelty? To the butchers in a thousand charnel houses? To the murderers of Lublin and Lidice? To the builders of barracoons into which non-German men were herded for slavery and non-German women were herded for an even more sinister fate, the uncomely to be made into drudges, the loveliest and most virtuous to be forced into prostitution?

Shall we be generous to those who tortured and murdered millions of Jews and sought to give practical effect to the Nietzschean doctrine that Christian morality is slave morality? To those who in the twentieth century have bowed down before a deity of expediency more dreadful than the bloodthirsty Huitzilopochtli of ancient Mexico? Shall we now be tender with men who consider tenderness the vice of weaklings—who have gloried in their breaking of every pledge, their violation of every code of moral law, their perversion of every decent principle which 2,000 years of civilization had developed in the human breast?

No. The day of victory is not a day for generosity, but neither is it a day for vindictiveness. It is most emphatically a day for the firm, cold, and impartial administration of justice. To us of the United States this war has cost more lives than we have lost in any other war in our history. The voice of the blood of our sons crieth out unto us from the ground. We owe it to their memory that we make sure, insofar as lies in our power, that this thing shall not happen to our people again.

"He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword!"

As one awaking at daybreak who still trembles from a nightmare, we, too, tremble when we reflect upon the narrowness of our escape. Three years ago the enemy's cause was approaching floodtide. In the Far East the pride of our Pacific Fleet lay broken or drowned at Pearl Harbor. Hongkong, Malaya, Singapore, the Netherlands Indies, the Philippines were in Japanese hands and Australia was in terrible danger. The continent of Europe, from Leningrad and Moscow west to the Pyrenees, from the North Cape south to the Aegean, lay prostrate before the legions of the Axis. In north Africa the Axis was knocking imperiously at the doors of Alexandria and Cairo. But in the east at Stalingrad, and in the south at El Alamein, the tide began to ebb. Foot by foot, then mile by mile, then league by league the enemy fell back before the terrible swift sword which a righteous cause had forged for Allied hands. The enemy lost Africa, he lost Sicily, he lost southern Italy, he lost France and Belgium, he lost the Crimea, he lost the Ukraine, he lost Poland, and finally he was driven to bay within his own Festung Germania. Now even this has been breached. Now also we may ask: "Where be your tongues that late mocked at heaven and hell and fate?" Most

of them are mocking no longer but are crying "kamerad!"

"His truth is marching on!"

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The unpardonable sin which totalitarianism has committed has been its repudiation of this basic doctrine upon which self-government alone bases its validity, from which self-discipline derives its only dynamic. The authors of totalitarianism in Europe have not only ravaged their continent; they have also debased the hearts and minds of their own peoples. Nazi authoritarians have taught hatred to young Germans and hardened the hearts of old Germans. By lies they have raised a fantastic and demoniac racism into a national cult. By lies they have instilled in the German mind an almost ineradicable suspicion and distrust of everything, however noble, that is non-German. They have transformed into ravening wolves a people normally exhibiting many kind and affectionate traits. Generations must pass away before these foul roots of dogma can be wholly extirpated. Meanwhile the rest of the world must protect itself against any recrudescence of a heresy so diabolical and destructive.

Germany has fallen. On to the Orient. The war is by no means over. There must be no slackening of effort until Japanese militarism has also gone crashing down to irretrievable ruin.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the New York Times on Thursday, May 3, 1945, entitled "What Price Control Has Done."

Mr. Speaker, for all the criticism of the Office of Price Administration, one of the most magnificent jobs done during the war has been accomplished by the O. P. A. The O. P. A. has saved us billions of dollars, both on the home front and in the actual cost of the war. The O. P. A. in holding the price line has insured the value of all the bonds that the American people have invested in to prosecute this war. The O. P. A. by holding the price line has protected the livelihood of the families of our servicemen and all those who work for a fixed salary.

It is easy to criticize, but we had better be sure that in the unjust criticism too often leveled at the O. P. A. we do not destroy the very foundation of our economic future.

The O. P. A. was set up as a protection of the people. It has been just that. The O. P. A. and the Emergency Price Control Act has acted as a great dike which has held back the floodwaters of inflation.

WHAT PRICE CONTROL HAS DONE

President Truman has called upon Congress to extend the Emergency Price Control Act for another year beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1945. In his statement the President emphasized that "our price-control and stabilization program has been one of the most remarkable achievements of this war." The amazing over-all record of economic stabilization is often overlooked in the frequent criticisms directed at many of O. P. A.'s price and rationing actions. During the last war wholesale prices doubled and the cost of living rose 64 percent. In this war wholesale prices have risen less than 40 percent and the cost of living has gone up about 30 percent.

The difference in the magnitude of the increases does not reflect fully the outstanding record achieved during this war. The pressures for price increases have been enormously greater this time, no matter what basis is used for measuring them. We are diverting almost half of our national income to the war effort, as compared with about one-quarter in the last war. Our total war costs to date have aggregated about $275,000,000,000, as compared with only $32,000,000,000 the last time. At our current rate of costs we spend more in 5 months than we did in all of the last war. In 1918 the public had a spendable income of $56,000,000,000; in 1944 the spendable income after taxes has been estimated at $137,500,000,000. In the other war the amount of money in circulation increased by $1,800,000,000; in this war the increase has been 10 times as great. Checking accounts in banks increased by $5,000,000,000 last time and by $25,000,000,000 this time.

Many of the monetary totals which have been attained in this war stagger the imagination. In the absence of control a tremendous inflationary price rise would have taken place. Moreover, this relative price stability has been achieved in the face of actions by Congress to raise farm prices and of the inadequacies of our fiscal and wage programs. O. P. A. cannot be held responsible for the pressures created by these developments. The conclusion is inescapable that, despite many mistakes, a highly creditable job of economic stabilization has been done.

Economic stabilization will be required until the end of hostilities in Japan. It seems clear, therefore, that the Emergency Price Control Act should be extended for another year, as requested by Mr. Truman.

Shall We Sell America Short?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Journal for May 1945:

SHALL WE SELL AMERICA SHORT SCIENTIFICALLY?

The present complacency of the American public while Selective Service officials continue "to fiddle while Rome burns" is difficult to comprehend. We have already lost one generation of future scientists because we have denuded our colleges and universities of qualified students enrolled in scientific courses in order to supply a few divisions to the armed forces, and we are well on the way toward losing a second generation unless prompt and favorable action is taken by Congress on the McDonough bill, H. R. 2827.

In strange contrast to our unwillingness to defer bona fide students in our institutions of higher learning is the current enrollment of foreign students in this country. One of our largest and best-known institutions, which was particularly popular with foreigners prior to World War No. 2, experienced this year an increase in enrollment of 100 percent in foreign students over the average attendance in the period 1920–39, and has on hand applications representing an increase of over 400 percent above the 1920–39 period. It is common knowledge that India is sending to this country in September 250 individuals holding masters degrees, and that France is establishing national fellowships in this country.

Recently released data from the Clearing House on Student Interchange of the Institute of International Education shows that there is a minimum of 3,256 students from other American republics enrolled in United States colleges and universities. Of this rather surprising number 58 are in chemistry courses and 68 are enrolled in chemical engineering. Scholarship or fellowship aid for this group comes from several different sources, including the United States Government. We applaud this growth in enrollment of young men and women from Latin-American countries in our colleges and universities and quote the figures merely to indicate the present contrasting policies as regards foreign students and American students.

Among the lay public lend-lease is supposed to provide an exchange of goods and services for the sole purpose of winning the war. Yet American manufacturers of equipment, scientific apparatus, and other highly technical commodities are deluged with orders under lend-lease which any 10-year-old child would recognize are to be employed in post-war for equipping plants and research laboratories in countries with which we are now allied in a common war effort.

If American citizens desire partly to finance the post-war research of our present allies through large shipments of equipment and scientific apparatus, and if they wish to educate large groups of foreign students in our universities and colleges to staff research institutions in these countries, while at the same time those who would be the future American scientists automatically are inducted into the armed forces, it is their sovereign right to do so. But we doubt that the American public has any knowledge of what is actually being permitted under the guise of lend-lease and the so-called good-neighbor policy.

Certainly we must have in Congress enough public-spirited men and women and those imbued with a fundamental love for America and concern for its future welfare to demand that the true facts be brought to light in order that their constituents may know what their Government is doing with funds raised through heavy taxation.

We bow to no man in our intense desire for better and long-continued improved international relationships. No one is more desirous than we that America assist the rest of the world to a higher standard of living. We do insist, however, that at least we make adequate provision for the future scientific and technological advancement of America. We deplore the shipment of equipment and scientific apparatus to an extent which is certain to cripple seriously American research and development. We protest the education of large numbers of foreign students when, at the same time, we refuse to defer even a limited number of qualified

young Americans so that they can continue in scientific courses in the colleges and universities of this country.

With reckless abandon, our Government is selling America technologically short. Unless an aroused public demands an immediate investigation and appropriate action, our country is headed for a second- and third-rate role in the post-war period. God help us if we become engaged in a Third World War in the next 25 years.

The time for congressional action is now!

Address of Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address by Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, delivered at the annual dinner meeting of the Maritime Law Association on May 4, 1945, at New York, N. Y., dealing with various matters pertaining to safety at sea and other problems under the administration of the Coast Guard and pertaining to the American merchant marine:

At the outset I want you to know that when the president of your association, Mr. Betts, invited me to address this annual dinner meeting I felt highly complimented; also, that I accepted with eagerness because it seemed to me that this would be an excellent opportunity to discuss with you some matters of common interest and to attempt to bring about a meeting of the minds on some subjects of mutual concern. I hope that you have not expected me to devote my time this evening to relating war stories and anecdotes illustrative of Coast Guard combat activities, because I do not intend to do so. I shall take it for granted that you are aware that coast guardsmen are doing their duty in the combat theaters, and I shall address myself to a few Coast Guard problems that concern you in your professional relations with the maritime industry.

First, however, I want to outline briefly the nature of the Coast Guard and to mention something of its history. The Coast Guard stems from the old Revenue Cutter Service, which was conceived by Alexander Hamilton and established by act of Congress in 1790. Its functions, as outlined by the creating statute, were to enforce the collection of customs duties and tonnage taxes; the law provided that officers of the Service should be deemed officers of the customs. Accordingly, the Service logically belonged in the United States Department of the Treasury. There it was put, and there it has remained ever since. It became apparent soon after the Service began functioning that an agency organized to enforce the customs laws was fitted for related police duties. With the enactment of our country's first navigation laws, the Revenue Cutter Service became the enforcement agency for such laws also. Thus the association between the Coast Guard and the merchant marine dates back almost to the founding of the Republic.

From these beginnings, the Revenue Cutter Service, now the Coast Guard, evolved into the agency of the United States responsible for enforcing all laws of the United States on the high seas, and on territorial and inland waters. This enforcement background of the Coast Guard is significant because it answers the question: Why was the Service organized along military lines? The duties of enforcement agencies, particularly those operating over large areas and using arms, have traditionally called for military organization, notwithstanding that the duties are civil. The Canadian Royal Mounted Police is an example. It was certainly not the intention of Congress in the founding statute to establish the organization as one for the waging of war. Indeed, Hamilton, in his request to the Congress for the establishment of the Revenue Cutter Service, recommended that the officers of the Service be commissioned as officers of the Navy. Congress refused to follow his recommendation in this regard.

In the 1830's the Revenue Cutter Service began to assume its first duties relating to safety of life and property at sea. First, cutters were sent on cruisers along the coast to assist vessels in distress and to administer to the needs of shipwrecked crews. From this origin, the Revenue Cutter Service developed into the Nation's safety at sea and rescue agency offshore. Then, in 1872 there was established, under the Treasury Department, shore facilities for the same purposes. This was the inception of the United States Lifesaving Service. While officers of the Revenue Cutter Service were assigned to the Lifesaving Service from time to time for various purposes, the two establishments remained separate until 1915, when they were consolidated as the United States Coast Guard. In 1939 the Lighthouse Service was consolidated with the Coast Guard. Thus, at the beginning of the present war, the Coast Guard had become the principal maritime safety and rescue agency of the United States. It was only logical, therefore, that the safety functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation should be transferred to the Coast Guard so as to establish, in the interests of efficiency and effectiveness of operation, a single agency in which all the Government activities related to safety at sea would be concentrated. After a 2-year study by the Bureau of the Budget, this was done in 1942 by Executive Order No. 9083.

Now, while the Coast Guard operates under the Treasury Department in time of peace, in time of war it operates as part of the Navy subject to the directions of the Secretary of the Navy. Congress had two excellent reasons for so providing. First, the training which coast guardsmen receive in carrying out our various civil activities and the equipment that is developed in that connection are of great value to the Navy in combat activities and are immediately available for those purposes. Thus, for example, our surfmen were perhaps the most competent small-boat operators in the world, and I need not remind you of the remarkable performances that they have given in amphibious landings in the Pacific and in Europe. Likewise, the ice patrol in northern waters gave us training and equipment that has paid great dividends in the Greenland patrol during this war.

The second reason for the operation of the Coast Guard as part of the Navy during time of hostilities derives from the wartime importance to the military of the various civil functions of the Coast Guard. These functions, being all intimately connected with maritime activities, must be subject to military or naval control during war. The Congress, therefore, determined that it was desirable that the agency charged with those functions should, in wartime, become part of the Navy and should, at all times, be prepared for that eventuality.

Since the Coast Guard must, in time of peace, be prepared to assume its place in the naval system in time of war and to integrate its officers and men into the naval scheme, it is obvious that the service had to be organized on military lines so that the wartime transfer could always be effected with the minimum of friction.

From this brief outline you can see that the Coast Guard is unique among the armed forces of the United States, for, although it is military in organization, its functions and duties are primarily civil, not military. Its normal place is in the civil establishment, not the military branch of the Government. Should the Coast Guard be absorbed by the military, it is clear that the civil branches would have to establish additional facilities to carry out those civil functions now vested in the Coast Guard.

In view of the consolidation in the Coast Guard of all safety at sea functions, it was natural that last summer, when the suggestion was made for a new International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, the Navy Department and the State Department should fix upon the Coast Guard as the agency to prepare the groundwork for the new conference.

It is now 16 years since the last International Safety Conference was held, and, in the meantime, notable advances have been made in the scientific fields affecting safe navigation. The present war with its emphasis on electronics and its other developments has given added impetus to progress in the field of marine safety. If much of this progress is not to be lost through economic pressure in the post-war period, it behooves us to take steps now that will insure that the merchant fleets of the world may take advantage of new safety measures and still compete on an equal basis. In so doing, we shall be giving effect to the policy expressed in article 61 of the 1929 International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, wherein the contracting nations agreed to hold conferences from time to time to revise and bring up to date the international treaty. There is another factor that makes modernization of the treaty desirable. There have been remarkable technical advances resulting in the reduction of both the time required for ocean voyages and the importance of distance as a factor therein. Accordingly, some of the requirements which were modern and desirable 16 years ago are today unnecessary and obsolete. It is time that the whole problem was reexamined and the dead wood cleared away.

Accordingly, we have set to work sifting suggestions and seeking to formulate proposals that the United States will be able to present to the other maritime powers at the proposed conference. There has been set up a framework of committees "to carry the ball" on this matter. There is one over-all general committee made up of representatives of the various agencies of government having an interest in the subject matter and of representatives of industry and the maritime fraternity. The purpose of this general committee is to serve as a sort of liaison between industry and Government agencies on the one hand, and the actual working committees on the other. It is not expected that this general committee will do much of the actual spade work. That will be the job of the various technical committees, but the general committee will serve rather as a board of overseers to pass on matters of broad general policy and to guide the programs developed by the working technical committees. There are 14 of these working technical committees divided into three groups: 1, construction; 2, lifesaving procedures, and 3, rescue procedures. Each group is headed by what is termed a group committee, made up in most instances of the chairman and vice chairman of the various working technical committees com-

prising the group. It is the purpose of these group committees to correlate the activities of the working committees, to prevent them from overlapping or working at cross purposes, and to bring about unified coherent proposals. Both industry and government are represented on the group committees and on the technical committees. In this connection, I am particularly pleased to note that 13 members of this association are serving on the various committees.

This evening I can report significant progress by the various committees. The general committee has met, all 3 group committees have met, and 11 of the 14 subcommittees have convened. Several have met more than once. An examination of the minutes of the proceedings of these committees has convinced me that we may anticipate a well-considered program as a result of their work. As you know, it is too often the case in committee activities, where the members have other pressing duties, that the study of roposals is perfunctory. The minutes of these committees reveal nothing of that kind. On the contrary, they indicate that the members are literally going over the matters assigned to them with "a fine tooth comb." I am sure that the American proposals will be as well studied as those of any other maritime power.

This evening I thought that I might mention a few suggestions that have been made relative to the proposed international convention. You will understand that they are only suggestions, and that I am calling them to your attention so that you may think them over and give the committees the benefit of your judgment.

One of the suggestions concerns a permanent secretariat of safety of life at sea. It is hardly necessary to remind you gentlemen that international conferences, with their diplomatic etiquette and protocol, their stiff formality, and the difficulty and inconvenience inherent in getting them under way, are a most cumbersome means of bringing about continued cooperation and agreement in any particular field of endeavor. To try internationally to regulate maritime safety by diplomatic conferences every 15 years is like trying to run interstate commerce among the 48 States by holding constitutional conventions every decade or so. In a growing and dynamic field, such as the one in which we are interested, it is necessary that some organization be instituted to provide continuity, to receive and explore new proposals, to make studies on how the requirements established by the high contracting powers are being met and how they are working out in practice. These would be some of the functions of the secretariat. It would also provide an establishment for giving various services to maritime nations such as hydrographic, meteorological, and navigational information.

I am convinced that by providing some continuing organization for keeping the field constantly under review and for receiving proposals and circulating them among the contracting powers the proposed international convention can make significant contribution to the maritime world.

There has been no thought of placing in the proposed Secretariat any power to amend the convention. Neither is it anticipated that the convention provisions will be amended by less than the unanimous consent of the high contracting powers. There are certainly grave constitutional questions, so far as the United States is concerned, that such procedures could be adopted, even were they deemed desirable.

Most important, from my point of view, is that some independent organization be established to receive and circulate proposed amendments to all the signatory powers, which proposals could be adopted by all of such powers. I wish to emphasize that there is nothing particularly new in this suggestion. Article 61 of the 1929 convention now provides that modifications may be proposed by any contracting power to the United Kingdom, which shall communicate them to the other contracting powers. If the modifications are adopted by all the contracting governments, the convention is deemed amended accordingly. I do feel, however, that there is merit in the proposal to take the responsibility for circulation out of the hands of any one of the contracting powers and to vest it in an international establishment.

I have been asked several times what connection, if any, is envisaged between the proposed Secretariat and any world organization that may eventually result from the San Francisco meeting. That is a question that can be answered, of course, only when the pattern adopted at San Francisco becomes more clear, but I believe we can all agree that a service bureau such as we have been discussing might fit in very well with a world organization which would probably contain several similar offices in different and related fields.

Before leaving this subject of the International Conference for Safety of Life at Sea, I wish to call your attention to the question of amending and clarifying the international rules of the road. Those rules were adopted in 1889 and have remained without amendment for well over half a century. Parts of them are obsolete, and some definitely need clarification. The technical committee in charge of rules of the road has prepared a questionnaire in which several proposed changes or clarifications are listed. This questionnaire has been sent out to various admiralty lawyers, ship masters, pilots, operators, and naval and Coast Guard officers. It has been sent to all of your membership. You have been asked for your comments and for any additional proposals that you may have with respect to amending or clarifying the international rules. If any of you present here tonight has not received such a questionnaire, and you are interested in the matter, I hope you will not hesitate to write me. I am anxious that any proposals we make at the international conference have the fullest and best consideration from the maritime legal profession and from the maritime industry. I hope it is clearly understood that in these proposals we are doing nothing that would in any way make changes in the inland, Great Lakes, or western river rules.

The second matter which I should like to discuss with you tonight concerns the future of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation functions transferred to the Coast Guard by Executive Order No. 9083 of February 28, 1942. As you are all aware, that Executive order stems from the reorganization authority granted to the President in title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941. That legislation expressly provides that title I shall remain in force only during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, unless the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, shall designate an earlier time. The First War Powers Act was approved on December 18, 1941. As of that date, a formal declaration of a state of war existed between the United States and Japan, the United States and Italy, and the United States and Germany. I take it, therefore, that notwithstanding the developments heretofore in Italy and those that may be anticipated shortly in Germany, the authority upon which Executive Order No. 9083 depends will not lapse until after the end of the Japanese war.

How long the Japanese War will last I do not know, and I doubt whether anyone is in a position to predict V-day in the Pacific with great accuracy. I am sure in my own mind that a tough, hard struggle lies ahead of us against a well-armed and stubborn enemy whose ethical standards have little in common with those of the western world.

At all events, we have already had over 8 years of experience in administering these merchant marine inspection functions, and from that experience, I am convinced that the time has come when we must give serious thought and study to the future status of the organization and personnel of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. The uncertainty inherent in the present situation does not make for good administration. I think that as practical men you can visualize the difficulty that arises, under those circumstances, in any attempt properly to integrate the marine inspection activities with the rest of the Coast Guard.

The Congress has been conscious of this difficulty and of the unsatisfactory results that spring therefrom. Only recently, the House Committee on Appropriations in its report on the Navy Department appropriation bill included a statement that I feel I should read to you:

"With respect to the Coast Guard, it is the sense of the committee that there is considerable room for improvement in the organization and administrative procedures of the Merchant Marine Inspection Service, which temporarily has become a part of the Coast Guard under the direction of the Executive. The committee's complaint no doubt results from the temporary nature of Coast Guard jurisdiction, because if such organization, the committee feels certain, had permanent supervision, there early would have been applied the efficient methods and procedures which long have been Coast Guard virtues. If the Merchant Marine Inspection Service is to remain permanently under the Coast Guard, there should be early legislation for effecting the transfer, because inefficiency very likely will continue under a temporary arrangement."

In the light of that statement, it is manifest that we in the Coast Guard would be remiss in our duty if we did not now commence to study and prepare proposals and plans for fixing the permanent place of the marine-inspection functions in the governmental establishments and for taking action in that regard at the proper time.

Frankly, gentlemen, the Coast Guard is desirous of retaining the B. M. I. N. functions. I sincerely believe in the wisdom of vesting in one agency all safety-at-sea functions, and I suggest, too, that it is desirable that regulatory safety-at-sea functions should be in the hands of an agency, one of whose functions is the enforcement of the laws of the United States on the high seas and Territorial waters.

Having stated the Coast Guard's position in this matter, I feel that it is only appropriate to outline to you as lawyers the attitude that the Coast Guard takes with respect to regulatory functions in general, with particular reference to those of the B. M. I. N.

The marine-inspection field is one of many in which the Congress has found it necessary to vest in an administrative agency both rule-making powers and decision-making powers—that is, both kinds of authority ordinarily exercised by agencies making and enforcing administrative law. It has been suggested to me, from time to time, that a military organization is not properly geared to carry out administrative law functions. This attitude seems to stem from a suspicion of what is often called the military attitude and of the ideas of rank and military command. My answer has always been that the Coast Guard is an organization that for generations has been carrying on civil functions and which, in time of peace, operates not under the military branches of the Government but under a civil branch, the Department of the Treasury. All its primary functions are civil in nature, and it is organized on military

lines because it is an enforcement agency and because in time of war it must fit into the naval organization in order to carry out its civil functions under naval supervision and control. If military organization in itself is an obstacle to efficient and proper administration of civil functions, then the whole theory of a Coast Guard is wrong and has been wrong for over a hundred and fifty years.

One of the fundamentals of administrative law to which we have sought to adhere in the Coast Guard is that in the making of rules and the rendering of decisions, care should be taken that the rule or decision squares with the intent of Congress. Under the American system of government, legislative power as such is vested in the Congress, and it is elementary that that power cannot be delegated. Only the power to fill in details or to carry out in concrete application a general standard established by the Congress can be granted to an administrative body. It follows necessarily, therefore, that when such a body seeks to go beyond the standard established by Congress and to make rules or decisions that do not square with the congressional intent, that agency is guilty of sheer usurpation of a function which it does not have, which it cannot have, and which, under the oath which every executive officer takes, he must avoid.

We are all aware that the great growth of modern economic and social machinery, with its accompanying augmentation of complexities, has created a demand on governments for a type of control that is flexible and based on specialized information. The democratic nations of the world have answered that demand with specialized administrative agencies operating under a standard established by the democratic legislature. No one can question the value or desirability of this system when the procedures and processes followed by the agencies are in keeping with fair play.

In rule-making activities, fair play requires that there be provision for consultation with affected members of the industry and opportunity for full discussion. The powers of administrative agencies over private enterprise are immense, and sound reason dictates that before subjecting persons to requirements that may have great economic repercussions the affected parties should be heard, not only to protect their own interests, but in order that the administrative body may function as it is intended, that is, with special knowledge of the circumstances. Anyone with government experience in the last 2 decades knows how often untold damage and embarrassment can result from ill-advised or ill-considered administrative action. It was largely for the purpose of providing a forum for consultation and discussion that we created the Coast Guard Merchant Marine Council. This body is made up of the chief officers of the Coast Guard charged with responsibility in connection with merchant-marine activities. It meets weekly and sometimes more often. Prior to the issuance of important new rules and regulations, affecting the industry, it is the policy to provide for notice and open hearing before the council. In this way, parties in interest can present their views to the Coast Guard officers most concerned with their problems. At any time, any person in the maritime industry can petition for, and secure, a hearing with regard to his particular problems as affected by the existing rules and may request modification and amendments of the rules.

The council is also charged with keeping itself advised at all times of developments, trends, and viewpoints of the industry. It is, in effect, the ear of the Coast Guard by which information can pass from the industry to the commandant. In this manner we seek to acquire and keep that specialized knowledge, which is one of the foundations on which the administrative agency device is based.

In the field of administrative adjudication, the right to notice and hearing, the right to counsel, and the right to call and cross-examine witnesses are, of course, fundamental. But almost equally important are the separation of the duties of prosecutor and judge, the right to have the decision of the case made by the man hearing the evidence, and the right to an impartial review of the actions of the deciding authority based on a full review of the record. If these principles are followed and any tendency toward star chamber activity is carefully avoided, I believe that substantial justice will be done and the confidence of the public in the administrative process will be retained.

Finally, any administrative body has a duty out of a decent respect for the opinion of the public with which it is concerned to explain unhesitatingly the basis for its decisions. Parties are entitled to know the basis of rulings and decisions so that they may govern themselves accordingly, or seek redress in some other forum. I know of few things that make for more dissatisfaction or which more often evoke the cry of bureaucracy that the administrative official who, after hearing a carefully presented argument, merely shakes his head, says no, refusing to give his reasons. Explanation of the basis of action is one of the best means of keeping one's own house in order as well as giving members of the public a guide to future conduct. It is a mainstay to consistent action and forestalls arbitrary or capricious measures.

It is my considered opinion that unless an administrative agency accommodates its procedures to the principles which I have outlined, it will find that Congress has either put it out of business or has forced it to apply the practices that we have been discussing. Any agency in the latter category is in the unenviable position of having aroused antagonism and suspicion which may permanently hamper its successful discharge of its duties. So far as the Coast Guard is concerned, I assure you that it is my aim and purpose to avoid any course of action which might result in the Congress passing a little Walter-Logan bill for the Coast Guard's benefit. I do not care to have the Congress of the United States publicly indicate that it feels my service does not apply principles of good administrative law.

In connection with administrative adjudication I want to call your attention to the system for disciplinary action against seamen which the Coast Guard established after the transfer of the B. M. I. N. functions in 1942. The framework of the system is to be found in the temporary wartime rules governing investigations of accidents and casualties, published in the Federal Register. In 1942, the great increase of shipping had created a strong demand for more efficient disciplinary action against seamen. Many men who had never been to sea before were signing articles, and voyages were often very long. Furthermore, men were living aboard ship under a severe strain resulting from the war dangers to merchant shipping which had not obtained in peacetime. All these factors were rapidly creating a situation which, had it continued, might have resulted in drastic action.

Accordingly, we entered upon a study of the disciplinary system that, pursuant to section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, had been established in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. Under the old system, disciplinary cases were heard by a board of three merchant marine inspectors who performed the functions of investigator, prosecutor, and adjudicator. Perhaps it is not quite fair to say that they performed duties as adjudicators, because while the board made recommendations with its report, decision was made by the Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation who never heard the evidence. Usually a board was not convened until after a complaint had been filed with the inspectors, then several days elapsed before the board began its investigation. In days of quick turn-around, it is obvious that that procedure meant that vessels had departed and witnesses had become scattered when action commenced.

As you can see, the system was cumbersome and not adapted to the intensified disciplinary problem. How inadequate it was can be understood when it is realized that while over a hundred thousand men were going to sea in the last year of its operation, disciplinary action was taken in only 207 cases.

Inasmuch as Executive Order 9083, in transferring the B. M. I. N. functions to the Coast Guard, centralized in the Commandant the authority of the various boards and officers concerned with disciplinary activities, it was concluded that the Commandant could exercise that authority under a streamlined procedure.

Here was a situation that called for the most careful application of good principles of administrative law, for we were dealing with the right of a seaman to a livelihood in their profession or calling. The sanction in disciplinary action pursuant to section 4450 is suspension or revocation of the license or certificate of the seaman, and without such license or certificate a seaman cannot sail on American vessels.

In our exploratory study we carefully reviewed the criticism of B. M. I. N. procedures contained in the report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1940, Senate Document No. 8. We examined the general recommendations of that committee on administrative procedure and also reviewed the recommendations made by the American Bar Association in its study which led to the Walter-Logan bill. We made comparisons with the systems set up by statute for other agencies. The present disciplinary system is the result of our studies.

In rough outline the present procedure is as follows:

1. Every vessel arriving in port is boarded before she docks by a Coast Guard officer who, after first reporting to the master, makes inquiry whether there has been trouble on the voyage. This is done by talking to the master, officers, crew members, and checking the log. In this preliminary investigation, Coast Guard officers have been enjoined to conduct themselves so as to avoid in any way undermining the authority of the master. If it appears that there has been trouble calling for disciplinary action, the Coast Guard examining officer is called.

2. The examining officer considers all the information available and permits the persons involved to state their side of the case. If the examining officer feels that there are extenuating circumstances or that the offense is of minor importance, he issues an admonition to the offender instead of commencing action against him. This eliminates many first offenses and reduces the number of hearings required. No action is taken against a seaman who is admonished, but the admonition is made a matter of record and may be considered in fixing punishment in case of a subsequent offense.

3. If the examining officer feels that the offense is a serious one he prepares written charges and specifications and serves them on the person accused. He fixes a time for hearing and issues subpenas for necessary witnesses.

4. At the hearing, the examining officer acts as prosecutor and an independent Coast Guard officer who has heard nothing of the case sits as hearing officer. These hearing officers sit every day and have the position of quasi-judges. At the trial, the attributes of a fair hearing are observed. The person charged has right to counsel and the right to cross-examine and call witnesses.

5. At the close of the hearing, the hearing officer makes his decision of "charge proved" or "charge not proved." In case the decision is "charge not proved," no further action is taken. If the decision is "charge proved," a suspension, revocation, or probation is imposed against the seaman's license or certificate.

6. The person charged has 30 days to appeal to the district Coast Guard officer from a finding of "charge proved," and if he has been "beached," that is, if there is revocation or suspension, an appeal lies to the commandant from the district Coast Guard officer.

From this brief outline of the new system, you can see that we have separated the functions of investigator, prosecutor, and judge. The man who hears the evidence makes the decision and imposes sentences. There is provision for reasonable notice, safeguards for a fair hearing, and the right to appeal. Furthermore, the boarding technique enables us to hear the case when the witnesses are present and without interfering with the ship's turn-around.

We have now had over 2 years' experience with the system, and we have made minor changes here and there, but, all in all, we believe that discipline has definitely improved and that both operators and labor organizations have generally been pleased with the results of the system.

Finally, I want to deal with a matter that several persons have raised with me from time to time. It has to do with possible conflicting interests of the Coast Guard in the exercise of the investigatory powers under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, in cases where a Coast Guard vessel may be involved in a collision or other marine casualty. Collisions between Coast Guard vessels and private ships in peacetime are so rare that I doubt that this is any real problem, but should such collisions occur, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I shall do everything in my power to insure that the Coast Guard will never use those governmental powers to secure any advantage as against private parties. To me it is beneath the dignity of the Government and smacks of downright chicanery for an agency of the United States to use the subpena power and the great investigatory weapons which Congress has granted for use in behalf of the public welfare for the purpose of gaining a pecuniary advantage or to escape the consequences of culpable action. I assure you that I will have no part of it.

Closely connected with this matter is the question of making available to all parties in interest the records of formal marine casualty investigations undertaken pursuant to section 4450 of the Revised Statutes. We all realize that military security sometimes demands that such records be treated confidentially. We are all aware and desirous that the winning of the war should come first. Furthermore, we can agree that often, while security reasons do not dictate that the whole record be treated as confidential, parts of it must be so treated. To make the records generally available with those parts deleted might in many cases present an unfair and untruthful picture. We can also set aside as inappropriate for public examination informal memoranda and reports made by examining officers as a preliminary step. Such documents reflect only the personal views of the officer involved, are often based on ex parte and unsworn information, and are intended usually as only a basis on which other officers may determine whether a formal investigation should be made. I doubt that there is any compelling reason or demand for making such interoffice communications open to examination by parties in interest. Aside from such classes of records, I am of the opinion that the Coast Guard policy should be to make casualty report records available without partiality to all parties in interest. That this is in keeping with the sense of Congress is evidenced by the express direction in the first subsection of section 4450 that all reports on casualties involving loss of life shall be public records open to inspection at reasonable times by all persons.

I do not believe that it is consonant with the standard of ethics which the American people have a right to expect from their Government to make available information to one party and not to the other, particularly when the parties are involved in litigation concerning the subject matter of the report. It seems to me that this is particularly true where one of the parties is an agency of the United States. The Coast Guard is attempting at this time to work out arrangements under which this policy can be more effectively pursued. We should always keep in mind, however, that the basic purpose of the investigative authority granted in section 4450 is to determine the cause of casualties so that they can be prevented in the future, not to serve as a detective agency to ascertain the facts making for pecuniary liability on the part of the interests concerned.

In closing I should like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to talk to you this evening and also for the understanding cooperation which the Coast Guard has always received from this association. The fine professional attitude displayed by the American bar is one of the factors that has made the democratic experiment in America a successful one. Let us now dedicate ourselves to the task of proving that under the rule of law a democratic nation can prosecute a great war to a final victorious conclusion and can then build a lasting and just peace.

Polish Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a petition to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, of Chicago, Ill. It is a very timely and righteous plea for the Polish cause:

POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The executive council of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, assembled at its regular monthly meeting on May 8, 1945, at its headquarters in Chicago, Ill., considered the present situation of our ally, Poland, who has been freed from German occupation.

This meeting fell on VE-day, the day of the official ending of the war in Europe—a day of rejoicing and thanksgiving. Nevertheless, our joy is tempered by anguish and fear because the Polish nation, which was the first to take up arms against the aggressors who now have capitulated before the armed forces of the United Nations, principally the forces of America, cannot be found among the other free nations at the Conference at San Francisco and cannot express her views. This situation is all the more appalling when we note how the Soviet regime is arresting, liquidating by deportations or executions, Polish patriots, who for over 5½ years have been fighting heroically with great sacrifices against our common enemy.

Soviet Russia is supposed to be an ally of the Allied Powers but she deals with Poland, one of the staunchest members of the United Nations, whom the immortal President Roosevelt called "the inspiration of nations," as one of her and our worse enemies. Soviet Russia imposing on Poland a communistic government which has nothing in common with the spirit of the Polish nation, renders more difficult the formation of a representative government in Poland; forms new communistic organizations; allows not freedom of religion, and acts toward Poland as a dictator.

Deporting 16 leaders of the Polish underground to Russia under false pretenses establishes new proof that the Soviet regime is not dealing honestly with the Polish nation but by all possible means is trying to destroy Poland's vital strength and to subjugate her to slavery.

The executive council of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America hereby fervently appeals to you, Mr. President, as the executive head of this country and the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, in which serve thousands of members of our organization, to demand from Soviet Russia, our ally:

1. That she give the Polish nation freedom in selecting her own government;

2. That she discontinue mass arrests in Poland and the deportation of its inhabitants and promptly release the 16 arrested Polish patriots;

3. That she allow American relief organizations entrance to Poland.

Moreover, we also request:

1. That Members of Congress and the press be sent into Poland and the territory taken away from Poland east of the so-called Curzon line to investigate the existing conditions there;

2. That the delegates of the legal Polish Government in London be invited to the conference in San Francisco.

Above all, Mr. President, the executive council of the Polish Roman Cathoic Union of America resolves unanimously to continue strongly and loyally to support all the war efforts of our Government in the victorious fight against Japan for the establishment of a lasting and just peace on earth. We believe unshakingly that you, Mr. President, as a champion of freedom, security, and the rights of nations will not allow harm to befall Poland, and will not permit that enslavement be the reward of this brave and trustworthy ally of the United States. Therefore, we place the fate of Poland in your able hands and your august judgment.

For the executive council of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America,

JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.
STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General.

Congress Faces a Great Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for today:

CONGRESS FACES A GREAT ISSUE

The House Ways and Means Committee approved yesterday the proposed extension and expansion of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Thus the first step has been taken toward enactment of one of the most necessary of all measures for post-war international economic cooperation. Yet committee approval came by the rather narrow majority of 14 to 11. One Democrat and all 10 Republicans on the committee voted against the bill. Such a line up indicates that the vote on this measure in the full Congress may be on traditional party lines, with a few Democrats wavering because of special interests which ask for tariff protection in their districts. A vote of this type, wholly apart from its danger to the extension of the act, would be an outstanding example, particularly from the Republican side, of the triumph of historic party tradition over common sense and present logical consistency.

Traditionally the Republican Party has been the party of strong central government. It has been the party of the tariff. These two aims were voiced by Alexander Hamilton, and to a large extent they went logically together. The Democratic Party, on the other hand, following the intellectual leadership of Thomas Jefferson, has been traditionally the party of restricted central government, the party of States' rights, and the party of free trade—or at least of a tariff "for revenue only." These aims also went logically and consistently together.

But in the long period in which the Democrats have recently been in power, the two parties have in some fundamental respects changed their historic position. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, the Democrats extended the power of the central Government in many directions. It was then the Republicans who began to talk most of restricting the central Government, of restoring States' rights, of abolishing a multitude of governmental controls, of protecting the freedom of the individual. But with respect to the tariff, both parties kept their traditional positions. President Roosevelt and the Democratic majority supported the reciprocal trade program of Cordell Hull. The Republicans in both Houses, on the other hand, opposed that program in 1934 by an adverse vote of 127 to 7, in 1937 by an adverse vote of 95 to 3, and in 1940 by an adverse vote of 166 to 5; though they fortunately broke this record in the war-time year of 1943 by voting in favor of extension by 163 to 66.

In recent years, indeed, insistence of Republicans on high tariff barriers has led them into obvious self-contradictions. They protest against "Government interference with business" while asking for the greatest interference with business in the tariff field. They demand the economic freedom of the individual at the same time that they try to prevent the individual, by prohibitive tariff barriers, from buying foreign goods. High tariffs distort the whole structure of production in America. They build up artificial industries and force the American consumer either to take a poorer product or to pay more for the same product than he would have to do without the tariff. By thus artificially restricting what we can buy from abroad, the tariff in the long run restricts by an equal amount what we can sell abroad, and so shrinks our export industries by at least as much as it expands the protected industries. The result, in other words, is to protect our comparatively inefficient industries at the cost of hobbling our most efficient industries. World tariff barriers mean a shrinkage of the total wealth that the world can produce and consume.

By an inconsistency similar to that of the Republicans, some of our extreme national planners have declared themselves in favor of freedom of world trade, not recognizing that such freedom would ruin their neat national plans. A few who have recognized this fact have continued to give lip support to free world trade while trying to introduce protection through the back door by an insistence that the wage scales paid by foreign concerns selling to us must be as high as our own. This would impose even more impassable trade barriers than high tariffs, and would do so under the false guise of humanitarianism.

It is time for the Republicans, and in particular those who sincerely wish to preserve free enterprise, to re-examine their first principles. They would come to see that high tariffs and other barriers to international trade are not consistent with free enterprise but are, notwithstanding their age, forms of Government planning which force production out of its natural channels. Freedom of international trade goes with freedom of domestic trade, while restrictions on the one beget restrictions on the other.

Victory in Europe!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 16), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victory in Europe!" published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of May 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY IN EUROPE!

It is faith again, after deep doubt.

It is hope again, after long and desperate struggles against despair.

It is belief in man, in life, in God—renewed or restored. It is the difference between a world making sense and a world gone mad. It is a lift and a light to men who have been dwelling in the depths of darkness.

Great realities produce this epochal renascence.

Intolerable evil has been decisively brought low. The moral law of the universe has been vindicated.

The awful slaughter and destruction—at least in Europe—have been ended.

We have won another chance to achieve a world in which men and nations can find satisfaction and joy in themselves and in each other.

Profound as are gratification and gratitude for the end of the fighting in Europe, there can be no frivolous, irresponsible rejoicing.

Our first thoughts, even now, must be for those who have died in this cause and for those who grieve for them.

Even now, we cannot forget the grave prospect still confronting all the world.

Millions of men, including tens of thousands of our own, have died for a world of justice, decency, and peace. The duty they leave with the rest of us cannot be forgotten—not even in this moment.

It is a terrific responsibility still imposed upon us. Surely no one can believe that we can now simply return to old, easy-going ways. We face a world still stricken with horror, still subject to intense hatreds, in many places fighting hopelessness—and hunger, everywhere facing complex problems.

We must not suffer the delusion that all is now well. We must not break faith with those who have made possible this new opportunity. This is a time for solemn rededication. So far we are victorious. But awful dangers remain. If we fail to fight on against them, all that we have won can still be lost.

Not yet has the world been wholly delivered from war. Far from it. A terrible struggle continues in the Pacific. Even now the news is emphasizing the awful costliness of that conflict. But the end there, too, is assured. Its coming will be accelerated by the utter downfall of Germany—perhaps greatly accelerated.

Every American's critical duty now is to do nothing to retard the coming defeat of Japan, to do everything possible to hasten it.

It is a fearful, unprecedented responsibility which comes with the victory in Europe. We Americans share that responsibility. The Continent is in a state of acute catastrophe.

Immediate urgencies in meeting human need and establishing order now confront us.

Beyond is the vastly complex and dangerously difficult business of reconstructing a world. It is a business in many ways more difficult and demanding than the making of war. If there is to be abiding hope that the great new opportunity now won will not be dissipated and lost, supreme qualities and heroic sacrifices will continue to be demanded.

The fate of Europe, and of the world, is in the making of the victors.

What is going to be done about it?

It took sacrifices to the death, infinite courage, absolute devotion, to win the war.

It will take the same spirit, the same fidelity, to achieve genuine peace.

But we had to fight to save the Nation, and the world. Yes, and we still have to fight in another way, we still have to go on giving out uttermost, if the Nation and the world are to continue safe, if victory is to be consolidated and completed.

The hardest tests still lie before us.

In Europe the destructive duties have been done.

Now the creative tasks must be assumed. Unless those challenges are met adequately, our victory will start slipping away from us before we realize it. There will be no victory.

Onward the battle must go, now to creative and final victory.

New York Foreign-Trade Zone Vital in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, before the Lions Club, of Quebec, Canada, at the Chateau Frontenac, May 16, 1945:

Now that the paramount task of defeating the Axis is well on its way to completion, both the Dominion of Canada and the United States are faced with the responsibility of readjusting their giant industrial machines to meet peacetime needs and what is even more important, to providing new jobs for war workers and former service men and women. The immensity of this task must not be understated.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace says that 60,000,000 jobs must be provided in the United States and that this pay roll would translate into an annual national income of from one hundred and forty to one hundred and seventy billion dollars. The Department of Commerce believes that a substantial increase in foreign trade, both imports and exports, is essential to the achievement of these goals.

Consquently, every device capable of accelerating our trade relations with other nations will be utilized fully in attaining this important post-war objective.

In searching for ways and means of this character, we in the Department of Commerce and the Foreign-Trade Zones Board were again impressed by the possibilities of foreign-trade zones, known in some countries as free ports.

A foreign-trade zone is a sort of hospitable fenced-off vestibule in or adjoining the customs port, where products from abroad may be deposited and stored indefinitely, rehandled, assorted, relabeled, reclassified, processed, repackaged, manipulated, and transshipped to foreign climes—without passing through the customs gates or barriers. While the goods remain in the foreign-trade zone they may be regarded as still in foreign territory and not subject to duty or customs requirements. Vessels entering the zone may discharge foreign cargo without delay incident to customs entry.

One of the little known but highly significant acts in the field of foreign trade was the establishment of a foreign trade zone on Staten Island in 1937. Congressman EMANUEL CELLER who sponsored the 1934 legislation which made this development possible, had hoped that in addition to New York, other zones would be established on the several coastal regions of the United States. Unfortunately, the war intervened before other zones could be developed and even the Staten Island zone had to be removed to temporary locations in the New York harbor to make way for war needs.

In spite of these set-backs, preparations are now being completed for the opening of a foreign-trade zone at New Orleans, La., and a similar facility will be established in one of the leading California ports as soon as war conditions permit.

It should be understood that the Celler Act is merely permissive legislation. Under the law, corporations—both public and private—may apply to the Federal Board for a license to operate a foreign-trade zone. Private corporations first must be authorized by the State legislature before making application for a license.

Ports of the United States are controlled by the States or municipalities rather than by the National Government, as in the case of the harbor here in Quebec and certain other Canadian ports. Therefore, the Federal Government can do little to develop these foreign-trade zones except encourage our major port officials to provide such facilities in the interest of international trade. When a zone has been authorized and established, the Foreign Trade Zones Board, created under the Celler Act, and of which the Secretary of Commerce is chairman, supervises the operation as a public utility. The other members of the Board are the Secretaries of War and Treasury.

In my capacity as executive secretary of this Board I have had ample opportunity to observe first hand the operations of the New York foreign-trade zone since it was established on the municipally owned piers on Staten Island early in 1937. Built shortly after the First World War, these facilities had seldom been used during the intervening years.

Like any other commercial activity undertaken during a major business depression, the zone was slow to get under way. Because there was little cargo attracted during the first days or weeks of its existence, skeptics quickly pointed out that the zone idea was without merit. They refused to recognize the obvious—that the zone's prospective customers and merchandise were located in distant foreign countries and that time and energy would be required to acquaint foreign businessmen with the advantages and purposes of the zone. Later on when an effective zone operation had been created, business began to clamor for admission to the foreign-trade zone. Even before war clouds began to hover over Europe, 152 different commodities from 50 foreign countries had already been handled successfully in the New York foreign-trade zone.

That this zone has successfully performed its function of fostering and promoting foreign commerce is clearly reflected in the cumulative summary of activities for the first 5 years that it was in operation on Staten Island. During this period, 11,790 lots of merchandise, weighing 451,000 tons and valued at $205,000,000, have passed through the zone. Duties collected on that part which entered the United States amounted to $6,688,745. The gross operating income of the 5-year period totaled more than $1,500,000.

During 1 year (1940) 70,000 tons of foreign merchandise, valued at more than $13,000,000 or 50 percent of all foreign goods handled that year was transshipped to 60 foreign countries.

Alongside its transshipment trade, the New York foreign-trade zone has built up an important consignment market for imports. This market has proven a bonanza for small importers who heretofore have been dependent on larger buyers to import and parcel out their raw-material requirements. At the foreign-trade zone an importer, however small, deals direct with the foreign owner. In a number of instances this practice has already proved a distinct advantage to both foreign suppliers and to small American manufacturers.

Canadian farmers have been materially benefited by the New York foreign-trade zone. In former years substantial quantities of potatoes were shipped direct from the ports of the maritime provinces to the Caribbean region and to South America. War needs necessitated the suspension of this service. As an emergency measure, thousands of bushels of potatoes were shipped by rail to the New York foreign-trade zone where as a protective measure they were repacked in baskets and loaded aboard steamers for forwarding to final destinations.

Following are a number of other important activities which have been carried on in the New York foreign-trade zone: Critical ores, including tungsten and antimony from China and South America, are classified, sampled, refined, mixed, and repacked in drums of domestic manufacture. Prior to the outbreak of the war we depended on Germany for refining and processing these vital ores.

Tobacco from the Netherlands East Indies is matured, reconditioned, sampled, weighed, repacked, and auctioned according to the age-long custom of the Dutch.

Diamonds from South America are examined, graded, and repackaged for industrial purposes.

Brazil nuts are ripened, ventilated, sorted, cleaned, bagged, weighed, and repacked.

Drugs, grains, and seeds are cleaned and graded.

Cotton and woolen piece goods from the United Kingdom are examined, cut, sampled, and various lots are combined for reexport.

Spirits, brandy, rum, wine, and whisky are stored to age, containers are examined for leakage, barrels recoopered and reconditioned.

An exporter of scotch whisky at Glasgow may ship hogheads of that now-precious liquid to New York's foreign-trade zone, where they can be emptied into bottles, cased, and shipped into customs territory, to State dispensary and bottle stores for sale to the consuming public. That canny Scot exporter could save the cost of excess sea freight on bottles and cases and avoid damage resulting from glass and case breakage.

South American canned meats are inspected, labeled, keys are affixed to cans and cans repacked in cartons for domestic markets or reexport.

Manipulations may change the customs classification of a commodity. For example, Peruvian and Chilean peas processed and split at the zone enjoy an especial advantage since duty on split peas is less than on whole ones.

Importers find it advantageous to use the zone when the tariff classification of merchandise is undetermined or subject to dispute. The formalities of adjustment between the amount of duty assessed on entry and that finally determined to be correct are elminated.

Fish-liver oils are a case in point. Several weeks are required for the Federal Government to conduct tests to gage the vitamin potency of these medicinal products. Only then is it known whether the oil is dutiable or nondutiable.

Imported merchandise affected by consumption quotas, pure food and drug regulations or other laws can be kept at the zone until such regulations are complied with. For example, while the restriction quota is in effect the goods may still come into the zone to await the lifting of said quota.

Despite the handicaps of the war, here is an excellent illustration of how the zone operates. During the year 1943, 5,000,000 pounds of plain, ordinary cotton thread was shipped from the United Kingdom to the New York foreign-trade zone where it was redistributed to 26 foreign countries, including all of Latin and South American countries as well as Soviet Russia and British West Africa. This one shipment was valued at nearly $6,000,000.

Here is another illustration which should appeal to the ingenuity of every foreign trader. Prior to the outbreak of the war, Japan had taken over the market for cheap cotton textiles worn by the natives of the Belgian Congo and east and west Africa. These articles of clothing, shirts, and so-called singlets had, in times past, been supplied by British mills. When the Jap supply was cut off, orders again reverted to Great Britain which was unable to manufacture them. New sources of supply were sought to no avail in the United States and finally the United States prevailed upon Mexico to manufacture these particular cotton articles. This business, estimated at approximately $15,000,000 a year, has been carried on to a considerable extent through the New York foreign-trade zone. During the past year, over 15,000 cases of these goods, destined for the natives of Africa and valued at $1,500,000, have been shipped to the zone for repacking and transshipment. As Mexico has no direct services with Africa, obviously if this business is to be continued after the war, it will have to be transshipped from New York or some other foreign-trade zone on our east or Gulf coast.

A distinct advantage of the foreign-trade zone is that it brings a new competitive facility into the field of foreign trade. In years past, the Congress of the United States has recognized the need for segregating that part of our foreign trade known as transshipments and reexports as far as possible free from the application of our customs laws. To accomplish this purpose, bonded warehouse and drawback laws were early enacted. I will not get into a technical description of those measures for I understand that similar provisions have been made in Canadian tariff laws.

Shortly after the close of the First World War considerable agitation arose in the United States to authorize foreign trade zones. Bills were introduced to this effect but Congress compromised or temporized by authorizing bonded warehouses to permit manipulation of foreign merchandise under

customs supervision (sec. 562 of the Tariff Act, 1922). Despite the granting of the privilege to manipulate in customs bonded warehouses, few importers took advantage of this provision. As in the case of the drawback laws, many importers considered there were too many formalities involved. Warehousemen generally had little desire to encourage importers to utilize this newly authorized privilege until the foreign trade zone came into operation on Staten Island.

Records show that few customs bonded warehouses offered manipulating facilities until the foreign-trade zone announced this service to the shipping public. A comparison of 1937, the year the zone opened, with 1944 bonded warehouse listings in the Customs House Guide, published in New York City for the past 75 years, will serve to illustrate this situation. Although the 1937 Guide does not have a single listing of a class 8 manipulating warehouse in the port of New York—note this, the 1944 Guide lists 39 warehouses in the port of New York offering this service.

This belated additional service to shippers was not restricted to New York for bonded warehouses in other ports obtained customs manipulating privileges to minimize arguments advanced by local foreign-trade zone proponents. For instance, according to the Guide, Boston did not have a single warehouse authorized to permit merchandise manipulations in 1937 but in 1944 this class of service was offered by 18 bonded warehouses. Philadelphia had only 3 manipulating warehouses in 1937, but by 1944 22 warehouses had obtained authority to manipulate. For the country as a whole, the number rose from 38 in 1937 to 140 in 1944, an increase of 270 percent. Prior to the enactment of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, warehousemen in only one United States port (New Orleans) attached importance to the manipulating privilege of the Tariff Act. In 1937 New Orleans had 21 manipulating warehouses, although strangely enough, by 1944, this number had been reduced to 18.

The advantage of manipulating imported merchandise in the New York foreign-trade zone is mainly because of the fact that the importer has free access to his merchandise at all times. If he desires, he may carry on manipulations and any other activity short of manufacturing on a 24-hour basis. If the occasion arises, he may erect his own building to meet his peculiar requirements. Bonded warehouse regulations limit manipulations and examinations of goods to regular working hours.

Merchants who have established operations in the New York foreign-trade zone state that it is akin to the satisfaction of owning your own home. On many occasions, upward of 500 people have been engaged in the various zone manipulations at the same time. Some operations have been conducted on a 24-hour basis.

You may ask—Why encourage us to establish facilities which may adversely affect the New York foreign-trade zone or other trade zones which may be planned in the United States? I frankly admit that a few years ago a selfish desire to retain zone benefits exclusively for our own ports would have made this assignment quite unattractive to me. Today, however, I have a somewhat different viewpoint and I am happy to be here to counsel with you, at your request, on the possibilities which the foreign-trade zone offers in the postwar period.

Should Quebec decide to go ahead with such plans, I entertain no fears that they would injure our own ports. On the other hand, I think the results would serve to stimulate them. If foreign-trade zones or free ports are authorized in Canadian harbors, our own gateway ports will of necessity be put on their toes to meet the requirements of modern commerce. Furthermore, if a foreign-trade zone or free port is established in Canada, there is every reason to believe it would substantially contribute to increasing trade between the two countries, a trade which is already greater than the total commerce between any other two countries on the face of the earth.

If Canada and the United States are to maintain national incomes on the scale needed to sustain employment and the standard of living to which both countries have attained, then their existing interchange of commerce must not only be maintained but substantially increased. While foreign trade is important to the economy of the United States, it is even more vital to Canada. A recent bulletin of the Royal Bank of Canada pointed out that in the years between the two World Wars, Canada's exports represented an average 30 to 35 percent of her national income, while less than 10 percent of the United States national income accrued from export business.

My records include considerable data regarding efforts which have been made to authorize foreign-trade zones in Canada. An examination of this material shows that most of the arguments advanced against the foreign-trade zone program in Canada were strangely similar to those employed in the United States when the legislation was before the Congress. Here is a typical example:

The geographical position of Canada is not analogous to European nations, being removed from other countries to which imported merchandise might be reexported.

Whoever developed this theory surely overlooked the United States which is right at Canada's front door and where nearly 140,000,000 people comprise the greatest market in the world. One enterprising United States firm appreciated this opportunity 20 years ago as official Canadian documents show that in 1927 a New York concern offered to expend $30,000,000 to build foreign-trade zone facilities on the St. Lawrence.

Improved surface and air transportation will also bring other areas into Canada's trading orbit, all of which will serve to aid in overcoming this so-called geographical disadvantage.

Another argument which we have all heard before is that foreign-trade zones would encourage smuggling and add to the cost of administering the customs laws. The United States Treasury Department has stated that the foreign-trade zone is the safest area in the New York Harbor as far as smuggling is concerned. In the United States the cost of customs policing the zone is borne by the operator. This is somewhat similar to the present practice wherein United States bonded warehousemen must reimburse the Government for storekeepers' salaries.

Another argument advanced in opposition to the zone is that local merchants and importers are satisfied with existing privately owned bonded warehouse facilities. Well, maybe they are, but the traders who will utilize the foreign-trade zone or free port are usually located abroad and as far as a proposed Canadian zone is concerned, some may be United States importers. I hope we can feel the same about Canadian importers in respect to the use of our own foreign-trade zones.

Since colonial days, the St. Lawrence River has served as a broad highway to the heart of North America. I am sure that its usefulness to industry and commerce will become more important as time goes on. When it was agreed that I would make this trip, I eagerly reviewed some of Canada's early history. In Donald Grant Creighton's recent book, Dominion of the North, the exploits of Jacques Cartier, the Breton from St. Malo, were vividly recalled. Cartier first explored the St. Lawrence Estuary in 1534 and immediately recognized the tremendous trading possibilities which this area offered. Seven years later he returned to the St. Lawrence region to develop this trade, but hurriedly sailed for France because he feared the hostility of the Indians. Those who are interested in introducing this new principle into the field of foreign trade may also encounter hostile Indians in the guise of selfish interests. Unless the sponsors have the courage to meet and overcome such opposition, it would be better to abandon the idea altogether.

In conclusion, let me say that it has not been my purpose to come here to sell you on the foreign-trade zone plan, or to influence any possible legislation in your country. Rather, my intention has been to try to clear up the misunderstandings which have been associated with this facility. If you good people of Canada decide to go ahead with such plans, you may rest assured that you will have our full cooperation.

Care of Veterans at Wakeman General Hospital, Camp Atterbury, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Eli E. Stone on the fine medical care and treatment given to our disabled and sick veterans of this war by the officers—doctors and nurses—and enlisted personnel of the United States Army, Wakeman General Hospital, located at Camp Atterbury, Ind.:

MARCH 27, 1945.

Congressman JOHN W. McCORMICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was my privilege to visit the United States Army Wakeman General Hospital at Camp Atterbury, Ind., on March 10, 1945, and to have been afforded an opportunity to tour the installation. As I understand it, it is one of the largest combined hospital and convalescent facilities in the country.

It has accomplished much under the inspiring leadership and untiring effort of its commanding officer, Col. Haskett L. Conner, of the Army Medical Corps, and his superior professional staff. The institution has been established less than a year, yet in a period of 8 months 2,896 major surgical procedures have been performed. Nineteen thousand, eight hundred and twenty-five patients have been admitted for hospital care up to the present time. Almost a thousand patients are being prepared for plastic surgical correction of deformities; 700 of these require dental and head and neck surgery. Three hundred are being prepared for the painstaking neurosurgical procedures necessary for recovery of function of severed nerves. Many of the excellent staff are physicians who were formerly faculty members of some of the leading medical institutions in the country.

It leaves one with a feeling of tremendous comfort and pride to witness the high spirit and morale of our young men who have disfiguring facial scars and deformed extremities. The observation of a bedside neighbor who has shown a dramatic restoration to a normal appearance and function gives a dynamic spirited assurance to the new arrival from the theater of operations. The most effective uplift of hope and confidence in full recovery is the chance for a soldier

to observe a buddy in the process of being restored to normal by modern scientific surgery. It is apparent that there is no other circumstance where the doctor-patient relationship is more harmonious than this; the sick or wounded soldier witnesses an Army surgeon laboriously throwing himself into restoring the health of his comrades with the same intense industry and anxious effort that the field soldier demonstrates in the performance of his duty at the battle front.

Colonel Conner has a deep conviction that he has in his command some of the finest medical and surgical talent available in this Nation and he has shown unwearying effort to place every available instrument of modern science in the hands of his medical officers for the restoration of the battle-injured youth of this country. The convalescent patient program unit attached to this hospital has been in operation for 8 months and is conducting an active program for its 4,700 patients, returning officers and enlisted men to duty in excellent condition, and conducting classes in crafts, trades, and academic subjects for those who are to be returned to civilian pursuits.

Last summer the hospital had an interesting twofold function. In addition to general hospital care, the entire One Hundred and Sixth Division, which as you know has been publicly lauded by the Secretary of War, received its medical care at this hospital in preparation for its valorous performance on the western battle front.

Commendation from surrounding medical groups in the State of Indiana for the excellence of its scientific caliber has been expressed by invitations for the professional staff to speak before several scientific and lay assemblies on the latest developments in the treatment of the war injured. Numerous scientific meetings have been conducted at the hospital for the visiting military and civilian physicians. Such achievement is all the more praiseworthy because it is one of the newest Army general hospitals in the country, having been in operation for less than 1 year. It is centrally located in the Midwest and enables convalescent patients to visit their homes in the adjacent States of Illinois, Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

The medical program is quite diversified and includes the Medical Technicians School of the Women's Army Corps program which has been fruitful in developing technical talents which result in well skilled and schooled effective personnel for the various medical departments and laboratories of the Army general hospitals throughout the country. There are 800 students enrolled in this technical educational program at the present time who will be distributed to the various Army hospitals as they request technicians. The self-effacing industry of the civilian nurses aides from the surrounding towns has been extremely helpful in lightening the burden of excessive demands placed upon the Army nurses. No verbal commendation can describe the toil and endeavor that the nurses at this hospital are administering in the care and comfort of the sick.

The facilities are constantly expanding to meet the increased need of beds for the casualties from both hemispheres. The recent appropriation of $1,500,000 to the convalescent and reconditioning program at this institution will effect progress and development of the program in which we may take just pride. A visit to a hospital installation of this type will prove to all citizens of this Nation that they can rest assured that devoted and painstaking scientific care is being given to the men and women in the service in the best American tradition. The entire staff has been fully conscious of the responsibility which a grateful nation seeks in the care of its heroic sick and wounded.

Very truly yours,

ELI E. STONE.

Case of Bootlicking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Mirror of May 14, 1945:

CASE OF BOOTLICKING

The one-way friendship between the United States and Soviet Russia was never better illustrated than in the story from Washington dated May 6 in the New York Herald Tribune.

It reveals as nothing else can the distrust of the Russian Government for the United States and makes a mockery of all the glib promises of the charming Mr. Molotov at the San Francisco Conference and his treacherous boss in the Kremlin.

The Office of War Information is about to send 20,000 copies of a monthly illustrated magazine to Russia to explain America's government and people to the Russians.

The reciprocal nature of our friendship for Russia comes to light in this paragraph of the story:

"This Russian-language O. W. I. magazine is the first magazine carrying American material to circulate freely in the Soviet Union since 1917."

On the other hand, not only has every kind of Russian (Communist) magazine circulated freely in the United States of America since 1917 but dozens of magazines and newspapers have circulated freely here which have not only directly advocated the overthrow of our form of government but a Moscow financed and directed political party was set up here to carry out that revolution.

Could anything better illustrate the fraudulent nature of the Russian democracy?

And, we may add, could anything better illustrate the infantile trustfulness of our own democracy?

Here is the way the O. W. I. in its publication is compelled to lick the boots of the Soviet Government. We quote:

"The material for each issue is dispatched to Moscow for review by the O. W. I. there and by the Soviet foreign office and then returned to New York, where it is set in type and printed."

This word "review" is a polite Elmer Davisism for censorship.

In other words, an American publication is subject to the censorship of the Soviet Foreign Office.

Meanwhile, Messrs. Molotov and Stalin and their Red "heels" in America drip honey from their lips about free democratic Russia.

No Communist publication in America is subject to censorship by our Government.

But we must smirk and crawl before the censors of Moscow.

Again:

"No frivolous aspects of American life are treated. Instead, subjects akin to Russian interests are treated."

Why Rusian interests?

Why not American interests?—seeing that the taxpayers of America are paying the O. W. I. something like $54,000,000 a year for their services.

Does not this sort of fawning before the Russian slave state on the part of the country—the United States of America—which has, according to Stalin, won her war for Russia against Germany, make all real Americans gag?

One section of the magazine is devoted to a study of the American form of government.

This is the form of government that Russia has been plotting to destroy since the founding of the commintern by Lenin in 1918.

So cold and impudently open was the continuous attempt of the Soviet Government to destroy our form of government that President Roosevelt in 1935 protested to Russia against activities on the part of Moscow involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States of America.

On August 27 of that year Russia declined to accept the protest. (Events Leading Up to World War No. 2. Government Printing Office.)

Is it not, then, almost comic that at this late day we should print a magazine for the Russians explaining our form of government?

The Red Russians know the form of our Government too well. They hate it. They have tried to destroy it for 27 years.

And will the Soviet Foreign Office censor our Bill of Rights as printed in the Elmer Davis magazine or will all 20,000 copies stealthily disappear—as did the recent delegation from Poland to Moscow and Messrs. Ehrlich and Alter, the Jewish Polish Socialists who were secretly executed by the Russian Government?

For the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Portland Oregonian of April 26, 1945:

FOR THE FUTURE

Oregon has reason to be proud that when the great emergency came her sons were ready. The percentage of rejections by Selective Service for physical reasons was lower in Oregon than in any other State. The Oregon rate was 24.4 percent, the national average 39.2 percent. But Oregon has no cause for complacency.

Many factors contributed to the good health of Oregon's youth—climate, attraction, and availability of outdoor life, medical care, and health programs for parents and children, sports and fitness programs in the schools—and it would be impossible to give to each its relative value.

Educators and health officers have known for years, however, that the health and physical training courses in elementary and high schools of the State, and particularly in some rural districts, have not always achieved the standards which are desirable. The range has been from virtual neglect to excellent, depending upon the affluence of the school district or the ability and interest of instructors.

To remedy these defects and to enforce a uniform and carefully planned program of physical and health education in all schools, the Oregon State Joint Committee for Health and Physical Fitness brought to the legislature a bill approved by medical, physical education, and military authorities of this State and the Nation. The assembly approved the bill and Governor Snell signed it into law.

The State superintendent of public instruction is directed by this act to employ field workers, under an appropriation of $26,000, to see that the school district boards carry out its provisions, which are to establish well-defined programs of physical fitness, health education, and health examinations in all elementary and high schools.

The superintendent will rate the schools on the basis of their records, and will set up the standards.

The assembly was well advised in defeating a bill for compulsory military training of all high-school students and passing the law to bring the health and physical standards of Oregon's boys and girls to the highest possible point.

Big Three Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of May 15, 1945:

MEETING OF BIG THREE DOUBTED AT PARLEY—TRUMAN WOULD DO WELL TO SPIKE SUCH PROPOSALS, SAYS OBSERVER

(By David Lawrence)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 15.—The persistent predictions that a meeting of the Big Three is soon to be held in Europe find little credence here. The idea is occasionally referred to also in Paris dispatches, where suggestions are made that General de Gaulle should be included in any such meetings.

As a matter of fact, President Truman would make the biggest kind of a hit with the American people if he squelched all the plans and proposals and suggestions looking toward personal diplomacy and if he returned intercourse with foreign nations to their normal channels.

Provision was made at the Yalta Conference for frequent meetings of the Secretaries of State. This is a very good formula and does not involve any embarrassments for the heads of governments.

President Truman did not come to the San Francisco Conference because, he said, the United States had a good delegation which had his complete confidence. He added that he would stay at his desk where he felt he belonged.

Marshall Stalin never leaves Russia, but requires the heads of other states to come to him. He always pleads pressure of business. The American people can hardly relish the idea of sending their President on roving missions to other distant parts of the globe to conduct their foreign affairs.

YALTA HANDICAPS KNOWN

The handicaps imposed by the Yalta Conference are well known. Some of the persons who attended that meeting say privately that it was a mistake for the late President Roosevelt to stake everything on personal conversations with the other heads of state without even keeping a stenographic record of what was said. Also the haste with which the Yalta agreement was written is today proof of the ill-advised nature of the whole conference.

Thus, the Russians are claiming that even the Polish question was not to be submitted to interallied consultations unless "in the opinion of the governments concerned" it was deemed desirable to do so. If this phraseology had been carefully examined or if there had been time for the text to be transmitted to Washington to be reviewed by the State Department, it is quite probable that the ambiguity would have been removed. Today Russia stands on that ambiguity and insists that the question of what to do about the new Polish Government is, strictly speaking, not yet ready, in her opinion, for interallied handling.

The using of a roving ambassador, as President Wilson employed Colonel House and as Mr. Roosevelt used Harry Hopkins, is not improper or unwise because a special envoy sometimes has to go to more than one post and an ambassador accredited to a single country cannot be effective in a variety of places.

COULD SEND BYRNES

It may be that President Truman will decide to send James F. Byrnes to Europe to talk with the heads of governments there on current matters. Mr. Byrnes was present at the Yalta Conference and has the necessary background. But for Mr. Truman to leave the United States and try to be his own ambassador or Secretary of State is to retain an element in American foreign affairs which cannot but bring more misunderstandings than before.

Mr. Truman has indicated that he is the kind of Chief Executive who likes to pick a good man and give him full authority and responsibility. In no field is this more important than in foreign affairs. Because Secretary of State Stettinius is tied up with the management of the United Nations Conference and will be for several weeks, it is natural for a special ambassador to be appointed to go to Europe in behalf of the President and the Secretary of State.

If it be insisted that heads of State must hold conferences to settle these thorny problems of the hour, then the next meeting should be held in Washington or London. If it is held abroad, then the United States should send a complete delegation with many officials and advisers very much as the British did at Yalta. But it is to be hoped that the President will find it desirable to act only through an intermediary and that he will not rely on secret personal conferences to deal with current problems of foreign relations.

O. P. A. Continues Mistaken Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Stuart (Nebr.) Advocate in the issue of May 10, 1945, points out a serious mistake that O. P. A. has been making in disregarding the recommendations of men experienced in the meat industry, for solving the problems of the production and distribution of meat. Instead its whole program is based on the policy of subsidies which tend to make people dependent on Government. He further tells what is bound to happen under the latest policy O. P. A. announces. The importance of this editorial is that it is written by a man in the meat producing section and reflects the opinion of people in the farming areas. It reads:

THE EDITOR'S COLUMN

(By Glenn E. Bunnell)

With more cattle on the range than ever, meat supplies are becoming shorter and shorter. O. P. A., it seems, fails to take the advice given it, and they seem no nearer a solution to the problem than they were several months ago.

A new O. P. A. regulation made with the intent of forcing more meat into packer channels, has limited small local slaughterers to 75 percent of the beef and 50 percent of the pork they killed a year ago. Will this help the situation? It is doubtful, but it will force a lot of small butcher slaughterers into the black market.

They will not be able to keep tab on all the smaller butchers, locker plants, and the like. These men can buy cattle and hogs direct from the farmer and kill them, reporting only the amount of their quota. Since they can show only 75 percent of the red points they collected last year they can sell a certain amount of meat without points. Not all the butchers will do this, but there will be enough of them who do, to make it tough on the honest man. The over-all result will be to increase the black market without increasing the meat supply in the centers of population.

The big, federally inspected packer, into whose hands O. P. A. is trying to force more meat, receives a subsidy payment of 2.9 cents per pound on beef or $29.90 on a 1,000-pound critter. This money from the Government must come from the people in taxes, and yet O. P. A. thinks to cut down the high cost of living by keeping down ceiling prices and paying the packer a subsidy. Why not increase the ceiling by 2.9 cents per pound and let the user of the meat pay the cost direct, rather than adding it to the tax bill?

It must be remembered, too, that every pound of meat diverted from small slaughterers to the large packers will cost the Government 2.9 cents per pound. This is added to our tax bill and provides a bonanza for the big packers.

The real reason for the shortage of meat is Government regulations. These change so often that feeders are afraid to feed cattle on a very large scale for fear some new bureaucratic whim might change the market and lose them money. They have always been willing to take a chance and back their own judgment on the open market controlled by the law of supply and demand, but they are afraid of O. P. A. meddling in the market.

Give the feeder some kind of assurance that he can make a fair profit, and put the ceilings at a level that will permit a fair profit to producer and processor and it will not be very long until the meat shortage is considerably relieved. The pork situation will take longer to mend, since many hog raisers sold their sows to the packer after running into trouble with the O. P. A. controlled market a year ago in December.

Congressional investigating committees have been very sharp in their criticism of the manner in which the meat situation has been handled. It appears that O. P. A.'s trouble has not been the lack of good advice, but rather, their failure to follow it. It seems that the bureaus in charge of foods have taken the stand that some form of subsidy is a panacea for food shortages, and they are not willing to give ear to any other advice.

Price control is all right, and so is rationing, but they must be wisely administered or chaos will result. I think that most of us will agree that the meat situation, at least, is chaotic.

Congress as a whole has been slow to realize the true state of affairs, but the constant urging of farm district Congressmen, and the shortage of meat on their own tables is starting to get results. It is to be hoped that Congress will soon curb the O. P. A.'s meddling and that the food situation will be put under the management of one bureau instead of three, as at present.

To get back to the small private slaughterer, who kills for sale in his own shop. Curbing them will not force more meat into federally inspected outlets. People in ths area where the beef cattle are produced are

going to have their meat. Living in a small midwestern town has its drawbacks, but one of the advantages is plenty of good meat. Many folks in this area are not willing to give up that advantage, and they will get the meat they want in spite of O. P. A. rules and bungling.

Many small slaughterers feed out the cattle they butcher, and they will not feed them for the city market.

Almost any man in this area knows more about the real facts in the meat situation than the high powered, alleged specialists of O. P. A. Recently an O. P. A. man met with the small slaughterers of this area to explain the new regulations. He read several pages of regulations from a bulletin and then said, "are there any questions?" There were but he could answer but a very few of the many questions asked. Many of these men drove 50 to 60 miles, on thin tires and scarce gas to have a man read them a few pages from a book, which he could not explain after he read it. That is a sample of O. P. A. regulation. It is one of the keys to O. P. A.'s failure to clear up the meat shortage.

Wounded Salisburian Gets His Stripes Back After Army Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Salisbury Times.

Sgt. Kenneth B. Dashiell, of Salisbury, Md., in the engineering branch of the service was wounded on D-day and spent 3 months in a hospital in England recovering from his injuries. Upon being discharged from the hospital, he was demoted to the rank of private.

I requested the War Department to investigate this situation, and I am pleased to advise that Sergeant Dashiell has been restored to his rank, and the War Department has rescinded the provisions of the Army regulations which permitted this demotion.

The article follows:

WOUNDED SALISBURIAN GETS HIS STRIPES BACK AFTER ARMY PROBE

An Army investigation of the unwarranted reduction in rank of a wounded Salisbury soldier has brought revision of Army regulations to prevent such action, Representative DUDLEY G. ROE reported today.

Sgt. Kenneth B. Dashiell, technician fourth grade, was wounded in Europe and, after hospitalization, returned to service. Assigned to a new unit, he was reduced in rank to private because there was no authorized vacancy as T-4 in the new organization to which he was assigned.

On the basis that Private Dashiell and many other wounded soldiers were receiving unfair treatment; a protest was made by the Times to Representative ROE. The War Department, conducting an investigation lasting several months, rejected one report from the European theater of operations as unsatisfactory and conducting a part of the investigation overseas.

REPORT TO ROE

Reporting to Representative ROE on the conclusion of the investigation and the receipt of a report from overseas, the War Department, through its general counsel, said:

"This report from the overseas command substantially confirmed the facts as set forth in the attached correspondence. Consequently, the headquarters of the European theater of operations has directed Private Dashiell's unit commander to restore him to his former grade of technician fourth grade, provided the soldier's conduct subsequent to the date of his reduction has been such as not to preclude this action.

"You will, no doubt, be interested to know that during the period that this case was under investigation, the War Department has rescinded the specific provision of Army regulations under which this enlisted man's reduction was accomplished."

Elmer B. Dashiell, Salisbury, father of Sergeant Dashiell, received a letter from him today stating that his stripes had been restored.

Polish Quibble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of May 15, 1945:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

POLISH QUIBBLE

If any case history were needed to illustrate the obstacles in the way of a true understanding between the western Allies, on the one hand, and Russia on the other, it was furnished by the note that Marshal Stalin sent to Prime Minister Churchill last Wednesday. Somehow news of the note leaked out and a small but noisy section of the press in this country spread sensational reports that Stalin had declared any further effort to work with Britain and America was hopeless. This is the section of the press that is deliberately trying to sabotage any international cooperation, apparently with the objective of making World War No. 3 inevitable.

The Stalin note was concerned solely with Poland. In effect, it served notice on Britain and America that the Soviet Union would accept in Poland only a security government; that is to say, the Lublin government dominated by Moscow. In other words, the note closed the door on any further discussion of Poland in accord with the Yalta agreement. Thus, while it went a long way, it did not justify the sensationalized accounts that in turn served to increase Russian suspicions and, consequently, was merely another step in the tragic circle in which this whole matter has been moving.

Since Yalta almost everything that has happened with respect to Poland has pointed to this final declaration by the master of the Kremlin. It may be useful to set forth here some facts that have not been generally known.

After the Yalta Conference, Britain and the United States submitted to Moscow a list of 30 names of Poles who were considered to have popular following and support from democratic groups within Poland. From this list, it was hoped, responsible men would be chosen who would join with responsible members of the Lublin Polish Government to form a new administration.

That was the hope. Moscow insisted that Lublin should have the right of veto over the selection of any men to go in the new government. Plainly, from the start, this made any new coalition government all but impossible, since one of the parties to the coalition was handed the veto power.

The result was as expected. After weeks of discussion only 1 name on the list of 30 was approved, and that was the name of an elderly professor whose inclusion in the Lublin government would have made no essential difference in its character.

That was the impasse when the news of the detention of the 16 missing Polish leaders was officially verified by Foreign Commissar Molotov at San Francisco. Out of this came a new impasse.

The Russians insisted on talking about 1 of the 16, Maj. Gen. Leopold Okulicki, whom they invariably refer to as a "Fascist saboteur." Neither the western Allies nor such Poles in exile as Stanislas Mikolajczyk, leader of the present party, are anxious to make a stand over General Okulicki. It is quite possible, they concede, that his reputation has been clouded by some form of collaboration.

What deeply concerns America and Britain is the fate of 14 of the 16—men of integrity and position who have proved themselves Polish patriots in the best sense. The Russians have little or nothing to say about these men. They talk about Okulicki.

Those who know Russia best would be completely pessimistic about the future were it not for one thing. There is no objective reason why the Soviet Union should take this unyielding stand. The Russians have everything to gain by making a few concessions and nothing, in their present position of world power, to lose. Therefore, say those who continue to cling to hope, common sense must sooner or later prevail.

But there is not likely to be any change until the facts, as seen from London and Washington, are put frankly before Stalin himself. Only Churchill and Truman can do that.

By making concessions, by keeping the Yalta agreement, by bringing a few men such as Mikolajczyk into the Lublin government, Russia would win over world opinion overwhelmingly. Credits and technical assistance from America would undoubtedly be forthcoming. Russia could make an inestimable contribution to at least 50 years of peace.

Following the present course, the Soviets are likely to bring on what apparently they fear most—a new hostile coalition that will mean a new war. They cannot bring themselves, it seems, to overcome old suspicions and old fears.

The difference between the two paths is so slight. It can happen, but not without a change of attitude at the top.

Seventh War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know the Seventh War Loan drive is now in progress and I think everyone will be interested to know that we have one Congressman who has been devoting his efforts to the sale of these bonds. I refer to Congressman GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, who last night appeared before

the Silver Spring, Md., Board of Trade and through his efforts the membership purchased more than a quarter of a million dollars worth of bonds. I want to take this opportunity to thank Representative CANFIELD for his efforts in helping to make the Seventh War Loan a success in western Maryland.

Rechristen Flying Fortress "Smiling Jack"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute to Lt. Jack J. Wangelin, son of Herman G. Wangelin, postmaster at Belleville, Ill., who was killed in action in World War No. 2, which appeared in the Illinois Postmasters News.

Jack Wangelin died a hero's death fighting for the perpetuation of our American way of life. He was one of the many young men of German ancestry from my congressional district who have given their life in this cause.

The tribute follows:

TRAGEDY

This war has left its cruel imprint upon the lives of many of our Nation's best. It has brought grief and suffering to hundreds of thousands of American homes through the sacrifice of loved ones upon the altar of freedoom.

When tragedy such as this deals its crushing blow, it is the thoughtfulness of friends that helps to heal a broken heart. It is through tributes such as the following, that a bereaved father gives his friends a glimpse into the character of the son he has lost. This appeared in Postal News, a publication issued monthly by the Belleville Service Relations Council, and was written by money-order clerk, Joe Reis its editor.

FIRST LT. JACK J. WANGELIN

I never knew the lad. I know his father. He thought the world and all of the lad. His picture stands on his desk. A determined looking chap.

I never knew the lad. I met a young man who had been with him in grade school. He tells me the lad was a good kid—never too formal or bold—not a bully—yet in for good clean fun—a real boy. In high school, a classmate tells me, he was a true sport—a square shooter—he co-captained his football team—he was a real leader—an outstanding student—he was given the citizenship award.

I never knew the lad, but his Army record is hard to beat. Various camps enjoyed his happy-go-lucky smile while in training. He worked hard and was commissioned a second lieutenant and got his wings at Stewart Field, N. Y.

I never knew the lad, but he was a pilot of a Flying Fortress and his plane was "wing" for the formation. He was training for squadron leader and he would have made it, they say, had not enemy flak cut him short—stopped him in the one determination of his indomitable will—the will to carry on, to fulfill the mission.

I never knew the lad, but one of his crew said: "There was an airman and a man," and they rechristened the Flying Fortress and called it *Smiling Jack* in his memory. A wonderful tribute to a wonderful pilot. It's like a diamond wreath to his previous awards of the Purple Heart and the Air Medal with Cluster.

I never knew the lad, but I know his friends, true friends, and I know his father, the Postmaster a fine man. Jack must have been a fine lad.

Ex-Soldiers Wallow in Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, guaranties in the G. I. bill of rights failed to eliminate and cut out red tape, thereby preventing the full enjoyment of all rights that should be enjoyed by the ex-soldier. This old red tape is so wound around the necks of ex-soldiers or ex-servicemen that they could choke before they could get relief. It is my opinion that Congress should do a constructive piece of work by cutting out such red tape as is revealed in the following article taken from the Miami (Fla.) Herald of March 28, 1945, and written by Jack Kofoed:

EX-SOLDIERS WALLOW IN RED TAPE

(By Jack Kofoed)

Hundreds upon hundreds of soldiers are being released from the armed forces every day. They have been told what the G. I. bill of rights guarantees them. Huh! Guarantee! All right, if they don't get what they expect, let them go ahead and sue.

The strong and the fit are not being released. A good many of those returned to civilian life have been battered about until they no longer fit into the military pattern. The crippled men suffering from battle fatigue, malaria, and other ills, are coming back to us.

So far the number is only a trickle compared with the flood that will come later. Yet apparently red tape prevents handling some cases as they should be handled.

Just the other day the Miami Herald carried a story about a man who suffered nerve shock and malaria in New Guinea. He had been released from the Army 3 weeks before, this 22-year-old youngster, who had gone into the service long before he could vote.

Malaria struck him again. He was a sick boy, and needed attention. His aunt, with whom he is staying, took him to Jackson Memorial Hospital. Nothing doing. The Jackson people wouldn't handle him. He was an Army case. Let the Army take care of its own.

All right. The aunt called the Biltmore and Pancoast Hospitals. She got a brushoff. See the Veterans' Administration. There must be a doctor's certification. Bay Pines had to be notified. Bay Pines would contact the administration office in Montgomery, Ala. Montgomery would in its own good time, contact Bay Pines, and the result would be forwarded to Miami.

Meanwhile the kid could be sick as he pleased. He was on his time, wasn't he?

The G. I. bill of rights didn't say anything about that, did it? Oh, no. Nothing would be too good for the boys when they came marching home. Nothing should be too good for those who came marching home in advance of the big parade. If this is a sample of what to expect it won't cheer up those who are still fighting, when they hear about it.

What is wrong with the machinery? If it creaks, with comparatively little burden placed on it, what will happen when this case is duplicated thousands of times?

In other wars a man was a hero as long as he wore the uniform. When he took it off, he became another bothersome problem, unless he was able to handle his affairs himself. Many a fellow who won medals in battle during the last war sold apples on street corners and ran into the strangling grip of red tape when he sought hospitalization, and was clubbed on the Anacostia Flats. The pawn shops were full of medals. They became a glut, and even the Medal of Honor wasn't worth more than half a dollar to the pawnbrokers.

The G. I. bill of rights was going to take care of that. The old story would never be repeated. This time everything would move smoothly.

That's the story. But, don't tell it to the kid with malaria. He might not believe it.

This red-tape procedure is vitally affecting the full and complete administration of the constructive acts of Congress. It appears that the various bureaus and some of the departments of the Government are so full of red tape that relief is difficult to obtain by our citizens.

Red tape might be compared with the tapeworm or hookworm that saps the vitality out of human beings—they suck the very lifeblood, and so it is that red tape removes the vitalizing force of not only the guaranties of the G. I. bill of rights for our ex-soldiers, but for giving relief to many of our citizens who have to deal with certain bureaus passing rules, regulations, and directives in compliance with which the relief afforded is hardly worth the price or burden of complying with such red tape.

Let us hope that Congress will destroy the hookworm of red tape so that our people can get relief from the laws passed by this body.

Russia Doesn't Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of May 9, 1945:

RUSSIA DOESN'T UNDERSTAND

Maybe America does not understand Russia, but neither does Russia understand America. This is of concern to all Americans and all Russians who believe that the true interests of both nations, and of all other nations, are alike. Those who do not believe an international organization for peace can succeed are happy at every symptom of disagreement. They exaggerate and misrepresent every point of conflict. To combat the doubters, misunderstandings should be weighed calmly.

The present difficulty is the arrest by the Soviet Government of 16 leaders of Polish

democrats who had been invited by the Russian Government to come to Moscow and discuss Polish affairs. This has so shocked American and British minds that it has caused a serious interruption in at least one phase of the work of the United Nations Conference. We have not expected perfection from that Conference. We have known that no one would be satisfied wholly. But it was Commissar Molotov himself who, in his opening speech, emphasized the need of trust. There must be a degree of mutual understanding.

Secretary Stettinius' statement made it clear that the other allies understood the discussions with the Polish leaders, who were invited in, were part of the process of broadening the Polish Provisional Government set up by the Soviet Government at Warsaw. To this Premier Stalin had agreed at Yalta. Nothing was accomplished, but the Russian Government twice asked that its Warsaw puppet government be invited to the San Francisco Conference, just as if it had kept its promise. Even after President Roosevelt and President Truman had both refused the request, Mr. Molotov still tried at San Francisco to have the Warsaw government asked to the Conference.

This is too one-sided a course for Americans to understand. We know there is a difference in background between the two nations. We have always been used to our Government's explaining its course, even of giving an accounting to other nations. It has been very different in Russia, where public information is limited to what the government wants the public to know. But any government must understand that it cannot treat other nations in this fashion. Mr. Stettinius did only his duty, only what American opinion required of him, when he insisted on an explanation of the arrest of these Polish guests of Moscow.

American and British aid to Russia was vital 4 years ago when Russia's national existence was at stake. We were cooperating to defeat the Axis. Our true interests are still the same, and will be in this narrowing world. But there must be understanding. There are too many groups, too many persons in this country, who for various reasons do not want America to join with Russia in assuring the peace of the world for the Soviet Government to leave unexplained an incident which invites distrust.

Secretary Stettinius and President Truman are both handicapped when such distrust grows. There must be at least a minimum of understanding. It is what we should ask of Britain or any other country in any similar case. A government must show some responsibility to the opinion of mankind, or it is not mature enough for collaboration with others.

It is time for Russia to show such maturity, if she does not want to find herself isolated again because of distrust. It seems to be beyond Russian understanding that in this country public opinion rules; and public opinion does not like the spectacle of men being invited to sit in a conference and then finding themselves clapped in jail.

An Open Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I take pleasure in including an open letter from the Liberal Party in New York to the delegates at the San Francisco Conference. Although a stanch Democrat I appreciate the broad and progressive views of the Liberal Party as expressed in this letter, which follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE'S DELEGATES AT THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE FROM THE LIBERAL PARTY

We are confident that you share our conviction that the deep moral commitments made by the United Nations in the darkest hours of the war must not be forgotten now that the immediate military crisis has begun to pass.

In the death of President Roosevelt the peace forces of our country, and of the world, have lost their greatest leader. His untimely death deepens the responsibility of those who represent the plain people at the United Nations Conference to see that the millions who have suffered the agony of this war shall not have suffered and died in vain.

As President Roosevelt clearly discerned, if the United Nations effort to organize a lasting peace is to succeed, it must avoid two pitfalls. On the one hand, it must not permit perfectionist demands to destroy the possibility of attaining a working agreement of the United Nations. An imperfect organization for the maintenance of security and peace will be better than no organization at all. On the other hand, it must not permit considerations of expediency to lead to compromises so unjust that they destroy the moral authority of the world organization. Unless the organization which results from San Francisco wins the approval of the conscience of mankind it will not endure.

We offer the following seven basic tests of the work of the Conference:

1. The rights of the great powers must be compatible with independence and security of the smaller and weaker countries. Realities in international affairs require that the major powers be given a leadership commensurate with their responsibilities. These special rights, as now provided in the Dumbarton Oaks plan for the Security Council, will not, however, make for security if they become in practice means by which the great states dominate their weaker and smaller neighbors. To guard against this the powers and functions of the assembly should be strengthened, and all nations—great and small—should be under the authority of a common international law.

2. Colonial countries and peoples, irrespective of race or color, should be assured their right to political and economic self-determination within the framework of the general international organization. No mutual security system can or should last which seeks to perpetuate the dominance of the white over the colored peoples of the world.

3. The post-war international structure must have economic and cultural, as well as political and military, foundations. Only as the international organization utilizes the resources of science and technology for the improvement of the standards of living of everybody, everywhere, can peace be maintained. The organization of the Economic and Social Council is a subject of supreme importance.

4. A statement of the basic liberties and rights of all men, groups, and nations should be included in the charter of the world organization.

5. The world organization should be founded on definite plans for progressive disarmament. Unless a program of general disarmament is followed by the major powers we shall not have succeeded in creating conditions essential to lasting peace. Increasingly reliance must be placed upon international policing.

6. The international organization should not seek to freeze for all time the territorial and political arrangements established at the end of this war. Senator VANDENBERG is wholly right in his insistence that only peace which is concerned with justice for all can be maintained. Because we recognize that no perfect world settlement can come at the end of this war, his seventh amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals should be vigorously supported. This amendment declares that "If the Security Council finds that any situation which it shall investigate involves injustice to peoples concerned it shall recommend appropriate measures of adjustment which may include revision of treaties and of prior international decisions."

7. Finally the delegates of the people should recognize that the task of developing machinery for keeping the peace cannot in any ultimate sense be divorced from the task of making the peace. Hence the aim should be to extend the work of the San Francisco Conference so that real account may be taken of the present dangerous tendency of the Big Three to seek security primarily by unilateral, rather than by cooperative, means. Indeed, if the present tendencies toward power politics, special spheres of influence, and imperialistic domination are not arrested, these great powers cannot serve as trustees of the world community.

Aid for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in calling attention to the needs of Europe, I am not forgetting our allies in the Orient, and particularly India. It sometimes seems as though India were the forgotten nation.

Her people have suffered tremendously from this war. Her famine and the aftermath were the results of war. Yet she is not eligible to receive help from U. N. R. R. A., since her territory was not occupied by the enemy.

A year ago, in large measure as a result of agitation by the India Famine Relief Committee of which I was a member, American aid was extended to India through the channel of the American Friends Service Committee. The National War Fund provided the funds, but then withdrew its support in order to concentrate on "liberated areas." Although general funds from the National War Fund were withheld, the two national labor organizations—the National C. I. O. War Relief Committee and the A. F. L. Labor League for Human Rights—succeeded in having some of their contributions allocated to continue the work for a time. Together, they have supplied more than half of all American funds for this purpose.

I feel that it would be an injustice to this great neighbor of ours in the Far East to withhold further help in medical supplies which can be given, I am informed, without even curtailing domestic uses. A group of outstanding Americans have organized under the name of American Relief for India to raise funds to continue this work.

The new organization is registered by the President's War Relief Control

Board. Its work is described admirably in a memorandum issued by the board of American Relief for India.

AMERICAN RELIEF FOR INDIA, INC.,
NEW YORK, N. Y.

1. INDIA, VICTIM OF BOTH FAMINE AND THE WAR

India, which holds more than one-sixth of the world's population, is the forgotten nation of the world. Her impoverished millions, who even in normal times were able to eke out only a bare existence, have suffered pitifully during the past 3 years, ravaged by a combination of famine and war.

The great famine that raged through Bengal and other provinces from the middle of 1943 to February 1944, caused at least 1,000,000 deaths and left a tragic legacy. For every person who died from starvation a dozen survived. Undernourished and lacking the food to restore their health they are easy prey to diseases which daily claim victims. Malaria, amoebic and bacillary dysentery, cholera, skin diseases, night blindness, pneumonia, and bronchial infections are the foes which old and young, their bodies wasted by hunger, are ill-prepared to fight.

Those who suffer most are the women and children. In Bengal alone the famine left 100,000 orphans and tens of thousands of women in the ravaged areas were left destitute. They subsist principally on rice or a native variety of sweetpotato. Fish, meat, eggs, fresh vegetables, and fruit, vital to rebuilding undernourished bodies, is beyond the reach of the meager funds of these people. Many thousands of the men in rural populations, due to the war's dislocations, are without means of earning a livelihood.

India's tragic plight, moreover, has been greatly accentuated by the war. The Government, through fear of an invasion by the Japanese, put 2,000,000 natives into uniform. In addition, India was a base for concentration of tens of thousands of American and British troops. On top of all this the war cut off much rice-growing territory, upset an already frail tansportation system, paralyzed the fishing industry in the mouths of the Ganges, and created countless other hardships.

Other highlights of this war-created situation are: The country's transportation system, always inadequate, is virtually monopolized by the military. Deteriorated rolling stock, depleted by shipments to the Middle East to meet the Axis threat there, moves troops and military supplies. The same is true of India's roads. Normally bad, there now is no labor, materials or money to keep them in repair. There are too few trucks for civilian supplies. The inevitable result of this situation on railroads and highways is that movement of desperately needed food and medical supplies to stricken areas is curtailed and sometimes stymied. In one area, East Bengal, where the network of the Ganges River makes life virtually amphibious, the people are without boats because the government requisitioned them early in the war when a Japanese invasion seemed imminent. Today the vast majority of those boats have been lost, destroyed, or else have rotted into disuse. Thus there is both a complete break-down of transportation in this area and the people are deprived of the fish which formerly provided them with much of their food.

Food prices, stimulated by vast purchases by the military, have skyrocketed from three to seven times pre-war levels. Wages have lagged and an Indian laborer who earns from 8 to 20 cents a day, can afford only rice or other foods deficient in vitamins. Meat, fish, fruit, and vegetables are beyond his purse. The Japanese occupation of Burma cut off one of the principal sources of India's rice supply and shipments from other countries for civilian needs have been drastically reduced as a military necessity. Thousands of war refugees who fled from Burma and other countries settled in Bengal and neighboring areas, bringing new diseases and imposing an additional strain on meager food supplies. The British and Indian Governments, in the face of the war and political tension, have found it impossible to cope effectively with the situation. India lies almost prostrate, half starving and wracked by disease.

2. AMERICANS RESPONDED TO INDIA'S S O S

The cry of the dying and starving in India was answered in 1944. On January 13, 1944, the President's War Relief Control Board was informed by the American mission in New Delhi (diplomatic representation of the United States of America in India):

1. That the relief needs of the civilian population are abnormal due to the famine.

2. That there is extreme distress in the areas where great numbers of American forces are concentrated.

3. That it is important to demonstrate to the Indian people that America is not indifferent.

4. That supplies should be sent rather than money.

5. That the American Red Cross or the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers) should, with the aid of some American personnel, organize distribution of relief supplies in India.

The President's Board asked the American Friends Service Committee to organize a relief effort in Bengal and other distressed Indian areas. The Quakers accepted this call to service with the full approval of the American Government, the Viceroy of India, the Governor of Bengal, and Indian leaders of every group.

The National War Fund promised financial support and contributed more than $540,000 up to September 1944, through the British Relief Society. When its support ceased financial aid from two other sources enabled the Quakers to carry on. The A. F. L. and C. I. O. earmarked $200,000 of their contributions to the War Fund for India relief. Governor Casey of Bengal, one time Australian minister to the United States, gave the Quakers a substantial sum from the Bengal civil relief fund.

American Relief for India, Inc., is a citizens' committee organized late in 1944 to mobilize the necessary support to assure the continuation of the American relief program in India.

Its board of directors comprises: Rufus M. Jones, honorary chairman; Henry F. Grady, chairman; J. Edgar Rhoads, president; William Phillips, vice president; Guy Emerson, treasurer; Frank Aydelotte, William Green, David Hinshaw, John Haynes Holmes, M. Albert Linton, Henry R. Luce, George Medalie, Philip Murray, Victor F. Ridder, and Sumner Welles.

3. WHAT AMERICANS HAVE DONE FOR INDIA

When the Quakers reached India to begin work they found that the famine had been halted by vigorous action in which the British Government, the Government of India, and the provincial governments had collaborated. Grain, shipped from Canada and Australia, had been distributed; food rationing and price control had been instituted; canteens and medical stations established; and a campaign undertaken to cultivate an additional 12,000,000 acres. The British and Indian businessmen had rallied with financial support. Essential medical supplies were lacking and were available only in the United States.

At the start the American relief workers established an organizational blueprint and principles that contributed immeasurably to the success of their work. Few in number, even when augmented by British Quakers, the Friends Service Committee workers devoted themselves to showing the people of India how they could help themselves. Local agencies were used to distribute supplies and these outlets included such diverse groups as only India offers—Hindu, Moslem, Baptist, Red Cross—200 agencies in all maintaining 4,500 different centers. Included were 88 Christian missions, Protestant and Catholic. It was decided that supplies would be distributed without distinction as to religion, caste, or politics. The people were told that the aid had come from Americans.

American aid, administered by Americans, has brought to India's suffering humanity the food to build wasted bodies, drugs to fight disease, and funds and counsel to aid in their rehabilitation. Milk, vitamins, and sulfa drugs share with the relief workers the credit for the success so far attained. More than 150,000 daily attend canteens set up in many villages, for children and mothers, nursing and expectant. Evaporated milk sent from the United States, and some from other countries, too, is distributed by the India Red Cross under Quaker supervision.

Multi-vitamin tablets—30,000,000 of them from the United States—have been distributed by local committees through a distribution that is systematic and controlled. The reputation of the little black pills previously unknown to the natives has spread. To them it is magic as it builds vitality to fight disease that menaces them and combats night blindness and skin afflictions from which many suffer.

Two million sulfa tablets have served as a spectacular aid to the medical men's battle to combat streptococcal infections, dysentery, cholera, sores, and venereal disease. Other basic medicines, such as atabrine to fight malaria, have been supplied from America to supplement the Government's meager supplies.

Rehabilitation has been aided through establishment of training centers where weaving, cane making, pottery, sewing, and embroidery are taught. Widows and children eagerly attend. With small loans destitute fishermen, cane workers, carpenters, and weavers are aided to buy nets, boats, cane, tools, and thread to again become self-supporting.

4. FUNDS ARE VITAL TO SUSTAIN RELIEF PROGRAM

Approximately $100,000 monthly is needed to enable the Quakers to carry on this practical and effective humanitarian work of mercy in the name of America.

American Relief for India is making a direct appeal to the American people to contribute $1,200,000 to sustain the relief work during 1945.

This direct appeal is made necessary by the decision of the National War Fund which rejected the request of American Relief for India to allocate a share of the money contributed by American citizens for this work. The War Fund expressed the hope that "your important program may be financed adequately in some other way" but that the War Fund "must of necessity concentrate its resources on liberated areas."

The President's War Relief Control Board recognized the relief work in India as a war relief measure in Authorizing American Relief for India to undertake an independent appeal for financial support. The Board itself recommended the relief program to the Community Chests of the Nation in an unprecedented endorsement. It set forth the following reasons for approving the independent appeal:

1. The program proposed by American relief for India must be construed as a war relief measure.

2. Increasing importance of military operations in the China-Burma-India theater and continued presence of American forces in India make it desirable to express American interest in conditions in the areas where the American soldiers are stationed.

3. The program serves a significant humanitarian objective in addition to being important to the war effort.

4. The British and Indian authorities have expressed their approval and the American Minister in New Delhi vigorously urges continuation of the relief program.

In addition, the American Relief for India Committee's program has the endorsement of the United States State Department, the President's War Relief Control Board, the British Ambassador in the United States of America, the Indian Agent General in the United States of America, the Labor League for Human Rights (A. F. of L.), the National C. I. O. War Relief Committee, the Foreign Missions Conference, and the Field Department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The committee, responding to these requests, and in recognition of the tragic need, will make a direct appeal for funds to the American people and Community Chests to support this work.

Prices Will Go Wild if Food Ceilings Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the fourth of a series of six articles written by Malcolm Logan and which appeared in the New York Post of April 12, 1945.

I believe this article is particularly appropriate for the reason that not only New York City, but the entire country, is facing the worst meat shortage of the century. It is evident that increasing the price to the meat packers will not solve the problem—the demand for meat is too great. Such increase would only increase the price to the housewife. The Navy has held down the prices of uniforms for its officer and petty officer personnel by a licensing program that has kept down the price of uniforms, has prevented the mulcting of its personnel by unscrupulous dealers and has been generally effective. Why not apply the licensing system to meats and keep the ceilings on food firm?

Malcolm Logan has the answer to the question "What will happen if the ceilings on food collapse?" in the following article:

PRICES'LL GO WILD IF FOOD CEILINGS FALL

(By Malcolm Logan)

At this moment, while we are entering the first stage of the worst food shortage of the war, a powerful drive to smash O. P. A. food price ceilings is under way in Washington.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has begun an investigation to find why we are short of meats, fats and oils, sugar, dairy products, and other foods most urgently needed here and in liberated Europe.

During the first week this inquiry was turned into an all-out attack upon the O. P. A. The meat packers spearheaded this offensive against price control by charging that O. P. A. ceilings were bankrupting them.

If meat subsidies are increased, or meat prices raised, or both, they told the committee, the meat shortage and the black market will automatically disappear.

IT WOULD SKYROCKET PRICES

Should Congress accept that theory, housewives may soon be paying 80 cents or a dollar a pound for hamburger.

But that, in the opinion of many Government officials, will be only the beginning of a wild rise in prices which will end in uncontrolled inflation. If the packers get more, the other food processors will want more, too; labor will demand wage rises, and everyone who employs labor will want higher prices.

AS THE CHAIRMAN SEES IT

The Senate committee's hearings will go on most of this month. Yet after the first week of hearings the committee chairman, Senator ELMER THOMAS, Democrat, of Oklahoma, told this reporter:

"Packers are losing money at present prices. O. P. A. policies are restricting meat for the Army, lend-lease, civilians, and Europe, and are building up the black market. If the O. P. A. doesn't get results, Congress will step in and get results."

As to the argument that a price rise would end the meat shortage, Agriculture Secretary Wickard told the committee:

"There is one cold, hard fact that must be faced: that is, black marketing cannot be controlled by price ceiling manipulations, since the demand for meat is far in excess of available supplies."

HOGS, SHEEP, CATTLE DWINDLE

These are the basic facts about our meat situation:

The supply of hogs, which furnish most of our meat, has fallen almost 30 percent in the past year because of the record-breaking slaughter of 1943–44 brought about by War Food Administration policies. And no large increase is possible before next spring.

The number of sheep on United States farms on January 1 was 51,769, compared with 55,775 a year earlier and an average of 52,777 during 1934–43.

The number of cattle, excluding milk cows, was 53,965 on January 1—very slightly under the all-time record of 54,708 a year earlier. But because of a break-down in our system of meat distribution this plentiful supply of beef is going largely into the black market or into small country towns.

As the meat shortage grows, less and less of the available livestock supplies are being sold to the large, federally inspected packing houses. More and more of the dwindling animal supply is being killed on farms and in nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses.

NOT NEARLY ENOUGH LEFT

"The diversion problem is serious," Deputy O. P. A. Administrator Brownlee testified. "Federally inspected slaughter is the sole source of supply for government purchase and no other meat can move across State lines.

"Consequently, when meat is diverted from these slaughterers, and military needs are met from the diminished volume, what is left is far too little to satisfy the requirements of the large cities and other low-production, high-consumption areas. The resulting shortages in turn stimulate the black market."

That is why New York is getting less meat, while even today there is an abundance in rural communities and in small country towns which have nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses. Many of these small slaughterers are supplying the black market and are outbidding the big federally inspected houses and paying prices far over ceilings for livestock.

WE'D ALL PAY MORE

If ceilings were raised the black-market slaughterers would simply raise their prices, and diversion of meat from the armed forces, the large cities, and Europe would continue. The only difference would be that everyone would pay more.

So far, despite talk of stern enforcement, the O. P. A. has failed to make any effective attack upon the black market. But two radical methods of dealing with it were proposed on July 31, 1943, in a report of a Government food advisory committee.

This committee pointed out that people with plenty of money could easily evade rationing by dining in hotels and restaurants.

The food advisory committee recommended that if diners-out had to give up ration stamps for their meals serious inequality could be to some extent corrected.

THE GOVERNMENT AGENT PLAN

The committee proposed another remedy: "Whenever a serious black market develops in rationed food, despite aggressive enforcement attempts, consideration should be given to a plan whereby the rationed food in question would be purchased by licensed dealers in the trade, acting as agents of the Government and buying for Government account."

Applied to the meat industry, this would mean that every slaughterer, large and small, would be made a Government agent. Anyone who bought or sold above ceiling prices could be prosecuted for misappropriation of Federal funds, carrying penalties more severe than those imposed for violating O. P. A. regulations.

United States Army Forces, Pacific Ocean Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Frazier Hunt, distinguished World War No. 1 and No. 2 correspondent, recently returned to the United States from the Pacific, from the March 24, 1945, Army and Navy Journal.

With Germany now defeated, the attention of the Nation is turning with full intensity to the Pacific, and one of the first places on which it will focus will be the command known as the United States Army forces, Pacific Ocean areas, according to Mr. Hunt's article. Important as the command of the Pacific Ocean areas has been since the war began, it will have far greater importance from now on because of its intimate relationship to the war against Japan. Through that area will pass the bulk of the troops diverted from Europe and the United States, and in it they must be trained for the special kind of battle action required against the fanatical Japanese. The responsibility for the discipline, training and efficiency of the troops will rest upon the shoulders of Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr.

The article follows:

With its headquarters in the Hawaiian Islands, that command stretches across some 20,000,000 square miles of island-dotted ocean, stops only when it touches the China coast, and—of extreme interest to the enemy—it is the command which includes the Japanese mainland. It is the jump-off point for units going into combat. It is the area into which thousands of men and thousands of tons of material pour each month to be fused together and sent out as a finished task force against the enemy. It is

the place where the trained infantryman receives further training that will make him more than a match for his tricky and dangerous enemy—the Japanese soldier. It is the point where standard weapons are adapted into more deadly instruments for the specialized requirements of amphibious warfare. Its mission is offensive and defensive at the same time. It must train and plan and provide everything needed by the Army to carry the assault against Japan, and it must train, plan, and provide forces to protect what it takes.

Atop the sprawling command is Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding general, known by his short title as "Comgenpoa." A cavalry officer with 41 straight years of military experience behind him, General Richardson runs his command with regulation meticulousness, insisting on what he terms "command attention" to the details of his vast organization. He exercises personal command attention partly by traveling. It may be a short trip in the area of his headquarters where he suddenly appears to question the enlisted men. Or it may be an 8,000 miles or more flight from island to island through his area.

To manage an area so widespread, General Richardson has broken it down into two subordinate, but almost autonomous commands, and soon will establish a third. The first one he created was the Central Pacific Base Command, which encompassed the Hawaiian Islands, Canton, and Christmas Islands. The second, with its headquarters in Noumea, is known as the South Pacific Base Command.

Above the base commands, directing the entire area, is the Pacific Ocean Areas. General Richardson has established it as a planning and giant logistical operating command. Its general and special staffs are housed in a single building which General Richardson had built especially for it. Their work begins when the War Department presents them with a mission and directs them to obtain the necessary men and material and prepare the force for the assault. Because of the speed with which American forces have driven across the Pacific, it means an unending job with no time out to relax when a task force is embarked and moving toward its target. For there remains the garrison forces to be established, and behind each new invasion there are the islands we have captured which must be maintained and supplied.

The P. O. A. staff is operated independently but the results it accomplishes are meshed into the plans of the Commander in Chief, Pacific Ocean areas, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, and other commanders in the Pacific. It is to them that the assault forces are finally delivered for the attack. With the naval leaders General Richardson maintains close and harmonious relations, which insure team work that brings victory.

Its training task is largely specialized. An example of the training necessary for Pacific fighting was a command which would incorporate all the knowledge necessary to live and fight in the jungle-like areas and tropical climates of the Pacific. The result was the establishment of the unit jungle training center which recently graduated its fifty-thousandth Jap-wise and jungle-wise fighter. Infantrymen first were put through the program. They learned to fight with their bare hands, to fight with knives. They learned to live on fruits and vegetables which they had never heard of before. They learned to shoot from the hip with everything from carbines to .30-caliber machine guns, to stalk and to detect cleverly hidden Japanese snipers. As the reputation of the jungle training center grew, more and more commanders asked to send the men of all their branches to it, and today it is a common sight to see the company cook carefully picking his way across a swaying rope bridge with explosives blasting around him, just in front of a soldier from the Quartermaster Corps. In fighting the Japanese it was found that rear area units frequently had to drop their work and start shooting at infiltrating Japs.

General Richardson, foreseeing that the day of island fighting is ending, converted his jungle training center into a combat training command to prepare his troops for large-scale land battles comparable with those now raging in Europe.

Also high on the list of specialized training came amphibious warfare. Beaches were selected in the Hawaiian Islands most nearly approximating those which would be encountered in future operations. Loading and unloading was practiced, landings were made until they became as familiar to the men as their G. I. shoes. Various type of matting were tried to enable vehicles to cross the sandy beaches of the Pacific, and the innovations which resulted are now SOP in amphibious attacks.

Two of the most effective weapons developed by the P. O. A. are the flame-throwing tank, and the mortar boat. The tank, which has been used with great success by both marine and Army forces, grew from the need for a more effective method of cleaning out Japanese pill boxes, and at the same time cutting down the casualties which our forces suffered in attacking the well-built, well-camouflaged strong points of the enemy. The first few tested in combat worked so well that work was soon completed on hundreds of the modified vehicles.

The mortar boat is a newer development, designed by P. O. A. to increase the fire power against beaches and to maintain that fire power until the last minute when the men of the first waves hit the shore. The boats are small and have a shallow draft. They mount 4.5 chemical mortars, and move in with the assault waves to pound any Jap installations visible on the beach and defensive works behind the beaches.

The record of the P. O. A. in the Pacific is a record of successful assaults that began with the offensive in the Gilberts. For each operation in which the Pacific Ocean area headquarters has participated, General Richardson has prepared a complete report showing what the command contributed. These reports make a rich source of historical information, but the purpose behind them is more than historical; they are keenly analytical critiques of the duties and responsibilities which were assigned to the command, and the manner in which they were carried out. In these reports the general lets the chips fall where they may, and this objectivity gives them their greatest value. On the basis of each report, succeeding operations are steadily improved.

One of the best examples is the report on the planning that led to the capture of Makin Island, one of the Gilbert group. It was the first offensive operation in the Central Pacific and had few precedents to follow. Several months in advance of the attack, a dispatch came to General Richardson from the Joint Chiefs of Staff giving him the mission, the concept of operations, available forces, target data, and instructions to formulate his plans. His staff went to work. The Twenty-seventh Infantry Division was designated as the unit to make the attack, and special training was instituted for the elements of the division to be used. The assault units were brought up to full strength. Troops were gathered from other units and a garrison force formed to take over and defend the island after it was captured. Intelligence training programs and schools were established and lectures were arranged for general and special staff officers covering such subjects as geography, topography, climatic conditions, and enemy installations. Objective folders were prepared, interpreter teams were assigned to the division, and began to train with it. Complete plans for Army land and air forces were drawn up along with a training program in three phases: intensive training and land operations, preshipboard amphibious training, and final ship-to-shore exercises. The supply task was, in many respects, unlike any previously faced by a unit of the United States Army. A show-down inspection was held to determine equipment condition and shortages. A detailed study of the objective led to the development of many special requirements, including additional bulldozers, water distillation units, pack howitzers, extra radios, flame throwers and chemical mortars. Special staff sections such as the engineer, chaplain, surgeon and ordnance officer, presented their plans and went to work.

When the troops were finally loaded onto their transports and ready to depart for their target they had everything which advance planning could give them. Along with them were observers from General Richardson's staff, officers who had done the planning and who were charged with the duty of criticizing their own work as the results showed themselves in battle.

Next on the list was Kwajalein, where the P. O. A.'s well-known Seventh Infantry Division went into action for the second time in the war. The stepping-stone drive across the Pacific brought battle experience to two other divisions—the Seventy-seventh at Peleliu, the Eighty-first at Anguar. The Twenty-seventh went into battle for the third time when it joined the marines in capturing Saipan. The largest single action of any of the P. O. A. divisions was on Leyte, where General Richardson provided General MacArthur with the Twenty-fourth Corps, completely equipped and ready to attack. It was used throughout the campaign, and its performance there brought a radio from General MacArthur to General Richardson which said: "The splendid efficiency of your Twenty-fourth Corps reflects the careful training it has received under your able command. The corps has performed most gallantly." Other units, such as the Twenty-fifth Division, veterans of the Solomons and now Luzon, have been trained under General Richardson's command and sent out of his area to fight in the Pacific.

One of the best illustrations of the work of the Pacific Ocean Areas Command is the portrayal of the job done by the Eighty-first Infantry Division at Anguar in the motion picture, Eighty-first Division at Anguar, which is being released to the Nation by the Treasury Department as part of the Seventh War Loan drive.

One of the little-publicized and undramatic tasks performed by the Pacific Ocean Areas Command is the cleaning up of back areas which the war has swept over and left. The islands are swiftly built up and protected, and as they recede further from the fighting front, they are slowly closed up. Equipment is inventoried, packed, and shipped to areas where it is needed. It is in marked contrast to some of the World War I areas where tons of equipment could not be reclaimed. Hopeful natives who eye American jeeps, food, and clothing are disappointed when they suddenly find the island cleaned up and bare. Outstanding examples of this can be found in the South Pacific Base Command, where Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath is in command. General Gilbreath is busy rehabilitating soldiers returning from the front lines wounded or sick, and is doing an outstanding job with the same care in reclaiming and salvaging American property, thus carrying out the great economic policy for which General Richardson is so well known.

As the P. O. A. divisions learned, so did the staff, and today it is an experienced command, battle tested and proved, and it knows that the jobs it faces in the future will dwarf those which it has solved in the past. Already it is deeply involved in those solutions.

For the veteran troops who will come over to the Pacific from the European theater,

General Richardson is planning a training course which will implement their fighting knowledge with the experience already gained by Pacific veterans in 3 years of combat against the Japanese.

New Jersey's Need for a General Medical Hospital for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, Union City, N. J., of May 9, on the need for the establishment in New Jersey of a general medical hospital for veterans of all our wars:

NEW JERSEY'S WOUNDED NEED HOSPITAL IN OWN STATE

In the midst of celebration over victory in Europe, and heightened confidence that the might of the Allies can bring Japan to a condition of unconditional surrender even sooner than experts predicted, a war-created problem is developing with great urgency.

It is the problem not only of proper care, but of sufficient hospital room, for the wounded. These are the men who gave arms or legs or lungs or eyes so that the victory in Europe might be accomplished. There will be, and in time of jubilation we cannot hide the fact, many more before the conquest of Japan.

New Jersey has sent a large proportion of its manhood into the armed services, as it has in every war in which this country has participated. And New Jersey's wounded are coming home, week by week, from many foreign fronts.

Where can they go for treatment? To the United States hospital at Lyons? That is being used almost exclusively now for psycopathic cases.

Then where? A New Jersey delegation of American Legionnaires, meeting with the State's congressional representatives, said that New Jersey veterans, including thousands from previous wars, have to go to Philadelphia Naval Hospital and veterans' hospital in the Bronx. Both these institutions already are overcrowded.

There is no hospital available for veterans in New Jersey now. That was why the Legion delegation went to Washington to plead for construction of a Federal hospital in this State for New Jersey's men returning from this war in need of medical aid. The delegation said that, from its survey, a 750-bed hospital is needed immediately, and that by 1952 1,000 beds will be required.

United States Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES is cooperating with the delegation, having convened the delegation at the Legion's request "to discuss this vitally important subject of a hospital for all veterans of all wars, regardless of what organization they belong to." He said no site has been recommended as yet, and that the matter of a site is up to the Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' hospitalization is a matter of national importance now. Four investigations of veterans' hospitals are currently in progress, two by congressional groups and two by the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Charles M. Griffith, medical director of that Administration, replying to critics, upholds the surgical record and high caliber of operating surgeons of its facilities. The Administration admits, answering an attack in the House, "that some of our hospitals are overcrowded, but not to the point where the health of the patient is endangered."

But how long, at the present rate of return of the wounded and with an all-out Pacific war still to be waged, before the hospitals are overcrowded "to the point where the health of the patient is endangered"? Must we wait until that point is reached?

Build a hospital in New Jersey now. Our veterans deserve better than to be forced to go to the Bronx or Philadelphia for treatment of wounds suffered in their country's service. Build a hospital in New Jersey before Philadelphia and Bronx become too crowded to accommodate New Jersey's wounded.

Before a serious situation becomes critical, the Veterans' Administration should give thought and action to New Jersey's problem. If the Veterans' Administration needs prodding, then New Jersey's delegation in House and Senate should prod, hard and firmly and persistently. There can be no excuses; no answer except, "Yes, now!"

Mr. Speaker, the entire New Jersey congressional delegation has met together on several occasions and has made strong representations to Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines of the dire and imperative need for such an institution. This need is well described in the above editorial.

At its last meeting, which was presided over by Hon ALBERT W. HAWKES, the congressional delegation was delighted to be advised by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, that he was of the opinion that a general medical hospital for New Jersey veterans should be established in that State. Senator HAWKES having been authorized to do so by the congressional delegation, issued a statement regarding the meeting with General Hines, as follows:

The entire New Jersey congressional delegation met this afternoon with Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and presented to him facts and figures to prove the need for immediate action for a general medical hospital in New Jersey for the medical care of all veterans.

General Hines has authorized the New Jersey delegation to say to the people of New Jersey that he will recommend such a new hospital with at least 1,000 beds to the Federal board within 30 to 60 days.

He thoroughly understands and appreciates the veterans' needs for this hospital at the earliest moment it can be completed.

The New Jersey delegation is happy to be able to report this progress to the New Jersey citizens.

Every member of the New Jersey congressional delegation is intensely interested in obtaining for that State such a hospital as has been described. They have good reason to hope that hospital accommodations which New Jersey veterans are entitled to will be provided.

VE-Day Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. SHARP
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my great privilege to incorporate in the RECORD the VE-day prayer delivered by Rev. Charles Fredericks, of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, East Northport, Long Island, N. Y., on the occasion of the VE-day services held by this church on May 9.

This prayer by Reverend Fredericks, I think, typifies, in a most salutary way, our hopes and our faith in these critical days. The prayer follows:

O Almighty God, Supreme Ruler and Governor of all things, who art a strong tower of defense to them that fear Thee, and whose power no creature is able to resist: Unto Thee do we give thanks on this day, which marks the end of hostilities in Europe. We acknowledge this to be a blessing which came down from Thy hand, for Thou art the only giver of all peace. Make us truly appreciative of this great gift, that we may not misuse it, but cherish it and do what we can henceforth to promote peace among men. Look in mercy upon the wounded, and upon those who have been exposed to peril, sickness, and death; comfort those who in our national hospitals are bearing the marks of conflict, and give them that consolation which is brought through the ministry of Thy word. If it be Thy will, cause also the conflict in the Pacific to come to a speedy end. Unite the hearts of the mighty ones on earth and establish peace and concord among them. Remove offenses, hatred, and ill will. Preserve to us and to our children the precious liberties which we as a Nation have enjoyed to the present time. Let Thy word be the power unto salvation to everyone that believeth. Grant us true peace of heart and soul which the world can neither give nor take away; and finally give us the victory of faith, even the life to come. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Those German Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very timely and constructive editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, May 15, 1945, entitled "Those German Generals":

THOSE GERMAN GENERALS

German generals should be speechless. We can and should dispense alike with their subtle praises of Allied generalship, their sinister attempts to make the Nazis the scapegoats of defeat, and their sickening efforts to treat the war as simply a game lost. The ban on press interviews should be extended to all public utterances, particularly to German generals' radio speeches.

General Eisenhower's warning about treating German officers as "friendly enemies" is welcome. The pattern of the German purpose is plain. This is General Guderian (we omit his titles):

"A soldier after battle soon feels at home with other soldiers. It's like a football match when you shake hands and wish each other luck."

And here is General Falkenhorst, commander in Norway, who is allowed to tell the German people by radio that the Allies have liberated the German Army and people from the Nazi yoke. And we have General Busch, reported broadcasting to Germans that he

is in charge of northwestern Germany with the consent of the Allies.

Military necessity may still dictate to Allied commanders. They have 6,000,000 prisoners on their hands. They may have to rely on the German military organization to transmit and carry out their orders until civil government can take over. But if the German generals have to keep their voices, let mufflers be put on public speeches.

The Allies have been spared the last-ditch, guerrilla fighting that was feared a month ago. But insofar as organized surrender leaves any chance for the German General Staff to play the hero role as final rallying point and protector of the German people, it will not be an unmixed blessing. For it begins to look as if de-Nazifying Germany would be less difficult than demilitarizing it. It is already almost impossible to find a Nazi, but there are still plenty of worshipers of the generals.

We trust General Eisenhower is moving as rapidly as possible to leave the generals unemployed. We trust no false sense of military courtesy will delay their early transfer to a clear prisoner-of-war status. Many of them deserve arraignment as war criminals. In any case, it is going to be necessary to disgrace them completely and finally. If these men, who either used Hitlerism or were used by it to produce this holocaust ("football match," indeed), are received with respect or allowed to talk and act like leaders of the German people, disgracing them will be that much harder.

Let us not forget that at Yalta, Britain, Russia, and the United States declared their "inflexible purpose":

"To break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism."

When do we begin?

H. R. 1270, if It Becomes a Law, Might Cost the Taxpayers Over $16,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I notice where the Rules Committee has reported a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 1270, which is a private bill authorizing an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd. This is the second time the Rules Committee has provided for special consideration of this claim. On the first occasion several years ago the House defeated the bill. I want to warn the Members of this House that it is their duty as representatives of the taxpayers to carefully consider this legislation before it is called up, because there are many millions of dollars involved.

It is an old claim growing out of the transfer of some ships to the Government at the outset of World War No. 1. The report of the committee does not tell the entire story.

In view of this let me say the bill would authorize Carden and Herd to appeal as a matter of right to the Supreme Court from the judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit heretofore brought by them against the United States and which was decided against them by the Court of Claims. Ordinarily the right to secure a review by the Supreme Court of a judgment of the Court of Claims is obtained by an application to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, which is granted in the discretion of the Supreme Court. Carden and Herd had this privilege.

The claimants seek to recover the sum of $7,161,000 with interest from May 3, 1917, or a total of about $16,000,000, as just compensation for ships owned by them and taken over by the Government during the World War. At the time that the ships were taken over by the Government, Carden and Herd were paid the sum of $6,778,000 for the ships. Subsequently they received an additional award of $550,000, thereby making the total amount received by them from the Government $7,328,000. They have been prosecuting their claim to secure still further compensation.

The report of the committee concerning the present bill—House Report 258, Seventy-ninth Congress—refers to the fact that the findings made by the Commissioner of the Court of Claims support the contentions of the claimants. The Commissioner's findings, however, were unanimously overruled by the Court of Claims after a full hearing, and the final findings made by that court were favorable to the Government, *Carden and Herd* v. *United States* (87 C. Cls. 189). Justice Green of that court, an eminent jurist who had been an outstanding Member of the House prior to his appointment to the bench, wrote the opinion. The following extracts from his opinion tersely summarize the facts of the claim and the reasons for the unfavorable conclusion reached by the Court of Claims in respect to it:

It appears from the evidence that on April 5, 1917, the plaintiffs acquired by purchase seven Austrian ships which had taken refuge in American harbors. About April 7, 1917, the plaintiffs sold these ships to a New York syndicate. The defendant wanted these ships, and negotiations were commenced for their purchase by the Government through Bernard M. Baruch under the direction of President Wilson. On ascertaining that the ships had been sold to the syndicate, Baruch requested the plaintiffs to get the sale to the syndicate rescinded, having previously informed plaintiffs that the President had expressed a desire to obtain the ships at the original cost price. Plaintiffs complied with the request made by Baruch and obtained a rescission of the sale to the syndicate. Thereafter the negotiations were resumed between Baruch and the plaintiffs and Baruch told them to go to William Denman, Chairman of the Shipping Board, who would close the transaction. Accordingly plaintiffs met Denman and after some preliminary conversations the plaintiffs executed a bill of sale to the defendant for each of the ships and signed a receipt reciting that they had received $6,778,003.70 in payment for the seven ships and had executed and delivered to the United States bills of sale therefor, the receipt being executed without prejudice to the further payment of $20 per ton for the transfer of the vessels free of restrictions in the trade. At the time of the execution of the bills of sale, there was also executed by Denman, the plaintiffs, and Phelps Bros. & Co., agents, an instrument denominated "Memorandum of closing" which recited that the price to be paid for the ships was the sum stated above and that there was a further balance of $20 per ton to be paid by the Government for the removal of restrictions on the ships and certain minor details of the transactions relating to the closing of the registers of the ships, including what was to be done with stores and supplies, repairs, and a payment to the original owners of the ships. (See finding 6.) Shortly thereafter defendant paid the further sum of $1,053,020 for the removal of the restrictions on the ships and has paid nothing since except $550,000 as an award which will be considered further on.

So far we have recited matters as to which there is no dispute. The plaintiffs allege in their petition that they transferred title to the ships to the United States with the distinct understanding that part of the compensation to be paid them for the transfer was the operation of the ships by them at the prevailing rate of commission, which was 5 percent of the gross freight receipts, that the United States has denied that the operation of the ships by the plaintiffs was a part of the compensation, and took and used the ships without the plaintiffs ever having received just compensation therefor.

The defendant enters a general traverse of the allegations of the petition and in argument contends that there was no other consideration for the sale of the ships than the price paid therefor; also in substance that the plaintiffs had no reason to understand or believe that they were to have the operation of the ships after they were sold; and finally, as a matter of law, it is argued that the written instruments signed and delivered by plaintiffs at the time the ships were purchased constitute the sole and only contracts between the plaintiffs and the defendant for the purchase of the ships and cannot be varied by oral testimony as to any understanding on the part of plaintiffs.

* * * * *

What we have here is a written contract in connection with which plaintiffs allege they understood there was an oral agreement. Defendant denies the existence of such an agreement and plaintiffs make no claim that it was made but content that the minds of the parties have not met and the written contract becomes invalid. If a written contract can be vitiated in this manner, then all that is necessary to be done in order to break a contract in writing is for one party to claim and testify that he understood that there was an additional oral contract upon which the written contract depended. Then, when the other party rests its case on the written contract, a "mutual misunderstanding" can be pleaded and the written contract held invalid although it is perfectly plain and unambiguous in its language.

* * * * *

The rule for which plaintiffs contend is in effect that when a written contract is entered into and nothing else is agreed, but one party believes that there was an oral contract preliminary to the written contract, this fact, if proved, invalidates the written contract. With this doctrine we cannot agree and we find no authorities that sustain it.

* * * * *

What we have said above is sufficient to dispose of the case but it may be that something should be added with reference to the claim presented to the Secretary of War by plaintiffs against the defendant for $7,500,000. This claim was made under what is called the Dent Act and set up the same matters that are now made the basis of plaintiffs' suit; namely, the failure of the defendant to turn the ships over to plaintiffs, and that at the time of the transfer of the ships there was no meeting of the minds between the parties to

the contract and therefore plaintiffs were entitled to receive the fair market value thereof less what had been paid. The War Claims Board denied relief but on July 16, 1921, the claim having been presented to the Secretary of War, John W. Weeks, he made an award in favor of the plaintiffs in the sum of $550,000. * * * The plaintiffs presented to the defendant through the Secretary of War a claim in substance and effect the same as that which they now make and upon which they seek to recover judgment. The plaintiffs were paid and accepted a certain sum in full payment and discharge of their claim.

Mr. Speaker, on August 13, 1940, this question was thoroughly debated in the House. The debate will be found in volume 86, part 9, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD starting on page 10258.

Prior to that time I received several letters in reference to this bill and without making any investigation I wrote and said I did not oppose ordinary private claims bills. While I do not have a copy of that letter nevertheless I evidently stated at the time that I would offer no objection to the measure, but after a thorough investigation I came to the conclusion that I certainly was not justified in supporting any such bill and I opposed it in 1940 for which I was criticized by some Members of the House who took the position that after writing a letter I should not have assumed such an attitude.

Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd, who are named in the bill, were not alone by any means in connection with the purchase and sale of the ships involved. The syndicate was organized and, as the debate in 1940 shows, members of this syndicate are the ones who advanced the money at the time of the purchase of the ships. At that time there was another bill pending before the House, introduced, I think, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who wanted the members of the syndicate recognized.

Let it be remembered that these ships were not in possession of Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd or the syndicate 30 days before they were taken over by the Government. Not a dime had been spent on them in the way of repairs between the time the ships were secured from the Austrian Government by the syndicate and the time the Government took them over. Mr. WALTER in his statement said that all the evidence showed the ships were secured by a down payment of $730,000, which was advanced by the syndicate and he further stated not a dime was spent by Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd.

It will also be seen in the decision of the Court of Claims, which is included in these remarks, that the Government paid $1,053,020 for certain restrictions on ships and that, further, under the Dent Act the Secretary of War allowed Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd $550,000 additional over the amount the Government paid for the ships. There is no evidence to show that any part of this money went to the members of the syndicate.

In my long service in the House I do not recall where the Committee on Rules ever before on two occasions granted a special rule for the consideration of a private bill.

When this legislation was pending in 1940 I offered an amendment, which read as follows:

Provided no interest shall be included in the judgment rendered by the court.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER] accepted the amendment. That amendment certainly should be offered in connection with the pending legislation and I hope that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER], who will be in charge of the bill when it is before the House, will again accept the amendment.

Owing to the fact that I am in the hospital at the present time, I might not be able to be present, but if I am not present some Member should certainly offer that amendment, although I will admit I would not even vote for the bill if the amendment were included. The report submitted with this bill does not contain the letter written by the Attorney General. In all fairness, that letter should be included in the report. That letter stated, in part, the following language:

On the other hand, after a full trial on the merits, the Court of Claims has held that there was no legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay to the claimants any compensation in addition to the amount which they had already received, to wit, $8,391,028.70. By the award of the Secretary of War, they realized a profit of $550,000 on this transaction. They now seek a further profit, for which they did not stipulate in their original contract.

As Messrs. Carden and Herd accepted the award of the Dent Board, certainly there is no legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay an additional amount. I sincerely hope that this bill will be defeated.

Nazi Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Pvt. (1st cl.) William Vavra, of Madison, Ill., giving his eye-witness story from an American soldier's point of view, of Nazi atrocities. Private (1st cl.) Vavra's letter was published in the Granite City (Ill.) Press-Record. It follows:

PVT. (1ST CL.) WILLIAM VAVRA WRITES VIVIDLY OF NAZI HORROR SCENES

The following letter, vividly describing conditions in one of Germany's bomb-destroyed metropolitan cities, was written to E. A. Friedman by Pvt. (1st cl.) William Vavra, a former clerk in the Friedman store and now an M. P. somewhere in Germany.

"We rolled into the town on the heels of the Infantry. What had once been a prosperous city was now a mass of rubble-strewn streets. It was our job to route traffic through this bombed-out metropolis. At one glance I knew we had more than traffic to contend with. The streets were teeming with slave laborers. Most of them were roaming the streets aimlessly. After anywhere from 5 months to 5 years, they were free and they wanted to make the most of it. From some bombed-out wine cellar they were dragging huge wicker-cased bottles of wine and schnapps. The starved and beaten look was gone from their faces. They were like a bunch of children with some new toys. Everyone wanted to shake our hands and say a few words to the American soldats. The ones that could speak a little American lost no time in making it known. With it and my little knowledge of the Slavic tongue, this is what we gleaned.

" 'Me Russki flyer. I am here for 2 years. Work on farm 12 hours a day.' This came from a young muscular lad of 23. He wore German boots and riding pants. He had blond hair and looked more like a German than most of the P. O. W. I have seen. 'Me Polski. Five years I have been in Germany a laborer. Nothing to eat but soup and sometimes a little bread. Meat? What are you talking about, pani; never tasted it in 3 years.'

"There were Poles, Russians, Czechs, Croats, and Serbs. The majority of them were Russians and Poles. They were the ones who had been mistreated the most. Some wanted to go to America as soon as they would be allowed. They had heard how rich everyone was and had everything he needed. Most of them were content just to be free. They would be taken care of by the Americans. They had no more fears. As long as the American soldats were there they would be taken care of. It made me feel good just to see them in their enthusiasm. The next 4 hours I spent on duty. With heavy traffic and the civilians blocking the streets, I was kept busy."

SEE ATROCITY CAMP

"That evening after chow the fellows asked me if I had heard of the concentration camp and if I wanted to go and see the place. It was situated on the outskirts of the city and covered a good many acres. It had also been bombed and the buildings were in shambles. The Army had already taken over, and civilian workers were laying the bodies of the victims in rows.

"The stench was terrible. I'll never forget it as long as I live. The first rows of bodies consisted of the ones that had been starved to death. They were skeletons covered with skin. The joints of their bones were swollen to twice their normal size. Their faces were lined with pain and agony.

"Next came the bodies of the ones who had been shot or beaten to death for various reasons and had been stacked like cordwood in some of the buildings. Their features were unrecognizable as some decay had already set in. Long lines of civilians were bringing in more on makeshift stretchers. These bodies came from the fields and a small creek that bordered the camp. Some had been shot while trying to escape and some had been thrown into the creek after dying from some terrible torture.

"I even saw some burned ones. They looked like half-burned logs. My stomach started to turn. I had seen enough. By the looks on the faces of the other 'Joes' there, no one would ever forget. This was nazism staring us in the face. This is what we had heard about but didn't think actually existed.

"And then these same civilians have the nerve and gall to stop me on duty and want to know who is going to fix the windows that have been broken in their homes during the bombing or shelling of their city. What kind of people are they? Do they think we are blind? I wonder how many of them will be punished for these terrible crimes they have committed. What is to be done with such a race of people? I hate to think of

the job we have on our hands. I slept very little that night."

Private (1st cl.) Vavra is married and his wife, Mrs. Angela Vavra, resides at 1003 Washington Avenue, Madison. He has been in the service a little over a year.

Nazi Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered last Sunday evening from the McDowell Pulpit of Foundry Methodist Church, in Washington, D. C., of which the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, is pastor:

When our American armies began liberating prison camps in Germany, General Eisenhower himself made a personal visit to the political prison camp near Gotha. He was so horrified at the atrocities committed there that he cabled General Marshall to invite a delegation from the Congress of the United States to see for themselves the real situation before time elapsed and it was cleaned up, in order that they might report their true findings to the Congress and to the American people.

Twelve Members of Congress—six Senators and six Representatives—were selected by the leadership of the two Houses to make an unexpected and hurried trip of inspection. It was my opportunity and duty to go on this unpleasant but necessary mission.

Most Americans, no doubt, by this time have read much in the press and have seen many pictures in periodicals and on the screen concerning these abominations. Although the reports are from reliable sources and pictures do not wholly lie, it is next to impossible to believe them. The whole sad and sordid story is so fantastic that it is beyond human comprehension. It staggers man's imagination.

I heard about it. I read about it. I saw pictures—but I could not believe it.

Being a Missourian, I have to be shown. And though I have seen with my own eyes, I still pinch myself and ask, "Is it true?"

For 14 days we flew over and rode through France and Germany, seeing for ourselves whether the stories about Nazi atrocities are true or false.

There is no artist skillful enough to paint, no linguist trained or clever enough to describe, the unspeakable scenes upon which we have painfully looked.

Only Buchenwald, Nordhausen, and Dachau have I personally visited. They are only three out of perhaps 100 camps in Germany, but they are typical. The same pattern runs through them all. The evidence is convincing and the conclusion is inescapable that the Nazis deliberately, intentionally, and in cold, calculated, premeditated manner, set out in an organized and systematic way to destroy all who dared oppose their sinister and satanic regime.

The cruel and universal weapon is that of starvation. Thousands upon thousands of miserable men have I looked at—with hollow eyes, fevered cheeks, emaciated bodies, with skin dried to the bone, and all hope died out of their eyes. Most of them were dead—and the living dead were more awful. They could still open their eyes, but they did not see. They had ears, but could scarcely hear. Their racked bodies and tortured minds had reduced them to a level below animals. They were helpless skeletons—hollow frames with departed souls.

The dead were more fortunate than these live corpses. They still breathed, but they did not live. They tried to smile, but did not have the strength. Some could barely lift their hands, but would murmur as a dying dog whimpers when you look into his hopeless eyes and speak a kind word.

All this made me sick. I was nauseated by the foul odors in these dirty, shabby barracks; by the squalor and filth of the bunks in which these overworked and underfed prisoners slept. One small building housed 2,300 of these poor, wretched unfortunates, who slept in long rows of 3 tiers. Six men occupied a single berth about 5 by 3 feet, and the bunks were too short for some men. They were literally packed in like sardines in a can and it was impossible for one to turn over. Many slept on bare boards and the best had only tattered rags to sleep on. Their bodies were covered with lice, which served as a blanket.

Tuberculosis was rampant, typhus widespread, and nearly all were suffering from dysentery due to undernourishment. Their day's ration usually consisted of a small piece of bread and a thin soup which was little more than water with a potato, a carrot, or a piece of cabbage drawn through it.

The prisoners at Buchenwald were compelled to work in a huge armament plant adjoining the camp. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that this factory which manufactured machine guns, small arms, and ammunition was totally destroyed by the precision bombing of our Air Force without many prisoners being killed. This was one of the pleasant sights we visited. It was the only bright spot in a very dark picture. One would think that the Nazis would feed these prisoners well in order to get the maximum work. A normal person would so treat an ox or a slave. This they did not do. These persecuted inmates worked as long as they had strength but when they became too weak to labor they were left to rot in their hovels and die of starvation and disease.

Prisoners were compelled to bury their own dead and we were told by those still able to talk that often they did not reveal for several days the death of a comrade in their own bunk in order to receive his slim rations. The insanitary conditions were indescribably shocking. There were only a few crude toilets and many victims were too ill and weak to walk to them. A pigpen would be preferred to these cesspools of hell. Again my soul cried out, "O God! How can humanity sink to such depths of moral depravity?"

For the slightest infraction these political prisoners were beaten unmercifully. Only the cruelest instincts of a sadist could inflict such barbarous punishment. Fifty-one thousand prisoners perished at Buchenwald alone and some reliable sources put the number as high as 75,000. I can well believe this after seeing many of the naked bodies piled high like cordwood, and trucks that were filled with dead men not yet removed.

Many of their burned remains I saw in great ovens in the crematory. Their bones and ashes were used for fertilizer. Their tanned human skins with their prison numbers and often their nationalities tattoed upon them were used for lamp shades by the vile and corruptible, the lewd and lascivious women of the Gestapo agents. When there was a coal shortage and the furnaces could not be fired, prisoners were forced to dig their own graves.

Thousands upon thousands were hanged, beaten, tortured, starved, gassed, shot, burned, relegated to oblivion, and I still wonder, "Can it be?"

Let us not speak of humanity because the human race is most inhuman. We have reverted to a thousand years of barbarism because Nazi rule was worse than the Dark Ages. All that is beautiful, sweet, dear, and decent to this life has been killed—and beastly men with brutal tendencies, with vile impulses and vulgar feelings, have robbed the world of its beauty, killed hope, destroyed faith, stabbed love in the back, and are no longer capable of human compassion. "The soul is a pearl of great price," but its dignity has been outraged.

Worse than the broken bodies of these prisoners are their broken spirits. Modern civilization in diabolical Germany is but a thin veneer covering the savage nature of men. One might expect these atrocities and enormities to be committed by a non-Christian, heathen nation like Japan, but it is unthinkable and certainly unpardonable for them to be committed by the German people. No doubt there are many people in Germany who knew little or nothing about these atrocities, due to the strict Nazi censorship and propaganda.

One of our lieutenant generals and a young Dutch doctor who had been a political prisoner for 4 years in several Nazi camps felt that many of the German people did not know about these heinous crimes. I agree with them, but I am also convinced that many of the most guilty now nervously profess innocence and falsely declare they had no knowledge of these horrible events. They are now cowardly trying to save their own evil hides. It is very strange and rather amusing that so few people in Germany today knew Hitler or care anything about him or his fate.

At Nordhausen the prisoners were compelled to work in the great underground factory which produced V-1 and V-2 bombs. Thirty-five thousand of these prisoners worked in the vast subterranean passages, 30 miles long, which were fully equipped with the most modern machine tools and would compare in size and efficiency with the assembly line at Alcoa, Boeing, or at Willow Run. The buzz bombs and rocket bombs were being produced on a gigantic scale when we liberated Nordhausen, and it is fortunate that we reached there in time. We saw the awful havoc wrought and the frightful destruction which these instruments of death caused both in London and Antwerp.

Three weeks before our armed forces captured this camp, 135 Russians were publicly hanged and their fellow inmates were forced to look upon the ghastly scene. No worker in this underground factory ever came out alive to reveal any secrets.

At Dachau near Munich, we witnessed even more gruesome scenes than at Nordhausen or Buchenwald. We arrived there only a few hours after the camp was liberated and saw thousands of dead men—50 carloads in 1 train with 14 to 20 men in each little car—with many corpses thrown on the right-of-way as we see ties scattered along railroad tracks in America. These prisoners were brought from Buchenwald, with other civilians from divers places, and were locked in cars for 2 days and nights without any food or water. Naturally, thousands of them in their weakened condition died before they could be unloaded at Dachau.

When we entered the camp itself, surrounded by a high electrified barbed wire fence, we saw innumerable dead bodies scattered all over the prison grounds. In the crematory with several furnaces and a gas chamber, called a shower bathhouse, about 20 feet square in which thousands perished, we saw at least 500 naked bodies promiscuously piled in 1 adjoining room and about 400 other bodies—some partly clad in rags—neatly stacked in another room.

The Americans moved in so quickly the SS guards did not have time to burn these bodies and fortunately some of the Russian prisoners succeeded in killing three of these

guards before the others escaped. Their dead bodies were the only pleasant sight in the midst of all this carnage.

Dachau has been a nightmare to me and I now almost faint when I think of it and the reeking stench of dead men. Oh, you cannot get the picture. You have to move and walk in the midst of all that—and touch it, and feel it, and smell it.

It must be pointed out that there was a vast difference in the treatment accorded political and military prisoners. On the whole our American prisoners of war in Germany were fairly well treated and I never spoke to one who had received cruel or brutal treatment. Germany tried, I believe, to live up to the rules of the Geneva Convention and gave our boys a fair amount of food—as much as conditions at the time and place permitted. Thank God for the American Red Cross for it kept many of our boys from starving.

On the other hand the political prison camps were filled with the most intelligent and democratic leaders from all the Nazi-occupied countries in Europe, including Germans themselves who dared to oppose Hitler and his murderous bunch of gangsters. Political prisoners consisted of four classes:

1. Those who rejected the Nazi philosophy or ideology of government.
2. Habitual criminals.
3. Religious or conscientious objectors.
4. Those who refused to work.

The most fanatical and ruthless members of the Schutzstaffel were selected as guards over these prison camps. Often the worst convicts in prison were released to carry out the executions of the prisoners and to burn their bodies. These hardened criminals were promised their freedom to work in these human slaughter pens. They were well fed and clothed during the time of their diabolical service, but when they gained too much knowledge they were given a new suit of clothes and were told that they were free. Before they could get out of the prison camps, however, some Gestapo agent always put two or three bullets in the back of their heads so that the convicts could not tell secrets to people on the outside.

Contrarily and surprisingly a few of the political prisoners who had rich relatives were given their freedom after paying a high ransom, but not until the prisoner was broken in body and spirit and then only that he might tell his friends back home of the fate awaiting them if they dared oppose the Nazis in the least degree. We now know why the German people have fought on so long and hard. They had a pistol held to their temple and a bayonet to their back. Terrorism and Nazism are synonomous.

Nazi Germany and old Germany are really quite different. Old Germany, with its Kant, Luther, Goethe, Schiller, and Hegel; its Wagner, Bach, Beethoven, Einstein, and Mann, was certainly different from Nazi Germany with its Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Himmler, and Hess; its Henlein, Terboven, Quisling, Inquart, and Frank.

It is amazing to the most disinterested observer from an objective point of view to note the difference between men who have contributed much to the world's civilization and those who have all but destroyed it. The inconsistency and contradictory nature of the German people will make one wonder how they can be so smart and so dumb at the same time. Technically they are unsurpassed, but socially and politically they are near the bottom of the list.

Having studied in Heidelberg and Berlin following the last war, I thought I knew the German people, but between the two wars of our generation they have been changed by a pagan philosophy. Ideas are powerful weapons. Often they are more dangerous than dynamite. "As a man thinketh, so is he." Fed on a crass materialism, believing with Nietzsche in the superman and in the will to power, following Treitschke and Bernhardi with a slogan that "might makes right," these fanatical youngsters, without historical knowledge, without foreign travel, and with little experience, have blindly accepted and slavishly followed the poisonous doctrines of the Nazi Party.

Under one-party system of government and one-man rule, they have forgotten all about courts and parliaments and have followed only the fuehrer—their leader. To them Hitler was an indispensable man. He was a messiah—their saviour. This is the manner in which tyranny grows.

There is no indispensable man in any country in all this world. Men come and men go, but the world goes on. Thank God America is not a one-man country! This land of freedom under God is bigger than any man, party, or section of the country. As long as we have three branches of government in America, each to act as a check and a balance on the other two; as long as we have free speech, free press, and free worship; as long as we have the right to petition and a trial by jury of our peers, our liberties are safe. Our only hope or chance we have to avoid the fate of Hitler and Nazi Germany is to preserve the Republic by preventing one-party government or one-man rule.

So much for the atrocities committed in these political prison camps, which was our chief and really only mission. In closing, however, I want to make a few observations, and what I shall say is not in the least dogmatic, but is given from a troubled mind and a heavy heart, in order that I might stimulate your thinking and arouse your feelings, that out of our collective mind will come a sane solution of our baffling problems.

In the last war Germany was not invaded. Today she has been not only invaded but blasted to bits, overrun and thoroughly defeated. Heidelberg, an old university town without military value and with only 80,000 inhabitants, is about the only city in all Germany that is intact. The people there had sense enough to surrender.

One may travel from Mannheim and Ludwigshaven on the Rhine down through Darmstadt, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, past Coblenz, Remagen, Bonn, Cologne, Aachen, and Duren, and it will be difficult to find one habitable building standing. The utter devastation and complete destruction of Germany's industries and her large cities is as difficult to believe as the atrocities committed in their political prison camps. Not one or a few in isolated spots, but all the cities in Germany have been reduced to ruins. Hamburg, Bremen, Osnabruck, Kassel, Hannover, Halle, Leipzig, Berlin, Dresden, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Munich, Stuttgart, Karlsruhe—all of them are a heap of ruins. It is altogether fitting and proper that Hitler should perish in the ashes of his own Reichschancellery.

Hitler promised the world that Germany, when conquered, would be a mass of rubble, rats, and ruin—and this promise was certainly fulfilled. The Ruhr with its vast and diversified industries has been blotted out. What our armies—the Eighth and Fifteenth American Air Forces and the R. A. F.—did not blast to rubble, the Nazis themselves wantonly destroyed; they blew up every bridge and sank every barge. Caught like rats in a trap these desperate men frantically carried out to the last their demoniacal dreams.

I do not have the time to describe in detail all the demolition and destruction, but it certainly will take years for Germany to rebuild her industries. I seriously doubt if many of their cities will ever be rebuilt, and it might be well for us to let the smoldering ruins remain as a monument to their colossal folly and as a living example that war is a crime and that crime never pays.

What are we going to do about it? Frankly, I do not have the answer nor have I met any man who has the solution. Of course, there are extremists—some of our blood-thirsty people—unfortunately some in Congress—would shoot every German and burn every home. This position is so irrational and unbalanced that it is untenable and needs no discussion. It is impossible, impractical, and even undesirable to destroy 70,000,000 people. For our own welfare, we need a strong, stabilized state in Central Europe. These extremists are fit subjects for the Nazi Party.

They have not learned that two wrongs never make a right and that we should not stoop to the level of our enemies. The other extreme view is to be complacent—forget and forgive everything. There are some silly sentimentalists who would allow these arch criminals who have sinned against God, civilization, and humanity, to go unharmed, and escape their just and deserved punishment. This, we must not allow.

Personally, I believe that every bona fide member of the Gestapo and member of the SS—who was not forced to join the organization in the last months of the war—as well as the high command of the Wehrmacht, the Potsdam Prussian military caste, should be liquidated. Rub them out.

Though German cities have been destroyed the spirit of the youth has not yet been broken. The old people and little children are to be pitied but we had better keep an eye on all persons, men and women, between the ages of 14 and 30. They are sullen, arrogant, and still defiant. They have never known anyone but Hitler. It is the youth of Germany which was poisoned by Hitler's philosophy and the Nazi doctrines that must be watched and controlled. It will require many years to make over these people but we must be patient, brave, just, and always alert.

I was highly pleased with a note which my fellow Missourian, our good President Truman, addressed to the Japanese people. He demanded complete and unconditional surrender but at the same time he promised, in good faith, that even the Japs who are worse, if possible, than the Nazis would neither be exterminated or enslaved. We are not seeking extermination or enslavement but we are going to do the right, honorable, and just thing by all men. America is a Christian land. As Lincoln once said, this fair Republic is the last, best hope of earth and America is God's last chance to make a world.

It is great to be an American. The more one sees of other countries the more he must love this one. Providence has smiled upon and blessed us. We have the greatest Army in the world. The cooperation and efficiency, the spirit of comradeship existing between all our officers and enlisted men is something that warms one's heart. Too much praise cannot be given them. All our field commanders and our Chiefs of Staff back home—these men who have fought and won this war—the ones who have suffered most, want it never to occur again. We shall trust God but keep our powder dry. We shall speak softly but will carry a big stick. We must, if we are wise, maintain a superior Air Force, the largest Navy, the best trained and equipped Army in all this world. We shall carefully guard against becoming militaristic but we have suffered too much not to learn some things.

Advice is cheap. It is easily given and difficult to follow. I am still not old enough to offer it and I am still too young to follow it. Perhaps we would do well to listen and to carry out the admonition of one of the greatest men of all time. St. Paul in Romans xii: 17–21 tells us:

"Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men.

"If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

"Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Wake Up! The Food Situation Is Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me by unanimous consent, I am bringing to the attention of the Members of the House and the country additional information as to the shortage of meat, lard, sugar, and other essential and necessary food products.

Many of us in the House and Senate have for some time urged the administration to modify its policies as to the production of food. The farmers and farm workers have been handicapped and obstructed in many ways in carrying out their farming operations and in the production of food. We have the greatest number of cattle, and perhaps the greatest number of hogs, that we have had on the farms at any one time in the history of this country. There is a great surplus of wheat and other farm commodities that are not reaching the legitimate markets and the people, because of the regulations, directives, and policies of those charged with aiding in the production, processing, and distribution of farm commodities.

The black markets have grown apace, and the American people are now in the clutches of these black-market racketeers in every town and section throughout the Nation.

The people of Canada are not threatened with a food shortage. The farmers of Canada are not hampered by a lot of restrictions, regulations, and directives that have been imposed on the farmers of the United States. There is no shortage of meat, lard, and other foods in Canada.

The food condition in this country can be placed squarely upon the shoulders of the present administration here in Washington. Unless the farmers are protected and encouraged and common sense is used, this Nation will find our food shortage growing; and if we should have a drought for any considerable period throughout any large section of this Nation, the American people will go hungry. This, of course, means that our war effort will be hurt and the American people who must produce our ships and other munitions of war and the people generally will suffer. Their productive capacity has been and is being greatly curtailed because of this shortage of food.

The scarcity of food is not confined to cities and populous centers. We find it everywhere.

The following letter comes from Mr. Samuel Caldwell, of Saylor, Ky., dated May 13, 1945. Mr. Caldwell is a very reliable farmer and businessman in a strictly rural community:

As the people in this community know of no other man to ask their questions of but you, they have asked me to write you this letter. What they want to know is, What are they going to do about some meat and lard? There are more than 300 families at this address that have no meat or lard and who want to know what they are going to feed their children on. I personally know of some families that haven't had any lard or meat for more than 30 days. Now, please, we don't know of any other man to appeal to but our Congressman, so please advise me so I can tell the people where the trouble is.

We received the following letter from Mr. C. C. Byrley, of Pineville, Ky., dated May 11, 1945. Mr. Byrley carries on an extensive business, and his business requires him to cover many counties of my congressional district. He is an intelligent, conservative person, and I can vouch for all that he has to say on this subject:

MAY 11, 1945.

DEAR MR. ROBSION: Although you may already know something about it but the shortage of meats and fats, especially lard and bacon, in our section is causing our people much concern, you know our people well enough to know that they use large quantities of pure hog lard and white bacon, they can do without beef much better than pork products, of course, breakfast bacon has been a thing of the past for some time, but working people can't produce on a vegetable diet without proper seasoning with white bacon or lard.

The writer was in Evarts last week and a working man came out of a store with 1 pound of lard, I was a stranger to him but he was so pleased at being able to get 1 pound that he had to break down and tell me that he had been to every store in Evarts trying to find either lard or bacon and this was the only store that could let him have 1 pound.

On yesterday a man well known to the writer who resides just outside of the city limits and his wife came to me and asked if I could advise him of any store here in Pineville that would let him have a pound of lard or a piece of seasoning bacon, he advised me that they had been to every store that sells this and could not locate or buy 1 single pound of either, some few people that have transportation go out in the country and can buy some home-killed bacon or lard by paying high prices, but this is becoming very scarce, country hams when they can be found are being sold as high as 60 cents a pound, poultry is high priced and very scarce.

I was talking with Dewey Asher who operates a mine in Clay County and he advises that over in Clay that it is almost impossible to buy any meat or lard, of course, I know you have many things to worry you, but I thought you would like to know of these conditions.

Kind regards,

C. C. BYRLEY.

We call your attention to the following editorial which appeared in the United Mine Workers Journal of May 15, 1945, which is most enlightening as to the effect that the meat and other food shortage is having on the production of coal:

UNLESS O. P. A. IS HOUSE-CLEANED STEM TO STERN, ALL PRICE CONTROLS-RATIONING WILL BLOW UP—PRESIDENT TRUMAN SHOULD ACT

Bert Williams, the greatest Negro comedian of all time, registered his greatest hit in the Follies singing You Can't Shake Your Shimmy on Tea.

Coal miners cannot produce coal on Coca-Cola, a doughnut, and a cigarette for breakfast; macaroni and peas, a peanut-butter sandwich, and a cookie for lunch; and for dinner, rice, beans, cabbage, potatoes, and coconut custard pie. It doesn't matter what the calories add up to, or what the professional dietitians say, or what the women who never saw a kitchen may assemble as menus and print in the columns of the papers and magazines, the facts are that the men engaged in coal mining, the most laborious work of all American industries, cannot produce unless they are furnished an adequate meat diet that builds and maintains muscle.

We have been trying to tell the O. P. A., the S. F. A., and other Government agencies that eventually coal production would decline unless the meat supply of American coal miners was increased. The Journal has repeatedly pointed to the decreased coal production in England resulting from a reduced meat diet.

Representatives of the British Government and of the British mine workers visiting this country have all said that it was a monumental mistake on the part of the rationing authorities to hold coal miners' meat and other rations to the same comparable amount allowed city workers and others employed in light industry.

Leaders of various U. M. W. A. districts have called upon the O. P. A. in Washington without results. It's always the same old runaround. It was already difficult for miners' families to spread the meat supply over various stews and macaroni dishes and boiled dinners before ration points were reduced and the total meat supply for civilians cut 20 percent.

In actual practice the reduced supply of meat furnished by packers to distributors in coal areas leaves many communities entirely meatless for a week or 2 weeks at a time. The local distributor can reduce his delivery territory by half and still not have enough meat to supply the customers served. There is an incentive for the distributor to do this. With his total volume of business being cut, he sees an opportunity to reduce his delivery costs, use less gas, and save wear on tires by limiting the territory he serves.

In a few isolated coal areas far-visioned operators had local slaughterers scour the countryside for cattle and buy cattle to serve their company-store requirements. But in the great reformation of the O. P. A. policy that was to put the city black-market racketeers under control, the O. P. A. boys, simply without regard for the necessities of local communities, canceled all local slaughtering permits. The result has been that operators in many coal regions, recognizing that production and working forces would continue to decrease unless an adequate meat diet is obtained, began appealing to the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration for relief.

The National Coal Association took the matter up with Government agencies, but like the U. M. W. A., it has run into a stone wall. The N. C. A.'s experiences have been the same as those of the U. M. W. A. Its representatives have been lied to and given the run-around. In all of Washington's history there probably never existed an agency which practiced deception and lacked the understanding of the adequacies and equations of a given situation to the same degree as Chester Bowles and his O. P. A.

Mr. Bowles is an advertising man. Some 35 years ago the advertising clubs of America created the slogan "Truth in advertising." It was a short-lived slogan. Only the clerks and copy-runners ever reckoned with it in the first place as possible of attainment. Insofar as our dealings, and all the dealings of those we know who have had dealings with the O. P. A., can be totaled, as the spirit or creed of an institution. * * *.

A bulletin prepared by N. C. A., now being sent to bituminous coal operators everywhere, asserts that—

"Reports are coming in from various sections that the stores serving miners have far

less meat than is needed and many have none. Working forces are being seriously reduced in many sections. * * * The men will not work without proper food. Coal production is being reduced by reason of insufficient food primarily needed. O. P. A. and the War Food Administration have demonstrated that pleas from management are of no avail."

Then the bulletin goes on to point out that there is nothing left but for the men to act for themselves and through their accredited representatives raise their voices and demand meat. The N. C. A. charges that this is just another "clean-cut case of bureaucratic bungling and impractical men handling matters in which they have no practical knowledge."

The N. C. A. then calls upon its membership to acquaint their representatives "in Congress with the facts—protests to the O. P. A. fall on deaf ears in this as well as other matters."

In Wyoming coal towns refrigerated cases are filled with locally slaughtered native beef and lamb. In this territory where the soil is not conductive to the growth of vegetables, and chickens and turkeys are novelties, miners' wives are forced to gaze upon the butchers' layouts and go home empty-handed because of the lack of red points, while the miners overtax their strength in an endeavor to produce coal on an inadequate diet.

The Journal believes in an over-all legitimate price control. We believe in equal distribution of food products, but under the scheme of price-fixing and distribution now in operation by the O. P. A., the people of coal regions as well as other segments of our population who most need protection become the innocent victims of bureaucratic incompetency.

Unless the O. P. A. reforms its methods and does it right away, the whole program of price-fixing, rationing and distribution is going to blow up. The people are fed up; they are tired of discrimination; they are tired of inefficiency. The present directing heads of O. P. A. have fully demonstrated their inability to meet the responsibilities of the duties imposed upon them.

It's a house cleaning job that only President Truman himself can perform, and regardless of how many statements Director Bowles gives out, or how many visits he makes to the White House to display the physiognomies of his regional directors, or financial or political support he has in the background for his methods, President Truman can no longer permit this cancerous agency to imperil his administration.

On May 16 I received the following telegram signed by Mr. Sam Caddy, president, district 30, United Mine Workers of America. Millions of tons of coal are produced annually in this district. He points out that two important mines have already closed down and there is a threat that others will close down because of shortage of meats and other foods:

Lexington, Ky., May 18, 1945.

Congressman JOHN M. ROBSION,
New House Office Building:

Two mines down on account of no meat or fats, employing 800 men. One of these mines, for 500 employees with twelve hundred and twenty-five population received 18 pounds of meat and 36 pounds of lard for 1 week. In a previous telegram I informed you this matter was serious as the people have waited for meat now for several months and have received no reply to their complaints, and have received no meat. While there are only 2 mines down today the demand is general and will likely involve 18,000 coal miners with 75,000 population. Miners cannot load coal for long without meat.

SAM CADDY,
President, District No. 30,
United Mine Workers of America.

These are only a few of the many complaints and warnings we have received from people in all walks of life from my district.

This situation is most critical. One of the very important battles that we must fight and win is to increase our food supply. We cannot wait until next winter. We must do it now.

Second Lt. Robert E. Femoyer

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I request my colleagues to join with me in saluting one of the outstanding heroes of this war.

Second Lt. Robert E. Femoyer, of Huntington, W. Va., has been awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor—the Nation's highest decoration—for fighting off death for 3 hours to navigate his crippled bomber home from deep inside Germany, the War Department announced a few days ago.

The 23-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Femoyer, formerly of Huntington and now of Jacksonville, Fla., died last November 2 at an Army hospital in England half an hour after the shell-torn Flying Fortress landed at an Eighth Air Force base.

The citation said that in fighting off death long enough to save the lives of eight fellow crewmen he "distinguished himself by service beyond the call of duty."

The target was the Leuna oil plant west of Leipzig, one of the most heavily defended targets in Germany.

Flak hit Femoyer's Fortress three times. The first burst smashed the nose of the plane, severely wounding him. Two other hits knocked out two engines.

Unable to maintain speed or altitude, the pilot dropped the bomber out of formation and ordered all possible equipment jettisoned to keep the plane aloft.

Mortally wounded in the side and back, Lieutenant Femoyer was hurled across the floor of the bomber along with all his maps, charts, and equipment. Successful return to the base depended on his charting a short route across the flak fields.

Too badly hurt to be moved but refusing sedatives which would have deadened the pain but dulled his senses, Lieutenant Femoyer asked to be propped up on the floor with the equipment laid out in front of him.

In that position, bleeding steadily, he worked for 2½ hours.

Lieutenant Femoyer gave the pilot six separate headings, recalled the route flak zones from memory, and computed the air speed and wind resistance so closely that the bomber landed with just enough gasoline to taxi to an ambulance. Only when the plane had arrived over the English Channel did he permit his comrades to give him a sedative.

While we mourn the loss of this great soldier, his act of heroism will live forever.

Treatment of German Soldiers

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper article published in this country relates a story of a further coddling of the Germans. According to this story, after the unconditional surrender of Germany on May 2, the remnant of that army at Bolzano, Italy, continued in authority for some 10 days thereafter, doing just as they pleased, but they did finally agree that the Eighty-eighth Division of our Army might establish a command post in the city; but the Germans continued in full authority, according to this widely publicized story, until the 12th day of May.

It is further reported that the G. I.'s, who had waged such a gallant fight under adverse conditions, and who had won the war in Europe, continued to ask the question, during that 10-day period: "Who won this war?" They were justified in propounding that question.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the War Department appears to have any information upon this subject. The story that was published apparently came from the theater of war. If that story is authentic, I am constrained to ask the question, "Why did any of our Army officers permit the Germans, in Bolzano, Italy, to continue in power after the unconditional surrender?" When we reflect on the horrors of the terrible German atrocities, ruthlessly committed, which have been publicized throughout the country, the people of this country are constrained to ask the question, "Why were the Germans permitted to continue in full power, and authority, in Bolzano, Italy, after the surrender?" The power of the Germans ceased immediately upon their surrender, and the victors were then in full command.

Mr. Speaker, it was further reported in the published story that all kinds of small arms, including rifles, machine guns, small mortars and other war materials were stored in buildings, and the Germans had charge thereof; that German youngsters, probably a part and parcel of Hitler's Youth Organization, goose-stepped along the main streets of that Italian city, singing "Hitler Is My Fuehrer" and "Horst Wessel" during that period of time, while our soldiers stood by and watched with much chagrin.

Since this story was published, the people throughout our country have been amazed at the apparent laxity on the part of our Army officers in that area who permitted a defeated country, and its people, to carry on in the manner related in that story after the surrender. When Germany surrendered that was the end of her authority. That was the time for our Army to take full and complete charge of the city of Bolzano, Italy, and of every function thereof. The minute Germany surrendered that was the time to stop the high-handed methods she had employed throughout this war. I am very anxious to know, and I am certain the people of this country want to know, why those Germans in that area were coddled and pampered by our military forces after the surrender, and this request is urgently requested since those German arch-criminals have so maliciously and shamefully mistreated our soldiers and sailors who were prisoners of war in their custody.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I demand that those in authority in our Army who were at Bolzano, Italy, make a full and complete answer to this entire matter in order that the people, and the fathers and mothers of our boys and girls in the service, may know all of the facts surrounding this highly publicized story.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include one newspaper article on this happening, published in the Washington Post, on Wednesday, May 16, 1945, which article follows:

IN BOLZANO—HANGOVER OF GERMANS IS ENDED

(By Sid Feder)

BOLZANO, ITALY, May 13 (Delayed).—The Nazis in this wartime nest of the SS have finally learned that the war is over and that Germany has been whipped.

For the last 10 days they have been swaggering around doing about as they pleased, granting the United States Eighty-sixth Division permission to set up a command post, driving through the streets in powerful cars, fraternizing with civilians or eating in restaurants catering almost exclusively to German soldiers.

But now the honeymoon is over.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLONEL TAKES OVER

Col. James C. Fry of 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., assistant division commander of the Eighty-eighth, took over yesterday as commandant of the town and told the Nazis bluntly they were a defeated army and from now on would be treated as such.

I had written a story last week about what was going on in Bolzano—headquarters of both SS troopers and the German Army—after spending 2 days looking over the town and listening to our soldiers by the dozen asking, "What the hell's cooking—who won this war?" But the story was stopped.

There has been no official explanation of why the situation was permitted to exist for 10 days after the German surrender in Italy on May 2.

Until today Gen. Karl Wolff, head of the SS in Italy and in charge of Gestapo Chieftain Heinrich Himmler's personal staff, and Gen. Heinrich Von Vietinghoff-Scheel, German commander in northern Italy, retained elaborate headquarters here.

The officers and men in their outfits paraded around the streets and had everything just about their own way. The Eighty-eighth was told to keep its hands off.

For at least 3 nights groups of 15 or 20 local youngsters—obviously hold-overs from Hitler's Youth Organization—goosestepped down the main streets in the early evening singing "Hitler Is My Fuehrer" and "Horst Wessel." It amused the sidewalk-watching German soldiers and shocked the G. I.'s.

EVEN PRINTED PAPER

What is more, a German paper was printed here for several days after the surrender and our occupation.

Colonel Fry has cleaned up most of the situation now, but his broom is still busy.

Wolff has been placed in confinement and was evacuated today, along with most of his staff. The Germans still around have been ordered to keep off the streets unless they have passes signed by Fry's headquarters. The Germans also have been told bluntly they will be thrown in jail for any violations and tried by an American court.

The Congressional Expense Allowance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the proponents of this allowance of $2,500 for Members of Congress. I know their sincerity. In the 44 years I have been around this Capitol as a member of the press and as a Member of Congress I have never known a finer or a better representative of the people than the gentleman who has sponsored this proposal. And I thoroughly understand from personal experience, as well as from observation, the reasons which prompted the introduction of this legislation. I have been a Member of Congress 16 years and every year I have grown poorer. That is the usual experience. Few people realize the financial drains on Members of Congress.

But I have serious doubts whether this is a time to increase the compensation of Members of Congress. We have a line to hold against inflation and it is of the highest importance in the national interest that the line shall be held. I sincerely fear that the enactment of this legislation may imperil that line. How can we Members of Congress increase our income 25 percent and at the same time say to vast groups of our population who are in distress as a result of the high costs of living that they must be content with the pay they are now receiving?

I have many constituents in the Indianapolis district—thousands upon thousands of them—who are caught between the lower millstone of fixed wages and salaries and the upper millstone of increased costs of living, and who are just as much entitled to increased compensation as I am. I cannot find it in my heart to vote myself more compensation until their situation is ameliorated. I will take potluck with them.

Office of War Information

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a grand opportunity awaits the Members of Congress when the $50,000,000 appropriation comes up for the Office of War Information. This war agency should be abolished to save $50,000,000 for the taxpayers and a lot of headaches to the American people.

On Monday, June 21, 1943, I stated on the floor of the House:

Now along comes Director Davis—and I am referring to O. W. I. Elmer Davis—and he threatens to resign unless Congress restores the funds to the domestic branch of O. W. I. If he wants to resign, he can resign, and I know the press will be only too pleased to record it under the heading of public improvements.

What I said then still goes now—double for the whole O. W. I. set-up. Mark me, there will be no threats to resign this time. The last suggestion made by O. W. I. Elmer Davis to bar henceforth all American newspapers and magazines from occupied Germany, a proposal that was vetoed by General Eisenhower and President Truman, is evidence enough to the Members of this Congress that this $50,000,000-a-year program should be blotted out and the O. W. I. definitely taken out of the picture and war propaganda turned over to the Army and Navy, where it belongs, and the distribution of domestic information back to the various departments of the Government.

Here is an opportunity to save $50,000,000 for the boys who are doing the fighting—boys who will come home to go to work to earn the money to pay the taxes to pay this wartime bill. When this appropriation bill for O. W. I. comes up let us give the boys a break and take a lot of literary genius out of lush pasture and let them go to work.

Certainly it is one of the wartime agencies that has outlived its usefulness and one that will never be missed—will never be missed.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 16, 1945]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

This Capital's most distinguished graduate of Queen's College, Oxford, the worthy Dr. Elmer Holmes Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, has just had the seat of his pants booted way up between his shoulder blades by an official White House rebuke.

With the White House directness and candor that now makes a Presidential press conference a refreshing and informative session, President Truman "reversed" (to put it gently) an O. W. I. program which very pompously and with a "papa knows best" smirk Director Davis had proclaimed from his O. W. I. ivory tower only last Friday.

This was the Davis decision, handed down as an expert on the psychology of public information in wartime, which would bar henceforth all American newspapers and magazines from occupied Germany.

In their place Davis proposed to use Treasury funds to print newspapers in German cities staffed by some of the pay-roll patriots of O. W. I.—whose draft exemption had been requested and obtained months ago when they climbed aboard the gravy train.

The important fact behind all this is that President Truman's reversal of Director Davis may not only mean the end of Davis' turbulent wartime career but may also mean the end of O. W. I. and its $50,000,000 a year spending program.

And if that happens few of the working press in Washington will grieve.

The great majority would like to see the propaganda set-up of the O. W. I. turned over to the Army and Navy where it belongs and the domestic information branches handed back to the regular departments of the Government, where reporters get their news anyway because of the incompetence or inability of O. W. I. to deliver the goods either on time or accurately.

In making his original announcement about the decision to keep American papers out of the hands of Germany, Director Davis very frankly said that a reading by Germans of certain American papers would give the populace of the conquered area under American control the impression that there might be a division of thought and policy among the beloved Allies of the United Nations.

More importantly, Davis certainly gave the impression to correspondents that this was a decision reached by the United States military chiefs in Europe—meaning General Eisenhower—that the authority behind it was strictly of Army origin and that O. W. I. had merely "concurred" with the decision.

This writer, in his report, indicated that despite this statement it was his belief that the whole scheme was cooked up by Davis and some of his brother "psychological" experts in and out of O. W. I.—including such individuals of the propagandist gentry as Archibald MacLeish and other breast-beating hold-overs from the Roosevelt regime.

General Eisenhower, of course, had never heard of the Army policy barring American newspapers from Germany as announced by Davis until President Truman, moving with simple directness and common sense, called him up and asked the facts.

The blunt statement which Truman, standing before a group of White House reporters, read with such crisp vigor, was the harshest indictment yet made of O. W. I. He read:

"General Eisenhower has advised me that he has issued no policy or order dealing with the importation of publications into Germany."

In other words, the information handed out by the head of the Office of War Information was 100-percent wrong.

The Agency, set up under Davis and given millions to spend, was created to assure "an accurate and consistent flow of war information to the public and the world at large." Under it, the news of the surrender of Germany was ridiculously messed and botched.

Under it, British and Russian press had consistently scooped the American press on vital and important war developments—such as the meetings of allied leaders at Cairo, Teheran, etc.

The reason for all this is that O. W. I. from its very start has been cursed with an overload of propagandists, press agents, self-appointed psychlogists and advertising experts who wanted to sell the war to America, etc., etc.

The idea that if you're handling news and information it might be a good idea to have a few competent newspapermen around never got very far in O. W. I.

A few respectable members of the craft were lured into the Davis set-up to give it the window-dressing of journalistic respectability. But they were few and most of them quit in disgust.

In all decency they couldn't stand the phony atmosphere created by the breast-beaters and psychopathic crackpots, the sweepings of editorial rooms, the draft dodgers who battled to get on the O. W. I. pay roll, and the slobbering do-gooders and world-savers.

O. W. I., of course, wants to keep its gentry on the pay roll for as long as possible. But, viewing yesterday's developments, we think some of the boys might be looking around for a job—or possibly the younger and healthier having a heart to heart talk with their draft boards.

Transportation Restrictions

REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleague from South Dakota in a plea for a review on transportation restrictions. A telegram received this morning from the Atlantic City Chamber of Commerce states the case concisely, and I will read it:

Until the Government canceled its restrictions on horse racing, while denying the right of assemblage to legitimate public groups for a discussion of war problems and for the purpose of backing up our men who are now fighting in the Pacific theater, every group had conscientiously complied with all official requests for cooperation. But when the Government itself decides that transportation problems are so well solved that horses, and jockeys, and race track patrons can expend travel miles so freely, we feel justified in urging you, and all other representatives of the American public, to raise a vigorous voice of protest on the floor of Congress, insisting on the right of unrestricted assemblage within each State of essential groups for the purpose of furthering the war effort, and a discussion of peacetime problems in agriculture, industry, reemployment, public health, religion, veterans' assistance, education and community problems, all of which are no less important than the resumption of horse racing.

I have heretofore received pleas from a number of religious organizations who are restrained from convening to discuss their problems by the transportation ban, and they say, and rightly so, that their constitutional rights are thus being impaired.

Furthermore, there is now in effect a general rule against increasing seasonal travel to resort areas. This has a drastic effect on the great seashore resorts included within my district, and seriously interferes with the vacation plans of the American people. Recreation is highly important to the health and welfare of a nation's people, who have undergone and are still undergoing great strain.

It goes without saying that we are willing to continue our sacrifices for all necessary support of the war effort, but I most strenuously object that serious public conventions and travel for necessary recreation and health should be regarded by the Government as less essential than travel to race tracks.

I am immediately calling this situation to the attention of Mr. Vinson and Colonel Johnson of the Office of Defense Transportation, and I hope they will review this problem fairly and equitably.

The American Postal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous approval of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, H. R. 3035 is now before this honorable body. It is a tribute to the proud record of the Postal Service that there is today no serious opposition to this bill. I do not believe that there will be more than a vote or two against the measure in the entire House. By all means it should pass unanimously.

It is only fit and proper that at last the poorest paid of all the Federal employees should have an equitable adjustment of their pay rates, which certainly is long past due. By the same token it is well to point out that besides the raise in pay to the workers the Postal Service stands to benefit from this bill in the guarantee of maintaining a high degree of efficiency. The good and faithful worker of high quality and service will remain and an invitation is made to desirable personnel to enter the service. The problem of morale, of which so much is said, is a problem of the Postal Service and today this bill will go far in building up a proper morale among the employees of the Service who were beginning to think they were really the "forgotten men." This is a record for legal, faithful, and competent service. We are making a conscious effort to meet and solve the basic pay and adjustment of wages problem of the white collar, as well as the industrial worker of America. We are dealing with a branch of the Government that is near to the American people and in whose welfare they have deep concern. When you speak of big business do not forget the Postal Service is one of the biggest employers of men and women in the country. And of all the departments of the Government in normal times it is the greatest employer and Nation-wide.

The obvious inequalities that exist will be removed by this legislation, and those with a low-bracket wage scale will be placed at a reasonable, proper level in keeping with the work they do and in recognition of the cost of living and the standard of living desirable for our people.

I shall not dwell on the technical provisions of the bill. These were fully discussed before the committee and will be outlined more fully on the floor by the gentlemen sponsoring the measure. But I do mention the $400 per year increase over the present base pay in place of the

$300 temporary bonus about to run out on June 30 of this year. And I do mention as well the theory of longevity pay provisions in many of the Service agencies, and the equalizing of a number of unfair situations that were going on between different branches of the service. In the time and one-half provision and the 10 percent grant over the day rate for night work were a long desired improvement. Aud surely the 15 days with pay leave and the 10 days with pay sick leave sections are among the most desirable.

It is indeed high time that Congress acted on this law. I, for one, feel that the postal workers have been patient and long-suffering with their problem. In recognition of this fact, as well as because of the merits of the case, I know this House will meet its responsibility and give justice where justice is due.

I can say that the postal workers in my district have always been kind and friendly to me. Many times they have aided me in helping the good people of my district. Never have they failed me. Nothing is too small an effort for these exceptional public-spirited servants to undertake. I am proud to call them all my friends and doubly proud to number them among my constituents. Their noblest nature is the public good. And my experience has been the experience of every one of my neighbors back home, and I am sure it is the same throughout the Nation. Everyone is almost daily in touch with postal employees. The citizens know them as fellow citizens, friends, and neighbors, in rain or shine, fair weather or foul, in gladness and in sorrow. And they represent to most people the great Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to vote for this measure, H. R. 3035. I want to do my part in the vital public interest of preserving our essential and efficient postal system at American standards and in the American way for a truly great group of American workers.

Mother's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before Mother's Day mass meeting in Hooper School, at Endwell, N. Y., Sunday, May 13, 1945:

Today we pause to honor our mothers throughout the Nation. As we do so, we find that the war in the Pacific is edging nearer and nearer to Japan.

Not so long ago we saw the might of the Japanese stretching almost to Australia, to Guam, and making inroads into India. In simultaneous, deft thrusts, Japan extended her domain over untold thousands of square miles in Asia. Few conquerors ever took in more territory.

One by one, however, the island bases which comprised the outer circle of the yellow empire's defenses have fallen to American armies. A hundred blood-soaked beaches and stifling jungles represent the hardest-won land ever fought for by American troops.

On a day such as this, while we honor the mothers of so many heroic sons who have died conquering those Pacific isles, I think it is timely to ask a few questions regarding future American foreign policy.

What is to become of American possession of these hard-won areas? Will some power other than ours come in and tell us we have no right to hold these islands for which we spilled our blood and treasure? What reason have we to put forth for giving up one inch of land we take from Japan?

I wish to make it clear on this hallowed day, when mothers of our fighting sons hope they have not died in vain, that I believe Old Glory must continue to fly wherever our boys have planted her. On Iwo Jima, in the Aleutians, in the China Sea, American armies have broken the power of the Son of Heaven. We must not retreat from our duty to keep that power from rising again.

Let us keep what we have set out to make American and never haul down the Stars and Stripes in the East.

The Billings Market Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only proper that at this time I should once again call to the attention of the House that while restrictions have been lifted for the holding of horse races, the right of assemblage to legitimate public groups has been denied. I am referring specifically to such outstanding organizations as the Billings Market Week, which has been forced to go out of existence for the time being because of the supposed heavy drain on transportation and hotel accommodations.

Some weeks ago a delegation of Senators and Congressmen from the Rocky Mountain States met with Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and pleaded with him that this market week be allowed to continue because of the fine, necessary, and economical service it rendered to the merchants of Montana, western North and South Dakota, and northern Wyoming. Even though this particular market week did not put a strain on the railroads going to Billings or the hotels in that city, our request was denied.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this worthwhile project is being unduly discriminated against when restrictions are lifted on such nonessentials as horse racing. I feel it is only proper that legitimate public groups, such as the one mentioned, church groups, and fraternal and veterans' groups should have the right to meet within their respective States when they can show there will be no undue drain on the transportation systems and on the hotel capacities. These groups do a real good in the furthering of their respective interests, and I urge the House to give this matter its most earnest and serious consideration.

Improvement of the Arkansas River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me at Little Rock, Ark., on May 7, 1945, before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in connection with the proposed improvement of the Arkansas River. The statement is as follows:

Gentlemen, my name is FADJO CRAVENS. I am a resident of Fort Smith, Ark. Since 1939 I have represented the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas in the Congress of the United States.

Availing myself of the invitation extended to interested parties by this board to offer information with respect to the comprehensive plan now under consideration for the protection, development, and improvement of the Arkansas River Valley I submit the following observations:

The city of Fort Smith is one of the principal cities situated on the Arkansas River. The agricultural lands in the valley in the so-called Fort Smith area are among the richest and most productive in this country. As a lifelong resident of Fort Smith and with a personal knowledge of the Arkansas River Valley in that and adjacent areas I feel that I can give the Board some helpful information as to the problems of the area and its inhabitants created by a treacherous and so far uncontrolled river. To say the least of the matter, and as one who has seen and suffered from the recurrent havoc wrought by the Arkansas River I can qualify as an interested party in any plan or project calculated to eliminate or reduce the existing hazards at the earliest possible time.

Based upon hundreds of contacts with people in the Arkansas Valley I am convinced that, without exception, they are chiefly and primarily concerned with protection against the damages occasioned by the recurrent, disastrous floods which have occurred in the valley at dishearteningly frequent intervals. This attitude is easily understandable when it is remembered that these people have, over a long period of years, seen human lives lost, witnessed incalculable damage to property, have faced pestilence and disease and famine, all of which unavoidably accompany or follow in the wake of a flood on a rampant and unpredictable river. The dangers they have faced and the anxieties they have lived through as a result of floods, naturally make protection against these disasters of paramount interest to them.

If we were forced to choose between the benefits of flood control, navigation, or the production of power, we would, I believe, unquestionably select flood control as our most urgent need and the thing we desire

above all others. We have, however, as a result of recent floods become intensely "river minded." What can be done to the Arkansas River to protect us from it and at the same time make that river an agent for the economic development of our area, has also come within the realm of our consideration on the subject. Most all of us feel that there can be fitted into the plan for the taming of the river features which will provide for navigation, the production of power and other benefits and that these things can be done without in any way jeopardizing the protection from floods. On the contrary, we are convinced that the complete all-purpose development of the river will enhance rather than endanger the flood-control phases of our objective. Our conclusion in this respect is supported by the development of the plan proposed, after careful study, research, and investigation by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and which plan you now have under consideration. We cannot help but feel that the plan is sound and feasible. We know that without consummation of some such project we will continue to face the disastrous conditions of the past and present, and that the economic development of our area will be substantially retarded.

Granting the need for the consummation of the proposal under consideration, there naturally arises the question of how, by what means, and through what instrumentalities is the proposal to become a reality. While, as is to be expected, there is some difference of sincere opinion the conclusion is inescapable that an overwhelming proportion favor the discharge of this responsibility by the Army engineers. In the first place, it is widely known that the Army engineers have a vast experience in designing, developing and operating river projects and improvements; that they have already in existence trained personnel capable of prompt action; that their actions and policies are nonpolitical and are dictated solely by hard facts, realistic concepts, and a true devotion to a public duty. It is, moreover, recognized that river improvements cannot be based on considerations involving only one river or one area. An over-all, coordinated program of construction and operation is the only means by which satisfactory results may be assured. Dividing authority among different groups to be carried into execution, each in its own way, in various geographic divisions of the country, with each constantly jockeying for advantage over some other area or authority, will produce only confusion and chaos. Lastly, we know from experience, that the Army engineers not only have a knowledge and appreciation of our problems but have as well a sympathetic attitude toward them and a real desire to intelligently help us reach a solution.

Today the outlook for a river, controlled to prevent flood damage, and harnessed to serve our material needs, is nearer to realization than ever before. Those of us who recall the long years of struggle to improve the Arkansas River Valley cannot bring ourselves to believe that all the progress that has been made should be tossed out of the window and the process of development begun all over again under the auspices of an unknown, and as yet uncreated agency, about which we know nothing and about which we cannot learn until it may be too late. To cast aside certainty for uncertainty would be, in my considered judgment, but little short of tragic. This view, I believe, is shared by a great preponderance of those in the valley.

One further matter before closing. Some apprehension has been intimated that improving the Arkansas River to make it navigable would cripple and weaken already existing transportation facilities to their detriment and to the detriment of the public whom they serve. I venture the assertion that the effect would be exactly the opposite and I believe experience elsewhere will support my contention. With the general improvement of the economy of any area business is better for every individual person and concern in that area. Improvement of any industry feeds and nourishes other industries with the end result that each helps the other. It is a well known fact that river transportation is necessarily slower than other types and hence is utilized mostly in carrying bulky, raw materials where speed in reaching destination is not an important consideration. Water transportation is also cheaper, giving a competitive advantage to those who may use it in transportation of raw materials for further processing or other purposes. They are thereby enabled to increase production and new industry is attracted to the area. The transportation of this new and increased production creates an additional volume of business for established systems of transportation and thus, in the final analysis and in an ever increasing way, the use of all methods of transportation are enlarged to the benefit of their employees and others dependent upon the operation of the transportation system of the country and of the public.

I am grateful for this opportunity to lay before you the picture of the Arkansas River Valley as it is seen by many of us who reside in that valley. I hope that what has been brought out will be of some aid to you in the discharge of your duties. I hope and believe that these hearings together with the investigations heretofore made will conclusively establish the economic soundness of the plans for the Arkansas River Valley which you are now considering and will enable you to recommend that they be undertaken. You may confidently count upon the full cooperation of practically every man, woman, and child in the area involved.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a talk given by a constituent of mine, Attorney B. J. Adamkiewicz, over radio station WISN, of Milwaukee, Wis., on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, May 3, 1945:

My fellow Americans, in Milwaukee, and in communities throughout the land, the Polish Constitution Day observance will crystallize in patriotic manifestations. That is as it should be, for in the lives of Poles and Americans of Polish birth or extraction, May 3 always shall be a truly great day, just as July 4 always will be a great day to all Americans.

To the Polish people generally, May 3 had always been a day of great rejoicing for it ever brings to their mind the resplendent glories of their native land. For more than 5 years, Poland had lain racked in the torture chamber that was Nazi Europe, and more than 2,000,000 Poles had died so that the very shadow of disaster. Less than 5 years later, Poland was totally dismembered; democracy and civilization would live. Because that is Polish tradition. The Polish Constitution was drawn up by patriots in and for 121 years there was no Polish state. But the Polish nation did not die; the Polish spirit was not crushed. And every year the Poles everywhere celebrate Polish Constitution Day, as they are even now singing, defiantly their national anthem: "Poland Is Not Yet Lost," singing it with a fervor that echoes and reechoes throughout the world as they once more are witnessing another crime of a millennium—the fifth partition of Poland.

This year there is greater significance to Polish Constitution Day, and Polish hearts, yes, and American hearts too, are heavy. They are heavy with fear that Poland, which had fought so gallantly when its soil was torn by the invasion of Nazi hordes in September of 1939, is about to emerge from its ruins, even before peace is declared, comparatively a small and shrunken state, shrunken, yes, because Soviet Russia, with the approbation of Poland's allies, Great Britain and the United States, had seized and holds the eastern half of Poland, and has proclaimed it to be an integral part of her vast domain under the guise that she must have the boundaries of June 1941.

Why do the Allies countenance and participate in Russia's sinister designs toward Poland? It is wholly obvious that Russia is determined to have Poland emerge from the ruins of war weakened to such degree that she will be utterly unable to defend her renascent national freedom and territorial integrity in the future, and that she will become easy prey to Russia's imperialism.

During a pontifical high mass for the victims of Warsaw, the Reverend Monsignor James Griffiths said, and I quote:

"Poland and the Poles have unquestionably vindicated themselves as invaluable and loyal allies, and they have vindicated their rights to their lawful aspirations—nationhood." It is for this reason that Americans and people everywhere who believe in God, who love Poland, who have even a rudimentary regard for natural justice are today appalled as they witness the travesty on international justice which is being enacted as Poland is pounded between the diplomatic anvil and the imperialistic hammer, in the name of peace. It is all so redolent of the period of Poland's partitions, when Maria Theresa wept for Poland but with each tear drop took another mile.

Poland has time and again been called the bastion of western civilization. Today she is something infinitely more—she is the litmus test of our war aims. If she must of necessity turn red regardless of the wishes of her people—and it has become apparent up to the time the San Francisco Conference had been convened that the Allies sought to have Poland turn red, and become fully subservient to Moscow rule; if Poland must sacrifice her national sovereignty, her national aspirations, her national honor and independence to gratify and satisfy and appease the imperialistic greed, then truly has this war been fought in vain, and "all the blood and sweat and tears," of which Mr. Churchill had spoken so eloquently at the outset of the war, shed not only at Warsaw but at Dunkerque, at El Alamein, at Guadalcanal, at Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, will have been expended in vain—and Poland and western civilization will stand in perfect juxtaposition, where they were on September 1, 1939. If this should happen, then, as the Reverend Monsignor James Griffiths had further said, and I quote: "The Atlantic Charter must go down in history as a pact made not merely geographically but ideologically as well—at sea."

The Polish people have hailed the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3 as a great step forward, for under that Constitution the Poles, not unlike the American people under the Constitution of the United States, were endowed with the right to life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And today, with Poland once again threatened with extinction, even powerful Russia cannot usurp these rights, notwithstanding anything the San Francisco Conference may bring to the Polish people, be that life of partial or complete servitude under a despotic, tyrannical, and arbitrary government of Soviet Russia.

For many weeks now, much of our American press has been in a great make-believe campaign to sell to the American people our supposedly great diplomatic triumph at Yalta. Of course, we won absolutely nothing at Yalta, neither for ourselves nor for the cause we are fighting. And the defenders of this triumph, finding themselves out on a limb, excuse this by telling the American people that a perfectionist attitude is as bad as isolationism. Indeed, no one expected perfection. We were prepared to accept compromises. But there were no real compromises at Yalta; there was surrender, nothing else.

The Atlantic Charter was desecrated while it was praised. One-half of prostrate Poland was handed over to Soviet Russia outright, to be communized and absorbed into the Soviet orbit, without the Polish people being asked whether they would like to turn their homes and farms, their factories and stores, to the collectivist system and their personal liberty to the dictatorship of Mr. Joseph Stalin. And upon the remainder of Poland, a Soviet chosen government was foisted, with full American and British recognition. The Polish Government at London, which had organized and directed the Polish resistance to the Nazis, under whose banner thousands of Polish airmen had died over England and Germany, which was the acknowledged organizer and leader of the Polish underground movement, was deserted and thrown overboard.

Thank God that at least the Moscow-sponsored so-called Polish government was denied participation in the San Francisco Conference.

I repeat, therefore, that the Yalta Conference was not a diplomatic triumph for our Government, but the very synthesis of abject surrender. It is pitiful indeed that on the morning after Yalta we were presented with spheres of influence covering Central Europe. Poland was betrayed, Germany was to be divided into three parts, and the Russians were to hold sway in the Balkans.

What destiny is planned for the people of the 54 small nations of the world? Certainly the American people are entitled to know this. Have we any fear of war with any of these small nations? Only the Big Three can and will once again precipitate the world into another maelstrom of destruction if Russia is not checked in her imperialistic designs in Europe. That Soviet Russia is even now laying the foundation for a major war by her seizure of the eastern half of Poland is now beyond the peradventure of a doubt.

Whether Soviet Russia's determination to retain seized Polish territory as her own is aimed towards security, as she claims, rather than territorial imperialism, which is obvious, is at the moment not at issue. But it should be born in mind that beyond arguments and theories are hard facts, and the will of the Polish people to preserve their birthright is a hard fact.

The magnificent spirit displayed by the Polish people in the face of oppression and the spirit that emanates from the hearts of Poles and Americans of Polish birth who are now fighting in American columns against a common foe is a gleaming flash of that resolve that lifts the hearts of men and nations and springs from the spiritual foundations of life itself. The Poles are experiencing an ordeal which by far exceeds anything that can be pointed to in the darkest pages of history, yet they endure, eternally fortified in the thought that the Constitution of May 3 shall not have been in vain.

Textile Workers Oppose Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented for the National Federation of Textiles, Inc., to the Committee on Ways and Means:

The manufacturers of rayon and synthetic yarn fabrics respectfully record their opposition to H. R. 2652, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, etc., and in so doing also record their recommendation that section 350 not be renewed either in its original or proposed amended form, and that the flexible tariff principle be governed by section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as originally enacted.

This statement is submitted on behalf of the rayon and synthetic yarn fabric manufacturers, members of the National Federation of Textiles, Inc. The manufacturer members of the federation produce over 90 percent of the rayon and synthetic yarn fabrics made in the United States. They operate textile mills in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The mills represented are the former members of the Silk Association of America, Inc., and the National Rayon Weavers' Association. The total production of this group in 1944 was one and a half billion yards of fabric, of which an increasing percentage is going into clothing and equipment for the armed services. Of the total million and a quarter employed in the entire textile manufacturing industry, 90,000 are in the rayon weaving mills and their earnings total $143,000,000 annually. The industry is one in which the individual worker plays the major part in the production of goods.

This group is conscious of the importance of maintaining a liberal attitude in international trade. The textile industry is particularly conscious of this, as it is itself, perhaps, the most international of all industries. It is found in nearly every country where there is any industrialization. In the majority of cases it will probably be the first industry to be revived in the war-torn countries.

Continuation of section 350 of the Tariff Act, however, in its proposed form has the potential power of crippling the American textile industry. The American textile industry is sufficiently important as a source of employment to a million and a quarter workers in many localities scattered over a wide area and as an integral part of the economic life of this country, to be considered as a major means of livelihood for the people of the United States. Of special importance, from the viewpoint of present-day conditions, is the American textile industry's contribution to national security. The many articles of clothing and personal equipment of the servicemen are made possible by the products of the textile industry, but in this war we manufacturers of synthetic materials have not only provided materials for clothing, but have seen whole new chapters of military action made possible by the development of special synthetic textiles in this country. The industry was able to provide these millions of yards of fabric in the time of need only because it had been given an opportunity to develop in the United States in competition with the longer established textile industries of other countries of the world. That opportunity was through the use of tariffs on imported goods that would compensate in part for the vast difference in wages paid in this country and others. For example, wages paid to the American textile worker are from 3 to 10 times those received in other countries.

Without that American synthetic fabric industry, the armed forces of this and other countries would have found themselves without parachutes for men, supplies, and bombs; without tire cord for use with synthetic rubber; without vermin-proof netting for jungle use; without bullet-proof gasoline tanks; life-raft sails; decontamination cloth for chemical warfare; and without many other wartime specialties made from rayon and synthetic yarns. The ability of those manufacturers to supply fabrics to meet uses specified by the armed forces is a factor in the successful prosecution of the war that will be vouched for by the Air Corps, the Navy, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Ordnance Department, the Department of Chemical Warfare, and many other procurement agencies.

Our opposition to H. R. 2652 and to the present section 350 of the tariff act is based on the following reasons:

THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS FOR WHICH SECTION 350 WAS ORIGINALLY ENACTED NO LONGER EXIST

Its original purpose, as stated in the first paragraph of the section is no longer tenable. The purpose says that it is "a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce." Since the war we have seen the American standard of living rise to new heights. There is no domestic unemployment nor at present an economic depression.

A FLEXIBLE TARIFF NEEDS A KNOWN MEASURING STICK FOR FAIR ADMINISTRATION

Where there is need for an adjustment of tariffs to permit freer importation of products from another country, that adjustment should be based on a careful investigation as to costs of production in the countries concerned. The adjustment should be made only to the extent that it has been proved needed after investigation by the United States Tariff Commission of relative costs of production between the domestic article under consideration and the foreign article. Only where the results of such investigation show that the existing duties do not equalize the difference in cost of production shall there be an adjustment of rates. The system of change of duties, incorporated in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is the system that we consider the only equitable, safe method of adjusting rates.

RATE ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD APPLY ONLY TO COUNTRY TO WHICH ORIGINAL CONSIDERATION WAS GIVEN

Moreover, the adjustment should apply only to the particular country or countries whose costs were investigated. The standard of living varies widely in the world. For

example, an adjustment of duty agreed upon for Great Britain with a relatively high standard of living and wage scale should not be applicable to China with a lower wage scale.

MASS PRODUCTION OF AMERICAN TEXTILES FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE IS THREATENED BY PRESENT METHOD OF INTERNATIONAL BARGAINING

No single industry in this country should be considered expendable on the international trading counter. The textile industry appears to be fair prey in such negotiations. Because the worker plays so vital a part in production of each yard of fabric, every yard imported has a direct bearing on the daily wage of a million and a quarter American textile workers.

In the United States we have developed to a high degree mass production of textiles for the population at large—not the cheapest, not the most expensive, but the finest medium-priced and usable textiles anywhere. The clothing and home decoration use of textiles in this country, compared to the quality and amount used elsewhere in the world, indicate the high degree of success the industry has achieved in meeting the demands of American consumers. Our domestic consumption of textiles is part of our higher standard of living. However, textile manufacturing efficiency is not necessarily a monopoly of the United States. From the post-war competitive standpoint, we know we will have to meet the competition of not only our old competitors, Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, etc., but the many new countries, South America, for example, who have had a chance to see American machinery and to use American textiles. They will soon secure similar machinery either through their own highly skilled textile machinery engineers or, as is indicated by recent visits from British missions of both cotton and synthetic fiber men through the purchase of American machinery. Furthermore, in contrast to our heavy consumption of our own textile products, the lower standard of living in other countries forces them to export a large percentage of their output.

TARIFF RATES ADJUSTMENT MUST CONSIDER RELATIVE COSTS OF PRODUCTION AND EFFECT ON LARGE GROUPS OF AMERICAN WORKERS

Wages are the major item in textile cost of operation whether in the United States of America or in Russia. From pre-war experience the industry knows that the big advantage for the foreign manufacturer is the great disparity in wages, and the much lower standard of living that exists abroad.

During this war, the American textile worker's wages have risen rapidly. In 1939, the average weekly earnings for rayon and silk workers were $15.78. In November 1944 that average had risen to $30.04 or approximately 100 percent. This trend is one that progressive manufacturers welcome and intend to continue, if they can. Such a general rise in the American textile worker's economic position, however, makes all the more marked the wide disparity between his income and that of his foreign fellow textile worker. Before the war, this difference ranged from 3 to 10 times the foreign worker's wages. After the war, the difference will undoubtedly be even more marked. The danger to his economic welfare must be apparent if these differences are not kept in mind during international trade negotiations.

We advocate, therefore most urgently that adjustments of tariff rates be subject to the type of investigation on cost of production which unfortunately section 350 does not require. It is true that the President is under obligation to hold a public hearing before the final consummation of a trade agreement and that he is also instructed to "seek information and advice" from the Tariff Commission. But we believe that the coming years need a more definite and specific provision that duties shall not be increased or decreased until the costs of production in the countries to be affected, are carefully checked by an experienced agency such as the United States Tariff Commission. Section 336 of the tariff act provides such a method of procedure.

ANY RENEWAL OF SECTION 350 SHOULD BE LIMITED TO 1 YEAR ON EMERGENCY GROUNDS ONLY

If, from the emergency viewpoint, Congress wishes to give the President something to work with in the pending discussions with Allied National representatives and for that reason wishes to extend the present Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, section 350, then we urgently recommend that the extension be limited to 1 year only. Under present wartime conditions, we do not know to what extent the textile industry of this country will have to provide employment for returning war veterans and returning textile workers from war industries. The textile industry as the country's second largest peacetime employer among the manufacturing industries has a major stake in that program. Therefore, it is advisable to us that a law affecting employment, as does the reciprocal-trade-agreement provision, should be continued only for a comparatively short period.

In the meantime, Congress will have an opportunity to consider the more specific method of adjusting duties, in section 336, and thus give American industry a chance to know what they have to measure up to in competing with corresponding industry in other countries. That competition affects only the million and a quarter people directly employed in the textile industry (on a peacetime basis) but also the small businessmen, the many thousands of people employed in service industries that depend upon the incomes of those workers in the hundreds of large and small communities in which textile plants are located. Other nations should be given a chance to supply us with what they can produce but not to the extent of injuring the operation of the corresponding industry in the United States and thus undermining the standard of living of many thousands of working people, disrupting local trade and community interests and endangering the national security in times of emergency.

BASE RATES SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED

Furthermore, if section 350 is renewed, it should certainly not be amended so as to make January 1, 1945, the base period for adjustment of rates. We do not know as yet the effect of rate adjustments already made in reciprocal trade agreements previously signed. These adjustments have never operated in a normal world market. They came into being when the major European textile countries were in the throes of war preparation.

What they will mean in peacetime operations such as the years, cannot be judged on the basis of records from 1937 to date. We believe, therefore, that if it is deemed necessary, for reasons of national policy to renew the reciprocal-trade agreements procedure at this time, there should be no pyramiding of changes above the 50 percent originally contemplated. The use of January 1, 1945, as a base period would have this result.

CONCLUSION

We are in hearty accord with Mr. Roosevelt's statement in his message to Congress of March 26, 1945, on this subject that "* * * we cannot succeed in building a peaceful world unless we build an economically healthy world." We believe that the present standard of living of American workers should be protected if we are not to find them the first victim of an economically unhealthy world. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, either in its present form or in the proposed form, does not give the American worker or his employer a fair opportunity to meet the challenge of substandard wage in other parts of the world. If we are to make the rest of the world healthy economically, we must observe the greatest care in seeing that the products of those substandard wages, all other costs of production being equal, shall not be given the encouragement of unfairly low rates of duty so as to permit use of American markets as a dumping ground.

The answer is elimination of section 350 of the tariff act, and reinstatement of section 336, now inapplicable to any products covered by a reciprocal trade agreement.

Respectfully submitted.

Irene Blunt, secretary and treasurer, the National Federation of Textiles, Inc., New York, N. Y.; on behalf of the tariff committee: Paul Whitin, Paul Whitin Manufacturing Co., Northbridge, Mass., West Warwick, R. I., chairman; G. H. Conze, Susquehanna Mills, Inc., Sunbury, Pa., Randleman, N. C., Philmont, N. Y.; Franklyn D. Griffin, Cheney Bros., Manchester, Conn.; John J. Goldsmith, Hess, Goldsmith & Co., Inc., Kingston, Pa., Plymouth, Pa., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; R. G. Emery, Dunean Mills, Greenville, S. C., Watts Mills, Inc., Laurens, S. C., Aragon-Baldwin Mills, Rock Hill, S. C., Victor-Monaghan Co., Inc., Greenville, S. C.; O. D. Frost, Crompton - Shenandoah Co., Waynesboro, Va., West Warwick, R. I., Griffin, Ga.; A. B. Sibley, Judson Mills, Greenville, S. C., Abbeville Mills Corporation, Abbeville, S. C., Laurens Cotton Mills, Laurens, S. C.; William G. Lord, ex-officio, Galey & Lord, Inc., selling agent for Cramerton Mills, Inc., Cramerton, N. C., and Aberfoyle, Inc., Norfolk, Va., Chester, Pa.

MAY 11, 1945.

America's Share in the Total Out-of-Country Purchases of All of the Principal Trading Nations of the World Grows Smaller Under the So-called Reciprocal-Trade Agreements Program. Instead of Expanding It, Our Foreign Trade Is Now Threatened With Extinction

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have been so many times assured by earnest advocates of the so-called reciprocal-trade agreement program that our trade opportunities in the markets of the world were constantly improving under its beneficent influence, that it occurred to me that it might be well to make a study of various more important foreign markets to ascertain just how America has fared in each of them, first, under the bumper-protective tariff years of 1926 to 1929, inclusive, second, under the de-

pression years from 1930 to 1934, inclusive, and third, under the trade-agreement years from 1935 to 1938, inclusive.

According to figures which I have obtained from League of Nations sources, it is revealed that in nearly all of the countries of the world, our share in those markets has dwindled, the lowest figure usually appearing during the years that reciprocal trading has been the order of the day. Can we infer from this that the Trade Agreements Act has served us well? Well, let the figures speak for themselves.

Unanimous consent of the membership having been granted, I hand the results of these studies to the Public Printer to be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulations to which I have just referred are the following:

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States

[Value of figures in thousands of dollars—old gold, 1926-32, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
UNITED KINGDOM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	6,030,825	100	1,112,005	18.4
1927	5,929,057	100	974,208	16.4
1928	5,818,380	100	917,080	15.7
1929	5,944,873	100	952,083	16.0
Average				16.6
The depression years:				
1930	5,080,506	100	748,131	14.7
1931	3,901,130	100	472,689	12.1
1932	2,465,254	100	293,772	11.9
1933	3,784,324	100	425,716	11.2
1934	3,685,815	100	413,001	11.2
Average				12.2
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	3,705,962	100	429,015	11.5
1936	4,219,976	100	463,785	10.9
1937	5,081,564	100	564,137	11.1
1938	4,495,847	100	576,854	12.8
Average				11.5
ITALY				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,006,688	100	218,141	21.6
1927	1,051,340	100	204,237	19.4
1928	1,153,015	100	211,198	18.3
1929	1,120,381	100	187,259	16.7
Average				19
The depression years:				
1930	912,432	100	133,497	14.6
1931	606,603	100	69,137	11.3
1932	424,126	100	56,850	13.4
1933	655,136	100	98,267	14.9
1934	657,146	100	82,092	12.4
Average				13.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	642,446	100	72,007	11.3
1936	440,361	100	65,270	14.8
1937	733,520	100	80,966	11.0
1938	593,021	100	70,405	11.8
Average				12.2
FRANCE				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,931,917	100	253,359	13.1
1927	2,077,444	100	266,853	12.8
1928	2,094,674	100	243,083	11.6
1929	2,284,757	100	281,371	12.3
Average				12.2

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousands of dollars—old gold, 1926-32, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
FRANCE—continued				
The depression years:				
1930	2,058,424	100	241,007	11.7
1931	1,654,469	100	148,979	9.0
1932	1,168,488	100	113,664	9.7
1933	1,885,715	100	194,666	10.3
1934	1,517,210	100	143,872	9.4
Average				10.0
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	1,284,554	100	118,032	8.5
1936	1,520,194	100	151,123	9.9
1937	1,701,782	100	161,914	9.5
1938	1,336,600	100	153,126	11.4
Average				9.8
CANADA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	927,329	100	609,720	65.7
1927	1,030,893	100	687,023	66.6
1928	1,108,956	100	719,436	64.8
1929	1,265,679	100	868,012	68.5
Average				67.4
The depression years:				
1930	1,248,274	100	847,442	67.8
1931	906,613	100	584,407	64.4
1932	452,614	100	263,549	58.2
1933	401,214	100	217,291	54.1
1934	511,275	100	291,775	57.0
Average				60.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	544,720	100	308,709	56.6
1936	632,801	100	368,127	58.1
1937	808,058	100	490,600	60.6
1938	672,670	100	421,721	62.6
Average				59.4
NETHERLANDS				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	979,220	100	103,445	10.5
1927	1,022,346	100	107,673	10.5
1928	1,078,929	100	106,796	9.8
1929	1,106,424	100	109,409	9.8
Average				10.1
The depression years:				
1930	972,139	100	84,943	8.7
1931	760,879	100	59,547	7.8
1932	552,370	100	34,459	6.2
1933	822,156	100	52,849	6.4
1934	699,623	100	46,633	6.6
Average				7.1
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	633,753	100	43,883	6.9
1936	647,394	100	46,015	7.1
1937	853,265	100	75,052	8.7
1938	778,250	100	84,367	10.8
Average				8.3
BELGIUM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	751,284	100	85,575	11.3
1927	808,286	100	88,971	11.0
1928	888,932	100	86,119	9.6
1929	990,341	100	94,702	9.5
Average				10.3
The depression years:				
1930	864,420	100	86,347	9.9
1931	666,285	100	58,447	8.7
1932	456,898	100	39,543	8.6
1933	716,988	100	67,208	9.3
1934	638,194	100	46,529	7.2
Average				10.7

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousands of dollars—old gold, 1926-32, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
BELGIUM—continued				
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	630,532	100	47,756	7.5
1936	720,641	100	49,912	6.9
1937	927,752	100	79,916	8.6
1938	763,518	100	84,084	11.0
Average				8.5
DENMARK				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	424,959	100	68,923	16.2
1927	444,162	100	67,221	15.1
1928	465,234	100	60,860	13.0
1929	480,677	100	64,071	13.3
Average				14.4
The depression years:				
1930	463,409	100	52,059	11.2
1931	367,961	100	38,708	10.5
1932	214,829	100	16,479	7.6
1933	320,187	100	19,226	6.0
1934	304,697	100	18,509	6.0
Average				8.2
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	291,082	100	15,283	5.2
1936	329,736	100	17,532	5.3
1937	369,385	100	19,247	5.2
1938	354,728	100	27,920	7.8
Average				5.8
SWEDEN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	398,673	100	53,354	13.3
1927	424,768	100	53,628	12.6
1928	457,732	100	67,474	14.7
1929	477,784	100	70,057	14.6
Average				13.8
The depression years:				
1930	445,463	100	61,459	13.7
1931	363,448	100	44,977	12.3
1932	213,363	100	23,058	10.8
1933	320,141	100	32,953	10.2
1934	339,000	100	39,912	11.7
Average				11.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	373,080	100	47,729	12.7
1936	418,388	100	54,064	12.9
1937	541,205	100	74,932	13.8
1938	524,579	100	85,294	16.2
Average				13.9
SWITZERLAND				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	455,636	100	36,252	7.9
1927	482,490	100	42,429	8.7
1928	512,171	100	47,062	9.1
1929	515,785	100	46,173	8.9
Average				8.6
The depression years:				
1930	487,527	100	39,528	8.1
1931	427,458	100	31,370	7.3
1932	330,047	100	22,183	6.7
1933	506,458	*100	29,483	5.8
1934	457,166	100	24,574	5.3
Average				6.6
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	408,336	100	22,592	5.5
1936	368,965	100	20,552	5.6
1937	412,227	100	28,944	7.0
1938	363,322	100	28,648	7.8
Average				6.4

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figure in thousands of dollars—old gold, 1926–32, inclusive; currency, 1933–38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
ARGENTINA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	757,931	100	186,886	24.6
1927	825,103	100	209,757	25.4
1928	807,256	100	187,439	23.2
1929	820,018	100	216,112	26.3
Average				29.7
The depression years:				
1930	618,217	100	136,204	22.0
1931	344,702	100	54,420	15.7
1932	215,034	100	28,968	13.4
1933	484,911	100	61,537	12.6
1934	502,360	100	44,782	14.8
Average				15.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	324,099	100	46,564	14.3
1936	388,197	100	56,512	14.5
1937	469,082	100	76,824	16.3
1938	430,374	100	75,960	17.6
Average				15.6
BRAZIL				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	390,682	100	114,626	29.3
1927	387,542	100	111,186	28.6
1928	442,290	100	117,511	26.5
1929	416,626	100	125,552	30.1
Average				28.6
The depression years:				
1930	251,011	100	60,638	24.1
1931	132,230	100	33,212	25.1
1932	108,131	100	32,532	30.0
1933	313,970	100	66,034	21.0
1934	207,738	100	49,045	23.6
Average				24.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	224,796	100	52,328	23.2
1936	246,718	100	54,661	22.1
1937	330,554	100	76,410	23.1
1938	295,369	100	71,518	24.2
Average				23.1
GERMANY				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	2,380,336	100	381,528	16.0
1927	3,380,587	100	492,645	14.5
1928	3,340,700	100	483,452	14.4
1929	3,201,681	100	425,676	13.2
The depression years:				
1930	2,475,648	100	311,272	12.5
1931	1,602,509	100	188,520	11.7
1932	1,111,560	100	140,968	12.6
1933	1,694,199	100	194,573	11.4
1934	1,752,600	100	146,743	8.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	1,674,187	100	96,891	5.7
1936	1,699,707	100	93,581	5.5
1937	2,198,506	100	113,506	5.1
1938	2,430,602	100	182,562	7.5
JAPAN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,120,271	100	320,504	28.6
1927	1,033,137	100	319,594	30.9
1928	1,019,310	100	290,311	28.4
1929	1,021,687	100	310,519	29.5
Average				29.3
The depression years:				
1930	763,595	100	218,739	28.6
1931	609,929	100	168,954	27.7
1932	402,384	100	143,325	35.6
1933	652,355	100	211,276	32.3
1934	678,282	100	228,663	33.7
Average				31.7

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousands of dollars—old gold, 1926–32, inclusive; currency, 1933–38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
JAPAN—con.				
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	709,697	100	232,507	32.7
1936	802,076	100	246,062	30.6
1937	1,088,344	100	365,502	33.5
1938	757,775	100	260,667	34.3
Average				32.7

The Over-all Picture of the Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Program for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a talk given by Maj. O. W. Price, Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, Veterans' Administration, before the State board of vocational and adult education and the directors of local vocational schools, Fond du Lac, Wis., April 26, 1945:

There is no problem so close to the hearts of all of the people as concern over the welfare of the returning veterans.

They must be provided with decent homes in which to live.

They must be given jobs whereby they may obtain the necessities and comforts of life.

They, if previously employed, must be restored to their former jobs with promotions which they missed.

They must be given a chance to make up for lost educational opportunities.

They must be given credit for their military education and experience.

If they return disabled, they must be given an opportunity to learn new skills and new knowledge whereby they may become useful citizens.

The returning veterans will have been away for a long time, they will have been busy fighting the most devastating war of all times against the most ruthless enemy of all times. After the hardships and sufferings which they have undergone, they will not be over impressed by the problem of post-war reconstruction. They will be realistic and practical; they will expect that we do without too much talk whatever needs to be done. They will not expect to find lack of planning for them while they were away; they will expect to find the schools ready to receive them with courses suitable to their needs and in occupations suitable for the post-war period.

These men have fought the good fight; they have kept the faith. It is up to us to show that we have kept faith with them. "Every citizen"—to use the words of President Wilson—"is endorser on the general obligation." Among the endorsers on this general obligation are the vocational schools of Wisconsin. They have had an important roll to play in winning the war and will have a still more important role to play after the war is won.

Never has a war required so much knowledge and skill as this one. It has been necessary to train millions of workers in how to make new weapons and millions of soldier and sailors in how to use them. When the Nation's call came, the schools immediately placed all of their resources at the service of the Government. Many thousands were trained in your fine vocational schools. Wisconsin's vocational schools literally went to war just as Wisconsin factories went to war. Your schools, like factories, will be faced with a problem of reconversion. There will need to be a retooling of subject matter and methods of teaching in order to adequately serve the post-war period. What happened after the last war has little relation to what we may expect this time. The situations are not analogous.

After the last war we had no law providing general educational benefits for all veterans. There is also a great difference in the educational levels of men of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. In World War No. 1, 80 percent of the men were in the grade-school level as compared with 34 percent in this war, and Wisconsin would make a still better showing. In the last war 4 percent were high-school graduates; in this war 24 percent. In the last war only 5 percent were college men as compared with 14 percent for World War No. 2.

A scientific sampling made by the Army showed that 8 percent of the men in the armed forces had definite plans to enter school in full-time attendance and that 18 percent planned to take up schooling on a part-time basis. Of those who wanted full-time training, 92 percent were single and 93 percent were under 25 years of age. Those who signified their intention of taking part-time training were older men with many of them married men. These were the men who prefer to work at a job and attend school part time or to take training on the job where they may receive training wages in addition to the subsistence allowance provided in Public Law No. 346. A majority of the men who will attend part-time instruction will select vocational schools, commercial schools, extension courses, etc.

Let us take the above figures and break them down. Take 8 percent of the estimated 13,000,000 veterans after the war, and you have 1,040,000 who will want training full time. Take 18 percent, and you will have 2,240,000 who will want training part time. Make this same computation on Wisconsin's estimated 300,000 veterans after the close of the war, and you have 23,400 veterans who will want training full time and 84,000 who will want training part time. These figures are startling when you consider that there undoubtedly will be increased civilian demands for education. We have never had such a situation before. Never before in the history of our country have we had millions of people eligible for education up to the college level and beyond with all expenses paid. Heretofore education above the high-school level was generally dependent upon the parents' ability to pay the bill. How many will take advantage of educational opportunities no one knows. I do not believe that any survey at this time will accurately foretell—it all depends upon the availability of jobs. The number who take training will increase in direct proportion to the scarcity of jobs. Thus, you see an old-fashioned revival in education is in the making. Schools should get ready for it by retooling of subject matter to make it fit changed conditions, by revamping methods of teaching so that they will appeal to the interest of the adult veteran and by streamlining and tailoring to fit the individual needs of the veteran.

This has been a long war. These men will have lost valuable time in their careers—many will be married, with family responsibilities. I do not believe that they will tolerate loosely organized and time-consuming courses, but, on the other hand, will want well-organized courses, clearly outlined and closely focused upon an objective. One of the noticeable traits of the returning veterans now in training is impatience over having to wait so long before they are ready for employment. The armed forces, by streamlining and acceleration, as well as your own experience in training war workers, has shown that men can be trained in shorter periods of time than heretofore was believed. While such methods may not seem sound from the standpoint of traditional practices and as applied to certain courses, nevertheless, they will have an important effect on all educational policies in future years.

Individuals differ as to ability and application. The time required to complete a course should not be rigidly fixed at so many hours or years of education or training but, on the other hand, should permit acceleration on the basis of individual ability to acquire skill and knowledge. Especially should this be true of veterans who, because of maturity and experience, may be expected to advance much faster than the teen-age student or trainee. The ideal educational plan is one such as we use for the handicapped veterans, whereby we fit the individual's need on a basis of his education and expierence, ability, aptitudes, interests, social adjustment, and physical capacity.

In getting ready for the returning veterans, schools, of course, should study the post-war occupational needs, especially with reference to their local community. The veteran generally has better opportunities for employment in his community where he is rooted through family ties.

Emphasis in Wisconsin in recent months has been in the industrial field and especially in the metal trades. Will this emphasis continue? One important field which has been more neglected than any other is distributive education. Business leaders realize that the distributive trades bear a heavy responsibility in making future America prosperous. This field must furnish millions of jobs for veterans. Many thousands of veterans, entirely too many, I suspect, will want to go into business of their own under the liberal provisions of the G. I. bill. Statistics show that nearly 50 percent of all new businesses fail and that the principal cause of failure is lack of knowledge of how to successfully operate the business. Practical courses should be available which will appeal to the veteran, and I am pleased to know that you are developing such courses. Whether such courses should be 2 months, 6 months, 1 year, or 2 years is for you to decide. There are other fields, of course, which should be emphasized. Some occupational fields which appear better than usual include: Building and construction, retail merchandizing, transportation, recreation and amusements, teaching, medicine, social work, and the jobs growing out of electricity and chemistry. The veteran will expect sound advice in keeping out of overcrowded occupations.

Many hundreds of veterans will take training on the job. In many instances the place of training will be insolated communities not served by vocational schools. Most of these men should have related training. What should this related training consist of, and how can it be provided? This is an important problem affecting the vocational schools, the extension division of the university, and the superintendent of public instruction.

With casualties exceeding 1,000,000 the furnishing of rehabilitation training to the handicapped veterans imposes an important responsibility. These veterans must ever and always be given first consideration. We want these men to be trained broadly and thoroughly in order to enhance their employment possibilities. Courses which are too narrow or too limited, generally, are not satisfactory for the rehabilitation case. The vocational schools, in addition to providing instruction, can be of assistance to us in helping to rehabilitate the handicapped. For example, by assisting the veteran in locating suitable housing, by helping us to locate training opportunities, by creating favorable sentiment among employers in your community, and in many other ways which will be discussed at this conference. Incidentally, the housing situation for veterans is becoming acute in some of your cities.

While the vocational schools principally are concerned with training vocationally, we should not lose sight of the fact that all education is for citizenship. It is the duty and right of the veteran to equip himself to take his place in the community. In other words, courses should be available which will broaden and enrich the veteran's life. As to how far the vocational schools should go into this phase of education is for you to decide. It is highly important. It is one phase which was neglected by the Army and Navy. It is a phase of education in which the veteran may not be able to see its full value.

Individuals differ in native endowment and talent. Obviously, the first step in educational planning is to analyze the individual's abilities, interests, and needs. The next step is to design a training program which will enable him to realize his talents and ambitions. The Veterans' Administration has tried to make this plan possible. In order to provide a convenient service, we now have established branch offices at Madison, Eau Claire, Green Bay, and in downtown Milwaukee where free vocational guidance is available to all eligible veterans. At these branch offices we utilize, under contract, the counseling and testing services of the University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, Eau Claire State Teachers College, and St. Norbert's College. In talking to you school men, it should be unnecessary for me to stress the importance of this service, except to state that we feel that every veteran should be urged to take advantage of vocational guidance before embarking on any education or training program. Unless they do so, many will get into wrong courses and discouragement and failure will result. We feel that the veteran is entitled to the best vocational guidance that modern psychology can provide and are trying to make this possible.

We should not forget or neglect the distaff side of education. Several thousand women are in the armed services and many of them will want further education. Already a number are in training. More and more each year women are coming into prominence in the business and industrial world.

The responsibility for determining what schools and training establishments are approved for training under the G. I. bill is vested in the Governor of each State. This is an important responsibility. This means that the education of the returning veteran is placed in the hands of the educational authorities, and if it is not successful, the fault will be theirs. The Veterans' Administration will not in any way interfere with the operation of the schools.

In this State, Governor Goodland has designated an educational advisory committee composed of the following officials as the approving agency: The secretary, board of normal regents; the director of public service, University of Wisconsin; the president, Marquette University; the State superintendent of public instruction; the director, veterans' recognition board; the director, State vocational and adult education; the State supervisor of apprenticeship training; and the chief, vocational rehabilitation and education division, Veterans' Administration.

This committee is fully cognizant of its responsibility and has taken appropriate steps to see that the returning veteran's educational rights are protected. Inferior schools and fly-by-night schools, which might be set up as a commercial venture, thereby short-changing the veteran as well as the Government, are banned from operation in Wisconsin. Every shop, store, office, and garage is a potential training facility. Without control, schools could spring up overnight. Without proper administration and control the program could turn into "boondoggling" of the worst kind. Wisconsin is the only State that I know of where the leaders of the various educational fields, immediately after the passage of Public, No. 346, got together and are working on a program for providing the best possible education for the returning veteran. This is very important. We cannot afford to let this great educational program fail because of inadequate courses and poor training facilities.

Recently the State veterans' recognition board allocated $25,000 to the Governor's educational advisory committee to employ four liaison officers who will work, respectively, with the State vocational board, the university extension division, the State apprenticeship supervisor, and the State office of public instruction. These men will help carry out the policies of the educational advisory committee.

In conclusion let me state, as I did in the beginning, that the returning veteran has placed upon all of the schools a sacred obligation. The schools are endorsers on that obligation. As public service institutions they must give a good account of their stewardship. In this regard, I know the vocational schools of Wisconsin are going to keep faith. Your schools are the leaders in the field of vocational education. With your staff and our staff working hand in hand, the problem will be easier and the accomplishments greater.

British Imperial Preference Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this presents only one of the discriminations practiced against the United States by Great Britain under the imperial preference plan by which England monopolizes the world trade by bringing a population of 394,235,338 within the orbit of her exclusive trade.

The idea of imperial preference started as far back as 1903 during the tariff reform campaign of 1903. The idea was further developed in 1915–17, and in 1919 a decree of imperial preference was instituted. This was on a limited basis but the principle had become well established by this time.

There is no uncertainty as to Great Britain's future with respect to the most-favored-nation clause. It was declared by the Empire Governments at Ottawa, that the grant of Imperial preference must override all considerations of the most-favored-nation treatment and that any such treaties that stood in the way of it should be denounced forthwith—Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa, page 11.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the following tabulation:

Countries coming under the British Imperial preference system and population of each

United Kingdom	47,888,958
Australia	7,177,590
New Zealand	1,631,414
Canada	11,506,655
Union of South Africa	10,708,500
India (British, 295,808,722; native states, 93,189,233)	388,997,955
Newfoundland	300,000
Southern Rhodesia	1,448,393
Agreements with limited purpose and scope	
Bahamas	71,474
British Honduras	61,068
Fiji Islands	220,787
Federated Malay States	2,212,052
Bermuda	32,451
Windward Islands	262,006
Leeward Islands	97,644
Barbados	197,956
British Guiana	354,219
Jamaica	1,241,420
Trinidad	506,316

Recovery Under Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act as Compared to Recovery Under the Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much loose talk to the effect that economic recovery following the depression was very much more rapid under the trade-agreements program that it might be well, it occurs to me, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statistical statement which has just been furnished me by the United States Tariff Commission in which the results of their study of recovery from 1932, the bottom year of the depression, to 1938, the last normal prewar trading year, is set forth with a break-down which reveals the percentage of this recovery which occurred between 1932 and 1935, inclusive, under the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, and, the percentage of recovery which occurred between 1936 and 1938, inclusive, under the trade-agreements program, this with a similar break-down in the figures from 1932 to 1939, inclusive.

It will be somewhat disconcerting to the proponents of this program to learn that, on the average, more than half of the total recovery from 1932 to 1938, inclusive, sometimes all of it and more, occurred in the years of 1932 to 1935, the years in which the trade-agreements program was yet unheard of.

In view of the fact that the average national income during the years 1932 to 1935, inclusive, was $47,129,000,000 and the national income for 1936–38, inclusive, was $66,879,000,000, the more favorable results obtained under the Smoot-Hawley tariff law becomes the more significant.

The statement of the Tariff Commission to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

United States foreign trade: National income by industrial divisions and distributive shares, and farm income; actual and percentage increases in selected years

Item	Actual increase of various years over 1932, the low point of depression			Increase to 1935 as a percentage of total increase to—	
	1935 over 1932	1938 over 1932	1939 over 1932	1938	1939
Foreign trade of the United States:				*Percent*	*Percent*
Exports of United States merchandise	$667,000,000	$1,481,000,000	$1,547,000,000	45.0	43.1
General imports	724,000,000	637,000,000	995,000,000	113.7	72.7
National income (total) [1]	15,756,000,000	24,237,000,000	30,866,000,000	65.0	51.0
By industrial divisions (total):					
Agriculture	2,609,000,000	2,619,000,000	2,876,000,000	99.6	90.0
Manufacturing	6,573,000,000	7,353,000,000	10,748,000,000	89.4	61.1
Finance	380,000,000	1,391,000,000	1,496,000,000	27.3	25.4
By distributive shares:					
Salaries and wages	4,589,000,000	10,154,000,000	13,209,000,000	45.2	34.7
Net income of incorporated businesses	5,314,000,000	5,304,000,000	7,874,000,000	100.2	67.4
Net income of unincorporated businesses	4,627,000,000	5,273,000,000	6,302,000,000	87.7	73.4
Farm income and net cash available to persons on farms after farm expenditures:					
Cash income, including Government payments	2,916,000,000	3,425,000,000	3,941,000,000	85.1	74.0
Cash income from farm marketings (excluding Government payments)	2,343,000,000	2,943,000,000	3,134,000,000	79.6	74.7
WAGES, FACTORY AND FARM					
Wages, factory and farm:					
Factory (average weekly wages)	$3.08	$5.25	$6.81	58.7	45.2
Farm (average monthly wages without board)	1.36	7.30	6.94	18.6	19.8

[1] Average national income, 1932-35, inclusive, $47,129,000,000; average national income, 1936-38, inclusive, $66,879,000,000.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, Agricultural Statistics and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Cut of Billions in Extra Pay Hits Consumer-Goods Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

CUT OF BILLIONS IN EXTRA PAY HITS CONSUMER-GOODS INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON, May 16.—A stake of $12,000,000,000 in national income is involved in overtime and extra pay now being paid American workers, statisticians of the Department of Labor here declare.

If present overtime pay is dropped in the present rush from war to peace conditions, millions of workers will lose fat overtime pay returns which mean the difference in their income from living in relative luxury, to just making both ends meet.

A slash of $12,000,000,000 in national income also means a blow to manufacturers of consumers' goods, who would see their potential market reduced by that much, if overtime pay is eliminated.

These are factors in one of the biggest struggles that is developing in the industrial transition period through which the country is now going.

Trade union leaders are putting up a stiff, but probably unsuccessful fight, to continue the same "take-home wage" for the normal peacetime 40-hour week, which workers have been getting for the 48-hour war week, in which time-and-a-half overtime is given for the extra labor.

TESTING PERIOD FOR UNIONS

American trade unions are facing a testing period of major proportions.

Most of the war industries, where machinery is used to the uttermost, are also organized by unions, and well paid. With the exception of the construction industry, the peacetime trades that will come into prominence with VJ-day, are less well paid, and less well organized.

Thus, John Jones, who goes from a war industry to a peace industry, is apt to move into a new environment. Hourly pay may be lower, overtime may be eliminated, and the union may be weak.

Many locals are expected to disappear, and some big unions will be sharply affected, notably the oversize Automobile Workers' Union, affiliate of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which is swollen with war jobs.

MORE LEISURE, LESS PAY

The peace industries expected to show employment gains are construction, textiles, apparel, boots and shoes, and service and trade branches of all sorts.

Take the case of Mary Smith, who now faces demobilization in 6 months or so. She has been getting 85 cents an hour in an aircraft plant, amounting to $34 for 40 hours, plus time-and-a-half overtime of 8 hours weekly, amounting to $10.20. That is good pay—at $44.20 a week.

When the airplane plant closes down, as many are likely to, Mary Smith may have the choice of work in a store as clerk, or in a laundry with pay at about $25 a week, for 40 hours. Mary will have more leisure and less pay. She probably will long for her war job.

This is the situation that faces millions of workers. Widespread estimate here is that the Japanese war will be within sight of conclusion in another year. In any event, big war supply orders, poured out to factories when the Army took alarm at the "battle of the bulge" in France, are likely to be canceled soon. The Army probably has all the supplies it can handle in many lines, if present orders continue another 3 to 6 months. Informed opinion here is that drastic shut-downs and contract cancelations will develop around November 1, if not earlier.

That will be a time of test and strain. Later on a postwar boom may solve matters. In the meantime going may be hard.

In his economic forecast last week Fred M. Vinson, War Mobilization and Reconversion Director, included the following estimates:

Total civilian workers, 52,000,000.

Total in munitions plants, 9,000,000.

Jobs to be lost, next 6 months, 1,500,000.

Jobs to be lost, succeeding 6 months, 3,000,000.

Army to demobilize, within the next year, 2,000,000.

The sum total of workers who will lose their jobs and of soldiers demobilized would therefore reach 6,500,000, according to these rough estimates, in the next 12 months. Mr. Vinson does not think this means cumulative unemployment of that size, for new jobs will be open as others close down.

Twelve months from now he only anticipates 2,500,000 jobless, as against 1,000,000 at present.

The unemployment compensation fund, accumulated in the States, will cushion some of the shock of this transition. An estimated $6,000,000,000 has been set aside. This will be its first great test.

The funds have been accumulated on a State instead of a national basis, due to the exertions of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, whose bill was substituted for the Kilgore bill, which would have set up a national system.

The unemployment compensation funds, accordingly, vary widely from State to State. An unemployed worker in one State may get as high as $22 a week, while in another it may be as low as $8 or $9 a week. Also, the period of compensation may vary from 20 weeks down to half that time.

A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, when war in Europe came to an end, Americans did not wildly celebrate the event. Instead most of us gave fervent thanks to our Creator that the butchery in Europe was at an end, and humbly implored the Almighty to so guide the leaders of all nations that a true and lasting peace would settle down upon the war-torn world.

Following out the suggestion of President Harry S. Truman, the churches throughout the country held special prayer services last Sunday, May 13.

My family and I worship at the church closest to the Nation's Capital—the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, the pastor of which is Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder. I consider him one of the outstanding preachers in the world today. He is ably assisted by Rev. Roy L. Sloop.

In his incomparable, sincere style, Dr. Blackwelder delivered the main prayer of the service. The prayer was a revised version of a prayer service suggested by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for use by the churches at the end of the war in Europe.

Because it was so inspiring to those who heard it, I am making it a part of these remarks:

Almighty God, who has taught us to make supplications, prayers and intercessions for all men, we pray this day for all those who are hungry and without bread; for those made homeless by war's desolation; for separated families; for those whose kindred have been ruthlessly slaughtered; for orphaned children; and for all those who have suffered under the heavy scourge of war.

For the men and women of our armed forces at home and throughout the world; for the sick and wounded in the hospitals; for doctors, nurses, and all who minister to the sick and suffering; and for all those who are prisoners of war.

For our beloved Nation and all those whom we have placed in public authority; for our homes that they may be Christian; for all schools and the teachers of our children; and for all our American institutions and organizations that serve our country's welfare.

For the church of Jesus Christ, our Lord, throughout the world; for all ministers who serve in His name; for missionaries at home and abroad; for all chaplains in the armed forces; for those who have suffered for their Christian faith.

For the uprooting of all causes of war; for the ending of prejudices of race and nation; for the confounding of all those who delight in war and the strengthening of all peacemakers.

For the triumph of justice in every human relationship; for the enduring liberation of the oppressed and for the lasting freedom of all thy children.

For the coming of that day when all men shall know the Lord and the realms of this world shall become the realm of Jesus Christ; for the coming of the time when nation shall not lift up sword against nation nor learn war any more.

O Merciful Father, we beseech Thee so to send forth Thy spirit into Thy world that all leaders of men everywhere, the rulers and spokesmen of the nations, may be instructed in the ways of peace, kept clean of pride and evil ambitions, and so guided in all their doings that they may make Thy ways known upon the earth, Thy saving health among all nations.

Our father's God, to thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Amen.

We now remember in pride, gratitude, love, sorrow, and tenderness the innumerable company of those whose courage and sacrifice have made this hour possible. They died for us. "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends." To those who have lost loved ones in this war, perhaps the words of Abraham Lincoln, written to a mother whose five sons died in battle, may be of comfort. He said, "I feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

To all who sorrow this day a greater than Lincoln has said, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Amen.

What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Warren B. Francis, from the Los Angeles Times of May 13, 1945:

WHAT NEXT?

(By Warren B. Francis)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Final arrival of VE-day brought not only incomplete announcements about industrial production cut-backs and initial reconversion steps but new proof of continued confusion and uncertainty about procedures for resuming normal manfacturing as well as still-existing disputes about disposal of Government-financed plants, excess real estate, and surplus goods worth many billions.

Despite the months of study and conversion in anticipation of the end of European hostilities, Germany's sudden collapse finds Federal agencies still grappling indecisively with a variety of policy questions and operating problems. Evidence of unpreparedness to outline the course for the second phase of the war was given this week in widely separated quarters.

BASIC QUESTIONS

The degree to which industrial production capacity diverted to war needs will be released for resumption of peacetime operations still cannot be gaged.

Aside from War Mobilization Director Vinson's sketchy remarks, few lines of enterprise yet can get answers to inquiries about acquisition of machine tools, availability of raw materials, easing of labor restrictions, and related topics of basic importance.

A case in point is the aircraft industry. Reflecting changed tactical requirements, the Army has curtailed orders and approved closing of certain plants. The War Production Board has advised makers of commercial models it favors stepped-up manufacture of these types at the earliest moment. However, industry even now has no concrete information on which to formulate plans or begin retooling.

ONLY MINOR STEP

Widespread worries of management are heightened by delays in making known vital features of the policies for liquidating the Government interests in factories of all kinds, stock piles of materials, costly machinery, and unused stores of articles ranging from ships' clocks to tractors.

Minor steps only have been made toward a solution of the disposal problem. Attorney General Biddle, holding broad power to influence the final policy, has made several advisory reports to Congress—for instance, he suggested immense Government-financed plants should be leased, not sold immediately, and turned over to enterprises which guarantee future operation at maximum capacity—and a special Senate investigating committee has sounded stern warnings about the dangers of indecision.

SPEED URGED

Aside from giving particular Federal agencies responsibility for getting rid of certain kinds of surplus goods, the Surplus Property Board has made slight progress in eliminating fears the United States Government may encourage some modernized "pro-

duction for use" scheme or dump on retail markets large volumes of articles badly wanted by the public.

More than 6 weeks ago the Senate investigators led by Senator HATCH (Democrat) of New Mexico, recalling the get-rich-quick scandals after World War No. 1, called for fast action to create the machinery and set the rules for dispasal of varied surpluses. The committee still is waiting for response to many of its criticisms and suggestions.

LABOR OBSTACLES

A still-muddled manpower situation stands in the way of seizing some anticipated opportunities to begin heading back to peacetime conditions. Until the military and naval needs are measured more exactly, concerns no longer required to turn out war items will experience trouble in returning to habitual operations because of labor supply obstacles.

To a large extent, the same is true regarding materials and machinery. While the W. P. B. has lifted restrictions on production of urgently needed items, like telephone equipment, the ingredients still are tied up by priority regulations. Outworn machinery cannot be replaced easily.

CONTINUED CONTROLS

Bit by bit, scarce articles will reappear in the stores, just as aluminum and iron cooking utensils have been coming back, but the continuing shortages of key materials like rubber and copper and tin will greatly delay resumed manufacture of a wide range of consumers' goods, even though the producers are freed from war operations.

The American people may discover eventually the real significance of O. W. M. R. Director Vinson's report on The War—Phase Two was not in the promises of more gasoline and immediate production of refrigerators and washing machines but in the softer warnings that many unpalitable emergency controls must be extended until after VJ-day.

The California Farm Bureau Opposes the Extension of the Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, with agricultural imports mounting and agricultural exports dwindling under the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program, it is not surprising to learn that the California Farm Bureau Federation should have taken a decisive stand in favor of tabling the pending proposal to extend the President's authority to negotiate more trade agreements under the Hull formula.

The reasons supporting this action which are cited by Mr. Ray B. Wiser, the able President of this famous agricultural association in his letter to me of April 12, 1945, are not only very interesting but of most timely importance, a circumstance which impells me to ask the consent of the membership to the inclusion of a copy of the communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The letter to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., April 12, 1945.

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEARHART: We have read with much interest H. R. 2652, a bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

We have also read the March 26, 1945, message of the President to the Congress on the subject of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The position of California Farm Bureau Federation has been and still is in opposition to the principle of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Some of the more important reasons for our opposition are:

(a) The need for protecting the wage level and standard of living of the people of the United States.

(b) The transfer of functions of the Congress to the administration.

(c) The extension of negotiated benefits with one country to all the more favored nations.

(d) The import quota control of countries that can nullify any supposed advantages accruing to the United States.

(e) The Empire preference policy of Great Britain that can operate to cancel any supposed advantages to us.

(f) The foreign exchange control of countries which can be and is used as effectively as tariff rates.

Our members share vigorously in the general desire for a permanent world peace, but to date have not been convinced that a free trade or low tariff policy is at all essential to the accomplishment of this purpose.

May we suggest that consideration of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act be tabled until after the deliberations of the United Nations World Peace Conference at San Francisco.

It is of little moment if the act dies for lack of action by the Congress, as it is probable that no negotiations under the act would be undertaken for some months. If it is found later desirable to continue the reciprocal trade practice, it can be done by action of the Congress at any time.

At the close of the San Francisco Conference some clarification may be made of the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference and of the Economic Committee of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

If the outcome of the Peace Conference develops some new facts or proposes some new foreign policies that involve reconsideration of tariff policies of the United States, both the public and the Congress can give consideration to the proposals in the light of the over-all objective, and act with intelligence on a well-rounded policy on the whole subject, so that action can be consistent and constructive.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

RAY B. WISER,
President.

Ecuador Honors Dr. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, it was with special pleasure that I read in the New York Times, the Washington Star, and the Americas, the latter a scholarly quarterly devoted to the cause of inter-American friendship, that my friend the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile, had been awarded the national decoration of the Republic of Ecuador, known as the Order of Merit, by a decree of President José María Velasco Ibarra. This decree was countersigned by Dr. Camilo Ponce Enríquez, Foreign Minister of Ecuador. We in the United States are happy about the distinction that has been conferred upon one of the most fair-minded and conscientious North American scholars. When I say that Dr. Thorning is my loyal friend and a patriotic worker for the good-neighbor policy, I am basing my observations on an association and friendship of many years. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following notices from the New York Times and from the Americas:

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1945]

PAN-AMERICAN CELEBRATION—HOUSE WILL MEET TOMORROW TO MARK DAY SYMBOLIZING AMITY

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The House will meet Saturday expressly for its first celebration of Pan-American Day.

To deliver the invocation it has invited the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, Catholic educator and co-founder of the Inter-American Seminars at the University of Havana, the National University of Mexico, and the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru.

Ambassador Galo Plaza, of Ecuador, announced today that President José María Velasco Ibarra had awarded Ecuador's Order of Merit upon Dr. Thorning for "scholarly contributions to hemisphere solidarity as well as for his cooperation with Ecuadorian students in the United States."

[From The Americas of April 1945]

ECUADOR HONORS DR. THORNING

By a special decree, Dr. José María Velasco Ibarra, President of the Republic of Ecuador, has awarded the national decoration, Al Mérito, to the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, co-founder and organizer of the Inter-American Seminars at several Latin American universities. According to the statement of President Velasco Ibarra, the decoration was awarded in view of "Dr. Thorning's contributions to hemispheric solidarity as well as his cooperation with Ecuadorian students in North American universities and colleges." Dr. Thorning was invested with the order in the Embassy at Washington by Ambassador Galo Plaza Lasso.

Resolution of Northeastern States Development Agencies Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Northeastern States Development Agencies Conference, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, May 3–4, 1945:

Representatives of the development agencies of the Northeastern States, including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, having conferred on matters of mutual concern and interest at a meeting held in New York City on May 3 and 4, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The Northeastern States were the cradle of liberty and economic progress and are the heart of the commercial and industrial life of the Nation. These States are the homes and workshops of nearly one-third of the people of the Nation and therefore America's greatest consumer market. At the same time they stand as the chief gateway for the exchange of goods between this country and the rest of the world.

We combine a rich experience in industrial skills, business judgment, and advanced labor relations with a wealth of youthful ideas and energy, and shall continue to expand our contributions to the benefit of the entire country.

We are continuing, as ever, to lead the way in progressive government and business measures for the benefit of all peoples, everywhere. Our histories have demonstrated that economic and political freedom are not merely compatible but complementary.

It is the sense of this meeting that the postwar prosperity of the Nation, particularly the reemployment of our returning service men and women, is the first order of business of the development agencies of the Northeastern States. To achieve this high objective the Nation requires the mature experience and skilled workmanship of the people of the Northeastern States.

In peace as in war, we take pride in the industrial development and prosperity of our entire Nation, and shall continue to give our best efforts and know how to the end that all States will profit from the contributions of each, so that economic expansion can be general.

We shall continue to resist any effort to destroy the national free market, the birthright of every American, or to erect artificial trade and industrial barriers between States or regions, or to grant any special privileges to any sections of the country at the expense of the others. Opportunity for growth is unlimited throughout America, and we shall all prosper as we expand together.

Crisis in Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of May 17, 1945:

CRISIS IN COAL

Secretary Ickes' order of Monday banning hard-coal deliveries to consumers having more than a 5-day supply on hand has now been followed by President Truman's word that the anthracite is to be mined despite the strike of 72,000 members of John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers. The President's statement that steps are to be taken to get the coal out is the kind of talk that New England, which makes up 6 of the 12 northeastern States affected by the Ickes' order, understands and appreciates.

Crises in coal are not new to New England, but this time the Solid Fuels Administration, of which Mr. Ickes is head, will have to change its tune. Hitherto it has sought to explain discrimination by talk about the war effort; and what makes this part of the country mad is the inference that we have failed to sense the war's demands.

That isn't so, of course. New England hasn't expected to obtain coal in normal amount. New England has reduced home temperature. New England has saved home fuel, tons upon tons of it. And New England knows that normal supplies cannot be obtained until after Japan is defeated.

But this new crisis in coal, it is to be reasserted, is not linked with the drive to victory. Indeed, the fact is that the labor situation that brought it about, and bureaucracy's failure, or inability, quickly to remedy it, penalize not only the conduct of the war but also bring increasingly grave worries to householders.

More than ever they are concerned about next winter. Prior to the strike their alarm was based on bureaucracy's decrees which again cut allotments—this time by 7½ percent, thereby limiting consumers to a maximum of 80 percent of the normal supply—and which made certain that orders received after March 31 were chargeable to the 1945–46 "burn."

As for the present, they are too well aware that shortages become accumulative. Anthracite not mined now cannot become a backlog for use when coal is needed most. The picture was disheartening before the strike. It is more so now. The longer the impasse, the more dismal it becomes. The more dismal and the more serious.

Homes must be heated next winter.

The Relationship of the Tariff Policy to Living Standards in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, with the official reports of the United States Tariff Commission revealing that agricultural imports, the American farmers' competition, has increased from 1934 to 1940 by 57 percent and that the export of American agricultural products, the farmers' opportunity of making money, has fallen off during the same years to 10 percent less than our agricultural exports of the year the so-called reciprocal trade agreement law was enacted, a truly alarming situation, to say the least, it will be gratifying to the practical farmers of the country to learn that Mr. C. C. Teague, president of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, has publicly championed a complete reform of the trade-agreements program, one which will assure to the American farmer a better break in the international field.

Mr. Teague, widely recognized as one of agriculture's experts, has recently prepared a memorandum in which he advocates an amendment of the trade-agreements program which should have the sympathetic consideration of the country, a memorandum which, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership, I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the memorandum to which I have just referred is the following:

Recent statements by Government officials and some business institutions indicate a further tendency toward free trade. Much of this thinking indicates that free trade will perhaps result in increased exports of manufactured commodities with a resultant shrinkage in the domestic production of agricultural commodities.

The United States Department of Agriculture in a bulletin issued January 1944, entitled "What Postwar Policies for Agriculture?" states the following: "We believe that, with due consideration for military necessities, we should evolve programs that will tend to reduce domestic production of agricultural commodities that cannot meet world competition and yield an American level of living to producers without tariffs." They further state that "There is no outlook for an enduring world peace except as it is based upon a relatively free exchange of goods and resources."

Much of the sentiment for free trade seems to arise from the hope that foreign countries will be greatly devastated, and will look to American manufacturers for supplies of manufactured goods. The fact that foreign countries, both Allies and enemies, have been able to produce untold quantities of mechanized war goods would definitely indicate their ability to produce peacetime manufactured supplies following the war effort. Both their economy and their labor will be geared to that type of production, and if given some freedom of action, manufactured goods will be produced perhaps in an even greater abundance than will agricultural commodities in most foreign countries. It is our opinion that the only exception to this will be under force, which was advocated during the past year by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was his pronouncement that Germany should be reduced to an agricultural Nation. Under such theory, Mr. Morgenthau undoubtedly had in mind the exportation of manufactured commodities from this country and from Great Britain in exchange for agricultural commodities which would be produced by German labor. History in this country has long since proved the necessity of a strong farm market if our manufacturing, transportation, and trading industries are to be kept in a sound financial condition. Certainly, the farm market in this country is much more important to commercial industries than are any postwar potential markets in foreign countries.

In connection with our tariff policy, we are frequently led to believe that imports and exports comprise a very substantial part of our total business operation. The facts are these:

During the prewar period from 1920 to 1940, 93 percent of everything we consumed in the United States was produced here. Of the 7 percent of consumer goods which was imported, only 40 percent paid any import duty. That represents 2.8 percent of our total consumption. Sixty percent of our imports which came in free of duty will perhaps continue in that category because it comprises such articles as coffee, tea, spices, and rubber, none of which with the recent exception of the latter commodity, are produced commercially within the United States.

From these facts it is evident that the great productive enterprises here have been developed and maintained by selling their products to people in the United States, who have had a high purchasing power, because the earning power of wage workers and producers was protected from the products of other countries with low wages and living standards.

Even with the protective policies which have been pursued until recently in this

country, the United States might well be considered a free trader compared to other large countries. The foreign trade of the United States for the period 1922 to 1941, inclusive, exceeded $132,000,000,000. That was more than the total of the foreign trade business done by all other industrial countries. Yet, in spite of this enormous volume of business, this country has derived during the past many years only about 6 percent of our national income from exports.

The problem of free trade versus a protective tariff policy for the United States simply comes down to this situation: Are we willing to reduce the standard of living of wage and salary workers and agricultural people to the levels of other countries? Unless we reduce such workers and agriculture to levels approaching theirs, it will be impossible to compete on an open world market basis. Wherever an exchange of goods and services can be made without a reduction in the living standards of American people, then such exchange should not be hampered. On the other hand, we should never lose sight of the fact that industry in this country, including the industry of agriculture, has been built to the present high level based upon protective tariffs. The competition between this and foreign countries can be on an equal basis only if American workers are willing to reduce their wages, increase their hours, and reduce their standard of living comparable to conditions both in Europe and in the Orient relative to the output per worker. Unless labor and industry are willing to make these sacrifices, certainly agriculture should not be placed on the auction block as was indicated some months ago by the Secretary of the Treasury.

As a specific recommendation we believe that tariff rates, including adjustments upward and downward, should be taken out of the administrative offices and be placed in the hands of a bipartisan tariff commission with the Congress having the right to veto. This then places tariff rates in hands of persons who are capable of analyzing the rates based upon sound economic conditions predicated upon the general welfare of all people in the United States.

Since the inauguration of legislation permitting reciprocal trade agreements and permitting the administrative branch of the Government to make adjustments downward and upward within the 50 percent limitation, no upward adjustments have been made. While some of these downward adjustments have been justified from purely economic point of view, it is believed that many of the adjustments have resulted from the desire to use the tariff policy of this country purely for diplomatic negotiations. The distorted world trade due to war conditions, which have existed since most of these adjustments have been effective, has given no opportunity to measure and appraise their effect upon our economy in times of peace.

Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association Opposed to Trade Agreements

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement before the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States:

The organic chemical industry in the United States is a beneficiary and also an outstanding illustration of the wisdom of a soundly conceived tariff policy. You will recall the fact that we had no such industry when the First World War began.

A striking illustration of the economic value of the industry is shown in the fact that prices of chemicals and allied products in the First World War went from an index figure of 100 in 1914 to 245 in 1918, whereas, in the present war, prices have risen from 100 in 1939 to 130 in 1942, and have since declined somewhat.

The value of the industry from the standpoint of public health and national defense is common knowledge and need not be stressed.

H. R. 2652, while a tariff measure, is said to be part of a grand plan intended to promote world cooperation, both political and economic. Like other Americans, we favor the objective of greater international cooperation in the hope that the goal of a more stable, prosperous, and peaceful world can be attained.

Any legislation planned to implement the fine objectives must be examined to determine whether it gives fair promise of accomplishing the desired ends. Likewise, we want to be sure that in our desire to accomplish one thing we do not follow a plan which will cancel out or seriously interfere with the realization of another objective of even greater importance.

It is still obscure as to whether the concept of H. R. 2652, and some of the Bretton Woods proposals are not contradictory. On the other hand, we can all agree that full employment in the United States after the war is of the very first importance. Unless this is attained, it is futile to expect that the United States can carry its own burdens, much less contribute to the help expected by the rest of the world.

Proponents say that H. R. 2652 will create jobs to make the things we will export. Obviously this can only be true if the things we import do not displace more jobs than the exports provide. We have no objection to the vast number and quantity of commodities we always import which do not displace jobs.

The very nature of H. R. 2652, however, indicates an intention to import commodities that we now produce for ourselves. It naturally follows that if we import enough of such competitive goods to be of substantial benefit to other nations, we will of necessity displace a great many American jobs.

It is not merely the question of the consumer price lowered to the last point of possible profit. If a reduction is sufficiently large, the total supply can be imported and the domestic production scrapped, since no quantitative limitation of imports is proposed. On the other hand, if duties are not reduced far enough to benefit the foreign producer, then the whole thing is a futile gesture.

Compare the manufactured commodities we export with those we import. There are more jobs for each $1,000 value of textiles produced than in the same value of automobiles. So, if we increase imports of textiles in order to provide dollars with which the other nation can pay for our exports of automobiles, we are displacing, not creating, employment.

United States exports of ten billions yearly are talked of, and, of course, that means imports of the same value, if the exports are to be paid for.

Even during the war years, and despite high prices, our imports have only slightly exceeded $3,000,000,000 a year. It seems very unlikely that the United States can import more than three times this amount without seriously crippling domestic production.

It should be clear that if we can import and use commodities in addition to what we produce ourselves, the effect on employment in the United States will be quite different than if the increased imports only replace what we now produce. H. R. 2652 is aimed directly at replacing what we now produce. If full employment is a prime necessity, even if it entails huge Government expenditure in an attempt to bring it about, it becomes even more important that no unemployment be created through a mistaken import policy.

Obviously the prime purpose of H. R. 2652 is not to ease our procurement of needed materials, for many, if not most of these, are now free of duty. The real purpose is to open our markets so that other nations can sell us more competitive goods by reason of the additional 50-percent reduction in duty.

It is a proper objective if its limitations are realized and if it does not result in mere displacement of employment in the United States in order to provide employment somewhere else.

These considerations point up some of the original weaknesses in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 that still exist. They need reviewing, for surely we can base our efforts at world cooperation on a far better foundation.

The act, in our opinion, was clearly unconstitutional. There was tacit admission of that fact when it was so framed, that there could be no judicial review. The name was deliberately misleading because had they been truly reciprocal, the trades would have been between two nations. There was no reciprocity involved when reduced rates were made available without quid pro quo to all nations of the world, except Germany.

Actually, the act of 1934 was an indirect attempt at repeal of the Tariff Act of 1930, and H. R. 2652 would complete the job.

We are not arguing for a return to the rates of the Tariff Act of 1930, or for any change in the rates reduced since 1934, unless some changes are or will later become necessary to carry into effect the objectives of that tariff act to encourage the industries of the United States and to protect labor.

We believe those objectives are entirely sound today.

The important point we want to bring out is that Congress should again clearly define the economic basis on which any changes in rates shall be made.

We agree that free, unrestricted trade among all people everywhere is a fine ideal. But an even greater ideal is high living standards for those people. Up to the present the standards of the United States have not been equaled anywhere else. It should be realized that there must be some equalization in standards as these affect unit costs, either bringing others up or else lowering ours, and that this must be a condition precedent before free trade can be put into practice. Otherwise, the cart is put before the horse and the result can only be ruinous to us.

It seems to be generally overlooked that many nations could not adopt free trade even if they wanted to. Most of their government revenue is produced by tariff duties.

Besides, the record shows a trend quite opposed to free trade, for all about us we find nations increasing tariffs and tightening other restrictions. What does it profit us to pretend otherwise?

It has been said that in the miracle of our war effort, Americans efficiently organized on a mass-production basis, can outproduce and undersell the world and so need no tariff. Unquestionably we have outproduced. But have we undersold? What of the essentials—food, clothing, and shelter? Which of these are cheaper today? The fact is that despite rigid price controls, prices of all commodities are about 140 now contrasted with 100 in July 1939.

As we read Government plans, the trend is toward higher wages and shorter hours. And there seems little expectation of drastic reduction in taxes. This does not point to low production costs. Wage levels in this industry are higher than the average industrial wage level in the United States. Wage levels in the chemical industry of other countries were very substantially lower than those in the United States up to 1939. Efficiency of the foreign worker was also lower than that of the American, but the difference in efficiency was not nearly so great as the difference in wage.

And, of course, any comparison of wages or tariffs is absolutely meaningless in the absence of stability of currencies and exchange.

The changes in exchange value of the currencies of France and the United Kingdom, are good illustrations.

The United States made trade agreements with each of these countries. By contrasting the exchange rate at the time the agreements were signed with the later depreciated rates, it can be seen how a foreign country can, through a change in exchange rate, give to itself the equivalent of a further drastic reduction in American tariff.

French trade agreement, May 6, 1936

French franc:

May 6, 1936	$0.0658
June 1, 1937	.044
June 1, 1939	.026

United Kingdom trade agreement, Jan. 1, 1939

Pound sterling:

Jan. 3, 1939	$4.626
June 1, 1943	4.035

Temporarily, we in the United States have more productive facilities than anyone else. That condition may not continue very long once the war is over, for many of these are Government plants solely for implements of war. And it certainly does not mean that existing facilities have everywhere else been destroyed. Besides, when destroyed plants are rebuilt they will be modern. In many cases the equipment and the know how will be furnished from the United States.

Free traders and protectionists both have their theories, but who actually knows what amount of tariff will be needed by the United States after the world once again gets down to work?

More than 1,200 reductions in the rates of 1930 have already been made since 1934, but as war began in 1939, there has been no normal trade since. Yet, House resolution 2652 would open the way to even more drastic reductions before the effect of those already made can be known.

This, in fact, involves something far more important than the mere determination of what rates of duty the United States should impose. It brings into focus the question of whether we shall have a government of laws or a government of men. Which is to have first priority in our economic policy, world politics or domestic welfare?

If Congress fails to recover and perform its constitutional duty in respect to tariffs, world political considerations will inevitably be dominant over the domestic economic considerations which should govern. In the laudable desire to reduce unnecessary tariffs these facts should be given proper weight. A fatal weakness of the Trade Agreements Act is the lack of such an essential economic basis on which to determine a change in rate. Congress had provided it in section 336 of the tariff law but the Trade Agreements Act discarded it, making possible a political rather than an economic basis of determination.

Our principal objectives in the United States have been and will continue to be:

High living standards.

High wages.

High level of social security.

With such objectives we must devise plans which, while promoting international economic cooperation, will on the other hand not defeat our domestic objectives.

The objectives thus become the yardstick by which to measure the effectiveness of the plans devised.

Full employment in the United States is paramount both for the realization of our domestic objectives, as well as to make fruitful our cooperation in international affairs.

We recommend the following:

1. As we believe that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is unconstitutional and that H. R. 2652 asks Congress to further abdicate its constitutional duty to regulate commerce, we suggest that a more suitable plan can be devised.

2. We ask that Congress preferably write a new bill, or if the framework of the existing section 350 (Trade Agreements Act) is to be used, amend it so that in either case a constitutional method of rate making will be provided.

3. The Congress should provide the economic basis or yardstick which is to be determinative in (a) deciding whether an existing tariff rate is too high or too low, and (b) the amount of change to be made. Such changes in tariff could be made in return for substantially equivalent changes by other nations.

4. Any changes, in accordance with purposes and rules laid down by the Congress, should be made by a reconstituted Tariff Commission. These should then be promulgated by the President, unless Congress by an adverse vote within a specified time rejects the proposals in whole or part.

5. The Congress should provide for mandatory action under the antidumping law of 1921 and under sections 337 and 338, dealing with unfair practices and discriminatory treatment.

6. Congress should provide (and this is very necessary if we plan to be as liberal as possible without detriment to our internal economy) that American producers shall at least have the right of judicial review and prompt redress if injury results or if satisfactory evidence can be produced showing that injury will result because of a changed rate.

7. Provide for the restoration to full force and effect of sections 336 and 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

8. Provide automatic adjustment of rates to equalize undue fluctuations in exchange rates between currencies. The power to nullify United States tariffs through wide changes in exchange rates should be removed. United States tariff rates, whether or not reduced in trade agreements, should be deemed to apply on the basis of exchange rates in force at the time the rate was made. There should be provision for compensatory rates to apply wherever exchange rates vary substantially.

Respectfully submitted by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States—August Merz, president; C. A. Mace, secretary.

APRIL 16, 1945.

We Fought a War To Save Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of the National Grange Monthly there appears a very timely article written by Fred Brenckman, national legislative representative of that organization entitled "To Regulate Coal Industry."

As there are several bills pending in Congress providing for the regulation of prices in the bituminous coal industry, I want to commend this article to the Congress. Legislation similar to that proposed is contrary to the basic fundamental policy of free competition which has made our country great. The future success of the coal industry depends upon its having a full and free opportunity and incentive to mine and sell coal at a profit. The coal industry is not a national monopoly any more than farms or timber, and if Congress is to set minimum prices based on cost of production for this national resource, would it not be logical to do the same for petroleum, farm products, and factory products. This, of course, would lead to regimentation and a bureaucratic controlled domestic economy. We have just defeated German national socialism at an unparalleled sacrifice of blood and treasure. Why support a measure here that leads down the road to serfdom?

The article by Mr. Brenckman reads as follows:

TO REGULATE COAL INDUSTRY—PENDING MEASURES IN CONGRESS POINT TOWARD DANGEROUS POSSIBILITIES

Farmers, together with other consumers of coal, both domestic and industrial, have a vital interest in several bills pending before ways and means committee of the House of Representatives to reenact legislation for the regulation of prices in the bituminous coal industry. As many disinterested people view it, these proposals are part and parcel of the movement for Government control of industry, as opposed to our traditional system of free enterprise.

It is worthy of note that Socialists, both of the right and left wings, endorse regimentation of the bituminous coal industry in their common hostility to competition and in their desire to replace it by a managed economy. If this legislation should be enacted, the precedent thus established for the coal industry would likely be extended to other industries allegedly charged with a public interest.

ENCOURAGES COST INCREASES

The proposed legislation encourages cost increases to the point where the price of bituminous coal will be pushed to such levels as to force the consumers, during normal periods of supply and demand, to turn to competing fuels, thus tending to decrease rather than to expand the existing market for bituminous coal. On the face of it, this would appear to penalize the industry as a whole for the benefit of high-cost producers.

In a nutshell, it is the cartel system, more or less disguised. Advocates of that system, who assert that free competition leads to chaos, fail to recognize the essential role that competition plays in the functioning of a system of free enterprise. Some of the ablest students of the question take the position that the attempt to stabilize prices arbitrarily, the attempt to keep inefficient high-cost producers in business, leads to chaos.

The stated objections of the proposed coal legislation are: To conserve the natural resources of the Nation and to promote interstate commerce in bituminous coal. This implies that price fixing should be done with a view toward encouraging efficiency; otherwise, the stated objectives would be fundamentally misleading.

WOULD PROMOTE UNSOUND POLICIES

The estimated coal reserves in some sections of the country are good for over 500 to 700 years; in other parts for from 2,000 to 3,000 years at the present rate of consumption. Other competitive fuels are much more in need of preservation. This being true, our purpose should be to promote

greater use of coal through efficient means of production, and to encourage the conservation of competitive fuels, such as oil, which in many sections of the country is already nearing the point of exhaustion.

Under the Guffey Coal Act, which expired some time ago and which was not renewed under the stress of wartime conditions, the contrary procedure was followed. That would be the case under the pending bills, which are closely modeled after the Guffey Act.

A price-fixing plan is prescribed, not on the low side, but on the high side; in other words, the proposed legislation would abolish competition and legalize a series of organized monopolies under Federal regulation.

The declared purposes of Congress as set forth in these bills are ignored by the establishment of inflated cost regulations that would result in a protective wholesale price, and a scheme for the benefit of certain coal companies, which would be placed in a position to overcharge the consuming public.

Members of Congress who believe in our American system of free enterprise will find little difficulty in justifying themselves for voting against this proposed legislation, if and when it is reported out of committee.

FRED BRENCKMAN.

House Concurrent Resolution 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement showing the necessity for passing House Concurrent Resolution 50, if we are to maintain equity regarding oil production in America:

INTANGIBLE DRILLING COSTS

The decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the F. H. E. Oil Co. case, filed March 6, is the immediate reason for the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 50.

The court held invalid section 23-m (16) of the Treasury Regulations relating to Federal income taxes, which provides that certain drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells may at the option of the taxpayer be deducted from gross income as an expense.

Section 23 of the revenue act permits the deduction from gross income of necessary business expense. It would be impractical for the statute to enumerate all items of expense. Hence, the Congress delegated authority to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate regulations. The regulation granting the option above referred to has been in existence for more than 25 years and has been followed and recognized by the Congress, the courts, the Treasury, the Commissioner, and the taxpayers.

The circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court have had occasion to consider the regulation in more than a dozen cases and have directly or inferentially approved the validity of the regulation. The Congress has enacted and reenacted the revenue laws since 1918, without substantial change of the provisions of section 23. In 1940, the excess-profits tax was made a part of the income-tax laws, and by section 711 the Congress expressly recognized the opinion of the taxpayer to treat intangible drilling and development costs as an expense. In 1942, representatives of the Treasury advised Congress that the regulation had by long usage become embedded in the statute and urged enactment of language that would change the regulation. This Congress refused to do.

On petition for rehearing the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals on May 4 withdrew the original opinion in the F. H. E. Oil Co. case and filed a substitute opinion eliminating the question of the validity of the regulation from consideration. If the original decision had been followed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as the law, it is reliably estimated that it would have placed an immediate tax burden for current and open tax years on the oil industry of more than a billion dollars. The future ability of the oil industry to serve the public interest, in war or peace, would have been injured to an incalculable extent.

In 1944 the industry drilled 22,477 wells, including 3,881 exploratory wells and 18,586 development wells. P. A. W. estimates that 27,000 additional wells in 1945 will be necessary to maintain our necessary production. Abolition of the producers' right to charge intangible drilling cost to the expense of finding and producing oil and gas and requiring such cost to be capitalized would, according to estimates of the industry, reduce exploratory wells by one-third and development wells by two-thirds, and would have a similar continuing effect.

The action of the Fifth Circuit Court has so disturbed and confused the industry that it is imperative that the situation be clarified by passage of House Concurrent Resolution 50. This confusion and uncertainty will seriously deter drilling activity. House Concurrent Resolution 50 is designed to remove existing doubt and confusion, and eliminate uncertainty as to the question.

McCarran-Sumners Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that at an early date the bill known as H. R. 1203, now before the Judiciary Committee, will come to the floor of the Congress for attention.

I am receiving from time to time resolutions strongly endorsing the passage of this legislation, and under unanimous consent I introduce into the RECORD a resolution which has been forwarded to me from the Cass County (N. Dak.) Bar Association, expressing their approval and recommendations of the passage of this legislation:

Be it resolved by the Cass County Bar Association at its meeting held at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 12, 1945, That this association having studied and carefully considered the McCarran-Sumners bill "to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure," now pending in the Senate and House of Representatives (S. 7 and H. R. 1203), and finding that said bill contains the fundamental requirements for fair hearings and decisions before administrative agencies of the Federal Government and that its passage now and without waiting for the termination of the present war is essential and in the public interest;

We do hereby approve said bill and recommend its immediate passage by Congress, and urge our Representatives and Senators to actively support said bill and diligently work to secure its prompt passage;

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives LEMKE and ROBERTSON by the officers of this association.

O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter in reference to the O. P. A.

The letter follows:

PASADENA, MD., *May 12, 1945.*

Hon. DUDLEY G. ROE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROE: Please accept my heartiest congratulations for your courageous stand in advocating the termination of the O. P. A. No doubt thousands of Americans who have suffered financially and in other ways as the result of the impractical activities of the O. P. A. and other bureaus agree with you. However, I believe a new organization should take its place.

A board should be established in all economic centers to supervise prices and production. That board should consist of a legal department as a member of the board, of inspectors and clerks, and mainly of persons with practical experience in the kinds of business that the board would attempt to control.

As an illustration, let us consider the rent division. On the board covering these activities should be persons who operate rooming houses, converted apartment houses, larger apartment houses, small hotels, and large hotels. That board should be the enforcement agency and should hear all reports of violations, all defenses of operators, all complaints from tenants, and all prayers of operators for relief. At the present time those who are attempting to control various kinds of business know nothing about the problems of that business. The result is persecution for business operators, unfair and un-American activities, and evils that are worse.

Among those evils are the severe shortages in the necessities of life, that have prevailed in the past and continue to this day—shortages of sugar, coffee, gasoline, tires, meats, cigarettes and other things—shortages in the midst of plenty—artificial shortage caused by the dreams of incompetents who supplant practical experience with untried theories. The O. P. A., together with other bureaus have achieved nothing good. They have caused inflation, have created black markets that the people must patronize or do without, and have caused severe shortages in food.

Any group of nitwits can claim to hold down prices by making them so low that businessmen cannot operate. Today Americans are starving for meat and other foods and our returning war heroes will meet a kind of prohibition that is even more sinister and evil than the kind our armed forces met here after the last war. It required 18 years to rid ourselves of that yoke; the parasites who infest our Federal bureaus today will cling to the body politic like

leeches, sucking the life blood from decent Government, from business, and from the American way of living, for years after this war, unless brave patriots like you end this farce and unnecessary expense right now.

No time is to be lost. Trouble is brewing. Law violations, persecutions, race troubles, and riots. Already the saying is going the rounds that if gentiles need anything they must go to a Jew to get them—in the black markets. That's not only evil, but unfair to many noble Jews, but it's being said and broadly. When Americans know a law or legal methods are unfair, unjust, and contrary to their wishes they unite in breaking such laws, just as they did with prohibition during and after the last war. They are doing that today, in large measure, with the rules and regulations of the O. P. A., and it is foolish for our legislators to ignore that fact.

Therefore, I plead with you to continue your fight in trying to influence your colleagues in the right direction—at least, try to save Baltimore and other large cities from a race war that is being agitated by special groups of racketeers in real estate and other activities. In this connection I refer you to a copy of my letter to Mr. Paul Patterson, president of the A. S. Abell Co., publishers of the Sunpapers. The letter, in part, relates to the attack by the Sun (evening) on your fight to abolish the O. P. A.

It might not be a bad idea to start an investigation of the activities of the Sun and other newspapers as to ownership and rates charged the owners for advertising which are said on good authority to be discriminatory and contrary to Federal laws. It certainly is time to start a serious investigation of activities in the award of contracts, of prices, of the condemnation of various products, and of their disposal through salvage companies. In the last war we had our Hog Island and other scandals; in this one there are worse evils, but our political rulers appear to hide them and to protect those lawbreakers of a special group who perpetuate a reign of graft and lawbreaking.

Knowing you personally, although you will not remember meeting me in Sudlersville and other places when I represented a large organization of Americans and was making an investigation in the county seats of Maryland, I am confident that no newspaper editor or any other person will intimidate you or force you to refrain from doing what, in your opinion, serves the best interests of all Americans.

Respectfully yours,

LEE UHLER.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of April 21, 1945, in which the question is asked "Are Farley's services to this Nation being fully appreciated?"

I heartily agree with the thought expressed by the editor in this comment on the wonderful services rendered by James A. Farley in behalf of our Nation and its people and feel sure that as time goes on the people of our country will the more realize his unselfish and outstanding service.

The editorial follows:

ARE FARLEY'S SERVICES TO THIS NATION BEING FULLY APPRECIATED?

We wonder if the significant service now being rendered to the American people by former Postmaster General James A. Farley is being fully appreciated. He has been going about the country in recent days, praising the virtues of private enterprise, and in general leaning toward democracy of the Jeffersonian type, rather than the near-totalitarianism too often practiced by the New Deal. In an address which he has just made to the Maryland Bankers' Association, he warns of perils from self-styled friends of free enterprise, and deplores the constant Government goading of business.

It will be interesting to watch the further career of Mr. Farley. It is unlikely he will forego the principles that he has espoused which led him to break with the higher leadership of the New Deal. Doubtless now he will enlist his resources in a formidable fight to re-orient the policies of his party in order to bring it more in line with traditional American principles, rather than to go in the direction that Henry Wallace apparently wants to go. Mr. Farley's political talents are concededly of a high order. It is quite possible that he and those associated with him will be able to regain leadership of the Democratic Party, in opposition to the Wallace-Hillman-Browder group. The outcome certainly will be watched by the Nation with a keen degree of interest.

Therefore his remarks, as follows, before the Maryland bankers will arouse more than passing study:

"Just as there has been no absence of convincing assurance that all possible effort will be made to balance the budget after the war, so we are left to speculate on the questions of the post-war attitude of government toward private business. Businessmen are aware of the challenge confronting them. Their appreciation of the importance of maintaining high employment is evidenced by the fact that they speak of the number of post-war jobs which they hope to offer as an objective of at least equal importance with the volume of goods which they plan to produce. It can be said with certainty that business leaders are in a frame of mind to make free enterprise work more effectively than ever before. But what will be the attitude of government? Will business be encouraged to go forward, to expand and improve plants, and to make commitments with labor, with producers of raw materials, and the distributors of finished products? This question is uppermost in the minds of bankers and businessmen throughout the Nation. Nor that we are fearful of the avowed enemies of the free-enterprise system. They are few in number and they seldom attain positions of power. The men who will bear watching are those who profess to believe in free enterprise, but with certain conditions always attached, such as provided it is helped by government, supplemented by government, regulated by government, protected by government against its own weaknesses, etc., etc. These are the same self-styled friends who say, 'If industry doesn't provide full employment, government must step in and take over,' having all the time a plan for that purpose in their inside pockets, ready to be flashed on the public the minute industry fails to perform to their liking.

"This constant goading of business, of threatening more regulation and more Government competition has prevented us from realizing the full benefits of a free economy. You bankers have had first-hand experience with Government competition.

"I understand that in the lending field you are required to compete with 46 different public agencies, and that you are now being threatened with more. You have indeed had a full experience with that technique by which officials soberly proclaim that credit for this and that is needed, and that unless the bankers meet the situation government will do the job. This kind of announcement, as we have seen many times, is an invitation to all groups to come in and ask for help. Soon a new pressure group is organized, and free enterprise is threatened with the loss of another foot of precious ground.

"In the early years of the depression it was necessary for government to supply credit for certain purposes which could not for good reasons be satisfied by private leaders. The need then was obvious to everyone. Today the situation is entirely changed. Our capital markets are functioning vigorously and effectively, both as regards equity and long-term debt. The banks are on the job looking for chances to lend money. I know that you are pounding the pavements and pushing into the byways looking for businesses requiring bank credit. I have been particularly interested in reading of the formation by banks in various parts of the country of your so-called bank-credit pools. The wisdom of adopting these measures is clearly apparent. By these means you have made certain that no credit application need be denied before it has been carefully scrutinized by a group specially set up to find ways of satisfying credit requirements which for one reason or aother fail to meet the tests of a particular lending institution. To me, and I am sure to many people, these credit pools are symbolic of the desire and determination of bankers to make sure that no legitimate business will be hampered by lack of bank financing in the great program of production and employment to which we look forward after the war."

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no State in the Union is more deeply concerned with the uses to which the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries can be put than is the State of North Dakota. It should be obvious to all who are concerned with the problems of the midcontinent, that full and complete use should be made of the streams to buttress the country against the recurring drought periods which have happened since the beginning of time.

These sections of the country have been reasonably heavily populated, and in many instances with large herds of cattle. The natural advantages to come to the country as a range country are impaired in these excessive drought years. It is imperative, therefore, that steps be taken to fortify and to supplement the country against these recurring droughts.

This can best be done by the use of the great Missouri River and its tributaries, by proper development of irrigation, and reclamation. This work can be accomplished by existing agencies, or it can be accomplished as proposed under the

Murray bill, S. 555, known as the authority bill.

I am receiving expressions on both sides of this issue from various groups of people in the State of North Dakota. Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Dickinson, N. Dak., in which they express their disapproval of the principles of Federal authority.

LIONS CLUB,
Dickinson, N. Dak., May 15, 1945.

The following resolution was adopted by the Dickinson, N. Dak., Lions Club on regular motion at its regular meeting on May 1, 1945:

"Whereas the proposed Missouri Valley Authority region appears too large and diverse in interest to be administered "workably" by an authority, and

"Whereas the subjection of industrial growth and agricultural development to complete domination by a Federal corporation clothed with the power of government and exercising autocratic control over the two most important basic economic resources of the areas; i. e., land and water, is deemed unwise and a complete departure from the laws and customs under which this country has developed and prospered, and

"Whereas we believe the rights of the States involved can best be preserved, their resources wisely developed and their economy advanced most soundly by control exercised by and through representatives chosen by the interested States, acting together in concert and in full cooperation, as heretofore, with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and other tested, experienced and regularly constituted agencies of the Federal Government, and the above relationship has worked satisfactorily and should be preserved, and

"Whereas the creation of a Federal supercorporate authority with vast powers in the lands of three men appointed by the President for 9-year terms is not in the public interest: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Dickinson, North Dakota Lions Club recommends that the proposed legislation establishing a Missouri Valley Authority be defeated."

DICKINSON (N. DAK.) LIONS CLUB
M. V. A. RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
FRANK P. WHITNEY, *Chairman.*
J. M. FOSTER.
ROY PULVER.

The Postal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an act of simple justice to postal employees and is long overdue. I have supported it from the beginning, and supported it in committee. It is useless to speak further in favor of it, because it will receive the unanimous approval of this House. I rise only to compliment the committee on the excellent work that it has done, and particularly my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], who is the ranking minority member of the committee. He has devoted his time and energy very generously to the preparation and passage of this bill.

An Unanswerable Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toronto Globe and Mail of April 27, 1945.

AN UNANSWERABLE PROTEST

The latest proof of the harm done to the prestige and name of Canada in the United States by the King Government's vacillating and piecemeal policy on manpower comes from a speech delivered last Monday in the House of Representatives at Washington by Mr. L. H. GAVIN, a Republican Member from Pennsylvania. Mr. GAVIN is no habitual critic of the British Commonwealth, and he gave unstinted praise to the valor, fortitude, and brilliant exploits of the fighting forces of Britain and her Dominions. But, in common with millions of other Americans, he cannot understand why there should not be uniformity of contribution and sacrifice in the partnership in the common struggle, and he resents the attitude of Canada, with whom he links Australia, in keeping in her draft law reservations which permit physically fit men of military age to decide for themselves whether they will fight overseas or stay at home on some garrison duty, and prevent the full use of her available fighting power.

"I feel," Mr. GAVIN said, "that national service acts of our allies should be on the same footing as ours, and no reservations made in any of the Allied countries. Certainly, we made no reservations. There should be no reservations. I feel that, if the British Dominions and our allies have equal voting rights in world affairs, they should amend their national service acts so that they should have equal fighting rights."

No fair-minded Canadian can take issue with this protest. Our Government has poured out huge sums of money to publicize in the United States the details of our national war effort, which is highly creditable to the people. But the effectiveness of this expensive propaganda largely has been nullified by the half-hearted mismanagement and culpable inadequacy of our so-called manpower policy. Moreover, episodes like the dismissal of Mr. Ralston from the Cabinet because he advocated unlimited conscription, the desertion of thousands of "zombies" on eve of embarkation for overseas, and the anti-draft disturbances at Drummondville, Quebec., and other places have created a most unfavorable impression in the United States about the ardor of the Canadian people for prosecuting the war to a victorious conclusion.

Undoubtedly this unfavorable feeling must have been deepened by the announcement of our Prime Minister that Canada's contribution to the war in the Pacific would be kept on a purely voluntary basis. A large body of the American people have all along been more concerned with the fortunes of the Pacific war than with the struggle in Europe, and the American casualties in the long series of bloody battles fought to wrest islands in the Pacific from the Japanese have been very heavy. But Canada is a Pacific power and, as Mr. GAVIN points out, being nearer to Japan than the United States, should be even more interested in the suppression of the evil war lords of Japan. Britain, which is far distant from Japan, has, through Mr. Churchill, given a solemn pledge that as soon as the European war ends she will throw all her available fighting power and resources into the battle in the Pacific.

When Canada refuses to do likewise, it is little wonder that Americans like Mr. GAVIN complain about her laggardness and suggest that her Government's claims for a greater voice in world affairs would come with a better grace if it agreed to a uniformity of her sacrifices with those of her partners. The great majority of the Canadian people want such uniformity, but their Government forbids it and exposes them to the humiliation of such reflections on their national repute as Mr. GAVIN has made.

The Higher Cost of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of May 3, 1945. From the great number of letters I am receiving from constituents endorsing the editorial I am satisfied that the sentiments expressed therein are very widely held by our people. They are willing to pay the cost but they want to be assured that the assessment is just.

The editorial follows:

THE HIGHER COST OF VICTORY

Anyone who discounted the warning here, weeks ago, that victory would cost us more in both money and food probably changed his mind after reading the side-by-side dispatches from Washington on May 1.

Sugar will be first slashed (to us) that America may feed the liberated nations of Europe.

There will be no increase in meat, nor will any Army demands be diminished for 6 months.

"We must tighten our belts"—again—because Judge Rosenman, the "White House adviser," says so and because an inter-agency committee says so, "if pressing needs of liberated Europe are to be met."

And there you have it.

It may be wholly necessary, it may be partly necessary, it may be partly a scheme to keep America under rationing after victory, that the specializers in planned regimentation may keep and increase their authority and keep and increase the jobs. It may be all three.

Meanwhile, we know that there is plenty of beef in Argentina, with that country all ready to bargain where she can get the best deal for it.

We all know there is plenty of meat—and butter—for our neighbors to the north, Canada.

We know that while America may have to operate the cash register and food dispenser to prevent chaos in Europe, in all probability later we'll have our ears kicked off, as we did the last time.

We have saved the British Empire.

We have saved Russia, the country that held the bloody hand with Germany until it became necessary to do otherwise.

The British Empire is a vast storehouse of food and wealth. Except for the British Isles, little if any of it has suffered to any extent.

How much are these nations, which we have saved, going to contribute to prevent chaos in Europe?

It is time we knew.

It is time we sent a nonpartisan, or bipartisan, committee of real experts to Europe to find out just what we must do, and it is time we started telling our beneficiaries what they are expected to do to help themselves and to help those whom we have liberated with our sons' blood, our food, our munitions, and our money.

It is time we checked up on estimates and opinions of what and how much we should do from people who have a personal interest in Europe, either here or there.

It is time we stopped believing the bunk that they held the fort for us until we had time to get there. They got themselves into it, and it is time they realized who got them out.

And it is time we began to watch closely for future propaganda that to prevent revolution, anarchy, or something, we must start feeding the enemy, the Nazis. We did that 25 years ago and nurtured the brats who (as we learn from first-hand stories in this paper from our own American prisoners) fed our "liberators" a crust of rotten bread and a bowl of dog-meat soup once or twice a day.

We know from first-hand soldier and war correspondent stories that the Germans fed pretty well on their own products and what they stole from other nations—and, what is worse, on what they stole from the American Red Cross boxes our money and loving hands prepared for them.

We know that even in the conquered country of France our "liberators" found the people much better fed and dressed than anyone dared suppose.

If the Nazis could do this while they were at war, why not make them continue to do it, for their own and for their victims?

Every American sympathizes with the afflicted people of Europe and is shocked by the pictorial and printed revelations of what has taken place there. Nevertheless, as a good many far-seeing writers and some courageous statesmen have pointed out, America cannot bankroll the universe, and a bottle-fed economy, with Uncle Sam as the milkman, cannot do anything but produce parallel conditions in this country.

VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith copy of a radio speech made on VE-day, May 8, 1945, by direct wire over radio station WOL, Washington, to radio stations WNOE, New Orleans, La., and KNOE, Monroe, La.:

It is a privilege to speak today, VE-day, to the good people of Louisiana, and particularly to my friends and constituents of the Fifth Congressional District. Humbly do I join with you in giving thanks to Almighty God on this occasion.

Today, May 8, 1945, VE-day to you and me, is one of the great days in history. It marks the crumbling and unconditional surrender of the most ruthless, the most barbaric, and inhuman dynasty in history. Nazism; its evil founder—one Adolf Hitler and his sneering, cruel, bully-boy followers—are no more. The myth of the superman has been exploded. Right, God-fearing right, has triumphed through the might of Allied arms, the brilliance of American and Allied leadership, plus the unmatched resources and industrial skill of the American people.

You, fellow Louisianans, have contributed mightily to this great victory. The farmers, in spite of the shortage of labor, machinery, and equipment, and the pestilence of floods, have contributed untold tons of food. Industry and labor have contributed ships and planes and lumber and pulp and tires, chemicals, gasoline and fuel, and lubricating oils. Commerce has flowed through our great Gulf ports. All of you have given your loved ones to the armed forces. Many have fallen, but we pray that by the grace of God and farsighted, unselfish leadership it will not be in vain.

To these fallen and to their families we humbly pay grateful and unstinted tribute.

We now turn our energies to the Pacific war with the prayerful hope that there, too, we may soon celebrate VJ-day and the return of our boys to the bosoms of their families and friends. May it be soon—very soon.

Meantime we must not falter in our determination to carry on for God and country to an everlasting peace.

A Solution of the Meat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that, in order to try to help solve the critical meat shortage in the United States I have introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution for the suspension for a period of 90 days, all orders, regulations, and directives issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or any other provision of law of temporary operation, insofar as they impose requirements, limitations, or other controls with respect to the allocation, slaughtering, sale, distribution, or processing of livestock for meat or of meat or meat products, but it is provided, however, under the joint resolution that the same shall not have the effect of suspending or making inoperative any such order, regulation, or directive insofar as it relates to the allocation, slaughtering, sale, distribution, or processing of livestock for meat or of meat or meat products for the armed forces of the United States or for any other governmental use.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed that the Office of Price Administration has bungled the meat program, and with more livestock available than in former years, many of the people of our country are unable to obtain any meat, except through the black market, and that notwithstanding all of the protests of the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of Congress, no solution has been brought forward to give the people any relief. In my opinion the situation is unwarranted and since the governmental agencies do not seem able or willing to offer a plan or program, except the one now in effect, which is unworkable and has brought about the present situation, then it is the responsibility of the Congress to take some action to give relief to the country in the critical circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that in my own home town the only packing house there, and all places handling meat except two, have closed, and only a few regular customers are able to obtain meat. This condition is general throughout the country, and in an effort to make it possible for the civilian population to obtain a reasonable amount of meat of which they have been deprived, I am offering this resolution to suspend all regulations of the Office of Price Administration and other agencies for 90 days, in which time it is my opinion that the committees of Congress will recommend to the Congress some plan to solve the situation.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I request that my joint resolution be printed in the RECORD along with these remarks.

House Joint Resolution 197

Joint resolution to provide for temporary suspension of the controls affecting the distribution and sale of meat for civilian consumption

Resolved, etc., That, for the period of 90 days beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this joint resolution, all orders, regulations, and directives issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or any other provision of law of temporary operation, insofar as they impose requirements, limitations, or other controls with respect to the allocation, slaughtering, sale, distribution, or processing of livestock for meat or of meat or meat products, are suspended and shall be inoperative: *Provided, however,* That this joint resolution shall not have the effect of suspending or making inoperative any such order, regulation, or directive insofar as it relates to the allocation, slaughtering, sale, distribution, or processing of livestock for meat or of meat or meat products for the armed forces of the United States or for any other governmental use.

Industrial Wire Cloth Institute Opposed to Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 18, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum relative to H. R. 2652:

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
Seventy-ninth Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Memorandum re H. R. 2652.

SIRS: The members of the Industrial Wire Cloth Institute are not in favor of an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Their objection is based on the fact that in the 1939 Canadian agreement, the United States rates of duty on industrial wire cloth, 90 mesh and coarser, were cut by 50 percent despite protests by the industry against that action. To reduce by a further 50 percent the meager tariff protection thus left to this industry, it is urgently felt, would be—for

the following reasons—inimical to the best interests of our country.

Industrial wire cloth is an obscure, but nonetheless vital factor in our prosecution of World War No. 2. It is on the War Manpower Commission's list of critically essential materials. For the past 3 years the urgent demands of our own Army and Navy, as well as from England and Russia, have far exceeded the industry's capacity to produce. And its production has been zealously fostered by the War Production Board.

There has been, and still continues to be, hardly a single military production program that is not dependent upon industrial wire cloth; either as a specific component or as a vital element in absolutely essential processing and manufacturing operations.

Industrial wire cloth is a "must" adjunct to the production of powder for all types of ammunition; it is an important factor in the cracking process employed in the production of high octane gasoline; it is used for the grading and sizing of raw materials such as mineral ores, coal, and coke; and it is employed in the processing of flour, salt, sugar, rice, and innumerable other basic and secondary food products. Industrial wire cloth is an important factor in the production of synthetic rubber; it is extensively used in the manufacture of chemicals and plastics; and it is essential to the production of aluminum, copper, steel, chromium, manganese, molybdenum, and tungsten.

Every drop of blood plasma administered to our wounded men, in the field and behind the lines, has to be filtered, at the time and place of application, through a screen of industrial wire cloth. Industrial wire cloth cleans dust and dirt out of the air which passes through the carburetor and into the engine of every military airplane, tank, truck, tractor, jeep, and motorized artillery unit. And oil for the crankcases of all such equipment is strained through industrial wire cloth. It is reliably said that without air filters our planes would have been grounded for overhaul after only one mission through the sand and dust of the African campaign.

On the farm, industrial wire cloth is used in threshers, reapers, hullers, fanning mills, corn shellers, and other grain harvesting, cleaning, and grading equipment.

Facilities for the production of industrial wire cloth cannot be created overnight. It takes from 2 to 4 years and more to train a competent weaver of industrial wire cloth, dependent upon the type of material to be produced. His is an entirely different skill from that of a textile weaver, and the equipment upon which he works is radically different from the ordinary textile loom.

The industrial wire-cloth industry is not large; its total production in this country before the war being only something like seven or eight million dollars. All United States industries, however, small or large, should be considered on the strategic importance of their products rather than in terms of dollar value of output. And by "strategic importance" is meant strategic in terms of our peacetime economy as well as in war.

Repercussions from the 50-percent reduction on industrial wire cloth in the Canadian agreement of 1939 were minimized by the outbreak of war in Europe. From the industry's experience with foreign competition on finer than 90-mesh wire cloth, however—competition which, in 1938, equaled in dollar value the entire quantity of that grade of wire cloth produced in this country—it is reasonable to assume that we would have found ourselves in distressing difficulties as a result of the 1939 50-percent reduction in our tariff protection on wire cloth 90-mesh and coarser.

This industry feels that its vitally important relationship to present war needs and continuing preparedness against future aggression, coupled with the normal peacetime economic need for adequate United States production of industrial wire cloth, and the obvious desirability of post-war full employment of labor, entitles it to relief from a very real threat of extinction due to the provisions for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as incorporated in H. R. 2652.

THE INDUSTRIAL WIRE CLOTH INSTITUTE,
RALPH W. BACON, *Secretary.*
NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1945.*

Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt by Rev. Joseph I. Gulick, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Idaho Falls, Idaho, delivered in the Trinity Methodist Church in Idaho Falls, Idaho, on April 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

(By Rev. Joseph I. Gulick)

When a great man leads, leader and people are bound in the bundle of life together. Perhaps that is why the heart of America seemed to miss a beat when the word flashed across the Nation last Thursday that the President's great heart had ceased to beat.

For so long he had been so large a part of the life and spirit and pulse beat of America. Even still, our hearts, like muffled drums, go softly as we think of him. Seldom has national sorrow reached so widely, or penetrated so deeply.

Since the hour he left us, tributes and eulogies have been heaped, like fragrant flowers, upon his memory. The official services in the Nation's Capital have just ended. But in thousands of cities and towns throughout America, and in countless homes and hearts throughout the world, the lamp of sorrow burns.

He was the good neighbor to humanity—an intimate, throbbing part of the life of the world.

Our service here in Idaho Falls today is but a continuing note in the chorus of universal sorrow and of universal tribute.

Who was this man?

And what gave him such a hold upon human hearts?

Thinking of him, I find my own thoughts slipping back to a windy March day in the Nation's Capital in 1933.

It was the day of Mr. Roosevelt's first inauguration. We were a part of that great throng of tens of thousands of American citizens lining the avenues and hoping to catch a glimpse of this man, who spoke as the prophet of a new order of things in the Nation, and who seemed to have taken the hearts of the Nation's people by storm.

In a throng, packed so densely that one hardly had power of motion, people pressed against the restraining ropes along the driveway to Capitol Hill. Others seated in cars and piled on top of cars, waited for hours and watched the passing parade. There were airplanes, helicopters, and giant dirigibles overhead. There were bands and Army trucks and tanks and infantry and cavalry on the march below. But all this was inconsequential to a crowd waiting for its first look at the new President.

Finally, a thrill ran along the avenue, and in a moment a big open car swung slowly up Capitol Hill, and thousands had their first glimpse of Mr. Roosevelt, the president-elect.

Smiling, friendly, human—and massive—he seemed that day as he sat in the rear seat of the big limousine. The crowd went tense as he passed. I noticed the men around me were excited. They were enthusiastic, and a man in working clothes right beside me in the throng said: "Look at him. Look at him. There's a man for you."

So he began his career as President 12 years ago. The man of the hour. The hope of a troubled and distressed Nation.

And now he has come to the end of the trail. And once again the crowds—the great world crowds—no longer jubilant and hopeful; but hushed, reverent and half fearful and wondering, do him honor.

Truly, he was one of us, and our hearts might well skip a beat, when his heart ceased to beat.

For him, the presidential trail led over a longer road and through more changes in American history than any other President has known. It led him through 12 years of time. It led him through unprecedented power and victory as party chieftain. It led him through revolutionary changes in American agriculture, business, and industry. It led him into the tragedy of a second World War.

No former chieftain traveled the presidential trail for so great a length nor—for good or evil—wrought such revolutionary changes in the American way of life. And in all these changes Mr. Roosevelt was sincere. I think even his opponents will admit that. History will have to judge of the wisdom of some of his innovation, but history will never question his sincerity. He strove constantly for the welfare of the Nation, and for the good of the common man. And when he had no chart, and knew not what would work, he tried out something.

Truly, he was a great American, a great President, and a great internationalist. His humanitarianism, his courage, his indomitable will, his social charm and persuasiveness of spirit—sometimes his opponents would refuse to meet him in personal conference or would cut his voice off the air lest his very tone and frankness and sincerity of manner persuade them to his way of looking at things.

Admittedly Mr. Roosevelt had his faults, as all mortals have. But as Mr. Hoover said: "In the regrets of death all things are buried."

And so he came to the end of the trail—America's most revolutionary President.

"As in the falling dusk he heard the final bell
And went out in answer to its summons."

What now is left to us—to the Nation he led—to the people he loved? What is left to us? Two things—two great things, among innumerable lesser things, are left to us: First, a name, a memory, a character with the perspective of history already bright upon it. This is left to us. "What will history say of him?" Often doubting men asked that question during the past 12 years. So many differed with him. So many knew not how to rate him. "Genius or demagogue? Realist or visionary? Statesman or politician? What color—what color will he take when the light of history shines upon him?"

As an apprentice in the blacksmith shop many years ago I used to watch the master forgeman heat the steel and hammer it upon the anvil to the desired shape and pattern, and then heat it again and thrust it for an instant into the cooling vat. And after that initial thrusting of the steel into the water he would hold it up and watch it intently to see what color the metal would take. And if a line of blue began running up across the blade, his face would break into a smile and

he would say, "Good stuff. Good stuff. Real steel." And he would watch while the line of indicating blue ran clear across the blade, and then he would plunge it a second time into the cooling vat, and would lay it upon the anvil—thoroughly tempered metal, the finest steel, every forgeman's pride.

What color will he take in the light of history? Friends and enemies alike asked that often concerning Mr. Roosevelt in the years gone by. But when, after the hammering and the forging and the furnace heat of 12 hard years, a sovereign power plunged his spirit into the chill river of death—in that first night, and in the lengthening hours since, we have watched the color tint that history is to give him. Watched it come out in clearer, brighter blue.

Shall he take his place in history as one of America's immortals? To that question the Nation's heart has already answered, "Yes; yes."

Now that he is gone there is left to us a name, a memory, a character with the blue of royalty shining from it—and to shine with increasing brightness in the lengthening perspective of history.

And then something else is left to a lonely America and to a wondering world, now that he is gone from us. And that something is a mood. What kind of a mood? As near as one can sense it or analyze it, there is in the Nation today a mood which thousands once felt in the open-air amphitheater in Arlington on Memorial Day.

It was nearly 12 years ago. It was Mr. Roosevelt's first visit, after he became President, to the Memorial Day services in Arlington.

Memorial Day in Arlington. It seemed as if a thousand emotions thronged the hearts of those who walked in Arlington for the first time that day. I can never forget it. We had gone out early, ahead of the crowds. We stood at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. We walked around the tower commemorating the sailors from the battleship *Maine*. We moved on the carpet of green among the rows of markers above the graves of the soldier dead. On each grave was a red poppy. They seemed like drops of crimson blood sprinkling the vivid green of the cemetery.

We passed under the oaks, the maples, the cyprus, and lotus trees. The crows sent forth their mournful calls in the distance. The baptismal drops of rain fell from the heavens—the scattered drops, like tears from the angels above, fell on the graves of the hallowed dead. And the long, long thoughts of history and of destiny were full in our hearts that day.

And then we came back to the amphitheater, where the crowd was assembled. It was a round marble structure with many arches for entrances, and chiseled in the top of the marble the old Latin phrase:

"Dulce et decorum est
Pro patria mori."

"It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country."

In the amphitheater the President was seated. And how anxious everyone was for a glimpse of him. Young mothers with children lifted their tiny tots up to see him. A grown daughter maneuvered her short, diminutive mother this way and that to help her catch a glimpse of him through the standing crowd. People were wistfully eager to see the President that great day.

The Secretaries of War and of the Navy each delivered an oration. The Marine Band played a wonderful elegy. And all hearts were swayed like harps under the spell of that patriotic pagentry for a country's dead.

And one could see that Mr. Roosevelt was touched and moved by it all.

But the most wonderful moment in that day of sorrow and of memory was that moment when, just at the close of the service, something stirred. (Was it a breeze across Alexandria's valleys?) And the flags, scores of them which had hung limp, dead, in the gentle sprinkle of rain during the morning—and the flags, just at the end of the service, suddenly came to life. They became rustling, creeping things in the arches above us and all around us in the amphitheater.

It was startling, almost electric, in its effect. These limp colors suddenly becoming flags afloat. Living things of the Nation. Stirring with a new impulse caught at the close of that day of sorrow. It was a thrilling moment. A never-to-be-forgotten experience when something stirred and the limp flags came to rippling, waving life again.

Shall it not be the same today, oh citizens of America? After these moments of memory, after the tears from a Nation's heart have fallen for him, our leader? Shall there not be a sudden stirring through all our pulses? Faint at first, then stronger. And then running, thrilling from heart to heart—from city to city—through the arches of the States, far across the Nation, and clear around the world. The stirring of a mighty purpose born from out of our sorrow and from our memory of him. Shall not this be the permanent mood to possess America henceforth?

Today we say, "God be thanked for a strong man and for an adequate leader in our country's hour of need. God made him great, and strong, and adequate for an hour of need. And God crippled him to give him the human, sympathetic touch with all mankind."

But now that he has finished his work and has been gathered to the Nation's fathers, now God make America great and strong and adequate. She must not rely always, and only, upon great leaders. Under God she must be great in her own right. To that end let there be great stirrings in American hearts of every faith and of every party.

And let the urge and the impulse from the lives of these great leaders—the men God sent us for the crisis hours—Washington and Lincoln yesterday, Wilson and Roosevelt today, America's immortals, henceforth—let the strength of their wills, the vision of their minds, the pulse and purpose of their great hearts, let it stir in us, and let it carry on, and let it carry through, and bring victory in war and in peace.

Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a matter of the utmost urgency to all the faithful employees of the postal service. For those who have invested their very lives in this extremely essential and important service, and have linked the security of their families to it, it is a matter of survival. I wish to point out and remind you that these people have been patient, that the 20-year gap between their incomes must, in justice to them, be brought to the 1945 level and not left hanging as they were in 1925. Living costs have increased. Standards of living must be maintained and improved insofar as it is possible to do so.

The functions of the postal service are too often taken for granted and seldom given due credit for the splendid public service being rendered by this Department. We are all aware that the services, even under many handicaps imposed by our present national emergency, are most commendable. We must not be unmindful of this worthy and deserving cause. We should and must rally to it. In view of the fact that the measure now before this body provides for the authorization of a justifiable and deserving increase in pay for these patriotic people, I urge each and every Member of this House to support it without reservation, and I am confident that upon careful consideration of all the merits of the legislation you will support it. I feel that it deserves to be passed by a unanimous vote.

Reemployment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a radio speech delivered recently by myself on Fraser Gardner's For the Veterans' program over radio station WINX:

We are fighting a war to preserve our democratic institutions. But the job will be only half done with the winning of the war itself. Peace will bring with it the danger of social tensions as great as any this Nation has ever experienced.

The period of economic readjustment will, in all likelihood, coincide with the time when millions of our fighting men are being brought home and demobilized. They will have a right to expect every consideration and assistance in finding useful jobs. But, momentarily, at least, jobs will be scarce.

In such a situation unscrupulous demagogues may try to win the support of the veterans by promising them other people's jobs. They may seek to provoke a head-on clash between veterans and the labor movement. Remember that wherever fascism won power the first institutions destroyed were the trade unions.

Some, at least, of our men in uniform are aware of the danger. The Army weekly, Yank, in an editorial published some months back, mentioned the "unscrupulous people who would like to see a wild scramble between veterans and civilians for jobs after the war." Yank then went on to say: "It is going to be tough enough reconverting to full civilian production without starting a fight among the men who will do the producing. And if you begin by setting veteran against civilian, you will end by setting Protestant against Catholic, Catholic against Jew, white against Negro—and you will wind up by having the very thing we are fighting the war to destroy."

That process will never start if the veteran gets a chance to learn how much labor is doing on his behalf. I think it is safe to say that no group in our population has been more concerned than the labor movement to do everything that lies within its power to protect the veteran's rights while he is away and to ease his readjustment to

normal, satisfying, and productive life upon his return.

It is natural that labor should do this. Some 3,000,000 union members are in the armed forces. Additional millions in military and naval service are the sons, husbands, and daughters of union members.

By its collective-bargaining agreements labor is closing the loopholes in the reemployment provisions of the Selective Service Act and backing up enforcement with the full power of the unions. Union agreements guarantee protection of the veteran's valuable seniority right during his absence and provide that such rights accumulate until his return. The law also provides this, but forces the veteran to go to court to secure his rights. Grievance and arbitration machinery in union agreements provides for swift settlement of the veteran's claims without the delays, the technicalities, and the expenses that court procedures involve.

The law gives no protection to the veteran disabled in military service who is unable, as a result, to perform the duties of his former job. The AFL and CIO worked out an agreement with one of the major veterans' organizations providing that to the maximum extent possible this situation will be remedied by union contract. The labor organizations are seeking, and in many cases have already obtained, agreements with employers providing that disabled veterans should be reemployed in other jobs which they can handle at the prevailing wages for the jobs they receive. That point about wages is important. It avoids the danger that some grasping employer will pay less than the prevailing wages for the job because the veteran is receiving a disability allowance from the Government.

The law makes no provision to compensate the veteran without reemployment rights for the opportunity to acccumulate seniority and all the privileges that go with it which he had to forego during the time he was in uniform. I doubt whether there is any way this could be done by law. Large numbers of veterans had no jobs when they entered the armed forces. They were unemployed, or students, or on the family farm. Others may not want to go back to their old jobs and will lose their legal seniority protection if they do not. An agreement, already embodied in many union contracts, provides that such veterans will be credited with seniority rights month for month for the period of their military service back as far as September 1, 1940, in the first job that they get after leaving the armed forces.

Union agreements with some employers provide severance pay allowances for workers entering the armed forces. Many union agreements call for the payment to men in the armed forces of annual vacation allowances and Christmas bonuses to which they would have been entitled if they had remained in the plant. Veterans' rights to wage increases granted in their absence are protected by union contract and they will receive the higher wages when they come home. Under many agreements all promotions made during the veterans' period of service are temporary. The veteran, upon his return, will get a "crack" at the better job which he might have gotten had he not left the plant in defense of his country.

Under some union agreements, the disabled veteran is given plant-wide seniority so that when lay-offs occur in his plant he can go from department to department remaining at work perhaps long after the last worker in his regular department has been laid off. In other cases, union agreements provide that the disabled veteran who cannot resume work immediately following his discharge from service will be given an extended leave of absence and that his seniority will acccumulate during that leave.

Some of you may wonder, perhaps, why there is all this stress on seniority. To the worker, however, it is one of the most important attributes of his job. The courts have held seniority to be a property right protected by the Constitution. Franklin D. Roosevelt called it "an institution in American industry." Congress deemed it sufficiently important to provide specific protection for it in the Selective Service Act.

You see, then, that the union's concern to safeguard the veterans' seniority is not by any means much ado about nothing. It is one of the most valuable services the unions could perform. Seniority means security, for the greater the worker's seniority, the less is the danger that he may be laid off. Seniority means opportunity, for in many cases promotions are based on length of service. Seniority means job privileges, because wage increases, vacations, and rights to pensions and insurance benefits are frequently based on length of service.

While protecting the veteran's job rights, the unions have not, by any means, neglected to protect his rights within the union. Most unions exempt their members from dues while they are in military service. Most also preserve his right in death benefits and similar funds maintained out of the union treasury. Some permit members in uniform to vote in union elections held during their absence. Most have already decided to waive payment of initiation fees by veterans who apply for membership after discharge from military service. A number of unions have established special veterans' departments to help the veteran with all the problems that will confront him in making the readjustment to civilian life. They are prepared to do everything from helping him to get his benefits under the GI bill of rights to finding him a place to live.

Unions have established special funds to aid in the rehabilitation of the disabled veteran. Unions have established special training and refresher courses for veterans. These will help skilled workers to catch up with new developments in their field of work, teach them to use new implements devised during the war, and help them to polish up skills grown rusty from disuse. One large union is providing all its returning veterans with a tool kit.

There is one other activity of labor of such importance to the disabled veteran that it must be mentioned. Some of you may know that employers hiring handicapped workers may have to pay higher premiums for workmen's compensation insurance. The result, naturally enough, is that employers are reluctant to employ the disabled. Yet we owe it to the disabled even more than to other veterans—and Lord knows we owe all of them far more than we can ever hope to repay—we owe it to the disabled veteran particularly to help him find as good a job as he can fill.

Yet many of them will have no job at all unless our workmen's compensation laws are amended to prevent the employer from being penalized for hiring the disabled. Labor is in the forefront of the campaign to amend workmen's compensation laws so as to protect both the employer and the disabled employee, be he veteran or nonveteran.

Though I have been able to tell only a small part of the story of what labor is doing for the veteran, there is enough to make clear how tragic it would be if irresponsible and misleading propaganda provokes a post-war clash between veterans and labor.

The working veteran will have the same interests as any other worker. The veteran, like other workers, will want security, decent living standards, and the freedom to speak up for his rights without fear of reprisal by his employer. Some 15,000,000 American workers have found it necessary to form and to join unions to pursue these objectives. That many people are not likely to be wrong about where their interests lie. The 15,000,000 workers now in unions eagerly await the time when millions of veterans will join with them. The union activities I have described tonight are tokens of the bond of fellowship between organized labor and the veteran.

Farmers and Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to include with my remarks in the RECORD a speech on farmers and cooperation recently delivered by Mr. C. Maurice Wieting, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

Farmer cooperatives in the United States have been a powerful factor in raising the standard of living of the over 25,000,000 people who live on the more than 5,500,000 farms in our Nation.

What is more, farmer cooperatives by improving the quality of farm produce and by the elimination of unnecessary middlemen, have long made it possible for city consumers to purchase higher quality farm products at lower prices.

No movement of the people in the world today offers greater promise of increasing mass buying power, both for the farm producer and for the ultimate consumer.

WHAT ARE FARMER COOPERATIVES?

Cooperation has always been part of the tradition of the American farmer; neighbors have always helped one another with barn raisings, harvesting, threshing. This has made it possible for farmers to perform tasks efficiently which would have been impossible if they had worked alone or competed with one another. There are examples of farmer cooperation in the United States as early as 1810, though the greatest development has come in the past 50 years.

"Agricultural cooperation is a method of doing business," says L. S. Hulbert in his book Legal Phases of Cooperative Associations. "An agricultural cooperative association is a business organization, usually incorporated, owned and controlled by member agricultural producers, which operates for the mutual benefit of its members or stockholders, as producers or patrons, on a cost basis after allowing for the expenses of operation and maintenance and any other authorized deduction for expansion and necessary reserves."

Most recent statistics of the Farm Credit Administration show that there are 4,390,000 members of 10,300 farmer cooperative asscciations, who in 1944 did a business of $5,160,000,000. Farmer marketing amounted to $4,430,000,000, and purchasing to $730,000,000, the latter figures rising to $1,010,000,000 when the purchasing business of marketing associations is considered.

NATIONAL COUNCIL

Today, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives speaks for almost 2,300,000 farmers who are members of 4,600 local cooperatives, which in turn belong to the 99 regional organizations which are direct members of the national council. It is the aim of the national council to promote "the interests of cooperative business organizations of farmers in the United States by serving as a medium

for; (a) a developing bond of friendship, understanding, and mutual helpfulness among farmer cooperatives; and (b) formulating and advocating policies of common concern affecting agricultural cooperation." It has consistently pursued these objectives throughout 16 years, marked by the continued expansion and growth of the council in which it has constantly helped farmers organize and maintain cooperative association.

Because the cooperative movement is dynamic and growing it is being attacked by powerful business interests who have a selfish reason for wishing to monopolize farm busines. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is taking the lead in defending the interests of all farmer cooperatives and in assisting small farmer groups.

IMPORTANCE OF FARMER COOPERATION TO A BALANCED ECONOMY

Few urban people realize that the average farm in the United States has but 87 tillable acres, and that the average cash income per farm family was only $1,398 in 1939, the last normal pre-war year. Even in 1944, it is estimated that average cash income per farm family was only about $2,000. With the nearing end of the war, farm prices already have begun to decline, and they may fall disastrously again as they did in the 1920's.

"Full industrial employment can hardly be hoped for unless the purchasing power of the agricultural population can be maintained at high levels," Randolph Paul, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, said in a recent statement.

The need for agriculture, industry, labor, and all consumer groups to work for free economy production at a high level has long been recognized by the members of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and other farm organizations.

HOW FARMER COOPERATIVES HELP FARMERS

Farmer cooperatives have made it possible for farmers in the United States to preserve the advantages of the family-owned and family-operated farm, while through their cooperative associations they have been able to secure the benefits of pooling their marketing and purchasing activities.

Acting as an individual, the farmer is at a disadvantage in the marketing of his product, he is forced to accept almost any price the marketing agency offers him—often far below true value.

Through marketing cooperatives farmers are enabled to combine their operations so they all benefit by the savings to be obtained by large-scale shipping, grading, packing, and bargaining.

Farmers have formed cooperative purchasing associations because individual farmers acting alone are forced to purchase their supplies at retail prices and sell their products at wholesale levels. Working together cooperatively, farmers now are able to pool their needs and secure feed, seed, fertilizer, oil, and all types of farm production supplies at wholesale prices.

John H. Davis, executive secretary, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, has summarized the benefits of farmer cooperatives in this way: "Cooperative management is interested in maximizing farm production income through providing better and cheaper farm production supplies; facilitating economical and efficient distribution; reducing market gluts and shortages; minimizing spoilage of products; stimulating better grading; improving varieties; developing better and cheaper transportation and storage; and encouraging fair competition."

HOW FARMER COOPERATIVES HELP CONSUMERS

Traditionally the farmer has received about 50 cents of the consumers' food dollar, though only 10 to 15 cents of his cotton and tobacco dollar, with the remainder going to processors and distributors. These costs of transportation and communication, processing and manufacturing, warehousing and storage, finance and banking, advertising and salesmanship, wholesaling and jobbing, and retailing are costs which cannot be eliminated, but they can be drastically lowered.

Farmer marketing cooperatives have largely done away with the evils that once were associated with the selling of farm produce, and many unreasonable margins have been eliminated. However, farmers have just begun to extend their operations to the fields of processing and moving food and fiber through their cooperatives from the farm to the consumer. Here real savings can be made to both producers and consumers.

As Anthony Lehner of the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau said so well in the Pennsylvania Co-op Review for May 1945, "If cooperative marketing means anything at all it means ownership of as many intervening agencies of distribution and processing as is practical and economically sound."

Farmer marketing cooperatives are now giving consumers higher quality of goods at a fairer price because many of them have accepted the modern challenge of gathering, processing, and marketing the food and fiber farmers produce. Some of the unnecessary "toll gates" that have always stood between the farmer and his city brother have thus been eliminated.

For example, consumers have benefited by greatly lower per unit prices for many farm products, such as avocadoes, citrus, cranberries, dried fruits, and nuts, because of increased production stimulated by farmer cooperatives. Quality has been improved by grading and marketing practices which have been pioneered in by farmer cooperatives. Highly perishable products have been brought to the market in an orderly manner.

FARMER COOPERATIVES AS AN EDUCATIONAL FORCE

There is no more powerful educative force in America today than the cooperative movement. Both on the farm and in the city earnest groups of men and women are coming together to form cooperative associations, which are founded on long and continued study of economic fundamentals.

In Ohio, the Farm Bureau Cooperative Association has 1,006 active advisory councils, groups of 12 or more families which meet once a month to discuss cooperative and other problems. Over 16,000 farmers attended such meetings in March 1945. Study meetings of farmers who belong to cooperatives are common in Missouri, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, North Dakota, in fact, wherever the movement is strong.

The fact that every cooperative is a democratic organization operating for the benefit of its members, gives every member an opportunity to play a part in its operation. Annual business meetings of the 10,300 farmer cooperative associations do much to awaken farmers to the economic issues of monopoly, supply and demand, prices, advertising, grading, monetary control, international trade, and the need for world peace.

SUMMARY

Farmer cooperatives increase the mass buying power of both producers and consumers. Their continued growth is to the best interests of the United States.

American farmers have never been able to consume to capacity because of their low incomes. Farmer cooperatives by helping in the marketing of farm produce and the purchasing of farm supplies, provide a double-barreled approach to increasing farmer purchasing power.

American consumers benefit by a strong farmer cooperative movement which improved quality of farm goods, and by added efficiency in processing, lowers many costs to consumers.

The Low Tariff Assassination of Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the failure to protect our watch manufacturing industry from foreign imports has struck directly and disastrously at a national-defense industry. Lest this fact be disputed by the State Department free trade officials I insert under leave to extend a press release of the Navy Department as follows:

TIMEPIECES PLAY VITAL ROLE IN WAR

Modern naval war is above all a war of timing. Just as the effcient performance of each individual ship and plane in the fleet is absolutely dependent upon accurate timepieces, so is the success of every large-scale operation, where huge sea and air forces must be coordinated for split-second action.

A vast undertaking like one of our major amphibious operations in the Pacific, involving hundreds of fighting ships, escort vessels, landing craft, transports, supply vessels and auxiliaries, hundreds of carrier-based and land-based aircraft, and many thousands of combined personnel of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, would be utterly unfeasible without the close integration made possible by reliable time-keeping instruments. The very fact that such a tremendous assault on enemy territory can be staged with the utmost precision is in itself a splendid tribute to the men and women engaged in producing fine timepieces for the armed forces. So important is the element of timing in an invasion, in fact, that every member of the Navy's amphibious forces is now provided with a waterproof, radium-dialed wristwatch, so that each man can carry out his combat task at the exact second.

On a warship, the chronometer and stopwatch are as vital as guns, for without these timepieces, safe and unerring navigation would be out of the question. The chronometer, used in connection with celestial navigation, is essential in determining the ship's position at any specific moment. The stopwatch, one of the most important of the navigation officer's instruments, is indispensable not only in taking sights, but also in identifying light by timing the intervals between flashes. It is likewise valuable for checking chronometers and ship's watches against radio time signals.

When it is realized that a slight error in timing might prevent an important rendezvous and thus foredoom a naval engagement to failure, it can be easily understood why the men of the fleet attach so much significance to the accuracy of their timepieces.

To insure maximum efficiency of our big naval guns, it is necessary that the timeclocks on various types of fire-control equipment be constantly checked by stopwatch. This instrument also times the rapidity of

fire and the flight of projectiles, among its other vital functions in naval gunnery.

One of the little known but highly essential uses of a stopwatch aboard our fighting ships is to determine how quickly battle stations can be manned when the alarm sounds over the battle-announcing system.

On our submarines, in addition to the navigational aid rendered by various kinds of timers, stopwatches are often used as a check on their torpedo fire. By timing the run of a torpedo until the explosion, it is possible to discover which "tin fish" hit which target, even when operating conditions prevent such determination by visual means. The stopwatch is also employed in timing submarine dives, as well as in keeping tabs on the length of time the valve is open when firing a torpedo, in order that no excess water enters to upset the delicate "trim" of the craft.

On the other hand, the stopwatch is also an invaluable aid to our anti-submarine vessels in tracking down Axis undersea raiders, since it helps them figure the rate of speed of the enemy craft they are pursuing.

Timing devices are equally indispensable to our fighting planes. With the flight of all aircraft strictly limited to fuel capacity, it is imperative that the planes be provided with accurate instruments to register elapsed time. Therefore, the elapsed timeclock is standard equipment on our planes to determine the elapsed time on long missions, such as long-range bombings; while an aviation stopwatch is used in much the same manner for shorter operations. Besides these standard timing devices, our big bombing planes use master navigation watches for celestial navigation, and in conjunction with them, special stopwatches.

But these do not represent the full complement of timepieces which our combat planes must have as regular equipment. A usual installation on all aircraft is the standard aircraft clock, and every pilot and crewman wears a wrist watch of proven accuracy.

One of the most common uses of the stop watch is, of course, the timing of many kinds of athletic events. The Navy places great emphasis on building strength and stamina through competitive sports, and stop watches are widely used in the intensive physical-fitness program to prepare men for the rigors of combat.

In these and many other ways, the workers manufacturing timepieces for the Navy and the armed forces in general are making an invaluable contribution to the war. Millions of these varied timekeeping instruments are required to regulate our combat effort on the firing line. They are needed not only to help insure victories but to safeguard American lives. Final victory will come sooner if the men and women in the watch and clock factories continue to give unstintingly of their skill and energy in order to meet these critical requirements.

Mr. Speaker, if there is doubt in any person's mind as to the extent to which the low-tariff bureaucrats have assassinated a national defense industry, I invite the attention of such person to the table prepared by the Tariff Commission, which I am including under unanimous consent, showing the importation of watch movements and parts by numbers, value, calculated duties, and equivalent ad valorem—percent:

Watch movements and parts: United States imports for consumption, 1931–44

Year	Watch movements (all widths)					Total movements	Watch cases (all types)	Jewel bearings imported separately	All other watch parts and assemblies
	1 or no jewels	More than 1, not more than 7 jewels	More than 7, not more than 15 jewels	More than 15, not more than 17 jewels	More than 17 jewels				
	Number (thousands)								
1931	35	385	251	177	2	850	148	12,862	
1932	11	212	122	88	(1)	433	59	2,882	
1933	14	290	83	58	(1)	445	34	5,417	
1934	79	636	119	86	(1)	920	67	22,331	
1935	64	838	150	149	(1)	1,201	58	38,389	
1936:									
Preagreement	6	4	1	1		12	2		
Postagreement	82	1,308	218	601	1	2,210	154	50,100	
1937	167	1,378	266	1,311	2	3,124	208	62,818	
1938	252	943	209	982	1	2,387	167	63,140	
1939	219	1,207	269	1,222	1	2,918	212	43,713	
1940	270	1,362	319	1,583	2	3,536	231	98,771	
1941	256	1,684	491	1,866	4	4,301	378	92,547	
1942	185	2,107	737	2,260	4	5,293	1,075	88,650	
1943 [2]	387	2,117	1,516	3,966	10	7,996	2,987	(3)	
1944 [2]	160	965	1,248	4,540	3	6,916	2,649	(3)	
	Value (thousands of dollars)								
1931	25	952	822	887	59	2,745	118	382	268
1932	16	493	390	368	8	1,275	48	101	126
1933	24	748	371	296	12	1,451	47	177	207
1934	116	1,699	529	467	23	2,834	92	746	425
1935	139	2,140	620	736	35	3,670	109	996	582
1936:									
Preagreement	10	10	5	3		28	4		24
Postagreement	79	2,747	763	2,189	54	5,832	213	1,242	484
1937	182	2,605	936	4,357	97	8,177	345	1,252	796
1938	303	1,940	776	3,495	49	6,563	280	1,288	583
1939	260	2,510	918	4,308	62	8,058	347	913	549
1940	380	2,905	1,165	5,688	82	10,220	402	1,831	829
1941	392	4,022	1,879	7,372	113	13,778	625	2,007	708
1942	238	5,482	3,108	10,299	85	19,212	1,764	2,771	294
1943 [2]	511	5,910	7,874	20,482	209	34,986	6,459	(3)	265
1944 [2]	235	2,959	7,625	26,283	125	37,227	7,658	(3)	555
	Calculated duties (thousands of dollars)								
1931	34	730	821	744	19	2,348	85	38	165
1932	15	442	390	356	2	1,205	34	10	75
1933	17	628	282	233	3	1,163	28	18	130
1934	79	1,393	400	335	5	2,212	56	75	265
1935	82	1,803	504	565	5	2,959	63	100	366
1936:									
Preagreement	5	7	3	2		17	2		15
Postagreement	64	1,754	457	1,412	11	3,698	81	124	275
1937	129	1,776	552	3,116	23	5,596	131	125	457
1938	192	1,196	422	2,278	10	4,098	103	129	325
1939	167	1,525	536	2,827	15	5,070	128	91	308
1940	205	1,706	633	3,644	25	6,213	143	183	443
1941	194	2,076	948	4,264	46	7,528	215	201	377
1942	140	2,638	1,449	5,150	38	9,415	589	277	165
1943	293	2,682	2,929	8,770	106	14,780	2,082	(3)	140
1944	120	1,176	2,365	10,002	35	13,698	2,315	(3)	277

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Preliminary.

[3] Not available.

Watch movements and parts: United States imports for consumption, 1931–44—Continued

Year	Watch movements (all widths)					Total movements	Watch cases (all types)	Jewel bearings imported separately	All other watch parts and assemblies
	1 or no jewels	More than 1, not more than 7 jewels	More than 7, not more than 15 jewels	More than 15, not more than 17 jewels	More than 17 jewels				
	Equivalent ad valorem (percent)								
1931	134.26	76.69	99.83	83.91	32.26	85.54	72.02	10.0	61.97
1932	93.79	89.62	99.96	96.66	26.50	94.51	72.02	10.0	59.82
1933	73.32	83.92	76.20	78.70	28.93	80.15	61.04	10.0	62.44
1934	68.73	81.98	75.49	71.83	23.14	78.05	60.96	10.0	62.26
1935	58.93	84.27	81.32	76.75	15.34	80.71	57.71	10.0	62.87
1936:									
Preagreement	52.60	74.92	62.36	72.94		60.70	64.50	10.0	64.97
Postagreement	80.86	63.83	59.88	64.51	20.00	63.41	38.19	10.0	56.78
1937	70.57	68.19	58.97	71.51	23.25	68.44	38.10	10.0	57.41
1938	63.24	61.66	54.35	65.18	21.10	62.44	36.84	10.0	55.89
1939	64.20	60.76	58.39	65.63	23.69	62.92	36.92	10.0	56.07
1940	53.95	58.72	54.34	64.06	30.33	60.79	35.68	10.0	53.36
1941	49.54	51.60	50.44	57.84	40.31	54.63	34.46	10.0	53.24
1942	58.83	48.12	46.63	50.01	44.78	49.01	33.39	10.0	56.02
1943	57.37	45.39	37.22	42.82	50.72	42.25	32.24	10.0	53.06
1944	50.79	40.71	31.25	38.15	28.18	36.99	30.23	10.0	50.23

Opportunity for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., as follows:

OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WEST

The West saved the Nation once. It can do it again if given the opportunity. That is the thesis of Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, who, summing up the situation soon to confront the United States, says:

"We had the same problem of debts and demobilization at the end of the Civil War, and then we solved them by the same means which are at our command today. To understand just what those problems were, think of what we would have had to do in 1865, if the Mississippi River had been the western boundary of our war-wracked Republic, and if the Pacific Ocean had come to the Twin Cities and St. Louis.

"The factories of the North were as surcharged in 1865 as they are now with war contracts which peace would cancel. To find work for the million Union soldiers who returned from the battlefields, 2,000,000 workers would have been dropped from the overloaded pay rolls. No governmental relief that was then available could have bridged such a gap.

"What did we do? We opened the great frontiers of the West. We gave each soldier a certificate good for $200 worth of land and told him to go out and find it. Citizens who were not soldiers could buy the same homestead at the land office for $1.25 an acre. We gave these men no further help—no Government-guaranteed loans, no pledge of unemployment relief, no subsidy. We said, 'Go west, young man,' and the ambitious men who went west to open that prairie frontier converted our Western States into the world's greatest agricultural empire. For 35 years—to the turn of the century—it absorbed all our surplus money, energy, and men, and half of Europe's.

"The miracle of that day can be repeated now by reopening the same frontier of the West, this time as the frontier of an industrial empire instead of an agricultural domain. For the West has resources in raw materials and power for industry greater than its resources for agriculture. Its mines and quarries, its oil wells, and its water power are richer than its farms and its forests."

The logic of that should appeal to all. Mr. KNUTSON, for 30 years Representative of his State in Congress and at all times a student of western affairs and possibilities, knows of what he speaks. The West again is a frontier, this time in an industrial way, and it has great potentialities. They need only to be developed. They can be developed by the manpower and capital easily available. The West again could be a beacon to the returning soldier, to the civilian with energy and hope. "The miracle of that day," says Congressman KNUTSON, "can be repeated now." Amen to that

Here is something else that Mr. KNUTSON said: "They tell us that private enterprise, individual initiative and ambitious manhood were all right when the country was young. Then land was free. Then the Nation was being built. But the building is finished and there is nothing left to be done today. We have reached the farthest frontier. The farthest horizon lies under our feet—only the abyss of disaster beckons the daring man who would march farther.

"Nonsense. America has just begun to grow. Our future lies ahead. The troubles that lie behind us—even the two World Wars into which we have poured our manhood and our wealth—are but the childhood sicknesses of the greatest Nation in the history of the world."

There speaks the courage of America, the renewed spirit that made the West what it is and established possibilities hardly imagined today. The "greatest Nation in the world" can be even greater. America can remain American. It will, we think.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from Commerce reports of February 17, 1940, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce:

RESULTS UNDER THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM DURING 1939

(Prepared by the Trade Agreements Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce)

There are given below tables showing the trade of the United States with trade-agreement countries and non-trade-agreement countries in 1939 compared with 1938, as well as the average for the postagreement years 1938 and 1939 compared to the average for the preagreement years 1934 and 1935. In addition to a summary table showing total trade with the two groups of countries, detailed statistics are given covering trade with the agreement countries and the principal nonagreement countries individually.

During December 1939 total United States exports reached the highest monthly figure recorded since March 1930. The increase was particularly marked in exports to the agreement countries, and as a result the statistics for the full year 1939 show an increase of 8.1 percent for this group compared with 1938, whereas for 11 months the increase was only 4.9 percent. In the case of the nonagreement countries, a decrease in exports of only 4.5 percent is shown for the full year, compared to the decrease of 7.9 percent shown for 11 months.

On the side of imports, both groups of countries also improved their position during December. Imports from trade-agreement countries for the full year 1939 show an increase of 20.1 percent over 1938, compared to the increase of 17.5 percent shown for 11 months, and imports from nonagreement countries for the full year show an increase of 15.6 percent, compared to the increase of 13.2 percent shown for 11 months.

In the analysis of trade with the agreement and nonagreement countries during the first 11 months of 1939, which was published in Commerce Reports of January 20, 1940, appropriate comments were made on the important changes that had taken place in the composition and direction of the foreign trade of the United States during that period. With few exceptions, these comments are equally applicable to the 12-month period, most of the tendencies previously shown having continued throughout December.

In the latter month exports of aircraft were valued at $28,900,000, compared to only $5,700,000 in the same month of 1938, the total increase for the year compared to 1938 having been $48,700,000. Exports of iron and steel semimanufactures, including scrap, and of

advanced iron and steel manufactures also showed heavy increases in December, which brought the total increase shown by these groups for the year up to $57,700,000 against an increase of $39,800,000 for 11 months. For metalworking machinery, the increase in exports for the year was $15,800,000, compared to the increase of $12,700,000 for 11 months, and for lubricating oils $22,100,000 compared to $14,700,000. Exports of passenger cars and motortrucks and accessories continued to decline in December, showing a decrease of $18,100,000 for the year, compared to the decrease of $12,300,000 for 11 months.

In the case of agricultural products, exports of raw cotton for 11 months were $9,800,000 below the corresponding period of 1938, but the exceptional increase of $24,700,000 shown by December exports left a net increase of $14,900,000 for the full year, compared to 1938. Also, in the case of corn, December shipments were somewhat above the December 1938 level, thereby slightly reducing the decrease that had been shown for the 11 months' period.

On the side of imports, the only major products showing an appreciably greater rate of increase during December than appeared for the first 11 months of 1939 were crude rubber and tin. For the full year rubber imports increased $48,500,000 over 1938, whereas for 11 months the increase was $34,500,000, while tin imports increased $25,700,000, against an increase of $17,000,000 for 11 months.

TABLE 1.—*United States trade with trade-agreement countries and with all other countries, 1939 compared with 1938, and 1938–39 compared with 1934–35*

[Values in millions of dollars]

Items	Comparison of 1939 with 1938				Comparison of 1938-39 with 1934-35			
	1938 value	1939 value	Change		1934-35 average value	1938-39 average value	Change	
			Value	Percent			Value	Percent
EXPORTS, INCLUDING REEXPORTS								
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 1,758	[1] 1,901	+142	+8.1	[2] 757	[2] 1,232	+475	+62.8
Total, nonagreement countries	1,336	1,277	−59	−4.5	[3] 992	[3] 1,306	+314	+31.7
Total, all countries	3,094	3,177	+83	+2.7	2,208	3,136	+928	+42.0
GENERAL IMPORTS								
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 1,155	[1] 1,387	+233	+20.1	[2] 774	[2] 942	+168	+21.6
Total, nonagreement countries	806	931	+125	+15.6	[3] 772	[3] 868	+97	+12.5
Total, all countries	1,960	2,318	+358	+18.3	1,851	2,139	+288	+15.6

[1] Including the 18 countries (and colonies) with which agreements were in operation during the greater part of the last 12 months. Only 1 of the agreements was in operation throughout 1935, 6 throughout 1936, 14 by the end of 1936, 16 by the end of 1937, 17 by the end of 1938, and 18 by the end of 1939, including the agreement with the United Kingdom (covering also Newfoundland and the non-self-governing British colonies). The agreement concluded with Turkey became provisionally effective only on May 5, 1939, and the agreement with Venezuela only on Dec. 16, 1939. Statistics for these countries are therefore not included in the above calculations.

[2] These figures do not include Ecuador, the United Kingdom, Newfoundland, and non-self-governing British colonies, Turkey, and Venezuela with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreement has been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[3] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies.

GENERAL NOTE.—Percentage changes have been calculated upon fuller figures in thousands of dollars.
Source: Latest records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*United States trade with individual trade-agreement countries—1934–39*

[Values in millions of dollars]

Trade-agreement countries (in order of effective dates)	Dates effective	Exports, including reexports						General imports					
		1934 and 1935 average value	1938 and 1939 average value	Percentage change	1938 value	1939 value	Percentage change	1934 and 1935 average value	1938 and 1939 average value	Percentage change	1938 value	1939 value	Percentage change
				Percent			*Percent*			*Percent*			*Percent*
Total, trade-agreement countries		757	1,232	+62.8	1,758	1,901	+8.1	774	942	+21.6	1,155	1,387	+20.1
Cuba	Sept. 3, 1934	53	79	+49.8	76	82	+7.0	92	105	+14.9	106	105	−.7
Belgium	May 1, 1935	54	71	+30.7	77	65	−16.1	33	52	+59.1	42	63	+51.8
Haiti	June 3, 1935	3	4	+31.3	4	5	+41.1	1	3	+151.6	3	3	+2.2
Sweden	Aug. 5, 1935	36	80	+125.7	64	97	+50.5	38	44	+16.1	45	42	−6.4
Brazil	Jan. 1, 1936	42	71	+69.5	62	80	+29.8	96	103	+7.3	98	107	+9.8
Canada	do	313	481	+53.6	468	493	+5.5	259	300	+15.8	200	340	+30.7
Netherlands (including overseas territories) [1]	Feb. 1, 1936	75	170	+126.4	168	171	+2.3	93	135	+45.3	124	145	+17.2
Netherlands proper		50	97	+93.4	97	97	+.08	35	30	−12.6	31	29	−8.0
Netherlands Indies		10	31	+200.8	28	35	+28.9	46	81	+74.4	69	93	+35.2
Netherlands West Indies		14	41	+192.0	43	38	−10.3	11	20	+87.8	21	20	−4.3
Switzerland [2]	Feb. 15, 1936	8	15	+82.1	11	19	+75.6	16	27	+70.4	23	31	+32.9
Honduras	Mar. 2, 1936	6	6	+4.1	6	6	−7.6	7	6	−9.2	6	7	+23.5
Colombia	May 20, 1936	22	46	+111.5	41	51	+25.5	49	49	+.8	49	49	−.8
Guatemala	June 20, 1936	4	3	+93.2	7	9	+25.0	5	10	+89.5	10	11	+12.6
France (including colonies) [3]	do	127	174	+36.4	148	199	+34.4	68	76	+11.7	71	81	+13.8
France proper	do	116	186	+35.7	134	182	+35.8	60	58	−2.3	54	62	+15.5
Nicaragua	Oct. 1, 1936	2	4	+43.3	3	4	+53.1	2	3	+20.8	2	3	+17.1
Finland	Nov. 2, 1936	6	13	+110.2	12	13	+12.1	11	19	+83.1	18	21	+14.3
El Salvador	May 31, 1937	3	4	+29.0	4	4	+18.3	4	6	+69.0	6	7	+22.7
Costa Rica	Aug. 2, 1937	3	8	+179.9	5	10	+79.6	3	4	+41.2	4	3	−21.3
Ecuador	Oct. 23, 1938	[4]	[4]	----------	3	6	+78.2	[4]	[4]	----------	3	4	+36.0
United Kingdom	Jan. 1, 1939	[4]	[4]	----------	521	565	−3.0	[4]	[4]	----------	118	150	+26.6
Newfoundland	do	[4]	[4]	----------	8	9	+16.2	[4]	[4]	----------	7	9	+31.3
British colonies	do	[4]	[4]	----------	71	72	+1.1	[4]	[4]	----------	161	208	+28.9
Total, nonagreement countries		[5] 992	[5] 1,306	+31.7	1,336	1,277	−4.5	[5] 772	[5] 868	+12.5	806	931	+15.6
Total, all countries		2,208	3,136	+42.0	3,094	3,177	+2.7	1,851	2,139	+15.6	1,960	2,318	+18.3

[1] These figures include Surinam (Dutch Guiana), the trade with which is too small to warrant individual listing.

[2] United States statistics show only a small portion of the actual exports to Switzerland, most of which are transhipped through third countries and are shown as exports to those countries. Therefore, too much significance should not be attached to the statistics of exports to Switzerland.

[3] These figures include all French colonies. Only France proper is listed separately.

[4] Countries with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreements have been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[5] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies.

GENERAL NOTE.—Percentage changes have been calculated upon fuller figures in thousands of dollars.
Source: Latest records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TABLE 3.—*United States trade with individual nonagreement countries—1934–39*

[Values in millions of dollars, except those inclosed in parentheses, which are in thousands of dollars]

Nonagreement countries	Exports, including reexports						General imports					
	1934 and 1935 average value	1938 and 1939 average value	Percentage change	1938 value	1939 value	Percentage change	1934 and 1935 average value	1938 and 1939 average value	Percentage change	1938 value	1939 value	Percentage change
Total, nonagreement countries	902	1,306	+31.7	1,836	1,278	−4.5	772	868	+12.5	806	981	+15.6
Mexico	60	73	+20.4	62	83	+34.1	30	83	+83.4	49	56	+14.9
Panama (including Canal Zone)	20	29	+45.7	24	33	+83.6	5	4	−14.2	4	4	+3.5
Dominican Republic	5	6	+20.7	6	7	+19.0	4	6	+32.0	6	6	+1.4
Venezuela [2]	19	57	+201.7	52	62	+18.5	22	22	+.2	20	24	+17.9
Argentina	46	79	+71.5	87	71	−18.1	47	51	+8.1	41	62	+82.1
Uruguay	6	5	−17.2	5	5	+2.3	6	7	+21.8	5	9	+97.3
Bolivia	4	5	+24.7	5	5	−16.4	(261)	1	+454.4	(865)	2	+134.6
Chile	18	26	+90.5	25	27	+8.9	24	34	+46.8	28	41	+44.1
Peru	11	18	+63.8	17	19	+13.9	7	13	+96.0	13	14	+8.9
Austria [1]	2	------	------	(746)	------	------	3	------	------	1	------	------
Czechoslovakia [1]	3	15	+406.7	27	4	−85.8	19	15	−22.5	26	4	−84.6
Denmark	13	24	+80.4	25	24	−3.8	3	4	+35.9	3	4	+14.1
Germany [1]	100	77	−28.0	107	47	−55.8	73	56	−20.2	65	52	−18.7
Hungary [1]	(423)	3	+541.4	3	8	−1.3	2	4	+66.5	4	4	+19.2
Ireland	7	18	+154.3	27	10	−64.8	(633)	1	+107.7	(956)	2	+74.5
Norway	12	27	+119.9	23	32	+42.3	17	19	+11.7	16	22	+36.2
Poland and Danzig [1]	22	20	−6.1	25	16	−35.2	8	12	+63.1	13	11	−14.3
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [3]	20	63	+217.8	70	57	−18.7	15	25	+62.7	24	26	+4.1
Italy	68	59	−14.5	58	59	+1.0	37	22	−40.8	41	40	−3.2
Portugal	9	10	+11.8	11	10	−8.6	4	5	+34.2	4	6	+62.3
Spain	40	20	−50.8	12	27	+118.0	19	10	−50.2	9	10	+11.5
Greece	6	7	+28.6	8	6	−20.6	9	19	+108.7	15	22	+50.3
Rumania	3	6	+92.0	6	6	−1.3	(640)	2	+279.1	2	2	−8.9
Yugoslavia	(607)	3	+201.0	2	8	+20.5	8	5	+51.4	4	6	+42.9
Iran	4	7	+68.9	9	4	−51.4	8	4	+10.2	8	4	+85.0
Turkey [2]	4	11	+200.0	13	8	−87.1	7	19	+159.6	19	20	+4.6
British India (including Burma)	29	41	+40.4	86	47	+31.1	59	63	+7.1	59	67	+14.1
Philippine Islands	56	93	+86.9	86	100	+15.7	92	98	+.7	94	92	−2.5
China	53	45	−15.8	85	56	+60.7	54	54	+.7	47	62	+80.8
Kwantung	4	16	+300.6	17	16	−8.6	8	2	−54.0	2	2	−4.9
Japan	207	286	+18.8	240	281	−3.4	186	144	+5.8	127	161	+27.2
Australia	50	65	+30.1	69	62	−10.8	12	12	+1.8	9	15	+71.1
New Zealand	14	20	+39.8	28	17	−29.5	8	9	+11.4	7	11	+71.0
Egypt	9	14	+57.8	18	14	+4.9	9	6	−34.0	5	7	+47.3
Morocco	8	3	−4.9	8	8	−6.6	(786)	1	+90.2	1	1	+5.7
Union of South Africa	49	70	+41.7	70	69	−1.4	3	22	+566.8	16	29	+79.7
Other nonagreement countries	28	34	+50.6	33	35	+5.9	16	27	+78.6	28	31	+36.0

[1] For statistical purposes, trade with Austria beginning May 6, 1938, and trade with the Sudetan area beginning Nov. 10, 1938, as far as ascertainable, has been included with Germany, while trade with the other Czechoslovak Provinces occupied by Germany, Hungary, and Poland has been included with these countries since Mar. 18 or 19, 1939.

[2] Reciprocal trade agreements with Turkey and Venezuela became effective on May 5 and Dec. 16, 1939, respectively.

[3] Since Aug. 6, 1939, a commercial agreement has been in effect between the United States and the Soviet Union under which the latter country expressed its intention to purchase annually American goods to the value of at least $40,000,000 and, on its part, the United States undertook to accord to the commerce of the Soviet Union unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.

GENERAL NOTE.—Percentage changes have been calculated upon fuller figures in thousands of dollars.
Source: Latest records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the two letters which are tendered herewith to be printed in the RECORD deal with an important aspect and an important cause of the concentration of governmental power in the Federal Government.

Mr. J. E. Sturrock, general manager of Texas Water Conservation Association, wrote me in opposition to certain proposed Federal legislation dealing with water pollution.

My reply to that letter and his further communication are as follows. His letter reflects a fine, commendable spirit, which the people and officials of the States must demonstrate they have if they are to retain these governmental powers:

APRIL 24, 1945.

Mr. J. E. STURROCK,
General Manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. STURROCK: I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th indicating the opposition of your association to Federal legislation dealing with water pollution.

I am very much in sympathy with the general attitude of nonextension of Federal power. One of the things, however, which I have discovered from an examination as to the causes of the shift of governmental power from the States to the Federal organization, is the failure of the States properly to discharge their governmental responsibilities. I do not mean that the failure of the States to discharge governmental responsibilities within their power would justify the Federal Government taking over; but I have observed that the power to govern, like all other powers, is not disposed to remain where it is not properly exercised.

The river between Fort Worth and Dallas, for instance, is so polluted that during considerable part of the year it is black, it stinks. From Dallas south it is the same condition. That condition has obtained for many years. People complained to me about it, and nothing seems to be done by the State authorities. I do not know whether or not that condition obtains with reference to other streams. But this is an outstanding example of the failure to exercise a State power, and is the sort of thing that makes it very difficult for those of us who are trying to prevent a further concentration of power in the Federal Government to do it, much less bring about a necessary decentralization of government.

You are at liberty to give this letter whatever publicity you feel would be helpful to you in the work which you are doing.

Sincerely yours,

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

TEXAS WATER CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Austin, Tex., April 27, 1945.

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of April 24 regarding the resolutions adopted by this association in opposition to Federal legislation dealing with water pollution.

I appreciate your position and have advanced the same argument over and over for the last 10 years. If this State does not exercise the power vested in it with respect to the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of our water resources, then the Federal Government is surely to step in and do the job itself; as our water resources mean too much to the welfare of this State and Nation.

I am taking the liberty of inserting your letter in the next issue of our Bulletin.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

J. E. STURROCK,
General Manager.

Department of Veterans Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. system on May 18, 1945:

ANNOUNCER. We have in the studio the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Representative to the United States Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

She is, currently, a member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, but for many years Mrs. ROGERS has been both personally and officially interested in what happens to

fighting men when they stop fighting and return home—what happens to the families of those who do not come back.

Mrs. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Ludlam.

Last month I introduced into the Congress a bill to establish a Department of Veterans Affairs which would place the Veterans Administration on a level with other governmental divisions of Cabinet status such as the Department of War, the Department of Labor, and the other departments. The Veterans Administrator would be a member of the Cabinet, and would be known as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Question. Before explaining the implications of this bill, Mrs. ROGERS, I wonder if you would give us a thumbnail sketch of the present size of the Veterans Administration.

Answer. Sixteen years ago veterans' affairs were consolidated under one agency. Now, in addition to a huge central office in Washington, the Veterans Administration has 95 hospitals throughout the country; 53 regional offices, 9 area offices, branch offices, and numerous suboffices and stations. To staff this large organization, the Veterans Administration has 56,000 employees, more than any other Government agency except the Department of Agriculture. Appropriations for the Veterans Administration in the current year exceed by four hundred and seven millions the combined sums appropriated for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.

Question. Mrs. ROGERS, had the work of caring for the veterans of World War No. 1 slackened off considerably for the Veterans Administration before the second World War began?

Answer. On the contrary, Mr. Ludlam, hospital care for World War No. 1 veterans had not yet reached its peak when the present war started. The peak load of World War No. 1 patients will not be reached until 1949. The number of World War No. 1 veterans living today is nearly four millions.

Question. How has World War II expanded the work of the Veterans' Administration so far?

Answer. World War II veterans have been granted the same rights to hospitalization and domiciliary care as World War I veterans. These include service-connected and nonservice-connected cases. Admissions to Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the country are so numerous that over 79,000 are receiving treatment and 2,000 nurses are needed immediately—today—to care for present patients adequately. And the present situation is but a beginning of a constantly increasing patient load.

Today the Army keeps men in the service because beds are not available in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

In addition to over a million claims for pension or compensation filed on the basis of World War I and prior wars, plus the regular peacetime establishment, for World War I cases, there were over 716,000 disability claims and nearly 150,000 death pension claims filed through February of this year. Also, there are claims for insurance; hospitalization and domiciliary care; vocational rehabilitation of World War II service-connected disabled; burial allowances; educational benefits; guaranty of loans for homes, farms, and business purposes; or readjustment allowances under the GI bill of rights. These benefits should be given to the veterans immediately.

Benefits for veterans and their dependents are delayed because of the lack of personnel in the Veterans' Administration. There should be no excuse for that.

There are hospitalized over 18,000 World War II veterans. One million five hundred thousand World War II men and women have been discharged from service.

By the end of this war, a Veterans' Administration statistician informs me that services for 12,000,000 men and women will be handled by the Veterans' Administration. Some years later services will be handled for 15,000,000 persons, including widows and dependents.

Question. Has the tremendous new burden on the Veterans' Administration been recognized legislatively in any effective way so far?

Answer. Not until December 1943 was there recognition of this important war and postwar organization as a war agency. Then, the GI bill of rights contained the first statutory provision requiring recognition, second only to the War and Navy Departments. This amounts to a priority for necessary materials and in the hiring of personnel. But as a matter of fact, the Veterans' Administration is not getting that priority.

And despite the priority gesture, the Veterans' Administration as it now stands, has not the necessary organization, the personnel, or the proper space to meet the enormous demands upon it.

I sometimes wonder what a returning veteran thinks when he sees the dingy old and overcrowded building which houses the Veterans' Administration, where he goes for his rights, and looks across the street at the large and handsome and modern building which houses the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where business goes to secure its loans.

That the Veterans' Administration is not now prepared to do the huge job already burdening it is becoming more obvious each day. Detailed criticism of both the medical and nonmedical activity of the Veterans' Administration is appearing daily in the press, and the public is beginning to be informed of the many inadequacies in the present situation, and the public is becoming impatient. Immediate drastic action is essential to assure a broader concept on the part of the Veterans' Administration of the job to be done, and to activate a complete overhauling of the outmoded organization, methods and paper work of the Veterans' Administration.

Question: Mrs. Rogers, how will your bill to create a Department of Veterans' Affairs aid in solving this problem?

Answer. It is my firm belief that regardless of the granting of authority to the Veterans' Administration in its existing status as an agency, the fact that it is given inadequate power and dignity compared with departments under Cabinet officers, introduces organizational and administrative weaknesses which frustrate the agency from accomplishing the purposes of the Congress. It is my belief that the change and improvement necessary at this time will be made possible by creating a Department for Veterans, and in this way will be accomplished the full intention and purpose of the Congress to insure the most satisfactory and prompt service to veterans and their dependents. The veterans deserve the best there is of everything. I can see no other way of making the Administration strong enough to care promptly and adequately for veterans' needs.

Question. Would you explain in some detail what your bill would provide?

Answer. My bill would establish an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs. At the head of this Department there would be a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs who would be a member of the President's Cabinet.

In the Department there would be an Under Secretary and five Assistant Secretaries, one of whom would be a Surgeon General for Veterans, a doctor, who would be completely responsible for the Medical Section of the Department. I have been fighting for a long time for an outstanding permanent Medical and Nurses Corps. Constant expert nursing care often means the offchance for life. The new organization would also provide excellent opportunity for the strengthening of other sections of veteran activity which needs streamlining.

With the establishment of the Veterans' Administration as an executive department, the head of the Department would become a member of the President's Cabinet. The present contacts of the Administrator with the President and the Cabinet members are not and cannot be as effective and convenient as they would be with the head of Veterans' Affairs in the status of Cabinet member. As a Cabinet member, he would sit around a table at the Cabinet meetings and discuss veterans' affairs informally with the other Cabinet members and the President of the United States—and then and there secure help for the veterans. Many of the matters of policy now handled through the devious channels of correspondence could be determined promptly by direct contact.

Question. Mrs. ROGERS, is it not likely that objection will be voiced to setting off the veterans as a separate class in creating a special department for them?

Answer. First of all certainly the veteran group who have fought for us deserve their own Department. Further, my answer to that criticism is that there are already separate departments for labor, for commerce, for agriculture, all of which could be accused of segregating certain groups of our population.

Question. Is there any precedent for the proposal of a separate department for veterans?

Answer. The proposal to handle veterans' affairs on a Cabinet level is not an original idea. Our neighbor to the north has proven the feasibility of such an arrangement—for Canada has successfully operated such a department for some time.

My bill H. R. 2920 would accomplish what I, and numerous others who have studied the question, consider a necessary purpose. It insures more efficient administration by enhancing the authority of the head of the organization, and by providing an opportunity for overhauling the entire Administration.

This is a question, by the way, that is of paramount importance to you and to me, for the answer to it will eventually affect the welfare of some member of every family in the United States.

I believe that now is the time to take action to assure the veterans and all concerned that the Congress will provide adequate organization, authority, and status to the department responsible for administering veterans' rights and benefits.

We talk so much about being grateful to the service men and women. Let us prove it by giving them every care and assistance possible, and giving it before it is too late.

Rural Electrification Extensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from the regulation issued by the War Production Board which you will

see relaxes the restrictions on the use of materials for rural power lines.

You will note that under this new regulation any such project may be constructed that does not cost more than $25,000.

This will enable the cooperative power associations to build many thousands of miles of lines that are badly needed throughout the country.

I hope it is only a matter of a very short time until all restrictions on the construction of rural power lines are removed; so that we can proceed to electrify every farm home in America—at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

The matter referred to follows:

PART 4500—POWER, WATER, GAS, AND CENTRAL STEAM HEAT

[Utilities order U–1 as amended May 12, 1945]

UTILITIES

Definitions

(a) Definitions.

How to obtain material

(b) Preference ratings.
(c) CMP allotment symbol.
(d) Certification.

Restrictions on ordering material

(e) Scheduling deliveries.
(f) Exceptions to paragraph (e).
(g) Short item deliveries.

Restrictions on use of material

(h) Restrictions on use of material for maintenance and repair.
(i) Restrictions on use of material for minor plant additions.
(j) Restrictions on use of material for major plant additions.

Selling material

(k) Sales of material.
(l) [Deleted May 12, 1945.]

Inventory redistribution

(m) [Deleted Aug. 31, 1944.]

General provisions

(n) Appeals.
(o) Records.
(p) Communications to War Production Board.
(q) Violations.
(r) Applicability of W. P. B. regulations.
(s) Special inventory directions.
(t) Special provisions relating to Form WPB–2774 approvals issued prior to May 12, 1945.

Schedules

Schedule A. Material Classes.
Schedule B. [Deleted August 31, 1944.]
Schedule C. Limits on Practical Working Minimum Inventory.
Schedule D. [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

SEC. 4500.1 Utilities Order U–1—(a) Definitions: (1) "Producer" means any individual, partnership, association, corporation, governmental corporation or agency, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or note, located in the United States, its territories, or possessions, supplying, or having facilities built for supplying, directly or indirectly for general use by the public, one or more of the following services:

(i) Electric power.

(ii) Gas, natural or manufactured, exclusive of the production and transmission of natural gas up to the point of its entry into gas transmission lines from field gathering lines.

(iii) Water, other than exclusively for irrigation purposes,

(iv) Central steam heating, or

(v) Any of the foregoing services but not for general use by the public, if a specific direction from the War Production Board entitles such person or agency to apply the ratings herein assigned. Application for such a specific direction should be made by letter to the War Production Board, Washington 25, D. C., Ref.: U–1.

(2) "Material" means any commodity, equipment, accessory, part, assembly or product of any kind.

(3) "Controlled materials" means controlled materials as defined in Schedule I of CMP Regulation 1.

(4) "Maintenance" means the upkeep of a producer's property and equipment in sound working condition. It does not include any plant addition.

(5) "Repair" means the restoration of a producer's property and equipment to sound working condition after wear and tear damage, destruction of parts, or the like have made such property or equipment unfit or unsafe for service. It does not include any plant addition.

(6) "Plant addition" means the construction or installation of new facilities or the replacement of existing facilities with facilities of greater capacity.

(7) "Minor plant addition" means a plant addition having a net material cost of not more than $25,000. No job or project may be subdivided to come within this limit.

(8) "Major plant addition" means a plant addition having a net material cost of more than $25,000.

(9) "Net material cost" means the cost of material incorporated in plant less the cost of material removed from plant, priced in accordance with the producer's regular accounting practice.

(10) "Operating supplies" means material, other than fuel, which is used or consumed in the course of a producer's operations, except in maintenance, repair and plant additions.

(11) "Inventory" means all material in the producer's possession, without regard to its accounting classification, excluding, however, (i) material incorporated in plant, (ii) appliances and merchandising supplies, (iii) fuel, (iv) water purification and treatment material except equipment, (v) gas chemical material, (vi) material segregated for use in approved major plant additions, (vii) scrap and (vii) war surplus materials purchased.

(12) "Class" means any one of those categories of material established as a basis for classification of inventory in Schedule A of this order.

(13) "War surplus materials" means material designated as surplus to the war effort and offered for sale by any Federal Government agency having jurisdiction over their disposal.

How To Obtain Material

(b) Preference ratings. (1) A preference rating of AA–1 is hereby assigned to orders to be placed by a producer for material (other than controlled materials), for use in maintenance and repair, as operating supplies, and for minor plant additions for which the net material cost is not more than $10,000, in every class except (i) the transmission and distribution class and (ii) the meter class.

(2) A preference rating of AA–1 is hereby assigned to orders to be placed by a producer for material (other than controlled materials), for use in the repair of an actual or imminent breakdown, in (i) the transmission and distribution class and (ii) the meter class.

(3) A preference rating of AA–3 is hereby assigned to orders to be placed by a producer for material (other than controlled materials), for use in maintenance and repair, as operating supplies, and for minor plant additions, except where an AA–1 rating is assigned in paragraphs (b) (1) and (b) (2) above.

(4) Material obtained with the AA–1 rating may be used for purposes which are assigned lower ratings, but it may be replaced in inventory only by applying the lower rating to an equivalent dollar value of material in the same class. Material obtained with the AA–3 rating may be used for purposes which are assigned the AA–1 rating and may be replaced in inventory with either the AA–1 rating or an authorized AA–3 rating. The provisions of this paragraph (b) (4) supersede those of section 944.11, paragraph (a), of Priorities Regulation 1.

(5) Preference ratings for major plant additions may be obtained by filing an application on Form WPB–2774.

(6) The preference ratings herein assigned may not be applied by producers to acquire material for uses not permitted by paragraphs (h) and (i) of this order.

(c) CMP allotment symbol. (1) The CMP allotment symbol U–9 is hereby assigned to orders to be placed by a producer for controlled materials for use in maintenance and repair, as operating supplies and for minor plant additions. Allotments of material for major plant additions may be obtained by filing an application on Form WPB–2774.

(2) An order for controlled materials for use in maintenance and repair, as operating supplies and for minor plant additions bearing the CMP allotment symbol U–9 and the certification required by paragraph (d) of this order shall be deemed an authorized controlled materials order. This CMP allotment symbol shall constitute an "allotment number or symbol" for the purpose of CMP Regulation 3.

(3) The allotment symbol U–9 herein assigned may not be applied by producers to acquire material for uses not permitted by paragraphs (h) and (i) of this order.

(d) Certification. The ratings assigned by subparagraphs (b) (1), (2), and (3) of this order and the CMP allotment symbol U–9 may be applied by a producer only by the use of a certification in substantially the following form unless an order of the War Production Board affecting a particular item of material requires some other form of certification:

"Preference rating ------, CMP allotment symbol U–9. The undersigned producer certifies subject to the penalties of section 35 (A) of the United States Criminal Code, to the seller and to the War Production Board, that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the undersigned is authorized under applicable War Production Board regulations or orders to place this delivery order, to receive, for utility uses under Utilities Order U–1, the material ordered, and to use the preference ratings or CMP allotment symbol which the undersigned has placed on this order."

The certifications set forth in Priorities Regulation 3 and CMP Regulations 1 and 5 may not be used but the standard form of certification provided in Priorities Regulation 7 is permissible if the producer adds a statement saying that material ordered is for utility uses under Utilities Order U–1.

Restrictions Ordering Material

(e) Scheduling deliveries. Except as permitted by paragraphs (f) and (g) below, no producer shall schedule for delivery to it any material to be used for maintenance and repair, as operating supplies, or for minor plant additions, unless the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

(2) The producer does not have reason to believe that its inventory of material in the same class is or will, by virtue of its acceptance of the delivery when made, become in excess af a practical working minimum. A practical working minimum inventory is that amount of material which a producer, exer-

cising prudent operating judgment, considers the smallest quantity of material it can hold and render service in accordance with sound and economical operating standards. It may be less than the values established in schedule C but it shall in no case exceed them.

(3) No producer may place an order for any item of material, including material for major plant additions, if the required item or a practical substitute therefor is in the producer's inventory in excess of minimum requirements for that item.

(f) Exceptions to paragraph (e): (1) The restrictions of paragraph (e) do not apply to a producer so long as its inventory does not exceed $25,000 in value, except that such a producer must restrict its inventory to that amount of material which in the exercise of prudent operating judgment, it considers the smallest quantity it can hold and render service in accordance with sound and economical operating standards. Each purchase of material by such a producer, however, must be treated as the purchase of a short item, and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (g) below. A producer engaged in furnishing more than one of the services named in paragraph (a) (1) may consider its inventory for each service separately for the purposes of this paragraph.

(2) The restrictions of paragraph (e) do not apply to material excepted from inventory by the definition in paragraph (a) (11).

(3) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

(4) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

(5) The War Production Board may from time to time establish specific limits for permissible inventory for individual producers, modifying the provisions of Schedule C.

(6) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

(7) Notwithstanding the restrictions of paragraph (e) or of paragraph (g) below a producer may schedule an item of material for delivery in a minimum procurable commercial quantity, and in the case of cast iron, carbon steel, and nonmetallic pipe, may schedule for delivery a carload quantity.

(g) Short item deliveries: Even though it cannot schedule deliveries without exceeding the limits of paragraph (e), a producer may schedule for delivery material which it will require for use in maintenance and repair, as operating supplies and for minor plant additions during the 90-day period following the date it expects to receive such material, so long as the producer's inventory of the required material, together with material already scheduled for delivery, will be insufficient to meet requirements during such 90-day period.

(1) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

(2) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

Restrictions on Use of Material

(h) Restrictions on use of material for maintenance and repair: A job which can be classed as maintenance or repair, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (a) (4) and (5), may be done without regard to the dollar value of the material required when the following standards are met:

(1) The job must be necessary to maintain or restore service in accordance with sound and economical operating standards or to prevent damage to facilities from serious overload, deterioration, storm, flood, climate, soil conditions, or similar contingencies.

(2) Design must emphasize economy of manpower and material as well as the substitution of the more plentiful for scarce material.

(3) [Deleted May 12, 1945.]

(i) Restrictions on use of material for minor plant additions: A job which is a plant addition, as defined in paragraph (a) (6), rather than maintenance and repair, may be done without special permission from the War Production Board, if it is a "minor plant addition"; that is, if its net material cost does not exceed $25,000. Paragraph (a) (9) explains what is meant by net material cost. However, all minor plant additions are subject to the following restrictions:

(1) [Deleted May 12, 1945.]

(2) Design must emphasize economy of manpower and material as well as the substitution of the more plentiful for scarce material.

(3) New facilities must be necessary for rendering service in accordance with sound and economical operating standards, or to restore the producer's facilities to safe and economical operating condition.

(4) No extension of a line to consumer premises may be made or connected by a producer as a minor plant addition unless the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) The extension does not duplicate an adequate service of the same type already installed or constitute a standby service.

(ii) In the case of an extension of gas facilities, no extension may be made to serve a consumer not permitted to accept delivery of gas under Order U-7.

(5) [Deleted May 12, 1945.]

(j) Restrictions on use of material for major plant additions. No material may be used for a major plant addition unles the job has been authorized by the approval of an application filed on Form WPB-2774. In an emergency approval may be obtained by telephone or telegraph. Confirmation must be obtained, however, by the submission of an application on Form WPB-2774.

SELLING MATERIAL

(k) Sales of material: A producer may sell material which is in its inventory or which it acquired for major plan additions to any person. However, the preference ratings or allotment symbol assigned by this order may not be used to replace in inventory material sold by a producer unless the sale is to another producer or to a customer of a producer for the repair of the customer's facilities. Producers may sell material pursuant to this paragraph (k) or in accordance with the provisions of PR-13.

(l) [Deleted May 12, 1945.]

INVENTORY REDISTRIBUTION

(m) [Deleted August 31, 1944.]

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(n) Appeals: Relief from any of the restrictions of this order may be requested by filing a letter with the War Production Board, Office of War Utilities, Washington 25, D. C., Ref.: U-1, stating the reasons why relief is necessary. If the relief requested involves an uprating or other special assistance for material needed for urgent requirements, the request should be filed on Form WPB-2774.

(o) Records: In addition to the records required to be kept under Priorities Regulation 1, each producer who applies the preference ratings or allotment number hereby assigned shall maintain a continuing record of inventory and of segregated material in his possesson.

(p) Communications to War Production Board: All reports required to be filed hereunder and all communications concerning this order shall, unless otherwise directed, be addressed to: Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, Washington 25, D. C., Ref.: U-1.

(q) Violations: Any person who willfully violates any provision of this order, or who, in connection with this order, willfully conceals a material fact or furnishes false information to any department or agency of the United States is guilty of a crime, and upon conviction may be punished by fine or imprisonment. In addition, any such person may be prohibited from making or obtaining further deliveries of or from processing or using material under priorities control and may be deprived of priorities assistance.

(r) Applicability of WPB regulations: This order and all transactions affected hereby are subject to all applicable regulations of the War Production Board, as amended from time to time, unless there is a conflict between this order and such regulations, in which case this order shall govern, if it specifically so provides. No producer is, however, subject to the restrictions of CMP Regulation 5, nor may any producer in any way use the preference ratings therein assigned.

(s) Special inventory directions: Nothing in this order is intended to supersede any special inventory base established by a specific direction from the War Production Board to a named producer. All such directions shall remain in effect unless modified by a further specific direction to the producer affected.

(t) Special provisions relating to Form WPB-2774 approvals issued prior to May 12, 1945: With respect to WPB-2774 authorizations issued prior to May 12, 1945, and involving not in excess of $25,000 net material cost, producers may:

(1) Use the preference ratings and CMP allotment symbol assigned in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this order in lieu of those specifically assigned on such Form WPB-2774 authorization.

(2) Treat as segregated under paragraph (a) (11) any material to be used pursuant to such a WPB-2774 authorization.

Issued this 12th day of May 1945.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
J. JOSEPH WHELAN,
Recording Secretary.

SCHEDULE A

MATERIAL CLASSES

Material in the inventory of any producer which has an inventory, as defined in paragraph (a) (11), in excess of $25,000 shall be carried on the producer's own records and reported to the War Production Board as may be required, classified as follows:

WATER PRODUCERS

Class 1: Material for sources of supply, water treatment plants, reservoirs, elevated and pressure tanks, pumping and booster stations, including related pipe, valves, valve parts, and fittings.

Class 2: Meters.

Class 3: Transmission and distribution material (excluding meters), such as cast iron, steel, and wrought iron pipe, copper and brass pipe and tubing, lead pipe, pipe fittings, valves and valve parts, hydrants, parts for meters and hydrants, and other transmission and distribution material and supplies except pipe, valves, valve parts, and fittings included in class 1 above.

Class 4: Other material and supplies.

GAS PRODUCERS

Class 1: Production and pumping station material.

Class 2: Meters and house regulators.

Class 3: Transmission and distribution material (excluding meters and house regulators), such as cast iron, steel, and wrought-iron pipe, copper and brass pipe and tubing, pipe fittings, valves and valve parts, governors and regulators, parts for meters, regulators, and governers, other transmission and distribution material and supplies.

Class 4: Other material and supplies.

ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCERS

Class 1: Generating-station material.

Class 2: Switching and substation material, such as power transformers, other station equipment, parts, and material, and other material and supplies.

Class 3: Wire cable, and bus bar, such as bare copper and aluminum weatherproof copper, underground cable, aluminum and copper shapes.

Class 4: Wood poles and cross arms.

Class 5: Meters.

Class 6: Transmission and distribution material (excluding classes 2, 3, 4, and 5 above),

such as iron and steel poles, towers and parts, line hardware, distribution transformers, meter and transformer parts, and other line material and equipment (including insulators, lightning arrestors, etc.).

Class 7: Other material and supplies.

CENTRAL STEAM HEATING PRODUCERS

Class 1: Production plant material.

Class 2: Transmission and distribution material.

Class 3: Other material and supplies.

[Schedule B deleted August 31, 1944.]

SCHEDULE C

LIMITS ON PRACTICAL WORKING MINIMUM INVENTORY [2]

For purposes of paragraph (e) (2) a practical working minimum inventory (except for producers having a total inventory of $25,000 or less, who are exempted by paragraph (f)), may in no case exceed the following dollar values:

WATER PRODUCERS [2]

Class 1. The dollar value of items of material of this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken, increased proportionately to the increase in system output in the 12-month period preceding the current quarter over output in 1940.

Class 2: Four-thirds of the dollar value of authorized withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

Class 3: Sixty percent of the dollar value of material in this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken.

Class 4: Two-thirds of the dollar value of authorized withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies", as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

GAS PRODUCERS [2]

Class 1: The dollar value of items of material of this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken, increased proportionately to the increase in system output in the 12-month period preceding the current quarter over output in 1940.

Classes 2 and 3: Four-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies", as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

Class 4: Two-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCERS [2]

Class 1: The dollar value of items of material of this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken, increased proportionately to the increase in system output in the 12-month period preceding the current quarter over output in 1940.

Class 2: The dollar value of items of material of this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken.

Classes 3 and 4: Four-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.

Class 5: Fifty meters at each operating headquarters plus 1¾ percent of the meters installed in plant on the first day of the preceding calendar quarter.

Class 6: Four-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

Class 7: Two-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

CENTRAL STEAM-HEATING PRODUCERS [2]

Class 1: The dollar value of items of material of this class in inventory on the most recent date in 1940 on which the producer's inventory was taken, increased proportionately to the increase in system output in the 12-month period preceding the current quarter over output in 1940.

Class 2: Four-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

Class 3: Two-thirds of the dollar value of withdrawals in this class made during the last 9 months of 1942 for use as "maintenance, repair, and operating supplies" as those terms were defined in Utilities Order U-1 as amended September 24, 1943.[1]

[Schedule D deleted August 31, 1944.]

MAY 10, 1945.

The construction or plant addition described in this application appears to be authorized under the provisions of Utilities Order U-1, as amended May 12, 1945. If this is the case, the preference ratings and the allotment symbol U-9 assigned by Utilities Order U-1 may be used to obtain material required for the purpose described in this application, subject to all applicable restrictions of that order. The application is therefore returned to you unprocessed.

PAUL B. VALLE,
Administrator, Utilities Order U-1.

---

[1] These definitions are reprinted here for convenience in reference; please note that they differ from definitions used in the current order:

"Maintenance" means the upkeep of a producer's property and equipment in sound working condition.

"Repair" means the restoration of a producer's property and equipment to sound working condition after wear and tear, damage, destruction of parts, or the like have made such property or equipment unfit or unsafe for service.

"Operating supplies" means (1) material which is essential to the operation of any of the industries or services specified above and which is generally carried in a producer's inventory and charged to operating expense accounts, and (2) material for an addition to or an expansion of property or equipment (including a minor extension of lines), provided that such addition or expansion shall not include any work order, job, or project in which the cost of material shall exceed $1,500 in the case of underground construction and $500 in the case of other construction, and provided that no single construction project shall be subdivided into parts in order to come below these limits.

[2] See schedule A for complete identification of classes.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Tariff Barriers in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was loudly proclaimed by the free-trade officials of the State Department in 1934 urging the adoption of the trade-agreement program that it would, aside from assuring world peace, remove trade barriers and discriminations in the field of international commerce. The program has failed in every one of its objectives to the injury of our country.

The free-trade negotiators have made concessions to 26 nations in tariff rates without a quid pro quo, and in no agreement has there been the elimination of export taxes imposed by those to whom concessions have been made.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by an eminent jurist, Michael G. Heintz, Cincinnati, Ohio, in which he points out the extent to which the people of the United States are being flimflammed by the export duties imposed on what we import from foreign countries:

TARIFF BARRIERS IN REVERSE

(By Michael G. Heintz)

The Boston tea party of December 16, 1773, was a livelier affair than the modern cocktail party. It had the charm of a Mardi Gras masquerade. The uninvited guests met at Faneuil Hall, disguised themselves as Indians, boarded a cargo ship in Boston Harbor, and threw overboard a shipload of tea.

The provocation for this act of sabotage was an export tax on tea. King George III and his Ministry, led by Lord North, had previously set up a comprehensive Stamp Act. Hardly anything in writing was legal unless it was writen on stamped paper, furnished by the mother country. The paper work of the colonists was nothing compared to the printing, typing, and manifolding of the present, but it was too much of a tax for the American patriots to stand for. The fiery speeches of John Adams, Patrick Henry, and John Otis alarmed the Ministry and the Stamp Act was repealed.

An export tax on tea was substituted, not with the hope of balancing the British budget, but solely as a face-saving gesture. As a face saver, it was a dismal failure. At Charleston the tea was stored in damp cellars until it spoiled. At New York and Philadelphia, the tea ships were returned to London, while in Boston the tea was dumped into the brine. The good women of Massachusetts sought cheer, but not inebriation, in a sort of moonshine tea made of raspberry leaves. It is said that the Connecticut traders began to adulterate raspberry leaves with weeds, and the Yankees quit drinking tea and took to coffee. All of this resulted from a small export tax on tea.

The United States is the largest consumer of coffee in the world. No coffee is grown in this country. However there is a Kentucky coffee-berry tree, whose fruit was used as a substitute for coffee beans in the days of Daniel Boone.

The largest coffee growing country is Brazil. It raises about 65 percent of the entire world's supply. The United States takes about 60

percent of Brazil's entire crop. Only a small part of the coffee grown in Brazil is consumed in that country. Consequently the growers depend on the export market.

During the past 15 years the production of Brazilian coffee has been entirely out of balance with the export demand. The average yearly production is something over 20,000,000 bags of 132 pounds each, while the export demand is seldom over 15,000,000 bags. This leaves over 5,000,000 bags annually which can not be sold.

To get rid of this coffee, the Government of Brazil buys it up for elimination. Following the example of the Boston Tea Party of 170 years ago, some of the eliminated coffee rests on the bottom of Rio de Janeiro Bay. More of it has been used to pave streets and roads and, of recent date, it has been used in the manufacture of plastics. Thus about one coffee bean in four has been eliminated.

Who pays for this eliminated coffee? The consumer, of course. You would naturally expect the cost of the destroyed coffee to be reflected in some way in the price paid by the coffee drinker. We plowed under every third row of cotton to raise the price of the rest of the crop. We killed pigs to raise the price of surviving swine. But the Brazilian plan is simpler than that. The Brazilian states levy an export tax on the coffee which goes to the world's markets and use the proceeds to pay the growers for the coffee which is destroyed. It is so simple that he who runs may read. Presently the export tax is on an average of slightly more than seven-tenths cent per pound. You pay that tax every time you buy a pound of coffee.

This tax costs the coffee consumers of the United States about $8,000,000 per year for the tax alone. How much it costs for the administration of the tax is not known.

The United States is the only Nation in the world which cannot levy an export tax. Article I, section 9, clause 5 of the Federal Constitution provides: "No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." This prohibition against the levying of an export tax was the result of compromise. Without it the Constitution probably could not have been adopted. The wise men who drew the Constitution did not have before them the example of any other nation which had prohibited its government from levying export taxes. Gouverneur Morris stated in the Constitutional Convention that all countries having peculiar articles, taxed the exportation of them, as France her wine and brandies. Indeed, Virginia and some of the other Colonies had been levying export taxes, particularly on tobacco, and had found it a convenient, if not a necessary, method of raising revenue.

This compromise was the handmaiden of the compromise on slavery. Its author was Mr. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina. It should have gone out of the Constitution at the time slavery made its exit via the thirteenth amendment in 1866. If Thaddeus Stevens had had his way in this matter, as he did in many others, this Nation would now have the power to tax our exports as many other nations do theirs. On December 5, 1865, Mr. Stevens introduced in the House of Representatives a proposal to repeal the provision of the Constitution prohibiting export duties. This proposal was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and died there. On the next day Mr. John A. Bingham, of Ohio, offered a similar proposal, with the same reference and the same result.

A pamphlet issued by the Department of Commerce in 1927 contains a list of all the articles on which export taxes are levied by foreign governments. It required more than 200 pages to list these articles, together with a few explanatory paragraphs. Almost every known commodity is found in one or more of these lists. There is a monotonous repetition of articles which we do not produce, but which we import in large quantities, as rubber, tin, coffee, sugar, tea, olive oil, almonds, bananas, ivory, tapioca, cocoa, spices, mahogany, diamonds, and a great variety of chemicals. Even now Cuba levies an export tax on sugar. I have been unable to get from the Department of Commerce a list of such taxed exports later than the one issued, called Export Duties of the World. It would seem that a list of these duties brought up to date will be essential for the use of the Commissioners who are to sit at the peace table at the conclusion of the present war.

While we cannot levy export taxes by way of retaliation against those nations which levy taxes on commodities imported by us, the door is now open to reach the same result by negotiation. Congress recently authorized the President to renew the reciprocal trade agreements for a period of 3 years. We have had a trade agreement with Brazil since 1935. It contains no provision with reference to export taxes. Brazil imposed export taxes on coffee, before, as well as after the execution of the trade agreement. The United States made no effort to end the impost by negotiation.

We have trade agreements with 27 nations. In not one of them is there a relinquishment of the power to levy export taxes on articles imported by the United States. With the proposed payments of a subsidy to reduce the cost of coffee has never occurred to the Department of State to negotiate with Brazil to waive the export tax on the coffee exported to her largest customer.

From the correspondence I have had with the Department of State, I am of the opinion that no effort will be made in the renewal of the trade agreements which are now being negotiated, to terminate this tariff in reverse. Scarce as coffee is at our tables, we, the consumers of 60 percent of the coffee of Brazil will continue to pay seven-tenths cent per pound to cover the cost of coffee beans, thrown into the ocean, used to make roads, or turned into plastics, called caffelite.

The present trade agreement with Brazil contains the following clause:

"Similarly, natural or manufactured products exported from the territory of the United States of America or the United States of Brazil and consigned to the territory of the other country shall in no case be subject with respect to exportation and in regard to the above mentioned matters, to any duties, taxes, or charges other or higher, or to any rules or formalities other or more burdensome, than those to which the like products when consigned to the territory of any third country are or may hereafter be subject."

It would be very simple and withal reasonable to insert a clause in the several trade agreements to put an end to this one-sided tax. We are prohibited by our own Constitution from levying such a tax. We should call upon all the other nations to assume a like restriction in the reciprocal trade agreements. That would be real reciprocity. A clause in the agreements like the following would do the work: "No export tax shall be levied on any article listed in the schedules hereto attached."

Since this short cut to remedy an intolerable situation finds no response in the Department of State, I suggest the longer road of going to the Congress and the legislatures with a proposal to amend the Federal Constitution as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and hereby is proposed to the States, to become effective when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by article V of the Constitution, to wit: That section 9 of article I of the Constitution be amended by striking out the words 'No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.'"

Many of our States now levy sales taxes. It is a convenient method of raising revenue. The Federal Government has not yet resorted to that method of taxation, but it has many advocates. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that a sales tax on articles sold for export, and in fact exported, is an impost or duty on exports and is therefore void. Such was the ruling of the court in the case of *Levick* v. *Pennsylvania* (245 U. S. 292). The State of Pennsylvania had passed an act requiring retail merchants to pay an annual tax of 1 mill on each dollar of the volume of business transacted, and a tax of half that amount on wholesale dealers. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania had declared the law constitutional, but the Supreme Court of the United States held that the tax was a direct burden on foreign commerce and therefore void.

As a result of the above decision, Congress has enacted appropriate legislation to exempt exported articles from the excise taxes which have been imposed on many commodities and has provided for drawbacks, where the vendor has already paid the excise tax and subsequently the commodity is sold for export and actually exported.

These exise taxes are levied now on a large number of items. Thus an American citizen must pay excise tax on any of these articles which he may purchase, while a Canadian, a Mexican, or a Brazilian may buy a similar article free of the tax.

If one of our fellow citizens, building a house, buys lumber he pays a tax of $3 per 1,000 feet board measure, while the foreigner gets the lumber tax-free. If he buys an automobile for $1,000 he pays $20 excise tax and if the purchaser lives in Ohio, he pays a State sales tax of $30, while the foreigner buys the same make automobile for $50 less. Mr. Citizen pays $3 on a thousand on cigarettes, while the foreign smoker pays nothing.

When the Constitution was adopted in 1787, sales taxes had not come into style. Had the framers of the Constitution known, that in time, a large part of the national revenue would be raised by such taxes, and had they suspected that our highest court would hold that section 9, article I, of the Constitution prohibits the levying of an excise or sales tax on articles exported, they would have realized that this clause discriminates against Americans and in favor of foreigners. The men who wrote this clause into the Constitution were not internationalists. They did not put it there because they wanted to favor Europeans. We should not keep it there to penalize ourselves, and favor foreigners. Whatever was the motive for its inclusion, it was a mistake. That it was a mistake was sensed by Mr. Madison and Mr. Washington, members of the Constitutional Convention. The vote on its adoption was by States. There were seven ayes, to wit, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; four nays, to wit, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Neither New York nor Rhode Island voted on the proposal. While Virginia voted in favor, Mr. Madison and Mr. Washington took the pains to record their votes in the negative. It seems clear that their judgment has been vindicated.

Address by Hon. Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, at Thomas Jefferson Day Celebration, Knoxville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid address delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] before a large and enthusiastic audience in Knoxville, Tenn., on May 17 last, at a delayed Thomas Jefferson Day celebration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be in Knoxville on this occasion. Knox County and east Tennessee, though normally Republican, have always been good to me, and my Democratic friends here have stood by me since my first race way back yonder in 1915. I never think of the first reception that I got in east Tennessee that I do not think of the Biblical quotation:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in."

You and all Tennesseans have been far better to me than I ever deserved, but I appreciate your confidence, your friendship, your support, and I can assure you that the greatest pleasure in life that I have is serving you and the people of Tennessee.

And, confidentially, this is so whatever some outsiders who are temporarily in Tennessee may have to say about it.

God and Tennessee have certainly been good to me. Insofar as I know, the only two personal enemies that I have are not Tennesseans, but are merely two men from other States temporarily sojourning here for whatever personal benefit they can get out of our State. When I see and read of some of their foolish statements I sometimes feel that I ought to be a Christian and pray God to "do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." At all events, I hope God may forgive them and that they in turn will stop despitefully using me and persecuting me.

They have certainly abused and vilified me for reasons entirely unknown to me ever since they have been in the State. I not only get along fine with all Democrats of Tennessee, but I pride myself sometimes that I get along pretty well with my Republican friends who are Tennesseans also. Insofar as my public duty is concerned, I try to be fair to all, for there are good people in both parties.

Speaking seriously, my friends, we are here tonight to talk about a great American, one of the very greatest Americans. We know Jefferson is great, because he was in a class which included perhaps the greatest, most courageous, most versatile, and most honest of them all, our own Andrew Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was not a Tennessean, although he has been called one. He was a Virginian. He was born on April 2, 1743, and died July 4, 1826. His father was Peter Jefferson, a Welshman. Thomas Jefferson married Martha Skelton, a widow. She was the daughter of John Sayles, of Williamsburg, a lawyer of large practice who owned a dozen plantations and over 400 slaves. In Jefferson's own writing he said he "loaned Mrs. Skelton 10 shillings 2 days before the ceremony; paid 40 shillings for the marriage license; gave 5 pounds to the Reverend Mr. Cloutts, the minister who married them; and then borrowed 20 shillings from the parson before the close of the day. He gave 10 shillings to the fiddler, and 5 shillings to each of the servants of the household." Times have changed since then. Two days later they took up their abode at Monticello. About a year after his marriage the death of his father-in-law brought him 40,000 acres of land and 135 slaves. The Natural Bridge in Virginia was included in this property. Jefferson inherited 1,900 acres of land from his own father. Thomas Jefferson was born in sight of Monticello. Monticello was the first mansion in that section of the State. It was built on the Doric plan of architecture in 1770 and not finished until 1802 and only cost about $7,200 but money had much more purchasing power in those days than it has now. Mr. Jefferson was President when the house was finished. He was the best educated man in Virginia and probably in the whole United States of his day. He was a great linguist and incidentally he was a great musician. He was a violinist of note. He was a gentleman born and bred and remained so all his life. Although one of the greatest Democrats of his or any other age, all of his views were liberal. He was a revolutionist against the British Government from almost the beginning and as everybody knows he wrote the Declaration of Independence and took the greatest part in establishing the American Government. He was not here, but was a minister to France, at the time the Constitution was written or no doubt he would have had a great part in drafting that great document. Probably he did have quite a part in it indirectly. When John Adams was elected President he was elected Vice President and presided over the Senate for 4 years. Then he was elected President in 1801 and served from March 4, 1801 to 1809. He had a contest with Aaron Burr, of New York, over his first election and it was decided by one vote in the House of Representatives as the Constitution requires.

That was a great day for democratic government in America. Mr. Jefferson was responsible for the treaty with France by which the United States acquired Louisiana, the treaty being known as the "Louisiana Purchase" and it included Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana and Wyoming. It was one of the outstanding accomplishments of his administration. He made an admirable and splendid President. He taught us what a real democracy or a real republic was.

Mr. Jefferson was a great thinker and a leading philosopher. He was wealthy and did not have to work for a living. He had time to do a great many things and he did a great many things. He was a member of the House of Burgesses in his early life. He was also a member of the Continental Congress and took the lead in its deliberations during the Revolutionary War.

For years he was a minister to France. He became Vice President in 1797, President in 1801, and retired in 1809.

The young Republic of America made great strides during his administration.

He knew Patrick Henry at Williamsburg and afterwards in the House of Burgesses and he was a great admirer of Henry's oratory. Mr. Jefferson himself was never a great speaker though he was a wonderful writer. This inscription written in his own handwriting is on his tomb: "Author of the Declaration of Independence of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom and father of the University of Virginia."

Jefferson was a graduate of William and Mary College and was one of the most prolific writers of his day. He had an accurate knowledge of all subjects. Politics was just one of them. He excelled in everything. He lived to 83 years old and died on the 4th of July the birth date of the Declaration of Independence which he wrote.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are several other topics beside the splendid life of Mr. Jefferson that I want to talk to you about very briefly tonight.

The first, of course, is the war. Before preparing this speech I looked over the speech that I was to make here on the 13th of April. Many things have happened since I prepared that speech. I did not know, of course, that President Roosevelt was to pass away, nor did I know that Germany would surrender so soon although I predicted in that speech that she would have to give in within 60 days.

America with the help of Russia and with the very much smaller help of Great Britain has won the greatest European war ever fought among men. We did not declare war; war was declared on us both by Germany and Japan. We were not prepared for war when they made war on us. Some preparation had been made, of course, but after war was begun against us we went the limit. We raised the greatest Army in the world—the best, the bravest and most successful Army that ever fought in the world. We built the greatest Navy and greatest Marine Corps. We built the greatest Air Corps. We produced more supplies for this war than all the rest of the nations put together. But for America and American materials the war could not have been won. We have fought it for more than 3 years and the greater half of it has already been won completely. Just as we said would happen when the war began, Germany has had to surrender absolutely and without conditions.

THE JAPANESE WAR

Now as to the Japanese war. If Japan expects to remain as a nation she will have to surrender and surrender soon otherwise she will be annihilated just as Germany has been annihilated. And I think her ruling powers should be tried and put out of the way.

At this point I want to call attention again to the European war. In waging that war our country has not made a single mistake. We have won every feature of this war. We have not lost a battle. We won in Africa, we won in Italy, we won in Corsica, we won in France, we won in Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and finally in Germany. No general from General Marshall down to the last general has made any serious mistakes. Every soldier has done what he set out to do. Our boys have made the greatest body of soldiers that ever faced an enemy in the world. I made this statement to some gentlemen not long ago and one of them interposed with the question: "What about our set-back at the Belgium Bulge?" I replied that that was a mere incident. It resulted in a great loss of lives to our boys and that was tremendously to be regretted but that set-back caused us to go forward with greater activity, with greater speed, than ever before and it really shortened the German war and instead of being a set-back it was a success as it turned out. Our Army, our Navy, our Marine Corps, and our Air Corps have all done everything that could possibly be expected of them and even more. They have not even faltered.

THE PEOPLE BACK HOME

Nor must we forget the people back home. Our country has furnished the materials, the food, and the clothing to carry on that war. Our manufacturers have done their full part. Labor has done its full part. There have been "Belgium bulges" at times, but they were mere incidents and no country has ever produced like American manufacturers and labor have produced. Even more to be praised is what our farmers have done. They have produced more food, bread,

meat, and every other kind of food, than was ever produced in the history of the world and their efforts have been crowned with the most signal success.

Lend-lease has made good too. As you remember Russia was almost conquered. The Germans had reached Stalingrad but there, through lend-lease, our arms, ammunitions, tanks, guns, and every other kind of material were furnished the Russians and they made probably what was the most remarkable military come-back in all history. They had been defeated time after time. They had been driven across the most important parts of their country, but when they got our ammunitions, materials, and food they turned the Germans back, and Russia, to my mind, has taken second place in this war. I do not like the Russian form of government. With many of her ideals I have no sympathy, but every candid and honest man must admit that Russian conduct in this war has earned for her the respect, esteem, and admiration of the world, and I take off my hat to her. I do not want her peculiar ideas of government implanted in this Nation, but if they suit her that is her matter. We cannot help but admire what she has done.

As to Great Britain, she took an honorable part in the European war. She came very near being conquered by Germany. She would have been conquered by Germany but for America. She suffered greatly, it is true, but in the great fight against Germany she had possibly only 1 army to 15 armies of America and Russia.

Taken as a whole, however, the Allies have won the greatest war in history, and I am proud of all of our Tennessee boys from the highest ranking officer to the last private. They have done their full duty. All honor and all glory to them.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

I cannot go further without expressing my admiration for another great leader in this war.

Not knowing that his life was in danger this is what I intended to say about him in my speech on April 13:

"Some of you, possibly the most of you, like him. Some of you may not; but I am one of his greatest admirers. As a planner, as a diplomat holding all the Allies together, smoothing out the rough places, always in the lead in everything that means the winning of the war, he has the highest place. Of course, I refer to that great man who has been President of the United States longer than any other individual ever was and who has made not only a wonderful success in governing the United States but he has made a wonderful success in winning this war. I refer to Franklin D. Roosevelt, our own President and Commander in Chief."

I reiterate those words now: Mr. Roosevelt was a military leader as well as a civil leader. He had the means of waging war and everyone will admit that he was the great leader of this war. He looked after its every detail. Crippled though he was, he went to all portions of the world in furthering the interests of this war, and my greatest regret is that he did not live to see his final unconditional surrender of Germany and that he will not be here to witness the final and unconditional surrender of Japan, which inevitably must come.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

I now come to the successor of President Roosevelt, President Truman. He has made a splendid start. He has made a fine impression throughout the country. I have no doubt that he has done his duty as he has seen it. He has done many things that the American people wanted done. For instance, as soon as the war was over in Europe he made a recommendation to the Congress that appropriations already made for the war, amounting to something like $7,000,000,000, be canceled. It was a fine start—a splendid start. He has made many other changes and taken many other positions that the American people approve, and my greatest hope is that he will continue to make, and I believe he will make, a splendid President of the United States. If I can say that in view of an appointment that he has recently made in Tennessee, which I opposed, I think any other honest-to-God American citizen can say and hope the same thing.

THE PEACE

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I come now to the peace. America and the various other nations of the world have been writing peace treaties ever since I can remember, and I know from history that they began long before. There have been the most solemn pledges written to keep the peace. Agreements to keep the peace were entered into by Theodore Roosevelt, by Taft, by Harding, by Coolidge, and by all the rest, and yet, whenever any European or any Far Eastern country wants to go to war, they simply call the peace treaties scraps of paper and go on and make war. Perhaps as great a man as I ever knew, the great and immortal Woodrow Wilson, made the greatest efforts to obtain a lasting peace of any man who ever lived. He was already famous, but his advocacy of the League of Nations made him more famous. I was a strong Wilson man, as you all know. I was a strong believer in the League of Nations, as you all know. I fought for it early and late, believed in it then and believe in it now.

The peace treaty that is being prepared, or which may be prepared at San Francisco, is really but a modified version of the League of Nations. I hope they will make an agreement that we can all get behind and stay behind. The agreement itself has but one opportunity to become permanent, and that is for it to have behind it real force and the real force of a nation that is really for peace.

As I have said before, America has the greatest Navy, the greatest Marine Corps, the greatest Army, and the greatest Air Corps in the world, and the greatest production in the world, and we are a peace-loving nation. If we retain our own power and keep our own agreement, the peace of the world will be established, because no nation, or all the nations of the world together, would be willing to make war on us as long as we stand behind the agreement to keep the peace of the world. We might as well be frank about it. We might as well be open about it, and we might as well be honest about it. It takes the American desire for peace and American power behind any peace treaty to make the treaty effective and keep the peace.

It will be remembered that after the First World War Great Britain took advantage of President Harding and had our great battleships sunk, at the same time sinking a few old hulks of her own, and Great Britain thereafter kept the largest navy in the world and America took second place. I regarded that as a mistake then. I did not vote for it. I regard it as a mistake now, and so far as I am concerned I shall never vote to sink or destroy America's first place on the seas or to destroy America's first place in the air, because without America's being in first place and without a sufficient army to look after keeping the peace no peace treaty will be effective.

CHANGES IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, I cannot close this address without saying that we must not let enthusiasm for winning the war interfere with our patriotism for America, or interfere with or have a desire to change American institutions. Bills, resolutions, amendments, and discussions on the Senate and House floors recently have been many and numerous, all wanting to change our form of government. Some want to make it a strong centralized government and reduce the Congress to a body whose principal duty will be the recording of the President's will. One amendment to the Constitution suggests that we allow Cabinet officers to appear on the floor of the House and Senate and advise and vote for or against laws that we pass. Others want to change the powers of the Senate and still others want to change the powers of the House. Some want a Communist government; some want a Socialist government; some want an all-powerful central government. I do not agree with any of these changes. I want a government as the great Lincoln said, "of the people, by the people, and for the people." I want a government as Thomas Jefferson wanted a government—a government of freemen, a government of divided powers, a government of divided duties. I want to continue our democratic government.

Think of it, my friends, the United States in 156 years has grown from the weakest government in the world to the strongest government in the world! It has outgrown all other republics. It has outgrown all kingdoms. It has outgrown all empires, and it has accomplished more than any government that ever existed, and here are some of us living under the freedom and under the beneficent influences and principles of this great government who at the height of its success, at the very zenith of its prosperity, want to change it and go back to a superannuated and out-worn government. Others want to change it to a Communist form of government that has never made a success. Others want a Socialist government, and others want any kind of government just so it is not like the one we have. Oh, my friends do not let us follow after these vagaries. We have been successful but let not success turn our heads. We have been victorious over the nations who would have destroyed us. Let us not destroy ourselves after they have themselves been destroyed. Let us stand by the declaration of principles enunciated by Jefferson in the long ago. Let us stand by the Constitution of our fathers; let us stand by the Government that they established. Let us stand by its principles, its policies, its constitution, and its practices. Let not success turn our heads but make us more careful that we continue in beaten paths, continue to let the people rule, continue in our peaceful ways. And another caution, in the settlement of this great war do not let us give away everything that we have.

OUR DEBTS

We will come out of this war owing some three hundred billion dollars. Let us begin the work right away of reducing and finally paying that debt. Let us not continue to give away our substance. Let us not spend untold billions of money in Europe or Africa or Asia or South America or Australia. Let us be generous to all our neighbors wherever they may be; let us furnish relief wherever it is necessary, but let us not spend our substance in riotous living; let us not spend our substance in giving away money that will never be appreciated. We gave billions to Great Britain after the last war. We gave billions to France in and after the last war. We were generous. We gave billions to Italy after the last war. They did not appreciate it. They never returned any substantial part of it. If we were to give everything we had and mortgage our future for further gifts they would not pay it back and they would not appreciate it, but as soon as it gave out they would begin to figure on war again. Let us be practical; let us be sensible; let us be just; let us be generous, but do not let us be a nation of spendthrifts.

The Hope for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered yesterday in New York City before the American Polish Association in the East.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it a great privilege to be invited to address this great meeting of American-Polish associations. This war began because Poland was unwilling to surrender its freedom to the brutal demands of the Nazi government. No people has suffered such destruction and slavery and systematic extermination as the Polish people. No soldiers have fought with more bravery and determination than Polish soldiers on every front throughout the world. I have had occasion to hear something of the magnificent work of the Polish Army on the Italian front under the inspired leadership of General Anders. The world has seen no more heroic struggle than that conducted by the Polish home army under General Kor-Komorowski in Warsaw.

I cannot express too forcibly my resentment at the disgraceful propaganda which is being carried on in this country today against the Polish people. It has dared to represent them as pro-German, when Poland alone of the occupied nations produced not a single Quisling. Are the memories of our people so short that they cannot remember the year and a half during which Poland fought with the Allies and the Soviet Government supported Germany? This propaganda represents Poland to be reactionary, controlled by a few landed proprietors when, as a matter of fact, it has a greater percentage of small farms than England or France. It has supported the smear against the 16 Polish patriots who were instructed to make themselves known to the Russians to aid the formation of the democratic government agreed to at Yalta. It is a propaganda designed wholly for un-American political purposes without a shred of fact to support it. I can only say to you that the American people and their representatives in Congress are not deceived.

WORLD PEACE IS A NECESSITY

After 5½ years of the most destructive war in the history of the world, the universal longing is for peace. Peace is a necessity because, in the developments of science, was has become so terrible that the alternative to peace may well be the complete destruction of modern civilization. The great problem before the world is how that peace may be best assured. At the end of every war treaties have been written, all purporting to assure perpetual peace between the parties. Time after time international organizations have been established and have failed in their purpose. What we need is not propaganda for some particular scheme, but careful consideration of its soundness and reasonable criticism to improve it. Among the real services that have been performed by the San Francisco Conference is the substitution of argument and careful thought for a propaganda of hullabaloo to convince the people that the words written at Dumbarton Oaks were an unchangeable revelation.

BUT FREEDOM IS EVEN MORE ESSENTIAL THAN PEACE

Peace is vital, but there is one necessity even above peace. That necessity is freedom. The people of the American Colonies preferred freedom to peace in 1776. The people of this country preferred war to slavery in 1861. The Polish people today are not interested in a peace which does not assure their freedom. This is the fundamental objection to a world state. Theoretically, such a state might insure peace more effectively than any international organization, but I would be wholly unwilling to submit the fortunes of the American people to an all-powerful state, with an all powerful army and navy and airforce, the majority of whose citizens would have no sympathy for, or even conception of American ideals. It is inconceivable to me that any statesman can favor a foreign sovereignty over our internal affairs no matter what the safeguards. And a world state would have such sovereignty because it would have all the power. A world state would soon come to have the same power over our citizens which is enjoyed by the Federal Government over the citizens of our 48 States. I hope that there may be no such conflict between peace and freedom in the postwar world, for if there is, the human determination to be free is likely to destroy the peace.

FIVE POLICIES NECESSARY FOR PEACE

What are the necessary steps to our goal of permanent peace? Certainly there is no panacea, and no panacea can be found at San Francisco. Those who claim the proposed United Nations organization to be the solution of every problem are not its real friends. Their propaganda may easily produce a disappointed reaction from the public no matter how desirable may be the results there achieved. There are five principal considerations affecting the hope for peace at this moment:

First. Overwhelming victory in this war is the most important insurance of future peace. The punishment visited upon Germany by modern weapons, and the same punishment which is being visited upon Japan should certainly prevent any nation from going to war for many years to come. Surely, it has become apparent that when any nation starts out to conquer its neighbors and the world, it arouses forces which can only lead to its own destruction. The fate of Germany and Japan will never be forgotten. Our men who have died in the war have not died in vain because the defeat of the aggressors is a lesson the world will not ignore.

Second. There must be created a world public opinion, supported by all powerful peoples, that disputes between nations must be settled, not by war, but by law, by arbitration and by adjudication. I believe that many peoples have reached this conclusion, but evidently some have not. In particular, Russia is unwilling to abandon its right to veto international action on any matter in which it is concerned.

Third. It is essential that the settlement of political boundaries and the freedom of nations be settled justly and with due regard to the right of people to self-determination. If these principles of the Atlantic Charter are not adopted, then we shall have perpetual turmoil and the constant probability of war from political sore spots throughout the world. No permanent peace can be based on national slavery. The peace conference to come, therefore, has even greater importance than that at San Francisco.

Fourth. There must be established a system of sound economic cooperation between nations. While economic causes are not so likely to lead to war as political and national causes, undoubtedly an economic sore spot creates constant protest and dissatisfaction—perhaps forcing a realignment of nations like the Austrian Anschluss. The San Francisco Conference is taking a substantial step in the right direction in the setting up of the Economic and Social Council.

Fifth. On the foundations of the first four steps, there must be constructed an international organization to concern itself with problems which lead to war, and to take action where such action can avert war. Surely an international body, meeting constantly and discussing every threat to peace, can help to move the world in the right direction. But it will have little hope for success unless the foundations are sound upon which it is built.

It is significant that the five conditions I have outlined prevail today in the American Hemisphere. Nations which desire to be free are free, and their boundaries are almost universally satisfactory. There is active economic cooperation. The peoples of America are willing to submit their disputes to a decision by an impartial tribunal. They have created, first by the Pan American Union, and then by the act of Chapultepec, an international organization which promises peace on this continent.

Unfortunately, these conditions do not exist elsewhere in the world today, and so the new international organization starts under a severe handicap. But with victory in this war, I believe it does offer a hope of future peace.

Of the five points that I have reviewed, I believe we can now count on the accomplishment of overwhelming victory.

THERE MUST BE A WILL TO PEACE

But we are not so fortunate in having a world public opinion supporting a law of nations, and demanding that every dispute must be settled by arbitration and adjudication instead of by war. The lack of this public opinion, particularly in Russia, prevents the formation of an ideal international organization. But even in this country our internationalists have emphasized a peace brought about by force, rather than by law and justice.

I have always favored a League of Nations under which all agree that they will submit all disputes to arbitration and adjudication, and that they will abide by the result of an impartial international tribunal. This implies a preliminary unanimous agreement to a law of nations by which disputes may be determined on the basis of justice and not power. If world opinion exists to back such a procedure, the organization should further be empowered to call upon its members to provide force against anyone which does not keep its agreement to abide by an official decision. Undoubtedly, we would have found many people in America unwilling to agree to submit our own international disputes to the decision of a foreign tribunal, but I believe that if the jurisdiction had been carefully defined to exclude matters of internal concern, the American people would have joined such an organization.

The question does not now arise because Russia has refused to go along. Russia has insisted that it must have a veto power over any decision and over the use of force. Consequently, every one of the five great powers is given the same veto power. I don't believe the people of this country have realized how this changes the whole character of the organization. The existence of a veto power, particularly on the rendering of a decision, makes almost impossible the establishment of an international law since nothing can be law from which nations may exempt themselves. Not only is the organization helpless against the great powers of themselves, but it is helpless against all of their satellites. For instance, if Bulgaria, with the consent of Russia, should attack Rumania, Russia could veto any action against Bulgaria, and this might easily be arranged in advance.

Basically, the organization is only an agreement between the powers holding most of the armament of the world to use that armament if they all decide at some future

time that it is in accord with the national policy of all of them to do so. Assume that after the last war, the five great powers would have been the United States, England, France, Italy, and Japan. If Dumbarton Oaks had been in effect, Japan would have vetoed any action against itself for the invasion of Manchuria. Italy would have vetoed any action against itself for the invasion of Ethiopia. In some ways the organization would have been less effective even than the League of Nations whose weakness arose partly from our failure to join.

The truth is that as long as vetoes are insisted upon, there is no real will to peace because there is no willingness to submit the decision of disputes to anything but the arbitrament of force. While that attitude continues, there is little hope of future peace. We can only hope that in time the position of Russia may change. We must admit that they have today some reason to be suspicious that tribunals made up of foreign nations cannot be impartial as between Russia and its neighbors. We can only hope that the continuous conference provided by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will gradually convince Russia and other nations that the people of this world propose to be guided by principles of justice.

THE POLITICAL SETTLEMENTS MUST BE JUST

The second difficulty is that in which Poland is so much concerned, the danger that we may set up political settlements containing in themselves the seeds of future war. We see today the unfortunate acquiescence of the world in the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Russia. We see boundaries apparently determined by unilateral action before the question has been considered by the world. The eastern boundary of Poland is certainly unfair to Poland today. Under the Yalta agreement the boundaries of Germany and of the countries of southwestern Europe were to be settled at the peace conference, but they are being determined on the basis of power and not of justice. It is the apparent intention of Russia to attach the province of Brandenberg to Poland and to establish Poles both in Frankfurt and Stettin. The occupation of that province will provoke a constant protest from the German inhabitants and may give Russia an excuse to maintain an army in Poland to prevent its recovery by Germany.

But even more discouraging is the apparent intention of Russia to dominate the governments of Poland and other countries in eastern Europe by maintaining in power governments whose members' first loyalty is to Russia. No reasonable man can doubt that the Lublin government, headed by a Soviet citizen, will prefer the dictates of Stalin to the wishes of the Polish people. Under such conditions Poland is not free. The loyal members of the underground army under a specious pretext are railroaded to prison and perhaps to death, although they fought as bravely against the Germans as any of our Allies. Surely the best test of freedom is whether the Polish armies fighting throughout the world can return and settle down in their homes in Poland. It is clear that they cannot do so today without the danger of sudden transportaton to Siberia. Under these circumstances Poland is no more free than are Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. How far the same condition exists in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Vienna, and Yugoslavia it is impossible to say. The gravest suspicions are correctly aroused because the Russians have almost completely excluded from these countries not only all independent newspaper reporters, but even the representatives of its allied governments. It is ridiculous to hope that future peace in eastern Europe can be based on the destruction of freedom for many peoples who have been and who yearn to be free.

We can only hope that this condition can be corrected at or before the peace conference. Certainly, we cannot and should not go to war with Russia, but we can take our stand firmly on the principles of international justice, and unless we do the San Francisco Conference is a futile gesture. Before the agreement at Yalta, which was perhaps misunderstood by the Russians, their attitude was entirely different. Surely we can present to them forcibly the reasons why their present policy must be reversed. Incidentally, I see no reason why we should continue lend-lease to Russia under present conditions.

Last Sunday, Winston Churchill made a notable statement of the British position when he said:

"There would be little use in punishing the Hitlerites for their crimes if law and justice did not rule and if totalitarian or police governments were to take the place of the German invaders. * * * We must make sure that those causes which we fought for find recognition at the peace table in facts as well as words. And above all we must labor that the world organization which the United Nations are creating at San Francisco does not become an idle name, does not become a shield for the strong and mockery for the weak."

We can well unite with Mr. Churchill. Our failure to insist upon a fair and just political settlement throughout the world will nullify the finest possible work done at San Francisco.

THE ECONOMIC SOLUTIONS MUST BE SOUND

On the surface the economic problems do not seem to present at the moment the dangers of the political problems. At San Francisco we are setting up an economic and social council which should give continuous study to these problems. Many countries require aid, and undoubtedly that aid must be given in relief and reasonable loans for rehabilitation. I believe the United States should participate in such a policy. But international plans to reform the world overnight and bring freedom from want to millions who hardly know what it means should certainly be critically analyzed, particularly when they are based primarily on the continued outpouring of American billions. Furthermore, there are a lot of dangerous economic fallacies abroad in the world today, and I question whether we should entrust much power to an international board where we have only a minority interest. Mistakes in guiding our economy in the 1920's brought down upon our heads the conditions of hardship and depression which contributed to the causes of a Second World War. In my opinion, a completely unsound plan like that of the international stabilization fund imposed upon the nations by our Treasury officials and the British delegation at Bretton Woods is more likely to hamper peace than to assist it.

In the long run, every country will have to solve its own economic problems. All we can do is to advise and help. Any country can ruin itself economically or can fail to take advantage of its opportunities. Too much aid may only postpone the adoption of sound policies. Loans should only be made of a size which can reasonably be expected to be paid. If they are so large as to lead to repudiation, they have only created an artificial inflation, both in this country and abroad, and the reaction will produce depression and hardship. Undoubtedly, tariffs and restraints on trade should be reduced as far as possible, but they cannot be abolished without ruining industries and forcing unemployment. It is ridiculous to claim that the rejection of the further tariff reduction provided in the reciprocal trade acts, or the rejection of Bretton Woods, in any way implies an unwillingness to cooperate with other nations or has any great bearing on future peace. Economic conditions are in no way the threat to peace which are the political outrages to which I have referred; and they can be constantly improved. The question of sound methods of increasing trade should be studied by the economic and social council before vast and untried experiments are adopted.

A UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION MUST BE ESTABLISHED

The fifth step toward peace is the formation of an international organization with the responsibility for maintaining peace. I cannot emphasize too often that this cannot be a cure-all, and is only one step in the whole program. Machinery is important, but there can be no doubt that the next generation will only remain at peace if they have the will to peace and the public opinion of that generation continuously demands the proper use of the machinery. But with all the handicaps arising from unsolved problems in the political field, and the unwillingness of key nations to agree to submit their disputes to lawful decision and abide by the results, I believe that the San Francisco Conference has done a great job and is proposing a plan which should be approved by the people and the Senate of the United States.

I do not believe that the failure to solve the other problems at San Francisco in any ground to refuse to proceed with this international organization, for I do not find that it freezes any injustices or prevents a constant effort to correct abuses. It is difficult to analyze the exact nature of the new organization. It is certainly not the establishment of law among nations with a provision for legal enforcement. As originally prepared at Dumbarton Oaks, the proposals apparently avoided entirely the concept of international law or justice. Even now there is no covenant on the part of the nations concerned to observe international law, but only to seek a solution of their problems by peaceful means. In determining issues, the Council is to be guided by considerations only of peace and security. Conceivably it could make a completely unjust decision if it felt that such injustice would maintain the peace. Many amendments have been proposed, and I believe many adopted, emphasizing the importance of law and justice, but I doubt if they change the fundamental concept of force and opportunism which dominated the draftsmen of Dumbarkton Oaks.

This all becomes of much less importance, however, because of the veto power given to each major nation. This veto changes the whole nature of the organization, and since we can veto any decision taken we can obviously prevent the abuses which might otherwise arise from a policy of opportunism. But it cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination that the new agreement establishes a rule of law throughout the world.

It does not seem to me that the new organization removes any of the causes of war. It is far from the ideals advanced in the resolution of the Republican Party adopted at Mackinac. All the nations agree to is to talk together and try to settle their disputes amicably; and to use force if all the large powers agree together that force ought to be used. But serious war can probably result only from aggression of one of the big powers which can veto action against itself or its satellites, and, therefore, the new association is powerless to prevent the development of any real world war.

Nevertheless, it is infinitely better than a military alliance, and it is not a military alliance for a number of reasons. We are not obligated to join Russia or England, either in an offensive or a defensive war, because we can exercise our veto. If a war arises through some nation attempting by force to correct a gross injustice in the peace settlement, even though that nation be an aggressor, we can refuse to permit the use of the new machinery against her. We are obligated to prevent a revolution to secure freedom, or adjust obviously unfair boundary settlements. We do not have to go to the

defense of any nation whose policies we disapprove.

In short, while there may be injustices in the treaty of peace, and political and economic sore spots throughout the world, there is nothing in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which freezes that condition, or guarantees the status quo, or requires us to take any action leading to war unless at that time our national policy so decrees.

Furthermore, it is not a military alliance because the policy of the organization must be determined in the open after consultation with all the nations of the world. With the exception of Germany and Japan, it is hoped that all the nations may soon become members. Any question may be brought to the attention of the council by any nation, and on that council are representatives of small nations as well as large. A military alliance would be likely soon to produce a counter-alliance until the world again is divided into two camps. If a few nations try to run the whole international organization with a high hand, there is still danger of that result. But it seems most unlikely to occur, for the assembly and the council will presumably afford continuously a forum where questions can be brought into the open and freely discussed.

The great advantage of the organization as I see it is that it does provide a continuing body with representatives accredited from every nation in the world, giving constant consideration to the situation which may lead to war, and taking constant thought as to the means by which those problems may be solved and war prevented. While the veto power makes it possible to nullify the use of force, nevertheless, the presumption is that some action will be taken when unwarranted aggression by a small power occurs, and at least such action will be constantly considered and may serve as a deterrent to aggression by smaller powers.

Under all these circumstances, I believe that the Senate should ratify the treaty, preserving the power of Congress over the American member of the council if his decision is likely to involve us in a distant or major war. Since we do not agree to abide by any law or the decision of any international tribunal, the exercise of the veto power becomes frankly and clearly a question of national policy on each decision relating to the use of force. If that decision involves the question of going to war, and not a mere police operation in the Americas, it should only be determined by Congress. That, however, is a matter for the statute of ratification rather than the agreement itself.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES ARE NEEDED

I frankly do not understand the reasons for the objections made to the establishment of regional conferences. The nations of the American continent agreed to enter into a league which does establish a rule of law and justice between nations, and does contain a willingness to abide by the decisions of an international tribunal. It proposes exactly the kind of set-up which we would like to have throughout the entire world. I cannot see why the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, with its emphasis on force, should permit anyone to veto the operations of such a league.

It is completely different from the bilateral treaties such as that between Russia and Czechoslovakia which are to be freely permitted. It is utterly unlike a so-called Arab league made up of a limited number of nations, but not all of the nations in the area. Mr. Churchill once proposed a Council of Europe. I should think that San Francisco could permit subsidiary leagues if they included all the states in some continental or other world area. Probably the possible areas should be limited to four or five. If all the nations of Europe or all the nations in the Far East can work out a regional agreement like that of Chapultepec, I see no reason why it should not be permitted. Of course, if such a league fails to maintain peace in its area, and disturbances within that area threaten the peace of the world, the World Security Council should be able to step in, subject to the power of veto. But I believe that the Amercan people will hesitate a long time before they send another army to Europe, for instance, in some minor European disturbance, until they are convinced that that disturbance really threatens the peace of the world. Certainly we should not go unless invited by a substantial majority of European nations. The whole league would be stronger through the existence of subsidiary regional conferences on a continental scale. Those who are hampering the establishment of an American conference for fear that it will injure the prestige of a world council do not aid the cause of peace. They are putting their whole confidence in the big stick of the major powers although it is almost completely nullified by the existence of the veto.

I may say further that the whole league will be nullified if it permits the making of bilateral military alliances unless they are related directly and exclusively to the enforcement of the occupation and disarmament of Germany and Japan. This is certainly the effect of the Soviet-French treaty, but the Soviet-Czechoslovakia treaty may be much more broadly construed, almost as an offensive and defensive alliance against any state which the Soviet considers to be Fascist. It should be clearly understood that it is only to be construed as an agreement to enforce the treaty against Germany.

PEACE DEPENDS ON ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING A LAW OF NATIONS

In conclusion, I believe the result of the war assures peace for a number of years. We must insist that that peace be just to Poland and all of the United Nations. The hope for world peace 25 years from now cannot be so strong, but the most favorable element is the creation of the international organization. We may hope that this will gradually allay the suspicions of the peoples who come to know each other around the council table and lead them finally to a willingness to abide by a code of law and justice. We may hope that it will lead to a gradual correction of some of the terrible political mistakes which apparently are to be made. We may certainly hope that through the economic and social council assistance may be given to the handicapped nations and a much higher standard of education and economic happiness established throughout the world. The failure to accomplish at this time all that is essential for ultimate success should not prevent the setting up of this great organizations.

But if it is established, we cannot sit back in the delusion that it insures peace. We must correct the evils which have grown and will grow out of the present war. We must go on to remove the fundamental causes of war. We must educate the world to a willingness to live by law, and in our educational processes we must emphasize continuously the necessity of nations abiding by the principles of law. We must not come to rely entirely on force, which, without justice, can only lead again to war.

Tribute to Senator Borah by Paul Mallon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter paying well-deserved tribute to the late Senator Borah by the well-known and much respected columnist, Mr. Paul Mallon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 15, 1945.

Mr. RAY MCKAIG,
Borah Memorial Statue
Commission of Idaho, Boise, Idaho

DEAR MR. MCKAIG: I am glad for the opportunity to add my estimate of Senator Borah to your symposium.

I knew him well as a reporter covering the Senate for the United Press for more than 10 years. I have some incidents in mind such as you requested, but none would serve to tell you of my reactions to the long contact with this great, underestimated man.

There is not much to single out and say that particular thing was Borah's work. There is no Borah law, for instance, which history will remember, no single cause of surpassing consequence, no unique great work. He was only a participant with others in the League of Nations fight, and not the leader of it.

Yet no man so greatly influenced the thinking of his time—his important time, 1917 to 1932. His mind reached out penetratingly to the heart of every problem in every corner of the earth. What he said or thought was what other men did. The Harding Disarmament Conference, for instance, was his conception alone. His was the generative spirit of the world course for more than a decade.

His views were so earnestly sought by all, he was the only official in all my time in Washington accustomed to holding daily press conferences. The President and other officials generally held these twice a week. But the newsmen sought him daily, not only on domestic problems but on remote internal questions of far-flung nations and peoples, so great was his acknowledged authority on all these affairs—an authority which was not gained by personal inspection, for he never left these shores.

I have heard many men question his stature because of what they thought was a personal tendency to avoid action. They do not know the measure of the man. His was a greatness beyond easy detection, the man who guided the theories of an era.

All good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL MALLON.

Why Sacrifice National Defense Under Trade-Agreement Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the statement of Russell B. Brown, general counsel, Independent Petroleum Association of America, on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, before the House Ways and Means Committee:

I am Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, which association is composed of the independent producers of crude petroleum and a few companies whose opera-

tions include refining and marketing as well as producing. These latter are known in the industry as independent companies.

This association was formed in 1929 when the principal problem affecting the independent producers was imports of oil from South America and Mexico. It sought and obtained the opportunity to discuss this problem with the Congress in hearings appropriate to the subject. In 1932 an excise tax of ½-cent per gallon was imposed by Congress on imports of crude oil and fuel oil and 2½ cents per gallon on gasoline.

The tax on gasoline has not been changed but under the reciprocal trade agreement with Venezuela in 1939 the excise tax on crude oil and fuel oil was reduced 50 percent as to a specified amount, making it ¼-cent per gallon, or 10½ cents per barrel.

That is the slender and the only protection which the oil producers of the United States have today against whatever deluge of foreign oil may be turned against them when military necessities shall have decreased substantially, making available the foreign oil for civilian use and freeing the tankers to carry it. The proposal in H. R. 2652 to authorize 50 percent changes from tariffs and duties existing on January 1, 1945, would confer discretion to reduce the excise tax on crude and fuel oil to 5¼ cents per barrel, or ⅛-cent per gallon.

The trade agreement with Venezuela provides for the importation at the reduced rate of 10½ cents per barrel of an amount of crude and fuel oil equal to 5 percent of the refinery runs in the preceding calendar year. This formula would permit the importers to bring in 228,000 barrels daily this year at the low rate. There is no limit to the amount that can be imported at the full rate of 21 cents per barrel.

We do not recognize that originally in the passage of the Trade Agreements Act it was intended to apply to the excise or import tax on petroleum and its products. In due time and in appropriate manner we expect to raise again the entire question of the desirability or appropriateness of such law. We do not feel that in this time of extreme war emotion it is desirable to attempt greatly to change or modify existing laws under which we are now operating, nor do we recognize this as a proper time for the fixation, great extension, or enlargement of such laws.

That is our situation, and the independent producers over the country are fearful of the future. Because of our apprehensions, we make the following recommendations:

1. That the executive authority to alter tariff structures in percentage or rate and the authority to transfer to or from dutiable lists be at least confined to that which it now is.

2. That the extension of the act, if extended, be for a period of less than the 3 years proposed in H. R. 2652.

3. That the act be amended to require Senate approval of all trade agreements which may be negotiated, and that provision be made for periodical reviews by the Congress of the operations of trade agreements and their effect upon industry and agriculture of the United States.

Whatever authority is provided will be used to the fullest extent. If through technical constructions it can be exceeded, that may be done. We in the petroleum industry have already had our experience with the noncompliance with what we believed was an express understanding. The Honorable Cordell Hull, early in 1940, assured the chairman of this committee, in writing, that in the event of a threat to industry—and the petroleum industry was specifically mentioned—through the operation of the trade agreement with Venezuela, remedial action would be taken by those in charge of the trade agreements. He said that the so-called escape clause provided ample protection to our industry.

The injury we feared did develop. Imports were increased under the reduced duty to the point where their effect on the domestic crude oil producing industry was direct and provable. In the month that the Venezuelan trade agreement was announced, November 1939, imports of oil averaged 165,000 barrels per day. They reached a high point of 289,000 barrels daily in December of the next year. The daily averages by years for 1939 and 1940 were 162,000 barrels and 229,000 barrels respectively. In November 1940 an official of one of the importing companies, in a letter addressed "To Those From Whom We Purchase Oil" declared that, "In our opinion, present conditions in the industry are worse than at any time since the chaotic days of serious overproduction in east Texas when the price of crude was driven far below the average cost of production."

The growing imports contributed directly to this condition. We appealed to the committee on reciprocity information and supplied the factual data to support our appeal. Our protests and evidence were disregarded. It was the familiar pattern of delegation of delegated authority without review by the source of that authority where the remote agency is entirely unresponsive to the legislative intent. Under this system of trade-agreement management, Mr. Hull was unable to prevent the great injury which he had so earnestly agreed to prevent. When we made our protest, Mr. Hull was closely occupied with the many phases of international relations and the drift toward war and it is possible that he heard nothing of our problem.

The last official figures that were released on imports covered the first 9 months of 1941. Then for reasons of military security they were withheld. For that period, however, the trend was still upward, averaging 252,000 barrels daily. Not long after the close of that period we believe there was an abrupt decline; the submarines and not the State Department being responsible for the drop in imports.

Imports of petroleum have long been a part of the oil supply of the United States. At times, and particularly in those years prior to the imposition of the excise tax on oil in 1932, there were imports of such volume as to depress the domestic price and cause severe hardship to the domestic industry.

The proposition that the domestic industry cannot compete on even terms with large-volume foreign production cannot be controverted and, in fact, no attempt has been made to dispute the contention. The domestic producer faces several factors which defeat him at the outset of any contest on even terms. One of those factors is a natural one—it is a matter of geology and the physical forces which formed and stored petroleum and reservoirs. The foreign oil fields which have contributed most to the imports stream entering the United States have been of the large volume per well type. Competition with production from fields so produced negatives and tends to undermine and destroy our own conservation program now recognized as so valuable to our own safety. The advantage of the big volume wells in respect to cost has been still greater in more recent years because of this conservation policy adopted by the domestic industry and written into the laws of nearly all of the oil-producing States. Under this policy, producing rates have been held at levels which would make effective use of the natural energy in the oil reservoirs and add to the total ultimate yield of oil from the reservoir.

Other factors which distinguish the business of producing oil in the United States in comparison with that in foreign fields is the high wage standard and high taxes.

Competition with foreign sources on even terms would be possible only by reduction of domestic costs to the level of those in foreign fields, which would, of course, mean a substantial reduction in the wage and salary rates in the oil industry of the United States, and a reduction in taxes. I am certain both these methods would be rejected if proposed.

The alternative—the only alternative—if the domestic industry is to be encouraged, is protection from the disproportionate cost of foreign oil. That could be accomplished in two ways: by subsidy from the public treasury to be paid on all the oil produced here, or by a tariff or excise tax which would tend to put imported oil on the same footing as domestic oil. I believe the choice here is a simple one.

That oil will be imported there is no doubt, nor is our position one of opposing all imports. We recognize the practical aspects of the situation. Imports on a scale that will not usurp too great a part of the market for domestic oil have their place in the general flow of international trade. The point should be preserved, however, that any volume of imports, produced at costs markedly less than in the fields of the United States, operates to affect realizations of the domestic producer.

We have good reason to be fearful of the menace of foreign oil in the postwar period. Realization of such fear need not wait on final victory in the Pacific. There will be available for entrance into civilian channels of consumption a far greater volume of oil in South America and in the Middle East than ever before. It has also been suggested in a recent Department of Commerce publication that Russia may become an exporter of oil, and other articles by the staff of that Department have indicated that Russian discoveries of petroleum fields have in recent years added enormously to that country's resources.

Under the stimulus of war's needs for petroleum, our Government has given great aid and encouragement to the development of foreign reserves. This has not been confined to any single area. In the Caribbean region, particularly in Venezuela and Colombia, great emphasis was placed on drilling, pipe-line construction, and refinery expansion. Aid has been given to Mexico, both in financing and in obtaining equipment, in the expansion of the Government-owned petroleum resources and their utilization. In Arabia and other oil regions of the Middle East, expansion and greater production were stimulated.

All these measures were necessary. It was imperative to the war effort that petroleum be obtained in the places where it was most accessible to the military and naval forces of the Allied Nations. But the stimulated and enlarged oil-producing capacity in these foreign areas is not a matter for the duration of the war only. The fruits of this endeavor will remain long after the war's end in the form of a great potential production, proved and substantially developed, and the owners and operators of the resources, spurred on by the governments of the countries in which the fields are located, will be seeking an outlet.

Our Government has, therefore, as part of the war effort given stimulus to foreign development and has thus enlarged the danger which the domestic petroleum producer has faced for years. It has been an enormous enlargement.

Ours is the best, the most concentrated market for petroleum in the entire world. The last complete registration statistics are for January 1, 1944, when the total of passenger cars, busses, and trucks in the United States was 30,136,500. The latest available figures for the entire world outside the United States, as published by the Automobile Manufacturers Association (quoting Department of Commerce figures) was 10,309,670 passenger cars, busses, and trucks. Thus, for each vehicle outside the United States, there were 3 in this country.

I quote these figures merely to lend point to the previous assertion that the United States is the greatest and best developed, the easiest to reach market in the world. It is

an alluring market. What is there available—or soon to be available—to seek entrance in this market?

There is the Caribbean area, nearest to us, with a present producing capacity of nearly 1,000,000 barrels a day. This is the highest rate in the history of that region. What the Middle East could produce we have no close estimate. There has been no time, since the first fields were found in that oil-rich region, when the producing capacity did not exceed the market, so far as I can ascertain. The indicated reserves, according to Dr. E. DeGolyer, who was head of a mission to that area in the winter of 1943–44, were twenty-five to twenty-seven billion barrels. The production from the fields of Iran, Iraq, Bahrein, and Saudi Arabia has recently been stated to be more than 400,000 barrels daily. In a recently published article, Mr. H. D. Collier, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, which company is co-owner of the Arabian-American Oil Co., said that the Arabian and Bahrein production was then more than 60,000 barrels a day and would be approximately doubled late this year. There is every probability that the Middle East production could be increased to 1,000,000 barrels daily.

I have not mentioned the oil resources of the Dutch and British East Indies and Burma, which are now in the hands of the Japanese. In due course, these fields will be recaptured and rehabilitated and will add substantially to the oil which is available in the markets of the world.

The ability of South American producers in the past to capture the markets of the United States through lower costs is well known to the oil industry. It may be a somewhat startling thought that the same is true of Middle East oil. Mr. Ralph T. Zook, president of the association which I represent, has made a careful study of the economics of foreign oil production and he asserts that oil from the Persian Gulf area can be delivered f. o. b. New York by tanker at an out-of-pocket cost of $1.17½ per barrel." In comparison with oil from the east Texas field, which has a difference in refinery realization of 20 cents per barrel, Middle East oil would represent a figure of $1.37½ per barrel. But, east Texas crude oil is now $1.64 per barrel f. o. b. New York Harbor and the Middle East producer has an advantage of 26½ cents per barrel. He found that oil from the Middle East could be shipped to Los Angeles Harbor at a cost advantage of 25½ cents per barrel over that of two representative grades of California oil.

I attach to this statement that portion of a recent address by Mr. Zook in which he presented the results of his study of costs and probable potential production of the principal foreign areas. In this study are the reasons for our fears concerning the future of the oil industry of the United States.

In the late twenties the philosophy of reservation of our oil supply and usage of large amounts of foreign oil was being advanced by some in Government. Some of the large oil companies, particularly those with foreign holdings, favored and actively supported that philosophy. The Congress, after much study of the question, decided to give encouragement to the rest of the oil industry of the United States. The issues were fully and openly debated.

Our war experience has demonstrated the wisdom of the decision made by the Congress in 1932. Had the markets of the United States been used as the dumping ground for foreign oil, discovery and development effort at home would have been ended or so restricted as to make us dependent in war upon foreign sources. As it was we had an established producing capacity that has not only provided for all our military needs but those of our allies as well in a period when no other was available.

In fact, I believe the war would have been lost without our oil. We have been the principal and at times the only supplier. For a long time the British-developed reserves in the Midle East were not available to Great Britain. Japan seized the oil fields of the East Indies and Burma. Russian oil was available to Russia alone and the submarines prevented any substantial movement from the Caribbean area.

An assured supply of oil equal to any emergency is essential. Doubtless there is no disagreement with that statement. Oil is so firmly integrated into the national security that it must be the wish of every citizen that there be at all times the assurance of plenty within our own borders.

Thus far the military needs have been satisfied. It has been necessary to ration civilian supply severely and to draw heavily on above-ground stocks, but the supply program has been met.

Of that achievement the oil industry of the United States is proud. It lays claim to credit only for performance of a duty to the Nation. It indulges in no undue heroics in the matter. It does ask now for consideration of the problems it faces in the immediate future.

In the sense that the excess producing capacity established before the war has been used up, we have a loss in ability to produce. The continuation of the present demand will mean a decline from present high rate of production. That is anticipated for this year. It is imperative that the industry set to work as speedily as possible to repair the inroads that have been made on our producing ability.

The domestic producers have been weakened. They have gone through the war to date under a frozen price and without allowance for their increased costs. Many of them have sold their properties to stronger companies, chiefly those engaged in refining and selling products. It is rare and unusual that one engaged exclusively in producing oil buys the properties of another.

It is still the hope of these producers that their needs will be recognized by those who control prices. To carry on the campaign that is needed for the restoration of the national position in capacity to produce oil, more money than is now available will be needed. It comes from one source—the sale of crude oil.

It requires the exertion of "multiple effort," as one authority on oil discovery has termed it, to produce results; in other words, a great many operators drilling hundreds of wells to test new territory.

I have said that the financial resources of the independent producers have been weakened during the war. It is going to cost more to replace through new discoveries the oil they produced and sold during the war than they realized during this period.

They hope for an improvement in price, but that improvement would be nullified if they became unable, through large imports, to sell the oil they found and produced. The machinery of discovery and development quickly falls apart unless used fully.

The program of unrestricted imports of oil which has been advocated by some is supported by them on two principal grounds. First, they say, we should conserve our oil resources and use those of other nations. Second, we should encourage trade with nations whose principal offering of commodities in world markets is petroleum.

As to the first proposal, it would mean merely the reservation, not conservation, of the reserves that have been found. The oil resources of this Nation would be frozen and they would not be increased. Men do not discover new fields and lock them up. We would cease to find fields and the undiscovered reserves would remain undiscovered.

The first impact of large-volume imports would fall upon the reserves, whose daily yield per well is small. The so-called stripper fields would be the first to be abandoned. Much is being done with these fields through secondary recovery methods of increasing the daily and the ultimate yield. The recoverable oil in such fields is estimated at four to five billion barrels. Progressively, through natural decline of the larger-volume producers, this class of reserves is increased. Every field in time becomes a stripper field. Three-fourths of all the oil-producing wells in the United States today are of the stripper variety. These would be the first to go. With them would go the mainstay of hundreds of communities.

The Nation cannot afford to lose so great a reserve of oil.

The stimulus to foreign trade would be more than balanced by the loss at home. The oil-producing industry is a large employer of men and women of many skills and crafts. Most of them would not choose to seek livelihoods in foreign countries. The oil-producing industry annually pays out many millions of dollars to landowners for the privilege of present and future exploration and development and in the landowners' share of the oil produced. This type of farm income could be greatly curtailed with a large enough volume of imports. The oil-producing industry is a principal taxpayer in several States and an important one in many more. Revenue derived from oil production is of great consequence in the support of many public and endowed educational institutions in many parts of the country. Great public injury would be done through a program of unrestricted imports of petroleum without equalization of cost of production. This is important to millions of our people.

From the standpoint of the consumer it is fortunate that there is a wide distribution of oil reserves in the United States. Their location avoids the shortages that could occur because of transportation difficulties. During this war the East and the Northeast—the shortage area, as it has been known—suffered restrictions earlier and more severely than those parts of the country in which substantial quantities of oil are produced. Let us consider for a moment the effect of a program of substantial dependence upon low-cost imports. As I have said, the producing industry here would be affected to the extent that search for new fields would be curtailed and perhaps almost ended. The higher-cost producing properties would be shut in or abandoned; low price invariably leads to the sale of equipment salvaged from producing wells. The supply of oil needed for the inland refineries would speedily decline.

Just a few of the refining companies are in position to use foreign oil—a bare half-dozen. Imports of oil historically have not been available to any except the companies that produce the oil and transport it to their refineries. The oil production in Venezuela, for instance, is not offered to anyone who would buy it. Venezuela has no domestic oil industry; it consists of American and British and Dutch companies who hold concessions, operate them and refine the oil in their plants. Whatever oil other refiners in this country would get would be at the discretion and through the kindliness of the producers in foreign countries. I can think of no more effective way of establishing monopoly.

To show the ownership of refining facilities in 34 States of this country as between companies with foreign producing position and those who rely solely on domestic crude oil, I submit a table which we have compiled from the latest published report on refinery ownership and capacity. It should be explained that ownership of refining capacity of a stated amount by a company with foreign production is not a guaranty that all its requirements could be met from foreign production. Generally, the coastal plants would be the ones which would utilize foreign oil. The capacity of these is great enough to handle a volume of imports that could wreck the domestic industry.

We in the petroleum industry of the United States have no fear of exhaustion of our domestic resources; our fear is that we shall not be encouraged to find and develop them. We believe that there are great reserves yet to be found. We are greatly impressed with the size of the unexplored areas.

Numerous specious arguments have been published in the past 2 or 3 years by some who would look everywhere except at home for oil. They have attempted to prove that we are on our last gasp in the discovery of oil. It would be an undue use of time on this occasion to debate whether we will ultimately have produced 100,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum in the United States (to date we have produced slightly more than 30,000,000,000 barrels), as one outstanding authority has predicted, or a greater or lesser amount. We know that under encouraging conditions the oilmen keep on finding oil and, historically, they have found the most when the incentives were best. We also know that unless th exploratory effort be exerted, discoveries will not be made. It would be a simple task to become a "have not" nation in respect to petroleum supply.

Back of the natural petroleum we have a second line of defense. We have enormous natural gas and coal reserves and huge quantities of oil shales. The Seventy-eighth Congress authorized a Government program to cost $30,000,000 to conduct research in synthetic motor fuels in plants to be built to adapt known techniques and if possible to improve on them. That work, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, is under way. Much is already known of methods of producing gasoline from coal and oil shale; numerous foreign countries lacking petroleum supplies have relied in part on such resources for years. The commercial conversion of natural gas to liquid products is not far off.

We have that second line of defense against shortage. Would it not be national folly to establish any policy that would wreck the first line—the discovery and production of crude petroleum?

Daily crude-oil capacity of refining industry in the United States

[Source: Oil and Gas Journal, Mar. 31, 1945]

State	Number of plants	Total crude-oil refinery capacity (barrels daily)	Total capacity owned by companies having substantial foreign production
Arkansas	6	45,800	None
California	49	886,950	530,500
Colorado	8	14,860	3,000
Georgia	1	4,000	None
Idaho	1	2,100	None
Illinois	19	302,150	188,000
Indiana	8	352,200	80,000
Kansas	19	191,400	49,000
Kentucky	9	58,750	5,000
Louisiana	17	271,030	155,000
Maryland	4	62,900	45,000
Massachusetts	2	55,000	35,000
Michigan	20	99,500	25,000
Minnesota	2	4,500	None
Mississippi	1	3,000	None
Missouri	1	25,000	None
Montana	12	38,630	20,000
Nebraska	6	9,000	None
New Jersey	5	258,000	161,000
New Mexico	8	18,150	None
New York	7	77,700	68,500
Ohio	10	215,200	48,000
Oklahoma	26	192,160	27,100
Pennsylvania	24	407,900	135,000
Rhode Island	2	6,900	5,500
South Carolina	1	6,000	6,000
South Dakota	1	100	None
Tennessee	2	6,500	None
Texas	88	1,506,850	1,007,900
Utah	4	17,900	None
Washington	1	5,000	None
West Virginia	4	14,300	None
Wisconsin	1	6,000	None
Wyoming	29	82,060	33,400
Total	398	5,247,430	2,627,900

A Guaranteed Beef-Production Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has been a pioneer in an effort to bring relief to the thousands, even millions, who have a just complaint by reason of the serious food shortages.

The subcommittee, having under consideration the meat problem, have made a report to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, which is complete and comprehensive. I am asking that it be printed as an extension of my remarks.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 18, 1945

A GUARANTEED BEEF-PRODUCTION PROGRAM

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee submits this report based on investigation of beef production by a subcommittee composed of Representatives J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado, chairman; FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, and FRANK L. SUNDSTROM, of New Jersey.

The committee finds that the major bottleneck to adequate beef production is in the feeding of beef cattle. It recommends: (1) Establishment immediately of an incentive program under which feeders of beef cattle can operate; (2) a guarantee that the program will be maintained during the feeding period; and (3) enactment of law requiring such a guaranteed program if responsible administrative agencies do not take action voluntarily.

There have been many suggestions, both official and unofficial, for relieving the meat famine now gripping almost all parts of the country. Some of these suggestions are good and should bring about long-range improvement, if adopted. Among them, establishment of a single head to have full and exclusive jurisdiction over all matters relating to the production and distribution of food has long been recommended by this committee.

It is obvious that the only way to bring about real improvement in the situation is to increase the production and weight of good beef animals coming to market. It is equally obvious that new regulations and controls which do not remove that bottleneck will not add substantially to the retail supply of this country, and are mere empty gestures, designed to make the public think something is being done while the officials responsible sit and wait in hope that a heavy crop of pigs this fall or home production of rabbits will relieve the situation.

Evidence presented to this committee indicates conclusively that the major bottleneck in our beef supply is in the operation known as "feeding." Under normal conditions, range cattle do not move directly to slaughter. They are shipped east into the corn belt and adjacent States and there are fed grain, hay, and concentrated feed for several months. During this period the animal puts on from 300 to 400 pounds of weight. Since practically full growth has been reached before feeding starts, this extra poundage is almost all edible meat.

This feeding operation should continue for a period of 4 to 12 months. Unless it is carried out for that length of time, animals arrive at the slaughterhouse underweight or only "grass fat," with a far lower ratio of good meat to bone and offal than should be the case. This is the condition in which most of our beef is now reaching the slaughterhouses.

As long as this condition continues, those who depend on city markets for their beef may expect to have limited supplies, an excessive proportion of ox tails and other undesirable cuts, and generally inferior quality in what they are able to buy—for this is the kind of meat unfed animals produce.

This is the situation that exists now and will continue to exist until Government officials take the steps that are necessary to remove the squeeze on beef feeders that is limiting production, and permit cattle once again to be fattened for market.

Plenty of feed for these cattle is available—is, indeed, going to waste now in the Corn Belt because it is not being fed. But before this necessary operation can again be resumed, cattle feeders must be assured of two things:

1. A fair margin of profit for their operation.

2. A guaranty that the rules will not be changed in the middle of the game—a guaranteed production program for at least 6 months.

Unlike the range operator, who has no other occupation to which he can turn—and whose cattle are going to breed, calve, and grow into feeders in spite of OPA—cattle feeders do not have to buy cattle and feed them. They can use their hay and grain for other purposes. It is a purely voluntary operation and a risk they will not assume unless they can anticipate a reasonable profit on their labor and capital.

There is nothing in the past performance or present regulations of OPA and WFA to make cattle feeders believe they can make a profit or even avoid a loss, on normal feeding of cattle into good and choice market beef. Evidence presented to this committee within the past few days indicates that feeders are not now undertaking the risk of normal feeding and have no intention of doing so until they are allowed a reasonable margin and guaranteed that the rules will not be changed during the feeding period.

Under present OPA price structures cattle feeders are caught between the lower millstone of demand forcing the price of lean cattle up to the OPA ceiling, and the top millstone of being compelled to sell fat cattle at that same ceiling.

OPA officials do not understand, apparently, the fact that a feeder cannot make a profit merely on the added weight his corn, wheat, and hay put onto the animal. The cost of feed alone is far greater than the market price of the 300 or 400 pounds of added weight. Feeders can operate only when their feeding increases the value of the whole weight of the animal by improving the quality, so that they receive a higher market price per hundred pounds for the whole animal than they paid.

Normally, a feeder may pay $11 or $12 per hundred pounds for cattle coming from the ranges, feed them 4 to 6 months, and sell them as choice or good beef for $15 or $16 per hundred pounds. He can make a living doing that. But he can't make a living if the demand for all cattle—even unfed cattle—forces the price of the stock he must buy up to the price of good or choice beef.

Under present OPA price regulations, there is no distinction between poor cattle and those which grade good or choice. If a packer wants to pay the ceiling for a lean cow that should be going to the feed lots, he can do so—and he cannot pay any higher price for a well-fattened choice steer. This

price squeeze must be adjusted before feeders will again do their accustomed part in bringing cattle to market.

But adjustment of price is not enough. There must be a flat guaranty by OPA and WFA that the price structure and the rules of operation will not be changed to the detriment of the feeder before he has had a chance to turn out a crop. Cattle feeding is a risky business at best. Those engaged in it have carefully calculated the risks they are taking from disease, market demands, feed supplies, and other normal factors. They are familiar with these risks and are willing to take them. But they can't predict the risk of an OPA theorist suddenly changing his ideas about how cattle should be produced, or of a new set of economists suddenly getting the upper hand in OPA and writing their own notions into the regulations. Before cattle feeders will again go into the business of providing good and choice beef for our tables they must have the assurance of the Government that the rules are not going to be changed in the middle of the game.

This policy of a guaranteed program has been applied to vegetables. After conflicting and constantly changing OPA prices and regulations had reduced truck farming to chaos and brought about unnecessary shortages of several important vegetables, Congress wrote into the law the requirement that OPA must announce its minimum ceilings on vegetables at least 15 days before planting time and not reduce them beyond that point during the remainder of the season.

The act by Congress forced OPA to permit stabilization of vegetable prices. It gave growers the assurance that they would be able to operate at a reasonable profit—and our supply of vegetables has not since then been seriously threatened.

But while vegetable growers can plant their seeds with the assurance that OPA will not be permitted to reduce ceilings below a stated minimum, or otherwise change the rules to their detriment before the crop is ready to market, feeders of beef cattle are expected to invest their money in expensive livestock, buy vast quantities of feeds and hay, and take all the normal risk of their business, without any assurance whatever that the rules will not be changed before their crop is ready for market. It just doesn't make sense.

Feeders have lost confidence in Government policies—and with just cause. In the late summer of 1944, just when they should have been buying their cattle for winter and spring feeding, there began to be open discussion in administration circles about establishing ceiling prices on live cattle. Stock raisers didn't like the idea of ceilings, but asked that if they were going to be imposed, action be taken immediately, so they could plan for the future.

In spite of their pleas for action, O. P. A. and the other agencies concerned delayed and quibbled among themselves. It was not until January 29, 1945, that ceilings were finally established. During those 5 months of delay and administrative indecision cattle feeders had no idea what kind of celings would eventually be established. They were prudent enough not to undertake long-range feeding under such uncertain conditions, and we are reaping the result today in a growing scarcity of beef for civilian use.

Since then there have been two other major changes in the price structure and the regulations governing production of beef—one on April 1, 1945, and another on April 23, 1945. The latter is the much-advertised "10-point plan" to solve the meat shortage, that has had no effect whatever on increasing supplies and is obviously so inadequate that it, too, must soon be revised or supplanted.

Beef cattle feeders cannot do business under those conditions. The only sensible conclusion is that they must be given an inducement to fatten cattle, and a guaranteed production program that will be established now and continued for a period of at least six months.

Congress should not be compelled to legislate on every detail of OPA administrative policy, but unless that agency voluntarily establishes such a guaranteed program for the beef production industry, this committee recommends amendment of the Price Control Act to compel such a policy.

Respectfully submitted:

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL
FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE,
By THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman.
HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Secretary.

Restore Poland's Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly urging the United States to obtain a guaranty in the peace treaty that Poland's boundaries be restored as they originally existed before World War II:

House Resolution 50

Whereas the first European nation to resist the Nazi aggressor and attempt to defend the freedom of their homeland was the valiant and courageous nation of Poland; and

Whereas the war which Poland waged against the Nazi has been unceasing and occupancy of their country only increased the zeal of the Polish patriots attempting to free their homeland; and

Whereas the remains of Warsaw stand as an international memorial to the courage and dauntlessness of its gallant defenders; and

Whereas this nation that has purchased her freedom with the blood of her sons, is now being liberated; and

Whereas with her resources gone, her people exhausted and with only her fighting spirit remaining this courageous country is now being forced to deliver part of her country to a former enemy, Russia; and

Whereas having reached the limit of her endurance, the great nation of Poland is no longer able to resist forcibly this attempt to annex part of her territory; and

Whereas freedom-loving nations the world over should rally to the cause of Poland and effectuate a return to her pre-war boundaries; and

Whereas our own democracy is obligated to aid Poland in her fight; and

Whereas the Big Three in their last conference gave no indication of restoring Poland to her former boundaries, but tacitly implied an agreement to permit Russia to absorb a part of Poland: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we do hereby memorialize the Representatives in Congress from Illinois and the two United States Senators, and request them to petition the President of the United States to have him obtain a guarantee in the peace treaty that Poland's boundaries will be restored to her as they originally existed before World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to each Representative in Congress from Illinois and to our two United States Senators.

Adopted by the House, May 16, 1945.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGY,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The Dodecanese and San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "The Dodecanese and San Francisco," written by Dr. N. G. Mavris, and published in the New Leader for April 28, 1945. I am sure that the subject is of intense interest and close to the hearts of all who appreciate the struggle for independence which Greece has made in this war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DODECANESE AND SAN FRANCISCO

(By Dr. N. G. Mavris)

No people has suffered more tragically because of the failure of previous attempts to achieve collective security than the inhabitants of the Dodecanese Islands. In proportion to their population, no people have contributed more to the Allied cause during the present war. Natives of the islands are serving in the Greek and American armed forces. In the islands themselves, the population has suffered starvation and unspeakable cruelty, and these conditions are continuing under the German occupation. In consideration of these facts, the United States Government officially recognized the Dodecanesians as friends by removing them in 1942 from the enemy alien classification, although their homeland was under Italian domination at that time. Similarly the British Government, in an official statement in the House of Commons, declared on October 18, 1944, that the Dodecanesians "will not be treated as enemies or ex-enemies but as friends."

Yet, the inhabitants of the Dodecanese will be without representation at the San Francisco World Security Conference. Since the capitulation of Italy, the islands are not internationally recognized as belonging to any state, and they have, of course, no government of their own. The repeated claim of the Dodecanesians to be officially recognized as part of their mother country, Greece, still awaits final confirmation by the great powers. Consequently, for technical reasons, the Greek delegates to the Conference will not represent the Dodecanesian people, while, even if Italian delegates were present there, this would afford no representation for the Dodecanesians.

Inevitably it will be asked: Why have the Big Three passed over the issue of the union of these islands with Greece which has been repeatedly sought by their inhabitants? The official view of the United States and the British Government is that "territorial settlements cannot be made prior to the termination of hostilities." Territorial settle-

ments and adjustments refer, of course, to changes in pre-war boundaries.

The record shows, however, that territorial settlements and adjustments of prewar boundaries have been made "prior to the termination of hostilities" in the following areas: Ethiopia, Austria, Korea, Formosa, Manchuria, the Pescadores, Russo-Finnish border, northern Bukovina, Bessarabia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, southern Dobruja, northern Transylvania (subject to confirmation), Polish-German and Russo-Polish boundaries, Danzig. We might even include among "territorial adjustments," the relinquishing by Great Britain and the United States of extraterritorial rights in China in 1943.

In order to explain the settlement of the above-mentioned territorial questions, despite the official declarations that they ought to be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities and be considered at the peace conference, Churchill declared in the House of Commons on March 14, 1945, that "there are, as is known, cases which fall outside that category." Likewise, Stettinius recalled on December 18, 1944, what his predecessor, Cordell Hull, had said: That "this does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement," to which the present Secretary of State added that "if a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned, the [United States] Government would have no objection * * *."

It is, therefore, quite difficult to understand why no settlement of the Dodecanese question has been effected, when so many decisions have been reached upon territorial and controversial issues. The Dodecanese question is not a territorial one; it is a legal issue. One receives the impression that the Big Three consider it a political matter, and that they have avoided making a clear statement for fear that this would constitute a commitment. No such fear can be entertained, however. The commitment already exists, and awaits only fulfillment. There is no room for debate or discussion.

The decision was reached 25 years ago by the Allies, including the United States. The fact that Italy has violated existing agreements, and has upon various pretexts remained in the islands, does not alter their legal status. Rather it calls more urgently for speedy fulfillment of this long-delayed obligation.

Furthermore, on February 23, 1924, Great Britain officially declared through her Prime Minister that the continued severance of the Dodecanese people from Greece "is hardly conducive to that general tranquillity which H. M. Government have so much at heart." On May 17, 1920, the people of the United States, through the unanimous vote of their Senate, affirmed that the Dodecanese must be awarded to Greece.

For these reasons, the Dodecanese question is not a political or otherwise controversial one awaiting a "decision." The issue is purely legal. For the sake of argument, however, let us consider it a political question. Even if this were the case, settlement would in no way threaten the relations among the United Nations. The case is entirely unique, for no country claims these islands except Greece. There is no counterclaimant, and no dispute, local or international, as to their ownership.

Even those who might have had objections, now officially agree to the union of the Dodecanese with Greece. Moreover, the inhabitants have repeatedly asked for and demanded this union. Italy has already surrendered the islands to the Allies, in accordance with the Armistice of September 8, 1943, and she raises no objection to the union of the Dodecanese with Greece. Turkey has twice, in international treaties, renounced her "rights and titles" on the Dodecanese and recently she has declared that she wishes to see them become part of Greece.

For what reason, then, is this one question subjected to some sort of taboo? Justice, international law, and the seemingly forgotten Atlantic Charter demand the settlement of the Dodecanese question. Such a settlement would also demonstrate to all small nations that the declarations of their great allies are not idle phrases uttered for the sake of expediency.

Let us hope that the Great Powers may immediately declare that the Dodecanese are to be assigned to Greece. Then the Dodecanesian people will not be absent from the San Francisco Conference. Then it will be clear that the great members of the United Nations have the same regard for all, whether they deal with a mighty nation of 150,000,000 persons, or with a small and weak group of only 150,000 souls—for this is about the total number of Dodecanesians throughout the world.

Warning on War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following well-timed editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch:

WARNING ON WAR CRIMINALS

"We again proclaim our determination that none who participated in these acts of savagery shall go unpunished. The United Nations * * * will pursue the guilty and deliver them up in order that justice be done. That warning applies not only to the leaders but also to their functionaries and subordinates." (President Roosevelt, March 24, 1944.)

A properly stern set of principles for the control and disciplining of Germany has been laid down by Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay and other high officers of General Eisenhower's staff to whom this vital duty has been entrusted.

There will be a long, strict military occupation, these officers declare. All that is left of Germany's war-making potential will be smashed. So will all vestiges of nazism. And the control group will "see that all war criminals are caught and punished."

This is exactly what the American people, like those of all other allied countries, wanted to hear and expect to see accomplished. Uncompromising treatment of the war criminals and drastic control of Germany for whatever time is required to make sure she can never plunge the world into bloodshed again—these are fundamental war aims in the view of the masses.

The policy statement is fine, but at the same time there comes a disturbing dispatch from Daniel de Luce, a correspondent with American occupation forces on the Rhine. Legal technicalities are binding the hands of Army men in their roundup of war criminals, he reports. Arrests so far are confined to the higher Nazi levels, while equally guilty men of lesser rank are exempt and, in the words of an American lieutenant, "their neighbors are convinced that the Allied authorities are suckers."

Here is an immediate job of issuing emphatic orders and cutting red tape for General Clay and his associates. It is important to catch and punish the big shots, of course, but the value of that example on the German people will be lost if the village and block leaders, the Nazis they know best, are not even investigated.

The Nazis are known to have high hopes in the alleged soft-heartedness and soft-headedness of Americans. They saw our dealings with Darlan and Giraud in north Africa, with Badoglio and the King of Italy, and confidently expect the same forgiving, compromising course in Germany. Past mistakes make a vigorous policy now more than imperative.

Mr. De Luce quotes an Army officer as saying that swift action is taken on crimes against American prisoners, while delays come up if the crimes are against foreign workers. Russia already is suspicious of American intentions and methods. Such discrimination against Russian and other victims is a sure way to cause a dangerous situation, not to mention the loss of faith it will create on the part of the liberated peoples in general.

The De Luce dispatch is a valuable report, even though it may deal only with awkward early moves that will be replaced by swift and efficient action. The point is that a complete program for far-reaching arrests and early trials should have been ready long before our troops took enemy territory.

The reported episodes are a powerful warning against letting Army red tape interfere with the doing of justice. General Clay is noted as a man of decisive and determined character. The people can have faith that the proper steps will be taken, now that he is on the job and under the orders of the uncompromising Eisenhower.

Lt. William Dow Markin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Lt. William Dow Markin, of my home city of Ironton, Ohio, gave his life for his country on December 20, 1944, under circumstances that won for him the Distinguished Service Cross.

I am glad to add my testimony of appreciation of the worth and character and sacrifice of this very splendid young man. He comes from one of the best families in my home city, where his ancestors on both sides of his family have been most estimable people and have stood for the best in the community.

Lieutenant Markin was a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and was serving as an artillery officer.

The citation accompanying the award of the Distinguished Service Cross carries the following:

When an enemy mechanized attack threatened to overrun friendly positions, Lieutenant Markin left the safety of his foxhole and moved alone through intense hostile fire to an exposed position in which he remained for over 3 hours directing effective artillery fire. A short while later, when an enemy self-propelled gun broke through defensive fire to friendly lines, Lieutenant Markin personally led two volunteers in an attempt to destroy the weapon. In the action that followed, Lieutenant Markin was wounded but immobilized the enemy vehicle.

While he was being treated for his wounds he was again hit by enemy fire and killed.

This heroic young man left a wife and one son, whose sorrow is assuaged by the knowledge of the fact that their husband and father died as a hero.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, to those who are of the opinion that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will create jobs, I submit the following telegrams from West Virginia labor unions:

Strongly protest the enactment of House bill 2652. We are glass cutters and mold makers, producing hand-made glassware, and we look to you to protect our jobs.

CURTIS E. SOUTH,
President, Local Union No. 59, American Flint Glassworkers Union.

Vigorously protest against the enactment of House bill 2652. We are hand craftsmen and cannot compete with the sweatshops of Europe without adequate tariff protection. This we know from past experience before the present war broke out. We expect you to protect our interests.

LAWRENCE F. LITMAN,
President, Local Union No. 10, American Flint Glassworkers Union.

Strongly opposed to bill 2652. Please help defeat measure.

WEST VIRGINIA GLASS SPECIALTY CO.,
Weston, W. Va.

Wish to enter our protest against the enactment of House bill 2652. We have supported all the war activities and given generously of our earnings to help finance the war. We know from past experience that we cannot compete with European labor and we want to still have our jobs when the war is over. We look to you to protect these jobs.

HARRY W. WILSON,
President, Local Union No. 507, American Flint Glassworkers Union, Moundsville, W. Va.

These telegrams are from labor men, citizens of the United States, if you please, appealing to this Congress to defeat House bill 2652 and protect their jobs from cheap foreign labor. If you are interested enough to investigate, you will find that our exports have decreased under the reciprocal trade agreements.

An Anti-MVA Slush Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 15, 1945:

AN ANTI-MVA SLUSH FUND

The launching by power companies of a costly and widespread propaganda campaign to prevent the launching of a Missouri Valley Authority should be about all that is needed to demonstrate to the public the size of the stake it has in this issue.

MVA advocates have been informed of the undercover campaign, and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, brought it to public attention in his address at Jefferson City last week by charging that a large New York advertising agency had sent into the valley nine high-powered public-relations men (at $1,000 a month apiece), to foment opposition to MVA among business and civic groups and State and local governmental bodies.

The power companies are not fighting the Army engineers or the Reclamation Bureau, both of which propose to develop the Missouri River's latent resources, including its potentialities for producing low-cost electric power. They are fighting MVA, and MVA alone.

Why do the power interests single out MVA and in effect support the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau by forbearing to fight them? Can it be because they believe MVA alone will develop fully the power potentialities of the Missouri River system, because they believe MVA alone will militantly carry the benefits of low-cost power to the people?

Can anyone conceive of any other reasons why the power companies should consider it worth while to spend so much money?

MVA is blessed in its friends, but doubly blessed in its enemies and in the nature of the attack upon it. This opposition is so manifestly anxious to conceal both its identity and its self-serving motives that it discredits itself in advance.

It is an insidious attack which the power companies are making. It is a costly attack. The substantial funds needed for this campaign are being raised, it is said, by the same scheme used for much of the Union Electric's slush funds in the days when it paid off legislators and took a hand in elections; through kick-backs and rebates concealed by connivance in the price of materials purchased. But wherever the anti-MVA fund comes from, it is being charged to the power companies' customers, for they are the only source of company revenue.

If there are still any citizens of the Missouri Valley who even are apathetically uninformed about what MVA means to them, they should be roused by the knowledge that keeping it from them is considered to be worth some hundreds of thousands of dollars to the power companies.

The German Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the Alameda Times-Star, one of the most progressive papers in the West, published a front page editorial pertaining to the surrender of Germany.

That this editorial may be read by all of the Members of Congress, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

(By Everett Johannes)

The document of unconditional surrender has been signed by the Germans. The war in Europe is officially at an end. And yet, what sort of a victory have the Allies actually won?

The Germans have not acknowledged that they were wrong. They have not admitted that Hitler's ruthless designs on the world and the virtual enslavement by Germany of the nations in Europe were sins. The Germans have surrendered their arms but they have not yet surrendered their pig-headed, murderous dream of world conquest. The "Superman" myth has not been exploded in their minds.

There can be no peace until the people of Germany are brought to realize that they are no better and no worse than all the other peoples in the world. There can be no peace until the people of Germany forsake their arrogance and their narrow, ferocious determination that in time to come the entire world must bow to them. The German lust for domination must be stamped out before any peace can be maintained.

The German Nation, now thoroughly whipped on the field of battle, now brought to its knees by the gigantic might of the Allied Nations, has not yet been courageous enough, or honest enough, to own up to its black deeds.

What do the Germans say about the horrors of the Nazi prison camps? Can they deny that thousands upon thousands of German men and women, boys and girls reveled in the victories which were theirs at the beginning of the war? Can they deny that they willingly and in blind obedience to the most arrogant and despised leader of modern times tortured the bodies and the minds of millions of innocent men, women, and children in fellow nations which the German machine raped, pillage, and subjected to slavery?

The German people, in their defeat, only ask for generosity. The German official who signed the papers of unconditional surrender proclaimed that the "German people both have achieved and suffered more perhaps than any other people in the world."

What have they achieved? Do they call their barbarous torture of Jews and Poles and Russians achievements? Do they call their degenerate years under Hitler achievements? Do they regard the war they heaped upon the world an achievement?

The German people have proven themselves to be the black sheep of the world family.

How generous were they to their fellowmen when the German war machine romped violently and notoriously through the countries of Europe? Let the Allied soldiers who have lost arms and legs and eyes in the battle against the Nazis sit at the peace table. Let the Jews who have been herded into ghettos and forced to undergo vile punishments sit at the peace table. Let the Poles and the Czechs and the Frenchmen and all the others who have suffered in Nazi slave-labor bands and prison camps, sit at the peace table. They'll deal out the proper sort of generosity to the guilty Germans.

The Germans have not forsaken desires for world conquest. The German nation should be broken up once and for all. Germany should be divided up among the smaller European nations.

Germany has brought grief to the peace-loving nations for hundreds of years. By wiping out Germany as a nation, the world will rid itself of a ruthless enemy.

While this editorial is attributed to the very competent Everett Johannes, the pertinent thought and pungent wording is characteristic of the publisher and owner, Abraham Kofman.

Administration of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on Sunday, May 20, on the Blue Network program:

I am a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, but let it be definitely understood that I am expressing my own opinion as a Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri. I am not speaking for the committee.

My first interest and concern as one of the 21 members of this important committee is to do my very best to assist the Congress of the United States in seeing that our ex-service men and women receive the consideration that they so rightfully deserve and which we as a grateful Nation so earnestly desire that they shall have and intend that they shall receive.

Serious charges have been made against the Veterans' Administration. These charges have prompted the Congress to authorize an investigation of the Veterans' Administration. This investigation, now under way, should be thorough and cool and deliberate.

If the Veterans' Administration has been and is now being poorly managed, if the veterans' hospitals are understaffed and practicing inferior-grade medicine, and if our ex-servicemen have been and are now being neglected, certainly we should find out why such conditions exist and take immediate and positive steps to correct this situation. If the charges are based on rumor and are overdrawn, then certainly this fact should be generally known.

I am neither accusing nor defending the Veterans' Administration. What has been done for the veterans should be judged on its merit alone. We have a right to expect and should demand the optimum service for the millions of dollars which we so willingly spent for veterans care.

To you who are personally concerned in this problem because you or your relatives are directly involved may I say this; even though cases of neglect may be pointed out, just remember that there are thousands of loyal, efficient, capable, and sympathetic people in the Veterans' Administration who are daily serving you and your people.

It is my wish and I believe that this investigation will be carried out with fairness to all. The facts will be made known. On the basis of facts the American people will pass judgment. We will accept nothing of the Veterans' Administration except the best service which a thankful Nation can give to those who have given so much for us.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post had an editorial on I Am an American Day. It contained some very important pertinent observations and suggestions. I quote from that editorial:

It was a happy inspiration that led Congress in 1940 to proclaim the third Sunday of May of each year as I am an American Day. The occasion affords special recognition of those who have been naturalized or have attained their majority during the past year and have thus come into the privileges and obligations of citizenship. The American stream is fed by a multiude of springs. Some are of such ancient American origin as rightly to be deemed indigenous—the heritage of the *Mayflower*, Plymouth Rock, and Jamestown. Others become Americans by adoption. They are the men and women who seek, as so many generations of Europeans have sought, the freedom and opportunity they cannot find at home.

The war has shown—the casualty lists are an eloquent reminder of this fact—that these new citizens and their children have contributed and are contributing their full share to the defense of the Nation. * * * Since I Am an American Day is a reminder to the new citizens of their newly acquired status and what it means, it should also be a reminder to the rest of us not to take lightly those same duties we share and privileges we enjoy. The day may well bring a reaffirmation of faith by all Americans in their common way of life.

It was 5 years ago that this I Am an American Day movement was initiated at Hollywood. I had the honor to participate in that initiation, and to deliver an address, which I am taking the liberty of asking to be printed in the RECORD with the hope that it may be of service to the public interest.

"I AM AN AMERICAN DAY"

(Address of Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, at Hollywood, May 19, 1940)

Citizens of America, newly come to that privilege and to that responsibility, we welcome you and declare with you in the spirit of dedication and high unyielding purpose, "I am an American."

If we are to survive as a democracy, the serious, solemn, sacred obligation and the all-but-divine privilege of American citizenship must come soon within the conscious realization of our people. You come to governmental responsibility with many inherited domestic difficulties in what may prove to be for the whole world the most tragic epoch of the ages. Things long established are being shaken to their foundations. The din of battle, the cry of the vanquished, the crash of democracies greet you today as you come to the threshold of governmental responsibility. Upon you as Americans, not upon agents of government, depend the mightiest issues of history.

You have a great opportunity. You are called to responsibility, challenged by a responsibility greater than that which in a thousand years has come to test the fiber and make it possible for a generation, your generation, to tower above all its fellows as they pass again in review before the historian, who must now rewrite the history of the world.

I use no figures of speech. I declare the solemn, challenging truth that either you will be the greatest generation that has lived on this earth in a thousand years, demonstrating your greatness by the greatest achievement which in that time has adorned the history of the world, or you will by your failure to measure up to the challenge of your difficulties go down in defeat, carrying with you the wreckage of what will probably for a long time be the last of the remaining great popular governments of the earth. Will you do that? The answer is, "I am an American." The battle cry is, "I am an American." But the answer is not in the waving of flags, the saluting of flags, the singing of anthems, the reciting of creeds.

They have their place, but they warn us of the danger of our patriotism becoming ritualistic. Patriotism without works, like faith without works, is dead. It is good to honor those who have served their country well, but we honor them best not by worshiping at their shrines but by emulating their example with a patriotism of flesh and blood, willing to work at governing, willing to sacrifice, to suffer that the things in government for which they sacrificed and suffered may live. It does not matter how often we salute the flag and sing the national anthem. Whenever the governmental capacity of a people operating a system of popular government becomes less and remains less for a considerable period of time than their governmental difficulties, the form of their government must change.

This is a challenging thought, a challenging fact. May I give you my conclusion based on the facts which I have got as near their sources as it has been possible for me to approach? Except by conquest, no people privileged to govern themselves ever lost that privilege until they had first lost their capacity for self-government. No people who failed to use their capacity for self-government were ever able to retain it. No people who had lost their capacity to govern themselves were ever able to remain free. I am using no idle words; I am declaring the solemn warning truths of history, that when any people become so inefficient governmentally in proportion to their governmental difficulties that they cannot do the business of government, government of necessity turns from them and lays its hand on a Mussolini or a Hitler to do its work.

Governments are no more accidents than worlds and trees and human beings are accidents. The fact that there shall be government is fixed by nature in human necessity. Human beings have a choice, but the only choice they have is which of two great systems of government they will have. It is either some form of totalitarian government functioning from the top downward, or a government by the people which by its nature functions from the people upward. One is directed by men who believe that might is right; the other is guided by principles which are fixed in the economy of nature.

Human wisdom unaided is not wise enough to operate such a system of government. Confused and muddled by the false belief that men, some human beings in convention, in a creative sense gave to us our system of government, we have been looking to no higher authority than human wisdom to guide us in its operation.

Each of the basic provisions of our Constitution originated out of necessity, and was tested by the experience of a people peculiarly gifted with the genius of self-government long before our constitutional conventions undertook the task of our written constitutional constructions. If we are to emerge from the difficulties that now endanger us, we must rid our minds of the silly, historically incorrect, humanly impossible mythological tales about some supermen having created for us our Constitution and system of government; and, instead of such tales, which have crowded out the truth, and which are as impossible of human accomplishment as the tales of the Grecian gods, we must realize the truth about our Constitution.

The constitution of a popular government comes from the same source that the constitution of your physical body comes from, the same source that a tree comes from. No political philosopher or constitutional convention in a creative sense ever fashioned the constitution of a living government. Constitutions of popular governments are living things; they must be rooted in the governmental concepts of a people

whose governmental capacity is able to sustain them, or they wither and die as a plant withers and dies rooted in a soil which does not sustain it.

We live in a universe of natural law governing everything from the smallest atom to the greatest systems of worlds. In this universe of law there is a live God, a great intelligence, a great power. I say in all reverence He is the Big Boss. We may be His copartners, if we will, but we must work in obedience to His law. Only in the field of government do human beings now ignore this fact, and in the field of government is the one outstanding failure of this age.

We have the choice aided by the guidance of great principles which govern governments, of governing ourselves or being driven by the lash of oppression to the discharge of a neglected duty. This is the fundamental law I would impress. People learn to govern by governing. They retain the ability to govern by using it. They lose the ability to govern by not using it. They acquire the greater ability to meet the greater problems of tomorrow only by using the ability today possesesed to meet the problems of today.

The difficulties of popular government, like all other difficulties, have been provided for the development of people. Nature has no disposition to avoid difficulties for people. It creates them. The development of people is the central objective of Nature. Difficulties are the gymnastic paraphernalia provided for that development. We know by our own experience and observation that no individual was ever greater than his difficulties. No victory was ever greater than the battle fought to win it. The greatest epochs of the world are those in which peoples with a purpose which would not yield, with a courage which sustained, fought their way through the greatest difficulties of time. The history of the world is but a record of difficulties overcome. Being on top of the hill is not important in the scheme of Nature. Had it been so, we would have all been created on the top of the hill. Climbing the hill and gaining the strength from the climbing is what is important, instead of sitting down at the foot of the hill because it is steep and rugged and letting the muscles grow flabby. It is a law, a universal law, and therein lies the philosophy of self-government.

Progress is slow. Progress is uphill. Progress is difficult. Progress is the road of struggle and of strength; along that road lies the thrill of victory, the fitness to live. We are getting soft in America. We want the easy way, the fast way. But the easy way, the fast way, is the road downhill. It is the road of retreat. It may be alluring, but it is the lure of death. Study your own life. Examine history.

When some difficulty comes to our communities, to the smaller units of government, to our States, which function largely through smaller units, where the people choose their chief officers and have the opportunity to control, where the individual's voice may be heard and his influence felt—instead of grappling with that difficulty and adding thereby t. our governmental capacity by the use of the capacity which we possess, we cry out for a supergovernment to come in and do the job for us. As a result we not only fail to receive the increased capacity to govern which nature gives as a reward to those whose use the capacity already possessed but we lose capacity. Nature takes from us the capacity which we fail to use. It is the law of life. Let the greatest athlete go to bed and cease to use his muscles; the strength in his muscles will not remain. Let any self-governing people shift their governmental responsibilities away from themselves and, in proportion as they do, the strength to govern departs.

Basically considered, from the disregard of these fundamental facts, great laws of nature which govern, not only in government but everywhere, which determine sound policy, which limit human discretion, which fix the program for the development and preservation of governmental capacity of the people, from that disregard, basically considered, our major governmental difficulties and dangers have come. That is my judgment. I have examined the facts. I have been trained in the school of practical experience. I have subjected that judgment to every test to which experience has taught me to subject judgment before yielding to its guidance. I give it to you for whatever it may be worth.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget" that we live in a world of universal law, that we talk through the air, fly through the air, and do all the other wonderful things of this complex age because we have discovered and are obedient to natural law, lest we forget that long ago great thinkers, practical people who had searched the mysteries of life declared as a discovered fact that "there is a God who presides over the destiny of nations." Young men and women, and those from other lands, coming to governmental responsibility, let me impress that government is not the one hiatus in nature where there is no governing natural law. There is no hiatus in all the universe. Only by obedience to that law can human beings now operate and preserve in his complex scientific age a great system of popular government, such as we have.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget."

OWI Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The propaganda fireworks and psychological nip-ups which Dr. Elmer Holmes Davis is planning to launch via his Office of War Information into the theater of the Pacific war will receive a careful going over from the Congress before it puts up the $50,000,000 which Dr. Davis plans to spend.

There is the reasonable possibility that Congress may boot the whole OWI set-up out the window, which wouldn't be a bad idea at all. But of immediate importance are the doctor's propaganda plans for the Pacific and more importantly who will carry them out and color them.

The great issue, come the inevitable defeat of Japan, is the disposition of the islands our forces have so bloodily won. The OWI propaganda to be poured out by Dr. Davis's employees will have important reactions among the Dutch, the Australians, and the New Zealanders, to say nothing of the Chinese, who want to know in their quiet but persistent way if we plan to give Hong Kong back to the British.

Already, at San Francisco, the British have indicated that they do not heartily approve of the Navy and Army's desire to have complete and absolute control of those island bases which we have torn from the Japs at tremendous cost. The Dutch eye us warily and the Chinese uncertainly.

Now, who is going to run American propaganda to the peoples in these areas?

The OWI big shot is, and will be, foreign-born George E. Taylor, who never applied for American citizenship until he got on the OWI pay roll long after Pearl Harbor.

The disclosure of Taylor's foreign birth and connections ties in with the revelation of a few days ago by our colleague, Mr. Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, that OWI's psychological twin, the Office of Strategic Services, is dominated and directed in the Far East by Lt. Col. Lynn M. Coffey, of the British Army, technically "on loan" to Maj. Gen. William J. "Wild Bill" Donovan, Chief of OSS.

The foreign-born Taylor, a self-proclaimed "expert" on the Pacific situation, came to OWI from a professor's chair in the University of Washington at Seattle, where he lectured on Life, Literature, and Politics of Pacific Asia.

This was the job formerly held by Upton Close, radio commentator and writer. Taylor, in fact, succeeded Close to the lecture chair. Now, here is Mr. Close's report on OWI Deputy Taylor, whom he knew well:

"All knew that he was of foreign birth. Previously to Pearl Harbor he had argued favorably to Japan in the case of Japan's seizure of Manchuria.

"When Taylor left his professorship to become associated with the New Deal crowd determining policy in the Pacific, I and others naturally assumed that somewhere along the line he had become an American citizen. * * * The OWI is, of course, ostensibly a United States, not a British agency. No American citizen could hold a similar position with the British Ministry of Information.

"Imagine then my shock to learn that Professor Taylor, although drawing warrants from the State of Washington for years as a State employee, had never applied for United States citizenship until after Pearl Harbor and after he had become an official of the Government.

"I learn from the Seattle office of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that he wrote there applying for citizenship January 27, 1942. Not until April 22, 1943, were the depositions of his witnesses taken—that was at Alexandria, Va., Taylor being with the Government in Washington."

The interesting Mr. Taylor, while holding down the juicy post of OWI deputy director, Pacific and Far East area, found time to turn his hand to belles lettres and tossed off a propaganda play on the problems of Asia which the young ladies of Hunter College in New York city produced last January.

We didn't see Brother Taylor's opus, but Burton Rascoe, dramatic critic of the New York World-Telegram, did, and here is what Mr. Rascoe thinks of the viewpoint of the gentleman who is directing United States propaganda in the Pacific:

"The most conspicuous purpose of the play is to idealize the Red army of China under the Communist Party boss, Mao Tzo-tung, and to defame the Chungking government and forces under Chiang Kai-shek.

"Incidentally, the purpose of the play is to slander and ridicule the United States and the political, social, and educational ideas of the vast majority of the United States."

But what interested us in checking up on the play was to discover that one of its sponsors was a gentleman of the air waves who currently used the name of William S. Gailmor, thereby following a not uncommon practice among the most ardent admirers and henchmen of the last administration of ignoring data on a birth certificate.

The gent who calls himself Gailmor is properly the exclusive meat of colleague Westbrook Pegler, who has tossed this cheapjack up for grabs on several lusty occasions. But Gailmor, in the course of his leftist radio blabbering, has cut loose with several below-the-belt slugs at this reporter.

Hence, in the interest of informing the taxpayers of the type of gentry who endorse

the propaganda plays of OWI Taylor, we present the following thumbnail biography of Brother Gailmor:

William S. Gailmor, 38, born William Margolis, in Passaic, N. J., was an apparently successful rabbi until the late '30's. On March 29, 1939, under the name of Margolis, he pleaded guilty in General Sessions, New York, to a charge of grand larceny in the first degree, confessing he had stolen five automobiles. Gailmor was placed on probation for 5 years and sent to Hastings Hillside Hospital for mental treatment. After a year he was released and given a suspended sentence on condition that he change his mode of life and profession.

He wrote radio ads and news scripts and began radio commentating on WHN in 1941. Received repeatedly favorable Daily Worker comment.

Consider the Home Folks First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a very critical food shortage appears imminent in this country. Everyone is willing for our armed forces at home and abroad to have first call on our food supplies and other materials. But many are beginning to think that a lot of our food is being supplied to other countries, and particularly to their civilian populations, in preference to the civilian population of the United States.

The situation is acute, and its effects are being keenly felt by our people. By all means, after supplying our armed forces amply, our own people should be supplied with the food produced in this country before it is given away, or even sold, to the people of other lands. Home folks should be considered first.

On May 9 I received a letter from the Rex Baking Co., of Tulsa, Okla., one of the largest commercial bakeries and users of sugar, fats, and dairy products in Oklahoma, depicting the critical situation which now exists. I immediately transmitted a copy of this letter to the Honorable Marvin Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, requesting his prompt consideration and reply. To date, I have not heard from Mr. Jones.

For the information of this House, I am privileged to quote the letter from Rex Baking Co., as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 7, 1945.*

Congressman GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Shortage of sugar, fats, and dairy products:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: If we are to believe the newspapers and trade information, it is apparent that some action must be taken to secure the food needs of civilians and industrial users of sugar, fats, and oils, and dairy products for these United States of America.

We do not question the legitimate needs of the armed forces of this country but concern ourselves merely with the food consumption needs of the citizens of our community. This company is a wholesale bakery, producing bread only for approximately one-quarter of a million people in this community.

Our production requirements of today are approximately 150 percent of 1941 volume. Our usage of sugar is limited to 75 percent of 1942 volume. Fats and oils are limited to 100 percent of 1942 volume. Milk is also limited due to a restricted supply. It is easy to understand how this "stretching" of our formula is reducing the standard quality of the "staff of life."

Further cuts in allocations of these various supplies seem inevitable unless those people who represent the food requirements of civilians in these United States are able to stand up and justify their claims against the steadily rising demands of the armed forces and other agencies concerned with overseas food demands.

The American public has shown a willingness to increase their consumption of cereal products so long as they are offered in an acceptable and palatable form. We feel it our duty to warn those in a position to help, that once the American public becomes dissatisfied with these plentiful cereals, and particularly bread, due to further stretching of the ingredients that give them palatability and nutritional value we will all be subject to a serious situation.

We are informed that the year 1945 will bring the greatest shortage of meat that the United States has even seen. In this event it is logical to assume that the citizens of this country must turn to cereal foods and dairy products as the basic food for their health and well being. Can this country afford to further weaken the nutritional value of these foods by further stretching the formula of the baking industry?

We have supported the program of the War Food Administration to the fullest extent. We have maintained our retail prices at the 1941 levels. We feel that Congress should secure the food supply of the American people so that the cheapest and most economical of foods will not have to be rationed due to an unnecessary shortage.

This is not an emotional appeal but a serious realization of the fact that this country cannot supply the endless demands of other countries for critical foods under the guise of military necessity. We honestly believe that the civilian and industrial needs of this country have first claim on our food supply. Your further efforts in this direction are earnestly requested.

Respectfully yours,

REX BAKING CO.,
By T. N. SLOAT.

The Trade-Agreement Program — The Industrialist Fattens as the Farmer Thins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission just granted I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two official tabulations, one relating to exports, the other to imports, in which is revealed just what has happened to agricultural and nonagricultural products under the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program.

With exports of agricultural products falling off to minus quantities and imports of agricultural products mounting to unprecedented heights, the farmer will find little in these tabulations to encourage him—when he notes the rapid expansion of both exports and imports in the nonagricultural columns, all this at his expense, his heart will be filled with despair.

But, Mr. Speaker, let the truth be known concerning the program that has failed. The United States Tariff Commission's figures, to which I referred, are the following:

United States imports for consumption, 1934 and 1937–40

[Value in millions of dollars]

A. FROM ALL COUNTRIES

Year	Value			Percentage increase over 1934		
	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products
1934 [1]	1,635	821	814			
1937	3,010	1,579	1,431	84	92	76
1938	1,950	956	994	19	16	22
1939	2,276	1,118	1,158	39	36	42
1940	2,541	1,286	1,255	55	57	54

B. FROM TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	1,061	513	548			
1937	2,006	1,037	969	89	102	77
1938	1,285	612	673	21	19	23
1939	1,551	718	833	46	40	52
1940	1,776	876	900	67	71	64

C. FROM NON-TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	574	308	266			
1937	1,004	542	462	75	76	73
1938	665	344	321	16	12	20
1939	725	400	325	26	30	22
1940	765	410	355	33	33	33

[1] Imports from the Virgin Islands have been deducted from the reported totals for 1934 to permit comparison with the later years.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce. Figures for 1934 from an arrangement of the basic data by the U. S. Department of State making the agricultural and nonagricultural groups comparable with those of later years.

United States domestic exports, 1934 and 1937–40

[Value in millions of dollars]

A. TO ALL COUNTRIES

Year	Value			Percentage increase over 1934		
	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products
1934 [1]	2,099	733	1,366			
1937	3,299	798	2,501	57	9	83
1938	3,057	827	2,230	46	13	63
1939	3,123	655	2,468	49	[2] −11	81
1940	3,934	516	3,418	87	[2] −30	150

B. TO TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	1,272	400	872			
1937	2,140	535	1,605	68	34	84
1938	1,970	583	1,387	55	46	59
1939	2,106	457	1,649	66	14	89
1940	2,842	361	2,481	123	[2] −10	185

Footnotes at end of table.

United States domestic exports, 1934 and 1937–40—Continued

[Value in millions of dollars]

C. TO NON-TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

Year	Value			Percentage increase over 1934		
	All products	Agricultural products	Non-agricultural products	All products	Agricultural products	Non-agricultural products
1934 [1]	827	333	494			
1937	1,159	263	896	40	[2] −21	82
1938	1,087	244	843	32	[2] −27	71
1939	1,017	198	819	23	[2] −41	66
1940	1,092	155	937	32	[2] −53	90

[1] Exports to the Virgin Islands of the United States have been deducted from the reported totals for 1934 to permit comparisons with the later years.

[2] Decrease.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the United States Department of Commerce.

Origin and Development of 4–H Club Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, just the other day the House passed the bill 1690 which, when it becomes a law, will permit a considerable expansion of 4–H Club work, as well as other activities of the extension service.

I am in receipt of a most interesting letter from Mr. W. A. Lloyd, director of information service for the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, which outlines the origin and development of 4–H Club activities.

In view of the great interest which Members of Congress have always shown in 4–H Club work, I am sure that many of them will appreciate the opportunity of reading this letter. Under permission heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the same:

ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,
May 18, 1945.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPE: In the debate in the House on H. R. 1690 the bill providing for the further development of the cooperative extension work of the land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture, a statement was made in regard to the origin of 4–H Club work which in the interest of historical accuracy should be corrected. The statement referred to occurred in the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois on page 4562 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 14, and on pages 4555–4556 of the same issue in your remarks and in a colloquy with Mr. JOHNSON. In this colloquy Mr. JOHNSON asks you, "Did the extension organization initiate or set up the 4–H Club work?" etc. You answer this question in part, but in the remarks by Mr. JOHNSON it was indicated that the club work was really initiated by private business interests and that, to quote directly from Mr. JOHNSON's remarks, "This work has been growing and it was picked up by the Extension Service and they are doing a good job with it."

I know that your remarks and those of Mr. JOHNSON were made in perfect good faith and that both of you and perhaps the Members of Congress would be interested in a statement of facts in regard to the origin of this now great and most worth-while organization.

As an extension activity, it is a direct outgrowth of work in the public schools. In the late 1880's and early 1890's, there was much interest in school circles in the study of agriculture, in the public schools in the country districts. In a very direct way this was incident to what was called "nature study work" actively promoted by Liberty Hyde Bailey of Cornell University. County school superintendents in several States developed agricultural clubs, usually they were "corn clubs", among their pupils. O. H. Benson in Iowa, Miss Mable Carney in Illinois, A. B. Graham in Ohio, and superintendents in Texas, Mississippi and other States developed such clubs. There were articles about them in the school magazines and they were a topic of much discussion at teachers and farmers institutes and State and national meetings of school teachers. There was a great pyramid of corn at the Louisiana Purchase World's Fair at St. Louis, produced by Illinois "corn boys" stimulated by the Illinois Department of Agriculture. A. P. Sandless, Secretary of Ohio Department of Agriculture brought a trainload of "corn boys" to Washington for several years. All of this work was done in cooperation with the public schools. During this time (following 1904) Dr. Seaman A. Knapp was developing his farm demonstration work in Texas and other southern States. This work was carried on in part by appropriation by the Congress to the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture. This work was at first with adult farmers only.

In 1906 the school exhibit of a county school superintendent in Holmes County, Miss., came to the attention of Dr. Knapp, and he made the superintendent a "cooperator" in his work and the club boys' demonstrations, and promoted the organization of corn clubs by farm boys as a part of the demonstration work. It spread rapidly through the South during the next few years. Dr. Knapp brought from Iowa, his home State, a successful school superintendent, Professor Benson, to help organize this work throughout the South. A little later, garden and tomato clubs were promoted for the farm girls. A market was found for the product of some of these tomato clubs at the local stores. A trade name was needed for this product. A three-leafed clover with an H on each leaf had been a badge in some of the clubs. These H's stood for head, hand, and heart. The late O. B. Martin, who was giving special attention to the work with the women and girls for Dr. Knapp, suggested a four-leaf clover, the good-luck symbol, with an additional H to stand for health. This was adopted and was used as a label on the cans of tomatoes produced by the girls' tomato clubs. From this the boys and girls clubs in Dr. Knapp's demonstration work began to be called 4–H Clubs, and the name in a few years came to supplant the earlier official designation, Boys and Girls Club Work.

When the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 was passed this work was already well established in both the Southern and Northern and Western States through county agents appointed by the Department of Agriculture, and it became an important project in the newly organized cooperaive extension work in all of the States. It has been officially a part of extension work from the beginning and a part of the work of the country agents, men and women. From that first boys' corn club, as an extension activity in 1906, it has grown up directly under the sponsorship of the Extension Service of the Department and the colleges until there are now nearly 2,000,000 members.

Very early in the work the extension service stimulated the boys and girls to make exhibits of their product at local, county, and State fairs. Bankers, businessmen, and chambers of commerce offered prizes. Railroads offered trips. It was in connection with these exhibits at fairs and national expositions that the interest of national business leaders and philanthropists like Mr. Wilson, of Chicago, and Mr. Moses, of Springfield, Mass., was aroused. About 1919 a national club committee was organized, of which Mr. Meredith, afterward Secretary of Agriculture, was the first president. This committee was organized to stimulate this work and act as a propaganda agency in securing prizes for national competitions. A national 4–H Club congress has been held by this committee each year at Chicago since about 1921. This national committee employs a full-time secretary and it has done much to help popularize the 4–H Club work of the extension service. It is this committee that Mr. Johnson confuses with the origin of 4–H Club work.

As a national movement in the interest of better agriculture and better boys and girls, and as a part of the organized cooperative extension service, it is entirely due to the vision and industry of Dr. Knapp, his associates and successors. It was he who took an incidental activity of a few school superintendents in scattered States and made it a great national movement directly promoted by the Federal and State governments.

Just who organized the first boys' agricultural club is unknown. There is historical record of a boys' corn club being organized in Sycamore Grove School on Dry Fork Creek in Butler County, Ohio, by school teacher William Bibb in 1828. Mr. Bibb was afterward Governor of Ohio. He does not tell us where he got the idea. This club of more than a century ago had most of the attributes of a 1945 model 4–H Club. Perhaps there were such clubs before this one and undoubtedly there were many in the period between this first club and the resurgence of school interest in the matter in the early 1890's, but the real founder was Dr. Knapp. Without his vision and the financial patronage by the extension service, the movement would have remained sporadic. While this is true it is also true that as an extension project it would have been impossible but for the splendid work of unpaid local leaders of the individual clubs. These farm men and women are the real heroes and their work has been helped and the young people's enthusiasm kindled by the prizes and trips made possible by businessmen. This is just a brief account to help keep the record straight.

W. A. LLOYD,
Director.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at an early date this body will be concerned with legislation extending the life of the price-control administration. We shall of necessity, at that time, give the matter our most serious

consideration. We shall be compelled to weigh the errors of OPA against their accomplishments and then vote our deep convictions.

With the full knowledge that this question is one which involves serious aspects to the daily lives of thousands of people, under unanimous consent, I introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution which has come to me from the North Dakota Implement Dealers Association, Fargo, N. Dak., expressing their views in the interest of price administration:

The Price Control Act should be continued, but legislation extending this act for another year should require some revisions in administrative practices.

Additional emphasis should be placed on the requirement that proper industry advisory committees be consulted before any new OPA regulations are issued, and the recommendations of such industry advisory committees should be made public.

Recourse to established courts of law should be easily accessible for an appeal from any action taken by OPA enforcement or prosecuting branches of OPA where there is any question about the legality or justice of their decisions. Summary action by a commission that has investigating, prosecuting, and judicial authority should not be tolerated without ready access to established courts of law.

The Price Control Act should, as its title implies, control prices as a means of preventing inflation, but should not control profits by fixing margins. In other words, costs all along the line should be considered in the writing of regulations controlling prices.

The fact that a business enterprise makes an over-all profit on its entire business operation does not justify any provision calling for the absorption of losses on individual items.

When new regulations are issued calling for revision of price schedules, filing of reports, posting of prices, etc., a minimum of 30 to 45 days should be allowed for the preparation of such reports from the time printed copies of the regulation are made available.

Requirements for reports and accounting records should be reduced to the minimum. Present practice places an undue and unnecessary burden on business by requiring detailed records which are not essential for the enforcement of price regulations.

A reaffirmation that the policy-making and administrative branches of the Office of Price Administration be placed under the direction of business executives with actual experience in the lines of business under their supervision.

NORTH DAKOTA IMPLEMENT DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE DIXON, *Secretary.*
FARGO, N. DAK.

It Was Appropriate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was a very appropriate and impressive ceremony we witnessed today when the President of the United States conferred upon a soldier thus publicly in this Chamber the most coveted award within the power of a soldier to earn from this Government. Without my knowing this young hero at all personally, he impressed me as a mild-mannered youth of cultured mien, very likely illustrating the words of the poet:

The bravest are the tenderest,
The loving are the daring.

As General Marshall read the citation, I looked at the slender youth beside him and found myself wondering whether the General could possibly have brought the wrong man.

Honoring the Infantry was a large part of the appropriateness of this ceremony. Having General Marshall take a prominent part in it was another part of the appropriateness. It was General Marshall who months ago called our attention to the vital part the Infantry must play in the winning of the war. In the beginning some of us thought the war could be won from the air alone or on wheels on the ground. We did not know what is meant by the Queen of Battles. Then we heard General Marshall more than a year ago indicate that the hardest part must be done by the Infantry. His soldier's insight, which many of us did not have, makes appropriate his part in the ceremony today even more than his high military rank of Chief of Staff.

The joint session today withheld its cheers from others for the sergeant. How he must have swelled with pride as he heard that prolonged cheering. Yet, undoubtedly, he knew it was not all for him. He was the one hundredth from the Infantry. Ninety-nine had preceded him without this distinctive honor—some had gone to their death without knowing they were regarded as meriting it. All too often the path of glory leads but to the grave. Not alone for 99 heroic infantrymen and himself did our sergeant receive applause and honor today. No; not 100 heroic foot soldiers received our thanks and appreciation in this special session but 100,000 who have died heroically in combat and many times that number who faced death and received wounds in the withering fire of the enemy. He represented that vast host of whom Ernie Pyle wrote so understandingly. Our sergeant today stood for all of them. The sergeant's hair is straight and black, but I thought of an infantryman with light and wavy hair—even so, we loved the sergeant for himself, plus a lot of love for someone else for whom he stands instead.

His parents were there. Most of us are parents of youths in uniform. We understand his parents' feelings and join them in a prayer to be worthy to match our spirit with the spirit of our own offspring. This gray-haired generation cannot properly take pride in our achievement, having brought the world to such a sorry plight. If we are to have any pride it will have to be in the courageous spirit of our soldier sons. In the Infantry theirs was the least dramatic part but cruelest in its toil, hardships, and suffering of cold-steel combat. It was they who in desert sands and mountain snows; in tropic heat and arctic cold; in sticky mud and choking dust; in inky darkness and glaring light with rifles, bayonets, and hand grenades faced and defeated the evil forces which our generation permitted to grow upon the earth.

Mother and Father Lindsey, we understand and appreciate your feeling today. Sergeant Lindsey, we love and honor you, partly for yourself alone, and mostly for those to whom you cause our thoughts to turn in this stark drama of life and death. Our blessings are upon you.

Let's Mind Our Own Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently there is evidence of a growing tendency among our people to wonder just how far our Government should go in intervening in European politics. There are some who think we should not participate at all. Others seem to want to participate in every issue that arises across the Atlantic. There is still a third group, which has thus far expressed itself less often, the members of which are beginning to say that we have perhaps gone far enough, if not too far, and that we should begin to watch our step and proceed with greater precaution.

Some of our independent journalists and newspaper commentators are sensing the new feeling that is developing and beginning to find expression among our people. An illustration of some of the thinking of today is found in the editorial of the Washington Times-Herald of May 16, 1945, which follows:

The United States has just finished helping England and Russia put down Germany, which 5 years ago was the first military power in Europe. Russia is now the first military power in Europe.

Nature abhors a vacuum. Russian power accordingly is flowing into the vacuum left by the destruction of German power—meaning Russia is setting up or sponsoring Communist or semi-Communist governments all over eastern and southeastern Europe.

It swallowed Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania long ago. The Lublin Polish Government is Communist, and everybody knows it. So is Tito's Yugoslav regime. Italy may fall to the Communists. France's local elections are producing large crops of Communist local officials. Russia rushed an allegedly independent government of Austria into office without a by-your-leave to the western allies. As to other European states—situation unclear.

In his adroit and eloquent speech last Sunday, British Prime Minister Churchill expressed the conviction that England and the United States must go on working together and marching together and sailing together and flying together whenever something has to be done for the sake of freedom and fair play all over the world. A few paragraphs later, he had this to say:

"On the Continent of Europe. * * * There would be little use in punishing the Hitlerites for their crimes if law and justice did not rule and if totalitarian or police governments were to take the place of the German invaders."

That sounds as if Mr. Churchill were contemplating an eventual war to cut down Russian power in Europe, with us to be induced to help England fight Russia in the name of democracy.

Mr. Churchill, now 70, might not live to see such a war. But it has been British policy since Spanish armada times (1588) to swing the weight of Britain and all the allies it could get against any strong leader who threatened to unify Europe—Louis XIV of France, Napoleon Bonaparte ditto, Wilhelm II of Germany, Adolf Hitler ditto.

If we are now so deep in European politics that England can haul us into any war to put down any strong power on the Continent, we are slated to lost a lot more of blood and money in European wars. We have already lost plenty in two of these wars.

The fact is that it is none of our business what kind of social and economic systems exist in Europe or Asia.

Russians like communism, or at least they stand for it. It isn't the old simon-pure share-the-poverty brand of Marxian communism. It is Stalin communism, under which everybody does what the government tells him to do and the smart fellows get more of this world's goods than the dumber fellows get. So it was under the czars, whom the Russians also liked or at least stood for.

LET'S MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS

If Russia is strong enough to spread this system over most of Europe, and into a large part of China after the Japs are licked, that is not our affair, and we should not go to war with Russia about it.

The Kremlin will doubtless go on trying to undermine our form of government through its American stooges, puppets, and dupes, as it has been doing ever since the 1917 Russian revolution. But that is no reason why we should fight the Russians. The thing to do about the local Reds is to keep an eye on them always, and jail any of them who violate any of our laws.

Should Russia try to grab the Aleutians or Alaska, or otherwise muscle militarily onto our territory, we should of course fight Russia. Otherwise, not.

All this illustrates what is meant when it is said, as it often and loudly is said by a lot of influential people, that after this war we shall need the world's strongest navy, and air force, plus a highly trained professional army preferably based on a system of universal military training.

Given such defenses, we can mind our own business, and can most probably keep the Russians or anybody else from chiseling into what is geographically and logically our sphere of influence; namely, the Western Hemisphere. And we can keep out of any more of Europe's wars.

That, we believe, is the ardent desire of most Americans on the home front today, and the even more ardent desire of millions of Americans who have personally witnessed the blood, misery, and tragedy of the fighting fronts.

"Debunking" TVA Bookkeeping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer, of Thursday, May 17, 1945:

SPEAKING OF YARDSTICKS

In the last dozen years—the supposed twilight era of free enterprise—we have heard much about "yardsticks" to measure the failings of private initiative as compared with governmental undertakings.

Perhaps the most celebrated of these yardsticks is the Tennessee Valley Authority, that vast electric power domain established with money from the Federal Treasury to prove—along with other things, of course—that the public utility industry was overcharging users of electricity.

It has proved no such thing. In any economic balance sheet weighing TVA against privately owned public utilities, one promptly is submerged in a morass of bookkeeping which has no real economic foundation. If the comparison proves anything, it proves only that an agency of Government, with unlimited access to the public purse and unhampered by the obligations with which Government saddles free enterprise, can manufacture power cheaper than a privately owned public utility—but then only if the bookkeeping is taken at face value.

Railway Age, replying to a eulogy of TVA published in a weekly paper of the railway unions, did an extremely effective job of debunking TVA bookkeeping in its May 12 issue.

TVA makes a pretense of paying taxes. We say "pretense" only because, as Railway Age points out, the Authority last year paid 6.1 percent of its gross revenues "in lieu of taxes." The figure was $2,168,798. Meanwhile, the privately owned electric power industry was taxed at approximately 23.8 percent of its gross revenues, In other words, applying the private enterprise "yardstick" against TVA, we find that it fell short by $6,263,434 of paying the taxes it would have paid had it been privately owned.

TVA last year charged $621,579 to interest. Its total assets meanwhile are listed as $763,666,809. Any privately owned utility has to pay interest on the money it uses—and so does the Government. Although the Government enjoys an extremely low interest rate, the fact remains that the great investment in TVA costs money. If it was not money invested in the Authority, it could have been money applied against the Federal debt, with a corresponding reduction of the amount on which the taxpayers must pay interest annually. Thus, even if we figure an interest rate of only 2 percent against the TVA investment, we find that the Authority is overlooking the neat sum of $14,651,757 in its allowance for interest on capital used.

These two items alone—taxes not paid and interest not paid—total $20,915,191. And that is three times the amount of net income reported by TVA last year.

In other words, had the Authority attempted to do business last year on its present rate schedule without the benefit of this bookkeeping evasion, it would have lost $14,333,562, which the taxpayers of the entire Nation would have been forced to make up as a contribution to the people of the limited area served by TVA. Or, conversely, had TVA's rates been increased to cover the item which private enterprise must include in its rate structure, charges to consumers of electric power would have been stepped up 43 percent.

It's quite a revelation, in other words, when you start to measure the yardstick of socialized enterprise against the rigid, accurate yardstick of orthodox economic practice. The result is not to make the private utility industry look bad, but to make it look better.

Postwar Position of California Grape and Wine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Wine Institute of California which contains a comprehensive statement of facts concerning the postwar position of the American grape and wine industry and its production and marketing problems, particularly in relation to imports. The letter is as follows:

WINE INSTITUTE,
San Francisco, May 15, 1945.

The Honorable FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HAVENNER: In connection with H. R. 2652, we wish to call attention to certain facts pertinent to the postwar position of the California grape and wine industry, particularly in relation to imports. There has been some public discussion as to the possibility of using substantial wine imports as a basis for making credits available to foreign wine-producing countries. We believe that much of this thought is based on lack of information, both as to the nature of our internal market and the type of commodity which would be available from abroad for that purpose. Hasty or ill-advised action under the broad authority proposed in H. R. 2652 would mean for this industry a return to the depressed conditions of 6 years and more ago, which the industry has since put behind it.

The California grape grower cultivates about 500,000 acres of grapes with an average annual yield of 2,500,000 tons. This crop is dependent on three major outlets for its disposal. Raisin packing would normally take about 1,000,000 tons, fresh shipment for table and juice purposes would normally take about half a million tons, and the remaining quantity must go to the winery. This means a crush of 1,000,000 tons, or 100,000,000 gallons of annual average wine production. In the event of a good crop, or if the markets in the first two outlets are unsatisfactory, then the wineries must be in even a better position to absorb the excess if they are properly to perform their function of carrying that excess. If the full crop cannot be absorbed, grower returns, of course, diminish.

During the thirties, it became clear that the raisin and fresh shipment outlets were tending to reach their saturation point. On the other hand, a definite under-consumption of wine was preventing the vintners from absorbing the remainder of the crop. By 1938 the annual consumption of California wine was tending to level off at about 55,000,000 gallons. Grape prices and wine prices were at dangerously low levels.

In 1938, a determined campaign to eliminate underconsumption of wine in the United States was inaugurated under the State Agricultural Marketing Act. Consumption of California wine began to increase by about 10,000,000 gallons each year, reaching a total of 96,000,000 gallons in 1942. With more assurance as to his markets the vintner was able to afford the grower a greater return. Where formerly prices as low as $10 per ton had been common, annual average returns to growers began to increase, reach-

ing $20 in 1941 and $30 in 1942. Wineries began to market their own brands, instead of selling off most most of their wine in bulk as a semisurplus commodity useful primarily to obtain current operating funds. Both grower and vintner finances have improved, and it is estimated that vineyard and winery loans have now dropped to about one-sixth of the amount formerly carried. The improved internal market was likewise beneficial to wine-producing States other than California and the consumption of other United States wines increased from about 9,000,000 gallons annually to 10,000,000 gallons in 1942.

This development of our internal market followed the pattern of most wine producing countries. In general, not more than about 2 percent of world production is shipped in export, the remainder being consumed locally. Export trade in wine, other than to nearby markets has almost always consisted of specialty or fancy wines, rather than the standard grades which constitute the majority of wines produced. For this reason, imports into the United States have usually been wines in the fancy or specialty categories for sale to a relatively limited clientele. Prior to the war their consumption here was at a low but fairly steady level (somewhat less than 4,000,000 gallons annually), and their importation did not tend to affect general grower conditions in this country any more than their exportation tended to affect general grower conditions in foreign wine producing countries.

In 1940, and again in 1941, California produced approximately 100,000,000 gallons of wine and was able to market 96,000,000 gallons in 1942. The inauguration of the Government's wartime raisin-drying program in the autumn of 1942 (and its subsequent continuation) brought about reduced production, lowered inventories, and lowered sales against the consumer demand that had, in 1942, been brought up to the point where it began to correspond to the grower's outlet needs. Sales of California wine fell to about 75,000,000 gallons in both 1943 and 1944.

In the meantime shipping space for importation was gradually becoming available. In 1944 importations about doubled their pre-war level, and reached nearly 8,000,000 gallons. This takes into account only a nominal amount of Italian and French-Algerian production, for which internal and export transportation was not yet available.

With an abnormally large percentage of the California grape crop being dried into raisins during the war, the internal wine market has not been as necessary an outlet to the grower as in normal times. We are now, however, beginning to return to the normal condition in which the vintner will again perform that function. Some reduction in last autumn's drying requirements brought production up to 90,000,000 gallons; the still lower drying requirements in prospect for 1945, plus prospects of a bumper crop, indicate a production this coming year of between 100,000,000 and 120,000,000 gallons.

We do not believe that there can be any substantial increase in the total volume of importations without (a) drawing on foreign wines of standard average grade that would normally go into local consumption abroad and (b) entering directly into the identical market upon which American grape growers rely as a main outlet for their crop.

Consumer demand for wine is being gradually developed in the United States, but we are not of the opinion that it has yet developed at a rate which would justify large-scale importation against the volume of our grape crop that must first have its own adequate outlets. The industry should not return to the grower and wine-price conditions that existed in the depressed thirties, and believes that their best interest makes necessary a program that would insure further continuance of the gradually improving conditions first attained in 1942. We have contacted the wine growers in other wine-producing States and find them in a substantially similar position with respect to their own production and marketing problems.

It is, therefore, recommended that H. R. 2652 be modified by confining the authorization for tariff reductions to the 50 percent reduction currently authorized, and by limiting the life of the authorization to 1 additional year instead of 3.

Sincerely yours,

WINE INSTITUTE,
HARRY A. CADDOW,
Secretary-Manager.

Cattle Upon a Thousand Hills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter just received from Mr. J. W. Burch, State director for Missouri, representing the University of Missouri, the Missouri College of Agriculture, and the Missouri Agricultural Extension Service.

Mr. Burch has had a long and distinguished service in the educational institutions and agricultural activities of the State, and is in position to speak with authority on the matters discussed in his letter.

His statements are on a subject of vital interest and importance to the Nation, and I trust will have the earnest attention of the legislators, economists, and administrative officials who have the responsibility of providing a solution for one of the most pressing problems of the time.

Mr. Burch's letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. CANNON: I have read with a great deal of interest House Report No. 504, on food shortages. I am in agreement and sympathy with most of the statements contained in this publication and certainly feel that some steps must be taken in order to remedy the situation as soon as possible.

I have also seen the reports in the papers of the proposals to take steps which will encourage an expansion in the feeding of cattle as a means of increasing the available meat supply.

As previously stated, I am in agreement with the statements regarding the need for encouraging an expansion of meat production, but I think it would be a mistake to overlook any methods which might result in an appreciable increase in the marketing of livestock during the next 3 or 4 months. Both of these proposals which I have read have to do with the encouragement of cattle feeding. The feeding of cattle, as you well know, requires considerable time, and steps taken now will not increase the supply of meat by this method before early next year. If we can do that and also take steps which will give us additional meat during this summer, we would be that much better off.

Another thing we need to keep in mind is the timing of these programs. Unless we are quite certain that the demand for meat will be adequate to take care of all the expansion which might be secured during the latter part of 1946, it might not be helpful to take those steps now and disappoint producers some 12 to 18 months later.

To be perfectly honest, we have two objectives in the proposals which I am going to make to you. Our consumers need meat now and I would like to see that demand cared for insofar as possible. Of equal importance, however, from the standpoint of the producer is the fact that we now have in this country an all-time record number of beef cows and heifers in our breeding herds. We feel that it is extremely important that these cattle numbers be adjusted before there is any probability of a reduction in demand or an appreciable drop in the prices paid for beef cattle.

These two objectives are entirely compatible in that a reduction in the number of breeding cattle would also satisfy the demand for meat.

As stated above, most of the emphasis now has to do with an encouragement of the feeding of cattle. Last year we slaughtered approximately 33,900,000 head of cattle and calves and our 1945 goal calls for a slaughter of 35,000,000 head. Probably no more than 5,000,000 head of these cattle will be grain fed. On January 1 this year there were approximately 4,100,000 head of cattle on feed.

That means that approximately six-sevenths of our cattle slaughtered are not grain fed and almost that large a proportion of meat is in the lower grades. Last year there was slaughtered under Federal inspection a total of 5,860,000 steers and 7,392,000 cows and heifers. Cows and heifers made up 52.9 percent of all cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection.

A War Food Administration publication reports the total production of beef, by grade, in 1943 was distributed as follows:

	Percent
Choice	19.4
Good	31.1
Commercial	23.1
Utility	14.7
Canner and cutter	11.7
Total	100

Any program designed to increase beef marketings must include consideration of the cattle furnishing the bulk of the beef—butcher cattle rather than good and choice steers.

This same publication shows that the seasonal distribution of federally inspected slaughter of cattle in 1943 was as follows:

	Percent
January to March	23.1
April to June	19.4
July to September	25.4
October to December	32.1

While I do not have any figures conveniently available, there is some unevenness in the seasonal distribution of cattle marketed in each grade. For example, a large proportion of the grass cattle are marketed at the close of the pasture season during the fall of the year. Since finished cattle make up such a small proportion of our total cattle marketings, that explains in part the large proportion of all cattle marketed during the last quarter of the year.

My proposal, based on these facts, is as follows: In addition to the steps now contemplated, a plan should be developed which would stimulate the marketing of so-called butcher cattle, those not finished on grain, during the next 4 months rather than allowing producers to follow the usual custom of waiting until the end of the pasture season

and marketing all of these cattle in a short period of time.

To induce cattle owners to market butcher cattle before frost will require the development of a program that will make the producer confident that marketing his cattle early will be more profitable than it will be for him to wait and secure some additional gain on grass.

It seems to me that it probably would be necessary to provide a support price on the market, not through the packer, but direct to the shipper for slaughter cattle marketed between now and sometime in September before the main run of grass cattle starts. This support price would have to be high enough to make it obvious that more could be secured for animals sold early than late. That support price or guaranty probably should be withdrawn entirely on some date in September and an announcement of that fact should be made at the time an announcement of the support price was made.

The Kansas City Times for May 19 announces "Effective May 19, 1945, the Commodity Credit Corporation will pay a subsidy of 50 cents per hundred pounds to the seller of AA and A grade cattle marketed for slaughter (sold for $14.25 or more per hundred pounds, Chicago basis) weighing 800 pounds or more, which have been owned by the seller 30 days or more. * * *

"('The subsidy will be a lot of help to feeders if the packers don't take advantage of it by lowering prices', Joe R. Hoover, president, of the Joe R. Hoover Commission Co., said last night * * *.)"

I feel that producers may be as skeptical as Mr. Hoover. The assurance to producers should be in the form of a support price on the market as in the case of the $13 floor for hogs at Chicago.

This announced plan is limited to AA and A grade cattle. It will have no effect on most butcher cattle which make up half our total beef supply and this plan will not secure more beef this summer.

Last year "good" cows averaged as follows during the last half of the year.

	Average price
July	$13.05
August	13.43
September	13.41
October	13.62
November	13.72
December	13.81
January, 1945	14.23

Obviously the support price would have to be higher during the summer than the market price is likely to be and enough higher to offset any additional gain in weight that might be secured by holding these cattle until October to December. It is also probable that if a uniform support price was provided from now until, say, September 20 producers would hold most of their cattle until about September 19 in order to get as much gain at this fixed price as possible.

I am not proposing to submit a finished foolproof plan, but it appears that something in the nature of having a support price, say at $15 per hundred for "good" cows during the month of June with a gradual reduction each month until September when the support price would be $14 per hundred would have a tendency to encourage early marketing. If it were announced that the support price would be withdrawn entirely at some specified date in September there should be a tendency for those producers who could to take advantage of the guaranteed minimum price.

That sort of a program should spread the marketing of butcher cattle over a considerably longer part of the year than is normally used, and the extension should be back into the summer when our shortage of meat is going to be most acute.

The encouragement of the marketing of cows and heifers which will bring a reasonably good price on the market will also tend to reduce our breeding herds and put the beef-cattle industry in a much sounder position for postwar developments.

While I have limited my discussion to a support price for good cows, I do not mean to imply that a similar program should not be developed for other grades of butcher cattle. I recognize that any program of this nature will be somewhat complicated, but I do think that it is feasible and will help to secure meat now when it is needed and will strengthen the beef-cattle industry in the future.

Another way in which we could get some meat reasonably soon would be to encourage an expansion of the production of broilers during the last half of this year by those producers in position to do so economically. As you know, the OPA program calls for a lowering of the ceiling on poultry each month from now until the end of the year.

This year, with the shortage of all sorts of meat, it might be worth while to encourage the production of broilers and other chickens. Actually that sort of a program might reduce the transactions in the black market.

I know that you are concerned with this problem of the food supply and also with the welfare of our agricultural group. I have talked this proposal over with some of the folks here in Missouri who feel it has possibilities. I hope you will have an opportunity to give it some consideration and make such disposal of it as you think best.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BURCH,
Director.

VE-Day Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mr. Seitz, director of public relations in the Port Ewen, N. Y., Hercules Powder Co. plant. This Port Ewen plant is in my district. It has done an outstanding production job from the beginning of the war and expects to continue until the Japs are vanquished.

On Saturday, April 14, the program, Bob Browning and the Local News, over the Kingston, N. Y., radio station, sponsored by the Hercules Powder Co., asked Bob Browning to read a prayer written by a Herculite. This prayer, along with a prayer offered at the plant's VE-day celebration by the Reverend Michael Curley, pastor of the Church of the Presentation, of Port Ewen, received such wide acclaim that I am placing both of these prayers in the RECORD so more Americans will have the opportunity to read them and learn of the praiseworthy work being performed by the employees of this Hercules plant:

VE-DAY PRAYER

(By Rev. Michael Curley)

The bells are ringing and the hearts of men are cheering, the bluebirds are over the White Cliffs of Dover, the hideous black night of war has lifted from Europe, the lights are going on in the world, O God, and millions of our loved ones have ceased firing after their epic battle march from the shores of Oran to the Brenner Pass, from the bloody beaches of Normandy to Prague and the center of Germany. Victory in Europe is won. With a profound knowledge that without Thy help, O God, we could never have achieved this glorious day, we humbly say from the bottom of our hearts, "Thanks to Thee, O God!"

Thanks for the iron and the ores that you placed in our land, thanks for the food from the fields, thanks for giving wisdom to the men who guided us, thanks for the sinew and the brawn of our men and women who used the God-given resources of this mighty Nation—that loves peace and fights mightily in war. Thanks for the ships and the guns, for the planes and the ammunition, for every single item that helped to win this triumph, we humbly thank Thee, O God of Victory.

Thanks for Thy protection to the boys who rode the sea, thanks for the fighting hearts that nerved brave men to stand up against the withering fire from the ruthless foe. In their name and in the name of all who love them, we say a thousand times, "Thank Thee, God of Justice and Right."

Thanks for the peace that comes to millions of European people who crouched in fear of tyrant forces, thanks for the light that is coming to their lives, thanks for the freedom of body and soul that starts once again from this hour, thanks for the bright skies in Europe to which little children may once again look without fear of thundering bombs, or deadly machine gun fire. Thanks to Thee that over there on the western side of the globe men may worship Thee as their conscience dictates—great and true God of the living and the dead!

Inspire us here with renewed vigor to accomplish the unfinished task ahead—to carry the light of liberty to millions still hiding in terrible fear of a pagan foe across the wide reaches of the Pacific sea. Protect our boys there, O God, as you did our dear ones across the Atlantic. Let this work of thanks, God of justice and of peace bring protection to them as they battle against a reckless enemy. Let there be no idling in the market place while work is to be done, inspire in us new zeal to push forward, let there be no slackening of pace, no pausing when our brothers call for help, let no obstacle block us, no false enthusiasm freeze our energy. Let the strong arms and nimble fingers of those here before me work more strongly and move more nimbly still to complete the redemption of men from horrible satanic war—that the whole wide world may one day join in chorus and say to Thee, "Thank God for victory, thanks for peace—peace in our time."

IN MEMORIAM

O God of the living and the dead, we pray Thee bless the great soul of our departed President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The eyes that once gleamed have now lost their luster in death. The cheery voice that brought hope to millions is hushed forever. Because of all he did for us, O God, vouchsafe to him grace and mercy before divine tribunal and let him attain to everlasting rest and happiness in Thy eternal kingdom.

Keep forever green in the mind of every American the memory of his virtues, his courage under difficulties, his zeal to help the distressed, his fight to keep freedom alive in the hearts of men all over the world crouching in fear of dictators and tyranny and let no man forget his magnificent devotion to duty in every trying circumstance to the end and limit of his mortal strength.

Inspire the children of future generations with the spirit of the man who began his

administration with the heartening words, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Let the recollection of his physical handicap spur others to go forward in spite of every obstacle.

Bow down Thine ear in pity to the wife and children of this good servant of the people. Grant that they may not languish in unavailing grief, but through their tears look meekly up to Thee, the God of all consolations. Amen.

Office of Price Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of correspondence which passed between Thomas L. Conlan, chief enforcement attorney for the Cincinnati district Office of Price Administration, and Mr. C. Herbert Clemens, of Dayton, Ohio, an investigator for the Cincinnati district.

This is evidence of reprisals which are being visited upon people within the Cincinnati district office when they seek to make the OPA more efficient and fair in its handling of violations. This is another sample of the indiscriminate attempt to break down efficiency within the Cincinnati district office.

Mr. Clemens was one of the best investigators employed in the Office of Price Administration, while he is apparently being replaced by a Mr. Robert E. Yelton, who was formerly connected with an automobile finance company and whose past record as an investigator for the Office of Price Administration clearly shows that he is not capable of making a full and complete investigation of matters which are assigned to him. It is proof again that the Cincinnati district heads are bound and determined to administer the Office of Price Administration without complete equity and fairness.

I believe that the only way in which this condition can be corrected is by instituting the congressional investigation that is called for in House Resolution 241, which is now pending before the Rules Committee.

The matter referred to follows:

MAY 2, 1945.

Memorandum to: Mr. C. Herbert Clemens.
From: Thomas L. Conlan.
Subject: Disclosure of information procured by you in the course of your duties as an investigator for the Office of Price Administration.

Acting upon my request you came to the Cincinnati district office this morning to discuss certain pending cases in connection with which, in the course of your duties as investigator for this Enforcement Division, you had handled. During the course of our conversation you stated that you had information pertaining to the operations of the Cincinnati district office, and to the operations of the Enforcement Division of the Cincinnati district office, which I, as district enforcement attorney did not have knowledge of. I requested that you disclose to me in my official capacity, or to any other authorized personnel of the Office of Price Administration either in the district, regional, or national office, any information you may have affecting the operations of this Cincinnati district office, and in particular the Enforcement Division.

This information you refused to disclose, and further stated you would refuse to disclose it to any other employee of the Office of Price Adminsitration.

In my official capacity, as district enforcement attorney, I demand that you furnish me by the close of business on May 3, 1945, either in writing or verbally, which you have, and are concealing from me pertaining to the operation of the Cincinnati district office of the Office of Price Administration, and particularly the Enforcement Division thereof. If you persist in your refusal to disclose this information I demand that you put your refusal in writing in a memorandum addressed to me stating the reasons therefore.

(Not delivered until 3 p. m. May 3. Extension of time for answer to close of business May 4, 1945. Thomas L. Conlan.)

MAY 4, 1945.

Memorandum to: Mr. Thomas L. Conlan.
From: C. Herbert Clemens.
Subject: Memorandum of May 2, 1945.

In conformity with your summons, I appeared at the Cincinnati district office on May 2 last to discuss with you such matters as you had chosen.

I categorically deny that I did, at any time in the course of this interview, make any statement or statements averring, affirming or even implying that I was in possession of any information pertaining to the operations of the enforcement division of the Cincinnati district office of which you, as district enforcement attorney, had no knowledge.

I further deny emphatically any refusal upon my part to disclose any such knowledge, since I do not admit such knowledge to have been in my possession.

It is, therefore, with regret that I confess my inability to accede to your demand that I furnish you such information verbally or in writing, by the close of business May 4, 1945; how can I furnish you with any information I claim never to have possessed and which I firmly deny concealing from you?

Obviously, compliance with your request that I refuse, in writing, your demands of May 2, 1945, is impossible, since I do not, cannot and will not admit that I have the knowledge to make such refusal.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 17, 1945.

Mr. C. HERBERT CLEMENS,
Dayton, Ohio.

DEAR MR. CLEMENS: This letter is writtten notice to you that as of the close of business May 22, 1945, you shall be terminated from service with this agency. I am compelled to take this action, which I sincerely regret.

You stated to me in the presence of Mr. Edward H. Brink, Jr., food enforcement attorney, on May 2, 1945, and again in my presence alone on May 3, 1945, that you had certain information of great importance relative to the operation of this Cincinnati OPA district office, and particularly, the Enforcement Division. I requested you to advise me what your information was, so that I could act upon it. You stated that you would not give me the information; nor would you release it to any other person within the Office of Price Administration. Rather, you said you would have to decide yourself how best to use the information. My demand in writing to you for such information met with a written denial on your part that you ever admitted or stated that you had such information. As I have stated to you verbally, your written answer is completely contradictory to your statements on May 2 and 3, and is most unsatisfactory.

You must recognize that every employee of this agency (or of any agency), including yourself, has a firm responsibility to exercise his or her best talents to improve the operation of this agency. This responsibility covers all improvements or corrections of operations whether they be procedural or otherwise, and compels you to report to your superiors information at your command affecting the operation of this district OPA office, and particularly the Enforcement Division thereof. This responsibility is in addition to the responsibility you have as an OPA investigator to investigate and report to your superiors fairly and honestly and without limitations upon full disclosure of the truth. From your statements and conduct on May 2 and 3, 1945, I cannot determine which of these responsibilities you have point-blank refused to carry out. Through your failure in either respect, or both, which you alone can decide, you have compelled the action set forth in this letter.

I believe you will agree with me that the position that you occupy as an investigator for OPA requires the highest degree of fidelity and trustworthiness. The relationship between you and your superiors within the OPA must be on the highest plane attainable. Your superiors must look to you for accurate and complete reports of information which you acquire, having to do with your and their official duties. Such information must be transmitted to your superiors without omissions or additions. Your actions on May 2 and May 3 destroyed the confidence so necessary between investigators and their superiors. I can never know whether you are reporting accurately to me and to your other superiors. I will never be able to tell whether you are exercising your own judgment with respect to what information that you shall pass on. In brief, you have destroyed the confidence that I must have in every investigator in this highly confidential work. I regretfully conclude there is no place in my Division or elsewhere in OPA for a person who refuses to report to his superiors matters affecting their respective responsibilities. Therefore, I am compelled to take this action.

Upon receipt of this letter you shall be suspended from your duties and shall remain suspended until the effective date of this release of you from your duties with the OPA. You have 5 days on receipt of this notice within which you may file a written reply to the foregoing reasons for your release from duty. Upon the effectiveness of the release you have the right to appeal to the district director of this OPA Cincinnati district office for review of my actions in this regard.

Please take immediate steps to surrender all property of the United States Government which is now under your custody as the result of your official position with this agency.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS L. CONLAN,
District Enforcement Attorney,
Cincinnati District Office.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
CINCINNATI DISTRICT OFFICE,
Dayton, Ohio, May 17, 1945.

Memorandum to: Mr. Thomas L. Conlan, district enforcement attorney, Cincinnati district office.
From: C. Herbert Clemens, Investigator.
Subject: Surrender of OPA investigator's credential and credential case.

Today, May 17, 1945, and orally effective on this day I have been requested by you, through Mr. Robert E. Yelton, to surrender my OPA investigator's credentials and credential case.

Please be informed that I will surrender the above-mentioned Government property

directly to you there in the Cincinnati district office.

DAYTON, OHIO, *May 19, 1945.*

Mr. THOMAS B. CONLAN,
District Enforcement Attorney,
Office of Price Administration,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. CONLAN: I am in possession of your letter of May 17, 1945, annotated 6F: 3-6: 4: TLC.

You permit me 5 days from the receipt thereof to file a written reply to the reasons set forth for my release from duty. This letter constitutes such written reply.

I begin by referring you to your memorandum to me dated May 2, 1945, and reiterate my positive adherence to the facts in reply thereto addressed to you in a memorandum from me dated May 4, 1945.

On April 30, 1945, an article in regard to the operation of the OPA in the Cincinnati district, based upon purported statements by Congressman EDWARD J. GARDNER, Third District of Ohio, appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer. The same day you and I had telephone conversations in regard thereto, and on May 2, 1945, I was summoned to your office for a personal interview, during which you charged me with withholding from you official information obtained by me in the course of my duties. From your conversations via telephone and in person, I am positive that you assured me that your opinion was derived from the article in the Cincinnati Enquirer referred to above. A second personal interview between us occurred on the following day, May 3, 1945. At all times, over telephone and in person, I have never denied having an interview with Congressman GARDNER, but have always refused, still refuse, and will continue to refuse to admit that I have ever possessed any information relative to the OPA, and particularly to its Enforcement Division, which you do not have. I specifically deny that I ever admitted to you, alone or in the presence of Mr. Edward H. Brink, Jr., food enforcement attorney, the possession of any such data.

I left a responsible position with the United States Government to become an investigator for the OPA for one reason, and one reason only, to wit: I did, do, and will continue to believe in the OPA program, its worth to the Nation, and its contribution to our war effort. Any and every move I have made since joining OPA is the result of considered thinking toward the furtherance of our program, and a deliberate withholding of information from you, as my superior, would, therefore, be not only contrary to my oath of office but against my innate instincts.

I believe that I have served the Dayton and Cincinnati district offices both faithfully and well for almost 3 years, and apparently no fault has been found with my work except that I deigned to discuss some aspects of it with my elected Representative in Congress. This latter I believe to be my prerogative, and hence I object vociferously to my termination on any such account.

Very truly yours,

C. HERBERT CLEMENS.

Jack Savage, Billion-Dollar Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of John Lucian Savage, Chief Designing Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, Interior Department, after 34 years of service, leads me to make a few observations regarding the fine, loyal men and women who serve their country in the civil service.

Mr. Savage is a good example of these faithful servants. A modest and unassuming man, he has given most of his working years to the Government, not for wealth, because his pay never reached more than a fraction of that which he could have commanded elsewhere; not for glory, because while fame as an engineer belatedly has overtaken him it embarrasses him more than it pleases him; but out of loyalty and in the quiet satisfaction of doing big things well, even if in comparative anonymity. There are thousands like him in the civil service. They give a continuity, strength, and dignity to our Government that is no small part of its power.

Knowing some of these men and women, it pains me to hear, as I occasionally do, epithets such as "bureaucrats" and "feeders at the public trough" carelessly thrown around. I believe we will all have a greater confidence in our Government if we know about Jack Savage.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to insert at this point the announcement issued by the Interior Department on the retirement of Mr. John Lucian Savage:

John Lucian Savage, world-famed designer of Boulder and Grand Coulee Dams, has retired as chief designing engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation, it was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Member of the staff for 34 years, Mr. Savage has drawn plans for the construction of more than a billion dollars worth of dams, including the mightiest ever built.

He has been chief designing engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation since 1924, having first joined the staff in 1903 after the agency, then known as the Reclamation Service, had been in existence less than a year. In that time the Bureau has built scores of dams to harness the waters of western rivers for irrigation, power development, flood control, and navigation, and the man who designed these projects has won international renown in the engineering field. Secretary Ickes said Mr. Savage will continue to serve the Bureau part time in the capacity of consulting engineer.

He has recently returned from a special mission to China and India where he represented the State Department in its cultural relations program. He made preliminary surveys and studies for several huge reclamation projects under consideration for postwar development, including one in the Yangtze Gorge.

Commenting on Mr. Savage's decision to retire at 65, Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore said:

"Jack Savage in a very real sense has epitomized the Bureau of Reclamation. He grew up with the organization. His extraordinary gift is the ability to bring a fresh mind to new problems in engineering. His approach is daring, but his plans are sound. Neither the necessity of building the highest dam in the world in Boulder Canyon nor the requirement for the construction of the most massive concrete dam so far conceived at Grand Coulee on the Columbia River dismayed Jack Savage. He simply proceeded to design the dams, and they now are the pride of the engineering world."

Mr. Savage was the designing engineer on the three largest concrete dams in the world—Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Boulder. Other famous dams that he has designed include the Norris Dam in the Tennessee Valley, and the Wheeler, another of the key structures in the basin-wide development of that area; Friant Dam, important coworker of Shasta Dam in the Central Valley reclamation project (California); and Madden Dam at the Panama Canal. The Marshall Ford Dam in Texas, Imperial Dam on the Arizona-California border, Parker Dam on the Colorado River, and American Falls Dam (Idaho) are among the numerous reclamation dams he has designed.

At the request of the Chinese Government, Mr. Savage in 1944 made extensive surveys for the postwar development of China's great natural resources, including the huge Yangtze Gorge project to irrigate 10,000,000 acres of land and develop some 10,000,000 kilowatts of electric power capacity. He also spent several months in India, visiting projects for irrigation and other developments in the United Provinces, Bengal, Madras, Mysore, and the Punjab.

When a cable came from London in 1940 asking the United States for Mr. Savage's assistance in connection with the Burrinjuck Dam in Australia, attention was directed to the law which prohibits officials of the United States from accepting emoluments from foreign countries. Rather than delay the voyage in this emergency, Mr. Savage wired former Commissioner John C. Page of the Bureau of Reclamation: "Any assistance given Government of New South Wales will be gratis and I shall not accept any fee or other form of compensation or any reimbursement." He said he needed a vacation, anyway.

In 1940, Congress passed a bill specifically authorizing the President to send Mr. Savage to Australia and India as an engineering consultant. He spent 4 months in Australia in 1941-42 as consultant on two projects—the Upper Yarra Dam for the Melbourne and Metropolitan Water Board of Works and the Kiewa Dam for the State Electricity Commission of Victoria.

Engineer Savage has been honored many times for his achievements. On his recent visit to China he received a gold medal from the Ministry of Economic Affairs for Humanitarian Services. The American Society of Civil Engineers awarded him this year the John Fritz medal, one of the highest honors of the engineering profession. In 1934, the University of Wisconsin conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Science. He was presented in 1937 with one of the most prized awards given to anyone in the engineering profession—the gold medal for outstanding engineering service of the Colorado Engineering Council, which represents all engineering organizations in the State. The award had been made only once in the previous 10 years.

John Lucian Savage, the son of Edwin Parker Savage and Mary Therese (Stebbins) Savage, was born on a Wisconsin farm near Cooksville, December 25, 1879.

His early years were spent in Wisconsin. He attended private school at Spring Green. He went to high school in Evansville and in Madison. In 1903 he received a B. S. degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin.

After graduation he left Wisconsin for field work with the United States Reclamation Service, now the Bureau of Reclamation, on the Minidoka project in Idaho. The next 4 years he worked in the Boise office, designing irrigation structures under the guidance of Arthur P. Davis, chief engineer; D. W. Ross, project engineer, and A. J. Wiley, consulting engineer. In 1908 Savage left the Reclamation Service to become associated with Wiley in an engineering practice in Boise.

During this time he designed many important structural works, including the Salmon River Dam, the Swan Falls Power plant on the Snake River, the Barber Power plant on the Boise River, the Oakley Reser-

voir Dam, and the American Falls Power plant. He also received a special assignment from the Reclamation Service to design gates for the Arrowrock Dam on the Boise River.

In 1916 Mr. Savage reentered the Reclamation Service in charge of civil engineering designs in the newly organized office of the Chief Engineer at Denver, Colo., where important design work of the Bureau is done. In 1924 he was placed in charge of all electrical and mechanical designing with the title of Chief Designing Engineer, the position which he held until his retirement, April 30.

On June 1, 1918, Savage married Jessie Burdick Sexsmith, who died on July 17, 1941. They had no children. He makes his home in Denver, Colo.

The Farmer and the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange:

THE FARMER AND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

(By Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange)

When the Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934, it was regarded as a temporary measure, and it was, therefore, made self-repealing at the end of 3 years. We were in the midst of a world-wide depression, with approximately 13,000,000 people unemployed; large surpluses of farm commodities had accumulated, and the theory was that we should do some "Yankee trading" to dispose of these commodities. The act has been thrice renewed, the last time for a period of 2 years. Unless again renewed, it will expire on June 12, 1945.

Under this measure, the President is authorized to raise or lower tariff rates to the extent of 50 percent in negotiating trade agreements with other nations. In a recent message, the late President Roosevelt informed Congress that so many concessions had been made to other countries under the original 50 percent limitation that little flexibility remains. He, therefore, suggested that to give the Government more bargaining power, the act should be brought up-to-date by amendment, making it possible to reduce 1945 rates to the extent of 50 percent.

UNDUE GRANT OF POWER

Where the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act have already been slashed 50 percent, another reduction of 50 percent would be equivalent to a total reduction of 75 percent. It should be kept in mind in this connection that in case of certain commodities, rates had already been reduced under the flexible provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 before the passage of the Trade Agreements Act. To grant the President authority to further reduce rates on such items would be almost equivalent to granting authority to transfer items from the dutiable list to the free list, which is denied in the Trade Agreements Act.

It is likewise noteworthy that while this legislation empowers the President to revise rates upward to the extent of 50 percent, not a single rate has been increased, for the simple reason that an upward revision of rates would not be well calculated to facilitate the negotiation of trade agreements with other nations.

Fifteen years have gone by since the last general tariff act was passed by Congress. If the Trade Agreements Act should now be extended for another period of 3 years, the span would be lengthened to 18 years. Under the Trade Agreements Act, Congress has for 11 years delegated to the President, or to the State Department, one of its most important constitutional prerogatives, namely, the power to regulate foreign trade, which also involves the raising of revenue. During this period Congress likewise delegated many other extraordinary powers to the executive department of the Government, and if our constitutional system is to be preserved, it would seem that the time has come when Congress should make a manly effort to recapture these delegated powers.

CONFLICTING POLICIES INVOLVED

In considering the extension of this act for another period of 3 years we must not lose sight of the fact that under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and our social security legislation, we have been trying to improve the American standard of living. By this process we have raised our cost of production all along the line. All this is a manifestation of a very definite trend toward economic nationalism. The policy we have been pursuing under the Trade Agreements Act might be termed one of international altruism. It is manifestly impossible to successfully pursue both of these policies at one and the same time in the same country.

Nor must we overlook the fact that before the lapse of another year the national debt will probably amount to $300,000,000,000. The interest on this debt, even at the rate of 2 percent, will amount to approximately $6,000,000,000 per year. This will call for heavy taxation, which will naturally increase our costs of production. In theory our tariff rates are intended to equalize the difference in the cost of production as between the United States and foreign nations. It is pertinent, therefore, to keep in mind the factors which have just been enumerated.

GRANGE ATTITUDE DEFINED

In appearances before the Ways and Means Committee at former hearings on the Trade Agreements Act, we have always made it plain that we are in favor of all the foreign trade we can get under proper conditions. The attitude of the National Grange has been that in our dealings with other nations we should take from them such commodities as we need and do not produce domestically, but that we should not make it easier for the rest of the world to send us the things that we do not need, or commodities of which we already have a surplus under normal conditions.

That is the only reasonable basis upon which a sound foreign-trade policy can be built. Manifestly, there is no advantage in trade merely for the sake of trade, nor is there any virtue in exchanging identical or competing commodities.

It has long been the settled policy of the United States to admit free of duty the productions of other countries that we really need and that are not indirect competition with articles produced domestically. We have the biggest free list of any country in the world. For many years, nearly two-thirds of our imports have been entered free of duty. These facts are cited to show that our tariff policies have not been as selfish as many people seem to believe.

The Grange believes in reciprocity in the true sense of the word.

M'KINLEY ON RECIPROCITY

As William McKinley so well expressed it in the address which he made at the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo the day before he was assassinated:

"By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we should extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade.

"We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us nor for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor."

While we believe in "sensible trade arrangements," there are various features of the Trade Agreements Act, together with the way in which it has been administered, to which we have objected from the beginning.

FINDING THE FACTS

Under the act, the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments "whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States." Scarcely anyone would seriously contend that the State Department, acting for the President in this connection, has seriously undertaken to establish the facts in any given case before entering into trade agreements with other nations. The United States Tariff Commission was established and is maintained as a fact-finding body to assist Congress and the President in matters relating to the tariff. While individual members of the Commission may have been consulted by the State Department when trade agreements were pending or in process of being negotiated, we do not believe that the Tariff Commission as such was ever consulted.

Be that as it may, we believe that the Trade Agreements Act should be so amended as to provide that whenever the President finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions are burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States, he should make a detailed report to Congress setting forth such facts as he may have in his possession. This should be done before entering into any trade agreement. By following this procedure, the finding of facts would mean something more than a mere perfunctory gesture on the part of certain officials of the Department of State, which we believe has been the case in the past.

The Trade Agreements Act repealed section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, thus making it impossible to seek relief in the courts or otherwise by the injured party. This has had the effect of depriving citizens of the United States of the right of property without due process of law. There has been no opportunity to even test the constitutionality of the act.

The act has been administered as if it were surrounded by all the protection accorded treaties with foreign nations, and yet the agreements entered into have not been submitted to the Senate as treaties.

CONCESSIONS NOT RECIPROCAL

We have also felt that in the agreements into which we have entered with other nations the United States has made greater concessions than it has received in return by virtue of the unconditional most-favored-nation policy which we have pursued. We do not believe that this policy should be carried out to the extent of granting concessions to all nations without equivalent or reciprocal concession on their part.

Again, some foreign nations have found it to their advantage to devalue their currencies, to block credit balances, to enter into

compensating agreements, or to otherwise control and manipulate their monetary or financial structure. Through any one or more of these processes they have been able to substantially modify the effectiveness of customs duties determined by our own Government as fair and equitable. If the present act is to be extended, it should certainly make provision for the protection of the American market in the event that any foreign nation engages in practices such as have been enumerated.

The same must be said with reference to subsidies, embargoes, quotas, licenses, and barter arrangements, any one of which might have the effect of adversely affecting the interests of the United States.

When it is found that foreign nations are engaged in dumping or other unfair methods of competition, or are discriminating against the trade of the United States, provision should be made that the Chief Executive shall take immediate action to protect our national economy.

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

In 1934, when the trade agreements bill was introduced, the farmers of the country were told that by virtue of the authority delegated to the President under this measure it would be possible to find new markets or restore old foreign markets for surplus farm products but that it would not result in any increase of imports of competitive farm products.

In the light of these promises, the following figures with reference to farm imports, compiled by the Department of Agriculture, make interesting reading:

Value of agricultural imports

Year	Total	Supplementary or competitive
1932	$613,737,000	$282,428,000
1933	838,952,000	418,515,000
1934	933,774,000	497,892,000
1935	1,141,191,000	641,622,000
1936	1,155,136,000	866,796,000
1937	1,155,136,000	588,316,000
1938	988,648,000	486,165,000
1939	1,239,444,000	571,443,000
1940	1,475,288,000	627,888,000

Imports of so-called supplementary or competitive products were admittedly larger during 1935–37 because of the drought situation in this country. But leaving those years out, it is noted that imports of competitive farm products increased from $282,428,000 in 1932 and $418,515,000 in 1933 to $571,443,000 in 1939 and $627,888,000 in 1940. Thus the value of competitive farm imports considerably more than doubled from 1932 to 1940, while physical quantity increased from an index number of 60 in 1932 to an index number of 104 in 1940. It is generally agreed that reductions in tariffs on competitive farm products let in more imports and made it more difficult to build a sound farm program. Incidentally this reduced the ability of the farmer to buy the products of labor and industry.

EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

When it comes to exports, we can find no evidence that foreign concessions resulted in any increase in volume of farm products sold abroad. Back in 1910–14 exports of farm products accounted for an even 50 percent of total exports. By 1932 farm exports were down to 41.7 percent of total exports. It was to rebuild the export market that farmers were asked to support the trade-agreements bill. Here, again, let us look at the record.

The United States Department of Agriculture furnished the following data:

Value of United States exports

Year	Total domestic exports	Agricultural exports	Percent farms of total
1932	$1,413,397,000	$589,650,000	41.7
1933	2,008,484,000	787,343,000	39.2
1934	2,085,092,000	668,713,000	32.1
1935	2,375,415,000	766,303,000	32.3
1936	2,790,880,000	732,474,000	26.2
1937	3,361,699,000	890,771,000	26.5
1938	2,884,687,000	682,962,000	23.7
1939	3,743,930,000	737,640,000	19.7
1940	3,959,262,000	349,821,000	8.8

While the dollar value of exports of farm products was about the same in 1938 and 1939 as during 1932 to 1935, they were held there only because unit prices were higher and through the paying of huge export subsidies, and not because of foreign concessions to us.

AMENDMENTS AND SAFEGUARDS

1. If the Trade Agreements Act is to be renewed, we respectfully urge that the extension be limited to 1 year. After the close of the war we will be able to make a more careful appraisal of the situation with reference to world trade than under present conditions.

2. The request for authority to reduce 1945 rates to the extent of 50 percent should not be granted.

3. Before the present system of negotiating trade agreements is extended, we should have a comprehensive definition of the term "reciprocity." No agreements should be entered into unless concessions received from any country are fully equivalent to concessions granted by the United States. Concessions should not be granted to any country unless that nation is clearly the principal supplier of any commodities covered by the agreement.

4. The right of court review, as provided by section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, should be restored.

5. We favor an amendment to the act providing that whenever the President finds that any existing duties or other import restrictions are interfering with the foreign trade of the United States, he shall report his facts and findings in detail to Congress before entering into any trade agreement.

6. The act should be so amended as to provide that whenever the landed cost of any imported commodity commercially available in the United States falls below our wholesale selling price, or parity price, in the case of an agricultural commodity, then the President shall impose an additional duty to equalize competitive conditions.

7. The act should be further amended so as to provide that before becoming operative trade agreements shall be submitted to both Houses of Congress for ratification or rejection by a majority vote. The Underwood Act of 1913, which empowered the President to negotiate trade agreements with other nations, contained such a provision.

The Meat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, through a subcommittee assigned to give a special study to the meat problem, has made a written report of its study on that subject. That report is directed to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the Republican leader of the House. I wish to commend to the Members of the House and to the country this fine report. I hope it is perused by many for it is informative and interesting. It comments with conviction on the recent announcement made by Director Fred Vinson, to which I refer as follows:

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 22, 1945—SUBJECT: VINSON MEAT ORDER

The order concerning meat issued May 18, 1945, by Mr. Fred Vinson, reportedly without clearance with the Office of War Information or review by the Office of Price Administration indicates, apparently, that Mr. Vinson has been given some measure of personal responsibility for control of both production and distribution of meat.

If this is the case, his authority should be announced openly by the President and should be extended to cover all foods and all food production. Centralized control is essential, but to be effective it must be centralized control over all foods, and it must be a public responsibility for both production and distribution—not merely someone acting on private orders from the President.

The placing of some control over meat in the hands of Mr. Vinson is not enough. There is a co-relation between foods and feeds and they should be administered together. Sugar and dairy products and farm machinery and farm labor are serious problems in themselves—and all with direct bearing on the volume of our food supplies.

The Vinson order does not give cattle feeders the full assurance they need to again undertake normal feeding. While it promises that ceilings of Good and Choice cattle will not be lowered without notice, it makes no promise that the price of corn and other feed will not be permitted to rise—nor in fact that corn may not again be frozen, as it was in April 1944, when for 2 months corn could be sold only to the Government and not a grain could be purchased in most parts of the country for feed.

The subsidies proposed by the Vinson order for packers of beef may be sufficient to prevent additional packers from going out of business, but they are obviously grossly inadequate to serve as a real incentive for packers to operate at fullest capacity. The promised additional subsidy on beef amounts to only one-fourth of 1 cent a pound at the wholesale level. Testimony before congressional committees has indicated that an increase of 1½ to 3 or 4 cents a pound is required to permit packers once again to handle beef and veal at a reasonable profit.

The bookkeeping system on live cattle which the Vinson order promises to set up will be ineffectual in eliminating at least one major source of black-market meat—purchases direct from farmers and feeders. No set of regulations and no system of bookkeeping can prevent farmers from selling their cattle and hogs at a price sufficient to give themselves a reasonable profit, if such a price is offered to them.

The whole Vinson order, therefore, is still trying to do by compulsion and by insufficient subsidies what can only be done by an adequate profit incentive and a return to the normal processes of orderly marketing. As long as farmers are offered 2 or 3 cents a pound more for beef, veal, and hogs by black-market operators than legitimate packers are allowed to pay, they are going to sell to black-market operators. We might as well be realistic about this matter.

There is only one honest and effective way to eliminate black markets and whip the meat shortage—and if Mr. Vinson is acquainted with Bureau of Labor Statistics indexes or retail food prices, he knows what that way is. It cannot be done by punitive regulations. It can be done only by giving legitimate producers, processors, distributors, and retailers of meat the incentive of a reasonable profit to operate at top capacity. This can be accomplished either by bringing the price structure of meats more nearly into line with the prices of other food commodities, or by subsidies which are so substantial they will have that effect. Half-way measures will not do the job.

In the summer of 1939 food was relatively plentiful and was moving on a free market. Prices were at a natural level in relationship to the cost of production, the demand, and the supply. Between August 1939 and February 1945 (as is shown graphically in the accompanying chart) the price of all foods was permitted to go up 46 percent; the price of eggs advanced 68.8 percent; the price of chicken 61.6 percent; dairy products were permitted to go up 43.4 percent; fats and oils 46.2 percent; sugar and sweets 32.1 percent; fish 116.1, and fruits and vegetables 82.8 percent. But in that same period, the price of beef and veal was permitted to advance only 18.9 percent. Such a situation doesn't make sense.

In later figures on specific food items the fact that the present price structure on meat is seriously out of balance with other food prices is even more evident. Between August 15, 1939, and March 13, 1945, there have been the following increases in retail price of specific food items:

	Percent
Green beans	180.6
Apples	159.1
Potatoes	125.0
Fresh and frozen fish	119.9
Dried prunes	98.9
Dry Navy beans	94.8
Lard	89.9
Other shortening in cartons	70.9
Wheat flour	79.3
Sweetpotatoes	70.9
Rice	70.6
Carrots	69.6
Butter	62.5
Fresh eggs	55.1
Evaporated milk	49.3
Rolled oats	45.1
Canned corn	42.3
Tea	40.1
Coffee	35.9
Fresh milk	30.0
Sugar	28.8
Chuck roast	24.0
Pork chops	19.7
Rib roast	13.1
Round steak	11.0
Sliced ham	7.8
Veal cutlets	2.8

It might be noted that while frozen fish, green beans, and wheat flour seem to be relatively plentiful, it has become somewhat difficult to buy round steak, veal cutlets, or sliced ham. It is obvious that if food prices were anywhere near in balance in 1939, they are seriously out of balance now—and that if the subsidy method is to be used to bring them into balance, the subsidies must probably be considerably more substantial than those announced by Mr. Vinson in his order.

Unfortunately for the city consumer of meat, a reasonable return to producers and distributors is not the only factor which determines when he will be able to go openly to the corner market and buy a good steak or a pork chop again. There is on the statute books of the United States a law which makes it illegal to transport across a State line and sell meat not killed in a federally inspected packing plant, and the Federal Government is taking a large portion of meat which can cross State lines.

Again seeking to do by compulsion what can be done in the United States only by adequate incentive and orderly marketing, the Office of Price Administration has recently issued orders requiring the relicensing of meat packers who do not have Federal inspection—with the announced intention of putting many of them out of business—and has severely restricted the amount of meat those who remain in business can slaughter. The Vinson order announces no modification of this program.

The following table indicates the extent to which residents of the various States are dependent on these nonfederally inspected meat packers for their supplies:

Per capita supply of nonfederally inspected meat [1] by States 1944, arranged according to volume

State	Total	Farm slaughter [2]	Wholesale and retail slaughter
Texas	94.07	23.42	70.65
Montana	93.06	36.87	59.16
Oregon	91.33	15.93	75.40
Idaho	83.68	31.80	51.88
North Dakota	83.62	57.35	26.27
Oklahoma	78.37	27.81	50.56
Nevada	75.10	30.17	44.93
Michigan	74.04	7.70	66.34
Arkansas	71.14	35.93	35.21
Washington	68.96	13.54	55.42
Georgia	68.74	39.71	29.03
Nebraska	65.95	33.27	32.68
Louisiana	64.66	17.08	47.58
Arizona	64.64	16.51	48.13
Colorado	58.62	16.23	42.39
Mississippi	58.22	38.35	19.87
Utah	58.14	11.67	46.47
South Dakota	57.91	43.80	14.11
Ohio	57.86	11.39	46.47
Kansas	56.66	23.43	33.23
Iowa	56.54	37.00	19.54
Wyoming	55.56	34.48	21.08
South Carolina	55.51	26.26	29.25
New Mexico	55.28	22.38	32.90
North Carolina	54.41	32.46	21.97
Tennessee	53.16	34.72	18.44
Kentucky	52.93	33.83	19.10
Florida	52.52	12.12	40.40
Vermont	51.94	32.12	19.82
Wisconsin	51.05	21.13	29.92
Alabama	50.43	30.01	20.42
Indiana	50.13	18.45	31.68
Virginia	45.79	28.57	17.22
Minnesota	45.37	28.26	17.11
Missouri	44.91	24.60	20.31
Delaware	44.50	14.25	30.25
Maine	42.29	10.17	32.12
West Virginia	41.31	19.27	21.86
Maryland	38.33	10.95	27.38
Pennsylvania	37.14	8.88	28.26
Illinois	30.86	10.77	20.09
Connecticut	28.75	1.93	26.82
California	24.74	1.89	22.85
New Jersey	23.81	1.29	22.52
New York	18.89	3.44	15.45
New Hampshire	16.41	9.53	6.88
Massachusetts	16.12	1.22	14.90
Rhode Island	15.01	1.21	13.80
District of Columbia	4.53	----------	4.53

[1] Total supply in 1944 (Federal and non-Federal) was 150 pounds per capita.

[2] No appreciable quantity of the farm slaughter reaches city markets.

It will be noted that the volume of meat available to consumers from these plants which cannot ship across State lines is almost a direct measure of the acuteness of the present retail meat shortage. In the States where most of the per capita consumption normally is provided by nonfederally inspected packers, the meat shortage has been thus far moderate. Where the chief supplies normally come from federally inspected plants, there is less meat; in the District of Columbia, where consumers depend almost entirely on federally inspected plants, there is none.

The reason for this is obvious. Meat for the armed services and other Government uses is taken only from federally inspected packers. During the first 3 months of 1945, federally inspected plants produced a total of 4,000,000,000 pounds of meat. Of this, the Government took almost exactly half. This left only 2,000,000,000 pounds of meat for the civilian population from federally inspected plants—exactly 16 pounds per capita for those 3 months—less than 1 pound a week, and this had to supply restaurants, hotels, and hamburger stands as well as retail markets. In areas largely dependent on federally inspected packers, 1 pound a week obviously doesn't go very far.

The situation would be bad enough in such areas if the packers without Federal inspection were encouraged to operate at top capacity. But many of them have suspended operations, or are slaughtering only at part capacity, because they say they cannot operate at existing prices. In the District of Columbia, for example, the few slaughterers who served the local market in 1944 have closed their doors.

The order further restricting production of meat by nonfederally inspected plants does not appear to be a sensible solution to the situation. The theory is that this will force more of the meat to go through plants with Federal inspection so that it can be shipped interstate. If this move is successful, the meat shortage may be reversed—with the areas dependent on interstate shipments finding it easier to get meat, while those normally dependent on nonfederally inspected plants feel the pinch of the shortage. And, ironically, some of these will be areas where cattle are grown and are today more plentiful than ever before.

By its quota system OPA may be able to force nonfederally inspected plants to reduce their production, but it is doubtful whether it can force federally inspected plants to increase their output against their will.

A competent authority in the Department of Agriculture has informed this committee that federally inspected plants have sufficient capacity that they could be supplying both the Government and their usual civilian customers today with the normal amount of meat, if they had the incentive to operate at top capacity. If they have no such incentive, it is hard to see how restrictions on nonfederally inspected plants will increase the production of interstate plants.

That is may have serious consequences for residents of States dependent chiefly on local packers is attested to by a national organization of such packers, which says: "The effect of this order is to cut down very sharply, and in some instances to cut in half and more than cut in half, the production of these plants as measured by their 1944 output. * * * All over the United States small plants are either closing, severely curtailing their operations, or selling out to chain stores or big packers."

This committee recommended a week ago that the quota restrictions on beef applying to nonfederally inspected packers be rescinded at once. It believes that failure of Mr. Vinson's order to take any action on this matter is a serious omission, and reiterates its recommendation that the quota restrictions be rescinded immediately.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman.
HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Secretary.

Percentage increase in cost of foods from Aug. 15, 1939, to Feb. 13, 1945

	Percent
Eggs	68.8
Dairy	43.4
All meats (including chicken and fish)	36.6
All foods	46.0
Fish	116.1
Beef and veal	18.9
Fruits and vegetables	82.8
Fats and oils	46.2
Sugar and sweets	32.1
Chicken	61.6

Office of War Information Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Appropriations Committee has not as yet reached a decision on the OWI appropriation. I have been told the committee has not yet made up its mind as to what they will or will not do. But previously I understood the OWI was requesting $42,000,000.

That is a lot of money for the OWI, particularly when we are asking little school children to buy war stamps to help win the war and then tossing it out the window on agencies such as OWI. So, I sincerely hope the Appropriations Committee will cut out the OWI appropriation and, like many other Federal agencies that have faded out, it will be something to be remembered but not talked about.

It might interest the Members to know also that the assistant to Dr. Elmer Holmes Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, whose recent rulings were reversed by President Truman and General Eisenhower, is, according to a local news story, none other than foreign-born Georgie Taylor, who never applied for his American citizenship until he caught on with OWI and landed on the pay roll some time after Pearl Harbor.

Certainly there must have been some able American who could have been assistant to Dr. Davis. Why it is necessary to place in a spot like Assistant to the Director of War Information a foreign-born individual is beyond my powers of comprehension. We certainly have developed talent here in America which could fill this position in a most satisfactory manner. Evidently American news writers do not rate too high with the doctor. This American, Byron Price, of the Office of Censorship, has certainly turned in a magnificent performance, which is proof that we have men of ability who could handle these jobs. I think this spot as assistant to the chief should be held by some native American, and there are plenty of them around who could handle it and not have the bungling confusion that has characterized the OWI since its inception.

Everything today here in Washington is pro-British, and a lot of stuffed shirts in the various departments think more about an invitation from the British for tea and cocktails than looking after Uncle Sam's interests. You would not find the British putting on the pay roll some foreign-born citizen as assistant to the chief of British War Information. Evidently a lot of our executives have overlooked the fact that we declared our independence from Britain on July 4, 1776, and it is about time we put soundthinking Americans in these key positions in the various agencies that have to do with the war effort who can look after our interests.

I also note a newspaper story that the Office of Strategic Services, a companion buddy to OWI, and another outfit that should be blotted out by the Appropriations Committee, is dominated and directed in the Far East by Lt. Col. Lynn M. Coffee, of the British Army, technically on loan to Maj. Gen. W. J. "Wild Bill" Donovan, Chief of OSS.

I just want to say to the Members that we certainly have gone far afield from what I was taught in public school. What is the matter with getting a little pro-American and sound off about our American press and the great job they are doing and have done? Get rid of not alone the OWI but the OSS. The War and Navy Departments and the other departments of the Government along with the American people would draw a sigh of relief if both of them were booted out unceremoniously.

The Office of Censorship under Byron Price could handle the war news as could the War and Navy Departments, and the other departments of the Government could handle the other news and the American press could cover them all and do a good job with a saving of approximately $100,000,000.

There should be no compromise on this agency as it would just prolong the agony of its existence. These pleas which we shall hear to continue either one of these agencies as being necessary are in my estimation an insult to the intelligence of not alone the American taxpayers but to every man and woman who wears a uniform. If we want to start to save money, and we have to start soon, here is a good place to do a little housecleaning.

Next year we are going to be looking for votes and the voters are going to be checking the record, so I want the record to show that I am vigorously and viciously opposed to a continuation of either one of these agencies. And the folks back home in my district in Pennsylvania, who are saving every dollar they can to buy war bonds, feel the same way about it.

We have been patient now for many years on a lot of this psychological stuff. Let us get back to that good old American common sense. It is about time Congress reasserts its prerogatives, and demand a voice in determining what the American people will or will not be compelled to accept.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

By all the rules of the game and the record of past performances an official censorship organization by its very nature should rub the working newspaperman the wrong way.

Usually, it does. And by the same rules and on the record of the past, an outfit established to provide the reporter with facts, provide them accurately, swiftly, and honestly—just the plain, unvarnished truth—should earn his benedictions, praise, and lusty support.

In a reasonable, intelligent wartime society that's the way things would have worked out. They certainly didn't under the Roosevelt regime. Things are in the process of change under President Truman, but the record might as well be kept straight. This is what has happened.

Within a fortnight after Pearl Harbor, the Office of Censorship was created by White House Executive order and placed under the direction of Byron Price, executive news editor of the Associated Press.

From its first day to the present, Office of Censorship has operated intelligently, exercised sound and reasonable judgment and so far as this writer knows has had the professional respect and willing cooperation of every honest reporter in Washington.

Now this was the outfit designed to whittle down, control and restrict the one commodity a newspaperman deals in and which he jealously defends—news.

A few months later, in June 1942, the White House set up the Office of War Information under Mr. Elmer Davis.

Its job was to see that working newspapermen got the news about the war to inform their readers and radio listeners.

It was welcomed with huzzahs and cheers by the newspapermen who had been bedeviled, misguided, and harassed by such New Deal press agents, incompetents, and screwballs as those collected in the world-saving and do-good menageries of Archibald MacLeish's Office of Facts and Figures (known as the Office of Fuss and Feathers) or Lowell Mellett's Office of Government Reports—better known as Mellett's Mad House.

This was the outfit, greased up with a lush load of the taxpayers' dough, passed out by a somewhat confused Congress which was to help out the Capital correspondent on his wartime chore.

From the spring of 1942 on, the OWI of Elmer Davis has received—and deservedly—nothing but Bronx cheers and hoots of derision from the working newspapermen.

They would welcome its demise and have nothing but professional contempt for the newspaper ability of the pseudo reporters, rewrite men, and editors who are in fact a collection of panting crusaders, drooling their world-saving global goo to pervert and twist simple statements of fact to suit their peculiar political, racial or ancestral affections.

It now appears that Dr. Davis and his OWI pay roll patriots are in for a very tough time in their fight for more cash from the Treasury. All of which is very fine. Now take the case of Director Price's Office of Censorship.

Price's office has established a splendid record and deserves the thanks of newspapermen and the gratitude of the country.

Office of Censorship was a success, whereas OWI has been a wretched and contemptible mess, because Price staffed his outfit with experienced, hard-boiled newspapermen who knew their job.

He cajoled some to working for him through personal friendship and appeals to patriotism, he put the slug on publishers to borrow some of their best men on a temporary leave of absence from their Washington assignments; he told them what their job was and let them do it.

The system worked. There were a few bobbles and fumbles on both sides—censorship and reporters. None was serious. There was mutual confidence and respect among fellow craftsmen.

Above all, there was none of the slobbering hyprocrisy and phoney propaganda goose-grease which reeked through the offices of the OWI.

Juggling Figures and Contorting Facts to Justify Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, when I recently read again the oft-repeated assertion that our exports to trade-agreement countries had, during the administration of the trade-agreements program, increased much more rapidly than had our exports to nonagreement countries during the same period, I asked my friend, Dr. John Lee Coulter, who is, incidentally, one of the greatest living experts on foreign trade, to make a thorough-going study and analysis of the facts and figures upon which such assertions are based in order that the truth might be revealed.

Because the report which Dr. Coulter has recently released demonstrates quite conclusively some startling facts and conclusions which should be brought to the attention of the country, I ask that the results of this study, a document which this eminent scientist has entitled "Unfortunate Use of Statistics by the Government in Connection With the Trade-Agreements Program" may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And in tendering this most interesting manuscript for inclusion in the RECORD, I cannot help but wonder who it could have been that so ingeniously juggled the figures and contorted the facts and then palmed them off upon the then Chief Executive who, trustingly, incorporated them in his message to the Congress of March 26, 1945.

But all this, notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, the report of Dr. Coulter to which I have just referred speaks for itself. It is the following:

MAY 1, 1945.

UNFORTUNATE USE OF STATISTICS BY THE GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

In order to make it appear that the Trade Agreements Act has served a useful purpose and, among other things, that it has resulted in a measurable increase in volume of mutually profitable foreign trade, Government agencies have resorted to the use of combinations of figures which call for objective examination.

The most recent illustration of such use of statistics in this manner is the statement put out over the name of the President in the form of a special report to Congress about a month ago, on March 26, 1945.

In this special report the then President is quoted as saying:

"The record of how trade agreements expand two-way trade is set forth in the 1943 report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This record shows that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our shipments to nonagreement countries increased by only 32 percent; between these same periods our imports from agreement countries increased by 22 percent as compared with only 12 percent from nonagreement countries. The disruptions and dislocations resulting from the war make later comparisons impossible. The record, published in 1943, is nevertheless as valid today as it was then. We know, without any doubt, that trade agreements build trade and that they will do so after the war as they did before. All sections of our population—labor, farmers, businessmen—have shared and will share in the benefits which increased trade brings."

This quotation, or the same figures, have now been used during testimony before the Ways and Means Committee by several witnesses and on several occasions. The table to which reference is made appears on page 7 of the report of the Ways and Means Committee above referred to, and reads as follows:

[Values in millions of dollars]

	Average 1934–35 value	Average 1938–39 value	Increase	
			Value	Percent
Exports (including reexports):				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 758	[1] 1,232	475	62.8
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 992	[2] 1,306	314	31.7
Total, all countries	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 774	[1] 942	168	21.6
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 772	[2] 868	97	12.5
Total, all countries	1,851	2,139	288	15.6

[1] These figures do not include Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela and the United Kingdom, Newfoundland and nonself-governing British colonies with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreements have been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[2] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies.

Attention is particularly called to the exclusion of Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom and Crown colonies, because of the short time the trade agreements were in effect. The trade experience of this group of countries, excluded from the table was as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Average, 1934–35	Average, 1938–39	Increase	
			Value	Percent
Exports (including reexports)	476	662	186	39.1
Imports (general)	329	362	33	10.1

The first observation is that the trade experience of the group excluded by Government spokesmen was even worse than the experience of all of the non-trade-agreement countries combined (excluding countries at war). Little wonder that they were excluded from the table.

The second observation is that during 1938–39 several countries were already in a state of war or interior revolution and yet these were all thrown in with the non-trade-agreement countries. These included Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, and China (including Kwantung). Actually exports to that group fell off $20,524,000, and imports from them fell off $14,714,000 between 1934–35 and 1938–39. If it was proper to exclude one group of nations to make a good showing for the trade-agreements group, would it not be equally proper to exclude countries engaged in war or revolution in order to get a fair comparison?

For the record, it must be remembered that Japan seized Manchuria during 1931–32 and the invasion of China began in 1937. It must also be remembered that Italy attacked Ethiopia in December 1934, and the invasion of Albania began in April 1939. In the case of Spain, while the Republic was established in 1931, the revolution began in April 1936 and was not completed until March 1939. German occupation of Austria was during 1938 and the seizure of the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia took place during the first 10 days of October 1938. The general invasion of Czechoslovakia began in March 1939. The invasion of Poland began September 1, 1939.

Separating these two groups, we have made a comparison of our exports to and imports from by groups of nations, which will be found in the table.

From the table it appears that when contrast is made between (1) the completed trade-agreement countries in effect during all of 1938–39 and (2) the non-trade-agreement countries carrying on normal trade, the increase in value of exports to the trade agreement countries was 62.8 percent while the increase in exports to the non-trade-agreement countries was 57.3 percent or differed only slightly. From this there is no indication that exports were stimulated as a result of trade agreements.

When we turn to an examination of general imports (without again listing the countries omitted from the trade-agreements group or those included in the non-trade-agreements group) we find that (1) imports from trade-agreement countries increased 21.6 percent while (2) imports from the other non-trade-agreement countries increased 24 percent. These were naturally, substantially the same, since concessions to one were extended to all—except Germany.

The only other point of significance is that exports increased almost three times as fast as imports. This is entirely accounted for by the tremendous volume of exports of automotive equipment, electrical and industrial machinery, agricultural implements, office appliances, etc. These items were largely exported by important domestic industries who believed that the world market was getting into position to absorb very large quantities. Actually, exports of these items increased between 1934 and 1937 about 120 percent.

Here again, the point of greatest significance is that when the countries in a state of war or revolution are excluded the exports were larger in amount and increased at a more rapid rate to the non-trade-agreement countries than to trade-agreement countries, as follows:

Increase to trade-agreement countries, $144,322,366, or 117.9 percent.

Increase to non-trade-agreement countries, $216,267,277, or 126.4 percent.

In addition to the reason just stated for more rapid expansion of exports over imports, it is important to remember that during 1937–1938–1939 important agricultural products were exported with benefit of export subsidies. Futhermore, many foreign countries were already beginning to build stock piles in anticipation of a possible outbreak of new international conflicts. It was during this period that the United States exported unsual amounts of iron and steel scrap, high-octane gasoline, and many other materials particularly needed in connection with military operations. All of these factors tended to stimulate exports entirely apart from any possible influence of foreign concessions in reciprocal trade agreements.

For detailed comparisons of exports to and imports from trade-agreement and other groups of coutnries, see following table:

United States exports and imports for the period 1934–35 contrasted with those for 1938–39

[Values in millions of dollars]

	1934–35 average	1938–39 average	Increase [1] Amount	Increase [1] Percent
Exports (including reexports):				
To trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938–39	757	1,232	475	62.8
Part of 1938–39 [2]	476	662	186	39.1
To non-trade-agreement countries:				
Those in war and revolution [3]	473	452	−21	−4.5
All other	502	790	288	57.3
Total exports	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
From trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938–39	774	942	168	21.6
Part of 1938–39 [2]	329	362	33	10.1
From non-trade-agreement countries:				
Those in war and revolution [3]	324	309	−15	−4.5
All other	424	526	102	24.0
Total imports	1,851	2,139	288	15.5

[1] Minus sign (−) denotes decrease.
[2] Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, United Kingdom, and the Crown Colonies.
[3] Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, China, and Kwantung.

Congress Should Pass the Federal Aid Bill to Education at Earliest Possible Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that we could greatly improve our educational system in this country if we would enact the Federal bill to aid education. This bill gives Federal aid but not Federal control.

The following is an excellent article on this subject which every Member should read:

HOW TO AVOID FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

The threat of Federal control of education: For more than a quarter of a century, education in the United States has drifted toward Federal domination. This drift has continued at an accelerated rate during the war. Present indications are that, unless this movement is sharply checked by an alert citizenry, it will continue even more rapidly after the war.

Following 1929 a mounting number of school systems, especially those in the poorer sections of the Nation, found themselves in a serious financial situation. The Federal Government responded through a series of indirect measures. Under the Works Progress Administration, funds were made available to help keep schools open. Other relief funds were used to establish and operate nursery schools and other educational services.

More recently, through the Lanham Act the Federal Government is distributing hundreds of millions of dollars for educational purposes in communities where war industries and training centers have been established. Again, meticulous Federal controls accompany these allocations. The GI bill of rights bypasses State educational authorities almost completely.

Continuance of recent and current trends in Federal-State relations in education will, within a short period of time, result in the transfer of responsibility for the control of education in the United States from State and local communities to the National Government. If our education become federalized, it will not be because the people desire it. In fact, the federalization of education is inconsistent and the best interests of our future American life.

If national control of schools becomes a reality, it will come by a process of accretion and infiltration. It will result from responses to many small emergencies and from the pressures of many special interests. It will not come as the fulfillment of a policy consciously adopted after mature deliberation by the majority of the American people; it will happen by default, resulting from failure to give this important matter the attention it deserves. No one presidential directive or piece of legislation will be decisive in itself.

Although new factors in our contemporary civilization require closer organization and increased centralization of some of the areas of our life, a central control in other areas is a definite threat to our American plan of social organization. The fact that the National Government must be the predominant authority in waging warfare and in determining the routes of transcontinental highways does not mean that it should similarly dominate such areas as the distribution of news and the education of the young. Education should be placed high on the list of services to be continued under State and local control. The ability to make distinctions as to what should be and what should not be centralized permits some nations to preserve their liberty. Those who cannot so distinguish may succumb to totalitarianism.

Sound Federal-State relationships: Federalization of education in the United States can be prevented by application of the following principles:

1. The Nation as a whole, as well as the States and localities, has a stake in education, and the Federal Government should continue to exercise, within properly defined limits, educational functions demanded by changing national conditions and needs.

Citizens are citizens of the Nation as well as of States and localities and thus the outcomes of education have their effects, both good and bad, upon the Nation as a whole. Accordingly, the Nation should exercise educational responsibilities which are essential to its welfare. Requisite Federal action, however, can and should be limited to functions which supplement and assist, rather than displace, States and localities in the conduct of education.

2. In its relations to education in the States the Federal Government should limit its action to two broad functions: (a) financial assistance and (b) leadership of a stimulating, but noncoercive character.

Four factors now largely determine whether a child is offered adequate or meager school facilities. These are economic status of the family, fiscal competence of the community, place of residence, and race. Education should be a major force in eliminating class distinctions and in equalizing the social conditions under which men live. However, as it operates in some parts of our country, education accentuates class difference, creates and perpetuates disparities in the conditions of men, and thus imperils the very foundations of the American way of life.

Federal financial assistance to education in the States is absolutely necessary if educational opportunity is to be provided throughout the Nation. This fact has been clearly established by a series of fiscal investigations. That such aid can be extended by methods which do not invalidate State and local control of education has also been demonstrated.

The requirements accompanying Federal grants to the States should be limited to minimum items, such as post-audit and the publication of reports to assure the use of these funds for the purposes for which they are granted.

By the Federal leadership function is meant all activities such as research and investigation, conferences, the encouragement of interstate communication and cooperation, the preparation of reports and recommendations for educational development, and all other similar methods which lead to educational progress on the basis of understanding and consent, as opposed to coercion and compulsion.

3. The Federal Government should limit such direct control and administration of education as it exercises to certain special enterprises.

This proposition recognizes that there are certain educational undertakings which the Federal Government should directly control and administer, such as the Academies at West Point and Annapolis. The number and scope of Federal educational enterprises and functions, however, should be kept within restricted limits. There is justification for the direct administration of an educational activity by a Federal agency when this activity is an integral part of some recognized function of the Federal Government and does not duplicate activities nor involve the administration of education in the States.

4. The Federal Government in its relations to education should recognize that this is a service of primary importance, which makes its greatest contribution to the general welfare as a well organized, integrated enterprise designed to develop well balanced citizens for democracy, rather than as a means of advancing unrelated aims or special interests.

This proposition holds that education is a matter of primary concern; that youth can be best prepared for democratic citizenship when their activities are guided by the mature experience of qualified teachers; that the curriculum should not be a patchwork of poorly related activities dictated by passing enthusiasms, ephemeral needs, and pressure groups; that the educational systems must be well organized, both as to their general control and administrative direction, eliminating competition between Federal and State Governments.

5. The decentralized pattern of public educational organization developed in the United States during a period of more than a century and a half, involving basic control and administration of education by the States and localities, is sound policy and should be continued.

The inherent merits of decentralized control derive from the necessity of keeping education attuned to the evolving demands of a dynamic industrial nation; from the desire to permit educational diversity; from the wish to keep education close to the people; and from the fear that if education became centralized in the Federal Government it might more readily be captured for political or other improper purposes. Educational progress in this country is due in substantial degree to the experimentation and adaptation which go on continuously in the State and local school systems.

The distribution of Federal funds for education: The mistake is often made of assuming that financial aid for education is synonymous with control of its program and administration. This is not the case. The presence or absence of control, as a byproduct of financing, depends upon the terms of the legislation. Federal funds for education should be allocated to the States in terms of the following six policies:

1. General grants are preferable to special grants: A grant of so many dollars per pupil

in attendance, available for the financing of all phases of education, or a grant to aid States in establishing an acceptable minimum of financial support in all districts, is a general grant. A specific grant is one specified for use in developing a particular school subject or type of service at some particular educational level or for a limited age group of children or youths. General grants permit the development of balanced educational programs with the needs of children and of society as a whole in mind. Special grants tend to direct attention unduly to particular phases of education.

2. The proportion of a Federal grant for education going to each State should be determined on the basis of objective factors: Objective factors would be, for example, the number of children attending school, or the number of youth of a certain age in the school district, or the fiscal capacity of the district. An objective basis of allocation is one that two competent persons can use independently and get the same result as to the amount due each State.

3. The granting of Federal funds for special educational purposes, accompanied with the requirement that similar sums be appropriated from State or local revenues, is undesirable. The two most serious objections to such "matching" requirements are: (a) The richest States or localities tend to receive the largest amounts of Federal money since they can most readily match Federal appropriations; and (b) subsidies so granted result in unbalanced educational programs.

4. State plans for the use of Federal educational funds should be prepared prior to their distribution and these plans should be worked out jointly between the agents of the States and the Federal Government. The role of Federal officials in this process should be limited to advisory functions.

5. Each Federal act to aid the financing of education should provide that the State legislature must formally accept the provisions of the act and designate the State office to administer it.

6. Federal funds granted to a State should be available for use in schools which the State itself recognizes as eligible to be supported from public funds.

Federal leadership in education: The National Government will be unable to organize properly its relations to education until it establishes an adequate Federal educational office. The present inadequacy of the United States Office of Education results neither from lack of competence nor from lack of effort on the part of its leadership and staff. Rather, it stems from its lack of status and financial support, and from the willingness of Congress to authorize or permit noneducational Federal agencies to develop their own elaborate, and often expensive and overlapping, agencies for dealing with education in the States, and even for the direct control and administration of major educational functions.

An essential step in correcting this situation would be the establishment of an adequate Federal educational agency as an independent office of the Federal Government. This agency must not be a subordinate bureau of some powerful department or independent agency of Government. It must have sufficient rank to deal directly with Congress and the President so that the voice of education will be heard in Washington.

Until such time as Congress takes fundamental action to establish an appropriate Federal educational office, the existing Office of Education should be granted more adequate funds. The President in his latest Budget message recommended more funds for a far-reaching improvement of the Office of Education. Such funds are necessary if the Office is to undertake the services which should be provided by such an agency. These funds would be a small fraction of the appropriations now made annually by Congress for a variety of educational activities.

The functions of the reorganized Federal educational office should not be mainly administrative, so far as the conduct of education in the States is concerned. Some of the principal duties of the new office would be: To serve as the agency of the Federal Government for dealing with education in the States; to administer all Federal educational undertakings except those which, for peculiar and valid reasons, are exercised by some other department of the Federal Government; to serve as an agency through which the Federal Government transmits funds appropriated for education in States; to conduct over-all national investigations and researches; to organize temporary demonstrations of promising new educational undertakings; to collect and disseminate useful information concerning education.

Our democratic technical society requires an abundance of good education. In the long run, the best way to provide that education is under a decentralized pattern of educational organization which keeps the schools close to the people and responsive to their needs and wishes.

A Fifty-Million Baby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of May 21, 1945:

A FIFTY-MILLION BABY

Do you know what the OWI is? It is the Office of War Information. This agency was created to propagandize the American people and to keep them informed of what was being done. The Director of this organization is Dr. Elmer Holmes Davis, a graduate of Queen's College, Oxford. It spends $50,000,000 a year of the American taxpayers' money.

Davis made a ruling which has just been reversed by President Truman. He barred all American newspapers and magazines from occupied Germany. In their place he proposed to print newspapers in German cities staffed by OWI pay-rollers. American funds were to be used for this purpose.

Director Davis gave the correspondents the impression that this decision was reached by the United States military chiefs in Europe, that the authority behind it was of American Army origin, and that OWI had merely concurred in this decision. Davis said that a reading of certain American newspapers would give the people of the occupied area the impression that there might be a division of thought and policy among the United Nations. When this situation was called to the attention of Truman, he called up General Eisenhower and asked for the facts. Then before the White House reporters Truman made this statement: "General Eisenhower has advised me he has issued no policy or order dealing with the importation of publications into Germany."

Do we need the OWI any more? Why does it need all of $50,000,000 a year of our Government's money? Do we need paid propagandists, press agents, psychologists, and advertising experts to sell the war to America? Fact of the matter is that this agency has never functioned expertly or efficiently. Says one writer: "Under it the news of the surrender of Germany was ridiculously messed and botched. Under it the British and Russian press consistently scooped the American press on vital and important war developments—such as the meetings of the Allied leaders at Cairo, Tehran, etc."

Fifty million dollars is more money than it takes to run the largest newspaper in the United States. What are these thousands of OWI employees doing? Here we have an example of the horrible waste of this war. We do not mind waste in the case of the Army and Navy. The winning of the war is up to them. But what of those costly excrescences which have increased the number of Government employees to 3,500,000, many of these young men who were fit for the armed services?

This is the greatest job facing President Truman. He must cut out this waste. He must see to it that the existence of these agencies is justified. The war with Japan calls for no such organization as the OWI. War publicity is a matter for the Army and Navy. Why not let General Eisenhower handle it for Europe and General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz for Japan?

England To Pay Advertising Subsidy to the American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from an article published in Printers' Ink that our Nation's press is to be subsidized in part by the British Government. With further concessions in our tariff rates to Great Britain under the proposed H. R. 3240 and with the advantage of Government subsidized advertising carried in the American press to sell goods exported to us, the proposal of another 50-percent reduction in tariff duties is a bit realistic as well as ironical. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the article in Printers' Ink:

BRITAIN WILL SUBSIDIZE ADS IN UNITED STATES MEDIA FOR INVASION OF AMERICAN MARKET

British manufacturers will make greater use of advertising in American media after the war in a determined effort to "corner some of the rich, lucrative market that the United States represents," Gordon Boggon, vice chairman of the London advertising agency, Mather & Crowther, Ltd., declared in a press interview in New York last week.

In addition to Scotch whisky which Mr. Boggon thinks is the only British product now well sold in the United States, British firms intend to increase their exports to this country of Irish linen, lower-grade chinaware, glassware, woolens, cotton goods, leather goods.

Advertising for these products will be placed in American media through offices of the British Export Trade Advertising Corp., opened in this country to represent British advertising agencies. The British Government will subsidize part of British advertising in this country through the Trade Development Bank.

Mr. Boggon declared that although Britain was before the war one of America's principal

customers with an unfavorable balance of trade of about 4 to 1, it will be an even greater customer for American goods after the war. Its greatest immediate needs are for prefabricated houses, lumber, plumbing, housewares, hardware, furniture, and home furnishings to replace millions of dwellings destroyed by war. "The next three governments will fall in Great Britain over the housing question," he asserted. "We will need at least 300,000 new dwellings a year for many years to come. After the last war the Government was able to supply us with only 60,000 dwellings per year. I'm afraid the housing situation is going to give us a great deal of trouble in England."

The British have learned much about advertising and merchandising techniques from Americans, Mr. Boggon asserted, and hope to learn more. He proposed that there be a two-way exchange of advertising ideas, information and knowledge between advertising agencies and advertisers in the two countries. Some 40 percent of all advertising in British publications has come from American firms, he estimated, and added that this has influenced advertising done by British firms.

Commercial broadcasting to Great Britain is inevitable, Mr. Boggon said. There is some doubt that the British Government will allow the export of money to any foreign radio stations to pay for commercial broadcasts into Great Britain. "That will cause a great deal of trouble," he predicted. "The Government eventually will be forced to allow the British Broadcasting Corp. to license two or three stations within Britain for the purposes of commercial broadcasting."

Before the war British manufacturers did an amateurish hit-or-miss job of export marketing, said Mr. Boggon. They will not make the same mistake in the future, he indicated, but will employ the newly organized British Export Trade Research organization to learn about the requirements of every market so that British goods can be manufactured to fit those requirements. "We're going to make the right goods for the right market."

"After the war, we shall do our utmost to sell you more than we did before the war," he said. "I don't know whether you will lower your tariff further. I hope you do. But I have to proceed on the assumption that you may not do so, and that British exports must do such a good job of merchandising in this country that they can jump clean over your tariff walls. I think we can do it; anyway in certain territories."

Discharges From the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly impressed that middle-aged men many of whom made much greater sacrifices to enter the service than did their juniors, whose age has prevented them from advancing nearly as rapidly, and whose age has so frequently prevented their participating in battle or even going overseas, should receive special consideration in the matter of being discharged.

A hurried perusal of the point system prompts me to believe that they should have received more consideration in its establishment. I am impressed, for instance, that a certain number of additional points should have been given to men who are 30 years old, a still greater number to those who are 35, and a larger number to those who are 39. Certainly, the awarding of such points would not have discriminated against anyone else but would have, in my opinion, been quite fair.

I do not know whether this point system has been fixed and finally established or whether it is subject to change. In the event it is, I urgently suggest that some such consideration be given those gentlemen whenever a change in this system occurs.

I quote without mentioning his name a letter from a very high-class man who finds himself in this situation and who is naturally thinking of the future, just as I am confident all in his age group are doing:

MAY 9, 1945.

DEAR PETE: I would like to acknowledge your long letter which I received many weeks ago. I have read and reread it many times and enjoyed its contents very much. It is my purpose to answer it in the near future and discuss some of the matters which it contains. I apologize for not having already done so, but we have all been straining so hard to bring about victory in Europe that many of our duties to our friends have been sadly neglected. This is not an answer to your letter, but pertains to what I think is a pressing matter now at hand.

You no doubt, in the course of your many daily duties, have occasioned upon a discussion of the increasingly popular subject of the older men in the Army. There have been so many things said already concerning their precarious plight that it is hardly necessary for me to enlarge upon it here. However, by way of putting in my bit, I might state that many of these men left good positions and professions and came into the Army as a good, bona fide dogface purely out of a desire to do their patriotic duty toward our Government. Most of them were excellent officer material, but due to their physical disabilities they were unacceptable. For the same reason they have never left this country and have therefore not accumulated any points on the proposed point system. Most of these men have no children, otherwise they would never have been drafted and would be home with many of their compatriots, making a wad of money practicing their professions. Many of them, as in my case, have exhausted their private savings trying to maintain their families in a respectable fashion. A large portion of them have other dependents besides their wives. This also is true in my case. They have little time to recover before passing middle age. Those who must earn their living with their hands will be lost in a field of young, robust competition.

In the matter of the GI bill of rights they are total strangers. Their benefits after the war (other than hospitalization) seem to be negligible. About the only effective help that I see for these men is to allow them to return to civilian life where they may join their professional brethren who were made secure by the lowering of the draft age many months ago, and thereby allow them to recoup some of their business before the competition becomes too keen.

I am ready to admit that my interest in this matter is, to a great extent, selfish, because my case is a glowing example of the circumstances stated above. On the other hand, I have the opportunity to observe many other cases of extreme misfortune among my fellow soldiers in this category. I acknowledge my presumptuousness in writing this letter. In defense of myself, however, I might add that I am not trying to tell Congress how to run its business. My purpose is to do my bit in conveying to Congress, through my good offices with you, what I believe it would like to know. I have never written a letter before regarding congressional policy and probably will never write another one.

It is my hope that you will give your support and your colorful influence to any bill which may arise calculated to give aid to the men described herein. I am well aware that the war must go on even though VE-day is a matter of history. On the other hand, more than 2,000,000 men will be discharged. The group herein referred to would constitute an infinitesimal fraction of that group. Most of these men have served well in improperly classified assignments. They have done their best at great personal sacrifice. I believe they deserve a break. Any consideration they get now will be a landmark in their lives and will be enthusiastically remembered many years to come.

My wife joins me in wishing for you and Mrs. Jarman the very best of everything, and hope for you many years of continued success in Washington.

Respectfully yours.

Black Markets Are Treasonable—Article by Oscar Vogl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by Mr. Oscar Vogl, of Chicago, entitled "Black Markets Are Treasonable," which appeared in the National Food Distributors' Journal:

In Chungking a 10-cent package of American cigarettes is sold for 70 cents. A pound of butter in Rome, Italy, costs $6. In the United States potato farmers are paid $2.25 for 100 pounds of potatoes (the ceiling price) plus $1 for loading it on the truck. On the New York jewelry market they are paying ceiling prices for watches, but lay down a cash bonus for the cases they come in. There are dealers in stolen goods all over the world, just as there are black-market operators who spring up like weeds every place where restrictions appear.

The law-enforcing agencies have not sufficient manpower to cope with this problem. War restrictions, like prohibition, are not popular. Such a situation always produces illegal traders, who thrive and profiteer while honest merchants suffer and get nervous prostration.

Only the other day the head of the meat department in one of the finer supermarkets located in a swanky Chicago suburb became so nervous under the high tension created by answering questions and sparring with grievances of his best customers that he threw up the sponge. He put on his hat and coat and walked out of the place saying, "I can't stand it any longer. Here we are living up to the law, turning down trade, while the bootlegging black-market operators do a land-office business and make life miserable

for us who want to help the country win the war."

Virtue and honesty have their own rewards, yet with temptations lurking from every corner there will be many who cannot stand up as did this one butcher. Who is to blame? What causes these disastrous conditions? How can we solve the problems? These are most difficult questions to answer.

There are always people who will justify any act from forgery to murder. There can always be found defenders of illegal and treasonable acts. Even Benedict Arnold had his defenders.

In a realistic world where the principles of morality, decency, justice, and Christianity have been trampled on from one end of the globe to another, it is most difficult to find a solution.

What is needed to discourage black markets is not morality preaching nor drastic law enforcement, though the latter would help immensely, but a general awakening. A national consumers' movement that will demand exactly what we are fighting for. These bootlegging black market operations are a defamation. They are an insult to our fighting forces. They are a scourge that must be eradicated or our national prestige will suffer immeasurably all over the world. What moral right have we to preach peace terms or suggest postwar policies if we cannot control our own back yard?

We made heroes out of prohibition era bootleggers and gangsters. We promoted war profiteers to high places. We pardon income-tax violators, and we give new trials to saboteurs. These actions are considered weakness by those who look upon us from a distance.

Black markets are a matter for our consuming public to take into hand. Let the service organizations, women's clubs, trade associations, labor unions, churches, and others on the righteous side of life institute a general boycott of the bootleggers and black markets.

In America we can do things, once we become sufficiently aroused and convinced that a condition which only profits a few and demoralizes the masses has no place in a democratic republic dedicated to justice and equal opportunity for all.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, it is my privilege to include in the RECORD a speech by Hon. Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general of the State of New York, on the subject of Palestine, given before the Albany Zionist District at the Shaker Ridge Country Club, on May 21, 1945, at Albany, N. Y. Mr. Goldstein's address is as follows:

On all of the battlefields of Europe, the roar of the cannon has been stilled. The madmen have died or vanished in the nowhere, but their names will, forever, carry with them a long and lasting burden of agony and misery.

Democracy now sights its guns toward the eastern fiend. The other half of the Fascist terror will soon be vanquished and with it will come the opening of the floodgates for the world of tomorrow.

The barbaric atrocities of the past 10 years illustrate what can happen to the human being when he fails to answer Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"—what has happened and can happen are portrayed by the specters who stalk the highways and byways of the world today. If a humane civilization is to survive, based on the rights of man and the sacredness of the individual, the world must be concerned with man's treatment of man everywhere.

Palestine has ceased to be a Jewish problem. It lives as part of a world problem, for peace is indivisible and can only be preserved on a global plan. When I speak of Zionism, I speak of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth for Palestine, and when I speak of Palestine, there are three important questions which arise in the minds of those who are not Zionists. First: Is Zionism consistent with Americanism? Second: What are the legal and moral rights of the Jews to Palestine? And, thirdly: Is there any other solution for the Jewish refugee problem of Europe?

Is Zionism consistent with true Americanism? Not only is there no possible conflict, answers the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, but there is a positive synthesis: "To be good Americans," he maintains, "we must be better Jews, and to be better Jews, we must become Zionists." Far from it being inconsistent with Americanism, "loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist." "Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent."

America is full of nationalities which accept their new American citizenship, yet look to some center in the old world as the source and inspiration of their national culture and traditions. No one impugns the patriotism and the loyalty of the Belgian, the Italian, the Greek, and the Pole, on account of their national origin or because of their desire to help the land of their forebears.

What are the legal and moral rights of the Jews to Palestine. Notable and crystal clear is the fact that the claim of the Jewish people to Palestine is based on those very principles of law and morality for which free democracy now fights. Not only does history furnish us with the facts on which the moral claim rests, but civilized nations have solemnly and formally recognized the legality of such claim. For 2,000 years Palestine was a Jewish land. There the Jews lived and toiled, struggled, and died, and gave to civilization its exalted moral and ethical concept. Palestine was more than a Jewish State. It was the core of the Jewish religious framework. There lie the greatest episodes with which Jewish history is identified. When the Jews were forcibly exiled, Palestine assumed a greater importance to them. The Jewish furnish the only instance in history of a disfranchised people neither losing its identity nor relinquishing claim to its homeland. Toward the end of the First World War came the first day of light. Legal recognition of the right of the Jews to Palestine was given by the world.

The Allies recognized that the Jews had a national character. The first great manifestation of such recognition was the historic Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which declared:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of that object."

Then came the mandate for Palestine, which affirmed with legal finality the right of the Jewish people to Palestine. It stated with respect to the Balfour Declaration that:

"Recognition has hereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

This mandate of the League of Nations, representing the will of upward of 50 powers conferred the mandate for Palestine on England. It became the trustee for the establishment of the Jewish national home. The intention was clear. At the peace conference President Wilson stated:

"The Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and the people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of the Jewish Commonwealth."

The United States Congress, by resolution adopted in 1922, gave force to the attitude of the American people as to Palestine, when it called for "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." Thereafter the Anglo-American Convention of 1925 made British action in Palestine subject to the approval of the United States.

A quarter of a century has passed. In these 25 years, based upon the representations of the great powers of the world, the land has been rebuilt and a people has been reborn. Acting on the promise of the Balfour Declaration, the Jews brought over half a million people into Palestine. They founded 300 agricultural colonies invested over $600,000,000, built 2,000 industries, and more than 5,000 handicraft establishments. The dead soil has been revitalized—out of the dirt, neglect, and stagnancy, there has arisen a new life, molded by the sweat, blood, and tears of these pioneers. Side by side with its agricultural rebirth, Palestine has progressed industrially and in this Great World War had already proven itself as the military arsenal for democracy. The waters of the Jordan have been harnessed and electrified; great chemical plants draw minerals from the Dead Sea—life has been breathed into the dead.

What will the world do with the European Jew for whom exile is enforced; who cannot return to his old habitat, and who cannot find refuge in any other free country in the universe? Unless civilization has so reverted to the Nazi and Fascist role, as to wish the destruction of these homeless Jews, it must encourage the proved medium to solve the problem—Palestine.

James G. McDonald, chairman of President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Political Refugees, and former League of Nations High Commissioner for German Refugees, sums it all up when he says, "On the record Palestine offers incontestably the primary hope for the solution of the problem of Jewish refugees. The conclusion which emerges inescapably from a realistic résumé of 25 years of intergovernmental dealings with refugees and from a realistic appraisal of the world situation is that in Palestine and only there can the mass of Jewish refugees hope to be welcome and to be assisted to integrate themselves into the life of the community. Only in Palestine will most of them feel that they have returned home."

Deeply imbedded in every people is the desire for full development; the longing to contribute their share to history. Nationality like democracy has been one of the potent forces making for man's advance. A people to survive need an address; a symbol of sovereignty; a home; a flag and a coat of arms. Switzerland, Norway, Greece, Belgium, Holland, Ireland—we can call the roll—all have standing in the world of today and of tomorrow. Yes, let us clearly keep in mind that Zionism is not a movement to remove all the Jews of the world to Palestine; it is not a movement to compel anyone to migrate there. It is a movement to enable the Jews to exercise the same right now exercised by practically every other people in the world—to live at their option in the land of their fathers—or in some other country. Zionism seeks to establish in Palestine, for such Jews as choose to go and remain there, and for their descendants, a legally secured home. Our Jewish pilgrim fathers have laid the foundation. It remains for you and for me,

for the architects who are to draw the peace, to build the superstructure.

The Jewish people have too long been waiting in the anteroom of history. Just as frontiers all over the world will be moved, so must the great nation return to its own, those fertile coastlands of the Mediterranean, where 40 centuries ago the Jews built a nation dedicated to the worship of God and the practice of His moral laws.

Development of the Third Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following address which I delivered over Station KUOA, Siloam Springs, Ark., in my district on February 19, 1945, with additional comment as of today:

Friends, I take this opportunity to speak to you about a matter which is important to our district, and I hope you will not think me presumptuous. I think the third district is one of the best congressional districts in the United States. I say this with quite a bit of pride. When I consider the 10 counties, predominantly agricultural, which comprise the district, I know of no comparable, compact territory in the State. Starting on the east, we have minerals, timber, and power; coming west to the counties of Benton and Washington, we have developed one of the greatest poultry industries in the United States, not to mention the great canning industry and the dairy development, where he had, at one time, one of the best fruit sections in the world.

With all of its fine natural resources, I believe there is still ahead of us our greatest period of development. Believing this, I have asked the Department of the Interior to make an industrial survey of the district, indicating each locality and getting ready with projects for the time when the war will have ended and we can get back to peacetime status, with the boys at home from the war. They have agreed to do it as soon as the manpower situation eases to the point where they can spare the men. The Congress has already authorized, as you know, the construction of Bull Shoals, Table Rock, and Lone Rock Dams. These dams, with the power generated there and with the aid of the private power companies in the State, will furnish plenty of power to develop the great mineral resources of the eastern end of the district where Tom Shiras, of Mountain Home, has pioneered for years. He is really the inspiration of the idea. We can use to the full one of our greatest resources, the fine timber, in all the counties and do it in an orderly and systematically planned fashion in order to keep the supply coming on through the years by the growth of new stock. We have wasted enough timber in the past 50 years to pave all the roads in the 10 counties in my humble judgment.

I think Harry Atwood at Berryville has an idea that will mean much to the people of our section of the State in his plywood experiments. He has developed a plywood which I understand is revolutionary. I am told, also, that certain chemicals have been recently discovered which make softwoods, like pine and maple and elm—quick growth woods—just as durable as oak and hardwood maple, when the lumber from them is treated. I can see, too, that with the development of the dams and the flow of power to private companies, as well as to the REA, the various processing plants for fruits, vegetables, berries, and chickens, will make available storage space for the small farmers of our section and enable them to settle on firm competitive ground in the production and marketing fields.

I was amazed to learn while at Yellville, not long ago, that there is a prosperous little industry down there distilling the sassafras. That is just an example of what I mean. I can see in the future many ways for our enterprising people to find new occupations and to improve the ones which now exist. With our lakes and streams and hills, we have recreational facilities untold. I can remember as a child that the one who thought of an airplane was a mystic, impractical, or just plain crazy. But we lived to see the airplane revolutionize world thinking, and today the Congress is planning and debating peace proposals that, some years ago, would have been unthinkable. In fact, the airplane has changed our whole future outlook in the business field as well as in the political field. Of course, we cannot as a people, or as a nation, if we wished—which we don't—get away from the old fundamentals which made our Nation great, of patience, hard work, thrift, faith, dependability, and perseverance. These are basic; so is progress.

I hope I am not beginning too early, but I am asking the cooperation of the chambers of commerce and all the people interested in the district to assemble projects peculiar to their own localities. As soon as funds are available the Interior Department will have a group of men in the field to get right down to earth on a long-time planning basis, founded on the fundamentals of good government and good citizenship which I have mentioned above. I have already received inquiries from those who are interested in our section and who have capital to invest in these projects. These things will not come in a day, or a month, or year, nor will they come without the good old American process of going after them.

It might be of interest to you to know that this week the House passed an appropriation of $150,000 for preliminary work on Bull Shoals. It also passed a further sum for the completion of Norfolk. I would appreciate the help and suggestions of everybody in this work of planning. I happen to be one of those who believes that there is work enough, profit enough, and room enough for us all in the great third district, and that the surface of its potentialities has only been scratched, as indicated by the little distillery of sassafras juice at Yellville, which I mentioned a moment ago. That is a symbol of the great possibilities at home which await the magic touch of enterprise.

There are two methods of approach to the development of the dams as dual-purpose projects: One is set forth in the Flood Control Act adopted by the last Congress, and under which the Corps of Engineers develops the rivers. The Department of the Interior makes the sale of the power generated by the dams. The other method is that one of the various authorities, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, which are authorized by Congress to dispose of the power and develop the industry around it. Apparently now the consensus of public opinion is that free enterprise should be given as much leeway in the use of power developed from these dams as possible, as it is more of what we have come to consider a democratic process, and follows what we have been taught by long tradition and sound judgment, known as the American system of free enterprise.

However, if private enterprise cannot do the job of building and developing the dams or refuses to do it, then, of course, some authority will be established in order that the whole people who really own the rivers will have the benefit of their property.

As I have stated, the Interior Department has agreed to make an industrial and mineral survey of the district and that is now being undertaken. Of course, we are handicapped by lack of appropriations but we hope to have that remedied before long. It was my idea in asking for the survey, to secure a great many small industries rather than a few large ones. It is my concept that a smaller industry near the towns in our district—none of which are large—is much better than the larger. For instance, say at Yellville, an industry employing 100 heads of families, who own their homes in the town or near, and who are interested in seeing the industry prosper, has a far more favorable set-up both for labor and management, because each one has the interests of the industry at heart.

One of the chief handicaps of the towns is the lack of water.

Another thing about this industrial survey prospect for the future that encourages me very much is the fact that the last legislature passed a law which has been signed by Governor Laney setting up an industrial and resources planning committee for Arkansas. Already this committee is at work dovetailing its activities with those of the Interior Department and I think that in the very near future we can get some real work done. The University of Arkansas Bureau of University Research, under the direction of Dr. C. O. Brennen, has already started out with a program as follows:

First. Forest-products utilization.

Second. Agricultural processing.

Third. Ceramics, including both heavy and light utilization.

Fourth. Minerals, with immediate emphasis on construction materials such as marble and cement.

Fifth. Study of water resources.

The work on each of these will be in two parts—laboratory work at the university, and field work involving inventories of basic raw materials and present utilization. For example, in the wood-products field we are conducting a close study of available timber stands with information on volume, quality, location, accessibility, and so on, and we are planning to set up a wood-processing laboratory at the university for the purpose of experimenting with all types of chemical and physical treatments with all wood species common to this State. The idea of this last is to determine methods of raising the value of material and bringing about higher types of utilization. For example, our common black oak timber is now used for fence posts, also rough undressed lumber and the like. If it can be determined through experimentation that this material, which is fundamentally of high quality so far as concerns strength and durability, can be used for

furniture manufacture, indoor construction material, and other of the higher-type uses, the value of this resource would be greatly increased and some increase in industrialization would materialize.

Along with this phase, close study is being made of wood-processing industries of the higher type, such as furniture factories, to determine the prospect that these industries have of continuing as at present, or the possibility that they may in the near future begin to substitute other raw materials, including plastic types. The idea is to try to get some view of the future of good-processing industries in the State.

In most respects the method of study is practically the same for the second, third, and fourth. In the case of the fifth, water resources, the Bureau will concentrate its attention on local studies of water as to type, volume, mineral content, temperature, or other quality, all of which would be interpreted in terms of industrial use of the adequacy of water for new industries. Included in this phase will also be close study of alternative methods of producing water, such as impounding through the construction of dams on streams. This work will be done in close coordination with the United States geological surveys that are being made in the State, and it is hoped that our specialized activity on this point will be conducted cooperatively with the United States Geological Survey. We have some promise that this can be worked out. In addition to the foregoing, the Bureau, as soon as it has more personnel, will cooperate to some extent on postwar planning studies wherever possible. In fact, a limited program is already moving along this line. Also the Bureau will proceed, as early as possible to study some of the over-all basic factors which constitute advantages or disadvantages to industrial development in the State, such as transportation, interstate trade barriers, market outlets, State policies and State taxation, and the like. This information will be brought to bear upon all local situations where plans are being made for the development of any type of industry.

We are on our way in the Third District. With your help we will not fail.

Report on Meat Shortage in Canton, Ohio, by Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, critical shortage of meat in the city of Canton, Ohio, where a large industrial population must be adequately supplied with meats if war production is to be maintained, impelled me to ask the Office of Price Administration at Cleveland, Ohio, to send special agents to that city to study the situation.

A full report of this investigation has now been furnished to me, and I have submitted it to packers, dealers, and consumers in Canton, Ohio, for reading and criticism.

Out of this discussion it is hoped that measures will emerge to relieve appreciably the meat shortage that is now troubling Canton and its vicinity.

The OPA report follows:

The general conclusions reached are:

1. Canton until recently probably has been getting more than its fair share of the Nation's meat supply for reasons indicated hereafter.

2. At present Canton apparently is getting approximately its share.

3. The situation may improve somewhat in the near future but—

4. Canton's meat supply will not improve greatly until the Nation's over-all civilian supply improves.

The basic reason why Canton until recently probably has received more than its fair share of meat is this:

A. Canton has received 65 percent of its meat from nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses in or near Canton. About 35 percent of its meat supply came from western federally inspected plants. The plants without Federal inspection which supply Canton with most of its meat provide no meat for the armed forces. All their output goes to civilians.

Communities depending for their supplies mainly upon federally inspected plants are in a less fortunate position. They have lost a substantial portion of their civilian supplies, because of the large set-aside for the armed services. At present war needs are taking 60 percent of all pork and from 60 to 80 percent of all the beef produced by federally inspected plants (60 percent of choice and good grades and 80 percent of utility and canner and cutter grades).

B. Inasmuch as only federally inspected meat may legally move across State lines, there was only one way to get to nonproducing areas, especially the Nation's big cities, their fair share of meat. That was to cut down on the kill of nonfederally inspected slaughterers and the meat supply of areas served primarily by such plants. Canton was such an area.

C. Nonfederally inspected slaughterers on May 1 had their kill of hogs cut to 50 percent, and their kill of cattle cut to 25 percent below their 1944 kill. This was less than the percentage set aside for the armed services by federally inspected plants.

Broadly, that is the reason why Canton, until recently, got more than its just share of the Nation's meat; why, recently, it has been cut to approximately its just share. But let's get down to concrete facts:

1. Four nonfederally inspected local plants have provided 60 percent of Canton's meat supply. It gets an additional 5 percent from 4 nearby plants and 2 country slaughterers. The balance of its supply has come from 12 western federally inspected plants.

2. One of the four Canton plants has been closed recently, due to the fact that it was located on a leased farm, which was sold. It is now out of operation. A quota, however, remains with the operator. A plan is being worked out to have one of the other plants kill his quota. This should somewhat increase the supply of meat in Canton.

3. The three other Canton packers had their pack cut about 25 percent the first quarter of the year, compared with last year. They have had their kill reduced approximately 25 percent more recently. Nearby nonfederally inspected plants have cut their shipments of meat into Canton from 5 to 60 percent since last year. The federally inspected western packers have cut their shipments of meat to Canton from 45 to 90 percent. The cut-back in nonfederally inspected plants should provide more meat to federally inspected plants and increase their excess for civilians over the large military set-aside. This should in time and to some extent restore Canton's meat supply from these sources.

4. One of Canton's packing houses, buying bulls in the Chicago market for manufacture of sausage, found prices going too high for purchase if ceiling prices on sausage were observed. As a result it has cut down on production of sausage, and laying off some of its help. The cure for this situation is better enforcement to keep black-market operators from bidding too high for cattle. Then the local plant may restore this production.

5. Local Canton plants report difficulty buying cattle in nearby cattle auctions, from which they formerly got many cattle. Reason: Small newly established plants are bidding cattle up above prices permitted by wholesale meat ceiling prices. The cure for this is better enforcement. The 700 additional meat enforcement inspectors just authorized by Congress should improve this situation.

6. Of Canton's present three operating plants, two are planning to take Army inspection and provide a set-aside for the armed forces. This will increase their kill; should improve their financial operations. It will not provide more meat for Canton civilians.

The third Canton operating slaughterer has not yet decided to apply for either Army or general Federal inspection; will do so, it is stated, if the Government will guarantee it against loss. The new Government program guarantees against loss those who formerly operated profitably and whose slaughter is cut back by the meat control program, the purpose being to prevent anyone being driven out of business by the program. There is no guarantee against loss for slaughterers whose slaughter is not restricted.

7. Canton food stores report a cut in their meat supplies of 55 to 60 percent over a year ago; a considerable drop coming since March 1, 1945.

These stores showed no carry-over of meat of any kind from Saturday to Monday when this investigation was made. Receipts for Monday were light, with little meat on display.

8. Hotels and restaurants checked reported a 45 to 60 percent cut in meat supply from a year ago. They averaged 2 meat dishes on the menu per meal; about the same as hotels and restaurants in similarly situated areas.

9. All facts taken together indicate that Canton is having a more severe meat shortage than any it has yet experienced. It is felt, however, that it is not worse than that being experienced by similar areas elsewhere.

The meat supply of Canton may be somewhat increased by these steps:

(a) Opening of the closed Canton slaughterhouse or by immediate arrangements for the kill of its quota by one of the operating plants.

(b) Better enforcement of ceilings on cattle purchases may divert more cattle to Canton's packers—restore curtailed sausage production.

(c) The meat-control program should increase somewhat the civilian supplies from federally inspected plants serving Canton.

While these developments may slightly increase Canton's meat supply—now probably at its lowest ebb there will be no marked improvement until the percentage of the Nation's meat supply, taken by the armed services, is considerably reduced.

A good illustration of the advantage which Canton until now has enjoyed in meat supply is illustrated when it is compared with

Cleveland. Both cities have received about 30 percent of their supply from western packers. Canton, however, received all of the rest of its meat from plants providing no meat for the armed services. Seven of Cleveland's local packing plants have Federal inspection and have been required to set aside 60 percent of their pork and 60 to 80 percent of their beef production to meet war needs.

There is nothing the matter with the Nation's meat production. While pork production is down from last year, beef production is at an all-time peak. Total meat production is 38 percent above average production for 1935–39. But millions of American families which formerly ate meat only once a week are now able to afford it several times a week. And quite rightly, we are giving our fighting men all the meat they want. That leaves less meat for all of us than we ate on the average before the war. For medium and well-to-do families, accustomed to meat two or three meals a day, it means a very severe cut.

Canton would not if it could, we believe, escape sharing with the rest of the country the shortage of civilian meat.

MAY 16, 1945.

The Cattle Industry Looks at Further Reduction in the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement from the American National Live Stock Association that presents some very important statistical information with respect to this problem. I trust the Members of the House will read it carefully. The cattle industry is one of the most important of all industries of this country.

The statement follows:

We present below some statistical information as to the cattle population in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and in South American countries. Also figures on United States beef production, cattle and calf slaughter, and the amount of beef exported from Canada in recent years. Also figures as to existing cattle quotas and the tariff cuts already made under the reciprocal-trade program to date on cattle, dressed beef, canned beef, and hides.

Cattle population

United States:	
1940	68,801,000
1945	81,760,000
Mexico:	
1930	10,083,000
1940	11,603,000

No recent figure available. Cattle numbers thought to have increased since that time.

Canada:	
1939	8,375,000
1944	10,346,000
Argentina:	
1937	33,207,000
1942	31,460,000

Decrease no doubt due to severe drought of last 2 or 3 years.

Uruguay:	
1937	8,297,000
1943	6,256,000

Decrease no doubt due to severe drought of last 2 or 3 years.

Cattle population—Continued

Brazil:	
1938	40,076,000
1942	42,500,000
Cuba:	
1936–40 average	5,024,000
1941	5,335,000
1942	4,897,000

Beef and veal production

	Pounds
United States:	
1936 (high for peacetime)	8,433,000,000
1939	8,002,000,000
1944	10,779,000,000

For first quarter 1945 total beef and veal production 345,000,000 pounds above same quarter 1944.

Canadian exports

	Pounds
Total Canadian exports of cattle and beef converted to dressed-beef basis:	
1938–42 average	90,000,000
1944 exceeded	112,000,000
1945 estimated to exceed	134,400,000

Note 1945 figure is increase of approximately 50 percent over 5-year average, 1938–42.

Total slaughter, cattle and calves

	Pounds
United States:	
1942	27,619,000
1943	27,683,000
1944 (revised)	33,700,000

Total slaughter (farm slaughter not included) first 4 months of 1945 14 percent above same 4 months of 1944.

Quotas under trade agreements made with Canada and Mexico now suspended for the duration

CANADIAN AGREEMENT

1936:	
Cattle weighing less than 175 pounds	51,933
Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds	155,799
1939:	
Cattle weighing less than 200 pounds (superseding the original quota on cattle weighing less than 175 pounds)	100,000
Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds	225,000

MEXICAN AGREEMENT

1943: Cattle weighing over 200 pounds and less than 700 pounds	400,000

Recently Canadian meat interests have suggested that the British market for Canadian beef may not extend beyond 1946 and have suggested seeking a raise in the quota on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds from 225,000 head to 500,000 head. If this request were granted it woul make a total quota for the two countries of exactly 1,000,000 head of cattle.

Reduction in tariff

CANADIAN AGREEMENT

1936: Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds reduced from 3 to 2 cents per pound; calves weighing less than 175 pounds reduced from 2½ to 1½ cents per pound.

1939: Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds reduced from 2 to 1½ cents per pound.

MEXICAN AGREEMENT

1943: Cattle weighing between 400 and 700 pounds reduced from 2½ to 1½ cents.

CUBAN AGREEMENT

1942: Dressed beef reduced from original preferential rate of 4⅗ to 3 cents per pound. (This reduction does not apply to other countries.)

ARGENTINA TRADE AGREEMENT

1941: Canned beef reduced from 6 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound; hides reduced from 10 to 5 percent ad valorem; tallow reduced from one-half cent per pound to one-fourth cent per pound.

You will note from the above that the cattle industry in this country is at a peak in numbers and that beef production is expanded to a wartime basis and that under the existing trade agreements law the full 50 percent cut in tariff has already been made on most of the important items affecting the cattle industry; that further reduction of the tariff as proposed in the pending bill would leave only a semblance of tariff protection for this great industry. It should not be forgotten that considerably more than half of the land acreage in this country grows grass and that much of this area cannot be used for any other purpose.

That use of the power to cut tariffs has not been limited to items where existing rates were a barrier to imports is clearly evidenced in practically all of the above items. Cattle imports have moved into this country freely from Canada and Mexico under the rates prescribed in the original Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. Dressed beef has come in considerable quantity from Cuba in recent years and it is now indicated that Canada, having expanded its processing facilities during the war, will seek also a reduction in the tariff on dressed beef in order to send part of its exports to this country in that fashion.

Our imports of canned beef from South America prior to the war ran around 80,000,000 pounds per year—some years higher than that. About the time the war began, when the Army made its first purchases of South American canned beef, it was found that they could undersell the domestic product close to 15 cents per pound. The cut in the tariff from 6 cents to 3 cents was entirely gratuitous.

On hides the original 10 percent ad valorem was a nominal tariff and certainly by no stretch of the imagination could be considered a bar to importations. Records show large importations annually from South America and other countries. There was no excuse whatsoever for the reduction in the tariff on this item.

It is our fear that further cuts in the tariff made at request of foreign interests without regard to the effect on American cattle producers can bring disaster to this industry when the war is over and we have to return to a basis of only domestic consumption. We have had no export trade in beef for more than a generation except during the two war periods. The possible heavy imports of cattle, dressed beef and canned beef from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and South America with cattle numbers expanding particularly in Canada and Mexico constitute a major threat to our industry and there should be no further reduction in the tariff. The only way to prevent it is to strike that provision from the pending tariff bill.

Respectfully submtted,

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,

By F. E. MOLLIN,

Executive Secretary.

DENVER, COLO., *May 18, 1945.*

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and introduced a statement urging the Senate committee

to view with favor a restoration of the Budget estimate for development of the Missouri River Basin. The appropriation as it passed the House greatly reduced the item for irrigation and reclamation below the Budget estimate and to a point which flirts with danger.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, a great many plans and programs have been advanced in recent months as the answer to our problem of keeping the national economy on an even keel during the postwar period. One of the soundest of these programs, in my estimation, is that proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. It calls for the construction of multiple-purpose projects by which the waters of our western rivers can be more fully utilized in developing the agricultural economy and stimulating the industrial growth of the 17 States lying west of the Mississippi.

One of the areas for such proposed development is the Missouri River Basin. The Congress has already authorized more than 30 of the projects included in the coordinated program of the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department's Corps of Engineers for irrigation and flood control. Needless to say, the people of North Dakota and the other Missouri Valley States, are wholeheartedly back of this program. I have had hundreds of letters from my constituents urging that action be taken toward harnessing the great river that courses through almost the entire width of our State. The people of North Dakota have waited and worked a long time for such a development program. They will not take kindly to suggestions for further delay.

So in their behalf, I want to express disapproval of the action of the House in making a drastic reduction in the appropriations for carrying out the preliminary work that will be necessary before the actual construction of these development projects can get under way. I hope the Senate will vote to restore those funds for Missouri Basin development and for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to the full amount originally recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Those funds are needed if we expect the Bureau of Reclamation to do its job, and if we want the preliminary work done on the program which the Congress has approved and the projects which it has authorized. In passing the Flood Control Act last year, we authorized $200,000,000 each for the bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers for the initial phases of the work necessary in developing the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin. We are asked now to appropriate $4,480,000 as the first funds to be set aside under that authorization. I think that that request should be granted and that there should be no reduction in that fund.

Eight North Dakota projects have been authorized under the Bureau of Reclamation plan for Missouri Basin development. These are the Heart River, the Knife River, the Missouri-Souris project, and five pumping units on the main stem of the Missouri. When completed, these projects will irrigate more than a million acres of land in the State, and the total estimated cost of construction would be about $120,000,000. Let me say that I know of no better investment we could make for the purpose of stabilizing our grain and livestock industry in western North Dakota. Back in the drought years, the Federal Government spent only a little less than that—some $92,000,000—for relief. Projects like those proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation will do much toward developing our resources so that we will be better able to meet similar problems in the future.

All of you realize that many things have to be taken into consideration before construction can be started on any of these multiple-purpose reclamation projects. They involve much more than the mere building of a dam, complicated as that phase of the operation may be. All kinds of surveys, investigations, and studies have to be made before a shovel of dirt is turned. Engineers, economists, and other specialists have to be sent into the field to make studies of the land, the water supply, the types of farming, the construction sites, and of many other factors that have a bearing in determining the feasibility of each project. Studies on some of these projects are already under way. They should be brought to completion. On projects which have been authorized, work on detailed surveys, preparation of plans and specifications and the performance of other work, preliminary to construction of the initial stages, has not yet been started, and will not be started if we fail to provide the necessary funds.

The Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation a vote of confidence last year in approving the coordinated program for development of the Missouri River Basin, but it takes more than that to put such a plan into operation. I think we ought to back up that vote of confidence with a vote of adequate funds so that the Bureau can go ahead with the necessary preconstruction work; so that we will be ready with the plans and blueprints and that construction of these projects can be started immediately when our returning veterans and demobilized war workers come back and ask for jobs and the opportunity of making homes.

I, for one, do not want to be in the position of telling them that they will have to wait; that before we can provide those jobs we will first have to do a lot more preliminary work and studies and draw up the plans and specifications. The time to do that preconstruction work is now. I urge this committee to recommend a full restoration of the appropriations in funds for Missouri Basin development and the general investigations work of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I want also to point out to the committee that the proviso at the end of the Missouri River Basin item will hamper the prosecution of this work.

I refer to the proviso which reads as follows: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for transfer to any other bureau or office of the Department of the Interior."

This proviso apparently repeals the Economy Act insofar as it would apply to the Department of the Interior bureau since, under the Economy Act, which is the existing law, an agency such as the Bureau of Reclamation can employ the experts of another bureau or office that is better qualified to do special parts of its work. This seems like a wise provision in our basic law and I do not see how this prohibition in the bill as it is before you serves any good purpose. If the Geological Survey or the Indian Bureau or the Fish and Wildlife Service can render expert assistance to the Bureau of Reclamation in the prosecution of this Missouri River Basin work, they should be permitted to do so. As I know the plan and the program, there will inevitably be times when these other Interior bureaus can be helpful. Any work these other Interior agencies do for the Bureau of Reclamation would be chargeable to the appropriation made in this item. As contemplated in the Economy Act, these other agencies would actually save money in the process by eliminating the necessity on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation otherwise to hire such experts as biologists, special hydraulic engineers, and air photographic experts that are already on the staff of the other agencies.

Address by Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina, at Commencement of Meredith College, June 3, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1940

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] at Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C., on June 3, 1940. This address was prophetic in nature and reveals how clearly Senator BAILEY visualized the developing conditions. I feel sure that it will be read with interest and profit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Young ladies of the class of 1940, you are now to receive your diplomas and enter upon your respective careers under circumstances without precedent. It is the hour of the death throes of a great epoch in history—of world convulsion, surely marking the end of an age, and, since humanity will carry on, and an extension of existing conditions is unthinkable, marking also the birth of an age that is to be.

Let me say at once that your first obligation, in the midst of terrors and alarms, is not to be either terrified or alarmed; and in the presence of circumstances darker than the blackest prophecies of the pessimists, not to yield to pessimism. Nothing may be gained by despair, nothing by cynicism, nothing by the philosophy of escape. Calmness and hope, when there is no argument for either, and the poise that they give, are their own argument and justification. Faith itself is founded in hope—it is, said the great apostle, "The substance of things hoped for," which is to say that where there is no hope there can be no faith.

And this reminds me to say that faith, hope, and love are still the great trinity of life, and so long as they are available even to one human being, come what may for the moment, the structure of the good life, the good society, the redeemed race may be rebuilt. And they are guarded by a citadel which no earthly power can ever reduce.

It is, therefore, your first duty to face the circumstances as they are, without excitement, to be calm and confident even though all in this world that you have until now been looking to for standards, for security, for reassurance, may seem to be sinking out of sight. "Well roars the storm to him who hears a greater voice across the storm."

Of the character of the age that is now dying this occasion affords me no time for description. I must be content to refer you to your studies in history. It was the age of the New World, of liberty and democracy, of the relief for a time of that economic pressure which had crowded down all preceding generations; the age of an exceedingly great and happy release of the minds and the energies of men; of matchless progress and general elevation of our race; and, I regret to say, of a gross worldliness and materialism and moral degeneration in its latter stages.

Of what the new age is to be, I dare not make prophecy; and it would be idle to at-

tempt it. But I can say that at once you are to discover vast differences. Individualism is gone. Freedom long since gave way to ordered liberty; and ordered liberty now demands economic liberty and security. A people who have been thinking in terms of what they could get out of their government must now think in terms of what they must do for their government in order that it may preserve to them the ultimate conditions of civilization and progress.

This is the meaning of that new phrase you are now so often hearing—the national defense, the common defense, as our fathers put it. We have been living under a regime of personal privilege, of the exploitation of personal rights, and generally of a gay self-indulgence. We must now live under a regime of duty and sacrifice, of those self-imposed restraints known as morals and of those law-imposed restraints known as statutes. We must gird our Republic to defend her people and her shores from any invader from without or any conspirator within, and that girding must be both personal and collective. We may not make war, but if we shall escape that ordeal, it will be because we convince all who rely upon force, that we can match them unit for unit and overmatch them with a faith in God besides, to which they are stranger; that our Republic can unite and move as one, not under the command of a dictator, but under the impulse of self-preservation, and of devotion to our historic ideals. It is perhaps for us alone to demonstrate that freemen are, after all, stronger than slaves—or failing, to surrender to force that last citadel of democracy, the rights of the soul, and those spiritual qualities which we embrace in two words—Christian religion. At once we must purge the Republic of the selfishness of its people.

Your second duty, therefore, for the present, is to consider that nothing that you have or may acquire is yours. You and all you have is your country's until the hour of peril shall have passed, and those responsible for it shall have been disposed of.

We do not know what will be the outcome in Europe, and there is little we can now do to determine that outcome. We do know that in any view of that outcome we must at once prepare our country's defenses and keep them prepared for years to come, and that to do so will require of each the utmost readiness to sacrifice. It means a new order of living, new discipline, new attitude, a new patriotism, a patriotism of piety, but I would not say that we will be the worse off for it. It is not unlikely that at length we will be the better and happier for it, for there has been too much soft living, too much soft thinking, too much easy living in our land, and if we may now learn how each may live for all and all for each in a free Republic, not only ourselves but the whole world and all generations will be the gainers thereby.

Many have long been convinced that we could not hope to go on much longer after the manner we have maintained these last 20 years. Our national scene has presented the spectacle—immeasurably depressing—of individuals and groups in unashamed and unrestrained scramble for advantages of their government and their fellows and of public leaders who dared not deny any demand lest they be thrust out of office by even more subservient successors. If the necessities of the common defense of the firesides of our fathers and the altars of our God shall serve to make an end of this and substitute for it a universal devotion to the common good and shall bring on an era in which the public servant who dares to serve all and therefore yields to none, who seeks the right and refuses to pander for votes, if we may have an end of pandering in politics and a beginning of genuine service, if the hour of opportunism shall pass and the hour of that righteousness which exalteth a nation shall come on in this new necessity for unity in the common defense, who will say that it were not better so?

But my theme relates more directly to each of you, young ladies—for months ago I informed your president that it was my intention at this hour to speak on the Personal Problem in a Dying Age.

You wish to know how you may proceed in a period of so vast transition. Perhaps I do not know. But what I have to say is not my own so much as it is the lesson of the ages confirmed at length by the observations and experiences of a long life. You cannot solve the riddle of existence, but you can make your contribution. You cannot determine events, but you can determine your character. And it will be sufficient if you give to your generation just one example of the good life. To this end I propose four standards as follows:

1. Fear of God and none other. Fear to offend Him, fear to displease Him, fear to disappoint Him. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

2. Do the day's work and do it with all your might. There may not be gainful employment, but there always will be profitable employment for you—right at hand. Not in high places, perhaps, but high work.

3. Be kind to every one of your fellows. The cup of cold water is the symbol of every man's obligation and every man's need. The kindly judgment, the kindly thought, the kindly deed are the solvents of mankind's deepest problems, the healing of humanity's deepest wounds.

4. Have faith in God. It will give you the courage that is born only of faith. And let me define faith for you. It is not to believe that good things hoped for will come to pass. It is firmly to hold when all good things are denied, when the worst has happened or is about to happen, that all is nevertheless well. It is to disregard immediate consequences, to hold a true course under any circumstances in the conviction that there is an eternal making for righteousness, that it cannot be defeated, and that its rewards are sure.

Take these four standards with you in the new time and they will take you through.

The Light Metals Industry in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject The Light Metals Industry in the West, delivered on April 20, 1945, by the Governor of my State, the Honorable Earl Snell, at the Western Governors' Conference at Reno, Nev.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIGHT-METALS INDUSTRY IN THE WEST

These are very busy days in the office of governor in any State. The presence at this conference of nearly all of the governors of the 11 Western States is indicative of their appraisal of the importance of this gathering and of their interest in the questions and problems to be considered.

One of these questions is the future light-metals industry in the West. I was assigned that topic. It seemed that the extra time necessary to prepare even this brief discussion simply was not available. Yet, I realized that the great importance of this industry to the future development of the West suggested the burning of a little more midnight oil on the part of all of us. It has a particular application to my own State of Oregon.

A unanimity in thought and action is necessary on the part of the western governors in connection with some of these problems if we are to obtain the results desired. Hence, the primary purpose of this conference.

And so, for the purpose of our discussion, I submit these few thoughts for consideration and subsequent action.

It seems to me that in any discussion of industrial development there are certain fundamental questions that must receive early consideration. Indeed, the retention and further development of the light-metals industry in the West is no exception.

Three of the more important questions which come to mind and which I would list for early exploration and analysis are these: Raw materials, cost of manufacture, markets.

LIGHT METALS

Magnesium

In discussing the light-metals industry, aluminum properly occupies the spotlight position but the importance and utility of magnesium is not to be minimized. Even though lighter than aluminum, the tensile strength of its alloys is practically the same as that of the best steels. Apparently its most practical use and its greatest commercial value are derived from being alloyed with other metals, principally aluminum.

The ore or raw material for magnesium is found in each and all of the 11 Western States. However, there was no production whatever of light metals here prior to the war. Now several large plants are operating in a number of our Western States producing a major portion of the Nation's magnesium capacity. The use of magnesium may be expanded considerably in the postwar period.

Beryllium

Beryllium is another light metal, but its total use is very small.

Aluminum

In the manufacture of aluminum during this war emergency period, the West has established records which are the envy of the entire Nation. Our case has been proved. However, the retention and continued operation of these plants is a question not quite that simple in its solution.

In my approach to the question I shall follow the steps previously outlined—namely, raw materials, cost of manufacture, and markets.

Raw materials

Bauxite is the accepted raw material for aluminum manufacture. From bauxite comes alumina. Alumina is then processed with electric power into aluminum.

The known supply of high-grade bauxite ore in this country is very limited. The greatest reserve of bauxite, known and potential, lies in the State of Arkansas. There are scattered deposits in some of the other Southern States, but the supply is either very small or the quality deficient. Large quantities of bauxite ore have been imported from Dutch Guiana.

The question of costs will be discussed a bit later, but I think it is timely at this point to mention that the manager of one of the Northwest aluminum plants recently made the statement that the costs of manufacture of aluminum at this particular western plant were so low that the raw material could be shipped to the West from Arkansas, processed here, and the finished product shipped across the continent again to the East, all at a cost less than the like aluminum product could be processed in the East. However, the need for a bauxite or alumina plant in the West is obvious. According to Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the War Shipping Administration, transportation savings from such an installation would total about $13 per ton of aluminum.

Materials other than bauxite from which alumina may be extracted offer promise here in the West.

Alunite is found in some of our Western States and large deposits of alumina clay have been discovered in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

An alunite reduction plant is located in Utah, and, through the facilities of the Defense Plant Corp., the Columbia Metals Corp., and the Chemical Construction Corp. are constructing and will operate in Salem, Oreg., a four and one-half million dollar alumina-from-clay reduction plant. The economic success of this process has not yet been determined, but if successful, it should open the door to a great development. An experimental plant also has been located at Laramie, Wyo., where large anorthosite deposits appear.

Recently, extensive deposits of iron-bauxite have been discovered in Oregon. Some of the tests show the alumina content to be nearly 50 percent. It is estimated to average about 35 percent and the iron content 25 percent. Eastern officials are now making additional tests. This discovery is cause for much optimism and encouragement.

COST OF MANUFACTURE

Electric power represents a big item and major classification of cost in the operation of a light metals industry. The West has the biggest block of cheap electric power to be found any place in the Nation.

The 11 Western States possess 66.7 percent of the potential water power of the United States. Washington, Oregon, and California alone have over 50 percent.

The ultimate rated capacities of the bigger hydro installations are as follows:

	Kilowatts
Grand Coulee Dam (Washington)	1,620,000
Boulder Dam (Arizona and Nevada)	1,322,000
Umatilla Dam (authorized) (Oregon and Washington)	690,000
Bonneville Dam (Oregon and Washington)	518,000
Shasta Dam (California)	375,000
A grand total of	4,525,000

To be added to these figures are the capacity ratings of the plants of the private utilities, both hydro and steam as well as many smaller hydro installations under public ownership. And there yet remains in the West a tremendous amount of undeveloped water power, a great never-ending source of cheap electrical energy.

Likewise is the West rich in the expendable items which are used for power development, for fuel and for industrial production—coal, wood, gas, and oil. Coal is found in all of the 11 Western States, the chief producers being Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Montana, and New Mexico. Gas and oil are found in California, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Substantial drilling operations are now underway in Oregon and I understand in some of the other States as well.

Twenty-three million tons of coal annually are produced in the West, as well as 25 percent of the crude petroleum supply of the Nation.

Three-fifths of all wood produced in the United States comes from the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States.

LABOR

Another item to be considered under the general heading of costs of manufacture is labor. The availability of a stable and dependable labor supply is important to the success of any industry. In the West we have just that. The western spirit prevails. On the whole, labor relations in the West have been very satisfactory. The men—and women, too—have been cooperative and understanding. They are definitely interested in the development of new industries in the West and can be counted on to cooperate and assist to the fullest extent.

I take pride in pointing to the fact that during this emergency, labor relations in Oregon have been outstanding in the Nation.

At this point it should be mentioned that the most favorable and desirable climatic conditions prevail in the Western States. Such is an asset of great advantage when measured in terms of costs.

TAXES

The next subhead I would include is that of taxes. The Western States have adopted the usual and accepted forms and methods of levying and collecting taxes.

Partly because of our limited population, no doubt, we find that the average per capita tax in the 11 Western States is $48.57 as against a national average of $42.58. The per capita tax runs from a low of $34.95 in Wyoming to a high of $75.74 in the State of Washington. The per capita income, however, of residents of the 11 Western States totals $1,069 as against a national average of $1,031.

Several of the Western States are now undertaking thorough studies of their tax structures with a view to improving the systems and providing greater incentive to prospective industrial development.

One item of great importance and one that gives rise to considerable concern is the large bloc of federally owned lands in the 11 Western States. The Federal Government now owns nearly 50 percent of the total area of lands in these Western States—47 percent, to be exact.

Such Federal ownership runs from a low figure of 26 percent in Washington to a high of 78 percent in Nevada. Obviously, those lands are not on the tax rolls.

There is a bill now pending in Congress which is designed to remedy this situation, as far as the question of taxation is involved. The proposed law would provide that the States be reimbursed by the Federal Government in amounts equal or nearly equal to the loss in taxes sustained by the States on account of such Federal ownership. Such a law would be very beneficial in further distribution of the tax load in these Western States and would in effect broaden the tax base to a considerable degree.

Recent reports indicate that passage of this proposed law this year is quite likely. We western governors should give unanimous support to the measure.

TRANSPORTATION

The Western States have access to all modern forms of transportation—rail, water, highway, and air. Barges, ships, and tugs operate on the inland waters and streams, while oceangoing vessels ply from the ports of the Coastal States. Transcontinental railroads and truck operations serve practically all of the main cities of the 11 Western States. Thus is assured dependable transportation at low cost. The States likewise are served by transcontinental air lines, which service is to be extended and improved in the postwar period.

MARKETS

The subject of markets and foreign trade undoubtedly will be discussed extensively at another period during this conference. However, I wish at this time to call attention to a few items which I deem pertinent and which have particular application to this subject of light metals.

Looking out over the broad Pacific toward the Orient—China—Russia—we can visualize a postwar potential market in the light-metals field of tremendous proportion. Then, too, we can anticipate a vast amount of business from the Americas alone—21 nations, with a population of 250,000,000 people.

Let us for a moment, however, give consideration to the possibilities of our own western division and to the Nation as a whole. In our 11 Western States we have a population of 15,000,000 people. Inclusion of the western Territories and possessions adds another 17,000,000, for a grand total of over 30,000,000, and, in my opinion, the West is on the eve of a great growth and development. However, with our very low cost of manufacture in the light-metals field, together with the advantage of excellent transportation facilities, we are placed in a favorable competitive position in the markets of the East.

The low production costs of aluminum here in the West give rise to the likelihood of greatly expanded use of this light metal. Consideration is now being given to its use in the building of trains, trucks, busses, boats, various building materials, irrigation pipe, and an endless number of appliances, utensils, and gadgets. Here lies opportunity for the development of untold numbers of small business concerns. Include also the necessary numbers of small plants, shops, and foundries turning out castings, forgings, and the like.

With proper development there is real opportunity in this western light-metals field to provide for the economic rehabilitation of large numbers of our returning veterans.

Aside from a considerable use of aluminum by the aircraft industry, a big potential field for expanded use of the product rests with the automotive industry. It has been predicted that, if and when the cost of aluminum is lowered and there ceases to be virtually a monopoly of the product, there then would develop a wide-scale use of this light metal in automotive equipment. Lighter-weight equipment obviously means longer life for our highways.

Last month the circuit court of New York handed down its Alcoa antitrust decision, which may have far-reaching effect in the disposal of the Government aluminum plants and the future of the industry in the West. In discussing the question of plant disposition, the court said that the disposal agency "may well believe that it cannot do so without some plan or design for the industry as a whole, some comprehensive model which shall, so far as practicable, reestablish free, independent, private enterprise, discourage monopoly, strengthen small competitors, foster independents, and not foster monopoly or restraint of trade."

The Western States have an unusual interest in the program of disposition that will be adopted by the Surplus Property Board.

Another policy of Government of vital interest and concern to the future of the industry in the West and to the industry as a whole, for that matter, is the one having to do with the American subsidized Shipshaw aluminum plant in Canada.

In 1941, the United States Government loaned, without interest, to the Canadian Aluminum Co., $68,500,000. This money was used in the construction of the power dam at Shipshaw and the adjacent aluminum ingot plant. Not only was the money loaned without interest but the obligation was to be repaid by the sale of aluminum to the United States Government. Furthermore, the price at which it was sold is higher than the price paid for aluminum to firms in the United States.

The amount of aluminum involved in the Canadian deal totals 1,370,000,000 pounds, with 245,000,000 pounds to be delivered in 1945.

There is just cause for all of us who are interested in the postwar development of the light-metals industry in the West to view this entire transaction with considerable alarm and much concern.

CONCLUSION

In developing this discussion I have attempted to point out the great possibilities for future development of the light-metals industry in the Western States and yet at the same time to focus attention on the obstacles to be met and these things that need action now and in the future.

Briefly, then, may I summarize with the following statements and suggestions:

1. The 11 Western States should become actively interested in the development of a plan for the disposition of aluminum plants by the Surplus Property Board that gives promise of a long-range, systematized program of development of the light-metals industry in the West.

2. The future success of the industry strongly suggests a suspension of settlement of the Shipshaw Canadian aluminum contract.

3. A bauxite or alumina plant, properly located, should be constructed in the West.

4. The Government should render assistance in making available to the West low-cost raw materials, particularly from foreign countries at least until local sources and methods have been proved.

5. It seems highly desirable for the Government to create emergency stock piles of aluminum as well as exercise care in the disposal of surpluses, if any, following the war.

6. The Western States should conduct surveys for future markets both here and abroad, as well as surveys looking to the location of light-metal plants, shops, and factories.

7. Through the medium of advertising and through the facilities of appropriate agencies, both public and private, we should "tell the Nation" of the great manufacturing advantages of the West.

8. Some of our educational institutions should establish courses in the light-metal fields and promote research in new uses and processes.

9. The Western States should review and analyze their tax structures with a view of offering every possible inducement to future growth and development. Immediate support should be given to the bill providing for payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands.

10. This conference, by resolution, should provide for the creation of a select and qualified committee, appointed by the Governors of these 11 Western States, to pursue actively all phases of this question so important to the future welfare and development of the West. In unity there is strength. The time for action is now.

American University of Washington, D. C., Graduates Class of National Service Officers for Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans, recognizing the need of furnishing expert advice and assistance to their veteran members who are seeking compensation or other benefits from the Government, are sending candidates from their membership for the position of national service officer to the American University, of Washington, D. C., to participate in its special course for such a career.

On Sunday night, May 20, a class of 22 World War II veterans, all disabled and a number of them having lost an arm or leg in combat, graduated from American University after completing its course for national service officers. Appropriate ceremonies were held at the Metropolitan Memorial Church in Washington, presided over by the aggressive and popular president of the American University, Dr. Paul Douglass.

The graduates after an apprenticeship in several Veterans' Administration facilities will become permanent employees of the Disabled American Veterans, and will be stationed as representatives of the DAV at facilities of the Veterans' Administration where compensation and pension claims are adjudicated.

It was my privilege to deliver the graduation address for this class, and I am appending herewith the text of my address:

Perhaps some of you will be properly inquisitive as to why out of 435 Members of the House of Representatives, I should be selected to take part in this graduation ceremony. The answer is that one of the class members, Mr. Albert Hasler, is a native of Massillon, in my Congressional District—that city known so widely as the home of General Coxey who marched the unemployed to Washington back in the nineties; of the Gish sisters so beloved by moving picture devotees; and lastly of the Massillon Tigers football team. If any of tonight's graduates is in ignorance of the record of the Tigers, Mr. Hasler and I are in accord that this ought easily to deprive him of the right to graduate.

The standard pattern for an address to a graduating class, if I remember those of my school days correctly, is to be profoundly philosophical, to moralize broadly and to supply an all too liberal measure of counsel. With due apology to any educators who may be in the audience, I must say that this type of discourse too often bewilders, and sometimes leaves the graduate, on the threshold of his departure into the world of affairs, wondering whether things are really so complicated and so difficult of comprehension.

I have determined to stray from this usual tendency and to say something to this class that will touch intimately on the type of work its members have chosen, to analyze if I may the scope of their duties; all of which observations I hope will exalt in their minds the profession of service officer, and cause them to leave this college that has served them so well with a higher consciousness of their responsibilities. This is, indeed, no mean calling they are about to pursue.

This class of graduates, all of whom were injured in the line of duty, is just a pitifully small segment of the thousands who will go through life under a physical disability as a result of the war. I am fearful that as the job opportunities diminish—and, of course, this is sure to occur—and as the emotional uplift of war vanishes, employers will begin to prefer men who are sound physically and without any physical impediments. That is why Government through the Congress will have to be vigilant to keep the door of opportunity open to these battle casualties, especially when the natural sympathy aroused by their plight begins to disappear.

It is difficult in these days to find anything in the recent history of Germany, corrupted and dishonored as it is by the cruel fanaticism of the Nazis, to applaud, but it is a historical fact that the German Republic in its constitution promulgated at Weimar, compelled employers to provide jobs, in certain ratio to the total employment afforded, for German soldiers of World War I, crippled or maimed, and therefore looked upon as undesirable. With the revelations of their concentration camps I am almost persuaded that this was not so much an evidence of humanitarianism and fair play as it was a token of encouragement to future soldiers who might be worried about being left permanently crippled.

This program of the Disabled American Veterans, by which it enables handicapped soldiers of World War II to equip themselves for trained and important civilian service, and to insure to their families a proper income, is a significant step. Disabled American Veterans, as an institution, is not just patriotically preaching to others about aid to the crippled soldier but as an employer it is making room in its own household for the disabled soldier.

With this example the Disabled American Veterans have a right in the future to ask the thousands of employers through the length and breadth of the land likewise to find in their organizations certain types of jobs under their control, that by their nature can be set aside for disabled soldiers and permanently occupied by them. That would be a comparable approach to the solution of the problem of the handicapped soldier with what the DAV are themselves doing. With assured knowledge that sufficient employers were ready to receive into their employment disabled veterans, the United States Government, through its educational aid, could keep a steady flow of soldiers emerging from schools and colleges, such as American University, prepared and technically trained for the jobs they know would be awaiting them.

In this instance these graduates are being educated at the expense of the United States Government for a certain career, and whilst in this course of preparation they are assured that when they leave the school they will not have to stand in the out-of-work line at a factory, perhaps to discover that the training they received is not needed, or that there is a surplus of workers with similar aptitudes. The Disabled American Veterans have managed to correlate training and actual jobs in existence.

It was only when I began reflecting about what I should say tonight, that it suddenly dawned upon me that I have some peculiar right to talk to men aspiring to the position of service officer for veterans. I came to Washington back in 1910 as private secretary to a Member of Congress, and in those days, when local organizations of veterans did not advise their members through local post and chapter service officers, the Congressman—or more accurately, his secretary—was the service officer extraordinary for all the veterans of his district—then confined, of course, to Civil War and Spanish-American veterans. I struggled enough with soldiers' folders, bulky with letters from pension departments, affidavits of doctors, and petitions from neighbors, to give me a picture of what you are going to face when you take your apprentice training in the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. Even when I came back here as a Member of Congress, the veterans of World War I were still depending upon their Congressman for advice and assistance, and I suppose I had as many as 1,000 soldier cases in my office. Other Congressmen had at times two or three thousand cases, especially if they were located in a district where a veterans' hospital operated.

Going back to my secretarial days, I recall the many trips I made to the old Pension Building, that immense red structure still standing in this city, where the pension files were kept and where the Commissioner of Pensions and his force were located. Old Grand Army men, proudly displaying in their coat lapels the little Grand Army button of bronze, met you kindly and courteously. After you revealed the pension case you were interested in, the clerk at his individual desk, talked socially with you until a colored messenger, after sometimes a prolonged wait, arrived on the scene with the bulky roll of papers, designated by case number, and hav-

ing inscribed in handwriting on its face the name of the veteran. If you were lazy-minded, you let the clerk give you his opinion on the case, but if you were inquisitive and alert, you listened respectfully to his judgment, than you asked for the papers and began the arduous task of beginning at the inception of the case and hastily reading over the innumerable reports and papers, sometimes yellow with age, specially noting medical examinations. Then if you amounted to anything you decided for yourself whether the pensioner's status could be improved and you acted acccordingly.

The most active cases, of course, back in 1910, were those of Spanish-American War veterans. As a boy, I had seen the soldiers of this war come back to my community, emaciated and some almost skeletons. Every time I see the current views of inmates of German concentration camps, my imagination summons up pictures of our Spanish War veterans being lifted into horse cabs and old-time street cars to be hauled from the depot to their homes. Fevers and malaria had brought most of them low. Invariably, dysentery had haunted them all the days they were in Cuba or other islands occupied in the Caribbean.

When their pension cases came up for adjudication, there was in uncounted cases, the same old medical opinion that dysentery and malarial fever had no lasting effects, and that the applicants therefore were not entitled to relief. I never venture to question medical science, especially when I am in urgent need of it myself, but I never as a layman could swallow the judgment that those Spanish War veterans whom I had seen—mere shadows of themselves, for I had known them before they marched away from my home town—did not carry in their systems to their dying days, vestiges of the poison that during their service filled their bodies.

Reviewing my experience in this field, I want to tell you after examining the curriculum of your present course, how much better equipped you will be than was I to handle and dispose of pension and compensation claims. You have had a course of elementary physiology. Come to think of it, I never in my study of claims ever tried to reinforce my limited knowledge of the human body and the diseases it is heir to. Upon reflection, I should say that my work was imperfectly done, if I could not properly interpret medical reports and apply to them well-known rules of medical science. You see, now, the great advantage of educational guidance, such as this college has given you.

It is properly suggested that you will lean heavily in your work on the technique and methods of the lawyer to interpret pension laws, and more particularly the regulations that flow from them. I presume, above all, that you must obey some of the professional ethics of the lawyer, in that the conversations you have with applicants for aid must be received in confidence and so kept. As advisor and confidante, you will often find yourself in the role of priest or preacher, and that which is whispered into your ear must remain your exclusive possession.

I can't help relate, at this juncture, an observation during my career as congressional secretary. It was before I had entered the legal profession. The Member of Congress I served had been a lawyer. Whenever a dispute about some phase of law arose in our office, the participants, including myself, ventured our opinion about what the law said, but it was only my chief who had sense enough to end the dispute by calling for the law volume. I can see him yet, adjusting his steel-rimmed spectacles, then leafing the pages of the volume—without uttering a word—and then finally terminating the dispute, now grown hot, by calmly reading the letter of the law. There was the answer, and not in our speculations. I think your instructors will agree with me that it is an invaluable rule always to follow, to get the law books down from the shelf and see what they say. That example of my old chief was never forgotten while I was in the active practice of the law.

But, then, you can never succeed as a service officer, endowed as you may be with medical and legal knowledge, and possessed of an acquaintance with methods of the Veterans' Administration, unless you have a patient and equable disposition that makes it possible for you to advise, without being irritable or dictatorial; that enables you to reduce instead of inflaming the tempers of some men who believe themselves unfairly dealt with; that enables you to look far and study deeply how to extricate unfortunate men from their dilemmas that have overwhelmed them and oftentimes have left them fighting mad. I know the unreasonable visitor, and however difficult at times, it must be your aim to bring him into an attitude where he can be made to see the right and wrong of a position.

I cannot help saying to you that, however much the disabled American veterans will want to retain your services if they are intelligently and conscientiously performed, your entrance into this field does not by any means freeze you in an occupation and preclude you from either promotion or successful performance in other capacities. The truth is that if you assimilate the body of intelligence which the university has tried to introduce you to in this course, you will—providing the end of the training is not the end of your search for knowledge—become a personality endowed with the talents of lawyer, doctor, and diplomat. With such qualities, the doors of ambition to many other fields will be opened to you, especially those fields where experience in social service is valued, and, not least of all, you will be ably equipped to fill offices of responsibility in your city, State, and National Government.

Besides your family interest, your occupational attachment, you will remain above all in your community, a citizen of the country you have all served so recently with so much sacrifice. I plead of you to keep in one corner of your mind a faith that will survive all cynicism and outlive as many temporary defeats as may come, in the eventual creation of a world where war will be banished as a determinator of national rivalries and differences. No one more than you, who have seen war, should realize its insanity, and should therefore for the sake of the generations that follow you, dedicate yourselves to the present movement for the preservation of a lasting peace.

Men once slew each other over a line fence dispute. Courts took over these personal controversies, and adjusted them without violent behavior. Until less than 100 years ago, educated men in colleges were insistent that honor required them to participate in duels, but this brutality has succumbed to the demands of public sentiment. Preservation of the peace has moved from the local community, to the State, to the Nation, and less slowly to the relationships between separate and independent states. Who would have prophecied that the United States and Canada, when they entered a treaty to keep their long boundary line unfortified and the great waters that separate them free of men of war, would have remained peaceable neighbors so long that there has grown up an atmosphere today that makes war unthinkable among their peoples. No, the whole trend is toward a world of peace and however much we shall falter on the way, the objective, I firmly believe, will be reached some day.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence between Mr. W. L. Clayton and myself with respect to certain products upon which the United States offered to reduce our tariffs in its negotiation of the trade agreement with Great Britain. It will be noted that Mr. Clayton pleads diplomatic immunity in refusing to furnish the desired information. This is a perfect sample, Mr. Speaker, of the secrecy surrounding the administration of the Trade Agreements Act:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 16, 1945.*

Mr. WILLIAM CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.:

Re letter May 11 received May 14 in reply my letter May 1: Your letter artfully dodges questions asked you in hearings. List you mailed published prior to public hearings on proposed agreements and prior to negotiations of such agreements. What I want as you know is list of items on which concessions were offered the representatives of the United Kingdom at last stages of negotiations whether accepted, rejected, or accepted in part. Request immediate reply either giving information or stating basis for your refusal. Believe information essential to proper consideration of renewal Trade Agreements Act and proper for committee member.

R. M. SIMPSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 18, 1945.

The Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SIMPSON: Your telegram of May 16 reached me yesterday. I am afraid you have misunderstood my letter. The list enclosed was exactly what I had at least understood you to ask for, namely, the items which were considered by the trade-agreement organization for possible concession in connection with the preparation for the British negotiations but on which no concessions were in fact made. The list I mailed you is not the list published prior to the public hearings but something quite different, namely, a carefully compiled list of the things which were (1) included in the public list and (2) not included in the final agreement.

What you now ask for is something quite different, namely, items on which "concessions were offered representatives of the United Kingdom at last stages of negotiation whether accepted, rejected, or accepted in part." In other words, you are now asking for the detailed contents of negotiations with a foreign government. I think you must be aware that since the time of President Washington the view has been taken by the executive department of the Government that the detailed course of negotiations with a foreign government leading up to an international agreement cannot in general be disclosed consistently with the public interests. I agree with this view and even if I did not

I regard myself as bound by the long practice of the executive branch in this respect.

I must therefore respectfully decline to make available the information now requested.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Ellison DuRant Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ELLISON DURANT SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, observing today the time-honored custom established by the First Congress, we pause amidst our arduous tasks to pay tribute to departed comrades.

Our thoughts for the moment are of a distinguished Senator, the Honorable ELLISON DURANT SMITH, who departed this life on November 17, 1944, after having served continuously in the Senate for a period longer than any of his predecessors.

From my earliest recollections of South Carolina's political history I have known the name of Senator SMITH. By reason of his active life in the State's political arena, extending over a period of half a century and his strong convictions in reference thereto, the name "COTTON ED" SMITH has become a household word.

Upon my election to Congress, thus being thrown closer to Senator SMITH in my official capacities, I found him to be patient, sympathetic, and courteous. Eager to serve my own constituents I often drew helpful suggestions from the long and valued experience of Senator SMITH. His office was most cooperative with the offices of other members of our State delegation in Congress and took pride in rendering effective coordinated service.

President Taft, the only individual who ever attained the distinct honor of being both President and Chief Justice, said on one occasion:

> Indecision is worse than adverse decision; one who cannot make up his mind is not to be dealt with, whereas one who decides against you at least takes a position and can be dealt with.

Anyone who knew Senator SMITH knows that he was a man of firm convictions, one who could and would make up his own mind, and when having thus done so he stood his ground "though the heavens fall and the hells boil over."

With many of his views we did not agree, but none ever doubted that he spoke the strength of his own convictions and none questioned the courage of his determination. In the storms of life he stood as firm as a rock.

The unswerving champion of States' rights, of white supremacy, of agriculture, and spokesman for cotton—cotton, he liked to say, was "his king" and again "his sweetheart."

As chairman of the mighty Committee on Agriculture, Senator SMITH wielded great influence in bringing better ways of living to those who till the soil for their livelihood.

His family has the sympathy of those who agreed with him and those who did not—all of whom join in paying tribute to his long service and in acknowledging his devotion to the principles in which he believed.

Senator SMITH was a master on the stump and was never happier than when participating in the many political battles of our State, from which he emerged victoriously over many formidable opponents, save only his last.

Quietly, surrounded by members of his own family, at his ancient and impressive country home, near Lynchburg, S. C., the Senator answered his last roll call. His passing was sudden, without struggle or pain, as I am satisfied he would have chosen.

Many gathered from the highest to the humblest on that bleak November day for the funeral services at the Smith home. It was my privilege to attend, as one of the official honorary escorts, and to stand with uncovered head in the rain as we paid our last respects to a statesman worthy of his steel.

Gently borne to his final resting place, in the midst of fertile fields white with unpicked cotton, six husky, faithful Negroes over whose dark skins coursed tears of regret, Carolina's stalwart son now sleeps.

Viewing the multitudes of those who came from far and near expressing their sorrow, I thought "were every one for whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers."

Sorrowing at the passing of a friend should remind us anew that all of us shall, one by one, be carried to the tomb by those in turn who shall follow after us.

Often amid the clash of conflict and the whirl of business, we may be tempted to forget the gravity, if not the certainty, of this last great call. But we here pay a sincere tribute to a noble man who carried in his soul a fearless answer to the last great summons.

Senator SMITH held off the shadowy ferryman from across the uncharted sea of eternity as long as possible because life was sweet and he hated to leave his loved ones and his numerous friends, to whom his devotion and loyalty were outstanding.

In his love of good literature, in his honesty of dealing, in his purity of purpose, in his devotion to truth, Senator SMITH was an ideal gentleman. Here we can strew sweet words, knowing that they are no sweeter than the life and memory of our departed friend. I am glad that though we cannot hear his voice, we can still feel his life. His body rests in peace, but he still lives within our hearts. The good influence of his life shall never die.

Senator SMITH was no Mammon worshiper. Though opposed by the high and mighty, he stood his ground. He was frugal, yet unstintingly gave of his means. He placed human service above price, and always the man above the dollar. Had he lived other than as he did, had he majored in material pursuits, he would not have been the exemplary man, the outstanding character whom we honor, and to whose memory we now pay tribute.

An outstanding citizen, a devoted and faithful husband and father, whose name is written across the sky—such was our friend. To think of him is to think of all that is best in life.

Our friend is not dead; he is sleeping

> There is no death! The stars go down
> To rise upon some fairer shore,
> And bright in heaven's jewelled crown,
> They shine forevermore.
>
> And ever near us, tho' unseen,
> The dear immortal spirits tread,
> For all the boundless universe
> Is life—there are no dead.

There is no more mystery about death than there is about birth. If his dear heart grew tired with the labor of years, if weary with a life of suffering, he sought oblivion in peaceful slumber, shall we complain or deny to him this boon?

What men call death is but the beginning of a richer life; it is but the transition from worthy strife to that bigger, better fuller life which our friend so richly merits. He is gone on the one-way trail where all who were worthy since the beginning of time have preceded him, and where all to the end of time shall follow

In the glory and reward beyond the grave, Senator SMITH, whose life was spent in the service of his fellow men, will be bathed in the waters of that fountain from which all mercy and justice flow.

We miss him. But think of him merely as on a trip. Partings are of the essence of Nature; as the butterfly emerges from the cocoon into God's sunlight, as the bird leaves its nest to try its wings in the far heavens, as our children forsake the paternal roof and build their homes in far distant lands, we do not complain, we must not grieve; we recognize the fact that they are following Nature's plan, nor would we deny them the happiness and the opportunity that is theirs.

Our lives have been made brighter and better by having had the opportunity to associate with Senator SMITH and to know him so well. He was always actuated by the highest aims and the noblest thoughts. He, indeed, believed that "an honest man is the noblest work of God." He has gone to his reward, but has left a record of which his family, friends, and acquaintances may well be proud. The world is better because he lived here and mingled with his fellow men.

Far from grieving, let us rejoice that his was the life full and rich and strong, and that we were privileged to know and share it. Let us rejoice in the example of courage, hope, and service that he gave to the world.

A great man, a prince among people, has ended his earthly career; a man rich in the many gifts with which God en-

dowed him, who devoted himself for a generation to the service of his country and the people, winning the confidence and affection of all his countrymen, passes from us mourned, honored, and loved.

Senator SMITH, hail and farewell! Light lie the earth upon you; soft be the sands that cover you; green be the carpet beneath which your ashes rest.

And now let us go forth resolved that his life has not been in vain; that the high principles which actuated him shall henceforth have an uplifting influence upon us so that the good which he did may endure forever.

Let us not mourn his going;
Let us rejoice to know
That—earthly labors finished—
He was prepared to go.

Let us emulate his virtues,
That men of us may say
The world is brighter, better,
Because he passed this way.

May the Lord deal with him as one who has gained the palm and may his place in the world beyond the grave be even higher and more glorious than that which he won for himself among men.

Peace to his ashes! Honor to his name! And immortality to his memory!

James Vandaveer Heidinger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, again the Congress of the United States pauses a few moments in memory of our dear friends who in the past year have folded their tents and quietly slipped into the Great Beyond. Those of us who must struggle on in this finite world appreciate the privilege we have today to pay tribute to the principles and the concepts our friends had of this great Government, and the unfailing patriotism and love of country they exhibited in the service they rendered to our great democracy.

One of the Members of the House who passed away on March 22, 1945, was the Honorable JAMES V. HEIDINGER of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Illinois.

Congressman HEIDINGER was a personal friend of mine. He came into the House the beginning of 1941, the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. I was a freshman Member of that Congress. Together we learned the routine and the procedures of the House of Representatives. We visited together on the great issues facing this Nation as we gradually drifted closer and closer to the great war we must prosecute to a successful conclusion. Congressman HEIDINGER was a man of clear vision, with a mind that understood the great fundamentals upon which this Nation was founded. Growing up in the very heart of America, he had absorbed the principles, the precepts, and the basic teachings that is America, and that will be the foundation stone that shall guide and direct us throughout the perilous period of civilization that will follow the end of this great catastrophic struggle which we are now forcing to a victorious conclusion.

I was influenced by his sound thinking, his balanced judgment, his calm, quiet and judicious decisions. Everyone loved him for his purity and his Americanism. No picturesque oratory, loud, ringing phrases or demagogic appeals to prejudice affected his balanced thinking. The House was better qualified to come to conclusions because of his influence.

To his dear wife, his son and family, I express my sympathies in his passing, and may a Divine Spirit grant them understanding and give them courage to carry on in the spirit for which JAMES HEIDINGER gave the last full measure of devotion.

James Francis O'Connor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public services of Hon. JAMES FRANCIS O'CONNOR, late a Representative from the State of Montana

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a great day for any baby Congressman like myself awaiting the moment of being sworn in, after being stopped by the doorkeeper for identification, I quietly and cautiously looked for a seat in this Chamber. As I sat gazing around watching my future colleagues gathering up and exchanging greetings after their reelections, one of these gentlemen came and sat by my side. He introduced himself as a Congressman from the State of Montana, JAMES F. O'CONNOR. He proceeded to talk to me in a very friendly way. He had singled me out—a new face in Congress—and was trying to make me feel at home in my new environment. I talked to him about the island of Puerto Rico, its products, its people, our war activities, our hopes, and desires. To my amazement the westerner, with an Irish name, who lived more than 5,000 miles away from my island, was quite versed in the affairs of my birthplace.

He told me that I had a big job before me. The only way, he said, to get anywhere was to fight one's way through like an old-timer would do. He promised to give me guidance and help at any time I would like to call on him.

The Speaker's gavel calling the House to order ended the conversation with my new acquaintance. I was feeling most fortunate. My friend left and my eyes followed him until he was lost in the swarm of Members who greeted him right and left as he moved away. Who could imagine at that time that I was to see him no more.

The news of his passing away stunned me a short time later. I listened to speeches from his colleagues all over the States when this House mourned his departure. I came to know more about him. He had outgrown the boundaries of his district, his State, and colleagues from the four cardinal points of the Nation paid tribute to his memory. Out in the West, I am sure, the Indians, whom he loved so well and for whom he fought his whole life, at the news of his departure must have stood in silent prayer by the setting sun.

I am sure he was also a good friend of Puerto Rico. Had he lived to see the days to come he would have been the ally of the dependent people of Puerto Rico.

May the Lord reserve for JAMES F. O'CONNOR a place beside Him for eternity. His love and kind heart for all humanity in the life he led fully warrants it.

James Vandaveer Heidinger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest features of one's service in this great legislative body is the time when a colleague by the stroke of inscrutable destiny, is removed from our midst. The handclasp which once gladdened our day is no more—yet the memory of the fellowship and of the statesmanship will linger with us throughout the years.

Born on a farm near Mount Erie, Wayne County, Ill., JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER loved his fine people of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District who made possible his serving in Congress. He has served and served well. A lover of the soil he wanted to be known at all times as a dirt farmer, and endeavored to farm his land which today is producing oil. Having been a farmer boy, a school teacher, a lawyer, a judge and Congressman, a Mason, a Shriner, and an active member in the Methodist Church, "the judge was known to a large circle of friends who cherished his excellent counsel and advice. He was kind. He was never too busy to be courteous and was a favorite with the people in all walks of life. He was just naturally big-hearted. His honesty, simplicity, ruggedness, and stainless character are priceless heirlooms. He labored among many nationalities, of many creeds and many faiths. He labored in the office and in the mart, in the sick ward, in the temples, and in the halls of justice; but his labors were all

united in one great cause, the betterment of humanity.

A wonderful family man, he loved very dearly his son, James S., a lieutenant in the United States Navy, his grandchildren, Sharon Elizabeth and James V. and their charming mother, and the beautiful association which he and his fine wife enjoyed will ever be an inspiration and example to us all. As a statesman, he was a great lover of the Constitution, having the best interests of his country at heart always. For the 4 years that I have known Judge and his fine family they became our very closest friends. We cherished the companionship and our visits together. During my last visit with him in Phoenix, Ariz., he realized that his stay on earth was short but had every confidence in the future, appreciating the comradeship of and association with his friends and colleagues in the House of Representatives. I know that my life has been made richer because of intimate contacts and genial fellowship with this great and grand friend and fellowworker.

Within the last few months of his life, JAMES V. HEIDINGER reached a decision to retire from Congress at the end of his present term. His cherished dreams was to return to his beloved State "to live by the side of the road and be a friend to man." It is mysteriously strange how a beautiful dream can be realized—the magnificent preparation to live becoming the magnificent preparation to die. The Judge has returned to his beloved State to rest forever beneath its peaceful, cloudless sky. No amount of hardships, no obstacles ever daunted his courage. He faced the frontiers of the next world confidently and with the same serene and courageous spirit. He fought a good fight. He kept the faith. We recall here his zeal and unselfish interest, and we glory in his accomplishments. These shall remain with us—our heritage forever.

Our Departed Colleagues

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that our most fitting desire, on this day when we honor those of our colleagues who have died in pursuit of their duties, is to forward those goals toward which they, and all of us, were striving. These goals were the complete eradication of fascism the world over, and the establishment of a permanent peace and increasing prosperity.

Our colleagues, and their comrades on the battlefields, will not have died in vain if we can outlaw war for all time; if we are a step nearer to the brotherhood of man in a real and practical sense.

Let us put our own house in order. Racial, religious, national, prejudice, and discrimination of every kind must be absolutely destroyed here in America, as well as in every land of the earth. Prejudice and discrimination go hand in hand with the fascism we are striving to destroy.

There must be unity and understanding between the nations of the earth. If we break faith with our allies, with Britain, or Russia, or China, or France, or others, then we break faith with those who have died, our colleagues and our sons and brothers on the fighting fronts.

Let us, then, with quiet and indestructible determination, dedicate ourselves, strengthened by the memory of our colleagues who fought so long and well, to the goals of unity, between men and nations of men, and permanent peace.

James Vandaveer Heidinger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, each year the House, in memorial service, pauses to pay respect and tribute to the memory of our departed colleagues who during the past 12 months have passed on from this busy world. Today we honor our former colleagues in this fitting ceremony, remindful that they too gave their lives in the service of their country.

On March 22, 1945, Congressman JAMES V. HEIDINGER passed away. He came to Congress on November 3, 1942, and capably served his district with honor and distinction until the Angel of Death called his name and the Judge, as we affectionately knew him, answered his last roll call.

I am glad I was privileged to know Judge HEIDINGER. We became fast friends during the years we were permitted to serve together in the House of Representatives. He was a true American. His honesty, sincerity, and personality made one love him. He was kind and generous, always intent on being helpful to his fellow man. He rendered great service to his district, State, and Nation. We all miss him.

Death is only a quiet door
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old garden wall.

James Vandaveer Heidinger

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while we meet today to pay our respect to the memory of our departed colleagues, we face the realization of the deep personal loss we have sustained in the death of our beloved and esteemed friend and coworker, JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER, of Illinois. Throughout the years of his service in this great lawmaking body he was ever at his post of duty as long as his health would permit. It is my personal privilege to express the very high esteem and the warm affection in which he was held by all Members of Congress. He was my personal friend, and it is with that treasured memory of him that I speak these few words in eulogy of his attainments. He was an outstanding American, a good citizen, a great statesman, and a loyal and sincere friend.

Judge HEIDINGER, as we affectionately called him, was a splendid legislator. He was born and reared in the great State of Illinois, and he loved that great commonwealth and her people with the ardor and affection of an illustrious son. In that environment, and among his own people, he came to the bar and became one of the great lawyers in his State. His practice of his profession was extensive and successful. His people called him to render a greater service for his country, and he was sent as their representative in the Congress of the United States. During his service in that great law-making body, as the years passed, he grew in stature and in his attainments. He was sound in thought and deliberate in action. He was as kindly as he was brave.

When I first met our friend—and that was at the commencement of his service as a Member of the House of Representatives—I then recognized in him those rare and outstanding qualities which appeal to all of us; he was a man of the highest character and his sincerity of purpose and his sturdy honesty was never doubted. I conferred with him when we faced the stress of turmoil and anguish respecting our country, and its future; I knew him when his constant concern was for the welfare and progress of all the people in our land; I knew him when he was gravely concerned respecting our form of government and for our Constitution. He loved our form of government, and he revered the American way of life; he was a true patriot. He was a constant American.

When great men pass across the pages of life and disappear, their acts and deeds will continue after them; the precedent which they have established

will be followed by others. So with our friend. He has fixed the standard. He has touched into activity forces which, influencing still others, will move on forever. I will long cherish the memory of my friend because of his unswerving Americanism, for his constant struggle for the people he loved, and for his sterling character and honesty. With these high ideals he lived, and with these same ideals before him he died. Thus, the outstanding career of this brilliant man has passed from the stage of life, leaving the rest of us to take up his labors where he left them.

Judge HEIDINGER needs no eulogy today. His life and the living of it stand before us in pristine beauty and in splendor—a beacon light for others. In bidding a fond and a last farewell to him, I speak those words which were uttered at the passing of a great hero in the years gone by—

"This was a man!"

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this hour is full of solemnity and inspiration.

It is full of solemnity because it reminds me that I, like my late colleague and friend, Congressman HAMPTON P. FULMER, who departed this life on October 19, 1944, shall some day be called upon to close my books for the last time, to write my last brief, to make my last plea before the courts of this world, and to stand in final judgment before the supreme court of the universe.

Inspiration flows from the life of this distinguished statesman to all who knew him because of the contributions he made to the age and generation in which he lived.

Years ago in conversation with a fine young college student, I learned from her that a successful country merchant and banker was making it possible for her to continue her education. It was from her that I first learned of HAMPTON P. FULMER, whom later I met as a member of South Carolina's General Assembly, and still later as my yokefellow here in the Congress of the United States.

A friend has parted the curtain and passed behind the scenes off the stage of life from whence he came. For a few fleeting moments, we who remain must play our parts in the drama of life, then silently follow him. Our late colleague, "UNCLE HAMP," as he was affectionately called, lived the maxim of Emerson, "the only way to have a friend is to be one." Ours is a rich heritage from the life of this friend. For us, yet live in our memories the eyes with their merry twinkle, the keen and whimiscal humor of speech, the generous hand, the heart of gold. Let us grasp and hold fast to this precious gift that flowed from him to us. May the virtues of him whom we call dead ever live in our hearts that ingratitude, meanest of all vices, may never gain entrance therein.

Congressman FULMER was one of the noblest men in our ranks. The welfare of humanity was always in his heart. His like adorn the State and honor humanity.

As a storyteller, recalling the many experiences he had had in the always successful political battles in which he engaged, he had no peer. To have served for a longer period in the House of Representatives from South Carolina than any of his predecessors is of itself a very high distinction.

Undertaking the task of this hour, I stand with bowed head and trembling heart. To speak words that shall be worthy to the memory of this good man is a difficult if not hopeless task. I never craved more than today the gift of clear insight and accurate, sympathetic statement. For I think that the real lessons of this man's life are tremendously important to us at this hour. His spirit would arise to smite me if I simply gave way to eulogy. You would neither be comforted, nor strengthened, to carry on by simple, formal, conventional words. I must try, therefore, to speak of him as I knew and loved him.

Would that we could do justice to his memory, and properly express the high need of praise so justly his due. We can truly say none knew him but to love him, nor named him but to praise.

Congressman FULMER was a man of fine character. Though born and reared poor, by reason of his energy and devotion to business, he was able to accumulate and leave his widow and children in comfortable circumstances. He was cheerful and always had an understanding attitude for others, especially his juniors.

A place is left vacant that will not soon be filled. A bright light at the fireside, the social circle, the sick chamber, is utterly extinguished, and the sad wail of lamentation for his death vibrates and finds an echo in every heart.

Kindly will we remember him until our hearts have ceased to beat their "funeral marches to the grave."

And so, in the quiet and peace of this hour, let us turn again, the leaves of memory and pay tribute of love and friendship to our beloved friend and neighbor whose chair is vacant.

Congressman FULMER was a genial, gracious, kindly gentleman, who treated all who came within the circle of his influence, rich or poor, exalted or lowly, with the same rare and exquisite courtesy. He was the noblest type of American manhood, self-reliant and self-made, incorruptible in private and public life. To the poor and humble, he was always accessible.

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, this was a good man."

His long and practical experience as a dirt farmer preeminently qualified him for the chairmanship of the House Committee on Agriculture in which capacity he served until the end of his life. He believed in the words of Henry W. Grady that—

> When every farmer in the South shall eat bread from his own fields and meat from his own pastures and, disturbed by no creditors and enslaved by no debt, shall sit down among his teeming gardens and orchards and vineyards and his dairies and barnyards, pitching his crops in his own wisdom and growing them in independence, making cotton his clean surplus, and selling it in his own time in his chosen market and not at a master's bidding; getting his pay in cash and not in a receipted mortgage that discharges the debt but does not restore his freedom—then shall be breaking the fullness of our day.

Congressman FULMER was preeminent among his fellows. He loved mankind and all who felt the kindly touch of his hand or caught the inspiration of his honest eye, felt their enchantment and loved him, too. He was a man of unsullied honor, of unswerving integrity and unwearing zeal in the cause of right. In every assembly he was recognized as a masterful force.

Congressman FULMER had a golden heart, a generous mind, and a knightly soul that inspired friendship, trust, and confidence. He was true to his friends and loyal to his convictions. He was an upright, conscientious, and industrious public servant. The world is better for his having lived in it. The influence of his life and his goodly deeds, will never die.

As evidence of this good man's popularity he was repeatedly elected over strong opposition by larger majorities each succeeding term, and when at last his voice was silenced his constituents further honored him by electing his widow, the Honorable Willa E. Fulmer, his successor.

He came into life and performed his part to the grand delight of those who knew him, and to the great benefits of those who may read the record for their future guidance. He was as unselfish as any man we ever knew. He knew his facts in everything he undertook. He had a temperament that fitted him peculiarly for the burdensome task that he had to perform during this troublesome period.

He was a man of deep sympathies. He had humanitarian views. His sympathies were as earnest, as tender, and as generous as his conceptions of his duty to humanity. He was a man of great intellectual vision. He did not live in the valley of ignorance and superstition, but scaled the heights of knowledge. He was able to look far and wide and had a broad vision of the activities of men. To all of these he measured up magnificiently and nobly.

Good will and cheerfulness were gospels his conduct radiated, his life proclaimed. Harsh words or words unclean were alien to his lips. He wished ill fate to none. With charity, he judged the race of men; and multitudes who came within the circle of his benefaction and

regard will hold him in the gentlest memory.

"What is the real good?"
I asked in musing mood.
"Order," said the law court;
"Knowledge," said the school;
"Truth," said the wise man;
"Home," said the sage;
"Fame," said the soldier;
"Equity," the seer.

Spake my heart full sadly,
"The answer is not here."
Then within my bosom
Softly this I heard:
"Each heart holds the secret;
Loyalty is the word."

Our friend's work here is finished. His enfranchised spirit has departed hence to join in sweet and perfect harmony and comradeship that innumerable host of immortals who wrought faithful and well here and who are enjoying their just deserts on the other shore.

Attitude of the South on the FEPC Bill—Article by Thurman Sensing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the most outstanding, worth-while, and influential industrial organization in the South is known as the Southern States Industrial Council, whose headquarters are at Nashville, Tenn. The director of research of the council is Hon. Thurman Sensing, who is one of the most correct thinking leaders of the entire South.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The South Takes a Stand," which was written by Mr. Sensing and recently released for publication. I ask to have it printed at this time because I noticed during today's proceedings that the Committee on Education and Labor has reported to the Senate the much-discussed FEPC bill. It should be known as the UEPC bill, because many of us take the position that instead of it being a Fair Employment Practice Commission bill it is an "unfair employment practice commission" bill.

I shall not take time to read the article which I have asked to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; but I ask my colleagues to read it because it is the most convincing argument which I have seen in print against the provisions of the FEPC bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix as follows:

DOWN SOUTH

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.)

THE SOUTH TAKES A STAND

During the past several years there have been promulgated in this country certain theories of government and philosophies of life directly contrary to those under which this Government was founded and on which this Nation was builded. It was inevitable that sooner or later the matter should come to a head in a way that would bring a "fight to the finish" clash between these two divergent views.

This has apparently now happened in the submission of H. R. 2232, the so-called Fair Employment Practice Act, in the Halls of Congress. This bill proposes to make permanent the Fair Employment Practice Commission, a bureaucratic control originally set up by Executive order as an emergency war measure, and proposes to "prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

The intents and purposes of this bill are such that to the people of the South at least there can be no compromise between its provisions and the principles of government which they cherish. While they may not mean much to others, such principles as racial integrity, local self-government, and rights of the individual mean much to the people of the South. The bill is, in fact, exceedingly dangerous to the whole Nation, but it is aimed directly at the South. Of this there can be no question because its main intent is to control relationships between the races and because it sets up certain restrictions and regulations which the people of the South would never accept unless by force.

So far as the South is concerned, it has no race problem. The people of the South settled the race problem long ago in the only sensible way in which it could be settled; namely, by segregation, which is not discrimination but instead works to the benefit of both races. The South will not accept any measure which has the undoubted intent of destroying this segregation and on the other hand of promoting social equality between the races in all its phases. The people of the South believe that they are now the best friends of the Negro race, and that they are giving the Negro race its best chance for self-development. They believe that it is only those outside the southern region, who have not settled the race problem and who do not seem to know how to settle it, who are interested in promulgating any acts which will affect race relations.

The South believes that this is a matter for local government, that the people of a State desiring such a bill should have the privilege of voting for it, and that the people of a State not desiring such a bill should not have it forced upon them. The South sees no reason why a bill that has almost the unanimous opposition of its people should be crammed down their throats.

Moreover the people of the South believe that the title of the proposed bill is a misnomer, that it is unfair rather than fair. They believe it is unfair to the employer because it takes away from him the right to select his own employees, a direct violation of all the individual rights upon which this Government was founded. If an employee should have the right to apply for work where he pleases certainly the employer should have the right to employ whom he pleases. It is also unfair to the majority of employees because it would force the employer against his will to place all his employees on an equal social level, something which both employer and employees do not want, but something over which they would have no control.

The bill is even unfair to the Negro race itself. The proponents of this bill would have us believe that their main intention is the professed purpose of protecting the rights of the Negro and his opportunity to secure employment. However, even if they believed what they profess to say, which is doubtful, they can hardly be so ignorant as not to realize that actual enforcement of the bill would lead to certain racial conflict more far-reaching and more disastrous than any this country has ever experienced. In other words, reaction against the Negro race would set back immeasurably its chances for self-improvement and advancement of its position in the life of the Nation.

The only conclusion that can be reached, therefore, is that the proponents of the bill are mainly interested in securing bureaucratic control over the business and industrial life of the Nation by throwing control of employment into the hands of a central governmental bureau rather than leaving it to the decision of the individual employer, and that they are interested in doing this in such a manner that it must be forced upon the people of the South who of themselves and in accordance with their own beliefs and principles would never accept such restrictions and regulations.

The Fair Employment Practice Act is bad enough in itself and in the various restrictions and regulations which it provides. In the light of its intentions and purposes, however, and in view of the administration it would receive at the hands of its proponents, it is immeasurably worse. The South can, and would want to, do no other than take a steadfast stand against this measure and all it represents. Visits to many sections and correspondence throughout the whole region are convincing that the people of the South are determined to do everything in their power to prevent its passage.

Other regions of the country would do well to examine the bill carefully in the light of their own self-interests and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Wood-Pulp and Paper Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important of the new southern industries is the wood-pulp and paper industry. It is providing a profitable market to timber growers, providing jobs for workers, and providing a stimulus to trade. The industry is just establishing itself on a firm footing. Its continued well being is of great moment to the southeast. But unless there is reasonable protection from ruinous foreign competition in postwar years, I cannot feel that the industry will survive the postwar slump.

We must realize that the wood fiber business now, in volume, is greater than the cotton-fiber business. We shipped, last year, the equivalent of 16,000,000 bales of cotton, in wood fiber. This business is too large to be ignored, and the utilization of our fine trees has brought such a demand for cut-over pine lands that this asset and the jobs it creates are playing a far more fundamental part in the expansion program of the South than any of us dream that it is. We must have protection for the tree farmers of the South, for the forest workers in the South, and for those who have

investments in the South. Capital investment in this industry now has reached over $600,000,000, and the jobs in the woods and in the mills now exceed 75,000.

I have this suggestion to make: Forestry itself can succeed only if we have, as a condition precedent, a healthy, profitable market for the trees that we propose to raise in our forests. If we give foreign nations our pulp and paper industry, or if a substantial majority of the pulp and paper consumed in the United States is made out of trees raised in foreign countries, our forestry program shall receive a set-back that will put back into the public domain millions of acres of land now owned privately, and whose owners are managing same for the profitable production of trees. No forestry program in the United States can carry on without income, and American forestry will not have an income if we are called upon to compete freely with forests located in countries that have substandard wage scales.

In connection with my remarks, I want to present a statement presenting the position of the United States Wood Pulp Industry on the subject of adequate protection for this promising and growing industry:

STATEMENT PRESENTING THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES WOOD-PULP INDUSTRY IN RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The interest of United States producers of wood pulp in the proposed 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act centers in the potential use of that act to deny to American producers the opportunity to protect themselves against imports of foreign pulp at prices which they cannot meet and continue to provide maximum employment of the industry's labor and capital under American standards.

NECESSITY FOR A STRONG DOMESTIC PULP INDUSTRY

The domestic wood-pulp industry, recognizes as its paramount consideration, the welfare, security, and economic progress of the United States. It is convinced that it can operate successfully only when our national economy is on a healthy and profitable basis.

The industry believes that the interests of this country will be best served by the adoption of trade policies and practices which make possible the maintenance of a strong and vigorous domestic wood-pulp industry, with maximum employment of its labor and capital.

The necessity of maintaining a strong domestic pulp industry has been amply demonstrated by the industry's contribution to our national war effort.

When war came, it was necessary for American industry and commerce to concentrate immediately on the production of essential goods and services. The wood-pulp industry of the United States met that challenge. Despite increasing difficulties resulting from shortages of labor, wood, and transportation, thi basic American industry increased its production of the specialized pulps essential to the war effort, and at the same time also increased its production of the pulps required by the Government agencies and the civilian population of the United States and those of many of the Allied Nations.

It seems assured that the demand for wood pulp will increase substantially in the postwar period. The domestic pulp industry must of necessity provide most of the wood pulp needed to satisfy that demand. Therefore, in order to ensure both our national security and economic progress, it is clearly evident that the wood-pulp industry of the United States must be maintained in a strong and vigorous condition. Its normal and logical growth must not be prevented by unfair foreign competition if this country is to be assured of the supplies of wood pulp which may be needed in both war and peace.

The wood-pulp industry of the United States is not seeking tariff protection. It will, however, endeavor to maintain its essential position in our national economy by seeking, through every possible legitimate means, to prevent unfair competitive trade practices which enable foreign producers to dump wood pulp in this market at less than fair values based on equalized currency relationships and United States costs of production.

The domestic wood-pulp industry will consider as unfair competition any form of dumping or sales of foreign pulp which are fostered by depreciation of foreign currencies, foreign subsidization and other inequitable practices.

WOOD PULP "BOUND" ON THE FREE LIST

Wood pulp was placed on the duty-free list by paragraph 1716 of the Tariff Act of 1930, conforming to legislation enacted by Congress in previous tariff laws. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act this duty-free status was bound by agreements with Sweden, Finland, and Canada. These countries, with Norway, have always been the principal shippers of foreign pulp into the United States market.

A duty-free status tends to restrict expansion of American productive capacity, needed to meet the economic growth of this country. When such duty-free status is coupled with depreciation of foreign currency the resultant situation becomes so serious as to necessitate legislative action to preserve the essential position of the domestic pulp industry in our national economy.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO OFFSET CURRENCY DEPRECIATION

United States producers of wood pulp therefore ask that if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is extended, amendments be included which will automatically make action mandatory to offset any burdensome differences in currency values between the United States and foreign countries shipping into this market.

Although the present agreements stipulate that terms shall be changed if the depreciation of the currency of a nation shall burden the commerce between them, no Government action has ever been taken to change or cancel any trade agreement. The currencies of the Scandinavian countries and Canada have depreciated from 8 to 11 percent since these agreements were made. This depreciation is sufficient to seriously burden the pulp industry in peacetime.

PURPOSE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The purpose of this proposed amendment is to provide for an automatic control of import competition based on foreign currency depreciation, so as to eliminate that type of unfair foreign competition which utilizes depreciated foreign currencies as a means of pricing competitive foreign products in the United States market.

This requested amendment is designed to enable domestic producers to sell competitive products in this market on a basis of equality of opportunity with foreign producers and continue to provide adequate employment of labor and capital under American standards.

In the absence of tariff protection, the domestic pulp industry is entitled to a legislative guaranty of currency relationships which will prevent the sale of foreign competitive products in this market at prices which do not equalize the difference between foreign and American currency values, and which therefore are not on an equivalent basis with our national competitive domestic prices. Without such legislative guaranty of currency equalization, the domestic pulp industry will continue to be subjected to unfair foreign competition based on foreign currency depreciation, with resultant periodic domestic unemployment, the profitless destruction of forest capital, and other economic ills which follow market demoralization.

FOREIGN CURRENCY DEPRECIATION AND DOMESTIC MARKET PRICES

From 1931 to 1933 foreign currency depreciation resulted in ruinously low prices for pulp and many other commodities in our domestic markets. When the United States left the gold standard in 1933, normal foreign exchange rates were restored. This resulted in increased prices in the United States. A period of recovery followed, which reached its peak in 1937. Then came the prewar foreign currency depreciation and further dumping of foreign pulp in this market.

When war came in September 1939, higher ocean freight and insurance rates, together with interruptions in shipping, removed the pressure of abnormal foreign competition, whereupon domestic pulp prices advanced to levels more in line with domestic costs of production. It is that relationship which we are seeking to have maintained by the amendment advocated in this statement.

The cost of a product in any given country largely depends on the wages paid for manhour output, including the wage costs of the materials used. It is obvious that domestic prices must reflect these costs if the national economy is to remain solvent and healthy. Our high American living standards are supported by wages far higher than those of other countries which sell competitive products in this market.

Foreign competitors have the same efficiency in their machines and technique that we have; but the wages paid in the Scandinavian countries of Europe, where most of our foreign competition has come from, range from one-third to one-fifth of the American wages paid in the woods and pulp mills. Also foreign ships' low ocean-freight rates to our Atlantic and Great Lakes ports, during normal peacetimes, permit European producers to deliver pulp to our domestic markets for about one-half of the freight cost of our Pacific coast producers, who supply much of the domestic pulp sold in our markets.

Despite these conditions imported pulp is still on the free list, and foreign producers can still dictate prices of pulp in our domestic markets.

Since abandonment of the gold standard by the trading nations of the world in 1931 and the formation of the sterling bloc there has been a close relation between variations in the pound-dollar exchange rate and the differential between price levels in the United States and in countries which belong to the sterling bloc. Their currencies follow the pound. Sweden and other Scandinavian countries have been members of that bloc.

When the exchange rate is lowered for the pound and the currencies of sterling bloc countries, in terms of dollars (foreign currency depreciation), our prices are lowered in relation to prices in such countries, because their producers can sell in our domestic markets at prices reduced by the amount of the depreciation in their currency and yet receive as much for the goods in their own money as they did before such currency depreciation.

Example: If a foreign producer is satisfied to sell a ton of pulp for 205 kronor, then in order to get this same return at the varying rates of exchange indicated below he would only have to ask the indicated prices in United States money:

	Exchange rate	Would sell at—
Foreign producer to get—		
205 kronor	August 1931, at 26.8 cents.[1]	$55.00
205 kronor	December 1932, at 17.9 cents.	36.70
205 kronor	January 1934, at 26.8 cents.	55.00
205 kronor	January 1939, at 24 cents.	49.20
205 kronor	July 1939, at 23.8 cents.	48.80

[1] Par value.

NEED FOR CURRENCY EXCHANGE CONTROL

Competition of foreign low-wage producers selling competitive products in this market at prices based on depreciated foreign currencies tends to lower our domestic prices below those dictated by our costs under American standards. This makes it difficult to maintain our high living standards and buying power, and tends to undermine our national economy.

Thus the effect of this type of unfair foreign competition clearly demonstrates the need for such amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as is herein recommended by the United States Wood Pulp Industry.

UNITED STATES PULP PRODUCTION ASSOCIATION.
(On behalf of the Wood Pulp Industry.)
APRIL 19, 1945.

Rhode Island Industries in Relation to the Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an analysis of the effects of the trade-agreements program on the industries in my home State of Rhode Island, together with a number of tables:

The Trade Agreements Act was passed in June 1934 and thereafter a number of trade agreements were made which affected the industries of Rhode Island, notably the French agreement of June 15, 1936 and the United Kingdom agreement of January 1, 1939.

Rhode Island income in 1939 approximately equal to 1927: Rhode Island's industrial production increased very materially from the early thirties to 1939, but it had not recovered by 1939 to the level of 1927–29. Net income of both individuals and of corporations in Rhode Island rose from the low level of the early thirties until they reached a level in 1939 about the same as that of 1927. Since the outbreak of war, production and income in Rhode Island has increased very sharply. (See table 1.)

Woolens and worsteds: The principal industries of Rhode Island are the production of woolens and worsteds, various other textile products (such as Bradford spun and French spun yarn, lace, etc., cotton fabrics, rayon, etc.), machinery, jewelry, and insulated wire and cable. (See table 2.)

The Rhode Island woolens and worsteds consist largely of medium and high priced materials. The principal type, men's suiting and panting worsteds, was valued at $1.34 per pound in 1939 which was about equal to the average unit value of the total United States production, $1.32 per pound. The average foreign unit value of the United States imports was $1.33 in that year, equivalent to a duty paid landed United States price of at least $2.33. It is apparent, therefore, that the imported materials sell at a much higher price in this country than the bulk of the Rhode Island production. Imports supply a substantial portion of the domestic market for high-priced woolens and worsteds, but the imports have accounted for from 1 to 4 percent of the total domestic market for woolens and worsteds since 1929. The United States duty on woolens and worsteds was reduced from 50 or 60 percent ad valorem, under the act of 1930, to 35 or 45 percent in the United Kingdom trade agreement, January 1, 1939—the specific duty of 40 to 50 cents per pound compensatory on wool in the woolens and worsteds remaining virtually unchanged by the trade agreement. The Rhode Island woolens and worsted industry reported a higher net income in 1939 and 1940 than in any year during the preceding decade. (See table 3.)

Other industries: Cotton fabrics represent an important textile industry in Rhode Island, although much smaller than the worsted industry. There are various rates of duty on cotton fabrics and very little duty change has been made on cotton fabrics under the trade agreements act. The principal prewar competition came from cheap Japanese cotton textiles.

Rhode Island is a large producer of jewelry, an item upon which tariff reductions have been made under the trade agreements. The duty, after the reductions, ranges from 30 percent to 110 percent ad valorem, many of the items being dutiable at 65 percent ad valorem. United States imports came from Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, and Japan before the war. Imports supplied only a relatively small portion of the domestic market. The United States exports of jewelry were many times larger than imports.

Machinery, iron, and steel products and insulated wire and cable are important products in Rhode Island. There will probably be a large export market in Europe and Asia for such products after the war if those foreign countries are able to sell something in this country to obtain the means of payment for American machinery and iron and steel products.

TABLE 1.—*Rhode Island: Manufactures and State income*

[Money figures in 1,000 dollars]

	Manufactures[1]			Net income from all sources[2]	
	Wage earners	Wages	Value of product	Individual returns and taxable fiduciary returns without income	Corporation returns
1927	120,009	138,896	592,233	157,465	32,853
1929	126,048	144,172	665,534	184,531	34,756
1931	95,424	96,023	409,524	111,159	−37,183
1933	92,512	76,124	331,046	92,590	−14,678
1935	101,316	94,990	418,889	113,641	−11,357
1937	108,031	112,933	517,196	151,295	30,109
1939	106,275	105,407	516,391	156,471	36,362
1940	-------	-------	-------	250,894	50,308
1941	-------	-------	-------	455,710	119,792

[1] U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract.
[2] U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income. Note that the 2 columns shown here should not be added, as a portion of the corporation income appears eventually as individual income.

TABLE 2.—*Rhode Island: Principal industries, 1939*

	Number of wage earners	Wages	Value of product
All industries, Rhode Island	106,275	$105,407,000	$516,390,000
Alloying: Rolling and drawing of nonferrous metals, except aluminum	982	1,300,000	13,612,000
Bread and other bakery products, except biscuits, crackers	1,699	2,154,000	10,111,000
Costume jewelry and costume novelties (except fine jewelry)	5,522	4,105,000	13,940,000
Cotton broad woven goods	7,304	6,449,000	20,927,000
Cotton narrow fabrics	3,930	3,322,000	12,470,000
Dyeing and finishing cotton, rayon, silk, and linen textiles	7,753	8,764,000	33,979,000
Insulated wire and cable	1,497	1,478,000	10,661,000
Jewelry (precious metals)	2,492	2,353,000	11,170,000
Rayon broad woven goods (regular factories)	7,208	6,124,000	28,781,000
Rubber products not elsewhere classified	3,332	3,611,000	16,253,000
Woolen and worsted manufactures (regular factories)	22,139	21,236,000	125,641,000
Textile mill products and other fiber manufactures	5,636	4,682,000	24,182,000
Iron and steel and their products, except machinery	3,403	3,954,000	15,112,000
Machinery, except electrical	3,911	6,450,000	20,119,000

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, 1939, vol. III, pp. 926–927.

TABLE 3.—*Woolens and worsteds: United States production, imports, and exports*

	1929	1931	1933	1935	1937	1939
	Quantity (1,000 pounds)					
Production	269,591	193,605	225,874	304,442	314,228	308,947
Imports	9,873	2,636	2,774	3,129	5,603	6,626
Exports	469	201	92	289	216	310
	Value (1,000 dollars)					
Production	485,092	294,065	270,974	401,165	460,628	408,541
Imports	19,577	4,897	3,910	4,854	9,058	8,801
Exports	933	431	129	339	374	440

TABLE 3.—*Woolens and worsteds: United States production, imports, and exports*—Continued

	1929	1931	1933	1935	1937	1939
	Value per pound					
Production	$1.80	$1.52	$1.12	$1.32	$1.47	$1.32
Imports [1]	1.98	1.86	1.41	1.55	1.62	1.33
Exports	1.99	2.14	1.40	1.17	1.73	1.42
	Percent—ratio of domestic production to—					
Imports	3.7	1.4	1.20	1.00	1.80	2.1
Exports	.2	.1	.04	.09	.07	.1

[1] Foreign value, not including duty, landing charges of transportation costs from the foreign country.

NOTE.—According to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income, corporate tax returns of the United States "woolen and worsted manufacturers, including dyeing and finishing," showed the following net income (+) or deficit (−): 1929, −$10,294,000; 1931, −$31,243,000; 1933, +$19,424,000; 1935, +$19,497,000; 1937, −$182,000; 1939, +$26,612,000; 1940, +$34,365,000.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Rhode Island: Corporation returns

[Money figures in thousands of dollars]

	Number of items	Gross income	Net income (+) or deficit (−)	Income tax	Excess profits tax	Total tax
Returns with net income:						
1927	1,536	735,728,000	+49,046,000	5,791,000		5,791,000
1929	1,650	683,002,000	+54,487,000	5,504,000		5,504,000
1931	1,217	265,321,000	+18,184,000	1,887,000		1,887,000
1933	846	314,510,000	+22,401,000	3,093,000	55,000	3,148,000
1935	1,071	411,535,000	+25,398,000	3,492,000	84,000	3,576,000
1937	1,164	519,630,000	+42,474,000	5,887,000	442,000	6,329,000
1939	1,326	589,752,000	+45,698,000	6,668,000	260,000	6,928,000
1940	1,464	702,519,000	+59,709,000	11,994,000	4,363,000	16,358,000
1941	1,911	[1] 1,167,112,000	+125,137,000	26,200,000	28,095,000	54,298,000
Returns with no net income:						
1927	947	160,030,000	−16,193,000			
1929	1,067	231,893,000	−19,731,000			
1931	1,655	373,103,000	−55,367,000			
1933	2,143	217,066,000	−37,079,000			
1935	2,197	270,891,000	−36,755,000			
1937	2,063	273,252,000	−12,365,000			
1939	1,876	202,266,000	−9,336,000			
1940	1,768	162,624,000	−9,401,000			
1941	1,278	[1] 73,106,000	−5,345,000			

[1] Total compiled receipts.

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income, pt. II, 1940, p. 302; 1934, p. 108.

Rhode Island: Individual returns and taxable fiduciary returns with net income

Year	Number of returns	Net income	Total tax
1927	25,184	$157,465,000	$6,332,000
1929	26,481	184,531,000	7,851,000
1931	22,375	111,159,000	2,599,000
1933	29,489	92,590,000	3,453,000
1935	33,009	113,641,000	6,002,000
1937	43,273	151,295,000	10,067,000
1939	51,297	156,471,000	7,524,000
1940	103,271	250,894,000	12,688,000
1941	203,347	455,710,000	32,165,000

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue, pt. I, 1941, p. 233, and pt. I, 1937, p. 163.

United States woolen and worsted manufactures, including dyeing and finishing—Corporation returns

[Thousand dollars]

Year	Returns with net income		Returns with no net income		Total net income, or deficit (−)
	Total compiled receipts	Net income	Total compiled receipts	Deficit	
1929	367,144	14,629	307,191	24,923	−10,294
1931	139,877	6,542	291,405	37,785	−31,243
1933	317,811	26,315	73,239	6,891	19,424
1935	454,422	25,009	98,010	5,512	19,497
1937	326,682	9,147	273,911	9,329	−182
1939	533,838	32,189	80,117	5,577	26,612
1940	620,350	38,140	70,609	3,775	34,365

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income.

Ice Cream a Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a representative of OPA testified before the special committee investigating foods that the sugar quota for industrial users would be cut to 50 percent of the base period use.

What a tremendous loss of milk such a cut would entail if applied to the ice-cream industry. For the third quarter alone the ice-cream industry would have to turn back over a half billion pounds of milk to dairy farmers.

The ice-cream industry produces 36 percent of its gallonage during the 3 months July, August, and September. If the cut suggested by OPA is applied to the ice-cream industry, it would save only 10,000 tons of sugar. But with that sugar the industry can produce 34,000,000 gallons of ice cream and would utilize 522,000,000 pounds of milk. I would like at this point to place in the RECORD a short table which was prepared by the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, which shows the disastrous effect if a cut in the sugar quota from 70 percent to 50 percent is put in effect on ice cream, one of the most wholesome and nutritious foods known to man.

The following table was prepared by the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.:

What a cut in sugar quota from 70 to 50 percent in the third quarter of 1945 would mean to the ice-cream industry's ability to take care of flush milk:

1942, WFO–8 base:	*Percent*
July	13.86
August	12.42
September	10.08
Percent of year's gallonage	36.36

The ice-cream industry in July, August, and September will use for civilian make 1,854,600,000 pounds of milk [1] at the present WFO–8 quota.

Sugar: July, August, and September

	Tons
1941 base [2]	54,904
70 percent	38,433
50 percent	27,451
Difference	10,982

Ten thousand, nine hundred and eighty-two tons of sugar will make 34,863,490 gallons of ice cream, 34,863,490 gallons of ice cream use a milk equivalent of 522,952,350 pounds of milk; therefore, a cut in sugar quota from 70 to 50 percent for the third quarter of 1945 will cripple the ice-cream industry's ability to absorb the summer's flush milk to over one-half billion pounds.

[1] Based on an estimate of annual usage of 5,100,000,000 pounds of milk.

[2] Based on data from OPA that ice-cream industry's base in 1941 was 151,000 short tons of sugar.

Data for State-Wide Planning of Veterans' Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excerpts from United States Office of Education Bulletin 4, 1945, which Commissioner John W. Studebaker sent me. The bulletin, Data for State-Wide Planning of Veterans' Education, prepared by Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, shows, by States, the age and education of 7,144,401 Army enlisted men and of 729,123 Army officers at the time they entered service and provides some cues for estimating the number likely to return to school and college.

This bulletin should be read by all citizens who are interested in the further education of men now in the Armed Forces. It is required reading for leaders who are responsible for the provision of facilities for the education, training, and placement of veterans. Every Member of Congress will be interested in the table which shows the situation in his

own State. I have particular pride in the showing made by soldiers from Utah.

There being no objection, the excerpts and comments by Dr. Hollis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATA FOR STATE-WIDE PLANNING OF VETERANS' EDUCATION

(The bulletin is based on data supplied by the Adjutant General's Office and the Information and Education Division Headquarters of the Army Service Forces, and on published data from other sources.)

Age and previous education are the two most important factors to use in estimating the number of men now in the armed forces who are likely to avail themselves of veterans' benefits for further schooling to fit themselves for good postwar jobs. These estimates must be made on a State-wide rather than a national basis because more than four-fifths of the men are expected to return to their home States for schooling and employment, and because the States individually are responsible for planning programs of education and training for veterans.

The accompanying table 1 has been constructed from data supplied by the Adjutant General's Office to show the educational status of two-age groups at the time they entered the Army. Since it includes approximately half the expected total size of all of the armed forces, by doubling the number of men in any category one can get a rough approximation of the total postwar veteran load for each State. Age 25 years was taken for separating the men into two groups because the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division Headquarters of the Army Service Forces had found from a study of 20,000 enlisted men that only 10 percent of the soldiers who in the summer of 1944 planned to return to school full-time at the end of the war were over 25 years of age. Said another way, the branch found that over 90 percent of the men who had such plans were under 25 years of age. This, of course, does not mean that 90 percent of all men under 25 years of age plan to come back to school. After calculation for a number of contingencies, the branch estimated that 8 percent of the men of all ages and levels of education would return to full-time schooling and that an additional 18 percent would want part-time schooling. The age division of table 1 is therefore simply to indicate the two age groups in each State that may be expected to furnish 10 or 90 percent of the men who now plan to return to school and college.

Table 1 presents a detailed analysis of the group likely to furnish 90 percent of the men who return to school. This is done because different proportions of each educational category are expected to come back to study, if the State groups follow the pattern set by the 20,000 men polled in every theater of the war. Without regard for age, table 2 provides a key for making a rough estimate of the number of men from each State at given levels of education who are likely to return for full-time or part-time schooling. Each reader is left to make his own calculations, but it should be noted that up to college graduation the more education soldiers had when they entered service the more likely they are to return to school. Table 2 also indicates that larger proportions (not numbers) of Negro than white soldiers now have definite and tentative plans for further education and training.

ILLUSTRATIVE STATE SITUATIONS

Distribution showing the formal education of Army personnel by States is of interest to two groups of people—those who want to compare soldier education by States, and those who are responsible for planning educational opportunities in a given State for returning servicemen. The latter group, for whom this bulletin was prepared primarily, undoubtedly know that better school opportunities for young men and women now in the Army are most likely to come through improvements open to all youths. In postwar civilian life young veterans who return to school will differ from other similar age groups largely in having funds provided for their education—not in their educational needs. It follows, then, that in planning postwar educational opportunities for veterans, State leaders face anew most of the perennial unsolved problems of prewar days.

Those who are interested in understanding the situation in the States will find useful a comparative study of the education of Army personnel in New Mexico and Utah. Selective Service rejections for the two States (see table 92 of the bulletin), indicate over-all educational differences greater than are warranted by their difference in ability to support education and greater than the differences in the education of their Army enlisted men. New Mexico rejected 40 percent of its military-age men—9 percent of them for educational deficiency—as compared to 26 percent rejections in Utah, where only 1.1 percent was rejected for educational deficiency.

The vastly different social composition of the population and equally different educational history of the two States account largely for New Mexico's having 33.4 percent of its enlisted men who are 25 years of age and younger at the eighth grade or below, as compared with 5.2 percent in Utah. The favorable elementary and secondary school situation in Utah combined with the existence of a comparatively well developed group of junior colleges was perhaps the determining factor in the State's superior showing in the category of men eligible to begin or resume college work. In other words, educational facilities in Utah carry the mass of its youth through junior college, but it will be noted that Utah does not equal bi-cultural New Mexico in the proportion of young enlisted men who have completed 4 or more years of college work.

Table 1 shows more pronounced educational differences in the 17 States that maintain separate schools and colleges for the white and Negro races. References must be made to the bulletin for tables showing a composite or average picture of educational achievement of Negroes in the 17 States and in other States of the Nation. However, for the purpose of comparison the first row of figures in table 1 show the average education of 7,000,000 soldiers from all of the States.

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of Army enlisted men to show the educational level of men 25 years of age and under*[1]

State, by region	Total	Percent 26 and over	Percent 25 and under	Number and percent of enlisted men 25 years and under at four educational levels								
				Total	Grades 1–8		1, 2, 3 years of high school		4 years of high school and 1, 2, 3 years of college		4 years of college and up	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Continental United States	7,144,401	47.0	53.0	3,789,545	899,127	23.7	1,233,304	32.5	1,551,800	41.0	105,314	2.8
New England:												
Maine	43,130	47.8	52.2	22,499	6,422	28.5	7,920	35.2	8,044	35.8	113	0.5
New Hampshire	23,931	46.8	53.2	12,721	3,094	24.3	3,623	28.5	5,851	46.0	153	1.2
Vermont	16,369	50.0	50.0	8,194	1,760	21.5	2,234	27.2	3,998	48.8	202	2.5
Massachusetts	227,809	50.8	49.2	112,137	20,667	18.4	39,761	35.5	49,560	44.2	2,149	1.9
Rhode Island	39,204	50.8	49.2	19,271	3,792	19.7	9,123	47.3	5,882	30.5	474	2.5
Connecticut	104,672	47.1	52.9	55,371	9,489	17.1	20,466	37.0	24,130	43.6	1,286	2.3
Middle Atlantic:												
New York	807,137	52.3	47.7	385,223	48,098	12.5	152,729	39.7	173,474	45.0	10,922	2.8
New Jersey	262,123	50.5	49.5	129,789	23,740	18.3	49,541	38.2	53,618	41.3	2,890	2.2
Pennsylvania	596,196	44.1	55.9	333,338	61,114	18.4	116,764	35.0	149,788	44.9	5,672	1.7
East North Central:												
Ohio	386,404	46.5	53.5	206,856	31,442	15.2	73,892	35.7	98,627	47.7	2,895	1.4
Indiana	185,833	45.1	54.9	101,975	15,036	14.7	31,454	30.9	53,369	52.3	2,116	2.1
Illinois	452,823	50.5	49.5	224,030	38,334	17.1	81,003	36.2	101,254	45.2	3,439	1.5
Michigan	288,339	43.0	57.0	164,237	28,465	17.3	60,758	37.0	72,772	44.3	2,242	1.4
Wisconsin	145,032	46.7	53.3	77,255	13,713	17.7	23,614	30.6	38,710	50.1	1,218	1.6
West North Central:												
Minnesota	136,886	52.1	47.9	65,518	14,146	21.6	17,869	27.3	32,487	49.6	1,016	1.5
Iowa	114,910	49.4	50.6	58,108	10,694	18.4	13,989	24.1	32,298	55.6	1,127	1.9
Missouri:												
White	180,688	47.0	53.0	95,760	26,454	27.6	25,609	26.8	41,939	43.8	1,758	1.8
Negro	14,236	49.9	50.1	7,134	2,086	29.2	2,826	39.6	2,222	31.2	----------	0
North Dakota	29,394	53.1	46.9	13,790	4,134	31.3	2,978	21.6	6,092	44.2	406	2.9
South Dakota	27,519	51.5	48.5	13,337	3,871	29.0	3,348	25.1	5,888	44.2	230	1.7
Nebraska	58,799	51.3	48.7	28,654	4,646	16.2	6,575	22.9	16,891	59.0	542	1.9
Kansas	90,448	49.1	50.9	46,034	8,552	18.6	11,190	24.3	25,954	56.4	338	.7
South Atlantic:												
Delaware:												
White	13,131	42.3	57.7	7,581	2,031	26.8	3,113	41.1	2,437	32.1	----------	0
Negro	2,254	31.9	68.1	1,535	409	26.6	509	33.2	617	40.2	----------	0
Maryland:												
White	85,837	43.9	56.1	48,155	12,724	26.4	15,364	31.9	17,829	37.0	2,238	4.7
Negro	22,562	50.2	49.8	11,246	6,482	57.6	3,267	29.1	1,497	13.3	----------	0

[1] Compiled from data supplied by The Adjutant General of the Army.

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of Army enlisted men to show the educational level of men 25 years of age and under*—Continued

State, by region	Total	Percent 26 and over	Percent 25 and under	Number and percent of enlisted men 25 years and under at four educational levels							
				Total	Grades 1-8		1, 2, 3 years of high school		4 years of high school and 1, 2, 3 years of college		4 years of college and up	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
South Atlantic—Continued												
District of Columbia:												
White	29,976	56.4	43.6	13,083	1,015	7.8	3,655	27.9	7,977	61.0	436	3.3
Negro	17,651	52.8	47.2	8,332	2,783	32.8	3,418	41.0	2,181	26.2	----------	0
Virginia:												
White	103,680	46.1	53.9	55,922	19,527	34.9	16,593	29.7	18,651	33.4	1,151	2.0
Negro	34,222	43.9	56.1	19,201	11,055	57.6	5,342	27.8	2,524	13.1	280	1.5
West Virginia:												
White	97,525	43.2	56.8	55,383	19,967	36.1	15,364	27.7	19,360	35.0	692	1.2
Negro	6,006	34.6	65.4	3,930	1,092	27.8	1,706	43.4	1,132	28.8	----------	0
North Carolina:												
White	127,767	42.7	57.3	73,174	24,307	33.2	24,787	33.9	22,794	31.2	1,286	1.7
Negro	39,935	42.9	57.1	22,822	12,965	56.8	7,322	32.1	2,216	9.7	319	1.4
South Carolina:												
White	54,600	42.8	57.2	31,259	10,209	32.7	10,356	33.1	10,220	32.7	474	1.5
Negro	27,846	39.4	60.6	16,880	9,963	59.0	4,981	29.5	1,809	10.7	137	.8
Georgia:												
White	104,418	47.0	53.0	55,341	15,847	28.6	18,038	32.6	20,373	36.8	1,083	2.0
Negro	41,102	39.8	60.2	24,751	18,046	72.9	4,486	18.1	1,949	7.9	270	1.1
Florida:												
White	65,954	53.1	46.9	30,917	7,716	24.9	8,122	26.3	14,458	46.8	621	2.0
Negro	27,929	47.8	52.2	14,591	8,417	57.7	4,263	29.2	1,911	13.1	----------	0
East South Central:												
Kentucky:												
White	131,957	42.8	57.2	75,430	33,723	44.7	19,914	26.4	20,507	27.2	1,286	1.7
Negro	13,757	56.6	43.4	5,975	2,749	46.1	1,998	33.4	1,160	19.4	68	1.1
Tennessee:												
White	130,494	45.2	54.8	71,481	31,405	44.0	18,817	26.3	20,670	28.9	589	.8
Negro	22,125	44.4	55.6	12,292	7,339	59.7	3,343	27.2	1,473	12.0	137	1.1
Alabama:												
White	96,646	44.2	55.8	53,983	18,749	34.7	18,048	33.4	16,510	30.6	676	1.3
Negro	39,893	39.6	60.4	24,105	15,064	62.5	6,662	27.6	2,311	9.6	68	.3
Mississippi:												
White	62,989	45.0	55.0	34,637	9,205	26.6	11,574	33.4	12,868	37.0	990	3.0
Negro	51,584	42.4	57.6	29,743	22,244	74.8	5,707	19.2	1,792	6.0	----------	0
West South Central:												
Arkansas:												
White	77,711	46.9	53.1	41,275	14,906	36.1	11,781	28.6	14,047	34.0	541	1.3
Negro	19,438	42.5	57.5	11,176	7,119	63.7	3,282	29.4	707	6.3	68	.6
Louisiana:												
White	82,244	45.9	54.1	44,481	15,220	34.2	12,367	27.8	16,104	36.0	880	2.0
Negro	44,599	44.8	55.2	24,642	15,420	62.6	5,879	23.8	3,275	13.3	68	.3
Oklahoma:												
White	101,099	44.8	55.2	55,828	15,067	27.0	17,763	31.8	21,848	39.1	1,150	2.1
Negro	8,164	36.8	63.2	5,161	1,774	34.4	1,855	35.9	1,464	28.4	68	1.3
Texas:												
White	301,622	48.3	51.7	156,066	46,848	30.0	49,776	31.9	57,406	36.8	2,036	1.3
Negro	51,926	44.7	55.3	28,727	13,442	46.8	10,303	35.9	4,845	16.8	137	.5
Mountain:												
Montana	26,574	51.5	48.5	12,888	2,234	17.3	3,046	23.6	7,201	55.9	407	3.2
Idaho	24,567	47.1	52.9	12,993	2,442	18.8	3,286	25.3	7,010	53.9	255	2.0
Wyoming	12,042	47.4	52.6	6,337	1,422	22.4	1,151	18.2	3,696	58.3	68	1.1
Colorado	50,281	49.9	50.1	25,194	4,673	18.5	7,147	28.4	12,888	51.2	486	1.9
New Mexico	28,838	43.7	56.3	16,235	5,416	33.4	4,408	27.1	5,746	35.4	665	4.1
Arizona	24,180	45.8	54.2	13,113	4,808	36.7	3,500	26.7	4,737	36.1	68	.5
Utah	30,018	40.7	59.3	17,801	920	5.2	5,391	30.3	11,168	62.7	322	1.8
Nevada	8,598	56.6	43.4	3,728	474	12.7	1,198	32.1	1,853	49.7	203	5.5
Pacific:												
Washington	81,814	49.4	50.6	41,425	4,554	11.0	12,692	30.6	23,705	57.2	474	1.2
Oregon	51,590	49.4	50.6	26,080	4,116	15.8	8,739	33.5	13,089	50.2	136	.5
California	385,279	51.7	48.3	186,185	20,529	11.0	57,376	30.8	103,887	55.8	4,393	2.4

TABLE 2.—*Educational plans of Negro and white enlisted men, classified by previous education, summer, 1944*[1]

Plans	Percent among men who have—									
	Grade school 1-8		High school				College			
			1, 2, 3 years		4 years		1, 2, 3 years		4 years and over	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Plans for full-time school:										
Definite	0.6	0.4	3.6	2.2	10.9	7.7	26.0	25.5	16.0	6.8
Tentative	6.8	1.6	5.6	2.2	10.7	5.0	10.6	6.9	16.0	5.8
Plans for part-time school:										
Would prefer full-time school, but planning part-time only	7.7	3.6	10.8	4.8	10.8	8.0	10.9	8.6	13.5	9.1
Want part-time school only	23.7	8.8	22.7	12.5	19.0	12.4	18.3	10.6	15.4	9.5
No plans for further education	61.2	85.6	57.3	78.3	48.6	66.9	34.2	48.4	39.1	68.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Reproduced from Report No. B-133, Post-War Educational Plans for Soldiers, Army Service Forces, 1944.

Further Invasion of States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the Committee on Interstate Cooperation of the State of Michigan relative to the proposal by the Federal Government to grant permits and issue licenses for the development of oil upon tide and submarginal lands lying offshore in States of the Union bordering upon the oceans and its tributary waters.

This language could be interpreted to include all land bordering on the Great Lakes and its tributary waters because these waters find their way to the oceans. Such a proposal is dangerous to the rights of the States in which tributary waters to the oceans exist and it is doubtful if any State would be excluded. It is a well declared policy that the States are the owners of all land beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. It is not difficult to foresee a sharp conflict arising between State rights and the Federal encroachment contained in this proposal. It is well for the people and their representatives in Congress to be alert to the danger that confronts them and especially in the States abutting the oceans and its tributaries, including the Great Lakes States and their tributaries.

This is but another example of the continuing and increasing threat to the sovereign States of the Nation to invade their rights and centralize all government and authority in Washington. This is the method by which totalitarian governments are established and by which freedom perishes.

The resolution follows:

Whereas information indicates that the United States Government is contemplating the granting of permits and issuance of leases for the development of oil upon certain tide and submerged lands lying offshore along States of the Union abutting upon the oceans and tributary waters thereof; and

Whereas such a policy, if engaged upon, would invade the rights of the States and ultimately might affect the State of Michigan by virtue of its proximity to international waters; and

Whereas by virtue of the sovereignity of the respective States, the States have heretofore been declared to be the absolute owners of all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries; and

Whereas the proposal of the United States Government to issue prospecting permits for oil and gas leases beneath tidewater and on lands beneath navigable waters, and in connection therewith the United States Government has asserted the United States to be the owner of such lands, thus creating clouds upon the titles of the true owners thereof; and

Whereas such a policy, if pursued, would work great harm to the people of the several States and would constitute an invasion of the sovereign rights of such States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Committee on Interstate Cooperation of the State of Michigan, That protest be entered against such a policy and that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman of this committee forthwith to all Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate representing the State of Michigan urging them to use their best efforts in the Congress to prevent the Department of the Interior or any other agency of the United States Government from adopting or pursuing any such policy invading the rights of the State.

Fig Garden Center Farm Bureau Vigorously Opposes Continuance of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as further and most impressive evidence of the rising tide of opposition in agricultural circles to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program, I ask that a resolution of the Fig Garden Center of the California Farm Bureau Federation may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The area in which Fig Garden Center is established represents some 15,000 acres planted to figs, a great and most profitable enterprise which has been developed under the protective-tariff system. If this tariff protection were withdrawn and the fig growers residing in this neighborhood should be required to compete with the near-slave-labor-produced figs of the Near East, ruination would be the lot of thousands of prosperous American families, an unhappy consequence which it is impossible to contemplate with equanimity.

The resolution of the Fig Garden Center, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, is the following:

FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
FIG GARDEN CENTER,
Fresno, Calif.

"Be it resolved by the Fig Garden Center of the Farm Bureau Federation in regular meeting assembled:

"That we vigorously oppose H. R. 2652, to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and give the President arbitrary power to reduce tariff protection for American industry and agriculture and labor, which reduction must reduce wages and income and destroy purchasing power needed to give employment to returning veterans and unemployed munition-factory workers; also it will impair American ability to carry the tax burden of interest and principal of our enormous war debts, destroy agriculture in the United States, and only benefit creditors holding hundreds of billions of dollars of city, county, State, and national bonds, and other forms of receivables and money on hand by increasing the value of money.

"We declare that any persons claiming to represent the agricultural interests of the country who favor any tariff reduction do not represent us in our opinions. We support the statement of our State president, Ray Wiser, that such tariff reduction will destroy California agriculture, and we support the position of the California Fig Institute, the Walnut Growers Association, the Almond Growers Association, the Raisin Growers Association, Orange and Lemon Growers, Livestock Growers, Dairymen, and others: 'We cannot sell at home unless we buy at home.' "

I, E. A. Munier, secretary of the Fig Garden Center of the Farm Bureau Federation, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Fig Garden Center held on the 11th day of May 1945.

E. A. MUNIER,
Secretary.

United States Must Eat Less or Watch Europe Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, no American is blind to the fact that the people of the liberated countries are starving. The disclosure of the condition of these people has horrified our country. It is un-American to stand by and watch other people suffer. America has never failed to respond to the call of people in distress. It will not now.

How we can respond is told in an article by Malcolm Logan, published in the New York Post on April 17, 1945, as the fifth of a series of six articles which he has written on the food situation. I desire to include in my remarks this article which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES MUST EAT LESS OR WATCH EUROPE STARVE

(By Malcolm Logan)

This country, despite our food shortage, is in no danger of going hungry.

But to most of liberated Europe, already underfed and in some areas starving, this shortage is not an inconvenience; it is a potential disaster.

During the years that preceded our invasion of the Continent, we repeatedly promised that we would relieve the hunger which the Nazis planned to leave behind them.

Yet today food shortages in most of Europe are actually much greater than they were under Nazi occupation.

IT MEANS WE EAT LESS

We can meet European food needs only in grain (except rice) and dried beans and peas. But we are short of the meat, fats, and oils, sugar and milk which Europe most desperately needs. We cannot keep out promises unless we ourselves go on slimmer rations.

"Our civilians during the war have eaten more food per capita than they did prewar," War Food Administrator Jones said last March 21. We are the only major United Nations power of which this is true.

Last year, according to Agriculture Department figures, American civilians had an average of 3,236 calories a day. In every liberated European country, up to the end of last year, the daily food consumption averaged considerably under the minimum 2,000 calories.

EUROPE'S FOOD NEEDS GROW

Last June, the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Agriculture Department in its monthly publication, Foreign

Agriculture, warned that the need for food in Europe would probably be greater than we had estimated:

"The outlook for domestically produced food supplies in continental Europe during 1944–45 is by no means favorable. The cumulative effect over the war years of the shortages in agricultural manpower, in fertilizers and manure, and in draft power and machinery does not augur well for crop production in 1944.

"For the first time since the outbreak of the war, there is also an imminent prospect that the impact of military operations upon general production and transportation may have significant repercussions upon the output, distribution, and utilization of food supplies during 1944–45."

BYRNES WAS OPTIMISTIC

Most of that prediction has come true. But apparently the WFA did not believe it. Only last September 9 War Mobilizer Byrnes, who must have relied upon the WFA for his figures on food, painted a very optimistic picture of food for Europe after VE-day.

"It is estimated," Byrnes said, "that in the year following VE-day our military food requirements will decline about 50 percent, or approximately 4,000,000 tons." This food, he said, would be available for European relief.

But it is now clear that this was a tragically optimistic estimate, a mistake as serious as refusal to stock pile food when we had it and to run the risk of food shortages rather than take a chance on surpluses.

ALL-TIME HIGH FOR DEMANDS

For the last week Assistant War Secretary Patterson said, "In 1945 the schedule of Army food purchases is 20 percent above 1944. The fact is that as the year 1945 brings the war to a climax it also brings food demands to an all-time high."

The situation generally in liberated Europe reached its most desperate point early this year. Little of the food which foreign governments and UNRRA were able to buy here could be moved to Europe because practically all Atlantic shipping was being used to carry arms for the smash into Germany.

DRASTIC ACTION FORCED

But shortly after the Yalta Conference the War Shipping Administration announced a big increase in the number of ships allocated for civilian relief supplies for France. This was followed by the appointment of a new agency, headed by Foreign Economic Stabilizer Crowley, to determine what food and other relief materials the United States could send abroad.

These two actions were interpreted in Washington as a recognization of the fact that liberated Europe's civilian economy was so near disaster that immediate action was imperative.

When it becomes possible to release the bulk of United States troops from Europe, our officials expect a period of about 3 months during which a large number of ships will have food cargo space.

But unless Americans are willing to share their reduced food supplies with Europe, and unless extraordinary steps are taken to get the food to Atlantic ports, we will not have the food to fill those freighters.

Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the introduction to the recently published book, Management at the Bargaining Table, by Lee H. Hill, vice president of Allis-Chalmers and industry member of the War Labor Board, and Charles R. Hook, Jr., secretary, Rustless Iron & Steel Corp.

While there is much in this book with which I disagree, there can be no question of the integrity of its authors. In the following paragraph I believe they have kerneled the right approach to postwar stability between the forces which work, and which must work together, in a system of free enterprise:

The goal of collective bargaining, like that of the complete industrial-relations program, is the establishment of a sound and stable relationship between employees and management. That goal cannot be reached by blindly refusing to grant any demand made; nor can it be reached by simply yielding to the demands of union negotiators; nor can it be attained by engaging in what might appear on the surface to be a good trade.

Increased Pay for Over-Point Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 I introduced in the House a bill to recognize special sacrifices on the part of individual members of our armed forces, a bill that would, so far as monetary reward can do so, compensate enlisted personnel of the services who, because of long and meritorious service, have earned the right to be released but who cannot be discharged because they are indispensable.

This bill, H. R. 3258, entitled "A bill providing for additional pay to military and naval personnel, and for other purposes," has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, where I hope it will be given early consideration and reported to this House for passage.

With VE-day the War Department announced its partial demobilization plan for the Army, which soon will have released and returned to their loved ones more than a million men who, by their long service and other considerations, have earned the right to return to civilian pursuits, now that some reduction in the armed forces is possible.

It is a good plan, evolved after many months of study, and, I believe, about as fair in most respects as it is possible to devise.

In one sense, however, the plan is inadequate. That is not the fault of the men who drew it up, for it falls short in a matter for which only the Congress holds the correction.

Under the plan not all men who have earned their release will receive discharges. Some, because of their high technical knowledge or skills, will be declared indispensable. For almost all of these men were engaged in combat and exposed to its dangers. Many bear honorable wounds suffered in the service of their country. Many others proudly wear decorations for heroism, earned in the struggle with our Nazi and Jap enemies.

Unfortunate though it be, the Army cannot spare these men and must keep them in service until adequate replacements for pressing the fight against Japan can be obtained.

Because the Army cannot, on its own, make some concrete recognition of the invaluable service of these indispensables, I am asking that the Congress do so.

H. R. 3258 will increase the pay of men who, with sufficient points for discharge under the Army's plan, either are required to remain in service or who elect to do so until the war is won.

The idea, the suggestion, comes from Mr. George Connery, able special writer of the Washington Post. Writing in the May 17 issue of his newspaper, he said:

The Army has one group of dependables who merit more consideration, and right away.

They are those privates and noncoms the Army cannot get along without, the little men who are doing their own particular jobs so well that even high-point scores won't get them out of service.

You cannot buy sacrifices like this. But is it practicable and reasonable to give them something on pay day to show they're not forgotten?

I will answer that question. It is practicable, and it is reasonable to do this.

Let the Members of this body imagine themselves in the position of one of these indispensables, yearning to return to his home and loved ones, knowing he has earned the right to do so, and being denied that opportunity only because he is just too good in his job to be spared. Would any extra compensation on pay day seem adequate reward for months more of the restrictions all soldiers experience—willingly in time of war but not so willingly when they know thousands of men with less service, less reason than they for discharge, are going home?

Besides the indispensables there are other adventurous spirits of high patriotic purpose in the service who do not want to leave until the job is finished. These, if they have the privilege of release under the point system but still are willing to take the rigors of Pacific combat, with all the dangers entailed, also are deserving of extra pay in recognition of such willingness. For every one who so elects to stay in service another can be released.

The Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard do not yet have a partial demobilization plan, because it is not yet feasible to release large numbers of the men in these services now vitally needed in the Pacific war. But, if they had a point system like the Army's, thousands of these sailors and marines, too, would be eligible for discharge. They are indispensables too, because the Nation must have them where they are. It would not be fair, therefore, not to recognize these men just as the men of the Army would be recognized under the bill I have introduced. It is no fault of theirs that there is not yet a point system to cover their cases.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, men of the Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard who would be eligible for discharge if the same plan as that used in the Army were applied to their cases, are included in the bill.

There is merit in the bill in addition to just recognition of our most deserving men. If there should be a tendency on the part of the services to delay or procrastinate in the discharge of men who have earned it, the extra-pay provisions undoubtedly would spur officialdom of the services to speed their releases, en masse or as individuals.

If there is fear that the extra cost to the Nation of this extra pay, which I am sure will be approved by a grateful people, will prove a burden on the Budget, it should be pointed out that the amount involved will be slight in comparison to the total pay roll, plus dependency benefits, for all our armed forces. It would be, I might say, virtually infinitesimal on a monthly pay roll and dependency benefits over-all that tops the $1,000,000,000 mark.

There also may be fear that the extra pay would encourage many eligible for discharge to remain in the service. This, I am sure, is a groundless fear. Except for those few who have a natural attraction for the military life, as enlisted men, virtually no monetary consideration would keep them in the service once they are offered release.

Neither will this bill mean a permanent raise in pay for members of the regular service, the career men who plan to stay in the service when the war is over. The extra-pay provision expires 6 months after the President shall have declared the termination of the war.

Patternmakers' League Denounces Bill To Continue the So-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to add to the long list of official communications from industrial organizations which have heretofore been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in protest against the renewal of the so-called reciprocal trade agreement program, a statement which has just reached my hands from the Patternmakers' League of North America, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, a statement in which a case is made out which will have a most convincing appeal to all of those whose minds have not become confused by the juggling of figures and the contorting of facts which have become the stock in trade of the proponents of this unhappy measure.

The statement of the Patternmakers' League to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

STATEMENT OF THE PATTERNMAKERS' LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA (AFFILIATED TO THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR) ON EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS (H. R. 3240) MAY 23, 1945

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 (Public No. 316, 73d Cong.) gave the President the power to cut tariff rates on imports as provided in the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 by any amount up to 50 percent.

H. R. 3240 now being debated in the House of Representatives enlarges the power presently conferred on the President by authorizing him to cut all tariff rates effective January 1, 1945, by an additional 50 percent, if he deems such action expedient.

In the early days of this Republic, the Nation was devoted primarily to production of raw materials and foodstuffs, but the wise policy which was later adopted, and which was in effect until 1934 when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act above-mentioned was enacted, brought about a change so that the United States became the greatest industrial Nation in the world and made it possible for it to produce the munitions of war which resulted in the winning of the war recently with Germany. It is our belief that had the policy of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act been in effect for a considerable period of time that we would have been absolutely helpless when the European war began.

We are bitterly opposed to the enactment of any law which permits the reduction of tariffs on molders' patterns which our membership produces. While molders' patterns are made of plaster, wax, metal, and wood, the great majority of patterns produced are of wood.

Under the 1922 tariff law molders' patterns were not even mentioned, and patterns made of wood were admitted under paragraph 410 under the same classification as clothes pins which are automatically manufactured and which carry a duty of 33⅓ percent. The wood used in constructing molders' patterns is an infinitesimal portion of the cost of a pattern, for on some of the intricate work as much as 350 hours of labor will be put upon a pattern requiring less than a dollar's worth of white pine.

In 1929 when the Hawley-Smoot Act was under consideration, our organization pointed out to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate these facts. (See House hearings, p. 9960; and Senate hearings, p. 1154). Our statement set forth the wage rates paid pattern makers in Canada, London, England, and the United States, which were as follows:

	Per hour
Canada	$0.87
London	.41
United States	1.04

The rates set forth above were the average pattern makers' rate of pay in Canada and the United States, but for the European countries the highest rate of pay in any locality was taken, which was 41 cents per hour in London, England.

Large corporations had been in the habit of sending their blueprints out of this country to England and Canada for the purpose of having their patterns made by men in those countries receiving much less money than is received by our members in the United States, and thereby saving enormous sums of money. The Hoe Co., of Boston, which manufactures printing machinery, was one of these offenders, and our organization carried the question through the highest court but lost the case because of a misplaced punctuation mark.

Patterns are not sold on the open market but are manufactured for the sole purpose of producing castings needed by a particular manufacturer, and they are of no value to any other firm. It is simply a case in this instance of permitting patternmakers' work to be transferred from the United States to a foreign country in order to cut labor costs, and naturally we strenuously object to such procedure, as in normal times about 6 percent of all patternmakers in the United States are unemployed.

As a result of our presentation to the congressional committees in 1929, the law was changed and the tariff on molders' patterns for use in the manufacture of castings was increased to 50 percent ad valorem. The patternmakers of the United States have the skill, the ability, and there are more than enough of them, to produce all of the molders' patterns required in this country. We object, therefore, to the importation of any patterns for reasons set forth above.

Our trade requires the highest skill, knowledge, and general understanding of all the metal trades. Our wage rates, as a result, are higher than those of other metal trades. At the present time we are advised that the highest skilled trades in London receive two shillings—equivalent of approximately 40 cents—per hour. The average rate for first-class patternmakers in Canada in $1.18½ per hour, and the average rate for the first-class men in the United States is $1.77 per hour. Under these wage rates if, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, tariff rates are lowered it means to us that much of the molders' pattern work will be done abroad and, in our opinion, none of it should be done outside of the United States.

If the Congress insists upon enacting the bill now under consideration, we feel that the tariff rate on molders' patterns should be increased to 100 percent, or an amendment enacted barring the entry of any patterns whatsoever into the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE Q. LYNCH,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Insurance of Full Employment Is Essential to the Survival of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix, following the list of 65 coauthors and cosponsors of H. R. 2202, the full employment bill of 1945, my remarks at an informal meeting of the coauthors and cosponsors, Tuesday May 22, in the House caucus room:

Responsible spokesmen for all parties and all nations are on record for postwar full employment. The full-employment bill of 1945 sets up machinery for implementing that purpose. Since its introduction, the need for practical steps to insure full production, full employment, and full consumption has become more apparent, not only to millions of war-workers facing lay-offs and shifts to peacetime jobs, but also to returning servicemen, far-sighted businessmen, and industrialists.

Critics and opponents of the bill have not yet offered practical alternatives, except a return to conditions which produced the crash of 1929 and, even in 1939, left us with more than 9,000,000 unemployed. We have had some scare propaganda to the effect that we cannot have both full employment and free enterprise.

As the war draws toward final military victory, we again face the final challenge of the industrial revolution—how to consume under normal peacetime conditions the

abundant production which our farms and factories are at all times capable of producing. The basic assumption in the full-employment bill of 1945 is that American democracy can insure full employment, full production, and full consumption without abridging genuine free enterprise, that, on the contrary, insurance of full employment is essential to the survival of free enterprise, the further flowering of our democratic freedoms and a just and enduring peace. Monopoly, cartels, totalitarianism, and war thrive on unemployment and want in the midst of plenty.

The bill denies the contention made by some that democracy cannot provide full employment and live; that democracy to survive must have fewer jobs than workers, more farm and manufactured products than consumers. The bill sets up a thoroughly democratic method and machinery whereby a democratic people, acting through their elected representatives in the Congress, can bring about a transition to a postwar economy of abundance and full employment plus our individual liberties that will strengthen and buttress those liberties and that will compare favorably with the best that Britain, Russia, France, or any other nation can achieve.

After the war, American democracy cannot stand the comparison of large scale chronic mass unemployment here with full employment plus German workers in other countries. Such a comparison is unnecessary. But, unless steps such as are proposed in the full-employment bill are taken, and soon, such a comparison is all too likely. We cannot afford such a return to the scandalous and tragic spectacle of idle machines, idle land, idle money, and idle men, want in the midst of plenty, want caused by the very "threat" of plenty. The full tide of production we have attained to win the war can and must be maintained and surpassed to win the peace on any lasting basis. Democracy, which grew stronger by exercise of its muscles to win the war, cannot afford to let those muscles grow flabby through mass idleness in peace. The full-employment bill provides the means for more effective exercise of those muscles, year by year and month by month, both in productive work and in seeing to it that the President and the Congress, the elected servants and agents of the people, accept and discharge the final responsibility for insuring job opportunities and business opportunities for all.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, which represents practically all of the business and industrial interests of the city and county of San Francisco, has unanimously endorsed the Doughton bill, H. R. 2652, providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The following is a letter which I have received from Dr. Henry F. Grady, president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce:

On February 4, 1932, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce enunciated a tariff policy calling for machinery for reciprocal concessions for tariff rates in the interest of the revival and the upbuilding of our foreign commerce. In 1934 Congress provided the requested machinery in the form of the Trade Agreements Act, which has been renewed from time to time with the endorsement of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

On May 3 the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, upon the recommendation of the foreign trade committee and the foreign trade association of the chamber, unanimously endorsed a resolution calling for the prompt enactment of the Doughton bill, H. R. 2652, calling for the extension of the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

In the postwar period the United States must be properly equipped to negotiate with other nations for reciprocal trade advantages. This chamber believes that during the past decade under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act we have had an effective instrument for the reciprocal modification of trade and tariff barriers. United States industry and agriculture have been provided with adequate safeguards through the provision of prior announcement of intention to negotiate a trade agreement and through subsequent public hearings. Though some 1,200 rates of duties have been modified under the trade agreements program, to the best knowledge and belief of the members of this chamber no American industry affected has suffered any real injury.

San Francisco as the host city to the United Nations Conference on International Organization is proud of its long and consistent record in support of the trade agreements program. The house currently being built by the United Nations at San Francisco will be a frail structure, lacking firm foundations, unless business and government build with care the essential framework on which postwar prosperity and international economic collaboration will depend.

Prayer of Thanksgiving on National Prayer Day by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the prayer of thanksgiving offered by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, on May 13, 1945—the day proclaimed by President Truman as National Prayer Day in memory of our complete victory in Europe.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING AFTER VICTORY

O God of Destiny!
Our Nation, still bleeding from the wounds of war,
Thanks Thee for the Victory of this hour,
Won by our valiant dead,
Our soldiers' blood,
Our country's tears.
We were not alone when we groped through the night of war,
When we drank the cup of grief,
Thou, Lord God of Hosts, wert with us.
For we were with Thee.

O God of Mercy!
Thou didst become our shield and sword,
When lawless nations rose against us.
Thou didst save us,
By Thy power that works in justice,
By Thy compassion upon our passion.

O God of Nations!
Thou hast builded this Nation in a vast wilderness,
Quickening it with the blood of many peoples,
Thou hast nurtured us in a chosen land
Potent with the riches of the earth.
Thou hast made us into a mighty Nation
Loving peace, yet terrible in war.

O God of Law!
Thy laws are force, ruling planet and plant,
Disposing all things mightily and gently.
Thy laws are light, guiding men's hearts and minds.
By the measure of Thy laws nations and men wax and wane,
For what they sow, they also reap.
Thou wilt not be mocked, O God of Law.
Make us to know and to obey Thy will.

O God of Justice!
Repent not making of us an instrument of right,
Spending our blood, spilling it freely, curbing mad nations.
But grant that in victory we not offend Thy justice
By revenge, sinning against mercy,
By hate, destroying also ourselves,
Turning upon ourselves the wrath of Thy judgment.

O God of Peace!
We thank Thee that the clouds of war are lifting,
We pray Thee that the peace that comes be Thy peace,
Thy peace, which alone is our good,
A peace in obedience to Thy laws.
Thou callest us
To feed the hungry,
To clothe the naked,
To defend man's rights,
And God's rights,
And in that service,
To win back men's hearts to Thee,
And make man worthy of Thy trust in him
By man's trust in Thee.

—*Francis J. Spellman,*
Archbishop of New York.

Steering Committee for Passage of Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when our Nation and the world face the great problems and the great opportunities of the change-over from war to peace production as final military victory approaches, I want to place in the RECORD the names of 65 Members of the House who have so far elected to become coauthors and cosponsors of H. R. 2202, the full-employment bill of 1945, which provides policies and machinery for insuring full production employment, and consumption after the war.

Under the rules of the House, a bill may carry the name of but one sponsor. In times past when more than one Member wished to sponsor a bill, it has sometimes happened that identical bills would

be introduced, printed, referred, and recorded by a number of Members, at considerable expense in paper, printing, and clerical time. In the interest of conserving scarce paper, and general economy, I propose, with the consent and agreement of the colleagues who wish, or who may hereafter wish, to be recorded as coauthors and cosponsors of H. R. 2202 simply to enter the facts in the RECORD. Thus, in time to come, when the bill shall have become law—or if, unhappily, such action is not taken in time to prevent a return of chronic mass unemployment and depression—there will be easily available the roll of those who favored early action on this bill.

Following the initial list of coauthors and cosponsors, appearing immediately below, I should like to have inserted the text of my remarks at an informal meeting of these cosponsors held Tuesday, May 24 in the House caucus room.

The 65 Members who have so far elected to become coauthors and cosponsors are:

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania; ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin; WALTER E. BREHM, of Ohio; WILLIAM T. BYRNE, of New York; EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington; HUGH D. DE LACY, of Washington; JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York; SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, of New York; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California; CLYDE DOYLE, of California; JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island; WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, of Minnesota; JAMES P. GEELAN, of Connecticut; THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; W. K. GRANGER, of Utah; E. J. HART, of New Jersey; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California; NED R. HEALY, of California; CHET HOLIFIELD, of California; FRANK E. HOOK, of Michigan; ED. V. IZAC, of California; HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington; ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio; H. P. KOPPLEMANN, of Connecticut; THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts; JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan; W. W. LINK, of Illinois; R. J. MADDEN, of Indiana; VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York; G. P. MILLER, of California; M. M. NEELY, of West Virginia; MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey; GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, of Michigan; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; GEORGE E. OUTLAND, of California; WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; LUTHER PATRICK, of Alabama; E. E. PATTERSON, of California; JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, of New York; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of New York; MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois; LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan; HOMER RAMEY, of Ohio; A. J. RESA, of Illinois; G. F. ROGERS, of New York; W. A. ROWAN, of Illinois; JOSEPH F. RYTER, of Connecticut; A. J. SABATH, of Illinois; G. G. SADOWSKI, of Michigan; CHARLES R. SAVAGE, of Washington; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California; FRANK T. STARKEY, of Minnesota; JOHN H. TOLAN, of California; J. H. TORRENS, of New York; PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, of Delaware; JERRY VOORHIS, of California; SAMUEL A. WEISS, of Pennsylvania; VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma; C. G. WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut.

Racial Discriminations and Governmental Policy in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, some months ago, when I was still chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, I requested the Legislative Reference Service to prepare for the committee a study on racial discriminations and governmental policy in foreign countries. It seemed to me that the interest in the subject in our own Nation made it desirable that we explore the experience of other nations which face similar problems.

The full report is on file in the office of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and may be consulted there by any Member interested.

So that Members may know something of its content, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the outline of the contents and an abstract of the report.

There being no objection, the outline of contents and abstract were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

1. Introductory statement.
2. Discriminated peoples.
3. Russia.
4. South Africa.
5. India.
6. Hawaii.
7. New Zealand.
8. Australia.
9. Some miscellaneous cases (Japan, Brazil and Arabia).

References.

ABSTRACT OF THE REPORT

In many countries racial distinctions have been synonymous with special privileges or invidious discriminations. Groups which have been discriminated against, herein called "discriminated peoples," are found especially in India, Japan, and other Oriental countries but are not unknown in Europe and elsewhere. They are often associated with disliked occupations as well as different racial traits. Discriminations have been somewhat ameliorated in the last century due to revolutions and to the voluntary action of governments.

In imperial Russia there were many different groups who were discriminated against in the interest of the russification policy of the czars. Under the Soviet regime a different policy has been adopted toward minority groups and this has led to the maintenance of those cultural differences of minorities which did not conflict with Communist ideology.

In South Africa the trend of events has been toward the strict residential segregation of the colored races and toward their restriction to particular occupational pursuits and very limited political activity. The discriminations here are maintained by a minority, the whites, against a majority, the colored peoples.

In India the chief divisions are the accepted Hindus who constitute a majority and the two very large minorities of Moslems and untouchables. Discriminations within the Hindu group proper have been largely removed by the Caste Disabilities Removal Act but the larger problem of customary discriminations against untouchables remains. The chief of these are residential segregation, occupational restrictions and all barring from use of public conveniences and facilities. Many of these restraints have been abolished in recent years.

Discriminations against minority races are not marked under the legal rights of citizenship in Hawaii. In New Zealand the Maori minority were granted rights of education and health instruction which have led to a rehabilitation of self respect and progress on the part of that race. In Australia the native policy of the different States has been directed to the preservation of the aborigines while giving them the advantages of European culture. The policy has been criticized as inadequate and marked by decline of full bloods and the rise of maladjusted half-castes. In Japan the Eta minority have been discriminated against for centuries in schools, the army, temples, and in everyday community life, being forced to live in segregated quarters. Some attempt to improve their condition has been made in recent years. In Brazil the abolition of slavery removed the last legal handicaps on the Negroes of that country. Since the emancipation they have made progress but are still in an inferior position. In Arabia discriminations have been maintained against Negroes as in the United States and Brazil but on a different basis.

Censorship of News Published in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John W. Hillman, published in the Indianapolis Times, relating to censorship of the news in Germany.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS—QUESTIONS

(By John W. Hillman)

The occupation of Germany, admittedly, is a grave problem. It will call for stern measures. There can be no soft peace for a nation ingrained with Nazi ideologies and warped by a generation of Nazi training. The evil growth must be rooted out and, until it is, strict controls will be necessary.

Granting all this, however, the details of American occupation plans announced this week by Philip C. Hamblet, head of the European Branch of the Office of War Information, are startling and alarming. The thoughtful citizen, breed in the tradition of American liberalism, may well wonder if the Allied Government is not to be nazism in reverse.

Particularly is this true of the censorship policy which has been worked out by the OWI, in cooperation with the Army's Psychological Warfare Division and the British Foreign Office.

ONLY OWI PUBLICATIONS PERMITTED

Under the plan as outlined by Mr. Hamblet, the only newspapers and magazines to be permitted in the territory administered by the American forces will be those published by the

OWI. These, he says, will feed "objective news" to the Germans, reminding them of their crimes and playing up Jap defeats.

American magazines, such as Time and Newsweek and the Reader's Digest—all of which publish foreign-language editions—will be barred. The reason given for this arbitrary prohibition is the shortage of paper and shipping space. But, if past performance is any criterion, OWI will not stint the paper nor the space for its own publications—and informed sources say that the real reason is that inspired propagandists fear that the freedom of expression permitted in American publications, including criticism of the Government, might not give the Germans the picture of democracy which is desired for them.

Is democracy so vulnerable, then, that we must color and censor the news about our country? If such magazines as Time and Newsweek, such newspapers as the New York Times, do not present objective news—who, in heaven's name does?

IS IT DEMOCRACY OR TOTALITARIANISM?

There are those in this country who believe that the truth is the best argument for democracy; who believe that freedom of the press is one of the cardinal principles of democracy, whether on a world or on a national scale; who believe that the greatest service we can give to the future welfare of Germany and the peace of the world is to teach the Germans to think for themselves and not to accept without question the ready-made doctrines handed them, whether by their rulers or by their conquerors.

And what is this announced policy but another version of the goose-step? Is it democracy, or is it totalitarianism?

Will it work? Not if we can read the precedents of history. What people ever trusted or believed a controlled press? What subject nation ever failed to reach out for truth through underground newspapers and clandestine radios? If we take this course, failing to heed the warning of others' folly and failure, we shall be sowing the wind, and in some not far-distant day we shall reap the whirlwind. No mental strait-jacket is so tight that an unwilling people will not wriggle free.

And how can we criticize such regimes as the one in Argentina which in recent years banned American magazines if we ourselves forbid them to the people who have the most to learn of the advantages of our freedom?

SUCH CENSORSHIP IS DANGEROUS

Such censorship, under the guise of military necessity, is dangerous. From it, there is but one step to similar controls over the news that reaches the people at home—again under the justification that "it is for their own good," that they are being educated by force-feeding of "objective news." Meaning, of course, news that agrees with and serves the viewpoint of those in power.

And who are the mature master minds who, at the point of American bayonets, are to tell the Germans how they are to think and what they are to read? Mr. Hamblet, according to a dispatch by Charles Stevenson of the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, is the 36-year-old head of the European Branch of the Office of War Information. And the dispatch has a significant postscript: "Mr. Hamblet has been in Government work for 8 years." There's food for thought there.

But that is beside the point. The real issue is clear: Are we afraid of news, accurate and uncolored, as reported by able men with years of training in their profession?

And for what did we fight this war: Freedom of expression or official indoctrination? The Atlantic Charter or Mein Kampf? Propaganda or truth?

Industrial Situation in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint statement of the Democratic members of the Michigan delegation relative to our views as to the present industrial situation in Michigan in its relation to the war and reconversion. The statement is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1945.

We, the undersigned Members of the Michigan Democratic delegation in the House of Representatives, join in the following statement expressing our views as to the present industrial situation in Michigan and its relation to the war and reconversion:

The war in Europe has ended, and all of us rejoice in our victory. We have shown that freemen can outproduce, outgeneral, and outfight the forces of tyranny and dictatorship.

The war with Japan is now our primary objective and there are certain problems which must be dealt with in order to succeed in this objective. The greatest war arsenal in America—Detroit—faces a grave crisis. Unemployment is already widespread. Overtime has been eliminated at Ford's, the Murray Corp., and other plants. There is no definite program evident in the handling of cut-backs. There are numerous threats of long delay in reconversion. We have reason to believe consternation and fear are growing among Detroit's war workers. The rest of Michigan is affected by the conditions existing in the metropolitan area.

We recommend immediate relaxation of War Manpower controls in Detroit to meet the actual manpower picture so that referral to jobs at lower wage scales will not be used to deny unemployment compensation. Unless labor and industry join together in the spirit of the recent management-labor charter, the outlook for our war effort and for the postwar period is not promising. For the cut-backs and lay-offs now taking place, we recommend emergency unemployment compensation—expanded benefits and expanded coverage. We also believe that transportation allowances should be paid to those who must return from war jobs to their homes or shift from one war job to another. We recommend immediate revision upward of the basic wage scales in order to offset the reduction of wages caused by the elimination of overtime. To take up the slack in purchasing power there must be no loss in take-home pay.

We recommend most careful planning of cut-backs and reconversion to minimize the hardships and confusion already apparent. Executive Order No. 9240 has served its purpose and should be rescinded.

Mr. J. A. Krug of the War Production Board is quoted as saying that 300,000 war workers would have to leave Detroit after VJ-day. We do not pretend to know what will happen after VJ-day, but we believe that with industrial peace, and the great need for cars and other commodities in America and abroad, a great many of the war workers now in Detroit willing and able to work can and should be employed in civilian production.

Our workers have made a magnificent contribution to our war effort. We cannot afford to announce in advance that they will be unemployed after the war is over.

As Members of Congress, we shall do all in our power to see that Congress, in cooperation with labor and industry, will act to maintain full employment and full production. To us, "the right to useful and remunerative job," which the late President Roosevelt expressed in the economic bill of rights, is basic for the survival of democracy. It is an elementary duty we owe to our servicemen and veterans, to our war workers, and to our communities.

JOHN D. DINGELL.
FRANK E. HOOK.
JOHN LESINSKI.
GEORGE D. O'BRIEN.
LOUIS C. RABAUT.
GEORGE G. SADOWSKI.

Mexico and the Intracoastal Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the various agencies of transportation, all of which have done and are doing a magnificent job in the winning of the war, none, I am sure, is rendering more valuable service than our inland waterways. For security reasons definite figures may not be revealed, but when they are made public they will furnish convincing proof of that fact.

Among all of our splendid inland waterways, I am quite sure that none is making a more valuable contribution to the assurance of final victory than the Intracoastal Waterway of Louisiana and Texas. This great transportation facility skirts the fertile coastal area "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande," a territory in which vast stores of essential raw materials abound in prodigal abundance.

For instance, Louisiana and Texas together produce 60 percent of the Nation's supply of oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products. Together they contribute practically all of the sulfur produced in the United States. These and similar commodities lend themselves perfectly to transport by water. As a result of their existence in that area, with practically unlimited quantities of natural gas, great industries have been and are being built in many localities in both States contiguous to the canal. The canal has provided an impulse to industrial growth and development which, in the years to come, is certain to make the great Southwest an industrial empire of almost limitless proportions.

About 3 years ago I introduced a bill to increase the dimensions of the Intracoastal Canal from a depth of 9 feet and a bottom width of 100 feet to a depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 125 feet. This bill, which became law July

23, 1942, also authorized similar dimensions for the intracoastal waterway east from the Mississippi to Apalachee Bay, Fla., and also authorized construction of a barge canal across Florida with like dimensions to connect with the Atlantic intracoastal waterway already completed and in operation with a 12-foot depth from Jacksonville, Fla., to Trenton, N. J. The measure also authorized the extension and completion of the intracoastal canal from Corpus Christi to the Mexican border at Brownsville.

For many years, indeed ever since the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas was organized nearly 40 years ago, there has been much interest in our sister Republic of Mexico in the extension of this great waterway south along the coast to Tampico and Vera Cruz. In this connection, the following exchange of letters between Hon. R. B. Creager of Brownsville, Tex., a leading citizen of Texas and Republican National Committeeman from that State, and Mr. Roy Miller, acting president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, is of special interest:

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., *May 18, 1945.*

Hon. ROY MILLER,
The Mayflower Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: From a News Letter being published in Mexico City I quote the following:

"Intracoastal Canal: Mexico City newspapers said this week that the Mexican Government is now drawing plans for an Intracoastal canal that will connect the cities of Tuxpan, State of Veracruz, Tampico, and Matamoros, in the State of Tamaulipas. The latter city is located across the Rio Grande River from Brownsville, Tex., and is 6 miles from that city's deep water port.

"Should this construction be completed it would connect with the Intracoastal Canal of Texas and Louisiana, giving southwestern Mexico water rates on barge lines for their oil, lumber, coffee, etc., and direct connections with the American ports of Corpus Christi, Houston, and New Orleans.

"It is understood that the Higgins Co. of New Orleans is the engineering contracting company that will construct the canal."

It is interesting to note that at least some character of serious consideration is being given by Mexico to the extension of the Intracoastal Canal.

I know this is part of the dream you dreamed a good many years ago. The extension from Brownsville to Tampico would be simple and inexpensive inasmuch as there are land-locked bays most of the way.

* * * * *

The best to you, as always.
Cordially,

R. B. CREAGER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 23, 1945.*

Hon. R. B. CREAGER,
Brownsville, Tex.

DEAR RENNIE: I am exceedingly grateful for your letter of the 18th in which you quote from a news letter published in Mexico City having reference to plans for an extension of the Intracoastal Canal from Matamoros south along the coast of our sister republic.

While I was not present at the first two meetings of our Canal Association, it is my understanding that at either the first or second meeting two representatives of the Republic of Mexico were present, being interested at that time in the possible construction of a similar project along the Mexican coast. If I remember correctly, the representatives were appointed by the late President Diaz.

I would like, if possible, to get some more information. Indeed, if you could give me a suggestion as to the proper official to address, I would like very much to communicate with him in behalf of our Canal Association and assure him of our interest and desire to cooperate. I presume such a letter would not trespass the proprieties. Maybe you can make a suggestion along that line.

The history of our Canal Association and the development of its plans present a fascinating picture, illustrative of the old adage that "great oaks from little acorns grow." The original idea which influenced our late friend, Clarence Holland, to call the meeting which was held in Victoria, August 1906, was merely an inland waterway "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande." It was based upon a survey made by Government engineers in 1875 and only had in mind the connecting of the shallow bays and lakes along the coasts of Louisiana and Texas.

The initial effort resulted in the construction of isolated and disconnected sections of a canal 5 feet deep with a bottom width of 40 feet. In due course, a canal of those dimensions was completed from the Mississippi River to the Sabine River on the Texas border. A canal of like dimensions was constructed between Galveston and Corpus Christi, comparatively little dredging being necessary since the canal followed the waters of the open bay. This project, however, proved inadequate because of its small dimensions.

Just before Congress adjourned March 3, 1923, a joint resolution, sponsored by the late Senator Morris Shepard in the Senate, and the late Representative Garland Dupre, of Louisiana, in the House, was adopted providing for a survey for a through connected waterway "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande." The report upon this survey recommended a canal 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide "from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans to Corpus Christi" at an estimated cost of $16,000,000. You will recall that such a project was authorized and finally completed to Corpus Christi about 3 years ago.

On July 23, 1942, the Mansfield bill was approved by the President. This bill not only authorized the enlargement of the canal to a depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 125 feet but also its extension to the Rio Grande Valley on the basis of the same dimensions. It also provided for the enlargement to the same dimensions of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Mississippi River east to Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the construction of a canal of the same dimensions across Florida to connect with the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, leading from Jacksonville, Fla., to Trenton, N. J., which already had a depth of 12 feet.

Thus, we now have an authorized project for an intracoastal waterway 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide all the way from Brownsville, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., a distance of approximately 2,400 miles.

Pending before the Congress is a proposal to construct a barge canal across the State of New Jersey, which will connect this through waterway with New York and through Long Island Sound and the Cape Cod Canal with Boston, Mass. Every section of the waterway from Mexico to Boston is now authorized with the exception of the connecting link across the State of New Jersey.

While no actual construction work has yet been undertaken on the stretch of the canal from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande Valley, an appropriation of $1,600,000 to start it was made by the Congress something more than a year ago. An effort is now being made to obtain approval of the Bureau of the Budget in order that actual construction work can be commenced. The connecting barge canal across Florida is in a somewhat similar situation, although no funds have yet been appropriated for it. Plans and specifications are being prepared and no doubt construction work will be started as soon as war conditions permit.

Thus it will be observed that we have come a long way since the meeting in Victoria, Tex., a little more than 38 years ago. I wonder if any of those valiant pioneers of Louisiana and Texas who were present at that meeting had any idea of what the ultimate culmination of their efforts might be. Texas, of course, has grown tremendously since that time and great industries have been established along our coast, supplying commodities for transportation on the canal amounting to millions of tons annually.

Indeed, the canal itself has been the major factor in promoting that development. While definite figures may not be publicized for security reasons, it can be said that the Intracoastal Canal has rendered a more valuable service to the war effort than any other waterway project in the United States. It can at least be said that the tonnage it handled last year was six times greater than the maximum estimate of the United States Army engineers when they recommended its construction 20 years ago.

That the canal would supply the same impulse for progress and development along the coast of Mexico south of the Rio Grande goes without saying. It would provide the cheapest form of transportation for the products of that area which might seek export into the United States. It would also open up a new and virgin market for the products of the United States.

We are, of course, entering upon a new era in our relations with the Republic of Mexico. I can think of nothing that will be more helpful to both of our countries than the extension of this great waterway project down and along the coast of our sister republic. It would multiply its utility and services manyfold.

* * * * *

With warmest good wishes,
Sincerely your friend,

ROY MILLER.

Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by William E. Keleher at a memorial service held in honor of the late Ernie Pyle, at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on Sunday, May 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Words, however chosen, are inadequate to express here today the depth of the regret of Albuquerque and New Mexico because of the passing of Ernest Taylor Pyle. Any eulogy that might be offered would fall far short of the desired goal. One of the outstanding personalities to emerge from the millions of men participating in World War II, Ernie Pyle's place is secure in any history

of that war. Countless Americans in the military service, everywhere, mourn his passing. Millions of civilians in every part of America join in that mourning, and this too, at a time when death has laid a heavy tribute on the nation, touched the lives of so many of our people.

Those who knew Ernie Pyle best, and something of his homespun philosophy of life, are well aware that he would not wish here today any undue display of emotion, any unseemly dramatization of his going. He would wish for no parade of bright, shining swords. Ernie Pyle was a brave man, and a courageous one, but modesty was the outstanding trait of his character. No man achieved more in his field of endeavor with greater humility than Ernie Pyle. No man brushed aside with greater modesty and looked away more quickly from the tendered glory and acclaim of fellow citizens. Ernie Pyle loved the simple things of life. He was a specialist concerning the thoughts lodged in the mind and heart of the common man. That gift made possible his professional greatness. Fame came to Ernie Pyle unsought. His preference would have been that the fame be bestowed on some other correspondent. With patience and appreciation, he thrust aside the honors and rewards that were offered to him.

Ernie Pyle liked Albuquerque and its people. Here he had many friends whose companionship he enjoyed.

Albuquerque was proud that Ernie Pyle had selected this town as his place of residence. He was intensely proud in turn of his little white house in the hills in the eastern part of our town. When here, back from the trips that called him to all parts of the earth, he never tired of looking east toward the Sandia mountains in the early morning. When he left Albuquerque each time on his assignments, he carried with him unforgettable memories of views from his front porch, of the beauties of our western skies at sunset, of the Rio Grande, as it meandered south toward the Mexican border, of the extinct volcanoes, as he saw them from his own front porch.

Here in the Rio Grande Valley, with an ancient cultural background, in New Mexico, his home by inclination and adoption, Ernie Pyle's personality was in harmony with its surroundings. Here he found happiness and contentment. Here he found true friendship. Thousands of people here and elsewhere, who never saw Ernie Pyle in person, felt that they were well acquainted with him and liked him instinctively. They felt they knew "Jerry," his beloved wife, companion of so many journeys up and down America, participant in so many of his adventures in far off lands, to whom constant reference was made as "that girl," in his writings. They felt that they knew his father, and his Aunt Mary, back in Indiana, his native State, which gave us James Whitcomb Riley, Eugene Field, and so many other literary people. They could visualize the white picket fence around the Pyle home here in Albuquerque.

A brave man, a courageous man, a modest man, with the whole world as his assignment, Ernie Pyle looked out on the field of light and life with eyes that were kind and charitable and understanding. He was generous and tolerant toward his fellow man. He had a great and generous heart, a mind that was quick and all-embracing. He hated sham and hypocrisy. As a war correspondent, Ernie Pyle could have written his articles, in all good conscience, behind the lines, and from safety zones at the war front. Spurning safety, he preferred to risk his life, as the fighting men risked their lives, and to write about the things he had seen at first hand pertaining to the ordinary soldier. He abandoned the customary routine of reporting a war. He walked and talked with the men at the front. He traveled with them, lived with them, shared in their dangers and hardships. In his column reports, Ernie Pyle gave the names of men who otherwise would not be mentioned in dispatches from a war front. He not only gave their names, but the names of their outfits, and a broad hint now and then for the comfort and assurance of the folks back home as to where their men were fighting and how they were faring. He made the war understandable to millions of people in America. Without any effort to do so, Ernie Pyle joined the ranks of immortals as a war correspondent, became an unforgettable character, an irreplaceable man. Conceding that his talent was a gift and an achievement beyond their reach, fellow correspondents did not resent his success, or become jealous of him because of it. They were proud to have a fellow craftsman receive the highest praise from grateful countrymen. Quick to detect insincerity in any man, the correspondents recognized in Ernie Pyle a true patriot, remembering that our heroes are our patriots, that patriotism is that other and higher form of love for which men die.

Ernie Pyle not only lived up to the highest and best traditions of his profession but he created and established new horizons and new frontiers in journalism. These will serve as guideposts in the years to come for those who will come after him and undertake service in a field calling for the highest integrity, the greatest loyalty, the most exacting devotion to causes and to principles. Ernest Taylor Pyle, in his many months at the battlefields, had ample oportunity to search the hearts of men, to learn their fears, their hopes, their ambitions, to know the cruelties, the avarice, the selfishness of those responsible for the plight of the world. He had observed at close range the Gethsemane of humanity. He had seen the aftermath of the crucifixion of everything that humanity loved and revered and held sacred. And yet he did not lose faith in humanity. He did not become cynical. He believed that in God's good time the last shot of the war would be fired, that some day the soil would no longer be scarred by the blood of American youth, that justice and liberty would again prevail, that man himself would be rehabilitated, that battlefields would revert to their highest and best use and again yield the fruits of the earth for man's sustenance.

It has been said that the dead take with them clutched tightly in their hands only the things they have given away. If that be true, and I am sure that it is, Ernie Pyle took much with him in death, because he had given much in life. Ernie Pyle gave freely for the benefit of the people of America, of his talent and his time, and the best that was in him every day of his adult life. America, all of America, is richer far because of Ernie Pyle's splendid contributions to American literature. America will always remember the integrity and steadfastness of his character, his interest in and compassion for the common man. In death Ernie Pyle took with him to that other land the deep and abiding love of the people of America, the gratitude and appreciation of a great nation. Ernie Pyle is gone, but he leaves behind him in Albuquerque, in all of New Mexico, in the hearts of the people of America, and in the hearts of the fighting men in Europe and in the far-off Pacific, a name and a memory that will never fade or tarnish. The love that he gave to men and the devotion that he displayed for his country, all without stint or selfishness, will bless his memory a hundredfold in the days to come. To paraphrase the words of Lawrence Binyon in his beautiful poem, Ode for the Fallen, may I say: "He shall not grow old, as we that are left shall grow old. Age shall not weary him, nor the years condemn. At the going down of the sun and in the morning we will remember him."

Trouble With Tito—We Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting delegations at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco is that of Yugoslavia. Its novelty lies in the fact that it represents one of eastern Europe's new Russian-sponsored, Communist-led dictatorships. The only other Balkan state represented at San Francisco is Greece, which has an old line, British-imposed government. The fact that Yugoslavia is by far the largest, strongest, and most dynamic United Nation in southeast Europe and the only one under Russian control gives it unusual significance and provokes a question as to Yugoslavia's basic stability.

Facts beyond dispute are that Marshal Josip Broz-Tito's revolutionary regime will control the whole armed force of the country; that the main opposition leaders have been, or soon will be, killed or exiled; that the opposition will be completely exhausted; that the administration will be as firmly in Tito's hands as the army; that the only positive statewide political force is Tito's Communist-led Partisan movement; and that it enjoys Russia's unreserved and aggressive backing.

Nowhere in Europe does more complete or enthusiastic international accord exist than that between Marshal Tito and Marshal Stalin. All these factors point to stability for the time being. It seems beyond question that Tito's Yugoslavia will, for a time, exercise unrivaled hegemony over the Balkans, outshining and outshouting every other state south of Poland. It will even exert much influence on Greece, making Great Britain's self-imposed task there increasingly difficult.

Nothing succeeds—for a while—like success, and since the Yugoslavs like playing important roles, many of them will feel Tito's lure. Slovenia will gain wide strips of territory; Croatia may annex certain areas, and Macedonia will serve as an octopus, stretching its tentacles toward northern Greece. Such expansion, power, and glory will tend to please most Yugoslavs. In addition, mighty Slav Mother Russia will aid the enlarged state in all its efforts to play a vital European role. If Yugoslavia serves as the pilot of southeast Europe and makes itself felt in international conferences, that will be only to the advantage of Soviet Russia. And if through Moscow's intervention, Yugoslavia succeeds in establishing a close federative alliance with Bulgaria which will make Belgrade the head and center of the 20,000,000 Balkan Slavs, that will enhance Tito's regime still more.

It seems certain, therefore, that for a time Tito will be master of Yugoslavia

and that Nation will lord it over the lower Danube. However, this does not mean that the regime is basically secure or that Yugoslavia itself is fundamentally stable. The fact is that Yugoslavia, as at present set up, carries within its bosom an irrepressible conflict that may eventually tear it to pieces. That conflict springs from the furious and abiding enmity caused by Tito's attempt to suppress the nationalist Serbs.

Tito's regime in all provinces, except possibly Montenegro, is supported only by a minority and opposed by the majority of Yugoslavs. This in itself is of no immediate importance, inasmuch as Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler have abundantly shown that a dynamic, ruthless, armed minority, holding power, can maintain itself indefinitely in defiance of popular desires. In fact it can mold popular desires to fit its bayonets. Furthermore, most Yugoslavs have borne oppressive yokes during most of their history, and ordinary peasants who for centuries endured the Hapsburgs and the Sultans might be expected indefinitely to suffer Tito, who is a very clever autocrat and could "divide and conquer" as well as Franz Joseph or Suleiman. However, the Croatian base is too small to impose subjugation long, and the Serbs are too dynamic and vigorous to endure it. And when they throw off the hegemony of Croatians and Communist Serbs, it may shatter Yugoslavia.

The Serbs are the most nationalistic, dynamic, and indomitable of the Balkan peoples. It was they who first rose against the Turks, fought longest and hardest, and accomplished most with least outside help. They alone of all the eastern Europeans created their own native dynasty by putting a fellow peasant on the throne. They like strong leadership, when it serves them, and are devoted to faithful kings, as symbols and champions of Serbia. When kings become unfaithful, Serbs assassinate them. This is the way they "vote" on royalty.

They are very democratic in a patriarchal way; seldom bow the head, bend the knee, or kiss the hand. They have a marvelous collection of folk songs, most of which are epic and revolutionary. Their religion is nationalistic, their literature is nationalistic, their costumes are nationalistic, and they naively believe God speaks Serbian.

In many respects they resemble Texans. They are samples of Europe's Wild East. I am not saying they are pleasant people; indeed, they are often disagreeable and dominating. They are quite illogical, fighting tyrants at certain times and acting as tyrants at others. They frequently swagger like Yankee carpetbaggers and strut about like Lone Star Rangers with an Alamo on each shoulder and a San Jacinto in each hand. And, like Texans, they are tall and strong. They resent being dominated by Croats as much as Texans would by Jay Hawkers. Many Serbian priests resemble Kansas' John Brown, with beards two inches shorter. There are about 7,000,000 Serbs—largest Slav group in the Balkans. All are members of the Eastern Church.

Now, what has happened to these people since 1940? On March 27, 1941, they pulled off a revolution and overthrew a Yugoslav Government that had just made a pact with Hitler. This was the most heroic popular act in the history of this war. Hitler at that moment was master of the Continent and Russia was with him. The Nazi army was at the peak of its power and free to act. England stood utterly alone. At such a moment the Serbian people by a revolutionary act set up an anti-Hitler government and stoned Nazis on the street. They simply invited destruction. No people among the 45 United Nations has a more heroic initial record than that. Only two can match it.

In contrast with this, the Croats, who formed an integral part of Yugoslavia, welcomed the invading Nazis into their capital, Zagreb, with drums, flags, flowers, and songs. Thus contrast stands, writ large, in the eternal annals of human events. And in every Serbian heart. The Serbs recall that the Russian Stalin and the British Chamberlain made pacts with Hitler as their people cheered, and they also recall that when a Belgrade government trafficked with Hitler the Serb people threw it in jail.

The record of many Serbs in opposing the Nazis, even before March 1941, is excellent. While Tito, his comrades, and his master were helping Germans and denouncing both Churchill and Roosevelt as capitalist imperialists, the Serbs were beating Nazis in bund camps and killing them in ambush.

After the Croatian Quisling, Ante Pavelich, had imposed a bloody Nazi-Fascist regime in Croatia, he and his fellows massacred in cold blood at least a third of a million Serbs, perhaps half a million. This was one of the most horrible acts of modern times. Nothing the Turk, Abdul Hamid, did to the Armenians equaled it. Pavelich's Croats swept through western Yugoslavia as a wild conflagration, devouring Serbs. They laid whole provinces waste. This fact is disputed by no one. The only question is how many hundreds of thousands were massacred.

The Germans and Hungarians also took terrible reprisals in Serbia, and killed scores of thousands of Serbs, shooting men and boys en masse and stringing scores to electric-light pillars. The Serbian Nation alone has had greater losses than the whole British Empire.

The present Tito regime has capped the climax by trying to exterminate Serb nationalism. It is to be recalled that Eden made Ivan Subasich, a Croatian, head of the Yugoslav government in exile, last June. Under British sponsorship the new Premier went to Italy and the island of Vis to see Tito. Together they conspired to finish off Serbian anti-Communist resistance. They made the following appraisal of the situation: At least 150,000 Serbs were in Germany as prisoners of war. We Americans now know under what terrible conditions they lived. Germany was exterminating these young Serbs in their prison camps because they had dared fight against Hitler and were still against Hitler. They had been seized at a time when Tito, his comrades and his chief were helping Hitler. In addition, another 100,000 Serbs were doing forced labor. This meant much of the fighting power of Serbia was neutralized. Also the Serbs were largely disarmed. The Croatians, Subasich, Tito, and Ivan Ribar, felt it was a very propitious moment to give the Serbs a knockout blow. So they decided to strike with all their might.

As Hitler was annihilating Serbs in foul prisons, the Croatian partisan chiefs and Serb Communist comrades decided to liquidate those still resisting in Serbia. Tito directed practically all his military efforts, not against the Germans, but against the Serbs. In the carrying out of this plot, Tito won the support of Britain and to a certain extent of America. Every day and night the British radio urged the Serbs to join Tito. For Tito, American airmen twice bombed Belgrade, killing a few Germans and thousands of Serbs. We even outdid the Nazis in killing Serb civilians—for Tito. Also, for him we bombed other Serb towns, killing almost exclusively Serb civilians, and the British radio exultantly announced that we were doing it for Tito. We publicly revelled in killing Serbs for Tito.

The British and Americans collected food, clothes, and weapons for Tito's men. They even went in as missionaries to urge the simple Serb peasants to join Tito. And to top it all they got the Serbian King to order his Serbian Nation to join Tito.

It is well for us to recall the dramatic situation, as that plot to crush Serbia was being carried out by Croatians, Serb Communists, and the great Allies. Every few hours Moscow and London urged the Serbs to give way. As 150,000 Serb soldiers languished in German prison hells for having dared fight on the side of England, the British Broadcasting Corp. denounced as traitors their fathers and brothers who dared oppose Communist revolutionists. American weapons were being sent in to kill Serbs. Tito's men engaged in killing Serbs were wearing British battle dress—made in America. Britishers were personally on the spot trying to decoy Serbs. It is a literal fact that Nazis, Communists, and the great Allies were united in trying to destroy the Serbs.

But still the Serbs did not give way. Tito and Subasich and all the Croat partisans and all the Serb Communists, aided by British-Russian propaganda and American supplies, could not take Serbia. The Red army took it, with the acquiescence of the Serb nationalists, and handed it over to the Communist-led partisans. No Serbs opposed mother Russia's soldiers. It was the Red army that made Tito and the Serb Communists masters of Serbia. And the new masters proceeded to execute anti-Communist Serb leaders.

In 1389 the Moslem Turks crushed the Serbs at the battle of Kossovo, but the Serbs never ceased to sing of liberty and first of all the Balkan peoples rose in revolution against their masters from Asia. That was in 1804 and for 120 years they kept up that fight to free and unite the Serbs. They played a leading role in the destruction of the Sultanic and Hapsburg Empires.

They made their whole national life for half a millennium center about the rectification of the Kossovo catastrophe. Now

the Serbs say that in 1944 they went through another Kossovo, inflicted not by hostile invaders only, but also by their allies, their Croat fellow citizens and Serb Communists. And in their hearts the Serbs add that this blow was deliberately inflicted, as 150,000 of their soldiers were held in Nazi dungeons.

If the Serbs did not forget the old Kossovo, will they forget the new? Did the Jews in Babylon forget Jerusalem? Would a Texan forget such a plot? Or any man who cherished loyalty to his nation? The Croatians, Bulgarians, Macedonians, and Serb Communists may continue their unified action for some time and keep the Serbs down. But those men and women of the Shumadian Mountains will sing of that 1944 plot in a thousand new folk songs. They will tell stories of it in a thousand dingy inns. Priests will tell worshippers of it in all the village churches. Mothers will consecrate their boy babies at baptism to the restoration of "Serb honor" as mothers did for 400 years after the death of Tsar Lazar at Kossovo.

I am not saying this will be nice. I am not praising Serb nationalism. Greater Serbism was an evil. Great Serbs aroused as much justified resentment among Croatians as Yankee "carpetbaggers" in Mississippi. I am not extolling; I am just reporting. As I might report the emotions centering about Harpers Ferry. Maybe the Virginians had a reason to execute Old John Brown, but his soul went marching on, as men sang and fought to sweep away a regime. A million Serbian souls will be marching on. Four million Serbian voices will be singing. The memory of an allied plot against a helpless nation will burn as the deep flames in Mount Vesuvius. And some day it will explode.

Another War in 25 Years—Unless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address given at Carnegie Hall, New York City, May 22, at a memorial meeting of the Society for the Prevention of World War III:

Who said war doesn't pay?

In thousands of hamlets, towns, and cities on the continent of Europe tonight there are legions of friends and kinfolk gathered together expectantly, hopefully, awaiting the return of loved ones. Of those who marched in the organized ranks, most will surely come back. A brief imprisonment for six or seven million German soldiers and even they will then be reunited with their families. And of course some day the armies of occupation will return to their native soils to resume the pursuits of peacetime.

But there are millions who will never return. No one wants to be the first to drive that spark of hope from the hearts of countless men, women, and children who, themselves now liberated, saw their countries engulfed by the German hordes and their loved ones carried away. But I know, and my colleagues know, that these millions will never return. We have looked on their places of torture, on the very implements of torture. We have seen thousands upon thousands of their poor emaciated bodies lying cold in death, strewn indiscriminately about the German countryside, in railroad cars, and in concentration camps, all bearing the unmistakable signs of brutality and torture.

And, as at Dachau, on the outskirts of that center of culture that was Munich, we viewed the thousands of naked bodies piled high in the warehouse, next to the gas chamber, awaiting disposal in the furnaces a few yards away.

But these are only a fraction of those who will never return. The fate of millions can be read in the ashes from the crematoria used in each concentration camp for the disposal of the dead—yes, and perhaps of some not quite dead. It is literally true that the ashes of the starved and tortured captives from all parts of Europe fertilized the fields of Germany. That's what it means to have a "master race" in the world.

But who are these millions who will not return? They are Russians, Poles, Czechs, French, Belgians, Dutch, Jews, and practically every nationality in Europe. They are the sons and daughters of the old folks gathered in these hamlets tonight. They are husbands torn from their wives' embrace. They are mothers and wives and sweethearts abducted and forced to do their captors' bidding. They are whole families impressed to do the work of the Reich.

As my colleagues tell you, we all saw the same sights, we talked with the same people, and we traveled together throughout Germany in our investigation of the atrocities committed by the Germans in their hundred-odd concentration camps for political prisoners. Our findings and conclusions as contained in our report to Congress were unanimous. However, there still remains to be said a word about the real significance of this ghastly thing. The design is not hard to interpret.

The general scheme of the German leaders appears to have been both immediate and long range. Having destroyed all military resistance and gathered what remained of the armed forces of the conquered nation into prison and concentration camps, they first tried by means of intimidation, of force, and of terrorism to reduce the opposition of the civilian population and thus render more simple and less costly the saddling of the German yoke on the "inferior" race who would be expected to provide the slave labor necessary to help feed the German armies and furnish some of the manpower and womanpower for the German war industries.

Then later, having gained an impregnable position militarily among the nations, the permanence of this position would be guaranteed by a studied policy of interference with the human reproductivity of neighboring populations. This latter was the reason for much of the biological experimentation that went on continuously in prison camps throughout Germany.

It is common knowledge that the intelligencia in overrun countries were approached and urged to spread the Nazi doctrine, and when they refused or failed they soon found themselves in one of these prison camps. In one camp there were seven generals of the French Army, numerous doctors, lawyers, professors, and churchmen of many nationalities. All these apparently were unwilling to do the German bidding and so were compelled to suffer indescribable hardships and torture. According to General de Gaulle, about 600,000 French Army personnel and perhaps a like number of French civilians made the supreme sacrifice, most of the latter having been compelled by the German Government, working in conjunction with the French Vichy Government, to leave their homes and become slave laborers in Germany.

The food ration for the slave laborers was so inadequate that slow starvation was inevitably their fate. At the same time that Germany was abducting from twelve to twenty millions of human beings from the other countries of Europe, she took at least half the food supplies and half the livestock from each occupied country. This resulted in wholesale hunger and reduced vitality for whole populations—and practical starvation for countless men, women, and children remaining in those countries. In addition to this designed effort to reduce millions to impotence, there is evidence that French and perhaps other prisoners of war held in Germany were subjected to treatments calculated to render them sterile. All of this goes to make up a pattern, not alone of brutal and inhuman treatment, but also a deliberate plan of extermination of neighboring populations, all aimed at making impregnable the German nation of tomorrow.

The conclusion reached by the congressional delegation after seeing and reviewing all the facts was, and I quote: "The policies herein described constituted a calculated and diabolical program of planned torture and extermination on the part of those who were in control of the German Government."

Hence for 5 years while neighboring peoples were subjected to a studied program of starvation and terrorism and extermination, the German people reveled in abundance and luxury. The loot of conquered Europe was theirs. Millions of slave laborers were there to wait upon their masters and do their most menial tasks. From works of art to machinery and raw materials, everything desirable found its way into Germany. The store shelves bulged with stolen food and Hitler could well repeat his early assurance that the German people would be the best fed in Europe.

Even today the only leather shoes to be seen on the Continent of Europe are on German feet. As we drove through towns and cities and countryside, German men, women, and children, fat, well clothed, and prosperous looking, presented a startling contrast to the thousands of emaciated victims of their cruelty. For the evidence of planned starvation can be seen wherever a naked corpse or a salvaged prisoner is encountered. In life or in death it is the same—the tightly drawn almost transparent skin encases the bones with scarcely a pound of flesh between.

On the other side of the ledger, much has been said and written about the destruction wrought by the air forces, both the British and our own. Since most of the larger war industries of Germany were in or near the great cities in order to be close to the source of labor, the bombing of these factories entailed the destruction of the cities as well. Cities like Essen, Ludwigshaven, Frankfurt are almost totally destroyed although some walls still stand and many of the former inhabitants live in the basements.

Until very recent months the damage to these war plants was quickly repaired after each bombing raid so new and repeated raids were necessary. This finally brought about the destruction of most of the houses and other buildings, cut production of fuel and supplies to a minimum, and thus hastened the end of the war. So while it is true that some suffering has been experienced by some of the German people due to being bombed out of their homes, it is not so extensive as one might think. Besides this has obtained for only a relatively short time. It is interesting to note that in the successive bombings of one of the greatest war plants of the Ruhr, continuing over a period of 3 years, only 70 persons lost their lives in the plant. Over 50,000 workers were continuously employed in that factory which is today in a state of complete ruin. But in Allied territory I saw one spot in Antwerp where, less than 3 months ago, an exploding V-2 bomb launched by the Germans killed nearly 1,000

innocent Belgian men, women, and children whose only fault was that they were within range of German weapons. In the case of the world's largest synthetic oil plant, the German managers informed us that although it was considered completely ruined, they would require only 3 weeks to get a portion of the plant in operation and in 10 months they would be in full production.

Our artillery caused considerable damage to some cities near the Rhine, but after the break-through, our spearheads of armor traveled so fast and so far that in only a few places did the Germans make a stand, and therefore no damage to towns and cities is to be found elsewhere. In flying from the Rhine eastward to Weimar to visit the concentration camp at Buchenwald, we passed over the heart of Germany for 200 miles. Flying only a few hundred feet above the ground, we could observe every detail of the country. I noticed as we passed over villages and towns, that not one tile of any roof was damaged or disturbed. I saw not even a bomb crater alongside the highways. And I counted the cattle in the fields over which we flew. From 6 to 30 head of cattle grazed in each pasture; the farmers were in the fields plowing with oxen, some with horses, and the fruit trees were in full bloom for it was April. Altogether a peaceful scene. War had not seared the heart of the Reich.

We traveled in a jeep with Patch's army for 100 miles surrounded by tanks, ducks, artillery, and supply trucks of all kinds. True, there was some damage to Ulm and Augsburg and Munich, but the people were still living in the undamaged portions of the cities and in the basements of damaged houses. Even in much bombed and battered Munich, where many of the beautiful architectural gems were damaged almost beyond repair, the massive memorials Hitler erected to his fallen beer-putsch comrades remain untouched as if prophetic of his dreams of permanence.

On the highway struggling against this onrushing wave of armor came the thousands of displaced persons—men, women, and children. Singly, by twos and threes, and sometimes in groups, these civilians of every nationality clung to a narrow strip of highway as they trudged onward, ever onward. Some were released prisoners of war, some slave laborers; some were German families bombed from their homes. A few rode bicycles; some pushed carts filled with bundles. One hayrack filled with French civilians and soldiers was pulled by an old steam engine, advancing about 2 miles per hour as it roared down the highway.

I marveled that these returning slaves did not stop long enough to wreak their vengeance on the perpetrators of this fiendish kind of life to which they had been subjected for so long. But I supposed some were restrained by the military, some were too weak, and some just wanted to get out of this cursed land even though there might be no home to return to.

So, of course, a few will return miraculously as from the grave. There are some who have known the starvation diet too short a time—they may live. The American medical men at Buchenwald have reduced the death totals from 50 per day to 25 almost overnight—and American care, American genius, and American food is today keeping alive that spark of hope that shines from the eyes of those kinfolk in the little hamlets of war-ravaged Europe who await the return of a loved one from the hell that is Germany.

This has a lesson for us. Remember the ogre or the bad giant in the fair stories? Because he is bigger and stronger he works his will on others. And so it is in true life—the strong and unprincipled can bend his neighbor to his will, and proceeds to do so.

There can be no doubt that Hitler and his people are exponents of and believers in the philosophy of force. They practiced the art and they have become more proficient than any other modern nation. In every country overrun by the German armies in this war, we have the same pattern of seizure of the men for slave labor, rape of the women, excesses both on and off the battlefield; the burning of churches filled with women and children; the massacre of surrendered soldiers; the strafing of refugees; the indiscriminate bombing with no military object in view; the inhuman treatment of other humans born in the same image and likeness.

But it is all a part of the German character and the German way of life; and if the rest of the world doesn't recognize it as such and take steps to eliminate it once and for all time, there will be no peace in our time nor in our children's. Since the era of Frederick the Great, Germans have glorified war and given to the profession of arms the highest adulation. In the last 100 years the German nation has been the aggressor in 6 different wars. The people of Germany must understand the difference for they have had full opportunity to choose between the moral teachings of such men as Pastor Niemoller and the Catholic bishops of Germany on the one hand, and the German General Staff on the other. Invariably they follow the General Staff. Tradition and pagan concepts of superiority and grandeur overcome the gentle teachings of religion.

So for 5 years the people of Germany have basked in the favor of their pagan Teutonic gods and only now for a few short months have they tasted the bitter dregs of partial defeat. Who wouldn't trade a few months of hardship and failure for 5 years of comfort and success? Hence, I insist that the members of the terroristic and fanatical Scheutzstaffel and Gestapo organizations, as well as the members of the General Staff, must be eliminated. And the rank and file of the German people must also be made to suffer, at least from some of the shortages and through some of the same kind of restrictions as were the lot of their so-called inferior neighbors. Stern justice demands that much; the preservation of world peace requires it.

Therefore, unless a punishment commensurate with the crimes committed is meted out, I warn that again before 25 years have elapsed, this same people will plunge the world into a holocaust infinitely greater than the one we are now passing through. A perfect vehicle will always be available—once it was the Kaiser—this time it was Hitler—and next time it will be someone else. And if no one else can furnish a name or a symbol, depend on the German General Staff to supply one.

War does pay—for the aggressors!

Reconversion Wage Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article entitled "WLB Reconversion Wage Policy" which appeared in the May edition of the Research Report, which is published by the International Research Department, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW-CIO—with offices at 411 West Milwaukee Street, Detroit 2, Mich. This is a very informative article and was forwarded to me by Mr. Irving Richter, national legislative representative of the United Auto Workers—UAW-CIO—whose office is at 1729 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

The article is as follows:

WLB RECONVERSION WAGE POLICY

Despite labor's repeated warnings for a new wage policy to gear into the 60,000,000-job program, the WLB still has not developed any over-all reconversion program.

Recently, however, it has given some indication of what its position may be on the issue of wage cuts to prewar levels during reconversion.

WAGE CUTS

In the *Cuneo Press Inc., case* (22 WLR No. 3, p. XXII) the employer proposed to cut wages of plant guards to 1942 levels—though job content had not changed—after war contracts had been completed. The Board unanimously denied the request because the decreases "were not necessary either to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war." The Board overruled a recommendation of its review committee to allow the employer to reduce rates to the bracket maximum.

The *Dunbar Furniture Mfg. Co.* (22 WLR No. 3, p. XXII) converted from furniture to wooden plane parts manufacture in 1942, when it secured wage increases to bring its rates in line with those of other plants in the area. Upon completing war work, the company asked to retain the higher rates in furniture manufacturing. The Board unanimously approved the request, because job content remained substantially the same after reconversion.

On the basis of these decisions, it appears that the WLB will not approve rate reductions upon reconversion where job content remains the same, even when existing rates are higher than the maximum of the bracket.

In only one case, however, has the Board approached the question from an over-all point of view.

In a case between the Richmond Radiator Co. and UAW-CIO Local 66 (23 WLR 120, and No. 3, p. VII) the third RWLB denied the company's application to reduce rates to 1942 levels after reconversion. The Board, with industry dissenting, ordered adjustments to maintain earnings at wartime levels. The chairman stated:

"Such a policy (reduction of rates to prewar levels) if pursued by the War Labor Board and other stabilization agencies undoubtedly would produce a substantial deflationary pressure on the national economy. Real doubt exists as to whether such a pressure would be consistent with the national interests. * * * There is much to suggest that when the economy is in process of being fully reconverted an industry-wide wage-stabilization approach will be desirable."

A genuine reconversion policy must:

Allow no wage reductions.

Authorize rate increases to compensate for loss of overtime and premium pay.

Abandon wage brackets for industry-wide stabilization.

Raise substandard wages to 65 cents.

Remove limitations on advancement imposed by GO 31.

Release controls on fringe issues.

Cabinet Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been quite interested, as everyone else

has, in the recent changes in the President's Cabinet. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Washington News, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, and the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) News]

THE CABINET SHAKE-UP

President Truman took three good steps yesterday toward making his Cabinet what a Cabinet ought to be.

Each change he announced is a distinct improvement. Together, they will strengthen the Cabinet greatly.

We see in his selections no evidence that he is steering "left" or "right," but only evidence that he intends to go forward, conducting his own administration, putting strong secretaries over Federal departments, and requiring them to be department heads in fact as well as name.

Tom C. Clark, of Texas, chosen for Attorney General, is an able lawyer of long experience in the Justice Department. His record encourages belief that he will enforce the antitrust and other laws vigorously and fairly.

Representative CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, now serving his third term in Congress, is a practical rancher and grain grower. As chairman of the House investigation of wartime food problems he has made himself an authority in that field. This is fortunate, because as Secretary of Agriculture he will be responsible for the War Food Administration if Mr. Truman goes through with his plan to put WFA under the Agriculture Department.

Louis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington State, who will leave the Federal bench to become Secretary of Labor, was one of Mr. Truman's closest friends when both were Senators. He was a consistent, effective supporter of New Deal measures. Whether he, or anyone, can please the leaders of both big factions of organized labor is a question. But if he does what we think the President intends—that is, if he gathers and coordinates in the Labor Department all the scattered agencies now stumbling over each other as they try to administer conflicting labor policies, and if he helps to develop a single, coherent Federal labor policy—he will serve the workers and the country well.

A Cabinet with half of its 10 members from beyond the Mississippi—the other two westerners being Commerce Secretary Wallace, of Iowa, and the new Postmaster General, Mr. Hannegan, of Missouri—will be unique. But we like this western breeze.

We hope Mr. Truman has in mind other changes.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

THE CABINET SHIFTS

Some changes in the Cabinet have been accepted as a foregone conclusion ever since President Truman took office. The choice of members of a President's "official family" is a peculiarly personal prerogative of the Chief Executive with which the legislative branch seldom interferes, and there is general recognition of the personal as well as political considerations which naturally dictate the selection of those upon whom the President so heavily leans in carrying out administration policies.

The shifts just announced are in each case supported by a background of developments which make them highly logical. Secretary Perkins had made known an earnest desire to leave the Department of Labor, after a long public service dating from the beginning of the New Deal. The Attorney General, more so perhaps than any other member of the Roosevelt Cabinet, was regarded as a willing instrument for his former chieftain rather than as one who brought any marked distinction to the administration of the Department of Justice. Secretary Wickard had been bypassed in the handling of affairs which properly belonged to the Department of Agriculture, and the resulting organization has been the subject of increasing criticism, to meet which required something more than a mere reshift of administrative agencies.

The new appointments have already brought expressions of approval from Capitol Hill and will sit well with the country generally. The appointees are good men, neither leftists nor rightists, with records of achievement behind them. Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach belongs in a category of men which has become small because of the jealousies and conflicts between the country's great labor organizations—being one of the few in public life acceptable to all of them as Secretary of Labor. His former Senate colleagues, of whom the President was one, regarded him highly. Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, to be Secretary of Agriculture, will find himself in the sometimes unenviable position of being made responsible for matters which have been, in the recent past, a target of his own effective criticism as chairman of a special investigating committee of the House. But behind this more recent activity on his part is a record for public service which impressed those who knew him before he ever came to Congress. The Attorney General-designate, Thomas C. Clark, enjoys the respect of those with whom he has worked as an Assistant Attorney General since 1937 in charge, first, of the Antitrust and later of the Criminal Division. He is young, likable, and regarded as fair.

While the President's disclaimer of any intent to appoint new Secretaries of State and of the Treasury was interesting, in view of past conjecture, it is still more significant that the question of any changes in the agencies conducting the military aspects of war was not even raised. There is comforting evidence that, as far as the war goes, there will be no change until it is won.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

NEW BLOOD IN CABINET

President Truman moved vigorously yesterday to reorganize his Cabinet for the immense responsibilities that will fall upon it in the remaining months of war and the postwar period. In a single day he announced the appointment of new chiefs for the Departments of Justice, Agriculture, and Labor. These shifts, together with the change already announced for the Post Office Department, go a long way toward reconstitution of his Cabinet.

The mere fact that such changes are being made is a hopeful sign. Being shifted unexpectedly into the great responsibility of the Presidency, Mr. Truman was naturally reluctant to effect immediate changes. As his grip on the reins of authority tightens, however, he is moving resolutely to put the Government's own house in order. That is not surprising, for, as the Post has repeatedly pointed out, the Cabinet has long been in need of reorganization. It has had no shake-up comparable to that of yesterday since 1933.

There may be a number of reasons why President Truman eased Francis Biddle out of the Attorney Generalship, some of them personal reasons. What is most important is that Mr. Biddle's chief service often seemed to lie in providing legal justification for whatever action the Chief Executive wished to take, even though he sometimes admitted that he had very little to go on. In safeguarding civil liberties Mr. Biddle has earned widespread commendation. His record in discouraging war hysteria and in judicious prosecution of wartime offenses does not, however, offset his blunder in asking Congress for criminal penalties for newspapermen or others found guilty of divulging information which Government officials wish to keep secret. Hearty support of civil liberties is not the sole measure of an Attorney General's services. We hope that Tom C. Clark, the new Attorney General, who is promoted from within the department, will attain a higher degree of statesmanship in providing the Administration with legal guidance.

Secretary Frances Perkins' resignation had long been foreshadowed. Indeed, she wanted to retire months ago, and only the difficulty of selecting an able successor who would be acceptable to both the A. F. of L. and CIO prevented her resignation from being accepted. Undoubtedly the appointment of Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach to succeed her will mean a reorganization of the Labor Department. As chairman of the Senate's committee investigating the war effort, Mr. Truman was sharply critical of loose organization and inefficiency in the executive branch. He pointed to "conflicting authority over and responsibility for" various war programs as one of the chief causes of failures and shortcomings. The scattering of governmental agencies dealing with labor is one of the most notorious examples of such conflicting authority.

In the Department of Agriculture the appointment of Representative CLINTON ANDERSON effects a large measure of reorganization. He will succeed both Secretary of Agriculture Wickard and War Food Administrator Marvin Jones. During most of the war years the Department has been split between these two officials. That impossible patchwork could not stand for any length of time. Apparently it was tolerated only because the late President Roosevelt could not find a satisfactory assignment outside of the Department for Mr. Wickard and could not bring himself to the point of dismissing a faithful subordinate.

Representative ANDERSON brings to his assignment a wide experience in investigating our war food controls. His reports, as President Truman noted yesterday, have been rich sources of information and constructive in approach. Now the critic and adviser will become the executive of the war food program. Much will be expected of him, and we hope that his executive operations will be as effective as his investigations have been.

In each case the new Cabinet members will be tested by their performance. Each will have numerous responsibilities, for President Truman's technique in administration, as we understand it, is to choose able men to head governmental departments, to group the great majority of governmental agencies under them, and to give the department heads a large measure of responsibility in their respective spheres. That method truly calls for new blood in the Cabinet, and we are glad to see that the President is acting resolutely to provide it.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

THE NEW CABINET

There is no escaping the fact that Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet was a left-over. A Cabinet is peculiarly the creation and the instrument of a President. And, though Mr. Truman inherited the going administration of Mr. Roosevelt, his differences in temperament and outlook made it inevitable that he would presently begin to surround himself with men of his own choosing. Now he has done so after a seemly interval. Let us see how the new Cabinet shapes up.

First, Mr. Stettinius remains as Secretary of State. That will surprise no one. In its general outline, our foreign policy is now fairly well shaped up. Mr. Stettinius, though he may not be the greatest Secretary of State

in the country's history, is a capable administrator and executant. It would be foolish to change him now.

Mr. Morgenthau likewise stays on as Secretary of the Treasury. To many, this will be surprising, since Mr. Morgenthau's long tenure has been felt to be a consequence of his close personal relationship with Mr. Roosevelt. But again, the Treasury is at present deeply involved in what might be called the economic half of our foreign policy—that is, the shaping up of the program developed at Bretton Woods.

Mr. Truman appointed no new Secretary of the Interior, and said nothing about Mr. Ickes. Possibly that door is still ajar. Nor did he mention Mr. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce. Considering the staggering political obligation which Mr. Truman owes to Mr. Wallace, we may be quite certain that Mr. Wallace will remain. Likewise there are no changes in the service posts.

Now for the changes.

Mr. Wickard is succeeded as Secretary of Agriculture by Representative CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico. Mr. ANDERSON has been emerging in the House as a particularly well-informed and trenchant critic of the administration's food policies. He has been head of the House Food Committee which recently made an exhaustive report on the meat situation, its recommendations having been adopted almost entirely as the new meat program of the OPA, and an equally able report on the sugar situation. Mr. ANDERSON may be expected to do some vigorous work as head of the Department of Agriculture; and he likewise becomes War Food Administrator, a post until now held by Mr. Marvin Jones, who has resigned. A bringing together of these two jobs is in line with good sense and efficient administration.

Secretary Wickard in stepping out of the Cabinet becomes administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration—in itself a significant appointment. The REA is one of those agencies which occupies the touchy border line between private enterprise and public enterprise. To a very substantial degree its administrator, whether zealot or moderate, can influence its policies. Mr. Wickard is a moderate.

As Secretary of Labor, Mr. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, formerly a Senator from the State of Washington and at present a Federal judge, will succeed Secretary Perkins. Mr. Schwellenbach is known as an ardent friend of labor in the New Deal sense. It has been conjectured that he received his present Federal judicial appointment largely on the strength of his vigor in behalf of labor. His appointment now to the secretaryship is not unexpected; and it is reasonable to suppose that his assignment will be to draw together into a coherent pattern the almost endless and widely distributed Federal labor activities. From an administrative point of view, this makes good sense.

Finally, Attorney General Biddle has resigned and will be succeeded by Mr. Tom Clark, Texan. Mr. Clark's background is that of a career lawyer in the Federal service rather than a politician. He was for 6 years in the Antitrust Division of the Attorney General's office under that truculent antitrust crusader, Mr. Thurman Arnold. When Mr. Arnold was appointed to the bench, Mr. Clark succeeded him as chief of the Antitrust Division. He is an ardent antimonopolist, and under him we may expect a vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

There are the changes. What do they add up to? It is a bit too early to try to pass a blanket judgment. But certain characteristics of the new Cabinet seem fairly clear. First, Mr. Truman expects his Cabinet members to be competent administrators, and in general the new Cabinet gives promise of providing a more tightly knit administration. Second, as evidenced by the appointment of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Truman is not afraid of critics of administration policies. Third, Mr. Truman evidently takes seriously his pledge to carry on the broad policies of Mr. Roosevelt. The appointment of Messrs. Schwellenbach and Clark, and the continuance in their posts of Messrs. Stettinius and Morgenthau, are clear evidence of this. If Mr. Truman is moving to the right, he is not moving very far.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very informative article entitled "Poland," which was written by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Sam B. Pettengill, of Indiana. It is in my opinion one of the most concise and fair articles I have read on the Polish-Russian situation. The writer has approached the subject from a different angle than generally viewed by columnists and it should be read by all students of this important subject. It has been printed in more than 60 newspapers in this country under the caption, "Pettengill—the gentleman from Indiana—inside your Congress."

The matter referred to follows:

POLAND

The following facts throw light on Russia's claim that she must have the east half of Poland for her own security. The figures given are prewar.

Russia has a land area of 8,173,550 square miles; Poland has 150,470 square miles. Russia is 54 times the size of Poland. The State of Texas would contain Poland with enough left over to accommodate all of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

From east to west Russia is 6,500 miles long—a distance as great as from San Francisco to Berlin.

Russia is twice the size of all the rest of Europe. It has one-sixth of the land area of the globe. Poland has one-third of 1 percent. Russia is almost three times as large as continental United States.

The population of Russia is 170,467,000; that of Poland 35,000,000.

Russia has 21 people to the square mile; Poland has 230. Poland's population pressure per square mile is 11 times that of Russia.

Since the war started Russia has seized from Finland 16,000 square miles, or approximately one-half of Kentucky. She has completely absorbed Latvia with 20,056 square miles, or roughly the other half of Kentucky. She has taken over Lithuania, 22,959 square miles, the size of West Virginia. She has taken over Estonia, 18,353 square miles, and from Rumania has taken 19,300 square miles—the two nearly equalling the size of Ohio.

Omitting Poland for the moment, Russia has therefore added to her area land equal to Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

By agreement with Hitler in September 1939 (which has now been substantially confirmed by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt) Russia has taken over from Poland 77,703 square miles—the equivalent of Nebraska.

The population taken from Poland is 12,775,000, which is about that of the State of New York.

The area of Czechoslovakia is 54,244 square miles—the size of Arkansas. Bulgaria has 39,825 square miles—the size of Virginia. Hungary has 35,875 square miles—the size of Indiana. Yugoslavia has 95,576 square miles—the size of Wyoming.

These latter four, by the agreements at Yalta or Tehran, are apparently assigned to Russia's sphere of influence if not eventual incorporation into the Soviet empire.

Russia's direct and indirect conquests of territory, so far, as the result of the war, therefore equal the land area of Nebraska, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Arkansas, Virginia, and Wyoming.

All this added to a country three times the size of continental United States.

It is now wondered in Washington, as the next secret to be brought to light, if Russia has not also been promised a free hand in Korea with 85,246 square miles—the size of Utah, and in Manchuria, with 503,013 square miles—which is twice the size of Texas, or twice the size of France plus Italy.

Reams of pages have been written about the Curzon line in Poland. Regardless of all other considerations of justice and fair dealing, the Curzon line is not a mountain range or a broad river; it is not a natural military barrier. The claim that it is necessary to Russia's military security seems nothing but an excuse for Stalin's expanding real-estate operations.

But justice to Poland cannot be disregarded in building a "just and enduring peace." On that point, I quote the Polish-American priests of Detroit: "It is inconceivable to punish an ally for its contributions to victory. History never recorded such a case."

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Philadelphia Industrial Union Council asking Philip Murray, president of the CIO, to instruct all CIO councils of the Nation to throw their full weight into the fight to have the St. Lawrence seaway project undertaken in the interest of the entire Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION COUNCIL BACKING SEAWAY—PHILADELPHIA, PA., LABOR GROUP ASKS CIO MAKE FIGHT FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 11.—The Philadelphia Industrial Union Council recently approved a resolution asking Philip Murray, president of the CIO to instruct all CIO councils in the Nation to throw their full weight into the fight to have the St. Lawrence seaway and power development started.

The council said that the project is in the best interest of the Nation and the realization for the program for 60,000,000 jobs after the war.

The resolution follows.

"Whereas the CIO went on record in its 1944 national convention for full support of a legislative program that will make possible 60,000,000 jobs in a postwar period; and

"Whereas this program of prosperity and full employment cannot be realized unless

the Nation undertakes vast projects which are beyond the capacity of private industry for the full utilization of our great natural resources; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is the greatest undeveloped natural resource on the North American Continent; and

"Whereas a few selfish interests continue to think in terms of a static economy, an economy of scarcity and not the life of useful employment and abundance that should be available to all our people because of our great natural resources, our highly skilled millions of workers, and the inventive genius and enterprise that has made unique the history of our Nation; and

"Whereas the realization of the promise of Dumbarton Oaks for greatly expanded world trade and free access to the markets of the world would be greatly strengthened by the opening up of a fourth seacoast in the industrial heart of our country; and

"Whereas progressive and forward-looking industrialists, farmers, workers, and consumers are uniting in an effort to secure favorable legislative action on this great project, which will aid our country in the immediate postwar period and contribute to our future well-being and prosperity in the years to come: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we call upon Philip Murray to instruct all CIO councils in all the States of the Union to throw their full weight into this fight which is in the interests of the whole Nation and the realization of the program for 60,000,000 jobs."

The President Should Stay Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa:

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD STAY HOME

President Truman has been in office only a little more than a month. He hasn't had oportunity to familarize himself with more than a small fraction of the duties and responsibilities of the Presidency. Scores of tough problems are crying for solution. It will be a long time before he can give most of them adequate consideration.

Yet he is being urged to rush off to a Big Three meeting right away. The Polish question, the Austrian situation, the ruckus at Trieste, conditions in Rumania and Yugoslavia and international affairs in general are threatening to make trouble. Only the President can compose the difficulties and get things running smoothly again, we are told.

Then there is the matter of thousands of American prisoners liberated by the Russian army. They aren't being released. So Truman must hurry right over and see Stalin about it.

We wonder if the editors and columnists who urge the President to make such a trip realize what they are doing.

They are saying in effect that whenever trouble develops anywhere in the world the President of the United States must deal with it personally.

Conditions are going to be very unsettled during the next few years. If the president endeavors to settle all the difficulties that arise he will be traveling a good part of the time. No man can possibly discharge the heavy duties of President of the United States and also act as roving ambassador extraordinary.

But that is not the most serious objection to the President going overseas to settle disputes. Every time he goes to meet Stalin, or the head of any other government who refuses to come to the United States, he places himself and the United States at a disadvantage.

Stalin knows perfectly well that if Truman comes to Russia he will be much more likely to make concessions than if he remains in Washington. That happened at Yalta and presumably at other conferences Roosevelt attended.

The United States will never be able to negotiate on an even basis with Russia if our President chases over to see Stalin every time he kicks up.

There is still another reason why Truman shouldn't make a practice of leaving the country for such conferences.

No Government head should imperil his health trying to do the work of several men. Churchill contracted pneumonia and very nearly died on one of his trips. And it is now admitted that President Roosevelt never recovered from the illness which followed his Tehran trip. The journey to Yalta practically finished him.

Let the President of the United States maintain the dignity of the United States and conserve his strength by negotiating with the heads of other governments through duly accredited representatives.

If the world is in such a parlous state that it can only be saved through periodical meetings of heads of states, it probably can't be saved anyway.

Postwar Economic Planning—Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, victory in Europe has thrown postwar economic planning into sharp focus. Suddenly the problems which we have so long anticipated are upon us.

There has been much discussion in this country on ways and means of assuring high levels of economic activity and full job opportunity after the war. The first, and so far the only, concrete step toward action is represented by the full-employment bill sponsored in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself, and in the House by Representative PATMAN. This measure is intended to "establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government." Public hearings are being planned by the Banking and Currency Committee, before whom the measure is pending.

Other nations, like England, Australia, and Canada, have already made considerable progress in working out a government policy for assuring postwar jobs, and enacting specific legislation to that end. This gives us a unique opportunity to profit by an analysis of what they have done.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to recent developments across the border in Canada. In April of this year a white paper on employment was presented to the Parliament by the Minister of Reconstruction. This paper clearly indicates the extent of the postwar responsibility assumed by the Government. I quote the following paragraph from it:

> The Government has stated unequivocally its adoption of a high and stable level of employment and income. The effort to achieve it must pervade all Government economic policy. It must be wholeheartedly accepted by all economic groups and other organizations as a great national objective transcending in importance all sectional and group interests.

It is interesting to note that, paralleling the full-employment bill, the recommendation of the Canadian Government stresses that reconstruction measures should "provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work."

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a memorandum prepared in our Department of Commerce on the developments in Canada with respect to postwar full employment.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENTS IN CANADA WITH RESPECT TO POSTWAR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Next to the actual prosecution of the war, the problem of insuring full employment (or, as some Canadians prefer to call it, high employment) during the postwar years has been uppermost in the minds of most Canadians. The broad outlines of a postwar reconstruction policy has been laid down by a special cabinet advisory committee on reconstruction, which was headed by Dr. F. Cyril James, principal and vice chancellor of McGill University, Montreal. The committee emphasized the fact that the success of Canada's reconstruction policy will be realistically measured in terms of the number of jobs that it offers to men and women who are seeking them. The report of this committee was tabled in the House of Commons and printed by the King's printer. The recommendations contained in the report are discussed in the attached article, Canada's Postwar Reconstruction Aims, which appeared in the April 15, 1944 issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly, official publication of the Department of Commerce. These recommendations have apparently served as guide posts to the Government's reconstruction policy.

The program of the current (Liberal) Government[1] was outlined at the opening of Parliament in January 1944. At that time it was said: "Postwar planning falls naturally into three broad fields—preparation for the demobilization, rehabilitation, and reestablishment in civil life of the men and women in the Armed Forces; the reconversion of the economic life of the nation from a wartime to a peacetime basis and its reconstruction in a manner which will provide opportunities for useful employment for all who are willing and able to work; and the provision of

[1] A general election has been called in Canada for June 11, 1945.

insurance against major economic and social hazards."

Several specific measures, all of which had either a direct or an indirect bearing on the postwar situation, have since been passed by Parliament and as a result of them it may be said that the postwar rehabilitation program has begun to take shape. On April 13, 1945 the Dominion's broad aims and general policy were further outlined to the public in the form of a white paper on employment and income presented to Parliament by the Minister of Reconstruction.

The white paper stated that, "The government has adopted the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment and income as a major aim of government policy. Its program inaugurates policies which break new ground." The paper stated further that the employment of about 900,000 over the 3,700,000 working in 1939 would provide a high postwar level of employment on the basis of the June 1944 population. The paper also estimated that this figure will be increased by about 60,000 annually through the natural increase of population.

With Canadian employment and income dependent on export markets the Minister of Reconstruction in the paper also set a goal of $1,750,000,000—Canadian—worth of exports annually during the postwar period as being essential to high employment. This, the report declares, is about one-half of current wartime exports in dollar value, but only about 15 percent higher than the prewar volume in the amount of goods exported. The white paper also advocates reduction of taxation, encouragement of private investment, maintenance of low interest rates, and government investment in public works adjusted to fluctuations of private enterprise.

The reconstruction program of the Canadian Government, as it now stands, was discussed in a number of public speeches made by government leaders shortly before the presentation of the aforementioned white paper. Specifically these plans or programs were summarized by Mr. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Health and Welfare, under three general headings of; aids to production, the provision of purchasing power, and the housing and public works development. Additional statements were made by Mr. C. D. Howe, Minister of Reconstruction, in a press interview on March 5. (Mr. Howe is also Minister of Munitions and Supply.)

The following outline has been drawn up under Mr. Claxton's three general headings on the basis of the information given in the various public statements referred to above. It should be emphasized, however, that the summary includes projects of a temporary nature aimed to tide Canada over the immediate postwar rough spots, as well as those of a permanent nature. In some of these measures the dividing line between these two classifications may prove to be quite thin with temporary measures conceivably becoming a permanent part of the set-up.

A. AIDS TO PRODUCTION—CONVERSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

1. The development of new industries to assist in the conversion of war industries and the encouragement of further technical improvements in assisting industries. Under this general heading Mr. Howe stated in his press interview on March 5 that in the sale of war plants encouragement would be given to industries which manufactured goods not previously made in Canada.

2. The elimination of restrictions upon output by government, business, or labor.

3. Assistance in the development of small business, primarily through the Industrial Development Bank which was established by an act of Parliament in 1944 and which began operations on a small scale in November 1944.

4. To encourage and promote the Canadian export trade and international trade generally by continuing to press other nations to adopt measures to promote flow of trade by general or reciprocal removal of trade barriers and by stabilization of currency.

5. The promotion of international trade by specific measures, such as the Export Insurance Act passed by the last Parliament and now in operation.

6. The encouragement and promotion of industrial research on a very much larger scale.

B. MAINTENANCE AND INCREASE OF PURCHASING POWER

1. The maintenance of price stability by continuing controls to the extent, and only to the extent, they are needed.

2. The maintenance of wages at the highest possible level by every means open to the Federal Government. Labor to share directly in production increases.

3. The maintenance of farm and fisheries prices by providing markets and establishing price floors. Mr. Claxton is quoted as having stated that legislation to this effect has been introduced and will be implemented.

4. Substantial reductions in personal and corporation taxes. (See attached special article, Canada Liberalizes Its Tax Structure, from Foreign Commerce Weekly, issue of August 26, 1944.)

5. A broad system of social security. Mr. Claxton (as no doubt is to be expected since he is the head of the Department of National Health and Welfare) has laid particular stress on the importance of the social-security program as a part of the postwar full-employment program, through the medium of maintaining and increasing purchasing power. Payments under the Family Allowances Act, passed in 1944, are expected to begin in July 1945, and at the rate of approximately $200,000,000 annually. Other measures referred to by Mr. Claxton in this general category are war-service gratuities and reestablishment credits for veterans, old-age pensions and health insurance, all being provided or to be provided by the Federal Government in addition to social-security measures provided by the Provinces.

C. HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEVELOPMENT

1. In his March 5 press interview Mr. Howe stated that house construction is expected to be the major activity of the construction industry after the war. He expressed the view that in the first period after the end of the war in Europe there would be no need for public projects to provide employment, as the great demand for consumer goods would provide employment for veterans and for labor released from production of war goods.

Public projects to provide employment are being surveyed by the provinces and municipalities, according to Mr. Howe, and these projects would be coordinated by the Federal Department of Reconstruction which would give advice as to their urgency and responsibility.

Regional committees are being set up to develop plans so that public projects will be ready if needed in any particular area. Establishment of a system of regional councils to assist the Department of Reconstruction in handling the conversion of the Canadian economy to a peace basis was also announced by Mr. Howe.

D. OTHER MEASURES

1. Assistance in the rehabilitation and reestablishment of veterans, specifically by the establishment of a Department of Veterans Affairs which was set up in 1944.

2. The extension of cooperation between government, business, and labor.

3. Cooperation between the federal and provincial governments on postwar problems. In one of his recent speeches Mr. Claxton stated that a conference for this purpose would be held as soon as it could be after the next general election.

The objectives of full employment aimed at in these various pieces of rehabilitation legislation are, in principle, accepted by members of all political parties, exception being taken however to the degree of Government participation considered necessary. This is exemplified in the following full-employment platform of the Progressive-Conservative Party presented by John Bracken, its leader.

"Every person able and willing to work must be assured of gainful occupation with sufficient means to maintain a home and family. The objective is full employment at fair wages under progressively improving standards. We oppose relief as a substitute of work.

"For the achievement of that objective—full employment at fair wages under progressively improving standards—and for the welfare and development of society, we strongly advocate the strengthening of the basic Canadian tradition of individual initiative and individual enterprise and opportunity, and the freeing of economic activities from bureaucratic controls. Government authority, however, should be maintained and exercised wherever necessary to protect primary producers, workers, and consumers from exploitation through such abuses as price-fixing combines, monopolies, and patent cartels. To those ends we believe that government should seek to create conditions under which the maximum volume of employment and the maximum national income may be assured through the initiative and enterprise of the people themselves."

The large expenditures to which the Government has apparently committed itself for the postwar period has met with some criticism. Specifically, R. B. Hanson, Progressive-Conservative Party veteran, complained in the House of Commons that Canada has been committed to expenditures "over and above those which are the ordinary inheritance of Parliament to the amount of $1,000,000,000." This criticism of government expenditures is in line with the Progressive-Conservative Party's aim of limiting government controls and participation in business to a minimum.

By contrast with the Progressive-Conservative Party's stand, M. J. Coldwell, spokesman of Canada's Socialist Cooperative Commonwealth Federation Party (popularly known as the C. C. F.) rose in the House of Commons, expressed dissatisfaction over the extent of the Government's efforts, and advocated Government expenditures of $5,000,000,000 in the 2 years following the war. In line with the Socialist viewpoint of the C. C. F., Mr. Coldwell stated that "private enterprise, by itself, has not the remotest chance of meeting this total. Even the optimistic forecasts of its propagandists fall far short of it. What is needed is a new freedom to organize production in the public interest. We must bid good-by to the restrictive practices of orthodox finance and orthodox industry whose only care has been the making of private profit."

The Liberal Party has contended right along that it is pursuing a middle course between the C. C. F. demands for complete socialization of business and the Progressive-Conservative platform of freeing economic activities from bureaucratic controls.

In this connection it is pertinent to note that while the previously referred to report of the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction went to great pains to emphasize the importance of the Government in the postwar period it did not neglect placing due emphasis on the role of private enterprise in creating full employment. It declared that every business enterprise must accept the clear responsibility for planning its operations in a manner that will provide continuous employment at steady wages for appropriate numbers of workers. A record high turn-over of labor in normal times must be universally recognized as business inefficiency. The committee urged management to assume the responsibility for the maintenance of a level of earnings for all its workers that is as high as possible in the light of prospective market prices, current costs of materials, and a rea-

sonable return on the capital invested in the business.

In approaching this ideal the committee stated that the annual income of the worker, rather than the hourly rate or the weekly wage, should be the figure on which attention is concentrated, and it must be remembered that comprehensive plans involving profit sharing, regular holidays with pay, or company pension plans to provide retirement allowances for all employees may constitute an important part of this total annual income.

Other important steps taken by the Government toward solving the problem of postwar employment in Canada include a Postwar Employment Survey begun in the summer of 1944 by the Research and Statistics Branch of the Dominion Department of Labor to determine such matters as plans which private industry has already laid for postwar conversion, the facilities available for postwar occupational training, the return of members of the Armed Forces to their former employment, estimated decreases in staff on the termination of war contracts and plans for the development of new products or services in the postwar era. The only establishments surveyed are those with 200 or more employees and the key question asks how many workers will be employed when the war is over and peacetime production is reestablished.

As part of this general survey the Department of Labor also began in March 1945, a sample survey to determine where Canadian workers intend to live and work 1 year after the surrender of Germany. Sixty thousand workers across the Dominion are now being asked this question. Labor Department officials state that the survey will help in gaging the extent of the probable postwar migration of workers back to their home areas.

The results of these surveys have not yet been made public. However, a similar investigation of employment possibilities, but on a smaller scale, was completed by the Toronto Financial Post, one of Canada's leading financial journals. This survey covered industries providing 12½ percent of all employment in Canada (or 22½ percent of all employment in manufacturing industries and services). Replies to the journal's question, "How many do you expect to employ 1 year after hostilities cease?" indicate that Canadian firms expect to employ 25 percent more workers than they did in 1939. Manufacturers were also asked to break down their working force between men and women today and their expectation for 1 year after victory. Replies from manufacturers indicated that they like women workers. Their indicated plans for 1 year after victory called for employing 17 percent fewer women than in 1943 but for the employment of 58 percent more women than in 1939.

In this connection it is interesting to note that a Gallup poll survey for the Toronto Reconstruction Council conducted in the spring of 1944 found that one-half of the married women now working want to go on working and that three-quarters of all women now working want to go on working.

Stop Goading the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is, unquestionably, one of the great newspapers of America. Its editorial page is replete with gripping, challenging, and courageous discussions of the issues of the day.

One of the dangers now lurking upon the international horizon is friction between the United States and Soviet Union. Powerful and subtle forces are behind the scenes pulling strings. The future peace of the world is menaced by frantic efforts of reactionaries to foment hostility between the two most powerful members of the United Nations.

Let no intelligent American delude himself into thinking that UNCIO will succeed if we alienate Russia. Now is the time to mitigate exacerbations growing out of relatively minor issues. Let us work together for the common good. Let us give some reassurance to the parents of America that the sacrifices made by their sons and daughters in this war will not be in vain.

The only reasonably definite hope we can give to the peoples of the world that there will be no recurrence of war within the measurable future is by welding a powerful coalition between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the two major powers, coupled with France, Great Britain, and China and the other nonaggressor nations of the world. If Russia is alienated, the world will continue as an armed camp White civilization will face destruction. The material resources of civilized humanity will probably be wiped out. The world today is standing at the very threshold.

The State Department has it within its power to thwart all these dangerous attitudes and programs, the effect of which cumulatively and inevitably will be to offend the USSR and drive it from the San Francisco Conference.

It is imperative that Stettinius call a halt to the sniping at our Russian ally. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial on April 24 entitled "Our Link With Russia," in which it refers feelingly to Russia's part in this war and to her record of historic friendship for the United States through the years.

This is the editorial:

OUR LINK WITH RUSSIA

When Alexis de Tocqueville, in 1835, published the first volume of his monumental study, Democracy in America, he ended the book with the following amazingly prophetic words:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power, but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. * * *

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

This must have seemed a wild statement at that time and for many years thereafter. When the French political scientist wrote, America was a youthful Republic; its President the frontiersman and fighter, Andrew Jackson. Russia was ruled by Czar Nicholas I, an absolute monarch who gave his people few, if any, liberties.

Today the prophecy of 110 years ago is being brilliantly fulfilled. The two great nations have proved not only to "tend toward the same end" but to be well on the way to achieving it. Their progress toward that end—the smashing of Nazi power and the creation of enduring peace—has been recorded in the headlines for months past. Momentarily the tangible symbol of that epochal cooperation is expected in the joining of their military forces in the heart of Hitler's empire.

The two great military forces have indeed "started from different points," as Tocqueville put it—points some 7,800 miles apart—separated by vast expanses of land and sea ruled by the high-riding Nazi enemy.

The Russians started their victorious march from far behind their own goal line at a point not far from the Caspian Sea. The Americans started on the far side of the Atlantic—at that time a sea of peril where U-boats took a continuing toll of ships and men and cargoes. They advanced to north Africa, to Sicily, to Italy, then to Normandy, and into the Reich, while the Russians, staging the greatest military comeback of all time, were steadily recovering their own territories, liberating Poland, and at last smashing their way into Berlin.

Shortly, the two forces will join. The bond between the two great nations will be ratified by the hearty handshakes and embraces of fighting men on the field of battle. Each side will have tributes to pay the other on military prowess and skill in strategy. G. I. Joe admires Ivan as a first-class fighting man. The Russian is grateful to the American for the outpouring of arms and equipment through lend-lease. The weary foot soldiers of both sides understand each other, better than do their home fronts.

This is a time for the handful of distrustful Americans to banish their enmity toward our Russian ally. Let them consider the sacrifices the Soviet armies and people have made to make possible the coming juncture, prelude to victory in Europe. Let them consider that alliance with Russia does not bind America to adopt Communist doctrines, any more than alliance with Britain obliges us to set up a monarchy.

It is a time, too, for Russian diplomacy to implement the impending symbol of the battlefield. Soviet acceptance of a fair compromise on the thorny issue of Poland's Government and representation at San Francisco would greatly gratify American opinion. We can see the justice of Russia's demand for a friendly Poland on her border, but we cannot understand the Russian insistence, despite the Yalta pledge, on seating the Warsaw group without change. A broadening of that Government, as agreed, would not harm Russia. It would start off the world conference with a sense of tension released, and higher hopes for achievement of lasting peace.

The juncture of armies will be a military triumph of highest importance. May the buoyant fraternalism of the battlefield carry over now to the conference table in San Francisco. And may each of the two nations fulfill the high responsibilities of its power "to sway the destinies of half the globe."

The Late Most Reverend J. R. Crimont, Catholic Bishop of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there is being laid to eternal rest today in

Alaska one of that Territory's great citizens. I refer to the Most Reverend J. R. Crimont, Catholic bishop of Alaska. By proclamation of Governor Ernest Gruening flags are at half-mast throughout Alaska today in mourning for this prelate, who by reason of outstanding qualities had won for himself a sure place in the affection and esteem of all Alaskans of whatever creed or race.

Bishop Crimont was 87 years old at the time of his death. He had carried on the good work in Alaska for 51 years, having arrived there in 1894. Although old as we count years, Bishop Crimont was always, and up to the very end, mentally youthful and enthusiastic and filled with the same passion for service which had actuated him during his residence of more than a half century in Alaska. He was the oldest active American bishop and the first Catholic bishop of Alaska. His was the largest ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this country.

Of him it could truly be said he was a great man and a saint on this earth.

Much as Bishop Crimont will be mourned and missed there is some consolation at least in the thought that his work, so solidily founded, will go on forever in Alaska.

Address of Prime Minister DeValera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, so many requests have been received by me from people unable to hear the radio broadcast, or to read the text of the speech delivered on May 16 by Prime Minister DeValera, of Eire, that I have obtained a copy as received by the Federal Communications Commission, and, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that those who are interested may have an opportunity to read it:

The long, fearful war which has devastated Europe has at last. mercifully come to an end. My first object in speaking to you tonight must be to try to express the gratitude to Almighty God with which all our hearts are full.

I am sure that we should be able to arrange for a day of national thanksgiving in which we may publicly express our due gratitude to God for his great mercy in our time.

To the peoples of all nations who have been directly involved in the war our thoughts go out in sympathy in their deliverance from the daily terrors in which they lived and in the sorrow that they must still endure—inevitable sufferings of the aftermath.

We have been spared what so many nations have had to undergo and there lies upon us, accordingly, the duty within our limited power to assist in succoring those who have been less fortunate than we have been.

I see here before me penciled notes from which I broadcast to you on September 3, 1939. I had so many other things to do on that day that I could not find time to (three words unheard—editor) and go to make a speech.

From these notes I see that I said, "noting that march of events your Government has decided its policy and announced its decision to the world." Eireann policy, I said, will be to keep our people out of war. I reminded you of what I had said in the dail that in our circumstances, with our history and our experience after the last war we would have (few inaudible—editor) I did not have to go into any details then as to what precisely were the circumstances to which I referred. Nor had I to go into detail as to what were our experiences after the last war. Nor had I to point out what a vital factor in our situation was the position of our country. I had merely to refer to them and I felt sure you would understand. Similarly, I do not think it necessary to dwell on them tonight. I pointed out then that the policy adopted had the support of practically the entire dail and entire community, irrespective of any personal views which persons held on the merits of the cause which occasioned the conflict.

That national policy then announced was thus supported by a unity rare to find amongst democratic peoples—a unity tested through three general elections in 1943 and 1944, a unity which happily survived with us to the end. All political parties and all sections are entitled to their share of credit of what that unity has achieved. It has been a triumph of national understanding and good sense.

There were times when we stood in gravest danger, but we have been preserved from the calamity of invasion, and such privations as we have suffered in our economic life have been by comparison very slight indeed. Dire economic consequences which might have been anticipated were prevented by the united efforts of our people, by the cooperation of public representatives of all parties, by hard work, by careful organization and by being enabled to obtain supplies from other countries. particularly Britain, the United States and Canada.

I know you all feel with me the deep debt of gratitude we owe to all those who at heavy personal sacrifice joined the army, including the marine service and various auxiliary defense organizations who helped guard us against the most serious of all dangers that threatened. Officers, noncommissioned officers and men of the regular army already in service at the beginning of the war formed, with the reserve and volunteer force, a well-trained nucleus around which it was possible in an incredibly short time to build up an efficient fighting force. Many tens of thousands of young men responded to appeals of the Government and of leaders of all political parties in the defense conference to join the army.

We have survived a heavy ordeal and I am sure you all realize that the end of the war in Europe does not mean the immediate or even early ending of the state of emergency. The world is still in a most unsettled state, and what may still happen no one can prophesy. Many difficulties concerning supplies and essential goods which the war created will still continue, and there can be no relaxation of the regulations relating to the distribution or use of commodities which have had to be kept under control.

We believe it probable that for a time the supplies of some important goods will be scarcer than ever. A great war is still in progress in the Far East the requirements of which will be at first demand on the productive resources and shipping of countries from which in time of peace we were accustomed to import great quantities of goods. There is, moreover, a grave shortage of food in European countries and the danger of famine in many parts of the continent. * * * We cannot therefore safely * * * to other countries to make good the deficiencies of our own production.

Not merely will international transport difficulties remain acute, but other peoples (have?) prior call on such supplies as may be available. Rationing and other forms of control of distribution and use of goods will have to be maintained so long as scarcity continues.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that there should be no relaxation whatever in efforts to produce all the food possible from our own soil. There is every indication the world food situation will be very serious, not only this year but for a considerable time to come, and that within the next few years we shall have to rely on our own efforts to produce the bulk of the food required to maintain the life and health of our people. We must indeed not only reduce to a minimum our dependence on imported foodstuffs but by increasing production endeavor to make substantial quantities available also to the peoples who have been less fortunate than ourselves.

So far as this year is concerned, the intention to provide food from our own resources to help in warding off starvation in European countries can be put into effect only by reducing the supplies available for our own consumption. This means not merely a reduction for a time of the present rations of some commodities but also the extension of rationing to other commodities not now subject to control. As to the future, there is no likelihood of any material change in requirements in regard to compulsory tillage in the year 1946 as compared with those in operation in 1945.

The difficulties which we have experienced in past years with regard to fuel will also remain. There are no prospects whatever of any early resumption of coal imports on anything approaching a normal scale, and our domestic fuel needs and the requirements of industry must in the coming winter be met by the turf.

The Government desires to restore normal trading conditions as early as possible and no control or regulations will be kept in force for 1 day longer than is strictly necessary. The controls established by the Government to prevent inflation must also be maintained for the time being. It will be remembered that it was after the end of hostilities in 1918 and because of a too early removal of wartime checks on expenditure that inflationary forces got out of control. The economic disorganization which caused so much hardship and distress in later years had its origin at that time. I know these restrictions are irksome, but in the national interest it is necessary for me to ask you to accept and bear them patiently until the danger is past. The Government will remove them as soon as it is found safe to do so.

Certain newspapers have been very persistent in looking for my answer to Mr. Churchill's recent broadcast. I know the kind of answer I am expected to make. I know the answer that first springs to the lips of every man of Irish blood who heard or read that speech no matter in what circumstances or in what part of the world he found himself. I know the reply I would have given a quarter of a century ago. But I have deliberately decided that that is not the reply I shall make tonight. I shall strive not to be guilty of adding any fuel to the flames of hatred and passion, which, if continued to be fed, promise to burn up whatever is left by the war of decent human feelings in Europe. Allowances can be made for Mr. Churchill's statement, however unworthy, in the first flush of his victory. No such excuse could be found for me in this quieter atmosphere. There are, however, some things which it is my duty to say, some things which it is essential to say. I shall try to say them as dispassionately as I can. Mr. Churchill makes it clear that in certain circumstances he would have violated our neutrality and that he would just-

ify his action by Britain's necessity. It seems strange to me that Mr. Churchill does not see that this, if accepted, would mean that Britain's necessity would become the moral code and that when this necessity was sufficiently great other peoples' rights were not to count. It is quite true that other great powers believe in this same code in their own regard and have behaved in accordance with it. That is precisely why we have the disastrous successions of wars; World War I and World War II, and shall it be World War III? Surely Mr. Churchill must see that if his contention be admitted in our regard, a like justification can be framed for similar acts of aggression elsewhere and no small nation adjoining a great power could ever hope to be permitted to go its own way in peace. It is indeed fortunate that Britain's necessity did not reach the point when Mr. Churchill would have acted. All credit to him that he successfully resisted the temptation which, I have no doubt, many times assailed him in his difficulties and to which I freely admit many leaders might have easily succumbed. It is indeed hard for the strong to be just to the weak; but acting justly always has its rewards. By resisting his temptation in this instance, Mr. Churchill, instead of adding another sordid chapter to the already bloodstained record of the relations between England and this country, has advanced the cause of international morality an important step; one of the most important indeed that can be taken on the road to the establishment of any sure basis for peace. As far as the peoples of these two islands are concerned, it may perhaps mark a fresh beginning toward the realization of that mutual comprehension to which Mr. Churchill has referred and for which he has prayed and for which I hope he will not merely pray but work also, as did his predecessor who will yet, I believe, find the honored place in British history which is due to him; certainly he will find it in any fair record of the relations between Britain and ourselves. That Mr. Churchill should be irritated when our neutrality stood in the way of what he thought he vitally needed, I understand, but that he or any thinking person in Britain or elsewhere, should fail to see the reason for our neutrality I find it hard to conceive. I would like to put a hypothetical question; it is a question I have put to many Englishmen since the last war. Suppose Germany had won the war, had invaded and occupied England, and that after a long lapse of time and many bitter struggles she was finally brought to acquiesce in admitting England's right to freedom and let England go, but not the whole of England, all but, let us say, the six southern counties.

Those six southern counties, those commanding the entrance to the narrow seas, Germany, however, singled out and insisted on holding herself with a view to weakening England as a whole and maintaining the security of her own communications through the Straits of Dover. Let us suppose further that after all this had happened Germany was engaged in a great war in which she could show that she was on the side of the freedom of a number of small nations, would Mr. Churchill, as an Englishman who believed that his own nation had as good a right to freedom as any other, not freedom for a part merely but freedom for the whole; would he, whilst Germany still maintained the partition of his country and occupied six counties of it; would he lead this partitioned England to join with Germany in a crusade? I do not think Mr. Churchill would. Would he think the people of partitioned England an object of shame if they stood neutral in such circumstances? I do not think Mr. Churchill would. Mr. Churchill is proud of Britain's stand alone after France had fallen and before America entered the war. Could he not find in his heart the generosity to acknowledge that there is a small nation that stood alone not for 1 year or 2, but for several hundred years against aggression; that endured spoliations, famines, massacres in endless succession; that was clubbed many times into insensibility, but that each time on returning consciousness, took up the fight anew; a small nation that could never be got to accept defeat and has never surrendered her soul. Mr. Churchill is justly proud of his nation's perseverance against heavy odds. But we in this island are still prouder of our people's perseverance for freedom through all the centuries. We of our time have played our part in that perseverance, and we have pledged ourselves to the dead generations who have preserved intact for us this glorious heritage that we, too, will strive to be faithful to the end and pass on this tradition unblemished. Many a time in the past there appeared little hope except that hope to which Mr. Churchill referred, that by standing fast, the time would come when, to quote his words, "the tyrant would make some ghastly mistake which would alter the whole balance of the struggle." I sincerely trust, however, that it is not thus our ultimate unity and freedom will be achieved, though as a younger man, I confess I prayed even for that and, indeed, at times saw no other. In later years I have had a vision of a much nobler and better ending; better for both our peoples and for the future of mankind. For that I have now been long working. I regret that it is not to this nobler purpose that Mr. Churchill is lending his hand rather than by the abuse of a people who have done him no wrong, trying to find in a crisis like the present an excuse for continuing the injustice of the mutilation of our country. I sincerely hope that Mr. Churchill has not deliberately chosen the latter course, but if he has, however regretfully we may say it, we can only say "Be it so." Meanwhile, even as a partitioned small nation we shall go on and strive to play our part in the world, continuing unswervingly to work for the cause of true freedom and for peace and understanding between all nations. As a community which has been mercifully spared from all the major sufferings as well as from the blinding hates and rancors engendered by the present war, we shall endeavor to render thanks to God by playing a Christian part in helping, so far as a small nation can, to bind up some of the gaping wounds of suffering humanity.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to set forth in the RECORD a paragraph from a letter written by Señor Ricardo Valdés-Flores, one of the official reporters of debates of the House of Representatives of Cuba, to one of the members of our own corps of Official Reporters. It is a very beautiful tribute to our late beloved President, and reads as follows:

In my name, representing the feeling of the whole staff of the office of official reporters of debates of the House of Representatives of Cuba, and in the name also of all the Cuban reporters, I want to express to you and all the good friends of your staff our sentiment of condolence for the loss of your beloved President, Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We realize perfectly well what it means to you, to the United States, to democracy, and also to the world, because he belonged not only to you but also to everyone who loves freedom.

What Economic Policies Will Insure the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a radio address delivered by me on the regular Tuesday night national broadcast of the Columbia Broadcasting System over some 140 radio stations on May 22, 1945.

This is a sustaining program of that broadcasting system which appears each Tuesday night under the name of "Congress Speaks."

My speech was sponsored by the People's Lobby, Washington, D. C. The address is as follows:

Abraham Lincoln was walking down the street of his native Springfield one day accompanied by his two sons. Both lads were bawling out loud.

"Why are your boys crying?" Lincoln was asked. "What's the matter with them?"

"Just what's the matter with the whole world," sighed Honest Abe. "I've got three walnuts and each of the boys wants two."

In his simple, homespun idiom, Lincoln was putting his finger on a problem that has been plaguing the earth for centuries. Nations, like children, have cried for more—whether it was for more breathing space, raw materials, or markets. They have lived by the creed of "Loot thy neighbor," and, failing to gratify their desires, have taken up arms against each other.

This time, if we really mean to have a lasting peace, the world must learn to stop living with its economic fists clenched. We must live by sounder economic policies. Otherwise, before long, any dove of peace will soon become a shrill mocking bird. Peace and economic warfare will not mix. There must be none of the bitterness which followed the last war. For it was this bitterness—and our own blindness—which gave wings to the dictators, to the sawdust Caesars, and the fulminating Fuehrers.

In Washington these days I occasionally hear some cynics wisecrack, "Peace, it will be horrible!" I don't believe our returning servicemen will consider that very funny. They have paid too dearly in this war to look forward to graduating from the battlefield to the breadline, from front-line action to backstreet apple selling.

If this war has taught us anything, it is that the world is merely one big neighborhood. And if our neighbor's house is on fire, we can scarcely live in peace ourselves by snuggling off to sleep—as we did a generation ago. This time, we must put our own economic house in order and ask our neighbor to do likewise. We can hardly close the door on him without expecting it to be slammed right back in our own face.

A peaceful world is a world in which all people live in freedom from the fear of unprovoked violence by their neighbors. It is

a world of freedom from the gnawing fear of want. Should a neighbor's individual frustrations multiply, aggression is inevitable and peace will not remain where starvation lingers. The hungry nation and hungry neighbor can break the peace. So can the idle, insecure neighbor without a useful, creative job. Only full employment will keep the peace. And security from war can only stem from economic security.

If we truly mean to live in harmony with our neighbors, we must be fair and above board in dealing with them. We must wipe out, gradually, artificial trade restrictions and unnatural tariff barriers. There must be no hindrances to our trade. We need our neighbors' business as much as they need our merchandise. And the higher their living standards the better customers they make for us. We must use our enormous productive capacity to export to the utmost and take our payments in imports.

On the domestic side, high tariffs are bullets aimed at our pocketbooks. For years some isolationist businessmen have hidden behind a high tariff smokescreen to conceal their true monopolistic practices. They have been more concerned with dividing up their own lucrative markets than in expanding our international trade.

It is only common sense that we produce the things we make best and let our neighbors do likewise. The channels of free commerce must be opened up rather than choked off with economic pressures and prohibitions. Those who are scheming to make trade a one-way street are leading us down the dead-end road to war. For nations, like small boys, retaliate when repressed. They answer boycotts with boycotts, economic nationalism with more economic nationalism. And, before long, the guns are again roaring.

That is the chief reason why the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, which the House of Representatives began debating today, must be passed overwhelmingly in line with President Truman's recommendation. Congress should not only extend this Reciprocal Trade Agreement legislation but bring it up to date.

Nevertheless, the administration's tariff reduction program is being bitterly opposed. And by whom? By a die-hard element which still seeks special privilege under the old high-tariff policy of the dizzy twenties. These bitter-enders are not even being subtle in their shabby efforts to protect the artificially high prices of certain American industries from the wholesome competition of other nations. They would rather we scorned our neighbors and embarked upon a reckless spree of economic nationalism. But they are being short-sighted. I believe they would be doing a disservice to any honest attempt at world peace. Their way out has been—and could become again—the road to war.

We see these economic isolationists and cultural imperialists bobbing up in many places, even though their ostrich heads are still buried deep in the sands of reaction. We see them opposing the Bretton Woods proposal for a world bank, which is a basic requirement in any lasting peace. Led by conservative big business bankers, they are sniping at the Bretton Woods plan, simply because they yearn for the good old days of uncontrolled currency manipulation, unregulated lending and speculative profits for the few. They prefer risking a recurrence of the financial chaos of the twenties and early thirties, rather than establish the machinery for settling our currency questions, with our 44 neighbor nations through an international monetary fund and world bank. Can our memories be so short that we already have forgotten that the Nazis used blocked marks and other pecuniary piracy to carry out their blood baths? The Bretton Woods plan would enable ravaged nations such as France, China and Russia to buy food, grain, clothing, machine tools—things they need to reconstruct their economies more desperately than our pity or charity.

You can see, then, how terribly urgent it is that Congress immediately approve the reciprocal trade agreements and the Bretton Woods plan. It would give the San Francisco delegates concrete proof that we are really serious about international cooperation. We must take the lead in this if only because we are the only unravished nation in this war.

But something more than lower tariffs, international banks and world food organizations are needed to insure the peace. Something more even than full employment and higher living standards for people everywhere. What I am thinking of is vigilance. Eternal vigilance is the price we must pay for eternal peace. For example, we must never again permit the cartel curse to plague us. Cartels put economic handcuffs upon the plain people of the world. A cartel is global monopoly, an international black market, an economic big, bad wolf.

We must never again permit those in our midst, whose conception of democracy is so cheap and cynical to resume prewar cartel deals. Once and for all, the power of cartels must be broken and free opportunity made possible in all democratic nations. Cartels are the exact opposite of free enterprise. Never again must we allow deals affecting the pocketbooks, health, and even lives of millions of people be secretly decided by cartelers, not subject to any public accounting for their deeds. We must not permit these imperialistic freebooters to plot against the peace and sow the seeds of another war.

But no peace will ever prevail without a fully employed people. I, for one, do not believe that depressions and poverty are inevitable.

Some business interests are now speaking of satisfactory employment for postwar America. The only kind of employment that will be satisfactory to our returning servicemen and displaced war workers is full employment, which means a steady job at good wages for every American, regardless of race, creed, or sex. This is not only practical idealism on our part but enlightened self-interest.

Without a genuine full employment and social-security program, we can never live in peace with our neghbors. We must plan for full employment. The Federal Government must accept the responsibility and not leave it to chance and private industry. Full employment is not only our number one domestic postwar problem, but also the citadel upon which we must build a sound international policy.

Regionalism, too, can be helpful in providing full employment and shaping a lasting peace. As an example, my own Pacific Northwest region for some time has been held in a kind of colonial economic bondage by certain eastern monopolists. During this war, however, we have developed a magnificent light metals production program, which can furnish thousands of jobs for our boys now coming home from the front. But there are sinister forces toiling overtime to strangle this lusty infant enterprise. I promise the small businessmen, the workers, the farmers, and the plain people of my region that I shall do everything within my power to see that this does not happen.

America's job of reconstruction is far easier than that of the European nations devastated by this war. We have rich resources in the United States and we must use them wisely. We have abundance within our grasp and must not forget it. Yet we must always bear in mind that the world is one economic family with one future and that democracy will work for the free peoples of the world only if they have a solid stake in it. We must not use our position as a creditor nation to exact special privileges from our neighbors as some myopic Americans are now urging us.

Of course, there are the faint-hearted in our midst, who are spreading the seeds of doubt and distrust. Selfish men will always seek to promote disunity in peace as they have in war. But I say to you tonight that we can live at peace with all the peoples of the world if we pay more heed to economic cooperation and less to power politics. We must show the world that we mean to have full employment and full production for the greatest good of the greatest number.

The United States is the leading member of the world economic family. We must not fail to put our own economic house in order and set an example for others. For it is only by doing our full duty as a family member that we can ever stop war.

I don't think very much can be added to the poignant words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his message to Congress exactly one month before he lay down to his final sleep. I quote:

"The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocks. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influece in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live."

Security for Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, with reference to security for the Western Hemisphere, I include an editorial of Spencer A. Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel Tribune, Bowling Green, Ohio:

PRESERVE ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC

There seems to be fear that the republics of this hemisphere will wreck a world peace charter, if they insist upon preserving the Act of Chapultepec on which they agreed at Mexico City last March.

But, if there be sincerity on the part of other powers, the preservation of that pact should prove no stumbling block. It provides that, if any of these republics is attacked by another nation, the rest of the republics shall rush to its assistance to preserve its territorial sovereignty.

Our Secretary of State Stettinius has made a suggestion which these republics are now considering. It is that the authority of the proposed security council shall be accepted to order international use of force against an aggressor but that, if any such member of a mutual defense system like the Act of Chapultepec should be attacked, it could immediately call on other members for help at once.

It will be well for the nations of this hemisphere to insist upon this privilege of mutual assistance. Although some of them are not as liberal in their form of government as the Republic of the United States, still they are republics in name and constitutional authority. They are already trained in what a representative form of government is meant to mean. Many other nations of the world are not so trained by experience.

We know that real peace of the world must ultimately depend upon the citizens of each country having a real voice in their govern-

ment through such representative form. We cannot afford to risk scrapping representative form of government by tying ourselves up with countries that do not have it.

We know that what the United States pledges to do, it will carry out regardless of what party is in power. So we do not want to pledge our word to something which we would later regret.

United States Delegates' Work at Conference Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of May 22, 1945:

UNITED STATES DELEGATES' WORK AT CONFERENCE HAILED—STETTINIUS AND DULLES HAVE DONE OUTSTANDING JOB, SAYS OBSERVER

(By David Lawrence)

Almost the first question heard here on returning from San Francisco is "What kind of a delegation is representing the United States at the United Nations Conference?"

The answer is that in no world conference, in my own recollection, has the United States been represented as well. This is due to a variety of reasons, but primarily to President Truman's good sense in placing the responsibility squarely on the American delegation to advise him on concrete matters up for final decision, instead of trying himself to formulate the policies at long range.

It is also due to the good sense of the Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius, who does not approach the work of the delegation with preconceived notions about personal publicity or explotation. If anything, the Secretary might be criticized for being overmodest and overcautious in seeking the detailed views of every one of his colleagues before arriving at a conclusion. This takes time, but no one can say we have had a one-man show in San Francisco or a rubber stamp for someone in Washington to utilize.

Obviously, the strength of the delegation is in the ability and keenness of Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and former Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, coupled with the commen sense and wise counsel of Senator CONNALLY, of Texas. This is not to say the other members of the delegation do not play a useful and helpful part, for they do, but the brunt of the work has fallen upon those named.

DULLES' WORK OUTSTANDING

Outstanding behind the delegation, however, is one figure who doesn't appear in the head lines, but to him more than any one man goes the credit for steering the American delegation through many difficult situations. He is John Foster Dulles, perhaps the best trained and experienced man in international law and world affairs in the entire group of 49 delegations. It was a master stroke of Mr. Stettinius to persuade Mr. Dulles to accept the inconspicuous post of adviser, and it would be about the best thing that could possibly happen to the evolution of American foreign policy in the critical years ahead if the President could find some way to preserve the team of Stettinius and Dulles.

The members of the delegation say privately that Mr. Stettinius has proved himself an extraordinarily capable manager and that his organizing genius is something that the Department of State should not lose. Yet it has been predicted by nearly all the correspondents that some change in the secretaryship of State might be made when the Conference is concluded. When, however, an effort is made to mention someone who has the organizing ability of Stettinius, so vitally needed in an expanding State Department, and also the diplomatic background which Mr. Stettinius lacks, the solution is not readily found.

The name most often mentioned for Secretary of States is that of James F. Byrnes. He, however, is advanced in years and is said not to be in the best of health. Perhaps the best thing Mr. Truman could do would be to keep Secretary Stettinius on the job and put in either Mr. Dulles or someone of his training in European affairs alongside as Under Secretary of State. The experience of Mr. Grew, the present Under Secretary, will be needed in the delicate Far Eastern problems that lie ahead, and he ought to be permitted to concentrate on that field without being burdened with all the difficult European situations that the Department of State must also face in the future.

PITFALLS AHEAD

It would be a good thing, too, when President Truman goes abroad to meet Messrs. Stalin and Churchill, if he took along Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG and Mr. Dulles, for it will be hard to keep out of the pitfalls that must inevitably be encountered unless Mr. Truman has at his elbow the men who have learned first-hand at San Francisco something about the conflicting currents of world affairs in these critical times. It would be fine if he could keep Commodore Stassen, too, though he is reported to be anxious to get back with Admiral Halsey's fleet for the decisive operations of the war with Japan.

The San Francisco Conference has brought out clearly the main outlines of American policy that will be guiding us in the many strained situations that are likely to develop soon. The most significant achievement, of course, is our close relations with the Latin-American countries, and in that field the skill and magnetic personality of Nelson Rockefeller, Assistant Secretary of State, has been an invaluable factor in keeping high the prestige of the United States at the San Francisco Conference. It is in the realm of European affairs that the Department of State needs more personnel and more trained diplomats.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this House will consider one of the most vital issues affecting the future of our economic welfare, in fact, if mistakes and misunderstandings come as a result of our embracing this new and untried program of a world-wide currency manipulation and management it could easily lead to complete chaos in the world, as well as disastrous break-down of our own national economy.

Over the NBC network on May 19, 1945, I delivered the following address entitled "A Look at Bretton Woods":

There have been presented to the Congress numerous schemes for putting into effect that spirit of world cooperation which now seems to be demanded by our people. It is our task to examine these projects and to judge whether they are the best means of integrating our own efforts with those of other nations in the various international bodies and suborganizations.

There is now pending before the Congress a bill called the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. Proposals in this act provide for an international fund of $8,000,000,000 to stabilize the currencies of the world and an international bank with a capital of 10 billions to finance the recovery of those countries which have been ravaged by the war.

The stabilizing of currency is a laudable aim. The proposal to rehabilitate ruined lands is equally praiseworthy. But what we are concerned about is, do these proposals of Bretton Woods accomplish the purpose?

While we are filled with a sincere desire to do whatever we can, for international concord, we should not allow ourselves to be carried away in our zeal, toward making a false step. A false step could mean that we would not be cooperating in the restoration of world economy nor would we be doing anything for the good of ourselves.

It is claimed that this project will help the flow of international commerce. Resumption of world trade will give sincere satisfaction to us all. No one will disagree with the desire to establish an economic balance that will mean not alone the prosperity of the United States but also the prosperity of all the countries in the world. Everyone of us would certainly be favorable to such an effort. But, do we find these aims fulfilled in these proposals?

What we must consider is whether this conference of Bretton Woods really gives us what we are looking for in this endeavor to restore trade to lift the world up from its shattered economy and from the wreckage which the ferocity of war has caused.

I am fully aware of the dark and chaotic confusion which struck Europe as a plague after the last war. I realize the painful effects of the postwar difficulties, the great wave of unemployment and industrial stagnation which swept the whole of the continent immediately after the arms were laid down and which continued for two decades until war broke out again.

We have been assured by those who are seeking the passage of the Bretton Woods proposals, that this is a method which will precent these human calamities from recurring in the coming postwar period. We are assured that Europe will be able to find its own way, will be able to get on its feet by the establishment of this international fund and by the organization of an international bank. No one is more willing that I am, to give my full and hearty approval to this great aim.

But do I find that it is in the Bretton Woods proposals that the key to world prosperity is found? I do not. Instead, I am filled with anxiety and misgivings lest we be led into a contract which binds us to all and returns to us nothing. As the greatest creditor nation, we pledge a great deal. As the greatest humanitarian nation, we can expect nothing—not even the good will of those of whom we become the benefactors—for thus is is written in the bond we sign.

To restore a normal economic balance, we must face the question of Europe's industrial and commericial chaos with bold and level-headed realism. To approach the problem otherwise is to delude ourselves. We have got to be assured of strict political integrity by the leaders of the countries of Europe. We have to know that stern measures are taken to restore economy through honest trade and industry rather than the easy way of manipulating credit and tampering with printed money, which despite Bretton Woods, they will always be able to do, if they are so minded and malintentioned.

These past 20 years have seen the currencies of all countries rise and fall, so that it sometimes happened, what was once a great standard of value all over the world, had time and again, fallen to be worth barely more than the paper on which it was printed. It is now known as one of the great errors of the time between the wars that currencies were allowed to run headlong toward an inflationary and bottomless pit in their value. The effects of this on world trade were catastrophic. We were among the first to realize that with such ruinous inflation, trade was at a standstill.

Through inflation, the Germans were able to undersell every country in the world. This crippled all competitors. Then they paid for their raw materials and other necessary imports in their worthless specie. This crippled their creditors.

Not alone did this practice become the rule in the ordinary channels of finance and trade, but also in the payment of the Government debt itself. The German Government paid its huge internal debts by simply printing money. What it had set up as the standard of value was an idle symbol. We know of the millions of American dollars which were poured into Germany and which were never paid back because of the deliberate policy of the German Government in making its money worthless.

The manipulation of currency and credit is one of the tricks of international economic strategy. It was not Germany alone who paid her debt this way. A large part of the debt of France, of Italy, the Balkan countries, and many others was paid in worthless paper. By debasing their currencies, all of their internal and much of their external obligations were wiped clean from the creditor's slate.

We have based our money on gold and have kept it sound. Germany had little gold when Hitler came to power. And yet, without gold, Hitler built up a strong industrial state. How did he do it? Craftily, he manipulated the money of Germany. He established artificial price levels. He tried to corner some markets—especially those of essential war materials—and flood others, to destroy his competitors. He made bilateral trade agreements to give temporary advantage to some nations at the expense of others. All in all, with his dictatorial power, he tried to jockey all world trade to the profit of Germany and to the detriment of the rest of the world.

In regard to currency, in his book The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, William Ziff says:

"The Reich used a deliberately depreciated currency as a whip whenever she found it desirable. The Nazi government instituted a large number of currencies whose monthly range fluctuated widely. These included more than 20 kinds of marks, each with its separate purchasing power. Utilizing the bewildering complexities of this system of devaluated money, the Reich would export on the basis of one type of mark and invoice her sales on that of still another.

Now this is the kind of international deception that is possible with credit, exchange and currency. How can we ever be expected to join with an international authority where we can be subjected to such trickery and fraud by any future predatory power?

The evidence of willful manipulation is right before our eyes. And in that connection, we can at least take note that with his artificial credit and tinkered exchange, Hitler built up that powerful army, navy and air force—five or six million men, with some twelve thousand airplanes, 6,000 tanks, 300 submarines and a big German high seas fleet.

Hitler mustered this gigantic army and navy without even the knowledge of the states which were his nearest neighbors. If a powerful army, navy, and air force could be mobilized by a conniving leader in secret, how infinitely easier to print treasury notes by the thousands—even of the highest denominations—without anyone having the slightest knowledge of where they came from.

There is the danger. The danger lies in the selfish ambitions and the unworthy moral code of nations which will enhance themselves at the expense of others, of nations who want wealth and empires on the cheap.

The get-rich-quick theory exists in states as well as amongst individuals. The formula of how it can be done by currency and credit has already been given them. All they have to do is to carry it out and it will again topple the whole wide-world financial structure into chaos.

We should remember that up until now the progress of the world has proceeded along economic and geographic paths which had almost become stratified. The fact—of relatively recent date—that the center of gravity in the financial world has been transferred from London to New York is an evidence of a change in this once-stratified course. It is an evidence of a change because economic power has changed. The world itself is developing along other lines than those which have remained the prescribed channels of the past. We have replaced England as the banker of the world and also as the world's greatest factory.

And as we view that great heaving mass of geographic and economic change which is solely but surely taking place in the world, we must pause to take stock. Where will the United States stand in this inevitable process of reallocation of global economy? The fall of Germany and her subjugation to allied policy eliminates her from the markets of the world for generations to come. But where Germany collapses as an industrial competitor, Russia rises to seek her place in the world economy of tomorrow. The great resources of China and India are waiting for exploitation. In the new set-up of the world's economic forces, the United States must be ready to hold her own and to defend her share in the commerce of the globe.

Above all, we have got to remain anchored and firmly anchored to gold as the basis of our currency. On this we have prospered and in this way we expect to prosper in the future.

Until we are assured that our own economy is not to be impaired by the slighest intrusion into our own economic system, until we are satisfied that this plan offers a straight road to international cooperation rather than be strewn with obstacles and pitfalls, until we are certain in our own knowledge that we have safeguarded and protected the well-being and prosperity of our own hardworking population—until then we should withhold approval of any measure which puts in jeopardy the firm position we hold at home and the powerful place we have won amongst the nations of the world.

Our America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the May 17, 1945, issue of the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune:

OUR AMERICA

I Am an American Day will be observed in this community on Sunday next simultaneously with programs throughout the Nation.

A day has been set aside each year by Presidential proclamation upon which all new citizens, either by becoming of age or by naturalization, are welcomed to the status of full-fledged American citizenship. The local observance will consist of a radio program Sunday morning and special impressive exercises Sunday evening in Oliver School hall.

The purpose of the day as originally intended was to impress upon those recently admitted to American citizenship through the process of naturalization and those who arrived at the age of full rights of citizenship the greatness of that citizenship. It was intended to help them to arrive at a full appreciation of the privileges coincident with that status and to instruct them along lines that would help them to intelligently exercise those great privileges.

No people on earth have rights and privileges comparable with those that are accorded American citizens. The right to vote and to participate in political campaigns, the right to aspire to and hold public office, the right of self determination and many others are what make America the horizon to which all oppressed people of the world look with hope. America has always been sympathetic toward those who suffered from tyranny and despotism. She has championed the causes of those who suffered and gave asylum to many through the years.

Never was there more reason to be proud of American citizenship than now and never did America stand for more than she does right now. The might of America was never greater, nor was she ever more respected by the other nations and peoples of the world. Every American today has right to be proud of the Armed Forces of this country which have during the past 2½ years dealt such a crushing blow to the greatest and most fanatical armies that Europe has ever seen, and today they are continuing to crush other great fighting forces mustered by the Japs in the carefully and long-planned program of conquest.

America, with her great privileges and freedoms, her expansive religious and educational programs, and deep love of peace, was struck a foul blow from a foul enemy in December of 1941. Unprepared for war, almost overnight her great resources were molded and welded into programs for the development of Army, Navy, and Air Force organizations that became the most feared in all history. That great war machine wrought unconditional surrender from a maddened and fanatical foe. It is repeating the same program with the pagan forces of Japan.

Those are some of the reasons why we should be proud to be Americans and why on Sunday next we should at least in spirit join in the welcome to our new citizens and renew our own pledges of loyalty to our flag and country.

I Am an American Day might give rise to inspirations within us to dedicate ourselves to at all times foster and propagate the fine principles of life and Government as expounded in the Constitution of the United States.

Cotton on the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Tom Linder, commissioner of agri-

culture of Georgia, before the subcommittee, House Agriculture Committee, May 14, 1945:

COTTON ON THE CROSS

DID YOU KNOW THAT?

1. From 1931 to 1941 imports of cotton and cotton substitutes into the United States amounted to the equivalent of 33,000,000 bales.

2. If these imports had been 50 percent less we would have been short of our needs of cotton on August 1, 1941, 4,000,000 bales.

3. Under reciprocal trade agreements four principal industrial exports increased 384 percent—four principal agricultural crops exports decreased 50 percent.

4. Proof of these statements is contained in the attached document. Proof taken from the office records of the governmental departments.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

1. Abandon reciprocal trade agreements.

2. Regulate all tariffs by congressional act as required by the Constitution.

3. Debar imports of cotton and cotton substitutes.

4. Construct cotton mills to process cotton for consumption.

5. Maintain domestic farm price in line with domestic industrial prices.

The story of cotton from 1933 to 1941 is without parallel in all the history of economic warfare.

Cotton has been in the hands of its enemies. Apparently it has had no friends.

The story of cotton as told by the official figures of the United States governmental agencies is beyond belief.

When reading the story of cotton in these official figures it is impossible to escape a conclusion that powerful influences have deliberately set about to destroy our cotton industry. They have almost succeeded.

In 1933 Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Under this act America's production of cotton has been sharply curtailed.

In 1934 Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been administered by two or three powerful corporate interests. Our State Department has been used to bring about a tremendous increase in business for these two or three corporate interests. The American cotton grower and other farmers have been crucified in the interest of internationalism.

Do these statements seem strong? Then listen to the evidence on which these statements are based. The following table A, shows the exports of the four principal industrial commodities for the years 1931 to 1941, inclusive.

TABLE A.—*The 4 main industrial export commodities*

[In thousands of dollars]

	1931-35 average	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
Automobiles and other vehicles	167,292	279,514	409,930	362,493	393,946	641,313	1,139,552
Industrial machinery	94,702	158,493	240,471	269,908	289,896	450,718	475,757
Iron and steel semimanufactures	37,961	79,845	232,149	132,471	169,123	371,185	327,354
Steel mill manufactures products	24,970	32,014	67,937	51,771	66,552	144,810	173,746
Total exports of 4 above commodities	324,925	549,866	950,487	816,643	919,517	1,608,026	2,096,409
Total exports, all industrial commodities	1,008,956	1,424,223	2,139,961	1,938,285	2,133,536	3,002,114	3,842,226
Total exports of domestic merchandise	1,988,914	2,418,896	3,298,929	3,057,169	3,123,343	3,934,181	5,019,877

Chart 582, pp. 514 and 515, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943.

In the last line of the above chart the total exports from 1931 to 1935 averaged $1,988,914,000 per year.

You will note a rapid increase of these exports. In 1941 total exports reached $5,019,877,000.

This was an increase in total exports of $3,030,963,000.

We are told that the reciprocal trade agreements are responsible for this increase of foreign trade.

Maybe reciprocal trade agreements are responsible for this increase in trade. Who, then, was benefited by these trade agreements?

During the period of 1931–35, industrial exports averaged annually $1,008,956,000.

In 1941 total exports of industrial products rose to $3,842,226,000.

This was an increase in industrial products annually of $2,833,270,000.

Total exports of agricultural products increased only $197,694,000 while exports of industrial products increased $2,833,270,000.

Exports of industrial products increased 384 percent. During the same period exports of agricultural products increased only 20 percent.

I made the statement that two or three large corporate interests had controlled the State Department and had received all the benefits from this increase in foreign trade.

Let us see if these governmental figures justify that statement.

From 1931 to 1941, total industrial exports increased $2,833,270,000. During the same period the four items of automobiles, industrial machinery, iron and steel semimanufactures and steel mill products increased $1,771,484,000.

These four commodities received 62 percent of all the increase in industrial exports. All other industrial commodities combined enjoyed only 38 percent of the increase in industrial exports.

Let us see how the farmers fared under the administration of these trade treaties by great corporate interests.

The following table will show us how the farmer has been crucified:

TABLE B.—*Four main agricultural export commodities*

[In thousands of dollars]

	1931-35 average	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
Cotton, unmanufactured	366,540	361,028	368,660	228,647	242,965	213,400	82,562
Tobacco and manufactures	111,601	147,898	147,772	170,028	93,341	57,456	82,393
Fruits and nuts	84,798	80,607	82,164	99,061	83,216	35,508	52,399
Grain and preparations	55,392	29,556	94,143	223,499	99,550	76,360	81,299
Total main 4 agricultural items	618,331	619,089	690,739	721,235	519,072	382,724	298,653
Total agricultural exports	979,957	994,746	1,158,968	1,118,884	989,805	932,067	1,177,651
Total exports of all domestic merchandise	1,988,914	2,418,896	3,298,929	3,057,169	3,123,343	3,934,181	5,019,877

Chart No. 582, pp. 514 and 515, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943.

The last line of the above table shows that total exports increased from $1,988,914,000 to $5,019,877,000.

Total exports increased 252 percent.

The last line of the above table shows that total exports of agricultural products increased from $979,957,000 to $1,177,651,000.

This was an increase in agricultural exports of $197,694,000 or 20 pencent.

Exports of industrial commodities increased 384 percent while exports of agricultural products increased only 20 percent.

Exports of industrial products increased 19 times as fast as exports of agricultural products.

I wonder if there is a reasonable man who would say that the officials of the State Department have not been influenced and controlled by a few large corporate interests in their every act in connection with these reciprocal trade agreements.

I say to you that these facts are so plain that "He who runs may read." I say to you that these facts are so convincing that "A wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

We have shown that exports of industrial products increased 19 times as fast as products of agriculture.

This, however, is not all the story. It is only half.

Take the basic farm crops.

Take those crops which the AAA was supposed to stabilize.

Take those crops which represent the sweat and toil of men, women, and children in the fields and see how these crops fared while 2 or 3 great corporate interests controlled our State Department. Let us see what happened to the men, women, and children on the farms while they were being deliberately sold down the river by a few great corporate interests and a few selfish politicians who had gained access to the State Department.

Let us see how the laws written by you men of Congress have been used to oppress the very people whom you were trying to help.

Refer back to table B, the last table above in the first line, unmanufactured cotton.

During the period 1931 to 1935 our exports of raw cotton averaged $366,540,000 per year. In 1941 this export, notwithstanding increased prices of cotton, had gone down to $82,562,000.

In the second line of table B take tobacco manufacturers. From 1931 to 1935 our average yearly exports amounted to $111,601,000. In 1941 in spite of increased prices these exports had shrunk to $82,393,000.

On the third line of table B we find fruits and nuts. During the period 1931 to 1935 our annual exports averaged $84,798,000. In 1941 this had shrunk to $52,399,000.

On line 4 of table B we find grains and preparations. During the period 1931 to 1935 our exports of grains and grain preparations averaged annually $55,392,000. In 1941 this had increased to $81,299,000.

Now let us take these four principal export items of agriculture and total them and compare with the total of the four major industrial export items.

Line 5 of table B shows that during the period 1931–35 our total exports of these four main agricultural items totaled $618,331,000. In 1941 the total of these four main agricultural groups had dropped to $298,653,000.

Exports of these main farm crops had actually fallen off $319,678,000. Our exports of these main crops had actually fallen more than 50 percent.

Remember that exports of the four main industrial items increased 384 percent.

Remember that exports of the farmers' main crops declined more than 50 percent.

Can any sane man doubt that the men who control iron, steel, and automobiles in this country also controlled our State Department in making these trade agreements?

In view of these figures, should sane patriots consider giving more authority to such men as Stettinius of J. P. Morgan & Co., to such men as Will Clayton of Anderson-Clayton Cotton Co., to such men as Rockefeller? It is inconceivable that men elected by the people of the United States to represent them in Congress and the United States Senate should think for one moment of doing this.

The greatest enemies on earth to this Nation could not plan or scheme anything more destructive to our civilization and our democracy than the things which have been going on right here in Washington in this Nation's Capital.

The following table C shows that in the period 1931–35 our exports were almost equally divided between industry and agriculture. Industry and agriculture were about 50–50.

Under the operation of the trade agreements this picture has rapidly changed and in 1941 agricultural exports had fallen from 50 to 24 percent while industrial exports had risen from 50 to 76 percent.

TABLE C.—*Total exports, 1931–41, with division in agricultural and nonagricultural exports*

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Percent agriculture	Agricultural	Nonagricultural	Percent industry	Total of all exports
1931–35	50	979,957	$1,008,956	50	1,988,913
1936	42	994,746	1,424,223	58	2,418,969
1937	37	1,158,968	1,139,961	63	3,298,929
1938	37	1,118,884	1,938,285	63	3,057,169
1939	33	989,805	2,133,536	67	3,123,341
1940	23	932,067	3,002,114	77	3,934,181
1941	24	1,177,651	3,842,226	76	5,019,877
Total	------	11,271,906	19,525,125	------	30,797,031

Chart 582, pp. 514 and 515, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943.

It is generally conceded that exports must be balanced largely with imports. Let us now look at the picture of imports, see what has happened to imports from 1931 to 1941.

The following table D demonstrates that the same influences controlling our exports are also taking care of their own interests when it comes to imports. These great corporate interests working through their hirelings and partners in the State Department are not traveling a one-way street. They are working both ends against the middle. The farmer and his wife and children are paying the freight. Industrial workers, white-collar people, and the general public will be made the victims of this same practice if our Senators and Congressmen do not call a halt to their deadly scheme.

TABLE D.—*Total imports, 1931–41, with divisions into agricultural and nonagricultural imports*

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Agricultural	Nonagricultural	Total of all imports
1931–35	1,314,348	389,919	1,704,266
1936	1,899,933	524,044	2,423,977
1937	2,346,641	663,209	3,009,852
1938	1,494,502	455,121	1,949,624
1939	1,726,260	549,839	2,276,099
1940	1,896,208	644,449	2,540,656
1941	2,372,180	849,775	3,221,954
Total, 1931–41	18,307,464	5,636,032	23,943,492

Table 584, pages 518–519, Statistical abstract of United States, 1943.

In the last line of the above table D, you will see that total imports from 1931 to 1941 reached the sum of $23,943,492,000.

Of this $23,943,492,000 imports, $18,307,464,000 were agricultural imports.

Total imports of agriculture was $18,307,464,000, while total imports of industry was only $5,636,032,000.

More than 75 percent of total imports was agricultural. Less than 25 percent of total imports was industrial.

We have seen how the farmer has been made the goat as to exports and as to imports.

We have seen how the AAA cut the farmers' production in the United States for the purpose of creating a market here for agricultural products from foreign lands.

We have seen how the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been used to flood this country with foreign agricultural products. We have seen how the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been used to destroy the American farmers' foreign market in order to create a foreign market for favored industrial products.

The farmers' crops were cut. The farmers' foreign market was destroyed. The State Department was used as the tool of a few great corporate interests to drink the blood from the open wounds of a prostrate agriculture.

These leeches like all leeches are no longer satisfied with the amount of blood they are getting. They are now asking that prostrate agriculture be bled anew so there will be more blood on which these leeches may feed.

We have seen how agriculture as a whole has fared as to imports. Let us now take a look and see how cotton has fared as to imports. How much cotton and cotton substitutes has been brought into the United States under the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements.

I refer to a statement entitled "Imports of Merchandise by Commodities, Groups, and Articles, 1931 to 1940" (general imports 1931 and 1932; imports for consumption thereafter). This table 619 is on pages 634 to 669 of Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1942.

Table 619 is very long and includes numerous items so that it is impossible within the limits of this discussion to undertake to go into the entire table.

For your specific information I have prepared some tables by selecting a number of specific items of imports of cotton, cotton manufactures and cotton substitutes from said table 619.

The following table E shows eight items of imports of cotton and cotton substitutes. I invite your careful study and consideration:

TABLE E.—*Selected groups of imports of cotton, cotton manufactures, and cotton substitutes, 1931–40*

[In thousands of pounds]

	1931–35 (average)	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	Total
Cotton, unmanufactured	64,660	105,688	134,121	106,382	103,578	131,780	904,849
Cotton waste	38,629	99,109	71,204	11,384	17,002	28,885	420,729
Cotton cloth (estimated 2 ounces to square yard)	5,237	14,274	18,415	7,285	13,728	10,543	90,430
Cotton rugs and floor coverings (estimated 8 ounces to square yard)	5,320	7,945	8,571	4,509	6,229	3,872	57,726
Cotton belting and rags	17,618	25,635	30,408	18,693	8,348	1,695	172,869
Jute and manufactures	618,667	813,385	1,045,127	704,209	581,930	668,983	6,903,969
Flax and hemp	20,426	26,868	29,254	6,908	28,017	19,971	213,148
Manufacture of flax, hemp, and ramie	43,272	53,430	52,445	31,932	37,404	17,246	408,817
Total pounds	813,829	1,146,334	1,389,545	891,302	796,236	882,975	9,175,537
Equivalent to thousands of 478-pound bales of cotton	1,702	2,398	2,398	1,864	1,665	1,847	------

From table 619, pages 631 to 669, Statistical Abstract of United States, 1942.

Explanation: The figures in column headed "1931–1935 average" represent imports averages over a period of 5 years. In arriving at figures headed "Totals" in the last column to the right, it is necessary to multiply all figures in column 1931–35 average by 5. The figures in column 1931–35 average, when multiplied by 5, are added to the figures of the individual years of 1936 to 1940, giving the total figures in the last right-hand column.

Line 1 of table E shows that from 1931 to 1940 we imported a total of 904,849,000 pounds of raw cotton. This is the equivalent of 1,892,880 bales.

According to line 2 we imported a total of 420,729,000 pounds of cotton waste. This cotton waste in weight is equivalent to 880,186 bales.

Line 6 shows that we imported a total of 6,906,969,000 pounds of jute and jute manufactures.

The amount of jute imported from 1931 to 1940 is the equivalent in 478-pound bales of cotton to 14,449,726 bales.

The eight items covered in table E aggregate 9,175,537,000 pounds. This is the equivalent in 478-pound bales of cotton to 19,195,000 bales.

TABLE F.—*Imports*

[Thousands of pounds]

	1931-35 (average)	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
Yarns and warps mainly bleached, dyed, combed, or plied	1,644	2,126	2,019	1,054	1,616	0,811
Blankets	.076	.029	.068	.031	.009	.006
Tablecloths		883	1,916	1,479	2,479	3,438
Velvet and velveteens	148	1,303	998	258	434	594
Bedspreads and quilts	1,074	1,587	2,796	2,228	2,611	1,807
Gloves and mittens	2,467	1,942	2,237	1,286	804	563
Hosiery	554	2,313	1,649	713	1,061	1,345
Mufflers and handkerchiefs	1,830	5,165	3,247	1,866	2,737	2,544
Mufflers and handkerchiefs, embroidery and lace	.034	.005	.009	.036	.035	.038
Manufacturings flax hemp, handkerchiefs	1,254	1,354	1,649	1,540	1,465	1,727
Towels, napkins, and bedclothes	3,234	3,100	3,441	1,997	1,690	1,064
Other vegetable fibers, unmanufactured	405,758	458,626	478,582	245,642	440,437	521,457
Binding twine, cordage, and other	47,145	80,146	68,158	67,446	66,576	41,367
Wool, mohair, etc., unmanufactured	135,824	257,725	326,035	104,274	245,971	360,637
Hair of angora and cashmere and carbonized wool	1,045	3,738	3,784	1,554	2,903	2,943
Wool, semimanufacturings	4,868	21,330	15,463	4,770	19,762	15,596
Wool manufactures	5,401	10,624	12,333	7,683	13,934	11,148
Total weight	572,351	851,996	924,384	443,907	804,524	967,065
Equivalent bales of cotton, 478 pounds	1,197	1,782	1,933	928	1,683	2,203
Equivalent bales of cotton from table E	1,702	2,398	2,907	1,864	1,665	1,847
Total equivalent to 478-pound bales of cotton, table E plus table F	2,899	4,180	4,840	2,792	3,348	4,050

From table 619, pp. 631-669, Statistical Abstract of United States, 1942.

Explanation: The figures in column headed "1931-35 average" represent import averages over a period of 5 years. In arriving at figures headed "Totals" in the last column to the right, it is necessary to multiply all figures in column "1931-35 average" by 5. The figures in column "1931-35 average," when multiplied by 5, are added to the figures of the individual years of 1936 to 1940, giving the total figures in the last right-hand column.

Table F shows 17 items of import.

We imported the equivalent of 14,514,000 bales of cotton of these 17 items from 1931 to 1940, inclusive.

When we add the 14,514,000 bales equivalent shown in table F to the 19,195,573 bales equivalent as shown in table E, we find that we imported of the 25 items shown in tables E and F enough poundage of cotton and cotton substitutes to be the equivalent of 33,709,573 bales of cotton.

Remember that only 25 selected items of imports were equal to 33,000,000 bales.

Remember there are a great number of other items of imports of cotton and cotton substitutes which are not incorporated in these figures.

It is, of course, possible that some cotton manufactures included in these figures were produced from raw cotton grown in the United States.

I do not know whether this is true or not.

Should it be true, however, that some of these imports were produced from American cotton, these will be fully offset by the hundreds of other items of imports which are not in any way included in this estimate.

Total production of American cotton for the 10 years of 1931 to 1940 was 132,546,000 bales.

On August 1, 1941, the carry-over of American cotton was 12,166,000 bales.

I have shown you where we have used cotton and cotton substitutes during the same period to the equivalent of over 33,000,000 bales.

Had we used American cotton in place of only 50 percent of these imports instead of carrying over 12,000,000 bales of cotton, on August 1, 1941, we would have been 4,000,000 bales short.

It is crystal clear from the above figures that all cotton's troubles are imported. It is equally clear that all of agriculture's problems are imported. We can almost see with equal certainty that all our troubles are imported.

What should this committee and Congress do for cotton?

1. Repeal Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Stop importing cotton and cotton substitutes.

2. Increase cotton-processing plants. People cannot wear bales of cotton; they cannot sleep on bales of cotton. Build cotton mills to make cotton bagging for cotton bales. Build cotton mills to make sacks for fertilizer, corn, and wheat. Build cotton mills to make every grade of cloth from the coarsest to the finest. Put our cotton in merchantable form and the people of the United States will use it and the world will cry for it.

3. Give the farmer a price for his cotton. We know from experience and from Government figures that high prices mean high consumption and low prices mean low consumption. We know from Government figures that every dollar the cotton farmer receives turns into $14 in national income.

4. Keep protective tariff high on manufactured cotton goods. It is impossible for the American manufacturer to pay American wages and then sell his product at world prices in competition with foreign pauper labor.

5. Quit trying to control the farmer. Discontinue the imports of things that destroy the farmer.

A Newspaper Editor Appraises President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Star, of Seattle, Wash., is a dynamic and enterprising daily newspaper of the progressive and providence-favored Pacific Northwest. Its publisher is Howard W. Parrish, well known in the journalistic fraternity and for many years an operator of newspapers in Florida for the Parry interests. He has now returned to his erstwhile bailiwick of Seattle.

Just a few years ago Howard Parrish and his associates purchased the Seattle Star from its former owners. The Star, at that time, had run down and was skirting the dangerous cliffs of bankruptcy, but under the brilliant, energetic, and skillful management of Howard Parrish the newspaper has prospered.

When newsprint again becomes available in unlimited quantities, I predict for the Star transcendent success and enormously increased circulation.

Cliff Harrison, the managing editor of the Star, is a genial and capable journalist, who enjoys the respect of all his colleagues.

Four days after the death of President Roosevelt, there appeared an editorial in the Star which struck me as a most fitting tribute to our new President. Especially was I impressed by its reference to Harry Truman's inspiring humility. Here is the editorial:

HARRY TRUMAN, THE MAN, HAS FRIENDS AT HAND

The President is dead—but government lives on in Washington.

We thought of that one, even though we can't remember its author, when the sad news came and even more forcibly when we read President Truman's speech to the Congress this morning; a speech, which, following his precedent-breaking call on congressional leaders Friday, and the warmth of their greeting both then and today, called for a unity of purpose that seemingly cannot be denied.

His reiteration of the "unconditional surrender" theme, his statement that those who have fought for the peace must have the responsibility of making the peace," his promise of justice to the smaller nations, of an honest attempt to improve world conditions, all had a solid ring.

Here is part answer to the many in this country and abroad who know little about Harry Truman. He has a mind of his own, but he works well with people. Those who know him best, Senators with whom he has worked for 10 years, are those who rate him highest.

One of Mr. Truman's characteristics is frankness. May we emulate that virtue by citing the chief criticism of the past from some who did not know him? He was elected Senator from Missouri with the aid of the Pendergast machine.

In the past century history does not record a single President who has climbed to that high office without the aid of political bosses of some kind. What matters is whether an official is under control of such a machine.

Mr. Truman has not been. That was proved by his Senate votes and by his investigation of Missouri Pacific Railroad financing over machine protest. Yet, when the broken and powerless Pendergast died, Mr. Truman had the courage to defy political expediency, leaving a public engagement and going across the country to attend his funeral. The balance there is on the credit side.

It would be hard to name any man who has entered the White House with so little

criticism against him. If Harry Truman has an enemy in Washington, nobody knows it. That, of course, is the main reason for his political rise. He was nominated for the Vice Presidency by the badly split Democratic convention because he was the only available man acceptable to all factions.

After a quarter of a century in politics he is rich in friends and poor in purse. That tells a lot.

But, aside from his character, what of his policy and of his ability for the hardest job on earth?

On the record his policy in general is the same as that of his predecessor. He has the same determination to make military victory complete.

His belief in American leadership for world peace, through a democratic international organization for security and justice, is deep.

His concern for building an ever better America for the future, where men may work and live in freedom and fellowship, is dominant.

He made that emphatic today.

Whether he is a New Dealer depends on your definition. He is not a zealot, not a radical, not an extremist in temperament or dogma. He is an old-fashioned liberal. Civil liberties matter greatly to him. He does not believe in authority that kicks people around. As one of humble birth, and still without wealth, he does not have to put himself in the place of the people—he is one of them. His voting record generally has been prolabor, profarmer, proveteran, propublic.

But he is an independent. Often he has voted against the New Deal administration, against the dictates of party machines, against the pressures of this lobby and that. He has proved, without parade, the courage of his convictions.

He has intimate knowledge of American affairs, though less of the details of foreign policy. Next to the late President and to the former assistant president in charge of the home front, Mr. Byrnes, Chairman Truman of the Senate investigating committee gained more information on this subject than any other official.

If the ability he showed in that investigation is indicative, he will make an able President. He ran it with little administration encouragement and with much opposition from interested parties. His were the brains and the will, but he worked quietly and gave others the limelight. He used the best technical assistance he could find. He hit hard but fairly. His emphasis was constructive. He ended up with reform of the war effort, and with a unanimous committee regardless of party or group. There was no minority report, a miracle of unity in such a situation. That is the way he operates.

His humility is not to be mistaken for timidity. He has the great potential power of a President without personal ambition or political debts. He did not seek the Vice Presidency and is indebted for his office to no living man. He has no personal commitments to any American group or foreign government. Few Presidents ever have started with such complete freedom to serve the Nation according to his conscience. Let those who would disparage his humility remember that he was chosen for this high office by the one who knew it best—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The White House breaks and makes reputations, and the test ahead is greater than ever. But we believe he will provide a leadership of integrity, of liberalism, and of national unity. The outcome will depend not only on him but also on his fellow citizens.

God grant our President wisdom and strength, and the patriotic loyalty of all Americans.

Three Outstanding Appointments by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with President Truman's appointments of three western men to Cabinet positions. The designation of Tom Clark, of Texas, as Attorney General; of Judge Lewis Schwellenbach, of Washington, as Secretary of Labor; and our own respected colleague, Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, as Secretary of Agriculture meets, I am sure, with widespread approval. We of the western United States feel distinctly honored in these appointments because we feel that signal recognition has been given to our area. It indicates a real interest on the part of President Truman in our part of the Nation, and we are deeply grateful to him for the consideration he has shown us. These appointments are in line with the sound policy which has marked our President's position since he has assumed office and, as such, gives an indication of how fair and considerate he is and will be. Again may I say we of the West are deeply grateful to President Truman for these outstanding appointments in his Cabinet.

Report From the Aleutian Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, much has been published in the way of poetry during the war, but most of that which has been written has been of only topical and fleeting interest.

This month, a poem appeared which I venture to predict will endure and will have a firm place in any anthology of war poetry.

I refer to Report from the Aleutian Islands, by Corp. Erwin Spitzer. It appeared in the May 12 issue of The Saturday Evening Post, and is copyrighted by the Curtis Publishing Co. The poem is reproduced below by special permission of the Post.

In 38 lines Corporal Spitzer has told better than could be told in a volume of uninspired words what every man who has served in the Aleutians feels. He has done so with remarkable economy of language and with magnificent expression.

Mr. Speaker, the weather in the Aleutians is not the world's worst. It can be borne. The lack of action is depressing but can be borne likewise. The terrible monotony, the inability to get away even for a brief hour from service life, is depressing but bearable. But combine all these things—weather, and inaction, and monotony—and after a time no man can fail to react.

They are, indeed, these men of the Aleutians, waiting for an enemy who will never come. It is 2 years ago this month since the Japanese garrison on Attu was defeated and annihilated in the first major land action against the Pacific foe. Shortly thereafter the Jap garrison was evacuated from Kiska, and since then the invader has never returned to this continent.

And he will not return because of the men of whom Corporal Spitzer writes. Theirs is a lonely duty and an especially lonely duty for young men to whom there is no greater enemy than monotony, day after day, week after week, and month after month.

"We whose rifles are ready but never called, have you forgotten us?" asks the author of the poem. I hope I may be privileged to answer for all the people of the United States, "We have not forgotten you and we never shall. You may wear no battle decorations but you have served as valiantly and as well as any American soldiers anywhere. We of Alaska owe to you a debt freely acknowledged, and that debt extends through the land. You have fought a winning fight against a foe more difficult to conquer than the one who is faced on the battle line, and history will have a sure place for you."

The poem follows:

REPORT FROM THE ALEUTIAN ISLANDS

(By Corp. Erwin Spitzer)

We fight phantoms here.
Bayonet and rifle are useless.
Shells gather dew under tarpaulin hoods.

Would you use a grenade
Against loneliness?
How large a cannon is necessary
To demolish monotony?
Where is the bombing plane
That can destroy a land already barren?
How many rifles, tanks, battleships
To conquer the people
Of these unpeopled islands?
How can we keep our memories from dying
When time and place murder them every day?

We fight no thundering battles,
Suffer no pity-inspiring wounds,
Are never found in the boisterous headlines
Or even the minor, modest print.
Only unnatural Nature
To snipe at our sanity.
Only the deceitful muck
Setting its traps for our feet.
Only the strangler fog
Creeping down the hills
To blind our eyes and minds,
Only the deliberate madness of the williwaw,
Shrieking, striking at each of us
With its million-pointed spears.

We whose rifles are ready but never called,
Have you forgotten us?
We who only dig and build and mend
And wait;
We whose fate is not to attack,
But to hold, hold.
Say you remember us!
Say you remember the men
Who, fighting only phantoms,
Still fight for you.

VE-Day Address by Ernest L. Wilkinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered at the Washington Chapel on VE-day, May 8, 1945 by Ernest L. Wilkinson, prominent Washington attorney and member of the Washington Stake Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

On the last day of January 1917 the German Ambassador handed President Woodrow Wilson a note from his Government announcing its determination to declare a submarine blockade about England, France, and Italy and warning this and all other nations to respect the blockade on penalty of having their ships and their citizens sunk without notice. Up to that time Wilson, in spite of the sinking of the *Lusitania* and other offenses made against mankind by the Imperial German Government, had tried his best to keep this country out of war. He had even stated that lasting peace could only be secured by a "peace without victory." But this breach of international warfare was too much for our peace-loving President. Without a moment's hesitation he dismissed the German Ambassador and requested Congress to declare a state of armed neutrality. Later on April 6, 1917, at his request Congress declared war and we entered the first world conflict for the avowed purpose of making "the world safe for democracy."

From that time on Woodrow Wilson was looked upon as the world leader of unselfish war aims. Until the end of the war his career is in great part world history; he swayed the world as no other statesman then, or probably since, ever swayed it. An English liberal has said that "it was like the voice of God talking over our heads to the continent and to the nations of the world."

His world idealism and leadership was summarized in his superb address of January 8, 1918, in which he outlined in 14 salient points the ideals for which this Nation was fighting, and the basis upon which it would conclude peace. These 14 points included an insistence upon open covenants of peace openly arrived at between nations, absolute navigation upon the seas alike in peace and war, the adjustment of colonial claims in which the interest of the population concerned should have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined, the evacuation of all Russian, Belgium, French Romania, Serbia, Austria-Hungary, and Montenegro territory, including the righting of the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, the establishment of an independent Polish state, and finally a general association of nations under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

His eloquent summarization of the ideals of democracy was accepted in public statements by European leaders and it is no overstatement to say that uncounted millions carried on the war in the belief that it was "a war to end wars."

I start at this point to remind us, in this hour of triumphant celebration, that it is much easier in this selfish world to agree upon lofty and unselfish principles of peace while in the agony of war than it is to adhere to those principles when once the shackles of war are removed and the specter of peace appears, and to direct our minds to some of the tragic mistakes made after the last war which permitted the struggle now partly ended.

For even before World War I had ended Wilson, not unaware of human nature, had remarked to a friend that he almost dreaded to think of the end of the war, for then every nation of Europe and every group of interests in the United States would begin to think of selfish ends. His intuition unfortunately proved true. For after the opening of the peace conference in Europe in January of 1919 the European leaders for 1 full month endeavored to arrange the preliminaries of peace without accepting the principles which in their hour of despair they had professedly accepted. In February, however, the whole conference met and accepted the idea of a League of Nations as a part of the treaty.

Wilson then returned to America. On returning to Paris 1 month later he found the conference had abandoned the League of Nations idea and with national interests paramount had informally agreed upon a peace of indemnities, annexations and reprisals. By vigorous protests Wilson was able to rescue the League and have it incorporated as a part of the treaty, but many of his 14 points were abandoned.

On returning again to this country we experienced the world tragedy of neither the President nor the Congress being willing or able to collaborate with each other. The result was that while our own President more than any other man was responsible for the creation of the League, his own country by refusing to become a member, rejected that opportunity for world leadership in international peace. Many of us recall that President Grant and other leaders of religious and political thought pleaded with the Senate to accept the League of Nations as written. But, right or wrong, because we did not, the League, from the outset, was deprived of the motivating force of its creation.

And the peace concluded was not the peace for which millions had borne arms.

The history of the world since the Treaty of Versailles has been a history of national selfishness on the part of many and of supine indifference on the part of other nations to unrighteous events leading up to the catastrophe which followed.

The only real bright spot in that history was the treaty signed in Washington in 1922 by nine great powers guaranteeing the territorial integrity of China and agreeing upon a limitation of armaments.

Other major events had evil forebodings.

MANCHURIAN CRISIS

Thus, while a financial panic was engulfing the Bank of England and sweeping upon New York, on September 18, 1931, the Japanese Army suddenly seized certain cities in Manchuria on a pretext of protecting against Chinese banditry. China immediately appealed to the League of Nations. Henry Stimson, then Secretary of State, sent a strong note to Tokyo reminding the Japanese of the Nine-Power Pact and authorized our observer at the League of Nations to sit with the League in consultation. The British representative at the League, Lord Cecil, favored marking time. The Japanese member assured the League that the troops would be withdrawn at the earliest opportunity and the Council of the League adjourned for 2 weeks.

On October 9 the Japanese bombed Chinchow, temporary capital of Manchuria, and 4 days later the League voted to call upon Japan to withdraw the troops. The call was ignored and by January 1932 all Manchuria had been occupied. On January 7, Secretary Stimson sent an ominous note to Japan stating that the United States would not recognize any situation brought about by force. He urged the British Foreign Office to send a similar note, but England was indifferent and declined to act. On January 29, 1933, the Japanese bombed the Chinese section of Shanghai at the very moment that a new disarmament conference was assembled in Geneva. Again Stimson urged Britain to take joint action with this country, but Britain declined to act. The League did nothing effective. Japan went ahead and declared the independence of Manchuria.

Finally, in 1933, the League adopted a report condemning Japan and recommending that all states refuse to recognize Manchuria. But Japan thereupon withdrew from the League, thus giving encouragement to one Adolf Hitler, who had just become Chancelor of the Third Reich.

1933: HITLER BECOMES CHANCELOR OF GERMANY

As a young man, Hitler, the son of an Austrian customs official, as later revealed in Mein Kampf, had already acquired an intense hatred for the "motley collection of Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croats" within Vienna, and, above all, "for that ever-present fungoid growth—Jews and again Jews." From being a feeble world citizen, he had become a fanatical anti-Semitic.

In 1920 he designed the swastika flag as the party emblem and organized the Storm Troops to prevent interference with his meetings. His Nazi party gained ground so fast that on November 8, 1923, they attempted to gain control of the government in the "Beer Hall Putsch." Hitler was arrested and sentenced to 5 years in prison. There he wrote Mein Kampf. He was released 8 months later. But he was smarting with resentment and thereafter followed consistently an adroit political strategy. This was it—

Never use force against those with superior force unless you are certain they will not use their weapons against you;

Terrorize the weak and timid among your foes by unrelenting pressure;

Hypnotize the multitude with promises and pageantry;

Promise everything and keep each promise only so long as it is expedient to do so;

Insist upon military discipline and unquestioning obedience from your followers;

Never lose sight of the ultimate objective—the destruction of the enemy.

The depression was seized upon by Hitler to apply his doctrines. His oratorical powers enabled him to play on the emotions of the masses by promising them a return to order and security. Within 3 years the Reichstag membership of the Nazi Party had increased from 12 to 230. In January 1933, Hitler was appointed chancelor by President von Hindenburg.

GERMANY WITHDRAWS FROM LEAGUE OF NATIONS

After World War I the dreams of Woodrow Wilson as symbolized in the League of Nations had caught the imagination of German liberalism. The German Republic under Stressemann's leadership had joined the League at Geneva in 1926. But the ambitions of Hitler were not consistent with the League's idealism. So in October of 1933, some 8 months after Hitler become chancelor, and just a few months after the withdrawal of Japan, the Third Reich also resigned from the League of Nations. In retrospect we can now see this was ominous.

ITALY ATTACKS ETHIOPIA

During these same years Il Duce was warning his subjects that the half decade between 1935 and 1940 would be an epic of conflict, and that 1935 in particular would be Italy's year of destiny.

Mussolini's objective finally became known. It was Ethiopia—the only native kingdom of Africa which still retained its independence. Italy had attempted the conquest of

Ethiopia in 1896 but was so badly beaten that the venture had been abandoned. In the Treaty of Peace that followed Italy recognized the "absolute and unreserved independence of the empire of Ethiopia as a sovereign and independent state."

In eight subsequent treaties Italy pledged herself to safeguard Ethiopia's integrity and independence or to submit disputes with Ethiopia to conciliation or arbitration. Seven of the nine treaties forbidding aggression against Ethiopia had been negotiated, signed, and ratified by the regime of Mussolini. But Il Duce was a disciple of the philosophy of Machiavelli that "a prudent prince cannot and ought not to keep his word, except when he can do it without injury to himself or when the circumstances under which he contracted the engagement still exist."

He had therefore no remorse of conscience in seizing upon a border dispute to have his army attack the Ethiopian troops in the African desert in December 1934. The primitive weapons of the Ethiopians were no match for Italian tanks and planes. Ethiopia proposed arbitration but Mussolini refused. Ethiopia then appealed to the League of Nations for protection. Great Britain, more sensitive to this aggression which was near at home, than it had been to the rape of China, moved a large part of its Atlantic Fleet into the Mediterranean and brought pressure on the League to threaten Italy with penalties for resorting to war in defiance of the League.

But Mussolini had witnessed the Manchurian debacle. So in the face of the bluff of the British Navy, for it was subsequently revealed that Great Britain had no substantial amount of ammunition to fire from the guns on its battleships, Italian troops continued to pour into Ethiopia.

In spite of impassioned and tragic pleas for help by Haile Selassie, neither the League nor other nations offered any resistance. On May 9, 1935, Mussolini announced to a howling, frenzied Italian throng that Ethiopia had fallen, that at last Italy had her empire.

GERMANY REMILITARIZED THE RHINE

Encouraged by Mussolini's success, Hitler watched and waited for an opportunity to further his purposes. He had designs on Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland but he knew that before he could make a move eastward he would have to protect his rear from attack by France. This meant he would have to seize and fortify the Rhine Valley in violation of the Versailles Treaty, and the Pact of Lacarno of October 16, 1925. He would have to find some way of circumventing the treaty obligations of Britain, Italy, Belgium, and Soviet Russia to come to France's aid in the event Germany armed this demilitarized zone.

Feeling his way cautiously, Hitler began sounding out the other nations with respect to whether they intended to perform their treaty obligations, and concluded that they would not.

Consequently, he invited the British, French, Belgium, and Italian envoys to call at Wilhelmstrasse on the morning of March 7, 1936. On arrival they were informed that German troops had marched across the Rhine at dawn.

That afternoon Hitler delivered a long and self-righteous address to the Reichstag indicting the Treaty of Versailles. Then he declared the Reichstag dissolved, and asked the German people to support him in a new election. Ninety-eight and seventy-nine one-hundredths percent of the voters did as they were told.

The French Cabinet then made the most disastrous decision in modern times by announcing to the press that France would do nothing in the Rhineland but would appeal to the League. It is now known that had France decided to occupy the Rhineland, German troops were under orders to retreat. Britain indirectly approved Germany's action by saying it involved no threat of hostilities. The League took no effective action. King Leopold of Belgium announced that his country rejected its alliance with France and would champion isolation and neutrality. France lost her closest ally. Hitler had won his gamble. He could now proceed with his European conquests

MARCH 1938—GERMANY'S ABSORPTION OF AUSTRIA

In January of 1938 on the fifth anniversary of his appointment as Chancellor, Hitler began his intrigue to annex Austria. He first organized a group of Austrian Nazis whose object was revolution. But the plot was discovered and exposed by Austrian police and the leaders arrested.

On February 8, 1938, Kurt Schuschnigg, the last Chancellor of Austria (who some 7 years later has now been liberated by Allied troops), was summoned by Hitler to come to Berchtesgaden. At first he hesitated but was urged to accept by the Austrian Foreign Secretary. When he did go, he was armed with the documents of the recent German plot to destroy the Austrian Government which he hoped to use for bargaining purposes. There Hitler charged Schuschnigg with failing to live up to his duties as a German. Schuschnigg grew nervous, but presented his documents in protest. Hitler was furious. He raged and shrieked insults. Schuschnigg threatened to leave. The storm ceased long enough for them to have luncheon to which a number of military guests had been invited. Then Hitler presented his demands: Amnesty for all imprisoned Nazis; appointment of Nazi sympathizers as Ministers of Justice and Interior; full political freedom for the Austrian Nazis. If Schuschnigg refused, Germany was ready to march. He would have 2 days to decide. He left the villa an exhausted and beaten man.

The Austrian president objected to the demands but when an ultimatum from Berlin came 2 days later, "Submit at once or face invasion," Schuschnigg capitulated.

Still the British and French press minimized the importance of these developments.

The new Nazi minister of Interior, appointed on Hitler's demand, then began visiting the various provinces laying the foundation for the organization of Nazi movements throughout Austria. He hinted at a plebiscite. This challenge was accepted by Schuschnigg who started to rally the people to Austrian independence. But it was never held. For at noon on March 11 came another ultimatum: Call off the plebiscite or face invasion. At 4 o'clock came another: Resign by 7:30 or face invasion. Schuschnigg was at wits end. He tried in vain to reach Mussolini, London, and Paris for help. No help came. Deserted and alone he surrendered.

German troops crossed the Austrian border at 5:40 a. m. the next day. Hitler himself crossed the bridge where his father once collected customs. The inhabitants of the little village strewed his path with flowers, and scooped up handfuls of sacred earth behind his car. Two days later he marched triumphantly into Vienna. Austria was annexed.

SEPTEMBER 1938, MUNICH SETTLEMENT—GERMANY'S ANNEXATION OF SUDETEN AREAS OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

His next victim was Czechoslovakia. In this sinister purpose he used Konrad Henlein, a Sudeten German who had organized a United German Party after an attempt to organize a Nazi Party in Czechoslovakia had been outlawed.

The first military threat came in May 1938 when Hitler decided on a lightning attack and began mobilizing troops on the frontier. Prague, however, which knew that the price of liberty was eternal vigilance and was willing to pay the price, sent 400,000 troops and 80,000 reserves to defend the border. Moreover, France which Hitler had expected would desert Czechoslovakia, this time came to her support. London, the appeaser, which was caught off guard had no option but to support Paris. In the face of this French-Czech and Anglo-French solidarity Hitler decided upon peace. In humiliation the German troops were withdrawn.

From the outside it looked as though the crisis had been averted. The following summer months, however, were filled with political negotiation and diplomatic intrigue. On September 1, 1938, Hitler violently demanded that the opposition of 3,500,000 Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia, which was not a fact, shall cease and be replaced by the free right of self-determination. He declared that if these tortured creatures cannot obtain rights and assistance by themselves, they can obtain both from us.

Prime Minister Chamberlain then speeded up his appeasement program. On September 15 he flew to Berchtesgaden only to be convinced that a peaceful solution of the Sudetan problem would be on Hitler's terms. The next few days were used by him to persuade the Czechs to agree to transfer to Germany all areas in which more than half the people spoke German. Prague agreed to this under the threat that if it did not, and war resulted, it would get no aid from France or Britain. With this offer in hand, Chamberlain went back to Hitler and found the Führer had new demands to make. To these Chamberlain refused to agree.

Again war threatened. The Czech forces were mobilized once more. The British fleet was put in readiness. France and Russia also agreed to act. With this united military front against him, Hitler decided again to substitute intrigue for force. He invited Chamberlain, Daladier, and Mussolini to Munich for a conference. No representatives of Czechoslovakia were present. At this conference on the solemn promise by Hitler that "This is the last territorial claim which I have to make in Europe," Chamberlain, Daladier, and Mussolini, in what has become derisively known as "the peace of Munich" decided to turn over the Sudeten area demanded by Hitler.

But an appetite grows by what it feeds on. Shortly thereafter, the Nazis extended their encroachment. Two small areas were added to Poland and the whole narrow eastern end of Czechoslovakia was turned over to Hungary. Germany assumed direct or indirect control over all the rest. In short, the result of the Munich Pact, the attempt to purchase peace, was to turn over to Hitler the powerful Czech Army with all its powerful equipment—possibly a superior fighting force to that maintained on the British Isles. Czechoslovakia as an independent nation ceased to exist.

The following spring, in March of 1938, Hitler demanded of Lithuania that it cede Memel to Germany. Simultaneously therewith the Germans swept in from East Prussia and took the small province with little opposition. Again the other nations of the world made little or no protest.

GERMANY ATTACKS POLAND

Less than a month after the annexation of Memel German newspapers began to print stories urging that Danzig and the Danzig area be returned to Germany and that a broad pathway across the Polish Corridor be granted to Germany.

Concerned over this threat of further German expansion, in violation of categorical pledges, England began negotiations with France and Russia for a treaty designed to stop Hitler from expanding eastward. If Russia would agree to join this alliance, aid, in the event of an attack, could be given to Poland. Germany, sensitive to these negotiations, felt it could not attack Poland until, contrary to the plan of England and France,

it had, by subterfuge or otherwise, neutralized Russia.

The negotiations between France, Great Britain, and Russia began to drag. Russia was distrustful of the western democracies—they in turn were distrustful of Communist Russia. Poland was fearful that if Russian armies ever came to occupy any part of its land, even in its defense, they would never leave it again.

This distrust gave Hitler his opportunity. And he made the most of it. For on August 21, 1939, the world was shocked with the announcement from Moscow that Germany and Russia had agreed on a nonaggression pact.

With that agreement a reality, Hitler was now ready to proceed against Poland. The prior newspaper suggestions were converted into formal demands, which Poland refused. On September 1, only 10 days after the signing of the German-Russian Pact, Poland was invaded by German armies, and the Polish leaders decided to fight.

Whatever may have been the mental processes of her leaders in deciding whether France and Great Britain would make good on their promises of help, as they had not with her neighbors, here at last was a country willing to fight for its existence.

This time also, at long last, Britain ended its policy of appeasement, stood by its obligation, and 2 days later, September 3, took its stand beside Poland. The ultimatum which it sent Germany gave that country only 2 hours in which to cease further attacks on Poland and to start withdrawing its troops. Failing this, Great Britain would be at war with Germany. When the 2 hours expired, Great Britain and Germany were at war.

A few hours later France respected its pledge to Poland and also declared war. But what actually happened was that when Germany was overrunnning Poland from the west, Russian troops moved in from the east. Although it was expected by informed observers that the Polish Army and "General Mud" would be able to hold off the Germans for a substantial period of time—until the British and French could effectively attack on the western front, the conquest of Poland was completed within 1 month. A boundary line separating the part of Poland claimed by Germany from the part claimed by Russia was agreed upon. One more country was conquered.

PHONEY WAR, WINTER 1939–40

After the conquest of Poland and during the entire winter of 1939–40, the Western front became relatively inactive. It was some more psychological warfare on Hitler's part. Many people began once more to think that probably with Poland he was at last satisfied. Many were hoping England and France could now find a way out of the war.

APRIL 1940. SEIZURE OF DENMARK AND NORWAY

Hitler assisted in lulling the appeasers into a sense of security by making pretensions about the territorial integrity of Belgium and the Netherlands.

Then suddenly at 5 o'clock on the morning of Tuesday, April 9, 1940, German land forces crossed the international boundary and within a few hours there were more than 45,000 German soldiers in Denmark. When this became known, the Danish Government decided to make no resistance. The only opposition seems to have been made by the Palace Guard which lost three men.

NORWAY

At 11 p. m. on April 8 some 6 hours before the Germans crossed the Danish borderline, a German armada of 125 German troopships and warships, accompanied by airplanes, was first noted steaming northward along the Danish Coast toward Norway, running without lights.

To be successful in their invasion of Denmark and Norway secrecy and simultaneous landing at various ports was necessary. Their success in keeping their plans secret was astonishing, the more so because they made intensive use of "fifth columnists" within Norway.

In the matter of timing the arrival of their troopships the Germans were almost as successful. On the morning of April 9 between 5 and 6 a. m. German troop transports reached seven Norwegian ports—Oslo, Arendal, Kristiansand, Egersund, Stavanger, Bergen, and Trondheim, and Copenhagen and other points in Denmark, and in a few days Norway was captured.

MAY 1940: NETHERLANDS—BELGIUM AND LUXEMBOURG OVERRUN BY GERMANY—THE NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM ATTACKED

On May 10, 1940, 1 month after the invasion of Denmark and Norway, at 5:30 a. m., without warning, German forces invaded the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg by land, sea, and air.

As soon as possible after the invasion began, but not until then, the troops of the Netherlands and Belgium were mobilized and offered such resistance as they could. But 4 days later the commander in chief of the Netherlands armies directed his troops to lay down their arms. Two weeks after the surrender of the Dutch armies the King of the Belgians announced the surrender of the Belgian Army to the Germans.

THE CHURCHILL CABINET AND ITS POLICY

On May 11, 1940, the day after the invasion of Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg, Neville Chamberlain, whose policy of appeasement had so completely failed, resigned. He was succeeded by Winston Churchill. On May 14, the very day that the Netherlands armies were ordered to lay down their arms, Churchill was given a vote of confidence motion in the House of Commons by a vote of 381 to 0. It was at this time that he uttered his now famous saying: "I have nothing to offer you but blood, toil, tears, and sweat. We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us many, many months of struggle and suffering. You ask, what is our policy? I say it is to wage war by land, sea, and air. War with all our might and with all the strength God has given us, and to wage war against a monstrous tyranny never surpassed in the dark and lamentable catalog of human crime. That is our war policy."

JUNE 10: ITALY TAKEN INTO WAR BY MUSSOLINI

Within 12 days after the fall of Belgium and when the encirclement of the Maginot line was in rapid progress and the spoils of victory appeared certain, Mussolini, by declaring war on June 10, gave France what he thought would be a fatal stab in the back.

FRANCE SURRENDERS

After the conquest of Holland and Belgium the Germans continued into France, by-passing the Maginot line. On June 17, only 1 month and 1 week after the attack on Holland began, Marshal Petain asked for an armistice, which was signed in Italy on June 24, only 14 days after the entry of Italy into the war.

With the surrender of the Belgians and the French, the Germans believed the whole of the British force would be wiped out or forced to surrender. But a large part of that force, with some French and Belgians, succeeded in retreating to the shore of the English Channel. There, on the beach near Dunkerque, they made a last heroic stand in an inferno of shells and bombs. In anything which would float—rowboats, ferryboats, troop ships, destroyers, cruisers, and even collapsible boats of various kinds—some 200,000, without their equipment, escaped across the channel to England. This heroic rescue was the only bright spot on the Allied side in the summer of 1940.

It was during this valiant retreat that Winston Churchill rallied the British Nation with his declaration: "We shall defend our island whatever the cost may be; we shall fight on beaches, landing grounds, in fields, in streets, and on the hills. We shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for the moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, will carry on the struggle until in God's good time the New World, with all its power and might, sets forth to the liberation and rescue of the Old."

THE HEROIC STAND OF BRITAIN

After the retreat at Dunkerque, Hitler took a month to regroup his armies and assemble them on the shores of France for a crossing of the Channel. In July the German Air Force started occasional raids with a view to terrorizing the English into submission. In August it began a series of systematic attacks to knock out British industrial plants. By this time, however, a new invention, the radar, had given the British a means of knowing when planes were approaching, so that the small British Air Force could rest between attacks and still be on the alert at all times. Late in August the Germans made an all-out attack, losing over 600 planes in 1 week and 286 in 1 day—a record which still stands for actual battle in air. If Hitler had known in June that the British had only a few dozen field guns, 12 tanks, and enough rifles for only half a million men, he probably could have crossed the Channel. By September our Army had sent 1,500,000 rifles and thousands of old, though still usable, field guns, and Britain was too strong for invasion from the sea.

APRIL 1941: GERMANY ATTACKS YUGOSLAVIA AND GREECE—HITLER AND THE BALKAN TIME TABLE

At the same time that heroic England was withstanding the German bombing the English Navy was outfighting the Italian Navy. Hitler, therefore, determined to reach the Mediterranean by way of the Balkans. His success in this regard is revealed by the following time table:

1. On November 20, 1940, Hungary yielded to German pressure and came into the Axis sphere of influence.
2. Rumania did so 3 days later.
3. On the next day, Slovakia capitulated.
4. But it was not until February 22, 1941, that Bulgaria allowed German troops to enter the country, and it did so unwillingly.
5. On March 29 Germany announced that the Prince Regent of Yugoslavia, through representatives of his appointment, had signed a pact with Germany.

But at this point the peaceful penetration of the Balkans ceased. The people of Yugoslavia objected to the pact signed by their Prince Regent and overthrew his government. The Prince Regent and his advisers fled the country, and young King Peter was called to the throne.

On April 16, 1941, however, the powerful German force struck the Balkans, crushed Yugoslavia within a month, crashed on into Greece, forcing the British to withdraw, and capturing many of them. The island of Crete was taken by an air-borne German division—first large-scale air-borne operation in history. Thus by May of 1941 the Germans had opened a way from the Danube Valley to the Black Sea and to the eastern Mediterranean, and had control over all Europe as far east as Russia.

ATTACK ON RUSSIA

Flushed with success, Hitler then made possibly his greatest mistake, for on June 22, 1941, despite the nonaggression pact which he had signed with Russia less than 2 years previously (August 1939), he declared war on that country, and without warning launched an attack on a 2,000-mile front.

His only excuse was that he had never trusted Stalin, that he had signed the nonaggression pact with a heavy heart and with

misgivings, and that it was necessary to crush communism before it engulfed the continent. At first Russian resistance was weak and the Germans drove 300 miles within a few days. However, when they reached the Stalin line, they found a new type of army, one which could receive heavy blows without being knocked out or broken through. Nevertheless, by November of 1941, the Germans had advanced 1,000 miles to within 40 miles of Moscow and except for an outlet to the sea, had entirely surrounded the great city of Leningrad.

But Stalin's scorched earth policy was a new experience for the Germans and for the first time they failed to replenish their stocks of clothing, food, and weapons at the expense of the enemy. The coldest winter in almost 100 years set in with such devastating effect that the German drive broke down and on December 8, 1941, the day after Pearl Harbor, Hitler announced that they would not be able to take Moscow that year. At that time, the great Russian, General Timoshenko, started his winter campaign which brought Hitler his first taste of defeat and drove the Germans back about 200 miles amid snowstorms.

PEARL HARBOR

The day before Hitler realized that he could not take Moscow until the following year, the other great mistake of the Axis Powers was made—the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. By November of 1941 our Government had cut off the flow of steel and gasoline to Japan and was actively aiding the Chinese by sending supplies up the Burma Road. On November 26 Secretary Hull handed the Japanese emissary a note setting forth in detail the changes in policy toward Japan. This message was never replied to, although Japanese emissaries were at the White House supposedly to deliver the Japanese reply at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Suddenly at 7:55 a. m., on Sunday, December 7, the Japanese, without warning or any formal declaration of war, struck at Pearl Harbor.

On the night of December 9, 1941, President Roosevelt addressed the country: "The sudden criminal attacks perpetrated by the Japanese in the Pacific provide the climax for a decade of international immorality. * * * The course that Japan had followed in the past 10 years in Asia has paralleled the course of Hitler and Mussolini in Europe and Africa. Today it has become far more than a parallel. It is collaboration, so well calculated that all the continents of the world and all the oceans are now considered by the Axis strategists as one gigantic battlefield. We are now in this war. Every single man, woman, and child is a partner in the most tremendous undertaking of our American history. We must share together the bad news, the good news, the defeats, and the victories—the changing fortunes of war."

The first hero of the war to be decorated with the Congressional Medal of Honor was our Capt. Mervyn S. Bennion, formerly of Chevy Chase bishopric, who died commanding our then largest warship, the *West Virginia,* at Pearl Harbor.

Since this is in commemoration of our victory in Europe, time will not permit an exposition of the changing fortunes of war in the Pacific—our initial defeats at Wake Island, Guam, and the Philippines—then our victories in the Coral Sea, the Battle of Midway, Guadalcanal, and lately our reconquest of the Philippines and the bloody victories at Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

AFRICAN CAMPAIGN

In the spring of 1942 the Germans continued their land victories, and by the summer of 1942 had driven within 60 miles of Cairo and the great British naval base of Alexandria. But with the aid of American supplies shipped around the Cape of Good Hope, General Montgomery, in August, surprised the Germans and sent them reeling back toward the west. Week after week he drove them from one position to another, and on November 7, when the great American armada arrived and General Eisenhower opened up our African front, the Germans found themselves between two fires. By the spring of 1943 they were finally crushed.

The invasion of Sicily followed in June, and Italy was invaded a month later.

Meanwhile, in June of 1942, the Germans had renewed their campaign in Russia, driving to capture the great Russian oil fields at Baku on the Caspian Sea. They struck probably the greatest defense ever fought at Stalingrad, being held without a gain for 2 months, despite all the power they could muster. In November the Russians suddenly struck out with a counteroffensive which trapped 22 German divisions and reversed the position of both armies. By the spring of 1943 half the Russian territory, formerly occupied, was cleared of Germans.

At this time the Russians began to demand a synchronized attack from the west. But our armies were not ready to strike with the force required to break into France. Instead, our air force began to strike at the great industrial centers to weaken the German industries and reduce their capacity for providing munitions of war. According to Marshal Von Runstedt, captured a few days ago, this air power was the turning point of the war—at least on the western front.

During the same time our armies proceeded methodically to drive up through Italy, driving Mussolini from control and liberating more than half of that country.

Finally, on June 6, 1944, Eisenhower's armies struck France with the greatest landing force in world history. It is said that the Germans who were captured gazed with open mouths when they saw the vast armada which brought the invasion force to France. The great drive of General Patton's army in August which resulted in clearing practically all France from the Germans is too well remembered to require further comment.

In December 1944 the Germans marshalled what forces they could spare for a final all-out effort to break through our armies and capture our principal port and base of supplies at Antwerp. They were nearly successful, and probably would have done so except for the great stand of General McAuliffe and his forces at Bastogne. Another of our boys, Don Ipson, one of McAuliffe's captains, was there and was seriously injured by an 88-millimeter shell which exploded almost between his feet. He is now recovering in a hospital and expects to be completely well again.

The last 5 months of events are so recent in our memories, I need not go into any detail. The greatest air destruction in history was visited on Germany. By destroying industrial, munitions, and rail centers and systems, this continuous air attack almost completely paralyzed Germany. One by one our troops bridged the rivers of Germany and took possession of the Third Reich. With this progressive occupation of the enemy's territory came our capture of concentration camps and the most shocking scenes of brutality and sadistic practices ever known to a so-called civilized world. Human bodies piled in long rows or in freight cars became a daily scene. The world came to realize that the stories of German brutality were true.

Then the end came suddenly. As if the wrath of God was brought forth, Mussolini was executed by his own countrymen. his body strung up in a public square for his disillusioned townspeople to desecrate. Like Judas Iscariot, he was then buried in a potter's grave.

Within 48 hours thereafter came the word that Hitler and Goebbels were also dead. The world of "might makes right", which they had created, may have consumed them also. Marshal Petain reentered France to stand trial for his life. Kurt Schuschnigg, Premiers Daladier, Blum and others, General Gamelin and others were liberated. We have witnessed the spectacle of a million men surrendering within 1 day. One company of American soldiers is reported to have taken 50,000 men as prisoners within 24 hours. Eleven months almost to the day from the time we landed on D-day the Allies have recaptured France, Luxembourg, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and others. Denmark, Holland, and Norway had been liberated. Germany had unconditionally surrendered.

Never before in our history has there been such a demonstration of the truism that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword.

But the cost has been without parallel in world history. Disregarding the exaggerated claims of both sides, it has been estimated that over 12,000,000 men have been killed; that Poland alone suffered fatalities of over 3,000,000 men; Germany probably about the same number; and Russia, around 4,000,000. This country with deaths now around 200,000 has, by comparison, escaped easily, although our total casualties aggregate nearly a million. There have, of course, been many more wounded than killed and it has been estimated that over 10,000,000 men have been taken prisoners. Those killed, wounded and taken prisoners may well total around 40,000,000 men.

It has been estimated that over $1,000,000,000,000 has been expended in the prosecution of the war. This country will emerge with a national indebtedness of over $300,000,000,000. It was less than 10 years ago when President Roosevelt said he had been informed by bankers that this Nation could stand a national indebtedness of seventy-five billion. We now have an indebtedness of four times that amount. This means a national indebtedness of nearly $2,500 for every man, woman, and child in this country. Assuming an average family to be composed of five persons, this would be enough to build and pay for a $12,500 home for every family in this land—something which most families never own.

This is a day for prayer and thanksgiving for the end of this terrible war—for the opportunities for loved ones to come home and be able to sleep away from the blood of battle. We pay homage at this time to those who have borne the battle and express our gratitude to our Heavenly Father for the safe deliverance of those who return.

But it is not a day for purposeless celebration. Rather, it is a day for world repentance for ever permitting this great consuming war to come upon us. It is a day of great consecration to the solution of problems that will soon confront us, the like of which have not faced any other generation.

We must dedicate ourselves first to the winning of the war with Japan and the organization of a concert of free nations dedicated to justice—not "my Nation, right or wrong," but my Nation only if it is right. And this concert of free nations must realize that if it has to choose between peace and righteousness, it will make a second mistake of Munich if it does not choose righteousness.

We must never forget we are our brother's keeper, although in the application of this we must always remember that the best way to help our brother is to so guide him that he will help himself. We can never expect to exert leadership that is worth a continental through seducing other nations with our wealth.

We must dedicate ourselves also to bringing economic order out of world chaos if we are not to see world starvation. At the

best we can expect that millions and millions of people will go hungry this next winter—there may be as much suffering as in this last year of war.

If economic order is to be restored in this country and in the world, we must learn, in the spirit of the Master, to be tolerant and fair with each other and work as brothers for the common good of all. This country and the world needs a renaissance of good will, and an end to political demagoguery by extremists on both sides.

Classifying people as liberals and conservatives or otherwise is always dangerous. Some people who parade as great liberals are liberals only in the sense that they are liberal with other people's money—under the guise of governmental forms they profligately spend money earned by sweat and saved by privation. Others, who in the jargon of the day are sometimes improperly characterized as reactionaries, are those who would preserve for this country some of the most enduring liberal principles upon which this country is founded—the right through industry and hard work to get ahead in the world; the right through the exercise of our talents and property to acquire new talents and property; the right to order our own lives free from unnecessary interference of government; the right to live under a government of laws which apply alike to all men, rather than under a government of men who in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them can favor their friends and punish their enemies. In the exercise of governmental functions, the rich have no right to take advantage of the poor, but neither have the poor the right to confiscate the property of the rich.

No greater disservice can be done to our country by any man than to array class against class. There is no more room for a labor government in this country than there is for a government representing vested wealth. Representatives in Congress should represent all of their constituents, not merely those who voted for them.

There can be no greater menace to our country than the doctrine preached by some in high places—that our country owes us a living. If that doctrine be accepted by the majority of our people, we are in great danger as a Nation. While the Government should work for the people, that does not mean it should support the people, for to the extent it does, the other people in turn become the slaves of the Government. The postulate of Jefferson that that government governs best which governs least is still entitled to some place in our political affairs.

In the days ahead, there will be great pressure, as in the days of the 1920's, to seriously reduce the taxes of all, and there will be many demagogues who will want to return to the method whereby only a small percentage of our people will be obliged to pay taxes. While I realize that some adjustment in taxes must be made, speaking for myself, I prefer to have this Nation pay off its debts by a continuance of high taxes rather than to have our children inherit a bankrupt Nation and I have a deep feeling that this country will be better morally, spiritually, and financially if we pattern our tax system after the Lord's law of tithing, and have even the widow contribute her mite to the expenses of the Government. If we all helped to support our Government rather than planned to live off it, the right thinking that would result would at once eliminate much of the reckless expenditure of public funds.

Finally, and this is the most important thought for our country at this time, there should be a realization that peace will come to the world only to the extent that individuals as a whole worship the Lord and keep His commandments.

In the words of the immortal Lincoln: "It is the duty of nations as well as of men to own their dependence upon the ever-ruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow * * * and to recognize the sublime truth that those nations only are blessed where God is the Lord."

On another occasion he said: "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and in prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to God that made us. It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

On two historic occasions the inhabitants of this hemisphere were promised—once to the Jaredites and once to the Nephites—that they would be free from despotic power if they but worshiped their Lord. On both occasions they failed. The promise is still open to this people.

May we so resist evil that we or our descendants will be ready for the coming of the Messiah—when "They shall bend their swords into plough shares, and their spears into pruning hooks," when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The Task Ahead of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Chester Bowles at a meeting of the Board of Trade in New York City on Thursday, May 10:

Today, with victory in Europe won at last, we face one of the most difficult and dangerous periods in our history—a period which will demand the best of all of us. Each one of us carries a very heavy responsibility—from President Truman, loaded with all the problems of the White House, down to the most humble citizen.

During the months that lie ahead of us, the war must be fought with the utmost vigor on all remaining fronts. This is our first and most important job, for everything else depends upon our winning the final victory.

During the months ahead, we must also lay the foundation for a lasting peace. The peace for which mankind has prayed so long. The peace for which we are paying and will continue to pay so great and so bitter a price.

During the months ahead, we must rededicate ourselves to the undramatic but vitally important job of preventing the inflationary blow-up which has characterized every war in the past. As of today, it can be said that all of us working together have kept the American economy on a sound foundation in spite of enormous strains and pressures. Having with so much pain managed to keep our economy on an even keel so far, we must redouble our efforts to maintain its balance until the pressures of war and the turbulence of transition are past.

Finally, during the coming months, we must develop plans and policies and adapt these plans and policies as rapidly as circumstances require to the task of attaining full production and full employment when the war is over. A prosperous postwar economy, with good steady jobs at high wages for our workers, with high income for our farmers and good profits for our businessmen is quite properly the dream of every American citizen. It is a dream which must be realized.

Each of these four tasks is great in itself. Taken together, they constitute the greatest challenge to our vision and courage and good sense that we have ever faced.

And they must be taken together, for each task is closely related to the others. If we fall down on any one of them, we shall be less likely to succeed with the others.

The war will not be truly won unless we succeed in establishing the political foundations for an enduring peace. If we fail on this front as we did a generation ago the end of war will not mean peace. It will mean merely a state of nonbelligerence while the forces are gathering for a conflict which will shatter everything that has any value in our civilization.

Peace, in turn, is not simply a matter of political arrangements. Back of these political arrangements, there must be well-being, productive employment, and high standards of living for all the people of the world. World peace requires good neighbors. Nations whose economies have broken down, whose peoples go hungry, cannot be good neighbors.

After the last war, we failed to build a durable basis for world prosperity. After a few hectic years of fake prosperity, the world was engulfed in the great depression. Out of that depression came the forces which, in 1939, plunged the world into war.

It is a commonplace to say that the Nazis drew their strength from the destruction of the middle classes during the run-away inflation in Germany in 1921–23, and the impoverishment of the entire nation in the run-away deflation of 1930–32.

If we fail this time to build a solid basis for world-wide prosperity and security, if we permit another cycle of explosive inflation, followed by paralyzing deflation, the political arrangements, the world organization—which I am confident will come out of San Francisco—will be powerless to prevent the rise of new tensions, new hates, and new dictatorships. In such circumstances there can be but one outcome—World War III. This time we simply dare not fail.

It is only fair to say that many expert foreign observers are not too optimistic about our ability to solve the stupendous economic problems which lie ahead. In my position as Price Administrator, I have had an opportunity to talk to some of the leading economists and statesmen from Australia, Canada, England, France, and other nations. Without exception, they are fearful of our ability to cooperate with the other nations of the world in building world trade and commerce, in assuming the responsibilities of a creditor nation.

Indeed, they go even further. They doubt our ability to take the measures which are necessary to sustain a high level of production and national income here in this country. They even doubt our capacity to resist the forces of inflation in the months ahead of us, despite the excellence of our record to date.

Gunnar Myrdal, a leading Swedish economist who spent some 3 years in America as a close observer of our people and our institutions, has stated that America, the land

of such tremendous wartime production and such capacity for prosperity, lacks the political and economic experience to make the economy function efficiently under peacetime conditions.

I emphatically disagree with these pessimistic experts from overseas. I am positive that America does possess the political and economic wisdom to see us through the difficult years that lie ahead of us.

But I would be less than frank if I did not say once more that these years will test our courage and our vision and our wisdom as they have never been tested before. To come through with a whole skin will call for the best there is in all of us. More than that, it will call for an honest facing of our difficulties.

My own responsibility lies on the inflation control front. On this subject of inflation control I believe that plain talk and blunt words are called for.

Wartime price control in America has been successful beyond our greatest hopes. During the period when Government expenditures, first for defense and then for war, have grown from practically nothing to a level of almost $100,000,000,000 per annum, we have succeeded in holding the increase in the cost of living since 1940 to something between 25 and 30 percent. With regard to industrial prices, the record since 1940 has been even better.

Even more important is the price control record of the last 2 years—the period in which our present price and rent-control program has been in effect. Since May 1943 when the President issued the hold-the-line order, 2 years ago, the Department of Labor states the retail prices of those items which go into the cost of living of the average low- or middle-income family has risen only 1.5 percent. Industrial prices—the prices of the basic items going into the total cost of the war—have risen only 2 percent.

It is perfectly true that some prices have risen sharply. It is equally true that many commodities are in extremely short supply and are very hard to get. But the fact is that in spite of the most tremendous inflationary pressures to which any country at any time has ever been subjected, the price level has been held to a very modest increase and for 2 solid years have been held to almost no rise whatsoever.

During this same period of effective price control industrial and farm production have been at all time peak levels. Business has had its greatest period of prosperity, with business profits (even after taxes) more than double their prewar levels.

A large part of the world has not been so fortunate. In France, Belgium, and Holland, in Italy, the Balkans, and China, in Mexico and in most of South America people are struggling today with runaway prices. Today, in Paris, a meal may cost $100. A pair of shoes $300. In China prices have risen 1,300 percent—250 percent in the last 60 days.

We might have had a 100 percent rise in prices here with purchasing power, savings, and investment 50 percent. But, thanks to the good sense of the American people, thanks to the support which the OPA has received throughout the length and breadth of the land and from every class of citizen, it hasn't happened here.

Nonetheless, I must confess that I am deeply disturbed by the recent attacks which have been made on price control. It is not the attacks as such which disturb me. The OPA has taken plenty of punishment before this and has weathered it.

What worries me is that the present attacks come at a very dangerous time. It was just at this stage of the last war that we lost the fight against inflation. And the fear that is in my mind is that we may make the same tragic mistake again.

The danger is not that the selfish few in many industries are using every trick in the lobbyist bag to feather their own nests at the Nation's expense. The danger is not in the black market and the black marketeer.

No, the real danger lies in the general feeling that the war is about over and that the threat of inflation is about past. Unless the American people can be brought to see that the threat of inflation did not end when the shooting stopped in Europe, we are in for some mighty rough weather.

Let me review for you what happened on the inflationary front after the armistice in 1918. The first impact of the cut-backs in the war program was a softening of prices, all prices, both at wholesale and retail. People at once jumped to the conclusion that the wartime scarcity was over and that wartime inflation was a thing of the past. In the frantic effort to get back to normalcy, price and production controls were stripped off fast and the wartime agencies folded up.

What happened then? Prices, which sagged for a few months during the winter of 1919, spurted up again. There was a mad scramble to build up inventories. In that scramble prices were built up higher and higher, and faster and faster, while wages struggled to keep pace. Before we knew it, dangerous inflation had set in.

By the middle of 1920, wholesale prices stood at 148 percent above their prewar levels, and the cost of living for the average citizen nearly as high. Sugar was selling for 28 cents a pound. Almost one-half of the total inflation of that period—and mark that well—almost one-half of the total inflation of that World War I period took place after the armistice, after the fighting had stopped and after we took off the few price controls which had been in effect.

The pay-off came in the spring of 1920. We went up fast in 1919. After the first few months of 1920, we came down hard. Wholesale prices dropped over 40 percent, factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent, and unemployment jumped by five and a half millions. In the devastating deflation of 1920–21, corporation profits were completely wiped out. Business incurred inventory losses of no less than $11,000,000, wiping out all the reserves accumulated during the war and more. More than 105,000 businesses closed their doors in the 5 years after the collapse.

What happened on the labor front and business front were matched, indeed exceeded, by developments on the farm front. Farm prices were out by more than half, farm income by two-thirds. Nearly one-half million farmers lost their farms by foreclosure during the next 5 years.

That's the tragic story of 25 years ago. It is the story of the complete bungling of a critically important job in a period during which the inflationary pressures were relatively mild compared to those which face us today.

In 1918 we were spending roughly $17,000,000,000 on war. During the next 12 months we will spend at the rate of $71,000,000,000.

In 1918, accumulated savings and war bonds totaled $45,000,000,000. Today they total $150,000,000,000.

In 1918 outstanding currency totaled $5,000,000,000. Today it totals more than $25,000,000,000.

In 1918 checking accounts totaled $15,000,000,000. Today they total well over $60,000,000,000.

In 1919 the gap between income and goods available totaled about $10,000,000. It totals more than $35,000,000,000 today.

I do not mean to stuff you full of statistics, but I believe it is important for us all to remember the results of our miserable failure in 1919 and 1920. We must appreciate that the dangers which came close to blowing our economy sky-high in those days are puny indeed compared with the pressures which face us today. These pressures can only be controlled by all of us working together, the OPA, the Congress, all of the hundreds of industries which have such a huge stake in our future, and, finally, the American people.

We in the OPA carry a particularly heavy responsibility in the months that lie ahead. Let me list for you some of the problems to which a solution must be found:

Our first concern is the meat supplies. This subject of meat has been one of the most misunderstood and some ways most misrepresented problems which has faced us in many months.

While beef production is at an all-time high, hog production is off 35 percent. If we are to even out the distribution of our reduced supplies we must see that a greater proportion of live animals are sent to Federally inspected plants for slaughter only. This Federally inspected meat can then be shipped into interstate commerce to our city areas which are now short.

The new program of slaughter control, for which OPA was finally delegated authority early in April, will go into effect Monday. This new program will not increase the total supply of meat—that can only come over a period of several months. But I am confident that it will prove a long step forward in maintaining fair distribution of supplies, particularly in the city areas of the East, where the shortages have been most acute.

Our second problem is that of the meat black market. Our staff of investigators has been ridiculously small in comparison to the enforcement problems which we have faced. On the average, we have had only one investigator for every county in the United States. With this small staff, we have, however, gone a long way during the last year toward breaking dangerous black markets in gasoline, fresh fruits and vegetables, and a dozen other products. Now we are out to lick the black market in meat.

The new slaughter-control program will give us for the first time the authority to control meat tightly at the starting point—the slaughterhouses. Together with the increased enforcement staff recently granted us by Congress, we can, I believe, make real progress in breaking the meat black market during the next 60 to 90 days. But I might as well warn you now that from coast to coast you will hear cries from black marketeers that honest businessmen are being persecuted. Only through a drastic program can these chiselers and profiteers be eliminated.

Our third problem is the pricing of the thousands of peacetime products which will result from the reconversion of many of our war plants. This is a problem on which we have been working hard for nearly 10 months—consulting with dozens of industry groups, getting cost figures and other essential information.

During the reconversion period we must do everything possible to encourage full production and full employment. Businessmen must be assured of good profits, based on high production. Individual adjustments must be made for small high-cost firms. Encouragement must be given to new manufacturers anxious, in the typical American way, to make a start in their own business.

We must make certain that our prices on reconverted products are not so low that they will in any way restrict or hamper production. At the same time, we must make certain that they are not so high as to throw our entire price level out of balance and start us on the inflationary spiral which we have fought so hard to avoid.

Tomorrow in Washington I expect to announce the full details of the reconversion pricing policy which we will follow during the next few months. I would like to emphasize

now that this program is a flexible program, and that it will change to meet changing conditions.

The fourth major problem which we face is that of clothing supplies and clothing prices. The Department of Labor tells us that food prices during the last 2 years have dropped some 4 percent at retail, while clothing prices for lower- and middle-income families have risen 12 percent. This rise in clothing prices has endangered our whole balance of prices and wages. It has jeopardized our over-all ability to control the forces of inflation.

The clothing program which has been announced will stabilize apparel prices for middle- and lower-income groups at slightly below their present levels. It should pull the over-all cost of clothing down. Again, it is a difficult program and one which is certain to cause problems in many areas. I can assure you we will do all in our power to eliminate hardships wherever they result.

The fifth problem which lies ahead is the continued stabilization of the cost of living, including rents, food, and other products which have been under price control during the entire war period. During the first 2 months of the year the cost-of-living index showed a very slight rise. During the last 2 months, I am glad to report that it has shown a slight drop. I am hopeful that we can maintain it at a stable level during the coming year.

The sixth problem is the selection of the right time at which to begin to drop our controls. We are well aware that the American businessmen are fed up with regulations and red tape. In general, I believe they will put up with any necessary inconvenience, but they will be the first to resent controls which are left in effect any longer than they are actually needed. I can assure you that I am in emphatic agreement with them on this point. Perhaps it is unnecessary for me to add that there is no group in the United States more anxious to get rid of unnecessary controls and regulations than the people in OPA, who have been faced with the difficult and often unpleasant task of administering these controls during the period of war.

These six problems must be met and solved during the next 12 months. They are stupendous problems, but, if we fail to solve them, the catastrophe which can overcome us will be far reaching.

The coming year will be made doubly difficult by our own natural weariness with war and the regulations that go with war. There are danger signs of this all around us. It expresses itself in the willingness of some normally honest citizens to justify their own participation in the black market. It expresses itself in blind, bitter editorial attacks on the bureaucrats and bunglers. It expresses itself in statements by ordinarily responsible people that, regardless of all consequences, price controls and rationing should be abandoned.

OPA organization today has the trained personnel and necessary experience to continue to keep the prices of inflation in check during the explosive months that lie ahead. Whether we can successfully carry out our responsibilities will depend to a major degree on American business, our Congress, and the people themselves.

Do we, as a people, have the good sense, the patience, and the courage to finish what we have begun? Will we continue to put up with the nagging irritations, the occasional hardship, the bother and nuisance of wartime regulations and red tape which are an inevitable byproduct of the controls necessary to lick inflation?

I have been working for the Government for 3½ years. During this period I have developed a supreme faith in the basic good sense of the American people. Once they are given the facts and an opportunity to understand them, they invariably come through with the proper answers.

Our people from one end of this land to the other have their hearts set firmly on a new America. In the postwar world the will insist upon a free America with individual right guaranteed to everyone. They will also insist on a prosperous America with full production and full employment for every citizen who is able and willing to work.

During the next year and the years that stretch beyond, the whole world will be watching to see what we do—and what we fail to do. Probably no people on earth have ever carried the responsibility which we Americans will carry. I have confidence, a firm, deep-seated confidence, that we as a people will come through with flying colors.

Opposition to Trade-Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following statement on behalf of the manufacturers of vitrified china at the hearing on the Doughton bill, H. R. 2652, made by James K. Love, vice president and secretary of the Shenango Pottery Co., of New Castle, Pa., and a member of the foreign trade committee of the Vitrified China Association, Inc., in opposition to the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements:

I am James K. Love, vice president and secretary of the Shenango Pottery Co., of New Castle, Pa., and a member of the foreign trade committee of the Vitrified China Association, Inc. I am speaking in behalf of the entire vitrified china industry. Other statements have been or will be made on behalf of this industry and I will try to avoid unnecessary repetition.

The principal factories manufacturing vitrified chinaware are located in these States: California, Georgia, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia.

The States producing the raw materials for the production of vitrified chinaware are: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont Virginia, Wyoming.

Any reduction in tariff, therefore, on chinaware or pottery would have an adverse effect on the labor and business in communities not only in the States in which the product is produced but in the other States mentioned above which supply the raw materials for the product.

We know, of course, that this is not a hearing with reference to a particular tariff rate. We fully realize that H. R. 2652 is designed only to continue in the State Department power that it has had for 11 years to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties. The bill, however, greatly increases the latitude within which the negotiators may work.

In the light of past performance we are not reassured by the oft-repeated statement made in this hearing that all that is wanted is the authority to operate under this increased latitude, and that this authority may not be used. Our opposition to this bill is based on the belief that the authority once given will be used, and to explain this opposition we naturally use our own industry as a background.

One thing which concerns us deeply is the fact that these treaties with respect to any commodity were intended to be made with the country which is the principal supplier of that commodity. In 1939 a reciprocal agreement was made reducing the rate on china containing 25 percent of calcined bone by approximately one-third and certain items of earthenware by approximately 40 percent. Notwithstanding the fact that at that time and for years before, by far the largest importations of household china both in number of units and in value had come from Japan, this trade treaty was not made with Japan, but with the United Kingdom.

Under our most-favored-nation policy the rate extended to one country is automatically extended to all countries manufacturing the same commodity unless they discriminate against us. It must be obvious that a rate extended to the United Kingdom to even inadequately protect the American potter against an average wage rate of 26 cents per hour in the United Kingdom was utterly useless as a protection against the Japanese average wage of 7 cents per hour.

Now, the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 might be loosely interpreted as a discrimination against the United States, and thus, of course, prevent Japan from taking any further advantage of this treaty. It is interesting to note, however, that even in 1941, 79.1 percent in quantity and 41.9 percent in value of importation of household china came from Japan. This was more than eight times in quantity and only a little over 15 percent less in value than the imports of the same commodity from the United Kingdom. (Table, p. 34, U. S. Tariff Commission, No. 7, pottery tableware, 1944.)

Japan and the United Kingdom have been used as examples as they represent the bottom and top wages in foreign china tableware production. A similar comparison exists in varying degrees between these two extremes as to France, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and many foreign china-producing countries. It may be contended that for a long time after the war Japan and Germany will not be factors to reckon with. It is our considered opinion that with respect to our industry the exact reverse is true.

According to plans given wide newspaper publicity, these countries are in the future to be excluded from the manufacture of any heavy products which might conceivably be used in making war. In this case their very existence depends upon their making the best use of what art and facilities they are permitted to employ.

As to manufactured products, this will mean peacetime articles, and what is more natural than that they concentrate on those industries such as pottery, in which their low labor cost gives them such a wide advantage.

Undoubtedly, at least two new competitors to this industry appear in the field also, Russia and China. Under the lend-lease program American machinery which we are sending abroad can produce a mechanization equal to that of the industry in the United States. The combination of machines and low wages will present a vastly greater threat to American living standards.

There has arisen in some quarters in this country a disturbing philosophy illustrated by a definition given the other day in this hearing. An inefficient industry was defined as one which could not compete in world markets. While I do not recall whether or not it was exactly stated, the inference was plain that an inefficient industry was one which could not compete in world markets without the aid of tariff protection. The inference was also plain that such an industry should be abandoned in this country, and

the product which it manufactures be purchased from those countries which by reason of their low labor rates, could manufacture the product much more cheaply than it could be manufactured in the United States.

The vitrified china industry gives employment to eight or nine thousand workers directly, and indirectly to many more. By far the greater proportion are skilled workers in their own craft, but not in any other craft. Years have been spent in learning their jobs and many have done nothing else for as many as 50 years. They are paid an average hourly wage of almost 3½ times the highest average wage of any foreign potter, which American wage is 60 to 65 percent of the selling price of the china.

If this philosophy which we have mentioned above is carried to its logical conclusion, it can mean only one of two things. Ether the standard of living and wages of the American potter must be reduced to such a point as to retain the American business, or the industry must be abandoned, which is the implication of the philosophy expressed above.

We contend that the standard of living of the American worker should be still further raised. We hope that it will be possible to further increase wages. We are entirely opposed to the philosophy expressed in the foregoing, but our opposition may be challenged as representing a selfish viewpoint.

It is gratifying, therefore, to find support in this opposition from a source which should carry a great deal of weight with most citizens of this country. With your permission, I would like to quote from an article in the New York Times of April 5, 1945, as follows:

"We have got to de-industrialize Germany and Japan—at least for a generation—so they won't go to war again. Also, we have got to see that those subsidized slave-labor countries do not again flood the world with their cheap products, lowering the standards of living of the United Nations."

This statement was not made by Mr. Herbert Hoover or Senator ROBERT TAFT, or anyone else who might be accused of a continuing bias toward protective tariff. Those are the words of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. Now, Mr. Baruch, as all of you know, is a logical and forthright man. The most casual reading of the above quotation would indicate that he does not favor the philosophy which would lead to the purchase of products wherever in the world they can be obtained at the cheapest price. Also that he does favor the protection of the wages and living standards of the American workman.

We think it a fair statement also that if Mr. Baruch thought that the simple replacement of an American earning power with a foreign earning power many times less would produce an increased world trade and result in a world peace, he would have said so.

It is easy to say that any certain industry should be abandoned, but it is not so easy when the results are contemplated. We have been speaking only of the vitrified china industry which represents only approximately one-third the number of workers of the entire pottery tableware industry. There are a number of other smaller industries, such as some major branches of the glass, textile, and watch industries, etc., which have been included in the category of inefficient industries because they require a tariff to protect the living standards of their workers.

If these industries are to be abandoned it would mean taking thousands of workers from the jobs with which they are familiar and which they have performed for years, to jobs entirely new to them. This is assuming that such transfer is realistically possible. It will mean the practical desertion of many small communities and the serious crippling of others.

With the announced goal of 60,000,000 jobs, and the recognized difficulty of producing them, the destruction of thousands of jobs does not seem the efficient way to start the program.

When we think of war we are inclined to think of guns, ammunition, tanks, planes, ships, and other heavy equipment. Armies must be fed and clothed, and otherwise outfitted. The vitrified china industry met, and met quickly, the sudden essential requirements of the Army and Navy for tableware for our armed forces. How they would have been equipped if the whole or principal source of china had been Europe or Asia is not a pleasant subject to contemplate. Also, if it were not for the protection of the potter's art and production facilities in the United States, we should not have had a powerful new war weapon fighting on our side: a nondetectable ceramic land mine developed by this industry and supplied in hundreds of thousands to our armed forces. Nor would we have had the skills and know-how to produce a new ceramic product to previously unheard of tolerances, steatite parts essential to the proper functioning of radar.

In a debate which involved tariff, and which enjoyed a very wide hearing in the United States, an opponent of protective tariff whether intentionally or unintentionally greatly exaggerated the actual amount of this tariff. In the case of decorated vitrified china on which the ad valorem rate is 70 percent and an additional 10 cents per dozen pieces it was represented to be 77 percent. The impression was also left that a foreign article which would sell in the United States at $1 if admitted free, would sell for $1.77 with the present tariff rate. This is far from true as will be seen from the illustration inserted below:

The price of a vitrified china (not bone china) service plate, made abroad, and selling to the American consumer at $30 per dozen is made up of the following factors:

American selling price per dozen	$30.00
Present retailer's ceiling mark-up, 75 percent	12.86
Price charged retailer by importer	17.14
Importer's mark-up, 25 percent	3.43
Landed cost to importer	13.71
Foreign transportation, ocean transportation, consular and other fees	2.25
Cost after tariff	11.46
Per dozen rate	.10
	11.36
70 percent ad valorem	4.68
Selling price f. o. b. foreign factory	6.68

Total tariff $4.78 per dozen or 15.9 percent of price to consumer.

Total tariff plus 25 percent importer's mark-up plus 75 percent retailer's mark-up $10.45 per dozen or 34.8 percent of price to consumer.

NOTE.—We are informed that the importer's mark-up and, cost of transportation, etc., are most conservative.

Retailer's ceiling on mark-up has just been set by the OPA at 75 percent. It may be assured that it has been higher.

The ad valorem rate is of course assessed on the foreign, not the American value. It will be noted that the actual duty on the service plate which is used as an example in the illustration is $4.78 per dozen, which is less than 16 percent of the price to the American consumer.

Referring now to the provision in H. R. 2652 providing that rates may be cut 50 percent below the rates existing on January 1, 1945, a statement has been made in this hearing that under the present bill 42 percent of importations in value have already been cut 50 percent. It has been further stated that the greatest advantage to the United States and the greatest trading benefit will be gained from further cuts on those items which have already been cut 50 percent. It has also been stated that no industry has been seriously injured by the cuts which have already been made.

We are not familiar with the situation as to all other industries. We will agree that the vitrified china industry has not been seriously injured as yet, but for a very obvious reason. The trade agreement providing the reduction in the rate on bone china was effected in 1939. All of Europe was either at war or preparing for war. Japan was at war with China. Early in 1940 the United States started preparations for war on a large scale. The vitrified china industry was called upon for immense quantities of china tableware for the Army and Navy, and the civilian requirements for this product were also vastly increased. Production in all industries was largely stepped up. Some of the vitrified china factories found their existing equipment insufficient to take care of the sharply increased demand for chinaware and found it necessary to greatly enlarge their plants. It is not difficult to understand that in such a situation there should be no serious injury to the vitrified china industry. The reason of course was the war, and the war alone.

However, it is rather naive to assume that because no serious injury was caused under war conditions an additional cut of 50 percent will cause no injury under peacetime conditions. It does not seem to us the part of good business to give authority to make further cuts in th tariff when the conditions have been such that we have been absolutely unable to learn what the effect of the present cuts would be in normal peacetimes.

Reverting for a moment to the philosophy as to inefficient industries as defined, and their possible abandonment in this country under this theory, we are confronted with the plight of our returning veterans. From the information at hand it would appear that the vitrified-china industry has furnished approximately 2,000 men to the Armed Services. They have been promised their old jobs when they return, and, of course, this means their old jobs at wages not less than when they went away. If serious cuts are made in the tariff rates, the industry will not be able to furnish those jobs at the wages in existence when the men went away, if at all.

We are also impressed with the problem which arises in the State of North Carolina. Right now its department of conservation and development is making strenuous efforts to build up a pottery industry in that State. Faced with the prospects of cheap labor competition from first English, then continental European, and then Oriental wage scales, there is no likelihood of this part of this State's economic gains being achieved unless their labor standards are adequately protected against 26-cent British, 12-cent Czechoslovakian and German, and 7-cent Oriental competition. The figures mentioned are, of course, average hourly rates in pottery industries of the countries mentioned, and compare with an average hourly rate of 85 cents per hour in the American pottery industry, this being the rate reported by the United States Tariff Commission in its 1944 report, page 39.

The opinion has been voiced at this hearing that practically all protective tariff advocates desire exclusion of competing products. While we do not know all protective tariff advocates, yet we have failed to see any widespread confirmation of this statement. The creed of this industry is comparatively simple in this respect. The profits never were large nor can they ever be large. All we want is a tariff to cover the difference in the labor costs so that the workers in this industry in

the United States may maintain and enhance their standards of living.

If foreign goods are landed at a cost no less than it costs to produce similar American goods, then if the American manufacturers cannot secure a sufficient proportion of the business to keep them operating at a profit they deserve to go down.

For reasons which must be obvious the argument for the reciprocal trade agreements as instruments of peace leaves this industry rather unimpressed. The past record is of course unconvincing and we would inquire with whom these agreements would be effective as instruments of peace.

It is inconceivable that any of our allies would go to war with us because we would not continually and progressively reduce our tariffs and thus lower the American living standards toward the standards of European and Asiatic nations. There remain, then, Germany and Japan. Are we to tell them that in order to avoid another war 20 years hence we will purchase from them vastly increased quantities of manufactured goods, of the same type that we manufacture in this country, but manufactured in Germany and Japan at low wages, at the expense of the labor of Americans? Even if we did so, we believe that it will be agreed that we could not rely on their keeping their part of the bargain.

It is to be regretted that there is a tendency to give less consideration to small industries, simply because they are small. It is also to be regretted that the degree of mechanization in an industry is taken in too large an extent as a measure of its efficiency.

Some industries can never be completely mechanized, and the vitrified china industry is one of them. Machines are rapidly coming into use in this industry in operations which can be mechanized. There are, however, certain skills of handicraft, certain arts which can never be replaced by machinery. To reduce the opportuznity of these artists and craftsmen to use their art, or to deny it to them altogether, and to purchase such artistry and such craftsmanship abroad because it can be furnished much more cheaply abroad, would provide an insignificant volume of world trade. The suffering and unhappiness produced by the dislocation in part or in whole of such craftsmanship would not be justified.

In china dinnerware, the reciprocal trade agreements have thus far largely affected only English bone china imports. That this is the case is due to the war, but in spite of the war and its disruption to civilian goods production in Great Britain, British exports of bone china dinnerware to the United States have been about four times as great in units in the years 1941–43 as the British exports of the same commodity to the United States in 1935–36 prior to the existence of the reciprocal-trade agreements with Great Britain.

That English bone china exports to the United States could increase so greatly despite the obstacles in civilian goods production which have existed during the war in England suggests that present tariff rates on bone china can be expected in a more normal peacetime period to produce a vastly greater increase in British exports here than the increase thus far experienced. This would seem to be certain under the present tariff rates not to mention any different or lower rates.

The preferential treatment of bone china has been based upon two misconceptions, and the need for its elimination seems clear. The first one is that bone china is noncompetitive because it contains bone. It is a very far-fetched conclusion that the competitive or noncompetitive character of an article can be determined by its raw material composition. The whole economy is filled with the most directly and keenly competitive articles and commodities of entirely different composition in the fields of both raw material and manufactured goods. Of course, the question of the competitive or noncompetitive character of an article is not determined by its raw material composition, but rather by whom, how, and for what purpose it is used as well as how it is distributed, bought, and sold, and the personal preferences of the buyer.

An examination of bone china as to price range, as to channels of distribution, as to types of consumers, and as to ultimate use all indicate the highly competitive character of bone china in the United States market.

The second misconception upon which the preferential treatment for bone china was based was that the use of bone as a raw material in china was uniquely characteristic of British production and that bone was not used in the production of china elsewhere.

While this has been largely true in the past or in an historical sense, there is little reason to believe it can remain true. On the contrary, known facts indicate the opposite.

There is no mystery about the use of bone in producing china. Bone china has been produced in Japan, France, Germany, and the United States in addition to Great Britain. Its technique is relatively simple and is universally known throughout the pottery industry in all china-producing countries.

Over a period of time preferential treatment for china containing bone will serve less in providing a preferential position for British china manufacturers than it will to bring about a widespread production of china containing bone in all countries desiring to export to the United States rather than other and, incidentally, superior types of china.

Therefore, if the preferential treatment accorded bone china in the present tariff is intended to provide a preferential status for the British, it will plainly not serve this purpose over any considerable period of time and will merely have the effect of altering the raw material compostion in china produced in other countries in order to take advantage of the substantially lower rates for china which merely happens to contain bone in its composition.

We contend that there is no justification for the reduced rate on bone china and urge the restoration of the rates on certain items of earthenware and bone china, existing before the trade agreement which was concluded with the United Kingdom.

We also urge that the present most-favored-nation policy be made ineffective in the operation of reciprocal trade agreements.

Our present position on H. R. 2652 is as follows:

We respectfully suggest the following amendments:

A. Limit the authority to change rates to the degree now existing instead of the increased degree expressed in the bill.

B. Provide for congressional approval of all reciprocal trade agreements.

C. Limit the operation of the act to 1 year. The problems in post-war will admittedly be vastly different from those which have heretofore been encountered during the operation of the act. It would seem highly advisable for Congress to retain a high degree of control over the operation of the act, so that it could quickly make such changes in the act as might be justified by changing circumstances.

With these amendments included we would not oppose H. R. 2652. Without them, or others which would produce substantially the same effect, we do oppose the bill.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES K. LOVE,
Member of Foreign Trade Committee,
Vitrified China Industry.

Effect of Tariff Reductions on American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as this House further considers the very important question of lowering the tariff on goods from foreign shores, we must not overlook its effect upon the men who labor in America. This Congress by its own acts ha. passed laws that have placed labor in a position in the complex social structure of our American life that gives it many advantages it heretofore did not enjoy.

I should not want to be construed as disapproving what the Congress has done in this respect, but I am deeply concerned with what the Congress does with the tariff today, because what we do today with he tariff is closely interrelated with what the Congress has done with labor.

There are many throughout the land who hold to the principle that only by large turn-over of business between the countries can we maintain the standard of living in America. Let us not be misled with that principle or theory. To me this would seem a perfectly logical situation if all the countries to whom we sold goods or from whom we bought goods had a living standard comparable with ours.

We are all familiar with the fact that no other country in the world enjoys the position we enjoy. All other countries will be inspired in the postwar period to batter at the gates of America with their products on their backs, hoping to gain entrance to the greatest market in the world, and if they make this approach they will have due regard for the fact that price will be a consideration.

Their products will come from the hands of laborers whose wages are vastly lower than America's wages; and if by our acts in the Congress we make it possible for these men with their packs to enter our doors, there can be but one answer to the question—the lowering of the wages of the American worker. And by this process we challenge the traditions that have made this the great Nation that it is.

Truly, the combination of our labor plus the ingenuity of our industrialists, the enormous proportions of our plants and their high efficiency, was a very important factor in the winning of the war. Let us not be neglectful of the fact that we must move with caution in this direction. These great forces must not be destroyed by international minds who hope and think, perhaps honestly, in terms of establishing a better international relationship in the world. I, for one, hope for that day to come. But I am not willing that that day shall come if with its arrival comes a program which automatically reduces the living standards we have produced, both by law and by practice, in our own country to our laboring men.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial taken from the paper called Labor, issued under date of Saturday, May 19, 1945:

ANTILABOR JOKES COME HOME TO ROOST—RETURNING FIGHTERS DISCOVER PROPAGANDISTS LIED ABOUT WAGES PAID MEN AND WOMEN ON HOME FRONT

"Where are those big-salaried jobs we have heard so much about at the battle front?"

That's one of the difficult questions propounded by returning veterans, says J. R. Kinder, war manpower commissioner for Nebraska, in an interview printed in Lincoln newspapers.

These fighting men, according to Mr. Kinder, or at least many of them, believe that $100 a week has been the prevailing wage in this country, and that no particular skill is required to earn it.

Naturally, they would like to have some of those jobs and they are disappointed when they find that they are not available and that the workers who did the big job on the home front did not receive such compensation.

Actually, at this time, Government employment offices are finding it hard to place veterans in new jobs at 55 cents per hour and up.

"Their hopes built up high, due to circulation of harmful rumors and misstatements regarding wages paid at home, the returning servicemen are at first unwilling to accept the fact that wages are not fantastic, and they cannot realize that, in addition, the take-home pay is still further reduced by tax deductions of more than 20 percent," Mr. Kinder discloses.

The jokes of the past are now providing a problem that must be tackled and solved at once by the people at home.

Similar reports are coming from New York and other large centers.

Who circulated those costly jokes and why did they indulge in such dastardly propaganda? Of course, readers of Labor know the answer. The newspapers, the radio, and hard-boiled antiunion employers all over the land are responsible. They hoped to inflame the soldiers against the workers.

Fortunately, the returning soldiers are beginning to discover the truth. For once, the propagandists may become the victims of their own lies.

Office of War Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the Washington Daily News of May 22, 1945:

ABOLISH THE OWI

Congress should abolish the Office of War Information.

This agency had about $58,000,000 to spend in the current fiscal year. It was budgeted to spend fifty-four million in the year beginning July 1. President Truman asked Congress to cut that to forty-two million, saying that victory in Europe had ended the need for psychological warfare there. Congress should give OWI just enough money to liquidate itself in a hurry.

On May 1 OWI had 9,385 people on its pay roll—in this country, 4,023; elsewhere throughout the world, 1,661 sent from the United States and 3,701 hired abroad. Since then it has been recruiting.

Some OWI employees are able and well meaning. Many are crackpots, professional do-gooders, and persons making the most of a chance to spread, at public expense, strange propaganda which would surprise and displease the American people if they know all that goes on.

What OWI does in this country is mostly made work. It assembles and passes on to the press information from Government departments and bureaus, most of which are overstocked with press agents of their own. Having power to select the substance and shape the form of the information it transmits, the OWI is under constant temptation to be a censor.

It's unlikely that anyone outside OWI knows all its plans for operating abroad, but much that is known is bad. For instance, it wants to publish German-language newspapers and magazines in Germany. It wants to operate radio stations in occupied countries. Until President Truman and General Eisenhower called a halt, it even joined in a scheme to bar privately published American and British newspapers from occupied Germany.

The American people don't want Government owned and operated newspapers and radio stations in this country. They would distrust the information and opinion thus transmitted, justifiably suspecting it as propaganda. The Germans and Japs would recognize the OWI output as propaganda. They would conclude that our democracy plays the same game as their tyrannies. Much better let people in the occupied countries publish such newspapers and operate such radios as they can afford, at their own expense, under strict Allied military censorship and control.

At home or abroad, there is no good reason for continuing the OWI. Its usefulness, if any, has ended. Abolish it.

HOW OWI SPENDS IS COMING TO LIGHT

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Some of the things for which the Office of War Information is expending its current appropriation of $58,625,367 will be brought to light soon with the publication of House Appropriations Committee hearings on the war agencies bill.

Personnel is the big item with OWI. On April 30 they were employing 9,385. Of this number 4,023 were with OWI in the United States and 5,362 overseas. This "overseas" force consisted of 1,661 Americans and 3,701 foreigners, which OWI designates as "locals."

What this army of employees has done was a matter of considerable criticism before the Appropriations Committee. For OWI Director Elmer Davis is asking for $42,000,000 to keep the outfit going for another fiscal year.

HOW TO SAVE

Both Democrat and Republican Congressmen have been outspoken in favor of its abolition. Some have said that they know of no easier way to save $42,000,000 than to end OWI.

Representative ALBERT GORE (Democrat, Tennessee) and others who spent considerable time at the front (Mr. GORE as a soldier on special assignment) said they were unfamiliar with just what it was OWI was doing over in Europe.

One Congressman said that he had heard a good deal about OWI in London, but it mostly was trivial, about how some of its personnel were spending their time in cocktail lounges.

A sample of what he called "the lack of alertness" of OWI was related by Representative ROBERT GRANT (Republican, Indiana), who flew to Australia as a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

"We were in Sydney 2 days," Mr. GRANT said. "We had been greeted by the American consul, and our pictures with stories about our inspection trip had been in all of the Sydney papers. At last an OWI man showed up and began questioning us—first he had heard of it.

"I saw where Elmer Davis said that OWI must spoon feed the Germans with its plan for newspapers and magazines to be printed and distributed in United States occupied territory. In fact, he was quoted as saying, 'Germany is a sick man.' That is true. But OWI also is sick, and it isn't worth $42,000,000 to restore it to health. It never can recover.

STORY OF WASTE

"The whole history of the OWI has been a sad story of wasted funds. It is time to put a stop to it."

On the domestic front OWI's function is to funnel handouts from the myriad other Government agencies, making most of the original writers mad because of the poor rewrite job. They also function as a barrier between the press and public departments.

Jefferson Day Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, delivered in Wilmington, Del., May 21, 1945:

Mr. Toastmaster, my colleague and valued friend, Congressman TRAYNOR, distinguished and invited guests, ladies, and gentlemen, in a speech that I made several years ago I stated: "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny." The events of the past 13 years, and particularly the last 5 years, clearly establish that fact.

An economic depression that threatened to stagnate and paralyze our future, thereafter the danger that threatened us from abroad, and afterward our forced entry into this war all have happened during this period of time. What a place the events of this period will occupy in history. This period, and particularly the last several years, constitutes the most important, historic, and tragic period in the known history of man.

During this time we have seen the peoples of some countries, in their despair and defeatism, in their loss of faith and conscience, responding to the appeals of the demagogue and the false prophet, turn to the dictator and accept the totalitarian form of government.

In their despair they gave up every noble and uplifting principle and thing they possessed and which decent mankind believes in for what they were promised—economic security. And they received slavery through the establishment of the state supreme, with the resultant destruction of personal liberty and human dignity. We have seen them indoctrinated and molded individually and in mass fashion into nations of hate, determined upon the conquest of their smaller and weaker neighbors, and after that the conquest of the world.

Here, in America, with our democratic institutions of government, we also had serious problems confronting us which had

to be met and solved in the national interest. But, unlike Germany and other countries, in the dark days of our depression the faith and sound judgment of the American people remained undaunted, and our people, through the use and the power of the ballot, turned to leadership that had vision, that was constructive, that was noble and courageous. We turned to leadership that defeated the depression, that saw years ahead of others the danger approaching us from abroad, and prepared our country for defense. Yes; we turned to the leadership that saved our country and preserved democracy throughout the world.

That leadership was Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Democrat Party.

In 1933, the people of Germany abdicated everything that decent people hold near and dear and give their very life to preserve, and they turned to Hitler, the cruel dictator, the destroyer, the mass murderer.

In the same year, the people of the United States turned to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the great humanitarian, the builder, the preserver of a decent way of life, the man of destiny.

During our lifetime we have seen these two men clash. Franklin D. Roosevelt standing for love of neighbor, for decency, for constructive progress. The other standing for hate, for persecution and death, for world conquest and destruction. And, thank God, under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt the forces of decency and progress have won.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is America's contribution of this era to the great men of all time.

It was through the Democratic Party, supported by independent Republicans and independent voters, that Franklin D. Roosevelt became our President to give to our people and to the world the sound, positive, constructive, humane, dynamic leadership that even long before his death gave him his place in history as one of the outstanding figures of all time.

In 1789, the immortal George Washington was inaugurated for his first term as President of the United States. His leadership and his contributions properly place him for all time as the Father of Our Country.

In 1861, 72 years later, the immortal Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated for his first term as the President of the United States. His leadership and his contributions properly place him for all time as the savior of our country.

In 1933, 72 years after Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated for his first term as the President of the United States. His leadership and his contributions will properly place him in history as the preserver of democracy throughout the world.

During his 12 years as President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his fight for the people, received and met bitter and uncompromising opposition. But his love of the common man, his vision, his constructive service, his courage, never became dimmed. He did not know the meaning or the feeling of fear in his fight for the cause of the people.

His love for the common people, the average American, for mankind in general, was intense. And the people knew it. The common man and woman of America, the backbone of our country, in turn loved Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it was they, in the main, that gave him the support which elected him for four consecutive times, and enabled our late President to give to us and to the world the noble character of service that is now a part of the heritage of America.

We can always point with pride that he and the Democratic Party gave our people the positive leadership that was needed from 1933 on, and which was denied them from 1929 to March of 1933, the kind of leadership necessary to meet the trying problems of the past 12 years.

Franklin D. Roosevelt used the powers and the machinery of our democratic institutions to bring about the passage of legislation necessary for the common welfare of our people, supported by the Democratic Party in the Congress, and he did this in the democratic way. In 1933, when he assumed his great office, our people were in despair; business and industry were stagnated, want and suffering existed throughout the land. Fear existed in all sections of our country. He inherited that state of American society and Government from his Republican predecessor. Upon his death, he left us virile, strong, confident, victorious in defeating the vicious depression, and victorious in defeating the cruel and powerful enemies of this war.

The internal improvements he brought about, his fight for the economic freedom of our people, his great progressive and reform measures, all of a stimulating and strengthening nature to our people and to our country, will always remain.

No future President or political party would dare attempt to repeal the beneficial laws brought about by the Democratic Party under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. No such President or political party would dare attempt this and expect to be successful at the polls for many succeeding national elections. A future President or political party might try to strengthen the laws he recommended, or to adjust them to future conditions as experience may require, but no President or political party placed in control of our Government would dare try to repeal any of his great measures which were necessary to preserve our basic political rights by bringing economic freedom and security to our people.

Yes, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt the depression was defeated. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt our institutions o Government were strengthened, faith and confidence restored. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt, and against great odds and bitter opposition, our country was prepared. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt, the plans were laid and carried out that defeated Hitler and Nazi Germany, and it will be under those same plans, the plans of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the defeat and unconditional surrender of cruel and imperialistic Japan will be brought about.

But, that is not all.

While giving to us the leadership necessary to win the war * * * Franklin D. Roosevelt was also giving us the leadership to win the peace.

God in His infinite wisdom has acted, but the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt is with us today. It will always live as long as human beings exist. His name and memory is and will always be enshrined for all time in the hearts and minds of decent men and women everywhere.

It was my pleasure and honor as majority leader of the National House of Representatives to be in close touch with the late President for the past 5 years. I can see him now, his indomitable will and courage, in the dark days of the year and more following the dastardly Jap attack on Pearl Harbor. Even shortly after our forced entry into this war, with the first task of winning the war confronting him, I can see him now as he was then looking ahead, confident of ultimate victory, and laying the plans for an enduring peace.

When the sudden attack came that took him from us, with the knowledge that Nazi Germany was defeated, and that meant that Japan alone could not win the war, he was giving primary consideration to planning an enduring peace. On a number of occasions I have heard him say "that man was created by God for peace—not war. It is the greed and selfishness of human beings and nations that produce wars. It is regrettable, but it is a fact, that we must also fight to bring about peace."

How often in our talks did he mention the efforts of another great democrat and American—Woodrow Wilson—to bring about world peace 25 years ago. How often did he mention and show his determination (as well as his prayers and hopes) that this would be the last war, that based upon the national interest of each nation, large or small, they should recognize that the world could not withstand another global conflict 25 or 30 or more years from now, and that the national interest of each and all nations (as well as the best interests of each individual) calls for peace and not war.

He recognized also the difficulties of the task, but he also recognized the necessity of its accomplishment. At the time of his death he was devoting all of his efforts to bring about an enduring peace.

He recognized that a sound and lasting peace had to be based on equity and justice among nations, and that the origin of such a peace was to be found in the moral law, the law of God.

Yes; he recognized to obtain this great goal that reasoning and decent mankind have dreamed of and strived for for countless generations, that in order to control the lust, and hate, and other baser and selfish influences that produce wars, that we had to be realistic in our approach, that all nations had to cooperate in this effort with the willingness to make such proper contributions to this end, and that our country should take its place as a leader among the nations of the world in a cooperative effort or movement to bring about an enduring peace by the outlawing of war.

He knew, based upon the experiences of the past, and particularly of the last war, and this war, that mankind was traveling the road of war and the only way to travel the road of peace was to take the necessary measures to prevent future wars. He knew that unless something was done that another global war more destructive than this one was just a matter of time. The world now remembers that it is only 25 years ago that Woodrow Wilson foresaw and predicted this war unless some steps were taken then to establish international order for peace.

If there is one thing we should learn from this and the last war, it is that if we let things go on after this war as they have been, that a war between two nations even in some remote spot of the earth means that the whole world—all nations—would eventually become drawn into war.

President Roosevelt knew that a challenge to liberty and human freedom anywhere was a challenge to liberty and human freedom everywhere, and that positive action had to be taken to prevent another conflict far more destructive than this one, from occurring again.

It was that great goal he was fighting for at the time of his death—enduring peace for mankind.

While he is not with us in person; while his great leadership is denied us, the influence of Franklin D. Roosevelt exists and leads us in our determination for ultimate victory over our remaining foe, and in our efforts for an enduring peace.

Yes; his spirit is present at the San Francisco Conference; it will always be present as a potent influence for good. It is our duty, it is to our interest, to carry on his work to a successful conclusion. We must and will do our part, but all other nations, large and small, must also do their part.

God having willed as He did on April 12, in accordance with our Constitution, shortly after the death of President Roosevelt, the then Vice President, Harry S. Truman, took

the oath and the office of the President of the United States.

In the tact and judgment that President Truman has shown we can all take a strong sense of faith and pride in democratic institutions as they exist in the United States. This is the first time that our country has experienced a change in the Presidency during a war, and with grave problems of such weight and scope as have ever been transferred by one man to another so suddenly and in such a critical time.

President Truman assumed his office and responsibilities with inspiring courage and confidence. Realizing his trying position of suddenly and unexpectedly becoming President after the death of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, the people of the country have closed in their ranks behind him. President Truman will give to our people the best type of leadership possible in the trying days ahead. He will fearlessly carry on the effort that Franklin D. Roosevelt finally gave up his life to achieve, future permanent peace.

While this dinner is political in character, being a postponed victory dinner, it is fitting that it should become a memorial occasion to honor the memory of our great leader.

In 1932, the people turned to Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party for the leadership they needed at that time. Again, in 1936, in 1940 and in 1944, they did the same thing. In the most important and tragic period of the known history of man, when if our country did not have the right kind of leadership we would not only lose a war but lose our country. The Democratic Party under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt have kept the faith with the American people.

With our record of achievements we can approach future national elections confident of victory.

As Democrats, we can feel proud, and as Americans, we can thank God, that in this trying period of our country's history we had as our President and our Commander-in-chief, he, who only a few weeks ago was with us, but who has now taken his place in history as one of the greatest of the constructive figures of all time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Return to Standard Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution for the purpose of returning the country to standard time.

The so-called war time was adopted by the act of January 20, 1942—United States Code, 1940, supplement IV, title 15, section 261. Section 2 of this act provides as follows:

> This act shall cease to be in effect 6 months after the termination of the present war or at such earlier date as the Congress shall by concurrent resolution designate.

This concurrent resolution would fix such earlier date as the date on which this resolution shall be adopted by the House and Senate. This proposed legislation is identical with a Senate concurrent resolution introduced by Senators WILSON and HICKENLOOPER of Iowa. The House resolution is introduced at the direction of all the Members from Iowa: BEN F. JENSEN, KARL M. LECOMPTE, THOMAS E. MARTIN, HENRY O. TALLE, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, CHARLES B. HOEVEN, and JAMES I. DOLLIVER.

The winning of the war against Germany has been followed by modifications of certain wartime controls. For instance, the curfew regulations, the ban against horse racing, and the brownout have been eliminated. It has been decided that the reasons for these regulations no longer exist. With equal propriety it can be said that the reason for war time no longer exists.

It is now evident that one of the great problems still unsolved relates to the production of food. Every encouragement should be given the farmers of the country to enable them to produce the necessary food which we shall so badly need. It is generally conceded that artificial time rather than sun time is a great detriment in the agricultural sections of the country.

It is my hope that immediate consideration be given to this resolution.

The Rise of the Goober

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the careful reading of the House membership, an article by Art Brown in the Nation's Business for April 1945. It is entitled "The Rise of the Goober." The article is ably written and it gives not only a picture of the importance of the peanut crop today, but it points out the danger of indiscriminate competition from foreign oils in the postwar period. This is a matter we cannot afford to overlook at a time when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is under consideration.

THE RISE OF THE GOOBER

(By Art Brown)

Peanuts have come into their own. For many years, peanuts have been associated with the inconsequential. Even in the dictionary, one definition for the word "peanut" is "small, petty."

But the peanut has outgrown that category.

Peanuts today represent big money. The war has been largely responsible. After victory, the peanut industry—along with our other newly developed vegetable oil industries—may face a serious nose dive.

Curtailment of vegetable oil imports (coconut oil from the Philippines, palm oil from the Dutch East Indies, olive oil from the Mediterranean area) greatly expanded the market for peanut oil—as well as for soybean oil, corn oil, and cottonseed oil.

At the same time, shortages of certain foods and of certain ingredients used in candy and bakery goods created an unprecedented demand for peanuts and peanut products.

The peanut growers rose to the occasion, practically doubled their output, and more than quadrupled their income.

Goobers are now one of the South's major money crops.

Last year 2,177,670,000 pounds of peanuts were picked and threshed, according to the Department of Agriculture, as compared with 1,211,700,000 in 1939.

The 1944 harvest netted the growers $188,000,000 in cash as against $41,00,000 in 1939.

Add to the 1944 crop the value of the peanuts raised for seed, for home use and for hog feed—and the farmers' return was well over $220,000,000.

NEW USES

The peanut possesses wide possibilities. Its oil can be used to make soap, shaving cream, cosmetics—also such food products as mayonnaise, salad dressing, and margarine (though margarine's principal raw materials are soybean and cottonseed oil). The peanut is richer in vitamin B-complex than liver.

From the peanut can be made plastics, adhesives, dyes, and a new silklike fiber which can be used with wool or woven into cloth by itself.

Peanut flour is finding new uses, particularly in the confectionery field. Peanut butter is becoming increasingly popular (nearly a third of the 1943 crop went into peanut butter).

In recent experiments, the Hillman Clinic of Birmingham, found that persons suffering from undernourishment diseases respond favorably when peanut butter mixed with 25 percent yeast is added to their diet. Appetites improve, weight and strength increase.

Yeast-peanut butter, the clinic points out, contains more protein than steak, as much carbohydrate as potatoes, and half as much fat as butter.

Peanut meal is becoming more and more important as a high protein content feed for livestock.

Even the shells have value. Peanut shells serve as a linoleum base and as a substitute for cork in bottle-top liners. Peanut shells are used to clean carbon from aircraft engines, for making paperboard, floor sweeping compounds, insulating materials, and as a base for commercial fertilizers.

POSTWAR OUTLOOK

What will the peanut industry be up against when peace comes? In some respects, the outlook is none too bright:

1. Demand for peanuts for war uses will end.

2. Other foods, for which peanuts have been pinch-hitting, will again be plentiful.

3. Imported vegetable oils will again be available, and at least some of the manufacturers, who have been using peanut oil as a substitute, want to switch back to coconut oil. "Coconut oil is an ideal sudsmaker," some of the soapmakers say, "and cheaper."

Some of the baking companies and salters now using peanut oil as an alternative material want to return to coconut oil.

"For making fillers for cookies and icings for cakes, coconut oil is satisfactory—and is cheaper."

4. The peanut will doubtless have a new competitor after the war in the babassu palm nut.

About 13,000,000,000 babassu palms grow wild in Brazil. Each tree bears two to four bunches of 200 to 600 nuts twice a year.

The babassu nut is as large as a lemon, contains two to six kernels—and, by weight, the kernels are two-thirds oil. The oil has a pleasant taste, is a substitute for olive oil, lard, and coconut oil. It can be made into soap varnish, artificial silk, can be used as a lubricant, and can even serve as a fuel for internal combustion engines.

5. In addition to facing new and renewed competition from foreign oils after the war, the peanut industry will be up against domestic cottonseed, soybean, and corn oils, all

of which are similar enough chemically to be strong contenders for the same markets—and all of whose markets have expanded during the war, for the same reasons the peanut industry's markets have expanded.

But the peanut industry is not planning to crawl back into its shell. To hold its present gains, develop new and better products, and to win new markets, the National Peanut Council expects to raise and spend $300,000 a year for the next three years on research, advertising, and promotion.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Biggest stumbling block, of course, will be foreign competition. Business men in general feel that, if the peanut industry is to be preserved at anywhere near its present size—if any of our newly developed vegetable oil industries are to be preserved, for that matter—adequate protection must be had against cheap oils from abroad.

The National Chamber of Commerce is on record as favoring reasonable tariff protection for any branch of agriculture which is of benefit to any considerable section of the country and which is subject to destructive foreign competition.

How worth while is it to try to keep the peanut industry from slumping after the war?

Compared with agriculture's total annual income (it was $22,700,000,000 in 1943, latest year for which complete figures are available) the millions of dollars which the South receives for its peanuts may not seem very important.

But the buying power which these millions represent is vitally important to the southern farmers who otherwise might have little or no cash. And it is important to the rest of the country.

If the peanut growers and distributors in Hugo, Okla., Thomasville, Ga., and Suffolk, Va., have millions to spend postwar, those millions will create jobs for the automobile worker in Detroit, the clothing maker in Rochester, the paint maker in Pittsburgh.

The southern farmers with money to spend will buy washing machines, refrigerators, bathtubs, and plumbing fixtures—all of which require steel to build. They will buy farm machinery, farm tools, and household furnishings—all of which require machine tools to manufacture.

All down the line and back again, the farmers' buying power will help build other buying power—all of which will help keep industrial America busy. The sheller, crusher, salter, candy maker, warehouseman, manufacturer of peanut products, distributor, retailer, each will earn his share of profit on the peanut crop, and each will buy more industrial goods. As a result, the industrial worker himself will have more employment and will, in turn, become a better customer for both industrial products and farm goods.

The time is past, of course, when America can afford to be isolationist. But while we are accepting our responsibilities overseas, we cannot afford to overlook our opportunities at home to bolster our own markets for our own products, to keep productive our farm acreage which otherwise might remain idle or be devoted to crops already in excess supply—and to step up our standards of living.

Within the 48 States, opportunities exist for a volume of trade among the different sections of America which most nations can equal only through international trade. The sole hitch is that the various sections of our country must be able to develop their resources so that they will have the wherewithal with which to buy.

The peanut industry—and our other recently developed vegetable oil industries—have brought new wealth and buying power to the southern farmer. If these industries can be prevented from taking a postwar nose dive, our whole economy will benefit.

Sgt. James P. Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware:

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution commemorating the distinguished and courageous services of Sgt. James P. Connor rendered at Cape Cavalaire, southern France, on D-day, August 15 A. D. 1944, in World War II.

Whereas it appears by the announcement of the War Department released March 12, 1945, that Sgt. James P. Connor, of Wilmington, Del., made a forced landing on D-day, August 15 A. D. 1944, on Cape Cavalaire, southern France, with a battle patrol of 36 men selected from among the invasion-trained veterans of the Seventh Regiment of the Third Infantry Division; and

Whereas because of the mine-infested areas, machine-gun nests, artillery and mortar positions around Cape Cavalaire, rated high in its importance by the Germans for defensive purposes, the battle patrol of the American forces was soon cut to shreds and reduced by one-half of its men, including the platoon lieutenant, who was killed by a mine explosion while standing near Sergeant Connor who also sustained his first serious wound therefrom; and

Whereas Sergeant Connor, fully realizing the tremendous importance of the mission of his patrol, took over the leadership of the remnants thereof and through his indomitable fighting spirit and fearless disregard for his own life, though now having suffered his second serious injury by being shot through his left shoulder by a German sniper, continued to give orders and commands for attack, ever pressing forward, by striking down the continued resistance of an enemy overwhelmingly superior in number until Sergeant Connor was again shot in the knee by a German sniper, thereby sustaining another serious injury, this being his third wound; and

Whereas though seriously wounded and advised by his comrades, who now counted about a dozen in number, to seek cover and await medical attention, Sergeant Connor nevertheless again gave orders for flanking attacks and, while shouting words of encouragement to his comrades, said, "They can hit me, but they can't stop me." His comrades, though now reduced to nine in number and thus imbued with the fighting inspiration of this fearless son of Delaware, went on to complete the successful mission of a most dangerous undertaking in total disregard of their own lives and bringing back with them 40 German prisoners; and

Whereas as the result of the successful completion of this very important mission, Sergeant Connor has been honored by his country and has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award that can be bestowed upon an American fighting man and probably the second time that this award has been made to a Delaware soldier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein):

SEC. 1. That public acknowledgment be made by the citizens of Delaware and grateful appreciation be expressed at some future time to be fixed and arranged by the commission hereinafter authorized commemorative of the distinguished and honorable services of a son of Delaware, whose heritage and fighting words, "They can hit me, but they can't stop me," flung at his enemy after having been wounded three times while on one mission, are an inspiration to this and future generations.

SEC. 2. That the Governor be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a commission to be known as the Sergeant James P. Connor Commission, composed of three members and of which the Governor shall be a member ex officio, to commemorate in a fitting way the memorable services which Sgt. James P. Connor rendered to his country and his country's allies at Cape Cavalaire, southern France, August 15 A. D. 1944 in World War II.

What Our Church Teaches About Christian Marriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter from the Honorable William B. Oliver, former Congressman from Alabama and one-time chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. The letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 21, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: On Mother's Day I had the good fortune to hear a very timely sermon, delivered by the Reverend Robert E. Sherrill, pastor of the Washington Heights Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on the subject, What Our Church Teaches About Christian Marriage.

I am enclosing a typewritten copy of this sermon, which I requested of the pastor, with a view of asking some Member from our State to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a sermon full of deep thoughts, well stated, and I am sure will be appreciated by the citizens of our State as well as other States, who recognize how important the family life, such as our forefathers, always practiced and recommended to others, has meant to America. If after reading the sermon you feel that my evaluation of it is not overstated, I hope you will request permission to insert it in the RECORD.

May I say in this connection that a copy of it will be sent by me to the pastor of every church in Alabama, and a copy will also be sent to every member of the United States Supreme Court.

I feel that it may yet be the basis of an appeal to the members of the Supreme Court and lead to a reversal of the opinion rendered in the case of *Williams* v. *North Carolina*, reported in volume 317, United States Supreme Court Reports, page 287, and in which opinion Associate Justice Black from Alabama concurred, overruling the case of *Haddock* v. *Haddock*, which overruled case, in my opinion, stated the law correctly.

Remembering that many of the dissenting opinions of Justice Holmes have since become majority opinions of the Supreme Court, I am led to hope that the two dissenting opinions in the case of *Williams* v. *North Carolina* by Associate Justices Jackson and Murphy

will, in the near future, become the majority opinion of the Supreme Court. Certainly the two dissenting opinions, in the opinion of many members of the bar as well as many citizens, acquainted with what has made America great, should be the unanimous decision of our highest Court.

This letter is hastily written, since I am on my way to catch the train for home, and I will appreciate your writing me what action you have taken on this request.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Sincerely your friend,

WILLIAM B. OLIVER.

(Enclosure)

WHAT OUR CHURCH TEACHES ABOUT CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE

During this past week we have witnessed the official proclamation of victory in Europe. As our President so aptly phrased it, "By God's guidance and help" we have been able to overcome the demonic forces set loose by the ruthless dictators of that land. We are humbly but justly proud of the splendid courage and supreme sacrifice revealed by those in the armed forces of our Nation.

Yet I wonder if we on the home front have ever had the wisdom and the courage to face the fact that there is a white flag flying in our midst—the flag of a shameful surrender. It is the emblem of our misfortunate marriages and broken homes. This flag has been moving forward to a perilous position at the front of our civilization with each passing year. We do not have to speculate on the matter—the records tell us the facts. There were some 31,000 divorces in America during the year 1889 and over 246,000 in 1940. Even this is a prewar record and the total is much higher today. The 1944 record of a neighboring city and county shows 9,981 marriages and 3,637 applications for divorce—over one-third as many applications for divorces as there were marriages. This is not the record of Reno, it is the ordinary city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

Perhaps instead of taking this one day to pay sentimental lip service to our mothers—for we owe them more devotion than we could pay in a lifetime—perhaps it would be better to try to regain our bearings on this all-important matter of stable Christian homes—for after all, isn't that the thing to which they gave their lives? Where did they learn the standards that kept them true? They gained them from the Christian church, whatever the denomination, for that was the accepted social custom of their day. To relearn the principles by which they lived, we must ask again, What does our church teach about Christian marriage?

For one thing, our church teaches that marriage is based on the sacred and not the secular. Certainly it is no secret that for the public in general, marriage has been reduced to that which is secular and that which is legal. This change has been brought about chiefly by our new sources of education. Education was formerly in the hands of the church and the public schools, but no longer. The church today makes scarcely any impression at all, and the public still demands that the schools shall limit their curriculum to the accepted academic studies. The result being that young people and most adults receive their real education from three other sources—the movies, the radio, and the press. All of these may be used for good or ill, but in the matter of training for marriage, the total results have been definitely detrimental.

Most of the movies have placed the marital standard at what the young people call "SA"—sex appeal. It is not revealed as one of the minor qualities along with others of equal importance but is played up as the major motive for all human affection. And do not think for one moment that young people can't comprehend the suggestive conversation that pretends to hide the trash—they get it, without a miss. The record along this line is quite amazing. Out of 133 pictures analyzed some time ago by a Catholic minister, there were found 107 major violations of sex morality and decency. One hundred and seven out of 133—quite a high percentage, isn't it? Thanks to this minister, Dr. Daniel S. Lord, the Catholic code of decency was adopted and has made vast improvements over a number of years. Needless to say, there is still a long way to go.

Nor is the general press and radio standard much higher. What are marital goals that glare out at us on nearly every page? Isn't it something like this—"She's lovely, she's engaged, she uses Pond's" (I must ask my wife if it was Pond's that got me). In other words, complexion is the goal for a happy marriage.

Then a beautiful symphony program will be interrupted with the amazing words: "Are you losing your man? Maybe your breath is blowing him away. Let us lead you to the rescue."

Humorous it may seem but that is just about the secular standard of our day. And the legal standard is not a great deal better. The major requirements are just a certain age limit and the price of the license. Some few States are at last beginning to consider the matter of health and physical fitness—but that is all.

In direct contrast to this, our church teaches that marriage is based on the sacred and not the secular. Do you recall the introduction to the marriage ceremony? "Dearly beloved, we are assembled here in the presence of God, to join this man and this woman in holy marriage; which is instituted of God, regulated by His commandments, blessed by our Lord Jesus Christ, and to be held in honor among all men."

Look at those words: Instituted of God. Marriage was begun and established by God. It is blessed with divine origin, filled with divine purpose, given to man as a divine heritage. It is nothing he created for himself, nothing for which he gambled to gain, nothing for which he has a right to use or misuse as he pleases. This is something holy, sacred, ordained of God—that is, if we accept these standards of the Christian church. I wonder if we have ever put it on its right level? A few have done so and their lives have shown the results. One of my friends was telling me some time ago of the event that took place on the night before his wedding. He and his bride to be went into the quietness of their home church, and there with their minister, partook of the sacrament of Holy Communion and rededicated their lives unto Him by whose providence they had been brought together. I would wager my life that their marriage will never be one of the three that goes on the rocks.

Instituted of God—and regulated by his commandments—our task is not finished after the vows have been made—it is only begun. Here is another great Christian commencement of which we spoke last week. It is our privilege and duty to know how God would have us order our lives. We are not on our own, we are under Him. Here are included our family devotions and personal prayers that keep us at our moral and spiritual best. With this we shall know that it is blessed by Christ and to be held in honor among all men. That which is Holy and sacred is always held in honor. Marriage is based on the sacred and not the secular.

Our church teaches also that marriage is maintained by self-sacrifice and not by self-satisfaction. We have been fed with such a heavy diet of self-expression and self-satisfaction in our day that we have become sick without knowing what ails us. It has been carried over into the concept of marriage as well. We must have that which satisfies our physical desires, our financial requirements, our social prestige, our pleasure concept. If any of these be frustrated in the least, we are ready to throw up our hands and use that very modern word that covers all—incompatible.

Well, marriage was never ordained to be merely a source of self-satisfaction. If we are so infatuated with ourselves, we should learn to "live alone and like it" (by the way, the woman who wrote that book betrayed her principles and got married). Hear a line from the constitution of our church which is the basis of this series of study: "Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife." How can there be mutual help unless there is mutual understanding and sacrifice, one toward another?

We do not have to theorize on the matter, we need only look at some lives to see the truth. One recalls the beautiful biography of Eve Curie, depicting the loving, sacrificial life of her parents in their long and arduous scientific search for the source of radium. Here was a blending of two lives in mutual helpfulness, dedicated to a high purpose. Their marriage was worthy the name. Nor do we have to search for it in the professional realms. Thousands of devoted couples throughout America, in the country, town, and city are dedicating themselves to the most worthy profession in life—the creation of a Christian home. But at the best, we still need some help in making the most of marriage.

We try to impress upon the young people of our day two important facts as they reach the age of serious friendships. One is not to proceed under the illusion that any one person will have all the qualities that we might desire—and certainly they will not have all the wisdom and experience that the long years have brought to our parents. It reminds us of the young married couple who were not quite adjusted to their new situation and while eating one night, the husband said very sourly, "You certainly can't make bread like my mother"—to which the young wife replied tartly, "Is that so? Well, neither can you make dough like my dad."

We say, select those with whose total personality you are most likely to agree and take the little differences in your stride. Your differing qualities may well complement each other and give a far better balance to the atmosphere of a home than your own personality would give alone.

The second fact we stress is the knowledge that though scientific progress has given us many conveniences that make life easier, the very specialization of our modern age has often made marital relations far more difficult. In the days of our grandparents and before, much of the daily activity was shared in common by husband and wife. They both pushed back the frontier and shared in the perils and rewards alike. They both labored on the farms and shared in the making of the home. They both spent long hours with their children and created a unified family group. There was mutual help and sacrifice and understanding.

Today the husband is likely to have a highly specialized business in which the wife cannot hope to share—and which makes the problems of both the home and the office more difficult for the other to understand. We have even moved to the place of having our separate social and recreational activities—and even worse, we have shoved our children into a little world of their own and expected them to grow up as they will. Yes, we are proud of our modern achievements, but the present day world is a perilous place for marital happiness. We shall have to put forth all the more effort (not less) toward developing a spirit of mutual help and understanding and sacrifice. Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife.

Finally, our church teaches that marriage contains the element of that which is eternal and not merely that which is temporal. "This ring I give thee, in token and pledge,

of our constant faith and abiding love." What could be more permanent than that? A husband and wife who have lived together for long golden years do not begin to count the time and figure if they have given enough in faithfulness and love. They know that with the passing years there has developed a trust and love that no price could ever pay and that no peril could ever threaten.

This past week we viewed another one of those heart-rending pictures from the barbarism of Europe. It showed a large box filled with wedding rings that had been torn from the hands of the helpless victims of the concentration camps of Germany. There were none left to tell the story, but we can well imagine that even when the Gestapo had done its worst and had written the final page in death (which it always did)—even in the midst of this turmoil and terror, those beautiful words gave courage and consolation in the last hour—"In token and pledge of our constant faith and abiding love."

Our faith and our love begins with one another, and from there it moves to the family and the community, and from there to the State and Nation, and from there to its small but vital influence in the world. And our Christian faith does not stop there, for the deeds of lives become a part of His Kingdom—and "His Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and His dominion endureth throughout all generations."

That's what our church teaches: Marriage is ordained of God, for the mutual help of husband and wife, that by our constant faith and abiding love we may be builders and creators of His Kingdom here on earth and throughout all of eternity.

Action on Trade Pacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal, May 17:

ACTION ON TRADE PACTS

It is unfortunate that some Republican Congressmen are trying to make a party issue of our trade pacts. Historically, of course, the tariff was long a party issue. But there are many leading men in the Nation's business circles who realize the disaster the tariff acts of 1922 and 1930 brought. They now support the reciprocal trade arrangements.

Charles P. Taft of the State Department, a brother of Republican Senator TAFT, testified recently before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the proposed 3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements. The department wants increased bargaining power, that is, authority to reduce rates as much as 50 percent.

Mr. Taft pointed out that delay is making other countries uneasy about postwar trade. In Britain and France there are suggestions of putting all foreign trade under Government control. Such action would make it more difficult to trade with these countries and would result in pressure to put our own foreign commerce in the hands of Government.

Obviously this would be a movement away from private enterprise. Yet the danger of this development comes from those who object to granting larger bargain powers, although they are among those who would like to strengthen private enterprise.

It will be bad business if schemes for fancied party advantage lead the Republicans to demand a return to the old political trading, boodle tariffs. The reciprocal trade pacts are no final solution, but they have worked to our advantage. Trade has increased with those countries with which we have agreements. And the balance has been in our favor. Moreover, as Mr. Taft reminded the Congressmen who heckled him, he has always been a Republican, and reciprocity in foreign trade has been Republican doctrine.

OPA Subsidies Versus the Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JOHNSTON MANUFACTURING CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 21, 1945.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I present a few figures?

Men in armed services, 11,300,000.

Probable total through service, including replacements, at least, 15,000,000.

These men are mostly young and in 5 to 15 years their families should consist of father, mother, and three children, total five.

Servicemen and their dependents will be more than half the population, 75,000,000.

If it takes 25 years to pay the Federal debt, now approaching $300,000,000,000, for each food subsidy dollar, the interest will be $1.09 or $2.09, and the servicemen will have to pay for each dollar of subsidy, one-half of this, or, $1.05.

Or, if it takes 50 years to pay the Federal debt, for each food subsidy dollar, the interest will be $3.30 or $4.38, and the servicemen, for each dollar of subsidy, will have to pay one-half of this, or $2.19.

These servicemen whose lives have been in danger and who have given of their best years in the service of their country should not have to pay also for the food consumed by persons now living at home comfortably and safely during the war.

Food costs must include subsidies and interest. Food subsidies are therefore a scheme by which OPA is trying to get unmerited credit for holding prices while actually injuring everybody and building the Federal debt still further toward national bankruptcy. We should pay now for what we use and eat now.

Yours very truly,
JOHNSTON MANUFACTURING CO.,
W. E. JOHNSTON, *President.*

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the House's attention to the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Manitowoc, Wis.:

Whereas the Wisconsin Legislature has adopted a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to develop the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway immediately upon termination of the war; and

Whereas the city of Manitowoc, having the finest harbor on the Great Lakes, is vitally interested in having the St. Lawrence waterway completed as soon as possible so that our city will receive all the benefits of increased shipping from our harbor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and common council of the city of Manitowoc, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to do all within their power to expedite the passage of necessary legislation to complete the St. Lawrence waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressman from this district and to our United States Senators from the State of Wisconsin.

EMIL BENISHEK.
Introduced May 21, 1945.
Adopted May 21, 1945.
Approved May 22, 1945.
MARTIN GEORGENSON, *Mayor.*

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent privilege extended to me, I am happy to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. M. E. Siebert, master of the Oklahoma State Grange, directed to certain members of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, in respect to the bill now being considered for the extension of reciprocal trade agreements.

CHICKASHA, OKLA., *May 21, 1945.*

Hon. JED JOHNSON.
Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE.
Hon. LYLE H. BOREN.
Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM.
Hon. ROSS RIZLEY.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The Oklahoma State Grange is opposed to extending the Trade Agreements Act for a longer period than 1 year. We also oppose empowering the President to reduce rates to the extent of 50 percent. The rates have already been slashed 50 percent in the past.

I understand the Doughton bill (H. R. 2652) is about to be voted upon. We hope you will vote against the passing of this bill.

We see great danger ahead in postwar agricultural policies, in competitive products shipped to the United States from foreign countries.

Let's take a stand to protect America first.

Yours truly,
M. E. SIEBERT,
Master, Oklahoma State Grange.

Address of Walter Hoving at the American Design Awards Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, it is a real privilege for me to include in the RECORD the address of Mr. Walter Hoving on the occasion of the American design awards luncheon held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on April 19, 1945, and part of the proceedings, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WALTER HOVING

Ladies and gentlemen, we are glad to welcome you here today for the eighth annual American design awards. When the awards were inaugurated in 1937, their purpose was to stimulate American creative genius, and to encourage an ever-rising standard of civilian living. As you may recall, the first awards went to designers of clothes and textiles, household appliances, and similar consumer products which touch our daily lives.

When America went to war, our creative thinkers turned their hearts toward the achievement of victory. It was only fitting that the American design awards should pay tribute to them for their great work. What more significant creative work, after all, than that which keeps America secure.

As our forces move into Berlin and approach ever closer to Tokyo, such names as Eisenhower, Nimitz, and MacArthur are on everyone's lips. These men and the armies under their leadership are making and shaping world history.

But there are other armies not in uniform fighting battles as great as those at the front. These armies are the thousands of men of science who have focused the searchlight of research on every phase of the war effort. From industries, from universities, from laboratories in every section of the United States, these men were mobilized for the gigantic task of research required by global war.

In times of peace it takes years for a new scientific discovery to reach the public. After the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor, we could not wait that long. The very survival of our Nation depended upon speeding up the work of our laboratories. Good weapons were not enough. We needed weapons better than those of the enemy. And we needed them fast.

What took 15 years of preparation by the Germans, our scientists accomplished almost overnight. How they did it, no one will ever know; but what they did is evident wherever men are fighting. The doughboys in the foxholes, the wounded in the hospitals, the marines at their beachheads—they may not know the names of their silent partners, but they know their work. Ten million of them are relying every moment on the test tubes and microscopes of research. Our scientists have not let them down.

Mobilizing the scientific brains of a great Nation was as tremendous a task as assembling an army. An administrative body had to be established to coordinate the products of the laboratory with the needs of the Army and the Navy. This vital job was assigned by the President to the Office of Scientific Research and Development which serves as the general staff of our research scientists. The armies it marshaled included every kind of scientist—chemists, doctors, physicists, metallurgists, engineers. One great army fought the foe of illness and disease. Another devised weapons and counterweapons of war. A third tackled the development of wartime metals, foods, and clothing; a fourth gave us the best fighting airplanes in the world.

Today the American design awards are paying tribute to the leaders of these vast armies of scientists. These men wear no uniforms; they have no insignia; but they merit a salute from the whole world. When this Nation emerges from the ravages of war, it will have been our research men who implemented the hands of your sons; it is their knowledge, their foresight, their unselfish devotion which made American liberty secure. Their victories will go down in history. The Nation owes them a debt it can never repay. They will live forever among the immortals of science.

During the past few years, military secrecy has shrouded the laboratories of the Nation. This was imperative. Our enemies would have welcomed any crumbs from the American table of science. Even today, the safety of our own fighting men requires that we keep silent about our certain weapons. But there is much that can be told. It will be told, told over and over again like the stories of the early settlers, or the pioneers who forged new frontiers. These are stories we can only marvel at, stories that will take their place in the legends of America.

One might be called the saga of the wind tunnel. It would tell of a group of scientists who devised mammoth tunnels and filled them with air so that our planes might be tested within them. This spared our test pilots from risking their lives. We have demanded fantastic requirements from our airplanes. We needed planes capable of unbelievable speed, able to fly thousands of miles without refueling, at heights well in the stratosphere. For these new conditions of war, new planes and new plane parts had to be designed. Once designed, they had to be tested.

At the three laboratory centers of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, wind tunnels seem to grow from the ground. The information they provided the armed forces and the aircraft industries vastly improved the Liberators bombing Ploesti, the B–29's over Japan, the far-ranging Mustangs. Every one of our new fighters and bombers was hatched in a wind tunnel.

The first wind tunnel was only 5 feet in diameter. The biggest one now covers 8 acres at Moffett Field in California. It contains 24,000,000 cubic feet of air. In the high-altitude tunnels winds hurtle through at 500 miles an hour.

In its wind tunnels the committee is presently investigating jet-propelled planes which will fly up to 2,000 miles an hour. Just think, in such a plane you could leave New York at lunch time, have lunch in San Francisco, and be back in New York for an early-afternoon appointment.

Sounds like a tall story, but it's true. And so are the other stories. The one about penicillin, for example. Now everyone has heard of penicillin. Signs on all drug-store windows tell us we can buy all the penicillin we want, yet only a short time ago there was not enough penicillin to treat one single patient. Even before America entered the war, the Committee for Medical Research recognized the value of this little-known substance for saving the lives of our fighting men. They helped to organize penicillin production in America. This was no easy task. The extreme difficulties of producing it on a commercial basis at a low cost and in great quantities seemed an impossible task.

The impossible was accomplished by the committee in collaboration with the War Production Board and commercial firms. Laboratory research was intensified. New methods of production were explored. Today there is enough penicillin for our armed forces, for our allies, and for total civilian needs, besides. Thousands of soldiers and sailors are alive and well who would otherwise have been dead of wounds, infections, pneumonia, and gangrene. This is but one more instance of scientific research at war one more vivid illustration of science reaching to the heart of every American family.

The story of DDT follows the same pattern. From an obscure chemical, it became a necessity for waging war. If you're not sure what it is, ask the soldier in your family. He'll tell you that in the last war epidemics of typhus raged wherever lice-breeding conditions existed. He'll also tell you that none of his buddies have had typhus in this war. Why? Because tons and tons of DDT have been produced by laboratory-devised methods, and DDT kills lice. It also kills the flies, mosquitoes, and other insects which infest many of the regions where our men are fighting. It was discovered that one impregnation of this chemical keeps clothing free from insects for several months; that it can be sprayed by airplane over huge areas; that it was easy to handle in powder form. Typhus epidemics in north Africa and Naples were completely stamped out by spraying every man, woman, and child with DDT. Science again defeated one of the great killers of mankind.

The Committee for Medical Research has also helped develop other vaccines and insecticides which prevent such deadly diseases as malaria, yellow fever, influenza, and cholera. One of the most recent is a cream which men in the Tropics smear on their faces to keep the malaria-bearing insects away. All of these came straight from the laboratory and went to every corner of the globe.

These have been stories of our men of medicine. There are other stories to be told of other scientists who have wrought seeming miracles. The very materials from which our ships and guns and tanks are made were first produced in our laboratories. When aluminum ores were scarce, but the need for more airplanes became greater, the Metallurgical Division of the National Research Council went to work testing until it succeeded in making aluminum from clay and plentiful ores. When our supplies of tungsten, nickel, and other alloys were shut off by the Japs, the Council spent endless hours working out substitutes for these critical materials. When the use of new metals required new types of welding, the Council met the demands with electronic welding which is faster and better than previous methods. The Japanese and Germans used to sneer at our statements that we could produce an airplane an hour or a Victory ship in 5 days. They did not realize that thousands and thousands of scientists were engaged in intensive and painstaking laboratory research to make the best materials in the world in the fastest way possible.

Certainly the enemy cannot sneer now. They know that their cities were not captured by exaggerated statements. Their captors were men—men with superior materials and weapons—men who detected the enemy hundreds of miles off by radar equipment from the physics laboratories—men who withstood mud and rain because their clothing had been waterproofed with synthetic resins from the chemistry laboratories—men who built bridges at a moment's notice by techniques developed in engineering laboratories.

When the war is over and all the stories have been written one of the most incredible will concern the bombing of Japan. Did you know that more damage has been done to Tokyo than to Berlin? The explanation for this is provided by our research scientists. They designed an incendiary bomb and constructed it solely for the type of building in Japan. It had its origin in the laboratory. This chemical went to war and from it emerged the jelly with which our incendiary bombs are now filled. A combination of soap suds and gasoline, this jelly spurts in a

vicious stream of flame when the bomb hits the target. Our March 10 raid alone caused as much damage in Japan as the earthquake which struck in 1933.

When Germany began sending its inhuman buzz bombs over England, we were desperate for a way to combat them. No one knew whether an ammunition depot or a children's school would be the next target. Our early efforts succeeded in shooting down only 20 percent. Then the National Defense Research Committee went to work. Its radar division joined forces with its fire-control experts. Together they devised an instrument combining both radar and fire control which works like magic. In a split second this machine computes automatically the exact location of the buzz bomb—so our guns can knock it from the heavens. Formerly this whole operation had been left to guesswork, for by the time the location could have been computed mentally, the bomb would have accomplished its destructive purpose. As soon as this instrument was put into operation, 74 percent of the buzz bombs were destroyed. This is an instance where American scientific research went to work for us and for our allies.

There are many more such examples. The duck equally at home on land or water; the plastic films which keep our guns dry even though the men carrying them are neck high in water; the propellers which permit unbelievable airplane speeds; the shoe soles which outlast prewar leather 8 to 10 times; the new methods of chest surgery and brain operations; the shrinkproofing of all Army and Navy woolens; the transfusion of whole blood and blood plasma; the life jackets stuffed with a light, noncombustible material; the torpedoes which have smashed the Jap Navy to bits; the smoke generator veiling our movements from enemy eyes; the chemical sterilization of water saving our men from dysentery and other enteric diseases; the flame thrower by which many a Jap on Iwo and Okinawa met death at the hands of a marine who carried his own flame-making chemicals on his back; the advances in aviation medicine; the de-icing equipment for planes; the pressure treatment of burns; the rockets shooting from planes, tanks, and landing craft to take every Jap island on the long sea route to Tokyo.

Yes, and that is why victory is in the air today. And that is why we are paying tribute today to the scientists who brought victory within our grasp—without whom the war could not have been waged. When peace reigns again, and we turn our energies to rebuilding our great land, the work of these men will be reflected in all of the Nation's endeavors. As we enter the aerial age about which men have dreamed, the wartime findings of the aeronautical researchers will keep America first in the air. Our new knowledge of food, of clothing, of metal will give us products we cannot now imagine. The miracles of medicine will save millions of world citizens from disease and from death.

It is with a sense of humility that I introduce to you the leaders of our armies of scientists. We salute first the man who coordinated the laboratories of the Nation with the fighting fronts of the globe, the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, Dr. Vannevar Bush; the chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and the president of Harvard University who unfortunately is ill at Cambridge, Dr. James B. Conant; the chief of the field service of the National Defense Research Committee, Dr. Karl T. Compton; the chairman of the National Research Council, Dr. Ross G. Harrison; the chairman of the Committee for Medical Research, Dr. A. Newton Richards; the chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker.

And representing the scientists wearing the uniform of our country who are responsible for the steady and unbroken flow of those newly developed weapons and these products of civilian research to the fighting fronts, we are also glad to honor the Director of the Special Planning Division of the War Department and the Coordinator of Research and Development of the Navy Department—Maj. Gen. William F. Tompkins and Rear Adm. Julius A. Furer.

AWARD TO DR. FRANK B. JEWETT

In appreciation of the war work of the scientists of America, it is now my honor to present the American design award to their distinguished representative, Dr. Frank B. Jewett, president of the National Academy of Sciences.

In so doing we express the earnest prayer that after this war we will avoid the kind of normalcy that robbed our country in the past of its adequate preparedness and defense. It is, therefore, our hope that this award will be used to further and encourage the kind of scientific research which will keep our country strong and secure.

Dr. Jewett, it is with great pleasure I present through you to the National Academy of Sciences the American design award for 1945, and with it Lord & Taylor's check for $25,000.

AWARD TO UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR ROBERT P. PATTERSON

There has been no man in this war who has been closer and more helpful to the scientific world in carrying out these tremendous projects than the Under Secretary of War.

It is, therefore, extremely fitting that he be here on this occasion honoring the scientists of America. Ladies and gentlemen, the Under Secretary of War, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson.

Strange Tariff Arguments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here a very excellent editorial from the New York Times on the subject of the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

The editorial follows:

STRANGE TARIFF ARGUMENTS

The majority and minority reports of the House Ways and Means Committee on the proposal to extend and expand the Trade Agreements Act are likely to represent the highest level that the congressional debate on the subject will take. These reports are prepared by the House group that has studied the subject longest and most carefully. That group has had the benefit of prolonged hearings and expert assistance, and in this written report the majority and minority representatives may be assumed to have made a fuller and abler statement of their case than is likely to come out of the rough and tumble of debate on the floor.

The majority report in this case is an admirable document, well reasoned, well documented, containing a lucid statement of principles and detailed answers to objections. The minority report, unfortunately, lacks even the merits of clarity and internal consistency. Thus it is not possible to make out from this report exactly what the minority is willing to agree to. It seems to declare at one point unreservedly "in favor of a short extension of the original Trade Agreements Act." But prior to that it has listed seven amendments offered by the minority. It is obvious to anyone who considers their implication that these seven amendments, if adopted, would among them reduce the Trade Agreements Act to a dead letter, under which practically no further concessions whatever in tariff schedules could be made.

Again, the Republican members who signed this report object to being called economic isolationists. Yet they can hardly bring themselves to talk of imports without expressing the fear that we are going to "give away the American market," "become a dumping ground for the surplus products of the world," open "the floodgates to the products of countries whose standards of living are considerably below those prevailing in the United States," and so on.

The Republican Members insist that they "have no quarrel with the principle of reciprocity" in tariff reduction. They even quote President McKinley's statement in 1901 that "We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. * * * The period of exclusiveness has passed," etc. But the next moment they are saying: "There is no better way of promoting economic warfare than trying to dump our surpluses abroad and launching a campaign for a huge export trade in competition with other producing countries." They seem to forget that we should in any case be able to sell abroad only what the voluntary tariff reductions of other nations permitted us to sell abroad. But it is at least an advance of a sort when the minority Members recognize that to attack imports to this market logically obliges them also to attack American exports

Some of the arguments in the minority report will cause a few readers to hold their heads in incredulity—for example, the expressed fear that the proposed mutual reduction of tariffs and trade barriers will cause "the establishment of even greater and more powerful bureaucratic controls over the movement of men and goods."

Let us hope that the full Republican membership in Congress, when the extension and expansion of the Trade Agreements Act comes to a vote, will show more respect for logic and more practical wisdom than its representatives on the House Ways and Means Committee.

A Good Example for Government Bureaus To Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important item in today's newspapers, so far as the people of America are concerned, is a little story to the effect that President Truman will reduce the large number of attendants that have formerly been present at the White House. While he does not save the Government much money, only the salary of 20 unnecessary people, he does set a glorious example for the "Alice in Wonderland" boys who head the Government bureaus—some of them subhead them—and whose great aim in life is to enlarge their bureaus, hire people they don't need, make a big showing, and

charge it all up to the American taxpayer. That is the rule, and I have yet to find the exception in any Government bureau, department, independent agency (name the baby) in downtown Washington.

This is what the Times-Herald for today, May 25, 1945, has to say in part:

THRIFT IN THE WHITE HOUSE—TRUMANS TO DROP 20 SERVANTS AND LIVE IN SIMPLE MANNER—DO NOT REQUIRE MUCH HELP BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT USED TO IT AND CAN'T AFFORD IT

(By Ruth Montgomery)

In keeping with the Trumans' long habit of thrift—they did all their own housework until he became President—the First Family is paring down the White House staff of servants, it was learned yesteday.

Rumor has it that 20 servants, a number of whom have already departed, were "given notice."

The staff's salaries are paid by the Government, but the President must pay for their food from what he has left after income tax of his $75,000 yearly salary.

NOT MUCH SALARY

Reason for the economy move is easily explained by the fact that, after taxes, the President's salary is only $28,000 a year. From this, Roosevelt paid out $2,000 a month for food for his family and staff leaving a Presidential income of $4,000 a year for all other expenses.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the foregoing policy adopted by President Harry Truman is really significant. It might well be followed by some of the department heads who maintain a large retinue of employees, the most expensive limousines—this is plural—that they can buy, and otherwise conduct themselves like oriental potentates.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by Hon. Vincent D. Nicholson, Deputy Administrator and Associate Solicitor, Rural Electrification Administration, at the annual convention of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, San Antonio, Texas, January 17, 1945.

The address referred to follows:

The total energies of our Nation are now devoted to a war in which we seek to preserve for ourselves and our posterity the American way of life. There is no need for me to attempt to define this way of life. Each of us feels it within the marrow of his bones. This great convention is concerned with a new Nation-wide enterprise that represents American tradition at its best. I believe this for four outstanding reasons which constitute the four cornerstones of your program:

First. This program of yours embodies the incentive of free private enterprise.

Second. It has the strength that comes with the organized cooperative effort of individuals and groups.

Third. It utilizes the assistance of your Government, articulated through democratic processes, for the promotion of the general welfare of the country as a whole.

Fourth. It is correlated closely with prevailing and general public opinion.

In this solemn hour of our Nation's history, when every activity must be measured by its relation to the conduct and the purposes of the war, we need to think clearly and deeply of those things which constitute the American way of life. Let me repeat these four significant aspects of the rural electrification program because I want you to analyze them with me for a few minutes.

This program, with its 800 electric cooperatives owned by a million rural consumers, financed by their Government, rests upon four foundation stones: (1) Free private enterprise; (2) organized cooperative effort; (3) assistance of the Government; (4) the support of public opinion.

Free private enterprise has built this country of ours. In that time-worn phrase the word "free" is more important than the word "private." It connotes freedom for all. There are countries in the world where a few individuals or a few powerful groups enjoy great freedom in promoting their private interest. But in these countries the great mass of the people have little freedom in the exercise of initiative and the solution of their economic problems. Throughout the whole of our American economy where can you find a more perfect embodiment of the spirit of free enterprise than a rural electric cooperative?

When a consumer-member of one of your cooperatives drives to town along the lines of the cooperative system he can say to himself, "I own a part of that line." When he pays his light and power bill at the cooperative office he is not dealing at arm's length with another business interest controlled from a distant city. He is paying a rate which he helped to determine and a part of his payment goes to increase the value of his ownership. His enterprise, worth several hundred thousand dollars, is a local enterprise. Its poles are sunk in the soil from which he earns his living; its wires, in a literal and also a symbolic sense, knit together a grassroots community which is interdependent in its social structure and its business economy.

Such communities are the foundation of our civilization, cities are merely the superstructure. The superstructure is important but the foundation must be strong if our democracy is to endure in a world that is tottering because of the evil ambitions of a few at the expense of the many. Cooperatives have become big business but they are the people's business.

You may search the whole of American history and all our institutions of 1945 and you will find nothing which better represents the American tradition at its best. I have no desire to idealize these electric cooperatives of yours. They share this American tradition with countless other expressions. They are far from perfect in their achievement of their basic ideals. Every once in a while I find that a cooperative board or a cooperative manager actually made a mistake. Once in a while I find even that they admit it. But your enterprise can stand proudly before public opinion in any forum of any State and claim that your private interest is peculiarly consistent with the public interest.

Let us look, now, at the second of these foundation stones—the strength of organized cooperative effort. Cooperation was the keynote of the early settlers as they established the footholds of civilization along the Atlantic coast. The Pilgrim Fathers, the Quakers who lived the first winter in caves dug into the banks of the Delaware, the Colonists at Jamestown and in the Carolinas, had to cooperate in order to survive. In the great trek to the Mississippi Valley and later to the broad reaches of the West and Southwest, community activity paralleled individual enterprise. Road building, barn raisings, spinning bees, harvesting of crops, scores of other activities required the organized efforts of all to conquer and tame raw nature and a physical wilderness. Then, for generations, the farmer lost step with growing national prosperity partly because of his individualism and his failure to keep step with the practice of organization. The biggest economic problem of the farmer has been the simple fact that when he took his products to market he had to take the price that was offered and when he wanted to buy he had to pay the price that was charged.

Cooperative enterprise alone cannot solve this basic and enormously complicated problem. But cooperation is a sound step in equalizing the position of the farmer within the whole national economy. I know of no single chapter in American agricultural history which records so vividly the power of organized effort as this rural electrification program. Ten years ago 90 percent of all farmers had lighting facilities that were almost medieval. Despite our machine age, much of the power on a farm was the back-breaking, heart-rending labor of human muscle. Here and there, close to town, a farmer with electricity, at the cost of a nickel, could pump a thousand gallons of water. Further along the road most of his neighbors and his neighbors' wives and children had to pump it by hand and then carry it to house and barn.

These farmers couldn't get anyone else to help them so they organized and arranged to help themselves. The Government assistance in this program is often overplayed. When we in REA did our first thinking and planning nearly 10 years ago we thought of cooperatives and talked with cooperative leaders. But we had no concept, even in our dreaming, of this cooperative enterprise of yours as it has developed. The initiative was yours. Indiana created an electric cooperative law before we were created. Even in 1935 we were bombarded with loan applications from existing or prospective cooperatives beyond our available funds. That situation continued and grew during each succeeding year.

Rural electrification is often called a Government program. It is much better to call it your program. The several million farm people now served (including men, women and children), the many more millions awaiting service, have voiced an increasingly insistent demand. The organization of this demand has been in large part the task of the persons gathered here in this room. The disparity between urban and rural electrification became a national problem and the Federal Government stepped in, not to own or dominate but merely to render you the assistance which you needed and which was available only from the Government.

The principle of organization and the strength that comes with organization is being developed further each year. Many of the problems are State-wide and to an increasing degree many are national in scope. So you have developed your State-wide organizations of one kind and another. Your national association, like all other developments in the program, has come along in due course, in response to matured and clearly outlined needs. I have attended many important gatherings but your convention in

St. Louis 2 years ago was, for me, a rare example of inspiring enthusiasm linked with the qualities of determined purpose and conscious responsibility. A year ago at Chicago you were experiencing certain inevitable growing pains and your meeting was a triumph of true democracy and cooperation. This year I want to thank you for the privilege of sharing again the inspiration of this great assembly.

Representing REA, and the Department of Agriculture, I want to say just a few things concerning the part of the Government on this program. You will remember that this was the third of my four cornerstones. I have said that this has been your program; the farmers' program. Essentially that is true. It often happens, however, in a democracy like ours, that Government action is necessary to give voice to a great public demand that has been largely inarticulate; necessary to crystallize a program that can translate this demand into accomplishment. This is what happened when the Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive order under the Emergency Relief Act of 1935, then continued for a long time program by the act of 1936, and later given the important assistance of the Department of Agriculture.

The advancement of agriculture and the solution of many agricultural problems has always been considered as a function of the Federal Government. In George Washington's first annual address to Congress in 1790, he said:

"The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by all proper means will not, I trust, need recommendation. The welfare of our country is the great object to which our cares and efforts ought to be directed and I shall derive great satisfaction from a cooperation with you in the pleasing though arduous task of insuring to our fellow-citizens the blessings which they have a right to expect from a free, efficient, and equal government."

Six years later in Washington's final message to Congress he said:

"It will not be doubted that with reference to individual or national welfare agriculture is of primary importance. In proportion as nations advance in population and other circumstances of maturity this truth becomes more apparent and renders the cultivation of the soil more and more an object of public patronage. Institutions for promoting it grew up, supported by the public purse; and to what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety?"

The well-being of agriculture has always been regarded as implicit in the general welfare of the country. Washington's words seem prophetic as we now contemplate this rural electrification program. He spoke of the function of Government in insuring the equal distribution of blessings. One of the greatest gaps of inequality in the blessings of our present civilization is the gap between kerosene lamps and electric light; between hard, hand labor and the electric motor. When Washington spoke of agriculture and the public purse and asked the question, "To what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety?" be voiced a time-honored policy which now finds significant fruition in these loans for rural electrification.

It should be noted that I say "loans" not "grants." And let no one assume that you and I mean anything other than loans when I speak for the Government and you speak for the borrowers. As a lawyer, in 25 years of active practice, I have had dealings with many creditors and many debtors. Most people want and expect to pay their debts but I have never known any group of debtors who take their obligations more seriously than the boards of directors of your cooperatives.

Recently I read a publication of a chamber of commerce in this great State to the effect that the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration showed a deficit to the United States Treasury of about $7,000,000. That figure was arrived at by a number of calculations but essentially it represents appropriations for the administrative expenses of REA. I do not want to be critical of the chamber of commerce because it quoted a Government publication, but any such statement needs a lot of analysis. This REA program, in reality, shows black ink rather than red ink, even when our administrative expenses are included. The spread between the interest rate which you have paid and the actual cost of money to the Government has been much more than the amount of our administrative expenses. That will undoubtedly continue to be true even under your new 2-percent rate which Congress fixed last year. This program has not cost the American taxpayer a dime.

Furthermore, and more important than mere figures, is the fact that the fiscal risks of this program constitute an investment in the prosperity and general welfare, not only of the farmer but of the country as a whole. No country can be considered prosperous when there are wide gaps of inequality in the standards of living of great groups. Agencies of Government—Federal, State, and local—under sound policies of promoting the general welfare, have given the farmer and his family good roads, good education, and rural mail delivery. REA is merely lending him the funds with which he is securing for himself the modern necessity of electric light and power.

My fourth cornerstone is the support of public opinion. Many private institutions and programs need to blaze new trails ahead of established public opinion. Much less frequently is this true of Government programs. An outstanding attribute of rural electrification is the fact that it is no longer a voice crying in the wilderness. It is no longer experimental. Most of the voices of skepticism and defeatism have become silent. Town people and city people; the public press by and large; most of the voices which articulate public opinion, regard the completion of the task of rural electrification as one of the musts of our generation.

Your local cooperatives, in their efficient management, are doing a grand job in justifying and maintaining this favorable public opinion. Let us guard this asset. Let us conduct our relations with each other at a high level of mutual respect and tolerance, forgiving our mistakes in a spirit of devotion to a common cause. Let us demonstrate before public opinion a highly successful partnership of private enterprise and Government assistance, each party to this great adventure playing its proper part.

As your lawyer, I am proud of my clients. For nearly 10 years I have tried to protect and guide this program according to the highest standards of the legal profession which I love. We have won most of our legal battles because justice and right were on our side. In your appearances before courts and regulatory bodies, in your many other contacts with public officials, in all of your public relations you need not walk with hesitant or apologetic tread. Some of your members may appear in overalls, with good American soil on their boots, as has happened in some of the cases I have tried. These farmers, however, in their demand for the right to solve their own problems by their own efforts, are building on the home front that democracy for which their sons are fighting and dying on the far-flung battle fronts of the world.

Address of Karl Taylor Compton at the Eighth Annual American Design Awards Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, it is a real privilege for me to include in the RECORD the address of Dr. Karl Taylor Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made on the occasion of the eighth annual American design awards luncheon held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on April 19, 1945. Dr. Compton's address follows:

INTRODUCTION OF DR. KARL T. COMPTON

So that the organized effort of scientific research which has made victory possible will go forward in the years of peace, a new research board for national security has been established. Our last speaker has been appointed chairman of this board. His experience during this war fits him particularly well for this task. Ladies and gentlemen, the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Karl T. Compton.

ADDRESS BY DR. KARL T. COMPTON

Mr. Hoving, Judge Patterson, Dr. Jewett, ladies and gentlemen, to receive recognition for achievement is both gratifying and inspiring. It is doubly so when this achievement has been in a field of real concern to all good men and true, in the present instance to every citizen of our great country. We scientists, privileged to be present at today's ceremony, are only representatives of many thousands of scientists who have joined in the national effort to back up our splendid fighting forces in this total struggle to preserve the way of life we all hold dear.

Our scientists are serving in many places and capacities. Most of us are engaged in research and development to produce new and more potent weapons—devices which can reduce our battle casualties, protect from enemy action our cities or our ships, or which can multiply manyfold the striking power of our troops. Many of us have developed those new medicines and surgical methods which are saving the lives and restoring the effectiveness of tens of thousands of young men who would otherwise be lost through disease or battle casualty. Some of us have been concerned with better rations and more durable or comfortable clothing. Some hundreds of us are in the active theaters of war, assisting the armed forces to introduce the newest weapons. We serve, some as civilians and some in the armed forces. All of us are grateful for today's recognition of the contributions of scientists to America's success in this war.

But the really useful purpose of an award is not simply to please the recipient; it is to encourage him to even better efforts and to inspire others to do likewise. Hence, on an occasion like this, we should look forward, not back. What is the significance of science to our future national security, and what should we do about it? To high light the future against the past, let me remind you that this is Patriot's Day, commemorating the Battle of Lexington. Paul Revere rode 170 years ago last night.

"On the eighteenth of April in seventy-five,
Hardly a soul is now alive
Who remembers that famous day and year.

* * * * *

"You know the rest in the books you have read,
How the British regulars fired and fled,
How the farmers gave them ball for ball
From behind each fence and farmyard wall."

Those were days of primitive warfare. Now we have tanks, television, radar seeing, automatic fire control, smoke screens, flame throwers, battleships, amphibious vehicles, warfare under water and in the air, rocket missiles, and scores of other new weapons. The spirit today is the same as in 1775—patriotism, courage, determination, skill. But the techniques are very different: Advancing science makes more powerful devices possible, for war as well as for peace. If we are not to become an easy and inviting prey to the next well-prepared aggressor, we must be alert to be ourselves prepared to meet what may come. What this may be, who can tell? Pilotless aircraft? Automatically guided missiles? Disease germs? Super long-range bombardments with super explosives? Devices not now even envisaged? What can we do to keep such horrors from being unleashed, or to protect ourselves against them if they are?

In order that the United States may be safe, it must be just and cooperative in its international dealings, but it must also be strong internally. One aspect of this strength must be scientific preparedness so that we cannot be caught technically at a disadvantage. This is important as never before because no other nation would again attack us unless it were convinced that it could secure a speedy victory by superior technical methods. While scientific preparedness is only one aspect of national preparedness, it is an essential aspect. It could probably prevent future war; it could certainly save enormous loss if we should again be forced into war.

To this end the Secretaries of War and Navy have jointly brought about the formation of a Research Board for National Security, for the explicit purpose of insuring the future scientific preparedness of our country. It is a peacetime organization which starts out based on the effective partnership that has been established between the armed forces and the civilian scientists during this war. Its main body is composed of 20 high-ranking Army and Navy officers and 20 civilian scientists, engineers, and industrialists. It held its second meeting yesterday, and it is planning to go into full-scale operation when the emergency war organizations like OSRD disband. As its chairman, I solicit your interest and support, for it is a new approach to peacetime security and it will need interest and support if it is to succeed in the job which has been assigned to it.

America, with its material resources, its scientific skills, and its industrial productivity, should be able, with only reasonable attention and effort, to keep itself in a position too impregnable to give any encouragement to any would-be aggressor. By reasonable effort I mean an expenditure of time and money, which would be insignificant indeed in comparison with the cost of fighting another war. Nowhere that I can think of is it more true that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Finally, a word about practical idealism. I hope that this program for scientific preparedness will not draw a charge that American scientists have become war-minded. They have become war-minded only to the extent of realizing what they should do to reduce the likelihood of again incurring needless waste and sacrifice in war.

There is no danger of America's becoming war-minded or seeking conquest. We are too fundamentally desirous of going about our independent peacetime pursuits without interruption. The strong pacifist sentiment of the 1920's and 1930's had basically fine objectives, to which we all still subscribe. The trouble was that the pacifist techniques for achieving these objectives were ill suited to the facts of life in this era. Ostrich-like, the pacifists ignored the Hitlers, Mussolinis, Hirohitos, and their followers. As a result, the Nazis, Fascists, and Japs were encouraged, not deterred, by the pledges of our youth never to bear arms, or by our refusal to strengthen the defenses of Guam, or to mount modern guns on Corregidor.

We have learned our lesson the hard and terrible way. We want peace more fervently than ever before. The scientists of America want to do their bit in safeguarding the peace which, thank God, we can now see ahead if we do not falter but press steadfastly ahead until victory is complete and this generation of international aggressors is so completely subdued as to remain forever an object lesson to any who might some time again be tempted to gain their ends by war.

The Benefits of Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Washington, I find that more and more people are thinking ahead to the hour when the war will be over. My friends ask me, "What do you think of the future? Are we going to have a depression or prosperity right after the surrender? And what about this talk of a Third World War? Will we have another in 25 years, or are we going to live in peace for a change?"

I think that these are about the most important questions we can ask today. What hath it availed us, O Lord, to fight through the long years of this war, to see so many of our California boys killed and wounded, if, after it all, we come back to a world of unemployment, depression, and World War III? Life is not worth living if we cannot have more hope for the future than that. Hope. Hope for full employment and a better standard of living for us here in the United States. Hope for the reconstruction of the devastated areas of the world, and hope for a condition of peaceful living that will stretch as far into the future as we can see.

I sincerely believe that we now have the possibility of realizing that hope. We had it once before when the League of Nations might have been made a going concern and we lost it. If we lose it now, I have no doubt whatsoever that the destruction which has laid waste so much of Europe and Asia this time will then be literally world-wide. It is the duty of every citizen to ponder over this fact, and to think as clearly as he can how we may break what to some seems an inevitable cycle turning every generation to slaughter.

Economic prosperity throughout the world is a fundamental requirement for world peace. When the wheels of our economy slow down look out for danger ahead. After this war, to avoid unemployment and depression, we must produce even more than now. We must have markets abroad that will absorb more than peacetime foreign markets have ever taken before.

This means that every possible barrier to trade between nations must be removed. We must have stable exchange rates so that a man who wants to buy or sell abroad today will know what his money will be worth tomorrow. We must be able to sell overseas without fear that a foreign government will arbitrarily refuse payment or make it difficult to obtain. Such practices had much to do with the drying up of trade in the years between wars.

To keep trade flowing and keep the people of the world employed we must have an international organization. We must keep the peace by force if necessary, but if we remove the causes of economic aggression we may not have to use force. That is why I see so much hope for the future in the meeting last summer of representatives of 44 nations at Bretton Woods, N. H. The whole purpose of their discussions was to smooth the way to expanding trade between nations.

I want you to consider for a few minutes what that can mean for a single California industry. The motion-picture industry which, directly or indirectly, affects virtually everyone in our State.

The Bretton Woods proposals provide for the formation of two organizations, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The fund is to deal with problems of current international exchange transactions; the bank is concerned with the long-run development of industry in the member nations and the improvement of their standards of living.

The bank will facilitate long-term international investment by guaranteeing loans made by private investors or itself making loans. Its purpose is to aid the expansion of production in the member countries. Increased production will mean increased income, and increased income will provide a greater market for American products. If the standard of living in foreign countries increases they will demand more American films. They will be able to pay more in royalties to the producers if the films can be shown to larger audiences. The bank will affect the motion-picture industry largely through its indirect effects upon the standard of living in foreign countries. The American motion-picture industry has made heavy investments abroad and it will continue probably to invest directly in foreign production and distribution facilities. It is important to the industry that the foreign countries in which investments have been made be prosperous.

The operation of the fund, on the other hand, will directly affect the prosperity of the moving-picture industry. From 1939 to 1943 the annual royalties and rentals of films in foreign countries produced an average of $73,400,000 for the American industry. For some of the film producers almost one-third of their rev-

enue from the rental of films came from foreign sources. About 57 percent of this royalty income was derived from Great Britain. Obviously the use of American films in English-speaking countries involved fewer difficulties than in countries using other languages. A further factor in the situation, however, is that in non-English-speaking countries there have been greater restrictions on the importation of American films, largely because of their adverse balance of payments' position with regard to the United States.

Contracts for the rental and royalties on films are made in foreign currencies; that is, the theaters using American films in England agree to pay pounds sterling. The American companies, to derive any benefit, must have this sterling transferred to the United States in the form of dollars. If the foreign country reduces its exchange rate on the United States, the amount which the American companies get is reduced proportionately. Thus, if the French franc is worth 6 cents, 100,000 French francs mean $6,000 income. If the franc is 2 cents, however, it will amount to only $2,000. Since royalties are paid generally on a percentage basis the amount of revenue which the American producer gets depends directly on the exchange rate. Consequently, it is important for the producer to know that this exchange rate will not be lowered. The proposed fund, by requiring countries to maintain their exchanges at par and not permitting reductions in exchange without consent of the fund, will mean that the American film producers will not be deprived of their expected earnings.

The moving-picture industry has also suffered seriously in the past from the blocking of exchange which it has earned. In the formulation of exchange policies most countries have been more liberal in permitting payment for goods or shipping services than they have for payments of royalties, rentals, or the earnings of investments. With the declaration of war the United Kingdom froze the balance of the American movie producers in England. In July 1942 the amount involved was about $50,000,000. These accumulated earnings could not be withdrawn and the stockholders of the American companies could not obtain the money earned on their investments. Earnings of the movie industry were regarded as a claim subordinate to those of the export trade. In addition, other profits of foreign subsidiaries could not be repatriated. As the industry well knows, this was a source of considerable friction.

In 1942 Britain agreed to unblock these balances and in the course of the next year they were repaid to the American holders. At the present time American movie producers still have about $5,000,000 in other assets which they cannot convert into dollars. The fund agreement will prevent this type of control in the future. While member countries are permitted to impose certain restrictions on capital movements, principally to prevent the flight of "hot money," they are prohibited by the agreement from imposing restrictions on the transfer of current earnings for payment for services. If the agreement is put into effect, the American motion picture industry will not find that it has frozen assets as a result of foreign countries' exchange policies and exchange difficulties.

The fund and the bank together will contribute to raising the standard of living in all of the member countries. Together they will enable the countries to maintain their trade and exchange relations on a more stable basis. Whatever contributes to raising the standard of living abroad will increase the market for the products of American industry. The motion picture industry has suffered in the past from restrictions which the proposed plan will eliminate. It is important to the industry that this program should come into operation as soon as possible.

I have used the motion picture industry only as an illustration of benefits which American industry in general can expect from adoption of the Bretton Woods proposals. Think what greatly increased trade will mean to our shipping industry and the many workers in it, to all the air lines, and to our tourist trade. On the basis of the international prosperity that is bound to follow from expanding world trade, we can look forward with hope to a world of peace.

How High Are United States Tariffs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD a reprint from the Cut Bank (Mont.) Pioneer Press, which speaks for itself:

HOW HIGH ARE UNITED STATES TARIFFS?

(By HAROLD KNUTSON, in his paper, the Wadena (Minn.) Pioneer Journal)

When America was young and undeveloped, the tariff was the big issue in American politics, the need was for industrial development. A series of tariff acts beginning with the Civil War, and fostered by the Republican Party gradually paved the way for such expansion to a point where we became the foremost manufacturing country in the world. Indeed, the industries fostered under the protective tariff system enabled the Allies to win World War I. American industries have played an equally important part in this war.

Following World War I, agricultural and industrial imports from the pauperized countries of Europe and Asia attained such volume that it was necessary for the Congress to repeal the Underwood Free Trade Act, then in force, and substitute for it the so-called emergency tariff law which gave a considerable degree of protection to the American farmer, workingman and industrialist in their fight to hold on to the American market.

We have frequently heard it charged that the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, enacted in 1930, was responsible for the depression. Nothing can be further from the truth. The depression began in Great Britain in 1926 and it was merely an incident that it reached America at about the time that the Smoot-Hawley Act went into effect.

People with long memories believe in tariff protection because they know from bitter experience that there must be some sort of differential tax imposed to equalize the great difference in labor costs here at home and abroad if we are to eat, but the younger generation know comparatively little about the subject, unfortunately. It has therefore been easy to sell them on the idea that protective import taxes are barriers to trade, and promote international discord. History does not bear out this charge. We were on a free-trade basis when World War I broke out and the depression of the late twenties and early thirties was a natural consequence of that war.

When the Democrats came into power in 1933, after having made the tariff the main issue in the campaign of the preceding year, the country naturally expected them to repeal the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which they had denounced in most severe terms throughout the campaign. Strange to say, they did nothing of the sort. Instead, they passed the Reciprocal Trade Act as an amendment thereto, which permitted the State Department to negotiate trade treaties with other countries without reference to the Congress, which is contrary to the Constitution. We were then told that the new method of dealing with foreign imports would mean an end of wars. After having negotiated 29 treaties, one of which has since been abrogated, World War II burst out in a fury theretofore unknown, so it can be safely said that the tariff has little to do with peace and war.

The American Tariff League began a scientific study of tariffs some 5 years ago and their findings were recently made public. In a study of the tariffs of 19 countries, it is disclosed that the United States was seventh from the bottom of protected countries while the United Kingdom, popularly considered a free trade nation, was ninth from the bottom. Taking the American ad valorem tariff at 100 percent, Spain leads with an average of 465 percent; Germany 279 percent; Mexico 149 percent; United Kingdom 118.3 percent. Sweden ranks nineteenth with an average of 32.8 percent. In five groups studied, the United States ranks among the bottom six in foods, fuels, metals, building materials, and chemicals. In textiles and house furnishings, we rank tenth, and in only one group, farm products, are we second from the very top with a rating of 95.8 percent as against 119.8 percent.

In his Chicago speech last October, President Roosevelt promised to provide 60,000,000 jobs. That is a big order and can only be filled if we embark upon a program of comparative self-sufficiency. Whilst we must have commercial intercourse with other nations, we definitely feel that this commerce should be confined to the export of those things of which we have a surplus and those things that we need but do not ourselves produce.

As the struggle for the American market develops after the close of this war, the tariff will come more and more to the fore because of the keen competition that we will have to meet from the pauperized countries of Europe and Asia. When that time comes, as it surely will, the American people will have to decide whether they are going to look after themselves first. We believe that we should look after our own welfare before we engage in the thankless job of playing Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

All want to be friendly with other countries and we are going to help them as much as we possibly can in their titanic task of rehabilitation, but the "do-gooders" should not lose sight of the fact that the degree of help that we can give other nations will be in proportion to our well-being and prosperity at home.

Memorials of the California Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my promise to the members of the California State Legislature, I would like to bring to the notice of the Congress of the United States certain memorializations they would like presented to this great body.

Having been a member of the Legislature of the State of California for 10 years, prior to my serving as a Member here, I realize the sincerity and earnestness behind each memorialization I have in my hand. They are, each one, carefully considered recommendations; and I would like to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House of Representatives to them.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 3: Relative to cooperation among nations to curtail the production and traffic of opium.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 5: Relative to memorializing Congress to consider early return to this State of the administration and control assumed by the Federal Government as part of a Nation-wide employment problem.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 8: Relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial assistance following the cessation of hostilities and during the period of reconversion to normal peacetime operation to those communities which have suffered deterioration of facilities owing to the impact of war industry and war-increased population.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 9: Relative to memorializing Congress to provide for the prompt removal of temporary war housing which violates local building regulations and relative to the timing and method of such removal and consultation with local legislative bodies to determine the need for retaining any such housing.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 10: Relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate additional and adequate funds annually for the maintenance and operation of the San Joaquin experimental range.

Senate Resolution No. 26 and House Resolution No. 36: Relative to memorializing Congress to enact stringent laws adequate to control the disposition of ship's garbage in the harbors and ports of the United States.

Senate Resolution No. 36 and House Resolution No. 87: Relative to memorializing Congress to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 12: Relating to the establishment of the seat of government of the Allied Nations of the world in the redwood empire of California.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 14: Relative to memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 2347, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to guayule rubber.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 16: Relative to memorializing the Congress in relation to prices for fresh fruits.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 6: Relative to making available to the Palo Verde Mesa lands certain waters of the Colorado River.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 15: Relating to claim of ownership of lands by the sovereign State of California.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7: Relative to memorializing Congress to enact a seamen's bill of rights.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 30: Relative to memorializing Congress to provide educational opportunities for war widows.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 32: Relative to memorializing Congress of the desire of the people of the State of California to provide such appropriate lands, utilities, and facilities as may be needed for the establishment within the territory of the State of the permanent site of activities of the world security organization.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 31: Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress and the Federal Surplus Property Board to establish or designate a special agency with which municipalities and other public bodies may deal in the purchase of Federal surplus properties.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 35: Relative to income and resources of recipients of aid to the aged and of aid to the blind.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 36: Relative to making President Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, a legal holiday.

House Resolution No. 153: Relative to the enactment by Congress of legislation amending the revenue laws to validate depletion allowances affecting the oil industry.

House Resolution No. 208: Relative to memorializing Congress to study the need for postwar recreational facilities on Government-owned properties in California and to earmark an adequate portion of postwar construction funds for the purpose of providing such recreational facilities.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the foregoing are all well-conceived recommendations. I hope that my fellow Members will give them their consideration, as being representative of the legislative thinking of the great State of California.

Assessment of Union Fees on Eastern Shore Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, most everyone knows that the Eastern Shore of Maryland is the garden spot of the world, and that we produce the most delicious vegetables and fruits grown in the United States.

A very serious situation has just developed. In spite of the manpower shortage on the farms with which to grow food for the Nation, and in spite of the dire need in the city for the food which the country produces, labor agitators have forbidden the receipt of Eastern Shore produce in either the Philadelphia or New York markets, unless the farmers pay the union a hold-up fee of $56 for the drivers of their trucks. It is amazing that Americans would take such action in these serious times. How they can call themselves Americans, I cannot understand; but I think the people residing in the cities need food worse than the Eastern Shore farmers need to be paid for the crops they grow.

I attach two news items from the Salisbury Times of Salisbury, Md.:

AFL TEAMSTERS THREATEN TO HALT PRODUCE—DEALERS HOPE TO DIVERT TO OTHER MARKETS AFTER UNION'S ULTIMATUM

PHILADELPHIA, May 16.—Faced with an AFL teamsters union local threat to embargo produce deliveries today on trucks not manned by union members, many produce dealers said they planned to divert their products to other markets.

Representatives of 20 farm organizations with membership extending from Maine to Florida met in Philadelphia yesterday to discuss the situation and following the meeting spokesmen for the conference said a majority of the growers would divert their trucks to other markets if the union insists on carrying out its edict.

Abe Goldberg, president of Local 929, teamsters union, said that drivers of produce trucks coming into Philadelphia "can join any AFL teamsters local, but they must have a paid-up card or produce handlers for commission merchants and carlot receivers won't handle their merchandise." The union also demanded a 5-day week for produce handlers. Goldberg said last night the embargo would start today.

EDICT WOULDN'T APPLY

Carroll R. Miller, of Martinsburg, W. Va., chairman of the growers' group, said the union edict would not apply to bona fide farmers and their sons.

Following the meeting, called by the Northeast Vegetable and Potato Council, the following statement was issued:

"The 5-day week now in effect for the summer months at the Philadelphia produce terminals threatens heavy loss of highly perishable farm products * * * which must be harvested and in the hands of the consumer in the shortest possible time.

"When growers are unable to make deliveries of highly perishable fruits and vegetables on Saturdays, the produce may be ruined by Monday.

"We contend that free movement of perishable fruits and vegetables to the consumer, at lowest possible cost, is to the best interest of both the consumer and producers.

"Arbitrarily imposed costs for unnecessary services defeat this end and induce wastage of food * * *.

"This situation, together with the need for acquiring union membership for farm hands who drive farmers' trucks, puts growers in a tight spot."

UNION HALTS SHORE PRODUCE IN NEW YORK—TEAMSTERS CLAMP DOWN ON TRUCKERS, ASK $56 UNION FEE

New York teamsters clamped down on the Eastern Shore produce truck fleet, assessing

$56 in union fees for each truck unloaded at the market last night.

"They picked the worst night of the week for us," R. P. Richardson, of the Eastern Shore of Virginia Produce Exchange said. "We were blocked, we couldn't even unload for cold storage."

He explained that the trucks had to be unloaded last night or produce would be spoiled as the market would not be open on Saturday and produce would not stand a layover until Monday.

The $56 fee was for union membership for each truck driver, he said, and the drivers had to join the union before the trucks would be unloaded.

Many of the trucks entering the New York market had been diverted from Philadelphia, Richardson said. On Tuesday the AFL teamsters there had embargoed nonunion driven trucks.

UNLOADINGS LIGHT

Unloadings at Philadelphia of produce trucks were the lightest last night of any night in the last 12 months, he said. Eastern Shore drivers, and those operating in North Carolina, have flatly refused to drive to the Philadelphia market.

The Cooperative Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association is appealing to the Federal Government for relief and a committee of growers is arranging a meeting with the House Agricultural Committee in Washington.

The State of Pennsylvania, faced with what may possibly develop into a fruit and vegetable shortage in Philadelphia, is conducting its own investigation of the impasse between truckers and the union.

Tacoma's Municipally Owned Light and Power System Makes Fine Showing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the record made by my home town of Tacoma, Wash., in its operation of its publicly owned light and power plant. Tacoma is the outstanding example of efficiency and effective operation of a publicly owned light system.

It sells light and power at the lowest over-all average rate per kilowatt of any publicly, or privately, operated power plant in America.

Recently, the Public Administration Clearing House of Chicago issued a report, which is illuminating and very encouraging and which is self-explanatory. Here it is:

CITY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES MAKE LARGE REVENUE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Municipally owned electric utilities contribute from one-sixth to one-fourth of their gross revenue to city operating funds in lieu of taxes, a report to the International City Manager's Association shows.

The amount of the gross revenue transferred to the general city government ranges from 1 percent in Seattle and Tacoma, to 45.5 percent in Jacksonville, Fla.

Contributions average a little more than 29 percent of the gross revenue of the utilities in 81 council-manager cities. Contributions were more than 50 percent of the gross revenue in eight cities—Bedford, Va., Belleville, Kans.; Brownsville, Tex.; Cushing, Okla.; Ellwood City, Pa.; Front Royal, Va.; Gastonia, N. C.; and Tallahassee, Fla.

A study of the 128 municipally owned electric utilities in Kansas shows that 118 cities contribute an average of 26.2 percent of their gross revenues to city operating funds.

A survey of the amounts contributed in 22 cities over 50,000 population having city-owned electric utilities shows that in one-half of the cities no contribution of any kind is made to city operating funds. The utilities in the other 11 cities contribute an average of slightly less than 17 percent of their gross revenue to the city.

The report compares the information about municipally owned electric utilities with information available on taxes paid by privately owned utilities. The president of the Edison Electric Institute recently estimated that 24 percent of the gross revenues of privately owned electric utilities is paid out in taxes. This estimate agrees substantially with a detailed analysis of 245 privately owned utilities made in 1943, showing they paid in taxes an average of 22.6 percent of their gross revenues.

Young America Speaks From the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune to have met a brilliant young American boy, who was raised and educated in Chicago public schools. He is, likewise, a graduate of the University of Chicago, from which he received his diploma at an unusually early age.

I like to think that this young man is typical of the generation now appearing upon the political, professional, and economic horizon of our country.

As I have observed this young man, both before his entry into the Army and subsequent thereto, I have been increasingly impressed with his adaptability, warm-heartedness, tender solicitude for the underprivileged, and penetrating grasp of the national and international problems besetting world statesmen.

Recently, he wrote me a letter from the Philippines, where he is now stationed. Because this letter is so well written and because it reveals how reflective is the author, as well as his philosophic and analytical appraisal of the Philippines and of the war and its implications, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I am inserting it hereinbelow in the RECORD.

The letter, which was written by A. Sheldon Newberger, is as follows:

SOMEWHERE IN THE PHILIPPINES,
Friday, March 30, 1945.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Received yours of February 3 and read with excitement and enthusiasm your speech delivered in Madison Square Garden last January. My only regret is that I couldn't have sat in the hall on that momentous occasion and lent my voice to those championing the cause of the people of Spain. I fear it would be an understatement if I told you your address was magnificent: Emphasizing not only what needs to be done, but also, how it can be done. It was a clarion call for action, and your crusade is a glorious undertaking.

Perhaps, being where I am today, I can sympathize even more with your position. For the Philippine Islands are a product of 3 years under fascism; and whether the brand be Hirohito, Hitler, or Franco—the results are always the same. The little man is inevitably on the outside looking in.

We had a quiet, uneventful voyage across the Pacific, crossing the Equator a couple of times, basking in the warm tropical sun, and taking a good look at the fabulous South Seas. And somewhere along the way I found myself shoved out of the Infantry and placed behind a typewriter, in the headquarters of the United States Armed Forces for the Far East (USAFFE).

What first strikes the new arrival in the Philippine Islands is the startling contrast between the old and the new. Side by side are the horse-drawn cartellas and the latest autos, candles and electric lights, thatch huts and modern buildings. The culture is a composite of native traditions mixed with the ways of the American, Chinese, and Spanish. The result is a country fascinating in numerous ways.

The western world has made its mark. Along the muddy roads of Tacloban, Leyte, every third store is a beauty parlor, each advertising the latest 1941 version of Hollywood style—and the remainder are taverns offering Tom Collins, specially prepared by American trained bartenders. Farther north inflation runs rampant with handkerchiefs selling for something like $15 and a dozen eggs for ten. In fact, John, the longer I stay in this portion of the world the more I become convinced that Henry Wallace was merely predicting the not to distant future, when he talked about a quart of milk a day—even for Hottentots.

The Filipinos are a proud, generous, friendly people. Their attitude during the Japanese occupation appears to have been that of continual resistance—passive in some places, active in others. And their welcome to American troops could hardly have been heartier. The youngsters line the streets, raising their fingers in the symbolic V sign and hollering their "Hello Joe's" from dawn until dark. And the remainder of the populace never seems to be able to do too much for their visitors.

But all is not rosy. There is widespread famine and around the Army mess halls hundreds of people gather—begging for whatever scraps they can find. You somehow gain a notion of what it means to be hungry when you look at the lean haggard faces of the children and the emaciated bodies of the women.

And when you see pictures of the prewar islands, as I did the other night, and compare them with what the war has left today, you realize fully something that has merely been a cliche to most Americans sitting comfortably in their homes in the States. Those who suffer most are the people—the common people who had absolutely nothing to do with the chaos they now find themselves in. And you can't help but wonder: Will man ever learn how to live peacefully and happily with his brother?

I think I learned the answer to that question yesterday. We attended a vaudeville show performed by an entire Filipino cast—and presented before a mixed audience of civilians and soldiers. There was a language barrier—a handicap which at first might seem difficult to overcome.

These people are talented. No one can dispute that. Graceful dancing and beautiful music inundated the stage, and out of a

common enjoyment sprang a unity within the crowd. We laughed at the same jokes, hummed the same tunes, demanded the same encores. And I understood then and there, John, that peoples of different lands, customs, environments, and traditions could find a meeting ground in culture. Art and music are universals that neither home-made barriers nor home-grown despots can destroy. There is a link between the peoples of this world—and it is that link that we must cultivate and strengthen and make so potent that neither guns nor bombs can ever again have any effect.

If I can extract any meaning out of the experiences that I have had—it is that our generation is at the crossroads of history. We have the opportunity to create a millenium of plenty; to use the great productive capacity of man in building a world where security and prosperity are a heritage of all the people; where want and poverty are outlawed, and where all men will be free to make their fullest contribution to society. Or we can have distrust and hypocrisy and ultimately World Wars III and IV—and 30 and 40. It is we who must make the choice.

That is why, John, I could appreciate your theme in the Garden speech: "Cry out in the night," make your voices so strong that even the mightiest will be forced to stop and take heed. We must awaken the people—we must educate them—we must show them that they will have to choose the path over which the human race will move. The roads must be clearly defined, and once the common man understands there can be no doubt about his decision.

For no matter how much we would like to blame Hitler and Hirohito for all that has happened, and no matter how much we would like to leave the planning up to Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin—the future rests with us, and us alone. We owe it to all the peoples who have suffered and slaved under the yoke of fascism, we owe it to the boys who fight in the front lines and dig out the enemy with their bayonets—above all, we owe it to ourselves and our children to make our voices sound forth bold and clear: announcing to all concerned that the little men in the world have resolved to unite in a brotherhood of justice and peace and are determined to make that resolution a reality. Then we can tell ourselves that the sacrifices made in this war, were not made in vain.

Yours,

SHEL.

Government Sponsored Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Carbondale Free Press, Carbondale, Ill., carried an editorial which deals with the question of Government-sponsored medical care. I would like to quote from that editorial:

On the question of Government-sponsored medical care, too much emphasis has been placed on the doctors versus the Government. In between are the people, and they are the ones who stand to gain or lose the most. As more than one doctor has pointed out, if State medicine is thrust upon the medical profession and the doctors don't like it, those who wish can escape by merely switching to some other line of business. But for the people, there is no escape. If State medicine is adopted and result in lowered medical standards there will be nothing the people can do about it—socialism is a one-way road. The people will be socialized, not the doctors.

The medical profession opposes State medicine because it has studied the lessons of history and knows that too much government in medicine will not bring adequate medical care to all the people. A tragic example of State medicine can be seen in the veterans' hospitals. Many veterans are getting worse than poor medical care all because their treatment is swamped in red tape—politics takes precedence over the requirements of good medicine. And who has suffered the consequences, the veteran or the doctor? Ask the veterans.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement from Americans United for World Organization, Inc., relative to the Bretton Woods Agreements:

Ulric Bell, executive vice president of Americans United for World Organization, issed today, May 21, a report of the public endorsement of the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreements. Mr. Bell stated that:

"One of the most encouraging aspects in the entire picture of international cooperation has been the widespread public support of the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreements. Because of our conviction of the importance of the adoption by the United States of the Bretton Woods Agreements, Americans United has followed closely the stand of various public groups on this subject.

"These national organizations endorsing the agreements represent women's, farm, labor, religious, and business interests. It is obvious from the varying groups represented that the American public as a whole is clearly aware of the significance of Bretton Woods and determined, moreover, that nothing shall interfere with its prompt adoption by the Congress.

"Americans United believes that this crucial test of our willingness to work with other nations for peace must pass the Congress without delay and without amendments which will require the calling of another international conference."

The list of organizations follows:

American Federation of Labor.

Advertising Committee on Public Affairs.

American Association of University Women.

American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Labor Conference on International Affairs.

Americans United for World Organization.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Central-Penn National Bank (Philadelphia).

Citizens Conference on International Economic Union.

Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Committee for Economic Development (with one slight amendment which can be negotiated without calling another conference).

Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Co. (Philadelphia).

Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America, the.

Camden-Rockport Chamber of Commerce (Camden, Maine).

Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

Export Managers Club of Chicago.

First National Bank (Damariscotta, Maine).

Girard Trust Co. (Philadelphia).

Girls Friendly Society of the United States of America.

Independent Bankers Association.

Independent Committee for the Arts and Sciences.

International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians.

Land Title Bank & Trust Co. (Philadelphia).

Market Street National Bank (Philadelphia).

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (San Francisco Branch).

National Association of Women Lawyers, North Middle Atlantic Conference.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

National Cotton Council.

National Council of American Importers, Inc.

National Council of Catholic Men.

National Council of Catholic Women.

National Catholic Welfare Conference.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Council of Women of the United States, Inc.

National Farmers Union.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

National Foreign Trade Council, Inc.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States.

National League of Women Voters.

National Women's Trade Union League of America.

National Peace Conference.

Pennsylvania Bankers Association, Committee on International Finance (Pittsburgh, Pa.).

Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting Annuities.

Philadelphia National Bank.

Philadelphia Saving Fund Society.

Provident Trust Co. of Philadelphia.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Tradesmen's National Bank and Trust Co. (Philadelphia).

Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

United Christian Council for Democracy.

Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.

Women's Conference on International Affairs.

Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress.

Women's Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Western Saving Fund Society (Philadelphia).

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Business and Industry for Bretton Woods.

National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.

Organizations which have filed resolutions or statements in opposition to the Bretton Woods legislation with the House or Senate Committees on Banking and Currency:

American Bankers Association.

American Coalition.

Bankers Association for Foreign Trade.

New York State Bankers Association.

United States Chamber of Commerce.

The Grange.

Contra Costa County (Calif.) Walnut Growers' Association Protest Application of Most-Favored-Nation Treatment to Trade Agreements and Demands That They Be Made Subject to Congressional Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, agriculture's deep concern over the future of this basic industry under the Hull trade agreements is further evidenced in a resolution of the Contra Costa County (Calif.) Walnut Growers' Association, which I am, with permission of the membership, extending in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of these instant remarks.

With the importation of agricultural products, the American farmer's competition, increasing during the years of so-called reciprocal trading by 71 percent, and the exportation of agricultural products, the American farmer's opportunity of profiting, falling off in 1940 to 10 percent less than our exports of 1934, it is high time that the American farmer, especially the western farmer, should "stop, look, and listen."

The resolution to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY WALNUT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Walnut Creek, Calif., May 23, 1945.

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the members of the Contra Costa County Walnut Growers' Association, held in Walnut Creek, Calif., on May 7, 1945, the following resolution was offered and passed unanimously:

"Whereas the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act represents a further surrender of authority by the people and Congress to the executive branch of the Government; and

"Whereas it permits tariff reductions by such undemocratic processes as prevent affected industries from obtaining full and unbiased hearings; and

"Whereas the facts and figures reveal that prior to the war the act failed in its purpose of stimulating American exports commensurate with the increase in imports, and that the treaties were not truly reciprocal; and

"Whereas many California agricultural industries, and specifically the nut industries, are placed in constant jeopardy by threatened tariff reductions and would be subjected to ruinous competition if tariff protection were reduced as permitted under the act: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Contra Costa County Walnut Growers' Association, which in 1944 packer $1,976,601 worth of walnuts for its 780 members, at its annual membership meeting, opposes H. R. 2652 which would extend the act for 3 years and would empower the President to make even deeper tariff cuts than were heretofore permitted; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this association approves the principle of reciprocal-trade treaties only if such treaties are subject to congressional approval, thereby safeguarding the inherent rights of the people and the industries affected, and further, if the inequitable effects of the most-favored-nation clause are removed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Members of Congress representing this association's growers be urged to oppose H. R. 2652 and to support the views expressed herein."

Respectfully submitted.

D. SADOROFF,
Assistant Secretary, Board of Directors.

Suggested Methods of a Good Understanding and Appreciation of the Importance of Immediate Collaboration Between and Among Three of the Great Powers, the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, in the Interest of Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of broadcast by Sumner Welles over Station WMAL, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, May 22, 1945:

It would be far more agreeable for me tonight to limit myself to telling you of the nature of the progress which has this week been made at the Conference at San Francisco.

On one critical issue, which has up to now been a major stumbling block, a solution has been found. The Soviet delegation, after some delay, has agreed with the delegations of the other major powers as to the way in which regional systems of collective security will be enabled to function under the authority of the world organization. This formula is acceptable to most of the other American republics which have been insistent that the inter-American security system should not be prevented by the world organization from operating if some country of the new world is attacked.

The solution of this difficulty makes it now seem probable that the conference can complete its work by June 9, and that all of the United Nations will then agree upon the final charter for a new international organization.

But there is nothing more dangerous than for an enlightened democracy, such as ours, to shut its eyes to facts and to think that, because the charter of the new international organization will be agreed upon at San Francisco, we can, as soon as our victory over Japan is won, sit back and enjoy the blessings of a peaceful world. For there is little use in concentrating upon the progress that is being made at San Francisco, and less than any use in believing that that alone implies an end to future wars and the security of our own country, so long as the present tension between the Soviet Union and ourselves becomes constantly more serious.

For while a charter for international organization will be agreed upon at San Francisco, it can neither function effectively, nor even perhaps be prevented from breaking down completely, unless this country of ours is able with vigor and determination to establish in the immediate future a wholly different relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States than that which, unfortunately, exists today.

When the final history of these times is written, I believe it will be realized that one of the greatest contributions which President Roosevelt made to the future interest of this country was his effort to establish a working agreement between our Government and Moscow. For President Roosevelt saw clearly that no world organization can operate successfully in the first years after the war unless it is based on understanding and cooperation between Russia and the United States. He knew that cooperation between the United States and Great Britain, whatever temporary difficulties might arise, could always be achieved. He knew that in the long run cooperation between our country and France or China would be possible.

But in the case of the Soviet Union, he always had in mind these facts.

Russia has been isolated from the rest of the world for a quarter of a century. For this reason, and because of the policies of the great powers during the years between the two great wars, deep-rooted suspicions of the western powers are imbedded in the minds of Russian leaders and of the Russian people.

Because of the stupendous victories which the Russian armies have won against Germany, the Russian Government, the Russian military leaders and the Russian people have today a feeling of almost unlimited physical power in their part of the globe.

The Russian concept of legitimate postwar security differs very materially from the ideas which the western powers hold on that point.

Present and traditional reasons for rivalry and antagonism between Russia and Great Britain are very deep indeed.

For all of these reasons, and for reasons of ideology as well, the President foresaw that the establishment of any true understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union would prove to be one of the most difficult tasks which our Government was going to confront.

On the other hand, the President remembered that during the whole of our independent history the United States has never had any basic causes for hostility towards the Soviet Union. He knew that there are neither geographic, political or economic reasons for rivalry or for antagonism between the Russian people and the people of the United States.

He saw that in its own interest and in the highest interests of world peace, the United States should undertake a patient, constructive and continuing attempt to serve as moderator when difficulties arose between the Soviet Union and the other great powers, and particularly between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

He never had the faintest idea of permitting the United States to be used as a cat's-paw either by the Soviet Union or by Great Britain. But he did believe that when disputes arose between those two countries, as he knew they would arise, the United States could act as a mediating and conciliating influence, and by refraining from serving the individual interests of either nation, undertake to serve the highest interests of the world.

In five short weeks since the death of President Roosevelt the policy which he had so painstakingly carried on has been changed. Our Government now appears to the Russians as the spearhead of an apparent bloc of the western nations opposed to the Soviet Union.

At the present moment there are four outstanding causes for friction between the Soviet Union and the United States.

These are the bitter controversy over what kind of a democratic government of Poland is to be set up under the agreement of Yalta; the action of the Soviet Government in establishing a government of Austria without the knowledge or consent of the United States or of Great Britain; the action of the Moscow-dominated government of Yugoslavia in occupying Trieste and the Istrian Peninsula

and regions in southern Austria; and the persistent refusal of the Soviet authorities to give the western powers any real knowledge of what is going on in such countries as Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, all occupied by the Soviet, as well as in that sector of Germany which is occupied by Russian troops. To these grounds for dissension there may well be added the inexplicable policy pursued by the Russian armies with regard to American and British prisoners of war who were liberated by the Russian forces from German prison camps.

Now, in my judgment, the policy pursued by the Soviet Union in regard to every one of these issues is wholly unjustifiable. What will do more harm, perhaps, in the long run is the failure of the Soviet Government to explain clearly to public opinion in the United States its own reasons for what it has done. There are few instances in modern times where the policy of a great nation has been so ineptly presented to public opinion in other parts of the world as in this instance.

The result has been that a certain section of the American press which thrives on its effort to create ill will between the American people and the people of certain other countries has been able to seize the opportunity to fan the flames of resentment. This element of the American press has been helped by many powerful groups within the United States which hate the Soviet Government. Every shred of alleged evidence which could be presented to foster prejudice and suspicion here has been utilized. Blind passion is rapidly rising.

And at the same time the Russian press appears to have given quite as biased a picture of American policy and of American intentions to Russian public opinion.

But if we here in the United States intend to be fair in our analysis of the reasons for the present situation, we will have to confess that the Russian press has been able to cite many evidences of American policy which can understandably stimulate popular misunderstanding and resentment in the Soviet Union.

At the very moment when the Russian armies and the American armies have as allies won their bloody victory against the common enemy, Germany, the people of Russia are informed of the increasingly bitter attacks which are daily being made in the United States against the Soviet Union.

They are told to their amazement of the extraordinarily cordial treatment accorded to leading Nazi criminals by the American armies which have captured them. They learn of Mr. Churchill's official announcement that German authorities will be permitted to administer Germany because it will be too much trouble for authorities of the United Nations to undertake the task. They learn that no contrary view has as yet been expressed by the Government of the United States.

To the average Russian such reports as these are quite as incomprehensible and quite as infuriating as the reports which we Americans receive with regard to those recent actions of the Soviet Government which I recited a few moments ago.

And what are in reality the chief causes for the present situation?

First of all, there is no committee, or council, of high-ranking authorities of the major powers through which political disputes, such as those which now exist, can be threshed out, and settled. If Russia enters the war against Japan, such machinery would be all the more necessary.

There is no agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on postwar policy toward Germany.

There is no agreement as to the treatment to be given German war criminals.

There is no agreement whatever upon a joint policy toward Poland, toward Hungary, toward Rumania, Yugoslavia, or Bulgaria, toward Austria, or with regard to the major economic questions, such as reparations, which have to be decided promptly if the situation in Europe is not to degenerate into a state of open anarchy, and if relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are not to deteriorate into open and bitter hostility.

There exists as yet no basis for that kind of cooperation between the two greatest powers of the world which is indispensable if world order is to be restored.

If this situation continues in the powder keg which is Europe, almost anything can happen.

There are two immediate remedies which can be tried.

The first is for President Truman, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin to meet without further delay in order to seek equitable and constructive solutions for the difficulties which have already arisen, and in order to set up adequate intergovernmental peace machinery capable of working out precise agreements upon every one of the settlements which must be had if a real peace is to be restored to Europe.

And the second step is for us here in the United States to refuse to be stampeded into that blind popular hostility toward the Soviet Union, into which many powerful and some sinister forces in this country—and by no means least among them those German propagandists who are in our midst—are endeavoring to drive us.

Of one thing we can be everlastingly certain, and that is that, unless the United States and the Soviet Union find the means of constructing a relationship of cooperation so that we can work together in solving the innumerable problems with which we will all be faced during the years to come, not only will the international organization to be founded in San Francisco prove to be ineffective, but chaos throughout the world may well become inevitable.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, in discussing this bill extending the life of the reciprocal trade agreements and reduced tariffs, I would support 1 year's extension at this particular time of reciprocal trade agreements if for no other reason than what some have termed good will to foreign countries, or to render psychological assistance in bringing about the desired results of the San Francisco Conference to outlaw wars. However, I do not want any reciprocal trade agreements when they sell America short.

However, to my mind the present bill will not do that. This bill digs down to the roots of American prosperity and the American standard of living.

In 169 years America has grown and prospered as no other nation on the face of the earth. We have had a happy, contented people. We have given our people a fine education. We have raised our standard of living, until today we have the highest standard of living of any country in the world. To be sure, we have had ups and downs, and they may come again, but, from the knowledge gained of experience, we want to prevent that if possible. Our laws are becoming broader and take care of the weak against the strong; they look after the poor by making the rich pay more taxes. Our wage rates are high, and our hours of work are few. Our recreation is plentiful. We have freedom of religion, speech, and press. Oh, what a grand country we have built upon the foundation of our Constitution, given us by sound-thinking, hard-working ancestors. We should be grateful to them.

What has been the one thing which has aided most in reaching our high standard? I should say a protective tariff. A tariff for revenue is one thing, but the protection is the greatest advantage. Protection for what and for whom? Protection for agriculture, industry, and for our workingmen. To be sure, if we have no tariff, we can buy cheaper goods, manufactured in foreign countries by cheap labor rates. No one disputes that. If we permit this to happen, then where do our markets go? To foreign countries. And who gets the work to do? Foreign manufacturers. And who does the work? Foreign labor. What happens to American manufacturers? They close down and go out of business. What happens to American labor? They have no jobs and have to go on relief. What happens to the Federal Treasury? It continues to go in the red and eventually into bankruptcy.

Gentlemen, this bill proposes to grant to the President and the State Department the authority to further reduce the tariff to the extent 50 percent on the 1944 scale of tariff, which means a 75-percent reduction in the tariff under our last act and I am opposed to it. It is wrong in theory; it is wrong in principle. It means a wreck ahead for our American business. It means less jobs, and poorly paid jobs for labor. I am not going to vote for that. Congress is the board of directors, and I am one of its Members, and shall do what I think best for our people, and as I see it, it is best to vote against this bill.

So many of our people today are talking loudly for foreign countries, and forgetting America. There are too many dreamers and idealists. Our troubles are due to human errors, and can be corrected. If we are to survive as a Nation, we must correct many things that have taken place in the past 10 years. First we must finish the war with Japan and bring the boys home. Aid and assist foreign countries by good will, by kindness, and by our limited dollars, but stop playing Santa Claus. We should terminate lend-lease to all countries not at war with our enemy at once, get rid of the Johnson Act and do business on a business basis. Stabilize the gold standard, terminate the executive power to devaluate the dollar, and terminate the broad powers granted by Congress to the Chief Executive and bureaucrats. Do the things that Congress should do, by looking after the interest of our American citizens at home. Remember that as you spend, so you must tax. As you sow, so shall you reap. As the board of directors looking after American inter-

ests, it is our duty to do that. Do not destroy those things that we know have made America great. Vote against this bill and save America for ourselves and our posterity. This should not be a party measure; it is an American issue.

Reduction of Sugar for Canning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to learn that the War Production Board has again given the green light to the distillers of the country, permitting them to manufacture almost unrestricted quantities of beverages. This astounding announcement follows recent further reductions in sugar allowances to householders for preserving and canning of fruits and berries. Such policies do not meet the approval of the people for whom I speak. I attach hereto an editorial from the Spartanburg Herald of May 24, as follows:

SUGAR TO CAN PEACHES SHOULD BE GRANTED

It is to be hoped that the OPA can see fit to release more canning sugar for preserving peaches.

Millions of trees in Spartanburg County and other South Carolina orchards are loaded down with a bumper crop of this luscious fruit.

A substantial portion of the crop will have to be disposed of through canning. It would be a shame if any of it went to waste because sugar is not available in the needed quantities.

The financial loss to the growers in having to abandon part of their crop would be bad enough, but even worse would be the food loss when millions of people throughout the world are going hungry.

Peach growers who met here yesterday are to be commended for their action in asking the OPA to increase home canning sugar allotments in order that peach preserving needs may be taken care of.

Although the sugar supply situation is admittedly tight, it seems that some sort of emergency plan could be devised to permit the canning of the huge quantities of peaches that will be available for preserving.

Oil in the Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

The independent producers of petroleum of the United States oppose further enlargement of the power of the State Department over import policies and restrictions.

These are the producers of the type who have discovered the majority of the fields in the United States.

We submit two broad considerations: An unrestricted oil import program such as is implied in the declarations of those who seek the enlarged authority will (1) establish oil monopoly at home; (2) it will place in jeopardy the national security.

As to the first proposition, there is no domestic petroleum industry in the countries which have large reserves of petroleum available for importation into our markets. A few American, British, and Dutch companies have found and developed those reserves. The funds for such foreign ventures came in large part from profits made in the United States. Venezuela would not export oil to the United States; these few companies would bring it in and further depress and control the independent petroleum industry.

As to the second proposition, national security in this war was assured by the oil of the United States. For a long enough period to have lost the war, no other oil was available to ourselves of our allies. The German submarine campaign made temporarily useless all outside reserves of oil.

Years ago, the program now being advocated as to oil was urged upon this Nation. Had it not been prevented by Congress, we would have entered this war with a large refining industry at home, chiefly in the hands of a few companies, dependent upon a supply of crude oil that was water-borne and vulnerable to enemy action.

The domestic producers of petroleum have already felt the effect of the exercise of authority to make trade agrements. Following are a few facts which we hope will be given proper weight in considering the bill which would make it possible to still further restrict the size and the energy of the domestic industry.

The policy of Congress made possible a strong, virile domestic petroleum industry to which the world is indebted for our present strength in winning this war. The policy of the State Department in creating monopoly is greatly weakening this industry.

Under the policy of Congress imposing restrictions on imports passed July 1, 1932, imports of petroleum fell from 388,000 to about 106,000 barrels a day for the balance of 1932.

The State Department in 1937 announced the intention to negotiate a trade agreement with Venezuela that would affect oil. It was finally concluded in 1939, reducing the tax 50 percent, or 10½ cents per barrel.

Concurrently with the announcement of the State Department to negotiate the trade agreement, the price of domestic crude oil began to fall off until in 1940 it reached the level of $1.02 per barrel, a drop of 16 cents per barrel from the 1937 average price.

The imports of petroleum in the 2 years following 1939 were 62 percent greater than for the 2 years preceding 1939.

Consumption and export demands for petroleum rose substantially in 1939, continuing through 1940 and 1941, yet following announcement of the trade agreement new well completions in 1939 were 5,223 less than in 1937. In spite of our greatly increased need, the completions have not again reached the total of 1937.

According to the Petroleum Administration for War, new crude oil discovered in 1939 was less than half of that found in 1937 or 1938. The average annual amount of oil found since 1939, according to that authority, has not exceeded half of the 1937 or 1938 figures.

In 1938 there were 5,992 corporations engaged exclusively in the production of oil and gas who filed income-tax returns with the Bureau of Internal Pevenue. In 1942 there were only 4,496 such returns made; 25 percent of the number of corporations engaged in the oil business in 1938 had gone out of business.

Economic Paradoxes in Government Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which is one of the soundest and soberest statements I have seen of the economic difficulties our country faces, and the impossibility of solving them by any panaceas, whether tariffs or otherwise, unless we are more willing to make certain adjustments than we have been in the recent past. The article is one of the weekly letters to businessmen and investors by a financial adviser who has a remarkable record in forecasting economic events to come:

ECONOMIC PARADOXES IN GOVERNMENT POLICIES

It is obviously very easy for an individual or a corporation to do rather absurd things in the realm of policy, and, granting this to be true with individuals and small groups, it is doubly true in a democratic government, where long and short views have to be merged, where political conditions are of the greatest importance, and where policy, right or wrong, has to be fundamentally popular to be acceptable.

The last 10 years of our history have been particularly full of such problems. We have pursued contrary courses without apparently any realization that history would record that we were negating our own efforts and doing so with extreme bursts of popular enthusiasm. A few instances might illustrate the trend. Not so long ago we went all-out for the NRA, apparently without the least realization that the long groundswell of anti-monopoly legislation and the NRA would run into a head-on collision at some future time and that we would face some economic problems entirely unacceptable to the American people. At a little later date, while preaching abundance and more sustenance for the underprivileged, we went through a period of killing little pigs and plowing up crops on some theory that price maintenance and wide abundance were good bed fellows. Fortunately for us, the unexpected and indirect difficulties of such programs broke them down of their own weight and we have been able to discard and forget some of these fantastic experiments.

The two examples that I have cited seem like an indictment of the New Deal, which is not my sole intent. It is very easy to go back into the previous Republican administration and review some economic absurdities that even to this day enter deeply into the thinking of many people.

The days after the last war found us burdened for the first time in our history with the responsibilities of being a great creditor nation, a responsibility that is a serious economic abstraction understood by few people. As a nation, we were delighted at our new prospect but had little sense of the difficulties that our new position develop for us. It is interesting to think back to the financial undertakings of the early twenties. We were a creditor nation with the balance of payments tending to come our way. We had a greatly expanded industrial and agricultural potential and for the first time in our history, really needed a great export market. Many people in all classes of society, both industrialists and

workers, felt that we had prospered under a highly protective tariff system and the average man seemed to be quite incapable of realizing that the postwar world was mathematically barred from buying from us unless they balanced such purchases with sales to us.

One element after another of our domestic industry began to break under the strain and the temporary expedient was indulged in, of lending generously abroad with many such loans including the provision that the proceeds of the loan should be spent in our country. Simultaneously we "upped" our already high tariff on the theory that this would stem a deluge of so-called underpriced foreign goods. For a while we sailed on under our own momentum but finally the pay-off came: The foreign loans were not good, altogether as the result of the exchange relationship that surrounded them. Our agricultural economy broke down most seriously. As we view the late twenties from the vantage point of the present, it is very clear that we as a people tried to get an economic rabbit out of a hat that had a hole in it. The troubles and emergencies that we have gone through and even the war that we are now facing are in no small degree the result of misunderstandings, ignorance, domestic selfishness, supplemented by a leadership which might have been good in some ways, but was inadequate to the problems that it faced.

The question is whether our experience has brought an end to these contrary and incompatible tendencies in our national policy. I dislike being a pessimist but I see troubles looming for the next few years very much akin to those that have been tried and found wanting in the past. Let me discuss one of them briefly. Our economic status from a world point of view is undoubtedly a further exaggeration of our great creditor position. If our wealth is the means of producing social requirements, the United States will be not only richer than it ever was before but relatively richer and more productive than any other nation ever was in history. Therefore, from a foreign exchange point of view, we are going to be burdened with the responsibility of receiving drafts of foreign credit as an offset to any lend-lease repayments that are made plus foreign relief and foreign reconstruction. There are only three known ways of absorbing such payments: First, we must accept dollars or their equivalent; second, we must extend long-time credit or make foreign investments; third, we must receive great quantities of foreign goods in liquidation of our accounts.

In addition to this very definite background, we have certain intangible social aspirations, namely the expectation of a high national income, an ever higher standard of living, this supplemented by a very general and hazy idea that we can run our economy so as to absorb and distribute the potential productiveness of that economy.

In this general conglomeration of very definite trends, there are some serious inconsistencies that may cancel out any prospect of an ultimate successful solution. In the first place, a large section of our society feels very strongly that we should be reimbursed for our lend-lease and relief extended. Of course, there is no reason why we should not be, but if it is paid for, it must be done by the importation of goods and not by foreign exchange.

In another direction, I am much impressed with the fact that all classes of society are taking a one-sided view of foreign markets. Many a manufacturer today has an interested eye on the potentials of South America, a reconstructed Europe, and an expanding Asia. He sees endless possibilities for the distribution of his product and for his ability to give employment at good wages and to ship that product into other parts of the world. Again, I say that such plans are faulty unless the concept is added that we must arrange to buy so that we can be paid for what we sell.

It is a fact that we have an enormously expanded manufacturing plant and apparently will have a surplus to send to many parts of the world but we also have a greatly expanded agricultural plant that must send its product into other parts of the world. If one assumes that lend-lease is to be terminated at some future time, we will have a fantastic number of millions of bushels of wheat and tons of lard, tobacco, and cotton that must find its final resting place in foreign lands, or we will again face the agricultural congestions of the early twenties.

It would take great wisdom to handle our affairs constructively even though we occupied a much more modest status in the world than we do. If we were less important, we might ship our millions and have them paid for by the importation of other millions, thereby balancing the transaction but we not only have our millions to ship but we have a residue from the past in the way of credits or lend-lease that may rack our exchange markets to the bone unless handled constructively.

There is one other important element of incongruity that should be mentioned and this is the general effect of our expanding labor costs and social security costs on the price structure of our production. It can be pretty definitely said that as a national policy, our shorter hours and minimum wages and our general efforts to supply economic privileges to the underprivileged is having its effect on our price structure and, after the peace comes, which we are dedicated to win, we face the inescapable fact that as the months roll by we will be the high-cost market of the world as far as basic material is concerned.

Under such circumstances, the automatic response is apt to be, let us increase the tariff, let us protect our cost structure so that our workers can enjoy in peace and comfort the high earnings which an enlightened policy has given them. If this is done we are again apt to face the incongruities and crushing pressures of the twenties. We may find that we have practically isolated ourselves from the trading world and that a further cut in the value of our dollar will appear as necessary as it did in 1932.

At the best, we have pretty grim news to face and serious problems to solve and it is going to be very expensive to try to solve them by methods that we have tried in the past and found wanting. We hear it preached on all sides that we are now one world, that we have got to cooperate, that we have got to trade and that the standards of all mankind must be based on reasonable living conditions. I firmly believe in these aspirations, but are we prepared to adopt the national policy and make the contributions to the cause which economic reality will eventually demand to accomplish our aspirations.

ECONOMIC TREND LINE STUDIES.
CHESTER D. TRIPP.

Meat Shortage at Schenectady, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the worst meat famine in the history of Schenectady, N. Y., which is included in the Thirty-first New York Congressional District.

This situation is of such a nature as to demand immediate action for relief. The meat supply there is practically at rock bottom in both wholesale and retail establishments, and the meat famine will last a long time unless something is done immediately. This situation has reached its critical stage and it was apparent even as late as last night that consumers who were turned away at the meat markets will find little relief in the restaurants, which also are seriously feeling the present pinch. Locally the wholesalers and retailers have no fresh meat at all; no fresh-meat shipments have come into the city during the week; and in some instances dealers have even given cutters part of their annual vacation because there was nothing to do. Restaurateurs said the situation was very bad as far as they were concerned. All legitimate meat sources are now dried up; and prices for chicken and other fowl, if they can be obtained, are way beyond reason.

In this connection it is believed that the black market is intensely active in this area; and it is my intention to press the FBI for an immediate investigation.

At Ellis Hospital, where more than 400 patients are being fed daily—in addition to the several hundred staff members and employees—the shortage is also being felt.

This is an unbearable situation and exists not only in that locality but elsewhere, despite the fact that the War Food Administration cites figures showing the Nation now has more live cattle than ever before in its history.

Five hundred members of the Schenectady Consumers Corporation are unable to obtain meat due to the fact that the packers allege they cannot supply meat at ceilings without great loss. In the meantime, to the crying shame of the Nation, the black market is still active.

We, the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following most timely and forceful editorial from the May 20, 1945, Sunday Item, Lawrence, Mass., in opposition to any further reductions in the tariff rates under our reciprocal trade agreements. I sincerely hope that all the Members may have a chance to read the very interesting article:

WE, THE PEOPLE—WE MUST FIGHT FOR OUR OWN

The bill calling for Presidential power to reduce tariffs a further 50 percent under the reciprocal trade treaties comes up for congressional action in the early days of June. For the social, business, and industrial lead-

ers and organizations of this textile center the time for a concerted crescendo of protest against this measure has arrived. From now until the bitter end of a bitter battle there can be no let-up until victory perches on our banners.

And in this fight for our very economic existence, be it remembered that we have all the strength of American tradition on our side. One of the prime purposes of the founding fathers in writing the greatest political document ever to come from human hands was to afford protection and assistance to American commerce and industry. They were practical idealists who knew that political freedom withers unless it is rooted deep in the soil of economic stability.

Despite an original difference in tariff views between the two great political parties in this country, the whole purpose of both of them in levying duties on foreign imports has been to favor domestic industries and economic interests. Any disagreement between the parties has been more political than real.

In the olden days of the young Republic our infant industries had to compete against the better machinery and the admittedly superior managerial ability of Europe. As a result, we had to have tariff walls. But the change that has come is in the labor cost. Throughout the rest of the world the war has brought a terrific drop in living standards. To save their national economies and to recapture and expand lost business in the postwar world, European and Asiatic nations, which are fast becoming industrialized, will resort to slave labor and huge governmental subsidies. This last measure is itself a disguised tariff.

Already in the halls of Parliament and in the pages of the London Economist there have appeared unmistakable signs that English interests are growing aggressive, not to say truculent, in their plans to dig into our trade. Russia, with her revolutionary government flushed by victory in the field, is entering a period of intense nationalism in politics and economics.

In the face of these growing signs of international economic bitterness, and sustained by our knowledge that we are holding fast to the American tradition and way of life, it is high time we let the Congress know in very decided terms that we crave a bit of economic rest after 12 breathless years of economic crusading, that we feel the need to consolidate our great gains before we dispense any more largess to the world at large.

The sliderule boys with their beguiling theories have made a murderous mess of our food, gas, oil, paper, and rubber supplies. Why let them play ducks and drakes with our very livelihoods? We have given the world our armaments, our ships, our clothes, our food—and, dearest of all, our boys and girls. Let us keep at least our jobs so that we can have something to offer our veterans when at long last they do come home.

Practical Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, while I am well aware of the fact that in this beloved country of ours there are literally millions of fine patriotic Americans who are making many sacrifices and are bending every effort to bring about the ultimate victory, yet once in a while, like a shooting star in the firmament, we learn of individual citizens who are contributing a particular human touch to the cause of suffering humanity. I think every one of my colleagues has undoubtedly had this experience and I believe it is a great help to us to bring such incidents to each other's attention.

In my district at Belmar, N. J., there is a great American couple who are contributing from the bounty of their hearts to the rehabilitation of our wounded veterans. Pat and Sandy Breslin operate a fishing concession at the Belmar Marine Basin where they rent boats, bait, and fishing tackle for those who are so inclined. Throughout this whole war Pat and Sandy have never charged any man in the uniform of the United States a cent for the rental of their boats or their fishing equipment, and they have also furnished free hot dogs, soda pop, and the like to them. Once every month the entire gross proceeds of their business was given to the Red Cross.

Now these generous-hearted Americans have set aside every Monday for the rest of the season for the exclusive use of the wounded boys who are located at the hospitals near-by. They are given free use of the boats, bait, and lunch, and they are urged to enjoy themselves to their hearts' content.

Pat and Sandy practice practical patriotism. They do not wear their Americanism on their sleeve; it is deeply entrenched in their hearts and they are setting us all an example as to what we should do to make this great country of ours a better place.

Stettinius and the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune, of Great Falls, Mont., dated May 18, 1945, and an article from the New York Times of May 24, 1945, both having to do with the good work being done at San Francisco by our Secretary of State.

I feel that these two expressions of opinion are important enough to call to the attention of the membership so that it can see for itself the type of leadership and activity Mr. Stettinius is bringing to the Conference. I know that as he faces the many problems which confront a world meeting of the kind now being undertaken at San Francisco that he is doing his best to settle them in a business-like manner and with a true appreciation of the feelings of our country and our people. He is, as Mr. Porter points out in the New York Times article, growing in stature as each issue comes up for settlement, and furthermore it is well to note the statement made by Mr. Porter to the effect that the Secretary has kept constantly in mind the fact that the charter must be ratified by the United States Senate and has to the very best of his ability endeavored to act accordingly.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 18, 1945]

LEADERSHIP AT SAN FRANCISCO

Following informative comment in this column on Tuesday morning the clear-cut positions taken by Secretary of State Stettinius may well inspire confidence in the mind of every American citizen. His forceful statements encompass just what needs to be said as he places the world policy of this country before the delegates from 48 other nations at San Francisco. There is satisfaction as he is reported to have pounded the desk to emphasize his statement that the world security council of 11 must have precedence and authority in making serious decisions.

The Secretary expresses the impressive wish that we may write into the general framework satisfaction to Latin-American countries. He is entirely willing to take into consideration all existent bilateral treaties and agreements. That is fair enough, and the San Francisco Conference would fail in its mission, if the security council cannot take effective action as occasion arises.

It is the leadership of Secretary Stettinius, and others who are willing to follow that leadership, which would enable a world peace to stand the test of history.

[From the New York Times of May 24, 1945]

STETTINIUS HAILED FOR PART IN PARLEY—DURING ABSENCE IN WASHINGTON OBSERVERS STRESS CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONFERENCE SUCCESS

(By Russell Porter)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 23.—Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. is expected to return here tomorrow to make renewed efforts to bring the World Security Conference to an early end. While he has been in Washington conferring with President Truman, observers here have been evaluating his contributions to the Conference as one of its four copresidents and his achievements in protecting American interests as chairman of the United States delegation.

Despite minor criticism to the effect that Mr. Stettinius does not appear to as much advantage at plenary sessions and press conferences as do some of his more experienced colleagues, especially Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, and Foreign Commissar Molotoff, of Russia, it is generally agreed that he has made important contributions to the success of the Conference.

PROMOTES FEELING OF UNITY

The most important contribution is the feeling of unity which he has promoted, first among the members of the American delegation and its advisers and consultants, then among the Big Five, and finally throughout the Conference. As one issue after another came to the fore, and had to be settled in the give-and-take of cross-table negotiations, the Secretary of State grew in stature. His approach is that of the practical businessman and he has a genuinely friendly way of dealing with people. Foreign delegates seem to like it, especially the Russians, regarding it as typically American.

Throughout the Conference he has stood consistently for decisions which would make the charter of the new world organization more effective. In the settlement of the regional question, Mr. Stettinius took a strong stand for the amendment which prevailed, maintaining the superiority of the

world organization without any question, while at the same time preserving the Pan-American region system and retaining the confidence of the Latin-American group that Washington intended to stick to the act of Chapultepec.

On another line he has stood for liberalizing the charter as much as possible, consistent with its effectiveness. He put his full influence enthusiastically behind the fight for the human rights amendment and was instrumental in getting unanimous agreement on it. He also played a leading role in the move to strengthen the economic and social council.

Mr. Stettinius has stood firm for the protection of American interests, particularly in the trusteeship question. At the same time he has persuaded the British to go far enough along the trusteeship road to offer real hope for the independent peoples of the world in the future.

It was largely the influence of Secretary Stettinius that persuaded Mr. Molotov to stay here 2 weeks longer than he had intended and join in the negotiation of the joint four-power amendments which took several controversial issues out of the Conference.

Mr. Stettinius also took the responsibility for carrying out the late President Roosevelt's Yalta pledge to support the admission of the White Russians and Ukrainian delegations. Despite disturbing factors such as the Polish question, a remarkable degree of cooperation developed between the Russian and United States delegations, and Mr. Molotov left the Conference voicing very friendly sentiments toward the Secretary of State, as did Mr. Eden also.

The day before Mr. Eden left San Francisco the regional issue was still unsettled at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Mr. Stettinius proposed that British and American experts put in an intensive survey, and 3 hours later Mr. Eden presented a British proposal acceptable to us, which the Russians later adopted with slight changes

The Secretary's friends say he has kept constantly in mind that the charter must be ratified by the United States Senate.

Witnesses for and Against Extension of the Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of witnesses appearing against the extension of the trade-agreement bill and those appearing for the extension is revealing. Those against the extension of the bill outnumber those for the extension of the bill by practically two to one.

Those persons and firms opposed to the extension of the trade-agreement bill are largely in favor of keeping up our national defense. These patriotic persons and firms do not want the internationalists to put the United States in a position where it will be caught short of essential war materials and obliged to depend on foreign nations for those materials, whether mineral, agricultural, chemical, or mechanical, which, if adequately protected, will underwrite our safety in time of either peace or war.

It is significant also that many of those appearing for the trade-agreement bill extension have an interest as exporters or importers, or as advertisers of foreign-made goods, sugar brokers, and those interested in promoting luxury exports to be paid for by the competing products of the lowest-paid labor in foreign countries.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the line-up of witnesses and briefs filed for and against the trade-agreement program during the hearing on the bill:

ANALYSIS OF WITNESSES APPEARING AND OF BRIEFS FILED WITH THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS PERTAINING TO H. R. 2652 PROVIDING FOR EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

For the bill:	
Administration officials	7
Members of Congress	1
Other witnesses	25
Parties filing briefs	21
Total	54
Against the bill:	
Members of Congress	4
Other witnesses	54
Parties filing briefs	30
Total	88

Other briefs may have been filed and may appear in final printed reports following part 19.

WITNESSES AGAINST THE DOUGHTON BILL (IN WHOLE OR IN PART)

Oral statements

Members of Congress (4)

Carl Hinshaw (Republican), of California.

Earl R. Lewis (Republican, of Ohio.

Reid F. Murray (Republican), of Wisconsin.

Jennings Randolph (Democrat), of West Virginia.

Others (54)

Arthur Besse, president, National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

T. Albert Potter, president, Elgin National Watch Co., American Watch Industry.

Joseph C. Mahoney, Soft Fibres Manufacturing Institute.

H. Wickliffe Rose, American Tariff League, Inc.

Claudius T. Murchison, president, Cotton Textile Institute (also American Cotton Manufacturers Association, National Association of Cotton Manufacturers).

Irene Blunt, secretary-treasurer, National Federation of Textiles, Inc.

E. R. Van Vliet, vice president, Tubize Rayon Corp., Rayon Yarn Industry.

Charles B. J. Molitor, American Lace Manufacturers Association.

J. Carson Adkerson, president, American Manganese Producers Association.

Russell B. Brown, general council, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Ernest V. Gent, secretary, American Zinc Institute, Inc.

Charles W. Holman, secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

F. E. Mollin, American National Livestock Association.

Kenneth O. Bates, Armstrong Cork Co., Linoleum and Felt-Base Floor Covering Industry.

Don E. Mowry, Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers.

Robert S. Palmer, manager, Colorado Mining Association.

Norris E. Phillips, vice president, Tile Council of America.

J. B. Wilson, National Wool Growers Association.

Felix Edgar Wormser, secretary-treasurer, Lead Industries Association.

Fred G. Taylor, vice president, United States Beet Sugar Association (also American Sugar Cane League, Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association).

Charles A. Turner, president, Chester Lace Mills, National Association of Lace Curtain Manufacturers.

Wilwyn Herbert, secretary, Narrow Fabrics Institute.

D. K. Brown, American Paper and Pulp Association.

H. L. Coe, Bicycle Institute of America.

Alvardo M. Garcia, president Cigar Manufacturers' Association of America.

Carl H. Wilken, National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture.

D. H. Angney, Rhode Island Textile Association.

Tom Linder, Georgia commissioner of agriculture.

H. K. Thatcher, Arkansas commissioner of agriculture.

John Burns, Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America.

Albert O. Trostel, Jr., Tanners' Council of America.

Edward B. Benjamin, president, Bay Chemical Co. and Myles Salt Co.

O. W. Bilharz, Bilharz Mining Co.

Millard D. Brown, president, Continental Mills, Inc., Philadelphia Textile Manufacturers Association.

James K. Love, Shenango Pottery Co.

C. W. Carlson, president, U. S. Glass Co., American Glassware Association, handmade glassware section.

Frederick Dixon, Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America.

Walter W. Generazzo, national president, American Watchmakers Union.

Harry H. Cook, international president, American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America.

John G. Lerch, attorney, Toy Manufacturers of U. S. A. and Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.

J. M. Jones, National Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

C. J. Uhrmann, vice president, Imperial Glass Corp.

E. L. Torbert, vice president, Onondaga Pottery Co.

J. M. Wells, Homer Laughlin China Co.

James Duffey, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, AFL.

Alfred C. Guant, Merrimac Mills.

Otto Herres, Combined Metal Reduction Co.

George E. Colby, International Braid Co.

Dr. Leo M. Christensen, University of Nebraska.

Frank F. Payan, French Worsted Co.

Norman Randall, Elastic Webbing Industry.

H. B. Van Dorn, Joseph Dixon Crucible Co.

J. M. Welsh, Farms Crops Processing Co.

Matthew Woll, president, American Wage Earners Protective Conference, AFL.

Parties Who Filed Briefs or Statements With the Ways and Means Committee

National Association of Manufacturers (Francis Hopkinson).

National Grange (Fred Brenckman).

American Mining Congress (Julian D. Conover).

American Paper & Pulp Association.

United States Pulp Producers Association.

Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers.

Book Paper Manufacturers Association.

Julius B. Beatty in behalf of: Calumet & Hecla Consolidated Copper Co.; Consolidated Coppermines Corp., Nevada; Copper Range Co., Michigan; Magma Copper Co., Arizona; Miami Copper Co., Arizona; Phelps Dodge Corp., Arizona and Texas; Qunicy Mining

Co. of Michigan; Shattuck Denn Mining Co., Arizona; Tennessee Copper Co., Tennessee.
Beet Growers Association, Nyssa, Oreg.
Idaho Sugar Beet Growers, Shelley, Idaho.
Pacific Wool Growers, Portland, Oreg.
S. Stroock & Co., Inc. (woolen manufacturers).
Institute of Carpet Manufacturers of America.
Clock Manufacturing Industry.
Domestic Manufacturers of Carpets, Rugs, and Mats.
Leather Goods Manufacturers of America.
Plastic Materials Manufacturers Association, Washington, D. C.
Hooven Allison Co. (rope and twine).
Cambridge Tile Manufacturing Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Service Tools Institute, N. Y.
Elastic Fabrics (James R. Kendrick), Philadelphia, Pa.
Sportings Arms and Ammunition Manufacturing Institute.
Paper Makers Felt Industry.
Wool Hat Manufacturers Association of America.
Shears, Scissors, and Manicure Implements.
Woonsocket (R. I.) Association of Manufacturers and Chamber of Commerce.
National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Washington, D. C.
Vegetable Growers Association of America.
English Walnuts (Paul A. Dobson), California.
Paul T. Beardsley, Sloan, Iowa.

WITNESSES IN FAVOR OF THE DOUGHTON BILL

Oral statements

Administration Officials (7)

Hon. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State.
Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Assistant Secretary of State.
Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.
Hon. Charles P. Taft, Director, Office of Wartime Economic Affairs.
Hon. Fred M. Vinson, War Mobilization Director.
Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce.
Hon. Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture.

Member of Congress (1)

Cleveland M. Bailey, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Others (25)

Irving Richter, United Automobile Workers, CIO.
Byrl A. Whitney, assistant general counsel, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Emil Rieve, general president, Textile Workers Union of America.
Jacob S. Potofsky, chairman, CIO Latin-American Affairs Committee.
Bjarne Asper, president, Overseas Automotive Club.
Benjamin Marsh, the Peoples' Lobby.
Franklin Johnston, publisher, the American Exporter.
Mrs. J. Austin Stone, National Women's Trade Union League.
Anna Lord Strauss, National League of Women Voters.
Dr. Caroline F. Ware, American Association of University Women.
Mrs. Harvey Wiley, General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Ralph E. Flanders, Research Committee, Committee for Economic Development.
Louis Marbe Cohn, importer.
Ernest Kanzler, chairman of board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp.
Stacey May, assistant to president, James H. McGraw, Jr., president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
R. E. Short, president, Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, American Farm Bureau Federation.
James W. Bevans, National Council of American Importers.
Samuel Fraser, International Apple Association.
Mr. Vyrgil Atkinson, Reid Robinson, president, International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, CIO.
James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO.
George Harrison, Railway Clerks' Union, AFL.
Clark H. Minor, director, United States Chamber of Commerce.
Robert Lincoln O'Brien, former Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.
Maurice T. McGovern, American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba.
R. H. Patchin, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co.

Parties Who Filed Briefs or Statements in Favor of the Doughton Bill (21)

Hon. E. R. Stettinius, Jr.
Hon. Cordell Hull.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers.
California CIO.
Detroit Board of Commerce (Allen Dean).
Export Division, United States Chamber of Commerce (C. A. Richards).
International Economic Council, Chicago, Ill.
Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.
International Harvester Co., foreign operations, Chicago (G. C. Hoyt, vice president).
American Watch Assemblers' Association, Inc., New York.
National Council of Jewish Women, New York.
American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York.
YWCA of United States (Mary S. Ingraham).
Typewriter Manufacturers Export Association, Washington, D. C.
United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America (CIO).
National Farmers' Union, Denver, Colo. (James G. Patton, president).
National Foreign Trade Council (Eugene P. Thomas).
List of 1,300 American economists.
James A. Farley.
H. H. Pike & Co., New York (sugar brokers).
Drug, Chemical, and Allied Trade Section of New York Board of Trade.

New Type of Disk Plow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the whole world is marveling today at the inventive genius of the men and women, many of them Americans, who have contributed the ideas which have been built by American engineers and industries into the tanks, guns, planes, ships, and all the other items which the industrial genius of the world is turning out in implements of war. We are aghast at V–1 bombs which fly without human control, and at V–2 bombs which go into the stratosphere and travel at an unbelievable speed before they drop on the designated objective. We wonder what jet planes will do to future aviation plans. We realize what inventions in light metals and plastics will do to post-war living. We try to determine in our minds this strange balance of the cruelties and sufferings of war on one side and the resulting improvements and inventions in surgery and drugs and methods on the other.

I thought it might interest the House, Mr. Speaker, to have me call attention to a peacetime invention, almost completely overlooked in the more striking inventions of the war, which many people believe can revolutionize orchard cultivation in agriculture.

The invention is very simple. It is a new type of disk plow, invented by Mr. Steven Toth, of Perris, Calif., which is in my congressional district. The new plow is so constructed that it will allow operation on a much shorter turning radius than present, more conventional designs. It will also allow right-hand turns and backing, maneuvers which Mr. Toth says are unknown in any similar implement presently in use. It permits close cultivation around trees and other obstacles, or in fence corners. At the beginning and during a turn, the disk assembly is automatically raised, and the turning is facilitated without hand operation and without stopping. Another advantage is said to be in the arrangements for raising and locking the disks or the plow while moving from one location to another or along the road.

There is a novel feature which gives a higher than normal suspension, and which consequently prevents the plow from accumulating weeds or other debris. This removes the frequent stops which the older models required. The plow can be rigged for tractor hitch or for pulling by draft animals, and the disk blades are interchangeable with moldboard types of plowshares.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very practical demonstration of what the peace-loving peoples of the world want to see, the beating of swords into plowshares.

Ellison DuRant Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ELLISON DURANT SMITH, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in every man's career when he must lay down his working tools and depart this life for the Great Beyond.

Our good friend Senator ELLISON SMITH, of South Carolina, was a great leader, an energetic Senator, and an advocate of those things of benefit to his country. He was especially interested in the affairs of his own State of South Carolina. His interest in cotton, and the farmers engaged in agricultural pursuits, earned him the title of "COTTON ED" SMITH.

It was my privilege and pleasure to live at the same hotel as Senator SMITH for a number of years. We both were members of the same college fraternity, Phi

Kappa Psi. As a result of these associations I learned to know "COTTON ED" intimately. He was a big-hearted man, unselfish and interested in the welfare of others. He was truly a great Phi Psi and our national fraternity will miss him. Our Federal Government has sustained a great loss, and his own State of South Carolina has lost a good friend to whom its people are indebted in a great many ways.

Now his work here is over and Senator SMITH has gone to his eternal rest. To this old friend and fraternity brother, I might say, We miss you, and we shall continue to miss you. But some day we hope it shall be our privilege to join you around the Great White Throne.

It is an old belief
That on some solemn shore,
Beyond the sphere of grief,
Dear friends shall meet once more.

Foreign Trade in a Stable Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in observing National Foreign Trade Week and National Maritime Day, the chamber of commerce and the Propeller Club, port of Charleston, S. C., was fortunate in having as its speaker the Honorable Amos E. Taylor, Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce.

I had often heard my very dear friend, C. W. Martin, of Charleston, who represents the Commerce Department in my city, speak of the outstanding ability of Dr. Taylor. I have known of the splendid work being done by Mr. Martin in my city and, therefore, knew that his director would have a fine message for the people of my community.

In obtaining permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am privileged to include therewith a copy of the excellent address made by the distinguished Director of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Dr. Amos E. Taylor.

I have just come from Savannah whence the steamship bearing that city's name sailed on May 22, 1819, on what was an historic mission. We have good reason to celebrate this event, the real significance of which was hardly understood at the time. The intervening period of 126 years, though representing perhaps a relatively short span in the history of our Nation, has bridged a wide gap in our industrial history. The period encompasses our growth from a nation of less than 10,000,000 facing a broad western frontier to an ocean-to-ocean economic empire of more than 130,000,000. In 1819 we were engaged in the development of a system of internal transportation which after another half century carried us to the Pacific. At the time the *Savannah* set sail the Erie Canal was in process of construction and, like most undertakings of that type, it was financed largely by European capital. The Atlantic was not a barrier but an avenue of contact.

The economic development of the United States during the nineteenth century was accelerated and in fact made possible largely through the use of capital borrowed abroad. It was as a debtor nation that this country began its rapid physical growth and development. With a rapid increase in wealth and national income and a growing foreign demand for our agricultural products the meeting of interest and dividend payments was simply part of a happy process which assured ready and profitable world markets.

Our ability to produce and transport goods in large volume was clearly demonstrated to the world during the First World War when the weight of our participation quickly made itself felt on both the economic and military fronts. Private and public loans granted to foreign governments with which we eventually became associated in a common effort, together with a substantial liquidation by Great Britain, France, and other foreign countries of their holdings in the United States, shifted our international position almost overnight from that of net debtor to net creditor.

I shall not be surprised if the historian of the future should find that the year 1945 marked the close of one era and the beginning of another. For it so happens that we are on the threshold of important decisions. Whatever the final import of those decisions, I believe that the Conference at San Francisco reflects a universal acknowledgment that the relationship of each part of the world to all others requires not only a code of law and order but a permanent basis of mutual understanding. We have long been conscious of a growing degree of economic interdependence among the nations of the world but it is somewhat ironic that it required two destructive world wars and a world depression to impress upon us the need for concerted action. While nations were moving closer and closer together they were totally unprepared to live together in peace. The failure to understand the nature of the world we live in led us to the brink of disaster and we cannot afford to repeat.

The war itself has produced far-reaching changes which have emphasized the necessity for cooperative action and organization. Compelled by the necessity to utilize our human and natural resources to the maximum we have found new means for applying energy drawn from nature's bounties for the production of goods and services in ever-increasing volume. This fact alone is of tremendous significance as we contemplate utilizing these same sources of power in time of peace. There is virtually no limit to what we can produce but if the machinery of production is to be kept operating at full capacity we must find means whereby each person able and willing to work can contribute his share and participate in the final result. It is only by making possible such contribution that all of us can enjoy the things which we produce. If we achieve this desirable end, it will necessarily mean a higher standard of living for all of us. Such an accomplishment cannot be achieved, however, by one region within the country at the expense of another. Nor can it be achieved by one country or world area at the expense of another.

If we assume, then, that a maximum level of employment and a system of international collaboration are both essential we can appropriately turn our attention to the importance of foreign trade as a means of achieving effective results. For it is in the field of foreign trade where the practice of making a living and instruments of international understanding can be most effectively combined into a practical formula. The free flow of goods and services in large volume is the only means whereby all nations can hope to participate in common opportunities for maintaining high standards of living. Countries dependent, for example, upon shipping as an important source of national income will find a necessary means of livelihood cut off if world trade falls to the low levels experienced, for example, during the early thirties. Moreover, it is only under conditions of unhindered world trade that many countries can find real opportunities for acquiring the foreign buying power so essential to the purchase of consumer products in foreign markets.

The primary requirement in such a program is the development of a state of economic health throughout the world. Export trade cannot be looked upon as an end in itself; it is part of a process which, if it is to be maintained, requires a good economic climate and sound economic conditions at each end of the transaction. It is only under such conditions that business can long be maintained on a basis of mutual confidence and benefit.

The United States constitutes the most important free marketing area in the world. Our unhappy experiences under the articles of federation prompted us to guard against any system of tariffs or trade restrictions between the States under the Federal Constitution. We have thus been able to develop our resources and to exchange goods and services freely throughout the whole Nation. That even national frontiers need not be viewed as difficult barriers to the exchange of goods and services in the larger world community is evidenced by the high volume of trade between the United States and Canada. Our heavy expenditures for travel in Canada and the large net purchases by Canadians of our merchandise represent reciprocal processes whereby the individual demands of thousands of people on each side of the border are met to the benefit of all.

The break-down of the international financial machinery in 1931 and the subsequent developments were the byproducts of an unstable world order that we are finally, let us hope, in the process of reconstructing on a firm foundation. While we may differ on details we are generally agreed on the necessity for establishing by international cooperation a program for stabilizing world currencies. We view with sympathetic understanding the need for other steps such as the establishment of an international bank which would by direct action or by its guaranty of private loans assure the availability of long-term funds for the development of resources wherever such development can be profitably undertaken. The proposed legislation providing for the removal of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is designed to make it possible for us to exchange further concessions with other countries, to the benefit of all.

If we should view the period of a century and a quarter since the historic crossing of the *Savannah* as a cycle in our economic history we may perhaps be justified in hoping for a new era of good feeling such as our political historians have long associated with the close of the second decade of the nineteenth century.

An examination of the statistics of our foreign trade shows that our prosperity index and the volume of our imports follow parallel lines. Since foreign buying power in the United States depends largely upon the dollar payments made by us when we import it follows that our ability to develop and maintain a prosperous economy determines in large part our success in developing foreign markets for our products on a sound and sustaining basis. Because of the importance of our export and import trade in the total stream of world commerce it is evident that our postwar level of domestic business activity will materially influence the degree to which the outside world will be free of the pressure which

might otherwise perpetuate a system of tariffs, quotas, and other restrictions.

Assuming a sound international investment policy and the effective reconversion to full civilian production and employment after the war we believe, in the Department of Commerce, that this country may look forward to total merchandise exports of $10,000,000,000 or more a year. On the basis of an estimated national income of $150,000,000,000, which a program of full employment should make possible, such a goal reflects a conservative ratio of export to total output. Also, with our expanded industrial capacity as a result of the war, major American industries will necessarily expect wider world markets if they are to operate at maximum capacity and under full employment. They will look for larger markets abroad for capital goods produced in this country. Any sound program of industrialization in undeveloped areas will mean not only a wider demand for equipment produced in this country but will also contribute toward the attainment of higher standards of living and thus broader world markets generally. The history of the United States during the nineteenth century as a world borrower bears ample testimony to this kind of mutually profitable development.

It is only under conditions of a rising level in world trade that we can hope to achieve these objectives. If we should assume that larger and larger markets for American goods were to be developed under conditions of a stationary level of international commerce, we would have to view international trade as necessarily a form of economic warfare and plan our trade-promotion problem accordingly. Unfortunately, in the past national trade policies were too frequently formulated on the assumption that the volume of total world trade was more or less fixed and that if we allowed the other fellow to get into a market, we would be deprived of such a market in direct proportion to his success.

Foreign trade and domestic trade cannot be cataloged in separate compartments. They go together, since imports in the long run provide the means of paying for exports. To us in the United States many of the former are essential and are not produced at home. Foreign markets absorb a relatively large proportion of the output of certain industries as well as of certain regions even though total exports may be a comparatively small part of our total national output. You are all familiar with the truth of this statement as it relates, for example to such export commodities as cotton and tobacco. As has been demonstrated during periods of national adversity a decline in exports and imports deprives our consumers and our industries of many products and raw materials which we can either not replace at all or replace only with difficulty. At the same time American industries are deprived of profitable outlets for their products.

Under conditions of full employment in the United States our ability to save is enormous. Our industries have achieved a much more advanced stage of development than have those of other countries. In many countries capital is relatively scarce and opportunities for profitable investment will be open to us throughout the world. Such opportunities if directed along sound lines are bound to result in higher levels of employment and income, higher standards of living, and stable social and economic conditions. The net result is a sure contribution to world peace.

The resources of all parts of our country are essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy. The industrial capacity of certain sections has risen sharply as a result of wartime developments. In these newer industrial areas labor and resources are available for continued development after the war. This is true, for example, in the South where the possibilities for expanded world trade are enhanced by the existence of excellent ports open throughout the year, ports located at what we might call our gateways to Latin-American and other markets. A sound development of these markets will contribute to higher standards of living, both at home and abroad.

In its recent report, The Postwar Foreign Economic Policy of the United States, the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning emphasized the fact that our foreign trade, even though small in relation to national income, is bound to have a very important impact upon the economy of foreign nations. Many countries depend heavily upon international trade as a source of national income. Since the United States is in position to contribute most to United States and world prosperity, the full utilization of our enormous capacity to produce, to consume, and to save must result during the postwar years in an expansion of exports, expansion of imports, and an expansion in foreign investments. It is important, therefore, that national policies relating to foreign trade and foreign investments be properly synchronized in order that we may avoid the unfortunate consequences of the 1920's. The scarcity of capital in undeveloped areas and in countries devastated by the war provides broad opportunities for investment. Under programs of economically sound industrial expansion both lender and borrower will benefit. Such form of mutual participation in an expanding world economy is reflected in the history of the United States during the century following the event which we are now celebrating.

Since trade and finance are interdependent it is well that we examine the case for future foreign lending. We are all familiar with our experience during the 1920's. It was not an entirely happy experience, but it is important that we do not confuse cause with effect. Our mistakes lay less in the fact that we engaged in foreign lending than in the fact that we failed to understand the nature of our position as a world creditor. We continued to be ruled by a debtor psychology and thus pursued policies which were inconsistent with each other.

American business has long had a tremendous stake abroad in the form of industrial and other investments. These investments range all the way from mineral developments in Latin America, plantations in Central America and Middle East, to branch plants in Canada, Great Britain, and the Continent of Europe. These investments taken as a whole have proved profitable to American business even during the depression of the thirties and have provided a source of foreign buying power to the countries in which they have been made. Foreign sources of raw materials become of increasing importance to us as our domestic reserves are being more and more heavily drawn upon by our highly developed industrial machine.

Although the United States has become the temporary guardian of billions of the outside world's capital funds, this country is destined to continue its strong creditor role after the war. It is not possible to draw up a blueprint showing in statistical terms the exact position the United States will occupy in the world economy after the war. We do have, however, a measure of the economic factors which are available as guides if we would turn to universal advantage the opportunities implicit in the country's economic power. The United States has achieved a degree of maturity in technological experience which has stood the world in good stead during the present war. This experience can be utilized after the war to the advantage of both ourselves and the rest of the world. Indeed, our responsibility as a nation wielding an unprecedented balance of economic power permits no other course.

During the period between the two wars the international economic and financial position of this country reflected many signs of instability. The causes lay partly within the United States but yet not entirely so. The modern industrial world is exceedingly dynamic; impulses generated by developments in a given world area do not automatically spend themselves when they reach a national frontier. The periodic disturbances in the United States balance of payments during the two decades following the last war had world-wide repercussions. Yet in a world which is rapidly becoming a more and more highly integrated economic unit it is safe to suggest that such disturbances are inevitable so long as machinery for international collaboration and for the effective handling of international economic problems does not exist.

The wide fluctuations between boom and slump and the erratic behavior of capital movements during the twenties and thirties reflected not only conditions of instability in the United States but they impressed upon us the important fact that, in view of the international repercussions, steps must be taken in the future to guarantee a closer coordination of the business-cycle policies of all the principal industrial nations. The possibility of such coordination rests upon a frank recognition of the principle that the modern interdependent world must do business with itself if peace and security are to be more than a distant hope.

The recognition of this fact is more important than the details of means and methods for achieving results. We cannot safely refuse to recognize the need for international exchange stability just because every detailed operation cannot be demonstrated in advance by a miniature model or because of a vague fear that a particular nation has ulterior motives whenever its spokesmen comment favorably upon some particular anticipated benefits.

The balance of economic power held by the United States after the war carries with it definite responsibilities in making it possible for goods and services to move and in making an adequate contribution to the total volume of world trade. On the other hand, it must be recognized that certain rights attach to such responsibilities. International cooperation, to be effective, requires that all parties be as willing to recognize each other's rights as to receive benefits from the common effort.

Fallacious Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post today, Saturday, May 26, entitled "Strange Melting Pot" is unfair to the House Committee on Immigration in general and to me in particular. This editorial, among other things in referring to me, states: "He does not intend to have any German or Italian girls admitted to this fair land." No statement ever made by me is subject to such interpretation. As a matter of fact, I would not exclude or reduce the immigration quotas from Germany or Italy without making similar reductions in the

quotas from all other nations now permitted immigration. I favor, and I am sure the majority of the members of the Immigration Committee favor, the admission of all bona fide spouses of American citizens who are not subject to exclusion under existing laws. I do oppose the enactment of legislation which might encourage promiscuous foreign marriages. Furthermore, I am advocating and have introduced a bill to exclude from this country persons who actively served in the armed forces of any nation while such nation was at war with America. The purpose of my bill is to exclude insofar as possible Nazis and Fascists.

I have both German and Italian communities within my congressional district. Many of the best citizens of America are of German and Italian extraction. Some of us on the House Commitee on Immigration feel that we should reduce the number of persons permitted to immigrate to this country, regardless of their national origin. Most of us feel that we should be much more selective in the matter of aliens who are given admission to these shores.

However, neither I nor any member of the Immigration Committee has made any statement justifying the erroneous and fallacious editorial above referred to.

Spain and the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, editorial writers in numerous newspapers throughout America have commented critically and caustically upon the effect of our continued collaboration with Franco Fascist Spain and with the Argentine—a Fascist camp follower of Franco.

With the consent of my colleagues, I am including hereinbelow some editorials typical of the viewpoint of outstanding newspapers of America.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of April 25, 1945]

OUT IN THE COLD

When the delegates of the 46 United Nations assemble today in San Francisco to form a world security league, no nation will view the proceedings with the same forlorn misgivings that must beset Fascist Spain at this moment of Axis defeat. Spain, as a neutral, is out in the cold, as are 5 other neutral nations, but only Spain's Fascist leaders can grasp the terrible significance of events both in Germany and in San Francisco.

German and Italian aid during the civil war of 1936–39 enable Gen. Francisco Franco to fasten fascism on Spain. Grateful for this support, the Spanish dictator made no secret of his sympathy as long as Hitler held the upper hand in Europe. But after the fall of Italy in 1943, Spain abandoned her status as a nonbelligerent ally of the Nazis and became a neutral. Now Spain, the only neutral that openly aided the Axis, sees every blow of the Allies bringing closer the day when she will become an island of fascism on the Continent of Europe. When the war is over, can this single Fascist state stand against the resurgent forces of world democracy? It hardly seems likely. No wonder General Franco recently has attempted to ingratiate his government with the Allies.

The victorious forces of democracy are not all that Franco has to fear. He is in danger at home. High prices, low wages, food shortages, and the bitter memories of civil war make him as unpopular with his own people as with those abroad. He is sustained in power principally through fear of more civil war that might follow his overthrow.

There are two principal groups contesting to succeed the Fascist regime. One is the monarchists, led by Don Juan, pretender to the Spanish throne, who has denounced the Franco Government and is expected to seek British support in restoration of the Spanish monarchy as the only way, he claims, to reestablish peace in Spain.

The other is the Republicans, who contend that an attempt to put Don Juan on the throne would lead to civil war, and that Spaniards will have no trouble in getting rid of Franco if foreign governments will keep hands off. Furthermore, Republican leaders feel that Franco's fall would be hastened if the Allies withdrew diplomatic and economic support. It also would be hastened, we might add, if the Republican factions, at home and in exile, could unite on a course of action. Representative COFFEE of Washington has introduced in the House a resolution urging the President to break relations with Franco and send arms and medical supplies to Republican guerrila forces in Spain.

Now that the Axis is in its death throes and Spain no longer poses any military threat on the Continent, the Allies can afford to withdraw diplomatic and economic support from the Franco regime and permit it to suffer from its own people the full fruits of its tyranny. If it is our purpose to rid the world of fascism once and for all, certainly the Franco regime in Spain cannot be overlooked. Spain must not remain a Fascist seedbed from which a third world war might easily sprout.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of April 27, 1945]

STRAINING AT A GNAT AND SWALLOWING A CAMEL

Sometimes one wonders about Congress. Particularly now one wonders at the weird mental processes animating the House Foreign Affairs Committee's resolution—which it urges that both branches pass—calling upon the Government to use force and ignore treaties in pursuing war criminals even into so-called neutral countries. The emerging picture of Congress' behind-the-brow workings is almost incredible.

The obvious thing in such a picture is that—whether or not it knows it—Congress thereby would be calling for war. That is what armed suasion or invasion of a neutral country would be. More than that, it would be aggressive war. Third, it would constitute aggression by the Nation that presently is putting forth such large gestures against aggressive war now and in future. Again, by the same token, that invasion would destroy—probably forever—any confidence in the United States good faith which the smaller countries now may feel. Nor would this Nation's assurances that it sought only war criminals have any effect.

The picture holds something even more alarming: It reveals the unhappy lack of perception in Congress concerning the present nature and situation of the enemy's real strength. What surely is plain to anyone except some Congressmen is that German war criminals are not worth such high political and other prices—because they are known, marked men and thus are relatively useless in future to their masters. They should be hounded down, taken, and punished where that can be achieved through normal processes; but they are not worth the kind of action or attitude which Congress proposes that this Government take.

What Congress had far better concern itself with is the fact that real German strength and brains today are ensconced in most "neutral" European nations and in Argentina, and that those brains and that strength are being turned to use in Latin America through Spain's embassies and legations there.

What Congress had better learn is that German agents—working with and through the Spanish Falange—already have created subversive organizations that are strong, tightly disciplined and growing and that reach into the United States. Federal agencies dealing with such matters are keenly aware of the scope, strength, and vicious means of appeal and command which Falange, Sinarquismo, and similar subversive movements have here, as well as largely throughout Latin America. It is high time—indeed, well past time—that Congress learn something about that menace.

The armed warfare with Germany in Europe is about over—for this time—but the war with Germany has not stopped and will not stop. It merely has moved its loci of operations from Germany to Argentina, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, and Portugal—to name them in the probable descending order of their importance to the German General Staff.

No guesswork is involved. The Germans are here, in this hemisphere—now. They have investments in Argentina alone, which an Argentine official in 1944 estimated at not less than a billion dollars—and probably by now one and one-half million—as against Britain's approximately $700,000,000. Those investments do not represent the total of German resources in Argentina, let alone throughout Latin America.

The Germans have boasted and still boast that they will succeed in disrupting this country from within and take it in the next armed phase of the continuing World War. They already have a long head-start in Latin America and a strong bridgehead in the United States.

If Congress be feeling its oats enough to want to invade something—fight some enemy force—let it take on the German General Staff, the Falange, and the Sinarquismo.

Resolution of Northeastern States Development Agencies Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the Northeastern States Development Agencies Conference at a meeting held at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City on May 3 and 4, 1945. The resolution was received by me this morning from M. P. Catherwood, of the Department of Commerce, Albany, N. Y.:

Representatives of the development agencies of the Northeastern States, including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, having conferred on matters of mutual concern and interest at a meeting held in New York City

on May 3 and 4, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"The Northeastern States were the cradle of liberty and economic progress and are the heart of the commercial and industrial life of the Nation. These States are the homes and workshops of nearly one-third of the people of the Nation, and therefore America's greatest consumer market. At the same time they stand as the chief gateway for the exchange of goods between this country and the rest of the world.

"We combine a rich experience in industrial skills, business judgment, and advanced labor relations with a wealth of youthful ideas and energy, and shall continue to expand our contributions to the benefit of the entire country.

"We are continuing, as ever, to lead the way in progressive government and business measures for the benefit of all peoples everywhere. Our histories have demonstrated that economic and political freedom are not merely compatible but complementary.

"It is the sense of the meeting that the postwar prosperity of the Nation, particularly the reemployment of our returning service men and women, is the first order of business of the development agencies of the Northeastern States. To achieve this high objective the Nation requires the mature experience and skilled workmanship of the people of the Northeastern States.

"In peace, as in war, we take pride in the industrial development and prosperity of our entire Nation, and shall continue to give our best efforts and "know-how" to the end that all States will profit from the contributions of each, so that economic expansion can be general.

"We shall continue to resist any effort to destroy the national free market, the birthright of every American, or to erect artificial trade and industrial barriers between States or regions, or to grant any special privileges to any sections of the country at the expense of the others. Opportunity for growth is unlimited throughout America, and we shall all prosper as we expand together."

Thoughts of a Fighting Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a poem written by my lifelong friend, Col. Lester J. Abele.

This poem portrays the thoughts of a fighting soldier on the front line who knows that his son is also wearing the same uniform and fighting the same big battle:

SOMEWHERE DEEP IN GERMANY,
March 27, 1945.

MY DEAR SON TONY:

I wish I had the power to write
The thoughts wedged in my heart tonight
As I sit here watching that great big star
And wondering how and where you are.
You know, Tony, it's a funny thing
How close a war can always bring
A family, who for years with pride
Has kept emotion deep inside.
I'm sorry that when you were small
I let reserve build up that wall—
I told you real men never cried
And it was mommie who always dried
Your tears and smoothed the hurt away
So that you soon went back to play.
But, Tony, deep down within my heart
I longed to have some little part
In drying that small tear-stained face.
But we were men—men don't embrace,
Now suddenly, I find my son
A full grown man, with childhood done,
Tonight you're far away across the sea
But soon you'll be waging war for men like me.
Well, somehow pride and what is right
Just doesn't seem to go tonight.
I find my eyes won't stay quite dry;
I find that sometimes men do cry.
And if we stood here face to face
I'm afraid we'd find men do embrace.
Tony, dads are quite a funny lot
And if I've failed you in some spot
It's not because I loved you less,
It's just this cussed manliness.
But if I had the power to write
The thoughts wedged in my heart tonight
The words would ring out loud and true
I'm proud, my Tony, so-o-o proud of you.

Your dad,

LESTER J. ABELE,
Colonel, JAGD, Staff Judge Advocate,
Twelfth Corps.

It Should Be Permanent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to include a splendid editorial that appeared on May 11, 1945, in the Home News, the leading publication in Bronx County, N. Y.

The Home News has long been noted for the soundness of its editorial policy and its ability to clearly reflect the opinion of the great community it serves. In its advocacy of a permanent FEPC it unquestionably expresses the firm conviction of almost the entire population of our Bronx County.

The editorial follows:

IT SHOULD BE PERMANENT

A few months before the war began for the United States, President Roosevelt, by Executive order in the summer of 1941, created the Fair Employment Practice Commission, to help assure that the intensifying national need for industrial manpower should not be balked by discrimination on account of race, creed, or color. This year, with the European hostilities nearing their predestined close, New York State, through legislation strongly endorsed by Governor Dewey, provided for establishment of an effective antibias agency of its own, becoming the first State to take such action.

The Federal FEPC has functioned to excellent purpose. Though without power to enforce its decisions, it has successfully handled thousands of cases, thereby playing a significant role for maximum manning of war industry while protecting Americans of every race in their basic right to earn a living. But it remains nonetheless purely a wartime bureau, temporary and due for dissolution when the war ends. Unless Congress moves for a permanent FEPC, hard times may loom for multitudes whose job prospects will be poorer in the postwar economy than they could possibly have been in the general wartime cry for workers of any description, and no questions asked—save in those numerous yet relatively exceptional instances where FEPC intervention has been necessary.

The Empire State has shown the way. For the implementation of a principle deep-rooted in American philosophy, Washington should take a lesson from Albany. New York projects its thinking, its idealism, and its respect for human rights into a coming era when job-finding may be less easy than during the past few years—and when, by every canon of justice, the willing and qualified worker ought not to confront extra difficulties because of his race or religion.

New York State formally asseverates that persons good enough to hold wartime jobs without regard to their ancestry or complexion are good enough for peacetime employment, too—especially after a war in which this country's sons of all races and religions have bled, and still bleed, to wipe out foreign tyrant enemies of democracy, equality, and fraternity. If the State of New York can do anything about it, none of those men (or any other) is going to be an economic victim of prejudice. And since the State of New York is very definitely trying to do something about it, the United States Government ought to do no less for all its people.

Pending in the House of Representatives is a bill by Congresswoman MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, to set up a permanent FEPC as an administrative agency with adequate powers of its own to prevent discrimination and proceed against violators. The House Committee on Labor has reported the measure favorably, but it lies dormant in the Rules Committee. To bring the bill before the House for an immediate vote, 218 Congressmen must sign a petition now circulating. Many have signed, but more are required.

It is true that legislation of this kind flies in the face of widespread, unenlightened, age-old prejudices. It is true that injudicious administration of antibias laws might spur serious resentments. But the social good and individual justice which such laws are designed to foster are considerations incomparably surpassing any real or fancied issues of expediency. This country should have a permanent commission for fairness in employment, and the people must tell Congress as much.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Judge Samuel H. Sibley, senior judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, to Mr. Jesse F. Orton, of Jackson Heights, N. Y.:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 3, 1945.*

MR. JESSE F. ORTON,
Jackson Heights, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ORTON: Thank you for sending me copy of your brief on the subject of congressional power to require abolition of poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections. I find your argument against the power unanswerable, though I myself needed no persuasion, for I have never understood how such a power could be claimed by Congress.

I am interested too in the statement the pamphlet bears, that you are personally opposed to limitation of suffrage by requirement of poll-tax payment. This, of course, is a matter of State policy. I am provoked to make a word of explanation of the policy and its history in my State, Georgia. I see in you a fair-minded man, really interested in the matter.

The poll-tax States are commonly spoken of as having invented the system to prevent the Negro from voting. The idea is mere provincialism and ignorance on the part of some; of willful misstatement on the part of others. I think southern people ought to take more trouble to explain to outsiders their ideas and position on many matters which the latter undertake to criticize.

In Georgia, the poll tax has nothing to do with the Negro, and the requirement of its payment for voting is not special, but applies equally to all taxes. So far as I know the poll tax dates way back before the Negroes paid any taxes, and so far as I know it has always been required of everyone in Georgia that they pay what they owe in support of the government before they are allowed to help run the government. This idea still seems just and right to me, especially as to recent taxes and those not so burdensome as to be unpayable. The poll tax in Georgia is small, so small that a man can deprive himself of tobacco for a week and pay it. If he can work at all, he can pay it if interested enough to take the trouble. The dues in every labor union are, so far as I know them, at least 12 times more onerous, but no union permits a man who does not pay his dues to vote, hold office, or have any benefits of the union if it can be prevented. The clubs of the country are the same way. I cannot see why the citizen should not pay moderate personal dues to his government in recognition of the benefits he daily receives. I would not take away the benefits if he will not pay, but I would deny him the privilege of helping to control taxation, expenditure, and other policies of government. My State, in sponse to pressure from unions and others who seek to have as many irresponsible voters as possible, has recently abolished the poll tax, but I regard it as the result of pressure, and not the expression of any real principle, unless it be to let everybody vote. This principle would also remove educational, age, crime-free qualifications as well. Georgia has also imitated Soviet Russia, though I have never seen any allusion to the imitation, in putting the age down to 18, males and females.

But to get back to the point: When in 1868, the Negro having become a voter, and the carpet baggers being in control of the State, a new constitution was adopted, the law stood thus:

A poll tax existed on "every free white person between the ages of 21 and 60." (Irvins Code, sec. 806 (3).)

The then onstitution, as its predecessors, required as a condition of voting that all taxes should be paid. (Art. V, par. 1, Irvins Code, sec. 4980.)

The new constitution (art. II, sec. II) continued the requirement for voting: "And shall have paid all taxes which may have been required of him and which he may have had an opportunity of paying."

In article I, section XXVII, for the first time among the objects of taxation was included this: "To provide a general school fund." Theretofore the State by statute had extended aid for schools in the counties, though quite inadequate, but there was no State system of common schools. This is remarkable, seeing that Georgia pioneered in State higher education, establishing its university in 1784, the oldest of the State universities.

Article I, section XXIX, read: "No poll tax shall be levied except for educational purposes, and such tax shall not exceed $1 annually on each poll."

Article VI, section I, required the general assembly at its first session to provide "a system of general education to be forever free to all children of the State." Section III sets up the educational fund, including, among other special taxes, the poll tax. A general ad valorem tax was to supplement the fund as needed.

In Georgia the poll tax, at $1 per head, was thus interwoven with the educational system of common schools in the days when the Negroes ruled the State, most white persons being disfranchised by participation in the late war. The good and wise arrangements then made about education were, however, retained in the succeeding constitution of 1877, along with the irrevocable pledge of the poll tax to the public schools, and remains the law today. It is a sorry man who will not pay $1 per year for the general support of the government. It is a sorrier man who will not pay it for the education of his own and his neighbor's children. I do not see how he can live at all and not be able to spare that dollar for this purpose. I shall always think he ought not to vote. It is the only way to call the attention of such a sorry fellow to his duty to pay the dollar. It is not worth the tax collector's time to try to collect it in any other way.

In operation, as many or more whites have been disfranchised as Negroes. There has been an abuse, whereby candidates for office have offered to pay up the taxes of white or black to enable them to vote for that candidate. This was fair and right in some cases. In others, there was mere vote buying. Such sorry citizens will continue to sell their votes all the more freely if the money comes to them instead of going to pay the poll tax.

The point is that in Georgia the poll tax came into the constitutional law by the action of the Negroes, and their radical guardians, and to aid in elementary education, and this is irrevocably dedicated to that use; and the thought has always been that a man who would not pay it for such a purpose was simply not a good citizen. There was the other thought too that those who had no property could not otherwise be made to pay. Being an old man, over 70, I still think both ideas sound. We did right in making a constitutional amendment whereby taxes for only a few years back are now required to be paid, and I would prefer that we had stopped there.

The danger I foresee is that our citizenry are departing from the old idea that they ought to support the Government, and are now clamoring that the Government support them. This can be accomplished for awhile by taxing those who have, and distributing to those who have not. It is a fine principle of private life, but a dangerous policy of Government. It is doubly dangerous when the irresponsibles who want to be supported are multiplied over those who are willing to help support the Government. The direct tendency is to increasing socialism, or communism, or disaster. I have great faith in the wisdom of our people if they understand a thing, and take time to think. I am chiefly worried over the tendency to speed up many things in themselves good, but which ought to take time to build up solidly. Among these I count the attempt to attain a general social security that bears fairly on all, and does not favor special organized groups; and the difficult questions of racial antipathies which exist north and south, east and west. I feel sure that in both these fields we had best make haste more slowly.

With renewed thanks for your service in the matter to which you have directed your thought, and hoping that I may have given you some insight into the State aspect of that question,

Yours truly,

SAMUEL H. SIBLEY.

Furlough Credits for Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time in the Nation's history the country is concerned with returning veterans from all phases of this war. The question, therefore, foremost in the minds of many of the people of the Nation is to the best methods of treatment to be accorded them by the Government, the length of their furlough periods, as well as an equitable recognition of rights between enlisted men and commissioned officers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a set of resolutions by the American Legion, Grafton Post, No. 41, Grafton, N. Dak.:

Whereas military and naval personnel of the United States, under existing regulations, may be granted a total of 30 days' leave or furlough each year with full pay and allowances, by their commanding officers, if such leave or furlough does not interfere with the requirements of the military or naval situation; and

Whereas commissioned officers of the military or naval forces of the United States, if they have not been granted leave or furlough in a total amount of 30 days for each year of active service in the military or naval forces, are granted a "terminal leave" on separation from such active service, with full pay and allowances for such time as would equal such accumulated leave that they have not received; and

Whereas many enlisted members of the armed forces of the United States have been and are now being released from such active service, who have served honestly and faithfully for periods of time varying up to several years and who have not been and are not being granted furlough or leave, or pay therefor as would have been due them had they been granted the same privilege as is granted commissioned officers of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the members of this post that enlisted personnel are entitled to equal consideration, in the matter of leave or furlough, as commissioned officers, and that they ought not to be deprived of the privilege of leave or furlough that they have earned and not received: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the membership of Grafton Post, No. 41, American Legion, Department of North Dakota, That legislation now be enacted to the effect that commissioned officers and enlisted personnel of the military and naval forces of the United States be granted leave or furlough credit, to be computed at the rate of 2½ days for each month in which they are in active service from and after December 7, 1941, and continuing until the date of separation from such active service or until 6 months after the present war shall have been declared to be over, whichever date is the sooner, such leave or furlough if not received to be cumulative from year to year, and that upon separation from such active service of any commissioned officer or enlisted man of the military or naval forces of the United States, if such person has not received a total of 2½ days of leave or furlough for each month of such active

service between the afore-mentioned dates, then those persons shall receive a sum of money computed at the regular rate of their pay for such length of time as equals the total time of such leave or furlough, accumulated and not received, and such pay and allowances shall be in addition to any other pay and allowances that may be then due them; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this post and be placed in the hands of the representatives now in the Congress of the United States, who were elected from the State of North Dakota, with our earnest request that they consider the justice of the proposed legislation and take such legislative action as is indicated herein and that copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the proper officers of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, that they may be acquainted with the desirability of such legislation and that they may ask the assistance of other posts and departments of the American Legion to the end that such legislation as is indicated may be enacted.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the members present at a regular meeting of Grafton Post, No. 41, Department of North Dakota, American Legion, May 15, 1945.

A. G. KERIAN,
Commander.
E. F. SCHUMACHER,
Adjutant.

Some Further Aspects of Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, because there has been so much discussion in the press lately relative to dealings between the United States and subsidiary Government corporations and the Aluminum Co. of Canada, a subsidiary of the Aluminium, Ltd., I thought it would be of interest to Congress and the country to read a recent article in the New York daily newspaper, PM, which discusses the aluminum plant at Maspeth, Queens, New York, operated by ALCOA for the Defense Plant Corporation during the time it was producing aluminum. However, the plant is now in disuse.

For a long time, ALCOA exulted in a decision it secured somehow in the United States District Court, holding that it was not a monopoly, but, on March 12, 1945, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the lower court and officially declared that ALCOA was a participant in a monopolistic conspiracy to violate the Sherman Antitrust Act.

However, the United States continues to employ this gigantic enterprise as operator, or manager, of the major share of the Nation's aluminum-producing plants.

The article from PM is as follows:

MASPETH ALUMINUM PLANT IS GOVERNMENT'S WHITE ELEPHANT—BUT MRC BUYS METAL FROM SHIPSHAW CANADIAN PLANT

(By James Parlatore)

There is no indication today that the $33,700,000 aluminum plant in Maspeth, Queens, will provide a single postwar job for New Yorkers.

Sam H. Husbands, president of the DPC (Defense Plant Corporation), owner of the installation, told PM that "no definite arrangements have been made for postwar use" of the plant, "but (we) would welcome any suggestions."

Largest DPC metal-producing unit in the country, the plant was ordered to stop production in June 1944, after operating for only 16 months, because the WPB (War Production Board) decided we had an oversupply of the light metal on hand. Several months later the Navy was given permission to use the plant to recondition Diesel motors and to produce ordnance material.

How long the Navy will use the site no one in authority could say, because the Navy considers its job in the Pacific to be "a long and tough one." Naval headquarters in Washington told PM that "the final decision concerning all plants to be retained by the Navy has not yet been determined." But a spokesman added that "when there is no longer any need for the plant, the Navy undoubtedly will not use it."

CONSPIRACY

The Aluminum Co. of America, which ran the plant for the DPC during the time it was producing aluminum, does not expect "ever again to be given the opportunity to operate that place," since the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, on March 12, declared the company was a participant in a monopolistic conspiracy to violate the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The Maspeth plant was planned and built to meet the increasing need for aluminum during the early stages of the war. Since one of the biggest items in the construction of such a plant is the availability of tremendous electrical power, to run the "pot lines" which smelt the metal, the Government had to build its plants wherever it could find sufficient electrical energy. Because of this consideration, New York City was included.

ELECTRICAL COSTS

Ordinarily the soundest competitive cost of electrical energy is less than 2 cents per pound of aluminum, and it requires about 10 kilowatt-hours for every pound of the metal. For this reason, most of these big aluminum plants are built near sources of hydroelectric power, but because the Government was more interested in getting the material to meet the critical needs of the Army and the Navy it decided to overlook this cost factor.

Consolidated Edison went as far as possible in furnishing cheap power to run the Maspeth plant, "but the cost of electricity there was too high," according to an official of Alcoa.

On the basis of this factor, then, this aluminum executive declared it was his opinion that "it would not pay anyone to operate that plant" as an aluminum-producing unit "unless he were willing to take a terrific loss."

The plant, which began to operate in February 1943, had an estimated annual output of 260,000,000 pounds of aluminum and employed about 1,600 men. On May 1, 1944, the WPB ordered an annual reduction of about 72,000,000 tons in production of aluminum, "as another step to bring aluminum metal production more closely in line with consumption." As a result of this ruling, not only the Maspeth plant but also another in Burlington, N. J., was shut down.

UNION CHARGES

Soon after Nicholas A. Zonarich, president of the Aluminum Workers of America, CIO, charged that curtailments of domestic aluminum production were ordered because Alcoa was preparing to restore a carefully controlled market in the light metal after the war.

In the spring of 1943 PM exposed how the United States Government bought aluminum from Canada at a higher cost, while domestic operations were being shut down in the United States of America. These purchases continued under secret contracts negotiated by Jesse Jones, former Chairman of the DPC.

In May 1941, the United States Government advanced $68,500,000 as a down payment to help finance construction of Alcoa's sister Canadian corporation, the Shipshaw Plant in Arvida, Quebec.

ALCOA OPTIONS

Under this contract, the United States Government was to get 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum in exchange for the money advanced. Records show that the first 1,000,000,000 pounds have cost the United States of America an average of 18.56 cents a pound delivered from Canada. On the basis of this experts feel that Alcoa will have repaid its debt to the United States by the middle of this year. This also means that Alcoa gets its Canadian plant free.

While the United States Government was shutting down the Maspeth plant and several others in this country, we continued to take aluminum from Canada because, under the terms of the contract, that was the only way the United States of America could get back the money advanced to Alcoa.

Although there have been rumors that Alcoa had an option on several of the Government-owned plants in the United States of America, including the Maspeth site, Husbands told PM that "Alcoa does not have an option or any purchase rights of any character in this plant, nor does any other party."

The electrical equipment and machinery was installed in the plant during a critical copper shortage. To meet this shortage, the Treasury Department permitted use of silver for bus bars (conductors used for carrying electrical current).

When PM asked a top Alcoa official if the amount of silver installed at the plant amounted to "several hundred thousand dollars," the executive said:

"If you added a great deal more ciphers to that figure, you'd be nearer the truth."

Alcoa declared that the company "acting as an agent for a general contractor for the DPC, supervised the taking out of the machinery and stored it in Queens for such disposition as the DPC sees fit." When DPC confirmed that the machinery and equipment still is located in the plant, Alcoa added:

NEW CONTRACT

"Some of the machinery that can stay out of doors without being damaged is out of doors, while that machinery which is subject to corrosion is set aside in storage space especially designated for it."

In the meantime, the MRC (Metals Reserve Company), acting on a request of the WPB last month, signed a new contract with the Shipshaw plant for an additional 250,000,000 pounds of aluminum, because petroleum production of the light metal "would be below the estimated requirements for the rest of the year." The cost to this Government, under the agreement, will be about 14 cents a pound plus an allowance of seven-tenths cent for transportation, or less than 15 cents a pound delivered to its destination in this country. Since its debt to the United States of America soon will be paid, this sale represents a clear profit for the Canadian plant.

Because the Maspeth plant must use electrical power manufactured wholly from coal, the cost of aluminum would be about 16 cents a pound. Since it would take about 2,500,000 kilowatt-hours to make the amount of aluminum called for in the new

contract, the Government feels the coal needed to make this energy can be used for other war purposes.

WAR VIEWPOINT

Experts point out, however, that had the power potential of the St. Lawrence River been developed, enough cheap electricity could have been brought to New York to operate the Maspeth plant at a much lower cost than that paid to Canadian interests.

From the viewpoint of the entire war effort, here is what actually happens:

Canadians must import bauxite from British Guiana by ships either to New York or to Portland, Maine. From these ports the ore must go by train to Canada. Since it takes about 4 pounds of bauxite to make 1 pound of aluminum, about 1,000,000,000 pounds of the mineral must be hauled by rail. And coal is needed for this ride.

Critics of the Canadian contract declare that great quantities of coal still are being consumed in transportation and that shipping space, used to import the bauxite from South America, could be used for other war purposes if the aluminum were made in this country from domestic ore.

We Must Feed Europe to Guarantee World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the sixth and last of a series of splendid articles on the food situation, written by the distinguished newspaper correspondent, Malcolm Logan. These articles have appeared at various times in the New York Post, which has been endeavoring to bring the food scarcity and the reasons for it to the attention of the American public. Mr. Logan has placed the blame where it belongs. That he has placed that blame properly can be fairly adduced from the recent change in the War Food Administration.

The article which I presently include in my remarks appeared in the issue of the New York Post of April 18, 1945, and reads as follows:

WE MUST FEED EUROPE TO GUARANTEE WORLD PEACE

(By Malcolm Logan)

When Senator THOMAS, Democrat, of Oklahoma, appointed five members of the Agriculture Committee to investigate our food shortages last month, he announced:

"War workers should not be robbed of an adequate diet so that people of other nations can be fed."

That remark was symptomatic of a strong tendency in Congress to welsh on our Government's repeated promises to avert hunger in liberated Europe rather than ask the American people to give up some of their food.

President Roosevelt answered this argument by saying that he believed America as a whole would make the necessary sacrifices as a matter of decency to prevent starvation abroad.

BUT ARE WE DOING THAT?

"We are feeding practically all the people of the world," Representative ALLEN, Democrat, of Louisiana, said recently, "and I am beginning to wonder if maybe the United States is not the biggest sucker."

Well, let's look at the facts and see if we are feeding the whole world.

UNRRA, which faces the job of feeding Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, set its meat requirements for the rest of the year at 633,000,000 pounds. Of that amount, only 33,000,000 pounds is in sight—and every ounce is coming from Canada.

"Of all food items in short supply—dairy products, all meats and all fats except lard," says Andrew Cairns, chief of UNRRA's food division, "we are getting little or nothing during the second quarter of this year."

THE HOPE AND THE REALITY

Director General Lehman, of UNRRA, said last month that his organization's request for meat from this country for the second quarter "means that 1 pound out of every 350 of the United States civilian supply would go to war victims in Europe whom UNRRA expects to help with food."

But UNRRA isn't even going to get that three-tenths of 1 percent of our meat supply.

We have begun to send lend-lease food to France, yet every correspondent who has investigated the food situation there agrees that it is far more critical than we here realize. Belgium, which always imported most of its food, is as badly off, and in occupied Holland people are dying daily of starvation.

NOT EVEN GETTING THE MINIMUM

The question is not whether we are making suckers of ourselves in order to feed Europe. We are not providing even the minimum food needs of Europe during these critical months.

The real question which we face is whether we can afford, in our own selfish interests, to let Europe go hungry much longer.

Many officials in close touch with conditions abroad are fearful that there may be rebellions in liberated countries. In France mass meetings have booed the name of the Food Minister.

The Dutch are reported turning against the Allies because of our delay in invading the starving occupied provinces.

A hungry Europe might well go antidemocratic; and if that happens, the security organization which is to be formed in San Francisco may be nullified before it even starts to operate. The future peace of the world may come down to the question of whether America is willing to give up a little of its food now.

English as a World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter from Hon. Robert L. Owen, a former United States Senator from Oklahoma, with further reference to the progress of his heroic undertaking to establish English as the world language.

Our difficulties in the postwar period will be greatly magnified by our lack of understanding of the languages of other people and their lack of understanding of ours. Senator Owen has perfected the global alphabet comprising a phonetic system of 33 letters and 9 digraphs by which any language in the world can be read and correctly pronounced. More than 200 leading linguists of the world have endorsed this system.

It is said that the global alphabet can be learned in 1 day by a child of 8 or 10 years of age. Senator Owen's recent letter briefly outlining the purpose and need for such an alphabet, and the ease with which it can be studied, is incorporated in my remarks.

I would like also to call the attention of the House to House Concurrent Resolution 33 by the Oklahoma State Legislature recently passed commending the global alphabet to all educators and language students, and requesting that the Congress and the President devise ways and means to promote the study and use of it to encourage English as a world language.

As a further supplement, I include a list of publications further explaining the global alphabet as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since 1942:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1945.*

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, M. C.,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: English spelling and pronunciation.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: English is the most widely distributed language in the world. It is known to 200,000,000 people. It is the official language of India of between three and four hundred million people, but it is unknown as a spoken and printed language to approximately 2,000,000,000. It has one serious obstacle, to which I call your especial attention. As currently printed, foreigners find the pronunciation and spelling impossible except through a professional tutor who will teach them the pronunciation word by word.

Our revered ancestors, in spelling English, gave multiple meanings to the letters, especially the vowels and the compound vowels. For example, the letter "a" has 9 different sounds, as in the words "man," "plate," "far," "fall," "ask," "fare," "prelate," "errant," "Persia." The letter "e" has 6—for example, "met," "meet," "her," "Episcopal, "prudent," "the." The letter "i" has 3—"pin," "pine," "machine." The letter "o" has 7—"not," "note," "move," "nor," "eulogy," "actor," "women." The letter "u" has 5—"tub," "mute," "pull," "singular," "nature."

I have a recent letter from Mr. R. Wrenick, member of the executive committee, Simplified Spelling Society, Ashley Rise, Walton-on-Thames, England. Mr. Wrenick in a printed article sent me says:

"Muddle in pronunciation: In addition, the digraph OO has 5 sounds, OU has 7, EA has 5, and EI 5, making a total of 22 sounds for 4 digraphs.

"Muddle in spelling: The sound A in eh, aid, lady, may, they, weigh, great, grate, gaol, and gauge is spelled in 10 ways. Similarly the sound E is spelled in 10 ways, I in 11, O in 11, and U in 11, making a total of 53 ways of spelling 5 sounds. In addition to this, short I sound is spelled in 10 ways, long OO in 10 ways AA/AR in 11, AU/OR in 11, making a total of 42 ways of spelling these 4 sounds.

"This muddle in spelling and pronunciation is the despair of foreigners and the confusion of our children, necessitating constant correction for which no adequate reason can be given. In Italy and Germany, where the spelling is phonetic, children of 7 and 8 can read as well as English of 9 and 10."

Mr. Wrenick further asks:

"In order that English may become a common world language as suggested by Mr. Winston Churchill, why not join the Simplified Spelling Society?"

The great amount of time it takes to learn to spell English correctly and pronounce it correctly is well known to all teachers. The amount of mental energy consumed in learning to spell and correctly pronounce English words could be advantageously employed in learning the facts of life of importance to children and adults alike.

The silent letters employed in English spelling multiply the difficulties cited above, because nearly four-fifths of English words contain from one to three silent letters, adding to the difficulties of foreigners in learning to pronounce English words.

The global alphabet requires the memory to deal with only 33 letters and 9 digraphs composed of such letters. The letters of the global alphabet are in form the simplest humanly possible and easily remembered. They can be learned in 1 day by a child of 8 or 10 years of age.

With this alphabet any person in the world can write any language in the world, and read and correctly pronounce the words of any language printed in the global alphabet. During the last 3 years I have given thousands of hours to the perfection of this alphabet and explaining it to others.

As you request, I enclose a memorandum giving some of the particulars where the global alphabet has been explained in the records of Congress, which I hope may be of interest to students of the subject matter. Within these records are the endorsements of Prof. Mario A. Pei, Ph. D., Columbia University, and Rev. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., director of the Committee on World Literacy, and many of their associates.

I deeply appreciate the endorsement of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress of February 10 last, particularly your friendly attitude.

Since dictating the above letter I have just received from the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, Governor of Oklahoma, a copy of a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, which the Governor sent me as having passed the two houses. I enclose it as a part of this letter to you for your information.

I am grateful to the people of Oklahoma and to Governor Kerr for their study of this matter and for their approval. I submitted the global alphabet and an explanation of it to over 200 leading linguists and have the approval of many and the disapproval of none of them.

With kind regards,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Concurrent resolution in appreciation of the work of Hon. Robert L. Owen, former United States Senator from Oklahoma, pertaining to the teaching of English as a world language through a global alphabet, and memorializing the President and Congress

Whereas the Honorable Robert L. Owen, who was elected United States Senator by the people of Oklahoma in 1907, and who served for 18 years consecutively in that high office, has devoted much time and study in recent years to the development of a global alphabet to promote international understanding by the use of English as a world language: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (and by the Senate), That the proposed global alphabet is hereby commended to educators and language students in schools and colleges for their study and evaluation as a means to encourage the use of English as world language to promote international good will and understanding; and

That the Congress of the United States and the President are hereby memorialized to devise ways and means to promote the study and use of the global alphabet as a means to encourage the use of English as a world language.

LIST OF GLOBAL ALPHABET PUBLICATIONS

December 15, 1942, published by JERRY VOORHIS, volume 88, part 10, page A4326, of the RECORD.

May 20, 1943, published by ELMER THOMAS, Senate Document 49, volume 89, part 4, page 4650, of the RECORD.

June 18, 1943, published by A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, volume 89, part 11, page A3062, of the RECORD.

July 8, 1943, published by A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, volume 89, part 11, page A3675, of the RECORD.

October 18, 1943, Senate Document 133, petition to Wallace, volume 89, part 6, page 8404, of the RECORD.

December 21, 1943, published by A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, volume 89, part 12, page A5660, of the RECORD.

January 24, 1944, published by JERRY VOORHIS, letter to Cordell Hull, volume 90, part 8, page A373, of the RECORD.

February 29, 1944, published by VICTOR WICKERSHAM, letter to Studebaker, volume 90, part 8, page A997, of the RECORD.

May 24, 1944, published by LYLE BOREN, volume 90, part 9, page A2552, of the RECORD.

June 22, 1944, published by VICTOR WICKERSHAM, volume 90, part 10, page A3284, of the RECORD.

December 4, 1944, published by ELMER THOMAS, Senate Document 250, volume 90, part 7, page 8718, of the RECORD.

January 24, 1945, published by A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, letter to Judson King, page A277 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

February 1, 1945, published by VICTOR WICKERSHAM, letter to Boudinot, page A393 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

February 8, 1945, published by JED JOHNSON, birthday luncheon proceedings, page A514 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

March 22, 1945, published by A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, page A1389 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

April 5, 1945, published by ELMER THOMAS, letter to Alice Paul, page A1658 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

April 17, 1945, published by WILLIAM LANGER, Phonetic Alphabet, page 3401 of the RECORD.

What Kind of Shenanigans Would You Call This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Hillsdale Herald, Hillsdale, N. J., which speaks for itself:

WHAT KIND OF SHENANIGANS WOULD YOU CALL THIS?

Mr. Taxpayer, would you shell out $2 to get back $1? Or would you rather receive three bucks for your one?

Well, don't laugh. Both of these propositions are being readied at Washington for the taxpayers of the Nation in the pending Federal $300,000,000 aid-to-education bill. It all depends upon what State you live in—whether you draw the big end or the little end of the Federal hand-out. Most of the money would go for school teachers' and school employees' salaries, says the New Jersey Taxpayers Association.

Under this bill, the taxpayers of New Jersey would pay $11,288,000 to get back $5,983,868 in Federal funds. Our $2 brings back $1.

It just isn't a game New Jersey ought to be playing in. Now watch the dealer closely. And the map. Here's the pay-off: Arkansas, Alabama, and Kentucky each receive $3 for every dollar they pay in. And the State of Mississippi gets four bucks for its one.

So it goes all the way down the line. Peter pays for Paul because Paul has a good location on the map. Paul is one of the so-called "poorer" States, many of which have big cash surpluses in their State treasuries but still like to lean on their big-hearted Uncle Sam.

The old shell game on the circus grounds would give New Jersey as good a break for its dollars.

The American Railroad System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement on the American railroad system. It contains much information, said in few words. I believe it will be of interest to every Member of the House:

THE AMERICAN RAILROAD SYSTEM

(By Carlton J. Corliss)

I am the burden bearer of the Nation. I am the Nation's No. 1 delivery boy.

I carry the products of millions of American farms to thousands of American factories and to millions of American homes.

I take the coal from the mines, the ore from the hills, the stone from the quarries and carry them to the market places.

I keep the factories of the Nation supplied with raw materials. I distribute the products of these factories to cities and towns and hamlets from Maine to California, from Oregon to Florida.

I meet the ships of the seven seas at our seaports. I receive the coffee, the sugar, the spices, the rubber, the copra, and the countless other things which these ships bring to our shores, and I deliver them to the factories and stores and homes where they are wanted. I gather up the surplus products of farms, forests, mines, and mills, and carry them in endless stream to fill the ships that come for cargo.

I bring the circus to your city, the entertainers to your theaters, the films to your movies.

I speed across America, from city to city, from town to town, with your express shipments—parcels and crates and boxes.

I am the mail carrier for the Nation. I carry 93 out of every 100 pounds of mail in this country. I bring you letters from distant relatives and friends—letters that mean so much in your life. I also bring you post cards, registered packages, and your favorite magazines.

I am the Nation's safest carrier of passengers. I am the swiftest carrier of passengers by land.

Not only do I carry the American people on their myriad errands—I provide them with comfortable beds in which to sleep. I serve them food and refreshments, and I look after their every want while they are my guests.

I am an employer as well as a transporter. Almost a million and a half men and women work for me and with me in performing my great transportation tasks.

I am one of the chief shoppers of the Nation. I am constantly buying; yet my wants are never satisfied. Yesterday I spent millions; today I am spending millions more; tomorrow I will spend other millions with mines and mills and factories and wholesalers for the many things I must have to keep my millions of wheels rolling.

I am one of the chief supporters of government. The taxes I pay—amounting to $2,000,000,000 a year—help to support our Army and Navy, to pay the salaries of our public officials, to meet the expenses of our public schools, to maintain our fire departments and our police forces, to build and repair our city streets and our public highways and to defray the cost of our public institutions.

I am an empire builder and a promoter of unity. I have knit this far-flung Nation together, linking North with South, East with West, in one great community of common interest and common understanding.

I never sleep. Night and day, month in and month out, year after year, summer and winter, rain or snow, in storm or flood—I carry on.

I am a vital part of the Nation's economic life.

I am indispensable in wartime.

I am the American railroad system.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by American Legion, First District of Indiana, on the death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

Whereas God, the Almighty Commander, has summoned Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to his immortal realms; and

Whereas words are not at our command to fully describe the life of our beloved President and Commander in Chief of the armed forces of America, who suddenly departed this life on the 12th day of April 1945, at 3:35 p. m., without being able to see the fruits of his toil for an enduring peace, so nobly rendered by him for the United States of America and for all liberty-loving people of the world; and

Whereas he was truly a great man; a champion of the right of the wage earners, of the oppressed, and of the crippled children, a guiding light in the darkest hour of peace and the guiding light in the darkest hour of war; and

Whereas his voice convinced America and the world that liberty and justice must first be attained, upon which foundation we could build a lasting peace; and

Whereas he was sincerely the world emancipator and the herald of freedom; and

Whereas he died on the battlefield as a courageous man for his country, and no citation can be given to this great soldier by Congress except through a special act; and

Whereas he was called away from our midst by the Commander of all, without leaving a written will to the people, but his acts and deeds in the past, manifested love and affection of mankind and unity of the people of America and of the world, which unbounded energy and courage filled the hearts of those who needed courage; and

Whereas the tragic grief that engulfed America and the world by said loss, caused the humble and great to feel the most solemn and deep sorrow over the departed President of the United States of America, as he was the most understanding and a great man: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion of the First District, Department of Indiana, in district convention assembled, do on this 2d day of May 1945 go on record as expressing its profound sorrow for his loss; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the members of his family, one copy to the American Legion, Department of Indiana, one copy to Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, Congressman of the First District of Indiana, one copy to the Congress of the United States of America to be recorded in its minutes, and required copies to the press, published in Lake County, State of Indiana.

Respectfully submitted by the American Legion of the First District, Department of Indiana:

LOUIS H. GEORGE,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.
MOR N. OPPMAN,
District Commander.

Attest:

A. L. KRUEGER,
District Adjutant.

Establishment of Veterans' Hospitals in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the early establishment of Veterans' Administration hospitals within the State of Indiana, for honorably discharged ex-service persons

Whereas the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, provides that "the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses to veterans of any war, military occupation, or military expedition not dishonorably discharged, without regard to the nature or origin of their disabilities: *Provided*, That preference to admission to any Government hospital for hospitalization under the provisions of this subdivision shall be given to those veterans who are financially unable to pay for hospitalization and their necessary traveling expenses, etc.; and

Whereas as a result of the above enactment of Congress there has been and continues to be an alarming increase of admissions to hospitals from the services of the military to the Veterans' Administration hospitals, and as this increase of admissions is expected to continue for years to come; and

Whereas in this State there is only two Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Marion facility and the one at Indianapolis, which are constantly filled to capacity; and,

Whereas those ex-service and present service persons of World War II triples the number in the service in World War I: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Indiana (the House of Representatives concurring):

That the United States Government is hereby respectfully urged and requested to provide the necessary funds for the establishment of three Veterans' Administration facility hospital centers, and that the present capacity of the Indianapolis facility be increased to 1,000 beds.

That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to each of the United States Senators and each Congressman from Indiana.

RICHARD T. JAMES,
President of the Senate.
HOBART CREIGHTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved March 6, 1945.

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor of the State of Indiana.

Portland, World Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of May 23, 1945:

PORTLAND, WORLD PORT

One of the marvels of the maritime world is the rate at which ships have been built in the Portland-Vancouver area. In 4 years local shipyards have turned out 1,100 new and reconverted ships aggregating 11,000,000 tons. We have done a shipbuilding business in this vicinity approximating $2,000,000,000 in the 4-year period. The fleet built here is just about 20 percent of the anticipated postwar American fleet of 5,300 vessels, totaling 54,000,000 tons and representing an investment of $18,000,000,000. In passing, the American merchant fleet will have the preponderance of weight in the postwar world fleet which, it is estimated, will aggregate 90,000,000 tons.

No port in the United States has given, in shipbuilding record, a more salutary demonstration of its capacity to be a world port than has Portland-Vancouver.

But the fleet built here is a one-way fleet. Its vessels depart from the Columbia River, in most instances not to return. Its vessels sail the seven seas and reach the ports of many lands, but after leaving their launching slips are not seen here again.

National Wartime Maritime Commerce Week brings home to Portland—brings home to the ports of the Columbia—the urgency of steps that must be taken now to reestablish Pacific coast leadership of this port in general cargo movement. These are practical steps. We need:

1. Home-owned steamship lines to make this turn-around port, leaving the values of their operation here. A comparatively small number of the ships we build could establish for Portland a conspicuous position in ship operation.

2. Modernized sea terminals. Portland has now berthing capacity for only 28 working ships at 8 private and 3 municipal docks. A $3,000,000 bond issue voted last year for port improvements is in the control of the dock commission, and full public information concerning the commission's plans is extremely desirable.

3. Service—economical and efficient—to shippers and to trade territory.

4. Reestablishment of the Columbia Basin rate differential, which was justly won by dint of hard fighting before the Interstate

Commerce Commission, and lost for technical reasons that no longer exist. The original set of factors which won the 10-percent rate differential favoring this port should win the reestablishment of the rate, and this is learned on high authority.

5. The tie-in of cheap and abundant power, of industry, and of highway, rail, water, and air transportation, should be vividly pictured.

In 5 tracts, 4 inside, 1 outside, the city, the port of Portland has obtained 569 acres available for industrial sites. Will this area meet demands of new industry or should conversion of Vanport be a prominent consideration?

6. Studies should be thorough, dealing with raw materials, processing, education and research, and marketing.

7. Understanding should be clear of the importance of a deep harbor entrance, the widened and deepened channel from the sea, and the advantages of a fresh water harbor, with long shorelines and great potential berthing areas. Also the barnacles drop off the ships.

8. Taxes: Ability to meet competition of other States in a tax structure that encourages industry, and investment is an essential feature of any program that involves the port, the city, or the State.

9. Coordination: In the course of his administration Mayor Riley has done nothing more creditable than to announce that he will appoint a committee assigning to it the coordination of the activities and related interests of the port and the community.

Competition will be increasingly keen among Pacific coast ports. By aggressive policy capitalizing natural advantages, Portland can stand out in the list that includes Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Or, by apathy and lack of concerted effort, we can be lost in the hurly-burly of shouldering competition.

This is the time to decide. This is the time for action.

War Food Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the President has received the following letter from the Honorable Marvin Jones:

MAY 22, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the time I tendered my resignation as War Food Administrator to you in April I advised you of my desire to return to my work on the Court of Claims. You requested that I stay on a while as War Food Administrator which I agreed to do. You indicated that I should let you know when I felt I should leave.

The Chief Justice has said that he would like for me to return to the bench as soon as my work here will permit. The Court has been very generous in giving me leave of absence. However, I feel that I should return to my regular assignment at an early date.

If it meets with your approval I should like for the resignation to become effective not later than June 30, the end of the fiscal year, although of course the date could be adjusted to suit your convenience.

In this connection I suggest for your consideration the advisability of merging the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

While the war was being fought on both fronts there was considerable logic in having an independent War Food Administration. It has worked well. In each of the war years there has been an outstanding record of production. There has been complete cooperation between the Secretary of Agriculture and myself.

Now, however, that victory in Europe has been achieved, I feel that the work of the Department and War Food could well be carried on by the Secretary of Agriculture, probably with somewhat less expenditure of funds.

I shall await your pleasure in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES.

Following is the text of the President's letter of reply:

MAY 23, 1945.

DEAR MARVIN: In view of your desire expressed to me last month to return to your place on the Court of Claims, I regretfully accept your resignation. I understand that the Chief Justice of the Court is now anxious that you resume your judicial work as soon as possible.

Let me express my own appreciation, and also the thanks of the people of the United States for the hard, conscientious, and efficient work you have done as War Food Administrator.

It was a most difficult assignment. The needs of our armed forces, of our allies, and of our own civilian population called for the highest degree of competence in food production, management, and distribution. It is to the everlasting credit of the War Food Administration that even after supplying the great demands made upon us from all over the world, the American people as a whole not only did not go hungry but actually enjoyed a better diet than in the days before the war.

It is an accomplishment of which you can be very proud.

With best wishes for continued success and happiness in your work,

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

One Master for Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of May 23, 1945:

ONE MASTER FOR RAILROADS

Representative BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, has introduced in Congress a bill to remove the apparent conflict between the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust law.

Out of the half-century-old laws creating an Interstate Commerce Commission for regulation of railroads has grown the concept of a national railway system, as distinguished from a large number of strongly independent and vigorously competing rail lines.

The spirit of the Transportation Act and the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission have encouraged and supported the organization by rail lines of rate bureaus, committees, and associations which deal collectively with rates, services, interchange of equipment, and a great variety of other matters which in the days when competition had full sway produced flagrant discriminations in behalf of large communities and large shippers and to the prejudice of small communities and small shippers.

The products of co-operative and collective action by competing lines have been subject to clearance by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That agency is now empowered on its own motion to inquire into the reasonableness of railroad agreements, and the agreements are also subject to contest by interested shippers.

But last August the Department of Justice filed an antitrust suit alleging that rate schedules filed by western railroads were agreed upon in advance, and were coercive and in restraint of trade, and therefore in contravention of antitrust laws. At the time some commentators cynically remarked that the Department of Justice should have included among the defendants another arm of the Government—the Interstate Commerce Commission. Shippers' organizations, as well as the railroads, deprecated the filing of the suit, foreseeing aggravating, if not chaotic, results if the attempted dispersal of railroad committees and associations were successful.

The issue is not new. In 1943 it was presented in a Senate committee hearing. At that hearing the late Joseph B. Eastman, who had been on the Interstate Commerce Commission a quarter of a century and was then Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, told the committee he did not see how the railroads could comply with mandates of the Transportation Act and orders of the ICC unless they consulted and conferred with one another, and that, inasmuch as a public remedy for abuses existed, he believed the carriers should be relieved of antitrust provisions, and was not sure but that may be the law now.

The Bulwinkle bill puts into effect the recommendation of Mr. Eastman. It is also the recommendation of the National Industrial Traffic League, representing shippers of all types in all parts of the country and is supported widely by shippers' associations. The bill authorizes rail carriers, and also common and contract carriers by motor vehicle, or by water, who are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval of agreements between two or more carriers, requires notice and opportunity for hearing, and relieves the lines from the operations of the antitrust laws when the agreements are approved by the Commission.

Passage of the bill would automatically dispose of the antitrust case now pending. The bill is not new in principle. Agreements of the same type entered into by air carriers and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board are relieved from operations of the antitrust laws, as are agreements by water carriers who come under the regulation of the Maritime Commission.

In short, the bill relieves the carriers involved from the impossibility of serving two masters whose orders conflict. It will put them exclusively under the mandates of the Interstate Commerce Act where they belong.

Abject Surrender of United States Market to Low Paid Labor Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what has been the American traditional

interpretation of most-favored-nation treaties? Let me quote from the Dictionary of Tariff Information as follows:

It (the most-favored-nation clause according to its traditional interpretation) rests not only upon sound reason but upon continuous precedent. Mr. John Quincy Adams declared the same view in 1817 in respect to France—that the "most-favored-nation clause only covered gratuitous favors and did not touch concessions for equivalents expressed or implied." President Monroe, in his annual message of 1821, speaking of the most-favored-nation caluse appealed to by France, said: "If this should be so construed as that France should enjoy, of right, and without paying the equivalent, all the advantages of such conditions as might be allowed to other powers in return for important concessions made by them, then the whole character of the stipulations would be changed. She would not only be placed on the footing of the most-favored-nation but on a footing held by no other nation." Mr. Gallatin, in 1823, in a note to the Viscount de Chateaubriand, took the same position, and said that "when not otherwise defined the right of the most-favored-nation treatment is that, and can only be that, of being entitled to that treatment gratuitously, if such nation enjoys it gratuitously, and on paying the same equivalent if it had been granted in consideration of an equivalent." Mr. Livingstons, Secretary of State under President Jackson (1832), reaffirmed this position. Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State under President Arthur (1884), instructing the United States Minister in Japan, approved the like position when taken by the Japanese Government, and said "that if a favor for a specific condition be stipulated with any one nation, no other may enjoy the favor except upon identical or equivalent conditions." In another instruction (to the Minister in Spain), speaking of the most-favored-nation clause, he wrote: "This country has that clause in many of its compacts with foreign states, but it has never occurred to them or to us to suppose that we were thereby constrained to grant those treaty powers without equivalent the privileges which we had by special engagements stipulated to concede to countries like Hawaii and Canada for a valuable consideration." In the case of our reciprocal treaty with Hawaii, both Great Britain and Germany acquiesced in the construction.

The question here discussed was presented in 1853 for consideration of the Department of Justice, Caleb Cushing being then Attorney General. That eminent lawyer, in the course of his opinion, commenting on the favored-nation clauses of our treaty with Denmark (1836), said that such clauses "are not applicable to advantages growing out of treaties containing various articles of reciprocal pact and stipulation; for such advantages are purchased upon consideration, upon mutual and correlative engagements * * * with perfect reciprocal obligation in terms and manner as to the things to be done or suffered. Such treaty benefits are not favors, boons, or concessions. These expressions apply only to things proceeding from the mere will or pleasure of the state granting them, in matters within its own sole jurisdiction, and which the other party, to whom they are proffered, may or may not, in its own good pleasure, accept."

The Supreme Court of the United States in 1887 had this precise question before it upon a claim made by importers of Danish sugar. The claimants asserted their right under the most-favored-nation clause of the United States treaty with Denmark (1826, renewed 1858) to the admission of their sugar imported from the Danish island of St. Croix free of duty, because the United States by a recent convention of reciprocity with the Kingdom of Hawaii had conceded to the sugar of Hawaiian production that privilege. This claim required a construction by the supreme tribunal of the most-favored-nation clause of our treaty with Denmark.

The decision of the Court is stated in the following language:

"Our conclusion is that the treaty with Denmark does not bind the United States to extend to that country, without compensation, privileges which they have conceded to the Hawaiian Islands in exchange for valuable concessions" (*Bertram et al.* v. *Robertson, collector of the port of New York* (U. S. Sup. Ct. Rept., vol. 122)).

The construction above given to the clause in question has been so long continued, and so generally acquiesced in by other nations, that it may now be fairly considered as a part of international law.

Mr. Speaker, it is a striking fact that it was only during the period when Great Britain felt she was so far superior to all other nations in industrial efficiency, and therefore able to compete with every other country in the world's markets, that she shifted to the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. This was done in the hope of either forcing or inducing other nations to remove every obstacle to her penetration and complete capture of the world's markets.

The unconditional most-favored-nation trade-agreement policy is now and always has been a condition precedent to free trade. This is why the New Deal departed from our traditional policy of conditional most-favored-nation principle in 1934 to play into the hands of the low-paid-labor countries of the world by giving them access to our market without consideration from them or concessions comparable to those generalized to them.

Now that our New Dealers have been maneuvered into the position of gradually surrendering our market under the unconditional most-favored-nation principle, the low-paid-labor nations have cleverly set up 29 trade barriers to shut the United States out of their markets while they have free access to ours.

An historical review of most-favored-nation treatment in political treaties, commercial treaties, and trade agreements covering policies adopted and changes made even in the more important nations of the world would involve a book of many pages. Suffice it to say that there have been periods of 50 years during which the trend has been toward unconditional most-favored-nation treatment and other similar periods during which the trend has been toward conditional most-favored-nation treatment.

Most treaties have been devoted largely to matters of foreign travel, international shipping, foreign investments, and a multitude of other similar matters. The problems involved have been the treatment of travelers, the right of vessels flying flags of different nations, the protection of investments of people of other countries, and similar matters. Needless to say, in this vast field of international, economic relations the effort constantly has been in the direction of uniform treatment for the people, ships, investments, and so forth, of all countries. In that vast area of foreign relations the trend generally has been toward the unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.

This principle has been steadily modified during the past 100 years or longer by the development of dominions, colonies, and other territorial possessions, immigration between nations and vast developments of merchant marine and foreign investments, with the result that a multitude of exceptions including preferential treatments have arisen. This in turn has led important nations to legislate reservations intended to modify the unconditional most-favored-nation provisions in treaties. Thus, when the Tariff Act of 1942 was passed, two major reservations were made by the United States: One provided for methods of conduct in the case of unfair methods of competition, dumping, and so forth; the other provided for action in foreign discriminations against the trade of the United States. Thus while in form we and many others were tending in the direction of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment in treaties, nonetheless we were reserving methods of protection against anything considered by us to be unfair or discriminatory.

While the above statement indicates the general direction toward unconditional treatment in the writing of treaties, it is significant that while the United States had such treaties with 32 countries in 1934, these countries supplied only 18.8 percent of our total imports and took only 14.2 percent of our total exports. The total trade of the United States with these countries—the sum of the imports and exports—amounted to only 16.2 percent of our total trade with the world. Thus we had unconditional arrangements with 32 countries but they provided less than one-sixth of our foreign trade. And, furthermore, in the Tariff Act of 1922 and again in the Tariff Act of 1930 we preserved conditional treatment with all nations by specifically reserving the right to act in our own defense in the case of any unfair method of competition and in the case of any foreign discrimination against our exports.

During the world depression which began in some parts of the world as early as 1925–26 and extending through the war period and has continued for a period of 20 years, the general trend has been toward literally hundreds of special bilateral trade agreements in which special concessions have been granted in return for equivalent concessions. These are generally defined as reciprocal agreements on the assumption that equivalent concessions are granted and received. The United States is the only principal nation which has attempted to apply the unconditional principles of uniform treatment to travelers, the merchant marine, investments, and so forth, to this field of reciprocal trade.

Over a long period of time most foreign nations have maintained from two to five different or alternative sets of tariff rates to apply to commodities which enter into international trade. Generally there has been either free trade or preferential rates of duty as between national governments and their several dominions, crown colonies, possessions, and so forth, with various degrees of higher rates applied to various other countries and used

as a basis for negotiating preferential areas. Many of these have taken the form of bilateral trade agreements.

The United States has generally maintained a uniform rate of duty in the case of each commodity applied to that commodity without regard to its foreign origin. Cuba has been the most outstanding exception to that rule. It must be remembered, however, that even the United States over a long period has with meticulous care distinguished between commodities by applying ad valorem rates of duty in some cases, specific duties in other cases, and other combinations. Furthermore, by classifications based upon values, prices, and other characteristics, the United States adjusted her tariff to the national economy of different foreign nations depending upon the character of commodity received from each.

When it is said that the United States has extended uniform treatment or unconditional, most-favored treatment to most or all foreign nations by general act of Congress, that is literally not true. Prior to 1934 the unconditional, most-favored-nation treatment was never extended to any foreign country except in the form of a treaty subject to Senate approval by a two-thirds vote of that body. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, is the first specific act by Congress purporting to grant universal unconditional, most-favored-nation treatment—except in the case of specific discriminations—to all nations without securing in return a treaty agreement to extend similar treatment to the United States.

Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars Expenses Held Fair for Lawmakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of May 26, 1945:

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS EXPENSES HELD FAIR FOR LAWMAKERS—WRITER URGES CONGRESS MEMBERS TO FACE PAY QUESTION SQUARELY

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress are going through a rather uncomfortable experience these days on the matter of their salaries. Some of them are frank and outspoken about the need for more money to meet expenses incurred in the line of duty and others are fearful they may be criticized for boosting their pay at a time when wages are frozen.

This is the kind of question which is difficult to handle because the Members who are up for reelection next year can be attacked in the primaries and also in the final elections by opponents, whereas two-thirds of the Senators do not come up for reelection next year and will not have to face the issue.

This does not mean that the cleavage that has appeared thus far is confined to those who are up for election and those who are not. On the contrary, in the ranks of opponents of the proposal will be found many Members who are not required to face an election for some time to come.

This problem is one that ought to be faced squarely and without hypocrisy. The Little Steel wage formula provides for an increase of 15 percent in wages over and above January 1941. Also workers have been able by overtime pay and other devices to increase their earnings. They also have been able to leave one job for another with higher pay and get more earnings that way. Yet Members of Congress have had no increase in salary for many years.

AFFECTED BOTH WAYS

The real reason why the Senators and Representatives deserve an increase in pay is that their expenses have gone up and their salaries are subject to taxes just the same as everybody else so that they have been affected both ways.

Most people in the white-collar class have also suffered a reduction in take-home pay and moreover have not been able to switch jobs during the war period. But the heavy expenses of a Member of Congress are due to the fact that theoretically he is supposed to maintain a residence in his district and in Washington, too. Congress long ago recognized that a Member should be paid transportation going from and coming to Washington when a special session is called, and at the beginning and end of a regular session. Yet again and again a Member of Congress finds it necessary to go home to see his constituents and he has to pay his own transportation.

Then there is the matter of entertainment. Constituents come to Washington, and many of them feel the Member of Congress should buy them a lunch or take them out to dinner. If the constituent is particularly influential, the Member wants to be the host. In the long run, and year in and year out, this amounts to a sizable sum. Yet no tax deductions are given for such purposes, whereas a businessman or sales manager in private business who makes trips does get a chance to charge the expense to his firm and the company is allowed to deduct the item as an expense for tax purposes.

The courts ruled recently that a judge who maintained a home at a State capital where the court was in session could not get as a deduction from Federal taxes the expenses he incurred in maintaining a home in his original place of residence.

LOOK TO OUTSIDE SOURCES

While $10,000 a year seems like a lot of money, it is nearer $7,500 after the tax collector takes his share. Out of this sum the Member must pay for two residences and entertain hundreds of his constituents a year. The unfortunate consequence of this is that too many Members of Congress have financial worries and are tempted to look for outside sources of income. Some of them practice law and take fees on cases presumably unrelated to Federal business. Others deliver lectures and accept fees from organizations that have been known to make the fees larger than usual in the hope of currying favor with a Member of Congress.

The job of Senator or Representative is worth at least $12,000 a year to the Nation. For members of the Cabinet get that sum, and they have all sorts of perquisites to go with the job, such as an auto at Government expense. There are various plans but what is being proposed in the main now is an expense allowance of about $2,500 a year for each Member of Congress.

This is a fair solution of the problem and Members of Congress ought to vote that for themselves with a feeling that it is more important to put an end in the possible abuses through outside sources of income for Members of Congress than it is to face the criticism of a self-granted increase in pay.

The Paper Industry and Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, some outstanding facts as to the relationship of the paper industry to the proposed expansion of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, by H. R. 2652, can be summarized as follows:

First. The paper industry is particularly sensitive to foreign competition because foreign nations have machinery of equal efficiency, and its workers have the same know-how as our own, with the result that every country in the world is a lower cost producer of paper than the United States, due to lower wage and lower standards of living. If the United States paper industry is to survive, it must either be by means of reduced wages and living standards, or by means of such tariff equalization as will permit the continuance of United States standards of wages and living.

Second. Every ton of imported paper is the equivalent of 3 days of lost time by one skilled American paper maker.

Third. American wage rates are from two to three times those for comparable workers abroad.

Fourth. Reciprocity cost the United States three-quarters of its newsprint industry. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has resulted in a progressive loss of markets for American manufacturers. For instance, novel news, a dutiable printing paper was formerly produced in the United States for a large portion of the consumption requirements. United States mills made 35,000 tons of this paper in 1939, less than 1,000 tons in 1944. This is equivalent to a loss of potential employment by United States paper makers of over 100,000 working days by skilled American workmen. The same condition is developing in four other printing paper grades, approximately 60 percent of the domestic market being taken over by lower cost Canadian producers. This has transpired in 5 years, and when the war is over the influx of Scandinavian paper will accelerate the destruction of domestic production of these grades.

Fifth. Of particular interest to the South is the effect of duty reductions on kraft paper. Foreign machine-glazed kraft, under the impact of duty reductions effected by trade agreements with Sweden and Finland, was sold in this market at $2.87 per hundredweight, as against a domestic price of $5.25. The entire domestic market was affected by reductions made to hold customers who were transferring their business to foreign manufacturers.

Sixth. Paper-mill profits are not excessive. In only two of the past 10 years has the average profit been above 5 percent, and the top figure was in 1941, a year of maximum prosperity, when the profit was 7.18 percent.

Seventh. Proponents of the Doughton bill state that the objective is to reach the low-tariff level of the Underwood Act of 1913. In the paper field, rates on 18 out of 23 grades of paper on which reductions have already been made under the Trade Agreements Act are as low or lower than those in the act of 1913. The Doughton bill would permit reductions to half of the rates in effect in 1913. The appended table gives the comparative paper tariff rates in detail under the acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930, and those now in effect under the Trade Agreements Act.

Eighth. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act binds the hands of Congress, denying Congress its constitutional duty to determine tariff rates. Under reciprocal trade agreements the Nation is bound by any action of the State Department, and pledged not to make any changes, by legislation or otherwise, in conflict with the decision of the State Department to reduce duty rates. No duty rate fixed by any trade agreement can be altered by act of Congress for 3 years from the effective date of any such agreement. The agreements are placed in effect for 3 years, and automatically extended unless formal notice is given in advance of a wish to nullify any such agreement.

Ninth. The United States paper industry represents an investment of $2,900,000,000, and must be maintained at approximately 75 percent of capacity to keep "out of the red." Its mills are located in 38 States.

Tenth. Of particular interest to Florida is the effect of trade egreements reducing paper mill output on the prosperity of communities where paper mills are located. Approximately half of the industry's entire investment is in towns wholly or partly dependent on the business developed through those mills. Fifty-eight percent of the Nation's mills are in communities with a population of under 10,000 and the largest percentage of the primary industry is in communities estimated to be from 70 to 100 percent dependent on the mills.

Eleventh. The paper industry is one of Florida's infant industries with possibilities of extensive enlargement unless tariff concessions to foreign competitors suppress efforts to expand the paper industry in the South. Fernandina and Port St. Joe are from 90 to 100 percent dependent on their paper mills for their existence. Panama City is from 25 to 50 percent dependent on the paper industry for community prosperity and Hialeah, Jacksonville, and Pensacola are classified as being up to 25 percent dependent on the mills in those localities.

APPENDIX C.—*Duty rates on paper, 1913 to 1945—Grades on which duty rates have been reduced by reciprocal trade agreements*

Grade	1913	1922	1930	Jan. 1, 1945	
				Actual rate	Equivalent to ad valorem computed on latest available statistics of actual importations
	Percent				
Printing	12	¼ cent per pound and 10 percent	¼ cent per pound and 10 percent	⅛ cent per pound and 5 percent	10.8 to 12 percent.
Paperboard, plain	5	10 percent	10 percent	10 percent (bound)	
Paperboard, processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	$14.50 per ton, not less than 15 percent or more than 30 percent.	
Pulpboard in rolls for use in manufacture of wallboard.	f	10 percent	10 percent	5 percent	
Same, processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Tissue, light weight [1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 3 cents per pound and 10 percent.	30 percent.
Tissue, heavy weight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent.	28.7 percent.
Tissue, stereo, carbon, pottery, light weight.[1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents, cents per pound and 15 percent.	21.5 percent.
Same, heavy weight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents, 4 cents per pound and 10 percent.	17 percent.
India Bible (over 10-pound)	12	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.6 percent.
Crepe paper	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 7½ percent	32.5 percent.
Simplex decalcomania	35	5 cents per pound	5 cents per pound and 10 percent	2½ cents per pound and 10 percent	22.1 percent.
Drawing paper	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if over 40 cents per pound.	13.7 percent.
Hand-made paper	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at over 50 cents.	12.9 percent.
Bristol board	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at not over 15 cents.	33.7 percent.
Hanging raw stock	12	10 percent	10 percent	7½ percent	
Filtering	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent, if valued at 75 cents or more.	8.1 percent.
Blotting	30	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Wrapping, kraft	25	do	do	20 percent	
Wrapping, other	25	do	do	25 percent	
Vegetable parchment	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	29 percent.
Straw board and paper, less than 12 pt. not less than 8 pt.	5–25	10–30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Cigarette	f0	60 percent	60 percent	45 percent	

[1] Lightweight refers to paper weighing not over 6 pounds per ream of 288,000 square inches. Heavyweight is paper 6 pounds or over, less than 10 pounds.

Will the Peace Agreement Stick?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of May 23, 1945:

WILL THE PEACE AGREEMENT STICK?

Some of the major disagreements that now stand in the way of a world security organization and a lasting peace are nothing more than old sores caused by wounds that were inflicted soon after the end of World War I.

The squabble over Poland at San Francisco, for instance, dates back to 1920 when Poland attacked Russia, and after victory with French aid, flouted one of the territorial agreements of the peacemakers by annexing territory east of the Curzon line. Later Poland absorbed territory which had been awarded to Lithuania, and Lithuania forthwith tore up another peace settlement by taking over Memel.

Likewise, the trouble the Allies are having with Marshal Tito can be traced back to Mussolini's annexation of Fiume, which had been reserved to Yugoslavia by the treaty of Versailles. By making demands in Poland and Trieste, Premier Stalin and Marshal Tito are simply righting what they consider to be wrongs inflicted upon their respective countries by the failure of other nations to abide by the promises they made at the peace table. And while this may not be the way to harmony and lasting peace, it is most certainly a natural reaction. Therefore, the chances for establishing a lasting peace this time depend largely upon the kind of peace settlements that are made and whether those settlements will stick.

World War II could hardly have broken out if the settlements of the armed conflict of 1914–18 had stuck—if the League of Nations

had worked, or if the provisions of the Versailles Treaty on German disarmament and conscription and submarine building had been enforced. Germany met her original reparations obligations to a considerable extent for 5 years, if only by dint of receiving war loans, especially from the United States. But reparations were scaled down by the Dawes plan of 1924, which also ended the French-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, and were scaled down still further by the Young plan of 1929. Only 2 years later—in 1931—reparations, as well as war debt payments, stopped completely. The general disarmament conference of that year got nowhere. Japan was allowed to absorb Manchukuo. And early in 1933 Adolf Hitler was allowed to come to complete power in Germany, although his program called for flat repudiation of the peace treaty.

After this there followed a series of open and official repudiations of the peace treaty. In 1935 Hitler formally flouted the clauses imposing disarmament on Germany and forbidding conscription. One year later he violated the treaty's prohibition on refortifying the Rhineland. Mussolini annexed Ethiopia and was allowed to get away with it. In the face of all this, Great Britain agreed to let Germany build up to one-third of the British naval strength.

In 1937 China was left unaided against the Japanese invasion. In March 1938, Hitler annexed Austria. In September he took the Sudeten areas of Czechoslovakia. Poland took the Teschen area, Hungary took some of southern Slovakia. In March 1939 Germany and Hungary took the rest of Czechoslovakia, and Germany took Memel. In April of that year Mussolini took Albania, and on September 1, World War II broke out.

These are the highlights in the story of the years between wars. It is a story of jealousy between the big powers, secret intrigue, and broken promises leading up to open repudiation of agreements solemnly entered into at the peace table. Similar agreements are now being made at another peace conference. Will they stick any better than they did before?

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Alfred C. Gaunt, former president of the New England Small Business Association, on reciprocal trade agreements:

I am an owner of a small worsted mill. I was the first president of the N. E. Smaller Business Association and chairman of the National Advisory Council of Independent Small Business. I come as a private citizen interested in the promotion and preservation of small independent business in America.

You gentlemen of the committee possibly have not had presented to you the particular angle of the so-called reciprocity program as it affects small business, and I should like to lay before you some facts that may help you in arriving at a sound decision.

You may be interested to note that the remonstrants against lowered tariffs are almost without exception from industries which are not monopolistic, but primarily made up of small-owner operated units, and among whom exists full, free, and fair competition.

Some of them are the following:

	Employees
Paper and allied products	264,716
Clock and watch manufacturers	20,287
Surgical instruments	14,339
Hat manufacturers	23,369
Lace manufacturers	7,254
Lumber manufacturers	360,613
Cutlery, tools, and hardware manufacturers	73,664
Cotton weaving	312,249
Footwear	218,028
Woolen and worsted	140,022
Cotton yarn	70,452
Rayon weaving	65,432
Chemicals	287,136
Tableware	27,330
Shoes	18,845
Glass manufacturers	67,000
Toys	15,610
Sugar refining	14,133
Vitreous and potteries	33,105
Beet sugar	10,410
Perfumes	10,363
Total	2,054,357

If to these are added such of the owner-operated farms and farm products processors, and the miners and others not on this list who ask or need protection, it is unquestionably fair to say that tens of thousands of small business concerns, and the jobs of several millions of their employees, will be adversely affected by any reduction of tariff which permits increased imports of lower-labor-cost products from abroad to undercut them. The long period of depression followed by tariff cuts had already put multitudes of small industries out of business, and many others like myself were "hanging on the ropes" when we were saved by the cessation of imports when war came.

To demonstrate to you that these industries are genuinely small business, may I give you the break-down of the business I know the best, the woolen business, which I think is largely typical of these small businesses listed. In the woolen business there were in 1937—

Plants employing from 1 to 100 persons	241
Plants employing from 101 to 500 persons	293
Plants employing from 500 to 2,500 persons	43
Plants employing over 2,500 persons	6
Total	583

There are no restrictive practices or patent or price agreements among the woolen mills. The largest single concern in the business by no means dominates, having less than 10 percent of the looms of the industry. There exists full free and fair competition, and free enterprise in its true sense. The units are generally located in small communities of which they are the chief support. They are over 95 percent resident-owner operated.

Cotton textile mills also belong in the same category. The potteries, the lumber manufacturers, the hat and shoe and lace manufacturers, and others, and their employees, are likewise all of the type and geographical distribution that are essential to the healthy economic and social life of America as a whole.

The point which I would like to make, which I feel sure has not occurred to you, is that the sufferers from lowered tariffs will not be the aluminum or steel or General Electric or automobile big business.

WOLVES

It will be the little fellows and their employees who will be thrown to the wolves. It is the existence of innumerable small businesses that is now threatened by the advent of peace.

Congress has universally and uniformly been friendly to small business. Congress passed by a unanimous vote of both Houses the bill creating Smaller War Plants Corporation. Most of the gentlemen on this committee are on record as being for the promotion and preservation of independent small business.

SACRIFICE

The glib answer of those who espouse lower tariff, that "it may be necessary to sacrifice one industry to promote another," overlooks entirely the importance to the Nation of the small industries they propose to sacrifice.

Most small businesses and farms cannot be moved. It would be uneconomic and antisocial to move them to Detroit, even if Detroit is booming with export orders. Moreover, not all small businessmen and their workers wish to uproot themselves and their families from their small communities.

Wool growing, for instance, is an occupation in almost every State, and the most important occupation of 11 States, which have a rural population and small towns.

To increase the activity and congestion and concentration in big centers, while small communities go on WPA, is certainly a condition we, all of us, wish to avoid.

So also the policy of snuffing out what some may call an inefficient industry is at direct variance with that of President Woodrow Wilson when he said, "We were absolutely at the mercy of the world on chemicals. We are not going to get caught that way again." A wise tariff policy launched shortly thereafter turned what many thought was an inefficient industry—chemicals and dyestuffs—into one that now leads the world. Without this industry our country would have been placed in a disastrous position for rubber and ammunition. Without the textile industry—also erroneously characterized by some as inefficient—our boys would have gone cold and short of shelter.

Any definition of "inefficient industry which should be sacrificed" as being "one which pays low wages" ought to be examined, especially if it is an industry marked for extinction. The textile industry would almost immediately qualify under this definition as inefficient unless one gets the whole story. If we say, for instance, that the automobile industry is efficient because it pays an average of $1.25 an hour then the textile industry is inefficient as its average is 81 cents an hour.

But here is the fallacy. In the automobile industry there is normally one worker in each family—the man. The variety and lightness of work in the textile industry makes it possible for not only the man to work but perhaps several of his unmarried daughters. I know of one typical family where the mother holds out her apron, and the husband and daughters and a crippled son toss in over $200 every weekly pay day. The average family income in textile communities is as great or greater than the average family income in the automobile industry or the mining industry or others where the rates per hour are apparently higher.

Condemnation or sacrifice of any such industry is a disservice to our plans for full employment.

The problem of survival of small business is very real. The mortality among small business because of war conditions has been over 500,000. Big business meanwhile has thrived and grown greater.

You gentlemen of the committee are naturally turning your eyes to the postwar period in your study of this trade-agreement bill.

HISTORY

After the Napoleonic wars, with the low protective duties then existing in our country, England sent shipload after shipload of products into the United States and nearly ruined what little industry we had at that

time. We were saved by erecting tariff barriers, as the Hollanders have been saved from the sea by raising their dikes.

You perhaps remember the period after the last war. The replacement of destroyed material kept all industries booming, until the tumble that came about 18 months after Armistice Day. We were at that time operating under the low-tariff Underwood bill of 1913. A tremendous flood of foreign goods started to overwhelm this country. We pulled out of that slump by raising the tariff. The Underwood low tariff was replaced with an antidumping bill and an emergency tariff in 1921, followed by the Fordney-McCumber tariff in 1922.

While the world-wide destruction of goods will keep productive facilities going at top speed for a period after the war, we know that the world's productive capacities will soon overtake the demand. It is time right now to put our tariff house in order.

The British Board of Trade already have sent scouts and "research men" to this market. They have appropriated substantial sums of money to place agents here who have already canvassed the users of fine woolens and worsted goods.

These British propaganda missionaries are earnestly working to revive the old idea that something imported from abroad is better than can be made in this country, notwithstanding the fact that it has been demonstrated now over many years that the American craftsmen and workmen are as skilled as any that exist anywhere. They used to tell us that only from Germany could be had such wonderful dyestuffs. Today our laboratories produce products which surpass any things that Germany ever did. It used to be that if a man wanted a fine automobile he went after a foreign make. Today our automobiles lead the world in beauty and value and serviceability. Certain interests still promote the propaganda that imported woolens are superior to American woolens. They even go so far as putting a tag on certain fine American woolens and stamp them "imported." I have seen where this very thing had been done on products of our own mills by some unscrupulous person. Today American ingenuity and skill and good taste produce woolens as fine or finer than those made anywhere in the world; and in sufficient volume to serve this greatest luxury market in the world.

Headlines in British papers frankly state they are looking to the "rich American market." In the prewar year 1939, the first year Britain got the benefit of reduced tariff on woolens, she jumped her shipments to us over 350 percent. Only the war prevented further distress to our woolen mills, most of which are owner-operated small independent businesses. Britain already is "squared away" to jump in at the advent of peace, even under the present 50-percent concession. She needs no further 50 percent. She should get less than 50 percent. This drive of hers is going to hit most especially the smaller mills like my own. You see the finer goods requiring higher skills are mostly made in the smaller units; and inasmuch as the finer cloths have the greater labor content, Britain with her much lower standard of living for workers is in a preferred position on finer goods to knock out our smaller mills. Our wage scale is more than double that of Britain. Czechoslovakia and Italian and Japanese wage rates are still lower, and they all have the same modern machinery that we have.

The tariff rates as now in effect under the Reciprocity Act on the products of these small mills are today lower than those which prevailed at the time the Underwood Act was in force, and when the 1920 postwar flood of foreign goods submerged us.

VETERANS

Under no circumstances should the power of making still further reductions be granted, unless you wish to kill off more small independent businesses. Hopeful as we are that the return of the veteran will open up many new small businesses, we must be concerned with seeing that he gets a fair start and fair show. In Sunday's New York Times is an ad of a returned veteran seeking to buy a small woolen mill. What a tragedy if we hand him one that must stand idle while Britain's mills run night and day.

The small businessman does not ask subsidies. He does not fear fair competition from big business neighbor or from abroad; but you note I say fair competition. As labor has protection from unfair labor practices, so must small business have protection from unfair business practices. The foreigner has no 40-hour week. He does not pay time and a half. He pays his labor low wages. Small business has a right to expect from its elected representatives laws that will shield it from this unfair competition. You may remember that as between North and South NRA said that it was unfair competition for industry to make profits out of lower wage rates. Exactly the same sort of fair parity as that directed between North and South should be established as between foreign producers and domestic producers. What the small businessman asks is a parity tariff—one that takes care of the cost differential (principally labor) and other unfair or artificial advantages that foreigners employ.

The farmer has a formula for agricultural parity, but we do not have any accepted standard of practice or policy of establishing a parity tariff for industry.

The reciprocal trade agreement law gives no practicable rule or standard by which changes in any tariff rates can be determined. They are left to the uncontrolled direction of the President—the only present limit being that he may not increase or decrease any duty by more than 50 percent. Although we have numerous studies of costs here and abroad and information on comparative labor rates, we make no use of these figures in arriving at changes. I know of no study that has ever been made, however, of the relative impact of so-called reciprocity reductions on small business versus big or monopoly businesses.

If you say "Well, why does not small business develop its export trade?"—you have the answer when you note that the principal manufactured exports that interest foreign buyers are our mass-production products; and small business does not and cannot make mass-production items. Moreover small business is not organized with export branches as is big business. The natural markets for small businesses are the nearby or home markets to which it should have access on at least as fair a basis as any foreigner. Big exporting business would in effect be given a further subsidy of tariff favors with further lowering as proposed.

PEACE AND WAR AND THE TARIFF

The absurdity of some arguments for a reduced tariff have doubtless already impressed you. For instance, the statement to the effect that anyone against continued or further reduced tariffs contemplated in this bill "is advocating another war." In fact when one examines the record, he is impressed by the regularity of war following a decreased tariff. In the 1890's we had the Cleveland low-tariff bill followed by the Spanish War. In 1914 World War I followed the tariff cuts of the Underwood bill. In 1934–37 came the so-called reciprocity reductions followed by World War II.

Does it not lie nearer to the truth for us to conclude that friction and irritation and disruptions and wars are more often caused by violent or radical shifts or changes in tariff policies and levels? Was not the reversal of Britain's free-trade policy and establishment of protection and Empire preference a restriction of world trade and a source of world irritation? And did not Britain attribute that change of her policy to our American "weather-vane" policy?

RECIPROCITY

As to foreign trade—of course, we want foreign trade. But it should be true reciprocity—on the basis of our buying from the other fellow what we can use without detriment to ourselves; and selling to the other fellow what he wants to buy. This can be done either in direct trade or in the so-called three-way trade. Rubber or tin or coffee or a certain amount of Australian wool imported do not displace American labor, and such imports promote prosperity in the countries of the exporters. In return we sell them what they want, machinery, automobiles, gadgets. That produces prosperity and employment in our country. That is true reciprocity.

Then as they raise their standard of living and the labor differential is narrowed we gradually, not violently, reduce our tariffs, keeping them at a level where there is a basis for them to enter our market in fair competition, not with an overwhelming flood such as hit and prostrated us in 1921.

The tariff should not be a football of politics or diplomats. A policy having been laid down, it should be consistent, based on scientific determination; and subject to supervision not by the State Department or bureaucrats far removed from public control, but by our Senators and Congress, who are the elected representatives of the interests and workers affected.

DECREE

You gentlemen, the duly elected representatives of the people themselves, are in a far superior position to know what is good for your constituents than are any bureaucrats or State Department officials trading behind closed doors. Opposition to referring back for ratification to you or the Senate is either a reflection on you or the assumption of a very great superiority on their part. If they fear to submit their agreements to you, they should not make them. If they are for the good of the country and its small independent businesses, they will be ratified. If they are not, they should not be ratified. No one man should have the power to decree the death of any industry and the unemployment of its workrs; and no few big exporting industries should be artificially giantized by killing off small businesses which supply our domestic market and do not need to export.

The State Department is open to severe criticism because of the method used in negotiating these treaties. Interested parties of small business or agriculture were not invited to attend preliminary mapping out of concessions to be discussed. Formal negotiations on the last British agreement began three weeks before the public hearings opened. The hearings given were so perfunctory and apparently so boring to our officials that everyone in attendance felt that the stage was already set. Announcement of the final agreements only confirmed our worst fears. The small businesses and small farmers had been made the sacrificial goats, and we had no forum of our elected representatives to whom we could appeal.

It is, of course, the hope of some that the lowering of tariff on imports will afford markets for increased American production, but the lowering should not be haphazard or done in star-chamber sessions. It is little consolation to a small business industry and its employees that is crippled or destroyed by foreign competition, that some big industry in some other section of the country is profiting.

I feel sure that this committee and the State Department have not fully appreciated the fact that the use of the authority to reduce tariff protection has been highly discriminatory and has been unwittingly applied to the detriment of small, independent, competitive business. Not only should there

be no further cut of another 50 percent of existing rates, but a policy of protection of small business having been established, let there be a reappraisal of all rates to the end that reciprocity, like charity, shall begin at home, with fair play and fair trade first of all to our own small industries and their employees.

If shortness of time and expediency indicate temporary measures, may I suggest that renewal be for but 1 year; and with rates frozen right where they are against any further reduction that will harm any independent competitive small business. Then during this ensuing year let a survey be made and recommendations be brought in for a parity tariff that will not discriminate against American independent competitive small businesses and their employees.

The Tariff Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Sun of May 8, 1945:

THE TARIFF PROBLEM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

To the fore again is the question of the American tariff—a political and economic irritant since Alexander Hamilton laid the foundations of our fiscal policies. The Republican Party has generally been for a high tariff; the Democrats have supported a lower tariffff, except on such agricultural products as they desired to have protected.

The author of the doctrine of reciprocal tariffs was a Republican, William Howard Taft, and his concepts have been expanded by Mr. Hull in the present tariff treaties. Those treaties are obviously obsolete because of the war and the alterations in the economies of all countries that have occurred during the war years. When, for instance, our reciprocal trade treaty with England was arranged, that country was the principal trading nation of the world. What is her trading position today? I think the British would like to know.

SIXTY MILLION JOBS?

Henry Wallace has, with characteristic self-assurance, hurled himself into this tariff argument and it seems to be his conclusion that if our tariff is low we shall enjoy 60,000,000 jobs, for which there can be no more than 46,000,000 workers, if any attention is paid to arithmetic. How does Henry Wallace or anybody else know what will bring more jobs out of foreign trade unless and until he knows the economic state of trading countries, the value of money—ours and theirs—rates of exchange, controls of production, wage scales, standards of living? For instance, what is the purchasing power of Germany today; what will it be 10 years from now? How can anyone tell?

A RUSSIAN LOAN?

Much is made of our postwar trade with Soviet Russia, yet every report indicates that that country is trying to borrow $6,000,000,000 for postwar purposes. In a word, Soviet Russia will pay us with our own money, which increases our national debt and our tax load. Is that kind of trade worth while? Maybe. But I should like to see some figures proving it. Henry Wallace's excitable words are not proof.

SHALL "WE RUSH IN WHERE," ETC.?

Before we can approach this question of a tariff rationally, we need to have some knowledge of the state of our own economy. We need to know what we shall be competing against, not only in the markets of the world but in our own market at home. Against what, let us say, are goods manufactured at $1 an hour to compete? Against goods manufactured at 20 or 50 cents an hour, or perchance against slave labor?

That is what we need to know before we decide for a high tariff, a low tariff, a reciprocal tariff, or any kind of tariff. We need facts which are today unavailable and without which no intelligent person can form an opinion.

KRUPP AND SKODA

For instance, we know that the Krupp works, the Skoda works, and similar European competitors of our steel-products companies have been bombed perhaps out of existence. Skoda used to manufacture locomotives and such heavy products in competition with us of excellent quality but lower price, the differentials coming out of their lower wage scale plus a subsidy from the French Government. Our plants had no such subsidy from any source and paid a higher price for wages and raw materials.

CAN THEY PAY?

Their destruction is to our advantage, if—and that is the big word—if somebody will discover a way for European countries to pay for what they want to buy. Up to now the only solution offered is that the United States lend them money, through credits or by exchange manipulations. That means that the American people pay for the goods that we sell to the Europeans and we agree to be repaid in goods, which we can ourselves manufacture, when they have them to offer us, and we pay for their goods in credits or cash. Then they pay the debts with our cash or their cheaper goods to compete with our wage scale.

LET'S STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

Maybe that is the only way it can be done. Maybe that is the only way we can keep our overexpanded industry going. But it will break us in the end because it is unsound. We need figures on all this—and accurate figures are still suppressed or unavailable.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on behalf of the Eastern Massachusetts Congress, an affiliate of the Polish-American Congress:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
EASTERN MASSACHUSETTS DISTRICT.

We, the members of the Eastern Massachusetts Congress, which represents 150,000 Americans, an affiliate of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., numbering 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, in a meeting assembled at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., April 22, 1945, realizing the historical importance of the San Francisco Conference, express the following:

Today the entire world is looking to America for enlightened leadership to lasting peace. Much blood has been shed for the ideals we Americans cherish. New hope is given in the assurance made by the new President that he will support these ideals with all his strength. Consequently we are certain that America will never become a party to any plan for partial victory. To settle for merely another temporary respite would surely jeopardize the future security of the entire world.

The grave responsibility of procuring peace must rest with the defenders of peace—the United Nations. We realize that in this shrinking world, it is futile to seek safety behind geographic barriers. Real security can only be found in justice and charity, based on divine law.

A sound world organization is not an utopian dream. With the honest goodwill of nations, it can be realized, and a new era in international relations would be created. We call upon our leaders not to yield to defeatism, but rather to show courage and firmness, so that right may prevail over might.

The present war began with an unprovoked attack on Poland by Germany, with Russia joining in the attack. We entered war dedicated to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, loudly proclaiming the "four freedoms" to the whole world. We, the American people, are cognizant and agreeable for the necessity of a cooperative and harmonious war effort against Germany. But we, the American people, do not see the necessity, much less the justice, of achieving such an effort through the despoliation of the Polish Nation.

Poland is the test of our sincerity. Poland was and is a faithful ally of the United Nations. She should not have been treated as a conquered or liberated country. We should not be totally unconscious of the dictates of humanity. Both Churchill and our late President have frequently referred to the great part Poland played in our general victory. Rightly she was called the inspiration of nations. Contrary to promises and elementary fairness, Poland was not represented at Yalta. Her people, as was pledged, were not consulted concerning their fate. Heroic Poland was not treated as an ally, but more like an enemy. Among the nations of Europe none has a more heroic history than Poland.

The test for the possibility of world order may well be found in considering the Nation that has sacrificed so much in the cause of liberty and independence. Poland should have a prominent place within the circle of the Big Three or the Big Five. Instead she was adjudged at Yalta and now excluded from San Francisco.

The Crimean Charter may have given new promises of peace, security, international cooperation, and new life to the ideals of liberty and democracy. But the Crimean proposals as regards to Poland are shocking to all those who adhere to the cause of freedom and the right of self-determination. Poland is made a victim of injustice, its Government is delivered into the hands of an unfriendly power, contrary to all rules of right and justice—that Poland which has suffered more than any other nation in this world holocaust; that Poland which stood against Nazi aggressors from the very beginning of the war; that Poland where you find no collaborators with nazism; that Poland which has fought and is fighting courageously with our armies on every European front—is being forced by her allies to surrender half of her territory.

Our late President pledged our country that in the choice of a permanent Polish Government the people of Poland would be guaranteed the right of a free secret ballot and no foreign power would be permitted to influence this election. The peace of the

world demands a free, independent, and democratic Poland. Poland, secure in her rights of freedom and independence, will make further great sacrifices for humanity and will continue to contribute her share toward the international welfare.

Let not the new security organization start off with the bitterness of the small nations and the fixed impressions in the minds of many people that the seeds of a future war have been planted in the field of broken pledges and injustice. We, the American people, therefore must see to it that at San Francisco the fulfillment of the terms of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," under which we marched to conflict, be carried out to the letter.

We ask that these ideals be invoked not only for Poland but for all small nations. We have sacrificed flesh and blood; let us not sacrifice principles. Faith must replace force; law and not the gun must reign; freedom and not enslavement; liberty and not tyranny; God and not Belial must rule.

We are deeply concerned that our Nation's sacrifices may not prove to be in vain but that the San Francisco Conference be successful in bringing about a just and lasting peace. We therefore propose:

1. The recognition of the principle that all nations be bound by the moral law.

2. An international bill of rights for all individuals and all peoples that would guarantee freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and respect for human rights.

A copy of the above has been forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, the Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Hon. Cordell Hull, Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Senator Tom Connally, Representative Charles A. Eaton, Representative Sol Bloom, and Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, with the earnest request that the decisions reached at Yalta regarding Poland be revised at the forthcoming United Nations Conference at San Francisco, so that justice may be accorded Poland and all small nations who have remained steadfast with the Allies.

Rev. LADISLAUS A. SIKORA,
President.
ANTHONY TRACZ,
Vice President.
Mrs. A. DABROWSKA,
Vice President.
JOHN PIETRASZEK,
Treasurer.
Miss MARY V. PIKOR,
Secretary.

Pledge of Support to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, pledging support to President Truman and expressing confidence in his leadership:

Whereas divine providence has placed the supreme direction of our National Government and the command of our armed forces in the hands of President Harry S. Truman in this most critical hour of our Nation's history; and

Whereas the decisions to be taken by our Federal Government in the immediate future and their influence upon the course of action of other governments with which we are allied may shape for many generations to come the destiny not only of our Nation but of civilization itself; and

Whereas in reaching these decisions our President will have need of not only all the technical and intellectual resources of the machinery of government, but the moral support of a united American people, as well as the guidance of divine wisdom; and

Whereas throughout his career as farm boy, as hero of World War I, as local administrator, as United States Senator, and finally as Vice President, Harry S. Truman has proved himself a humble man of God, understanding, courageous, capable, and worthy of carrying forward the mighty banner handed on by the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

Whereas in his first acts as President, Harry S. Truman took steps to further unity between the executive and legislative branches of government, to assure the continuation of plans for the establishment of an international organization to prevent future wars, to voice for the entire people our determination to prosecute the war to complete victory under our present military leaders, and to carry on the policies charted for us by his immortal predecessor; and

Whereas in his first address to the Congress on Monday, April 16, President Truman reaffirmed his resolve to carry on in accordance with the battle maps and plans for action already approved by the American people, specifically unconditional surrender with punishment of the war criminals, world organization to keep peace under law, continued cooperation of the United Nations with responsibility of the great nations to serve, and not dominate, the small; increased international trade, production, and employment and better living standards throughout the world; continued efforts to improve the lot of the comman man, preservation of religious tolerance, political freedom, and economic opportunity; and

Whereas the declaration of these lofty and courageous principles and objectives at a time of national and international mourning has given new hope and courage to human kind throughout the civilized world; and

Whereas in reaffirming these policies, President Truman has called upon his fellow citizens for their moral support in these words:

"With great humility I call upon all Americans to help me keep our Nation united in defense of these ideals which have been so eloquently proclaimed by Franklin Roosevelt," and again: "I appeal to every American regardless of party, race, creed, or color, to support our efforts to build a strong and lasting United Nations organization"; and

Whereas the people of Chicago in every national emergency have demonstrated their love of country by responding to each patriotic call that has been made upon them, to the point of offering their lives, their blood, their fortunes, the toil of their bodies, and their united will to victory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the City Council of Chicago, in behalf of the citizens of Chicago, answer this call of our President and commander in chief by pledging our united and unfaltering support of President Truman and expressing our utmost confidence in his leadership; and be it further

Resolved, That, as a living symbol to the world of the measure of our support, we hereby authorize Mayor Edward J. Kelly to appoint a committee of one hundred consisting of representatives of the armed forces, of the clergy, the economic, social and intellectual life of our city, from members of all faiths, racial and national origins, to arrange at the earliest possible time for a mass demonstration and day of public prayer for divine guidance in behalf of President Truman and the American people; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly engrossed, be presented to President Truman, and that other copies be sent to both Members of the United States Senate from Illinois and to all Members of the House of Representatives from Chicago Congressional districts.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, by a vote of yeas 44, nays none, at a regular meeting held on Monday, the 23d day of April A. D. 1945.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the city of Chicago the 18th day of May A. D. 1945.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Sol Bloom, Delegate to San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Murray Frank, from the Jewish Advocate of May 10, 1945:

SOL BLOOM, DELEGATE TO SAN FRANCISCO
(By Murray Frank)

SOL BLOOM'S selection as one of the eight American delegates to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco is no accidental twist of circumstances. It is a public tribute to his accomplishments and a recognition of his capabilites as a statesman, which he has proved himself to be on many occasions during the past two decades.

Today SOL BLOOM, the only Jewish member of the American delegation, is looked upon by the State Department as one of the most esteemed and highly regarded Members of Congress who are of invaluable assistance in the conduct of this country's foreign relations. And that was frankly admitted by none other than Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius at a testimonial dinner recently in honor of SOL BLOOM.

In appearance BLOOM has a striking similarity to George Arliss, and immediately the thought flashes through one's mind of Arliss' characterization of Disraeli, the great British-Jewish statesman of the last century. BLOOM is somewhat shorter than average height, has a lively, mobile face, and brown, thinning hair. Always nattily dressed, clean-shaven, and carefully groomed down to the broad black ribbon on his pince-nez eyeglasses. BLOOM looks every bit the statesman that he is as he makes his way through the maze of the Capitol corridors or receives his visitor in his private office in the Capitol Building.

INTERESTING CHARACTERISTICS

There are many other interesting features which characterize SOL BLOOM. A native of Illinois, raised in San Francisco, to which he is now returning as an official American delegate to the international parley, BLOOM later settled in New York, which to him became home, but is actually a resident of Wash-

ington ever since he was first elected to Congress more than 22 years ago. Originally a Tammany Democrat, he has far outgrown that bailiwick and is today a national figure, known as an ardent liberal and a strong advocate of progressive legislation.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he has proved himself to be a parliamentarian and diplomat of first rank, skillfully guiding important legislation on national and international affairs of great significance to the United States in times of war or peace. By faith an Orthodox Jew, BLOOM is very much perturbed by the lack of unity in Jewish ranks, particularly so when dealing with governments and world leaders and at international conferences, such as at San Francisco.

When the eight American delegates to the international conference first divided among themselves the respective spheres of responsibility, BLOOM was delegated with authority to select and recommend the representative groups of the three religious faiths in the country. At once his cry went out for one united Jewish representation to be prepared to present the most pressing and most important problems of present-day Jewish life. On more than one occasion he literally cried his heart out to this correspondent complaining of the lack of cooperation on the part of American Jewish leadership, saying, "I am hitting my head up against a stone wall." The result, as we are all aware of it now, is that American Jewry is coming to San Francisco widely torn asunder and represented by two organizations possessed of conflicting views on major Jewish problems.

IN THE MIDST OF PLANNING AT 75

BLOOM celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday on March 9 last. He was born at Pekin, Ill., the son of poor Polish Jewish immigrants. After the family moved to San Francisco young Sol had to go to work at the age of 8, because of his father's ill health. In his later teens he was very successful in the theatrical and musical fields, where his enterprising business career was most successful, particularly in real estate and construction of apartment houses and theaters in New York.

By the early 1920's he was ready to retire "to devote his life to public service." In January 1923 he was elected to Congress in a special byelection, winning by a majority of 145 votes in a Republican stronghold. He has been a Member of Congress ever since, having been reelected 11 times. During his long incumbency of the legislative office BLOOM was a member of several important congressional committees, but his statesmanship and diplomatic skill developed and reached full maturity in the Foreign Affairs Committee, whose chairman he is since 1939. As a result, he found himself in the thick of American war planning throughout the war years, and at present is gradually emerging in the midst of international peace planning.

It would take us too far afield to recount his manifold efforts in guiding important legislation through Congress, a story which is by this time well known and universally recognized. Suffice it to merely mention his guidance and leadership in recent years in obtaining the enactment of the Selective Service Act, the Lend-Lease Act, repeal of the arms embargo and of the ban on arming merchant ships, UNRRA legislation and others. He has been a staunch supporter of the Roosevelt administration and a great admirer of our late beloved President. BLOOM was a member of the inner circle of congressional leaders who were in constant touch with President Roosevelt since the beginning of the war, and will undoubtedly continue in the same capacity under President Truman.

Despite his advanced age, BLOOM retains his clarity and freshness of mind, his joviality and quick wittedness, and his pleasant personality. His greatest pride is the fact that political friends and foes alike admit freely and frankly that he is fair and just, courteous and tolerant, in his role as committee chairman. On his birthday recently, the members of his committee gathered in the Speaker's dining room in the Capitol at a surprise luncheon, to pay tribute and express their admiration for SOL BLOOM.

His only daughter, Vera, lives with him in Washington. Prior to his wife's death several years ago, the BLOOMS led an active and enjoyable social life. Since her death, and more recently due to exigencies of war, BLOOM has sharply curtailed his attendance at social functions, limiting it to the most necessary. He now devotes all of his time to the intricate problems of foreign affairs, and lately to the problems of building a lasting peace and perfecting world security.

BLOOM AT SAN FRANCISCO

BLOOM will undoubtedly prove to be of invaluable assistance at San Francisco, no less than he has been in recent years to the State Department on matters of foreign policy. He will be a perfect representative of the American people, steeped in the knowledge of American history, a true patriot and a great humanitarian at heart.

Shortly before he left for San Francisco, I had a lengthy chat with him in his private office. We talked of San Francisco, of lasting peace for the world, of the possibility of Jewish problems coming up at the Security Conference, and of Jewish affairs. He had spent several hours that morning conferring with the other American delegates at the State Department. He looked somewhat tired, but nevertheless was full of enthusiasm about the Conference.

"Murray, despite all the talk you hear about disagreements and dissension," he said, "I tell you that San Francisco will be a success. We shall come away from there with a security agreement that will assure lasting peace for a long time to come. But I should like to see more than that. I should like to see all countries adopt and put into practice equal rights for all people all over the world. To me the individual counts most, and the people are above all. A true enactment of equal rights will automatically eliminate the troublesome minority problems with which the world has been afflicted in recent decades.

"As for purely Jewish problems, judging by the agenda of the Conference, I do not see where they will come up at San Francisco except in the discussion of the trusteeship plan for expanding the number of trustees over certain mandates, in which case Palestine may be involved. The mandates, as such, will not be changed. It is merely a plan for widening the responsibility for the mandates to two or more countries. You can be assured that where Palestine is involved, the Jewish representatives at San Francisco will be called in for consultation."

SOL BLOOM, who is known as a down-to-earth realist, is at heart really a dreamer of a happier and better world, a philosopher of the people and for the people. Though he mingles among the mighty of this earth, he stands humbly before God, in full humility that God has bestowed upon him a keen sense of understanding human needs and troubles, and has given him wisdom, sagacity, and good judgment in reshaping and building the world of tomorrow.

San Francisco, we are sure, will prove to be the crowning glory of an active public life, in the interests of his country, and in the interests of his people and all people of the world over. Godspeed to San Francisco, SOL BLOOM! We shall pray that your dreams are fully realized there, in the land of sunshine and newborn hope!

Reciprocal Trade A B C of American Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, reciprocal trade is the A B C of American prosperity, of world prosperity, and of economic cooperation between nations. It substitutes economic cooperation for economic warfare. It gives substance to our good-neighbor policy. It lays the only possible basis upon which permanent peace and prosperity can be founded.

The United States, in order to utilize its full productive capacity and provide jobs for all, can and must produce more goods, farm and industrial, than can be sold profitably to the American market.

These surpluses must be sold abroad. For if they are permitted to pile up, unsold, here in this country, farmers and manufacturers lose money, wages go down, the home market is able to buy less, and the depression spiral is already twisting swiftly downward.

On the other hand, if we sell our surpluses abroad, farmers and manufacturers have larger and more numerous markets, the home market is expanded because more workers, employed in manufacturing products for foreign as well as home markets, have more jobs. With more employment, more goods, and more purchasing power, the standard of living of the whole Nation is raised. Foreign trade can supply 5,000,000 of the 60,000,000 job goal. The spiral of prosperity twists swiftly upward.

Foreign trade is, and must be, a two-way street. We cannot export unless we import. For our purchases from other nations give them the money with which to buy our goods. The more we buy from them, the more they can buy from us.

High trade barriers, tariffs, hinder the free flow of trade. By making it difficult for its own people to buy the things they need and want from other countries, a nation makes it difficult, and eventually impossible, for its own producers to sell their exportable surpluses in other countries. This of course means depression.

The purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Acts is to increase foreign markets for United States products. This is done by reciprocal adjustment of too-high trade barriers. The President is given power, by the act, in order to obtain lower tariffs from other nations on our exports to them, to cut our tariffs on certain of our imports from them. He can bind existing tariff rates on imports against increase, and guarantee continued duty-free entry of products now on the free list.

The President, by the terms of the act, cannot modify tariff rates except under a trade agreement with another nation whereby our exports to them benefit through their lowered tariffs. He cannot reduce the duty on any import by

more than 50 percent, nor can he transfer any item from the dutiable list to the free list.

Trade agreements can only be concluded, under the terms of the act, after the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and other appropriate Government agencies have been consulted, and only after public notice and full opportunity for presentation of information and views by any interested person.

Lowered barriers on imports similar to United States products will be granted only when they are in the national interest, when reciprocal concessions are obtained therefor, and then only after careful study of the whole question. Usually such imports are limited in amount and time.

Reciprocal trade protects American producers against foreign tariff and other discriminations. It makes for American prosperity and world prosperity. Among other direct advantages, reciprocal trade will encourage a large merchant marine, which, as an industry in itself, can be responsible for one-half million jobs and serve as an important arm of our national defense. Reciprocal trade ends economic warfare. Economic dog-eat-dog, cutthroat jungle life is supplanted by cooperation for the mutual benefit of all.

Today our trade agreements with the other American republics form one of the strongest pillars in the structure of hemispheric solidarity and of our global good-neighbor policy.

These agreements stand today for economic cooperation in war and peace. It took a second world war to teach the American people that political isolation from the rest of the world does not prevent, but rather breeds, wars. We must not allow a third world war to teach us that economic isolation is just as surely a breeder of war. Economic insecurity and unrest, depression, caused in large part by excessive trade barriers and discriminatory trade policies, proved a fertile breeding ground for fascism and helped bring about this war.

Secure peace after victory must and can only be built on the solid foundation of economic cooperation. The passage of the Reciprocal Trade Acts will strengthen our determination to win a victory that will be worth the cost. It will inspire confidence that the United States will undertake its responsibility in building a permanent peace. It will help build that peace.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a worth while contribution to the discussion in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements bill, I present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from the Eli Lilly International Corporation of Indianapolis. The operattions of this corporation include many countries and it is well known throughout the world. Its letter follows:

ELI LILLY INTERNATIONAL CORP.,
Indianapolis, Ind., May 16, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The ways and means to secure a peaceful world are occupying the attention of all thoughtful people. In order to accomplish such an objective, an economically healthy world is necessary.

One of the essential measures tested and approved by 10 years of notably successful experience toward the attaining of this objective has been the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

H. R. 2652, a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act from June 12, 1945, is soon to be acted on.

We have carefully reviewed the pros and cons of what the extension of such a measure will mean and it is our conclusion that in the interest of a sound and prosperous economy for our country, this bill should be passed.

The increased authority to decrease or increase duties, which this bill also grants, we believe will be advantageous in the furtherance of the export business of the United States and helpful to world trade.

We hope that in the interest of our country and international cooperation you will lend your support by voting for the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act.

Yours very truly,

A. L. YOUNG,
Vice President and General Manager.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my speech on this bill will be short and sweet, as the saying goes. Here it is. Ever since the great spending New Dealers have been in power they have become so engrossed and proficient in the art of giving away that they have completely lost sight of the fact that unless we begin now to think and act for America's interests not only will we sink to the depths of want, misery, and strife in our great land but also the whole world will lose its one last bright ray of hope for a better world because of our inability to show the way.

Our first and greatest responsibility is to keep America strong in every sense so as to hold the respect which the great majority of the liberty-loving peoples of the world holds for us today. I would have voted to extend this reciprocal-trade treaty as is for another 2 years if section 2, which provides authority by the State Department to further reduce our tariffs an additional 50 percent, had been eliminated; but I shall certainly vote against the bill now since that section is left in the bill. During this debate it has been proven beyond any question of a doubt that to permit another 50 percent reduction in our tariffs on farm commodities will sooner or later bring about a greatly reduced farm income.

Mr. Speaker, we must bear in mind that for every dollar decrease in farm income we always suffer a $7 reduction in our national income. Our American farmers and our American laboring men cannot compete with two-bit land and two-bit labor and continue to live like Americans are entitled to live.

The Sugar Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in opposition to H. R. 2652 we find not only many manufacturing, mining, and agricultural interests but, in the State of Colorado, labor organizations are almost unanimously opposed to the provision in the measure granting the Secretary of State authority and power to make direct tariff reductions as high as 50 percent.

I wish to place in the RECORD a letter from the Colorado State Federation of Labor, signed by its president, Mr. George Brayfield, and the following labor unions:

COLORADO STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Denver, Colo., April 27, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: Information has been directed to this office advising that a hearing will be held before a committee on H. R. 2652, which, if passed, would give the President and his administration the right to direct cuts in the tariff rates on various commodities. As much as 50 percent is being proposed on tariff rates in effect as of January 1, 1945.

I am particularly interested, which no doubt you would be, if this applies to sugar. If such would be the case, the State federation of labor is seeking your opposition and full cooperation in any further reduction in the tariff on sugar.

Our reasons being that we have been able to effect an almost 100-percent organization in our State and because of this have built up a continuous excellent labor and management relationship with a good standard of living for the sugar-refinery workers. Further, the largest consumers of sugar are the working people; therefore if a further reduced rate in the tariff on sugar is passed whereby Cuba, Peru, West Indies, and other countries could import their wares to the United States under this reduced rate, it would mean a wholesale lay-off of our sugar workers, a reduction in sugar-beet raising, which would mean a considerable loss to our farmers; and last but not least, the closing of plants with a great loss in taxes to our State treasury, which is a very important item. To think of such a thing is not only alarming but would end in disaster if such should happen.

A few figures I have before me show that under the reciprocal trade agreement entered into with Cuba in 1934, the duty on sugar

was reduced to 90 cents per hundred pounds. In 1941 there was a further reduction to 75 cents per hundred, and in July 1942, under a trade agreement with Peru and other countries, reduced the duty to 93¾ cents per hundred; this did not apply to Cuba.

In conclusion, again, I wish to call to your attention that the rates of pay of our own sugar-refinery workers so far exceeds our competitive workers of Cuba and elsewhere that a further tariff-rate reduction would be not only unstabilizing but unsound.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BRAYFIELD,
President.

COLORADO STATE ASSOCIATION
OF JOURNEYMEN BARBERS,
HAIRDRESSERS, AND COSMETOLOGISTS, INTERNATIONAL
UNION OF AMERICA,
Denver, Colo., May 3, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We, the barbers of the State of Colorado, wish to ask that you oppose House bill 2652 to the point of adding any proposal to lower tariff on sugar.

We request that the workers in the beet-sugar field be allowed to maintain their present standard of living and not be compelled to meet the competition of cheap labor of other countries.

With a minimum wage of approximately 65 cents per hour now being paid where the industry is organized by the beet-sugar industry, how can they maintain that standard of wages if they are forced to meet the competition of Cuba, Peru, and the West Indies, where the top wages are $1.10 per day to the highly skilled and as low as 25 cents per day to the average worker?

Trusting that you will keep this in mind when the measure comes up for consideration, we are,

Very truly yours,

C. R. HAMILTON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES,
UNION NO. 21767,
Brighton, Colo.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to call to your attention H. R. 2652, which has to do with foreign trade agreements.

Such an act has been in effect for some time and as you know it authorized a reduction of 50 percent in the tariff on imported sugar. However, if the present bill is allowed to pass it will authorize another reduction of 50 percent in sugar tariff. If the power sought to be granted by the pending act should be exercised, the tariff against Cuban sugar could be cut to 37½ cents and against other foreign sugars to a little over 46 cents a hundred pounds, which rates would for practical purposes amount to no tariff at all, if the proper level of a tariff is to be measured by the difference in cost of production because of higher living standards.

We earnestly request that sugar be exempt from the provisinos of this bill, for any further reduction in the tariff on sugar imported into the United States would tend to tear down the higher living standards which have been built up over a period of years through the efforts of the unions of this country.

We are appealing to you as our Representative in the Congress of the United States to do all in your power to have sugar exempted from H. R. 2652, thereby protecting the sugar industry in the United States.

Thanking you very kindly for your cooperation in this matter, we remain.

Yours very truly,

DANA E. WELLS,
Secretary.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES,
UNION NO. 23807,
Sterling, Colo., May 18, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are under the impression that House bill 2652 extending the power of the Executive to enter into foreign trade agreements, for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1945, may authorize a further reduction of approximately 50 percent in tariffs existing January 1, 1945. We believe that the present law works undue hardship upon American industry and agriculture, but the conditions in House bill 2652 would be unbearable, particularly in the case of sugar.

You are probably aware of how we, in the sugar industry, have labored to produce, to the utmost of our capacity, the sugar so vitally needed in the economy of a Nation at war; this in spite of the most adverse conditions ever experienced in the industry. The problems of trying to raise beets in the face of inequalities in subsidies to other agricultural products—of manufacturing costs enormously increased, while sugar prices remain at near prewar levels; of obtaining sufficient labor for proper factory operation—have presented practically insurmountable obstacles, but we have been able to overcome these difficulties. We hear, however, that if the protection afforded by our tariff system is removed, it may well spell the doom of the domestic sugar industry and the economy of thousands of American citizens who depend upon the manufacture of sugar for their livelihood.

We earnestly urge you to use every means at your disposal to defeat House bill 2652.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER SWANEY,
Secretary.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES
UNION, LOCAL NO. 22573,
Eaton, Colo., May 12, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that House bill No. 2652, which is now before the Congress of the United States, provides for a reduction of 50 percent in the tariff now existing on sugar imported into the United States.

It is interesting to note that sugar tariff in the past 10 years has been reduced from $2 per hundred pounds to 75 cents per hundred pounds on sugar imported from Cuba and on other foreign countries the tariff has been reduced from $2.50 per hundred pounds to 93¾ cents per hundred pounds.

It is needless to say that the living standards which have been built up in the United States as a result of higher wages will be torn down by the further reduction in tariff rates now existing on sugar imports from countries where sugar is produced at a much lower wage scale and by people whose living standards are much lower.

As you know, the sugar-beet industry is one of the most important agricultural industries in the State of Colorado. We wish to protest the provisions of House bill No. 2652, permitting the executives of our Government to grant a 50-percent reduction in the tariff now existing on sugar imported into the United States, and request that sugar be exempted from the provisions of House bill No. 2652.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration in this matter, we remain,

Very truly yours,

ROY E. BIDDLE,
President.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES
UNION, NO. 23637,
Ovid, Colo., May 12, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The employees of sugar manufacturing are protesting House bill No. 2652 relative to tariff on imported sugar. This bill is before the House now for action.

If the tariff on imported sugar into the United States is reduced it will have a tendency to tear down the higher living standards which have been built up over a period of years through the efforts of the unions of this country.

American labor employed in factories today have a much higher standard of living, based on a much higher wage scale than the $1 to $1.10 per day for 8 hours work that was paid to Cuban sugar factory workers in the year 1938, and the proposed reduction in House bill 2652 would mean there would be practically no tariff at all on foreign sugars measured in the difference in the higher living standards of the American workers as compared to the standards of workers producing sugar that is imported into the United States.

Therefore the employees of American sugar manufacturing are asking you to do all you can to prevent this bill being passed.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I remain,

Fraternally yours,

FLOYD WHEELER,
Recording Secretary.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES,
A. F. OF L. LOCAL, NO. 22443,
Fort Morgan, Colo., May 11, 1945.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: We are writing to you protesting against the authorization provided for in House bill 2652, which allows the executives of our Government to grant 50-percent reduction in the tariff existing on January 1, 1945, on sugar imported into the United States and also that sugar be exempted from the provisions of House bill 2652.

We wish to call to your attention that in the last 10 years the tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced from $2 to $0.75 per hundred pounds. On other foreign sugar the tariff has been reduced from $2.50 to $0.9375 per hundred pounds.

We greatly fear that any further reduction in tariff would seriously endanger the higher standards of living which have been built up by the unions over a long period of time in this country. American labor has a much higher standard of living, based on a higher wage scale, than $1 to $1.10 per day labor, which was Cuban wage scale for 1938.

This bill is still in a committee hearing, we understand from the press, but we want to present our protest so you will be fully informed that we wish your support in removing sugar from the provisions of House bill 2652.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE L. SPENCE,
Secretary.

Copy to Representative WILLIAM S. HILL.

LOVELAND, COLO., *April 25, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: We, as employees engaged in the refining of beet sugar, are deeply interested in any action the Congress may take concerning this industry.

Having noted in the press that the above bill is up for a hearing before a House committee, we wish to emphatically protect against any favorable action on this bill.

Inasmuch as the tariff has already been reduced by previous action from $2 to 75 cents per 100 pounds on Cuban sugar, and from $2.50 to 93¾ cents per 100 pounds on sugar from other foreign countries; and also realizing that this bill, if enacted into law, would make a further reduction to 37½ cents per 100 pounds on Cuban sugar, and to about 46 cents per 100 pounds on other foreign sugar—which would, in effect, be no tariff at all, we, as workers depending on this industry for our standard of living, find it difficult to see how we can maintain this high standard, and compete with labor in other countries which realizes $1 a day or less, for 8 hours' work, or more.

Very truly yours,

W. R. MOORE,
President, Local Beet Sugar Refinery Employees Union No. 23791.

BEET SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES UNION, No. 23801,
Greeley, Colo., April 30, 1945.

Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND CONGRESSMAN: The news of today is of great importance to us all, as the course taken on many matters will have direct effect on us individually; however, we look forward with confidence.

Just recently it has come to the attention of the sugar-factory workers at Greeley that the House bill 2652 would permit authorization of a 50-percent reduction in the tariffs existing January 1, 1945.

During the past 10 years the tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced from $2 per 100 pounds to 75 cents per hundred pounds. In a trade agreement with Peru in 1942, other foreign imports of sugar were reduced to 93¾ cents, which formerly was $2.50 per 100 pounds. This reduction in the protective tariff has had direct effect on the beet-sugar industry without any doubt.

Any further reduction in the tariff on sugar would do even greater damage to the industry, as it would reduce the tariff down to where there would be hardly any tariff at all, when comparing costs of production with that of foreign markets. When considering the daily wage of $1 to $1.10 per day paid in Cuba to sugar-factory workers during 1938, to the American wage scale, it is no wonder that sugar can be imported at a cheaper price and the only protection given the beet-sugar refinery workers is the tariff on sugar imports.

All of the sugar-factory workers in our local union would not want to be forced to reduce our standard of living, which took the unions of the country so many years to build up, in order to compete with cheaper markets elsewhere.

The sugar-factory workers employed at the Greeley factory of the Great Western Sugar Co. implore you at this time to give us the protection we need at this time and do whatever you can possible to exempt sugar from the provisions of House bill 2652.

Thanking you for any personal consideration you may extend us regarding this important matter, and with the kindest personal regards, we remain,

Yours very respectfully,

ROBERT BRESNAHAN,
Vice President.
TED SADEK, *Secretary.*
FRED BROTHERS, *Trustee.*

BEET SUGAR REFINERY,
EMPLOYEES UNION NO. 22125,
Longmont, Colo., April 28, 1945.

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you at this time in behalf of the 365 members of the above union, to ask you to emphatically stress the exemption of sugar from the provisions of H. R. 2652.

In the last 10 years the tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced from $2 per hundred pounds to 75 cents per hundred pounds, and on other foreign countries the tariff has been reduced from $2.50 per hundred pounds to 93¾ cents in a trade agreement with Peru in 1942.

We earnestly feel that any further reduction in tariff of imported sugar into the United States will have a tendency to tear down the higher living standards which have been built up over a period of years, through the efforts of the unions of this country.

I believe you will agree that American labor employed in sugar factories today have a much higher standard of living, based on a much higher wage scale than the $1 to $1.10 per 8-hour day that was paid to Cuban sugar factory workers in the year 1938, and that the proposed reduction in House bill 2652 would mean there would be practically no tariff at all on foreign sugars measured in the difference in the higher living standards of American workers as compared to the standards of workers producing sugar that is imported into the United States.

Therefore as good American citizens we earnestly appeal to you to use your good offices and vote against any further reduction in sugar tariff.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with best wishes, and kindest regard.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM M. HAMILTON,
President.
JESSE WRIGHT, *Secretary.*

Statement of Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., at San Francisco Conference

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., at the San Francisco Conference:

The provisions on human rights proposed by the four sponsoring governments for the Charter of the International Organization represent a long step toward the realization of social, economic, and political justice for the peoples of the world.

It is a far-reaching step because it would pledge the members of the world organization to cooperate effectively in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms for all individuals and peoples, regardless of race, language, religion, or sex.

These provisions are essential if we are to build peace on the basis of justice and freedom for all. Never before have the destruction, the turmoil, and the hatreds of war affected the lives of so many people in all parts of the world. Millions of men, women, and children are homeless and destitute. Established customs and long-standing habits have been broken down. Racial tensions have been built up since the rise of Nazism and Fascism by systematic campaigns of hatred and prejudice. Every nation must overcome the severe dislocations of war in the transition to peace.

Nor are these the sole reasons why the provisions on human rights and freedoms are essential. From malnutrition, disease, ignorance, unemployment, low wages, bad housing, and racial and religious persecutions arise many of the conditions that lead to war.

The people of the world will not be satisfied simply to return to an order which offers them only worn out answers to their hopes. They rightly demand the active defense and promotion of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. It is a matter of elementary justice that this demand be answered affirmatively.

That is the compelling purpose of the amendments on human rights which the four sponsoring governments propose.

These provisions are not mere general expressions in a preamble; they are woven through and through the document. Moreover they are closely tied to the all-important provisions on economic and social development.

There are four amendments on human rights. The first would establish the promotion of human rights and freedoms as one of the fundamental purposes of the organization stated in chapter I of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

From this amendment stem three other amendments. These provide the constitutional basis upon which the members of the world organization can build as they work toward translating these purposes into reality.

One of these amendments—in chapter V—would give the general assembly the power to assist in the realization of these rights and freedoms.

The other two amendments are in chapter IX, covering international, economic, and social cooperation. By these amendments the assembly's responsibility on human rights will be exercised through the economic and social council, which will, in turn, establish a commission for the promotion of human rights. This commission represents the heart of the matter.

The amendments on human rights and fundamental freedoms are closely linked with the amendments establishing equal rights and self-determination of peoples as one of the fundamental purposes of the organization. Both have a significant relationship to the legitimate hopes of peoples of dependent areas.

There can be no misunderstanding where the United States stands on this issue. As a Nation which has been devoted throughout its history to the cause of liberty, the United States will continue to exert its full influence in behalf of the right of all peoples to govern themselves according to their own desires whenever they are prepared and able to assume the responsibilities of freedom as well as to enjoy its rights.

We are proud of our own record in the Philippines, which have stood so valiantly beside us against the Japanese and are soon to become independent. This record is only one manifestation of the long-standing and frequently demonstrated policy of the United States.

We believe, furthermore, that it is a special obligation of the greater and more powerful nations to respect the right of self-government, not only in their relationship with the peoples of dependent areas, but in their relationship with the peoples of small na-

tions who are already independent and wish to remain so.

The provisions proposed for the Charter will not, of course, assure by themselves the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all people. The provisions are not made enforceable by any international machinery. The responsibility rests with the member governments to carry them out. We can here make only a beginning, but I believe it is a good and substantial beginning.

Through the Charter we can place in the hands of the international organization both the possibility and the responsibility of using powers of report and recommendation with great potentialities for the benefit of humanity. Whether the opportunity is used effectively or not will depend, as it must, upon the governments of the member nations and upon the peoples who elect them to office.

The Bill of Rights was written into the Constitution of the United States over 150 years ago. It is not yet fully realized, but we have made good progress and its effect upon our history has been decisive.

The four sponsoring governments agreed that an enumeration of individual and collective human rights and fundamental freedoms in the charter could not be attempted at this conference. It would take much too long to obtain agreement upon such an enumeration among more than two score nations of differing social systems, environments, and traditions. I believe that when the organization is established the economic and social council, through the commission on human rights, should promptly undertake to prepare an international bill of rights which can be accepted by all the member nations as an integral part of their own systems of law, just as our Bill of Rights has been an integral part of our system of law.

The "four freedoms" stated by President Roosevelt—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—are, from the point of view of the United States, the fundamental freedoms which encompass all other rights and freedoms.

Freedom of speech, for example, encompasses freedom of the press, freedom of information, and freedom of communications.

Freedom from want encompasses the right to work, the right to social security, and the right to opportunity for advancement.

Freedom from fear encompasses the protection from persecution or discrimination of all men and women, regardless of race, language, religion, or sex, and the protection of their equal right to enjoy all other fundamental rights and freedoms.

The United States Government will work actively and tirelessly, both for its own people, and, through the international organization, for peoples generally, toward the protection and promotion of these rights and freedoms.

We must be eternally vigilant against assaults upon them. We must also act affirmatively to enlarge the scope of their protection and to nourish their growth. As long as rights and freedoms are denied to some, the rights and freedoms of all are endangered.

Everything possible must be done to bring to effective life not only the commission on human rights, but the other vital agencies and functions of the economic and social council.

I believe the charter and the structure and procedures of the world organization should and will provide the means for full consideration of the views and interests of all branches of organized labor, and of agriculture and business. Without such full consideration, effective performance by the organization in economic and social matters would obviously be impossible.

It is my conviction that the foundation which we are laying here for the economic and social collaboration of nations in the cause of fundamental human rights and freedoms may well prove to be the most important of all the things we do here for the peace and advancement of the peoples of the world.

Cooperatives, Taxation, and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith correspondence between myself and Mr. John Carson, the Washington representative of the Cooperative League of the United States, dealing with a number of questions which are currently being asked regarding the relationship of cooperative business to the Government, to taxation, and to small business.

Mr. Carson was for many years the secretary of Senator James Couzens of Michigan, has had also many years' experience as a Washington newspaper correspondent, and at present Washington representative of the Cooperative League is unusually well qualified to discuss these questions:

APRIL 28, 1945.

Mr. JOHN CARSON,
The Cooperative League of the United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARSON: I have received many letters from small-business men who express their concern over what they believe are special concessions and special tax treatment from the Government to cooperatives. I am much concerned for the welfare of the small-business man. I am sure that every intelligent man who believes in democracy must be interested in the welfare of small business. I also have been interested, as you know, in cooperatives and look on them as small business because they are organizations of individuals who contribute their little money to organize the small business. It seems to me that cooperatives and small business should be allies, and whether they know it or not, they are allies in fact against a common foe—monopoly.

I think I know something about cooperatives and their associations with Government, but in view of these letters, I am wondering whether I do. I think I am justified in asking you some questions, and even challenging you with them. That I am doing, and I would be happy to have your answer, an answer which I can make use of for any purpose I think it would serve. The questions are:

1. Have cooperative organizations been unfriendly to small business, or opposed to small business?

2. Have cooperatives done anything to injure small business?

3. What, if any, special tax concessions are given to cooperatives by the Government?

4. Many of the letters refer to the exemption given "consumer cooperatives." Is there any exemption of that kind?

5. Because some of the letters refer to "savings," I suspect the writers believe that what cooperatives refer to as "patronage returns" should be taxed, and perhaps that is why they refer to "exemptions" for "consumer cooperatives."

6. One criticism of the cooperatives is that—and I quote—"they are permitted to keep their profits and use them for buying other business, and they do not pay taxes on the profits they keep."

7. Many writers of letters inquire, "Where is the Government to get revenue if these exemptions are continued?"

8. What other concessions are accorded to cooperatives by the Government?

I shall be happy if you will answer these questions and permit me to make any use of your answers that I wish to make. I think I am entitled to make this request because of my interest in cooperatives, as well as in the small-business man.

Very truly yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1945.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your request that I comment on the many letters you have had from small-business men who express their concern over what they believe are special concessions and special tax treatment from the Government to cooperatives comes as a challenge which our cooperative organizations could not ignore even if they wished to do so. And, I assure you, they would have no fear of any inquiry or challenge.

I am answering now, not as a representative of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, because I have not had the opportunity to present this to the league. I am answering as a member-owner of consumer cooperative enterprise. And to qualify myself as a witness, I recall to you that I spent more than a score of years writing on taxation and finance, that I initiated and directed an extensive inquiry into the administration of our tax laws for the United States Senate, that I proposed the establishment of the Joint Congressional Committee on Taxation and helped to organize the committee, that I was once an owner of small business and that I also was associated with big business for many years.

Every member-owner of cooperative enterprise will have interest in the welfare of the small-business man. He was, and is, a vital part of the community life in our country. He was, and is, a man of goodwill; in fact, his most important business asset was, and is, goodwill. He expressed the goodness of a decentralized society as contrasted against the steady encroachment of centralization and totalitarinism. Our cooperatives will applaud you for your interest in his welfare. And, incidentally, I shall gladly testify that you have always been fair to cooperative enterprise.

I am not concerned about the tax issues which are presented in this correspondence. The questions can be answered readily and no bona fide cooperative organization will worry what the decision will be. I am concerned, however, about the state of mind which is reflected in this propaganda. I am certain that very few of our small-business men are conscious of the forces which are at work and which threaten our democratic institutions. I should like to present that all-important phase of this correspondence some time, to show you the contribution to democracy the cooperatives are making and to demonstrate that all of us have an obligation to be interested in cooperatives.

Before I answer your questions, I would like to establish these general facts:

The small-business men who are writing to you are small merchants. But we must not forget the farmer, and the wage earner are also small-business men, that the cooperatives are the federations of these small-business men, and that the farmer and the wage-earner have always paid a far greater proportion of the tax burden than they would if we respected the rule of the "ability to bear the burden."

Your questions and the answers are as follows:

Question: Have cooperatives organized to injure small business, and do they operate to injure small business?

Answer. Cooperatives have never acted to injure any legitimate form of business. They are the uncompromising foes of monopoly. But monopoly is the enemy of the farmer and the wage-earner and of the small-business men of all kinds, so that the cooperative in attacking monopoly is aiding the small-business man who writes to you. And it is important, and true, that the only effective attack on monopoly in this country and in foreign countries is, and has been, made by cooperative organizations. That is why these attacks are being made now on cooperatives, and why I suspect that there is monopoly support for these attacks, and why the propaganda is directed at consumer cooperative organizations.

It is important also, and true, that in our country and in other countries cooperatives have helped to improve the business opportunities for small business. Our consumer cooperatives have operated to free the economy. They have done that in Sweden. They have done it in some of our States in this country. Through cooperative action they have strengthened the buying power of consumers and have helped to keep that buying power at home, rather than have it drained off to distant financial centers. The small merchant has been helped by this service from consumer cooperative organizations.

Question. Do cooperative organizations enjoy any special tax concession from Government?

Answer. The word "cooperative" embraces a wide expanse. There are many kinds of cooperative organizations. They develop to perform some particular service or function.

Insofar as the common good or public interest is concerned, cooperatives must be classified, broadly, according to the purpose they serve or the function they perform. We find them performing that function in the market place where they are either selling or buying. Thus the only sound classification of cooperatives is that of "marketing cooperatives" and "consumer cooperatives." The marketing cooperatives are owned, usually, by those who produce goods and hence they are called producer-marketing cooperatives. The consumer cooperatives reach into many fields of buying and sometimes they are called consumer-purchasing cooperatives. But the simple classification of "marketing cooperatives" and "consumer cooperatives" is sound. Incidentally, our labor unions are marketing cooperatives which are organized to help the workers market their raw labor just as the farm marketing cooperatives are organized to help the farmer market his labor in the form of vegetables and fruit, etc. Now, these broad classifications may be broken down as follows:

Producer-marketing cooperatives: Farm production-marketing cooperatives of many kinds, such as citrus fruit, tobacco, milk, grain, livestock, and other cooperatives. Organized labor.

Consumer-purchasing cooperatives: Grocery, oil, seed, feed, and other cooperatives in almost unlimited number. Credit cooperatives, such as credit unions, banks, etc. Insurance cooperatives, health cooperatives, burial cooperatives. Rural electric cooperatives, etc.

Many years ago Congress decided to assist our farmers. Agriculture was prostrate, its markets were disappearing, its credit lines were slashed. The welfare of the entire country was in jeopardy. Congress then became interested in helping the farmer to help himself through cooperative enterprise. I was a newspaper correspondent then and I covered the hearings before the House committee. I am confident that no one of us had an understanding of cooperatives. We thought only of cooperatives as agencies to market the goods of the farmer and cooperatives developed for that purpose. They have rendered excellent service.

Several years passed and then some very able farm leaders began to realize that they were not making any marked progress toward remedying the ills which were causing the farmers to suffer. They learned then that their marketing cooperatives were just one more agent in the market place where more powerful monopolistic agents competed with them. The farmers then learned they had to organize as buyers, or consumers, and gain ownership of the market place to make certain that it would be a free market. And the ablest of these farmers realized they could not restrict their operations to any class, to farmers or to city workers, if they wished to compete successfully with the monopolists who did not restrict their operations. These farmers organized Rochdale consumer cooperative organizations with membership open to everyone. They have had outstanding success. It is at these organizations that the monopolists are now striking.

There is a natural law in operation here. If we are to have a free economy, and free enterprise, and political freedom, we must have a free market. If we are to be assured of a free market, then the market must be owned by all who use it. It must be controlled and operated for the common good, and not for the profit or welfare or any particular class or individual. The consumer cooperative organizations assure us of free ownership of a free market, which is the common good.

We have revealed here, also, the inherent power in the consumer cooperatives. Their strength is not to be found in tax provisions. It is found in that they are built on the broadest of foundations, or the common interest of all people. They inspire individual responsibility to the common good. They offer the opportunity for class interests to serve the common good. Through their patronage return principle they assure the individual of just reward for his participation and he thus gains, materially, and spiritually.

We have had buying cooperatives organized by labor unions, and for the members of labor unions. But they also failed because they were restricted to a class. But we have many cooperatives organized in cities with membership open to overyone, to members of labor organizations, to white-collar workers, to farmers—and they have succeeded.

I know that Congressmen believe that bona fide cooperatives could not have income, and thus they wrote into the revenue laws a provision exempting farm cooperatives from income taxation. It was discovered later that cooperatives might have insignificant receipts of money which could be legally declared to be income but there is fact and reason behind the statement that the tax revenue from income taxes which might be levied against the little income cooperatives could have would not equal the cost of administering the law. You will find in the legislative history of this exemption complete justification for the statement that Congress recognized also that in extending this aid to agriculture, Congress was attempting to aid the entire Nation and all of the people.

Question. Many of the letters refer to the exemption given consumer cooperatives. Is there any exemption given to consumer cooperatives?

Answer. Yes. There are many cooperatives which are sometimes called farm cooperatives, which are buying cooperatives. Thus they are consumer cooperatives. That is their function, to buy in their own market. These consumer cooperatives may be exempt. There are however, many consumer cooperative organizations which are organized in urban areas and they have no exemption, whatsoever. I am confident that these urban organizations have paid to the Government large sums of tax money on receipts which were not income and that they have a legitimate claim for millions of dollars of refunds if they wish to press for the refunds.

Question. Because some of the letters refer to savings, I suspect the writers believe that cooperatives should be taxed, through the income-tax laws, on what cooperative organizations refer to as patronage returns. Perhaps that is why they refer to exemptions for consumer cooperatives.

Answer. I suspect that you are reaching the vital part of the discussion. I suspect that some of these small merchants have been misled into believing that cooperatives are granted, by law, some exemption when they are permitted to return money, or property, to the owners tax free. That is all the patronage return is—property or money returned by the trustees to the owners of the property.

The constitutional amendment provides for taxation of income. The word "income" has been defined and refined by the courts and as law is a living thing, it will continue to be defined and refined. But now, and henceforth, income will mean income. You cannot have taxable income unless you have an increase in wealth, wealth which you own and control.

Bona fide cooperatives do not have income. They do not have an increase in wealth which they own and control. There are two exceptions to this general statement and I shall refer to them later. But the general rule stands. Every cooperative has the natural and the legal right—and obligation—to return property to the owners. It is the obligation of trusteeship. There is no exemption involved in the patronage return.

The two exceptions to the general rule about income are as follows: Cooperatives may do business with nonmembers and it may be impossible to discover these nonmembers and return their property to them, although every cooperative endeavors to restore all property to the owners. If this property, receipts of money, or savings cannot be restored to the nonmembers, it may become income to the cooperative organization. Any exemption which applies to that income would involve insignificant sums of money. The second exception is related to the payment of a wage for money used as capital. Cooperative organizations usually are authorized by their charters to pay a certain wage for capital invested in the business. The cooperative has, therefore, ownership and control over that part of its receipts of money and that would become income. The amount is insignificant, however, and it is not going to affect the cooperative organization or its operations if a tax is paid on it.

The answer then is that no law can be written and supported under the Constitution which would permit the placement of an income tax on patronage returns or savings. The member-owners of a cooperative might have income through the operations of their cooperative, and they should and do pay income taxes on this income.

The further answer is that I am afraid some small merchants are being mulcted by some irresponsible higher-ups, if they are contributing money to an organization which is deluding them into believing that

an income tax can be applied against cooperative savings.

Question. One criticism of the cooperatives is that, and I quote: "They are permitted to keep their profits and use them for buying other businesses and they do not pay taxes on the profits they keep."

Answer. Cooperatives do not have profits, if they are bona fide cooperatives. A cooperative which retains some property it receives does so only when the member-owners of that property authorize the cooperative to do so. That does not produce a situation where the cooperative would have income. If the member-owners of cooperatives want to invest their savings, and I mean savings of all kinds and from any and all sources, in the purchase of property of any kind, there is no reason why they should not do so. If the small merchant wants to save his money and buy another business, the law does not prevent him from doing so.

You are touching here on another point on which you will hear much, if you have not already had letters on it. The point is summed up in the word "reserves." The argument often made is that a speculative profit corporation can retain the income of the corporation; that is, keep it in reserves, only after the corporation has paid a tax on those profits but that the cooperative corporation can keep its receipts of money in reserves and use them for any purpose without paying a tax on them.

That is a true statement, but it is an avoidance of fact. The speculative profit corporation takes property or money from others and owns and controls that money it has taken. That is "income." Obviously, as long as there is a corporation income-tax schedule, the profit corporation must pay an income tax on income. But the cooperative corporation takes nothing that it owns and controls. It does not have an "income."

I would have to admit that under certain conditions where a cooperative corporation might retain money or property over a long period, and even though it did so with the consent and under the direction of the member-owners of that property, the cooperative corporation might develop a situation where it had "income in reserves." There are rare situations where a cooperative might have "income" through retaining "reserves" but they are so rare we need not discuss that point unless someone raises another question.

Question. Many writers of letters inquire "where is the Government to get revenue if these exemptions are continued?"

Answer. I have stated that exemptions are given only to one class of cooperatives and that it will be found, on investigation, that the exemptions affect an insignificant amount of revenue. There is very little additional revenue the Government can get from cooperatives through any kind of an "income" tax which would be constitutional.

But there is an answer to your question, or rather the question submitted by your correspondents. It is as follows:

Through wiping out the exemptions from taxation given to powerful industrial interests, many of which are monopoly interests, the Government can get more than $1,000,000,000 of revenue each year. I refer to the exemptions, the subsidies, given oil-producing corporations, to other natural resources industries, to the owners of tax-exempt securities, to the charitable and educational trust funds, et cetera. I am curious, in fact, when the small merchant is silent when his national representatives incite him to attack cooperatives and when these same representatives are so considerate of the tax subsidies given the monopoly industries. Is it possible that these national representatives of small merchants are also overly friendly with monopoly interests?

Then we could and should reorganize our income-tax laws and provide that all corporate-income tax be abolished, but provide also that every dollar of net income of the corporation be taxed against the individual owners of the corporation. Under this plan, the Standard Oil Co. would be compelled to notify its owners that the net income of the corporation was so many millions of dollars and that the stockholder, who owned, let us say, 100 shares of stock was actually the owner of his part of that total net income of the corporation—let us say $10. The owner of a million shares of stock would be notified that his share of the net income was $100,000, let us say. Then the individual stockholder would be compelled to report his portion of the total net income in his individual income-tax report and he would pay taxes on it regardless of whether the corporation sent him his $10 or his $100,000.

Then we would have a system of income taxation whereby the profit and nonprofit corporations of all kinds would be classified alike for tax purposes.

The absentee managers of corporations, the powerful inside groups which assert arbitrary authority to manage and control the property of others, are opposed to this plan. Why? They know that if the stockholders of the corporations have to pay, directly, a tax on the earnings of the corporations, the stockholders will insist on having their portion of the earnings of the corporation. They will insist on a distribution of the corporate earnings.

By that act we shall contribute to the common good. We cannot maintain and develop our democracy unless we develop among our people that characteristic we know as responsibility. Our corporations are now organized and operated to discourage the development of responsibility on the part of the millions of investors in corporations. These investors are often called owners in the propaganda of the apologists for corporation practices but they are not owners because they cannot assume the responsibility of ownership. They merely lend their money to the corporation and then permit a few inside managers, or directors and managers, to use that money as they wish.

Through putting a direct tax on the individual's portion of the earnings in the corporation we will take one step toward encouraging the individual owners to assume responsibility for their investment in the corporation.

Incidentally, through minimizing the opportunity of the inside managers of corporations to use other people's money as they wish, and through compelling distribution of corporation funds, we will take one step toward discouraging the concentration of money or financial power in the hands of the inside managers of corporations. Thus we will discourage monopoly.

But there are other arguments against the corporation income-tax structure.

It is grossly unfair to the small stockholder. Where the corporation pays the tax, the income of the small stockholder is assessed at a rate exactly similar to the rate assessed against the millionaire stockholder. That violates the basic principle of the income-tax law.

It is grossly unfair to the consumer and the common good. The corporation endeavors to pass on to the consumer the tax burdens of the corporation and usually it succeeds in doing so. The result is the consumer pays the tax and pays it pyramided many times. Thus the powerful and wealthy inside managers of corporations favor the corporation tax instead of the individual income tax because they know they have every possibility of passing the tax on and thus escaping its burden. But if they had to pay an individual income tax they would have relatively little chance of passing it on.

Any tax imposed on the threshold of production is a deterrent to production. The corporation tax thus discourages full production and thus is antagonistic to the common good. If we would get rid of the corporation tax and provide for taxation of all income to individuals we would have an equitable base for our income taxation. Then we could adjust the rates of taxation to take just as much of the total national income as we needed to take.

Question. What concessions are accorded to cooperatives by the Government which might be referred to in the phrase "other concessions" which is common in these letters:

Answer. I have seen many of these letters and I shall try to list what are termed "concessions." They are as follows:

Robinson-Patman law: This law attempts to prevent large and powerful buyers from forcing, or inducing, the sellers of goods to give to them discriminatory prices. The purpose of the law is to prevent discrimination between the patrons of a seller of goods. The cooperatives do not and cannot discriminate between buyers. Cooperatives are open membership organizations. Their books are open books. There is nothing to hide. Moreover, if they did discriminate in any way they would be subject to the law, as they are not exempt from its application. The law merely states the obvious fact, a fact which cannot be denied, that patronage returns are not a violation of the law. There is no concession to cooperatives in this law.

Antitrust-law exemption: Some cooperative organizations, farm cooperatives, are granted exemption in the antitrust laws, but to qualify for exemption they must conform to rigid regulatory provisions of law which are more stringent in fact than are the antitrust regulations. Bona fide cooperatives operate to destroy trusts and monopolies. They cannot operate to constitute a monopoly. I cannot imagine any situation where this provision of the law is of any value or of any importance to a cooperative organization.

Farm Credit Administration: Through the Farm Credit Administration a credit system was established for agriculture because control of the credit system by the industrial-financial groups gave them power to destroy agriculture, and they used the power. The story of 1920–21 cannot be written out. A committee of the Congress has investigated the Farm Credit Administration recently. The facts are available to the Congress. It is certain that this credit machinery is in the public interest. It would be very interesting to compare any of the alleged benefits of this system to agriculture with the actual benefits given to other forms of business through our commercial banking systems which have had tremendous benefits from Government.

If there are any other questions you wish to present or which your constituents wish to present, I shall be happy to attempt to answer them. I repeat again that I would like to discuss with you the forces which are at work in our country, and throughout the world, and which are impairing our democracy. I am certain that our cooperative institutions are rendering tremendous service in preserving democracy.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON.

National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by Capt. John L. Beebe, superintendent, United States maritime training station, Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y., on National Maritime Day, May 22, 1945:

Today across this Nation, National Maritime Day ceremonies and tributes are being held in countless cities and towns in honor of America's merchant marine and the men who sail the ships.

This is our third National Maritime Day at Sheepshead Bay, and it is an occasion upon which we may pause to look back upon our accomplishments. This station has certificated more than 70,000 men for service on the freighters, tankers, and transports. They have carried the name of this, the largest training station for merchant seamen in the world, into every port where the tide of battle has made it necessary for our ships to go with all the supplies of combat. Many have been killed or listed as missing in action.

Our men, and all the men of the maritime service are serving valiantly and are adding new luster and honor to the high tradition of the merchant marine.

Merchant seamen as perhaps never before in history have formed a battle-front partnership with their brothers of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marines. They are not an armed force, but they have fought and died to get the goods delivered. The enemy has fought the merchant ships with all the weapons and fury at his command. Six thousand merchant seamen have been lost in action in the war. On this day we pay them honor, and avow our own renewed determination to carry on in that combat partnership.

We are especially honored that today the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard are represented here with us and will have assigned units of their men and women to march in this review with the officers and men of Sheepshead Bay.

We, in turn, take the Maritime Day to salute these other branches of the Government with whom we collaborate and whose enthusiastic aid has helped to ease our job. We hail the comradeship and recognize the interdependence of all.

We are together a team, a team that has been formed and tested in the greatest war in history. Each force in that team has shared with dignity and honor in the recently achieved victory in Europe. We are confident that the team will grow even stronger and gain even greater realization of our mutual interdependence, until our victorious forces march through Tokyo and our ships unload their cargoes on the docks of Kobe and Yokohama.

We salute on this day too, the workers in every shipyard of the country whose efforts have produced the ships. And we salute most of all the people at home whose steadfastness, faith, and support made all our achievements possible.

Expanding Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 26, 1945:

EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY

Identical bills to expand and liberalize the social-security program have been offered in the Senate by Senators WAGNER, of New York, and MURRAY, of Montana; and in the House by Representative DINGELL, of Michigan. The measures would establish a national social insurance system consisting of prepaid personal health service; unemployment and temporary disability insurance benefits up to $30 a week on a uniform national basis; and retirement, survivors, and total disability insurance with more liberal benefits than in existing law. They would provide grants to States for expansion of health services, maternity, and child health, and welfare services. They would inaugurate a program of Federal grants and loans for construction and expansion of hospitals and health centers. They would extend the coverage of the social insurance system to an estimated 15,000,000 additional persons—farm and domestic workers, employees of nonprofit institutions, independent farmers, professional persons, and small businessmen.

It is a central aim of social progress to mitigate the hazards of unemployment, need, sickness, disability, and old age for the individual. Every step is to be welcomed by which this can be done without itself introducing equal or greater hazards. This indicates the questions to be asked of a proposal like the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Will it provide relief where it is needed without producing it where it is not needed? Will it mitigate the penalties for failure or misfortune without weakening the incentives to production and success? Will it provide aid to individuals without making them politically dependent and without dangerously extending the power of the Central Government?

Under the bill as it stands it is more than doubtful whether these questions can be answered satisfactorily. Even under the present social-security program we face problems for which we have not yet produced adequate answers. Yet under the new bill vast new programs would be undertaken and existing programs would be tremendously "liberalized." Unemployment insurance, for example, would be taken out of the hands of the States and placed in that of the Federal Government. The Federal Government would pay unemployment benefits for 26 weeks (far beyond the average length of time for which such benefits are now paid by the States), and it is even provided that the duration of benefits may be extended to a maximum total of 52 weeks.

A schedule is provided, also, under which a worker making, when employed, an average of $40 a week could draw as high as $30 a week unemployment benefit. This schedule is also far above the average of what the States now pay. Would not such payments tempts the creation of the very unemployment they are designed to meet? If a man who can get $40 a week for working can draw $30 a week for not working, then so long as he is entitled to draw benefits he is in effect working for only $10 a week; that is the way many will naturally look at the matter when they are asked to take a job, or when they consider giving themselves a vacation at Government expense.

Again, old-age benefits under the new bill would be raised from a present maximum of $85 a month to $120. In many cases, in fact, workers who have received an average monthly wage of $100, would receive a larger monthly sum than that for retiring. Still again, the bill provides for differential grants to the States ranging from 25 percent of the total payments to the richer States to 75 percent of the total to the poorer. This differential treatment sets the stage for political jockeying among the States for formulas especially favorable to this one or that. In addition, it provides for large payments to individuals in States with a low per capita income, without considering whether this may accompany a proportionately lower State cost or standard of living.

A question must be raised about the total costs of this bill, which its sponsors seem to treat so lightly. An 8-percent tax on pay rolls (4 percent to be paid by workers and 4 percent by employers) is in itself an extremely high tax. It is a direct tax on employment. Hence it tends to discourage employment, the very thing upon which our whole welfare and prosperity, including the success of social-security plans, must depend. Yet there are strong reasons for thinking that the sponsors of this bill have greatly underestimated the cost of their measure, and that this 8-percent tax would not be nearly adequate, after a few years, for what they propose.

The tremendous financial commitment involved in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill ought to involve the most careful study, even in a period when the budget is balanced and on a relatively manageable level. To undertake it lightly at the present time, when the budget is already unbalanced to an unparalleled extent by war, and when the path back to balance and manageability is already far from clear, would be an assumption of obligations without considering how they are to be paid.

The Paper and Pulp Industry and the Proposed 50-Percent Reduction in Duty Provided in H. R. 2652

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of Congress I have made every effort to obtain the facts about this industry. The paper and pulp industry is an important industry in the United States, in Wisconsin and in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin. Some of the unions in the paper mills have for many years indicated an interest in the duty and have felt an additional duty should be levied in order to protect the jobs of the American paper and pulp workmen.

The National Paper and Pulp Association presented the facts before the Ways and Means Committee. Among the points and facts they brought out were:

First. That the paper industry would be more adversely affected than any other major industry by a further reduction of 50 percent in the duty.

Second. That the United States paper industry is easily affected by duty changes because foreign methods of production are very similar to ours.

Third. That the wage rates of other countries are lower than in the United States as shown in the following table taken from their testimony:

APPENDIX A

Comparison of wages in European and American mills

[Average rates per hour on comparable machines]

Position	Norway	Sweden	United States	Canada
Machine tender	$0.41 to $0.44	$0.38¼	$1.16 to $1.37	Wage rates in mills average 10 to 12 percent below American wages.
Back tender	$0.31½ to $0.33¼	$0.33½	$0.98 to $1.16	
Third hand	$0.30½ to $0.32	$0.32½	$0.84 to $0.85	
Fourth hand	$0.30 to $0.31	$0.30¾	$0.64 to $0.68	
Oilers	$0.32	$0.31½	$0.54 to $0.66	
Head beaterman	$0.31¼	$0.31½ to $0.38¼	$0.68	
Electricians	$0.32¾		$0.60 to $0.77	
Acid maker	$0.36½	$0.35¼	$0.55 to $0.82	
Laborers	$0.31¾	$0.30¾	$0.62½ to $0.70	

Sources: Special committee of American Members of International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite. and Paper Mill Workers. American Paper & Pulp Association. Averages include mills comparable to foreign mill in size and speeds of operations.

NOTE.—The union committee commenting on the relative cost of living in Scandinavia and the United States states that it takes the worker in Norway and Sweden 100 hours of work to buy what the American worker can purchase with 65 hours of work.

GENERAL NOTE.—The wage rates are those available in January 1940. Since that time American wages have risen materially, but there is no information on the results of the war on Scandinavian rates. No effort has been made to weight the wage rates given to compensate for any depreciations of currency.

Fourth. That the paper made in Japan, Norway, Sweden, Russia, Mexico, Canada, Great Britain, is made in exactly the same way as in the United States and of the same materials, same machinery, and by the same kind of employee, which employees must be familiar with paper processes.

Fifth. That paper machines require the same number of workers to operate them in any country.

Sixth. That the only advantage in cost of production of paper can have over another country is in wages. This means wages in the mill, in the cutting of the pulp, and other raw materials.

Seventh. That the country with the lowest wages and the lowest standard of living can easily be the lowest cost producer of paper.

Eighth. That when foreign mills, by subsidies in shipping or by lower wages in transportation, can deliver paper on our seaboard cheaper than the paper from prominent United States mills can be shipped to New York.

Ninth. The average freight rate for paper from Sweden to New York is between $5 and $6 per ton while the freight rate from Ohio and Wisconsin mills to New York is $8 to $9.50 per ton. The freight rate on wrapping paper from Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin to New York is $7.40 to $11.20 per ton.

Tenth. That the paper industry is not in favor of a high tariff. The industry evidently asks only a duty rate that will allow it to compete on even terms with other countries for the United States paper market.

Eleventh. The United States experimented with a one-way reciprocity in 1911 and many paper mills moved to Canada and newsprint in the United States has been practically abandoned although Canada never ratified the treaty.

Twelfth. That following this loss of the newsprint industry no further attempts to negotiate special treaties have been made until the ones of the present administration.

Thirteenth. That the United States paper industry, because of its experience in the 1911 newsprint reciprocity deal has opposed these so-called treaties since that time.

Fourteenth. That paper mills are located in 38 States and that if American labor is to be found jobs in paper and pulp plants the industry must have a certain amount of protection.

Fifteenth. That there are thousands of jobs incident to the paper and pulp industry in the United States and there is a capital investment of nearly $2,900,000,000 in the United States.

Sixteenth. That in 1939 there were 939 paper and pulp units in the 38 States.

Seventeenth. Approximately one-half the paper and pulp mills are in towns wholly or largely dependent on the business developed through these mills.

Eighteenth. That 58 percent of the Nation's mills are located in towns of less than 10,000 population.

Nineteenth. The export markets for paper is negligible due to the lower wage rates of other countries.

Twentieth. That the United States should not permit its paper industry to be so hamstrung by tariff concessions to other countries that the United States markets will become more and more reliant on foreign mills for the paper needs of our country.

Twenty-first. That the paper industry is an enterprise that must maintain a 75 percent of capacity production. The value of the output is about equal to the investment, a ratio smallest of any major industry.

Twenty-second. That labor is a controlling factor in the cost of producing paper. The paper industry leads all major industries in the amount of capital invested per employee.

Twenty-third. Every ton of paper imported deprives an American paper mill employee of 3 days' employment.

Twenty-fourth. A tabulation of tariff rates on many principal grades of paper are not only lower than those in effect in 1922, and some rates even below those fixed by the 1913 act.

Twenty-fifth. In 1938 imports of paper and pulp were over $185,000,000, approximately 25 percent more than the importation of coffee, the next largest commodity, and still a larger percentage above cane sugar, crude rubber, or raw silk, the three next largest importations, all of which are produced either in very small quantities or not at all in the United States.

Twenty-sixth. Paper and pulp imports were over twice as large as those of chemicals from 1930 to 1940.

These 26 statements are taken from the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee by the Paper and Pulp Association when they opposed a further reduction of the duty on paper and paper products.

Wisconsin is one of the leading paper and pulp States. Many large and successful mills are located in the Seventh Wisconsin District.

The following table shows the duties on various paper products and was also included in this testimony:

APPENDIX C

Duty rates on paper, 1913 to 1945

[Grades on which duty rates have been reduced by reciprocal trade agreements]

Grade	1913	1922	1930	Jan. 1, 1945	
				Actual rate	Equivalent to ad valorem computed on latest available statistics of actual importations
	Percent				
Printing	12	¼ cent per pound and 10 percent	½ cent per pound and 10 percent	⅛ cent per pound and 5 percent	10.8 to 12 percent.
Paperboard:					
Plain	5	10 percent	10 percent	10 percent (bound)	
Processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	$14.50 per ton, not less than 15 percent or more than 30 percent.	

Duty rates on paper, 1913 to 1945—Continued

[Grades on which duty have been reduced by reciprocal trade agreements]

Grade	1913	1922	1930	Jan. 1, 1945	
				Actual rate	Equivalent to ad valorem computed on latest available statistics of actual importations
	Percent				
Pulpboard in rolls for use in manufacture of wall board.	5	10 percent	10 percent	5 percent	
Same, processed	25	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Tissue:					
Lightweight [1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 3 cents per pound and 10 percent.	30 percent.
Heavyweight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at not over 15 cents, 2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent.	28.7 percent.
Stereo, carbon, pottery, light weight.[1]	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 20 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents 4 cents per pound and 15 percent.	21.5 percent.
Same, heavyweight [1]	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	If valued at more than 15 cents, 4 cents per pound and 10 percent.	17 percent.
India Bible (over 10 pounds)	12	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	4 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.6 percent.
Crepe paper	30	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	6 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 7½ percent	32.5 percent.
Simplex decalcomania	35	5 cents per pound	5 cents per pound and 10 percent	2½ cents per pound and 10 percent	22.1 percent.
Drawing paper	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if over 40 cents per pound.	13.7 percent.
Hand-made paper	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at over 50 cents.	12.9 percent.
Bristolboard	25	do	do	2 cents per pound and 10 percent, if valued at not over 15 cents.	33.7 percent.
Hanging raw stock	12	10 percent	10 percent	7½ percent	
Filtering	30	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	5 cents per pound and 15 percent	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent, if valued at 75 cents or more.	8.5 percent.
Blotting	30	30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Wrapping kraft	25	do	do	20 percent	
Wrapping, other	25	do	do	25 percent	
Vegetable parchment	25	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	3 cents per pound and 15 percent	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	29 percent.
Straw board and paper, less than 12-point, not less than 8-point.	5-25	10-30 percent	30 percent	15 percent	
Cigarette	50	60 percent	60 percent	45 percent	

[1] Lightweight refers to paper weighing not over 6 pounds per ream of 288,000 square inches. Heavyweight is paper 6 pounds or over, less than 10 pounds.

The following table was the one included in the testimony showing the tariff rates of the United States and the United Kingdom:

APPENDIX D

Comparative tariff rates—United States and United Kingdom

Grade	Actual rate	United States rate—equivalent ad valorem based on latest actual available import data	British rate
Printing	⅛ cent per pound and 5 percent	10.8 to 12 percent	20 percent.
Paperboard, plain	10 percent	10 percent	15 to 20 percent
Same, processed	$14.50 per ton not under 15 percent or over 30 percent.	15 to 30 percent	Do.
Pulpboard in rolls for manufacture of wallboard	5 percent	5 percent	20 percent.
Same, vat-lined	15 percent	15 percent	Do.
Sheathing paper	10 percent	10 percent	Do.
India and Bible	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.6 percent	Do.
Simplex decalcomania	2½ cents per pound and 10 percent	22.1 percent	Do.
Vegetable parchment	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	29 percent	16⅔ percent.
Tissue, lightweight	3 cents per pound and 10 percent	30 percent	Do.
Same, heavy	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent	28.7 percent	20 percent.
Drawing paper, over 40 cents per pound	2 cents per pound and 10 percent	13.7 percent	Do.
Hand-made paper	do	12.9 percent	Do.
Bristolboard, not over 15 cents	do	33.7 percent	Do.
Wrapping:			
Kraft	20 percent	20 percent	16⅔ percent.
Other	25 percent	25 percent	20 to 25 percent.
Strawboard	15 percent	15 percent	15 to 20 percent.
Blotting paper	do	do	20 percent.
Filtering paper, if 75 cents or more	2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent	8.5 percent	Do.

The following table shows the amount of imports of paper products and the value thereof:

United States imports of paper base stocks and paper and paper manufactures

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
	Quantity				
Paper base stocks:					
Pulpwood (1,000 cords)	2,420	3,045	2,589	2,261	2,872
Wood pulp (1,000 short tons)	2,278	2,395	1,711	2,026	1,225
Other paper stock (1,000 short tons)	185	181	79	116	79
Paper and manufactures (1,000 short tons)	2,835	3,404	2,336	2,683	2,812
	Value (in thousands of dollars)				
Paper base stocks:					
Pulpwood	9,482	12,393	11,038	9,437	12,194
Wood pulp	82,837	98,269	72,778	75,892	60,194
Other paper stock	6,602	7,190	2,550	3,097	3,027
Paper and manufactures	110,113	137,071	112,975	126,783	132,611
Total	209,034	254,923	199,341	215,209	208,026

The exports of paper base stock and paper and paper manufactures had a dollar value of between forty and fifty million dollars although in 1940 these exports, due to foreign demands no doubt influenced by the war, rose to about $100,000,000 in value.

One can readily see that the exports of paper and its products is rather small in comparison to the imports of these items.

One of my Democratic colleagues said on the floor that the paper and pulp industry was presented as an industry that was subject to harm by further duty reductions, it was not an industry of much importance and not many people were affected. This is not a true picture. As shown in the testimony, the industry is a large industry, has a large number of

employees and should not be subjected to a cut in the duty rate at this time.

We hear about the 60,000,000 postwar jobs, but if we do not change our course and quit allowing a few people to have complete control over the pay rolls and the grocery bills of our citizens we may see the 60,000,000 jobs somewhere else than in the mills, factories, and manufacturing plants of the United States.

First. A vote in favor of this measure is a vote in favor of legislation by men instead of legislation by law.

Second. A vote in favor of this legislation is a vote that jeopardizes the jobs of millions of American employees.

Third. A vote in favor of this legislation is a vote to delegate additional legislative powers to the executive department of our Government.

Fourth. The American people want the Government given back to the people. They do not want to see any new schemes to give away their jobs.

Fifth. Five years before the war the United States did not even produce enough food to feed the people of the United States.

Sixth. If H. R. 2652 is put into operation the American people will not only have to depend on food produced in other countries to feed their families as they did for 5 years before the war, but the American people will be compelled to depend on people of foreign countries for more of their paper products as they do now for newsprint.

Seventh. Logrolling was supposed to have been in operation when tariff bills were presented to the Congress. This was not a scientific approach, that is sure. We now have sectional logrolling. Under the present administration's domestic and foreign commerce policy, we find embargoes placed on exports, near embargoes on imports, subsidies paid on exports, limited quotas of world markets provided American producers, the creation of import quotas, the domestic subsidy payment arrangements, and the price floors established for 2 years after the war and then we see the duty juggling, the sectional favoritism as practiced by the manipulators of the duty rates under the reciprocal treaties. Then I question whether or not the logrolling is a more offensive approach than the program of the treaties where they are honeycombed with deception and dripping with deception. This bill is a bill to create unemployment.

The Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I present and request unanimous consent for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address on the public health delivered by the Governor of North Carolina, Hon. R. Gregg Cherry, at the dedication of the health center at Monroe, N. C., on May 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every American, regardless of creed, color, or economic status, is entitled not only to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but also to good health, in order that he may properly enjoy these blessings—not as a matter of charity, but as his or her inherent right.

Health is the basis of human happiness; the cornerstone upon which rests not only the welfare of the individual, but of the Nation as well. I emphasized this principle in my platform when seeking the nomination for the office of Governor; also in my inaugural address. In each case, I urged the adoption of a program that would provide for the medical examination of and adequate care for all children in the State whose parents are not able to provide these. I pointed out then, and I reassert now, that such a program is in no sense intended to be a plan of socialized medicine; but it is my earnest conviction that where parents are unable to finance the cost of remedying physical defects among their children, the State should assume that cost. This is neither "federalized," "socialized," nor "State" medicine, but the fulfillment of a solemn human obligation.

Altogether too many of our young men have been turned down by draft boards because of physical defects which could have been remedied by proper medical care in childhood. Until this whole subject finally is reviewed, the question of our standing as to the percentage of rejectees will remain a debatable subject; but, whatever our rank in this matter, we should determine to give our children the best in the way of health opportunities, in order that they may be fitted for the tasks that lie ahead. We know that upon their shoulders will fall responsibilities unparalleled, perhaps, in human history, as they, taking our places—picking up where we left off—strive to build a world in which the barbarities of the immediate past can never be repeated.

If we are to get the most out of the millions we are investing in public education, we must make certain that our children are healthy. Education cannot reach its full fruition in the mind that is housed in a diseased body, or one that is impaired by defects. If these defects can be remedied, but are not, because of our indifference, then upon our shoulders the blame must rest.

It is as much the right of every man, woman, and child in North Carolina to enjoy the benefits of public health as it is to enjoy the benefits of public safety, public roads, public schools, and the many other things for which we pay, in taxes, and take as a matter of course.

We labor under no illusions of having received charity when we send our children to the public schools, when we ride along our highways, when we look about us and see policemen ready to protect us against the criminal element. Such services belong to us, as citizens.

Public health is simply mass protection. It in no way jeopardizes the livelihood of the private practitioner, who has invested his money in a medical education and has the right to expect a reasonable return therefor. In fact, it takes many burdens from his shoulders, enabling him to give his time to those who are able to and who should pay for his professional services. The average doctor cannot be expected to be responsible for mass protection against communicable diseases for which preventives have been discovered. That is a matter for the State, just as the State provides the legal machinery for guaranteeing all its citizens justice in the courts. But because such machiney has been provided for mass protection against crime and injustice, this does not mean that the private practitioner of law must go out of business. Not at all. His services are made to fit into those provided by the State.

The same is true of medical doctors, as to their relation to public health. In fact, in the early years of its existence, the North Carolina State Board of Health consisted of the entire State medical society, which acted through a committee, and today four of the nine members comprising the board are elected by and from the membership of the State medical society.

As most of us know, there are two branches of medicine—curative and preventive. These are so interdependent that the success or failure of one means the success or failure of the other. The line of demarcation is often very faint, perhaps, in the eyes of the laymen. It is, therefore, highly advisable that each person who is able to do so go to his private physician for periodic check-ups, in order to prevent the preventable while there is yet time. The Psalmist declared: "I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are thy works." The human body is a delicate piece of machinery, fashioned by the Great Architect of the Universe; and to the declaration of the Psalmist, St. Paul declared: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost." This imposes upon man an added responsibility. He should protect his body against disease, not only because of its value as the instrument with which he must work and receive wages to care for himself and those dependent upon him for support, but also as the dwelling place of the highest ideals of life.

We hear much these days about the dignity of the individual, and to preserve that dignity millions, during the past five and a half years, have suffered and died. Unless we make their great loss our priceless gain, their blood will have been spilt in vain, and we can never hope for that final brotherhood of man toward which we look forward and for which we so earnestly pray. We have won great military victories; we have overcome enemies which appeared to be all but invulnerable, as they went up and down the world spreading death and destruction among innocent men, women, and children. But unless we translate these military victories into spiritual gains, we may well ask ourselves that searching question: "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Just over a month ago this Nation and the world suffered a staggering loss in the death of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose life was dedicated to the highest ideals of mankind, but more especially to helping the weak and the underprivileged. He was truly a friend of man, and he left us an incentive unparalleled, perhaps, in history. Though himself afflicted in body, his great mind towered into the blue skies of clear and sympathetic thinking, and "seeing the multitudes, he had compassion upon them."

Through the agencies at our disposal, it is possible for us to achieve much toward the uplift of humanity—and I know of no more important medium through which this can be accomplished than through the organization we know as public health, to which this building stands as a magnificent tribute—a tribute to our efforts in behalf of mass protection against preventable diseases.

We have in North Carolina a State health department which is regarded as one among the very best in the United States. This is borne out by the fact that in time of peace, when international travel is permitted, the North Carolina State Board of Health is visited by public health workers from all parts of the world, who come to study the methods we employ. Preceding the opening of hostilities that grew into World War II we had visitors from every continent—from

Turkey, Hungary, Great Britain, India, the Philippines, Hawaii, the West Indies, and many other places. During the past year, public health workers have come from the Argentine, Brazil, Ecuador, Chile, Mexico, Costa Rica, the Republic of Panama, and other South American and Central American countries. They came, for the most part, under the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation, in whose eyes the North Carolina State Board of Health occupies an important place, not for any sentimental reason, to be sure, but because of its achievements.

Public health, as I have said, is dedicated to the prevention of disease; and, I might add, to the alleviation of suffering among the underprivileged.

Now, let us consider, briefly, some of the gains we have made in North Carolina that might be attributed to preventive medicine. I might stand here and talk for hours in general terms—I might make all sorts of claims, but unless these claims could be substantiated, there would be little profit or encouragement in what I might have to say.

During the year 1917, when we became an active belligerent in World War I, more than 14 out of every 1,000 persons in North Carolina died, many from diseases that could have been prevented. During the following year, that is, 1918, when we were visited by the great influenza epidemic, nearly 18 out of every 1,000 died. No one who survived that dreadful year will ever forget it. The plague struck in our homes, in our armed camps, here and overseas—everywhere people were dying by the thousands. On the platform of every railroad station coffin boxes containing the remains of influenza victims were piled high on trucks, awaiting shipment.

As compared with our general death rate of more than 14 per thousand in 1917 and nearly 18 in 1918. North Carolina's death rate last year was only 7.9 per 1,000 population, which was the lowest in the history of this State. We should do everything within our power to preserve that record—yes, to lower it.

In 1917, North Carolina's infant mortality rate was nearly 100 out of every thousand babies born. Last year it was just 44.7, the lowest in our history. Even that rate is entirely too high, but it shows that we have made gains. We still have a long way to go, and it is going to take much hard work and the spreading of much information among prospective mothers—but we can do it, if we set our hands and our hearts to the task.

Another encouraging achievement in North Carolina last year was the reduction of the maternal death rate to 2.9 for each thousand live births, which was also the lowest in the State's history. In 1917, 7.8 mothers died as the result of every 1,000 live births, as compared with less than three such deaths in 1944.

There are in North Carolina approximately 300 public-health maternity and infant clinics to which the indigent of all races go for examination and treatment, if they need it. Expectant mothers are supplied with the very best information that will help them over the period through which they are passing. These mothers and their babies are given the same treatment they would receive if they were able to pay for it.

In addition to all this, the North Carolina State Board of Health is the agency through which the Federal Government administers funds for carrying on the emergency maternity and infant care program in this State. This program provides for free maternity care for all women whose husbands are in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades of the armed forces, and for free medical and hospital care for infants of men in these classes during their first year of life. At the present time, between 1,000 and 1,200 wives of servicemen are being delivered every month that passes. Through March of this fiscal year the United States Children's Bureau channeled through the North Carolina State Board of Health for the prosecution of this program the sum of $1,048,178—that is, from July 1, 1944, through March 31, 1945, making a grand total of $1,855,703 since the program got well under way about 2 years ago. Of this amount, the sum of $1,095,625 has actually been spent in North Carolina, under public-health supervision, for prenatal, obstetrical, and post partum care, and hospitalization for wives and babies of servicemen. Under this program, the families are allowed absolute freedom of choice in the matter of selecting their doctors and hospitals, who are paid out of the EMIC fund. However, there must be selected a cooperating hospital, as these were chosen because they measured up to the standard requirements and were willing to have a part in this work.

There has been a perceptible decline in both maternity and infant mortality since the inauguration of this program, which insures standard medical care at no cost to the beneficiaries.

We have, through immunization and sanitation, all but stamped out typhoid fever in North Carolina. Throughout last year, there were only 12 deaths from typhoid fever in our State, as compared with 19 in 1943, and—believe it or not—839 in 1914 and 129 as late as 1933.

We have gone for years without a single death from smallpox, but this does not mean we should relax our efforts, for it is through constant vigilance in our vaccination, immunization, and sanitation efforts that communicable diseases are eliminated or controlled. This was demonstrated in Canada several years ago, in a community that had neglected vaccination. A pullman porter developed the disease en route to one of the Canadian cities, where he made contacts on his way to a hospital. Shortly thereafter, a very serious epidemic broke out that resulted in numerous deaths. We must never let that happen in North Carolina.

North Carolina's death rate from tuberculosis in all forms dropped last year to a new low of 36.5 per 100,000 population, compared with 39.1 in 1943. Twenty years ago that same rate was approximately 100, while 30 years ago it was approximately 140. But we can never be safe from the spread of tuberculosis until all open cases are detected and segregated for treatment. We must separate the well from the sick if this dread disease is to be controlled.

The United States Government recently made available the sum of $10,000,000 to aid the States in a great case-finding program, and the North Carolina Legislature, at its 1945 session, appropriated approximately $40,000 with which to match Federal funds for the next biennium. In the meantime, however, approximately $19,000 has been made available by the Federal Government for work in North Carolina until July 1, this year, when State-appropriated funds will become available.

The continued downward trend in North Carolina's pneumonia death rate, as reflected in the 1944 vital statistics report, is also highly gratifying. During last year there were in North Carolina 1,555 deaths from pneumonia, with a death rate of 41.5 per 100,000 population, as compared with 1,692 deaths and a death rate of 45.7 per 100,000 during the preceding year of 1943. Thanks to the sulfa drugs and penicillin.

During the entire year of 1944 there were only 37 deaths from diphtheria in North Carolina, compared with 56 in 1943—but from now on there should be no such deaths, and diphtheria is a preventable disease and the law provides for the immunization of every North Carolina baby before it reaches the age of 1 year. Twenty years ago, the death rate from diphtheria in this State was nearly 12 for every 100,000 population. Now, it is just one.

Recently, we have heard much about efforts designed to conquer cancer, which continues to make terrific inroads into our population. It is hoped that all such efforts will continue and that this dread disease may some day be brought under control; but even now cancer deaths can be greatly reduced by early diagnosis, surgery, radium, and X-ray. North Carolina's cancer death rate last year was 61.4 per 100,000 inhabitants—too high, to be sure, and growing all the time; but, at that, the North Carolina cancer death rate is only about one-half of the national rate, which is around 122 per 100,000 population. Moreover, North Carolina has the lowest cancer death rate of any State in the South Atlantic group. While this is gratifying, it should cause no relaxation in our efforts to bring the disease under control, as our own cancer death rate has risen about 10 points in the past 10 years. Cancer is now fourth among the leading causes of death in this State, having passed tuberculosis, which has dropped to eighth place. As late as 1916, tuberculosis stood at the top of the list.

No State in the Union has made greater strides in the war against venereal diseases than North Carolina. For the control and final eradication of this form of pestilence, North Carolina has within its borders one-tenth of all the public-health clinics in the United States. In combatting venereal diseases and bringing them under control, our public-health officials have kept abreast of the times. With the aid of Federal, philanthropic, and State funds, the results have been definite. At the present rate of the decline of syphilis deaths—from 421 in 1940 to 241 in 1944—the disease undoubtedly, in the opinion of public-health officials, will appear as a minor cause of death 10 years from now. That would be the earliest date that death reports would reflect the true situation in regard to today's syphilis morbidity, which shows a reduction in late syphilis in the past 4 years of more than 50 percent.

I have given you some of the outstanding reductions in mortality rates in North Carolina in recent years, most of them in connection with preventable and controllable diseases. As I have previously told you, public health is chiefly concerned with preventive medicine. It has not, does not, and will not infringe upon the rights of the private practitioner of medicine. It will cooperate, but it will not seek to dictate. On the other hand, the private practitioner should give and has given public health a cooperation that is commendable and which emphasizes the interdependence of the two great branches of medicine.

This health center, which today we are dedicating in the progressive county of Union, stands as a tribute to preventive medicine, and its importance will be demonstrated to a greater degree with the passage of time.

This is one of seven such centers that have been erected in North Carolina defense areas with the aid of Federal funds provided by the Lanham Act. Whether there are more such centers will depend upon the passage of what is known as Senate bill 191, now pending in Congress, which would provide aid to States wishing to erect such centers, not only in defense areas but anywhere they are needed and counties will match funds. Hence the passage of this bill is of extreme importance to the public-health picture, as it would make available the sum of $110,000,000 for hopitals and health centers throughout the United States.

The Lanham Act was passed as an emergency measure. Senate bill 191 would provide a continuing fund for postwar construction of such centers as this and, under certain conditions, it could result in the erection of centers in many other counties where

they are so sorely needed in the promotion of public-health activities.

A public-health worker recently made this suggestion, which I pass on to you as food for thought. "What," he asked, "could be a finer monument to men in the armed services from any county who have made and will make the supreme sacrifice, than a health center?" Some communities are considering the erection of auditoriums, others playgrounds, and still others monuments, but what finer monument could be erected in any county than a health center dedicated to the saving of human life and the preaching of the gospel of disease prevention?"

You have only to consider the quarters in which your county health department formerly was housed to appreciate this magnificent plant, which stands out as a beacon of progress. It is not only a tribute to the advance of public health, but a civic asset, as well.

The plant we now dedicate not only symbolizes the dignity and importance of health, but the dignity of the individual, who, to be at his best, must be healthy.

North Carolina has come a long way down the path of material progress during the past two or three decades. We have kept abreast of the times, and in many instances we have blazed new trails. We have not achieved perfection, and we never will, because perfection is something that, at best, can only be approximated, but never reached. Yet we have many reasons to rejoice in our achievements, especially those reached through our desire to serve humanity.

Long ago, we realized we could not live in mud and ignorance, and we provided facilities for our emergence from both. We now know that we cannot make terms with any disease that can be prevented. We must, with the help of science, prevent the preventable. We intend to do just that. We have provided the means for universal education, and each of us looks forward to the day when not only more than 95 percent of our people—as is now the case—enjoy the benefits of organized public health, but 100 percent. What has been done here will go a long way toward furnishing an incentive for that goal.

The First Peace Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The First Peace Issue," published in the New York Times, May 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE FIRST PEACE ISSUE

At the end of a long and sharp debate, which culminated in a personal appeal by President Truman for favorable action, the House of Representatives has approved a bill which proposes to give the Government power to continue and expand the Hull program of reciprocal trade agreements. No more important legislation has come before Congress in many months than this first test of American policy toward the nature of the postwar peace. For at least three chief reasons a continuation of the Hull program is indispensable—so indispensable that the defeat of this legislation at this time would have been a major political calamity.

In the first place, it is evident that both public and private loans from the United States—loans made on a sound basis—will be necessary for the reconstruction of Europe, a task which needs to be undertaken as much in our own interest as in the interest of our European allies. Such loans cannot possibly be made on a sound basis unless there is reasonable hope of repayment. And since the only practicable method of repayment is in terms of goods, the whole problem of postwar reconstruction is tied up intimately with the problem of achieving reasonable reductions of barriers to trade.

In the second place, even more than in the years before the war, many American industries are now geared to a production which will require profitable foreign markets if the existing volume of domestic employment is to be maintained. Again we face the fact that, in the long run, and particularly since we have already acquired most of the world's gold, American goods can be bought abroad only with the proceeds of goods sold in our own markets, and bought there, because they represent good values at reasonable prices, by American consumers.

Finally, since the United States is admittedly the most powerful economic unit anywhere in the world today, it is obvious that our action will be the most important single influence in establishing the whole economic pattern of the postwar years, and in determining from the very start whether the trend will be—as it would certainly have been if the Hull program had been rejected—toward a narrow economic nationalism, with foreign trade largely in the hands of Government monopolies, or whether the trend will be—as there is now more reason to hope—toward a freer exchange of goods, a relaxation of governmental controls, a survival of the private enterprise system, and an era of economic good will which will lap a sound basis for the work of the new international peace organization which is now being established at San Fransico.

This is the first important international issue to come before Congress since the end of the war in Europe, and the vote on it must give cause for second thought to many of those who felt in the last election that it was safe to trust the Republican Party in Congress with the direction of international issues, on the ground that that party had turned over a new leaf and seen a new light since the days of its opposition to lend-lease, to repeal of the arms embargo, to Selective Service, and to the original grant of authority to Mr. Hull to negotiate his trade agreements. For, on the critical test which this new legislation met on Saturday—the question whether or not to kill the bill by recommitting it—only 7 Republicans could be found in the entire House of Representatives who were willing to give their support to continuing and expanding the Hull program. One hundred and sixty-seven Republicans—a majority of 23 Republicans to 1—voted to send the new bill back to committee.

Such a performance as this can profit the Republican Party, politically, only on one assumption: Only on the assumption that there is a swing-back of public sentiment in this country to the old days of political and economic isolation between the two World Wars. On any other assumption the House Republicans have taken a position and written a record that must be a heavy handicap to any Republican candidate for the Presidency in the next election.

It now remains to be seen what will happen in the Senate.

Reorganization of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Reorganization of the Federal Government," delivered by Mr. David A. Simmons, of Houston, Tex., president of the American Bar Association. The length of the address is a little in excess of the two pages allowed, and I have therefore attached an estimate from the Public Printer showing the cost of printing to be $156.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week, as one of its last acts before the Christmas recess, the Congress passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, known as the Maloney-Monroney resolution. It provided for a committee of 12, 6 Senators and 6 Congressmen, to study the organization and operation of the Congress and to recommend improvements with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationship with other branches of the Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. The appropriation for the committee, $10,000, is a mere pittance in these days of billion-dollar appropriation bills, but the announced function of the committee is one that is of special interest to us both as lawyers and as citizens.

Newspaper reports from Washington, in the pithy language of the press, said the purpose of the legislation is to lift Congress out of the "snuffbox and wig era" by improving its cumbersome machinery.

One Congressman, in urging the adoption of the resolution, said that he expected to submit a proposed constitutional amendment to provide that Congressmen and Senators should be prohibited from acting as messenger boys for their constituents and would be required to give their entire time to their legislative functions. He said he thought another Representative should be elected from each district to a second Congress, and the function of these officials would be to keep in touch with the executive departments and bureaus, run errands for constituents, and do that mass of detail which now takes 90 percent of the time of the present Congressmen and Senators. Of course, being a realist, he said they would have to provide that the new Representative errand boys should be prohibited from running for the Senate or Congress for a number of years, as obviously they would have a wonderful opportunity to cut the ground from under the statesmen, who thereafter would be functioning solely in the higher legislative atmosphere.

"Congressmen should be elected," this Member said, "on the basis of their grasp of national problems rather than their ability as errand boys and favor extractors. Personal demands on a Congressman's time should not be such as to prevent him from legislating intelligently. The present system is not fair to the majority of the people nor to the Congressmen. The executive branch has expanded to meet modern conditions and

so must the legislative branch. Most of our laws today do not originate in Congress. They come from the executive branch or elsewhere."

The last sentence is particularly intriguing. In a recent address Senator McCARRAN elaborated the same thought as follows:

"Only a few decades ago the Congress reprimanded most severely a Cabinet member who had the unprecedented temerity to send to the Senate the text of a bill which he wished to see enacted. Today this procedure not only is common practice, but is by no means confined to Cabinet members. If you list the major bills which have been enacted into law by the Congress in recent years, you will find that a substantial number of them originated, not in response to popular demand expressed through the duly elected representatives of the people, but in the brain of some one member of the executive branch of the Government, or some small group within that branch; and were drafted, not in the halls of Congress but in some administrative office, or executive conference room, or in the cubbyhole of some second assistant supervisor of auxiliary functions. Such a bill, however brilliantly written, cannot be an expression of the will of the people, but only a mirror of the ideas and ideals of its author and of the mood of his executive and administrative superiors."

When the new committee clears its deck for action, I think it will discover that, instead of wanting to escape from the "snuff box and wig era," it will be necessary to go back to the fundamental principles of government of the "snuff box and wig era" in order to accomplish the purposes it has in mind. It will also discover that legislative efficiency under our form of Government is no simple matter. The edicts of a powerful executive, be he emperor or what not, are much more efficient to formulate than the enactments of a Senate of 96 Senators and a House of Representatives of 435 Congressmen. Our form of Government has three branches, not for the purpose of promoting efficiency but, as Mr. Justice Brandeis said in the case of *Myers* v. *United States*, to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The founders were determined to save the people from autocracy.

Consequently, I hope the lawyers of our country will give serious thought to the functioning of this new committee on reorganization of the Government and will give the committee the benefit of their ideas as to the scope and extent of that reorganization. Obviously, we may leave to the committee the details of the functioning of Congress itself, that is, such matters as the consolidation of the committees of the two Houses and the legislative procedure in the enactment of a law. However, a reorganization of Government requires much more than that.

We are well aware that our form of Government, presumably much the same as it was in the beginning, has changed radically these last 50 years, due to what we now call "bureaucracy." Let us give a little thought and attention to the historical background of our form of Government to see if we can suggest something that may be helpful, not only in promoting efficiency but in preserving the checks and balances originally devised.

As a consequence of their knowledge of the history of the governments of the world, the men who founded this Nation decided upon a republican form of government, with checks and balances against the misuse of power. Recognizing that the legislative, executive and judicial were separate functions of government, they placed those powers in separate departments. There is no equivocation about the language. The Constitution provides that all legislative powers granted shall be vested in a Congress which is to consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives. All the executive powers are given to the President, and all judicial powers vested in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

Notwithstanding the express mandate of the Constitution and the intent of the founders to vest all legislative power in the Congress, we now find that, of the multitude of regulations being issued in the name of the Federal Government, 90 percent are the product of executive bureaucracy and less than 10 percent are from acts of Congress. This administrative growth is due, at least in part, to the incessant demand by some for the regulation of others and to the belief that efficient regulation requires, in addition to punitive justice, more regulative and preventive justice than can be supplied readily by the injunctive process. Therefore our legislators, in their desire to please the executive or on demand from some bloc or pressure group, have taken it upon themselves to give away a large part of the power entrusted to them by our Constitution. Some of their power of regulation has been turned over to the Executive; a large part of it has gone to the more than a hundred bureaus and commissions set up as independent agencies and invested by the Congress with power to make laws, administer them, and try the alleged offenders.

Today the business of regulating the lives and conduct of the citizens is not only the largest, but the most important, activity in the country. It is not my purpose at this time to decry that fact. Let us forego name calling and leave to others the debate as to whether this bureau system is fascistic, communistic, or foisted upon us by naturalized citizens of European background who have never assimilated the theories of our Government but are familiar with the intermingling of all power in the same hands in the countries from which they came. Neither is it necessary to assert that the Executive, New Deal or old deal, is engaged in a conspiracy to strip the Congress and the courts of their power and reduce them to subordinate positions. Although I do not believe it, I shall admit for the sake of argument that all the laws passed, all the bureaus created, and all the people employed were necessary to correct abuses in the life of the national community.

My present purpose is to consider this matter of governmental organization, look at the abuses which have grown from the concentration of all powers in the same hands, and see if we can suggest a remedy for some of them.

From the standpoint of numbers and expense, the so-called equal and coordinate departments of government today are anything but equal. In the legislative branch we have 96 Senators, 435 Representatives, and a few thousand miscellaneous employees, mainly clerks and stenographers. The appropriation for the current year is approximately $13,900,000 for salaries and other expense. The judicial department consists of 255 judges, supreme and inferior, and a few thousand clerks, commissioners, stenographers, reporters, and bailiffs. The current appropriation for that department for salaries and expenses, including jurors' fees and expenses, is $13,618,000. With 136,000,000 people in this country, the cost of the finest judicial establishment in the world is 10 cents each. The cost of the congressional establishment is a fraction over 10 cents. The two combined cost 20 cents per person.

Since taxation, direct and indirect, now reaches from the cradle to the grave, it is safe to assume that you are paying some Federal taxes this year. Any amount you pay in excess of 20 cents goes to the executive department for either routine or war purposes. The last tabulation that came to my attention showed 3,016,000 civilian employees of the executive department with expenditures of six or eight billion dollars for their salaries and expenses. This does not include the military and naval personnel nor the direct war expenditures.

Let us be optimistic and assume that after the war the civilian personnel of the executive department will be reduced one-half. I think we may still hazard the assertion that there will be 10 times as many persons in the executive department and the so-called independent establishments and bureaus engaged in legislative research and drafting as there are in Congress itself. We may also safely assert that there will be 10 times as many people in the executive branch judging controversies between the citizens and the Government and hearing alleged violations of governmental regulations as there will be in the entire judicial department.

That this commingling of the three powers in the executive branch would produce abuses should have been apparent. That it was a violation of our tradition should have been a warning, for, after all, tradition is but the memory of past experience. Why is it that man learns but to forget and, forgetting, must relearn?

One could document at great length the specific instances of abuses. Zealots have legislated, investigated, prosecuted, tried, and judged in their own tight little bureaus, and the wails of those who have suffered therefrom have been heard in all parts of the land. To anyone who thinks that the right of trial by jury has remained inviolate in the present decade I suggest that he read the recent case of *Yakus* v. *United States* to see the device perfected to prevent those accused of crime not only from having the right of trial by jury on essential issues, but from even raising the question of the constitutionality of the very laws and regulations under which they are threatened with penitentiary sentence.

The National Government, by congressional action, Executive directives, judicial decisions, and administrative activity has abolished, to all intents and purposes, certain of the powers of the State legislatures, contrary to the founders' intention as expressed in the tenth amendment, and has drawn into the Federal vortex in Washington those powers which the people had reserved to themselves. Are these results necessary and inevitable in connection with the governmental process? If not, why do we have them, and what is the remedy?

The standard justification of the bureaucrats for withdrawing the legislative power from Congress and conferring it upon these ex-officio experts, as Dean Pound calls them, is that Congress simply has neither time nor experience, even if it has the capacity, to investigate, and legislate in detail on, all the multitude of matters with which bureaucracy concerns itself. As Robert H. Jackson, then Attorney General, said in 1941:

"Serious practical consequences wait upon the distribution of power between the President and the Congress. When the Court held that NIRA code making could not be delegated to the President and the executive agencies, it destroyed any possibility of the code technique in industry, for everybody recognized the impossibility of Congressional action on hundreds of codes."

In other words, the standard apology for the failure of Congress to act, and the justification for giving broad legislative powers to the executive department, is that Congress is so weighed down that most of the legislative functions must be performed by somebody else after Congress has granted in broad terms the general authority in a particular field. Personally, I think that is an afterthought. Because the bureaus now enact 10 times as much legislation as Congress, and because Congress itself is swamped with such legislation as it is enacting, it is easy to say that the impossibility of performing the task necessitated giving legislative powers to a hundred alphabetical agencies, even though NIRA code making fell by the wayside.

Someone may rise to say I have conceded that the increasing complexity of life in our society has made necessary vastly increased legislation. I am also familiar with the cases which, little by little, have justified the executive encroachment upon the powers of the legislative and judicial departments. In essence, the dictum of the bureaucrats has been accepted: that the legislative task is beyond the power of Congress and the judicial task beyond the power of the courts, at least in those lesser fields that now govern 90 percent of the activities of the people.

I deny this dictum and believe that Congress has unwittingly defaulted in its written duty and in its obligation to the people.

Does this have a strange sound? Everyone else is denouncing the Executive for grasping at power. Who created the agencies? The Congress. Who appropriated the money to finance them? The Congress. Who gave them the power to make laws governing the liberty and property of the citizens? The Congress. Who inserted in those laws that there should be no appeal in the average case from their bureaucratic courts? The Congress. Who provided that if there was any evidence to sustain the finding of the bureaucrat, the finding should be final and binding upon the courts? The Congress.

How was it possible in the greater republic in the world, dedicated to equal justice under law, that Congress set up agencies of Government not dedicated to the even-handed administration of the law but using all three powers of Government to whip into line those who did not eagerly embrace this latest offspring of paternalism? In days of governmental sanity who would have dreamed that a great governmental agency would be set up with the power almost of life and death in the matter of employment, its membership frankly composed of pressure blocs whose members seem to vote the views of their affiliated organizations?

The newspapers a little while ago published the demand of the leader of an independent union for equal representation on the War Labor Board with the CIO and the A. F. of L. There you have the key to bureaucracy. Special interests demand special representation and special treatment. This is true whether it be an independent union or any other group that wants legislation in the hands of its friends. We understand and may even sympathize with the aims of some or all of these groups, but how did it happen in a government of the people, by the people, for the people, that pressure groups were able to establish so many bureaus and agencies free of general control?

The groups and blocs securing enactment of the great variety of legislation setting up a hundred different bureaus to regulate a hundred different activities each wanted its pet law zealously enforced by its friends, without having their energies dissipated in other fields of endeavor. The natural result has been that every bureau and agency has felt that it must expand its jurisdiction and personnel in geometric proportion in order to justify the faith of its friends and lay a foundation for more and bigger appropriations to come. The blocs or groups lobbying these acts through Congress, some of whom were acting through and with the executive department, and some strictly on their own, also wanted and secured the power of legislation. Neither did they wish any control by the judiciary.

Their aims and views are perfectly understandable. What is not understandable is how Congress, as the representative of all the people of this great Nation ever permitted itself to be led into so altering the form of our government that it is now hardly recognizable. I say that it not only was not justifiable, it was not even necessary.

Is there a remedy? I think there are several. Some deal with attitudes, some with governmental organization, and some with fundamental principles. For instance, in the last category it would help if, as a people, we could formulate, approve, and observe certain reasonable and attainable personal ethical standards. A little more honesty and fair dealing in business might conceivably have obviated the necessity for several of the present bureaus and commissions. A little more honesty and fair dealing in the future may bring about a relaxation of some of the present restrictions.

Not long ago the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, commenting on the desire of businessmen for a more favorable Government attitude toward business in the postwar era, said that such an attitude was possible "if illegal price cutting, if misbranding, if misrepresentation are stopped; if large distributors are precluded from arbitrarily favoring certain customers; if there is an end to commercial bribery, inducing breach of contract, bogus independents, of 'lifting' and then advertising a competitor's product at greatly reduced prices to the injury of the product's reputation, exclusive sales and purchasing agreements, rebates, and preferential contracts; acquisition of exclusive or dominant control of machinery or raw materials used in manufacturing; if there is an end to stealing copyrights and patented articles, mergers to suppress competition, or interlocking directorates to create monopoly; and if there is an end to combinations in restraint of trade."

Just before the war, Reader's Digest published several articles reporting on Nationwide surveys of the repair and service trades and professions, particularly garages, radio repair shops, watchmakers, and one or two others, which indicates what they called "chiseling" or "over-reaching" in 49 to 64 percent of the places tested. This is a sad commentary on those trades, and a mass of indignant letters following the articles charged that the situation was little different in a multitude of other businesses. Such conditions cannot fail to bring about a demand for Government regulation and control of all such activities in the public interest.

I mentioned that a change of attitude by our people might help toward a solution of this problem. HATTON W. SUMNERS some time ago wrote an article entitled, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrat." He said bureaucracy was caused by the failure of the people to govern themselves at the city, county, and State level, and the demand of those people that the Federal Government intervene and attempt a solution of every problem, national or not. This attitude is well expressed by the saying, "Let George do it," instead of pitching in and solving our own and our community problems as they arise. The attitude that Mr. SUMNERS referred to is a fundamental cleavage in personal and political philosophy between those who politically believe in a strong central government and those who believe in local self-government and States' rights.

It is well for us to remember that these forces are similar to the centripetal and centrifugal forces in nature; and I think it is no accident in government that the centrifugal force, which trends outward, ends in the calm water of local self-government, while the centripetal force, drawing all things into the center, ends in a vortex of absolutism. I am not, however, concerned here with whether we should aline ourselves with either, but we can recognize the tremendous power of the centripetal force and perhaps prevent the vortex stage by vigilantly preserving the three channels into which it was directed by its founders. The power conferred upon or taken by the Federal Government has overflowed those three channels, and the Executive channel is tending to cut into the banks separating it from the legislative and judicial, and which were placed there for control purposes.

A philosophical analysis will easily demonstrate that the legislative, executive, and judicial are not one power which has been artificially divided into three parts, but are actually three separate functions which quite properly should be separatedly performed. A rearrangement of Federal power by congressional enactment could reestablish the checks and balances in our Government, and maintain them without in any respect detracting from the present enormous power of the central government.

How could this be done? First, let Congress recapture its legislative power by the creation of a bureau of legislation, under the immediate direction, supervision, and control of Congress and its committees, to investigate and draft all subordinate rules and regulations needed to supplement any acts of Congress. Take out of the executive departments and administrative agencies all the people, or as many as may be needed, who are engaged in composing, writing, and expertizing these minor laws. How many? I do not know. If there were 10,000 it would probably be a very minor fraction of those now presumably engaged in those functions. There would be this additional advantage: that the bureau, being under the direction, supervision and control of Congress and acting in its various divisions under the authority of congressional committees, would have a legislative esprit de corps and a broad general outlook on these problems distinct from that of administrative bureaucrats intent on expanding their authority. Certainly the draftsmanship of all rules and regulations would become more uniform and more consistent with the spirit of our laws and institutions.

Second. Create a system of petty Federal courts. Take out of the departments and administrative agencies all employees, or as many as are necessary and qualified, now exercising judicial functions, placing them under the courts as masters, commissioners and examiners, to become a part of the judicial establishment with the outlook, impartiality, and espirit de corps of the judge. Again I say, if there were 10,000 of these, that would be less than there are now. Localize them throughout the country in Federal courthouses to be available for the prompt hearing of complaints involving the thousands of minor governmental regulations.

Third. Create a department of Federal police headed by a Cabinet member, placing in it all the necessary police officers, experts, and investigators now scattered throughout all the departments and agencies. Let it be charged with the enforcement of all the Federal laws, rules, and regulations, just as our State and city police are charged with the enforcement of all State and local laws and regulations, instead of having, as now, one set of Federal police to investigate violations of liquor laws, another for narcotic laws, another dealing with counterfeit money, another with stolen automobiles and interstate crimes, another to serve court process, and others to trail aliens illegally within the country, smugglers, or writers of letters obscene or deceptive, and a multitude of inspectors for a long list of agencies dealing with everything from boilers on ships or trains to bugs coming over the borders. We would immediately eliminate tremendous duplication of effort, to say nothing of the traveling and other expenses of the limited and special sleuths who now roam the country from one end to the other searching for violators of their particular little laws and regulations. Localize the offices throughout the country so that citizens concerned with the enforcement of the laws, as well as those who are being investigated, may know where, how, and by whom the laws are being enforced. Need I add that this would bring the Federal power to the home locality where the citizen could represent himself or be represented by his home-town lawyer in his controversies with the Federal Government?

With their detective forces, their legislative powers, and their judges and magistrates stripped away and placed where they belong, the remaining functions of most of the agencies would be administrative, and we would then realize that such functions could well be performed by the great executive departments, with perhaps few and minor exceptions. One such change, urgently needed, is to put all the lawyers now engaged in agency enforcement work back under the supervision of the Federal district attorneys and the Department of Justice.

Slowly at first, then with ever-increasing momentum, our form of government would change back to the spirit, if not to the size and shape, envisioned by the founders. There would still be blocs and groups seeking regulation of their competitors and favors for themselves; but the laws, if enacted, would be written by the legislators or under their immediate control and supervision. The execution of the laws would be aided by an even-handed investigation and presentation of alleged violations. Most important of all, the accused citizen would have his day in court, in his own vicinity, before trained and impartial members of the judicial establishment.

You will recall Madison's warning against the encroachments by tyranny:

"In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed and, in the next place, oblige it to control itself; and it is of great importance in a republic not only to guard society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part."

In a message to Congress on January 3, 1936, President Roosevelt said:

"In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

In other words, instruments have been forged which in the hands of philosophers will not injure the people, but in the hands of ambitious men will prove ruinous. Since when have men changed their character? Since when have men put away ambition and lust for power? Since when have men renounced selfishness?

In 1936 it was still reasonable to believe that we had become civilized and that no longer would men grasp for power and use it ruthlessly against their fellows; but our experience with centralized power in Europe and Asia these last 5 years is sufficient to indicate that ambitious men have not changed their ways, and that governmental power must be so checked and balanced that no one man or set of men can use that power to provide shackles for the liberties of either their own people or their neighbors. We must relearn what Jefferson said:

"In questions of power let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

We have the greatest Nation in the world, the best labor, the best management, the best inventors and scientists, the greatest production, the highest standard of living, the most liberty, the finest administration of justice. We know the form of government under which these gains were made. Let us restrengthen the foundations while we preserve and magnify the superstructure of that Government. Let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of justice and liberty, and of their essence, reason. Let us accept the full responsibility of our position as lawyers and citizens. Then may we face the future with full confidence that we shall preserve the gains for which our forefathers fought and died, for they left us the noblest heritage that ever fell to the lot of man—a land rich in natural resources, rich in history, and rich in the form of government by and through which the people rule. Let us look with assurance down the corridors of time and envision the great nation of that day, with a material magnificence beyond our conception, with a people worthy of the sacrifices of their ancestors, and with a government based upon reason and the consent of the governed, opposed to force in whatever form it may manifest itself and true to the ancient American ideal of liberty under law. Then may we say with Rousseau: "These wonders are the work of law. It is to law alone that men owe justice and liberty."

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1945:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. James A. Farley suggests a special commission to study the question of the succession to the Presidency. He points out that when a Vice President becomes President he can name his own successor, who will be a nonelected official. The provision for the succession is first the Secretary of State, then the Secretary of the Treasury, and so on in appointed order through the Cabinet. Since Cabinet officers are most often from the President's party and know his policies and commitments, this seems fair enough—at least, as a temporary arrangement.

In any ordinary course the chance of a Cabinet member becoming President is slight. It hasn't happened in the country's history. However, it could happen. Back in 1844, in President Tyler's term, the Presidential party, including several of the Cabinet, boarded the war steamer *Princeton*. One of its new guns was fired in a salute. It exploded, killing the Secretaries of State and the Navy and several others. Had the others included the President—Tyler had succeeded President William Henry Harrison; so that there was no Vice President—and one or two more Cabinet members, the supply of successors would have been pretty well drained. A commission might recommend that provision be made for a special election should the succession of a nonelected official come, say, less than half-way through a 4-year term or should it go beyond, say, the Secretary of State.

Particularly well taken is Mr. Farley's point regarding the period between election and inauguration. Should something happen to both the President and Vice President-elect in the time between early November and January 20, the country could easily be without a President for some time. The choice would apparently devolve, Mr. Farley notes, upon the House of Representatives, and a deadlock there is not inconceivable. Provision for new conventions and another election in such a case would seem, definitely, to be called for.

Mr. Farley suggests a commission representing all three branches of Government to recommend legislation or a constitutional amendment, if that is necessary, which would establish a better and a better-safeguarded succession. The suggestion is a sound one.

Ten-Cent Piece Bearing Likeness of the Late Franklin Delano Roosevelt Will Soon Be Produced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of introducing a bill which provided for the coinage of a memorial 10-cent piece bearing the likeness of our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. My primary purpose in introducing such a measure was in creating a fitting tribute to the remarkable good accomplished by Mr. Roosevelt in establishing the annual March of Dimes, which so greatly benefited thousands upon thousands of youthful victims of infantile paralysis and which promises to contribute greatly to the eventual eradication of this dreadful affliction.

MORGENTHAU GIVES O. K.

As a result of introducing this bill, I have received widespread favorable comment, emanating from all sections of the United States and even from foreign countries, in regard to this measure. I am very happy to have been informed by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, that plans have been formulated by the Treasury to prepare a striking 10-cent piece bearing the likeness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and to release the first consignment of the new issue at the beginning of 1946.

This also met with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Some time ago the fact was brought to my attention that the presently circulated Mercury dime has more than completed its 25-year span of usage, as it was adopted in 1916. While this is one of our most beautiful coins, I feel confident that my able colleagues, as well as the millions of Americans who share my keen admiration for our late President, will agree that it should properly be replaced in tribute to one of our greatest leaders in all history.

Danger of Centralized Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter written by a member of the United States Army following our victory in Germany. This letter points out the danger of centralized government. The writer traces the change of government in Germany from the local

communities to the central organization headed by Hitler. Our Nation might well give serious consideration to the ever increasing control and expansion of our national affairs from Washington. We can maintain a democracy only as long as we maintain our government in State, local, and municipal subdivisions.

It is often said that "it can't happen here" but it will happen here unless we continually oppose further bureaucratic control of our own Government.

The letter follows:

SOMEWHERE IN GERMANY,
April 30, 1945.

DEAR ———: I wrote a letter just the other day so I really haven't any news to tell, but I have been doing some thinking and I have a little spare time this evening so I'll just unload them on you (I mean my thoughts). You can use it as you see fit—it may be that coming from overseas as it is, it might carry a little more weight. Incidentally, I picked up a fancy German officer's dress sword the other day that I thought someone there might like for a souvenir. I'm sending it to you, hoping that you will like it; however, if you don't care for it, just pass it on to Sedgwick or someone else who might want it.

Now that most of the fighting on this front has been completed we have been taking time out to study a little of the background of the people that we have just defeated. We have had ample opportunity to make a hasty study of them, as they are today, during our battles and our advances across the greater part of Germany. In all our contacts so far, the common expression from all American soldiers is the same: "Why, they appear to be just like us. They live just like we do at home, their homes and their furnishings are as nice or nicer than ours are. What in the world are they fighting for?" I'll venture to say that I have heard essentially that same statement by a dozen different American soldiers around my headquarters. I don't know why they are fighting; I am not an advanced student of government. I know why we are fighting, and I think that every red-blooded American also knows why. But as to why the German people are fighting—I'll have to leave that question for some expert to answer.

The Allied Powers have decreed that Germany shall be occupied by a military force for an indefinite length of time so that the people will have become thoroughly imbued with the horrors and the inconvenience of waging war. In as much as we in the Army are the people who will do the actual occupying of this defeated nation, we feel that all unit commanders should be oriented as to the governmental background of the German communities in which their troops will be billeted. According to the best information that we can get, local government in Germany was very much decentralized until shortly after Hitler took over the power. Each city and county was pretty much its own boss as far as local matters were concerned. In fact, after the First World War most of them felt free to dabble into a number of businesses. All public utilities were taken over by the municipalities and then they branched into the theater business, the hospital business, and some others. It was easy to borrow money and they all went heavily into debt, thinking, apparently, that they would be able to repay the loans out of the profits of the enterprises.

The profits didn't materialize, though, in a lot of cases, and the Central Government in Berlin felt it necessary to put some kind of a control on the proceedings. It did the natural thing for a government to do—even if it was Hitler's government—it took from the counties and the cities the self-government that they were enjoying and in its place it substituted a very centralized government—with one-man rulers of each town and area who was acccountable only to those above him in the chain of command. The fact that the municipalities already owned a lot of the local business made it very convenient for the Hitler government in Berlin to gain control over the means of livelihood of a great many of the people in every locality. Either the people who were working for the municipally owned business evidenced loyalty for the Nazi Party or they were out of a job and also probably out of something else, too. Naturally, the schools were sifted carefully for nonparty instructors and officials. Everything was organized on a national basis—nothing was left to the discretion of the state or the counties and cities. Of course, they used the argument that the local government had failed and that the central government was the solution to all the troubles.

Now Germany is beaten. All of her industrial centers have been practically destroyed. Millions of people, both soldiers and civilians, have been killed, wounded, or forced from their homes. It is a common sight to see old men, women with babies, and small children trying to escape the horrors of war by moving along the roadside in rain and wind. They don't have cars and trucks to take them; just a very small percent of them even own a horse or an oxen. However, just before the war started their government, who controlled the automobile industry, promised every family an automobile—an automobile on which it had forced the industry to standardize. It looks like the first step we will have to do in occupying Germany will be to see that the government is decentralized back to the local cities and counties. I'm sure that the Allied Governments will insist on that—I hope they will go further and take those local governments out of business and complete the decentralization of power to the individual again.

Now that the heavy fighting is over in this theater for many of our troops, I suppose that we should experience a great feeling of relief. We do. But there is one little dark spot in the back of the minds of those of us who have been doing some thinking about the causes and effects of this horrible experience. In the first place we think that a condition should never be permitted to exist where it would be possible for one person to seize complete power of a nation. Those of us who are doing some thinking on this matter have been away from both government and business for a number of years so we think that we are not prejudiced either way. We think that there are two ways with which one man or a small group of men can seize power in a country. If monopolies and the merger of large corporations are allowed to go on unrestricted it is possible that the man who ultimately is in charge of the controlling interest may find himself in a position to wield complete power over the nation. We think that the administration of laws controlling those two developments will keep that threat well under control.

The other way with which an individual or small group of individuals can gain complete control is through a national socialistic arrangement such as Germany had before her defeat. It is an insidious thing. From the history of Germany it would appear that it begins with the local governments dabbling in business. As they take over the businesses from the individuals they find that it is expedient to take over another business, too. Until before long the local people all find that they are working for the local government for a living. Then something happens as it did in Germany and the local governments become unable to handle what they have started; but instead of turning them back to the individuals the central government takes them away from the local government and then all the people are working for one government—not the government working for the people, as all governments should.

We know that this all must sound like a lot of idle thinking to you. You are there all secure in the United States. Of course, it can't happen there. And we would be inclined to agree with you if we were sitting there as you are, secure from enemy bombings, secure in the thought that the American people are better educated and freer thinkers than those in Germany or any other country. But we are not sitting there where we can feel fully safe from enemy bombings and we are here among the Germans in the heart of Germany. We can see that these people are just as well educated as we are over there in the States. We can see that their living conditions before the war were almost exactly the same as ours. We can see that the German people look just like the American people. In fact we're wondering if we aren't doing them just a little injustice when we place the whole blame for this horrible war on their shoulders. We say that they should have refused to support the Hitler regime. Yes, that is true; but the Hitler regime owned a large part of the commercial enterprises and it very closely controlled all the others that it didn't own. How would they have been able to get food, clothing, and even shelter, in some cases, if they didn't support the Hitler regime? We are not defending the German people, we think they were to blame for this war, but they made their mistake years ago when they allowed their Government to step in and take over the railroads, the telephone and telegraph system, the power system, the theaters, and the dozens of other businesses that the Government absorbed.

The thing that worries us is the thought that while we are busily engaged in condemning the German people for allowing their Government to get them involved in this war, we may be overlooking the same tendencies on the part of our own Government back there at home. It would be a great disappointment, indeed, if, after seeing our buddies killed beside us on the battlefields here, we were to come home only to learn that our Government, both local and Federal, was stepping into the businesses that we left; only to see our own Government taking the same steps that Hitler's government took nearly 10 years ago. The American GI appreciates his Government's offer of assistance to him if he desires to go into business for himself. He also hopes that his Government will not go into business, too, to compete with him.

Respectfully,

———.

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial speech delivered by me at Arlington Memorial Cemetery on May 27, 1945:

While the whole world is resounding with jubilation over VE-day, the nations have not forgotten the cost of this victory. Nations, as well as individuals, pay dearly for conflicts. Nations attempt retribution for damages incurred, but nothing can ever repay to nations or to individuals, the loss of prized manhood.

At the close of the Spanish-American War, shortly after the first nurse, Mrs. Anita Campos, was buried in Arlington Cemetery, this plot was set aside as a burial ground expressly for nurses. Three years later in memory of women who gave their lives as nurses during the conflict, a monument to Spanish War nurses was dedicated. Since that beginning, more than 150 nurses, 45 of them with Spanish-American War service, have been buried here. The others all have been Army or Navy nurses, and are commemorated by the fine monument dedicated in 1938. All of them, like nurses in military service today, served loyally in whatever jobs they were given. Many of them experienced adventures that set them apart from the rest of women. Still others attended to routine tasks, the unimportant, unglamorous nursing duties that have occupied the time of nurses but have attracted small interest compared with the dramatic services of the former group.

At the time of the Spanish-American War, although nurses were allowed to work with surgeons in the Army, they were not Army nurses. Contract nurses, they were called, and they did heroic work in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands. Thirteen of them died in the service. One of them had allowed herself to be infected in the interest of yellow-fever research, and died a martyr to science and humanity.

No one wishes to become maudlin or oversentimental in thinking of the dead. But it is fitting, when we gather in memory of nurses buried in this plot, that we reflect on those who have lost their lives in the present conflict. Our whole Nation felt the blow when it was announced that six nurses had been killed on the Anzio beachhead, when enemy shells and bombs fell in hospital areas there. People were reawakened to the sacrifices nurses are currently making when news was received of the death of Lt. Frances Y. Slanger, an Army nurse from my own State of Massachusetts. I saw her at the hospital at Liege in October. One evening later in October, she wrote a beautiful appreciation of the wounded which appeared in Stars and Stripes. She was killed the next morning when her hospital was bombed. Two other nurses also were killed as a result of enemy action in the European theater. Only recently we all were aghast at word of a suicide plane attack on one of our Army hospital ships in the Pacific Ocean area.

These are nurses whose deaths awakened Nation-wide interest and comment. Few of us consider that many others have given their lives in line of duty, while serving their country. They were mourned quietly by friends and relatives. No headlines, no editorials about their passing. They are the ones who succumbed quietly to the rigors of life in the Tropics, to the strain of enforced hardships, who were in jeep or automobile or plane accidents.

All of us gathered here today are interested in the military nursing services. Many of you are wearing the uniforms of the Navy or the Army nurse corps. Others, I am sure have sisters, cousins, or friends who are nurses. I myself am vitally interested in nurses and their work. My visit with nurses at every type of hospital installations, at the front line or in the rear European theaters of war strengthened my admiration for them. Everywhere I went, I heard the soldiers sing their praises. And by soldiers, I mean officers as well as enlisted men. Wounded men declare, "You nurses deserve a medal for coming up here to look after boys like us." And as we know, many of them have medals for service above and beyond the call of duty.

One surgeon from a clearing company across the road from a field hospital, in my hearing said to its commanding officer, "If our morale gets low, all we have to do is to look across the field and see your nurses slogging around in the mud. If they can take it, we certainly can."

And the nurses themselves? They do not care for praise. Most of them pooh-pooh the idea that they are heroic. The simplicities of life in a combat zone have brought them a certain contentment not to be found in civilian life. Many of them declare, we would not trade our jobs here for the highest-paid job back home. Sometimes you want to cry over them, but we are too busy for that. We asked for this job. There is sense to our work and we are staying here until it is finished.

Now, praise God, some of their work is slowing up. Later, we can welcome them back with our fighting heroes. They are fighting heroes, too, you know, for they have fought disease, slaughter, and death.

What of the other heroes, unsung, who have fought death and disease behind the lines? There are nurses, both Army and Navy, who have served for 4 or more years and never have seen service overseas. No indeed, they have not side stepped responsibilities. Many of them have undertaken increasing burdens in hospitals in the United States, thus lightening the loads of nurses in active zones. Many have chafed under enforced inactivity in small installations, only half realizing that all soldiers at sometime must endure a waiting war. None of these many thousands of nurses will wear a service ribbon, nor win an award for service, above and beyond the call of duty, but just as surely as the nurses who have endured shellfire, they have helped in our recent victory in Europe, and they will continue to serve long after VJ-day.

When we evaluate the price we shall have paid for a free world, we must not forget she has paid with her health, her life, her courage, and her love. We must never forget her.

So, on this day, while we are gathered in tribute to the service of the nurses now resting in this plot, we pay a tribute to the nurses who have given thir lives in World War II and we salute the living with a hearty, "Well done, and Godspeed."

Tangled Tapestry of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of May 28, 1945:

TANGLED TAPESTRY OF HATE

(By Marquis Childs)

It is hard for an American to understand the blood feuds of central Europe. While we have our own racial tensions within our country, they are not fed by the memory of centuries of conflict, war and pillage and conquest unending.

That is the framework of the present Polish dispute, it seems to me. To ignore the blood-stained background, to overlook the long history of horrors and hatreds, is to get a wrong perspective on what is not so much a political issue as it is another outbreak of the hatred between Russian and Pole that has flared up so often in the past. We can see now at this moment how it grows and feeds on itself. It is instructive to take a single example—the Pole whom Stalin personally denounced in his outburst of a week ago.

This is Gen. Leopold Okulicki, one of the 16 arrested at Moscow's orders. When I wrote about General Okulicki some time ago I said there was a suspicion he had collaborated with our common enemy, the Nazis. That was an injustice to General Okulicki, and I am sorry for it.

His record in this war is remarkably revealing. As a full colonel, he took part in the Polish-German campaign of 1939, when the Nazi blitzkrieg overwhelmed in a few weeks Poland's pitiful, romantic nineteenth century army. Not wanting to be taken by the Germans, General Okulicki gave himself up to the Russians in Lwow in the fall of 1939.

He was put in a GPU prison in Moscow. Anyone who has read Arthur Koestler's extraordinary Darkness at Noon will know what this meant. It appears that the Russians wanted Okulicki to head up Polish units within the Red army. He refused, and his refusal did not make his position any easier.

Released from prison in the summer of 1941 as a result of an agreement reached between the Soviet Ambassador in London and the Polish exile government, Okulicki went to work at once on the organization of the Polish army in Russia, although he was in very poor physical condition. At that time he became Chief of Staff to General Anders.

The following year the Polish forces were evacuated from Russia and Okulicki went with Anders to Italy, where the Second Polish Army Corps played an important part in the long, costly battle up the Italian Peninsula. Still a colonel, Okulicki was Anders' right-hand man during most of the Italian campaign.

Then, although he was 50 years old, he went through regular paratroop training, and in the summer of 1944 he was dropped from an Allied plane into German-occupied Poland. At the side of General Bor he took part in the Warsaw uprising. When Bor was arrested by the Germans he was made chief of the Polish underground army, with the rank of general. On August 29, 1944, that army was officially recognized by Britain and the United States as a full-fledged combatant force.

As the Poles see it, the Russian failure to come to the aid of this force amounted to betrayal. After a long and terrible siege in Warsaw, they were left to the mercy of the Germans.

All the time, of course, the Germans were exploiting these differences to the fullest extent in propaganda beamed to the Poles. With diabolical persistence and ingenuity, they have fanned the flames of these blood hatreds wherever they found them in Europe, as part of a calculated policy. Mere liberation has not overcome the consequences of this sinister business.

The story of General Okulicki could be repeated many, many times over, both out of contemporary history and out of the czarist past. Nor are the cruelty and injustice all on one side by any means. These are the bloody threads that make up the tapestry of reprisal and revenge.

Certainly we Americans cannot unweave this tangled tapestry of hate. We cannot make it come right. Even if we had physical power in that area, even if we were to go in, which is unthinkable, as conquerors, we could not undo the work of centuries.

What we can do, in my opinion, is to stand firm for what we believe to be right. We can work as mediator and friend, trying not to become involved in the quarrel as a partisan.

Above all, we must have patience. We must realize how deep are the roots of this feud. We must understand that it has little to do, really, with contemporary political forms and that its cure will not come overnight.

Some of our politicians would ignore the historical perspective. They would make us a party to this ancient quarrel. Down that path lies certain disaster.

Mr. Farley's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Sun of May 14, 1945:

MR. FARLEY'S PROPOSAL

Seven times in its history the United States has experienced the tragedy of the death of its President in office. In each instance for periods of time ranging from 1 month short of 4 years, in the case of Tyler's succession, to 18 months in that of Coolidge's succession, the country was without an elected successor to the incumbent in the White House. This has led James A. Farley to propose that a special commission be created not only to study this problem but to reexamine the question of succession if both a President-elect and Vice President-elect die between the time of their election and the date of inauguration. He would have this commission decide whether a constitutional amendment is desirable or whether it would be sufficient to change the present Act of Succession adopted in 1886, when the deaths of Lincoln and Garfield were fresh in the public mind.

Possibly a misguided sense of delicacy has prevented some action of this sort before now. Some are inclined to feel that debating such a problem can be construed as a reflection on the President and his Cabinet, members of which succeed him in order of the seniority of their departments when no Vice President is available. To prevent any such strained construction of the commission's purpose, Mr. Farley would have some of its members appointed by the President in addition to those designated by the Congress from among the Members of both Houses.

No question of personalities is involved in admitting that there are flaws in our present procedure or in setting up machinery designed to correct them. The matter has been discussed often in general conversation in recent weeks. Mr. Farley simply happens to be the first to have attracted general attention with a speech on the subject. There are many suggestions which present themselves, such as an amendment to provide for the election of a new Vice President within 90 days after that office shall have become vacant because of death. A commission would find no shortage of ideas and from them might advocate changes which would strengthen our constitutional structure.

Cooperation Versus Government Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith further correspondence between myself and Mr. John Carson, the Washington representative of the Cooperative League of the United States, dealing with the reasons for the current attack upon cooperatives as well as the function of the cooperative method of doing business in our country at the present time and in the future:

MAY 12, 1945.

Mr. JOHN CARSON,
The Cooperative League of the United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARSON: I have your very interesting letter of May 10. Unless you have objection to making it public, I shall offer it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and perhaps in doing so shall inspire some of my good friends among the small-business men to ask some questions which you might answer.

But I think in all fairness you should explain what you mean by "the hidden forces which are behind this attack on cooperatives." You agree that the small-business man is not consciously a part of this propaganda. You must believe then that they are unwitting victims of some force. What is it?

I think, for example, that we can all agree that a new world is developing, and I think that most of the small-business men would be interested in knowing what they can do about it. You have assumed to take a position, and I think you should help us to answer that question.

Now, I would like to ask you a question which is often put to me and which I think I might answer. But I would like your answer. It is, Why do not cooperatives develop more rapidly if they are so sound? The question is justified because if we are going to be subject to rapid change in our way of life, and if we have to depend somewhat at least on cooperatives, we should know why they develop so slowly. It seems to me my friends may ask why anything so sound as you say cooperatives are do not appeal more to our people.

One thing more. I am concerned about your reference to "class organizations." I do not know just what you mean and I fear others may not know what you mean.

Yours sincerely,

JERRY VOORHIS.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1945.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am answering your letter of May 12, in which you suggest that "in all fairness" I should explain what I mean when I refer to "the forces" which are at work in the current attacks on cooperative organizations. I did not wish to burden you with this further discussion, but I sincerely believe that I am justified in doing so. Our democratic way of life is suffering now from terrific pressures, largely economic in character. The common good is being attacked in these attacks on cooperatives. I am happy, therefore, to answer your additional questions and any more that you might wish to ask.

You ask, firstly, "What are the hidden forces behind this attack on cooperatives?"

1. It is significant that the first rumor about a forthcoming attack on cooperatives was heard around the Congress some 3 years ago and that rumor was associated with one of the most powerful and aggressive of our monopolistic industrial groups.

2. It is significant that the anticooperative propaganda organization which calls itself the National Tax Equality Association is devoted much of its effort to attacks on consumer cooperatives. This organization, nevertheless, is building its propaganda on tax exemption granted to organizations by the Government. Consumer cooperatives are granted no tax exemption by the Government. Why then is NTEA attacking consumer cooperatives and distorting facts? The answer is that consumer cooperatives are, and always have been, the most effective defender of free enterprise and the most effective enemy of monopoly.

3. Is it not probable then that monopoly is the real force behind these attacks on cooperatives? We must remember that it was monopoly and cartels in Germany which, in hours of economic distress, fanned the flames of economic hatreds and race and class prejudices and thus developed the horrible state we know as nazism.

4. We are in a period of economic uncertainty and most of us are suffering from a state of mind which can be summed up in the word "insecurity." It is in these periods that evil forces make use of bigotry and prejudice and ill will to establish their power and put "men on horseback."

5. An entirely new economic order is going to evolve out of our economic necessities. We must have an "economy of abundance" if democracy is to survive. Monopolism and its "economy of scarcity" must go. As the conflicts and pressures develop, will we be able to hold fast to democratic principles and make the transition period one of peaceful, evolutionary change? Or will the monopolists and the beneficiaries of monopoly cause to be repeated in this country what was experienced in other countries? We are complacent in the belief that our freedom-loving people will make certain that democracy will survive. But is there not danger in the very fact that we are so tolerant of monopoly and so indifferent when others warn us about the menace of monopoly? We have been warned that "eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

"You must believe then," you continue in another question, "that they—the small-business men—are unwitting victims of some force. What is it?"

I endeavored in my first letter to emphasize that the small merchant and the small manufacturer was, and is, a man of good will, that his primary business asset was and is good will. In those years before our industrial economy became so dominant, before power was concentrated in so few business and financial groups, the asset of "good will" was very influential in determining the success of the small-business man. But as the forces in that economy—which I shall continue to describe as the "speculative competitive profit economy"—influenced the concentration of power in fewer hands, the small merchant had to realize that his primary asset of good will was not powerful against the ruthless competitive forces which confronted him.

I think the small merchant might look at the story of newspaper advertising over the last few decades and discover where his enemy is to be found. He would be impressed by the constant increase in "national newspaper advertising" and the constant diminution of "local advertising copy." He would thus realize that an incessant appeal, dinned into the ears and through the eyes into the brain, was made to his customers to buy something manufactured in some distant city and by some monopoly organization. That should help him to realize what force it is behind this attack on cooperatives. That force is "monopoly."

You say, "I think we can all agree that a new world is being developed and I think that most of these small-business men would be interested in knowing what you think they can do about it."

Some years ago I heard you make a speech in which you said that "an old world is dying all around us," and that "it began to die in 1929," and that "it was sick long before that." Events have proved how factual was your statement.

Our "old world" began to expire rapidly after the last war because the debt load, public and private, was too much for the economy of scarcity to bear. The only escape offered to our people was that of inflation, installment selling, and bank-credit inflation. We had a joy ride which ended in 1929 with the first death rattle. This war is an extreme convulsion. The patient will linger for some time, and should if we are to avoid revolutionary surgery, but you were right—"an old world began to die in 1929."

You have presented many times and most effectively the national debt picture—a nation of people sinking in the quicksands of debt and sinking deeper as we struggle to escape. I think you have demonstrated that we will not free ourselves from this quicksand until we create a monetary system which will liquefy our commerce without creating more debt. It is encouraging now to notice that more Members of Congress are affirming what you have stated so many times.

We must then create an economy of plenty. We must produce wealth sufficient to maintain an adequate standard of living for all and also surplus wealth which we can use to retire the debt.

How can we create and compel an economy of plenty?

Experience should tell us that the economy we have, the speculative competitive profit economy, has forces inherent in it which compel an economy of scarcity.

It is dangerous to attempt to deal with this subject briefly, to be tempted by oversimplification, but cannot we think of this economy as a "selling economy"? We obtain profits—and I am using the word in its commonly accepted sense for this discussion—through selling something for more than it has cost us. Obviously the seller is intent upon making the articles for sale as scarce as is possible so that the buyer or consumer must pay a higher price for them. That exposition can be expanded almost indefinitely, I think, to prove that as long as we are interested in "selling something for a profit" we will have on economy of scarcity.

I know that some of our more enlightened businessmen are now urging that business must insist on a program of lower margins of profit and lower prices so that our national buying power will be increased. That is a step toward the goal we must achieve, the goal of economy of plenty, and these men must be commended for their enlightened interest. They may succeed—in fact they have to succeed if we are to have evolutionary changes in our national life instead of revolutionary changes. But how they will succeed in the degree necessary to preserve the speculative competitive profit system when it is "profit" which makes the wheels of the system go round, I do not know. It seems to me we must create machinery of production and distribution which invites and induces "abundance" if we are to have an economy of abundance.

If we are to have abundance, I think we must develop a "buying economy" or a "consumers economy." Then we will think of getting as much in goods as is possible for our dollars and the natural forces inherent in that system will influence the production of abundance.

I am pleading for peaceful, evolutionary processes of change. We have institutions and customs with roots established in great depth and over a long period of years. We cannot tear those roots out without doing great violence. Consumer cooperatives have established a business system which influences evolutionary changes. Incidentally, that system and the evolutionary features of it, are made possible by what we know as "the patronage return." And the enemies of cooperatives are now seeking to destroy "the patronage return" device. It seems to me that wisdom would dictate that they should assist us in making use of cooperatives while we yet have time rather than to court conditions where advocates of revolution and violence may sway our people. When I think of the stupidity, or cupidity, of the monopolists who would tear down the house if they cannot use it for their own selfish purposes, and who are now expressing their will through attacks on cooperatives, I become angry.

You ask me, or rather repeat a question which you are asked and which I am asked very often, and it is: "Why do not consumer cooperatives develop more rapidly if they are so good and so sound?"

The answer is, as I think you know better than I do, that cooperatives develop from voluntary action on the part of people. They cannot be imposed by fiat of government or of any group. They develop out of the hearts and minds of people and through an educational process.

It is only natural that you will find the fishermen of Nova Scotia who are member-owners of cooperatives to be the best educated of men. It is only natural that farmers in our country who participate in cooperatives are exceptionally well informed. Only recently, in one Midwestern State, representatives of organized labor participated in a cooperative educational course. Through consumer cooperative activity, our people are helped to apply instruction and theory to concrete problems and there is no better process of education.

Incidentally, I must inject here that it is only natural that in Nova Scotia, in one town, where some thousand and more persons used to parade on May day as members of a Communist organization, there is no parade of that kind today. Those men became interested in consumer cooperatives and they were no longer interested in revolutionary force. They became educated.

Then the development of cooperative enterprise is impeded by those of us—all of us, in fact—who are hesitant to change our way of life. The wage earner, the farmer, the professional man, the small merchant—all of us who have only our labor to sell—should know from the experience of 1929–39 that we cannot hope to enjoy success in an economy of scarcity which is controlled by monopoly. But, nevertheless, we cling to our "selling economy" and "bear the ills we have" rather than move into a new order and a new world. The monopolists make use of our infirmity also and use every device to prejudice us against change. I warn you against this propaganda campaign of the National Tax Equality Association again.

Now, you ask me to what I refer when I mention the development of class organizations.

The "selling economy" was, inherently, an economy which encouraged self-interest, sometimes sugar-coated with the word "individualism." It was an economy of force. It encouraged leaders to arise and to induce others with similar interests to become a part of a militant army. The first class group formed was probably the corporation, in which the owners of capital organized to improve their bargaining power. The immediate brunt of their attack fell on the wage earners and eventually they, or we, were compelled to struggle on, through blood and tears, to organize. The farmer was less interested in militant class organizations until about 1921, but he then organized. The small merchant is now organized. The professional men are organized, etc.

It was comparatively easy to organize capital or money into a class group. It was far more difficult to organize people, wage earners or farmers or professional men. The advantages had from that kind of economic development and class development will always be, over a long run of years, with those who have the most powerful weapons, and in a profit economy the most powerful weapon is the "dollar" or credit which has been controlled, and will be controlled in a selling economy by monopolists.

The conflicts between these groups becomes sharper as the volume of goods becomes less and an economy of scarcity incites us to greater degrees of selfishness and of militancy and eventually to destructive competitive warfare. It is then that interest in the common good becomes of less concern to all of us. It is then that we become a prey to intolerance and bigotry.

Now as the new era is being forced upon us, we find the greatest number of our people from all of these class groups interested in holding fast to that which they have and resenting change. That is true of the small merchant, the wage earner, and the farmer. It is true of all of us.

But there are two other groups of people who have the opportunity to become better informed as to impending change and they are active now to direct and control the processes of change. One group believes—and let us be charitable and agree that these people are sincere—that the force of political governments must be used to remove injustice and to compel an economy of abundance. They believe that men must exist for the State because only through the power of the State can men be compelled to be fair to their fellowmen. They believe in the policeman. Sometimes these people favor a plan which we know as "communism" and others, sometimes, favor a plan we know as "fascism."

It is difficult to discover wherein the ultimate objectives of these advocates of stateism will differ. Man is either going to be governed from within or without. Men who love freedom and who are willing to accord equal rights to their fellowmen, who love democracy, are going to be willing to govern themselves in fairness to their fellowmen. Men who have no faith in self-control will turn to the state and submit to force, or the policemen. One of the great philosophers once said that when a man becomes an imbecile his friends put him into an asylum but when a nation becomes bankrupt and imbecillic the people who make up the nation turn themselves over to the state.

Then there is always the little and much more powerful group which is assisted by the wealth it has accumulated and all the special pleaders who can be employed with that wealth. It is the monopolistic group. Those men are anxious to recover the power they feel slipping from them. They inspire men in the other groups to war. They employ propagandists to organize the war. They have long been dominant in our Government and in other governments and they wish to recover that position they onec held. As they become pressed by the economic changes which are now coming, they will become more desperate. They will also become interested in stateism if they can own and control the state.

There is the middle way out of these dangers. It is the cooperative way in which men are encouraged to become owners in a free society, in which they are permitted to assume responsibility and to grow as they exercise that responsibility. If man is to be a freeman, he must own and control the state and he can only be a freeman and own the state through cooperating with his fellowmen to make certain that his fellowman is granted every opportunity to express his personality and to obtain respect for his human dignity.

Our job is an educational job, then, if we would ward off these dangers and preserve democracy. Cooperatives are instruments of education. They cannot exist in a monopolistic state. They can only exist in a democracy. Their task is to oppose tyranny of all kinds, to expose and attack intolerance and bigotry, to provide an opportunity for class organizations to serve the common

good, and to make certain that they will serve the common good.

I am asked, often, what you will be asked, I am sure. That is, do I want the entire economy to become cooperative. Let us deal with the present. The cooperatives are educational and let us make use of every method of assisting our people to educate themselves. Presently, I think the cooperatives can be most effective in an economy where there will be public corporations and profit corporations and cooperative corporations. They can be the yardstick to influence evolutionary processes of change. As to the future, let us leave that to the people to decide and as their education advances, we need not fear what their choice will be.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe of May 12, 1945:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

In the 156 years of the Presidency, all seven Vice Presidents whom death has elevated to the Nation's highest office fortunately have lived to complete their terms. Although this has consistently happened in the past, the American people have no guarantee of its unbroken continuance in any like emergencies the future years may bring. This fact gives weight to ex-Postmaster General Farley's proposal for creation of a special commission of Senate and House Members, perhaps amplified by an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and other officers, to examine the need for a constitutional amendment covering all possible exigencies with relation to the Presidential succession.

To be sure, section 3 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution empowers Congress to provide by law for successors, in case of the death or disqualification of both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect in the interim between their election and the January inauguration. But Congress could become involved in a protracted deadlock on this duty, a possibility that warrants further attention. And if a Vice President whom death has advanced to the Presidency should die, his appointee as Secretary of State (having no reference at all to the electorate) would carry on. These possibilities make the Farley suggestion one which deserves consideration.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article and an editorial on the subject of full employment published in the May 24 issue of Kenosha Labor, which is the official organ of the AFL and CIO unions of Kenosha, Wis.:

DRIVE FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL STARTS UP—SPONSORED BY 60 IN CONGRESS—LABOR GROUPS PREPARE FOR SENATE HEARING

WASHINGTON.—A committee of "60 Congressmen for 60,000,000 jobs" was informally set up here this week by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat) of Texas. The 60 Congressmen, all cosponsors of the pending full employment bill, will act as an unofficial steering committee when the legislation starts its way through Congress.

Hearings on the full employment bill will probably start late in June before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. First, however, price control renewal and Bretton Woods ratification must be disposed of. House hearings on the full employment legislation are expected to start before the Committee on Executive Expenditures only after the Senate committee has finished.

JOINT EFFORT

Establishment of the committee of 60 Congressmen for 60,000,000 jobs was in great part the result of combined efforts on labor and farm leaders and the Union for Democratic Action whose top committee lists both AFL and CIO national leaders.

Meanwhile union groups continued to prepare their testimony. Scores of AFL, CIO, Railroad Brotherhood, and independent unions are planning statements to be submitted to the House and Senate committees. Senator WAGNER, one of the authors of the full employment legislation, has announced that the Senate committee hearings would be "a democratic forum."

GROWING CONCERN

Labor officials are becoming increasingly concerned about the full employment bill because of the reconversion mess and because they know that labor will have to put on a full dress fight over renewal of the Price Control Act.

The need for the swiftest possible passage of the full employment bill was pointed out by one union official who said that, "The antiunion forces have been planning their strategy against the full employment bill for months, and also for removal of price controls which would make possible more profit grabbing. If they win on the price-control bill it will encourage them to concentrate on the worst hatchet job on the full employment bill that Congress has seen since the war started.

KICKING LABOR IN THE PANTS

American war workers whose miracles of production made possible the defeat of Germany and Italy are about to be kicked in the pants. And already they are being told they had better like it. As war contracts are being terminated and cut back all over the country, newspapers and magazine writers and radio commentators stooging for corporations are ridiculing labor demands for full employment and maintenance of purchasing power.

Two typical attacks on the workers were those of the Hearst sycophant, Paul Mallon, in his column in Tuesday's Milwaukee Sentinel and of the Saturday Evening Post's Washington editor, Forrest Davis, in a recent issue of that magazine.

Mallon hit at the recommendation of the UAW-CIO, that basic wage rates be revised to provide the equivalent of 48 hours pay for 40 hours work. It is obvious that widespread cuts in take-home pay will have a seriously depressing effect on the whole economy but Mallon does not see that. He says, "How much good the wage increases will accomplish is subject to objective questioning." He says increases in basic wage rates would "necessitate great price increases" and would "sponsor further inflation."

Well, price increases and inflation would not necessarily follow maintenance of take-home wages, especially if price controls by the Government are not lifted.

But the true position of Hearst's man Mallon is told in this comment of his:

"Millions of war workers are inefficient, unskilled labor, which receive far more pay than their services were worth, but which is now determined to keep those overpaid jobs in preference to returning to their former lower paid work."

Mallon's column reveals him to be a despiser of the workers and an ignoramus in economics, but all of that is not unique in a Hearst paper. The purpose of noting his column here is to show the kind of attack being made on the American war worker these days.

The Saturday Evening Post article, entitled "The Sixty-Million-Job Myth," is a vicious effort to club down labor's demand for full employment in the postwar period.

The article is contemptible in motive and dishonest in its presentation. Its motive is to obstruct a national program for full employment. Its method of presentation is to make side cracks about Henry Wallace and Sidney Hillman, to tell half-lies and whole lies about the full employment program, and finally, to miss completely the point of the sixty-million-job slogan.

In his article Davis says that 60,000,000 jobs "became the slogan of a left-wing cult—a cult, energetically captained by Wallace and Hillman, determined to put job-finding at the center of a State-controlled economy and the wage worker in the national saddle. If democracy is government of the people, the Wallace-Hillman junta may be called a jobocracy."

In the above sentence Davis' object is to direct the fear and hatred of the middle-class readers of the Post against the workingman, to scare the reader into believing that grimy, overalled factory workers are going to run the Government and that such control, called jobocracy, is quite different from control by the people, which is democracy, and which apparently does not include the filthy workers.

A little later in the article Davis insinuates that this jobocracy or control by the workers is the same as nazism and that that is really what Henry Wallace is advocating. He says that when Wallace testified before the Senate Commerce Committee in January he advocated "jobs guaranteed to the worker, farms for the tenant, capital to the small businessman, homes, education and medical care for all flowing from the ever-bountiful Government—what more did the heralds of National Socialism offer?"

Dirty, isn't it?

It is also clear that the Saturday Evening Post is opposed to job opportunities and homes, education and medical care for everybody.

A sideswipe is taken in the article at the full employment bill of which Senator JAMES E. MURRAY is a sponsor. Davis says the bill "is surely the farthest north in the left-wing campaign for a planned economy here."

Of course, Davis does not tell what the provisions of the bill are. Nor does he tell what its purpose is.

The bill calls for an annual report by the President to the Congress on the total number of jobs which private enterprise can offer, and on the total number of job seekers, with recommendations on how the Government can assist private enterprise in providing more jobs and how Government can make up whatever deficit exists in the job budget in order to attain full employment. Clearly, the bill is a move to save private enterprise.

Davis, like other reactionaries, keeps on repeating the false argument that advocates of full employment want the Government to provide jobs for everybody. The truth is that they only want the Government to provide jobs for those whom private enterprise cannot employ. If private enterprise can provide full employment jobs for everybody, then hurray, Government will not have to do it.

Another below-the-belt blow in the article is the assertion that the CIO's main interest in full employment it its greed for dues. No kidding, here is what the writer says, "A mass labor movement such as the CIO needs an abundance of workers who can be levied on for cash and regimented at the polls."

The big point in the article is that nobody can tell how many jobs will be necessary for full employment in the postwar period but the figure of 60,000,000 is too high. Because, says the Post, there will not be that many workers.

Well, the point of labor's demand is that jobs be available for every person who can and wants to work. To bring about that situation there will have to be more jobs than workers. It is jobs that labor wants—jobs for workers. Not workers for jobs. If 60,000,000 is too many, if America can get full employment with 57,000,000 jobs, shall we say we have failed?

Soldiers' Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, everyone has a postwar plan. Supplemented by elaborate charts, graphs, and statistics, we are all preparing blueprints for reconversion. Our American GI's, however, have quietly formed their own plans for the future. From their meager salaries the doughboys have deposited $150,000,000 with the Treasury of the United States. They have invested additional millions in War bonds.

This is potent evidence that our fighting men realize their stake in the future, and are intelligently planning for it.

Today I introduced a bill which will permit the soldier, at his option, to leave his deposit with the Treasury, to be repaid in three or six equal monthly installments after his discharge.

Under the present law the entire deposit with the Treasury is repaid to him on the day of his discharge. Usually he has no immediate need for the money. If it can be paid to him after he returns home to familiar surroundings, he will be less subjected to the pressure of unwise expenditures—he will have an opportunity to orient himself—to adjust himself to civilian life before drawing upon his savings.

In other words, I have constructed a little asbestos lining for his pocket to prevent the money from "burning a hole in it." It will be his own decision, however, whether he needs it, or uses it.

Address by Hon. Andrew J. Higgins, Before the Academy of American History, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech by Hon. A. J. Higgins which is of tremendous interest to every American:

Thursday, April 12 will forever be remembered as one of the fateful moments in American history.

In the sudden death of President Roosevelt our grief-stricken Nation faced a crisis that tested both the character of our people and the new Chief Executive. There were possibilities for panic or worse in the loss of such a great personal leader as Mr. Roosevelt.

That the American people and Government never once faltered withal the intense grief and sense of personal loss is perhaps the highest tribute that can be paid to Harry S. Truman.

The midwesterner who neither sought nor desired the Vice Presidency squared his shoulders as he saw his chief lowered into the grave—and we, the people of the United States, figuratively squared our shoulders with him and said, "Harry, we're for you. So step in there and pitch."

My own estimate of President Truman was summed up in this statement issued after Mr. Roosevelt's death:

"President Truman comes to office ably prepared to do the job in a simple, sensible American way. He has the ability to designate authority. His knowledge of war activities, his position in the Senate—particularly as head of the Senate investigating committee that bore his name—and his ability to select sound advisers qualify him well. His fundamental Americanism causes us to have complete confidence in our new President.

"There should be no disturbance on the part of our allies as to our continued interest in world affairs. President Truman has said he will carry on the broad war and peace policies of his great predecessor."

The following morning in talking to him for half an hour or so at the White House, I was impressed by his confident and decisive manner and by his humility. There was a certain heroic quality in this man as he grasped the reins of government in the firm hands that had held a plow on the Missouri Valley plains, and the way he handled himself gave reassurance to those who saw him and to the stricken Nation.

When he went to Capitol Hill for conference he became the first President in at least two decades who had gone up the hill for such a meeting. Humbly and simply he told his congressional friends of both parties that he just wanted to assure them in person of his intense desire for cooperation.

His audience in the Senate has been described as "warmly sympathetic" and it was just that.

Here is how Time magazine describes his first few days in office:

"In a few breathless days the United States people got an idea of how their new President would carry on. Harry Truman was quick, decisive, seemed to have a talent for working hard without getting confused or losing his temper."

The past is prologue to the future. Let us look at the background and the character of Harry S. Truman, and there we may find evidence of the kind of President he will be.

Our thirty-third President was born in Lamar, Mo., May 8, 1884, but spent most of his early life on the family farm at Grandview, in Jackson County, near Kansas City.

His forebears, of Scottish and English stock, came to Missouri from Kentucky. His father was a farmer and horse trader, who had served in the Confederate Army. Perhaps that accounts in part that President Truman's viewpoint is more southern than midwestern, for the fact that on the walls in his Senate office hung the pictures of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

He grew up on a farm. His 91-year-old mother recalls that he could plow the straightest row of corn in the quarter. He knows well the struggle with the soil and the heartbreak and happiness of working on the land, both as a child and later as an adult partner with his father on their 600-acre farm.

Low family finances prevented college, so he went to work. His early jobs included wrapping papers in a newspaper circulation department, washing bottles in a drugstore, and clerking in a bank.

Few know it, but Truman was a decorated hero of the last war. He led his tough Kansas City outfit through heavy fighting at St. Mihiel and the Meuse-Argonne, winning a citation for calming a panicky company in action. One of his favorite souvenirs is indicative of the high regard his men felt for him. This is a 10-gallon loving cup purchased by the men of Battery D from the dice-game kitty on the troopship journey homeward.

After the war he started life anew by setting up, with a war buddy, a haberdashery in Kansas City. In the depression of 1921–22 it failed, as did many another small business at that time. Truman went into debt $20,000 but paid off every one of his creditors over a period of 15 years.

His business gone, he went back to the farm, where we find him approaching the age of 40 back at his boyhood job of plowing.

I have heard President Truman say—and his experience has special significance today as our boys begin to come home from World War II—that the starting point in his political career was his overseas military service. Mark it well that overseas military service started Harry Truman off in politics, because we will have its parallel many times again.

Because he was beloved by the men in his battery he was put forward by a group of these comrades for the office of judge of the Jackson County court. One of the loyal supporters in Battery D was Sgt. Jim Pendergast, nephew of Tom Pendergast, the Kansas City political boss. Jim Pendergast told his uncle that "the boys in Battery D want Harry Truman on the ticket."

Truman was elected. In 1926 he was made presiding judge. For the next 8 years he supervised public works, levying taxes, building highways, and directing the spending of impressive sums of money. He served in that capacity until a few months before his election to the Senate in 1934, dispensing more than $25,000,000 for road building without a shadow of a doubt ever having been cast on his honesty or integrity.

Paul Wooton, Washington correspondent for the Times-Picayune, who knows Truman intimately and likes and respect him, had this to say of his association with the Missouri organization:

"This was also true of Nicholas Longworth. It has been true of a large number of men who have made great contributions to public service. This is due to the fact corrupt bosses often select impeccable men

to hold jobs in the Nation's Capital where they necessarily live in a goldfish bowl. Insofar as President Truman is concerned, his private life and personal integrity are above the slightest suspicion."

After taking a seat in the Senate, Truman quickly won the respect of his colleagues by his quiet but efficient activity.

He played a leading part in the railroad finance investigation—an inquiry that resulted in the Transportation Act of 1940. He also helped plan the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Now we come to his most important contribution in the Senate—his work as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, which became known by the work of its chairman, as the Truman committee.

I once gave Harry Truman a chuckle when I said the United States now has four branches of government—the executive, the legislative, the judicial, and the Truman committee, and although it was said in jest, it came close to the truth.

The history and conduct of the Truman committee are of interest to us because they afford the best yardstick by which to appraise the methods President Truman may use in administering the vastly greater problems which now face him.

Truman urged that it would be smarter, more efficient and more economical to do the investigation and checking up on this war at the same time the money was being spent.

He introduced a resolution setting up a special committee to investigate expenditures in the rapidly expanding defense program of 1940–41. The Senate voted him a $15,000 appropriation and the chairmanship of the committee.

The first thing he did was to name as committee counsel a brilliant young Midwestern lawyer, Hugh Fulton, who is responsible for much of the committee's good work. Fulton directed a small but exceedingly able staff of fact-finders. The committee's work began with an investigation of military camp construction, which resulted in an estimated saving of $200,000,000 in that activity alone. And here the Missouri Senator found his World War No. 1 military experiences of great help to the committee.

Truman's conduct at the committee investigations reveals a good deal of his political and administrative methods. He did not, as some other congressional figures, operate his committee as a one-man show for his own aggrandizement. He delegated responsibility to other committee members, notably Senator MEAD, of New York, who is now the committee's able chairman, and Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia. Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, and Senators BURTON, BALL, and BREWSTER, among others. Yet with all this delegation of authority, when it came to decisions they were made by the chairman, or in accordance with his ideas.

Senator Truman, who in 1942 and 1943 had emerged as a national figure, was now well along his way for a date with destiny in the White House.

Anyone who knows Harry Truman knows that he neither sought nor desired the Vice Presidency of the United States. On June 4, 1944, about 6 weeks before the Democratic Convention in Chicago, it so happened that I made a talk there before a meeting of Rotary International. In this talk, I referred to the outstanding record of the Truman committee, and went on to say that Senator Truman's knowledge of the administration of government and American industry made him the best qualified man to be a strong right arm to Mr. Roosevelt in the conduct of the war and in the postwar diplomatic conferences to secure a workable and enduring peace.

A few days later I received a letter from Senator Truman. He said for me please not to run him for Vice President, that he had no ambition to be the Vice President. He added that, while it is a most honorable office and anyone ought to be honored to fill it, he liked his job as a United States Senator, and that is where he wanted to stay.

Truman not only did not seek the Vice Presidential nomination but he felt the President might not want him because of the slashing criticism of some phases of the administration made by the Truman committee.

Well, we all know what happened at the Chicago convention. Other candidates who were prominently mentioned were considered, for one reason or another, unacceptable to certain groups. Senator Truman was nominated as the outstanding man for that high office.

Vice President Truman made himself exceedingly useful to Mr. Roosevelt in matters concerning relations between the White House and the Senate. Many times in his 4 months as Vice President he helped to smooth over differences and to promote better understanding and more harmonious relations.

The Vice President of the United States occupies a rather peculiar office which is not exactly what it appears to be. In a business firm the vice president is an assistant to the president and relieves him of much of the burden and detail of running the company. Unfortunately, in the early days of our Nation, it seems that the Vice President had so little to do, besides presiding over the Senate, he spent most of his time representing the President at social functions. The tradition was set.

However, now that we find ourselves without a Vice President for one of the few times in American history, would it not be well for Congress to reexamine the duties and responsibilities of that office and enact legislation that would make him actually an Assistant President? Let the Senate elect its own Presiding Officer and have the Vice President at the White House where he belongs instead of listening daily to senatorial oratory which, interesting as it sometimes is, is not sufficiently important to claim all the working time of the No. 2 official of our Government.

From the background, character, and public acts of Mr. Truman we may draw certain conclusions as to what his policies will be as President. His greatest strength is his ability to work with different personalities with varying viewpoints.

He believes that Congress should share with the President in deciding important issues. His standing with Congress is high. As a Senator he had the friendship and respect of practically everyone on Capitol Hill. That he values his relationship with Congress is shown by his luncheon visit to Capitol Hill within 24 hours after taking the oath as President. This relationship will undoubtedly be of the greatest significance when the end of the war terminates the present congressional grant of extraordinary Presidental powers.

The increased influence of Congress has already been seen in the invitation extended by the President to Senator MCKELLAR, the Senate's new Presiding Officer, to sit in at Cabinet meetings. Mr. Truman's belief in a balanced constitutional government may be expected to have far-reaching changes. If other Allied Nations have had fears that Congress and the Senate would stand in the way of a permanent world peace organization and security treaties, they should take note of this relationship and find in it reassurance.

In the prosecution of the war there should be no important changes.

In the domestic management of our Government President Truman will expect and demand efficient, common sense operation of executive departments. If he does not get it, I predict that those at fault will feel the effect of the old Truman committee techniques in action. Offenders will be called to the White House and given a deadline to get right—or else. He brings into the executive department a desire for impartial investigation of governmental operations which do not meet these standards.

As to his political philosophy, let us turn to his own words on that subject. On February 22, in making a Washington Day address to the Jefferson City High School, he said, and I quote:

"I like to think of our State of Missouri as situated near the heart of America and politically—like its physical counterpart—just a little left of center."

He has described himself as a "common-sense liberal." His liberalism was born of struggle and experience. More so than perhaps any other President in history, he is the average American in heritage, in appearance, and in experience. The farmer's boy who plowed the straightest row in Jackson County, the war hero who fought bravely in his country's service; the merchant who failed during a great depression; the man who would not be licked.

Our new President is as much a symbol of the American people as Winston Churchill is of the British. He is of the people more than any President since Lincoln. He is impeccably honest, fair-minded, and loyal. He has a remarkable talent for making and keeping friends. He is a hard worker. His patriotism runs deep, and he has shown ability to rise to his responsibilities. He is cautious but he is also courageous. He meets issues squarely. He can be tough when he thinks the public interest is not being served. His humility and modesty is demonstrated by his remarks the morning after Mr. Roosevelt's death. Here is what he said:

"There have been few men in all history the equal of the man into whose shoes I am stepping. I pray God I can measure up to the task."

He is a clubbable person. He likes people, enjoys playing poker, spinning yarns, and taking an occasional drink. He is unassuming, quiet, and unspectacular. He has a desire for privacy and moderation to a greater extent than any public figure I know. He plays the piano for relaxation.

He is the holder of several "firsts." He is the first President from Missouri, the first war veteran to be President since Theodore Roosevelt.

In his dealings with the statesmen of other nations he will be a shrewd bargainer and quite likely unyielding on certain points. Events have already demonstrated that our State Department has toughened up in certain of its relations.

In recent months Mr. Truman has emphasized that the establishment of a permanent peace is his one major objective above all others and that he will put aside all other considerations to obtain it. There can be no question of his sincerity on this point.

His understanding of the average American—what he is and what he wants of life—may well make of Harry Truman a mighty leader for this Nation in the years just ahead.

In concluding these impressions of President Truman, let us recall the words President Roosevelt left behind. In a speech he had prepared only a few hours before his death, Mr. Roosevelt said: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

And so I say to you, a great Captain of the Ship of State has passed on. Another now stands at the helm. The course is plotted, the chart prepared. The log records our victories on all the seas, in the air, and upon lands strange to us. There awaits but to

record our complete triumph in the final battles ahead and to bring permanent peace upon the world.

May I here paraphrase the immortal words of Longfellow:

Our Ship of State will sail on—a Union strong and great.
Humanity, with all its fears and hopes of future years,
May safely hang upon its fate.
And we vow to the new Captain of our Ship of State—
We will not fear to breast the sea;
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

Education Must Play a Vital Role in the Postwar World if Permanent Peace Is To Be More Than a Global Political Phrase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, peace is a way of life which requires preparation and training just as training and preparation are required for war. The world must train itself to want and practice peace if the world is to enjoy it permanently.

The action taken by this House last Tuesday, May 22, when it voted its approval of my resolution (H. Res. 215) advocating the creation of an International Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the action of the Senate in approving a companion resolution the following Thursday are steps in the direction of creating a world desire and a world demand for peace. I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that word has just reached me from San Francisco that a wording committee representative of over 30 nations has agreed upon the wording of an amendment to the San Francisco charter which would incorporate the gist of the resolution which we approved last week as a part of the document to come out of the present United Nations Conference. This is another big step of progress in the direction of making possible a world consciousness which will understand and utilize the ways of peace.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a recent editorial appearing in the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This editorial thoughtfully discusses some of the problems which will challenge the forces of education and statesmanship in the postwar world:

UNFORCED DEMOCRACY

You can't make people good by law, according to an old maxim, and a demonstrably true one. Neither can you browbeat or sandbag any people into accepting democracy as a form of government and way of life. This is especially true if, in their origins and traditions, they have known little of the spirit and practical application of democracy.

The Southern Congressman who is advocating that German prisoners of war be subjected to "forcible indoctrination" in democracy is indulging in sloppy thinking. True lovers of an enduring peace cannot afford the emotional luxury of endorsing such a viewpoint. Carried to its logical conclusion, that policy would refute, with deadly effectiveness, everything for which they now stand.

Imposition of any tenet or principle by force implies the use of authoritarian tactics, which is exactly the thing we want to avoid if we want to show our conquered enemies that our system is better than theirs. Teaching them democracy under duress would not be merely self-contradictory, it would only make the obdurate pupils ask, in all reason, just how democratic methods differ from the totalitarian ones they have always known.

The Christian Science Monitor soundly answers the "forcible indoctrination" proposal with this warning:

"Democracy is not just a body of doctrine, which can be taught by rote. It is a scale of values, a way of life, an attitude of thought, which can be learned by observation, by hearing or reading, what democrats think, and best of all, by experience. To compel a soldier trained in the Nazi climate to learn or even listen to mere words about democracy would confirm his belief that democracy is a sham."

The Army, which is as close to the problem as any agency could be, is taking a sensible and promising view. It is reported that prisoners showing a tendency to be open-minded and of flexible disposition are being encouraged to observe and inquire into the merits of democratic processes. Educational courses are being made available to them.

If this is "coddling," as might be thoughtlessly charged, then it is also "coddling" to teach American boys and girls, in the home and school, of the incomparable advantages of living under a republican form of government and accepting the responsibilities of good citizenship.

The present war has been correctly blamed by Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, on improper educational systems thriving in various parts of the world. German and Japanese teachers have been "on the wrong side of the ledger," MUNDT recently told the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee.

Only by a positive approach can this dreadful mischief be undone. The task of reindoctrination will be hard enough without making it more complicated—and even downright futile—by our succumbing to an orgy of hate and hysteria.

For United States Courthouse in Civic Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on May 24, 1945:

FOR UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE IN CIVIC CENTER

With the plans for a Brooklyn civic center rapidly approaching a state of assurance, the Eagle is delighted to learn of the possibility of the inclusion of still another important governmental building in the group planned for this area. We refer to a Federal courthouse.

At present the Federal courts are all housed in the so-called Post Office Building along with various other Federal offices. But the existing court accommodations are becoming more and more inadequate as the volume of business in them increases due to the numerous war-connected cases now coming before them. It is the belief of Federal officials—to which we subscribe—that the calendars of the Federal courts will increase constantly during the postwar era.

We were therefore glad to learn of the action of the Brooklyn Bar Association in appointing a committee to try to bring about the erection of a new and separate Federal courthouse and the endorsement of that move by Representative EUGENE KEOGH and Lewis C. Ryan, president of the New York State Bar Association.

Postmaster Frank J. Quayle also warmly approved this plan because the new courthouse would give more badly needed room to the Post Office Department. The area suggested for the new courthouse is the block bounded by Washington, Tillary, Adams, and Sands Streets.

It is well to remember that one of the most outstanding buildings in the Manhattan Civic Center is the striking Federal Courthouse. The situation of the court calendars here fully warrants such a structure in Brooklyn.

Albert Deutsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that the people and press of the great State of Wisconsin are alarmed by the contempt charges voted by the Veterans' Committee against Albert Deutsch, reporter for the newspaper PM. Many people have written me, protesting what they believe is a serious violation of freedom of the press.

I personally concur in that view. I further believe it is high time that either the charges are formally revoked by the committee or are brought on the floor for immediate action.

As indicative of the attitude of the press of Wisconsin, I include two editorials, one from the Capitol Times, of Madison, Wis., and the other from the Milwaukee Journal:

[From the Capital Times of May 22, 1945]

FREEDOM OF PRESS IS AT STAKE IN THE PM CONTEMPT CASE

A real issue of freedom of the press has popped up in the Nation's Capital, the outcome of which may have far-reaching effects on the historic rights of newspapers and their correspondents.

The case involves Albert Deutsch of the Washington staff of the liberal New York daily, PM. Using information supplied to him in confidence by inmates and employees of veterans' hospitals, Deutsch published several articles critical of the administrative

policies of those institutions. He was called before the Veterans' Legislative Committee of the House of Representatives, ostensibly to testify concerning the charges made in the articles.

However, when Deutsch appeared before the committee there was no effort made to get at the subject matter of the articles. Instead, the committee, which is headed by the Mississippi medievalist and demagog, Representative JOHN RANKIN, sought to force him to divulge the names of those who had supplied the information. This Deutsch refused to do on the ground that it would constitute a violation of journalistic confidences.

RANKIN, who has carried on a malicious campaign of vilification against PM, sought and secured a citation of contempt of Congress against Deutsch. The swift action RANKIN was able to obtain against the representative of a liberal organization is in notable contrast to the hesitancy shown by congressional committees when the spokesmen for reactionary groups refuse to divulge information to official committees.

The reactionary propaganda organization, the Committee for Constitutional Government, one of whose high officials was sentenced to the penitentiary in the last war for collaborating with the German Government, is a good case in point. Summoned before a congressional committee last fall, spokesmen for this tory outfit bluntly and arrogantly refused to provide a list of its contributors. There was a lot of loud talk about contempt at the time, but no action was taken.

When a liberal organization like PM is involved, however, strutting Congressmen suddenly become aware of their majestic dignity.

The Capital Times believes that a newspaper has as much right to withhold confidential information as a lawyer or a doctor. This right is indispensable to one of the most vital functions performed by the press—the exposing of graft, corruption, and injustice. If this right can be nullified it will result in encouraging administrative officials to conduct their duties in their own interests rather than in the interests of the public.

If the House votes to hold Deutsch in contempt, it will have established a precedent fraught with danger for the future freedom of the American press.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 24, 1945]

THE "CONTEMPT" OF DEUTSCH

After committee members had twice refused Chairman RANKIN'S demand that they cite for contempt Albert Deutsch, representative of the New York newspaper PM, they were bullyragged into a vote of 13 to 5 for doing it. But before they met again, the committee members had decided that the matter should not go to the House. Now Congressman EDITH ROGERS, Republican, says the contempt charge is dead. A wise decision.

Mr. Deutsch, who had written a long series of articles on the care of veterans, including abuses, was called before the Veterans' Committee. There he offered to give them all the information he had. But Chairman RANKIN wanted to know where and from whom he got it. Mr. Deutsch was ready to give him all his sources, except the names of five physicians who had asked and been given his pledge of secrecy.

These five names RANKIN demanded and Deutsch refused. RANKIN wanted none of Deutsch's information. Apparently he wanted to drive Deutsch into a corner with his threat of contempt proceedings in the House, which could be punished by fine and imprisonment for 30 days.

That is Congressman RANKIN'S idea of a free press. The country was benefited by the revelations Deutsch made, but he proposed to keep his word. Everyone who knows anything about newspaper work knows that useful information is frequently obtained in this way. Government officials say many things off the record, with confidence that the source will not be revealed. A promise given physicians, presumably in the Veterans' Administration and afraid of reprisals, is just as much a promise.

Whether Mr. RANKIN had in mind persecuting doctors who had talked is not known. He certainly did not have in mind getting the best and fullest information for the use of his committee and the service of the public.

Twenty-two Groups Support Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 28, 1945:

TWENTY-TWO GROUPS SUPPORT EXTENSION OF OPA—INFLATION DANGER GREATER THAN EVER, SAY HEADS WHO URGE FIGHT ON AMENDMENTS—TAFT PROPOSAL ASSAILED—LEADER OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN FAVORS PRICE CEILINGS AND FLOORS FOR TWO MORE YEARS

WASHINGTON, May 27.—Heads of 22 national organizations today issued a call to their memberships to join in a Fight Inflation Week, June 10 to 17, in a move to support legislation to extend for 1 year the Price Control Act, which expires June 30. Their call to action declared:

"The danger of inflation is greater than ever before. There must be no negotiated peace with inflation. There must be no compromise with black markets. Rationing must continue to assure fair sharing and to enable us to prevent starvation of liberated peoples."

In a press conference, spokesmen for the organizations assailed two proposed amendments to the price-control bill—the Taft amendment and the Thomas amendment.

Both Paul Sifton, of the Union for Democratic Action, and Don Montgomery, of the CIO, asserted that the Taft amendment would end price control by compelling OPA to figure cost plus profit, item by item, putting an end to the price-freeze system which has thus far been used to control prices.

WANTS RIDERS TAKEN OFF

Mr. Montgomery defined the Thomas amendment as "a plan to make each industry show a profit, more profit than in peacetime." Once that got started, he said, it would soon become a profit-insurance law instead of a price-control law. He reported 300,000 unemployed in Detroit due to cutbacks, as a warning that inflation would add to other threatened economic ills. He continued:

"We want the riders taken off, such as were put on by the canners, preventing OPA from using the Government definition of quality to set prices, so that all grades were put at top ceiling."

Dr. Caroline Ware, of the American Association of University Women, declared:

"Remembering the last war, and the fact that the real inflation came after the cessation of hostilities, my organization favors price floors and ceilings for 2 years after the war is over. But Capitol Hill committees are wedded to the 1-year idea."

Representatives of the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the League of Women Shoppers said they were certain their organizations would carry out intensive campaigns in Fight Inflation Week.

OFFICIALS SIGNING CALL

Officials signing the call for their organizations were:

Katharine Armatage, League of Women Shoppers, Inc.; Mary McLeod Bethune, National Council of Negro Women; Elisabeth Christman, National Women's Trade Union League; Nathan E. Cowan, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Ruth Craven, National Council of Catholic Women; Laura Essman, Ladies Auxiliaries, Railroad Labor Organization; Mrs. Herman Lowe, Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, A. F. of L.; Willard E. Givens, National Education Association; Mildred Gutwillig, National Federation of Settlements; Mrs. James W. Irwin, National Board, YWCA; Elizabeth McGee, National Consumers League; Kathryn McHale, American Association of University Women; Rev. Francis McPeek, Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches; Lelia Massey, American Home Economics Association; James G. Patten, National Farmers Union; Leslie Perry, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Millard W. Rice, Disabled American Veterans; Mrs. Faye Stephenson, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, CIO; Colston Warne, Consumers Union; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, National Council of Jewish Women; A. F. Whitney, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Mrs. Sifton, Union for Democratic Action.

Urgent Need for Investigation of Our Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of my home town, and all over the country for that matter, are deeply concerned over conditions reported to exist in our veterans' hospitals throughout the country. Our veterans' organizations, particulary the American Legion, feel that a speedy, thorough, and searching investigation should be made of the facilities now offered our wounded and disabled veterans by our veterans' hospitals and the policies and practices pursued by those in charge of these institutions.

I sincerely hope that the committee of Congress charged with this responsibility will go into these charges and reported conditions at the earlist possible date and make its report back to Congress so that remedial action may be promptly taken.

Mr. Speaker, these wounded and disabled veterans are entitled to the best facilities, treatment, and care that a grateful Nation can give them. Whatever is necessary to be done to insure them these benefits, care, and treatment, must be done and done speedily.

As a member of the Samuel T. Adams Post, No. 66, I know personally the fine group of veterans who adopted the resolution their commander mailed to me and

their deep concern for a thorough housecleaning if found necessary. The time has come when the country should know the facts.

Under the leave granted, I am inserting the letter of the commander of our post and resolution adopted by its members, which are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
SAMUEL T. ADAMS POST, NO. 66,
Kennett, Mo., May 23, 1945.

Hon. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am herewith enclosing a resolution which was passed by Samuel T. Adams Post, No. 66, of the American Legion, relative to the reported conditions which are prevailing in a great many of our Government's veterans' hospitals.

There was approximately 90 members of our post present when this action was taken and the members of this post are deeply concerned about the future of our veterans' hospitals if these conditions which the newspapers and the magazines are relating are true.

We are quite sure that the present committee which Congress has set up to investigate this situation can depend 100 percent on every veteran and American Legion member to lend his full cooperation to the end that such conditions can be eliminated and remedied to a great extent.

We have full confidence in you to the end that you will exert every effort to give the needy veterans of World War I and II every consideration, and especially those who are in need of hospitalization.

Yours very truly,
HUGH R. CAWTHON,
Commander.

Whereas Samuel T. Adams Post, No. 66, of the American Legion at its regular meeting held on May 3, 1945, did, among other things, discuss the conditions relative to the veterans' hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the said membership of the Samuel T. Adams Post, No. 66, was of the unanimous opinion that the United States Congress should make a thorough investigation of the conditions which are said to exist in the veterans' hospitals relative to the care and treatment of the veterans of World War I and II: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Samuel T. Adams Post, No. 66, of the American Legion, assembled at a regular meeting in the city of Kennett, Mo., respectfully requests, That the Congress of the United States require of its special committee appointed to investigate veterans' hospitals to make a thorough investigation of each and every veterans' hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration so that the American public may have a true and correct picture of the situation which prevails among said hospitals in regard to the treatment of disabled veterans; and

Resolved, That if the special committee appointed by Congress to make said investigation finds that the same have been operated in a careless, unskillful, and haphazard manner, then to reprimand, discharge, and relieve the present personnel of the Veterans' Administration from their duties in the operation of said hospitals and place the operation of said hospitals in safe and careful hands in order that disabled veterans shall have the proper care and treatment while patients in such institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee shall and will make public its findings and facts and its recommendations to Congress so that the American public and the veterans of World War I and II will know that such conditions, if true, will at once be remedied and that the veterans will be supplied with the kind of medical treatment that Congress and the people of the United States have always intended for them to have.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of Missouri's United States Senators, our Congressmen, and the National and State headquarters of the American Legion with a request that they exert every effort to remedy the situation in order to stop what might soon be a national scandal.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH R. CAWTHON,
GEORGE T. GILMORE,
ELBERT L. FORD,
Resolutions Committee.

Blessed Is the Peacemaker—Tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt by Fuller Warren

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and moving address entitled "Blessed Is the Peacemaker," by Fuller Warren, an eminent and beloved citizen of the State of Florida. The address is a eulogy of and tribute to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When President Roosevelt died yesterday, desolation laid its cold and numbing hand on the heart of humanity all over the world. With his body will be buried the brightest hopes for mankind's deepest yearning—permanent peace. He is gone, and no man can fill his place.

"I am one among the thousands who loved him, and I stand with the millions who lament his death." These tender, beautiful words, spoken a little more than 55 years ago of another great and good man who also died in Georgia, express my feelings about President Roosevelt.

No person in all the long and tragic history of the world ever meant so much to mankind. No man ever did so much for so many people. No man was ever needed so badly. No death ever left the world in such a lurch. No death was ever so universally mourned. No such man ever before lived. "He caught the heart of humanity in the fervid glow of his own, and sweeping from triumph unto triumph, died on yesterday the foremost statesman in all the world.

For thousands of cruel years mankind has groped in vain for peace. Billions, literally billions, of living, breathing, feeling human beings have been brutally slaughtered in the unending succession of wars which have ravaged the world. God's own son came down from heaven and tried to stop war, but He failed. Since the Saviour "walked and talked" with men, there has been an average of about one war every 13 years in some part of the world. Each succeeding war has become increasingly more destructive and ruinous. World War I killed something like 25,000,000 human beings. Nobody knows how many people have been slaughtered in World War II. It is estimated that the number of slain and starved is near 100,000,000—almost as many as the entire population of the United States. It is generally believed that one more world war will destroy the human race.

President Roosevelt was the one bright hope of humanity that another world war could be prevented. By common consent he was the world's ablest and most ardent apostle of peace. He created the good-neighbor policy for the western world, which was and is a practical demonstration that a large and important part of mankind can live together in peace, concord, and good will.

He had gone a long way toward extending the good-neighbor policy throughout all the civilized earth. His good will, genius for friendship, and great heart enabled him to harmonize the two most diverse and dissonant nations in the world—Russia and Great Britain. He had lifted up fallen France. He gave help and hope to charred and crushed China. He saved Italy from actual starvation.

President Roosevelt was the greatest unifying influence in the universe. He was, in fact, the only unifying influence in a bewildered world. I have seen his smiling picture alongside the pictures of Christ and the saints in the humble hovels of the poor and propertyless in Europe and Africa. Even in the islands of the sea, his name was uttered with affection—almost with reverence. In every land I have been, he was well beloved. Truly, he was the incarnate triumph of a heartful man.

The deep devotion that freedom-loving peoples of all lands felt for President Roosevelt, his marvelous gifts of mind and heart, and the almost universal belief that he more than any other man was responsible for defeating the most terrible assault ever made upon civilization, placed this brave and beloved man in the best position any person ever has been to make a peace that would prevent the wreck and ruin of another world war. President Roosevelt had dedicated, consecrated himself to the terrific task of eliminating war forever. Before death struck him down yesterday, he had already gone a long way toward doing it. He had avoided all the tragic mistakes President Wilson had made. He made isolationism a hissing in the ears of most Americans. He personally brought into being and named the great coalition known as the United Nations. His unrivaled genius for diplomacy guided the Grand Alliance through the crucial Conferences at Casablanca, Cairo, Tehran, and the Crimea. He watered the soil of international cooperation and planted in it the seeds of enduring peace for all peoples.

This marvelous, mighty man had prepared the blueprint of permanent peace. He was in a fair way to erect from it a lasting structure at San Francisco. He had already planned a message for that momentous meeting. Why he was not spared for that great and sorely needed service at San Francisco is something I can't understand. Inscrutable, indeed, are the dispensations of fate. No man ever had a better and brighter opportunity to bring the priceless blessing of lasting peace to a war-weary world. He was taken just when we needed him most. What will it profit us if we win this war and are forced to fight another one a few years from now—all because he could not be there to make the peace permanent?

No death was ever so untimely. No death was ever so fraught with terrible danger for all mankind. I cannot help fearing that President Roosevelt's death means that the earth will again run red with the blood of countless millions of innocent victims of another and infinitely more horrible world war.

The world never owed so much to any man. When the new barbarians of Germany set out to reduce civilization to ruins President Roosevelt was the first statesman to challenge the cruel killers. No friend of freedom

can ever forget the "quarantine speech" against aggressors which he made at Chicago in 1937. He clearly foresaw and foretold the brutal nature of the Nazis, and he took timely steps to repel the ruthless killers. But for President Roosevelt millions of Americans very likely would be in German concentration camps or in mass graves, and the cities of our country a charred pile of ruins. A hundred years from now people will kneel in gratitude to God that Roosevelt was here to lead America and the world in their darkest hour.

It is a cruel and bitter irony that he was not permitted to witness the great victory he did so much to bring about. But it is some consolation to the millions who loved and admired President Roosevelt that, like Moses who looked across Jordan to the Promised Land and then died, he was spared long enough to see ultimate victory not far off.

Out beyond the stars amid the amaranths that bloom perennially in the garden of the immortelles, may his great soul find the rest which was denied his weary body here on earth is the hope and prayer of one who loved him in life and mourns him in death.

Retrocession of South Tyrol to Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by me for delivery in New York City which the business of the Senate prevented me from delivering.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apart from Vienna, there is no geographical designation so characteristic of Austria as is the name of Tyrol. Though Tyrol is only one of Austria's provinces, it has left a deeper impression on the imagination of the world than almost any other European region. It has always stood for untouched nature, pinewoods, pastures, and a bewitchingly beautiful and majestic mountain landscape. It is a country of mighty mountain ranges, which, like Switzerland, have produced a hard-working, pious, stubborn, and freedom-loving people—the Tyrolese.

The favorable and protected position of their country has filled the Tyrolese with the love of freedom and democratic institutions which is unmatched even in the famous Swiss cantons. Indeed, the Tyrolese preceded Switzerland in their peasant democracy. While everywhere else in Europe, the farmers were mere serfs, the peasants of Tyrol were free and formed one of the sovereign provinces of the country. Their army, like that of the Swiss, was a people's army, and each Tyrolese jealously guarded the right to keep his own weapons in his home. This long tradition of uncompromising independence produced fighters, who, in 1809, guided by their peasant leader Andreas Hofer inflicted the first crushing defeat on Napoleon, at a time when even the powerful nations of Europe were unable to fight him.

Since 1919 the name of Tyrol has become synonymous with one of Europe's most aching questions—the problem of south Tyrol. The Treaty of St. Germain allocated to Italy half of Tyrol, placing 230,000 Austrian Tyrolese against their will under Italian rule, creating thereby a new minority problem hitherto unknown. To understand the tragic mistake one must realize that Tyrol, except for a short while at the time of the Napoleonic war, has never known foreign masters. Tyrol has been an individual state unit ever since the seventh century and the north had never been separated from the south. They had always remained loyal to Austria.

The annexation of south Tyrol was made in shocking violation of President Wilson's 14 points. Point 11, dealing with Italy's future border, reads: "A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality."

Lloyd George, writing about south Tyrol, says: "It must be admitted that the hacking off of essentially Tyrolese villages from the rest of Tyrol was incompatible with the principles of self-determination implicitly embodied in the original war aims of the Allied statesmen."

Colonel House writes: "I have often wondered just why Wilson consented to this (Brenner) line. Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and I discussed it during the armistice proceedings, and the three of us came to the conclusion that the Tyrolese should not be taken from Austria."

And Dr. Charles Seymour explains that President Wilson admitted that the injustice "has been due to insufficient study."

Even prominent democratic leaders in Italy are now sharing this view and are willing to return this border region to Austria as it does not represent a material or ideological value to Italy.

During the Fascist regime in Italy, south Tyrol—as neutral reports sent to the League of Nations show [1]—has suffered worse mistreatments than any other minority in Europe. The Italian attempt of denationalization included the prohibition of their language in schools and churches, and the word "Tyrol" was banned by law. Singing of Tyrolese songs was punished by jail sentences or even deportation. Even tombstones had to be Italianized. All towns and villages received Italian names. And the population was forced to accept all Italian institutions and were compelled to it by Fascist brutality. Finally part of the unyielding and heroic Tyrolese population was deported by force to Germany following an agreement reached between Hitler and Mussolini. For the first time in 12 centuries this highly civilized and profoundly democratic people had lost their freedom.

Now it is time to repair this miscarriage of justice as the Encyclopedia Brittanica calls the partition of Tyrol.

Under the guarantee of self-determination of nations and of the Atlantic Charter, south Tyrol must be permitted right now to rejoin northern Tyrol.

The first step ought to be to put southern Tyrol under Allied military government depending from the commander of the Allied occupational forces in Austria. South Tyrol, today liberated from Fascist tyranny, ought to be under the same administration as north Tyrol, liberated by American troops. Local Tyrolese administration should be reinstated and the Italian administration ought not to be permitted to function again in southern Tyrol.

The next step would be to give back to Austria and to its province of Tyrol the 100 percent Austrian part of southern Tyrol until Salurn. In the southern part then, more commonly known as the Trentino, a democratic plebiscite under Allied supervision ought to determine its future.

All liberal-minded and democratic Italians agree with Austrian liberals and democrats, that in the future the best possible relation must exist between Austria and Italy. This good relation can only exist if south Tyrol is returned to Austria in the forthcoming peace.

[1] Memoires of Sir Willoughby Dickinson and Sir Walter Napier. Union Internationale des associations pour la SDN. Commission permanente des Minorities: Bruxelles 1927.

Mighty New Veterans' Organization Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham, from the Boston Herald of May 27, 1945:

MIGHTY NEW VETS' OGANIZATION SEEN—COULD EVEN BE INTERNATIONAL—MAIN FUNCTION TO END ALL WARS

(By Bill Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—So far as the machinery of Congress is concerned, an investigation of the War Veterans' hospitals has provided most of the clanking and creaking this past fortnight. The distinguished Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been up front in this laudable effort to get at the facts. Representative PHILBIN has made the issue of veterans' hospitals a prime personal mission and Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is also prominent in the subject.

What will or will not come out of this investigation is vital, but it's only a part of the general war veteran subject, and that general subject is due to be a very important one for, at least, the next 20 years. It's coming freshly home to us because we're beginning to meet the real alumni of the battlefields now, and we're due soon to meet more by the hundreds of thousands. Personally, I've never seen finer nor more self-assured men.

THREE CLASSIFICATIONS

As of the moment, the veterans fall into three classifications. These are the able-bodied veterans, the disabled veterans, and a temporary category consisting of veterans who've had a long stretch as prisoners of war. We all know the case of the disabled veteran and are consecrated to the determination that he have every comfort and care.

It's his case that's been getting the attention in Congress. The charge, right or wrong, is that there has been laxity and negligence in the field of his hospitalization. Those friendly with the officials who have had it in charge are claiming that the agitation is more political than patriotic, but the facts will no doubt wash out eventually.

The veteran who's been a war prisoner, especially if he stood behind the wire for a string of endless months, may call for some sympathetic understanding for a while. Army officials, especially doctors, who've been processing these men toward their homes on the other side, send word that they may need a little help getting back into the swing of things.

"STIR CRAZY" IF HELD LONG ENOUGH

It's known that incarcerated people get what is known in the argot as "stir crazy" if held long enough, even if their time is kept occupied with work and recreation as it is in most of our modern penal systems. The everlasting monotony finally moves in on them to induce a mental lethargy they can't seem to shake. And these are people with something to do.

The war prisoner, on the other hand, frequently has nothing to do, unless he and

his fellow prisoners organize it themselves, and then they have pitifully little to work with. Day follows dreary day and month follows endless month with the same deadly and chloroformic monotony. Finally, in many cases, all sense of time is lost, ability to concentrate is temporarily impaired and, if the dose is especially long, the man may become something of an automaton.

The doctors abroad have reported, for instance, that some of the long-held prisoners find it extremely hard to concentrate. Something will appear to the man to be very important, but if some interruption breaks into the conversation or the thing he is doing, he will find it hard to get back to the subject. If it's something he's been talking about, he may not be able to remember what it was.

NEEDS TO BE UNDERSTOOD

They hasten to say that there's nothing about this that is serious, but the situation needs to be understood by those the men come home to. They simply need a little help to get things back into gear. There's but a limited number of these, however, and, given the right sort of help, they'll be as good as new in short order.

Those are the two categories of veterans who need special handling. There've been a lot of stuffed prophets and pseudo-scientific bilge peddlers who've tried to say that all veterans should be pasted with the billing, "Handle with care." Bearing down especially in the women's magazines and in some of the weepier radio programs, they've practically scared the women of this country into nervous wrecks. They've seemed to be trying to sell the idea that the mother or wife or sweetheart of a GI had best repair herself to the nearest academy of learning that boasts a course in psychology, and drink deeply from that font, lest she get walked out on, or get her everlovin' block knocked off.

This was undoubtedly one way to make money, but if it was anything else, that has yet to be proved.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GI

All of us in this land have watched the GI grow up. I can remember the first awkward and bewildered group of him, gathered north, east, south, and west in those great raw cantonments in uniforms that didn't fit, trying to get the swing of a life that didn't either. We can remember them 4 years ago on the streets, in the hotel lobbies, the bars, and the cocktail lounges. Many of them were away from home for the first times in their lives. Many of them had money to spend for the first time in their lives—some even jobs, or at least, steady pay for the first time in their lives.

Many of them were noisy, silly, some even obnoxious. I haven't seen a dozen men in uniform really drunk in practically 5 years of compulsory service and in travels that have cruised from coast to coast, and all stations between. But in those early days, I saw quite a number who had smelled a few beers and then put on an act.

It's interesting to recall how rapidly those young men grew up. You could practically see discipline straighten the shoulders and pull up the chins. You could see the pride that came with those shoulder patches, and the dignity that came with those campaign ribbons.

THOUGHT IT SMART AT FIRST

Probably the whole story is best summed up in the words of the manager of a hotel that has a bar that, from the first, has been especially popular with the enlisted men of all services.

"We had a lot of trouble in the early days of the war," he said, "We got a lot of kids that obviously didn't know much about city life, and who seemed to think it was smart to get plastered and noisy. We tried to humor them along, but it mostly didn't work. We had trouble aplenty, none, fortunately, of serious trouble, but I never knew when it might get serious.

"Finally, I went to the shore and military police and told them that they'd better post men in our place. They said they didn't have the men. I told them then I'd have to go to the city police, as I couldn't risk a riot, or somebody getting killed. They asked me not to do that, and they finally assigned us a couple of men.

"Their presence cooled the place off a little, but I began to notice as the months went by that it was the customers, not the coppers, who were cooling the place off. Their services were just naturally turning these kids into men. They had a sense of responsibility, a pride in the uniform. They still took a drink or two but they handled it like gentlemen.

NOT NEEDED ONCE IN A YEAR

"We still have the representatives of the shore patrol and military police, but you know where they are now? I have a room for them up on the mezzanine floor. They come in every night about the time the place opens, have their dinner up there and sit around reading the newspapers and magazines. Not once in the past year have we ever called them downstairs. There's nothing for them to do. Those kids have grown up."

They have grown up and never mind the testimony of the proprietors of such metropolitan oases. They've grown up in more important ways. We're meeting them now, especially these homecoming veterans of Europe with the banks of gold slats on their sleeves. There's something in the faces of many of them that wasn't there before, something of maturity, of strain, of, in some cases, suffering, but there's certainly nothing that seems to call for anything but our appreciation and admiration. The very last thing needed unquestionably is a psychological approach. The very last thing these gentleman want is "to be understood," or to have anybody think that they need "to be understood."

Instead, it's pretty sure that they understand, and that they understand a lot of things that maybe we don't. For many of them, the war is not yet over. Japan is very much in business still and many of them will be in uniform in one capacity or another until the world is speaking of Hirohito in the past tense, too.

GOING TO ORGANIZE

It's pretty certain that when they get around to it, they're going to organize a mighty veterans' association, or perhaps move en masse into one of the existing veterans' associations and take it over. When they do they can be the most powerful organization of the Nation and perhaps of the world. Organized labor at the moment is said to have 13,000,000 members in the United States, but organized labor is split into two hostile camps.

The veterans, men, and women, including all who've been in and out, will practically equal that number, and if they stick together they'll outnumber all the rest. What they'll do then remains to be seen, but the guessing is that from their present poise and temper they'll be a more positive force in the postwar affairs of their Nation than organized veterans have ever been up to now.

The bidding for their membership is already active. Hundreds of thousands of them have already joined both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and both these organizations are naturally hoping to perpetuate themselves with this new and mammoth membership. Both were hovering around that San Francisco Conference to see where, if anywhere, they could build for the future.

It seems more likely, however, that when it all shakes down the men of this war will have their own organization, working with the others, perhaps, along the lines of benefits and rehabilitation, but definitely breaking new ground from there.

SUBJECT ALIVE IN FRISCO

Reports at various times seemed to say that at least 100 starts, major and minor, have been made toward organizing the veterans, or their relatives, or both, into some sort of postwar unit. The subject was definitely alive at San Francisco, with at least two groups of this war's veterans publicly stating their plans while representatives of the existing organization watched them carefully from the sidelines.

If not the most articulate of the younger generation, the one that, at least, was getting the more publicity was still very near and very elastic in form, and it called itself the American Veterans Committee. One gathered that that is merely the name of the organizing group, and that the organization, if formed, would have a more typical name eventually.

The spokesman for this crowd was a young Dartmouth alumnus named Charles G. Bolte. His class, as I remember it, was 1940. Through the era of pacifistic excitement on many college campuses he campaigned vigorously in the college newspaper for all the get-ready issues of the time. To show that he had the courage of his convictions, he enlisted in the British Army as soon as he'd received his degree, and, as a member of the King's Rifles, he fought with Montgomery against Rommel in Africa, and lost his right leg at El Alamein.

CLEARING HOUSE OF VIEWS

Back in this country eventually and working for the OWI he found a group of serious-minded young veterans, and some soldiers who still were in action, who were exchanging letters constantly upon the subject of what the war meant to them, and what sort of world they hoped to see after it. He not only joined the correspondents, but, at length, he was the clearing house for it. He finally left the OWI to devote himself entirely to it, and now he is openly trying to promote this interest into the big new veterans' organization that will bind the men of these wars together.

Men of these wars may say it, too, if his plan goes all the way, because when I left San Francisco, he was thinking in terms of an international veterans' organization, an idea that is strictly new. Some young marines are out there, too, with some organizational ideas of their own. They and Bolte's crowd seemed to get this international idea at the same time, and there seemed to be some prospect that they might join forces.

Many men of this war have done some serious thinking, and one constructive idea expressed is that no organization of these new veterans will have the requisite appeal unless it devotes itself to something more serious than just keeping old memories alive. Those who feel that way say that's the chief weakness of the older organizations. Their original platforms were big, but they've really done little. Annual conventions and choral renditions of "Hinky Dinky Parley Voo" are scarcely enough.

GREAT RESEARCH SCHEME

This time, for example, if the new organization, or even, perhaps, if one of the existing organizations would set up and support a great foundation to research the causes of war, to spot them, and prescribe for them if they show up anywhere in the world, the appeal to the new veteran would possibly be strong. That is included in what the San Francisco Security Conference is striving to

achieve, of course, but there'd still be room for a great and serious laboratory.

Those enthusiastic about this plan think top experts in the various fields should be hired and paid salaries level with their status. They could work like the Truman committee, delving into the uncolored facts and giving their findings the fullest publicity. That or some other real excuse for being is necessary in the opinion of those who think in this fashion.

That, however, is looking ahead.

In terms of merely looking around, the veteran of this war is the fellow you said good-by to 3 or 4 years ago, broadened, matured, poised, and self-reliant. There'll be exceptions, of course, but the average amongst him is exactly the same stuff—hungry for home, for the folks, for things pretty much as they were, so far as the comforts and the good times go. Certainly he needs no understanding, nor any special handling, beyond a little common sense. The purveyors of all that bunk need to be especially handled themselves—preferably by a kick in the pants.

Bretton Woods in the Pulpit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

BRETTON WOODS IN THE PULPIT

A special dispatch from this newspaper's Washington bureau opened with the words, "Bretton Woods will be preached from the pulpit" and proceeded to state that the Treasury Department was conducting "educational" sessions for clergymen on the subject of the Bretton Woods agreements, with the idea that they should in turn educate their congregations concerning the merits of these proposals and the importance of their ratification by the Congress. These sessions were held off the record in Federal offices—among others, in the State Department Building and the Senate Public Lands Committee room—and no official reports of their proceedings have been available. Our correspondent describes it as part of the general effort of the Treasury to "build a fire under Congress" and hasten its affirmative action.

Assuming the facts to be as reported [we have no doubts on the point], this sort of thing almost beggars comment. It is hard to decide whether effrontery or stupidity is the main characteristic of the idea of harnessing church pulpits to advocacy of a highly complex matter of international finance, upon which expert opinions differ widely and sharply, in order to influence the actions of Congress.

It is not that church pulpits have not been often used in the past for political propaganda. A few church preachers have always been found willing so to use them. But to the best of this newspaper's recollection, covering some two generations of time, this is the first time that a department of our Government has ever sought to bend them to its purposes. If individual churchmen are willing to misuse their office, that is their own private affair for them to settle with their own consciences and their congregations. Not so when the arm of the state attempts it.

Who started this thing this newspaper does not know. It might interest Congress to find out. But that it should stop is clear. It can do nothing but harm to both church and state.

The Place of Metal in Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest factor in the advancement of our country to its present preeminent position among the powers of the earth has been the utilization of our metal and mineral resources.

It is my privilege to present for the consideration of my colleagues, the address of Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., at the regional conference of the Committee for Economic Development:

POSTWAR PROSPECTS FOR THE BASE METALS AND BASE-METAL MINING

(By Frank Lilly, statistician, Mines Research Bureau, Spokane, Wash.)

In my discussion of the postwar prospects for the base metals and base-metal mining it is not my intention to "accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, or mess with Mr. In-Between."

I am neither a producer of the base metals nor a manufacturer of base-metal products. My interest in the subject is technical and academic, for I am a statistician. I hope that this word will not disturb you too much, although I am well aware that it has been said that a statistician is a man who, given a few figures, can jump off into any body of water, go down deeper, stay down longer, and come up drier than a professional diver.

I promise to use only a few figures—just enough to give you the essential facts, which are both good and bad because this picture has both its lights and shadows.

What is a base metal? What are the base metals? Why is a discussion of their prospects pertinent to a conference of this Committee for Economic Development?

According to Webster the word "base" is applied to certain metals in distinction from the precious metals. However, in practice the nonprecious metal, iron, is not regarded as a base metal; nickel, tin, chromium, and others are classified as alloy metals and aluminum and magnesium as light metals.

The base metals are copper, lead, and zinc, which, although nonprecious in terms of weight price, are essential and precious in their usefulness to mankind. Man had gold, silver, and iron back in the stone age, but gold and silver were useless to him except as ornaments, and iron at best was only temporarily useful because it soon rusted away.

Bronze, an alloy of copper and tin, copper, lead, and/or zinc, provided man the first useful metal because it was nonferrous—not subject to rust—and had the required hardness, weight, and workability to provide the tools man needed. Thereafter, civilization grew apace and more or less in proportion as mankind learned to mine and to utilize the base metals.

Think for a moment what our position would be without the base metals. No practical use of electricity without copper; no self-starting automobiles, very little glass without lead; and a severely restricted use of iron without zinc galvanizing to protect it against rust. These are only a few of literally thousands of uses of the base metals, without which our modern industrial civilization would crumble almost overnight.

It is not too much to say that there would have been no VE-day except for the base-metal superiority over the Axis Powers provided by the production of the mines of North America and especially the United States. (Our iron and steel could not have functioned without the base metals.) We are also assured of VJ-day, and by proper economic development, distribution, and use of the base metals a permanent and prosperous world peace can be maintained.

Thus we see why a discussion of these metals is pertinent to the Committee for Economic Development. There are, however, two important supplementary reasons, which in a certain sense are paramount to us as businessmen and patriotic citizens.

First, the United States, and particularly the Pacific Northwest States, produce enormous tonnages of each of the base metals. And now I must cite you some of the figures you have been expecting, but I'll give them to you in sugar-coated round figures.

World production of the three base metals normally averages around 6,000,000 tons of which two-fifths is copper and three-tenths each is lead and zinc. Of the 6,000,000-ton world total the United States produces about one-third, of which five-twelfths is copper, one-fourth lead, and one-third zinc.

The States included in your Pacific Northwest Regional Conference, Idaho, Utah, Washington and Oregon produce one-fourth of the copper produced in the United States, nearly one-half of the lead and nearly one-fifth of the zinc. If to these States we add the output of another Northwest State, Montana, the proportion of the total output is one-third of the copper, over one-half of the lead and over one-fifth of the zinc. This in turn is one-tenth of the world production of copper, one-eighth of the lead and one-sixteenth of the zinc.

In other words, the production of the base metals in the United States is big business, the average annual yield for the United States approximating one-half billion dollars and for the Northwest States nearly $150,000,000.

And may I in passing call your attention to the fact this metal output is clean, new, permanent wealth that takes nothing from our soil, nothing out of another man's pocket even on a basis of a fair and square trade but, on the other hand, provides new wealth for this generation, and also by its permanency for the many generations to come.

The second supplementary reason why this matter of the base metals is pertinent to this Conference and your committee is the important relation it bears to the jobs it can and must provide for the boys in uniform. I do not need to tell you how important this matter of jobs is nor that now is the time to do something about it.

There has been a great deal talked and written about this matter, but most of it has dealt with businesses rather than jobs. Much of what I have heard and read was inane. One high Government official in an article in Colliers wrote mostly about how the boys would want to go into business as garage or service station owners. This emphasis upon business rather than jobs would disturb me except for the fact that I think the average returning soldier and sailor will not want a ready-made, hand-picked Government financed business but a decent paying job that will in due time provide him through his savings the necessary capital to establish a business of his own choosing and suited to his own capabilities.

Far be it from me to suggest that I have any sure-fire plan for providing the necessary jobs in connection with the production of the base metals or the manufacturing of base metal products. I do, however, contend that the base metals can and should provide far more jobs than ever before.

The consumption of the base metals in our war effort has practically exhausted our supply of these metals, and to a far larger extent than in any previous war, the metals have been utterly destroyed. From all indications the percentage of metal salvage will be very small as compared with the First World War, and much of this salvage will be needed and used in Europe before the war with Japan is finished. Salvage of metals from the Pacific area will probably be negligible because weather conditions will eat up much of it and also because it will be so widely scattered.

Meanwhile we are wearing out our manufactured metal products at home at a rate that is alarming in view of the continuing war in the Pacific and the rapid depletion of our mines. Few mining companies have been able, because of manpower shortage, to do any development work for the last 3 years, and nearly all of the mining companies have patriotically drawn most of their ores from their best ore bodies.

Therefore, we will face at the end of the war, what I predict will be an unprecedented demand for the base metals and base metal products on the one hand and a heavily depleted mine ore reserve on the other hand. At the same time, mining men fear that they will also be faced with continuing high taxes, high wages and, worst and most dangerous of all, bureaucratic regimentation, interference and control.

Right now mining men have another fear, and that is the possibility of a further lowering of the tariff on the base metals on the pretext of being a good neighbor. If this is done it will actually mean creating for foreign cheap labor jobs which by right belong to our boys who are winning the war. Personally, I doubt that President Truman, who comes from one of the largest lead-zinc producing States in the United States, is going to go along on any proposal to reduce the tariff—and jobs for Missouri boys—on these metals.

Singing the same tune as the good neighbor boys, but using different words, are the have-not lads, who argue that this country has reached a have-not stage in our mineral resources and that we should, therefore, conserve them by obtaining our metals from abroad. This, of course, is just another way of depriving our boys of jobs, because it goes without saying that the job we create abroad deprives one of our boys of a job.

There is one other thing that must be corrected if the base metals and base metal mining are to supply a maximum number of jobs. I refer now to the impossible restrictions placed upon the financing of mining ventures by the administration of our State laws and the national SEC law. The laws in themselves appear innocuous enough in the reading of them, but in practice and as administered they have all but eliminated prospecting. That "noble experiment" the prohibition law, created the bootlegger and corrupted our young people. Blue-sky and SEC restrictions are sidetracking and driving venture capital into slot machines and other gaming devices.

Looking at this audience consisting of a goodly number of 200-pounder "he men," it is at first thought hard to realize that they were ever little 9-pounders in three-cornered pants. By way of analogy, every one of our big mines was once a little prospect.

The fact that these prospects were developed into mines and that this country developed the greatest mining industry under procedures now outlawed and illegal should be proof enough that there was something fundamentally good in the old free-enterprise methods.

It is my judgment, based upon an intimate on-the-ground knowledge of the Northwest that its mineral resources have scarcely been scratched. This is particularly true of the State of Washington. No one can convince me that the mineral-bearing areas are marked off from Washington by the Canadian border on the north and the Idaho State line on the east. Nor can I believe that the mineral areas are marked off from Oregon by the California, Nevada, and Idaho State lines.

We have large developed mineral resources and still larger undeveloped indicated and potential resources. And we have and will have for a long time to come a big demand for the base metals. On the whole, therefore, the prospects are bright provided we turn from restrictive to constructive measures.

While I abhor war with every fiber of my being, my study of the world's history leads me to believe that some practical good can come out of war. Perhaps this Nation was getting a bit soft, but, be that as it may, our fighting men, one and all, are learning what work means—that it takes work to win. Facing and learning realities as they are, they are going to have little patience with platitudes, theories, and technicalities. They are entitled to jobs and they are not going to accept any excuses or explanations as to why they are not forthcoming. The base metals and base metal mining can and must provide its fair proportion of these jobs.

This is your job and mine and, as Barney Google's "yardbird" says, "time's awastin'."

What's Causing the Meat Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System May 26:

Shortages are due to:

1. Government regulations.
2. Set-aside orders from the Army.
3. Lack of profit to the producer.
4. Black markets.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

With 22 different Federal regulations in the past 2 years which affect the production of beef and pork, there is little wonder that we have a shortage. Some of these regulations are: Price ceilings, roll-backs, weight limitations, quotas for slaughter, subsidy programs, restrictions on selling and freezes on feed. Rules have been changed in the middle of the feed lot. The Government has not kept its promise to the raisers of hogs. Retail price ceilings are fictitious. To get meat the housewife must go to the black market. The ineffectiveness of meat price ceiling is a notorious failure. The bureaucrats should remember that we do not eat heads of cattle and hogs, but pounds of meat.

These New Dealers who have had charge of the meat program have consistently refused to take the considered judgment and advice of men who are in the meat producing and processing business. The answer of the Government to all their failures has been more subsidies. The recent subsidy of 50 cents which is now being offered to the cattle feeders is hardly a drop in the bucket.

It is interesting to note that the Government is breaking the OPA ceiling on live cattle when it has started to pay this 50-cent subsidy to the farmer. This will place the price on cattle above $18 at Chicago. For a packer to pay above the OPA level is a criminal offense and means inflation. Apparently the Government may exceed the price and they call it preventing inflation. The planners do a jig dance in trying to find a logical explanation. The Government would not think of letting the buyer pay the extra money by letting him have a price for meat that would warrant a profit. The planners must have lots of red tape and have the money pass through several hands before it actually gets to the feeder of cattle. They would not think of letting cattle reach their own level in a free market.

Packers, after June 4, may now collect up to $3.40 on the best grade of cattle. This will mean that $18 cattle will be selling for $21.40, and if we add the 50-cent subsidy to the producer, it makes a ceiling price of $21.90. Now, if these New Dealers would establish a ceiling price of $21.90 and forget about the subsidies, it would not take long for the feeder and the packer to supply all the necessary meat to the armed forces and our civilians. It would also eliminate the black market. Meat would flow through free channels to the public. At the present time there are no free channels. Government regulations and red tape made it possible for the black markets to flourish. It often seems that the OPA and WFA have had a desire for more power over the civilians. They know that if they can control the food supply they can control a nation.

SET-ASIDE ORDERS FROM THE ARMY

Set-aside orders for the military, lend-lease and other Government services is 60 percent, of the good, choice, and commercial beef. It is 80 percent of the cheaper grades and 50 percent on pork. This meat comes from federally inspected plants. Uninspected meat cannot cross State lines; hence, the shortages in centers of population. A recent estimate showed as high as 550 pounds of meat per soldier, either in Europe, or in the pipe lines to Europe. Slaughter quotas for uninspected plants may give the Government more meat but will create additional shortages in the cities.

In my humble judgment, the military has entirely too large a set-aside order of meat. When the war is over, this country may well find that it has a tremendous surplus of meat on hand.

LACK OF PROFIT TO THE PRODUCER

Hundreds of small packing plants have been forced to close because of slaughter quotas and inability to make a profit. Cattle feeders cannot, under present regulation, finish cattle and make a reasonable profit. The Government has been taking meat from the small packers, at less than cost. In doing this, OPA is violating its own regulations. Feeders and packing plants must have the cost of production plus a fair profit or face bankruptcy. The OPA has been trying to limit profits instead of encouraging production. Their downright destructive policy has reduced the supply of meat.

The OPA has tried to prove that the packers and feeders were making money. Their argument falls by its own weight because packers have had to quit by the hundreds. Feeders have not finished their cattle. If such enormous profits are being made, why do they pay additional subsidies? Certainly, the hand of the Government agencies has had a paralyzing influence upon the production of meat through so many unnecessary regulations. Rules, regulations, and charts do not produce meat. Certainly, Congress does not expect any one group to serve the war effort and serve the public at a loss.

Government agencies have failed to cooperate with each other. They have been at loggerheads, issuing bickering and contradictory statements. If this continues, additional "No meat" signs will appear over many counters in this country.

BLACK MARKETS

Bureaucratic arrogance, wrong guessing, ill-advised control, and general incompetence by the OPA and WFA have caused black markets to flourish. The housewife, if she gets meat, must pay black-market prices. Unless food is ample for the civilian population, rationing will be destroyed through black markets. There are only nine meals between man and revolution. People have money and will insist on getting food, regardless of price. When price control breaks, dangerous inflation is on our doorstep.

The only way to beat the black market is through ample production. Black markets pay no taxes. The housewife who must resort to black market prices in order to get meat for her family pays far more than the present fictitious price ceilings which the OPA is trying to maintain. The regulations will cause the legitimate operator to either work at a loss, go into bankruptcy, close his shop, or go into the black market. The OPA and the WFA cannot escape their responsibility in the present shortage of meat. To have production, there must be a reasonable profit. The food commodity must sell within the range of the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. Canada has not had a shortage of meat and they have fewer regulations than in this country. Under a free production, without ceiling prices, their meat costs are less than in the United States.

The uncontrolled, extensive and growing black market will produce a shortage of all kinds of food. Any Government regulation which discourages production and a reasonable profit leads to black markets.

I believe it is possible to write on a post card a few suggestions which, if put into effect, would be a remedy for the shortage of meat. They are as follows:

1. Permit a reasonable profit to the grower and the processor.
2. Remove all unnecessary Government controls.
3. Encourage production.
4. A coordinated food program under one individual with the responsibility and the authority over all other agencies now handling food, which includes production, distribution, rationing and price of food.
5. First priority on production of food with sufficient manpower and machinery to do the job.

In the matter of responsibility and authority, it is my earnest hope that our colleague, Mr. ANDERSON, who will undoubtedly be the Director of Agriculture and assume the responsibility of the War Food Administration, will have undivided authority to put into effect the recommendations he made to the House of Representatives. If there is a divided authority, then Mr. ANDERSON will have no more success than his predecessors, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Jones.

Protest Federal Leasing of Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Committee on Interstate Cooperation of the State of Michigan. A like resolution has been adopted by the Administrative Board of the State of Michigan:

Whereas information indicates that the United States Government is contemplating the granting of permits and issuance of leases for the development of oil upon certain tide and submerged lands lying off shore along States of the Union abutting upon the oceans and tributary waters thereof; and

Whereas such a policy, if engaged upon, would invade the rights of the States and ultimately might effect the State of Michigan by virtue of its proximity to international waters; and

Whereas by virtue of the sovereignty of the respective States, the States have heretofore been declared to be the absolute owners of all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries; and

Whereas the proposal of the United States Government to issue prospecting permits for oil and gas leases beneath tidewater and on lands beneath navigable waters, and in connection therewith the United States Government has asserted the United States to be the owner of such lands, thus creating clouds upon the titles of the true owners thereof; and

Whereas such a policy, if pursued, would work great harm to the people of the several States and would constitute an invasion of the sovereign rights of such States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Committee on Interstate Cooperation of the State of Michigan, That protest be entered against such a policy and that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman of this committee forthwith to all members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate representing the State of Michigan, urging them to use their best efforts in the Congress to prevent the Department of the Interior or any other agency of the United States Government from adopting or pursuing any such policy invading the rights of the State.

Why Destroy Our National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter entitled "Protection at Home" by Otto Herres to the editor of the Wall Street Journal:

PROTECTION AT HOME

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Perhaps an answer to your editorial, Trade Act Irrelevancies (April 26) is given in the succeeding editorial, Gifts Are Not Exports (April 27). However, when the observation was written that, "so far hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on the bill to extend the life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and widen the President's authority to reduce tariff rates without reference to Congress have accomplished little more than a waste of time," only high officials of the administration supporting the bill had been heard.

No doubt it was a waste of time for administration proponents to assert that the depression in the thirties was caused by our tariff laws. Certainly Secretary Wallace was wasting time in saying that we must be able to cut our tariffs another 50 percent to avoid World War III.

The surest way to bring on World War III is to impair our capacity for effective self-defense and destroy our self-sufficiency. If we fail to protect our productive resources as a means of preparedness against foreign aggression, in whatever form, the aggressor will find his way into the Western Hemisphere and our War III will be on.

As to opponents of the bill, a showing has been made by representatives of the mining industry, for example, that tariff reductions caused a drastic curtailment of the domestic zinc industry not in the public interest and resulted in a very critical condition at the start of the war. Today there is a serious shortage of lead, and reserves of ore in sight and developed are limited. But under normal peacetime conditions the domestic production of lead and zinc is entirely adequate for all needs if given reasonable tariff protection. Cut the lead tariff another 50 percent and mineralized ground available for the development of new ore in the Rocky Mountain region after the war will stand idle while capital and technical skill move to Mexico, South America, Burma, or Africa to produce new wealth wherever they will be treated kindly.

It will be no waste of time if the committee learns that a bipartisan tariff commission and the Trade Agreements Act have not solved the tariff problem by permitting administrative officials to write regulations and manipulate schedules. Then perhaps Congress will decide it is time to take a hand in the game and protect the living standards of the people at home. It may be that destruction added to depression equals peace and prosperity, and that free trade, great public debt, and high taxes will give the Secretary of Commerce his 60,000,000 jobs, but somehow that does not seem to be the right answer. Congress might find that we can do more to help the world by keeping this country prosperous.

OTTO HERRES.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of roll call 89, which extended reciprocal trade agreements, I found it necessary on this roll call to pair my vote with the Honorable CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico. He voted for and I voted against the bill. Mr. ANDERSON and I paired our votes to keep a 6:15 appointment with the Columbia Broadcasting System to discuss the problem, "What's Causing the Meat Shortage?"

I voted against the reciprocal trade agreements, not because I do not believe in reciprocal trade, but because of the provision in the bill which would give the State Department the further right to cut our present tariffs as much as 50 percent. I honestly believe that, if this were done, we would find widespread unemployment in the United States because we would not be able to compete with the slave wages and low standard of living which exist in many countries with whom we would trade. I am a firm believer in trading with other countries but we should export those things of which we have a surplus and import those items which are not sufficient for our needs.

It is possible for parts of South America to raise their market beef cattle for as little as 4 cents a pound and realize a profit. It is not hard to realize what a treaty might do to the cattle business in this country if we were to permit this cheap beef to take our domestic markets.

Before the war with Japan and Germany, I had an opportunity to make a modest survey of the so-called variety stores in Nebraska. I found in these variety stores that about 75 percent of all the articles were marked "made in Japan" or "made in Germany." Many of them were cheap imitations of what we make in the United States. However, the fact that these goods dominated the shelves meant that someone in America was thrown out of a job because it was impossible to compete with the cheap material coming in from Japan and Germany.

If America is to remain strong and be able to help a weak world, then we must accept the first law of Nature and that is self-preservation. It is for that reason that I voted against the bill which would permit a further reduction in our tariff regulations.

Tribute to Dead and Missing Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address by Commissioner Thomas M. Woodward, United States Maritime Commission, at the National Maritime Union ceremony to pay tribute to dead and missing merchant seamen, and the memorial dedication of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hall in New York City on Maritime Day:

War is the most terrible thing in human experience. It can be justified only to preserve feedom and civilization. It brings to surface all the hideous passions and barbarities that civilized man thought had been put behind him. It also discloses the finest qualities in civilized man. All that a man hath will he give for his life, yet how many a man has held ideals and purposes worth more than life in this holocaust.

It is most fitting on this Maritime Day, 1945, that we pause for a moment in tribute to the men of the merchant marine who have laid down their lives in a holy cause. Words are so futile to express gratitude to those who gave their lives that we might live—the thousands who went bravely forth over the seven seas to meet the challenge of a ruthless enemy in the face often of almost certain death.

We have today the largest merchant marine in the world, more than four times as large as before the war. We hope to operate in domestic and foreign commerce more than 15,000,000 dead-weight tons. This depends, however, on our haying sufficient commerce to employ these ships. It depends upon national and international measures which will make for the free flow of commerce. It means that we cannot live to ourselves alone.

No group knows better than those assembled here that our merchant marine is made up of men as well as of ships and that however good the ships they can be no better than the men that run them. The Maritime Commission and the country know and are today recognizing what a magnificent job you men have done in this war. You brought the ships through. You delivered the tanks and guns, the food and supplies to the battle fronts in the four corners of the world and on practically every voyage you yourselves passed through battle fronts often more terrible than the very scene of conventional battle. Without your great performance the war of Europe would not have been won. These are not idle words. They are bald facts. The country will never forget that you fought a good fight, that you kept the faith, that you kept your no-strike pledge, that not a ship was delayed by you because of cessation of work. The men on the battlefields and the mothers, sisters, brothers, wives will be eternally grateful. You saved countless lives by your faithfulness and what a glorious record you wrote for the United States merchant marine.

Congress, in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, laid out a clear long range policy for our merchant marine and established the Maritime Commission to administer the act.

It is significant that title III of this act is captioned "Merchant seamen." It recognizes a broader governmental obligation to these seamen. It directs the Commission to investigate employment and wage conditions aboard ships and to incorporate into operating differential subsidy agreements minimum manning scales, minimum wage scales, and minimum working conditions.

Almost immediately upon its organization in 1937, the Commission made an investigation pursuant to these provisions. It held hearings in various ports. It took many hundred pages of testimony. If I recall correctly, your long-time president was one of the witnesses. As a result of these hearings, the Commission drew up and incorporated minimum scales in its operating differential contracts. No one knows better than your president and some of the other officials what were the living and working conditions aboard many American ships 10 years ago. I, too, had some direct knowledge of these matters, for I conducted some of the hearings, and in their course went aboard about 80 ships, examining quarters and working conditions. The Commission set up a Crews Quarters Committee. This committee examined many ships. It made specific recommendations, which the Commission adopted. Certain definite improvements were brought about by the Commission's action but it was difficult to improve greatly old vessels that had been built with an antique concept of the minimum needs of Amemricans on board ship. It was in the new ships where substantial improvements were able to be made and today, generally speaking, our new ships, particularly the long-range ships, offer decent living conditions for Americans. The Crews Quarters Committee still operates and will continue to operate.

Collective bargaining has, of course, had a great part in improving conditions and compensation. Both the men and the operators have greatly profited by it. It has been a mutual educational process and few industries today would contemplate abandoning this method of dealing between employer and employee.

The act thus recognizes men as well as ships and provides that our ships be manned by American citizens. The obvious conclusion of this is that these Americans should be well housed, decently compensated, have all the rights of American citizens, and that, so far as practicable under differing conditions, compensation and living and working conditions comparable to shore-side standards. They have a right in reality and not in theory only to sufficient compensation to live decently and maintain a family and as much of a family life as seafaring will allow. Axiomatically, they should be secured in the four freedoms—freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

We have expended hundreds of thousands of live and hundreds of billions of dollars for these freedoms that are at our masthead. What we can do in war, we can do in peace if we are as determined in peace as we were in war. We have demonstrated that we do not regard democracy as an idle word but that we intend to translate it into realities. It is a sad thing that too often we have failed in instances to make democracy a reality even in our own Nation. We intend that this shall not be in the future. Labor unions and collective bargaining have come to stay.

All groups in the past, whether they be of management, of government, or of working men, have at times been shortsighted and frequently selfish. This is the price of all progress. But we have learned during this war the tremendous power of cooperative action. The intelligent cooperation of the government and of labor unions and of operators which has done such magnificent things in war, if continued in peace, and it must be, will make our merchant marine one of our greatest national assets to serve the country and the world and to approach more nearly the democracy we dream of, and the brotherhood of man.

"Sail, sail thy best ship of democracy. Of value is thy freight, 'tis not the present only, the past is also stored in thee."

Admission to the United States of Fiancees of American Soldiers and Sailors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was attracted by a very interesting article appearing on the front page of the Times-Herald. It says: "Dan Cupid gets a lift—Government to cut red tape to bring GI's fiancees here."

The State Department proposes to facilitate the entrance into this country of the brides-to-be of American soldiers and sailors.

First. I question the wisdom of this action, and further, as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, I question the authority of the State Department to arbitrarily set aside any United States statute.

We now have about 70,000 wives of servicemen, married abroad, who await passage to America. This constitutes a serious problem which has not yet been solved. In the new proposal to facilitate the entrance of fiancees, I see possibilities of grave consequences. You are reminded that throughout Europe there are four or five women to every three men. Everyone, both men and women, are clamoring to come to America. If their entrance is made simple, there is a possibilty that we open the way for wholesale engagements—for convenience—and in the natural course of

events, marriage for convenience. If and when these marriages are consummated, then comes the hardship cases. We will find that the new wife from abroad is the only support of aged parents or the sole support of minor sisters and brothers. So eventually the whole crowd will clamor for admittance to America.

I want to tell every American soldier and sailor, in all parts of the world, that we have a fine American girl here waiting for him to come back home. Our girls are beautiful and healthy and want to live here in America, marry American men, and raise American families.

Let our boys get back and away from the strain and drama of war and they will want a girl just like the girl that married dear old dad. Our girls do not need a break. Just do not handicap them. Again, let us think of our own for a while.

Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, according to the following news item, it seems that an article appearing in one of our leading weekly magazines a few days ago critical of the loan provision of the GI bill is to some extent in error.

Contrary to the article, Mr. Pitt H. Stark, vice president of the First National Bank of Ceredo, W. Va., states that his bank considers that the loans that it has made are good and sound and involve no great amount of paper work.

This bank is located in a town of about 1,300 inhabitants and leads the Nation in loans granted under the provisions of the G. I. bill:

GI LOANS MADE BY CEREDO BANK

Pitt H. Stark, vice president of the First National Bank of Ceredo, announced today that the bank has made 20 loans to veterans of World War II, all for buying homes, under provisions of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. Stark made his announcement following appearance of an article in the current issue of Collier's magazine, by Kyle Crichton, associate editor, contending that red tape and credit-standing requirements were defeating the purpose of the bill's loan provisions.

Mr. Crichton in the article said that only nine loans to veterans have been made nationally to date under the act, which insures 50 percent of such loans up to a maximum of $2,000.

The associate editor claimed that veterans, applying for such loans, must have gilt-edge credit ratings and must fill out forms a yard long before the applications are even considered by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Stark said his bank considered the loans it has made "good business and sound loans." He added the bank considers it a patriotic duty to give every consideration to applicants for the loans, and that making them involves no great amount of paper work.

Representatives of the Veterans' Administration here said that the First National Bank of Ceredo occupies first place in the Nation in number of GI loans granted. A Texas bank, with six loans, occupies second place.

The First Peace Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

At the end of a long and sharp debate, which culminated in a personal appeal by President Truman for favorable action, the House of Representatives has approved a bill which proposes to give the Government power to continue and expand the Hull program of reciprocal trade agreements. No more important legislation has come before Congress in many months than this first test of American policy toward the nature of the postwar peace. For at least three chief reasons a continuation of the Hull program is indispensable—so indispensable, that the defeat of this legislation at this time would have been a major political calamity.

In the first place, it is evident that both public and private loans from the United States, loans made on a sound basis, will be necessary for the reconstruction of Europe, a task which needs to be undertaken as much in our own interest as in the interest of our European allies. Such loans cannot possibly be made on a sound basis unless there is reasonable hope of repayment. And since the only practicable method of repayment is in terms of goods, the whole problem of postwar reconstruction is tied up intimately with the problem of achieving reasonable reductions of barriers to trade.

In the second place, even more than in the years before the war, many American industries are now geared to a production which will require profitable foreign markets if the existing volume of domestic employment is to be maintained. Again we face the fact that in the long run, and particularly since we have already acquired most of the world's gold, American goods can be bought abroad only with the proceeds of goods sold in our own markets, and bought there, because they represent good values at reasonable prices by American consumers.

Finally, since the United States is admittedly the most powerful economic unit anywhere in the world today, it is obvious that our action will be the most important single influence in establishing the whole economic pattern of the postwar years, and in determining from the very start whether the trend will be—as it would certainly have been if the Hull program had been rejected—toward a narrow economic nationalism, with foreign trade largely in the hands of Government monopolies, or whether the trend will be—as there is now more reason to hope—toward a freer exchange of goods, a relaxation of governmental controls, a survival of the private enterprise system and an era of economic good-will which will lay a sound basis for the work of the new international peace organization which is now being established at San Francisco.

This is the first important international issue to come before Congress since the end of the war in Europe, and the vote on it must give cause for second thought to many of those who felt, in the last election, that it was safe to trust the Republican Party in Congress with the direction of international issues, on the ground that that party had turned over a new leaf and seen a new light since the days of its opposition to lend-lease, to repeal of the arms embargo, to selective service and to the original grant of authority to Mr. Hull to negotiate his trade agreements. For, in the critical test which this new legislation met on Saturday—the question whether or not to kill the bill by recommitting it—only 7 Republicans could be found in the entire House of Representatives who were willing to give their support to continuing and expanding the Hull program. One hundred and sixty-seven Republicans—a majority of 23 Republicans to 1—voted to send the new bill back to committee.

Such a performance as this can profit the Republican Party, politically, only on one assumption: only on the assumption that there is a swing-back of public sentiment in this country to the old days of political and economic isolation between the two World Wars. On any other assumption the House Republicans have taken a position and written a record that must be a heavy handicap to any Republican candidate for the Presidency in the next election.

It now remains to be seen what will happen in the Senate.

The Golden Gate Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the opening of the Golden Gate Bridge on May 28, 1937. This majestic publicly owned bridge is one of the engineering marvels of all ages. Its magnitude and beauty are only surpassed by the supreme majesty of the Golden Gate itself—the world-famous marine highway which connects the great Bay of San Francisco with the Pacific Ocean—and whose shores it connects.

The Golden Gate Bridge had its official inception on November 12, 1918, when I introduced the following resolution as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, which I had prepared in collaboration with James H. Wilkins, longtime mayor of San Rafael:

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco has been impressed by the discussion relative to the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate by the Federal Government; and

Whereas it is evident that the construction of such a bridge would be of incalculable value to San Francisco by connecting it directly with the northern and central counties of the State and with the transcontinental railroad system; and

Whereas such a bridge would add a feature to the Bay of San Francisco without parallel in the world; and

Whereas it is a necessary step to determine by expert examination whether the project involves insurmountable engineering difficulties or prohibitive costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be urged to promote the necessary legislation providing for a preliminary survey and report with a view to determining

whether the projected bridge is practical or not.

Adopted: Board of supervisors, San Francisco, November 12, 1918.

Ayes: Supervisors Brandon, Deasy, Gallagher, Hayden, Hocks, Hynes, Kortick, Lahaney, McLeran, McSheehy, Mulvihill, Nelson, Schmitz, Suhr, Welch.

Absent: Supervisors Hilmer, Power, Wolfe.

J. S. DUNIGAN, *Clerk.*

Approved, San Francisco, November 13, 1918.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr., *Mayor.*

The passage of this resolution by the unanimous vote of the members present marked the beginning of a long uphill fight that tried the souls and patience of the men who pioneered the project. Differences of opinion arose as to the feasibility of the project. Encouraged by the selfish ferry interests, which held a monopoly on all bay transportation, these differences increased in magnitude so as to almost defeat the entire project.

Nevertheless, there were public-minded citizens who believed that the construction of the bridge was entirely feasible at reasonable cost. Supported in their position by such outstanding bridge engineers as Ralph Modjeski, O. H. Ammann, Leon F. Moisseiff, Joseph B. Strauss, and Gustave Lindenthal, they carried on the fight under the most trying circumstances. Those of us who supported the project recognized the urgent need for the construction of the bridge and we conducted a strenuous campaign to encourage public support in the counties of northern California. As a result of this campaign the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, through its president, Frank P. Doyle, sponsored a meeting of citizens in 1923. To coordinate our efforts through organization, I introduced a resolution at this meeting providing for the appointment of a citizens committee of five. This committee, consisting of Joseph Hotchkiss, Frank L. Coombs, Capt. I. N. Hibbard, Frank P. Doyle, and myself, carried on the fight in the months that followed.

As a result of the work of this citizens committee, Hon. Frank L. Coombs sponsored legislation which was enacted by the State legislature, of which he was at the time a member, creating the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, composed of San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties. This action made the financing of construction of this great publicly owned bridge possible.

Another serious problem in connection with the construction of the bridge arose in the fact that Federal military reservations occupy each side of the Golden Gate. To construct the bridge it was necessary to secure a grant from the War Department, and to also secure the War Department's approval because the bridge was to cross navigable waters.

To facilitate this matter, I introduced the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on September 7, 1923. At the time I was chairman of the committee on commercial development of streets and highways of the board of supervisors:

Whereas the commercial, financial, and economic development of the State of California, and particularly the cities and counties located on and adjacent to San Francisco Bay, would be accelerated by the establishment of modern and rapid transit facilities; and

Whereas tentative plans have been prepared by J. B. Strauss, of Chicago, and M. M. O'Shaughnessy, chief engineer of the city and county of San Francisco, for the construction of a bridge connecting the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, which plans are both practical and economical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the War Department be respectfully petitioned to improve or correct, if necessary, the proposed plans for said bridge between the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, and to order that a hearing be held in the near future, to determine whether or not said bridge would be a hindrance and obstruction to navigation in said waters.

Adopted: Board of supervisors, San Francisco, September 4, 1923.

Ayes: Supervisors Bath, Colman, Deasy, Hayden, Hynes, McGregor, McSheehy, Morgan, Mulvihill, Powers, Robb, Rossi, Schmitz, Scott, Shannon, Welch, Wetmore—17.

Absent: Supervisor McLeran—1.

J. S. DUNNIGAN, *Clerk.*

Approved, San Francisco, September 7, 1923.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr., *Mayor.*

The War Department conducted an exhaustive investigation. Hearings were held before the United States Army engineers in the city of San Francisco. The strategic importance of such a bridge in national defense plans was demonstrated at these hearings. It was pointed out that the large number of military and naval establishments in and around San Francisco at that time would be directly connected by the bridge and thus would be eliminated the use of the circuitous and antiquated ferry system, which required three-quarters of an hour as compared with less than 5 minutes by use of the bridge.

The important geographical and strategic location of San Francisco and the entire San Francisco Bay area to the security of this Government in the event of war in the Pacific and the fact that the bridge would bring the huge empire to the north of the Golden Gate into direct traffic communication with the great seaport city of San Francisco, were both emphasized. That high naval and military officials were aware of this importance is amply indicated by repeated testimony of these officials before congressional committees.

Finally, as chairman of the committee on commercial development, streets, and highways of the board of supervisors, I received the following grant from the Secretary of War, John W. Weeks, dated December 20, 1924:

CHAIRMAN, COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSBAY BRIDGE COMMITTEE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Under date of March 31, 1924, you applied through the district engineer for approval of the plans of a bridge to be constructed across the Golden Gate, San Francisco Bay, in behalf of the city and county of San Francisco and the county of Marin of the State of California. Your application has received full consideration by the War Department, and I am pleased to inform you that the project as a whole meets with my approval, subject to the following comments:

Since this bridge connects two military reservations there was a military question involved which prevented it being handled in the ordinary manner and final action taken by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War only, as would have been the case if the question of the interests of navigation alone had been the only one to consider. The objections to the bridge from the military point of view can be eliminated if the city of San Francisco and the counties interested in its construction will bear all the expense connected with the moving, rebuilding, and replacing of elements of the defensive and other military installations damaged by such construction; will bear the expense of construction and maintenance of approaches to the bridge; will give the United States complete control over the bridge in time of war; will permit Government traffic at all times free of charge; will make provision for wire and pipe lines on the bridge for War Department use free of charge; and will subject the construction of the bridge and its approaches, so far as such construction relates to the military defenses of the harbor and the military reservations affected, to the direction of the Secretary of War or his authorized representative, the district engineer, First San Francisco District.

It is understood that you will proceed with your plans and will submit applications for the definite permits necessary before actual construction can commence. These are:

1. Approval by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War of detailed plans of the bridge;

2. Permits from the Secretary of War for rights-of-way across the military reservations, Fort Baker on the north and the Presidio, San Francisco, on the south;

3. A permit for the temporary occupancy of certain areas on the two military posts necessary for construction activities.

The application for the approval of the plans for the bridge should be submitted to the United States engineer office, First District, San Francisco. The other applications may be submitted directly to the Assistant Secretary of War. All applications should be for a definite and settled project, and it is suggested that the exact site of the bridge and location of approach roads must be determined, after consultation with the Commanding General of the Ninth Corps Area, before applications for the rights-of-way and the temporary use of land are submitted in order that the exact metes and bounds of the territory required may be given. When these applications are received they will be given immediate attention.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. WEEKS,
Secretary of War.

Full justification of these early predictions are to be found in the fact that today San Francisco is one of the greatest ports of embarkation in this country, if not in the entire world, and that the San Francisco Bay area is a literal beehive of military and naval activity. Within that area are to be found some of the most important permanent military and naval establishments in the United States. I have referred to these establishments in detail in my statement before the House of Representatives in January 1945, concerning the need for adequate highway and bridge construction in defense areas.

With the enactment of the necessary State legislation creating the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District and the grant of authority from the War Department, the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge was assured. An election was held under the laws of the State of California to provide for a bond issue of $35,000,000 to finance the project, which received more than the required two-thirds majority favorable vote.

Because of the interest taken in the project by Joseph B. Strauss, who gratuitously furnished his technical knowledge and service throughout the preliminary stages, a contract was entered into appointing him chief engineer. Associated with him at the express request of Wilmer P. Filmer, chairman of the bridge directorate, and myself, were Messrs. O. H. Ammann and Leon S. Moisseiff, world renowned bridge engineers, whose contributions were largely responsible for changing the design of the bridge from the ugly cantilever type originally proprosed, to the graceful suspension bridge now spanning the Golden Gate.

And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I may be forgiven for my pardonable pride in having been directly associated with the Golden Gate Bridge from its inception, both as the member of the board of supervisors who introduced the original resolutions before that body, as a member of the original citizens committee of five, and officially as a director of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District from its creation to the present time.

The great importance of the Golden Gate Bridge to national defense is further demonstrated by the fact that practically all north and south troop and supply movements along the entire Pacific coast pass over the bridge, thus saving the valuable time that would be lost by the use of a long since outmoded privately owned ferry system. The value of this time-saving bridge would be incalculable in the event of an attempted invasion at any point along the Pacific coast.

I have already referred to this great structure as one of the engineering marvels of all time. It is the longest single clear-span bridge in the world, being 4,200 feet in length. It is 700 feet longer than the George Washington Memorial Bridge, which crosses the Hudson River. The towers, which support 36-inch cables, carry the full weight of the bridge span and are 746 feet above mean high water, or approximately 200 feet higher than the Washington Monument here in the Nation's Capital. These 36-inch cables contain approximately 80,000 miles of wire and were woven in place on the bridge at the rate of 173 tons of wire per day. The vertical load on each pier is 164,800,000 pounds, and they are sunk into bedrock. Their great size can probably be appreciated to some extent by a description of the south pier at the San Francisco end of the bridge. Its depth extends from 44 feet above to 100 feet below the water level; its base area is 80 feet by 160 feet, while its top area is 65 feet by 140 feet, and it contains 152,311 cubic yards of concrete.

This magnificent structure was built during the depth of the depression and without a single dollar of Government aid. It marks the triumph of public enterprise so well demonstrated by the city of San Francisco and her sister counties to the north. The inspiration of the Golden Gate Bridge prompted the late Hon. John Steven McGroarty, poet laureate of California and former Member of this House of Representatives, to write a poem, from which the following is taken:

THE BRIDGE

Dream of the years and ages past—
Now sky and sea are spanned at last,
The severed land is joined once more
As in the aeons gone before,
And once again, bright-winged of Fate,
The gods salute the Golden Gate.

Now shall we call from Time's dim maze
The mighty ghosts of other days,
Pontists and sailormen and all
Who saw the empires rise and fall,
They that in their hour and day,
A striving world set on its way,
Striking new milestones on the land,
Teaching new cunning for the hand
Of groping, stumbling man, that he
Might mark the trails and chart the sea.

Ghosts of old Pontists, dead and gone,
Who bridged the streams at Avignon,
Who wrought where tides of Tiber ran,
Who laid the stones of Isfahan.
Builders in Albion and Cathay—
Rennie, Abbas, and Benezet.
And he who in the new-born West
Put mill and furnace to his test.

* * * * *

Wraiths of the mariners who dared
The unknown tides and seas, and fared
To find in flame of sunset fire
The lotus shores of Heart's Desire,
A land that only dreams can make—
Puget, Cabrillo, and Francis Drake,
Viscaino and his ships in flight
Off Gaviota in the night.
And then the dearest of them all
That ever sailed a brig or yawl,
Swart Juan Ayala, crew and mate,
The first to win the Golden Gate
Steering from cypress-shored Carmel,
Prow of a Spanish caravel
Eager and bold, and on its lea
A shallop from a redwood tree.
Ghosts of builders and sailormen
Come from the dust and waves again!
Look on this wonder time has sped
On the dim way your visions led.

Here on the road the cable spans
Is ceaseless clamor of caravans,
Laden with spoils of plain and field,
Fruit of the vine and orchard's yield,
Gifts of the loom, meat for the mart,
Silver and gold from earth's deep heart,
Magic lamps for Aladdin's eyes,
And furnace flame in the midnight skies.

Gods of the trees, the vine, and stone,
Lord of the Covenant, does this atone
For burdens borne and the bitter load
That left its scars on the age-old road?
Is this reward for the stone and tree?
This mighty path o'er the mighty sea,
This sky-swung, dazzling dream, elate,
A starlit roof for the Golden Gate.

Man and his servant Time stand here,
Builder and toiler and engineer
Who, in the grime of their labor, smile
And go to their tents to rest awhile,
The kingly battle they waged is won,
The bridge is builded, the task is done,
The story told that was long to tell—
And God's in His Heaven and all is well.

Celebration of I Am an American Day at Chicopee, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in many cities and towns throughout the Nation I Am an American Day was observed on Sunday, May 20, when several hundred thousand men and women were formally welcomed into American citizenship. In the city of Chicopee, Mass., which I have the honor to represent in Congress, the Kiwanis Club sponsored the celebration, and through its president, Mr. John J. Korkosz, honored me by inviting me to deliver the principal address at the exercises.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the address which I delivered as follows:

Today in all parts of our vast Nation the hand of welcome is being extended to those who in the past 12 months have become citizens of the United States of America. Some have acquired citizenship through naturalization, others through reaching their majority during the past year.

We whose privilege it is to have been born Americans, and we who were equally privileged to achieve American citizenship in past years through naturalization, rejoice with you that you have joined the great company of those who call themselves Americans.

Today is I Am an American Day and all of us are tremendously proud that we are Americans. But on the particular I Am an American Day the pride which we feel is extraordinary. For less than 2 weeks ago the valiant men of our Army and Navy forced the unconditional surrender of a foe who threatened everything that being an American stands for and who would have destroyed all that we Americans hold dear.

Relentlessly, from the hot sands of Africa on to the hard-won beachheads of Italy and Normandy, and across France and into the German homeland itself our gallant young men drove our enemy before them and finally forced his capitulation. In the doing they brought liberation to the people whose lands had been overrun by the conqueror and whose liberty and freedom had been torn away by the oppressor.

Many of you who today make up this inspiring gathering of Americans came from those oppressed countries. By the taking of the oath of American citizenship you have proclaimed yourselves lovers of liberty and freedom, and so, in the victory of our arms you have especial cause to rejoice. The loved ones and friends you left behind in those countries have been saved because Americans were willing to fight for their freedom. Now as Americans yourselves, you have a rightful share in the satisfaction which all Americans feel in the heroic deeds of their fighting men.

The American, as you have doubtless discovered from living among your neighbors in this country, is not by nature a truculent individual. The American Nation has no dreams of conquest, no desire to take by force from other nations their territory or their trade. In the winning of his own freedom, the American came to have a great respect for it. Liberty was not easily acquired by America and like any possession which is secured through hardship, it is cherished.

What is this freedom which Americans throughout our glorious history have been willing to lay down their lives to obtain and to hold? What is this liberty, this democracy, which Americans have gone to war twice in the last 25 years to preserve?

This freedom, this liberty, is based upon a number of rights and privileges guaranteed to every person who is an American. These rights and privileges, which all of you here today acquired the moment you took the oath of citizenship or which you secured as your birthright, are the law of the land and no man or group of men can take them away from you.

First of all, you have the right to speak and write your thoughts and to assemble with your fellow Americans for the purpose of solving the problems which confront you as an individual or collectively as a group. If you have grievances, you are entitled to petition those in authority to remedy them.

You have the right to vote—to choose your public officers, who are, in fact, not your masters but your servants. When you believe that your elected representatives have not performed their duties as you would wish them to, you have the right to vote them out of office and replace them with others.

The right to choose your work, your profession, or your vocation is yours. Our national life is studded with men of great distinction in the arts and sciences, in business, and in the professions, who foresaw their opportunities and in the free society which is America were able to take advantage of them without interference from bureaucratic officials.

To be sure, the right to choose one's field of employment has been somewhat curtailed during the war, due to the necessity to divert labor into essential industries. But this restriction is only temporary and like all other controls which the exigencies of the national emergency have forced upon us, is being relaxed as conditions permit.

In this connection, may I quote from a recent address of the leader of the Government of our great neighbor and ally, Great Britain. In a speech before the annual conference of the Conservative Party of March 15, 1945, Winston Churchill said:

"If we are to recover from the measureless exertions of the war, it can only be by a large release from the necessary bonds which war conditions have imposed on us. No restriction upon the well-established liberties that is not proved indispensable to the prosecution of the war and the transition from war to peace can be tolerated.

"Control for control's sake is senseless. Controls under the pretext of war or its aftermath which are, in fact, designed to favor the accomplishment of totalitarian systems, however innocently designed or whatever guise they take, whatever liveries they wear, whatever slogans they mouth, are fraud which should be mercilessly exposed * * *."

As Americans, we have the right to speedy trial by jury if we are accused of a crime. Before the courts, every man is equal and there is the same justice under the law for the poor man as there is for the rich.

Another of the rights of Americans is the privilege to educate your children in the free public schools. No other nation in the world has finer schools and nowhere in the world are the educational opportunities so great. In this generation, the young American man or woman who does not possess at least a high-school education is the exception rather than the rule. Great numbers continue to study in the State universities or in other colleges and go on to become doctors, lawyers, clergymen, or specialists in the scientific and commercial fields.

The earliest immigrants to these shores came here to escape persecution for their religion. They came in order to worship God as they saw fit. And so, when the founding fathers met to frame the Constitution, which is the supreme law of our land, they wrote into it in unmistakable language a provision that there should be no interference with an American's right to worship his God according to the dictates of his own conscience. That is another and one of the most priceless privileges which is ours as Americans.

Now, all these rights and privileges are not without their responsibilities. If we are to enjoy liberty and freedom, we must be willing to accept certain obligations that are necessary to their preservation.

It has been said that "Obedience to law is liberty." Certainly the author of that statement did not mean that there is any freedom under political systems where the people are obliged to obey the edicts of dictators or tyrants. He was talking about America, where the laws are enacted by the chosen representatives of the people. In this country the people make their own laws. The laws are made not for oppression but for the protection and benefit of all citizens.

A learned judge once said, on addressing a group of newly naturalized citizens:

"You will miss the whole message of American democracy if you fail to apprehend the truth that our national way of life is founded on a broad and rational accommodation between unrestrained individual freedom on the one hand and the necessities of community living on the other. Washington and his collaborators in the molding of the Constitution publicly acknowledged and defended that adjustment, for it is a compromise of social living, not of conscience."

As an American, therefore, your first duty is to obey your country's laws.

Where the will of the people prevails, your Government seeks to reflect the will of its citizens. The way in which that will is expressed is through the ballot. It is, accordingly, your duty to vote and to keep yourself informed of the issues before your Government. It is your duty to judge the men who seek public office on the basis of their honesty, their ability, and their worth as public servants.

You have other duties as Americans. As you demand certain services of your Government you must be prepared to pay for them and you therefore have a duty to pay such taxes as are assessed by your Government for their cost. You have a duty to serve on a jury when called, so that any of your fellow citizens accused of a crime or involved in a civil process, may be fairly judged. You have, above all, the duty to defend your country if the need arises.

This year, on this I Am an American Day we are paying especial tribute to those who have answered the call of their country in its hour of greatest need. This day, which we here observe is dedicated to the more than 100,000 servicemen who have been naturalized since Pearl Harbor.

These are the men who, if called upon, are prepared to give their very lives that the rest of us may continue to enjoy the fruits of liberty and freedom in America. In dedicating this day to them, let us solemnly pledge that we will keep faith with them. Let us here resolve that we will ever be worthy of our American citizenship; that we will be mindful of the great sacrifices which the men and women of this and other wars have made that our lives, our liberties, and our right to the pursuit of happiness might be secure.

Although Germany has been beaten, there are still difficult days ahead of the Nation. A strong and fanatical foe still faces us in the Pacific. The fight to final victory will be a hard one. When that victory is achieved, the tremendous problems of building an enduring peace will be upon us. It will be a time when the leaders of ours and other nations will need all the wisdom and judgment they can command. It is such a time as inspired Josiah Gilbert Holland to write the immortal lines with which I will close.

"GOD GIVE US MEN

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds;
Their large profession and their little deeds
Mingle in selfish strife, lo, freedom weeps.
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps."

Religion Must Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the world must never have a repetition of the imprisonment of preachers in concentration camps for teaching the gospel, or of Gestapo spies sitting in the congregation of every church, or of churches becoming the propaganda agency for a totalitarian state.

The framers of the Constitution of the United States, who learned of freedom the hard way, forged a document which has withstood the storms and fires of time. In that document a free press, free speech, and free religion are guaranteed. The world has marveled as the United States became great and remained great under these principles of freedom. Even under wartime restrictions, these freedoms have been affected a minimum in this country.

As nations look and hope for a new world document that will bring peace on earth for a longer period than ever before in history, consideration must be given to the inclusion of these principles.

Churches are vitally interested in any document drawn in connection with the San Francisco Conference or any other world conference. Freedom of religion in all of its phases will play an important part in the world's future.

One of the documents handed to the delegates to the San Francisco Conference deals with this subject and is so thought provoking that I desire to have it read into the RECORD.

It follows:

Honorable delegates, you are not unaware that among the most prolific causes of war are efforts to repress and control the exercise of religion. Consequently, one of the chief contributions which can be made in bringing war to an end is to completely free religion, in its profession, its practice, its propagation. Freedom of worship is not enough. What is required is complete freedom of religion in all its phases.

God made man free. He imposed fetters on neither mind nor soul. Even the choice

of evil, of turning away from God, was not denied. He meant that freedom to continue. But men have ventured to impose restraints, to exercise coercion, where God conferred complete liberty. Freedom of belief has been denied; freedom of worship has been suppressed; freedom of religion has been refused. And out of these denials, suppressions, and refusals have issued many of the wars which have cursed mankind.

As a tortured world emerges from the intolerable agonies of war, the United Nations, upon whom now rests the responsibility of victory, have chosen representatives from among their sagest statesmen and entrusted to them the solemn responsibility of planning a world organization to safeguard and maintain peace and security. To this high station you have been called. We petition you to meet the lofty hopes of humanity by including among your actions one that will completely remove all shackles from religion and the exercise thereof.

Freedom of religion is a basic freedom. It affects all other human rights. It is more than religious toleration. It is more than freedom of worship. It goes far beyond these. It includes not alone the right of the individual to put into practice his conscientious religious convictions, but also his unrestricted right to change his religion. It includes freedom to rear and train children in their parents' faith, freedom to preach, teach, propagate, publish, and carry forward missionary activities, as well as freedom to organize with others, function as a church, and acquire and hold property for the inculcation, maintenance, and propagation of the faith.

The Seventh-day Adventists of the world join other Christian bodies in petitioning you to remove one of the chief causes of armed conflict by establishing as a part of the basic law of the proposed World Security Organization a provision guaranteeing complete religious liberty to the peoples of the earth. In this connection we venture to invite your consideration to what earnest, Christian people hope may be included. Your petitioners respectfully submit the following suggestion, not necessarily in its form, but in its impartiality, its inclusiveness, and its refusal to favor one religion above another.

Recognizing that the relations of the individual soul with its Creator should be free, and that repression and coercion in the field of religion are fertile sources of war, the powers signatory hereto agree that all nations admitted to membership in the World Security Organization shall give assurance that they will make no law, nor engage in any program which will place restraints on the free exercise of religion, either in worship, teaching, or propagation, and that they will in no way discriminate, either in law or in fact, against those who practice any particular creed, religion, or belief whose practices do not interfere with the equal rights of others.

In support of the foregoing principles we offer the following statements:

The Archbishop of York, in his analysis of conditions essential to the maintenance of a durable peace, said:

"First of all, there must be religious freedom. Without religious freedom it is impossible for the churches to act spontaneously and vigorously. Without religious freedom they will be suspected of being a mere department of the state. By religious freedom I mean that the churches should have freedom of worship, freedom of preaching and teaching, and freedom of determining their own organization, and that the individual should have freedom to worship or not to worship God, as his own conscience dictates. This freedom has been largely set back during the war. * * * I hope indeed that when the peace treaties are drawn up a very special care will be taken in seeing that religious freedom is secured as well as political freedom and economic freedom." (The Spiritual Issues of the War, No. 271, January 18, 1945, distributed by British Information Services, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.)

In the case of *United States* v. *Ballard et al.* (322 U. S. 86, 87; 64 S. Ct. 886, 887), decided by the United States Supreme Court on April 24, 1944, Mr. Justice Douglas, delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

"Men may believe what they cannot prove. * * * The fathers of the Constitution were not unaware of the varied and extreme views of religious sects, of the violence of disagreement among them, and of the lack of any one religious creed on which all men would agree. They fashioned a charter of government which envisaged the widest possible toleration of conflicting views. Man's relation to his God was made no concern of the state. He was granted the right to worship as he pleased and to answer to no man for the verity of his religious views. * * * The first amendment does not select any one group or any one type of religion for preferred treatment. It puts them all in that position."

In the case of *Jones* v. *City of Opelika* (316 U. S. 618, 621), decided by the United States Supreme Court on June 8, 1942, Mr. Justice Murphy, in a dissenting opinion, in which he was joined by Chief Justice Stone, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Douglas, said:

"Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion all have a double aspect—freedom of thought and freedom of action. Freedom to think is absolute of its own nature; the most tyrannical government is powerless to control the inward workings of the mind. But even an aggressive mind is of no missionary value unless there is freedom of action, freedom to communicate its message to others by speech and writing. * * * Important as free speech and a free press are to a free government and a free citizenry, there is a right even more dear to many individuals—the right to worship their Maker according to their needs and the dictates of their souls and to carry their message or their gospel to every living creature."

(NOTE.—The dissenting opinion in the *Jones* v. *Opelika* case became the majority opinion in 319 U. S. 103.)

Among the pledges made to the German people in the name of the Allied Nations, General Eisenhower, in a broadcast on December 7, 1944, promised complete religious liberty. Surely, if conquered nations can be guaranteed full religious liberty, the Allied nations, through their representatives meeting at San Francisco, will provide and guarantee nothing less for the people of all the world. We urgently request your cooperation in bringing to final realization this age-long hope of the world.

By official authorization of its World Executive Committee, we, with deep respect, subscribe our names in behalf of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

J. L. MCELHANY, *President.*
E. D. DICK, *Secretary.*

Resolution of Tri-State Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the constantly increasing lumber requirements in the Northwest States have reached a point where they border on the acute. This has been stimulated to some degree by information that has reached the country that it will be the policy of various agencies of our Government to process and send to devastated sections of Europe Federal housing. This in itself is not of far-reaching importance, but the idea has generally gotten into the community that vast amounts of lumber being denied to this territory is also going to Europe for other purposes. This country is badly in need of lumber for repair and for houses for returning soldiers.

As a result of this information there has been held in the Northwest what has been known as the Tri-State Lumber Conference.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the conference:

ACUTE HOUSING SITUATION FACING RETURNING VETERANS

RECOMMENDATIONS OF TRI-STATE HOUSING CONFERENCE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

On May 10, 1945, a tri-State housing conference was held in Fargo, N. Dak., at which there were delegates from North Dakota, western Minnesota, and northeastern South Dakota. This meeting was designed to bring together some of the top men representing Government and private business in the housing and building-materials field to consider first hand the acute housing situation existing in this area, and the serious social and psychological problems to be avoided as veterans now returning in increasing numbers are unable to find living quarters for themselves and their families.

Over 100 persons participated in the conference, including: William K. Divers, Chicago, regional manager, National Housing Agency; J. G. Skaaren, Minneapolis, regional manager, Lumber Division, War Production Board; Charles L. Freeman, Minneapolis, regional manager, Surplus Lumber Division, Reconstruction Finance Corporation; W. H. Badeaux, Minneapolis, secretary, Northwest Lumbermen's Association; F. A. Mapes, Chicago, regional manager, Surplus Materials Division, United States Department of Commerce; Ben B. Lawshe, Washington, D. C., manager, commercial organization department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; C. A. Williams, Fargo, chairman, Fargo Chamber of Commerce Housing Committee and general chairman of the conference; Senator J. B. Bridston, Grand Forks, N. Dak., chairman, Grand Forks Civic and Commerce Association Housing Committee, and moderator of the conference discussion; R. A. H. Brandt, president, Minot Association of Commerce, and vice chairman of the conference.

Organizations represented at the conference included: Service-wives clubs, veterans' administration, chambers of commerce, municipal officials, builders, suppliers, and financial institutions.

The following resolutions were adopted at this conference:

"Resolution 1

"Whereas there is an acute shortage of building materials in the hands of distributors and retail outlets in this area; and

"Whereas the transportation rates and shipping facilities limit the purchase of lumber to mainly one source—the Pacific Northwest States; and

"Whereas the lumber material needs of the returning veterans must be met mainly from the Pacific Northwest States' supply; and

"Whereas AA3 priorities in this area do not secure from the Pacific Northwest mills the necessary building materials for the distributors and retail outlets:

"Therefore, the tri-State housing conference here assembled recommends to the President of the United States, and to Congress assembled: That:

"1. The existing priorities allocated by the National Housing Agency for returning veterans be raised above the AA3 rating in order to provide high enough priorities to secure materials in this or any other area where similar difficulties are being experienced.

"2. Civilian needs of the United States be given priority over civilian rehabilitation in other countries."

"Resolution 2

"Whereas war surplus building materials may, and probably will, become one of the important sources of materials to meet the existing crisis of housing shortage in this area; and

"Whereas there is a lack of national policy to insure equality in the geographic distribution of said war surplus building materials:

"Therefore, the Tri-State Housing Conference recommends to the President of the United States and to Congress, that necessary action be taken immediately to establish a national policy limiting to a minimum the number of agencies which will handle the sale of surplus property, and to incorporate into their programs recognition for the needs of the areas far removed from the location of the surplus materials.

"Duly passed and adopted this 10th day of May 1945."

R. H. BARRY, *Chairman, Fargo, N. Dak.,*
C. M. CARLSON, *Crookston, Minn.,*
GEORGE NYGAARD, *Watertown, S. Dak.,*
JOHN F. OLSON, *Jamestown, N. Dak.,*
JOHN SCHNOOVER, *Jamestown, N. Dak.,*
S. S. SHAW, *Watertown, S. Dak.,*
DEANE WILEY, *Crookston, Minn.,*
Resolutions Committee of Tri-State Housing Conference.

Information Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to correct any misunderstanding regarding testimony given before the Committee on the Organization of Congress, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Neil Dalton, director of the Domestic Branch of the OWI. The testimony in question is that of Mr. Malcolm Morrow, head of the Division of Public Inquiries, given to the committee Friday, May 25.

Mr. Morrow was invited to appear before the special committee, following an inspection made of the Division's facilities by Dr. George B. Galloway, staff director of the committee. The invitation was formally issued by the chairman of the committee, in an effort to determine whether any of the Division's present services might be useful to the Congress in expediting the work of Congress. Mr. Morrow, in appearing before our committee, was not volunteering additional new services to Congress, but sought to explain the available service for any use Members wished to make of it.

I want to call attention to the following letter from Mr. Dalton, which was sent to me, because I was acting chairman of the committee when the testimony was given:

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONRONEY: I am addressing this to you because you were temporary chairman at the time Mr. Malcolm Morrow, Chief of the Division of Public Inquiries of the Domestic Branch, Office of War Information, testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on May 25.

Mr. Morrow's appearance before the committee was on invitation of its chairman, Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and followed a personal visit to the Division of Public Inquiries by the committee's staff director, Dr. George B. Galloway.

As you know, this particular Division has been in existence much longer than the Office of War Information. The Division of Public Inquiries dates from 1934 and has functioned as a central information service of the Federal Government in the sense that it answers questions about the Government which it receives by mail or telephone or in person. The functions of this Division were not changed when it was made a part of OWI; it performs today exactly as it did before there was an OWI. Whether any or all of these functions will be retained after OWI is dissolved is a matter for decision by the Congress and not by the Domestic Branch of OWI.

Mr. Morrow, at the committee's invitation, explained how this Division operated and, again at the committee's request, gave his opinion as to the potential service of this Division for the Congress. I want to emphasize that there will be no change whatsoever in the service which the Division of Public Inquiries renders the Congress unless the Congress directs it. There has been no thought in the minds of anyone connected with OWI to propose a new service for Congress or to expand any existing service for Congress.

Cordially,

NEIL DALTON,
Director, Domestic Branch.

Lend-Lease Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave previously granted, I insert an interesting editorial from Saturday's Washington Post:

LEND-LEASE REPORT

Lend-lease, the secret weapon that welded the United Nations into a unity and gave them the overwhelming strength with which to crush Germany, is now to be turned full force against Japan. This is the keynote of the letter of transmittal accompanying the nineteenth lend-lease report to Congress—the first such letter to bear the signature of Harry S. Truman. "While the bulk of the United Nations forces were engaging the Nazis in Europe," he wrote, "Allied forces succeeded in piercing the perimeter of Japanese defenses and established the bases from which decisive offensives can be launched. Now all of the might and power of the United States, the British Empire, France, the Netherlands, and our other Allies can be brought to bear, together with the Chinese forces, against Japan."

Although lend-lease supplies thus far have been devoted principally to the war in Europe, they have been provided also, in such quantities as were available, to the Allied military and naval forces battling the Japanese. And these Allies, through reverse lend-lease, have significantly aided our troops in the Pacific, especially by supplying them with foodstuffs. Our shipping difficulties would have been enormously aggravated had it not been for this facet of the mutual-aid system. We have received from Australia, for example, a total of more than $720,600,000 worth of reverse lend-lease; from New Zealand, $171,400,000 worth; from India, $411,900,000 worth. French, Belgian, and Netherlands colonies made their contributions, too.

It was thought necessary in the nineteenth lend-lease report to refute a number of absurd and mischievous rumors to the effect that the civilian populations in Allied countries are being given all sorts of scarce supplies for peacetime purposes at the expense of civilians here. Lend-lease has had from its inception a single simple purpose—the effective utilization of the manpower and resources of all the United Nations. It has served us well. It would be tragic now to let it be beclouded by misconceptions, for it still has a great and vital task to perform.

War Prisoners—Send Them Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, a storm of protest has flooded the Congress with regards to the coddling of German war prisoners. The disclosure of brutal and bestial actrocities in the German prison camps by a congressional committee sent to Germany at the request of Gen. Ike Eisenhower is certainly sufficient grounds for stern treatment of German war prisoners. Let us send these German war prisoners back to Germany, to reap with their German brethren the seeds of destruction they have sown.

As part of my remarks, I am happy to include an editorial that appeared in the May 21, 1945, issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, entitled "Feeding War Prisoners":

FEEDING WAR PRISONERS

Public opinion in England is fed up with the favored diet allowed German war prisoners as compared with British civilians. The prisoners get 2½ pounds of meat a week; the civilian three-fourths of a pound. There is little doubt that the cartoon reproduced herewith from the London Daily Mail struck a responsive chord with that paper's audience.

The campaign to grow more food need not concern the prisoners. As one reassures the other—"Don't worry Heinrich, it doesn't mean us; we just eat it."

In answer to criticism the British War Department gives the same reply as our own. We must abide by the Geneva Convention. Yes, but the Geneva Convention was drawn on the premise that war was a professional affair and that armies ate less well than civilian spectators. The civilians haven't

been spectators in this war—certainly not in London. Furthermore, there is ample evidence that American and British prisoners held by the Germans did not get the same food allowance as the Nazi soldiers. A couple of crusts of black bread, some cabbage soup, an occasional spread of grease and perhaps some ersatz coffee comprised the daily ration. Had it not been for Red Cross packages many would have starved.

Nobody suggests that enemy prisoners of war should be starved or maltreated in any way. But it doesn't make sense to stint our own people in order to give the prisoners more than our ration cards allow. If the Germans get 2½ pounds of meat per week in British camps, they probably get more here as the American Army eats better than the British. And the OPA now has admitted that red points allotted American families provide only about 1¼ pounds per week, or half what the German prisoner in England gets. And, of course, they must have their cigarettes and chocolate.

The sooner they are shipped back where they came from to share with other Germans the none too heavy fare which Allied authorities are scheduling for them, the better we will like it.

America's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1945:

AMERICA'S ROLE

In a special dispatch from San Francisco yesterday our correspondent, Mr. Bert Andrews, was able to reveal something of the unpublished history of the Polish question, which has become, since the supposed settlement at Yalta, a source of so much alarm and disagreement among the great powers. From this account at least two salient facts emerge through the mystery and secrecy in which the whole matter is still so deeply clothed.

The first fact is that the Polish question cannot fairly be painted in those stark terms of black and white in which it has been consistently represented to the American people. At the time of his death President Roosevelt—who was one of the three men in full possession of the facts—believed that there was considerable merit in the Russian position regarding the reorganization of the Lublin government. Mr. Roosevelt, at least, did not think that the Russian attitude represented a flat violation of the Yalta agreements, and was working to compromise the difficulties which had subsequently arisen.

The second salient fact in this disclosure is that in the matter of Poland, and therefore, presumably, in the matter of European questions in general, Mr. Roosevelt did not conceive it to be the function of the United States to act as an appendage of either Russia or of Great Britain, but as a disinterested third power which could mediate in and mollify whatever differences might develop between our two great allies. For whatever reason—whether through fate, blunder, or design—this far-sighted policy has not been followed since Mr. Roosevelt's death. At San Francisco we allowed ourselves to become involved in the Polish matter in exactly that sort of Anglo-American "front" against Russia which Mr. Roosevelt had consistently striven to avoid; and compounded the mistake by also getting involved in what appeared to be a Western Hemisphere "front" directed both against Russia and against the idea of an effective general security organization.

That this second error was not intentional is shown by the rather frantic subsequent efforts to undo it. The fact remains that both developments tended to disqualify this country for the greatest service which it could now perform in world affairs—that of acting as the genuinely independent balance wheel in the mutual interorganization of the three greatest powers. It was long ago evident that the organization of peace in general had to begin with the organization of peace among the three or four major centers of effective military power. It is unfortunately evident now that this task has been very imperfectly performed as yet; that it will be a hard and complex task, and that it may prove impossible (as a somewhat similar task proved impossible after 1918) unless the United States can act as the understanding and more or less impartial and active friend of all other parties involved.

This country cannot fulfill such a role if the American public takes passionate stands on matters of vital interest to either of our allies which the American public itself only imperfectly understands. To avoid such stands, on the other hand, will clearly be difficult in the atmosphere of secrecy and suppression which now cloaks the whole of international affairs. The Russian position on Poland, eastern Europe, and many other questions has, to put it bluntly, been stated about as badly and incompetently in this country as it could have been stated. Perhaps the American position has been stated badly to the Russians; this newspaper does not know. It does know, however, that as long as the fate of western civilization remains dependent on rumors, gossip, partial facts, oppressive censorship, and the outgivings of propaganda officers, who have little understanding of the publics they are addressing, its destiny will be difficult in the extreme.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project—Address of Hon. Maurice P. Davidson, Trustee of the Power Authority of the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable Maurice P. Davidson, one of the trustees of the Power Authority of the State of New York. This address was delivered before the Spectrum Club, at Albany, N. Y., on April 30, 1945. In it Mr. Davidson presents most ably facts and arguments pointing to the conclusion that the Government of the United States should take prompt action now to develop the power and navigation facilities in the St. Lawrence River. His address is not only informative but reviews in a very careful manner the history of efforts to secure favorable action on this project, and points out its great benefits to the American people. I commend it to every person who believes in doing something for America and for the American people. It is as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF OUR NATIONAL WATER-POWER RESOURCES

In 1931 the New York State Legislature, by unanimous vote and with the approval of Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, declared that the international section of the St. Lawrence River was a natural resource of the State for the use and development of commerce and navigation in the interest of the people of this State and the United States, and for the creation and development of hydroelectric power in the interest of the people of this State. And they further settled the public power policy of the State by declaring that this natural resource shall always remain inalienable to, and ownership, possession, and control thereof shall always be vested in, the people of the State. The law embodying this policy constitutes chapter 772 of the laws of 1931 and is known as the Power Authority Act.

That policy has been reaffirmed on many occasions. It declares that that part of the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the State of New York is a natural resource of the State for the use and development of commerce and navigation in the interest of the people of this State and the United States, and for the creation and development of hydroelectric power in the interest of the people of this State. It further declares that such natural resources include the bed and waters of the river and are instrumentalities of commerce and navigation.

For the purpose of effectuating this policy, the Power Authority of the State of New York was directed to proceed in cooperation with the proper Canadian authorities and those of the United States to improve and develop the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River (from Ogdensburg to the point where the St. Lawrence leaves the territory of the State—a distance of about 48 miles) for the aid and benefit of commerce and navigation and for the development of the hydroelectric power inherent therein. In other words, the Power Authority is the trustee or guardian of the St. Lawrence River and watershed and is the trustee of the State of New York for the purposes which I have stated.

Now it is interesting to note that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not a matter of political controversy. It is, however, a matter of sharp economic controversy. Volumes have been written and floods of oratory have been poured forth on the subject, but all this expenditure of verbal energy can be divided into two general classifications.

On the one hand, we have the unanimous, nonpolitical, nonpartisan endorsement of the project in its entirety by Presidents of the United States from Theodore Roosevelt down to, and including Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by Governors of the State of New York from Gov. Charles Evans Hughes to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, supported by the urgent approval of every investigating body and committee—international, national, and State—over a period of many years. It was approved by the majority of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941 and by a majority vote of the United States Senate in 1934, when the treaty with Canada failed to pass because the majority did not add up to two-thirds of the total vote of the Senate.

The other classification consists of the efforts of representatives of special interests to impede this development by propaganda, legislative obstruction, and the organization of minority groups.

As I have said, this is not a political issue. It is purely an economic proposition, centered upon two simple questions:

1. Shall we utilize the 2,200,000 horsepower of the St. Lawrence River to produce the lowest-cost electricity in the United States in the interest of abundant use by the consumer, or follow a policy of high rates, economic scarcity, and low consumption?

2. Shall the navigation facilities of the international section of the St. Lawrence River be improved so as to permit the passage of vessels with an increased draft of 13 feet? In other words, is it more sound economically to restrict transportation of freight from Ogdensburg to Montreal to ships with a draft of only 14 feet than to use ships of 27-foot draft?

It would seem that considerable ingenuity is required to support a negative position on these two points and we might well expect to witness the most exquisite torture of logic and facts. Failure to fully develop the power and transportation facilities of the St. Lawrence is the one blind spot in our industrial planning for the postwar era.

As we look across the country and witness the marvelous development of our natural water resources for navigation and power, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars, to which the State of New York has contributed so liberally, our attention is riveted upon the fact that in the roster of these great public developments the St. Lawrence is conspicuous by its absence. We have the Grand Coulee in Washington, Bonneville in Oregon, Shasta in California, Boulder in Nevada, Fort Peck in Montana, Big Tompson in Colorado, the TVA in the Southern States, and numerous other National and State projects in every section of the United States except the Northeast.

Among the great dreams and visions of national achievement none was dearer to the heart of Franklin D. Roosevelt during all the years when he was Governor of the State of New York and President of the United States than the development of the great natural resources of the St. Lawrence River in the interest of the people. As late as last December President Truman, then a Senator, voted in favor of the resolution presented by Senator AIKEN to amend the rivers and harbors bill by incorporating in it the Aiken bill providing for that development. And in his last annual message Governor Dewey affirmed the traditional policy of the State of New York for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project when he said:

"After 20 years of discussion, the tremendous power potential of the St. Lawrence River still remains undeveloped. Its estimated 1,620,000 kilowatts would be the second largest project of its kind in this continent. Its beneficiaries would be the residents of this State and nearby areas.

"At the last session of the legislature, upon the recommendation of the State administration, resolutions were unanimously adopted declaring for the prompt development of the St. Lawrence River by measures which would provide low-cost power from these resources under the inalienable ownership of the people.

He further said:

"I recommend, therefore, that the State continue vigorously to assert its substantial rights and interests in the St. Lawrence development.

"For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. During the past decade the means have been found and billions in Federal funds have been appropriated, to develop great rivers in other sections of the country, for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and like purposes. The incomparable resources of the St. Lawrence River should no longer be wasted. If the Federal Administration is unable or unwilling to proceed, then the State of New York itself should undertake to complete the project on a self-liquidating basis, in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

And it should be remembered that the legislature of 1944, with the strong backing and support of Governor Dewey, adopted a concurrent resolution declaring: "It is the sense of the Legislature of the State of New York that prompt measures should be taken to provide for the development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River, with adequate provisions to safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the State of New York in these resources under the inalienable ownership of the people." The authors of this resolution were Senator Rhoda Fox Graves and Assemblyman Grant F. Daniels.

In an interview on April 19, 1945, Mayor LaGuardia said, of the St. Lawrence seaway:

"I'm on record in favor of it (the seaway). I've favored it ever since it was first suggested. Seventeen years ago as a Member of the House of Representatives, I was for it.

"I always think of it as a power proposition. It would be a great benefit for the people of New York State.

"I have no fear, though, of New York City losing any of its shipping business."

Asked his opinion of the plan of Senator JAMES M. MEAD to develop only the power phase of the St. Lawrence program, Mayor LaGuardia disagreed.

"The plan may have some merits but I don't see why we don't do the whole thing."

What is the present status of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project? The actual plans, blueprints, surveys, and estimates, are complete in every detail, having been made by the United States Corps of Army Engineers over a period of 2 years from 1940 to 1942. This great engineering report embodies complete plans for the construction of the development. All that is lacking is the approval by Congress of the agreement entered into between the United States and Canada in March 1941, so that there is only one step to be taken before the final development of the project can be actually undertaken. At this point, the enemies of low-cost electric power and low-cost water transportation have thrown themselves with renewed energy into the desperate work of obstruction.

On April 20, 1944 the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator of the State of New York, said:

"I am happy to send you a statement of my views on the constructive plans now pending for the improvement of the St. Lawrence River.

"There is overwhelming sentiment for the earliest possible use of the power resources in the St. Lawrence River, resources essential for the postwar development of New York and the Nation. For half a century, the people of New York have carried on a ceaseless battle, first to prevent these resources from falling into private control and more recently since the Power Authority Act of 1931 passed in the administration of Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to develop and distribute the power for the public good. This power project has had my fullest support throughout my service in the State legislature and the Congress.

"I am convinced that the enactment of the Aiken bill, S. 1385, furnishes the most direct means of achieving these public benefits and I am therefore giving that measure my active support."

The Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Representative from Minnesota, called attention to the false economy in pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the development of natural resources of other countries, while at the same time sidetracking and delaying the development of our own. He referred to the Shipshaw project in Quebec Province, for which over $100,000,000 was advanced to the Aluminum Company of Canada, Ltd., by the Metals Reserve Company of the RFC.

This enabled the Canadian aluminum monopoly to build the enormous Shipshaw power project on the Saguenay River in the wilds of the Province of Quebec. Representative PITTENGER has reintroduced his bill for the approval of the United States-Canadian agreement, known in the last Congress as the Aiken-Pittenger bill. His bill is now awaiting action.

There are twelve or thirteen billion kilowatt-hours of electricity going to waste in the St. Lawrence every year. Compared with Ontario rates charged right across the river, the difference in New York State alone is about $225,000,000.

The new and preferred technique for preventing the development of the St. Lawrence project is ostensibly to favor the power development but to object to the seaway. This brand of obstructionism is of the type of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board and Buffalo interests which strongly urged the adoption of the Graves-Daniels joint resolution passed unanimously by the State legislature in 1944. Previously, and afterward, opposed to power, as well as navigation, they went on record as endorsing the power project. What are the agencies of opposition? Also, it might be asked, who are the principals? The membership in all these agencies overlaps. They are largely the same people acting under new and varied titles. We have long had with us the Niagara Frontier Planning Board and the Niagara Frontier Planning Association, and we have the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, the Washington lobby. More recently, we have a new organization in the State of New York created by the same interests known as the New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

It is a sad chapter in the history of our democracy that a minority group of entrenched corporate interests should have so long successfully defied the mandates of the State. It reminds me of the little group of willful men who opposed the entry of the United States into the League of Nations, thereby precipitating a Second World War. Now we have the spectacle of a little group of willful men bent upon preventing the development of our water-power resources, thus promoting an exodus of population and industry from the State. This will seriously hamper the postwar development of the State and curtail employment of our returning soldiers.

Among other techniques of the opposition is the claim that the power project could have been built long ago if the power authority did not insist on improving the waters of the St. Lawrence for navigation purposes. Let me analyze this a bit.

1. The law of the State directs the improvement of navigation in the international section from Ogdensburg to Massena.

2. Cargo boats with a draft of 25 feet now traverse all the Great Lakes and, thanks to the Welland Canal, can proceed over the Niagara escarpment from Lake Erie into the St. Lawrence River and proceed as far as Ogdensburg.

3. The building of the power dam at Massena across the St. Lawrence to Cornwall will deepen the channel of the river behind the dam. Navigation works will be needed in any event, and, this being an international stream, can only be undertaken in agreement with the Federal Government and the Dominion of Canada, which have a joint sovereign control over the navigation of the river.

4. The Congress of the United States, by concurrent resolution or by treaty, must approve the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, or some other agreement between the two countries, to provide for the development of the power and the seaway project. But those members of Congress, who directly represent 50,000,000 people

in the Middle West, will hardly vote an approval which eliminates the navigational improvements so essential to their interests out of mere deference to a narrow sectional opposition. They will assuredly not consent to give New York State a great power project at the sacrifice of the vital interests of a score of States which are clamoring for an improved seaway to open the door to farm and industry.

5. If it were possible to separate the power from the seaway, it would damage the power project because this would add $75,000,000 to its cost, which amount would otherwise be allocated to the capital cost of the seaway to be borne by the Federal Government. General Robins, of the Corps of Army Engineers, says that it would be a crime not to develop the seaway, and thus increase the cost of the power project by $75,000,000.

6. Under the terms of the accord between the Federal Government and the State of New York, which was negotiated by the Power Authority, the costs of the seaway and the power project are to be divided so that the Power Authority would pay the cost of the power facilities in the State of New York plus one-quarter of the cost of the works common to navigation and power in the International Rapids section. The total of these costs to be assumed by the Power Authority on a self-liquidating basis would be $93,375,000, to be repaid over a period of 50 years at 3 percent interest.

Under the provisions of the Pittenger bill now pending in the House of Representatives, the State of New York, through the Power Authority, acting under the Power Authority Act of 1931, would enter into a specific agreement with the Federal Government for the protection of the interests of the State of New York in St. Lawrence power. The Power Authority has taken the position that quite aside from the question of constitutional rights, the national interest coincides with the interest of the people of New York State in dictating the acquisition of the proposed St. Lawrence development by the State. For reasons both of geography and of historical initiative in promoting the project, the State is an ideal region for a State public-power development, decentralized from Washington. There can be little doubt that the success of the Power Authority to date in establishing and maintaining the precedent of a Federal-State accord which recognizes the rights of New York State to the power resources of the St. Lawrence River is due primarily to past action by the State in the creation and administration of the Power Authority.

The philosophy of the obstruction technique of those who say, "It's O. K. for the power, but the seaway would be ruinous," is essentially designed to play off the East against the West, so that the effort of one would cancel the other. This would be amusing, and in fact our opponents probably find it a very diverting and entertaining performance, but playing with the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of people is a serious matter. When powerful minority groups seek to impose their ruthless, selfish purposes, whether foreign or domestic, they should be driven to unconditional surrender.

Something should be said on the basis of costs. In the bill introduced by Senator AIKEN in the last Congress, now reintroduced by Congressman PITTENGER in the House of Representatives, $93,375,000 is allocated to the power project. This compares with $133,000,000 which is the equivalent of one-half of the total cost of the development of the International Rapids section, where this power is located. On the basis of this $93,375,000 allocation to power, we have a total annual cost of $6,200,000 for producing this power, including operation and maintenance, fixed charges at 3 percent, provision for taxation, provisions for amortization over a period of 50 years, provision for the equivalent of taxes; and for this total annual cost of $6,200,000 we obtain 6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. This represents an actual cost dealing with purely at-site power of between $7 to $8 per killowatt-year. That is extremely economical power. It means approximately 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. Magnesium and aluminum needs would be well served by a cost of from 3 to 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Incidentally, it takes 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce 1 pound of aluminum. At the present time, we are importing from Canada into New York State approximately 234,000 kilowatts of capacity because of lack of domestic power, and we have in general in the area of New York State very high electric rates, higher than in 25 of the 48 States. In terms of commercial rates, our rates for commercial light and power service are the highest in the country; in terms of industrial rates, with the exception of the power sold at Massena for aluminum production, the power sold directly to industry at Niagara Falls, and a few special cases, our industrial rates are higher than the rates in most of the States of the Nation.

On the general subject of costs, the estimated total costs to the United States to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project under the pending agreement and the bill introduced by Congressman PITTENGER are $277,056,515. From this amount is to be deducted the cost of the power project to be paid by the power authority, amounting to approximately $93,000,000, so that the net cost to the United States will be above $184,000,000. As against the gross sum of $277,000,000, the United States cost, Canada will contribute an approximately equal amount. She has already expended approximately $135,000,000 in the construction of the Welland Canal, which is used by ships of the United States as well as Canada without toll charges.

We had our attention directed sharply to the coal shortage, the lack of transportation facilities, the consequent cutting down of electric power made from coal, the resultant brown-out, the 12 o'clock curfew, and all the inconveniences in light, heat, and power due to the coal shortage. Let us not forget, in this time of strain and stress upon transportation, that the 6,650,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy which we would have at our disposal if the water power of the St. Lawrence were developed, instead of wasted, is the equivalent of 4,950,000,000 pounds or 2,500,000 tons of coal. Reckoning 50 tons of coal to a car, it would require 50,000 cars to move coal sufficient to produce the electrical energy which the power project would develop. In terms of oil, the equivalent would be 3,300,000 pounds, and estimating 100,000 pounds of oil per tank car, it takes 33,000 tank cars of oil per year to produce the 6,600,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy now being wasted. Is there a better illustration of the necessity for the utilization of this St. Lawrence power?

The National Coal Association in the summer of 1934 referred to the TVA as a menace to the coal industry and talked about the "disastrous consequences of such displacement of coal by TVA electric power." How erroneous this prediction was has been demonstrated by the experience in the TVA area since 1933. In 1940, in the four TVA States of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, and Mississippi, 10½ times as much coal was used to make electricity as in 1933, and 4 times as much as in 1929. As against 334,000 tons of coal in these TVA States in 1929, the use is now 1,346,000 tons as of 1940.

Coal and hydro are not competitive but help each other. They are complementary sources of power supply. Coal consumption will be stimulated as a result of the St. Lawrence project, because the long-run industrial expansion in the St. Lawrence area resulting from the project will call for the use of more coal for locomotives in transporting raw materials to the industries and finished products to the markets. Also, these new industries will use coal for nonpower purposes such as heating. Our studies show that the St. Lawrence project will stimulate coal consumption and the TVA experience confirms this amply.

In a recent address on the St. Lawrence made before the Detroit Board of Commerce, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, stressed the national importance of an expanding foreign trade as part of the postwar program of this country. He emphasized particularly the wisdom of developing this trade so as to conserve our exhaustible natural resources through the importation of raw materials offsetting the exportation of manufactured goods. Yet, paradoxically, some of the most bitter opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway comes from those who oppose its use as a means of conserving the country's supplies of coal, iron ore, and other natural resources. Thus the coal interests want to force New York State to burn coal for the sake of generating electricity instead of harnessing the water power of the St. Lawrence River, and thus the iron ore people, so far from urging that we encourage the importation of foreign ores during peacetime in order to reduce the drain on our own ore resources, and in order to help us tide over the period pending our ability to exploit low-grade ores at low costs, argue that we should shut out these ores either by a high tariff wall or else by a refusal to break down the natural barriers of the St. Lawrence rapids.

Senator AIKEN has recently called attention to official studies conducted by the Department of Commerce under Herbert Hoover and Jesse Jones, which indicated that the savings in transportation costs would be many times the annual overhead and operating expenses of the seaway. Studies of the power project by the Federal Power Commission and the New York State Power Authority similarly prove that the savings to the consumers of electricity will be more than ample to meet the cost of power and will save about $26,000,000 a year for the people of New York and adjacent territory. The Senator also called attention to the fact that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey recently proposed that New York and Ontario build the seaway and power project on a self-liquidating basis if the Federal Government fails to act.

Another objection is that the railroad lines would be endangered by the development of water transportation, but the total capacity of the proposed fully developed St. Lawrence seaway is 25,000,000 tons, of which nomally 9,000,000 tons already move on the existing 14-foot canals, which would give an additional capacity of another 16,000,000 tons of new traffic. How can 16,000,000 tons of water-borne traffic ruin railroads whose traffic is over 1,000,000,000 tons a year? Furthermore, the growth of our country has not ceased. The increase in population and industry will provide additional traffic growing out of commerce not now in existence.

Recently, the Commerce and Industry Association, of New York, in opposing the St. Lawrence seaway development, expressed fear that we cannot compete with foreign industry and that we would be overrun by foreign ships in the Great Lakes. They are afraid that raw materials and the products of manufacture from Europe would be delivered in European boats, if the St. Lawrence River is opened to world traffic, and they say that the inland ports of the Great Lakes must not be exposed to foreign goods or foreign ships. Why don't they advocate a national embargo against all foreign ships visiting the coast-wise ports of the United States to prevent competition with American ships? If the people of the coast cities are entitled to the benefits of foreign trade, then the people and the industries in the lake ports are equally entitled to these benefits; and if it is bad for the people of the lake ports to be in direct contact with foreign commerce transported in foreign ships, then it must be bad for the people of our

coastal cities to be exposed to that misfortune. Of course, these arguments are just silly. Closer relations with other countries on a reciprocal basis are necessary, and the economic exchange of goods and services is essential to our prosperity and an enduring peace.

Another technique of the opposition is to prevent a vote in Congress on the question of the approval of the United States-Canadian agreement. It is well known that a joint resolution would command the support of a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the Senate. For that reason, the Washington lobby, known as the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, is spearheading opposition to action by joint resolution, insisting that such approval must be evidenced by a treaty which would involve action by the Senate alone, and require a two-thirds instead of a majority vote. It takes only one-third plus one hostile vote in the Senate to defeat a treaty.

Buffalo refuses to be a full-fledged seaport, the first city in history to claim that distinction. Not so Albany. Albany is proud to be a seaport. Much money has been properly spent to open the port of Albany and its approaches for deep-draught vessels. Has New York City suffered because Albany is a port? Would New York City suffer if Buffalo were a port? The truth of the matter is that no great national development should be dependent upon narrow sectional advantage or prejudice. This development would be beneficial to the whole State and, indeed, the whole country, and all would share in the common benefits. This business of playing off one part of the country against the other, section against section, is the kind of thing that we are trying to escape in creating a permanent world order. We must think in terms of the prosperity and happiness of the State and the Nation. This State and National economy cannot be geared to the interests of one locality, even assuming that a certain locality might suffer, which is not the case here. It is surely reasonable to anticipate that at the end of the war industry will be attracted not only to the regions which have most fully developed their hydroelectric power resources but especially to those cities and industrial centers where the most reasonable rates are provided on the most secure basis, as inducements to industrial, commercial, and residential customers.

We are nearing a time of testing when millions of jobs will be at stake. Prosperity and well-being depend upon jobs. In order to keep faith with our returning servicemen, and to meet the supreme demand of employment, we must provide for the expansion of industry in the State of New York. Once the pioneer State for the establishment of the electrical industry and large-scale generation of hydroelectricity, New York has suffered a virtual stagnation in development of its water-power resources over a period of more than a decade.

Let us have the vision which involves only the use of common sense in developing those great natural resources which lie on our very doorstep to help build a better America.

Address of Claude Rains at Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address delivered by the motion-picture actor, Mr. Claude Rains, at the I Am an American Day exercises at Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, May 20, under the auspices of the Springfield Adult Education Council.

Mr. Rains' address follows:

Today, for the sixth straight year, we are celebrating I Am an American Day. I have read a multigraphed sheet prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice which says that observance on this day "will be in honor of newly naturalized citizens and native-born citizens who have reached their majority." Well, since it is a privilege of American citizenship that one may with impunity disagree with a Government official, I rise to declare that whoever wrote that multigraphed material is wrong. I am a naturalized citizen, and I think I speak for all my fellows when I say that to us this is not a day on which we ask that others honor us. No—I Am-an-American Day is a day when by Presidential proclamation certain ceremonies, certain exercises, give us the opportunity to honor America under official auspices.

This day comes once a year—and once a year millions of us stand up in public and say: "I am an American." These words are spoken not just in this auditorium (or park) in Springfield, Mass. They are spoken also down among the tobacco and cotton fields of the South and the wheatfields of the Midwest and, yes, this year on the battlefields of the southwest Pacific, everywhere where anyone is privileged to say these words, he says them, proudly.

"I am an American."

Who says this? Whites? Nordics? Protestants? Yes, in many cases. But also blacks aand yellows and reds and Latins and Jews and Catholics, and I believe a considerable sprinkling of Mohammedans. For it is the particular glory of America that its children are not all cast in the same dreary mold. America's national religion is housed in meeting houses and temples, synagogues and cathedrals. American leaders are named Eisenhower, DiMaggio, Baruch, Joe Louis, Stettinius. America's national architecture is the Gothic and the Norman, the Georgian and the Spanish, the Colonial and the Baroque. America's national dishes are borscht and spaghetti, goulash, and corned beef and cabbage, chop suey and smorgasbord and Yorkshire pudding and chile con carne, and what to me is the best of them all, the hot dog.

You know, I have a personal definition of the word "America"—personal, but one which I'm sure you will find an echo in your hearts and minds. America, I often say, is the place where everyone may feel at home. That is really what I have been perhaps, clumsily saying up to now: America is the place where everyone may feel at home. And that is the theme, really, that I want to point up here this afternoon.

Oh, I am aware that there are injustices in American life—that sometimes the majority oppresses some minority, or that sometimes a financially fortunate minority tries to oppress the less fortunate majority. I often become as indignant over these oppressions as the most socially minded could wish. And since these things occur in other lands, too. Some may say, what, then, is the difference between America and any other country—except in terms of material wealth? Anti-Semitism, for example, was never confined to Germany. We have anti-Semitism here. But here we call anti-Semitism un-American. No one ever called it un-German. The difference between America and Germany, or between America and any other place, is that here the only alien is the man who hates his neighbor. Everyone else is right at home in America.

America, in short, is the only country that could have produced the Springfield plan.

You people of Springfield know more about that plan, of course, than I do. You have been able to see it in operation. You have been able to hear your children calling each other "Joe" and "Sam" and 'Pat" instead of "wop" and "kike" and "mick." You have been able to note their interest in the American cultural tradition, their dawning realization that that tradition stems from China as well as England, from Italy as well as Scandanavia, from Africa as well as Russia—and their growing pride in that tradition because it borrows the best from everywhere and overlays it with the creative efforts of our own energetic people.

And I imagine that two thoughts must frequently have occurred to you: first, that as you no less than your children learned more and more about Czechs and Chinese, Filipinos and Finns, Negroes and Newfoundlanders, you were in a real sense discovering America; and, second, you must have thought that only in America could this happen, that only in America could there be a Springfield Plan.

And I say, in defense of that definition of America that I gave a few moments ago, that only in a country where the Springfield plan is possible can everyone feel at home.

Any naturalized citizen knows what I mean. I think that most natural-born citizens must know what I mean, too—but on the assumption that there are some who do not, a word or two of autobiography may help.

When I was a boy of 10 I went to work after school hours. Very soon there were no school hours at all, and I found myself on my own, wandering the streets of Glasgow and London with no money in my pockets and large holes in my shoes. And throughout this time I was told that the upper classes were different, that I must mind "my betters." Now, here in America, no one can tell my 7-year-old daughter that.

I started in the theater with Sir Herbert Tree in London as a call boy, and though I rose to be first, prompter, then carpenter, then electrician, then property man, until finally I was company manager, I was always conscious of "my betters."

I first came to America in 1912, and was amazed to find that there were no "my betters" here. I liked that. I might have stayed here, but the First World War broke out and I went to join a Scottish regiment; and although by the time I was demobilized in 1919 I had become a commissioned officer, I found I still had to mind "my betters."

I went to work in London as a stage manager and small part actor—always with "my betters"—and I thought always of America.

When I returned to this country again in 1926, I discovered anew that here I could say and do as I wished and that here there were no "my betters."

It was in this country in 1928 that I met my wife. My wife is a typical American, which means that she is part Czech and part Jew, and that her father had got out of Europe because he wouldn't mind his "betters."

In 1935, I went back to England to work, but more important, to find out if there might still be some latent nostalgia, some feeling that my native land must remain my homeland. I walked up St. James Street in London, and the first thing that hit me were "my betters." I could tell who "my betters" were. I could tell by the way they looked at me and through me, by their reserve, which I could understand, and their disdain, which I could not forgive. And while I am a rather reserved person myself, I'd have given a good deal for an American greeting—the greeting an American gives that tells you how little he cares who you are provided you are a fellow being—"Hi ya,

Mac?" I could not get back to America fast enough. I could not become officially an American fast enough. And I've lived here since—not among "my betters," but among my equals.

Perhaps this recital gives you some idea as to why I call America the land where everyone may feel at home. Whether it be a Professor Einstein or a bewildered 10-year-old victim of the London blitz, everyone with any claim to respect or to human sympathy may feel at home in America. The American idea seems to be this: That if you put your arms about a weak person and support him, not only does he become stronger, but you become stronger too. And when we think of the careers of Senator Wagner, Steinmetz, Knudson, David Sarnoff, Justice Frankfurter, or a thousand others, we know that this American idea must be right.

That is why on I-Am-an-American-Day so many of us naturalized citizens wave little flags and speak the little words with the big meaning. I am an American, we say. But on 364 other days of the year, believe me, the flag is waving in our hearts and the words are singing in our minds. We are proud and grateful that we should be entitled to that flag and those words—proud and grateful that we are Americans.

Planting by Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 28 (legislative day of Thursday, May 24), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article Planting by Airplane, by Tom Ashley.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANTING BY AIRPLANE—TAKING HIS CUE FROM NATURE, THE ORIGINATOR OF AIR PICK-UP OFFERS INGENIOUS MEANS FOR UTILIZING AVIATION IN WIDESPREAD AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS

(By Tom Ashley)

Dr. Lytle S. Adams, the Pennsylvania surgeon who fathered the pick-up device which made possible air service to more than a hundred United States cities and towns, has come up with another aeronautical development—planting large quantities of seed from the air at incredible speeds.

"I've gone Mother Nature one better by duplicating bird and animal droppings," says Dr. Adams, who has interested Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, several Congressmen, and many agriculturists in his latest undertaking. His first aviation contribution, the air pick-up device, was more difficult to "sell," he says, forecasting a speedier and wider application for his newest idea. Legislation has been introduced in Congress which would appropriate $2,500,000 for a Federal seeding program using aerial planting.

Heretofore, only rice has been successfully planted by airplane on a large scale, other seed being too light in weight and mass to be dropped in a satisfactory pattern, and subject to destruction by animals or the elements before germination. But Dr. Adams believes he has overcome such obstacles by two means: (1) Perfection of a seed pellet, and (2) sowing of pellets by a centrifugal machine attached to the bottom of the airplane.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE ACRES PLANTED PER MINUTE

The pellet consists of seed germ, from which the shell and chaff have been removed, coated by a mixture of soil containing growth-promoting vitamins and chemicals to repel insects an animals. Round in shape, the pellet has mass and weight sufficient to bury itself when dropped from the air onto soft ground, and planting is done immediately following a rain.

The centrifugal planter is a wheel, or impeller, of ¾-inch pipes, rotated at high speed by an electric motor. Pellets fed by gravity into the hub of the impeller are hurled from the spinning pipes in a circular pattern. The planting pattern can be varied by controlling the impeller's speed, the forward movement of the airplane, and its altitude.

Seed pellets, according to Dr. Adams, can be made inexpensively for almost every requirement. An average grass-seed pellet, used for revegetating the range, counts 1,920 to the pound. To plant an acre of range with 1 pellet per square foot requires 43,566 pellets, or 22.69 pounds. Airplane planting can be performed at the extremely fast rate of 241.66 acres per minute. Therefore, a large airplane is necessary because heavy loads of seed pellets must be carried (5,483 pounds can be planted per minute). But the airplane used for planting can be stripped of fuel and accessories, for the longest flight will be measured in minutes rather than hours. If a cargo airplane could carry 10 tons of seed pellets, it could plant 831.54 acres in only 3½ minutes.

"Planting by airplane, as we have arranged it, will be especially effective for revegetating lands in the public domain, in soil-conservation districts, and for reforestation," Dr. Adams says. "Protection of land values through proper grassing and with promotion of growth, together with the need of erosion and flood control, amounts to a gigantic undertaking in the West. In the United States and its possessions is an area of public lands embracing 750,000,000 acres. Because of its great natural wealth, such land is administered by Federal agencies to protect its value and resources. Secretary Ickes has said that approximately 130,000,000 acres of land administered by his Department is in such condition from past improper use or neglect that some remedial action is necessary.

"PROJECTILE" FOR REFORESTATION

"In the past, rehabilitation of the range has been attempted by patch planting, in which small areas here and there were cultivated and planted with grasses in the hope their growth would spread and eventually revegetate large areas. But what frequently happened was that animals, attracted to the small patches of new greenery in a vast expanse of dead growth, destroyed or prevented full growth of the new planting. In other cases both seed and loosened soil have been washed away by rains. One difficulty has been the neglect of inaccessible areas. The biggest problem, however, is in the hugeness of the task of revegetation—there are too many acres for so few hands and such little equipment and time as are available to the Federal agencies.

"Now let's consider how airplane planting could fit into this picture. The seed are mixed with pulverized soil and water, containing certain growth promoting and rodent and insect repellant chemicals. This mixing is speedily and inexpensively accomplished with a simple machine. It forms the seed pellets and dries them to prevent pre-germination, turning out about 50,000 pellets per minute. The size of the seed pellet is controlled to insure proper covering for the type of seed used, and to give the pellet sufficient mass to cause penetration when dropped by airplane. The amount of penetration is in turn controlled by the moisture content of the soil and the altitude from which the pellets are dropped.

"It can readily be seen that it is unnecessary to prepare the soil for such planting. Seed pellets will penetrate the barest spots when dropped following a rain. They will not be blown away or washed into the gullies and creeks by rain. They can be planted in areas where surface machinery could not be used, such as on slopes, high plateaus and the like."

Dr. Adams has a special pellet for reforestation in soil covered with mulch, such as leaves or pine needles. He uses a small, pointed, hollow metal projectile, in which the pellet is imbedden in the open top. The metal is perforated so moisture can reach the pellet. Dropped from the air, it penetrates the mulch cover and buries itself in the soil.

MINIATURE "BOMBS" USED

Suppose, we asked the inventor, the area to be planted does not receive enough moisture from a single rain, and rainfall is light and infrequent. His answer was that his seed pellets do not require as much moisture as ordinary seed, but if steps must be taken to "store" moisture before planting he can do that, too.

"I have a small explosive pellet which pocks the terrain, thus creating thousands of miniature craters," he explained. "With them I can prepare the soil just before the season when infrequent rains occur, and store moisture until it is sufficient for planting."

How about row crops? He has provided for that, too: "Just turn the centrifugal planter on its side and it will shoot the pellets downward in a controllable, straight line. Or, by using a bomb sight developed some years ago by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, the pilot can plant a curving row such as one following the contour of the terrain."

Dr. Adams said a company has been formed in San Deigo, Calif., to develop seed pellets not only for aerial planting but for farmers and gardeners using ordinary methods of planting. Experiments have proved, he said, that 90 percent of the pellets germinate and grow.

No airplane seeding has been done, he said, but plans call for planting several thousand acres of range lands in the Southwest this fall. He and his associates have been working lately with agricultural representatives of several colleges and universities.

The possibilities for airplane planting are almost unlimited, Dr. Adams believes. Russia is faced with tremendous revegetation problems, for example. He believes the Soviet Union could accomplish in a matter of days, using its military aircraft for aerial planting, what would require months and seasons to do with ordinary planting methods.

"One of the big problems, of course, will be seed production," he points out. "But it isn't as complex as it might appear. For example, public lands will largely require native plant seed, which can be gathered and processed much more expeditiously than food-producing seed. Wild plants are needed to halt erosion from wind and water, preserve irrigation and drainage canals by checking flowage across slopes and level lands, and to preserve moisture throughout our huge range areas. Once growth is started, it will lead to automatic reseeding by nature itself. Wildlife, finding new food and shelter, will thrive and renew nature's own marvelous cycle of plant and animal production. But to avoid future neglect and destruction aerial planting will be necessary about every 10 years, as experience has proved the disastrous results of allowing range lands and other areas to lie idle for longer periods."

Dr. Adams estimates the costs of airplane planting to be inexpensive when used on a

large scale. He won't quote figures, but points out the savings in time and labor would "more than pay the costs." Use of airplanes in dusting cotton has proved inexpensive in the South.

SUCCESS BASED ON NATURE

But there is another reason the former Pennsylvania surgeon believes his latest aeronautical development will succeed.

"Don't overlook the fact that it very nearly duplicates nature," he reminded us. "The idea occurred to me back in 1924 out on the fringe of the California desert. I was living on a ranch and used to spend much time studying the growth of cactus plants. In bare, infertile soil a clump of baby cacti would appear. As it grew, rabbits would nibble at it for moisture. Rabbit droppings thus were left close to its shelter, and soon other tiny plants would sprout. In a couple of seasons the growth would be considerable. I was fascinated and soon concluded that rabbit droppings not only contained seed germs, bereft of chaff and hard coating on which the animal had fed, but provided germination stimulant and insect and rodent repellent. Left in the shelter of a large plant, such as a cactus, these natural seed pellets utilized what little moisture was present, and, needing no long-period deterioration, quickly germinated and began to grow. Perhaps it is easier to understand, after that explanation, how we can almost duplicate nature's original method of processing seed germs into pellets.

"But we have done more. We have actually improved on Mother Nature by using the airplane for planting our seed pellets, and our centrifugal planter, combined with the airplane's speed and altitude, allows us to control the frequency and thoroughness of revegetation."

Federal Judges Pay Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to the American Bar Association by the committee on judicial salaries with reference to H. R. 2181 and S. 920:

REPORT TO THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SALARIES ON H. R. 2181, INTRODUCED BY MR. HOBBS, AND S. 920, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WAGNER, ENTITLED "A BILL TO FIX THE SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES"

The Hobbs bill (H. R. 2181, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) and the Wagner bill (S. 920) provide for an increase of $5,000 in the annual salary of each member of the Federal Judiciary.

PRESENT SALARIES

There has been no change in the salaries of the judicial officers of the United States since 1926, when the present salary schedules were established. Since that date there have been at least two fundamental changes in conditions affecting judicial salaries.

In the first place, the present salary schedules were established at a time when it was thought that Federal judicial salaries could not be subjected to Federal income taxes and at a time when Congress had no intention of attempting to apply the Federal income tax in reduction of those salaries. In 1932, however, Congress subjected the salaries to Federal income taxes and also since that time they have been made subject to State income taxes. The application of the Federal income taxes alone has resulted in a reduction in effective salaries of between 25 and 35 percent for the various members of the Federal judiciary.

The second substantial change of circumstances followed as a natural consequence of the first. Since 1932 there have been substantial increases not only in the tax rates but in the cost of living as well, so that we find that an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court with the same $20,000 salary that he received in 1932, just prior to the imposition of Federal taxes, now receives approximately $13,000 after Federal taxes. Giving effect to the increase in the cost of living of approximately 30 percent during the same period, we find that the $13,000 is equivalent to approximately $10,000 in 1932. In other words, the effective salary of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court has been cut approximately in half since 1932.

The Hobbs bill would restore, in part, the situation existing prior to the imposition of Federal taxes on judicial salaries. The effect of existing taxes and of the Hobbs bill are set forth in the following schedule:

	Present			Proposed by Hobbs bill			
	Salary	Federal tax [1]	Net salary	Salary	Federal tax	Net salary	Effective increase after taxes
Chief Justice of the United States	$20,500			$25,500			
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	20,000	$7,035	$12,965	25,000	$9,985	$15,015	$2,050
Circuit Court of Appeals, U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Court of Claims	12,500	3,365	9,135	17,500	5,695	11,805	2,670
Chief Justice, District Court for the District of Columbia	10,500			15,500			
District Courts and Customs Court	10,000	2,400	7,600	15,000	4,465	10,535	2,935

[1] It is assumed that each judge is married and has at least $500 of other deductions.

SALARIES OF ENGLISH AND STATE COURT JUDGES

England, and to some lesser extent the more populous States in this country, provide much more liberal compensation for their judges. In England the Lord Chancelor (who corresponds with the Chief Justice of the United States) receives in addition to £4,000 as Speaker of the House of Lords an additional £6,000 as Chancelor. The English equivalent of Associate Justices of our Supreme Court receive £6,000 per annum, as does the chief justice of the court comparable to our circuit court of appeals. Other judges equivalent to our circuit court judges receive £5,000 per annum. The chief justice of the trial court (equivalent to our district courts) receives £8,000 per annum and the other judges of that court receive £5,000 per annum. In other words, the salary schedule in the English courts is very considerably higher than in the Federal courts and substantially higher than the increased salaries proposed by the Hobbs bill.

In New York judges of the highest court receive $23,000 per annum and the chief justice $23,500. Judges of the intermediate appellate court receive between $18,000 and $29,500 per annum and judges of the trial court receive between $16,000 and $26,000 per annum. These salary schedules are also higher than those in the Federal courts and, except for the proposed Supreme Court salaries, higher than those set forth in the Hobbs bill.

The English and the New York salaries are considerably more realistic than those of the Federal courts, as they approximate the amount which a man fit to hold the office of judge would probably earn in private practice. The payment of such salaries should result in obtaining better judges as it enables the most capable members of the profession to accept judgeships without substantial financial loss.

Substantial judicial salaries are paid in most of the populous States where the judges are called upon to handle important litigation in quantities approaching those of the Federal courts. States paying their supreme court judges $10,000 per annum or more are:

New York [1]	$23,500
Pennsylvania [1]	20,000
New Jersey [2]	19,000
Massachusetts [2]	15,000
Illinois	15,000
California [2]	14,000
Louisiana	14,000
Connecticut [1]	12,500
Ohio [1]	12,500
Michigan	12,000
Maryland	$11,500
Rhode Island [2]	11,000
Delaware [1]	10,500
Wisconsin [1]	10,500
Indiana	10,000
West Virginia	10,000
Missouri	10,000

[1] $500 less for associate justices.
[2] $1,000 less for associate justices.

States paying judges of their intermediate courts $10,000 per annum or more are:

New York	$18,000 to $29,500
Pennsylvania	18,000 to 18,500
California	12,000
Ohio	8,000 to 12,000
Indiana	10,000

States paying trial court judges $10,000 per annum or more are (maximum salaries):

New York	$26,000
New Jersey	15,000
Pennsylvania	15,000
Illinois	15,000
Massachusetts	13,000
Connecticut	12,000
Maryland	10,250
California, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Louisiana	10,000

The following is a complete schedule of judicial salaries paid by all of the States:

Judicial salaries

State	Highest court	Intermediate appellate courts	Trial courts
Alabama	$7,000	$6,500	$5,000–$8,000
Arizona	8,500		4,000– 6,000
Arkansas	7,500		3,600– 6,000
California	13,000 [1] 14,000	12,000	4,750–10,000
Colorado	6,500		2,000– 6,000
Connecticut	12,000 [1] 12,500		[2] 12,000 [3] 9,000
Delaware [4]			
Federal	20,000 [1] 20,500	12,500	10,000
Florida	7,500		[5] 6,000
Georgia	9,000		[5] 6,000
Idaho	5,000		4,000
Illinois	15,000	[6] 8,000	8,000–15,000
Indiana	10,000	10,000	4,200–10,000
Iowa	7,500		6,000
Kansas	6,000		4,000
Kentucky	5,000		3,000–5,000
Louisiana	14,000	8,000	7,500–10,000
Maine	8,000 [1] 9,000		7,500
Maryland	11,500		8,500–10,250
Massachusetts [7]			
Michigan	12,000		6,000
Minnesota	8,500 [1] 9,000		6,000– 7,500
Mississippi	7,500		5,000
Missouri	10,000	8,500	6,000– 8,000
Montana	7,500		4,800
Nebraska	7,500		5,000
Nevada	7,500		4,500– 7,200
New Hampshire	7,000		7,000
New Jersey [8]			
New Mexico	8,000		6,000
New York	[9] 23,000 [1 9] 23,500	[9] 18,000–29,000 [9 10] 18,500–29,500	[9] 16,000–26,000
North Carolina	8,550		7,550
North Dakota	5,500		4,000
Ohio	12,000 [1] 12,500	8,000–12,000	[9] 3,500– 9,000
Oklahoma	7,500		4,000– 7,200
Oregon	7,500		5,000– 6,500
Pennsylvania	[9] 19,500 [1 9] 20,000	18,000 [10] 18,500	9,000–15,000
Rhode Island	10,000 [1] 11,000		9,500 [10] 10,000
South Carolina	6,750		6,750
South Dakota	5,400		4,900
Tennessee	7,500	6,500	5,000
Texas	8,000	6,500	5,000– 7,400
Utah	5,000		4,000
Vermont	6,000 [1] 6,500		5,000
Virginia	8,500 [1] 8,900		5,400– 8,400
Washington	8,500		6,500
West Virginia	10,000		5,000– 9,000
Wisconsin	10,000		[9] 8,000–10,000
Wyoming	7,000		6,500

[1] Chief justice.
[2] Superior.
[3] Common pleas.
[4] $10,500, chancelor and chief justice; $10,000, associate judges; $7,500, vice chancelor.
[5] And supplement.
[6] Plus $15 per day and expenses.
[7] Supreme judicial, $14,000 ($15,000 chief justice); superior, $12,000 ($13,000, chief justice); probate, $3,000–$9,000; land court, $10,000; municipal Boston, $9,000. ($10,000, chief justice); district, $1,200–$6,000 (part time); special justices, $5–$25 a day (part time).
[8] Court of errors and appeals: Chancelor, $19,000; chief justice, $19,000; justices, $18,000; lay judges, $40 per day (about $9,000 per year); vice chancelors $18,000; circuit judges, $16,000; common pleas, $15,000 down.
[9] Corrected to latest legislation.
[10] Probate judge.

THE TREND TOWARD INCREASED JUDICIAL SALARIES

In 29 of the 48 States action is being taken upon proposals to increase the salaries of judges and it is assumed that many if not most of these proposals will be adopted. Some of these proposed increases are very substantial whereas others are relatively modest. However, this is a recognition of the need for paying adequate salaries in order to obtain a competent judiciary.

In each of the States, as well as in the Federal Government, the cost of maintaining the judiciary is almost infinitesimal in comparison with the general expenses of government. Therefore, the proposed increases of State court salaries as well as the increase in Federal court salaries does not pose a real question of economy but merely a question of fair compensation.

NEED FOR INCREASED SALARIES

Members of the Federal judiciary occupy a position which requires the extraordinary legal talent of men of standing and integrity. As one of the three great coordinate departments of the Government, it is their responsibility to interpret and enforce the Constitution and the multitude of Federal laws which affect the welfare of the citizens and the conduct of our Government. Since 1926, and particularly since 1932 when the Federal tax laws were made applicable to judicial salaries and since which time the cost of living has consistently increased, there has been a vast expansion in both the quantity and importance of matters coming before the Federal courts for decision. Although at all times the importance of the service of Federal judges was second to none in the country, each year finds that the matters which by Congress have been left to the decision of the Federal courts have become increasingly of greater importance to the Nation than the matters customarily dealt with by the State courts. Yet, the salary schedule in the Federal courts is below that of certain States which have adopted the policy of attempting to obtain a competent judiciary by the payment of adequate salaries.

Federal judges should be chosen from the best members of the profession. Although there is no necessary constant relationship between ability and earnings, it is noteworthy that .0.5 percent of the lawyers in the country earn $9,000 or more per annum.[1] Assuming, as we certainly believe to be the fact, that the Federal judiciary generally is representative of the very top of the profession, it is clear that these men are being substantially less well compensated than if their abilities had not been devoted to public service. Any continuation of this disparity between compensation and ability must lead inevitably to a situation where judges will be drawn from among those with adequate private incomes or, the really able members of the profession not being able to afford to accept Federal judgships, relatively incompetent judges will be appointed; either of these events would be extremely unfortunate.

By virtue of his office, a Federal judge is a leading citizen in the community and his salary should permit him to comport himself with dignity consistent with his office and should take into account the obligations and expenses which necessarily and properly result from his public office. The present level of salaries is inadequate for that purpose.

No one disputes the necessity for increasing the salaries of judges sitting in districts located in the more populous areas of the country or where State court judges are more substantially rewarded than the judges of the Federal courts. There have been many suggestions, however, that increased Federal judicial salaries are unnecessary in those States where the local judges receive less than $10,000 per annum; in some States judges of the supreme court are paid only a $5,000 salary. To date, no fair method has been suggested for paying different salaries to different Federal district or circuit court judges, depending upon where they sit, whether the differences be based upon population or cost of living or the amount or importance of litigation in the district (as is done in many States), nor do we find any merit to suggestions that a base salary be set for Federal judges to be increased to equal the highest salaries paid to State court judges performing the same duties in the same district or circuit.

It has been the long-standing practice of Congress to provide uniform salaries for Federal judge regardless of where they sit; if the proposed salaries seem a bit high in relation to State court salaries in some localities, they will still be low in comparison with salaries paid to English judges and those of other State courts. The outstanding fact is that a Federal judge, wherever he sits, is as important and must be as competent as any State judge anywhere and the proper basis of comparison is with the salaries paid by those States having the most important litigation, such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts.

COST OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

There are in the United States only 284 Federal judges, so that the additional annual gross expenditure provided by the Hobbs bill, is only $1,420,000, or about 1 cent per capita. Of that amount a substantial portion would be returned to the Federal Treasury through taxes, and it is estimated that the entire additional expense, after Treasury recoveries, of a salary increase of $5,000 to each Federal judge, would be only approximately $817,290.

[1] See, E. F. Denison, Incomes in Selected Professions, pt. 2, Legal Service, 23 Survey of Current Business No. 8 (Department of Commerce, August 1943), 23 et seq.

CONCLUSION

The Hobbs bill would result in an effective salary increase for judges of the district courts and the Customs Court of approximately $535 over the salaries received in 1932 before they were subjected to Federal taxes. The salaries of all other Federal judges, after taxes based on the 1944 level, would still be less than they were between the time the present schedules were adopted in 1926 and the time when they were subjected to Federal taxes in 1932.

In view of all of the foregoing, the Hobbs bill is approved, subject to the following qualification as to section 3.

Salary increases for Federal judges are urgently needed today. Section 3 postpones the effective date of the Hobbs bill until the termination of the Stabilization Act of 1942. We are reluctant to suggest anything which might interfere with the Stabilization Act and we recognize that the effect upon that act of the immediate application of the Hobbs bill is not within our province. However, unless postponement of the effective date is really necessary, we believe that section 3 should be eliminated.

Respectfully submitted by the Committee on Judicial Salaries, American Bar Association:

ARTHUR H. DEAN,
Chairman.
CALVIN T. COTHAM.
DANIEL DEBAILLON.
GEORGE DONWORTH.
HARRY B. MACKOY.
HENRY I. QUINN.
SAMUEL W. SAWYER.

MAY 8, 1945.

Dumbarton Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress, upon my request, has furnished me with some very interesting notes regarding the background of Dumbarton Oaks, the Georgetown estate here in Washington, D. C, which has come into international prominence by reason of the conference held there. The notes prepared by the Library of Congress are as follows:

It is a lovely old Georgetown estate located at 3101 R Street NW., Washington, D. C. It takes its name after the Rock of Dumbarton on the Clyde in Scotland, which was the place of origin of the first owner of the new world property, Ninian Beall. An inscription on the outside wall of the estate gives the history of its owner as follows:

In 1702 the Rock of Dumbarton was granted by Queen Anne to Col. Ninian Beall. In 1717 Col. George Beall, his son, added to his lands. In 1780, Thomas Beall, his son, sold the property to William Dorsey, and in 1801, William Hammond Dorsey built the house. In 1805 he sold it to James Bradshaw Beverly. James Edward Calhoun (brother of John C. Calhoun) bought the property in 1823.

In 1829 Brook Marshall purchased the land and sold it in 1846 to Edward Magruder Lithicum. He enlarged the house and garden, changed the name to Monteray, and bequeathed it in 1869 to Edward Lithicum Dent. In 1891 Henry Fitch Blount bought the property and named it The Oaks. His widow sold it to Mildred and Robers Woods Bliss who remodeled the house, added to the grounds, enlarged the gardens and rechristened the whole Dumbarton Oaks in 1920.

The 32-room Georgian mansion that lies behind the walls of Dumbarton Oaks has been greatly changed from its original style by a mansard roof and other alterations. It is set in a grove of trees, giving it the regal air of an eighteenth century chateau. The exterior of the mansion is adorned with carved stone ornaments, classic cornices, and crowning pediments. The former music and living room, added by Mr. and Mrs. Bliss, contains many fine works of art from abroad. It is a two-story room, renaissance in character, it has a painted, beamed ceiling from the chateau de Chimerly, arches of red Verona marble, and a seventeenth century chimney piece showing traces of polychromy taken from the castle of Theobon at Loubes Beraicin, France. It contains an Italian cassone of the fifteenth century with Pastigilia panels, and an immense two-bodied sacristy cupboard from a villa at Caprarola, near Rome. There are benches from the Cathedral of Zamora in Spain with the original heraldic velvet coverings.

The garden and grounds of Dumbarton Oaks are extensive. To the east lie formal garden terraces with a box walk, tennis courts, and a swimming pool, near which may be seen two of the oldest and largest of the Dumbarton Oaks.

Mr. Bliss, former Minister to Sweden and Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, and Mrs. Bliss, a student and collector of books and art, originally planned to leave the estate and appurtenances to Harvard University, but in 1940 decided to make the gift at once. They transferred 16 acres of land with the buildings including a research library of about 18,000 volumes. Under a succession of notable owners, the building has been the scene of many social gatherings. Lafayette is said to have been a guest there.

Sermon by the Most Reverend Michael J. Ready, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon at Memorial Military Field Mass, Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, May 27, 1945, by the Most Reverend Michael J. Ready, D. D., bishop of Columbus:

We have laid our victorious flags on this altar of thanksgiving. Our prayerful voices speak for millions of men and women in a national act of reverence for the Nation's honored dead. The white crosses of Arlington stand in serried rows about us. They preach of the devotion and sacrifice offered by heroic citizens in defense of the institutions of this Republic. We bear the flags that others died for. We kneel in prayer on hallowed soil. The white crosses of Arlington must be more than symbols of sorrow. They must be seen in the skies of the universe proclaiming that in the sign of Christ's victory we must conquer the world for peace and justice.

This is Trinity Sunday. Throughout Christendom Christ's charter to His apostles is proclaimed: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature." They, as leaders of Christ's society, the church, were to stand in defense of the truth which was to make men free. They were to preach the new commandment of the love of neighbor. They were to administer the strong help of Christ's grave in His sacraments. They were to protect and to aid the poor and to comfort the sorrowful. They were to encourage the weak, to bless those that strove for peace, and even to suffer persecution for justice' sake. They were to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. History records their valor and their martyrdom. History also records the invincibility of the truths they preached. Other apostles fulfilled Christ's commission to be witnesses to Him in Judea and Samaria and to the utmost limits of the earth. Neither the power of emperors, nor the might of armies, nor the treachery of friends could repel the loyal army which went forth to preach truth and to do charity to all men. Down the ages against the fury of vicious persecution, the church spoke the strange doctrine of justice, of the dignity and liberty of men, and of the sanctity of the family. Her ministers emphasized their preaching by deeds of mercy and love and soon great nations were molded on a pattern which came to be called Christian civilization. At least western society took on a new form of civilization, even if all peoples did not follow the Christian principle underlying human dignity and social justice. Against the force of persecution and opposition the church kept preaching justice and charity and peace until the laws she fostered gave protection to the basic rights and dignities of individuals, families, and social institutions. In the ages of faith there was at least a recognized formula of social integration. Men as individuals and men as a society referred their lives and institutions to God. There was no place in that tradition for the present-day secularist notion that neither man nor society has any higher point of reference for law or rights or duties than the state or the government.

Throughout the years of long, difficult centuries, in times of glory or of persecution, the church kept before men and nations the ideas of justice, of human dignity and of charity, which is brotherhood. It was in the hope of progressing to a better and, indeed, to an ideal society, that nations wrote their covenants and treaties and established alliances and leagues. What awful defeats were suffered by men in their striving to follow the gospel of peace and justice. Yet, in every age, what inspiring nobility among men who, in the midst of voices that preached the gospel of hate and war, strove the mightier to build a society dedicated to human freedom, truth, and social justice.

If the church has not removed from men and nations the spirit of selfishness and the irrational cruelty of war, nevertheless she has kept true to her mission of preaching the gospel to a world which often reviled and persecuted her. The whole of man's outlook on ethics, politics, economics, and social relationships is governed by his answer to the essential question, What is man created for? His true freedom can be protected only if his last end is known and his attainment of it secure. In the darkest days of the present

world war, the words which brought courage and determination to conquered peoples were freedom and liberty and democracy. They were a challenge to the souls of men. They represented realities which made life precious and noble. They were a call to the spiritual, unconquerable forces of nations. The greatness of the Atlantic Charter rests on its principles of justice and honor—spiritual realities. The power of the "four freedoms" rises from the universal conviction that man's happiness is based in his spiritual character. Trust in justice and honor and decency kept brave men suffering and fighting in the terribly bleak days of defeat and exile. The religious tradition which informed men about his higher destiny and his final end was strong enough in the face of the world's most vicious persecution to defeat the power which claimed man merely as a creature of the state. The position of the church in relation to governments is here well defined. The church stands out as the great institution in human society which is too big for the rapacious grasp of the state. The church stands before men as a challenge to the claim of the state to direct and to order the whole of human activity and thus to be an end in itself. To the church falls the supreme duty of keeping before men their true and eternal destiny.

It is significant that the great Christmas pronouncements of the Holy Father for the past 5 years have been concerned with the political and social activities of men. The motif in all is the purpose and end of man. "By her very existence," Pius XII said last Christmas, 1944, "the church rises above the world as a shining beacon to remind us constantly of the divine order in life. Her history reflects her providential mission. The struggles which she had to sustain in defense of the liberty given to her by God were, at the same time, struggles for man's true liberty. The church's mission is to announce to the world, seeking for better and more perfect forms of democracy, the highest and most needed message that there can be: The message that men have great dignity and that they are called to be the sons of God."

The refusal to recognize man's relation to God contains in germ the greatest threat to human freedom. For, ultimately it means rule by force. Man can be sure of his freedom only when he recognizes the purposes and supremacy of God.

We have met on this solemn occasion and in this national shrine of honor to offer grateful tribute to men who fought and died for the principles and virtues which guard our heritage of freedom. Note well, my brethren, that I speak of our heritage of freedom. We who live to mourn the valiant dead must cherish and protect that freedom. Freedom must not be for us a sentimental patriotic slogan.

While we here consider the spiritual basis of a society dedicated to justice and liberty, distinguished representatives from more than 40 nations are convened in San Francisco to write a charter for a world organization to promote international security and peace. It is sobering for us, and for them especially, to consider that the war is ending with its most devastating weapons still in their technical infancy. It is not difficult to be either cynical or desolate as the awfulness of war is surveyed in all its harshness. It is not difficult to be thoroughly dismayed by so much death and so much destruction and so much famine. It is indeed very easy to view the future in catastrophic terms, with suffering populations compelled to choose between further bloodshed or acquiescence in the single-party tyranny of another ideology—the Communist, which like nazism, makes its first condition the overthrowing of traditional Christian society.

But we must not follow these easy paths to pessimism. In these days, now, we have the tremendous responsibility to stand with out fellowmen working for a proper recognition of human rights in whatever world organization will be established. If we really cherish freedom and justice, then we must be quick to join all peace-striving peoples in identifying the spurious democracy of totalitarian regimes and the travesties of democratic justice which enslave millions of yellow and brown and black men.

The United Nations agreement (in January 1942) pledged that the principles of the Atlantic Charter would be the basis of postwar world society. Those principles are clear. They outlaw international assault and robbery and grant to all peoples equal justice under the law. The citizens of the Nation recognize the hard problems which confront the distinguished conferees at San Francisco. They will be patient in the face of the known difficulties. But they will not be supine if the old international crimes of power politics, of deceit, and of injustice destroy the present God-given promise of a peaceful world.

As representatives of the organized forces of the Catholic laity, you must be conscious of your social responsibility in these historic days. Through the department of lay organizations, the bishops of the United States have offered to the men and women of the church an important and effective means of association and cooperation and comradeship in the National Catholic Welfare Conference. It is in times of crisis that men understand the power of unity. The challenge of peace is as great in its social consequences as the challenge of war. You and your sons and your daughters met the challenge of war. We are confident that the same loyal devotion to God and country will win the final victory—peace.

The men of Arlington are speaking. Their comrades in arms now suffering and dying in the Pacific are speaking. They dare us in decency and justice to live with our consciences if we fail to make the world secure from war; if we again permit hate and power and injustice to destroy liberty and freedom; if we allow aggression and tyranny again to destroy peoples and their rights and their happiness. From the tombs of the honored dead in this field of national honor, from the beaches of France and the South Pacific, from the bloody banks of the Rhine, from the deep mountain passes of China and Burma and from the depths of the seven seas, our sons cry to us, and the sons of all nations join their cry, to keep faith with them; to do for the little peoples what we promised to do and what they fought and died to make possible the doing. From Main Street, and Maple Street, and High Street in every village and city of this great land people hear that cry, "Keep faith with us." We must answer those cries. The justice and charity which are fundamental to all decent society must be so clearly written today in charters and pacts and treaties, that we of this generation shall have done our best duty to the brave men who gave their lives to America—so that America might live in honor and liberty to do its full share in establishing peace among men.

It's Your Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice Admiral E. S. Land, United States Navy, retired, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration, at Propeller Club luncheon, Maritime Day, May 22, 1945, in Mobile, Ala.:

A hard and bloody year has passed since last we celebrated Maritime Day. During those 12 months we have completely dissipated the strength of our enemy in Europe. We have destroyed his power. Today some of us can turn our eyes from Europe to the Orient. I say some of us, but not all of us. We in shipping, which is the supply line both for military and the civilian in this war, still must keep our eyes on both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The destruction of our enemy on the Continent and his unconditional surrender have not relieved the merchant fleet of any of its previous responsibilities. They have, in fact, increased them in a number of respects. Military cargoes must move to the Pacific in greater volume. There must be immediate and substantial increases in the movement of troops; there are wounded to be returned home; there are others to be redeployed, still others to be rotated between battle front and home. To expedite the solution of this enormous transportation problem, the Maritime Commission is converting 100 fast Victory ships for the carriage of military personnel. Use of these ships will reduce substantially the time it will take to bring a soldier home.

But in addition to this movement of men there are great amounts of food, clothing, materials for reconstruction, and essential imports and exports to be carried across the Atlantic to England, Scandinavia, and other areas. So you will understand what I mean when I say that within the next month or two we expect shipping to be tighter than at any time since the war began. It will continue in that status for an indefinite time.

It seems to me, however, that this is not the time for oratory, on my job at least. I gather from congressional hearings (which I have to attend), and correspondence, and from conversation that many people have many questions they want answered now. Sometimes I come to the end of a week feeling like an unhappy combination of Information Please and the Quiz Kids. And, as that other radio program has it, I can understand how It Pays To Be Ignorant—in peace of mind at least. However, I know that this Maritime Day is an appropriate occasion to try and answer a number of pertinent questions which have come to me recently. So I have decided to get a lot of the answers out of my system today and leave the oratorical embroidery to other people who will speak in many other places on this Maritime Day. Therefore, and hoping you will not object, we will have some questions and answers, beginning with this one which so many people are asking constantly:

Question. How much tonnage has the United States lost since the war began in Europe in 1939?

Answer. Approximately 6,500,000 deadweight tons, or considerably more than half our entire prewar merchant fleet.

Question. How much tonnage have we built in this country since the war began in 1939?

Answer. Approximately 56,000,000 deadweight tons.

Question. How many ships have we built in this same period?

Answer. Of all types the total runs to more than 7,100.

Question. What expansion of shipyard facilities was necessary to do this job?

Answer. We started with 10 private yards containing 46 ways and employing 60,000 workers. This had to be expanded to 81 yards containing 300 ways, with 1,300,000 employees.

Question. What types of ships were built or are building excluding those strictly for the military service?

Answer. More than 2,600 Liberty ships, more than 460 Victory ships, 24 of the big P–2 type, 288 C–2's, 156 C–1's, 133 C–3's, 84 C–4's, 641 tankers, 24 self-propelled concrete vessels, 53 concrete barges, 65 wooden barges, 300 coasters, 16 ore boats.

Add to the above list: Thirteen vessels of combination types, 13 of transport types, and 29 of special types, and you have the answer. You will note that there are in this list approximately 1,200 fast, modern ships in addition to the 641 tankers.

Question. What about the ships built by the Maritime Commission and assigned directly to what we call defense aids and the military services?

Answer. We built 895 of about 5,000,000 dead-weight tons. Of this total 221 are of combatant type.

Question. How is the merchant fleet operated?

Answer. It is operated through the War Shipping Administration by 114 private operators who act as general agents, subagents, and berth agents of WSA. They are paid a fee for the job, just as the builders in Maritime Commission yards are paid a fee for building ships.

Question. How many ships are under WSA control?

Answer. The number is now in excess of 4,000 ships of approximately 43,000,000 deadweight tons.

Question. How much seagoing personnel is required to operate these ships?

Answer. In 1939 the total was between 45,000–50,000. Last year it had been expanded to more than 175,000, and by the end of this year we expect to have over 242,000. And, I might add, that several million men have depended upon those few to deliver most of what it has taken to do the fighting job for which we give thanks today.

Question. How much cargo did this great supply fleet move in 1944?

Answer. The total of all shipments was 78,500,000 tons. Of this amount 65 percent was military, 27 percent lend-lease and rehabilitation, and 8 percent civilian.

Question. What are all these reports about a shortage of ships?

Answer. Personally, I am fed up with the eternal alibi that "a shortage of ships is responsible for all the difficulties of the war." There are in 1945, under the United States flag, four and a half times as many ships as there were in 1939. It is not a shortage of ships so much as it is temporary shortages of cargo at pierheads, delayed turnaround, shortage of ports, shortage of inland transportation, too extensive use of ships as floating storehouses, congestion of ports, selective discharge, shipping priorities, and a number of kindred ailments. They must bear their share in this shortage-of-ships disease.

Question. What about the postwar merchant fleet, particularly the one I spoke about of 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 deadweight tons?

Answer. I get that tonnage from the following components: 3,500,000 tons for the Great Lakes, 2,500,000 tons for the rivers, 3,800,000 tons coastal and intercoastal, 7,500,000 tons in foreign trade.

I would like to emphasize that the increase in our foreign trade merchant fleet should be supported primarily from trade formerly carried by the Axis Powers and, so far as we are concerned, primarily from Japan.

Question. What about our postwar foreign trade necessary to support a vigorous merchant fleet?

Answer. We talk and write very glibly about exports, but we do not seem to be as vocal in discussing imports—this, despite the fact that for every seller there must be a buyer. The Honorable James A. Farley recently said, "We hear a good deal about increasing our exports, but not so much about the necessity of imports. It is time for a considerable change in this emphasis if we are to take steps in the direction of making it possible to liquidate our prospective postwar loans." For that reason, I am very much in favor of the extension of our reciprocal trade agreements. I do not believe they should be a partisan political issue. I am a 50–50 guy and certainly believe in reciprocity.

Question. When can our merchant fleet return in substantial measure to its strictly commercial activities?

Answer. The answer to that one generally is to be found in what is known as The London Agreement of Principles. This provides for continuance of the Combined Shipping Adjustment Boards under which all United Nations merchant tonnage is operated until 6 months after the fall of Japan. This will keep the merchant shipping pools of the world under unified control, which in turn gives first call to military requirements while at the same time making the most equitable distribution possible with regard to the allocation of merchant tonnage for other purposes.

Question. What about the future of the German and Japan merchant fleets?

Answer. So far as I am concerned, they have none. There should be no oceangoing merchant fleets in either of these countries for many years to come. They used them before the war primarily to promote their military objectives and, in my opinion, thus forfeited their right to have them.

Question. Won't very heavy operating subsidies be necessary to support the expanded merchant fleet after the war?

Answer. The answer is "No." There are two kinds of subsidies, operating and construction. The construction subsidy goes to the shipyard—not to the operator. It permits the operator to buy American-built ships at approximately the same cost he would have to pay if they were built abroad. The operating subsidy is a parity payment pure and simple. It merely puts the American operator on a parity basis with his principal foreign competitor. Its major element is wages made necessary by our higher American standard of living. It goes as wages for seagoing personnel and to labor in our repair yards. It should be noted, however, that any excess in the operating subsidy is subject to recapture. When the uninformed talk as they do of huge operating subsidies, just remember this—if our 1939 merchant fleet were doubled, the maximum annual cost for both operating and construction subsidies would not be greater than 44 cents per capita per year, and that is less than the cost of a movie.

Question. What about employment in the shipyards?

Answer. The shipbuilding program is on a descending curve and it is apparent, as we have stated, that many now engaged in shipbuilding will be released during the present calendar year. Repair yards will need many of these employees, and we should maintain a proper nucleus of shipbuilders both for the merchant marine and the Navy, postwar. That is not only an economic necessity but a national-defense requirement as well. Some of the shipyards are being converted to repair yards now. Some conversion work will be available. Other employment may be found in ship-breaking, and some yards will continue building certain ships for postwar use such as passenger liners, small coastal types, custom-built types to suit special trade routes, and surely some Navy building to avoid an obsolescent Navy.

Question. What about postwar employment of our seagoing personnel?

Answer. Information now available indicates that there will be ample employment afloat for anywhere from 6 months to 3 years after the fall of Japan. As I said earlier, American-flag ships will be busy bringing troops home, rotating others, supplying occupied areas, returning the wounded and the prisoners of war, and carrying materials for rehabilitation, national programs, and meeting the requirements of UNRRA. Also, I trust they wil gradually be increasing their activity in foreign trade.

Question. What about the GI bill of rights for the merchant marine?

Answer. A suitable bill has already been introduced in the Congress. It is recommended that this bill, with any proper amendments which may be offered and accepted, should be enacted into law by the Congress, and the time to do that is now.

Question. What about uniforms for our merchant marine—postwar?

Answer. When first considered, the answer appeared to be in the negative for two reasons, mainly, regimentation and militarization.

Question. Do these objections still obtain?

Answer. To all intents and purposes it will always be a dungaree uniform aboard ship, but it may well be that a distinctive merchant marine uniform might be adopted without any idea of regimentation or militarization in this voluntary service.

Question. What about training, recruiting, and manning for the merchant fleet after the war?

Answer. Kings Point Academy, which is the Annapolis and West Point of the merchant marine, is a model institution and should continue to stand out as a beacon light for the merchant marine of the future. The same is true of Sheepshead Bay and our other training institutions. These institutions should continue in a qualitative manner with a quantitative reduction as may be required by the peacetime size of the American merchant marine. Great credit is due to our training and our recruitment and manning organizations for the splendid work they have accomplished during this war. It should be thoroughly understood that our major rivals in this work have been and are, naturally, the Army and the Navy, considering the definite distinction that ours is a voluntary service, while the military comes under the Selective Service Act. However, we have manned the ships; those ships have delivered the goods. That seems to me to be the answer.

Question. What about operations?

Answer. The shipbuilding program has been thoroughly recognized by the American people as well as by other nations in the world. However, the operators of this gigantic fleet, largely because of security reasons, have received relatively little publicity. But they have done their difficult part in delivering the goods, and done it well. As results are what count, possibly that is all the advertising necessary. Certainly they have done a job, and they have done it 24 hours a day, every day of these painful years.

Question. What about aviation and its effect on the merchant fleet after the war?

Answer. There is no doubt that postwar transocean aviation will probably skim the cream from the fast passenger trade. Nevertheless, there will be substantial passenger traffic across the oceans of the world carried by surface ships for a long time to come. Aviation, in my opinion, will not make any serious inroads from the cargo-carrying point of view. All that the shipping industry asks of Congress and the American people is that there be no inhibitions and no prohibitions, either by regulation or statute, to prevent the American merchant marine from supplementing its activities with aviation auxiliaries.

Question. What about this so-called ship-sales bill now before Congress?

Answer. As to policy, it attempts to follow in general the policy of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The last bill dis-

cussed was designed to establish a formula for the sale of surplus war-built tonnage—a formula to be written by the Congress. Cargo ships are to be offered at depreciated prewar foreign cost. Tankers are to be offered at depreciated prewar domestic cost. American citizens are to have first call on all the ships available under the bill for sale or charter. Foreigners are not permitted to charter. A floor is proposed for Liberty ships so that they will not be offered at less than 50 percent of their cost before depreciation. It should be noted that we are dealing with a surplus commodity and most of which, I might add, was built to be expendable in warfare, so we should determine a procedure as about half way between (a) scrapping of war-built surplus ships and (b) giving them away. It is an extremely difficult problem and any solution must be a compromise because it will always be impossible to satisfy all hands.

Question. What are we going to do with all these ships? This is the $64 question.

Answer. I have a little computation on that. Let us assume:

	Dead-weight tons
Completed wartime building program of	56,500,000
United States merchant marine, 1939	11,500,000
Total	68,000,000
Estimated losses	6,500,000
Assigned for military service	6,000,000
Scrap for old-age obsolete tonnage	7,000,000
We should sell (foreign)	10,000,000
We should operate	17,000,000
Total	46,500,000
National defense reserve ("in sanctuary" by statute)	21,500,000

I hope that this venture into the business of talking to myself, or answering my own questions, has at least provided you with a few facts. Information, accurate and objective, is vital to intelligent solution of many complicated problems of the postwar merchant fleet. There are many partisan prejudices, and uninformed views being circulated concerning your merchant marine and its future. I hope all of you here today will at least keep an open mind on this subject until you have satisfied yourself thoroughly as to what you honestly feel our merchant marine should be in the peace to come. It is of vital importance both to our foreign trade and to our national defense. As long as we have a strong Navy, we must have a strong merchant fleet. To maintain it in strength and efficiency, it is necessary to utilize it. I do not suggest that we hog the seas. I do believe, however, that we should carry a substantial share of our foreign trade in our own ships. I think we are entitled to that break and I know that the competition thus afforded would strengthen greatly our own operations and those of all of our maritime competitors.

In closing, I should like to quote the statements made during the past 30 days by two of our ablest leaders concerning their opinions as to what our merchant marine has done during this war.

Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall, said: "America's merchant marine has carried out its war mission with great distinction and has demonstrated its ability to meet the challenge of redeploying our full power to the Pacific."

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King said: "The armed forces, with the help of the merchant marine, have pushed the fighting 5,000 miles west. Together, they will go the rest of the way."

To those expressions, I say amen.

James Francis O'Connor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES FRANCIS O'CONNOR, late a Representative from the State of Montana

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to have this opportunity to say a few words about my very dear friend, the able and distinguished Congressman from Montana, the late JAMES F. O'CONNOR.

As a new Member of this Chamber, I was always pleased to hear the words of JIM O'CONNOR. He was a man of strong convictions, well informed on the affairs which were discussed in this great body.

At this time of year there always comes the gentle, blissful day when we feel how fine it would be to get into the outdoors. Often we wonder, on entering the catacombs where we work, what would happen if in sudden brash rebellion we should head for the open road. From there we would turn off into some deep woods where the trees were radiant in their new foilage, the grass soft underfoot, the air full of earthy fragrance. We would wander on forgetting the city, the irksome office or home tasks, the war, the peace problems, feeling completely free and irresponsible, and at the same time smugly virtuous in our proximity to Mother Nature. We would listen to the birds, spot an occasional wild flower, come unexpectedly upon a sparkling brook, perhaps sit on a grassy knoll and meditate on the futility of man's rush and strain, his slavery to clocks and conveniences.

There is that earthly paradise when all is calm and we have the opportunity for clear cool recollection, our thoughts would dwell on the many pleasant experiences we have had in our past lives.

I am sure were I to take that journey and so contemplate the past, one of my most refreshing recollections would be my having known the late JIM O'CONNOR. He is now gone. One of the most beautiful sentences, by way of prayer, I know to express my sentiments toward him, is:

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon him.

Nazi Horror Camp Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Northwest Alabamian of May 24, 1945:

MANASCO DESCRIBES NAZI HORROR CAMP ATROCITIES—CONGRESSMAN GIVES EYE WITNESS ACCOUNT OF HORRIBLE CRIMES AT BUCHENWALD AND INTERESTING OPINIONS

A detailed report of his recent visit to a German horror camp at the request of General Eisenhower was received this week from Congressman CARTER MANASCO.

Representative MANASCO described the sights as the most horrible and unbelievable he had ever seen.

Following a review of what he saw at the Buchenwald camp, the Seventh District Congressman outlined his views concerning the reeducation and reconstruction of Germany and declared that eternal vigilance on the part of the public is necessary to prevent future wars.

Congressman MANASCO's report:

"During the latter part of March arrangements were made for me to go to Europe for conferences with British, French, and American officials in an effort to find out what amendments to the Surplus Property Act were needed to effect the rapid disposal of war surpluses in those areas that were no longer needed by our armies.

"I arrived in London on the 21st day of April. Upon my arrival there was an invitation from General Eisenhower for Members of Congress to fly to Germany to inspect one of the political prison camps just liberated by our armies.

"Right here let me make it clear that these horror camps were for political prisoners and civilians and were not camps for prisoners of war. Some of our people have the mistaken idea that American soldiers were in these camps. This is an error.

"We left London Sunday, April 22, and arrived at Weimar, Germany, about noon. I had read about the camps and seen pictures of the inmates who had been tortured. Frankly I didn't believe all that I had read, and I don't believe anyone else did.

"We were driven to Buchenwald, about 3 miles outside the city of Weimar. The prison camp was surrounded by two barbed-wire fences, one of them charged with electricity, and a guard stationed every 20 feet. We were then taken to the barracks used to house the prisoners.

"When this camp was liberated there were 23,000 human beings in the camp, composed of Russians, Poles, French, Belgians, Dutch, 2,400 Jews, and 1,800 German civilians. The personnel was made up of doctors, scientists, businessmen, preachers, priests, and others who opposed the Nazi ideology.

"In each of the barracks 2,300 people were crowded into a space that would not comfortably house 100 people. Seven people were forced to sleep in a bunk, with the wooden floor being the only mattress. When I entered the first barracks the most unbelievable sight that I have ever seen was before my eyes. Hundreds of the inmates were unable to raise their hands. Huge eyes with a fixed stare protruded from nothing but a skull covered with dry human skin.

"They were so starved that their facial muscles could not smile. The stench was unbelievable. These people were given one thin slice of bread per day, and two cups of weak soup which a potato, carrot, or some other vegetable had been drawn through.

"This particular camp had a fixed quota of 400 deaths per day. Starvation and illness usually resulted in the deaths of over 300. The remainder were killed. The prisoner to be killed was given a choice of three methods of death.

"There were four hangman's nooses from which they could volunteer to jump. If the prisoner declined this method, he was offered a syringe containing a deadly poison that he could inject in his arm, and, refusing this, he was thrown down a 13-foot concrete chute into a room about 20 by 20 where there were 42 hooks on which to garrote the bodies until they choked to death.

"This was done by an SS guard. If the noise was too great, a machine was turned on to drown out the cries and gurgles of the poor unfortunates. After they were strangled to death, there was an elevator with a capacity of 18 bodies to take them up to the next floor, where 6 ovens were used to cremate them.

"These ovens had a capacity of 18 bodies per burning and a capacity of 400 bodies per 10-hour day. Some of the unburned bodies were still in the ovens when our troops arrived. A truck loaded with 80 skeletons who had just died and were awaiting cremation was also there when our troops arrived. While we were in the compound many of the unfortunates died.

"The Nazis conducted a scientific research study in this prison camp. They would inject typhus germs and tuberculosis germs into the bodies of the poor unfortunates to study the effect of the diseases on the different organs of the body. Of course, any person who submitted to one of these tests was told that he would be liberated upon the completion of the tests; but no man who submitted to these tests ever came out alive.

"The wife of the camp manager had a mania for lamp shades, ash trays, and other articles made from human skin. I saw these skins with my own eyes. The wife would select a design that suited her taste, and this design would be tattooed on the chest of the person from whom the skin was to be removed. Then the skin was removed, cured, and the lamp shade or whatever she wanted was made.

"The American medical officer in charge told us that of the 23,000 people still remaining in the camp, between 3,500 and 4,000 could never get well. Their digestive juices had been destroyed by lack of food. Some of the patients were being fed by intravenous injections. Of course, all of the 23,000 unfortunates can never be normal beings again.

"We were told that there were over 100 camps like this in Germany. It was estimated that over 15,000,000 human beings were liquidated in this manner.

"The sight of this horrible, cruel, inhuman treatment started me to thinking. The conclusions I reached might not coincide with the views of other people. I am firm in my belief that the young Nazi generation could in their own minds justify this inhuman method of liquidating their fellow man. While in the camp I saw some of the older German women weeping. At the same time, I saw girls between 20 and 30 smiling.

"Germany has been a great nation. She has contributed to the world such famous poets as Goethe and Schiller. She has contributed to the world such leading philosophers as Kant. She has contributed such great musicians as Wagner, Bach, and Beethoven. Germany has contributed Martin Luther, one of the great founders of the Protestant religion. She has contributed atabrine, a drug which has made it possible for us to defeat the Japs by keeping down malaria. The Germans discovered the sulfa drugs.

"They are far ahead of the rest of us in conservation of forests and other natural resources. Germany pioneered in social legislation. As far back as 1870 she was paying old-age pensions. The Germans pioneered in payment of unemployment insurance, care for children, hospitalization of the poor.

"They were far ahead of the rest of the world in the care and physical training program of the youth of their country. They pioneered in regulation of the flow of commerce. They had a very efficient, smoothly operated industrial economy. Why, then, could nazism get such a hold on the people that they would tolerate the liquidation of their fellow men?

"My conclusion is that they had so completely regimented their people that every segment of their economy was dependent on the central government for its livelihood. Big business could not operate without the consent of the central government.

"The pensions could not be paid, the health program could not be carried on, even the playgrounds could not be operated, without the blessings of the central government; and I might add, the Germans were far ahead of the rest of the world in organized playgrounds and organized sports. You saw no slums in Germany. Their people were well housed, well fed, and well clothed.

"Any person who becomes so dependent on his central government for a livelihood soon loses all independence of thought. Anyone who disagrees with the program of the central government or its political leaders immediately becomes an enemy of the individual, for the individual thinks that an obstructionist might push him away from the public trough. What is the result? Those individuals and industrialists collectively who were dependent on the government for their livelihood in their own minds can justify the elimination and liquidation of all opposition.

"Can it happen in America?

"I say 'Yes.' Unless we Americans slow down on our demands of the Federal Government to take care of us from the cradle to the grave, sooner or later anyone who voices disapproval of such a program or of any act in the Central Government, as the case may be, can be, and might be, placed in a concentration camp. What happened to the farmers in Russia when they resisted the taking of their farms by the central government? Many were sent to Siberia to work camps, and many were killed on their own farms.

"This danger to our country can only be averted by a strong public opinion. You and I must be more vigilant than we have ever been.

"The above is the dark side of the picture. In all I spent 9 days in Germany. I saw the result of the work done by your sons in conquering the beasts of nazism. I saw cities the size of Baltimore and St. Louis totally destroyed. Mannheim, a city larger than Birmingham, does not have a habitable building standing today. Cologne is razed. Every industrial city is destroyed.

"Germany can become a great peaceful nation. It will take years of education to remove the blight of nazism from the minds of the younger generation. Unless we want to have another war in which the children of our boys will have to give their lives, it is our responsibility to see that this menace to peace is removed.

"I firmly believe that this can be done by education and through religious missionary work. Christianity cannot survive in a totalitarian country. Neither can a totalitarian country exist where people are devout followers of the Christian religion.

"After seeing the destruction wrought by this war, I am convinced that with the advancement of scientific discoveries the next war could easily destroy our civilization. We have a grave responsibility, and I hope and pray that we do not shirk our duty.

"When I come home this summer, I hope to make a detailed report to the people of the district."

Subsidies to Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be considered by the other body in the near future, it is desirable that we have the benefit of the opinions of the people from all sections of the country.

Today I am pleased to submit to you a splendid editorial from the Wausau Daily Herald, published in Wausau, Wis. The statement is timely and interesting:

SUBSIDIES TO MANUFACTURERS

With the close of the European war there is a renewed effort to extend reciprocal trade treaties on the basis of the argument that if the United States is to export more it must import more and on the plea that if this Nation ever hopes for a repayment of loans to foreign nations it must open wide its doors to imports.

A statement by Matthew Woll, president of the American Wage Earners' Protective Conference, a tariff group of the American Federation of Labor, and who is also president of the union label trades department of the A. F. of L., appears in the May 7 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and points out that international rivalry grows to some extent, at least, out of competition for raw materials.

After carefully analyzing imports and exports since 1921, he said that the disastrous consequences of the reciprocal treaties would be partly overcome by payment of a subsidy to the men in control of those industries that would be adversely affected by the operation of the treaties, according to the latest proposals of those advocating the extension of these treaties. Woll said, "We feel that the tariff is the simplest method of protecting the job opportunities of our workers, and, therefore, the high level of employment that is conceded to be indispensable if we are to meet our tax burden and our public debt," he added.

"We find nothing in the American standard of living to apologize for to the rest of the world. On the contrary, we recommend that other countries follow our lead in establishing higher wages and shorter hours for their workers."

HUBERT S. ELLIS, Congressman from West Virginia, stated in the same issue of the RECORD, "When we import low-wage goods, we export jobs. The threat of foreign competition is greater today than it has ever been."

Penalty Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. J. J. Haggerty, comptroller, Bureau of Accounts, Post Office Department, with tabulation relative to penalty mail:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS,
Washington, May 17, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BURCH: Attached hereto is a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1944; the number of pieces procured during the September and December quarters, and the estimated cost to the Post Office Department of handling these mailings, by departments and agencies, for the quarters ended September 30 and December 31, 1944.

The 435,182,417 pieces of matter mailed free of postage under the penalty privilege during the quarter ended December 31, 1944, was a decrease of 81,803,057 pieces mailed during the corresponding period of the previous year.

During the period July 1 to December 31, 1944, there were 920,927,810 pieces of matter mailed free of postage under the penalty privilege, a decrease of 101,465,212 pieces mailed during the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year.

Inventories received in the Department indicate surplus stocks of penalty envelopes and labels in some of the departments and agencies. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget, with the suggestion that a bulletin be issued calling attention to the advantages of transferring this surplus stock from one department or agency to another.

Very truly yours,

J. J. HAGGERTY,
Comptroller.

Statement of penalty mail, Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944—Adjusted to Dec. 31, 1944

	On hand and on order, June 30, 1944	Procurements, September quarter 1944	Procurements, December quarter 1944	Total	Estimated mailings, September quarter 1944	Estimated cost, September quarter 1944	Estimated mailings, December quarter 1944	Estimated cost, December quarter 1944	Total estimated mailings, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1944	Total estimated cost, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1944
Legislative branch:	*Pieces*	*Pieces*	*Pieces*	*Pieces*	*Pieces*		*Pieces*		*Pieces*	
Architect of the Capitol	35,985			35,985	3,700	$55.50	3,500	$52.50	7,200	$108.00
Botanic Garden	12,600			12,600	300	4.50	325	4.88	625	9.38
Library of Congress	1,933,193	73,089	348,659	2,354,941	197,927	2,968.90	183,159	2,747.39	381,086	5,716.29
Government Printing Office	244,000	5,136,931	3,934,694	9,315,625	4,281,531	64,222.96	2,778,094	41,671.41	7,059,625	105,894.37
The Judiciary:										
Supreme Court of the United States	161,407	55,000		216,407	9,303	139.55	4,712	70.68	14,015	210.23
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	20,910			20,910	1,183	17.75	1,337	20.06	2,520	37.81
United States Customs Court	46,300			46,300	8,300	124.50	6,000	90.00	14,300	214.50
Court of Claims	37,400			37,400	700	10.50	1,400	21.00	2,100	31.50
Miscellaneous expenses, United States courts	7,933,208	676,768	740,227	9,350,203	1,402,189	21,032.83	990,000	14,850.00	2,392,189	35,882.83
Executive Office of the President:										
The White House	120,000		20,000	140,000	17,173	257.60	5,944	89.16	23,117	346.76
Bureau of the Budget	241,856			241,856	6,306	94.59	6,969	104.54	13,275	199.13
Office of Censorship	960,658	152,500	48,000	1,161,158	152,700	2,290.50	98,362	1,475.43	251,062	3,765.93
Petroleum Administration for War	2,180,177	3,093,000		5,273,177	428,000	6,420.00	382,044	5,730.66	810,044	12,150.66
Office of Price Administration	517,519,000	26,183,725	158,095,150	701,797,875	100,000,000	1,500,000.00	60,189,600	902,844.00	160,189,600	2,402,844.00
Office of Strategic Services	890,200	197,000	90,000	1,177,200	42,707	640.60	51,003	765.05	93,710	1,405.65
War Refugee Board	650			650	600	9.00	788	11.82	1,388	20.82
Office for Emergency Management:										
Office of Alien Property Custodian	401,956		155,000	556,956	110,000	1,650.00	80,000	1,200.00	190,000	2,850.00
Office of Civilian Defense	18,345,914	5,000	1,000	18,351,914	29,500	442.50	23,750	356.25	53,250	798.75
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	95,878			95,878	7,800	117.00	7,637	114.56	15,437	231.56
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	3,357,400	290,000	17,500	3,664,900	165,476	2,482.14	128,592	1,928.88	294,068	4,411.02
Office of Defense Transportation	19,187,278	235,000	705,000	20,127,278	3,267,316	49,009.74	2,722,362	40,835.43	5,989,678	89,845.17
Office of Economic Stabilization	68,120	25,000		93,120	1,500	22.50	27,220	408.30	28,720	430.80
Foreign Economic Administration	2,485,029	1,075,000	644,000	4,204,029	854,650	12,819.75	835,000	12,525.00	1,689,650	25,344.75
National War Labor Board	2,782,756	50,000	555,500	3,388,256	763,188	11,447.82	805,638	12,084.57	1,568,826	23,532.39
Office of Scientific Research and Development	403,831	481,625	10,000	895,456	107,734	1,616.01	115,095	1,726.43	222,829	3,342.44
Office of War Information	7,250,500	33,000	480,539	7,764,039	1,115,526	16,732.89	1,542,539	23,138.09	2,658,065	39,870.98
War Manpower Commission	82,833,691	7,087,844	4,413,290	94,334,825	9,194,694	137,920.41	9,008,290	135,124.35	18,202,984	273,044.76
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	208,500	37,500		246,000	52,000	780.00	34,000	510.00	86,000	1,290.00
War Production Board	20,788,976	1,774,267	1,788,759	24,352,002	4,390,367	65,855.50	3,251,667	48,775.01	7,642,034	114,630.51
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,155,895	385,000	450,000	1,990,895	600,500	9,007.50	406,829	6,102.44	1,007,329	15,109.94
Independent executive agencies:										
American Battle Monuments Commission	25,640			25,640	412	6.18	296	4.44	708	10.62
American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments for War Areas	2,950	3,000		5,950	750	11.25	475	7.13	1,225	18.38
Civil Service Commission	19,574,563	1,214,010	2,695,000	23,483,573	4,708,960	70,634.40	2,670,184	40,052.76	7,379,144	110,687.16
Employees' Compensation Commission	817,138	330,000	229,600	1,376,738	159,953	2,399.30	218,851	3,282.77	378,804	5,682.07
Federal Communications Commission	2,662,008	488,500	62,000	3,212,508	120,618	1,809.27	156,672	2,350.08	277,290	4,159.35
Federal Power Commission	850,918	32,000	135,000	1,017,918	80,767	1,211.50	76,719	1,150.79	157,486	2,362.29
Federal Security Agency	52,619,837	7,124,125	4,879,636	64,623,598	5,732,474	85,987.11	6,034,356	90,515.34	11,766,830	176,502.45
Federal Trade Commission	1,207,673	50,000	56,000	1,313,673	54,471	817.06	50,483	757.25	104,954	1,574.31
Federal Works Agency	4,451,547	70,576	62,065	4,584,188	324,730	4,870.95	381,652	5,724.78	706,382	10,595.73
General Accounting Office	2,221,303	310,000	710,000	3,241,303	612,840	9,192.60	625,000	9,375.00	1,237,840	18,567.60
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,818,072	442,480	130,292	3,390,844	331,211	4,968.16	375,990	5,639.85	707,201	10,608.01
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	595,217	90,000	20,000	705,217	50,675	760.12	53,563	803.45	104,238	1,563.57
National Archives	127,407	5,402	10,000	142,809	7,277	109.15	8,011	120.17	15,288	229.32
National Capital Housing Authority	97,150	50,000		147,150	6,853	102.79	6,772	101.58	13,625	204.37
National Capital Park and Planning Commission [1]	12,032			12,032	391	5.87	105	1.58	496	7.45
National Housing Agency (Office of Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and Federal Housing Administration)	23,854,925	4,788,330	775,100	29,418,355	3,684,585	55,268.77	3,549,041	53,235.62	7,233,626	108,504.39
National Labor Relations Board	993,332	5,000	50,000	1,048,332	185,000	2,775.00	97,000	1,455.00	282,000	4,230.00
National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board	129,200		21,000	150,200	9,197	137.95	9,292	139.38	18,489	277.33
Railroad Retirement Board	2,519,432	1,186,950	1,308,966	5,015,348	481,487	7,222.30	854,208	12,813.12	1,335,695	20,035.42
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,359,980	275,000	75,000	1,709,980	222,563	3,338.44	279,893	4,198.40	502,456	7,536.84
Selective Service System	139,253,838	8,034,829	11,761,831	159,050,498	32,004,329	480,064.93	17,504,331	262,564.97	49,508,660	742,629.90
Smithsonian Institution	340,548	41,183	12,101	393,832	34,637	519.55	11,215	168.23	45,852	687.78
Smithsonian Institution (National Gallery of Art)	99,006	27,395	11,200	137,595	18,769	281.53	18,289	274.34	37,058	555.87
The Tax Court of the United States	85,300			85,300	4,624	69.36	6,703	100.55	11,327	169.91
Tennessee Valley Authority	1,606,079	276,000	165,000	2,047,079	318,562	4,778.43	295,069	4,426.04	613,631	9,204.47
Veterans' Administration	19,811,544	4,477,500	11,854,500	36,143,544	5,982,548	89,738.22	6,051,872	90,778.08	12,034,420	180,516.30
U. S. Maritime Commission (includes War Shipping Administration)	7,423,846	1,537,000	413,300	9,374,146	1,620,483	24,307.24	1,630,232	24,453.49	3,250,715	48,760.73
U. S. Tariff Commission	181,950	12,100	5,000	199,050	28,487	427.30	8,386	125.79	36,873	553.09
District of Columbia:										
National Capital Parks [2]										
National Capital Park and Planning Commission			3,000	3,000	195	2.92	317	4.76	512	7.68
Juvenile court	35,000			35,000	5,000	75.00	5,000	75.00	10,000	150.00
Municipal court	76,272	34,300		110,572	24,496	367.44	2,350	35.25	4,846	72.69
Municipal court of appeals	49,500			49,500	2,500	37.50	2,500	37.50	5,000	75.00
Probation System	13,835			13,835	800	12.00	883	13.25	1,683	25.25
Office of Register of Wills	29,057	7,000	20,000	56,057	6,700	100.50	6,548	98.22	13,248	198.72

[1] Includes District of Columbia Park and Planning Commission.

[2] Included in Department of the Interior.

Statement of penalty mail, Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944—Adjusted to Dec. 31, 1944—Continued

	On hand and on order, June 30, 1944	Procurements, September quarter 1944	Procurements, December quarter 1944	Total	Estimated mailings, September quarter 1944	Estimated cost, September quarter 1944	Estimated mailings, December quarter 1944	Estimated cost, December quarter 1944	Total estimated mailings, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1944	Total estimated cost, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1944
	Pieces	*Pieces*	*Pieces*	*Pieces*	*Pieces*		*Pieces*		*Pieces*	
Department of Agriculture	362,498,362	31,210,232	33,951,646	367,660,240	57,338,495	$860,077.42	36,249,898	$543,748.47	93,588,393	$1,403,825.89
Department of Commerce (except Civil Aeronautics and loan agencies)	31,497,801	9,804,832	5,191,582	46,494,215	4,130,443	61,956.64	4,036,982	60,554.73	8,167,425	122,511.37
Civil Aeronautics Board	222,505	135,000	4,500	362,005	44,562	668.43	52,789	791.84	97,351	1,460.27
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (includes RFC Mortgage Company)	5,930,425	25,000	7,115,000	13,070,425	2,005,600	30,084.00	1,976,900	29,653.50	3,982,500	59,737.50
Department of Interior	35,909,514	948,938	961,077	37,819,529	2,495,869	37,438.32	2,794,960	41,924.40	5,290,829	79,362.72
Department of Justice	25,828,989	2,612,160	955,133	29,396,282	6,168,899	92,533.48	6,170,393	92,555.90	12,339,292	185,089.38
Department of Labor	14,899,504	844,010	467,573	16,211,087	1,542,810	23,142.15	1,082,307	16,234.61	2,625,117	39,376.76
State Department	2,055,527	682,000	620,000	3,357,527	745,400	11,181.00	745,400	11,181.00	1,490,800	22,362.00
Treasury Department	334,404,525	109,866,743	57,068,775	501,340,043	70,665,968	1,059,989.52	101,444,958	1,521,674.37	172,110,926	2,581,663.89
War Department—civil functions: The Panama Canal	524,150	90,000	115,000	729,150	70,200	1,053.00	72,380	1,085.70	142,580	2,138.70
Total covered by appropriations	1,731,420,663	234,178,844	314,413,195	2,280,012,702	329,226,460	4,938,397.09	279,311,081	4,189,666.37	608,537,541	9,128,063.46
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	1,421,273	53,000	260,000	1,734,273	159,584	2,393.76	152,140	2,282.10	311,724	4,675.86
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation [3]	74,000			74,000						
Central Administrative Service—Division of Office for Emergency Management [3]	37,410,044	100,000		37,510,044	635,043	9,525.64	1,048,585	15,728.78	1,683,628	25,254.42
Office of Contract Settlements		50,000	40,000	90,000	1,000	15.00	7,200	108.00	8,200	123.00
Department of Agriculture, State experiment stations	3,272,239	304,693	230,687	3,807,619	651,056	9,765.84	542,284	8,134.26	1,193,340	17,900.10
Department of Agriculture, State extension service	6,194,632	601,870	755,180	7,551,682	1,018,099	15,271.49	789,869	11,848.04	1,807,968	27,119.53
Department of Agriculture, farm credit corporations	2,412,883	176,250	60,570	2,649,703	225,312	3,379.68	254,173	3,812.60	479,485	7,192.28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,778,754		950,000	2,728,754	204,000	3,060.00	190,000	2,850.00	394,000	5,910.00
Inland Waterways Corporation	464,856	784,000	1,540	1,250,396	104,802	1,572.03	92,374	1,385.61	197,176	2,957.64
Legislative Counsel:										
House of Representatives	4,272			4,272	28	.42	31	.47	59	.89
United States Senate	6,475			6,475	294	4.41	181	2.72	475	7.13
Pan American Sanitary Bureau	594,919		5,000	599,919	26,200	393.00	29,758	446.37	55,958	839.37
Pan American Union	387,100	25,000	475,000	887,100	63,400	951.00	77,619	1,164.29	141,019	2,115.29
Washington National Monument Society [4]	150			150						
Total not covered by appropriations	54,021,597	2,094,813	2,777,977	58,894,387	3,088,818	46,332.27	3,184,214	47,763.24	6,273,032	94,095.51
Subtotal	1,785,442,260	236,273,657	317,191,172	2,338,907,089	332,315,278	4,984,729.36	282,495,295	4,237,429.61	614,810,573	9,222,158.97
Post Office Department (exempt)	543,187,836	88,694,750	37,717,500	669,600,086	51,891,002	778,365.03	58,032,188	870,482.82	109,923,190	1,648,847.85
War Department, Navy Department (exempt) [5]					101,539,113	1,523,086.69	94,654,934	1,419,824.01	196,194,047	2,942,910.70
Grand total	2,328,630,096	324,968,407	354,908,672	3,008,507,175	485,745,393	7,286,181.08	435,182,417	6,527,736.44	920,927,810	13,813,917.52

[3] Liquidated. [4] Now paying postage. [5] Exclusive of V-mail penalty envelopes.

A Second Look at Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview in which I participated on the Congressional Record of the Air program last night over Station WOL, Washington, and a number of other stations:

Mr. LEWIS. From Washington, D. C., you are about to hear the one-hundredth broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air. This public service feature presents each week a well-known Member of Congress in a discussion of national interest. Our guest this evening is a Member of the House of Representatives. He will be introduced to you now by Billy Repaid, the noted news commentator.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, Charles Lewis, and good evening ladies and gentlemen. A few weeks ago for the second time in a generation, we have seen the might of America turn the tide of war in Europe into the channels of victory for the Allies. In this war that American might has been twofold. Into the fray went the might of millions of strong, virile American men. And into the fray, also, went the might of millions of weapons of war. Never before in all history has any nation produced materials of war in such astronomical quantities. United States labor and industry turned out billions of dollars' worth of tanks, guns, ships, planes, food, clothing, and countless other articles. Not all of this went to our own forces—much of it went to arm fellow members of the United Nations and to support their war effort. They received this material under a plan we call lend-lease. When the Lend-Lease Act was originally passed back in 1941 it was the subject of much debate. And tonight, as the war in Europe gives its last spasmodic gasp, lend-lease is again the subject of discussion. Where do we stand at this time on lend-lease. Should it be continued to the European nations? And if so, on what basis? Those are a few of the questions you will have answered for you on this one-hundredth broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air. Our guest for the occasion is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a recognized authority on lend-lease and one of the Nation's most capable legislators. We are glad indeed to have with us, Congressman JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, who in the next few minutes will give us some lend-lease background and then answer some questions. Congressman VORYS.

Congressman VORYS. First, let's see just where we are on lend-lease. Under the law lend-lease agreements can be carried out until July 1, 1940—4 years from now—if they are entered into before July 1, 1946.

When this year's extension came up before the Foreign Affairs Committee, it was obvious that we should continue lend-lease for mutual war aid, and just as obvious that there was no support in Congress for lend-lease as a postwar mechanism, although this was a possibility under the law. However, when I offered an amendment in committee to bar postwar lend-lease, it was defeated. About this time the French agreement was announced, involving two and one-half billions of possible postwar lend-lease. I again tried to secure in committee amendments barring postwar lend-lease, and was again defeated. Then five of us Republicans, on March 8, issued a minority report, arguing that Congress should not extend the lease-lend power, administration, and practices into the postwar period. Within 24 hours after this lend-lease officials got in touch with me and a compromise amendment was drafted in my office, which was later approved unanimously in our committee and adopted overwhelmingly in the House.

This amendment provided that nothing in the law should be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for postwar relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction except that a lend-lease agreement in which we undertake to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, etc., "for use in the prosecution of the present war" and which provides for the sale of such defense articles "after the President determines they are no longer necessary for use by such government in promoting the defense of the United States" shall not be prohibited. The amendment had 2 parts: First, an absolute prohibition of postwar lend-lease; second, and exception, to take care of war-supply contracts during the transition from war to peace. The exception permitted the carrying out of contracts

for war supplies even after hostilities ended, provided the receiving country paid for the supplies. This exception permitted us to go full tilt to the end of the fighting, but provided an orderly and equitable way of taking care of supplies caught midway when the fighting stopped. This took care of the French agreement. Similar agreements were made with the Dutch for two hundred millions and the Belgians for three hundred and twenty-five millions before VE-day. No one knew when VE-day was coming when this amendment was passed or these agreements were made.

This exception was attacked in the House, and again in the Senate, where Senator TAFT's motion to strike out the exception and leave in only the straight prohibition of postwar lend-lease, was defeated by a vote of 39 to 39 and Vice President Truman cast his vote as Vice President to break the tie, in case of doubt. He signed this bill as Vice President, then signed it as President. No President ever understood the legislative intent of a bill better than President Truman did this one, for he heard it debated and voted on it. Opponents of the exception, such as Senator TAFT, said it furnished a loophole for the use of lend-lease in the postwar period. I agree on this possibility. I have said it was not airtight, not even machine-tool tight, if the Executive wanted to abuse the power given him by this exception. Supporters of the exception argued that it was necessary to cover the perplexing transition period, and assured everyone that it would not be abused.

The test of this law is now before us. President Truman has announced that the whole question of post-VE-day lend-lease is up for review and readjustment. It is a difficult problem. Announcement should be made soon. If the President uses this exception to furnish obvious postwar relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction supplies to France, Holland, Belgium, Britain, and Russia on the basis of some remote help they may be giving in our war against Japan, well, my face will be red, and Congress in general will have a good deal to say, and President Truman's next 3 years will be harder. The test words in the French and other agreements are these: "After a determination by the President, that any of the articles and services set forth, are no longer necessary to the prosecution of the war." Note that the test is not whether the stuff is convenient, or helpful, but necessary to the prosecution of the war. This must not be used as an excuse to bolster France's or Britain's economy. Such help must be on some other basis. This must not be used as a device for appeasing Russia.

A lot of countries will need to borrow some money from us. We should make it available, on mutually satisfactory terms, but we should stop lend-lease soon, altogether.

Mr. REPAID. Exactly, sir. And here is the first one. When the lend-lease act was written * * * was there any time limitation put upon it. I mean by that, was it passed for a certain number of years, or is it one of the wartime executive grants that can be continued until peace is declared?

Congressman VORYS. Well, it was passed in 1941 for 2 years, not as a war measure at all but as a peace measure. Remember, it meant three things: First, a prewar measure to keep us out of war. Second, a measure for mutual war aid between allies. Third, a postwar relief and reconstruction measure. As a prewar measure to keep us out of war by arming Britain and others, lend-lease was a bitterly controversial issue, to put it mildly. Of those who voted against it, 56 are no longer in Congress; of those who voted for it, 106 are no longer here; percentage-wise, 72 percent; of those who voted for prewar lend-lease and wanted to stay in Congress are still here, and 81 percent of those who opposed prewar lend-lease are still here. It was unsuccessful in keeping us out of war, and unpopular, according to these figures.

After Pearl Harbor, however, lend-lease as a mechanism for mutual war aid received overwhelming public support and has been extended three times by Congress, first in 1943, again in 1944, and this year in 1945.

Mr. REPAID. Now, why do we call this act lend-lease, Congressman VORYS? That is, When do we lend and when do we lease, and what is the difference between the two?

Congressman VORYS. Except for ships, which are leased, there is no lend-leasing at all. We keep title to all the stuff. What we will do with used gunpowder, food, etc., has never been explained. We actually sold $422,000,000 worth. This has a secret classification. Of the total lend-lease of 39 billions—from the last report released a few days ago—about 28 percent of our exports went to Russia, and although the total to the British Empire is concealed and subdivided, it is about 65 percent. The rest went to South America and others. We have gotten about 4.6 billion in reverse lend-lease.

Mr. REPAID. Now, how about this problem of lend-leasing to countries not actively at war with Japan?

Congressman VORYS. I believe that under the law nothing should go, or can go legally to countries not at war with Japan. This includes any country—Russia and other countries—not at war with Japan, because I don't see how we can spell out under the language in the law how our defense is involved in furnishing lend-lease to countries not at war. It might be convenient, but not necessary to our defense, to continue supplies to a country not at war.

Mr. REPAID. Now, that is the original wording of the law?

Congressman VORYS. No; it was not in the original law, but is now, and was written in the French agreement which became the standard after VE-day. And that is what President Truman and his associates are considering now, at this time.

Mr. REPAID. In your earlier talking about the history of the amendment barring lend-lease after the war—what about the opposition? What brought about this change?

Congressman VORYS. I can't tell exactly. It is rather interesting that although President Roosevelt last fall in November had said lend-lease and reverse lend-lease should end with the war, and although Crowley, Lend-Lease Administrator, said so, too, there were forces in the administration that caused the defeat of the amendment to forbid postwar lend-lease twice. Then something changed. The President was out of the country, also the Secretary of State. I don't know what caused the change, but obviously there were those who wanted to preserve the possibility of postwar lend-lease in opposition to those in the administration and in Congress who felt as I did.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, indeed, Congressman JOHN M. VORYS of Ohio. For my part, and I am sure our listeners will agree, we all have a better appreciation now of this lend-lease problem.

Memorial Day, 1919—American Expeditionary Forces in France

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, 1945, I am glad to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following story of the manner in which Memorial Day, 1919, was observed by the AEF in France. Mr. S. W. McGill, who arranged the AEF Memorial Day program and who wrote the story, is a prominent citizen of Fort Wayne, Ind., in the district I represent, and, I might add, the brother-in-law of my distinguished colleague, Congressman HOBBS:

ANOTHER MEMORIAL DAY—MCGILL RECALLS SELECTION OF AEF UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(By S. W. McGill)

As United States approaches its eightieth observance of Memorial Day, the ceremonies that marked the AEF Memorial Day in France in 1919 are recalled.

There for the first time after the armistice we were honoring the heroic dead of the AEF. The services were held at temporary military cemeteries. During the early part of 1919 it was my privilege to be attached to the Graves Registration Service with headquarters at Soisson.

For weeks we had been engaged in the most gruesome task of the war. This task was that of locating bodies buried where they had fallen. Then the bodies had been wrapped in heavy burlap, piled high on trucks and taken to the temporary military cemeteries for burial. The soldiers engaged in this task wore no army uniforms. There were no brass buttons on display. They were clad in blue overalls, wore rubber boots and rubber gloves. Their equipment consisted of spade or shovel and a long sharp-pointed stick. These members of the AEF covered every square yard of the combat territory. Where a grave had been marked, the task was simple. When a sunken piece of earth looked suspicious, but had no marking, the sharp-pointed stick was used. High tribute should be paid to the GRS of the AEF. By hard and skillful work they reduced the percentage of unknown American dead to less than 1 percent. No other nation made such a fine record.

The temporary cemeteries were located at Chateau-Thierry, Soisson, Juvigny, Missy-aux-Bois, and Vimy Ridge. For weeks doughboys had been busily engaged in digging what appeared to be a countless number of graves. They were left open, awaiting their precious cargo. Later these bodies were transferred to what we called permanent military cemeteries. Many times during World War II we have wondered what happened to these American cemeteries. We do know that at one time 30,405 American soldiers were buried in these cemeteries. Thirty were buried outside, in various places. Forty-six thousand two hundred and fourteen bodies were returned to the United States, and 3,432 were still missing.

The time was approaching for the observance of Memorial Day in 1919 at the five military cemeteries. Associated with me in all of this work were two American women, Miss Ethel Lyman Mackey and Miss Mary Hopkins Emerson of New York City. Together we had made our plans for the observance of the first Memorial Day observance for the AEF. Then arose complications which we had not expected.

Word came from the Bishop of Soisson, a dignitary to be respected, that he would be present to conduct the rites at the graves and to preach a sermon. Then word came from Dr. Henry Churchill King, located in Paris, and head of religious work with the AEF, under whose direction we were working aside from military authority. He said he would send Dr. Hugh Black, celebrated Scotch preacher, to preach the Memorial Day sermon. But our supply of speakers was not exhausted. Miss Anne Morgan, head of the Committee Americane for the devasted area, notified us that John Kendrick Bangs would be sent to make the address. By this time we had word from GHQ that General Pershing was to send Chaplain King of the First Division to conduct the Memorial Day services.

As most of the casualties were members of the First Division, this seemed a natural right. Finally, word came from General Mauldin of the French Army, who was really in charge of things, that he would be present. He said he would have French children decorate the graves with flowers and he would make the address. This complicated situation was reported to Captain Trigg. He ordered me out of his office. Told me that I had my orders and he wouldn't be bothered.

SERVICES 9 TO 5

On May 30 General Molandin of the Ninth Infantry of the French Army was present. He brought a detachment of the Thirtieth Artillery and the Thirty-first Engineers to do honor to the AEF dead. General Maisonrouge made an address in French, after which General Molandin presented a huge wreath of flowers with the First Division AEF emblem made of poppies. Miss Mackey sang "In Flanders Field." Hundreds of French children were present and dropped flowers on each grave. The Catholic bishop made a brief address. Both Dr. Black and Chaplain King spoke. The firing squad fired the last salute over the grave of Lt. Johnny Overton of Nashville, Tenn. The bugler sounded taps and the ceremony closed. The procession moved on to other cemeteries where similar rites were conducted, with slight change in the rotation of speakers. Services had begun at 9 a. m. and closed at 5 p. m.

It is appropriate at this time to recount the story of the selection and burial of America's Unknown Soldier. The burial in Arlington Cemetery occurred 24 years ago. Yet this is a story that should never be forgotten.

FOUR BODIES SELECTED

When the order was received in 1921 at headquarters of the Graves Registration Service in Paris to select, prepare, and return the body of an American Unknown Soldier, there were about 1,500 AEF dead who were still listed as unidentified. The list was carefully checked for any possible means of identification. At the final check up, four bodies were selected, one each from four widely separated cemeteries. These cemeteries were Bony, Romagne, Thiacourt, and Beilau.

The four bodies selected were shown by the forms to have had their faces blown away so that it was not possible to make even a tooth chart. The bodies themselves were carefully searched and prepared by specially trained groups of men, each group under the supervision of an officer. Each body was wrapped in a blanket and placed in a metal casket, which in turn was placed in a shipping box, but only after the box had been planed white to insure that no private identifying marks had been made.

On October 24, 1921, the bodies were sent to Chalons-Sur-Marne where they were carried from trucks to the Hotel De Ville by French soldiers. At Hotel De Ville the bodies were placed in a room that was decorated with the flags of the Allies. A guard of noncommissioned officers was placed over the bodies, with a guard of French soldiers in the outer room.

On the following day the officials who were to take part in the ceremony to select the one body to be sent to the United States gathered in the room in which reposed the four bodies.

HIS SELECTION MADE

After a brief prayer all left the room except one officer and a civilian worker. The windows were carefully covered so that no one might see in. The caskets were opened and the blanketed bodies laid on top of the caskets. The civilian worker then left the room, leaving only the officer. The door was locked and the bodies were changed and inter-changed by the single officer. The officer then left the room and another officer entered and performed the same duties so that by the time the officers had finished their work, any possible means of identifying the body, or the cemetery from which it came, had been destroyed. This was done so that any chance of identifying the cemetery and then tracing the troops which may have fought in that locality might be in vain.

The bodies were placed in the caskets on which they rested and the caskets closed. The doors were opened and Sgt. Younger of the Second Battalion, Fifty-ninth Infantry, who had been selected because of his excellent war record, was handed a spray of white roses by General Allen.

Passing the four coffins Sgt. Younger turned and passed again. Twice he made the turn more slowly, then pausing, he raised his hand and amid intense silence placed the roses on the casket to the right. The body was removed to another room and there placed in special casket on which was engraved "An unknown American soldier who gave his life in the Great War." An American flag was placed over the casket and the body was ready for the journey home.

Capitol Hill Goes Over the Top on Red Cross Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, most of us had an opportunity to contribute to the Red Cross drive which was recently sponsored on the House side of Capitol Hill by the Congressional Secretaries Club.

As a charter member and former president of this club, I can appreciate the amount of effort that it took to bring this drive to so successful a conclusion.

It is significant to me that the House Members and their personnel contributed so generously that they were given a rating of 141.60 percent of the quota set by the national headquarters of the American Red Cross for the House of Representatives Office Building.

The following letter was received by Miss Antoinette Hart, who is general chairman of the drive:

I am most grateful for the excellent performance of the House and House Office Building in our 1945 Red Cross War Fund campaign, which has just come to its close. Your own leadership was partly responsible, I know, for the effective results in your own department. You helped so materially to make this war fund the most successful campaign in Washington in recent years.

You will be interested to know that we have now received $3,285,031.80. This record leads all the other large No. 1 chapters of the country in percent of accomplishment. The Government unit has raised $1,391,453.17, or 119.85 percent of its quota. Of this amount, the House and House Office Building contributed $3,259.10 or 141.60 percent of its quota.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the division chairman and other members of your department organization for whose fine cooperation we are so greatly indebted. However, I am keenly aware that the generous contributions and support of all our Government employees is due to their abiding faith in the great work of the Red Cross among our servicemen of the land, sea, and air, scattered all over the world.

Again thanking you and with all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Chairman, Government Unit.

In talking with Miss Hart a short time ago I was informed that she had appointed a chairman for each building. Mr. Russell C. Jones was chairman for the House Office Building, and he and his workers collected $1,194.75. Mr. Millard Carlisle was chairman of the New House Office Building, and his workers collected $1,615. The total collected in the two buildings amounts to $2,809.75. Miscellaneous donations amounting to $449.35 brought the total up to $3,259.10.

Following is a résumé of the report submitted by Miss Hart and the chairmen of the two Office Buildings:

Congressional Secretaries' Club 1945 Red Cross report, New and Old House Office Buildings

(House Office Building, Russell C. Jones, chairman, $1,194.75)

First floor:	
Betty Ickes	$79.50
Susan E. Davidson	92.50
S. Verdi	9.00
Second floor:	
Ainslie Maxwell	72.00
Helen Morris	130.00
Doris Bocock	50.00
Hazel Pickard	51.00
Third floor:	
Mabel Barton	48.50
Mabel Donnelly	79.00
Sammie Lee Cecil	37.00
Dorris Bocock	87.00
Fourth floor:	
Essie Coleman	69.00
Emmaline Jackson	76.00
Margaret Marquis	90.75
Alice Shyosky	52.50
Fifth floor:	
Dorothy Nelson	107.00
Ruth Kilburn	64.00
	1,194.75

(New House Office Building, Millard Carlisle, chairman, $1,615)

Ground floor:	
Merrill Winslett	$210.00
Jane C. Bittner	99.00
First floor:	
Martin Cunningham	29.00
Jean Charon	56.00
Second floor:	
Marguerite Lopez	70.50
Mary Stack	74.00
Third floor:	
Janet M. Moore	99.00
Julia Pepper	119.50
Fourth floor:	
Ethel Hester	98.50
Parthenia Beasley	80.00
Fifth floor:	
Phillis Schools	200.50
Doris Whitney	70.50
Sixth floor:	
Marcella Langdon	94.00
Violet Lesch	75.00
Seventh floor:	
Margaret Welch	88.00
Henrietta O'Donoghue	84.50
Folding room (M. C. Vehue): Joseph Callahan	67.00
	1,615.00
Total	2,809.75
Other memberships and donations	449.35
Grand total	3,259.10

ANTOINETTE HART,
Chairman.

Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Troy, N. Y., the very home of Uncle Sam—Samuel Wilson—on Sunday, May 27, 1945, again became a focal point for national interest when Under Secretary of War Patterson presented Congressional Medals of Honor to the widows of both Lt. Col. William J. O'Brien and Sgt. Thomas A. Baker, former residents of Troy, and members of the gallant Twenty-seventh Division.

A more heroic record has never been written in this or any other war than that contained in the citations which accompanied the presentation of the Congressional Medals. It is a record which every Member of this House should be made aware of, and for that reason I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Trojans are immensely proud of the fact that there lived among them such sterling Americans as Lieutenant Colonel O'Brien and Sergeant Baker, and they are fully aware too of the fact that they are obligated to see to it that her heroes shall not have died in vain.

Lieutenant Colonel O'Brien and Sergeant Baker take their places among Troy's immortals. Their heroic deeds shall never be forgotten.

LT. COL. WILLIAM J. O'BRIEN—NEW YORK NATIONAL GUARD INFANTRY—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTH INFANTRY, SAIPAN—POSTHUMOUS

Next of kin: Mrs. Mary O'Brien, widow, R. F. D. 2, North Troy, N. Y.

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty at Saipan, Marianas Islands, from June 20 through July 7, 1944.

"When assault elements of his platoon were held up by intense enemy fire, Colonel O'Brien ordered three tanks to precede the assault companies in an attempt to knock out the strongpoint. Due to direct enemy fire the tanks' turrets were closed, causing the tanks to lose direction and to fire into our own troops. Colonel O'Brien, with complete disregard for his own safety, dashed into full view of the enemy and ran to the leader's tank, and pounded on the tank with his pistol butt to attract two of the tank's crew and mounting the tank fully exposed to enemy fire Colonel O'Brien personally directed the assault until the enemy strongpoint had been liquidated. On June 28, 1944, while his platoon was attempting to take a bitterly defended high ridge in the vicinity of Donnay, Colonel O'Brien arranged to capture the ridge by a double development movement of two large combat battalions. He personally took control of the maneuver. Colonel O'Brien crossed 1,200 yards of sniper-infested underbrush alone to arrive at a point where one of his platoons was being held up by the enemy. Leaving some men to contain the enemy he personally led four men into a narrow ravine behind, and killed or drove off all the Japanese manning that strongpoint. In this action he captured five machine guns and one 77-millimeter fieldpiece. Colonel O'Brien then organized the two platoons for night defense and against repeated counterattacks directed them. Meanwhile he managed to hold ground. On July 7, 1944, his battalion and another battalion were attacked by an overwhelming enemy force estimated at between 3,000 and 5,000 Japanese. With bloody hand-to-hand fighting in progress everywhere their forward positions were finally overrun by the sheer weight of the enemy numbers. With many casualties and ammunition running low, Colonel O'Brien refused to leave the front lines. Striding up and down the lines, he fired at the enemy with a pistol in each hand and his presence there bolstered the spirits of the men, encouraged them in their fight and sustained them in their heroic stand. Even after he was seriously wounded, Colonel O'Brien refused to be evacuated and after his pistol ammunition was exhausted, he manned a .50-caliber machine gun, mounted on a jeep, and continued firing. When last seen alive he was standing upright firing into the Jap hordes that were then enveloping him. Sometime later his body was found surrounded by enemy he had killed. His valor was consistent with the highest traditions of the Service."

Announced overseas March 14, 1945.

LT. GEN. ROBERT C. RICHARDSON,
Commanding Army Forces,
Pacific Ocean Area.

SGT. THOMAS A. BAKER—COMPANY A, ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTH INFANTRY—NEW YORK NATIONAL GUARD INFANTRY—POSTHUMOUS

Next to kin: Mrs. Constance Baker, widow, 145 Ferry St., Troy, N. Y.

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty at Saipan, Marianas Islands, June 19 to July 7, 1944.

"When his entire company was held up by fire from automatic weapons and small arms fire from strongly fortified enemy positions that commanded the view of the company, Sergeant Baker voluntarily took a bazooka and dashed alone to within 100 yards of the enemy. Though heavy rifle- and machine-gun fire that was directed at him by the enemy, he knocked out the strong point, enabling his company to assault the ridge. Some days later while his company advanced across an open field flanked with obstructions and places of concealment for the enemy, Sergeant Baker again voluntarily took up a position in the rear to protect the company against surprise attack and came upon two heavily fortified enemy pockets manned by 2 officers and 10 enlisted men which had been bypassed. Without regard for such superior numbers, he unhesitatingly attacked and killed all of them. Five hundreds yards farther, he discovered six men of the enemy who had concealed themselves behind our lines and destroyed all of them. On July 7, 1944, the perimeter of which Sergeant Baker was a part was attacked from three sides by from 3,000 to 5,000 Japanese. During the early stages of this attack Sergeant Baker was seriously wounded but he insisted on remaining in the line and fired at the enemy at ranges sometimes as close as 5 yards until his ammunition ran out. Without ammunition and with his own weapon battered to uselessness from hand-to-hand combat, he was carried about 50 yards to the rear by a comrade, who was then himself wounded. At this point Sergeant Baker refused to be moved any farther stating that he preferred to be left to die rather than risk the lives of any more of his friends. A short time later, at his request, he was placed in a sitting position against a small tree. Another comrade withdrawing, offered assistance. Sergeant Baker refused, insisting that he be left alone and be given a soldier's pistol with its remaining eight rounds of ammunition. When last seen alive, Sergeant Baker was propped against a tree, pistol in hand, calmly facing the foe. Later Sergeant Baker's body was found in this same position, gun empty, with eight Japanese lying dead before him. His deeds were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Army.

Announced overseas March 14, 1945.

Lt. Gen. ROBERT C. RICHARDSON,
Commanding Army Forces,
Pacific Ocean Area.

Investigation of Raw Material Resources for Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no nation of the Allied group has contributed so greatly of its raw materials in this war as has the United States. This is particularly true on the question of steel. Such enormous inroads have been made of our stock piles of steel that we must now begin planning for the future welfare of ourselves by research and investigation in this field of steel and iron.

Fully appreciative of this fact, Budget estimates have been recommended to the Bureau of Mines. The House, in passing upon this legislation, has seen fit to materially reduce the Budget estimates.

With a full recognition of the importance of this situation in our national picture, I appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate and made the following statement, dealing with the question of investigation of raw material resources for steel production.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement made before the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate on May 21, 1945:

Two important items have been decreased considerably by the House of Representatives below the Budget estimates, even though both of them already had been cut below the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year. The work conducted under these two appropriations is of such vital importance to the national security that it would be more appropriate to increase them than to cut them.

I refer to "Investigation of raw material resources for steel production," on page 73 and "Investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals in the United States and its possessions," on page 78. The former item was cut from the $3,250,000 that was appropriated last year to $1,000,000, a reduction of $2,250,000. The other item was cut from $2,900,000 to $2,000,000, a reduction of $900,000.

The Bureau of Mines has been conducting under these two appropriations a well integrated mineral resource development program. It has done an excellent job that is extremely important from the viewpoint of the national security. As the committee report so ably points out: "The Bureau of Mines has been engaged more actively in support of the war effort than any other agency in the department." It "has played a highly important role in locating new ore reserves so essential in the war as well as carrying on research and experimental work."

In spite of its excellent work, however, the mineral resources of the country have been seriously depleted during the war. We have been accustomed to consider this country to have rich, unlimited resources of all kinds of metals and minerals. Recently we have heard such of another philosophy, that we are fast becoming a have-not Nation in minerals; that we should import all our mineral raw materials.

Actually, the truth lies somewhere between the two viewpoints. It is true that the days of bonanzas are over, but it is not true that we shall soon be finished as a producer of metals and minerals. It is true that the ores we are now finding are lower grade and more difficult to treat than those we worked 50 years ago, but it is not true that we have lost our inventiveness nor our ability to make use of what we have.

It has been given as a reason for the reduction of these items that "the Bureau of Mines should begin to readjust itself for post-war operations." There can be no argument with that statement, but I cannot agree that our responsibility for national security will end with the European war nor with the Japanese war. It has been demonstrated during the wars that two of the most important factors in a nation's strength are its resources of minerals and its ability to use them effectively. If the United States is to be prepared for emergencies, it must know how to be largely self-sufficient when necessary.

The mineral production of the Nation is not something that can be turned on and off like a spigot. We cannot lock up all our minerals in the ground and save them for the future. If we attempt it, we shall not know how to use them when, in an emergency, we must depend upon them. Our smelters and refineries will know how to use only the higher grade, imported ores. If we are to be prepared for future emergencies, we must have a healthy, going mineral industry based upon our own resources.

A particular project which comes under the heading of the two items I mentioned above is one now being operated at the university of my State, located at Grand Forks, N. Dak. This pilot plant, primarily constructed for the gasification of lignite producing a high hydrogen gas for use in reducing ores from the iron ranges of Minnesota can be and will be of inestimable value in providing "know-how" for the future national security. I would like to point out at this time that the lignite coal in North Dakota has reserves estimated at more than 600,000,000,000 tons.

Perhaps it is true, as the promulgators of the have-not philosophy would have us believe, that private risk capital is now reluctant to take the long chances involved in financing the preliminary development of low-grade deposits and novel treatment processes. But is that sufficient reason for us to jeopardize the future security of the Nation? If that be true, it is all the more reason for the Bureau of Mines to continue its excellent work of mineral resource development.

Fortunately, we have in the Bureau of Mines an agency with an experienced, competent staff of engineers ready to find out how our domestic mineral resources can best be utilized for the national security. I should not like to believe that national security is to be of less vital interest to us, now that victory in Europe appears imminent, than it has been during the war. Rather than a cut-back in these two appropriations, an increase should be made.

I also wish to endorse the proposed 5-year exploratory and research program of the Bureau of Mines, which is being sponsored by the Subcommittee on Ship Design and Construction Materials which has as its chairman the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN. It is my belief that this proposed 5-year program will accomplish a great deal in providing for the future national security.

Addresses by Hon. Robert P. Patterson and Dr. Frank B. Jewett at the Eighth Annual American Design Awards Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to include in the RECORD, I am submitting addresses by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Dr. Frank B. Jewett, President of the National Academy of Sciences, in connection with the Eighth Annual American Design Awards Luncheon held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, on April 19, 1945, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

Seven days ago mankind lost a man of courage and of vision. America lost its President and Commander in Chief. The death of President Roosevelt is a tragedy which does not lend itself to the measure of the spoken word. For each of us that loss will be the object of inner reflection and quiet sorrow. For each of us that loss must effect a rededication to the remaining tasks of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Hating war as he did, President Roosevelt recognized that its lessons, taught for a fee of human lives, of suffering, of sacrifice, and of incalculable expenditures in resources and energy, were lessons to be learned and remembered. The lessons learned and mastered with his counsel he would wish us to take as precepts for the future. It is well to make that our determined resolve.

We Americans have learned that the strength of our land and people, great as it is, is not alone sufficient to meet the challenge of modern warfare. The transition from peace to war is sudden and violent. The aggressor strikes swiftly, the pace of combat is furious, overnight the leisurely river of time becames a torrent. The Nation that cannot adjust to these swift demands is lost.

In the last 3 years we have learned that when a nation goes to war all its people must go to war. All its people, not merely its best and bravest young men. We have learned that survival depends upon a universal effort, a gathering together of all energies for a single purpose. We have learned that we need women no less than men. Management no less than labor, scientists no less than farmers. We have learned, in particular, that without the help of our best scientists and technicians our military engine will soon become little more than a museum piece. Science, the servant of peace, is the artisan in war, indispensable in either role.

Every aspect of our military effort reflects the skill and devotion of our scientific workers. They came willingly from the laboratories, workshops, and classrooms of industry and university and government to unite their effort in defense of their country. Laying aside their peacetime activities of increasing human knowledge and promoting human welfare, they took up the task of designing new weapons and equipment for our fighting men, of saving lives and healing the wounded, of safeguarding the welfare of our soldiers and sailors in every phase of their daily existence.

It is scarcely possible to list the examples of scientific ingenuity and inventiveness which have contributed to our military effort. When war came several of the raw materials most essential for production were cut off by our enemies. Where new sources were to be found our scientists found them; where substitutes were feasible our scientists made them; where rubber, drugs, plastics, new skills, new methods had to be created our scientists created them. So were achieved in the laboratories miracles and creation, duplicating in the space of months processes of nature that take hundreds of thousands of years.

In weapons and other military items scientific workers have given us inventions and developments which have radically altered the character of warfare. Electronics is one; jet propulsion another; new types of ammunition and rockets another. Never in history have armies gone into battle with vehicles in such quantity or of such diversity as those used by our men. Vehicles that can traverse every kind of terrain; vehicles that can carry troops where they are needed, care for the wounded, maintain an endless flow of weapons and supplies, batter down stone walls, move mountains of earth, build roads and airfields; vehicles that can swim, and run and fight; vehicles, in short, that can do almost everything a soldier can do except talk. Never before have the component parts of an army, widely separated, always on the move, been so closely knit together into a single organism by intricate machines and by networks of communication. Our men are better clothed, better fed, better housed, better cared for medically than we ever dared hope. These, all these, are the works of science.

In peace as in war science is a cooperative effort. Scientists are accustomed to work together, to share their knowledge, to contribute their effort to the solution of a common problem. But the mobilization of scientific talents for the national defense—a single problem in name only—entailed a prodigious effort. The conception was as massive as the achievement. For both, we are indebted to the leaders of science, the men and organizations we honor today.

Even before America entered the war President Roosevelt, unfailingly aware of the importance of science and scientific method, established the Office of Scientific Research and Development, an emergency agency designed to bring civilian scientists of the highest caliber into active participation on matters of military research. This civilian body, reporting directly to the President, was given power to support and initiate research on matters essential to the national defense. The program was supported by Congress with a grant of ample funds. Universities and research institutions of industry and Government were quickly mobilized by the Office of Scientific Research and Development in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council. Close working relationships of the highest importance were established with other civilian groups, such as the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

The whole of the research machinery so created was linked up with the technical services and bureaus of the Army and Navy. This last achievement deserves special emphasis, because it is a tribute to the wisdom and organizing ability of the leaders of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and its cooperating groups, a tribute also to the entire body of scientific workers. The scientific advances that I have mentioned are the fruits of the working together of all scientists, regardless of organizational lines, in the laboratories, testing fields, and conference rooms. They are the finest proof of what freedom-loving men and women can achieve when all are pledged to a common cause. In the organization of research on a Nation-wide scale, in the execution of count-

less details of administration, in the successful establishment of a unified community of science, the leaders we honor today played a brilliant and tireless role. They have given us something that is at once a model and a foundation for cooperative scientific activities in the future, whether pointed toward national security or to the pursuits of peace. Despite the scale of their immediate duties, they have given thought to the establishment of a more permanent organization to carry on research and development programs for national security after the war is ended. Under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences there has been created a research board for national security which will draw upon the support and counsel of the academy until Congress determines whether to establish an independent agency of Government for the advancement of science relative to the techniques of war. It is to be expected that the research board, with its distinguished civilian scientists and representatives of the Army and Navy, will build soundly on the foundations which have now been laid.

There is a final debt which we owe to science, its organizations, its leaders, its workers, a debt arising from their contribution to America's war effort, but continuing far beyond it. It is a debt which arises from the sweeping character of modern warfare. The responses of science to the terrible demands of war will in many ways be of lasting benefit. New developments in clothing, nutrition, transportation, aircraft, chemicals, plastics, metallurgy, electronics, and medicine will inure to the benefit of our people and the people of the entire world long after this bitter struggle is ended. These advances will contribute to our material welfare and to our economic stability by creating new products, new industries, and new jobs. Even in the ashes of war we may discern the promise of a brighter future.

It is a privilege to participate in the conferral of this award, a tribute alike to the scientists of America and to their leaders. In the fight for freedom science strikes its greatest blows and continues its honored traditions. It participates in the vindication of the life of decency and the life of reason.

ADDRESS OF DR. FRANK B. JEWETT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Mr. Hoving and distinguished guests, as president of the National Academy of Sciences, I accept for it and through it for all American scientists the American design award for 1945 and the check which accompanies it and which is very tangible evidence of Lord & Taylor's appreciation of the services these men have rendered the Nation in this time of peril.

I can assure you that the Academy will expend this money for worthy purposes in the field of science. In line with your expressed hope, we will, so far as possible, administer it for the encouragement of research in those things which are deemed most likely to enhance the security of our country.

While the council of the Academy will make final determination of how the money can best be employed, the structure of the Academy and two of its operating agencies, the National Research Council and the National Science Fund, are such as to insure that any determination will be wisely carried out.

The scientists for whom we accept trusteeship of this award are many. They are both civilian and military. Many of them and much of what they have accomplished in these war years will never be generally known or acclaimed. It has been a labor of high patriotism freely given, performed anonymously, and mainly in surroundings which lack the glamor and appeal to human sympathy and emotion which surrounds the fighting front. But deprived of what they have contributed, our fighting forces would not have been able to accomplish what they have. In a very real sense scientists have been defenders of the Nation and, in addition, have reduced immeasurably the toll of human life and human suffering.

What they have shown themselves capable of doing cooperatively in war is a happy augury for the days of peace, not only for a more decent postwar world but likewise for a greater security of the Nation should it and its cherished way of life again be threatened.

We value the evidence of appreciation which the American design award conveys and more the confidence of us in the future which you, sir, have expressed in making it.

Letter of Elmer W. Hanak, of Kenosha, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, as Secretary of Commerce, by a friend and constituent.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this lette: is to the point and clearly raises issues that must be met in the days ahead. If we are to have full employment, so-called in the postwar period, then it is imperative that sniping against businessmen cease. We must enter upon a new era of relations between capital and labor and only by an honest spirit of cooperation will our employment objectives be reached. Some progress has been made in this direction; however, not sufficient to meet the goals we have chosen. In spite of all the false propaganda that has been sponsored by New Deal bureaucrats this Nation still enjoys the highest standards of living in the world and this has been possible because of the courage, initiative, and foresight of men who have been willing to create business organizations in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I am submitting states more forcefully than I can the thoughts I have been attempting to convey:

KENOSHA, WIS., *May 18, 1945.*

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have carefully read, and with much interest, your article entitled "Planning for Freedom," appearing in the May issue of Reader's Digest.

It is easy for me to agree with you that Abraham Lincoln did much good for the world and belongs to the ages. I also agree with you that the Republican Party did much good for the American people. Many people throughout the world know and have known of the good work done by Herbert Hoover. All of this, of course, is not exactly a new discovery. History has written many pages since it recorded these facts.

It is encouraging to learn that you support the bill introduced by Senator TAFT, from Ohio, to aid and assist small business, even though the Senator "strongly fears your tendency toward humanitarian governmental dreams."

In your article there are some principles and policies cited that measure up to the highest ideals and purposes of the majority of the American people. I shall hereafter only deal with the subjects on which I would appreciate having more light.

You stated that the company you organized and served as president has plants in the States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio; that you sell $4,000,000 worth of seed corn a year.

What would your opinion be if your company, in addition to the plants in the four States mentioned, had plants in, let's say, four more States—perhaps, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wyoming? Then if your products served the people of these eight States satisfactorily and fulfilled a required need, would you be opposed to establishing plants in Nevada, Maine, Alabama, and Alaska, so the people of those States would realize the benefits enjoyed by the people of the States already being served by your plants?

What would your opinion be if your firm, by expanding to the 8 other States specified, increased its sales to $12,000,000 and later on, if your company expanded further and had plants in 48 States, your sales increased to $48,000,000 annually? What if you served all the people of the world and increased your sales to a billion dollars a year?

What I want to know is—How far can one go in doing good by promoting trade and commerce before becoming damned as some sort of an evil creature?

When and how does one become a common man? When and how does one become something other than a common man?

In the various plants operated by your company, what happens to an individual—rich or poor, common man or otherwise—who is industrious and endeavors to do the most good for himself and for the most people?

What happens to an individual—rich or poor, common man or otherwise—who makes no effort to help himself or anybody else?

Why are some families—whom you term "eastern wage earners" who migrated into "being western independent property owners," who under the Homestead Act settled on 160 acres of land and after 5 years of work—perhaps, good old-fashioned hard work—could have the land (you say "free"—did they not have to work 5 years in order to possess the land?). Why are some of them owners of businesses selling $4,000,000 or more of their products annually, some of them good, self-reliant, and cooperative American farmers, merchants, or employees, and others totally irresponsible citizens, or the equivalent? Is it not all somehow related to freedom? Did not all the western property owners you refer to secure 160 acres of land for 5 years' work? Did the Homestead Act, approved by Lincoln, specify or guarantee that all settlers forever would only have or always have 160 acres of land? Or did each settler, in addition to the Homestead Act, have the additional privileges and freedom granted to all American citizens by the Constitution of the United States, which Lincoln also approved and labored under such great difficulties to keep inviolate?

In the so-called new plans or scheme of things, where do these fundamental principles, objectives and factors stand or rate: Individualism, intelligence, research, science, self-reliance, honesty, work, sacrifice, courage, common sense, intelligent thrift, patience, constructive cooperation, love, faith, liberty, human leadership?

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE?

And what ratings do these elements carry: Fuehrers, dictators, fanatics, mythopoets, pied prophets, hatred, jealousy, waste, red tape, tinkering, the philosophy which tells people "Do not utilize your talents and

abilities—let somebody else do your thinking, chores and duties for you," insane totalitarianism?

WITH MALICE TOWARD SOME?

It is a big universe. It a big world. Why should we fear big sales, big production, big consumption, big men, big industries? All legitimate American industries and businesses—large or small—should be encouraged to grow, to make improvements and to better serve the people.

The American people deserve good leadership and, ultimately, always go out and secure it. We owe much to many American citizens and we owe much to American industry. Who established the first industrial research laboratory and developed many new and useful products? Who produced and transported goods in volume at low cost? What country has the highest standard of living for most of its citizens and the greatest hope and prospects for the future?

No one should disseminate too much nonsense to the gullible. It is not good for them or the world at large.

Above all, let's promote and practice sound American citizenship and forever strive for improvement. We need not be fanatically anti or pro anything. Let's just be men and good Americans.

Respectfully yours,

ELMER W. HANAK.

Protection of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 26, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the name "reciprocal trade agreements" is a misnomer. It only works one way and that is against America, by authorizing reduction of protective tariff as much as 75 percent on low-paid labor goods coming into the United States.

American industry and labor prospered when America was protected against low-paid foreign labor.

Everyone knows that America pays the highest wages in the world. Yet there are those who want to reduce wages by inviting cheaply paid foreign-made goods to the United States by cutting protective tariff as much as 75 percent.

Such tariff reduction can only lower American wages.

The glass industry and its workers would have to again compete with 15-cent-per-hour wages of Czechoslovakia, while the average wage in the glass industry here in America is 80 cents per hour.

It not only cuts the hourly rate, but would cut the worker's time to only several days per week.

The workers of the United States are entitled to American wages and American standards of living, and must not be brought down to the foreign low-wage scale.

In the glass industry alone the cut in tariff on this bill would affect more than a million people, and it would hurt every worker if he is made to take less wages to meet low foreign pay envelopes.

I believe the American worker should be protected against foreign labor, and not be forced to compete for his job with cheaply paid foreign labor.

Overexcitement About Racial Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, many political pressure groups, including groups interested in social development, mistake an expressed instinct to preserve racial integrity for racial prejudice, intolerance, or racial bigotry. Much criticism continues against the attitude of white people in the South toward the colored race. My observation is that much of the overzealous interest in overmagnifying the situation serves a perfect illustration of a situation referred to in Holy Writ as those who "have a zeal but not according to knowledge." The people of the South know they are not prejudiced against the colored race and know they are not intolerant, and they also know they are anxious to maintain their racial integrity and that most of the colored people are equally anxious to retain theirs. Simply because white people refuse to associate socially or fraternize with colored people is not because they are prejudiced or guilty of racial bigotry. A similar situation prevails in many of our religious groups, but they do not refer to it as religious prejudice.

Frequently we hear leaders in these groups proclaiming to high heaven about racial prejudice, but at the same time they fail or refuse to fraternize or join in with those who happen to have a different religious creed. They do not call that prejudice or bigotry. Yet they criticize the white people of the South because they insist upon having separate schools, separate churches, and labor standards that provide for separation or segregation of the races under certain conditions. Here they call it racial prejudice or racial bigotry, and say it violates every code of religious ethics. I could just as easily and with as much justification charge these critics with religious prejudice or religious bigotry, because they have separate churches, separate schools, and discriminate in employment against each other, which, in the last analysis, is simply prejudice or discrimination against another on account of creed instead of color. They are just as determined in maintaining their religious integrity as we are in maintaining our racial integrity, but they rise in holy protest if we charge them with being prejudiced, intolerant, or being guilty of religious bigotry. I do not charge them with religious bigotry or prejudice for I do not think they are prejudiced, even though there is a point beyond which neither will go to fraternize with the other. They maintain separate schools and seminaries. They have their separate churches. In fact, they have very little to do with each other in many respects, not because there is real prejudice, but because they are endeavoring to maintain the integrity of their faith or their creed. Nevertheless, their attitude is the same spirit that prevails among white people of the South toward the colored race. We are not prejudiced; we are simply anxious to maintain our racial and social integrity.

I know that some of the groups referred to criticize us for discriminating against the colored race in employment. We do to some extent and for the reasons I have given. Simply because we are endeavoring to maintain our racial integrity by practicing a degree of isolation these groups are endeavoring to stir up strife by alleging that it is all due to prejudice and racial bigotry when, in fact, these same trouble makers and critics are, as we have observed, guilty of the same offense, if it be an offense, when they undertake to establish and maintain their religious faith, religious creed, or religious integrity. I am making these observations to suggest that in all fairness and sincerity, without the spirit of criticism, it is probably time for such critics and fault finders to make an inventory of their own cherished virtues and adopt a policy or attitude that he who is without fault should cast the first stone. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

Some are now emphasizing this racial prejudice or racial bigotry idea with the hope that the sentiment created may be reflected a little later when the proposed FEPC bill comes up for consideration in the Congress. It is not my purpose to discuss that matter at this time further than to suggest to some of the groups I have referred to that if the FEPC proposal should become a law some of their chickens may come home to roost, particularly when a person of another religious faith or creed presents himself or herself for employment.

Solomon, a man who had the reputation of being wiser than these critics, refers to ants as "little people." That is what he calls them. They are of different races or different colors, some being red, some brown, some black, and others white. They gather their meat in summer from the same field or the same source, but they do not cooperate or affiliate with each other. They preserve their identity and their tribal instincts. I do not know that they are prejudiced toward each other, but they do not fraternize or associate with each other. They do not visit each other, they do not tolerate social equality but, on the contrary, they work and strive to preserve their own identities, because God created them with different characteristics, gave them different missions to perform, and charged them with the responsibility of preserving their racial integrity. A similar purpose or design appears to have been in the mind of the Creator when the honey bee was created. They are of different colors, not on account of anything that man has done, but are the

unmistakable product of the hand of creation. They work in the same field, they gather honey from the same tree, sip nectar from the same leaf, and collect food from the same flower but in each case carry the products of their labor to their own storehouse. They do not cooperate or affiliate with others but persist in the preservation of their own separate tribes. There is no prejudice or intolerance toward each other, but there is a fighting instinct that enables them to preserve their tribal integrity.

I have not found anyone able to prove or to show conclusively the Creator did not have the same purpose in mind when He created man in different colors, with different instincts, different capacities, different purposes, and different missions, but created them with an instinct that would enable them to preserve their racial purity, and I have an idea these racial problems could be solved more easily and more nearly in accordance with Nature's law if the zeal of critics and would-be reformers were exercised in accordance with knowledge.

Returning Veterans and the Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, during the next few months thousands of American veterans of World War II will be returning to their homes under the Army point system. I have received many inquiries about this program, and recently was interviewed on the air by Bob Evans, of C. B. S., Washington correspondent of radio station WFBL, Syracuse, N. Y., on this question. With the permission of the House, I will include this interview in my remarks, as follows:

Mr. EVANS. Congressman HAD FULLER, who represents Oneida and Oswego Counties, is our guest this evening, and Mr. FULLER is going to talk about returning veterans and the point system.

Congressman FULLER. Yes, Bob. I want to discuss some of the problems of the returning veteran. I don't mean his problems. I mean our problems, our duty toward him to see that he gets a square deal. But first, as is your custom, let's hear your 2 minutes of news in Washington this week, and then we'll go along to our discussion.

Mr. EVANS. All right, Had. This is the week to which the Army fixed 40 years as the age at which enlisted men may apply for discharge, a drop from the previous age of 42, and the Army also promised that when the military situation permits, a further reduction in age limit will be made. President Truman pinned a Congressional Medal of Honor on Technical Sgt. Jake Lindsey before a joint session of Congress, and the President also announced those awaited Cabinet changes. Changes which saw Attorney General Biddle resign to be replaced by Assistant Attorney General Tom Clark; Claude Wickard leaves Agriculture to be succeeded by Representative CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico, while Mr. Wickard was nominated to be head of the Rural Electrification Administration. And Frances Perkins ends more than 12 years as Secretary of Labor to make way for Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Spokane, a former member of the Senate. Judge Marvin Jones resigned as War Food Administrator to return to the Court of Claims. President Truman also disclosed that Harry Hopkins was on his way to Moscow on a special mission, a talk with Premier Stalin, and that Joseph Davies was bound for London to see Prime Minister Churchill for the President. Mr. Davies arrived there today. This is the week, too, in which the Army and Navy reported that Japanese long-range balloons have been making sporadic attacks on the western part of North America for the last several months. But, so far, the joint announcement said, there has been no damage to property. There's only about one chance in several million of anybody getting hurt, but to eliminate that one chance as much as possible, the warning was issued so that people might be on the lookout and not touch unfamiliar objects. Selective Service also announced a policy of indefinite deferments for men who have reached their thirtieth birthday and who are engaged in useful work. Useful work was defined as work that contributes to national health, safety, and interest. But the Army's need for younger men was again reemphasized. And this week President Truman and the FEA said there will be substantial reductions in Allied war production now that Germany has been defeated. Some of that substance became evident yesterday when the WPB gave automobile manufacturers a green light to make 200,000 cars for civilian consumption this year. And now Congressman HADWEN C. FULLER and our discussion on the returning veteran.

Congressman FULLER. Bob, we know, of course, that everybody in this country is concentrating with all his might on the punch which will knock out Japan; but, at the same time, it is unwise and unfair if we do not appreciate the fact that thousands of Americans who have fought on battlefields abroad are returning to their homes to pick up the threads of civilian life.

Mr. EVANS. The point is, Had, that they are returning right now. Many of us think that they are going to start coming home some time in the near but undefinable future. But the fact is, that boatloads are getting back as of today. Why, only yesterday some 7,000 landed in the port of New York alone.

Congressman FULLER. And that's why we've got to get busy right now. These men, who have fought in north Africa, Italy, France, Germany, yes, and in the Pacific area, are being released from the service under the so-called Army point system. They will appear among us briefly in their uniforms, with their gloriously won service stripes and campaign ribbons, and then, quickly, they will be back in civilian clothes.

Mr. EVANS. And thinking about getting back on the old job or a new one, ready to do their part in the war plants to back up their pals who still are slugging it out against the Japs.

Congressman FULLER. Right; and it is important that we do not forget what they have done. It is vital that they do not become lost in the shuffle, while the front pages and the radio news programs are still filled with the Pacific war. Let's keep our eyes on the returning serviceman. Let's see that he gets fair play.

Mr. EVANS. Well, Had, I think everybody wants the returning serviceman to get a square shake.

Congressman FULLER. Certainly; that is true for the great majority, Bob; but, unfortunately, it isn't true in every case, and this is the thing we must guard against. Here is an example: The Veterans' Administration tells of a veteran who paid $250 down on a farm, with the assumption that he would be granted a loan to purchase the farm. But the loan was turned down because the price of the farm was found to be excessively high. So the veteran lost his $250 in down payment when the owner refused to refund it to him because there was no clause in the option specifying it was contingent on the GI loan.

Mr. EVANS. Had, it seems incomprehensible to me that there are people like that. I know that sounds a little naive coming from an old newspaperman, but putting it on a practical basis a lot of people have made money out of this war, including the smart operators, so why can't they leave the returning serviceman alone?

Congressman FULLER. We have got to face it. Some people are going to try to take advantage of the veteran. And so, I'm appealing to Americans in my district to inform me speedily of instances where sharp and dishonest practices are injuring the veteran. I will see to it that these cases are properly dealt with insofar as the law provides. All you have to do is drop me a line here in Washington at the House of Representatives Office Building, and I'll see to it that an investigation is made promptly.

Mr. EVANS. I hope every Congressman does the same thing.

Congressman FULLER. They will, Bob, when they are told the facts. But to take up the matter of the Army point system for release of men with long service. This system was set up after a poll had been made among the soldiers themselves. More than 90 percent of the men interviewed said they thought the first to draw releases should be those who have been overseas longest and in combat longest and those with children. Thus, in expressing their views these soldiers upheld the finest traditions of fair play. They are all weary of war and eager to return to their homes, but they showed, as they have repeatedly, their unselfishness in regard to their comrades.

Mr. EVANS. They have. But at this point, Had, I want to tell you a little story I saw on the wires the other day about soldiers and points. It's true, too. The OPA down in Stamford, Conn., had a telephone call from a housewife. She said she wanted some points. And the OPA said, "Yes; what for?" And she replied, "My son writes me from the Pacific that he wants to come home, but he hasn't enough points. Will you please give me some so I can send them to him." And so the OPA man explained the difference between soldier's points and ration points, but when she hung up in disappointment they gathered that she still hadn't figured out the difference.

Congressman FULLER. I know, Bob, and that is why we have to emphasize that even if a man does have the 85 points necessary for release it is by no means certain that he will be released. Although this has all been explained before, I've had several letters on the subject, so I'll explain it again. The War Department announced that in cases where a man is considered important to the continuation of the war against Japan, that man will remain in the service regardless of his points, until he has been replaced by a qualified man. The exception applies particularly to men with special skills, and men in units which will be moved so swiftly into the Pacific area, that no time will be given for replacements.

Mr. EVANS. There's one other thing, however, Had. General Eisenhower has made it plain that no man who served both in Africa and in Europe, too, should go to the Pacific. The War Department has concurred in this.

Congressman FULLER. That's right, Bob. Now, in this brief talk it is impossible to go into the many details which involve the point system. However, in answer to the families and friends of servicemen who have written me about the point system, I will say this. I am sending you a copy of the

War Department demobilization plan. This answers every question that could be asked about the plan. I will also be glad to send it along to any of our listeners in upper New York State. All they need to do is write me here in Washington.

Mr. EVANS. I think we have time enough, Had, to go over the system in a few words.

Congressman FULLER. All right, Bob. In a few words, each man gets a point for each month of service since September 16, 1940. He also gets one point for each month served overseas since that date. He will get 5 points for each combat award and major campaign, and 12 points for each child under 18 years of age, up to 3 children.

Mr. EVANS. And then when all this adds up to 85 points or over, the man will be returned home. He'll be released from the Army unless his skill is such that it is vitally needed in the Pacific.

Congressman FULLER. And that's the system in a nutshell. I know that parents and wives with sons and husbands in the service are wondering how this point system is going to work out. Well, the War Department assures me that all but 2 percent of the men to be released will be men who have served overseas. Of course, we will see how this picture is working out first hand, when demobilization is in full swing.

Mr. EVANS. One thing more, Had. The War Department has not fixed the 85 points as an arbitrary minimum figure. Once the Army knows the score, knows how many servicemen are eligible for discharge under this rate, there is a strong possibility that it will be lowered. That men with even fewer points than 85 will start coming home to stay.

Congressmen FULLER. That's correct, Bob. And now in conclusion I just want to say this. During the war I have edited a news letter which has been sent to several hundred boys and girls in the service who come from my home community of Parish. Since World War I, I have been active in American Legion affairs, and have served as county commander and in other capacities. There is no problem closer to my heart than that of the veteran, and during my service in Congress my voice and my vote will be dedicated to his welfare, which, of course, is the welfare of the American people as a whole.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, HADWEN C. FULLER.

Postwar Program of Alabama Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to set forth the address delivered by Mr. A. B. Hope, of Notasulga, Ala., upon his elevation to the presidency of the Alabama Bankers Association. Mr. Hope's address, I think, details well the plans and program of the Alabama Bankers Association to work with Alabama farmers and returning war veterans to achieve a bright postwar standard of living in Alabama. Mr. Hope's address:

Being elevated to the highest office of our association is a recognition and honor of which anyone should be proud. Certainly I do appreciate it sincerely and only trust I may merit the praise of you and of all my coworkers as has been true of my predecessors.

I am sorry that Federal restrictions made it necessary to streamline the convention into a mere business session, or a meeting limited practically to the executive council. Remarks by the retiring president, Mr. Gordon Palmer, were so appropriate, so timely, and so brimfull of sound banking information, advice, and inspiration that every member of the association should have the benefit of it. Furthermore, it would have been a treat to the association for Gordon to preside over its large convention. Among other accomplishments during his administration Gordon referred to having won the war with Germany. Now he will at least expect me to whip Japan. In passing, he stated that there is hardly anything quite so certain and so inevitable as change itself.

In the changes that come, banking, and the things that influence the public with reference to it, are by no means exceptions. This is even more true during emergencies caused by war.

PUBLIC RELATIONS—GI LOANS—WAR-BOND DRIVES

In every bankers' meeting I have attended since the passage of the GI bill of rights, it has provoked serious discussion. It has almost always been the consensus of opinion expressed that the provisions of the act are so generally misunderstood by the veterans themselves until it is often difficult to make them understand that it is not a bonus nor a gift of any kind. Therefore, banks are being cautioned against any part of indifference upon their own part and further urged to give the veteran every consideration with the hope of being able to meet any and all of his reasonable expectations in business. And, by all means, to give the veteran a sympathetic hearing and the full benefit of information he should have and through which he should benefit greatly by having.

It has been pointed out in a recent discussion that successful administration of GI loans by banks is a major postwar problem, much more serious than at present. It involves public relations fundamentally. Potentially 16,000,000 veterans will influence four times that many persons—mostly bank customers and voters. So it might be added that we cannot too strongly caution against the pitfalls of failure to cooperate. Apparently it is recognized by those giving this most study that banks have more perils to dread from misunderstandings, misinformation, and lack of manifestation of a sincere desire to assist than they can hope to have benefits from a standpoint of direct, profitable patronage. As a matter of fact, most discussions conclude with the assumption that, aside from the value in public relations, this will cost banks much more than they can hope to get out of it.

Alabama, it is claimed, has established unique leadership records in war loans up to date. It has the distinction of having raised its full quota in every county in every drive. This has been made possible largely through the tireless effort of the banks of the State—even though our good bankers (meaning all so far as we know) do not seek publicity and credit for this excellent service. The urge is that we "keep on keeping on" in this and kindred duties toward helping the war effort.

CLOSE COOPERATION WITH AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS—CERTIFICATES OF AWARD

We have a very strong, capable, and conscientious agricultural committee, which is but typical of the committees serving in this capacity for years in the past. Perhaps this committee is one of if not the very most important single committee serving the association. It has more contacts and more potential avenues for real service in our State, which is mainly agricultural, than any other arm of the association. The group chairmen are urged to take active leadership in all matters pertinent to the welfare of the banks. The agricultural committee will have the assistance of the group chairmen and also have the county key bankers throughout the State. All are especially urged to give the agricultural committee fullest cooperation in carrying forward the very excellent work in cooperation with the soil conservation department and other agencies as regards the project of extending certificates of award to farmers doing outstanding work in conservation—especially conservation of the soil. This project has been under way for more than a year and has the approval and encouragement of the agencies and departments (State and Federal) most vitally interested in agriculture and conservation.

SERVICE THROUGH SECRETARY'S OFFICE

We acknowledge gratitude to Roland Adams for his alertness to the needs of our members—a tireless worker and an efficient officer. Through his excellent service and the enthusiastic, conscientious cooperation of group chairmen, committees, and key bankers, we ought to continue to make distinct progress this year. I pledge you my best effort toward making this possible. I thank you.

Ellison DuRant Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ELLISON DURANT SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, no people become great and remain great who fail to honor their heroes and pay tribute to their leaders. It is appropriate, therefore, that the Congress has set aside and dedicated this day when we may pay appropriate tribute to the life and character of our deceased colleagues.

The distinction of being a United States Senator is second only to that of being President of the United States, and to have the distinction of having been elected to serve six consecutive terms and to have the further distinction of having served in the Senate longer than any other Member is a coveted honor and that distinction goes today to the Honorable ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, who died November 17, 1944, lacking only 1 month, 16 days, of completing a continuous service of 36 years.

There may be many who disagree with the philosophy of a political leader, and he may have many pronounced political enemies, but when faced with the fact that, regardless of the political party to which he belongs or the State from which he comes, any man chosen by the people and living to serve longer than any other as a Member of the United States Senate is entitled to be classed as one of the Nation's great leaders and a man of many coveted virtues and outstanding qualities.

Senator SMITH came from a family strongly dedicated to fundamentals found only in American life; he was brought up in a home consecrated to the Christian religion emphasized by that great leader and founder of the Metho-

dist Church, John Wesley; his father was a minister; and his brother, Dr. Coke Smith, was honored as a bishop of the Methodist Church for many years; he was a graduate of Wofford College, one of the oldest and most outstanding liberal arts colleges of South Carolina, he was a student of history, literature, and affairs of State; he had pronounced convictions as to the purposes and functions of our National and State Governments and never permitted himself to waver in the discharge of his obligations and responsibilities to both.

It was my privilege and pleasure to know Senator SMITH personally for 40 years and to enjoy the associations with him here during my 14 years of service in the Congress. He was always approachable, cooperative, and took pleasure in counseling with Members of Congress from his home State.

I recall Senator SMITH's first campaign in the Democratic primary for nomination to the Senate. He was opposed by six of the most able debaters of his State. Under the rules of the State Democratic executive committee they were required to speak at least once in each county of the State in joint debate at a time and place fixed by the committee. Mr. SMITH had been a member of the State legislature and was in his prime, both physically and otherwise. Although his opponents were all eloquent and experienced debaters he proved to be a fluent, eloquent, and convincing orator and there is little doubt but that his masterful oratory determined the result of the election in his favor. This was in 1908. He was again elected in 1914, 1920, 1926, 1932, and 1938, but he was never elected without opposition. His service in the Senate is a matter of record, which I could not undertake to present in this short address.

Senator SMITH owned and operated one of the largest and best farms in South Carolina, and it was here he devoted his entire life when not engaged in the discharge of his official duties. At home and abroad he was looked upon as the farmer's friend and was probably better advised of the economic problems incident to agriculture than any other man in the Senate at the time of his death, and his memory will long be cherished by his many farmer friends throughout the State and Nation.

His unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the institutions of his country will be a lesson to the youth of the State he loved so dearly, and serve as an inspiration to them and those who may follow him for years to come. His reverence and love for the Constitution of the United States may be likened to the loyalty and devotion of a dutiful child to its mother, which devotion increased with maturing years, until a few years preceding his death he became greatly alarmed as to the possibility of its defeat. Like Calhoun, the guiding star of his political life, he feared the interpreters of this great instrument may exert a greater influence in determining the institutions and the future life of the American people than the framers of the instrument itself.

America—Something to Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column by Dick Neuberger entitled "This Is America" from this morning's Washington Post.

Here in a land nearly 18,000 miles in boundary circumference and 3,000 miles from sea to sea we have achieved a unity of purpose that somehow has brought peace and progress and, yes, brotherhood.

As this scarred old world now searches for the basis for some peaceful unification of the men and women of the world this column is well worth reading and pondering over:

THIS IS AMERICA—A COMMUNICATION

In the bright sunlit morning the train rolled down the Feather River Canyon and stopped on a siding near a grove of Ponderosa pines. I walked up the track with the tall delegate from Yugoslavia. He inhaled the mountain air and looked off toward the distant peaks.

"America is the so great country, captain," he said. "We travel now, day after day, night after night, and still the land is America. We have never seen anything like this before. In Europe we would have crossed many nations, many boundaries, many customs, and, oh, so many passports. Now we realize what America is. Now when we say 'America' we shall know exactly what we mean. We shall mean this so great country across which a train can go for so many days and nights."

Some people think that the late President Roosevelt selected San Francisco as the scene of the United Nations Conference in the deliberate hope that the delegates would see the United States—not merely New York or Washington or San Francisco itself, but the whole United States—spread out in a 3,000-mile panorama from coast to coast.

This wish would have been in keeping with Mr. Roosevelt's ideas. Once a visitor asked him how to know and understand the United States. Go out to the Pacific seaboard by the southern route, the President said. Then return by the northern route. See the mountains and plains and forests and rivers and plateaus and valleys, he advised. Then, he concluded, the wayfarer would have some notion of what America was all about.

In conformance with this counsel of Mr. Roosevelt, the delegates to the United Nations Conference are seeing America as surely as if the late President himself were on hand to plan their itineraries. Don Watson, in charge of transportation for the State Department, selected routes which would afford a bona fide glimpse of the continent.

The trains bringing the foreign diplomats and their staffs spanned the Nation by numerous lines. Some of the visitors experienced the thrill of the Royal George. Others saw the Wyoming Rockies. Still others rolled across Arizona's mesas and tablelands. All of them pressed their faces against the windows, as the varying landscape twisted and passed. "My country has no deeper canyon than that," said a Norwegian secretary, as the chasm of the Green River in Utah yawned in the middle distance.

The delegates did not glimpse the heterogeneous American scene—prairie by day, snowy mountains that night—without knowing something about it. On each special train the Library of Congress placed 125 selected volumes. These included the WPA Guides to each State crossed by that particular train. They also included such informal geographic books as Gertrude Atherton's Golden Gate County, Lanks' Highway to Alaska, and Vestal's The Missouri. I saw a Belgian delegate with a WPA map in his lap, following the progress of the train along Lake Utah and into the outskirts of Salt Lake City.

The multiplicity and magnitude of America's geographic features astounded the delegates. Lord Halifax said he never ceased to be amazed by the vast expanse of the Great Plains. A Frenchman, awed by the Rockies, watched in wonder as the train struggled with a second range, the Wasatch. And when the Sierra Nevada, faint and far on the horizon, came into view, he gasped.

Even a visitor like Molotov, so busy that all long trips had to be negotiated by plane, has glimpsed something of the diversity and resources of this Nation. He motored to the Kaiser shipyards on a Saturday afternoon and saw steel cargo ships being built in assembly-line fashion. And on the following Sunday morning, walking along a path in the cathedral-like silence of the John Muir redwoods, I came upon Molotov and his bodyguards, gazing up in wonder at the needled giants towering more than 300 feet into the California sky.

All the foreigners have an intense curiosity about America in general and the far West in particular. A story appeared in a local newspaper about the Shasta Dam reclamation project in the nearby Central Valley. Immediately delegates from four nations with irrigation problems, India and China and Australia and Saudi-Arabia, made arrangements to visit the great dam themselves. Marshal Smuts, heroic warrior-statesman of the Union of South Africa, read of Yosemite's plumed waterfalls and then rose at 4 in the morning to drive the 250 miles to the famous Granite Valley.

Many of the delegates have been amazed by the extent of America's natural resources.

"All of us have read about the great American continent," said a Frenchman, "yet this reading then seemed mere abstractions. Now we see these things for ourselves."

Franklin D. Roosevelt constantly urged all visitors from abroad to see the sundown side of the continent. One is sure that our late President would approve heartily could he see Molotov strolling in Muir Woods, Marshal Smuts gazing up at Nevada Falls, a Yugoslav examining the forests of the Feather River. Norwegians exclaiming at the beauties of the California seacoast, and Chinese admirals watching Liberty ships putting out through the Golden Gate.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

SAN FRANCISCO, *May 24.*

Secretary Stettinius' Speech on Progress Made at San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Nation and of the world have been upon the United Nations Conference on International Organization which has been in session at

San Francisco for more than 5 weeks, and which is expected to adjourn on June 6.

The Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State and chairman of the United States delegation to the Conference, made a speech last Monday evening with reference to achievements at the Conference thus far, and outlining what was hoped to be done before adjournment, and it is an able report of the proceedings of this important Conference, and under leave granted same is submitted herewith.

The United Nations Conference on international organization is now in its fifth week. I feel that the time has come for me, as Secretary of State and chairman of the United States delegation, to report to the American people and to our armed forces throughout the world on the progress we have made here in San Francisco.

You will recall that last fall, at Dumbarton Oaks, conversations between the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China resulted in proposals for an international organization to maintain peace, which later were supplemented at the Crimea Conference.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals were submitted to all the United Nations, and their representatives were invited to come to San Francisco to prepare a charter based upon them.

When this charter—or constitution—is completed, it will be submitted for ratification to the member nations. Once the required number of member nations have ratified the charter, the world organization will come into being.

Gathered here in San Francisco are delegates from almost 50 nations—men and women of different races and religions, accustomed to different political forms, influenced by different geographical environments. Yet we have come together with the same great purpose in view—to form a permanent organization to preserve peace throughout the world.

After years of war, the sound of open debate in a world assembly on the issues of peace has an unaccustomed ring. But we are working for a peace which must be democratic as well as strong, and it can be developed only in the give and take of frank and vigorous discussion.

After 1 month of work, I can now report to you my confidence that we will succeed in writing a strong and democratic charter solidly based on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals with which we started.

It will be strong in the power to prevent aggression and to develop the economic and social conditions which will reduce the causes of war.

It will be democratic in the encouragement which it will give to nations and to peoples everywhere to extend the application of equal justice in the world and to promote and protect human rights and freedoms.

At the very outset of our work, we were confronted with a number of urgent problems. There was the question of seating the Byelo Russian and Ukrainian Republics and the Argentine and the further problem of how Poland could be represented. These questions involved important issues affecting both the Conference and United States foreign policy.

At the Crimea Conference the Soviet Union directed our attention to the grievous injuries sustained by the Byelo Russian and Ukrainian peoples in their long and gallant struggle against the common enemy, and requested that these two republics be given membership in the proposed world organization. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill agreed to support this request. The United States delegation fulfilled this pledge in the opening days of the Conference.

The Conference also voted to admit Argentina. I wish to make clear that the vote of the United States in favor of seating Argentina did not constitute a blanket endorsement of the policies of the Argentine Government. On the contrary, with many of these policies, both the Government and the people of the United States have no sympathy.

We have in no way abandoned the principles for which this country has always stood. We steadfastly adhere to those principles of morality and decency which were the basis of our foreign policy under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull. During the war the paramount aim of our policy in this hemisphere has been to eliminate Axis penetration and unite all the Americas in the struggle against the evil forces which have attempted to destroy liberty and free institutions throughout the world.

We recognize that the people of Argentina have been traditionally democratic in their ideals and good friends of the people of the United States. The Mexico City Conference last March opened the way for Argentina to return to her traditional policies and restore the unity of the Americas.

After the conference Argentina took the first steps in this direction. She declared war on the Axis and committed herself to the democratic and peaceful policies of cooperation agreed upon at Mexico City by signing the final act of that conference. As a further step in this process the American republics felt that Argentina should be admitted to the San Francisco Conference.

By voting to admit Argentina in these circumstances, the United States, however, has by no means changed its position that Argentina is expected to carry out effectively all of her commitments under the Mexico City declaration. On the contrary, we consider that her admission to the San Francisco Conference increases her obligation to do so. We expect the Argentine Nation to see that this obligation is fulfilled.

The Soviet Union requested that Poland be represented at the conference by the provisional government in Warsaw, which is not recognized by a majority of the United Nations, including the United States.

It is a matter of deep regret to the United States that the people of Poland, who have suffered so terribly and fought so bravely during the war, are not represented in our deliberations. Poland is a United Nation and should be here. But there are two Polish Governments—the London Government and the Warsaw Provisional Government.

Last February it was agreed at Yalta that the provisional government now functioning in Warsaw should be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new government, it was agreed, should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. The Yalta agreement on this matter has not yet been carried out. The United States took the position that Poland could be represented only by a Polish Government formed in accordance with that agreement, and the Warsaw Provisional Government was not admitted to the conference.

The negotiations for reorganization of the Warsaw Provisional Government have been disappointing. It is the intention of the United States to exert all its influence, in collaboration with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, toward fulfillment of the Yalta agreement on Poland.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that the primary objective of the United States foreign policy is to continue and strengthen in the period of peace that wartime solidarity which has made possible the defeat of Germany. This is as true of our relations with the Soviet Union as it is of our relations with Great Britain, China, and France. There have been differences between us. There will continue to be differences. But the effectiveness of our wartime collaborations has demonstrated that our differences can be adjusted.

It is our purpose to seek constantly to broaden the scope of our agreement and to reach common understanding on those matters where it does not yet exist. We have the right to expect the same spirit and the same approach on the part of our great allies.

Let me give you an example of our collaboration at the San Francisco Conference.

When Mr. Molotov came to the United States, he planned to stay only a few days because of the heavy burden of his responsibilities in Moscow. He stayed here for over 2 weeks.

The reason Mr. Molotov stayed longer than he had planned was this. The United States delegation wanted to make some important changes and additions to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at San Francisco. The changes we had in mind reflected not only the views of the United States delegation but those which had been expressed before the Conference by other United Nations, particularly some of the smaller powers. We felt that if we were able to submit these as the unanimously agreed amendments of the four sponsoring nations, not just as our own, they would have an important, indeed a decisive, effect on the whole work of the Conference and the speed with which agreement on a charter could be reached.

So Mr. Molotov stayed on and worked with Mr. Eden, Dr. Soong, and myself on the United States proposals. They had important contributions of their own to make. I regard it as a great achievement and a good omen for the future that agreement was reached on the exact text of these important amendments by all four nations within a very few days.

When Mr. Molotov came to me to tell me that his government agreed with us on the text of the last two remaining amendments he expressed again the importance which his government attached to the successful establishment of the world organization and his satisfaction with the results of our collaboration toward making the charter of the organization better and stronger than it otherwise would have been. It was only after this agreement had been made complete that he said he felt it was appropriate for him to return to the important work which was awaiting him in Moscow.

The unanimity of the sponsoring powers on these amendments has had the decisive effect we expected it would have on the work of the Conference. They have met with general approval among other nations at the Conference, and have greatly eased and speeded the task of the working committees.

After submission of the joint amendments of the four sponsoring powers, together with the amendments submitted by other United Nations, the Conference entered its working committee stage.

One of the first committee decisions was formerly to extend to France that fifth permanent seat on the Security Council which had been contemplated for her at Dumbarton Oaks. I am happy to say that France now sits in the Conference committee of five with four sponsoring nations. The United States welcomes this important step in the return of France to her rightful place in world affairs.

During the past fortnight, general agreement has been reached on a number of other important points. Taken together with changes previously agreed upon, these form the basis of proposals which are now being drafted, section by section, into the charter.

I wish to point out what I consider to be the most significant of these changes.

The Security Council would be given additional powers to settle a dispute in its early stages and to stop preparations for war long before war actually begins.

The relationship to the world organization of regional security arrangements like that contemplated in the Act of Chapultepec for the Western Hemisphere has been clarified by another provision.

The United States shared in the desire of the other American Republics to maintain the inter-American system within the framework of the world organization. We also agreed that the world organization must be supreme in matters of enforcement. World peace is indivisible. The world organization must therefore have the right and the power to prevent or suppress aggression anywhere and at any time. This conviction was embodied in the proposal put forward.

At the same time that proposal strengthens the role of regional organizations in peaceful settlement of disputes. It reemphasizes the inherent right of a self-defense and extends that right to a group of nations whenever an armed attack against one of them can rightfully be regarded as an attack against all of them until the world organization has taken effective action to restore peace.

The inter-American system is thus brought within the larger framework of the world organization. The United States intends to negotiate in the near future a treaty with its American neighbors which will put the Act of Chapultepec on a permanent basis in harmony with the world charter.

The steps by which a final solution of this problem was achieved offer a good example of the advantages of effective collaboration. The original United States proposal was partly based on separate amendments previously proposed by France and Australia. It was submitted simultaneously to the five large powers and to the other American Republics. Mr. Eden and his British colleagues offered opinions which strengthened and clarified its meaning. A later suggestion from the Soviet Union resulted in a further improvement. Because many nations collaborated on this problem we have emerged with a far better solution than any nation produced alone.

Another amendment reaffirms that the responsibility for standing guard over the enemy powers shall be carried by the nations which defeated them. But for the first time it specifically opens the way for the world organization itself to assume this responsibility later on. In the meantime the automatic operation of treaties directed against a renewal of aggression by enemy states is permitted.

This is in accord with the aims of the United States toward Germany, as affirmed in the Crimea declaration. It is our intention to continue collaboration to the fullest extent with our allies in order to achieve, first, the utter destruction of German militarism and nazism, and second, the absolute assurance that Germany shall never again be able to threaten its neighbors or disturb the peace of the world.

Our policy toward Japan is directed to the same end. Before leaving the discussion of the Security Council I want to refer to the question of voting procedure in the Council. The Conference has not yet taken final action on this matter. The Crimea proposals require that the five permanent members must agree to any enforcement action. There would be a similar requirement on action for the peaceful settlement of disputes, except that a party to a dispute must refrain from voting. This requirement, however, does not apply to the right of any nation to bring a dispute before the Council and to full discussion of the merits of its case. It applies only when the Council makes a decision involving positive action.

This provision has been criticized both here and elsewhere as giving a privileged position to the large nations.

This criticism is not justified. It is not a question of privilege, but of using the present distribution of military and industrial power in the world for the maintenance of peace.

The Security Council is the enforcement agency of the world organization, and hence must be the repository of its power to prevent aggression.

The five permanent members of the Security Council have at their disposal an overwhelming proportion of the men and material necessary to enforce peace. Their permanent membership in the Security Council therefore becomes essential, for without their strength and their unanimous will to peace, the Council would be helpless to enforce its decisions. And it must be remembered that any action taken by the Council toward settling a dispute may ultimately lead to the necessity for enforcement action if peaceful methods fail.

But, it is objected, what happens if one of the five permanent members embarks upon a course of aggression and refuses to recognize the machinery of the world organization? How can the aggressor be restrained if his own contrary vote prevents the Council from invoking force against him? In such an event, the answer is simple. Another world war has come, vote or no vote, and the world organization has failed.

But I think we should not be too deeply concerned with the kind of question Franklin Roosevelt always characterized as "iffy." The five great nations have come here with the other United Nations to form an organization for peace—not to conspire for war.

Twice in the last 30 years they have fought side by side as allies—not as enemies. Their intentions are honorable and their necessities for peace are fully as urgent as those of any other nation, large or small. To assume that they seek to violate pledges rather than to enforce them is to oppose the existence of any organization for peace, and to resign the world to an endless succession of wars.

Another important matter before the conference has been the establishment of a trusteeship system under which dependent areas may be placed by later agreements.

This subject was not discussed during the Dumbarton Oaks conversations. The United States Government felt that it was of the utmost importance that such a system be provided for in the charter. We therefore took the initiative in discussions to that effect with the other sponsoring governments even before the conference began.

I think I can now say with assurance that, as a result of this American initiative, the charter will provide for an effective trusteeship system. It will not be all that we desire but it will offer real opportunity for progress to de endent peoples.

In all the discussions on trusteeship the United States has continued to stand fast for provisions which will fully safeguard the control by the United States—within the trusteeship system, but on conditions satisfactory to us—of those strategic points in the Pacific which are necessary for the defense of the United States and for world security.

And we have stood with equal firmness for a trusteeship system that will foster progress toward higher standards of living and the realization of human rights and freedoms for dependent peoples, including the right to independence or another form of self-government such as federation—whichever the people of the area may choose—when they are prepared and able to assume the responsibilities of national freedom as well as to enjoy its rights.

The United States has demonstrated this long standing policy in the Philippines. It looks forward to the time when many other now dependent peoples may achieve the same goal.

I regard the provisions which are being made in the Charter for the advancement of dependent peoples, and for the promotion of human rights and freedoms, as of the greatest importance. Together with measures to strengthen the Economic and Social Council, they will help to bring the world organization closer to the needs of the peoples of the world. They will provide the means by which nations can work more effectively together for that economic and social development without which lasting peace is impossible.

We must realize that our most important task in the next decade is not likely to be the enforcement of peace, but to prepare the economic and social basis for peace. If the work of the economic and social council is well done, we will have gone far toward eliminating in advance the causes of another World War a generation hence.

This is the objective of the second group of new proposals put forward at San Francisco.

These new proposals state clearly that justice and international law, together with equal rights and self-determination of peoples, shall be guiding principles of the new world organization. They embody a complete statute of a new permanent court of international justice.

They stipulate that international cooperation in the protection and promotion of individual human rights and freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex as a fundamental purpose of the world organization.

They give the assembly of the world organization sweeping power to recommend measures for the adjustment of any situation which is likely to impair the general welfare—and this includes violations of the purposes and principles of the organization.

They provide for a commission on human rights which will have the powe to work out an international bill of rights which can be accepted by member nations as part of their fundamental law, just as we in the United States have a Bill of Rights in our Constitution.

The "four freedoms" stated by our great President Franklin D. Roosevelt—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—are, from the point of view of the United States, the fundamental freedoms which encompass all other rights and freedoms.

Freedom of speech, for example, encompasses freedom of the press, freedom of information, and freedom of communications.

Freedom from want encompasses the right to work, the right to social security, and the right to opportunity for advancement.

Freedom from fear encompasses the protection from persecution and discrimination of all men and women, and the protection of their equal right to enjoy all other fundamental rights and freedoms.

The United States Government will work actively and tirelessly, both for its own people, and—through the international organization—for peoples generally, toward promoting respect for and observance of these rights and freedoms.

The charter will also be strengthened by naming the economic and social council along with the general assembly and the security council as principal organs of the world organization.

We have provided that the views of nongovernmental international organizations in agriculture, labor, business, education, and related fields can be made available to the council.

We have conferred upon the Economic and Social Council the power to promote cultural and educational cooperation among the nations and made more specific its function in coordinating the activities of specialized intergovernmental organizations dealing

with labor, agriculture, finance, trade, and other matters—all of them having as their ultimate objective higher living standards and full employment.

I must emphasize, however, that the Economic and Social Council is essentially a coordinating and recommendatory agency. It cannot interfere with the domestic affairs of any member nation. Its hope for success lies in the cooperation of the member nations—in their willingness to participate effectively in those organizations which will be affiliated with it.

There are, I am sorry to say, people who seem to think that our American economy can function in a vacuum, completely without relation to other national economies; and that by some miracle we can hope to achieve prosperity for ourselves without taking into account the economic condition of our neighbors.

After the defeat of Japan, millions of young men and women will return home to take their proper places in agriculture and in our enormously expanded productive system. We shall not be able to provide jobs for them if we have not helped, through the Economic and Social Council, to create those world-wide conditions under which other nations are able to purchase much greater quantities of our goods than ever before, and we are able to buy more from them.

We must choose between a constantly expanding economy throughout the world, or mass unemployment in our own country. Full participation in the economic and social council provides us with our greatest opportunity to break, once and for all, the vicious circle of isolationism, depression, and war.

I look upon this charter as, in the deepest sense, a compact between peoples, reached through their governments. Certainly the American delegation's part in the work of this Conference has been carried out in the closest possible relationship with the American people. We have been in constant touch with the consultants representing 42 nongovernmental organizations widely representative of American life. Through their suggestions they have made valuable contributions to the charter. I hope and believe that we can build upon this experience in the future.

I want also to say a few words about the American delegation.

This delegation has carried out all its work in a splendid spirit of nonpartisan cooperation. Each member has borne, with high distinction, a full share of the grave responsibility which is upon us all. Each has been guided only by the higher interests of our country as an inseparable part of the world community.

The delegation includes four outstanding Members of Congress, two from each party, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Representative SOL BLOOM, of New York, and Representative CHARLES EATON, of New Jersey. The delegation also includes two representatives of the public, Dean Virginia Gildersleeve and Commander Harold Stassen, who is on leave from active duty in the Navy.

Our senior delegate, Cordell Hull, has unfortunately been unable to attend the Conference. But we have been in daily communication with him and have leaned heavily upon his wise counsel and guidance. It was Cordell Hull's achievement at Moscow in 1943 which made this Conference possible.

The charter which is written at this Conference must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and must be wholeheartedly approved by the American people if the world organization is to succeed. The important part played by our widely representative and nonpartisan American delegation should assure the kind of charter that will win this approval. We have carried one step further here the policy of close cooperation with Congress which was initiated by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull. Our purpose is to provide that continuity and strength of foreign policy which has been so difficult to achieve in the past history of our country.

Finally, I wish to report that we have been in daily communications with President Truman. He has been fully informed of every step in the work of this Conference. As Chief Executive of the United States he has guided our course. His leadership has been essential to our progress.

Our remaining work here at San Francisco moves ahead steadily. Since the committees have already approved most of the important provisions of the charter, we shall be principally occupied during the next few days with drafting those provisions into charter language. The various drafts will then go to the four commissions for approval, and finally to the planary session of the whole Conference. Our work will then be concluded. I hope we shall finish during the early part of June.

I have no doubt that the final charter prepared here will offer great hope of lasting peace. But I cannot speak so surely when I try to answer the question: Will it work? Will it keep the peace? For that depends upon the will to peace with which the nations of the world support the charter and build strength into the world organization. We can do no more at San Francisco than to establish the constitutional basis upon which the world can live without war—if it will.

Our own foreign policy will play a great part in determining the achievements of these ends. What, then, are the major considerations which must govern our foreign policy?

First. We must carry the second phase of the war to final victory and see to it that Germany and Japan are never able to wage war again.

Second. We must maintain and extend the collaboration and community of purpose now existing among the great nations which have fought this war together. The interests of the United States extend to the whole world. We must maintain those interests in our relations with the other great powers and we must mediate between them when their interests conflict among themselves. In both cases our own interests, as well as theirs, require that agreement be achieved and the solidarity of the great nations be preserved.

Third. We must seek constantly to make our full contribution toward the establishment in practice of the supremacy of justice and of fair dealing for all peoples and states, large and small. The power that happens to be in the hands of certain nations must never be used for any purpose which is not in accordance with justice. And the formulation of international law to embody justice must be speeded.

Fourth. Those social and economic conditions which create a climate for peace must be advanced. The beginnings we shall make through the Economic and Social Council and its related agencies must be constantly developed.

Finally, we must realize that we live in a world where the sovereignty of no nation, not even the most powerful, is absolute. There is no such thing as complete freedom of decision for any nations. It was not the action of our Congress but a decision of the Japanese high command to bomb Pearl Harbor which put the United States into this war.

We in America can never again turn our backs upon the world. For we are not only a part of it—we are one of its most important parts. If we do not assume our new responsibilities willingly, then we shall be compelled to assume them by the brutal necessities of self-preservation. There is no possibility of retreat.

Let us, instead, with God's help, march forward in the cause of peace, with a greatness worthy of our heritage and of the men who gave lives on distant battle grounds.

Westerners for Cabinet Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I make these few remarks and include an editorial appearing May 24, 1945, in the Press-Telegram and Long Beach Sun, published in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. I respectfully inform you and the Members of this legislative body that I believe this editorial is clearly indicative and expresses the thinking of the vast number of citizens of this great Nation who might appropriately be termed "westerners."

During the last several weeks it has been my pleasure to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my own remarks emphasizing the advantages and progress, as well as the problems of the west coast and my native State of California, as will more clearly appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A2098, and in the April 5, 1945, issue of the RECORD, on page 3134.

The last paragraph of this important editorial, "there is a western revival in National Government," is most encouraging, I am sure, to us Congressmen from the western seaboard. It expresses the opinion of the folks on the west coast as a result of the appointments by our great President Truman of the distinguished gentlemen from the Western States who are named in the editorial. It follows:

WESTERNERS FOR CABINET POSTS

By his appointments in the first big reorganization move since he took office, President Truman has effected a desirable rectifying of the lack of geographical balance that has existed in the top level of national government for years. The west is signally recognized by appointment of three westerners, counting Texas as western as well as southern, to the Cabinet.

Young, energetic, and capable Tom C. Clark, of Texas, Assistant Attorney General, is promoted to the head of the Justice Department, succeeding Attorney General Francis Biddle. The appointment appears to be well-earned promotion for Clark. Biddle's resignation, probably submitted under Presidential prodding, removes the Cabinet's most glaring misfit.

United States Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach, former United States Senator, succeeds Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, who might well have been permitted long ago to gratify her desire to retire to private life. Under her, the Labor Department has been deprived of functions, transferred to various Federal agencies, and has lost prestige. Secretary Schwellenbach gives the Pacific coast representation in the Cabinet for the first time since the Hoover administration.

Appointment of Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, to succeed Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard is significant, not only because he completes the trio of westerners going into the Truman Cabinet, but also because it indicates probability of a new plan as well as personnel in food administration. ANDERSON, as chairman of the House Food Investigating Committee, has severely criticized the Government's food policy and demanded a new coordinated at-

tack on the problem of shortage. He also is slated to take Judge Marvin Jones' place as War Food Administrator, so will have all the reins in his hands and possess ample authority to try out the ideas he has voiced as critic of the Food Administration.

Consolidation of the offices of Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator is in line with reports of the President's reported determination to tighten up and simplify the sprawling organization of Federal agencies.

It will be recalled that one of President Truman's first appointments was the naming of Edwin W. Pauley, of California, to the War Reparations Commission, while the first Truman appointment to the Cabinet was that of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General, thus recognizing the Pacific coast and a State west of the Mississippi River, in marked departure from the long-established custom of picking Cabinet officers mostly from the eastern third of the United States, often from the Atlantic seaboard.

There is a western revival in National Government.

Assisting the Returning Vet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Long Beach Labor News published in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. Labor News is the official publication of the A. F. of L. in that area. This appropriate and significant editorial emphasizes to the attention of all people that the millions of sons reared in the working-people families of this great Nation are also in the armed forces in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this editorial bespeaks the same dedication of purpose of which I have often heretofore read and spoken on the part of the responsible leaders of the Labor Union Act of this great Nation of ours, which is that the labor organizations themselves will do their full duty and will welcome with open arms their distinguished sons who take off the uniform of armed battle and put on the civilian attire of peace and neighborliness.

Furthermore, this editorial clearly identifies the fact that the labor organizations themselves have been forward looking and soundly taking necessary and efficient steps toward establishing relationships with other community agencies to the end that the GI's coming home shall have the maximum of prompt courteous service and cooperation in the interest of the earliest possible return to gainful employment and to the end that all the community resources shall be helpful to these distinguished and returning men tc most ably and promptly reallocate their employment desires and needs. With pleasure I include this significant editorial in this forward-looking publication:

ASSISTING THE RETURNING VET

More than 1,500,000 A. F. of L. members are in the armed forces. It is doubtful if there are any of our families not affected by one or more members entering the service.

At its last meeting, the A. F. of L. executive council called upon the 900 Central Labor bodies in the United States to set up committees to assist returning veterans to find jobs.

A returning veteran who is a union member will naturally look to his labor organization for assistance in getting his job back. He will also expect help for many of his personal problems. A discharged serviceman who is not a union member will likewise appreciate assistance in getting work in one of the organized trades.

There is no solution to the problem of work for veterans short of full employment. Soldiers in hospitals, in separation centers, on the battlefields—all want a job when they are released. They know there will not be an oasis of security in a desert of unemployment.

The A. F. of L.'s Labor League for Human Rights has established strong working relationships with councils of social agencies, community chests, the American Red Cross, and other community organizations.

Because of this, it is able to offer sound advice and practical assistance to central labor body veterans' committees. Regional directors of the Labor League will furnish material on veterans' programs to these committees, and thereby help them establish proper contacts with all organizations engaged in assisting servicemen.

Many central bodies may choose to designate their local labor league committees to assist newly returned veterans. If so, they will be ready to assume the new responsibilities. There are 500 of these committees throughout the country. A wartime record of outstanding service testifies to their willingness, their capability.

Regardless of the type of committee CLU's establish to assist veterans, the A. F. of L.'s Labor League will cooperate with a single objective: To help returning veterans successfully readjust themselves.

It's a wide chasm from war service to civilian life.

Help the vet across.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Sarah Berman, of Oakland, Calif., a wholesome, motherly woman whose interest in humanity is known beyond the limits of my State, has written a poem she has dedicated to Americanism.

Mrs. Berman's philanthropies are well known in Oakland where she has worked unceasingly in behalf of the sick and underprivileged, dedicating both time and money to this work. She has asked me to present a copy of this poem to the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the poem in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICANISM

A new day is dawning!
Many projects being planned—
Still in the workshop,
Where new designs are in formation;
Fashioned best for "our glorious Nation."
We are building better roads,
Than we have traveled on before,
To make America "the land of the free!"
And the "home of the brave!"

A land of peace, love and real democracy,
Where civilization may yet achieve
A way of life where none shall grieve,
Where persecution shall not exist
Nor barbaric methods tabulated
On our ways and means list.
"We Americans want to be
Kind, true, and orderly!"

We shall always our future plan
Through the night and through the day,
A program whereby each of us can
Proudly proclaim and say:
I am glad, yes very glad
"I am an American!"

—*Sarah Berman.*

Half-Truths Are Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Tri-County Truth of Hartsburg, Mo.:

HALF-TRUTHS ARE DANGEROUS

The greatest evil that can possibly be done either an individual or a cause can be accomplished by the use of half-truths or the favorite partial quotation method employed by some reporters, newspapers, and politicians.

If any person connected with either the press or public life wants to destroy confidence in his opponent or the opposition, there is no better way than by the use of half-truths or partial quotations; but it should also be remembered that the use of such methods eventually is revealed to the public with a resulting destruction of confidence in the reliability of the erring reporter.

It is notable that the men who are winning praise as war correspondents are not the men who are setting themselves to the task of interpreting the news as they see it, but the men who are giving factual reports of what they see and experience. These are not half-truths nor elaborated stories but simple direct statements that have the ring of truth in them.

The same tendency which inspires men to encourage prejudice through personal interpretation of news or of statements made and half quoted, occurs in state as well as in national and international reporting. It is a policy which should be shunned but is shamelessly employed to divert the reading public's mind from the true facts in the case. Eventually the true facts may emerge, but usually the damage which was willfully intended has caused sufficient damage to make the results seem worthy of the method employed. Thus, this policy of half-truths and partial quotation works toward the ultimate destruction of faith in news reporting.

The use of half-truths, interpretive news reporting, and partial quotation which leaves much to the imagination can easily become a Frankenstein that will destroy its master.

Although the pen is considered mightier than the sword, we believe that, injudiciously and indiscriminately used, the pen is also a more dangerous weapon than the sword.

Recalling a journalistic code which our revered forbears in newspaper editing passed on to us, this newspaper shall follow the

practice of publishing statements either in full or sufficiently complete so that their meaning cannot be misinterpreted; then if our personal opinion clashes with the statement made, the exception to the statement can be made with the reader having ample opportunity to weigh both sides of the question and come to his own conclusions.

We believe in formulating and in expressing opinions, but we do not believe in attempting to gain either a political or prejudicial victory by printing either half-truths or partial quotations leading toward misinterpretation. This may be stuffy journalism, and old-fashioned ethics, but it is far less dangerous, in our opinion, and more soul satisfying, than creating attacks upon persons in public life by giving false impressions or selling the public short with interpretative writing or reporting.

We may not agree, but we will give every man his right to make his statement in full and base our opposition fairly and fully upon the facts as they stand, not as we interpret them. Fair play and half-truths simply cannot keep company, and we believe that this newspaper and its readers will be best served by strictly adhering to the facts, and expressing our opinions as either supporting or opposing those facts. That, to our mind, is journalistic honesty, and honesty still remains the best policy.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, 70,000 people, on Sunday, May 20, 1945, assembled in the Los Angeles Coliseum to celebrate I Am an American Day. The meeting was held under a resolution passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States.

Similar meetings were held in various parts of the country, but one of the largest was held in my own city of Los Angeles.

These meetings should be encouraged and emphasis laid upon the importance of having our people assemble on various occasions to recall the rich traditions and the grand heritage that Americans enjoy.

The Army and the Navy participated in an unusual parade with high-ranking officers present. Mayor Fletcher Bowron presided and the motion-picture industry, as usual, contributed to the success of this event. Among those participating were Eddie Cantor, Frances Langford, Barry Fitzgerald, Richard Dix, Lauritz Melchior, Margaret O'Brien, Marilyn Maxwell, Peggy Ann Garner, Arthur Lake, and Dick Haymes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the remarks of Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor, formerly United States Comptroller of the Currency and former Vice Chairman of the FDIC:

We are gathered here pursuant to a resolution passed by the Congress of the United States and a proclamation issued by the President to commemorate I Am an American Day. This vast throng, numbering many thousands, in this coliseum, the largest in our land, is at once a spontaneous expression of patriotism and a challenge to those who would impair or destroy our way of life.

Two groups are especially honored today—the recently naturalized citizens and the native-born who have reached their majority. During the fiscal year of 1944, 435,483 aliens were admitted to citizenship, and of this number 17,448 were admitted in southern California. While the quota allowed all countries was, in 1944, 153,879, only 6 percent of the quota was used. On December 17, 1943, the many years of injustice to China was corrected and that peace-loving country and gallant ally was given a quota of 105, but only 19 Chinese came to us last year under the quota.

One of the first laws passed by Congress to admit aliens to citizenship was enacted in 1790 in conformity with section VIII of article I of the Constitution. Since then hundreds of thousands have broken family ties, renounced allegiance to their native lands and pledged allegiance to our Constitution and laws. Valuable contributions have been made by these men and women to our country, in science, literature, the arts, government, as well as industry. Their strong arms have helped build our railroads, our highways, our harbors, our cities—and turned prairie into golden fields of grain, and dotted the landscape with farm homes and the lonely plateau with trees. Here new horizons, new fields of opportunity, new freedoms undreamed of in the lands beyond the sea; here for their children unlimited possibilities; schools and churches, and no door closed because of race or creed. This was and is America.

President Calvin Coolidge said: "Whether one traces his Americanism back three centuries to the Mayflower or 3 years to the steerage is not half so important as whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine." And President Woodrow Wilson said: "This is the only country in the world which experiences this constant and repeated rebirth. Other countries depend upon the multiplication of their own native people. This country is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward-looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people it is being constantly renewed from generation to generation by the same process by which it was originally created." During the past year 2,000,000 native Americans have reached their majority. Assuming responsibility of participation in our elections, this day is set aside to emphasize the importance of this civic obligation and the duty to exercise this high privilege. The greater the number of citizens voting, the greater is the assurance that democratic processes will be preserved.

The importance of the transition from boyhood to manhood was celebrated by a religious ceremony with many tribes. Many tests were imposed and even torture inflicted as part of this ceremony. The young brave was taught the customs, ritual, and tribal history. He was impressed with his new status, no longer a boy, but a man, who shared the responsibilities and privileges of the tribe with a new name, and a new robe. At the conclusion of the ceremony the tribe danced and sang and rejoiced. There is no ceremony, and, in fact, in the past no emphasis has been placed on the attaining of majority in our country. The youth exercises the highest privilege of citizenship by merely coming of age. The alien is required to read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and swear allegiance. He must swear to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States. No such requirement is exacted from the native-born. Would it be too great a hardship to impose the same conditions on the first voter?

For nearly 6 years a war more terrible than any in history in loss of life and property has devastated the greater part of the earth. At one time it was the savage who made war—now it is the so-called civilized man. Not in our lifetime will the destruction be repaired—not in many generations will the fires of hatred have burned out. One enemy has been crushed; another as ruthless and barbaric still continues his senseless bloodshed. One cry arises from every hamlet and city in America: "Unconditional surrender." To accept less would break faith with the men who died on the beaches of the far-away islands. To all our gallant men and women who fell fighting in the cause of freemen—to all those in our armed forces under whatever sky who face the grim reaper—to all the soldiers and sailors under the flags of the United Nations—you have our support, our encouragement, our praise and prayers—may God speed you in victory and bring you back to enjoy the fruits of your labors and your sacrifice.

Responsibility of OPA for Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we do not want to lose sight of the fact that the OPA is the one Government agency that started out to solve our food problems and maintain a system of price controls. In my opinion, this agency has done neither of these things. I was amazed the other day from a statement that was made on the floor of the House to the effect that the OPA has done fine work. Of course, I do not agree with that. It is not true. It sounded to me like a political statement and it is high time that these folks who are afraid to admit mistakes, because it might hurt them politically reverse the direction in which they are traveling. It does not help the situation any to make bad matters worse. OPA, to be charitable, has been a grand and glorious mistake. It is an agency that ought to be abolished and a food administrator put in charge of the whole food situation. In fact that should have been done a long time ago. As matters stand now, the OPA can pass the buck to WFA, and WFA can pass the buck to OPA. That might be a good way to get physical exercise but while the braintrusters are doing that it is hard on the American people.

I have just received a letter from one of my constituents which tells me its own story and indicates that the administration leaders in this House ought to get busy. Promises and delay and continued inefficiencies will never solve the question. This letter reads as follows:

MAY 26, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: The meat situation in Duluth and vicinity is getting steadily worse. For the past several weeks meat, except processed loaves and various types of sausage, has been virtually nonexistent in retail shops. Then what there is in the way

of red meat is at such high point value that only families with several small children could ever have ration books enough to get a piece of meat once a week. Just imagine, if you can, our best food stores displaying great trays of lungs and brains in otherwise empty meat cases on Saturday—no chickens, no beef, no veal, lamb, or mutton, or hamburger even.

I predict that if no relief comes in the meat situation there will be food riots in Duluth within a very short time. I have overheard men who are working hard declare that they will start something if they can't get any meat. You know the climate up here—it is still as cold as in midwinter in other places, cold and damp, and a little sandwich meat doesn't satisfy hard-working men and women. I work in a shipyard first-aid station, and I have plenty of opportunity to hear what is going on.

A week ago, May 19, I was in a store when a middle-aged woman asked the clerk at the "once-was" meat counter about one of the processed loaves—there was nothing else—and he said that would be 6 points. She burst into tears and said: "But I haven't points left and my husband works hard and has to carry a lunch and it's almost 2 weeks until I get any more points." There were at least a dozen persons in that store who heard her, and there was an ominous growl audible from a number of those people. I heard one man say: "And they tell us not to patronize black markets. I wish I knew where there was one." Within the past week I have heard several responsible, respectable men declare that they will not question whether or not there is a black market if this keeps up.

And in the face of this, OPA tacks 10 points onto all fats instead of giving some relief. For instance, I get 50 points a month. I surely need one-quarter pound of butter a week, a pound a month. That's 24 points. A pound of beef is from 10 to 12 points. No matter how closely one figures it, about one-half pound of meat is all any adult can get a week if one uses any butter at all, and people up here are meat eaters. Sure, there is fish at 65 to 80 cents a pound, but one has to have fat to fry it in so the point saving doesn't help much. (Today I saw carp in one of the best stores at 38 cents a pound—something that people up here used to seine out as rough fish and throw away.)

We know there is plenty of meat in Canada. Just why can't the Government import meat from there? Is there an international law or something that prevents such importation? A few years ago when beef and pork was selling at $3 or $4 a hundred (what the farmer got), and the market was choked, all food stores were flooded with meat from Argentina and Uruguay and Paraguay. I know, because I saw it; cases stacked high in small stores in small towns in Iowa, where I was working then. But now it seems that it must be a law against getting meat from across the border. One would think Canadians were Japs or something instead of our allies. After all, Canada should be as close to us as Argentina. Another thing, when people at Detroit go to Windsor for meat they have to furnish points when they come back to Detroit. Is there any sense to that? If people are able to go somewhere to get meat to ease up the situation in the home town, why should they be penalized by the OPA?

And last spring, 1944, when the Government clamped down on the feeds, millions of baby chicks were destroyed. Hatcheries killed them in 50,000 lots since they couldn't sell them. Who was responsible for a bright stunt like that? There hasn't been a chicken for sale in the open market here for weeks.

A serious shortage of grain labor is tieing up the grain boats in Duluth and Superior. Men refuse to go to work without meat. Give out the word that every man who goes to work shoveling grain will get a 4-pound roast and I believe that there would be enough help to care for 10 times the grain tonnage now stuck.

We know you are not responsible for this. But maybe if you hear how some of the people feel, and can tell it where it will do the most good, it might help some. And if something can be done to humanize the OPA, a real victory will have been won.

Very truly yours.

It is not any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States found it necessary to request Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, to come to his office the other day. Someone must have tipped off President Truman and really told him the truth, otherwise Mr. Hoover would have been called to the White House long, long ago because he handled food problems in World War I and the American people had no shortage in food and there was food enough to send to Europe to help the people who faced famine and suffering in the war-torn lands. I want to conclude these remarks by repeating that OPA ought to be abolished.

Armies of Occupation Should Be Made Up of Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TWELFTH WARD REPUBLICAN
PRECINCT ORGANIZATION,
St. Louis, Mo., May 24, 1945.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Congressman, Twelfth District of Missouri, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: At a meeting of the Twelfth Ward Republican precinct organization on May 22, 1945, the following resolution was introduced and unanimously adopted. The organization has been instructed by unanimous vote to forward this resolution to you:

"Resolution

"Be it resolved by this organization, That we believe that, insofar as is possible, the armies of occupation should be made up of volunteers. We believe that with better compensation paid to the soldiers who are to occupy these places it would be possible to secure men who are in a position to spend some time in other lands.

"We are of the opinion that the drafted soldiers should be returned home as soon as possible so that they may return promptly to their regular vocations . We feel that this is very vital to the well-being of the Nation.

"Be it resolved, That the chairman of this organization be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, our Representative in Congress, and Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL, United States Senator from Missouri."

We believe that this resolution fairly reflects the attitude of all the people in our ward.

Yours for an early victory,
L. S. WOODCOCK, *Chairman.*

Save Our Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER PATRICK
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this permission was secured to allow me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from a student in Birmingham, Ala. While I cannot agree with this fine youngster that we can so maintain a government that it will stand free from competition with any of its citizens, it is wholesome and profitable to find youth coming forward with well expressed ideas.

Also, this young James Holmquist is here with a subject our people as a whole must engage.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *March 15, 1945.*

Hon. LUTHER PATRICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATRICK: Our boys and girls today over land and sea are fighting for the same principles upon which our Nation was founded—freedom of the individual.

It is apparent that a new conception of democracy is being born which will disrupt our existing democratic institutions and ideals, the present tendency to break down our individual free-enterprise system.

The individual is the basic unit of the free-enterprise system. The fundamental rights of capital and labor must be guaranteed and protected, but there must be no oppressive and unreasonable bureaucratic control of either by government. Government can and should accomplish these objectives by constructive regulations. If we accept the declaration that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we also revert to the original philosophy that, "government derives its powers from the consent of the governed."

The best example of free enterprise is found in the small-business man who wants to be in business for himself. He helps to keep the markets active, creates jobs, controls his own livelihood, and represents true economic freedom.

Deficit financing by the Federal Government tends to destroy individual free enterprise. If corporate savings are paid out to cover deficit financing by the Federal Government during good times final destruction of the individual free-enterprise system will result. Adequate reserves should be allowed to take up the shock of business cycles and enable business to continue, and pay taxes during bad times. Small business and new corporations especially need favorable consideration, in taxing the very source of new capital, so vital to expansion and diversification. There should be excepted, corporate savings which are to be converted into needed plant and equipment which will provide more employment, contribute to business stability.

Any reallocation of the Federal tax system should give consideration to the preservation of the incentives to go into business. This review should be taken to encourage risk capital to go into business and thereby provide greater production and broader employment opportunities.

When our loved ones come home, they will want a chance to work in a country where their enterprise will be rewarded according to their efforts. It is our responsibility to see

that they get what they are fighting for—freedom. Our boys want protection against any tendency toward socialistic atmosphere. Pensions, demobilization, bonus, free training and such are Government benefits of an emergency nature. Such benefits cannot suffice. They want a chance to go int business for themselves. Bureaucratic regimentation will destroy initiative and our free-enterprise system. It can survive only with hard work, courage, honesty, and initiative. The things that have made our country great will continue to do so, as long as we are free from depressing bureaucratic control. Our boys can take it on the chin. They will not want to return to a society of weaklings with politicians directing their every more, but to run this Government through representatives elected by them and other citizens.

As power-mad dictators amassed great strength in facilitating prosecution of the war, we, as free people, have given more power to the executive branch of our Government. This transfer of power was temporarily bestowed upon individuals until total victory is achieved. We realize there is danger in unwise use of power in unrestrained and prolonged use of directives. There exists the responsibility of returning this power to the democracy we hold in trust.

For the past several years we have seen a steady retreat from democratic ideals in the form of Government we love. Our democracy is on the defensive. Democracy, the dream that men can govern themselves, has been the dream of a road from slavery to freedom, where we can make our laws for ourselves and obey them. The fight for democracy will be won in battle, but will it be won in peace?

"Freedom from want" is a fair objective in our postwar plans. Any attempt to provide social security "from the cradle to the grave" by the surrender of our freedom will destroy not only private free enterprise, but also constitutional government. How can we have this freedom? "Full employment" is the answer. We cannot have social security with our workers without jobs. This can only be attained by prosperity in American industry. All breadwinners must be provided with adequate employment—not relief doles. All phases of business should be encouraged to help solve this problem. Government can help in times of need, to fill the gaps. But the real employment problem is up to business to furnish the jobs. Industrial activity is the source of good living and security for workers. Good management and good workers have put this country ahead. Congress should do all in its power to encourage private free enterprise and industrial progress.

Freedom from want is attained by freedom to work unhampered by burdensome bureaucratic restrictives. History records nation after nation whose governments had so ordered the lives of their people that self-reliance, initiative, and individual responsibility were destroyed.

Lack of interest in the preservation of the free enterprise system as represented in business, labor—both organized and unorganized—agriculture, and the professions will result in its loss. Congress is beset by small minority groups with strong fronts ready to wage war for special interests. What is needed to overcome this evil is to arouse everyone to a greater sense of duty to country as a whole rather than allow it to be run by small vociferous groups who ask for special favors which when granted react against our democratic system. Government must be reestablished to serve the interests of all the people, not used to exploit certain groups.

Our people are so absorbed in their own problems they are likely to put aside the very thing that made prosperity possible. Lack of interest in our free enterprise system is "killing the goose that laid the golden egg." There should be the closest cooperation and understanding between the citizens and Congress for the preservation of free enterprise. This is necessary to protect the future of democracy, and its expansion will be accelerated by the education of the public. With bureaucracy there will be no freedom, and no enterprise. Already there is a distinct tendency toward socialism. Too many theorists talk of Government ownership of this and that industry on the assumption that an inexperienced individual with Government authority can run a business more intelligently than one whose very existence depends on his success or failure.

Coordination applied to industries can make them powerful in maintaining a prosperous peace just as they have been cooperating with the Government in winning the war. In cooperating with Congress industry can keep the working forces of America producing things everybody wants. Any activity by Government in competition with any of her citizens should not be tolerated.

There is great need for better understanding between the citizens of this country and its elected Congress. The farmer, businessman, and workingman have much to fear in controls, restrictions, and socialistic ventures by our Government. The system of free enterprise is cooperating toward a solution of the momentous problem of full employment in the face of unnecessary laws of restraint, restriction, and direct competition by our Government.

Cooperation of Government and business is imperative. Our citizens cannot fight our Government. They cannot be governed by fear, unnecessary restraint, and needless limitations. Free enterprise must be released for service. The time is at hand when those we elect to represent us should speak up for the same free-enterprise system that has made America great. Let our Congress protect and defend the individual free-enterprise system as the job-producing system, that will give self-respecting jobs to freemen and preserve freedom to all individuals, as guaranteed them by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. HOLMQUIST.

Reconversion and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] before the Chicago Reconversion Conference, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., May 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the conference, about a year and a half ago, as a result of the successful progress of the war, considerable anxiety developed in business circles because of the uncertainty and confusion bound to develop at the end of the war. Business demanded an effective system for the prompt and equitable settlement of claims on terminated war contracts. They faced the danger of interminable delays—through the existing legal procedures—review by the Comptroller General—through disputes between prime contractors and subcontractors, and through long drawn-out controversies in the courts. At the time World War II broke out in Europe, unsettled claims were still pending from the last war. In view of the magnitude of war contracts in this war, delays in settlement would threaten widespread bankruptcy and confusion in industry.

This problem was presented for solution to a Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, composed of the former Senator from Missouri, President Harry S. Truman, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. REVERCOMB, and myself as chairman. We held extensive hearings and received the testimony of hundreds of war contractors, large and small. We conferred with every contracting agency of the Government. We had the advice of both the Comptroller General and the United States Attorney General. Every phase of the problem was thoroughly explored. Scores of expert accountants and legal representatives of American manufacturers were called in to aid in formulating vitally important legislation.

Our committee finally reported the Contract Settlement Act. It was enacted by an overwhelming vote in the Senate and in the House. That act had the general approval of American business and is regarded as one of the most effective pieces of legislation recently passed by the Congress.

The unconditional surrender of the German Army has already brought America into the first stage of conversion from war to peace. As a result of VE cut-backs, according to War Manpower estimates, from 4 to 5 million workers will be released from war production. The plans for demobilization of the armed forces already contemplate returning 2,000,000 men to civilian life during the coming year. This limited conversion already presents a serious problem.

But the second and final stage of reconversion will begin when Japan is defeated. We must then be prepared for war production cut-backs that will displace at least 5,000,000 workers. We must also be prepared for the release of probably 5,000,000 men from the armed forces during the very first year of demobilization.

Last December President Truman and myself submitted to the Senate a report which contained the following statement relating to the gigantic war economy which had been built up in this country. I quote:

"Almost half of the framework supporting this giant structure consists of war contracts. When war contracts are withdrawn, the danger is that the entire edifice will topple over. * * *

"Unless an economic substitute is found for war contracts, mass unemployment will become a serious threat and the number of unemployed men and women in this country might easily surpass the tragic conditions of unemployment during the last depression."

Earlier this year, Senator WAGNER, Senator THOMAS of Utah, Senator O'MAHONEY, Representative PATMAN and myself introduced a bill which undertook to meet this problem and protect our economy in the years ahead.

This bill, known as the full-employment bill, recognizes that the Federal Government has the responsibility, in cooperation with its citizens and the various economic groups and with State and local governments, of assuring job opportunities for all citizens who are able and willing to work. To carry out this responsibility, under this bill, the President is called upon to submit to the Congress every year a statement of economic requirements, in terms of the number of people who will be seeking work, the total amount of goods and services they would produce, and the total demand necessary to absorb those goods and services. The President would also submit an appraisal of current economic trends, which may or may not be moving in the right direction, and his proposed plans for administrative action and recommendations for legislative action to meet the requirements for full employment and full production.

The President's program would then be studied by a joint congressional committee. It would be amended or modified, if necessary, and reported to the Congress in the form of a joint resolution. It would then be subject to full debate in both Houses. When agreed upon, with whatever changes might be made, the joint resolution would serve as a guide to Congress in enacting specific legislation on taxes, expenditures, measures for the stimulation of business and industry, or other programs which might be expected to produce the desired results.

It will be seen that this legislation leaves the basic decisions entirely up to the Congress. When times are prosperous the Congress might desire to collect more revenue than it authorizes to be spent. If conditions are unfavorable, it might provide incentives for business through lower taxes and increased Government expenditures to stimulate industry. In other words, the Congress would scrutinize business trends and undertake to maintain a balanced economy, preventing serious unemployment, on the one hand, or the threat of inflation, on the other.

In short, the bill establishes a national policy based on the Government's responsibilities toward full production, employment, and economic stability, and it provides a method whereby the Executive and the Congress can work together in carrying out this policy.

It is charged by some in our country that while American business is willing to cooperate on policies which work in its favor, business is not entirely willing to cooperate in mapping out a postwar policy and program for the maintenance of full employment.

This, of course, is not true.

American business is fully alive to the need for a full-production policy and a full-employment program. Every businessman knows that a man on a pay roll is a better customer than a man on relief. American business realizes that another depression such as we experienced in the 1930's might well mean the end of capitalism in America.

Naturally there are many differences of opinion in the business world as to exactly what objectives we should seek and what responsibilities the Federal Government should assume toward those objectives.

Let me illustrate with a few quotations from letters by businessmen on the full-employment bill.

Here is one quotation from a prominent retail executive who favors the bill. I quote:

"It is the basic responsibility of government to see to it that private business is given opportunity to provide jobs which will enable those who are able and want to work, to maintain a decent standard of living and undertake to improve upon it. When private industry fails in this purpose, it should be the function of government to fill the employment gap.

"The full-employment bill should be enacted, because only two courses of action remain. Either to let things take their course or commit the Nation to some form of planned economy."

Now, let me call attention to another businessman who opposes the full-employment bill. I quote:

"We feel that private competitive capitalism requires a floating number of unemployed. * * * For this reason we do not feel that Senate bill 380 would be desirable legislation."

In my opinion, the first quotation I have given you symbolizes the realistic view. It is the kind of practical, businesslike attitude that America needs from business and that business should and can give to America.

The second quotation is evidently from a man who sincerely feels that full employment is not compatible with our system of capitalistic enterprise. He expresses the view that private enterprise needs a sizable reserve of unemployed workers in order to operate to the better advantage of business.

Let me ask you to think this over very carefully. I believe you will reach the conclusion, as I have, that if business leadership adopts this latter position, namely, that business needs and wants a standing army of unemployed, it will carry us into another depression which we cannot afford to risk. The last depression which we went through should be a warning.

Our American way of life, as we know it, cannot survive unless the men who employ labor, the men who manage industries, the men who invest capital, the men who risk their capital in marketing a new product or developing a new idea adopt the goal of jobs for all workers who are able and willing to work.

But this goal is an idle dream unless with care, with patience, and with a lot of hard work, we develop a method and a procedure whereby business, labor, agriculture, State governments, local governments, and the Federal Government, can work in reasonable harmony year in and year out in achieving and maintaining full production and full employment.

There are some who believe that we can sit back and let business follow its natural course. They believe that we are heading into a postwar boom which will come after a short period of dislocation following the defeat of Japan. They anticipate 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of highly prosperous conditions. They point to the tremendous backlogs of demand for automobiles, washing machines, and other products of modern industry. They point to demands for new business plants and equipment, for housing, for needed highways and other public works; they point to large export demands to rebuild the new world and to industrialize China, Russia, South America, and other areas. All these things, they contend, spell boom.

All this may be true. But these conditions may also spell disaster. Every one of these factors operated in the years following World War I. They will run their course again in the coming period, as they did in the 1920's.

It seems entirely probable that we will have a period of boom based on these undoubted needs and on the accumulated purchasing power of wartime savings. We may even see a period of serious inflationary conditions. To cope with these dangers and maintain a balance, we will need the broad policy framework of the full-employment bill.

After the period of inflation which we anticipate has run its course, we will have collapse as we did in 1929 unless we do something to prevent another depression.

The full-employment bill is intended to provide a method and a procedure for meeting these dangers within the framework of our free-enterprise tradition.

There has been too much misunderstanding about free enterprise.

I want to make it perfectly clear that when I talk about free enterprise, I mean the kind of a free enterprise that the American people are prepared to fight for.

I want to see American enterprise free from unfair, unreasonable, or monopolistic restrictions by irresponsible private groups, whoever they may be.

I want to see enterprise free from all unnecessary Government controls and restraints, likewise. This does not mean freedom from the operation of laws enacted for the welfare of the people.

This is the kind of free enterprise that the sponsors of the full-employment bill had in mind in the provisions of section 2 (a) of the bill—and I quote—"It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States."

The sponsors of the full-employment bill recognize that it requires a full and careful study before it is enacted. If it can be improved upon in any respect, we welcome suggestions for clarification or for constructive amendment. We have been in conference with many businessmen with a view toward obtaining their advice and assistance. We solicit your advice and assistance. If you believe the bill is so hopeless that it cannot be perfected, then we ask: "What alternatives do you suggest?" It seems incredible that any businessman could ignore the dangers that are bound to threaten our country in the postwar period.

In the near future public hearings will be held on the full-employment bill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to obtain the views of all who have anything to contribute on the provisions of the bill or on the general problem of maintaining full employment and production.

It is the intention of the sponsors to handle this full-employment bill in precisely the same manner in which we handled the contract-termination legislation last year. Businessmen representing all sectors of the American economy participated in the formulation of the Contract Settlement Act. In the same way full business participation is needed in the formulation of a full-employment bill.

It is my belief that in considering this momentous question businessmen will not be content with repeating the ready-made phrases handed down from earlier decades when life was a good deal simpler than it is now. In the last 40 years greater changes have taken place in our economic system than in all the years that preceded. These changes have been clearly recognized by leading economists and editorial writers in recent years. Let me quote from a Fortune magazine editorial which appeared in that magazine in 1938:

"Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to guarantee, without Government intervention, the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another 1930."

It is the hope of the sponsors of the full-employment bill that as a result of the coming hearings, with the help of American business, we will develop a concrete national policy that will assure prosperity for business and for workers, a policy that will strengthen our American system of competitive enterprise and preserve our democratic form of government.

Whisky Holiday

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for an investigation of the action of the War Production Board providing for a whisky holiday during the month of July. If this order goes into effect there will be diverted to the manufacture of whisky millions of bushels of valuable grain which will be needed within the next few months as food for our armed forces, for our civilian population, and

to relieve hunger among the starving people of the devastated countries of Europe. Part of this grain will be needed for human food, part of it for livestock feed to produce dairy products, poultry, and meat, of which we are now so woefully short.

It seems to me an astounding thing that such an order should be issued at the beginning of what is likely to be the most critical food year in our history. Our supplies of grain at this time are fairly large as compared with consumptive needs during normal times but no one can contend that they are large or even adequate when we consider the demands which will be made upon this country in order to meet our commitments for the coming year. The amount of meat, poultry, and dairy products which can be produced is dependent upon the amount of grain which may be available for feed. The demands for grain for human food will tax our utmost ability in the way of production. No one can safely predict at this time what our crops will be. Winter wheat prospects are daily declining. A cold, wet season in the Corn Belt has seriously interfered with the preparation of the soil and the planting of corn. This means a late crop and a reduced acreage. Prospects for other feed grains are none too good.

We have been lucky in our weather during the past 6 years. We have had bumper crops but we cannot count upon continued good fortune in this respect. The law of averages is still functioning. A poor crop is past overdue. Severe drought conditions in the Southern Hemisphere have resulted in short grain crops both in South America and Australia. Under these circumstances the issuance of this order constitutes a reckless and wanton disregard of our requirements for food.

The farmers of this country have done a heroic job in food production. Both old and young have worked early and late in storm and sunshine and in the face of shortages of labor, machinery and transportation because they have been told that such strenuous efforts were necessary to win the war and to feed a starving world. I am satisfied that they have not undergone these hardships for the purpose of making possible a whisky holiday.

The First Peace Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on May 28, 1945, entitled "The First Peace Issue":

THE FIRST PEACE ISSUE

At the end of a long and sharp debate, which culminated in a personal appeal by President Truman for favorable action, the House of Representatives has approved a bill which proposes to give the Government power to continue and expand the Hull program of reciprocal trade agreements. No more important legislation has come before Congress in many months than this first test of American policy toward the nature of the postwar peace. For at least three chief reasons a continuation of the Hull program is indispensable—so indispensable, that the defeat of this legislation at this time would have been a major political calamity.

In the first place, it is evident that both public and private loans from the United States, loans made on a sound basis, will be necessary for the reconstruction of Europe, a task which needs to be undertaken as much in our own interest as in the interest of our European allies. Such loans cannot possibly be made on a sound basis unless there is reasonable hope of repayment. And since the only practicable method of repayment is in terms of goods, the whole problem of postwar reconstruction is tied up intimately with the problem of achieving reasonable reductions of barriers to trade.

In the second place, even more than in the years before the war, many American industries are now geared to a production which will require profitable foreign markets if the existing volume of domestic employment is to be maintained. Again we face the fact that, in the long run, and particularly since we have already acquired most of the world's gold, American goods can be bought abroad only with the proceeds of goods sold in our own markets, and bought there, because they represent good values at reasonable prices, by American consumers.

Finally, since the United States is admittedly the most powerful economic unit anywhere in the world today, it is obvious that our action will be the most important single influence in establishing the whole economic pattern of the postwar years, and in determining from the very start whether the trend will be—as it would certainly have been, if the Hull program had been rejected—toward a narrow economic nationalism, with foreign trade largely in the hands of Government monopolies, or whether the trend will be—as there is now reason to hope—toward a freer exchange of goods, a relaxation of governmental controls, a survival of the private enterprise system, and an era of economic good will which will lay a sound basis for the work of the new international peace organization which is now being established at San Francisco.

This is the first important international issue to come before Congress since the end of the war in Europe, and the vote on it must give cause for second thought to many of those who felt, in the last election, that it was safe to trust the Republican Party in Congress with the direction of international issues, on the ground that that party had turned over a new leaf and seen a new light since the days of its opposition to lend-lease, to repeal of the arms embargo, to selective service, and to the original grant of authority to Mr. Hull to negotiate his trade agreements. For, on the critical test which this new legislation met on Saturday—the question whether or not to kill the bill by recommitting it—only seven Republicans could be found in the entire House of Representatives who were willing to give their support to continuing and expanding the Hull program. One hundred and sixty-seven Republicans—a majority of 23 Republicans to 1—voted to send the new bill back to committee.

Such a performance as this can profit the Republican Party, politically, only on one assumption: Only on the assumption that there is a swing back of public sentiment in this country to the old days of political and economic isolation between the two World Wars. On any other assumption the House Republicans have taken a position and written a record that must be a heavy handicap to any Republican candidate for the Presidency in the next election.

It now remains to be seen what will happen in the Senate.

America and World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Blue Network Tuesday, May 29, 1945:

The other day I saw a reporter-friend just returned from the San Francisco Conference. "Day and night," he said, "there was only one topic: Soviet Russia. Sometimes I wondered if Russia's strength or ideas really merit so much attention."

Of course he knew the answer: They do.

Russia's physical strength has been proven in many mighty battles. We know that America's factories have sent Russia 12,850 combat vehicles, including tanks, approximately 175,000 guns, and unknown quantities of ships. Altogether American industrial workers and taxpayers have sent $8,000,000,000 of lend-lease material to our Russian allies. Even so, Russia's own great industry, fine generalship, and rich manpower have played a decisive part in the defeat of Germany.

And now the German war machine is destroyed and German industrial strength all but obliterated. This leaves Russia immeasurably the strongest military and industrial power in Europe.

Russia has a fresh, untried, and powerful army in Asia. Because it is to Soviet Russia's own national interests to get into the Pacific war, that army is certain to be used against the Japanese before the final kill. When the Japanese are at last beaten to the ground, their Army destroyed, and their factories pulverized, Russia will emerge as the strongest military and industrial power also in Asia.

There is no question that Russian physical strength—her iron muscles and machine brawn—make her the world's No. 2 power, the military and industrial Titan of Eurasia. And this certainly merits the attention it has received from the men who seek peace in our time at San Francisco.

As for Red Russia's ideas—well, at this hour every government in central Europe is either controlled directly or indirectly by Moscow-minded rulers. This has been and is being accomplished by a three-point policy: (1) By a policy of fraternization with the conquered peoples. (2) By the liquidation of all anti-Communists. This means that if people resist communism, whether they are Fascists, Monarchists, Socialists, Democrats, or Liberals, they are shot, imprisoned, or deported by the tens, and, if necessary, by the hundreds of thousands. (3) By a policy of putting guns, money, and food, which is to say, political power, into the hands of all discontented minority groups which will agree to adopt the Soviet programs, regardless of those groups' previous political convictions.

In Greece and in Italy the groundwork is laid for the Communist or so-called Partisan, Patriot, Free Democratic, or Liberation elements to take over as Anglo-American armies leave.

There are already strong clamorous Communist Parties in Belgium, Holland, France,

and Spain. In the Near East there is much Communist fire.

The young despairing intellectuals of India are increasingly looking toward their near and mighty neighbor, the Soviet Union, for guidance in the technique of revolution. They get it, increasingly.

We all know that there is a powerful Chinese Communist Party, oriented toward Moscow, whose great opportunity will come when Red Russian armies move against Japan and offer to "liberate" Manchuria.

Mexico, Central America, and South America are all well provided with strong Communist groups. I need remind no one that we have our own Earl Browder.

In view of these facts, we must say that Red Russia's ideas merit all the attention they get from the fascinated statesmen of many nations at San Francisco.

Naturally we must ask ourselves: Is this rising world tide of Moscow-controlling communism a good or evil thing for the world? Upon the individual American's answer to this question will depend the fate of all the peoples of Europe and Asia in the very immediate years ahead, and the ultimate destiny of America 20 years from now.

But before we answer that question let us talk for a moment about words—the words, for example, "good" and "evil."

Do these words have any meaning to you? Of course they do. They are the words men have used since the most ancient times—indeed, since speech itself was born. Now, these words, when applied to fundamental political policies and actions, have about the same meaning to all average Americans. But do they mean the same to us as they do to Communist leaders in Europe or Asia or South America or North America today? The appalling fact is that good and evil not only don't have the same meaning for them—they sometimes have no meaning at all.

Let me give you an example. Do we not as sane men agree that murder is evil? I think we do. When a Nazi SS man seizes a Jew, without due process of law, and throws him into a concentration camp, where he is tortured or starved to death, we say that deed is murder. No Nazi nonsense about racism or international Jewish plots or the security of the Reich can change that judgment in the eyes of man or God.

When a Communist OGPU agent strips a Russian of his small farm and few pigs, without due process of law, and then allows him to starve to death, or sends him to a slave camp in Siberia, that deed is murder, too. And no Communist twaddle about implementing the peoples' revolution, international capitalistic plots, or the security of the proletariat should change that judgment in the eyes of man, or can change it in the eyes of God.

The imposed death or imprisonment of any individual who has not been tried by a free jury of his peers under laws which have been framed by the will of the people are, we say again, evil things called murder, called slavery. They were evil when the Nazis practiced them. They are evil when the Communists practice them as they do today on a wholesale scale in all of Russia and in central Europe.

Let us get down to three fundamental political tenets, which all Americans hold to be right, good, and just.

We believe in a free press, free speech, and free worship. The Communists, wherever you find them in America, Mexico, China, or Europe, believe that the press should be precensored and controlled; that men should refrain from criticizing their leaders under pain of death; and that any religion not subject to state control should be liquidated. In short, we and the Communists are exactly 180 degrees apart on our most fundamental political concepts. Moreover, the very words "right," "good," and "just" mean exactly what Stalin says they mean—but only on Monday morning. For on Tuesday morning he may change his mind. If so, the Russian people are required and every Communist leader in the world is required, under pain of death or exile, to change their minds accordingly before Wednesday. For truth to a Communist and Moscow leader is never an absolute. Truth is exactly what suits the Communist leaders' political policy or purposes, or even personal whims, at any given moment.

I expect at this point you will say that in principle you agree with everything I have said. But, you say, that's the way the Communists see things. They have the right, haven't they, to see things and do things the way they choose?

If the Moscow Communist leaders and their agents and puppets outside of Russia have the right to communize all of Europe—and then all of Asia—by liquidating all non-Communists; if they have the right to work within all other countries to overthrow their systems of government by force and murder; and if they have the right to plead that this international technique of terrorization and subversion is morally justified by the need of security for the Soviet Union or the welfare of the masses, then, my friends, should it not logically follow that every other nation had or has that same right?

Well, we never thought the Nazis had this right yesterday. Logically then, we must agree that the Communist dictators don't have it today, either. It is hard to have to display this troublesome moral consistency in our great hour of military victory in Europe, and when our gratitude is so very, very great to the heroic people of Russia, who helped us gain that victory. But a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that we examine the immoral nature of this communism that is sweeping Europe. And we know that millions upon millions of individual souls there and in Asia are yearning for freedom—the freedom to talk, to speak, to worship, to work at that which lies to their hands or appeals to their minds. Yes, the Russians, too, this valorous and imaginative people—even they are yearning for freedom. Have we any proof of that? We have.

Let me ask you: In this war, did any large group of Americans, any American generals, ever desert American forces to fight with the Japanese or Germans? Never. And yet almost to the end, Russian soldiers by the thousands, and Russian generals by the dozens, deserted Red Russia, fled Stalinism, escaped from communism, and fought willingly beside the Nazis.

They were, of course, deceived in their search for freedom, just as deceived as the German soldiers who deserted to Stalin. Today in the Balkans over 300,000 Russian soldiers have deserted victorious Russian armies to seek a better, richer, happier way of life. Their search becomes every day more fruitless, because the hand of Stalin reaches out for them, reaches over the Balkans.

Of course, millions of Russians put up a hard fight for their homeland. So did millions of Nazis. So do millions of Japanese. Only Communists would have you believe that the hard fight millions of Russians put up proves that communism is, therefore, justified. And 180,000,000 Russians are today incarcerated behind a towering wall of censorship. They are unaware that there is a world in which the words "law and justice, charity and freedom" have a sweet and real and personal meaning for great masses of men. Like the Nazis, they have been subjected to years of propaganda and terrorization, or death, if they would not swallow the propaganda. The fate that has overtaken the wonderful Russian people is now about to overtake almost all the peoples of Europe and Asia.

I know what you are thinking now; I can hear your thought.

And what shall we Americans do about it? What can we do about it?

First, we can get our own thinking straight. We can, as individuals, write a balance sheet—a strictly moral balance sheet on communism as it has been revealed in Europe, versus parliamentary and constitutional forms of government. When we have made that balance sheet, we can decide where we each, as individuals, stand. I think morally we will find communism in the red—blood red. And then when we've got that balance sheet clear in our minds, we can as individuals help our Government to act abroad.

And what should our Government do abroad?

First and foremost, use our great diplomatic power and vast military prestige—now—to help all Asiatic and European statesmen and officeholders—Frenchman, Poles, Italians, Greeks, Belgians, Dutch, Germans, Austrians, who are not either Fascists or Communists, to stay in power providing—and only providing—they are willing to form, and do form, true representative parliaments and congresses, and grant constitutions, which guarantee the people freedom of press, speech, religion, and assembly, and other essential legal rights natural to freeman. Such governments, however imperfect at the beginning, will tend increasingly to respond to the real will of the people.

It is a heartbreaking pity that the heroic but enslaved Russia people—the common men of Russia—are not free to aid us in an effort to enlarge the area of human freedom. But we must understand that the plain people of Russia live in a vast concentration camp, the prisoners of their own leaders. When we remember this, we will never act or speak as some people do, as though the great Russian people were our enemies. The Russian people are and must continue to be our friends, for the peace of the world depends on that friendship. We are the two most powerful peoples on earth, and all our national good will and international diplomatic efforts must be directed toward cementing our friendship. No American wants war again in our generation. But surely in this last decade we have learned in blood and toil and tears and sweat that appeasement is the road to war. If we want to stay out of war with communism we must not appease communism. And we dare not appease communism. This cannot long remain two worlds, as it is today—the world of totalitarianism and the world of liberty. Indeed, as our conflict with Nazi totalitarianism proved, these two worlds are doomed to come into conflict. It must, and will be one world sooner or later.

Shall it be one world in which all mankind crawls and cringes in the darkness of slavery? Or shall it be one world in which all the great nations of mankind love and live in the light of freedom?

My Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt from the Washington Daily News of May 30, 1945:

MY DAY—F. D. WOULD HAVE WISHED TO REST IN SOIL WHERE HE FELL

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Tuesday.—Tomorrow will be Memorial Day, and all over this country people will be going to our cemeteries and placing

flags and wreaths on the graves of the men who died for their country in this and other wars in our past history. The graves of others, too, will not be neglected.

But it is not of those who have died that I am primarily thinking today. During the past weeks I have been able to go to my husband's grave in the quiet and beautiful hedge-enclosed garden. Delegations from many foreign nations have come to pay their respects, and they have gone away apparently with a renewed strength of spirit. I believe this always comes when we think of the courageous people who bear their burdens in life without fear and, like Lincoln, never troubled about their detractors but did the best they knew how from day to day, trusting in the strength of a greater power than their own.

Each time that I talk to people who seem to leave here with a little more courage than they came, I cannot help thinking of the many women who have written me during the days when I lived in the White House, begging to be allowed to bring home from overseas the fathers, husbands, or brothers who lie buried far away. Always I had to answer that when the war was over the question would be sympathetically considered by the various departments, but that for the present people must lie where they fall.

I talked about it with my husband, who always said: "If I die at sea, I want to be buried at sea just like any sailor;" and I am sure that had he died on foreign soil he would have wanted to be buried in the place where he died, much as he loved his own land and the little patch of ground which was particularly his.

One wonders, nevertheless, when there is no tangible grave to be visited, how these people can get comfort not only on Memorial Day but on all the other days of the year. They would still get it, of course, from the man who gave them courage and care and love on earth, if they could feel his spirit. Everyone who leaves this world must want to give those left behind that lift of the spirit which he left in his home in the morning and brought back when he returned.

Perhaps if the women who have no grave to visit could go to some place that together they had known and loved in the past, and think not of the body of a man but of his mind and soul and heart, they might then be able to feel some of that sense of nearness which is, I think, at the root of the craving people have to know and visit the spot where someone they have loved and depended upon is laid to rest. Perhaps if, day by day, they try to carry out some wish or some interest which was close to the man's heart, they may find themselves sharing more intimately in the actual things which moved him. This will give them comfort and courage to face the future with a "head that is bloody but unbowed."

Reducing the Gold Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on voice vote, for protest purposes, I voted against H. R. 3000, the bill to reduce gold reserves. I wish there had been a recorded vote. In my opinion, our country is following a topsy-turvy financial policy which I would expect to find only in Alice in Wonderland.

On the one hand, we are told that gold reserves must be reduced because our country is experiencing continuous losses of gold through gold exports. On the other hand, our gold mines have been closed for 2½ years and there is as yet no indication as to when they will be reopened. On the one hand, we are told that H. R. 3000 is necessary to the financing of the war. On the other hand, the Congress, day after day, appropriates extravagantly for the peacetime activities of the Government with no thought whatever to the achievement postwar of a balanced budget.

Our financial disease cannot be cured by soothing sirup. Cure requires a major operation and that major operation is the elimination of every unnecessary job and every unnecessary expenditure so that Budget balance, with the end of the Japanese war, can actually be achieved. There would then be no necessity for reducing gold reserves, and confidence in our currency would be correspondingly strengthened.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the Congress the resolution adopted by the Independent Hungarian Political Club of Gary, Ind., on the passing of our late President.

This organization, through the leadership of Julius J. Danch and George J. Domonkos, over the last 13 years, has been untiring in its loyalty to our departed President. It has, without exception, during this period, supported his great program for the uplift of humanity and the rights of the common man.

The resolution follows:

THE INDEPENDENT HUNGARIAN
POLITICAL CLUB,
Gary, Ind., April 29, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

At our regular meeting, April 29, 1945, upon recommendation of the officers and our board of directors, the following resolution was offered and accepted:

"Whereas all nationality groups, in particular American Hungarians, by naturalization, and/or descent, feel that we have lost a friend, indeed, and wish to pay our respects also to our friend and benefactor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

"Whereas that in the course of human events the hand of God touched upon the souls of nations, meting out punishments upon them, punishments far reaching in scope, in severity, and in justice. Men lost sight of His destiny, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the inalienable right to worship God regardless of race, creed, or color. That out of this chaos God has provided this Nation with a leader who was given the great and far-reaching ability and foresight to look far into the future and plan the rebirth of democracy in its true sense, not only in these great United States of America but also in the United Nations of the world, as evidenced by the San Francisco Conference: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That in memory of this great national humanitarian we pray Congress will see fit to establish a national shrine; we further

"*Resolve*, That our sympathy, together with the sympathy of Congress, be extended to the bereaved. The memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will live for time immemorial in the halls of fame and the annals of history."

Submitted and accepted by the members of the Independent Hungarian Political Club in regular meeting assembled this 29th day of April 1945.

JULIUS J. DANCH,
President.

Attested:

GEORGE J. DOMONKOS,
Honorary President.
FRANK DOBROSZI,
Recording Secretary.
LOUIS BRUSZ, *Director.*

Angleworms and Rattlesnakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Angleworms and Rattlesnakes," which appeared in the Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis., under date of May 24, 1945:

ANGLEWORMS AND RATTLESNAKES

Unless the OPA speedily mends its ways it is headed toward the same tragic fate which caught up with the noble experiment, prohibition, a dozen years ago.

Unlike the noble experiment, which had only a scant mathematical approval, the OPA was launched with a practically unanimous endorsement of manufacturers, retailers, and customers. The principles of OPA still have that endorsement, but the public rapidly grows weary of its elephantine and thick-skulled gyrations.

The first grave error of OPA was the maze of red tape in which it tangled itself, red tape which reached the ultimate of confusion in the recent regulation No. 580. An official high in OPA circles recently confessed privately that he doubted if the best advices of the larger Chicago and Milwaukee stores could comply technically and absolutely with regulation No. 580, and he was positive that the average small-town merchant couldn't comply. A program which could have been made simple and easy was made complex and difficult. Red tape was the first sin of OPA.

But, worse still, have been the failure of OPA to stop black-marketing activities at their source in the high places on the one hand, while they persecuted technical violators with good intentions on the other. With considerable flourish the OPA has penalized a few farmers for selling poultry over ceiling prices. They have penalized a few frozen locker owners, they have nipped a handful of motorists for gasoline rationing violations, they have pointed the finger of shame at a few harassed businessmen, but the scandalous black markets in the metropolitan areas have successfully thumbed their collective noses at them. The OPA has chopped the heads off angleworms while the rattlesnakes have gone their merry way.

The OPA should have read in the history of prohibition that these tactics would soon forfeit public approval and respect. Certainly the OPA cannot fail to recognize the handwriting on the wall at this moment. A few weeks ago George Greene, of the Waupun Leader-News, one of Wisconsin's ablest newspapers, told the OPA bluntly to go to hell. That was on the occasion of the OPA breaking its word to the housewives by invalidating ration points before expiration. No one recognizes the necessity for sensible price control more than does Mr. Greene, but the high-handed antics of the OPA have irked Mr. Greene as they have the rest of us. In the fort we have been unusually fortunate, OPA regulations have been left in the hands of an intelligent and cooperative local committee, with the exception of one regrettable incident. As a result, we have had few offenses and few complaints. Just how fortunate we have been is indicated in a bitter story of OPA persecution visited upon our neighboring city, Whitewater, last week. The Whitewater Register is ably edited by a family whose capable idealism and devotion to duty are respected all over Wisconsin. Here is no crackpot weekly speaking, but the voice of an intelligent, thoughtful publication, driven to distraction by invaders who prefer to pounce upon well-meaning midgets while malicious giants run at large in the land:

"That scourge, known as the OPA investigator, visited our city this week. There were two of them. They went into most of our grocery stores, checked the prices, jotted down errors, and at the bottom of the record stated the amount they, as dictators, elected to assess the culprits. Dierfeld's, Hackett's, and the I. G. A. were all found to be run by criminals.

"These overpowered investigators, whose methods are making good Americans blush, are not specializing in the shyster, crooked merchant. No, they are after anybody with stock on their shelves who, because of the rush of business with an understaffed force failed to check an item in the almost daily change of prices and rewrite the price tag under that commodity on the shelf.

"At Hackett's, for instance, there were 11 items found wrong, 10 for 1 cent, 1 for 2. The gravest offense was the discovery of a few cans of grated tuna in with the higher priced light meat cans. The fine for that covered the price of tuna sales for a year.

"No dishonest merchant can last long in a town this size. The public weeds out all such and so, when the Government is behind this practice of heavily penalizing the honest ones for honest mistakes while working under terrific handicaps, the Government suffers.

"The OPA is helpless in its contest with the black marketeers but honest mistakes by honest merchants are easy to spot, so it has turned to that field to get the cash returns which would seem, in Washington, to justify its existence.

"As a taxpayer, the Registerman wishes heartily that it were possible to use city funds to fight, in court, this cancer on our democratic form of government."

Harry Truman Is the Seventh Vice President To Become Chief Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and poem from the McKinney (Tex.) Courier-Gazette:

HARRY TRUMAN IS THE SEVENTH VICE PRESIDENT TO BECOME CHIEF EXECUTIVE

As the Nation and the world paused to pay tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt in prayer and praise, President Harry Truman took over the duties as the Chief Executive of these United States with prospects of unusual close cooperation between the White House and Congress. Truman took oath of office as the President of the United States at 7:09 p. m. last Thursday, a scant few hours after the death of Franklin Roosevelt at Warm Springs, where he had been for several weeks undergoing treatment. Mr. Truman was the seventh Vice President in history to be elevated to the office of President by reason of death.

Though Mr. Truman acted alertly to maintain the essential continuity of government during these first few days of his responsibility he is remaining deliberately in the background as a sorrowful Nation pays tribute to the first President to die in office since President Harding in 1923.

In taking up the reigns of government, President Truman has promised a continuance of the program started by our late President. No changes have been made and no intentions of changes has been announced in the President's Cabinet. Unconditional surrender of the enemy and the establishment of a lasting peace, the goals set by Mr. Roosevelt, will be the chief aims of our present Commander in Chief.

Even though Mr. Roosevelt did not live to see the ultimate victory of the Allies and the peace he so often dreamed of, yet he saw this victory and peace many times during this war. He saw it after Pearl Harbor, when our Nation reeled under the cowardly attack of barbarous Japan. He saw it at Casablanca and at Yalta and in the meetings that followed with the Allied chiefs. He knew as no other man knew that there was only one end to this present conflict—ultimate and complete victory for the Allies.

HE IS NOT GONE

Did some one say, he has passed on?
Did some one says, he is no more?
'Tis not so, for his light gleams on,
While his great soul walks Eternity's shore.

Can ye not see his trenchant blade,
Still leading the ranks of men?
Can ye not hear his golden voice?
The voice of a helper and friend.

Then say ye not that he is gone,
His flag still waves o'er sacred sod,
Still he leads embattled hosts,
On to victory and to God!

—*W. M. Pierson.*

DALLAS, TEX.

Regional and Valley Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in view of the position taken by the National Farmers Union in the matter of regional and valley authorities, it is interesting to note that Flint Creek Local, No. 522, of Hall, Mont., has adopted a resolution opposing Senate bills 460 and 555 and H. R. 1824.

In accordance with permission heretofore granted, copy of the resolution is hereto attached and made a part of these remarks:

Whereas Senate bill 460, introduced by Mr. MITCHELL, Senate bill 555, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, and House bill 1824, introduced by Mr. RANKIN, as well as other bills of a like kind pertaining to regional or valley authorities, have been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such legislation would give a group of three directors control over the destinies of the areas covered, thereby depriving such areas of their long-recognized rights to carry on their own development; and

Whereas such authorities would exercise the right of public domain and take from citizens in the community their homes and property and would eliminate said assets from taxation; and

Whereas we already have agencies and authority, passed by the last Congress, to complete such work; and

Whereas we fully realize that in these arid areas water should have its first use for domestic consumption and the growing of crops and further recognize that on the use of this water depends our economic life and the establishment of homes; and

Whereas we feel that such legislation would take from us our long-recognized rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Flint Creek Local, No. 522 of the National Farmers Union, after studying discussions of these matters, voice our strong opposition to such legislation and recommend that it do not pass; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to our congressional delegation for the State of Montana, and to other organizations who agree with our beliefs, and in addition that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this organization.

FLINT CREEK LOCAL, NO. 522, HALL, MONT.,
WALTER WICKBERG, *President*,
MRS. LOUIS ORMESHA, *Secretary*.

Plenty of Fat Cattle But No Steaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has us in another jam. I am in receipt of a telegram dated May 30 from Mr. C. W. Cotton, chairman of the agriculture department of the Tulsa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, which reads:

We are confronted here with one of the most serious livestock marketing and food situations in the history of our livestock industry. There exists in this important farming area largest number of food livestock on the hoof in history. As you are aware the normal marketing period for grass-fat cattle is just beginning and will continue until middle of October. Present Government restrictions prevent local packers from slaughtering more than very limited number of these cattle. Therefore they are entirely helpless to care for normal offerings. Our local stockyards are daily refusing acceptance many hundreds of head of cattle and large percentage are being returned to ranches and farms because these cattle are brought into stockyards in small numbers by hundreds of farmers who have no other available market.

Many other localities in southwest are also confronted with this very serious problem. When cattle are fat and there is no market it naturally causes economic loss to producer as well as food loss to public. At large meeting business and professional men at Tulsa Chamber of Commerce today resolution was passed respectfully asking agriculture committee to request you to provide means of immediate relief and to suggest increased killing quotas for local packers.

One of my constituents sent me a clipping from the Tulsa Daily World of May 29, 1945, which he says describes a good example of some more OPA bungling. He further says:

Meat is almost nonexistent here with the market flooded with cattle and no market in which they can be sold and turned into meat.

I quote the following from the clipping of the Tulsa Daily World:

CATTLE QUOTA SLASH CLOSES LOCAL PLANTS—BUYERS IDLE WHILE STEAKS AND ROASTS ON HOOF MILL ABOUT PENS AT YARDS IN CITY; PRICES SAG ON MOST CLASSES OF ANIMALS

(By Lorren Williams)

Tulsa's critical meat situation reached famine proportions Monday when local packing plants closed down for the week under the abbreviated slaughter quotas set by the Office of Price Administration.

Several hundred head of cattle which ordinarily would have been purchased by a dozen buyers for local concerns milled and bawled in the pens at the stockyards, while potential steaks and roasts which would have gone into the ovens of Tulsa housewives before the end of the week went begging.

Prices sagged from 50 cents to $1 on most classes of cattle at the market, with farmers and livestock men in the Tulsa area taking another beating. Some were unable to sell their livestock, and loaded them into their trailers and trucks to take them back home.

All observers ascribed the situation squarely to the recent ruling of the OPA that cattle quotas must be cut 75 percent and hog quotas 50 percent for local packers (or those not federally inspected). All of the Tulsa packers come under this classification, and all had exhausted the quotas for May by Monday morning.

Most of the packers will not resume operations until Friday, and some not until Monday, thus cutting off Tulsa's principal meat supply for an entire week.

Many retail merchants in Tulsa who sell meat over the counter to the housewives threw up their hands in despair when they learned of the new situation.

AREA PASTURES FULL

"I haven't been able to get any meat for 2 weeks, and so I let my butcher go this morning," said one operator of a moderate-sized market.

Adding irony to the situation is the report of livestock men that the pastures in this area are full of cattle, which could move to market.

Fear is openly expressed that if the OPA quotas are not boosted within a matter of weeks, the livestock raisers in this area may face ruin. Should a dry season develop which would cause the pastures to dry up, it probably would start a marketing stampede, and with the local buyers out of the market, the only recourse would be to ship the cattle to Kansas City, Chicago, and eastern markets as grass-fed stock of poor quality.

"It was a plain case of too much cattle and not enough quota," said P. C. Hawkins, manager of the Tulsa Stockyards, who was disturbed at the slow and unsettled market, particularly on cattle. Hogs were selling about steady, although quotas have been cut 50 percent because of a scarcity of hogs in the feed lots.

Hawkins hoped, however, that the situation here would be temporary, and that the Tulsa market could return to free competition among buyers after the end of the month.

Bob Layman, manager for the National Live Stock Commission Co., 7300 Sand Springs Road, who has been in the local market for 30 years, asserted "the local buyers furnish most of the meat to the local market, and they are just not buying today."

He said there were many cattle in the yards which would have gone to local plants "and prices are down from 50 cents to $1."

Layman said buyers for Swift and Hunters were in the market at the yards but "about a dozen local fellows are out of the market, and they are the ones who make the competition. They can buy closer to the ceiling than the out-of-town packers can."

BUYER TAKES LOSS

Jay Keefer, buyer for the Tulsa Commission Co., reported he had bought about 50 cows and cattle during the day above the quoted price. He said the big packers were offering $10, and he paid $11 and $11.50 a hundred pounds so that the farmers and livestock men would not have to truck their cattle home.

"I will lose money on the deal, but I am trying to take care of my customers," said Keefer. "I figure the locals will be back in the market nex week, and will take the stuff off my hands. But I will take a loss on the deal, and I can't keep on doing that indefinitely."

Not so fortunate was L. A. Carrington, a livestock man of near Tahlequah, who brought a load of yearlings to the market and at 1:30 had not a bid on the lot. He said he supposed he would have to take the cattle back home.

"I could have done better than that in Muskogee," he lamented. "I have 175 more cattle at home that I was planning to bring to the Tulsa market, but I guess now I'll send them to Kansas City."

Joe Jarboe, of the Jarboe Commission Co., said it was a plain case of "not enough quota for the local packers. They were cut down to 50 percent of their quota of last year on hogs and 75 percent of their quota on livestock, and they didn't have enough quota last year."

Layman asserted, "The farmers have the livestock, the people have the money to buy it, but the OPA regulations just won't let the fellows around here kill."

Livestock men estimated the run of cattle and calves at 700 at the market Monday, with many of them unsold or turned back. When the peak season arrives in July and August the market often has as many as 2,000 to 3,000 cattle a day.

Many were hesitant to talk about the situation for fear it would start a stampede to market early in June, throwing many animals on the market before they are ready and causing a sharp slump in prices which would cost farmers thousands of dollars.

One buyer who was out of the market was Ed P. O'Brien, of the Stockyards Packing Co., who in an ordinary week would purchase 200 head of cattle. He wandered about the pens Monday, looking at the cattle, and watching representatives of out-of-town packers do the buying.

"It looks like the OPA wants to turn the market over to the big packers and destroy competition in the local yards," he said.

A few hundred yards away the Stockyards Packing plant was silent, and butchers had been laid off for the week.

Banfield Bros. Packing Co., 915 Apache Road, reported their plant closed down until the end of the week. With quotas on hogs cut 50 percent, spokesmen for the company said there wasn't much Tulsa could do but tighten its belt and get along without much meat.

Other plants closed down were the Brooks Packing Co. at Lake Station, the Blue Packing Co. on the Sand Springs Road, the Gabriel Packing Co., 4006 East Pine, the Banfield Frozen Food Co., 4200 Dawson Road, and the Frank Wickman Co. at Sapulpa.

SHIPMENTS EXPECTED

Some meats were destined to reach Tulsa from out-of-town packing plants. Managers of Swift & Co., 3 South Cheyenne, said the company would have available about the same amount.

It was explained that the meat supply had been allotted over the country, sometimes more and sometimes less, but on an equitable basis, but Tulsa will get about its usual allotment.

The manager asked that his name be withheld.

At Armour & Co., 1 North Detroit, it was explained that that company's quota has been cut, but the supply for Tulsa will be about normal.

Neither of these companies slaughter livestock locally, and neither could estimate the amount of meat which would be available for shipment to Tulsa.

Mr. Speaker, I am this morning in receipt of a letter from Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, dated May 30, and I suppose the same letter was sent to each Member of Congress. This letter is accompanied by a release of the OPA dated May 30, 1945, with much to say about stopping black-market operations, cutting of quotas, prosecution of black market operators, and so forth. In conclusion, the release states:

The two programs outlined in this report, as I pointed out, will not increase our total supply of meat. This can only come through the stepped up hog production, and through the increase in cattle feeding. Both of these objectives, as you know, have been dealt with in the program announced by the Vinson office a week ago.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the reports which have appeared currently in the newspapers here in Washington, to the effect that those in charge of supplying our armed forces have been patrons of the black market for meats.

In the Washington News of May 30, 1945, the following item appeared:

KIN OF DESK SOLDIERS GORGING ARMY MEAT

Steaks, such as you haven't seen since the war began, chops, ham, and roasts, it developed today, are being diverted from the Army's extra-special premium grade purchases for its fighting men so the wives, children, aunts, and uncles of Pentagon chair-borne troops needn't suffer in the current meat famine.

The amounts daily being made available constitute a military secret, but the red meat is pouring into the showcases or neighborhood Army commissaries around Washington. And the public is barred from these stores, along with the Navy and soldiers just back from overseas who don't have an official desk here.

FIFTH STORE ADDED

The stores, for the exclusive use of families of Army men stationed here, have been doing such a land-office business at prices less than those charged by private business that recently it was necessary to add a fifth in order to take care of the overflow.

The situation, it develops, is causing considerable discontent, not only among the 16,000 civilian laborers of the Potomac River Naval Command, but among naval and Marine Corps personnel, who are doomed to suffer along with civilians in the city most affected by the meat famine. Naval personnel quote their commander's policy:

HERE'S NAVY POLICY

"We don't see any reason why naval personnel stationed in Washington should receive benefits civilians working just as hard cannot get. Throughout the Nation the Navy has only 64 commissaries where staples, meat, and groceries are sold. And these were established only at places like Key West, Norfolk, and Patuxent Air Base, where there were no facilities or the shopping district was inadequate."

The Army has a different opinion. The general policy of the service has been to establish commissaries where married personnel had not been able to purchase groceries "without considerable inconvenience." And are not Washington buses crowded and waiting lines long and inconvenient?

ENTRANCES GUARDED

Military police guard entrances to the five family commissaries here to check the cards of authorized customers. None without a card is supposed to enter, and to get one, proof of dependency must be established, as well as the number of persons in the family. Customarily, the Army family is assigned to buy only at the store nearest its residence, and because the stores order from the Army stocks on the basis of the customers' wants and red points, there is no reason for shortages.

The Fort Myer commissary is in a new cement building. It's large, equipped with all the latest in display technique. Vegetables with reflecting mirrors; soapflakes and soap loading one aisle. The meat counters run along the entire end of the building.

NO WAITING LINES

You don't even have to wait in line in this tremendous and efficient store run by an Army major, and manned in part by Army personnel.

Opening the fifth commissary at the Washington Quartermaster Depot, at Cameron, near Alexandria, eliminate all line-waiting in commissaries. The others are the Army War College, Walter Reed Hospital, and Bolling Field. The area each serves covers a stipulated part of the city.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the great Southwest, where cattle are raised, the farmers and cattlemen are beginning now to bring their grass-fat cattle which have been fattened with supplemental feed, to the local markets, and are either forced to return the cattle to their farms and ranches or accept a price below what they should receive for their cattle. The OPA has set such rigid quotas and so sharply reduced the number of local slaughterers and packers who are allowed to buy, that their quotas for May became exhausted before the end of the month. Hence, the cattle were brought to the market, but the local buyers who could afford to pay more than the large packers, under the OPA regulations and curtailments and rigid quotas, cannot buy these cattle. Now, in our part of the country we have plenty of fat cattle, but no steaks.

The OPA has had much to say about shipping cattle to areas where an insufficient number is produced to supply local demands. But here is a situation where the cattle were raised by neighboring farmers and ranchmen, who were encouraged by Federal agencies to feed and get them on the market; but when they arrived at the market there were no buyers because the OPA had reduced the quotas to the extent that the people where the cattle have been raised and are now available, cannot have meat to supply their own needs.

The whole situation has been so bungled by the OPA, through its numerous and changing regulations, that district and local OPA officials are giving up in disgust and resigning rather than carry out OPA orders.

Early last fall the farmers were warned against overproduction, particularly of hogs. This discouragement resulted in the sale of many brood sows that should have been kept for producing the 1945 pork which we now need. As a characteristically impractical suggestion, we found the OPA saying yesterday that the total meat supply can only be increased by stepping up the hog production and through the increase in cattle feeding, as above quoted. Everyone knows that it takes approximately 1 year to breed and rear hogs and cattle sufficient to step up production to any appreciable extent. This sounds like an attempt to blame the farmers and stock raisers, after they had been warned against overproduction last fall.

The authors of OPA regulations and directives change their rulings in such rapid succession that it is impossible for the farmers to know just what policy to pursue. They tell us to slow down production and the result is a shortage of meat, and then they tell us we must step up production. It is impossible for the farmer to change his plan of operations with the same speed with which the OPA changes its policies and directives. The OPA is now trying to "pass the buck" to the farmers, but the OPA is responsible for reduced production by discouraging the raising of hogs and cattle, and the people will hold them to that responsibility.

Where Do We Go From San Francisco?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the subject Where Do We Go From San Francisco? The Senator from Louisiana participated in a debate on this question in the Free Speech Forum, on May 29, and the remarks were broadcast from Station WWDC, in Washington, and from Station WMCA in New York. I listened to the discussion, and found it not only interesting, but informative.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Senate must, without delay, ratify and approve the charter of the world organization that will be agreed upon at the San Francisco Conference. We have delegated some of our best talent to represent us at the Conference and it is up to us to back their decision to the limit.

I make that statement unqualifiedly and without knowing what the charter will finally contain, but conscious of the fact that unless the United States is willing to participate in and become an active member of the organization, the world will soon again be plunged in a war that will destroy civilization.

I know that the charter will not be perfect. Many of its provisions will cause much dissatisfaction among some of the nations of the world—even among our own people—but let us hope that in the course of time, and in the light of experience, the charter will be amended so as to give assurance to the discontented. Let those who object to some of the stipulations in the charter review the history of our own Federal Constitution. They should be convinced that its success can be duplicated in the world organization, if participating nations are sincere in their desire for a permanent peace, founded upon law, justice, and devotion to the general welfare.

We should take a leading part in all of the activities and deliberations of the organization. It should meet often. The general assembly should be used as an open forum for free discussions among the representatives of the nations who have membership in the organization. In that way nations can learn more about each other. Suspicion, jealousy, and greed can, to an appreciable extent, be dissipated, and as nations become better acquainted with each other, it is my hope and belief that there will spring among them more team work to foster world peace.

We should encourage the use of a world court to settle international disputes among nations. I realize that it will require much time and effort to create a court that will inspire confidence among the nations of the earth. Under proper guidance, and in time, I can foresee the adoption of a code of rules and regulations founded on law, justice, and equity that will form the basis for deciding international disputes among nations in the same manner that the common law of England is used today to settle disputes among individuals. Why is that not feasible if nations are sincere in their desire to further peace among the peoples of the earth?

As leading advocates of such a plan we could point with pride to our performance in the two global wars that engulfed the world in the last 25 years. We never have sought more territory for our own aggrandizement. All that we have asked for is to be permitted to maintain our own form of government and in return accord the same right to other nations. We should be able to give convincing proof of the futility of war and the absolute necessity of settling disputes amicably in the future.

Until the world organization has been firmly established and has proven its ability to maintain peace, we should not agree to disarm. We should maintain a substantial Navy, a sizable air force, and a fairly large mechanized Army—not so much for our own protection but to assist in maintaining world peace.

We should, by all means, retain in trust such of the conquered islands in the Pacific, or portions thereof as, in the judgment of our Army and Navy advisers, are necessary for our own security and to aid us in preserving the peace of the world.

We should assist in carrying out the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, else the world may remain in turmoil and a lasting peace may become but a dim hope. The vexing Polish question should be amicably settled at an early date, and I do believe there is much merit to the proposed settlement tentatively agreed upon at Yalta. Let us not forget that the Curzon line was set by arbitration and it was when Russia was weak and unable to resist that the Poles extended their conquest from the Curzon line to the east. Let it further be known that within this conquered territory only 7 percent of the population were Poles.

All nations should have free access to the seas. The Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Dardanelles, and similar channels should be open, free from tolls to all nations except for such charges as may be necessary to retire existing obligations which may have been incurred for their construction and to pay the cost of their maintenance and operation.

We should take the lead in the establishment of world trade. No nation can cope with us in industrial production. We have demonstrated our ability in the last 4 years. For our own good it is imperative that we lower our tariff barriers by extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as advocated by President Truman.

The Congress should enact without delay the two Bretton Woods proposals. One creating a monetary fund to stabilize the value of all currencies in terms of each other, and the other establishing an international bank, the functions of which will be to finance the construction of long-range productive projects in war-torn countries. Both proposals involve an investment of about $6,000,000,000 on our part and should go far toward building a durable peace and reestablishing without much delay a stable world trade. We have spent almost $200,000,000,000 to fight the Axis Nations in an effort to preserve our way of life, and why we should quibble over an investment of $6,000,000,000 in an effort to avert future wars does not make sense to me. Those suggestions are not a cure-all but are essential to our own welfare. Before the world recovers from the shock of war my guess is that we will be compelled to venture still further in world affairs in our efforts to solve the problems of battered nations.

All people are looking to us for leadership. We stand in a position to blaze the trail and we should not hesitate to take advantage of our situation while opportunity knocks.

Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative and inspirational speech delivered by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] at the Jefferson Day dinner, May 26 last, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 12, while waiting in Chicago for my train to carry me to Sioux Falls to attend the Jefferson Day dinner, I learned the sad news that our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had died. Our Jefferson Day dinner in this city was then postponed and I returned to Washington.

Permit me to say that in my opinion the people of this Nation suffered a great loss by the death of President Roosevelt. He will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents the United States has ever had. It takes time for a nation or people to properly evaluate the worth of a man, so in years to come we will look back upon his acts and deeds and appreciate them much more than we do at the present time.

I firmly believe that his election in 1932 saved this country from a revolution. We must remember that Germany, Italy, and other nations were falling into the hands of dictators. If any man had been nominated on the Democratic ticket in 1932 who had wanted to be a dictator, he could have easily become one in the United States.

In my opinion, any person would have beaten Herbert Hoover in 1932, for the people were disgusted with the Republican Party and wanted something to be done that would give their children meat and bread and a place to sleep. The historians writing this period, I believe, will give credit to whom credit is due for saving us from dictatorship.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell a Sioux Falls audience that my State, South Carolina, is an agricultural State like yours. I am a country boy from an agricultural State. In addition, I spent 12 years of my life working in the cotton mills of my State—and for your information, South Carolina has in operation one-fourth of the textile spindles of the whole United States.

I am proud of my heritage and I am glad that I am a farmer and I know that you are likewise proud of your accomplishments as farmers. I feel that you can quote with me the ode entitled "I Am the Farmer":

"I am the provider of all mankind. Upon me every human being constantly depends. A world itself is built upon my toil, my products, my honesty.

"Because of my industry, America, my country, leads the world; her prosperity is maintained by me; her great commerce is the work of my good hands, her 'balance of trade' springs from furrows on my farm. My reaper brings food for today—my plows hold promises for tomorrow.

"In war I am absolute; in peace I am indispensable—my country's surest defense and constant reliance. I am the very soul of America, the hope of the race, the balance wheel of civilization. When I prosper men are happy, when I fail all the world suffers.

"I live with Nature, walk in green fields under the golden sunlight out in the great alone, where brain and brawn and toil supply mankind's primary needs; and I try to do my humble part to carry out the great plan of God.

"Even the birds are my companions; they greet me at the new day's dawn and chum with me until the evening prayer is said. If it were not for me the treasuries of the earth would remain securely locked; the granaries would be useless frames; man himself would be doomed speedily to extinction of decay."

The world today is in a chaotic condition. We are facing the greatest crisis in civilization. Today we stand at the end of the European war and our armies are advancing against the enemy—Japan. We look forward to an early victory in this war.

When peace comes we will have a battle against as great, if not a greater enemy, as that of the Germans and Japanese. That battle will be known as the postwar conflict.

The democratic ideals will be necessary in order to preserve the rights and liberties of the individuals of this Nation. Our great party has always been the party of the masses. From the very beginning there were two lines of thought—one led by Hamilton and the other by Jefferson.

Today both parties are claiming to be advocates of the Jeffersonian principles of States' rights. I like to think of our Government and the laws of the land being made to protect the weak against the strong. This being so, how can we afford to let the Republican Party gain control of our Government when the principles they have practiced from the beginning are unequal rights and privileges to the few.

Of course, the Republican Party will not openly advocate special privileges to the few and unequal rights, but in reality, let's look at the picture for a few minutes. They do shout individualism from the housetops. What does this mean? Turn loose big business without control and you have unequal rights and privileges to the few. Our great party has tried to help the individuals at the bottom of the ladder.

Farmers in South Dakota have been helped. Let me give you a comparison of the South Dakota farmers' cash returns with prices all farmers paid for things they bought and with their interest and tax rates, showed that the buying power of income from farming in the State in 1935–39 yearly average was 142 percent greater than in 1932 and 335 percent greater in 1944 than in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration.

In 1932 the total annual receipts amounted to only $59,471,000. The 5-year period ending 1939 the annual receipts averaged $93,800,000. The cash receipts for sale of farm products in South Dakota during the year 1944 totaled $340,849,000 and the Government added to that in Government payments $13,813,000, which brought the year's cash returns to farmers of this State to $354,662,000.

The farmers of South Dakota should be congratulated in the way they have used this increased income. The record shows that on January 1, 1944, the South Dakota farm mortgage debt was only approximately $105,000,000, compared with approximately $462,000,000 at the peak on January 1, 1924, another Republican year.

Let me remind you again how the people were suffering at the close of the Republican administration. Farm foreclosures and other forced sales in the State of South Dakota for the year ending March 15, 1933—the year Hoover went out—was 78 foreclosures and forced sales in every thousand farms. I thought I would mention this. Lest we forget! Lest we forget!

No Republican can accuse the Democratic Party of bringing on the great depression of 1929 through 1933. Even though we oft'times heard the remark "Prosperity is just around the corner," but the corner was never reached. But, the people created another corner by electing a Democratic President of the United States.

I mentioned a few moments ago that the battle after the war would be known as the "Postwar conflict." We will have many problems to solve. There will be more than one front—the very first front that will face us in the postwar period will be unemployment.

Now is the time to begin to fight against the maladjustments of our economic system and the greatest implement is to produce jobs for the men and women who will be returning to their homes from the war.

It must be our fight to see that every man and every woman has a job to do and that every citizen of our Nation will have sufficient food, clothes, shelter, and medical care. This cannot be done through the means of relief by the Federal Government.

This reminds me of a story I once heard. There was a group of pelicans which secured their living by feeding off the refuse from a sardine factory on the Pacific coast. When, because of war conditions, the factory closed, the pelicans were faced with starvation.

The story goes that they had many conferences among themselves wondering what to do, for many of them—particularly the younger ones—had never known anything but a bountiful supply of food. At an indignation meeting, resolutions were offered complaining to their Congressmen and Senators demanding relief from the public till. But the older heads among them wisely advised that under the circumstances, "If we wish food, we must relearn the art of fishing for it."

This fable, I think, pictures to us what may happen after the war. We must learn to be energetic and work. Some people wonder why it was that the Germans could come

back so quickly after the First World War. The answer is they did not mind working. Any person or any nation that becomes lazy and fails to work cannot hope to prosper and progress.

I mentioned earlier in my speech that the Republicans shout and want to restore to the people of the United States the right of individualism. I did not mean by that that we should not give the individuals in this Nation the right to develop to their greatest extent, but at the same time, we must throw proper governmental restrictions around monopolists in order to guarantee individuals their proper protection.

Jefferson always fought for the rights of the laboring people, and when I say laboring people I mean farmers or any one else who earns his livelihood by the sweat of his brow.

Let me quote from a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to William Johnson in 1823:

"Still further to constrain the brute force of the people, they (the tories and reactionaries) deem is necessary to keep them down by hard labor, poverty, and ignorance, and to take from them, as from bees, so much of their earnings as that unremitting labor shall be necessary to obtain a sufficient surplus barely to maintain a scanty and miserable life. * * * And in the convention which formed our Government they endeavored to draw the cords of power as tight as they could obtain them."

That is Jefferson speaking—not Olin Johnston. Bear in mind that Tories of that day were Republicans and reactionaries—the same as we have today.

To combat the authoritative Tories seeking to draw the cords of power as tight as they could obtain them, Jefferson fought for States' rights, seeking to protect the great body of the people against the will of a minority who were hoping to appropriate the earnings of labor and set up an Old World feudalism with all its glittering trappings.

Today, in their fight against the progressive measures of the Democratic administration, the Republicans have picked up the phrase "States' rights," and even have the temerity to call themselves Jeffersonians. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Republicans have stolen the phrase because they can no longer turn to Hamilton—the father of their party—for comfort and the advancement of their philosophy—characterized for generations by exploitation of the common man.

The Republicans use the phrase "Jeffersonian" in a hopeless effort to protect private vested interests—a raid against the continued progress and welfare of the people as a whole. Their conception of States' rights and that of Jefferson stand poles apart.

The Democratic Party, unlike the Republican Party, has always been interested in preserving the rights and extending the liberties of the common man.

Let me quote again from a letter from Jefferson to William Johnson written in 1823:

"Our (object) was to maintain the will of the majority of the convention, and of the people themselves. We believed that man was a rational animal, endowed by Nature with rights and with an innate sense of justice, and that he could be restrained from wrong and protected in right, by moderate powers, confided to person of his own choice and held to their duties by dependence on his will. * * * The cherishment of the people then was our principle—the fear and distrust of them that of the other party."

Jefferson was a great prophet and political philosopher. Reading from a letter written by Jefferson to John Adams in 1821, we find Jefferson saying the following:

"I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on a steady advance. We have seen indeed once within the record of history, the complete eclipse of the human mind continuing for centuries. Even should the cloud of barbarism and despotism again obscure the liberties of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them. In short, the flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

How true are his words today.

Only a few days ago I stood at the great memorial in Washington erected to Jefferson's memory. I read the following words, which are his own:

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind, as that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

Today, as always, the Democratic Party, is carrying out the principles of Thomas Jefferson—the greatest of all Democrats.

Approximately 25 years ago, the Senate of the United States refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and enter the League of Nations. In my opinion, had the Senate ratified the Treaty and entered the League of Nations, we would not be at war today.

Instead of ratifying the League of Nations, the Republican administration sank our battleships, junked our planes, and did away with most of our Army and Navy.

Some Republicans will suggest that we do the same thing again. So, now is the time for America to say to the entire world that she will be prepared in the future with a modern Army, a powerful Navy, and an invincible Air Force, so that never again will there be another Pearl Harbor.

We live in a democratic country but our Senate of the United States, on March 19, 1920, failed to follow the wishes of the people of the United States. Even a majority of the Senate was for entering into the League of Nations but not two-thirds of the Senate needed for ratification. The vote in the Senate was 49 for and 35 against.

I cannot help but quote the words of our great Democratc President, Woodrow Wilson, who said, "I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another war if the nations of the world do not concert the methods by which to prevent it."

Oh, how true were those words. We did have another war in the next generation. It has cost us almost a million casualties and has cost us, the United States, almost $300,000,000,000 and the end is not yet.

Today, there are men and women fighting your battle in this great war. I well remember my experience in the last war in France and Germany and how I longed for the day to come when victory would be ours and we would return to our homes, but I expected of the people back home, that they maintain a wholesome civilization for me and my comrades when we returned home.

Out on the battlefields our boys are sacrificing to the greatest extent. They are undergoing hardships, they are even giving of their life's blood to preserve the American way of life, which our forefathers gave to us. As we have been handed the torch of freedom and decency, we must hold high this torch so that when these boys return we can say to them, we have not failed you in your expectations of us. And when that day arrives, we must with all of our souls, feel that the fight has just begun. We must not do as we did after the last war—become selfish, self-satisfied, lazy, indifferent, and complacent. If we do, in 25 years from now, we will have the same wars of destruction to fight. This must not happen again. The Democratic Party is determined to see to it that everything humanly possible is done to set up an international organization to prevent another world war and bring about a permanent peace.

May God guide all of us to that end.

Decoration Day Service at Grave of Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Hon. Frank C. Walker, former Postmaster General, at the memorial service at the grave of Franklin D. Roosevelt, under the auspices of the Roosevelt Home Club, Hyde Park, N. Y., on May 30, 1945, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of our land think it good to meet with their neighbors on this day and to pay to the brave who have gone from them tributes of love and gratitude.

Here in this quiet garden we, friends and neighbors, are gathered in such a meeting. We who are here near this grave are but a handful of those who today honor the name of Franklin Roosevelt and invoke God's mercy upon him. Mourning his loss, people throughout our country and throughout the world cling together today to lessen, by sharing it, the sorrow that is in their hearts.

The grace was given us gathered here to be close to him as friends and as neighbors. We know his qualities from intimate association. Yet in the most remote communities of America and of the whole world, Franklin Roosevelt is thought of in the same terms and loved for the same qualities that bring us to his grave today.

What made Franklin Roosevelt what he was? Was it his talent of leadership, his force of character, his courage? Was it the deep humanity which was so much a part of him and which suffering peoples in their hours of anguish recognized?

Courage, force of character, leadership, humanity, all these he had.

Human he was, and men loved him for it. Warm and generous, friendly and tender, gifted with captivating charm and buoyancy of spirit, he was the people's man.

They knew he was their own, that his hopes were their hopes. The humblest and most obscure knew they were in his thoughts—as much a part of them as were the mighty. They gave him their trust and their love. They knew that he saw, beyond their gropings and their failures, the grandeur which was in them.

When he erred they forgave him, for they knew he was theirs. And to them he gave of himself in generous measure. Rarely in history have whole peoples so taken from one man's fire the flame of courage. Never before did whole peoples look so searchingly and hopefully to one man to win for themselves and their children peace among nations.

Men and women of all races and creeds, of all stations in life, rejoiced to see in him one as human as themselves. They identified themselves with him. They merged their hopes with his.

They saw the courage with which he rose above his own affliction and looked to him to lend them some share of that courage. He never failed them.

His first words as President gave them the courage they had sought and could not find. In the years and in the crises that followed he inspired and quickened them.

There was need for this man's gifts, need for such a leader. When men driven to desperation looked in the faces of their hungry children, it was good that they knew that the head of the state was one who could not bar from his heart the sufferings of any human being. It was good for the world that his people trusted him and dared to follow him along the hard path which they would have to walk if they were to keep their freedom. And so he led the people in the democratic way of life. He led them to accept simple truths.

Economic collapse, or the onrush of tyrants, or military distaster or differences among allies could not shake his courage. Despair and defeat vanished before his voice.

Under his leadership and by the glory of his example, America looked into the face of evil and resolved to strike it down, however great or horrible the cost.

And so it was that when the forces of aggression against which he had warned the world so often began to roll over the free peoples of the earth, he roused this peace-loving Nation into a sense of its mortal danger. He led it to become the great arsenal of the world, the staunch bulwark of democracy, the stone wall of freedom.

When the attack came upon us, we had begun to feel our strength. We had allies, allies whom we had armed, whom we had enabled to stand in the breach until we were ready.

He spoke to his people and the world. He gave them courage, as well as arms. The beaten, the oppressed and the voiceless had their champion. The greedy and the tyrannical shouted their menaces, and the spokesman for America and for the world gave answer to them. He spoke in words which all might understand. He spoke boldly, clearly, and triumphantly. Always he spoke for his friends, and his friends were the honest people of the earth.

From the depths of defeat this man led the nations of the world to victory. Through the dark months his courage sustained their courage, his skill and energy and leadership created the greatest forces of might in the history of the world. His was the guiding genius which showed the way to triumph over the forces of evil.

The trials and the years brought him finally to a new eminence. Not by force, but by reason and by the trust which he earned, he became the leader of peoples who looked to him for the peace of the future world, from every continent on earth.

His wisdom and foresight told him that the victory of arms is but the prelude to the battle for peace and that true victory must come on the battlefields of the spirit after the guns are silent.

Today men are beginning to lay a foundation for that world peace and security. And as they work and think, there is one name in their minds and in their hearts—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It was in his home near his garden that the words of Christ were first made known to him: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

At home under his leadership the corporal works of mercy became a part of the Nation's code.

He taught his countrymen that they must be good neighbors to each other, and that they must be good neighbors to their fellowmen wherever God placed them on earth.

His countrymen and his fellow citizens of the world know that he loved his neighbor—his fellow man—with deep and real love.

His neighbors throughout the world know the sore loss that has come to them—a loss which has brought sorrow to countless hearts.

By God's grace, his neighbors who learned so much from him have learned how to bear that loss:

Scarcely had word of his death been received when a man from a far off land exclaimed that only the combined effort of all men for the common good could meet that irreparable loss.

We who are here, friends and neighbors of Franklin Roosevelt—and his friends and neighbors everywhere—must now see that what he said and what he did will survive for the good of all mankind. When he lived among us, the exalted rostrum from which he spoke brought his voice to millions. It is for his friends and neighbors, for the good of all men, to see that he shall speak, even more eloquently, from his last resting place in this garden.

In ancient Athens it was the custom to bury those who fell at the forefront of battle in a sepulcher laid in some beautiful spot apart from the city. Then a man from the seat of Government would be asked to come and express the gratitude of his fellow citizens. It was thus that Pericles stood before the Athenians one day, four centuries before Christ, and told what the brave had lost and what they had gained.

"So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth," he said, "and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all supulchers—not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is graven not only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

He is gone. We shall not see him on earth again.

Here in his own garden at the sun dial, at a spot of his own choosing, he rests.

Here, close to his home, where his character was early molded—close to the library where Americans of the future will read the record of his struggle for them and for the good people of the world—here lies our friend and neighbor.

He had a simple faith in God and where his beloved head really rests, God's hand will smooth his pillow.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime Will Destroy Government by the People, delivered by me at the Gettysburg National Cemetery on May 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the United States of America, I am greatly honored to be invited to come here today to the Gettysburg National Cemetery and express, inadequately I know, the obligation which we feel to those who fell on the greatest battlefield of the Civil War, and the reverence which their service to us still inspires 82 years later. I know that I cannot express that obligation and that reverence as effectively as it has been many times expressed before upon this occasion. I can only relate the sacrifices of our soldiers to the more immediate problems which we face today.

The soldiers of 1863 gave their lives to preserve the Union and make permanent the Government which had proved to the world that a Nation, founded for the purpose of securing freedom, and governed by its own people, could survive through a great war without being destroyed from within by the very forces of freedom developed in a free country. Many other American boys have fought since then to preserve our people and their freedom. Our hearts are full today with our gratitude and devotion to those who are fighting now and who have fought in this war, those who have given and those who have risked their lives that our Nation may be preserved and may preserve its freedom.

In these wars with Germany and Japan, we are now approaching the great sacrifices of the Civil War—we have suffered a million casualties among our boys in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. About 300,000 have been killed, or missing and probably killed. That means that there are 300,000 families who mourn a beloved son, 300,000 wives and mothers to whom this war has brought tragedy and grief. Too many newspapers and too many individuals have come to accept the military attitude that American boys are only pawns in the game, that we can properly sacrifice so many impersonal lives for this goal, and so many impersonal lives for that goal. But every life is a boy with a father and mother, or a wife or sweetheart. We should never forget the awful catastrophe that war is, that it means the destruction of all the hopes and purposes which have formed the ideals of hundreds of thousands of American individuals and families. Let us remember today that very few purposes can justify the sacrifices which we are calling upon our boys to make. Let us remind ourselves that neither foreign conquest, nor hate, nor revenge, can justify such a loss, that the only purpose of this war that can justify its continuance is to insure the future peace and freedom of the American people. Let us not gloat because we burn or destroy the city of an enemy, and remember that such destruction can only be justified as a means of bringing this war to a quicker end. The moment that we can achieve a peace which will guarantee the prevention of future aggression on the part of Japan, it is our duty to all those whom we honor here today to see that peace is brought about, whether by arms or by negotiation.

But we have a further duty to the men who are suffering in this war when peace has been brought about. There can be little doubt now that the defeat of our enemies will prevent attacks upon this country from without for many years to come. We are all agreed that that result may be strengthened and assured by the creation of an international organization to preserve peace. We hope that such an organization can insure peace, not only in the immediate future, but for generations to come. The San Francisco Conference, under the most severe handicaps of political and economic differences will at least establish an international forum constantly working to prevent the recurrence of war.

But we must constantly remind ourselves that the only purpose of this war, the only purpose of the battle fought here at Gettysburg in 1863, the only purpose of any war in which this country has been engaged is to maintain here at home the freedom which was won in 1776, the freedom to work out here the destiny of the American Republic.

American foreign policy and international organizations are only a means to that end. And so we should be equally concerned here today that we retain in Washington the policies necessary to assure that freedom. It is useless to destroy totalitarianism in Germany and Japan and then establish it in the United States.

There is real danger of just that result for the whole thought of the world has moved steadily toward the totalitarian philosophy, toward the subjection of the individual to the state instead of a government by the people. Government controls such as peacetime military conscription which would have been indignantly rejected in the nineteenth century, are given serious consideration, even in this country. Totalitarian thought has spread over the world. When Mussolini established a dictatorship in Italy, many of our citizens thought that a little benevolent despotism was a good thing for the Italian people. Hitler brought it to Germany, the military caste brought it to Japan, largely because so many people lost faith in the efficacy of democratic government. We see it also on our side, in the great Russian Soviet, in Chiang Kai-shek's China, in Brazil, in Argentina and in many other Latin-American countries. It has made progress because so many people have been persuaded that it is perhaps desirable to surrender individual freedom and let someone dictate their lives better than they themselves can arrange them. In this country many people who would indignantly deny any soft feeling for State control are advocates of measures which lead inevitably in that direction because they are dissatisfied with the necessary slow progress involved in a government where all the people are given a voice.

I believe that freedom can only be preserved if we retain government by the people all the time. I heard a United States Senator argue that we could have freedom and democracy even though Congress delegated all its powers to the President during the war and adjourned, because, he said, we could meet again and take those powers away. There are two fallacies in that view. While that form of government lasts, there is no freedom and it is not government by the people. Secondly, if it lasts too long, the powers granted by the people are never returned to them. That has been the history of popular government from the days of Greece and Rome through the Middle Ages to Germany and Japan today.

The best protection of freedom is to maintain continuous rule by the people. It cannot be done without constant vigilance against the turning over of power to governments and to men who are in effect beyond the reach of the people. The very size of the Republic today leads to a delegation of power. The machinery by which 135,000,000 people govern themselves is necessarily so complicated that it is hard to devise a system in which the real voice of the people is heard. Hundreds of bureaus have been created, and even here in Washington we don't know how many bureaus there are or what it is that they are doing. Each one is a little kingdom in itself. When the ordinary man comes to Washington, he has a hard enough time to find out which is the bureau which is bossing him, and an even harder time to get consideration for his views. More than a hundred Government corporations have been created, even less accountable to Congress than the bureaus. Washington is a vast rabbit warren of bureaucrats, all issuing regulations having the force and effect of law and building up a control to which the people gradually come to conform their lives.

The war has required a suspension of many freedoms, and the people have become so used to regulations that they almost forget what freedom is. The danger of totalitarian government is that the people do get used to it, as to a narcotic. The time has come to remember that many of these restrictions on freedom were only created to preserve freedom and should be abandoned when freedom is assured. The size of the Republic, the complexity of modern problems in the economic field, all lead the people to the easy course of turning over the problems to someone else, to some expert, perhaps, to solve the whole business. Instead of thinking out problems for themselves, inhabitants of a totalitarian world would accept the advice of supposedly expert columnists or radio commentators, who are also too busy to think out their problems, and who accept what is handed to them by the Government. A people unconcerned with their own liberty want every problem to be handled by a czar. They are impatient with Congress if Congress takes time to argue a case on its merits. A frame of mind in dealing with public questions which moves on waves of emotion, engulfing editors, writers, and broadcasters alike, and demands solutions today for every complex problem, is a frame of mind leading to totalitarian government.

While we talk constantly of democracy and free enterprise, I see too many of the very people who use that language advocating measures which deny it. Too many businessmen believe in controls of the NRA code variety, quotas, cartels, division of production, the fixing of minimum coal prices, and other measures to protect business from excessive competition. Labor unions, which ought to be the very core of democracy, are ruled by perpetual leaders almost without the formality of reelection.

At this very moment demands are being made that Congress give up its power to fix tariffs and to provide for the reorganization of the Government departments, on the ground that democratic processes are too slow and ineffective. Arbitrary power must be granted to carry through the currently popular theories.

Every bill proposes that Congress delegate its power to make law to some board, and the Supreme Court itself is dominated by the thought that the people themselves and their represenatives are incompetent even to prescribe standards, but must give power to make law to administrative agencies. Nearly every bill introduced proposes increased Federal power, and the reduction of the power of States and local governments where the people's voice can be heard. In education, in health, and in unemployment compensation, Federal bureaus seek wide and arbitrary power to affect the lives of millions of individuals.

People who think themselves sincere believers in democratic government want everything desirable at once, and the more attractive the goal, the less they care about the method. If this frame of mind were carried to its logical conclusion, it would lead to the turning over of all power to a benevolent dictator to carry out the good things which he promises and which he presents in a sufficiently attractive package.

Of course, this general attitude makes the ground fertile for Government propaganda. A desirable end such as peace or extended foreign trade is linked with certain particular methods and panaceas proposed and highly recommended by the Government, or accompanied by a demand for broad power to solve the problem without further interference from Congress. Anyone who is opposed to this particular panacea is at once labeled as opposed to peace or foreign trade, and probably pictured as a reactionary, a Fascist, or even a Republican. All the arguments for the favored remedy are blared over the radio and broadcast in pamphlets, and no argument is admitted against it. The first Dumbarton Oaks proposal was pictured as so letter perfect, that I am still getting attacks on Senator VANDENBERG'S amendments by people who don't know that the State Department has accepted them. Bretton Woods and the revised reciprocal trade treaties are pictured as the only cures for all foreign-trade difficulties. The question is not the desirability of these various delegations of people's power, it is the frame of mind which seems to be willing to abandon that power without question. It is the frame of mind which avoids the discussion of the merits of a problem and accepts the voice of the state as the voice of God.

Nothing is so dangerous to democracy as a vast machine of propaganda, for it strikes at the very root of democratic government. Government by the people can only endure if it is founded on intelligent decision based on accurate knowledge.

This afternoon I wish to speak particularly about one step now proposed, supported by Government propaganda, which seems to me to strike at the very basis of freedom, for which our boys are fighting. It is the proposal that we establish at once compulsory conscription for military training in time of peace. The proposal is that we establish in this country a continuous 12 months' military training for every boy, the same military set-up which we have gone to war to abolish in Germany and Japan. Whether we become a militaristic and totalitarian country depends more on this measure than any other. It does not relate to any limited class or group. It reaches every family and every boy. It subjects them completely to the domination of the Government for a year during their most formative period. It keeps them under constant supervision as reserves for years thereafter. The power to take a boy from his home and subject him to complete Government discipline is the most serious limitation on freedom that can be imagined. Many who have accepted the idea favor a similar Government-controlled training for all girls.

There is no doubt that the Government, and particularly the War and Navy Departments, are straining every nerve to secure the enactment of this legislation before the war ends. Secret meetings are being held in the Pentagon Building and elsewhere. On April 26 the chief executive officers of some 40 or more women's organizations were invited there, and it is said they were addressed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of State, General Marshall, Admiral King, and other high-ranking officers. The ladies were requested not to disclose the substance of the speeches made or identify the War Department or its officials with the sponsorship of the plan. One newspaper stated that the ministers of various churches were invited to a similar meeting and attended, and that Negro organizations have been approached. Invitations went out from a citizens committee in New York to hear Secretary Forrestal, Under Secretary Grew, and General Weible at an off-the-record luncheon on May 25. Government propaganda is bad enough when it is open, but it is inexcusable when secret. We may expect a flood of open propaganda after the ground has been prepared, and everyone who is opposed to the plan will be pictured as for war and for unpreparedness.

We have fought this war to preserve our institutions, not to change them. We have fought it to permit us to work out our problems here at home on a peaceful foundation, not on a foundation dominated by military preparations for another war. The question of the best form of military organization should not be an emotional problem. It should be dealt with by argument and not by propaganda. But the methods being used threaten the freedom of this country, for if they are successful they can be used to fasten upon us every kind of regulation, price control for business, wage control for labor, production control for farmers.

If we approach this problem logically and not emotionally, the first question should be how large an Army we need to insure our freedom. Why not discuss what the right size is so that we can determine the best

method of providing it? How can we tell how large an Army we do need until the peace is made and the organization of the world effected? It seems to me impossible to pass intelligently on the need for conscription at this time. Must we not see first what kind of a world is established at San Francisco and at the peace table?

There are approximately 1,250,000 American boys in every age group. Is it necessary to train them all for a full year at a cost of at least two and a half billion dollars a year? This would provide reserves of about twelve and a half million men between the ages of 18 to 27. Is any such reserve necessary? Certainly, it is not needed in a hurry, for the armies we now have will be the best possible reserve for the next 3 or 4 years. The Selective Service Act expressly provides that all drafted men at the end of the war shall be transferred to the reserve and remain there for 10 years. Apparently, the argument for doing this job now is that the people might not be willing to do it later. That is certainly a typical totalitarian argument. It is an attempt to base a great permanent national policy on war emotion, because the proponents are afraid of government by the people when they have time to think it over.

It seems improbable to me that the training of a million and a quarter boys a year would ever be necessary. The vast reserve provided could only be needed for a great overseas expedition like that in which we are now engaged. For such an expedition, it would take several years to organize ships, planes, and munitions, just as it did in this war. We would surely have to have new modern equipment in many fields, and it would take longer to build it than it would to train the men, as we found in this war. It would seem that for sudden attack, or for attack from the air or from attack by rockets the great mass of millions of reserves would be of little value. I should think we rather need an expert Army with the most modern weapons. In the event of a sudden attack, our main reliance would have to be a Regular Army of highly trained and technically trained men, and during such an attack they would not be much aided by 10,000,000 reserves. The argument that we can save in the size of a professional army by having many millions of reserves bears all the earmarks of a propaganda argument instead of one based on common sense.

Having determined that we need an Army of a certain size, with certain reserves, we could then decide whether we could get it by voluntary means in the American tradition. Suppose we need a million men in the armed forces. We expect to have at least 50,000,000 people working at civilian jobs in this country. Surely we can make the Army sufficiently attractive as an occupation for 2 percent of these to be willing to volunteer. With good pay, reasonable treatment for men and their families, and provision for retraining and retirement when a man is too old to stay in the Army, I don't see why Army life cannot be made just as attractive as working daily on a machine, mining coal, or engaging in hundreds of other occupations. Many jobs in the Army should give highly technical training with interesting knowledge which makes the trainees capable of advancement in other activities in life.

To provide the necessary Reserves, it could be made worth the while of many boys to take the necessary training. Many alternative plans have been suggested to a year's conscription. For instance, adequate reserves might be provided by training 200,000 boys in each age group. It should be possible to obtain volunteers in that number for a 3-month course and basic training during one summer, courses in school and a later 3-month summer course in the field. The boys could be paid a sum which would assist them in their regular education during the winter. Additional courses could be provided for those who wish to become Reserve officers. What I have suggested is only one idea and there may be many others. The Army will immediately criticize any plan, because they are determined to have conscription. They want the boys for 12 months consecutively because they want to change their habits of thought, to make them soldiers, if you please, for the rest of their lives. Nothing less will do. We are indeed bankrupt of ideas if we cannot provide a method by which necessary military forces and Reserves are provided by an American voluntary system.

The other arguments for conscription seem to me almost too trivial to discuss. It is said it will teach the boys discipline and that they need it. My own opinion is that we need more initiative and original thinking and less discipline rather than more. Our present Army is not the most disciplined Army in the world, but there isn't any better Army for the simple reason that the boys do some thinking for themselves.

It is said the Army will improve their health, and that they need it because so many failed to pass the strict health requirements of the Army. As a matter of fact, the great bulk of defects were those relating to teeth, eyes, mental, nerves, and heart conditions, all of which had arisen long before the age of conscription. There is nothing to show that the Army would conscript any of these boys. To improve their health, we must reach them at a much younger age.

The argument that it would improve the morals of our boys has almost been dropped because of its foolishness. If there is one place where morals will not be improved, it is in the vicinity of Army camps.

It is true that there are some boys who are benefited by Army control, but to improve a few, let us not change the whole character of the American life which I believe has been the cause of success in this war.

It is said that we are going to teach the boys citizenship in the camps. This argument makes clear a real danger in the whole system. By handing boys over for 12 months to the arbitrary and complete domination of the Government, we put it in the power of the Government to indoctrinate them with the political doctrines then popular with the Government. It has all the dangers of Federal education and none of its advantages. Attempts along this line have been made with the present Army, and a large amount of propaganda sent out to be taught to the soldiers. In wartime it is bad enough; in peacetime, it would be intolerable.

Some have supported this project on the ground that the training is only to be part military and a considerable amount of it is to be character training along other lines. We have already a complete school system in this country. If it isn't adequate and does not give education in citizenship, we can well spend our time and money in trying to improve that system. As a matter of fact, it is already the finest system of education the world has even seen.

Military conscription is essentially totalitarian. It has been established for the most part in totalitarian countries and their dictators led by Napoleon and Bismarck. It has heretofore been established by aggressor countries. It is said it would insure peace by emphasizing the tremendous military potential of this country. Surely we have emphasized that enough in this war. No one can doubt it. On the contrary, if we establish conscription every other nation in the world will feel obliged to do the same. It would set up militarism on a high pedestal throughout the world as the goal of all the world. Militarism has always led to war and not peace. Conscription was no insurance of victory in France, in Germany, or in Italy. The countries with military conscription found that it was only an incident and not the determining factor in defense or in victory.

Military training by conscription means the complete regimentation of the individual at his most formative period for a period of 12 months. If we admit that in peacetime we can deprive a man of all liberty and voice and freedom of action, if we can take him from his family and his home, then we can do the same with labor, we can order the farmer to produce and we can take over any business. If we can draft men, it is difficult to find an argument against drafting capital. Those who enthusiastically orate of returning to free enterprise and at the same time advocate peacetime conscription are blind to the implications of this policy. They are utterly inconsistent in their position. Because of its psychological effect on every citizen, because it is the most extreme form of compulsion, military conscription will be more the test of our whole philosophy than any other policy. Some say it is unconstitutional. It makes very little difference whether it actually violates the terms of the Constitution. It is against the fundamental policy of America and the American Nation. If adopted, it will color our whole future. We shall have fought to abolish totalitarianism in the world, only to set it up in the United States.

Government by the people can only exist if the people are individuals who think. It can only exist if the individual is free to rule the state and if he is not ruled by the state. We must be constantly vigilant to keep alive the thinking of free men, and there is no such threat to that thinking as the course which would impose on the Nation compulsory military training. We have no greater obligation to the men who fought at Gettysburg, we have no greater obligation to the men who fought in Europe and who are fighting in the Pacific, than to preserve here in America a state in which the individual shall be free to think and be master of his own soul, and where the people shall be free to govern their own Government.

Memorial Day Address by Ensign Hudson Hyatt, United States Naval Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it is not often we have an opportunity to hear a Memorial Day address by a man who is actively in the service at the time. It so happened that there came to me recently a Memorial Day address written by an ensign in the Navy now serving in the Pacific Ocean area. I had occasion yesterday to read it in connection with a Memorial Day address at the home of Admiral of the Fleet Ernest J. King, in Lorain, Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this unique and timely Memorial Day address by Ensign Hudson Hyatt, USNR.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We gather today to do honor to our dead who lie in the jungles of Guadalcanal, the barren sands of Eniwetok and Tarawa, the coral rocks and hills of Saipan, Guam, and

Tinian, the volcanic ash of Iwo Jima, the verdant death-strewn valleys of Okinawa. We honor those who died on the icy Murmansk run, who perished in Tunisia, who fell at Sicily, Anzio Beachhead, the deadly hills of Italy, who were shot or bombed in Normandy, Belgium, and the Rhineland. We honor equally the unknown GI Joes and Franklin Roosevelt, the Colin Kellys and Ernie Pyles—the thousands from the lowest to the highest, the unknown to the heroes, who died in this great struggle.

We honor them; we mourn their loss. But we do more: we rededicate ourselves today to that for which they died. They died because democracy and tyranny cannot flourish side by side. They gave their lives for the ultimate freedom of man. They are now blood brethren with those who died at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, and the Argonne.

We who survive are by the same token, blood brethren of those who lived to frame the Constitution, who extended freedom to all races, and who erected a League of Nations. We who survive have the greatest task in history, to make enduring for all time the liberty for which our dead have given their lives. If we fail, their lives will have been given in vain. If we succeed, and succeed we must, we can do no greater honor to them than to erect a parliament of man in which all nations and all men shall find equality, justice—and peace. To this task, in honor of those who perished in the struggle, we dedicate ourselves and our posterity.

Memorial Ceremony at Muir Woods in Memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 19 the United Nations Conference on International Organization held a memorial exercise in the beautiful redwood grove in California called Muir Woods, in memory of and out of respect to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proceedings at the exercises, including a letter from Capt. Richard L. Neuberger commenting on the exercises.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION,
San Francisco, May 23, 1945.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR WAYNE: Last Saturday, May 19, 1945, we had a most impressive memorial ceremony at Muir Woods in honor of President Roosevelt. Field Marshal Smuts gave the principal address, a guard of honor of wounded soldiers from Letterman General Hospital was on hand, and Secretary of State Stettinius formally dedicated an appropriate plaque to our beloved President. Pedro Leao Velloso, chairman of the Brazilian delegation to the Conference, also spoke briefly on the program.

The ceremony was most awe-inspiring and historic, particularly in view of the setting in a great cathedral-like grove of redwood trees nearly 350 feet in height. It was attended by many delegates and by both Navy and Army personnel. The plaque is now in temporary form, but later will be reproduced in bronze. Because President Roosevelt loved the far West and was a great American conservationist, we all thought that Muir Woods National Monument was a highly fitting place in which to honor his memory.

For your interest, I am enclosing herewith the talks made at Muir Woods, which is near Mill Valley, Calif., by both Field Marshal Smuts and Mr. Stettinius. I hope you like them. Incidentally, you will find the exact wording of the plaque dedicated to the President at the end of Mr. Stettinius' remarks.

I hope you and yours are well.

Faithfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Captain, United States Army.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE, IN TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, AT MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT, MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

This magnificent grove is a fitting place in which to honor the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Trees were an important interest in his life. I have often heard him talk of the trees he planted and grew at Hyde Park. He rests for all time in hallowed ground surrounded by these and older trees that held for him such cherished memories.

These great redwoods at Muir Woods National Monument are the most enduring of all trees. Many of them stood here centuries before Christopher Columbus landed in the New World. They will be here centuries after every man now living is dead. They are as timeless and as strong as the ideals and faith of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Our beloved President is gone, but his spirit, like these trees, lives on to inspire and strengthen all those who shared his hopes for mankind. In the days to come he will still be here in spirit to help guide us toward lasting peace.

In the presence of representatives of the Unted Nations, who are joined in the great purpose of making peace secure, I now dedicate this plaque to Franklin D. Roosevelt. It will be cast in bronze with these words inscribed upon it as a reminder to posterity of this historic occasion and of the world's eternal debt to a great man:

"Here in this grove of enduring redwoods, preserved for posterity, members of the United Nations Conference on International Organization met on May 19, 1945, to honor the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-first President of the United States, chief architect of the United Nations, and apostle of lasting peace for all mankind."

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY FIELD MARSHAL J. C. SMUTS, PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN DELEGATION, AT THE UNVEILING IN THE MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT ON SATURDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 19, OF A PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

It is fitting that the memorial which the Secretary of State will unveil to the memory of President Roosevelt should be placed in this unique setting, in this botanical paradise, which forms one of the most beautiful features in the magnificent scenery of San Francisco. For he was ever a lover of nature, of trees and plants and all things beautiful. And both at his home in Hyde Park and in other parts of this spacious land he initiated the planting of trees, not only for beauty but also for use and for the protection against the ruder forces of nature. Here among the great redwoods this great man will find fitting and congenial company. Here henceforth will be the company of the giants.

Both the time and the place for this ceremony are appropriate. The official period of mourning for him is over; and this tribute to his memory is rightly placed at the seat of the great Conference which he himself selected but in the hour of victory did not survive to open himself.

To him personally his going in the supreme hour of certain and assured victory was indeed gain. No moment is greater or more fitting for the passing of the hero than the hour of victory. Such was Roosevelt's going from the personal point of view—the intolerable burden dropped when the great task was done. There was the added glory of the great leader killed by the herculean job he had done—for such indeed was Roosevelt's fate. The mystic air of the martyr was over it all. The same fate happened to Abraham Lincoln, whose glory was as much in the moment and the manner of his going as in the vast labors he had successfully accomplished. To Lincoln it was gain; to Roosevelt it was release from burdens borne, but too heavy for any man, let alone for a stricken man, to continue to bear.

But what a loss to Lincoln's country, what a loss to Roosevelt's world. What a difference it might have made to the generation that followed after Lincoln if his wisdom and wide humanity and greatness of soul had been brought to bear on the postwar problems of his young nation and sorely tried country. For the personal factor counts and is a real and mighty force in the affairs of men. What a glory it is for a country to have produced such leadership as theirs in the hour of need and at its call. But the gain is even greater than the glory. Such men are an asset beyond prize, and their going produces an emptiness which nothing can fill.

For look at the world situation which Roosevelt has left behind him. But first let us look for a moment at the man Roosevelt himself.

His is a very remarkable case of leadership and self-training for it through suffering and will power. People are apt to forget that he was a sick man carrying such burdens—physically only half a man. By all the usual tests he should have been written off when, in the prime of manhood, he was struck down by fell disease. But in fact the calamity produced the man; called forth unsuspected reserve forces in his personality; changed the good companion, the apparently easy-going man of good position and good fortune into the statesman that has left a trail of glory behind. The will to conquer his fate, to overcome his physical disability, and to make good changed apparent softness into the hardest-tempered steel. He conquered fate by conquering himself, and in that self-conquest brought out what was latent in him, and so set out on a career as remarkable as that of any other man in this era of outstanding leaders. Self-mastery was the key to his success and to a career which students and historians will follow with deep interest in the future. Will power to win through, purification through suffering—such were the steps by which this remarkable personality was, so to say, reborn and made fit to play his great historical part. Roosevelt's case, on the purely human level, is a call and an inspiration to all who suffer under cruel misfortune never to give in or surrender, but to use adversity as a stepping stone to a higher self, to fresh soul force and the sublimation of the self or the personality. So Roosevelt equipped himself for the call to duty in the great economic and social crisis of his country 12 years ago. And so he trained himself for the call of the world in one of the gravest crises of all history.

I met him at various stages in his life both before and after his illness. I last saw him at Cairo in December 1943 on his return from the Teheran Conference, and was deeply grieved to see how dreadfully tired he was while still carrying on the heaviest burdens with high courage and a gay spirit. If he had lived, what a service he could have rendered the world in the great period which now looks ahead.

For the colossal victory in Europe—the greatest in all recorded history—which we have been celebrating this week, is not the end of the crisis. This is only the first great phase. The march of destiny continues. Japan has still to be conquered, and her proud spirit humbled in the dust, before Asia could also be set free in this tide of liberation which is sweeping over the world. Nor will the successful writing of the world charter at San Francisco be the end. The supreme problem of a satisfactory European settlement after the war still looms ahead—the greatest and hardest of all. Victory however great, and paper plans of a future security, however well laid, will not avail us unless we can also succeed in the settlement of Europe. That remains the heart of our problem, and from the international point of view that will be journey's end for our generation.

And it is just here that we shall sorely miss Franklin Roosevelt. For that job we shall need men of Roosevelt's stature. He was the personification of America, but he was also a great European. He was the carrier of the message of the New World to the Old, the daughter's message of hope and faith and good cheer to the old mother continent of our western civilization in her sore distress. He stood not only for the overpowering might of this continent but for its fresh human outlook, its freedom from ancient wrongs and obsessions, its sanity and virile faith in democracy and in man's vast future.

We have other leaders who have piloted our passage through this war and its mortal perils. Was it not Churchill's warning voice which rang loud and clear through the prewar years, when appeasement was the prevailing mood? And has he not been the indomitable soul of our resistance and dogged struggle through the darkest years of the war? His share in the shaping of the peace will no doubt be immense. But how much more decisive and beneficent would have been the role of Roosevelt and Churchill together. We hail also that great leader Joseph Stalin, who led his people from the darkness and abasement of vast revolutionary convulsions to that unity and strength which have made the Russian war effort one of the most outstanding feats of all history. If the trio who had piloted our united war effort through all its critical phases to final victory had remained together to plan and carry out the peace, what an added confidence we should have felt in the final results. The military victory is and will be complete; the world charter will, we trust, be written; but the settlement which must complete the victory and must form the foundation for the world charter has still to be achieved. It will be the greatest task of all, and as difficult as it will be great.

For Europe lies in ruins, moral, political, and material, after the nameless suffering all have endured. Hatred, poverty, and hunger are rampant, and social and political disintegration is spreading through most of its countries. The situation will probably become worse now that the discipline of war is relaxed. Constructive statesmanship of a high order will be called for, unless Europe is to be allowed to lapse into decay and anarchy and become a breeding place for ideas and disorders no better than nazism and fascism. Our policy should be planned for healing and building up rather than destroying, for punishing the guilty while extending the helping hand to the innocent. Every effort should be made to reconstitute European society and reestablish its organs of political and social life along sound common-sense lines. Injustices should be avoided which will rankle and fester more than the memory of war, long after the war and its horrors are forgotten.

We should do everything in our power to bind the wounds, to knit Europe together into a cooperative society and community and thereby restore it once more to a position of power and glory which it has held so long and so beneficently among the continents. In doing so we shall indeed honor the work of Roosevelt and carry out the spirit of his historic declarations in the Atlantic Charter and other public documents. That would be his finest monument, and the best contribution of America and the American spirit to the pacification of Europe and its restoration to its proper place among the continents.

[From the United Nations Conference on International Organization Journal, San Francisco, Calif., of May 21, 1945]

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL CEREMONY AT MUIR WOODS

At an impressive ceremony on Saturday afternoon, May 19, 1945, delegates and advisers to the Conference participated in the dedication of a plaque in memory of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt at Muir Woods National Monument. First suggested by the chairman of the Brazilian delegation, Mr. Pedro Leao Velloso, the ceremony comprised speeches by Mr. Velloso, Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, and Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. Invitations to the ceremony were extended by Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, who was represented by Major Tomlinson, of the National Park Service.

Emphasis was laid by Mr. Velloso on the character of the late Mr. Roosevelt, whose intelligence, vision, and force of character had, Mr. Velloso said, early enabled him to sense that this generation had a "rendezvous with destiny." As author of the good neighbor policy for the nations of the Americas, President Roosevelt sought to apply its principle of friendship to all nations of the world, Mr. Velloso said. It is for that very purpose that the United Nations have gathered in San Francisco, a task almost beyond the limits of human power to achieve. It is through the inspiration of the divine spark which animated the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, Mr Velloso stated, that the work of San Francisco may be accomplished.

Field Marshal Smuts spoke first of the late President's love of nature and all things beautiful, which made this ceremony particularly fitting. "Here among these great redwoods this great man will find fitting and congenial company * * * the company of the giants." Mr. Roosevelt's death, the field marshal said, was, like Lincoln's, to him a gain in that it came in the hour of triumph, as befits the death of heroes, but, also like Lincoln's, it was the world's loss. For Roosevelt, whose personal history was a "call and an inspiration to all who suffer under cruel misfortune * * * to use adversity as a stepping stone to a higher self," possessed a stature and an understanding sorely needed in the tasks that lie ahead. He was the personification of America and the carrier of the message of hope and good cheer from the New World to the Old.

Europe lies in ruins, the field marshal said, and if the work of the present Conference is to last it must restore Europe to a condition of spiritual, political, and material order. This work of binding up the wounds through effective implementation of the spirit of Roosevelt's historic declarations will be the greatest monument that the nations can build to him and to the America which he represented.

Mr. Stettinius spoke briefly, thanking the Brazilian Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister of South Africa for their remarks, pointing also to the suitability of placing the memorial among the grove of great trees whose timeless age epitomized the late President's spirit. Mr. Stettinius then unveiled the replica of the plaque to be erected in bronze "as a reminder to posterity * * * of the world's eternal debt" to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "chief architect of the United Nations, and apostle of lasting peace for all mankind."

Billionth Gallon of High-Octane Gas Produced at Baton Rouge, La., Refinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on tomorrow, June 1, the billionth gallon of high-octane aviation gasoline will be produced by the Standard Oil of New Jersey refinery located at Baton Rouge, La.

The employees and workers at this Baton Rouge plant will pause in this great war-production job for a brief ceremony to deliver the billionth gallon of high-octane gasoline to a representative of the Nation's fighting airmen. They are to be congratulated for their splendid work and cooperation with the Federal Government in the production of a product so essential to aerial warfare. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release covering this event.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 30.—Production of the billionth gallon of high-octane aviation gasoline at the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey refinery here will be reached Friday, M. W. Boyer, vice president and general manager, has announced.

The Baton Rouge refinery is the second in the Nation to reach the billion gallon mark in finished high octane gasoline, the first being another affiliate of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), the Humble Oil and Refining Co., Houston, Tex., which achieved the distinction in December. The Baton Rouge refinery has in addition manufactured the components of high octane to be shipped for blending purposes at other refineries, which, totaled with the finished product, sends its production well over the billion and a half mark.

Refinery workers will pause in their war production job for a brief ceremony at the plant Friday to deliver the symbolical billionth gallon to a representative of the Nation's fighting airmen. Accepting for the men who fly the planes powered by 100 octane aviation fuel will be Maj. James F. Collins, a native of Baton Rouge, who distinguished himself in the Pacific aerial fighting. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Flying Cross. He now is stationed at Eglin Field, Fla.

A distinguished special guest will be Maj. Gen. Troy T. Middleton, commander of the Eighth Army Corps, now on leave at his home in Baton Rouge. Middleton, cited a number of times by Gen. George Patton for his outstanding leadership, was Commandant of Cadets at Louisiana State University when Collins was a member of the cadet corps.

Since the entrance of the United States into the war most of the Baton Rouge refinery's equipment and processes for making products from petroleum has been turned to the manufacture of products useful in winning the war. Figures recently released in Washington show that 1 out of every 15 planes used in all theaters of combat have been fueled with high-octane gasoline produced at the Baton Rouge refinery.

Thousands of hours of pre-Pearl Harbor research in laboratories at the Baton Rouge

refinery made it possible for volume production of high-octane and other products essential to the successful prosecution of the war—butadiene, perbunan, buna-S, butyl rubber, in an amazingly short time after war was declared. Baton Rouge designation as the "cradle of the synthetic rubber industry" in the United States resulted from the pioneer rubber experiments begun here in 1931 by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

A partial list of the production facilities employing new processes and new materials built for the first time at Baton Rouge include:

The first fluid catalytic cracking plant in the world to go into commercial production, pioneering the process that made possible large-scale output of 100-octane gasoline, synthetic rubber, and other war-essential petroleum products. The "cat cracker" was developed in the Esso research laboratory at the Baton Rouge refinery during the years 1930 to 1940.

The first full-scale plant to produce buna-N, specialty synthetic rubber.

The first full-size plant for cracking oil into its component parts to produce butadiene, buna-S's basic raw material.

The first "quickie" plan for the production of butadiene.

The first large-scale butadiene plant in the country to be finished and placed in operation by the oil industry.

The first plant to produce butyl rubber, used for inner tubes and specialty purposes.

Major Collins will arrive by plane in Baton Rouge Thursday. While in Baton Rouge he will be the guest of Charles P. Manship, publisher of the Baton Rouge State-Times and Morning Advocate, and Mrs. Manship, with whom he lived while a student at LSU. Collins is the godfather of the Manships' grandson, 2-year-old Douglas L. Manship, Jr.

Back in this country almost 2 years, after exploits which included leading an attack which smashed a Jap aircraft carrier in the Battle of Midway, Collins is now in charge of accident investigation and prevention at Eglin Field and other fields assigned to Eglin.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Collins, of Meridian, Miss., residents of Baton Rouge until about 1928.

Friday afternoon's program will begin at 2:45 o'clock with a 15-minute concert by the Esso Refinery Band.

Observance of Independence Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent proclamation by the Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Ralph F. Gates. This proclamation urges the official observance of Independence Day, or the Fourth of July, as we have come to term it popularly, for a period of five significant days, as the body of the document will reveal. I believe the idea of dedicating each day to a separate one of the significant freedoms which Americans enjoy is a particularly good one. We have been informed that this is the concept of a young Hoosier, Mr. William Fifield, of Gary, Ind., and that it has the support of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. But no matter whence it comes, we find it worthy and hope to bring it thus to the attention of other States and of the Nation itself, with the hope that it will gain general recognition and approval throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

INDEPENDENCE WEEK, JUNE 30 TO JULY 4

Whereas Independence Day always has symbolized those indispensable freedoms which have been the foundation of our country's greatness and which have been enjoyed uniquely by the peoples of the United States of America; and

Whereas the significance of Independence Day should be continued and nurtured by a more adequate and comprehensive annual observance of the historic event that gave life to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of opportunity, and freedom of self-government; and

Whereas the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce, through its Americanism committee, passed a motion urging that I, as Governor, in issuing a proclamation setting aside a week as Independence Week designate therein certain days to represent the various freedoms which we have and which we cherish: Now therefore

I, Ralph F. Gates, Governor of Indiana, do hereby designate and urge the observance of Independence Week from June 30 to July 4, in the State of Indiana, with each day being observed as follows:

Saturday, June 30, freedom of speech.
Sunday, July 1, freedom of religion.
Monday, July 2, freedom of press.
Tuesday, July 3, freedom of opportunity.
Wednesday, July 4, freedom of self-government.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Indiana to be hereto affixed this 16th day of May 1945.

[SEAL]

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor.
RUE J. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of State.

Health Features of Social Security Amendments of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter addressed to me by Dr. Ernst P. Boas, chairman of the Physicians Forum, a statement issued by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and a statement issued by Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, all three endorsing the bill S. 1050 entitled "The Social Security Amendments of 1945," which I introduced, together with the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], on May 24.

There being no objection, the letter and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHYSICIANS FORUM,
New York, N. Y., May 25, 1945.

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: In the name of the Physicians Forum I wish to congratulate you and Senator MURRAY on the introduction of your revised social security bill. As physicans, we are concerned particularly with the health provisions of the bill, provisions we are competent to evaluate. We commend your plan for Federal grants-in-aid for the construction of hospitals and health facilities, for the extension of public health, maternal and child health and welfare services, and for research and professional education. We also approve your proposed national health insurance plan, providing for prepaid personal health service insurance. After mature study we are convinced that such insurance offers the best means to extend the benefits of modern medicine to all our citizens, many of whom today receive inadequate medical care.

We second your statement that health insurance is not socialized medicine, nor State medicine, and note that under the provisions of the bill full freedom of choice is given both to doctor and patient, and that adequate safeguards are established to protect competent existing medical services and institutions.

Your efforts to make the bill as perfect an instrument as possible is shown by your acceptance of many suggestions made by physicians and others who were interested in the objectives of your previous social security bill, S. 1161. You have succeeded in providing a fair balance between the principles of administrative responsibility and democratic administration. You have provided for decentralization of administration, as well as adequate participation of doctors and public in both local and general administration.

It is our hope that you will be successful in bringing about enactment of this legislation, which, particularly in the difficult postwar years, will be so vital to the health and welfare of our country.

Sincerely yours,

ERNST P. BOAS, M. D.,
Chairman, the Physicians Forum.

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, issued the following statement on the introduction yesterday (Thursday) of the new Wagner-Murray social security amendments:

"The American Federation of Labor wholeheartedly endorses and supports the new Wagner-Murray social security bill introduced as an improved substitute for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

"Enactment of this measure will provide the American people with a well-rounded social-security program for their protection during the transition period between war and peace and during the years to come.

"Particularly important at this time are the provisions for a comprehensive unemployment compensation system, with uniform benefits throughout the Nation. Only by such action can millions of war workers and returning servicemen be adequately safeguarded against unnecessary hardship arising from temporary unemployment during the reconversion period and in any subsequent economic crisis.

"In addition, the new Wagner-Murray bill offers basic protections against the economic hazards of illness, temporary disability, extended disability, old age, and retirement. It extends the benefits of old age and survivors' insurance to 15,000,000 persons now excluded.

"The American Federation of Labor is proud of the fact that it originally sponsored this legislation and has consulted closely with Senator WAGNER and his colleagues in efforts to improve and perfect it.

"A full measure of social security against the hazards of our complicated economic civilization must be guaranteed by a humane government to every American family.

"Social security means more than protection to the individual and his family. It provides insurance for the free enterprise system against its own shortcomings and serves to buttress the American way of life.

"The American Federation of Labor calls upon the Congress of the United States to approve this important measure without delay."

President Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, today issued the following statement on amendments to the Social Security Act proposed by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Representative DINGELL:

"The CIO welcomes the introduction of a revised social security bill by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Congressman DINGELL and urges its members to lend every support to early hearings before the appropriate congressional committees. The American people want an adequate system of social security throughout the country, covering the widest possible group of Americans, including agricultural and domestic workers and the self-employed. We want to see the aged properly cared for.

"We expect early action on emergency unemployment compensation. Persons temporarily or permanently disabled should be properly protected by insurance. Where the blind, the aged, or dependent children and others in need of public assistance are not sufficiently provided for, the Federal Government should aid the States in meeting these needs.

"Finally, we favor early action to meet America's health needs. Our war production proved that Americans can afford the social security our people want and need.

"In the months immediately ahead the CIO proposes to conduct a Nation-wide discussion among CIO unions in preparation for presenting testimony at the forthcoming hearings."

The FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the message of the mayor of a leading California city, vetoing a resolution of the city's board of supervisors approving the California Fair Employment Practices Act.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYOR LAPHAM GIVES REASON FOR VETOING RESOLUTION INDORSING FEPC BILL

In vetoing a resolution of the board of supervisors approving assembly bill 3, the California Fair Employment Practices Act, Mayor Roger Lapham stated his objections at length in writing. His statement is such an important contribution to public discussion of this matter that the News herewith publishes it in full for the information of readers. (The Editor.)

After a great deal of thought I am returning, marked "disapproved," your proposal 4800 reading as follows:

"Resolved, That this board of supervisors does hereby approve of the purposes of assembly bill No. 3, the California State Fair Employment Practices Act, and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to his honor the mayor with the request that they be transmitted to Mr. Don Cleary, the legislative representative at Sacramento."

To understand fully the meaning of proposal 4800, a careful reading of assembly bill 3 is necessary.

Section 2 of this bill defines its purposes and reads as follows:

"It is hereby declared as the public policy of this State that it is necessary to protect and safeguard the right and opportunity of all persons to seek, obtain, and hold employment without discrimination or abridgment on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"It is recognized that the practice of denying employment opportunity and discriminating in the terms of employment for such reasons, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the State of the fullest utilization of its capacities for development and advance, and substantially and adversely affects the interests of employees, employers, and the public in general.

"This act shall be deemed an exercise of the police power of the State for the protection of the public welfare, prosperity, health, and peace of the people of the State of California."

It is very plain that the use of the police powers of the State to accomplish a desirable objective—viz, no discrimination or abridgment in employment or in union membership on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry—is the main purpose of the bill. I repeat, the exercise of the police powers of the State to attain a desired objective is the meat and core of assembly bill 3.

If I had approved proposal 4800, I would have committed myself to all the policies clearly defined in section 2. Without any doubt, all fair-minded people believe that no person should be deprived of employment or of union membership because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; but it is highly questionable whether the State police power is the right instrument to accomplish what is sought.

The act as drawn creates a State fair employment practice commission of five members, appointed by the Governor. The commission is granted broad powers to formulate policies to effectuate the purposes of the act. It can, among other things, hold hearings, subpena witnesses, compel their attendance, and administer oaths.

The act makes it an unlawful practice for an employer, "because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry" of any person, to refuse to hire or employ him. It also makes it unlawful for any labor organization, because of "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry," to "exclude, expel, or restrict from its membership such persons."

In making its decisions the commission is not bound by technical rules of evidence, and orders of the commission shall be enforced by the District Court of Appeals upon petition of the commission. Judicial review of commission orders shall be by certiorari and disobedience of an order of the court enforcing commission orders shall be punishable as contempt of court. In the case of employees of a political subdivision of the State, decisions of the commission must be appealed to the Governor.

I am aware that the State of New York and the State of New Jersey recently enacted antidiscrimination laws very similar to that proposed by assembly bill 3. The New Jersey act became effective a few weeks ago. The New York act takes effect on July 1 next.

Despite recent legislative trends to compel nondiscrimination in hiring and in union membership by the use of governmental police powers, I cannot conscientiously endorse this method. Based on my experience in the field of management-labor relations, it is my considered judgment that passage of antidiscrimination laws is not in the public interest or in the interest of any minority group. I do not believe that you can solve the always present and eternal problems of human relations by legislation.

History teaches that prejudice exists, has always existed, and probably will continue to exist. We have heard of cause and effect. I do not believe that you can remedy effect unless you remove the cause. How to minimize the cause—in this case, prejudice—is our ever-present problem. I do not believe that prejudice leading to discrimination in employment or in union membership can be eliminated overnight. The evolution of civilization is a slow process. The pendulum swings back and forth; but always, despite set-backs, moving toward a higher plane. Education—the cultivation of tolerance and the effort to understand the other man's viewpoint—is a much more effective approach than legal compulsion. The passage of laws aimed to cure human-relationship problems overnight only irritates and aggravates and tends to set back progress in this particular field. Successful enforcement of any law is largely dependent on the almost unanimous support of public opinion. Based on experience, as evidenced by the repeal of the National Prohibition Act, I do not believe antidiscrimination legislation will have the public support necessary to accomplish enforcement.

A more rational approach would be for all employers individually and collectively to practice sincerely no discrimination in employment and for labor organizations to make certain no man fitted for a job is denied an opportunity for livelihood because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. In my opinion, voluntary efforts along these lines will be more helpful and effective than creating more laws and commissions. But to attain that goal—to avoid legal compulsion—forward-looking business and labor leaders should assume affirmative responsibility.

At this point I should like to have it clearly understood that the existence or nonexistence of this statute can in no way affect the tenure of men and women presently employed by the city and county of San Francisco under civil-service provisions of the charter. With the exception of those employed on a limited tenure basis, the charter guarantees continuation of present employment. The same instrument also guarantees an equal opportunity to participate in all future civil-service examinations, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

May I here emphasize what forward looking people are now concerned about, the problem of making peacetime jobs. Assembly bill 3, if passed, in no way solves that problem. It cannot help by adding even one job.

When there are more men and women than there are jobs, there will be job competition. If assembly bill 3 passes, it would leave to five individuals (and much will depend on the type of commissioner) final determination of thousands of complaints. It is certain that the commission will be besieged by those who charge discrimination in the hope that the commission will order hiring of the men or women whom the employer—for good business reasons—has refused first choice.

I did consider disapproving this proposal on the same grounds as I have others—that the subject was not the business of the board

of supervisors or the mayor. However, the more I studied Assembly Bill No. 3, the more I realized it dealt with a fundamental issue, of concern not only to the city but to the State and the Nation. For that reason, I have felt impelled to express fully and freely my own views on the merits of the issue.

I am aware that some holding political office prefer not to publicize their real opinions on issues of this kind because they are fearful of political retaliation which may be exerted by various pressure groups. I believe such fears should not influence any executive of a political subdivision. I believe the public is entitled to know the honest convictions of any elected executive.

I realize full well my own reasons for disapproving assembly bill 3 may be misunderstood and perhaps deliberately misinterpreted. I believe that all of us should recognize that discrimination is a matter which must be constantly considered and studied and that there can be honest differences of opinion how best to secure the desired objective.

I again repeat—I am against all discrimination or abridgment in employment or in union membership because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. But it is my conviction that man-made laws—the compulsory method—is not the right way to deal with a human-relations problem of this kind.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,
Mayor.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A River and an Issue," published in the May 21, 1945, issue of the Omaha Evening World-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RIVER AND AN ISSUE

Those who advocate and those who oppose a Missouri Valley Authority are at last bringing their fight to the people.

It is about time. The issue has become enveloped in confusion.

The confusion is spread, in large measure, by outsiders who know little about the river, but who are convinced that the issue is one of liberalism against toryism. They see in Senator MURRAY'S MVA bill a rallying point for the forces of the left. They attack the opponents of MVA as tools of the Power Trust and reactionaries of assorted hues.

The great plan to harness the resources of the river must not be permitted to become a sounding board for the yapping social uplifters. The people of the valley must not allow the Pick-Sloan program to be wrecked by forces that scarcely know of its existence, forces which seek to use our river for the promotion of an ideology.

If the men and women who advocate an MVA had the interest of the people of this valley at heart, which would concern them most, the actual development of the river for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power or the means by which such a development shall be constructed and administered?

We know now from the evidence before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee that their emphasis is not upon the development of the river but upon the TVA method.

These new bleeding hearts who have just recently located the Missouri River on their maps don't give a whooping darn about the dams and the power plants, the navigation channel and the irrigation works.

What they are after is another charter for regional socialism, which is opposed by the governors and State legislatures of the Missouri Valley as well as by the overwhelming majority of the citizens who know what the conflict is about.

Time after time, Chairman OVERTON, of the Senate subcommittee, propounded this question to witnesses favoring the Murray MVA bill:

"What argument have you to advance that some unknown authority can do a better job in the Missouri Basin than will be done through the use of the dams that are constructed through the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation?"

One can look in vain through the pages of the subcommittee testimony for an answer to that question. Most of the witnesses confess their ignorance of the Army-Bureau program, known as the Pick-Sloan plan, and now the law of the land. They talk instead of the TVA and the glories of regional planning—and in the vaguest terms, for there is nothing concrete in the MVA program excepting the form of control.

If any further evidence were needed, it can be found in the editorials and magazine propaganda emanating from the eastern seaboard. Last week the New York Post turned its guns on the Army engineers and with a sneer proclaimed that the Army does not like the MVA because "the Army is concerned with floods, not the level of the Kansas farmer's income."

Frantically, other MVA-ers are turning the attack from the Army engineers to certain mysterious and possibly fictitious power interests. They are attacking the governors, the legislatures, and the valley Members of Congress for their criticism of the MVA idea and they are claiming the support of the people for MVA when, as Missouri Valley residents well know, there is no such support.

Is it any wonder, then, that in this effort to discredit existing Government agencies, in the hunt for dark and devious opponents, that the MVA doubtless wishes it had; in the efforts to defeat a sound and tangible program with a vague three-letter slogan—is it any wonder that the citizens of the Missouri Valley are confused?

It is none too early for the earnest advocates of both sides to arrive on the scene. Perhaps they will be able to answer the one question that would resolve the Missouri River controversy for a great many people. It is simply this: How will an MVA do a better job for the Missouri River than the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now the law?

That is the issue. The MVA should stand or fall on its proponents' ability to answer it.

Resettlement of West Africa by Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from a leading Negro of Baltimore, Md. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the contents of this letter, so that there may be a general understanding that the proposition to resettle the American Negro in West Africa is meeting with the approval of Negroes throughout the country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *May 20, 1945.*

Senator BILBO.

DEAR SIR: I saw in the People's Voice of your wonderful Back to Africa Move for colored people of America. I think that's a great idea that you have. I think God has installed that in your mind. You must keep up the fight. God will bless you in many ways. We know that we have many in our race that are willing to return to their motherland as free people; not as a subject under any European flag, under the protection of the American Government until we get strong enough to go for ourself. Those who want to stay, let them stay here. The Negroes have played a big part in this war, also every war this country has fought. I think it is high time he should be rewarded. The ones that think he can remain here and get to be the President someday of the United States of America, let them remain. Your plans are only fulfilling the Bible. You keep up the good work; do not let anyone discourage you, there will be millions ready to go back to the land which God gave them. That is the only plan that will solve this race problem. We have men in our race that can do for others, why not let them do for themselves. We can build a government by the black man and for the black man in our motherland, Africa. Africa is our motherland which God gave to our foreparents. It's a part of every black man on earth. The Jewish people are demanding homeland for their race. Why don't the black man wake up before it is too late?

Although we realize we are American citizens, we were the first to shed our blood for the American flag. You cannot find in the history where a black man has ever been a traitor to this country. I think that is more than any one can say about any other race. I know God has given you the wisdom to see the future. May God bless you, that you may succeed in your plans.

For the success of my race,

W. L. JACKSON.

Address of Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid and inspiring speech made by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, at a joint meeting of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, held in Boston recently:

When representatives of three large religious groups in the United States gather to work for social justice, there is hope of international peace ahead. Probably no one, anywhere in the world, really doubts that justice belongs to the whole human race in

all its entirety; those who know God know that it is the reflection in finite things of His eternal justice. But only those whose life is centered in God will be stirred to sustain an unyielding battle until the man-made barriers that impede the flow of justice be torn down and crushed into dust.

That is why a meeting like this is important. We are, however, realists, and we cannot but acknowledge to ourselves that so far our efforts have had but slight results. This same disheartening observation might have been made by the forward-looking founders of our country, leaders who not only were to witness the driving of the wedge into the almost hopelessly blind wall of colonial prejudices, but were themselves to produce the historic document which at the same time that it declared us politically free presented to the world a statement of the true and eternal principles of just Government upon which our Nation is built.

It is those principles which urge us, the political descendants of the founding fathers, to defend all liberties wherever we see them attacked or endangered, and the success that rewarded the consecrated leadership of our first war gives us encouragement and hope that the thoughtfulness that should attend a new postwar era will help us rid our country of the evils that are now gnawing at the entrails of our society.

The motives that drove the early immigrants across the ocean to America were many and varied, but back of most of them was the specter of persecution, in front of them the promise of freedom. That held true, certainly, for the majority of the English who came to New England, to Maryland, to Pennsylvania in the seventeenth century, and for the Germans and the Irish who opened up the lands beyond the Alleghanies in the eighteenth century. It was but natural that those immigrants would bring with them the hatred and the fears upon which they had been fed in a Europe that had been shattered religiously and was beginning to crumble politically. The colonial schools and colleges which trained the children of those immigrants took prejudices for granted and even regarded them as safeguards of their society.

In that atmosphere of accepted bigotry and respectable intolerance, it would have been easy for the leaders of the colonists, when they decided to make the break with the mother country, to drift with the tide of popular narrowness so long as their own fortunes and positions were secure. But their leadership was of better stuff. Even while, and though, revolutionary armies were being recruited by an old familiar appeal to bigotry, the founding fathers of our Nation were stripping things down to fundamentals, patiently placing principle before policy, drawing on the wisdom of all ages, adapting it and casting it into a new mold. They not merel, personally broke with previous bigotry but officially they began to build their policies on new principles of sane civic tolerance.

NECESSITY OF GOD

In their Declaration of Independence, they announced a Government which recognized God as the source of authority and the fountain-head of the rights of man, rights which must be respected by just governments everywhere. Ancient Greece and Rome, the medieval Italian republics, the social philosophy of the great European kingdoms, the political theories of the British Constitution, all gave of their experience and their theories to the founding fathers, but they gave that previous history a fresh note and a new departure when they actually set up a government on the acceptance of the inalienable rights of man as a self-evident truth, a truth admitting of neither qualification nor debate.

There was another premise, however, basic to their new thought. From one point of view, the character of our Nation might be truly called a declaration of dependence—of dependence on God. It is a way of saying that without God there can be no true democracy. The Declaration is the substance of our Government, and the substance of that Declaration is its insistence upon the God-given character of the rights of man. That doctrine is the soul that gives America its characteristic breath of life.

Now we are fighting, nation against nation, in global warfare, to save that soul—to save it for ourselves, to make it possible for others. We know only too well that the world has brought sorrow and desolation upon itself by forgetting God and glorifying man as man, supreme and omnipotent. Analyze the ideologies that threaten us: Nazism glorifies man in race. Communism glorifies man in the masses. Fascism glorifies man in the mere citizen of the state. Shintoism glorifies man in the god-emperor. These are the ugly philosophies behind the forces that attacked us—against which we are fighting, we who believe that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Make no mistake about the outcome of this war. Despite our recent victory, the war is still lost unless it succeeds in maintaining for ourselves and for the world the everlasting principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence. One of these is the doctrine of the divine origin of the rights of man. Another is the human duty of acknowledging the rights of God.

Some day our armed forces will defeat our last enemy. Then, when the power of our totalitarian foes has been overthrown, we shall rejoice that our homes and our altars will be safe. But will they be safe in any permanent sense? Can we be sure? It might be wiser to say: "Our homes and our altars will be safe unless someone destroys them from within." That possibility still exists.

STANDARD OF MORALITY

Here is a paradox to consider. On several foreign fronts Americans have fought and are fighting with the zeal of crusaders to preserve the God-given rights of man. But on the home front, meanwhile, men and women—many men and many women—are abandoning the standards of morality which protect those rights, are making a mockery of that "pursuit of happiness" which should be the exercise of those rights, sometimes even presuming to use as their excuse for their actions the demands which wartime acceleration makes upon their health and nervous systems.

About 100 years ago a certain political faction died a quiet death after its members became known as "barn burners." The name came from the well-publicized act of a misguided farmer who, with more zeal than intelligence burned down his barn to get rid of rats. I am sorry to note evidence that there are barn burners aplenty among us. Our victory over the Axis will be hollow, indeed, if in winning it we wilfully sacrifice at home the very things that we fought abroad to save.

Concentrating upon the defeat of the enemy, we may lose sight of our ultimate goal: to remain a strong Nation living in accordance with a definite set of principles and a definite moral code. Such a Nation we have hitherto been, especially when the training ground of our sound citizenry was the home, when God-fearing parents reared God-fearing children in His love, and dedicated the home to the exalted service God Himself assigned to it. It needs but a moment's reflection to see that certain aspects of the war program are fraught with danger to this unit—this cell—of society. Juvenile delinquency, increase of major crimes, divorce, defeatism, excessive luxury, and the rapid rise of communism and other subversive systems of thought are at work tearing down the very sources of our strength, blasting the ideals we proclaimed so passionately as we asked our best boys to go forth to fight and die for them on distant battlefields.

Five years ago I used to hear much talk about the American way of life. You and I know boys who gladly died for what they then heard about it. I must confess to a certain uneasiness when I now hear less often about it. Can it be that those who stayed at home are less willing to live by that tradition than those who went abroad were willing to die for it?

To lay the blame for the appalling conditions in our society on the war is to cloud the issue and shirk our own responsibility. The war only aggravated a case of moral anemia from which we had been suffering ever since first we began to exclude God from our lives. We are paying now for this, our initial crime. No people ever denied God without eventually turning on their fellowmen. The convenient example of the moment—the horrible example, if you will—is, of course, the Nazi state. A distinguished Jewish columnist recently gave a flawless analysis of the religious, or rather the irreligious, roots of Nazism. It is worth repeating here tonight, for its application is universal. Wherever Christian nations diminish or deny their integral faith because of their attachment to any doctrine or practice inconsistent with that faith, immediately the seeds of destruction are sown. George Sokolsky writes that it was his emphasis on race—a non-Christian emphasis—that forced Hitler to hate not Judaism alone, but Christianity. "He could not imagine that the intellectually dominating forces of Western civilization, the Old and New Testaments, were written by men who were not Aryans. If the apostles were Jews, how could Christianity be anything but offensive to Aryans? If Christ came from among those peoples, Christ must be inferior to Thor. The emphasis here is not anti-Jew. If we are to understand the confusions in Hitler's mind, it must be pro-Aryan, pro-Nordic. In a word, everything in history that is not Aryan, not German, was, to his mind, trash."

WAR AGAINST GOD

"And so, Hitler's great war was not against the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. His real war was against God. For to him God must be wrong as He is not exclusively an Aryan. His racial purity cannot be complete, as He is God of all men, even the inferior races."

The outcome of reasoning like this is war—international fratricidal war. And the roots of it are negation, the negation of the ancient faith.

Let me put it another way. Let me put it positively, as you and I prefer to put things. It is historically true that a nation's strength—its spiritual strength, which is the kind that chiefly counts—may be granted by its fidelity to God. The God-fearing nation enjoys the fruits of its fidelity. All other things that make for national strength are added to it: opportunity for manhood, reverence for womanhood, a sound family life, schools that teach men how to live well here on earth in order that they may live eternally in the sight of God. Jesus Christ once said to His disciples: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all things else shall be added to you." That is good spirituality. It is also good sociology. It is excellent community ethics.

So, if we are to preserve our American heritage we must once again put first things first. I think that is what our founding fathers did. I submit that we must do so, too, before it is too late.

One place to begin doing so is in our peace plans. Some of us sense in many of the plans for the postwar world which have so far appeared a sign of the degeneration of our political concepts. A new society based on almost any one of these plans would have the same inherent fatal weaknesses that have already caused two appalling wars. Nowhere in them do we find convincing evidence that their authors recognize God and His natural

law with its concepts of rights and duties as they apply to nations as well as to individuals. Nowhere in them is there any real place for religious morality, let alone religion. They do not read like the harbingers of a new and better era. The ring of these international charters is very hollow, indeed, as compared to that of the great charter of our national liberties, the political credo of old America, the Declaration of Independence.

Yet, even before we give ourselves over completely to international planning we had best take careful stock of our national spiritual resources. Unless we do, we may find ourselves a nation of Mrs. Jellyby's. You remember that thoroughly sincere woman in Bleak House who was so concerned with the plight of the heathen in Africa that she devoted all her energies to plans for the colonization of Borrioboola-Gha while her own family shifted for themselves in a chaotic household for which she had neither time nor attention. There are grave grounds for asserting that our national household, like Mrs. Jellyby's, is in chaos. Is it not presumptuous to talk of creating an international society if we ignore the decline of family morality that is undermining our national vitality? May not the world raise its eyebrows if we preach a democratic peace when class hatred, race discrimination, and religious warfare are becoming commonplaces of our national life?

INTERNATIONAL GROUP

World peace we must have, an international organization to preserve that peace we must help construct. But these elaborate technical plans must find support in a moral atmosphere, and this requires that first we rid our hearts of enmity and hate here at home, and fill them with love of God and love of neighbor—not at the ends of the earth alone—but right here, at home.

In all this weary, silly world are there any men so foolish as those who talk world peace, and are deaf to neighborhood discord, or who bid us love the human race but hate the man next door!

"Six things there are which the Lord hateth," says the Book of Proverbs, "and the seventh His soul detesteth: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that diviseth wicked plots, feet that are swift to run to mischief, a deceitful witness that uttereth lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren." Into this seventh class fall the exponents of racial and religious prejudice. Their number, sad to say, is legion. Judging by the amount of anti-Catholic literature of all kinds rolling from the presses of this country, judging by the opposition being organized against Catholics, Jews, and Negroes, a staggering percentage of people in this land of the free must still hate many millions of Americans.

Unfortunately, the only basis of unity some people have is a hate which they nurture in common. Some are united in their hatred of the American way of life; others in their hatred of Catholics, of Protestants, of Jews; others in their hatred of the Ten Commandments, of discipline, of order; we have even seen mighty organizations grow up in our country around a hatred for nicotine and for fermented grapes. But this sort of thing becomes intolerable when sowers of discord feed hatred by indicting a whole people because of the delinquency of a few individuals.

GOSPEL OF HATE

Some do this because there is no charity in them and they frankly follow a gospel of hate. Others do this out of a mistaken and distorted sense of the excellence of their own race or nationality, forgetting that no national or other group claims can possibly prescribe the prior claims of humanity. There is a pathetic story told of a Negro who was filling out a questionnaire. He came to the question: "What is your race?" With unconscious irony he wrote: "Human."

What better one-word parable for a generation which persecutes those not of its own race. Don't forget it—that your race is, first of all, the human race—the race for which Christ died. For sentimentality's sake, there is nothing wrong about being happy about your Irish, Italian, or French, ancestry. Such pride in nationality has been a great factor in human progress, as we can appreciate in the art, architecture, literature of the various peoples of the earth. Each has its own unique and beautiful type of expression.

But that pride of nationality which leads one race to hate another is a wicked thing. To hate people of another nationality is to hate Christ. We can hate their ideas, but we cannot hate them. They are of our race, the human race which Christ died to redeem. He loves everyone of them. We are not "one in Him" unless we do the same.

That is why I argue that, so far as Christians are concerned, all "anti" movements spring from the rejection of the commandment of Christ: "This is My commandment—that you love one another as I have loved you." Or again: "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." Our Lord understood how difficult it is to wipe out national and racial and religious prejudices; nevertheless He refused to soften His injunction of love. He went even further. In the midst of the hatreds surround Him, He proclaimed: "You have heard that it was said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies * * * pray for those who persecute you." To be pro-Christian does not mean to be anti-anybody; on the contrary, it is exactly the opposite doctrine.

God forbid that the American people should ever cease to follow the moral code which instilled in their forefathers a sense of fraternity and a desire for righteous love for one another. God forbid that they abandon the commandment of love, and thus turn their backs on their own national charter. If they do, whence can come the inspiration to treat every man as an equal in the sight of God, or the moral energy sufficient to insure every man the rights that belong to him as a person, precious to society, precious to his Maker? Not until all our citizenry regains the concept of the inherent, spiritual dignity of every man will our intranational hatreds be banished. This is the crux of the problem—as I see it—and the reason why hatred movements particularly challenge religious leaders.

EQUALITY OF ALL

We must in conscience wage battle against every philosophy that holds men to be economic or political or biological individuals only and denies them spiritual personality. All men are equal as spiritual persons and we must love all spiritual persons as equals. This is not to say that as individuals they are in every sense equal. Some are patently superior, judged by many norms. They are unequal in ability, unequal in achievement, unequal in health, unequal in opportunity, unequal in wisdom, unequal in virtue, unequal in wealth, unequal in happiness. But they are equal as spiritual persons. Even whole races, nations, and sects may excel in a certain respect, surpassing all others by their superiority in one or another regard. But when we look at those some individuals as persons, or reduce the group to an aggregate of persons, that is to say, creatures endowed with souls, all moving alike toward the single destiny of union with the Eternal God, their Father in Heaven, then we have perfect equality, and, on the basis of it, we have the inescapable obligation to love each member of our common human race.

There are men who scoff at this truth; but their scorn does not affect the soundness of the truth nor indeed its practicability. This doctrine recognizes natural groupings, the superiority of some, the inferiority of others, the special interests of all. It may sometimes even seek to discourage the intermingling of groups, under certain conditions, as detrimental to society. The Jews, for instance, were once forbidden to intermarry with the surrounding nations because of the gross idolatry that hemmed them in on every side. Other reasons make a similar policy, especially in religious matters, equally good even today. Again, in the social and economic field, one can understand that particular groups may have certain prior rights in a given locality and may resist the advent of other groups, provided the "resistance" be equitable and such as the other groups would reasonably understand were the positions reversed.

We could multiply circumstances in which a group can be regarded as a group and treated as a group, but there can never be circumstances which permit a group to stand condemned by society for the individual faults or sins of its members, especially of a minority of its members. The reason why this group condemnation, group hatred, group discrimination is wrong has nothing to do with tolerance; it is a question of simple justice.

ULTERIOR MOTIVES

There is one further thing I think should be said once and for all about group hatred as it usually manifests itself: The group-baiter finds himself in very questionable company, for most of the group hostility that is stirred up, especially in our cities, has beneath it a sinister motive of exploitation. Employers of cheap labor, holders of desirable jobs that might be threatened by competition, owners of slum properties, vested interests of every kind, these men are certainly not without ulterior motives when they raise a hue and cry against the Negro, the Catholic, or the Jew. And I make one further observation; these interests are certainly not without satisfaction and even complicity when they sit in silence while their spokesmen exploit or foster differences among the religious and racial groups of this city or elsewhere.

The Jews and the Catholics have centuries of persecution behind them in history; we have, I suppose, developed a technique in dealing with it. The problem of the Negroes is a much more serious one for the Nation. Organized opinion among the Negroes considers that the United States as the chief exponent of democracy owes it to itself as well as to them to blot out this stain of racial discrimination. They know that they have been for generations loyal Americans, contributors in conspicuous degree to our economic success. Yet, all too often, they have looked in vain for justice from our political and economic agencies. We tell them that the solution to racial intolerance lies in religion; we tell them that Christianity teaches the brotherhood of all mankind in Christ, that this brotherhood is of all races, unconcerned with the color of one's skin. All that is perfectly true—and America accepts it in principle. But there must be what popular parlance calls a practical follow-up.

RACE TOLERANCE

What if the oppressed and humiliated millions turn their back on Christianity, declaring that though it teaches the fatherhood of God, Christians act as if they did not believe the doctrine? What if these millions, in despair, turn to communism, hearing its propagandists assure them feverishly that in communism alone can they find equality? What if, in blindness, they give to that foreign ideology the numbers it has not been able to attract from the various strata of whites? How far, then, would white Christians and Jews be responsible for the deathblow such a backing of communism would give our institutions?

I can answer for the Catholic. When he fails to take a stand against race tolerance he is a slacker in the army of the church militant at a time when history's most crucial battle is being waged to determine whether the spiritual or the pagan conception of life will rule the world. Christ placed all this on a supernatural basis. He knew that once men had seen the relationship of all men to God and to one another, then it would be easier to see the dignity of one's fellow man. Only on a supernatural basis can the great truth of the brotherhood of men come to fruition. Christ identified Himself with the poor, the lowly, and no Catholic can despise a fellow man and remain a true follower of the Nazarene. The believer who considers the Negro on the basis of the color of his skin is at once untrue to his religion and blind to this great national problem.

There is no master race here in the United States, thanks be to God. God has not given to any race a monopoly of intelligence, character, or patriotism. Our country has never pretended, in principle, that He did. But our lofty principles are being contradicted, and not all the challenge is abroad. Our worst enemies are within. They are spiritual enemies; they attack our moral reserves and fortresses. So the future of our Nation, great though we are, will not be assured until we again make spiritual and moral principles, in a word, religion, the vitalizing force of our lives.

From religion are distilled justice, charity, and mercy; these are the world's greatest needs. We shall always have to struggle to preserve what we have won. But the struggle will be easy if we love one another; love our neighbor, and love him irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Tolerance such as this is no less than justice. It spells no compromise with true faith. Any devout Protestant, any believing Jew will know well how to paraphrase for himself these Catholic words:

"Truth is truth, we cannot be tolerant of error.
Right is right, we cannot hear willingly the claims of evil;
Christ to me and to millions of others is the Light of the World,
We cannot be asked to walk in darkness,
But we can be kind and loving and merciful to all."

Employment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we hear so many criticisms of the United States Employment Service that I am glad to place in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a letter from a manufacturer which reveals some of the difficulties with which the Employment Service has to contend:

VALENTINE CLARK CORP.,
St. Paul, May 25, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Just to keep your file alive on the subject of additional workers, it may be interesting to know that one of our vice presidents has put in the entire week at the United States Employment Service office in St. Paul. We were granted a priority for 10 additional workers, which is still less than our ceiling, and want to be on record that all the people in the Employment Service have been most courteous and helpful.

After interviewing a great many men, we succeeded in employing two, and since they have reported for duty the second day we can reasonably expect they may stay a while. Of course, in the meantime, five of our regular crew have decided to go fishing for a few days.

The situation seems to be rather difficult at the moment because most of the applicants have been released from defense plants like the Rosemount Powder Works, where men who handle lumber are classified as carpenter's helpers and men who handle any kind of a tool are classified as mechanics, either skilled or semiskilled. They seem to be shopping around hoping to find similar classification in civilian industry work. We have had many who would be willing to come out and manage our institution for us, but either they don't like indoor work or they don't like outdoor work or they can't stand heavy work, and it seems that the same men come back day after day waiting for the proper type of job to show up.

In due time these folks who have been improperly classified in these defense factories will adjust themselves, and I thought this angle might be interesting to you because it is an indication to us that it is probably going to be rather difficult to keep up the production schedules on defense materials for the Pacific war area.

I didn't realize that the very earnest workers in the employment office had to contend with such a difficult situation, because they are really trying hard to place the workers to best advantage.

Yours very truly,

M. H. SPERRY.

A Mining Problem of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there are many approaches to that desired goal of postwar full employment which we all hope for and seek. As a member of the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, I have heard this desired goal mentioned many times by very many different experts, each indicating a different approach. Today, an investment banker suggested a modification of certain recent acts and their administration, pointing particularly to the Security and Exchange Commission, if we want waiting capital to be invested and to offer this much-desired employment. As his is one approach which has received less attention thus far, I pointed to metalic mining as one field of investment which offers the most crying need of encouragement and new capital.

Coming as I do from a mining community, I offered as my chief question: What changes can and should be made in the law, or the administration of it, which would have a wholesome effect upon the mining industry? Being a layman, I stated frankly that I approached the matter of modifying our protective laws with suspicion. I recall that it was Mark Twain who, probably with more wisdom than humor, at one time remarked, "A mine is a hole in the ground owned by a liar." I never understood the meaning of this until I went with an optimistic gentleman into the mountains of the West, and he showed me a hole in the ground with some interesting looking rocks in it and about it. Said I, "What is this?" He replied, "High-grade copper ore." Then said I, "What are we waiting for? Let us get it out and take it to the smelter." "Oh, no," said he, "it is not rich enough for that, but it is rich enough to sell stock." Now, he had sold me some copper stock some time previously on another mine, but this stock I subsequently found to be on beautiful paper which had been depreciated by the printing upon it. Of course, all this happened long before 1933.

MINING NEEDS RISK CAPITAL

Members of the committee were quick to ask whether I did not want the public to have protection. Naturally I explained that I did want the fullest possible protection for the investing public, but felt it my duty to call attention to the fact that practically no risk capital from private sources is going into the development of small mines in the West. I have been told by small-mine operators that there are several reasons for this ominous fact and that some of it is chargeable to unnecessary governmental red tape. While I cannot vouch for the absolute accuracy of this diagnosis, I am distressed by the tragic fact that the important mining industry is facing this situation, and I would be remiss in not calling attention to it.

Large mines grow from small mines, but not all small mines grow large. Let it be understood that mining is a hazardous investment. I have heard men from the mining West declare that they did not want to conceal the truth or to fool anybody about mining risks and that they were willing to have stamped in big red letters on promotional mining stock certificates, "This is a gamble." What they contend is that development capital is needed to develop small mines and those who want to take a chance with their eyes wide open ought to be permitted to do so and that the law or regulations ought to be modified toward that end. Whether this can be wisely done remains a problem, but I have taken this occasion to pose the question in Congress.

War Weariness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include herewith an article entitled "War Weariness" by Malvina Lindsay, which appeared in the Washington Post on May 9:

WAR WEARINESS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

INFLATION HARVEST

Symptoms of a "back to normalcy" epidemic are showing up alarmingly. They suggest that 18 months after the end of this war the main topic of conversation may be, as in the spring of 1920, the exorbitant cost of living. They hold the possibility that American fighting men may come home to a country in which their bonds and savings are depleted in value.

These symptoms include a wave of public antagonism to OPA, stirred up by the meat shortages, stepped-up military demands, and the low-cost clothing program; increased talk of lifting war controls, and a drive on Congress to discredit controls, a let-down in moral standards by housewives who, in their zeal to get food, yield to black-market restrictions; a general war weariness and reaction against restriction.

Because of the recent OPA crisis the National League of Women Voters has sent out a call to action urging its members to enlist citizen support for retention of vigorous price control. On Capitol Hill legislative representatives of consumer groups, including 12 national women's organizations, are trying to hold the line for after-the-war rationing and price control against the guerrilla warfare of those who want to get in on the peacetime boom demand for goods before production can catch up with it.

Price-control snipers

The Price Control Act comes up for renewal next month. Consumer groups are asking that it be continued long enough after the fighting stops to prevent a postwar boom and subsequent depression such as followed the last war. They would like a renewal for 18 months instead of a year. They are also trying to prevent the act's being emasculated by crippling amendments and lack of enforcement funds. Present strategy of its opponents is to attack not the act but its administration. In the House, which holds the money bags, and which will start hearings on the act next week, lies the answer as to how effectively price control will be continued.

Biggest job, however, before the consumer groups is to combat national end-of-the-war psychology among citizens. Like the fighting man in Europe, the civilian at home dreads going on with the war now that VE-day has come. Yet his most crucial battles lie ahead—in fact, will come after complete victory. Forty percent of the inflation of World War I came after the armistice—price controls having been dropped almost as soon as the war ended. Favorite bon mot of 1919 was that the man without a dollar was 50 cents better off than he once was. In November 1918 sugar—if any could be found—was 11 cents a pound. A year and a half later it was 26½ cents. During this war the average price has been around 6½ cents.

Road to apple selling

Unhampered by food rationing, hoarders during World War I bought up large quantities of scarce articles, thus increasing shortages and forcing up prices. After the war came a rush for goods that had been scarce. There was a limited supply of goods and no price control. The result—a boom. Then production caught up with demand, exceeded it. The result—canceled orders, bankruptcy, unemployment (5,500,000 workers lost their jobs), soup lines, and apple selling.

If this folly is not repeated, women, who do the bulk of the buying in this country, will have to awaken to the fact their money management extends beyond the home, and will have to wade into problems of price control, taxes, and tariffs. They are the ones who will pay heavily in household stint and sacrifice if, by their insistence on buying what they want when they want it, or by sitting back and having no say as to what Congress does now about their postwar grocery bills, they permit another inflation era to develop.

Not only price control but other important measure, as the Bretton Woods agreements and reciprocal trade treaties, on which the stability of a world security organization largely depend, are pending now before Congress. But while a Nation watches the San Francisco Conference as if it were a football game, comparatively few citizens make the more arduous effort to understand these less spectacular measures.

It it not going to be easy for weary fighting men in Europe to shoulder their packs and start for the Orient. But no one doubts they will do it. It would seem that civilians also could get some injections of iron into their spines, overcome the urge-to-quit virus, and start grappling with the pressing problems of peace.

OPA Blind to Nation's Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House of Representatives to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter from Dr. Harry G. Clark regarding the welfare of expectant mothers and their children.

It seems incredible that we in America can be so short-sighted to the Nation's welfare as to deny, through Government rationing, the essential foods required for normal health of unborn children.

This is a dangerous policy and should be corrected at once. The letter follows:

HARRY G. CLARK MEDICAL GROUP,
Detroit, Mich., May 25, 1945.

The EDITORS,
The Detroit Medical News,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR DR. LIGHTBODY: When a baby is born, the mother all of a sudden receives twice as many meat and fat points as she received the day before. This baby did not suddenly come into being even though it did suddenly come into view. The only change that occurred was that prior to birth the baby was a parasite on the mother and was a drain on the mother's food supply, while afterward it was not. The double supply of points should have been allotted as soon as the mother became pregnant.

We are having a famine and are facing a worse famine in proteins and fats. This is important to the normal person but it is a serious and grave consideration for the pregnant woman. Anemia, edema, miscarriage, prematurity, and perhaps eclampsia have all been traced to a deprivation of proteins in the mother—an increased death rate, prematurity, malformations, and general debility are the lot of the baby. In protein starved France during the German occupation, there was a saying apropos pregnancy, that a woman might have—"One baby, yes; two babies, maybe, and three babies, never." In most countries, including Great Britain, pregnant women had an allotment of more and better food than the average person—should this not occur in the United States also?

I am writing this in hope that the Detroit Medical Journal will print it—that it will be copied at once by other medical journals, and also, the newspapers. By so doing, it may be brought to the attention of the Office of Price Administration immediately whereas if this communication were sent through the usual Government channels it might be answered by a clerk, or lost track of entirely.

The national death rate is rising during this last year. This change in the distribution of food is urgent and important. It can be changed by a simple directive from Washington. Every woman certified by a physician to be pregnant should have double the number of meat and fat points as the average individual.

I am sending copies of this communication to the local Office of Price Administration, the head Office of Price Administration in Washington, and to Dr. Fishbein, so that there may be action taken before too much harm is done to our expectant mother.

Yours very sincerely,

HARRY G. CLARK, M. D.

Copy to Congressman GEORGE DONDERO.

The OWI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles by Ernest Lindley expressing his views on the Office of War Information, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 28, 1945]

GERMANY AND NEWS

(By Ernest Lindley)

WAS ELMER DAVIS RIGHT?

Elmer Davis, it has become apparent, was right in saying that the German diet of information would be "what the doctors prescribe." The Allies will control closely, for a time, news and opinion published in Germany. They will do more than that. They themselves will gather and disseminate most of the information which the Germans read, hear over the radio, or see at the movies.

No one would maintain that the Nazi propaganda machine should be allowed to continue to function. But this machine embraced the entire press, the entire radio, the movies—all channels of communication. When it is liquidated nothing is left. There is no remnant of a free democratic press or radio. There is not even a corps of journalists with even so elementary a qualification as respect for facts.

Gradually some Germans may emerge who can be trusted with newspapers or radio stations or publishing houses. But their ability to discharge these responsibilities, which are so completely intertwined with the reeducation and reformation of the German people, will have to be thoroughly tested. To leave these powerful weapons in German hands now would be foolish.

The other choices are, roughly: (1) to leave Germany "blacked out" with no published information on current events; (2) to let the Germans get what they can from publications from abroad; (3) to give them what the Allies think is good for them through radio programs, newspapers, newsreels, and pamphlets published by the Allies or under Allied supervision.

A "black-out" would not serve any good purpose. The ailments of the German people have been aggravated by the "blacking out" for years of everything except Nazi

propaganda. An even more thorough "blackout" now would leave the effects of these years of propaganda uncorrected. In fact, the propaganda can be expected to continue by word of mouth and underground publications.

The second alternative—permitting the Germans to pick up what they can from publications and radio programs from abroad—would not go very far in itself toward improving the situation. And it contains, at this stage, many serious dangers. Even in the bona fide, privately owned and unsubsidized press of the United States and Britain there are some publications which it would not be good for the Germans to read. And the door would be open to every type of subsidized ax-grinding, including outright Fascist propaganda.

Even without considering these dangers, the second choice would mean muffing an opportunity. This is the time to begin to re-orient the German mind. One of the first tasks is to present to the Germans some of the facts about the war. This can be done through pamphlets, movies, and by other means. It is a special job requiring special handling. And it is important that the Germans should not be diverted from this elementary reeducation by an abundance of other material to read, see, and hear.

The course adopted is the only one which is both safe and potentially constructive. The Germans are to be given simple factual information about current events. Until a corps of competent and trustworthy Germans can be built up this information will have to be prepared and disseminated by Allied authorities—through newspapers, and movies, and over the radio. In addition, the Germans will be given information about past events which they have hitherto seen only through the distorted lenses of Nazi propaganda.

Gradually, as conditions permit, this simple, wholesome diet can be expanded. This regimen will not be easy to manage. The doctors are only too likely to disagree. What the Germans hear over radio stations in Russian hands is likely to be different from what they hear over radio stations in American or British hands. But certainly we want the American story to be told as well and widely and as thoroughly as possible. It will not be told unless we see that it is told.

[From the Washington Post of May 30, 1945]

KEEP O. W. I.

(By Ernest Lindley)

TELL THE AMERICAN STORY

Most of the Continent of Europe was fed Nazi propaganda for from 3 to 5 years. From some countries, which we want to be friendly to us, the lid has been lifted only within the last 3 weeks.

There are a great many facts about us those peoples do not know, but which in justice they should know or be made to realize. For example:

They should know what prodigious contributions the United States made to the defeat of Germany and the liberation of Europe, and how they were made.

They should know that simultaneously we have been waging with brilliant success a great war against Japan and that the completion of that war is our first order of business and is of vital concern to them, too.

They should understand why, largely because of the great war with Japan, we cannot provide promptly as much economic help as many of our friends in Europe want or think they should have.

They should know what our peace objectives are and what kind of people we are. Many of them had a favorable opinion of us before the war, but they have been fed on distortions for several years. And, remembering the aftermath of the First World War, many of them may not realize that there has been a fundamental change in American policy: that we intend to see this time that the peace is organized to the best of our ability, that we are not going to withdraw.

These are a few of the things which we need to drill into the heads of the peoples of Europe by every means at our command. They will not find them out by themselves.

We cannot expect our big allies to tell the American story as we would like to have it told. The Russians have been chary of admitting even to their own people the extent of the American contribution to the war. Outside Russia, they advertise the Red Army, not the American lend-lease which put the Red Army on wheels, or the American Air Force or the American Navy or the American merchant marine. The British, who are more factual and more generous in their acknowledgments, are naturally interested in building up their own prestige. The French, too, have their own axes to grind.

Our influence at this critical juncture depends largely upon the broadcasting of the facts about what we have done and what we intend to do, and why. No one will do this for us. And privately managed American agencies, such as the press associations and magazines, can do it only in part. Someone has to see that the American story, present and past, is told in the French and Norwegian and Belgian press, that it is heard over the radio stations of these and other friendly nations, and that it appears in the movies which are shown in these countries and in special pictorial exhibits and in pamphlets.

Yet at this very time, when a tremendous job needs to be done for the United States, some of the Members of Congress seem to want to cripple our chief instrument for doing it—the Office of War Information. The OWI, on its own account, planned to curtail its European operations—possibly too much over all. Their character must change in part. But during the next year or two every means at our collective disposal must be used to put our story before the people of Europe. This requires not only the transmission of information and the preparation of a great deal of special material for pamphlets and movies and other agencies of communication, but daily personal contacts with editors, public officials, and other key people in other nations, to see that the information is disseminated. It is not an easy job. It requires men with experience, perseverance, and resourcefulness.

The Russians and the British are not cutting down their propaganda or information services in Europe or anywhere else that such services can be of any value to them. It we cut down ours, it is not their loss.

Today the Tariff Has Deeper Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., for May 29, 1945:

TODAY THE TARIFF HAS DEEPER MEANING

We have always had the tariff as an issue in the United States, but never before has it carried so deep meaning for the future of this country.

After the tragic disappointment the American people suffered by having a Second World War only 25 years after the first great struggle, the conviction was borne home that not peace and safety but war and danger may follow political isolationism.

When Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, spoke for the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act he said that here was the first real test to show whether the United States is willing to join in international cooperation or is going back to both political and economic isolation. He told the House that many nations soon would make decisions whethey they would move toward freer trade or toward "narrow economic nationalism," with tariffs, quotas, subsidies, discriminations, and government control of foreign trade. And Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, said the future of the trade agreements bill might well tilt the whole international balance one way or the other.

The House passed this measure 239 to 153, with President Truman appealing directly for favorable action. Democratic spokesmen declared that the vote would show whether America wants to cooperate with other nations or become isolationist, and that the action of the House would be watched by United Nations delegates at San Francisco.

If the Extension Act is not passed by the Senate, where some current circumstances are unfavorable, the San Francisco agreement will lack a certain force and appeal, and the nations might again engage in economic warfare which would hold threat for good relations and the future peace of the world.

Expense Allowance For Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10 on page 4428 the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] made a statement with reference to the rule providing for the consideration of $2,500 expense allowance to Members of Congress. The statement is as follows:

Therefore, the only roll-call vote which can be had on this question would be a roll-call vote on the adoption of this rule. Upon such a roll call those favoring the adoption of the rule would be voting in favor of this $2,500 per Member appropriation, while those opposing the adoption of the rule would be voting against it.

On page 4434 of the RECORD, roll call No. 75, my name is listed among those voting against the adoption of the rule which was as above stated, a vote against the expense allowance.

I then felt and now feel that making any additional allowance to ourselves at this time is a mistake regardless as to how great the need is therefor.

I have found by practicing rigid economy it is possible to live on the salary now provided for the Members of Congress, and I have always felt the honor to be a Member of this great body is the highest compensation of all.

It is encouraging to know that the newspapers generally, and especially in my district, have views similar to my own regarding this matter.

I insert herewith editorials from the Spartanburg Herald and the Greenville News of May 30, 1945:

NO TIME FOR CONGRESSMEN TO RAISE PAY

On Monday the United States Senate voted down an appropriation bill clause that would have provided a $2,500 raise in expense money for each of its Members.

This action followed previous approval by the House of the same amount of expense money for its Members. Thus, there is, in actuality, a salary difference between the two parts of Congress.

Various arguments have been presented to justify the appropriation of expense funds for Congressmen. It has been shown that living costs in Washington have boomed; that travel expenses are higher; that Congressmen are expected to maintain a high standard of living; that there is an increasing demand upon Members for things that call for higher expenses.

In fact, however, we suspect that the real reason for the consideration of "expense money" in Congress is that Members feel that is one method of voting themselves a raise with least complaint from their constituents.

Regardless of the real cause, we do not feel that this is the time for Congressmen to take such action. The Little Steel formula has controlled and limited wage increases for industry. Excess profits tax has kept the businessman from making huge profits as during other periods of high demand for their products. The so-called white-collar worker has not been raised in proportion to higher living expenses. Last—and most important—the American fighting man has not received large recompense for offering his life on the battlefield. We do not believe the Congressman is in greater need of expense money than these others.

If Congressmen feel their expenses have increased so greatly, then they should go about getting a raise in a different manner. While the average person's taxes rise in an ever-expanding ratio as his income goes up, the House-approved expense money is tax-free. This does not seem cricket in view of national conditions at this time.

Some Members of the House will have to do some explaining later to justify their action. If the Senate can stand the high cost of living in Washington without a raise, House Members will be hard put to prove their needs.

THE SENATE AND PAY RAISE

The action of the United States Senate in turning down the opportunity to vote its Members an additional $2,500 each for tax-free "expenses" may come as something of a surprise, for most of the political prophets had been predicting that the Senate would go along with this House idea and include its own Members among the beneficiaries.

But the Senate vote in refusing this extra money for itself reflects, we think, a wholesome appraisal of a strong public sentiment that such an action would be highly inappropriate at this time; and by the same token its decision is an implicit rebuke to the House. For while the Senate has felt that the principle of "comity" between the two Houses should cause it to refrain from interfering with the House decision as to its appropriations for itself, it has said in effect that the additional "expense" allowance is unwise and unjustified, for it is obvious that there can be no better reason for such funds for Representatives than for Senators.

Certain Washington advices indicate that the organized-labor leaders have been watching the course of this legislation with the keenest interest, since its adoption for both Houses would provide the very best example and precedent they could want for more vigorous demands for an elimination of the wage-stabilization formula and a very substantial increase in hourly wages throughout industry.

For the effect of the legislation is, to give the House Members much more than a 20-percent raise in income. On its face, it figures a 20-percent increase, but it must be remembered that by using the dodge of voting this money as expense it is not subject to income taxes. Such an untaxed addition to an income of $10,000 would thus work out to 30 percent or more, on a basis of strict comparison with wage earners who might get a raise which would be taxable.

In view of the Senate's action, we wonder if the House will not now see the wisdom and propriety of retreating from its own much-criticized position; or at the very least making its additional income fully subject to taxation?

Foreign Trade and Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to have placed into the RECORD two editorials with reference to the Sixth Report of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning on the subject of Foreign Trade and Shipping, which was recently released by our committee.

The editorials, which appeared in the Providence (R. I.) Journal and the Gulfport-Biloxi (Miss.) Daily Herald, respectively, are as follows:

FREEDOM OF TRADE

The report of the Colmer committee, setting forth the views of the lower House of Congress on postwar international economic cooperation, takes in general a most enlightened attitude toward this major problem.

It is noteworthy that it endorses the International Bank provision of the Bretton Woods agreement but avoids approval of the Monetary Fund portion of that pact. It recognizes however, a need for establishing an international pool of currencies to stabilize foreign exchanges in the interest of a smooth-flowing world commerce. Presumably it believes such an objective can be achieved through the International Bank, although the published summary of its report is not specific on this point.

Likewise significant is the committee's recommendation that the Government should subsidize such portion of our postwar merchant marine as may be essential to national defense, charging the cost thereof to the national-defense budget. But the remainder of our ocean merchant shipping, in its opinion, should take its chances in international competition without benefit of Federal financial aid. That is sound reasoning if an equitable basis can be found for making such distinctions.

The committee's conviction that the resources of the Export-Import Bank should be enlarged so that it will be better equipped to make "developmental loans which would be beneficial to our international position" is in keeping with established administration policy. It conforms also with what far-sighted American businessmen and economists deem to be a sound postwar economic procedure for this Nation. The committee's advocacy of repeal of the Johnson Act prohibiting private foreign loans to countries in default on previous borrowing is in keeping with the present sentiment of the country.

Its denunciation of cartel agreements and its emphasis on the necessity to take every proper step to prevent the establishment by any nation of artificial barriers to the flow of international commerce and currency are in harmony with progressive economic thought. It is encouraging to know that the House, if it accepts the guidance of the Colmer committee, can be a constructive influence in shaping America's course in any future international conference that may be convened to consider all of these fundamentally important economic matters.

The committee's recommendation that an international meeting be called to establish concerted action on all policies with respect to commerce between nations, particularly in relation to permanent avoidance of such arbitrary restrictions as were imposed by various nations after the First World War, should be heeded. For such an agreement could be made one of the foundation stones on which to build a better economic order. Upon such building we must depend in no small degree for the future stability and security of the world.

AN IMPORTANT REPORT

The sixth report of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Planning treats in 55 pages of our postwar foreign economic policy and other kindred and basic underlying matters, but space does not allow even a full condensation nor an elaborate review here, and its volume and importance are so elaborate and extensive that we cannot give it the commentary nor the adequate time, study, and industry which preceded its conclusions. It is very full in detail treatment and specific recommendations based on fully argued bases. The foreign economic policies are said to be intended "to establish the economic foundations of a durable peace and to assist in providing high and expanding levels of income at home and abroad," yet preserving the principles of individual freedom and private initiative. The belief is expressed that high levels of output and employment at home are required for expanded world trade, and that the measures the committee suggests are intended to enable this country and all others to enjoy the lasting benefits of a larger and expanding volume of world trade. Reciprocal trade will secure foreign products and essential raw materials for certain American agricultural and manufactured products.

Payments for American exports must be in dollars, says the committee, acquired by foreigners primarily (1) by sales of their goods and services to us, (2) through interest, profits, and dividends made here by other countries in the past. Extensive foreign postwar investments by the United States will benefit this country and the world, it is argued; opportunity for which will come from scarcity of capital in undeveloped and devasted regions; if loans are made on a productive basis, it will bring industrial expansion and benefit both borrower and lender. To encourage all this, the committee recommends (1) Establish the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; (2) Increase the resources of the Export-Import Bank to increase its lending power; (3) Remove restrictions of the Johnson Act on our foreign loans; (4) Clear and prompt understanding on settlement by lend-lease obligations.

Our postwar international monetary system must be free of restrictive control; therefore, there must be exchange-rates agreements at levels to create a balanced condition in each country; to help do this; establish an international reserve of foreign currencies.

The committee believes that a postwar international conference should be called * * * to establish a general policy of reducing trade barriers, which would aid foreign and domestic businessmen in making

plans. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended. It would eliminate certain private practices as fixing world prices, division of markets, allocation of export quotas, etc. Restriction of other private practices mentioned, should be registered for vigilant consideration.

The need of American flag merchant shipping is recognized for national security and peace, and operation and construction subsidies recommended.

The above condensation gives but scant review of the research, hearings, consideration, comprehensiveness, and broad outlook found in the report, sustained by astute analysis and argument.

Down here, we are honored and pleased that our Congressman, W. M. COLMER, is chairman of this important committee, whose report to Congress deserves and will receive profound study and the most careful consideration. The committee deserves much credit for its very valuable work for postwar policies.

Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been following the sugar shortage program of the New Deal with interest and alarm. The Administration has been so inefficient in other fields of endeavor that I had misgivings when the Government took over the complete control of sugar in 1941. Once the New Deal obtained control of sugar it forgot the importance of proper production, distribution, and price incentive; but instead it directed its energies to political appointments. Thus a major problem vital to the war effort abroad and to the home front, was placed in the hands of inexperienced persons rather than calling into the service experienced and expert sugar producers and distributors to handle this very vital food product.

There is no use in dwelling on the mistakes that have brought on one of the most critical food dislocations in the history of our Nation, because that will not cure the shortage of sugar which now confronts the farmers and good processors. Public opinion ought to be brought to bear immediately upon the administration in a effort to have it appoint a man of ability to replace the present inefficient bureaucratic management of the sugar situation, and take immediate steps to procure certain supplies which could be made available to the United States. Delay in dealing intelligently and promptly with the problem will mean not only a critical shortage this year but a sugar famine next year.

The task of underwriting the present as well as the future sugar supply of this Nation is not one for inexperienced men to tamper with. There are men who have lived with the problem of sugar production and distribution over a period of many years who, if given the opportunity, could and would take hold of this problem, and relieve the situation before it is too late.

I live in and represent a fruit-growing area. This is no time, when the world is crying for food, to permit a group of bureaucratic incompetents to force the fruit growers and the housewives to see good fruit waste and rot for want of sugar to preserve it. Sugar can be obtained under a proper administration.

Atmosphere of "Hate" in White House Cleared by Truman, Says Observer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., May 30, 1945:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—ATMOSPHERE OF "HATE" IN WHITE HOUSE CLEARED BY TRUMAN, SAYS OBSERVER

(By Frank R. Kent)

In various publications there have appeared recently extended reviews of President Truman's "First Forty Days" in office. Almost unanimously these have reflected the feeling that he is functioning in a competent and highly encouraging manner. His Cabinet changes have been commended; his tax views indorsed; his steps toward coordination applauded; his reorganization plans approved; his clearheadedness admired.

But the most salutary thing achieved has not had quite the attention it deserves. It consists of an atmospheric change about the White House which has been noted by numerous observers, though not recognized for what it is by all.

What Mr. Truman has done is practically to clear the air of the hate with which for a long period it had been heavily saturated. The new President seems not to hate anyone very much, and no one—not even Republicans—appears to hate him at all.

It may be that in the course of time he will develop enemies and acquire aversions. It is inevitable that any President serving more than one term should do both. But, certainly, Mr. Roosevelt had more of each than any of his predecessors. Partly that was due to the fact that he had been President longer than anyone else, but partly also to the character of his policies and the flavor of his personality.

LENGTHY BLACK LIST

To be sure, he made friends as well as foes, but he did cherish grudges inordinately and his blacklist surpassed in bitterness and length any other. During his administrations there not only was very real hate between the two parties but there was besides intense factional, class, and individual bitterness.

In this administration this hate has largely disappeared. Not only does Mr. Truman seem to have no blacklist but the terrific antagonism between New Deal and anti-New Deal Democrats has diminished. There has been an increase of tolerance all along the line.

How long this will last no one can say, but it is refreshing and generally welcome at the moment. It is more than that; it is distinctly in the national interests.

The best illustration of the cleared air was Mr. Truman's invitation last week to ex-President Hoover and Mr. Hoover's prompt acceptance of the opportunity to discuss with the President food distribution and war relief, subjects upon which, by virtue of his experience, he is concededly the outstanding world authority. The Hoover invitation was followed by friendly, though general, invitations to Governor Dewey and ex-Governor Landon, the two other living Republican Presidential nominees.

But the Hoover visit was of real significance, as in his case a specific date had been fixed and his advice asked on specific subjects. And because, too, for 12 years Mr. Hoover's name had been high on the White House blacklist. After we got into the war, though he was always available, Mr. Hoover was never called into consultation nor permitted to make the kind of contribution to the war effort for which he was so clearly equipped.

Particularly was this omission notable in connection with food distribution and control. It is hard to contend that this vital business has not been badly managed. That two food administrators resigned, that the set-up was scathingly criticized by a Democratic investigating committee, and that last week the President changed the machinery and moved to bring about the coordination long demanded—these things constitute convincing evidence of trouble.

MUTUAL ESTEEM

To cap it all, Mr. Truman invites the hated Hoover to come down and advise with him about the food emergency. This is the more interesting as Mr. Hoover not only had been blacklisted for 12 years, but had been the favorite target for administration propagandists who never tired of repeating the libels that he was personally responsible for the last depression; that he forced veterans of the last war to sell apples on the streets; that he was a reactionary tool of the moneyed interests with no sympathy for the common man, and so forth.

No public man of our time has been more misrepresented and maligned. That after 12 years of this sort of thing, Mr. Truman should ask Mr. Hoover to the White House to talk of food and other things shows that he has no intention whatever of taking over the Roosevelt personal likes and dislikes. The Truman-Hoover conference seems to have been mutually agreeable and to have developed mutual esteem.

Whether it will go beyond that is doubtful, but at least it is encouraging to know that, for a while anyhow, the hating days are over, and that men such as Mr. Hoover, Senator Byrd, Senator Taft, Mr. James Farley, and others are no longer regarded in high administration circles as vicious or ignorant or both.

Perhaps, too, with the President making it clear that he does not feel that those not in accord with him politically are necessarily devoid of honor and destitute of shame, there may be a decrease in bitterness among all save those incurably sour New Deal products unable to flourish in any other soil. There is nothing so helpful as tolerance at the top.

Pfc John Randolph McKinney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH PETERSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding

feats of valor in this entire war is that of Pfc John Randolph McKinney, of Sylvania, Screven County, Ga., as related in a special news dispatch appearing in the Atlanta Journal of Monday, May 28, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent to place this article in the RECORD.

I am naturally proud that Private First Class McKinney is a citizen of one of the counties which I have the honor to represent in Congress. His almost superhuman achievements are such as to stir the imagination and thrill the heart of every American citizen. His family and his friends have every right to be proud of him and of the marvelous record that he is making in so effectively destroying the enemy. His dauntless courage and undying valor typifies the spirit with which the men in our armed forces are fighting our Nation's battles, and such fantastic feats as this should arouse each of us to an equal degree of patriotic effort in bringing this dreadful war to an early end so that these fine young men may again turn their faces homeward and be reunited with their families and loved ones.

The article above referred to is as follows:

SYLVANIA CYCLONE IN ACTION—GEORGIA FARM BOY KILLS 36 JAPS IN SUPERHUMAN, ONE-MAN STAND—PRIVATE FIRST CLASS MCKINNEY'S FEAT ON LUZON RIVALS SERGEANT YORK IN LAST WAR

(By Gerald R. Thorp)

WITH THE THIRTY-THIRD DIVISION IN NORTHERN LUZON, May 23.—Pfc John Randolph McKinney, slight, wiry Georgia farm boy, today became one of America's all-time war heroes when his buddies revealed that he had killed 36 Japanese in a single combat mission.

McKinney, blond, blue-eyed, 140-pounder, previously had knocked off a dozen Nips, so his total now stands at 48. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. D. H. McKinney, have a farm near Sylvania, Ga.

The 24-year-old southerner was with a task force of this veteran division's One Hundred and Twenty-third Infantry a few days ago. He had just gone to sleep in his pup tent after standing guard on the perimeter. What happened there is McKinney's own story, substantiated by the men who saw the Georgia cyclone in action:

"I was just about getting to sleep in my tent when I heard a noise. I thought it was some of my buddies and yelled, 'What the hell's wrong out there?'

"I happened to look at the entrance of the tent and saw two Nips out there hackin' at the tent with sabers. I crawled out the back and konked one of 'em over the head. That took care of him. Then I shot the other one.

"I saw the cover come off our machine gun a few yards away and thought it was one of our boys getting it ready for action. I ran over to help him, but it turned out to be a Nip. I had to shoot him, too.

"My ammunition was almost gone, so I started for the command post to get some. Two Japs tried to cut me off and I killed them. About that time I heard one of my buddies calling, saying he was hit. I went over to him and asked him if he had a rifle. He did, so I took it and fired what ammunition there was in it.

"I got another one from the tent and jumped into a hole with the machine gun. There were 60 or so Japs comin' across from a sandbar in the river, so I let go a couple of bursts and watched 'em drop."

HIT BY POLE

"Then I got hit on the head by a pole and all at once that hole got awful crowded. Ten or fifteen Japs piled in. Every one was sluggin' at me, but mostly they just hit each other. I managed to do a little shootin'. Some of 'em I just stroked over the head with my rifle. Later, I found out I had killed eight in and around the hole.

"I tried to drag the gun away but I couldn't quite make it. It wasn't light yet, so I ran for the tent and dug out all the rifles there and threw 'em in the bushes. The Japs were at the machine gun again, so I started firing. My M-1 jammed and I got another one outa the bushes and kept shootin', drivin' 'em away from the machine gun.

"The wounded man said he was losin' lots of blood. I called Red Barrette (Pfc Adolph Barrette, of Sheboygan, Mich.) and told him to put a tourniquet on the guy's arm."

COVERS RED

"Red had to go to the tent for a first-aid kit and the Japs were throwing lots of stuff at him. So I fired right over his back to keep 'em off while he got the kit. All the time Red was puttin' on the tourniquet this wounded fellow kept yellin' at me, asking me 'How'm I doin'?'

"After that, Red joined me and we knocked off some more with our M-1's. He got six himself. The Japs were about all gone then when a machine-gunner opened up from the beach. I fired a few times and killed him. Another one ran for the gun and I shot him. There was another Nip on the beach firing a knee mortar. He caught one of mine through the head.

"There was just one more Nip left. A guerrilla was chasin' him, cuttin' hunks of flesh out of the guy with his saber. It more or less looked to me like this guerrilla was playing with the Nip. I figured I might as well get him, too, so I did.

"Well, I guess that's everything. Maybe I left out somethin', but you know how it is when you're busy like that. It's kinda hard to remember all the details."

McKinney knew how to shoot long before he entered the Army in September 1942. He did his target practicing on the farm between chores. He has been overseas since May 9, 1944.

TO LEAVE FRONT

McKinney, shy and drawling, will be relieved of his hazardous duty immediately in accordance with an order from the Sixth Army Headquarters.

Capt. Harry Ice, Oklahoma City, Okla., all-American football player from the University of Missouri and commander of Company A of McKinney's outfit, added more details to the incredible story of the Georgian's one-man stand against the Japs.

McKinney was with a force operating on the Umiray River, on the east coast of Central Luzon. The Nips were continually sifting down the coast from the north but Ice's company had disposed of all of them, killing 228 and capturing 6 without having a man wounded.

Clad only in his shirt, shorts, and shoes, the Georgian was the main factor in stopping a suicidal banzai attack by more than 100 Japs. There were 13 Americans and a few guerrillas in the area. During the time he was performing his superhuman feat, the Japs were firing in a frenzy at the wraith-like figure who seemed to be everywhere at once.

When enemy fire dwindled to almost nothing, McKinney discovered that all the Japs in the attack were either dead or had fled. McKinney came out of the slaughter with only a slight scratch on his left ear.

When Nips first came into the area that morning they had hidden in civilian huts, killing several natives and bayonetting a few babies. The Nips wore native broad-brimmed hats and began their attack by howling and screaming.

"If Japs had advanced 10 more yards before McKinney went into action it would have been just too bad," said Captain Ice.

"It's hard to tell you much about McKinney," the captain added. "He's one of those boys who has always done his job."

Postmastership, Cleveland, Ohio

REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Mr. Guy R. Lucas to the office of postmaster of Cleveland, Ohio, was sent yesterday by the President to the Senate, and confirmed by that body on the same day, after Senator BURTON hurriedly made a unanimous consent request to consider the nomination. The swift action of the Senate came as a surprise to me. This post office is situated in the Twentieth Ohio District, which I have the honor to represent.

Upon learning early Wednesday morning that this nomination was contemplated, I endeavored to speak with the President, but was unable to do so. Wednesday morning, I sent a special delivery letter to the President, a copy of which will be appended to my remarks.

Upon hearing that the nomination was sent to the Senate, I immediately telephoned Senator MCKELLAR, chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, who, at the time, was presiding in the Senate, which was in session. I requested his office to have the Senator return my call. I then sent a letter to him requesting an opportunity to be heard before the committee when the qualifications of Mr. Lucas were to be considered. The letter did not reach Senator MCKELLAR while the Senate was in session. When the Senate adjourned, Senator MCKELLAR left the chair and returned my call. When I apprised him of the situation, he stated that if I had reached him in time, I would have had an opportunity to be heard before his committee. Time did not permit my reaching him earlier.

In my opinion, the President has been misled in this matter because the people who made the investigation have apparently not given him all the facts.

A thorough investigation of Mr. Lucas would have disclosed barriers to his selection.

Mr. Lucas has admitted activity in violation of United States Code, title 18, section 211—section 51, paragraph 3, Postal Laws and Regulations—which reads as follows:

No officer, clerk, or other person in the service of the United States shall, directly or indirectly, give or hand over to any other officer, clerk, or person in the service of the United States, or to any Senate or Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commisisoner, any money or other valuable thing on account of or to be applied to the promotion of any political object whatever.

The penalty statute for this offense reads as follows:

Whoever shall violate any provision of sections 208-211 of this title shall be fined not

more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 212.)

Another section of the criminal code reads as follows:

No person shall, in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by any officer or employee of the United States mentioned in section 208 of this title, or in any navy yard, fort, or arsenal, solicit in any manner whatever or receive any contribution of money or other thing of value for any political purpose whatever. (U. S. C., title 18, sec.209.)

Violation of which is also subject to penalty under section 212 just stated.

Any man who admitted activity in violation of the above referred to section 211 is not qualified to assume the duties of the high office of postmaster of Cleveland.

Moreover, if Mr. Lucas becomes postmaster, we will have the sordid spectacle of the person who admitted activity in violation of section 209 of the United States Code, title 18, by accepting political contributions, having been relieved of the office of postmaster in 1933 and the person who admitted activity in violation of section 211 of the Code, namely, making a political contribution in violation of the law, later being appointed and confirmed to the very same office of postmaster under Democratic administrations. Why was it better to give than to receive on this occasion?

This, in my opinion, casts an unsavory reflection upon the present Democratic administration.

The Postmaster General had promised to consult with me before any nomination to the office of postmaster of the city of Cleveland would be made, but I did not hear from the Postmaster General.

Since 1935 Mr. Lucas has been one of the five members of the Cleveland post-office cafeteria committee, which has complete charge of the operation of the cafeteria. Numerous postal employee unions have made complaints because of the inefficient operation of this cafeteria, with special reference to the high prices. I brought those complaints to the attention of the Post Office Department. Upon inquiry, I was informed that the post-office cafeteria commitee paid, for the purchase of meat, 35 percent in excess of the amount that was paid by other purchasers to the same packer. Mr. Lucas, as a member and secretary of this committee, to my knowledge, never raised his voice in protest. If Mr. Lucas had knowledge of this practice, he was derelict in his duty by failing to take action to correct it. If Mr. Lucas did not have knowledge of this practice, he was derelict in discharging his responsibility as a member of the cafeteria committee. Only after the unions registered their complaints was an investigation made by the Post Office Department, following which cafeteria prices were reduced 16 to 20 percent.

It is my information that Mr. Lucas had promised promotions to postal employees as a reward if they succeeded in obtaining my recommendation of him for postmaster. I believe promotions should be granted upon merit and outstanding ability.

These are some of the reasons why I am convinced that Mr. Lucas is not qualified to assume the duties of postmaster of Cleveland.

My remarks are not motivated by any feeling of vindictiveness because the long-established custom of honoring the recommendation of the Representative of the district in which the post office is situated has been disregarded. I am making these remarks so that my constituents may know that the nomination of Mr. Lucas and the confirmation which followed swiftly in the Senate were made without consultation with me, and that I disclaim all responsibility for the appointment of this man, whose record I consider disqualifies him for the position.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Word has been received by me that you plan to nominate for the office of postmaster in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Guy R. Lucas.

The Cleveland post office is located in the Twentieth Ohio District, which I represent. I have not been consulted, and I believe firmly that I should be consulted.

As far as Mr. Guy R. Lucas is concerned, I have information bearing upon his qualifications for this position, which might possibly eliminate him from any serious consideration. Therefore, I have requested an appointment with you at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

Selective Service as the Tide of War Turns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there was delivered to my office this morning an elaborately bound copy of the Third Report of the Director of Selective Service entitled "Selective Service as the Tide of War Turns," printed at the United States Government Printing Office.

The volume comprises 666 pages, is illustrated in a great many instances and is printed on machine-coated book paper.

I have today checked with the Government Printing Office and now disclose the following officially reported facts and figures:

Total number of copies ordered and printed for the Selective Service System for its distribution were 65,641.

Each bound volume weighs 2 pounds and 10 ounces.

The total number of copies printed required the use of 140,000 pounds of paper.

The total cost of printing and binding these volumes was approximately $45,000, with the following break-down: Cost of paper $10,000, cost of composition $17,800, and cost of binding $16,600.

I shall not speak of the printed contents of the volume, but those who receive copies can without question draw their own conclusions as to its alleged value as compared to the foregoing stated enormous cost of printing and binding the same.

Private industry of printing houses, newspapers, and so forth, in my district and in fact the country over are just not able to get sufficient paper stocks to carry on.

If this costly volume has been printed as a monument to General Hershey and the Selective Service System he and it are possibly entitled to this false honor at the expense of the taxpayers.

The American Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement relative to the organization of the American Veterans of World War II:

FELLOW COMRADES: The American Veterans of World War II was formed by veterans of World War II for veterans of this war, to assist in building a bigger and better United States, in reestablishing the veteran when he returns to civilian life, in getting jobs, looking after the welfare of the veteran's family, sponsoring education, and working for the greatest over-all benefits of the veteran of World War II.

ORGANIZATION

The American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) was established at a conference held in Kansas City, Mo., December 9 and 10, 1944. Independent veterans' groups from every section of the United States were in attendance and merged into one national group known as the AMVETS, with national headquarters at 1507 M Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Officers were elected and all members were directed to engage in a positive progressive program with the view of making the AMVETS the outstanding veterans' organization in the United States.

National commander: Elmo W. Keel, Washington, D. C.

Vice commanders: First, George E. Burke, St. Petersburg, Fla.; second, Rudolph Ruzicka, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Executive committee: William Blake, Buffalo, N. Y., George E. Burke, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Joseph Motta, Providence, R. I.; Floyd Cooper, Jr., Amarillo, Tex.; Jimmy Linn, Shreveport, La.; Col. E. E. Linsert (chairman, finance committee), New Orleans, La.; M. J. Perrino, Charlotte, N. C.; Thomas Bulman, Tucson, Ariz.; Edward Trudell, Boston, Mass.; Floyd Williams, Arlington, Va.; Edward Weisenberg, Bethlehem, Pa.

Finance officers: Col. E. E. Linsert, New Orleans, La.; Carl G. Freudenberg, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Judge advocate: T. Paul Moody, Los Angeles, Calif.

National executive secretary: Albert C. Geremia, Providence, R. I.

Public relations: Claude C. Morgan, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. Elmo W. Keel is national commander of the American Veterans of World War II; was

a master sergeant in the Air Corps on duty in the Burma-China area; was wounded and evacuated to the United States and received a medical discharge; is attending George Washington University, majoring in engineering. Mr. Keel is 30 years of age and prior to his entry into the armed service was employed as an industrial engineer. His home State is Virginia.

PROGRAM

Though present officers and members of the AMVETS consider themselves the trustees for members in the armed forces still in the service of their country, these men feel that there is an immediate need for a new veterans' organization which can best express the aims and purposes of the veterans of this war, and can concentrate its efforts on carrying such a program to completion. The present organization is so constituted that it may be revised before or after considerable demobilization, as necessity requires. National officers will be elected each year at the national convention, and at that time major policies will be discussed pending the convening of the first convention.

We want it understood that the AMVETS will take a definite stand on well considered and worthy propositions that has for its purpose the furtherance and protection of the veterans' interest.

We, of course, do not know all the answers as yet, and it follows that as a young and growing organization we have not had the opinions of a sufficiently large group of men to form a consensus of opinion on all the momentous problems with which we are faced.

We are seeking the cooperation of employers in exercising the utmost tolerance and understanding when they are faced with the problem of employing returning veterans.

It should be the desire of every returning veteran when he takes his place in civil life to affiliate himself with every worth while endeavor that has for its purpose the good of the entire community, and by so doing the veterans of World War II will demonstrate to the community that the things for which they fought shall receive their attention, interest, and cooperation.

The national headquarters contemplate a monthly publication which will bring to you and all veterans the progress of your organization and the activities of the State and local groups. We, therefore, shall appreciate your cooperation in making this publication a newsy and living chronicle of events transpiring in your locality.

Veterans, let's all stand and work together so that in the end we may all take some satisfaction in the fact that we made some contribution to a better Americanism.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP

Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the American Veterans of World War II who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, WAVES, SPARS, Army Nurse Corps, the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve of the Armed Forces of the United States, or our allies, on or after September 16, 1940, and who served during some period between this date and the date of cessation of hostilities. Those who are qualified for membership by date of service under limitations indicated above, who have been separated from active service, must have been honorably discharged or must have been separated from active service under honorable conditions, in order to be eligible for membership.

Those members who have not been discharged shall be known as members at large.

DUES

Annual dues are set for $4 per year. Members of the armed forces are members at large. Their annual dues are $1.

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Preamble

We, the American Veterans of World War II, fully realizing our responsibility to our country, State, and Nation—associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; to promote the cause of eternal peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy and Americanism; to perpetuate the friendships and associations of the great war of liberation, and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance.

Article I

The name of this organization shall be "American Veterans of World War II."

Article II

The aims and purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all of its inhabitants.

2. To encourage, in keeping with the policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace.

3. To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility, and to develop leadership, for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

4. To aid in promoting a lasting peace among nations predicated upon honesty, justice, and understanding of mutual rights, duties, and problems.

5. To help unify divergent groups in the overall interest of American democracy.

6. To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a democracy with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship.

7. To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veteran organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II veterans. We feel strong bonds of friendship for the men of our country who fought in the First World War and the previous wars of our history. We recognize and appreciate the unity, interest, and strength they lend to all movements for veteran welfare. In our common efforts to achieve benefits for veterans and to protect the rights of our comrades still under arms, we are eager to cooperate.

8. To insure the orderly return of the veteran to civilian life by protecting his rights as an individual while he is still in uniform.

9. To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran by maintenance of employment services, sponsoring educational opportunities, and providing counsel, for insurance, housing, recreation, and personal problems.

10. To act as a liaison agent between the veteran and the Government.

11. To seek community planning for the adequate care of all disabled veterans and the general welfare and rehabilitation of all veterans.

12. To provide an organization to encourage fellowship among all veterans of World War II.

13. To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II fought or served to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

Article III. Organization

SECTION 1. The American Veterans of World War II shall be organized with a national headquarters, State and Territorial departments, and under these departments, local posts. Intermediate administrative groups may be created by the national executive committee where such action is deemed advisable.

SEC. 2. The national headquarters shall be composed of officers hereinafter described; one department representative from each department, and such other members who by the nature of their work are serving the national group. It shall be the duty of the national headquarters to advance the cause of the American Veterans of World War II, carry out their aims and purposes, provide the machinery of organization, represent its members in national affairs, and specify the national policies and plans of the entire organization.

SEC. 3. The States and departments shall be set up in a manner similar to the national group and shall be composed of officers and representatives chosen by post delegates to a department convention. It shall be the duty of the department to aid in organization and maintenance of local posts and to carry out the policies and plans delegated to it by the national headquarters, and to adhere to the provisions of this constitution.

SEC. 4. Local posts shall be chartered by the national headquarters and administered by the department headquarters, but shall be governed locally by their own officers chosen according to its constitution and by-laws. The policies, activities, and actions of the local posts must never be at variance with those prescribed by the national constitution.

Article IV. Membership

Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the American Veterans of World War II who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, WAVES, SPARS, Army Nurse Corps, the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve of the armed forces of the United States; or of our allies; on or after September 16, 1940, and who served during some period between this date and the date of cessation of hostilities. Those who are qualified for membership by date of service under limitations indicated above, who have been separated from active service, must have been honorably discharged or must have been separated from active service under honorable conditions, in order to be eligible for membership.

Those members who have not been discharged shall be known as members at large.

Article V. National Convention

SECTION 1. A national convention shall be held annually at a time and place fixed by the previous convention for the purpose of choosing a commander; first, second, and third vice commanders; finance officer; judge advocate; chaplain; and adjutant. It will have the further purpose of deliberating upon legislative matters and matters of policy, including any changes to this constitution or the national bylaws.

SEC. 2. The members of the convention shall be made up of department delegates. Each department shall be entitled to five delegates. For the first convention under this constitution, each post shall be entitled to one delegate. The same number of alternates may be chosen. The departments shall choose delegates at a convention at least 2 weeks prior to the national convention.

SEC. 3. Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. The vote of an absent delegate may be cast by the alternate chosen by the delegates of that department. Alternates shall have all the rights and privileges of the delegates, except the vote.

SEC. 4. The department representative to the executive committee shall be chosen at the department convention and by such election shall become one of the delegates to the national convention for that department, and shall head its list of delegates.

SEC. 5. Sixty percent of the voting delegates shall constitute a quorum.

Article VI. Officers

SECTION 1. In addition to the officers elected by the national convention, there shall be

appointed by the commander, with the approval of the executive committee, an historian, service officer, chaplain, surgeon general, public relations officer, and national executive secretary.

SEC. 2. All the elective officers shall be members of the executive committee, but the commander will vote only in the event of a tie.

SEC. 3. Elective officers and the departmental representatives of the executive committee will convene immediately following the close of the national convention at which time the old officers will retire, and the appointment and approval of the officers to be appointed will take place. Commanders and vice-commanders shall not succeed themselves in office.

Article VII. National Executive Committee

SECTION 1. Between national conventions, the administrative power shall be vested in the national executive committee, which shall be composed of the national commander, vice-commanders and other elective officers, and one national executive committeeman and one alternate from each department, to be elected as such department shall determine; the alternate to act only in the absence of the committeeman.

SEC. 2. The term of such national executive committeemen and alternates shall be three (3) years. The term of office of each national executive committeeman and alternate shall commence immediately upon the adjournment of the national convention next ensuing after their election and shall end at the adjournment of the third next succeeding annual convention. At the first national convention only, the sixteen (16) departments with largest membership shall introduce their national executive committeemen for a three (3) year period; the sixteen next largest departments shall introduce their national executive committeemen for two (2) years of service; and the remaining national executive committeemen will be introduced to serve for a one (1) year period only.

Article VIII. Department Organization

SECTION 1. Each State or Territorial area of the United States shall constitute a department, which shall be patterned along the lines of the national headquarters. The department will have its own executive committee and will maintain its own convention, to be held not less than 2 weeks before the annual national convention at which time it will choose delegates to the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The departments shall be chartered when application has been made to the national headquarters and approved by a vote of two-thirds of the executive committee.

SEC. 3. The departments shall have the authority to create intermediate administrative groups for the handling of the local posts should they deem such action advisable.

Article IX. Local Posts

SECTION 1. Local posts may be formed by any ten (10) eligible individuals by making application to its local department, and if there be no department, directly to the national headquarters. If the department approves, it shall be forwarded to the national headquarters and a charter may be issued upon the approval of the executive committee and signed by the national commander and national adjutant.

SEC. 2. Local posts are subject to the jurisdiction of the national headquarters and the department headquarters, but shall be allowed to use their own initiative except where their actions conflict with the principles and practices of the organization. They shall be named for gecgraphical locations or for a veteran killed in World War II, and if there is more than one in that district, then they shall be numbered.

Article X. Finances

SECTION 1. All finances of the American Veterans of World War II shall be under the control of the finance officer, who shall make an annual report at the national convention. Revenue may be derived from annual dues and other sources approved by the executive committee. Regulations of annual dues shall be by a majority vote of the delegates in annual convention.

SEC. 2. An annual budget shall be submitted for approval at the first annual meeting of the executive committee. It shall be prepared by the retiring finance officer, who shall have received departmental budgets from the other retiring officers and shall have consolidated the same. In the event that the budget is not approved a finance committee consisting of five retiring members of the executive committee shall be appointed by the new national commander.

SEC. 3. Each local post shall remit annually to the national headquarters the sum of $2 for each member of the post, and remit annually to the department headquarters the sum of $1 for each member of the post. The post shall retain the balance of the annual membership fee. The annual membership fee for each member shall not be less than the sum of $4.

Article XI. Discipline

SECTION 1. Disciplinary rules relating to the post will be prescribed by the departments.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee after notice and hearing before a subcommittee, may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of any department for any good and sufficient cause to it appearing. Procedure for such action will be prescribed by the judge advocate.

SEC. 3. In the event of such action the national executive committee is empowered to take over the operation of the department, but is bound by the constitution and bylaws thereof. At the next department convention a new department must be selected to carry on the work of the department.

Article XII

Any member in good standing may change his post or department, and may join a new post without paying annual dues, upon proof of his previous good standing.

Post-VE-Day Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1945.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned are anxious to know the policy you intend to follow after VE-day in carrying out the powers given to you under the lend-lease law.

When lend-lease extension was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we proposed amendments which would have limited the postwar use of lend-lease. When these were defeated we refused to vote for the extension of lend-lease, and on March 8 filed a minority report urging that Congress should not "extend the lend-lease power, administration, and practices into the postwar period." In this report we quoted President Roosevelt, who said "lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply. It should end with the war," and testimony, before our committee, of Lend-Lease Administrator Crowley and Secretary of War Stimson to the same effect.

A few days after this report, we five agreed with lend-lease officials upon the wording of an amendment which we were assured would effectively prohibit the use of lend-lease as a postwar measure, but permit the orderly and efficient liquidation of war supply contracts already made with foreign governments. This amendment was then unanimously approved by our committee and overwhelmingly adopted in the House.

The exception, in the postwar prohibition, permitting sale of war supplies no longer necessary for our defense, was attacked in the Senate as permitting a loophole for the postwar use of lend-lease. An amendment attempting to strike out this exception was defeated by a vote of 39–39. You cast your vote as Vice President against this amendment, and signed as both Vice President and President the lend-lease extension bill. Because of this historic series of events you have a peculiarly intimate knowledge of the legislative intent involved in the statutory limitations on postwar lend-lease. The undersigned, having first approved and supported the precise language of this limitation, feel an especial interest in its administration.

The amendment adopted permits only agreements for the furnishing of defense articles, etc., "for use in the prosecution of the present war." Since May 8 the only present war is with Japan. We, therefore, believe that since your announcement of May 8 no new agreements can be made except with countries at war with Japan. The French, Belgian, and Dutch agreements provide for payment in dollars for any war supplies already contracted for that "are no longer necessary for the prosecution of the war." (See art. III.) The only war now being prosecuted is against Japan and therefore except for articles which are necessary for the prosecution of the Japanese war, the three governments should begin to pay in dollars for articles and services received after May 8. Even though some of this may be convenient or helpful for the Japanese war, it sohuld not be furnished under the lend-lease no-pay pattern, unless it is absolutely necessary for fighting the Japanese.

We believe the same principle should be applied to all lend-lease.

It was clearly the intention of Congress to legislate the interpretation we have stated. We realize the great postwar needs of many of our allies and believe that we should make mutually beneficial agreements to help meet these needs, but not under lend-lease. We appreciate that the policing of Germany is an aftermath of this war which is in part our obligation, but lend-lease should not be used for this purpose.

Holding these views as Congressmen, we are anxious to know your views as Chief Executive. While we know that you are limited to the powers given you by law, we also know that it is not necessary that you exercise every conceivable bit of power conveyed by law to "lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of" the property of the people of the United States.

We feel confident that you will follow the wisest policy for which you have clear authority in law. Your policy on post-VE-day lend-lease has been obscured, rather than explained, by the combined effect of your own statements, those of Under Secretary of State Grew, and Lend-Lease Administrator Crowley. There may have been sound political and diplomatic reasons for this confusion during the past few weeks. We know that this is a difficult problem, involved with many other problems. The time has come, however, when decisions must be made. In the field of foreign affairs we do not wish to intervene in matters that are your responsibility under the Constitution. In the

field of congressional relations, we feel justified in offering our views. If you seek loopholes in the lend-lease law to extend your power to act without consulting Congress, we feel this would be disastrous. If, under the guise of aid for the Japanese war, you furnish postwar help to France, Britain, and Russia, we five, and many Members of Congress, will feel we have been fooled. If, on the other hand, you limit lend-lease to the present war and come to Congress with the vast and complicated problems we still face, aside from the Japanese war, after VE-day, we pledge you our loyal support.

Will you let us have a statement of the policy you intend to apply as to lend-lease after May 8?

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD.
JOHN M. VORYS.
KARL E. MUNDT.
BARTEL J. JONKMAN.
LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Another Example of Maladministration in the War Dairy Food Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from the War Food Administration in regard to the allocation of tin plate for filled milk:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 27, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REID: This is in reply to your letter of April 16. We have been unable to locate the letter which the War Production Board reported was forwarded to us. We are sorry if the delay has inconvenienced you.

Since 1942 the allocations of steel to the filled-milk industry have been established on the basis of the 1942 pack except for the current year the restriction on the use of steel has been lifted as was the case with condensed and evaporated milk.

Following are our estimates of the consumption of tin plate for filled milk:

Year:	*Short tons*
1940	5,519
1941	5,510
1942	3,870
1943	3,483
1944	3,676
1945	4,044

We estimate evaporated milk production in 1945 to be 110 percent of 1944 and have applied this same increase in this instance.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Let us analyze this situation as far as skim milk is concerned in the United States in general, and in Wisconsin in particular. The OPA sued the powdered skim-milk producers of Wisconsin for an alleged overceiling charge on powdered skim when the product had not had a dollars-and-cents ceiling price put on it. They not only harassed, persecuted, prosecuted, and sued these Wisconsin co-ops but they also collected from them as well.

There is at the present time a suit pending wherein the OPA has sued one co-op, and it is to apply later to the other co-ops, for an overcharge on condensed skim reputed to be twenty-three one-hundredths of a cent per pound. This is really a small part of a cent per quart overcharge for the skim milk per quart.

While all these ridiculous performances have been going on that have been harmful to the war dairy food program, the same War Food Administration has been allocating over 52,000,000 pounds of strategic material to can skim milk. Evidently when a little cottonseed oil is injected into the can and added to the skim milk, the skim milk then has a more favorable position. The product after it is manufactured cannot be legally shipped interstate. The Supreme Court upheld this law again in October 1944.

In the Agricultural appropriation bill for next year $1,300,000 was added to the bill to hire another $1,300,000 worth of bureaucrats to ration cream and milk under Order No. 97.

The WFA has enough men on the pay roll now working on other orders that could be transferred and still be beneficial to the war dairy food program.

While the OPA persecutes the producers of skim-milk products, the WFA takes over the cream and fluid-milk groups, and allocates greater and greater amounts of tin plate to make more of the concotion known as filled milk.

A ceiling is put on the production of foreign-type cheeses. Golf balls are evidently more important than food products under the present set-up.

One had to get down on bended knee to get enough tin plate to repair a corner cheese factory, while the filled-milk people were getting thousands of tons of tin plate to can a product with a couple of cents worth of skim milk in it.

If one agency is to handle these food problems it is hoped that the agency selected will use more judgment and fairness in handling the dairy food program, than has been exhibited by the OPA or the WFA.

Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Louanne Wilder:

IWO JIMA

A little speck in God's great ocean
And yet it causes great emotion
When we think of our marines
Fighting on those far-off scenes;
We owe them all our deep devotion.

We think of how "we knew them when"
The fighting urge was just a yen;
When they were spending time in training,
Lots of laughs and more complaining!
I wish they all might laugh again!

They joined the corps with so much pride;
Then came the months at oceanside;
That's not the place for making hay!
So they headed for old L. A.
Trying their best to get a ride.

It took some time to get acquainted,
But when they did the town was painted!
You always knew when they would land,
The "situation was well in hand";
The IV–F's swooned and the women fainted.
The USO's took on a gleam
Whenever they'd walk upon the scene;
And everywhere you looked you'd see,
That famous "spearhead with the V"
On many a sleeve of forest green.

Then the orders—and, as I remember,
It was in the beginning of September;
They bade farewell to us at home,
And started out, the seas to roam,
To kindle the fire that was still an ember.

That fire soon raged against the Japs
From little-known places on world-wide maps.
They lingered a while in old Hawaii,
Some at Oahu, some at Maui;
Counting the time 'til they'd spring their traps.

Then suddenly there came to view,
News of a place we little knew;
The blazing headlines told the story
Of how our friends were making glory.
Soon they'd be raising the Red, White, and Blue.

The 19th of February in '45;
Our memory will keep that date alive,
For on that date we first discovered,
That the trap had been uncovered;
They were out for Japs, Division Five.

With eager eyes we scanned the news;
Of course, we knew the Japs would lose;
But nevertheless, we watched and waited
With eager hearts and breath abated;
Wondering how many friends we'd lose.

With unleashed fury they plunged the knife,
Sharpened by vengeance, despair, and strife;
There ensued our history's fiercest battle;
That resembled a sea of slaughtered cattle;
But they shortened immeasurably Tokyo's life.

"In Flanders Field, the popies grow,"
But what is there on the shores of Iwo?
No brilliant blossoms to scent the air,
And yet we know that God looks there
On cold, white crosses, row on row.

We'll never know the names of some,
And so throughout the years to come
They'll ever lie in peaceful slumber,
Marked not by name, but just a number;
Yet living in the hearts at home.

—*Louanne Wilder.*

Bretton Woods Bank and Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Charles S. Dewey, former Member of Congress from Illinois:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1945.*

Hon. JESSE WOLCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is with pleasure I respond to your inquiry as to my present

attitude regarding the so-called Bretton Woods bank and fund as proposed in a bill containing sundry amendments agreed to by the Treasury and all but three members of the Banking and Currency Committee and recently reported by that committee to the House of Representatives.

As you are aware, I took a most active interest while a Member of Congress in the matter of postwar international economic and financial collaboration. At the time the plan for an International Clearing Union with its novel feature of a new international currency called the Bancor was introduced by Lord Keynes of England and a counter-proposal known as the International Stabilization Fund was offered by our own Treasury Department, I, too, offered a plan for a financial institution. That institution contained many of the featurees existing in your committee's bill as amended for the creation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These features were supplemented by the powers for short and intermediate term financing of foreign credits provided by the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

My interest in foreign trade, which is aided when world currencies are fairly stable, goes back some 20 years. It should be remembered that World War I left in its wake the same type of demands of rehabilitation and currency stabilization that face the world today. I recall vividly, and as an agent in putting into effect the Stabilization Plan for the Government of Poland, the work and deep study of such experienced individuals as Gov. Benjamin Strong, of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Montague Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, and Governor Moreau, of the Bank of France. With them were engaged the heads of 11 other central banks of issue. Their work and the practical knowledge gained should be given careful consideration.

In facing current problems of currency stabilization, let it be remembered that experience teaches that the providing of easy loans or the making available of dollars to foreign countries will not in themselves stabilize their currencies or domestic economies. This method was tried in 1919 when the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., as agent for the British Government, used dollars provided by the United States Treasury in an attempt to hold sterling exchange at a fixed rate with the dollar. Nearly three billion of Government funds were employed in this manner together with an additional sum of another $3,000,000,000 of private credits for stabilization and related purposes of the British and other European allies. The result was that exchange rates for nearly all European currencies were held far higher in their relation to the dollar than was justified by the economic conditions of respective countries, and these countries made many purchases they could not really afford.

The whole situation culminated in 1920. As a result of our loans and credits our exports increased to an all-time high putting such a demand upon our reduced supplies that prices soared. Then the credits became exhausted, no more loans were forthcoming. The pegs were pulled. Prices collapsed here and the artificially maintained values of foreign currencies collapsed abroad. Our money was lost and the whole job had to be recommenced. The history of the twenties was a struggle back to sound economies and stable currency. In this later period also we made the mistake of lending our dollars too freely and with too little care.

When the Bretton Woods plan was presented, I was opposed to the so-called stabilization fund for the reason I feared the dollars contained therein were not properly safeguarded and could be too easily withdrawn with the same unfortunate results that followed our efforts at stabilization in 1919 and again in the late twenties. In principle I approved of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development because I thought, with good management, it could be made a sound and useful mechanism for foreign loans.

The amendments which the Banking and Currency Committee in cooperation with the Treasury have approved give notice to one and all as to how and for what purpose dollars in the fund are to be used. There may be occasions when this red light will not be observed but if these occasions occur too frequently I presume that the Congress might deem it advisable to close this thoroughfare entirely. This right is reserved under the terms of the agreements and one of the new amendments provides a full review of the question every 2 years.

The new section in the act, permitting the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to make long term stabilization loans is all to the good. This permits governments to develop plans, and obtain long term loans to put them into effect, under which their national economy can be developed upon a sound basis. The temptation to run to the "fund" to obtain dollars for any purpose, while the "obtaining is good" will thereby be easier to control if the management is competent and courageous.

There has been considerable discussion as to the advisability of having a single board of directors direct the policies of both the fund and the bank instead of having two separate boards as originally provided. One of the amendments goes part of the way toward a merger by providing a single United States governor for both institutions. Proponents of two boards take the grounds that short and long term credits are of an entirely different nature and should be dealt with separately. On the other hand in so complicated a question as currency stabilization many short term factors are governed by long term policies, and in setting up comprehensive stabilization plans for any country better results might be obtained, if one group had the over-all picture rather than having the problem divided into two parts, each being dealt with separately. There will be many border-line cases. This is one of the questions the Senate Committee may wish to consider further. It is not the sort to debate on the floor of the House.

Of course nothing in this life is perfect, but it is my belief that the long and careful consideration of the fund and bank by the Banking and Currency Committee has produced good results. Further consideration in the Senate may bring out points that the Conference will wish to adopt. However, as it has now been amended and reported to the House, if I was still a Member of the Congress, I would vote in favor of H. R. 3314.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES S. DEWEY.

Presbyterians Oppose Peace of Vengeance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 31, 1945:

PRESBYTERIANS OPPOSE PEACE OF VENGEANCE

MINNEAPOLIS, May 30.—The One Hundred and Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States today opposed isolationism, vengeance in peace settlements, and peacetime military conscription.

The assembly adopted the comprehensive report covering both international relations and domestic problems prepared by the standing committee on social education and action.

The report warned against imperialism under the guise of self-defense and recommended justice free from vengeance and vindictiveness in the United States' treatment of Japan and Germany. The report also recommended treatment of the defeated enemy should include these elements:

"Essentials of economic wellbeing, territorial integrity, and political stability for both these nations.

"Encouragement of reeducation of the German and Japanese people through strengthening the constructive forces within them."

The assembly reaffirmed its conviction that "action upon a postwar policy of peacetime military conscription should be deferred until after the war" and expressed hope this country would "use its good offices for international agreement on elimination of national peacetime military conscription."

Voluntary Recruitment of Army and Navy Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is good news that the War Department has withdrawn its request for legislation to draft nurses, and admits it is getting good results from the voluntary recruitment campaign. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 28, 1945. It is gratifying to have the position presented therein vindicated:

THE NURSES HAVE NOT LAGGED BEHIND

President Roosevelt's request to Congress to draft nurses for military service and the subsequent misunderstanding and misinformation have created the impression that nurses have failed to volunteer for war service.

Actually, the record of Army and Navy nurses for voluntary enlistment is extraordinary. The record for the Army Nurse Corps shows that there were 955 members in 1940. As of today, it has been expanded to more than 46,000 members. These are all volunteers. The Navy Nurse Corps is close to filling its quota of 11,500 members. These, too, are volunteers. Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, author of the Bolton bill creating the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, has pointed out that "a higher percentage of nurses has volunteered for military service than any other skilled or professional group, with the possible exception of doctors. Seventy-five thousand of our 274,405 active graduate, registered nurses have applied for service. Fifty-seven thousand of these are or have been serving in the Army or Navy. This glorious record of voluntary service should be recognized by the War Department and the American public."

The War Department, which insisted upon the draft, delayed too long to authorize its Medical Department to assign a bare mini-

mum of personnel to the recruiting drive. Volunteers of the American Red Cross are relied on for recruiting and processing. Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, a physician who has a vast experience with Chinese troops, asks, "How do we know the voluntary system has failed, since it hasn't had a chance to work? The War Department has reason to explain why it has given little support and no appropriation to the nurse-recruitment drive while implying through its demand for a draft that the voluntary method has failed. On the other hand, to secure less than 100,000 Wacs, the Army has spent more than $3,000,000 of Government funds for publicity and advertising; more than $10,000,000 have been contributed by generous advertisers throughout the Nation for the same purposes; and some 3,800 personnel are assigned to recruiting duty."

Certainly no one has a right to conclude from recent discussion of the draft that nurses are laggards. Advocates of the draft of nurses made no such unjust charge, but have been led to believe that voluntary enlistment, splendid as it has been, would not produce the nurses needed by the Army and Navy. Perhaps it wouldn't, but the record of nurses at Anzio, Corregidor, in France, Germany, India, China—wherever our troops are—is a record of daily heroism by nurses who chose to be where they are. No law compelled them.

The to-do over the nurse draft has taken attention from many things which civilians can do to make it easier for nurses to enter Army or Navy service. For one thing, civilians can relieve some of the home-front pressure on nurses by relaxing demands for private special nursing and by organizing such plans as that adopted in Hartford, Conn., where every application for a "special" must be reviewed by a committee of doctors. Hospital authorities can help by insisting that special nurses be available for ward duty whenever the care of their patients boils down to arranging flowers, reading aloud, or playing cribbage. Thoughtful community planning for the dwindling resources of medical care will be necessary anyway.

Obviously, the first consideration is to get nurses to our sick and wounded men. If the draft is needed to accomplish that, particularly when mounting Pacific casualties strain our resources to the limit, we must accept that fact. Nevertheless, the public is entitled to ask why nurses, who have volunteered, in proportion to their numbers, far beyond the record of any other group, were prematurely singled out for conscription, unless that policy was to be part of a draft for al women war workers, Wacs, Waves, Spars, and all the rest. Unless that is the intention, our heroic nurses have good reason to feel that American officialdom, at any rate, has not understood one of the outstanding voluntary achievements of this war.

Also included is an interesting letter a friend has received from one of our Minnesota nurses now in Europe. It reveals in vigorous terms why the Army had a nurse shortage—faulty distribution and inefficient use of the nurses it had:

A GENERAL HOSPITAL IN EUROPE,
May 6, 1945.

MY DEAR ———: * * *

At last it seems the end of war in Europe is here—and it's a blessing it is. I believe none of the stories are exaggerated that you're reading now. We have seen some of the returned P. W.'s, and they are truly pitiful. Even Allied soldiers fared poorly. We've had some patients who were captured as late as the 23d or 25th of March in that air-borne deal, and they look terrible. However, with the millions of slave laborers to feed, political prisoners and Allied soldiers also to provide for, it's no wonder they starved when you hear how our air force ruined their transportation. Thank God for our Air Force.

We have no idea about our return home. Don't know the policy of the War Department, but we certainly should have a high priority as far as medical units go for a return trip to the States. Just think—it will soon be 3 years. Little did we think we would be gone this long time. Three bronze stars.

There was a fine article on drafting the nurses in Time not long ago. It certainly hit the pertinent issues—such as treating us like a boarding school, etc. I think the whole thing is faulty distribution. There are 300 nurses sitting in one spot right now who have never worked on the continent. Some of them have been there for 3 months. And on the other hand—girls up in the front in evacuation hospitals some days work 14 hours. It doesn't make sense, and then they wonder why we discourage girls from joining the Army.

At one of the busiest hospitals in Paris they have a nurse on nights all the time on duty in the quarters for the sole purpose of checking the nurses in at night. I believe I would take a court martial before I would do that job. These are just a few facts—and don't hesitate to tell them.

Kaye tells me they are unionizing the nurses in Los Angeles. I'll bet that will soon be a mess.

Went to the opera in Antwerp—heard Madame Butterfly. She was lovely but had poor support.

The next letter will be from a peaceful Europe, I'm sure.

Love,

Jo.

Not New But Somewhat Startling

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the apparent greed of those who, especially in wartime, should set us an example of unselfish devotion and whole-hearted service in the interests of our country, again crops up in the administration's official family.

The people have become accustomed to the money-making proclivities of Henry Wallace and Harry Hopkins, who have long profited through the publication of articles and books containing information which in part came to them only because of their official positions. Few of us, however, ever thought that E. R. Stettinius, Jr., reputedly wealthy, the head of the conservative State Department, would follow in their footsteps.

We have been told that in the 4 years which ended on March 31 last, lend-lease cost the United States $38,097,797,000, but the people generally have never been advised as to how that money had been spent; as to the articles which were purchased; nor as to who received them, nor when. It would seem that as long as the people furnished the money for lend-lease, paid the expenses and the compensation not only of Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State, but of a multitude of employees in that Department, that if there was information worthwhile which the people should have, that the Department, under his direction, should have made it available to the public without charge and as an official publication. But such seems not to have been the policy of Mr. Stettinius, for this morning to the desk of Congressmen comes the announcement of the Macmillan Co., publishers, that Mr. Stettinius has written a book, and we are told that it is available to each of us who cares to send on the sum of $3.

The Macmillan Co. letter reads as follows:

OVER $200 PER PERSON SPENT ON LEND-LEASE IN UNITED STATES—ARE WE GETTING OUR MONEY'S WORTH?

You want the facts and figures on what your dollars have done in lend-lease and on what is coming to us in return.

Lend-lease, Weapon for Victory, gives you the facts on one of the most ambitious foreign policies ever undertaken by the United States. Edward Stettinius, Jr., shows you the over-all picture of the war of supply, of an organization which has encircled the globe—how it is set up and how it works, what happens to the goods that your dollars have bought, and how they influence military action on all fronts.

But this is more than a report on facts and figures. It tells the stories of individuals and dramas in this large-scale operation and cooperation of the British Commissioner in New York, who in the early hours of the day France fell, took over $500,000,000 worth of French contracts in the name of his government, on his own responsibility; of Wellington, New Zealand, where earthquake damage remained unrepaired in the summer of 1942 while supplies of cement, lumber, and civilian labor were reserved for reverse lend-lease projects for United States forces.

This is a book you won't want to miss, because your dollar is involved. We enclose a card for your convenience in ordering.

Very truly yours,

THE MACMILLAN CO.,
Mail Service Department.

Enclosed with the letter is an illustrated 12¼ by 13¼-inch, 2-page, 2-color circular, advertising the book which, it is said, contains 60 illustrations, giving a vivid, pictorial history of lend-lease. There are 7 graphic maps, 4 in full color; 13 graphic charts giving statistics in picture form; and 40 official photographs—note that word "official"—which include pictures of the men behind lend-lease operations and of lend-lease supplies in action on all fronts.

The worst thing about the New Deal and its official family is not the national bankruptcy—and I will say nothing about the war—but the moral bankruptcy which it has brought about. Under the New Deal not only have our people been told by word and by example that the Nation owes them a living; not only have racketeers and loafers been rewarded in return for their political support, but some of those at the head of that administration who should have given the people examples of integrity, of faithfulness to the public service, have set an example for the youth of the land which, whatever may have been its purpose, will tend to destroy thrift, the ambition to work, unselfishness, and single, wholehearted patriotic devotion on the

part of public servants to the interests of their country.

How low the official morale of the country's public servants has fallen is indicated by the fact that some in high positions use the facilities of their positions to further their own personal interests.

Many of us are relying upon President Truman to restore to the Nation that standard of integrity which existed before the coming of the New Deal.

Justice Versus Vengeance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 1, 1945:

JUSTICE VERSUS VENGEANCE

Plans for trials of German and Italian war criminals have not yet jelled sufficiently to give anybody a clear preview of what the trials are going to be like.

It is known, however, that Supreme Court Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson is our representative in setting up the arrangements for the trials. It is evidently in the cards too, that whatever tribunals are created will be run by the Allied governments. Allied prosecutors, naturally, will press the cases against the German and Italian war criminals. Whether the defendants will be permitted counsel of their own choosing, or be given attorneys appointed by the war crimes court, we don't know.

While the plans go forward, a good deal of solemn talk comes from Allied sources to the effect that the war criminals are to be given "stern justice" only; that no vengeance or punishment for revenge's sake is sought.

The kind of trials described above may be the kind of trial these Germans and Italians, and later the Jap leaders, should get. We're not talking about the right or wrong of that just now. But trials of this kind will not produce what is generally understood as justice. They will produce vengeance for the Allies in each case where a defendant is convicted.

To afford what is commonly understood as justice, these trials would have to be held before neutral judges, with both the Allies and the Axis defendants introducing all the evidence they wished, and with the judges solely concerned with deciding the cases impartially.

That is to say that the main war-crimes court would have to be made up of the Lord Chief Justice, or whatever his title is, of—some people are not going to like this—Eire (southern Ireland), plus the Chief Justices of Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal. All these countries were neutral throughout the German war. The court would have to sit, too, in some neutral country.

Justice Jackson would then function as chief prosecuting attorney for the United States, along with prosecuting attorneys from Britain, Russia, France, and any other countries wanting to press charges against any Germans or Italians for what they did during the war. The Axis defendants, of course, would have their own attorneys.

Such trials would conform to the general conception of the meaning of the word "justice." The trials now being planned will produce vengeance or punishment, not justice.

That may be entirely O. K. But let's call these things by their right names. Let's not dress them up in words designed to paint them as something they aren't.

It may be that these trials, in which the Allies will be both judges and prosecutors, will eventually bring into existence a new rule of war—namely, that to lose a war is a crime in itself, and that the leaders of any nation which loses a war are automatically to be "tried" by the winners, solemnly found guilty of having been war criminals, and executed or given long prison terms at hard labor.

NEW CONCEPTION OF WAR CRIMES

That will be something new in war customs—or something as old as the pre-Christian habit of parading conquered chiefs before the people and then executing them—but it may be all to the good.

It won't be "justice" as most people understand the word. But it may have the effect of discouraging pugnacious national leaders here and there from hauling their countries into wars. If some future Hitler, Mussolini or Tojo knew that the inevitable penalty for losing a war would be the loss of his personal life, he might be deterred from starting some war he had in mind. That would be quite a blessing for the young men of his nation who would have had to do the fighting and dying for him if he had started the war.

If it becomes established as a crime to be the leader of a nation which loses a war, then we should abide by this new rule of war like any other nation.

Suppose some day we have a President who keelhauls us into a war, and that then we proceed to lose that war. Let us then reconcile ourselves to seeing him solemnly "tried" by a court and prosecutors controlled by the victorious enemy, found guilty, and executed as a war criminal. From our point of view, a war criminal is exactly what he will be.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 4, the Special Committee on Postwar Military Policy will begin hearings on compulsory military training. It is expected the hearings will last for a period of 2 or 3 weeks. Both proponents and opponents will have the opportunity to appear before this committee and express their views.

The question of whether the United States will adopt a policy of 1 year's compulsory military training remains to be seen. This is an important question and argument can be made both for and against a proposition of this character. We find many sincere people advocating the passage by Congress of such a measure, while other equally sincere people violently oppose it. I am glad that hearings are to be held in order that both sides of the question will be clearly presented to the committee, Congress, and the whole country.

Recently, the largest newspaper in my district, the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill., sponsored a letter contest on the proposal of compulsory military training. There were many splendid letters written on both sides of the question. War bonds were issued as prizes to the winners. The sponsoring of such a contest I feel was a splendid idea, in that it created discussion and thought amongst many good citizens who reside in my district.

On Wednesday, May 30, the Daily Pantagraph carried a splendid editorial on the subject Will Peacetime Draft Give United States Best Security? Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial as a part of my remarks in order that interested Members of the House may read it:

WILL PEACETIME DRAFT GIVE UNITED STATES BEST SECURITY?

On this Memorial Day we could say a few sentimental things about the men who gave their lives for this great Nation—and stop there. This time we are not going to do that. We are going to express firm opposition to a proposal that apparently has the support of a considerable number of the people of the United States. We are opposed to compulsory peacetime conscription. We oppose it because we feel that this free democracy for which these honored men died can best be developed if it stays forever divorced from even the potential dominance of a military clique.

We are opposed to peacetime military conscription because history does not record a time when it prevented wars. There is plenty of room for debate as to whether it ever won a war. Certainly it is not winning World War II and it did not win World War I.

A number of red herrings are drawn across the path of the real issue. We are told that compulsory peacetime military training will build up the health of the Nation, that it will offer much-needed vocational educational training, that it will give our young men disciplinary training in which they are lacking, and that it will help solve the unemployment problem.

ELIMINATE STRAW MEN

Morrs Fuller, of Bloomington, who has presented the most logical and convincing argument for this program we have heard to date, frankly eliminates all such claims. He says that anyone who expects his boy to come out of a year of military training a better boy than he went in just doesn't know the tenor of the military services. He says military training is training in mass killing. We are willing to take his word for that.

Let it not be assumed, however, that we are advocating the junking of our air force and our navy and our standing army. We have unshaken faith that this world will some day advance to a point where wars will be considered as the idiotic devices of madmen, and we will have nothing to do with them. When that time comes in perhaps 200 or 2,000 years, there will be no need for armed forces. But we live today. Man has not advanced yet to a point where he can think with his brains instead of his glands. He gets mad and fights. Individual man acts in that way. He fights over his religion, his boundary line, his public utilities, and the color of his skin. As long as individuals act that way, nations cannot be expected to do better.

A strong military force is expedient, therefore, if we are to live in today's world. We believe our navy should be kept intact and constantly improved. We think that it should be expanded if it is not large enough to give us adequate protection in both oceans. We believe our air force should be maintained at a high rate of efficiency and in sufficient force to give us protection. We believe that the Nation should have an adequate standing army, if we can determine

what that would be. All that, we believe, can be done in peacetime without conscription.

COMPLACENCY GREATEST FOE

It can be done by raising the standards of pay for military service. It can be done by increasing the enrollment and the number of war colleges. One such college for each area command could be considered. It can be done by stimulating scientific research.

Yet we do not look there for our greatest national protection and strength. We look to the average citizen. The largest military force can only reflect the state of mind of the citizenry. If we get complacent, if we forget the dangers of the past and the obligations of the future in a mad and shortsighted spree of self-interest, no military force can save us.

Let us never forget that our humiliating defeat at Pearl Harbor was not due to lack of military might on the scene. We had highly trained Army, Navy, and air personnel there December 7, 1941. We probably could have wiped out the entire Japanese attack force. We didn't, because we were too complacent. That is an example the proponents of compulsory peacetime military training should never forget.

Military forces in peacetime only shadow box. The officers are inclined to operate on a 24-hour, year-round, country-club basis. The whole military personnel become the most ardent devotees of the status quo. We do not wish to place the future of this country in peacetime in the hands of a collection of brass hats and drill sergeants.

Compulsory peacetime military training is a sedative. It follows the too familiar American pattern of trying to solve a problem by passing a law. If the law doesn't work, then the next thing to do is to make an appropriation.

COSTS MORE THAN ALL EDUCATION

Let us not overlook that second step—the appropriation. A committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce signed by such persons as Henry I. Harriman and Harper Sibley says: "It is probable that universal military training will ultimately add to the Budget of the United States not less than $3,000,000,000 and possibly $4,000,000,000 per year."

That is as much and possibly more than this country now spends for all elementary, secondary, and higher education both from public and private sources.

Shall we spend more on a copy of Prussian militarism we have sacrificed a million lives to stamp out than we now spend on all public and private education from crib through college? Is that the way to forge a stouter democracy? Is that the way to make our greatest contribution to the ideal of world peace? Is that the spirit of the United States? Is that the way to provide security for ourselves and our descendants? We think it is not.

We think that this Nation's greatest security is in an enlightened citizenship—a citizenship that recognizes and accepts its responsibility in the ward as well as the world, in the market place as well as in the chapel.

We Face a Famine of Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

WE FACE A FAMINE OF SCIENTISTS

Although the United Nations have forced Germany's capitulation and are making impressive gains against Japan, we shall never know how much more quickly our triumph would have come had we from the outset recognized the vital importance of technology in this war. We still draft young technological experts into the armed services, which do not need them, and thereby take them from war industry, which needs five times as many as are available. Perhaps this is not the sole reason why Germany came up with the first robot bombs and the first rockets, but that fact is something for the greatest industrial producer in the world to contemplate in humility when mapping out future policy.

As we face the enormous task of converting our war industries into peace industries—and into jobs for millions of people now employed in war plants—it may be a good idea to face some of the facts which we have shoved to one side during the war. First, it will be impossible to produce 60,000,000 jobs or anything like that figure either by pouring out the taxpayers' money or by telling business and industry to produce jobs or the Government will produce them. The only way to make jobs is to make available for peace needs the technical advances which have been made in the war. Development of transportation, from the horse and buggy to the airplane, with the collateral boom in petroleum, rubber, steel, electrical devices, and curb service, was not accomplished by speeches about guaranteeing jobs. It was accomplished by the hard work of thousands of technologists who were permitted to experiment and dabble and try out their hunches. As the result of our selective-service policy, we face a real shortage of technical men for a new technical era. We expect miracles to be performed by science, but forget that the job—which is no miracle—has to be done by scientists.

The fight to retain technologists in positions where their efforts would be useful has not been waged by the technologists themselves. The skilled men below 30—who virtually monopolize the new knowledge on which leadership in war depends—have been silent. They have had to be. The fight had to be led by older men who understood the importance of technology in war. As one of the leaders in the fight puts it, "If technologists were like some other groups, they would just keep quiet and let the supply of technologists run as low as possible. Then the law of supply and demand would boost their pay to the skies. A mere handful of technologists in about 10 years solved the problem of quick-freezing foods. Now the results are applied in hundreds of centers with less highly trained specialists or laymen to carry on. The man who did the most in this development is no longer in the field. He is seeking new problems to solve, not for the financial reward, but because technologists are made that way." Because the chemist is not much of a squawker in his own behalf, we have ignored his right to be heard.

Consequently, more than 15,000 chemists and chemical engineers are found in the armed services doing work having no relation to their training. At the same time we have dammed up the supply of new technicians who would normally be entering technical schools and colleges. A bill has been introduced in Congress making it possible to undo some of the damage by relieving a few of the chemists from K. P. duty and scrubbing decks, and sending them back to industry, and by permitting a limited number of boys to take technical training. This appears to be about the least that must be done if we are to avoid a disastrous shortage of trained scientists in an age which every 5 minutes we describe as "scientific."

Radio Address of Pope Pius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Pope Pius' broadcast:

Here at last we behold the end of this war, which, during almost 6 years, has held Europe in the grip of the most atrocious suffering and most bitter sorrow.

A cry of humble and ardent gratitude arises from the very depths of our heart to the Father of Mercies and the God of All Consolation.

But our canticle of thanksgiving is accompanied with the suppliant prayer to implore also of divine omnipotence and goodness the termination, in accord with justice, of the sanguinary warfare in the Far East.

On our knees in spirit before the tombs, before the ravines disturbed and reddened by blood, where repose the innumerable corpses of those who have fallen, victims of the fighting or of inhuman massacres of hunger, or of misery, we recommend them all in our prayers, and especially in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, to the merciful love of Jesus Christ, their Saviour, and their judge.

And it seems to us that they, the fallen, are giving warning to the survivors of this cruel scourge and are saying to them: Let there arise from the earth, wherein we have been placed as grains of wheat, the molders and builders of a new and better Europe, of a new and better universe, founded on the filial fear of God, on fidelity to His Holy Commandments, on respect for human dignity, on the sacred principle of equality of the rights of all peoples and all states, large and small, weak and strong.

The war has created on all sides chaotic ruin, both material and moral, such as mankind has never known in the entire course of human history. The task of this hour is to rebuild the world.

As the first element of this restoration, we long to see, after so long a period of waiting, the prompt and speedy return, insofar as circumstances permit, of the prisoners, of the interned, combatants, and civilians, to their homes and to their wives, children, and the noble works of peace.

To all them we say: Let not your energy flag nor your courage fail; dedicate yourselves ardently to the work of reconstruction, sustained by a strong faith in Divine Providence. Apply yourselves to labor, each one at his post, resolute and determined, with a heart animated by a generous, indestructible love of one's fellow man.

It is difficult, certainly, but it is also a holy undertaking that awaits you in repairing the immediate and disastrous consequences of the war. We refer to the decay of public order, misery and hunger, the relaxing and brutalizing of customs and usages, the lack of discipline among the youth.

By so doing, little by little, you will prepare for your cities and your villages, for your provinces and your fatherlands, a lot more acceptable and renewed vigor to your blood.

With the threat of death lying in wait driven from the earth, from the sea, and from the sky, the lives of men, creatures of God, and that which remains to them of their private and common possession henceforth assured by the laying down of arms, men can now set free their minds and spirits to the building of the peace.

If we limit ourselves to consideration of Europe, we find ourselves face to face now with gigantic problems and difficulties which we must overcome if we wish to plan the way to a true peace, the only one that can be lasting.

Peace, indeed, cannot flower and prosper except in an atmosphere of secure justice and of perfect fidelity, joined with reciprocal trust, mutual understanding and benevolence.

The war has aroused everywhere discord, suspicion and hatred. If, therefore the world wishes to regain peace, it is necessary that falsehood and rancor should vanish and in their stead that sovereign truth and charity should reign.

Above all, however, in our daily prayers, we should beseech God constantly to fulfill his promise made by the mouth of the Prophet Ezekiel, "And I will give them one heart, and will put a new spirit in their bowels: and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh: that they may walk in my commandments, and keep my judgments, and do them: and that they may be my people, and I may be their God."

May the Lord God deign to create this new spirit, His spirit, in peoples, and particularly in the hearts of those to whom he has entrusted the responsibility of establishing the future peace.

Then and only then will the reborn world avoid the return of the thunderous scourge of war and there will reign a true, stable and universal brotherhood, and that peace guaranteed by Christ even on earth to those who are willing to believe and trust in His law of love.

A New Way To Make the Desert Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, millions of acres of public domain in the semiarid West have been used for livestock grazing. Overgrazing and periodical dry years have greatly reduced its carrying capacity and the vegetative cover so necessary in conserving moisture, preventing floods, and protecting the soil against erosion. The largest percentage of this western range land will never be fit for any other agricultural use. It is, however, of the utmost importance that we restore the once-abundant vegetation in our efforts to protect our investment in irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

How to bring about a restoration of this cover and its former carrying capacity and, if possible, increase the forage and cover on these areas, is an economic problem of unestimated importance to the whole West and to the Nation. Without discounting the spendid work which has been done by Government agencies on our forests and in our range-control and public-land management and on our drainage areas and watersheds, we still seek for better and cheaper methods than have heretofore been used. I refer to the proposal to seed or reseed vast areas quickly from airplanes.

This proposal has appealed to other public officials and to publicists alike, as evidenced by the fine article beginning on page 166 of the June issue of Fortune magazine. The fact that one of the Nation's outstanding publications gives this proposal such wide publicity is highly significant of their evaluation of the suggestion. This article explains Dr. Lytle S. Adams' plan for sowing seed, incased in pellets, over 20,000 acres per hour, and is as follows:

THE FARM COLUMN

TWENTY THOUSAND ACRES PER HOUR

"The farm is still the broad enduring base upon which the entire United States economy rests."

Dr. Lytle S. Adams, of San Diego, inventor of an airplane mail pick-up, has developed a peacetime use for war transport planes and, at the same time, a method for the quick and inexpensive planting of large acreages. He claims he can plant 20,000 acres per hour with his airplane seed-pellet disseminator. Rice has been successfully sown from airplanes, but most other attempts at aerial seeding have failed because the seeds were too light, and, if not blown away, were easily destroyed by animals or weather. It is well known that bird and animal droppings play a large role in natural seeding, and Dr. Adams thought a mechanical way could be found to simulate and magnify that humble function.

Dr. Adams noted that nature's way was effective because the animal droppings provided weight, protection, and fertilizing elements to give the seed high germinability and a good start in life. His experiments showed that a clay or adobe coating would provide weight and protection, yet would dissolve easily in most soil to release the seed after it had penetrated the ground. By mixing nitrogen, phosphorus, potash, and vitamins in the protective coat, he gave the seed its "starter." The coating also contains a rodent and insect repellent. By hammermilling the seed to detach the husk he speeded up germination 24 to 48 hours. And finally, by inventing a machine that can turn out 30,000 pellets per minute he prepared the seed pellet rapidly and cheaply.

While Dr. Adams' original idea was to seed large acreages of range land and reforest blighted areas by airplane, a secondary but potentially even wider use occurred to him. Many vegetable seeds are too small to be used efficiently in the ordinary planter, but a pellet coating would bring them up to suitable size. This year Dr. Adams is making pellets of carrot, spinach, lettuce, celery, and onion seeds and will plant them by ordinary drills or planters in various test plots around the country. Thus, Dr. Adams hopes, everyone from commercial growers to victory gardeners may utilize his invention.

In airplane seeding, Dr. Adams uses another Adams invention, the seed disseminator, a kind of rimless wheel with hollow spokes. The device is mounted under the plane with its tubes parallel to the earth. It provides a controlled, wide band of dissemination with as many seeds per acre as desired. The weight of the pellet plus the altitude of the plane determines penetration. Hardness of the soil can be overcome and optimum planting depth can be reached by changing the elevation of the plane.

In most instances, airplane planting will be done when a rain is expected, providing the soil crust is not impermeable. If it is crusted hard, as it often is on western ranges, the seeding can be done just after a rain. Where rain is so unreliable that no forecasting is any good (common in the arid southwest), Dr. Adams will use a metal-enclosed pellet with holes in the top to admit moisture. This "bullet," largely used in reforestation, will drive into the hardest soil. The seed lies dormant, yet fully protected, until rain eventually comes to start its growth.

The possibilities of this type of airplane seeding will be breath-taking if this year's experiments prove it practicable. From south Texas to California are 93,000,000 acres of semidesert range land overgrazed and sadly in need of replanting (Fortune, November 1944). Other great areas west of the one hundredth meridian and from the Canadian to the Mexican border could have their carrying power in animal units increased phenomenally. The new method of seeding may play a part in reversing the trend toward abandonment of arid land in the dust bowl, may raise the yields in large grain-producing areas.

Because of the speed of seeding, the low manpower requirements, and the certainty of germination, costs should be extraordinarily low. Dr. Adams estimates that range land can be reseeded for half the present cost of about $3.20 per acre. Later, when postwar equiment is available, this figure should be even lower. Savings in grain sowing will be somewhat less; wheat, for instance, in blocks of 500 or more acres, could be seeded for 75 cents per acre (present estimated cost, 90 cents). The cost of seeding vegetables will be reduced materially by the high rate of germination and by controlled spacing, which eliminates the need for thinning. For reforestation Dr. Adams claims the most spectacular saving: costs of $3.50 per acre, compared with $15 for hand seeding.

This year, seed-pellet experiments will be carried on in Texas at the giant King Ranch and at the Texas Experiment Station in Spur, and also at San Diego. A bill presented to Congress asks for $2,500,000 to be spent by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior for renewing and increasing forage on forest and range lands in the public domain through the Adams plan. If the tests prove out, Dr. Adams expects that millions of acres of public lands will be rejuvenated, and veterans will be given new and healthful jobs, both on public lands and on large private ranches that already show cash-on-the-barrel-head interest in the Adams method.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Gould Lincoln, covering the San Francisco Conference for the Washington Evening Star, yesterday sent his newspaper a dispatch on the subject of universal military training. It is both timely and challenging. His conclusion corresponds with that I have reached after two visits to our fighting fronts, this year and last. I sum up my thoughts in these words:

We must persist in our efforts for world peace and we must remain strong militarily. We live in a hard-boiled world in which men's hearts have not yet become filled with the spirit of peace. Bitterness, resentment, intolerance, suspicion, and hatred still plague mankind and nations are respected according to their ability to defend themselves and defeat the aggressors. It is my profound hope that we in America will be able to work

out some sane, democratic system of universal physical education and military training which, while not Prussianizing our Nation, will keep our youth ready and fit for any emergency arising in the days ahead which it would be folly to describe other than uncertain.

Mr. Lincoln's dispatch follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, May 31.—Moscow's announcement of the biggest peacetime military training schedule ever ordered in the Soviet Union, with thousands of 15- and 16-year-old boys called up for Red Army training, lays an emphasis on national defense, an emphasis which should not be lost sight of in the United States. Not because this country need expect or fear war with the Soviet Union—there is every reason to believe that the two nations can and will live at peace—but because of the wisdom of universal military training.

Twice within a quarter century the United States was caught without adequate military forces when attacked. It can happen again. This country, along with Russia and the other United Nations, is at work in San Francisco on a charter for a world organization to maintain peace. It is a great adventure. Nevertheless, the United States must take adequate measures to insure its own safety, certainly until it has been proved the world intends to live in peace.

For months there have been pending in Congress proposals to establish a universal peacetime military training system. Similar proposals were made after the close of the First World War, but were kicked aside. If they had not been thrown into the discard the whole course of history might have been different, and this country might not have been compelled to fight the greatest war of all time, war which is not yet ended.

In order to avoid giving an impression that the United States was talking of world peace in San Francisco while in Washington Congress was preparing to set up universal military training, the House Committee on Future Military Planning laid the training proposals aside. "Let's do nothing to rock the boat" was the argument advanced. "Let's wait and see what comes out of the United Nations Conference." The Soviet Union is more realistic. It has gone right ahead with its plans for peacetime defense training. At the same time it has joined with the United States and the rest to form a peace organization.

Everyone hopes the new organization will work 100 percent. No one knows whether it will or not. In any event, it still remains for the Great Powers to be in position to enforce peace by arms, if necessary, and to do so they must have military strength. This country has huge armed forces today. But even now partial demobilization has begun since the war in Europe ended. The sooner a military training plan for the years ahead is developed, the better. President Roosevelt had come around to the support of such a plan. President Truman can give it added impetus, if he will, with a special message to Congress.

Russian Lt. Gen. N. N. Pronin, chief of the training administration of the Commissariat for Defense, announcing the call for Russian youth, said, "General military training in the present period should be conducted on an even higher level than in the days of war. The peaceful period into which our country has entered should not lessen our attention to the problems of defense." He stressed, too, the value to the youth of the nation of military training, for physical hardening, for the inculcation of decisiveness, endurance, stubbornness, and initative.

The charter of the proposed world organization for peace refers to possible future regulation of armaments and disarmament. The military staff committee, which it proposes to set up to aid the Security Council, is to look into such matters in the future, but its main job is to assist the Council on all questions relating to military requirements for the maintenance of peace. Obviously, any question of limitation of armaments or of disarmament lies in the dim future. It's up to Americans to prepare for national defense in the world as it is today.

Governmental Bretton Woods Propaganda Drive Blacks Out Democratic Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods committee report fails to include in its index a page guide to the minority views. In an ordinary committee report this oversight would be unimportant. However, in this case the report is both bulky and confusing, and is further complicated by lengthy appendix material.

Accordingly, in the effort to get just a minimum expression of the opposition views before the membership, I am inserting the section of the minority report entitled "Governmental Bretton Woods Propaganda Drive Blacks Out Democratic Processes":

GOVERNMENTAL BRETTON WOODS PROPAGANDA DRIVE BLACKS OUT DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

Regardless of the merits or demerits of the Bretton Woods proposal, the propaganda drive accompanying it demonstrates the fearful power of government to influence, through control of modern publicity facilities, the actions of a legislative group. The ultimate consequences of such power, ruthlessly used in this instance, are terrifying to us, who have watched it operate at close range. Those interested in the future of liberty in America should understand this State use of the instruments of public information.

Your attention is directed to an editorial prophecy of the New York Herald Tribune, March 4, 1945. We can testify that the forecasts in that editorial have been borne out by events:

"There is a disturbing accumulation of evidence that the administration is determined to employ the most ruthless strong-arm tactics to drive through Congress without alteration the so-called Bretton Woods program, on which hearings are scheduled to begin this week before the Banking and Currency Committee.

"For some time past there have been reports that sponsors of this legislation have boasted that they had 'greased the wheels' to slide the measure through. Events have shown that such reports were not without foundation.

"But a more insidious weapon than any of these is the studied effort on the part of the administration to tie the issue of all-or-none acceptance of the Treasury program with the issue of isolation. * * *

"* * * the issue of isolationism here is a synthetic one, created for purely political purposes."

Except for the substitution of a silk-glove technique, the fears of the Herald Tribune were well founded. Departments of the Government have shrewdly used every possible method of propaganda, most of which today are conrolled by the Government. Cunningly using the prestige of public office, sales meetings were reported held with radio commentators, news reporters, columnists, religious leaders, and others who play a decisive part in influencing public opinion in America.

With a technique and effectiveness resembling a totalitarian ministry of propaganda, through these influential avenues, the Nation has been drenched with publicity for Bretton Woods.

Officials of organizations of imposing voter membership filed into the hearings demanding that the committee pass this confusing and intricate proposal without change. To our knowledge, not a single one of these organizational witnesses had secured first-hand testimony giving an opposition appraisal of this plan. Upon questioning, these witnesses usually declined to pretend to be able to discuss the proposals themselves.

This political pressure, plus other less obvious tactics, were carried on behind the protection of lengthy and carefully staged hearings.

We could write a lengthy report detailing the propaganda methods used to promote this plan. Instead, we summarize with this conclusion:

This experience constitutes sobering evidence to us that the propaganda weapons in the hands of government can eliminate the processes of orderly legislation, based upon a fair presentation of both sides. Unless opposition to the regime in power secures equal publicity facilities to present its views to the people, bad government or bad proposals cannot be effectively exposed. Until those on both sides of a public question have equal opportunity to present their case to the people, representative government is not functioning.

Postmastership at Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, for 8 months a vacancy has existed in the office of postmaster for the Cleveland postal district. On May 31, the President appointed and the Senate confirmed Mr. Guy R. Lucas as postmaster for the city of Cleveland.

I have urged that it was for the best interests of the postal service that a career man, so-called, that is, a man who has spent his lifetime in the service, should be placed at the head of the office.

The highest quality of service can best be assured by observing the principle of selection on the basis of superior ability, efficiency, and attention to duty. A most important factor to be considered in connection with the selection of a person to the head position in any service is the principle of seniority, chiefly because of the wholesome effect on the entire service. The appointment of a person having a record for efficiency and ability, and with 4 or 5 years to serve in the evening of his life, is most desirable. Such an appointment constitutes for everyone in the service an incentive to devote his best efforts to establish a record for good service. Those in the service

would then feel that when they will have served 40 years or more they will have an opportunity, in fair competition, to secure the highest award in the service.

A great many prominent citizens of Cleveland have spoken in the highest terms of Mr. Lucas' ability and hard work in the service. Let me quote some of the statements which have been made in regard to Mr. Lucas.

First, let me quote from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, October 1, 1944:

Lucas seems to us by far the more desirable candidate. Harbour is only a postal clerk, while Lucas has had years of executive experience and must have a broader knowledge of the complicated business. Information volunteered by postal employees is to the effect that for years other postal officials, including the postmaster himself, have referred all seemingly insoluble problems to Lucas—an indication that he knows the business thoroughly.

We therefore urge the Postmaster General to place Lucas in this responsible position.

Excerpts from page 52 of report of survey of the delivery division of the Cleveland, Ohio, post office dated May 7, 1930 by inspectors Hart, Hadfield, Jefferson, and Mouser:

Mr. Lucas is particularly efficient and has rendered especially meritorious service, and consequently his promotion to the $3,100 grade is recommended in a separate report.

Mr. M. J. McGuire, 8116 Dorver Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, who has been in postal service more than 40 years, says:

If Lucas is named, he will honor his sponsor, and the Cleveland office will so function as to make a career man postmaster a permanent institution, and Crosser's efforts in that direction will be recognized as just another illustration of a statesman, rather than a spoils politician, acting for good government.

Mr. F. H. Cogan, member of legislative committee of branch 46, National Association of Postal Supervisors, wrote from Cleveland on November 15, 1944, as follows:

My many years of service, personal contact, organization experience has fitted me so that I may speak advisedly on this subject.

Being in a position to observe at various times throughout the year the personnel of the Cleveland office, I believe that Guy R. Lucas would make an outstanding executive whose successful operation of the office would reflect credit upon those who were responsible for his endorsement. Favorable comment by visiting commissions of postal inspectors in the past, and their recommendation to the Post Office Department have placed his name in the vanguard of efficient postal workers.

The president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. W. C. Doherty, in a letter dated at Washington, D. C., September 22, 1944, said:

I am taking the liberty to personnally recommend that Guy R. Lucas be appointed postmaster at Cleveland. He is an assistant superintendent of mails at the present time but did serve as a letter carrier during his early postal service.

I know that Mr. Lucas is well qualified to serve in the capacity of postmaster. His long years of service make him well suited for the exacting duties required in that particular office.

The vice president of the Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Mr. John J. Joseph, in a letter dated August 9, 1944, said:

Mr. Lucas has been in the postal service for 42 years and at the present time is assistant superintendent of mails. Through various sources throughout the years I have been informed that he is a very efficient public servant and has thorough knowledge of the many operations and functions of the Cleveland office. Perhaps one of his strongest points is the respect and esteem in which he is held by his contemporaries.

I have known the Lucas family for many years and consider it a genuine privilege to commend Mr. Lucas to you. I feel sure that his selection would meet with general approval here in Cleveland.

Mr. Joseph C. Hostetler, of the law firm Baker, Hostetler, and Patterson, former assistant city solicitor, and a law partner of former Secretary of War Newton D. Baker until the latter's death, enthusiastically recommended the appointment of Mr. Lucas.

General Statement of Minority Views on Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods committee report fails to include in its index a page guide to the minority views. In an ordinary committee report this oversight would be unimportant. However, in this case the report is both bulky and confusing, and is further complicated by lengthy appendix material.

Accordingly, in the effort to get just a minimum expression of the opposition views before the membership, I am inserting an excerpt from the general statement of the minority report on the propaganda aspects of Bretton Woods:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The minority believes that the future of civilization depends upon the maintenance of the solvency of the United States and the stability of the dollar. Accordingly, we share with every thinking citizen the earnest desire to establish sound foundations for international cooperation and stable monetary conditions everywhere. The achievement of these purposes is the high road to the restoration of peace and personal liberty.

The question before the House is not the need for currency stability and international cooperation. In a world where the only place the value of money often can be determined is in black markets, resulting from fiat currency, no one can question the desperate need for stability. The question is whether the Bretton Woods proposals will (1) promote the objective of monetary stabilization and cooperation, (2) constitute the best available means for achieving that purpose.

The Bretton Woods proposals are so intricate and complicated that the attempt to discuss them adequately is a difficult, if not an impossible, task. During the lengthy hearings various experts interpreted the agreements in a multitude of ways. More significant, however, was the fact that no substantial evidence was offered that the delegates who ratified the plan were in agreement on the meaning of many vital clauses which determine the operation of the so-called stabilization fund.

Accordingly, we urge the Members of the House to appraise this proposal, not by the stated objectives, but by whether or not this diversely understood proposal in its present state, is the best approach, or even a practical approach, toward the achievement of monetary stabilization.

We believe the Members of Congress are realists. We submit that the plan's advocates should prove conclusively, by authoritative evidence, that there has been a genuine meeting of the minds among the principals who are considering these agreements. Unless competent evidence is placed before the House that the nations understand each other on the modus operandi of the plan, truly intelligent debate is impossible. Rosy and glowing American oratory about the benefits of this plan is either futile, or worse still, misleading, until Congress secures competent testimony regarding the conceptions of this proposal held by other nations.

Certainly recent events should teach us that international agreements, like individual contracts, should represent a clear and definite understanding between the signatories. Even at the outset Bretton Woods lacks this elemental virtue.

Accordingly, we believe the plan, with or without the committee amendments, defective and unworkable. Members may find guidance in appraising the scheme from the analysis by one outstanding economist:

"Some people seem to believe that Bretton Woods is a cheap way of buying currency stability, or even world peace. It is nothing of the kind. It is a very high fee for entering the game. We have no right to sit down to play it until we know what the rules are going to be and how the others propose to play."

San Francisco Conference and World Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 1 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the subject of the San Francisco Conference and world conditions, which I delivered over the radio last Sunday night in connection with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The results of the San Francisco Conference are not yet clear. We do not yet know what actual power will be vested in the new league to determine the shape of the world to come. If the league exists and has real power to curb aggression or to settle the complicated problems which are sure to arise in the future, that is one thing. If the league is going to be a weak debating society, that is another thing.

In any case, we must try to settle the fundamental problems which have already given us two terrible world wars and are liable to give us a third and worse one.

The common people, ordinary folk like you and me, don't want war. We are always amazed when it comes, anyway. This time we had better make up our minds that we are

going to stop it. The whole question about where we go from San Francisco relates simply to this: How do we stop the world from the disaster of another war?

I notice that our opponents, for whom I have a great personal respect, are apparently of the same mind as I, but they keep asserting that in addition to going into a new security league, we have to be armed to the teeth. Now, if we are armed to the teeth, the other fellow is armed to the teeth, and when you have two or three big fellows armed to the teeth, with a bunch of little fellows also armed to the teeth, shooting is going to begin somewhere. Being armed to the teeth can mean only one thing, and that is that the Nation is prepared to take the law into its own hands. That can only mean the rule of force and not the rule of law. In fact, that is the great objection I see to the plan of the league in that it is concentrated too much on the rule of force. It speaks of the right of a few large states to police other and smaller countries, but the big states themselves cannot be policed. That isn't organized security; it is organized power politics; it is organized suspicion, organized fear. Fear of what—frankly, I don't know. It must be fear of each other.

We will have to get over some of our deep suspicion of the Russians. We will have to agree that the Chinese and the Orientals can be free of interference by European imperialists for whom we will otherwise be forced to fight a war every decade or so. We will have to seek the "four freedoms" not only for ourselves, but for everyone. In short, we will have to make the business of being a good neighbor a practical policy.

We will have to abolish those terrible war-making machines, the cartels and monopolies. If there is anything to the reasons advanced for cartels and monopolies, then they should be owned and controlled by the people and not by a few financiers who can manipulate them to their own advantage.

There are certain newspapers who are already pounding the drums of war. They tell us, for example, that the United States must sooner or later fight Russia. Some of them even suggest that we may have to fight Great Britain. I say that all of this is fantastic. I don't think the Russian and the British people are fundamentally different than we are. I think the common people over there hate and detest war, just the same as we do. They know what it means to lose their sons and brothers and to saddle their economies with enormous tax burdens. We have fought a great war for what we consider a noble purpose, to rescue the world from tyranny. I tell you now, that we have fought this war to rescue the world from the tyranny of—war itself. We have fought to create a world in which war and tyranny can never exist again. If we fail to create such a world, and to start by creating this view within our own hearts, then we have failed miserably.

I say let us start with the idea that we have won this victory and that we have won it with real allies at our side, and not a lot of coyotes who will struggle in turn at the garbage pile of power.

Under no circumstances should the youth of this country be called upon to fight the youth of any other country—yes, including that of Russia. Let those who wish enshrine war as the proper goal of man, but they have had the consequences of it. Let us enshrine peace, and if to love peace makes me a worse man than I should be, then I will have to accept the consequences of it.

I suspect that it should be part of our policy not only to adjust our relationships in practical terms with all the other nations of the world but also our relationships with some of our own citizens, with the professional war mongers, Fascist personalities, and the whole dying tribe of pultocrats who look with terror on the Russian experiment and who feel it is our duty to go in there and crush it. I don't know whether the affairs of this country have been run by 60 leading families, as has been alleged, but if it is true, it is time that we ripped their grip off of the future policies of America and returned the future of this country to the people who have to fight the wars and build the wealth which wars waste. In my judgment, there must be a full and complete spiritual revival in this country. Hatreds and prejudices must be abolished. Brotherly love must be really instituted in fact. There must be an end to 1 percent of the people owning 99 percent of the wealth. The wealth must be distributed on a more fair and equitable basis, equality of economic opportunity must be given to every man and woman, and it follows that what takes place in America will take place in every country upon the face of the earth. I welcome the day when airplanes and ships will bring thousands of the youth of Mexico, Iraq, Russia, China, India, and every country on the globe to attend schools here in America, and when those same airplanes and ships return they will bear to every other country folks from America. During the war we sent our young men to the four corners of the earth for war purposes. Now let us send them out for educational purposes. If San Francisco teaches us anything, it teaches us that the next war should be a war not of killing, maiming, and wounding but a war against ignorance everywhere, a war for brotherly love, a war for clean living conditions, for a decent standard of living, fair honest wages everywhere upon the face of this earth. That is what I hope and pray will follow the San Francisco Conference.

Bretton Woods Should Be Honestly Considered by Itself, and Not Be Falsely Tied to Peace Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, some promoters of Bretton Woods lack either the integrity or the intelligence to present this scheme straightforwardly.

So, with cunningness or stupidity, they declare that it is essential to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the San Francisco Conference.

Are they telling the truth? Or is this simply a trick in the Hitler-Goebels fashion—you know that method—tell a big lie, keep telling it, and pretty soon the people will be believing it, and repeating it themselves.

The answer to this falsehood can be found in the New York Herald Tribune editorial columns, back on March 4. The Herald Tribune is a newspaper that has been generally accepted as a leader among those with international views. They indicated that hooking up Bretton Woods with peace conferences was deceitful and dishonest, as pointed out in the following editorial:

THE BRETTON WOODS ISSUE

There is a disturbing accumulation of evidence that the administration is determined to employ the most ruthless strong-arm tactics to drive through Congress without alteration the so-called Bretton Woods program, on which hearings are scheduled to begin this week before the House Ways and Means (sic) Committee.

For some time past there have been reports that sponsors of this legislation have boasted that they had "greased the wheels" to slide the measure through. Events have show that such reports were not without foundation. When the House was being reorganized in January, membership of the Banking and Currency Committee, according to George B. Bryant, Jr., Washington correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, in a recent dispatch to that newspaper, was selected with unusual care. The five Democratic vacancies on this committee—which will have much to say about continuing New Deal financial and economic controls, in addition to its international financial plans—were filled with Democrats of the New Deal school, and it was then expanded to include two more. This new committee, which the administration refers to as "streamlined," and Republicans as "stacked," had its trial test a month ago on the George bill, and for the first time in recent years the Democratic Members voted as a unit in opposition to a Republican-sponsored measure. Next, when the Wagner-Spence bill, designed to give legislative effect to the Bretton Woods program, was introduced it was revealed that it proposed to finance the initial needs of the monetary fund from the so-called gold profits in the present stabilization fund. Critics of this procedure interpret it as a device for bypassing the Appropriations Committee.

But a more insidious weapon than any of these is the studied effort on the part of the administration to tie the issue of all-or-none acceptance of the Treasury program with issue of isolation. The theme is constantly reiterated that, as Dean Acheson, of the State Department, put it before representatives of 104 national organizations invited to Washington for a pep talk by the Treasury on Wednesday, other nations "would be chilled toward Dumbarton Oaks" if the Bretton Woods proposals for international cooperation in the financial field are rejected.

It would be a grave error of Republican leadership to permit itself to be maneuvered into a false position before the public on this measure, for the issue of isolationism here is a synthetic one, created for purely political purposes. The $18,000,000,000 financial set-up, which is conveniently referred to as the Bretton Woods program, did not emanate with that conference nor was it drawn up under any authorization from Congress. It was developed out of plans produced by Lord Keynes and associates on behalf of the British Treasury and Dr. Harry White and others acting for our Treasury and as represented a tentative agreement among unnamed technical experts of 30 nations. Discussions at Bretton Woods were confined rigidly to this joint statement of principles, and no attempt was made to explore other proposals. Largely because of this limitation on discussion, the delegates were not authorized to bind their respective governments. Lord Keynes himself made this unequivocally clear when he declared:

"We (the British delegation), in common with other delegations, reserve the opinion of our government on the document as a whole and on every part of it * * * We do not even recommend our government to adopt the result. We merely submit it for what it is worth to the attention of the legislators concerned."

In other words, the so-called Bretton Woods program was never intended as anything but a starting point for legislative action to achieve the objectives it seeks. It is a complete distortion of the facts to imply that any modification of that agreement could be construed as in any sense a repudiation of the achievements of Dumbarton Oaks.

Postal Pay and Mr. Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in a recent issue of the Times-Dispatch, published in Richmond, Va.:

POSTAL PAY AND MR. GARY

The House last week passed the bill to increase the salaries of postal workers. Those who are familiar with the postal pay situation know that this group of Government employees has been long-suffering in this respect. The postal workers have not had a general pay increase in more than 20 years, and their basic scales are among the lowest in the Government service for the character of work performed. It is to be hoped that the Senate will give early approval to this measure for the correction of a long-standing injustice to one of the most faithful and hard-working groups of civil servants.

The new Representative from this district, J. VAUGHAN GARY, made the consideration of the bill the occasion for his maiden speech in the House. "Some of my constituents," Mr. GARY said, "will probably think it strange that, although during my campaign, I emphasized the need for economy in government during the postwar period, I am making my first speech in support of salary increases." He then proceeded to make a persuasive statement in support of the measure.

We believe we can assure Mr. GARY that no one is likely to hold it against him for voting with the majority on a bill so obviously deserving that it was passed by a vote of 361 to 1.

Important Reductions in Telephone and Cable Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission has recently put into effect very important reductions in domestic long distance telephone rates and in international telegraph and cable rates which, it is estimated, will save the users of these communication services approximately $21,000,000 a year. I have just received the following explanatory letter from Commissioner Ray C. Wakefield, California member of the FCC:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1945.

Congressman FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: Two significant actions affecting your California constituents have been taken by the Federal Communications Commission recently. One involves a reduction in long-distance telephone rates and the other in international telegraph and cable rates. * * *

I am pleased to be able to report these reductions to you as I have been particularly interested in the telephone and telegraph work of the Commission. Commissioner Walker and I constitute the telephone committee. Particular credit is due to Commissioner Walker for the coast-to-coast long-distance telephone reductions which are effective July 1, 1945. When Commissioner Walker came to the Commission in 1934, he visualized the possibility of the $2.50 rate. At that time the rate was $10.25 station-to-station and $12.75 person-to-person for a 3-minute call. Effective July 1, 1945, the rate will be $2.50 station-to-station and $3.50 person-to-person as compared with the present rate of $4 station-to-station and $5 person-to-person.

The international telegraph and cable rate reductions which became effective May 1, 1945, are the most drastic ones ever effected in lowering communication costs for the public. For example, formerly the rate for a full rate ordinary message from San Francisco to Italy was 41 cents per word; from New York to Italy, the rate for the same message was 27 cents per word. Under the reduced pattern, the rate for the same message from San Francisco to Italy is 24 cents; or from New York to Italy, 20 cents. The former rate from San Francisco to Russia was 44 cents and to Denmark, 40 cents; or from New York to Russia, 30 cents, and to Denmark, 26 cents. To both points the rate is now uniformly 24 cents from San Francisco, or 20 cents from New York.

As you know, the charges for international messages are composed of two basic elements (1) the charge for the domestic service in sending the message from the point of origin within the interior of the United States to the place where the message is turned over to the radio-telegraph or cable carrier which is, generally, New York; and (2) the charge for the message by the radio-telegraph or cable carrier for the overseas transmission. As further indicated by the attached news releases, the charges for such messages vary according to the class of service rendered, that is, ordinary service, which is carried on a full-rate basis, code, deferred, and night letter.

The reduced basic rate pattern of 20 cents per word for the full-rate ordinary message applies to international messages from the United States destined to foreign points of communication in Europe, Latin America, and the Philippine Islands. Further, in view of the reduced United States land-line charges (the domestic service) on overseas telegrams and cables which simultaneously became effective on May 1, 1945, it is to be noted that residents of California will receive even a more substantial reduction in the charges for such communications than residents of New York. Prior thereto and with the exception of traffic from the United States to South America, the West Indies, and Central America, the United States land-line charges for messages from the west coast to New York were based upon the distances of the overland haul and were added to the basic international rate. Residents of the west coast paid 14 cents a word for the land-line haul of full-rate ordinary messages destined to foreign points; residents of the Middle West paid 8 cents, and residents of the East paid less. With respect to traffic from the United States to South America, Central America, and the West Indies, in a proceeding which I held about 2 years ago, looking toward the establishment of reduced rates from the United States to South America, the land-line rate differentials were eliminated and a flat 4-cent rate for the full-rate ordinary message was applied to traffic from all points beyond New York destined to Latin America.

By the rate reductions, effective May 1, 1945, this principle of a flat, uniform land-line rate for all points beyond New York is no longer restricted to traffic destined to Latin America, but has now been extended to international traffic destined to all parts of the world. Accordingly, west-coast residents now have added to the basic rate for the full-rate ordinary message only 4 cents as compared with the 14-cent former land-line rate.

The new rate pattern, of course, provides for proportionate reductions in the other message classifications, such as code, deferred, and night-letter telegrams. This information is set forth in the enclosed News Releases. In this connection, you will be interested in knowing that traffic figures indicate that only 5 percent of international traffic is in the full-rate classification. Thus, the bulk of traffic will now be transmitted at costs substantially below the 20-cent figure.

The foregoing rate reductions represent only a part of the Commission's activity in the field of postwar international communications. There is even much more to be accomplished in order to insure a low-cost, prompt, and uninterrupted flow of communications between the United States and all places of the world, and the Commission will continue with its efforts in this field.

Sincerely yours,

RAY C. WAKEFIELD,
Commissioner.

The Cattle Industry and Tariff Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 1 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by F. E. Mollin, executive secretary of the American National Livestock Association, setting forth the view of the cattle industry with reference to a further reduction in the tariff.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CATTLE INDUSTRY LOOKS AT A FURTHER REDUCTION IN THE TARIFF

We present below some statistical information as to the cattle population in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and in South American countries. Also figures on United States beef production, cattle and calf slaughter and the amount of beef exported from Canada in recent years. Also figures as to existing cattle quotas and the tariff cuts already made under the reciprocal trade program to date on cattle, dressed beef, canned beef, and hides.

Cattle population

United States:	
1940	68,801,000
1945	81,760,000
Mexico:	
1930	10,083,000
1940	11,603,000

(No recent figure available. Cattle numbers thought to have increased since that time.)

Canada:	
1939	8,375,000
1944	10,346,000

Cattle population—Continued

Argentina:

1937	33,207,000
1942	31,460,000

(Decrease no doubt due severe drought of last 2 or 3 years.)

Uruguay:

1937	8,297,000
1943	6,256,000

(Decrease no doubt due severe drought of last 2 or 3 years.)

Brazil:

1938	40,076,000
1942	42,500,000

Cuba:

1941	5,335,000
1942	4,897,000

(1936–40 average 5,024,000.)

Beef and veal production

United States:

	Pounds
1936 (high for peacetime)	8,433,000,000
1939	8,002,000,000
1944	10,779,000,000

(For first quarter 1945 total beef and veal production 345,000,000 pounds above same quarter 1944.)

Canadian exports

Total Canadian exports cattle and beef converted to dressed-beef basis:

1938–42: Average 90,000,000 pounds.
1944: Exceeded 112,000,000 pounds.
1945: Estimated to exceed 134,400,000 pounds.

(Note 1945 figure is increase of approximately 50 percent over 5-year average 1938–42.)

Total slaughter cattle and calves

United States:

1942	27,619,000
1943	27,683,000
1944 (revised)	33,700,000

Total slaughter (farm slaughter not included) first 4 months of 1945 14 percent above same 4 months of 1944.

Quotas under trade agreements made with Canada and Mexico now suspended for the duration

CANADIAN AGREEMENT

1936:

Cattle weighing less than 175 pounds	51,933
Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds	155,799

1939:

Cattle weighing less than 200 pounds (Superseding the original quota on cattle weighing less than 175 pounds.)	100,000
Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds	225,000

MEXICAN AGREEMENT

1943: Cattle weighing over 200 pounds and less than 700 pounds	400,000

(Recently Canadian meat interests have suggested that the British market for Canadian beef may not extend beyond 1946 and have suggested seeking a raise in the quota on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds from 225,000 head to 500,000 head. If this request were granted it would make a total quota for the two countries of exactly 1,000,000 head of cattle.)

Reduction in tariff

CANADIAN AGREEMENT

1936:

Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds reduced from 3 to 2 cents per pound.
Calves weighing less than 175 pounds reduced from 2½ to 1½ cents per pound.
1939: Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds reduced from 2 to 1½ cents per pound.

MEXICAN AGREEMENT

1943: Cattle weighing between 400 and 700 pounds reduced from 2½ to 1½ cents.

CUBAN AGREEMENT

1942: Dressed beef reduced from original preferential rate of 4⅘10 to 3 cents per pound. (This reduction does not apply to other countries.)

ARGENTINA TRADE AGREEMENT

1941: Canned beef reduced from 6 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound.
Hides reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent ad valorem.
Tallow reduced from ½ cent per pound to ¼ cent per pound.

You will note from the above that the cattle industry in this country is at a peak in numbers and that beef production is expanded to a wartime basis and that under the existing trade agreements law the full 50 percent cut in tariff has already been made on most of the important items affecting the cattle industry; that further reduction of the tariff as proposed in the pending bill would leave only a semblance of tariff protection for this great industry. It should not be forgotten that considerably more than half of the land acreage in this country grows grass and that much of this area cannot be used for any other purpose.

That use of the power to cut tariffs has not been limited to items where existing rates were a barrier to imports is clearly evidenced in practically all of the above items. Cattle imports have moved into this country freely from Canada and Mexico under the rates prescribed in the original Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. Dressed beef has come in considerable quantity from Cuba in recent years and it is now indicated that Canada, having expanded its processing facilities during the war, will seek also a reduction in the tariff on dressed beef in order to send part of its exports to this country in that fashion.

Our imports of canned beef from South America prior to the war ran around 80,000,000 pounds per year—some years higher than that. About the time the war began, when the Army made its first purchases of South American canned beef, it was found that they could undersell the domestic product close to 15 cents per pound. The cut in the tariff from 6 to 3 cents was entirely gratuitous.

On hides the original 10 percent ad valorem was a nominal tariff and certainly by no stretch of the imagination could be considered a bar to importations. Records show large importations annually from South America and other countries. There was no excuse whatsoever for the reduction in the tariff on this item.

It is our fear that further cuts in the tariff made at request of foreign interests without regard to the effect on American cattle producers can bring disaster to this industry when the war is over and we have to return to a basis of only domestic consumption. We have had no export trade in beef for more than a generation except during the two war periods. The possible heavy imports of cattle, dressed beef and canned beef from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and South America with cattle numbers expanding particularly in Canada and Mexico constitute a major threat to our industry, and there should be no further reduction in the tariff. The only way to prevent it is to strike that provision from the pending tariff bill.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
By F. E. MOLLIN, *Executive Secretary.*
DENVER, COLO, *May 18, 1945.*

A Debt, Not a Donation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1945, I introduced House Joint Resolution 192, the text of which follows:

Resolved, etc., That all monetary benefits awarded veterans of the wars of the United States, and/or their dependents, by the Congress of the United States, on account of physical or mental disabilities incurred by said veterans in defense of their country, are hereby declared to be both in law and in fact, a partial repayment of a debt owed by the Nation to such veterans and/or their dependents.

That the common-law doctrine holding such awards to be, as a matter of law, a gratuity, is hereby abrogated and annulled.

The background and reasons for the introduction of this measure are set forth so well in the following article written by Capt. A. A. Roe and published in the Arcadia Bulletin, of Arcadia, Calif., on May 21, 1945, that I am simply going to ask consent to include that article with my remarks here concerning my joint resolution:

VETERANS DESERVE MORE THAN JUST A GRATUITY, SAYS ROE

(By Capt. A. A. Roe, a veteran of three wars)

Oh, yes; the Congress from time to time has granted war veterans and their dependents monetary and other benefits in recognition of their service and sacrifices in defense of our common country; but here is where the rub comes: Under an old common-law doctrine it is held that such benefits granted by the Congress are a gratuity, and as such are not enforceable as a matter of law. Hence veteran claims cannot be brought into a court of equity for adjudication.

This is why it was necessary to create a special agency, something distinct and independent of courts of equity, for the adjudication of veterans' claims under the acts of Congress. This agency is now known as the Veterans' Administration; it is a sort of court beyond the pale and power of our democratic system of jurisprudence. Its like cannot be found in any other democratic country in the world.

Through the years we have proceeded under this old common-law doctrine, a relic of a barbaric age, in the matter of veteran benefits, which holds that all such benefits are a gratuity. What is a gratuity? Look at Webster. He says: "A gratuity is something given without any equivalent or recompense, or without claim or merit, being without reason, cause, or proof; a free gift; a present; a donation." In other words, under this doctrine the people and their Government owe the human wreckage of war nothing, as a matter of law.

One wonders how many patriotic citizens and members of our fighting forces, and their families, would agree to this definition of veteran benefits? Do we owe these men now coming back to us from the battlefields of the world, maimed and wounded in body and mind, a debt or a donation? You, Mr. and Mrs. America, must answer that question now.

The President, most citizens, and this writer is of the opinion that there is no debt

contracted by this Government more binding and sacred than the debt we, as a people, owe these veterans. This debt of all debts should be made enforceable in a court of equity, organized in accordance with due process of law.

Is it any wonder that, under the present system, veteran claims are adjudicated on the basis of favor instead of justice under law? That this evil theory of gratuity permeates every department of the Veterans' Administration? It is reflected, of necessity, in the attitude of investigators, examiners, adjudication officers, and rating boards toward veteran claims filed under the acts of Congress; it is the established policy.

No catch-all legislation, no GI bill, no new veteran organization, no change in the personnel of the Veterans' Administration, will remedy a condition that has forced thousands of disabled veterans and their loved ones into poverty and privation throughout the years. This false and inhuman doctrine and policy must be banished and wiped out before we can even talk intelligently of the so-called veteran problem.

The evils growing out of the existing policy are far reaching in their various ramifications and too numerous to be gone into here; it is safe to say, however, that 90 percent of the wrongs complained of by disabled veterans will be found to have their roots buried deep in that one word, gratuity. It should be distinctly understood that the Veterans' Administration, as such, cannot be held in any way responsible for the application of the common-law doctrine being applied to veteran claims.

At a conference between Congressman VOORHIS and national, State, and local representatives of the Disabled American Veterans, reported in these columns last month, this was one of the subjects discussed, and as a result on April 23, 1945, House Resolution 192 was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on World War Legislation. Those interested in the welfare of disabled veterans may communicate with JERRY VOORHIS, Congressman, 501 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., or Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., 543 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C., for such information as may be desired upon this subject.

You may be sure that the returning soldiers from this war will repel with scorn any implication that he wishes, desires, or will accept charity, gratuity, or donations in any form. As upstanding fighting men they will demand justice. He who would accept less is a fool; he who seeks more is a knave.

Proposed Fair Employment Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 1 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid editorial written by Mr. Robert L. Thompson, editor of the High Point Enterprise, High Point, N. C., May 25, 1945, in which he discusses sensibly and dispassionately the so-called Fair Employment Practice Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A FRIEND OF THE NEGRO RACE

There is no newspaper, no public official, no sociologist, no individual of either race who is more anxious to see an improvement in the relations between the white and colored races than is the Enterprise.

There is none more anxious to see an improvement in the economic status of the Negro.

And there have been very few who were quicker to point out and to oppose incidents of injustice to the Negro race—incidents which we all know occur frequently but nevertheless, much less frequently than was once the case.

Our attitude is not based on charity. Rather it is based on the conviction that no country, no section, no community can achieve real prosperity as long as a large proportion of its population is ignorant, poverty-stricken, and the victim of economic discrimination.

Likewise no country, section or community can progress far unless its progress is based on fair play—fair play upon the part of both the majority and the minority.

It is for these reasons, and speaking as a friend to the Negro race, that the Enterprise is unalterably opposed to the bill now before the Congress which is miscalled the fair employment practice act.

We know of nothing which would do more to cause inter-racial strife, and to retard the progress the Negro race has been making for the last 80 years, than this proposed law. Truly it is an abortive brain child, begot by the passionately impractical do-gooders, conceived by politicians avidly seeking the Negro vote, and nursed by the totalitarian bureaucrats who never miss an opportunity to increase the power of government over the lives of men.

The effect of this proposed law would be to tell an employer that he must employ a certain number of Negroes for whatever type of work the bureaucrats said they were qualified to do, regardless of the situation within the plant or organization, regardless of the attitude of the other workers, regardless of the desires of the management.

Carried to its logical conclusion the passage of this law would mean that a certain percentage—approximately 10 percent—of the workers in every department of every plant, the conductors on railroad trains, the tellers in banks, the clerks in hotels, the stenographers in offices, the mechanics in garages, and every other type of worker on every other kind of job, would have to be Negroes. Just so long as they applied for a job, and the bureaucrats said they were qualified to do the work, the employer would be forced to hire them or close down.

We agree with the statement made by Senator CLYDE R. HOEY the other day that this proposed law is contrary to the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution protects the rights of an employer to pick the people whom he wants to work for him, just as it protects the worker from being forced to work where he does not want to work. But there is always the possibility that the courts will interpret the Constitution either way. So let us assume that such a law is passed and is upheld? Then what?

Can you imagine anything which would do more to create strife, strikes, economic chaos, and actual riots?

Can you imagine anything which would do more to retard the advance of the Negroes than such strife?

How long will it take us to learn we cannot settle such problems by the mere passing of a law?

We all know that there is a scarcity of certain types of work for Negroes. One reason may be racial friction. But a much more important reason is the fact that there is a scarcity of Negroes trained for all types of work, a scarcity of Negro capital, a scarcity of Negro management. And these things take years upon years to work out. First must come education—and we are making great strides in that direction. Second comes the birth of initiative on the part of the rising race—and the Negroes are making great strides in that direction. But anyone who has ever read history, anyone who has ever observed his fellowman, should know that this whole racial problem is not to be solved by the mere passing of a law—especially a law which could not be enforced and which would stir up strife throughout the Nation. The Detroit riots would be as nothing to what would follow the passage of this bill, in our carefully considered opinion.

We are wholeheartedly in favor of improving the economic status of the American Negro. We look forward to the time when capital—far-sighted white capital as well as Negro capital—erects plants for colored workers and pays them equal wages for equal work. We look forward to the time when these plants develop their own management. We look forward to the time when the improved earning power of Negroes results in a great increase in Negro capital. We look forward to the time when the white and colored races develop an ever-increasing respect for each other—and for each other's rights.

But we will never see such a day as long as the approach to it is attempted by any such fool law as the Fair Employment Practice Act—a law which attempts to increase the opportunity of the minority by depriving members of the majority of their constitutional rights and freedom; a law which would turn the great majority against the 10 percent minority just at a time when relations were becoming better; a law which would backfire and cause the Negroes of America, the greatly outnumbered colored men and women, the greatest setback since they began their wonderful progress upward from slavery, only 80 years ago.

Chicago Municipal Transportation System—Attitude of Judge Michael L. Igoe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 1 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Sun Inquiry Shows Friends of Judge Igoe in Fat Car Line Posts," published in the Chicago Sun of May 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUN INQUIRY SHOWS FRIENDS OF JUDGE IGOE IN FAT CAR LINE POSTS

(By J. M. Klein)

Most important hurdle to be cleared to give Chicago a publicly owned unified transportation system is the attitude of Judge Michael L. Igoe, of United States district court.

Next Monday the people of Chicago, longtime sufferers from the antiquated, high-priced transit service which has accompanied court receiverships of the privately owned lines, will vote on the question of adopting the city-State plan for public ownership.

Two days later a report is due from the Illinois Commerce Commission on the city's plan for purchase of the transit properties.

But Judge Igoe, because of his judicial authority over the traction litigation, is in a position to veto the program, even though the people vote for it and the State commission gives approval.

In view of this situation, the Chicago Sun has inquired into the prolonged control of the Federal district court over the traction properties, particularly the streetcar lines, which have been longest in litigation.

FACTS DISCLOSED IN INQUIRY

Information obtained by the Sun reveals:

1. The manner in which the traction lawsuits, dating back to December 1926, were transferred, with other big receivership and bankruptcy cases, from Judge James H. Wilkerson (now retired), in the United States district court to Judge Igoe, who still wields judicial authority over them.

2. An unsuccessful effort by other United States district court judges to censure Igoe and Wilkerson in connection with the lawsuit transfers.

3. Selection of friends of Igoe and Wilkerson for important jobs in the management of the Chicago Surface Lines, either by court appointment or employment by the management.

4. Appointment of five separate legal staffs, employing at least 37 lawyers to handle legal matters for the trolley lines or trustees of the streetcar properties.

5. A heavy increase in general office personnel of the surface lines at the same time the company was losing large numbers of conductors, motormen and other operating employees.

(Representatives of the Sun had made an appointment with Judge Igoe for yesterday afternoon, with the view of getting Judge Igoe's comment on the matters discussed in this article. However, Judge Igoe later sent word that he could not keep the appointment because of other business and that he would be unable to see the Sun's representative before tomorrow.)

The public ownership plan coming before the voters Monday would terminate the costly litigation tying up the surface lines and the elevated lines of the Chicago Rapid Transit Co.

The surface lines, composed of two separate streetcar systems, were in receivership for nearly 13 years until Judge Igoe placed them in bankruptcy last fall.

FOUR MILLION NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN EXPENSES

Receivership fees and related expenses have taken more than $4,000,000 out of streetcar fares. The elevated lines have been in bankruptcy since 1937, after 5 years of receivership. Expenses in this case total over $900,000.

Judge Igoe has had jurisdiction of the traction cases since March 27, 1940, when he inherited them from Judge Wilkerson.

Court records show the transit litigation was transferred on that date from Wilkerson to Igoe by orders signed by the executive committee of the United States District Court, then composed of Judges Igoe, Wilkerson, and the late Charles E. Woodward.

FRICTION OVER FEES

This action, together with later transfers from Wilkerson to Igoe of other important cases involving large fee allowances, had a disturbing effect on some of their colleagues, the Sun has been informed, and subsequently led to friction.

The matter came to a head at a stormy meeting of the Federal district judges in February 1941, when a resolution of censure against Igoe and Wilkerson was considered, according to unimpeachable information, Wilkerson had retired from the bench a few weeks before.

BARNES PROPOSES CENSURE

The censure resolution was proposed by Judge John P. Barnes and was seconded by Judge William J. Campbell. After some debate it was defeated by a vote of 4 to 2. The votes against the resolution were cast by Judges Igoe, Woodward, Philip L. Sullivan, and William H. Holly.

This incident, hitherto unrevealed, is recorded in the minutes of the meeting. (Minutes of the judges' meetings are not public records.)

Reasons for the censure proposal have not been divulged.

RECORDS SHOW CASE TRANSFERS

According to court records, a number of transfers from Judge Wilkerson to Judge Igoe were made in August 1940, on orders signed only by them. These transfers included big bankruptcy cases involving a hotel company and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.

In November 1940, after a new executive committee of judges began to function, Judge Wilkerson sent the committee several other important cases from his calendar "for reassignment to Judge Igoe." The executive committee, composed at this time of Judges Wilkerson, Holly, and Sullivan, transferred the cases accordingly.

CONGRESSMEN REPROVE JUDGE

A congressional committee investigating Federal court receiverships and bankruptcy matters in Chicago in 1934 sharply censured Judge Wilkerson, in a report to the House Judiciary Committee, in connection with his fee allowances in the traction case and other receiverships.

Later a final report, of the inquiry group, in April 1935, recommended that no further steps be taken toward impeachment of Wilkerson and two other judges involved in the inquiry, but said that "it appeared that there existed favoritism in the appointment of receivers, attorneys, referees, and allowances of excessive fees."

In December 1937, President Truman, then United States Senator from Missouri, referred to Judge Wilkerson in a Senate speech as "the most notorious receivership judge on the Federal bench." Senator Truman specifically criticized Wilkerson's fee allowances in the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad case, one of the cases subsequently transferred from Judge Wilkerson to Judge Igoe.

JUDGE IGOE TAKES OVER

Judge Igoe actually assumed jurisdiction of the traction cases a week before their formal reassignment to his calendar; he called into court all parties in the proceedings and asked for a report on progress of negotiations for unification of the streetcar and elevated lines. His entry into the case came as a surprise to the traction litigants.

Later, Judge Igoe explained he was handling the traction matter to permit Judge Wilkerson to give full attention to an important criminal case, and said he would retain jurisdiction of the traction case "until Judge Wilkerson asks for its return."

RETAINS PERMANENT CONTROL

However, Judge Igoe retained permanent control of the transit litigation. Wilkerson left the bench January 1, 1941, and went into private law practice.

Igoe and Wilkerson have been warm friends for many years, although belonging to different political faiths. Igoe is a Democrat and Wilkerson a Republican.

In 1932, when Wilkerson was nominated by President Hoover for promotion from the Federal district bench to judge of the United States circuit court of appeals, Igoe, then Democratic national committeeman from Illinois, supported the nomination, which provoked a storm of protest from labor spokesmen. The nomination died in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

WILKERSON WELCOMES IGOE

When Igoe was inducted as Federal judge in November 1938 in a public ceremony, in Judge Wilkerson's courtroom, Wilkerson, in a welcoming address, recalled that when he was United States district attorney (1911–14), Igoe was one of his assistants. Igoe was appointed special assistant to Wilkerson in November 1913.

Igoe has put in force a series of changes in the operating control of the Chicago surface lines since he has had jurisdiction.

Control of the surface lines, comprising two separate streetcar systems, now is vested in a joint board of management and operation created by Judge Igoe. One of the five board members selected by him has had any previous traction experience.

THREE FRIENDS OF JUDGE

They were appointed in the most recent shake-up last September 18, when Judge Igoe, over protests of some litigants, took the surface lines out of receivership and threw them into bankruptcy.

At least three of the five board members are known to be intimates of Judge Igoe.

There are indications that personal or political associations may be linked with the appointments of some of the men at the head of the surface lines and with the employment of some of their aids.

It is a matter of record, although no public mention has been made of the fact until now, that Judge Igoe has put a former law partner into the lucrative job of general counsel for the surface lines, said to pay $25,000 a year.

JOBS TO WILKERSON ASSOCIATES

While putting his own appointees in charge of the streetcar system, Judge Igoe awarded fee-paying jobs to two friends and law-office associates of Judge Wilkerson, William J. Froelich and Jacob I. Grossman, who previously had served in the transit case under Wilkerson.

Froelich and Grossman serve jointly, by Igoe's appointment as counsel for the joint board of management and operation of the surface lines. Each was awarded by Igoe a fee allowance, "on account," of $1,000 a month, effective since March 1, 1941.

Previously Froelich had served in the case, by order of Judge Wilkerson, as counsel to the court's traction adviser, receiving fees of $59,000 from 1938 through 1940. Grossman was special master for Judge Wilkerson in a minor phase of the traction proceedings, getting $3,000 for such service in 1938.

Judge Igoe recently appointed Grossman as court representative to participate in traction reorganization proceedings, in addition to his other duties. The new appointment did not fix any additional pay.

After Judge Wilkerson's retirement from the bench, January 1, 1941, he and Froelich and Grossman announced their association in the private practice of law at 231 South La Salle Street, where they still maintain offices together.

Grossman was Wilkerson's secretary when the latter was chairman of the Illinois Public Utilities Commission (predecessor of the Illinois Commerce Commission), and later was Wilkerson's master in chancery while he was on the Federal bench.

Judge Igoe's top man in the surface lines management is John E. Sullivan, a close friend and political associate.

Sullivan was made chairman of the present joint board of management and operation when Judge Igoe put the surface lines into bankruptcy last September.

At the same time Sullivan became president of the surface lines, an office that had been vacant since the death of Charles W. Chase in May 1942.

Sullivan has refused to divulge his salary but it is understood to be substantially lower than Chase's salary of $50,000 a year.

A former banker and State bank examiner, Sullivan was hired by the surface lines management as chief financial officer and treasurer in April 1941, about a year after Judge Igoe assumed jurisdiction of the traction case. He succeeded the late M. B. Orde.

In 1943 Sullivan became vice president of the surface lines, a post previously vacant, and also retained the title and duties of treasurer.

ADHERENTS OF O'CONNELL

Both Sullivan and Igoe were political adherents of the late William L. O'Connell, Democratic leader, who was general receiver for closed banks in Illinois under the State auditor until his death in July 1936.

Sullivan served under O'Connell as receiver for the Garfield State Bank.

Before Igoe left private law practice to become United States district attorney in June 1935, he and his law partner, William J. Flaherty—the partnership name was Igoe & Flaherty—served O'Connell as counsel for the State receiver of six banks.

Flaherty continued as receiver's counsel in the bank cases after Igoe withdrew from the firm, according to State records.

In addition to Chairman Sullivan, the joint board of management and operation of the streetcar system includes these four Igoe appointed bankruptcy trustees of the companies constituting the surface lines:

Edward J. Fleming and Charles H. Albers, trustees of the Chicago City Railway Co. and the Calumet & South Chicago Railway Co. (South Side lines).

Thomas J. Friel and Charles C. Renshaw, trustees of the Chicago Railways Co. (north and west side lines).

Fleming and Albers served as receivers of the south side lines by appointment of Judge Igoe before the surface lines were thrown into bankruptcy. Friel and Renshaw were brought into the traction case for the first time by Judge Igoe when he issued the bankruptcy order last fall.

Fleming and Friel, like Sullivan, are numbered among Igoe's intimate friends.

FLEMING COAL EXECUTIVE

Fleming is a business executive, president of the Fleming Coal Co. He was appointed by Judge Wilkerson as receiver for the Congress Hotel in April 1938, serving until the hotel was sold in January 1941. Two months later Judge Igoe made him a traction receiver.

Friel is a grain trader, operating as a broker for his own account on the Chicago Board of Trade.

Albers was assistant to "Billy" O'Connell when the later was general receiver for closed banks in Illinois. He succeeded O'Connell in this post when O'Connell died in 1936, resigning in March 1941. Soon afterward Albers was given a receivership in surface lines by Judge Igoe.

Renshaw has been an investment broker on La Salle Street for more than 35 years and is a partner in the firm of Mitchell, Hutchins & Co.

On his appointment as a bankruptcy trustee in the Surface Lines case, Renshaw filed an affidavit declaring that neither he nor his firm has any interest in securities of the Chicago streetcar lines, although his firm has handled such securities for clients.

NO BANKRUPTCY FEES YET

Thus far there have been no fee allowances for the bankruptcy trustees of the surface lines. Prior to the bankruptcy order, Judge Igoe allowed the receivers $15,000 a year each.

Judge Igoe's former law partner, Flaherty, has been general counsel of the surface lines since December 1941. A formal order was signed by Judge Igoe at that time approving Flaherty's appointment by the Surface Lines' management in place of John R. Guilliams, the former general counsel.

It was announced Guilliams had resigned because of illness. Guilliams, who was retired on a pension, had been getting $25,000 a year.

Another important replacement in the top personnel of the surface lines since Judge Igoe became judicial overseer was the appointment of Charles A. Burns, former banker and associate of Sullivan, as comptroller in February 1944. He replaced Charles H. Allen, veteran financial officer who retired on a pension.

ADVANCED TO TREASURER

Burns was moved up to treasurer last December in place of Sullivan after the latter became chairman of the management board. Burns and Sullivan had been associated some years before as vice presidents of the old Foreman-State National Bank.

Burns first joined the surface lines in August 1941, as auditor for the receivers of the South Side lines.

Under Wilkerson's jurisdiction of the traction case, the late Charles M. Bates, a Wilkerson protégé and former clerk of the United States district court, was employed by the surface lines in February 1935, as assistant secretary. Bates was retained on the surface lines pay roll after the traction case was transferred from Wilkerson to Igoe, until his death last September

It may be of interest to Chicago's streetcar riders, whose fares pay all the bills, that 37 different lawyers are employed to handle various legal matters for the Chicago surface lines, the trustees of the streetcar systems comprising the surface lines and the joint board of management and operation of the surface lines.

SET-UP OF LEGAL STAFF

The surface lines have a general legal staff headed by Flaherty, the former law partner of Judge Igoe.

Two other lawyers, David R. Watson and Thomas E. Strachan, Jr., serve as assistant counsel under Flaherty, according to a report filed with Judge Igoe in January.

The surface lines also have a personal-injury law department headed by Frank L. Kriete and employing 27 other lawyers. Nine of Kriete's lawyer aides are on a regular salary while the other 18 are trial lawyers employed on a per diem basis, the management board reported. The pay roll for this department has not been disclosed.

The board of management and operation has two lawyers appointed by Judge Igoe. They are Froelich and Grossman.

OTHER LAWYERS EMPLOYED

Members of the management board include the two bankruptcy trustees of the south side lines and the two trustees of the north and west side lines. In addition to the attorneys for the management board, a separate lawyer serves each set of trustees.

Charles Aaron, appointed by Judge Igoe in 1941, is counsel for the trustees of the south side lines. He has been paid at the rate of $15,000 a year.

Weymouth Kirkland of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, is attorney for the receivers of the north and west side lines under a fee allowance of $15,000 a year. He was appointed originally by Judge Wilkerson in 1927 at the start of the traction litigation and was retained by Judge Igoe.

TWO TAX ATTORNEYS HIRED

Recently, on January 26, Judge Igoe authorized the trustees and the management board to employ two other lawyers, David L. Bazelon and Leo J. Schwartz, as special counsel to handle Federal tax matters.

Bazelon served under Igoe as an assistant United States district attorney during Igoe's tenure as Federal district attorney here (1935–38) and remained in that office as chief of the civil tax litigation division until February 29, 1940.

Both Bazelon and Schwartz are members of the law firm of Gottlieb & Schwartz, counsel for first mortgage bondholders of the south side streetcar lines.

In addition to the large array of lawyers, the Chicago Sun has found a curiously heavy increase in the surface lines staff of general office clerks since 1942 in the face of a large loss of operating personnel, such as conductors, motormen, and maintenance men.

This is revealed by sworn reports filed annually by the surface lines with the Illinois Commerce Commission.

MANY OPERATORS LOST

The reports show that from January 31, 1943, to January 31, 1945, the surface lines staff of transportation and maintenance employees declined about 10 percent because of the wartime manpower shortage. This loss included 1,277 conductors, motormen, and trainmen; 175 track and roadway workers; 69 carhouse employees, and 44 shopmen.

Yet during the same period, the number of general office clerks rose from 435 to 547, an increase of 25 percent. And the total pay roll for this group of employees jumped 42 percent, from $345,169 to $1,205,123.

Sullivan gave this explanation: The general office force had to be enlarged since 1942 because of additional clerical work entailed by increased war savings activities, pay roll withholding tax records, adoption of a half-fare rate for students, installation of a new biweekly pay-roll system, and various other innovations in the last 3 years.

Were new jobs created for patronage purposes or other questionable reasons? Positively not, said Sullivan.

"No one has been put on our pay roll for any reason except to fill a necessary job," Sullivan declared, "Our pay roll records are clean and will stand the most searching scrutiny."

However, Sullivan refused, on advice of counsel, to furnish pay roll lists requested by the Chicago Sun for the purpose of ascertaining specific changes and additions in personnel.

OTHER LINES' INCREASE LOW

In comparison with the 25-percent increase in the number of general office clerks in the surface lines since 1942, the Philadelphia transit system reported a rise of 8 percent in the number of such employees during the same period, the Detroit street railways, an increase of 10 percent, and the Boston elevated lines an increase of 13 percent.

The surface lines' reports to the Illinois Commerce Commission also disclose a 66 percent increase since 1942 in annual expenditures for "pensions and gratuities."

This item, listed as an operating expense, was reported at $661,525 for the year ended January 31, 1943, and $1,096,018 for the year ended January 31, 1945.

Sullivan explained that during this period the retirement pension plan for surface lines' employees was supplemented by other benefits, including group life insurance, accident, and health insurance, hospitalization, and full pay for sick leave up to 7 days.

The new benefits added to the normal increase in retirement pensions, account for the 66 percent jump in the "pensions and gratuities" expense since 1942, Sullivan said.

As in the case of the pay-roll lists, Sullivan refused to furnish any pension lists or other details about this expense, except the total number of pensioned employees. He gave figures showing the number of pensioners rose from 769 to 1,080 from January 31, 1943, to January 31, 1945, an increase of 40 percent.

OFFICERS PAY OF 9 PERCENT

Salary scales of general officers of the Surface Lines have been boosted an average of 9 percent since 1942, according to the reports filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission.

The last three reports showed:

January 31, 1943: Total pay roll of $294,886 for 23 officers, an average salary of $12,821.

January 31, 1944: Total pay roll of $307,009 for 25 officers, an average salary of $12,280.

January 31, 1945: Total pay roll of $363,328 for 26 officers, an average salary of $13,973.

Individual salaries are not listed.

It may be significant that between the last two reports, one general officer was added, while the total salaries rose $56,319. It was during this period that the office of president, previously vacant, was given to Sullivan, who had been vice president and treasurer.

International Peace Conference Planning Should Embrace Education Office; R. M. Davis Makes Contribution to Youth Participation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that our world security plans incorporate, within the pattern of peace, the provision for an international program of education. In this connection, it is gratifying to recognize the appropriate action which Congress has recently taken in the passage of legislation which urges the participation of our country in the creation of an international educational and cultural organization.

In reference to the House measure sponsored by Representative MUNDT, I include at this point, copies of correspondence between Dr. W. W. Trent, State superintendent of free schools, Charleston, W. Va., and myself, and also with Mr. Phares E. Reeder, executive secretary, State Education Association, Charleston:

MAY 18, 1945.

House Resolution 215, which in substance "urges participation by the Government of the United States in the organization of an International Office of Education * * *: *Provided, however,* That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations or their administrations," is now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Possibly by the time you receive this letter, the Foreign Affairs Committee will have completed its hearing on this resolution.

It is the honest and sincere belief of educators throughout the Nation that such an International Office of Education should be established. In West Virginia, during the past 2 years or more, we have held regional leadership conferences and other educational meetings in which we have discussed the general topic Education and People's Peace. Furthermore, we have sent before numerous parent-teacher organizations and civic clubs' speakers who have discussed this all-important topic. Within these discussions we have attempted to emphasize the importance of the establishment of an International Office of Education. Educators in West Virginia and many forward-looking lay citizens believe that such a step will go a long way toward effectuating a permanent peace.

Because of developments at the San Francisco Conference, it is believed that an immediate passage of House Resolution 215 will have constructive influence upon the development of Conference opinion favorable to the creation of an International Office of Education in the peace structure of the postwar era. If passage is to be effected, it will call for quick House action.

In behalf of the West Virginia teachers who so ardently have been interested in education as an aid for developing a lasting peace, I not only solicit your support of House Resolution 215 but urge that you use your influence in getting it brought to the floor of the House. I have wired Congressman KEE, who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, regard this matter.

Thanking you for your cooperation and extending to you my best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

PHARES E. REEDER,
Executive Secretary.

[Telegram]

MAY 18, 1945.

Request your support for House Resolution 215, which urges participation by the United States in an International Office of Education with certain safeguards for the educational system of the several nations. I believe that such office can make a definite contribution to world peace.

W. W. TRENT,
State Superintendent of Free Schools, Charleston, W. Va.

My reply, in both these instances, follows:

MAY 23, 1945.

I appreciate your communication in reference to House Resolution 215. I am strongly in favor of the purposes of this legislation, and I feel that such an office would be helpful in the cause of an enduring world peace. Education must play an important roll in the postwar world. Any international organization which is formulated must, in my opinion, include the establishment of an International Office of Education.

Barriers that have kept the nations apart culturally can eventually be lowered or erased by the activity of such a unit within the framework of our peace building.

One of the principal reasons for my intense interest in this subject is because of the successful program which has brought a ready response from the youth of Monongalia County, which section, as a part of the Second West Virginia District, I have the responsibility to represent. R. M. Davis, of Morgantown, sponsored, earlier this year, an essay contest which was participated in by more than three hundred high-school students. This businessman, who is a courageous and far-visioned citizen, arranged a visit for the contest winners to Washington, D. C. They came to the National Capital April 2, 1945, and on the afternoon of that day I briefly addressed my colleagues, and called attention to their presence, in the following words:

Mr. Speaker, our citizens, regardless of party or creed or color, are intensely interested in seeing to it that when victory comes, which we hope will be soon in all theaters of war, there will be written a permanent peace. Two young people, Pauline Pyles and Tony Pataki, from my congressional district, are in Washington today. First prize winner, Darla Lou Eddy, was unable because of an injury to make the trip. They have won awards for the writing of clear-cut essays on the subject of a constitution for the United Nations. They are here as the guests of a splendid citizen of my district. I call him a rank-and-file citizen, a coal operator, R. M. Davis, of Morgantown, who is a pioneer in working for a permanent peace of the world. I believe their visit to our National Capital, and the recognition we give to these students, is something which will be embraced by the American people as symbolic of our earnest desire that peace must be nurtured in the hearts and minds of the youth of our land.

Their subjects were woven about the need for a Constitution for a United Nations Government.

There is noteworthy of quotation from that document, published on January 15, 1945, a provision in which Mr. Davis proposed, among other articles, an Office for Peace Education, in the following words:

OFFICE OF PEACE EDUCATION

1. While the United Nations government must be effectively prepared to fight to preserve the peace of the world it should also do everything within its power to remove all obstacles to a lasting peace. One of the greatest obstacles to such a peace is ignorance of international affairs. In recognition of this fact there shall be created by the executive council an International Office of Peace Education, to be presided over by a secretary of peace education, which shall develop an international-peace program to be carried to the four corners of the earth. In order to prevent overlapping and duplication of activities, cooperation shall be extended to the authorities of member nations in formulating an educational program to be carried on in the school systems of the member nations.

At this point, I include the following explanatory letter:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *April 11, 1945.*

DR. JOHN W. STUDEBAKER,
United States Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. STUDEBAKER: I want you to know how happy I was to see you the other night at the dinner given by Congressman RANDOLPH for the winners of the essay contest on the Constitution for an International Government. I have reflected upon this meeting several times since my return to Morgantown, and have been wondering how we might get an expression of the boys and girls of America on the kind of an international government that they desire. If the boys and girls in the high schools of this country could express themselves in essays on the kind of government that the world should have following the present conflict, I believe it would do a tremendous amount of good.

The more I think about it, the more I am convinced that Mr. R. M. Davis is on the right track, and that the boys and girls now in high school will be the men and women most vitally concerned with the problems of the postwar era. If a just and lasting peace, supported by a world organization of peace-loving nations is not provided, then we are doomed to a series of recurrent world wars.

It seems to me that the office of education would be the logical agency to stimulate the young people in the high schools to do the same type of thing that we have done here in Monongalia County. If you would address a letter to the different State superintendents of schools telling them what we have done in Monongalia County, they might be stimulated to do the same thing in the high schools under their supervision. Mr. Davis will be very happy to send 100 copies of his Constitution for a United Nations Government as an example of a concrete plan for stimulating original thinking on the part of the State superintendents as well as the boys and girls

in the high schools of the Nation. I shall appreciate having your reaction to this general idea.

Again assuring you that it was a pleasure to see you again, I am

Cordially yours,

FLOYD B. COX,
Superintendent,
Monongalia County Schools.

I agree with Mr. Cox, and I hope that the time will soon come when other individuals will do what Mr. Davis has done, because I believe that students throughout America would welcome the opportunity to participate in these essay contests. Dr. Studebaker at the dinner had indicated we should have contests in the 3,000 counties of the country.

I believe it worth while to quote from the essays of the first, second, and third prize winners respectively.

First prize winner, Miss Eddy:

Education must not alone be national but universal. The fundamental precepts of the common brotherhood of man must be set forth in our textbooks. The world must be educated for peace even as the Axis nations have been educated for greed, for egotism, for war.

The whole world needs a spiritual awakening. We must have spiritual security before we can have material security. We must have faith in men and must realize that the only foundation upon which a peaceful world can ever exist is in the ideas which we know as the golden rule and the brotherhood of man. These have been the basis of our own civilization. They are spread by teaching in the home, school, church, and community, and by example. If we would spend only 1 percent of what we spend on war to spread these ideals among mankind, the world would astonish us with its progress toward intellectual and moral unity which alone can give meaning and power to constitutions, councils, assemblies, and courts.

We must have faith in the future, and not exaggerate our fears and difficulties. Our problems can be solved by intelligence and good will. We have a better opportunity than any generation has ever had. We can have a decent and peaceful world, but we must act and act now

Second prize winner, Mr. Pataki:

To create a just and lasting peace it is necessary to set up an international organization to promote justice and to preserve peace.

Peace leads to international cooperation, understanding, and justice. War serves only to create distrust, suspicion, destruction, increased taxes, uncertainty, moral decay, and great sacrifice. It interrupts peace projects and leads to more war. The most fundamental antidote for war is the philosophy of love. In the church we are to love our neighbors and enemies. God taught us to overcome evil with good. Men and nations must obey the moral law which comes from God.

Third prize winner, Miss Pyles:

The most difficult political task in the world's history will rest upon the men who will build the peace which must follow World War II. I say must because I feel that if another war is to follow this one civilization will be completely wiped out. We must realize that our degree of civilization (while being highly advanced) makes it possible for whole cities to be literally demolished by a few bombs. If another war follows this one, innocent people far from the scene of battle will be killed by the new robot bomb. We cannot have another war! This new peace must be a lasting one! It is up to the youth of this country to see that the peace is carried out (putting it on a purely selfish basis) for our own good. A world peace plan must be drawn up which will be democratic, excluding no nation, race, or color.

It is up to us to use to the fullest extent our natural resources for the good of the people of the world. Nothing is gained by war but death, misery, backward steps in progress. A peace organization and an enforced peace is necessary simply because people cannot fully comprehend the disadvantages of war. They must be shown the path of peace.

I was first contacted by Mr. Davis early in 1942 in reference to his belief that an international constitutional convention should be held.

In accordance with his ideas, and my desire to cooperate, I introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress, on July 17, 1942, House Concurrent Resolution 77; in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on January 7, 1943, House Concurrent Resolution 5; and in the Seventy-ninth Congress, on January 3, 1945, House Concurrent Resolution 8. Copy of the measure is herewith presented. It will be noted that the sixteenth point indicates the need for the international delegates to adopt a program of international education and improvement.

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress respectfully requests the President to invite foreign governments to send representatives to attend an international constitutional convention charged with the duty of drafting a constitution which shall provide—

(1) For an international government;

(2) For participation by all nations desiring so to do;

(3) For an international administrative board consisting of 15 men;

(4) For an international supreme court;

(5) For an international congress consisting of senators from each participating nation;

(6) For free religion;

(7) For free press;

(8) For free speech;

(9) For free assembly;

(10) For retention by all nations of the right to maintain the form of internal government desired by each;

(11) For the abolition of all armaments by all nations; except an international police force under the control of the international government;

(12) For complete control by the international government of all international questions and relationships;

(13) For a program designed to raise the economic condition, living standards, wages, etc., of all people;

(14) For a program of improved international trade relations;

(15) For a program of international social improvement;

(16) For a program of international educational improvement; and

(17) For machinery to amend the constitution when found necessary.

In conclusion, I would like to state that Mr. Davis attended the opening days of the Security Conference in San Francisco. I am informed that he was most helpful in counseling with the representatives who were present. More than 300 copies of his proposed constitution were effectively distributed.

Responsibility of Congress to the City of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 1 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able editorial in the Washington Post on the problems of the District of Columbia. The editorial makes a truthful statement when it says that the responsibility for the government for the District of Columbia falls directly upon Congress. I am glad to commend the editorial as being thoroughly sound.

There being no obection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

So long as Congress insists on functioning as Washington's city council, it cannot unload the governmental failures on local officials, but what we need more urgently is a genuine local government, of which a department of public welfare would be a part. It is in failing to provide such a government that Congress has been grossly unfair to the District. Local citizens find it impossible to eliminate atrocities because all the power to govern is in the hands of a National Legislature which is too busy to exercise it wisely.

Nor is it to be supposed that Mr. COFFEE and other friends of the District can change the basic situation by appropriating funds for new welfare institutions. Of course, new buildings are needed. But far more than new buildings will be required to give this backward city a modern public-welfare system. Eternal vigilance is the price of successful management, as well as of liberty, and that sort of vigilance in the direction of municipal affairs comes only when officials are directly responsible to the people they serve. Until Congress is ready to apply the American formula of home rule to the District it would be naive to expect anything more than opportunistic patching up of disgraceful conditions.

World Peace Plans Threatened by Failure of Russia and Rest of World To Cooperate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am reprinting herewith the text of remarks I made at Memorial Day exercises held May 30 at Newcomerstown, Ohio, under the auspices of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, with Mr. J. W. Robe acting as master of ceremonies:

As Americans observing Memorial Day this year in loving remembrance of soldiers of

past wars, we stand more confident and self-assured of our national strength than we did last Memorial Day. If you will let your minds travel back to Memorial Day of a year ago, you will recall that we were then in great anxiety and concern lest the invasion of the European Continent might meet with failure. We feared that at best we must expect countless casualties from wholesale destruction of troop ships.

None of these fears materialized.

May it come to pass that Japanese resistance we now know to be so intense will break soon, so that our next Memorial Day will see our people freed from the ever-present apprehension that fills every home which has sent a son to the front.

I have never quite outgrown my boyish idea that Memorial Day primarily is in memory of the veterans of the Civil War. The blue-coated Grand Army men were the outstanding personalities of my youthful days. If in those times there was any parading to be done, or a flag to be raised, or a cannon salute to be fired, it fell to their lot. Later, then, in the late nineties, whilst the columns of the Civil War veterans still headed the Memorial Day parade, and easily formed the bulk of the marchers, a new division brought up the rear—the Spanish-American War veterans, whom I saw leave home young, and wild, should I say, for the experiences of war about which the Grand Army men had talked so much to them in school and in public meetings.

This year in most communities everywhere there will be no Civil War veterans to head the parade, for there are now only 240 of them on earth, all of them of an average age of 98 years—what a pitiful remnant left of the army of the blue that numbered over 2,000,000.

In most places, therefore, oldest soldiers in line will be the Spanish-American War veterans, of whom there is now some 129,000 and better. Then will come World War I veterans, commingled, I assume, in most cities with World War II veterans just now streaming home covered with honor and distinction. At the moment, it does not seem that the veterans of the two world wars are to be independently organized, so that we shall almost begin to think of them as belonging to one great conflict between Germany and the world enacted in two episodes 25 years apart.

The Decoration Day processions, therefore, will grow longer and longer, because there will be more veterans than ever in the whole history of the United States—a melancholy sign that proves our deep yearning for the preservation of peace has not to date borne fruit.

If you will indulge my reminiscing a bit longer, may I tell you that in 1924 I was in Berlin, Germany, and there I witnessed the observance by the German people, of memorial day for the German dead of World War I. Fritz Ebert, President of the German Republic, was delivering the memorial address from the Reichstag Building, to which great crowds were repairing that bright Sunday afternoon. What I saw that day persuaded me that perhaps Germany was beginning to realize that her military urgings were futile and disastrous. Many young men were in these Berlin crowds, wearing on their coat lapels a paper streamer imprinted with the words: "Nie Mehr Krieg." Interpreted this means "No more war." To me this was significant, for on this day of national mourning such a slogan, it seemed, might impute blame to the Germany of Emperor William. Yet these young Germans were defiantly asserting themselves in this way.

At the very moment these young Berlin Germans were flaunting their sentiments against war, there was imprisoned in a fortress at Landsberg, Germany, Adolf Hitler, brewing his hateful philosophy which he incorporated in Mein Kampf, that fountainhead of all the malice and hate which finally threw the world into global war. I had then never heard of Hitler, although the Germans themselves knew of him as the wild, radical leader who had tried to upset the Republic by proclaiming a nationalist-socialist revolution in Bavaria in 1923, and had rather ingloriously gone down in defeat. In many eyes, he was looked upon as a mountebank, and an English writer drawing his conclusions evidently from the sentiments of the German people in 1927 wrote about him as follows:

"Hitler, a native of Vienna, had been apprenticed to a house painter, and from being a Socialist was driven by his own violent anti-Semitism into the ranks of the other extreme. He first came to Munich when the war broke out, and he served in the German Army, subsequently acquiring German nationality. Modeling himself on Mussolini in all but political intelligence, he cast himself for the part of a German Gambetta, for which he was totally unequipped. Though combining sincerity with a gift for glib oratory and more than a touch of megalomania, he was a complete stranger to the realities of politics, and seemed lost in a world of fantasy as he delivered his harangues, a mixture of anti-Semitic hatred, pose, and vanity. In his ecstatic visions he saw a dictatorship with himself as President of the Reich, destined to restore order not only in Berlin, but to operate beyond the German frontiers and liberate Germany from the consequences of the lost war. He had fired the imaginations of the younger men."

If ever man failed in prophecy or in estimate of the abilities and capacities of a public character, this author did so most woefully. If he still lives, he must realize how much all civilization all over the world would have profited if Hitler had been the inept and unequipped person he pictured in his book.

But the train of ruin that Hitler left is a part of a bloody history that we now cannot alter or change, and therefore we must concentrate our minds on the future, nourishing the hope that war makers must and can be stopped in their tracks, before they again upset the world and bring another harvest of death and devastation. While the San Francisco Conference sits in solemn session, we ought by prayer and by encouragement strengthen the men who guide it.

It is too early to predict what the issue of the Conference will be, but I have come from Washington down to your community, to make you conscious of one overshadowing and fateful fact, that if the world and Russia, this new giant in the family of nations, cannot find a way to live together in confidence and good will, all we do in San Francisco will be a waste of time and effort. Therein lies the gravest and most terrible problem of the moment.

Let me say with all the emphasis I possess, that the persons who now hopelessly declare, in your presence and in mine, that the United States is inevitably destined to fight another great people, are wittingly or unwittingly creating a national psychology that may bring to us in the not distant future, another world conflict. This, I think, can be avoided by wise statesmanship, and by the creation of a sentiment of understanding, despite the fact that both countries are diametrically opposed in their economic, religious, and political conceptions.

The soldiers of the United States and Russia marched hundreds of weary miles over European territory, much of which they had never before set foot on; they faced the perils of ambush and of hidden underground explosives; and by courage and dash unparalleled in the history of warfare, they met together to clasp hands on the sacred soil that Hitler boasted would never be touched by foreign soldiers. And ever since these European fronts of the east and west armies merged at the Elbe, the fraternizing American, British and Russian soldiers, at long last released from personal danger, are in a perpetual state of rejoicing, banquetting and jollification. Russian women soldiers, I read, are seen on the streets of German towns, carrying flowers to American soldiers. When one of our outstanding generals, a dignified figure, ended his vocal praise of the superb singing and dancing of Red Army men, the latter gave him "the business" by tossing him up repeatedly to the ceiling. Russian generals in their colorful uniforms went wild when they saw Americans dance "the jitterbug". Here's Russia's greatest general posing for a picture with one of America's movie stars. Yes, the men who risked all, and endured all, are getting along famously, and what we in America want to see is this spirit permeate the high-up diplomats who are representing the United Nations in the negotiations now in progress to make impossible World War III.

I believe most sincerely and devoutly in the American way of life, in the competitive system or the free enterprise system, as some refer to it; I do not want the United States Government to be the employer of every one of its citizens, and have all our manifold business and manufacturing activities directed by Government officials. If Russia, however, accepts these principles and refrains from attempting by force to impose them on us, I see no reason why her devotion to an ideology we do not like, should involve us in war.

I have a feeling Russia in some instances is pursuing a wrong course, yet, critical as I may be, I think it is essential for the peace of the world that the western nations patiently try to understand the Russian position, and strive by every means, without the sacrifice of our real interests, to bring about accommodation of conflicting views. This was accomplished in the waging of the war against Germany and we should not despair of it now.

As between the United States and Russia, there are fundamental reasons why we should not be brought into open conflict. Both countries have great expanses of land, underlaid with rich mineral resources, and obviously need no expansion of area to permit their complete and prosperous development. Our aims are not unlike—to provide full employment and to elevate the standard of living. Such a goal is surely not attainable if a country is to waste its resources and manpower in eternal conflict. Russia's terrific human losses, moreover, ought to be a brake on war as a means of promoting her national interests.

May I read, in conclusion, prophetic words from the monumental study of Alexis de Tocqueville, great Frenchman, who wrote, in 1835:

"There are at present two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and Americans.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits and they have only to maintain their power, but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived.

"Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

These two nations—Russia and the United States—are now said to control 75 percent of

the productive capacity of the world. They have fulfilled the predictions of the great Frenchman. Upon how these two nations, together with England, react to each other depends, it seems to me, all our hope for peace in the future.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the magnificent victory of our armies in Europe is now making possible the return of many great generals who directed their mighty drives. We have just been told that the supreme commander himself, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, is to visit Washington on June 18. Plans have already been made for public acclaim of this illustrious hero. The leaders of both branches feel, and have agreed, that a special ceremony should be arranged by the Congress of the United States to symbolize the welcome and gratitude of all his countrymen for the service General Eisenhower has rendered to the Nation.

Surely some national honor must be prepared for the man to whom his country owes so much. For 3 years, since he left these shores in June of 1942 to command our forces in Europe, he has borne a responsibility more grave than that of any other soldier in the field. The armies under his command have been the greatest we have ever mobilized in defense of our liberty.

Through a series of strategic and tactical triumphs, General Eisenhower has discharged his responsibility with a brilliance that has fired the imagination of every Allied Nation, as it has struck terror at the hearts of our enemies. Now he is coming back to us briefly, before he returns to the task of bringing order out of the chaos which the funeral pyre of the Nazis has left as ashes in a broken land.

Mr. Speaker, the calamity of war places heavy burdens upon the shoulders of military leaders. Despite the training of our service schools and the lessons of field exercises, there can be no thorough preparation for the magnitude of the problems suddenly thrust upon a man called to carry out such gigantic endeavors.

When General Eisenhower went to Great Britain as the choice of our Chief of Staff to plan the defeat of the conquest-mad Axis Powers, there were few outside his profession who even knew his name. During the last war, as a young officer not long out of West Point, the fortune of assignment kept him from the battlefields of France. It was his growing professional competence in the two decades of peace which commended him to posts of mounting responsibility. When General Marshall selected him for the crucial assignment at the head of our European forces, he was Assistant Chief of Staff of the Operations Division of the War Department General Staff.

I do not know everything that may have been in the mind of the Chief of Staff when he selected General Eisenhower for the top post in Europe. We may have no doubt that he possessed the utmost confidence in this modest man's genius for high command. But, in addition, I can guess that General Marshall was thinking of the close relationship which must be established between the British and American forces as the key to their effectiveness against the enemy. He knew that one of Eisenhower's greatest assets was the warmth of his personality. No one could experience it without realizing that it came from a deep integrity of character and a rugged honesty. For 3 years the strength of these qualities has symbolized in the minds of our allies the all-out determination of our people to have victory at whatever cost.

General Eisenhower's task, Mr. Speaker, has not been wholly military. His victory has revealed him as a military statesman of the highest order. War has matured his genius for leadership, which has won the admiration of our allies as well as of our own Nation. From the outset of his service in Europe he ordered and enforced rigidly a close collaboration between our forces and the British. When Axis propaganda attempted to create suspicion and discord between us, it was General Eisenhower, by the example of cooperation already achieved in the combined staffs of his headquarters, who caused it to fail.

On the combined strength of his forces depended the success of the strategy in north Africa, which won us the first of our stunning victories in May of 1943. That winter and spring were anxious days for the American people. For the first time American soldiers, almost untested in battle, were face to face with the combat-hardened German veterans who had overrun all of Europe. These Germans had been described for us as supermen, skilled in blitzkrieg, adept in every phase of modern war.

I do not believe that any of us doubted the outcome. There is something in every American's heart which tells him that no other soldier is a match for our fighting men. But the German had created for himself an awesome reputation. There must have been some during those days when Rommel threatened a wide break-through at the Kasserine Pass who wondered whether our men, for all their courage, were a match for these hardened troops.

We were not long in having our answer. General Eisenhower's valorous counterblows first blunted, then contained, and at last threw back the weight of Rommel's mechanized thrust. We realized then that armored tactics learned in the mud at Fort Knox brought success in battle. We learned that infantry doctrines taught at a dozen posts in this country were the equal of any tricks in the German bag. We learned that the massed artillery fires developed at Fort Sill could immobilize great formations of German soldiers and literally destroy their will to resist. Finally, in those triumphant days of early May, we saw these veterans of Hitler's victories driven to relentless defeat at Bizerte and Tunis.

Such victories are won by the courage and fighting heart of our soldiers. But their architects are the men who plan the strategy and lay out the tactics. Weeks, sometimes months before, they draw the blueprints of a campaign's success. In the end, it is one man's responsibility—the commander's—to select and approve the final plan and the timing of its execution. In Tunisia, it was General Eisenhower who won the first great Allied victory over the Axis.

As we look back now on the series of campaigns—Sicily, Italy, the Channel crossing, the invasion of southern France, the break-out over France, the thrust across the Rhine—there seems to have been a certain inevitability to their pattern. The strategy has paid off so handsomely that we may be lulled into the belief that its success was foreordained.

I am sure there was nothing inevitable about it to General Eisenhower, who was charged with the responsibility of each one of these gigantic moves against a well-prepared foes. Mr. Speaker, every soldier knows that there is nothing sure in war. Disaster might have met any of those great assaults against the German force. It could have been avoided only by the cool, clear estimates of the situation which the supreme commander was able to make. Only by the minute planning of his staff down to the last detail, capped by the element of surprise, could we go into each new battle with confidence that from this calculated risk might grow a formidable victory.

We are now almost at the eve of the first anniversary of the Normandy landings. A year ago at this time, our invasion armada was poised for the greatest single assault in history. The unknown enemy in those fearsome hours was not the German strength. It was the weather. High winds had whipped the Channel to dangerous turbulence. Cloudy skies threatened disaster to our airborne troops. For a day the invasion was postponed. Another delay must stall it for days until tides were once more right.

That awful moment of decision on the 5th of June was General Eisenhower's alone. We know that he met it boldly and, after ordering the operation to proceed according to plan, he drove to the fields where the transport planes were waiting. He watched the paratroopers while they blackened their faces and chatted with the airborne infantry which would ride gliders into battle. Whatever anxiety he felt, it was his confidence that fired these men.

Toward midnight the sky trains were on their way to a rendezvous at the bridges which guard the roads to the beaches where our troops would land at dawn. Mr. Speaker, that night the lives of tens of thousands of courageous young Americans depended on the plans which had been made long before to win this epic beachhead on the Norman coast. Those plans and their execution were

the high responsibility of General Eisenhower.

The courage of this quiet man must have had its greatest test that night and during the days that followed. Coolness and calm, clear thinking above all things were necessary to draw from the confusion of battle on the beaches the moves which would give it success. As our strength grew and the fighting swept across the marshes and fanned westward toward the prize of Cherbourg, the battle plans were tested and confirmed. At last, after 2 years of preparation, the commander's flag was firmly planted on the mainland of France. The plains lay before him, a classic battleground for a war of maneuver which would bring victory in the west.

Mr. Speaker, in all the events that have followed his command in Europe, General Eisenhower has proved himself a man of truly heroic stature. He has seemed to grow with the growth of our military operations until now I have no hesitation in saying that history must mark him as one of the world's most illustrious military leaders. His genius has directed the moves of great generals who commanded the armies and the army corps, the divisions, and the smaller units which cut to pieces the mightiest military machine the Germans could build.

In honoring the supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force, I feel that we shall be paying the Nation's homage not only to him but to the other leaders and the brave men who have earned his highest praise and our own. We shall consider it a great privilege to have General Eisenhower come here where the entire Congress may in some small way show him the warmth of the Nation's regard for his superb achievements.

The Mystery About Jose del Castano, Spanish Consul General in Manila

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1945, over 3½ months ago, I made a speech on the House floor, in which I discussed the status of one Señor Jose del Castano. At that time, I warmly urged the State Department and the War Department, in collaboration, to pick up Del Castano upon the liberation of the city of Manila, try him as a war criminal and, if convicted, deal with him summarily.

During the last few days, I have been advised that Del Castano has been in the United States since May 10. Upon being apprised of this startling information, I made strenuous efforts to secure the latest data relative to this gentleman from the War Department and the State Department.

I am now advised by Dean Acheson, principal Assistant Secretary of State, that Del Castano has been sent out of this country on a vessel flying the Spanish flag, from New Orleans—that he has been kept under surveillance during his entire time in the United States—that he was required to board the ship for departure at New Orleans, with his family, immediately upon arrival at that port.

It appears that Jose del Castano was declared persona non grata by our State Department; that our Army authorities in the Philippines had picked him up on the capture of Manila; that Del Castano had claimed diplomatic immunity and that he was accorded the rights and privileges of a diplomat by our State Department.

Personally, I am disgusted and outraged that we are so solicitous of these Fascists and so careful to safeguard their interests. It has been my experience that people whose prominence has been achieved in the democratic field, internationally, have a very difficult time securing an entree into the United States and are often denied means of transportation. With our railroads and merchant vessels congested, it would appear that we should be very cautious about extending privileges to men of the character of Jose del Castano.

I have been advised by Allan Chase, author of Falange and the Five Arrows and a leader in the crusade to expose Franco, by wire from San Francisco, that Del Castano's military aide, Vice Consul Guiterrez, is now a prisoner of American military authorities at Manila. The same treatment should have been accorded Del Castano. He is a war criminal—he is a proven enemy of the United States. The New York Post editorially has taken a leading part in demanding that summary justice be meted out to Del Castano.

For the sake of refreshing the memory of those who may be unfamiliar with the situation, I am quoting the facts concerning this Falangist:

On November 3, 1940, Jose del Castano, chief of the National Delegation of the Falange Exterior—or the overseas division of the German-run Falange Party of Spain—was appointed Spanish consul general to Manila. Twenty-four hours later, the official newspaper of the Falange in Madrid, Arriba, published the official announcement that Jose del Castano had also been named chief of the Philippines cells of the Spanish Falange. A veteran leader of the Falange—the Spanish branch of the Nazi Party—Del Castano had long taken orders from Gen. Wilhelm von Faupel and the other Nazi officers who really control the Falange.

At the same time that Del Castano was sent to Manila, the Nazi-Falange Spanish Government also sent General Riestra to Habana as consul general. Riestra was just as important in the Falange as Del Castano, but Cuba was more alert to the Falangist menace than we were. Within 60 days of his arrival in Habana, Riestra was thrown out of Cuba—thanks to a courageous campaign led by Senator Augustin Cruz, and to the determination of the Cuban Government to stamp out falangism.

In Manila, Falange leader Del Castano was to suffer no such indignities. He built up the Falange, and, when Manila broke diplomatic relations with Germany, Italy, and Japan, on June 18, 1941, Del Castano took over their official duties in the Philippines. The Spanish consulate, under Del Castano, became the clearinghouse for all Axis confidential messages.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the action of our State Department for letting Del Castano slip through our hands. Is not it time that we reassured the American soldier, fighting against the Japs in the Philippines and elsewhere, that we are determined to punish enemies of the United States?

James R. Young, former International News Service war correspondent, novelist, author of the book and motion picture entitled "Behind the Rising Sun," has repeatedly inveighed against Del Castano. The attorney general of California, Robert W. Kenny, has stated that Del Castano, during May, was in attendance at the San Francisco Conference. Gen. Douglas MacArthur expressed vigorous opposition to the position taken recently by Brig. Gen. Manuel A. Roxas, a prominent Filipino politician, who was captured by the Japanese, when Roxas announced his objection to the current policy of eliminating from the Commonwealth Government and the Filipino Army any who had worked for the Japanese.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with universal military training written by Hon. John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War. The article, which is entitled "We Do Not Want Another War," recently appeared in a national publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER WAR

(By John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War)

Opponents of universal military training for youth in the postwar years frequently raise the question as to why we should develop our military capability when our Nation is dedicated to the maintenance of peace through an international organization such as that contemplated in the Dumbarton Oaks plan. They go further and ask the proponents of the training program to name the nation or nations we are arming ourselves to fight after we have demilitarized Germany and Japan and set up a world peace organization.

Through the two questions spring from the same approach, the second one is not constructive in that it is based upon a hidden or

loaded assumption, much as is the well-known trick question, "Have you quit beating your wife?" The hidden assumption is that we must prepare to fight a particular enemy or not prepare at all. Stated another way, the second question carries the hidden assumption that we should do nothing about preparedness until another nation becomes our enemy, until another nation attacks us.

In still another respect it seems to be unfair. Those who urge it must realize that to provoke a discussion of possible war with another nation may harm our international relations. The balance of good relations between nations is delicate at the best. As the price of preparedness to defend our security against any aggressor or combination of aggressors which might hereafter wish to attack us, we in America should not have to single out particular nations and talk about them as possible enemies.

We do not think of ourselves as a fickle nation. But our international alinements in the past 200 years should at least be thought-provoking to those who insist that, with Germany and Japan crushed, we can forget all about the problems of national defense until we see the whites of the eyes of the next enemy. In 1754, in the French and Indian War, we were alined with the British against the French. In 1776, in our War of Independence, the situation was exactly reversed. In the War of 1812—the one in which our Capitol was burned—we again had the French for allies in our war with England. In 1846, we fought a war with the Mexicans over a large part of the South. In 1898, we fought the Spanish. The next year, in the Philippine Insurrection, we fought Filipinos whom we had freed from Spain. In 1914, we fought the Mexicans at Veracruz and 2 years later we were fighting them again on the Texas border.

OUR UNPREDICTABLE ALLIANCES

In the First World War, we and the British and the French and the Russians and the Italians and the Japanese fought the Austrians and the Germans and the Turks. In early 1941, we began our support of the British and French who were alined against the Germans. The Finns were alined against the Russians who were, in turn, in a treaty relation with the Germans. In late 1941, we began our fight with the Germans and the Italians. The Russians and the British and later the Turks became our allies. The Finns were fighting our ally, Russia, with German help. In the same year, we began our fight with the Japanese, and the Filipinos were on our side. In 1942, we were alined against some of the French and fighting with others, and we had the Mexicans on our side against the Germans and the Japanese.

So, as to the question of who our enemies are now, we can tell today, but as to who they will be, the only answer that can be made is that we do not know.

This is not a specific answer, but it might give us some food for thought as to whether we want or need a specific answer now to the question in order to consider further the matter of preparedness. Perhaps the best approach to the first question is to set out, in McGuffey's Reader style, a few basic assumptions upon which both the opponents and the proponents of military preparedness can, probably agree:

1. There have always been wars. This does not imply that there always will be wars, but the statement is pertinent to our consideration of the matter.

2. We do not want another war. We abhor war and as a peace-loving Nation we will do all in our power to prevent it. We must at the same time realize that we are only one Nation in an ever-contracting community of nations and we may or may not have all of our wishes.

3. We in America have sought earnestly to avoid war. We have set the pace in scrapping our armament. We have set an example in disarmament. We have not gone in for territorial aggrandizement, at least—to stay strictly away from arguments at this stage—not in recent years. On the contrary, we have gone in for what actually amounted to unpreparedness, in the belief and the hope that war could thus be avoided.

TIME TO PREPARE FOR WAR

4. We have, twice in 50 years, become involved in wars transcending, in horror and ferocity, all preceding wars. In both cases, we were able to demonstrate to our enemies just how tough we can be—if given time.

5. In both instances, we had some time to get ready. But while our allies suffered temporary defeat and devastation, we were in such paroxysms of haste that we paid dearly in lives and extravagantly in our national substance, for quick conversion from unreadiness to meet the enemy.

6. In both of the wars of this century, our Nation's participation probably made the difference in the outcome.

7. This land of ours is a great and wealthy nation, rich in natural resources, rich in the productivity of our soil and in the capacity to produce all things that add to the comfort and pleasure of living in this world. As such, would it not be a natural objective for an aggressor to pick?

8. And finally: Assuredly it is true that we will strive for peace and peaceful solutions of conflicts of national interest; that we will do our part, in collaboration with other peace-loving nations, to avert future wars. We in America want no more plagues like facism, nazism, or bushido.

With these factors in mind, let us now look at the problem that we as a nation face. Obviously we are not all in agreement about what are the proper measures to solve it. But we do agree that, whatever those measures are to be, they had better be good.

The alternative, their failure and military defeat, with what military defeat would mean should another war come, is an unthinkable prospect. Worse than a repetition of this world-wide holocaust would be its repetition plus military defeat for America. Planning, in which this grim possibility is not given proper place, would seem to be far short of complete. Consequently, we should keep this point in mind as we look at the ways in which we might accomplish our objective.

I believe that the best possible way to safeguard our Nation's future security is through the plan devised at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference or some similar plan. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal does not offer a magic formula for the postwar years. It is not a slide rule which statesmen can work when trouble threatens, and thereby automatically produce a peaceful answer.

It is a plan by which the combined power of the peace-loving nations will be pledged to enforce better behavior among nations which threaten to run amok. If a future Hitler or Mussolini realizes that the combined power of all the nations dedicated to preserving peace in this world is really going to be used for that purpose, and if that combined military potential is so great that it cannot be overcome, then he is not likely to be so foolish as to start something that will surely end in defeat and disaster. And, further, if he does start something, the fire can be put out swiftly by force before it becomes a conflagration.

In other words, the Dumbarton Oaks idea is one with teeth in it, designed for the very practical world in which we live. It is based upon the availability of military power to enforce its objective of peaceful settlement of differences.

Now if we are to join with other peace-loving nations in such a world organization, shall we not be obliged to have the military potential to give life and strength and meaning to the decisions made by that organization? Unless we have the required military potential capable of going into action on short notice, will not the words of our diplomats be hollow and meaningless? Here is where military preparedness would seem to fit in.

Military strength, amply sufficient for the purpose and cause of preserving peace in this way, might be kept available in a large standing army. This would be one way. Or it might be kept available in a well-trained citizen reserve,

AN ARMY OF TRAINED CITIZENS

It is foreign to our American policy to burden ourselves with a huge standing army—large numbers of men taken for long periods from productive effort in our Nation's economy to stand and wait in peacetime for a war which we hope will never take place. By maintaining a large standing army, together with other peace-loving nations, we would have enough combined military strength to discourage or stamp out aggression in its beginning. But a preferable way to have potential strength in sufficient size would seem to be to give every man thorough and intensive training in his youth and then release him to go ahead with his trade or profession or job, thus leaving the regular armed forces relatively small. Then the citizen would be ready—in reserve but not in service—to do his duty capably, efficiently and with a decent chance of survival, if the emergency should ever come.

So, to summarize, Dumbarton Oaks is a means by which it is hoped we shall attempt by active steps, backed by force if necessary, to keep the peace in a world where lasting peace has never yet been achieved. Americans might not all agree that universal military training—applicable democratically to all young man alike—is the preferable way to build up this reserve strength, but at least it has its points. It seems to fit the idea of our role in a Dumbarton Oaks plan better than a large standing army would.

We do not control or seek to direct world affairs. That would be contrary to the principle that other peace-loving peoples have their rightful part in shaping them. We do want to influence world affairs in what we believe to be peaceful directions, with due regard for the rights and views of others. Thus our first care will be to avoid wars by all honorable means. But in this attempt to outlaw war, we shall never gamble with our national security.

To go back to those afore-mentioned eight points of agreement: The inevitable conclusion any future aggressor could not miss is that the United States should be attacked and defeated first. Failure to do this has twice cost the aggressor his war. We know—and we may be sure that he will know, too—that distance has been a saving factor for us in the two World Wars. We also know, as does he, that modern implements of transport and warfare no longer make distance the barrier that it was, even in the early days of this war. Unless we blind ourselves to reality, we will realize the distance will be an even less formidable obstacle in the future development of planes, rockets, and ships. So, the question of which nation an aggressor would attack first deserves a lot of consideration by all of us who love our country and want to hold on to it.

If such an attack should come—and it could come from anywhere on the globe—and if our situation is then similar to our state of unpreparedness in 1940 when France fell, what would be our prospect of a successful defense? What would be our course, despite all that we might do as a member of a world-peace organization?

Again, the answer seems to be: Either a large standing armed force or a well-trained citizen reserve ready to mobilize and move quickly.

Now, the taking up of arms in the Nation's defense is something that has been recognized as an obligation of every able-bodied man of fighting age in this country

from the very beginning. Aggression threatening our national security we would resist to the best of our ability. The question really is whether or not the resistance will be trained, organized, and effective, or untrained, disorganized, and ineffective.

The answer to this question also will determine whether in case the emergency should come, these young men will be able to meet their well-trained adversaries in combat with a better chance of survival.

What it seems to boil down to is whether or not our able-bodied manpower, ever the bulwark of national defense, is to be always ready to discharge that traditional obligation. There is nothing new about the obligation. There is, however, a plain need that those who may be called on to discharge it should be trained and fitted to do so.

The need for training is—and will be—greater than ever before in view of the rapidly increasing intricacy of implements of warfare. Perhaps no lesson emerges more clearly from the experience of this war than that modern techniques in warfare require intensive training on the part of those who use them. While it is beyond the scope of this article to describe the details of a training program that would be adequate for the future, it may be stated that the training should be intensive, well-balanced, and carefully planned. It should include basic, specialist, and small and large unit training, and a sufficient period devoted to combined field maneuvers.

READY FOR NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Improved training techniques developed in recent years and proved in this war should be employed and further improved. The prime object of the program should be that, at the end of the period, the trainee—skilled in at least one of the necessary specialties of a modern army and trained in the use of that specialty in teamwork with others—would be able capably and confidently to discharge his duty to his country in time of national emergency.

Universal military training is not offered as the sole or automatic answer to the problem of preparedness. The vast reaches of science in modern war are just dawning on us. Manifestly our research and development program would have to go forward, so that, if another war should come, our men would not be handicapped with antiquated or obsolete equipment or thought. Likewise, the Nation's readiness for industrial mobilization ought to be maintained. As with the case of manpower, a state of readiness in reserve is indicated all around.

But whatever the nature of the implements, wherever the scene of combat and whenever it may come, men—well-trained men and alert—must use the weapons. There never was and never will be a substitute. Men—well trained and alert—must plan and direct the execution of our national defense program. Men—well trained and alert—must be the keystone of our national security.

Proposed Fair Employment Practices Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from Rev. L. L. Scott, of Savannah, Ga., in reply to attacks which have been heaped upon him because of his open opposition to the so-called FEPC or UEPC.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH,
Savannah, Ga., May 25, 1945.

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yours of the 19th instant reached my desk today. Since the receipt of your first communication, it has been my very unpleasant lot to have been the object of a wave of race-wide criticism, originating in Washington. Some even took a chance with the law of libel in order that they might pour out their venom upon me. They are due congratulations however, for their suddenness of attack. They made the simple mistake of declaring a state of war against one who would never do his race an injustice, nor would he permit anyone else to do so if he could prevent it.

The immortal Wendell Phillips, in his tribute to the gallantry of the great statesman and soldier, Toussaint L'Overture, had this to say: "You read history not with your eyes but with your prejudices." No truer statement could be made of those who took exceptions to our correspondence, as was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If freedom of speech is forever reserved to American citizens by the Constitution, and is embodied in the Atlantic Charter, most certainly the minority groups can ill afford to encourage its abridgement, nor penalize one of their own number who exercises the very right for which they claim they fight.

I opposed the FEPC because I think it impractical, inoperative, and purely idealistic. I think the ends to which the FEPC is aimed may be met with another better and more fundamental program, and one that is a hundred times more satisfactory to all concerned. If as an American citizen, I had no constitutional right to speak opposing this measure, then I owe 13,000,000 Negroes an apology, and I hasten here and now to make it.

The United States Government, together with the various States and cities, should inaugurate a program designed to eliminate slum districts, which are nothing less than breeding places for disease and crime among Negroes, and with the money spent in the prosecution of criminals, build a decent place for people expected to grow into decent citizenship. This can be done. In addition to this, many Negro schoolhouses are mere firetraps, surrounded by unholy sanitary conditions, and are far from being an inducement to Negro boys and girls to attend school further than the age in which they are forced to do so. And it often happens that as soon as they reach the age where they cannot be forced to attend school, they immediately stop.

One last word about the school situation. The Negro school teacher's salary is not commensurate with the type of work he is required to do, and the qualifications required of him. This situation can and will be solved by amicable means in the South, if given a reasonable time, together with the right kind of cooperation and with the right kind of people on the job.

The Negro has the right without any violation of the law whatsoever, to pool his small holdings and make for himself a business in almost any field, where he can hire his own people, if he so desires, as some are doing. And thus rather than seek to be an employee, as the FEPC contemplates making him, he could thus become an employer.

The above three paragraphs constitute my major reasons for opposing the FEPC, and are the things I think should, and do, constitute the fundamental program which should get under way, instead of that offered by the FEPC.

Now without taking more of your time than is necessary, with your indulgence I close with a reference to Back to Africa. It is to be grievously regretted, that you and I would be understood by any person of yours or my group, who deem either of us interested in sending by force, American citizens of any color or creed to Africa or anywhere else.

. very small part of Africa belongs to Negroes, notwithstanding it is their native land and one of the largest and wealthiest countries in the world. Not even that part on which Negroes died during this war, driving the Desert Fox to his lair—and Mussolini upon the path of his much-deserved doom.

When the map of the world is redrawn and the races of the earth shall receive their just and equitable share, free from the heels of tyrants and oppressors, the Negro shall have apportioned to him as the holder in fee simple his native land, whether all or any of those in foreign lands return. The position of Negroes all over the world will be improved a thousandfold, for living together peaceably is a voluntary matter and cannot be forced upon any people in a democracy.

The United States should take the initiative in this direction, in this international apportionment, particularly as it affects the Negro. It is a debt that is due him, and the time is now.

This is the only solution for world peace, and not until then shall the lamb and lion lay down together and a little child can lead them. If as you say, your friendship for Negroes has often been questioned by them, you now have the opportunity to remove for all time, any further presumption in that direction, by lending the dignity of your office to the support of this national and international matter affecting America's largest minority. I would be pleased to hear again from you soon in this connection.

With apologies for taking up your valuable time with this lengthy correspondence, I beg to be

Very truly yours,

REV. L. L. SCOTT.

P. S.—I shall be pleased if you will do me the kindness of reading this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

L. L. S.

World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on world security, published in the Vermont Farm Bureau News for June 1945. This editorial is written by Arthur H. Packard, president of the Vermont State Farm Bureau, a real dirt farmer, and a man who looks ahead in this world of ours.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This year on Memorial Day we saw boys and girls decorating thousands of graves of veterans of former wars. Next year many more of the graves of soldiers of this Second World War will receive recognition. It is good to live in a nation where human beings are all important. Great progress will be

made when every nation of the world values human lives as we do.

It has been well said that the price of liberty cannot be paid for in one great war and the benefits passed on for generations ahead. A little over 25 years ago a substantial number of our boys gave their lives to end wars and to make the world safe for democracy. What they really did was to make the supreme sacrifice so that we and all the nations of the world could have one more chance to enjoy the "four freedoms."

Evidently we and the other great powers did not realize the punishment that demagogs could deal out to the world if we did not improve the great opportunity which was ours in 1918.

Who caused the Second World War? It would be more comforting, of course, to say that Germany, Italy, and Japan caused all the trouble, but possibly the profit motive, some greed and selfishness might have been factors also. It must have been the profit motive and a complete indifference to the opportunity for world peace of 1918 that prompted us to ship all our scrap iron to Japan for 10 years.

When every nation in the world starts building protective trade barriers and embargoes it must be that men forget that God makes a great variety of climates and soils. Vermont and neighboring States, for instance, should be producing maple syrup, sugar, or candy for those who love it in this Nation and other nations, and at a price which makes maple production profitable, but we, in Vermont, should not be trying to produce coffee, rubber, or bananas and a multitude of other products which we need. We had better pay for these with milk, eggs, fruit, and vegetables. Each part of the world will be happier if it will learn how to produce efficiently so it can exchange goods and services with others. This is largely a new horizon but worth a trial.

Let's remember that destiny has given us one more chance for a peaceful world. I believe that this is what millions of men and women all over the world have asked for in earnest prayer.

Marquis Childs told me a few days ago that he believes that the reason that we have escaped the robot bombs was that Hitler and his crew knew that at best they could send us only a few and these few would create a unity in America, like Pearl Harbor did: but Mr. Childs said something else; here it is: "If America can truly picture the destruction of civilians and property in Germany and England and France, then they will realize what bombers and robots can do to any nation in 10 or 20 years."

Yes, it is true that one generation cannot pay for the security of the future with blood, sweat, and tears. but the San Francisco Conference, and others to follow, can find a plan built from tolerance, a desire to live and let others live, a firm conviction in Christianity which can replace a third World War.

When the war with Japan is over, let us be prepared to thank our God that we have a second chance for peace—a chance which was most uncertain 4 years ago and a chance which Christian people may never have again.

War Refugees at Fort Ontario, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the situation of nearly 1,000 war refugees housed at Fort Ontario, N. Y., has attracted wide attention in the Nation.

I wish to include in my remarks a memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the freedom of these refugees which has been placed in my hands by the citizens' committee for the Fort Ontario Refugee Shelter, of Oswego, N. Y. This gives the history and present status of these people.

In view of the importance of the matter, I believe the reading of this memorial is worth while for every Member of the House.

The memorial is as follows:

A MEMORIAL TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING THE FREEDOM OF WAR REFUGEES TEMPORARILY LIVING AT PORT ONTARIO, OSWEGO, N. Y.

In August 1944, 982 refugees, natives of 17 European countries, were brought to Oswego, N. Y., as guests of the United States. Many of these people had been on the march since 1934, escaping ever from Hitler's advancing power and persecution. During their years of flight, most of the values ordinary humans hold dear and sacred were lost to them—homeland, possessions, security, friends, relatives and, in some instances, family. Consequently, when, to a limited group, the invitation was extended to come to America, it was seized with eagerness and anticipation. Now at last, behind them lay terror, persecution and insecurity; ahead of them was freedom and an opportunity to build life anew.

These refugees have now lived in our land for almost a year. They have a tentative security, the friendship of the people of Oswego whom they have been able to meet, modest provision for food, shelter, and medical care. But instead of the freedom they sought and of which they dreamed, they have been closely held in a fenced area on the shores of Lake Ontario, with permission to be absent from the camp for only 6-hour periods, and without permission to visit relatives or friends beyond the limits of the city of Oswego. Instead of the opportunity to fashion a new life for themselves and their families, they have been deprived of a chance to work at any gainful or life building pursuits; and this last in the face of a local and national war manpower shortage of critical proportions.

To be sure, after all arrangements for their departure had been made and they were at the ports of embarkation, these people signed statements saying that they agreed to reside at Fort Ontario for the duration of the war and then to return to their homelands. When, for so long, one's very life has been in jeopardy, all the ramifications of a document one signs to gain security do not immediately become evident, and it does not seem fair to enforce commitments which are inhumane and which are accepted only in desperation.

Succoring these people, less than 1,000 of the distressed millions of the world, represents our "token of good will to all mankind." Such was our statement when we carefully selected them to be our guests. The wisdom exercised in their selection has been confirmed by our own relations with them, for we have learned that they are unquestionably very worthy. They are intelligent; the adults, in their contacts through lectures, visits, etc., have provided an intellectual stimulus to the city of Oswego. The children and young people in our schools and college rank high. All are cultured and talented; many of the group were formerly business and industrial leaders; some are musicians of concert-stage ability, artists, actors, writers, and members of many of the learned professions. They are law abiding. Having so long been the victims of autocracy, they are imbued with the idea that democracy represents the good life. Some are already tightly bound to this country. Nineteen have sons in our armed forces; some even have wives and many have brothers and sisters who are citizens of this Nation.

These 982, wisely or unwisely, we have brought to our shores. They are now very definitely our problem. We need to face it realistically. Regardless of what they signed, they cannot all go back to their homelands, for in some cases these have been destroyed, and approximately one-third have been deprived of citizenship in the countries of their origin. We cannot keep them confined for an indefinitely longer period, inactive and desperate (to the point in some cases of insanity and suicide) as they see life slipping by with no opportunity to make a place for themselves and families in an onrushing world.

Less than 1,000 in a population of 135,000,000 will not in any way disturb the economic life of our country, and, since they represent a unique experiment, our treatment of them will not in any way establish a precedent or in any way complicate existing laws. As a matter of fact, we could permit them all to stay in this country without conflict with our immigration quotas. In the last 3½ years only a small percentage of the immigration quotas have been filled. To give as examples, the four countries which are most numerously present at the Fort Ontario shelter:

	Quota for last 3½ years	Immigrants to United States, 3½ years	Representatives at shelter
Yugoslavia	2,963	490	364
Germany and Austria	105,595	7,913	337
Poland	22,834	6,000	151
Czechoslovakia	9,959	1,436	41

Unless we are to deny the very essence of what we are fighting for now and have always stood for (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness), we should give our guests their freedom. If we do not do this, our pledges of world good will indeed sound hollow.

At the time of the arrival of the refugees, the War Relocation Authorities requested that a citizens' advisory committee be formed in Oswego to act as a liaison group between the refugees and the people of Oswego and the other nearby communities. Its members were appointed from citizens representing the varied business, civic, social, educational, religious, and labor interests and activities of the city of Oswego. It is nonpartisan in character. Both the individual members of the committee and the committee as a whole have visited the shelter many times during the past few months and have been in continuous contact with authorities at the shelter.

Gradually the committee has become cognizant of the situation as described above, and now finds itself facing a much greater responsibility than it anticipated. After long and careful consideration, the committee believes that—

1. The situation is different from anything anticipated by all concerned a year ago.

2. Action to meet the new situation is imperative.

3. Action should be taken along the lines of the following resolutions.

4. That the action recommended is in conformity with the thinking of the citizens of Oswego who share the information given in this memorial.

Resolved, That—

1. Benevolent and generous as was the intent of our Government in providing a shelter for the 982 refugees, because of restraint of their freedom, Fort Ontario has taken on the psychological aspect of a prison. We feel the refugees should be permitted to reside at

places of their own choices with friends and relatives. The taxpayers of the country should be relieved of the expense of caring for these refugees when relatives, friends, or private agencies are ready to care for them, if necessary, and guarantee that they shall not become public charges.

2. In this period of critical manpower shortage, the refugees should be permitted to accept gainful employment, and build themselves anew into their professions. In the case of many who have seen their productive years uselessly spent and no security ahead for their families, this is an imperative need.

3. The refugees who would, except for their present peculiar circumstances, be eligible under our existing immigration quotas should be permitted, should they so desire, to become citizens of the United States under existing rules and regulations.

4. Those who desire to return to their homeland or any portion of the world should be given the opportunity as soon as conditions permit.

Finally, the committee believes that the problem of these 982 refugees now living at Fort Ontario should be considered unique and apart from all other refugee problems consequent to the present war. They constitute our country's immediate responsibility. It is the Nation's clear duty, in charity and decency, to carry to its logical solution this definite obligation.

Signed: Ralph W. Swetman, president, Oswego State Teachers' College; Harry C. Mizen, lawyer and president of citizens' committee for Fort Ontario refugee shelter; Marian C. Mackin, executive secretary, American Red Cross; Daniel A. Williams, director of Oswego County Savings Bank; Jeremiah J. Davern, pastor of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church and member of Oswego ration board; Charles E. Riley, superintendent of schools and past president of United War Fund; William T. Griffiths, pastor of Congregational Church and president of Oswego City Council of Churches; Charles F. Wells, professor of English, Oswego State Teachers' College, and Secretary of Oswego County Schoolmasters' Club; Robert L. Allison, president, Wilcox Bros. Wholesale Grocers, Inc.; Margaret Roach, president, Oswego City Classroom Teachers' Association; Edwin M. Waterbury, publisher of Oswego Palladium-Times and past president of the New York State Publishers' Association; Louise H. Culkin, widow of Congressman F. D. Culkin and former president of the Oswego Board of Education; Marion E. Mahar, professor of history at Oswego State Teachers' College; Ralph Shapiro, president, Shapiro Paper Co. and past exalted ruler of the Elks; Matthew Barclay, past president of the Lions Club; George F. Lavere, vice president, Oswego Building and Construction Trades Council; Ralph M. Faust, principal, Oswego High School, and vice president, New York State Association of Secondary School Principals; Juanita Kersey, head librarian, Oswego City Library; Lionel A. Mohnkern, director of Retail Merchants' Bureau and third vice president of Oswego Chamber of Commerce, Inc.; James H. Lally, organist and choirmaster of St. Mary's Church and secretary-treasurer of Oswego Rotary Club; Harry B. Lasky, president, Clip-On Manufacturing Corp., and general manager, Oswego Netherland Co., Inc.; Charles G. Goldstein, chairman, war price and ration board, and past president of Oswego Chamber of Commerce, Inc.; Mrs. Anna S. Riley, member of Oswego Board of Education, and past president of the Board; Hugh C. Franklin, director of Oswego Chamber of Commerce, Inc., and a member of executive committee of Retail Merchants' Bureau; John W. O'Connor, collector of customs and president of Rotary Club; James M. Shanahan, pastor of St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church; A. J. Thompson, vice president of the United Trades and Labor Assembly, members of Oswego advisory committee.

Immigration status, 1942–45

Country	Quota, annual	Total immigration, 3½ years	Number of representatives at Fort Ontario
Yugoslavia	845	490	364
Germany and Austria	27,370	7,913	337
Poland	6,524	6,000	151
Czechoslovakia	2,874	1,436	41
Russia	2,712	1,860	18
Belgium	1,304	806	1
France	3,086	1,991	13
Bulgaria	100	51	4
Hungary	869	759	3
Turkey	226	----------	7
Spain	252	979	5
Greece	307	970	4
Italy	5,802	455	1
Holland	3,153	685	1
Danzig	100	----------	8
Libya	----------	----------	5
Rumania	----------	----------	18

Francis Thomas Maloney

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS THOMAS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, today, at the memorial exercises of our colleagues in the Congress who have passed away, in reverence we honor the memory of those whose presence once inspired our assemblies.

We miss our colleagues who shared with us the heavy burden which is upon us in these grievous times.

Particularly do my thoughts revert to an old friend from my own State of Connecticut, the late Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY, who died on January 16, 1945, at the early age of 51.

FRANK MALONEY gave the major part of his adult life to the services of his community and his State. He served with distinction as mayor of Meriden, Conn. In 1932 he was elected to the House of Representatives. In 1934 he was elected to the United States Senate and reelected in 1940.

Senator MALONEY, who began his Senate career as a member of the Appropriations Committee, was chairman of the joint committee created to study the procedures of the Congress, served on four other committees, one joint committee and was a member of several commissions at the time of his untimely death. In the short period of 6 years he had taken his place in the Congress of the United States as one of our foremost legislators.

But aside from his record as a constructive legislator, as a man his sense of justice, his sympathetic approach to the problems of his constituency and of the Nation, his willingness to understand attitudes whether or not in agreement with his own, bore eloquent testimony to his fairness and demonstrated his concept of a universe of "one for all" and not "all for one".

As a friend and as a colleague, I am grateful for the association which was ours and feel honored that for a period of many years we served our great State together.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his family who courageously are carrying on, blessed with the memories of a great and good man.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4 (legislative day of Thursday, May 31), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement entitled "We Believe Bretton Woods Is Good Business" from the Washington Post of May 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE BELIEVE BRETTON WOODS IS GOOD BUSINESS

Because we believe the Bretton Woods agreements can open new postwar frontiers for American business and industry and become the economic foundation for prosperity at home and a secure peace abroad;

Because we believe the Bretton Woods agreements will put international transactions on an orderly basis, and safeguard the American businessman and investor from currency manipulation and unsound foreign loans which lead to world economic disaster and war;

We have formed this business and industry committee for Bretton Woods, to give expression to the views of American businessmen on this subject We invite all businessmen who favor the Bretton Woods agreements without substantial change to join our committee.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE FOR BRETTON WOODS, INC.
HOTEL ROOSEVELT, *New York, N. Y.*

Inviting members: Henry P. Bristol, president, Bristol-Myers Co.; Robert Butler, president, Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc.; C. N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels, Inc.; Emmet J. McCormack, vice president and treasurer, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Louis Sachar, president, Reliance Textile Co.; Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co.

Committee (in formation): Clarence Avildsen, chairman, Republic Drill & Tool Co.; Barney Balaban, president, Paramount

Pictures, Inc.; William Benton, chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica; Edward L. Bernays, New York; J. A. Bloch, president, Bloch Bros. Tobacco Co.; John K. Boyle, Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce; Edward E. Brown, chairman of the board, First National Bank, Chicago; P. R. Bunker, vice president, Dodge & Seymour, Ltd.; Gardner Cowles, Jr., publisher, Des Moines Register and Tribune; Albert M. Creighton, chairman of the board, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; Will Crocker, Crocker National Bank, San Francisco; Milton Dammann, president, American Safety Razor Co.; A. R. Davis, president, State National Bank, Garland, Tex.; Ben DuBois, secretary, Independent Bankers Association; E. A. Emerson, president, The Armco International Corp.; Ralph E. Flanders, president, Jones & Lamson Machine Co.; Henry F. Grady, president, American President Lines, Ltd.; Albert M. Greenfield, chairman, Bankers Securities Corp.; W. L. Gregory, president, Independent Bankers Association; Michael A. Heilperin, economic adviser, Bristol-Myers Co.; Henry H. Heimann, executive manager, National Association of Credit Men; James Hill, Jr., president, Sterling Drug, Inc.; Charles R. Hook, president, The American Rolling Mill Co.; Croil Hunter, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Oscar Johnston, president, National Cotton Council of America; Ernest C. Kanzler, chairman of the board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp.; Henry P. Kendall, president and treasurer, The Kendall Co.; Jay Richard Kennedy, president, Jay Richard Kennedy Management Corp.; Edwin J. Kuh, Jr., Chicago, Ill.; William L. Maas, president, Pacific Sound Equipment Co.; John J. Mack, president, Detroit-Wolverine Corp.; Sidney Maestre, president, Mississippi Valley Trust Co.; E. H. Martindale, president, The Martindale Electric Co.; Allen May, president, Mutual Savings Life Insurance Co.; Stacy May, assistant to the president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; Frederick G. Melcher, president, Publishers Weekly; William Morris, president, William Morris Agency, Inc.; John D. McCutcheon, president, John D. McCutcheon & Co., Inc.; James H. McGill, chairman of the board, McGill Manufacturing Co.; Irwin A. Olian, president, Olian Advertising Co.; Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.; Harry Scherman, president, Book-of-the-Month Club; A. Wessel Shapleigh, president, Shapleigh Hardware Co.; Blackwell Smith, Arthur Kudner, Inc.; Morton E. Snellenburg, president, N. Snellenburg & Co., Inc.; John A. Stevenson, president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; W. W. Wachtel, president, Calvert Distillers Corp.; Carl M. Wynne, president, Overseas Industries, Inc.; F. R. von Windegger, president, the Plaza Bank of St. Louis.

(The company names used in connection with the above list are used for identification purposes only.)

Capt. James Kimble Vardaman, United States Naval Reserve

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by appointing Captain Vardaman as his aid, President Truman has, I understand, started a very fine precedent, according to Frances Burns, a writer for the Boston Daily Globe. It is the first time that a President has ever recognized the Naval Reserve and appointed as his aide an officer from this branch of the Navy. This is an extremely helpful and just action. I hope the Navy will realize that they must recognize the Reserve Corps if the Navy is to live and be strong after the war is over.

The article by Francis Burns, follows:

TRUMAN'S NAVAL AIDE IS FIRST RESERVIST TO BE GIVEN POST

(By Frances Burns)

WASHINGTON.—Capt. James Kimble Vardaman, Jr., UNSR, had been 28 days on Okinawa when a message was delivered to him in the field. It was an order directing him to report to the White House to assume the duties of naval aide to the President, his old friend and fellow artilleryman, Harry S. Truman.

That was April 28. The then Commander Vardaman had been attached to the twenty-fourth Corps shore party for the assault on Okinawa; after 14 days he had rejoined the military government section as executive officer. On April 21 he received word from the Navy that he had been made captain. But he was still in battle khaki, in a uniform which hadn't been changed for 16 days, when he climbed into a plane loaded with stretcher cases and walking wounded, and headed home.

There hadn't been time or opportunity on Okinawa to bother with stripes. They were added to the sleeves of his wartime dress blues in Washington. He wears now also the gold aiguillettes which, looped over the right shoulder, denote the President's naval aide (on the left they're an admiral's aide). But in the White House these mornings, the captain, his lined face still brown from the Japanese sun, his white hair still bristling in a crew cut, just wears field khaki with a blouse and a simple gold braid circle from shoulder under arm.

They say no other naval reservist has been a President's aide. Certainly there's never been another artilleryman-turned-Navy-man to have had the job. But Vardaman has had a third service connection. He has been in the Marines, too.

Back in 1917, the skinny young son of James Kimble Vardaman, ex-Governor and United States Senator from Mississippi, joined the Marines. He was 6 feet tall, but weighed only 117 pounds, and they bounced him out of the Marines two or three times because of his physique but he kept getting back. Finally, opportunity was offered him to go to officers' school in the Army, and the exchange was made. From September 1917 to April 1919, he served with the Three Hundred and Fifty-fifth Field Artillery in this country and with the AEF, finishing up as captain. He still weighed 117 pounds.

Captain Vardaman was a retired banker in St. Louis when he joined the Navy. For 20 years he had been a Missourian, although to this day he keeps the ancestral Vardaman residence and farm in Jackson, Miss. From 1919 for 10 years he was associated with Harry Truman in the Missouri Field Artillery Reserve. Other fellow artillerymen were John W. Snyder, Federal Loan Administrator, and Col. Harry Vaughan, the President's military aide.

It wasn't all work at summer camps. "I shoot good craps and play a tight game of poker," the captain admits with a twinkle.

They asked Captain Vardaman to join the Naval Reserve in 1939 in the Intelligence Division because of his knowledge of the industrial situation in the Eighth Federal Reserve District. He had been president, vice president, and director of various businesses, and had reorganized, liquidated, and rehabilitated industries and banks, many times in association with Mr. Snyder. After Pearl Harbor, Vardaman asked for foreign service and got it.

As r lieutenant commander, Vardaman was wounded in the Sicilian invasion by an enemy shell explosion. But, strapped up with bandages, he helped plan and conduct the leapfrog raids for General Patton's army on the north shore of Sicily, east of St. Stephano, which led to the fall of Messina.

His first overseas duty had been as security officer on Admiral Stark's staff from May to August 1942, followed by 3 months as executive officer of a naval base in Scotland and then as commanding officer of a landing party in the African invasion. He served at Oran, in Algeria, and Tunisia.

"Evenings, the captain would listen to music," his aide in north Africa says, "switching the radio to any symphony program he could find. Tea was his one vice. How that man could drink it."

His wounds unhealed, Captain Vardaman was returned to the United States for hospitalization. In December 1943 he was executive for a training program of LST crews and for 6 months last year he took special training at Columbia in the Naval School of Military Government and Administration, going from there to Samar, Leyte, and on to Okinawa.

Captain Vardaman married Beatrice Middleton Lane of Pocahontas, Miss., in 1917. Their only son, James Kimble 3d, enlisted in the Marines at 17 and is a sergeant in the Pacific.

When Bureaucracy Runs Wild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on May 28, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star of New Rochelle, N. Y., on May 22, 1945, titled "When Bureaucracy Runs Wild":

WHEN BUREAUCRACY RUNS WILD

Under the New Deal's peacetime program, magnified by the demands of war, Federal employment has grown to the stage where at present 1 out of every 11 employable persons in this Nation is on Uncle Sam's pay roll. If we eliminate from consideration school teachers, only 1 State in the Union, West Virginia, has within its borders more State than Federal employees. And, according to a recent survey of postwar plans in Washington, this condition is to grow worse instead of better unless something is done about it.

That is why the plan now proposed for a general manager over all Federal employees is worth study and sympathetic consideration. This new executive would be directly responsible to the President and his job would be to streamline Federal bureaus as an efficiency expert would undertake such a task in private enterprise. It would be a gigantic job, but it could be performed, provided patronage and politics were tossed out of the window.

Surely the time has come, with the end of the war in Europe, to consider methods by which the tremendous burdens of Federal taxation are lightened, and there is no more direct way to approach this job than to start cutting useless persons from the Federal pay rolls. As bureau has been piled upon bureau in Washington and in the multitudinous branches of Federal Government throughout the 48 States, it has seemed from the side lines that these agencies have run

hog wild with authority and supremely careless with the public's money.

For the job of Federal manager we can conceive of no one better qualified than the Senator who has year after year voluntarily assumed the role of watchdog, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. We suggest his availability.

A Square Deal for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the banquet tendered the Italian Ambassador, His Excellency, Alberto Tarchiani, on May 31, 1945, at the New School, New York, N. Y.:

It is indeed delightful to break bread with His Excellency Alberto Tarchiana and to participate in this tribute to him. This gathering augurs much for his success as the Ambassador accredited by his beloved country to the United States. We admire his steadfast adherence to his anti-Fascist principles at a time when it meant travail and suffering so to do. We all wish him well in his new undertaking and we want him to know that he comes to a country that has had a long and solid history of friendship with Italy; that there has always been between our two countries the fullest exchange of cultural and commercial relations. Wherever he travels in the United States he will see constant evidence of the continuous stream of immigrants from Italy to our shores, seeking the opportunities and liberties—shall I say the "four freedoms"—that America bestowed. It proved to be an enriching stream of great endurance and vitality, and those Italians readily identified themselves with America. They came to share in the American dream and abide by the doctrine of Woodrow Wilson—"Americanism consists in utterly believing in the principles of America."

When I think of Italy, I am grateful for Gentile, one of America's great aces; I think of Mucci, who was chosen by General MacArthur to lead the epic march to release the heroes of Bataan and Corregidor; I think of Sergeant Basilone, on whom we bestowed the Congressional Medal of Honor, and whose glorious death has left us a heritage to inspire future generations.

The late lamented President Roosevelt joined Prime Minister Churchill in a statement issued September 26, 1944, reading as follows: "The Italian people, freed of their Fascist and Nazi overlords, have in these last 12 months, demonstrated their will to be free to fight on the side of democracies, and to take a place among the United Nations, devoted to principles of peace and justice."

I earnestly desire Italy to take her rightful place among the United Nations. The pending congressional resolution giving fullest recognition to Italy as one of the United Allies should and must pass. She is entitled to such a distinction. There are 6,000,000 loyal Americans of Italian lineage, who are making every sacrifice on the home front and who have contributed to the armed forces of the United States more than 1,000,000 men and women. They are fighting and dying on the battlefields of the world for the American ideals of freedom, tolerance, and equality. To deny Italy a voice at the peace conference with the other United Nations would be to stifle the forces working so desperately for her rejuvenation. It would ill repay Italy and the Italian people, whose hands held high the lamp of learning through the Dark Ages, and caused that light to glow into the brilliance of the Renaissance. Italy and her people have suffered immeasurably from bad leaders but fascism is no longer in the saddle in that fair land. We now underscore the names of liberals, e. g., Sforza, Croce, Tarchiani.

Americans were startled the other day when Pietro Nenni, Italian Socialist leader, was arrested for a so-called violation of Allied military regulations. In support of the cause he represented he made a speech to a group of workers in northern Italy. Such an arrest was most improvident. It could not have reasonably been made on the grounds of military necessity or military security. There are no Nazi armies fighting in Italy, but the north does contain antifascism elements and democratic forces which are the political backbone of Italy. As a result of universal protest, Nenni was released, but his arrest brought into focus the disheartening fact that military security has been used as a facade to prohibit freedom of speech in Italy. This suppression of free speech and gagging of press are the very twin evils we fought against so desperately. In addition, censorship has been restored, another docile handmaiden of fascism. We are setting a discouraging example to the vigorous democratic forces in liberated Italy with this unwarranted suppression of the vaunted Four Freedoms. How in thunder we permit ourselves to be used as tools for this aid to reaction is beyond me. Are we becoming the backstairs assistants of British imperialism? Is Uncle Sam expected to sneeze every time John Bull takes snuff? Are the British to be permitted to repeat in Italy the tragedy of Greece? I do indeed hope we will have no further participation in such untoward occurrences and that the Italians will, without interference, proceed to their task of establishing their own form of government and pursue the destiny so rudely interrupted by the dead, degraded Il Duce.

Italian cities have been left in ruin and rubble. Her economy had progressively deteriorated under Fascist mismanagement and Nazi gangsters and the results of military operations to drive the Huns from Italy, accentuated the destruction.

The Allied Control Council, now the Allied Commission, has accomplished a heroic task. It has aided greatly in whatever rehabilitation that has been effected and in all instances sought and received the earnest cooperation of the Italian people who want, most of all, the opportunity to help themselves. It is indeed hoped that the Allied Commission will offer that opportunity and that the Italian people will work out as far as they can their own economic salvation.

For reasons of self-interest we should lend an economic helping hand to Italy. After VJ-day we shall have more workers, more factories, more machinery, and far greater skills and ingenuity than ever before. We shall need additional markets for our greater productivity. The war has left a wearied world yearning for civilian goods. Italy will be hungry for American machinery, autos, tractors, radios, bulldozers, shoes, clothing, etc. But Italy is now prostrate. She has no credit—no American dollars with which to pay. We must help supply that credit and dollars.

Foreign trade must be a two-way street. We cannot hope to sell unless we buy. Italy was always a fertile market for our goods. That market can be enlarged, but we must be prepared to earn and retain the good will and friendship of the people of Italy from Palermo, Perugia to Piedmont and beyond and between. Italians have good memories. They shall long remember her friends and give short shrift to her detractors. They will reward us if we help build a new Italy out of the ashes of the Fascist disaster and Nazi gangsterism. Expressions of good will and sympathy are not enough. We have had too much of that. Action is what counts. "An ounce of action is worth a pound of preachment." Let us implement our expressions of good will with the repeal of the Johnson Act, so as to permit loans to Italy and Italian entities, and thus, in part, supply them with the wherewithal to resurrect their mangled cities and to redeem a shattered economy—supply them, in part, with the credits to buy our goods.

The reciprocity bill should be passed immediately. We would, thereby, level down the barriers that impede a free flow of Italian products to America; otherwise, Italy's economy will remain anemic.

As was recently stated in the Nation:

"Naturally, Italians and many of us are puzzled by the delay in revealing the Allied armistice terms. If the terms are honorable, every future Italian Government will make it its duty to fulfill them, but if the courage, sacrifices, and democratic intentions of the Italian people have made them no longer applicable, the Allies had better modify them—for the sake of justice and of friendly relations in the future."

Italy has been smashed and torn and she has suffered horror and terror but Italy has not died. Her soul goes marching on and her indomitable spirit and her unquenchable thirst for freedom carry her forward. Her suffering and sacrifice have given her great spiritual strength to rebuild and reunite.

Italy wants no charity—no mere handouts—no international boondoggles. She has the right to expect that amount of relief and rehabilitation that will enable her to start anew. Recovery can only come as a result of back-breaking labor, soul-retching pain, but we must help her bind up the wounds of war. We can only do this with a sympathetic understanding. Italy will get our technology and our skill, but she needs more. She needs our kindliness. She knows she is not blameless. She knows the "moving finger writes, and having writ, moves on." She can't blot out the fact that she followed Mussolini but she is contrite and she is anxious and she is willing to redeem herself. She realizes full well that the invasions of Ethiopia, Albania and of France, blackened her escutcheon but she has paid dearly for such violence in the desolation and death that has been visited upon her. It is not my purpose to whitewash Italy but there are many facts to offset the darkened vision. It is worthy of note that thousands and thousands of Italian soldiers, driven by their intense hatred of the Nazis, came over to the Allied side, and inflicted great damage on the enemy. So did the Italian Fleet and a major part of the Italian Air Force.

According to Marshal Alexander, 250,000 Italians died in the fight for liberation. General Mark Clark, on May 11 of this year, announced that the Italian Partisan Army had liberated more than 200 towns, including Milan, Turin, Genoa, Spezia, and Venice. General Clark said he found in those cities an amazing degree of order, due to the smooth working administration of the partisans. He added that Venice had been liberated "from the interior by the armed forces of the Freedom Volunteers, with the support and encouragement of the entire population." He proclaimed "the world must have no fear that Italy cannot produce men to guide her in the future. On the contrary, there are men in Italy who are more than fit to take an active part in the reconstruction staged by the Allies."

Let no one believe that A Bell for Adano cannot be supplied by liberated Italians.

By some (even in Congress) the Italians are considered as "not quite enemies." That attitude is utterly wrong and indefensible. They are our allies now. They would be willing to fight in any theater of combat operations. Others consider Italians as victims of

fascism, who are to be freed, but who are not quite free. I counter by saying that Mussolini is dead, and the Italians have withdrawn from fascism and thrown it away as though it were a soiled and foul-smelling garment. Still others consider Italy an enemy on parole. I am convinced that she has purged herself. Her parole is ended. She has completely expiated. She vindicates our confidence in her. She is more than a cobelligerent. She must become a member of the family of Allied Nations.

It is for those reasons that I ask justice for Italy and I ask for economic aid to help her help herself.

Duck Damage to Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Duck Damage to Crops Stressed in Union Resolution," from the Bottineau Courant of May 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUCK DAMAGE TO CROPS STRESSED IN UNION RESOLUTION

At a meeting of the Bottineau County Farmers Union board of directors a resolution was adopted dealing with the damage done to crops by ducks in the past year in Bottineau and McHenry Counties. This resolution is being sent to our Congressmen in Washington. The board realizes that individual letters will have more bearing on the subject in Washington than the resolution adopted by the board.

The board urges every individual farmer who realizes the damage done in the past to the crops, and the damage which may be done during the crop season of 1945 by the great increase in the population of ducks in these counties to write to your Congressmen and urge that steps be taken to control this destruction to farm crops and food production in our State.

Plans were also made for a farm meeting to be held in Bottineau pertaining to postwar planning for agriculture, according to County President V. L. Tarvestad. This meeting will be widely advertised and it is to be hoped that every farmer as well as businessman in a wide area will attend. The main speaker will be M. W. Thatcher, manager of the Grain Terminal Association. Further announcement of this meeting will be made later—watch for the dates. Talk it over with your neighbors and see that they attend.

"Resolution adopted Monday, April 23

"Whereas we believe there may be a great shortage of food in the United States and abroad in the months to come; and

"Whereas the wild duck destruction to crops in the harvest of 1944 was unbelievably heavy in Bottineau and McHenry Counties and the duck population appears to be double or more than what it was a year ago, of which many will nest here and will increase greatly by harvesttime of this year and the destruction to crops may be double or more the coming harvest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Federal Government take steps to control the destruction of farmers' crops by the ever-increasing wild-duck population on the wild-game reserve and the county as a whole by the abundance of water that has been dammed up, as well as the great amount of water in the marshy places and lowlands caused by the heavy rainfalls of the past few years; and be it further

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of this body, and it recommends that the season for taking ducks be opened earlier in the fall and that it continue open until April 15 in the spring and the hours be from daybreak until dark.

"V. L. TARVESTAD, *President.*
"ALDA FRASER, *Secretary."*

Memo on Hoover

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, just about 2 years ago when I as a farmer stood here in the well of this House and called attention to the food situation and prophesied a shortage, some people laughed. It was then that I coined the phrase "Lick your platter clean." Today people are licking their platters clean not because of my advice but because of necessity. The food situation is growing more acute daily and will continue to do so regardless.

I am very happy that President Truman has seen fit to call former President Hoover to Washington and consult with him on the food situation. I am quite sure that if we had Herbert Hoover at the head of the food program and a man like Andrew Mellon in the Treasury this country would be better off and the world outlook would be brighter.

In this connection I set forth here an article entitled "Memo on Hoover," written by George E. Sokolsky. It reads as follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
MEMO ON HOOVER

President Truman has again exhibited a faculty to assuage ill-will and to requite injustice. His invitation to Herbert Hoover to visit him at the White House was a simple act of decency and good taste. It may turn out to be more than that, namely, a call to service, although I doubt that one visit will accomplish that much.

Mr. Hoover has been the most viciously smeared and maligned man in the whole of American history. The attacks on him were not accidental. They were the result of a planned conspiracy designed to make of a man a symbol of opposition and hate and to heap upon that symbol every possible vilification. I have studied that process in detail. I have access to the entire file of lies, falsehoods and libels. I have traced many of these foul deceits to their authors, with the astonishing discovery that among them were not always these little mosquitoes who call themselves communists nor the leftist moles, but that often the authors of the infamies were persons who had benefited while Hoover was in office and who took advantage of his apparent unpopularity to dissociate themselves from him on the "stop thief" principle of making the most noise to hide their own treacherous guilt. It has been a fascinating study in cheapness and vulgarity.

It is then an act of simple courtesy and fineness when President Truman recognizing the dignity of position invites the only living ex-President to call upon him—ending the apparent approval of the White House for the abuse of an individual for political purposes.

Until this meeting Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman had never seen each other, and what their personalities will do at first impact is difficult to analyze. In spite of his prolonged public career, Mr. Hoover is a shy, awkward person, deeply emotional, unselfish, capable of expending himself in a righteous cause. Since 1914 his cause has been food. He believes that there is ample food for all human beings on their own level of consumption, but that the distribution of food is frightfully mismanaged, so that in time of crisis, innocent civilians, particularly children, starve. In this war that has been indisputably and tragically true.

His administration of world feeding and domestic American feeding during the last war was altogether more efficient, more able than anything produced in this war. The Food Administration of the last war makes OPA altogether ridiculous; Belgian Relief and the American Relief Administration of the last war still put UNRRA of this war in the shade.

One reason for this is that prices in World War I were based upon stabilizing prices at points nearest to the producer—that is, elevators, stockyards, creameries, milksheds, etc. Then a mark-up was established for each stage of manufacture or distribution. Prices in World War II were fixed at arbitrary levels at various outlets with subsequent adjustments. World War I methods resulted in the uninterrupted flow from farmer to consumer, required only a few hundred men for enforcement, and resulted in no black markets and no local famines. World War II methods require thousands of men and women for enforcement, require hundreds of millions in subsidies to patch up irregularities, and have resulted in local famines and black markets.

Prices in both wars had advanced considerably before the United States entered the wars, and before control of prices was established, but the increase has been greater in this war.

The total administrative expenses of the Food Administration in World War I from beginning to end, including the relief of Europe, was under $8,000,000. The expenditures during the first 19 months of World War II food agencies probably exceed $200,000,000. The Food Administration in World War I returned all appropriations of working capital intact and earned a net profit of over $60,000,000 in food operations. It paid out no subsidies. The food agencies of World War II have paid out several hundred millions of losses on food and subsidies. Thus, the Food Administration in World War I, under Hoover, cost $50,000,000 less than nothing for its 19 months, whereas the food agencies of World War II have cost several hundred millions in the same period.

Propaganda Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this House a great many quotations from newspapermen regarding the propaganda work of OWI. There is one newspaperman who is qualified above

all others to speak on the subject of propaganda. He is Mr. William L. Shirer, the noted author of Berlin Diary, who has studied and written about propaganda for the last 3 years. I want to read to this House a few excerpts from Mr. Shirer's column Propaganda Front of May 27:

PROPAGANDA FRONT

(By William L. Shirer)

Ignominious defeat has at last silenced the poisonous voice of nazism in this world, but at the very moment of our great victory the voice of America may become silenced too, if the Congress fails to grasp what is at stake.

Washington dispatches last week told of the possibility that the House might abolish the appropriations needed by the Office of War Information to stay in business for another year. This is hardly likely, in view of the fact that the Japanese war has still to be won. But the Washington correspondents report strong sentiment in Congress to curtail greatly or even abolish the funds needed by the OWI to operate in Europe and other areas not directly connected with the Pacific war.

SILENCING VOICE OF AMERICA

This would be tantamount to silencing the voice of America over most of the globe. Maybe that is what the American people want, but I doubt it. For then the voices of Russia, of Great Britain, and perhaps of France would become dominant in the world. That may be what the Congress wants, but I doubt that, too.

It will be argued, no doubt, that the voice of America was heard mainly and appropriately of late through the roar of her guns and her bombs, which spoke a language much more articulate than that of mere words. But the same could be said of our gallant allies. Now, with the guns silent, they are substituting words and pictures. For politics, which for the last 6 years has been conducted principally by the waging of war, will now be handled by other means.

The Russians understand this when they reopen movie houses throughout the vast part of Europe which their armies occupy and show, even in Berlin, such Soviet films as Lenin in 1918, Professor Mamlock and Zoya. They understand it in their broadcasts, which are now going out over the Berlin radio and other captured stations. The British understand it by holding a great exhibition in France to show the glories of the British Army in this war. They show they know what is at stake when BBC programs suddenly come over the air from German radio stations controlled by the western Allies.

UNITED STATES MUST TELL OWN STORY

There is what we might call a Russian story and a British story to be told to the masses of this world and, as is quite natural and indeed proper, they will be told from the respective viewpoints of the two nations and the two peoples.

I believe there is an American story to be told, too. I know it will not be told by our Russian or British or French friends. If it is told at all, it will have to be told by ourselves. That is what is at stake.

There are, of course, many ways to tell it. And there are undoubtedly many sincere men in Congress who believe that the OWI is not the one to tell it. In fact, they would like to take the state out of this business and hand the matter over entirely to private enterprise. And they can advance many good arguments for their stand.

But before we abolish the OWI, with all its faults, let us remember that our British, French, and Russian friends will be telling their story in the years to come almost exclusively through state agencies. We may not like it, but that's the way it will be done. And just as diplomacy, as one means of handling foreign affairs, is a prerogative of national government, so to a considerable extent will be public relations, insofar as they have to do with furthering foreign policy and making the voices of nations heard around this world.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN HELP

There will be plenty of opportunities for our private enterprise to help, especially in the field of news agencies and radio where American talent is especially great. Certainly no American wants the voice of his country to sound stereotyped or echo the dullness of Government bureaucracy. And obviously there are many voices in America, including that of the party out of power and those of capital and labor and agriculture, which are not always in harmony. But above all this there is a synthesis that stands for the American Nation and the American people, regardless of class, party, or creed. This is what we must give voice to. And it is the burden of a democratically elected government, it seems to me, to take a responsible part in propagating that voice.

The war taught us the potential power of the new technique of propaganda and of the special role of the radio and the motion picture. But the media are not the only things to be considered. Much will depend on the wisdom of our national policies and the expertness of our diplomacy.

At San Francisco we learned how inept diplomacy could weaken and confuse the voice of America in the world. This great Republic, which still holds to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson, was temporarily maneuvered diplomatically into the utterly false position of seeming to champion Argentine fascism and seeming to be against eventual independence for the dependent peoples and seeming to be against labor being heard in the councils of the new world security organization. Actually, nothing was further from the thought of those in the government directing the present course of the Republic. But harm was done to our prestige and to the good will which we have built up in the world. And harm was done to the Allied coalition which won the war and must, in the beginning at least, keep the peace.

The voice of America faltered not because America faltered, but because of a surprising ineptness in our diplomacy and a corresponding failure to realize the consequences in terms of public relations.

RADIO'S ROLE

At the moment radio seems destined to play an important role in peacetime politics. Unfortunately, the end of the war did not bring the end of political censorship in Europe. But the radio will go over the heads of the censors. The crisis over Trieste provided an example. Allied-controlled radio stations in Italy gave Field Marshal Alexander's side of the controversy. Yugolsav stations broadcast Marshal Tito's position. There was censorship on both sides. But the radio seems to have overcome it to a considerable extent.

There are today certain countries where the facts about America, its immense contribution to the war and its sacrifices for the peace, are not very well known for reasons which we need not go into here. Some in those lands think that we ought to provide more food or fuel or transport, that we are waxing fat while they starve. Some think that we are too friendly to the Fascists, too kindly disposed toward the war criminals, or that we plan to turn on the Russians when the Japanese war is over, and so on ad absurdum.

Chiefly by radio, which will get over any local restrictions on the voice of America's being heard, we can, unless Congress decides otherwise, do a great deal to set these things and many others straight immediately. And through the turbulent years that lie just ahead, we can, if we are not blind, do a great many other things to make the voice of this great land heard.

Joint Congressional Committees to Check Executive Agencies and Bureaus—Needed in Present Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution, providing for the establishment of joint congressional committees, to be assigned to each Government bureau, and keep a check on its activities, give it good advice, and report to Congress from time to time. Such committees would render great service to Congress and to the American people. Under this resolution Congress would be in touch at all times with these executive agencies, and could prevent many of them from making mistakes. I have in mind an agency such as the Office of Price Administration. The men in that bureau, responsible for the present food shortage, started in 2 or 3 years ago to adopt policies which had the necessary result of curtailing food production. They must have liked the doctrine of artificial scarcity, because that is where we find ourselves—without a meat supply. Now, a committee of Congress could have helped prevent this sad situation. This committee would be helpful to Members of Congress in many other ways. We would get direct reports from such a committee about the policy of any particular Government agency. I hope that the committee to whom this bill is referred considers it carefully and seriously.

NEW SLAUGHTERHOUSE REGULATIONS OF OPA

I discuss the good effect such legislation as I have introduced would have on the Office of Price Administration because on June 1 my attention was called to the slaughterhouse regulations promulgated in May, and which I understand became a law April 30, 1945. Now, here is a regulation that is law, and a violation subjects the person to a maximum fine of $10,000 and 2 years' imprisonment, without Congress having anything to do about it.

Now, I am not certain about the details and effect of this slaughterhouse order, but I am sure the farmers will be interested to know that the number of hogs they may slaughter for their own use will probably be determined by OPA, and they will have a quota. There are probably other features of this new order that will be more or less popular. We shall see.

COUNTY HOME FOR AGED PEOPLE AFFECTED BY ORDER

Under date of May 29, 1945, I received a letter from the county official of St. Louis County, Minn., whose office is at Duluth, Minn., and who says, in part:

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: You are familiar, I am sure, with the fact that the county welfare board operates the Cook home and the Cook farm in connection with it. It has been the practice for many years now to raise our own pork, and we have occasionally slaughtered

some beef whenever we had an animal which was of no other use.

Recently, a representative of the OPA, Mr. ——— called at the Cook farm, and stated we would have to reduce our slaughtering to 50 percent of our 1944 total. He was very gentlemanly about the whole situation, and stated that he could make no exception to our institution, and requested that we put our protest in writing.

We protested this decision of OPA because of the following facts:

1. All of the animals which we slaughtered at the Cook farm have been utilized for food at our own institutions.

2. We have given up ration points for every pound of meat which has been slaughtered.

3. Our only object in raising our own meat is to furnish meat for the institutions, and none of it is put up for sale to the general public.

4. If we do not use these animals for food for the institutions, we will quit raising them * * *.

5. We believe that if the requirements of the institutions are burdened on to the general meat supply, that such a move would serve only to accentuate the shortage of meat.

There is correspondence submitted with this protest indicating that the young men representing the Duluth, Minn., OPA office in connection with this problem were very courteous, but stated that they did not have specific regulations from Washington, D. C., which would exempt the Cook home and farm from the new slaughterhouse regulations. Thereupon the county agency wrote me to contact OPA and get an answer to their protest against the new slaughter order, so that they might continue to raise their own livestock so as to provide meat for the inmates of the homes.

Of course I am taking this up with OPA, but I have no idea when I will get an answer. This observation is based on past experience. In the meantime, I want to advise your colleagues, who will doubtless be called on for relief in identical cases of this kind.

I may add that the county official is not at all critical, but just presents his facts and asks for relief. He says in his letter to me, in part:

While we are sympathetic with the efforts of OPA in trying to alleviate this meat shortage, we fail to see where there is any possible gain if we are required to reduce our slaughtering.

Ideological Issue Seen Barring United States as British-Soviet Mediator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune by Mark Sullivan.

Mark Sullivan brings to our attention the confusion in the minds of the people with regard to Russia. When men who have studied the situation are puzzled, we certainly cannot blame the public for being leary. I believe the majority of the American people want to understand Russia and want to be friendly with her. Americans have had enough of war, and that is the reason we are continuing wholeheartedly in every effort toward defeating Japan at the earliest possible moment. I believe that the Russian people must feel the same way about war. This transition period is difficult for Russia, even as it is for us and our ally, Great Britain. We Americans must be patient and do all that we can to persuade Russia, not Stalin alone, but also her leaders and her people, that security problems must be openly discussed so that all people may understand them, if we are to reach satisfactory agreements. The Moscow Government has much to win by maintaining a lasting friendship with our country. The time is here when an attempt by the Russians should be made to show more friendliness and more understanding of the American way of reasoning in order to boost the faith that the American people are so willing to give.

IDEOLOGICAL ISSUE SEEN BARRING UNITED STATES AS BRITISH-SOVIET MEDIATOR—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS AMERICA MUST STAND WITH BRITAIN AGAINST ANY EXTENSION OF COMMUNISM; SEES THE QUESTION ARISING IN CHINA, TOO

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Three events last week illustrate a state of the public mind and, to a larger degree, the official mind.

The House Committee on Foreign Relations, moved by "the increasing volume and complexity of world problems," and wishing to acquire more information, divided the world into five regions and itself into five subcommittees, each to study and search for information about one region. It is doubtful if such additional information as the subcommittees acquire will reduce that "volume and complexity of world problems" which already bear down on them. What is significant in this action is the puzzlement it reflects. And if the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives is puzzled, much more so is the public.

Another committee of the House, this one informal and self-created, laid before Acting Secretary of State Grew five questions. The questions show that this group of Representatives think the State Department is not as friendly toward Russia as these men think it should be. But it would be easy to find another group of Representatives who think that State Department policy toward Russia is not as firm as it should be. What this incident illustrates is cleavage of official thought. The same cleavage exists in the public mind.

TWO SIDES PRESENTED

In a discussion at Town Hall last week, broadcast by radio, two speakers took the position that we should be more tolerant and patient toward Russia. Two opponents put emphasis on actions by Russia which make patience and tolerance difficult. The significance of the event is suggested by a statement of the moderator of the meeting. He said there was more interest in this question than in any other Town Hall had discussed recently.

The Russian question is not a clear issue upon which everybody is on one side or the other. It is a tangle of many different issues. The arguments do not start from two opposed points of view but from several, many of which overlap. Some regard one consideration as paramount, others any of several different considerations. The result is not conclusion by confusion.

One large section of American thought was earnestly expressed at the Town Hall meeting by Raymond Swing. This position, as held by many Americans, may be stated in 3 sentences: If Russia and the United States get on together a future world war may be averted. If they do not get on together another world war is possible. Therefore, in all this discussion about Russia, the primary purpose should be that America and Russia get on together.

The position is sound, but does not help to solve the problem. America and Russia getting on together is prevented, for the present, by the difficulties between them, and these difficulties compose the real problem. Meanwhile, the easy assertion that Russia and America must get on together gives encouragement to what Senator La Follette the other day called the Russia-is-always-right school of thought.

NO SIMPLE SOLUTION

There is no simple solution, eagerly though statesmen seek one and the public wishes one. It is proposed that America take the role of mediator between Russia and Britain. This might be possible as to some territorial problems in Europe and Asia where Russia and Britain have interests and America has none. But beneath all lies the ideological issue. It is between democratic government, free speech, and other institutions practiced in common by America and Britain and totalitarian government practiced by Russia. About the extension of one or the other of these systems to liberated and conquered countries the United States cannot be a mediator. Of necessity it must stand with Britain.

The Russian problem and the tangle of other world problems associated with Russia will increase when and if Russia enters the war against Japan. Just as Russia in the peace settlement in Europe insists on dominance of her own interests as respects countries close to her borders, so presumably will she follow the same course in Asia. This will raise problems about the independent and territorial integrity of China even more troublesome than those about Poland and the Balkan states.

Postwar Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the speech delivered by Mr. Jiminie Chappell, of Union Springs, Ala., in the finals of the Alabama State oratorical contest, that is sponsored each year by the Birmingham News and Age-Herald. Jimmie is the youngest entry to ever gain the finals of this oratorical contest. His speech:

Mark Twain, the famous American writer, once said, "Education is not what you learn, it's what you unlearn."

This will be true in our postwar world.

The people of Japan are taught from earliest childhood that their Emperor is divine. They must "unlearn" this.

The people of Germany are taught that they are supermen and should be masters of the world. They must "unlearn" this.

The Mohammedans were taught that others were infidels and had to be killed. They had to "unlearn" that.

Lack of education has caused practically every war since the beginning of time.

Military leaders have taken advantage of the people's ignorance to lead them on wild schemes of conquest.

A German took advantage of his people's ignorance and started World War I.

A Mohammedan took advantage of his people's ignorance and tried to invade Europe.

Another German took advantage of his people's ignorance and plunged us into World War II.

What shall we do about ignorance in our postwar world?

The answer to this is simple—youth. The youth of the world will blow out the torch of ignorance and kindle the torch of education.

The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow.

It will be these future citizens that will teach the ignorant people the ways of peace, democracy, and justice.

Though many of us will not be called upon to teach these ignorant people, we shall still have a great task at home. A task of keeping the world out of war by reasoning and thinking.

We have found the answer to this problem, but now we face another.

How are we to finance this great crusade against ignorance?

Our Government and other governments will have much to do in our post-war world. But we shall manage to save enough money to finance this great crusade.

With these problems disposed of, we now face the last and greatest problem of all. Will these people want education?

We see pictures of Poles and Slavs studying on crude slates in torn down buildings. They want education.

We hear of Chinese starting schools in the mountains. They want education.

But the Germans? People who have always lived under a Prussian military rule. Will they want education?

The Japanese? People who are taught that others are inferior. Will they want education?

We must make them see how great education is and how it will keep our world out of war.

One of the greatest mistakes in history was made after World War I. Instead of taking Germany in hand and showing her a peaceful world, we let her alone. Then out of the dust rose a dictator. A dictator who said, "Follow me and I will give you riches." The poor, dumb, ignorant people followed and plunged us into this great World War.

Oh, how much could have been averted if only we had educated these people. They would have been able to reason and think and resist the dictator.

The only possible way to avoid another world war is to educate the world.

In this postwar world, we cannot sit back and say, "I have nothing, let those with money educate these ignorant people."

Some of the world's greatest educators have risen from almost nothing. Take for instance, Booker T. Washington. He was but a poor Negro, born in slavery. Yet today we honor him as one of the world's greatest men.

In this postwar world, education must be so cheap that the poor as well as the rich can afford it. For if we did not, then the rich could take advantage of the poor and plunge us into more wars.

In this postwar world, we will have places only for those who work and none for those who do not. For it is the lazy people that follow the easiest path to riches and plunge us into wars.

In this world of tomorrow, we must toil and sacrifice and not sit back and watch. So as Winston Churchill says, "With hope in our hearts, a prayer on our lips, and work on our hands"—we set out on a vast crusade for education. May it succeed.

The Average American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, every person is entitled to these five things:

First. A normal birth.

Second. A liberal education.

Third. A position suited to his ability and temperament.

Fourth. Security during his declining years.

Fifth. Last, and most important, recognition.

I wish to emphasize the word "recognition" and to speak about the real man, the average man. This average man has been scolded, and when I say "average man," I mean, of course, the average man and woman. He buys bonds to the limit but is never noticed in the public headlines, nor does he try to attract attention. His sons are in the fighting fronts, but he does not tell the public his boys are the only boys there. He works for his country, prays for their safe return, but does this in the closet. He is a tither and gives 10 percent of his earnings to God's Kingdom; yet he does not have his name on the envelope; he realizes that any charity with the name signed to it is not charity. He does what he can for all public functions without attracting attention. He is the average man after all—the real hero not receiving recognition. This man is truly God's nobleman.

God Almighty will not look us over for medals, worldly recognition, or acclaim, but He will look for scars. Have we suffered? Have our hearts been wounded? This average man receives no applause as he marches, no applause at the close of some statement which is sound wisdom. He does not want it. Whether in the trench, the work shop, the farm, whether a little mother caring for the household—they crave no worldly plaudits. The average man has no press agent—he avoids, rather than seeks, publicity. Whether at home, abroad, in battle, or in civilian duty, "he carries the message to Garcia." No letter to his Government is written by him asking "What about me and mine?" He just thinks, "What can I give to my God and my country?" Yet he has not only been forgotten but has been scolded. Chain speakers, chain writers, and the heads of those who are seeking publicity have created for him a most harrowing experience. He is waking up. Some day his voice will be heard.

I am attaching hereto an editorial written by a man who dares to speak and who speaks with a zeal for righteousness forged into white heat. I now have the pleasure of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I hope will be read by every student of Government in this country, as well as other countries.

THE SILENT AMERICAN SOON WILL BE HEARD

There is a man in this country who seldom speaks up. He eats, sleeps, works, votes, and pays taxes, but his voice is usually as silent as the falling of the dew. He should be the most powerful man in the country, yet he says little. He listens to others, praises what he likes and condemns what he does not like—to his limited cluster of associates, yet his voice is never heard on the floor of Congress or the State assembly. He wins our wars and pays for them. He spends sleepless nights worrying about his debts and whether he can send his son away to school. He cuts his own lawn, repairs the family vacuum cleaner, washes his car, and paints the back fence.

He is the average American.

When elections come he votes, more often at the November polls than at the primaries. He scans the ticket, puzzled over a lot of names with which he is not familiar. He does the best he can. But there is not much choice. The political parties have put up their favorite candidates. Any way he votes he turns his Government over to organized political machines. After election day he goes home to see what will happen. Nothing does, so he goes back to the shop or office and obscurity.

He is told what he can buy, how far he can drive his car, and what he can eat. When he gets his pay check the Government already has taken out a generous slice. He has read in the newspaper that the war is costing untold billions. But he does not complain. It is patriotic to pay taxes, especially for a war. His life, in spite of the freedoms he is told he enjoys, is hardly his own. There doesn't seem much he can do about it. So he keeps on working, eating what he can get, and paying his taxes.

Some day he will insist upon being all he has been told he is—a free citizen. He will insist upon his privileges being restored. He will insist upon a voice. He will break the silence. He will demand his rights—his freedoms in such a way that they cannot be disputed.

He is told before national elections that he is as important as the President when he walks into a voting booth. It makes him feel good. The day after election, he knows this is not true. It was merely political salve on his vanity.

He is getting a little tired of a government so far away running all of the small details of this every-day life. He is going to throw the whole thing out the window as soon as the Japs give up. He wants to be his own voice. And some day not too far away he is going to do it.

You know him. He is the man who sits next to you on the bus. He lives across the street. You meet him in the elevator with a last year's straw hat. He stands in line with you for cigarettes, shines his own shoes, and uses a razor blade almost a week.

His political harness is beginning to chafe. He is preparing to cut the straps and make himself known. His ancestors pitched the tea into Boston Bay in the Revolution; they fell in Gettysburg and in Cuba. He is ready to break loose and be himself again.

He is the average American.

Resolution of the Mayor and Council of Jersey Homesteads, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted

me, I append herewith a set of resolutions recently adopted by the mayor and Council of the Borough of Jersey Homesteads which would change its name to Roosevelt in memory our late President. This community was founded some years ago by the Federal Government and is now operated under the control of the National Housing Agency, Federal Public Housing Authority. This proposal is most appropriate, because it was due to the efforts of the late President that the homes in this community were made possible.

BOROUGH OF JERSEY HOMESTEADS,
Jersey Homesteads, N. J.

Resolution adopted by mayor and borough council at meeting held May 14, 1945

Whereas on April 12, 1945, a war-stricken world learned with tragic suddenness of the untimely death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this Nation; and

Whereas this Nation and the world have lost one of its greatest leaders of all time, who had unselfishly devoted his health and his life to their cause; and

Whereas as President of this great Nation, he led this country through its most severe economic crisis and reestablished American faith in the future; and

Whereas as a result of his program for rehabilitation came about the creation of our community and many hundreds of others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Borough Council of the Borough of Jersey Homesteads, That in honor and out of respect to the memory of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we change the name of our borough to Roosevelt; and be it further

Resolved, That the borough clerk is hereby instructed to have this decision put on the ballot of the forthcoming election, to be held November 6, 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That the borough clerk is hereby further instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Representative of our district, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, and to the Senators of our State, the Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES and the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Approved:

JACOB N. REARSON,
Mayor.

Attest:

JEANNE G. REARSON,
Borough Clerk.

Immigration Bars To Be Let Down by Letting in Products of Sweated Foreign Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following statement of Harry H. Cook, of Toledo, Ohio, international president, American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, before the Senate Finance Committee, June 1, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, those demanding the continuance in their hands of the power to destroy American industries, to transfer the jobs of America's workers to workers in other countries, especially the jobs of those workers in industries where labor costs represent a high percentage of the total costs, seemingly act Hitler-like in that the more often they repeat a statement, irrespective of its accuracy, the more people will believe it.

CLAYTON CLAIMS UNTRUE

Secretary Clayton represented to your committe, I quote, "No single American industry can show that it has been seriously injured."

Speaking for and on behalf of the officers and members of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, I want this committee to know that that statement is wholly untrue. Further, the State Department has admitted, by its own actions in canceling or suspending the trade agreement with Czechoslovakia, its knowledge that such a statement is wholly untrue. In addition, the Ways and Means Committee recommended and the House of Representatives, in adopting the pending legislation with the proviso that the Czechoslovakia trade agreement could not be reinstated, bore witness to the falsity of the statement that "no single American industry can show that it has been seriously injured."

The Czechoslovakian trade agreement was the only trade agreement entered into with a foreign country, which country was overrun by the Nazis, which trade agreement has been suspended or canceled.

The State Department has made trade agreements with France, with Belgium, with Holland, with Finland, which countries have been overrun and occupied by the Nazis. None of these trade agreements were canceled or suspended. Why?

The only trade agreement affected by the unusual action of the Ways and Means Committee, and by the action of the House of Representatives, was the trade agreement we had entered into with Czechoslovakia.

In view of these undisputable facts, so well known to those in the State Department actually in charge of trade agreements, we feel that the members of this committee, and of the Senate, are warranted in most carefully weighing the value of unsupported assertions presented by those who, solely through this unusual power placed in their control, become for the moment important in our economic life.

Of course, members of this committee may have noted from answers you may have received from Secretary Clayton that he may not be aware of the actual facts or the real history of the trade agreements.

When questioned by members of the Ways and Means Committee I noted that he invariably stated that he did not know because he had only been in the Department for a period of a few months.

TARIFF COMMISSION REPORTS COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We state to your committee without the slightest hesitancy, that the concessions made by the State Department officials in the trade agreement we entered into with Czechoslovakia seriously injured our industry and transferred the jobs of hundreds of our workers to the lower paid workers of Czechoslovakia.

The United States Tariff Commission, in its report to the Senate, April 1945, page 2–59, states, referring to handmade glassware, "Methods of production are much the same in the several producing countries and the high proportion of hand work required gives competitive advantage to countries with low wage levels."

The same report, same page, also states that imports of hand-made glassware represented 15 percent to 30 percent of United States consumption value, and that imports in 1939 represented 25 percent of the United States consumption of hand-made glassware for that year.

IMPORTS WHICH CONTROL 25 PERCENT OF AMERICAN MARKET NOT NEGLIGIBLE

Further, the United States Tariff Commission, in this same report, same page, states, "Because of the increase in United States demand and the decline in imports, domestic production—jobs—increased in value from less than $12,000,000 in 1939 to more than $19,000,000 in 1941, the latest available estimate. This was possible without expansion of the capacity of the industry because much of the existing capacity was not previously in use."

Is it fair to say that from 15 percent to 30 percent of the American market represents what Secretary Clayton often refers to as negligible imports?

It is evident to us that if this legislation is extended that in some other trade agreement, either with Czechoslovakia or some other glass-producing country, our industry and our jobs will be faced with a reduction of tariff rates which will leave us with tariff protection of not more than 30 percent to offset what the Tariff Commission reported to the Senate of the United States "the competitive advantage to countries with lower wage levels."

COUNTRY ON NOTICE TARIFF RATES TO BE REDUCED TO 30 PERCENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Secretary Clayton has placed the Congress and the American people on notice of what he intends to do not with some certain industries but with all American industries, the products of which compete in the American market with products of other countries, if and when you delegate to him the power which this legislation will confer upon him.

I did not personally hear Secretary Clayton's presentation to this committee. However, I have a copy of the statement handed out and I wish to quote two paragraphs which prove what I said.

On page 3 of his statement I note he said, "No one familiar with the exorbitant rates in the Smoot-Hawley bill, many of them running over 100 percent, can deny that tariff adjustment, selectively and carefully made, is called for." Then, he added, "At the time the Trade Agreements Act went into effect, 11 years ago, the average rate of duty on dutiable imports under the Smoot-Hawley bill was about 50 percent."

Secretary Clayton has publicly stated to the Congress that he believes that average tariff rates of 27 or 28 or 30 percent are fairly high.

In response to a question of Congressman SIMPSON, Secretary Clayton, when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, stated, as shown on page 341, "I think an average tariff of 27 or 28 or 30 percent is fairly high."

In addition, Secretary Clayton has publicly told this committee why he wanted tariff rates reduced to 27 or 28 or 30 percent.

Secretary Clayton refers to the tariff rates in the Smoot-Hawley Act as exorbitant. He also states that rates of 30 percent are fairly high. No reference is made to whether or not these fairly high tariff rates of 30 percent will equalize the difference in production costs. No reference is made or interest shown in the fact that the foreign produced competitive glass tableware articles, product of workers in foreign countries at less than our costs of production, are sold to American retail consumers on basis of American costs.

Secretary Clayton is officially and publicly aware that the Maritime Commission has definitely found that the difference in production costs, American and foreign, are 100 percent higher in America. When asked

about this situation at Ways and Means Committee hearings he raised no objections thereto.

Why should America's workers, dependent on the sale of glass tableware in American markets, be limited to a production differential of, say, 30 percent—tariff rates—and other American workers allowed a differential—tariff equivalent—of 100 percent over foreign costs?

In all fairness, why should the Senators and Congressmen from glass-production States and districts permit such discrimination to be continued?

Throughout his presentation before this committee you will note that he wants the value of our mechanized exports, as well as our loans in foreign countries, invested in production plants in those foreign countries, and insists that "if we fail to adopt the tariff policy which this bill embodies, we cannot expect to receive the returns that will be due us on the large foreign loans which we shall inevitably make during the reconstruction period" (p. 7).

NO CITATION OF FOREIGN TRADE BARRIERS REDUCED

In addition he stated (p. 2): "Now, for the debtor countries to pay the interest and dividends on such investments and continue to buy our goods, it is absolutely essential that trade discrimination be eliminated and that excessive barriers to the international movement of goods, such as tariff—in excess of 27 or 28 or 30 percent—quotas, etc., be substantially lowered."

I have read the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and so far as I have been able to learn no presentation or citation has been made by any of those who seek the continuity and expansion of the power which the Constitution delegated only to the Congress of any trade barriers, or quotas actually filled, which have been placed in actual effect by any of the foreign governments as a result of the concessions we made, which reduced our average tariff rates from 50 percent to 35 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States, the Congress of the United States are on notice of what is going to happen to those workers who are dependent for their means of livelihood on those American industries where the difference in production costs of American-made goods exceeds more than 30 percent of competitive foreign-made goods.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN TRADE TREATY CLOSED GLASSWARE PLANTS

We do not know what other Americans are going to do. We faced the same situation in 1938 when, as a result of the reduction of the tariff rates on glassware from 60 percent to 30 percent the jobs of our workers were literally transferred to lower paid glassware workers in Czechoslovakia. We instituted a Nation-wide boycott of foreign-made goods.

We are satisfied that as a result of the agitation and the education we promoted that we saved the jobs of our members, and finally, when the excuse presented itself, the State Department lost no time in canceling the trade agreement which made necessary the boycott campaign which we had instituted.

We have made our appeal to the elected representatives of the American people. We have presented our case to the members of the Ways and Means Committee and to the members of the Senate Finance Committee. Failing to secure proper redress and protection we have no hesitancy in placing our case before the American people.

GLASSWARE WORKERS WANT JOBS—NOT CHARITY

There are about 10,000 members of our international union serving in the armed forces, in addition to many others who are sons or sons-in-law of our members. Many of these will not return as they have already sacrified their lives that we might preserve what some call freedom in the United States. The possession of freedom or liberty, dependent on some relief roll or the charity of one's friends is not what our members in the armed forces sacrificed their lives for. When they went away we all, employers and representatives of the employees, promised that their jobs would be there for them on their return. We know that with tariff rates of 30 percent there will be no profitable jobs for them.

Others will return too crippled to take their places in any industry. Our organization, to a man, will not hesitate to take such measures as we deem necessary and helpful to assure our returning members, who served in the armed forces, and, those who carried on as soldiers in the production lines, of their rights to a job in an American glass tableware industry at decent wages and under decent conditions of employment.

RESPONSIBILITY THAT OF CONGRESS—NOT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in closing I wish to impress upon you that the duties of the President of the United States are such, especially in these days, that he is dependent upon the advice and the recommendations which he receives from those he entrusts with or delegates responsibility to. In this case it is not the responsibility of the President. The Constitution of the United States entrusts to the Congress of the United States the raising of revenues. When you, for any reason, see fit to delegate your responsibilities to some unnamed and unknown persons the responsibility is not that of the President of the United States; it is yours.

Succession to the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Columbus Dispatch, dated May 11, and an article from the Columbus Citizen, dated May 15, 1945:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of May 11, 1945]

WHITE HOUSE SHIFT EMPHASIZES FLAWS IN PRESENT SYSTEM

(By Elmer P. Fries)

Under existing provisions relating to Presidential succession it is possible for a Chief Executive of the Republic to be a man upon whom the voters never have passed judgment at the polls. And a Vice President who becomes President is in a position to pick his possible successor without reference to the electorate. These important but seldom noted flaws of our Federal Government system were pointed out by James A. Farley to a chamber of commerce meeting in Pennsylvania the other night.

And the former Postmaster General, who knows both history and politics through diligent study as well as long experience, contributed a constructive suggestion for doing something about various aspects of the matter of succession which present laws do not cover.

Mr. Farley's discussion was based on the elevation of Harry S. Truman to the White House office through Mr. Roosevelt's death—the seventh instance in history in which a Vice President has thus taken over.

He told his audience in part: "Under the Constitution, of course, the Vice President succeeds in the event of death, removal, resignation, or inability to perform Presidential duties. And under the same paragraph of the Constitution, the Congress may by law provide for the situation that would be presented if a succeeding Vice President likewise were to be removed, to die, to resign, or to become incapacitated.

"The present statute in this respect was enacted in 1886 and provides that the Secretary of State is next in succession, and after him in series the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, and finally the Secretary of the Interior—in short for a cabinet succession based upon seniority among the Departments.

"But this raises a question. Under our present method, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate.

"The first in line, as I have remarked, is the Secretary of State, whom he appoints subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible short-circuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved. There are other aspects to the problem of succession which never have been worked out by law."

One of the latter, Mr. Farley explained, is the possible creation of a complicated situation in Congress which presumably has the power to name a President and Vice President if both persons elected to those offices should die before being inaugurated.

A congressional deadlock due to party divisions conceivably could result in much delay and confusion which would leave the country without a President for a period.

The remedy, as Mr. Farley sees it, lies in setting up a special commission on which the Senate and House would be represented, with one or more other Members appointed by the President and perhaps one Supreme Court Justice selected by the Chief Justice.

This commission would make recommendations clarifying the various problems relating to Presidential succession. These might include a constitutional amendment or merely legislation.

And Mr. Farley holds, with sound reasoning, the importance of devising proper action warrants immediate study by an eminently qualified group such as he proposes.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of May 15, 1945]

NOW IS THE TIME

Representative MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma says he will soon introduce a bill to authorize study by a special commission of the question of succession to the Presidency. James A. Farley advocated the same idea the other day.

When, as now, a Vice President has succeeded a President, the man next in line is the Secretary of State, with a number of other Cabinet members following him. Maybe that's the best possible arrangement; maybe not. Whether there could be a better arrangement is worth considering.

And, as Mr. MONRONEY says, there are many blind spots and ambiguities in the present system. Various contingencies that might arise, and for which the Constitution and the laws do not provide, could create grave doubt as to who should become President, or whether there is anyone legally qualified to become President. None of these contingencies has arisen in 156 years, but that's no guaranty that none ever will.

We agree with Messrs. Farley and MONRONEY that now is the time for a nonpolitical commission to study the whole subject and recommend such improvement in the Presidential succession system as may be found desirable.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Fred M. Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by War Mobilization Director Fred M. Vinson at Arlington National Cemetery on Memorial Day:

Memorial Day marks, always, a solemn pause in each year of our Republic's life. Here, at Arlington National Cemetery, we gather once more to pay what honor we can in words and by observance to the men who have served our Nation to the end of their capacity. We are humble in the presence of these dead.

This is the one hundred and sixty-ninth year of our Republic. Once more, the heirs of America's freedom are proving in battle that our liberal tradition breeds fighting men. Great victories have been won; final triumph will be achieved. But the cost is heavy. Here, looking about us at the marble and granite which marks the resting places of our heroes, we can count in some degree, the cost of our freedom.

There are many other dead who do not lie here, whose bodies rest beneath foreign soil: In France, and Italy, and Germany, in Africa, and on far-off islands of the Pacific, Iwo Jima and Tarawa, and Okinawa. There are others whose bodies have been consigned to the seas; who have fallen from the skies to nameless graves. We have lost many men, many, many sons, and husbands, brothers, and lovers. We have lost also our great leader, in the cause of human justice and freedom, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We mourn these men, soldiers and sailors, and warriors of the sky. But in our Nation, grief gives us always greater resolution. We go on, with stronger armies, with new leaders. Our trial is not over. Here at home, we labor unceasingly, and will labor harder. Overseas, we fight more strongly, and with greater determination now that one of the enemies of freedom has been crushed. It is our tradition in America that we count no cost too great if it will secure to us, and to the world, the freedom of men.

We have struck a strong blow against tyranny in Europe. We have wiped out the armies and we are expunging the leaders of fascism and nazism. The war criminals who have not destroyed themselves at the threat of retribution will be brought to the bar of international justice for judgment. We have set ourselves the task of making sure that these nations who once proclaimed themselves masters of the world shall learn the error of their ways. We will make sure that they have not the power again to strike us in the back. They must begin now to learn how to live in a civilized world. They must answer to justice for the crimes they have committed; for the damage they have caused. Then, and only then, will the United Nations permit them once more to earn their way back into the fellowship of men of good will.

While we perform this necessary task of cleansing Germany, we are striking fresher and stronger blows against tyranny in the Pacific. Crippling damage has been done to the Japanese Fleet, and to the Japanese merchant marine. Our planes are driving home to the Japanese the truth that democratic nations are always stronger than despotism. Our soldiers and our fleet have smashed through Japan's outer defenses and brought us to the very doorstep of the home islands. Yes, these are great victories and point the way to the ultimate triumph. We are proud of these achievements.

It is a tragic thing that men must die because of the evil that other men do. It is tragic that evil is allowed to take root and flourish until only the savagery of war can tear it out. There is another way, and we must find it.

These wars that destroy treasure and manhood do not "just happen." Let us once and for all root out of our thinking the idea that wars are beyond control. Wars are not "acts of God." They are caused by man, by man-made institutions, by the way in which man has organized his society. What man has made, man can change. We can alter the shape of things so that war is no longer an ever-constant threat. It is within our power, as man, as members of the United Nations to accomplish this. It will not be easy, but the homage we pay our dead here today will be a mockery unless we use to the utmost the opportunity for which they fought and died.

We of the United Nations can do this, because the future of the world is in the hands of mankind. We must do this because mankind must progress and grow. We will do this because it is mankind's destiny to live in peace, and liberty, and brotherhood upon earth.

What are the means by which we may accomplish the quarantine against wars? The means are not simple to find, nor are they easy to put into operation. Yet ways must be found: The world must work together. The separate nations of the world must not only be willing that brother nations should have economic security, but they also should assist each other to attain it. There must be a method for working in concert, with force if necessary, to put down those who seek by violence to attain selfish and anti-social ends.

At Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta and at San Francisco, we of the United Nations have been shaping machinery intended to prevent aggressions. We have been blocking out the systems and the methods by which men and nations can come to a peaceful solution of their differences. We are seeking to substitute debate, discussion, compromise, and legislation for the horror of modern war.

We are making progress. It is a healthy thing that the problems of the world are being decided, with all the world listening in. This is not secret diplomacy such as marked the end of the last war. This is the modern, democratic way of working, free debate in the open. Through these means, we are shaping the constitutions of the United Nations.

I think that, no matter how great the difficulties of the moment may seem, the San Francisco Conference, and other international conferences, will succeed. They will, because the people of the world have demanded it.

Solid measures are also being forged in the Congress of the United States and in the parliaments and assemblies of the United Nations to serve the cause of world cooperation.

The United Nations confront two main problems: the suppression of aggression and the assurance of a full flow of trade among nations. It is equally important that we are applying to the task of peace the cooperation that we learned in the hard school of war. We are determined to eliminate the causes of war. We cannot evade this responsibility. The world looks to us for leadership, and we are accepting the role.

America has never wished for war. Yet there are things dearer than peace—and so, sometimes we do go to war. What are these things dearer than peace? What is it that makes American men willing to die in fields and seas and skies of battle?

They are simple things, as our men, as all men everywhere are simple in their hearts: security of their homes and loved ones; the opportunity to work, to achieve, to grow in a land free from the tyranny of little men greedy for power.

Yes; these are simple things. But their attainment is not simple. The Declaration of Independence is a living document that was born in strife and whose fulfillment has required, and still requires, the selfless devotion of generations of men. The "four freedoms" of men have been proclaimed. They are being born in battles more savage, more demanding of courage than the framers of our independence could ever have imagined. We are setting about the fulfillment of those freedoms.

A job for every man and woman who wants to work would constitute a good beginning to the fulfillment of the "four freedoms," and to the prevention of war. Our country has more than attained this goal during the war.

We have glimpsed a treasure of prosperity beyond anything this Nation, or the world, has ever known—by providing a multitude of jobs. But there is something wrong when such standards of living can be attained only by producing for war. There is something wrong with us, with the systems of mankind that have caused war.

There will be something wrong with mankind, too, if we allow wars and depressions to return with clocklike regularity as of old. Depressions, like wars, are not acts of God. Man makes them. If we make them, we can unmake them. We must create, in peace, a new prosperity and a greater opportunity for jobs than has existed before.

A difficult task? Of course it is. But during the last 5 years, America has accomplished many difficult tasks. In 5 years, we have doubled our national production. We have piled an entire war economy on top of a civilian economy already operating at what, a few years before, some would have considered an impossible peak of nearly $100,000,000,000.

We are a nation of prodigious accomplishment, and we can do this job, too. Our efforts in this war have opened our own eyes to the tremendous production which American labor and the American genius for management and organization can accomplish as a team. But this record, this vast number of jobs, has been attained through the establishment of an unlimited market by the Government's purchases for war. The change to peacetime production and employment, on a similar scale, will call once more upon the genius of all of us, upon business and agriculture, labor and management, State, local, and Federal Governments to create new peacetime markets to take the place of war-born demands.

We have the means to produce a standard of living far higher than any we have ever known. We are rich in resources, in manufacturing facilities, and in manpower and the know-how of management.

If the ceiling of our production seems almost unlimited the needs of our people are also great. Our needs, plus those of the war-blighted lands overseas, are so various and so great that they challenge the production capacity of even the greatest industrial nation on earth. Yes; the needs are great, but needs do not constitute the means. The people of the United States must have steady income, and must feel sufficiently secure to want to spend that income, before the people become customers for all their needs.

This is the real challenge to America. We know we can produce what people need and what people want. We know that our system of distribution can get the goods to them. But the creation of steady pay presents the test of the genius of our business management, large and small. They must actuate demand by expanding their business,

offering better services and better goods at fair prices. Labor and agriculture can increase man-hour production and thus make an important contribution to higher incomes and higher standards of living.

Government, too, has its responsibility and it is a large one. Business, labor, and agriculture cannot alone assure the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. The Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must be responsible for broad economic policies. Their purpose should be to promote and encourage the expansion of business, and to broaden markets, to support consumer spending.

The way to this goal, like the way to enduring world peace, lies through the joint work of all of us, through the genius of all of us; through the spirit of mankind. What can be done here at home will be done. The leaders of America, in every walk of life, will work individually and collectively. Where Government can help, it will. But the task is, first and foremost, the job of every one of us; of everyone within the reach of my voice; of every living man and woman of America and in the world. We living owe it to those who have died. We owe it to those who will return. They are fighting to get the job done, to get home and to pick up the task, the happiness, of living. What we, and they, do now and in the future will be the measure of whether or not we who live have fulfilled our duty to those who die.

I have called this a solemn pause in the year, a pause to honor those who have served our Nation to the death. Let us also pay them the tribute of searching our own hearts to see what service we can perform, what duty we owe to the dead and to the living. Let our actions today confirm to the hearts of our fighting men the fact that we know why they are fighting. Let them see that we are planning together, laboring together, acting together to wipe out the causes of future conflict, and to guarantee to common men everywhere the freedom to live and work in peace, in harmony with their brothers.

This is the least that we can do; to bring about the realization and the fulfillment of freedom for the world—for which all of us have fought, and some of us have died. Only in this way can we truly honor our dead.

God care for the hero dead and all who fight to preserve the rights for which they died.

The Friant-Kern Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, time and again you have heard me address the House on the subject of the importance of the Friant-Kern canal, the most necessary and vital irrigation unit of the Central Valley project, and the need for which justified that project from its very inception.

Since 1939, when construction of the great Friant Dam was started, I have urged and pleaded that construction of this great irrigation canal be commenced and carried on to completion without delay. Year after year since that time I have never ceased my efforts to bring about the start of work on building this project.

When the clouds of war first darkened the horizon, I submitted facts and figures to show the tremendous food production that the water this canal would bring to our thirsty lands would produce. My congressional district, comprising the counties of Kern, Tulare, and Kings, is undoubtedly the highest ranking agricultural area in the value of its products that exists anywhere. The value of its agricultural crops last year exceeded $300,000,000. The waters that this great canal will carry are necessary to maintain this production and protect the huge investment in orchards, vineyards, and farms of all kinds from utter ruin, should another drought cycle occur. It is imperative that this canal be built as speedily as possible, for dry years in this area can occur with frequency and no one can predict what the future holds for us in the way of rain and snow and weather.

Again and again I have gone to the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and urged them to expedite getting the work under way. I have testified again and again before the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate, asking them to make funds available for the work.

In 1941 the Reclamation Bureau did advertise for bids to construct the first unit of the project, only to cancel them as the country became involved in war. As time passed on and the need for food became acute and apparent to the whole world, I again submitted the possibilities for increased food production that the construction of this Friant-Kern canal would make possible. Very comprehensive data were prepared, to show in detail what the building of the canal would produce. I submitted these data to the War Food Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the War Production Board. Hearing after hearing was held by various committees and agencies of the War Production Board. The project was endorsed and recommended by the War Food Administrator, whose knowledge of the great productivity of the lands under this canal caused him to give enthusiastic support to the canal program.

The Bureau of Reclamation awoke from its apathy and indolent attitude toward the irrigation features of this huge project and evidenced a desire to get construction under way. They promised to build the canal in 2 years if given the opportunity, for they, too, realized the tremendous increased production of foodstuffs that its completion would bring.

The War Manpower Commission gave its blessing to commence the undertaking. However, the War Production Board would not give its approval. Without any doubt, the most incompetent consideration was given this canal project by some of the WPB committees. It would have been looked upon as a comedy of errors if it had not been so tragic.

If the canal had been started in 1939 when the Friant Dam construction began, millions of tons of foodstuffs would have been produced from the waters that have wasted to the sea through lack of a conduit to carry it to the farmlands. If the canal had been started in 1942 or 1943, the waters this year would be growing a million new tons of foodstuffs. Some of our food shortage can be directly traced to the lack of diligence and foresight of a few of our governmental agencies that should have known better.

Here I wish to pay a tribute to my colleagues in Congress. Again and again I have been the only Congressman to appear before the Appropriations Committee to ask for funds to implement the construction program on our irrigation canals. In spite of the fact that we have had no power shortage at any time in this area, while all the time we have had a water shortage, a food shortage, and increased power loads and costs due to having to pump the water from an ever increasing depth, I have been the only Congressman to plead for funds and construction of the canal that would bring the water to the lands that need it so desperately.

The members of the House Appropriations Committee, most of whom had taken the time to come to California and see this great Central Valley project, see at first hand the marvelous productivity of its lands, see the water wasting to the sea, see the plight of the farmers suffering from a water table that had dropped out of economic reach, and see the majestic Friant Dam serving only as a roosting place for birds, with wisdom and understanding appropriated funds to commence the construction of the Friant-Kern canal. They even earmarked the funds to make certain that money would be available at any time a clearance could be obtained for the construction program.

I am grateful to them and so are the people of California who have prayed and worked for this water project for 25 long years. We are grateful, too, to the Members of the House who have supported this program and who have approved the appropriations made available by the members of the committee. I assure you that your faith and confidence in this irrigation works will be justified a thousandfold once the waters are brought to the lands.

Today I am happy to report that on last Saturday afternoon, June 2, the War Production Board approved the construction of the first unit of the canal and the excavation of its entire length of 160 miles. This decision was reached after I had conferred with J. A. Krug, Director of the WPB, and members of his staff. Their consideration and understanding of the importance of this irrigation canal reflects great credit upon their administration of the functions of the War Production Board.

Commissioner Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, has promised energetic action to see that work gets under way, and I am confident that under his able guidance we shall see work underway before the end of this summer.

On behalf of the people of this great valley, I wish to thank everyone who has assisted in bringing this matter about.

Pledge to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the United States Flag Association, national headquarters, Washington, D. C.:

AUTHORSHIP OF PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

The original pledge to the flag read as follows:

"I pledge allegiance to my flag and[1] the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

MODIFICATION OF PLEDGE

At the First National Flag Conference held in Washington, which was attended by eighty-some-odd delegates from patriotic societies, fraternal orders, civic bodies, and other organizations, the Pledge to the Flag was modified to read:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

FURTHER MODIFIED

The Second National Flag Conference held in Washington on Flag Day, 1924, further modified the Pledge to the Flag to read as follows:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

CONFLICTING CLAIMS OF AUTHORSHIP

For several years the family of Francis Bellamy and that of James B. Upham have each claimed for these men the authorship of the original pledge to the flag. At the time the pledge was written both Mr. Bellamy and Mr. Upham were connected with Youth's Companion.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE AUTHORSHIP

To determine, in the interest of historical accuracy and certainty, the authorship of the original pledge to the flag, the United States Flag Association appointed a committee consisting of Charles C. Tansill, professor of American history, Fordham University, chairman; W. Reed West, professor of political science, George Washington University; and Bernard Mayo, professor of American history, Georgetown University. All three of these university professors have had long experience in research work, in which they are known to be experts of a high order.

FINDING OF COMMITTEE

After carefully and impartially weighing all evidence submitted by the two contending families of Francis Bellamy and James B. Upham, the committee unanimously decided that to Francis Bellamy unquestionably belongs the honor and distinction of being the author of the original pledge to the flag.

The report of the committee, which was submitted to, and approved by, national headquarters of the United States Flag Association, May 18, 1939, is given below in full.

REPORT

After a careful examination of all the data submitted by the Upham and the Bellamy families, the committee of historians appointed by the United States Flag Association has come to the unanimous conclusion that the credit for the authorship of the pledge of allegiance to the American flag belongs entirely to Mr. Francis Bellamy, of Rome, N. Y. The data submitted by Mr. David Bellamy in defense of his father's claims to the authorship of the pledge are especially significant.

On February 17, 1892, the department of superintendence of the National Education Association adopted a resolution to perfect plans for a national Columbian public school celebration to be held on October 21, 1892. In order to carry out these plans, the association arranged for the appointment of an executive committee of five persons, with Francis Bellamy, of the Youth's Companion staff, as the chairman. From the extensive literature issued from the headquarters of this committee, it is apparent that Francis Bellamy played an outstanding role in making a success of this national Columbian public school celebration. Not only did he carry on a voluminous correspondence with leading educators in the United States, but he also kept in close contact with the American press and with men who were prominent in public life. For the official program of the national Columbian public school celebration, Mr. Bellamy wrote the formal address in easy and fluent language, and its smooth cadence bears some resemblance to the phraseology of the pledge of allegiance.

In three long affidavits, dated August 13, August 30, and September 1, 1923, Mr. Bellamy gives an intimate picture of the background of the pledge of allegiance. These affidavits are clearly and cogently written and bear the unmistakable stamp of verity. In this connection it should be kept in mind that Mr. Bellamy had served many years as minister in the Baptist Church before entering upon his duties as a member of the editorial staff of the Youth's Companion. There seems to be no good reason to doubt the authenticity of the statements that he makes in these affidavits, and the fact of his clerical connection gives added weight to his testimony.

In the three affidavits there is a detailed account of the events leading up to the actual writing of the pledge of allegiance. There is also a statement which explains the evolution of the phraseology of the pledge. In this regard it is important to note that Mr. James B. Upham did not write any statement asserting his authorship to the pledge. The claim that he was the author of this 23-word salute to the American flag rests almost entirely upon the testimony of members of his family and upon statements made by members of the staff of the Youth's Companion. It is pertinent to note that the evidence in favor of Mr. Upham as the author of the pledge of allegiance is of comparatively recent origin and has come to light since his death in 1905.

In addition to the affidavits of Francis Bellamy with reference to the authorship of the pledge, there are additional data which support the Bellamy claim. In the Bellamy scrapbook there are two drafts of the pledge in the handwriting of Mr Bellamy. Just when these drafts were written it is impossible to detemine. There is also in the Bellamy scrapbook a page from the Youth's Companion of September 8, 1892, in which the program of the Columbus Day celebration is given in full. In the handwriting of Mr. Bellamy there is a notation alongside of the pledge of allegiance and of the address to the effect that Francis Bellamy is the author of both pieces.

It is very true that these notations could have been made some time subsequent to September or October of 1892, and it is equally true that the drafts of the pledge of allegiance in the handwriting of Mr. Bellamy may have been mere exercises in penmanship. The fact remains, however, that the links in the chain of Bellamy evidence are numerous and well-fitting and cannot be lightly disregarded.

The American Flag Manufacturing Co., of Easton, Pa., presumably in 1893 or 1894, published a small pamphlet entitled "A Ritual for Teaching Patriotism in the Public Schools." In this pamphlet there are detailed directions for the holding of a ceremony for honoring the American flag and the pledge of allegiance is printed in full. There are two salutes to the American flag published in the pamphlet, and the ritual that accompanies the holding of these salutes is explained by George T. Balch and by Francis Bellamy. The fact that Mr. Bellamy was chosen to write the ritual that was later associated with his name is a fact that cannot be overlooked.

Shortly after the appearance of this pamphlet, Mrs. Lue Stuart Wadsworth, a member of the national committee of the Woman's Relief Corps on Patriotic Teaching in the Public Schools, paid a visit to the office of the Youth's Companion to ascertain if that publication would print and distribute some copies of the so-called Bellamy salute for the children of the public schools. During the course of a conversation with Mrs. Wadsworth, Mr. James D. Upham remarked: "While Francis Bellamy wrote that salute, it should never have been published under his name, as he was in our employ."

During the session of the Twelfth National Convention of the Women's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, September 11, 1894, Mrs. Wadsworth brought to the attention of the convention the Bellamy salute to the American flag.

In the fall of 1894, therefore the pledge of allegiance was widely known as the Bellamy salute, and in the Acme Haversack of Patriotism and Song, published in Syracuse, N. Y., in March 1895, the pledge of allegiance is frankly credited to Francis Bellamy.

In view of this strong contemporary evidence it is the opinion of the members of this committee that the author of the pledge of allegiance to the American flag was Francis Bellamy, of Rome, N. Y., and not James B. Upham, of Malden, Mass.

Before concluding this report the committee wishes briefly to discuss the basis of the claim that James B. Upham was the author of the pledge. This claim is based upon a series of letters and affidavits from members of the Upham family and from friends and associates of Mr. Upham. Letters from former members of the editorial staff of the Youth's Companion like Charles M. Thompson, Edward W. Frentz, Henry S. Chapman, and Ira R. Kent are strongly in favor of the view that James B. Upham was the author of the pledge of allegiance. They also indicate the sterling character of Mr. Upham and the credit that rightly belongs to him for his share in making the Columbian celebration such a conspicuous success. But these letters were written many years after his death, and they are balanced by letters written by Mr. Bellamy by other members of the staff of the Youth's Companion (Harold Roberts, LeRoy Phillips, and Mrs. H. Underhau), who were convinced that Francis Bellamy wrote the pledge.

Because of the conflicting evidence in the letters from former members of the staff of the Youth's Companion, the committee inclines toward the view that the contemporary evidence adduced by Mr. Bellamy in support of his father's claim has unusual weight. After surveying every aspect of the question of the authorship of the pledge, the committee is of the opinion that Francis Bellamy wrote the pledge of allegiance to the American flag in the form in which that salute is reproduced on the program of the National Columbian public school celebration as printed in the Youth's Companion, September 8, 1892: "I pledge allegiance to

[1] In later versions "to" was added after "and."

my flag and[2] the Republic for which it stands: one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Aviation Development Will Help Furnish Jobs in Postwar Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is already evidence of unemployment problems following VE-day on May 8, with the curtailment in production in war industries. This might indicate that some of our administrative Government agencies have not been on the job. There has been a lot of talk about postwar planning in some of our executive departments. I hope some of it has been more than talk. I fear for the worst, however.

In this connection I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House one item of aviation development that would furnish employment to a large number of people. I refer to many uncompleted airports throughout the United States. When the Administration liquidated WPA several airports were being constructed, but uncompleted. Three such airports were in the Eighth Congressional District, located at International Falls, Hibbing, and Eveleth, Minn. The Federal Government had spent money on these projects, and it would be wasted, unless the work was finished. A number of Congressmen, including myself, sought a congressional appropriation in 1943, for these projects. We succeeded and Congress enacted Public Law No. 216, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 23, 1943. This law directed the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to finish these airports. It will be interesting to note just what is going to be done. This is one project where the money is available, and all they have to do is start to work. This sounds simple, but, nevertheless, it is true. It is high time that we cut off landlease foolishness for foreign countries, and started to build America for our own people. Finishing these airports would be a good start.

So there may be no question about my attitude, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have advocated and shall continue to advocate the development of aviation in the United States. Its possibilities are just in the beginning. This includes both passenger and freight service. The Federal Government ought to help, and we ought to do it now. Thousands and tens of thousands of Army and Navy men in our Air Forces will be coming back to civilian life. They are trained aviators or they are trained ground mechanics. They will be looking for jobs. Commercial aviation offers the answer.

But preliminary to all this, there must be a network of airfields, from east to west, and north to south, all over this country. This is a sound project for those who want to furnish employment in a postwar program.

The demand is immediate, for without these airfields, you cannot have air transportation to different localities. With these landing fields in operation, men will be needed at the different airports and work will be given the trained pilots. Surely we cannot overlook this opportunity to create jobs for our returned servicemen who have been trained and whose experience fits them to take part in the development in future aviation expansion.

If the proper kind of program is carried on, it will mean the manufacture of new airplanes, which will give employment to people now employed in factories which make the planes for the Army and Navy. Unless there is a demand for new planes, these factories will be closed down, with resulting unemployment.

[2] In subsequent edition of the pledge of allegiance to the American flag the word "to" was inserted, thus making it a 23-word pledge.

Dedication of Thomas Jefferson Memorial Auditorium, United States Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Thomas Jefferson bicentenary celebration, the Congress created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. I was honored by appointment on the committee. One of the several recommendations which the committee made for perpetuating the memory of Jefferson with agriculture was the naming of the Department of Agriculture auditorium in his honor. Appropriate exercises were scheduled for Jefferson's birthday, April 13, 1945, but due to the death of our late President the program was postponed until May 29, 1945.

When the auditorium was dedicated on May 29 short addresses were delivered by Mr. W. A. Lloyd, Washington representative, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and myself. Under unanimous consent, I insert the addresses in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MAY 29, 1945

FARMER TOM

Farmer Tom was a versatile man. He was many sided. To the lawyers who only saw his deep interest in establishing canons that would enjoin the right and restrain the wrong, he was a great jurist. To the students who only saw his long and arduous application to the acquisition of knowledge, he was a great scholar. To those who believed in the harmonious development of all of our faculties, he was a great educator. To the political leaders who only saw his skill in the science of government, he was a great statesman. To the lovers of popular government who believed, in the matters of state, the duly chosen representatives of the people should translate the voice of those they represent into policies of government, he was a great leader. To the planners and builders who only saw his genius for designing and constructing, he was a great architect and engineer. To those concerned with establishing facts, laws, and proximate causes, he was a great scientist. But to all those who really knew Thomas Jefferson, it matters not from which side they approached, he was ever a great farmer.

Born the son of a dirt farmer whose farm was located in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, which was then the fringe line of American civilization, the malodor of the barnyard followed his eventful, Nation-making footsteps down his trail of life, though that trail led to the Virginia House of Burgesses, to the Continental Congress, to the Governor's mansion, to the French court, to the Cabinet, yea, to the Presidency of this great Republic, reminding all with whom he came in contact that the soil has a way of identifying and marking its own.

A product of the soil, the rustic skein of agriculture was woven through his life by nature, the master agriculturist, with a persistency and continuity that far excelled the work of the most delicate hand that ever fashioned a golden skein in some great tapestry, and so we find him while in attendance at the French court collecting seed and vegetation to be sent back to his beloved America; experimenting in crop rotation and soil conservation while busily engaged with matters of state; corresponding with the different State agricultural associations, and others interested in agriculture, all during his busy life; and resigning from Washington's cabinet and returning to Monticello "to scenes," as he expressed it, "of greater tranquillity than these which neither my talents, tone of mind, nor time of life fit me," and from there writing John Adams, "I return to farming with an ardor which I scarcely knew in youth, and which has got the better entirely of my love of study."

It is written of man: "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he." Farmer Tom was a great agriculturist because agriculture was entwined in his heart. He loved the soil and the fruits thereof. And he loved those who peopled the soil. Listen to these heart throbs: "No occupation is so delightful to me as the cultivation of the earth * * * I have often thought that if Heaven had given me choice of my position and calling, it should have been a rich spot of earth, well watered, and near a good market."

In order to impress upon you the love he had for the soil and the people thereof let me read a few excerpts from his writings.

The importance he placed upon agriculture is clearly set forth in a letter to Robert Livingston written in 1800. Here is his valuation: "The first and most precious of all arts."

In a letter to R. Izard he stated: "Agriculture is the wisest pursuit of all."

Why did he think agriculture the wisest pursuit of all? Let me answer in his own words. Here is the answer he gave in a letter to George Washington: "Agriculture is the wisest pursuit, because it will in the end contribute most to real wealth, good morals, and happiness."

Why? In a letter to Baron De Moll, written in his seventy-first year, he again answered:

"Agriculture is the basis of the substance, the comforts, and happiness of man."

And what did he think of farmers?

In a letter to Arthur Campbell he said this about those who till the soil: "Farmers, whose interests are entirely agricultural, are the true representatives of the great American interests, and are alone to be relied on for expressing the proper American sentiments."

In a letter to John Jay: "Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country, and wedded to its liberty and interest by the most lasting bonds."

In his notes on Virginia he had this to say: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if He ever had any chosen people, whose breasts he has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which He keeps alive that sacred fire, which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth."

Again in his notes on Virginia he said: "The proportion which the aggregate of the other classes of citizens bears in any State to that of its husbandmen is, generally speaking, the proportion of its unsound to its healthy parts, and is a good enough barometer whereby to measure its degree of corruption."

Born Farmer Tom, neither his deep interest and leadership in freedom's cause, nor his great effort in the field of jurisprudence, nor his love for and outstanding works in education and science, nor his successful fight to free the soul of man from legal bondage and his mind and conscience from the tyranny of power, dampened his ardor or dimmed his love for the soil and those who dwell thereon, and so he died as he was born, as he had lived, plain Farmer Tom.

And today, as one of the representatives of the farmers of America, I take pride in publicly saluting Farmer Tom as the greatest American farmer that has so far appeared upon the American field. May the soil of Monticello that he loved so deeply, so affectionately, ever rest lightly upon his remains.

And now, in a few minutes, we will, here in this beautiful temple of agriculture, dedicate this, its auditorium, to our own Thomas Jefferson, the father of American agriculture, in loving memory of the great contribution he made to God's good earth and the people who dwell thereon. May those who in the future gather here from time to time for discussion and instruction ever look upon agriculture as did our patron saint, as being "The first and most precious of the arts," is my sincere hope, my earnest prayer.

ADDRESS OF W. A. LLOYD, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MAY 29, 1945

It is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I bring you greetings from the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. The State colleges and universities comprising this association have a very deep interest in what is transpiring here today. We welcome this opportunity to render homage and recognition to the great contribution made by Thomas Jefferson in the development of public education in America; and particularly for his original concept of grants of land by the Congress in the interest of education.

In his old age, and after much opposition and controversy, he secured a grant of funds from the Virginia Legislature to found the University of Virginia. It was to be the apex of the educational pyramid he visioned for his State. As he conceived it, it was to include useful and practical as well as cultural education as indicated by his provision for a chair of chemistry, which was to include specifically its application to agriculture. Jefferson had little relish for the refinements of science: for "the philosophers who wrote for each other." He desired that scientific discovery be related to something useful that would help people in their everyday life. Intrenched scholasticism was slow in surrendering the classical tradition. Not only did Jefferson contemplate what 50 years later became agricultural chemistry in its relation to soil fertility and increased food production, but he also envisoned its application to household economics in such homely matters as "making soap, cider, bread, butter, and cheese." It took long years for that idea to ripen into action, as it finally did in the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided for the establishment in each State of at least one college that "without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military science, should teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."

Philosophically this was the Jeffersonian concept. It visioned the completely educated citizen, with a broad cultural background steeped in the classics and the humanities but also versed in the application of science to the requirements of daily life. This is the ideal embodied in the Land Grant College Acts. Just as the University of Virginia, at the outset, fell somewhat short of Jefferson's ideals, so too the land-grant colleges were long years in attaining in completeness this grand idea: The unity of education—the integration of the ornamental and cultural with the useful and practical in the development of the truly educated citizen.

The debt which the State colleges and universities owe to Jefferson, however, is much deeper and more fundamental even than the founding of the University of Virginia. It rests on broader though less well recognized foundation. The celebrated Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory are almost wholly the fruit of Jefferson's genius. By these ordinances "lot 16 of every township" was reserved from sale "for the maintenance of public schools within said township." Here is the precedent for all future land grants in aid to education and for public improvements. This even more than the founding of the University of Virginia establishes his title as the patron saint of the land-grant colleges. Shortly after the promulgation of these ordinances, the Ohio Co., in 1788, and the Symmes Purchase, in 1794, were given grants of land by the Congress for the founding of colleges in the western wilderness comprising the Northwest Territory. To these grants of land we are indebted for the organization of Ohio University at Athens and Miami University at Oxford. These were pioneer institutions of higher learning west of the Alleghenies. So do great results follow turning loose a fruitful idea in a waiting world. The idea was to be used again and again and for many purposes in our political development and was ready made for Congressman Morrill in his bill providing for a national system of State colleges.

Chiseled in stone on the cornice of Hilgard Hall, the Agricultural College of the University of California, are these words: "To preserve for society the native values of rural life." It would be difficult indeed to better epitomize Jefferson's philosophy of the stabilizing influences of the rural population and their need for a cultural inheritance. This is the goal of the land-grant colleges. There are values in rural life that are important; that must be preserved, if "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," as envisioned in the immortal Declaration, are to be preserved. Genuine country culture in America is now in serious danger. City ideals and influences are becoming increasingly predominant. The open country is becoming suburban in activity and outlook. The country tradition is vanishing. This is not progress, as some would have us believe. It can be disaster. The last citadel of democratic ideals, institutions, and processes lies in the people of the open country. This too, was a Jeffersonian concept.

Our State colleges and universities are happy to join you, Mr. Secretary, in the dedication of this auditorium as a forum for free discussion, where the steady light of a genuine country culture may be forever burning and so keep our land from the eclipse of a discordant urban night. In a democracy there is no substitute for informed public opinion if liberty is not to perish from the earth.

Postwar Puzzle: What To Do With Portland Housing Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregonian of May 27, 1945:

POSTWAR PUZZLE: WHAT TO DO WITH PORTLAND HOUSING LAND—HOW PROJECTS WILL BE LIQUIDATED IS STILL UNANSWERED

(By Harry H. Harrison)

In the early stages of the war, Portland and Vancouver worried about where to house the thousands of shipyard workers who crowded into the area. The problem is in reverse now: What to do with all the extra houses when peace comes?

Vanport City, McLoughlin Heights, and others—what becomes of them? The answer would be simple if they were owned by municipalities; they could be ordered torn down immediately after the last shot is fired.

But Uncle Sam, believe it or not, has $100,000,000 invested in war housing in the Portland area. Five of the ten largest war housing projects in the United States are in this area. The biggest—by two and one-half times—of anything else in the country, of course, is Vanport City.

And that very fact worries both cities unless some of their plans are approved by the Government. If not, they fear each may wake up some morning with approximately 31,000 war homes on their hands to compete with permanent rental property and sadly depress the real-estate market for years to come.

When the Government built the war housing, it was the general understanding that the buildings were temporary and must be torn down within 2 years after the war ends. But city planners know that there may be considerable pressure to retain some of the dwellings, especially if approximately half of the present force of outside shipyard workers remain in the area.

SURVEY SHOWED MANY WORKERS PLAN TO REMAIN HERE

A year ago, when Henry Kaiser hired Dr. Chilton Bush, of Stanford University, to survey workers in his yards, he learned 21.3 percent will definitely stay in the area; 30.6 percent will stay if jobs are available; 23.6 percent will leave; 21.9 percent undecided, etc.

Some observers believe that a high percentage of the outside Negro workers will stay, since many southern Negroes nowhere before have found such an equality of conditions.

There are some workers who complain about Oregon's "continual rain." Then

there are others, like the elderly white worker who was sitting on a bench in the waiting room of Vanport's administration building the other day. He volunteered that he was again moving back "into one of those damn, paper-thin shacks after living downtown for a year."

He also volunteered that he was from St. Paul, had been in Portland 2 years in the shipyards, and intended to stay. He had learned, he said, that Portland was a much milder place to spend a winter than St. Paul, where "last year I was there the snow covered the sidewalks before Christmas, and we didn't see them again until the end of March."

Portland and Vancouver housing authorities have no fear that they will not have a comfortable dwelling for the worker from St. Paul and thousands of others like him who want to remain in the milder climate. But they want to do it with private capital.

Only recently Chester A. Moores, chairman of the Housing Authority of Portland, refuted charges that Portland and Seattle are "missing the boat" in not asking for Federal funds for postwar housing for the low-income groups. It came from E. Stanton Parker, regional PFHA project planner, Seattle.

Portland housing officials suspect that the Government would like to have the city commit itself to many more houses before it has had a chance to dispose of the temporary ones. Foster had estimated Portland will need 3,360 new permanent housing units.

MR. MOORES WANTS TO KNOW FATE OF HOMES

Mr. Moores asked what the Government was going to do with its $60,000,000 worth of temporary housing in the Portland area alone, of which approximately $30,000,000 is tied up in Vanport and East Vanport. University Homes and Guild's Lake projects are also among the Nation's 10 largest.

Again Mr. Moores reiterated the first objective of the Portland plan: Raze Vanport City and East Vanport as soon as feasible and convert the 790 acres into badly needed industrial sites. Right now the Portland Chamber of Commerce's industry committee has a special subcommittee spending much time on that very item.

The Vanport site has everything to attract industry, once dwelling units are razed, the committee points out. Five railroads: Southern Pacific, S. P. & S., Great Northern, Union Pacific, and Northern Pacific serve the area, thus eliminating switching charges. Public power is assured because it is near a Bonneville substation.

Five wells supply Vanport City with its own water. It has sewers, utilities, and buildings ideal for industry. It is outside city limits, assuring low taxes; it is on a branch of United States highway No. 99, and it is near the confluence of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, to which a channel could be dug, for seagoing vessels.

And what's more important, Portland, like other cities on the Pacific coast, is short of good industrial sites.

Early last year the Housing Authority of Portland had suggested that the Government use Vanport for a few years after the war as a rehabilitation center for soldiers. A soldier could live with his family at Vanport while receiving medical treatment at nearby Barnes Army Hospital at Vancouver. But nothing came of this proposal.

VANCOUVERITES HAVE WORRIES ABOUT PROGRAM AFTER WAR

"Vanport, blocked out, could be the most model industrial district in the United States," Mr. Moores said. "It's got everything."

Residents of Vancouver even profess more worry than Portlanders. So much, in fact, that the Vancouver Housing Authority recently issued a printed brochure entitled "Vancouver's Plan." The brochure points up the problem in this manner:

"To understand the seriousness of the problem, it is necessary to look back to the community before the war. Vancouver then was a quiet little city of 18,000 people. Within its boundaries were some 6,000 homes. With the war came the Kaiser shipyards, and suddenly a great influx of workers from all over the country. A housing authority was set up and the Federal Government built 8 great projects totaling 12,350 family units and 10,000 dormitory units, occupying in all, 1,950 acres of land."

With a 60,000 population and much Government war housing, Vancouverites want to know what will happen to "this great expanse of Federal land? To the 1,000 permanent-type homes, schools, shopping centers, community buildings and a network of streets and utilities?"

The Vancouver Housing Authority wants to be sole agent for the real estate, once the houses are razed, on the theory it should be disposed of by local agencies "that understand local conditions" and put on the market as "the community requires."

VANPORT BATH TUBS SOLD TO NAVAL FORCE

Already the authority has heard reports from Washington, D. C., that the Federal Public Housing Authority does not think Vancouver's plan feasible.

W. K. Perry, executive direct of the Vancouver authority, said: "We have no argument with Washington over the physical disposition of the temporary houses. The law already requires they be taken away when no longer needed. What we're worried about is how the Government is going to dispose of the land."

The McLoughlin Heights project is Vancouver's largest. Occupying nearly 1,100 acres, it cost the Government nearly $20,500,000 and has 6,096 family housing units. Second in size is Bagley Downs, costing $5,000,000, which has 2,100 housing units. In total, the Government has spent $40,000,000 in the Vancouver area for 12,350 family units and 5,000 dormitory rooms, not including the Government-operated Hudson House $4,000,000 project at the Kaiser shipyard.

If Vancouverites can get somebody in authority to give them the green light, they would like to carve approximately 1,000 homesites from the housing area some day, without upsetting the real estate market. They believe part of it would make a site for a junior college, a tuberculosis sanitarium, and an 18-hole golf course (Evergreen Country Club was swallowed up in the building of McLoughlin Heights project). Also, there is the matter of restoring part of the city cemetery.

It was only last January that Vancouver war housing reached its peak, with 11,450 war workers or families sheltered. But shipyard layoffs now are making a big dent, and recently only 10,500 units were occupied.

The trend has been downward, too, at Vanport City, this largest of family dwelling units in the United States, with 10,414 apartments ranging from one to four rooms. Recently Vanport had 8,870 out of 10,292 units available for occupancy, or about 86.1 percent. This was a little below the average for Portland's 18,157 available units, of which then 90.9 percent were occupied.

Vanport reached its peak, too, on January 20, 1945, when a 95.9 percent occupancy was gained.

The trend in the last 3 months has been the return to Vanport of many former residents, reports Quentin B. Griffin, general manager.

"Many who went back home last fall, believing the war over, found the old home town not what they thought it was, that their home-town industry hadn't reconverted to peace, so they came back to Vanport," he said.

But Vanport continues big business when it comes to war housing. Its size and its activities continue to be an ever source of interest. Harry D. Freeman, executive director of the Housing Authority of Portland, revealed that Vanport collects about $8,000,000 in rents annually, of which Uncle Sam gets $2,250,000.

Every nationality in the world, except Japanese, lives at Vanport. Negroes make up 22 percent of the population, but occupy 18 percent of the units because many families live double. There is no discrimination and none is tolerated by any of the six shopping centers, which have 45 separate commercial projects.

Other than considerable vandalism and a few knifings that send Vanporters to their own fully equipped 130-bed hospital, crime is at a minimum. Only one murder has occurred since the project opened in December 1942.

If and when the 31,000 war homes in the Portland-Vancouver area are razed, it is a pretty good guess that all the surplus thousands of windows, toilets, stoves, pipes, and the hundreds of other items will be sold by the United States Treasury Department's division in charge of selling surplus war property. That was the case some time ago when it was found Vanport had 400 unneeded bath tubs (they had previously been located in the laundry rooms). At that time, the Treasury sold the bath tubs to the Navy.

However, when it comes to disposing of approximately $100,000,000 worth of real estate, it is not a small matter.

What a City Housewife Thinks of Daylight Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

GREEN BAY, WIS., *June 1, 1945.*

TO OUR WISCONSIN REPRESENTATIVE, MR. STEVENSON (REPUBLICAN, WISCONSIN):

This is just a plea from a Wisconsin housewife to have our old daylight plan back again. I am a housewife that gets up at 4:30 present time (3:30 old time and who should be in bed at that hour) to get my husband off to work for the 6 o'clock shift.

Now, when all wartime business plants are working 24 hours a day what difference does the daylight-saving plan make? None at all.

Who wins on this daylight-saving plan? Not the housewife. I burn light from 4:30 till 8:30 on those long, cold, dark mornings. That's the complaint you hear from all our housewives. They can't go back to bed, because if they have two and three members of their family working they must stay up to get the next breakfast ready, then by that time it is time to get the children off to school. It's still dark when our children start off to school—and our schools and business plants burn more light in the morning than they ever had before. This daylight plan does not hurt the white-collar-job man. It is the plea for the war worker who has to get up so early to be on his job at 6 o'clock and still travel from 10 to 60 miles or more to get there. A man that's put in a hard day's work and is used to going to bed at 9 or 9:30 p. m.—in the summertime goes to bed at 8 or 8:30—which is broad daylight in Wisconsin.

A man's work is from sun to sun and not getting up with the moon shining full on his face as he goes to work.

Our electric companies are forever reminding us that the electric rates haven't gone up. They don't need to, because those dark, early mornings that we burn lights make up for any cut in light power we ever got.

Here's hoping our man in the White House will listen to our plea. Who in this world has the right to tamper with God's time? He made this world, not us. He gave us the privilege to live in it so let us leave it as He made it.

Sincerely yours,

GREEN BAY HOUSEWIFE.

A Prayer for Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a letter addressed to President Truman by Mr. Waldo F. Operer, president of the Masonic Club of Larchmont, N. Y., and copy of the prayer offered by the club's chaplain, Lt. Col. George H. McClelland, for the President:

MASONIC CLUB OF LARCHMONT,
Larchmont, N. Y., April 23, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At our meeting held Friday evening, April 20, 1945, our chaplain, Lt. Col. George H. McClelland, delivered a prayer for our President.

A resolution was presented by our Congressman, Brother RALPH A. GAMBLE, to have this prayer inscribed upon the minutes of our meeting and a copy thereof sent to you. This resolution was enthusiastically and unanimously adopted.

It is my cherished privilege to enclose a copy of our chaplain's prayer.

Respectfully and fraternally yours,

WALDO F. OPERER,
President, Masonic Club of Larchmont.

A PRAYER FOR OUR PRESIDENT

(By Lt. Col. George H. McClelland)

Our Eternal God, to the secret pavilion of Thine unfailing strength and unerring guidance we repair in these climactic days of our Nation's history.

Thou hast summoned to the leadership of this great Nation Harry S. Truman, as President of these United States.

For him we beseech a plenteous bestowal of physical strength for the tasks ahead of him, and for a rich endowment of wisdom, courage, and decision as he faces the gigantic problems of world reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Succor him we pray Thee, as he summons the forces of righteousness to cleanse the muddy stream of our civilization from its barbarity, godlessness, and inhumanity.

We fervently pray that peace and just government may be restored to the nations of the earth; that concord, unity, good will, and fair dealings may be established in the farthest corners of the world.

For these tasks ahead, wilt Thou, Almighty God, strengthen the soul of our President, cheer his heart, and illumine his pathway with the beacon light of faith.

Into Thy gracious keeping we commit him, together with the weal of our Nation, and to all these high endeavours we pledge our fraternal aid and our patriotic devotion.

Amen.

APRIL 20, 1945.

Willow Run Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the fact that the Willow Run bomber plant at Ypsilanti, Mich., in which the Government has an investment approximating $100,000,000, was to cease manufacturing Liberator bombers about July 1.

Incidental to the operating of this plant, additional housing was required for the employees, and the problem of disposition of this housing and facilities must now be settled. The Ann Arbor (Mich.) News contains an editorial which is to the point. The Ypsilanti (Mich.) Daily Press gives additional information which is indicative of what is beginning to happen in communities where war projects are no longer needed. Pursuant to the privilege given me, I include this editorial and this news article which are as follows:

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of June 2, 1945]

SEE WILLOW RUN VILLAGE BEFORE IT IS DESERTED

Eight miles east of Ann Arbor stands a war emergency housing project that invites the sober study of all those seriously and objectively concerned with the economics of governmental welfare projects. It is Willow Run Village, now in process of becoming deserted. In a lesser degree it is also in process of being torn down.

Gasoline and tires are precious, but their expenditure on a visit to Willow Run Village while it still is functioning, would be justified in the cause of practical, visual education.

Willow Run Village and Willow Run Lodge have served a highly useful and necessary function in the war effort. They have sheltered men and women who were needed to build Liberators in the bomber plant—Liberators which had a very real part in helping to pound Germany into submission.

But mistakes were made in the building of Willow Run Village. Mistakes due to many causes. Mistakes due to overestimating needs. Mistakes due to unrealistic theorizing. Mistakes due to a species of sociological hysteria. Mistakes due to faulty planning. Mistakes due to pressures from self-serving groups.

It is no use now to weep over these mistakes. But from these mistakes we should learn lessons—lessons that may save us many thousands of dollars, that may save us from going astray in connection with future projects of this type. It is well for us to realize these mistakes and particularly to profit by them.

Visitors to Willow Run village will see many houses that were never occupied—even when the bomber plant had peak employment. They will see the so-called corncrib dormitories for men that were never used. They will see the concrete pavements and foundations of a proposed trading center that was located far from the village and across two main trunk lines—a trading center so foolishly misplaced that abandonment was ordered immediately after it was checked by a responsible Government agent. They will see housing sections that were already well on the way to becoming blighted areas, at least in appearance, even before word came of the bomber plant closing. They will see things to admire and things to condemn.

But the important thing is that those who are interested see Willow Run village before it is too late. Then, perhaps, they will have a better idea of what Federal emergency housing means. Perhaps they will be able to form more sound opinions on both public housing and low-priced housing in general.

[From the Ypsilanti (Mich.) Daily Press of May 31, 1945]

THOUSAND IN USES OFFICE

Nearly a thousand former workers at the Willow Run bomber plant filed through the United States Employment Service office today to apply for unemployment compensation or to be referred to new jobs. Many companies have representatives at the office to recruit workers for their plants in Detroit, Cleveland, Jackson, and along the west coast.

Women workers feel the squeeze more and more as the labor market, already oversupplied with women, struggles to find some type of employment for them.

Most of the men are referred to other jobs, but many pay less than those which they have held at Willow Run.

Despite talk of extending the compensation, the figure remains the same, a maximum of $20 for 20 weeks. The worker's earnings and length of employment regulate the exact amount he may receive. In any event, he must apply for the compensation, then wait a week before drawing any money. He is not paid for the first week of unemployment after making application.

STAY FOR SCHOOLS

Rentals at Willow Village have not dropped seriously since the new lay-off schedule at the bomber plant, however most of the residents seem to be waiting for school to close June 15.

There were 1,968 apartments occupied April 24. The number has dropped to 1,400 plus 288 rooms rented in the lodge, or a total of 1,688 occupied units of the 9,474 in the entire project.

The project was built in several sections. There were 2,500 units in Willow Village, 960 in Willow Court, 1,000 in West Court, 3,014 rooms in Willow Lodge, and 2,000 in West Lodge. In addition to these units, space was provided for 535 privately owned trailers. There was a total of 4,460 family units constructed, and 5,014 rooms for single workers.

Why Lower Wages and Living Standards by Admitting Foreign Competitive Goods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following statement of James

M. Duffy, president, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, presented to the Senate Finance Committee, June 1, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Finance Committee, in the short time allotted to me, on behalf of the officers and members of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, I will try to present sufficient reasons, from America's industrial workers viewpoint, why the pending legislation, especially that section authorizing further reductions in tariff rates, should be rejected.

I ask permission that I may file a brief setting forth additional reasons why this authorization should be rejected.

Great emphasis has been laid on the allegation that workers employed in export industries receive higher wages than those workers dependent for their livelihood on allegedly tariff-protected industries.

WAGES HELD DOWN BY COMPETITIVE IMPORTS

Workers employed in mechanized and patent-protected industries, where labor costs are low, and where margins between costs and sales prices are ample, and, which industries are not forced to compete with low-wage products of foreign countries have opportunities, through collective bargaining, for better wages than workers in industries such as pottery where the products of our workers have to compete in the American market with products which are delivered into American markets at less than our costs of production.

We believe that an employer, if he is to continue to provide jobs for workers, must secure a reasonable profit on his investment.

SMALL BUSINESS PROFITS SMALL

The pottery industry has been thoroughly investigated by two Government agencies in the past 10 years. In both cases the reports of these agencies were made public. The Tariff Commission, in 1936, issued a report showing that the employers, without any allowance for depreciation or obsolescence, retained some 7.1 percent. The Office of Price Administration, in 1943, found that the industry had a margin of less than 5 percent.

The workers in the American pottery industry do not receive the wages they are entitled to. Our workers, through their economic strength, representing more than 90 percent of all the workers in the industry, would, I am sure, secure better wages if the products of their labor were not forced to compete in American markets with competitive products of workers in foreign countries which products are delivered into American markets at less than our costs of production.

We do not ask for high tariffs. We are not isolationists nor are we exclusionists.

We appeal to the Congress for tariff rates which will permit the products of our workers to have an equal opportunity of sale in American markets. In so doing are we un-American?

CONGRESS FAVORS MAINTAINING WAGE SCALE AND LIVING STANDARDS

Are we to understand that the Congress of the United States, in enacting legislation in 1936, and, again in 1938, years after the first authorization for our entry into trade treaties or trade agreements, which legislation provided, I quote "that American wage scales and standards of living be maintained," intended that such wage scales and living standards would be maintained only for a certain group of America's wage workers?

It is our understanding that tariff rates, in the past, were supposedly based on the differences in costs of production, American costs and foreign costs. It is our understanding that with the negotiation of trade treaties this principle has been eliminated on the assertion that differences in costs of production cannot be definitely ascertained.

AMERICAN PRODUCTION COSTS 100 PERCENT HIGHER THAN FOREIGN

However, one of our largest and most important Government agencies, entrusted with billions of dollars of Government moneys, has apparently found no difficulty in ascertaining the differences in the costs of production, American and foreign.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee disclose that the Maritime Commission, before the war, definitely ascertained that American costs of construction or production was 100 percent higher than comparable costs in foreign countries.

In so finding, the Maritime Commission, paying out hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars, had to be certain its findings were correct. The law under which these findings were made, section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, revised in 1938, reads:

"The construction differential approved by the Commission shall not exceed 33⅓ percent (American costs) of the construction cost of the vessel paid by the Commission except that in cases where the Commission possesses convincing evidence that the actual differential is greater than that percentage, the Commission may approve an allowance not to exceed 50 percent of such cost, upon the affirmative vote of four members."

You will note that the law definitely requires that the Commission must "possess convincing evidence that the actual difference is greater than 33⅓ percent" of American costs. Further, that such difference in costs must be found affirmatively by four of the five members.

Emphasizing such findings, Chairman Land, in testimony shown on page 198 of the Ways and Means Committee, cites cases as illustrative, one case where a foreign-built vessel which cost $982,000 would cost $2,002,000 if built in American shipyards, and another case where a vessel built in foreign shipyards at a cost of $600,000 would cost $1,000,000 when built in American shipyards.

Yet, despite these definite findings of the Maritime Commission, we find Chairman Land, in an address at Mobile, Ala., May 22, 1945, which address was widely publicized, advocating the adoption of the pending legislation, including the presumed reduction of 50 percent in present tariff rates, and stating, "I am a 50–50 guy and certainly believe in reciprocity."

CONSISTENCY?

Are we to understand that Chairman Land, presumably one of the leading figures in foreign-trade activities in the present administration, advocates that 50 percent of the American market shall be supplied with competitive products of foreign countries? If Chairman Land really believes in reciprocity, does he believe that American shipyard workers should reciprocate their protective wage scales and living standards, secured through legislation, with America's industrial workers dependent for their livelihood on the production of articles which must compete with lower-cost competitive products of other countries?

We do not believe that those Members of the Congress representing the great majority of States and congressional districts, where there are no shipbuilding yards, are justified in supporting legislation which, after an official and undisputed finding that American costs of production are 100 percent higher than foreign costs, require the products of their constituents to compete in American markets with products of other countries on a basis of 25 percent or 30 percent tariff rates or cost differentials.

The Congress has enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act. That legislation requires that in the production of articles which move across State lines that minimum wages of 40 cents per hour must be paid for not more than 40 hours and 60 cents for hours worked in excess of 40 hours.

FOREIGN PRODUCTIVITY REDUCED ONLY 20 PERCENT

We contend that inadequate tariff rates which permit of the delivery into American markets of competitive products of workers of foreign countries at less than our costs of production will nullify such beneficial legislation.

Secretary Clayton told the Ways and Means Committee that the productive capacity of England, France, and Belgium, as I recall his testimony, had been reduced some 20 or 25 percent. We are also told that Japan and Germany will not be competitive factors in world markets for many years to come. Having been forced to accept lower wages than we believe we should have received due to the excessive competition, first of Germany, and in later years of Japan, of course, that is music to our ears. Yet such statements are not backed, and, as yet, cannot be backed, by any facts.

We do not know what the facts will be in 1947 or 1948. We do know that under what we believe to be an unwarranted delegation of the constitutional responsibilities accepted by those who sought election to the Congress of the United States that trade treaties or trade agreements entered into by the State Department in 1946 or 1947 will be binding on the United States for a period of 3 years thereafter, or into 1949 or 1950.

Surely, such a gamble is well worth looking into before we enter into it in view of the chaotic world conditions now existent.

Stress has been laid by advocates of the pending legislation on the assumption that our mechanized industries can compete with products of any foreign country, and, that low wages result in high labor costs.

EFFICIENCY OFFSET BY LOWER WAGES

We are concerned with the competition of pottery produced in foreign countries and sold in American markets in competition with the products of our workers.

The United States Tariff Commission, in its report to the Senate, 1945, on pages 2–38 states "Pottery production is technically more efficient in the United States than in all other countries, although in all countries such efficiency has increased in recent years. So far as costs are concerned, however, the greater efficiency has continued to be more than offset by the lower wages in the pottery industries in foreign countries."

This report indicates that our industry has been found to be efficient, therefore, we presume, our jobs will not be transferred to workers in other countries as readily as the workers in other industries who are less fortunate in that such a finding has not been officially made.

We also note that this finding indicates that despite the inability, due to war conditions, of foreign countries to secure additional mechanical equipment they have increased their efficiency.

SMALL BUSINESS VERSUS BIG BUSINESS

In conclusion, I wish to remind the Congress that the Congress has for a period of years concerned itself with the purpose of helping the small business concerns of this country.

The 1939 census shows that out of 184,230 manufacturing concerns, 181,925 employ less than 500. Of the balance, 176 provided jobs for more than 2,500; 634 provided jobs for more than 1,000 and less than 2,500; 1,495 provided jobs for more than 500 and less than 1,000.

WAGE STANDARDS IMPERILED

It is the belief of many who have had to study this matter of international trade insofar as it concerned job opportunities for America's workers that the negotiation of trade agreements is now nominated by or influenced by international bankers and international industrialists. We believe that this reques' for a further reduction in tariff

rates is solely for the purpose of transferring the job opportunities of America's workers to workers in other countries, where many of these international bankers and international industrialists either have or are planning to have production plants. Thus, through lack of job opportunities, to strike down our present wage standards.

An analysis of the list of those supporting this legislation will show, outside of the Government bureaucrat with a lust for additional power and authority and those who appeared in the belief that this program will lead to world peace, an idea which Secretary Clayton, in his presentation to the Ways and Means Committee refuted, consisted of those representing or influenced by international bankers and industrialists such as the London Chamber of Commerce, Overseas Club, Importers Association, and the CIO.

The record shows those in opposition, in addition to representatives of American Federation of Labor unions, and the recorded historic position of the American Federation of Labor conventions down to November 1944 seeking not high tariffs but tariff rates which will permit the competitive products of America's workers to have an equal opportunity of sale in the American market, and the representatives of free American Farm organizations such as the National Grange; the National Milk Producers Association and other dairy interests, the National Livestock Association, the National Association of Wool Growers supported by a host of witnesses consisting of those who actually operate the small business concerns of our country.

The Congress could do nothing better to help the small business concerns of this country as well as the skilled workers and farmers of our country than to reject this pending legislation.

A False Impression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the cessation of organized resistance in Germany there came a false impression that the fighting was over. Parents, brothers, sisters, and wives throughout the land jumped to the conclusion that their fighting men would soon be home and, happy in that belief, began to make preparations for the loved ones' return. Others, not so closely connected with the war effort, had a subconscious feeling of dismay, caused by the thought that a war job might, through the cancellations of Government orders, be ended, and they began to speculate as to where they would find another job with equal pay for the same amount of work.

It is extremely unfortunate that so many of us have not realized the enormity nor the frightfulness of the wars in which we were engaged. Too many of us with more money in our hands, with more money to spend than we ever had before have been enjoying a false prosperity. The war, to all too many, has been too far away, too unreal—something like motion pictures, which we view sometimes with delight, sometimes with horror, but which, in any event, were to us unreal and did not affect us personally. Unconsciously, too many of us have accepted as a matter of course the fool's gold which is a byproduct of this war. We have gone to the beer parlor, the dance hall, the bar in the classy and expensive hotel, the places of entertainment which were high-priced but always available for those who had money—and more people than ever before have had money and plenty of it—and the wars in Europe and on the Pacific has been something to talk about, to regret, but all too soon to forget. We were not living in the mud; we were not being shot at; we were not seeing our friends blown to pieces, having an arm or a leg blasted off.

THE WAR IS NOT OVER

But the war is not over. Yesterday President Truman tried to bring that fact home to the Congress by telling it that 10,000,000 men will be sent to fight Japan. Here, statements from the military authorities convey the heartbreaking information that more than a million of our men, who have faced death in front lines for two or more years, will be required to remain in Europe an indefinite time; that other millions, who have personally endured the horrors of war, will be sent to the Pacific; some receiving a 30-day furlough if they go through their homeland; others going direct without a glimpse of the country whose battles they have been fighting.

The war in the Pacific has been a bloody one. The press has always told us, as have our military authorities, that our losses there were slight, small when compared to that of the enemy. As an example, we were given to understand that a few men died on Iwo Jima, but after the battle was over the press gave us pictures of one cemetery where 4,189 Americans were buried. Yes, 45 percent of the marines who conquered that island were killed or wounded in the 26-day campaign. The total casualties were 19,938—766 a day, 1 every 2 minutes. Now in a war involving millions of men 5,000 is a small number, but if I am to be, or you are to be, the one killed or wounded, that, you and I are quite sure, is one too many. Five thousand sons or husbands is an appalling number to the parents and wives.

Yesterday's press told us that the Japanese had lost a thousand killed a day since the beginning of the assault on Okinawa, but it also carried the information that as of May 29, 9,602 young Americans, with everything to live for, were dead or missing, and the attempt to take this island has cost us more than 30,000 casualties. The Navy has been losing ships and men at an appalling rate.

SO WHAT?

Just this: We turned the tide of war in Europe, added the punch which saved the British Empire from destruction, furnished the material, and by the attack on the west enabled Russia first to save herself and then to overrun eastern Germany. All on the theory that if Hitler was not defeated, we would be invaded.

Today we have all the strategic islands necessary for our defense from Japan. Japan should be taught a lesson, but the British Empire and Russia have greater interests at stake than have we, and there is no reason why we should carry on this battle alone. Russia has an enormous army in Asia. Britain has rich colonies in the east. And the time for asking is past. The time for demanding that they step into this war and bear a share of the burden proportionate to their interests has arrived. Ten million young Americans may soon be fighting a long, long way from home, and we here at home should begin to pay, and individually through self-denial or discomfort of some kind, a small part of the cost.

When this war is ended, there should be a few million young American men to be returned to the homeland, there to become the husbands of our young women, the fathers of the future generations, the foundation of an America such as our forefathers envisioned.

COOPERATION

We are the most powerful Nation in the world. Let us act like one. Let us remain just that. Let us demand that our allies, whom we have saved from destruction, cooperate with us. We have heard plenty about cooperating with them. Now is the time for the British Empire, for Russia to cooperate with us.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, of May 15, 1945:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION PROBLEM NEEDS ATTENTION

(By John M. Cummings)

James A. Farley believes something should be done to clarify the procedure of designating a President in the event the President-elect and Vice President-elect should die or otherwise become ineligible for office between election day and the time fixed for taking the oath.

During a speech last week at Hazleton the former Postmaster General and one time chairman of the Democratic National Committee gave it as his opinion—or so it seems at this distance—that there is no constitutional provision covering an emergency of this character.

Naturally there has been some controversy, some citizens stating Jim has the right slant. Others say he is wrong as far as the Constitution is concerned, but right in that Congress has never enacted the necessary enabling legislation.

In any event Mr. Farley proposes that a commission be appointed to study the whole matter. It is a sensible suggestion worthy of close consideration.

It would appear that as far as the Constitution is concerned the subject is covered in the twentieth or Norris Amendment which advanced the Presidential inauguration date from March 4 to January 20.

The third section of this amendment states that Congress shall have the power to enact legislation covering the type of emergency mentioned by Mr. Farley.

The legislative body is given the right to designate a person who shall act as President until a duly chosen President or Vice President qualifies.

However, Mr. Farley believes—and others share the view—that the whole thing is obscure; that clarification is needed and a fixed procedure should be incorporated in the law.

The statute of succession is plain enough in the case of a Vice President who had already risen to the Presidency to fill a vacancy in the constitutional manner. Even so there is room for improvement and the Farley proposal might open the way for an exhaustive study of the subject.

In article 11, section 6 of the Constitution you find Congress given authority to designate the officer who shall take over in the case of vacancy in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, but this does not cover the gap between election and the time for taking the oath.

The Secretary of State is the first in line in the act of succession passed by Congress. Not a few citizens believe this is a faulty way of handling the problem. They point out that it gives the occupant of the White House sole authority to name his successor.

Mr. Farley believes the whole matter should be thoroughly examined by a competent commission and its recommendations be given due and proper consideration by Congress.

President Roosevelt had scarcely passed the threshold of his fourth term when death suddenly ended his career and Vice President Truman stepped into the highest office in the land. Should the inevitable overtake Mr. Truman while in office he would be succeeded by a man not of Mr. Truman's selection, but of Mr. Roosevelt's.

It is pointed out by those who have given the subject some study that a Vice President succeeding to the Presidency and who, in turn sees death approaching could, if he were so disposed, dismiss his Secretary of State and appoint any John Doe or Mary Roe who might come to mind.

Many and varied are the problems presented by this matter of succession to the Presidency. Mr. Farley performed a public service by bringing some of them to public attention. The time to prepare to meet an emergency is before it arises.

Why Let Domestic Food Rot for Want of Sugar, While Foreign Candy Admitted to U. S. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following news item from the New York Herald Tribune under date of June 4, 1945:

FOREIGN-MADE CANDIES' IMPORTATION IS HEAVIER

CHICAGO, June 3.—Imports of foreign-made candies are increasing manyfold, with the supply of sugar for American food-processing industries being reduced steadily, Philip P. Gott, president of the National Confectioners' Association, disclosed here yesterday.

The War Food Administration reported that granulated, cube and tablet sugar bought in January through April of this year for lend-lease territorial emergency and other purposes totaled 133,579,950 pounds.

"Cuba's shipment of candy to the United States totaled 626,000 pounds in 1941, rose to 31,643,000 in 1944, or a 4,950 percent increase, and 17,220,000 pounds in the first quarter of 1945," Mr. Gott said.

Punishment of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by the Tallahassee, Fla., Kiwanis Club:

Whereas America is a God-fearing Nation and was founded on the principles of liberty and justice for all mankind; and

Whereas our forebears have handed down this heritage to their posterity who have defended these principles upon the battlefields of the world; and

Whereas we are now emerging from one phase of a world conflict where our sons and daughters, like their forefathers, have bled and died, that the tyranny of would-be world masters should not rule the earth and that freedom, as we know freedom, might be preserved for all nations; and

Whereas the Nazi Party of Germany were able through controlled education and youth training to deprave their nation as a whole and together with Italy and Japan collaborating did attack without provocation, unsuspecting and unprepared nations, thus throwing other nations of the world into a maelstrom of war, whose slaughter and destruction was heretofore beyond the conception of the human mind; and

Whereas these war criminals, leaders of the Nazi Party, in their maniacal frenzy did devise and execute atrocities such as planned undernourishment, slave labor, concentration camps, organized terror and torture against all persons opposing them regardless of race, creed, or nationality; and

Whereas our President has affirmed the statement of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who together with other great leaders of the Allied Nations did pledge to bring to trial and punishment these war criminals when victory comes to our arms; and

Whereas this pledge met with universal approval by the peoples of all Allied Nations whose sacrifices have made this victory possible; and

Whereas some of the dastardly leaders and collaborators who would have had a part in the enslaving of the peoples of the world have already met their just deserts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club of Tallahassee, Fla. (with the membership concurring):

1. That we earnestly petition our President and other officials, both civil and military, that the pledge of trial and punishment of these war criminals be renewed and restated, and that they be brought to trial as speedily as consistent with prevailing civil and military necessities; and

2. That the government of these people be controlled by the Allies to the extent that it cannot wage war and that this control be continued until such time as their government shows that it is again able and earnestly desires to take an orderly place in the family of nations and subscribe to the principles of freedom, justice, and universal brotherhood; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Florida Representative in the Congress of the United States and a copy be sent to each Senator of Florida in the Congress of the United States and that a copy be placed in the permanent records of the Tallahassee Kiwanis Club.

Use of High Court Justices for Other Work Is Called Dangerous Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1945:

USE OF HIGH COURT JUSTICES FOR OTHER WORK IS CALLED DANGEROUS POLICY

(By Frank R. Kent)

Nothing is more natural than for a man who achieves the Presidency through the death of his running mate to propose carrying out the policies and commitments of his predecessor. It is the decent as well as the politic thing to do. It creates stability during an emotional period, increases confidence, promotes calm.

Mr. Truman wisely followed this procedure upon taking office, but no one has a right to take this as meaning he will not develop policies of his own nor that he will continue indefinitely either Mr. Roosevelt's appointees or economic advisers—particularly in domestic affairs. It would be disappointing indeed if he did not reverse some of the governmental habits of the Roosevelt regime. Certainly there is no obligation to perpetuate Roosevelt mistakes.

REGRET JACKSON DRAFT

Believing this, some of those who wish Mr. Truman well felt regret when he drafted Associate Justice Robert Jackson of the Supreme Court, who now is in France, to head the prosecution of war criminals. Not that in character and ability Justice Jackson is not an ideal man for the job—because he is.

The objection is not in the least personal, but is based on the far broader grounds that as a matter of public policy it is a mistake for a President to detach a member of the Supreme Court for duties unconnected with the court, no matter how important they may appear nor how convenient it may be to him.

Mr. Roosevelt did not look at it that way. He not only consulted with members of the Court on patronage and political matters, from which they are traditionally supposed to be aloof, but more than once he reached into the Court and drafted one of its members for outside work.

For example, he named Justice Roberts as head of a commission to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster, a mission which detached him from the Court for approximately 4 months. He did it again when he got Justice Byrnes to resign to become War Mobilization

Director. And he once asked Chief Justice Stone to head an important commission, but the Chief Justice declined.

DESTROYS TRADITION

The points made against this practice are:

1. That it destroys the tradition of aloofness of the Supreme Court, detracts from its dignity and tends to lower respect for it as a tribunal whose members are permanently removed from all considerations save the interpretation of the basic law and the promotion of justice. The same arguments apply to efforts made from time to time to persuade members of the Court to become candidates for President or Vice President.

2. That detachment of one justice easily might put the Supreme Court in position where it could not function. Though the Court is composed of nine members, six, not five, is a quorum of the Court. In the present court three members were formerly Attorney Generals and one was Solicitor General. Cases constantly arise where one, often two—and more—of these feel disqualified from sitting. Thus, detachment of one member and sickness of another could reduce attendance of the Court to five, which is not a quorum.

ADDS EXTRA WORK

3. Even if the danger of no quorum did not exist, the detachment of one man imposes additional work upon the remaining members. Instead of the Court's work being divided among nine, it has to be divided among eight or seven already fairly well burdened.

4. Detachment of one man and the certainty that in many cases one other Justice will be disqualified either by former connections or illness greatly enhances the danger of decisions by four members, one less than a majority. These four-Justice decisions are concededly unfortunate, breed discontent, criticism, and confusion.

One notable instance occurred last year when the detachment of Justice Byrnes and the disqualification of Justice Reed reduced the Court to seven. Thus, in the insurance case four Justices were enabled to reverse consistent decisions of the Supreme Court which had not been questioned in more than 100 years.

DECISION CAUSED CHAOS

As a result, Congress is still trying to find a way to nullify the harmful effects of that decision, and both President Roosevelt and his Attorney General recognized that a condition of chaos threatened the entire insurance industry—a condition the companies are still trying to avert.

It is true the expectation is that the work which President Truman has asked Justice Jackson to undertake will be completed within the next 4 months while the Court is not in session. But it is not sure that it can be completed in that period; and in any event, that does not affect the principle.

Many judges and lawyers—laymen, too—feel deeply on this subject. They are convinced that President Truman does not fully understand the dangers of these detachments. They hope the points above will be brought to his attention and that the case of Justice Jackson will be the last of its kind.

Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 1, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, although I have spent several years in studying monetary problems, finance, and foreign exchange, I cannot claim, nor do I claim, to be an expert in such matters. I, therefore, marvel at the ease with which certain individuals and pressure groups have endorsed the Bretton Woods proposals without limiting amendments. If it were not for the serious impact that these proposals might have on the future economy of our country, it would indeed be humorous to observe the manner in which a large number of well-intentioned individuals lend their influence because of high-pressure propaganda for the spending of public money in the complex and tricky field of international finance.

In passing, it must not be overlooked that the same self-styled monetary experts, who sold the scheme of deficit spending to the New Deal 12 years ago, are also the originators of the Bretton Woods proposals. These experts also proposed the scheme which embarked the United States on the policy to purchase all of the gold in the World at an inflated price. This policy resulted in our purchase of nearly 75 percent of all known gold, only to bury it beneath the ground in Kentucky. They were also the originators of the spend, spend, and tax policy which failed to solve our farm and unemployment problem until war overtook our country. They also coined the erroneous theory that the size of our public debt did not matter as long as we owed the money to ourselves. And now, these monetary experts are proposing the Bretton Woods agreement as the only scheme to bring world economic stability, and the only method whereby a lasting peace may be secured. In view of our experience with these so-called monetary experts during the past 12 years in the field of finance and monetary manipulation, it should not be surprising to anyone that there are a few of us who look with some suspicion on the schemes agreed to at Bretton Woods, which will soon be up for consideration in this House.

I have tried to give careful study to the language and intent of the Bretton Woods proposals, but I must confess, that I am still in a quandary as to whether or not these proposals should be approved by Congress. I sincerely desire to act for the best interests of our country. I feel that this is my primary duty, and such a course must naturally be the objective of every Representative in this body.

If the Bretton Woods proposals are not agreed to as presented to Congress, I am convinced that the Democratic administration, now in power, will find some other method to finance and enter into the field of international finance. It is quite apparent to me that the tremendous amount of propaganda which has been broadcast over the country for the past 6 months will be sufficient to approve the Bretton Woods proposals in the House of Representatives. In view of this fact, we can only hope that the administration will protect American interests, and not be led into the trap of using American funds for rebuilding world cartels or engaging in world power politics.

In my search for the truth as to the authority conferred upon the International Bank and Stabilization Fund created under the Bretton Woods agreement, I submitted a series of questions to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of March 31, 1945. These questions were answered under date of April 10, 1945, by Mr. H. D. White, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and I am including the questions and answers as a part of my remarks. The questions and answers may be helpful to other members of Congress, who may have some doubt as to the merits of the bill which commits the United States to the Bretton Woods agreement.

As far as I am concerned, I will hold the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration to the answers given in response to my questions. I cannot believe that Mr. Morgenthau and his associates who are charged with the responsibility of handling the financial affairs of our country, would sell the American people short. Should future events disclose that I have been misled by the commitments made to me by Mr. White, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, I shall without hesitation vigorously oppose the continuation of United States participation in the International Bank and Stabilization Fund agreed to at Bretton Woods.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 10, 1945.

Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: This is in reply to your letter of March 31, 1945, to Secretary Morgenthau in which you ask certain questions on the Bretton Woods proposals.

Question 1. "At the beginning of the operations of the stabilization fund, will the Board in charge of the fund, have the power to equalize the exchange value of the money of any member country, in the effort to stabilize foreign exchange? If such authority is given, can the Board devalue or revalue the currency or money of any member country without the consent of such member country?"

Answer. Before the fund begins exchange transactions each member country will be requested to communicate to the fund the par value of its currency in terms of gold or the United States dollar based on the rates of exchange prevailing on the sixtieth day before the agreement on the fund comes into effect (article XX, section 4–a). The par value communicated by a member becomes the par value of its currency for the purposes of the agreement unless within 90 days the member notifies the fund that it regards the par value as unsatisfactory or the fund notifies the member that in its opinion the par value is not an appropriate one. In such a case the fund or member must agree upon a suitable par value for the currency. If the fund or the member do not agree, the member shall be deemed to have withdrawn from the fund (art. XX, sec. 4–b).

Section 6 of H. R. 2211 provides that "when the United States is requested by the fund to communicate the par value of the United States dollar such par value shall not be communicated as other than $15\frac{5}{21}$ grains of gold nine-tenths fine." The parity of the United States dollar will therefore be the present gold content of the dollar.

No change in the parity of a currency can be made except on the proposal of the member and only after consultation with the fund. Any proposal for a change in the par value of its currency must come from the country. Section 5 of H. R. 2211 provides among other things that "unless Congress by law authorizes such action neither the President nor any person, or agency shall on be-

half of the United States * * * (b) propose or agree to any change in the par value of the United States dollar under article IV, section 5, or article XX, section 4 of the articles of agreement of the fund, or approve any general change in par values under article IV, section 7."

Question 2. "Does the Stabilization Fund Board have the power to fix the world price of gold and silver?"

Answer. The fund does not have the power to fix the world price of gold or of silver.

The fund in no way affects a country's dealings in silver or the silver content of its coinage.

The relationship between gold and the currency of each member is determined by the par value of its currency which is defined in terms of gold. Members agree not to buy gold at a price above the par values of their currencies plus the prescribed margin, or to sell gold at a price below the par value of their currencies minus this margin. In this way the maintenance of exchange stability within a small range above and below the gold parity of a currency is assured.

Under the fund agreement the price of gold in terms of each currency would be fixed. This is inherent in any system of maintaining stable exchange rates by defining currencies in terms of gold as a common denominator. The concept of a world price of gold refers to the fact that when currencies are defined in terms of gold, the price of gold is the same in all countries at the par of exchange for each currency.

The fund agreement provides that by a majority of the total voting power the fund may make a uniform proportionate change in the parity of the currencies of all members, provided that such change is approved by every member which has 10 percent or more of the total of the quotas (art. IV, sec. 7). Under this provision the United States would always have the power to veto a proposal to make a uniform change in the par values of all currencies. It should be noted that under the terms of section 5 of H. R. 2211, quoted above, this country cannot consent to a uniform change in par values unless Congress by law authorizes such action.

Question 3. "Does the stabilization fund have the authority to fix tariff duties for any member country?"

Answer. The fund has no authority whatever to fix tariff duties.

Question 4. "Does the stabilization fund have the authority to allocate or direct the distribution of goods in foreign trade or to direct the flow of foreign commerce?"

Answer. The International Monetary Fund has no authority to allocate the distribution of goods in foreign trade or to direct the flow of foreign commerce.

When a general scarcity of a currency develops, members of the fund are authorized to limit transactions in the scarce currency. Under this provision the fund would not allocate or direct the distribution of foreign trade although member countries would be able to limit the purchases of imports where they are not in a position to pay for them.

It should be clear that the fund is not the cause of the scarcity of a currency. In the absence of the fund the scarcity would be more severe and the restrictions that would be imposed unilaterally by each country would be as drastic as each country wished. The fund would have the effect of limiting restrictions that might otherwise be harmful to this country.

The fund would supplement the accruing supply of the scarce currency from its own resources and it would secure a fuller utilization of the gold and dollar reserves that member countries already hold. Further, under the fund, when a currency becomes scarce the limitations imposed by member countries may be no more restrictive than is necessary to limit the demand for the scarce currency to the supply held by or accruing to the member, and the limitations must be relaxed and removed as rapidly as conditions permit (art. VII, sec. 3-b).

Question 5. "Should a member country refuse to be bound by the decisions of the stabilization fund, can the fund apply 'sanctions' that would imperil imports and exports to and from such country?"

Answer. The fund cannot impose any sanctions that imperil the imports or exports of a country.

The fund has three means of inducing members to abide by the provisions and the purposes of the fund agreement:

1. The fund may communicate its views informally to any member, and with a two-thirds majority, it may publish a report regarding monetary or economic developments which tend to produce a serious disequilibrium in the international balance of payments (art. XII, sec. 8).

2. The fund may limit a member's use of the fund's resources (article V, section 5) or it may declare a member ineligible to use the fund's resources (art. V, sec. 5; art. XV, sec. 2-a).

3. If a member persists in failing to fulfill its obligations under the fund agreement, the country may be required to withdraw from membership by a majority of the governors representing a majority of the total voting power of the board of governors (art. XV, sec. 2-b).

Question 6. "If the hard cash and gold placed in the fund by the United States is used up, what will happen to United States imports and exports in the event that no additional money or gold is subscribed by the United States to the fund?"

Answer. It should be remembered that other countries will subscribe more than $1,000,000,000 in gold in addition to the nearly $700,000,000 in gold subscribed by the United States. The dollar holdings of the fund will amount to about $2,100,000,000 and its gold holdings to about $1,800,000,000. With these holdings it is very unlikely that the fund will be unable to sell dollars to members who are eligible to deal with the fund, if our imports are maintained and if we undertake even a moderate amount of foreign investment for sound and productive projects.

The articles of agreement for the fund provide that a country using the fund's resources must reduce its own monetary reserves by an equal amount. Therefore, to exhaust the fund's holdings of gold and United States dollars it would be necessary for the United States to have a favorable balance on current and capital account of nearly $2,000,000,000 a year for 6 years. With such a large favorable balance on current and capital account, the members of the fund could use $4,000,000,000 of the fund's resources. Ordinarily, to do this over a 6-year period they would have to use $4,000,000,000 of their own reserves and $8,000,000,000 of newly mined gold outside of the United States. Making allowance for the inadequacy of the gold holdings of some countries and accumulation of newly mined gold by countries not using the fund, it may be assumed that exhaustion of the fund's resources of gold and dollars might occur with use of $8,000,000,000 of reserves outside the fund. This would require a $2,000,000,000 favorable balance for 6 years.

The fact is that at no time in our history have we run a favorable balance on so large a scale for so extended a period. In the 5-year period from 1934-38 the net inflow of the gold to the United States amounted to slightly less than $7,000,000,000. Of this, known current transactions accounted for less than $1,000,000,000, known capital transactions for $4,500,000,000, and the residual for more than $1,500,000,000. The greater part of the residual probably reflects unrecorded capital movements. This was the period of the greatest scarcity of the dollar; and yet even in this period the favorable balance of the United States on current and capital account amounted to less than $7,000,000,000 over a 5-year period. If the flight of capital from Europe to this country is not resumed after the war, and if we undertake even moderate foreign investment, there is no great danger of a scarcity of the dollar.

That is not to say that with every disturbed international economic relations a scarcity of the dollar cannot occur. Obviously, it can, and that is why the international monetary fund provides a means for dealing with it. But the consequences of a scarcity of the dollar should be properly evaluated.

A scarcity of dollars in the fund would mean two things: The fund would no longer sell dollars under the provisions of article V, section 3 (a); and members would be authorized temporarily to limit exchange transactions in dollars. In all other respects, the fund would function in precisely the same way as if there were no scarcity. Exchange rates and exchange policies would continue to be subject to the provisions of the fund agreement. The fund's exchange transactions would go on much as before. It would have adequate holdings of the 43 currencies other than the dollar and it would sell such currencies to members to meet deficits in their international accounts. The fund would never suspend its sales of dollar exchange, although like member countries it would have to limit its sales of dollars. The fund would have some gold and dollars at the time the scarcity is declared and it would receive additional gold and dollars from its other transactions. These resources would be sold under article VII, section 3 (a) by apportioning the funds' existing and accruing supply. In the meantime, the fund would report on the situation and make such recommendations as it found necessary.

When a currency becomes scarce, there is no practical way to limit the scarcity except to allow some restrictions in exchange transactions in that currency. The only alternative would be a general limitation on international payments through increased trade barriers, or widespread depreciation of exchanges (or an appreciation of the scarce currency) which may be wholly undesirable, particularly if the scarcity can in time be corrected in other ways. Under such circumstances, it is far wiser to permit a temporary limitation on exchange transactions. Such restrictions would necessarily be imposed in the absence of the fund. With the fund the restrictions are limited to the extent necessary to adjust demand to the scarce supply; they are under the supervision of the fund; and the member country whose currency is involved has an opportunity to be heard regarding the administration of the controls. Furthermore, the amount of restriction is bound to be less with the fund because the fund's resources supplement the reserves of members, the fund has accruing resources which are available to mitigate the scarcity, and the fund is in a position to facilitate a correction of the conditions causing the scarcity.

If the dollar should become scarce, the exports of goods and services from the United States would have to be limited to the amount of dollars available from our imports, our purchase of services abroad, and our net new capital investment. This might be supplemented somewhat by the fund with gold and dollar resources it acquires from other members who are building up their monetary reserves. Obviously, if the dollar became scarce, our exports would be less than if the fund were in a position to meet all demands for dollars. They would not be less than our exports in the absence of the fund. On the contrary, even during the period of scarcity our exports would be on a larger scale than without the fund, for the fund would supplement the dollars held by members, it would see that limitations on exchange transactions are no more restrictive than is absolutely necessary, and the fund would require removal of these restrictions as soon as the scarcity was ended.

The scarce currency provisions of the fund are a fair means of dealing with a difficult problem in a period of severe economic strain. The fund would prevent the development of serious exchange disorders and it would provide an orderly means of dealing with such problems.

Question 7. "What is the voting power of the United States in the fund, and can the United States veto any action taken by a majority of the members of the fund, which may be detrimental to our country?"

Answer. The United States has 28 percent of the total voting power in the fund. Further provision is made to insure an increasing voice to all countries whose currencies are used by the fund. On all matters of voting that deal with the use of the fund's resources, a country whose currency has been sold by the fund secures an additional vote for each $400,000 of the net sales of its currency by the fund. Under such provision the voting power of the United States could rise from 28 percent of the total to 35 percent of the total.

Certain of the decisions made by the fund which vitally affect the interests of the United States require more than a simple majority of the total voting power. No change in the quota of the United States could be made without our consent and a change in the parity of the dollar could be made only on the proposal of the United States. In the case of a vote for a uniform change in the par values of all member currencies any member having 10 percent or more of the total quotas, which includes the United States, can veto the proposal. Changes in the quotas of any member country and amendments to the fund agreement require a four-fifths majority.

It should not be inferred that the influence of the United States will be limited simply to its formal voting strength. The power and influence of the United States over decisions in the fund will be far greater than its voting strength would indicate. It is doubtful whether the fund's management would make an important decision without the affirmative vote of the United States.

Please let me know if there are any further questions on the Bretton Woods proposals which you would like to have answered.

Very truly yours,

H. D. WHITE,
Assistant Secretary

Expenses for Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me, I include in my remarks an editorial entitled "Expenses for Congressmen" from the Asbury Park Evening Press, Asbury Park, N. J., of June 2, 1945. The Press enjoys the largest circulation of any daily paper published in Monmouth County, N. J., which I have the honor to represent, and is noted for its constructive, independent, and progressive views on matters of public interest. This can be readily appreciated by reading this editorial and it is refreshing to see in a newspaper such a straightforward and honest approach to the question of the payment of Congressmen's expenses. It is regretted that so much has been misinterpreted in the discussion of this proposal that the public mind has been misled and confused as to what it is all about. I am firmly conviced that the provision in the bill to cover, in some measure, the legitimate expenses of Members of the House is the most honest and businesslike way to solve the problem. Here is the excellent editorial:

EXPENSES FOR REPRESENTATIVES

Representative AUCHINCLOSS has offered an able defense of the House's action in voting its Members an annual expense of $2,500. Unfortunately, the expense allotment measure has been widely construed as an attempt to use the back door in collecting more pay from taxpayers. It is also suggested that the Representatives choose an expense account rather than a higher salary, because salaries are subject to income taxes whereas compensation for expenses is not. Thus, the impression created by the expense-account measure has been less than favorable. It became especially unfavorable when the Senate refused to share in it.

But Members of the House are probably entitled to this additional revenue for actual expenses incurred. They are compelled to spend a large part of the year in Washington and yet maintain residence in the district they represent. In business it is common practice to compensate employees for expenses incurred while traveling on business or while living away from home for business reasons. As Mr. AUCHINCLOSS points out, business houses and newspapers allow their Washington representatives adequate expense accounts. There is no reason why those who perform the public's business in Washington should not be treated as well. Nor should compensation to allay legitimate expenses be taxable for, were taxes to be deducted, it would be necessary to raise the compensation to equal the expense it is intended to meet.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS indicated that out of his $10,000 salary he nets but $4,000 for living expenses. And while this may be adequate, it is hardly sufficient to support the type of living which is forced upon a Member of the House of Representatives.

It is possible, of course, to find candidates for Congress, however low the salary. The honor is inviting. But inasmuch as you can't eat high honors, men and women of moderate means would thereby be excluded from Congress and the Nation's legislative body would become in truth a millionaires' club.

Rather than convert Congress into an exclusive society, we should prefer adequate compensation so that citizens in all economic levels will be in a position to serve if the voters select them. A democracy can afford nothing less.

The Filson Club of Louisville, Ky., and Gen. George Rogers Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution adopted by the George Rogers Clark Memorial Committee of the Filson Club, of Louisville, Ky. The Filson Club is an old and distinguished historical society which is widely known for its important work to preserve American history.

I am also including an article sent to me by the Filson Club on George Rogers Clark prepared by Hambleton Tapp.

The lives of very few men in American history have influenced the future of America as much as has that of Gen. George Rogers Clark. It is hoped that the electors of the Hall of Fame, New York University, will elect General Clark this year to membership in the Hall of Fame.

The resolution and article follow:

"Whereas George Rogers Clark, during the Revolutionary War, conquered and held for the American Nation the Old Northwest (comprising present-day Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and a part of Minnesota), thereby saving Kentucky and Virginia, as well as preventing General Washington's army from being attacked from the west and possibly destroyed;

"Whereas George Rogers Clark has not been generally accorded recognition commensurate with his distinguished services and brilliant and great contributions to the Nation; and

"Whereas the Governors of Kentucky, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, in behalf of the citizens of their respective States, have solicited, through letters, the electors of the Hall of Fame (New York University) to vote for the election of General Clark this year to membership in the said Hall of Fame: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Honorable EMMET O'NEAL, Congressman from the Third District of Kentucky, be, and is hereby, petitioned to request introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement of the life and services of George Rogers Clark, to the end that copies of said biographical statement be printed and passed to the electors of the Hall of Fame, in order to call attention to the significance of General Clark in the saving and expanding of the Nation."

Passed this the 24th day of May 1945 by vote of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Committee of the Filson Club, of Louisville, Ky.

HAMBLETON TAPP,
Chairman of the Committee.
OTTO A. ROTHERT,
Secretary of the Committee.

In the spring of 1775, George Rogers Clark, 23 years of age, stood on the high ground above the gracefully curving Kentucky River; he leaned on his long rifle and gazed out over the rolling green land below. The panorama was beautiful and fascinating; the land was a veritable Eden.

Never before perhaps had the eager young Clark beheld such a galaxy of natural splendor and loveliness. To the brilliant imagination, the country was worthy of the most exalted dreams of the far-traveler seeking the Utopia. This land, Kentucky, the bold, handsome pioneer, determined, at all hazards, to make his home.

But, like the lovely maiden chained in the castle of a demon, the fair land could not be had for the asking. Danger lurked everywhere; not only the known dangers of the wilderness, with its perils—its wild beasts and venomous reptiles—but dangers from savage men who sought with fiendish cunning to ply the tomahawk and the scalping knife upon every white person in the country.

Moreover, as the war for Independence had begun, there was the peril that hordes of these savages, supported and led by British and Tories, would cross the Ohio River, fall upon the lonely settlements, destroy them, and murder or torture every person who could

not escape. Within a few months seldom a day would pass in which some luckless settler and his helpless family would not be attacked, often tortured and killed. This peril was so imminent that the whites were in danger of being driven out or annihilated, and Kentucky lost.

Actually, even then, strong forces were being prepared to be loosed upon the Kentucky stations. And there was the added danger that Virginia, with a precariously-exposed western frontier, would be overrun by savage hordes led by British officers, and the cause of independence in the east crushed out.

Such by 1777 was the condition of the lovely land which had on that spring day in 1775 so fascinated the intrepid, sandy-haired young Clark. If ever a strong leader was needed, then was the time, and Clark was the man. "He (Clark) was brave, energetic, bold, prepossessing in appearance, of pleasing manner * * * with all the qualities calculated to win * * * a frontier people."

The one thought uppermost in his mind was this: Kentucky must be saved. He would make a desperate effort. He planned a bold move. He would lead a force into the heart of the hostile territory in the Northwest and destroy the enemy at his source.

Colonel Clark's little army left Corn Island, at the falls of the Ohio, now Louisville, on June 24, 1778. That small force of 150 men which shot the rapids in flatboats on that summer morning while the sun was in total eclipse was probably the strangest, wildest band in appearance that the eyes of white men had beheld since the time of Attila. The soldiers were savagely bronzed and bearded, big, and fierce; they wore hunting shirts and breechcloth, were naked of foot and limb, with bed, food, powderhorn, knapsack, and gun about their shoulders or at their side.

The first object of Colonel Clark's campaign was Kaskaskia, probably a hundred miles north of the mouth of the Tennessee, near the Mississippi River.

That post was surrounded on the night of July 4. So stealthily and quickly did Clark's men move that the British commandant was taken in bed with his wife.

The dazed and befuddled garrison had been surprised, immobilized, and made prisoner before its men fully realized what had befallen. That hot summer night at Kaskaskia was the biggest 4th of July that Clark and his backwoodsmen had ever known. Colonel Clark's was the sword of the Declaration of Independence in the West.

Clark's campaign for the capture of Vincennes on the Wabash, 200 miles from Kaskaskia, in February 1779, is a familiar chapter of Kentucky and of national history. It is a thrilling story of courage and patriotism, recounted by school children. Yet to us of this late date, the intense action, the superbly brilliant leadership of Clark, and the stark heroism maintained throughout is fairly overwhelming. Each scene was crammed with thrilling drama.

The small force of 150 men set out from Kaskaskia on the morning of February 5. You will recall the colorful scene; the steady soldiers and the excited French natives standing in Kaskaskia with heads bowed listening to the eloquent benediction of the patriot priest, Father Pierre Gibault; the gay and exhilarated long-rifle men marching out of the town—Clark mounted on his fierce Mexican charger, soon to be abandoned; the plucky little drummer boy beating wildly, while the giant sergeant beamed down with an approving, good-natured grin.

Then the changing scene: The driving, pelting rain made icy by the chilly mid-winter wind; the miles upon miles of dreary watery waste; the monotonous, fatiguing wading, with the never-ending slush, slush of boots sinking knee-deep into water and mud; Clark's clever rescurcefulness in keeping the men in good spirit.

And then with the passing of each day a spectacle more grim: deepening water, stretching for miles; the downpour almost continuous and becoming more icy with the passing of the hours; clothing wet all the time; fires no longer possible; food practically gone; physical strength ebbing rapidly; sleep, only fitful sleep, on wet, freezing ground in wet, freezing clothes.

The final 2 days out were days of absolute desperation: On reaching the last vast stretch of water, Clark's men, dangerously near complete exhaustion, hesitated. Without pausing the resourceful young leader blackened his face with dampened power, raised the Indian warwhoop and plunged into deep water encrusted with a sheet of ice. The stronger men plunged in behind him; many of the weaker ones clung to comrades; some plunged in and sank, but were picked up by boats; others grasped the branches of trees. Many reaching the other side were too weak to pull up the bank. All the while Clark was calm and indefatigable, his courage invincible, his leadership brilliant and inspiring.

The remaining part of the story is well known. Whether or not the rude American flag was made and raised by the pretty hands of patriotic Alice of Old Vincennes, suffice it to say that an American flag was raised over Fort Sackville at Vincennes on February 25, 1779.

Colonel Clark's desperate venture had succeeded beyond the wildest dream. The results were astoundingly far-reaching. The lives of the people of Kentucky were saved. The western boundary of the new Nation would be the Mississippi River. Washington's exposed western flank was no longer in danger. In addition, an empire had been gained. The northern boundary of the United States would be the Great Lakes instead of the Ohio River. The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and a part of Minnesota would be saved out of Clark's magnificent conquest:

The glorious day, February 25, 1779, was the highest point in Clark's career. Yet he continued to serve Kentucky and Virginia brilliantly until the close of the Revolution, never failing to strike terror into the hearts of the Indians whenever he met them.

Following Captain's Byrd's bloody forays with his force of Indians into Kentucky in June 1780, General Clark led an army of approximately 1,000 Kentuckians against the Shawnees in Ohio and destroyed their principal villages: Chillicothe on the Scioto and Piqua on the Great Miami. Again, in 1782, following the tragic defeat of the Kentuckians at the Blue Licks, General Clark collected an army and overran the Shawnee territory, completely destroying their villages and their supplies and effectively breaking their spirit.

Something strange there was about the rapidity with which Byrd's army retired from Kentucky. His force was not only large but carried along cannon large enough to batter down any stockade in the district. Kentucky for the moment was in his power.

The story persists that the Indians, while they were collecting scalps and plundering and burning cabins at Martin's and Ruddle's stations in northern Kentucky, heard a rumor that General Clark was approaching. Their superstitious fear of the name Clark completely overcoming them, the savages fled so rapidly that they abandoned much booty, even tomahawked prisoners along the way who could not keep up. The suggestion has been advanced that Captain Byrd, horrified by the brutal slaughter, made no effort to deny the rumor of Clark's aproach, in order to prevent recurrences of the inhuman butchery.

In addition to these services, General Clark founded Louisville, and many authorities insist that it was he who named the town in honor of the French king, Louis XVI, out of gratitude for French aid to the Americans.

At the end of the war, General Clark was residing with his parents at Mulberry Hill, on what is now Poplar Level Road, near Louisville. He was practically penniless. During that year, 1783, he made the long, tedious, and lonely journey across the mountains to Richmond, the capital of Virginia. There, fatigued and in rags, he applied to Governor Harrison for a small advance on money which he had advanced to supply Virginia's army. The man who had saved a State and won an empire was obliged to supplicate his government for money to buy food and clothing. In Richmond, sympathy and praise were profusely expressed, but no money for food and clothing was available, and the forlorn hero sadly retraced his painful steps to the falls of the Ohio.

Already dejected and despondent, General Clark was soon beset with lawsuits for the recovery of sums advanced to him for the support of his army. Even though independence was at stake and the lives of the people were in danger, Clark had been unable to obtain supplies except by using his own property as collateral. Practically all he had left in the way of salable property was taken from him. Yet, swallowing his disappointment and sorrow, he resolutely set about the task of making a living.

During the years 1798 and 1799, death came to his aging parents at Mulberry Hill. This was a great loss, as the affection between Clark and his kindly father and mother was deep. They had treated him as tenderly as though he were an only child. The fine old man had considerable property, yet he could leave practically nothing to his son, George Rogers, because any property so willed would be subject to seizure by creditors. But General Clark continued to reside at Mulberry Hill for 3 years, forced to depend upon the generosity of his admiring and sympathetic brother William. His many brothers and sisters ministered with fine loving kindness to his afflictions, giving him comfort and encouragement at every turn.

General Clark, in 1803, moved across the Ohio River opposite the falls and founded a town which came to be called Clarksville. There he built a log cabin on a prominent point within sight and sound of the falls.

It is said that he was fond of sitting on the rude porch and gazing out over the beautiful Ohio, a stream which had figured so prominently in his great career. The graceful bend below the falls, the mighty pounding of the waters along the rapids and the slowly rising mist presented a scene which must have been soothing to his troubled mind. At this house, he received each year Indian chiefs and warriors. These old braves visited him to smoke the pipe of peace and friendship, with, as they insisted, "the first man living, the great and invincible Long Knife."

It was from Clarksville that, during the year 1803, the aging warrior had the great honor of giving his blessing to his beloved brother, William Clark, and to Captain Meriwether Lewis, of the Lewis and Clark expedition, as they set out from Clarksville on their hazardous and thrilling adventure across the vast stretches of the West to the vast expanse of the blue Pacific.

Ever and anon, the old debts would rise to plague him; they would not be permanently downed; and lawsuits were continuously coming up, giving his troubled mind no peace. But never did Clark's friends and brothers cease to help. His eldest brother, Jonathan, pleaded for the payment of the just claims before both the Virginia Legislature and the Congress at Washington.

In the written petition to Congress, General Clark spoke feelingly of the justness of his claims. "I engaged in the Revolution with all the ardor that youth could possess," he wrote. "My zeal and ambition rose with my success. * * * At the most gloomy period of the war, when a ration could not be purchased on public credit, I risked my own, gave my bonds, mortgaged my lands

for supplies, paid strict attention to every department. * * * At the end of the war, I had the pleasure of seeing my country secure, but with the loss of my manual activi'y and a prospect of future indigence. * * * Suits commenced against me. * * * My military and other lands earned by my service as far as they would extend were appropriated for the payment of those debts, and demands yet remaining. * * * I see no other resource remaining but to make application to my country for redress."

The exposure and sacrifices of the "great campaign" had overtaxed Clark's strength, seemingly superhuman though it had been. His health gradually failed. Painful rheumatism developed. And then a fateful day in 1809, the paralytic stroke. That day a party of acquaintances from Kentucky on a hunting excursion made him a visit.

"After spending some time with him in a jovial way, they departed on their hunt, leaving him alone in his humble cabin. Some time after their departure, he was stricken with paralysis and fell to the floor helpless, and, for a time, unconscious, without any one present to assist him. He fell in front of the old-fashioned log fireplace, in such a way as to burn one of his legs, which brought him to consciousness, but he never recovered from this stroke of paralysis. * * * He lived in a helpless condition, and the burn on his leg finally turned to erysipelas, which made its amputation an absolute necessity."

General Clark bore up under this terrific affliction with remarkable firmness and bravery. The amputation was performed by Dr. Ferguson, of Louisville, amid surroundings which are probably as unusual as any in medical history.

Friends and neighbors came in, all striving to help and bring comfort. Col. George Rogers Clark Floyd, son of the old warrior's beloved friend, Col. John Floyd, who was killed by the Indians in 1783, brought a company of soldiers to Dr. Ferguson's office near what is now Main and Fifth Streets in Louisville. The troops surrounded the building, while fifers and drummers made lively music for 2 hours, the time required for the amputation of the leg. During that ordeal Clark kept time to the music by beating with his fingers on the table. Other than a good quantity of whisky, no anesthetic was administered; it was before medical opiates had come into common use. The suffering from the operation was torture, yet the great old soldier bore it unflinchingly. Early that evening fifes and drums once more made lively music to soothe the suffering man and later he was serenaded with violin music until late at night.

Following the amputation, General Clark was taken by his lovely sister, Mrs. Lucy Croghan, wife of Maj. William Croghan, to Locust Grove, a few miles from Louisville. There he resided, a helpless invalid, the remaining 9 years of his life.

A day came in the year 1812 when the State of Virginia, through its legislature, voted to present to the old hero of Vincennes a sword as a symbol of that State's appreciation for his meritorious services. An eloquent letter informing him of the action of Virginia was written by the Honorable James Barbour, Governor of Virginia. Gen. Charles F. Mercer, member of the Virginia Assembly, who had introduced the bill, journeyed to Kentucky and at Locust Grove presented the beautiful sword.

General Clark was then old and decrepit, one leg gone the other paralyzed, and all the energy and ambition of his younger days had departed. Earthly honors could be of little moment to him then, as he sat there in his invalid chair and listened to the polished Virginian's eloquent words. He took the beautiful and unsheathed sword and, holding it before him on his two open hands, looked at it long and earnestly. Doubtless at the moment his memory dwelt upon the glories of Kaskaskia and Vincennes * * * it is * * * probable that * * * he said, in a feeble voice, broken by tears, 'you have made a very handsome address, and the sword is very handsome too. When Virginia needed a sword, I gave her one. I am too old and infirm, as you see, to ever use a sword again, but I am glad that my old mother State has not entirely forgotten me, and I thank her for the honor and you for your kindness and friendly words.' "

When Clark was an old man—health gone, a paralytic, one leg amputated, penniless, beset by lawsuits for sums which he had obtained to maintain an American army to hold an American empire, all hope gone—it was then that he made, perhaps, his finest, most patriotic statement. Here is the statement: "By involving myself so imprudently in the public expense * * * I doubt without assistance * * * I shall ever get clear of debt, but a country was at stake, and if it was imprudence, I suppose I should do the same should I again have a similar field to pass through."

On a snowy day, in February 1818, at the age of 66, the sad, lonely, old hero breathed his last.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. John J. Baker, assemblyman of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, on May 30, 1945, at the annual memorial services held under the auspices of the Seventeenth Ward United Veterans' Association, the veterans of the Eighteenth Ward Service Men, and Post No. 435 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Reverend Fathers, friends, and neighbors, as we come together to do honor to our heroic dead, I believe we realize that this Memorial Day has greater significance than any other we have observed in our lives. This day was set apart many years ago for us to do homage to the honored dead of the American Civil War, which terminated just 80 years ago this spring.

Eighty years after the end of the struggle between the American States the great European conflict came to an end, a successful end for the forces of men who believe in the emancipation of slavery.

As in the great war between the States the men on both sides of this recent conflict fought for what they thought was the right. Otherwise they would not have been willing to lay down their lives, to undergo the danger and shock of battle, the extreme suffering and missery from the long marches over mountain and plain, the intense discomfort of filthy fox holes, the ever increasing thunder of the great guns and the shattering crash of exploding shells and bombs, the clatter of machine gun fire, the sudden impact of the sniper's bullet.

Many of the boys whose bodies lie in lonesome graves far from their homes and loved ones, are those same boys who were born and grew to young manhood right here in this community.

They have mingled their prayers with ours on this same ground, now doubly hallowed by their sacrifice. They were prepared to meet their God unafraid. They may have flinched in the face of sudden death or mutilation of the body, even as our Saviour asked that the bitter cup may pass his lips, as he suffered on the cross, the eternal souls of these heroes now sup with him in paradise.

As President Abraham Lincoln so eloquently prayed on the battlefield of Gettysburg, it is for us, the living, to dedicate ourselves to the task of completing the work for which our friends and relatives have sacrificed their human lives.

The world has been bathed in a baptism of blood and tears. Many young men who would have made valuable contributions to the progress of civilization have been taken from us. If we who remain have faith in the cause for which they died then we should realize the great task that does lie before us.

That task is the readjustment of our regard for the whole race of mankind. What I have said before, and on a similar occasion, is that the world demands a moral and economic regeneration that should not be longer postponed.

We have a great abundance of scientific knowledge here on the earth. But what we must undertake is the task of reconsidering a great part of the opinions of man and his relations to his fellow man that have been handed down from generation to generation.

Science has advanced through extensive research and application to unheard-of heights. But the materials to accomplish the purposes of science were always present, ready at hand. They were all a part of the original creation of the world. Even the late phenomenon of radar was known from the beginning of time.

The blind bats fly in safety past obstacles which they avoid by means of the natural gift of radar, the use of which has only recently been discovered and put to use by man.

The world is full of the things that we can put to use for the good of man, not in the way of the minerals of the ground alone but the mysterious currents of the air, over which we can speak and be heard in every part of the earth. As we gain knowledge of these forces we harness them for the common good of all. On the other hand, we also use these forces to help destroy one another.

Therefore, what we most stand in need of is another force, which also has been waiting for us to use. We can easily find it. This greatest thing in the world is love. What we can do to make this world a better place for living is the application of love for one another, as taught by our Lord and Saviour, who also gave His precious life for the redemption of the world, as the fulfillment of His mission to bring this important truth to His people.

To put love to practical and effective use, we need to learn how to respect other people, people whose language we may not understand but whose history, culture, and problems of living we may learn.

Through love and understanding our dealings with them may be made more pleasant, more profitable, by becoming more interested in them as human beings, as fellow men, having the same right to exist as we claim for ourselves.

May our enemies receive the same blessing as we pray for ourselves, that greed, selfish national pride, arrogance, and the desire to conquer and destroy shall perish from the earth, that the people who have been placed on this earth through the goodness and mercy of our Heavenly Father may dwell in peace and happiness together.

To God above us may I offer this Memorial Day prayer for our honored dead:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, guide, we beseech Thee, the nations of the world into the way of truth, and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of justice. Grant victory to the United Nations and, after victory, peace with order and justice to all the nations of the world.

We remember before Thee on this Memorial Day all those men and women of our community who have given their lives in the service of our country, beseeching Thee to grant them light and refreshment in Thy divine presence.

Strengthen and protect all those who are serving in the armed forces and our country. Support them in the day of battle, and in time of peace keep them safe from all evil; endow them with courage and loyalty, and grant that in all things they may serve without reproach. Amen.

Bretton Woods Is a Maginot Line Against Economic Warfare—Barron's Article Tells How Britain Fences in Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been assured that Bretton Woods means the end of economic warfare. Like so many other flamboyant claims for this scheme, this assertion is largely created out of thin air.

Paul Wohl, writing in Barron's National Financial Weekly, June 4, seems to explode this notion in a realistic discussion of British trade plans. Members would find the entire article interesting, but to save space, I am only including that part which details how their trade plans go contrary to the freer trade claims of Bretton Woods promoters:

The British, like it or not, have had to take a page from the book of Hitler's former economic adviser, Dr. Schacht.

The British master plan seems to have three objectives: (1) Renew industrial equipment and replenish raw material stocks with the aid of American credits; (2) revamp export industries, cutting out obsolete plants and concentrating on lines of production which require a minimum of imported raw materials; (3) develop a system of financial and industrial agreements which would weld the nations of the sterling bloc and other capital-poor countries into an almost self-sufficient combination, absorbing roughly three-quarters of the world's imports and two-thirds of its exports.

While the British goal is very different from that of militaristic Germany, which was not so much interested in expanding her exports as in preparing for war the three phases of the operation are the same.

The Germans needed American capital to build up new industries and to make existing ones more efficient. They offered very favorable conditions of investment. Eventually, their coal mines were more mechanized than those of the United States, and their largest strip mill turned out broader sheets of steel than any American mill up to the war. They managed to accumulate substantial stocks of industrial raw materials on credit.

The British today are in need of even greater quantities of American raw materials and machines. Many of their industries have to be overhauled completely. Their coal mines, with an output less than two-thirds of that before World War I, must be equipped with modern hauling, cutting, and loading machinery. Everywhere, the wear and tear of more than 5 years of war calls for replacements on a very large scale. The amounts involved are so vast that Britain will have to finance at least part of her imports from America through direct loans, once the Johnson Act is repealed, or through the International Bank provided in the Bretton Woods plan.

* * * * *

Before the war, most of Britain's progressive export industries had production and market agreements with their opposite numbers on the Continent. There are many indications that agreements of this kind also will feature in the financial side of Britain's postwar plans.

Just as they supported Germany's barter and clearing scheme, they may help to cement the sterling bloc. The origin of this financial system, under which sterling surpluses arising out of commercial transactions between Britain and other countries are blocked in London, is similar to that of the financial system of Dr. Schacht. The motive in Britain's case was legitimate defense, while the German motive was to obtain political control of foreign countries by making them economically dependent on Berlin. Yet, the effect is more or less the same.

In both cases it was stipulated that deliveries will not be paid in free exchange, but in credits of which at least part cannot be transferred and which the creditor country can mobilize only by making purchases in the debtor country. Today these blocked sterling balances in London are reported to be closer to 2,000,000,000 than 1,500,000,000. They represent commercial claims held not only by members of the British Commonwealth but also by such independent countries as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Iraq, Peru, Portugal, and Uruguay.

As previously stated in Barron's, this "cobweb of British clearing and payments agreements" recently has been extended to Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, and France. Similar pacts with Holland, Norway, and Turkey are in preparation.

While some of the older commercial debts may be funded or, as far as Empire nations are concerned, canceled as an additional contribution to Great Britain's war effort, there can be no doubt that in her relations with independent countries, Britain will have to pay her debts mainly in goods and services. Unless she can obtain large dollar balances through loans or greatly increased exports to America, which in turn would entail a substantial cutting of our tariff, Brittain's only way out of this predicament is to make payment of her commercial debts dependent upon placement of orders with British industries.

In countries which have linked their currencies to that of Britain, especially in the Middle East, her position is even stronger than was that of Germany under Dr. Schacht. Commercial interests there find it impossible to place orders in the United States or other countries outside the sterling bloc without London's consent. An Egyptian importer, for instance, can purchase goods in America only if he is able to obtain free exchange, and the granting of this exchange is made dependent on the approval of the projected deal by London. In every case where the commodities the Egyptian wishes to import can be obtained at the same price from Britain, a deal with a nonsterling country is out.

* * * * *

Directed from London by far more subtle methods than the one the Germans tried to organize within their sphere of trade, it would not only be more effective, because British political interference would be less obvious, but also because it would extend to a far greater number of countries with more variegated resources and needs. Eventually, it might cover such a large portion of the world's foreign trade and include so great an industrial capacity (many times that of Britain) that there would be little room for an expansion of American commercial exports or even their maintenance on prewar level. The only way for the United States to bolster its exports would then be to finance them by supplying prospective buyers with the funds for which to pay for American goods or services—not exactly a commercial operation.

Six Months Vacation at Government Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems which this Congress will probably have to face, is whether or not we shall provide appropriations to pay untold thousands of people a gratuity of $25 per week for 6 months.

Patriotism was the motive that actuated many of our defense workers, and only praise and appreciation of their efforts should be expressed. But there are many thousands who worked in the defense plants with the highest wartime wages ever known, with gasoline, tire, and other priorities granted them, with deferments which kept them out of combat or other military duty and performances, who have been enabled to save money and lay by a nest egg for their old age; who are not entitled to further preferences, or bounties from the public treasury.

Compare with this latter group—and the number is all too large—those who voluntarily enlisted or were drafted into the armed forces and have performed so heroically for only nominal compensation. Thousands of those have died of battle-inflicted wounds. Hundreds of thousands will carry the scars of war to their graves; and among these are untold hundreds whose future economic efficiency has been tremendously impaired.

What will our returning veterans think of our paying, without discrimination, all who have worked for these fancy wages and salaries in the war industries, a 6 months' vacation at the rate of $25 per week? Are they not justified in condemning such an idea, and will they not be justified in severely criticizing all who are responsible for any such proposed appropriation? It is reported that 3,000 former prisoners of war have already demonstrated their opposition in a parade they staged last Saturday in Paris, France. An account of this appeared on the front page of the Washington Sunday Star of June 3, 1934, which I quote:

FORMER WAR PRISONERS SNARL TRAFFIC IN PARIS

PARIS, June 2.—Three thousand former prisoners of war, most of them wearing the ragged uniforms in which they left for the front in 1940, snarled traffic in the Place de

Concorde and Champs Elysees today, marching with banners reading:

"Three months' vacation with pay," "Decent clothes and boots," "Three thousand francs a head for each year of captivity," and "Purge the black market and war profiteers."

The demonstration was orderly.

What about the farmers who have so nobly attempted to furnish an adequate supply of food for the armed forces and the civilian populations of this country and of a large portion of the world, with hampering bureaucratic regulations under which they have had to work? What will the so-called white-collar group, whose salaries were frozen and whose pay could not be increased by their employers, who have worked longer hours under greater pressure than usual, have to say about such discriminatory favortism? What will be the reaction of the taxpayers when they find themselves forced to pay the bill? Please do not forget that this bill will be paid out of borrowed money. It will put Uncle Sam and his family still further in debt. All of the people, including the returning servicemen, will have to bear part of this load during the remainder of their natural lives. It will be a large bill, and will require sacrifice on the part of millions of people, to pay it.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is being discussed far and wide over the entire country, and we should consider very carefully the appropriation of any public fund of our Government borrowings before we vote for such an expanditure. It is a form of pampering that cannot be justified.

A very appropriate editorial appeared in the Bartlesville (Okla.) Enterprise of May 29, 1945, which I am pleased to quote, as follows:

I'm not very hot about President Truman's plea for federally financed jobless pay during the reconversion period. It smacks too much of the same old thing we have had in great gobs and doses for the past 12 years. He pleads, in his message to Congress, that there will be an unemployment gap during the reconversion period.

His plea sounds screwball to me on two points: 1. We have been consistently told for the past 5 or 6 years by the administration that the big idea of high wages was so workers could accumulate a nest egg to tide them over any temporary unemployment gap. If this long and often-repeated statement isn't wholly fallacious, then this argument won't hold water. 2. There is lots of work just beginning to be done. Sure, not at $100-a-week wages of wartime Government spending programs but at decent, livable wages.

I'll bet my hat that a minimum of 500 men could find work—skilled, semiskilled, and plain old day labor—right here in this little community for a period of 6 months to a year doing the repair jobs and the other million and one things that have gone undone since December 7, 1941.

Of course, if we are going to proceed on the premises that a man or woman can only work—and will work only—in a wartime assembly line, then Mr. Truman's argument might hold water. But can we plan an America of tomorrow where people must find exactly the type of work at exactly the rate of pay they want or else be put on the public pay roll for doing nothing without making a shambles of what we've been fighting for? I doubt it.

There probably are as big a percentage of business owners who would also like to prowl in other and greener fields—something more to their liking—as there are of pay-roll workers who want a particular kind of a job at a particular rate of pay. But they carry on because, having been in business, they know something of the operation of economic laws and know that there is no Utopia where everyone can do just as he pleases and just when he pleases with the assurance that if he isn't happy in what he's doing the great white father in Washington will see that he's taken care of anyway.

There are plenty of jobs for all in the reconversion interim if the American people as a whole and if the administration at Washington have the wit to see it without going off the deep end of jobless pay, which has too many political implications to suit me as well as a further pandering to man's worst inherent fault—plain, garden variety laziness.

In the final analysis, the Truman proposal is nothing less than an open invitation to the men and women who drew the fattest wartime factory pay in history to profit still further by taking a 6-month vaction on $25 a week pay. Wonder how the fighting men like it?

Come, come, Mr. President. Most of the things you have done up to now have made sense with most folks. But this one won't, I am sure.

Nobody, I am sure, really wants to see anybody working at starvation wages at any time. But in America there are jobs for all if we have the wit to make them instead of resorting to the old Rooseveltian leftist theory of a central government assuming all the responsibility for everybody, whether they are willing to work or not. After all, the Government is the people and we can't continue to attempt lifting ourselves by our bootstraps. It takes honest sweat and honest toil at fair wages to return America to sanity. The sooner the great masses understand this thing, the better off we all will be. The leadership in this direction must come from Washington, and I am sorry to see such poor leadership being exhibited by the new President at this juncture.

Possibly he has been listening too much to pressure groups. Maybe he is just plain misinformed and misguided. Whatever it is, I am sure he will hear from others as well as from me, unless we have become a Nation of spineless nitwits who are willing to sell any and all of our brithright for a fantastic mess of pottage such as the Truman scheme envisions.

As an illustration of the thinking of the fathers and mothers of sons in the service and of our everyday run of citizens, who after all, are the stabilizing element of our population, I am pleased to quote the following from a letter which I have just received from one of my constituents living in the town of Ramona, Okla.:

Considering the past, in which these workers have really been the favored class having received priorities on auto tires and gasoline, about the highest wages of any class, ranging generally from $160 to as high as $300 and $400 per month and where two or more members of a family are doing such work, sometimes $700 to $800 per month, it seems unfair to me to tax and burden the rest of the Nation for such purposes. My son, as other boys and young men have done and are doing, have faced death on the battlefields for much less remuneration. If they are fortunate they will return home and help carry the burden of debt for such class legislation if same is enacted.

I trust you will use your influence in defeat of this and like measures. I am not opposed to governmental aid and control to prevent a recurrence of the calamities of 1920 and 1921, which broke and ruined so many of our good citizens financially. A high national income from useful production and services should be our goal and aim and not an income by artificial, governmental priming and temporary relief.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the reaper of death has no particular harvest season; he is busy every hour of the day and every day of every year executing orders of the Creator; he makes no compromises and permits no delay in the execution of orders as planned. Since our last Memorial Day he appeared and removed our friend and colleague, the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, who successfully served 12 successive terms in the Congress and was renominated without opposition to serve in the Seventy-ninth Congress. He was stricken and died suddenly in his home here in Washington, October 19, 1944, lacking only about 2½ months of continuous service of 24 years.

Mr. FULMER was a man of many parts. He was born on a farm near Springfield, S. C., June 23, 1875, about 10 years after the close of the War Between the States, a time when there were few and limited opportunities for higher education in our section of the country. His academic training, therefore was confined almost exclusively to that furnished in the public-school system of the State. However, he was endowed with unusual natural ability and applied himself to the mastery of many lines of work. Before being elected to Congress in 1920 he had demonstrated his ability as a farmer, merchant, and banker. He had wide and varied experience in all these activities and had marked success in each. He knew people; he knew their virtues and political reactions; he knew their problems and was, therefore, fitted by training and experience to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

During his stay here he gave the country the benefit of his wide and successful experience by devoting his talents, energies, and efforts largely to legislation dealing with agriculture or farm problems. As a member of the Agriculture Committee for 20 years and as chairman of the committee for the past 4 years he aided and assisted, or engineered through the committee and the House of Representatives all worthwhile legislation relating to agriculture enacted by the Congress within the last quarter of a century. One of his outstanding contributions to the cotton farmer, the cotton trade, and the public

generally was when he sponsored and became author of the United States Standard Cotton Grading Act, standardizing the grading of American cotton, now acepted by the users and manufacturers of cotton throughout the world.

Mr. FULMER was a man of strong conviction and always alert and loyal to the interests of the people he represented. His devotion and loyalty to those engaged in agriculture stand out as one of the great virtues and characteristics of his political life and in his death that great group of people who live by the products of the soil have lost a loyal friend.

I know how much Mr. FULMER regretted the lack of opportunity in early life to obtain additional school training which he felt would have aided him in fulfilling his mission in life, but his success both in business and public service well illustrates the possibility of unusual accomplishments by honesty, ambition, hard work, and application to an ideal despite the number of difficulties and obstacles to be overcome; it illustrates further that the greater the difficulties and obstacles met and overcome the greater the manhood may be developed.

It was my privilege to know Mr. FULMER a number of years before he became a Member of this body; I served with him here for 14 years and learned to admire and have great respect for his dependable and sound judgment. The sudden call to his reward is a source of great sorrow and grief to those of us who knew him. He was a man of fine character, many virtues, and with few, if any, faults.

Francis Thomas Maloney

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character and public service of Hon. FRANCIS THOMAS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, prior to his service in the Senate, Senator MALONEY was a Member of the House, and it was my privilege to have served with him.

The first time I ever met him was in Connecticut, in 1932, when I was campaigning in behalf of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic ticket in Connecticut. Senator MALONEY was at that time mayor of the city of Meriden, and was a candidate on the Democrat ticket for Representative in Congress, and was elected.

From contacts which I made in Connecticut at that time, I soon learned of the popularity of Mayor MALONEY, and this was demonstrated by the fact that he was elected to Congress at that time, notwithstanding the fact that Roosevelt and the Democratic national ticket were defeated in Connecticut.

Our acquaintance ripened into a warm friendship during his service in the House, which continued after his election to the United States Senate.

There was no harder working or more conscientious Member of the House and later, of the Senator than Senator FRANCIS MALONEY. He had the confidence, esteem and affection of his colleagues in both bodies. His death was a great shock and a great loss to his State and Nation, and I am glad to pay this brief tribute to him, for his passing is a distinct personal loss to me.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1944, I was shocked and distressed to learn of the sudden and unexpected death of my lifelong friend, the Representative in Congress from my district for almost a quarter of a century, HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, of Orangeburg, S. C. Diligent, able, and devoted to his task, he spent long and tedious hours carrying on the work of his district and promoting agriculture as a whole, until he eroded his health and caused the slender thread of his life to snap.

"Hamp," or "Uncle Hamp," as he was affectionately called by all who knew him—and there were thousands—desired above all else to see the farmers of his State and his Nation protected and enlightened as to the best methods of producing and of marketing their products. How well he succeeded is attested by the fact that he served in the Lower House of Congress longer than any other man from my State, to this date. How fine were his abilities is evinced by the fact that he rose to be chairman of the powerful Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, a position held by only one other Representative from my State and by few others from the entire South.

His tenure of service was during a most trying era. Starting his national career shortly after the last war, he toiled through the great agricultural and economic crises of the deflation period of the early 1920's, through the depression period of the 1930's, and through the most critical years of the greatest war in history. Such major legislation as the Agricultural Adjustment Act, United States Cotton Grading Act, National Forest Land Management Act, and Federal crop insurance were harvested from his labors. Using the agencies and procedures which Mr. FULMER helped to create, the farmers of our Nation have more than done their part in producing food and other critical agricultural products, without which success could not have been attained over the most powerful and ingenious enemy in our history.

Wherever in these United States the sower goes forth to sow, wherever the plowman wearily plods his way homeward when the day's work is done; wherever cotton is picked or grain is cut, the work and achievements of HAMPTON P. FULMER will bless his fellow man even after his name, now well known, will have faded from memory.

It is fitting that today, the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, by my beloved State, that we pause humbly in our daily tasks to pay tribute to one of her distinguished sons and to extend sympathy to his loved ones. May He who guides the destinies of men give us here on earth others of the mold of HAMPTON P. FULMER.

Full-Employment Bill of 1945, H. R. 2202

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former Member of this House, now assigned by statute the responsibility for reconversion of our entire economy from war to peace, has after careful study and consideration endorsed the purposes and principles of the full-employment bill of 1945, H. R. 2202, originally introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], since joined in sponsorship by 68 other Members.

I know that many Members of the House will want to study the endorsement given H. R. 2202 by Judge Fred Vinson, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and I therefore asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of Judge Vinson's letter to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is shortly to begin hearings on this vital piece of legislation to insure freedom from want after final military victory.

I wish to call particular attention to Judge Vinson's final paragraph which, in effect, is a challenge to the Congress to accept and discharge its constitutional responsibility for the formulation of national policy, in this instance for the maintenance of full employment after the war. I hope and believe the Congress will accept this policy and accept it in time, so that it will not be necessary, in the midst of a new and worse depression, for the executive branch to work out emergency programs to arrest the spread of unemployment, hunger, and

evictions, as unhappily was necessary 12 years ago.

We of this House who believe this bill is a necessary and practical first step toward insuring full employment are determined to promote the widest possible understanding of its purposes and its provisions, what it would and would not do, to dispel the effect of misrepresentations, so that, when the bill comes to hearings, debate, and final action, necessary perfecting amendments shall have been made, the greatest possible public appreciation of its purpose will exist, and favorable action here can be followed swiftly by effective administration. Thereby we will reduce the length and difficulty of the vast, yet delicate, job of changing over from an economy of full production and employment for war to full production, consumption, and employment for peace.

It is very late to prepare for a peace of full production and employment. But it is not too late. If we of the Congress act with the dispatch which the times demand, the curve of unemployment inevitable in the change-over of between fifteen and and twenty million servicemen and war workers to peaceful employment can be on the downgrade by the time of primaries and the final elections of 1946, when every one of us must face our constituents and answer to them for our action or inaction on this vital issue. As Judge Vinson so well says, this issue is second only to a speedy and complete victory over Japan. It will continue to be an issue until we meet and solve it—and the sooner, the better for all concerned.

DEAR BOB: This is in response to your letter of April 9 concerning S. 380, a bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government."

Next to a speedy and complete victory over Japan, a steady, well-paid job after the war is first in the minds and hearts of most Americans. The war has demonstrated that our economic system can provide jobs when demand for its products exists. It has done more. It has opened the eyes of all of us to the vast productivity of which American labor and the American genius for organization and management—working as a team—are capable.

But these jobs—this productivity—has been achieved in wartime through the creation of an unlimited market by the Government. To reach and maintain high levels of employment and a steadily rising standard of living in peacetime will call for a program suited to peacetime conditions and needs. In this program, business, agriculture, labor, and local, State, and Federal Governments must all play their parts.

We know we have an abundance of resources, plant, manpower, and managerial know-how to produce a standard of living far higher than anything we have ever known. Likewise, we know that we have unfilled needs in America so diverse and so great as to challenge the capacity of even the greatest producing Nation on earth.

But needs are not demands, in the economic sense. People must have steady income and they must want to spend their income before needs become demands and people become customers.

Business management, large and small, has a great opportunity and a great challenge to help create these steady incomes, and to actuate demand by expanding their businesses, offering better goods and services at attractive prices. Labor and agriculture through their efforts to increase production per man-hour can contribute importantly to higher incomes and a higher standard of living.

But history shows us that business, labor, and agriculture cannot in themselves assure the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. The Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must assume this responsibility and take measures broad enough to meet the issues. Only by looking at the economy as a whole, and adopting national economic policies which will actively promote and encourage the expansion of business and the maintenance of markets and consumer spending, can we hope to achieve full employment. S. 330 recognizes this responsibility of Government and seeks to provide a definite vehicle for the Congress and the President to measure the size of the employment need of the country and to provide specific programs for meeting it.

It would be idle to pretend that it will be easy to reach and hold full-employment levels. It would be folly, on the other hand, to pretend that it is impossible. The American people will not be content to go back to protracted large scale unemployment. It is imperative that we find ways and means to provide jobs for those willing and able to work. Depressions are not acts of God, any more than wars are. They are the product of our man-made institutions and the way we organize our society. We can and must organize to prevent both.

We must be prepared to make changes. At the same time we must be jealous of any encroachment on our freedoms. National economic policies must not be allowed to develop into regimentation of business, or labor, or agriculture, nor of the people. Direction of private output by public authority in peacetime is repugnant to American ways of thought. Instead the maximum possible freedom must be afforded every producer to produce what he wishes, in the amounts for which he can best find a profitable market. Given an adequate market, our producers will supply the goods and the employment. We can be sure of that.

We cannot, however, leave the creation of that market to chance. We must start now to find out what measures are needed to maintain markets and steady jobs. S. 380 does not profess to present a fully conceived program for the achievement of full employment. It is the necessary first step from which a full-dress program of economic policies to promote the well-being of our free competitive economy will stem.

As a former Member of Congress, I have certain general reactions to the bill. I regard it as desirable that such a bill should limit itself to providing the machinery to be followed to assist in arriving at national policy and full employment, rather than attempting to specify in advance policy measures to be used to meet future conditions. I believe it wise to leave to the President full discretion in the matter of preparing estimates of the national production and employment budget. And I regard the consideration of proposed measures by a congressional joint committee, which can analyze the interrelationships between the various matters of special concern to the House and Senate committees represented, as an important step in the process of preparing national policy to maintain full employment.

I heartily endorse the purposes and principles of the bill.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON.

Training of Wisconsin Veterans in the Field of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a most interesting training program for Wisconsin veterans.

It seems that under the direction of O. W. Price, Chief of the Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division of the Veterans' Administration, located at Wood, Wis., veterans of this war are being trained in the field of agriculture. It is a privilege for me to offer as a part of my remarks an interview between Mr. Arthur Page, associate editor of Prairie Farmer and Mr. Price, over radio station WLS, Chicago, Ill., on May 15.

At a time when every Member of Congress is interested in the rehabilitation of our men who have done the fighting for us, I am sure that Members will find this radio interview very enlightening:

Mr. PAGE. At the close of the war we will have some 13,000,000 veterans, most of whom will be entitled to free education or training at Government expense. Many of them were on farms when they went into service. What is being done for them, and what is planned? To answer these questions, we are pleased to have as our guest today Mr. O. W. Price, Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, Veterans' Administration, from our sister State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Price, do you think that there will be many veterans who will want to return to farms or take up farming? You recall that old song they sung during the last war, "How're you going to keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree?" Now how are you going to keep 'em down on the farm after they have seen Africa, Europe, Asia, the South Sea islands, and all other points of the compass?

Mr. PRICE. I agree, that some of these World War II veterans will be world travelers in every sense of the word and will have some difficulty in settling down after they return. However, many of them will be so tired of traveling that they will be only too glad to settle down to the peace and tranquillity of farm life. It is estimated that four-fifths of farm youth in service will return to farming and that there will be a considerable number of city youth, possibly too many, who have learned to like the great outdoors while in the Army and will want to take up farm life. Love for Mother Earth, love for animals and growing things, and a life of quiet independence, sort of gets into a man's bones, and a fellow who has spent most of his life on a farm and likes it doesn't change easily. Right now there is a noticeable trend away from the farm among veterans, however I do not believe that this will continue. I am inclined to think that there will be a back-to-the-farm movement after the end of the war.

Another reason is the loan feature of the GI bill which will make it possible for thousands of veterans to buy farms, and on better terms than anyone else has ever been able to buy. If a veteran can talk some Federal agency, such as the Farm Security Administration, into a first loan, the Veterans' Ad-

ministration will, under certain conditions, guarantee the entire amount of the second loan. The loan features of the GI bill should greatly stimulate farm ownership.

Mr. PAGE. Do you think that veterans should be urged to stay away from farming?

Mr. PRICE. I do not. There are about 1,000,000 farm youth in the armed services. Many of these should return to farm life. The World War II veteran represents the best brains, brawn, and skill in the country. Agriculture needs him. Let me put it this way: Farming is the lifeblood of the Nation, and by the end of the war it will need new blood—a transfusion. The returning veteran will furnish it. For many years now the farm has been losing many of its fine young men to the city.

In Wisconsin, for example, a survey made for Governor Goodland last year showed that in this State one-third of the 186,000 farmers are 55 or more years of age. The war over, the land-planning agencies figure that many of the 62,000 older farmers will want to retire; that some 50,000 farms will be for sale. Many of these farms are among the best in the State, so I would say that the outlook for the returning GI is good in Wisconsin. We expect to train some very fine farmers among the veterans. There is grave danger that prices may get out of hand and something may have to be done to prevent it.

Mr. PAGE. Of course, many veterans will take up training in jobs related to farming.

Mr. PRICE. Yes; we have veterans who are being trained as general farmers, dairy farmers, cheese makers, poultry farmers, bee keepers, dairy herdsmen, farm managers, agricultural agents, agricultural engineers, nurserymen, veterinarians, soil specialists, dairy testers, milk inspectors, teachers, plant pathologists, farm mechanics, implement salesmen, etc.

Wisconsin has many lakes and considerable State and United States forestry areas. We expect a considerable number of veterans will be interested in the various types of conservation jobs. There is also the great field of service occupations which serve the farmer.

Mr. PAGE. I understand that you have some veterans in training on the farm. Tell us about this method of training.

Mr. PRICE. That is right. So far, I believe that we have the only ones in the entire country.

Mr. PAGE. Just how are the selections made?

Mr. PRICE. We may find in counseling with the veteran that he has aptitude for farming, that he has a farm or knows of a farm which would provide the type of training needed and that he is the type of person who would profit more by personal instruction on the job than by going to school, or he may have finished a course at school and is now ready for practical instruction in farming.

Ours is an individualized program with special emphasis on what is best for the particular veteran. We send a training officer, who is a specialist in agriculture, to make a detailed survey of the proposed farm in order to determine whether it lends itself to a satisfactory training program.

We only approve family-size farms, that is, farms that are large enough and good enough to be economically sound from which he can earn a sufficient income to keep his family in comfort and health, to educate his children and to integrate himself into the community as a happy and useful citizen. We are opposed to putting veterans on so-called marginal land and oversized city lots of a few acres where they will later starve out when Government assistance is removed. We are also not in favor of colony farms for veterans. These were tried out after World War I, and were found very unsuccessful. I have reference to some of the "Veteransvilles" which were complete failures.

If the farm is approved, the training officer then prepares a detailed training program, listing the various farm operations in which he is to receive instruction. A budget is made up, and the veteran keeps detailed records of his income and outgo, as well as records of all of the things which he does while in training. We then arrange, under a contract with the State board for vocational and adult education, for the local Smith-Hughes agrictultural teacher to visit the veteran at least once each week and to give him personal instruction in the operation of the farm.

He also attends any courses given for local farmers, and uses the shop facilities of the local school. If possible, he attends one of the farm short courses held during the winter months at the university. He may also be provided with home study courses from the extension division of the University of Wisconsin. Books and magazines needed are furnished by the Veterans' Administration. The veteran is visited by a training officer from the Veterans' Administration once each month, who checks up on his progress and assists him with his training.

He is encouraged to take part in all community affairs, farmers' associations, etc., and become an integrated part of the community. We have a few veterans in this type of training who are doing exceptionally well. For example, a 25-year-old ex-private first class near Gleason, Wis., who is on a rented farm with 110 acres of tillable land and 200 acres of pasture. He has the beginning of a nice herd of dairy cattle.

Then we have a former paratrooper with a bad head injury in training on his father's farm near Appleton. Upon completion of training, he will take over the operation of the farm.

I also recall a veteran who found it impossible to adjust himself to university life because of a serious diabetic condition. A training project was set up for him on a farm near Wilton, Wis., where he was able to make good adjustment.

Another young veteran, with a crippled arm, near Menomonie has made wonderful progress and is about ready for rehabilitation. He has a fine dairy herd started and will do well on the farm he has purchased.

There are some people who contend that the only place to learn farming is on the farm. Ordinarily, we would prefer that the veteran take 1 or 2 years of instruction at a good agricultural school to be followed by training on the farm.

Mr. PAGE. I know that the University of Wisconsin has fine courses in agriculture for high-school graduates. Have courses been established for veterans who have less than a high-school education?

Mr. PRICE. Yes. Recently the University of Wisconsin restored its 2-year terminal courses in agriculture. We also have practical courses at Platteville and River Falls State Teachers Colleges. These two schools operate farms in connection.

Mr. PAGE. A few minutes ago you referred to training veterans to be farm mechanics. What are the possibilities along this line?

Mr. PRICE. The possibilities are very good. A survey made by the Implement Dealers Association last year showed that there was an acute shortage of farm mechanics. Every dealer needed one or more. Throughout the smaller towns there are good opportunities for all-around mechanics who can fix a tractor, a cream separator, do repairs to houses and barns, etc.

We have two such courses—one at the Racine Vocational School and the other at the Platteville State Teachers College. These are general courses which include blacksmithing, welding, machine-shop practice, woodwork, etc. Practical work is done on farm machinery in the community. The institutional training may be followed by training on the job, where they acquire the necessary skill to become expert mechanics.

A recent survey made by Prof. F. W. Duffee, chairman of the agricultural engineering school at the University of Wisconsin, showed that there are 19,840 farms in Wisconsin that were in need of major repairs to their buildings. He estimated that a total of $150,000,000 would be necessary to install such comforts as bathrooms, furnaces, electricity to make their homes modern and comfortable, so you see there is a splendid opportunity for well-trained veterans to go into business for themselves and sell their services to the farmers.

Mr. PAGE. Wisconsin is a great dairy State. Do you expect to train veterans for jobs related to this industry?

Mr. PRICE. Yes. It is expected that many of the veterans will find jobs of this kind. Some are being trained at college and some on the job. We have a former Air Corps sergeant who served in Africa and Italy. This veteran, after a short training period at the University of Wisconsin, now is in training on the job as a dairy herd tester with the Dairy Herd Improvement Association of Jefferson, Wis. Then we have a 28-year-old exsoldier who sustained a 30-percent leg injury in combat who is being trained as a milk inspector with the Cooperative Badger Consolidated Milk Plant at Shawano, Wis. Another 33-year-old veteran who came here from Germany at the age of 16 is being trained as a dairy herdsman with the Bo-Cann Farms at Fall River, Wis.

Mr. PAGE. Do you find some city-bred veterans who have a so-called romantic attachment to the farm?

Mr. PRICE. Yes. We do not approve a veteran for training as a farmer unless he had been raised on a farm, or has a very definite interest in being a farmer. Some people do not know how much hard work and how much skill is required in order to be a successful farmer. A very high degree of technical skill is needed nowadays. If married, we ascertain whether the wife likes farm life. This is very necessary inasmuch as the prospects of making a good farmer might be spoiled if he has a wife who would not be satisfied with life in the country.

Mr. PAGE. Are the various courses which you speak of open to veterans under the GI bill the same as for handicapped veterans, and where should veterans write or inquire who might be interested?

Mr. PRICE. The courses which I speak of are open to both types of trainees. World War II veterans should communicate with the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration in the State in which they are located. In Wisconsin the regional office is at Wood, with branch offices at Milwaukee, Eau Claire, Madison, and Green Bay.

Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over radio stations WJMS, Ironwood; WHDF, Calumet; WDMJ,

Marquette; and WDBC, Escanaba, May 4, 1945:

Friends and neighbors in the Twelfth District, during the last 4 years, 4 long years of war, all of us have made heavy sacrifices to bring the war to an end. We have worked and prayed as never before for victory and peace. Many of you have given sons or brothers or husbands to that cause. That sacrifice of life, the sacrifices still to come, must not be in vain. All of us must pay our debt to the dead and wounded who purchased victory for us so dearly.

We learned at bitter cost, after the last war, that peace is not easy. In many ways it is more difficult, more complex, and more uncertain than the waging of war. For 20 years, between the two World Wars, the enemies of peace haunted the capitals of the world unrecognized. This time we must be wiser. We must not be brought to the brink of disaster again by our refusal to recognize the causes of war.

Because of the widespread devastation abroad, of the total political and economic collapse of many countries, the job of peace will be almost unbelievably complex and difficult. It will demand tolerance and patience and understanding on the part of all of us.

Tonight I want to discuss with you one of the bills now before Congress which I believe will aid immeasurably in laying the foundation for a just and lasting peace. This is the Wagner-Spence bill, which incorporates the proposals of the so-called Bretton Woods agreement. This agreement, under the official title of the United Nations Monetary Conference, was signed last summer in the little New Hampshire town of Bretton Woods by delegates from the United States and from 43 other nations. It has been put into legislative form and introduced in the Senate by ROBERT WAGNER and in the House of Representatives by Congressman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky.

What the Bretton Woods agreement does is to lay the groundwork for jobs at home and peace abroad. Of course, the agreement standing by itself will not bring full employment at home nor prevent wars for all time. As our late President, Franklin Roosevelt, described it in his special message to Congress urging its enactment into law, the agreement is "the cornerstone for international economic cooperation." He called its proposals "part of a consistent whole, * * * a whole that is our hope for a secure and fruitful world."

A great deal of hocus-pocus has been written about the Bretton Woods agreement, and because most of us are pretty uninformed about international economics a lot of this hocus-pocus has been accepted as sound reasoning.

I think all of us are a little too inclined to let someone else worry about the things we consider to be over our heads. But this very timidity and "let George do it" attitude about this particular legislation is dangerous because the ratification or rejection of the Bretton Woods agreement by the Congress will touch our lives very intimately in the years after the end of the war. It is not only a bread-and-butter question for workers and consumers here in this country; it may very well contain the answer to the question of whether or not or when we fight World War III.

I don't believe there is very much doubt in anyone's mind now about the direct relationship between the great world depression of the thirties and the World War into which we were drawn in the first year of the forties.

In all of the great manufacturing countries of the world—including the greatest of them, the United States—production fell off almost to a standstill in the thirties. What this meant in the international field was a mad scramble for new markets, for greater exports and fewer imports.

Artificial respiration in the form of high tariffs, of currency devaluation, of trade quotas, and other devices to limit importation of foreign-made goods, was applied by the individual countries to revive their world markets. I don't have to tell you that these devices didn't work; their failure was felt in your own town—in mines shut down, in bank and business failures, in ghost towns.

Now, of course, this very unstable economic condition—we called it depression—was good business from the point of view of some banking interests who made profits from the frantic efforts of entire nations to adjust to the loss of their markets.

The international bankers and financiers did not lose on the bankrupt and abandoned business enterprises here and in most of the countries of the world. The people who lost were the men and women who were thrown out of jobs; the men and women who invested their savings in businesses that were swallowed up in the bottomless pit of world-wide depression.

World trade actually never did recover from the depression of the thirties. It has been for almost a decade now living on the goods of war. When the war is over, when shoes and blankets and automobiles, and corn and tobacco replace guns and tanks and planes in the cargo space going to Europe and all the ports of the world, we will be involved in the same cutthroat competition for markets unless plans are laid now to stabilize world trade. This stabilization must be through controls over the moneys and methods by which trade is conducted.

Before I go into the specific details of the agreement, I want to emphasize the over-all objectives of the nations who drew up the agreement.

Their first desire was to prevent the kind of financial and economic aggression that helped Germany and Japan build their military machines. What they sought was the creation of a healthy world economy in which the virus of economic piracy and tyranny could not survive; a world economy in which Germany could not drain the resources of weaker neighbor states to build her war machine, or in which Japan could not drive China to the point of inflationary collapse to feed her dreams of empire.

The agreement seeks to achieve a balance, not only in monetary terms but in terms of exchange of goods and materials so that nations and peoples may prosper and live together instead of fighting and dying together.

The Bretton Woods agreement does not provide a solution for all the economic conflicts among the countries of the world; in itself it is not a sure guarantee against war. But, because it sets up controls over one of the chief causes of war—economic rivalry—it is an important and necessary step toward permanent peace.

Essentially what the Bretton Woods agreement proposes is the creation of two international cooperative organizations; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund.

The purpose of the bank is to help the war-devastated countries of Europe and Asia in their programs of reconstruction. It is also designed to aid in the development of backward countries so that they may not be a drag on postwar world economy. The bank will function through long-term loans among nations.

These purposes of the bank make good sense from our point of view because, when our war-production program becomes a peace-production program after the war, this country will have to export something like $10,000,000,000 worth of goods if we are to have anything like full employment.

Most of the countries of the world have been stripped of their ability to pay for American goods unless they can borrow the money on a long-term basis. A great deal of this necessary borrowing for postwar purchases can be made through private banks and financiers, but firms in most of the countries that have been impoverished by long years of war cannot put up guaranties to secure private loans at a low rate of interest. This is the function of the bank. It will add its guarantee if the borrowing firm is sound, if its project is endorsed by the government of the country in which the firm is located, and if the rates of interest and amortization schedules are reasonable.

The bank may also make direct loans through selling its securities in a member country and lending directly to the borrowing firm, or it may lend directly from its paid-in capital.

The first function, however, that of guaranteeing private loans with reasonable rates and terms of payment, is its primary function and the one which will most widely be used.

The best example of working of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development that I can give is through a comparison I recently read of the bank with the Federal Housing Administration. The bank will operate in the international field of lending in almost exactly the way FHA has operated in home mortgaging in the United States.

In this way the necessary financing of reconstruction and rehabilitation of the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia can be done through private banking interests but without the risk to the private investor. The risk is assumed by the International Bank, and is mutually shared by all of its 44 members. Of course, while removing the element of risk to the investor, at the same time this plan removes the opportunity for unreasonable profit from the private bankers and financiers. This is the simple reason behind their objections to the plan.

The bank may also make direct loans through selling its securities in a member country and lending directly to either a borrowing country or private firm, or it may lend directly from its paid-in capital.

The first function, however, that of guaranteeing private loans with reasonable rates and terms of payment, is its primary purpose and the one which will be most widely utilized.

The capital of the bank will be subscribed to at agreed-upon quotas by all member countries. Of the total proposed capital of $9,100,000,000, the share assigned to the United States is $3,175,000,000. Of this amount only 10 percent is to be paid in at the outset, which means that the immediate investment of the United States would be $317,500,000,000.

As against the cost of war and economic anarchy, this figure does not represent a drop in the bucket.

The Monetary Fund set up by the Bretton Woods agreement creates machinery for the prevention of currency manipulation. Under its terms agreed to by the 44 nations, all member nations must set their currency valuation in terms of gold or the dollar, and they must abide by that valuation.

Because of the dislocations caused not only by the war but by the long period of economic chaos before the war, many countries do not have sufficient dollars or gold to pay for import goods and materials. They have not themselves been exporting and therefore do not have the moneys of the countries with whom they will now want to deal.

The fund will make it possible for them to buy or borrow on short-term notes limited amounts of foreign currencies or facilitate their foreign trade and will prevent artificial jockeying of money values. Money will not be, as it has been in the past, a commodity in itself but will be the means by which goods and materials can be purchased.

The important thing to realize is that this fund, agreed upon by 44 nations to protect themselves against artificial money manipulations, is protection against the chaotic international finances which permitted Germany and Japan to so maneuver their currencies that they could flood the world with cheap, useless gadgets while they purchased in exchange the materials of war. Of course, monetary policies alone were not responsible for the war machines of Germany and Japan, but they were a big factor in enabling these aggressor nations to prepare for war after they had made the political decision to make war.

The Bretton Woods agreement, I would like to reemphasize, is not the economic cure-all which will bring peace and prosperity to the world; nor is it the total answer to the why of war. It is an important beginning to achieving international accord in the economic field—the accord without which we cannot have peace.

The Situation at Trieste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I desire to call the attention of the House to a letter written by Frank E. Karelsen, Jr., published in the New York Times on May 28, 1945.

It is important to note that Mr. Karelsen was the representative of the World War I Peace Conference, who, following the last war, was ordered to Fiume and the surrounding country and charged with responsibility of investigating the political and social conditions and making a report to the Peace Conference.

Through this mission he became an authority on the situation at Fiume and Trieste, which again today is disturbing that section of the world and threatening the relations among the United Nations.

Mr. Karelsen's letter takes on greater significance, coming, as it does, out of this authoritative background. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is even more important because of its conclusions, in which I believe most Americans must concur. This Nation must retain its role of the independent mediator in disputes among the United Nations, friendly to all but a partisan of none. It was this position which our late great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, strove so hard to maintain. And it was this position which enabled the United States to act as a balance wheel in international affairs, to keep and preserve the unity and friendship between itself, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain, a unity and friendship even more vital today for the keeping of the peace.

The letter as published in the Times reads:

TRIESTE CONTROL ANALYZED—ACTION AFTER LAST WAR RECALLED IN CONNECTION WITH SEAPORT CITIES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We have all heard a great deal about Tito's army taking control of Trieste and Fiume. However, to see his actions in the proper perspective, a few facts about some happenings at the close of the last war should be recalled.

Immediately after the armistice of World War I the writer was ordered to Fiume and the surrounding country to investigate political and social conditions and report the findings back to the Peace Conference. He was to gather evidence which would throw light on whether Fiume and Trieste should belong to Italy or Yugolsvia.

The writer was the first American officer to enter Fiume and the neighboring country, and on his arrival there he found that the Italians had taken possession of the city and were suppressing, by every means known to dictatorship, Croatian or Yugoslav activities and political groups. His investigation showed that the people of Fiume and environs four or five to one wanted that city to belong to Yugoslavia, and that, economically, beyond question both Fiume and Trieste would be more prosperous and politically free if they did not belong to Italy. All of this was reported back to the Peace Conference, and that Conference decided Fiume should belong to Yugoslavia, and that Trieste, while under Italian sovereignty, should be an open city.

Through machinations of various kinds, the Italians never left Fiume and never paid any attention to the decision of the Peace Conference in regard to either city, so that Yugoslavia, by waiting for the decision of the Peace Conference, lost what this time she does not wish to lose.

REASON FOR DISTRUST

When the writer revisited Fiume and Trieste in 1926 he found that they were literally dead cities. Trieste, which under Austria was a thriving seaport, under the Italians lost nearly all of its commerce and industry. The wharves were empty, and blocks of the city buildings and stores were deserted. Many streetcar lines were abandoned, and the population had diminished substantially. The reasons were obvious. As a seaport neither Fiume nor Trieste had any value to Italy. The tariffs and economic controls were such that Yugoslavia and Austria were deprived of the use of these cities, and, geogrpahically, Venice, Ancona, Brindisi, Genoa, etc., were far better located for Italy's needs. In fact, neither Fiume nor Trieste was of any commercial use to Italy whatsoever.

It is little wonder, therefore, that this time (especially since she has Russia's sympathy) Yugoslavia should desire to pursue an entirely different course and not trust the decisions of the Peace Conference.

It should be remembered that in the last war the Croatians and Yugoslavs helped materially in bringing about the peace by their revolt against Germany. This time Italy was on the other side of the conflict and has caused a tremendous loss of life to the Allies, while Tito and his forces have sacrificed enormously for the Allied cause. It is not surprising, therefore, if Yugoslavia should be very much aggrieved if she does not this time get possession of these cities.

These seaports are absolutely vital to the commercial life of Yugoslavia and would also be valuable to Russia, if Yugoslavia should be under the sphere of influence of Russia. For centuries Russia has desired a warm-water seaport, and for those same centuries England has maneuvered to keep this away from her or from any country under her sphere of influence.

In this, as in other matters where British and Russian interests conflict, the position of the United States should be neither pro-Russian nor pro-British, nor anti-Russian nor anti-British, but we should be guided by the justice of the claims presented and their influence on future peace.

FRANK E. KARELSEN, Jr.

NEW YORK, *May 23, 1945.*

Maritime War Bonuses Must Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me, I include a statement which I presented to the Maritime War Emergency Board on Thursday, May 31, 1945. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I respectfully submit the following statement to supplement the statement made on my behalf and at my request by my secretary, Mr. H. Richard Seller, at the hearing held before your honorable board May 12, 1945. I fully concur in Mr. Seller's statement. However, at that time, Mr. Seller requested that I be permitted to file an additional statement in writing upon my return to Washington, and this request was granted. I appreciate the opportunity thus extended me.

As a former merchant seaman—a marine fireman in 1926 and 1927—I have a deep interest in the welfare of our merchant marine, and I know of my own personal knowledge of the advances which have been made in the past 10 years and of the real needs of the merchant seamen which have only begun to be met under the so-called war bonus during this war.

War bonuses have now become part of the seaman's take-home pay. It is not now a question of whether the risks are lesser or greater, but of how anxious America is to keep a loyal, courageous, and skilled a body of seamen as any nation ever had able to afford to continue working in the United States merchant marine.

According to the statement announced by the War Shipping Administration, the unions, and the operators, war-risk compensation was always considered as an aid in the prosecution of the war. To quote the statement's language, "In order to afford a procedure for settling questions relating to war-risk compensation and insurance * * * such questions shall be settled in such manner as shall most certainly assist in the prosecution of the war."

Now that we expect complete triumph over the last of our enemies, we are surely not indifferent to our peacetime merchant marine strength. If we turned to war bonuses to aid the prosecution of the war, there is no principled reason why, in approaching peacetime, we may not find an equivalent means to maintain whatever level of skilled employment the Nation deems advisable in its merchant marine.

As Senator BARKLEY said on the Senate floor, commemorating Maritime Day, May 21, "Today our merchant marine is manned by resolute seamen. If we allow the conditions of employment to slip back to pitiful levels, as we did following the last war, we shall perforce make the ships a haven for the shiftless and irresponsible. We cannot build a powerful merchant marine on low wages, poor food, dirty fo'c'sles and archaic employment practices.

"For the first time in the history of the American merchant marine, the earnings of American seamen have, during the course of the war, approached the standards of American industrial workers. This has enabled our seamen to marry and have homes. Today the majority of our seamen have dependents. They must be assured continued adequate compensation for their difficult and hazardous work * * *."

On May 22 my colleague the distinguished majority leader of the House, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said:

"Though faced with sharp reductions in take-home pay through readjustments in the war bonuses, a problem which must be met with the establishment of an adequate minimum wage for seamen, though faced with longer periods away from home than ever before and with Japanese savagery and ferocity, every ship will be manned and our fighting men shall not want for supplies."

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, my colleague from Washington, added:

"The questions of adequate wages, working conditions, health standards, and social-security protection, the maintenance of training and upgrading facilities, the establishment of orderly methods of entrance and exit to the industry are all of as grave importance in the future of the American merchant marine as ship-sale policy.

"In 1937 the newly established United States Maritime Commission made an economic survey of the American merchant marine. Referring to the last World War, the survey said:

" 'During the war thousands of fine young Americans were brought from every section of the country to man the vessels acquired by the Shipping Board. They learned quickly, demonstrating that American seamen, given decent working conditions and proper encouragement, are the equal of any.'

"The experience of the last few years has closely paralleled previous history. Entering the war with a maritime labor force of approximately 55,000, less than 4 years later, we have over 225,000 skilled and courageous merchant seamen delivering the goods in time.

"Referring to the postwar World War I period again, the Maritime Commission's economic survey continued:

" 'Then came the era of liquidation when the Government began to withdraw from shipping. Lines were one by one discontinued or turned over to private enterprise. Wages fell and working conditions grew steadily worse until at the depth of the depression some American seamen were receiving as little as $25 a month, living under wretched conditions, eating unpalatable food, and working 12 hours or more a day. The result of such conditions was bound to be disastrous. Many of our young men left the sea, never to return. Questionable elements filtered into the ranks of our seafarers. The men grew bitter and desperate. An explosion was bound to occur.'

"That explosion did occur and the maritime industry was in constant eruption for a number of years. We want no repetition of such history. We have learned at sorrowful loss to the Nation of the imperative need for an adequate, modern, and efficient merchant fleet and for the skilled manpower to operate that fleet.

"The American seamen, through the maritime unions, have established an excellent wartime record of manning the vessels without delay, of speeding turn-around, and of solving in orderly and cooperative fashion the many difficulties confronting them. They have advanced as their goal a minimum program which I am sure has the wholehearted support of the American people. The American seaman is asking for wages and working standards which are comparable to those afforded shore-side workers who have generally fared better during the war period, having been exposed to none of the grave risks of the maritime profession, and have suffered none of the unpleasantness of separation from home and family."

It should be quite clear to the Board that the question of any action on revision downward of the war bonuses at this time would not "certainly assist in the prosecution of the war."

There is no doubt in my mind that the war bonus was intended and, in fact, has become an integral part of the take-home pay of merchant seamen. This is borne out by the fact that steamship companies and unions had negotiated and arrived at wage increases prior to the war which were called "war bonuses." They also negotiated and agreed upon coverage on dangers inherent in the global war. This was reflected in a war risk insurance coverage which later was taken over by the Government. This war-risk policy has been administered under what is known as the first and second war-risk insurance policies. Congress has dealt with this war-risk coverage on two occasions, first in Public Law 17 and second, Public Law 449.

Congress now has before it H. R. 2346, a bill which gives further coverage to war risk as such by permitting an extension of the benefits of war-risk insurance policies.

When we consider that the basic wage of skilled merchant seamen in a majority of cases is less than 40 cents an hour, there can no longer be any doubt that the so-called war bonus was a wage increase given to maintain a labor supply.

Depriving the loyal and skilled men of the merchant marine of their war bonuses now, before an adequate adjustment in their base pay can be made through the normal channels of collective bargaining, would have two deplorable results:

1. We would lose many of our merchant seamen because the pressure of simple existence for them and their families would be too great to allow them longer to remain at their jobs. This would impede the prosecution of the war and the transfer of needed men and supplies from one war theater to another.

2. We would have set the stage for the identical chaotic condition in which our merchant marine found itself following the last war.

Both these results can be offset by your Board if you do not revise the war bonus downward until a satisfactory basic wage adjustment has been approved by the War Labor Board. Even then, any downward revision should not exceed the upward revision in basic wages approved.

I am certain that your Board is also well aware that the licensed officers' agreements cannot be opened until 6 months after the war. Any decision to revise the bonus downward should, therefore, not be made until the War Labor Board has agreed to the reopening of these agreements.

Since the war risk insurance coverage was designed to protect merchant seamen against the dangers inherent in war, I respectfully recommend to the Board's consideration the revision of this coverage to meet all contingencies.

I have carefully considered this matter and feel certain that your Board, giving as I know it will your fullest attention to this vital matter, will agree that in the interest of the war effort and the future of our merchant marine, no downward revision in the war bonus should be made until and unless upward revision is similarly made in the basic wage rates of our men of the merchant marine.

If the program I have outlined is followed, it will relieve the economic hardships of the seamen, make for a bona fide war risk coverage and assure a manpower supply sufficient to man the ships for the duration of the war. In addition it will contribute in large measure to the strength of our merchant marine in the postwar era.

A Good Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding job of war-bond salesmanship. The newspaper carrier boys in San Jose, Calif., who did the job are entitled to the highest praise and commendation. Following is a letter which I have just received from Thomas F. Kilmartin, field representative of the War Finance Committee of the Treasury Department, setting forth in full detail just how the highly desirable results were accomplished:

MAY 29, 1945.

SAN JOSE CARRIER BOYS SELL OVER $300,000 IN E BONDS

In a prewar bond drive, 250 San Jose Mercury Herald and Evening News carriers established an amazing record in selling nearly 10 percent of San Jose's E bond quota before the Seventh War Loan drive officially opened on May 14. Given a quota of $300,000 by the War Finance Committee, under the chairmanship of John O'Keeffe, these newspaper boys proved their ability as topnotch salesmen by exceeding their quota over $15,000.

The idea of carrier boys selling bonds was originated through their circulation director, Donald W. Farmer, who foresaw great possibilities of 250 well-trained little merchant carriers in an all-out drive to cover nearly 25,000 homes in San Jose during their monthly collection period to sell at least one E bond to each of their subscribers.

The two papers, with the cooperation of Mr. William McLaughlin, manager of the Pioneer Investors Savings and Loan Association, who also officiated as a cosponsor in the promotion of this carrier drive, laid very comprehensive plans for this city-wide coverage with grand prizes and special awards for recognition for the high bond sellers in each district.

The city was divided into 10 districts with 25 carriers comprising a district, and each district was supervised and managed by a full-time district manager. Vacation trips of 10 days' duration were awarded to the highest bond sellers in each district. This trip, with all expenses paid, to the YMCA camp in the Santa Cruz mountains, also included spending money for the boys. War bonds in the amount of $200,000 were awarded to other high carriers throughout the city.

Special recognition in the form of merit award certificates were awarded all carriers who sold five or more E bonds; and, in addition, every carrier who sold one or more E bonds was the guest of the newspapers and the savings and loan association at a special theater party.

How successful this prewar bond drive was was explained by Mr. Farmer, who claims that over 6,000 individual bonds were sold during the drive from May 1 to May 10, inclusive. Over $315,000, or nearly 10 percent of San Jose's E bond quota, was subscribed through these loyal carrier boys. This is proof of our belief in the success of this enterprise.

"E bonds were easy to sell to my customers," says William Welker, grand city champion,

who sold 161 individual bonds totaling $21,000 in cash. "All of my subscribers realize the importance of backing the mighty Seventh War Loan bond drive, so I just refused to take 'no' for an answer from any of my subscribers."

Richard Carmichael, second high carrier in the city, used the positive approach in selling nearly 150 individual bonds in the amount of $23,125. "You are going to buy an extra bond during the Seventh War Loan drive, so why not buy that bond from me, your Mercury Herald carrier boy."

Every known method of stimulating a desire to buy was employed by all carriers in selling bonds, as all boys received daily instructions in the form of pep bulletins or bond rallies by well-trained district managers. Very few, if any, boys resorted to the usual approach, "Would you like to buy a bond from me?"

Such approaches were common: "Good evening, Mr. Jones; my name is James White, your San Jose News carrier. I have something of importance to explain to you. May I step inside, please?" Gaining admittance, his message was in form of explaining the value of backing the Seventh War Loan drive to the limit by buying at least one extra bond from him.

By knowing their paper boys through monthly contacts during their collection periods, all subscribers greeted their boys with cordiality, and all were anxious to help their own carrier boy win a vacation trip or a bond prize.

To help stimulate additional interest throughout the city during this prebond drive, local banks and building and loan associations offered their facilities to our subscribers in the form of purchasing bonds at their local institutions and, upon their request, the carrier boy would receive his due credit. In addition, a daily booth in the front office of the local newspapers, with two girls in full-time employment, was offered for the benefit of the public as well.

During the campaign, many of the live and energetic carriers who were striving for leadership throughout the city operated and maintained their own hand-built display booths in the downtown areas, and thousands of dollars in bonds were sold through this medium.

As an indication of the tremendous response and interest displayed by various organizations throughout the city of San Jose, the Santa Clara Valley Shrine Luncheon Club, in one of their local luncheons, subscribed wholeheartedly to support the carrier war bond drive by all pledging to buy an additional one from their carrier.

Daily publicity and pictures were graciously given by the publisher of both papers for the purpose of helping stimulate the carrier drive, and contributed much toward the success of the boys reaching their quota.

In recognition for oversubscribing their quota, the 10 high boys in the city were asked to participate in a spearhead of the Santa Clara bond drive, which officially opened on May 20. These boys were given the opportunity to participate in this bond rally from the stage of the theater; and, through their efforts, they helped sell over $10,000 in the opening bond rally in the city of Santa Clara.

This is an indication of a great response from the general public as to their feelings toward the grand job done by a small group of boys numbering just 250. The enclosed letters were received by Mr. Donald W. Farmer, circulation director, from members of the war finance committee, the chamber of commerce, and chairman of the Seventh War Loan drive; and, in all cases, they were unsolicited, which gives further proof of the feeling and the success of this campaign in San Jose.

I wish also to include with my remarks a letter from the Treasury Department confirming the fact that the San Jose carrier boys made a significant contribution to the county's war effort. The success of this bond-selling campaign sets a pattern that might well be followed elsewhere in the country during future war loan campaigns. I am happy to join with others in congratulating the boys for a good job well done:

MAY 30, 1945.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Your letter of May 25, addressed to Secretary Morgenthau concerning the unique San Jose (Calif.) Mercury-Herald and Evening News carrier boys' seventh war loan campaign, has been referred to me for reply.

Due to their newspaper carrier training, the circulation manager of the San Jose Mercury-Herald & News, Mr. Don W. Farmer, was certain his boys would make excellent war-bond salesmen, and, in April 1945, with the cooperation of Mr. Thomas Kilmarten, the local war finance chairman, a war-bond sales school was started for the carriers. A goal of $300,000, to be reached during their collection period which ran from the 1st to the 10th of May, was set. The carriers used the regular E bond application form, collected all payments for the bonds, and issued receipts therefor.

Every home in San Jose was contacted during this period. When the final returns were tabulated May 14, it was found that the 250 newspaper boys of the San Jose Mercury-Herald & Evening News had exceeded their goal by $15,000, making a grand total of $315,000 in E bonds sold in this 10-day effort. Mr. Farmer reports that, instead of diminishing E bond sales during the "mighty seventh," which began May 14, this prewar-loan activity increased war loan consciousness in the community of San Jose.

This is but one of the many War Savings stamp sales campaigns which the newspaper boys of this country have made a success. Their activities are not generally special spurts and large sales, but their all-together sales total is the result of consistent, small sales, the result of steady plugging, in bad weather and good, week after week. It is their constant contact with the home-delivery subscriber, their continuously unswerving loyalty, which has contributed so generously to the war-financing effort—approximately 10 percent of all the war stamps sold.

The carriers of over 900 daily newspapers in the United States started functioning as war-financing agents, even before Pearl Harbor, in the newspaper boys' War Savings stamp sales program, and as of May 30, 1945, the 150,000 newspaper boys of America have sold more than one and one-half billion, or to be exact, 1,630,325,667 10-cent War Savings stamps or their equivalent.

It is expected that before VJ-day their total sales will exceed two billion 10-cent War Savings stamps.

Sincerely yours,

TED R. GAMBLE,
National Director, War Finance Division.

The Western Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to the needs of the Western States for a satisfactory Government policy in connection with the great steel facilities which have been erected in California and Utah.

We of the West are not asking any special privilege when we urge the orderly transfer of $300,000,000 worth of Government-financed steel facilities to private ownership which is dedicated to providing steel to the new industries of the West on a basis of cost of production plus a reasonable profit. Rather, we are urging that discrimination against the West, and against the growth of western industry, be halted in the interest of the entire Nation.

Hundreds of thousands of men and women have come to the Pacific coast to work in our great war industries and to make the West their home. We do not have a problem of reconversion on the Pacific coast. Ours is a problem of converting our wartime industry to a new and greater peacetime industry.

We of the West take seriously the program of full employment. We do not intend, if it is humanly possible—and we believe that it is possible—to have unemployment greet the men and women of war production who are doing such a tremendous job today in the cities and towns of the West. Yet much of the West's future—and the future of our full employment program—will be decided within the next several months as we determine the future of our Government-financed plants and facilities in both steel and light metals.

It is a privilege to include with these remarks the able statement of the steel committee of the Western States Council, a voluntary federation of chambers of commerce in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. This first report of the steel committee, developed at a meeting of the committee in Los Angeles on May 11, details the steel situation in the West and offers some sound suggestions. The report reads:

REPORT OF THE STEEL COMMITTEE, WESTERN STATES COUNCIL

In order to make full use of the natural resources of the West and to efficiently supply the industries of the West during the war, the Federal Government has, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Defense Plant Corporation, financed the construction of steel mills at Geneva, Utah, and Fontana, Calif.

To erect the two new plants during the war, the Federal Government has spent approximately $300,000,000. This is an investment of the people of the United States made primarily to help win a war. The extent to which this investment can make a permanent contribution to the economic welfare of the Nation has become a matter of public interest and concern.

The measure of such a contribution is the extent to which the new plants at Geneva and Fontana can furnish to steel-consuming industries in their logical markets (the West) a more abundant and a lower cost supply of steel.

In order to determine whether or not these new Government-financed plants can play such a part in the civilian economy of the Nation, businessmen of the West, through the Western States Council, a voluntary federation of chambers of commerce in the

States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, met in Salt Lake City, Utah, on February 12 and 13, 1945.

At a conference concerned with developing facts on the subject of western steel, these businessmen heard representatives of railroads, western industry, government, technicians, economists, and a United States Senator from the State of Maine present factual reports. It is worthy of note that neither representatives of steel-producing companies operating the Government-financed mills nor officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Defense Plant Corporation appeared before the conference.

Reports made at this meeting were factual. Full opportunity for discussion of the facts presented was afforded and took place. The conference was truly democratic in form and spirit. Full publicity given to the conference resulted in unanimous approval in the daily papers and trade press of the character of the reports and discussions.

At the conclusion of the conference an all-western committee was appointed to study the facts presented and was instructed to meet after the development of further factual information, and adopt a program of action and place it in effect.

None of the members of this committee are officers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, nor the Defense Plant Corporation, nor the corporations operating the two Government-financed steel mills of prime interest in the subject of study. The committee, on the other hand, is truly representative of western industry and commerce.

The committee developed further facts through staff employees, standard sources of facts on the steel industry, consulting engineers, business records of its own members, figures of the United States Department of Commerce, research departments of steel-producing companies, trade papers, and personal consultation with acknowledged experts on the subject under examination. The committee also consulted with local auxiliary committees in San Francisco and Los Angeles, Calif., representing jointly, 80 of the leading steel-consuming industrial plants of the West.

The steel committee of the Western States council met at the call of its chairman in Los Angeles on May 11, 1945. Based upon the facts developed from the best sources available to it, the committee adopted the following program and plan of action. The committee further ordered that its chairman and secretary present this program to Congressmen and Senators, from the 11 Western States, the governors of these States, Federal Government agencies of direct interest, newspapers, and the trade press, the steel industry of the Nation, and the committee further pledged itself to work for the adoption of this program.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. During the war, manufacturing operations have expanded tremendously throughout the West. The population of the West, particularly in California, Oregon, and Washington, has been greatly increased since 1940. The percentage of workers engaged in manufacturing operations has likewise increased. A large portion of the newcomers are employed in the shipbuilding and aircraft industries, neither of which is expected to maintain present high levels of employment in the postwar period. Employment must be found for these workers, and this will require a substantial increase in the manufacture of peacetime goods, particularly in the field of metal products. Both the plants and the workers are here and they must be used in the manufacture of products never before made in the West as well as through the enlargement of markets for the products formerly made here.

To accomplish this objective, the greatest single contributing factor will be the elimination of the premium paid by western steel buyers during the prewar period over prices paid in other industrial centers of the Nation.

2. The Geneva and Fontana plants together with the plants operating in the 11 Western States in the prewar period and wartime additions to those plants have a combined annual production capacity of 4,613,160 tons. From this figure should be deducted 801,120 tons of railroad products sold by Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., of Pueblo, Colo., to railroads of the West and Midwest, leaving a total of 3,812,040 tons of steel for industrial, commercial, and construction purposes. Estimates of postwar steel consumption in the 7 Western States published by the United States Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning indicate a total of 3,675,000 tons annually. Adding to this the prewar annual exports of steel to countries in the Pacific area, Alaska, and Hawaii, averaging 1,010,125 tons, we reach an authoritative estimate of 4,685,125 tons annual steel consumption based entirely on prewar market demand. A more competitive price on steel than existed prewar will permit the manufacture of products not previously made in the West.

Considering the prewar demand, plus the potential increase which would result from a lower price on steel, the committee is confident that the plants at Geneva and Fontana can operate at a level of production as high, or higher, than the average for the steel industry as a whole.

3. The new war-built steel-producing plants at Geneva, Utah, and Fontana, Calif., should be operated under private ownership. The transfer of title of the Geneva mill or final determination of settlement of Kaiser's obligation to the RFC should be made as soon as possible in order that both properties may be kept in continuous operation.

Because a considerable investment must be made in each plant for alterations and additions before the plants can properly serve the western market, we believe that the plants should not be leased. These investments certainly would not be made by a lessee of property owned by the Government and should not be made by the Government for the benefit of a lessee.

The sale contract of the Government-owned mill at Geneva and the adjustment of the loan at Fontana should include statements of the price policy to be put in effect by the mill owners. That price policy should be based upon production costs plus a reasonable profit and should not include "phantom freight" arbitraries, or other factors not related to actual costs.

4. Both the Geneva and Fontana mills were constructed during wartime when costs were much higher than normal. Furthermore, these plants were built primarily for the production of plates and structural shapes for the shipbuilding industry. Substantial alterations and additions will be necessary before either mill can produce the diversified products necessary to properly serve the western market.

While the Geneva plant is owned by a Federal Government subsidiary and the Fontana plant is encumbered by a mortgage of another Federal Government subsidiary, the capital investment has been made by the people of the United States in both instances. If the Federal Government should attempt to realize its full investment in the Geneva plant and insist upon full payment of the mortgage on the Fontana plant, these mills would undoubtedly remain idle because the capital investment per ton of rated capacity would not permit operation in a competitive market.

We believe that a fair value for the sale of Geneva can be established by the following method:

(a) Estimate the fair value of the plant after necessary alterations and additions will have been made to equip it for the manufacture of the diversified products necessary to properly serve the western market.

(b) Deduct the cost of such alterations and additions.

(c) The remainder would represent the maximum amount which the Government should expect to realize from the sale of the plant.

Even after arriving at a sale price by the method suggested, further consideration must be given to the invested capital per ton of rated capacity which would then exist as compared to the average of the steel industry.

The adjustment of the loan made to construct the Fontana plant should bear such a relation to the disposal price of the Geneva plant that neither plant will have an advantage over the other from the standpoint of capital cost to the private owner.

5. In general the price for different types of steel in Pacific coast markets has reflected the basing point prices in the eastern steel production centers plus an amount which was approximately equal to the all-water transportation costs from Atlantic or Gulf ports. This Pacific coast price has in general been from $10 to $15 more per ton than in the eastern steel production centers. In the past these prices have been paid by western buyers of steel for steel produced in and delivered by eastern mills and also for steel produced in western plants. As a consequence, western manufacturers and fabricators have paid prices for steel that limited their ability to market products made from steel to definitely restricted market areas. We are convinced that even though the Federal Government were to place the new western steel mills in the hands of private owners at a capital cost comparable to eastern steel mills, a continuation of the present steel-pricing formula by steel-producing companies would deprive the industries and consuming public of the West of the advantages they should receive in the transfer of these properties, publicly financed, to private ownership. In placing these properties in the hands of private owners, the Federal Government should properly evaluate the effect of the recent Supreme Court decision in the case of the *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* relating to basing point price systems which attorneys advised this committee, has direct bearing on the prewar and present pricing system applied in the sale of steel to western buyers.

We wish to point out also that under present OPA price regulations the Pacific coast pays the highest prices in the Nation for basic steel products and that the OPA's price ceilings include the described steel-pricing formulas. We recommend that the steel-producing companies establish at the earliest possible date western prices on steel based upon cost of production at, and transportation from, western mills, plus a reasonable profit instead of basing the western price on eastern prices plus real or arbitrary charges.

6. This committee recognizes that delivered prices for steel must include transportation costs. Even though competitive capital and operating costs are established in the war-built western steel mills, transportation rates could prevent their successful operation. A basing-point price at the Geneva mill equivalent to that in effect at Sparrows Point, Md., would not result in lower delivered costs to Pacific Coast users because the freight rate from Geneva to the Pacific coast ($12 per ton) is almost identical to the rate for water transportation from Sparrows Point in effect prewar.

For the Geneva mill to operate in the postwar period, the freight rates on finished steel from the mill to western markets must be substantially reduced, and this must be done in advance of the disposition of the mill.

7. Studies of this committee as to the possible production costs at Geneva and Fontana lead to the conclusion that our objective of lower western steel prices with the attendant

beneficial effect upon the industrial growth of the West can and must be attained.

CONCLUSION

We seek new markets for the products of the West in order to employ the workers who have come here to live, and in order to furnish opportunity for returning servicemen. We do not seek special privilege or competitive advantages to which we are not entitled.

We believe that a pattern for the disposition of Government-owned plants throughout the Nation can be established by the settlement of the western steel situation where the approach to the subject is made on the basis of a united desire to serve the entire economy of a region.

We believe that the element of time is important; we are ready to make definite postwar plans and material requirement commitments; bidders for the Geneva steel mill have signified their interest in purchasing or leasing the property; owners of the Fontana mill have publicly stated their desire to stay in the steel business; some of the western railroads have made public statements regarding rail rates; the question of basing-point prices is before the courts and the Federal Trade Commission; war requirements for a sizable portion of the Geneva and Fontana mills are definitely declining; expansion or alteration plans of other western steel mills are being held in abeyance.

These matters can all be resolved around the common objective of the orderly transfer of $300,000,000 worth of Government-financed property to private ownership as the basis for a permanent western industry serving all of the people of the West on a truly competitive basis.

The foregoing report and program of action was adopted Friday, May 11, 1945, by the Steel Committee of the Western States Council whose membership is composed of the following: Kenneth T. Norris, chairman, president, Norris Stamping and Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; R. N. Allen, Star Iron & Steel Co., Tacoma, Wash.; Gus P. Backman, secretary, Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah; Clark D. Carpenter, professor of metallurgy, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.; F. T. Letchfield, consulting engineer and assistant vice president, Wells-Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Charles E. Moore, president, Joshua Hendy Co., San Francisco, Calif.; A. T. Peterson, president, Montanans, Inc., Helena, Mont.; Alden Roach, president, Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Los Angeles, Calif.; William M. Schmitt, president, Schmitt Steel Co.; Portland, Oreg.; John R. Simplot, president, Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho; E. L. Soule, president, Soule Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Milo B. Spaich, general manager, American Forge Co., Berkeley, Calif.; Clyde Summerville, Seattle Steel Co., Inc., Seattle, Wash.; Charles Voight, president, Stearns-Roger Manufacturing Co., Denver, Colo.; John M. Wallace, president, Walker Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; James F. Bone, secretary-manager, Industrial department, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif.; Morris B. Pendleton, president, Plomb Tool Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

American Slav Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a speech by the Honorable Edward E. Kelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, at the Midwest Conference of the American Slav Congress on the occasion of the third annual conference held in Chicago, April 29, 1945. Mayor Kelly's speech follows:

I am happy and proud to be here because it brings back many fine memories. These are solemn days. We still have heavy sorrow in our hearts at the loss of the greatest man of our century.

We know of and appreciate the work of the American Slav Congress, which did such a great job in supporting the President and also myself as mayor. You and I think alike—we are thinking of our fellow men. We want to see a happy, prosperous world for everyone and all men living as brothers. Your meeting on this occasion is of great importance to these goals; you are asking for the unity and cooperation of the great countries of the world, of all the peace-loving nations, which is the only way we can possibly stop all wars forever and make a lasting peace.

We might at this time reminisce a little because you and I took a little punishment during the last few years for believing that the rest of the world concerned us, and what happened in any country might affect all of us. We were called warmongers by the isolationists—our great President Roosevelt was pilloried from Maine to California because he knew that this was our war. You remember what a narrow escape the Selective Service Act had, being renewed by one vote. We will never forget the dedication of the Outer Drive Bridge in 1937, when I was chairman and the President called for quarantining the aggressor nations. If it had not been for the foresight of the great President of the United States, the Nazis would have easily walked into England and into Russia.

Our President was the greatest man our country ever produced—democratic, strong and mighty—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was a man who loved humanity; who worked to protect labor, children, and all mankind.

This country has a great opportunity in assuring the success of the San Francisco Conference which will establish the unity of all nations, and a lasting peace on the principles that Roosevelt worked and died for. Roosevelt died on the battlefield, figuratively speaking, for our victory and an organization to maintain the peace.

You and I realize that those were not lies when we heard of the brutality of the Germans. I couldn't believe it, but I do believe it now. These acts of brutality are coming out of a country which was supposed to be civilized and which produced men who were looked up to by the rest of the world for their mental achievements. I just received a letter from my nephew, a chaplain in the Third Army fighting in Germany, in which he says that he saw with his own eyes a pit in which 3,800 people were tied together and stacked like wheat and burned to death. Those Germans are the people we are wiping off the earth. Those are the people who should be wiped off the earth.

Countries have been brought closer together, due to air transportation. When this war is over, we can fly to Great Britain in 11 hours—that is just the length of time it takes to fly across our country. We know we can't be fighting with each other—we must have unity of nations.

I have the greatest faith in President Truman who has already declared that he will follow in the footsteps of the great President Roosevelt. I am proud to be the one who nominated him for Vice President at the last convention here in Chicago at the Stadium, for I knew at that time what kind of a man he was.

I don't think we should celebrate the European victory while our boys are dying in the Pacific. Let's wait for complete victory and have a real celebration. I hope and pray that the war will be over soon and our boys will be back here, seated at our tables.

Years back in 1940, President Roosevelt told me that he could not run again, because he was a detail man and keeping up with the many details of his work would kill him. He did not want the third term. I spent an evening with him and I told him that, with all due respect, so what? Many lives were at stake—our boys' lives—and if things went wrong because he was not President, he would never forgive himself. The very next day, President Roosevelt announced that he was running for the third term. He went in with his eyes wide open, knowing that he might lose his life.

Roosevelt always considered that you were his friends and thought as he did. He always asked me about the Slav Congress and what your organizations were doing whenever I saw him. You know, unofficially he was a sponsor of the American Slav Congress. He knew that he could count on your support and backing. He always held the American Slav Congress as an example of unity and the cooperation he wanted and needed from the American people.

The important thing for your organization to do is to continue to preach the gospel of unity, preach the gospel of decency, preach the gospel of Roosevelt—and when you preach that gospel, you will be preaching the gospel of God.

Address of Hon. Luis Muñoz-Marín, President of the Senate of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESÚS T. PINERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a speech made over the Columbia Broadcasting network by the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, President of the Senate of Puerto Rico on Saturday, May 26, 1945.

Senator Muñoz-Marín came to Washington as head of a joint commission of the insular legislature to testify before the Senate Insular Affairs Committee on a bill introduced by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, which would give Puerto Rico outright independence.

The Commission, in a statement to the committee printed in the RECORD of Monday, May 14, 1945, opposed the bill as presented, and acting on a mandate of the insular legislature proposed a bill defining various types of permanent political status which might be possible for Puerto Rico and which would permit the Puerto Rican people to choose one of them, on the basis of a plebiscite.

The new bills, S. 1002 and H. R. 3237, are discussed by Senator Muñoz-Marín in this speech:

The future peace of the world depends to an important degree on the solution or solutions that may be found to the colonial problem. It also depends, to a still greater degree, on the prestige of the United States among the peoples of the world—on the confidence that the common man everywhere

shall continue to have in the human understanding and the democratic sincerity of the American people.

It is of the utmost importance to democracy that the United States shall not cease to be the champion of democratic rights in the minds of men and women everywhere. It is clear that our great ally Russia is making a bid for that confidence and that trust which have been the traditional heritage of the United States. Of course, Russia's attitude in this respect should not be unwelcome. There is no such thing as too much good will, as too much recognition of rights and liberties. The world certainly needs as much of that as it can get from all possible sources. But certainly Russia's attitude should not be allowed to displace and substitute the traditional American attitude, but only to complement it and support it. Russia's developing international liberalism would appear best in its proper place, that is, as a follower of the tradition that the United States has made its own these many years.

In the treatment of colonies and of otherwise dependent peoples, the United States has an eminent field for sustaining, strengthening, and developing its policy for a good, for a confidence inspiring, for a lasting peace under the principles that have reared the national greatness of the American people.

I am proud to say that in this respect my own country, Puerto Rico, which has contributed without stint to the war effort, is now making what is perhaps a still more important contribution to the peace effort. Puerto Rico is a Caribbean island-country of 2,000,000 people which came under the jurisdiction of the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War almost half a century ago. Puerto Rico is a colony of the United States. It is a colony, it is true, that has been administered in a mild, though not always intelligible way, by the United States Government. But it is a colony. It is what each of the original Thirteen States were before 1776; basically its government does not derive its powers from the consent of the governed. That is, by the time-honored definition written by Jefferson, what colonialism means to the American mind; and by that definition, Puerto Rico is a colony of the United States. Puerto Rico is also a very poor country in its economic geography. It has but 3,500 square miles of territory. Half of its land is not arable, much of the rest is not of very good quality; there is not much mineral wealth under that land, and 2,000,000 people, that is 560 persons per square mile, must make their living from the top of that land. In order for so many people to subsist on such a scarcity of resources the bulk of production must be of intensive cash-crops that can be sold in extensive markets at reasonably good prices.

It is this same people of Puerto Rico, to whom Nature has been so harsh, who have reached their political maturity, according to a message of the late President Roosevelt to the Congress. They have given proof of this maturity. Eighty-five percent of the registered voters vote on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Although political passions frequently run high, elections are absolutely peaceful and orderly. Defeated candidates recognize their defeat and the fairness of the electoral process. The buying of votes has been unheard of for quite some time. The people vote on the clear understanding that they are giving a mandate for certain laws to be enacted and certain policies to be carried out insofar as their elected legislators have the legal authority to do so, and they are vigilant as to whether their clear-cut democratic mandates are carried out or not. The Puerto Rican people, in fact, are more than just a politically mature people. I sincerely and proudly believe that in their hinterland of the world they constitute the best rural school of democracy in America today, and that there is profit in looking to its poverty-stricken electorate as an example of sound democratic practice.

It is these people, so politically sound and so economically harassed, that are now contributing to the peace effort, as they are contributing to the war effort. They are now proposing to the Congress and the Government of the United States a plan for self-determination. This plan may well serve as a basis for dealing with the colonial problem in many other parts of the world as well as in Puerto Rico. It should also help the United States in clarifying, maintaining, strengthening, and developing that leadership of hard-pressed mankind everywhere which is of such decisive importance to world justice and world peace.

The Legislature of Puerto Rico has unanimously proposed to the Congress of the United States a clear-cut straight-forward method of solving the colonial problem, on the basis of self-determination, in democratic terms, and in the fiber of American policy and tradition. The Puerto Rican proposal is as follows: At the request, the unanimous request, of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all political parties concurring, a bill has been introduced in the Senate by United States Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, and in the United States House of Representatives by Resident Commissioner PIÑERO, of Puerto Rico. This bill contains four titles and offers three alternative forms of government to the people of Puerto Rico. Title 1 provides that there shall be a referendum in which the people of Puerto Rico shall decide whether they want independence under certain economic conditions necessary for their survival, or statehood, or dominion status similar to that of Australia or Canada in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Title 2 describes independence. Title 3 describes statehood. Title 4 describes dominion status. If a majority of the people of Puerto Rico vote for independence, then title 2 shall go into effect. If they vote for statehood, then title 3 shall go into effect. If they vote for dominion status, then title 4 shall go into effect. In this manner, if the bill is approved, the people of Puerto Rico themselves will choose their own future, on the basis of an offer by the American Congress, and in choosing it they will have before them the fullest possible picture of what they are voting about.

It is worthy of note that the proposal provides that the United States shall have in perpetuity all the military and naval bases and rights that they may need in Puerto Rico for the defense of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. This is of very great importance, as Puerto Rico constitutes one of the chief military protections of the Panama Canal, and has been called by military authorities "the Gibraltar of the Caribbean." Parallel with these perpetual rights of the United States, under any form of government that the people of Puerto Rico may choose, certain minimum economic conditions are established, also under any form of government that the people of Puerto Rico may choose. These minimum economic conditions are considered necessary if the people are to survive in the face of the difficult economic circumstances that confront them. I should call attention to the fact that these minimum economic conditions do not represent any increase in economic facilities. Therefore the granting of them would not in any way increase the commitments of the United States, but would rather decrease them. What is, therefore, proposed is to wipe out political discontent without intolerably increasing economic suffering and discontent. This is of importance not only as a matter of justice and of American leadership in democracy but also as a means of surrounding important military defenses with the greatest possible democratic good will.

Let us look at what the colonial problem means in broad terms. Obviously, the United States will have need of military and naval establishments in many parts of the world. But just as obviously these establishments are a second line of defense. The need for military establishments is predicated upon the sensible provision that all good-will means of keeping the peace may fail. The first line of defense is the maintenance of peace, the creation of conditions that, so far as human understanding and good sense can make it so, will tend to keep the world at peace with itself. For that reason, the need for military establishments—the second line of defense—should not contradict the need for democratic procedure in the maintenance of world confidence in American leadership. Neither, of course, should the need to maintain this leadership weaken in any way America's maximum ability to defend itself if peace should fail. The Puerto Rican proposal is made in the clear recognition of these two paramount factors.

Military and naval establishments may be needed in two broadly different kinds of places. They may be needed in small places scantily populated, and they may be needed, as they are in Puerto Rico for instance, among large populations with a developed civilization, with a recognized political maturity, and an acute consciousness that the principles of freedom are applicable to them also. The United States is making this distinction clear at the San Francisco Conference. Military and naval bases and establishments, of course, must be where strategy says they must be, whether on small rocks of the sea where the problems of the population are at a minimum or in developed communities where the problems of the people are of great significance and importance with relation to the general democratic principles and policies at stake.

In offering its proposal for self-determination, Puerto Rico is bearing in mind these considerations. The United States, at San Francisco, are standing for self-government to colonies, which may include independence. The Puerto Rican proposal is a specific proposal for self-government on the basis of an alternative offer by Congress of different forms of self-government, which may include independence, and an acceptance by the people of Puerto Rico, in referendum, of one of the forms of self-government offered by Congress.

The proposal that the Legislature of Puerto Rico has unanimously presented to the Congress of the United States is a self-determination proposal as embodied in Senate bill 1002 and in House bill 3237. We make this proposal both as a claim of justice for Puerto Rico and as a contribution to American leadership—a leadership so completely necessary for the prevention of future wars—in the minds and hearts of average men and women the world over. For both reasons we hope to receive for our proposal the support of the American people.

The Late Hon. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two newspaper articles from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, re-

spectively, of June 4, on the life of Col. J. Mayhew Wainwright:

[From the New York Times]

J. M. WAINWRIGHT DIES IN RYE AT 80—FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR, EX-REPRESENTATIVE, WAS A COUSIN OF THE GENERAL

RYE, N. Y., June 3.—Col. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, Assistant Secretary of War in the administration of President Harding and formerly for more than 8 years a Member of the House of Representatives, died here this afternoon at his home on Stuyvesant Avenue, in the Milton Point section, after a long illness. His age was 80. He was a member of the law firm of Barry, Wainwright, Thacher & Symmers, of 72 Wall Street, New York.

A first cousin of Lt. Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who has been a prisoner of the Japanese since he was captured in the Philippines early in the war, Colonel Wainwright achieved prominence as a soldier in three wars, lawyer, and financier. A Republican, he served as Representative from the Twenty-fifth New York District, which embraces northern Westchester and Rockland County, until 1931.

ADVOCATE OF PREPAREDNESS

Colonel Wainwright preached the doctrine of preparedness long before this country became involved in the European War. In 1940, with a group of military and political leaders, including Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, he urged the immediate adoption of compulsory military training with universal service for both men and women in time of war.

A year later, at the one hundred and fifty-eighth annual convention of the Episcopal Diocese, he endorsed the stand taken by the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Bishop of New York, asking the Federal Government to take a full and open part in the conflict.

In January 1941, Colonel Wainwright became chairman of the Westchester County Defense Council, serving until April of that year. During the time he held the chairmanship and on many occasions after he resigned because of ill health, he warned the residents of the county to shake off their complacency and realize that they were close to war.

EXPONENT OF DRY LAW

Colonel Wainwright's political career came to an end, it was believed, because he had long been known in Congress as a militant prohibitionist. When the temper of his constituents changed, William L. Ward, Westchester Republican leader, offered him a renomination, but Mr. Wainwright declared that after 30 years of public service he felt he should retire.

Born in New York on December 10, 1864, Colonel Wainwright was the son of John Howland and Margaret Livingston Stuyvesant Wainwright. He attended Columbia University, receiving bachelor of arts and bachelor of philosophy degrees there in 1884 and a bachelor of laws degree from the Columbia Law School in 1886. In 1908 the university conferred on him an honorary master of arts degree.

Admitted to the bar in 1886, he practiced law in New York and made his home for many years in Rye, where his residence was regarded as a show place. He was also interested in Westchester financial affairs and had served as a director of the Rye National Bank, the Westchester Trust Co., the Mutual Trust Co. of Westchester, and the Westchester Title and Trust Co.

BEGAN POLITICAL CAREER IN 1902

In 1902 Colonel Wainwright made his political debut and was elected an assemblyman. In the assembly he gained a reputation of being a hard worker and of being an independent and a progressive, although in later years in Congress he was known as a regular Republican.

He served in the assembly until 1909, when he became a State senator. In the senate he opposed direct nominations, took a prominent part in the developments following the Allds bribery investigation, and was prominent in the demand for a general graft probe.

He came from a family of old Colonial and Dutch stock, one of his ancestors, Jonathan Mayhew, having been a Boston minister of Revolutionary fame, and another having been Peter Stuyvesant. He served for years in the National Guard, beginning in 1889 and ending in 1906, and being promoted through the grades to lieutenant colonel.

On the call for volunteers at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898 he entered the service, becoming a captain in the Twelfth New York Volunteers.

SERVED ON MEXICAN BORDER

In the Mexican border trouble of 1916 Colonel Wainwright served as lieutenant colonel, Inspector General's Department, and in 1917 became lieutenant colonel and division inspector of the New York division of the Guard. In July 1917 he was mustered into the Federal service and occupied the same post with the Twenty-seventh Division. He then served in France, participating in all the battles and engagements of the division.

He won the American Distinguished Service Medal, the decoration of Officer of the French Legion of Honor, and the Belgian War Cross with Palm and Silver Star.

In 1919 he launched an attack on "inhuman treatment" of American soldiers in Parisian jails, blaming "the American commanding officer in Paris." He charged cruel and brutal punishment for petty offenses and forwarded his charges to Congress.

In 1921 President Harding appointed Colonel Wainwright Assistant Secretary of War, which post he held until 1923. He was particularly interested in the development of aviation, in improving the conditions of military life, and in laying the groundwork for preparedness for war so that an army of 4,000,000 men might be called into action in a short space of time.

When Mr. Ward, Republican chairman of Westchester County, died in July 1933, Colonel Wainwright was one of a triumvirate which ruled the party in the county until April 1934, when Charles H. Griffiths, New York attorney, was elected to Mr. Ward's place.

He also was at one time chairman of the committee on diocesan finances of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York and served on the standing committee of that diocese.

Colonel Wainwright was a trustee of St. Luke's Hospital, this city, and a member of the American, State, and New York City Bar Associations, as well as of Delta Psi Fraternity. His clubs were the Union, University, and Republican of New York, the Metropolitan and Army and Navy of Washington, and the Apawamis and American Yacht, the Downtown Association, the St. Nicholas Society, the Colonial Lords of the Manor, and the Sons of the Revolution.

He leaves a widow, Mrs. Laura Buchanan Wainwright, whom he married in 1892, and a daughter, Mrs. Philip K. Condict, of Rye and South Stratford, Vt.

A funeral service will be held on Wednesday at 4 p. m. in Christ Episcopal Church, Rye. Burial will be in the family plot in Greenwood Union Cemetery, Rye.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

COL. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, 80, DIES; STATESMAN, SOLDIER, AND LAWYER—ASSISTANT WAR SECRETARY IN '21 FOUGHT IN 3 CONFLICTS; SERVED 8 YEARS IN HOUSE

RYE, N. Y., June 3.—Col. J. Mayhew Wainwright, 80, former Assistant Secretary of War, and a leader in the Republican Party in Westchester County for more than 4 decades, died today at his home on Stuyvesant Road, in the Milton section of Rye, after a long illness.

Colonel Wainwright, a cousin of Lt. Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, last commander on Corregidor, now a prisoner of the Japanese, made a name for himself in three careers—in law, in the Army, and in politics. Born in New York, the son of John Howard Wainwright and Mrs. Margaret Livingston Stuyvesant Wainwright, his ancestors were among the earliest Americans.

Through his mother he was a descendant in the seventh generation of Peter Stuyvesant, the last Dutch Governor of New Amsterdam—now New York. On his father's side he was a grandson of the late Bishop Wainwright, of the Protestant-Episcopal diocese of New York, for whom he was named.

LAWYER SINCE 1886

He studied in this country and in France and Germany, then returned to the United States and was graduated from Columbia College and the School of Political Science in 1884. Two years later he received his law degree from the law school of Columbia University and started a legal career which took him into practice in Rye and in New York, where he served in the district attorney's office, then with the firm of Strong & Cadwalader.

Except for interruptions occasioned by military service in three wars and terms in public office, he remained in active law practice until the time of his death, when he was a member of the law firm of Barry, Wainwright, Thacher & Symmers, of 72 Wall Street, New York.

He turned early in life to military affairs. In 1889 he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Twelfth Infantry Regiment and served as its regimental adjutant. He was a captain in the Spanish-American War with the New York Volunteers and, after the war, was commisisoned a lieutenant colonel in the National Guard.

Colonel Wainwright was with the punitive expedition to Mexico in 1916 with that rank. He was divisional inspector in 1917 when the United States entered the First World War and the National Guard was mustered into the United States Army.

WON FOUR MEDALS IN FRANCE

Serving with the Twenty-seventh Division in all its engagements in France, he won the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Honor, the Belgian Croix de Guerre, and the Silver Star Medal for gallantry under fire.

Discharged in 1919, he returned to the legal and political careers which the hostilities interrupted. He had first been a candidate for office in 1896, when he was defeated for the legislature. A successful candidate for the same post in 1902, he served a 2-year term. In 1909 he was elected to the State senate, and was one of its most active Republican members for 4 years. It was on his report as chairman of the State commission that the State workmen's compensation act, the first of its kind in the country, was enacted. He served a second term, then retired temporarily to the law and the Army.

President Harding called him into his official family in 1921 as Assistant Secretary of War, in which post he remained 2 years. For a time, during the illness of Secretary of War John W. Weeks, he was Acting Secretary of War. He battled consistently for an organized reserve of the Army which would facilitate quick mobilization of 4,000,000 fighting men, and toured the Nation as an advocate of preparedness.

IN CONGRESS FOUR TERMS

In 1922 the Republican organization of Westchester County named Colonel Wainwright as its candidate for United States Representative from the Twenty-fifth District. He won, resigned his War Department

duties, and was a Member of the House of Representatives for four 2-year terms. He was in the forefront of the fight for a separate Army Air Corps and was successful in his espousal of a $75,000,000 bill to finance it.

Despite his activity in national affairs, he paid keen attention to civic affairs in Westchester. He was a director of four banks and, after his retirement from Congress, a member of the Westchester County Park Commission.

In 1892 he married Miss Laura Wallace Buchanan, of Baltimore. A daughter, Mrs. Phillip Condict, of Rye and South Stratford, Vt., also survives. A funeral service was held at 4 p. m. Wednesday in Christ's Church Episcopal, Milton Road, Rye, with the Rev. Wendell Phillips, the rector, officiating.

A Tribute to Our Departed President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR DEPARTED PRESIDENT

(By Rev. H. C. Hathcoat, in Oklahoma House of Representatives)

Truly a "prince in Israel" has fallen in the Nation's greatest battle for liberty and democracy. Human language groans in its feeble attempt to express the grief sustained by 130,000,000 Americans, while freedom-loving nations, from zone to zone and from pole to pole, pause to pay him tribute, and flags hang at half mast from the rivers unto the ends of the earth. Lincoln belongs to the ages, but Roosevelt belongs to the universe.

He was the symbol of undaunted courage, the expression of unwavering faith, the example of unselfish liberty, and the champion of unprejudiced tolerance. His magnanimous spirit lifted him above personal retaliation, while his love for his country and his devotion to duty exalted him above partisan prejudices. The gravity of the problems of state, coupled with the burdens of the great war, have taken their toll of the stamina and health of our beloved leader for the past few years, especially, and have robbed him of the happiness of eating the fruits of his labors ripened into full fruition. However, he has tasted of their yieldings, and, like another illustrious leader, he ascended his Mount Pisgah to envision the Promised Land of peace and security, to which he had led the Nation, and for which he gave his all.

Truly he "served his generation by the will of God, fell asleep, and was gathered unto his fathers."

Historians will record his achievements, poets will sing his glory, scribes will write of his greatness, statesmen will quote from his discourses, and true Americans will emulate his example. The Nation will, in due time, erect a monument of granite or marble as a token of his undying spirit. Yet in a fuller sense over 130,000,000 Americans will enshrine the memory of him in the fleshly table of their hearts. This appreciation of him will be handed down to posterity, and generations unborn will rise up and call him blessed. Like the Master Teacher, it can be said of him, "the common people heard him gladly."

God buries His workers but carries on His work. Let us all join in our prayers that the mantle of our departed leader may fall on our new President. And may a double portion of the spirit of foresight and courage be given him as he pilots the ship of state through the troublesome days that lie ahead. Our earth-dimmed vision may, at times, be prone to question the providence of Him who guides the destinies of men and nations, yet we should remember the Scriptural injunction, "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Let us all, in this sad hour, find comfort in the words of the poet William Cooper, who wrote:

"God moves in mysterious ways
His wonders to perform,
He plants His footsteps on the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

"Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up His bright design
And works His sovereign will.

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust Him for His grace,
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face."

Medical Corps Ambulance Drivers Real Humanitarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there are several classes of servicemen who are not much discussed and concerning whom the public knows little. During the European hostilities, the ambulance drivers of the Medical Corps were chiefly young men of tender years. Frequently they were our 19- and 20-year-old boys. Usually, they were not armed or protected, but while on duty were almost constantly within the range of the guns of the enemy. They were habitually called upon to render the most humanitarian service to their wounded buddies. The dispatch with which they performed their duties frequently meant the saving of the life or lives of their human cargoes. They witnessed horrible and gruesome sights of suffering and dying humanity. The compassion of their souls was poured out and yet they must use precision, accuracy, and cool-headedness in the performance of their delicate and responsible tasks. The ambulance drivers of the Medical Corps were real humanitarians.

Mr. Speaker, the youngest of my four sons in the service is one of these boys. He was 20 years old when he entered the European theater of operations. The first ambulance he drove was not taken out of service until, as he expressed it, the enemy had put more than 60 air holes through it. This illustrates the hazards and dangers to which these young boys have been subjected.

Now that the hostilities in Europe have ceased, these boys have begun to reminisce, and I am today in receipt of a poem written by an ambulance driver in France which describes somewhat vividly the importance of the humanitarian service these ambulance drivers of the Medical Corps have rendered. The poem follows:

AMBULANCE DRIVER'S BALLAD

(By an ambulance driver in France)

There's the Joe who pleads for water
Mile after pleading mile,
With his guts shot out by shrapnel;
All you give him is a smile.

Then the guy right down below him
With an amputated leg,
Says his feet are numb and cold,
It's hell the way he begs.

The guy behind my buddy
Begs to have a smoke;
My buddy holds it for him,
All his arms and legs are broke.

Down below, the other Joe,
Is calling for his dad;
You drive a little faster,
That kid is bleeding bad.

Yes; it seems to be a thankless job,
Devoid of thrills and praise;
But it pays in dividends
A dozen different ways.

It's swell to walk into a ward,
And have a guy say, "Hello,"
That single word is praise enough,
You've saved another Joe.

For there's a boy you counted gone,
A bullet in his head;
You know your driving got him through,
He's sitting up in bed.

Let 'em save the decorations,
Our job is saving lives,
We want the praise that really counts,
From thoughtful moms and wives.

For those lives are dedicated to,
Those guys who drove in France,
Who saved sons for wives and mothers,
In a GI ambulance.

Marvin Jones' Report on Food Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, shortly Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, will retire and resume his duties as a member of the United States Court of Claims.

No Administrator could have administered the War Food Administration in time of a great war without making some mistakes, and it would have been impossible to please everyone, yet, on the whole, I think the American people are agreed that Judge Marvin Jones has done an excellent job in a most difficult period, and those of us who know him personally and who served with him in the House throughout the years know that he has conscientiously and ably performed his difficult task and has rendered a real service to his country in time of war, for which the American people should be grateful.

Recently he issued a brief letter addressed to the Members of the Senate and the House, summing up, in a few words, some of the accomplishments of

the War Food Administration during this war.

It is not only a tribute to the effectiveness of the War Food Administration, but is a tribute also to the American farmers and the farm workers of America to have accomplished what they have, and the record made by the farmers of America will go down in history as one of the outstanding achievements of this war. Under leave granted, Judge Jones' letter is submitted herewith:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 24, 1945.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

We are getting many requests for information on what has actually been done in the production and use of food during the years of the present war, as compared with the last war. Our people are increasingly aware of the vital importance of food in the total war effort, and I am sure you will be interested in having the important facts.

Here are the answers to the more general questions:

"The United States has produced 50 percent more food annually in this war than in World War I.

"With 10 percent fewer workers on farms, and with total national population up a third, our people have had about 10 percent more food per capita during this war than in the 1917–18 period.

"During the present conflict, twice as much food has gone annually to the armed services and for overseas shipments as was used for these noncivilian outlets each year of the last war."

This record has been accomplished notwithstanding a shortage of labor and machinery, and many other handicaps.

These are the highlights of the situation, comparing food in the two wars. A table giving details on production of key commodities, with total production and per capita consumption percentages, is reproduced on the other side of this letter for your reference.

In view of the fact that the primary obligation of the War Food Administration is to assist in securing war food production, we take pride in this magnificent production record.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Production of selected agricultural products, total population, farm employment and index number of food consumption and agricultural production, selected years

Item	Unit	1910-14 average	1917	1918	1935-39 average	1942	1943	1944
Production:								
Wheat	Millions of bushels	724	620	904	759	974	841	1,079
Corn	do	2,614	2,908	2,441	2,316	3,132	3,034	3,228
Rice	do	24	35	40	50	65	65	70
Potatoes	do	350	399	346	356	370	465	379
Dry beans	Millions of pounds	715	1,011	1,039	1,455	1,896	2,092	1,613
Cotton lint	Millions of bales	14	11	12	13	13	11	12
Tobacco	Millions of pounds	1,046	1,326	1,445	1,460	1,409	1,406	1,950
Beef and veal	do	6,960	7,983	8,486	7,962	9,970	9,683	10,732
Pork (excluding lard)	do	6,735	7,055	8,349	7,337	10,723	12,349	12,893
Chickens (including broilers)	do	1,909	1,857	1,896	2,325	2,988	3,806	3,460
Eggs [1]	Millions of dozens	2,580	2,539	2,667	3,335	4,430	4,973	5,305
Milk [2]	Billions of pounds	69	74	73	104	119	118	119
Total food fats and oils	Millions of pounds	[3] 4,804	4,311	4,866	6,205	7,313	8,136	7,787
Agricultural production for sale or home consumption:								
Total (all agricultural production)	1935-39=100	83	86	90	100	124	129	133
Food only	1935-39=100	78	82	90	100	125	132	138
Food consumption per capita	1935-39=100	97	96	95	100	[4] 107	[4] 106	[4] 109
Total population, July 1	Millions	95.6	103.4	104.5	129.0	134.7	136.5	138.1
Farm employment (BAE series)	do	12.0	11.8	11.3	10.9	10.4	10.3	10.0
Agricultural production per capita	1935-39=100	112	108	111	100	119	122	124
Agricultural production per farm worker	1935-39=100	75	80	87	100	131	130	145

[1] Farm egg production plus allowance for nonfarm production equal to 10 percent of farm.
[2] Figures for World War I period are estimates of E. E. Vial.
[3] 1912-14 average.
[4] Civilian only.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks, I include therein an article taken from the Detroiter for June 4, 1945.

Apparently there are a few people in England who keep their feet on the ground and their heads out of the clouds. One British industrialist has had the audacity to write an article entitled "Obstacles to Prosperity" in which he quotes a leader high in the Government of the United States and is clearly disturbed that there are leaders in England who are pledged to the same doctrine as we hear from high quarters in this country. That doctrine is "spend more than we make so you can get rich."

No one has ever conceived a system of government that is superior to simple arithmetic or honest work.

Such a program as outlined in the article mentioned does not mean utopia but means destruction and not prosperity:

SPEND MORE—GET RICH?

Evidently the industrial leaders of England—as well as those of the United States—are facing serious problems. We have received from John R. Millar, Detroit, an article entitled "Obstacles to Prosperity," which was published by a British industralist who is bemoaning the fact that there are many leaders there "who are preaching the same doctrine advocated by Marriner Eccles, namely, 'Spend more than you make so you can get rich.'" The article goes on to show that labor leaders and economists say:

"Five years of destruction on a scale unknown in the world's long history are but the prelude to an era of universal plenty with a minimum of effort on the part of the individual. The standard of living is to rise, not only here but in all the wide spaces and the remote corners of the world; hours of labor are to be shortened; and work is to be carried on to an accompaniment of music, breaks for tea and private conversation, and comparison of notes on the symptoms of industrial fatigue.

"Work will thus be dignified, and the remarkable discovery will be made that, with every reduction of hours of labor production increases alike in quality and quantity, till it reaches its peak at the point when no one does anything at all. That will be the great triumph of the century. It will be the final justification of industrialism and the machine.

"All that will remain will be for the psychoanalysts to diagnose what is wrong with leisure and to suggest remedies for overcoming its evident frustations. More entertainment, perhaps, to relieve its monotony, more frequent introductions of tea and gossip, more exchanges of confidences on individual experiences of leisure fatigue, with an occasional address by the Minister of Labor on his success in abolishing the evil of employment, as he once abolished that of unemployment."

Lend-Lease Report to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the nineteenth lend-lease report to Congress was made a few days ago by President Truman, and an editorial appeared in the Washington Post of May 26 relative thereto, which, under leave granted, is submitted herewith:

LEND-LEASE REPORT

Lend-lease, the secret weapon that welded the United Nations into a unity and gave them the overwhelming strength with which

to crush Germany, is now to be turned full force against Japan. This is the keynote of the letter of transmittal accompanying the nineteenth lend-lease report to Congress—the first such letter to bear the signature of Harry S. Truman. "While the bulk of the United Nations forces were engaging the Nazis in Europe," he wrote, "Allied forces succeeded in piercing the perimeter of Japanese defenses and established the bases from which decisive offensives can be launched. Now all of the might and power of the United States, the British Empire, France, the Netherlands, and our other Allies can be brought to bear, together with the Chinese forces, against Japan."

Although lend-lease supplies thus far have been devoted principally to the war in Europe, they have been provided also, in such quantities as were available, to the Allied military and naval forces battling the Japanese. And these Allies, through reverse lend-lease, have significantly aided our troops in the Pacific, especially by supplying them with foodstuffs. Our shipping difficulties would have been enormously aggravated had it not been for this facet of the mutual-aid system. We have received from Australia, for example, a total of more than $720,600,000 worth of reverse lend-lease; from New Zealand, $171,400,000 worth; from India, $411,900,000 worth. French, Belgian, and Netherlands colonies made their contributions, too.

It was thought necessary in the nineteenth lend-lease report to refute a number of absurd and mischevious rumors to the effect that the civilian populations in Allied countries are being given all sorts of scarce supplies for peacetime purposes at the expense of civilians here. Lend-lease has had from its inception, a single, simple purpose—the effective utilization of the manpower and resources of all the United Nations. It has served us well. It would be tragic now to let it be beclouded by misconceptions, for it still has a great and vital task to perform.

The Students of the University of Nebraska Write a Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Nebraska held a miniature peace conference. Various campus groups represented the individual nations of the world. It was a most worthwhile project. It was very apparent that these students were well grounded in history, geography, and current events.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a summary of the peace treaty that was adopted:

SUMMARY OF TREATY OF PEACE AS ADOPTED AT THE FINAL PLENARY SESSION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA PEACE CONFERENCE ON MARCH 9, 1945

The treaty provides for a world security organization as follows: (1) Dumbarton Oaks plan with some alterations and additions providing initial membership comprising all of the United Nations with other states admitted by three-fourths vote of the Assembly, (2) for 4 years punitive measures require a two-thirds vote including all of the permanent members excepting an accused state which shall be deprived at the time of the right to vote. Economic sanction must be tried before a military. At the end of 5 years there shall be a conference to consider renewing those rules. (3) regional organization. (4) the retention of the present World Court but with compulsory jurisdiction in justiciable cases.

Regarding war criminals it is provided: (1) Two commissions to deal with the subject, one for the Far East, and one for western states, (2) that these commissions deal with arch criminals directly and with other criminals if national courts fail to do so, (3) that the commission authorize the boycott of neutrals giving asylum to such criminals, (4) that the commissions encourage national courts to take jurisdiction.

Regarding territorial settlement of eastern Asia it is provided: (1) an independent Korea, (2) Manchuria shall go to China, (3) China free, with foreign concessions and settlements terminated, Hong Kong returned to China, but a British naval base there for 10 years, (4) Siam independent, (5) Indochina returned to France.

Regarding territorial settlement of Germany it is provided: (1) France to have Alace-Lorraine, and the Saar Basin, (2) adjustment of Dutch boundary in favor of Netherlands, (3) Flensburg to Denmark, (4) internationalization of Rhineland, the Ruhr, Heligoland, and Kiel Canal, (5) eastern boundary the Oder River, (6) Austria and Czechoslovakia boundaries as of 1938, (7) integrity of the rest of Germany.

Regarding territorial settlement of eastern Europe it is provided: (1) Curzon line with modification of 5 to 8 kilometers, (2) Dardenelles free, (3) division of East Prussia, most of it to Poland and the rest to Russia.

Regarding territorial settlement of Central Europe and the Balkans it is provided: (1) Balkan federation, (2) East Thrace to Greece, (3) South Dobrudja to Bulgaria, (4) Salonika a free port, (5) plebiscite on Macedonian independence, (6) Transylvania to Rumania for 7 years, then a plebiscite.

Regarding territorial settlement of Italy it is provided: (1) Istria to Yugoslavia, with Trieste a free city, (2) Dalmatian coast to Yugoslavia, (3) Nice and Corsica to remain French, (4) Albania free, (5) Trentino divided according to Austrian proposal in 1915.

Regarding colonies and mandates it is provided: (1) Retention of mandate system with improvements, (2) Formosa and Pescadores to China, (3) islands formerly mandated to Japan and the Bonins to be under United States mandate, (4) South Sakhalian to Russia, (5) northeast Libya to Britain, the remainder a French mandate, (6) Ethiopia independent, (7) Rhodes and Dodecanese to Greece, (8) Pantelleria to Britain.

Regarding the treatment of Germany, it is provided: (1) Reparations in kind as fixed by a commission, (2) disarmament of Germany, (3) military occupation by Great Britain, United States, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, (4) reeducation, (5) control of German cartels, (6) temporary government by the United Nations.

Regarding the treatment of Japan, it is provided: (1) industrial reparations to China, (2) disarmament of Japan, (3) military occupation by United States, China, Great Britain, and Russia (if at war), (4) reeducation, (5) removal of the Emperor, (6) provisional government under the United Nations, but ultimately a new government based on Japanese wishes.

In regard to ethnic groups, it is provided: (1) Right of peoples forcibly moved by Germans to return, (2) an international bill of rights, (3) retention of the League system of protecting minorities, (4) establishment of Jewish homeland.

In regard to economic and social matters, it is provided: (1) replacement of International Labor Office by a commission of the Economic Council of the United Nations, (2) a conference to consider elimination of trade barriers, (3) a commission to deal with cartels, (4) international monetary fund, (5) an agency to control air navigation.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I call attention to a very timely editorial on the political status of Puerto Rico, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. This editorial reads as follows:

PUERTO RICO

Puerto Rico presents a live, urgent, and real test of trusteeship right in our own back yard. We shall have to meet it a great deal more satisfactorily than we have met it in the past if we are to lecture the British and the French on colonial policy with any ease of conscience. Puerto Rico's economic situation is too desperate to be solved either by haphazard handouts to it as a dependent territory or by a grandiose grant of independence which would transform the island into a graveyard.

The existing relationship to the United States perpetuates an undemocratic system of government in Puerto Rico. As Secretary Ickes observed a year ago, "Those who lose local elections, and those who are dissatisfied with local affairs, attack the Federal and insular officials and appeal directly to the Congress upon matters of purely local concern which should be decided in Puerto Rico." This situation has not only promoted a sense of insecurity and injustice among Puerto Ricans; it has also, until now, kept them from agreement upon effective and permanent resolution of their political future. If one group in the island put forward a proposal for independence, an opposing political faction at once clamored for statehood or some alternative status.

Now, however, Senator Luis Muñoz Marín, President of the Insular Senate and head of the majority party in the island, the Popular Democrats, has come to Washington at the head of a delegation representing all parties with a proposal unanimously adopted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. This proposal has been embodied in a bill introduced by Senator TYDINGS. Under it, three alternative forms of political status—independence, statehood, and dominion relationship to the United States—would be submitted to a referendum of the people of Puerto Rico. Whichever form secured an absolute popular majority would then be carried into effect.

This strikes us as a sensible and democratic procedure. Earlier this year, R. G. Tugwell, Governor of Puerto Rico, said in his message to the legislature that "it would be unfair to propose a plebiscite which had not been authorized and defined by the Congress. To do so would be to ask Puerto Ricans to choose among alternatives which might seem completely unreal. * * * Fairness to everyone requires that the Congress offer the choices it is willing to accept rather than to require that Puerto Ricans should petition for status with the risk of rejection."

At the same time, we feel that Congress would be well advised to rule out the alternative of statehood. We doubt the advisability of including in the Union an area which is not a part of our continental land mass. There is no doubt, however, that Puerto Rico, in our own interest as well as hers, ought to maintain a close liaison in which her aspirations for self-government will be realized. Whatever the future political status of the island, it is clear that it must embrace two essentials—provision for

permanent military bases by which the United States can protect the welfare of this hemisphere and economic arrangements which will permit Puerto Ricans to enjoy real freedom rather than famine.

These essentials are embraced both in the formula for independence and in the formula for dominion status as outlined in the bill which Senator TYDINGS has offered on behalf of the island legislature. Independence, as there defined, would mean complete sovereighty, save for our military and naval installations, together with a free-trade relationship with the United States, except for tariffs imposed by mutual consent. Dominion status would mean local sovereignty without statehood, but with dual citizenship, liability to service in the armed forces of the United States and subordination to the United States in foreign affairs. It would also embrace free trade. The choice between these two approaches to their future ought to be made by the Puerto Ricans. We have an opportunity now, in dealing with their plea for self-determination, to provide a model of trusteeship for the world.

Credits to Soviet Agencies in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, so much misinformation is being spread these days about the relations between this country and our ally against Germany, Soviet Russia, that it seems to me every opportunity should be seized to present facts. With this in mind I am including, as a portion of my extension of remarks, an article by E. C. Ropes, Chief of the Russian Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, entitled "Credits to Soviet Agencies in the United States":

CREDITS TO SOVIET AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES—A HISTORICAL REVIEW

(By E. C. Ropes, Chief, Russian Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce)

The history of the extension of credits to Soviet agencies in the United States, to finance exports or for other purposes, could be covered adequately only in a volume of considerable size. In this short article it is possible to bring out hardly more than the high points, which form a curve with abrupt lows and highs, culminating with proposed credits of billions for postwar Soviet purchases which do not arouse as much concern as those for a few millions did in the late twenties. It is not out of the way to say that as a credit risk the Soviet Union has traversed the distance from zero to one of the highest rated in the world, and in popular esteem from the position of a distrusted disturber of world peace to that of a country without whose aid that peace will be impossible of attainment.

The extension of credit in any amount to Soviet buying agencies in the United States really began only after the establishment in 1924 of the Amtorg Trading Corp., as a consolidation of the Products Exchange Corp. and the Arcos-America Ltd., both New York State corporations. These, and the Centrosoyuz America, an agent of the Russian cooperatives, obtained a few short-term credits in their purchasing, but not enough to establish the Amtorg, as their successor, with sufficient standing in the eyes of American sellers and banks to justify a line of credit on goods worth millions of dollars for which the Amtorg at once began shopping. The billion dollars' worth of orders for United States products which Ludwig Martens in 1919 had dangled before the eyes of manufacturers and exporters held insufficient lure to attract loans to cover, and the attempts of Amtorg along similar lines met with the same reception. Only the All-Russian Textile Syndicate, in buying hundreds of thousands of bales of cotton, was able to persuade the Chase National Bank to finance its shiploads sent to Murmansk, and it has always been understood that that bank did not fail to protect itself against possible defaults in payment, by requiring adequate deposits to Amtorg account to cover itself in case of need—a need which, it may be noted, never arose.

In 1926, therefore, the Amtorg, when buying from American manufacturers in the United States, found itself usually obliged to pay cash on shipment, even at times with order; discounts for cash were occasionally offered and taken. Always, even when short credits were allowed, from 30 to 75 percent of the invoice was on a cash basis, with the balance running from 3 to 12 months. There was no general agreement on terms, each manufacturer making his own agreement, dependent on his usual export practice, the pressure of competition from rival manufacturers, and his own financial resources.

FIRST CREDIT CORPORATION

By 1927 the picture had improved somewhat for the Amtorg, though the general situation had not changed. This improvement was brought about by the establishment in New York of a corporation, later followed by others, to discount the credit portion of invoices presented to Amtorg, the portion covered by acceptances running up to 12 or more months, and carrying interest at 6 percent. The first company, the Industrial Credit Corporation, headed by a former American Amtorg official, secured the bulk of the business, and was understood to represent investors in the United States, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom who had confidence in Amtorg's ability to pay and were willing to wait until the acceptances matured.

For the service of providing cash to impatient or needy manufacturers, the rate of discount without recourse was high, up to a maximum of 45 percent of the face of an acceptance. But it may be assumed that, when possible, selling prices to Amtorg were adjusted to cover the cost of disposal of the paper, there is no record in this period of any manufacturer complaining of the ultimate results of the practice or refusing to sell to Amtorg except for cash. Indeed, there are cases known where Amtorg business in an otherwise slack market may have saved a manufacturer from the need of shutting down, temporarily or permanently. Particularly is this probably the case with the smaller machine-tool building firms and the manufacturers of oil-well machinery, who were faced with a low demand for their products at home and abroad.

It must be remembered that this situation prevailed in the United States, with Amtorg the only large potential buyer and manufacturers competing strenuously for all business, at a time when Soviet purchases in Germany were being eagerly financed by the German Government, although at fairly high rates and prices. The German example was followed by other European countries and later even by the United Kingdom and Japan. It is not surprising that the Amtorg pressed for credits in the United States on the strength of the credit standing of the Soviet Government in Europe, which enabled it to run up a large foreign debt for goods purchased abroad to carry on its drive for industrialization under the first 5-year plan.

THREAT TO CREDIT POSITION

Yet this very success in obtaining credits abroad became a threat to the credit position of the Soviet Government, which was always regarded as the real principal behind Soviet buying agencies abroad. Foreign purchases could be paid for only in goods or gold exported, and the maximum term on credits, even in Germany, was 5 years. Soviet gold production at that time was low, about 1,000,000 ounces a year, and Germany claimed all that could be spared. It has been estimated that prices dropped about 40 percent on goods exported from the Soviet Union and many sales were made under great resistance both from the home market against selling and the foreign markets against buying, except at prices below the world or local levels.

The situation that resulted from the overextension of Soviet purchasing on credit, and the difficulties the Soviet Government met in procuring and selling the goods with which to meet its obligations, even under the rigid control of foreign trade by the state monopoly, naturally reacted against the Amtorg in its persistent demand for credits. Nor did the successful negotiation of a contract with the International General Electric Co.—for generators and other electrical machinery to a value of $26,000,000, with payments spread over 5 years—have any effect on the general resistance of manufacturers to granting the Amtorg similar terms on orders placed in the United States.

The Soviet authorities, however, temporarily succeeded in balancing outgo with income, by drastic reduction of imports, and in maintaining their reputation for prompt payment. A survey made in 1929 in the United States emphasized this reputation: While the terms of sale to the Amtorg varied considerably in the amount of cash demanded and the proportion and length of the credit portion of an invoice, there was no variation in the record of the Amtorg for paying as agreed.

By 1930 rumors began to circulate of a possible crop failure in the Soviet Union, threatening the largest export, grains, and of the possibility of another famine like that of 1921. Yet during that year, in spite of the refusal of United States banks to finance Soviet orders, it was estimated that credits to the Amtorg rose to a high of $80,000,000, dropping to $40,000,000 by the end of the year. The maximum term for which credit was given seldom exceeded 18 months, and the discount rate on Amtorg paper in July 1931 remained at 25 percent.

The American Manufacturers Export Association was reported in the press as advising terms of payment of 50 percent of invoice "down" or on shipment of goods, and a maximum of 6 months for the balance. But in certain fields of industry, like shipbuilding, much longer credits were urged by the manufacturers interested, although no orders resulted from this propaganda. Even the conservative banking fraternity was attracted by a proposal made in September 1931 for the creation of a special bank whose business it would be to disccunt Amtorg acceptances; but this plan also failed to develop into actuality. The memory of the Tsarist bonds floated in New York in 1916 was still too fresh.

RFC LOAN IN 1933

In the meantime, however, the Amtorg had firmly established itself as a bulk buyer of machine tools and similar equipment, and the Soviet Government had contemplated its first 5-year plan and launched the second, for the execution of which much machinery had to be purchased abroad. Preference was shown for Germany and the United Kingdom, where government-guaranteed credits were available. Congress was not willing to enter the field of guaranteeing payment for goods

exported, under an extension of the Reconstruction Finance Act; the question of recognition by the United States of the Soviet regime was a further complicating factor in the situation. Many favored such recognition as a spur to lagging trade; others proposed a huge barter arrangement, whereby exports to the Soviet Union should be balanced by imports from that country.

The only actual result of all the discussion was a loan in July 1933 of $4,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Amtorg, to enable the latter to purchase, and pay for in a year, about 75,000 bales of cotton, of which there was a large surplus in the country. Repayment of this loan, it may be added, was made promptly. It was not followed, however, by any further large sales of cotton or textile goods on credit, as urged by some manufacturers of the latter.

Nor did private efforts to set up a discount bank, to function as a channel by which sellers to Amtorg could shift their risks to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, ever get beyond the stage of obtaining favorable publicity and support from a number of prominent manufacturers. Other similar plans, which took their cue from Mr. Litvinov's offer in London in June 1933 of "$1,000,000,000 worth of orders" if a credit of that amount were offered by the countries interested, seldom even reached the public through the press.

EFFECT OF RECOGNITION

Recognition of the Soviet Union in November 1933 did not of itself affect favorably or unfavorably the Amtorg's credit standing. This continued to be dependent on the international financial position of the Soviet Government, which now, however, was becoming steadily stronger. The peak of the foreign debts assumed earlier had been weathered, no defaults marred the record of payment, and the economic situation of the Soviet Union had definitely begun to improve. The position of the Amtorg as a credit risk naturally reflected these favorable developments; its purchases on credit became an accepted custom with manufacturers and there was even some extension in the maximum terms granted. But the total of the orders placed in the United States was small, even taking into consideration the reduction in Soviet imports from all countries in 1933, and pressure for longer credits to permit larger purchases became insistent, usually in the form of a demand for United States Government support of individual exporters in their extension of the credits demanded. One proposal which received much publicity involved utilization of the newly-formed Export-Import Bank for Trade with Russia, a Government organization, to finance large credits with a term of 25 years. But for a number of reasons, few of which have ever been publicly disclosed, this bank was never allowed to function, and was finally closed.

Little actual change was to be noted at this time in the length of the credits extended to the Amtorg. They still seldom exceeded a maximum of 18 months, although some large sales were recorded without any cash payments, 100 percent of invoice being payable in 12 months. The interest rate on acceptances was reduced to 5 percent, however, and the discount rate dropped to 12 and later, by 1936, to 8 percent. The Soviet foreign debt had been reduced, by January 1, 1935, to $150,000,000, and was not considered as a factor affecting the credit standing of the Amtorg.

More and more manufacturers and exporters accepted Amtorg orders, but their habit of years of selling for export for cash was a deterrent to the kind of mutual confidence and spirit of cooperation that the steadily increasing business relations should have engendered. On the one hand there was the confirmed custom of United States firms, on the other the insistence by the Amtorg on a change in that custom. The show went on, but there was a ghost behind the scenes, which occasionally made its presence uncomfortably felt.

NEW AMTORG POLICY

This condition persisted until 1938, when the Amtorg itself "cut the Gordian knot" by announcing that henceforth all purchases would be made on the basis of cash 45 days after the shipment of goods, the delay being necessary to permit time for inspection of the goods after their arrival in the U. S. S. R. This new policy proved readily acceptable to most firms seling to the Amtorg, and was maintained until 1939, when exports from the United States were seriousy reduced by the outbreak of war in Europe. Although these rose again, in 1940, by 50 percent over 1939, the question of credit did not arise, for the need of the Soviet Union for the products then available only in the United States market was paramount, and the new basis of payment, now well established, was satisfactory to both buyer and sellers.

The ghost was laid, at least for the duration of the war. What will happen after the end of that struggle is unpredictable.

Yalta Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received several telegrams similar in content, which read as follows:

PEORIA, ILL., *June 4, 1945.*

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Congressman from Illinois,
Washington, D. C.:

Americans of Serbian descent urge your support in requesting that Dictator Tito stop imposing a totalitarian regime by terror and ask that the provisions made by Big Three at Yalta regarding Yugoslavia be carried out, otherwise our claims of fighting for democracy are a sham.

SERBIAN LODGE NO. 50 OF SERB NATIONAL FEDERATION, PEORIA, ILL.,
NICH LACANSKI, *President.*
ZIVAN ALEKSICH, *Secretary.*

PEORIA, ILL., *June 5, 1945.*

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Congressman from Illinois,
Washington, D. C.:

Americans of Serbian descent urge your support in requesting that Dictator Tito stop imposing a totalitarian regime by terror and ask that the provisions made by Big Three at Yalta regarding Yugoslavia be carried out, otherwise our claims of fighting for democracy are a sham.

SERBIAN NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, PEORIA, ILL.,
TIMA BOOKVICH, *President.*
VUKSOIN GRUYICH, *Secretary.*

The reason I allude to that at this time is simply this: I have been rather reluctant to discuss some political aspects of the recent sojourn that I made abroad. Time did not permit before, but I do want to say, and certainly will do so circumspectly without roiling the waters or embarrassing those in high position, that I believe the time has arrived now when there should be some rather frank and exploratory discussion of this matter. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on June 14 I be given permission to address the House for 1 hour on this general subject, after the disposition of other business. That will be Flag Day, and a most suitable occasion for some observations on matters which are of real import to those who live under the flag of this Republic.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address delivered by me as the guest speaker over radio station WLLH, Lawrence, Mass., on May 30, 1945. This program was sponsored by the Department of Massachusetts, American Legion Auxiliary, and was conducted by Kathryn E. Harty, department vice chairman of radio in Massachusetts:

We pause in this, the most decisive year of history, to think of our dead.

The scene is much the same as it was when we, the grown-ups, were children. The solemn beauty of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the uniformed veterans of this and former wars, the bands, the flowers, the bright little flags in the cemetery—here is the annual pilgrimage of America at the end of the month of May. All over these sacred fields we see the living, some coming, some going, others motionless as they kneel in prayer.

It looks the same as so many other Memorial Days that we can remember, yet we sense a difference. Here is no mere routine, dulled by unthinking repetition. In sad and silent wonder we recall the looks and speech of loved ones who are gathered in the embrace of kind earth. This plot of ground, this tablet, they comfort us with the knowledge that those we knew are free from pain and fear. Today, however, the loss we feel is more than a personal emotion. It reaches out to share the grief of a community, a nation, a world. This day we think of others who are buried in the far, strange places of this earth. From Normandy to Okinawa, from Italian hillsides to ocean depths they rest. We think of them; we think of those who are dying at this moment, and of those who must die so long before their time. This Memorial Day is different.

Out of the anguish of our present trials we must come forth strong and steadfast to carry through the task for which so many have fallen. Here, in the company of the dead, we become aware of our own brief time on earth and of the work that must be done. Through us and those who follow us, they who lie here depend for the fulfillment of their mission.

They were, they are, so young—these men who die for us. Not lightly have they given up the chance to love, to found families, to have children; to experience joys, sorrows,

and responsibilities together; to bring gifts to life which the world so sorely needs; to dream dreams that we shall never know. Their eager voices are like music that dies on the wind while we strain our ears to hear the melody that is stilled forever.

Not lightly have they given all, for the burden of their giving falls on us. We must now do and speak for them. In this we cannot fail. Before the desperate challenge of aggression they gave body, mind, and faith, all the bright promise of years to be lived. They gave so fully, believing and trusting in us to redeem their sacrifice.

Are we ready? Are we now thinking, planning, working toward the great and difficult goal of lasting peace? For this is the only memorial that can fittingly honor their giving. Think hard and earnestly, my friends, because this is no idle pledge to be lightly made and as easily forgotten. This is the supreme responsibility of our times. All the victims of cruelty and greed, all the legions who have perished in war since the beginning of history, weigh heavily on our consciousness this day. The grim facts speak for themselves. We know, all too well, that the issue is now clearly drawn. It is, "Eliminate war, or it will eliminate civilization." Through the murmuring grass that covers the dead we seem to hear this warning. We read it in the faces of the bereaved. We see it in the crippled minds and bodies that fill our military and our veterans' hospitals.

In our generation this menace has reached a climax. There may be some who wish they had been born earlier or could live later than this present crisis but wishing will not relieve them of responsibility. We've got to outlaw aggression. We've got to build a peace that will work. There is no other way. From those who have died to those as yet unborn, it is we, the living who must build or destroy the continuity of civilization. The hopes of the past and the heritage of the future are passing through our hands. You and I will decide, for better or worse, the outcome of this challenge to humanity.

Little boys and girls, in childish innocence, are playing on this Memorial Day. Free from the restraints of school, their happy energy is matching the springtime of the year. Some are playing the game of war. It is exciting and full of heroic exploits. The evil enemy is quickly and decisively beaten, and no one on our side is hurt. It is so much fun, this playing at make-believe. But the world in which they will grow up, will be far different from this convenient, imaginary world of childhood. It may be a world of bloodshed and anarchy. It may be a world in which the children of today would become men and women in name only, condemned to hopeless slavery. Or it might find them prowling, like subhuman creatures in the blackened ruins of great cities or clawing for roots in the jungle-weeds of abandoned farms. All this could and might come to pass if we fail them now.

On the other hand, these laughing children of today may grow up into a world of friendly human fellowship, enjoying material, cultural, and spiritual values beyond our vision, if we make the world safe for them. Chaos or progress, which shall it be? To have a civilization that is worthy of humanity will require great efforts, the best in each and every one of us. Our world stands poised on a very delicate balance, uncertain of its course. Any delay on our part, any evasion of our responsibility, will decide whether these children playing on Memorial Day in the year 1945 will inherit a world of hope or a dark world of despair.

Through the mysterious barriers which separate the living from the dead, the voice of one so recently gone seems to come to our ears again. Or maybe it is just the memory of a vital and valiant personality who lives on in our hearts. This man fell in the line of duty, fighting not only for the life of civilization but for its progressive future. He is the spokesman for all those who died that we might live. His faith-inspiring voice, undimmed by death, is with us yet. It says, "Have no fear. Go forward. You can and will reach the high goal of a just and permanent peace. Fellow Americans, humanity itself depends on you. I know that you will do this job."

Up from the paralysis of domestic failures, this bright spirit led us. With the world vision that was so truly his, he saw the gathering storm long before the millions of Americans wakened to their peril. With brave and brilliant leadership he brought us from the brink of defeat to the crest of victory. Even as we were vindicating the strength and enterprise of our democracy in the agony of war, he was drawing blueprints for the most sublime creation man ever dared to conceive—the functional architecture of a durable, serviceable peace. His tireless, eager spirit, however, was stronger than the mortal frame which housed it and gave it human being. Worn out by constant labor, the flesh died and the great spirit burst its bonds. Our Nation had lost one of its finest leaders. The ordinary people of this world had lost a true friend. The cause of freedom had suffered its most serious casualty. Franklin D. Roosevelt was gone.

Why he should have been taken from us at the very moment we needed him most only an all-wise Providence knows. This much we do know, he revitalized our complacent democracy, giving it a deeper meaning, a wider application.

To the millions of unemployed in our country he brought freedom of opportunity, the right of all men and women to have self-supporting jobs. To humble people all over the world he became the champion of human rights. Fear-burdened men looked up as they heard his hopeful voice assuring them that the world was a neighborhood and calling upon them to join with him in promoting the general welfare.

He spoke for a new American democracy that is creedless because it is a composite of the fundamental good in all creeds. It is raceless because it is a blend of all racial qualities. By this common denominator of our Americanism we shall be strong, just, and united as we face the stern tasks that lie ahead.

He spoke these truths that make us brothers and they became a part of our American way of life. Today, he is the shining symbol of all the hero dead we mourn. Like him, they lived and died for ends far nobler than the narrow claims of self. These martyrs in the cause of human dignity have left us a spiritual heritage which we cannot deny. Through us, in time, it must pass to other men as a glowing inspiration to truth and goodness. This, the immortal spirit of free and responsible men, is the last, best hope of earth.

Though lilacs bloom in purple requiem, the world is green with life and hope. After the long winter of our discontent, the sun breaks through again. We rise from our knees, our eyes still lingering on the graves of those we knew. Sleep well, dear friends, your share of the work is done.

Today, in spiritual communion with them, we have consecrated ourselves to carry on their task and bring it ever nearer to fulfillment. Today, we have given humble thanks to the faith and courage which they have bequeathed to us by their example.

And so we leave the dead and face forward to the urgent demands of life. The burden of our responsibility is heavy but we cannot fail. With God's help we shall not fail. The fate of our world depends upon us, the living, in this hour of great decision.

What Do We Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of May 29, 1945:

WHAT DO WE MEAN?

Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace is giving very serious thought, he says, to a series of questions just asked him by Robert Gaylord, board chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers.

And all other Americans could well be giving consideration to these questions, too.

No. 1 is this: "Private enterprise must be subject to regulation by the Government. Everyone accepts that. The only question is, How far can that regulation go before it changes private enterprise into controlled or public enterprise?"

Some have suggested that so long as regulation is by law, so that every man and every enterprise may know in advance what rules must be obeyed but can then operate freely and with confidence within those rules, private enterprise is not endangered; but if regulation becomes a mere caprice of a vast bureaucracy, changing its own rules overnight and discriminating as it pleases, there is no real freedom of enterprise left. Probably this definition is too simple; but certainly we do need to know the point at which postwar regulation must stop if we are to keep free enterprise as the basis of our national life. Not only Mr. Wallace but the Nation in general needs to do some hard and practical thinking on this matter. President Truman already is starting a sincere attack on the problem of excess bureaus. The freeing of business from the dead hand of red tape and petty regulation by incompetents is a vitally important step on which some reconversion could well begin at once.

Another question asked by Mr. Gaylord is this: "If we are to increase employment through expanded private enterprise, it follows that private investors must be persuaded to put their money to risk in order to make that production possible. What are the potentialities for private enterprise and what are the opportunities for private investment?"

This country was built up on the investment of people who took risks with their money to get new enterprises—and expansions of old enterprises—under way. Some of them lost; some of them gained. The incentives to risk private funds must be restored. Recently the Securities and Exchange Commission in order to help small business raised from $100,000 to $300,000 the amount of securities which a business could offer the public in any year's period without formal registration. This may indicate a trend toward a return to more open marketing conditions. But a certain "climate" must also be created within which citizens will feel that they can risk their funds in a business on the basis of their judgment of its management and product, without worrying hopelessly about general tax and regulation policies which can change overnight and upset the best managed and planned private enterprise.

Then Mr. Gaylord asks a question also about those public enterprises which are to

be continued in operation by the government after the war. He points out that all the citizens of this country are investors, by reason of taxes, in these enterprises—and all are stockholders, too, by reason of their vote. He inquires: "are not these investors and stockholders entitled to the same information about public enterprise that private management gives to them as stockholders and investors in private enterprise?"

We have the spectacle today of a government which is ultra-cautious about requiring private business reports to stockholders while at the same time it operates more than a hundred public corporations and does as it pleases about accounting for those operations or keeping their business a mystery. Certainly uniform accounting to the people on how their money is invested in these operations is just as important as the accounting on their private investments. Otherwise they will never know what should be done about keeping or abandoning these vast Federal ventures into enterprises of many types.

Finally, Mr. Gaylord asks a couple of questions about foreign trade. "Our exports," he notes, "are limited by our ability to import at some time and in some form. Temporarily we may loan money to make payment of our exports possible, but in the long run we must accept payment in goods or services from those who buy our products. If we increase our imports we will have little difficulty in expanding our exports. Just what kind of imports can our country make profitably?"

That's one issue on which we shall require a real policy very soon, unless we intend to pour out goods indefinitely without any return whatever. And here's another—the vague public objection to cartels set up in foreign nations to monopolize all foreign trade and prevent its conduct by individual enterprises on a free competitive basis. Mr. Gaylord wants cartels clearly defined. Facing the fact that cartels whether we like it or not are going to conduct all the foreign business of a number of countries, he wants to know whether it is in the public interest that American businessmen try to get some of the foreign business of these cartels. If we decide they should, he wants to know "How can they do this in a way that will not interfere with the play of competition in this country?"

These seem very sensible questions to ask the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Wallace is turning the Gaylord letter over to "a special committee which we have set up in the department." We may well hope the questions aren't pigeonholed there, for a frank answer on Government policy—an answer all Americans can understand and trust—needs to be forthcoming very soon. The piping days of war are running out.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the memorial exercises held in the House today, honoring our departed colleagues who have died during the past year, like all these annual memorial exercises, are impressive.

The number of deaths during the past year is smaller than usual, there being only three from the Senate and three from the House.

The senior Member of the House delegation whose memory we honor today is Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. He was first elected to the House in 1920 and served continuously as a Member of this body for nearly 24 years. At the time of his death he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, having succeeded Hon. Marvin Jones as chairman of that committee upon Mr. Jones' retirement from the House. He had been in ill health for several years, but remained at his post of duty and carried on notwithstanding his illness.

The people of his district demonstrated their faith and confidence in him by having chosen him as their representative in Congress in 12 different elections, and he kept the faith by ably representing them during his long service in the House.

It has been my privilege during my entire service in the House to know HAMP FULMER, as his intimate friends called him, he having been elected to Congress 2 years before I became a Member. He was my friend and I had an affectionate regard for him and shall miss him and mourn his loss, and sympathize most deeply with his wife and family in their bereavement.

Address of Gen. O. N. Bradley to the Graduating Class at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gen. O. N. Bradley, commanding Twelfth Army Group, June 5, 1945:

General Wilby, distinguished guests, and gentlemen of the corps:

To you wartime graduates, I bring the congratulations of your comrades overseas on your completion of this first phase of your service in the Army.

With the peacetime course of 4 years compressed into three, your instructional period at West Point has been made more urgent by the tempo of these times. Your class has been shadowed by headline world events, demonstrating need for the leadership you have been trained to provide.

We are certain you bring to the commissioned ranks those continuing standards of duty and honor that are the great contributions of this institution.

Relatively few people are acquainted with the complexity and enormity of war as it is fought today. I have seen something of war during the last 2½ years, yet I confess that I sometimes feel I know very little about it.

It was just 1 year ago today that our invasion army sailed from the south coast of England to assault the Continent of Europe. And although we had been planning it for months, many of us were surprised by the fleet we saw crossing the channel. There were ships of all descriptions from one horizon to the other. Ships that 2 years before had been blue prints carried men and equipment, especially trained and designed for the hazardous tasks that formed the pattern of invasion. Overhead thousands of planes provided protection while others sped ahead to bomb the German defenses.

Essentially, however, this was not an army, not a navy, but a nation sailing to war. Our ships were filled with the achievements and hopes of the American people. And allied with them, the desperate hopes of half a world suffering under German occupation.

For more than 2 years the full and limitless efforts of our Nation—and those of our allies—had been pointed to this day. Millions of American troops had been trained and equipped for this ordeal. Never in the long history of the world had so huge an accumulation of the world's talents, wealth, and effort—thought, ingenuity, and skill—been funneled into a single operation, never had an operation such meaning to the future of the world.

To launch this attack, to expand it, and support it, we were compelled to secure thousands of shiploads of troops, tens of thousands of carloads of ammunition, millions of tons of rations and special equipment. This equipment included thousands of ships and aircraft, acres of cannon, innumerable radios, hospitals, laundries, bakeries, machine shops, switchboards, bridges, sawmills, bulldozers, cranes, generators, freight car, and the enormous variety of items we carry to war.

I tell you this only to illustrate the enormous and complex character of war. As professional soldiers, you will remember that wars are won, not alone by the bravery of soldiers and by the quality of their leadership, but also by the mass of material provided by the Nation. And for this, I bring to the American people the thanks of our soldiers overseas—the thanks of their sons whose lives have been saved by the overwhelming superiority of our forces. Battles were won by the infantry, tank, artillery, and air teams—by soldiers living in the rain and huddling in the snow—but the war in Europe was won by the great strength of the Nation—soldier and civilian working together.

And so we see the advent of the machine has made war the total conflict that it is. Nations, not armies, go to war. In preparing yourself for a lifetime of service, you will not only train for the leadership of troops in battle, but also to provide leadership for the Nation in the event war should recur again.

With the ending of the war in Germany and the return to the United States of many veterans of Africa, Sicily, and Europe, there has been some apprehension on the difficulty with which these men shall readapt themselves to life in their communities.

Our Army today is a literal cross section of our national population, in better health for its years of service. True, some will return confused, bewildered, or embittered in their attempts to adjust themselves. But the overwhelming preponderance of these American men are returning more matured, greatly broadened, mentally sturdier, and more imaginative than when they went away.

For even in the cruel and wasteful destruction of war itself, some benefit has accrued to these men, not as a result of the war, but rather from the military training in which they have engaged.

The American soldier overseas has seen the great strength and ingenuity of his countrymen. They have taught him pride in the Nation and in the people of the Nation. This pride has been transfused to the American soldier himself.

Our soldier has developed confidence in his individual accomplishment. He has devel-

oped confidence in his ability to achieve great projects in company with other Americans like himself.

To the man who has reduced a concrete fort deep rooted in the Siegfried line, anything is possible. To the man who has built a bridge across the Rhine in 10 hours under artillery fire, there is no limit to his accomplishment. A man with the resiliency to stand off his enemy in the torturous cold of a winter battle does not frighten or discourage easily.

Military service has not submerged the dignity of the individual. Instead he has been trained to apply initiative and imagination—the greatest pair of weapons he carried into battle. And yet at the same time he has learned that individuals function best in teams. When our troops landed on the beaches they landed in boat teams. When they assaulted the Siegfried line, they attacked in assault teams.

This development of teamwork, their living together and working together has taught them consideration for each other, respect for the privileges of each other, and tolerance for the rights of others.

At the same time, our troops have accepted the fundamental characteristic of good citizenship. They have honestly acknowledged their responsibility to the Nation. They have discarded an earlier selfish attachment to extreme privacy. Their intense and absorbing interest in private effort has given way to greater concern for their public responsibilities.

In association with other men from all elements of society and from all sections of the country, our troops have responded to a desire for information, education, and further training in their vocations. Classification tests have assisted men in discovering hidden talents. Highly technical duties have stimulated the imagination of many and awakened their interests in a wide variety of scientific studies. The many more of them that continue on to university educations will do so with a sobering earnestness resulting from more matured judgment.

Finally these troops have known the people of many nations. They have viewed similarities between themselves and others and adjudged the differences. They are better informed on world affairs and will carry home opinions on our world relationships.

These, then, are the men you have been trained to lead. They have achieved standards that will be difficult for many of their companions at home to attain. As leaders of these men, you must not only attain, but even hope to excel those high standards.

As soldiers, your responsibility to the Nation in peacetime will be even greater than that in war.

For with the inevitable defeat of Japan and the ending of hostilities, the American people shall be faced with the need for redefining the role of our military forces in the life of our Nation—and in the conduct of its relationships with other nations of the world.

Our Government—and the governments of our allies—have indicated they will accept the principle of international cooperation among the nations of the world. In an earlier declaration of principle, our Government indicated that such cooperation shall be founded on liberty, equality, justice, morality, and law.

With the establishment of an international agency, it is probable that machinery will be prepared and empowered to use force, if necessary, to insure the preservation of peace. We, therefore, shall be charged by the people with the necessity of providing professional counsel and advice on the structure and employment of these defense forces.

By retaining the core of a professional force about which we can mobilize a great citizen army—perhaps systematically trained through some form of military service—we can establish the foundation stone of a system of national and international security.

As a part of this professional core, it will be necessary for you to give intelligent service to the Nation when called on for advice. You must fully understand not only the military nature of war, but also the enormous problems of its psychological, economic, and industrial characteristics. For these are the crucial factors of the war potential of our Nation, and that of other peaceful nations with whom we shall be working together in concert.

Naturally, our strongest guaranty of peace lies in a world order that will prevent the reestablishment and rearmament of those world powers that have been—and in the case of Japan, will be—shattered in defeat.

If the American people elect to insure the maintenance of peace in company with other nations, and if they elect to employ the use of military power to enforce their diplomacy we must stand ready to provide that power.

Historically, diplomatic conversations have been meaningful largely in proportion to the military and economic power available for their enforcement. In the years of crisis that preceded this war, even strong declarations of principle had little effect in deterring an aggressive Germany.

In closing, again let me impress upon you the seriousness of war. Modern war is a work war, a war of detailed planning, of specialized equipment, of long hours of drudgery, while still yet a war of courage and death. You will now take your place in this great citizen army of ours. In so doing you accept responsibilities that can be met only by loyal devotion to duty. You will become the guardian of the welfare and of the lives of your men. They will look to you for food, equipment, clothing, and shelter. They will expect you to share their problems and to advise them on personal matters. But above all they will expect to be led in such a manner as to bring military success with a minimum cost of life.

To this end you must know your men, your profession, your equipment, and you must exercise continual resourcefulness. Your first concern must be for your men. They will sleep willingly in the mud or eat a meager ration if they understand that you have exhausted every possibility for improving their conditions. And they will follow you into combat if you will lead them. By demonstrating ability, you will acquire their confidence.

A sense of duty and the will to succeed must go with you always. There can be no acceptance of failure. At the crossing of the Roer, when engineers were struggling under fire to hold an assault bridge in the flooded waters, a young second lieutenant was called on by his commander for a report of progress. He answered simply: "Sir, we've tried everything we know and we can't get the cable to hold. But we'll get it in somehow." With this spirit and resourcefulness he did. And an unknown number of lives were saved.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the importance of your duties. I can only advise that you apply yourself diligently to build further upon the military foundation given you here and that by honest work and brave performance you maintain the fine traditions of the service.

The Academy has equipped you mentally, morally, physically, and professionally for the most important task anyone can assume. From now on you must develop yourself and increase your value to the Nation. Assume your duties in the knowledge that you are dealing with the lives of men and that nothing short of superlative effort can ever be tolerated. Our trust and the hopes of our Army go with you and will follow you always. In turn be grateful for this opportunity to serve your Nation. Be grateful to our people for the maintenance of this institution, and to this Academy for all that it has done for you.

May God give you strength to perform your duty, to live in honor and with devotion to your country.

Number Three Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of May 21, 1945:

NUMBER THREE MAN

There was an exciting moment early in this century when it seemed as if John Hay was on the point of taking the oath as President of the United States. Theodore Roosevelt was President at the time. He was riding in a carriage on a public highway in western Massachusetts. Then a trolley car entered the picture, moving too fast. There was a crash. When Mr. Roosevelt emerged he was heard to say that it was a close call for John Hay. At the time, Mr. Hay was Secretary of State, having been continued in office by Mr. Roosevelt after he moved into the White House on the death of President McKinley.

The passing of President Franklin Roosevelt, elevating Vice President Truman to the executive chair, places Edward R. Stettinius next in line of succession. Certainly no one anticipates that our present Chief Executive will do other than complete his term of office; yet tragic events have brought sudden changes in the past.

This is not the first time in our history that finds the Nation without a Vice President. To be sure, such men as Johnson, Tyler, Theodore Roosevelt, and Coolidge, who succeeded to the post at the passing of their predecessors, lived out their terms. But simply because it has happened that a Vice President advanced to the highest position in the land has continued to breathe is not a good reason for assuming that a man in such a place will stay alive until the machinery of the law provides a successor.

Mr. Stettinius may turn out to be one of the ablest men ever to hold the office of Secretary of State. But he is entirely without the practical political experience obtained from running for office, being elected and administering public affairs from an executive position.

In our national life there have been three Presidents, all of them men of large ability in fields where they rose to eminence, for whom the Presidency was their first elective office. These were Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, and Herbert Hoover.

General Grant was one of the finest generals in the history of warfare; Judge Taft had shone in the administration of the Philippines, and Mr. Hoover, eminent as an engineer, had a remarkable record in relief work. But the many admirers of these Presidents prefer to think of them outside the White House rather than in it. The same lack was common to them all. None had previous personal political experience.

That is good reason for being doubtful about Mr. Stettinius, should he be suddenly thrust into the White House. Yet the hope is general that he will shine as Secretary of State.

The Constitution provides that when the President is incapacitated his place shall be taken by the Vice President, and authorizes Congress to provide for the succession after a Vice President.

The present law, enacted by Congress in 1886, puts the Secretary of State in the No. 3 place, after the Vice President. The Secretary of the Treasury follows, with other Cabinet officers ranked in the order of the establishment of the departments.

Ex-Postmaster General James A. Farley has recently called attention to what he feels is the need of making some other arrangement. It is suggested that the Speaker of the House of Representatives would be better in the No. 3 position than the Secretary of State. The reason given is that a Speaker is elected by the popular branch of the national legislature, each of the Members having been themselves elected by their districts.

On the other hand, the Secretary of State is an appointee of the President. To be sure, the nomination has the approval of the Senate but that body is almost always prompt to permit a President to name his own Cabinet.

Looking back through the list of Speakers, it is evident that putting one of them into the White House would provide an Executive of thorough political experience.

This, however, is a problem that should not be settled in a hurry. Mr. Farley's suggestion that the matter be examined with care by a competent commission is sound.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Race Tracks and Fairs—Why the Discrimination?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, immediately after VE-day, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion announced that the ban imposed upon horse and dog racing had been removed and that hereafter operators of racetracks would be permitted to operate without any restrictions.

On the 1st day of June, the War Committee on Conventions, which is an agency set up by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, issued a statement to the effect that no State or regional fairs were to be held this year. There is no way of reconciling these two orders unless we accept the theory that horse and dog racing, which are at least 95-percent gambling and perhaps 5-percent sport, are more essential to the war effort than are State and regional fairs, which are educational and constructive in their nature.

The excuse given for the order banning fairs is that it is necessary to save rail transportation for the movement of troops and supplies. This, in spite of the fact that race horses are being shipped all over the country by rail transportation and that very few people who attend State fairs use rail transportation.

I feel that our State and regional fairs have definitely contributed to the war effort. They have afforded an opportunity for the Army and Navy to bring the war directly to the people through the medium of war shows and exhibits. They have contributed to the sale of war bonds and have cooperated with the war food program. They have kept up the morale of the people in the agricultural sections of the country by furnishing both education and entertainment.

I am sure that no one wishes to see State and regional fairs conducted if they in any way interfere with the war effort. The burden of proof, however, is certainly on the Office of War Mobilization to show why it is permissible to operate race tracks all over the country while prohibiting fairs. If this ban on fairs is to stand, let us be consistent and let us close the race tracks also.

Postwar Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of June 5.

Mr. Speaker, there is much loose talk about an unworkable, un-American proposal to provide full unemployment after the war by Federal regulation and by the use of unlimited Federal funds.

We all want full employment, but we cannot have full employment by Federal legislation and at the same time retain freedom and the American way of life. We would have a Government as un-American as the German Gestapo, which we have just destroyed, if we try to pass such unsound, ridiculous legislation.

Because I think the editorial in question is unanswerable, I am pleased to include same:

IT IS TIME TO FACE UP TO THE IMPLICATIONS OF JOB GUARANTIES

In a public letter which may represent the position of the Truman administration, War Mobilization Director Fred M. Vinson has spoken favorably of the Murray-Wagner full-employment bill. Mr. Vinson's letter is very discreetly worded and is not quite clear just what he means by it. He says he wants guaranteed full employment, but he is against any regimentation of business or labor. Whatever the intent of his letter, many zealous people are going to believe that Mr. Vinson thinks Government can guarantee every man a job without impairing the normal American freedoms.

But this is moonshine, and for plain reasons. On this point, as on certain others, the British politicians have been a good deal clearer and a good deal more candid than our own people, Sir William Beveridge, for instance, who has devoted a life of close and scientific study to the subject, propagandizes for government guaranties of employment not in lyric speeches and cagily drafted letters of recommendation, but in solid full-length books replete with graphs and tables.

And in the course of these studies Sir William confesses what to him seems the obvious: That Government can't underwrite full employment unless it can assign men to the place in the economy where their services are needed to assure full employment; and that in so doing the Government will necessarily have to override what Sir William calls the "sovereignty" of private ownership.

Can any of the serious thinkers in Washington really be unaware of this commonplace truth? Take a single instance. The Navy Department is now crying out for 15,000 new mechanics to repair urgently needed navy ships in west coast shipyards. But the jobs so far have had few takers. There are workers available, all right. But for a variety of reasons (some of them, no doubt, quite good reasons) the workers aren't interested in the Navy jobs.

But does anybody think the Government is going to permit that Navy work to go undone? Suppose the Government were underwriting jobs in peacetime. Suppose it worked up a ship-repair program offering 15,000 jobs. Suppose the idle workers who were holding the Government to its job guaranty then decided they didn't like ship-repair work. Would the Government planners answer, "O. K., then, let's see if we can't work out something else—say, at shorter hours and more pay"? No one can really think the Government planners would prove so accommodating. The overwhelming pressure of their responsibility for the public's economic welfare would force them to pressure the unwilling workers into the ship jobs.

Critics of full-employment programs cannot, of course, deny that maximum employment must be achieved. Certainly they cannot be called callous about the great and justified yearning for steady jobs at good pay. But they can and should point out the implications of the programs offered. Even fair-minded advocates of those programs ought pretty soon to confess that sovereignty can't guarantee jobs without sovereign powers to fill them.

The Battleship "Iowa"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1943, it was my privilege to be present at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Iowa* at the navy yard, New York. Since that time this 45,000-ton battleship has played an action-packed role in the war against Japan.

Under command of Capt.—now admiral—John L. McCrea, Marietta, Mich., the *Iowa* bombarded Kwajalein and Eniwetok in the Marshalls prior to their invasion early last year and pursued Japanese ships fleeing the February 1944 attack on Truk.

She participated in the invasion of Hollandia, April 1944, bombarded Palau, Ponape in the Carolines, and Saipan and Tinian in the Marianas.

The *Iowa* covered carrier operations against the Philippines and fought in the battle of Leyte Gulf last October.

When launched, the *Iowa* was the heaviest ship ever to go down the ways in American shipyards. She now has three sister battleships, the *New Jersey*, *Wisconsin*, and *Missouri*.

Capt. Allan R. McCann, Washington, D. C., succeeded McCrea as the skipper.

The *Iowa's* present skipper is Capt. James L. Holloway, Jr., Dallas, Tex., and Arlington, Va.

In 1943 the *Iowa* carried President Roosevelt to Africa for historic meetings with other Allied leaders.

The Adaptability for Postwar Service of United States Maritime Commission C Type and Victory Type Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a paper presented on April 27, 1945, by Vice Adm. Howard L. Vickery before the New York Metropolitan Section of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers at the Downtown Athletic Club in New York City, on the subject of the adaptability for postwar service of United States Maritime Commission C type and Victory type ships:

The subject set for me is the adaptability for postwar service of Maritime Commission C type and Victory type ships. I have assumed the right to add to these groups another type; namely, the P–2 or transport type.

When the Commission was originally organized there was considerable discussion as to the wisdom of designing standard types, it being held by many that in order to secure effective service a ship should be designed around the immediate requirements of the trade route in view, together with the policies of competing lines and the characteristics of vessels which the competitors had already placed or contemplated placing on the trade routes.

Inasmuch as there had not been constructed in this country any cargo-carrying vessels for a long period of time, excepting the two ships of the *Angelina* type constructed by the Bull Line for Puerto Rican service, it was necessary for the Maritime Commission to consider new cargo-carrying vessels generally rather than ships of special characteristics intended for particular trades.

It is provided in the legislation responsible for creating the Maritime Commission that the Commission shall design efficient vessels capable of rendering satisfactory service as auxiliaries in time of national emergency. When the designs were submitted to the Navy Department for its consideration prior to placing of contracts the contemplated speed received particular attention and by mutual agreement, 15 knots was accepted as meeting the minimum needs of the Nation. In only one class of vessel, namely, the C–1, did the Commission propose a speed lower than this, and, therefore, it accepted 14 knots although with reluctance because of economic justification.

In addition to the speed requirement, it was accepted as basic that the Commission-designed vessels should provide adequately for the working and living conditions of seagoing personnel. As a result of a careful study of working and living conditions in American vessels already in commission, there were developed standards involving the area of floor space, the location in the ship, the type of berthing, the food preparation and service, etc., which in recent years have combined to secure for the American seaman comforts at least equal to and in many respects superior to those enjoyed by the sea-going personnel of any other nation.

In all standard C-type and Victory ships crew accommodations are located in the midship structure and above the weather deck, doing away with the old forecastle and poop segregation. In general, no more than three persons are assigned to one stateroom and a separate stateroom is provided for each licensed officer. Separate messrooms are provided for crew, petty officers, and officers, each properly equipped with pantries, etc., and sufficient to heat the full complement at the same time. Sanitary facilities in excess of usual standards; proper lighting, heating, and ventilation; ample provisions for hospital ship's offices, and store spaces make the available accommodations entirely adequate.

In connection with this it is noted that concurrently with the construction program, the Maritime Commission has established fully equipped and up-to-date training schools which are placing in the merchant service young men who possess the desire, stamina, and technical skill necessary to man modern oceangoing vessels. These men are thoroughly trained in the operation and maintenance of C-type and Victory vessels; they are trained to seafaring as a profession and constitute the active nucleus that will carry the flag and commerce of this Nation to every port in the world. The Commission considers it highly important to insure for these men living conditions on shipboard that are satisfactory and compatible with the high standard of their profession.

Another basic concept uniformly carried out in C-type and Victory vessels and directly connected with the safety of crew and cargo is adequate subdivision that enables these vessels to sustain damage under reasonable conditions of extent and loading. The standard was adopted in compliance with provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which directed that the Commission shall design the "best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels. * * *" The reasons and considerations that led to the adoption of standards of subdivision in excess of those required by law have been set forth in a paper included in the Transactions of the Society of 1942. The effects of this policy on the characteristics of the Commission vessels are discussed in detail in that paper; the point that is made here is not one of policy in design but a statement of the fact that the general safety thus built into the vessels has contributed to establish these vessels among the finest in the world for their particular service.

The most careful consideration was given to the problem of propulsion. As you know, the power range of the standard C-type and the Victory-type ships lies between 4,000 and 8,500 horsepower. Electric drive for these vessels was investigated; however, the economics of the power ranges considered indicated that the loss in efficiency due to power transmission and the increase in weight of propulsion equipment did not justify adopting this type of propulsion.

Both diesel and steam were given the most careful consideration. In the diesel field contracts were placed for both direct drive machinery and for main units of higher revolutions operating through reduction gears with electric coupling. In general, it may be said that both types have rendered acceptable service.

For steam propulsion, in the power range considered, the Commission adopted a pressure of 450 pounds with total temperatures of 750°. All of these installations have been turbines with mechanical reduction gearing so designed to give a range of propeller revolutions per minute suited to high propeller efficiency. These installations are also characterized by their excellent results in service as to reliability and low fuel consumption.

The P2 type of transports previously referred to were the result of a design started by the Commission before the war for passenger vessels intended for intermediate services. During 1941, when investigation of the country's resources in ships for military use was completed, it became apparent that should we be forced to engage in warfare any distance from our shores there would be a serious deficiency in vessels available for transport duty. Therefore, the design work was pushed as rapidly as possible, so that at the time of the unexpected attack at Pearl Harbor the Commission was in a position to negotiate with prospective builders for immediate construction of this class of vessel, knowing that when wartime requirements ceased and postwar plans were initiated this tonnage would be valuable. The contracts were awarded in the middle of January 1942, and the first vessel of the class was delivered in July of 1943, which represents the shortest time for development and construction ever achieved in a vessel of this type and size. Contracts for building ships of this general type were placed with the Federal Shipbuilding Co. and with Bethlehem Steel for construction in the Alameda yard.

The P2 types are generally similar in dimensions; however, those now being converted to the R4 type of passenger ship by Federal are fitted with two C3 machinery installations, while those of the R3 type under construction on the west coast are also twin screw but with turboelectric drive.

The principal characteristics of the ships which we are considering are summarized below:

	C1A	C1B	C2	Victory		C3	P2–R3	P2–R4
				Type 1	Type 2			
L. B. P.....feet..	390	395	435	436–0	436–0	465	590	590
Draft.....do....	23. 5	27. 5	25. 75	28. 5	28. 5	28. 5	30	26. 6
Dead weight.....tons..	7, 271	9, 398	9, 036	10, 800	10, 700	12, 120	12, 350	9, 550
SHP.....	4, 000	4, 000	6, 000	6, 000	8, 500	8, 500	18, 000	17, 000
Designed speed.....knots..	14	14	15½	15½	17	16½	19½	19½
Number of passengers.....							550	550
Bale capacity.....	448, 995	447, 748	560, 000	453, 210	453, 210	730, 000	332, 000	364, 000

The figures given are for vessels equipped with geared turbines except for the R–3 type which, as previously stated, is turboelectric.

The construction of the standard types has been restricted in general to independent building yards which have provided their own facilities but were expanded by the assistance of the Commission to meet the production requirements of the war. The exception to this is the North Carolina yard which is Commission-owned but operated by a subsidiary of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. These yards which have so nobly carried on prewar standards of construction with wartime production requirements are Bethlehem, the Alameda and Sparrows Point yards, Consolidated Steel Co., Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., Gulf Shipbuilding Corp., Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., Moore Dry Dock Co., Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., The Pusey & Jones Corp., and

Western Pipe and Steel Corp., as well as the North Carolina yard.

The Victory ships are to be credited to the so-called production yards which accepted the monumental task of constructing long range types with organizations and equipment set for the assembly of the far simpler Liberty ships. The Kaiser yards at Oregon, Richmond, and Vancouver, the Bethlehem Fairfield yard, and Calship are the ones who have done this task.

Previously listed are the salient features of the standard "C" types of ships which it is now proposed to discuss in some detail and from the standpoint of their adaptability for specific purposes in world postwar trade. Obviously, there can be no material changes in the main propulsive units. It is equally obvious that the hull structure in its main characteristics cannot be changed. However, evidenced by the requests of many operators almost everything else about the ship can be and has been changed. The types are discussed according to their size and tonnage.

There are two types of C1, namely, the C1A and C1B. The C1A was the earlier design and, like the C2 vessels, were designed as shelter deckers. Before placing contracts, the Commission received comments from many operators who felt that it would be desirable to have a vessel of this size and speed, however, for use in the deadweight trades. There was sufficient interest shown in a vessel of this type so that C1B was designed as a full scantling vessel. Both types have seen considerable service and proven satisfactory for the trades for which each was suitable. Fewer changes have been introduced in these than in other types, primarily because of the restrictions imposed on conversion, due to their smaller size as well as the lack of flexibility in operation, because of the slower speeds than the other standard types.

The C2 types and Victory ships of the AP2 type may be considered as the second family, as they have many characteristics in common. The speeds are approximately the same. The C2's possess a somewhat large bale capacity, as may be noted in the tabulation. Thus, the C2 is adaptable to general cargo trades, particularly package freight, whereas the Victory ship could be considered better suited to routes where deadweight or bulk cargoes are to be found.

The AP3 type of Victory ship is powered with 8,500-horsepower geared turbines, which became available at about the time this design was under way. It was possible to make slight compromises and use the same hull for both the AP2 and AP3 types, with excellent performance for this range of powers, despite the resultant variation in speed. This vessel can well be utilized in deadweight trades where speeds are important, especially those involving voyages of a considerable length. Although there are not as many AP3 vessels available as the slower AP2's, as a considerable number have been converted for the Navy's use as combat transports, it is possible that some of these may be returned to the Commission for reconversion for postwar use. It may be stated here that many of the standard types are in a similar category, that is, after the need of the military has been accomplished they may become available for reconversion under somewhat favorable conditions from a standpoint of general financial outlay.

As previously mentioned, some C–2 vessels were constructed by North Carolina. These C–2's differ from a standard C–2 in that they have been constructed as full scantling vessels with a dead weight of 10,800 tons. The standards of subdivision have been retained by eliminating the shelter-deck features and may be considered as competitors to the AP–2 Victory ships which possess similar dead weight and a somewhat lesser cubic. There is definite advantage, however, in this North Carolina C–2 that should the owner, after purchase, desire to reduce the tonnage and the dead weight, it is possible to install tonnage openings and the tonnage well with a minimum of change to regain the characteristics of the original C–2 design. This feature has been appreciated by many operators and consequently many of these vessels have been allocated for conversions which will be hereinafter discussed in further detail.

The C–3 vessels of the Commission's program are perhaps best known and it is believed that they have been adapted to more uses than perhaps any other vessel ever constructed. Outstanding in these conversions are the following types: Escort aircraft carriers, destroyer tenders, seaplane tenders, passenger and cargo vessels of four types, attack transports for the Navy, troop transports for the Army, besides multitudinous minor modifications made prewar to suit the requirements of various operators on standard trade routes. Although designed as a 16½-knot vessel, these ships have been scheduled regularly at 17 or 17½ knots and have proven capable of maintaining this speed, and there are records wherein on certain routes an over-all speed of 18 knots has been attained where such a voyage has been favored somewhat by favorable winds and currents.

In order to give a more specific picture as to what can be done, particularly with the C–2 and C–3 types of vessels, I will outline certain conversions which have been made or are in the current construction program in order to permit a more general evaluation of the flexibilities and capabilities of these designs. No attempt will be made to detail the particular vessel of the design or building yard involved, but rather the operator desiring the changes and the over-all characteristics thereby attained.

GRACE LINES, C–2

Two sets of vessels of the North Carolina type have been converted for the Grace Lines; the first series of changes included additional cargo-handling gear which provided double ganging of all the cargo hatches and a change in the boom capacity for the midship hatches from 5 to 10 tons. Also about 100,000 cubic feet of refrigeration especially adapted to the carrying of bananas was added in Nos. 2 and 4 upper and lower 'tween decks to care for this commodity which is a principal item of trade. This resulted in a remaining bale cubic for dry cargo of 400,000 cubic feet and an available dead-weight of 10,350 tons.

The second phase of this conversion is in prospect wherein accommodations for approximately 52 passengers have been added. This was accomplished by completely modifying the superstructures above the main deck in order to provide for the necessary staterooms, an adequate dining room, lounge, and cocktail room, as well as a small open-air swimming pool. This addition, of course, resulted in a further reduction in dead weight so that approximately 10,000 tons will be available with the cargo capacity similar to the previous conversion mentioned.

UNITED STATES LINES, C–2

The changes for United States Lines, also North Carolina built, have not been as extensive as those for the Grace Lines in that refrigeration is primarily for frozen produce and limited to Nos. 3 and 4 upper 'tween decks. In No. 4 hold additional deep tanks have been provided by the installation of a new flat slightly above the shaft at level to provide approximately 800 tons of cargo oil and additional fuel oil to obtain the necessary cruising radius. In this connection the deep tanks in No. 2 hold have been eliminated as ballast voyages are not expected in normal operation. The resultant bale cubic is approximately 426,000 cubic feet for dry cargo and about 37,000 cubic feet of refrigerated; the dead weight is about 10,400.

C–2'S, GENERAL

In addition to the above specific changes, many of the earlier C–2's were modified slightly in their cargo handling rig, and most of them assigned for operation to regular trade routes had refrigeration added generally in accordance with the changes noted for the lines above.

In order to warn the more ambitious it is desired to point out that the additions of passengers to the C–2 type of vessel have to be considered with extreme care and caution. The addition of superstructures has a pronounced effect on the center of gravity and such modifications may lead to the necessity of reducing the dead weight by the installation of fixed ballast in a quantity necessary to maintain satisfactory operating conditions.

C–3 CONVERSIONS

Many of these, of course, have been for the Army or Navy which have no bearing on the subject in hand, that is, postwar utilization of tonnage. I will review the prewar conversions and those presently contemplated to show the scope of long-range planning that has been covered.

AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES, C–3

Certain C–3 vessels were modified for the round-the-world trade to replace vessels then being utilized which were of the First World War construction program. The changes, in general, were to provide for the carrying of about 96 passengers, maximum with the addition of refrigeration and cargo oil tanks to meet the necessity of this trade. The design changes were planned by the office of George G. Sharp, and, while the war intervened so that not all of these vessels could be placed in service, sufficient operating experience was gained to indicate that they would have been successful.

In more detail the passenger accommodations consisted of 38 staterooms, together with a pleasing lounge and spacious foyer serving as a smoking room and cocktail bar. A swimming pool was also incorporated, together with a dining room capable of seating the maximum complement.

All the passenger quarters received adequate ventilation. Air conditioning was provided for the inboard rooms, public spaces, and dining room. The refrigerated cargo was approximately 43,000 cubic feet and special provisions were made for liquid cargoes in No. 4 hold whereby structural interferences within the tanks were eliminated, thereby minimizing the problem of cleaning. The result in bale capacity for dry cargo was approximately 435,000 cubic feet.

AMERICAN SOUTH AFRICAN LINE, C–3

In order to provide a regular passenger service with a schedule capable of competing with foreign services to South Africa, the Commission arranged to convert three C–3 vessels for the American South African Line. In very general terms the changes were similar to those outlined for the American President Lines previously, but the passenger capacity was increased to about 116 and the public rooms enlarged somewhat beyond those installed on the previous conversion.

The dining room was increased in size to provide seating for 128 and a large smoking room as well as lounge were installed together with a small bar and sitting room. The amount of refrigeration was increased to approximately 57,000 cubic feet resulting in reducing the dry cargo capacity to about 420,000 cubic feet. The resultant dead weight was about 9,900 tons and showed a very good balance with the other characteristics.

UNITED STATES LINES, C–3

Just previous to the start of the war in Europe in 1939, arrangements were made to convert 4 vessels of the C–3 design for use on a London service. This conversation contemplated 165 passengers, considerably more

than the previous conversions, with a resultant increase in the amount of space allocated to public rooms and other features. Again refrigeration was installed to the extent of about 53,000 cubic feet, the dry-cargo capacity was about 537,000 cubic feet, and a satisfactory dead weight of 8,200 tons was expected. However, before completion of the first vessel, this country entered the war, and immediate conversions for military purposes was commenced, so that final checking of the above figures was not possible.

MOORE-M'CORMACK, C–3

These vessels were another prewar conversion similar to the United States Lines above, in that they, too, were never finished but were converted for naval use as escort carriers. This design was the most extensive conversion contemplated for a C–3 vessel in the prewar period. It is felt that in this case an endeavor was made to secure more in several directions than the dimensions of the ship justified.

The total passenger complement finally provided for was about 216, with the passenger facilities increased in that proportion as compared to the 3 conversions just mentioned.

Due to the extensive addition of superstructures, this marked the first attempt of the Commission to introduce light materials such as aluminum for structural work as well as such equipment as lifeboats and davits. Also novel in the design was the proposal to use compartments which in essence are extremely small staterooms designed primarily for single occupancy but with an upper berth should minimum accommodation for 2 persons be desired. It is felt that this type of stateroom with a private toilet and bath will have considerable postwar merit, as it permits the average individual to travel at a minimum rate and still enjoy the luxury of private accommodations. The staterooms contemplated were about 6 by 12 feet, with the bathroom included.

MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO., C–3

There is at present contemplated a conversion of the C–3 type for the Mississippi Shipping Co. Rather than go into detail and repeat the above, it is sufficient to say that passenger carrying characteristics are being introduced and as the design is in the hands of our friend George C. Sharp, we may expect many novel and interesting features when inspection is made upon delivery.

CARGO VESSELS, C–3

The variations in the design of the C–3 cargo vessels are too many to outline in detail. It is sufficient to say that most of the adaptations involve the addition of refrigeration, modification in cargo-handling gear to suit the requirements of the various trade routes, alterations in structure to permit deep tanks of various types, and in the case of the new vessels for the American South African Line modifications in the hatch sizes and cargo gear to meet their special requirements.

I am sure that these comments indicate the extremes in flexibility which may be obtained from a general design, which has a basic sustained speed of 16½ knots and an initial cubic capacity of 730,000 cubic feet and a dead weight of 12,100 tons.

As further statistics would be equally boring let us jump to more glamorous subjects and I will discuss briefly the plans for our first postwar passenger vessels, the conversion of the P–2 transports previously mentioned.

UNITED STATES LINES, P–2

This design bears the designation P–2, S–2, R–4 and is a conversion of those vessels being built at Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., whose general characteristics have been tabulated previously. These vessels will probably represent the initial American provision for trans-Atlantic passenger travel by ship as soon as this route is declared safe for such operation.

Two types of accommodations are provided—cabin class and tourist class—and the vessels are scheduled to operate on a 28-day turn-around with 7 days to England and 8 days to the first continental European port. In developing this design the Commission has had the full support of the United States Lines, and jointly we expect to offer new standards in appearance, accommodations, and decoration. The vessels will be thoroughly modern, both externally and internally, and in full keeping with American standards of living that we have endeavored so hard to achieve.

I might state also that this standard of accommodation is not only confined to the passengers but extends to the crew as well as the officers. I trust that all present may have the time and opportunity to inspect these first vessels, which reflect in some measure our postwar desires, and it will be a pleasure to receive your comments after such inspection as to whether, in your opinion, we have achieved the ends we have desired to obtain.

As noted, accommodations for about 550 passengers have been provided. These are divided, roughly, into 350 in the cabin class and 200 in the tourist class. Each class is provided with two large public rooms, consisting of a smoking room and a lounge, or, more properly, social hall. We have departed from the former practice of providing a spacious main lounge as it is the result of many observations and the consensus of opinion that the utilization of this space on older vessels was limited to elderly people and movies. In lieu thereof we have provided a theater accessible to both classes, which has many advantages. Some of these are:

1. It obviates the necessity of tying up one public room in either class for this function and eliminates the interruption of those enjoying the pictures by those passing through the space for other purposes.

2. It permits practically full time utilization of a public space as it is expected the use of this theater will be devoted to the tourist class in the day and the cabin class in the evening.

3. By its very nature it is possible to place this room in the center of the vessel occupying space which would normally be given to inside staterooms, which in themselves are not wholly desirable.

It is felt to be desirable to call attention to one other feature, namely that of air conditioning. In addition to providing what we feel to be an outstanding installation, the extent of air conditioning has been greatly increased so that it not only covers the dining rooms and inside passenger public spaces, such as a theater and staterooms, but also extends to all staterooms occupied by passengers as well as the mess rooms for officers and crew.

Cargo handling has received careful consideration as in order to maintain the schedule, efficiency for port loading and discharge must be obtained. It is not proposed to discuss the novel features introduced at this time but details of the vessel as a whole will be made the subject of future publicity when the same have been completed.

AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES, P–2

These vessels are being constructed by the Alameda yard of the Bethlehem Steel Co. and as previously mentioned they were designed with turbo-electric drive. These vessels have identical dimensions with the U. S. Lines P–2's, except that from the beginning it was apparent that the trade routes operated by the various lines of this country fall into distinct classes as to required cruising radius and consequent oil tankage. Therefore, these vessels have considerably more tankage and radius of operation than those on the east coast.

Inasmuch as there is a distinct difference in the services of the two lines involved, the conversions have been made in such a manner as to suit the particular trade requirements. This vessel carries three classes of passengers with a good proportion of the third class having open berthing as has been customary for the trans-Pacific run. Again for economy, certain features have been made interchangeable, particularly between the tourist and first-class accommodations and as an incentive to tourist trade, a swimming pool has been provided for this class as well as the first-class passengers.

For the third class, a change in the standard practice for dining will be tried. This will consist of the introduction of a form of cafeteria system whereby vegetables and meats are served free of charge from a cafeteria counter at the request of the individual. By this scheme it is felt that it will be possible to give a greater variey of food without a material increase in the cost of serving the same, due to certain economies which may be obtained with cafeteria type of service.

It is desired to call attention to a rather interesting trend in the minds of the operators regarding both the above passenger vessel conversions. During the planning stage of the designs it was felt that on vessels of this type passenger requirements should be subordinated to those of cargo and its associated handling and consequently the early studies were limited to between 300 and 400 passengers in one or two classes. This was felt to be relatively sound because the scope of the war was not known and the prospect of airplane competition indicated the possibilities of that form of transportation making severe inroads on the passenger traffic normally carried by water-borne carriers. However, when these conversions were discussed with the prospective operators, every attempt was made to build up the passenger complement on all decks available for berthing the same. Decrease in cargo carrying was accepted, the idea in mind was that in all cases the cargo requirements of the trade would be met by the addition of the Commission's long-range cargo vessels in such a number so as to meet the tonnage requirements.

This feeling in the minds of operators is distinctly encouraging to the outlook of postwar passenger vessel construction. In general, the feeling exists that there will be a considerable amount of passenger travel immediately after the cessation of hostility and the sea lanes are open for commercial operation. Obviously the air lines cannot absorb all such requirements for transportation without adequate equipment immediately available, and furthermore, there still will exist a considerable number of persons who prefer to travel in the atmosphere of restfulness and comfort provided by the surface vessel. These travelers will form the nucleus upon which postwar future business will be based. Therefore we have endeavored to modernize and streamline our accommodations in service in strict accordance with the high standards the American public have set for themselves. Every effort has been made in planning to give service which will be second to none and plans are already being formulated for the training of personnel to accomplish this end.

I have outlined briefly the flexibility of standard designs, but I wish to make the point that these should not be construed as being all the variations that may be obtained. The Commission holds no brief for originality and, in fact, many of the conversions of the designs were the work of independent yards or carried out upon the initiative of the various shipping companies for which they were constructed. The basic

thought is, given a properly designed hull, from a subdivision and structural point of view with efficient and modern machinery, multitudinous possibilities exist to shift the available characteristics to obtain balance in cargo requirements, passenger requirements, cruising radii, and provisions for special commodities in special trades, so that it may be well for all to consider what can be done with standard designs to obtain the over-all economies which come with group production.

As noted in the preceding paragraph, much credit is due the industry as a whole. I desire to express our indebtedness to the private design agents, to the shipbuilders and their staffs, and to the operators for their wise counsel, untiring effort, and wholehearted cooperation which have made this program possible. Also, credit is given to the seamen, to the officers, and those who man our merchant fleets, as their expressions have assisted us in providing those features which will in the long run make efficiency of service, proper handling at sea, and quickness of turn-around possible. It is only by such means that this country can establish a peacetime merchant marine that will survive.

Opportunity and Responsibility of Youth in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on June 4, 1945, the Honorable Breckinridge Long delivered an address entitled "Opportunity and Responsibility of Youth in the Postwar World," at the commencement exercises of Lincoln Memorial University, at Harrogate, Tenn. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this peaceful setting it is hard to realize that the world is passing through the greatest crisis in its history. Though the sounds of another battle once echoed among these hills, the din of this great struggle does not penetrate their seclusion. The cries of suffering do not reach us here. Nor can the devastation of whole countries nor the signs of desolation of their populations be seen from its highest peak.

While we may be removed from actual contact with the belligerent activities of this greatest of conflicts, we must be conscious of those developments in the world outside and must appreciate that conditions have been created which will have profound influence on our future lives. We may thank God that we and our homes have been protected from the widespread destruction and may find some solace in the thought that we have been spared the suffering of physical injury, but we may not deny the fact that demolition has been so widespread that the effects of it will have a profound influence on our own future. Nor can we escape responsibility for charting our course so that our social establishments and cultural institutions shall survive the effects of great disaster.

Except the Americas, every continent has been the scene of battle. Little islands protruding above the level of the seven seas have been raked with bursting shell and made wet with blood.

Our own involvement in this was the result of a plan executed by the partners in crime which had each previously attacked other peaceful countries one by one, overcoming smaller nations by the magnitude and violence of their assault. As the area of warfare spread, Africa, Europe, Asia, the islands of the seas and the waters which lave their shores were all either subjected to the predatory might of the offending nations or were used as bases for launching an attack. And so extensive was the resulting turmoil that nowhere on this broad planet—not even in a mountain fastness—could man move in the course of his normal activities without coming in contact with one repercussion or another of the state of war.

The nations which instituted this mad orgy determined to overthrow the systems through the orderly operation of which free peoples establish their rights to liberty and maintain the enjoyment of those rights. They deemed these peoples weak and held them in contempt. They felt that these democratic nations would constitute no serious obstacle to the complete realization of selfish ambitions for world domination.

Whole populations were deprived of the rights of human beings. Millions were uprooted and transported by the Nazi armies to work as slaves to produce the weapons by which their fellows would be destroyed. Those who demurred were persecuted with fiendish cruelty. At the same time Japanese sadists maltreated helpless civilians, subjected them to merciless torture by confinement and starvation and even beheaded those courageous men who had the temerity to carry a righteous war to their homeland and be so unfortunate as to be captured alive.

As each nation fell before the gigantic war machines it became harbinger for its neighbors of impending fate. The remaining peaceful nations, aghast at their own prospect, shuddered at the sight of demolished cities, devastated homes, wrecked and destroyed lives—at populations driven in bondage, at the threat to civilization itself.

When we ourselves were eventually attacked we assumed the leadership of those not yet embroiled and of those brave peoples still resisting oppression. We decided to make common cause with them against the enemies of mankind. We opposed the greatest and most widespread force history had ever seen and to overcome it organized, with the help of our allies, a greater and more destructive power as the only means of preserving our liberties and ridding the world of the evil agents of destruction. This power has been applied in specific forms of force and fortunately has brought to our righteous cause success in Europe where the leading malefactors have paid with their lives only too cheap a price for the havoc they wrought and where the symbolic capital of vindictive violence lies as rubble.

While victory for human rights is triumphantly proclaimed in one sector the remaining culprits in the Far East are still so strongly entrenched it is necesary to continue the supreme effort until the arrival of that happy day when we can welcome home those brave men who justify our faith and fight so valiantly the battle to preserve our liberties.

We have been protected from the physical impact of all this—even from its sights and sounds. But the invisible influences of disintegration which result from it are omnipresent and unless eradicated will eat like a cancer into the vitals of our civilization.

It would be a happy state if the destructive effects of this war would end with its final shot. Such, however, is not to be the case. When so many millions of the human race have suffered bodily and mental pangs, when desolation, persecution, and hunger have been visited upon so great a number, there exists among them a low state of morale which in some degree will linger as an aftermath and will continue as a cause of further degradation to those unfortunates and constitute a potential menace to the rest of humanity as long as the conditions which cause it remain. And when to protracted suffering and disease is added physical destruction of cities and farms, of roadways and bridges, of mines and factories, we must realize that any return to a normal state is somewhere in the future and will be in the future still when the last instigators of the treachery at Pearl Harbor are no longer a challenge to democracy.

Those conditions make for a chaotic world and if order is to be brought out of a chaotic world, it must be accomplished by patient effort well sustained to revive industries in those stricken countries and by the intelligent cooperation of all nations in maintaining international order.

A similar situation, but on a much smaller scale, existed at the close of that other great war. It is true that a generation ago there was proposed and formed an organization for the purpose of maintaining order in the world. But it is also true that some great and powerful governments either abstained from joining it or subsequently withdrew and that those factors together with certain inadequacies in its underlying instrument of authority contributed to the failure in preventing the initial steps of the predatory governments which brought on the present conflict. It permitted us to enjoy a few years of peace, but the security they witnessed was ephemeral and evanescent, though that instrumentality could have been used for the continuing conservation of our welfare.

In this wonderful land of curs with its abundance of spiritual and physical resources we have been apt in the past to assume an attitude of happy complacency about affairs abroad, especially when they were far away.

But we realize now that the trouble in the Far East which engaged us at Pearl Harbor had its origin years before in an open aggression on China, gradually to spread from one adjacent area to another; that the trouble in Europe which involved us at the same time started earlier with a vicious attack by Italy upon a defenseless nation in Africa; and that indifferent treatment of those two incidents emboldened Germany to institute her own lawless campaigns, and finally made allies of those three aggressor nations which it has taken a terrific toll of the world's resources to oppose successfully.

These hard experiences taught us that complacency about far-away events and indifferent attitudes toward the rights of individual nations—even if small and far-removed—are elements of a dangerous foreign policy.

If we have learned anything in those years which measure the maturity and wisdom of a generation it is that it is necessary to join with other nations to maintain order in the world.

We found it necessary to cooperate with other nations to win the war. We now find it necessary to cooperate with other nations to win the peace—and to keep it won.

We must also be conscious that in those very extensive areas of the world which are still the scenes where destruction is an accomplished fact and where misery and hunger stalk amidst its ruins actual conditions exist which are not good incubators of peace. We must realize now that our cooperation in the reconstruction of those places and rehabilitation of those peoples is not only an urge to fulfill a humanitarian desire but the only safe way to insure the enjoyment of our own rights which Jefferson succinctly phrased as "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We must now understand that our only safe course is to cooperate not only

to suppress war but, in order to make insurance doubly sure, to eliminate the causes of war.

That leadership which we assumed in the affairs of the world while it was in the process of destruction is not to be thrown lightly aside when the victory is won but is to be used as a continuing influence to support a system of law and order for all time and to effect the cure of conditions which might lead to war.

Our leadership also places upon us a responsibility to readjust our own internal affairs from a war basis to a peace basis as the demand for military supplies diminishes to an extent which will permit the resumption of normal activities. The revival of civilian domestic consumption, the reestablishment of international trade, the reinforcement of our personal liberties with due regard to our neighbors' rights, the reestablishment and maintenance of international peace—these all call for a rededication of our energies to reconstruction on an enormous scale at home and in cooperation with other nations abroad.

When the fighting is brought to a final and victorious close our happy people will take adequate steps to secure their own welfare and to collaborate with other peoples so that this scourge of destruction shall not again be allowed to descend upon our children.

Through our efforts at home we shall reaffirm our faith in our political system, establish our economic life on secure bases, and through the medium of international cooperation arrange that trade will flow in increasing volume in an era of peace.

Recovery will be the watchword—recovery of the spirits of despairing humans, recovery of sick and emaciated millions, recovery of governments from disintegrating influences, recovery of the ordinary business of ordinary men, recovery of factories and farms and lines of transportation, recovery of economic and industrial activity in a world of fair dealing and friendly cooperation.

Thus it develops recovery becomes our goal and its achievement becomes our duty. It does not often occur on a large scale that a duty is so distinctly recognized and of such universal importance that people generally are conscious of it and expectant that it will be discharged. Nor does it often happen in the passage of time that a generation comes to maturity with a definite task confronting it and the world expecting it to perform that task.

However, that is the situation that confronts you and those like you who step forth from institutions of learning where your minds have been stored with knowledge to prepare you for active participation and eventual leadership in the affairs of mankind. You will be joined by those others of your generation who are for the time being in the armed forces, receiving their education in a different school, but who will return to be with you in the work ahead.

There falls on your shoulders a definite responsibility but with it also opens a great opportunity. You find the world distraught by war and its aftermath. You can lead it into peace and a realm of reestablished order.

We of the older generation, while we have not carried the torch of war, have struggled through many of our mature years in actually resisting aggressions which culminated in war and on two awful occasions in waging war to suppress war. When this agony reaches its end our thoughts will yearn for peace and our nascent hope will be accompanied by a delightful sense of satisfaction in the thoughts that we will have preserved the institutions which permit us to enjoy our liberties and that we will relinquish responsibilities for the recovery of the world from its present ills to the shoulders of youth—and we will do so with an expectant confidence for the future.

It will be for you of the younger generation to carry the torch of peace and to bring about the recovery. The will for the one and the desire for the other will be insufficient to attain either. In addition there must be an actual leadership exerted through intelligent effort to a practical end.

The opportunity to serve is enhanced by the developments of science now at hand and constantly developing. It is as if the world had grown smaller for we are able to make contacts with distant places with a miraculous celerity. The mysterious influences of electricity have annihilated time for the purpose of exchanging intelligence and the explosive phenomenon of gas and chemicals has reduced space to a minimum for purposes of physical transport. Those media can be used to amalgamate the understandings and to coordinate the activities of peoples everywhere so they can live in the confidence of a justified hope that their homes and lands are safe from depredation and that they may follow the normal course of their way of life. Conversely these same agencies of communication and transport can be used to scatter discord, to arouse suspicion and hatred, and to engender strife and disorder.

But science which has pried from nature the secrets of these phenomena can point the way to guard humanity from such use of them as will contribute to another bath of blood. There must be some way to protect civilization from the distorted use of the very ingenuities which have sprung as illegitimate offshoots from the parent stem, intent on destroying the very system which gave them birth. There is some way to organize the forces of peace and order so they will be stronger and more alert than the forces of violence. There is some way in which the great majority of peacefully inclined people can shape their destinies and continue their daily existences without fear of molestation at the hands of congenital fratricides or maniacal saboteurs.

A formula is being developed and an organization will be set up through which the cooperation of other governments can be secured to prevent the unauthorized or lawless use of force. Based on justice, granted power sufficient to prevent wars, equipped to neutralize situations which engender war, it will need only the support of governments and their peoples to lead it to a state of effective operation and to direct it to serve the high purpose for which it is intended. Some of its provisions may not receive the entire approval of various individuals. We cannot expect complete agreement on every detail to be accorded the product of any human endeavor. But objection by some person to one detail and by others to another ought not be magnified out of their true proportions nor allowed to prevent the consummation of a deep and yearning desire on the part of mankind as a whole to put into effective operation a plan to prevent, if possible to do so, willful men from using the forces of destruction again to plunge the world into a cataclysm of fury.

With millions dead and countless thousands crippled and infirm, with untold numbers decripit and hastened to a premature age by the stress and strain of conflict, with morale shattered, faith endangered, and civilization itself imperiled, our duty is to take immediate steps to stop the disintegration and to establish some system of international order to prevent further damage to our lives and liberties. That it may by some be considered imperfect is of less consequence than would be failure to agree upon an instrumentality to serve the immediate common need. Time, experience, and a little patience will permit readjustments in a less pressing period, but the crying needs of the moment are to complete the defeat of our remaining enemy, to reestablish international order and to readjust our home economy as soon as the consequences of war permit.

While steps to meet these needs must be taken in the present, their development and ultimate realization will be the work of the future. The hand of present-day youth will guide the plans to their full fruition. Responsibility for their development will be relinquished gradually to younger hands and with that charge will go a great opportunity for service. In our imaginative and wishful moods we have been wont to envy those in ages past who marched with Alexander the Great, who followed Ceasar in Gaul, who rode the steppes of Asia with Genghis Khan, who were with Napoleon in the days of his military triumphs. In these last few years the magnitude of our own armies and the enormity of their battlefields bring us to the realization that we are seeing Alexander, and Caesar, and Genghis Khan, and Napoleon all rolled into one.

Of less glamor but of more importance were the effects of those historic movements upon the lives and times of those who followed in their wakes. Each of them had its effect upon the course of history. And each of them afforded an opportunity to build a better system of life upon the ruins which they left behind. Great upheavals destroy but they also leave an opportunity to reconstruct on better bases, to carry to higher pinnacles the aspirations of man and to bring closer the realization of an improved state of society in which his rights and the enjoyment of his liberties may be more surely advanced.

As the damage to the world of our day is more widespread and in some respects more profound than was that caused by all those movements in ages past, so the present opportunity is greater to build on more solid foundations and to bring a fuller measure of security to mankind.

Truly we are passing through an experience of enormous import to ourselves and to all posterity. We have not recovered from the physical impact nor do we yet appreciate the full effects of the concussion upon the ethical and cultural organizations of our society. Some of the damage resulting can be discerned by the eye but the effect upon the institutions man had set up to cater to his spiritual, social, and political welfares are not so readily perceived.

We are still in the vortex of the maelstrom and from here must find a way out of it to a future which will witness the reconstitution of an orderly society, which will secure man's liberties, bring satisfactory solutions to his social and economic needs and prevent the possible peradventure of a repetition of the present tragedy. From here roads lead in different directions and it depends on which we take whether we go where we want to be. Roads lead to a future of good, to one of bad, to one of indifference, and to one of decay.

We seek the high road to peace, the road which leads to the most good for the greatest number, the road which will carry us to the place where justice will be supreme and where honest nations, like honest men and women, will make their contribution to an orderly and decent society with fairness for all.

The atmosphere along this road will be surcharged with the dynamics of old emotions and new ideas. It will be for youth to direct us along this highway, to rebuild, to reconstruct. There is no panacea. There is not even a precedent. Ahead of them lies a work of great responsibility. To prevent the disintegration of world civilization and to reconstitute the impaired institutions which man has used to serve his nobler purposes presents a solemn problem but one which beckons to the vigor and imaginative instincts of youth. It is the greatest opportunity for constructive leadership any generation ever inherited.

Never before have men and women been given an experience at home and on far-flung

battlefields which could be used for such lasting benefit for all mankind; nor ever before has youth been confronted with an opportunity to build on such stupendous scale—to re-create cities, to reconstitute nations, to increase peacetime productions, to stimulate world-wide commerce, to conserve international peace, and to bring a war-worn but determined and undiscouraged people to a happy realization of a revived and fortified civilization. That is the unfinished work—the task ahead of youth.

And as we look upon the maturing generation and view the future we are confident that again will be answered the call of Abraham Lincoln:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is for us here to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * *."

Livestock in the Postwar Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Prof. Marvel L. Baker, of the University of Nebraska, on the subject Livestock the Mainstay in the Postwar Farm Picture. I make this request because I think the material contained in the address will be of particular interest at this time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We hear a lot of discussion concerning plans of industry and business for the immediate postwar years. Any realistic plans for business and industry, especially in Nebraska, necessarily must consider the position of agriculture. Frequently its importance is forgotten or overlooked; sometimes it is misunderstood; or again it may be attacked as a selfish interest by representatives of some other group or industry which may itself be labeled selfish with at least equal accuracy.

Some time ago I was impressed by a statement by one of our members that in his business, they did not like the term "postwar planning" because that term was too definite in its meaning; they preferred the term "postwar preparedness."

As far as agriculture is concerned this certainly is the preferable term. Agriculture does not know what obligations to the rest of the world we shall assume; nor what our trade policies are to be; nor what our national debt, our tax policies, or our general price level may be; it does not know what Government policies toward agriculture are to be. In short, there are many important factors which will affect agriculture in the postwar world about which agriculture is now uninformed. To talk of planning under such conditions lacks realism.

Anything which can be done to give business, industry, and the general public a better understanding of agriculture and its problems constitutes the best type of postwar preparedness for agriculture and incidentally for the rest of the Nation as well.

IT'S A LONG-TIME BUSINESS

From its very nature agriculture is a long-time business with relatively slow turn-over. It cannot adjust itself quickly and painlessly to the shocks which are the lot of our economic machine; it must depend to a considerable extent upon the inherent soundness and flexibility of the individual farm business. An intelligent program of livestock production usually is the keystone of such a farm business organization.

We have in Nebraska approximately 48,000,000 acres. Agricultural production within the State varies greatly because of variation in soil, in altitude, in topography, and in the rainfall or water supply.

Here at North Platte's very doorstep we have slightly more than one-fourth of the State, or twelve or thirteen million acres, included in the Sandhills area. It is the best managed large body of pasture land in private hands in the United States and is far superior to most of the publicly controlled range areas. This vast body of land is adapted only to the production of grass and hay. Besides the Sandhills, another one-fourth of the State is in pasture and about 4,000,000 acres in hay. Between one-half and three-fifths of the total area of the State produces pasture and hay. More of it should.

This year we grew for harvest 15,000,000 acres of grain with a total production of about 415,000,000 bushels. Of this about eight and three-fourths million produced more than 325,000,000 bushels of corn.

LIVESTOCK A FUNDAMENTAL

The ancients had a proverb that no land is poor which is rich in livestock, and no land is rich which is poor in livestock. Livestock production is of primary importance in Nebraska. As already suggested more than one-half of the total area of the State is in pasture or hay crops.

It is only through the use of roughage-consuming animals, principally beef cattle that the production of this half of the State can be mobilized for human needs, either in peace or war. It is only in this way that the products of this part of the State can be made available to give employment to men and capital employed in transportation, in processing industries such as the important meat-packing industry, and in the business of distribution. It is only in this way that the products from our range, pasture, and hay lands can be converted into products suitable for exchange for all of the industrial products and the services used by the farmer or rancher and his family.

The same thing applies to a great extent to the products from the land devoted to other agricultural production. In the first place in periods of low rainfall the nonirrigated portion of this land produces little in the way of marketable crops, but does produce roughage, which, if properly utilized by livestock enables the farm family to hang on until nature is in a more kindly mood.

In years which we like to regard as normal, years of good farm production, livestock still adds stability and flexibility to the agriculture of the State. More than 85 percent of the corn grown on American farms normally is used for livestock feed. Somewhat more than 40 percent of our corn is used for hogs, about 24 percent for cattle and 15 percent for poultry.

Wheat, which is grown on about one-fifth of the land devoted to grain production in Nebraska, is thought of primarily as a bread grain. Even here, the byproducts from its milling and at times a considerable part of the wheat itself go into livestock feed. Most of the other grain and the thousands and thousands of tons of roughage produced as a byproduct of grain production, as well as the byproducts from sugar production go to market by way of livestock.

STATE'S INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL

It is not surprising, therefore, to find in Nebraska about 700,000 milk cows, more than 3,000,000 other cattle, three and one-half to four million hogs, 1,000,000 sheep, and 20,000,000 chickens. From 75 to 80 percent of the cash farm income in Nebraska comes from livestock and livestock products.

A few years before the war, Nebraska's manufacturing industries measured by cash volume, were based almost exclusively on agricultural products, with the meat-packing industry, the milling industry, the butter and ice cream industries, the sugar industry, the canning industry, the poultry dressing and packing industries, as good examples. Industries based upon livestock production comprised something like 80 percent of the industries mentioned.

From all of this it is obvious that Nebraska's entire economy is based on its livestock industry. The functioning of that economy in the postwar years depends upon a progressive, efficient livestock industry as well as upon the attitude of the public toward livestock production. This is true, even to a much greater extent than I have indicated and despite probable great advances in the industrial use of agricultural products in the years to come.

Agriculture in Nebraska is relatively new. Up to the present we have given little attention to soil fertility and soil conservation. Satisfactory agricultural production depends upon the conservation and improvement of our soil resources. We have reached the point in our agricultural development where the conservation of the soil is of primary and vital interest to every Nebraskan.

LIVESTOCK IS SOIL CONSERVING

The increasing emphasis being placed on irrigation in the State merely makes the problem more acute. It is useless to talk about a program of soil conservation and improvement unless the program includes the intelligent use of livestock. The maintenance of soil fertility and the conservation of our soil resources are based almost entirely upon livestock production.

What can we expect for Nebraska's agriculture and hence for ourselves in the years which lie ahead? The answer depends largely upon what the Nation does in its approach to national and international problems, and what we in Nebraska do about our own problems.

No man can foretell with any accuracy the change in industry and agriculture which will come as a result of this war and the settlements attempted at its close. We know if we know anything that peace will not bring us the kind of world for which we wish. That remains for us to build. The most that we can logically hope for is that we shall set our faces in the right direction, determined to build a progressively better world.

If we can learn anything from history it is that we are not likely to cooperate effectively in such an undertaking unless we can keep our own social, economic, and political house in order. Some there will be who will argue that the other must come first.

I submit that the very cornerstone of a stable peaceful world will be a stable, progressive United States with a highly developed sense of social responsibiilty. In such a United States, the great agricultural area of which Nebraska is an important part, with its economy based upon a sound and stable program of livestock production must play a vital role. Livestock production makes for patience and stability. It breeds faith and confidence in orderly process and determination that order shall prevail.

STOCKMAN A CONSERVATIVE

Of course there are speculators in the livestock business but by and large the livestock producer is not a speculator. His program necessarily is a long-time program.

When he saves a heifer calf to add to his breeding herd he knows that from 2½ to 3½ years must elapse before his investment brings him any return. If he feeds out the heifer's first calf or carries it over in the producing area, another year or more passes before he cashes in on his investment. Is it any wonder that the livestock producer believes in evolution rather than revolution? Normally he operates on narrow margins and the maintenance of even these margins depends upon constant attention to the details of his business. The processes of nature may be helped; she cannot be cheated. It is not surprising that the livestock producer believes in order and stability; that he is a man giving and inspiring faith and confidence; that he tends to put first things first.

Agricultural stability and progress in Nebraska require the achievement of an agricultural philosophy as profound as the great philosophies of the ages; one which looks upon the soil as a precious heritage to be cherished as the necessary basis for an enduring progressive civilization; not as a free resource to be exploited, despoiled, and thrown away.

There is no new soil; we stand or fail with what we have. We need to take to heart the story of the giant of Greek mythology who, when thrown to the earth leaped to his feet, his strength and vigor renewed from contact with Mother Earth, but who was destroyed when Hercules observed the source of his strength and lifted him from the earth while he crushed him. The maintenance of the soil is the direct responsibility of the man of the land; it is no less the vital interest of the business and professional man.

NEED FOR MORE RESEARCH

Any sound, constructive agricultural program for Nebraska is a growing, dynamic, not a dead, static thing. Such a program is not possible without an aggressive, well-organized, and well-directed research program both in the pure and applied sciences. Both are essential to agricultural progress. To speak only of livestock production, the fields of animal breeding, nutrition, and management in relation to our other resources have hardly been touched. I make no pretense of knowing how much money Nebraska should spend on agricultural research. Some months ago I heard a prominent Nebraska manufacturer say he liked to think of spending 3 percent of his sales on research. As nearly as I can estimate it, we spend less than one one-hundredths of 3 percent of the cash agricultural income of the State on agricultural research in Nebraska.

Research in agriculture is of as much importance to the nonagricultural population as to people on the farm. Improvements in the efficiency of farm production are reflected back to the consumer in better food, more food, or cheaper food, or all three. Today a smaller proportion of our population than at any other time is producing our food, and is sending a substantial part of its products overseas.

This research program should be accompanied by a forward-looking, dynamic extension program based on vision, definite direction, broad knowledge, and careful, painstaking work. In many parts of Nebraska great improvements in livestock production are possible. Livestock production can be made, as it must be made, an integral part of a sound, well-balanced farm economy, contributing to better living for all the people.

HUMANITIES A FACTOR, TOO

Above all, we shall always need the right kind of leadership in agriculture. It seems to me that effective agricultural education must be the most difficult of all educational programs. It needs to be as thorough and exact as the sciences and engineering; and as broad as the humanities. It should develop the attitude that man does not live by material things alone; that science does not provide the solution for our ever-recurring problems but is merely an extremely useful tool; that the successful use of this tool in furthering agricultural and human progress depends upon the faith, hope, intelligence, and attitudes which we bring to the use of science in our daily tasks. "Ad astra per aspera" is the motto of my alma mater. It might well serve as the motto for those who strive to help young men and women fit themselves for the great responsibilities of agricultural work and leadership.

There is nothing new in suggesting research, extension, and education for leadership as the basis for agricultural and hence for general progress. It is vital that people in general, and especially community leaders, such as Rotarians, understand their relation to the building and maintenance of a sound and stable agriculture to a worthwhile social, political, and economic structure; and may I venture to suggest—even to a stable world economy.

Jefferson Day Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, at Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on June 2, 1945, before a Jefferson Day meeting held at Indianapolis, Ind., my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], delivered an able and interesting address, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we all know, this gathering of unterrified Indiana Democrats was to have been held on April 13, Jefferson's birthday. And the whole world knows that the reason for this postponement was the tragic death on the very eve of Jefferson Day of our great war President and Democratic leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Stricken down just before that gigantic victory over Nazi Germany which he had done so much to make inevitable, Roosevelt automatically becomes one of the Big Five of American history: George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Now is not the time to pay tribute to his magnificent achievements or to express our grief at his departure. We can best do both by the vigor with which we follow through on Roosevelt's program and policies, to which his successor, President Truman, has subscribed, and above all by the sincerity with which we keep the Democratic Party liberal, forward looking, and sensitive to the rights and interests of the common man.

It seems appropriate that we should take note of the marked resemblance between the ideals and policies of the founder of our party and of President Roosevelt. Thomas Jefferson was much more than the founder of the Democratic Party—he was a great American, a great political philosopher, and a great citizen of the world. Thomas Jefferson gave voice and substance to principles and ideals which are truly immortal and which endure in the Nation today because of the Democratic Party.

Those ideals are exemplified in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights—those famous first 10 amendments which have well been called the soul of the Constitution.

Jefferson was no cloistered scholar, no mere writer, but a man who lived in and worked with the world of men and events. His greatest single achievement was the enactment of the statutes of religious toleration in the State of Virginia and he accomplished this at the early age of 25. Thirty years later this was made a blessed and permanent part of our way of life through the Bill of Rights.

Thomas Jefferson believed in human rights as against property rights and, if need be, he even suggested that it might be well if there should be a revolution every generation to prevent the growth of privilege. He pitted himself from the start against unscrupulous men of property—the bankers, the landowners and merchants, whose hero was Alexander Hamilton, and who perpetuated their interests and privileges in what later became the Republican Party.

What makes Thomas Jefferson so outstanding in his bold philosophy of human rights is the fact that he himself was a man of wealth, with ample means and a fine education, a landowner and country squire, a slaveholder who advocated the abolition of slavery, a man who saw, long before it was asserted by others that it was wrong for men to own human property, that the real wrong was in allowing property to own men.

Jefferson was a man of the world. He was at home in the world of men and ideas. He represented his country as Minister to France and warned the property-minded administration of his day that the French Revolution was an expression of the same human rights which had given form and meaning to the American Revolution. He served as Secretary of State under Washington and as Vice President under John Adams, but faced with the blind reaction of the Hamiltonians against liberalism, he formed the Democratic Party and through that party became President. He put into practice the political philosophy he had enunciated.

In this connection let me urge you to read, if you have not already done so, Young Mr. Jefferson, by our distinguished Ambassador to Chile, the Honorable Claude G. Bowers, of your State. Here, placed in perspective and with fresh interest and mature scholarship, is the best current account of some of the greatest years of this dynamic American. Ambassador Bowers, as we all remember, served as our Ambassador to Spain before and during the Franco revolution. In contrast to some of our other envoys to Europe, Mr. Bowers gave clear warning of the dangers to America in the events which he witnessed. Unfortunately, in those years the Congress and the public refused to see the truth, ignored the facts, and attacked those who warned them.

It took Pearl Harbor to convince some Senators that the Axis meant business, and even today, after three and a half years of bitter war, there are some Americans who still believe things are not as they are and that we can all go back to where we were a generation ago.

The Nazis made no such mistake. Documents captured by our intelligence forces contain the text about America taught in the Nazi High School for Politics in Berlin. This political academy was a sort of political West Point for the Nazi officials and in their training they tried hard not to deceive themselves about the real political strength of this country. What Goebbels told the German people about us was one thing; what the future Nazi diplomats were taught was another.

The Nazis taught their future officials that America was divided politically between those who followed the policies of Alexander Hamilton and exalted property rights and those who followed the principles of Thomas Jefferson and believed in human rights. The students were carefully warned not to dismiss Jeffersonian democracy as foolish or unscientific. On the contrary, said the Nazis, Jeffersonism was a dynamic theory which could become a very great danger to the Third Reich. Jeffersonian democracy is what the Nazis feared in America more than they feared our physical power or industrial production.

The Nazis were absolutely right in fearing Jeffersonian democracy. The war is being won by the United Nations because Jeffersonian democracy has given fire and courage to our allies and has carried our men and power to the ends of the earth. Thanks to Jeffersonian democcracy, the frontiers of freedom run far beyond the Rhine or Manila. It has conquered Germany and is lapping the very coasts of the Japanese homeland.

Yes, the Nazis taught well in this respect—for the thing which defeated Adolf Hitler was the Jeffersonian democracy of the United States. Hitler's challenge to human rights and world freedom naturally made us Americans aline ourselves against the Axis. We followed what Thomas Jefferson wrote and did a century and a half ago.

Because of this, our country has come through this terrible war with no material menace to human rights, with no threat of insurrection and no anti-American underground. Because of this, we have held two national elections—one congressional and one presidential—during this war, without faltering for a moment in our military efforts. Because of this, we have maintained a free press and tolerated political opposition, with no serious damage to our national morale or to our national unity.

That is why, fellow Democrats, it seems clear as daylight that the future of Jeffersonian democracy is assured. It has survived the greatest test of all—the test of war—in which all human institutions are weighed in the scales of battle. It is winning for our country a world-wide battle against enemies who had prepared for decades to destroy us. It is that political force which is greater than all the political forces which can be brought against it. Because it rests simply and sincerely on human rights, human dignity, and human happiness.

I know that we Democrats will always venerate the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. I also know that Roosevelt's birthday will be celebrated not only here, but all over the world.

A few minutes ago I mentioned Claude Bowers, great as a diplomat, as an historian, and as a political journalist. Ambassador Bowers, now in Chile, recently published an article in the Virginia Quarterly Review entitled "In Defense of Politicians." I quote from that article:

"To recapitulate: Democracies operate best through political parties.

"Political parties function only through politicians.

"Eliminate politicians and you wipe out parties.

"Wipe out parties and you throw democracies into a state of unorganized, undisciplined chaos.

"And when in a democracy the people are unorganized, undirected, undisciplined, the Fascist has his excuse and the tyrant appears to dominate the nation by brute force.

"That is the reason the Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Francos hate and exterminate the politicians; and that is the reason it is so stupid in a democracy to join them in their hue and cry.

"And that is the reason why the theorists and scoffers who sneer at representative government, political parties, and politicians are consciously in some cases, and unconsciously, let us hope in most, making their contribution to the Fascist effort to destroy democracy in the United States."

That is the end of the quote.

I believe in politicians and I'd like to say to you right now that if Indiana had sent its No. 1 politician, Tom Taggart, to the Senate in 1916 and if Illinois had sent Roger Sullivan to the Senate in 1914, America would have joined the League of Nations and we would not be engaged in this Second World War. Both Taggart and Sullivan were attacked by the Republicans on the ground that they were politicians—so they replaced Taggart with Jim Watson, who never had a thought that was not 100-percent partisan politics, and replaced Sullivan with Sherman in Illinois on the ground that Sherman looked like Abraham Lincoln.

Please don't think that in making these references to "unhappy, far-off things and battles long ago" I am attacking the two-party system. I only wish we had real, honest opposing parties operating in every State in the country. We need true and convinced conservatives—social and economic conservatives—to balance the dynamic liberalism of Jeffersonian democracy.

What we face, instead, is an opposition of blind, stubborn reaction which may, in time of stress, engender a spirit of ruthless radicalism, unless we can maintain the spirit of Thomas Jefferson as the controlling force in our public life. That there have been and are many fine, public-spirited and patriotic Republicans I would be the first to insist, but they do not and have not represented or controlled the program or policy of the Republican Party since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. The Republican Party has not adopted a liberal idea or forward-looking program since Lincoln freed the slaves.

I speak as a life-long Democrat. I first became active in politics in 1896, when I voted for William Jennings Bryan, who was then the best leader of Jeffersonian democracy and whose courage, leadership, and persuasive oratory lifted the party out of its rut and prepared it for the leadership of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. I joined the Democratic Party then and I have joined no other organization of any kind since then. And as a lifelong Democrat there are two things in particular which I would like to say to you tonight.

First, as you know, I led the floor fight for the renomination of Henry Wallace as our party's Vice President last year. It was a good battle and a fair one. On April 26, five Pennsylvania Democrats—both Senators, the national committeeman and national committeewoman, my sister, Mrs. Miller, and Chairman Clark, of Philadelphia—called on President Truman to assure him of our wholehearted support and confidence. We came away full of pride in our President and satisfaction in his achievements in the most difficult job in the whole world.

We found him the same Harry Truman he had been in the Senate for 10 years, humble, efficient, trustworthy and wise; a man to be relied upon both in party and national emergencies; a true servant of the people who will call in the best advisors, but who will do what he thinks right, any influence to the contrary notwithstanding.

It does not take much imagination to realize the feelings of President Truman when he heard that he must take the oath of office of President of the United States. He told us he thought when he was called to the White House on the afternoon of April 12 that he supposed the President had returned and wanted to see him. It was not until he met Mrs. Roosevelt that he knew what had happened. Despite the personal grief he felt, President Truman never faltered. He immediately made plans to carry forward the Roosevelt policies. He wastes no time on nonessentials—gets right to the point—and proceeds in a straight line.

So once more we Democrats can be proud of our Chief. We are all united behind him and our present job is to give him every ounce of support now and in the future.

Not only has President Truman pledged himself to carry out the Roosevelt program. He is also committed to carry out all of the pledges of the Democratic Party platform on which he was elected. This includes his support for the equal rights amendment—which will be heartening news for you Indiana women who have worked so long and so unselfishly for this national reform.

I want to assure you that I am for Harry Truman all the way and in 1948. He is doing a great job. He needs our united support and he shall have it.

The second thing I want to tell you, as a lifelong Democrat, is that it is always a mistake not to fight for our principles.

For example. I remember my father telling me that the greatest mistake ever made by the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania was not to demand a recount in the election of 1880. That was the year when Garfield defeated Hancock for the Presidency and the electoral vote of Pennsylvania was obtained by corruption and fraud. The Pennsylvania high-tariff Republicans raised a large slush fund in alarm over General Hancock's remark "that the tariff was a local issue, depending upon whose ox was being gored." Those fraudulent ghost votes gave the State to the Republicans. The Democrats did not demand a recount because it would not have made any difference in the national outcome. After that, the ghost votes of Pennsylvania grew from a few thousand in 1880 to nearly six hundred thousand in 1930 and the State of Pennsylvania was safely and corruptly Republican for more than 50 years.

You in Indiana face a similar situation today.

Fraudulent Republican votes in Marion County and corrupt Republican election officials not only stole this State's vote from Roosevelt but counted out the Democratic candidates for the United States Senate and Governor.

In my opinion, if there had been a contest before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Republican candidate would not have been seated in the Senate.

You Indiana Democrats still have the opportunity and the clear duty to prosecute those Republican officials responsible for this outrage.

You know who they are.

The facts are fully covered in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944, pages 61 to 68.

The committee found that prior to the 1944 election a State director of registration in Marion County had canceled the registration of 19,278 Democrats, and 2,232 Republicans. The responsible official was named as Mr. Moss.

The committee found that a change in the boundaries of 80 precincts in Marion County had confused the registration records of thousands of voters. These changes and this confusion were supervised by Mr. Carroll Kramer, a Republican ward worker who resigned on November 5, 1944.

The committee found that about a week before the election, the Republican member of the Marion County election board, Mr. Albert Thompson, and the Republican member of the State election board, Mr. Edwin Steers, had conferred for the purpose of finding effective means to disfranchise Democratic voters by an opinion from the attorney general, himself a Republican candidate, advising county officials, without statutory authority, to deny the validity of affidavits in lieu of registration. The Republican responsible for this extra legal opinion was Mr. James A. Emmert, attorney general, who directed the election officials of 92 Indiana

counties to ignore the instructions of the State board election officials on November 4, 1944.

The findings of the majority of the committee were supported by a minority report by Senator BALL, of Minnesota, Republican, who declared that "the proportion of Democratic registration cancellation * * * supports the general impression * * * that partisanship entered into the conduct of the election to an unfortunate degree."

Senator BALL also confirmed the majority's finding on Republican manipulation of registration. Senator BALL added that the telegrams dispatched to the 92 Indiana County election boards sent in the name of the Republican Attorney General were paid for by the Republican State committee. These telegrams, said Senator BALL, were used by election officials to deny the ballot to Democratic voters. Senator BALL termed the Attorney General's conduct "highly improper" and concluded that the whole conduct of registration and voting by the Republican Party officials in Indiana amounted to a deliberate attempt to disenfranchise many voters and declared that the present Republican system in Indiana is "an invitation to fraud."

Take it from the voice of experience—if you knuckle down and go along with this theft now, you may not again carry the State of Indiana for the Democratic Party within the lifetime of any man or woman present here this afternoon.

You have let the Republicans taste the blood of stolen votes without a contest and they will keep on with their stealing, no matter how the people of Indiana may actually register their political desires unless you stop their racket. Here is a good battle for you Indiana Democrats to make for your own sakes and for the sake of the entire Nation.

Battles lie ahead. They always have and always will. But we Democrats can fight the good fight with a stout heart and no compromise with evil. We have learned from great men like Jefferson and Roosevelt that the source of political power in a democracy is a sense of practical responsibility for and accountability to the average man and woman. We know that the future is America's and the future of America is ours only so long as we make human right the touchstone of our program and policies.

Yes; it is splendid to have fleets of thousands of bombers roaring over Berlin and Tokyo. Yes; it is grand to have our battlewagons masters of the broad Pacific. Yes; it is great to see our armies move on to victory. But it is finer, grander, and greater still to realize that all of this power is evoked by and is at the service of that which is divine and enduring in humanity; decency, dignity, justice, and neighborliness to all mankind.

Review by Richard L. Neuberger of the Autobiography of George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the autobiography of the late Senator George W. Norris, entitled "Fighting Liberal." The review, which is by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, appeared in the Progressive of May 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE NORRIS' PROGRESSIVE LEGACY—THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A FIGHTING LIBERAL

(Fighting Liberal, the autobiography of George W. Norris, the Macmillan Co., reviewed by Richard L. Neuberger)

For a year and a half after his defeat for reelection in 1942, Senator George W. Norris lived in the little Nebraska town of McCook, from where he first had gone to Congress four decades before. This was sufficient time to enable him to complete his autobiography and to leave for liberals all over America a rich legacy of the progressive movement.

The book has just been published. This is no ordinary publishing event. It is the story of one of the most remarkable careers in American history, a career which embodies the tale of the long fight in behalf of the average man. Here appear names familiar to liberals throughout the land—Gifford Pinchot, Teddy Roosevelt, Borah, the La Follettes, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harold L. Ickes, Harry Lane, Paul Y. Anderson, Dave Lilienthal, and, of course, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The book is jerky. The sequence is poor. Not all the logs in the structure are dovetailed. Much of the chinking is left out. Some of the characters are ignored. But these are not major criticisms. Here is the testament of a great man, a man whose monument is the Tennessee Valley Authority, a mightier edifice than any pharaoh ever reared.

The story of Norris is the story of the struggle to change the American Congress from a refuge for privilege to a bulwark for the common man. The struggle has been successful. Today legislation to aid the people can get a hearing in Congress. Usually it is adopted.

When George Norris went to Washington in 1902, this was not the case. Uncle Joe Cannon ruled the House omnipotently, squashing bills which displeased him. Norris was a regular Republican, a GOP stalwart. But he broke the iron rule of Cannon. When he left the House to enter the Senate in 1912, the lower Chamber had been democratized. No longer could one man, the Speaker, superimpose his own will on colleagues elected from all over the United States.

Norris commenced in politics as an orthodox Republican. Yet he came from a boyhood of poverty, in Sandusky County, Ohio. He and his widowed mother supported his eight sisters. The mother, Mary Mook Norris, a remarkable and courageous woman, spun her son's clothes.

As a young man, George Norris went to Nebraska, but first he migrated all the way across the continent to Washington, then a Territory and not yet a State. On that wild frontier he taught school. In Nebraska he became a prairie lawyer. He ran for office on the Republican ticket and was beaten for district attorney of Furnas County by a Populist. The Populist called him a reactionary. None of them could see into the future, when reactionaries from Puget Sound to Cape Cod would be denouncing as a wild-eyed radical the man who began his political career so conservatively on the Nebraska plains.

Looking back, Norris says he believes he deserved defeat in that election. This is one of the warm qualities of his autobiography. Today, with rich rewards to be won by men who seem infallible, it is unique to read a book which confesses to mistakes.

Sorrow is a crucible in which greatness is often smeltered. Norris suffered intensely in his early life. His mother, whom he worshipped, dwelt in poverty. He himself, wandered about Washington Territory seeking in vain for opportunity for them. His first wife lost a child when their buggy overturned. Then his wife died. His second wife, who still lives and is the Senator's widow, came into the home to become "a tender-hearted, loving mother" to Norris' three daughters. His second wife gave birth to twin boys, who died in infancy.

"It was a shadow that never lifted completely from us," the Senator writes.

Out of this agony and sorrow came the melancholy courage which inspired so many Americans. Franklin D. Roosevelt once referred to Norris as "the very perfect gentle knight of American progressive ideals." Unconsciously, without pomp, Norris lived this role. His old friend, James E. Lawrence, says in the introduction, "Senator Norris never knew what it was to play." In the Senate he often worked 16 hours a day. He was never frivolous, never gay. He might stand around a piano with a few associates and sing Clementine or Tenting Tonight, but such interludes were rare. He spent his time on the job.

Norris' job was looking after the interests of the average man. No article or review could detail so rich a career. It stretches in retrospect through many valiant battles—against the purchase of Senate seats, against imperialism in South America, against monopolies, for public ownership of power, for minimum wages and maximum hours, for the conservation of the country's natural resources.

After his early experiences as a regular Republican, he invariably supported the liberal candidate for President. He was for Teddy Roosevelt in 1912, for Bob La Follette in 1924, for Al Smith in 1928, and for Franklin D. Roosevelt all four times that he ran, although death cut short the old Senator's final opportunity to vote for F. D. R.

Four years after his indorsement of the elder La Follette, Norris stumped the Nation for Al Smith. This required great political bravery, for Nebraska was dry and Protestant, while Smith was a Catholic who advocated repeal. In fact, Norris himself was inclined to back prohibition, but he felt that economic issues outweighed the liquor question. In his autobiography he says that his stand was justified when "Mr. Hoover later vetoed TVA in the most outspoken terms."

HIS GUIDE: CONSCIENCE

Norris tells why he voted for American participation in the present war, but fought with all his strength to block the war resolution in 1917. "The circumstances were most dissimilar," he claims. "In 1917 there was no immediate threat of war reaching American soil. In 1941 an act of war was committed by Japan against the United States at Pearl Harbor under the most treacherous and despicable circumstances, and the following day Germany and Italy issued declarations of war against the American people. In the present struggle the Axis plan of aggression and conquest in my eyes constituted a direct threat to the safety and security of the United States."

Norris details the persecution and vilification which he endured for his opposition to war in 1917. He was denounced all over the Nation, as were the other five Senators who voted with him, including his good friends, Bob La Follette and Harry Lane. Lane, who came from Oregon, died a few weeks later.

"In this connection the war resolution, perhaps, more than any other issue," writes Norris, "raised the question of what should be the attitude of a Member of Congress. Should he always follow what he believed to be the majority sentiment of his district, or should he obey his own conscience even when, in doing so, it appeared he was voting against the wishes of a majority of his constituents?

"I have thought conscience was the guide.

"Otherwise, a Member of Congress giving weight to expressed public sentiment, becomes only an automatic machine. If that

is the line of duty of a Member, then Congress requires no patriotism, no education, and no courage. All a Member has to do, if he does follow that which he believes to be the will of his constituency at all times, is to attempt to take such action as will bring him the most votes in the next election.

"In the end, the only worth-while pay in Congressional service is that which comes from a satisfied conscience in the knowledge that you have done your duty as God gives you light, regardless of the effect it may have upon political fortunes."

This was Norris' creed. It might well be the creed for all Members of Congress. The aged Senator never rode the bandwagon. He backed T. R. and Fighting Bob La Follette and Smith while Nebraska was voting for their conservative opponents. He clung to F. D. R. after majority sentiment in Nebraska had returned to the Republican Party. Fortunately for Congress and for the Nation, others have followed Norris' example. Men of such diverse views as Wheeler, of Montana; Coffee, of Washington; Tom Eliot, of Massachusetts; Lister Hill, of Alabama; and Morse, of Oregon, have defied sentiment in their constituencies to vote their convictions.

FIGHT FOR PUBLIC POWER

The Hetch Hetchy power fight in California began in 1912, the year Norris entered the Senate. It still continues today. In his chapter on Hetch Hetchy, the old Senator gives a picture of what the persistent battle for public power has meant to him.

He reviews the long and untiring effort to have the people of San Francisco, rather than a private monopoly, generate and sell the water power from the Hetch Hetchy project. The old man from the prairie tells of the majestic Sierras, pouring their tribute of melting ice and snow down through granite canyons to the Pacific. He describes what this vast energy, harnessed and tapped, can mean to the homes of the Nation.

Power became to him a symbol of the struggle between entrenched greed and the hopes of the masses of the people. If a great river—a river belonging to the Nation—could be developed for private profit, then where would the people's interests be protected?

Into the White House in 1933 came a President who was not afraid to act, who was not afraid to use the sovereignty of his great position to help the average man. The relationship between George Norris, the boy from 80 acres of stumps, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, the squire of Hyde Park, became one of the stirring stories of America. They put through TVA. Dams were built on other rivers, on the Sacramento, on the Columbia, on the Missouri, on the Colorado. "Mr. President," said Norris with tears in his eyes, "my dreams are coming true." And Roosevelt, standing at Ak-sar-ben Coliseum in 1936, paid tribute to Norris as the outstanding leader of American liberalism.

THE WORK LIVES ON

Senator Norris' book contains one chapter which might be read with great profit by the men now making the peace. This is his chapter on the defeat of the League of Nations. Although a strong supporter of President Roosevelt's foreign policy, Norris defends vigorously his opposition to the Treaty of Versailles. He calls attention to the fact that the treaty gave Japan the Shantung Peninsula of China, and that China was a friendly power.

"Here were 30,000,000 people of Chinese blood to be placed under brutal Japanese rule," the old Senator writes. "I was outraged by this injustice to China. Japan was a part of the League of Nations but her heart was impure. The Shantung provision * * * was compounding and perpetuating a crime against the Chinese people. I attacked that transfer of Shantung to Japan."

With righteous indignation, Norris tells how he based his opposition to the League on the way that the great powers sold China into the clutches of Japan. And he reminds his readers that in October of 1919 he stood on the floor of the Senate and warned:

"If you will look at a map of the Pacific Ocean, you will find that the giving of the German island possessions north of the equator to Japan means that Japan is brought thousands of miles nearer our coast. When Japan gets those islands fortified she will not be so distant from us as she has been heretofore."

And, sadly, sorrowfully, the old Senator recalls the American blood shed to get back those fortified islands, and the Chinese blood shed because Japan was put astride the Shantung Peninsula.

Backer of President Roosevelt's foreign policy that he was, Norris could not bring himself to put in his autobiography that he regretted his attacks on the League, for he felt that the treaty establishing the League was the beginning of Japan's brutal march of conquest.

Good will among nations was as much a part of Norris' creed as good will among men. In a highly interesting passage he tells how he came to know about Russia and Russia's people from Col. Hugh L. Cooper, the brilliant American engineer who constructed the huge Dneprstroy Dam. Norris was so impressed by what Cooper had to say about Russia that he sent the colonel to see President Roosevelt, who also learned much from the American who was harnessing the Soviet Union's great rivers.

Both of them are gone now—F. D. R. and Uncle George. Defeat at the polls marred Norris' final years, although he writes, "I have no bitterness in my heart. I have no ill will toward any man."

Roosevelt sleeps forever. Norris is dead and gone. Yet water breaks over the great parapet of Grand Coulee and flows through the penstocks at Bonneville. The Clinch foams white as it topples across the crest of Norris Dam. The Tennessee hums a dull roar where it surges through Wheeler and Pickwick and Hales Bar and Chickamauga. The Sacramento spreads out in a broad lake, as it is slowly penned up behind Shasta. Across the uplands the transmission towers stretch, carrying power to farms and homes and factories.

In this fashion does Uncle George's work live after him. This is one of the ways that F. D. R. will be remembered.

As a boy Norris saw his mother planting an apple tree. "Why do you work so hard, mother?" her son asked.

"I may never see this tree in bearing, Willie," she said, "but somebody will."

The lesson which uneducated Mary Mook Norris taught her son, George William, was well learned.

Value of Schools and Educational Opportunity in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "New England as a National Example of the Value of Schools and the South as a National Challenge Toward the Equalization of Educational Opportunity in America," by Frank P. Graham, delivered in Boston, Mass., December 8, 1944, before the annual meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it is estimated it will cost $130 to print the address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND AS A NATIONAL EXAMPLE OF THE VALUE OF SCHOOLS AND THE SOUTH AS A NATIONAL CHALLENGE TOWARD THE EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

(By Frank P. Graham)

THE SOUTH AND NEW ENGLAND

The South and New England have in common their proud but different sense of locality and region. New England, with its far northeastern projection, its geographic detachment from the interior continent, its stubborn Puritan tradition, its two centuries of the maritime economy and its rich cultural heritage, is, with all its nationally creative Americanism, also a region distinguished and apart. The South below the Mason and Dixon line and below the Ohio River, with its Southern sun and soils, with three centuries of a bi-racial structure, and more than a century of the cotton economy, with all its nationally historic traditions and nationally creative leadership, has long been a region unto itself.

Beyond this deep sense of locality and the rooted attachments of place and region, New England and the South have in common the same British folk strains. They share the pioneering in colonization, the primacy in the American Revolution and the founding of this Republic. Running through both their histories has been the Biblical faith with a heavy Calvinistic tone and emphasis on simple piety, hard work, and thrift. These two were the twin nurseries of the young and ever moving West. These two regions have experienced and reconciled both separatism and nationalism. May there always shine through both of them for all America an idealism persistent above all our faults and failures. Today the strongest ties of faith and history and a common aspiration bind together New England and the South with the other great regions in one America fighting for one world of freedom, justice, and peace for all peoples regardless of race, color, creed, or economic power.

When we look back to our American beginnings we see rise early into view the rough shores of what is now Maine and the shallow sound of what is now North Carolina. Maine and North Carolina have in common both the hazards of their shorelines and the historic ascendancy of their mother commonwealths, Massachusetts and Virginia. Maine which became one of that large family of States given birth by Massachusetts was yet the forerunner of Massachusetts. The shores of Maine were the proving ground for the first New England settlements.

ROANOKE ISLAND

Before Massachusetts, before Jamestown itself, on Roanoke Island was built the first English home, the first English chapel; was born and was baptized the first English child in the New World. Earlier English explorers had landed on bleak Newfoundland shores. English sea dogs had raided the Spanish Main and had captured rich treasure fleets in many western seas. For a long time the English, too, with constant illusion looked for the Northwest Passage and the southwest gold. Nevertheless, it was on Roanoke Island, in what is now North Carolina, that the English people first came ashore in 1587 to build a home, till the soil, establish a rival base of

commerce and power and lay the foundations of an overseas empire. Running through the story of the Lost Colony are overtones of legend, mystery, tragedy, and the deep silence of the forest unbroken save by the syllables upon a tree.

Back of it all we see in England, towering across the seas and centuries, the majestic figure of Sir Walter Raleigh, courtier, statesman, historian, poet, soldier, seaman, who was not to see the promised land but was to become the founder of English America. He sank a personal fortune in his American failures but his unbroken courage and unfailing faith caught the imagination of the English people and stirred their corporate will to build the overseas dominions. The failure and lessons of Fort Raleigh made straighter the way to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. Roanoke Island upon which Raleigh stumbled became Britain's stepping stone to empire. In the first colony planted there were the seeds of the old Empire and the new Republic.

The men, women, and children lost on Roanoke Island rose from the dead all the way from Maine to Florida. Facing west to the wildnerness with axes, muskets, Bibles, and chartered liberty in their hands and history, they crossed mountains, rivers, prairies, plains, deserts, and mountains again to another sea. They cleared the forests, tilled the earth, exploited its mines and resources, built churches, schools, roads, canals, railways, factories, libraries, hospitals, cities, and States, making America to the pattern of their haphazard but relentless wills. Looking toward some such time as this in his unconscious immortality, Sir Walter Raleigh, in the midst of his failures and some years before there was to fall upon his neck the ax, which, he jested, was a sharp medicine that would cure all diseases, said simply, "I shall live to see it an English Nation."

NEW ENGLAND LEADERSHIP

New England with rugged shores, rigorous climate, and reluctant soil, without great rivers and superior harbors, without rich natural resources in coal, iron, copper, and oil, has played an eminent and at times preeminent part in the making of America. New England, a chief base of English colonization and American expansion and a cradle of the American Revolution, was the birthplace of American shipbuilding and maritime enterprise, the American industrial revolution, the American renaissance in literature, history, science, and philosophy, of far-reaching religious movements, and humanitarian causes, of colleges of liberal arts, of private preparatory and public schools, public libraries, denominational colleges, schools of technology and graduate universities for scholarship and research.

The textile industry had its American origin in Rhode Island, copper mining in Vermont, the brass industry in Connecticut, the maritime industry in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine, and machine tools in Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. The invention of the mechanical techniques of the interchangeability of standard uniform parts, by which was erected the modern American process of mass production, had its origins with the gunsmiths of Connecticut, the precision tool makers of Rhode Island, and the clock makers of Massachusetts. By these techniques of mass production through the cooperation of labor and management all over the Nation, America has risen to be the world's foremost industrial power.

On these early New England processes of standard and interchangeable parts, expanded to the proportions of American daring and enterprise across a continent, now turns the freedom of mankind. The region of these inventions of the land, these discoveries of the mind, these resources of the spirit, these great scientific, literary, philosophic, and humane movements, is coincident with the region of preeminent private, denominational, and public schools, libraries, laboratories, colleges of liberal arts, and universities of thorough scholarship and unceasing research. The year 1936 marked the tercentenary commemoration not only of the founding of Harvard but also of the significance of higher education in America. Three of the greatest American universities, four of the most historic colleges of liberal arts, two of the foremost schools of technology, are in New England. Three of the half dozen most distinguished colleges for women in America are in the one State of Massachusetts. The North American Review and the Atlantic Monthly long set the critical standards of American literature and thought. Public schools which began in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are now the chief concern of State and the chief resource of the hope for freedom and equality of opportunity in our national democracy.

To call the roll of New England preachers and teachers, sailors and soldiers, lawyers, orators, and statesmen, poets and painters, philosophers and seers, reformers and crusaders, scholars and critics, editors and publishers, scientists and technologists, shipbuilders and railroad men, merchants, industrialists and labor leaders, insurance leaders and financiers in the little States of New England is to call a long list of the makers of America forever on the honor roll of the Nation.

THE VALUES OF THE MIND AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT EXPRESSED IN SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

The explanation of New England is not in rivers, harbors, soil, or natural resources. The character and education of the people rose above the lack of resources in a tough environment. New England teaches us that the resources of the mind and spirit are the greatest resources of all. The historian Morrison makes clear that the resources of New England were the resources of a people steeped in the Bible and bred to the sea. To the acknowledged part played by the Bible and the sea must be added with justification also in the record the school and the library.

Whether the people of New England spent more per capita on schools and libraries because they had more to spend or whether they had more per capita wealth because they spent more on schools and libraries, there has been a long continuation of the coincidence. Some communities here and there have learned the value of this coincidence and have even surpassed the communities of New England. The test of the mind and the spirit of a people is not only in their sense of values and in their day to day work and living, but also in the way they meet a crisis.

Three times the New England commonwealths have found themselves near the edge of economic decay and disintegration. Three times their doom was pronounced. But religion and learning, education and skill, character and will, schools and libraries became the foundations of intelligent adjustments to hazardous times. When it became clear in Massachusetts and adjoining communities that they could not greatly survive as agricultural communities, the people had the necessity, the enterprise and the trained intelligence to turn to the sea. Massachusetts, at the center of New England, became in the eighteenth and far into the nineteenth century the great maritime and commercial community of the New World.

Fishing, shipbuilding, shipping, whaling, and commerce became the resources of economic readjustments whose intelligence, skill, and daring transformed the region of abandoned farms into a region of wider enterprise and higher economic and social well being. The clipper ships of New England led the world in efficiency and beauty of design, in grace and speed of sailing, in maritime adventure and romance in the trade of the southern, the Mediterranean and Baltic Sea, through the Straits or around the Horn to Pacific America, the East Indies, and the China seas. Instead of a decline, there was an overlapping advance, and instead of disintegration, there was a reintegration of wider enterprise at higher levels of life and culture, a more vivid destiny at home and in the far places of the earth.

NEW ENGLAND CRISES AND ADJUSTMENTS EMPHASIZE VALUE OF SCHOOLS

Crisis came again to New England with the decline of the American merchant marine. New England was for a time laid low by the embargo of 1807 and the War of 1812. New tariffs cut across the free trade of the seas. New York, with its superb harbor, the broad Hudson, reinforced by the Erie Canal as the new gateway to the west, was to challenge the commercial primacy of Boston. Philadelphia, the City of the Friends, seat of the Declaration of Independence and the framing of the Constitution, first Capital of the young Republic, home of Franklin, Rush, Priestly, the University of Pennsylvania, and the American Philosophic Society, and haven of heretics, bade fair to surpass the Old World culture of Charleston and the New World leadership of Williamsburg and Boston. Moreover, oil from the earth was to supplant the whale oil from the seas. Steamships and bunker fleets of coal from other ports and other lands were to replace the clipper ships of New England.

In the War Between the States the American merchant marine practically disappeared from the seas. American concentration on the development of manufacturing, railroads, and the vast new continent long prevented the revival of the old maritime enterprise on the seven seas. Loud again were the wails announcing the doom of New England. But the people of schools and libraries, skills and insights, again made intelligent and gradual adjustments in the shift from commerce to industry. Ships and oil gave place to shoe factories and cotton mills harnessed to the waterfalls of inland streams and later to the coal from the interior continent. The people again with foresight and insight reorganized their work and lives in the management and skills of industrial mass production. In this reintegration of the English and Puritan strains were more lately interwoven the Irish, French Canadian, the southern and eastern European, and the Catholic spiritual influences to give fresh vigor, color, and variety to the texture of New England.

In these recent decades when many textile mills moved south to the cotton fields and many shoe factories moved west toward the cattle ranches, it was lamented that the flowering of New England was turning into the "sere and yellow leaf." Not so. Rather New England turned to making finer textiles and better shoes. With old skills, New England became one of the most productive arsenals of democracy. Higher skills, new specialties, and relentless enterprise against new adversities and new declines will reenergize with a new will the old land of fish and oil, ships and trade, textiles and shoes. New England will not end its chapter in the making of America as long as the resources of the mind, the enterprises of the will, and the precious things of the human spirit rise above the circumstances of time and place to reassert the unconquerable aspirations of an enlightened people for a freer and better world.

It was not what was in the soil, it was not what was under the land which provided the means of life and leadership to New England. What was in the sea was for a time largely to take the place of what was not in the land. It was mainly what was in the people which determined their destiny. The best ways in which ideas and ideals get into people are through religion and learning, a free church, a free press, and a free university. Teachers and books, schools and libraries, helped to

make New England help to make America. New England has helped to teach America that the public schools are one of the chief sources of our freedom and democracy, our progress and power.

America has not yet learned to make the public schools equal in opportunity for all the children of the people. If the people in some States would spend all their general revenues on the public schools alone, they would have schools below the national average and far below the schools in some other States which spend on schools only part of their revenues raised by comparatively moderate taxes for schools. The combined endowments of all the colleges and universities in 13 Southern States is less than the endowments of two New England universities. In such a national situation some children are educationally doomed to an unequal chance regardless of ability, talents, and aspirations. This is the case in the rural States and especially some of the southern rural States. The only fair and democratic answer is found in Federal aid to the States for education with control expressly left in the hands of the States and localities.

SOUTHERN LEADERSHIP AND PRESENT HANDICAPS

As Americans, I know you will bear with me in a discussion of the economic handicaps of the southern people in their struggles toward a fairer and more democratic society. It is needful at the outset to remind ourselves of a great southern heritage as a spiritual resource for transforming the Nation's economic problem number one into a basic hope for the whole Nation. In the South we find the first English child born in the New World, the first English settlement overseas, the first representative assembly in the Western Hemisphere, the first legally established haven of religious tolerance, the first colonial resolution for American independence, the four of the five first State universities founded in the United States, the third being the University of Vermont in the then frontier territory of New England.

In the South was born George Washington, father of our country; Patrick Henry, eloquent voice of liberty and revolution; Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence; James Madison, chief framer of the Constitution; John Marshall, its basic interpreter; James Monroe, promulgator of the American doctrine of the two hemispheres; Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, chief founders of democracy in America; Lee, preeminent soldier and stainless example of American reunion; Booker T. Washington, the American Moses of a modern Israel; and Woodrow Wilson, the world's major prophet of international cooperation.

The southern people have heroically risen from the ruins of war and reconstruction, and despite a great tradition, find themselves under severe economic handicaps which constitute a national economic problem. This section, with 28 percent of the population, receives only 8 percent of the Nation's income and educates 33 percent of the Nation's children. The tariff structure lifts wealth out of the South. The freight-rate structure, with its high differential against southern farmers, manufacturers, and merchants, draws wealth away from the South. The industrial-financial structure pyramids capital whose great peaks of wealth and power rise far beyond the southern region. The population structure with its very large proportion of southern school children constitutes an economic overload for the South, and yet, if justly accounted for, through more equal educational opportunity, can become one of the chief hopes of the Nation.

FEDERAL AID TO THE STATES TO EQUALIZE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Federal aid to education became a historic part of the American system before even the adoption of the Constitution, has been continued in a long succession of congressional grants to the States for agricultural, vocational, and higher education, and will be a further fulfillment of the great American tradition of Federal aid to the States for roads, agriculture, health, research, higher education, and social security. Failure to provide Federal aid now for the elementary and secondary schools is a failure of the American system to follow through for the most basic of all American institutions. Equal educational opportunity of the children who are to be citizens of both the States and the Nation is the main responsibility of our constitutional republic of States and people.

The emergency amount of $300,000,000, which was the amount spent annually on 300,000 young men in the CCC, is not an unreasonable amount to be spent toward the equalization of the educational opportunities of over 26,000,000 school children. The two main principles for the distribution of the Federal funds will be equitable distribution between the races and democratic distribution among the States according to the economic ability of the States and the number of children per adult population.

In three Southern States less than $40 per child was invested in public education, while in three States outside the South more than $120 per child was invested. A higher tax rate is required to provide the $40 per child in three States than is required to provide the $120 per child in the three other States. An economic, social, and cultural lag in any part of the country is an economic, social, and cultural damage to all parts of the country. Forty percent of the young people, 10 to 20 years old on farms in 1920, were in cities at the end of the decade. Sixty percent of this net migration was from southern rural areas.

While some regions are failing to reproduce their own population, the South has a 30-percent excess of births over deaths. The region with less than a third of the population has more than 50 percent of the excess of births over deaths in the Nation. A large proportion of the children who in their nonproductive years are supported and educated by rural people become in their economically creative years the producers in the vital industries and the citizens of the urban communities. Just as within the States, children in rural localities can have a fairer educational opportunity only through State aid to the localities, so children in the rural States can have a more equal educational opportunity only through Federal aid to the States.

The Federal Government is the only agency which can redress this economic and educational imbalance between the metropolitan areas of the greatest concentration of wealth and the rural areas of the greatest concentration of children per adult population. Three-fourths of the cost of public education is and will be carried by taxation of property, chiefly local.

For the most part taxation of agricultural property is taxation of the people on the farms where the tax is imposed. It cannot readily be shifted. Taxation of financial and industrial wealth, to an increasing extent in our integrated national industrial systems, is shifted to the consumers of the whole Nation. Since all sections, all resources, and all the people combine to produce the wealth concentrated in the great centers, and since all the people as consumers help pay the taxes on this wealth, comparatively it is just a tiny bit of the income from this wealth as Federal aid to public education should go back to the States whence it came and where are now the largest proportion of children whose equality and quality of education determine the future of democracy in America.

The South is proceeding on its part to spend more in proportion to its wealth on public education than any other American region, is proceeding to eliminate unfair discriminations in the salaries paid to Negro teachers, to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, to eliminate racial discriminations in the primaries, and to establish the principle of equal pay and upgrading for equal work, regardless of race, color, sex, or creed.

In North Carolina through university consolidation and interuniversity cooperation we are planning and patiently proceeding to develop one of the great university centers of the Nation. The South, also on its part, is asking for the elimination of freight-rate discriminations and for moderate Federal aid to the States for the elimination of educational inequalities in our democracy.

REGIONAL AND NATIONAL ISOLATION IMPOSSIBLE

The South and the Nation cannot be isolated from the example and teachings of New England. New England cannot be isolated from the markets and values of the South. Increased education can create new needs for goods, new desires and tastes in the South, which is potentially the richest undeveloped market in the Western Hemisphere. New England and the South and all America need more equal educational opportunities for all children north, south, east, and west, more markets, more jobs, regional, national and international intelligence and cooperation for the great tasks ahead.

In this modern dynamic world there is no isolation of race, color or creed, region, or nation. We cannot be isolated from our heritage and history, from the freedom which has made us what we are. We cannot be isolated from the woes and miseries of the conquered, stricken, and hungry peoples of the earth. We cannot be isolated from democracy, for democracy hurt anywhere in the world is democracy hurt everywhere in the world. We cannot be isolated from the air above, the seas around, or the lands beyond.

New England schools and colleges, mills, shops, and factories have had their part in the unprecedented military and naval organization and training of youth, and in the gigantic American production of war materials which tonight give dynamic power to the massive forward movements into Germany and across the far Pacific to the island gateways of Japan. In the name of our heroic dead we dedicate ourselves in this historic city of liberty to the unfinished work to win the war for human freedom, to guarantee more equality of opportunity, to provide jobs for all, and to help organize justice and peace in a world neighborhood of human brotherhood for all the peoples of the earth.

Editorial Tribute to Hon. Guy M. Gillette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of June 6 with reference to our former colleague, Guy M. Gillette.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL MIRACLE

Page Diogenes! We have at hand in the person of Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa, the very man whom the Greek cynic philosopher, lamp in hand, sought so assiduously and so hope-

lessly a couple of thousand years ago. Mr. Gillette has turned down a seat on the Federal bench, offered to him last week by President Truman, for the simple, incontrovertible and altogether extraordinary reason that he thinks he is not qualified to occupy it. Until he was defeated for reelection last year, he was a Member of Congress continuously since 1932, first in the House, later in the Senate. Prior to that, he was engaged, according to his biography in the Congressional Directory, in farming, and presumably has not done active legal work since he served as prosecuting attorney of Cherokee County, Iowa, from 1907 to 1909. When the President, as reported, suggested that he "brush up" on the law, Mr. Gillette is understood to have replied that a brief brush-up would not give him the legal background and experience necessary for a Federal judgeship.

Diffidence and humility are not common characteristics in public life. And, indeed, we are not at all sure that Mr. Gillette was manifesting them. It may be that he simply has an old-fashioned and peculiarly high regard for the status of the Federal bench—a respect for the traditions of the legal profession and for the sanctity of American justice which make him unusually exacting about appointments to our judiciary. Perhaps Mr. Gillette reasoned that, were he still a Senator, he would not vote for his own confirmation. We need more men like him in the Senate. His scruples and his candor afford ample justification for President Truman's desire to keep him in the public service in a position for which he feels he is truly fitted.

Presidential Succession Clarification Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Portsmouth (Va.) Star of Saturday, May 12, entitled "Presidential Succession Clarification Needed":

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION CLARIFICATION NEEDED

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, speaking on Monday night last before businessmen at Hazleton, Pa., probably made a wise suggestion when he proposed the appointment of a commission to be composed of Members from both Houses of Congress, others to be appointed by the President, with at least one representative from the Supreme Court of the United States, to study and make recommendation of new law governing the Presidential succession in the case of death or incapacity of both the President and Vice President.

Under the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, commonly known as the Norris amendment, provision is attempted to be made for the choosing of a President in the case of the death of either a President-elect or both a President-elect and a Vice President-elect before inauguration.

Under law enacted by Congress in the Grover Cleveland administration the Presidential succession passes, in the event of the death or incapacity of the President or Vice President to the Secretary of State, and after him in series, to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, and finally to the Secretary of the Interior—because there had been no creation of the office of Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce or Labor when the Presidential Succession Act became a law. Before this law was passed the President pro tempore of the United States Senate was in Presidential succession. To show how this was wrong, Senator Ben Wade, of Ohio, holding the position of President pro tempore of the Senate, actually voted for the conviction, under impeachment, of President Andrew Jackson, for removing a Cabinet officer, named by Lincoln, in alleged violation of law, the Ohioan hoping at the time that he (Wade) would by Johnson's conviction become President. But President Johnson was acquitted, though only by a single vote of the Senate sitting as a trial court.

Mr. Farley in his address urging the naming of a commission to study and make recommendation on the question of new Presidential succession law, pointed out that to leave the law as it stands today even permits the possibility of a Vice President succeeding to the Presidency, with power to name his potential successor through appointment of a Secretary of State of personal choice, subject, of course, to Senate confirmation.

Mr. Farley calls this "short circuiting" of the electorate with a "gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved." The comment is not out of place, and furnishes good reason for the adoption of the former Democratic National Chairman's proposal for a commission to revise present law on the subject of Presidential succession.

On the subject of the Congress providing for the naming of a President, especially in the event of death of both President and Vice President prior to inauguration, Mr. Farley correctly points to possible confusion. Only 17 days elapses between the convening of a newly elected House of Representatives and date set by law for inauguration of the President and Vice President. Close political division in membership of the House-elect could conceivably tie up organization of that body for an unlimited time and there might thus come a condition of affairs whereby the country would have no Chief Executive until the deadlock was broken.

It has long been understood how the original Constitution provides for the election of a President directly by the House of Representatives provided the electoral college fails to elect by majority vote, for this happened in the case of President John Quincy Adams early in the last century, but that section of the twentieth amendment on Presidential succession appears confusing when it says:

"If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them."

Certainly after reading this, which Mr. Farley did not directly quote in his Hazleton speech on Monday, it would seem that there comes much justification in the suggestion that a commission on Presidential succession might unravel some of the existing confusion, and provide a law of clarification and more simple understanding than existing statutes give us.

Dachau Concentration Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter Mr. Max Abelman, secretary to the board of the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, received from Maj. Theodore Barnett, former resident physician of that hospital:

KONZENTRATIONSLAGER DACHAU,

Fernsprecher, Dachau 293, May 3, 1945.

From the letterhead, which comes from the desk of the ex-commanding officer of this place, you can see that I have visited the most notorious of all concentration camps at Dachau—a place that must be forever remembered for its utter infamy. I am going to try to tell you something of what I have seen, not because I want to terrify or nauseate you but because I feel that everyone must be told what kind of people these Nazis really are. Since I couldn't possibly write this description more than once, I am going to ask you to show it to everyone you possibly can. All Americans must be told what inhuman beasts the Germans have become and anyone who has any idea of gentle treatment for our defeated foe must be forced to change their mind.

I have had to let my blood cool and my anger subside before I could even start to put a word on paper. Dachau is the first of the concentration camps and was used for political prisoners—German, Russian, Polish, etc. We approached it on a beautiful highway and just before the entrance is a sign that is a classic. It shows two smiling, gay peasants playing on an accordion being led into the camp. What irony.

When one gets into the area it looks like a group of hospital buildings, but about a half mile beyond, out of sight, the "place" begins. It is a completely walled-in enclosure extending for several thousand yards and is divided into two large compartments by a concrete moat. On one side are the barracks for the inmates, on the other side the murdering devices. The entire area is also fenced in with barbed wire which is electrically charged and the place bristles with concrete pill boxes.

We first inspected the area where the poor unfortunates are housed. There are still thousands and thousands of them there, miserably nourished and diseased. The wooden barracks are primitive, cold, and completely unsanitary. The saddest sight we saw was a group of Jewish boys, 10 to 14 years old, in terrible shape. They were used by the camp commander and other personnel of the camp for homosexual and sadistic purposes. At least these people were still alive and although their present behavior is more animal than human, we are moving hospitals nearby and perhaps can restore health to some of them.

Then we crossed the moat and saw the murder section. Here I saw things that I couldn't believe even after I saw them. First, there were the dog kennels, where huge animals were starved and then turned loose amongst

the prisoners. Then a huge pit full of charred human bones, where prisoners were made to squat along the edge of the pit, and then were shot, tumbled into the pit and burned. Gallows were strewn carelessly around. Then for the masterpiece, a large brick building that served as a gas chamber and incinerator. First, the prisoners were taken to a shower room, presumably because it was easier for the gas to be absorbed after the dirt was removed. In the shower room was a sign, "Cleanliness is next to Godliness." From the shower they were taken to a gas chamber where masses of human beings were herded and systematically gassed to death. From here they were taken to huge ovens where the bodies were incinerated. When the Americans arrived, they were in the midst of their gruesome work, and we saw hundreds and hundreds of bodies waiting to be burned. It was the most horrible thing I have ever seen. Besides these measures, which at least ended in the surcease of death, they had professional torturers who performed odd jobs with lashes, hot irons, etc. I took many pictures, and whenever someone begins talking of so-called good Germans, I'll show my wares. The delegates to the Peace Conference should all be brought to Dachau and then perhaps Germany will be given the type of peace terms she so justly deserves.

We talked to many prisoners, and their stories are simply fantastic. The coup-de-grace was our visit to the place where the high officials of the camp were being detained. They appeared more cruel looking and sadistic than I possibly could have pictured them.

The place was swarming with correspondents and photographers, so perhaps the total picture will be painted much better than I have done. It is a story that the world must know about. A major general was making an inspection tour as I was taking pictures, and he said, "Good work, Major; show them to all the people back home, and then perhaps they will know how to treat Germany."

Maj. THEODORE BARNETT, M. D.

Hon. Frances Perkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay from the Washington Post of June 6, 1945:

SERVING THE PUBLIC

(By Malvina Lindsay)

MADAM SECRETARY

The next woman member of the Cabinet will find the going easier because of the 12 years of punishment Frances Perkins so gallantly has taken. The trail has been blazed and the perspective of time will reveal the contribution the first woman Secretary of Labor has made in expanding democracy economically and socially. Also, as in the case of Woodrow Wilson, the lesson of warning will be there—that in a republic the practice of successful human relationships is an essential part of statesmanship.

No public official has ever suffered more misunderstanding and abuse than Secretary Perkins. She has been lambasted both as a dangerous radical and a stubborn reactionary. She has been blamed for every strike and labor dispute, though the functions of her office did not include such responsibility. Because she had the good sense to stick to a becoming style of hat, her headgear has been ridiculed and cartooned. She has been badgered at congressional committee inquisitions. The public, the press, Congress frequently have made her their whipping boy. To all this she has paid no attention, made no defense. She placed her resignation periodically on the President's desk, and when it was not accepted kept on sawing wood.

Tough job

Secretary Perkins took office with many strikes against her. In taking over a masculine stronghold, she faced the usual prejudices and suspicions—particularly the legend that no woman can be a good administrator. Organized labor resented not having one of its own men named to the post. The Nation was in economic upheaval, a war with attendant strikes lay ahead. The public generally had a misconception of her duties and powers, which under the 1913 act that established her Department were "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of wage earners of the United States"—not to prevent their strikes.

Also she was unfitted by background and temperament for the human side of politics. Inevitably the first woman Cabinet member was news. But the new Secretary came from an ultraconservative New England family. She was innately reserved, had a horror of publicity, was adamant against having her private life given public attention. She would not pose for the traditional photograph of the woman official whipping up a cake in her kitchenette, nor give interviews on the best methods to bake beans or bring up children.

This would not have mattered greatly even to a sociable and folksy citizenry. But more unfortunately, the first woman Secretary lacked the talent for bridging the gulf between herself and people in her public life. She consistently had bad press relations. Consequently, her aims, program, and achievements were not interpreted to the people to the extent they might have been. This reserve also handicapped her relations with certain Congressmen, labor leaders, political associates. Being an intellectual, she inevitably attracted the epithet "cold," and her own social restraint further awed those inherently suspicious of "brainy" women.

Glad-hand tradition

But why, it might be asked, should a public official be expected to bow to the tradition of glad-handing and back-slapping? Was not Secretary Perkins entitled to her aloofness (shyness, her friends call it) and her private life? No one can deny the right of an official to abjure cheap popular appeal and to be true to his own nature. But skill in human relations can be acquired, to an extent at least, and in a democratic government is highly essential. In a sense, it is the essence of democracy for it rests on a recognition of the importance of the individual personality. Secretary Perkins, for all her deep passion for individual liberty and concern for the welfare of human beings, seemed unable to translate her feeling for people in the mass to the individual when she faced him.

True, she will stand in the future on her achievements. "I'll let history judge my record," she has told her friends who repeatedly have begged her to defend herself against false accusations. Her admirers maintain she will be rated as one of the great Cabinet officials, that her ideas have been responsible for most of the social legislation of the last 12 years. Certainly her dignity and courage on the firing line will always be proudly remembered by her sex. But even so, her own way would have been much easier, her achievements possibly greater, had she been able to bring out in herself more of the common touch. Strangely, those with the most to contribute to democratic government often leave this technique entirely to the two-penny politicians.

Revision of the Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a of interest to those students of the legislative procedure and in view of the cooperation that the Committee on Revision of the Laws has received from the leadership and membership of the House, I thought it would be appropriate to insert the following report filed in the House of Representatives during the first session of the Thirtieth Congress, dated June 14, 1848.

The report is as follows:

[30th Cong., 1st sess. Rept. No. 671, to accompany bill H. R. 535]

REVISION OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Joseph R. Ingersoll, from the Committee on the Judiciary, made the following report:

Writers on the principles of government have suggested the propriety of revising, at certain definite periods, the prevailing system of laws. They advise that such a revision should be provided for by fundamental or organic arrangement. They also recommend that this original and constitutional provision should not only be inherent and obligatory in its character but self-operative in practice. By making it the duty of certain established officers to carry out, at the end of precise and brief terms, the intention of the fundamental law, without new or additional legislation, the Nation would almost unconsciously glide into the correction of abuses, and the substitution of improved enactments in place of those which experience may have proved to be defective or inapplicable. In the absence of standing regulations, occasional ones must sometimes be resorted to. It can scarcely be supposed that relief of this nature should not sometimes be required. The wants of all communities are expansive; it is impossible to anticipate either the extent or peculiarities of them. In providing for them, from time to time, legislation often becomes complex and irregular. Laws are enacted under the pressure of momentary emergency; if not inconsistent, they are obscure; sometimes involved in statutes dissimilar in title and object and always scattered over different parts of a broad surface, in the numerous hiding places of which they are concealed.

These evils are, as it were, necessary incidents of legislation. They can scarcely fail to exist and to be numerous, even where great care is bestowed upon the machinery, and the workings of it, of parliamentary proceedings. In a country which, like England, has in one branch a permanent set of members, who terminate their career only with their lives, and, in the other, many representatives who, during a long career, keep a steady eye upon the science of legislation, and thence acquire something like proficiency in it as an art, a better chance exists that great errors may be avoided. Yet we are told of strange irregularities among hereditary legislators, notwithstanding all the advantage of having a high law officer of the crown, with munificent endowments, to prepare the laws. A statute is said, not many years since, to have passed through all the forms by which the penalty of transportation was awarded half to the king and the other half to the informer. Among ourselves the danger of vicious or clumsy legislation, from inadvertence and inexperience,

is far more considerable. Few persons among us do more than turn aside, occasionally from other vocations, to pursue the vocation of lawmakers. Fewer still devote to that vocation the study of their lives. The particular duty of drafting statutes, or examining them after they have been drawn, devolves on nobody. Skill is seldom acquired by experience, which is its ablest teacher. Each individual, without any especial familiarity with the rules of parliamentary law, and without any official duty or experience, prepares the statute which he desires to submit, and it is passed or rejected without any particular reference to its terms, or correction of its ambiguity.

Besides the danger of imperfect phraseology, other evils are developed in the progress of time. Alterations are made as the particular exigency requires. These alterations are sometimes accompanied by an ad referendum clause, and the former legislation is not easy of access, either from not being clearly pointed out, or from a succession of references, which become multiplied and intricate.

Sometimes an important ingredient in a general or comprehensive topic is inserted in the midst of irrelative and incongruous matter, and presents itself to view only or probably by accident, there being no known clue to its discovery. A leading provision of the naturalization laws, which requires that a party who intends to become a citizen shall not only have a legal residence but never personally depart from the United States during his term of probation, is found in the sixth section of an act for the regulation of seamen.

Enactments defining the duties of a particular office should naturally be so united as to furnish all needful information in one comprehensive body. That which seems to be complete in its enumeration should be so in reality. Yet a single officer, the Register of the Treasury, whose office is of comparatively recent creation, is obliged to search for a knowledge of what is prescribed to him through more than a hundred statutes.

If in the course of nearly 60 years even contradictory enactments should be found, it would not be matter of surprise, although neither be designed to repeal or supersede another. But without positive interference there may readily be unnecessary repetition, with great peril of such differences as prevent an easy ascertainment of the more appropriate and complete remedy among several of them for a given evil. Both the evil and the remedy may be obsolete, and everything that relates to them may well be taken from the statute book together.

It not infrequently occurs that mischiefs are perceived for a course of years which require legislation, and yet they are not brought into view in the proper place, because they have not presented themselves to those whose especial business it is to correct them. A careful revision brings them up to notice. In reviewing an entire system, faults that mar its beauty are necessarily observed. Omissions which under other circumstances would escape attention become apparent. Symmetry and order are the result of such an entire examination. Deficiencies are supplied, redundancies excluded, errors corrected, similar subjects brought together, improvements made, and the whole arranged in harmony.

One of the mischiefs that have been complained of is that of intricacy in the combination and separation of laws in pari materia. The mischief is imputed in part to a multiplication of clauses of reference and repeal. It frequently occurs that even the number of references and partial repeals does not present the chief inconvenience. If on each occasion of reference specific mention were made of the thing alluded to, the difficulties, however considerable, might be overcome. Patient labor could trace repeals through all their complexities. Although the task might be difficult, it would not be impracticable. Few might be willing to take up the burden, but none would be absolutely deterred by the absolute hopelessness of the effort. The difficulty assumes its most formidable shape when it furnishes no aid whatever to inquiry and research. Statutes, for example, are passed concluding with words so indefinite as these: All acts and parts of acts repugnant to the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Among the States occasional revisions of the laws are resorted to. The time has arrived when a similar proceeding has become eminently proper on the part of the General Government. The Committee on the Judiciary accordingly report a bill.

Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the meat situation has caused us all great concern. Much of the trouble has been caused by reason by the fact that so few packers were federally inspected establishments and therefore the Government, in procuring its necessary needs for the armed services, was compelled to obtain such a large percentage of its meat from the comparatively few federally inspected plants.

The Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, has known about this bottleneck for some time and has been endeavoring to straighten it out by enticing into Federal inspection as many of the slaughtering places as possible.

I am inserting herewith a letter I have just received from Administrator Marvin Jones on this subject, and also a statement from Mr. Clarkson, of the Meat Inspection Division, relating to the progress that has been made in this direction:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 5, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR WRIGHT: In further reference to your inquiry about our efforts to increase the number of packers and slaughterers who accept Federal inspection under the liberalized wartime legislation, I enclose herewith a memorandum which has been prepared in the Meat Inspection Division of the Livestock and Meats Branch

You will note that the number of such establishments has been greatly increased during the last few months and that the percentage of Federal slaughter to total slaughter now averages above 70 percent.

You will understand that most of the large establishments are now under Federal inspection and that many of those outside are local butchers or very small establishments.

However, there are a number of other concerns which we feel should come in for the duration of the emergency, and we are making every effort to get them to do so.

The Army is cooperating. We have assured the various packers and slaughterers that it is desirable that they should come under Federal inspection under the liberalized provision during the war period.

The only requirement is that the animals slaughtered be not diseased and that the meat be slaughtered under sanitary conditions that assure that it is wholesome.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

JUNE 2, 1945.

To: The War Food Administrator.

From: M. R. Clarkson, Acting Chief, Meat Inspection Division, through S. R. Newell, Chief, Livestock and Meats Branch, OMS.

Subject: Expansion of Federal meat inspection.

To meet the steadily increasing demand for federally inspected meat for the armed forces and other Federal agencies, the Meat Inspection Service has put into effect a program of expansion which has made the inspection available to a great many of the larger intrastate meat packing plants. These are the plants which are not compelled to have Federal inspection because, in each case, their business is confined within the borders of a single State. This expansion has increased the number of federally inspected establishments from 656, of which 300 conducted slaughtering, before the emergency, to 1,027, of which 531 conduct slaughtering, as of June 1, 1945.

During the calendar year 1944, the slaughter of animals under Federal inspection compared with the estimated total slaughter as follows:

	Total slaughter	Federal slaughter	Federal slaughter, percent of total
Cattle	19,652,000	13,960,000	71.04
Calves	14,307,000	7,770,000	54.31
Sheep	24,420,000	21,876,000	89.58
Swine	97,352,000	69,017,000	70.89
Total	155,731,000	112,623,000	72.32

Requests for inspection are referred to the inspector in charge of the field station in the area where the applicant's plant is located. The inspector makes a survey of the plant to determine the sanitary condition of the buildings and acceptability of the water supply, sewage disposal, equipment, and facilities for proper handling of product and conduct of the inspection. The requirements have been modified to meet the present situation, maintaining, however, the essential sanitary necessities. When adjustments are necessary, the inspector assists the owner to work out an acceptable arrangement. Inspection is granted when the inspector finds the plant to be in suitable condition.

Within the last month, to facilitate the handling of applications for plants that can supply meat to the Army, an arrangement has been made with the Army Quartermaster Corps whereby meat-inspection representatives in various sections of the country accompany officers of the Quartermaster Corps calling upon the owners of slaughtering plants which might supply meat to the Army. In this way it is possible for the owner to have settled immediately questions pertaining to the inspection, as well as Army procurement. He is able then to decide whether he wishes to obtain the inspection and participate in the production of meat for the Army.

At the present time, more than 40 requests for inspection are being received monthly. During May, inspection was inaugurated at 23 plants. Of these, 13 conduct slaughtering and 9 others are engaged primarily in preparing boneless, three-way beef for the Army.

M. R. CLARKSON.

Authority Over Food Should Be Removed From the Office of Economic Stabilization and From the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican congressional food-study committee strongly recommends that all authority over food be removed from the Office of Economic Stabilization now presided over by William H. Davis, former Chairman of the War Labor Board.

If the President really means to put the food activities of the Nation under one agency and then hold that agency responsible, he must not only take authority over food from the Office of Economic Stabilization but must also transfer over to the Department of Agriculture the authority now exercised over food by the OPA under Chester Bowles.

One of the principal bottlenecks in the food administration at this time is the Office of Economic Stabilization. This is strongly evidenced by the fact that disputes which arose many months ago between the War Food Administration and the OPA have not been decided and are still pending in the Office of Economic Stabilization.

Many of these disputes relate to canned fruits and vegetables. While the general canning season for 1945 is now well under way, the 1945 price policy, under which canners must operate, has not yet been fully established.

It is well known that the Republican congressional food-study committee has maintained for the past 2 years that the best way to settle problems of food price and food distribution is to encourage sufficient production to meet all demands. The new Secretary of Agriculture should be charged with this responsibility and should be given the necessary authority.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, Bretton Woods—magic words. Magic, because they are the symbol of peace. Bretton Woods agreements, when adopted by all nations, will be the cornerstone of a just and lasting peace.

Nearly all wars in the past have been caused by nations vying with each other for world trade. Yes, even the cause of our Revolutionary War was England's attempt to force the American Colonies to trade with her only. The manipulation of money values by international money lenders could and did shut out the competition from any nation at their will.

Germany, for instance, after the First World War, manipulated her money values so skillfully that no nation could compete with her. By devaluating her money and keeping it within her own borders, she built the most powerful war machine in history. Then, using her power as a threat, she forced the weaker nations around her to sell their goods to her at her money value, and buy her goods at their money value. The high Smoot-Hawley tariff in our country prevented nations from selling to us, therefore, their choice of markets was very limited, except as dictated by Germany. Consequently, our exports dropped to nil, and the great depression swept over the world, except in Germany, and she grew stronger and stronger each year. Finally, Germany felt so strong, that she set out to conquer the world, and came much closer to doing it than we dare to admit. During this time, Japan worked hand in hand with Germany. Now, if the monetary policy as outlined in the Bretton Woods agreements had already been in use by all nations of the world, Germany could not have manipulated her currency, because all money values would be guaranteed by all the nations under the Bretton Woods agreements, and Germany could not have grown to be the threat she proved to be to the world.

Dumbarton Oaks, which aims to be a world-security organization, will have a much better chance to succeed, if the Bretton Woods agreements are adopted, for then the primary reason for wars will be eliminated. When nations will know what their currency will be worth today, tomorrow, or next week or month, they will be in a much better position to carry on trade between themselves, they will be much more friendly toward each other, they will learn to trust each other, and, I repeat, the chief reason for war will be eliminated. They will not have to work in secret, but will be able to come out in the sun.

Truly, Bretton Woods is the cornerstone of a lasting peace.

Postwar Development of Natural Resources of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Labor Council and the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, which are composed of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, have jointly adopted the following resolution:

Whereas various private and public agencies are now engaged in formulating plans for the postwar development of California land, water, power, and other natural resources, some of which plans are inadequate or designed to serve special interests, and the sum of which represents duplication of effort and results in public confusion; and

Whereas the future welfare and prosperity of the people of California depend largely upon the manner in which we conserve and develop our basic natural resources; and

Whereas the proposed construction of the necessary dams, canals, power plants, and other works not only will provide immediate peacetime employment, but such works will make available the basic resources on which later we can build and expand our economy by creating permanent homes, industries, and communities; and

Whereas if the people of California are to derive the maximum benefit from the development of these resources such works must be constructed and operated under a unified, articulated, and comprehensive plan on an over-all, region-wide basis; and

Whereas water development projects should give full consideration to all possible beneficial uses and purposes, including irrigation, domestic, and industrial water supply, navigation, flood control, production of electric energy, maintenance and development of fish and wildlife resources, salinity control, recreation, and other uses, each accorded its relative importance; and

Whereas the program of the Bureau of Reclamation is designed to foster the maximum number of resident-owned and operated farms, prevent the spread of land monopoly and land speculation, and provide the widest possible opportunity for mustered-out servicemen and ex-war workers seeking California farm homes; and

Whereas when electric power is developed through the expenditure of public funds, Californians should enjoy the lowest possible rates, and under the Bureau of Reclamation's program for the distribution of public power, preference is given to municipalities, cooperatives, and other public agencies, thus resulting in lower consumer rates; and

Whereas the program of the Bureau of Reclamation is based on full recognition of all State water laws and rights established thereunder; and

Whereas the policies and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of these valuable resources give to water and power users the advantages, through Federal financial assistance, of low-rate and interest-free money, and at the same time, comply with the aforesaid policies for resource development; and

Whereas under the reclamation laws the costs of these public works are largely repaid to the Government through the sale of water and power, rather than charged against the general taxpayer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the A. F. of L. postwar planning committee of San Francisco in regular session assembled this 8th day of May 1945, That it deplores the multiplicity of conflicting and haphazard plans and efforts and urges the adoption of the time-tested, orderly and economically sound program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the development of our land, water, and power resources, and that we respectfully urge that the California Representatives in Congress and other public officials be requested to give their full endorsement of and active support to the comprehensive program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the departments of the Government.

(Adopted by the San Francisco Labor Council and the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, May 1945.)

Doctors in Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from a doctor friend of many years. For obvious reasons it is advisable to omit identifying names or places.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' HOSPITAL.

DEAR WALTER: I noted your statement about lay control of veterans' hospitals in the AMA this week, and knowing you and having worked for VA for more than 10 years, wish to commend you for your special interest in us doctors. All the doctors here are encouraged to know that somebody is trying to do something about it. More power to you, and let me know if I can give you any inside information. I was at ———— ———— several years. Went to ———— ———— on promotion as chief of medicine several years and then have been here several years.

Politics, both Legion and party, dominates the situation. We have managers with their assistants and staff, all laymen, who draw the big salaries and make all the important—including medical—decisions. They all have secretaries, etc., at their command, but the doctors can write out their reports in longhand and there are regulations galore even telling them much of what to write. Of course, there are doctors, too, that know Senators who get them assignments and promotions irrespective of knowledge or ability. It seems hopeless to expect that Congressmen would create a medical corps that would take away from them the privilege of doing things for their special friends.

As to work, we are handled as help. The incompetent are assigned trivial tasks and no effective effort is ever made to eliminate them. And there are plenty of them. Civil service created a 48-hour work week with compensatory overtime. Doctors here average 60 hours a week, with 48 hours pay. One 28-hour officer-of-the-day stretch once a week accounts for our overtime.

I could write pages. I have no personal gripes or wants. I like institutional work and plan to stay with it. But if we are expected to do first-class medicine, drastic changes must be made.

Again, please allow me to commend you on your activity in our behalf. I have been keenly interested but have never taken the time to write.

More power to you.

Confidentially yours,

———— ————.

The Underlying Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., of April 29, 1945:

THE UNDERLYING FORCE

"So far as our domestic affairs are concerned the problem of our return to peace is a problem of economic and industrial readjustment. * * * Our people do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would become hopelessly tangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All that we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there and elsewhere as we may. I have heard much counsel as to the plans that should be forced and personally conducted to a happy consummation, but from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of 'reconstruction' emerge which I thought it likely we could force our spirited businessmen and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience."

Thus spoke President Woodrow Wilson in his message to Congress in 1918, just a few weeks after the end of World War I.

Quoting this great leader of American liberalism, James A. Farley said the other day, in a speech at Milwaukee:

"We could demonstrate no greater attachment to Americanism than to lend our support to that Wilsonian doctrine at the conclusion of this war. That does not mean that every wartime control should be dropped when the final gun is fired. Our economic system has been too greatly dislocated for that. But it does mean that relaxation of controls should be rapid and clean-cut * * * Our freedom in peace has been our strength in war * * * We have fought wars and are fighting this one only to preserve freedom. We have all given up great measures of freedom to achieve victory. We should let no one forget for a minute that we want those freedoms back and we intend to have them."

It is timely in this connection to quote the words of another true democrat:

"I believe in individual initiative. The profit motive of our economic system, I think, is incomparably superior to any other system the world has known. Certainly we do not want any part of the fear motive of the National Socialist states. But the profit motive does lead in some cases to excesses which cause difficulties."

"At the end of the war we will have the factories, the tools, the labor supply, the materials and the processes of manufacture on which we can found the world's greatest prosperity. * * * We must not regiment business, because to do so will stifle progress. But business cannot be operated on a public-be-damned policy. Business must display statesmanship and operate in the public interest as well as its own selfish interest."

This is what Senator Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, said, speaking in 1942 and 1943.

He is now President Truman.

At the beginning of an era when the freedom of democracy must meet the challenge of communistic regimentation it is good to know that a man believing as Harry Truman believes—as Woodrow Wilson believed—as true democrats everywhere believe—is prepared to accept that challenge in behalf of the American people.

Other peoples are entitled to their own political and economic creeds, to their own philosophy and form of government. Whatever these may be we shall plan and hope to get along amicably with those who accept them, to cooperate with them heartily in the cause of peace. But the philosophy of communism or of fascism, government by regimentation imposed from above—these are not for us. For, as Farley says: "Freedom is the very breath of America, its very life. It is the underlying force, the inner power, the spirit which is singular to our Nation."

Stalin and the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, officially Russia is now at peace with the rest of the world. We are told that Russia has suffered the loss of 15,000,000 men killed in this war. We all acknowledge that she did her full part in the war against Germany. The great question in the minds of the Allied Nations today is, "Will Russia do her full part to establish an effective world peace organization?"

We can only judge the future by the past. Every move Stalin has made since the war in Europe first started has been made entirely from a nationalistic standpoint. Stalin has never lost sight of Russia's interests and has never failed to keep them uppermost in mind. From the time he teamed up with Hitler to invade Poland until this present moment every move he has made has been in the interest of Russia. His invasion and later absorption of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the eastern part of Poland are clear evidences of his materialistic aims and objectives. He has succeeded in establishing communistic minorities in Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Austria, setting up puppet governments in each of these countries to do the will of, and be subservient to, the Soviet Union. His exclusion of American newsmen and American officials from countries and territories that Russia has "liberated(?)" cannot be justified now that an enemy no longer exists. This situation is bound to engender suspicion concerning his future policies.

Russia has emerged from this war more nationalistic than ever. She is more nationalistic today than the United States was in 1919 when the Senate refused to ratify the League of Nations Treaty. Stalin is the one person who insists upon retaining the "hidden veto power" in the Dumbarton Oaks peace set-up. He does this so that Russia may continue to have a free hand in the world of the future. His unilateral actions since Yalta, affecting Roumania, Yugoslavia, Austria, Poland, and Turkey—in direct violation of the Yalta big three agreements—proved to be the greatest stumbling blocks at San Francisco to the formation of a world peace organization. Stalin does not waste time talking about his aims and objectives; he acts to accomplish them without regard for the wishes of others. He still believes that might makes right, and acts in accordance with that belief.

The future of Europe and the success of a world peace organization rest very largely in Stalin's hands. What this future will be can be judged by what he did to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Poland, where the people who objected to Stalin's program of supervision and domination were "reported, deported, and liquidated." Judging the future by the

past, what can we expect from Russia? What will Stalin do next?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 5, 1945, entitled "Russian Policy in Germany":

RUSSIAN POLICY IN GERMANY

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, toured American and British occupied areas of Europe recently, with the Mead Committee on War Expenditures, and is now back home telling a few of the things he heard and saw on the trip.

Senator BREWSTER says he heard on high authority in London and Paris that the Russians are liquidating the upper crust of professional people in the Russian-occupied part of Germany, while buddying up to the working people. BREWSTER gathered that German lawyers, engineers, businessmen, and other professional people are being done away with, though the doctors and dentists have not as yet been molested.

If the report about the doctors and dentists is true, the Bolsheviks nowadays are smarter than they were in the revolution in Russia led by Nicolai Lenin. In that affair the Reds liquidated the Russian doctors along with the rest of Russia's wealthy and middle classes, with the result that Russia had practically no medical profesison for 15 or 20 years after and hasn't a first-class one yet.

LIQUIDATIONS IN GERMANY

This report of the communizing of eastern Germany is not surprising. It is the less surprising in view of the fact that the Russians, up to Eisenhower's Berlin conference this week, have kept Allied representatives and observers out of Russia's part of Germany. The Mead committee couldn't get in and look around; neither could newspaper correspondents.

Though the report persists that American troops could have taken Berlin before the Russians got there, our forces stopped on the Elbe River. They also stopped outside Prague, capital of Czechoslovakia, and let the Russians move in. This, though our air forces had done the bulk of the softening up of both Berlin and Prague with bombs.

These maneuvers are believed to have been one of the things the late President Roosewelt let us in for in his conversations at Yalta with Churchill and Stalin. The general agreement is understood to have been that Britain, France, Russia, and the United States would share in the management of postwar Germany.

Russia is now, according to Brewster's and other reports, busily communizing its part of Germany. It is also communizing the rest of eastern Europe—Poland, Finland, the Baltic States, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia—and seems determined to communize all Europe if it can.

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill is already visible and audibly disturbed over these developments. He is making remarks which seem to foreshadow a British turn against Russia, as the latest dominant power on the European continent. To any war which such a turn might produce, the United States, it seems almost needless to say, would be urgently invited by the British.

What is the significance of it all for Americans?

We have now gone to two of these European conflicts, to fight for various high ideals. We have not realized the high ideals, but we have realized the deaths of a lot of young men on both occasions, and the maiming of many more.

Our casualties in World War II have now topped 1,000,000. A large percentage of these were incurred in Europe, so that Stalin might proceed to communize most or all of Europe.

NO FIGHT RUSSIA

The moral of it is: No fight Russia, at anybody's urging or for any reason, unless Russia sometime attacks us. In that case, we should fight to the limit.

If we should attack Russia, we could not defeat it. Napoleon couldn't, and Hitler couldn't.

Russia, on the other hand, could probably not defeat us, if we were ready to meet any attack it might launch against us. Such readiness would involve our having the world's most powerful navy and air force after this war, plus a highly trained skeleton Army swiftly expandible to war strength from a reserve of young men who had learned the elements of warfare under a system of universal military training.

The American Council on Education, polling college presidents on this latter subject, finds that about 75 percent of them are against deciding the universal military training question before the end of the war. These gentlemen, of course, are voting in their own interest, as they would rather have the young men in the colleges than in the camps.

As for the rest of us, we had better become isolationists as far as Russia is concerned, by resolving not to fight Russia unless Russia starts a fight with us, and by keeping our defenses strong from now on.

It turns out that we fought the German war for Russia's ideas and ideals. There should be at least a decent interval of time before we turn around and begin to fight against Russia's ideas and ideals.

Duquesne University Honors Congressman Samuel A. Weiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, SAMUEL A. WEISS, known as SAMMY WEISS to the sporting world, graduated from Duquesne University Law School in 1927. While attending Duquesne, he was captain of its football and baseball teams, and president of its student association. He began practicing law in 1927 and soon earned a reputation before his county bar as an able advocate and a lawyer of unquestionable integrity. He was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1934, and reelected in 1936, where he established the reputation of being one of its outstanding members. He was the author of the new election code and many other worthwhile reforms. He gained State-wide reputation as the author of the Weiss liberal workmen's compensation law that paid widows and workmen for life and brought Pennsylvania from thirty-seventh to fourth in rank in the Nation with respect to liberal compensation payments.

Sammy was elected to the United States Congress in 1940 and reelected in 1942, and again in 1944. He has become the sports champion in Washington, informing the Nation of the great value of competitive sports in time of war. He is also one of the Nation's outstanding football officials, being a referee in the National Professional Football League.

Congressman WEISS is a proven friend of the working men and women of America, always opposing restrictive and repressive antilabor measures. He is a champion for GI Joe, being the author of the bill giving soldiers, sailors, and marines free postage; he is the author of the Ernie Pyle bill to give combat pay to fighting and combat infantrymen. He fought for the GI bill of rights and many other veterans measures.

Sammy is an honored member of the directors of Roselia Foundling Hospital of Pittsburgh; and he is a member of the athletic council of his alma mater, Duquesne University.

Duquesne University is proud of Congressman SAMUEL A. WEISS. At its sixty-seventh annual graduation exercises on Sunday, June 3, 1945, at Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall, Pittsburgh, Pa., Duquesne University, a great institution, presented its outstanding meritorious alumni service award to Congressman WEISS. We, his colleagues in the House, join in hearty approval of this signal honor to one so deserving, and we commend the university for its selection.

As part of my remarks I am happy to include the acceptance speech of my distinguished colleague, Mr. WEISS, delivered at the graduation exercises:

His Excellency, Bishop Boyle, the Very Reverend Father Kirk, members of the clergy, honored guests, members of the class, and fellow Americans:

To say that I am deeply privileged to receive this award sounds like a platitude. Yet I am fully aware of the honor you have accorded me, and I want you to know that I am grateful—and also very proud—to receive your alumni meritorious service award in the company of such distinguished Americans as the Honorable Leo Crowley, the Honorable Philip Murray, Father Hyland, who are honored today by my alma mater.

Duquesne University is my school. Here I learned science and law—and something of football, too. My teachers and my books taught me a great deal, but the most valuable lesson of all came from the spirit that pervades this university and its student body, the spirit of democratic living, of fair play and teamwork that was found in the classrooms as well as on the ball fields. It was the Duke of Wellington who said that, "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." The battle for American democracy is won in schools like Duquesne. What better example than here today? Duquesne University—a great American university which is Catholic—honoring an American of the Jewish faith. This is democracy at work. This is the democracy we are today fighting to preserve.

Millions of the world's best manhood have died in this gigantic Global War. Millions will suffer because of the basic failure of ruthless tyrants to recognize the worth of each individual. Instead, they and their bestial hordes judge a man on his origin, or religion. These same fanatics adhere to the principle of the state above Almighty God. A nation built upon a foundation of such godless philosophy cannot survive. So we witness the collapse of Nazi Germany. Yet only half the battle is won.

It is now imperative for us, the living, to dedicate and consecrate our lives—even if it takes years—to the grim task of laying the foundation for a peace that will last for generations to come, in order that we shall redeem the heavy price paid in bloodshed and human life.

For people throughout the world to live in a world of universal brotherhood, they must adopt the spirit of this commencement—mutual understanding, respect, and faith. To realize this objective of universal brotherhood, the nations of the world must restore human dignity among mankind. There can be no dignity of man without faith in God. Unless all men are imbued with that faith, our hope of realizing the dream of universal brotherhood will crumble in hopeless disaster. Every one of us, Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, believes in the basic religious ideology—that "the immortal hope and destiny of every human being is the Kingdom of God." It gives human life its worth.

Our first obligation is to meet the moral and spiritual conditions that are the essentials of universal peace and brotherhood. As Pope Pius XII so eloquently stated following the termination of the European war, "Peace cannot flower and prosper except in an atmosphere of secure justice and of perfect fidelity joined with reciprocal trust, mutual understanding, and benevolence in a spirit of universal brotherhood." But before this is a permanently peaceful world, it must be a just world. Before there is an enduring peace among the peoples of the world, there must be brotherhood among them.

War has aroused discord, suspicion and hatred everywhere, but united together in the spirit of universal fellowship, we can overcome these obstacles and build a better world. It is a challenge and an obligation to God-fearing people everywhere. The responsibility is ours. We cannot and will not shirk it. To this task the world must bring a strong faith in divine providence. For its fulfillment, the people of the world must have hearts animated by a generous indestructible love of one's fellow man. We must exercise world statesmanship. Such statesmanship must be animated and governed by the great principle first enunciated in the Old Testament and then spread the world over through its quotation in the New Testament that, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

So long as race riots occur in Detroit and in other cities, so long as the poll tax can continue in the South—preventing even soldiers on the front from voting—so long as anti-Semitism continues to increase in America, there is little likelihood of our securing an enduring basis for cooperation with the Orient or even the countries of Latin America.

The brotherhood of man must grow at home before it can be in wider commonalty spread. Our real task lies not between the nations but within each nation. Yes, within the heart and mind and will of every man.

Moreover, the day is past when we can work for ourselves alone. The day is past when Americans can hope to enjoy freedom and security without regard for the other peoples of the world. Human rights are the same for all of us, and surely we know by now that what threatens them in one country threatens them all over the world. That is why some of us in Congress have been talking about an international bill of human rights, to be recognized and enforced by the world security organization we are now creating in San Francisco. It is a big goal we have set for ourselves, but one that all of us can help to achieve, simply by working toward it in our own home, in our own back yard, in our own community, and in our schools. Yes, just the way it is taught and practiced at Duquesne University. Doing this, we shall see human rights protected in the only place where they can really be secure—in the hearts of our fellow men.

General Grant, Exemplar for Modern Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered by Charles J. Zinn, commander of Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, at Grant's Tomb, New York, on May 30, 1945:

In keeping with a custom of many years—which has indeed become an integral part of the tradition of Memorial Day in New York—it is again my privilege, as Commander of Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, to speak briefly to you and to recall to your minds something of the glories of our great Civil War hero, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. As you know, the first of these ceremonies was held soon after this tomb was erected under the auspices of U. S. Grant Post, No. 327, Grand Army of the Republic, and for the past quarter of a century we of Lafayette Camp have carried on as the successors of that post.

We like to believe that the simplicity of these services and our humility in conducting them are peculiarly and appropriately consonant with the true simplicity and humility of him whose memory we are honoring. Without question we could readily obtain the services of famed and gifted orators who would eagerly welcome the opportunity of singing the praises of General Grant in choice word and measured phrase above the reach of ordinary man, and it may be that only in such fashion can we do him justice. But no practitioner in panegyric, no professional purveyor of praise, lacking a deep and heartfelt appreciation of the man his tongue extols, would ever satisfy our sense of reverence for that truly great man. And it is just such simple and homely words as ours that we believe he would have preferred.

A few years ago it was considered smart and sophisticated to scorn and degrade our national heroes in what was fatuously called "debunking" them, and it is to our everlasting shame that some of our esteemed authors succumbed to that mood so far as to attack even Washington, the Father of our Country, and Grant, the preserver of the Union. Fortunately, during those years there were still proud Americans, like you who have attended these exercises year after year, and by whom the memory of our heroes has been preserved and held sacred. And let us not for one minute ever forget the glory that is Grant's. The words of Cicero in one of his orations against Cataline are especially appropriate: "If the glory of him who founded Rome was great, how much greater should be that of him who saved it from overthrow after it had grown to be the mistress of the world."

It almost appalls us when we try to estimate to what extent we and the world are indebted to the victor at Appomattox. The glorious accomplishments of our armed forces which so recently culminated in VE-day would never have been were it not for General Grant and all that he was.

Our generation is not the first to admit its error and to revise its opinion of that Civil War leader. Horace Greeley, whose name is synonymous with journalism, was one of Grant's severest critics, rarely missing an opportunity to berate him editorially, even though after Shiloh one of Greeley's own correspondents wrote to him that "General Grant displayed not only great coolness but cheerful confidence, skill, and good judgment. It is easy to indulge in flippant criticism, but the country is too much indebted to General Grant to condemn him without cause."

After Vicksburg, Greeley, making a complete about-face, wrote with his brilliant pen of "the steady purpose, the unshaken fortitude, the fertile talent, the heroic determination of General Grant."

Grant's comrade in arms, Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, was also highly critical of the plans before Vicksburg and went so far as to write a letter of protest on behalf of the other generals. After the battle, however, Sherman was the first to acknowledge his mistake, and wrote to his wife: "Grant is now deservedly the hero. He is entitled to all the credit of the movement, which was risky and hazardous in the extreme and succeeded because of its hazard."

Finally, even our great Civil War President had been, at least privately, critical of Grant's plans but hastened to admit his error and wrote Grant: "I now wish to make the personal acknowledgement that you were right and I was wrong."

If we analyze the man and his achievements with a view of discovering the source of his greatness I believe that we will find that it can be summed up in one word—"character." As Wister so graphically put it: "It would be strangely inconsistent to find in Grant's adolescence any signs of precocity, such as mark, for example, the early years of Webster, another rustic boy with very similar antecedents. For intellect was Webster's gift. while character was Grant's; and character finds no outward expression save in life's chances."

No more striking tribute to his character could be made than that of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, a Confederate officer who wrote of Grant in the following terms:

"He bore a great soul. He was a large man. He was a rough soldier. He struck hard blows and did rough things but war is no holiday spectacle, nor parlor amusement. But Grant never in his whole career as a soldier of the Union Army ever did one thing for which his posterity will blush or which his countrymen must palliate or excuse. He foraged in Mississippi as he had the right to do, and he foraged like a soldier and a gentleman, as he was, in a legal, decent, orderly way."

That is what his adversary thought of him.

The North remembers and honors him for his unfaltering courage in the hour of danger. The South remembers and loves him for his unvarying kindness in the hour of triumph. All his countrymen, North and South, unite in admiration for his genius and affection for his character.

It has been said that the United States is constructed on a great pacific political principle which was enunciated more than 1,900 years ago: "Peace on earth, good will toward men." And that the struggle of 1861–65 was a contest to determine whether a nation so conceived and so dedicated could long endure. With Cicero let us always remember that the man who preserved such a nation is entitled to the deepest gratitude not only of his fellow countrymen but of all the world.

This man who was the first to be appointed General of the Armies of the United States under our Constitution, is the perfect exemplar for our modern generals of whom we can be so justly proud.

Brilliant strategists, resourceful tacticians, utilizing their every weapon to its best advantage, they—the Eisenhowers, the Clarks, the MacArthurs—like Grant, are model soldiers. Despite their professional military education they cannot be called professional soldiers as that term is understood in the Old World, because the ravages of war are

hateful to them. Their inspiration is in the cause for which they have fought and are now fighting. If no crisis had occurred to threaten our national existence, perhaps not one of them would be known beyond a small circle of friends, and perhaps no evidence of their genius would ever have been displayed. It seems to be one of the blessings of our democracy that when danger threatens there evolves a man often hitherto unknown, dominated by a persistent sense of duty to God and country, to rise up and overcome it.

Grant's compassion for a conquered adversary which was such an outstanding part of his character, which redounds so creditably to the victorious general and which may well be emulated by our modern generals, was no maudlin expression of a weak man nor did it blind him to the necessity of punishment for actual war criminals. In a letter to his devoted wife he wrote:

"The suffering that must exist in the South the next year, even with the war ending now, will be beyond conception. People who talk of further retaliation and punishment, except of the political leaders, either do not conceive of the suffering endured already, or they are heartless and unfeeling and wish to stay at home out of danger while the punishment is being inflicted."

That is only one of the many expressions of the magnanimity of the fine, God-fearing, Christian soldier and gentleman, who having achieved a brilliant military victory sought to cement in the bonds of universal brotherhood the Union which he had preserved. Where can our modern soldiers look for sounder guidance in the hour of victory as well as in the awful contacts of battle. That they have Grant for their exemplar and that they are following in his footsteps in waging the war and laying the foundation stone of peace is no mere accident but is a demonstration to the world of the true meaning of the American character.

American Armies in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following portions of a letter received from a friend who has recently returned from many years of service as a phyisician in interior China:

WESLEY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Chicago, Ill., June 1, 1945.

DEAR WALTER: I have read and reread with a great deal of interest your speech, What Is the Truth About China. We hold similar views, and I say many of the same things that you have said in this speech. I have had much less evidence to back my statements but we come out at about the same point.

As we traveled across China we were saddened by the number of Americans in the armed forces that were soured on China. I soon discovered that they had received no conditioning at all. They hadn't the slightest idea what China would be like, nothing of its customs, etc. I am sure I would be worse than they if I were dropped into the middle of a village and unable to talk with the Chinese. I understand that something is being done to improve this situation. It is high time. "Vinegar" Joe didn't believe in it so I have been told.

The other notion I have is that we will profit more in the long run if we try as an ally to proceed at a rate a little more nearly the speed at which the Chinese can cooperate. If we insist on going at our speed then we will do the job for them and they will come out as weak or weaker than they went in. It will be a real tragedy to all if we do most of the driving in getting the Japanese out of China.

Sincerely,

GERALD.

The Late Alton P. Tisdel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Alton P. Tisdel, Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office, where he has faithfully worked for nearly half a century, has been noted with regret.

In company with my colleagues, Congressman BECKWORTH, of Texas, and GATHINGS, of Arkansas, I attended the funeral services of Mr. Tisdel on Monday, June 4, here in Washington. The large crowd paying last respects to this devoted public servant gave testimony that he was held in high esteem by his superiors as well as his subordinates.

During the 48 consecutive years of Mr. Tisdel's work he was seldom, if ever, absent except for the short time before his passing.

Through faithful and diligent application to the public trust assigned him, Mr. Tisdel advanced from the grade of a common laborer to that of superintendency of his department. Upon taking over the Document office which at that time was running at a deficit to the Government and by applying strict rigid business principles thereto, a net earning of a million dollars annual profit now flows into the Government Treasury.

It is entirely fitting and proper that this loyal, patriotic public servant's record be officially acknowledged. Let all of us seek to emulate the fine example set by Superintendent Tisdel. As a part of my remarks I attach hereto an article from the Washington Post of June 2:

ALTON P. TISDEL, VETERAN UNITED STATES OFFICIAL, DIES

Alton P. Tisdel, 65, whose position as Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office won him the title of "Uncle Sam's Bookseller," died at Emergency Hospital yesterday morning after more than a month's illness.

In his 48 years of Government service Mr. Tisdel built up the Office of Superintendent of Documents from an organization which cost the Government money each year to one that now returns more than a million dollars in profits to the Treasury annually. He served as Assistant Superintendent from 1908 until 1921, when he was advanced to Superintendent.

STARTED WITH THE POST

Just prior to the 90's Mr. Tisdel was a Washington Post carrier boy. He told with considerable pride of the days when he would walk from his home on O Street NW. to the old Post Building at Tenth and E Streets NW. at 4 a. m., get his papers, and then serve his paper route from his home up to Florida Avenue NE., then the "boundary" of Washington.

Mr. Tisdel was born in Washington, D. C., on October 17, 1879, the son of Henry Carter Tisdel and Martha Ann Purdy Tisdel. He attended the public schools, graduated from Central High School, and later from the Pace School of Accountancy.

His long Government career of more than 48 years began in 1897 when he took a position in the Documents Division of the Government Printing Office. His maternal grandmother, his father and mother and two aunts, as well as his only brother, Willard S. Tisdel, all at some time worked in that office.

HANDLED BIG TASK

The office which Mr. Tisdel headed now distributes about 30,000,000 publications yearly, many of them at no cost. About 60,000 types are distributed. One of the biggest jobs he directed was the distribution of the National Recovery Administration codes during the early part of the New Deal. A best seller has been a baby book issued by the Labor Department, which retails at 10 cents a copy.

Although the GPO was prohibited by law from advertising, Mr. Tisdel received considerable help from the American Library Association of which he was a member. Each month, its bulletin listed the Government books and pamphlets available. Another practice that brought in revenue was close cooperation with trade journals, which pointed out to their readers the advantages of certain Government books.

Mr. Tisdel, who was also a member of the Graphic Arts Association, always attended Library Association meetings as the Government representative.

CREATED "CAREER" OFFICE

Mr. Tisdel's ability in building up the Superintendent of Documents' office was recognized by the various administrations since that of Theodore Roosevelt's last administration. The office has been considered during his incumbency not as a patronage position but as a career position.

As a young man Mr. Tisdel, who was of robust build, was a member of the old Analostan Boat Club and was a member of its rowing crew on the Potomac. He also was a skilled tennis player.

On his birthday in 1907, he married Miss Virginia Cooke, a native of Newark, N. J. Mrs. Tisdel survives him, as does his only brother, Willard S. Tisdel, retired secretary of the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., St. Louis. Mr. Tisdel's father died in 1891 and his mother died in 1938.

Mr. Tisdel was well known in Government circles, especially to members of the congressional committees on printing and in all departments whose publications he distributed to the people of the country. He was much beloved and had many friends in the Government Printing Office. His long record of service there was uninterrupted until about 5 years ago when he was compelled by illness to remain away from work a month. His last illness had kept him from his desk more than a month.

He Will Be There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an ode to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt by Gladys J. Stephenson entitled "He Will Be There":

The great white ship moves slowly through the Golden Gate. No one sees it, but it is there.

And on the topmost deck is a tall man who loves the sea. The winds whip the old navy cape which he has worn around the world. His eyes are calm, serene with the full knowledge of the eternal verities. In his eyes is still the vision of a brave new world. And he walks the deck. He walks—freely, triumphantly, he walks.

And no one sees him—no one except the host of sailors who are his guests on this voyage. They are all there, all those who have died at sea in this great war—who have died that you and I and all men might be free. And their eyes shine, and they smile with happiness, and they walk a little more proudly, because their Commander in Chief has come to be with them. No one sees them, but they are there.

And the tall man in the navy cape will be present at that meeting of men from many lands, in the great city by the Golden Gate. And the sailors will be there. And soldiers from many battlefields, and men who winged their way through death-filled skies. They will all be there. They will watch and they will listen.

And the tall man will speak to the men from many lands, from our land. He will speak to their minds. He will speak urgently to their hearts.

O God, grant that they listen.
God grant that they heed.

GLADYS J. STEPHENSON.

APRIL 17, 1945.

Open Letter to the American Delegates to the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of my constituent, Judge William H. Wadhams, an international lawyer, who was in attendance at the peace conference following World War I, an open letter sent to our delegates in San Francisco and the signers of this letter:

MAY 17, 1945.

To the United States Delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization:

In order to accomplish the expressed purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals "to establish an international organization" to "maintain international peace and security," it is necessary that a set of rules of fundamental law be agreed upon and be incorporated in a constitution or organic law, and that a Supreme Court of the United Nations be established with judicial power to determine when those laws have been violated by nations or the individuals who compose them.

This judicial function should not be entrusted to the Security Council. The Security Council should be restricted to the use of force to maintain the status quo until the Court renders a decision, and to enforce, when necessary, the decision of the Court after it has been rendered.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, ignoring, excepting in minor matters, the necessity of a judicial determination, have centered attention on the use of force by an executive body to suppress aggression or use of force. The use of force, however, cannot be prevented when justice is denied. Justice is denied unless rules of conduct between states have been agreed upon, and are impartially applied by a court to the particular case, and are enforced.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals fail to prohibit the acts which the United Nations have already agreed are the principal causes of war. These causes, and the way to eliminate them, were proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter. This method was agreed to as a basis of joint action by the United Nations in their declaration signed on January 2, 1942. It was subscribed to as a common program. It should, therefore, form the basis of the set of rules of fundamental law regulating the conduct of states. This set of rules should be incorporated in the charter or constitution now being drafted at San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted.

Warren R. Austin, United States Senate; Ruhl J. Bartlett, Dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Medford, Mass.; W. Calvin Chesnut, United States District Judge, Baltimore; Richard S. Childs, Chairman, Institute of Public Administration; Guy Richards Crump, Former Judge of the Superior Court of California; Stephen Duggan, Educator; Lucien D. Gardner, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Alabama; Chauncey B. Garver, New York Bar; Pierson Hall, United States District Judge, Los Angeles; William M. Hepburn, dean of School of Law, University of Alabama; John C. Knox, Senior United States District Judge, New York City; Arthur K. Kuhn, Former President, American Branch, International Law Association; Charles M. LaFollette, United States House of Representatives; Robert McC. Marsh, Former Justice, New York Supreme Court; Marshall F. McComb, Associate Justice, California Court of Appeals; J. F. T. O'Connor, United States District Judge, Los Angeles; Owen J. Roberts, United States Supreme Court; James W. Ryan, Chairman, Committee on International Law, New York County Lawyers Association; William H. Wadhams, Former Judge, New York Court of General Sessions; Myron Westover, Judge, the Superior Court, Los Angeles; Robert M. Wilkian, United States District Judge, Cleveland; Ignatius M. Wilkinson, New York Bar.

Court Action Begun To Compel Shipyard To Rehire Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from this morning's Washington Times-Herald:

COURT SUIT BEGUN TO COMPEL SHIPYARD TO REHIRE VETERAN

NEW YORK, June 5.—A possible test case on the right of veterans to claim their prewar jobs started through Federal court channels today.

It was the case of a shipyard welder who was honorably discharged from the Army and was refused full reemployment in his old job because a labor union objected to his replacing a nonveteran.

Col. Arthur V. McDermott, New York City director of Selective Service, sought action through the United States attorney in Brooklyn to compel the Sullivan Drydock & Repair Corp., Brooklyn, to rehire the veteran for full-time work and pay him for time lost during lay-offs.

McDermott said the worker is Abraham Fishgold of Brooklyn. Fishgold, he said, was honorably discharged last August, rehired at Sullivan on a temporary basis and laid off several times because Local 13, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilders Union (CIO), protested his employment.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the word "unity" has become the key to our times. It first swung wide the heavy doors to military victory in Europe. At Teheran and Yalta the three great Allied Nations, Britain, the United States, and Russia, met, and chose this key to open the political door to a great tomorrow of peacetime victory for all the peoples of the world.

The decisions reached at the Crimea Conference signified the determination of all the nations of the world to place foremost, disregarding as minor all distracting factors, cooperation for permanent peace and world prosperity. On February 15, two economic unity keys were stuck in the doors of the House and the Senate, respectively. One was formally labeled S. 540, and introduced by Chairman WAGNER of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; the other, H. R. 2211 (later changed to H. R. 3314), and introduced by Chairman SPENCE of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Both bills authorized United States participation in an International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in accordance with principles formulated at the Bretton Woods Conference.

Our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has called Bretton Woods the "cornerstone for international economic cooperation." The world must be rebuilt, and its capacity to supply its 2,000,000,000 people expanded if we are all to enjoy a future of prosperity and peace. First, Europe must be put on her feet. Good business dictates that this shall be reconstruction, not merely relief; to this end the peoples of Europe must obtain a means of payment for what we sell them,

since, at the moment, they are financially prostrate.

Unless a suitable means of financing them is found, they, unable to restore their economies, will be forced to beg again the dog-eat-dog system of discriminatory trade practices, restrictive exchange controls, competitive depreciation of currencies, and other forms of economic warfare that have always in the past led to political and finally military warfare. Second, we must sell at least fifteen billion in products and services abroad to sustain at home the full employment in peace that we have achieved in war.

Bretton Woods is the key to expanding foreign trade, and on foreign trade depends a minimum of 5,000,000 of the 60,000,000 goal in postwar jobs. In addition to recreating and expanding our former European markets, new world markets must be created by developing backward countries. By raising the standard of living for the whole world, the economic security of every individual nation is insured.

The monetary fund will primarily stabilize currency and exchange rates between nations, thus facilitating financial transactions and eliminating the old competitive barter system. It will also make short-term loans for immediate revivication of trade. The bank will be primarily concerned with long term loans for reconstruction and development, guaranteeing private loans and selling stock.

A very important and infrequently mentioned consideration is that the bank will insure against German or European rearmament, since it can control the economic development of member countries through channeling private investments so as to grant loans only to nonwar enterprises. The spreading of cartels can similarly be prevented. We in California will be particularly benefited in our trade with China, since the Monetary Fund will stabilize exchange rates between the two countries, and the bank will back loans made by us to China. With the aid of the bank, China and California can be of great mutual benefit in an economic sense.

The enemies of Bretton Woods will seek to add to S. 540 and H. R. 3314 crippling amendments which will draw support from forces which have reservations on certain phases. They know that to amend Bretton Woods is to kill it. The old game of destroying by accepting nothing short of perfection, the game which worked so well in 1919 with the League of Nations, will be tried again.

But the issue before Congress now is not a system whose perfection or completeness is guaranteed. That would be impossible. Franklin Roosevelt has said:

> I do not want to leave you with the impression that the fund and bank are all that we will need to solve the economic problems which will face the United Nations when the war is over. * * * There are other problems. * * * It is my expectation that other proposals will shortly be read.

Bretton Woods is only the first step, but it is the essential, primary step, and one on which 44 nations have agreed. That in itself is no mean trick. As the Crimea Conference sought an end to political warfare, Bretton Woods seeks an end to economic warfare, an assurance that the war will not only be well fought but well won. The keys of economic unity, S. 540 and H. R. 3314, are sticking in the doors of Congress. It is up to the American people to turn them, to open yet one more gate on the road to lasting peace and increasing prosperity. I cannot ask, "Will we do it?" I must say, "We must do it."

Mr. Speaker, when I have considered the conditions under which our lives have been lived—two world wars within less than 25 years, the succession of wars between that prepared the way for the second world conflagration, Nazi degeneration and brutality, drought, bread lines, depression, foreclosure, hunger, poverty, and man's inhumanity to man—I have felt that of all generations that have lived on the earth ours is one most accursed and desolated. Yet, when I dream of the future, I sometimes think we may be among the most fortunate and blessed of generations. The Old World is in ruins, and many of our best and bravest men lie buried under those ruins. But we have been given in unlimited measure the godlike opportunity to create a new world on the ruins of the old. We owe it to those men to seize the opportunity.

H. R. 3314, the Bretton Woods agreements bill, offers the American people, through us as Representatives, the first creative opportunity to make a new world different from the old. For the practice of the destructive techniques of economic warfare we may substitute cooperation among nations. We cannot lose sight of the weight and significance that attach to United States action. When the Banking and Currency Committee voted favorably, and by such an overwhelmingly majority, on this legislation, the effect on the delegates to the San Francisco Conference was electric. It is not a rhetorical exaggeration to say we can substitute cooperation for the play of selfish antagonisms. We are the richest, the most productive, the most powerful, and the most respected nation in the world. The shape of the world of the future can be of our making.

I like to draw an analogy between the creation of the world as described in the first chapter of Genesis and the creative task that lies before us. If we build solidly and well, I believe that we, too, will be able to look upon the world and say that it is good.

To build solidly and well, we must begin at the very foundations of our world, and create the material conditions on which moral and spiritual values must be based if they are to live. The Bretton Woods agreements will create those conditions. In its statement on this legislation, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was echoing the sentiments of business and professional groups throughout the South when it wrote that it "recognizes these measures as the minimum for an international program basic to the solution of the economic, social, and political problems of the South and the Nation."

I would add: "and of the world."

Full employment, a high standard of living, financial stability so that businessmen in one country can conduct business swiftly and with confidence with businessmen in other countries, expanded production, sound money, orderly procedures for international exchange—these are the essentials to a healthy international economy within whose frame we can create political stability and peaceful international cooperation in all fields of human activity. This is the great creative endeavor which we have been offered the chance to initiate by voting United States approval of the Bretton Woods agreements.

Release of Automotive Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, because of the growing fear of widespread unemployment during the reconversion period, I take pleasure in introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter sent by my good friend J. R. Millar, president of National Automotive Fibres, Inc., to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board.

Mr. Millar's thoughtful letter brings strongly to the attention of the War Production Board the need for governmental action at the present time to release textiles for the production of automotive interior trim.

National Automotive Fibres, Inc., has nine plants in various sections of the country, one of which is located in my home town of Trenton, N. J. I realize how important it is for my Trenton constituents, as well as for the country as a whole, for the War Production Board to take aggressive action to solve the problem which Mr. Millar has brought to the attention of Mr. Krug.

Mr. Millar's letter follows:

JUNE 5, 1945.

Hon. J. A. KRUG,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KRUG: The increasing cutbacks in production in all of our plants for the war effort has forced me to bring to your attention the urgent necessity which has arisen for release of textiles for the production of automotive interior trim.

Our corporation was, before the war, the principal supplier of trim materials for the automotive industry. During the emergency we devoted our facilities 100 percent to aiding the successful prosecution of the war. We have manufactured parachutes, tents, lifebelts, life jackets, ponchos, and a myriad of other items which played a material part in the victory over Germany.

The great bulk of our production has been for the Army Air Forces which are now cutting back on their contracts due to the changing nature of the war in the Pacific. As a result of these cut-backs, we are faced, in all of our plants, with a considerable reduction of personnel unless some assistance

is given us by the War Production Board which will enable our corporation to return to its normal peacetime production for the automotive industry.

Despite the belief prevalent that automobiles could be manufactured without Government assistance, this situation does not apply to the interior-trim field, since the Government has commandeered all facilities for the weaving of textiles and has also commandeered all importations of textiles. Under this 100-percent commandeering policy, it is impossible for us, or any other firm, to fabricate automotive textiles unless the necessary quantity of goods are made available by WPB to our industry for that purpose.

Several large automobile manufacturers are now sending us orders which we cannot fill. We have the equipment, which is now running at a slow pace and will soon stand idle, we have the manpower which will soon become surplus, and we have the market for our products. The only thing we do not have is the material necessary for the fabrication of these products. We believe our request that the Government assist us in obtaining the textiles necessary for the first production of cars is in the best interests, not only of our organization and its employees, but also in the interest of the economic struction of our Nation. The cut-back period in our industry will throw a labor surplus into the manpower markets of the country. If we are permitted to resume our peacetime line of business and if we are given the necessary textiles, our corporation will be in a position to assist in absorbing some of the imminent and serious labor surplus. Naturally, any large-scale production in our company for the automotive industry will require several months of preparation. Before we can adequately prepare for such production we must have assurance from the Government that a sufficient quantity of textiles will be made available to us for this purpose.

We have plants in Detroit, Mich.; Oakland and Los Angeles, Calif.; Cohoes and Little Falls, N. Y.; and Trenton, N. J.; whose facilities are normally devoted almost entirely to production for the automotive industry. Each of these plants and the thousands of men and women they employ will be benefited by a release of fabrics.

I should like specifically to bring to your attention the fact that the cost of the interior trim in an automobile is only an insignificant percentage of the total cost of the car. However, the men and women who are employed in the manufacture of this trim are just as important to our Nation's economy as are the men and women in any other industry. Present plans are for cars to be rolling off the assembly line by August 1, 1945. Not only are our employees as important to the Nation's economy as are the men and women in any other industry but the trim we manufacture is as important to the automobile as is the motor or the wheels. Consequently, if we are unable to obtain materials for the manufacture of this trim, it will be impossible to produce automobiles; and resultant unemployment will spread through the entire automotive industry. To give you a specific idea as to the amount of textiles and allied materials which are now under the control of the Government and which will be required for the first 3 months of new-car production, I append a complete list of these materials by months. You will note that we must have the material at least a month in advance of shipment to the automobile manufacturers so we can fabricate the trim. This list has been figured by our plant managers and is definitely on the conservative side. It represents the minimum amount of material required by us to meet the minimum demands upon us for interior trim by the automobile manufacturers. The list follows:

Tobacco cloth, 36-inch:	*Yards*
July 1945	190,000
August 1945	870,000
September 1945	1,340,000
Cotton sheeting:	
36-inch, 44/40, 7.45 yards:	
July 1945	4,000
August 1945	18,000
September 1945	28,000
52-inch, 44/40, 5.15 yards:	
July	4,200
August	19,500
September	31,000
60-inch, 44/40, 4.46 yards:	
July	6,900
August	32,000
September	48,000
60-inch, 40/40, 3.26 yards:	
July	4,800
August	23,500
September	36,000
66-inch, 44/40, 4.05 yards:	
July	6,000
August	26,500
September	42,200
Sisal:	*Pounds*
July	310,000
August	1,375,000
September	2,427,000
Head linings:	
71-inch, 38/46, 1.12 yards:	*Yards*
July	3,900
August	17,400
September	27,950
31-inch, 44/40, 5 yards:	
July	4,500
August	21,000
September	55,000
Osnaburg:	
July	90,000
August	208,000
September	300,000
Burlap for pads, 40-inch, 7½ ounces:	
July	72,000
August	320,000
September	509,000
Burlap for carpet, 48-inch, 7½ ounces:	
July	46,000
August	122,000
September	211,000
Cotton linters:	*Pounds*
July	158,000
August	587,000
September	926,000
Thread:	
12/4 silk finish, 4,800-yard cones:	*Cones*
July	20
August	72
September	124
16/3 or 12/4 natural cotton:	
July	1,250
August	5,500
September	8,500
16/4 silk finish:	
July	92
August	410
September	650
12/4 regular:	
July	3
August	10
September	21
16/4 cotton, 4,800-yard cones:	
July	20
August	52
September	75
20/4 cotton:	
July	65
August	290
September	420
30/4 cotton, 4,800-yard cones:	
July	10
August	45
September	75
30/2 cotton:	
July	6
August	25
September	38

I can easily support this letter by requests from the Chrysler Corp. and other automobile manufacturing concerns with which we do business, but I know that with your knowledge of the automotive field you can see how urgent it is that material be made available for trimming the interiors of the new cars. This really boils itself down to the essential fact that new cars cannot be produced without automotive trim and no textiles can be obtained for this trim unless they are released by the Government in sufficient quantity.

There have been reports in the automotive industry that a plan for the allocation of textiles to our field has been drafted within WPB and that this plan is awaiting policy approval by you and your assistants. I hope you can give this matter your immediate attention and that you will see to it that arrangements are made to make available to us, and others in our field, textiles which will be required to trim the passenger automobiles which will be produced this year and which are badly needed to avert a breakdown of our transportation system and to avoid serious unemployment which will be destructive to our national economy.

Very sincerely yours,

J. R. MILLAR,
President.

Congressional Expense Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on the question now before the House, with respect to the allowance of $2,500 to Members for expenses incurred by them in the conduct of congressional business, although there are many reasons to justify an allowance.

Without enumerating all of these reasons I merely mention, by way of illustration, that a Member of Congress should not be expected to pay out of his own pocket the expenses he incurs, in the conduct of the business of his constituents, any more than for any businessman who comes to Washington representing his employer, to pay out of his own salary the expenses he incurs while doing the business of his employer. To require him to do so would be considered unfair and unjust on the part of the employer. Consequently, it is the universal custom for the employer to allow his representative an expense account and to pay all of his expenses so incurred. Furthermore, the expense money so received is not considered by our Federal income laws as taxable income. Therefore, it is exempt from taxation.

The position of a Member of Congress is analogous to that of the businessman I have already mentioned. He is elected by the citizens of his congressional district to come to Washington and represent them. He is in Washington on their business. He incurs expenses far beyond the clerical assistance that is provided.

The bill now before the House makes an allowance for payment of such expenses. In view of the fact that the allowance is for expenses it is not subject to income taxation. This bill seeks to establish the same basis for payment of expenses incurred by a Member of Congress as now applies to all businessmen throughout the entire country.

However, there are reasons beyond the question of whether the legislation is just or meritorious that, in my opinion, should be taken into consideration. It is these reasons that prompt me to vote against the allowance of expenses at this time.

While strictly speaking, such an allowance is not an increase of salary, as some may argue, yet it does have that effect in that at the present time all such expenses are paid out of the salary received by the Member. Thus, by such an allowance there is a net gain to the Member. Under these circumstances it does not seem, in my opinion, to be appropriate or proper to take any action that may even be considered an increase in salary for Members of Congress, when the national policy, in the fight against inflation, has been to refuse any increase above the 15 percent fixed by the Little Steel formula, nor when so many white-collar workers have not even had such an increase.

The following editorial from the Courier-Post newspapers, published in Camden, N. J., dated Thursday, May 31, 1945, has so forcefully and logically presented the viewpoint that notwithstanding the merit of an increase in congressional compensation, yet this is not an appropriate time, that I include the editorial as a part of my remarks:

CONGRESS DESERVES A RAISE—BUT WAIT A WHILE, BOYS!

Members of Congress deserve a boost in pay, a good-sized boost.

But we don't like to see Congressmen shoving to the head of the line of all those waiting for pay increases.

Apparently the Senate doesn't, either.

For the Senate has refused to vote itself a $2,500-a-year increase in compensation in the form of "expenses." But, applying senatorial courtesy to the lower House, it did approve the same increase which the Representatives had voted themselves.

That leaves the Representatives in a highly embarrassing position. If the boost goes through, they'll be getting $2,500 a year more than the Senators. (Members of both Houses receive the same base pay of $10,000 a year.)

It seems certain that President Truman will gracefully remove the Representatives from their embarrassment—by a veto.

That will leave Congressmen's pay where it was, with the Members of Congress forced to put Uncle Billy and Aunt Sue on the pay roll as clerks to eke out their pay.

As a matter of fact, we don't believe the $2,500 increase is enough for normal times.

Last January we published an editorial endorsing a suggestion of the National Planning Association to increase the pay of Members of both Houses to $25,000.

But we added: "It would have to await the war's end, of course. It would be unthinkable to boost wages so spectacularly in Washington while we are striving to hold the wage line against inflation throughout the rest of the country."

That still holds.

If the $2,500 increase were merely a straight increase in pay, it would amount to 25 percent—far beyond the Little Steel formula of 15 percent.

But it becomes more than that, what some Congressmen have called a "big steal," because the money is labeled expenses—although not subject to accounting—and free from income tax.

We hope the House doesn't wait for Truman's veto and rescinds its action before the rest of the country gets as stirred up as the two Representatives who indulged in a fist fight Tuesday.

Federal judges deserve pay increases, too.

Their position, of course, is different from that of Congressmen. They can't raise their own pay. All they can do is to sit on the bench and look sad.

But there are bills before Congress to increase the pay of Federal judges $5,000 a year, from the Chief Justice to judges of the district and customs courts. That's fair enough. The rate of pay hasn't changed since 1926, and the judges in effect got a pay cut when in 1932 Congress made their pay subject to Federal income tax.

But the Federal judges, too, should take their place in line along with the rest of us.

We apply high standards to our Federal servants, in Congress and on the bench. Most of them are able, honest men who do not deserve the caricatures and caustic jokes leveled at them. They deserve commensurate pay. But they should set an example, by waiting for increases until it's O. K. for Joe Doakes to get a boost in his weekly pay envelope.

Education for Farm Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following colloquy between Bob Evans, distinguished CBS news analyst, and myself over Station WFBL, Syracuse, N. Y., May 18, 1945:

Mr. EVANS. Here is Congressman HALL to talk about education for farm youth.

Congressman HALL. Bob, 25 years ago, life on a farm to the boy or girl who was raised there was generally considered by that child, as just one long drudge, and to the city children who joined their country cousins for a few weeks' summer outing on Grandpa's farm, the rural boy or girl seemed sadly lacking in every positive characteristic.

Mr. EVANS. They had no educational facilities such as Dick Tracy and Terry and the Pirates in the comic strips.

Congressman HALL. And no Superman or Tom Mix on the radio. But seriously Bob, the rural boys and girls in those days were not lacking in positive characteristics. Whenever the exterior of the farm youngster was rubbed off a bit, the real values and qualities which have made American agriculture what it is today peered forth. But there was no question but that the farmer's kids could do with a lift. Not alone to develop the character the city folks didn't see on the surface, but also to spur on the initiative so sorely needed for better farming in the days to come.

Mr. EVANS. And so some forward-looking people got together to see what could be done about it.

Congressman HALL. Yes. The school authorities, the farmers themselves, and a lot of other interested people held meetings and talked it over. They saw that possibilities were rich for giving agriculture a brand new approach, and a brand new lift toward a better life for the generations of farm people to come. Moreover, these citizens wanted to find some way to keep young people on the farm; to make farming so attractive they would want to stay.

Mr. EVANS. And then too, they realized that in order to bring production and progress, the youth of a nation must take a positive, healthy interest in production and progress.

Congressman HALL. Yes. They concluded that to save agriculture the farm boy himself must want to save it.

Mr. EVANS. And so——

Congressman HALL. And so they examined rural areas in all parts of the country. Some were found to be thriving and well off. Many other parts, however, were backward and poverty stricken. A careful analysis showed that where the youth stayed on and took pride in the land, the land and the community almost invariably responded.

Mr. EVANS. I imagine education—school systems had much to do with bringing about more advanced communities.

Congressman HALL. Bob, wherever rural school systems excelled, the youngsters knew a lot about their parents' farms. In upstate New York, where education in the rural districts—right out in the country—had been fostered thoroughly, farm youths were raising their own stock, planting their own gardens, and gleaning knowledge which was to prove invaluable to them in their later life on the farm.

Mr. EVANS. The answer, then, was to provide specialized and extensive courses for all communities.

Congressman HALL. Yes. Courses in agriculture and home training subjects. Subjects designed to build interest in farm life as well as to teach better ways of farming.

Mr. EVANS. And so the 4-H Clubs were born.

Congressman HALL. They were. The four-leaf clover supplied the lofty symbol, along with an H for every leaf—head, hands, heart, and health are necessary attributes. They are the positive forces which can be encouraged to really develop agriculture.

Mr. EVANS. I presume you are thoroughly familiar with 4-H Club activities in up-State New York?

Congressman HALL. I am, Bob. The New York State 4-H Club movement has consistently grown during the last few years, and now represents a great force for good; for progress on up-State farms. 4-H Club leaders are chosen for their intelligence, their ability to handle young people, and their genuine interest in building knowledge and character.

Mr. EVANS. But 4-H Clubs didn't have easy sledding in the beginning.

Congressman HALL. No. At first only a handful of youngsters responded. It took a lot of persuasion and perseverence on the part of the organizers to convince some parents that anything but doing actual farm work could teach their children how to run a farm. But 4-H Club extension courses and instruction were interesting. The club meetings were wholesome and conducted on a high plane.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; many a successful farmer today gained as much experience out of the books and courses of an agriculture college as he did driving a tractor in the back forty.

Congressman HALL. That's right, Bob. The practical knowledge of how to operate a farm can't be obtained by spending all one's time hoeing potatoes or milking cows. New methods are being discovered every day about how

to do these and a hundred other farm jobs better. The 4–H Clubs, with their capable leaders and agents, are pointing the way to greater efficiency in American agriculture.

Mr. EVANS. And Congress has taken new note of this only this week.

Congressman HALL. We have, Bob. Early this week the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, reported out favorably H. R. 1690, otherwise known as the Flannagan bill. A bill which increases the 4–H Club budget by nearly $4,500,000. The House passed this bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. EVANS. Perhaps you'd better tell us a little about the bill's specifications.

Congressman HALL. Under the provisions of H. R. 1690, Bob, any county agent whose duties are so manifold that he is unable to cover his territory properly, may be given an assistant to work with the clubs in more detail. The bill also extends appointments of regular agents to those counties where there is no 4–H Club organization or where there is no agent.

Mr. EVANS. In short, 4–H Club activities will be expanded.

Congressman HALL. And given impetus. It is anticipated that increased personnel and more adequate facilities will enlarge upon the great work 4–H clubs are doing nationally. Individual attention to each club is something which can be improved upon, I am told. The appropriation will accomplish this.

Mr. EVANS. But do I understand that there still is some opposition to 4–H Clubs?

Congressman HALL. Bob, I know quite a few people are skeptical about money going for what they call extracurricular activities. Some consider 4–H Clubs are extracurricular because they are outside the regular rural-school education. They cannot see why money should be spent on them. However, so much actual good has come from these groups that farmers themselves would not allow their discontinuance. The true stories told about how much 4–H has taught rural youth are testimony of their value.

Mr. EVANS. Yes. I understand that 4–H Clubs have come to be considered of great value ever since the start of the war.

Congressman HALL. Bob, these 4–H Clubs have served as spearheads for production efforts on the farm. They have encouraged not only individual boys and girls to excel in the cultivation of Victory gardens but also whole sections in the job of increasing wartime crops. A few weeks ago, I saw firsthand the work of what the 4–H Clubs are doing in my own county. I made the awards at a large hobby show in Binghamton and saw the rural youth of the district run off with the honors of this show. Those youngsters had built and constructed just about every kind of object you can imagine. They were practical and accurate in their building, too.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; as a newspaperman, I have seen some of the achievements of the 4–H Clubs now and then, and couldn't help but be impressed. In addition to that they always seemed to be such healthy, happy kids.

Congressman HALL. Any boy or girl who gets the enthusiasm to follow 4–H work is bound to become a better American, a better citizen. Knowledge is power and whatever the child learns as a result of his contact with this practical application of good farming is sure to make him a successful farmer. Naturally, the extent of his learning is up to the individual boy or girl, but the sky is the limit. I have talked with a good many farmers, and I have yet to hear one say anything but the very best about their children's relation to 4–H work. So, the rural youth is now sure of a vehicle of progress. He need not stand still as did many of his kind in the old days. There are fewer barriers in his way. In his close contacts with new fountains of practical learning he can reach brighter horizons than ever before. He has the chance to make an agriculture experimental station out of his dad's farm, at the same time finding ways and means to help his parents. It is a golden opportunity. Taking into consideration all these benefits which 4–H has brought to the farmer, to his children, to his community, I am glad that I had a chance to speak in Congress for H. R. 1690 and to cast my vote for it.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Detroit Jewish Boy Kills 17 Germans—Hero Wins Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just read this very interesting article in the publication, the International Teamster, giving details on the heroism of a Detroit boy, and the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to his father. This soldier was killed in action. Let us hope that his heroism and his sacrifice will be recognized by everyone. This is just another reason why there is no place in America for racial or religious prejudice.

The article follows:

DETROIT HERO WINS CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

How little Jewish teamster killed 17 Germans and captured 92 members of the "master race" is revealed in the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Lt. Raymond Zussman, of Detroit.

Zussman was a shop steward of local No. 337 of Detroit. He was killed in action as a tank officer with the Seventh Army in France last September, 3 days after the exploit that won him the Nation's highest military decoration.

The story of his heroism has just come to light in the presentation of the Congressional Medal to his father, Nathan Zussman, a veteran of the Russo-Japanese war.

Zussman was a little man. He weighed 140 pounds and he stood only 5 feet 4 inches in height. But he was 100 percent fighting man! The 92 Germans he captured were big, arrogant, blood-thirsty men. But they didn't have the guts to fight little Ray Zussman, the Detroit Jew.

They dropped their guns and shouted "kamerad" when Zussman charged into the French village of Noroy le Bourg ahead of his own tanks.

Zussman turned them over, 10 to 30 at a time, to the infantry when it caught up to him. Seventeen Germans who tried to fight the little American lieutenant were taken care of later by burial squads. They were full of lead.

By rights, Zussman should never have been in Noroy le Bourg on foot. He should have come in protected by the thick armor and heavy artillery of his tank.

But if he had done that, he would have missed the fighting.

Zussman's tank broke down in a field at the approach to Noroy le Bourg, held by the Germans. Zussman grabbed a carbine and went into battle ahead of another tank. He directed its fire at enemy fortifications, and finally he jumped up on the outside of the tank and rode it like a cowboy as it charged and silenced a machine-gun nest.

Still fully exposed, Zussman directed the tank against a German jeep. Then, with his carbine ammunition gone, Zussman seized a tommy gun and went on ahead of the tank.

Machine-gun fire from a house forced him back, but he attacked again with the tank. While the tank blazed away with its 75-millimeter shells, Zussman charged the house alone, dodging hand grenades and rifle shots until he had put it out of action and captured 11 prisoners.

Throughout the day Zussman and his tank fought on through the streets of Noroy le Bourg, driving the Germans back. With complete disregard for his personal safety, Zussman and his tank captured two antitank guns, an antiaircraft gun, two machine guns, and two trucks.

Zussman had previously fought in Africa and Italy. He was wounded at Cassino, and after recovering was assigned as an aide to a general. But Zussman requested a transfer back to the tanks. He was a combat officer. And as a combat officer he died. The Germans finally got him. But it took a couple of hundred of them to do it.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the column in this morning's Washington Post by Mark Sullivan.

Why should we have a peacetime Army?

This question is today before the American people. I am reassured with the way that our Postwar Military Policy Committee has approached this problem.

As I understand it, they have seen fit not to directly consider any specific bill but to approach the problem broadly. They are trying to locate the American ideal of freedom and morality in the whole province of military preparedness.

In this connection, I personally read with considerable interest Mr. Sullivan's column and I commend its reading to all those who are seeking more light with regard to our postwar military problems. It follows:

HISTORY'S LESSON

(By Mark Sullivan)

A congressional committee is holding hearings this week on whether America should adopt compulsory military training during peacetime. For the country, this is one of two experiences, strangely related, which duplicates what we went through following the First World War a quarter century ago. Then, as now, we considered whether to keep ourselves prepared against future war by adopting permanent compulsory military training, and on that occasion decided not to.

The former fight for permanent military training, peacetime and wartime alike, was part of what went on from the beginning of the First World War in Europe in 1914 until some 2 years after it ended. It began with a fight for preparedness, and as such was, in the beginning, strongly opposed. As late as December 1915, after the war in Europe had been on for a year and a half, President Wilson, in a message to Congress, declared: "We shall not alter our attitude toward the question of national defense because some among us are nervous and excited."

After the fight for preparedness had been won, even after we had declared war on Germany, there was still strong opposition to compulsory military service, to a draft. Those opposing it held that America should fight this war as it had fought all its previous wars, by voluntary enlistment. (There was a slight exception which rather proved the rule—a brief, violently resisted and quickly abandoned attempt at a draft during the Civil War.) Dislike for a draft was shared for a time by President Wilson, though he abandoned that position when the reality of war came upon him. There was real doubt whether Congress would pass a draft act. In the debate, opponents of it used the harshest words: "Un-American," "Prussianize America." "Conscription is another name for slavery." The Speaker of the House, Champ Clark, left his rostrum to join in the debate and said: "I protest with all my heart and mind and soul * * *" Senator Reed of Missouri told Secretary of War Baker, "You will have the streets of our American cities running red with blood on registration day."

After the fight for conscription during wartime had been won, and after the war itself had been won, leaders kept up a fight for compulsory military training as a permanent peacetime policy. Conspicuous among them was Gen. Leonard Wood, who was a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1920. But peacetime compulsory military training did not have enough vitality to become an important campaign issue. America would have none of it.

During the quarter century since that time, America has learned some things. There is proof. During the present war, there was no material opposition to compulsory military service. America had become reconciled to the obligation of the individual to be drafted in war. The present question is whether we have become reconciled to the obligation to be drafted for military training in anticipation of war.

One thing we should have learned from the suddenness of the attack on Pearl Harbor. As Under Secretary of State Grew put it in the hearing this week, "Latent power is not enough." Our power should be trained and ready for instant action. At Pearl Harbor, within less than 2 hours, some hundred Japanese planes put out of commission over a fourth of America's naval strength. In future wars, if, they come, attack will be equally sudden and more devastating; probably there will be several simultaneous attacks at different points.

The lessons of 25 years ago and since point plainly toward a present program for America. It would be a double program and would be the opposite of what we did after the First World War. The program would be to unite in the international organization for preventing war, to hope it will work, and to strive to make it work. At the same time, by permanent universal military training, and by other means, be prepared for war in case the peace organization should fail to work.

Fort Wayne Remembers Those Who Have Served

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a few short days ago on Memorial Day we, as a nation, devoted our thoughts and prayers and words to memorializing those who have died in the service of their country. On this Memorial Day was delivered in my home town—Fort Wayne, Ind.—an address by our good Mayor Harry W. Baals which to me expressed so eloquently the gratitude of our Nation to our soldier dead and the purposes for which they gave up their lives that I desire to call it to the attention of all who read these pages. I am sure you will find in his words, as I did, an inspiring statement of the challenges we must meet now and in the days to come if the many words spoken across this land on Memorial Day are to be more than static and futile thanks to those who have sacrificed their lives and their futures for the protection of our individual rights and liberties. The price in precious lives which that noble purpose has exacted can only be redeemed by our constant vigilance in carrying on where they left off.

Yes, the price has been high. The price will be larger. From every town, every city, every neighborhood of this vast land some of our finest youth have been taken. Out of Fort Wayne, a city of 130,000 people, 12,511 have gone into service and of this number 60 percent have seen duty overseas. Casualties suffered have been 888, and 283 of these have given their lives, a casualty record well above the national average.

This is the record of just one town, but every town has paid its price. Recounting the greatness of the sacrifice should instill in all of us a feeling of the enormity of our obligations. We must carry on the war to final victory with all possible speed. We must do all we can to ensure that out of our present San Francisco deliberations will come the machinery on which we may base hopes for continued peace. And we must fight at home as they have fought abroad to keep America free and strong.

Fort Wayne is paying its share—and more—for the right to live in peace and freedom. Fort Wayne has done its utmost to see that those who do return from service are given all possible assistance in readjusting themselves to civilian life. The Veterans' Aid Commission established there has won Nation-wide acclaim as one of the best, if not the best, system for rehabilitation of servicemen in the country. No matter how extensive or well-intended the legislation we here enact for providing for our deserving veterans, we cannot properly discharge our responsibilities to them unless the service is administered on the community level. Fort Wayne has gone beyond the community level by putting its veterans' affairs administration on a neighborhood level. In addition to a large, main information center for servicemen, 11 neighborhood branches have been established in fire stations in every part of the city in order to facilitate assistance to servicemen by trained and capable people who are devoted to their welfare.

Just as the good people of Fort Wayne are well aware of and fulfilling their immediate responsibilities to the servicemen who return, so also are they aware of their ideological and spiritual duties so well expressed by Mayor Baals in this address.

Once each year, this magnificent Nation of ours by Presidential proclamation, sets aside one day for paying deserved tribute to those gallant Americans who have given their lives in the service of their country. I suppose no public speaker on this occasion ever feels anything but a humble appreciation of the fact that his theme is much too sacred for any attempted eloquence. The eloquence of a human being who lays down his life—the most precious possession that he has, on the altar of his country, is far too great to be matched by anything so cheap as words or phrases.

Over this world today, there are millions of our finest young men plodding wearily but courageously through the literal hell of modern warfare in order that you and I may know freedom from a tyrant's cruelty. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of fine American homes in which the footsteps of loved ones will never again be heard, and there are other homes by the hundreds of thousands who likewise feel sorrow but in a lesser degree. This situation is one that would inspire a deep humility in the most brash of public speakers.

CONSOLES PARENTS OF DEAD

It is very difficult to say any words that will console the parents of those who have died in the war in which we are engaged, and which ended only in part on VE-day. To these parents, one fact stands out alone in the consideration of their stark grief, namely, their boy is no longer alive.

But, if I may say just a word to these parents, I would like to do so. We must not forget that our destinies at any time are always within the hands of the God who created the world, and who both gives life and takes it away.

We must continue to adhere firmly to our American principles of faith in the wisdom of God. We have a right to be proud that our sons were not cowards. We have a right to feel inspired that our sons still cherish a sense of duty to their country, even to the extent of giving their lives for it.

DEATH ONLY IN HUMAN SCHEME

We have a right to feel proud that nowhere in the annals of American history has there ever been a lack of a high spirit of valor on the part of those Americans who fought on land, sailed the seas, or flew in the air. Death is a tragedy only in the human scheme—not in the divine scheme.

It runs against the usual course of Nature for the old to bury the young, and for parents to kneel at the grave of a child, but no parent forced to choose between losing his son in honor, and having him in dishonor, would prefer the latter.

We, as parents or relatives of the men who have sacrificed so nobly and so generously in this war, have more than an obligation to mourn or to praise. We have an obligation to these warriors to see to it that the torch extended to us by their falling hands is never extinguished.

What is that torch? That torch is the American way of life—not merely the American material way of life, but the American spiritual way of life. That torch is the torch of human freedom which says that man is sacred because—whether rich or poor, white or black, educated or uneducated, he possesses a human soul which God alone created and which to Him alone belongs.

MAN A CREATURE OF GOD

In this war, many Americans may have frequently asked themselves—what is this war all about—what are the basic issues involved?

It is not for me to answer these questions, but I will insist that the most important issue that every American must fight for, either in war or peace, is the right of the

individual to command respect as a property of Almighty God.

Hitlerism was wrong basically because it denied the dignity of the individual human being.

Mussolini's false philosophy was wrong for the same reason, and the philosophy of communism is wrong also for the same reason.

In this country, any political or economic movement is likewise wrong that begins with the proposition that the welfare of the state or the group, is more important that the welfare of the individual man.

In this country, we have always uniquely insisted that the state exists only to serve man—that nothing is good for all which denies liberty unjustly to a single individual.

BLESSED WITH DIVINE INSPIRATION

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the greatest document even penned by the hand of man, he based the American system of liberty on just a few basic principles. But what basic principles they are. Namely, man's creation by God, man's equality before the law, and the existence of certain self-evident truths.

We were blessed with a divine inspiration when this country was formed. We have been blessed by that same divine inspiration ever since. Principles that are true are unchanging, and what Thomas Jefferson gave us in a political philosophy will be as true thousands of years from now as they were when he wrote them, or as they are now.

The inherent totalitarian germ which we are fighting on a hundred world-fronts today, is not something which can ever be isolated in any one country or any one part of the world. We have it here now as we had it when the Constitution was framed. We will always have it, but we need never fear it as long as we remember that our traditional way of life is the cure for it.

CITES FRISCO CONFERENCE

Right now, there is a tremendous world conference going on at San Francisco, in which the world's lovers of peace are vitally interested. There at San Francisco in the making, is what all of us hope will be the guarantee of future peace and the preventive of future wars. We must not ask too much of that Conference, but neither on the other hand must we ask too little of it.

We must not ask for a world program from San Francisco which conceives all men as angels and all nations as working arms of Providence, but neither should we permit to come from San Francisco any program which substitutes the principle of might for the principle of right, or which substitutes the doctrine of secularism for the doctrine of man's spirituality.

In these days it has become almost blasphemous in some quarters for an American to stand up and say that he is for America first. But to me the most sacred words in our language are these two.

On all our fighting fronts in this war men have fallen either dead or injured, not for some remote international abstraction but for their native or adopted country.

DIED FOR OUR COUNTRY

They sacrificed their lives not that some home in a remote country might be protected, but that their own home might be protected. They died not to save persons they never knew in some far-off land, but to save their loved ones and their friends at home.

We would be less than loyal to their memory if we ourselves did not try as their grieving survivors to devote our last ounce of strength to the perpetuation of American ideals, American institutions, and American interests. A nation is a family, and it is not a matter for shame that one has obligations to his own family which he does not have to another family living on a different street.

Someone said recently that Hitler was wrong when he said that the whole world belonged to Germany, and that we are equally wrong when we permit anyone to say that the United States is the property of the entire world.

PLEADS FOR AMERICA FIRST

No nation in these days can adopt an attitude of indifference to the fate of the world. We never have adopted such a view and never shall, but neither in these days should anyone of us forget to place first things first by denying that American self-interest is proper.

We must keep forever the proper balance of American traditions which says that we should live as interested citizens of the world, but not as meddlesome busybodies in the fates of all peoples.

It was to obtain a sanctuary from injustice and oppression that many of our forefathers came to this country. It was for us to provide such sanctuary, but it was never for us to attempt guaranteeing that such sanctuary shall always be available in all the other countries of the world.

Even were it desirable that we sit in a seat of judgment as arbiter of the entire world's destiny, it would not be an objective capable of attainment.

We are neither guilty of all the sins of international intercourse in recent years, nor are we capable of preventing a repetition of those sins in the future.

MUST NOT SACRIFICE FREEDOM

There is one test to be applied to almost any proposal offered to the American people for the guaranteeing of world peace. Does that proposal require us to sacrifice some essential part of our freedom of action as a sovereign nation?

If it does, it is contrary to our best national interest. No one, least of all myself, has any desire for an aggravation of the kind of nationalism which tries to run roughshod over other countries, but I admire and love the kind of nationalism which made Russia turn back the Nazi hordes at the gates of Stalingrad, and the kind of nationalism which made the Poles keep on fighting even after they were licked.

It was American nationalism that inspired our campaigns in Italy, Africa, France, Germany, and the South Pacific. And if I understand the prevailing sentiments at San Francisco now, there is faith in the security of Western Hemisphere solidarity on the basis of nationalism in the Americas, both South and North.

MUST KEEP INHERITED TRUST

But, whatever happens at San Francisco, we as the living must keep our inherited trust with the dead by devoting every fiber of our physical, mental, and moral beings to keep America free and in a position where by preserving its own health it may perform its necessary work in the world.

Recently a very humble man who became President of the United States, pleaded with the American people to pray for him in order that this Nation may stay on its course.

All of us here in the presence of the dead, and feeling the consciousness of our own unimportance as human beings, might well join with the spirit of the President's request and ask similar prayers for all of us.

The Heroic One Hundred and Sixth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I have written to Secretary of War Stimson suggesting that a Presidential citation be awarded to the One Hundred and Sixth Infantry Division for the great valor it displayed during the recent Rundstedt drive in Europe. My letter follows:

JUNE 4, 1945.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has seemed to me and to many others with whom I have conferred that the splendid achievements of the One Hundred and Sixth United States Infantry Division in Europe and the outstanding nobility of its performance well entitle that division to a Presidential citation.

It is beyond my poor powers of language to describe adequately the accomplishments of the One Hundred and Sixth Division in repelling Rundstedt's mechanized legions in one of the fiercest and most critical episodes of the war or to portray the glorious record it made during its gallant stand in the Ardennes at the center of the German drive, but even if I could it is not necessary for the purposes of this letter for you, sir, know and can visualize better than I the division's unsurpassed valor and its magnificent contribution to the success of American arms. I need not remind you of your own recognition of the performance of the One Hundred and Sixth Division in a statement listing the division's total casualties at 8,663 and closing with this deserved tribute:

"It was the contribution of the men of this division and of other less heavily hit divisions in the area which helped to make possible the halting and repelling of the enemy."

For three awful days this division bore the hammer blows of Germany's crack troops, taking almost one-fifth of the total casualties of the Battle of the Bulge. To quote from one commentator:

"It held its ground until half its force had been rolled under the wheels of the German charge."

The superlative bravery exhibited by this division in the crucible of war thrilled America and wrote a page of history that will be an inspiration to our children and our children's children down to the remotest generation.

The Indianapolis Star gathered from many reliable sources the epical story of the One Hundred and Sixth Division and printed it in pamphlet form under the caption "The heroic One Hundred and Sixth." The information contained in the pamphlet was collected and assembled by the Star's Washington correspondent, Mr. Jack Reed. It tells the story interestingly and accurately and I enclose a copy, knowing that you will enjoy reading it. This division was trained at Camp Atterbury and many of the boys of the division were from Indiana and surrounding States, and when German propaganda blared forth the report that the division had been decimated by Rundstedt's blow at St. Vith our people were torn with agonies of grief and fear. The sorrow caused by the actual losses will be tempered with the solemn satisfaction of knowing that the division's sacrifices are recognized and appreciated if this request for a Presidential citation is granted.

In presenting the request I feel that I am but the humble instrument of thousands upon thousands of our people who would like to see the division officially recognized in this appropriate manner.

I am writing, therefore, respectfully to request that you initiate whatever proceedings may be necessary to confer on the One Hundred and Sixth United States Infantry Division a Presidential citation for extraordinary valor.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

The Japanese Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting, timely, and thought-provoking editorial on the vexing Japanese problem.

A good friend of mine, Mr. George Dunn, editor of the Half Moon Bay Review in Half Moon Bay, Calif., has written an editorial on this subject, which has received a great deal of attention throughout the Nation.

I am hopeful that the State Department will find Mr. Dunn's suggestions of value, and I commend his editorial to my colleagues for their consideration. The editorial follows:

THE JAPANESE PROBLEM

There are so many people with so many suggestions as to what should be done with Japan, after this war, that we hesitate to make any further comment. We all feel that so many experts are working on this very grave problem that it is, to say the least, presumptuous on the part of any outsider to feel that he has an idea which hasn't already been thoroughly probed. Nevertheless we venture to make a suggestion which may have some worth. Since we have not come across this idea on the outside and since it looks so good to us, we give it to you for your careful consideration.

Invade the Japanese homeland and cut it off from the outside and let the American and Allied Navies keep watch until a democratic regime is assured.

Bring the Emperor and all other war criminals to trial. Replace the tycoons by democratic minded Japanese. Destroy the navy, merchant marine, and war factories, get together all the leading, trustworthy Japanese-Americans, graduates of our universities and all the best from the Japanese who fought in Italy and give them all the key positions in Japan.

Send Chiang Kai-shek all the necessary material to take both Manchuria and to deal with other antagonistic forces. Get this program on the airways and send our boys home.

Under these new Japanese conditions, many if not all the Japanese-Americans might prefer to return permanently to their homeland. This would solve a serious Japanese-California difficulty.

Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 173 declaring the policy of the United States with respect to use and disposition of enemy property. The resolution provides that it shall be the policy of the United States to assume and exercise full and complete ownership over all enemy property heretofore or hereafter vested in the United States, and to hold, use, manage, administer, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such property in the interests of nationals of the United States who have claims against any enemy country or countries arising out of any act or omission of such country or countries in, or in connection with, the present war, to the end that such claims may, as soon as practicable, be satisfied to the fullest possible extent.

I am sure it is timely to adopt a definite policy for this country with reference to enemy alien property over which we now exercise control. Germany was able to get back some 80 percent of the property which was placed under the jurisdiction of the Alien Property Custodian as a result of the First World War. Moreover, the facts will disclose that many claims of our nationals were never settled. I am one who is interested in seeing that every person in the United States who has a legitimate claim against Germany or Japan shall have that claim adjudicated and satisfied. It is my judgment that if this Nation does not have a firm and definite policy concerning this problem that the outcome could possible be similar to the result which obtained after the World War. Furthermore, those individuals who have been sent or gone to Germany or Japan not by choice and who have suffered injury thereby should have their claims satisfied before those who sought to profit by doing business with people of the two countries that have expended so much energy and effort to destroy America.

Fraternity and Postwar Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I am reproducing herewith a thoughtful article contributed to the Moose magazine on postwar planning by our colleague the Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota:

Activity in the lodges of the Loyal Order of Moose has never been more pronounced, and all reports indicate a high point in membership increase and financial assets. All lodges have shared in the war prosperity. The Loyal Order of Moose has been fortunate in this period in having as executive officers men like Malcolm R. Giles, Paul P. Schmitz and others to work out the great program which places the Moose fraternity in its present unique position.

When the war clouds pass away and peace on earth returns, the Moose will be vitally concerned with the program of changing a social and economic life, built up and carried on for war purposes, back to a domestic and peacetime basis. Already the leaders of this fraternity are giving serious consideration to this future situation. Every lodge of our fraternity is greatly interested in postwar planning. Unless steps are taken now, looking forward to industrial and economic development of our own country, every seciton of our land will be faced with men and women who are seeking jobs.

DIFFICULTIES TO BE MET

When the time comes to change our American industrial and agricultural life from a wartime economy to a domestic peacetime economy we will face a great many difficulties if the problem of unemployment is not solved. During this war we have learned the art of production. We have been able to produce goods in unprecedented amounts, twice as much as in 1929, and four times as much as in 1932. In spite of the fact that one-half of our national economy has been devoted to the prosecution of the war, we have been able to produce enough civilian goods and food to satisfy our essential needs, in an amount almost equal to that of the best peacetime year, and notably in agriculture surpassing any previous year. We have been able to do this because we have given employment in production to nearly 55,000,000 people, in addition to 12,000,000 men and women under arms.

We must, we cannot fail, to mobilize our total productive capacity after the war for the reconstruction of our country just as we have been able to do during the war for the defense of this continent and our institutions. We can do this by arranging our affairs so that we are able to supply constructive and productive employment to people at least equal in number to those now employed. If we allow our total employment to fall below 50,000,000 people, you can expect a depression. Demobilization of the Army is going to bring into the labor market large numbers of our young people who must be given opportunities for jobs. If we assume that there will be retirement from the labor market because of age or preference, sufficient in numbers to equal the number of soldiers returning to civilian life, then full employment means that we must offer opportunities for employment to between fifty to fifty-five million people. If we can do this, we can expect a national income of $165,000,000,000.

STANDARD OF LIVING

This will mean an improvement in the standard of living throughout the country unequaled in the history of the world. It is only by this means that we will be able to forestall a depression and keep our country strong in comparison and in competition with other countries no matter what form of government they choose to live.

Full employment and high purchasing power is as essential for he farmer as it is for the worker in the cities. The principal methcd whereby farm surpluses can be averted in the future is to give the people of this country the purchasing power with which they can increase their consumption of farm products as has happened during this war. The salvation of our democratic institutions depends upon our ability to maintain such a scale of employment and production. If we fail in this then you can expect internal unrest, and insecurity to the national debt. You can expect decline in foreign trade and depressions in other countries. Under such dismal conditions it would be difficult if not impossible to sustain the best devised international machinery for security and peace. It is axiomatic that the stability of world economy and consequently the political systems in other countries will depend upon our ability to maintain prosperity in the United States.

What must we do in order to maintain employment and production for our own welfare, for our own people, and for the stabilization of the world?

First. We must control the disposal of surplus goods accumulated during the war

in such a way as not to interfere with current production and markets. This is one of the most important legislative problems now before the Congress of the United States.

Second. We must facilitate the conversion of war plants to peacetime production to the extent that they are adaptable. This must be done under private ownership and control, not by monopoly, but by giving opportunities for more Americans to engage in business enterprise, including credit assistance if necessary. In other words, we must foster the development of small business. We must never allow plants to be scrapped if there is economical peacetime use for them.

Third. We must encourage public and private agencies to engage in the renovation and maintenance of facilities which have been allowed to depreciate during wartime as a result of the shortage of materials and labor. Our highways, railroads, real property, both residential and business, power systems, etc., have been sadly neglected and necessarily so during the past 4 years, and with proper financial help the condition of these facilities must be brought up to normal. This can furnish a great amount of employment.

Fourth. We must undertake the construction of new highways, dwellings, airports, river-basin developments, reforestation, and other worth-while and wealth-creating projects.

In this category there are many projects in the preliminary stage of planning which should be pressed forward to the blueprint stage and legislative authorization. Among these are numerous waterway, power, and flood-control projects now before Congress, which are designed to improve our land, to save farms and property against floods, and to provide cheap water transportation and cheap power.

In approaching a legislative program to repair and reconstruct our country, we must not be sectional in our viewpoint, but national. A few examples: Saving the lower Mississippi Valley from the devastation of floods, and the destruction of farms is nearly as important to the Northeast, for instance, which buys the products of the farms and sells to them the products of its factories, as it is to the people of the valley immediately concerned. Similarly the creation of new industries and employment for a growing population in the Northwest is important to the steel factories of the Middle West, the shipping companies of the East and the railroads which traverse our country. For an expanding and prosperous Northwest will be a needed market for the production of other regions of the country.

Government Should Inaugurate Support Prices on Oats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable correspondence relative to the advisability of inaugurating a support price for oats.

This is one of the big grain crops in my part of the country. Farmers are becoming discouraged over the prospects of making any money out of oats. The price fluctuates up and down to such an extent that the producer often loses money on his crop. Because this crop produces one of the most essential feeds for livestock in the Northwest and throughout the country, it is important that increased production be encouraged.

I am reprinting herewith a letter which I received from Mr. Eugene Sullivan, vice president of the Norman County Farm Bureau, Ada, Minn.:

NORMAN COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Ada, Minn., May 28, 1945.

The Honorable HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Representative in Congress,
Ninth District,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HAGEN: In answer to your letter of recent date, concerning the support price for Government loan on oats, I find the arguments that are used against support price are really arguments for it.

Argument 1 is that it is a feed crop, largely fed where it is produced. This is not the case. The facts herewith submitted should prove the incorrectness of this statement. The Lockhart, Minn., elevator handled 131,000 bushels of the 1944 crop. Of this, only 1,000 bushels were sold locally. The other 130,000 went on to Minneapolis. One of the elevators in Ada bought 193,335 bushels of 1944 oats. Of this amount, 179,300 bushels were shipped out. Mr. O. N. Bodding, manager of the Ada Elevator, informs me that the volume of the past year was only half the normal marketings, due to floods and excessive moisture. He also states that less than 10 percent of the grain marketed here is resold for feed in the immediate area.

It would be perfectly all right if every farmer fed all the oats he produced. But is it fair for one farmer to grow oats and sell on the speculative market for some other man to feed and produce products which are protected and subsidized such as poultry and dairy products? It seems strange that nearly every other farm commodity is sold on a support price when next to corn, oats has the highest bushel production of any farm crop. This leaves the oat farmer at the mercy of the speculator and the other powers that enter into price determination. It is interesting to note that when the oat crop first came on the market last fall, oats sold for 62 cents here in the county. It soon dropped to 39 cents. During seeding this spring it was up again to 67 cents. Now it is down to 50 cents and below.

As to the importance of the oat crop, the USDA figures show that during the past 25 years the production of oats has dropped below a billion bushels only four times. According to Oswald Daellenbach, Norman County agricultural agent, about one-fourth of the total crop acres in the county is seeded to oats. This represents the largest acreage in the county of any single crop.

Unless something is done to protect the price of oats, the farmers of this county and elsewhere will plant their acres into crops which have a support price. This may create a serious shortage in this very important feed crop.

I am a firm believer in the quotation, "The rights we demand ourselves, we must concede to others." This can be done by giving us a support price on Government loan on oats the same as is done on other crops.

There should be no place in our agricultural life for the gambler, the speculator, or profiteer.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE SULLIVAN,
Vice President, Norman County Farm Bureau.

King Haakon Returns—OWI Has Done a Good Job in Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, King Haakon VII has returned to his homeland of Norway today. Norwegian flags adorn the buildings and drape the streets of Oslo. The people of Norway rejoice on this Thursday, June 7, their symbolic day of complete liberation. Today is a national holiday in Norway.

The Office of War Information, of our own United States, has helped to restore Norwegian liberty through the power of the written and spoken word. I know the influence of news upon Norway and its freedom-loving people. I know it because I once edited and published a Norwegian-language newspaper—the Vesterheimen—at my home town of Crookston, Minn.

Norwegians wanted to know about America even when they were under the cruel domination of the Nazis. They want to know about friendly America at this very moment and every day. Yet, Norwegians are selective in their judgment of news. They will not accept as facts either isolated news reports or an unbalanced news file. They are apt to reject news about America which reaches them by circuitous routes, from the major cities of Europe. Norwegians are direct people and they want direct news. They are quick to discover when they are told half of a story or even nearly all of a story. They want the best composite news picture of the whole of America that they can get.

I believe that the news needs of the Norwegian people concerning the United States can be best met by the Office of War Information.

It would be disastrous to these people and to their splendid relationship with our people if, after subsisting on a news diet of unimpeachable accuracy, they would be fed slanted, over-emphasized news. To arouse unwarranted expectations among them would be a greater catastrophe than holding out no expectations whatsoever. To inform a people whose national characteristics are restraint and dignity, dignity and restraint must be employed. In this manner they must be told of the development, the problems, the social progress, the intellectual achievements, the agricultural and industrial achievements of America during the five long years when the Nazis occupied their country. The American way of thinking concerning world issues must be explained to them impartially—not in small segments, but in entirety.

The OWI must be kept on the job. The informational task of reestablishing the strong ties between Norway and the United States under freedom cannot

wait for the creation of another governmental information agency, or the substitution of private information agencies. It must go on as the OWI is going on, without interruption. The American news link across the Atlantic to Norway was, is, and it must continue to be maintained.

What applies in our informational relations with Norway also applies in our informational relationship with our allies and with other liberated nations everywhere. It requires the telling of the whole American story by Americans for Americans so that false impressions may be corrected. In order to live together in the family of nations, we must understand each other.

The Office of War Information has the facilities, the experienced personnel and skill acquired in the use of truth-telling methods to do this job and to do it well. I am going to support its continuance and vote for adequate funds to carry on its work.

Urges Increase in Salaries for Federal Public Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution offered at the meeting of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, May 18, 1945, Bankers Club, New York City:

Whereas owing to the natural growth of the population of the United States, the great development of its industries, and its extraordinary progress from the time when it was brought into existence in 1789, the Federal Government has become more complicated and it is much more difficult than ever before to fairly and properly administer it; and

Whereas the conscientious performance of the duties of our Senators, Representatives, and judges requires much more time, effort, skill, ability, and responsibility than ever before, it is not more than just to increase the salaries of certain of our Federal public officials upon which this great responsibility now rests.

In view of the foregoing situation, it was, on motion of Edward A. Alexander, duly seconded by Aaron Lasser,

Resolved, That it is the consensus of opinion of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut that the salaries of Members of both Houses of Congress should be increased at least from $10,000 per annum to $15,000 per annum, and of our Federal judges to $15,000 per annum; and it was further

Resolved, That it is the consensus of opinion of our association that the services now being performed and to be performed by the above-named Federal officials have become proportionately of greater importance than those to be performed by State officials, and that the problems and questions arising from time to time which the above-named Federal officials are compelled to solve and decide have become of much more importance than ever before in the history of our country and such officials are justly entitled to the moderate increase in salaries mentioned in this resolution; and it is necessary to increase their salaries, if we wish to attract to such offices men and women of great ability, honesty, and culture, as the life of our great Republic and democracy may in the future depend upon the personnel of our important Federal officials; and it is further

Resolved, That the president of our association, Henry Ward Beer, be and he hereby is authorized and directed to take whatever lawful steps may be necessary to see that the objects of these resolutions are carried into effect, and to appoint as many members of this association, whose services he considers to be necessary for the purpose, to aid and assist him in urging upon the public and the proper officials to carry the objects of these resolutions into effect.

Subcommittees on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Geographical Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has been divided into five subcommittees, each with a subcommittee chairman, and each with a geographical region of the world in which it will specialize and to which it will devote concentrated attention.

This plan has been in the process of development by the committee for several months, and the final plan was worked out by a subcommittee composed of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and was unanimously approved by the full committee, after having been submitted to and approved by Chairman SOL BLOOM and the ranking minority member of the committee, Congressman CHARLES A. EATON, who are now serving as delegates to the San Francisco Conference.

Chairman BLOOM will serve as ex officio member of each of the five subcommittees.

The increasing volume and complexity of world problems has necessitated this arrangement for specialized study of the economic, political, and social conditions of the various regions of the world. Each subcommittee will, therefore, give such specialized study to the particular region assigned to it with a view to a more valuable contribution to the work of the whole committee.

The list of subcommittee assignments, as officially approved by the committee, follows:

SUBDIVISIONS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

1. The Far East: JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman; DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California; JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin.

2. Eastern Europe, the Near East and the Balkans: LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, chairman; THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois; JOSEPH F. RYTER, of Connecticut; KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota; FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio.

3. Western Europe: JOHN KEE, of West Virginia, chairman; JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York; CHARLES L. GERLACH, of Pennsylvania.

4. Africa and the Mediterranean problems: JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, of New York, chairman; W. O. BURGIN, of North Carolina; WIRT COURTNEY, of Tennessee; BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of Michigan; CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire.

5. Western Hemisphere: PETE JARMAN, of Alabama, chairman; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas; CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey; ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois.

SUBDIVISION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

1. The Far East: China, Japan, Korea, Manchukuo, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Thailand, French Indochina, British India, Nepal (Bhutan), Burma, Malay States, Australia, Territory of New Guinea, Tasmania, New Zealand, Sarawak, British North Borneo, Netherlands East Indies, Philippine Islands, Portuguese Timor, British island possessions, French island possessions.

2. Eastern Europe, the Near East, and the Balkans: Russia; Baltic States: Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania; Poland; Czechoslovakia; Balkans: Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary, Austria; the Near East: Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Trans Jordan, Palestine, Saudi-Arabia and territories of Arabian Peninsula, Egypt.

3. Western Europe: Iceland, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxemburg, Lichtenstein, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Andorra, Portugal, Germany.

4. Africa and the Mediterranean problems: Spanish: Spanish Morocco, Rio de Oro; French: Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia; French West Africa: Senegal, French Guinea, Ivory Coast; French Equatorial Africa; French Somaliland; Madagascar; Italian: Italian East Africa, Libya, Ethiopia; Portuguese: Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea; Belgian Congo; Liberia; British: Gambia, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sudan, British Somaliland, Kenya, Tanganyika, Rhodesia, Bechuanaland, Union of South Africa.

5. Western Hemisphere: Canada, Greenland; South America: Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Brazil; the Guianas: British, Dutch, French; Central America: Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama; Mexico; the Caribbean area.

Our National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Mr. James I. Dissette, a distinguished and scholarly citizen of my home city—Indianapolis—in which he submits a most interesting argument in favor of substituting America for the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem. Because of the interest that attaches to Mr. Dissette's sub-

ject and his entertaining way of presenting it I have secured unanimous consent for the insertion of his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM

Recently our esteemed fellow townsman, Rev. Charles Fillmore—a man who has achieved world-wide and lasting fame for his valuable contributions to our hymns and sacred songs—in a card in our local paper has made the suggestion that our beautiful hymn America be substituted for the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem. The suggestion deserves thoughtful and favorable consideration.

The Star-Spangled Banner is not an anthem. It centralizes and extols a critical situation in the War of 1812. The remoteness of that situation, the mellowing influence of time, and the overshadowing importance of even more critical situations in subsequent wars have all tended to relegate this happening of the War of 1812 to its proper place in the records of our early history, and there it should be allowed to rest—not resurrected and revived as a present-day incident to be paraded before patriotic gatherings and public assemblages.

The Star-Spangled Banner, when played or sung before a public assemblage, fails to touch a responsive chord in the hearts of its hearers that a national anthem should do. The assemblage stands respectfully—and silently—through the rendition of one stanza. Few participate in the singing because the air is beyond the range of the average untrained voice and because they do not know all the words of even the first stanza, and probably have never heard the three remaining stanzas. (Can you recite from memory even the first stanza?)

Just the contrary is true of America. The words of that beautiful hymn are comprehensive in scope, embracing our whole Nation and domain; it has dignity and majesty in its structure, simplicity in its expression of sentiment. It is an anthem of grateful praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God for His great gift of freedom, couched in such simple language as to touch a responsive chord in the hearts of all hearers, and these become eager and joyful participants in the rendition. It never grows old, applying today with greater force than when first made public more than 100 years ago (in 1832). The average audience is gratified when given an opportunity of joining in the singing of not one but all four stanzas; the air being so simple, the average untrained voice can easily participate. Love of country, love of homeland, love of home is innate in every human breast, hence it is easy to understand why this beautiful hymn, America, appeals so strongly to all our people.

Objection has been made to Reverend Fillmore's suggestion on the ground that the air to which America is sung is the same as that of the British national anthem, God Save the King, and that the air belongs to England; that we would be borrowing it from England. But is this true? In a discussion of this matter some years prior to the adoption by Congress in 1931 of the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem, the assertion was made—and never refuted—that the air originated as a folk song of a disappeared and forgotten people; that England rescued the air from passing into oblivion, and adapted it to the words of her national anthem. The air is also claimed by Germany, by Switzerland; Russia formerly used the air as her national anthem. Apparently, the air belongs to the world, and we have the same right to use it as any other nation.

Our Nation is founded upon the declared principle of human freedom and equality, and under that God-given, beneficent principle our Nation has acquired outstanding prominence among the nations of the world. Due to this principle, individual freedom and initiative have been encouraged and developed as nowhere else in the world. When the demands of the present World War II were made upon us, we had the capacity to respond to every demand in a way that amazes and staggers the world. In view of this, would it not be peculiarly appropriate as a postwar action for Congress to rescind its action of 1931 and substitute as our national anthem America, an anthem in which our whole Nation heartily joins in singing praise to Almighty God for our great blessing of freedom and for our preservation?

This God-given principle of human freedom should be indelibly imprinted on the hearts and in the minds of our boys and girls in our grade schools of today, so that our great Nation will be safe when our flag of freedom passes into their hands and to them, under the guidance of an All-wise Heavenly Father, becomes the responsibility of seeing that, in the words of our immortal Lincoln, "this Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." To this end, all of our grade school children should be required to memorize and frequently join in chorus singing of this beautiful anthem America.

JAMES I. DISSETTE.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *February 11, 1945.*

The Future of Boston Industrially and Commercially Is What Through United Action the People Make It

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at meeting of businessmen, Stuart Street, Boston, Mass.:

Prior to the advent of steam-propelled ships, sailing ships flying the American flag were welcome visitors to every port of the world, and these ships were largely constructed in New England. The outstanding designer was an east Boston man, Donald McKay, and one of the ships designed by him held the record for passage from Boston to Europe for more than 20 years after the coming of steam-propelled ships. One gets some idea of the character of the ships and the courage and skill of the crews when we learn of the slogan of the captain of one of the ships was "Boston to Melbourne or the hereafter in 60 days" and not infrequently the journey was made in 58 days. Would that we, in our day, had more of the courage, determination, and faith of these brave men who went down to the sea in ships, and the appalling situation now confronting both State and city would not be in evidence. It has been my privilege to be instrumental in securing the sum of $5,000,000 for the improvement of Boston Harbor as a result of which, the channel has been widened to a depth of 1,500 feet with 40 feet in depth at mean low water and extending 5 miles from President's Road to the Boston Navy Yard with a turning basin opposite the Army base rendering it possible for ships to enter and leave on their own power without either tugs or lighters. This represents an advantage equivalent to $25,000 for a round trip by any of the larger ships in use. It has likewise been my privilege to secure from Federal funds $20,000,000 for the completion of the Cape Cod Canal which makes unnecessary the long and hazardous journey around the tip of Provincetown between Boston and New York and which proved of inestimable value in the present war when enemy submarines were operating off the coast.

Unquestionably, these two improvements have been a contributing factor in the selection by the Army and Navy Departments of South Boston as an embarkation port for the shipment of men and supplies to the battle fronts of the world. The great embarkation port constructed by the Federal Government at South Boston representing an expenditure in excess of $20,000,000 should be available for use at a nominal rental by the city for commercial purposes at the close of the war, making possible a real beginning of port development. The solution of the problems confronting Boston has, at least, become the accepted objective of everyone and through unity of action and cooperation commerce can be revived and restored. What has been accomplished in other Atlantic seaboard cities should prove easier of accomplishment in the case of Boston. Perhaps the best contrast is between the city of Boston and the city of Baltimore, Md. Boston is located on the ocean with the most accessible channel and harbor on the entire Atlantic coast while the city of Baltimore is 160 miles from the ocean. Boston and Baltimore are about of equal area. Baltimore, however, has but about one-third the population of Boston. Yet despite this fact, the commerce handled by Baltimore is more than three times as great as that handled by the city of Boston. The carrying of freight through the port of Baltimore has been doubled in the last 20-year period while Boston, with the exception of war activities, has been practically at a standstill. If one were to seek a reason for the situation, it might be found in the fact that both the Commonwealth and Boston have devoted more thought, attention and money to politics rather than to the development of commerce and industry. There is every promise, however, that at last this situation may be changed. Nearly a quarter of a century ago, I advocated not only port development but the development of the airport. Yet there was no support at that time for either of these vital essentials. Today, however, we find substantially every influential agency in State and city united for the carrying out of a program through which commerce and industry and port development may become a reality.

In the case of Baltimore, an enabling act was adopted by the legislature and submitted on referendum to the voters of Baltimore, making provision for the expenditure of $50,000,000 for the development of piers, and it was accepted by the legislature and the people, with the result that Baltimore today has port development and piers second only to New York. To the present time the total investment in port development lines by the city of Baltimore with, as I have previously stated, one-third of the population of Boston in the vicinity of $200,000,000. The Massachusetts Legislature will be called upon shortly to consider an expenditure of $57,000,000 for port development, and an initial expenditure for airport development of $15,000,000, which represents a truly courageous departure from established policy.

It is unfortunate that while Baltimore has been undertaking these courageous and major expenditures with an eye solely to the future, we have been quibbling on matters of lowly consequences and questionable value so far as the welfare of the entire people is concerned. What is true of Baltimore is equally true of other Atlantic coast cities. Philadelphia presents a striking contrast to the public spirit that has been lacking in Boston. During this

period of time there has been complete unity, coordination, and cooperation upon the part of the entire people. Philadelphia, which is located 40 miles from the ocean, has quadrupled its facilities and port business since the close of the First World War. Most of the modern piers of the port of Philadelphia have been developed by the city, there being some 13 constructed since the end of World War I, and the port-development program is still in progress. About one-third of a great program for development of its lower central water front along a 2-mile shore has been completed during the past 25 years.

The city of Philadelphia has likewise expended $40,000,000 for a radial highway serving the port, 250 feet in width and extending for 33 miles along the river front with every known facility for the handling of cargoes with the highest degree of efficiency. Plans have been determined upon for the expenditure, after the present war, of more than $25,000,000 additional for port development, including four large berths capable of providing for the requirements of 20 modern victory size or larger ships. The great Porter Street Municipal Pier in Philadelphia is 900 feet in length and 366 feet in width, constructed of concrete and steel with berths for 4 super ships. The Green Street Municipal Pier is of sufficient size to store 18,000 tons of cargo upon a single floor, while more additional types of piers are available for rental to any shipping. In the matter of facilities for expediting the handling of materials, a grain-elevator has been constructed with capacity of 4,750,000 bushels; also two coal tipples with a capacity of 100,000 tons and two fully equipped piers for the unloading of iron ore.

The city likewise controls some 48 warehouses with a storage warehouse capacity of 78,000,000 feet of storage space. We have some conception of the tremendous strides made by this city, which is 40 miles from the ocean, in order to develop a port of Philadelphia and thereby enrich the business of State and city, when we learn that accommodations are available to the 191 piers, 100 of which piers are served by the railroad lines and some 60,000 feet of berth space.

The grain elevators of Philadelphia are so constructed that it is possible to bag mixed grain, clean of brier, and delivered in bulk on vessels at the rate of 90,000 bushels an hour. The turn-over coal-type dumpers can unload vessels at the rate of 1,500 tons an hour while the tidewater terminal, a port within a port, can load 15 cargo ships at one time, and all served by rail connections with trunk-line facilities. It must be apparent to every thoughtful citizen that the decadence of the port of Boston has been due in large measure to our timidity, since with the best natural advantages we have failed to take advantage of them in the same manner as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans.

For more than 50 years on every platform we have proclaimed that Boston is 1 day nearer to Europe than any port on the Atlantic coast and likewise nearer to South American ports, but to the present we have failed to take advantage of this situation. The action of businessmen and public-spirited citizens generally would indicate that at last we have become port-minded. The development of the port is but one step in the movement to revitalize Massachusetts and Boston industrially and commercially, and this port-mindedness must be the business of every industrial establishment not only in Massachusetts but throughout New England and our slogan should be "ship goods through the port of Boston for the benefit of New England."

Today, fully 60 percent of all the goods produced west of Worcester in Massachusetts are shipped via New York. Provided this situation can be revised and the bulk of goods and commodities shipped through the port of Boston, it would mean money pouring into every artery and channel of trade in every section of the entire Commonwealth. What is true with reference to the development of the port of Boston is equally true in the matter of the airport development. Some 15 years ago, or in 1930, as mayor, I extended an invitation to the Congressional Committee on Military Affairs to visit Boston with a view to conveying to the city Governors Island and making it an extension of our present airport. Unfortunately, at that time, due largely to political considerations, there was a lack of public spirit necessary to sustain such a procedure and nothing was done for the development of the airport, which, provided it had been done 15 years ago, would have brought to the port of Boston tremendous wealth during the period of the present. During the past year, money has been made available for the razing of Governors Island, but the work has been conducted in such a leisurely manner that it is still in progress when it should be completed.

During a snowstorm this winter it was impossible to land a plane at East Boston Airport for a period of 4 days, due to the fact that the sole rotary plow utilized for the purpose of clearing the runways had been temporarily shifted to the western part of the State to open up roads in that section. The unfavorable advertising resulting from the failure to clear the runways has done irreparable injury to what should be one of the best airports in the entire Nation when you consider the East Boston Airport via the tunnel is but 5 minutes from downtown Boston and that today it is the most accessible airport in the entire Nation and that an extension of the tunnel facilities to the airport would make it even more accessible, you get some realization of our shortcomings and lack of both vision and initiative. We have been too prone to live in the glories of the past, and our failure to recognize the necessity until the present hour for courageous, aggressive action is unquestionably largely responsible for our commercial and airport decadence.

Happily, there is an indication of a change, and what has been accomplished elsewhere is possible of accomplishment here, and as mayor it will be my purpose to devote my every effort to the promotion of that unity and cooperation that is vital to the achievement of the objectives essential to the prosperity of commonwealth and city.

Forest Resources of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if sufficient thought is being given among us to the relation of the progressively worsening condition of the forest resources of the United States to the problem of full forest and forest industry employment in postwar. I am informed by the United States Forest Service that of our commercial timberland we now have only about 100,000,000 acres of virgin timber left; that, of the remainder, some 280,000,000 acres has been cut over and is producing only a fraction of the forest products which could be produced, and that some 80,000,000 acres has been cut over, burned, and neglected to the point where it is now practically idle. Reports from my own State of Washington, and Oregon, are that 50 percent of the present sawmills, shingle mills, veneer mills, and pulp mills there, will be out of private-owned timber in 5 years, and 76 percent in 15 years. It seems apparent that if we are to have full employment in lumber and allied industries a Nation-wide conservation program, including public action designed to bring about better forest practice on private lands, is indicated. This situation is arousing organized labor in the forest regions as never before. As representative of labor's new interest and attitude in this important matter, under leave granted, I submit for printing in the RECORD a story by W. W. Sylvester which appeared recently in the Union Register, which is owned by the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, AFL:

TIMBER BARON PROPAGANDA HIDES FACTS ABOUT FUTURE

(By W. W. Sylvester)

Confronted by repeated public warnings of the United States Forest Service that present logging practices are exhausting timber reserves, publicity experts of lumber associations are flooding the country with reams of booklets, maps, and charts purporting to show that the Government's gloomy predictions concerning the future of the industry are unwarranted. Yet, it is clear from the developments of recent years that operators are not swallowing their own poison.

While the West Coast Lumbermen's Association chides the Forest Service for playing fast and loose with facts, its members are folding up one mill and logging operation after the other, and investing heavy sums in the development of synthetic, molded, and glued-wood products. At the same time the industry is doing very little about reforestation.

A recent yarn in the monthly, Big Trees, issued by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, starts with the proposition that there are 1,760,000,000,000 board feet of commercial saw lumber in the United States. One of the organization's writers concludes that this supply contains enough lumber to build three eight-room frame houses for each of the 35,000,000 families in the Nation and leave a comfortable margin for numerous other uses. This revelation is expected to pacify all alarmists.

Forest Service analysts start with the same figure. But in a booklet entitled "Some Plain Facts About the Forests" they point out that this statement fails to take into consideration the terrific drain of timber reserves that has taken place in the last 4 decades, and particularly during the present war.

"It is estimated that in 1909 the total volume of saw timber in the forests of the United States was 2,826,000,000,000 board feet," the Forest Service booklet asserts. "In 1938 the estimated stand of saw timber was 1,764,000,000,000 board feet." Recognizing that the 1938 estimate included species and stands not considered merchantable in the earlier estimate, it is safe to say that the total volume of standing saw timber was reduced almost 40 percent in 30 years.

INDUSTRY IGNORES WARNINGS

Industry propagandists also attempt to gloss over the Government warnings by asserting that more than 11,000,000,000 cubic feet of new growth occurs each year. But the figures reveal that the excess of drain over growth is mounting steadily. It is estimated that the drain, including timber removed by cutting, fire losses, destruction by insects, disease, etc., on forests of the United States in 1943 amounted to nearly 17,000,000,000 feet and exceeded total growth by 50 percent. The drain on saw logs was

almost twice the estimated growth. The dispute between Government analysts and lumbermen does not rest on a controversy over facts. Both accept the same basic data. But the operator spokesmen rest their case on the remaining timber. The Forest Service takes the same position, but declares that the rosy predictions of the operators can never be realized unless the industry gives its full support and cooperation to an all-out conservation program.

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

It is, therefore, not a question of remaining timber, but of what kind of timber, its location with reference to the cost of removing it, the growth rate and quality of the trees planted to replace virgin stands.

"Why worry," says the lumber publicists, "when only about 2 percent of our present stand of saw timber is cut in any one year." Such an assertion ignores the fact that the cut for lumber is only about 60 percent of the total drain on stands of this quality. In 1942 the total cut for all purposes, including pulpwood, fuel wood, and many other products, was estimated at 3.2 percent of our present total stand. It should also be noted that in 1938 only about two-thirds of the estimated 1,864,000,000,000 feet (the figure used by the operators' publicity experts) of remaining timber was considered accessible for cutting at a reasonable cost.

Contrary to the claim of the operators' associations, the Government has not taken a sour puss attitude toward the future of the industry. It merely declares, candidly, that too little has been done too late to preserve the health and vigor of lumbering as it has existed for the past half century. Private tree farms, forest service officials admit, is a step in the right direction. But they make two salient points with regard to artificial reforestation. In the first place, planting programs will merely serve to offset some of the timber ravishment of the past; and even this will take generations. Secondly, unless present logging practices and wood misuse is not cleaned up, even the most extensive nursery plantings will never mature into merchantable timber in time to permit a measurable continuity of lumber production.

CLOSURES THREATENED

Stepped-up programs for engaging in the production of plactic synthetic, molded, and other wood-derivative products constitutes conclusive proof that lumbermen are not following the claims of their own propagandists that there is a glorious future for lumbering. The operators know it to be a fact that there is even now a shortage of saw logs (regardless of the manpower shortage) for the mills in western Washington. While there may be enough remaining timber to supply immediate needs following the war, the best advice from the regional office of the Forest Service office in Portland indicates that a large percentage of existing mills will be forced to close within a comparatively short time.

STRAW IN THE WIND

Recent closure of Bloedel-Donovan's large cargo mill at Bellingham, Wash., is a straw in the wind. Another is the announced shut-down of the huge Clark-Wilson operation in Portland.

The Forest Service case for timber conservation is predicated on the principle that strenuous efforts must be put forth at once to preserve the remaining stands. USFS officials advocate Nation-wide participation by States and local communities in programs for restocking after cutting, prohibition of wasteful logging methods, providing a reserve of growing stock to keep forest lands reasonably productive, preventing damage to young growth and uncut stock, regulating grazing to prevent tree damage, and prohibiting clear cut except where it is silviculturally necessary, or when the land is to be put to some other use.

DUTY OF UNION

Meanwhile, the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union has the tremendous responsibility of doing all within its power to see that correct logging practices, fire-prevention techniques, and reforestation programs are carried out in the various forest areas of the Northwest. A great deal has already been done along these lines. Through Northwestern Council and district council resolutions, pressure has been put on many operators to improve their logging methods and engage in reforestation practices. A number of local unions have forest marshals, and nearly all have solicited the support of their respective communities in practical fire-prevention programs.

It would be impossible for union members to overemphasize the importance of continuing and extending such activities, because the protection and proper harvesting of our forests insure the jobs of everyone in the industry.

Better Too Soon Than Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I issued, on behalf of the Republican Tax-Study Committee, composed of 27 Republican Members of the House, a preliminary statement of tax policy.

The committee believes that the time for decision in tax matters is now, in order that some glimmering of the postwar pattern of our American economy may be glimpsed by businessmen and by industry, labor, and agriculture, which must furnish the jobs which will be required on demobilization of the munitions workers at home and the men and women in the armed services.

We were told in the thirties that the system of free enterprise was out of gear because there were too many saved dollars which were idle and could not find employment in private enterprise. We were further told that public enterprise and expenditures must employ these dollars.

The war completely reversed this condition and need. We have put tremendous new purchasing power in the hands of consumers and at the same time curtailed the amount of goods and services available for purchasing. Nearly everyone has, therefore, assumed that there has been a large accumulation of buying power reserve which would generate a new high level of private enterprise operation as the reduced war effort released materials and labor. We were told that under these conditions the important job of government was to preserve a sound public economy and sympathetically to aid private enterprise to expand production and jobs. It was further understood that the reduction of war tax levels was one specific action to demonstrate this sympathetic attitude.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation some time ago requested individuals and organizations to present suggestions and specific ways to proceed in postwar tax reduction. The result was a variety of general and specific proposals. If there was anything unanimous in all of them it was the agreement that the weight of the future tax burden depended on the scale of private enterprise operations and that, as a corollary, an important objective of tax reduction should be to encourage venturesomeness among individuals and their enterprises through the profit motive and likewise give more buying power to consumers so that they could replace the production of war goods with the products of private enterprise.

We had arrived at the time for a great decision.

Soon official Washington raised the cry that the decision relative to tax reduction must await the end of the war. That it would have an inflationary effect unless it was delayed to come when war expenditures were sharply curtailed. There was even the statement that tax reduction hopes were premature, both as to time and degree.

Meanwhile, one war has ended and the decision is squarely before us.

What is happening? There are no clear-cut acts of the Federal Government which commit it to the road of individual enterprise. No positive action on tax reduction either now or later. It is rather the opposite. Proposal after proposal and bill after bill is offered to increase Federal expenditures. We hear much of substantial unemployment in the near future and pleas to immediately legislate, to mitigate this condition by increasing the scope of Federal spending. Is it any wonder that the enterprising citizens who were to be relied upon to risk, to work, and to develop production and jobs in private enterprise are confused or even discouraged?

The proposed increases in Federal expenditures are more inflationary than tax reduction. Federal spending does not create goods and services which people wish to bid for. Tax reduction, however, would spur individual enterprise to produce the goods and the services needed and wanted. Therefore, it would be deflationary. How, then, can official policy denounce immediate steps to tax reduction as inflationary and still push for increased Federal spending which is inflationary?

If substantial unemployment confronts us, is the decision again going to be Federal subsistence dollars and not productive jobs? With the financial resources now available to individuals and State and local governments is there a better time to make decisions which commit us to the road we have been told was our objective; namely, individual enterprise?

If present proposals for Federal spending mature, the people may as well know that tax reduction is a false hope. Unless these hopes have been piously mouthed anesthetics it is time now for Federal action clearly to show the firm decision to take the individual enterprise road. If not now, when again will a better opportunity for this decision come?

This decision calls for two steps now.

First. A refusal to plunge the Federal Government into new and more fields

of expenditure, and, as the Comptroller General said, "Courageously apply the pruning knife day after day to present Federal spending."

Second. Action should be had now on the first steps in tax reduction so that it is a clear disclosure of the official path that will be followed. These first steps should above all be a spur to profit ventures and a timed reduction of taxes on consumers so they may increasingly absorb the products and services of private enterprise.

The United States Delegation to the United Nations Reparations Commission at Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago several Democratic Members of this House called upon the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, to question him concerning this country's relations with the Soviet Union, which, they feared had deteriorated sorely since the days of Yalta. They reported Mr. Grew as saying "this country is leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to Russia." If one may judge by the complexion of mind of several Members chosen to represent the United States on the United Nations Reparations Commission, now assembling in Moscow, Mr. Grew's reported remark is a correct analysis of our Government's conciliatory attitude toward the Soviet Union.

The head of this delegation is Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, former national treasurer of the Democratic Party. Under Mr. Pauley is Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, the distinguished president of the University of California, who will advise our delegation on the human aspects of reparations. Dr. Sproul has an excellent record of friendship for the Soviets and for Soviet groups in America. In 1943 Dr. Sproul extended the hospitality of the university he heads to a congress of the Hollywood writers' mobilization, and made the welcoming address. That was the 3-day meeting at which greetings were brought from Russia to the writers of the United States by Mr. Mikhail Kalatosof, the agent of the Soviet moving-picture monopoly, Sovkino. It was at that same meeting, also, that Mr. Robert C. Miller, an American newspaper correspondent just back from Guadalcanal, was forbidden by Dr. Sproul and the censors of the Hollywood writers' congress to deliver his remarks on the war in the Pacific. They felt that any statement about the war in the Pacific might tend to cause friction, since the Soviet Union was—as it still is—not at war with Japan.

The most important member of the delegation, perhaps, is the expert on international law, Mr. Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., of New York, legal adviser to Dr. Isador Lubin, also a United States representative on this delegation. Mr. Scandrett's record of avoiding friction with the Soviet Union goes back 16 years to the time when he was associated with the law firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, American legal representatives of Amtorg, the Soviet trade agency, from 1919 to 1923.

According to the Daily Worker, which considers him a great good friend to Soviet Russia, Mr. Scandrett was a prominent signer of the statement in the Daily Worker, July 5, 1943, defending the film Mission to Moscow, a statement which bitterly attacked critics like Prof. John Dewey, who had charged the film with distorting history. Also, he was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union, published in the magazine Soviet Russia Today, issue of November 1937, page 79, along with Mr. VITO MARCANTONIO, and numerous other loyal Communist supporters. He was a sponsor of a dinner given by the editors of this magazine on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red army, February 22, 1943, at the Commodore, New York City, a sponsor of a dinner given by the American-Russia Institute and dedicated to American-Soviet postwar relations at the Commodore, New York City, October 19, 1944. He is a member of the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce, associate and collaborator of the late Alex Gomberg, who was the leading Wall Street promoter of Soviet enterprises in textile and other fields. Gomberg was a brother of a leading Bolshevik who called himself Gorin—his party name, as Stalin is of Djugashvili, and Lenin was of Ulianov. Gorin was very close to Litvinov and was called by Max Eastman "the regular agent between the heads of the Bolshevik Party and its supporting clique in Wall Street."

Just before Mr. Scandrett went to Moscow he is reported to have spoken very plainly on the subject of reparations to various acquaintances. In Mr. Scandrett's view the postwar world will be dominated exclusively by the United States and Russia. There will be no more Germany—only German provinces under Russian, American, British, and French "colonial" administrations.

In these four provinces living standards will be reduced to the level now existing in the Siberian concentration camp and exile areas. In the final analysis, these areas will be ruled by the United Nations Reparations Commission, which will decide just how many Germans will be needed in each province to maintain minimum agricultural production. All German males not required for this minimum production will be drafted into slave battalions, which will be transported under orders of the United States and Soviet Russia, with particular emphasis on their use in restoring the damage done to Russian areas by the war, since the Soviet Union, unlike France, Great Britain, or the United States of America, does not fear the internal competition of slave labor—an already well-established domestic policy there.

No regard is to be paid in the enslavement to the education, family connections, or dependent wives or children of the German deportees. No exemptions will be allowed to priests or pastors. In fact, Mr. Scandrett is quoted as saying a complete agreement has been reached between the United States and the U. S. S. R. on the matter of respect for religion in eastern Europe. Under this alleged agreement the Russian Orthodox Church, recently readopted by the Kremlin, will be given the status of the official religion in the Baltic Republics—Poland, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria. Roman Catholics will be cut off from any pastoral connection with Rome.

As partial confirmation of the latter plan, Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia announced on June 5 that the Roman Catholic Church in Croatia should become independent of Rome and accept a status subordinate to that of the orthodox church.

If these are, indeed, Scandrett's sentiments, there can be little friction between the American and Russian reparations delegations on the subject of international legal questions. Mr. Scandrett's views are identical with those of the official Soviet line as it was promulgated in May 1945 in a booklet called the Treatment of Defeated Germany, written by Mr. V. J. Jerome, and published by the New Century Publishers of New York, the semiofficial printers for the Communist Political Association.

As to how many Americans may agree with Mr. Scandrett and Mr. Jerome, I do not know. But every American must agree that Mr. Grew's statement that we are "leaning over backward" not to give offense to the Soviet Union is certainly true insofar as it applies to the choice of key members of the Reparations Commission sent by us to our allies in Moscow.

Research for Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Research for Health," which was written by me and published in the New York Times of April 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH FOR HEALTH

(By Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Senator from Florida)

A few years ago, when the war was just reaching our shores, an urgent call was sent out for a dried blood plasma concentrate which could be stored in quantity in the crowded confines of modern fighting ships. Space aboard them could not be spared for the bulky equipment needed to handle liquid plasma or whole blood.

In answer to the appeal, a group of medical scientists at Harvard University, financed

by the United States Government, greatly expanded their research on blood. In a period of a few short months they had developed methods of producing huge quantities of a blood-albumin concentrate which has since saved thousands of lives on every one of our far-flung naval and military battle fronts.

But that was not all they found. During the experiments on blood, which were necessary for perfecting the concentrate, the Harvard research workers happened on a curious discovery, far removed from the realms of martial activity. They isolated a blood substance called gamma globulin which turned out to be not only an effective cure, but an actual preventive, for measles. Gamma globulin, after the war, may help eliminate measles from the list of ailments children have to go through before they can be considered grown up. And this is only one of many possible developments which may stem from the blood research project undertaken by the Harvard scientists.

Another, even more extraordinary weapon against disease which has come out of the war, is penicillin. It has already proven irreplaceable in reducing the incidence of fatalities from war wounds, with their dangerous concomitants of peritonitis, osteomyelitis, cellulitis, gas bacillus infection, and so on. Likewise, in the diseases of peace, penicillin is a nearly certain cure for most types of pneumonia, meningitis, septicemia, mastoiditis, sinusitis, and a majority of the human ills caused by the common bacteria. One of the most dramatic new uses for this amazing therapeutic agent is in the fight against syphilis. Only a few short months ago the United States Army announced that it had perfected a course of treatment with penicillin which was curing nearly 90 percent of all men with primary syphilis in seven and a half days, as compared with the weeks and even months necessary with older methods of treatment. Moreover, the penicillin therapy is more effective and much less dangerous or painful than any other treatment used heretofore.

These are only two among dozens of the outstanding discoveries of wartime medical research, DDT, the miracle insecticide, is another; still others are a new method of combating dysentery; a potent vaccine for the prevention of bubonic plague, invaluable new surgical techniques, and a whole category of discoveries in aviation medicine. Many more are still hidden behind the veil of military secrecy.

How did it happen that all these medical miracles were discovered simultaneously? Had we suddenly come upon a rich vein of medical research talent which we had never before tapped?

No, the talent was there. The urge to go forward was there, deep in the heart of every scientist who knew what the possibilities of medical research were. The only thing that was lacking was the money to finance such research.

Indeed, many of the discoveries which seem so new to us have been known for many years, but only as laboratory curiosities. Penicillin, for instance, was first found to have remarkable antibacteriological effects as far back as 1929, when the British scientist Fleming first reported its deadly effects on disease germs. But adequate financing for its development was lacking. It remained merely the subject of test-tube experiments until the demands of military medicine brought money for its production out of hiding.

Or take the components of blood, of which albumin and globulin are only two of several. They had been known for some time. But it took the war, and the provision of Government funds for wartime medical research, to bring about the perfection of methods of producing blood components in quantities large enough to be useful in medical practice.

DDT was actually on the market before the war as a commercial insecticide. It has been packaged and sold by an established pharmaceutical house for several years. The only trouble was that this firm was a long way off—in Switzerland. It was not until the Army issued an emergency request for an improved insecticide to be used in the pest-ridden jungles of the Pacific islands that scientists here in America were given the necessary funds to enable them to test and prove its efficacy, and to improve it by adding the chemicals which today give the substance its astounding penetrative powers.

All these facts add up to one very simple and very shocking statement: It took a world war of catastrophic dimensions to jar enough money out of the national pocket to enable medical research men to conduct their work on an adequate scale.

The relative insufficiency of funds before the war was not due to a lack of medical problems needing study. On the contrary, that there was a pressing need for many types of medical research is evidenced by a few hard facts on the state of the Nation's health.

During the year 1940 nearly 165,000 people died of cancer in the United States; over 536,000 died of diseases of the heart and arteries; and about 107,000 died of diseases of the kidneys. Among them, these three major types of diseases accounted for nearly 57 percent of the actual deaths occurring in 1940.

Yet the sum of only $493,815—or less than 62 cents per death—was granted in 1940 for research into the causes and treatment of these diseases by American philanthropic foundations, the main prewar source of medical research funds.

In 1943 nearly 614,000 people were in nervous and mental hospitals, total charges on Federal, State, and local governments, or on their families. Yet the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, the foremost organization doing research on psychiatric problems, could spend only $38,930—or less than 6¼ cents per hospitalized patient—on research in 1943.

In that same year an estimated 1,917,000 man-years—well over half a billion man-days—of productive working time, and upward of $2,000,000,000 worth of purchasing power, were lost by American workers because of absences from work of 8 days or over due to illness. Yet foundation grants for research on respiratory diseases, such as influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and the common cold, which usually cause between a third and a half of all absences from work due to illness, totaled in 1940 just $163,795.

One final figure. As of October 1944, approximately 5,500,000 men, over 34 percent of the 16,000,000 men aged 18 to 37 examined by Selective Service for the armed forces, had proven so defective or diseased that they either had to be put into IV–F or were given medical disability discharges from the services after having first been accepted for duty. No war wounded are included in either group.

Yet the total funds granted by American foundations for research into all the problems of medicine and health in 1940, the last year for which figures are available, totalled only $4,958,511. More than three times that amount was spent by one corporation alone in 1943 for industrial research on its commercial products. The estimated total expenditures for profit-making industrial research by American corporations reached the astronomical figure of $275,000,000 in 1941—over 55 times the amount granted for nonprofit medical research by American foundations the year previous.

As I have said, philanthropic foundations are the major sources of funds for medical research in this country. The principle national voluntary health agencies spent approximately $810,000 on medical research in 1943, much of which may have come from the foundations. Expenditures by the Federal Government for medical studies in peacetime were very small, and were limited largely to the fields of public health, sanitation, and epidemiology. The amounts for research allocated out of medical school funds cannot be accurately established, since the schools do not keep their books in such a way as to show research expenditures. However, they are known not to have been very large, and are believed to have been decreasing rather than increasing of recent years as a result of shrinkage in medical school incomes from endowments.

In other words, medical research in peacetime has always been seriously under-supported. And yet it is phenomenal how little money actually has been spent by the Government for emergency medical research during the war. The Office of Scientific Research and Development, which was established by President Roosevelt in June 1941, to coordinate and finance all the scientific problems arising from the onset of the war, appropriated only $15,349,826 for medical research during the period ending in December 1944. During the same period the Army, the Navy, and the United States Public Health Service together spent another $15,000,000 for special wartime work on medical problems.

In all, therefore, a total of not much more than $30,300,000 had been expended by the Federal Government for medical research up to the end of 1944. This is approximately 10 percent of the cost of the war to the American people for one day.

But it is only when you start to count up the gains which the Nation has received from the program that its inexpensiveness becomes obvious. To be crassly pecuniary about it, if penicillin alone had saved only 3,030 soldiers' lives—and any Army doctor will tell you that is nothing in comparison with what it really has done—it would have earned for the people the total cost of the whole wartime medical research program in uncollected $10,000 military life-insurance policies alone.

However you look at it, there can be no question that the accomplishments of American medical research have been phenomenal, and phenomenally inexpensive, during the war. I do not think that we can afford to permit this work to slack off when peace comes. I do not think that we can complacently ignore the fact that disease, disability, and premature death are costing the Nation, according to estimates by the Social Security Board, as much as $10,000,000,000 a year in shortened lives, in medical care, in unemployment, and in lost national income and national product.

I believe that we must not only work to cure everyone who is sick, but to discover the medical causes of sickness, if we are to succeed in eliminating this enormous waste of our human and material resources.

The Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, of which I have the honor of being the chairman, is formulating a program for bringing the best existing medical care to everyone living in this country, regardless of his economic status or his geographical location or his race. In this the subcommittee is tackling one of the most important jobs to be done in America today. Yet I feel that we cannot limit ourselves to bringing the benefits of preventive and curative medicine as they exist today to each and every citizen, although we must do that. We must also, and of this there can be no reasonable question, bring the resources of the Federal Government to the aid of those who have the talent and the urgent desire to eliminate the causes of disease, disability, and premature death—the unsung heroes of medical research.

But Federal aid to medical research is necessary not only because of the results to be expected in better health and less disease, although that is of course the major importance of such a program. In addition, anything which will increase the amount of medical research work, add to the number of skilled workers in the field, and give them

and the existing workers better security and higher salaries, as such a Federal program must do, will be of inestimable value in a yet larger program which the President of the United States has set the Nation as an immediate goal: the goal of full employment in the postwar years.

On the 24th of November 1944, President Roosevelt wrote a letter to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. In it the President stated, "The research experience developed by the Office of Scientific Research and Development should be used in the days of peace ahead for the improvement of the national health, the creation of new enterprises bringing new jobs, and betterment of the national standard of living."

Without question the American people are looking forward along these lines. They are expecting, and they will demand a postwar program for full employment which will result in prosperity such as has never before been experienced in this country. They are ready for it, and they also are ready for any change or improvement in the methods of government, of conducting business, and of maintaining national and individual welfare which may be required to bring such a program to fruition.

However, we cannot have full employment as long as we are losing hundreds of millions of man-hours of productive employment a year because of avoidable illnesses and avoidable premature deaths. Nor can we expect full employment as long as we let our human resources in terms of expert medical research scientists and eager, intelligent young research trainees go to waste because of lack of funds. We must, therefore, not only make the benefits of today's medical science available to every one, but we must also employ our medical scientists in the task of improving that science at every point and by every method. A program of medical care for all is only half a program if we do not at the same time devote every effort at our command to making that medical care unnecessary.

There is already a precedent for postwar Federal aid to research. Earlier this month Senator BYRD, of Virginia, offered a bill in the Senate to establish a Research Board for National Security. The bill provides for the expenditure of Federal funds for constant research on new methods of national defense. Only thus can we be certain that our Nation will at all times be strongly protected. But if we can appropriate Federal money for the development of new methods of warfare we can certainly spend whatever we need on the development of new methods of attaining good health for all.

One thing is certain. Penicillin, blood plasma, DDT, and all the other wartime medical discoveries have shown the way. We know now that adequate medical research adequately financed is an integral part of any national health program and of any national program for full employment. I believe that we shall proceed to act upon that knowledge, and that we shall provide the means whereby medical research can pull its full weight in the race for a healthy, busy, and prosperous Nation.

Visits Abroad by Members of Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time in order to correct a misinterpretation of several of my remarks which recently appeared in some of our local newspapers. First, I would like to say that I am not a man who has grown used to astronomical figures. A dollar, a single dollar, is a lot of money to me, it always has been, and I expect that it always will be. However, I hope that I am wise enough to realize that the intelligent expenditure of a dollar can save its producers 10 times, a hundred times, or even a thousand times as much as the original investment. I think any businessman would agree that such an investment would be good business.

I was recently privileged to make a trip to England, and I did not spend $1 of the taxpayers' money. I made the trip at a time when Congress was in recess, and while in Great Britain I used every minute of my time talking with our American GI's about conditions back home and explaining the GI bill of rights.

At the end of one of these speeches I was requested by high military authorities to visit certain air bases in Europe, and give the same information to other servicemen. I consented because I felt it was my patriotic duty to do so. I made as many as two and three speeches per day. I spoke before audiences of thousands of soldiers, often traveling at night, and many times missing my meals, but I was more than happy to do so. My reward was in the fact that not once, but hundreds of times, I was asked this question, "Why does not my Congressman come out here and tell me some of these things?" Many veterans of the last war said to me, "Certainly no Member of Congress came to see us in the last war, to tell us what was being done back home to help us in our readjustment." Needless to say, this was the highest recommendation for my action that I could have asked. However, every experience I had in Europe convinced me more certainly that we must never let another world war happen.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did suggest that it would be a good thing if every Member of Congress could see Buchenwald, and others of the horror camps. I am convinced that such sights seen and reported back to the people would be sound insurance against another world war. I did not say, however, that the cost would be small. In my opinion, compared to the value we would certainly reap, the investment would be a valuable one, and the expense of sending 300 or 400 representatives of the people to Germany would be the best possible investment in permanent peace. It is more or less of an obligation on the part of men who have spent, by their votes, thousands and millions and billions of dollars to wage a war to go, in the interests of peace, and see what that money has bought. The war has cost every American taxpayer thousands of dollars, and the expense of sending the taxpayers' elected agents to the battlefields would cost less than one-fourth of 1 cent per person. Does that seem to you an exorbitant investment, when not only money but lives are at stake? I cannot believe that any person who has sent a relative or a friend into battle would object to a one-fourth of 1 cent risk on the chance that it would keep such heartbreak from America's page in history in the future.

I have not risen to defend myself, Mr. Speaker, this is but a statement of my reasoning, and I hope it clarifies the suggestion which I made regarding future trips for Members of Congress.

Pauper Oath for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello, Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

At this writing five Members of the House and one Member of the Senate have introduced individual bills aimed to eliminate the obnoxious and un-American pauper oath demanded of every veteran seeking hospitalization for non-service-connected ailments or disabilities. Of interest, also, is the fact that every wounded soldier is required to sign this oath if they seek medical aid for illness not traceable to cause of discharge from the armed forces.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration insists and secures the execution of a pauper oath from ex-soldiers who may be in need of medical services, and who cannot establish a service-connected status for the particular ailment.

Little has been written about this pauper oath, therefore, the average veteran has been kept ignorant of the significance or the reasons for this oath.

Veterans' Administration officials are quick to disclaim the implications or the seriousness of this legal requirement, and their stock rebuttal is that the oath is merely routine and meaningless.

Yet when attempts are made to eliminate this routine and unimportant oath the Veteran's Administration sets in motion every means at their command to befuddle the issue and to attempt to stifle criticism.

If the oath is unimportant as the Veterans' Administration contends, then why in the name of logic is it being retained on hospitalization forms, and why are Veterans' Administration authorities so determined to prevent the elimination of the oath?

I repeat as I have said over and over that one of the basic reasons for this oath is to discourage veterans from applying for Government hospitalization, and to encourage the former soldier to give his business to private hospitals or to civilian doctors. If this is not a logical conclusion, then what is the reason behind the insistance of this oath?

When a veteran reaches a point where he must go to a hospital, I contend that there should be no conditional admission. To force a veteran to swear under oath that he is a pauper and to have this oath flanked by penal threats is degrading and un-American. As it stands now, a man to be admitted to a bed must declare himself either a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar. I want it clearly understood that no decent veteran should seek veteran hospitalization if he has the funds to pay for any necessary services in a private hospital.

Here are the bills that have been introduced to date to eliminate the pauper's oath:

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 599—formerly H. R. 5454—In the House of Representatives, January 3, 1945, Mr. SPRINGER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation]

A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government," approved March 20, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 706), is amended to read as follows: "No applicant for the benefits of this section shall be required to state on any form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affair (1) the value of the real and personal property owned by such applicant, or (2) whether or not such applicant is financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care."

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—S. 235—In the Senate of the United States, January 10, 1945, Mr. LANGER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government," approved March 20, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 706), is amended to read as follows: "No applicant for the benefits of this section shall be required to state on any form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (1) the value of the real and personal property owned by such applicant, or (2) whether or not such applicant is financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care."

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 1923—In the House of Representatives, February 1, 1945, Mr. MORRISON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation]

A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government," approved March 20, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 706), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. In addition to the pensions provided in this title the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized under such limitations as he may prescribe, and within the limits of existing Veterans' Administration facilities, to furnish to men discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for disabilities incurred in line of duty or to those in receipt of pension for service-connected disability, and to veterans of any war, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, domiciliary care where they are suffering with permanent disabilities, tuberculosis, or neuropsychiatric ailments and medical and hospital treatment for disease or injuries: *Provided*, That any veteran of any war who was not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, who is in need of hospitalization or domiciliary care, shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation) in any Veterans' Administration facility, within the limitations existing in such facilities, irrespective of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service."

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not require any applicant for hospital treatment or domiciliary care to make any statement, written or oral, with respect to the value of the real or personal property owned by such applicant.

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 2413—In the House of Representatives, February 28, 1945, Mr. WICKERSHAM introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation]

A bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from requiring "pauper oaths" of veterans applying for hospital treatment or domiciliary care, and to eliminate inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite of obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not require any applicant for hospital treatment or domiciliary care to make any statement, written or oral, with respect to (1) the value of the real or personal property owned by such applicant, or (2) the financial ability of such applicant to pay the necessary expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 706), is amended—

(a) By striking out "and is unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor (including transportation to and from the Veterans' Administration facility),"; and

(b) By striking out the last sentence thereof which reads as follows: "The statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses."

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 2587—In the House of Representatives, March 12, 1945, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation]

A bill to dispense with the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under certain laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents

Be it enacted, etc., That any application for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, or any law or regulation administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury shall for all purposes be deemed to have been made under oath or affirmation.

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 2717—In the House of Representatives, March 21, 1945, Mr. SASSCER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation]

A bill to eliminate the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under all laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

Be it enacted, etc., That any application for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or any other law or regulation administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury shall for all purposes be deemed to have been made under oath or affirmation.

Other Members of Congress have expressed support in the hope of removing the pauper oath from the statute books of the Nation. Some of the legislators are Members of the House World War Veterans' Committee. I am pleased to call attention to the following correspondence:

NOVEMBER 23, 1944.

I appreciate very much your letter of the 22d. I favor H. R. 5454—now H. R. 599. In fact, I have just recently filed a rather strong protest with the Veterans' Administration as to this particular matter and I had the matter up with them. I shall be glad to support H. R. 5454 and even sponsor similar legislation.

Thanking you for writing me and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Member of Congress from Florida.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Acknowledging your letter of November 22, 1944: I concur with your position in regard to eliminating the requirement that veterans take the paupers oath, and you can count on me among your supporters in that matter.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
Member of Congress from California.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Answering your letter received today, please be advised that I am in favor of the passage of H. R. 5454.

Sincerely yours,

B. W. KEARNEY,
Member of Congress from New York.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Replying to yours of November 22 regarding H. R. 5454, this is to say that I will not only support the measure on the floor but in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am a member.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
Member of Congress from Mississippi.
(Now resigned from committee.)

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Your letter relative to H. R. 5454, was received this morning. You can rest assured that it is my intention to vote for the bill introduced by Judge SPRINGER. With kind regards.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Member of Congress from South Carolina.

DECEMBER 5, 1944.

I have read your letter of November 22, and the attachment thereto, and I am pleased to inform you that I am in favor of the legislation proposed in H. R. 5454.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress from Illinois.

Assistance has also come from the following Members of Congress: NOBLE J. JOHNSON, of Indiana; GEORGE H. GILLIE, of Indiana, EARL WILSON, of Indiana; CLYDE DOYLE, of California.

The Lost Generation of Scientists

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have already lost one generation of future scientists because we have denuded our colleges and universities of qualified students for scientific courses. Congress should immediately enact the McDonough bill. I recently made a lengthy argument on it.

In this connection I hope you will notice the number of foreign students who are already in this country. A whole generation of scientists has been lost. I think it should command our attention.

[From the Journal of Chemical Education for June 1945]

EDITOR'S OUTLOOK

Good old, big-hearted Uncle Sam! Never a thought for himself and always ready to help the other fellow out of his troubles. Even feeding the rest of the world while he tightens his own belt—which, after all, is but a good, Christian act and not to be criticized.

But now comes the pay-off. Have a look at the registration figures in our graduate schools, to see especially the proportion of foreign students. It was brought to our attention recently that one of the country's largest technical schools has a present registration of about 150 graduate students, of whom over 100 are foreigners. It has also been pointed out that an increasing proportion of Asiatic students are coming to our shores.

We have always advocated international good will; we don't believe in any protective tariff on education; we have always befriended and encouraged every foreign student we have met, and expect to continue to do so, but doesn't there seem to be something wrong with the picture when we turn our young men out of their technical-training courses and send them to the Pacific to make Asia safe for the Asiatics, while their young men in the same age group come here to take the empty places? Maybe it is a good thing that there is someone to keep our graduate schools going, but there is no denying that these young foreigners are being given an advantage from which our own boys are excluded and that they will go back to their own countries equipped to compete on more than favorable terms in the technical professions. We are not suggesting for a moment that we turn the foreign students out, but rather that we should never have turned our own students out.

And if the FIFO discharge policy—first in first out—should by any change prevail, another error will be committed, if we assume, of course, that the important thing is not individual convenience but the greatest long-range good to the country. It is of the utmost importance to put our technical professions back on a normal basis as soon as possible, but the men trained in these fields (and in training for them) were among the last to be drafted into the armed services. Selective Service at least started to do a job of selection.

Now, we should have some selective process of getting men out of the services, in relation to their importance in civilian life. It is understandable that the Army does not want to do the job of selection, but it is said to be receptive to the idea of a selective discharge process if some other agency will establish the basis for selection.

Distribution of foreign students by countries (with exception of Latin-American students)

	Male	Female	Total
Afghanistan	13	0	13
Africa	0	1	1
Albania	1	1	2
Australia	16	14	30
Austria	80	66	146
Bahama Islands	10	6	16
Belgium	24	27	51
Bermuda	10	13	23
British Guiana	36	6	42
British West Indies	18	3	21
Bulgaria	1	7	8
Canada	393	459	852
China	661	162	823
Czechoslovakia	35	37	72
Danzig	1	3	4
Denmark	15	9	24
Dutch East Indies	0	1	1
Dutch Guiana	1	0	1
Dutch West Indies	0	2	2
Egypt	10	2	12
England	53	93	146
Finland	3	2	5
France	43	72	115
Germany	214	187	401
Great Britain	37	50	87
Greece	19	3	22
Greenland	0	1	1
Hungary	21	16	37
Iceland	81	27	108
India	53	22	75
Iran	45	7	52
Iraq	12	3	15
Ireland	5	5	10
Italy	28	23	51
Jamaica	64	29	93
Japan	33	12	45
Java	1	1	2
Korea	10	7	17
Latvia	5	3	8
Lebanon	2	0	2
Liberia	7	4	11
Lithuania	5	6	11
Luxemburg	1	3	4
Morocco	1	0	1
Netherlands	47	33	80
Newfoundland	9	5	14
New Zealand	3	3	6
Nigeria	3	0	3
Norway	13	7	20
Palestine	14	7	21
Persia	3	1	4
Philippine Islands	66	50	116
Poland	71	68	139
Portugal	8	2	10
Rumania	18	9	27
Russia	31	27	58
Scotland	7	3	10
Sierra Leone	2	0	2
Singapore	3	0	3
South Africa	9	4	13
Spain	13	9	22
Sweden	9	12	21
Switzerland	33	27	60
Syria	3	2	5
Thailand	5	0	5
Trinidad	27	5	32
Turkey	197	3	200
Virgin Islands	1	4	5
Wales	0	2	2
West Africa	5	0	5
Yugoslavia	10	5	15
Stateless [1]	14	24	38
Total	2,692	1,707	4,399

[1] 20 of the "Stateless" students listed above gave as their birthplace the following countries:

	Men	Women	Total
Austria	2	2	4
Germany	4	10	14
Russia	1	1	2
Puerto Rican students studying here (these are United States citizens and under draft regulations)	328	265	593

TABLE III.—*Foreign students at Massachusetts Institute of Technology* [1]

Area	Average attendance 1920-39	Registration March 1945	Applications on hand
Latin America	42	99	95
British Empire	14	9	19
Northern Europe	15	4	10
Western Europe	12	14	40
Central and southern Europe	8	13	17
Near East	8	37	61
China	36	95	153
India	7	31	271
Other Far East	14	0	1
Total	156	302	667

[1] Does not include Canadian students since they are classified with United States civilian students.

TABLE IV.—*Massachusetts Institute of Technology registration*

	Civilian undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	United States citizens	Foreign	United States citizens	Foreign	United States citizens	Foreign
1939	2,238	169	645	48	2,883	217
1940	2,239	161	675	63	2,914	224
1941	2,256	133	604	62	2,860	195
1942	2,342	118	528	60	2,870	178
1943	1,984	106	286	69	1,370	175
1944	1,090	89	229	120	1,319	209
1945	675	129	[1] 61	173	871	302

[1] If military and naval officers assigned for special training are included, the number is 173. The figures for 1943-44 include military personnel.

Soviet-American Unity in Victory and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I made in Madison Square Garden in New York City on Thursday, May 31, 1945, as a part of a program entitled "Salute to the GI's."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are privileged spectators this evening of a part of the greatest drama of all time. We see here men who are the unshakeable symbols of Soviet-American unity in victory and in peace.

When the hands of states clasp hands, that is great. When workers of two nations clasp hands, that is greater. When the soldiers of the Soviet Union and the United States joined hand across the Elbe, that was one of the greatest events in human history.

Those young men met in the heart of a continent. They began their fighting march far beyond that continent. They had come across the snows and the steppes. They

had traversed the broad rivers, the wide and infested ocean, over the beaches and over the hedgeways and hills. They had surmounted every obstacle of both nature and of the evil enemy and finally with their feet upon the neck of tyranny they stood triumphant.

They are here tonight to prove that in Soviet-American unity, freedom lives and tyranny is dead. I say tyranny is dead. I mean Mussolini is dead—hanged by the heels and the stench of fascism is being cleaned out of Italy. Nazism is not dead because many Nazis still live but Himmler is dead—Goebbels is dead—Hitler is dead or will be, and soon Goering and Hess and all the rest of their hellish gang will hang in part penance for their crimes, and if we do not sicken of the task of justice too soon, there will be rooted out of German soil the fungus of nazism and Nazis.

If you wish to know whether the United States of America and the United Republics of Russia respect and trust each other, ask these men. If you wish to know whether the fighting men and women of America and the Soviet Union were friends and will be friends, ask these men. If you wish to know whether there is any sense in the loose talk that we and the Soviet Union are bound to fall out and go to war, ask these men and ask the millions of Americans and Russians with whom these men have fought the common enemy.

It is hard for one's mind to reach back from these days of victory to June 1941, when Hitler exulted over his mastery of western Europe, closed in for the kill upon the Soviet people. Memory cannot recreate the sad scenes of those awful days and weeks and months in which the bestial eyes of Hitler feasted through glasses upon the towers of the Kremlin. What was done by the Red Army and the Russian people along every foot and yard and mile of that long road back—what they did in every village and town and city, along every highway and in each forest, has no counterpart in history.

Finally, at Moscow and Stalingrad the flowing tide of evil stopped against the wall of blood and spirit of both Army and people under one of the greatest names in history—Joseph Stalin—and began to ebb. It did not flow back to Berlin however, it was driven back by shell and steel and strength. Finally the Red Army having torn and cut to pieces and smitten down the cowed and conquered "superior race", enveloped Berlin and then met American GI's at the Elbe. When these men clasped hands they welded the two mightiest links in human history.

History is rich with mighty exploits of war, the deeds of the brave and the unconquerable. History's pages are replete with the heroes and the heroines of war. But, pen has not written and words have not described the exploits of the heroes and the heroines, more majestic than those of the Red army.

Something, too, can be proudly said for the GI's who stood on the west bank of the Elbe. The Elbe was a long way from home for them. From the Elbe to the cottonfields of Alabama, the mines of Montana, the plains of the Dakotas, and the rugged hills of New England is a long way, too. Yes; it was a long way from the GI's, the peer of any soldiers in the world, who shook hands with their gallant friends of the Red army, to the American boys who grew up amid the peace and plenty of America. They weren't born or reared to be soldiers. They had no lust to kill or to conquer. They would have sworn when they played Indian or cops and robbers or cowboys that they would never fight wars; yet they outsmarted, outshot, and outfought the best the Nazis had, though they had been spawned for war.

It is a military record that not one turned back until the task was done—the world was free again of the threat of conquest and tyranny.

Now, at long last, there is peace in Europe—enforced peace. Peace for which so many have died, given their limbs, and their faces, and their minds. Peace for which so many have given their homes and their hopes. I wish I could say there was peace everywhere on earth and that the price for world peace had been fully paid.

The Jap, accursed as he is, must yet be finished off and the earth freed of his poison. To that task we are equally, as we were to the defeat of nazism and fascism, dedicated and devoted. But the peace in the Orient will come as it has come in Europe—enforced peace.

I know the western world is saddened by the spectacle we see in Syria. As one who honors and loves France, I must say that it ill becomes France, so recently liberated, so soon to attempt to enslave another people.

Now the question the GI's are asking is what will come of this peace? What sort of a world have they won? Who are these people talking about war with Russia? What do they want? Are they some of these people who preferred Hitler to Russia, who have come out of their hiding and found their voice? Are they really the enemies of communism or of democracy? To hear them you would think that they are defending the institution of private property and our inalienable civil rights. Yet the truth is they hated Roosevelt as much as they hate Stalin, and never was private enterprise so flourishing and civil rights so secure as under that other GI of democracy who has gone on with the GI army of the dead, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Who disseminates this constant stream of poisonous propaganda against Russia, which makes every effort at self-security and preservation on the part of the Russians an act of aggression upon the world and world peace? It is easy to see that it is Russian policy to have friendly states around her borders. Who does not have that policy? Yet have you heard Russia questioning Britain's concern for friendly states across the Channel or what Britain has done in infested Portugal and Spain or Italy or any other area adjacent to her life line or territory? Have you heard Russia say anything about our relations with Mexico or Central and South America or Canada or even about our having bases in the Pacific?

No one will deny, however, that the Soviet Union has taken a great and good part in building the edifice of the United Nations. In fact, you will remember that it was Russia which suggested that full employment for all nations should be one of the objectives of the United Nations. Twice in 9 months has Russia come to American shores and labored unstintingly with us all to build world well-being and world peace upon the graves of the honored dead in this war against tyranny.

Of course Russia will keep her powder dry after the war and keep a lot of it, no doubt. Our GI's who still live and we all are grateful Russia has not just started that policy. We, too, are going to keep our powder dry and keep plenty of it.

God forbid that we should participate ever in another war or that another war should come to curse the earth. We must, if we are to retain, however, the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the fervor of our old freedom declare to the world that whoever enslaves another is our uncompromised enemy and in one way or another we shall break his shackles. If we do not, the war shall not have been fully won and the dead shall have died in vain.

As we stand before the crosses of the dead, as we stand with awed silence before the all-seeing eyes of those fine and fresh young spirits who have died for a decent world, now is the time for us to consecrate ourselves again to a full measure of freedom for the race of man—the "four freedoms" of Franklin D. Roosevelt—freedom of religion, freedom of speech and expression, freedom from fear, freedom from want everywhere in the world.

There were never sadder days than these. There were never so many sacrificed in war, never so much devastated earth, never such wreckage and ruin, never so many broken bodies and wretched spirits as lie in the wake of this terrible war.

Yet when one lifts one's eyes to the horizon and sees the illimitable future which stretches ahead of us, there was never such reason for hope—such hope for peace, such hope for plenty, such hope for happiness for so many as there is today. The call and the cry in peace, as it was in war, is forward, conquer, live. Go out, therefore, you who in your hearts honor these GI's, living and dead, and preach this doctrine of democracy. And add to your faith, works. Man is not only walking upright like a man again, he is running into his new world.

Plan To End World Trade Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an able and timely address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey last night in New York, in which he offered a plan to end world trade curbs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to be here tonight and to extend to all of you, on behalf of the State of New York, warm appreciation and encouragement for the great work you are doing. As far as I know they have not given out any medals in this war to those who have worked so hard on the seven successive war-loan drives. But I do not think any of you need medals to sustain your enthusiasm and energy. None of you has any hope or desire for reward. You are engaged in floating this Seventh War Loan because you know how tremendously important that job is.

New York State has been called upon to play a major part in this as in previous war-loan drives. Nearly $4,000,000,000, more than one-fourth of the total national goal, has been assigned to the quota of our State. That is a staggering sum. Yet I know you will achieve it.

The importance of the work you are doing does not lie alone in the amount of money that is raised. Even more important is the way that money is raised. In fighting total war, money is less important than machines and it can be manufactured more easily. It can be manufactured by a mere stroke of the pen. But to finance the war that way would be unadulterated inflation. It might serve to

finance the war for a time, but it would gravely jeopardize the peace.

AID TO POSTWAR STABILITY

The national goal is to raise one-half this great war loan out of the savings of individuals. Thus you are working not only to win the war but to lay the foundation for economic stability after the war. Only with economic stability can we realize the promise of a lasting peace.

So it is appropriate, I think, to talk with you briefly about what must be done if we are to achieve economic stability and lasting peace in the world.

It will not be enough to crush Japan militarily, as Germany has been crushed. Enduring peace cannot be won on the battlefield alone. Nor will it be won alone by the establishment of the world organization which is now being hammered out in San Francisco.

Real peace will only be achieved if the nations of the world can live and work together in mutual respect and confidence.

In the last World War we were also victorious in the field. But the end of armed conflict did not bring peace. War continued in a different form—the battle royal of economic warfare. It was every nation for itself and devil take the hindmost. In that economic war, stupidity played a greater role than malice. The blind blows struck were aimed unwittingly at friend and foe alike.

Prohibitive tariff barriers, failure to settle the problems of war debts and reparations, a struggle for self-sufficiency led on to currency break-downs, competitive devaluations, quotas, exchange restrictions, clearing agreements, and a progressive descent into authoritarian controls over every aspect of international commerce. Here was a grim game which weakened and divided the nations which carried high the banner of freedom, while the totalitarian aggressors grew bold and strong.

PLAYING WITH DYNAMITE

We all know it is playing with dynamite to repeat those errors of the past. Yet that dynamite already exists. We must recognize that we will emerge from the present war with many wartime restraints on international trade in effect and with many countries impelled by dire necessity toward the establishment of a whole new system of restrictions and controls. In other words, we will end this war with many nations using the implements of exchange restrictions, export and import controls, and other authoritarian devices which appeared at the very end of the last period of peace. The vital question is, Where do we go from here?

Most of the countries of Europe have been impoverished. The wholesale destruction of their industrial plants leaves them in desperate need of imports at a time when they have little to export in exchange. Inevitably such a condition is likely to encourage measures of self-protection to limit and control foreign trade.

The position of Great Britain is particularly significant. She will emerge from the war weakened by the loss of a large part of her foreign investments and owing an enormous short-term debt abroad. Much of her industry will need rebuilding; her foreign trade has been disrupted and her shipping partly destroyed. At the same time she is in need of large imports of food and raw materials. The problem of Britain is serious. It is serious for us as well as for the British, because restoration of a strong and prosperous Britain is essential to world recovery.

Before the war traditionally free-trade Britain had been forced to turn to protection and to a system of empire preference. Now billions in blocked sterling are owed to India, Egypt, and the Dominions. The urge toward Empire preference is stronger than ever, and an influential section of British opinion has urged the creation of a tightly knit sterling bloc within which trade would be encouraged to the exclusion of nonsterling nations.

ECONOMIC WARFARE THREAT

Almost everywhere we look—to the British Empire, the Low Countries, the Scandinavian Nations, France, and other nations—the dangers of renewed economic warfare in the years ahead are great.

We in the United States will emerge from the war with overwhelming power—financial and industrial. We shall have a gigantic burdensome internal debt. But, nevertheless, we shall have great power. Inevtiably the rest of the world wonders how we will use that power. We, beyond all other nations, have the capacity to produce quickly the machinery and goods which virtually every nation will desperately need. There is no question of the huge demand for our exports that will exist. The great question is whether we are prepared to accept payment for these goods in the only sound way that payment can be made—by taking in exchange the goods and services of other nations.

If that question is left in doubt, then, inevitably, we shall see our present allies seeking to protect themselves by import quotas, currency blocs, blocked currencies, and all the freedom-menacing machinery of economic war.

I am not one of those who believe that we have in this country a "mature economy" in the sense of an economy that has lost the capacity to grow and expand under a system of private enterprise. But I do think we have become a mature country, capable of playing a wise and mature role in the community of nations.

I take it we are agreed that we do not intend to see the world fall back into the conflicts and antogonisms of ultranationalism. Certainly, speaking for the Republican Party last year, and consistent with its platform, I made it very clear that I stood for no such proposition. Equally clearly, the Democratic Party stands for no such proposition. The American people have made clear their determination to join with other nations in a world organization to maintain peace. But real peace cannot be achieved merely in the political field. The causes of international strife go deeper than mere unprovoked military aggression. All of the work being done at San Francisco will mean tragically little if economic conflict is to divide the nations.

UNITED STATES CANNOT LIVE ALONE

Our primary objective is to secure peace and prosperity for the United States. But we know that we cannot live alone in the world. Certainly we cannot obtain the healthy, vigorous economy we seek if the rest of the world is sick. We seek an economy of abundance with full opportunity for employment and a rising standard of living. A board, flourishing trade among nations is essential to the establishment of peace and prosperity in the world. This in turn is essential to our own goal of high level employment and a rising standard of living under a system of competitive free enterprise.

In the achievement of these ends the United States must take the lead. Our preponderant economic power makes us the nation which can make the most effective contribution to economic peace and can best afford to take the lead.

How shall we do it? Certainly no single step or action will do it. Many, if not most, of the controlling factors are in the hands of other nations. The United States has never, in peacetimes, taken to government-controlled cartels, exchange controls and restrictions, the widespread use of quotas, or dumping. These are the handicaps to trade which other countries must lead in removing.

But there is much we can do. High tariffs are one barrier we ourselves can lead in reducing, as we have done in recent years and as we shall continue to do under the renewed Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act when the Congress completes action upon it. Beyond that, our country should initiate a world conference for general tariff reductions. Such a conference ought to develop a program for the speedy removal of wartime trade controls and other barriers to the exchange of goods and services among nations. None of these measures can work only one way. This must be a two-way street and serve the primary interest of our own people, or it will not work and will not continue to be supported at home. There are other serious barriers to world-wide economic recovery, including problems of exchange and of uneconomic debt, some of which still remain as a legacy of the First World War.

The 25-year-old foreign government debts to the United States arising from World War I will never be paid because they cannot be paid. We should be honest and intelligent enough to say so officially and cancel them. Along with this should go an immediate repeal of the Johnson Act which forbids private loans to governments and nations now in default on these debts remaining from World War I.

LEND-LEASE SETTLEMENT

Efforts should begin at once toward settlement of the lend-lease obligations arising out of this war. Every action to this end should, in accordance with article VII of the mutual aid agreements, be directed to the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and to the elimination of other trade barriers.

It is an essential part of the lend-lease agreement that the terms and conditions of final settlement shall not be such as to burden commerce, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations. In carrying out this program it may well be that we shall have to cancel a major part of the financial obligations under lend-lease. We are entitled to ask in return that our partners shall fully live up to the other part of their obligations by eliminating barriers to commerce and promoting the betterment of world-wide economic and social relations, as well as the cause of freedom of the individual, for which this war is being fought.

As a part of this whole program the United States should join in the Bretton Woods proposals for the establishment of an international monetary fund and international bank for reconstruction and development. I recognize fully the imperfections of the Bretton Woods plan. The ablest brains of our country were excluded in its preparation and, in many respects, it was a clumsy job. The greatest danger is that this plan may be considered a final solution to the problems of money, credit, and trade. It should be obvious that it provides no final solution but merely a method and an organization through which men can work toward solutions.

If the United States were to look upon Bretton Woods simply as a method of stimulating exports, or if other nations were to consider the fund merely an easy method of obtaining American goods, nothing but disillusionment would follow. But the prolonged debate and the important amendment procured at the insistence of the minority in the House Banking and Currency Committee have already lessened this danger. The interpretations which the American delegates are

to obtain will greatly clarify the functions of the fund and the bank. They will mean that the fund is to be confined to strictly monetary stabilization and may not be used for relief, reconstruction, of other long-term capital requirements, while the bank will be equipped to make general stabilization loans. These interpretations are essential if the plan is to be a success.

A further important safeguard is provided in the proposal to give the fund and the bank a common board of governors. The success or failure of this plan will depend upon the management of the fund and the bank. The various member nations will need to appoint as their representatives men of ability and sound judgment. We would not be justified in abstaining from the proposals for lack of faith in the willingness of ourselves and other nations to appoint such men, and it is essential that we go forward with it.

CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Moreover, I see no reason why an effort should not immediately be made by the United States and Great Britain for the long-term stabilization of the all-important dollar-sterling rate. We must begin now to pick up at least part of the pieces from the wrecked London Economic Conference of 1933.

An overwhelming preponderance of world trade is carried out in these two exchanges—the dollar and the pound sterling. If once the relative value of the pound sterling and of the dollar is settled, the most important step that can possibly be taken toward the ultimate establishment of world-wide currency stability will have been accomplished. Cooperation between the British and ourselves must be a cornerstone in any program of world economic revival.

These are merely some of the measures which should be taken to lay the foundation for economic peace. We cannot expect that all of the difficult economic problems left in the wake of two world wars will be solved in a few months. I have said before, that when the war is over we shall have to wage peace with all the vigor and energy with which we have waged war. We are learning at San Francisco just how hard we must wage peace even to launch upon it. Just as the United States has taken a leading part in the solution of the political problems of lasting peace, so it must take a leading part in the solution of economic problems.

It does not lie wholly within our power to make certain that the world of the future is a world of active trade, expanding commerce, and broadening opportunity. But it does lie within our power to block such a development if we fail to assert the leadership which our strength and prestige demand. In our self-interest we should take the lead in promoting the trade which is the lifeblood of our standard of living, our enterprise system and our individual freedom.

I cannot think of any group better equipped to take leadership in these problems than the men and women who are leaders in our war-financing work. As you push forward in the drive for individual war-bond subscriptions, you are thinking not only of the weapons that money will buy, you are thinking of the billions of savings securely invested for the future, of the safeguards against inflation and the foundations of economic stability thus erected. You are helping the fight for victory over Japan. You are also helping the fight for an American future of broader opportunity, greater individual freedom, higher standards of living and greater security. We want that kind of America and we want that kind of a world.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, at Commencement Exercises, Catholic University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to the graduating class of Catholic University, at Washington, on May 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency, very reverend and reverend fathers, men and women of the class of 1945, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor to be at the Catholic University of America today.

Having been graduated from a university and having subsequently taught school in Philadelphia, I feel some justification in believing that I can at once share the hope that is yours and the wave of relief that what a few years ago seemed a faraway day is at last here.

Since time immemorial, on each commencement day it has been said that the graduates hold opportunity in the palms of their hands. It is not my intention to dispute that statement, but to say that if ever a graduating class must accept the responsibility to grasp the opportunity that is theirs it is the class of 1945.

It is an enormous opportunity and a tremendous responsibility.

Pope Pius, in a recent statement summed up the essence of this opportunity which must be realized, as an inherent desire on the part of man "to create for himself and his own an existence of just freedom not only economic but also political, cultural, and religious."

Institutions of higher learning have, do, and must continue to play a major role in our national life if man's quest to achieve these lofty objectives is to succeed. The reason is quite simple. Education is the fountainhead of modern civilization, and the Catholic Church almost at its very inception contrived a system of education to foster the gospel of Christianity. Our present educational system is, in many respects, the outgrowth of the monastery schools and the subsequent system of education as formalized by St. John Baptist de la Salle, St. Ignatious Loyola, and other leaders of the church.

Aside from its purely academic significance education has made us cognizant of our individual and collective responsibilities to the well being of society. This is a primary function of immeasurable importance to the progress of civilization. However, if its labors are to be beneficial to mankind our educational system, like the church, must be free to perform its stated function without being coerced by foreign spheres of influence.

We have seen the havoc wrought by just such interference in Germany where the ducational system was completely dominated by the Government. The Hitler inspired negation of men's right to some semblance of intellectual freedom has resulted in a whole generation of German Youth so saturated with Hitlerian philosophies that it may take 50 years to erase its influence from the German mind and society.

For the German people it will be a long voyage back to the Elysian field of intellectual freedom.

With you graduates of the Catholic University of America it is another story.

This is a day you will long remember in a year the world will never forget.

Within the month the evil force that has laid waste to half the world these past 5 years has at last been vanquished. Yes, there was just cause for rejoicing VE-day—but there was more reason to think—to think and to remember that the war is far from over, and that even when Japan is defeated we shall not have won the victory until we have won the peace.

As after the last war—as after every conflict to date, history has chronicled the ill-fated efforts of mankind to insure the peace of succeeding generations. From the record, it would seem that peace is an experiment ever doomed to failure and that war, if not altogether a natural state, is at least tenable in the affairs of men and nations.

Our immediate objective in this war—as in every war—is the triumph of our armed forces, the crushing defeat of our adversaries. To this end the armed might of the United Nations has been marshalled to conquer the malignant ideologies of nazism, fascism and the barbarous savagery of the Japanese. The success of the Allies in Europe was hard won.. The redemption of the peoples enslaved by the Japanese in the Pacific has, and will continue to demand the utmost of our armed strength—and not a few American lives until the inevitable victory is ours.

It most certainly will be ours, but that is not the final answer to the peace. We all know that it wasn't the answer after the last war nor will it be after the present conflict has ended.

The restive period between World Wars I and II, instead of being one of peace was, perhaps, the most combustible era in human history. It was a period of extremes, by the so-called golden years of prosperity and by the greatest depression. It was a period of vainglorious self-sufficiency and a world-wide wave of intellectual isolationism that tolerated the rise of dictatorships with an amazing lack of concern. It was an age of indifference to the acts of aggression committed by the Empire of Japan in China, by Italy in Ethiopia, and by the inculcation of false moral and political philosophies into the minds and hearts of German youth by the Nazis that conditioned small nations to fear and the invaders to arrogance and precipitated the frightful war from which we are now just emerging.

We cannot be indifferent to the war, and we cannot be indifferent to the peace, without exposing ourselves to the risk of another war. It was a people's war and it must be a people's peace.

The governments of the United Nations have taken cognizance of the fact and we all realize that whatever terms of peace are eventually resolved, one great factor will determine its success or failure. It is the consideration that must be given its moral values as predicated upon the dignity of man and his right to evolve his own destiny. We cannot foresee what the future will bring; therefore, we of this generation must not again commit the fatal, time-honored error of attempting to regiment—if not plan—the lives of succeeding generations, as was done in Germany. The men engaged in the present struggle are the victims of just such planning after the last war. However, we can, and must, lay a firm foundation for a world organization to guide and help insure

the peace of future generations. We must make that effort, and with God's help we shall succeed.

At Bretton Woods, at Dumbarton Oaks, and again at San Francisco, the United Nations have participated in a series of conferences calculated to pave the way to the formation of a world security organization. They are not the end but the beginning of a program of international conferences that must be continued through the years of peace in order to maintain a vigilant safeguard over that peace—in order to equitably resolve future problems as they arise.

It is, therefore, apparent that the plans for peace must be evolutionary and not static; that the mechanics of a world security organization be geared to change.

To achieve any semblance of world order it will first be necessary to educate the people to an awareness of their individual and collective responsibilities in the democratic system of government. For an organization established to encourage world security is nothing if it is not founded upon true democratic principles and is a practical demonstration of democracy in action.

We Americans, living in the United States, might well ponder the full implications of the word "democracy," for democracy as expounded by our Constitution is only now coming to full fruition. We are only now beginning to activitate pledges already promised us in our Bill of Rights and Constitution.

I mention this because I feel that we should recognize that talk alone will not get us anywhere. Treaties can die over night, agreements be broken, and promises fade away. But, if we the people believe and say of the proposed world security organization—this is the best job that can be done now, and insist that it be made to work, then the hope for enduring peace becomes more than an ideal—it becomes a practical reality.

If we the people keep ourselves constantly informed and are articulate in our desires then no government—local, national, nor world-wide—will dare fail us.

We share with all the plain peoples of the world a common desire for peace. The plain peoples of Russia, of Belgium, or France, England, China—perhaps even the people of Japan want peace. Certainly we do in America.

However, if we simply say—now we have established an organization to maintain the peace and do nothing about it we shall have again been indulging in the naive and curious notion that wars just happen and that peace is determined merely by an accumulation of military victories. Peace is no more an accident than is war. Let us ever remember that single point.

Of late some of the more erudite defeatists in and out of Government have been castigating the efforts of the United Nations toward a security organization as projected at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco. The critics of the Conference may be divided into two camps: the perfectionists, and the disbelievers or confirmed isolationists who disavow the necessity of any such organization. The crux of their arguments seems to revolve around one word—politics.

In its proper usage the word still means the art and science of government despite the fact that virtually every failure, be it war or peace, has been attributed to politics. There is no need to analyze the diverse meanings given that word: suffice to say—in a democracy politics is the driving force that makes the government succeed or fail in its objectives—in the United States we the people are that government.

Our ability to govern ourselves is America's great contribution to the philosophy of government.

The proposed world-security organization is simply an expansion—an extension of that system of representative government to unite the nations in a common bond of understanding for the sole purpose of fostering peace and good will.

At a terrible cost in millions of lives, human misery, broken hearts, and untold destruction, the free peoples of the world have come to realize that nations like human beings are interdependent. These war years have conclusively proved that no nation can successfully isolate itself economically or intellectually from the community of nations. We must learn to live with our neighboring nations in friendship and peace or die side by side in another war.

At best, our efforts are frought with human fralities, but it is our sacred responsibility to make an effort toward world peace. We are doing that today. If in this vast undertaking the projected security organization has the whole-hearted approbation of the people—and I believe that it has—I am confident that it will succeed.

Educated opinion in America, mobilized to the support of this great endeavor will help insure that success.

However, if through the years it is to remain an effective instrument for world peace, it will be necessary to educate our youth to a full realization of the enormous responsibilities to which they will fall heir.

The war has instilled in us a realistic and earnest awareness of the need for collective world security as, perhaps, the last hope for enduring peace. We have grown politically adult these past few years and it is only natural that as a nation we should assume the responsibilities incidental to that high estate. Out of the carnage we of our time leave a legacy of promise and hope of fulfillment to future generations. We of today are only erecting the signposts that point the way to lasting peace. It remains for them—for you—to triumph over adversity where in the past men have failed.

I think it opportune at this time to recall the words of hope President Roosevelt expressed in a letter to Pope Pius XII in a letter written in 1939:

"I believe that while statesmen are considering a new order of things, the new order may well be at hand. I believe that it is even now being built, silently but inevitably, in the hearts of masses whose voices are not heard, but whose common faith will write the final history of our time. They know that unless there is belief in some guiding principle and some trust in a divine plan, nations are without light, and people perish. They know that the civilization handed down to us by our fathers was built by men and women who knew in their hearts that all were brothers because they were children of God. They believe that by His will, enmities can be healed; that in His mercy, the weak can find deliverance and the strong can find grace in helping the weak.

"In the grief and terror of the hour, these quiet voices, if they can be heard, may yet tell of the rebuilding of the world.

"Because the people of this Nation have come to a realization that time and distance no longer exist in the older sense, they understand that that which harms one segment of humanity harms all the rest. They know that only by friendly association between the seekers of light and the seekers of peace everywhere can the forces of evil be overcome.

"When the time shall come for the re-establishment of world peace on a surer foundation, it is of the utmost importance to humanity and to religion that common ideals shall have united expression."

They were prophetic words. The time to lay that surer foundation for world peace is at hand.

We are now on our way in the realization that freedom is more than a word—it's a way of life without which civilization is impossible.

Let us then complete the task before us. Let us implore the divine guidance of the Prince of Peace in the sacred mission which now engages our minds and hearts that in the years to come the nations and peoples of the world may live in peace and good will toward men.

Slaughter Quotas on Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 I called the attention of the House to the order of OPA establishing slaughter quotas on cattle in all nonfederally inspected plants, and cited this order as the principal cause of the shortage of beef in certain areas. Today I received a letter from Mr. Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, in which he seeks to defend this order.

In my opinion Mr. Bowles absolutely fails to justify this order and I have written him to again urge that this ill-advised order be canceled immediately. Unless this is done we witness the anomalous situation of having a surplus of cattle, but the housewife is unable to purchase beef because the OPA refuses the local packer permission to process the same. This order is contributing to the shortage of meat in this country, just at a time when we should be making every effort to make additional supplies available. I am still hoping that the OPA will admit a mistake has been made and correct the same by revoking this order at the earliest possible moment.

I include herein the letter from Mr. Bowles and my reply:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1945.

The Honorable J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHENOWETH: It has been called to my attention that on May 15 you discussed on the floor of the House the meat shortage, attributing it to the recent order which establishes slaughter quotas on cattle in all nonfederally inspected packing plants.

We can perhaps best illustrate the need for the order by pointing to the situation in Chicago. Here is the greatest meat-packing center of the world. Yet it is experiencing a severe meat shortage. Why? Because the military is forcing Chicago packers to set aside approximately 50 percent of all their meat for war needs. In the case of beef, the set-aside covers 60 percent of all good and choice, and 80 percent of utility and canner and cutter beef. That leaves very little meat for civilians normally supplied by these packing plants. Federally inspected plants are the only ones permitted under act of Congress to ship meat across State lines. Therefore nonfederally inspected plants have

greatly expanded their kill in order to fill civilian demands in their own local areas.

The main purpose of this order is to secure a fair distribution of available meat supplies for all the people in all areas, and to halt black-market operations. The order does not in any way affect total available supplies.

Along with the slaughter regulation the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has outlined a program which is designed to increase the feeding of beef cattle, to encourage the maximum slaughter of cattle and hogs, and to improve the distribution of meat. This program was based on recommendations made not only by this agency, but by WFA, the Army Defense Supply Corporation, and also by the Senate and House committee which investigated the food supply. The effects of this program cannot be felt for several months. But we believe that in the interim, the control of slaughtering quotas in nonfederally inspected plants will result in a better distribution of the supplies now procurable.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1945.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Your letter of the 6th relative to the remarks I made on the floor of the House on May 15 concerning the meat shortage is before me. I appreciate hearing from you and have read your observations with great interest.

I might state that I have been in almost daily touch with your Meat Section, and have spent a large part of my time during the past few weeks endeavoring to obtain increased slaughtering quotas for small packing plants in my district. All of this work was made necessary by the unfortunate order establishing slaughter quotas on cattle in nonfederally inspected packing plants.

In almost every mail I receive a letter from one of these small packers complaining that his quota is exhausted, his customers are clamoring for meat, plenty of cattle are available, but he is prohibited from processing the same by reason of this order. As I stated in my remarks, the theory of such an order is very fine, but in practice it is drying up the meat supplies in many areas of this country.

I might state that since I called the attention of Congress to this situation I have received letters from packers and merchants in both Texas and Wyoming, advising that the same conditions prevail in those States. I read just recently where the Governor of Kansas had called upon you to rescind this order, and that many of the Kansas packers were being compelled to suspend operations.

You state in your letter that the purpose of the order is "to secure a fair distribution of available meat supplies for all the people in all areas, and to halt black-market operations." I respectfully submit that you are accomplishing the very opposite to what you are attempting to do.

The denial of meat supplies to areas where cattle are plentiful, packing facilities are available, and supplies are short does not in any way add to the amount of meat available in other areas. If this order is continued, cattle which are now ready for market will be returned to the ranges. These cattle are now in good condition and will make a fair grade of beef. They will not produce the same quality of meat if put back on grass for the summer.

I am trying to make the point that there is a large supply of cattle that should be slaughtered at this time, and any delay means the loss of a considerable amount of beef. It naturally follows that the black market will get a good proportion of these cattle, as the producer cannot continue to hold them and hesitates to send them back to grass pasture.

From all information reaching me the number of cattle arriving at the large packing centers is in excess of last year's receipts. I have been following the Denver market rather closely and according to the figures up to May 30 of this year, 30,532 more cattle had been received in 1945 than for the corresponding period in 1944.

I mention this to prove my point that by allowing the nonfederally inspected plants to process the cattle available in their local communities you are not withholding cattle from the large markets. According to all of my information, the supply is sufficient to take care of both the large and small packers.

During the past few years these small packing plants have been producing more and more of the meat supplies in their respective areas. This condition has been brought about in part by the heavy demands made upon the large packers by the Army, Navy, and lend-lease programs. Now, when you tell the small local packer that his operations will be restricted and curtailed, you are virtually advising the people of that area that their usual supply of meat will not be available. I cannot conceive how you can continue to justify such an order in the face of the maladjustments that are becoming more and more apparent every day.

I respectfully urge that you reconsider your decision in this matter and that you immediately rescind this order establishing slaughter quotas on cattle in nonfederally inspected plants. To do otherwise would be to encourage black-market operations, and I am sure that all of us can agree that it is most desirable to channel as much of our meat supplies as possible through legitimate packers. My information is that black-market operations are increasing and no doubt will continue to do so if aided and abetted by the unwise policies now being followed.

Sincerely,

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Member of Congress.

Opposition to Missouri Valley Authority Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Battle of Befuddlement," relating to the efforts to prevent the passage of the Missouri Valley Authority bill. The editorial was published in the Progressive of Monday, June 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF BEFUDDLEMENT

As the Progressive recently pointed out editorially, it is worth $106,000,000 a year to the Power Trust to prevent the passage of legislation authorizing the Missouri Valley Authority. That is the difference between what the people of the Missouri Valley are paying for their electricity and what the people of the Tennessee Valley are paying for theirs.

It was to be expected that the power gang wouldn't give up this kind of cash without a struggle. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana Democrat and sponsor of the MVA bill, has disclosed that the utilities are sparing no expense to fight MVA. They have hired a large public-relations agency in New York to carry on the battle of befuddlement.

Nine of this agency's slick promoters have been sent into the Missouri Valley at a salary of $1,000 a month each, and large expense accounts. Their purpose is to foment opposition to the MVA proposal. That MVA is the only feasible plan for developing the valley on a multipurpose basis can be seen from the fact that the utilities are not fighting hydroelectric development if it is done by the Army Engineers or the Reclamation Bureau, but only by an MVA.

The expenses involved in this campaign, it is reported, will come from the old power-trust game of kickback. This was the method used, you will recall, in the notorious Union Electric scandals in St. Louis, Mo. It consists of the utilities overpaying someone for services or materials and then having the money kicked back to the utility. The utility books thus show an ostensibly legitimate expense, but fail to show that the money was returned for illegitimate purposes.

This type of a campaign is expensive, to be sure. But expensive as it is, it will never cost $106,000,000 a year.

West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with real pleasure and pride on my part as Congressman from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California, and with consent given, I herein set forth and refer to as part of my remarks a most inspiring and strengthening letter which I received from one of our gallant, ambitious, and forthright young men in uniform. It is from Pvt. Robert V. Young, and came from him some place in the world other than the continental United States.

Promptly upon coming to this great Congress, having already studied the problem involved, and obtained the benefit of the opinion of several members of the Army and of the Navy, as well as others, I announced that all of my appointments to Annapolis and West Point would be made from the results of competitive examination, to be given by the United States Civil Service Commission. I announced this by newspaper, letters, radio broadcasts, and every way possible.

I have received the utmost cooperation from everyone in the Civil Service Commission in this connection, even to the extent of their utmost cooperation in

response to my request that boys in uniform, wherever they are in the world, also be enabled to take the competitive examination which is being given in my congressional district at Long Beach on July 28 for the cadets of 1946.

Every one of the lads and their parents but one uniformly and emphatically stated they felt this method of distributing these few highly privileged responsibilities and honors was the most democratic and most thorough way.

Naturally, a few lads spread over the face of the world in the United States armed forces had not yet heard of my earlier announcement of my policy as their Congressman. So I received two letters from such lads asking for appointments. But upon these lads learning of the competitive basis, they, too, complimented me upon my policy announced. They, too, entered the list to compete with their fellow Americans in the American way of making meritorious advancement and progress.

This letter from the son of one of my constituents is so significant; it is so patriotic; it says so much in so few words as to the worth-while elements which enter into American lads' decisions, that I obtained permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that all Americans, young and old, might read it and also be strengthened and inspired by it. Such inducements as this lad has to have the worthy ambition to enter West Point are the foundation stone of the prowess and the efficiency of American officers and enlisted men. The letter follows:

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My father has written me of his conversation with you in Long Beach, and he has advised that I write you concerning your 1945 West Point appointment.

I studied for the Academy's entrance examinations all through high school so that I might follow my brother's footsteps there; and when he was killed in an air accident in 1943 at the Academy I was given a third alternate appointment through the office of the Secretary of War. My brother's ill-fortuned death had made me more determined than ever to gain admission to the Academy, and this appointment gave me the chance to go to West Point at my own expense and take the June entrance examinations there.

I studied continuously until June, and managed then to pass the entire examination, both mentally and physically. However, as the principal candidate also passed, I was not admitted at that time.

Being in the Army has served to strengthen my desire to have a share in the greatness of West Point. I want the cleanness, the strength, the honor, and love of country that only West Point can give to a man. In my brother and his classmates I have seen the type of man the Academy delivers, and I want greatly to be of a common caliber with them. I am asking for your appointment, Mr. DOYLE, that I may join them in a greater service to my country than I can render here. The fighting is important now, but tomorrow it will be the planning—your job, sir; and I hope through West Point, mine.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT V. YOUNG.

Associate Justice Jackson's Report on Trials for War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD text of Associate Justice Jackson's report to the President on the trials for war criminals. Having been a member of the Senate committee which investigated the concentration camps in Germany, the report is of great interest to me, and I am sure it will be of great interest to all the people of the United States, as well as to the legal profession of the world, because it outlines views which are expressed by Associate Justice Jackson, who is to be the chief prosecutor on beha'f of this country in connection with what will probably be some of the most renowned international trials in the history of the world.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to report accomplishments during the month since you named me as chief of counsel for the United States in prosecuting the principal Axis war criminals.

In brief, I have selected staffs from the several services, departments, and agencies concerned; worked out a plan for preparation, briefing, and trial of the cases; allocated the work among the several agencies; instructed those engaged in collecting or processing evidence; visited the European theater to expedite the examination of captured documents and the interrogation of witnesses and prisoners; coordinated our preparation of the main case with preparation by judge advocates of many cases not included in my responsibilities; and arranged cooperation and mutual assistance with the United Nations War Crimes Commission and with counsel appointed to represent the United Kingdom in the joint prosecution.

I

The responsibilities you have conferred on me extend only to "the case of major criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the governments of the Allies," as provided in the Moscow declaration of November 1, 1943, by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin. It does not include localized cases of any kind.

Accordingly, in visiting the European theater, I attempted to establish standards to segregate from our case against the principal offenders, cases against many other offenders and to expedite their trial.

These cases fall into three principal classes:

1. The first class comprises offenses against military personnel of the United States—such, for example, as the killing of American airmen who crash-landed, and other Americans who became prisoners of war.

In order to insure effective military operation, the field forces from time immemorial have dealt with such offenses on the spot. Authorization of this prompt procedure, however, had been withdrawn because of the fear of stimulating retaliation through execution of captured Americans on trumped-up charges. The surrender of Germany and liberation of our prisoners has ended that danger.

Summary action advocated

The morale and safety of our own troops and effective government of the control area seemed to require prompt resumption of summary dealing with this type of case. Such proceedings are likely to disclose evidence helpful to the case against the major criminals and will not prejudice it in view of the measures I have suggested to preserve evidence and to prevent premature execution of those who are potential defendants or witnesses in the major case.

I flew to Paris and Frankfort and conferred with Generals Eisenhower, Smith, Clay, and Betts, among others, and arranged to have a representative on hand to clear questions of conflict in any particular case. We also arranged an exchange of evidence between my staff and the theater judge advocate's staff.

The officials of other countries were most anxious to help. For example, the French brought to General Donovan and me in Paris evidence that civilians in Germany had beaten to death with wrenches three American airmen. They had obtained from the German burgomeister identification of the killers, had taken them into custody, and offered to deliver them to our forces.

Cases such as this are not infrequent. Under the arrangements perfected, the military authorities are enabled to move in cases of this class without delay. Some are already under way; some by now have been tried and verdicts rendered. Some concentration camp cases are also soon to go on trial.

Trials by local authorities

2. A second class of offenders, the prosecution of which will not interfere with the major case, consists of those who, under the Moscow Declaration, are to be sent back to the scene of their crimes for trial by local authorities. These comprise localized offenses or atrocities against persons or property, usually of civilians of countries formerly occupied by Germany. The part of the United States in these cases consists of the identification of offenders and the surrender on demand of those who are within our control.

The United Nations War Crimes Commission is especially concerned with cases of this kind. It represents many of the United Nations, with the exception of Russia. It has been usefully engaged as a body with which the aggrieved of all the United Nations have recorded their accusations and evidence. Lord Wright, representing Australia, is the Chairman of this Commission, and Lt. Col. Joseph V. Hodgson is the United States representative.

In London I conferred with Lord Wright and Colonel Hodgson in an effort to coordinate our work with that of the Commission wherever there might be danger of conflict or duplication. There was no difficulty in arriving at an understanding for mutual exchange of information. We undertook to respond to requests for any evidence in our possession against those listed with the Commission as criminals and to cooperate with each of the United Nations in efforts to bring this class of offenders to justice.

Requests for the surrender of persons held by American forces may present diplomatic or political problems which are not my responsibility. But so far as my work is concerned, I advised the Commission, as well as the appropriate American authorities, that

there is no objection to the surrender of any person except on grounds that we want him as a defendant or as a witness in the major case.

Third class of cases

3. In a third class of cases, each country, of course, is free to prosecute treason charges in its own tribunals and under its own laws against its own traitorous nationals—Quislings, Lavals, Lord Haw Haws, and the like.

The consequence of these arrangements is that preparations for the prosecution of major war criminals will not impede or delay prosecution of other offenders. In these latter cases, however, the number of known offenses is likely to exceed greatly the number of prosecutions, because witnesses are rarely able satisfactorily to identify particular soldiers in uniform whose acts they have witnessed.

This difficulty of adequately identifying individual perpetrators of atrocities and crimes makes it the more important that we proceed against the top officials and organizations responsible for originating the criminal policies, for only by so doing can there be just retribution for many of the most brutal acts.

II

Over a month ago the United States proposed to the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, and France a specific plan, in writing, that these four powers join in a protocol establishing an international military tribunal, defining the jurisdiction and powers of the tribunal, naming the categories of acts declared to be crimes, and describing those individuals and organizations to be placed on trial. Negotiation of such an agreement between the four powers is not yet complete.

In view of the immensity of our task, it did not seem wise to await consummation of international arrangements before proceeding with preparation of the American case. Accordingly, I went to Paris, to American Army headquarters at Frankfort and Wiesbaden, and to London, for the purpose of assembling, organizing, and instructing personnel from the existing services and agencies and getting the different organizations coordinated and at work on the evidence. I uniformly met with eager cooperation.

The custody and treatment of war criminals and suspects appeared to require immediate attention. I asked the War Department to deny those prisoners who are suspected war criminals the privileges which would appertain to their rank if they were merely prisoners of war; to assemble them at convenient and secure locations for interrogation by our staff; to deny them access to the press; and to hold them in the close confinement ordinarily given suspected criminals.

The War Department has been subjected to some criticism from the press for these measures, for which it is fair that I should acknowledge responsibility. The most elementary considerations for insuring a fair trial and for the success of our case suggest the imprudence of permitting these prisoners to be interviewed indiscriminately or to use the facilities of the press to convey information to each other and to criminals yet uncaptured.

Our choice is between treating them as honorable prisoners of war with the privileges of their ranks, or to classify them as war criminals, in which case they should be treated as such. I have assurances from the War Department that those likely to be accused as war criminals will be kept in close confinement and stern control.

Conferences in London

Since a considerable part of our evidence has been assembled in London, I went there on May 28 with General Donovan to arrange for its examination, and to confer with the United Nations War Crimes Commission and with officials of the British Government responsible for the prosecution of war criminals.

We had extended conferences with the newly appointed Attorney General, the Lord Chancellor, the Foreign Secretary, the Treasury Solicitor, and others. On May 29, Prime Minister Churchill announced in the House of Commons that Attorney General Sir David Maxwell Fyfe had been appointed to represent the United Kingdom in the prosecution. Following this announcement, members of my staff and I held extended conferences with the Attorney General and his staff. The sum of these conferences is that the British are taking steps parallel with our own to clear the military and localized cases for immediate trial and to effect a complete interchange of evidence and a coordination of planning and preparation of the case by the British and American representatives.

Despite the fact that the prosecution of the major war criminals involves problems of no mean dimensions, I am able to report that no substantial differences exist between the United Kingdom representatives and ourselves, and that minor differences have been adjusted easily as one or the other of us advanced the better reasons for his view.

The Provisional Government of the French Republic has advised that it accepts in principle the American proposals for trials before an international military tribunal. It is expected to designate its representative shortly.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, while not yet committed, has been kept informed of our steps and there is no reason to doubt that it will unite in the prosecution. We propose to make provision for others of the United Nations to become adherents to the agreement.

III

The time, I think, has come when it is appropriate to outline the basic features of the plan of prosecution on which we are tentatively proceeding in preparing the case of the United States.

1. The American case is being prepared on the assumption that an inescapable responsibility rests upon this country to conduct inquiry, preferably in association with others, but alone if necessary, into the culpability of those whom there is probably cause to accuse of atrocities and other crimes.

We have many such men in our possession. What shall we do with them? We could, of course, set them at large without a hearing. But it has cost unmeasured thousands of American lives to beat and find these men. To free them without a trial would mock the dead and make cynics of the living.

On the other hand, we could execute or otherwise punish them without a hearing. But undiscriminating executions or punishments without definite findings of guilt, fairly arrived at, would violate pledges repeatedly given and would not set easily on the American conscience or be remembered by our children with pride.

The only other course is to determine the innocence or guilt of the accused after a hearing as dispassionate as the times and the horrors we deal with will permit and upon a record that will leave our reasons and motives clear.

Fair hearings required

2. These hearings, however, must not be regarded in the same light as a trial under our system, where defense is a matter of constitutional right. Fair hearings for the accused are, of course, required to make sure that we punish only the right men and for the right reasons. But the procedure of these hearings may properly bar obstructive and dilatory tactics resorted to by defendants in our ordinary criminal trials.

Nor should such a defense be recognized as the obsolete doctrine that a head of state is immune from legal liability. There is more than a suspicion that this idea is a relic of the doctrine of the divine right of kings. It is, in any event, inconsistent with the position we take toward our own officials, who are frequently brought to court at the suit of citizens who allege their rights to have been invaded.

We do not accept the paradox that legal responsibility should be the least where power is the greatest. We stand on the principle of responsible government declared some three centuries ago to King James by Lord Chief Justice Coke, who proclaimed that even a King is still under God and the law.

With the doctrine of immunity of a head of state usually is coupled another, that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. It will be noticed that the combination of these two doctrines means that nobody is responsible. Society as modernly organized cannot tolerate so broad an area of official irresponsibility.

Plea of superior orders

There is doubtless a sphere in which the defense of obedience to superior orders should prevail. If a conscripted or enlisted soldier is put on a firing squad, he should not be held responsible for the validity of the sentence he carried out. But the case may be greatly altered where one has discretion because of rank or the latitude of his orders. And, of course, the defense of superior orders cannot apply in the case of voluntary participation in a criminal or conspiratorial organization, such as the Gestapo or the SS.

An accused should be allowed to show the facts about superior orders. The tribunal can then determine whether they constitute a defense or merely extenuating circumstances, or perhaps carry no weight at all.

3. Whom will we accuse and put to their defense? We will accuse a large number of individuals and officials who were in authority in the government, in the military establishment, including the general staff, and in the financial, industrial and economic life of Germany who by all civilized standards are probably to be common criminals. We also propose to establish the criminal character of several voluntary organizations which have played a cruel and controlling part in subjugating first the German people and then their neighbors.

It is not, of course, suggested that a person should be judged a criminal merely because he voted for certain candidates or maintained political affiliations in the sense that we in America support political parties. Organizations such as the Gestapo and the SS were direct action units and were recruited from volunteers accepted only because of aptitude for and fanatical devotion to their violent purposes.

Accused organizations

In examining the accused organizations in the trial, it is our proposal to demonstrate their declared and covert objectives, methods of recruitment, structure, lines of responsibility, and methods of effectuating their programs.

In this trial important representative members will be allowed to defend their organizations as well as themselves. The best practicable notice will be given that named organizations stand accused and that any member is privileged to appear and join in their defense.

If in the main trial an organization is found to be criminal, the second stage will be to identify and try before regular military tribunals individual members not already personally convicted in the principal cases.

Findings in the main trial that an organization is criminal in nature will be conclusive in any subsequent proceedings against individual members. The individual member will thereafter be allowed to plead only personal defenses or extenuating circumstances such as that he joined under duress, and as to those defenses he should have the burden of proof.

There is nothing novel in the idea that one may lose a part of or all his defense if he fails to assert it in an appointed forum at an earlier time. In United States wartime legislation this principle has been utilized and sustained as consistent with our concept of due process of law.

Major defendants

4. Our case against the major defendants is concerned with the Nazi master plan, not with individual barbarities and perversions which occurred independently of any central plan. The groundwork of our case must be factually authentic and constitute a well-documented history of what we are convinced was a grand, concerted pattern to incite and commit the aggressions and barbarities which have shocked the world.

We must not forget that when the Nazi plans were boldly proclaimed they were so extravagant that the world refused to take them seriously. Unless we write the record of this movement with clarity and precision, we cannot blame the future if in days of peace it finds incredible the accusatory generalities uttered during the war. We must establish incredible events by credible evidence.

5. What specifically are the crimes with which these individuals and organizations should be charged, and what marks their conduct as criminal?

There is, of course, real danger that trials of this character will become enmeshed in voluminous particulars of wrongs committed by individual Germans throughout the course of the war, and in the multitude of doctrinal disputes which are part of a lawyer's paraphernalia.

We can save ourselves from those pitfalls if our test of what legally is crime gives recognition to those things which fundamentally outraged the conscience of the American people and brought them finally to the conviction that their own liberty and civilization could not persist in the same world with the Nazi power.

Gage of criminality

Those acts which offended the conscience of our people were criminal by standards generally accepted in all civilized countries, and I believe that we may proceed to punish those responsible in full accord with both our own traditions of fairness and with standards of just conduct which have been internationally accepted.

I think also that through these trials we should be able to establish that a process of retribution by law awaits those who in the future similarly attack civilization.

Before stating these offenses in legal terms and concepts, let me recall what it was that affronted the sense of justice of our people. Early in the Nazi regime, people of this country came to look upon the Nazi Government as not constituting a legitimate state pursuing the legitimate objective of a member of the international community. They came to view the Nazis as a band of brigands, set on subverting within Germany every vestige of a rule of law which would entitle an aggregation of people to be looked upon collectively as a member of the family of nations.

Our people were outraged by the oppressions, the cruelest forms of torture, the large-scale murder, and the wholesale confiscation of property which initiated the Nazi regime within Germany. They witnessed persecution of the greatest enormity on religious, political, and racial grounds, the break-down of trade unions, and the liquidation of all religious and moral influences.

This was not the legitimate activity of a state within its own boundaries, but was preparatory to the launching of an international course of aggression and was with the evil intention, openly expressed by the Nazis, of capturing the form of the German State as an instrumentality for spreading their rule to other countries.

Our people felt that these were the deepest offenses against the international law described in the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 as including the "laws of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience."

International pillage program

Once these international brigands, the top leaders of the Nazi Party, the SS, and the Gestapo, had firmly established themselves within Germany by terrorism and crime, they immediately set out on a course of international pillage. They bribed, debased, and incited to treason the citizens and subjects of other nations for the purpose of establishing their fifth columns of corruption and sabotage within those nations.

They ignored the commonest obligations of one state respecting the internal affairs of another. They lightly made and promptly broke international engagements as a part of their settled policy to deceive, corrupt, and overwhelm. They made, and made only to violate, pledges respecting the demilitarized Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and Russia. They did not hesitate to instigate the Japanese to treacherous attack on the United States.

Our people saw in this succession of events the destruction of the minimum elements of trust which can hold the community of nations together in peace and progress. Then, in consummation of their plan, the Nazis swooped down upon the nations they had deceived and ruthlessly conquered them. They flagrantly violated the obligations which states, including their own, have undertaken by convention or tradition as a part of the rules of land warfare and of the law of the sea.

Cities wantonly destroyed

They wantonly destroyed cities like Rotterdam for no military purpose. They wiped out whole populations, as at Lidice, where no military purposes were to be served. They confiscated property of the Poles and gave it to party members. They transported in labor battalions great sectors of the civilian populations of the conquered countries. They refused the ordinary protections of law to the populations which they enslaved.

The feeling of outrage grew in this country, and it became more and more felt that these were crimes committed against us and against the whole society of civilized nations by a band of brigands who had seized the instrumentality of a state.

I believe that those instincts of our people were right and that they should guide us as the fundamental tests of criminality. We propose to punish acts which have been regarded as criminal since the time of Cain and have been so written in every civilized code.

In arranging these trials we must also bear in mind the aspirations with which our people have faced the sacrifices of war. After we entered the war, and as we expended our men and our wealth to stamp out these wrongs, it was the universal feeling of our people that out of this war should come unmistakable rules and workable machinery from which any who might contemplate another era of brigandage would know that they would be held personally responsible and would be personally punished.

Our people have been waiting for these trials in the spirit of Woodrow Wilson, who hoped to "give to international law the kind of vitality which it can only have if it is a real expression of our moral judgment."

Chances against top Nazis

Against this background it may be useful to restate in more technical lawyer's terms the legal charges against the top Nazi leaders and those voluntary associations such as the SS and Gestapo which clustered about them and were ever the prime instrumentalities, first, in capturing the German State, and then in directing the German State to its spoliations against the rest of the world:

(A) Atrocities and offenses against persons or property constituting violations of international law, including the laws, rules, and customs of land and naval warfare. The rules of warfare are well established and generally accepted by the nations. They make offenses of such conduct as killing of the wounded, refusal of quarter, ill treatment of prisoners of war, firing on undefended localities, poisoning of wells and streams, pillage and wanton destruction, and ill-treatment of inhabitants in occupied territory.

(B) Atrocities and offenses, including atrocities and persecutions on racial or religious grounds, committed since 1933. This is only to recognize the principles of criminal law as they are generally observed in civilized states. These principles have been assimilated as a part of international law at least since 1907. The Fourth Hague Convention provided that inhabitants and belligerents shall remain under the protection and the rule of "the principles of the law of nations, as they result from the usage established among civilized peoples, from the laws of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience."

(C) Invasions of other countries and initiation of wars of aggression in violation of international law or treaties.

The persons to be reached by these charges will be determined by the rule of liability, common to all legal systems, that all who participate in the formulation or execution of a criminal plan involving multiple crimes are liable for each of the offenses committed and responsible for the acts of each other. All are liable who have incited, ordered, procured, or counseled the commission of such acts, or who have taken what the Moscow declaration describes as "a consenting part" therein.

IV

The legal position which the United States will maintain, being thus based on the common sense of justice, is relatively simple and nontechnical. We must not permit it to be complicated or obscured by sterile legalisms developed in the age of imperialism to make war respectable.

Doubtless what appeals to men of good will and common sense as the crime which comprehends all lesser crimes is the crime of making unjustifiable war. War necessarily is a calculated series of killings, of destructions of property, of oppressions. Such acts unquestionably would be criminal except that international law throws a mantle of protection around acts which otherwise would be crimes, when committed in pursuit of legitimate warfare.

In this they are distinguished from the same acts in the pursuit of piracy or brigandage which have been considered punishable wherever and by whomever the guilty are caught.

But international law as taught in the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth century generally declared that warmaking was not illegal and no crime at law. Summarized by a standard authority, its attitude was that "both parties to every war are regarded as being in an identical legal position, and consequently as being possessed of equal rights."

This, however, was a departure from the doctrine taught by Grotius, the father of international law, that there is a distinction between the just and the unjust war—the war of defense and the war of aggression.

Status of international law

International law is more than a scholarly collection of abstract and immutable principles. It is an outgrowth of treaties or agreements between nations and of accepted customs. But every custom has its origin in some single act, and every agreement has to be initiated by the action of some state. Unless we are prepared to abandon every principle of growth for international law, we cannot deny that our own day has its right to institute customs and to conclude agreements that will themselves become sources of a newer and strengthened international law.

International law is not capable of development by legislation, for there is no continuously sitting international legislature. Innovations and revisions in international law are brought about by the action of governments designed to meet a change in circumstances. It grows, as did the common law, through decisions reached from time to time in adapting settled principles to new situations. Hence, I am not disturbed by the lack of precedent for the inquiry we propose to conduct.

After the shock to civilization of the last World War, however, a marked reversion to the earlier and sounder doctrines of international law took place. By the time the Nazis came to power it was thoroughly established that launching an aggressive war or the institution of war by treachery was illegal and that the defense of legitimate warfare was no longer available to those who engaged in such an enterprise. It is high time that we act on the juridical principle that aggressive war making is illegal and criminal.

War that is justifiable

The reestablishment of the principle of justifiable war is traceable in many steps. One of the most significant is the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, by which Germany, Italy, and Japan, in common with ourselves and practically all the nations of the world, renounced war as an instrument of national policy, bound themselves to seek the settlement of disputes only by pacific means, and condemned recourse to war for the solution of international controversies.

Unless this pact altered the legal status of wars of aggression, it has no meaning at all and comes close to being an act of deception. In 1932, Mr. Stimson, as Secretary of State, gave voice to the American concept of its effect. He said: "War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal throughout practically the entire world. It is no longer to be the source and subject of rights. It is no longer to be the principle around which the duties, the conduct, and the rights of nations revolve. It is an illegal thing. * * * By that very act we have made obsolete many legal precedents and have given the legal profession the task of reexamining many of its codes and treaties."

This pact constitutes only one in a series of acts which have reversed the viewpoint that all war is legal and have brought international law into harmony with the common sense of mankind—that unjustifiable war is a crime.

Geneva protocol of 1924

Without attempting an exhaustive catalog, we may mention the Geneva protocol of 1924 for the pacific settlement of international disputes, signed by the representatives of 48 governments, which declared that "a war of aggression constitutes * * * an international crime."

The eighth Assembly of the League of Nations in 1927, on unanimous resolution of the representatives of 48 member nations, including Germany, declared that a war of aggression constitutes an international crime. At the sixth Pan-American Conference of 1928 the 21 American Republics unanimously adopted a resolution stating that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

The United States is vitally interested in recognizing the principle that treaties renouncing war have juridical as well as political meaning. We relied upon the Briand-Kellogg Pact and made it the cornerstone of our national policy. We neglected our armaments and our war machine in reliance upon it.

All violations of it, wherever started, menace our peace as we now have good reason to know. An attack on the foundations of international relations cannot be regarded as anything less than a crime against the international community, which may properly vindicate the integrity of its fundamental compacts by punishing aggressors.

We therefore propose to charge that a war of aggression is a crime, and that modern international law has abolished the defense that those who incite or wage it are engaged in legitimate business. Thus may the forces of the law be mobilized on the side of peace.

Any legal position asserted on behalf of the United States will have considerable significance in the future evolution of international law. In untroubled times, progress toward an effective rule of law in the international community is slow indeed. Inertia rests more heavily upon the society of nations than upon any other society.

Now we stand at one of those rare moments when the thought and institutions and habits of the world have been shaken by the impact of world war on the lives of countless millions. Such occasions rarely come and quickly pass. We are put under a heavy responsibility to see that our behavior during this unsettled period will direct the world's thought toward a firmer enforcement of the laws of international conduct, so as to make war less attractive to those who have governments and the destinies of peoples in their power.

V

I have left until last the first question which you and the American people are asking—when can this trial start and how long will it take? I should be glad to answer if the answer were within my control. But it would be foolhardy to name dates which depend upon the action of other governments and of many agencies. Inability to fix definite dates, however, would not excuse failure to state my attitude toward the time and duration of trial.

I know that the public has a deep sense of urgency about these trials. Because I, too, feel a sense of urgency I have proceeded with the preparation of the American case before completion of the diplomatic exchanges concerning the tribunal to hear it and the agreement under which we are to work.

We must, however, recognize the existence of serious difficulties to be overcome in preparation of the case. It is no criticism to say that until the surrender of Germany the primary objective of the military intelligence services was naturally to gather military information rather than to prepare a legal case for trial.

We must now sift and compress within a workable scope voluminous evidence relating to a multitude of crimes committed in several countries and participated in by thousands of actors over a decade of time. The preparation must cover military, naval, diplomatic, political, and commercial aggressions.

The evidence is scattered among various agencies and in the hands of several armies. The captured documentary evidence—literally tons of orders, records, and reports—is largely in foreign languages. An immense amount of work is necessary to bring this evidence together physically, to select what is useful, to integrate it into a case, to overlook no relevant detail and at the same time and at all costs to avoid becoming lost in a wilderness of single instances.

Some sacrifice of perfection to speed can wisely be made and, of course, urgency overrides every personal convenience and comfort for all of us who are engaged in this work.

Full preparation essential

Beyond this I will not go in prophecy. The task of making this record complete and accurate, while memories are fresh, while witnesses are living, and while a tribunal is available, is too important to the future opinion of the world to be undertaken before the case can be sufficiently prepared to make a creditable presentation intelligent. Informed and sober opinion will not be satisfied with less.

The trial must not be protracted in duration by anything that is obstructive or dilatory, but we must see that it is fair and deliberative and not discredited in times to come by any mob spirit. Those who have regard for the good name of the United States as a symbol of justice under law would not have me proceed otherwise.

May I add that your personal encouragement and support have been a source of strength and inspiration to every member of my staff, as well as to me, as we go forward with a task so immense that it can never be done completely or perfectly, but which we hope to do acceptably.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

For a Permanent FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune for Thursday, June 7, 1945:

The Republican Party pledged backing for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission in its 1944 platform. The Republican administration in New York led the States with legislation to combat unfair practices locally. Representative MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, introduced in Congress a bill to combat racial or religious discrimination in industry which crosses State boundaries. On Tuesday President Truman put the full weight of the Democratic administration back of that bill. He urged the Rules Committee to speed it to the floor of the House for debate.

The Norton bill is a composite of bills sponsored by six Republican and six Democratic Representatives. A similar bill has bipartisan sponsorship in the Senate. It has the support of great labor unions, of a long list of national church and civic organizations. It is being considered at a strategic time, at the close of the most savage of world wars fought, in part, to repudiate the arrogant and insupportable ambition of one race

to exploit or suppress others. There would seem to be no reason whatever why this bill should not speedily be made the law of the land, reaffirming the principle of equal opportunity for all.

The bill forbids discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry by: (1) Agencies of the Federal Government; (2) Federal contractors and subcontractors; (3) employers of six or more persons whose operations affect interstate or foreign commerce; and (4) labor unions whose practices affect interstate commerce. It dictates no social practices, invades no local legislative province. It sets up a commission similar to the one now operating under Executive order, to receive and investigate complaints, to secure voluntary adjustments, to conduct full and fair hearings, and, finally, to issue a decision and order. The order, however, cannot be enforced without court approval; if it has court approval, violation will be punishable as contempt of court. The Commission itself can impose no civil or criminal penalties whatsoever. It is a moderate bill.

We believe that FEPC should be legitimized and given permanent status by the Congress. An intransigent minority from the South would like to see it die. But the legislation is of too great importance just now, not only nationally but in its effect on world councils, to admit of politics or prejudices as usual. We hope that it may be enacted promptly.

FEPC Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star, June 6, 1945:

The Fair Employment Practice Committee is faced with another threat to its existence.

Last week the House Appropriations Committee, in reporting out the supply bill for the war agencies, failed to make any provision for FEPC funds. This was a deliberate omission, the theory being that there is no cause to continue a temporary agency created by Executive order when legislation is pending for the establishment of a permanent FEPC. But this is a line of reasoning which ignores the practical aspects of the matter.

Unless it is granted an appropriation the present FEPC will cease to function at the end of this month. Nor is there the slightest chance that a permanent FEPC will be in existence by that time. On the contrary, the legislation to set up a permanent agency is facing a long, hard fight in Congress, and there is no assurance that it will be enacted in any form at this session. Consequently, unless funds are appropriated for the existing FEPC, there will be, at best, a long period of time during a critical phase of reconversion when there will be no governmental agency to deal with the important problem of discrimination in employment.

On its record the FEPC deserves a better fate. During 1944 the agency docketed 3,835 cases. Satisfactory adjustments were obtained in 1,324 cases, the great bulk of the remaining complaints being dismissed because of insufficient evidence, lack of merit or lack of jurisdiction. These statistics indicate that the temporary FEPC deserves to be continued until Congress acts on the pending legislation to create a permanent agency. but if this is to be done, the Senate must take the initiative in making available the appropriation which the House committee was unwilling to recommend.

Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that appeared in the McLean County (N. Dak.) Independent of May 31 last, together with three postal cards dated May 31, June 1, and June 3, respectively, showing the number of tractors and combines and other farm machinery being exported to Canada through Portal, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the article and postal cards were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCREASE POSSIBLE IN FARM MACHINERY

Farm machinery manufactures have been given the green light by WPB for increased production through removal on July 1 of production quota limitations for both large and small manufacturers and a broadened list of farm implements using rubber tires which may be manufactured.

Large producers whose total net sales of all products were $500,000 or more in 1941 are still required to obtain an approved schedule from WPB for each item of farm machinery and equipment that they plan to make after July 1. Monthly reports of production by large producers are still required. Both large and small producers are to continue to receive allotments of controlled materials and other priority assistance. The new order has eliminated the requirement that nonfarm users must have a rating to buy farm machinery and equipment. All orders for farm machinery, equipment and repair parts are to be treated as unrated, unless they are from one of the military agencies, WPB has requested producers to advise dealers.

PORTAL, N. DAK., *May 31, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: There were exported at Portal on May 30, 1945; eight small John Deere combines on rubber; six Case combines on rubber; five Case tractors on rubber; six Cockshutt tractors on rubber, two of each size; four John Deer threshers No. 36, two on steel, two rubber.

Sincerely,

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

PORTAL, N. DAK., *June 1, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: Exported at Portal May 31, 1945: four large McCormick Deering combines on rubber; two large John Deere combines on steel; one McCormick Deering and two John Deere threshers on rubber.

Was advised that most shipments are in boxcars. I can count only those on flatcars.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

PORTAL, N. DAK., *June 3, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: There were exported on flat cars, June 2, 1945: five Case tractors on rubber; two John Deere No. 36 threshers, one steel, one rubber; four McCormick Deering self-propelled combines, No. 123, on rubber.

June 3, 1945: three large John Deere combines on rubber; five John Deere tractors on rubber.

Remember, I can't see what's in boxcars.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Why I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay entitled "Why I Am an American," by George J. Chryssikos, of New York.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM AN AMERICAN

(By George J. Chryssikos)

In these critical and momentous times, when the United States of America is fighting for its life, and millions of young men and young women are risking their precious lives for our right to exist as a free Nation, it is incumbent upon all of us to be self-conscious and deeply cognizant of our duties, opportunities, and responsibilities as citizens of this democracy. We hear it said every day that we are fighting to preserve the American way of life. To understand the meaning of that expression, it is necessary to know what characteristics make one an American. Once these are determined, one proceeds automatically to search for them throughout the depth and length of one's innermost self in order to be convinced of their possession. It is then only that we consciously ascertain why we are Americans.

The need of every American to participate actively as a real citizen in the affairs of this great Republic led, so significantly, to the consecration of I Am an American Day. To be an American, new or old, is more than a privilege. It is a responsibility, a trust, to be administered for humanity. On this day, in the midst of this unprecedented war, which has taken the Stars and Stripes to all continents, the American Nation lifts its heart and awakens its mind in veneration of the splendid traditions, the high ideals of its forefathers, and the virtues which enabled the American people to rise from their lowly beginnings in the time of the Revolution to their present unequalled position in the world.

But it is only on I Am an American Day that the question is asked of us: How are we going to prove ourselves worthy perpetuators of these traditions and these ideals? And on every day the answer is the same, and it is always a simple one: By being good Americans. We call ourselves Americans, don't we? The Americans who made the United States such a wonderful country, were good Americans. Were it not for the fact that they were good Americans, this would not be so good a land to live in.

And how did they start, those Americans who made America for us? What was their equipment for the tremendous task which they undertook on the morrow of the revolution? Nothing but their will to create a better world for themselves and for all American generations to come; nothing but their individual virtues, their faith in themselves and the Almighty, who helps those who help themselves; nothing but their hard-working habits, their perseverance and, of course, their intelligence. They did not even have the benefit of previous examples set for their guidance or of traditions from which to draw inspiration. On the contrary, they knew that they had to create traditions for their successors and to inspire them with their example. The knowledge of this, perhaps, made them more deeply conscious of their responsibility and fanned the flame of their enthusiasm for their great undertaking.

Yes, this is a good country to live in, in fact a country unique in the world, and we ought to be thankful to the men and women who made it. Let us not forget, however, that goodness is an infinite quality—a quality capable of endless expansion. Even good America can become a better America. And this is precisely the job of young men and young women. Let us not forget also that goodness in this imperfect and ever-evolving world of ours is always found mixed with evil. It is the job of every succeeding American generation to weed out evil from the field of American goodness and to leave the positive elements of the character of this country in a purer and nobler form.

Past generations have performed their tasks with the result that American history presents a picture of continuous improvement and progress. To do our part we must, above all, know ourselves. "Know yourself," admonished Socrates, and it is as true in our day as it was in his. When we have achieved that, our Americanism will enable us to strive and to struggle successfully for the continuation of the process of improvement of our national home.

We call ourselves Americans. But what does it mean to be an American? A purposeful restudy of American history will give us the answer. It will reveal to us the moral character of the American we should strive to be—his attitudes, his soul, his aspirations, his motives, and his creative tools. Let us search ourselves thoroughly and persistently and we will find ourselves possessors of the same moral character. Let us dig it out, awaken it, and put it to work for our country and for ourselves.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: Why am I an American? Simply because I live in America and call it my country? Because I was born of American parents or of naturalized American citizens? Or is it because I have something intangible in common with the Americans of the past who put the seal of their spirit and the imprint of their hands on this land?

A little thought will convince anyone that the latter is the correct answer. Americanism is a spiritual quality, a disposition of the mind and the heart. It is the will to be an American, a good and useful citizen of this country. Objectively, Americanism is the treasury of American tradition, the moral inheritance of the Nation. Subjectively, Americanism is one's eagerness to follow the American examples of the past, to make active and full use of the capital of American tradition, to develop and enrich the American heritage, and to further embellish the American picture.

Loyalty to the country and to her flag is of course included in the meaning of Americanism. Loyalty alone, however, is not sufficient to make one a real American. Loyalty must be accompanied with acts which are typically American, acts which are of the same character and have the same effect as those of the men and women who made this such a wonderful country.

Our country is in a war which it must win in order to survive and to preserve its liberty. Knowing this, should we consider it sufficient for a citizen to declare his or her loyalty to the flag? Certainly not. One must also be ready to defend the flag even at the risk of losing one's life or limb. But even this is not enough. Americans must strive at all times to make the national flag the symbol of high ideals, a flag worth fighting for, a flag which stands for all that is noble and sacred and worthy among civilized people.

Our flag is the symbol of freedom; it is in our hearts, however, that the love of freedom resides. One of the reasons, therefore, for which we call ourselves Americans is that we are a liberty-loving people. Our flag is the symbol of justice, because we who call ourselves Americans believe in justice. Our flag is the symbol of humanity, because we Americans are humane. Our flag is the symbol of civilization, because we Americans are dedicated to the preservation and advancement of civilization. Our flag is the symbol of progress, because American generations have devoted their lives to progress, have shown themselves capable of progress. They have believed that the realization of the hopes and aspirations of humanity lies in continuous progress. Our flag is, finally, the hope of humanity, because the American people believe in the brotherhood of man within and without the boundaries of their homeland. By word and deed, they have shown their devotion to that principle and are ready to do everything in their power to bring about its universal adoption as the basis of international relations.

To be an American, then, means to share all the ideals of the American people and to be ready to serve them. To make real Americans of our youth is the task of school, church, and family. That is their supreme duty. Let it be understood, however, that they are not required to develop any peculiar or novel type of human beings because the moral values which the term Americanism expresses are those which make better men and women in any climate. They are the moral values which all true philosophers have recognized through the ages as the imperishable treasures of civilized society. Any good man and any good woman can be a good American. No matter what our ancestry has been, no matter where we or our parents were born, no matter what our race or creed is, if we are bent on being good, we are first-class Americans.

In some other countries and in recent years, mad adventurers have undertaken to recast human character in order to create a new type of man to suit their purposes. Their moral code and their political principles are the exact opposite of all that is inherent in the meaning of Americanism. They have used the school as a factory of distorted souls. They have reduced the family to the status of a purveyor of living robots without conscience, without ideas of their own, without an independent will, without self-respect, and without that sense of responsibility and self-reliance which are the characteristics of good citizens and worthy members of society. They have even tried, and with some small measure of success, to make the church an instrument of the policy which tends to separate man from God by infusing an evil spirit where the Creator planted the seed of goodness. This sacrilegious policy has borne fruit—the only fruit that could be expected from it—violence, bloodshed and misery among men and the threat of extinction of civilization.

Americanism condemns all that. We are at war with the countries where such distorted ideas prevail, and we are going to defeat them. Our system of government, guaranteed by the vigilance of freedom-loving citizens, precludes the possibility of tyrants turning the people into a herd of animals marching at their command. Our schools, instead of forging tools for malevolent despots to use for their own purposes, are trying to bring forth the best that is in youth, so that they can serve themselves and society with the aid of the positive qualities of their nature. American schools do not subscribe to the doctrine of certain German pedagogs who teach, "Break the character of the child and make a new one for him." Our teachers believe that all that a child's character needs is selective cultivation and the development of those elements which bring him nearer to his Creator.

To all who want to assure themselves that they are Americans and to all who want to know just why they are Americans, I would recommend careful reading of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. The founding fathers recognized and publicly proclaimed certain truths, which have become the guiding principles of American policy and American life. If we believe in them, we are Americans. And, vice versa, we are Americans because we believe in them. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, so we affirm that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. * * *"

This political creed of America is supplemented by the recognition of certain particular rights, without which there can be no liberty and the pursuit of happiness becomes impossible. As a result of this recognition, we enjoy, in this country, all the privileges which are denied to the peoples of countries ruled by autocrats. We can express our opinions without fear of punishment; we have a free press, which keeps us informed of what is happening about us and exercises the right of criticism. We can worship our God in our own way without interference from public authority or from private persons.

American citizenship is a priceless possession. However, Americanism implies duties as well as rights; but the duties which are imposed on us are such as to work for the benefit of the citizenry as a whole and not of individuals or groups invested with power to exact their performance from us. America is our common garden to which every citizen is expected to contribute his share of work and from which every citizen is entitled to reap his share of the fruit.

Here in the Western Hemisphere there has arisen a modern Phoenix based on the noblest principles of Christian civilization. Its ethical system is the perfected idealism of Plato and Aristotle; its laws are the realization of the legislation of Solon and Justinian. Here we find the sons and daughters of all the peoples of the earth gathered to create a new nation dedicated to the service of humanity. Therefore, there is no grander epic than that of 130,000,000 people cemented into one loyal nation pledged to the support of the principles of democracy and working conscientiously with their hands and intellects, their hearts and souls, to build a nation upon these foundation stones: Liberty, justice, equality.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 20, 1945.*

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the letter which I include herein from "Bob" dated May 19, 1945, comes from the distinguished son of another patriotic American home in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California, and I include it by consent granted.

Briefly, however, part of the background of this letter coming to me from this distinguished lad's parents is that a request came to me from them to ascertain whether or not under the rules and policy of the War Department, this distinguished lad was now entitled to come home. I made inquiry for these heart-torn parents and you can judge from the boy's letter that the information sent him was that he could not be allowed to come home yet. But you will notice I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that apparently the lad, himself, had not made the request. Apparently it was the well-founded fears of the parents and meritorious domestic conditions surrounding the home which caused these patriotic parents to ask their Congressman to find out what the rules of the game of war were, as applied to their distinguished son.

So the parents sent this distinguished lad, who was fighting for our freedom, the information which, of course, was that the boy could not come home yet. The boy had not yet received my letter which I also wrote him explaining. Of course the boy did not know I was making the request about his case. This explains his mention of his Congressman in the letter to his parents in response to their letter to him.

Mr. Speaker, the letter tells its own story so much better than tongue could tell or pen could scribble—I submit it to all those who read, and know that I will have unanimous agreement that it is one of the most inspiring letters that an American lad, in almost momentary danger of being killed by the enemy, could possibly write his parents. It is worth reading over and over again and then framing in the hearts and minds of all Americans.

The reading of these two letters from these two distinguished American lads, both on the fighting front, makes me as their Congressman daily more determined never to get physically, mentally, or spiritually tired, or lack faith, that the freedoms of democracy for which these boys fight must be achieved and that I, as their Congressman, together with all the other Members of this great legislative body, must tenaciously tackle every problem, every day, in every way possible, to achieve victory for the same principles here on the home front.

MAY 19, 1945.

DEAR FOLKS: Today I received two letters from you. I was very surprised to hear of you getting the letter from Congressman DOYLE. I haven't received it. Apparently it has something to do with an effort to get me home.

As far as I am concerned no fellow ever had a better family than I have, and more than anything else, I want to be with you. But, you can, I am sure, understand something of what I feel. It isn't just being patriotic or eager—I just have to do my part. Maybe this next part is poor psychology, but several of my buddies from VT–98 are dead. First, naturally, is Yearsley; the second is my other roommate from Los Alamitos, Ensign Tschudin, the one you met in the lounge the day before I left; a third is Ensign Chaney, he was standing outside by his car talking to his girl and said "hello" as we went by; a fourth is Ensign Hilliard, he went through Oxnard and Los Alamitos with me—they have all been killed. And there are others—fellows you didn't know; Ensign Habbob, Ensign O'Brien, Ensign Dawson. After things like that I can't come home and say I have done my share. Until I have really been in combat and have done my best, I don't want to, and I wouldn't want you to expect me to come home. It won't be too long and I'll come through okay as long as I know you believe I am doing what is right. So let's all do our best at what is right—my job is here, yours is there—backing me up. We'll make out okay.

Well, that's enough of that. I just hope you can understand and please try not to worry too much.

Everything here is fine and I feel perfectly wonderful. From your letters the milk is really coming through, first letter 116 cans, the second 120 cans. Nice work.

I hope you keep on doing as well and please take care of yourself for

Your loving son,

BOB.

Failure of American Propaganda in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include extracts from a letter which I have received from one of my constituents who is now on active duty in Europe as a lieutenant in the United States Navy. The letter reveals a situation in Europe which should be of interest to every Member of the Congress:

PARIS, *May 28, 1945.*

DEAR MR. GARY: * * * America is fast losing the war in Europe. Saturday night at dinner with a celebrated French artist, another young lady of royal lineage, and others of distinction, I heard the same sentiments expressed that are increasingly prevalent in Paris and France—"Britain won the war." Without discounting Britain's noble efforts, the future peace of the world is jeopardized if the peoples of Europe underestimate the part and power of America. It is well to leave additional occupation troops here to strengthen our hand in peace parleys, but troops quartered in German or outlying camps elsewhere do not sell the story to the people, and it is the memory of the people that will be our hope. What we need is positive propaganda to emphasize and dramatize America's contributions and the might we control in men and production. In this we are failing utterly. The man who lights the fire under the responsible parties will render our country a great service if we but take appropriate action. It may well appear that I am unduly excited, but I assure you I am merely recording the general feeling among many of our people who are in a position to see what is developing. An Army colonel, who at home was a member of the board of directors of a large Baltimore bank and is reputed to be in line for the presidency of a railroad back home, remarked the other day when speaking of the matter, "I don't see how people can be so misinformed." And in a presumably well-informed group of French men and women the other night, the suggestion that American matériel had been of help to the Russian advances was greeted with hoots of laughter.

Actions of the British support this evaluation of the value of positive propaganda. Only last week they opened a huge exhibit to dramatize the fact that Britain won the war, and visitors to the Grand Palais come away convinced. In the 3 months the exhibit is scheduled to run, tens of thousands of converts will be spreading the word. They chose colorful General Montgomery to open the exhibit, after laying a wreath on the Unknown Soldier's Tomb and parading down the Champs Elysees to the cheers of the Paris populace. The exhibit features battle scenes, equipment, simulated jungle, moving pictures, and telling propaganda blurbs. All is designed to heighten appreciation of Britain's war efforts and as is to be expected is selected material and figures, but the sum total is the distinct impression that from Alemein to the French coast and thence across the Rhine, Britain won the war. A dangling paratrooper features a display extolling the triumph of British arms at Nijmegen and Arnheim, with no mention of American troops who shared that horror. Our troops were there; I lost a brother there. The triumph of the secret weapon "Mulberry" is placed up, but the tons of matériel and thousands of troops who crossed the beaches at Omaha and Utah are not mentioned. And so it goes; all true, but not the whole story, nor calculated to be the whole story, but giving the impression of completeness to those who know no better. Figures on British production of war weopans stun you with their weight but comparison to the whole appear only when favorable or favorably put, such as "seven-tenths of all matériel used by the armies of Great Britain were manufactured in Great Britain." And so it goes. The French have several exhibits designed to exploit the feats of Le Clerc's division or of the First Free French Division.

My complaint is not that Britain is smart enough to sell herself as the savior of a continent, but that America, cockily and even arrogantly, assumes that her story needs no telling—a gross error in our thinking. In our preoccupation with the unfinished war in the Pacific, let us not leave until the full job is done here and that includes telling the peoples of Europe how that victory was obtained. We scuttle our chances of peace if we leave those people unaware of the might that lies back of our words in the councils of the nations. Let us march a hundred thousand of our homeward-bound soldiers down the Champs Elysees advertised as a few of the millions of Americans who fought to make France free. Let us drive a division or two of our armored divisions down the same street placarded as a token of the armored might forged in the "arsenal of

democracy" to free a continent of tyranny. Dress the whole with bands galore and supplement with exhibits and other media to bring the facts to them. Let us drive home the story now, not with words alone but with an avalanche of might.

I am no authority on the nature of the French people, but in my 11 months here I have come to know that no people may more truthfully cry, "I love a parade," nor are more impressed by one. England knows our manpower and matériel; they still speak of the "invasion of 1942," but the continental nations need to be told promptly and vigorously and impressively. If you can help to have that done, I say again you will have truly served the cause of peace.

When I started this I had no intention of writing at such length, but I feel that our inactivity on this score is so real a threat to ultimate and continuing peace that I risk your frown at its receipt. It might have been written by anyone of a dozen or more fellow officers with whom I work, for they feel as do I and vehemently express themselves.

Scientist Warns to Watch Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nation's News of May 29, 1945:

SCIENTIST WARNS TO WATCH RUSSIA

Many wise observers of foreign policy and adept students of political science believe that if Josef Stalin could properly adapt Russia's natural resources to industrial advantage and apply the whole, he could dictate world policy through hard-fisted military domination of Europe. It is believed that Russia in such a position would become a serious threat to America's free way of life.

It is being recalled that Russia's successful prosecution of the war against Germany is due largely to the help she received from the United States, and there are many who believe Russia would be too grateful to this Nation to ever take advantage of America's good nature. Still others point out that Russia takes the attitude that the United States was pracically forced to the charitable position of lend lease to save her own skin and keep the European fracas as far as possible from her ports of entry.

The other day America's fears could well have been advanced as being soundly founded in the warnings of Dr. Henry B. Hass, head of the chemistry division of Purdue University.

Speaking before a commercial group in Chicago, Dr. Hass pointed out that America must keep pace with, or ahead, of Russia in the matter of industrial research lest Russia outstrip the United States in future years. Dr. Hass said that this could be the final result if America's present ratio of expenditures for industrial research isn't changed.

Fact is Dr. Hass warned the British also when, speaking strictly in terms of ratios, he said, "While the United States is spending 0.3 percent and Britain 0.1 percent, Russia is spending 1 percent," and he added, "If the order isn't changed the future lineup of the three nations may be foreseen in these expenditures.

"At the start of the war, the United States made a mistake in not reserving manpower for technical training, the scientist said. Both England and Russia have continued educating thousands of scientists in the war period.

"The greatest and newest force in American life is organized industrial research," now it is just a baby.

"In 1939, a total of $300,000,000 was spent for research in this country, while the aggregate has risen now to $500,000,000. The only limit is the supply of technically trained manpower."

At the present time, American industry could use 50,000 engineers, Dr. Hass advised.

Smaller War Plants Corporation Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, created the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Three pieces of legislation enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress placed new important duties upon the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the matters of reconversion, contract termination and settlement of claims, and loans to veterans.

Since June 1, when appropriation bill H. R. 3368 was reported out, the Surplus Property Board issued its regulation No. 59, dated June 2, designating the Smaller War Plants Corporation as buying agent, or clearinghouse, on all purchases for veterans desirous of obtaining surplus items for any commercial, industrial, manufacturing, financial, service, medical, dental, or legal enterprise, with an invested capital not exceeding $50,000. It placed on the Corporation the responsibility of determining whether the veteran has a good chance of success in his business venture.

By this delegation of authority, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, in its 102 offices throughout the Nation, will, after July 1, 1945, receive applications from all returning veterans for surplus property they need to go into any type of business, or profession, or farming. Each veteran can obtain up to $2,500 worth, under a first priority, on the most favorable terms and conditions. They can purchase for cash, or, under special circumstances, on credit.

The above delegation of authority will greatly increase the work of the corporation and will require additional personnel. Surveys among servicemen indicate at least 1,000,000 desire to set up their own business or profession, not including farming, on return to civilian life. Therefore, several millions of dollars may be needed for administration. Each veteran must have personal attention, and be given assistance in determining his needs, and making his request therefor.

It is regrettable the Appropriations Committee had no way of knowing of these heavy additional duties, before reporting out the bill. It appears certain $7,000,000 will not be sufficient to provide full and adequate assistance to returning veterans, in addition to the other increased duties and mandates placed upon the Smaller War Plants Corporation under laws enacted by Congress. Returning veterans must not be brushed off, slighted, or neglected in their requests for any type of surplus property they wish to acquire to enable them to engage in any and all kinds of business or professional enterprise, or farming.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Times of May 19, 1945, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Since the death of President Roosevelt, there has been considerable discussion in and out of the Halls of Congress on the question of succession to the Presidency. Under a law passed in 1886, if both the President and Vice President die, the Secretary of State shall succeed to the Presidency.

The present Secretary of State is Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. It is no reflection on him personally that many persons do not believe the man holding his office should become President in the event Mr. Truman should meet with death. Mr. Truman, by appointing another Secretary of State, could pick his own successor.

This is an important matter that rises above ordinary politics and personalities to far-reaching public policy. Such a practical politician as James A. Farley, says:

"Under our present method, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate. In his case, a vacancy caused by his death, resignation, or removal, is filled by the Secretary of State whom he appoints, subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible short-circuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved."

Representative MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, a former newspaper editorial writer, has introduced a bill to authorize study of the situation by a special commission representing the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative branches of our Government.

He also advocates that the law be changed to provide that next in line should be the Speaker of the House, now held by Representative SAM RAYBURN of Texas.

A law passed in 1792, which was dropped when the latest measure was passed in 1886,

provided that next in line after the Vice President should be the President pro tempore of the Senate, now held by Senator McKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, and after him the Speaker of the House.

The suggestion for a survey cannot be construed as political. Death is always a possibility among all our statesmen. It is only common sense to be prepared so that our democratic processes will function as well should Mr. Truman die as they did when Mr. Roosevelt went to his untimely end.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WELLS COUNTY VETERANS' AID COMMITTEE,
Bluffton, Ind., May 23, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: We have been requested by the unanimous vote of the Veterans' Aid Committee to write to you concerning a matter of mutual interest to you, to us, and to the people of America.

We know that you are wholeheartedly in accord with the principle set forth many years ago by Abraham Lincoln when he urged that we "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan." Veterans' legislation is, broadly speaking, but a manifestation of the gratitude of a nation of people indebted beyond words or deeds.

During the several months of the existence of this committee, it has become evident that many returning ex-servicemen feel that the endless red tape and delay definitely prejudice the advantages they expect to derive from such legislation. In several instances, it has been easy to detect a feeling of having been let down—of having had something promised to them that just wasn't available for one reason or another.

The loan-guaranty provision of the GI bill is at present the outstanding example of this condition. Legislation providing for Federal guaranty of a loan is worse than no legislation at all if such a loan isn't available, or is available weeks too late to be of any real value to the applicant.

The benefit of Government-provided hospitalization is questionable under currently rumored conditions existing in veterans' hospitals. Greatly overcrowded facilities are a major problem which we think should be immediately corrected by any means at the disposal of the Government.

Dependents of deceased veterans are often required to spend too much time and go through too much red tape in establishing claims, often creating unnecessary hardship because of delay in receiving pension or insurance checks. Letters to the Veterans' Administration and War Department which go unanswered for weeks to the bitter resentment which can be the only result of the average person's efforts to cope with the mountains of red tape involved in dealing with the Government.

We of this committee do not know whether the cause of the complaints is due to improper legislation or inefficient administration or both. We only know that there are some disillusioned boys returning from having offered their lives in order that we may continue to exist as a free people. Because of their plights, we offer this criticism; that we feel every effort should be made immediately to make the entire program of assistance to veterans and their dependents a simplified one, and a quickly functioning one.

It is for them that we protest against all things and anything that prejudices or delays their attainment of the things to which entitlement exists. It is in their name that we ask you to do your utmost to make it possible that these persons who know the meaning of the word "sacrifice" shall enjoy the things which our people, through its representatives, have declared they shall have.

We trust you will consider this letter as being constructive in its intent. We feel you are sufficiently interested to do whatever is within your power to help correct any condition existing which you believe to be wrong.

Thanking you on behalf of the boys of this county, whom we are trying to represent, and with best wishes, we are

Very truly yours,
Rev. H. T. RAFNEL,
Chairman.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter—condensed—written by a soldier presently with the Ninth Army in Germany:

MAY 28, 1945.

DEAR * * *: Just a brief note to let you know that I am coming along O. K. and half-way expect to be in the States soon. * * *

Could you, and would you, be able to stir up enough racket among a few Congressmen to get them to demand that the Army tell upon what basis men will be discharged after Japan falls, and tell it before the war is over? One of the things the enlisted men in the Army are most interested in is the basis of discharge, and the Army brass seems to consider it none of our damned business. You probably heard that the present plan was the result of a poll—yet the Stars and Stripes are full of pleas for one single soldier who was interviewed to step up and prove to the enlisted men that there was actually a poll. I think one of the greatest morale boosters to the men would be to know how they stand, how quickly they are building up points, etc.

There is no united stand upon the unfairness, of course, because everybody who doesn't get out thinks it should have been screwed around to include him in the group of discharges. Men without children think too many points were given for dependents, etc.

However, everybody would like to know now just what the score is for the future. I think Congress could make itself more popular with the enlisted ranks in the Army by making it widely known that it is demanding an open acknowledgment from the Army as to what the intentions of the postwar discharge plan will be, much more popularity than it can gain by outrageous bonus plans. Quite a few of us in the Army are fairly intelligent, and are not too enthusiastic about adding another ten to twenty billion dollar peak to the present debt. We will have to start cutting the debt down, and it will not help much to give soldiers every possible monetary remuneration. We pay taxes, too.

I have no particular gripe about the discharge plan as of now, because I feel that it was "established" to be fair. However, there is one other thing I would like to call attention to: the "combat time or battle credit" fourth of the plan has been outrageously usurped. Instead of giving combat time for the time or number of battles, it is based upon "decorations." * * *

I think it almost scandalous to give the pilot, himself, several times more combat credit than a fellow who has beaten his head against pillboxes and sweated out small-arms fire, mortars, etc., hours at a time—not just a few minutes during a spectacular and geometrically perfect "pattern bombing" period. To give a fellow who has never been on the continent several times more combat credit for warming his heels on a desk—I can't even express my disgust.

Then there is another angle: even if the Air Force does not get discharged until after Japan falls, neither will we—and while we sweat and bleed to finally earn 85 points the dog robber back at a heavy bomber base several hundred miles from the immediate zone of action will have easily earned 200 to 300.

Now just who the hell is going to get out first, the man who ate K rations for weeks, etc., or the boy who sat back a few hundred miles and complained because the daily movies were several monthse old? I have been in places where I ate cold C and K rations because I was just too damned tired to walk two blocks to get a hot meal.

I have also been in spots where one of our fellows refused a rotation furlough home because he would have had to go across a bridge to get to the rear. That particular bridge was "hot" and I saw more gallantry at its site in an hour than I have seen anywhere else in all my life put together. Yet, we don't get combat credit while the boy in the office in the Air Force does. * * *

Regardless of what the public is told—the Bronze and Silver Star awards are jokes. Every single officer in the regiment has at least one, several of them two. They are given on a quota basis, and because the officers get firsts in everything, very few enlisted men get them.

Personally, I am in for one—because the officer I work for couldn't take the embarrassment when he got his because he not only didn't earn it, he was dead drunk over two-thirds of the time we were in combat. Dead drunk, hiding in the cellar, and letting a warrant officer do his work. Drunk? He passed out several times. Yet he has the Bronze Star, kept some fellow who really deserved it from getting it because of the quota and rank.

I say I am in for one—I haven't got it yet, and wouldn't be surprised if I didn't—they are starting to give seconds to the officers. One officer got the Silver Star for gallantry in action because he visited regimental headquarters while we were in combat. Incidentally, we didn't even get any artillery on us that day. If an officer—a colonel—gets the Silver Star for gallantry in action for coming down to regimental headquarters, why shouldn't the fellows out in front of us, and us, get something in the line of combat credit for living out there months at a time?

This sounds a little bitter. I don't mean it to be. I am not a professional bellyacher,

and just can't make it sound as if I am "speaking for John"; also, it sounds as if I am mainly interested in myself. Believe me, I am not. I am just keenly interested in seeing somebody with authority force the Army to give the men of the United States—the future leaders, the present voters—something in the line of decent consideration.

Who has that authority if the Congress of the United States of America does not?

I am sorry if it sounds as if I am just griping because I am sure that would make you forget the request as soon as you finished the letter. I would appreciate it, as well as several million other guys, if you could bring this to the attention of some Congressman with "guts" enough to do something about it. I would gladly let him use and edit this letter and retain my signature, even if it meant a court martial, if it would accomplish something.

As ever,

——— ———.

Mr. Speaker, I have inserted the foregoing letter in the hope that I can get some help, action, or even advice on the questions raised by this GI Joe. The assistance of any colleague interested in this subject will be most welcome and is earnestly solicited.

Increase in Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] over Station KYW, Philadelphia, Pa., on April 21, 1945, dealing with increase in pay for postal employees.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Anything important to the 350,000 postal employees in the United States must, of necessity, be of importance to all Americans. I have been invited to speak this evening on just such an important matter.

In Washington last February 8, the Honorable THOMAS G. BURCH, of Virginia, chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, introduced to the House legislation that provides for the reclassification of salaries for postal employees. Yesterday Senator MEAD, of New York, introduced a similar bill in the Senate. If bill number H. R. 2071 is passed it means that the average postal employee will receive a yearly salary increase of $400. Furthermore, it provides for time and one-half for overtime—a stipulation made in harmony with the recommendation of our late President that Congress deal as fairly with Government employees as it has with outside industry.

I should like to feel that the overwhelming majority of Americans will share my conviction that this bill calling for an increase in the salaries of postal employees is just and fair. I should like to feel—and know—that its passage will have your active support—because it will mark the first pay rise given the thousands of postal employees since 1925.

During those 20 years the postal worker has been the forgotten man who was never remembered. At this time when our Postal System is rendering yeoman's service to the Nation, to our millions of men and women overseas and their families at home, there is no need to eulogize the enormous wartime contribution of this vital Government agency. But it is not out of tribute alone to the unfaltering services of the Postal Department that I urge immediate action on the Burch bill. There are other equally cogent reasons which are of immense significance to the economic security of the postal employee, to his family, and to our national economy.

In 1943, when the costs of living had risen out of all proportion to the yearly wage of the postal employee, Congress authorized a temporary annual bonus of $300. It was a temporary measure and it expires June 30 of this year. Thus it is apparent that legislation must be enacted before that time otherwise the 350,000 postal employees in the United States will actually suffer a cut in their wages. If $300 was needed to balance the budget of the postal worker in 1943, how can the Nation reasonably expect them to get along on less than that today?

Anyone going to a grocery store, or a department store is very much aware that living costs are higher than in 1943—that what was once called a temporary condition has turned out to be a permanent state of affairs. And, that it is likely to remain so for many years after the end of the war. Business and industry and labor, at large, have approached the problem with a realism that has, almost without exception, resulted in higher wages in virtually every field of endeavor.

The opportunities offered by business and industry have naturally induced many postal employees to leave their Government jobs and seek work in private enterprise. More thousands have, of course, gone into the armed forces. In face of these extreme difficulties, the postal system in the United States is doing the biggest job in its history—and doing it well.

If you are wondering why the hundreds of thousands of postal employees in the Nation and the 6,000 postal employees here in Philadelphia continue to tolerate low wages and the threat of an actual decrease while workers in other fields prosper, there is but one answer.

Postal employees are public servants. They are loyal public servants to you, and to me. They cannot strike. They have no bargaining rights and they may not appeal to any agency or labor board. Legislation in behalf of the welfare of postal employees must be passed upon by Congress.

The postal workers may be public servants but there is certainly no reason for anyone to believe that they are dedicated to lives of poverty and insecurity. They are not. They can no more afford the risk of insecurity and want than can any man and his family.

Considering the fact that postal employees have not received a salary increase in 20 years, the $400 annual wage increase that would be given the average postal worker under the Burch bill is indeed modest.

For those men and women who were in the employ of the Post Office Department in 1925 when the last wage increase was effected, the passage of the Burch bill would net them the equivalent of a $20 raise for each year of their employment in that Department. During that same period the wage benefits which have accrued to workers in industry have been immeasurably greater than those accorded employees of the Federal Government.

The function of the Postal Department is of cardinal importance to our national war effort. It is a life line in the vast and complex system of communications that on one hand aids in expediting the enormous orders for war material, in relaying the messages of state that help speed the victory; on the other hand, and of commensurate importance to the millions of Americans with sons or daughters or relatives in the service, mail is a balm to anxious hearts; it means reassurance and hope, but, most of all, letters mean a link with home.

It is inconsistent that a government that has enacted progressive legislation for labor at large should at the same time fail to enact measures for the well-being of Federal personnel.

It is inconsistent and it can be dangerous, for, unless adequate provisions are made for the present welfare of Federal employees, one of two things is bound to happen: The men and women will leave the employ of the Government for the greener pastures of private enterprise or else their work will suffer. It is quite a natural reaction. Work is work, whether it is with the Government or outside, but the reward for that work in the form of good wages is the factor which will determine the caliber of man attracted to serve the Federal Government—serve the community, the State, the Nation.

There is yet another point that makes the passage of the Burch bill necessary. It is the common-sense factor, the business factor, for $400 in the pocket of the postal employee will not only serve as a bulwark for the economic security of the individual but mean an increase of millions of dollars in buying power to the community in the postwar years.

Will the Burch bill be passed? Will postal employees enjoy a greater degree of economic security by virtue of their first wage increase in 20 years? Will they be given an opportunity to better their standard of living commensurate with the workers in private enterprise?

That is up to you. It is up to you to make your will known to Congress and it is up to Congress to translate that will into action.

This is a democracy. You are the Government. Let your voice be heard.

I am speaking to you this evening in behalf of the 6,000 postal employees in the Philadelphia area. I am asking that you support the Burch bill by writing to your elected Representative in Washington today to tell him that you, too, support the bill H. R. 2071. It is important to the future well-being of postal workers throughout the country and it is vitally important to the future welfare of the Nation's postal system.

It's the best postal system in the world. Let us keep it that way.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri River crosses diagonally the State of North Dakota. At the present time this stream is receiving favored consideration by this Congress in legislation now upon the books. In addition to this, the President has asked that the Missouri River and its tributaries be placed under what is known as the Missouri Valley Authority. This is a question on which good people

have deep convictions and on which they can readily disagree.

I am constantly in receipt of expressions of various sections of the State, some favoring the Authority principles and some in disapproval.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution from the Board of County Commissioners of Stutsman County, N. Dak., which expresses their views on this important question:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *May 26, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Board of County Commissioners of Stutsman County, whose names are hereto subscribed, respectfully represent:

That the county of Stutsman is particularly interested in the matter of unified control and resource development of the Missouri River and surrounding region and the membership of this board are members of the North Dakota Reclamation Association, so that they may keep in direct contact with the proposed project, which would be of especial advantage to this county.

That the undersigned have considered Report No. 246 to the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on the Missouri Valley Authority Act and the suggestions therein outlined for establishment of a valley authority as proposed in S. 555.

We desire to express our unanimous opposition to the bill and against the Missouri Valley Authority.

We are advised that the MVA bill will be considered at an early date by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and we hereby respectfully request and petition the North Dakota delegation above addressed to oppose the measure as offered and to add our expression of disapproval to the opposition already presented.

Very respectfully,

HUGO A. RIEBE,
Chairman of the Board.
WM. KREKOW,
JACK MCCARTHY,
A. C. GELHAR,
C. FLUETSCH,
Members of the Board.

Tribute to Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Honorable Joseph L. Dailey, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., is one of the leading lawyers of my State. He is a native son of the State of Indiana. On the 13th day of May, at Albuquerque, memorial services were held for the late noted and, I think, great newspaper correspondent, Ernie Pyle, during the course of which Mr. Dailey delivered an address.

On this occasion the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] was present. Unfortunately, he is unavoidably detained from the Senate today. He has asked that I insert Mr. Dailey's address in the Appendix of the RECORD. So now, in behalf of the Senator from Indiana and myself, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dailey's remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mere words, however painstakingly written, cannot pay proper tribute to the memory of Ernie Pyle, for they can neither express nor explain the love and affection in which he was held by the men and women of all our armed forces—the soldiers, sailors, and marines—the esteem of the millions of his readers in this country regardless of race or creed, or of the peoples of other nations of the world, be their positions high or low.

For almost 6 years that the world has been at war we have read so much of death and destruction that we have become almost immune to its horrors. We have heard so much of bravery and heroism that we have come to regard it as rather commonplace. It is, therefore, an unusual tribute in itself that we, joined in spirit by countless others, are paying our respects to the memory of one of millions of battle casualties, who was not himself a fighting man, who performed no unusual feat of heroism—a war correspondent who became in universal regard one of the outstanding heroic figures of the war.

The tribute of America to Ernie Pyle, however, was probably best expressed, not in messages from the world's dignitaries, but in a telegram received by Mrs. Pyle signed "A Soldier's Wife," in these simple words, "He knew me not, but I loved him."

Ernie Pyle was not an heroic figure in appearance, nor in his thoughts did he desire the reward of personal heroism or public acclaim. Frail in body, humble, human, humorous and understanding, peaceful and kindly, he was one of the last men you would have expected to emerge from the war as a national hero—the selection of other war correspondents as their leader, of the people as the one who best kept them in touch with the lives and exploits of their boys in service, and the idol of our fighting men.

Ernie Pyle, born on a farm near Dana, Ind., on August 3, 1900, educated in the School of Journalism at Indiana University, a newspaperman for over 20 years, had become a roving reporter for the Scripps-Howard newspapers prior to the outbreak of the Second World War.

It was perhaps natural that he should have journeyed to England in 1940 to report the blitz bombings of London, and then, after the entrance of the United States into the war, to have followed invasion after invasion and campaign after campaign—in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the Anzio beachhead, from England to Normandy and the fighting in France until the Germans were driven out, and then to the Pacific war theater, from Guam, Okinawa and to Ie Shima, where he met his death.

Ernie Pyle hated war—yet wherever he went he was in the thick of it. He loved peace and comfort—yet he lived in the dust and the muck of the fox holes with the GI's. He feared death—and yet he slept, lived and marched forward with it—from north Africa to Ie Shima.

Writing from this welter of muck and blood of things he hated and despised, from a sense of duty to tell the people back home of the kind of life their sons, husbands, and brothers were living through the hell of war, Ernie Pyle had emerged by the end of 1944 as this war's greatest correspondent—the winner of the Pulitzer prize award for 1944 for distinguished reporting, twice winner in successive years of the Raymond Clapper memorial award, the author of two best sellers—"This is Your War" and "Brave Men"—and the wearer of the Purple Heart.

This would have been sufficient reward for one with less conscientious regard for his duties than Ernie Pyle. First and last a reporter, he felt a duty to write stories from the place where the action occurred. Even greater was his belief that he owed a duty to write for the people back home of the part of the GI's in the war, and in order to report that life accurately that he share it with them.

Anyone who talked to Ernie Pyle—from New York to San Francisco—on his brief stay in this country on his way from the European theater of war to the Pacific, knew how much he dreaded the return to the active field of combat. He had no illusions as to his chances of survival—he knew that by the law of averages if he returned to action his number was probably up.

His thoughts are best expressed in his own simple but vivid words, written in one of his first columns from San Francisco before he took off on his last trip:

"There's nothing nice about the prospect of going back to war again. Anybody who has been in war and wants to go back is a plain damn fool in my book.

"I'm certainly not going because I've got itchy feet, or because I can't stand America, or because there's any mystic fascination about war that is drawing me back.

"I'm going simply because there's a war on, and I'm part of it, and I've known all the time I was going back. I'm going simply because I've got to and I hate it—"

And so he went—and will never return.

On the morning of April 18, 1945, the United Press flashed the news from Ie Shima: "Ernie Pyle, a peaceful little guy who became this war's greatest correspondent, has been killed in front-line action."

Everyone of us felt a sense of personal loss. No longer could we read Ernie's daily column with its warm, human portrayal of the lives of our fighting men and feel that we were living it with them. The men in the service felt they had lost their best and most understanding friend.

The life of Ernie Pyle had ended, a martyr to his devotion to duty, but his memory will live on and his name will be legendary.

Perhaps the deeds of this little guy who hated war but who braved its dangers and wrote so humanly and understandingly about it will help us hear in mind the utter futility of war and aid us in planning for a future and everlasting peace.

In the words of Ludwell Denny, Ernie's friend and associate of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, "Good-by, Ernie—good-by for now. God bless you, God keep you forevermore."

Old Question Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and the Ogdensburg Journal:

OLD QUESTION REVIVED

James A. Farley has reopened an old question by proposing that a commission be appointed to examine the need for a constitutional amendment concerning the succession to the Presidency of the United States. He points to a number of defects in the present rule of succession, by which the Secretary of

State is placed next in line after the Vice President, with other Cabinet officers following in fixed order.

For one thing, as he says, the Vice President, in the event of his succession to the Presidency, could appoint his own successor by naming his Secretary of State without reference to the electorate. This might bring to the White House a man whose qualifications had never been passed upon by the people.

Objections like this may seem theoretical, for Presidents invariably pick a man of outstanding eminence, acceptable to both parties, for this important Cabinet post. Nevertheless, as Mr. Farley says, the possibility of embarrassment exists. He also points out that if both the President-elect and Vice President-elect should die before January 20, the country would have no Chief Executive until the House of Representatives decided what to do about it.

Mr. Farley has no suggestion, however, for improving the present arrangement. The framers of the Constitution, of course, intended that the Vice President should be the candidate for President who received the second highest number of votes in the electoral college, which today would mean the loser of the major party candidates. This was an eminently sensible idea, but our two-party system has not only outmoded it but made any substitute for it an obvious makeshift on which the people themselves have little or no voice.

Care of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the statement made before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation today, by Dr. John H. Baird, Assistant Medical Director, Neuropsychiatry, Veterans' Administration, answering attacks made on veterans' hospitals in recent magazine articles.

I wish every father and every mother who has a son in one of these veterans' hospitals, or in the service, as well as every serviceman and every ex-serviceman in the Nation, could read this statement and understand the true facts in this controversy.

I certainly hope that every Member of Congress will read it, because it is one of the most enlightening statements on this subject you can posssibly find.

The statement follows:

The Administrator and the Medical Director have requested me to prepare a statement on the many allegations made by Mr. Albert Q. Maisel in his article entitled, "Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men," which appeared in the April issue of the Cosmopolitan and also a statement on the allegations made by Mr. Albert Deutsch in various issues of the newspaper PM, concerning the handling of veterans with neuropsychiatric diseases by the Veterans' Administration.

Before answering the many allegations made by Mr. Albert Q. Maisel in his second article entitled, "Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men," published in the April issue of the Cosmopolitan, I should like to advise you that I have had ample opportunity and experience to obtain sufficient knowledge to speak on the subject matter and to point out why, in my opinion, the articles by Mr. Maisel should be entitled, "Third Rate Lying and Slander for Money and Undisclosed Purposes," instead of "Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men." If in doing this I evidence considerable bitterness, you will pardon me because it is my natural reaction to this type of malicious sabotage of work well done under very trying circumstances. I naturally resent Mr. Maisel's personal insinuations. However, this is not the cause for my bitterness. It is the needless and malicious irreparable injury done to the peace-of-mind of the thousands of veterans whose sufferings the Veterans' Administration has honestly, faithfully, and efficiently tried to alleviate, to their relatives and friends and also the injury to the morale of the thousands of faithful employees who have toiled long hours and at times under great handicaps, to say nothing of the effect of such articles on those millions who are still members of the armed forces.

My training, experience, and knowledge of the manner in which Veterans' Administration hospitals are operated and the various treatment methods employed, especially in our neuropsychiatric hospitals, enable me to brand Mr. Maisel's articles as gross distortions of the truth, half-truths, and malicious falsehoods with malignant purposes and results. I might add at this time that half-truths are frequently more misleading and more harmful than outright falsehoods. I also believe that any fairly well informed, intelligent person without personal knowledge as to the operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals, would be fully justified in making the same appraisal of Mr. Maisel's articles from merely reading them as I have.

I shall now point out a few of the things which enable me to say that Mr. Maisel's articles are a composite of half-truths, falsehoods, and contortions of facts. First, the Veterans' Administration has had the largest hospital organization in the world for more than 20 years; second, there have been more than 3,000,000 admissions to and discharges from these hospitals; third, no other hospitals are subjected to the same official and unofficial inspections, surveys, and investigations; fourth, no hospitals serve a more critical clientele; fifth, all of the physicians in these hospitals have qualified for their positions under Civil Service and most of them are veterans; the nurses are graduate registered nurses; practically all physicians, nurses, technicians, and attendants have sons or near relatives in the armed forces; and sixth, at no time has there been any widespread or organized dissatisfaction among the patients and practically all sporadic isolated group complaints have been traced to a busybody, like Mr. Maisel, whose motive has been other than the welfare of the patients.

Now, if conditions as alleged by Mr. Maisel existed, you and the public would have known of them months before he wrote his articles. It is to me inconceivable that such conditions could exist without you and the public knowing of them, with representatives of ex-service organizations visiting these hospitals regularly, representatives of the American College of Surgeons making annual surveys of these hospitals, Red Cross representatives on duty at many of them, and gray ladies ever present to assist disabled veterans in a myriad of ways.

It has always been my experience that if conditions were bad at a hospital and if corrective action seemed indicated, it was not necessary to lie and exaggerate the conditions in order to effect needed changes. Do not understand that I am contending that the care and treatment of our patients at this time is all that we desire and that no changes are indicated and no improvement can be made. Progressive medicine calls for continuous change and improvement. What I am telling you is that we are not practicing third-rate medicine. Of course, we have crowding at some of the hospitals, but not unhuman, deplorable overcrowding. We have employees who do not measure up to our high standards, but is it our fault that the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor? No Federal agency has lost a higher percentage of valuable trained personnel to the armed forces and war plants than the Veterans' Administration. Approximately 400 physicians, innumerable nurses, technicians, dietitians, and attendants have left us since we entered the war. They were replaced so far as possible but with inexperienced personnel and in some instances with inefficient, unqualified personnel. It has not been a matter of selecting personnel to replace the employees who left us to enter the armed services or to work in war plants. It has been a matter of accepting any personnel that could be obtained. Attendants too old to perform such duties and in some instances in their seventies have been employed, which should be sufficient to prove how difficult it has been to recruit personnel of any kind. And it has been next to impossible to obtain a sufficient number of trained nurses.

It is true that recently the Army has released physicians to us, but these physicians generally cannot replace the ones we lost, because they do not have the necessary training and experience for our work. It is also true that the Army has furnished soldiers for attendants but, here again, they are inexperienced and not capable of replacing the ones we lost. The losses of trained personnel have to some extent lessened the high degree of physical care given our patients but have not lessened the high quality of medical treatment which has been maintained even with shortages in professional personnel. Patients in our hospitals are very fortunate in that they are not dependent upon any one physician for their treatment. They have the benefit of the entire medical staff before which body each case is carefully analyzed before a full treatment plan is decided upon.

ALLEGATIONS

1. That more than 10,000 mental cases of World War II have been "shoehorned" in beside nearly 30,000 from World War I in overcrowded wards while thousands more wander in cities completely untreated or cynically discharged as "unimproved."

It is true that thousands of mental cases from World War II have been admitted to our various neuropsychiatric hospitals since Pearl Harbor. It is also true that there has been some crowding, but such crowding has not reached serious proportions anywhere. The space allotted patients in our neuropsychiatric hospitals is and always has been more than usually provided by State hospitals, and because of this liberal space allotment for each patient prior to the present war, we have, during this emergency, been able to add several hundred beds without serious overcrowding. But crowding is certainly to be preferred to jails or other places of detention, which would undoubtedly have been the disposition of many of these men. The building program of additional accommodations in our neuropsychiatric hospitals was begun soon after this country entered the war, but because of a lack of priorities in materials and labor, there has been a delay in the completion of these projects. However, a number of new buildings have been made available and thousands more beds will be ready within the near future by additions to presently operated hospitals and by the building of entirely new hospitals.

2. That the veterans are not getting the services ordered and paid for—that instead some are being beaten by sadistic brutes—tens of thousands are receiving almost no

treatment at all—and thousands, who should achieve a speedy cure, are instead being allowed to deteriorate, degenerate, and die.

The treatment program in our neuropsychiatric hospitals has been well organized for years; and since the receipt of veterans from the present war who are younger and whose mental conditions are generally more acute, the program has been modified to meet the requirements of this younger group. The Veterans' Administration has had years of experience in the care and treatment of nervous and mental disorders and our hospitals are operated along the most modern lines in respect to both diagnosis and treatment. Every accepted therapeutic agent is employed where indicated, in the individual case, including insulin and electric shock, fever therapy, physical therapy, carefully planned psychotherapy, and recreational, occupational, and group therapy, with the purpose in mind of bringing about maximum improvement and of returning the veteran to his home community and prewar occupation at the earliest possible time or else to a vocational educational assignment, if in need of and if eligible. Our patients are definitely not allowed to deteriorate, degenerate, and die because of lack of treatment. It is true that there were instances of maltreatment of patients at Lyons, N. J., and there have been allegations of brutality at other stations; but it is difficult to imagine any institution caring for the number of actuely disturbed psychotic patients as are hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration without frequent charges of this kind. Whenever such charges are made, they are thoroughly investigated; and if substantiated by facts, the most practicable solution possible is effected. The loss to the armed forces of some of the best trained attendants in our hospitals seriously crippled our service in this respect but through intensive courses of training for newly recruited attendants, both civilian and military, it is felt that the character of such services is improving materially.

3. That unless millions of us demand reform within these hospitals, there will be no hope for our veterans already in these institutions or for the many thousands who will yet pass into them from the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific; that the conditions within these hospitals are not a secret to the men who run them, they have had a chance to clean house, but they have not done so.

I deny emphatically that conditions in our neuropsychiatric hospitals are anywhere near as pictured by Mr. Maisel in his most vicious article published in the April Cosmopolitan. The problem of occasional abuse or mistreatment of patients with mental conditions has been with us ever since institutions have been established for psychiatric cases. There isn't a mental hospital in the land that is not confronted with this problem. It is also a very difficult problem to cope with. All instances of mistreatment are not necessarily intentional and sadistic abuse is very, very rare. Many times patients are accidentally injured in reasonable efforts to subdue and control them, so that it is not easy to determine whether a patient has been intentionally abused or was accidentally injured by his own hyperactivity. Abuse of patients in our hospitals has been kept to a minimum because of eternal vigilance on the part of physicians, nurses, and charge attendants to prevent it. All injuries, regardless of how minor, are investigated by medical boards or other investigations, including occasionally trained investigators from central office.

The statement of Mr. Maisel that the conditions within these hospitals are not a secret to the men who run them, is a wild sensational charge without any foundation whatever. Improvements in the operation of these hospitals have been continuous from the beginning and will continue to be made whether or not there are criticisms from any source.

4. That one Robert Hegler, former attendant at the Facility, Lyons, N. J., kept a diary disclosing certain "unbelievable brutality":

(a) Hegler wrote, "A veteran of this war was tied to a chair with a sheet. One of the attendants told him to shut up. When the patient refused, the attendant threw several virgorous punches into him. Five other attendants, including a head attendant, looked on without comment."

(b) "The same night * * * I saw another attendant hit a young, nonresistive patient in the back * * * and hit him on two different occasions while he was in bed."

(c) "Two weeks later I was ordered by the head attendant to turn cold water on a patient held forcibly under a shower."

(d) Hegler wrote of patients being "wrung out"—the attendants' lingo for choking a veteran with a towel around the neck—while other attendants looked on and did nothing.

(e) Hegler told of a patient who was held down by one attendant and kicked in the head by another, until two stitches were required to repair the damage.

(f) Hegler reported "one seriously ill patient was beaten up in bed by two attendants." This man, according to Hegler's diary, died the next day.

(g) Hegler reported "a nurse throwing medicine into a patient's face when he failed to finish drinking the dose."

5. That Investigator M. W. Vogtman took evidence at Lyons, N. J., following which, on November 17, 1944—"after the storm in the papers had blown over—General Hines issued a statement, admitting abuses and promising a clean-up."

Mr. Maisel has apparently accepted completely the allegations of Mr. Hegler, who was a former attendant assigned to us at Lyons with a group of conscientious objectors. Upon careful investigation, no substantiation could be found for many of Mr. Hegler's statements, some of his allegations were sustained and some were sustained only in part. It is, therefore, my belief that Mr. Maisel grossly exaggerated the situation in order to paint as black a picture as possible of the whole affair.

6. That the investigation "reveals some substantiation of the charges made by Robert Hegler. The abuses were to a considerable degree due to * * * untrained and inefficient attendant help and inadequate coverage of the wards."

"The untrained and inefficient attendant help and inadequate coverage of the wards," were conditions over which the Veterans' Administration had very little, if any, control during the period so many of our best-trained attendants were taken by the armed forces, and also when physicians were being called into the Army and Navy and nurses were resigning to enter one of the armed services, the number of these professional personnel were so depleted that training programs were of necessity seriously affected. This situation existed in the face of marked increases in hospital admissions, many being acutely disturbed, suicidal and homicidal, and, therefore, requiring special nursing and attendant attention. However, this unsatisfactory state of affairs has improved, as more beds have become available and as more professional personnel have been assigned to permit of better supervision and training of the subprofessional group.

7. That the Administrator had stated, "Appropriate steps are being taken to remedy the situation as to the attendant group, as well as certain changes in the professional and subprofessional groups, and whatever disciplinary measures are warranted will be taken."

This allegation is true and has been carried out.

8. That Mr. M. E. Head, the manager of the Lyons facility during the period of "alleged abuses," was still manager in January 1945, and that Col. L. V. Lopez, chief medical officer of the hospital, was still chief medical officer.

This allegation is very misleading and a subtle attempt to place responsibility for the few instances of abuse upon the manager, Mr. Head, notwithstanding the fact that in allegation 6 Mr. Maisel correctly stated the abuses were due to untrained and inefficient attendant help. The same inference is made concerning Lt. Col. L. V. Lopez, chief medical officer. Of course these official were not removed for abuses of patients they could not have prevented and did not in any way condone. It is not the practice of the Veterans' Administration to persecute loyal employees who have rendered efficient service for years.

9. That the physician who had been in charge of the acute service during the period covered by Hegler's charges had, according to Colonel Lopez, been ordered transferred to another facility and "He had not been discharged, although the substantiated abuses—to use the Administrator's own mild phrasing instead of the words they reserve—had been inflicted upon patients under his guardianship and by employees under his control."

The implication that the physician in charge of the acute service was responsible for the instances of abuse and should have been separated has no basis in facts. The administrative action taken in transferring this physician was in keeping with the evidence developed.

10. That he was informed by Colonel Lopez January 15, 1945, that "no dismissals had occurred, although a few attendants—two or three—had been permitted to resign."

Appropriate disciplinary action was taken against all attendants involved in the mistreatment of patients. You can't dismiss employees who have resigned or left the service.

11. That Robert Hegler was sent to prison because he violated the rules that forbid a conscientious objector to leave the hospital grounds without permission.

The subtle inference that the Veterans' Administration had something to do with Robert Hegler being sent to prison for reporting abuses of patients at our Lyons hospital is a vicious slander. The officials at Lyons and at central office all appreciated the bringing to their attention the fact that patients were being abused by a few employees at that hospital. Furthermore, they all cooperated with Hegler and everyone else, and did everything possible to establish the facts in order to prevent further abuses.

12. After stating that "restraints" of any sort are forbidden in many of the most progressive mental hospitals, Maisel reported that "at veterans' hospitals 'restraints' include these great cuffs—leather bands 3½ inches wide, that are locked over the wrists and tied to a leather belt fixed tightly about the patient's waist."

You will note that Mr. Maisel omitted naming the so-called "most progressive mental hospitals" that forbid the use of restraints. Restraints of patients are not limited to mechanical devices such as cuffs, camisoles, restraining sheets, etc. Continuous flow tubs and neutral packs are forms of hydrotherapy, but both are also restraints. Psychiatrists have honest differences of opinion as to the extent various restraints should be used. However, in our hospitals at no time has there been uncontrolled use of mechanical restraints such as cuffs, restraining sheets, etc. The use of mechanical restraints to control certain patients at certain periods is predicated entirely on what is believed to be for the best interest of the patient restrained and the other patients on the ward. On the acute wards there are usually a few homicidal and several suicidal patients. The homicidal patient is not necessarily danger-

ous to himself and may be in fairly good contact. However, frequently he is very dangerous to other patients and to attendants and other personnel. He strikes frequently without warning and often injures the person he strikes, sometimes seriously and occasionally fatally. This kind of patient cannot be kept in a continuous flow tub or pack all the time and as he is not necessarily hyperactive and disturbed, hydrotherapy does not prevent his taking an impulsive swing at another patient or an employee when he is on the ward unrestrained. Of course, a patient of this type could be controlled by being kept in solitary seclusion or under the influence of sedatives, but most of us believe it is better to put him in cuffs and give him the freedom of the ward. In fact, it is more humane to do so. The suicidal patient or the hyperactive one may have simply the urge to inflict injury on himself, but not infrequently he is also dangerous to others.

Occasionally hydrotherapy, in the form of tubs or packs, will not relieve the hyperactivity or the desire for self-destruction, and in these cases, in their best interest and for the protection of others, mechanical restraint is used. Mechanical restraints, as well as all other types, are not used on any patient except upon specific orders of the physician and are always applied in his presence. Such restraints are removed at frequent intervals and completely discontinued as soon as the patient's condition will permit. Indiscriminate use of mechanical restraints is forbidden and, as stated before, they are used only when believed to be for the best interest of the patient and when hydrotherapy, the moderate use of sedatives, and psychotherapy fail to produce the desired results. There are no hospitals in the country which make greater use of hydrotherapy than the Veterans' Administration hospitals. This form of treatment is available at our hospitals during the entire 24-hour period. Incidentally, our hospitals which have tried to operate without resorting to mechanical restraints had more injuries than those where intelligent use was made of them. The picture in the Cosmopolitan of a patient wearing cuff restraint would lead the reader to believe that the Veterans' Administration is resorting to the methods of the Spanish Inquisition. These cuff restraints are not uncomfortable, being well padded, and loosely applied will permit the patient to smoke and, what is more important, allow him freedom to walk about the day room, read, play cards or checkers, and do most anything any other patient does.

13. That the Veterans' Administration has denied "advances to its patients for 3 or 4 years after they had been widely adopted throughout the country on the grounds that the veteran must not be experimented upon."

Just as soon as new therapeutic methods are introduced, the Veterans' Administration begins investigating their merits, and when there is a reasonable assurance that such procedures are valuable they are employed as soon as equipment and supplies can be procured and physicians can be specially trained to administer them. The Veterans' Administration has always been conservative in the application of new and especially radical forms of therapy as a precautionary measure, but it certainly cannot be said that it has denied such therapy to its patients for any appreciable length of time.

14. That when a new procedure (as to treatment of mental cases) is "at last grudgingly adopted, I have found it turned over to sketchily trained, overworked, doctors whose every move is, of necessity, an experiment conducted at the patient's risk."

All doctors, both within and without the Veterans' Administration, are overworked these days and all have assumed extra duties whether in the Veterans' Administration, the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, or in civil life. If Mr. Maisel has the answer to the doctor-shortage problem, we would be glad to have it. Shortages will become more acute as time goes on, as I understand there are no draft deferments for medical students, except those in IV-F. As to our doctors being sketchily trained, I can say that they have been adequately trained in the administration of the special therapeutic methods Mr. Maisel had in mind. The Veterans' Administration has followed the recommendations of qualified medical advisers as to the time necessary in training physicians in these special methods. And it might be said in passing in regard to the statement "overworked doctors, whose every move is, of necessity, an experiment conducted at the patient's risk," that under any conditions, in any hospital, shock treatments are attended by certain risks.

15. That the veterans' hospitals have no internes or psychiatric resident physicians; that Col. John H. Baird told him on August 15, 1944, "Our younger men seldom come to us with psychiatric training. But we give them a 2-month indoctrination course," and further, that he was told by Dr. Baird that "We'd rather have men who didn't know any psychiatry. * * * Then they can learn our methods when we detail them to our indoctrination schools."

It is true that the Veterans' Administration has no internes or residents in its hospitals. However, steps are being taken to develop the institution of both. Until now, internes have not been utilized for the reason that until now our hospitals have not treated women in any appreciable numbers and have, therefore, not been able to offer a well-rounded clinical service which is necessary for candidates to qualify for State board examinations. As to the establishment of residences in particular, this requires most extensive arrangements, so that when residences are established there will be no question but that they will be recognized by the council on medical education and hospitals of the American Medical Association and the specialty boards.

Mr. Maisel, in referring to his conversation with me, has given the impression that the Veterans' Administration does not desire psychiatrists nor does it intend to see that its physicians receive psychiatric training. This is, of course, ridiculous. What I told him was that we preferred recent graduates coming to us without previous neuropsychiatric training or experience unless such training were of the best, for then we could assign them to recognized psychiatric centers for intensive courses and to our own hospitals for initial practical training.

Psychiatrists are at a premium, there being less than 4,000 known specialists in this field in the entire Nation. The Veterans' Administration needs psychiatrists very badly, but first of all physicians are needed and very few are psychiatrically trained when reporting for duty. A group of 17 physicians are to be assigned for a special course in neuropsychiatry at an Army hospital next month, and it is expected that this will be a continuous process.

16. That not a single one of all the hundreds of doctors who man these veterans' mental hospitals is a diplomate of the Board of Neurological Surgery and that only 22 staff members are to be found on the latest list of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

17. That in contrast with the foregoing, St. Elizabeths Hospital, with a staff of only 43 full-time medical officers, has 26 diplomates on the board's list—"more than can be found in all 30 of the veterans' facilities."

18. That the New York State system of psychiatric hospitals numbers 85 diplomates on its hospital staffs.

It is true that none of our full time physicians are diplomates of the American Board of Neurological Surgery. All neurosurgery in the Veterans' Administration is done by outstanding consultants in this specialty, who have a national and international reputation, including Dr. Walter Dandy, of Baltimore, Dr. Howard C. Naffziger, of San Francisco, and Dr. Loyal Davis, Chicago.

The statement concerning the relatively small number of diplomates of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology among the staff members of the Veterans' Administration is true. In this connection, the establishment of a medical corps, which would permit of the selection of physicians on the basis of their professional qualifications, primarily, as recognized by the medical profession, and also of their promotion within the organization upon the basis of professional examination, would undoubtedly be desirable. Certification by the various specialty boards would naturally become a part of the requirements for promotion to the next higher grade.

19. The Veterans' Administration declined to instruct surgeons in the performance of the operation described as prefrontal lobotomy until 1944, although this operation was first devised in 1937; that "Last year it sent four physicians from the Marion, Ind.; Downey, Ill.; Roanoke, Va.; and Lyons, N. J., facilities to study under Dr. Freeman. After waiting so long, you might think the Veterans' Administration could wait a little longer—until these men completed 6 months or a year of resident training. But no; they just took a 2-week brush-up course."

The operation of prefrontal lobotomy is a very radical procedure and is by no means generally accepted by the medical profession. Very few operations of this type were performed in this country prior to 4 or 5 years ago and even now are frowned upon by many competent medical authorities. The physicians selected for training in the technique had all had training and experience in general surgical procedures, which is a prerequisite and a 2-week course is considered sufficient by competent medical advisers of national reputation. Only men at stations where neurosurgeons were not available as consultants were trained in the technique of this procedure.

20. That in reference to the above mentioned surgical procedure he offered the following comment: "One cannot help wondering why the Veterans' Administration waited 7 years before it considered this operation no longer experimental and then plunged into it with a bang, permitting ordinary surgeons to perform so delicate an operation instead of hiring brain specialists as operating consultants."

It is believed this accusation is answered above. The Veterans' Administration still considers this operation as experimental and this opinion is shared by others competent to express an opinion.

21. That in the last available Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs it is shown that 23,147 veterans were discharged from these 30 hospitals during a year. But of all these, less than 8 percent are rated as recovered, apparently recovered, or cured!

22. That the last available record of St. Elizabeths Hospital shows that more than 45 percent of its discharged male patients were rated as recovered. It is also a Federal Hospital, yet it achieves a recovery rate nearly six times as great as that of the Veterans' hospitals.

The statement concerning the discharges quoted from the Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs does not apply only to those discharged from the 30 neuropsychiatric hospitals, but the total neuropsychiatric patients discharged from all hospitals of the Veterans' Administration,

during the fiscal year, 1943. The figures themselves are statistically correct. Comparable figures for the fiscal year, 1944, show 31,444 discharges for neuropsychiatric conditions from all hospitals with 6.2 percent recovered, apparently recovered, or cured. However, of this group of 31,444, 44.1 percent were psychotic. Statements of the kind made by Mr. Maisel which were of course intended to place the Veterans' Administration in a bad light, involve merely the matter of terminology. The Veterans' Administration has always been conservative in the use of the term "recovered," especially in cases of psychosis. Indeed, in most psychoses, the question of whether recovery, as such, ever occurs is a moot question.

If we could use the expression "in remission," we would show a much higher rate of so-called recoveries. Many—perhaps the majority—of those patients discharged against medical advice would otherwise have been considered as recovered, but we cannot make a statement as to their condition unless examinations are completed and a diagnosis is made. Of the total of 20,129 discharges from neuropsychiatric hospitals during the fiscal year 1944, 5,540 were discharged as against medical advice. This represents more than one-fourth of the total discharged.

23. That the Navy refuses to discharge most of its mental cases to the tender care of the Veterans' Administration, but that it insists instead on sending these men to St. Elizabeths.

This statement is a definite misrepresentation of fact. For many years—long before the creation of the Veterans' Administration—the Navy has sent its mental patients to St. Elizabeths Hospital, not discharging them from the Navy until a diagnosis is confirmed. Many of them are later transferred to Veterans' Administration hospitals.

24. That the records of the Lyons facility covering the year 1944 show that "Month after month patients have been sent out on so-called trial visits—3-month experimental discharges—until the year's total reached over 500. But more than one-fourth of all these men—sent out because there was no harm in doing so—failed so decisively to adjust to the outside world that they had to be recommitted."

A report from Lyons discloses that during the year 1944 a total of 725 patients were on trial visit and that of this number only 125 returned to the hospital during the same period. In other words, 17.2 percent of those on trial visit failed to make a satisfactory adjustment. This is actually an excellent record.

Mr. Maisel is apparently ignorant of trial visit purposes and procedure. Hospitals with comparatively large numbers of patients on trial visit are to be commended, as the object of treatment in a mental hospital is to hasten the day when a patient may return to his home community, and every day out of the hospital is a step ahead for the patient. Trial visits are approved for patients only after they have shown evidence of a definite remission in their psychotic symptoms and have at the same time made a good hospital adjustment. For a period of time they have had no conflicts with their environment, have shown a sustained interest in some constructive activity, and have required only a minimum of supervision. When patients have improved to this extent, an effort is made to determine what the environment will be to which they are going on trial visit and what plans are being made for occupation and recreation outside the hospital. Only when this investigation indicates that the veteran will have a reasonably satisfactory opportunity to continue his improvement does the medical staff recommend a trial visit. While on trial visit, he is contacted at least once during a period of 90 days either by the hospital social worker or by a social agency in his community and a report is made of what his adjustment has actually been. If this report indicates that the patient is making a satisfactory adjustment both from a social and economic standpoint, then the trial visit may be extended, or the patient may be discharged. If the report is unfavorable, the hospital initiates efforts to have the patient returned for further treatment. Mr. Maisel indicates by the statement that "these men * * * sent out because there was 'no harm' in doing so," that no care or interest is shown by the medical staff in granting trial visits. It is obvious that Mr. Maisel has no conception of modern psychiatric principles and that he does not appreciate the consideration given to these cases both before granting the trial visit and while the patients are out of the hospital.

Mr. Maisel is further laboring under the mistaken idea that all patients are committed to the Lyons Hospital, or at least he gives this misleading impression in the statement that patients who fail to adjust to trial visit status had to be recommitted. Less than 30 percent of all the patients at Lyons are committed by the courts. The remaining 70 percent are there as voluntary patients and cannot be held against their wishes.

25. That in company with the acting chief of the acute service he visited disturbed wards for examination of five patients in seclusion; that we peered through a tiny porthole in the doors, into these seclusion cells. Each had a bed as its only furniture. Each held a veteran in a shapeless bathrobe from which the cord had been removed. These, I presumed, must be dangerously violent patients. That an old man whom Maisel judged to be 90 pounds in weight was stated by the acting chief of the acute service to have been in seclusion to protect him from other patients. Comment was made by Maisel of a touching bit of consideration, that of protecting a man by confining him alone in a locked cell.

According to a signed statement made by Capt. Harry Hoffman, acting chief of the acute service at Lyons, Mr. Maisel visited that service on January 15, 1945, and remained in the building about 20 minutes. He visited 3 of the 4-day rooms, 2 dormitories, the pack room, and a few of the seclusion rooms.

The following is Captain Hoffman's statement relative to Mr. Maisel's reference quoted above:

"On the day of Mr. Maisel's visit the total number of patients in seclusion was two. Mr. Maisel refers to the seclusion room as cells. These rooms have exactly the same construction as all other single bedrooms in the hospital, and are converted into seclusion rooms merely by locking the door. They differ in no respect from a nonmental hospital room such as one might place an appendectomy patient in. They have linoleum floors, a large glass window or windows and a large radiator behind a protected, metal grill. Construction of the room is exactly the same as that of the manager's office.

"One of the two seclusion patients was James Berry. This man is small, of slight stature, who presents as his outstanding symptoms, agitation, confusion, verbal activity, physical restlessness, which cause him to wander about constantly touching other patients, engaging them in rambling conversation and by so doing frequently causing other patients to become angry with him and to assault him. Inasmuch as this man is well along in years and possesses a cardiac disease, it was the unanimous opinion of three ward surgeons that he be placed in a locked room in order that he might be protected from the assaults of other patients. This action was ordered only after he had been actually injured in other wards. The second seclusion patient was a man on 2–A who was kept in seclusion because of continuous nudism. Mr. Maisel refers to shapeless bathrobes from which cords have been removed. These bathrobes do not have cords to begin with."

It might be stated that seclusion of certain types of mental patients is definitely the best method of handling them. The two cases cited by Captain Hoffman are good examples and another type of patient for whom seclusion is indicated is one who becomes agitated in the company of others.

26. That a patient's dayroom measuring "perhaps 40 by 60 feet, was furnished with about a dozen hard chairs and benches. The rest of the forty-odd patients had the choice of standing or sitting on the cold concrete floor. Half a dozen were sleeping on the floor, although a dormitory, just across the hall, was filled with beds." Maisel quoted the Acting Chief of the Acute Service as saying, "We can't let them stay in bed during the daytime. It's not good for them."

This is definitely a gross distortion of the facts, as Captain Hoffman's statement quoted below will show:

"The furniture of the dayrooms of building No. 2 is made up of heavy oak chairs, benches, and tables. The census of the acutely disturbed ward is 74. By count, the number of seats supplied by benches and chairs add up to 66. If all seats are occupied and if the ward census was up to complete capacity, only 8 patients would have to stand or lie on the floor. However, there are always patients who are working on occupational details, at recreational events, etc., so that in actual practice if all the patients on the ward at any one time were seated there would never be necessity for a patient sitting on the floor or standing because of the lack of available seats. Psychotic patients do have a tendency to sit or lie on the floor in preference to using benches or chairs. Continuous effort is always being made by attendants to persuade these patients to use the furniture. It is obviously poor therapy for a psychotic patient to allow them to stay in bed whenever they wish. An effort is always being made to get them to perform normal daytime activities during the daytime. There are no concrete floors in any dayroom, dormitory, or hallway."

27. That the Acting Chief of the Acute Service reported to Maisel as to the restraints used daily, "Thirty is about tops," adding, "That doesn't mean all at once. That means 30 in any one day. We take them off every 3 hours."

It is believed that this allegation of Mr. Maisel is appropriately answered by Captain Hoffman, whose statement is quoted below:

"According to this writer's recollection, he did make the statement that 30 restraints a day was the maximum used on building No. 2. Thirty patients out of almost 2,000 patients in a mental hospital is not considered a large number of hyperactive, violent patients who require measures to prevent the infliction of injuries upon themselves or others."

28. That in answer to Maisel's interrogatory as to the limitation in time of the use of restraints the acting chief of the acute service stated in part: "After 3 hours the attendant must take the man to the lavatories. Then, if the doctor prescribes it, the restraints may go on again."

Captain Hoffman's comment on this allegation is as follows:

"The acting chief of the acute service gave Mr. Maisel the regulation concerning the use of restraint. The regulations as promulgated are considered humane and obviously for the protection of the patient and in promoting his comfort."

29. That the vast majority of other veterans' mental facilities are overcrowded—brimful, filled to capacity and far beyond. In September 1944 the facility of Northport, Long Island, had 437 more patients than it was built to hold. Downey, Ill., had an overload of 191; Coatesville, Pa., an overload of 215; Waco, Tex., an overload of 243; Perry Point, Md., an overload of 196. At Northampton, Mass., 992 patients are crammed into buildings built for 770. And at Lyons, on January 15, 1945, 1,901 patients were housed in a hospital built for 1,716.

It is believed that this subject of overcrowding has been adequately discussed. I believe you are all aware of the fact that in practically every town in the country, at the present time, hospitals are overcrowded, as evidenced by beds being placed in hallways, on porches, and elsewhere in order to meet the wartime demands. Such crowding in veterans' hospitals is neither disgraceful nor needless.

30. That the Veterans' Administration does not admit overcrowding actually exists and that capacity has been increased by the simple device of adding so-called emergency beds, a process which has "already crowded more than 3,000 extra beds into spaces never designed for them and which can go on indefinitely."

This allegation has been discussed previously.

31. That "at Northport I found dayrooms and even a dining hall converted into such 'emergency bed' wards, while patients were forced to eat in a relocated dining room, underground, in a dark cellar. At Lyons even the 'disturbed' patients' dormitories have been crowded so that rooms designed for 22 beds now hold 33 or more."

Mr. Maisel visited Northport several months ago, remaining on the station from about 11 a. m., until 4 p. m. During his visit he interviewed the manager, Col. Louis F. Verdel, the clinical director, Lt. Col. H. E. Foster, and the Chief of the Research Unit, Lt. Col. James Huddleson.

Colonel Verdel's comment on the specific allegation is as follows:

"In this allegation I presume that Mr. Maisel refers to our dining room in building No. 9. It is true that in order to provide additional beds to take care of patients coming from the Army, the dining room on the first floor of this building was converted into a dormitory, and the dining room was moved to a room in the basement. This room is 30 feet by 44 feet 9 inches plus a space 13 feet 6 inches by 26 feet which is used as a diet kitchen. The floor to this room is 5 feet below ground level; the ceiling is 5 feet 3 inches above ground level. There are 7 windows 36 inches wide by 36 inches high with 16 lights of glass, 7 windows 44 inches wide by 36 inches high with 20 lights of glass, and 1 window 28 inches wide by 36 inches high with 12 lights of glass in this room. Proper ventilation is maintained from 3 directions. There are draperies at these windows, and tablecloths are supplied for the tables. I would not consider this an ideal dining room, and neither would I say that it was objectionable."

32. That at Northport, Long Island, in August, 1944, only 19 patients were discharged as having achieved "maximum hospital benefit" while 89 were discharged "against medical advice," despite the fact that these are all legally committed patients who cannot leave of their own free will.

Colonel Verdel's comment on this allegation is as follows:

"In this allegation Mr. Maisel has strayed from the facts, and has only stated half truth. In August of 1944 the records of the clinical records office disclose that we had 193 admissions and 133 discharges. It is true that 89 of these discharges were against medical advice. It is not true that we had only 19 discharged maximum hospital benefit. We had 28 discharges as maximum hospital benefit and the 89 that were discharged against medical advice were not legally committed patients as stated by Mr. Maisel. As we all know, the majority of our admissions have been coming direct from the Army. In many instances the relatives were here 1 or 2 days after the patients were admitted demanding their discharge. The records disclose that the average stay in the hospital of 86 of these 89 patients was 17 days. Their discharges were demanded before we had had an opportunity to get them before the medical staff for final diagnosis. We had a number of cases that were minors and the relatives refused to sign the voluntary admission application. Every effort was made to prevail upon the relatives that the patients should remain at least until they had been taken before the staff, and those discharged against medical advice were cases that were either in remission, or partial remission, or questionably psychotic. In each instance the relatives were given the benefit of all the information that we had on the patient. In no instance in August, or any other month, have we discharged a patient against medical advice who has been legally committed to the institution."

33. That the clinical director at Northport in answer to a question as to the advisability of discharge of mental cases against medical advice responded, "The veterans' hospitals feel that, as long as they are not violent, there is no harm in letting them go against medical advice."

The clinical director, Lt. Col. H. E. Foster has submitted the following quoted signed statement regarding this allegation:

"He asked about discharges and the clinical clerk was requested to furnish the figures. He asked why so many were going against medical advice and I explained to him that many of the patients' families could see nothing wrong with their sons or brothers and if they did they felt that the patient would get along better and quicker at home. He was told that every relative was talked to and advised by me to allow their patient relative to remain here until examinations and treatments were completed. He was told of the excellent facilities we had here for treatment. He was advised that it was no unusual thing for relatives to come to the hospital with the patient and his Army attendants or to come the next day or so and demand their discharge. He was told that every new admission was interviewed and examined by the admitting officer or officer of the day—if after hours—the physician assigned to examine the veteran and present him to staff with recommendations and also by myself to determine their mental status, likelihood of self-destruction, suitability for the reception ward, need for immediate medical or psychiatric treatment, and their suitability for admission as a voluntary patient.

"The criteria for discharge against medical advice was explained to him, viz, that they would not be likely to harm themselves nor to injure others; and that if we feared either of these and the family refused to cooperate, we then sent them to Bellevue or Kings County Hospital for commitment under the mental hygiene laws of the State of New York. He was told that in every case of discharge against medical advice the reception officer, examiner, and I conferred prior to such discharge.

"We discussed the mental hygiene laws of New York—he, probably to learn if I knew anything about them—and he was advised that patients committed to our care were never discharged outright but granted a leave of absence or trial visit. The man is absolutely vicious in his misstatements regarding allowing 'legally committed patients who cannot leave of their own free will.'

"I categorically deny making any statement regarding any policy and emphasized our solicitude for them to remain till properly disposed of, as stated above, that they might receive proper care and keep their records clear with the Veterans' Administration."

34. That the first electro-shock instrument in the entire veterans' system was acquired only in October of 1942 and that it was not until late in 1943 that electro-shock was widely introduced into the veterans' mental hospitals.

There was a delay in the procurement of the first electric-shock machine for the research unit at Northport, where this therapy was first administered, because of priorities, and this element delayed the procurement of subsequent equipment for the other neuropsychiatric hospitals. Physicians were sent to Northport for training in this method in November 1942, and immediately steps were taken to introduce this therapy in other hospitals. This was accomplished as soon as equipment could be procured and physicians trained to administer it.

35. That at Northport he found electroshock administered by a single physician, Capt. Leon Rackow, whose duty it was to give the treatment to several hundred men every week; that Captain Rackow's main job was to care for the inmates of an entire building—225 patients—and that electro-shock was just a "sideline."

As to this allegation, there is quoted below the comment of Colonel Verdel:

"This also is a misstatement. At the time of Mr. Maisel's visit to this station we had two physicians assigned to electric-shock treatment, Captain Kashe and Captain Rackow, and we were only treating 25 patients with electric shock. At the present time we have 50 patients undergoing electric shock, and expect in the near future to increase this to 100. There are two physicians assigned to one building that is devoted entirely to electric-shock treatment. That part of the allegation which refers to the number of patients on Captain Rackow's ward is correct."

Physicians in veterans' hospitals, as in other large institutions have many and diversified duties to perform, in addition to their specialistic work. This will continue until more medical officers can be obtained, and even then many will perform various functions in accordance with the needs of the hospital concerned.

36. That at Lyons, N. J., electro-shock therapy was performed by Maj. M. Presberg who was also the roentgenologist of the hospital; that Major Presberg administered 20,579 electro-shock treatments in a single year and that "He 'treats' as many as 90 cases in a single morning—2 minutes per patient for this streamlined service."

This allegation is answered by Major Presberg, who has submitted the following statement:

"At 1:30 p. m. I was introduced to Mr. Maisel and directed to show him the electric shock therapy department. He asked me where I had received my training in the administration of electric shock and I replied that I had received it at the Veterans' Administration at Northport, L. I. When questioned as to the number of treatments we had administered at this facility, I told him we had given 20,579 up to that date (January 15, 1945), which was a period of approximately 13 months.

"Mr. Maisel was given a detailed explanation of the technique employed in this facility and I told him that on several occasions we had given as high as 90 treatments in one day. Because of the heavy load of

newly admitted patients and the great demand for beds, we have treated a great number of patients daily with very good results. In the explanation of the technique used, it was brought out how quickly electric shock can be administered. The time-consuming aspect of this form of therapy ensues only when the ward physician utilizes psychotherapy and reeducation of the patient. Anyone who implies that treating a large number of patients one right after the other with electric shock, is doing so incorrectly, does not know the most elementary principles of electric-shock therapy.

"While I was accompanying Mr. Maisel to War 1–C (infirmary ward) I informed him that I was also in charge of the X-ray department and would he like to see it. He declined."

37. That St. Elizabeths Hospital, "with the same Federal pay scales and far higher standards of service, operates at a cost of $2 per day per patient. The State of Wisconsin spends $1.48 per patient daily at its Mendota Hospital and $1.27 at its Winnebago hospital. Minnesota's progressive mental hospital system operates at costs varying from a low of 48 cents per patient per day to a high of 79 cents. New York State, in the highest-cost area in the country, manages to run its mental institutions at a daily cost per patient of 84 cents." That in contrast to the foregoing, "the Federal Treasury pays out, for every patient on the rolls of the Veterans' mental hospitals, $2.24 per day."

The information developed on State neuropsychiatric hospitals is not sufficient to make a complete comparison between State neuropsychiatric hospitals and Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospitals. However, some information has been developed on State hospitals in California, Texas, North Carolina, New York, New Mexico, and Massachusetts. This is sufficient to prove that State hospitals are crowded the same as Veterans' Administration hospitals; that they have from two to three times as many patients per physician, six or seven times as many patients per nurse and more patients per attendant than the Veterans' Administration hospitals and that the food cost is approximately 33 percent below the food cost for Veterans' Administration hospitals. Also, that the ratio of dentists, technicians, and dietitians is much lower than that in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The reports on hospitals in the State of Massachusetts, which is considered to be one of the more progressive States in the care of mental patients, indicates that on account of personnel shortages, the hospitals in this State are now only rendering custodial care.

Of course, it would be very unfair to compare State hospitals with Veterans' Administration hospitals, but it can be truly said that perhaps most State institutions at the present are merely maintaining mental patients and that the Veterans' Administration is treating them and giving them every reasonable opportunity to recover.

38. That by medical backwardness the Veterans' Mental Hospitals stand indicted as third-rate institutions and that "Only when it comes to expenses do they outdistance comparable Federal and State institutions."

I believe the two items in the operation of any psychiatric hospital which require the most money are salaries and food. In hospitals such as those operated by States, there are much simpler finance, supply, and plant maintenance procedures than is the case with the Veterans' Administration, which involve considerable expenditures and the State hospital menus are generally not at all comparable with ours. Then too, the Veterans' Administration has a much higher ratio generally, of physicians, nurses, dietitians, technicians, and attendants and these personnel cost money.

This statement made by Mr. Maisel is a complete misrepresentation of the true state of affairs insofar as State hospitals are concerned. Anyone who has had occasion to contrast the type of service given in most State hospitals and that given at our hospitals, will admit that there is no comparison.

39. That the Veterans' Administration claims it is building hospitals just as fast as it can; that nearly 20,000 more beds are supposed to be under way at the present time. "But those familiar with the record of the Veterans' Administration know that buildings for 498 new beds were to have been completed at Lyons last January—but won't be ready until June of this year, at the earliest."

The Veterans' Administration does not only claim it is building hospitals and additions to presently operated hospitals as fast as it can, but it claims this to be a fact. It also admits that the building program has not kept up with expectations or plans. The reasons for the delays in the completion of building projects include the question of priorities for materials, delays in deliveries of materials, strikes, manpower shortages, and certain unforeseeable structural difficulties. The program calls for over 20,000 additional beds to be made available before the end of the calendar year, 1946, of which nearly 8,000 will be ready for occupancy by July of this year; over 4,000 by January, 1946; 5,000 by July, 1946; and the remainder toward the end of the year, 1946. It is expected that this number of additional beds will meet the needs of the Veterans' Administration for psychotic patients for the period concerned.

The building program at Lyons has been delayed for several reasons, including a strike. One of the three new buildings should be ready for use by May 15 and the other two, several weeks later.

40. That because of overcrowding, hospital managers instead of pressing for a cure, encourage discharges at the earliest possible date because beds must be made available for new patients.

This allegation is entirely false and is not supported by any evidence other than the discredited word of Mr. Maisel. All recommendations for discharge from neuropsychiatric hospitals are made by the medical staff after due consideration of all angles of a given case. No patient is discharged until he has attained maximum benefit from hospital treatment unless he is discharged against medical advice.

41. That beating of patients has been "discontinued" at Lyons. But the men who did the beating haven't been fired. And "disturbed" veterans are still put into "seclusion" or "restraints." Worst of all, no one at the hospital seems to think there is anything wrong about all this.

It is believed that there is no longer any abuse of patients at Lyons. As a result of a recent survey it has been found that since the investigation in October 1944 a few instances of mild abuse were found concerning which appropriate action was taken. Following the investigation and based upon the evidence obtained, charges were preferred against one attendant resulting in his dismissal from the service, others against whom charges would have been preferred resigned before that action could be taken, three conscientious objectors were returned to their civilian public service camps and several others were reprimanded, admonished, or cautioned.

The evidence obtained on those in the latter group tended to indicate maltreatment of patients, but was not sufficient to warrant more drastic action. Charges were preferred against the chief of the acute service, most of which the charge committee failed to sustain. However, he was transferred to another station with a change of assignment. The supervisor of attendants is to be transferred where a suitable place can be found for him. Likewise, the chief medical officer is to be transferred in the near future. The ward surgeon on the acute service has been transferred to a general medical hospital. As a result of the investigation which showed that attendants had not been properly instructed as to their duties, instructions were issued to conduct an indoctrination course for all attendants. This course has been operating very successfully at Lyons for the past several months and it is felt that the cessation of abuse can be attributed in large measure to this indoctrination course. Further, a young, alert, and aggressive psychiatrist has been assigned at Lyons as clinical director and the acute service is now in charge of a capable psychiatrist.

Seclusion and other forms of restraint are employed only when indicated for the best interest of the patient concerned and then only on a physician's prescription.

42. That "one might cite a Detroit case—an honorably discharged, wounded veteran of Guadalcanal who broke into a store and stole $1,500 and a gun. That man was on the records of the Dearborn Veterans' Hospital, diagnosed as 'hysteria, shell shock, war neurosis.' But he was discharged uncured—supposedly 'harmless.' "

The manager of our facility at Dearborn, Mich., was requested to furnish a report on this case and a portion of his letter is quoted below:

"The author of the story undoubtedly had reference to the case of Mitchell E. Lodzinski, C–3,429,580, a World War II veteran who was disabled at Guadalcanal and subsequently discharged to his home in Hamtramck, Mich. This veteran in company with Arthur D. Davidowicz, also a World War II veteran who was disabled at Guadalcanal and later dishonorably discharged, were arrested for breaking and entering a Detroit saloon and taking cigarettes and a considerable sum of money. When the story concerning the arrest of the two veterans appeared in the Detroit Free Press, I immediately instructed our chief attorney to visit the Wayne County jail for the purpose of obtaining complete information in connection with the incident in order to determine whether the Veterans' Administration had fully discharged its responsibility and whether the facts in the case appeared to indicate the need for further action by such Administration. There is attached a thoroughly detailed report on both veterans as prepared by our chief attorney. There is also attached copy of report of neuropsychiatric examination in the case of Mitchell E. Lodzinski; also, copy of last rating showing a combined disability rating to a degree of 70 percent, for which the veteran is receiving pension in the amount of $80.50 per month.

"Since Arthur D. Davidowicz was dishonorably discharged from the military service, he is not entitled to any benefits from the Federal Government. The records fail to indicate that Mitchell E. Lodzinski was at any time a patient at this facility. However, on May 10, 1944, he submitted to a thorough examination including a neuropsychiatric examination in our out-patient service, and as a result of this examination his pension was increased from 50 to 70 percent.

"Because of the fact that both boys had been wounded at Guadalcanal the stories with reference to the arrest of both boys that appeared in the local newspaper created considerable sympathy and as a result an official of Camp Legion, a rehabilitation center which was established several months ago by Mr. Ford and located within a short distance from this facility, appealed to the authorities to dismiss the charges against both boys in order to give them an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves at Camp Legion. Since the

proprietor of the saloon and the local authorities were agreeable to such action, both boys enrolled at Camp Legion and it is my understanding that they are still there and are conducting themselves to the satisfaction of the authorities at Camp Legion."

The neuropsychiatrist who examined Mr. Lodzinski on May 10, 1944, made the diagnosis of psychoneurosis, hysteria, war neurosis, with inadequate industrial and social adjustment.

43. That "From Westchester County, N. Y., one might bring up the case of another World War II veteran charged with nine crimes within a single week. He, too, was an uncured mental case—but far from harmless."

This case cited by Mr. Maisel has not been identified. Doubtless many cases of this sort could be cited.

44. That every State in the Union could produce similar instances.

This is probably true.

45. That the Army is too large to "boycott the veterans' hospitals. Already, thousands of World War II veterans have been escorted to the doors of the nearest veterans' facility and discharged into these mental man traps. For these men—and for the tens of thousands who will follow them—there is no hope unless the veterans' hospitals are cleaned up—drastically, thoroughly, and promptly."

The author of this article in the Cosmopolitan has taken unfair advantage of this Administration, which is attempting to handle an unprecedented number of neuropsychiatric cases incident to the present war, in the face of serious personnel shortages, particularly in the specialist class and especially trained psychiatrists, nurses, qualified attendants, and technicians. He has decidedly overemphasized our weaknesses over which we have very little control, and has utterly ignored the splendid organization of our hospitals and their functions which have been developed since the last war. It is unfortunate, and, indeed, criminal, that such vicious denunciations, and in some instances sheer nonsense, can have such wide publicity. Certainly, in time of war it can do nothing but harm in its effect upon the morale of veterans, their families, and those in the armed services.

As to Mr. Maisel's recommendations contained in his article in the April Cosmopolitan, the following comments are submitted:

1. That "under our form of government, the means are available for a rapid and permanent cure of such a situation."

I believe I am in a position to assure you that the neuropsychiatric hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration are emphatically not represented by Mr. Maisel. Being maintained as they are now with shortages of personnel, some subgrade personnel, and with an unprecedented admission rate, many problems naturally arise. However, the high standard of medical treatment has been held and our hospitals compare favorably with the best in the country.

2. That "The President can, by Executive order, place the running of these hospitals—as a wartime emergency measure—in capable hands. He can call upon the Surgeons General of the Army, the Navy, or the Public Health Service to act as temporary 'receivers' for these hospitals."

Inasmuch as our hosptals are solvent, no temporary "receivers" are indicated.

3. That "Congress, through its committees on veterans' legislation, can institute an immediate investigation of all the veterans' hospitals—to root out the incompetents, lay bare the failures and bring forth the advice of the best medical and administrative brains in the country."

An investigation of our hospitals is now being conducted by the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4. That "immediately, without waiting for long-term reforms, the building program of the Veterans' Administration can be speeded up."

The building program of the Veterans' Administration is being speeded up insofar as is possible.

5. That "immediately, the overcrowding can be relieved by using resort hotels as hospitals—as the Army and Navy do."

The conversion of resort hotels as hospitals for neuropsychiatric cases would, in my opinion, require as much time as the building of new buildings.

6. That "immediately, bad food can be replaced by good food."

As to this recommendation, the Veterans' Administration has given much thought to the food service in its neuropsychiatric hospitals and takes great pride in the system which has been developed which embraces the various types of service applicable to the different patient groups. First of all, the best food obtainable is purchased and at all hospitals; it is prepared by experienced cooks under the supervision of competent dietitians. The ambulatory continued treatment type of patient take their meals in the general dining hall, being served by cafeteria or plate method, either of which assures hot food. Patients on the receiving ward, the acute service, and the general infirmary service are served in the same manner as those in the general dining hall, from electrically heated food carts which are loaded in the main kitchen. Bed patients, such as those under treatment on the tuberculosis service, the general medical service, and the most infirm group are served their meals on trays which are prepared in the main kitchen or in the diet kitchen on the ward and sent to the patients in electrically heated tray conveyors.

7. That "outmoded methods can be replaced by modern medicine."

Through liaison with the National Research Council which has brought together the leaders in clinical and research medicine for consultative advice to the Army and Navy, and through the valuable assistance rendered by the members of the Medical Advisory Council to the Administrator and Medical Director, those in the medical and hospital service of the Veterans' Administration have had the unique opportunity of being thoroughly informed in regard to the many new developments which the science of medicine has contributed. By these two particular means, I can assure you that the physicians throughout the Veterans' Administration are being kept thoroughly informed of the advances made in war medicine and rehabilitation and that new methods of diagnosis and treatment are instituted as their value is demonstrated.

8. That "callous, incompetent, or brutal employees can be replaced by top-notch men detailed from the armed services—which have already bailed out the hindsighted Veterans' Administration by the loan of more than 7,000 troops and hundreds of physicians."

Troops have been detailed by the War Department to over half of our neuropsychiatric hospitals to relieve the shortage of attendants and more are being assigned as the need arises.

9. That over a longer term, new and competent administrators can convert the veterans' hospitals into modern medical centers, attractive to the best of the medical profession.

The character of any hospital or medical center is primarily, if not wholly, dependent upon the calibre of the physicians who serve in such institutions. In our neuropsychiatric hospitals we have many excellently trained physicians and psychiatrists, but we also have others who are not so well trained and many, who, after the war, will likely leave the Veterans' Administration to enter private practice. Many of this latter group and the best of the recent graduates of grade A medical schools are of the type we want as permanent medical officers. However, unless some action is taken to create an independent medical service of some kind within the Veterans' Administration, which will be as attractive from every standpoint as the regular establishments in the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, we cannot expect to obtain the type of young physicians so urgently needed, in any appreciable numbers. Perhaps the chief advantage of such an arrangement would be the privilege of the Veterans' Administration in selecting those who would constitute the service, the criteria of which would be second to no other Federal standards. In my opinion, now is the time to create such a permanent service, in order to attract physicians from the armed forces who are seeking a career with the Federal Government.

10. That "They can encourage research and postgraduate study. They can replace backwardness and brutality with the kind of medical treatment that Congress and the people have always intended our veterans to receive."

Regarding research in the Veterans' Administration, it is my understanding that consideration was being given before the war to the establishment of a research and teaching institute. Conditions which have arisen since have necessarily postponed such a project. As to postgraduate study for our physicians, many were assigned to special courses of instruction in a variety of specialties before the war but when personnel shortages began to be felt, such courses had to be discontinued. However, such postgraduate study for our physicians is now being resumed and as many medical officers as can be spared for such training are to be so assigned.

Welfare of the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert a resolution which was adopted by the Senate of the State of New York on March 21, 1945, and concurred in without amendment by the assembly:

Whereas the State of New York throughout the entire period following its ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1789 has expended largely of its means for the welfare of the Indians within its borders by the establishment of schools and the employment of teachers therein, by the construction and maintenance of highways through the Indian reservations within the State, for the support of indigent Indians and the improvement of health and sanitary conditions among these people on their reservations, all without expense to the Indians or to the Federal Government; and

Whereas neither the Federal Government nor the Indian residents of reservations within the State of New York have formulated an adequate system of laws for the government, protection, and regulation of such reservations or for the regulation of relations

between Indians and other residents of the State; and

Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts challenging the right of the State of New York to exercise jurisdiction over Indians within the State have endangered a successful continuance of the services being performed by the State and the creation of more harmonious relations between Indians and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized and urgently requested to enact legislation declaring the Indians within the State of New York, whether residing within or without any of the reservations within such State, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the State of New York in all respects excepting only those matters wherein jurisdiction has been or hereafter shall be expressly assumed by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the foregoing resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 23, 1945.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

H. R. 2536

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, from all over the State of North Dakota, which I represent at large, I am receiving almost continuous approval of what is commonly known as the Bulwinkle bill or H. R. 2536.

I have this day received from the North Dakota Stockmen's Association, a very important organization in our State, resolutions favorable to this bill.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith these resolutions:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *May 19, 1945.*

The Interstate Commerce Commission in its report to Congress in 1944 recommended that rate-making processes of common carriers should be removed from the sphere of antitrust law prosecution and should be subject of adequate regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This recommendation followed initiation of suits against the railroads for violation of the antitrust laws by the antitrust divisions of the Department of Justice. We have complete confidence in the manner in which the carriers have been regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and believe that the Transportation Act passed by Congress in 1920 should be amended to prevent any uncertainty as to which Government agency shall regulate the carriers. It is obvious that the railroads cannot follow the mandates of one Government agency if in doing so they make themselves liable to prosecution by another Government agency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Stockmen's Association go on record as approving the principles of the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) now before Congress and that we respectfully request Congressmen LEMKE and ROBERTSON, and Senators LANGER and YOUNG to support this bill; and be it

Further resolved, That our secretary is hereby instructed to send copy of this resolution to said Congressmen and Senators from North Dakota, and also to Congressman LEA, chairman of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, before whose committee hearings on this bill will be held, and further request Mr. LEA to include this resolution in the record of testimony offered for the bill, it being impossible for this association to send a representative to testify personally at the hearing.

NORTH DAKOTA
STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
By J. C. EATON, *President.*
L. E. ARNDT, *Secretary.*

Writing on the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 3, 1945:

WRITING ON THE WALL

President Truman's factual survey of the United States plans for completion of the war rains upon the heads of the Japanese hammer blows no less devastating than those of our B–29's over Tokyo and Osaka. The President's message was given out in the form of a report to Congress and the American people. But it must have been primarily intended as a post-VE-day warning to the Japanese. Indeed, he told the Japs in direct and forceful language that only surrender can save their country from the kind of ruin which they have seen come to Germany as a result of continued, useless resistance.

Not for a moment did the President underestimate the magnitude of the task we are facing in the Far East. The Japs, he said, have more than 4,000,000 troops under arms, a force larger than the Germans managed to assemble on the Western Front. Still others are waiting to be called up. We have not yet met the main body of the Japanese army. Most of those we have met are fighting with fanatical zeal, although not always with intelligence. While the Japanese air force has suffered enormous losses, the area it must defend has shrunk drastically and given the enemy a density of air power four or five times as great as it was. This fact, coupled with the delirium of Japanese suicide attacks as our forces approach the home islands, makes it necessary to contemplate heavy American losses.

The point is that we can absorb all the losses essential to the winning of complete victory, painful though they will be. The Japanese, too, have the capacity to sustain great losses—their casualties are now running six times as great as ours—but their chance for victory, if they ever had one, long since disappeared. The end in sight for them can be only ruin if they persist in fighting to the last division. President Truman has now made plain that we shall fight them with an army of 7,000,000 men equipped as no other army in history has been. We shall throw into the battle air power that will dwarf even the mighty raids that have already leveled Tokyo. Japan's production facilities will be smashed. Her transportation will be paralyzed. There is no escape from this impending catastrophe for Japan, except surrender. All the President needed to do to hammer that point home was to outline actual battle plans now being put into effect in the Pacific.

Many Americans will doubtless feel that an army of 7,000,000 men is larger than necessary to bring the Japs to their knees. But the President is doubtless thinking in terms of maximum strength to end the war as quickly as possible. The war is still to be an all-out effort in the sense of using all the men and equipment that we can transport across the Pacific. That is sound policy even if the number of men who can be effectively employed is overemphasized at this time. It is well to let the Japs know from the very beginning of our great offensive the magnitude of the power to be used against them.

We still hope that this stepped-up offensive will be accompanied by a vigorous attack in the sphere of political warfare. President Truman again held out to the Japanese people the assurance that "we have no desire or intention to destroy or enslave" them. But he also repeated the vague demand for "unconditional surrender." We think that the price the Japanese must pay for their offense against humanity should be made much more definite than that. The winning powers should tell the Japanese in simple and positive terms what they must do to stop the slaughter of their people and the destruction of their homeland. Those terms must necessarily include, as we have previously noted, stripping Japan of her gains by conquest as well as complete demilitarization of that country. But millions of Japanese are likely to prefer these harsh terms to utter destruction. We should encourage them to throw off at the earliest possible moment the military rule that is leading them to their doom, and thus avoid paying a higher price than necessary for the kind of victory that is essential to future peace in the Pacific.

The Meaning of Lidice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the word "Lidice" will always signify to all men everywhere the inexorable operation of eternal justice.

Lidice was a small Czechoslovakian town whose men were swiftly murdered, whose women and children were led away to the slow death of concentration camps, and whose buildings were leveled to the ground by a sudden manifestation of Nazi brutality.

The numerical loss of life in the destruction of Lidice was small in com-

parison to the depopulation of Poland. Other villages in Greece, in Yugoslavia, in France, and in Norway have been annihilated. It was not the magnitude of the crime against Lidice which aroused the wrath of every free people. This was a terrible slaughter of innocents, but innocents had been slain in wholesale lots elsewhere. We have had many betrayers of nations. Yet, they are all known by the name of one twentieth century Judas—Quisling. We have had many instances of the resistance of a few brave men against hordes of aggressors. We call them after the scene of one such battle—Bataan. As Quisling has become the symbol of treason, as Bataan has become the symbol of bravery, so Lidice has become the symbol of Czechoslovakia's resurrection as a nation.

Czechoslovaks—crushed to earth by their Nazi oppressor—have risen from their bondage. Heydrick, the hangman, is dead, executed by Czechoslovak patriots. Himmler, Heydrick's infamous master, is dead by his own hand. Daluege, who ordered the razing of Lidice, is a prisoner of the British. Justice is being meted out to Lidice's murderers.

It has been 3 years since, on June 10, 1942, a Nazi column roared into the peaceful Czechoslovak village. In those 3 years, Czechoslovakia has been liberated and Germany has been defeated. Events of world-shaking importance have transpired. Where, 3 years ago, we were fighting desperate rearguard actions against the victory-glutted Japanese in the Southwest Pacific, we are now disposing of the beaten remnants of the enemy on Okinawa—350 miles from Japan—and mounting ever-increasing aerial assaults against the Japanese home islands.

In the mids t of these changes, these achievements, the message of Lidice has not been forgotten. We still hear and heed the message of the martyred village. The basic righteousness of peaceful men cannot be destroyed. It will be reborn. It will rise again. The sheer evil of Nazi killers has brought down just retribution upon them. The sacred duty of this generation to posterity is to see that the forces responsible for the crime against Lidice shall not again terrorize the humble folk of nations now rededicated to the ideals of freedom.

The Auto Industry After the War—A Program Adopted by the International Executive Board of the UAW-CIO, April 20, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a program and a plan adopted by the international executive board of the UAW-CIO on April 20, 1945. This UAW-CIO plan is known as the Thomas plan, and is named after R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO. It is a practical program for reconversion in the auto and aircraft industries, and I believe that it should be read and studied by every Member of Congress.

THE AUTO INDUSTRY AFTER THE WAR—A PROGRAM ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UAW-CIO, APRIL 20, 1945

The workers and the machines of the auto and aircraft industries have been meeting the gigantic production assignments of war. By the time the war is over the 900,000 men and women employed in the plants of the automobile industry will have produced well over $30,000,000,000 worth of munitions. From the aircraft industry warplanes have been coming at a rate of 100,000 every 12 months—twice the 50,000-a-year goal which prompted the derision of the "experts" when it was first proposed by President Roosevelt.

There are now 2 auto workers for every 1 employed in 1940, and about 15 for every 1 on the pay rolls of the aircraft industry in that year. Government funds have served to double the productive plant and equipment of the auto industry and to multiply that of the aircraft industry many times over.

Our union, the UAW-CIO, has always held that to scrap this equipment and consign these workers to unemployment after the war would be unforgivable waste of the Nation's most precious resources. For us victory has never meant the return to so tragic a state of "normalcy." Defeat of the Axis on the world's battlefields must banish the prewar social insanity of idle men and rusting machines and ever-widening circles of human misery. It was in these conditions that the roots of fascism were planted; it will be from such conditions—if they are permitted to come again—that fascism can be resurrected even after shattering military defeat.

As Franklin Roosevelt said only a few weeks before his death, "Victory, without the use for abundance of the powers we have developed in production for war, would be, indeed, a hollow victory."

Such "use for abundance of the powers we have developed in production for war" is not now contemplated by major corporations of the automobile industry. In defense of this position a spokesman for one of these corporations has stated, "One of the most absurd of current fallacies is the idea that everyone has the right to a job."

Spokesmen for the industry do foresee a brief postwar boom—with production reaching a peak of 6,000,000 units per year, to be sold at 25 to 30 percent above 1942 prices. This is expected to last for no more than 2 years while we work off the replacement demand created by 4 years in which no passenger cars rolled off the industry's assembly lines.

When those easy pickings are over, the industry plans to beat a quick retreat to normalcy. Production is expected to fall back to the level of the late 1930's—between 3,500,000 and 4,500,000 cars and trucks per year.

This is a plain invitation to social and economic disaster. Such levels of production would allow for employment for little more than half the number of workers now on industry pay rolls.

Such normalcy would contribute at least one-half million jobless auto workers to the total of 18,000,000 unemployed which the United States Department of Commerce has prophesied will come if the Nation is allowed to sink back to its 1940 levels of production.

For the communities dependent on the auto industry and its workers this outlook spells defeat and disaster. Business, agriculture, and industries which prosper with high pay rolls would face paralysis from their recession.

JOBS FOR 1,000,000 AUTO WORKERS

We know the productive capacity of our industry. We have studied its possible postwar markets. It is our conviction that 5 years after the end of this war not 4,500,000 but 10,000,000 cars and trucks should be coming annually from the plants of our industry. And right now, as we take the first steps toward reconversion, our sights must be set on no lowe, goals. The whole process of reconversion should be geared to this—not to a relapse into unemployment, with men and machines thrown on the junk piles of industry.

At 10,000,000 units per year the industry would give employment to between 900,000 and 1,000,000 workers. This has been roughly the industry's wartime level of employment. It must become its peacetime employment if the need of the country and the world for motor transport is to be met, and if the industry is to shoulder its full share of 60,000,000 jobs in peacetime America.

No one can question that the manpower, the industrial skills, and the productive capacity for such output is on hand. Even in its best prewar years the industry never approached capacity operation. Conservatively estimated the prewar capacity of the industry was well above 6,000,000 units per year.

Since 1940 new machine tools and new plants have been built to the value of $1,100,000,000—a 100-percent increase. Some of this may not be immediately convertible to auto production. It may be difficult, for instance, to convert midwestern bomber plants to the production of coupes. But at least 80 percent of industry's new equipment—such as the grinders, the lathes, the milling machines, and the heat-treat furnaces—are direct additions to automotive-production capacity.

The mammoth new aircraft engine plant operated by the Chrysler Corp. could, by itself, more than meet the demand for auto and truck engines for the entire auto industry during a normal year.

To produce 10,000,000 units per year would require no expansion in basic productive capacity. Some work in reorganization would be needed and some planning to open up isolated bottlenecks in the supply lines of the industry. These would be no more than incidental measures required to mobilize for car production in the already existing power of the industry for the casting, forging, machining, stamping, and assembling of metal products. An industry which has turned out 26 percent of the Nation's vast war equipment can readily switch that productive power to the annual production of 10,000,000 cars and trucks. No one can seriously question that such capacity exists.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MARKET

When industry executives assume that capacity will not be used, they assume that the buying power of the average American will shrink back to approximately its prewar levels. They assume a return to the normalcy of economic insecurity and cancerous social misery. Their major premise is the inevitability of the narrow markets which stifled output during the 1920's.

In our planning for the postwar world we do not assume such conditions. Instead we are—along with the vast majority of the American people—fighting for the materialization of an opposing conception: that the purchasing power of the common man throughout the world will rise to new and unprecedented heights as a direct result of victory in the world struggle for humanity.

Nonagricultural wages and salaries of the American people are now running at over $100,000,000,000 per year, more than twice the prewar level. Savings have already been accumulated to the amount of $140,000,000,000. This means buying power beyond anything the Nation ever reached before.

We give our full support to the program of the National CIO, which proposes to maintain and extend this purchasing power against the threat of deflation when the load of Government war buying is lifted and full reconversion begins. We propose that this be done by a national program which will—

1. Maintain firm price controls through the reconversion period until such time as supplies of consumer goods match demand. Inflation must not be allowed to wipe out the buying power of the people's savings and income.

2. Carry through a speedy reconversion aimed at a 60,000,000 job economy. Speed in reconversion together with more adequate unemployment compensation and other social security benefits will avoid draining purchasing power away in change-over unemployment.

3. Adjust the Nation's tax program to protect mass purchasing power.

4. Bring immediate and substantial wage increases. If living costs are increased, or if there is a decline in weekly earnings for workers remaining employed during reconversion, the result will be a disastrous drop in wage and salary income. It is essential that wage increases be provided from industry's mounting profits in order to bring the equitable distribution of national income needed to make tens of millions of Americans good postwar customers for the products of American industry.

For the same reason farm income, too, must be protected against the threat of deflation.

5. Establish the annual wage in all industries. Stability of employment and income for American workers will mean stability of production, sales, and profits for industry and business throughout the country.

6. Give full Government support to needed public works. Projects such as the St. Lawrence waterway, program for improved roads, airport facilities, hospitals and schools must be prepared to meet reconversion unemployment and to counterbalance downward trends in the postwar business cycle. Such projects serve to create jobs in private industry and thus guarantee free enterprise the conditions under which it can achieve full employment.

7. Develop new industries. The aircraft industry has no more than scratched the surface of its postwar possibilities. Improved techniques and facilities will bring hundreds of thousands of additional jobs in aircraft manufacturing and transport services.

8. Carry through the United Nations' program of world political and economic cooperation. The tremendous markets of world reconstruction and development can be opened for us through the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks agreements. Only through such foreign trade can the production and savings created by a full employment economy be absorbed. This trade can be the margin between a drop into economic chaos and a steadily expanding prosperity.

9. Promote sound industrial relations. In their adherence to the recent labor-management charter, representatives of the majority group of American industrialists have shown their farsightedness. They know that full production and employment cannot be obtained by declarations of war upon labor and the institution of collective bargaining.

On the other hand, certain automobile industry executives have launched a campaign to repudiate the labor-management charter in the reckless hope of bringing about a peacetime industrial war aimed at bringing back the open shop. How well these reactionary employers understand the consequences of this is demonstrated by their sharp repudiation of the goal of postwar full employment. They know that full production and industrial civil war do not mix, and they prefer the latter.

The UAW-CIO seeks harmonious and peaceful relations with industry, as indispensable to the progress of the Nation. But we now serve notice that our full power will be mobilized for the defense of our union and the principles of collective bargaining if the actions of irresponsible employers make it necessary.

These are key national policies for 60,000,000 postwar jobs. They are policies in which the interests of labor, agriculture, business, and industry can find common ground. As the days of reconversion come ever nearer the people, as a whole, look to government for speedy and decisive action for this program.

INDUSTRY POSSIBILITIES

These broad national policies provide the framework within which the problems of our industry can find solution. In addition, specific responsibilities must be faced for the industry itself if it is to contribute its full share toward the Nation's postwar goals.

We propose the following:

1. A policy of price reductions rather than increases. It was by a low-price policy that the industry multiplied its production and employment levels many times over in the days of its most vigorous development. New home and foreign markets are yet to be tapped by renewed concentration on high-volume, low-cost production.

2. Disposal of Government-owned plant through policies geared into a program for 60,000,000 jobs and fully calculated to break down restrictive monopoly practices.

The UAW-CIO calls for the establishment of boards under the Surplus Property Administration, representative of labor, industry, and government, to explore postwar uses of Government-owned plants. No adequate study has yet been given UAW-CIO proposals that excess aircraft plants be used for the production of prefabricated housing and housing units. Such a study must be made.

3. Equal pay for equal work throughout the industry, to check the disruptive effect of wage competition among the areas and plants of the industry, so sharply accentuated by the present area bracket system of the National War Labor Board.

4. Rapid technological improvement in motor cars. The use of new materials and techniques should create new cars which will be safer, more efficient, and more economical than any before operated. Decreased fuel consumption is necessary if oil resources are not to be depleted within a short span of years. A revival of real competition in this area among auto manufacturers is essential. Existing governmental postwar guarantees against low profits should give ample leeway for full technological development by the small as well as the large producers of the industry.

5. Jobs for returning veterans in postwar industry with special compensation in accordance with the UAW's proposal for a 6-month veterans' bonus amounting to 20 percent of standard rates.

6. Establishment of an economic council, with the participation of labor and management, for the purpose of determining the facts regarding the economic problems of the auto industry and recommending policies based on such investigations which shall be in the interests of the industry and the Nation.

7. A special committee to be set up by the World Labor Conference to consider ways and means of meeting world demand for automotive transportation. From such deliberations may come proposals for expanding the market for automobiles through adjustments in the tariff, tax, and wage policies of various nations, and for working out international credit arrangements under the Bretton Woods agreement for the financing of such international purchases.

The purpose of such discussions shall be to assure an expanding market in which the United States will have its normal and necessary share. It must be recognized that maximum industrial development in foreign countries presents no threat of international competition, but rather the sound basis for world expansion of employment and the heightening of living standards.

Through the accomplishment of measures such as these the future of the auto industry and of the auto worker may be made secure. Our program is part of a national program for 60,000,000 jobs. We urge industry, Government, and the public to give it the most sincere consideration and the earliest possible enactment.

PRODUCTION SCHEDULES FOR 1,000,000 AUTO INDUSTRY JOBS

For some time our union has been studying the problem of postwar employment. We have been seeking to determine how the postwar auto industry is going to look. Our general conclusion is that the answer to that question will depend upon how fully the program of the UAW–CIO and the National CIO are carried into effect by the people and their elected representatives in government.

We have chosen to assume substantial success in this. On this basis we have sought to calculate postwar auto production. Behind these figures lies the assumption of a steadily expanding purchasing power at home and abroad. Behind them lies the assumption of a world at peace, with its peoples enjoying consistently higher levels of freedom and abundance.

These figures should be taken simply as estimates of what can reasonably be expected from the industry operating under conditions of full markets and full production to meet the human needs of those markets.

Domestic, foreign, and total production, cars and trucks, United States auto industry, 1946–50

[In millions]

Year	Domestic	Foreign	Total
1946	3.1	0.5	3.6
1947	6.4	1.2	7.6
1948	8.3	1.3	9.6
1949	8.5	1.5	10.0
1950	8.8	1.6	10.4

This total schedule assumes the defeat of Japan by the middle of 1946. With minor adjustments it could be fitted to an earlier or later date of victory. It assumes that even by 1947 some production or material supply problems will still hold the industry back from capacity production. By 1948 production will begin to match demand. Following 1950 the maintenance of this level of output will depend primarily on expansion of world demand; domestic demand could be expected to level off at that time.

(A) THE DOMESTIC MARKET FOR PASSENGER CARS

Domestic passenger cars to be produced, scrapped, and total registrations, 1946–50

[In millions]

Year	Produced	Scrapped	Registration
1946	2.0	1.5	23.0
1947	5.0	2.0	26.0
1948	6.8	3.5	29.3
1949	7.0	3.5	32.8
1950	7.2	3.6	36.4

We foresee an increase in passenger-car registrations from the level of 23,000,000 by the first of 1946 to a level of 36,400,000 in 1950. This is to be reached by annual car production rising from a level of 2,000,000 cars in 1946—while the industry is winding up its war-production job—to a total of 7,200,000 in 1950.

An estimated total of 36,400,000 passenger-car registrations by 1950 is by no means excessive The increase in population alone, assuming prewar income levels and no increase in the proportion of persons owning cars, would bring registrations from their 1941 total of 29,500,000 to 33,100,000 by 1950.

But the income of the average American has gone up sharply since 1941. In that year 38 percent of nonfarm families had incomes of less than $1,500 per year; 62 percent had more. In 1944 this proportion was halved; only 19 percent had less than $1,500 per year; 81 percent had more.

Millions of families have moved into income brackets which for the first time allow enough money left over, after the purchase of necessary food, shelter, and clothing, for the ownership of an automobile. Our present income—even after adjustment for increased living costs—is sufficient to allow for the ownership of about 40,000,000 passenger cars, if cars were now coming from the assembly lines of the automobile industry.

To assume that the Nation will not be able to own 36,000,000 cars in 1950 is to assume the inevitability of wholesale slashes in wages, salaries, and farm income. But this is not inevitable. On the contrary, it will happen only if there is bungling of the whole problem of economic and industrial reconversion.

(B) THE DOMESTIC MARKET FOR TRUCKS

Trucks produced for domestic market, 1946–50

[In millions]

Year:	*Trucks*
1946	1.1
1947	1.4
1948	1.5
1949	1.5
1950	1.6

Military vehicle and parts production is now running at a rate of $2,400,000,000 per year. This output is equal to the production of 2,500,000 civilian trucks per year.

Our schedules call for the production of only 1,600,000 trucks for domestic markets in 1950. This means an increase in truck output above prewar levels which will no more than match the increase in gross national product to be expected in a full employment economy.

(C) FOREIGN MARKETS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

In the United States there is 1 motor vehicle for every 4.1 persons. For the rest of the world's population, some 2,000,000,000 human beings, there is 1 motor vehicle per 200 persons. Our country, with 6.5 percent of the world's population, has 74 percent of all motor vehicles.

To bring the rest of the world up to the level of American automobile ownership would skyrocket the number of vehicles operated outside the United States from today's 10,000,000 to a total of 480,000,000. The UAW-CIO counts on the accomplishment of no such Paul Bunyan task of world economic development within the immediate future. Giant needs for food and shelter must be met before hundreds of millions of the world's peoples can begin to aspire to ownership of a family car.

Our estimates have been made on a much more modest basis. We have assumed simply that foreign registration will increase in the five postwar years at their average rate for the years 1921–25, and that America would have the same share of that market that she held in those years. This would mean an increase in world registrations (exclusive of the United States of America) from 10,000,000 to over 25,000,000. And this in turn would mean the production in that 5-year period by our own factories and workers of over 6,000,000 cars.

To assume any lower level of motor exports is to assume that the whole program of the United Nations for peaceful world economic development is so much international pie in the sky. We know the needs of the world peoples for the products of American industry. Since we are confident of the sincerity of those who framed the Bretton Woods agreement, we believe that the machinery for financing substantial American exports to meet those needs is being set up. It will work to smash the barriers which stifled foreign trade in the years before the war.

In fact, our forecast of foreign demand may be open to attack as an underestimate. Certainly, the pace of world development to be expected after the rooting out of the Nazi infection should be far more rapid and far more certain than that of the years after 1921. Historically, the establishment of political freedom for the common man has always opened the way for tremendous new advances in his economic activity and in his living standards. The world victory over dictatorships with their programs of worse than medieval misery for common people everywhere must be and will be reflected in new high tides of world economic activity. In this, American agriculture and industry are bound to have a full share. Foreign trade will directly increase the export markets for the products of auto workers. In addition, such trade will serve to increase the wage and income level of millions of American workers, farmers, and businessmen. The American makers of machine tools, of railroad equipment, of the thousand-and-one items needed for the rebuilding and development of the world also will be customers of the American automobile industry.

SPECIAL AIRCRAFT PROBLEMS

In 1940 the American aircraft industry employed 100,000 workers. Today 1,500,000 men and women are at work producing the war planes that have cleared the Axis from the skies of the world.

In no other industry except shipbuilding has there been such enormous expansion. In few others will there be greater danger of shattering peacetime deflation.

Estimates of postwar aircraft employment range from 100,000 jobs estimated by some to the 400,000 jobs in the industry prophesied by Secretary of Commerce Wallace. At the best there will be hundreds of thousands of jobless workers and there will be large-scale migration of workers in search of employment in other industries.

About 450,000 workers in the aircraft industry are now employed in plants operated by automobile companies. For them, our proposals for employment of 1,000,000 workers in the automobile industry will answer the problem of jobs. Others among the remaining aircraft group—the very old or young and 15 to 20 percent of the women—may not choose to work after the war. But this departing group is scarcely as large as the group of servicemen formerly employed in the aircraft industry who will be seeking reemployment after demobilization.

For at least 500,000 aircraft workers postwar jobs depend on the execution of the general CIO program which we have already outlined. If industry expands its general operation, if large-scale housing and other programs are inaugurated, if Government acts to meet the needs of servicemen and workers by increased unemployment compensation and other reconversion benefits, then the bread-and-butter problems of this critical group of workers can be solved.

The UAW-CIO is by no means content to accept the goal of 400,000 aircraft workers as the full measure of the peacetime possibilities of the aircraft industry. We favor action along the following lines:

1. Full development of air freight and passenger service for America and for the world. Costs for such service could be cut to a fraction of the present levels, and traffic thus multiplied many times over. Assuming volume operations with new planes, air-freight rates could be cut to one-third of present levels.

2. Extensive building of airports and airport facilities.

3. Intensified research with the help of Government for the development of a light "flivver" plane, which could be safe, cheap, and efficient, for the development of mass aircraft sales.

4. Develoment of large-scale training programs for civilian aviators.

5. Conversion of surplus aircraft plants. The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion should establish immediately, in conjunction with its advisory committees, a committee of competent engineers and experts whose responsibility it would be to survey the surplus aircraft facilities which would be available after VE- and VJ-day, with the view to ascertaining the degree to which these facilities can be converted to the manufacture of other products and the extent of unemployment which will accrue. Competent authorities have already indicated that existing aircraft assembly plants could readily be converted to the manufacture of prefabricated low-cost housing units. Such a program alone could easily reabsorb a minimum of 500,000 displaced aircraft workers. Likewise, the much-needed modernization of our railway rolling stock—a large portion of which now in use is more than 25 years old—offers great possibility for the use of surplus aircraft plants. Assembly plants and even subassembly plants manufacturing wings and fuselages are ideally suited to the manufacture of cheap coaches and freight cars, making employment opportunities for at least an additional 200,000 aircraft workers.

These are but a few examples of peacetime uses for surplus aircraft plants. The UAW-CIO is certain that a committee of experts recruited from industry, labor and Government can locate a host of others. These plants, built at great public expense, have been symbols of American war-time industrial supremacy that must not become industrial ghosts which haunt an America of unemployed veterans and war workers in postwar America. These vast tools of defense must become tools of plenty for America and a world deserving a richer and fuller future.

RECONVERSION

Since February of 1942 no passenger cars have been produced in America. The complex industrial networks which channeled the flow of parts and subassemblies through the thousand or more plants of the industry to steadily moving final assembly lines, have been totally broken. An industry organized for the production of one basic product has been reorganized to the production of thousands of weapons of war, ranging from B–29 or B–32 bombers to precision parts for radar equipment.

After Pearl Harbor the limitless needs of war swept aside all industry resistance and brought speedy success to the job of conversion.

Now the sweep of allied armies through Germany brings VE-day ever closer and with it the time of reconversion for at least one-half of the auto industry.

Already the strategic bombing of Germany has been ended. UAW members employed in production of B–24 or B–17 strategic bombers have been warned of lay-offs only a few days or weeks ahead. Jobs for 100,000 workers in the Detroit area are to be ended with the termination of B–24 production at the Ford Willow Run plant. Thousands of aircraft engine workers in Chicago and Flint are to be laid off in the fourth week of April.

Announcements of cut-backs in tank and other munitions programs are expected within the next few days.

Will the Nation's need for speedy reconversion of our industry be met with at least the decision and dispatch of the original conversion to war? Can one portion of the industry be changed over to civilian production while the other half continues to turn out weapons for final victory in the war against Japan?

These are the problems which can be fully solved only by the closest cooperation of labor, industry, and Government, including the procurement agencies of the armed forces. We of the UAW-CIO early recognized this need for close and detailed planning in meeting the problems of reconverting the auto industry, and proposed last fall that an Industry Council on Reconversion be established. This council is more urgently needed now than ever before, for now we are immediately confronted with the deflationary menace of large scale reconversion unemployment. Failure to meet this threat can only be at the expense of the Nation's goal of 60,000,000 postwar jobs. To allow it to develop will in addition create sharp dislocations bringing into peril the satisfactory conduct of the war itself. Resolute and effective action on the other hand will be a guarantee that Government and industry are preparing sure foundations to a postwar world of full production, with expanding abundance to all the people.

Such action must move along two main lines: (1) The physical process of reconversion must be speeded to the utmost; (2) the economic blow of reconversion unemployment must not be allowed to fall with shattering force on the hundreds of thousands of workers who have made the industry's war production possible.

SPEED RECONVERSION

Months ago the UAW-CIO outlined measures required to prepare the ground for a speedy reconversion of the auto industry. Our proposals included:

1. Immediate construction of the minimum number of machine tools necessary for getting out automobile production at the anticipated level of 2,000,000 cars a year.

2. Authorization for the use of manpower and materials for required engineering, designing, and tooling work to prepare for reconversion wherever such authorization could be given without interference with the war production effort.

3. Sale or lease to industry with the minimum delay of Government-owned machine tools not needed for post VE-day war production, but essential to civilian passenger car output.

4. A system of continuing priority and production controls to avoid interference with continuing war work and to protect civilian production against all avoidable bottlenecks.

Partial measures along the lines of this program have been taken by the War Production Board. The need for action has been thus recognized by Government. But too frequently steps actually taken have been too little and too late. Certainly the conviction expressed by the former Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion that post VE-day unemployment would be insignificant can be described as far more complacent than accurate. It at least assumes the prevention of measures which as yet hardly appear to have been conceived.

About 35 percent of the workers in critical machine tool shops have been at work on production jobs, which would have been assigned to thousands of metal working plants throughout the country. Even now with reconversion unemployment looming no more than a few weeks away, reassignment of this production load to clear the decks for production of crucially important machine tools has not been announced.

Policies for the disposal of excess plants and equipment have not yet been clearly outlined; management has not been able to learn what plants and what machines may be made available—or when. Agencies responsible under the George act for doing this job have been working, so timidly—if conscientiously—and on such minor issues that a major disaster of unemployment is being recklessly courted.

No action has been taken on our suggestion that skilled labor required for the industry's reconversion job be pooled. Such pooling would guarantee the industry against situations in which skilled workers may be idle in one plant while critical retooling work in the plant next door is held back because of a shortage of skilled labor.

Neither labor, management, nor the civilian agencies of Government have told exactly what plants will no longer be needed for war production after VE-day. The general principle of concentrating remaining war work in Government-owned plants has been adopted, but no specific schedule of cut-backs in any shape or form has yet been made available. As a result no one knows what parts plants, for example, will be freed of war assignments in time to meet orders from final assembly plants. Major plants in the industry may be prepared to start their assembly lines rolling only to find that supplies of critical parts—anything from transmission assemblies to spark plugs—cannot be provided. The apparent assumption of some high officials that the total effect of haphazard VE-day cut-backs will be sufficient to open industries' supply lines is an evidence of hope rather than knowledge. Trusting to chance can be no substitute for the planning and control needed to clear such channels for the flow of supplies and subassemblies.

We in the UAW–CIO offer our full cooperation to industry and Government in support of all steps which may now be taken to overcome these initial weaknesses in planning for reconversion. We are convinced that even half-way success in such a program will materially reduce the long months of unemployment which now seem to threaten the workers of our industries.

Reconversion in 6 weeks rather than 6 months after VE-day should be the goal. And this goal can be reached.

PROTECTION FOR WORKERS' LIVING STANDARDS

Whatever may be the success of reconversion planning a certain amount of unemployment for workers must now definitely be expected. Workers will be laid off, their buying power will be cut, their savings consumed, or their living standards dangerously cut. Take-home pay for the employee faces sharp reduction. The full extent of this deflationary sag in such communities as Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and Los Angeles has not yet been revealed. The Chairman of the War Production Board has announced cut-backs for the entire war program including food and clothing for the troops, to the amount of 12 percent in the first quarter after VE-day. Obviously in the munitions industries themselves the cuts will go far deeper. Indeed, unofficial estimates have placed them at 50 percent of present levels.

Serious unemployment is, therefore, a certainty for the months ahead.

The paralyzing economic effects of this can be and must be offset by planning now. This is the need not only of UAW–CIO members but of our country as a whole. The Nation cannot look forward to a peace of full production and full employment which is built on the impoverishment of workers or servicemen or farmers.

To meet this danger from reconversion unemployment the UAW offers the following economic program:

1. Wage policies of the National War Labor Board must be shifted at once from fighting the bogeyman of the inflationary gap to meeting the rising and very real menace of the deflationary gap.

Take-home pay must be maintained by wage increases as working hours are cut. Employers must be prohibited from shifting rates downward as jobs are shifted from war to peace.

The wage-bracket system must be abolished in favor of the principle of equal pay for equal work.

2. Government and industry must give laid-off workers full assistance in securing new employment.

Some critical labor-shortage areas may be expected to exist even after VE-day. Government and industry should join to meet the expenses of moving unemployed workers to areas where their skills are needed. Transportation expenses of migratory war workers who choose to return home should likewise be met.

Training centers to fit workers for peacetime occupations should be set up at once, and should be made available to those whose unemployment is due to reconversion.

3. Unemployment compensation benefits must be increased. Even before the war the average benefit payment was totally inadequate to maintain the worker and his family at a decent minimum level. Now with steep increases in the cost of living the buying power of benefits has shrunk severely.

The UAW-CIO continues to give full support to the proposals on unemployment compensation advanced in the last session of Congress by the Kilgore bill. Industry has been guaranteed through the generous provisions of the Revenue Act against financial loss or reduced profits; for labor there must be at least the assurance of essential living standards.

In addition the legislatures of the various States cannot shirk their immediate responsibility for increasing benefit rates and ending the wholesale disqualifications which have been denying benefits to great masses of war workers.

More adequate old-age protection should be given with benefits available to lower age levels.

4. The drive to break OPA price ceilings must be defeated. Unemployed workers and their families must not be allowed to become victims of unscrupulous profiteering. The Nation's system of price control must be strengthened rather than relaxed in the months ahead.

5. Programing and planning for needed public works must be started without delay. We call upon city governments to arrange immediate conferences with officials of State and National Governments to work out details for such projects. The blueprinting and the paper work must be done now if we are not to be overwhelmed by the crisis of reconversion unemployment which is now developing.

Every measure must be taken to stimulate public and private construction once materials again become available.

Finally, we call upon President Truman to exercise the full powers of his high office for the protection of American workers and the communities dependent upon them. We propose that he summon together in conference for this purpose representatives of labor and industry together with the directors of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Price Administration, and the Chairman of the National War Labor Board. Through the realistic facing of the issues by such a group and the same determination of a common program the crisis threatening workers and the people may be overcome. This is the course of action now required in preparation for an America of peace and prosperity in the future.

A Soldier's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, April 30, 1945, Mr. T. M. Sample, of New Palestine, Ind., who is almost 90 years of age and whose eyesight has almost completely failed, wrote a poem entitled "A Soldier's Prayer," which has since been presented to a number of luncheon clubs and other groups. This grand man of the Tenth Congressional District continues his activities in life regardless of age or infirmities. He writes his own letters, poems, and articles upon the typewriter—he having memorized the keyboard and he retains in his memory the location of each letter and figure thereon. I wish to commend and compliment this fine American citizen upon his thought, his great ability, and his never failing effort to go forward as one who expresses his desire for peace when this war is over. I congratulate Mr. Sample upon his energy and effort for our future, and I am happy to place his poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that all may read it.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the poem written by Mr. Sample, entitled "A Soldier's Prayer," which follows:

A SOLDIER'S PRAYER

After this war is over and we boys get back home,
None wants to be a rover or over earth to roam,
Home never seemed so dear: at home we long to be;
When we get out of here, our homes we wish to see.
It's there our loved ones wait, and pray for us and yearn
To greet us at the gate with joy, when we return.
We'll settle down by firesides, hear not the guns dread roar;
See not the awful fratricides, nor battles crimson gore.
How happy we shall be, the doors of hope ajar,
Where all are safe and free, and there is no more war.
Lord, give us peace; sweet peace, a peace that comes to stay,
Where wars forever cease, for lasting peace we pray.

Hawaii's Gross Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clipping from the Christian Science Monitor under date of April 9, 1945:

HAWAII FINDS GROSS INCOME TAX PRODUCES

HONOLULU, April 9.—Hawaii's gross income tax is rounding out a 10-year period of almost spectacular performance as a revenue-producing measure, having been largely responsible for building the Territory's finances up from $1,000,000 deficit in 1935 to a surplus which will approximate $20,000,000 at the end of the current fiscal year, June 30.

The steady and increasing flow of revenue from this tax has been the chief source of support, enabling the Territory to maintain a balanced budget and to retain a sound, financial position despite steadily increasing costs of government.

Because of the accumulation of substantial reserves in the general fund, Hawaii has been able to withstand the strain of emergency appropriations and unexpected expenses, resulting from wartime conditions. Dependence on Federal assistance for such wartime needs as air-raid shelters, civilian-defense organization and equipment, temporary housing and food and rent controls has been proportionately lessened.

GOOD PERFORMANCE

Dependable performance has silenced most of the critics and skeptics who represented a strong minority both in the legislature and in the business community when the measure was added to the statutes. There is now in Hawaii almost unanimous acceptance of this principle of taxation—a gross tax on all forms of business.

It would be distorting the financial picture, however, to give the gross income tax exclusive credit for the currently prosperous condition of Hawaii's treasury. Substantial income has been derived from other taxes, including the new 2-percent withholding tax on compensation and dividends and real property and personal property taxes. But in the past 10 years, the gross income tax has consistently produced a greater percentage of revenue than any other levy and now is commonly referred to as the budget-balancing tax.

When the 1935 territorial legislature convened, Hawaii faced a deficit of approximately $1,000,000. Salaries and wages of all Government employees had been cut 10 percent and automatic salary increases provided by law had been suspended. Expenditures in all departments had been curtailed to such an extent that governmental activities were not functioning properly.

TAX PLAN STUDIED

To cope with this situation, Joseph B. Poindexter, then Governor of Hawaii, appointed an advisory committee on taxation. This committee, after a year of tax study, recommended the gross income tax. Upon the Governor's endorsement of this recommendation and despite considerable opposition from a minority of legislators and business leaders, the gross income-tax law added to the territorial statutes.

At the end of the 1935 to 1937 biennium, after the gross income tax had been in effect a year and a half, the Territory had not only wiped out the $1,000,000 deficit, but had closed its accounts with a surplus of more than $1,300,000 after restoring salary cuts and lifting the suspension on automatic salary increases.

Since then, due to the steady increase in the tax base, or the gross business on which the tax is collected, revenues from this source have mounted steadily.

Performance would not have been so spectacular, however, if the adoption of this form of taxation had not coincided with the start of a 10-year boom resulting from prewar and wartime activities which inflated Hawaii's prosperity out of all normal proportions, trebling retail sales and the other principal business activities from which the gross income-tax moneys are derived.

PRIVILEGE TAX

As applied in Hawaii, the gross income measure exacts a tax from each person or entity in business. It is a privilege tax measured by gross income. The subject of the tax is the business activity, whether it be Hawaii's largest sugar and pineapple industries or a part-time piano teacher who may gross no more than a few dollars a month.

Business, as defined in the act, includes all activities—personal, professional, or corporate—engaged in with the object of economic gain, direct or indirect. Gross income is construed to mean gross receipts without any deductions for costs, taxes, or other expenses.

Salaries or wages for services rendered by an employee to an employer are not covered by this tax, but are subject to the new 2 percent withholding tax recently effective in Hawaii.

The gross income-tax law establishes various rates for business activities from a minimum of one-fourth of 1 percent for producing, wholesaling, and manufacturing, to a maximum of 2 percent for such activities as retailing, sugar processing, and pineapple canning.

RATES ARE FLEXIBLE

Rates are flexible, permitting the Territorial Treasurer, working in conjunction with the Director of the Budget—and upon the written approval of the Governor—to decrease or increase the rates within set limits to offset requirements of Territorial expenditures. Increase of rates may not exceed one-fourth of 1 percent at a time, and the maximum is set at 2 percent.

In 1936, the first complete fiscal year the tax was in operation, the gross income levy produced $3,550,538 from a tax base of $353,697,498. In 1944 the tax base, the gross receipts from all forms of business and other activities to which the tax is applied, amounted to $946,783,466, and the tax added $10,276,471 to Territorial revenues, representing 26 percent of all tax moneys collected in the Territory.

Hawaii's experience with this form of taxation has attracted wide attention in the mainland United States. In nearly every mail William Borthwick, Territorial Tax Commissioner, receives inquiries from various individuals or groups interested in tax problems and wanting to know how the gross income is working out in Hawaii.

ATTRACTS ATTENTION

Although similar taxes are in effect in 26 States, including West Virginia, whose tax law served as a model for the Territory, the

Hawaii law probably has attracted more attention because it has been applied in a period of rising prosperity which possibly has not been paralleled in all of the mainland localities where similar taxes are in effect. Hawaii's experience gained additional publicity through Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who made a personal visit in Hawaii to determine whether this form of levy could be used to finance his old age revolving pension plan.

More recently, the Territorial Tax Office has been in communication with Paul Chase of Syracuse, N. Y., in connection with Mr. Chase's advocacy of a gross income tax on a Federal scale. Mr. Borthwick is convinced that on the basis of Hawaii's experience, the gross income measure could and should be used by the Federal Government as a revenue-producing tax instead of the net-income principle.

Mr. Borthwick regards the gross income law as having many advantages from the tax collector's standpoint. Requiring returns on a monthly basis, it provides frequent contact between the taxpayers and the tax office, and also spreads the flow of income evenly throughout the year.

Army Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to state that much has been said pro and con as to the merits of the discharge point system announced by the Army. No doubt, from time to time, the Army will perfect this system to iron out inequities. It is my personal opinion that a combat soldier under the system is not given enough points for actual combat service. In this connection I am inserting a letter from a fine boy who has had long service in Italy, to his mother, who resides in my district in South Carolina. This mother has three other sons in the European theater, and naturally she is very much concerned that her fighting boys be given a fair break for actual combat service:

APRIL 1945.

DEAR MOTHER: Yesterday I figured out my points, and I have 73. You are supposed to have 85 points before you can get a discharge. Well, I wish some of the big shots back in the States could hear what the old men who have been doing all of the fighting think of the system. They haven't been given any consideration at all for the fighting that they have been doing. The only thing mentioned about combat time is that they are given five points for each battle star. Well, the catch in that is that the men in the rear who have never seen the front line are given battle stars and in most cases they have more battle stars than the front-line soldier. The reason why they have more battle stars is that they are never in the danger zone. The front-line soldier doesn't live long enough to get that many battle stars. When I was having some dental work done at the hospital, my dentist told me that he had four battle stars and that he thought he was going home. Well, he has been stationed over one hundred miles in the rear. The old men who came over with this company only have three battle stars. We have had between six and seven hundred men to pass through this company since we first went into combat. Now we have about thirty old men left who started off with this company, and I don't think that it would be fair to send these men back into combat. Most of the old men have been wounded once or twice and they have had just about all that they can take. It is almost impossible for a combat soldier to live long enough to gain the required amount of points to be eligible for a discharge and this is why we think the system is very unfair. There are about 40 men in the rear for each man on the front line. If the old men are needed in the South Pacific, I think they should be given the jobs in the rear, and let those men in the rear who have never been in combat come up and take our place. Well, I guess the majority will rule again, and they are the ones who have never seen any combat. It is a funny thing how the press can lead the public around, and make them believe most anything. Maybe I had better stop on this subject before I say too much. There is a lot more that I could tell that wouldn't sound so good, and no one would be able to understand or believe unless he had been here.

Affectionately,
Your son,

TOM.

The Flag of All Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very beautiful poem, The Flag of All Nations, by Miss Hallie McMillan, of Charlotte, N. C. Miss McMillan is an accomplished poet, musician, and artist. She is an active member of the Alumnae Limestone Association of Limestone College, Gaffney, S. C. It has been proposed by civic organizations and prominent individuals that this poem be adopted as the universal peace hymn.

It is with great pleasure that I call the merits of this composition to the attention of the Congress:

FLAG OF ALL NATIONS

(By Hallie McMillan)

Flag of all nations, wave on through the night.
Thy royal sphere banner with power and might,
Wherever thou wavest, wave peace to thy world,
O'er thy United Nations, forever unfurl.
Wave truth to every nation, thy strength in unity,
Symbol of peace and justice,
Thou flag of victory.
Flag of all nations, float on day by day.
Thy emblem of freedom unfold thou our way.
Thy bright stars will guide thee wherever thou be,
O'er every global boundary o'er air, land, and sea
Peace reigns, o'er thy horizons glory in liberty,
For worlds of our tomorrow.
Triumphant victory.

Who Writes the Trade Agreements?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the astounding disclosure which has just been made by the FBI that certain officials of the State Department have been disclosing the secrets of that Department to foreign nations brings up a very important point with reference to the trade agreements.

There has been an effort, through propaganda paid for by the taxpayers, to lead the citizens of this country to believe that they could more safely trust their affairs to the State Department bureaucracy than to the duly elected Members of Congress.

Internationalists have been delegated power to write trade agreements, under the terms of which pay rolls in this country can be destroyed, agriculture deprived of its domestic market, industry stifled, if not ruined, which is too much power to place in the hands of a group of international-minded functionaries.

Under leave to extend, I include an article from the Washington Daily News under date of Thursday, June 7, 1945, relating to this deplorable situation, now existing in the State Department:

TOP UNITED STATES SECRETS OPEN TO COMMIES—UNITED STATES AIDES' ARREST BARES RED TIE-UP

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, June 7.—With the FBI arrest of two State Department officials, a Naval Intelligence officer and three private citizens on charges of espionage, the Scripps-Howard newspapers today reveal that through Philip J. Jaffe, the ringleader, the American Communist movement had access to "high confidential documents," some of "top secret" importance, in six Government wartime departments or agencies. They included the Departments of War, Navy, State, and the Office of Strategic Services.

Jaffe, who according to FBI Director Hoover received the data stolen from secret Government files, has been for more than 10 years a leader and heavy financial supporter of Communist propaganda causes.

RICH BUT RED

Although a wealthy businessman, Jaffe is a Communist and teaches at the Jefferson School of Social Science, official school of the Communist Political Association.

In 1934, at the request of Earl Browder, he took charge of the American Friends of the Chinese People, a Communist front. Under the alias of J. W. Phillips he became its executive secretary, financial angel, and editor of its publication, China Today.

So seriously did the Government regard the series of thefts that Acting Secretary of State Grew took the unprecedented step last night of issuing a statement in connection with the arrests. He said they followed a thorough investigation in which the State, Navy, and Justice Departments "for the past 2½ months * * * have been working together to determine how the official secret data was obtained."

Arrested last night along with Jaffe, now editor of Amerasia, were his coeditors, Kate L. Mitchell, writer and Bryn Mawr graduate, and Mark Gayn, a writer for Collier's and other national magazines.

THREE ARRESTED HERE

Also arrested were Navy Lt. Andrew Roth, formerly Jaffe's research associate on Amerasia; Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, specialist in the China Division of the State Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and John Stewart Service, State Department foreign service officer returned recently from China.

(High-placed Government officials hinted in Washington today that the six arrests comprised one of "a whole series" of cases involving illicit use of confidential Government information. One official said the Government was digging into "a good many" similar incidents.)

Larsen, Service, and Roth were arrested in Washington last night, charged with conspiring to obtain, possess, or transmit information affecting the national defense. The other three, arraigned here on the same charge, were released on $10,000 bonds.

Gayn, United States Attorney John F. X. McGohey said, "was apparently preparing to flee the country," evidently intending to reach the Orient through Russia and India.

GREETING CARD MAGNATE

Mr. Hoover said that most of the stolen documents, both copies and originals, were turned over to Jaffe. FBI agents discovered data taken from OWI and the FCC as well as the four other bureaus.

Some of the information, according to Mr. Hoover, appeared in Amerasia. An article by Gayn, Terror in Japan, will appear in this week's Collier's, which was in print before the arrests were made.

Jaffe is president of Wallace Brown, Inc., a greeting card manufacturing firm. His contribution to the Communist cause is known to exceed $5,000 annually.

Among his other activities Jaffe is a member of the board of directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., the leading pro-Soviet propaganda organization in this country. On May 21 the Scripps-Howard newspapers disclosed that this council, which operates with an imposing list of sponsors, spearheaded a national pressure campaign against the current best seller, Report on the Russians, by W. L. White.

Jaffe was a founder of the American-Soviet Friendship Council, originally named the American Council on Soviet Relations. He served as its national director when it conducted a Nation-wide campaign "for the purpose of making contacts, organizing local councils, and speaking" in many cities to spread the message of what the council called Russia's "achievement in the building of a Socialist state."

PAL OF LAMONT

Jaffe's close associate and national chairman of the council under both its names was Corl'.s Lamont, foremost United States apologist for the Soviet system.

An even closer associate of Jaffe over the last 11 years has been Frederick Vanderbilt Field, wealthy backer of the Communists and now columnist on their tabloid, the Daily Worker. In October 1935, Field spoke at a banquet given by China Today. Jaffe was chairman of the banquet as J. W. Phillips. The featured speaker was Earl Browder.

While still editor of China Today, Jaffe in 1937 founded Amerasia, along with Field, as managing editor and chairman of the editorial board respectively.

During their coeditorship of Amerasia Field found time for other activities. In the period of the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact Amerasia's chairman headed the American Peace Mobilization as executive secretary.

The Justice Department has since characterized the American Peace Mobilization as a front formed "under the auspices of the Communist Party" to discredit "lend-lease and the entire national-defense program."

PICKETED WHITE HOUSE

Field, according to the Department, directed a continuous picket line at the White House against what Field called America's march toward fascism.

Jaffe was busy too. He saw to it that both Amerasia and China Today hewed to the Communist Party line. For example, when Amerasia found occasion to mention the European war it politely referred to Hitler's side as the Germans and not the Nazis.

And when France had fallen and Britain faced her darkest crisis, Jaffe wrote in the November 1940, issue of Amerasia:

"The war in Europe is between Great Britain, the greatest imperial power in the world, and a country which is ambitious to replace Great Britain in that role. * * * Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses.

"Thus the war in Europe is between two powers, each with similar economic ends, each denying its subjects democratic procedure."

In the same issue Andrew Roth, one of the six charged today with conspiracy, had an article telling, in a pleased tone, about England's troubles with India as a result of the war in Europe.

A fellow member of Amerasia's editorial board with Jaffe was Owen Lattimore, whom the Government the following year sent to China to be Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's personal adviser. Mr. Lattimore later became director of the Pacific bureau of OWI.

Originally a Socialist, Jaffe found this too mild and drifted into the Communist orbit. About 1933 he became contributing editor of Labor Defender, monthly magazine of the International Labor Defense, the legal arm of the Communist Party.

From this post Browder transferred him to leadership in the American Friends of the Chinese People, where he ran a campaign against Chiang Kai-shek and in defense of Communist-controlled areas of China. Following a trip to these sections in 1937, Jaffe wrote a long report for the New Masses, Communist weekly.

Broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over Mutual Network, Wednesday, May 23, 1945, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Well, the first chapter of the long-awaited shake-up in the governmental high command in Washington has come finally, and to call it a shake-up is a masterpiece of understatement; it turned out to have almost the proportions of a convulsion.

President Truman announced at his news conference at the White House this afternoon that he has accepted the resignation of Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor, and Mr. Claude Wickard as Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Francis Biddle as Attorney General, effective the last day of June, and in their places he has appointed, as Secretary of Labor, former Senator Lewis Schwellenbach of Washington State, now a Federal judge there, and as Secretary of Agriculture, Representative CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the special House committee that has been investigating the Nation-wide food situation, and as Attorney General, the present Assistant Attorney General in charge of war frauds prosecution, Mr. Tom C. Clark of Dallas, Tex.

And may I say, as one who knows all three of those men personally, and knows two of them very, very well indeed, that no three better appointments were ever made to any President's Cabinet, in all the history of this country. These are three of the topmost of top-flight men. They are not rich men's sons; they are not play boys, amusing themselves with the glamorous business of public life. They are all men who have worked for a living all their lives, and who understand what it is to make a dollar.

You have heard Representative CLINTON ANDERSON'S name many times over this microphone. It was he who wrote the extraordinarily fine and comprehensive meat investigation report for his committee—which I commended to your attention, and for which, by the way, he has received more than 33,000 requests from you—and it was he, also, who wrote the committee's report on its investigation of the sugar situation, which I mentioned to you day before yesterday. He's a farmer himself, he has a farm of 800 irrigated acres in New Mexico and two more farms in the Dakotas, and he knows what it's all about. What's more, he is one of the keenest and soundest and most realistic minds, in the entire Congress. But of top importance, the President not only gave Representative ANDERSON the Department of Agriculture today, but he also put him in complete control of the War Food Administration, as well—accepting the resignation of War Food Administrator Marvin Jones. That means that the process of getting all of the food powers of the Government back under one head, where they belong, is actually under way and the man who has control is one who believes and says that the only way to control black markets, is to produce more meat and other foods, and to allow everyone along the line to make a fair and reasonable profit. He also believes and says that in dividing up the short supplies we do have available, the Army should continue to come first, as it does now, but that thereafter the American civilian public should get what it needs, leaving the remainder for lend-lease, instead of lend-lease getting what the whim of the moment dictates, and letting the civilian public have what is left.

As for Lewis Schwellenbach, he left the Senate to accept the place on the Federal bench in the Northwest back in 1940, if I remember correctly, and you recall that as late as a year ago when I was passing through Washington State, I mentioned to you the remarkable record that he had made for himself there. He has done such an outstanding job that he won the outspoken admiration of even the most partisan Republicans. I was told that there was one case that came before him, in which some little citizen had had his land taken away from him by the Army and couldn't get any satisfaction, and was being imposed upon generally, and Judge Schwellenbach hauled the Army officers into court and threatened to punish the whole lot of them, uniforms or not, unless they settled the trouble at once.

Tom Clark I know less well, personally, but what I do know is on a par with the other two. He came into the Government service as a young lawyer from Dallas, Tex., at $4,500 a year, and has worked his way up ever since. From all reports he has done a very creditable

job as chief of the War Frauds Division, and he, along with the other two, are highly intelligent, feet on the ground, healthy, honest citizens, who believe that two and two still make four. They are not superthyroid, and they talk in language that makes sense, instead of doubletalk, and they have not the slightest tinge of exhibitionism or tint of parlor pink. They are, let's say, "liberal but honest."

The really great significance of these changes today lie in the fact these appointments are strictly a swing back to the Democratic Party and away from the radical and long-haired fringe. In fact, the slogan among political topsiders today is that "the Democratic Party is coming back into control." By way of further evidence along the same line, President Truman's calling list of yesterday showed, in immediate succession, the names of Jouett Shouse, Lawrence Wood Robert, and Homer Cummings—all former top figures in the Democratic Party but long since sent into political exile. These changes today also suggest that there may be a realistic reorganization of the labor functions of the Government, too. In the course of the last few years, as you know, virtually all real powers were taken away from the Labor Department under Madam Perkins and put elsewhere, and the various war labor agencies were all set up as independent agencies, sprawled all over the lot. It's not at all improbable that under Secretary Schwellenbach they'll be gathered back into the Labor Department, where they should be, too. Incidentally, Judge Schwellenbach is strictly a nonpartisan, as between the CIO and the American Federation of Labor. He is eminently satisfactory to all factions alike.

The President said today that he has no intention of accepting the resignation of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, or Secretary of State Stettinius. Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard will be named as head of the Rural Electrification Administration.

House Resolution 287

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber when the yeas and nays were ordered on roll call 287, covering H. R. 3109, referred to as the House expense allowance bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my constituents have a right to know my position regarding this legislation. When H. R. 3109 was before the House on May 10, I stated my position at that time. My remarks are recorded on page 4942 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 1945. Under leave to extend my remarks on House Resolution 287, I desire to include as part of my remarks the statement I made on that date:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provision contained in H. R. 3109 which would allow the sum of $2,500 per year as an expense allowance for each Member of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to make clear my position in this matter. I do not question the sincerity of those Members who urge the necessity for this legislation, but, for myself, I am opposed to it for the following reasons:

First. Recently the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin considered the question of allowing the members of the legislature an amount to cover expenses while in attendance at sessions. The bill was overwhelmingly rejected and newspaper comment was almost unanimously opposed to it. Therefore, I must assume that my constituents have spoken in this matter and I yield to their judgment.

Second. This is no time to be voting expense allowances for ourselves. It is true that many Members need this extra money in order to meet the heavy monetary demands of this office; for many it is a considerable sacrifice. But, Mr. Speaker, when I attempt to justify my sacrifices with those of my son and my daughter, I find no basis for comparison.

Third. It is my opinion that a straight salary-increase bill should be submitted to the Congress when the war is over—then the subject can be considered under more normal conditions.

United States Communists Adopt a New Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, newspapers last evening carried headlines that top United States secrets were available to the Communists. The story gave an account of certain arrests made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is encouraging to know that at least something is being done.

Within the past few days a development has taken place fraught with grave consequences for our country. The statement of Jacques Duclos, secretary of the French Communist Party, acting as the official spokesman of international communism, in criticizing the line of the American Communists, and the subsequent adoption of a new revolutionary line by the Communist Political Association of the United States, will undoubtedly usher in a period of accentuated strife and subversive activities under the leadership of the American Communists. I place these statements into the RECORD to sound a note of official warning to the FBI, the Army, the Navy, and our own Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

Since the Communist organization has shown in its 25 years of existence in this country its complete and consistent subservience to the dictates of its masters in Moscow, we must lay the responsibility for any activities emanating from Communist sources squarely at the door of the Soviet Government. The great masses of the American and the Russian people have the greatest desire for friendly relations between their Governments. Should the activities of the American Communists injure these relations, then ours will not be the blame.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further extend my remarks by including an article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 25, 1945, and an article from the New York World-Telegram of May 24, 1945:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 25, 1945]

REBIRTH OF UNITED STATES COMMUNISTS UNDER FOSTER HINTED BY FRENCH WRITER'S BLAST AT BROWDER—REMOVAL OF AMERICAN PARTY HEAD PRESAGED—CRITICISM BELIEVED INSPIRED BY STALIN

(By Walter Trohan)

A sensational Communist article, which presaged the return of revolutionary and subversive policies against the United States and Great Britain and signaled the possible removal of Earl Browder as the head of American Communists, was being studied in official circles last night with grave interest.

The article, which reached official circles here through France, consisted of a sizzling rebuke from one Communist to another. Jacques Duclos, secretary of the French Communist Party, assailed Browder in an article, entitled "Notes on the Dissolution of the American Communist Party," which appeared in Les Cahiers du Communisme, official publication of the French Communist Party.

INSPIRED BY STALIN

As the French article was being translated here, it was published in full in the Daily Worker, with a note by Browder, which asserted that the article demands "our most respectful consideration."

Those conversant with international Communist procedure said Browder's publication of the article gave it official stature and made certain the suspected fact that the article was inspired by Josef Stalin. It has been the rule of the allegedly dissolved Comintern that every Communist leader must publish attacks upon him by leaders outside the country. This rule was enforced to keep leaders in various countries under party discipline.

Officials here also recognized that a leader of Duclos' stature would not criticize the head of the American Communists without the approval of Moscow. These officials said criticism of Browder could not very well come from Moscow, since the international Communist organization is dissolved, so that Duclos was evidently employed to announce the change of Communist Party to the world.

It was recalled that, whenever Stalin changes his line, he disposes of his previously-authorized spokesman. For this reason, Litvinov was placed on ice along with collective security when the Hitler-Stalin pact, which precipitated the war, was signed and Molotov became the chief Soviet voice on foreign affairs.

It was predicted here that Browder will be similarly shelved and William Z. Foster, veteran Communist, will become the head of Communist activities in this country. If Browder is not actually removed, it was reported in official circles, he will be forced to execute a rapid about-face on policy.

The article of the French Communist was viewed as heralding the end of the Communist democratic honeymoon, which began when Hitler declared war on Russia. Such a step was held to be fraught with possible grave consequences to the United States.

It was recalled that strikes are one of the chief weapons of the Communist world revolution and that a strike of the maritime union, which has been held in Congress to

have heavy Communist affiliations, might delay the return of American soldiers from Europe. It also was recognized that strikes would hamstring the Pacific war.

FAULTY CONCEPTION CHARGED

Significant passages in the Duclos attack on Browder for dissolution of the American Communist Party into the Communist Political Association, which was condemned by the French leader as a renunciation of world Marxism, include:

"Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a faulty conception of the direction of the social revolution in general and in particular of the direction of the special evolution of the United States."

"In spite of the declarations concerning the recognition of Marxist principles, we are witnessing a manifest reconsideration of Marxism by Browder and his partisans, a reconsideration expressed through a conception of lengthy peace between classes in the United States, through the possibility to suppress class warfare in the postwar period, and through the establishment of harmony between labor and capital."

"The French Communists will not approve the policy followed by Browder, for it is spreading dangerously far from the victorious doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, whose rigidly scientific application could only lead to one conclusion; not to dissolve the American Communist Party."

CONFUSION OBSERVED

"Moreover, one will observe a certain confusion in Browder's declaration as concerns the problem of nationalizing monopolies and what he calls the transition from capitalism to socialism. The nationalization of monopolies is by no means a Socialist achievement, contrary to what some are inclined to believe. No; nationalization is merely a reform of a democratic nature, and the achieving of socialism cannot be conceived without seizure of power.

"In truth, nothing justified, according to us, the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States."

Duclos insisted the American Communists "are spreading dangerous opportunist illusions which will have a negative influence on the American labor movement unless they are properly countermanded."

In the light of the recent Communist successes in elections in France, the Duclos statement takes on additional significance, it was said here. It follows the general belligerent Soviet attitude in dealing with the Allies on Yugoslavia, Poland, Greece, Austria, and Rumania.

[From the New York World-Telegram of May 24, 1945]

BROWDER ADMITS REBUKE ON POLICY—PARTY LINE MAY REVERT TO CLASS WAR

(By Frederick Woltman)

Earl Browder and the leadership of his Communist Political Association were forced by the World-Telegram today to admit to their followers and the world in general that they have been sharply rebuked by a spokesman of the international Communist movement for abandoning basic revolutionary tenets. As a result, they announced also, America's Reds now face a drastic reversal from a policy of cooperation with capitalism to one of Marxist class struggle.

The official condemnation was first disclosed in this country Tuesday in an article by Nelson Frank, World-Telegram staff writer. After 2 days of silence Mr. Browder finally was smoked out. Today's Daily Worker, of which he is editor, publishes the complete text of the rebuke, using 3 of its 16 pages.

ARTICLE REPRINTED

Both the rebuke and its public acknowledgement were regarded by Government circles today as extending in significance far beyond the shores of the countries involved and indicating the future political trend of Soviet Russia, since 1919 the mecca of communism.

Following the World-Telegram's prod, the Worker reprints the politically authoritative diatribe against Mr. Browder and his policies by Jacques Duclos in the magazine Cahiers du Communisme, described by the Worker as the "theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France."

This marks the first publication of any criticism of Mr. Browder in an official Communist organ since he was made leader in 1930.

HUMBLE AND PENITENT

Among other things, the Duclos document charges Mr. Browder with false concepts, a notorious revision of Marxism, erroneous conclusions, deforming in a radical way the meaning of the Teheran Allied agreement, and sowing dangerous opportunist illusions which will exercise a negative influence on the American labor movement. * * *

Accompanying the lengthy text is "A Foreword to the Article of Jacques Duclos," written by Mr. Browder himself, in the dual capacity of Daily Worker editor in chief and president of the Communist Political Association.

Humble in manner and penitent in tone, Browder characterizes his attacker as "one of the main leaders of the Communist Party of France, whose policy or his own country is, unquestionably, sound. * * *

"Unquestionably," he says, the article "reflects the general trend of opinion of European Marxists in relation to America and, thus, demands our most respectful consideration."

As evidence of Browder's alleged backsliding, Duclos, in the Daily Worker version, quotes the top American Communist as pledging on September 25, 1944:

"To loyally support the existing system of private enterprise which is accepted by the overwhelming majority of Americans * * * to restrain all impulses toward strike movements among workers and to prepare the workers for a continuation of national unity after the war."

"READY TO COOPERATE"

Duclos also disapprovingly quotes this Browder commitment to America in behalf of his Communist organization:

"If anyone wishes to describe the existing system of capitalism in the United States as 'free enterprise,' that is all right with us. And we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively in the postwar period with the least possible burdens upon the people."

Remarks Duclos, according to the Daily Worker: "Browder's analysis of capitalism in the United States is not distinguished by a judicious application of Marxism-Leninism."

So Browder, in today's report, accommodates by tossing overboard the American Communists' year-old program of wartime and postwar unity:

"We must make the most careful inventory, balance our political books and know clearly how we stand as we enter a new period of sharpening struggles, crises and profound changes."

All along Browder has been promising that the Tehran declaration makes possible a policy of unity and cooperation by the Communists here long after the Nazis and Japs are defeated. Now, with Russia out of the war, he suddenly abandons this line and announces: "It has been clear at all times that the end of the war in Europe would require a fundamental review of all problems by American Marxists."

PERIOD OF NEW STORMS

Hence the national board of the CPA will quickly take up "the main questions raised by Duclos," according to Browder, to formulate "a clear perspective for the coming period of new storms."

"Now," he warns, "is the testing time for the integrity, understanding, and maturity of the CPA and of each member."

Apprehensively, he adds: "Our enemies will raise a gleeful clamor to greet the open discussion of difference of opinion between Communists of different lands and between Communists within America."

Browder and his associates have had the Duclos attack for some weeks, but were holding it under wraps, it was learned from sources close to CPA headquarters, 35 East Twelfth Street. They hoped to keep it quiet until Browder could crawl back on the limb gradually.

Since the World-Telegram's article appeared, 2 days ago, CPA headquarters has been disrupted by frantic emergency conferences. One top official of the CPA, according to Duclos, had tried, unsuccessfully, to defeat the Browder line, William Z. Foster, former Communist Presidential candidate.

Mr. Foster has been wearing a wide grin around headquarters the past 2 days.

Big Industry Points Out Threatened Shortage of Bread and Bakery Products

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I conferred yesterday with one of the men in the baking industry who is genuinely alarmed over the present critical problem which has developed in connection with the bread and baking industry. There is a threatened cut in the amount of sugar and the amount of shortening which will be available to the baking industry. If these cuts go into effect, the amount of bread and bakery products will not be sufficient to meet the demand and someone will not be able to get bread or bakery products. If such a shortage of these supplies should develop it will mean rationing to the American housewife.

Certainly this situation gives an added reason why we should have a food czar to straighten out the mess. The report of the House committee to investigate the food shortage was transmitted to the House May 1, 1945. That is exactly 1 month and 8 days ago. We are just 37 days late, Mr. Speaker, in not having a food czar to straighten out some of these matters and protect the American people and see to it that there is an adequate supply of bread for the American housewife.

This condition calls for immediate action by Congress. It is so important that the Bakers Weekly ran a message in the Post and the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., under date of June 5, 1945. This message reads as follows:

MUST WE NOW FACE RATIONING OF BREAD AND OTHER BAKERY PRODUCTS?

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, T GOVERNMENT AGENCIES CONCERNED WITH FOOD, AND TO THE PUBLIC

True, no one yet is obliged to turn in ration stamps for a purchase of baked goods.

It is equally true, however, that we face an indirect but very effective form of rationing. Right now additional cuts in bakery use of sugar and shortening are being proposed. If they are put into effect, the bakers of America will be forced to reduce their production to levels that will seriously endanger the feeding of the general public.

This in the face of a supply of wheat, more than adequate to meet any conceivable demand, a supply, however, that is virtually useless as a food until it is rendered palatable by the addition of sugar, shortening, and other ingredients.

This in the face, too, of increasingly critical civilian shortages in meats and other protein foods, for which bread and other bakery products provide the most satisfactory and nutritious replacement.

The demands of war workers and other civilians for these energy foods have been met by increasing bakery production to 145 percent of prewar levels. This has been accomplished in spite of drastic curtailments in the amount of sugar and shortening allowed bakers. By direct rationing, bakers are now limited to 75 percent of their prewar use of sugar and to 80 percent of shortening.

To meet this all-time high in public demand with limited materials has required the utmost of skill and all possible conservation methods in order to keep bakery products wholesome and flavorful.

Further curtailment of sugar and other essential materials can mean only one thing; a corresponding reduction in the amount of baked goods that can be provided for the American public. The neighborhood baker will close his store earlier in the day, or several days a week. The grocer's bread and sweet-goods department will display a sold-out sign earlier and oftener.

There will be less bread, cake, and other baked foods for workers' and school children's lunches, and for the family table.

Able congressional committees have lately turned the spotlight on our growing crisis in food. In our opinion, most of the Government officials in the many agencies concerned with food are genuinely alarmed. No one man or agency is responsible for the situation.

Food processors generally have welcomed President Truman's appointment of Congressman CLINTON P. ANDERSON as Secretary of Agriculture. With his associates on the House Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages, he has laid the groundwork for his new assignment to overhaul our critically tangled food supply and distribution set-up. The President has indicated that Mr. Anderson will have the necessary authority to really function through coordinated controls—an authority which has not been delegated to anyone up to this late date in the war.

It may be that no measures can bring adequate relief immediately. But prompt action on the Anderson committee recommendations—including full disclosure of foreign shipments—is our only hope of maintaining a decent minimum base for our home-food program for the balance of the war and the reconversion period.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOOD SHORTAGES

1. Establish authority and responsibility for procurement, transportation, pricing, and distribution under one coordinating head.

2. Open negotiations immediately for the purchase of the 1946 Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar crops.

3. Provide Hawaii with heavy type machinery such as crawler cranes and front-axle-drive trucks for sugar production.

4. Provide adequate machinery, supplies, and labor for domestic beet and cane areas by fullest cooperation between War Food Administration, War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, and the War Department.

5. Make available to friendly European countries that are in short supply for plantings in the spring of 1946 our surplus beet seed. Consideration should be given to the substitution of other carbohydrates, particularly cereals, for part of the sugar now tentatively allocated to them.

6. Encourage the production of corn sugar and syrups in 1945.

7. Tighten rationing controls so that allocations will not be exceeded.

8. Establish a minimum figure below which the supply of sugar for United States civilian use will not be allowed to fall.

9. Reexamine allotments made to different classes of industrial users.

10. Review all foreign commitments and adjust to safeguard minimum allotments for United States civilian use.

11. Make public all commitments and allocations, domestic and foreign, with explanatory supporting data.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

STEPHEN PACE.
EARLE C. CLEMENTS.
MARTIN GORSKI.
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.
HAL HOLMES.

Mr. ANDERSON has demanded, through his committee's recent report on sugar, that the American public be given access to all possible facts. This means that secrecy be maintained only where military considerations are involved; but that on the other hand the public be told the truth of our commitments to foreign noncombatant populations, for direct-consumption or industrial use.

FROM THE SENATE

Extract from a letter to Chairman ANDERSON from Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Senate Small Business Committee:

"As you have now been nominated for Secretary of Agriculture and, according to press reports, will also become War Food Administrator, I feel it is incumbent upon you to see that your committee's recommendations are implemented immediately so that we may most effectively utilize our present supplies of sugar."

STRAIGHT TALK FROM LEADING BAKERS TESTIFYING BEFORE THE HOUSE FOOD SHORTAGES COMMITTEE

"Wheat-flour is not acceptable food unless combined with sugar and shortening (and other ingredients) to become, as bakery products, the principal consumable form of grain. Bakers predict that further reductions in quotas of these necessary ingredients, including sugar, will result in the equivalent of rationing of bakery products through production cutbacks despite the plentiful supply of wheat flour."

JOHN T. MCCARTHY,
President, American Bakers Association.

"If our allotments of sugar are further reduced we will have to reduce our utilization of the abundant wheat supply and the availability of bakery products to just that extent. In other words, if we are going to sustain a reduction of 10 percent, or 20 percent, in our present allotments of sugar, there will be 10 percent or 20 percent less bread and other bakery products for the American people. Many bakers cannot sustain any such cut in production without closing their doors."

FRANK G. JUNGEWAELTER,
Secretary, Associated Retail Bakers of America.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this message or advertisement summarizes the recommendations of the committee headed by our colleague CLINTON P. ANDERSON for the purpose of trying to avoid or at least minimize a food shortage.

You will note that the Bakers Weekly lists 11 recommendations of the House Food Investigating Committee. Congress ought to know if those recommendations are being translated into action. The American people have a right to look to Congress for protection against irresponsible and ill-advised policies of Government agencies and bureaus. If they do not function, Congress should abolish them and new administrative departments created with able and qualified men to direct them. We will have no relief from the food shortage until this is done.